UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 81st CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

Appendix

VOLUME 96—PART 15

APRIL 21, 1950, TO JUNE 7, 1950

(PAGES A2863 TO A4294)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1950

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

MAY 4 1951

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 81st CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Appendix

National Capital Sesquicentennial Celebration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an address by the Honorable ALBEN W. BARKLEY, Vice President of the United States, at ceremonies marking the official opening of the sesquicentennial celebration on the Capitol Plaza on April 15, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Distinguished guests and fellow Americans, we are celebrating this year the Sesquicentennial of the city of Washington as the Capital of the Nation. In particular, we mark the anniversary today of the laying of the foundation stone of the Federal City which has in time become not only a noble Capital befitting the Government of a great and free people, but a symbol of the hope and strength of freedom to people everywhere in the world.

At about the time when the city of Washington was beginning to rise along the edges of the marshes which lined the Potomac River, Tom Paine was writing his famous book, "Rights of Man." Paine, who said of himself that, "My country is the world, and my religion is to do good," had come to America penniless and self-educated, as he was not the first and by no means the last to do, to one of the great glories of our Nation.

In the Rights of Man, Tom Paine was seeking parallels between the American Revolution and the French Revolution which our land had stimulated. In arguing that the American revolution had broken the ice, as far as revolutions were concerned, and that it was only natural that revolutions would follow in other places, Paine said this, "That the probability is always greater against a thing beginning than of proceeding after it had begun."

Tom Paine was one of the relatively few people anywhere in the world in his day who understood the full significance of the American revolution. He knew that this was no mere result of complaints against absentee government. He knew that it was not solely the consequence of taxation without representation, and that it was not alone the result of dissatisfaction with rule under the British crown. He recognized that the changes which would be wrought by the revolution in the American colonies would be vaster than a change in allegiance from a foreign to a local government. He understood that this was a fundamental reconstruction of the purposes of government and of the society on which that government was based. This was the revolution for the establishment of the rights of man.

Paine could not really have thought that there was much improbability in the staging of a revolution in America. That revolution grew straight out of the developing character of the American people. Different action on the part of the British parliament and leaders might possibly have changed the date of the American revolution; but at most it would have been postponed. The particular types of people who felt the call of America and came to her shores, the nature of the boundless country to which they emigrated, together demanded the right to independence for their colonies, and more particularly for themselves. They demanded the ultimate dignity of freedom.

"The revolutions which formerly took place in the world," Paine wrote, "had nothing in them that interested the bulk of mankind. They extended only to a change of persons and measures, not of principles, and rose or fell among the common transactions of the moment. What we now behold may not be improperly called a counterrevolution. Conquest and tyranny, at some earlier period, dispossessed man of his rights and he is now recovering them, and as the tide of human affairs has its ebb and flow in directions contrary to each other, so also is it in this. Government founded on a moral theory, on a system of universal peace, on the indefeasible, hereditary rights of man, is now revolving from west to east"—that is, from America to France—"by a stronger impulse than the government of the sword revolved from east to west. It interests not particular individuals but nations in its progress and promises a new era to the human race."

Paine thought that it was more difficult to win freedoms in the first place than to maintain them after they were won. I am not sure that this is the case. Party platforms are rarely known for their quality as abiding literature. But one sentence from the platform of a political party in 1924—it was the Progressive Party of Bob La Follette—has become a part of our heritage. "Every generation," it said, "must wage a new war for freedom against new forces which seek through new devices to enslave mankind."

That has been relentlessly true in our own country. It is true today as we face the most powerful and aggressive foe in our history as a nation. If the American and the French Revolutions were triumphs for the rights of man, what the world is offered today is the counterrevolution of tyranny, and let us make no mistake about it. What is hidden in the vestments of a utopian Marxist world of peace and plenty is a perverted and gnawing lust for imperial power which in its magnitude of scope would have made Caesar pale and Alexander tremble.

The propagandists for this foe call us warmongers. They claim to be the sole champions of peace, and they maintain the largest military machine in the world.

The propagandists for this foe claim to be apostles of freedom, yet in their so-called labor camps are more slaves than have been kept in bondage by any nation at any time in the history of the world.

No citizen is free from searches and seizures of the secret police. Trial by unimagined tortures take the place of trials by jury. There is no freedom of expression, no freedom of the press, no freedom to worship in one's own way, no freedom of enterprise, no freedom to enjoy the profits of one's labors.

This we know, and this as free citizens of a great nation, and as leaders among the forces of free men throughout the world, we can face, confident in our rightness and our strength. But there is another foe of our freedoms, no less insidious, no less dangerous. And this lies within ourselves.

The sharpest threats to the freedoms which we enjoy here in America have come, up to now, not from outside sources, but from within. And it is often precisely when we are threatened with a loss of our freedoms from the outside that we hear voices among us demanding that we cede away some of our freedom here at home in order to protect ourselves from this outside threat. And these same forces which would abridge our freedoms sow rumors and suspicion among us.

The plain truth is that our freedom is our sword. Ours is an imperfect freedom, but year by year, generation by generation we have tempered it and made it strong, polished the dark places to make them glisten like a beacon.

Being human, we make mistakes as people, as a government, as a nation. But if we now diminish, abridge, and reduce this precious heritage of rights and freedoms we shall have made a mistake fatal to the rest of our freedoms, and, in the end, to our existence as a nation.

On the contrary, we must extend our rights and freedoms, we must perfect our own democracy here at home, we must vigorously seek the means of equal freedom for all the world's peoples. We must see that our own Revolution fulfills the prophesy of Tom Paine, that it truly brings a "new era to the human race."

In times such as these there is usually a troubling and pernicious threat to freedom of thought and freedom to hold our own ideas, unpopular though they may be. Tom Paine was one of the real molders of the thought of our infant nation, although he was regarded by many then as peculiar and

unrespectable, perhaps even dangerous. Today he might be charged with being subversive. To those who might so regard him now it is well to recall that Paine wrote that in his day—and it should be pointed out that he was talking about European governments—"we still find the greedy hand of government thrusting itself into every corner and crevice of industry and grasping the spoil of the multitude." We can hear those sentiments still echoed frequently by highly respectable people.

There is a clear danger in attempting to halt the give and take of ideas, for it is here in the realm of reason, and by the test of morality that we shall truly and finally win or lose the battle which is before us.

Those who seek to restrict ideas are those who have no real confidence in America, its people, and its institutions.

"Those who deny freedom to others," said Abraham Lincoln, "deserve it not for themselves, and, under a just God, cannot long retain it."

In the 150 years since the establishment of the seat of the Federal Government in the city of Washington we have seen our Nation grow in size and in might until now it stands at the very forefront of all free and democratic nations. We have seen this city grow out of the marshes to become one of the most magnificent cities of the world. This has been accomplished in part because of a vigorous and growing population, partly because of a wealth of readily available resources. But just as responsible for the growth of this Nation and its power and position in the world has been the insistence on freedom which has welled up from the hearts of every generation of Americans. Our generation will meet all challenges to its freedom, as past generations have done. We shall work and pray to the end that we shall deliver to our children not only a free nation but a free world.

The Fair Deal in Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "The Fair Deal in Virginia," delivered at Richmond, Va., on April 18, 1950, by the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], one of the outstanding and most consistent liberals of the country.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I want to express to you my deep appreciation for the opportunity to visit your State—the birthplace of democracy—and to meet with you here in Richmond. I know that frequently it is difficult for those of you who live in Virginia to realize with how much awe and respect those of us from other sections of America look upon your native State. I well remember my school days as a youngster in a small town in South Dakota, reading about Monticello and Mt. Vernon, and studying the lives of Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, George Mason, Patrick Henry, and the many other illustrious figures in American history. I remember my sisters and my brother and myself talking about those early days and about the great State of Virginia with my father. Later, as a young man in Minnesota and as a student and a teacher of political science at the university there, the picture of Virginia as the birthplace of Presidents took shape more clearly. During my first visit to Washington not so many years ago, I remember that in my mind I looked forward as much to visiting Virginia—the cradle of great American tradition—as I did to visiting our Nation's capitol.

In many ways, therefore, it is with deep sincerity that I say how pleased I am to be with you tonight and to talk with you about affairs of state—problems of our democracy.

I was invited here tonight to participate in a debate with your senior Senator. I welcomed that opportunity and accepted that invitation, because I realized that whatever differences of political philosophy we may have, and whatever differences we may have about our interpretation of current trends, all of us share a common belief in the democratic process and in the importance of free discussion to our democratic way of life. One of the most essential parts of the American tradition is a respect for differences of opinion honestly held, and a recognition that a society without these differences of opinion is not a free society.

I also accepted the invitation to debate here in Richmond, Va., because I was conscious of the vital historical role which the public debate has had here in your own State and in the early development of our country. I need merely to mention the name of Henry Clay to illustrate that role.

I assume that the officers of the Virginia Commonwealth League and the representatives of the affiliated organizations sponsoring this meeting invited me here because I had the occasion in recent months to make clear and public my opposition to some of the activities of your senior Senator. Most particularly, I took issue with the activities of a committee of which he is chairman. It is the merits of my proposal to abolish that committee which was assigned as the topic of this evening's discussion.

I regret very much that the senior Senator from Virginia found it impossible to be here tonight, and to accept your invitation. I do feel that under the circumstances it would not be proper or courteous for me to debate that question in his absence. I do hope that we will have an opportunity to do so soon.

In the spirit of free discussion, however, I want to take this opportunity to discuss what I consider to be one of the most significant new developments in our American political scene. I refer to the growing participation of people in politics.

At the outset, before I begin to tell you what I have to say, let me make very clear what I do not intend to say. If your Virginia newspapers quote no other portion of my remarks tonight, I hope they will quote me to the following effect:

I am not going to discuss your State and local affairs. In spite of the fact that the State of Virginia and the State of Minnesota are both States with approximately 3,000,000 population, and with the same proportion of rural and urban population, and with many of the same problems, I fully appreciate that it is impossible for me, a citizen of Minnesota and a former mayor of Minneapolis, to attempt to tell you here in Virginia and in Richmond how you ought to run your government affairs. I shall not attempt to do so. I know that you, the people of Virginia, are fully able to make whatever changes may be necessary in your own way, in your own time, and in accordance with your own judgment.

We in America have passed through a very interesting period in our political history. There was a time not so long ago when it was possible for an American citizen to live his life, with but few exceptions, relatively free from direct contact and association with his Government. Ours was a simple society. Yes, we paid taxes, but not too much of that.

Affairs of government therefore were frequently and in many States a concern of the few. In the early days it was the concern of those who owned property. In the latter days it was the concern of those who had a business interest to advance through participation in government. Let us not forget that not too many years ago, only those who owned property and were considered men of means had the legal right to vote. There are only a few States in our Nation today who have any remnants of those undemocratic and aristocratic practices left. And even in those States, certainly in your own State, the poll-tax requirement is on the road to oblivion.

It was, therefore, quite understandable that with only the few participating in the political process, only the few were cared for through the political process.

Here is one of the greatest problems our democracy had to face. Democracy is based on the principle of majority rule. The great teachers of democracy have taught us that the judgment of the majority of the people is a far better judgment to follow than the judgment of any single minority, whether it be the few who own property or the few who control wealth. They had that faith because democracy to them meant participation by all the people in the political process. And the political process to them meant that the people would rule through their votes, after becoming informed and intelligent through debate and discussion and a free expression of their views.

The development of American history since that early day has been one of broadening and extending democracy. It has been a continuous striving to attain that goal so beautifully described by Abraham Lincoln when he said that ours was to be a "government of the people, by the people, and for the people." It was striving to make a political reality out of the immortal idea created and championed by that noble Virginian Thomas Jefferson, when he said "all men are created equal, and are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights."

That tradition of human equality, of human brotherhood, and of increasing democracy has been championed in the twentieth century by Theodore Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, Franklin Roosevelt, and Harry Truman. It is receiving its greatest expression today in the program and political life of the New Deal and the Fair Deal.

This, my friends, explains the intensity of the opposition faced by the Fair Deal and the New Deal. The people are beginning to express themselves and as they express themselves the few and the privileged who have looked upon political activity and politics as their business and only their business are fighting to maintain their power and positions of privilege.

Make no mistake about it. The programs of the New Deal and the Fair Deal have helped business. Profits are at the highest level that they have ever been in the Nation's history. The New Deal and the Fair Deal have been good to them at the same time as those programs have provided for our welfare—yours and mine—and the millions of American farmers, workers, and small-business men.

There is only one logical reason for their opposition and their bitter hostility to the New Deal and to the Fair Deal. It is their realization that with the New Deal and the Fair Deal they no longer make the decisions; it is the people who make the decisions.

Nevertheless, it is good constantly to reevaluate the principles of the New Deal and the Fair Deal and subject that program to criticism and constant debate. I would personally far prefer to discuss the issues represented by the New Deal and the Fair Deal

rather than the slogans which the opposition has seen fit to repeat. But, I am prepared to discuss the slogans, too.

I was amused recently to read in the New York Herald Tribune that Governor Dewey delivered a lecture at Princeton University in which he said that it must have been some clumsy Republican who first used the slogan of the "welfare state" to label the Truman administration. You and I know, of course, that it is not only the Republicans who have used that label, but a great many who call themselves Democrats and who use that title behind which to hide their Dixiecrat and Republican ideologies.

In the election of 1948 the Fair Deal program of the Democratic Party faced the opposition not only of the Republican Party but also of the so-called Dixiecrat Party and its allies, many of whom did not have the courage to call themselves Dixiecrats. That Republican Dixiecrat coalition failed in 1948 to take away from the American people the benefits of the New Deal and the Fair Deal, and they will fail again.

You in Virginia know what I mean. All around you you see the signs of a well-laid plan to combine the Republican and Dixiecrat Parties into a seceret alliance to defeat the national Democratic administration and place in power a program and philosophy which would overthrow the principles of the Fair Deal and the New Deal, which we and the majority of the American people believe in and voted to support.

For many years now those of us who call ourselves liberals or New Dealers or Fair Dealers have been accused of trying to change our form of government and our form of society. Our critics say we are trying to create a welfare state or a Socialist state. In my opinion the use of these slogans is an attempt to confuse the issues and to escape facing the issues. It is an attempt to frighten the American people with words by repeating these words over and over again.

I would not deny that there is some merit to the Republican claim that the Fair Deal program seeks the welfare state as an objective. The welfare state is a legitimate objective—one that is perfectly consistent with our traditions and with the current wishes of the American people. A state which is devoted to the welfare of its members, a state which looks upon man and his welfare as an end in itself, is one I support and urge you to support.

The United States began as a welfare state when its Constitution charged the Government with the responsibiliy of the general welfare of its people. In a sense this was one of the great differences between this new country which was born and the tired nations of Europe in the eighteenth century.

From that day until this day the history of the American development has been a history of providing greater welfare for its people.

As early as 1806 Thomas Jefferson of Virginia, as President of the United States, asked Congress to approve a donation of lands for a National Establishment for Education. It is fair to characterize this step as one of the earliest forms of Government subsidy, since land was a financial asset. The use of land during that early period played an important role in developing the concept of Government subsidies. Our Government eventually granted 250,000,000 acres of land for various welfare purposes: for education; for wagon roads so that everyone, not only the rich, could travel easily; for canals and levees; for public buildings; for railroads.

Let us not forget too the significant role played by the Homestead Act of 1862 in developing our Nation and in bringing it to a position of power and responsibility in the world. For those who were not able to make an adequate living in the industrial areas of the East, Congress gave away vast areas of public lands to individual families. Today the Federal Government no longer gives land grants. The modern expression of that program, however, is legislation in behalf of unemployment insurance and social security. Today the method of payment is changed. But land or money, income-producing property, or income, there is no change in principle.

To provide financial assistance for welfare programs has always been a part of America's tradition. Furthermore, I issue the challenge tonight that it is an American tradition which even the opponents of the welfare state want to preserve. The only question which remains an issue is the question of "whose welfare."

As early as 1791 Secretary of the Treasury Alexander Hamilton—the symbol of conservatism—made a plea before the House of Representatives for Federal subsidies to manufacturers.

During the nineteenth century the United States Government gave to the railroads a total of 179,000,000 acres of land.

At this very moment the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the Export-Import Bank assists private industry financially. I suggest that Mr. Guy Gabrielson, himself one of the leading exponents of reaction in America and spokesman for the Republican Party, is in favor of continuing that form of Government subsidy since the Carthage Hydrocol Corp., which he heads, has received the total of more than $18,000,000 in loans from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

In this connection I have one further observation to make. I am a member of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee. In our committee is a bill to raise postal rates. The same magazine and newspaper publishers who daily attack the Fair Deal as a welfare state and oppose Government subsidies for the American people are daily in my office and before our committee, insisting the Government postal subsidy to their business be maintained. Last year the newspaper and magazine publishers of America received a subsidy upward of $200,000,000.

Many of these Government subsidies to business are desirable. But if they are desirable to help profits, they are desirable to help people.

Those of us who would advance proposals for welfare legislation do so because we are striving for a more perfect democracy in which the American people through their Government can build a constantly improving society.

Abraham Lincoln said in 1854, "The purpose of government is to do for the people what they cannot do for themselves or cannot do so well for themselves." That is philosophy which the New Deal and the Fair Deal represent and which I today represent.

What we strive for can best be put in the phrase "economic democracy." That phrase means "a system which preserves the political fabric of democracy and the freedoms traditionally associated with it at the same time as it searches for increased economic freedoms."

A wise man once said, "hungry stomachs do not make good political advisers." It is our objective to use the great wealth, the greater resources, and the great genius which is ours toward strengthening the establishment of a society free from economic insecurity.

We are moving into the second half of the twentieth century, a century which has seen America's productive strength grow beyond the dreams of even the most visionary of our national founders. Today we have the natural resources and the technical knowledge to open up a new vista. President Truman's recent messages to Congress have demontrated the possibilities that are open to us. Merely by continuing our past rate of growth we can within five years increase in production 20 percent, which would mean increasing the average family income by about $1,000 a year. Within our grasp in the next 50 years we can treble today's standard of living which would mean average family incomes of $12,000 a year.

We have an opportunity for the first time in the world's history to establish a society in which every family can have a decent standard of living and in which luxury living will be available to an increasing number of our citizens. It can be a society in which all have enough without unduly limiting the rewards available for the more industrious and the more able.

Yet as these possibilities come to mind, there also comes to mind the increasing complexity of our society.

In the not too distant past opportunity was open to all. If a man was willing to make the effort he could have the richest land and the richest resources for the asking. Today millions of families are dependent on jobs that may disappear tomorrow with no others available. Millions of families live on tiny worn-out farms eking out a bare subsistence. Many of them live right here in Virginia.

In this the land of plenty—in this the century of progress—we in America still have almost 10,000,000 families, or about one quarter of our population, trying to get along on less than $2,000 a year. Many of them live right here in Virginia.

Here is the crisis we face. Here is why we need a Fair Deal program working toward an increasing welfare program working toward greater economic democracy.

There are some who feel that the realization of the dream which is before our eyes cannot be achieved without sacrificing the free enterprise system—and they prefer the free enterprise system.

They are of little faith. I believe in the free-enterprise system—I am not a Socialist. No other system could have made the progress we have made in the past 150 years. But the free-enterprise system in America as we have seen it has always been one receiving encouragement, stimulation, and protection from Government activity—from Government welfare programs.

Let us not forget that the protective tariff, the darling of big business for so many years, was one of the most flagrant examples of governmental interference in behalf of business.

The greatest threat to the free enterprise system in America is not social security, minimum wage, aid to education, rural electrical programs, and the like. The greatest threat to free enterprise in America is growing monopoly in America.

There are those who would have us believe that an unbalanced budget spells the end of free enterprise in America. That is nonsense. I am more concerned about the fact that the Federal Trade Commission recently reported to Congress another half a dozen industries which are dominated by 4 to 6 companies making a total of 19 highly concentrated industries out of 26 studied. I am more concerned that 3 companies control 95.3 percent of the tin cans and other tinware industry; that three companies control 92.1 percent of the linoleum industry; that another three companies control 88.5 percent of the copper smelting and refining industry. In this connection Anaconda Copper alone controls almost half the capital assets of the whole industry and another quarter of the capital assets of the copper industry is controlled by Kennecott Copper Corporation.

I am concerned about the future of the free enterprise system when I learn from the Federal Trade Commission reports that 113 companies, all with assets of more than $100,000,000, own almost half of the manufacturing plan and equipment in the whole of our United States.

The free enterprise system is in danger but the danger does not arise from welfare programs. The danger arises from the fact that from 1940 through 1948, according to the Federal Trade Commission, more than 2,450 formerly independent firms in the manufacturing and mining industries alone disappeared as a result of merger and acquisitions. The asset value of these firms amounted to about $5,200,000,000 or nearly 5 percent of the total asset value of our manufacturing corporations in America. Moreover, nearly one-third of the companies merged were absorbed by the very largest corporations, those with assets exceeding $50,000,000,000.

It is monopoly which threatens a free America. I do not consider unbalanced budgets to be desirable objectives. Unbalanced national budgets, however, are not indications of the basic health of the American economy. The Republicans would balance the budget but they would do so I suggest at the expense of unbalancing the American economy. I remember well the days of the balanced budget under Ogden Mills, Andrew Mellon, and Herbert Hoover, and I remember that those balanced budgets spelled unbalanced family life for millions of Americans. I am more concerned with balancing the daily lives of Americans and their families so that they have full employment; so that they can enjoy the fruits of their labor; so that they can participate in the good life which is possible in our society.

You in Virginia have clear evidence of the effect which the New Deal and the Fair Deal have had on your State and the welfare of your citizens during the past 15 years. Let me address myself for a few moments to those of you who are farmers or who are interested in agricultural problems. I know what I am talking about. I grew up in a farming community in South Dakota. I was a young man in South Dakota when the depression and the drought combined to play havoc with the farm families. I learned a great deal about agricultural problems from first-hand experience—as much as some men learn in the ivory towers of State colleges. I know what it means to own a farm or try to live on a farm with declining farm prices, with mortgages past due, with poor soil conservation and soil erosion, and with big debts.

In 1932 the cash income of the farmers in Virginia was $70,000,000; in 1947, after 15 years of the New Deal, the cash income of the Virginia farmers was $413,000,000—an increase of five times. This is the welfare state of which you are to be frightened. In 1929 nearly $92,000,000 in mortgages was outstanding in Virginia; in 1947 these debts had been reduced to $72,000,000, in spite of the fact that the value of the dollar decreased; and this is the welfare state of which you are to be frightened.

Since 1933 the Farm Credit Administration has given assistance to nearly 12,000 Virginia residents to buy farms through loans of approximately $29,000,000. This has encouraged and made possible the ownership of family-size farms. This has strengthened the institution of private property and free enterprise in Virginia. This is the welfare state of which you are to be frightened.

Today more farmers are able to produce their own food by their own labor and on their own land than ever before. Here is the essence and the finest expression of free competitive enterprise that this or any country could offer. This was made possible through the program of the New Deal—through the welfare state, if you please.

Is it economical? I ask, could we afford to do anything else? The investment of approximately $29,000,000 to help Virginia farmers has done more to preserve free enterprise and the American way of life than any other single investment of like amount that I can think of. The alternative is a land system under which the banks, absentee landlords, and gentlemen farmers in the city own all the good farms.

But I must confess to you that in addition to promoting family farm ownership, the Roosevelt and Truman welfare programs are guilty of another grievous sin insofar as the farmer and his family are concerned. Do you know what they have done? They have very nearly destroyed the market for kerosene lamps on Virginia farms. Now, isn't that awful? Yes, through the REA Virginia farmers, acting together to form cooperatives, have strung in the first 12 years of the REA 14,555 miles of rural lines. They have brought service to 50,000 farms which never enjoyed the benefits of electricity before. When the REA was set up in 1935 less than 8 percent of the Virginia farmers had electric lights. I am told that today that percentage is in excess of 80 percent. I now fully understand why the Virginia citizens voted for Harry Truman and Alben Barkley in 1948, even though they did not receive encouragement from within their own State to do so.

More than two-thirds of Virginia's farmers are participating in the agricultural conservation program of the Production and Marketing Administration. Soil has been conserved and restored. Farms have been improved. Farmers have been enabled to obtain fair prices for their crops. Farm mortgages have been reduced. Tenants are now able to buy farms and make rented land their own. Farmers and farm people appreciate the benefits of electricity as much as you and I in the city. Today the farmers of Virginia are able to get telephone service through the use of REA funds by cooperatives. Incidentally, this market for telephones and electrical appliances will compensate the city folk many hundreds of times over the kerosene-lamp market.

Let me go on with a few additional direct examples of how the Fair Deal program affects the residents of Virginia. In 1947 nearly 115,000 Virginia residents received direct benefits from the Federal Security Agency in old-age pensions or unemployment insurance or child care. In 1947 alone more than $13,000,000 went to Virginia for these programs which benefited every resident of your State through improved health, education, vocational rehabilitation and social security. You should have received more, and more was available to you from the Federal Government. But more than 41,000 residents of Virginia received unemployment benefits in 1947.

I have already made it clear that the Fair Deal and the New Deal programs have helped all the people—and that includes the bankers—the bankers who forget the year 1932 when banks were closing and bankers were committing suicide. In 1933 nine Virginia banks with deposits of $879,000 failed and closed their doors. Today there are deposits of $1,800,000,000 in 314 banks in Virginia. None of these banks have closed and all of these deposits are insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. We still have many problems to concern ourselves with, but the closing of savings banks is not one of them. I thought all of you bankers in the audience would like to know that.

Let me say a few words about the education of your young boys and girls. It might be that the State of Virginia doesn't need Federal funds for education—I don't know. It might be that Virginia has the finest set of schools anywhere in the country—I don't know. But you did receive $105,448,147 in Federal funds for education during the first 16 years of the New Deal beginning in 1932. Furthermore, in 1947 the Veterans' Administration spent $30,769,778 to educate the veterans of World War II in Virginia.

This is the welfare state of which you are to be frightened.

In the dark days of 1938 President Franklin Delano Roosevelt warned the American people. He said: "Democracy has disappeared in several other great nations, not because the people of those nations disliked democracy, but because they had grown tired of unemployment and insecurity. * * * In desperation they chose to sacrifice liberty in the hope of getting something to eat. We in America know that our democratic institutions can be preserved and made to work. But in order to preserve them we need * * * to prove that the practical operation of democratic government is equal to the task of protecting the security of the people."

Yes, this program and these principles which I state have international implications as well. America must prove to the peoples of the world that political democracy and political freedom is not synonymous, as the Communists would have them believe, with industrial anarchy, growing unemployment, and the monopoly state. American democracy must prove that political freedom and political democracy can bring about an economy which is a healthy economy—one which is concerned for the welfare of the people. In fact, political democracy and economic oligarchy are incompatible and there can be no lasting political freedoms so long as economic control is in the hands of the few and so long as economic security is missing in our society.

America has a responsibility in international affairs. It is a responsibility to preserve democracy in the world. It is a responsibility to preserve the peace of the world.

In a speech in the First Continental Congress in Philadelphia on October 14, 1774, the great Virginian, Patrick Henry said, "I am not only a Virginian; I am an American."

We today have a responsibility to say "We are not only Americans; we are citizens of the world." If we are indeed sincere about preserving democracy as a way of life for us and for our children, we must understand that democracy has to be protected all over the world. Those who would oppose assistance to the peoples of Europe—striving to keep their heads above water—are opposing efforts to preserve democracy. They are performing a great disservice; not only a humanitarian disservice, but a great disservice to our own interests and to the interests of our children.

In conclusion, my friends, I make a plea for a rational rather than an emotional approach to the problems of government. I make a plea that we respect the facts.

It is difficult for the American people to understand when Mr. Alfred P. Sloan, Jr., head of the board of General Motors, makes a statement on January 15, 1950: "In recent years economic incentive has been weakened by the ever-increasing take of Government. I fear the effect is beginning to be felt on the economy." And then for General Motors to announce that it had earned $600,000,000 profits in 1949—more than any other company has ever made in the history of American industry. I suggest this is not a rational approach to discussing political issues.

Since the war American big business according to the Federal Trade Commission has been making approximately 20 percent profit on its invested capital after taxes. This compares with about half that figure before the war.

If our political opponents wish to label the program we stand for as a welfare state—then let it be so. Call it what you will—one fact, however, stands out in bold relief. This program has raised the living standards of the American people. It has given a modicum of security to all areas of our population. It has provided a floor on living standards. It is furnishing relief from the apprehensions and anxieties which lead men to surrender their freedom. It is providing minimum protection against the hazard of old age and unemployment. It will provide

prevention from catastrophe of sickness and disease. It is giving decent shelter to more and more of our people. It is putting a floor under wages. It will provide Federal aid to education so as to give every boy and girl equal educational opportunities so that none will remain the slaves of ignorance.

These programs are strengthening the ring of freedom that centuries of struggle has drawn around western man.

These programs are providing the incentive and will set the example which will undermine totalitarianism wherever it may be.

Jefferson, Jackson, and Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I delivered in Denver last night to the annual Colorado Jackson-Jefferson Day banquet.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

After all these years of hope deferred, I cannot tell you how honored and pleased I am to be the speaker at the traditional Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner in Denver. Those who asked me must have been shocked by the immodest speed with which I accepted. Ordinarily I play hard-to-get, like a pretty girl who loves to shop around, but this time I spoke up fast. Frankly, I feared that it might turn out to be one of those pleasant dreams which fade with awakening, so I shouted "Yes" before the ink was dry.

Just 20 years ago when I was candidate for the office of lieutenant governor a very dear political friend, Max Schradsky, who, like all true friends, was brutally frank, said to me, "You will get along with the people all right but the party leaders will never like you." I have pondered that severe observation through the years. And then came this surprise invitation by the unanimous vote of the party leaders. So, at long last, here I am.

I am deeply indebted to the Democratic Party of Colorado. They have honored me with high offices and they have been very patient with me through the years. Our party won a sweeping victory in Colorado in 1948, but it was not an accident. It was according to plan, well thought out and well executed by our party leaders. State Chairman Joe Little and Vice Chairman Fern Miller did a superb job and George Rock, president of the Truman-Barkley Club made political history in Colorado. National Committeeman Barney Whetley and National Committeewoman Marguerite Thompson lent a thousand "assists" in a thousand different ways through the campaign. President Truman and Vice President Barkley gave us the kind of political leadership which counted most. All in all it was a magnificent job.

To a lawyer a place on the bench is a spot near heaven. Therefore, the rest of us are glad to see the man we love, Governor Knous, become Federal Judge Knous. If ever a person deserved the best of Democratic Party has to offer it is Governor Knous. His candidacy in 1946 marked the beginning of the come-back trial for the party in Colorado. Twenty years before, in 1926, the dean of Colorado politics—the beloved Billy Adams and Judge Knous' counterpart—the two men have a strong family resemblance—started the party back from an unemployed status without compensation to a place of trust and responsibility. In 1926 and 1948, a Democratic designation in Colorado was almost as hopeless as a Republican nomination in the solid South, but a miracle happened. The party owes much to both of these humble but stalwart men of noble character. Unpretentious but wise; warm-hearted but firm; self second but Colorado first, their careers stand out like the great mountain peaks which adorn this State. The rich qualities which made Jefferson and Jackson the patron saints of the Democratic Party whom we honor tonight predominate in Billy Adams and Lee Knous.

Like them both Jefferson and Jackson feared the public debt and all four of them have made the "pay-as-you-go" fiscal policy their passion. Jackson, as you will recall paid off the national debt while he was President, and is the only man in history to turn the Presidency over to his successor entirely free from debt. Some sort of a monument ought to be erected in his honor to commemorate that notable achievement. Governors Adams and Knous proved to be not only faithful guardians of the exchequer but they were faithful to every interest of the people. Governor Knous will go on to make the Nation a great—a really great trial judge. His own struggle in life has given him a clear understanding of the tribulations which worry mankind and his big heart, tempered by his firm adherence to simple justice, will make conspicuous his career on the Federal bench.

It gives me genuine joy to congratulate my old friend and member of the Johnson clan as "His Excellency the Governor of Colorado" and to greet his lovely better half, Mrs. Walter Johnson, as the "first lady" of this great State. In you, Walter, Colorado will have another careful, faithful and economy-minded chief executive. I wish both of you the success and happiness you so richly deserve. The Walter Johnson family and the Truman family have so much in common. Both of these first families are humble, sensible, God-fearing commoners whose public careers are dedicated to the promotion of mankind's highest and best aspirations. The solemn words "promote the general welfare and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity" so significant in the preamble of the Constitution, will guide and inspire Walter Johnson just as they have Harry Truman.

Last night in Washington the Colorado Society held a banquet in honor of Colorado's two Cabinet members, Oscar Chapman and Charles Brannan. Without precedent it is a mark of real distinction for one State to have two men sitting in the President's official family. Most States would feel honored to have one Cabinet member, but now the Centennial State has two. It makes us feel mighty important. Both are recognized as distinguished national figures. Both stand out as very able and greatly respected men and officers.

Just 5 years ago upon the sudden death of America's beloved President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, in deep sorrow Harry Truman was called to the most difficult task on this earth. It is hard enough to follow in the footsteps of a man the whole world worshipped, but when Harry Truman succeeded to the Presidency the war still raged on two fronts. With the end of fighting came the transition to peace by a Nation geared to war as the economy and activity of a Nation were never geared to war so completely before. But Harry S. Truman, often with the misgivings of the people, took it in stride. After his surprise victory in 1948 we have quit worrying about Harry S. Truman.

Colorado has four Congressmen. Three of them are Democrats who deserve a big hand from the party. JOHN CARROLL proved to be the "freshman Congressman of the year" when he was first elected and he has continued to grow in stature and favor in Washington from that day to this. WAYNE ASPINALL and JOHN MARSALIS are top men among the newscomers in the Capital today. SAM RAYBURN, the beloved generalissimo of the House, a few days ago said to me, "Where do you Colorado miners dig up all the splendid men you send to the House?" Really, folks, I have never seen two rookie Congressmen take hold of things the way MARSALIS and ASPINALL have. It has been a joy to labor in the congressional vineyard with them.

We are gathered here on an important occasion. This is "kick-off" night. This is the time and place in which the Democrats open the 1950 political "hope chests" in Colorado. From now until the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November it will be buzz and buzz; and yakity-yak, yakity-yak, yakity-yak—for in the springtime of even-numbered years old men's fancy turns to politics. Seeking political office, however, is both honorable and vital in a democracy, so on with the array of political hopefuls. I hope, too, the Democrats may have many women candidates this year. Politics would be stupid indeed without the active participation of candidates and workers from the gentler sex. And especially workers!

Even though events justify it, tonight I shall not follow the time-honored and shopworn "point with pride" and "view with alarm" blood-and-thunder-roaring type of political speech. While this is a partisan group who might enjoy that kind of straight-faced kidding, I hope to be more philosophical in what I have to say, but doubtless less entertaining.

God and country both come before party; but since Government is our most vital and serious business, politics in election years is entitled to our undivided attention. Nevertheless, we must remember always that a political party is the servant of the people and not its master. A political party is not a religion, a social scheme, an economic philosophy, a system of government, or a way of life. A political party is not an end; it is a means to an end. A political party is merely a convenient and realistic instrument of the people through which, by collective action, they are able to participate effectively in the affairs of state. For more than 160 years we have maintained the world's oldest government and the world's foremost democracy through the political party technique.

In Europe many democracies have more than a hundred political parties. There every political faction and every political philosophy has its very own party. There, after the election the leaders of the splinter parties meet in a smoke-filled room and decide the fate of the country through coalition. Over here we have succeeded in holding the number of political parties to the barest minimum. Over here we have just as many shades of political thinking but we form the coalition before we vote instead of afterward, thus escaping from the uncertainties of loose political affiliations.

Nevertheless we have failed miserably and traditionally to get out the vote in the United States. In the democracies of Europe more than 90 percent of the eligible vote. Over here we do well in a red-hot Presidential campaign to get out 50 percent of the eligible voters. Equipped as America is with modern communication and transportation conveniences, coupled with our generous provisions for absentee balloting, there is no comforting explanation for this disquieting situation. Neither of our great parties can be very proud of the disturbing and unpleasant fact that 45,000,000 eligible voters failed to cast a ballot in 1948. Such indifference is dangerous to the Republic. It is a national disgrace

that our great political parties were so lacking in appeal that 45,000,000 electors said, in effect, "I want no part of either of you." Neither party can point with much pride to that bad record and, in truth, to the advantage of the Republic both might well view it with soul-searching alarm. Unless the two parties do a better job of appealing to the voters we may have to go to the splinter-party system here, too. As Democrats, then, it is our first duty to make our party so attractive and compelling that we will get out our share of those 45,000,000 nonvoters in 1950 and thereafter.

Since 1946 for the first time in many years only two political parties are represented in the United States Senate. That does not mean, however, that there is greater political unity in that great deliberative body or in this country for that matter; nor does it signify that the only division of political thinking is between the traditional Republican and Democratic Party philosophies. Far from it.

I have never seen sharper division in political thinking than exists today in the United States Senate. The Republicans have 42 Senators and 4 distinct factions. The Democrats boast 54 Senators and are burdened or blessed, however you view it, with at least 3 very well-defined schools of thought. That is not the whole story by any means. Almost every Senator, in some degree, follows his own ideas. Too, many Members of both parties talk one way in the cloakrooms and vote the other way on the floor. That does not necessarily convict them of being politically fickle or guilty of gross double talk. Senators never forget—nor should they—that in this Republic they represent the people of their States and are duty bound to cast their votes on the basis of what they think the people at home want.

I feel that it is to the credit of the Senate and to the country that we do have these 7 well-defined political schools of thought and probably as many as 50 lesser well-defined political philosophies in the Senate. It proves conclusively that there is no thought regimentation in America. It means that in the Senate we have that friction of minds which is so essential to political independence and freedom.

Should a bandit burst into this room and rob some of the wealthy Republicans who honor us by their presence tonight and who have become prosperous through these many years of Democratic rule from us Democrats, the police would get a wide range of descriptions of the robbers.

One would say the bandit was lean and hungry looking; while the ladies—bless their hearts—might describe him as tall, dark, and handsome. Some would swear he wore an overcoat, while others would insist it was a zoot suit.

Parade the social and economic facts of life before the 96 Members of the Senate and we come up with 7 different verdicts. That is an indication of the complexity of life in the midyear of the twentieth century. It takes all of those 96 concepts blended together to cover the whole field of our social and economic problems. Three blind men examined an elephant and then tried to describe its appearance to their wives. One tall fellow felt of its massive side and said an elephant is exactly like a great wall. A short chap wrapped his arms around the elephant's ponderous legs and decided that an elephant for all the world is like a tree stump. The third observer took hold of the elephant's trunk and concluded an elephant is very much like a rope. Taken separately these blind men badly missed the appearance of a pachyderm. But their collective conclusions properly put together make sense. It requires many minds to make a sound decision. That is why we put 12 men on a jury and 9 good and true men on our Supreme Court.

What a congestion there would be in the world if every human being wanted to live in Colorado, or California, or Canada, or New York City. How hungry would we get if everyone insisted upon spending his life fishing or painting or writing poetry or building highways? What a dreary world it would be if every male were a playboy and every female a glamour girl or, on the other hand, if every youth were austere and every damsel wore a veil. God was wise in making us different mentally and physically. It takes all kinds of people to make a world. No one is sufficient unto himself.

Why, then, should we expect uniformity in the interesting field of politics? Why not a little variety there, too? The Democratic Party is a big tent. It houses a wide range of political thinking. Across the tracks is another tent. It harbors many factions, too. Each of us has his own reasons for selecting either one tent or the other. That free choice is precious and must endure. But the choice within the tent is precious, too, and if the tent is not to be torn in shreds, the right of individual thinking within the party must be respected and accepted as proper and advantageous to the political party housed there.

No wise parent expects all of his children to be exactly alike in their appearance, aspirations, habits, tastes, and deportment. No wise party leader would insist upon his whole membership being peas-in-a-pod. If we want our individual political views respected as being honest and sincere when they are honest and sincere, we must respect the political views of others. The freedom to be wrong is just as vital as is the freedom to be right.

The saddest human performance reported by the press these days is a Sunday election in a totalitarian state. One ticket, one candidate, one bayonet in the buttocks, and 95 percent of the eligible electors voting like sheep, is the most depressing story of intellectual degradation which can be told. Rebellion rages within me when I hear my fellow Democrats advocate voting the party line, meaning their own narrow conception of the party line and in deadly earnest insisting that other members are dirty so-and-sos because they have minds of their own. I recognize such thought oppression for what it is—a Klu Klux Klan concept with disaster for the party lurking under its white robes of good intentions. It is the identical intolerance and bigotry which made Hitler infamous. For Democrats to despise other Democrats for their honest convictions and honest political conclusions is a concept of insane regimentation foreign to the Jeffersonian philosophy of freedom. The fiery independence and spontaneous abruptness of Jackson and the revolutionary nature of Jefferson have intrigued me always.

I am a Democrat because regimentation is repugnant and abhorrent to me. There is something way down deep in me which insists upon reaching my own conclusions in my own awkward way without the domination of anyone or interference of any kind. I feel strongly that God wants me to be that way. With rebellion in my heart I became a Democrat when I was 19 years of age. My whole family were stanch party-line Republicans who looked upon Democrats as evil-minded political heretics.

It has always seemed to me that, until Teddy Roosevelt, Republicans followed the party line religiously with conformity and regularity their great party objective. I couldn't and wouldn't take it. But Teddy planted some seeds of insurrection in the GOP which are bearing fruit today. I rejoice for them and I rejoice for America that they do have four factions in the Senate today. It makes their party bosses uneasy and uncomfortable but it is the most wholesome thing that has ever happened to them.

Perhaps it will make them angry for me to make an observation about their failure to win elections lately, but everyone else is doing it so I shall venture one anyway. Once the GOP learns that shades of opinion is not a crime; once it discovers that its party belongs to the people, too, and that special interests do not have the divine right to call the shots; once it welcomes heretics, free thinkers, and political sinners, to sit at the banquet table with full rights, it will be summoned to power again at least part of the time. The Republican Party tent does not need a purge; it needs to open the entrance flaps a little wider, which will permit some of those 45,000,000 nonvoters to enter and add their counsel and advice to the smug exclusiveness which too long have characterized it.

If the Democratic Party becomes the errand boy for self-serving pressure groups, if it becomes haughty, cocksure, domineering, bigoted, intolerant, and Hitler-like toward all who dare to do their own thinking; if, with purge in its heart and regimentation its goal, it casts a jaundiced eye with nasty suspicion toward other Democrats; and if on the other hand, the Republican Party opens up its tent and its heart to all who want better political service, you will see the minority and the majority parties change positions in America. That is not going to happen because the Democratic Party will not be that foolish nor the Republican Party that wise.

But where does such a philosophy leave party responsibility? After all, the only justification for a political party is to carry out the will of the people and give the individual voter a voice in government by associating him with others of like mind, thereby conferring upon him the advantage of collective action. The thing to remember is that "like minds" is a very general term and does not mean "identical minds."

This is how it works in the United States Senate: Each party elects its party leaders in the good old democratic way and these leaders do what they can in the party caucus and in personal contacts to obtain the collective action of their respective groups. Each party has a policy committee whose duty it is to determine what are and what are not party issues. Any Senator pushing specific legislation has an open invitation to appear before his respective policy committee and try to convince that group that his legislative proposal is sufficiently important to designate it a party issue. However, fortunately for the country, not 1 bill in 20 is made a party issue by either party.

In the Senate, party platforms are not taken seriously. They are written in such glittering generalities traditionally and are so manifestly election propaganda documents that they cannot be much of a guide. All party platforms are against sin, and all are "for the people." So most Senators reserve to their own judgment how best to combat sin and how best to serve the people. Too, most Senators resent and rebel against party pressure except in justifiable and infrequent instances. They like to think that they serve God first, country second, and their party third. Oh, to be sure it is nearly always possible for Democrats to serve all three simultaneously.

I want to confine my discourse tonight to political philosophy without getting into the field of specific political issues, but I am compelled to discuss one issue briefly which, however, does border on political philosophy.

Our foreign policy should not be determined on a partisan basis. Once we get beyond that 3-mile shore line, partisan politics should end. During the war, F. D. R. very wisely made the war's prosecution bipartisan. The Atlantic Pact, the Chapultepec Conference, and the United Nations San Francisco Conference, out of whose loins came the United Nations Charter, were set

up by him on a strictly bipartisan basis. President Truman followed that policy religiously for 4 years. However, since the election in 1948 our bipartisan foreign policy has been falling apart at the seams. Both parties equally are to blame for this unfortunate state of affairs.

The situation has been high-lighted in recent weeks by the McCarthy charges and countercharges. In an uneasy and distraught world, washing our dirty linen in public has been bad—very bad. The net result has been, temporarily at least, to embarrass and destroy our diplomatic service throughout the world. President Truman is trying hard now to restore the bipartisan status. His appointments to the State Department of former Senators Cooper and Dulles, who are partisan Republicans, are steps in the right direction. More, much more, needs to be done.

The United States must settle down to the facts which are embarrassing the world, with candor, sobriety, and full comprehension. While the tension in Europe and Asia is growing alarmingly, the dangers of a shooting war are remote, but our arch-enemy, Russia, may be expected to wage an unrelenting cold war against us during the whole foreseeable future. Russia is especially proficient in that kind of warfare. Her oriental concept of limitless time, and her known ability at international chess, make her a formidable foe. We dare not lose it for a cold war can be as dangerous as a hot war. The nation which does not win the aggravating cold war, in which we are presently engaged, faces frustration, economic instability, and political dissolution. May we ponder that shocking dilemma prayerfully.

We must start playing chess too. Russia has her Politburo of 14 master minds where every international issue is weighed and analyzed with meticulous care. To combat that excellent technical strategy for prosecuting a cold war we must organize at once a bipartisan council of 14 of our ablest men. Seven of them should be partisan Republicans, not so-called Truman Republicans but partisan Republicans chosen by the Republicans whose love of country rises above partisan considerations in foreign affairs, and seven of them should be the same kind of Democrats.

They should be given every shred of secret information on foreign developments and international maneuvers which we are able to gather. Given the facts, they could develop long-range strategy, make realistic plans and outline international policies. Regardless of what party was in power in Washington, they would remain on guard. Great Britain is the most successful world power in the field of diplomacy of history. Her foreign policy does not change with her elections. Under Tory, Liberal, or Labor Parties Great Britain's foreign policy remains the same yesterday, today, and tomorrow. Such stability in itself insures success.

Under our Constitution the President cannot be bound by the decisions of such a council as I have outlined. Under our system the President is supreme in international affairs, subject, of course, to certain limited congressional checks, but it is inconceivable that any President of any party would not make the proposed council his good right hand. As I see it, that is the first step in combating Russia's cold war which is forcing us so rapidly into uncontrolled inflation and bankruptcy. Personally, I would go so far as to amend our Constitution and provide by law for such a council, spelling out its duties and responsibilities and making its decisions binding upon all.

And now in conclusion:

While I enjoy having the Democratic Party the top dog I believe in the two-party system with all my heart.

The people of this State and this country need vigorous party competition. I can think of nothing more detrimental to the progress of Colorado than to have but one political party. Party rivalry along constructive lines is the people's best political insurance. Of course, no one can find fault with the Democratic Party if it plans to render such an excellent service that a majority of the voters will support it. That is what we are here for tonight. That will be the heart and soul of our 1950 political campaign but none of us want the opposing party to roll over and play dead. We want them and we expect them to fight to the last ditch for their policies and their principles. Out of such a contest will come better government.

I want the party of my choice to render the people a progressively better political service. I want to see it attract to its folds as many of the 45,000,000 nonvoters as it can—not by glittering promises of unearned gifts and special privileges, but by espousing the principles of our patron saints, Jefferson and Jackson, and on such a basis appealing for confidence and approval. I repeat that it is a reflection upon all political parties that 45,000,000 eligible electors in the United States see so little in any political party to inspire them today that they refuse to bother about voting. That great army of voluntarily disfranchised Americans is our party's greatest challenge, and our party's grandest opportunity.

Address of Hon. Thurmond Chatham, of North Carolina, Before the National Association of Wool Manufacturers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE R. HOEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix to the RECORD a very splendid address delivered by Representative THURMOND CHATHAM, the able and distinguished Representative from the Fifth Congressional District of North Carolina. Representative CHATHAM has had broad experience in domestic and international affairs, and this address deals with most important and vital questions relative to our international problems. It will be found both interesting and informative.

The address was delivered before the National Association of Wool Manufacturers in New York on April 12, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THROUGH THE LOOKING GLASS

Of course I am happy to be here among my friends and associates of former times. I spent many pleasant years as an active member and director of this association, and, in my whole experiences, I have never encountered a group of men who were more forward-looking, patriotic and hard working than the members of this company. Through peace and war, you have tried to do your part for the building up of our country and our general welfare. I have not always agreed with the policies of the association, nor with the policies of my competitors, nor, in fact, with the policies of my own associates in the manufacturing and merchandising of Chatham blankets, but I have never felt that disagreement was unhealthy—at least in business. I may have to reserve my opinion of the political healthfulness of disagreeing—at times—with one's own administration.

If you disagree today with many of the things I am going to say, I will be more pleased than if you take it for granted that I am following some party line and that my observations and opinions are not worth the energy required for an argument.

I feel very fortunate to have had practically a front row seat in the world's theater during the past 11 years. I was in England when the war clouds were gathering in 1939, and I was there when the German-Russian agreement was announced, and I shared the apprehension and depression which that news created. I was there when the German legions marched into Poland, and I was within 4 hours steaming of the ill-fated *Athenia* when she became the first major casualty of the new war.

I came home fired with the determination that I would try to do something to help us avoid war. I had served in the United States Navy during the period 1917–19 and my experiences on various fighting craft were not pleasant. I, therefore, made several speeches in North Carolina in the fall of 1939 and my theme was "Get Prepared." I was severely criticized by a large segment of the press of my State and called a warmonger and perhaps a war profiteer. These articles and editorials are a matter of record.

When we were attacked at Pearl Harbor, I was called into the service of the Navy as a former Reserve and served 4½ years in various capacities. I was asked to organize the lend-lease section of naval ordnance. I dealt with our allies, including the Russians, for 15 months. I then went to sea as third in command of the U. S. S. *Phoenix*, one of our light cruisers and the flagship of Crudiv 15, *Phoenix, Boise,* and *Nashville*. I was at Casablanca for a brief time and then in the Southwest Pacific where I saw action against the Japanese for many months, and was recalled to Washington to serve with my good friend, James Forrestal. I had a front seat during the closing months of the war because I was with a man who will probably go down in history as one of our all-time all-Americans.

Came the final peace—VJ-day—and a few months later I returned to normal life—but not to normal condiitons. The problems of peace can be just as great as the problems of war, and since I had been out of active service in business for some years, I entered the political field—arena might be a better word. I was persuaded—quite easily—to run for Congress in the spring of 1946, and, because I had given up the active direction of my business, I felt that I might be of further use to my country—the one that had done so much for me, and the one that I had done so little for between World Wars I and II.

I feel very embarrassed in giving you such a personal account of my own activities but I hope that you will appreciate the fact that I have had the fortunate experiences of taking an active part in world events that has been afforded to few people—certainly to few people of my age and training. What I say now will be on my own—my own summary of the present situation and my estimate of a view through "the looking glass."

I am not here to talk Democratic or Republican politics. I hope I am able and qualified to talk American politics.

I am convinced that our prewar world has gone forever. We, the United States of America, are the main cog in a big wheel—whether we like it or not. At the end of the war we thought we had agreements among our allies, and that we faced a long era of peace—an era to repair our wartime casualties and form a firm foundation for continued progress. No one of us ever thought we would at once enter into a new sphere of uneasy peace. It was inconceivable.

Let's bring it down to our own businesses. We have weathered a crisis, and we breathe a sigh of relief—smooth sailing should lie ahead. We wake up and find one of our main partners completely out of step. We wake up to find a trusted partner has turned out to be undependable, secretive, grasping, untruthful, and dishonest. How can you do business with a partner like that? In business, if he was a minority partner, you would throw him out. If he was a majority partner, he would throw you out. If he was an equal partner, you would have to fight it out with him.

We are today fighting it out with him—move and countermove. Our battle lines have formed, and the strategy of each side is becoming plainer every day. If you agree with me that weaklings seldom win, you will also agree with me that we must never again be classed as weaklings. I would like to quote something that I heard from my preacher many years ago. He is now a bishop, but then he was a young minister speaking to a small group on Navy Day 1927. I take it from my diary. After telling us that we should each do something for our country and of our obligations to our country, he said, "As a minister of the Gospel, I speak of peace, but also as a minister of the Gospel, I commend to you the words of the Apostle 'When a strong man, armed, keepeth his palace, his goods are in peace.'"

I commend this to you. To each of you.

As a sophomore in the Congress, and as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, I am still sitting in the front row. I am wholeheartedly in favor of our present foreign policy. It is a policy unique in American history, but I believe that to them that do good will come the rewards. The Marshall plan is unique but it is working and will continue to work if our own fifth column does not sabotage it.

When General Marshall set forth his plan at Harvard in 1947, western Europe was in turmoil. Here was a meeting of a man and a date with destiny and one of those opportunities so seldom afforded in the history of our civilization. It was a new concept of the Golden Rule for, without hope of reward, we, the American people, were advised to give of our sustenance to those in distress, friend and foe alike. I couldn't take it in—I was too dumb. And then I began to think. I was raised in the shadow of the Civil War—the War Between the States. On one of my grandfather's knees, I heard the stories of Bull Run, of Second Manassas, of Shiloh and Missionary Ridge. On my other grandfather's knees I heard the story of Bedford Forrest, of the hit-and-run principle of "getting thar f'ustes with the mostes'." But more than that, I heard of the plight of the South during reconstruction. I heard of the loss of the South's best friend, Abe Lincoln, of Andrew Johnson who was persuaded to punish the prostrate rebels—of Sumner and Stevens and the long bitter years of recrimination.

Suppose the North—many of our own blood kin, had offered the South a Marshall plan? Suppose the North had said, "We have won the war, we are now one people and we are going to give you money and technical skills—and sympathetic understanding. We are going to help build you up in a partnership, forgetting past differences, forgetting past bitterness and forgetting everything except that we are Americans." Supposing they had said that? Don't you think we would have been ahead 50 years and that we all would have profited enormously by the transaction?

That's my own argument for the Marshall plan. I have seen it in action—in western Europe during the last few months. Recovery beyond belief—recovery among friends and foes. The tide of communism, so rampant in 1947, pushed back within its own constricted borders. Recovery in Holland, Belgium, France, Italy, western Germany, and slowest, but not least, in Great Britain. Of course, it is not perfect. Is your own business? But recovery just the same. The forces of democracy have made so many touchdowns against the forces of communism, that the score is becoming one-sided.

As I see it, we have got to become international-minded. We have got to forget about what is happening in Fall River, New Bedford, Lawrence and Elkin, what is happening in Massachusetts, Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont, Virginia, North Carolina and Georgia, and begin thinking what is happening in Belgium, France, Italy, Israel, Egypt, India, Pakistan, and China. We had better begin thinking about our selling agents in a world so tiny that we could go around it in less time than our grandfathers took to cross Rhode Island.

I'll get a little confidential. I have always been very pro-British, although they have out-traded me all my life. They have proved to be our most dependable allies when the chips were down. I have fought by their side and I know personally that when the going is tough, they will step in where angels fear to tread. But today, the project of western union—the almost necessary combination of western European nations, is in my mind, being held up by our British cousins. They can't see that their survival depends upon their giving up something they have not got—the glory and prestige of the nineteenth century British Empire.

I stand before you as an advocate of our present foreign policy—a strong foreign policy. To be strong we must be prosperous, and we cannot be prosperous nor strong alone. I stand before you and express my confidence in the direction of our State Department. I think Secretary Acheson is one of the greatest Secretaries of State in our history. I agree with Senator VANDENBERG that politics should be out, and I think that Dean Acheson is just as capable of directing our foreign policy as Albert Butler is capable of running Chatham Manufacturing Co., and that's saying a lot—verse, chapter, and book. I think that our President has lately made a series of outstanding appointments, even if he has turned down my own postmasters in North Carolina. Gordon Gray, Stuart Symington, Frank Pace, and Tom Finletter are ace high in any company. We are in a warm war and we desperately need good men. We have got a lot of them. If I could pick Franklin Hobbs, Lew Hird, Dean Walen, Harold Walter, Mose Pendleton, Everett Kent, Win Schuster, John Hutcheson, Chet Wiese, and some of the rest of you to run the United States of America, I would say that it would be in fairly good hands. We might even put our friends Bennett and Riemer in charge of propaganda, but the cotton fellows would say that we were playing politics. I would make Hugh Bolton my General Vaughan and Vern Fisher Director of the Budget. If I could appoint Tom Sheehe as Protestant Chaplain General, we would really have a team.

Forget foreign competition. You are never going back to the "good old days," because there never were any "good old days." If we have a prosperous, peaceful world, we will prosper. We are lucky to be alive and kicking and to be the wonder and envy of the rest of mankind. Forget politics as such and go out and do some work for your Government, and I don't mean contracts. Consider a foreign hook-up, as you used to consider a branch in the South. Why don't you think about helping build up the standard of living in other lands? Just as the United States of America is your best market, help make a market in countries friendly to us. American industry, and I speak especially of the woolen industry, has a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity. Think seriously of point 4, giving technical know-how to other countries. Forget tariffs and concessions. Think of your survival and preach the advantages of more things for everybody. We came up by our own bootstraps. How about helping some other nation do the same? We in the South came from nothing and the worst that could happen to us would be to go back to nothing. That would be just where we started, and I can't see anything frightening about that.

If I had you with me in government, and we could make Arthur Besse Secretary of State and Ed Wilkinson Secretary of the Interior, we wouldn't hear many squawks about Socialist trends. I wish I could put over the fact that we are in a new age—you know it as well as I—and that if we can have peace, we have not scratched the surface of prosperity. The world is our oyster, but you—you here before me—have got to take your responsibilities. Don't come moaning to me about what is going on. Do something about it in your own bailiwick. I'm sick and tired of my business friends coming to me and saying that the country has gone to hell and that they want me to do something. If you send a man to Washington to represent you, what he does there is your responsibility. You had better come down South and find out why we have so many important committee chairmanships. You had better look around and see wh' Emil Rieve controls so many votes in Congress. I admire Emil Rieve because he sticks to his knitting, and so many of our group constantly drop stitches.

If you can go to bed tonight and say that you have done something today that will forward the causes of democracy, I will take off my hat and make my best bow. But don't go to bed thinking that you have outtraded Davis and Furber or Crompton and Knowles when you had better be thinking about a good foreign policy and what you—you—could do for your country.

I leave you with a word of advice—how easy it is to give and how hard to take—and I say it seriously:

Send your business abroad.
Send your boys into Government.
It's your business and your Government.
It's my business and my Government.

Our Government has got its hands in your pocket, and my pocket, and as long as we fail to take an active part in the management, we should not have the right to say much about its policies.

Personally, I hold you responsible for the actions and decisions of my colleagues in Washington. I have seen very few of you there, although you are important stockholders in the United States of America. I am almost bitter in my feelings toward those who criticize so freely and dodge so adroitly. We talk of budgets and balances—we talk of farmers and unions. Why don't you jump in and see whether the swimming is fine?

We have been blessed beyond belief, and if everything doesn't go to suit you, don't blame it on Harry Truman or THURMOND CHATHAM, or your own Representative. Take a look in the glass and see if you can say to me—I've done the best I can.

Defense Department Press Releases Constitute Dishonest Hoax Upon Aircraft Workers

REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL HINSHAW
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 20, 1950

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, certain press releases have been emanating from

the Office of the Secretary of Defense, such as one which I will include in the RECORD as part of my remarks. This article is as follows:

AIR FORCE AND NAVY TO BUY 2,048 PLANES FOR NEARLY $2,000,000,000

(By John A. Giles)

The Air Force and Navy are purchasing 2,048 new aircraft this fiscal year.

The Defense Department, announcing the award of plane contracts yesterday, said the Air Force would get 1,250 planes at an estimated cost of $1,297,500,000 and that the Navy would buy 798, costing an estimated $557,500,000.

The largest Air Force contract went to Boeing Airplane Co., for B-47 Stratojet bombers, costing an estimated $303,600,000. A Stratojet set an unofficial transcontinental record of 3 hours and 46 minutes, flying 2,289 miles from Moses Lake, Wash., to nearby Andrews Air Force Base last February.

The Air Force will spent $267,800,000 with Consolidated Vultee for the controversial B-36 bombardment planes.

HELICOPTERS ORDERED

The only new type of procurement by the Air Force is for helicopters. It will buy H-21 Arctic rescue helicopters, or Flying Bananas, from the Piasecki Helicopter Corp., for $9,300,000. The Navy will spend $4,156,064 with Piasecki for helicopters.

North American Aviation, Inc., received a $130,900,000 Air Force contract for building F-95 interceptor fighters, while the Lockheed Aircraft Corp. was awarded a $120,000,000 contract for F-94 two-place radar-equipped interceptors.

Fairchild Aviation will build more C-119 Packets, capable of hauling 18 tons of men and equipment, at a cost of $40,000,000 for the Air Force.

The Navy's largest award went to Grumman Aircraft Engineering Corp. for twin-jet F9F Panther fighters, costing $92,902,841. The same firm also received a contract for $41,308,714 for building AF Guardian single-engine attack bombers.

SIXTY-EIGHT MILLION DOLLARS FOR BANSHEES

McDonnel Aircraft Corp. received a $68,637,434 contract for building the F2H Banshees, which the Navy has said was capable of knocking down the B-36 at altitudes in excess of 40,000 feet.

The Navy will spend $36,700,941 with Lockheed to provide additional P2V Neptune jet bombers. A Neptune holds the world's long-distance record.

Other Air Force contracts:

C-97 transports, $32,800,000, Boeing; T-29 transport navigational trainers, $9,800,000, Consolidated Vultee; C-124 troop carriers, $84,500,000, Douglas Aircraft Co.; SA-16 amphibious air-sea rescue planes, $7,800,000, Grumman; T-33 trainers, $26,900,000, Lockheed; F-86 Sabre fighters, $34,400,000, North American; T-28 jet trainers, $15,600,000, North American; F-89 Scorpion all-weather fighters, $81,800,000, Northrup Aircraft, Inc.; F-84 Thunderjet fighters, $37,400,000, Republic Aviation Corp.

MORE NAVY JETS

Other Navy contracts:

F3D twin-jet fighters, $61,666,933, Douglas; AD single-engine attack planes, $12,121,360, Douglas; TO single-jet trainers, $1,265,000, Lockheed; P5M two-engine bombers, $31,700,941, Glenn L. Martin Co.; AJ twin-engine single-jet attack bombers, $16,563,982, North American; F4U single-engine fighters, $9,112,000, United Aircraft Corp., Chance Vought division.

The Air Force said additional aircraft procurement of about $94,300,000 is being obligated for related items of service, such as transportation, ground handling equipment and modification of existing types. It added that minor adjustments in costs and total number of aircraft might take place before June 30.

The Navy said that in addition to contracts already awarded for aircraft and aircraft equipment, $174,700,000 of procurement, primarily for Government furnished equipment, is being negotiated.

Mr. Speaker, the Defense Department, the Air Force and Navy, are not issuing new plane contracts and did not do so yesterday. These articles constitute a cruel hoax upon the aircraft workers and all persons connected with the aircraft industry, as it leads them to believe that new planes are being ordered. As a matter of fact, these planes were ordered last October and November pursuant to appropriations made last year for plane purchases. Nearly all of these contracts were announced in the press at the time so that this is only a rehash of what was published 5 months and more ago. In consequence of reading these articles today in the newspapers, unemployed aircraft workers are flocking into their union headquarters and into aircraft plants looking for their old jobs. Some of them have made contracts for the purchase of homes in the expectation of getting work or having assurances of continued work. Others have contracted for other types of purchases on the strength of these articles. This constitutes a dishonest hoax upon the aircraft workers of the United States, and news releases like this should not be permitted to emanate from the Office of the Secretary of Defense. Members of Congress are not fooled by these releases because they understand the terms used, but aircraft workers and the local merchants and others do not understand. They think that new orders are just now being placed.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, the numbers of planes stated in these releases fool the people because the ordinary citizen is lead to believe that all the planes listed are combat types, whereas many planes in the totals are trainers or transports.

Mr. Speaker, I append hereto the original news releases from the Department of Defense which served as the basic information upon which the many news articles were based.

The news releases referred to are as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE,
OFFICE OF PUBLIC INFORMATION,
Washington D. C. April 18, 1950.

AIR FORCE PURCHASING 1,250 AIRCRAFT FROM FISCAL YEAR 1950 FUNDS

The United States Air Force is purchasing 1,250 new aircraft from fiscal year 1950 aircraft procurement funds at a total estimated cost of $1,297,500,000

The estimated cost for complete aircraft and spares is $1,203,200,000. The airframe manufacturers listed below will receive approximately one-half of these funds for the manufacture of airframes only, and the remainder of the estimated cost will go to other manufacturers for engines, propellers, armament, communicat'ons equipment and other related items of procurement.

Additional aircraft procurement funds in the amount of $94,300,000 are being obligated for related items of equipment or service such as transportation, ground handling equipment, modification of existing types, and other costs to support the aircraft program which are not chargeable to the purchase of specific aircraft models.

Model	Estimated cost of complete aircraft (millions)	Air-frame manufacturer
B-47	$303.6	Boeing.
C-97	32.8	Do.
B-36	267.8	Consolidated Vultee.
T-29	9.8	Do.
C-124	84.5	Douglas.
C-119	40.6	Fairchild.
SA-16	7.8	Grumman.
F-94	120.0	Lockheed.
T-33	26.9	Do.
F-86	34.4	North American.
F-95	130.9	Do.
T-28	15.6	Do.
F-89	81.8	Northrop.
H-21	9.3	Piasecki.
F-84	37.4	Republic.
Subtotal	1,203.2	
Transportation, ground handling equipment, modifications of existing types, etc.	94.3	
Total	1,297.5	

The Air Force aircraft-procurement program for fiscal year 1950 is under continuing study and minor adjustments in estimated costs and total number of aircraft may take place before the end of the fiscal year.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE,
OFFICE OF PUBLIC INFORMATION,
Washington, D. C., April 18, 1950.

NAVY PURCHASING 798 AIRCRAFT FROM FISCAL YEAR 1950 FUNDS

The United States Navy is purchasing 798 new aircraft with fiscal year 1950 aircraft-procurement funds at a total estimated cost of $557,500,000.

The estimated cost for complete aircraft and spares is $550,600,000 and the remaining $6,900,000 will cover related items such as ground handling equipment not chargeable to specific models. Airframe manufacturers will receive approximately one-half of these funds for the manufacture of airframes only, and the remainder of the estimated cost will go to other manufacturers for engines, propellers, communications equipment, and other related items of procurement.

The amounts indicated below represent contracts let to date for each model for both airframes and other aircraft equipment.

Model	Contracts awarded	Air-frame manufacturer
F3D	$61,666,933	Douglas Aircraft Co., Inc.
AD	12,121,360	Do.
F9F	92,902,841	Grumman Aircraft Engineering Corp.
AF	41,308,714	Do.
P2V	36,700,942	Lockheed Aircraft Corp.
TO	1,265,000	Do.
P5M	31,406,562	Glenn L. Martin Co.
F2H	68,637,434	McDonnel Aircraft Corp.
AJ	16,583,982	North American Aviation, Inc.
HUP	4,156,064	Piasecki Helicopter Corp.
F4U	9,112,000	United Aircraft Corp., Chance Vought division.
Total contracts awarded to date.	375,900,000	

In addition to the contracts already awarded for aircraft and aircraft equipment, $174,700,000 of procurement, primarily for Government-furnished equipment, is in the process of negotiation.

Address by Hon. James M. Mead Before the Baltimore Organization of the Better Business Bureau

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, a distinguished former Member of the United States Senate, the Honorable James M. Mead, now a member of the Federal Trade Commission, addressed the Baltimore organization of the Better Business Bureau recently regarding the role of the Federal Trade Commission in furthering and safeguarding the American system of free enterprise.

The facts and views presented by Mr. Mead will interest the great body of businessmen throughout the country, I am sure. For this reason I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Mead's address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The president of your organization sent me a copy of the notice of your meeting today which stated that the subject of my remarks would be threefold: Why there is a Federal Trade Commission; How its operations affect your business; and The part the FTC plays in promoting and protecting the American free-enterprise system of business.

That is a large order for a few remarks after lunch, particularly from one who has only been recently appointed as a member of the Commission. However, during the period in which I was in the House of Representatives and the Senate, I had on occasion the opportunity to observe the work of the Commission and I was impressed not only by its past accomplishments but by the opportunity the Commission had to foster and promote fair practices in American business.

Our political and economic principles are based on the concept of free enterprise. For enterprise to be free, however, it must be fair. That concept is basic. You are not free to transact your business if you are stifled and suppressed by monopolies or beset by unfair competitors. The consumer does not buy on a free competitive market if the price which he pays has been fixed by conspiracy or monopoly or he has been induced to purchase commodities by deceit or fraud. Most of our people demand that our commerce be free, competitive, and fair. Because of that demand there is a Federal Trade Commission.

A little historical perspective may be informative and of interest. After the industrial revolution and the advent of the machine age in the latter part of the nineteenth century the problems presented by the concentration of productive wealth and the resulting monopolistic conditions were growing apace. In 1890 the Congress enacted the Sherman Act which made illegal conspiracies in restraint of trade. In the early part of the twentieth century, due to the constantly increasing problems of monopoly and other unfair trade practices, there was a strong demand for new legislation to supplement the Sherman Act. This demand culminated in President Woodrow Wilson sending a message to Congress in 1913 in which he recommended the creation of an Interstate Trade Commission. President Wilson said:

"The opinion of the country would instantly approve of such a Commission. It would not wish to see it empowered to make terms with monopoly or in any sort to assume control of business, as if the Government made itself responsible. It demands such a Commission only as an indispensable instrument of information and publicity, as a clearinghouse for the facts by which both the public mind and the managers of great business undertakings shall be guided, and as an instrumentality for doing justice to business where the processes of the courts or the natural forces of correction outside the courts are inadequate to adjust the remedy to the wrong in a way that will meet all the equities and circumstances of the case."

That is a very good general answer to the question of why there is a Federal Trade Commission and most of it is pertinent as of today.

For the purpose of brevity, the answers to the next two questions assigned to me for my remarks can be combined, that is, how the operations of the Commission affect your business and the part the Commission plays in promoting and protecting the free-enterprise system in American business.

The Commission was created by the Federal Trade Commission Act passed by the Congress in 1914. The act provides for the appointment by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate of five Commissioners for terms of 7 years each. All policy and other important decisions of the Commission are made by a majority of the Commissioners. The work of the Commission may generally be divided into economic and legal or fact reporting and law enforcing. However, no clear distinction between the two can be made because economic studies and fact finding often present legal questions which must be solved, and the problems of law enforcement in our particular field are partly economic. In matters relating to monopoly and unfair competition, economics and law overlap, and the one is frequently a part of the other.

As one of its functions, the Commission makes general investigations and reports thereon to the Congress for the purpose of aiding the Congress in initiating and considering legislation. For illustration, the investigation by the Commission of the meatpacking industry was largely responsible for the enactment by the Congress of the Packers and Stockyards Act. The utility investigation by the Commission was greatly responsible for the creation of the Securities and Exchange Commission. As a result, you and others have more and better information available to you when you purchase shares of stock in corporations.

You are perhaps more interested in our law-enforcement activities. Section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act makes it illegal to engage in unfair methods of competition or unfair or deceptive acts or practices in interstate commerce. You may ask—how do these provisions affect you or your business? If you live in this country and do not live in a complete vacuum, these provisions affect you very strongly and very directly. For illustration, you are interested in building an addition to your store or factory and cement must be purchased for such construction. You believe of course that you are entitled to purchase cement at a competitive price. You will not be quoted a competitive price if the manufacturers of that cement agree on the price they will sell you that cement. It is our job to see that they do not agree on that price but sell at a competitive price so that you will enjoy the benefits not only of price competition but also of quality competition as well. As this is true of cement, it is also true of all other types of commodities sold in interstate commerce. Without the spur of competition quality stagnates and salesmanship becomes more of a question of who knows and likes whom rather than selling on the basis of price and quality.

All of us, even the large manufacturing corporations are consumers, as no person or corporation makes all of the things he or it uses. All of us, therefore, are interested in buying at a competitive price although there are some who are adverse to selling at a competitive price.

Another illustration of how the operations of the Commission affect you is that you may be a retailer and after an argument with your supplier about prices, about terms, or about anything else, you are cut off. Your supplier tells your other potential suppliers that you are a bad fellow and, in the bonds of comradeship, all of the suppliers agree not to sell you any more merchandise. You may know that you are not a bad fellow and that the supplier has wronged you but because you cannot get the proper merchandise you begin to lose business and are faced with bankruptcy. However, you can appeal to the Federal Trade Commission if your suppliers are engaged in commerce and agreed to boycott you. You may never need the help of the Commission in a matter of this kind but it is comforting to know it is there and it is available. The very fact that this help is available largely makes its use unnecessary.

Another illustration is that you may be in business selling a first-rate product. A competitor, however, disparages your product and injures the reputation and the business of your firm. You may appeal to the Commission as it is an unfair practice under our statutes to make false, disparaging statements in respect to a competitor's product, his business or his financial credit. Your competitor may also violate the Federal Trade Commission Act if he attempts to pass off his product as your product, if he engages in commercial bribery, if he induces the breach by your employees of their employment contracts, if he threatens you and others in bad faith with patent infringement suits or engages in other unfair competitive practices which may injure competition.

In our business we are constantly learning about the other fellow's business, and that is a liberal education. I did not know until recently that there is a substantial business in second-hand hats—men's hats, that is. Sometimes these hats are referred to in the trade as "ashcan" hats. This is probably due to the fact that when some men grow too tired of the old fedora they throw it into an ashcan. In any event, these old hats are cleaned and blocked, and new sweatbands inserted, and they are then offered for sale. The Commission does not object to this business, but we only ask these sellers to inform their customers that they are buying used hats. I submit that this is not an unreasonable request, but we have been called upon to make it.

Another tremendous field in which you are directly affected whether you are a consumer or a competitor is the field of advertising. Hundreds of millions of dollars are spent each year for advertising, and it is the duty of the Federal Trade Commission to see that these advertisements made in connection with goods sold in interstate commerce do not contain false or deceptive statements. It is an unfair trade practice to advertise falsely or deceptively in commerce. If your competitor advertises his merchandise falsely and the customers are thereby induced to believe they will get a better deal from him than from you, they will buy from him instead of from you. You are injured in your business, and trade is unfairly diverted. The customer or consumer is injured because he has been led to believe he will receive an article different from that he actually receives.

Both you as a competitor and the consumer may appeal for help to the Federal Trade Commission.

In connection with this question of advertising, a member of the staff recently invited my attention to a copy of a magazine published in the late nineties. There was an article in the magazine describing the acclaim given to Admiral Dewey when he returned from his great victory at Manila Bay, but what interested me in a professional way were the advertisements. There were a number of advertisements giving glowing accounts of cancer cures, sure remedies for baldness, and other answers to nearly all of man's problems. You may object to the advertising you now hear over the radio and read in publications. However, insofar as falsity and deception are concerned, the advertising of today is a great improvement over the advertising of other years. Some advertising of course is still objectionable. We have not reached the millennium. Human nature being what it is, some people will continue to misrepresent their wares in the market place. However, I am an optimist and I believe we are improving. Much of the credit for the improvement in this field is due to the excellent work of the better business bureaus in this and in other cities.

We have at times problems which have their lighter side in connection with the regulation of advertising. One enterprising chap advertised that he had a device which was guaranteed to kill roaches on the first application. He offered to sell his device by mail for $1 if the customer would send him a dollar. After sending the dollar, the customer received two blocks of wood with the direction that he place the roach between the blocks and press firmly. This was guaranteed to kill the roach on the first application. This is rather an extreme illustration of an advertisement which may, as far as it goes, be literally true, but it is also fraudulent because it only tells half of the truth.

The Clayton Act, which was passed in 1914, and was amended by the Robinson-Patman Act in 1936, authorizes the Commission to prohibit discriminations in price which substantially lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly.

For illustration, your place of business is located near a competitor and both you and your competitor purchase your merchandise from the same manufacturer in substantially similar quantities. However, the manufacturer may sell to your competitor at a cheaper price than he will sell to you. Because of this cheaper price, your competitor resells the merchandise at a price lower than you can afford and your customers begin trading with him. You lose business. This is apparently a case of an illegal price discrimination and you may appeal to the Commission for aid. In addition, if the seller offers your competitor advertising or other allowances, he must offer it to you on proportional equal terms if you continue to be a customer of that manufacturer. That sounds like common sense. It is common sense and, more than that, it is the law.

The Clayton Act also prohibits tying-in contracts. You may want to buy a keg of nails. Your supplier offers to sell you a keg of nails provided that you also purchase from him a case of left-handed catchers' mitts. You tell him you do not want the catchers' mitts and, besides, you are not left-handed. But your supplier is adamant and to get the nails, which you must have, you purchase the mitts. That is a tying-in sale which is prohibited by the Clayton Act and you may appeal to the Commission for aid. There are other provisions of the Clayton Act administered by the Commission which I shall not take time to describe.

The Webb-Pomerene Export Trade Act, another of the acts administered by the Commission, was passed in 1918. As I have stated, concerns engaged in domestic commerce may not agree on prices or engage in common selling arrangements. Many foreign countries do not have similar laws regulating the business of their nationals. American business must usually compete in foreign trade with cartels or Government trading agencies. Under the Export Trade Act American concerns engaged in the export business may organize an export trade association and file their papers with the Commission. They may sell in export trade through the association and agree on common selling terms provided they do not restrain our domestic commerce or the business of an American exporter who may not be a member of the association. By utilizing the terms of this act, American exporters may therefore compete on more equal terms with foreign cartels or state trading agencies. This act can well be utilized by groups of small business concerns in order to pool their resources and share expenses in selling in export trade.

The Wool Products Labeling Act which was approved in 1940 is administered by the Commission. As a consumer, when you and your family purchase clothing which purports to be wool, you are entitled to know that it is properly labeled and whether or not it is virgin wool or reprocessed or used wool.

The Commission also administers parts of the Lanham Trade-Mark Act approved in July of 1946. Under the terms of this act the Commission protects you as a competitor and as a consumer by applying for the cancellation of registered trade-marks which are deceptive, immoral or scandalous or which have been obtained fraudulently or which are being assigned for the purpose of misrepresenting the source of the goods.

You may be interested in the procedures of the Commission relative to alleged false and misleading advertising. A questionable advertisement may be brought to the attention of the Commission by either a complaint from a competitor, or from a member of the public or through the observation of advertising by a member of the staff of the Commission. The Division of Radio and Periodical Advertising of the Commission conducts a continuous survey of advertisements appearing in newspapers, magazines, radio broadcasts, etc. If a complaint is filed by a source outside the Commission, that is, by a competitor or a consumer, the identity of the complainant is kept confidential. Most of these matters relating to alleged false or deceptive advertisements are settled by the Commission in an informal manner. It may be that the practice has been discontinued and a statement to that effect from the advertiser may be taken and the matter closed without further action.

In false and misleading advertising matters as distinguished from antimonopoly cases and from cases involving fraud or dangerous drugs, the advertiser, within the discretion of the Commission, may be offered the privilege of stipulation. Pursuant to this procedure, the advertiser may voluntarily enter into an informal agreement to discontinue the false or deceptive advertisements in the future. If the particular practice complained of appears to be widespread or prevalent in the industry, the Commission, consistent with the objectives of the statutes which it administers, has initiated and developed the trade practice conference procedure. Under this procedure representatives of the members of an entire industry meet in conference under the supervision of the Commission. These conferences are for the purpose of enlisting the cooperation of the industry in considering, and when advisable, in drafting rules for the purpose of simultaneously correcting unfair or otherwise illegal trade practices which may be common in an industry. These are referred to as trade practice conference rules. The Commission has found this procedure has been very successful and has been informative to members of industry and has promoted fair competition and at the same time has protected the public interest.

If the various voluntary procedures used by the Commission are not effective in stopping the use of apparent false and misleading advertisements, the Commission may issue a formal complaint alleging that the respondent has engaged in unfair practices. This complaint is served on the respondent and thereafter a trial of the issues is held wherein the respondent has the right of presentation of evidence and the cross-examination of witnesses. If the record made in the course of trial sustains the allegations of the complaint, an order is issued requiring the respondent to cease and desist from the unfair practices. The respondent may, within 60 days after the issuance of the order to cease and desist issued pursuant to the Federal Trade Commission Act, appeal to the courts for the reversal of such order. We welcome the review of our proceedings by the courts. It is always helpful for a public official to have someone looking over his shoulder. When I was in Congress, it was my constituents. At the Commission, it is the courts.

My previous remarks have briefly outlined the affirmative procedures which may be used by the Commission in preventing illegal practices in interstate commerce. I have generally described how the work of the Commission affects you in your business and the part the Commission plays in protecting the American free-enterprise system of business. However, I believe, and I am sure that you will agree, that the most effective deterrent to unfair practices is the conscience of the individual businessman. I believe that the great majority of businessmen are honest and ethical and are interested in selling their merchandise on the merits of such merchandise without the use of any fraud or deception or other unfair trade practices. The Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *FTC* v. *The Standard Education Society* (302 U. S. 112) stated:

"The fact that a false statement may be obviously false to those who are trained and experienced does not change its character, nor take away its power to deceive others less experienced. There is no duty resting upon a citizen to suspect the honesty of those with whom he transacts business. Laws are made to protect the trusting as well as the suspicious. The best element of business has long since decided that honesty should govern competitive enterprises, and that the rule of caveat emptor (let the buyer beware) should not be relied upon to reward fraud and deception."

I am sure that the better business bureaus throughout the United States are in hearty accord with those statements made in an opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States. The Commission appreciates the great contribution that the better business bureaus are making in the field of fair competition. The Commission stands ready to cooperate with you in your endeavors and to help you in any way which we can under the statutes which we administer. I thank you for the privilege to be with you here today.

Washington's 150 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed

in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Washington's 150 Years," published in the New York Times of April 17, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON'S 150 YEARS

The National Capital's Sesquicentennial Celebration has been slow in getting started, despite a small congressional appropriation last fall and some talk since. On Saturday, however, it seemed to come to life with a 35-gun salute and some good words from Vice President Barkley. Mr. Barkley denounced a foreign slave power without actually mentioning it by name. Standing in the shadow of an 18-foot facsimile of the Capitol's Statue of Freedom, he also urged his hearers to take care that our own precious heritage of rights and freedoms be not abridged. He suggested that Tom Paine, whose pamphlets reinforced General Washington's tattered battalions, might be charged with being subversive if he were alive today. Perhaps Senator MCCARTHY will some day find time to look into this matter.

We hope that during the coming months Washington's anniversary will receive the attention it deserves. In the long parade of history it is just a little while since the Federal Government and its 126 employees moved down from Philadelphia; since Abigail Adams hung the wash to dry in what is now the East Room; and since President John Adams addressed the Sixth Congress at the first session ever held on Capitol Hill, the plaster, paint, and chips still smelling.

But Washington's short history has matched in meaning that of the older capitals; a handful of pioneers have become a great Nation; the democracy of Lincoln has succeeded that of Washington and still grows; we who wished only to be let alone in peace must now exert our influence all around the earth; decisions fateful for all mankind are made here, whether or not we asked for that responsibility. These events should be celebrated, this year and perhaps next, solemnly and with the participation of the whole country.

Educational Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able address made by the Governor of South Carolina, the Honorable J. Strom Thurmond, at the annual convention of the South Carolina Education Association, on March 31, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

One group of South Carolinians with whom I feel at home is our school teachers. All my life I have fought for the cause of education in South Carolina. I have always been keenly interested in our educational problems.

For 10 years I was directly associated with our educational system, 6 years of this time as a teacher in the public schools and 4 years as county superintendent of education in my home county of Edgefield. As a member of the State senate, I sponsored legislation for higher salaries for teachers and longer school terms, and I was chairman of the senate committee that wrote the present school-attendance law. As governor, I recommended, and the legislature passed, the best teacher-pay schedule in the history of the State, the State school survey, provision for the area trade schools, and many other progressive educational measures.

Today South Carolina is at the highest educational level in her history. Our State's educational effort has steadily advanced until we are now eleventh from the top in the percentage of income spent for education. A few years ago we were twenty-fifth.

Our progress, however, is far from enough to make our schools the vital instruments of public service they should and must be. This year I recommended to the general assembly a forward-looking school program, which included increasing teacher salaries, an expanded in-service teacher-training program, restoration of sick leave for teachers, loan scholarships for teacher education, State aid for school buildings, better organization of school districts, and an equitable formula for distribution of school-transportation funds. I reiterate my support of these objectives and will work shoulder to shoulder with you in seeking to bring them about.

Our educational problems have been more difficult to solve because we have not been a rich State. We have been near the bottom among States in per capita income and in income per pupil in average daily attendance. While our effort has been high our income has been low.

A number of those interested in education in our State have in the past sincerely believed that the speedy solution of our educational problems may lie in the passage of legislation granting Federal aid for our public school system. Their theory has been that Federal aid will come to the rescue of the so-called poorer States by providing greater assistance when the need is greater.

Today, I want to discuss this matter with you as honestly and frankly as I know how. Because of my interest in any proposal that will improve our educational system, the question of Federal aid has deeply interested me, and I have given it my most earnest consideration.

Several years ago I publicly advocated Federal aid for public education, provided that such aid be without Federal control and the State public school system remain entirely under local control where it belongs.

With the growing centralization of power in the Federal Government, and the flagrant violation and disregard of the rights of States and local authorities by the present national administration, I have been forced to the firm conviction that we cannot accept Federal aid for our public schools without ultimately losing control of them to the Federal Government.

I have also been forced to the conclusion that even if we should escape nationalization of our public school system in accepting Federal aid, restrictions will soon be imposed which will prevent the States with the greatest educational need from receiving Federal funds.

The vital issue confronting us is whether we can maintain a locally supported and locally controlled public school system. This Nation has grown great because of our free public schools. They are the bulwark of our liberty and the backbone of our democracy.

Less than 5 percent of the people who ever lived in this world have enjoyed freedom. Today less than 25 percent of the people of the world enjoy anything approaching the liberty which is our birthright under American citizenship.

No greater menace to that liberty and our democracy could arise than the transfer of the control of our public schools to the National Government in Washington.

Can we now doubt that if the Federal Government appropriates money for our public schools the Federal Government will control them?

In view of the record of the present administration in Washington, no one can feel confident that it will not use Federal subsidy of education as a political weapon. Can an administration which has already sought openly to bend and twist the Constitution to give the National Government control over ballot boxes, over police power, and over local business, be trusted to renounce control over the education of the youth of the Nation, once it has established the principle of contributing Federal money toward such education?

Within a generation, the principle of Federal control of education would be an accepted fact.

One deplorable result of Federal subsidy is the tendency to decrease the feeling of local pride and responsibility which has been the secret of our good schools. The local school inspires more pride and interest on the part of the average citizen than any other institution, except the home and the church.

The attitude and tendencies of the present administration in Washington give cogent evidence that restrictions could be, and would be, placed on Federal education funds—restrictions which South Carolina would be unable to accept or legally comply with under our State Constitution.

The primary policy of the administration demagogues has been to eliminate the South's historic custom of separating the races.

The most startling example of this policy was the recent refusal of the administration to extend housing funds to areas in which separation of the races is practiced. The application of Charlotte, N. C., for a housing development was refused on the ground that the housing would be restricted to Negroes, despite the admitted need for such housing.

This action was taken by the administration in spite of the fact that the Congress had declined to place any such restriction on the distribution of housing funds.

Another example is found in the recent action of the Department of Justice in the matter of the Henderson case to be taken up by the Supreme Court during April. The Henderson case involves separate seating in railroad dining cars, a practice approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission. This Commission asked the Department of Justice to intervene in an effort to have the case dismissed. Solicitor General Perlman not only refused to assist the Interstate Commerce Commission, but he actually filed a brief in favor of Elmer Henderson, the complainant, opposing separate seating in railroad dining cars.

It is perfectly clear that the Department of Justice would use the full weight of that Department to make certain that no Federal aid for education would be extended to schools which separate the races.

The so-called safeguards of the Federal-aid bill now under discussion do not and cannot guarantee local control. There are three ways in which these safeguards can be circumvented. Any one of these three would be enough to render the safeguards null and void.

The first of these is the familiar congressional device of amendment, commonly called rider. As you know, the Federal-aid bill pending in Congress, which we are now discussing, is merely an authorization bill. The money to finance the program must be provided for in a separate appropriation bill. When the appropriation bill is written, it will be possible to attach a rider thereto which can limit distribution of the appro-

priated funds. A rider providing that Federal funds shall not be allotted to any State practicing separation of the races is certain to be offered and unquestionably would be adopted.

The second way in which legislative guaranty of local control can be circumvented is by the action of another Congress. One Congress cannot bind another, and action by the next Congress or any future Congress would supersede the action of a previous Congress.

The present Federal subsidy bill is merely a foot-in-the-door technique. It is only temporary. Its proponents know very well that, once they have established Federal aid for education, the next Congress can come along and insert provisions giving Washington the right to regulate our schools or place conditions on the funds that will make it legally impossible for South Carolina to receive them.

The third way in which local control of schools may be nullified is by administrative fiat. The administration may arbitrarily refuse to give Federal funds to schools which separate the races, in defiance of the views of Congress. We have seen this happen in the distribution of housing funds.

The dangers of Federal aid for education are clearly expressed by those in a position in Washington to know. Eminent among these is Hon. SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, the Speaker of the National House of Representatives. Mr. RAYBURN opposes Federal aid for education. He opposes it on the ground that, under it, Federal control of the schools is inevitable.

I have a copy of a letter written by Mr. RAYBURN on this subject a few weeks ago. Let me read you what this distinguished Texan, who has been in the Congress for 37 years, has to say on the subject of Federal aid.

Mr. RAYBURN said: "I am now, and have been, opposed to Federal aid for education. * * * Once you start giving Federal funds you get Federal control too in the long run. * * * I know that the Federal Government contributes money to few things that it doesn't ultimately run, in its entirety, or is in a position to do so, when it so desires. I can imagine our voting money, in hundreds of millions, then somebody gets up and offer an amendment providing that no part of these funds be used in any State where there is segregation in the schools among the races. If a roll call was had on that, it would certainly carry—then we would be paying for something we weren't getting."

An argument made in favor of Federal aid for education is that under Federal court decisions we shall have to equalize school facilities, and that we cannot do this without accepting Federal funds for local school purposes.

Those making this argument evidently assume that we will get Federal money to help us continue racial separation in our schools. Everyone should know that this is directly contrary to present Federal policy. Everyone who looks at the matter realistically is fully aware that as soon as we become so dependent on Federal funds that we cannot do without them, the Federal administrators will deny such funds to States which have separate schools for the races. We in South Carolina will then be faced with the necessity either of throwing our school children together in the same schools, or doing the best we can without Federal aid after having become dependent on it. The ultimate result is that we would be paying taxes for something we are not getting. We will contribute our share, but our schools will not get the benefit of the Federal funds.

The other leading argument in favor of Federal aid for schools is that we are already accepting Federal aid for such programs as vocational education, agricultural education, and the like, without unreasonable Federal control.

This is false reasoning. The proposed Federal aid bill is something entirely new. For the first time in history, it is proposed to extend Federal subsidy down to the level of our elementary schools and the very roots of our educational system. This would affect our children from the very first day they enter school, in every classroom and in every book they study. There is a vast difference between Federal aid for certain specialized programs, and Federal aid throughout the entire public school system.

We have accepted Federal aid for vocational and agricultural education, and a certain amount of supervision, because to do so has not affected our basic educational program. The temptation to regiment a nation through its children is certainly not present in such specialized fields.

We can continue to accept such special assistance only so long as objectionable restrictions are not placed upon it, and today we have plenty of cause to wonder just how long it will be before such restrictions are put into effect.

We can never accept the slightest degree of Federal control over our public-school system if we hope to remain free citizens in a free republic.

Seeing then, the unavoidable dangers of inviting Federal subsidy of our schools, we must seek and find another solution to the educational problems now pressing upon us.

The job ahead is going to be an exacting one, and new financial resources will be necessary. There are at least three ways in which we can do that job without Federal aid: first, we can demand that the Federal Government return to the States and localities the tax sources which rightfully belong to them; second, we can demand greater economy in the Federal Government, which will leave more money in the State for educational purposes; and third, we can continue to push our industrial-development program to increase our income, and thereby our ability to pay for education. The best source of revenue will be an adjustment in the spheres of taxation which will clearly define the fields of taxation rightly belonging to Federal, State, and local governments. We have permitted our various areas of taxation to become confused, and the Federal Government has gradually usurped practically all tax sources including those which should belong to the States and localities. Our tax system is today a hodge-podge of overlapping, duplication, and injustices.

Unless the unsurpation of tax fields by the Federal Government is checked, it will inevitably turn our States and cities into mere subdivisions, or departments, of the Central Government.

On the other hand, if the States are given back the fields of taxation that are rightfully theirs, and the revenue sources which belong to them, they can do their educational job without Federal assistance, and do it better and cheaper than the Federal Government. There is terrific wear and tear on a tax dollar which goes first to Washington and then comes back in the form of Federal aid.

An equally important way in which we can have more money for schools is by demanding greater economy in the operation of the Federal Government. Experts have said that a financial saving amounting to billions can be brought about without affecting existing programs. A saving of from three to five billions of dollars a year could be saved simply through a more sensible and efficient Federal organization, without eliminating any present functions.

The taxable income left in South Carolina by such a saving would be tremendous. South Carolina's per capita share of a $3,000,000 annual saving would be $40,000,000—considerably more than we now spend for public education, and three times greater than the $13,000,000 which it is claimed we would get from Federal aid to schools.

The best way Uncle Sam can help South Carolina is by cutting down his expenses, not incerasing them. It is a strange sight indeed, to witness a Federal Government already burdened with $260,000,000,000 in debts, proposing to extend financial aid to States whose budgets are without exception in a sounder position than its own.

The standing debt of all the 48 States, added together, is about $2,500,000,000. Thus the debt of the Federal Government is already 100 times greater than of all the States put together.

Yet some people are asking Uncle Sam to go further into debt in order to help all of the States in the Union, including our own State of South Carolina, which owes not a dime in the world not covered by cash on hand or self-liquidating bonds.

The low income of the Southern States handicapped them in the past in supporting their schools to the extent that other States have. The picture, however, is rapidly changing. In 1940 the 16 richest States had 46 percent more income than the 16 poorest States. In 1947 those 16 richest States had only 14 percent more income than the 16 poorest. All indications are that this differential between the South and other States will continue to be cut down.

Our greatest hope for additional support for our schools is South Carolina's amazing economic development during the last few years. Our State today is in an era of economic growth such as we have never known before. Our per capita income is rising steadily. Our industrial potential is expanding faster than that of any State in the Nation. Our agricultural might is growing, and most recently in the livestock field.

As a result of this economic development, our ability to pay for education is steadily increasing. The day is not too distant when our growing wealth will permit a vastly improved public-school program. We are already doing a far better job than we did a few years back. Our expenditures for public schools have more than tripled in the past 3 years. A survey by the Council of State Governments shows that South Carolina was the second highest State in the Nation in the percentage by which we increased our expenditures for education in 1948, as compared with 1938. Our increase was 41 percent higher than the national average.

We are already improving our school program, and the control of that program should be retained in our communities and in the State, where our taxes can be made to yield their maximum returns. Will we gain by sending our educational dollars to Washington, to be put through the Federal shrinking machine?

We have more to gain by encouraging the sense of local pride and responsibility which makes better schools, and by emphasizing the higher values of moral purpose, character, and responsible citizenship which our democracy needs.

I want to repeat to you what I told the general assembly this year:

"Let us resolve to provide whatever is necessary to educate our children through the marshaling of our State resources behind our public-school system, and keep that system free from Federal regimentation and the intermeddling of Federal bureaucrats."

Schools that are close to the people will guarantee that our Government will remain close to the people. We cannot afford to take any step which will lessen the citizen's responsibility for the education of his children, or which will undermine the position of our schools as strongholds of self-government and guardians of our freedom.

Remembering that our children will be what they are taught to be, let us put our own shoulders to the wheel, with the determination that our schools can be, and will be, greater instruments of service to our people. Let us rededicate ourselves to the

well-being of our schools, and go forward together in self-respect and self-reliance, with new confidence in our own ability to manage our own affairs.

The Port of Baltimore and the Ship Subsidy Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, some of the many and complex problems incidental to the present deplorable condition of the United States Merchant Marine as they affect employment and general economic conditions in the great port areas of our country are presented forcibly in an editorial appearing in this morning's Baltimore Sun, entitled "The Port of Baltimore and the Ship-Subsidy Bill."

The editorial serves, among other things, to remind us that the problem of rehabilitating the American Merchant Marine is one that affects not only this one segment of American industry but a great many related phases of our Nation's economy. In view of the importance of the problem discussed I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Baltimore Sun be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PORT OF BALTIMORE AND THE SHIP-SUBSIDY BILL

The bill to give increased Federal aid to the country's maritime interests is being accorded the long and careful consideration called for by the importance of the problems involved. Our own Senator O'CONOR, a cosponsor of the measure and a member of the subcommittee on maritime matters, is taking an active part in that task. That is as it should be. Maryland has a bigger stake in the bill than most of the other States because shipbuilding, ship repairing and water-borne commerce play such a big and direct part in our economic picture.

The bill before Congress would liberalize the plan under which the Nation subsidizes its maritime fleet. It would extend that plan to bring within its provisions ship operations not now covered by subsidies. It would ease the tax burden on private interests in water-borne commerce. And it would, according to its backers, assure this country an adequate mechant fleet in time of emergency.

There are differences of opinion about the need for the bill and about the kind of aid it would provide. Those differences are being aired before the subcommittee on maritime matters. The compromise stage (if there is to be one) has not as yet been reached. There is no need for present purposes to discuss the merits and demerits of the measure. But two pertinent items in the news columns of the Sun yesterday illustrate the nature of the problems at which the bill is directed. And each of those items had to do with our own port of Baltimore.

In the financial pages it was reported that the total business of the Maryland Drydock Co. for 1949 was $14,800,000 as compared with $33,400,000 for the previous year. That more than $18,000,000 drop brought a corresponding contraction in employment figures at the company's shipyard. And the worst of it is that a further fall off in business is expected for 1950.

In the regular news columns it was reported that two big ore carriers which will start operating next year between Liberia and Baltimore will fly the Liberian, not the American flag. The two ships were to have been built at Sparrows Point. But the contract went to Glasgow, Scotland, to save 50 percent in construction costs. That was a single specific loss to the port, however welcome the contracts were to the British. Now there will be the continuing loss resulting from the sailing of the ships under the Liberian flag.

To cite those two cases is not to urge increased Federal aid for the country's private maritime interests. They are presented merely to show the complexity of the maritime problems under consideration in Washington and the great and direct interest Baltimore has in a sound solution for those problems.

The Farmer Pays for His Own Price Support

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES O. EASTLAND
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement, under date of March 28, 1950, addressed by Mr. O. F. Bledsoe, of Greenwood, Miss., president, Staple Cotton Cooperative Association to the members of the association, on the subject the Farmer Pays for His Own Price Support.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FARMER PAYS FOR HIS OWN PRICE SUPPORT

To Our Members:

Within our artificial price structure, Congress found it necessary to support agricultural prices so the farmer could live and at the same time pay for his own price supports and Government support. Based on agricultural income, the best tax accountants in agricultural areas estimate the income taxes paid by the farmers were $2,247,000,000 for the year 1947, $2,124,000,000 for the year 1948, and $1,833,000,000 for the year 1949, which totals $6,204,000,000 for the last 3 years, while the Government accumulated $4,000,000,000 worth of surplus agricultural products.

According to the United States Bureau of Agricultural Economics, the per person farm income and the per person nonfarm income was as follows:

Farm income:	
1947	$857
1948	905
1949	763
Nonfarm income:	
1947	1,439
1948	1,572
1949	1,555

This disparity of per person farm income of about one-half with price supports gives the reason for the migration from the farms. The rural population, which is the lowest in the history of this Nation, is now less than 20 percent of our national population, while the Government entered the socialistic plan of building the former agricultural workers homes in the cities, which are already the hotbed of socialism, especially support by the Government. This movement from the economically sound farm group has given socialism its greatest boost. The politicians looking for the big city vote will finish the job with such ideas as the Brannan plan.

Of course, Congress is human and makes mistakes in trying to adjust prices within this artificial price structure, but the biggest mistake was to subsidize industry with the tariff wall, which produced this artificial price structure and prevented the export of our surplus agricultural products. The farm group with the smallest income put the money in the Federal Treasury to pay for these errors, as well as price supports. The air-conditioned city newspapers and radio commentators are playing up these mistakes by telling the public only part of the truth, as their source of revenue comes from advertising subsidized industrial products.

The putting into operation of the natural price-fixing laws of supply and demand with our natural allies who need our surplus agricultural products would remove from Congress this great price-fixing responsibility. It would help to eliminate the bad feeling between the urban and farm group. It would also turn this Government away from artificial devices that promote socialism and governmental regimentation. The farm problem is not on the farm but in Washington, directly behind the tariff wall without a gateway—an economic crime.

If our agricultural problem is not solved on a sound, economic, free-enterprise basis, then good-by to the other sections of our economy that operate under a free-enterprise system. The Brannan plan should be ample warning.

O. F. BLEDSOE,
President, Staple Cotton Cooperative Association.
MARCH 28, 1950.

Why Oklahoma Should Reelect Senator Thomas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELMER THOMAS
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by Oscar V. Rose, superintendent of schools, Midwest City, Okla.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY OKLAHOMA SHOULD REELECT ELMER THOMAS TO THE UNITED STATES SENATE

(Statement by Oscar V. Rose, superintendent of schools, Midwest City, Okla.)

The strength of either a Senator or a Congressman in the United States Congress is quite largely determined by the seniority he has gained through the length of his term of service. This is largely true because committee assignments, as well as the positions held on the committees, are wholly determined by seniority. At the present time, only two of the 96 United States Senators

have a longer tenure of service in that body than Senator ELMER THOMAS of Oklahoma.

The legislative processes of the United States Congress are achieved primarily through committee study and action. Upon introduction of legislation by a Member in either House, it is immediately assigned to the appropriate committee. If it is to pass beyond that stage, it must receive a favorable report of the committee to which it is assigned. A large majority of the bills introduced never receive such consideration and therefore are never presented to the floor of either House for action. Whether they receive committee consideration and study is largely dependent on the chairman of the committee. Of course, the various members of a committee may influence the chairman in the same manner as any other human endeavor is influenced. However, the influence of committee members, to a great extent, is determined by their tenure on the committee represented by the position they hold below the chairman. Thus the committee assignments and positions held on the committees are of tremendous importance in determining the effectiveness of a Member of either House in representing his constituents.

Senator ELMER THOMAS is not only the third senior Member of the United States Senate but is chairman of the Agriculture Committee. He is also the second ranking member on the Appropriations Committee and chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Military Affairs. Both of these committee assignments are among the choice positions in the United States Senate. Since all States have agricultural interests, Senator THOMAS, as chairman of that committee, has an excellent opportunity to cooperate with Senators from all States in working out their respective agricultural problems. This places the other Senators in an excellent position to reciprocate his cooperation in fields over which they hold control but in which Oklahoma is particularly interested. Certainly in this position the Oklahoma farmer has an advocate which it cannot afford to lose. As chairman of the Subcommittee for Military Appropriations, Senator THOMAS has charge of the largest money bill in the Congress, the bill for developing and maintaining our military establishments. Certainly Oklahoma is interested in the continuance of its four largest military establishments; namely, Oklahoma City Air Technical Service Command, Oklahoma City, Fort Sill, Lawton; Vance Air Force Base, Enid, and McAlester Naval Depot, McAlester, Okla. It would seem logical that these installations will receive more consideration from an Oklahoma Senator than one from any other State. As the second ranking member on the Appropriations Committee and a member of the Subcommittees handling Indian appropriations, flood control, and power development, he is in an excellent position to contribute to the interests of Oklahoma.

A Senator is not elected to the important position Senator THOMAS now holds and which is detailed above. A Senator gains this enviable position only through a number of reelections by the voters of a State which enables him to gain the seniority necessary for such advancement. The voters of Oklahoma elected ELMER THOMAS to the United States Senate in 1926 and reelected him in 1932, 1938, and 1944. Because of this repeated confidence and support, he now holds a position which cannot be transferred to any other candidate, but will be lost to the citizens of Oklahoma should ELMER THOMAS not be returned to the Senate.

In the committee organization of the United States Congress each Congressman is given one committee assignment, and each Senator is allowed two committee assignments. They advance toward the top of the committee as vacancies occur above their present position. The present relative positions of the congressional representation of Oklahoma compared to 10 other Southern States on the committees of the United States Congress is shown below.

Committee assignments

State	Total for State	On upper half of committee (percent)	Either as chairman, second or third place (percent)
Oklahoma [1]	12	4 or 33	2 or 17.
Oklahoma [2]	12	1 or 8	0 or 0.
Texas	25	18 or 72	7 or 28.
Georgia	14	14 or 100	9 or 64.
Arkansas	11	10 or 91	3 or 27.
Louisiana	12	6 or 50	5 or 42.
Mississippi	11	10 or 91	5 or 45.
Alabama	13	7 or 54	1 or 8.
South Carolina	10	8 or 80	5 or 50.
North Carolina	16	14 or 87	7 or 44.
Tennessee	14	9 or 64	4 or 29.
Virginia [3]	13	8 or 62	6 or 46.
Total	139	104 or 75	52 or 38.

[1] At the present time 4 of the 12 committee assignments for Oklahoma representatives in the United States Congress are in the upper one-half of the various committees. Two of these are held by Senator Elmer Thomas. One, fourth place on the Banking and Currency Committee is held by the Fifth District Congressman. One, sixth place on the Public Lands Committee is held by the Sixth District Congressman.

[2] Since both of the first, second, and third committee assignments are held by Senator Elmer Thomas and one of the other two assignments in the upper one-half of committees is held by the Fifth District Congressman who is not seeking reelection, Oklahoma will have no representative on the upper one-half of committees in the United States Congress should Senator Elmer Thomas not be reelected.

[3] In the 10 Southern States entitled to 139 committee assignments, we find 104, or 75 percent of them, to be in the upper one-half of the various committees; 52 of these 139 committee assignments, or 38 percent, are either as chairman, second or third place assignments.

These facts show conclusively that Oklahoma is, in comparison, already at a disadvantage insofar as committee assignments are concerned. Certainly, it would not be advisable for the voters to place the further disadvantage on its congressional delegation, through eliminating its most powerful Senate committee assignments at the present time.

How About the Excise Cut?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 19, 1950

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the April 7, 1950, issue of the Bridgeport (Conn.) Telegram relative to wartime excise taxes:

HOW ABOUT THE EXCISE CUT?

Little is being said these days about the reduction or the total elimination of the troublesome wartime excise taxes. Former Speaker MARTIN, in a speech deploring current unemployment, which he said was caused by the "economic quackery" and "irresponsible political philosophy" of the New Deal and Fair Deal administrations, declared the removal of the wartime taxes would help to "reverse the tide," especially here in New England where so many of the products taxed are made, and where incentive is needed for capital investment.

Even Mr. Truman, in his last recommendations on taxation advocated substantial reduction of these burdens. These are the taxes on a sizable list of commodities and services, including the things we buy in the drug stores for the nursery, household uses, the sick room, and ordinary toilet uses; long distance telephone calls and telegraph tolls; transportation of both passengers and freight, and so on. Practically everyone is familiar with the tax that has been so objectionable since the war ended.

The President's views on elimination of these taxes carried a proviso, however. He said that any loss of revenue must be offset by new taxes, and asserted he would not approve any bill which did not accomplish this.

Naturally, Mr. Truman is entitled to his own views, and because of his position, they may prevail. But the fact is that all manufacturers, retailers, and the people in general are against them. Most people agree that they present a definite barrier to trade and employment. They apply not to luxuries, but to necessities.

There is only one sound way to make up for any loss of revenue the elimination of these taxes might cause. That is by cutting even further the cost of Government. The present temper of Congress seems to be in favor of eliminating the wartime taxes, and against any tax increase of any kind. It would be a blessing to all Americans if that temper would flare into action. Congress by cutting these taxes has an opportunity to contribute to our economic stability—and incidentally, gather in a lot of votes in the fall.

The Facts on Minnesota Farm Meeting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on April 17, I addressed the Senate regarding the State PMA conference held at St. Paul, Minn., April 3 and 4. In connection with the subject, I ask uanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, an editorial which appeared in the April 11 issue of the Park Region Echo, which is published at Alexandria, Minn.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PMA FACTS DISTORTED BY STAR

Two scathing editorials against the Production and Marketing Administration's 2-day conference in St. Paul last week appeared Thursday and Friday in the Minneapolis Star. One was headed, "Political propaganda for captive audience," and the other, "PMA: aid to farmers or political weapon." We claim that the editorials were deliberate distortions of the truth and the rantings of an editorial writer who had an ax to grind.

What was possibly the most provoking to the Star editorial writer or reporter must have been the praise some of the PMA speakers gave Alfred Stedman, agricultural editor for the St. Paul Pioneer Press and Dispatch. Mr. Stedman had aided the farm program for many years and later he had been of much help to the Federal set-up in giving advice at times when called upon to do so. The Department is still availing itself of Mr. Stedman's knowledge and he spends many off-hours along this line. It is natural that the

Star editorial department should become irate over the entire affair.

To state that the 2-day sessions were devoted entirely to political propaganda is a deliberate falsehood. To hint that the committeemen were paid $8 per day for attending a political rally is another falsification of the facts. It is also an attempt to smear the good character of the 4,000 committeemen of the State if they accept money for something to which they are not entitled. The committeemen on Monday attended meetings of instruction pertaining to the 1950 farm program. Most of these talks on PMA matters were important and much needed in order to carry on the farm program this year. Likewise, the Tuesday program was important in several respects and about the only part of it that could be called political was Senator HUMPHREY'S talk which was more or less an added section of the program.

It was important that Secretary Charles F. Brannan come to the St. Paul conference to explain his much-discussed farm proposal. That his talk, modest in the extreme, can be distorted to be political propaganda is far from the truth. Mr. Brannan was not presumptive in the least and he did not take advantage of the occasion to lambast the opposition, as the Star editorial writer has done.

For the Star to state that the Brannan plan would make farm-income guaranties high or the support unusually high indicates the Star editorial writer either does not know the details of the plan or else intends to fool its readers. The support price is to be set by a board and if the market price of the products are high the cost will be nil.

Friday's editorial cites the article from the Country Gentleman magazine in connection with the PMA administration in DeKalb County, Ill. It sought to convey the idea that the farmers there were paying excessively for the PMA administrative work, 590 man-days of work needed to complete the work. The Star stated: "That county had 178 part- and full-time Federal employees to provide services to the farmers. Minnesota is comparable."

If the Star editorial writer had taken Mr. Brannan's interpretation of this very case the statement would have been different. The 590 man-days included the time spent by two office girls of the PMA and if this time is taken out, there would not be many man-days for the 178 county committeemen. That this is an extensive set-up in the counties in Minnesota is a prevarication of the truth. Any farm plan that is as effective would cost equally as much.

Undoubtedly, Mr. Stedman's deserved praise is going to bring more subscribers to the St. Paul dailies, but it can also be taken for granted that the outbursts of the Star are going to deflect more subscribers in addition to the process of adjustments.

Because the Star failed to mention, at least in the edition reaching the Alexandria area, the tribute given Mr. Stedman by Frank Wolley, deputy administrator, we want to insert the words of acknowledgment:

"We found a fund of well-documented historical information in the AAA (Agricultural Adjustment Administration) annual reports, which were prepared, as some of you may know, under the leadership of an outstanding citizen of this city, Alfred D. Stedman, now with the Dispatch and Pioneer Press.

"More than once Mr. Stedman has been called away from his writing duties to serve his country in important posts. As triple A's first director of information, Mr. Stedman helped build a solid foundation for the farm action programs which today enable farmers to work together in striving toward a sound agriculture and Nation. He may find some satisfaction in knowing that farm agencies continue to draw on his sound advice, through the written word."

Rendition in Richmond, Va., of Dixie by Toscanini

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, on April 19 the great maestro, Toscanini, in conducting the NBC symphony orchestra, suddenly waved his orchestra into a rendition of Dixie, which created a tremendous response from the audience.

The reason for the excitement was that Toscanini's classic symphonies are away up in the higher stratosphere of music, but his grandson, it is reported, who is a student at Yale, had educated the maestro into the subtleties of Dixie, and Toscanini had really done a research job on the score of the music.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the Associated Press dispatch describing the occasion, which was printed in many newspapers.

There being no objection, the dispatch was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RICHMOND, VA., April 19.—Toscanini played Dixie.

That's right—Toscanini. That's right—Dixie. You might call it the national anthem of the South.

It happened tonight in the Mosque Auditorium here as the 83-year-old maestro, appearing with the NBC Symphony Orchestra, conducted his second concert of a cross-country tour of 20 cities.

As the master unbent long enough for the unprecedented encore, rebel yells echoed to the rafters of the auditorium, jammed by a crowd of 5,000 which paid prices starting at $6.

Prior to the climactic encore the program was staid enough.

The finale furnished the excitement, and the surprise.

The audience, stunned momentarily, rose with one accord. Yells, howls of surprise, and rousing cheers crashed through the music.

And the maestro—who had kept a dignified austerity all night—grinned back at the sea of faces before him as he took bow after bow.

The surprise rendition of Dixie is credited to Toscanini's 20-year-old grandson, Walfredo Toscanini, a Yale University student. He'd been after the maestro for some time to interest himself in the South.

But grandfather hadn't ever played Dixie—hadn't even heard of it, in fact, until 10 days ago.

He halfway decided he'd play the tune somewhere during his current tour, which will take him into the deep South.

Toscanini arrived here Tuesday. He went to Williamsburg, visited some of Richmond's monuments—and made up his mind to play Dixie in the capital of the Confederacy.

There were frantic rehearsals today. He heard one arrangement, didn't like it, sent out for others.

Finally, he settled on the authenticity of Dr. Frank Black's music sheets—and he played Dixie as old Dan Emmett wrote it but as it had never been played before.

Now he plans to repeat the playing of Dixie in Atlanta and New Orleans. And, said an orchestra spokesman tonight: "The maestro is more interested in the life of Dan Emmett than in Tschaikovsky."

Taking Credit for Prosperity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Taking Credit for Prosperity", written by Dan Kidney, and published in the Indianapolis Times of Sunday, April 16, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEAR BOSS
(By Dan Kidney)

TAKING CREDIT FOR PROSPERITY—PRESIDENT TRUMAN MAY BE CHALLENGED ON STATEMENT

WASHINGTON, April 15.—Dear Boss: President Truman proposing to take all the credit for prosperity can well be challenged by both the Republican Eightieth and Democrat Eighty-first Congresses.

Leaders of the Federal Government's legislative branch can just as well say that they brought about prosperity by refusing to enact the Truman program. For that is exactly what happened.

The President told his first press conference at the White House since he returned from Florida that things are in fine shape after his first 5 years as Chief Executive and that he intends to take credit for it.

If the Federal Government had a great deal to do with prosperity though, it certainly wasn't brought about by enacting Truman's Fair Deal promises into law. The GOP Congress did exactly the opposite.

So the President stumped the country crying that the Eightieth Congress was do-nothing. The people reelected him and gave him comfortable Democratic majorities in both the House and Senate.

But the Eighty-first Congress has turned out to be a super-do-nothing so far as the President's program is concerned. And he plans to take the stump again this year, although he isn't up for reelection until 1952.

LITTLE OF PROGRAM PASSED

Thus the President taking credit for good times now is about like the man who said he saved a fellow's life—shot at him and missed him.

Oleomargarine tax repeal, which hasn't even gone into effect yet, and a middle-income housing bill, with the co-ops cut out, are as close to the Fair Deal program as this Congress has come so far. Nor do they have any intention of doing more of what President Truman wants domestically before adjourning to go home and run for reelection.

Only in foreign relations has the Truman administration won congressional support and that was done on a bipartisan or "unpartisan" basis as Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG (Republican, Michigan), who probably deserves more credit in that field than the President, calls it.

So it may be well to review what President Truman didn't get done. It is all spelled out clearly in a simply written pamphlet distributed by the Democratic National Committee and entitled "Democratic Platform 1948."

The subtitle is "A Program of Progressive Liberalism."

"PROGRESSIVE" PROGRAM

It starts out by bragging about all the New Deal accomplishments under the late F. D. R. No mention is made about that "progressive" program not having been expanded a bit since 1938, a fact which still holds true.

On the domestic front the program promises curbs on inflation which President Truman asked of the Republican Eightieth Congress and didn't get. These he hasn't asked for lately.

Then there is this gem:

"We pledge the continued maintenance of those sound fiscal policies which under Democratic leadership have brought about a balanced budget and reduction of the debt by $28,000,000,000 since the close of the war."

Instead the President has asked each session of the Democratic Congress for deficit financing of an unbalanced budget, and that is one thing that he did get.

Repeal of the Taft-Hartley law was a Presidential promise which put all organized labor on the Truman bandwagon. The law still stands without even an amendment.

Upping the minimum wage to 75 cents was passed, but that too was bipartisan.

ONLY PROMISSORY NOTE

An expanded and increased social-security program still remains a promissory note and compulsory health insurance a thing that kept Federal Security Administrator Oscar R. (Jack) Ewing out of the Cabinet.

Federal aid for education is in the House ice box. It has been promised by the Democrats for years, but is as far from delivery as their civil-rights pledges on antilynching, poll-tax repeal, and FEPC.

That the Democrats have done all right for themselves during these years of large promises and no deliveries cannot be doubted. All you need to do is count the new millionaires in their midst, or those on the way to making a million based on their Democratic connections.

Maybe that is what President Truman means when he says he is so successful. If so, his attitude might be fittingly described by these lines from Oscar Wilde's play, "Lady Windermere's Fan":

"He thinks like a Tory and talks like a radical, and that's so important nowadays."

Carroll Binder Reports From Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present and ask to have printed in the RECORD two additional reports written by Mr. Carroll Binder, editorial editor of the Minneapolis Tribune, relating to conditions in Europe. Five of the reports in the series have heretofore appeared in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WEST EUROPE RED SPOTS LIMITED TO THREE—COMMUNISTS COULD THREATEN FRANCE, ITALY, WEST GERMANY

(By Carroll Binder)

PARIS, FRANCE.—Today Communists appear to be in a position to cause serious trouble in only three countries of western Europe—Italy, France, and western Germany.

In the United Kingdom, Scandinavia, and the low countries they do not have sufficient political or trade-union strength to seriously interfere with the play of free political and economic forces or military defense.

Even in Italy, where they polled 30.7 percent of the vote in April 1948 and are the largest Communist Party outside Russia; France, where they polled 28.2 percent of the vote in November 1946; and in western Germany, where they got the fourth largest vote cast for any party (1,360,443 votes) in August 1949, the Communists appear to be less influential than they were.

ECA GETS BLAME

The Marshall plan is entitled to a considerable share of the credit for this set-back to Communist hopes. So, American aid to Europe is blamed by Communists for everything that is disagreeable from the flu to unemployment.

Wage earners in the cities are told that the Marshall plan is responsible for high prices of foodstuffs. Peasants are told that it is responsible for the low prices they obtain for foodstuffs.

At the moment Communists in France are making fewer overt attacks on the Marshall plan.

They seem to fear that their attacks may have the undesired effect of acquainting Frenchmen previously unaware of American aid with what the United States has done for their country.

But Marshall plan officials occasionally are subjected to hostile demonstrations. "France for the French, America for the Americans," a Communist railwayman muttered to a Marshall plan official getting off the train to dedicate a hydroelectric project built with American aid.

SABOTAGE CHARGED

When the Communists heard that a group of American editors to which I belonged was to visit the Renault Automobile Works in Paris they got out leaflets urging hostile demonstrations to show French defiance of American imperialists. The Communists got set for a demonstration Saturday but our visit was not until Monday. No hostility was shown us and the workers generally were indifferent to our presence.

But anti-Communist French trade-unionists who have spoken well of Marshall-plan aid report having had their tools mislaid and their machines sabotaged with a view to causing accidents.

The Communists brand French, Italian, or German political parties which recognize the role played by Marshall aid in their countries' recovery as agents of Wall Street, looters of strategic materials for the American octopus, colonizers of Europe for decaying American capitalism. Russia is glorified as the paradise of the workers and the liberator of France by the Communists.

TROUBLE EXPECTED

The Communists believe that their finest hour will come in western Europe after Marshall-plan aid ends in 1952.

They expect that discontinuance of dollar assistance will create the kind of economic dislocations which they seemed to be about to exploit so successfully when American aid took the revolution right out of their grasp in Italy and France.

The present diminution of the Communist threat to western Europe thus cannot safely be assumed to be permanent. The Soviet leadership still believes that the world will not be safe for sovietism until capitalistic and socialistic democracies have been supplanted by Soviet regimes.

It is prepared to take whatever time may be necessary to bring about such a consummation. It believes it can outwait, outsmart, and outdo the democracies.

Mayor Ernest Reuter, of Berlin, who is in the farther outpost of European democracy; German Socialist leader, Kurt Schumacher; British Minister of State, Hector McNeill; Anthony Eden, and Italian Foreign Minister Carlo Sforza all discount the possibility of early armed hostilities. American officials and newspaper correspondents with whom I have talked take the same view of Soviet tactics.

DEFEATISM PUSHED

But almost everyone with whom I talked also assumes that the democracies cannot afford to neglect either their military or their social defenses. The best way of avoiding a military show-down is generally assumed to be to have sufficient military strength at the disposition of the democracies to discourage Soviet attempts to take by force what they cannot take by wile.

There remain defeatists who object to their countries taking steps to resist possible Soviet military attack on the ground that western Europe would be overrun before Atlantic Pact countries could put up effective resistance.

The Communists assiduously cultivate this mood among western Europeans.

Pravda gave the cue to its disciples on December 26 when it said: "The United States is now turning Marshallized countries into military bases with local people as cannon fodder. The purpose of the military-aid program is complete submission of Marshallized countries."

So Communist fire tends to be concentrated more on MAP than on the Marshall plan at this time. At Soviet direction, Communist-dominated trade-unions have refused to handle cargoes for Indochina and are organizing demonstrations against the delivery of American military assistance to France and other Atlantic Pact countries.

TROOPS USED

Assuming that the Indochina cargo stoppages are rehearsals for more audacious demonstrations against arms shipment to the democracies, French Defense Minister Rene Pleven has used troops to load goods for Indochina and threatened to cope with anti-MAP strikes in the same way. He also is taking measures to replace workers who go out on such Soviet-inspired strikes.

These strikes reveal Soviet fears that France may become a formidable factor in the defense of western Europe if not thwarted by Moscow's disciples. Pleven is proceeding with plans for using American equipment to mechanize a number of elite divisions which would constitute the backbone of ground resistance to any military attack Russia might make.

American military men who have studied the problem say that in 5 years France and the other western European countries can develop ground forces capable of successfully resisting a Soviet attack in cooperation with our air and naval forces and the air and naval strength of Great Britain.

Their plans envisage close coordination of ground and air forces and use of atomic bombs for tactical as well as strategic purposes.

By being ready to use such defenses it is hoped they may never have to be used. Without such defenses and if rising tides of communism succeed in creating a defeatist mood in western Europe, there are likely to be Soviet coups a la Czechoslovakia every other week end until Russia has taken over the Continent.

UNITED STATES AID GIVES EUROPE LIFT, BINDER FINDS—SPIRIT OF PEOPLE RISES AS JOBS AND FOOD BECOME AVAILABLE

(By Carroll Binder)

PARIS, FRANCE.—One has to know how critical conditions were in western Europe 3 years ago to appreciate fully how much has

been accomplished with $8,000,000,000 worth of Marshall plan aid.

Western Europe's remarkable recovery should not be lost sight of because of disappointment at its failure to integrate economically and politically.

Even those who had seen western Europe recover from the ravages of World War I and appreciate its remarkable recuperative and staying powers did not dare hope 3 years ago that so much progress would be made as can be seen when one journeys through Britain, France, Germany, and Italy.

While the specters of communism and runaway inflation have not been banished permanently from western Europe they have lost their terror for the time being as a result of increased employment, production, and available supplies of food, clothing, and other necessities.

Without the dollar purchasing power provided by American aid this state of affairs could not have been brought about.

Despite their diligence, skills, initiative, and resources, the intelligent, hard-working people of western Europe could not have made as great a comeback without machinery, raw materials, food and other indispensables to be had only with dollars advanced by the American people.

Large numbers of western Europeans are unaware of the character and extent of American aid and many others think we had to give. But this should not obscure the more important fact that our aid helped make it possible for people who belong on our side of the east-west struggle by preference, geography, and institutions to remain there.

CHEAPER THAN LIBERATION

It will take continuing effort to keep western Europe on the side of the free. But the recovery program has won time for that effort.

Instead of having to liberate western Europe for our security we have only to help it lay the bases of enduring stability and independence—a task far less costly in blood, effort, and dollars than liberation.

The contrast between what I saw here in 1946 and what I have just seen is remarkable in many respects.

It is not simply in the buildings rising out of the rubble of wartime destruction; the blasted bridges, culverts, docks, roads, railways, and canals again in normal service; the battle-scarred fields again yielding crops or the factories which had been razed turning out larger production than before they were bombed.

It is the spirit of the people. Hope and confidence have returned to people who were still stunned by war, enemy occupation, collaboration, social revolution, and other experiences of the previous decade.

GAIN FOR UNITED STATES CITED

This is the stuff of which much can be made for the free way of life if given time and the right direction. As the nation with the greatest stake in peace with freedom, justice, security, and prosperity, we may feel that our investment here has not been in vain.

We must not forfeit what we have invested and gained because all of our expectations have not been met.

When one visits land-reclamation projects in overpopulated, land-hungry Italy or fields and factories in France and Britain one sees tangible evidence of benefits due to American aid.

At the Renault automobile works here in France there are rows of transfer machines as up to date and efficient as anything to be found in Detroit, Mich. It is American equipment which could be obtained only with dollar aid.

American assembly-line methods have been introduced into this establishment, which was almost put out of business by Allied bombardment because it produced war materials for the Axis.

The destruction of obsolete equipment in wartime made it easier to modernize this industry. Thus it is producing twice as many cars as it produced prewar with the same number of employees.

Legislation which compels it to employ many more workers than are required so as to help absorb Italy's labor surplus does not give the great Fiat motor works the same incentive to introduce American production techniques.

But Fiat is putting modern American machines bought with Marshall plan dollars to good use. Four hundred cars are being turned out daily and a new model is about to be marketed to help Italy's economy.

(Fiat, Renault, and other firms, as well as farmers who get tractors, pay full value in lire, francs, or pounds for American machinery. The proceeds go into special "counterpart funds" which can only be expended by the governments for purposes approved by the United States. Marshall aid is necessary because the governments lacked dollars with which to pay for essential productive equipment. But individual beneficiaries do not receive "gifts" from the American taxpayers. Only the nation as a whole benefits from such aid in the sense that it does not pay for much of the dollar aid with dollar equivalent.)

Renault and Fiat, which are only two of a wide variety of productive enterprises aided by Marshall plan funds, also use their own considerable resources to increase their productive capacity. They have helped themselves to a far larger extent than they have been helped by American aid.

The margin given by the United States helps provide employment, goods, and earning capacity, which in turn strengthen the economic and social structure of western Europe.

We try to see that the lire, franc, and other local currency equivalents of our dollar aid—the counterpart funds—are used in ways that will permanently benefit the countries we are helping.

In some countries part of these funds go for retirement of internal short-term debt because that serves to reduce inflation and thus furthers social stability.

More visible to the observer are such projects as the reclamation of great tracts of land in Italy which have been unproductive for centuries because of their swampy character.

I have seen two and three crops a year being harvested from land which was useless when I lived in Italy 20 years ago.

By getting rid of malaria and putting in pumps and drainage canals and farm-to-market roads it is being made possible for peasants to come down from their hilltop towns and live in the fields they cultivate.

This saves hours of travel back and forth daily as well as increases the amount of food and labor available to impoverished Italy.

It is estimated that extra employment can be provided for 500,000 Italians annually—nearly one-third of Italy's chronic unemployed—by these reclamation projects partially made possible by American counterpart aid.

Sardinia, hitherto only sparsely settled because of malaria and related problems, is expected to absorb from 300,000 to 400,000 Italians from the mainland as a result of malaria elimination and land reclamation.

By making American hybrid corn available to Italian farmers, the yield has been doubled in some parts of Italy and the average yield is up 30 percent.

Readers of the stark tale of south Italian peasant hopelessness, "Christ Stopped at Eboli," will be interested to know that ERP aid is bringing water and improved methods of cultivation to such long-neglected areas.

Index numbers show production in the 18 participating countries to be well above prewar levels.

Industrial production is 15 to 20 percent greater than it was at the highest prewar level.

Agricultural production is between 95 and 100 percent of the prewar level.

There are now no critical bottlenecks, no commodity shortages that can disrupt the industrial effort. Excluding Germany, the output on a man-year basis is 10 percent above the prewar level.

For these encouraging figures American taxpayers can take considerable credit. So far so good. But our interest in Europe goes beyond its restoration to prewar levels of production.

What we must continue to seek is the construction of a sound basis for the survival of western civilization.

Since that is not yet assured, it is more important to discuss what remains to be done than to report on what has been done. That will be the subject of remaining articles in this series.

Reorganization of NLRB

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 21, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Minneapolis Morning Tribune of April 19, 1950:

PLAN NO. 12 IN TROUBLE

President Truman's bid to whittle away a portion of the Taft-Hartley Act in the guise of a Hoover Commission reform has run into a snag. The Senate Expenditures Committee voted 9 to 4 against his proposal to abolish the Office of General Counsel to the National Labor Relations Board.

The action means Senator TAFT's resolution of disapproval will reach the Senate floor with a favorable recommendation. If it wins the support of 49 Senators, Reorganization Plan No. 12 will be junked.

Mr. Truman justifies plan No. 12 on the basis of a general recommendation by the Hoover Commission that administrative responsibility ought to be vested in the chairmen of regulatory commissions. The change, he said in his message of transmittal, would restore unified authority and responsibility to the Board.

Obviously, the President was either misinformed about what the Commission actually recommended or he is attempting a dubious maneuver for political purposes. For nowhere in the Hoover reports is there any suggestion that the Office of NLRB General Counsel be abolished. In fact, none of the Commission's final recommendations exclusively affect the Board.

The Commission's task force expressed concern about the General Counsel's broad independent powers and felt that some changes might be desirable. It proposed that a council of labor under the chairmanship of the Secretary of Labor be set up to coordinate Federal labor policy and to advise the President. It would include the General Counsel and other officials concerned with labor problems.

Examining the specific suggestion that the General Counsel's functions be restored to the Board, the task force said:

"To this the objection is made that the prosecuting functions should be separate from the hearing of complaints. But * * * only in part are his duties genuinely prosecution. It may be that the administrative and policy-making functions could be subordinated more clearly to the Board's control while still maintaining an adequate separation of the truly prosecuting activities."

When Congress passed the Taft-Hartley law the Office of General Counsel was made independent of the Board in response to complaints that the Board had been acting as prosecutor, judge, and jury in labor matters.

Perhaps Congress is ready to change its mind about the desirability of separating NLRB functions. Perhaps not. The problem, however, is one that needs to be considered in relation to over-all Federal policy in labor relations. It should not be disposed of separately or by indirection.

I Am an American Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 21, 1950

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the annual I Am an American Day program will be under the general chairmanship of Col. Waldron E. Leonard, and I feel sure that these ceremonies on May 21 and 22 will be as impressive as the previous ones that were organized by Colonel Leonard. The occasion of I Am an American Day has been set aside by resolution of Congress and by a proclamation issued by the President of the United States.

With our Capital City being referred to quite often as the capital of the world, I believe it very proper that we give special attention to this 2-day observance, not only as an inspiration to our new American citizens, but as a rededication of our energies and talents to the American way of life.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald, entitled "We're Proud of America":

WE'RE PROUD OF AMERICA

These programs are a fitting prelude for the big 2-day observance of "I Am An American Day," scheduled May 21 and 22.

On May 21 which is a Sunday, Washingtonians will celebrate this day, set aside by Congress and the President as a time for reaffirming their citizenship, in their homes and churches.

The following day an enormous program will be held on the Capitol plaza. President Truman will make the principal address. Members of the House and Senate and officials of the various Government departments will participate in the program.

And, we think it would be an excellent idea if the Government departments were let out early enough for all employees to attend the ceremonies planned for 4 p. m. Arrangements should also be made to see that as many school children as possible have an opportunity to attend.

The children will really enjoy this show because the committee in charge has received a promise that Hopalong Cassidy will be present. Hopalong, hero of one of the favorite comic strips appearing in the Times-Herald, is also the big rage among kids on television.

The program will be climaxed with a recitation of the American creed. Music will be furnished by the service bands in this area.

It will be a grand show and Col. Waldron Leonard, chairman of the committee in charge, is due for thanks from the community for working up the program.

Let's give him a great big hand and let's see there is a turn-out at the Capitol big enough to show the rest of the Nation and the world that the people in Washington are proud to be Americans.

Truth Must Prevail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 21, 1950

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by our President, the Honorable Harry S. Truman, at a luncheon of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, Hotel Statler, Washington, D. C., on Thursday, April 20. The President's address carried a most timely message on using truth as the best weapon to fight the falsities of Communist propaganda. The President has directed the Secretary of State to plan a strengthened and more effective national effort to use the great power of truth in working for peace. His remarks are very much to the point and I am happy to place them in the Appendix to the RECORD so they may receive the attention merited by their importance.

The address follows:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, members of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, I am happy to be here today with this group of editors. You and I have a great many important problems in common, and one of the most important of these is the responsibility we share in helping to make the foreign policy of the United States of America. That is why I am going to take this opportunity to discuss with you some aspects of that policy.

No group of men in this country is of greater importance to our foreign policy than the group your society represents.

In a democracy, foreign policy is based on the decisions of the people.

One vital function of a free press is to present the facts on which the citizens of a democracy can base their decisions. You are a link between the American people and world affairs. If you inform the people well and completely, their decisions will be good. If you misinform them, their decisions will be bad; our country will suffer and the world will suffer.

You cannot make up people's minds for them. What you can do is to give them the facts they need to make up their own minds. That is a tremendous responsibility.

Most of you are meeting that responsibility well—but I am sorry to say a few are meeting it badly. Foreign policy is not a matter for partisan presentation. The facts about Europe or Asia should not be twisted to conform to one side or the other of a political dispute. Twisting the facts might change the course of an election at home, but it would certainly damage our country's program abroad.

In many other countries today, the papers print about foreign affairs only what their governments tell them to print. They can't add anything, or cut anything. In the democracies, the papers have a free hand. Only in a democracy is there such mutual trust and confidence among citizens that a private group is given such an all-important role in determining what the Nation as a whole shall do. There is too much nonsense about striped trousers in foreign affairs. Far more influence is exerted by the baggy pants of the managing editor.

There has never been a time in our history when there was so great a need for our citizens to be informed and to understand what is happening in the world.

The cause of freedom is being challenged throughout the world today by the forces of imperialistic communism. This is a struggle, above all else, for the minds of men. Propaganda is one of the most powerful weapons the Communists have in this struggle. Deceit, distortion, and lies are systematically used by them as a matter of deliberate policy.

This propaganda can be overcome by truth—plain, simple, unvarnished truth—presented by newspapers, radio, and other sources that the people trust. If the people are not told the truth, or if they do not have confidence in the accuracy and fairness of the press, they have no defense against falsehoods. But if they are given the true facts, these falsehoods become laughable instead of dangerous.

We can have confidence that the free press of the United States and most of the other free nations will keep us from being deceived by Communist propaganda. But in other parts of the world the struggle between falsehood and truth is far more intense and dangerous.

Communist propaganda is so false, so crude, so blatant, that we wonder how men can be swayed by it. We forget that most of the people to whom it is directed do not have free access to accurate information. We forget that they do not hear our broadcasts or read impartial newspapers. We forget that they do not have a chance to learn the truth by traveling abroad or by talking freely to travelers in their own countries.

All too often the people who are subject to Communist propaganda do not know Americans, or citizens of the other free nation, as we really are. They do not know us as farmers or as workers. They do not know us as people having hopes and problems like their own. Our way of life is something strange to them. They do not even know what we mean when we say democracy.

This presents one of the greatest tasks facing the free nations today. That task is nothing less than to meet false propaganda with truth all around the globe. Everywhere that the propaganda of Communist totalitarianism is spread, we must meet it and overcome it with honest information about freedom and democracy.

In recent years, there has been tremendous progress all over the world in education and the exchange of ideas. This progress has stirred men everywhere to new desires and new ambitions. They want greater knowledge, they want better lives, they want to be masters of their own affairs. We have helped and encouraged these people, but the Communists have seized upon their desires and ambitions and are seeking to exploit them for their own selfish purposes.

In the Far East, for example, millions are restlessly seeking to break away from the conditions of poverty and misery that have

surrounded them in the past. The Communists understand this situation very well. They are trying to move in and take advantage of these aspirations. They are making glittering promises about the benefits of communism. They reach directly to the peasant or the villager in these vast areas, and talk to him directly in his own tongue about the things he has learned to desire. They say that they can get these things for him. And too often he hears no voice from our side to dispute them.

We know how false these Communist promises are. But it is not enough for us to know this. Unless we get the real story across to people in other countries, we will lose the battle for men's minds by default.

The Communist propaganda portrays the Soviet Union as the world's foremost advocate of peace and the protector of defenseless peoples. The contradiction between what the Communist leaders have promised and what they have actually done is so startling that we are amazed that anyone can be deceived. In Berlin, in Czechoslovakia, in the Balkans, in the Far East, they have proved, time after time, that their talk about peace is only a cloak for imperialism. But their intended victims will not learn these facts from Soviet propaganda. We are the ones who must make sure that the truth about communism is known everywhere.

At the same time, we must overcome the constant stream of slander and vilification that the Communists pour out in an effort to discredit the United States and other free nations.

Soviet propaganda constantly reviles the United States as a Nation of war mongers and imperialists. You and I know how absurd that it. We know that the United States is wholly dedicated to the cause of peace. We have no purpose of going to war except in defense of freedom. Our actions demonstrate that we mean exactly what we say. But when men throughout the world are making their choice between communism and democracy, the important thing is not what we know about our purposes and our actions—the important thing is what they know.

Communist propaganda also seeks to destroy our influence in the world by saying the American economy is weak and about to collapse. We know this is preposterous. The industrial production of the United States is equal to that of the rest of the world combined. Our agricultural production is more than adequate for our needs. Our people enjoy the highest standard of living in the world's history. Our economic strength is the bulwark of the free world.

From every standpoint, our free way of life is vastly superior to the system of oppression which the Communists seek to impose upon mankind. In many parts of the world, however, where men must choose between freedom and communism, the true story is going untold.

We cannot run the risk that nations may be lost to the cause of freedom because their people do not know the facts.

I am convinced that we should greatly extend and strengthen our efforts for making the truth known to people in all the world.

Most of us have recognized for years, of course, how important it is to spread the truth about freedom and democracy. We are already doing some very good work—through the Voice of America and the United States information offices and libraries in many parts of the world, through the exchange of students, through the United Nations and its affiliated organizations, and in other ways. But events have shown, I believe, that we need to do much more, both ourselves and in collaboration with the other free nations. We must use every means at our command, private as well as governmental, to get the truth to other peoples.

Private groups and organizations have an important part to play. Our labor unions have already done fine work in communicating with labor in Europe, in Latin America, and elsewhere. The story of free American labor, told by American trade-unionists, is a better weapon against Communist propaganda among workers in other countries than any number of speeches by Government officials.

The same principle applies to other groups. The best way for farmers in other countries to find out about us is to talk directly with our own farmers. Our businessmen can speak directly to businessmen abroad. We need to promote much more direct contact between our people and those of other countries.

We should encourage many more people from other countries to visit us here, to see for themselves what is true and what is not true about our country. We should find more opportunities for foreign students to study in our schools and universities. They will learn here the skills and techniques needed in their countries. They will also see at first hand the rights and duties of citizens in our land of democratic institutions.

Our colleges should train more Americans to go abroad as teachers, especially to teach modern methods of farming, industry, and public health—and, by example, to teach our concepts of democracy. The notable record of our many charitable and religious organizations who send teachers abroad is proof of what can be done.

Another major part of our effort must be carried out through our great public information channels—newspapers and magazines, radio, and motion pictures. We must strive constantly to break down or leap over barriers to free communication wherever they exist. We must make full use of every effective means of communicating information, in simple, understandable form, to people whose backgrounds and cultures are different from ours.

This poses an enormous challenge to groups such as yours, a challenge which can be met only by extraordinary inventiveness and enterprise. I am confident that the American press can and will make a tremendously useful contribution toward finding new solutions.

The Government's programs for telling the truth about the United States to the peoples of the world also need constant improvement. Our present overseas information and educational exchange program is getting results. For example, the Voice of America has been carrying to people behind the iron curtain the true story of world events. It has been so successful that the Soviet Government is using a vast amount of costly equipment in an attempt to drown out our broadcasts by jamming. We must devise ways to break through that jamming and get our message across. And we must improve and strengthen our whole range of information and educational services.

This is not a conclusion reached by Government officials alone. We have had the valuable aid of the United States Advisory Commission on Information created by the Congress. Your own society is ably represented on that Commission by Mr. Mark Ethridge and Mr. Erwin D. Canham. The members of the Commission have given intensive study to the overseas-information program and have made repeated recommendations that it be substantially expanded. Similar recommendations for the exchange program have been made by the Advisory Commission on Education, headed by Dr. Harvie Branscomb. I have been glad to see that many Members of the Congress have urged an improved and expanded program in these fields—as shown, for example, by the resolution introduced recently by Senator BENTON for himself and a number of his colleagues.

Because of the pressing need to increase our efforts along this line, I have directed the Secretary of State to plan a strengthened and more effective national effort to use the great power of truth in working for peace. This effort will require the imagination and energies of private individuals and groups throughout the country. We shall need to use fully all the private and governmental means that have proved successful so far—and to discover and employ new ones.

Our task is to present the truth to the millions of people who are uninformed or misinformed or unconvinced. Our task is to reach them in their daily lives, as they work and learn. We must be alert, ingenious, and diligent in reaching peoples of other countries, whatever their educational and cultural backgrounds may be. Our task is to show them that freedom is the way to economic and social advancement, the way to political independence, the way to strength, happiness, and peace.

This task is not separate and distinct from other elements of our foreign policy. It is a necessary part of all we are doing to build a peaceful world. It is as important as armed strength or economic aid. The Marshall plan, military aid, point 4—these and other programs depend for their success on the understanding and support of our own citizens and those of other countries.

We must make ourselves known as we really are—not as Communist propaganda pictures us. We must pool our efforts with those of the other free peoples in a sustained, intensified program to promote the cause of freedom against the propaganda of slavery. We must make ourselves heard round the world in a great campaign of truth.

We have tremendous advantages in the struggle for men's minds and loyalties. We have truth and freedom on our side. The appeal of free institutions and self-government springs from the deepest and noblest aspirations of mankind. It is based on every man's desire for liberty and opportunity. It is based on every man's wish to be self-reliant and to shape his own destiny.

As we go forward with our campaign of truth, we will make lasting progress toward the kind of world we seek—a world in which men and nations live not as enemies but as brothers.

Budenz' Unerring Finger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 21, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Charles T. Lacey, from the Washington Daily News for April 21, 1950:

BUDENZ' UNERRING FINGER

(By Charles T. Lucey)

There is no blithe laughing off of the testimony of Louis F. Budenz by Government officials who have worked most closely with him since he renounced communism 5 years ago.

They look back over the record and give him credit for solid devotion to facts.

Time and again the ex-Communist, now teaching at Fordham University in New York, has appeared publicly against the Communists, and repeatedly his testimony has led to court convictions or has been borne out by subsequent events.

Mr. Budenz was the Government's leading witness in the long New York trial of 11

Communist leaders. For days he sweated under vigorous cross-examination of defense lawyers trying to shake his story. But in the opinion of some who followed the case almost microscopically, they never laid a glove on him.

This same man earlier had put the finger on Gerhart Eisler as the No. 1 power in United States communism. Most Americans never had heard of the little commissar—they thought Earl Browder, later tossed out by Moscow, was the chief revolutionary.

But Mr. Budenz, who held an important Communist command post as managing editor of the party's newspaper, The Daily Worker, was able to tell how Mr. Eisler berated and pushed around lesser fry. Mr. Eisler subsequently was convicted for contempt of Congress, skipped the country, and today serves Stalin in the Russian zone of Germany.

In August 1948, Mr. Budenz testified that it was known among Communist Party officials in New York that Alger Hiss was linked to party affairs.

Mr. Budenz helped put the finger on Sam Carr, convicted in connection with the operation of the Communist spy ring in Canada.

He testified against John Santo, secretary-treasurer of the New York City Transport Workers Union—the man brought to New York to organize the subway system for the Commies—in a deportation case that led to Santo's voluntary departure from the United States.

In that case he knew his past private life was sure to be the target for a smear campaign by the Communists, but he went ahead anyway.

Those who know Mr. Budenz well say it has been only after the deepest soul searching that he has decided to tell all he knows about the operations of the Communist Party in this country. When he renounced communism in 1945, it wasn't a case of suddenly seeing the light, but of prolonged mental struggle within himself.

It was not so difficult for him, his friends say, to expose the party's top leaders, but it was difficult to disclose facts concerning personal friends in the Communist movement.

But eventually he made his decision on the ground that this had to be done to tell the whole story of what communism was attempting in this country.

Mr. Budenz took the step that gave dramatic substance to his renunciation of communism on October 10, 1945, in St. Patrick's Cathedral in New York. There, with his wife and three daughters, he made the profession of faith that carried him back into the Catholic Church he had left many years before.

Another Boost for Big Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1950

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I want to discuss President Truman's veto of the Kerr amendments to the Natural Gas Act. Because many consumers of natural gas are of the opinion that the President's veto has warded off the threat of higher rates for this popular fuel, I believe it is well that you should know there is far more danger of higher gas rates now than there would have been had the President signed the Kerr bill. In spite of all the fog that was thrown up during consideration of the Kerr bill, it was purely a measure simply to retain to the various States the control over their natural-gas resources they hitherto have enjoyed; also control over distribution of gas within their borders.

In vetoing the bill the President deliberately broke his word, both express and implied, to leaders of his own political party. He did so, it is obvious, solely because of the tremendous pressure put upon him because of a Nation-wide propaganda campaign sponsored by those who would centralize all power in Washington.

The people of the United States were told that putting the Kerr bill on the statute books would constitute a victory for monopolists and would result in higher natural-gas prices for ultimate consumers. No statement in this connection could possibly have been more false. Yet, the President, who should have known better, if he did not, deliberately inserted this false propaganda in his veto message.

In saying these things I am sure I express the conviction of a majority in Congress. Yes; a majority of both political parties. Everyone on Capitol Hill knows that the Kerr bill, as finally passed, had been rewritten in exact accordance with the expressed wishes of the President. The leaders of his own party in Congress fought for the bill.

But the President, coldly and cynically, betrayed them. It must be assumed that he deserted those who trusted him and were loyal to him to curry favor with those whose political philosophy is that of big government—bigger and bigger government, until socialism is the end result. We all know now that socialism is a form of social and economic slavery. We know it to be the precursor of communism, the antichrist, the ultimate terror.

Now, why did the majority of both Houses of Congress vote to pass the Kerr bill? Was it merely to serve the interests of a selfish minority who would boost the price of natural gas, or was it to defeat the conspiracy of a still smaller and far more selfish minority in Government, in this instance to take another long step toward the ultimate socialization of the Nation's economy? Was a vote for the Kerr bill a vote for big government or a vote for the right of States and municipalities to handle their own business within their borders? Was it a vote for higher or lower gas prices?

Let me tell you about that. Let me make it clear to you that many have been misled by those who would give the bureaucratic Federal Power Commission virtually dictatorial powers over the production and sale of the natural gas they find so cheap and convenient for their daily household uses.

When Congress passed the Natural Gas Act in 1938, the intent was to provide for Federal regulation solely of natural gas moving through interstate pipe lines and interstate commerce—this and nothing more. This policy, moreover, was confirmed by amendments to the act in 1942 and 1947. But as it happened there was a flaw in the statute—a flaw which the Kerr bill was designed to correct. As written, the Natural Gas Act provides that the Federal Power Commission may assume regulatory jurisdiction over a pipe-line company only after it has officially designated it as a natural-gas company as distinguished from a gas-producing or distributing company. Under the statute, such a company must be engaged in interstate commerce and qualify as a natural-gas company.

In the so-called East Ohio case, which was litigation involving only the city of Cleveland and the pipe lines operated entirely within the State by the East Ohio Gas Co., the Federal Power Commission intervened. The East Ohio Co. was designated as a natural gas company. Thus, the Federal Power Commission assumed jurisdiction over a matter pertaining solely to the State and not involving interstate commerce at all. The Supreme Court of the United States later upheld this action of the Federal Power Commission.

Having thus successfully invaded the rights of States to handle their own affairs in this respect, more recently the Federal Power Commission has sought to assume jurisdiction over the production and gathering of gas within the States for sale to interstate pipe line companies. A hearing in this connection is now pending in Oklahoma and, I understand, there are nearly 50 other jurisdiction cases listed. From all this, it becomes apparent that the Federal Power Commission seeks regulatory power over natural gas all the way from its discovery underground to the point where it is burned in the kitchen stove. That is big government; it is socialization.

Why is it socialization? Simply because by this means Washington bureaucrats would determine not only whether the people get gas at all, but how much gas they get, how and where they get it, when they get it, and how much they pay for it. Producers and distributors of gas would, in effect, become appendages of a Government bureau, subject to its every whim.

From all I have said thus far, Mr. Speaker, you may understand that the Federal Power Commission has challenged the authority of every State public utility commission in America, including our own Michigan Public Service Commission. It has arrogantly disregarded the will of Congress by seeking, and in large measure obtaining, authority over every natural gas distributing company in America; and unless stopped, will take authority over the production and gathering of gas.

Now, aside from the socialistic implications of this grab for power, what may be expected so far as concerns the quantity and price of the natural gas available to the consumer under total regulation by the Federal Power Commission? The answer is not a difficult one.

Over the past two or three decades, since natural gas became an important factor in the Nation's fuel market, under State regulation, the price of natural gas at the well-head and at the end of the gathering line, where it is delivered to

the interstate pipe-line companies, consistently has moved downward. Under State regulation the price of natural gas has become lower from year to year. It is cheaper today than it was 20 years ago.

Over the past 12 years, under Federal Power Commission regulation of interstate transmission of gas, the price of gas delivered to distributing companies by the interstate pipe lines has consistently moved upward. Natural gas delivered at the home is still cheaper than it was 20 years ago. But the increases of late years are due almost entirely to the policy of the Federal Power Commission. This policy is to grant rates which yield the interstate pipe-line companies 6 percent above a rate base that contains all costs. These costs include all financing, all operations, amortization of the total investment, local, State and Federal taxes, and everything else a lot of smart lawyers can think up and persuade the Commission to allow in the rate base.

If the Federal Power Commission gains jurisdiction over production and gathering of natural gas, and its sale at retail by distributing companies, there will be a direct conflict of authority between State and Federal commissions. It would throw the natural-gas business into chaos for many years to come, until the battle is won by one side or the other.

Moreover, gas producing and distributing companies would have to keep at least two sets of books, one for the State and the other for the Federal authorities, and these increased costs would have to be paid by gas consumers through higher gas rates.

At any rate, being on the ground and knowing the conditions at first hand, State commissions have reduced natural-gas rates at both producing and distributing ends, while permitting the producers enough income to enable them to explore for new wells and the distributors enough income to give good service. With the Federal Power Commission the opposite has been the case. Prices charged distributing companies have gone up and only in part because of increased costs of labor and materials.

The State commissions have regulated natural gas business within the States without having to hire large numbers of people, at high cost to the taxpayers. But if the Federal Power Commission has its way, you may be sure that thousands will be added to the Government pay roll.

Even if the Federal Power Commission should reduce rates still further at the wells and at the gas burners in your home, you would undoubtedly pay more in boosted taxes to pay for the hordes of new Federal Power Commission employees than you would save in gas rates. moreover, natural gas rates at the wells are now so low that some States have been forced to put floors under prices to make sure that gas producers have enough money to explore for new wells and thus maintain the supply.

The President said interstate pipe lines must be protected from high prices at the wells, because they can buy gas only in restricted areas. This is a direct misrepresentation of the facts. Gas wells cannot be moved from one place to another, but gas pipe lines can be moved. The gas producers need the protection. The President put the cart before the horse, in order to make it look as if he were driving in the direction of lower gas prices instead of higher.

So I submit to you, that a vote for the Kerr bill was a vote for lower gas prices to the consumer, and for ever-growing supplies of gas. The Kerr bill was well designed to prevent further socialization of the natural-gas industry, and to maintain States' rights. It was a bill to protect gas consumers, and not to exploit them.

As I remarked once before, in Washington things hardly ever are what they seem. And in this instance, as in so many others, the Committee for Democratic Action and other big Government boosters were not concerned with the welfare of the people, or even with the truth. They were concerned only with the furtherance of their socialistic ideology.

The National Capital Sesquicentennial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 21, 1950

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech of the gentleman from Washington, Hon. WALT HORAN, as part of the Salute to Freedom pageant, April 15, 1950, on the steps of the Capitol:

We Americans are gathered here today to launch a Nation-wide celebration of the founding of our Nation's Capital. It is the only capital city in the world that was hewn out of a wilderness to shelter a government that was first created on paper, then erected of brick and stone. This National Capital, dedicated to freedom, was George Washington's last legacy to the American people. It vindicates Lafayette's prediction, for it has become the central star of the constellation that enlightens the whole world.

I know I can safely say that never before in history has there been an anniversary so important as that which we begin to observe on this spot today. In 150 years this city has become the capital of the greatest nation on earth and the hub of the whole civilized world. And it is the world's symbol of hope for the future of humanity, of free individuals, of government without tyranny.

Freedom—let me repeat, freedom—must be the heart and theme of this sesquicentennial birthday of the Federal City of Washington. Every feature and event that you witness in the months to come will be dedicated to that theme—just as our country itself is dedicated to preserving the precept of freedom.

For more than 7 months this proud and beautiful city will enact the dramatic Pageant of Freedom. Let each and every one of us be impressed with what it means to be a free American. We of the Sesquicentennial Commission pray that every man, woman, and child in America will, in some way, participate. We pray for a lasting appreciation of the good fortune and tremendous responsibility which are ours. We earnestly hope that an increasing spontaneity will develop the greatest civic celebration in history—an unprecedented display of mutual, nonpartisan faith and good will.

We commemorate today the laying of the cornerstone of the District of Columbia. One hundred and fifty years ago today that cornerstone was laid at Jones Point, in which is now the city of Alexandria, a part of the Federal reservation that has since been ceded back to Virginia. The 22d of November marks the day when, 7 months later, the Sixth Congress convened, the first to meet in the new Federal City of Washington. The infant community, made up of segments of the colonies of Maryland and Virginia, really deserved its early nicknames of "the city of streets without houses," and "the city of magnificent mudholes." Our farsighted patriots were still wrenching it from the wilderness.

Recently I read about the discovery in Asia Minor, on the Persian Gulf, of stone tablets. They told of the principles of government of the ancient Sumerian region of Babylonia, many hundreds of years before Christ. There, in the very cradle of civilization, scientists have unearthed the first known record of a nation with true social conscience. They found a government which not only allowed but demanded the participation of all its people, great and humble—truly a predecessor of our own Republic, dedicated as it is to government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

It is good that this ideal has somehow persevered, to spread from the Tigris and the Euphrates to the Potomac and the Hudson, over thousands of years and miles. Today we Americans can take pride in the fact that our own land has produced the highest fulfillment of that ideal—and created the most successful government ever to be based upon it.

I think that in all the writings of the man whose vision and triumph we celebrate here today, there are none more appropriate than this passage from Washington's Farewell Address:

"The unity of government which constitutes you one people is now dear to you. It is justly so; for it is a main pillar in the edifice of your real independence, the support of your tranquillity at home; your peace abroad; of your safety; of your prosperity; of that very liberty which you so highly prize."

But as it is easy to foresee that from different causes and different quarters, much pains will be taken, many artifices employed, to weaken in your minds the conviction of this truth—as this is the point in your political fortress against which the batteries of internal and external enemies will be most constantly and actively (though covertly and insidiously) directed—it is then of infinite moment that you should properly estimate the immense value of your national union to your collective and individual happiness—discountenancing whatever may suggest even a suspicion that it can in any event be abandoned, and indignantly frowning upon the first dawning of every attempt to alienate any portion of our country from the rest, or to enfeeble the sacred ties which now link together the various parts.

These are the most stirring words I can summon with which to welcome all of you to the National Capital Sesquicentennial Celebration, and commend to your keeping the future of our country and the preservation of the ideals which have made it so great.

Report on Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 20, 1950

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, under the sponsorship of the American Zionist Emergency Council, Rabbi Leon Stitskin, a distinguished clergyman of Rochester, N. Y., and liaison officer between the council and New York State government officials in Washington, visited the infant State of Israel last year and there made a detailed study of political, economic, social, and religious problems.

His report has been forwarded to me with the suggestion that it might merit the attention of my colleagues by inclusion in the RECORD. I am happy to accede to this suggestion, due to the extremely high qualifications of the author and the great importance of the issues he discusses. Although I realize their controversial character in part, the contribution of Rabbi Stitskin to the thinking on this timely subject is significant.

The report follows:

REPORT ON ISRAEL

(By Rabbi Leon Stitskin)

The political cauldron in Israel seethes over four issues which I was asked to investigate: One, the Arab refugee problem; two, territorial adjustment; three, the status of Jerusalem; four, the holy places.

As to the problem of Arab refugees, a wave of slanderous propaganda has been unleashed which distorts the facts and leads to erroneous conclusions. As a result of the propaganda, the Foreign Minister of Israel was forced into a compromising, almost suicidal, position when he consented to the admission of 100,000 refugees into the cramped and impoverished territory of Israel against the protest of the cabinet. Nobody with a practical knowledge of Israel believes that the country can integrate into its strategy and social economy 100,000 Arabs. Nevertheless, our State Department continued to pressure Israel for the admission of 250,000 Arab refugees.

On November 29, 1947, the people of Israel were fully prepared to set up a State on the basis of a settlement which entailed that at the outset 45 percent of its population would be Arabs. This would indeed have been effected had the Arab nations, too, accepted the UN decision and cooperated in maintaining the peace. But the Arabs revolted against the UN decision and wrecked the peace. They did so both within Israel and from without, forcing Israel to fight against five implacable armies, that converged upon the Jewish state from all sides, and an insurgent army from within. Their efforts failed. The invasion and rebellion collapsed. Then followed the Arab exodus. The Arabs fled despite the pleadings of the Jews for them to remain. Why did they go? Who prevailed upon them to leave? It was the Arab high command that promised them that the British were going to reinforce their armies and within a few days all the Jews would be drowned in a torrent of blood and they could return to divide the spoils and take possession of Jewish homes and belongings, settlements, and cities.

The primary and most decisive consideration in the Arab refugee problem is Israel's security. A flood of returning Arabs is liable to blow up the State from within. The Arab refugees will constitute a potential fifth column.

Even if those who return may now be seeking peace, they could not be relied upon in the event of new outbreaks. A mass repatriation of refugees without peace with the neighboring countries would be an act of suicide on the part of Israel. No government placed in such a position would think of doing anything of the sort. Israel is told not to worry about future outbreaks. But who is ready to give a pledge of peace to Israel? In the hour of need, who offered it a helping hand? The UN stood by impotent. The United States imposed an embargo on the export of arms to aggressor and victim alike. Today the Arab states have assurances that Great Britain will renew the supply of arms to them. Egypt has recently increased her war budget and she received eight warships from England. Lebanon is increasing her army to 10,000. Syria has sent 500 men to train in the British Air Force. Arab radio stations are daily pouring forth a stream of vituperative propaganda directed against Israel, threatening a second round. Such being the position of Israel, where is the moral and political justification for the unreasonable demands that are being made upon her? Why should this infant state be asked to undermine its national security with its own hands?

Then there is the economic factor. The truth of the matter is that the Arab economy in Israel has collapsed. Moreover, a large part of the geographical and economic vacuum created by the exodus has been filled by the new immigrants. A mass return of Arab refugees would require a creation of a new Arab economy.

Thirdly, the State is harnessing all its energy and resources to the great task of absorbing the new immigrants. This calls for unusual sacrifice in terms of high taxation and austerity which would have to be shared by the Arab population on an equal basis. The Arabs would no doubt resent being drafted for helping increase the Jewish population and there would be some justification for their disgruntlement.

What then is the solution? One of the wisest international measures taken after the First World War was the exchange of populations between Greece and Turkey. If any single factor has contributed to terminate the age-old enmity between those two countries, it has been the removal of the minority populations. But this may appear to be a far-fetched solution at the moment. In the meantime, Israel has declared its readiness to help in the resettlement of the displaced Arabs.

Israel is prepared to pay compensation for abandoned lands (there are not many precedents for this) and will continue to help in the reunion of families which were separated by the catastrophe. Israel will also admit 100,000 more refugees and will integrate them in its social economy. (We must not forget, however, that there are already in Israel at present close to 170,000 Arabs.) This will be accomplished only after peace negotiations are completed and the Clapp Commission will make its final recommendations on the economic development of that part of the world.

The second point at issue is the territorial question. Although Israel has fully earned its right to the Negev, Egypt has not become reconciled to this state of affairs. Great Britain, too, is dissatisfied with Israel's hold on the Negev. Why? In case of another war it would serve the best interest of Britain that all Arab countries be united by land as well as by sea. The assignment of part of the Negev to Egypt would establish a direct route from Egypt to Transjordan while depriving Israel of the important strategic port of Akaba. Thus, if Egypt were to close the Suez, Israel would have no outlet to the sea.

But aside from this consideration, Israel must have natural boundaries. The Jewish state needs bridgeheads and outposts to protect the heart of the nation. The Negev will not only serve as a vast reservoir for the resettlement of thousands of refugees but also as a military zone protecting the southern entrance to Israel. Every colony and settlement is in a sense a strategic outpost, a military zone, in addition to being an agricultural settlement. Hence Israel needs the Negev not only for settlement but also as a natural boundary for the defense of the land.

The natural frontiers between Israel and Egypt, Lebanon and Syria, are the former boundaries between British mandated territory and these three countries. The same holds good for the frontier between Israel and Transjordan. In the case of Egypt there is a special problem of the Gaza-Rafa strip. In this matter, too, the Government of Israel is prepared to seek a solution by negotiations. The same is true of the road to Bethlehem, which is in Jewish hands, and the road to Mount Scopus, held by the Arabs.

Yet Israel can on no account acquiesce in the seizure by invading armies of any strip of territory forming part of the area of the Jewish state. For this reason Israel will never agree to leave in the hands of Syria the strip lying to the east of the Jordan and Lake of Galilee.

Mr. Sharett has pointed out it will not do to encourage the Arab aggressors by intimating that they might succeed in obtaining territorial concessions by political pressure. Said Sharett: "The contribution made by the United States of America toward adoption of that great historic decision will never be forgotten, just as the outstanding contribution of the Soviet Union and of other powers, large and small, will be remembered. But the lesson taught by the fate of that resolution and the mortal pains of its implementation has also been deeply engraved in letters of fire when the state of Israel at birth hung between life and death. It was not the resolution of November 29, 1947, which proved its salvation. Israel's soldiers did not sacrifice their lives in gaining for this state defense positions and security zones in order that political leaders of the nation should throw away this sacred, blood-drenched patrimony."

The status of Jerusalem is the most controversial and explosive issue. As far as Israel is concerned, Jerusalem constitutes the heart of the nation. It is vital to its future security and Israel will therefore never accept any compromise on New Jerusalem. Any attempt to force the internationalization will lead to renewed warfare in the Middle East. The new city of Jerusalem is 95 percent Jewish and is an integral and inseparable part of the Jewish state. During the war Israel paid for the defense of Jerusalem with untold sacrifices and a heavy toll of life. Israel has made many concessions, but on this question there will be no compromise. As to the holy places in Jerusalem, it is pointed out that 95 percent are situated in the old city, and Israel will agree to accept some form of international supervision over the holy places and shrines.

With regard to the holy places in Israel, slanderous and libelous campaign propaganda has been conducted by certain quarters who are pressing for the internationalization of Jerusalem. There has been a great deal of misrepresentation and mischievous fabrication.

Atrocity stories have been published about alleged violations of the rights of the church,

arrests of priests and high ecclesiastical dignitaries. What are the facts?

There are within the area assigned to Israel approximately 200 Christian churches and monasteries administered by 12 Christian denominations. The value of Christian property within the territory of Israel amounts to $80,000,000 of which damages incurred during the war constitutes less than one-half percent, or less than $500,000. The war damage to Christian property is virtually confined to one Jerusalem church, The Notre Dame, because the Arabs turned it into a fortress. The Jewish Army was reluctant to train its guns on this church, until its position became untenable. There is no damage to any church property in Nazareth. The Government has promised to make all necessary repairs and has set up a special department to look after the interests and welfare of Christian and Moslem sacred shrines.

The Israel Ministry for Religious Affairs watches over the holy places with a vigilance and zeal which cannot be surpassed. A number of heads of Christian churches have their seats in Israel and are active in protecting their rights and interests. They enjoy every facility and are working in close contact with the Israel Ministry for Religious Affairs and the local authorities.

I have a copy of a letter addressed by Father Terence, patriarchal vicar of Jerusalem to the Ministry of Religions of Israel in which he categorically denies "the exaggerated and false impression made public on May 18, 1949, concerning an incident which is said to have occurred in Ain Karem."

Another Catholic leader, Father Terence Kuehn, vicar general for the southern area of Israel and a member of the Franciscan Order in Jerusalem, also testified that the Israel Government's attitude is one of definite good will. "A number of incidents have occurred at the hands of fanatics, including the breaking off of some locks from doors of Franciscan property and the throwing of stones at one of the windows, but I do not think that circumstances would have been different under another government considering what has taken place in the Holy Land. The Jews have made true efforts and I am sure the position of the church in Israel will improve."

Rev. Leigh F. Irish, pastor of the American Gospel Church, who said his church was the first American church in Jerusalem, described the Israel Government as most agreeable, kind, and considerate. He ruled out persecution and desecration, and said: "I am against the false type of propaganda some persons are spreading in the United States and elsewhere to slander Israel. Israel deserves the utmost commendation for what it has done."

Rev. Robert Lindsay, leader of the Jerusalem Baptist Congregation, smiled at the suggestion of any desecration of church property. He expressed opposition to the internationalization of Jerusalem "which would put the Holy City on a pragmatic basis. Israel has done just as good a job in Jerusalem, if not better, than others could have done."

In conclusion: Israel's accomplishments during the first 2 years are phenomenal. Everywhere there is marked progress. The functions of the Government are conducted with western efficiency. Law and order rule supreme. The humanitarian impulse and the willingness to build cooperatively a state based on justice, equity, and peace—are auspicious portents for the future.

All in all, Israel is the best investment as far as western democratic ideals are concerned in a sea of reaction and primitive feudalism. The Jewish state constitutes an oasis in a desert of undeveloped areas.

Dr. Shoulders Endorses Hospital Construction Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT GORE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 21, 1950

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, since making the statement here on April 4 that I would offer at the proper time in consideration of this bill an amendment to restore the unjustified $75,000,000 reduction in funds for construction of hospitals under the Hill-Burton Act, and giving my reasons therefor, I have received many letters and telegrams endorsing the program and urging support of the amendment.

One of the most thoughtful letters on the subject comes from Dr. H. H. Shoulders, of Nashville, Tenn.

Dr. Shoulders, who endorses the hospital construction program and endorses, too, the amendment which I propose to offer, makes such an interesting commentary upon certain of my remarks regarding the scarcity of doctors, in which he raises a point of view that I did not have thoroughly in mind at the time I spoke, that I would like to read certain excerpts of Dr. Shoulders' letter, which I think my colleagues will find interesting:

MY DEAR ALBERT: I have read your speech with interest. I heartily approve of the position you have taken on this issue. I heartily approve of the arguments you have made with one exception. I hope I can express myself with regard to this exception in such a way as not to offend you, but rather amplify your arguments in favor of the amendment you propose.

You cite figures as to the number of doctors in Tennessee in 1921 and 1948, together with an increase in the population, and interpret these facts to mean there is a marked shortage of doctors and urgent need of less waste of time on the part of the physician. This is another important reason for the support you are giving to the Hill-Burton program. It is also a reason why those figures, however accurate, don't tell the story.

I have used just two examples. I could use many more.

There is not an over-all dearth of physicians, in my opinion, at all. The deficiency in physicians exists where hospital facilities do not exist. There is a surplus of physicians in many areas where hospitals exist. It is my opinion, therefore, that the maldistribution of physicians is due very largely to the maldistribution of hospital facilities and that this maldistribution of physicians will be corrected automatically by accomplishing a more even distribution of hospital facilities, and without the Federal Government entering into the field of medical education and without the enactment of any compulsory measures whatsoever.

I would now cite to you the fact that more than 20,000 young graduates of medicine were inducted into military service in World War II on the completion of only 9 months of postgraduate training.

Under the GI bill of rights these young physicians have been able to carry their postgraduate training to completion. Many have already completed training and are looking for locations where hospital facilities exist. Certainly a young surgeon with complete training could not utilize the skills and judgment he has acquired in his training in a town or community where hospital facilities do not exist. I don't know of a place where a good, modern, new hospital has located in which a well-trained young man has not located soon thereafter.

The point I am trying to make is this, that this correction of maldistribution takes place as a result of the Federal aid in medical education.

The figures, as is often true of statistics, are misleading. I will endeavor to state my reasons for such an opinion.

To a marked extent the same things have happened in medicine that have happened in agriculture. A very much smaller number of farmers, as result of progress in farming techniques and equipment, are still producing a surplus for a greatly increased population.

Progress in the art, science, and techniques of medicine have also altered practices in medicine. For example: Before the days of the antibiotic drugs (penicillin, etc.) a physician treating a case of pneumonia in the home would probably make daily visits or twice daily visits to the patient for a period of 7 to 15 days, whereas today he may visit the patient twice or three times.

In 1921, a vast majority of deliveries took place in the home. The physician in attendance spent a majority of his time in waiting for developments.

Each of those patients today would be admitted to a hospital if accessible. As a result the time of the physician is not consumed in travel and waiting. He could properly treat both cases under modern conditions in a modern hospital with great advantage to both types of patients without spending a vast majority of his time in travel and waiting.

Other progressive developments have taken place which have an intimate bearing on this question also.

Roads have been improved. Modes of transportation have been altered. A few miles of distance between a patient and a hospital is not the handicap it used to be. By car or ambulance any patient can be brought to a modern hospital facility where the physician can render the most modern type of service under the most advantageous conditions with establishment of modern facilities and that it is not a result of a compulsion in any sense and that the Hill-Burton program does not disturb in any way the local autonomy of the institution nor the freedom of the patient and the physician.

The Hill-Burton program is going forward in Tennessee in fine shape, in my opinion.

Most sincerely yours,
H. H. SHOULDERS, M. D.

Mr. Speaker, the amendment will probably be voted upon next Monday. I request your careful consideration and urge support of this meritorious program.

Tariff Rates on Shoes and Rubber and Canvas Footwear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 21, 1950

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my re-

marks in the RECORD, I include the following letters:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, March 30, 1950.

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. ROGERS: For the Secretary, I wish to acknowledge your letter of March 29, 1950, in which you state that you have received a copy of the communication which Mr. Maxwell Field, executive vice president of the New England Shoe and Leather Association, directed to the Secretary, asking that action be taken under the Anti-Dumping Act of 1921 in connection with the alleged dumping of Czechoslovakian shoes in the United States.

This matter has been brought to the attention of the appropriate Treasury officials for consideration and a reply will be forthcoming as soon as possible.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM L. LYNCH,
Acting Administrative Assistant to the Secretary.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, April 6, 1950.

The Honorable EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MRS. ROGERS: The receipt is acknowledged of your letter of March 29, in which you state you have received a copy of a letter dated February 28 from Mr. Field, executive vice president of the New England Shoe and Leather Association, Boston, Mass.

In accordance with your request, the following is the text of the Department's reply to Mr. Field's letter of February 28:

"The receipt is acknowledged of your letter of February 28, in which you request information on the official policy of the Department of State with respect to the importation of footwear from Czechoslovakia. You also state it has been brought to your attention that the Department of State has approved the importation of these shoes and has set a quota on the quantity of shoes which can be imported from Czechoslovakia to the United Staes during 1950.

"The Department of State has not established a quota on shoes and, in fact, has no authority to establish such a quota. Neither can it be said that the Department has 'approved' the importation of these shoes.

"Trade between the United States and Czechoslovakia is carried on within the framework of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, concluded at Geneva, Switzerland, October 30, 1947, the signatories of which include the United States and Czechoslovakia. On April 22, 1948, the President proclaimed the following changes in rates under paragraph 1530 (e) of the Tariff Act of 1930, which rates were negotiated with Czechoslovakia under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade:

General agreement rate

Commodity:	*Percent*
Boots, shoes, or other footwear:	
McKay sewed, other than skating	20
Molded soles laced to uppers	10
Other (principally cemented soles)	20
With fabric uppers and leather soles	20

"These concessions are subject to Article XIX (the 'escape clause') which permits a contracting party to withdraw or modify any concession if, as a result of unforeseen developments and of such concession or other obligations, increased imports threaten or cause serious injury to domestic industry. If it is felt that injury is being suffered in this case, a request for consideration and action should be addressed to the United States Tariff Commission, Washington, D. C."

Sincerely yours,

JACK K. MCFALL,
Assistant Secretary
(For the Secretary of State).

UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., April 7, 1950.

The Honorable EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MRS. ROGERS: I have your letter of March 29, 1950, in which you refer to a bill which would reduce the duty on imported rubber and canvas footwear. Enclosed with your letter are several pages from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 28, giving your remarks concerning the competition from Czechoslovakia on rubber shoes and canvas shoes.

We have no information concerning a bill which would reduce the duty on rubber and canvas footwear. Possibly the editorial in the Watertown Sun refers to a bill, mentioned in the press in recent weeks, which would change certain customs administrative laws. This bill is being drawn up by the Treasury Department and I suggest you refer your request for a copy of the bill to that agency.

Under article VII of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade signed at Geneva in 1947, the United States has agreed to change its method of evaluating merchandise for duty purposes which, when carried out, would preclude the use of American selling price as a basis of customs valuation. This basis is currently used for the assessment of duty on rubber footwear and on rubber-soled footwear with canvas uppers. Before the United States could carry out this part of the general agreement, legislation by Congress would be necessary. Whether or not the bill being drafted by the Treasury Department will contain a provision on American selling price has not been finally determined.

I should like to point out that if the basis of valuation is changed, the United States has the right to adjust the rate of duty so that the total amount of duty collected will be the same under the new basis as it would have been under the old basis. If this right is exercised, it does not appear that the rubber-footwear industry is likely to be injured as a result of such a change in the basis of valuation.

I am enclosing an excerpt from the Tariff Commission's publication, Summaries of Tariff Information, which gives information on production and imports of rubber footwear through 1947. Also enclosed are tables which show more recent import statistics on rubber footwear.

If I can be of any further service in this or any other matter, please do not hesitate to call upon me.

Sincerely yours,

OSCAR B. RYDER,
Chairman.

LOCAL NO. 22763,
RUBBER WORKERS F. L. UNION,
Malden, Mass., April 10, 1950.

MRS. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives,
Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. ROGERS: I observed in the Boston Globe of Sunday, April 9, an Associated Press dispatch from Washington which carried the headline "Tariff board denies move to cut duty on rubber footwear." There followed a story to the effect that a report had been addressed to you from the United States Tariff Commission which stated that there was no move to cut directly duty on rubber footwear, but that there might be a change in the method of computing the duty.

Several weeks ago when we first learned of the proposals to cut the tariff on rubber footwear, I wrote letters to the entire Massachusetts delegation in Congress and some of the replies that I received from the Massachusetts members were accompanied by letters from the United States Tariff Commission over the signature of Mr. Oscar B. Ryder, chairman, which, I supect, were similar to the communication Mr. Ryder addressed to you. With your permission, I would like to point out that this letter is considerably less reassuring than it at first appears to be, and that the newspaper article referred to above indicates.

Firstly, there is a paragraph in Mr. Ryder's letter, in my copy, it is the second paragraph which says that the duty on rubber sole footwear with fabric uppers, which is now 35 percent ad valorem, based on the American selling price, could be reduced to 17½ percent; it then goes on to state further that the rate on other rubber footwear, "which is now $1.50 per dozen pairs, but not less than 12½ percent nor more than 25 percent ad valorem, based on American selling price, could be reduced to 12½ percent ad valorem."

The inference here is that this is something which might occur. Actually, it has occurred. The duty on Czechoslovakian rubber footwear is now 12½ percent ad valorem on the American selling price. You are probably familiar with the concern the leather shoe industry is manifesting over imports from Czechoslovakia. In fact, they make the charge of "dumping."

The second point, and this is major, is that under article 7 of the general agreement on tariff and trade, the United States has agreed to change its method of valuing merchandise for duty purposes which would preclude the use of the American selling price. The argument is then advanced that the rubber-footwear industry will not suffer from this arrangement because the United States has reserved the right to adjust the rate of duty so that the total amount of duty collected will be the same under the new basis as it would be under the old.

This is unconvincing and unsatisfactory to us because the foreign invoice price is variable and subject to governmental control; and because these industries are either socialized or subsidized, and therefore, the Czechoslovakian Government, for instance, could determine both the price and the quantity to be exported according to its need for dollars. The percentage rate necessary to yield the same protection as now granted would be at the rate of several hundred percent. It would be difficult to determine; it would be fantastically high; and would therefore be a far greater violation of administration trade policies than anything else which could possibly be proposed. It would appear to be also a considerable amount of movement to the end result of merely remaining in the same place. However, even if present policy makers were to arrange adjustments of the rate of duty furnishing the industry with the same measure of protection which it has now, the fact still remains that with the abrogation of the American selling-price principle, the way would be open for any future set of policy makers to open the floodgates to a deluge of products from these low-wage nationalized or subsidized industries.

The abrogation of the American selling price principle may occur in either of two ways—(1) is from a bill to be introduced by the Treasury Department which has the harmless sounding title of a Bill to Revise the Administrative Procedures of the Bureau of the Customs. This bill contains provisions to revoke the American selling price principle as it applies to rubber footwear.

The other means by which tariff reductions could occur would be through negotiations under the framework of the general agreement on tariff and trade which would take place in December 1950.

We feel that this is a real threat. We know that our industry cannot possibly compete with the nationalized industries of Czechoslovakia or with the products of Japanese workers, with their Oriental wage and living standards. And even if the maximum which is promised by the Tariff Commission is awarded us in the way of protection, the removal of the American selling price principle would leave us in the state of permanent uncertainty.

The rubber-footwear industry is located chiefly in southern New England, a very substantial portion of it in Massachusetts. This is the section which already has more than its share of distressed areas and which has already seen two of its major industries—leather shoes and textiles—blighted in the last few years.

The nature and source of this low-wage competition should also be taken into consideration.

Very truly yours,

FRANCIS MULCAHY,
President.

UNITED STATES RUBBER CO.,
New York, N. Y.

As a supplier of materials entering into the manufacture of our waterproof rubber footwear and canvas-upper rubber-soled footwear, we feel you would wish to be informed as to the possible jeopardy of this truly American enterprise and its effect upon you.

This situation will develop if the State Department and other governmental agencies continue along the lines of encouraging foreign imports through a lowering of tariffs to a point where the American manufacturer can no longer compete and survive.

Tariff rates at the present time on these commodities apply on the domestic selling price of American-made footwear like or similar to the imported items. We have unofficial but authoritative information that under the guise of revising the administrative procedures of the Bureau of Customs, a bill is to be introduced in the House of Representatives repealing the American selling price principle established by a Presidential proclamation in 1933 and which was sustained in 1937 by President Roosevelt when a Czechoslovakian trade treaty was under consideration.

At the Reciprocal Trade Conference held in Geneva in 1947, the American delegation granted concessions in duty rates on waterproof rubber footwear to this same iron-curtain country which for practical purposes cut the American duty in half. This was done over the clearly defined and logical protests of the entire American industry involved in the production of this necessary commodity. This trade treaty became effective in April 1948.

Fortunately, canvas-upper rubber-soled footwear was not on the 1947 agenda—but will probably appear without too much advance notice on the list of products to be considered for tariff concessions in the reciprocal trade-agreement negotiation with foreign countries to be held in southern England in September of this year.

The attached schedule tends to show the effects that can be expected if the American selling price principle is abolished and if the duty on canvas footwear is reduced by the full 50 percent which is permissible under the Reciprocal Trade Act.

Members of Congress in both Houses in the States in which you operate could be helpful in bringing this problem to the attention of the President, the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Defense, and others, including Members of Congress from other States. If your employees are organized, they could probably call the situation to the attention of their various labor organizations.

The enclosed booklet, The Case of Rubber Footwear, contains some pertinent facts.

As one of your customers, we earnestly solicit your cooperation in our effort to protect this old and long-established industry. We should like to specifically request that you let us know what you think you can do to help us and yourselves.

Very truly yours,

H. A. JOHNSON,
Division Purchasing Agent.

Imports of rubber footwear—waterproof and canvas

Item	Approximate invoice price landed	Tariff rate	Tariff	Total landed price	Price of comparable United States item
Men's canvas oxford (Japan)	$0.49	At 35 percent American selling price	$0.62	$1.11	$1.80
Do	.49	At 17½ percent American selling price	.31	.80	1.80
Do	.49	At 35 percent ad valorem	.17	.66	1.80
Do	.49	At 17½ percent ad valorem	.085	.575	1.80
Waterproof strap overboot	.99	At 25 percent American selling price	.61	1.60	2.50
Do	.99	At 12½ percent American selling price	.305	1.295	2.50
Do	.99	At 12½ percent ad valorem	.125	1.115	2.50
Stadium-type boot	1.47	At 25 percent American selling price	1.04	2.51	4.25
Do	1.47	At 12½ percent American selling price	.52	1.99	4.25
Do	1.47	At 12½ percent ad valorem	.18	1.65	4.25

The above tabulations are intended as a rough measure to indicate the effects which would result from the 50-percent reduction in the existing duty on rubber-soled canvas footwear and the effects of the elimination of the American-selling-price principle on both waterproof and canvas footwear.

This tabulation is based on a men's canvas oxford (Japanese) which is being offered for delivery in New York this spring. The tabulations on the waterproof items are from offerings that were made during the past season.

With reference to the canvas oxford, line 1 reflects the approximate delivery price in New York after duty based on the present 35 percent of the American selling price. Line 2 shows what would happen if that duty is cut in half which is permissible under the present Reciprocal Trade Act. Line 3 shows what would happen if the present rate of duty (35 percent) was applied on the ad valorem rather than the American selling price. Line 4 shows the result of cutting in half the present 35 percent rate of duty and applying it on an ad valorem basis rather than on the American selling price. In the tabulations on the waterproof items, line 1 takes a duty of 25 percent of the American selling price which was effective prior to the reduction granted at the Geneva Conference in 1947 and which became effective April 1948. Line 2 reflects the present duty, 12½ percent of the American selling price. Line 3 reflects the approximate result if the American-selling-price principle is repealed and the present 12½-percent duty is applied on an ad valorem basis. The extreme right-hand column is the American selling price of like or similar articles quoted by one member of the footwear industry.

Encouragement of Science

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 21, 1950

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article entitled "Encouragement of Science," by Robert Oppenheimer, of the Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, N. J., based on an address given at the awards banquet of the ninth annual science talent search in Washington, D. C., March 6, 1950:

ENCOURAGEMENT OF SCIENCE

(By Robert Oppenheimer, the Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, N. J.)

Science has profoundly altered the conditions of man's life. During the last centuries, the discoveries in science and their applications to practice have changed the material conditions of life. They have changed as well many matters of the spirit. They have changed the form in which practical problems of right and wrong come before us; they have changed the focus of moral issues, both for the individual and for governments. They have given us new methods for defining the meaning of problems that face us, and for judging whether or not our solutions are just.

The most manifest of the changes are the material ones. Yet even here it takes a certain perspective to see their true extent. Advances in the study of man and other living forms have extended our life span by decades. Discoveries in physical science have immeasurably lightened our toil and enriched our lives. They have given leisure to an ever-widening group of men. They have made a reasonable education not a special privilege, but a common right. They have made the world, in its physical dimensions, a small place, and established the means by which people in remote parts of the earth can communicate with each other, can get to know each other, and can learn to work together. They have put at the disposal of everyone the resources of physical power, of ease, and of knowledge that were in the past reserved for the few.

Not all of the changes in material well-being that science offers are realities. Yet the very fact that they are possibilities has changed the nature of the responsibility that we bear, both as individuals and as a community of men and women banded together in government. In the Greek cities, political democracy, and civilization itself, appeared possible only on the basis of a slave economy. Technology, born of science, has altered that; it has enabled mankind, as it has forced mankind, to deal with the issues of slavery as a moral issue. Poverty has always been an ugly thing, and in its extremes a desperate one. Today, it is an evil, in the sense that it lies within human hands and human

hearts to abate it. Science can provide us, for the first time in history, with the means of abating hunger for everyone on earth.

Perhaps nowhere has the impact of science more clearly altered the specific terms of a great political issue than in the effects of scientific development on warfare. This is a can of worms with which I have myself unhappily been engaged for some years. It would not be honest to say—as it would be folly not to hope—that the very terror of modern weapons would in itself put an end to war; it would not even be honest to say that because of this terror the abolition of war and the maintenance of peace have become the one absolute, final objective of all political decisions. There are other things in man's life: his freedom, his decency, and his sense of right and wrong, that cannot so lightly be subjected to a single end. But what we need to remember is that war today has become, and is increasingly becoming, something very different from what it was a century ago or a millennium ago. We need to recognize the new situation as new; we need to come to it with something of the same spirit as the scientist's, when he has conducted an experiment and finds that the results are totally other than those that he had anticipated.

Four months before Hiroshima, in the last days of his life, President Roosevelt's thoughts turned to these questions. In the last words that he wrote, in words he did not live to speak, the President looked to the future, to the atomic age. He looked to the past, to the days of the founding of the Republic. He wrote:

"Thomas Jefferson, himself a distinguished scientist, once spoke of the 'brotherly spirit of science, which unites into one family all its votaries of whatever grade, and however widely dispersed throughout the different quarters of the globe.'

"Today science has brought all the different quarters of the globe so close together that it is impossible to isolate them one from another.

"Today we are faced with the preeminent fact that, if civilization is to survive, we must cultivate the science of human relationships—the ability of all peoples, of all kinds, to live together and work together, in the same world, at peace."

Science has greatly extended the range of questions in which man has a choice; it has extended man's freedom to make significant decisions. Is there anything in the methods of science itself, or in the spirit of science, that can help in the making of these decisions? To what extent is there a play on the word "science" which can mislead us and take us up false roads when we speak of this science of human relationships? Is there anything we can learn from the relevance of science to politics?

If we are to answer these questions, and answer them honestly, we must recognize important and basic differences between problems of science and problems of action, as they arise in personal or in political life. If we fail to recognize these differences, we shall be seeking magic solutions and not real ones. We shall delude ourselves into laying aside responsibility, which it is an essential part of man's life to bear.

In most scientific study, questions of good and evil, or right and wrong, play at most a minor and secondary part. For practical decisions of policy, they are basic. Without them political action would be meaningless. Practical decisions and, above all, political decisions can never quite be freed from the conflicting claims of special interest. These, too, are part of the meaning of a decision and, of course, of action, and they must be an essential part of the force of its implementation.

Political decisions are unique acts. In politics there is little that can correspond to the scientist's repetition of an experiment. An experiment that fails in its purpose may be as good as or better than one that succeeds, because it may well be more instructive. A political decision cannot be taken twice. All the factors that are relevant to it will conjoin only once. The analogies of history can provide a guide, but only a very partial one.

These are formidable differences between the problems of science and those of practice. They show that the method of science cannot be directly adapted to the solution of problems in politics and in man's spiritual life. Yet there is relevance of a more subtle, but by no means trivial, kind.

In trying more fully to explore this relevance, I should like to start with a text. This text is a letter [1] written by Thomas Jefferson to a young man who had enquired of him as to the usefulness of his studies of science. It was written in the middle of the year 1799, the year in which Napoleon abolished the directory and began to assume dictatorial power in France, the year before Thomas Jefferson was elected for the first time as President of the United States. Jefferson and the diverse brave and hopeful men who with him laid the foundations of our own Government had learned much from the peoples of other nations. Many of their highest political ideals and their most powerful political instruments were built on the experience, the insight and wisdom of European scientists and philosophers. Even today we need to remember that this was so, and that there may be much that we can learn from others, and that we should be glad to learn, as in turn by example we should be glad to teach.

Jefferson's letter starts with a survey of the subjects in science which he believes young Munford ought to pursue. I will quote one characteristic passage which may strike a familiar and homely note for you:

"The science of calculation also is indispensable as far as the extraction of the square and cube roots; Algebra as far as the quadratic equation and the use of logarithms are often of value in ordinary cases; but all beyond these is but a luxury; a delicious luxury indeed; but not to be indulged in by one who is to have a profession to follow for his subsistence."

But that is not really the part of Jefferson's letter which I commend to you. Here it is:

"I am among those who think well of the human character generally. I consider man as formed for society, and endowed by nature with those dispositions which fit him for society. I believe also, with Condorcet, as mentioned in your letter, that his mind is perfectible to a degree of which we cannot as yet form any conception. It is impossible for a man who takes a survey of what is already known, not to see what an immensity in every branch of science yet remains to be discovered, and that too of articles to which our faculties seem adequate."

And later, in the same letter, still more explicitly:

"And it is still more certain that in the other branches of science great fields are yet to be explored to which our faculties are equal, and that to an extent of which we cannot fix the limits. I join you therefore in branding as cowardly the idea that the human mind is incapable of further advances. This is precisely the doctrine which the present despots of the earth are inculcating, and their friends here reechoing; and applying especially to religion and politics; 'that it is not probable that anything better will be discovered than what was known to our fathers.' We are to look backward then and not forward for the improvement of science, and to find it amidst feudal barbarism and the fires of Spitalfields. But thank heaven the American mind is already too much opened, to listen to these impostures; and while the art of printing is left to us, science can never be retrograde; what is once acquired of real knowledge can never be lost. To preserve the freedom of the human mind then and freedom of the press, every spirit should be ready to devote itself to martyrdom; for as long as we may think as we will, and speak as we think, the condition of man will proceed in improvement. The generation which is going off the stage has deserved well of mankind for the struggles it has made, and for having arrested that course of despotism which had overwhelmed the world for thousands and thousands of years. If there seems to be danger that the ground they have gained will be lost again, that danger comes from the generation of your contemporary. But that the enthusiasm which characterizes youth should lift its parracide hands against freedom and science would be such a monstrous phenomenon as I cannot place among possible things in this age and this country."

To me there are two striking impressions this letter of Jefferson's makes, even beyond its eloquence and its beauty. The first is that the letter is pervaded with the idea of progress, that ideal that owes so much to the development of science and that in turn has provided the great enriching human faith in which scientific discovery and invention has flourished. Jefferson is confident that an increased understanding of the world will lead to progress; he is convinced that the barbarisms of the past cannot stand up against inquiry and understanding and enlightenment; he is confident in man and sure that as men know more they will act more wisely and live better. In our contemporary expressions of hope that catastrophe could be averted and civilization yet be saved, that confidence has lost much of its robustness.

The second point is that for Jefferson there is something in the ways of science that is relevant to political life. Even in religion and politics, he holds that it is probable that things better will be discovered than what was known to our fathers. This conviction that new knowledge is possible, and that not all the answers are known, is, of course, the stuff of the day-to-day life of the scientist. Science itself does progress; new knowledge is possible; and new knowledge, because it does not destroy or ignore the old, can only increase our understanding. The very idea of the development of science is an example of progress, and of progress which in no true sense can ever be reversed. But this is only part of the story. It is true, as Jefferson knew, that, in the large, science has flourished in conditions of human freedom, and that its growth is parallel to the growth of democratic institutions. Today, looking back on more than a century and a half of further history, we can be even more sure of this. We have seen not only the inspiriting example of science and democracy flourishing together, but the tragic examples of their foundering together. We express the hope that of this tragedy we shall soon have seen the end.

What are these lessons that the spirit of science teaches us for our practical affairs? Basic to them all is that there may be no barriers to freedom of inquiry. Basic to them all is the ideal of open-mindedness with regard to new knowledge, new experience, and new truth. Science is not based

[1] I am indebted to Dr. Julian Boyd, of Princeton University, for the copy of this hitherto unpublished letter.

on authority. It owes its acceptance and its universality to an appeal to intelligible, communicable evidence that any interested man can evaluate.

There is no place for dogma in science. The scientist is free to ask any question, to doubt any assertion, to seek for any evidence, to correct any error. Where science has been used in the past to erect a new dogmatism, that dogmatism has found itself incompatible with the progress of science; and in the end, the dogma has yielded, or science and freedom have perished together.

Our own political life is predicated on openness. We do not believe any group of men adequate enough or wise enough to operate without scrutiny or without criticism. We know that the only way to avoid error is to detect it; that the only way to detect it is to be free to inquire. We know that the wages of secrecy are corruption. We know that in secrecy error, undetected, will flourish and subvert.

Let me be clear. Science is not skepticism. It is not the practice of science to look for things to doubt. It was not by deliberate attempt of skepticism that physicists were led to doubt the absolute nature of simultaneity, or to recognize that the ideas of strict causality embodied in classical physics could not be applied in the domain of atomic phenomena. There is probably no group of men who take more for granted in their daily work than the scientists. Common sense, and all that flows from it, is their principal basis for what they do in the laboratory and for what they make of it on paper. But for scientists it is not only honorable to doubt, it is mandatory to do that when there appears to be evidence in support of the doubt. In place of authority in science, we have and we need to have only the consensus of informed opinion, only the guide of example. No scientist needs to order his colleagues to use a new technique of experiment or to enter a new field of discovery. If he has done this, it will be an invitation to his fellows to follow.

These then are some of the attitudes of mind, these are some of the disciplines of spirit, that grow naturally in the scientist's world. They have grown there in part as a result of a humane and liberal tradition in political life, and in part as a cause of that. The open mind, the reliance on example and persuasion, rather than on authority—these are the heritage of the centuries in which science has altered the face of the earth. Science can help in diverse ways in preserving and extending this heritage. Its very universality speaks across frontiers to make truth manifest in lands otherwise darkened; its material applications create the preconditions—in leisure, in education, in means of communication—for the converse of men with each other. Science provides the material and the intellectual basis for a world in which example and understanding can help all men to fulfill their hopes. Today we need to remember that our country, founded on these practices, and grown strong by their exercise, owes its strength to them. In this time of crisis, we need to cherish that strength.

Resolutions of Agriculture Committee of American Small Business Organizations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 21, 1950

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I want to insert certain resolutions adopted by the Conference of American Small Business Organizations at its eleventh national session here on March 27–29, 1950.

In my judgment, these resolutions constitute constructive and affirmative suggestions worthy of the immediate and careful consideration of the congressional committees concerned and of all of us.

I call particular attention to the recommendation of the creation of a special commission charged with the careful and complete study of the agriculture problem and the recommendation for enactment of basic legislation covering agriculture in the United States. We have had a clear demonstration of how effective such a commission could be in the work of the so-called Hoover Commission. Certainly with the problem of the agricultural program involving the jurisdiction of so many congressional committees, it would seem as though a single approach by a single commission, composed of members of our congressional committees, leaders in recognized farm organizations, businessmen and businesswomen, men and women in the fields of education and labor, offers the best prospect of the satisfactory solution of the problem which is of vital importance to the future of this country.

I am also including a copy of the resolution I have filed today covering this suggestion.

The matters follow:

CONFERENCE OF AMERICAN SMALL BUSINESS ORGANIZATIONS, ELEVENTH NATIONAL SESSION, WASHINGTON, D. C., MARCH 27–29, 1950

AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE RESOLUTION ON THE FARM-PRICE-SUPPORT ISSUE

Whereas for 2 years this conference has expressed its steadfast opposition to uneconomically high price supports for agricultural commodities and has repeatedly exhorted Congress and the Department of Agriculture in carrying out existing price-support laws and commitments to aim for price-support levels which would prevent serious subnormal agricultural income, but yet would avoid price incentive to excess production; and

Whereas, despite the admonition of many competent agricultural leaders, Congress has seen fit to continue Government price-support operations at such high price levels as to bring certain inevitable evil results, viz:

(1) The piling up of unmanageable surpluses of many of the supported commodities involving Government inventories and loans already in excess of $4,000,000,000;

(2) Consequent prohibitive cost of these operations, already requiring additional billions to handle 1950 crops;

(3) The loss of export markets for many of these commodities except on a give-away basis to foreign countries;

(4) The displacement of private taxpaying business from the handling of these commodities;

(5) The extensive and growing regimentation of agriculture through acreage, production, and marketing controls;

(6) The gradual elimination of opportunity for individuals to freely enter agricultural pursuits where acreage already in production is being rigidly prescribed;

(7) The projection of agriculture into the realm of partisan politics; and

Whereas the people of the United States do need, and must have, an assurance of adequate food and fiber production from an economically healthy and stable agriculture: Therefore be it

Resolved:

1. That the Congress of the United States be, and herewith is, petitioned by the Conference of American Small Business Organizations to set up a special commission to consider the whole situation of necessary and adequate farm legislation.

2. That the commission be composed of outstanding national leaders, headed by some individual whose fairness, wisdom, and loyalty are recognized by a majority of our people; with committees to include Members of Congress, leaders in recognized farm organizations, businessmen, and men from the fields of education and labor.

3. That this commission, from information and recommendations from its committees, be directed to formulate and then to report to the Congress, within a time reasonably adequate for careful and complete study of the problem, a recommendation for enactment of basic legislation covering agriculture in the United States.

NO. 1—COMMODITY EXCHANGES

Whereas the commodity exchanges have successfully for over a century broadened and stimulated the marketing of agricultural products at the lowest cost to the producer and redounding to the benefit of the consumer: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Conference of American Small Business Organizations endorse the continuance of our free competitive system of marketing commodities; and be it further

Resolved, That the present government regulatory powers over the conduct of commodity exchanges are ample and that Congress should guard against the granting of more arbitrary Federal powers of control over these exchanges which might readily lead to their sudden destruction.

NO. 2—COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Whereas it is the function of the Commodity Credit Corporation to make loans on, and to support the prices of, agricultural commodities under requirements of law; and

Whereas the Corporation now has nearly $5,000,000,000 of available funds for its programs, and is asking for another $2,000,000,000; and

Whereas in spite of restrictions in present law the CCC is tending toward the acquiring of permanent interests in real estate, which if effected would threaten further the many small-business firms of the Nation with which they now are in direct or indirect competition: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Conference of American Small Business Organizations does oppose any authority to the CCC which will enable it to own real estate, and opposes authority which allows CCC to expand emergency commodity storage facilities without public establishment of the necessity therefor.

NO. 4—GOVERNMENT ECONOMY IN AGRICULTURE

Whereas the cost of the Federal Government has reached an almost prohibitive level; and

Whereas the continued high cost of Government operation places the solvency of our Government in jeopardy; and

Whereas the first step toward the reduction of our national debt must be the drastic reduction in the cost of peacetime operation of Government: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Department of Agriculture be streamlined to the end that the appropriations for the Department would be reduced substantially without affecting the good work done by the Department, and that to carry out the purpose of this resolution the recommendations contained in the Hoover Commisison Report be given most careful consideration.

NO. 5—ANTITRUST LAWS

Whereas various agricultural industries have been indicted by the Federal Government on antitrust charges rather frequently; and

Whereas even when cleared the adverse publicity has done irreparable harm and destroyed public confidence unjustly: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Conference of American Small Business Organizations meeting in Washington, D. C., March 27, 28, and 29, 1950, endorses and supports the work of the Sawyer committee to bring about clarification and codification of the various antitrust laws.

NO. 6—THE KEFAUVER BILL

Whereas H. R. 2734, called the Kefauver bill or the acquisition of assets bill, has passed the House and is now in Senate Committee; and

Whereas this bill prohibits the purchases of small businesses to eliminate competition, and may limit or prevent sale of small businesses to larger competitors and so work hardship on owners or heirs of small businesses: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Conference of American Small Business Organizations meeting in Washington, D. C., March 27, 28, and 29, 1950, opposes the passage of this bill.

A bill for the establishment of a Commission to study the agriculture situation and to recommend adequate farm legislation

Be it enacted, etc.—

SECTION 1. (a) There is hereby established a bipartisan commission to be composed of 12 members appointed as follows:

(1) Four appointed by the President of the United States, two from the executive branch of the Government and two from private life;

(2) Four appointed by the President protempore of the Senate, two from the Senate and two from private life; and

(3) Four appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, two from the House of Representatives and two from private life.

(b) Of each class of two members mentioned in subsection (a), not more than one member shall be from each of the two major political parties.

(c) Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

SEC. 2. The Commission shall elect a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members.

SEC. 3. Seven members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

SEC. 4. (a) Members of Congress who are members of the Commission shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress; but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(b) The members of the Commission who are in the executive branch of the Government shall each receive the compensation which he would receive if he were not a member of the Commission, plus such additional compensation, if any (notwithstanding section 6 of the act of May 10, 1916, as amended; 39 Stat. 582; 5 U. S. C. 58), as is necessary to make his aggregate salary $12,500; and they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(c) The members from private life shall each receive $50 per diem when engaged in the performance of duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

SEC. 5. The Commission shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, in accordance with the provisions of the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

SEC. 6. (a) The Commission shall study and investigate the present organization and methods of operation of all departments, bureaus, agencies, boards, commissions, offices, independent establishments, and instrumentalities of the executive branch of the Government engaged in agriculture or related activities, to determine what changes therein are necessary to prevent serious subnormal agricultural income without placing an undue burden on the consumers and taxpayers of the country.

(b) Within 30 days after the Eighty-second Congress is convened and organized, the Commission shall make a report of its findings and recommendations to the Congress.

SEC. 7. (a) The Commission, or any member thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, and take such testimony, as the Commission or such member may deem advisable. Any member of the Commission may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before the Commission or before such member.

(b) The Commission is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purpose of this act; and each such department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Commission, upon request made by the chairman or vice chairman.

SEC. 8. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, so much as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

How To Buy More Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1950

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an article by Henry Hazlitt, How to Buy More Unemployment, which I believe is "must" reading for all Members of Congress. The article appears in the current issue of Newsweek.

HOW TO BUY MORE UNEMPLOYMENT

(By Henry Hazlitt)

In the first 3 months of this year, according to official estimates, there has been an average of nearly 4,500,000 unemployed.

This is paradoxical and premonitory. For this unemployment, the greatest since prewar days, exists not in a depression but in the midst of an inflationary boom. It exists, in fact, in a period when the Administration boasts that personal incomes have reached the highest levels in our history.

Yet this paradox is not inexplicable. It is simply what discerning economists predicted was certain to happen if we continued to push up wage rates and labor costs faster than prices and productivity. And we have kept boosting labor costs recklessly through union policy, pension demands, Government fact-finding awards, the Wagner-Taft-Hartley Act, and the new law jumping minimum-wage hourly rates from 40 to 75 cents last January.

The presumptive effect of this last factor is striking. Unemployment averaged 3,395,000 throughout 1949 and stood at 3,489,000 in December. This January it shot up to 4,480,000.

Does the administration recognize the cause of this unemployment? Has it taken warning? On the contrary, it does everything to intensify the problem. In a message to Congress on April 6, President Truman called for a further increase in unemployment benefits. For existing unemployment he offered two explanations, both wrong. He explained that more people have been coming into the labor market every year. But they have been doing that since the beginning of our history, with the annual increase in population. Increased population means not only more people looking for jobs; it also means more consumers and consumer demand.

Mr. Truman's other explanation is that "as new plants and equipment have been added * * * businessmen have been able to produce more with the same number of workers." This assumes the immemorial fallacy that machinery creates net unemployment. But as man-hour productivity increases, prices go down or wages and profits go up, and per capita demand increases with per capita supply.

Because he makes the wrong diagnosis, Mr. Truman proposes the wrong remedy. We need not examine here the real revisions required in unemployment insurance. It is enough to point out that all Mr. Truman's own arguments ignore the salient fact that as we increase the amounts and period of payment of unemployment benefits we encourage an increase in unemployment itself. The more we pay men who are idle, the more we reduce the penalties and increase the incentives for idleness. Mr. Truman wants to pay a man who has been earning $60 a week as high as $42 a week for not working. But if this man is offered another $60 job before his unemployment benefits expire, he may logically ask himself: "Why should I work for only $18 a week?" Or if he is offered a temporary $42 job: "Why should I work for nothing?"

Our national labor policy is, in fact, the equivalent of the farm-price-support policy. Government support boosts the price of farm products so high that part of the supply must remain unsold. The taxpayer is then forced to hold the unsold surplus. Government and union labor policy, likewise, pushes up wage costs to the point where part of the labor force must remain unemployed. Then the taxpayer must pay unemployment benefits to this idle labor. "Surplus" labor rots in storage like "surplus" eggs, butter, and potatoes.

The present American situation—of high unemployment even at the peak of an inflationary boom—is not unprecedented. Precisely the same anomally occurred in Germany in 1927, and for the same reasons.

In 1927 economists like Gustav Cassel warned in vain that the German wage policy was senseless. Will such warnings today, in America, prove equally futile?

Oil and Blood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 21, 1950

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article by David Berry entitled "Oil and Blood" which appeared in the Vet-Times, on April 22, 195-:

OIL AND BLOOD
(By David Berry)

Congress is hip-deep these days in its favorite election-year sport—investigation.

Its newest target is the Reconstruction Finance Corporation—the RFC—which aids private business with loans not otherwise available from commercial lenders and investors.

Ordinarily we don't run a temperature when a big multimillion-dollar corporation such as RFC gets tangled up with Congress; nor do we lose any sleep if the big and little oil interests of the country get slapped around a little.

However, we remember that, just 5 years back, oil meant life and death to millions of American GI's fighting in Europe and Asia. In the final analysis, oil was the vital component which kept the machinery of freedom lubricated.

All that—and the fact that civilian travel in this country was slowed down materially by the wartime shortage of gasoline and oil—seems to have been forgotten by some Members of Congress, as they seek an issue on which to curb the authority of the RFC to lend money to private business interests.

To some Congressmen—and some newspapers—RFC looks like a fat target and the boys are whetting their knives. Perhaps we wouldn't even run a temperature in this case except that some veterans are involved.

We like a good investigation as well as the next man—when the conditions and the facts support it. But our memory is not as short as the memories of some Congressmen.

What could be more important to the United States—and to its fighting men—than to lend financial assistance to increase our national capacity to produce oil in case the threat of world war III becomes real?

In this case it appears that politics is more important. A subcommittee of the Senate, headed by Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT (Democrat, Arkansas), presently is exercising itself—and the newspapers—over the fact that RFC is considering approval of the application of a group of World War II veterans for a $10,000,000 loan to develop proved oil lands in Texas and five other States.

The veterans control the Texmass Petroleum Co., which, as the name implies, involves a number of big and little investors in Texas and Massachusetts. We'll concede that the veterans weren't enlisted men; several were lieutenant colonels, and one was a full colonel during the war, and their branches of service included the Air Force, the Infantry, and armored divisions.

Nowadays most people admit that officers helped win the war—and thus are entitled to be known as veterans.

From reading the papers and reading Senator FULBRIGHT's remarks we aren't quite sure what—if anything—these Texmass veterans have done to warrant coming under the investigative eye of the subcommittee. As far as we can make out, their presumed crime is twofold: They want to develop $44,500,000 worth of proved and productive oil lands and wells located in six States—that's on the basis of Government estimates—and they want to borrow $10,000,000 from RFC to rehabilitate the properties and pay off long-term lenders under a general reorganization plan.

Consider this charge from a Scripps-Howard newspaper editorial: "Maybe it is a good loan, but what does the RFC mean using taxpayers' money to take such risks?"

Maybe it would be smarter to risk defeat in world war III?

And consider this remarks by Senator FULBRIGHT: "Without wanting to prejudge the case, it looks to me like an unjustified use of RFC lending power."

Perhaps, instead of approving a loan to produce oil in the United States, we should appropriate a few hundred millions under the point 4 program, to use searching for oil in the undeveloped areas of the world.

Both the newspaper's and the Senator's statements are, in themselves, damaging statements, but each is hedged with qualifying phrases. Why? Why? If it's a bum deal, it's a bum deal.

As a matter of fact, from all we can gather, it's a good deal. The fact is that the Texmass Co., as presently constituted, is a sound business enterprise. It has title to 493 producing oil and gas wells located on 20,000 acres of proved oil lands in 6 States—proved lands being areas in which oil reserves have been geologically and scientifically measured. In addition, it holds the lease on 2,000 additional acres of proved land which have not yet been drilled.

Independent petroleum engineers, hired by the company, have estimated that these lands have reserves of more than 15,500,000 barrels of oil, plus 34,800,000,000 cubic feet of natural gas, and this does not include estimated reserves of 14,600,000 barrels of oil in undrilled lands.

The Texmass engineers place the total valuation of the company, exclusive of allowances for drilling and other operations, at $48,000,000.

But the RFC, upon receipt of their loan application, didn't accept that as gospel. To protect the taxpayer, it hired its own petroleum engineers, whose minimum estimate of reserves was only 3,000,000 barrels less than the company's. And the RFC's own estimate of collateral is $44,500,000, which is only $4,000,000 less than the company's.

Even then the RFC hesitated. The company had sought a $15,100,000 loan to rehabilitate its properties and pay off long-term lenders. Said RFC: Raise $5,000,000 in private capital and we'll lend you the other $10,000,000. This Texmass did. And then came the Fulbright committee—and the newspapers.

A "questionable investment," they called it. Why? Because RFC had never been in the oil business before. They hadn't been in the housing or automobile business either until they made their first loans in those industries. "Too speculative," said the committee and the press, apparently confusing proved oil leases with wildcatting operations which are two entirely different problems.

The charge that the investment is bad business is interesting in the light of a recent article in the magazine Oil World by Fred Florence, president of the Republic National Bank of Dallas—largest oil bank in the country. "Making oil loans is good business," he wrote. "Just how good is indicated by this institution's loss record on oil loans. During the last 16 years net losses in this field have totaled $90,000, a sum substantially less than 1 month's interest and representing a loss ratio of 0.03 percent of the total loans made." And that's typical—not unusual.

We're willing to forget that the Texmass Co. is representative of World War II veterans trying to put free enterprise to work for themselves and their investors.

However, we aren't willing to forget that oil is to war machinery what blood is to you and me. And we hope Senator FULBRIGHT and Congress don't forget that this time.

Rent Control or Chaos

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SIDNEY R. YATES
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 21, 1950

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Sun-Times of April 19, 1950:

RENT CONTROL OR CHAOS

Federal rent control will end within 11 weeks unless Congress takes action to extend it.

If Congress does nothing, the State of Illinois should follow the example of New York State and adopt an emergency rent law. In the absence of any law, rents in Chicago probably will go up on an average between 20 and 40 percent. That's the finding of Sun-Timesman Bruce Taylor, who has been talking with real estate people, public officials, and others interested in the housing problem.

If you are a tenant, the amount of rent boost you can expect depends on your individual case.

In the confusion that is certain to follow if rent controls die, municipal court judges probably will allow plenty of time before enforcing eviction notices. But even such consideration will not spare Chicago—which has an extraordinarily severe housing shortage—from undergoing chaos that could bring severe economic damage and social turmoil.

What's the answer? Will Congress extend controls?

There is stronger pressure on Congress to wipe out rent controls now than at any time since war's end. Owners contend that they have been deprived of their property without due process of law. Although the law has provided for rent increases to prevent hardship on landlords, many have failed to take advantage of those provisions. The landlord resentment at continued rent controls while most other prices have gone sky high has made an impression on many Members of Congress.

As we have often said in this column, we believe landlords are entitled to reasonable increases in their rent collections. Let's repeat that word: Reasonable. And, to their credit, many landlords have been reasonable.

If controls are stopped suddenly many gougers will turn the screws on helpless tenants and demand unreasonable increases. As long as there is a real housing shortage the gougers will be able to profit from it. Any society has the right and the duty to provide for the general welfare by prohibiting profiteering that results from famine, disaster or the effects of war.

Congress is expected to consider a bill which would extend rent controls but make it mandatory upon cities to allow citizens to vote on continued controls within 6 months. If such a bill passes, Chicago would have to vote to retain rent control—probably at the November election—or else allow controls to die here on January 1.

Chicago's housing shortage is so acute that it's unlikely that there would be a popular vote in favor of ending controls. There is a question whether such a vote would satisfy the need for fairness. Tenants would naturally vote to retain controls. Just because there are more tenants than landlords doesn't mean that they should be able to keep their rents down by ballot. Rents should be controlled for the general welfare, not for individual welfare. Landlords, too, are entitled to consideration.

Rather than lift rent control completely, or continue as is, it seems to us a limited rise in rents would be preferred. The main idea is to prevent unreasonable rent increases that would throw the city into an economic tailspin.

RFC Versus ECA—Or Which Government Agency Can Produce the Greatest Absurdity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 20, 1950

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, with the kind forbearance of my distinguished colleagues, I should like to take the time of this House to tell a bedtime story to those who will listen, in the hope that it will not put them to sleep. It may cause the more thoughtful among us first to roll in the aisles and then to start tearing their hair.

You know, Mr. Speaker, so many things happen in so many different places in Washington, it is difficult for our right hand to know what our left hand is doing. I cannot pretend that I keep up with everything that happens in all the thousands of bureaus, in which hundreds of thousands of bureaucrats take part, but I do believe that I must see a few more of the absurdities than others. As a result I am constantly puzzled. Puzzled at the American people for keeping such a gang in power. Puzzled at the bureaucrats who are taking part in these absurdities, for these bureaucrats are Americans and, at heart, in most instances, should realize that they are going to have to live in the country they are creating. Puzzled at sensible men—many of them on the Republican side of the aisle, but most of them fortunately on the other side—who not only smile at these absurdities, but sometimes protect the men and policies that bring such absurdities to pass.

Now, let us read about the absurd happenings.

The first thing to keep in mind in this bedtime story is that the United States, under the New Deal and Fair Deal, for years has been heading toward a free-trade policy. Cordell Hull, James F. Byrnes, Dean Acheson, and all the other free-traders have been saying that we must encourage European manufacturers to sell more over here so that our manufacturers, in turn, could sell more over there. They have been promoting this policy through lowering our tariffs, giving huge sums to European industrialists with which to build plants to compete with ours, and otherwise striving to tear down America and build up Europe, Asia, Africa—any place but the old home place.

Now, during World War II, our Government faced almost a blockade for a while, due to the submarine menace. There was a great hue and cry about the lack of skilled watchmakers—men who could work with precision machinery, to make bombsights, and so forth. Everybody suddenly realized that it was a good thing we had an American watch industry, although the New Deal had been trying for 10 years to build up the Swiss watch industry and to kill the American watch industry.

Then, the war ended. We won, or at least, we defeated the enemies. Now, the American watch industry begins to fold. Waltham Watch Co., in Massachusetts, went on the financial rocks. It was hopelessly lost, so everyone thought. The New Deal finally had killed the Waltham Watch Co. Elgin Watch Co., which recently has been cutting off workers, is going on the rocks eventually unless something is done.

But be that as it may, what then happens? The State Department, keep in mind, has been killing Waltham Watch Co. through its low-tariff policies. Now, another Government agency, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation enters the picture. Mr. John L. Hagerty, one of the RFC's bright boys, cooks up a plan by means of which RFC can lend about $6,000,000 to Waltham. Mr. Hagerty, after selling RFC on the plan, promptly resigned and became $30,000-a-year president of the newly-reorganized Waltham Watch Co. He was going to do wonders for it, in spite of the mean old State Department and its absurd policies. But he could not. Not even a Fair Dealer, working inside with other Fair Dealers, can repeal the laws of economics. RFC directors finally decided they would not let even their fair-haired Mr. Hagerty have the balance of $2,000,000 worth of credit which they originally promised.

Now, instead of being punished in any way, scolded in any way, for having poured $4,000,000 worth of RFC money down a drain, what happens to our good Fair Dealer, Mr. Hagerty? Why, he turns up "advising" the RFC at $10,330 a year. What advice he could give that would be worth 10 cents a year, I am not in a position to say, but there he rests.

Unfortunately for our sanity, this is not the end of the story.

While all of this is going on—while RFC is lending a stricken industry money to get well, if it can, and the Department of State is perpetuating policies to kill the same industry, another alphabetical agency enters the picture. Slyly, to be sure, but it enters the picture nevertheless.

We learn from a release put out by the Economic Cooperation Administration, the ECA, to those who are not familiar with the bureaucratic alphabetical jargon, that the ECA has authorized to the General Time Instruments Corp., New York, N. Y., $1,000,000 in cash "to establish the manufacture of clocks and watches in the United Kingdom." According to the ECA release, this loan "will reduce previous heavy United Kingdom imports of timepieces from the United States and Switzerland."

In other words, Mr. Speaker, it is bad for us old Republicans to think of keeping a watch industry alive in the United States just in case there is a war and we need the help of the skilled employees in that industry. That is reactionary. It is obscurantism. It is Hawley-Smoot, and all those other bad terms the New Republic and our liberals toss from one to the other.

But, it is good, it says here in the ECA release, for American money to be sent to Great Britain so that Great Britain can reduce its imports of clocks and watches. In other words, we are supposed to be dumb and stupid enough to think we ought to kill the watch industry in the United States, but should build up the watch industry in the United Kingdom with American money. That is progress. It is enlightenment. It is, by some magic abracadabra, economic progress as the Fair Deal interprets it. More unemployed in the United States. More watchmakers in the United Kingdom. This ECA grant is not even in line with the Department of State's apparent purpose to create the only watch-making industry in the western world in a little country we know as Switzerland, which, incidentally, never has been an ally of ours in any war. Then, in case of a war, Russia could neutralize Switzerland and our Nation would be caught without any watch-making industry, without any of the skilled workers such an industry would have prepared for use in our military and other highly strategic industry.

Mr. Speaker, I must confess that none of this makes sense to me. As I noted before, the actions of our bureaucrats, each working at cross-purposes and each in possession of huge public sums to throw around, are so absurd as to make a sensible man want to bite tenpenny nails. If we could not develop a sense of humor, it is likely most of us could not last until the time comes when the people, long-suffering and patient, awaken to the stupidities which are being perpetrated in the name of "progress." If there is any man who can explain the action of our Department of State, our Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and our Economic Cooperation Administration in relation to the question of watches, their import and export, and the protection of America in case of an emergency, I should like to hear him make the explanation in simple words.

That is the end of this bedtime story, but I am afraid it will not put many Americans to sleep. It is a mystery. The final chapter might be entitled, "Which agency actually killed the American jeweled-bearing industry?"

Collectivism Subsidized by United States of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 19, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Henry Hazlitt, of Newsweek, again points out how private enterprise in this country supplies the money to make collectivism in Europe possible. The administration takes the profits from a free economy to support State cartels and phony exchange controls. I commend to all Members a challenging article by Mr. Hazlitt which I include as part of my remarks:

HOW WE SUBSIDIZE COLLECTIVISM
(By Henry Hazlitt)

The action of the House on continuance of ERP does not indicate that we are going to use any more common sense in dealing with the European economic problem in the future than we have in the past.

The administration has dismissed all critical discussion of the Marshall plan as partisan and isolationist. It attempted to drive the new ERP bill through Congress under a barrage of emotional slogans and scare words. Though we originally offered Marshall aid to Communist Russia itself, it is now represented as our chief weapon for combating communism. Once more it is implied, by the President, that refusal to vote for the administration bill may bring on the third world war. "Failure to enact its full amount," he writes, "would do irreparable damage."

Properly resenting these tactics, but without leadership of their own, a bipartisan majority in the House did have the temerity to cut the authorization by the moderate amount of $250,000,000. They also cut the authorization for point 4 by $20,000,000. But they failed to recognize that in accepting the premise of point 4—that the American taxpayer owes the rest of the world a living—they were letting him in for a bottomless obligation.

If the Senate is interested in the kind of revision that is really needed in the ERP program it could not do better than to read the article by Dr. William Roepke in the Commercial and Financial Chronicle of March 16. Writing from his European watch tower in Geneva, Dr. Roepke says supremely well what some of us have also been trying to say over here for the last 3 years. The present economic troubles of the countries of western Europe, he points out, spring mainly from the nationalistic policies being pursued within those countries:

"It is no longer necessary to define those national policies. They are familiar ever since Hitler came to power and, under the guidance of Dr. Schacht, set the example of a type of national economic policy which we propose to call national collectivism. It is the well-known combination of repressed inflation, collectivist controls, 'full employment,' exchange control, State monopolies, bilateralism, subsidies, fiscal socialism, 'cheap money' policies, and the strange mixture of the restriction of private consumption and of public waste which goes under the name of Austerity. * * *

"With the exception of Switzerland and Belgium, all European governments still practice national collectivism to the extent that they feel compelled to retain exchange control. It is exchange control which is the real keystone of national collectivism. * * *

"The devaluations certainly eased the strain, and they were in most countries the indispensable condition for the removal of exchange control. * * * But the chance offered by the devaluations has not been used, which means that the European governments resemble a surgeon who opens the abdomen without removing the inflamed appendix."

Dr. Roepke then turns to the proposed European Payments Union. "It is being realized by most observers that convertibility of currencies is the cardinal problem. To restore convertibility, however, is tantamount to abolishing exchange control. Not daring to face this thorny issue, many people prefer to believe that there is something 'almost just as good.' It is the idea of a European Clearing Union. * * *

"The crucial point, however, is again whether the national governments retain exchange control or not. If they do, then the idea of a European Currency Union has hardly more sense than an American currency system would have if the United States would split into 49 systems of state collectivism and of state exchange control. If they abolished exchange control, then we have all the monetary integration we need without the new cumbersome machinery of a European Monetary Union."

As a result of the evangelistic and intolerant fervor with which its sponsors promote the ERP over here, none of these economic realities is getting any serious attention.

Government Policies Are a Menace to the Coal Industry

REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 21, 1950

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, much is being said today about the coal industry being "sick" and the need for a Government Coal Commission to study the industry.

My congressional district is one that depends upon coal for its lifeblood and when the miners are digging coal and the railroads are transporting it to market we have a happy population.

The idea has become prevalent that the coal industry is sick, but I do not believe that is a complete diagnosis of the ills that have befallen it.

Nor do I believe that the creation of a Coal Commission is the answer to the problem. Any information that a Coal Commission could develop is already available through Federal agencies, the United Mine Workers of America, and through the National Coal Association.

In discussing the plight of the coal industry I recognize the differences that from time to time have existed between labor and management. Then, too, there is a natural trend on the part of the consumer to use substitute fuels for many reasons.

Anyone who has studied the coal industry has found that the industry's greater threat comes from policies of the Government of the United States. All of these policies have been formulated by Congress. Therefore, if any real contribution is to be made to the coal industry, Congress is its only means of salvation.

Before discussing how Government policies are destroying the coal industry, it is imperative that we realize how the demand for coal has fallen sharply from war and postwar levels.

Let me quote information on this subject from an article in the March 21, 1950, issue of the Wall Street Journal, written by Staff Correspondent Philip Geyelin:

In 1947 exports to coal-short European countries and to Canada totaled 69,000,000 tons. Last year they were down to some 27,000,000 as European mines got back in full operation.

In this country 3 years ago, coal was supplying 50 percent of the energy for homes and industry. By last year its share was down to 38.9 percent.

The railroads have been taking less and less coal as they put in more oil-burning Diesel engines. In 1947 they bought 109,000,000 tons of coal. Last year they took less than 70,000,000 tons, a drop of 37 percent. More electric utility companies are finding it's an economy to shift to oil, too. They consumed only 80,000,000 tons of coal last year, compared with 95,000,000 in 1948.

Meanwhile, householders have been swinging to oil at a rapid clip. Last year oil burner sales were up 39 percent over 1948, while factory shipments of warm-air coal furnaces dropped 47 percent. Where natural gas is available, this fuel is grabbing some coal customers, too.

These shifts to competitive fuels are expected to continue apace unless the coal industry can lower the price of its fuel, industry observers believe.

In discussing Government policies and their threat to the coal industry let us consider the Tennessee Valley Authority, commonly called TVA. As of June 30, 1949, the Congress of the United States had appropriated for TVA approximately $767,000,000 with an additional appropriation of $49,500,000 made available as of July 1, 1949. If you total the cost of TVA to the taxpayers including interest and tax costs of TVA production that are not paid by TVA, you then have an over-all figure ranging from $884,000,000 up to $1,200,000,000.

During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, the TVA, which operated at a total net loss of over $113,000,000, if interest cost of financing is charged to TVA for the period from 1934 through 1947, generated by water power more than 13,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity. This production of electricity, subsidized by the Government up to $1,200,000,000 in terms of coal equivalent, amounts to about eight and one-half million tons. This amount of coal means over $44,000,000 in revenue to coal companies and over $23,000,000 in miners' wages, or an annual wage of $4,000 to 5,750 workers.

To the railroads the eight and one-half million tons of coal displaced by TVA means a loss of twenty-seven and one-half million dollars in revenue, with over $12,000,000 representing wages of railroad employees, or a salary of $3,600 a year to 3,333 railroad workers.

In addition to the TVA and passing over similar Government projects, we have the threat of the St. Lawrence sea-

way project which has been in and out of Congress since 1914. The total estimated cost of this economic monstrosity has been placed at anywhere from one and one-half billion dollars to almost three times that amount, or three and one-half billion dollars.

These estimates of the St. Lawrence seaway were made prior to 1940 and must be increased to reflect price increases if a true cost as of today is to be shown. By increasing these estimates in the same proportion as wholesale prices of all commodities other than farm products and foods increased in January 1950 over January 1940, they range from three-quarters of a billion dollars to over $2,000,000,000.

It is recognized that the United States portion of the cost is more than half, and therefore the cost of the St. Lawrence seaway could easily cost the American taxpayer more than the TVA has cost to date, which is up to $1,200,000,000.

The St. Lawrence project as originally planned, looking at the power part of it, only would displace about five and one-half million tons of coal annually, which would mean a loss in revenue to coal companies of $28,000,000. Of this amount, almost $15,000,000 would be lost in miners' wages, or an annual salary of $4,000 to 3,750 workers.

From the standpoint of the railroads, they would likewise suffer a loss of over $18,000,000 in revenue, with about $8,000,000 of that amount representing a loss to railroad employees in wages, or a salary of $3,600 a year to 2,222 employees.

Another factor to be considered is the importation of cheap foreign oil, as well as any foreign oil. At the present time foreign oil is being dumped on our American market at the rate of 885,000 barrels a day and covers all grades and kinds of oil. This is an increase of 72 percent over the daily average in 1947.

Out of this total of 885,000 barrels, about 460,000 barrels are fuel oil, and this quantity is equal to 115,000 tons of coal per day. I do not claim that every barrel of low-priced oil from foreign countries displaces coal, but the great majority of the foreign oil imported does take the place of coal. Over a period of a year, this quantity of foreign oil displaces 40,000,000 tons of coal, which means the loss of $104,000,000 in miners' wages, or an annual wage of $4,000 to 26,000 workers. It also means the loss of $130,000,000 in railroad revenue, of which about $59,000,000 would represent workers' wages, or $3,600 annually to 16,389 railroad employees.

Let us look at the steel industry for a moment. Because of importers of foreign-made steel offering fast delivery at prices 10 to 18 percent lower than domestic vendors, our steel industry suffers, as does coal, from the result of our foreign-trade policy.

As I said in the beginning, Government policies are a menace to the coal industry, and the present administration or Congress cannot deny this fact. If the Government wants to help the coal industry, let it cease the program of subsidizing hydro-power projects, such as TVA and others. Let Congress shelve the St. Lawrence seaway project and let the administration restrict imports of foreign-mined coal, oil, and steel.

The coal industry can be helped if it receives assistance in regaining its markets which have been lost through the use of subsidized fuels.

One Hundred and Seventy-fifth Anniversary of Lexington and Concord

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 21, 1950

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, I am sure I reflect the gratitude of every Member from Massachusetts when I express appreciation of the action of the House and Senate in passing the resolution providing for the creation of a Commission to celebrate the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of Lexington and Concord and I am grateful to you, Mr. Speaker, for honoring me by an appointment to that Commission.

We who come from the old Bay State take intense pride in our possession of hallowed shrines in those two historic Middlesex towns and April 19 has long been celebrated in our State as a legal holiday.

Among all the historic spots in Massachusetts, none are revered more highly. As long as tourists flock to New England to draw inspiration from that part of our land where liberty began, loyal and patriotic Americans will visit the site of the rude bridge that arched the flood and thrill at the realization that here was fired the shot heard round the world. Then at Lexington Green, the same loyal Americans will gain inspiration from the letters hewn in the everlasting granite quoting the undying words of Captain Parker "if they mean to have a war, let it begin here."

As long as history is written, our boys and girls of succeeding generations will read the thrilling story of Lexington and Concord and realize that here was the actual birthplace of the Nation.

A century and three-quarters has passed into history since that April morning in 1775 during which time the people of the globe have seen this Nation of ours write glorious history until our onward and upward path to prosperity and power has become one of the wonders of the world.

Now, after 175 years, we find ourselves in a world doubtful and confused. This much we do know, that war-weary peoples across the seas are looking to America for direction and guidance just as surely as the mariner scans the darkness of the night for the reassuring rays of the beacon light. This much also we must bear in mind as we seek to evaluate the lesson from Lexington and Concord, that if an emergency should arise where our leadership is actually in need, we will hardly be in a position to make that leadership fully effective unless we continue to hold fast the principles of freedom and liberty and self-reliance which were the prime elements in the spiirt of the Minutemen of '75.

Our Defeat in China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 20, 1950

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, the saboteurs, who twist American foreign policy at the orders of a foreign power, are more dangerous to American security than those who trained to sabotage our railroads or our munitions plants.

The United States has suffered a military defeat in China, more serious than its defeat at Pearl Harbor. The voters did not know for years how great our losses were in Pearl Harbor. So it will be in the case of China. How vulnerable has it made our own coast? Who is responsible for this terrible defeat? McCARTHY is trying desperately to find out. The administration is covering up. It hides behind national security crisis talks.

The defeat of China was accomplished in our State Department. People believe that there was something rotten in that Department long before the McCARTHY charges. Since then Peurifoy admits nearly 100 sex perverts have been fired. Obviously that is only part of what has caused the fantastic defeat of the once most powerful military Nation on earth.

For 10 years we have had a Communist cell in charge of our foreign policy-making. These men are not deluded young students. Their business is to confuse our top officials so that they will adopt policies advantageous to the U. S. S. R. and fatal to our military security.

Ten years ago, there began a curious series of resignations and transfers of officials, like Ambassador Grew. He had had long and honorable experience in our far-eastern policy. Such men were replaced by newcomers who consistently favored Soviet Russia in their decisions. We had a succession of men as Secretary of State who were either blind or were suddenly relieved from office when they began to see.

When Marshall was made Secretary, after the very sudden resignation of Byrnes, he went to China and insisted on a truce. He demanded that the Chinese Nationalist armies be disbanded and sent home. But he got no reciprocal action from the Communists. He imposed an embargo on our shipment of war material to free China, but he got no embargo on shipments of arms from Soviet Russia to Communist China. Why? Was it because he was surrounded by advisers who favored the Communist side?

The Republican Eightieth Congress opposed President Truman's abandonment

of China and insisted that aid be given the Nationalist government. The Chinese bought arms of us, but, because of the State Department red tape, they could not get ammunition. Nor, oddly enough, could they get permits for shipment. These permits had to come from a bureau in the Commerce Department. The chief of this bureau was born in Manchuria. He had been appointed by Henry Wallace, although twice rejected for American citizenship for his un-American opinions. The paper work on these arms shipments was for some strange reason not finished until Harry Bridges had called a strike on the west coast. Then not a vessel could move from our Pacific ports to China or Alaska. That was, curiously enough, the moment when the Communist armies began their final push in China.

McCARTHY wants more light on this. The Fair Deal Party has chosen to laugh at his charges. Great names are used to inspire feelings of danger to our foreign policy. What foreign policy?

When China fell, we lost the air bases from which bombers could fly to inner Siberia, bases which were our best insurance against war. Some morning we may wake up and learn that the Philippines have been captured, as China was captured, by a domestic uprising, armed by the U. S. S. R. Then Formosa, Japan, and Korea will be outflanked. Alaska and California will be our front line. Such mistakes are paid for in the lives of our young men. They may have to retake, under withering fire, what our State Department so lightly gave up.

We must clean the Communists and all their dupes out of our foreign policy-making. Then the United States can resume its obligations to its ally, free China, and help train the Chinese soldiers who are bravely trying to recapture the air bases on the Chinese mainland. Such air bases might not only serve China but also constitute our first line of defense.

The New President General of the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, Mrs. James B. Patton, of Columbus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 21, 1950

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, Ohio is very proud that, at the National Congress of the Daughters of the American Revolution, just ended, Mrs. James B. Patton, of Columbus, Ohio, was elected president-general.

Mrs. Patton is known far and wide for her fine Christian spirit, her executive ability, and her understanding of human needs. She has had a long term in the organization, serving her State with consecrated devotion. Her elevation to national responsibility is a natural recognition of her capacity.

The Ohio Republican delegation, having extended their felicitations to her, have asked me to express their appreciation of this recognition, congratulating both the new president-general and the national organization.

Address of Brig. Gen. E. Dorman O'Gowan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 21, 1950

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased indeed to insert in the RECORD as part of my remarks the excellent speech of a former distinguished officer of the British Army which admirably sets forth certain strategic elements in our present distressing world situation.

General O'Gowan, who is Irish-born, has brilliantly pointed up some of the weaknesses arising from the iniquitous partition of Ireland, which in event of war might well bring dire and disastrous results to western civilization.

It is time that this Congress and this Government, in self-interest as well as altruism, took cognizance of the plight of Ireland and her unanswerable claims to unity and self-determination. I hope and urge that action may be taken at an early date to eliminate partition and implement full-fledged, total, and complete self-government for Ireland.

The address follows:

As you have heard, I served for 32 years in the British Army. Five years ago I retired to my birthplace in Ireland, where I hoped to settle down to archeology and farming. Instead, my proximity to what has become the Anglo-Irish boundary, inside my home Province, Ulster, compelled me to look into Irish and Anglo-Irish affairs. So much did I dislike what I saw, both from the national and international angle, that archeology had to go by the board, and, at this moment, the farm is looking after itself. Neither of these facts do I regret since I am today being given an opportunity to present you with some of my conclusions.

I need hardly remind you that my youth was spent in an undivided Ireland. Then the very idea of there even being three separate governments involved in Ireland would have seemed fantastic. Though this thing has happened it still seems fantastic. To the great Anglo-Irish parliamentarians of the late eighteenth century the idea of the parliamentary union with Britain must have seemed equally fantastic, but it happened, and it has had to be undone. It is natural for me, therefore, to regard the division of Ireland as the final effects of that act of union, and something in due course to be undone in the interest of sanity.

You have been told something of my military record. I would like you to realize that its importance lies in my almost unique experience of disaster in the operational and organizational fields, for most of my actual eperience in war has been at the losing end, before the winning began. In two world wars I have seen the price, the enormous price, and the quite unnecessary price, which civilization has had to pay for fundamental unpreparedness, particularly for political unpreparedness, before the war began. Civilization has survived. But each time with a smaller margin. There is no guaranty, in fact there is little likelihood that, if we enter unprepared into the third crisis of this century, should that occur, our civilization will again survive.

War preparedness in a democracy, or group of democracies, must be fundamentally political preparedness. It is the business, it is the duty, of political leaders to provide their military planners with a realistic and practical political background. It is the business and the duty of military planners to indicate to their political chiefs any deficiencies in this regard. But they seldom do so. The military mind is allergic to politics. And the military mind is accustomed to working, particularly in times of peace, with a large basis of assumption. A trained staff officer can assume almost anything, and start working from there. Nothing is more dangerous to war preparedness, or in fact to any human activity, than to begin action on an unreal political basis. A body such as this, so well grounded in the past, and so highly trained in prognostication of the future, will hardly require me to support this contention by many examples.

Let me remind you that the Maginot line, constructed at enormous expense, was left with its northern flank in the air at Mezieres, because political planning was unable to tell the French High Command, what, in the circumstances of a war with Germany, neutral Belgium would do. Again the British fortified Singapore only against seaward attack. Those great weapons never even fired, because the "Nips" who took Singapore, had the advantage of operating from an unresolved political situation, no political assumption having been made covering the entry of Japan into Indochina and Thailand and so into the Malay peninsula. Similar examples cover the failure of political planning for the defense of Burma. To return to the west, the British General Staff had authority to plan for military action in France and Germany, but the possibility of its forces being thrown off the continent, had never been foreseen. Yet this possibility was inherent in the political set-up in western Europe at the beginning of World War II.

In Cairo, in April 1941, when I was Director of Operations, General Wavell handed me one morning a slip of paper on which was noted "Start examining the WPC." General Wavell is a man of few words, and normally I respected reticence, but I asked him, so that I could begin work, what WPC meant. He replied, "Eric, you should know by now it can only mean one thing, The Worst Possible Case." General Wavell is a consummate strategist and a high-grade political philosopher. In fact the only soldier I know supreme in both fields, Eisenhower excepted. It is from him that I learned that in all military matters politics must take precedence of operational planning.

War is fought between two extremes, the best possible case, when our side has complete freedom of action, and the worst possible case, when one's own side has no freedom at all. It is a curiosity of the military mind that, before war begins, planning only takes account of the period prior to either side achieving any freedom of action. This, of course, was not unreasonable 30 years ago, today having regard to the speed and range of ballistics and logistics, it is patently absurd. Prewar operational planning has now to be total planning, and must therefore, because of the speed at which victory and defeat can be expanded, take into account, from the beginning, the worst possible case. You are aware of the vast effort financial, military, and political, now being made to ensure, in the case of world war III, an

Atlantic Pact victory east of the Rhine But supposing Lord Montgomery, who has never yet fought any enemy superior in armament and numbers to himself, should fail. There can be for us only one unsuccessful battle in northwest Europe, in the opening phase of the war.

There is only territorial room, in the present set-up, for one lost battle in northeast Europe. The worst possible case may begin, on land, 1 week after world war III breaks. In fact, taking account of the range and blast power of guided missiles, the worst possible case may well begin for the inhabitants of southern Britain from D+1 minutes. The gage in this early struggle is Russian access from the Baltic to the eastern Atlantic, past the barrier of the British Isles. If that eventuates, the east coast of the United States becomes the front line. That is, ultimately, civilization's worst possible case. Our immediate problem then is to insure in the event of defeat in Europe that the British Isles do not fall to Russia, as the Philippines fell to Japan. This can only be insured by an over-all defense coordination of the British Isles, politically and strategically, to cater for the worst possible case, long before war begins, in the light of the foreseeable effects that will result should Russia reach the Atlantic coast and the channel.

Clearly southern and eastern Britain will then become a war zone, exposed to heavy guided-missile bombardment from the continent, on a scale which might well demand a major shift of the civil population to a safer area, which would certainly necessitate the deployment of large military forces in southern Britain, and would, partially at least, incapacitate such vital ports as Liverpool and Glasgow, and totally cancel out the port of London, on which Britain depended for survival in World War II. Besides, not only would guided missiles reach southern Britain from France, eastern England and eastern Scotland would get those coming in from Norway. In such circumstances any planning which presumes the nonparticipation of all Ireland, condemn Britain to fight without depth in her strategical set-up, and largely without entrance ports.

Moreover, we westerners may omit Ireland from our strategy, but will the Russians do so? In such lamentable circumstances, the arrival of an airborne invasion in Ireland, might well be the end. In World War II Britain escaped invasion after the fall of France because the Germans had never planned for their best possible case, the rapid total defeat of France, which took place unforeseen. They began, only then to study, too late the follow-up into Britain. Were history to repeat itself, that hiatus would not recur. Why is there this hole in the strategical map of the Atlantic Pact where Ireland is? Surely, it is because the political chiefs of the Atlantic Pact fail to see the necessity for a sound political background for their strategical planning, and have not yet realized that any strategical plan, without a worst-possible-case codicil is unrealistic. Conceive for a moment the cooperation which would be required, were a politically integrated Ireland to be called into the planning councils of the Atlantic powers.

It would be necessary, not only to prepare Ireland operationally as an air base, to ring its coasts with the most modern radar devices, to arm and organize Ireland's man power for defence against modern air-borne invasion, but also to organize the country logistically, so that when the great ports of Britain became ineffective, Ireland would become a depot and a material base, from which would go a wide-front shuttle-transit of air craft and small ships, to the invulnerable, because highly dispersed harbors and coves and emergency landing grounds in the west of Britain, and, for that purpose, it might be necessary to create on the coast of Connaught, in the deep fiords of southeast Munster, modern Mulberry harbors, able to receive the seaborne traffic which, under present planning, will expect to use the great vulnerable target-ports of Glasgow, Liverpool, and Bristol. Again, where is the displaced population of southeast Britain to go if not to Ireland once the rockets and V2's come rolling in on the south coast of Britain and on London? No provision for these serious matters can be written into the Atlantic Pact planning, because the political leaders of Ireland are excluded, by a political situation created by one of the major Atlantic powers, from even thinking of such contingencies as I have just outlined. This, of course, is highly unrealistic, and yet is inherent in the very wording of the Pact itself, which, without full consideration of the meaning involved, guaranteed the integrity of existing frontiers in western Europe, and thus underwrote among other frontiers, the Anglo-Irish frontier, in the middle of the Irish Province of Ulster; so making it politically impossible for any Government of Ireland to survive for 24 hours, if it sought to cooperate in the Atlantic Pact, at the price of underwriting the partition of its own territory, and thus abandoning, for all time, its conationals who are unwilling British subjects inside the British bridgehead in Ulster.

The Government of the United Kingdom rules in Northern Ireland for reasons of imperial politics, economics, and strategy which were obsolete by the end of World War I, and threadbare during World War II. You have therefore the paradox of the Irish nation, a nation recognized by Russia to be fundamentally hostile to communism, the one nation in the whole Atlantic world where there cannot be a Communist fifth column, a nation which is almost certainly marked down for the most condign re-education should she ever fall into Russian hands, remaining for political reasons, aloof, frustrated, and powerless to assist the anti-Communist powers. It may be said, that, with this background, it will be easy, border or no border, to involve Ireland to the full once war starts. Any such drastic and high-handed action would meet with rigid non-cooperation on the part of Irish democracy. But moreover, it would be ineffectual in the short run because it would be both belated and uncoordinated. If, however, Ireland were to be occupied without consent it would be a sine-qua-non of effective action, that the insular defense of Ireland should be conducted under one military command, responsible or, at least geared to, one government, an all-Irish government.

Of course, in such circumstances, Britain might be only too ready to cut her losses in Ireland, if the alternative were her own national extinction, a contingency which did not arise in World War II with the same force. But is it not absurd that, while civilization is forging the chain which will hold her from ultimate collapse, neither the political nor military leaders of the western world seem to be aware of this missing link?

It has been said by the agents of the British Government in British Northern Ireland, that there is no incompatibility in the government of Free Ireland taking part at this moment in the Atlantic Pact, and the Irish Government's failure to do so is unrealistic and pedantic. There are no pedants in the Irish Government. It is a realistic government. In World War I, Ireland, governed as a unit by Britain, could both suppress a serious internal rising, and also provide large bodies of troops for external use, because it was under one military command responsible to the then government in Dublin. In World War II the situation was considerably more hazardous for all concerned, though the worst did not happen. But preparations to defend Ireland in World War III would, in present circumstances, demand collaboration between three governments, two sovereign and one subordinate. All would be exposed to heavy internal political strain, because, for historical reasons, that collaboration would be opposed by the Orange element in Northern Ireland as well as the extreme national element in the republic.

In the military field, were the British Government to assure the role of senior partner, that would be equivalent to the renewed military subordination of the Irish nation to Great Britain, an unthinkable political situation. Any attempt to involve the British command in northern Ireland in a defense plan in which the Irish Government was the senior partner, would be opposed by the pro-British minority in Belfast and the Tory party in Britain. With unity these factions would disappear. Till then these political factors are supreme. While they continue to obtain they nullify all strategical planning before the outbreak of war. In consequence there is no more vulnerable instrument today than the Atlantic Pact, as at present constituted. It can, like so many other pacts in the past, for instance the British guaranty to Poland, make it possible for war to begin; it can also make it possible for defeat to be swift and complete. As a soldier with considerable high-level operational experience I find the situation alarming. As a citizen of Ireland, I find it little short of desperate. I may be forgiven by saying that I do not believe we should permit the obsolete prejudices of a 20-percent minority of the population of Ireland, less than 300,000 adults concentrated unfortunately around Belfast, to nullify the great edifice of nonaggressive defense which the people of the United States are constructing in their own interest, and that of civilization. Particularly when in fact the susceptibilities of the Ulster Orangemen are completely out of place in our own time. Moreover, we must realize that those susceptibilities would rapidly wilt and wither, were they not backed by successive United Kingdom Governments be they Conservative or Socialist. It has been necessary, in the interest of a better world, to break down this residual imperialism in the British mind in India and elsewhere.

It was equally necessary to insist, democratically, on the Netherlands being realistic in the matter of Indonesia. Is it impossible at this present time, with all its urgency, to tackle as a world problem, the Anglo-Irish issue, and persuade the British people that not until they finally withdraw from Ireland's six northern counties, can their own strategical safety be guaranteed?

The United States, Ireland, Canada, and the United Kingdom should sit down together at the council table to strive to compose old differences in the face of such new and urgent dangers.

When that day comes a reunited Ireland will not be unworthy of her responsibilities to Europe and America.

Reorganization of Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 21, 1950

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting the press release issued by the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government at the time it made its report on certain recommendations as

to the basic organizational changes, consolidating major land agencies and grouping them in the Department of Agriculture.

Basic organizational changes which would consolidate major land agencies and group them in the Department of Agriculture were proposed today by the Commission on Organization of the Executive branch of the Government.

The Commission recommended that the land activities of the Department of the Interior, chiefly the public domain (except mineral questions), be transferred to the Department of Agriculture. Water-development activities (except the local farm supply of water) would be transferred to the Department of the Interior.

"There has been a long and wasteful conflict and overlap between certain soil conservation, range, forest and allied services due to the division of their functions between the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior," the Commission declared, adding that it "believes the logic and public policy require that major land agencies be grouped in the Department of Agriculture." (Separate views of a minority of the Commission will be filed with a subsequent report on the reorganization of the Department of the Interior.)

The report on the Department of Agriculture is the sixth section in a series of about 15 which will be given to Congress between now and March 13 by the 12-man, bipartisan Commission which was created by Congress in July 1947. The report proposes an extension of the functional organizations of the Department of Agriculture and a new grouping of major purpose activities. It also recommends a thorough overhaul of the Department at State, county, and farm levels.

The report notes that "The Department of Agriculture has been a vital and effective agency of Government since its creation in 1862. In the last 20 years the Department has expanded from about 22,000 employees to over 82,000 and expenditures have increased from about $25,800,000 to $834,000,000 in the fiscal year 1948."

PROPOSED DEPARTMENTAL STRUCTURE

The Commission recommends that the present positions of Under Secretary and two Assistant Secretaries be retained and that an additional Assistant Secretary and an Administrative Secretary be added. These officials should be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate with the possible exception of the Administrative Assistant Secretary. The duties of these officials in supervision of Departmental activities should be assigned by the Secretary. All officials below the Under Secretary and the Assistant Secretaries should, preferably, be appointed from the career service.

It is intended that the Administrative Assistant Secretary should have charge of staff services and should, if possible, be selected from the career service.

The Commission recommends that operational functions of the Department in Washington be grouped into eight major units: 1. Staff services; 2. Research Service; 3. Extension Service; 4. Agricultural Resources Conservation Service; 5. Commodity Adjustment Service; 6. Regulatory Service; 7. Agricultural Credit Service; 8. Rural Electrification Service (pp. 8-9-10).

DEFICIENCIES OF THE DEPARTMENT (P. 3)

The Commission's task force on agricultural activities enumerates the following problems in the organization of the Department:

"(a) Its rapid growth has resulted in some 20 different offices reporting directly to the Secretary, causing an unnecessary diffusion of authority.

"(b) The Department has grown to its present size without sufficient integration of its parts and with considerable overlap and duplication. It is a loose confederation of independent bureaus and agencies.

"(c) There are agricultural activities in other parts of the Government which overlap and duplicate those of the Department of Agriculture.

"(d.) The Cooperative Extension Service established by the Federal Government and the States for educational purposes is being increasingly bypassed by several of the bureaus and agencies of the Department.

"(e) With the rapid growth of new activities, many field organizations at State and county levels have developed. Their work results in duplications, overlappings, and often conflicting policies. They confuse and multiply the difficulties of the farmer in his relations to the Department.

"(f) The Department has organized a variety of local advisory committees at the county level, and their members tend to become local administrators of uncoordinated agencies instead of advisers.

"(g) The inspection of agricultural products for protection of the consumer and the farmer is scattered through many agencies of the Government, and the resulting confusion requires producers and manufacturers to comply with regulations issued by agencies of two or more departments or administrations.

"(h) The present systems of budgeting, treatment of intra-departmental funds and earmarking of recurring funds have the cumulative effect of obscuring bureau expenditures and of promoting waste.

"(i) The services and policies of the several Farm Credit Agencies overlap. Their organization is contrary to sound banking principles. Some of them make loans which require costly individual supervision."

FIELD ORGANIZATION (P. 11)

The Commission recommends a thorough overhaul of the organization of the Department at State, county and farmer levels.

State level: "The State governments operate effective agricultural departments and have in the past engaged in effective cooperative activities with the Department at State, county, and farmer levels: In recent years, the Department has not taken full advantage of the established and effective State organizations in performing many agricultural programs and has thereby produced some duplication of national and State effort at local levels."

County level: "The Commission was unable to conduct a detailed survey of activities at the county level. Sampling inquiries, however, revealed that considerable duplication has developed. For example, 47 employees attached to 7 distinct and separate field services of the Department of Agriculture in one cotton-producing county in Georgia were working with 1,500 farmers; a fruit and grazing county in the State of Washington has 184 employees of separate field services working with some 6,700 farmers: a dairy county in Maryland had 88 employees attached to these field services working with less than 3,400 farmers. In these and other counties, representatives of each agency frequently advise the same farmers on the same problems. Farmers are confused and irritated, as climaxed in one Missouri county where a farmer recently received from five different agencies varying advice on the application of fertilizer on his farm."

The Commission noted that the separate field services usually found at the county level include the Soil Conservation Service; Extension Service; Farmers Home Administration; Production and Marketing Administration with its conservation payment program and school-lunch program; Farm Credit Administration through its Production Credit Associations and National Farm Local Associations and the Rural Electrification Administration.

In addition, the Forest Service may be represented by Federal-State farm forest management advisers; the Bureau of Animal Industry by specialists on animal disease eradication programs; and the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine by others who work on plant disease eradication and insect control.

Separate from those of the Department of Agriculture, representatives of the Veterans Administration are usually present to administer the on-farm industrial training program for veterans. The farm labor representatives of the Federal-State Employment Service and Federal-State Department of Agriculture may also be in the field at the county level.

A multitude of county advisory committees of farmers has been created and employed by these various activities at a cost exceeding $5,000,000 a year. The Commission's task force recommends that only one committee be set up for each county and estimates that their annual cost for the entire Nation would not exceed $700,000.

Farmer level (p. 13): The Commission recommends that Department of Agriculture councils comprising representatives of the several departmental services in each county be organized to exchange information on their programs.

"In view of the widespread activities of the State governments in agriculture, the Commission recommends that, except in the most unusual circumstances, activities that are services to individual farmers should be administered in the field by departmental employees through offices based on the States as units," the report says. "The services at county levels and to farm units should be so merged as to reduce the number of duplicating and unnecessary employees, with due regard to avoiding divided authority."

The Commission also recommends the establishment of one State council in each State, and one county council in each agricultural county, as aids to orderly operations in the field (p. 14).

FURTHER RECOMMENDATIONS (P. 15)

"(a) In the future, new Federal agricultural research stations should generally be established only where existing joint Federal-State facilities cannot be developed to fill the need.

"(b) We recommend that conservation payments to a farmer should be restricted to those which will bring about the adoption of complete and balanced conservation programs on his farm. They should not be used as income supplements in disguise. When the conservation plan on any farm has been completed, such payments to the owner should stop.

"(c) We recommend that adjustment programs with respect to commodities and commodity groups should be operated on a standby, rather than a continuous, basis.

"(d) To obtain economy and efficiency, this Commission recommends that inspection costs on farm products, when imposed for the benefit and protection of the general public, be paid by the Federal Government. Inspection and grading services primarily for the benefit or protection of producers or processors should be paid for by the producers or processors.

"(e) We recommend that customs receipts now allotted directly to the Department be paid into the Treasury and that direct annual appropriations be made by the Congress for specified purposes."

AGRICULTURAL CREDIT ACTIVITIES (P. 17)

The Government has an investment of about $2,000,000,000 in a maze of agricultural credit agencies. Current loans approximate $3,500,000,000 as compared with lending authorizations of nearly $7,000,000,000. Borrowings from private sources included in

the above total authorization have been utilized to the extent of approximately $1,200,000,000. The Commission in its upcoming report on business enterprises will recommend a number of requirements which apply in part to the agricultural lending agencies. These recommendations are designed to strengthen and simplify the agriculture credit structure and to bring about savings of capital and expenditures.

The administration cost to the Federal Government of these agencies might be reduced by more than $36,000,000 while much larger sums can be saved by better organized lending agencies.

IRRIGATION PROJECTS (P. 18)

The Commission notes that long-continued friction between the Bureau of Reclamation in the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture has marked the planning and operation of irrigation projects. The Commission recommends that the Department of Agriculture be required to report to the President and the Congress on all irrigation or reclamation projects about their use or timeliness.

REGULATION OF FOOD PRODUCTS TO PROTECT CONSUMER (P. 19)

There are some 21 legislative acts bearing on the purity of food and drugs, standards and grades of products, etc. (See annex II, p. 35.) The Agriculture Department is vested with regulatory authority to grade various agricultural products, is directed to inspect meat, animal-virus serum, toxins, insecticides, and seeds. It also supervises the standardization of containers. The Federal Security Agency, the Federal Trade Commission, and the Bureau of Internal Revenue in the Treasury are also involved in similar regulatory activities.

"Many of these authorities were once in the Department of Agriculture," the Commission said. "Their separation from other departmental activities in these fields creates great overlap and also confuses the public. The Department (Agriculture) is much better equipped for research in these matters. * * * We believe, as does our task force, that the Department of Agriculture will be vigorous in the protection of consumer interest."

TRANSFER OF BUREAUS FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS (P. 22)

Certain major questions of functions to be included in this Department or removed to other departments of the Government have necessitated major conclusions by this Commission.

Citing a "long and wasteful conflict and overlap" because of a division of functions between the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior, the report says one of the important areas of duplication relates to the management of the forest and range lands of the public domain. The Forest Service, the Bureau of Land Management, and in some areas the Soil Conservation Service, operate on adjacent or intermingled Federal land areas under different statutory and administrative policies. Conflicting, confusing, and duplicating activities of the agencies concerned present problems, the Commission said, which call for basic organizational changes.

The Commission's report says:

1. "Our task forces on agriculture, natural resources, and public works all urgently recommend the consolidations of these agencies. It has been urged for many years by students of government. The Commission agrees with this recommendation." (Annex I, p. 31.)

2. "This Commission believes that logic and public policy require that major land agencies be grouped in the Department of Agriculture. (Separate views of a minority of the Commission will be filed with a subsequent report on the reorganization of the Department of the Interior.) It recommends that the land activities of the Department of the Interior, chiefly the public domain—except mineral questions—and the Oregon and California revested lands, be transferred to the Department of Agriculture, and that the water-development activities—except the local farm supply of water—be transferred to the Department of the Interior.

Finally, the Commission recommends:

"That on completion of the organization of the Department as contemplated in this report, the Secretary of Agriculture institute immediately a comprehensive management survey to determine further savings, and to eliminate facilities, stations, and offices that duplicate facilities and work otherwise conducted by the Department or the States."

The Commission's task force on agriculture was headed by Dean H. P. Rusk, of the Illinois State College of Agriculture. The committee included: Dean H. W. Martin, of the Rutgers University School of Agriculture; Dr. D. Howard Doane, of the Doane Agricultural Service; F. W. Peck, of the Farm Foundation; Prof. John Gaus, of Harvard University; Dean W. A. Schoenfeld, of Oregon State College; Chester Davis, president of the Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis; and William Rhea Blake, of the National Cotton Council.

G. Harris Collingwood was research director of the task force and Frederic P. Lee its legal counsel. Consultants were Gen. H. P. Seidemann, formerly of Brookings Institution, and E. H. Taylor, associate editor of the Country Gentleman.

COMMISSIONERS

Hon. Herbert Hoover, Chairman, New York, N. Y.

Hon. Dean Acheson, Vice Chairman, Secretary of State, State Department, Washington, D. C.

Hon. George D. Aiken, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Hon. Clarence J. Brown, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Hon. Arthur S. Flemming, president, Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, Ohio.

Hon. James Forrestal, Secretary of Defense, Pentagon, Washington, D. C.

Hon. Joseph P. Kennedy, New York, N. Y.

Hon. John L. McClellan, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Hon. Carter Manasco, Washington, D. C.

Hon. George H. Mead, Dayton, Ohio.

Hon. James K. Pollock, professor and chairman of the department of political science, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.

Hon. James Rowe, Jr., Washington, D. C.

One Hundredth Anniversary of Clinton, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1950

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include excerpts from a recent editorial appearing in the Clinton Daily Item on the growth and progress of the town of Clinton since its founding. The community is celebrating its one hundredth anniversary this year.

The matter referred to follows:

In the field of music, John Redmond and William H. Heagney, both of New York City, today, hold high rank in the field of music, while Clarence E. Brown, a former resident of Grove Street, as considered among the top movie directors, in Hollywood.

Carroll Gibbons, a Clinton native, has attained international fame, for many years, as the director of the Hotel Savoy Orchestra, in London.

Edward O'Connor, of 26 Prescott Street, is in charge of the Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer interests in Indonesia and Al Altman, both born here, serves as a M-G-M talent scout, with headquarters in New York City.

Just before the turn of the century Clinton claimed more big league baseball players than any town or city, in Massachu.etts, with such famous diamond stars as the late William R. Hamilton, whose stolen base record has stood untouched for 50 years; Shavey Ryan and Malachi Kittredge, of the Chicago Cubs; Frank H. Connaughton, of the Boston Braves, and John C. McGeachey of the Indianapolis Club, a member of the old National League at one time.

Clinton saw the genesis of Brockelman Bros,. Inc., which originated in a little store, on Green Street, until its removal to the Tyler Block, when it acquired the Boston branch store, then located at the northerly end of that structure and which soon expanded into its present quarters embracing the entire ground floor and basement.

Singularly enough the site of the chain enterprise which now operates units in many New England cities and towns is in the same building where Gustavus F. Swift and his brothers conceived the idea of bringing dressed beef east in refrigerators cars from Chicago, which at that period, was rapidly becoming the center of shipments of cattle for slaughtering.

The Swifts removed from Cape Cod to Clinton in the early seventies and operated, in the Tyler block, a meat and provision store, and in accordance with the then prevailing universal custom of retail merchants of food products owned a small fleet of meat carts which went from house to house on established routes serving local and out-of-town customers.

In 1850 Clinton sported but few streets, all of short length. Berlin Road was not laid out until 1852, and the road to Sterling came into being in 1853 and 1854, while Boylston Road was not built until 1860 and 1861.

The new town spent $603.87 in 1850–51 for the construction of Grove Street, California Road, Wilson Hill Road, and bridges, but today Clinton has 35 miles of modern highways.

In 1850 the selectmen asked for and received an appropriation totaling $8,200 for expenditures during that year, and according to Ford's History of Clinton the amount raised, by taxation, was $9,059.33 on a total valuation of $262,803, and at the rate of $7 per $1,000 valuation.

The town had 575 poll-tax payers, and Ford's History reports the debt that year of $24,525, a few thousands over the 1950 debt of $18,000.

Clinton's expenditures totaled approximately $1,450,000 in 1949, with most of the income coming from the taxation of real estate and personal property valued at $11,947,000 on a tax rate of $55.80 per $1,000.

At the date of the incorporation Clinton possessed, according to the assessors, a population of 2,788, but the United States census, taken that year, announced a population of 3,118.

It was a time of beginning for all residents of the new-born town.

Economy in the present for the sake of a competence in the future was the motto of private life, but, at the same time, the spirit of enterprise was abroad with a full recognition of the fact that false economy in laying the foundations of our municipal institutions spelled a great increase of expenses in the future, and the citizens wisely adopted a farseeing program of liberality.

While the town owned some school property and a few roads and bridges it lacked provisions for the care of the poor, a place for interment of deceased citizens, and a protection against fire.

When the needs of the community are considered the $8,200 appropriation asked by the selectmen appears small, yet at the close of the first year of municipal life a net balance in favor of the town of $371.11 remained in the treasury.

It is a far cry from the modest living costs of 1850 and the average share of the Federal debt of that period that was borne by every Clintonian with those prevailing as the town enters upon its second century of municipal existence and even a contrast with 50 years ago when it observed its semicentennial is amazing.

The average share of every Clinton man, woman, and child of the 1950 Federal debt is $1,694, or 113 times as much as it was in 1902 and 130 times larger than it was in 1912.

He or she owes nearly 11 times as much as in 1932, 5 times as much as in 1947, 7 years after Roosevelt entered the White House, and 3 times as much as in 1942.

These authentic figures were revealed by the United States Census Bureau, December 16, 1949, in a survey of tax trends, Federal, State, and local.

Back in 1902, the per capita amount of the debt of each Clintonian was $15, and 10 years later, in the Taft administration it was $13.

In 1932, in the Hoover administration, it had risen to $156, and in 1940, after 7 years of the Roosevelt administration, it stood at $326, and in 1942 at $538.

Until the New Deal came in, the statistics showed that State and local government actually cost more than the Federal Government.

In 1902, the State and local debts of each person was $28; in 1912, it was $46, and in 1932 it stood at $157.

Today, it is even less than it was in 1932—$140, or one-twelfth the average citizen's share of the Federal debt.

Added together the per capita public debt stands at $1,834, with the Federal debt 92.4 percent, and the State and local debt only 7.6 percent.

The Federal debt, the Census Bureau figures showed, was $252,770,000,000 at the end of this fiscal year, while the 48 States owed $4,024,000,000 and local governments $16,851,000,000, for an over-all public debt of $273,645,000,000.

In contrast, the total public debt, in 1902, was $3,373,000,000, of which $1,178,000,000 was Federal and $2,195,000,000 was State and local.

The Federal debt has multiplied 80 times in the period between 1902 and 1950, and is 4½ times larger than in 1940 and about 3 times that of 1942.

State and local debts have remained about the same since 1932. In that year they totaled $19,576,000,000 and in 1940 they had increased to $20,246,000,000 and dropped steadily during World War II to $15,992,000,000 in 1946 and have since risen to $20,875,000,000, or still less than one-twelfth of the Federal debt.

On top of the debt of each Clinton man, woman, and child the average citizen pays $39 a year in interest alone, of which $35 goes to the Federal Government and $1 and $3, respectively, to the State and local governments.

The interest charges on the entire public debt amount to $5,732,000,000 more than the total debt itself in 1912.

The Massachusetts State debt, as broken down by the Census Bureau, was $207,261,000 in 1947 and $179,296,000 in 1948.

The interest on the Federal debt is $5,188,000,000 each year; on the State debt, $87,000,000 and on local debts, $457,000,000.

The men who make up the State budgets have been doing right well, too, as not since 1933 has a single one of the 48 States decreased the amount of money it took from taxpayers.

In 1949, the States alone grabbed $8,342,000,000 out of the pockets of their taxpayers and between Uncle Sam, the 48 States and the cities and towns in the Nation they paid $54,500,000,000 in tax levies, in 1948 one-fifth of the entire national income of all the people in the country, according to the official figures of the United States Census Bureau.

This year, three governors have decided that a little thrift might come in handy with two of them actually urging their respective legislatures to save the taxpayer a few dollars.

One of the most astute leaders of the Democratic Party was the late Gov. Albert C. Ritchie, of Maryland, a thoughtful man and an exceedingly clear-headed statesman who, in perusing the national situation a few days after the second election of Roosevelt remarked to a group of friends: "They have started something that can't be stopped." His reference was to the political program of appealing to large groups of voters, not with reason but with promises and gifts.

The gifts, of course, came from the United States Government and from the pockets of every taxpayer and formed the foundation of the New Deal—cash subsidies for the farmers, unemployment relief for the idle, social-security payments for the indigent and the aged, legislative favors and White House support for the labor union bosses, unlimited pay-roll patronage for the politicians, all of which created the huge deficits which the Democratic Party had pledged to decrease and pile up the national debt to hitherto unapproached heights, but which was laughed off as wholesome, particularly the national debt, "because," as those in power said, "we owe it to ourselves."

Of course it was apparent to the man in the street that it was poor arithmetic and worse logic but it was eminently successful at the polls. Conditions in 1950, 12 years later, make it clear that the Maryland Governor knew what he was talking about. In that period we have gone to extremes in the business of buying groups that were not dreamed of when it was started, with more than 2,000,000 on the Federal pay rolls and with one out of every nine persons in the United States directly or indirectly receiving Government funds.

The size of the national debt and the depth of the recurring annual deficits are far beyond the direst predictions of the most pessimistic of the antispending element. The Washington administration and the party in power are more closely bound to the labor bosses, particularly the CIO than ever before.

To the lonely voices of Democratic Senator HARRY F. BYRD and a few others, who for years, have pointed out that this policy of buying voting groups and ever enlarging the Government pay rolls was the sure way to calamitous national bankruptcy has now been added the powerful one of former Supreme Court Justice, former Secretary of State, and former Governor of South Carolina.

Perilously unsound as these vote-buying policies are and little as some of their conspicuous advocates believe in them, their political success has been so great that few men in public life have had the courage to rise up and say so.

Most of them are pusillanimously content to coast along cheered by the notion that the collapse will not come in their own time. It is, of course, a cowardly path they have taken but it is the one they are committed to and they can't stand still either. They realize that if they don't turn around they have to go on.

A notable example of this condition is in the present passionate advocacies of pensions for the aged which have broken out in both major political parties all over the country. A decade ago, both parties shunned the so-called Townsend plan and branded its proponents as morons or crackpots, but not today by any means.

Just a few months ago James Roosevelt announcing his gubernatorial candidacy in California, came out for pensions for everybody, while the Secretary of Labor in addition is urging $1 an hour as a minimum wage and insisting that the country must, at once, inaugurate a plan to give every retired person a pension of $100 a month. That was the original Townsend plan a few years ago.

The record shows that every pension proposed to which Congress has given close study and consideration has eventually been enacted into law and the warning of the BYRDS and the Byrneses do not even slow them up. If we are not over the brink before this $100 a month pension plan passes we will be after it becomes law.

The results of economic ignorance, the kindest phrase that can be used, applies the worst dictionary definition of "liberal"—"licentious." By feeding their bible of slogans and catch-phrases through blinding propaganda machinery the electorate has been deluded with dizzy pictures of the welfare state, a brief synonym for totalitarian collectivism and only a reactionary step from the slave state which the United States Constitution was designed to wrench from its age-old grip.

The taxation of pay rolls by the Federal Government has became one of the devices by which the New Deal strove to convert the United States into a socialistic welfare state.

The gadget is that pay roll taxes may produce, in small units, enormous sums of money which need not be especially accounted for and which may be used as economic planners desire. This insidious form of taxation was introduced when the Social Security System was adopted.

Dual taxes up to $30 a year each were levied on employees, being made deductible from their pay envelopes, and also on employers for the avowed purpose of providing old-age retirement pensions for the workers.

At the same time other taxes were imposed on employers along in conjunction with State unemployment compensation programs. Under the second arrangement State agencies operated the unemployment compensation programs but the Federal Government collects three-tenths of 1 percent of pay rolls to pay for the administrative expenses of the State agencies, which is a subtle scheme that makes the State dependent on the bureaucracy.

In both instances the taxes exacted by the Federal Government have been greatly in excess of current requirements and billions of dollars for old-age pensions have been collected and spent by the Federal Government with only a minor portion being needed for the legitimate payment of pensions.

Almost $2,000,000,000 have been paid by employers to the Federal Government for State expenses under the unemployment-compensation program. Out of this sum the States have received back only $850,000,000, or less than half of the total, leaving a surplus of more than $900,000,000 in the custody of the Federal Government.

Morally this surplus is a trust fund belonging to the State governments or to the employers from whom it was needlessly taken.

But a rapacious Federal bureaucracy wants to spend the money to influence pay roll votes and accordingly the Secretary of Labor proposes that the unearned surplus be used up by requiring the the States "to increase the amount and duration of jobless benefits under Federal standards."

Actually the scheme would perpetuate a steal on every State and employer in the country. Not only every employer but every State legislator, every worker, and every voter ought to become aware of the encroaching danger to free enterprise and to individual liberty that exists in Federal pay-roll taxes.

Such is the outlook, in Clinton, in 1950, as the town starts on its one hundred and first year—a municipality of small area, but with every life essential within easy reach; lines of three railroads, with direct connections with the main arteries of travel to all parts of the Nation; postal service unsurpassed by any town of its size in the country; ample banking facilities, telegraphic and telephonic connections with the entire world; an industrious population with thousands owning their homes and all skilled and thrifty; a fine market for the surplus products of the farms in the six agricultural towns that adjoin it and with a potential consumer public of between 25,000 and 30,000 souls; a modern gravity system of the purest water to be found anywhere in Worcester County and unrivaled for domestic and manufacturing purposes; a well-equipped fire department, an efficient police department, unsurpassed school facilities, an extensive public library, churches of many denominations, a collection of municipal buildings unequaled by any town of its size in the Commonwealth; four parks; a health country so elevated as to command extensive views of unusual New England beauty; modern highways, shaded residential streets and a law-abiding population.

It is not within the ken of any of us to predict the future of our beloved town, but every resident hopes that the fears besetting them at the present time may be only ephemeral and that the next 100 years will be as fruitful as those that are closing.

New Low in Crime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN B. SULLIVAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 21, 1950

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the St. Louis Star-Times of Wednesday, April 19, 1950, entitled "New Low in Crime," which discusses the tragedies and near-tragedies in airplane transportation. These man-made "accidents," caused by heartless fiends seeking vengeance on one particular person and involving other helpless passengers, is fully discussed in this fine editorial, and a remedy is suggested. I commend this editorial of the Star-Times to my colleagues in the Congress. I am sure this subject will receive the attention of our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The editorial follows:

NEW LOW IN CRIME

It is only because of a miracle that the headlines today do not read "16 Die As Airliner Crashes in Flames." That miracle was the discovery of a home-made bomb by a United Air Lines baggageman. Only the accident of the baggageman's dropping a gasoline-filled suitcase, causing it to catch fire just before the take-off, saved the passengers and crew, not to mention the plane costing several hundred thousand dollars.

It is hard for a normal human being to realize that this world includes fiends who would murder their families and a dozen to 50 other persons to collect a life-insurance policy. But it is a fact, as has been proven three times.

It happened once near St. Joachims, Quebec, when a twin-engined Canadian Pacific air liner exploded in the air and crashed, bringing 23 people to their deaths. Included among them were E. T. Stannard, president of the Kennecott Copper Co.; Arthur D. Stork, who reportedly was touring the company's facilities before succeeding Stannard as president; and R. J. Parker, vice president. The other time it happened was in the Philippines.

It almost happened again on the Los Angeles-San Diego flight of a twin-engined United Air Lines DC-3. John H. Grant had planted the gasoline-filled suitcase, along with a time bomb, in the baggage of a plane that was to carry his wife and two small children. It almost went undiscovered.

There is no way of knowing whether any of the other unexplained crashes after an airplane burst into flames in the air may have been due to the same cause.

In the St. Joachims, the Philippines, and the Los Angeles cases the culprits were caught. Catching them is not enough, however. That will not bring back to life the 23 victims of the Canadian accident; it would not have brought back the 16 persons on the United air liner who would have been killed if it had not been for the miracle.

Clearly a Federal law is needed, so drastic that it will wipe out such crimes. This can be done as certainly as the Lindbergh law has wiped out kidnaping, and by the same method. Congress should pass a Federal law that any attempt, successful or not, to blow up or wreck an airplane in interstate travel is punishable by death. Every such case would then automatically fall to the FBI, which would almost certainly find the motive and the murderer every time such a heinous crime was attempted.

An effort should be made now to get such a law while memory is keen and indignation high about the Canadian and California incidents.

A Good Citizen of the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 21, 1950

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, my attention has recently been directed to the thinking of some of our young citizens and their concern over accepting the responsibilities of American citizenship as well as receiving the many benefits from it. In particular, are the thoughts of one young citizen, Cyrus Johnston, of Corsicana, Tex., whose theme on the subject of a good citizen of the world won an award from the local civic organizations.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include this theme by Cyrus Johnston of the Corsicana High School, Corsicana, Tex.:

A GOOD CITIZEN OF THE WORLD

The dictionary tells us that a citizen is "an inhabitant of a city or town—specifically one enjoying its privileges and freedom as freemen. A member of a state; a person, native or naturalized, who owes allegiance to a government." Upon birth one becomes a citizen of a city or town, a county, a State, the United States. Especially since World War II the world has been brought very close together. The airplane has made distance a matter of hours. The United Nations organization has brought representative citizens from most of the countries of the world around the same table in New York City. As one observes these citizens of many nationalities, one wonders how long it may take to build a world of good citizens with the fundamental things in common.

As citizens we have privileges. We enjoy citizenship, which is the relation of an individual to his state, which relationship is of a dual nature in our country: "That of the Nation and that of the particular State of which one is a resident." The meaning of our citizenship is defined in the fourteenth amendment of the Constitution. Along with this privilege of citizenship goes protection of the person and his property at home and abroad.

Accompanying privileges are responsibilities. Every citizen owes obedience and loyalty for this protection. It is the citizen's responsibility to grow physically, mentally, morally, socially sound, clean, and right, so that he may do his share in developing his country to the best interests of all the people. In this development education is very important. The first citizens of our country—our forefathers—who came from other parts of the world, believed that education was not only a right but a duty which freemen owed to their Creator. They believed that church members should choose their own pastor and help rule their own church. As you know, this democratic idea can be traced wherever the church spire rises in an American town. These pioneers created self-governing towns which were the basis of local government, and they established the first free schools in America. I mention these things because they are fundamental in the spiritual, mental, and moral growth of good citizens. They are the factors that make people good citizens.

What is a good citizen? What qualities may a person have that place him in the category of a good citizen There are many such qualities that might be named, but I shall name and comment briefly on seven.

In the first place, I think a good citizen is a working citizen. Work is a noble thing, and by noble, honorable pursuits man goes forward and makes the world a better place to live in. Someone has said "Better to wear out than to rust out," and 'tis true that "The dog that trots around finds a bone."

The men we call great, the men who have been good world citizens, the men whose birthdays are marked on the calendar have been the men who have worked and found the bone. They have been hard-working citizens. Take Abraham Lincoln as an outstanding example. He worked himself, and he believed in a man's right to work and keep the fruits of his labor. He believed in free enterprise which has come to be known as the American way of life. This is the system of work that has made our country great, and as the generation that will be in places of leadership tomorrow, we high-school students must take advantage of our opportunities—opportunities made possible by good citizens from all over the world who have had the courage to work for that which they loved.

The thrifty person, one who is frugal, industrious, and provident, is a good citizen to have anywhere in this world. When we think of the quality of thrift, our mind turns to the good and great Benjamin Franklin. His philosophy as stated by Poor Richard is well known, for who of us has not read The Autobiography of Benjamin Franklin?

"Plow deep while sluggards sleep, and you shall have corn to sell and to keep.

"God helps them that help themselves.

"A penny saved is a penny earned.

"Wine and women, game and deceit, make the wealth small and the want great."

We do well to ponder these thoughts from the well-disciplined mind of Franklin. We should be mindful of the fact that good citizens are thrifty with time and efforts as well as money.

The quality of self-reliance makes me think of my recent visit to our Mesa Verde National Park. The dole, social security and societies for the advancement of this, that and the other things were unknown to the Indian living on this green mesa from 1,200 to 700 years ago. They didn't have present-day Robin Hoods, bureaucrats, self-styled liberals to soak the rich to give to the poor. No, these red men were self-reliant people. They took what God gave them and made the best of it. They were realists. They worked hard. They made definite contributions to civilization, and the products of their labors still stand today.

The next three qualities of a good world citizen: fair play, tolerance and respect for the rights of others, may be summed up in the words of our Master, the greatest Citizen who ever lived, when He said:

"All things therefore whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, even so do ye also unto them" (Matthew 7: 12).

And now we come to the seventh quality of a good world citizen. This is the most important of all, in fact, it is the fundamental. If a man has the love of God in his heart, then these first six essentials will just naturally follow.

God-fearing people have been the instruments through which civilization has progressed upon its course always in a westerly direction. Take a look at our own country with its background of the Puritan spirit. Our forefathers had the unshakable faith that God was on their side both in war and in peace. This conviction gave these first citizens the strength to make the first powerful American commonwealth out of the wilderness of New England. It gave them a feeling of independence that was different from anything that had happened before on the North American continent. We learn from American history that the Puritans brought with them their own charter, proceeded to organize their own churches, make their own laws, elect their own magistrates, and build their own schools. When they made money by hard work, they kept it among themselves. These Puritans started doing the things that all Americans have sought to do ever since. Their spirit lives on, because wherever they went they carried with them the indomitable faith of their Puritan ancestors who believed that God had chosen America as a specially favored land.

Since God has been so good to us and because of His many blessings to His people here in America, we of this generation in the public schools of our land should take advantage of the opportunities we have to prepare ourselves for honorable work. We should be frugal, industrious, and provident. We should be self-reliant and make the very best we can with the opportunities we have. We must be fair-minded and respect the rights of others. Above all, we must love and obey God and, like the wise man, build our house on the rock foundation. We must build a character that can withstand the storms of life.

By so doing, we'll be able "to make our lives sublime" like all the host of good citizens who have gone before us.

"Lives of great men all remind us
We can make our lives sublime,
And, departing, leave behind us
Footprints on the sands of time."

Opposition to Postmaster General Donaldson's Order

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. WALSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 21, 1950

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I served notice that today I would introduce a House resolution to authorize and direct a sweeping investigation of the scandalous situation existing in the Post Office Department, particularly with reference to the subsidies and overpayments made by the Department to railroads for transportation of the mails.

I have caused the introduction of the House resolution referred to; it is House Resolution 547.

In my statement of yesterday, I called attention to the deplorable condition wherein the Post Office Department pays double transportation charges for space purchased from the railroads, out of postal appropriations, for the transmission of the mails. Postmaster General Donaldson testified as much before a committee of the House of Representatives on March 7 of last year.

In hearings before the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, on H. R. 2945—which had for its purpose a readjustment of postal rates—the following colloquy took place:

Mr. HAGEN. At that point, let me ask this question: Has any survey been made recently as to what percentage of the actual paid-up space that is used in railway cars—and I understand it is on a cubic-foot basis—is used on the average run? In other words, we now pay the railroads, as I understand it, for the baggage cars for mail and the mail cars, so much per cubic foot on each railroad run, and we pay for that space regardless of whether there is 1 sack or 100 sacks, and some days it is more and some days less. Has any survey been made to show the average amount of usable space that has been used on these various runs over a period of time?

Postmaster General Donaldson made the following reply to Congressman HAGEN'S inquiry:

Yes, Mr. HAGEN; there is a difference of pay to railroads. In other words, I think what you are talking about is space purchased by full cars or storage cars or what-not. That is different from the regular RPO lines, the lines in which railway postal clerks operate.

Now with reference to the space for transporting mails by full carlots or by 15 feet or 30 feet or 45 feet or what not, I think that our investigation indicated that we used about half of the space that we paid for. Under the law, if we transport a carload of mail from New York City to San Francisco, we pay for that so much per foot per mile, so to speak, and then we pay for the return movement of the car, whether we use it or not. There is far more mail moving west than there is mail moving back.

I might add in this connection that an investigation on the basis of cost-ascertainment figures in 1946 indicated that the Post Office Department paid for 580,462,152,219 cubic-foot-miles for the transportation of mails, and actually carried only 323,677,344,195 cubic-foot-miles of nonlocal surface mails. This indicates that 44.24 percent of space was paid for but not used.

Now here we find an administrator who testifies before a congressional committee that his Department contracts with the railroads for so much storage space, uses only half of it, and, mind you, pays for the total amount contracted for with the taxpayers' money. This same administrator, on April 18, issued drastic curtailment orders reducing delivery service in the Post Office Department to such an extent that it will mean a reduction in force of a minimum of 10,000 employees. One can only surmise that empty boxcars are more important than human beings.

I should like to invite attention to the apparent policy pursued by the Post Office Department with respect to payments for service furnished by railroads transporting the mails. The policy adopted gives no consideration or, at best, very little to the taxpayer.

On February 14, 1946, William V. Griffin and Hugh William Purvis, receivers for the Georgia & Florida Railroad, were suing the United States Government. The case was heard in the United States Court of Claims. John Hardy, General Superintendent, Railway Mail Service, Post Office Department, was on the stand. Under oath he declared:

I might add that the most—probably the determining factor in my decision was the fact that the railroad company pleaded that we continue the service because of the financial benefits that were accruing to the railroad, and that has been one of the policies of the Department, that in considering any curtailment or discontinuance of rail service is to first make inquiry of the railroad company as to what effect upon the finances of the operation of their railroad any such curtailment would have, and we are invariably governed in our decision by the plea of the railroad in response to our inquiry.

During this same litigation Mr. Hardy was asked the following question by Mr. Stern:

Question 19. Have you had occasion to deal with and compare the rates for your service and railway express service?

Mr. Hardy replied:

Well, all large railroads have what is known as managers of the mail and express traffic. The majority of those employees are former employees of the Post Office Department, Railway Mail Service, and in my position we have almost daily contact with these managers of mail and express traffic, and from frequent conversations with those railroad representatives I can positively state that the railroads value the mail traffic greater than the express traffic; that is that they consider that their revenue from mail traffic, in consideration of what is furnished for the Post Office Department as compared with that which is furnished the express company, brings them a greater return.

Mr. Donaldson has stated that the Post Office Department used about half the space that was paid for. From the evidence at hand, that might well be described as an understatement. Mr. Peter J. Schardt, chairman of the committee on railway mail transportation is quoted in the November 20, 1948, issue

of the Railway Age, in an article entitled "What Future for Mail Revenue?" as follows:

Mail traffic is not evenly balanced; it is heavier going south and west than north and east. The unbalance, moreover, varies sharply on different roads. The ratio of loaded mail space to total mail space authorized varies from 98.9 percent on one big class I road, down to 57.9 percent on another.

It is my firm conviction that the entire question of postal subsidies should be thoroughly investigated. Railroads are not the only ones to benefit by subsidies at the expense of the taxpayers. Let me show what a waste of taxpayers' funds is going on in the air industry under the pious name of postal subsidies. House Document No. 1242, Survey and Study of the Postal Service, Preliminary Report, January 15, 1948, page 6, reported:

In paying the air-mail subsidy, the Post Office Department is called upon to finance inefficient management, parties, hotel suites, entertainment, excessive public relations costs, and to finance competition between existing scheduled carriers.

Getting back to the railroads, the statement has been made that the Postmaster General has no control over rail rates. That is true only in part. It is true that the Interstate Commerce Commission has the right to determine the rate to charge per unit, but the Postmaster General determines how many units are to be purchased. In a hearing on S. 1596 before the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee on May 27, 1949, Frank J. Delany, Solicitor of the Post Office Department, pointed out:

In other words, we prescribe the service; the Commission—the Commission figures how much it costs the carriers and fixes the rates, also figures the mechanics, whether the rate is to be calculated in terms of space as provided by the Railway Mail Pay Act, or weight, the old weight system, but nothing about directing the Postmaster General in his determination as to what service he requires or how often he requires it, or whether he wants it on a one-way basis or a round-trip basis.

On more than one occasion the Postmaster General has stated in effect that his is an untenable position with respect to fees paid railroads for the transportation of mails. As I pointed out above, that is only half true.

Here is another interesting aspect of this question. Page 23 of the report on the post office appropriation bill for 1949 carried the following:

Special contracts with railroads are authorized by statute for transportation of mails where the Postmaster General believes special conditions warrant higher rates. Testimony reveals that there were six such special contracts in effect as of July 1, 1947, providing for an annual increase over regular rates in amount of $111,763. The committee questions the necessity for such special contracts, and desires that the Department undertake a survey to determine the possibility of their discontinuance.

I understand that these preferential contracts are still in effect, despite the recommendation of the committee. It is interesting to point out the swiftness with which the Postmaster General complied with the recommendation of the House Appropriations Committee this year with respect to looking for economies by a reduction in services that would not be a hardship or inconvenience to the general public. The Postmaster General, in my opinion, went much further than the recommendations of the committee implied.

the general public. The Postmaster General under the law has authority to negotiate with railroads for more favorable rates; this authority has not been used to secure favorable rates where a competitive situation exists. This is exactly opposite to the policy followed by the Department where small contractors are involved. As a matter of fact, the Department encourages cutthroat competition among letter carriers on so-called mounted routes where the difference in their contract bids is seldom more than a few paltry dollars.

The resolution I have introduced will investigate these unhealthy conditions and bring about corrective action to the end that legitimate rates will be determined for legitimate services performed by the railroads, the air lines, and the steamships. If the Congress in its wisdom decides that these agencies require help from the Federal Government through subsidies, then I am sure they will give consideration to that question. I do hope that any subsidies authorized will be distinctly separated from payments for actual services performed so that these subsidies will not be charged against the operating cost of the Post Office Department.

I invite support of my resolution. Something must be done to save the postal service and the American taxpayer from the horrible situation which exists today.

Security—A Myth?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD O. LOVRE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 21, 1950

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert the following editorial by Prof. Walter J. Jerde, of Northern State Teachers College at Aberdeen, S. Dak. The editorial appeared in the student publication of that school, the Exponent.

Professor Jerde has set forth his thoughts on the important subject of security and what he has to say is well worth reading and thinking about. I call the attention to the Members of this body to Professor Jerde's editorial.

SECURITY—A MYTH?

(By Prof. Walter J. Jerde)

When the writers of the history of our generation get around to evaluating the events of the midtwentieth century, they may well call it the era of search for security. It would be interesting to know how many column-inches have appeared in newspapers and magazines and how many hours of radio time have been used since 1930 in discussing economical security, social security, old-age pensions, income security, freedom from want, freedom from fear, and so on ad infinitum.

What is the security which people of our times want? As we hear it discussed, it becomes apparent that it has almost as many meanings and implications as there are persons who discuss it. There seems to be one thing on which they all agree, that is, that somehow the Government is supposed to be the possessor of this security. There has developed in the thinking of the American people a strong conviction that security is some commodity which the Government has stock-piled as you might an inventory of goods. There is good reason for the people 18 to 50 years of age to have developed this attitude. Was it not the Government which came to their aid and to the aid of their fathers in the catastrophic thirties? It gave them financial aid and new hope. The error, it would seem, is in thinking that the security comes from such a source. Only the conditions within which security can be developed is the most any people can expect from its government.

Peace and security are closely knit together. It seems quite evident that one cannot exist long without the other. There can be no argument with the statement that Americans want peace. But they do not want peace at any price. If the price of peace is injustice, they will reject peace. If the price of peace is loss of freedom, they will reject the proffered peace. How about security? Is it a more precious jewel than peace? Is it worth giving up freedom of speech, action, choice of vocation, choice of how you shall invest your savings? Is security in old age as represented by the receipt of a pittance worth mortgaging future generations? There seems to be a deep-rooted conviction that somehow government can do things better than the people themselves. This thought reminds me of what a Briton remarked: "This nationalization is a very queer thing. The more you own, the less you have. We own the Bank of England in Britain, but I am no better off. We own the coal mines, and I have less coal. We own the railroads, but I can't get a railroad for my holiday: This is socialism; the more we own, the less we get." Perhaps we should ask ourselves the question, Shall future generations of Americans be freemen or puppetmen?

It seems that security must be more a frame of mind than anything measured in dollars and cents. Our founding fathers were satisfied that here was security, security based on opportunity to work out individual problems, free from the dictates of an all-powerful state. Not security for the indolent, not security for the spendthrift at the expense of the thrifty. Security from interference in the matter of where, how, and how much, economically speaking, the individual might wish to accomplish. Real security is of the individual's own making. Collectively the individuals in a society can make a government secure; never can a government make security for the individuals of that society.

How does education fit into this whole matter of security? Education is being challenged as never before. Security for the individual can come only through the development of well-informed, self-reliant individuals equipped with well-disciplined minds. Education must demand from its leaders and its learners alike a vigorous program which leaves no room for lazy thinking and the too prevalent habit of rationalizing. The educational system on any level is certainly not perfect, no more so than the functioning of our free enterprise system of business nor our republican form of government. Education, both formal and informal, has much to

offer by way of assistance in making individuals secure, secure in the conviction that they are capable of working out their own economic and social destiny.

I would remind you of a sentence from the preamble to the charter of UNESCO. "Since wars are made in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defense of peace must be constructed." If the minds of men can make war or peace, then certainly the minds of men can fashion a lasting security. What fashions the minds of men? More than any other one institution, the schools and colleges of the land.

Congressional Haste Makes Waste

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 21, 1950

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the answer to those pressure groups who continually ridicule Congress for the deliberate manner in which it considers the business before it is found in the article by Mr. Wheeler McMillen in the current issue of Pathfinder magazine. Especially do I invite your attention to the statement that Congress is the President's coequal and that it has no obligation to follow his direction no matter how large the must label that is attached to his recommendations. I also like Mr. McMillen's suggestion that a Congress that passed no bills at all, except essential appropriations, might well do the most for the people. His able article follows:

ALONG THE AMERICAN WAY—LONG LIVE THE "BOG-DOWN"

(By Wheeler McMillen)

By now the people have been thoroughly told that Congress has "bogged down." Every year this story appears, just preceding the opening of the baseball season. Like the Washington cherry blossoms, it tends to be overwritten.

When Congress opens in January, bills begin to pour in. The President presents a program of new legislation. The bills are referred to House and Senate committees for detailed study. Meanwhile the pressures for and against descend upon Congress.

About 60 days later, the annual cry rises that, because Congress has not passed any major legislation, it has bogged down. The citizen distant from the Capitol is offered the impression that his Representatives and Senators have been dawdling.

The President is required by the Constitution to report to Congress on the state of the Union. It is within his prerogative to recommend legislation.

But Congress is his coequal. It has no obligation to follow any President, every obligation to scrutinize in detail each bill, from whatever source. Its verdict should reflect the best information that can be obtained. Seldom can unanimous agreement be expected from among 531 Members so compromises have to be worked out if a law is to be passed.

The bog-down usually is charged when administration measures move slowly. The charge is one form of Executive pressure. Where dictatorships arise, the Executive program gets enacted quickly.

One might easily argue that the most useful service Congress performs is not to pass laws.

If Congress at any one session were to pass every bill proposed, the Republic would soon be wrecked. Some bills are introduced purely for private or political effect; even their own sponsors vote against them. Foolish bills and evil bills are introduced, sometimes sincerely—and soon put aside.

A Congress that passed no laws at all, except essential appropriations, might well do more for the people than any Congress has ever done. Better yet would be a Congress that concentrated on repealing laws.

The deliberations of Congress contribute to the formation of sound public opinion. When issues are discussed through a period of months, information about them flows out to the people. Informed opinion, reflected back to Washington, makes for wiser legislation.

Congress deserves gratitude rather than criticism when it takes its time. July laws are likely to be wiser than January laws simply because more study and analysis will have gone into their making. When Congress ceases to study and debate, this will cease to be a Republic of free people.

In a way, Congress has no "spokesman." It is a large body made up of many kinds of men. Each speaks for himself, for his party and for his constituents. No one can speak, even in defense, for the whole body. It stands as a safe target for criticism.

Certainly the acts and intentions of Congress should be under constant public scrutiny. Its sessions are public for that purpose. Every committee hearing, except for a few, is public.

This body, chosen directly by the people to exercise the legislative function, contains within itself the best guarantee of continued American freedom. The mistakes it makes are generally the people's mistakes. A clear understanding of how Congress works, and of why it works the way it does, is essential if the Republic is to enjoy the best government.

United States Coast Guard Reserve Should Have Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 21, 1950

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the able pen of John McMullen of the Panama City (Fla.) News-Herald:

A VALUABLE ASSET IN WAR AND PEACE—UNITED STATES COAST GUARD RESERVE SHOULD HAVE FUNDS

An integral part of the United States armed forces, with an outstanding record in war and peace dating back to 1790, can't get $4,000,000 from the Congress of the United States to operate a creditable reserve program.

The United States Coast Guard has a reserve, but for some unknown reason the Congress which established that unit has failed to give it any operating funds.

The Coast Guard serves as the Federal police force and protector of life and property on the sea and in navigable waters of the United States. This role includes maintenance of more than 36,000 aids to navigation along 40,000 miles of waters; lifesaving activities; removal of derelicts and other menaces to navigation; marine inspection; medical aid to seamen; law enforcement on the high seas and navigable waters of the United States and in Alaska; the prevention of smuggling; patrol of the North Pacific Ocean and Mering Sea to regulate the taking of fur-bearing sea mammals and fish; aid during flood and hurricanes; maintenance of the International Ice Patrol to report the amount of iceberg drift for the benefit of vessels crossing the North Atlantic; maintaining ocean weather stations.

Those are just a few of the many peacetime duties of the Coast Guard. We in Panama City know the United States Coast Guard cutter *Boutwell*. Some of us remember the cutter *Dix*. Many of us were here during the war years when the beaches and port facilities of the Gulf coast were carefully guarded from possible sabotage by aliens, guard work performed primarily by the Coast Guard or subsidiary units of the Coast Guard.

Those who served overseas during World War II know that the Coast Guard manned LST's, troop transports, patrol boats, and many other floating units. The Coast Guard also participated in assault landings during practically all major operations in the Pacific and European theaters of war.

During World War II, the Coast Guard also maintained air and surface submarine patrols off both major coast lines of the United States.

In every daily newspaper, almost every day, the Coast Guard figures in at least one rescue, one distress call answer, one errand of mercy, one more task in the continuous performance of peacetime duties.

How much is $4,000,000?

Compared with our national budget of $47,000,000,000, it is only $1 out of each $12,000. Compared with the total (and reduced) defense budget $13,000,000,000, it is only $1 out of each $3,250. Compared to the current NSLI dividend, it is only 50 cents out of every $350.

President Truman, Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson, Admiral Forrest Sherman, Chief of Naval Operations; Secretary of the Treasury Snyder, and the United States Senate all have approved the Coast Guard Reserve training program.

The Bureau of the Budget has approved the $4,000,000 appropriation, but the House has rejected it.

An organization that has proven its value in peace and war should not be rendered impotent because of an inadequate training program for its reserves.

The several thousand officers and enlisted men who are holding on to commissions and enlistments in the Coast Guard Reserve should be given an opportunity to maintain peak efficiency.

Congress should see that the needed funds are made available at the earliest possible moment.

Commissioner Mead's Testimony Before Celler Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD part of a statement given before the Subcommittee on Monopoly Power of the House Judiciary Committee by Commissioner James Mead of the Federal Trade Commission on April 18, 1950.

In this statement Commissioner Mead indicated that in addition to the matter of pricing practices the Federal Trade Commission is concerned with three other problems raised by the steel industry—the problem of iron-ore supply, the problem of forward integration through acquisitions of customers, and the problem of the adequacy of steel capacity. Commissioner Mead indicated that each of these problems may well result in a substantial lessening of competition not only in the steel industry itself but in the much broader area of metal fabrication.

A legislative means to deal with the second of these problems is now before the Congress in the form of H. R. 2734 (Celler bill), a bill to amend section 7 of the Clayton Act. This bill, which bears my name, has already passed the House but is awaiting action by the Senate. This bill will close the wide-open loophole in the Clayton Act whereby large corporations easily evade the original intent of Congress and acquire other firms by the simple means of purchasing their assets rather than or in addition to their capital stock. Although all of Commissioner Mead's statement should be of interest to every Member of Congress, that part of his statement dealing with this problem of acquisitions and mergers should be of particular interest in view of the present state of legislation on this matter.

The statement follows:

Although steel producers have been engaged in this practice (i. e., buying up their own customers) since the earliest days of the industry, this form of expansion was rather limited in scope until around 1930. Prior to that time the energies of the steel producers in promoting mergers had largely been expended in bringing together other steel companies, i. e., horizontal mergers; and in acquiring their own sources of iron ore. coal, and related products—i. e., backward vertical acquisitions. In commenting on the apparent disinclination of the steel companies to enter the fabricating fields, E. S. Mead, a prominent writer on corporate finance, stated in 1930 that:

"Vertical consolidation in the steel industry stopped with the raw material of other industries. The steel corporation sells its products to machine tool builders, building erectors, automobile manufacturers, manufacturers of agricultural machinery, railroads, public utilities, and a variety of other industries which use steel as raw material of their operations. The steel corporation has not, however, gone into these industries either to own or operate. It stops short at the line of rails, sheets, plates, billets, wire, and structural shapes." (Corporate Finance, D. Appleton & Co., 1930, p. 460.)

I would like now to list briefly the acquisitions of fabricated and finished goods producers which have been made since 1930 by just two of the large steel companies—United States Steel and Bethlehem Steel.

During this period the United States Steel Corp. has acquired:

1. Oil Well Supply Co., one of the largest manufacturers of supplies for drilling oil and gas wells in the United States.

2. Witte Engine Works, another producer in the same field.

3. Neilson Pump Co., a third producer of oil-well machinery.

4. Boyle Manufacturing Co., a leading manufacturer of steel drums and barrels.

5. Petroleum Iron Works, another steel-drum manufacturer.

6. Bennett Manufacturing Co., a third steel-drum producer.

7. Virginia Bridge & Iron Co., a large firm with fabricating plants in Virginia, Alabama, and Tennessee, having an annual productive capacity of approximately 100,000 tons of finished structural work.

8. Gerrard Co., Inc., a manufacturer of oil strapping machines.

9. Jackson Fence Co., a manufacturer of fences.

10. Gunnison Housing Corp., a leading producer of prefabricated houses.

11. Consolidated Steel Corp., the largest steel fabricator on the west coast.

12. Savannah Wire Cloth Mills.

13. Moise Steel Co.

The acquisitions by Bethlehem Steel during this period followed somewhat this same pattern, with the exception that Bethlehem has been more active in purchasing firms engaged in the fabrication of structural steel. Since 1930 Bethlehem Steel has acquired the following producers of fabricated and finished goods:

1. McClintic-Marshall Corp., a large firm engaged in the fabrication of bridges, buildings, tanks, river barges, etc.

2. Levering and Garrigues Co., another firm engaged in the fabrication of structural steel and the erection of buildings.

3. Hay Foundry and Iron Works, a third firm engaged in the fabrication and erection of iron and steel.

4. Hedden Iron Construction Co., a fourth firm engaged in the same field.

5. Taubman Supply Co., a firm engaged in manufacturing and selling oil-company supplies.

6. International Supply Co., another producer of oil-well equipment.

7. American Well & Prospecting Co., a third firm engaged in the same field.

8. The Buffalo Tank Corp., a manufacturer of steel storage tanks and other welded plate products.

9. Rheem Manufacturing Corp., one of the Nation's largest manufacturers of steel drums.

10. Atlas Steel Barrel Corp., another producer in the same field.

11. United Shipyards, Inc., a large firm engaged in the business of building, repairing, and drydocking vessels in New York harbor.

12. Union Shipbuilding Corp., another company in the same field.

13. Pennsylvania Shipyards, Inc., a third shipbuilding company.

14. Pacific Coast Forge Co., a manufacturer of bolts, nuts, spikes, rivets, and similar products.

15. Shoemaker Bridge Co.

In some industries the effect of these forward acquisitions has been to give the steel companies almost complete dominance over the fabricating field. Such is the case of steel drums, which, since the war, has been absorbed almost in its entirety by the large steel producers, a movement which was succinctly described by Iron Age as follows:

"Long, long ago, in 1939, before the words postwar and planning were wedded, the manufacture of heavy steel barrels and drums was a rather volatile business firmly in the hands of a large number of highly individualistic enterpreneurs. Most of these fabricators had started on a precarious shoestring and were justifiably vocal in their pride of success in the classical Horatio Alger pluck and luck tradition.

"A few weeks ago, the purchase of Bennett Mfg., Chicago, by the United States Steel Corp. pretty well completed the capture of the entire barrel and drum business by major steel producers. Some 87 percent of the business, representing about 435,500 tons of steel consumption yearly has been corralled by the mills and the remaining 64,500 tons of independent capacity will probably remain so for a variety of reasons" (September 21, 1944, p. 103).

Today, the country's leading steel producer is also the leading steel drum producer. In the steel drum industry, U. S. Steel shares the Pacific coast region on a 50–50 basis with Bethlehem Steel. It is the leading steel drum producer in the Houston-New Orleans area; and it is one of the leading producers in the Chicago-Cleveland-Pittsburgh region. Bethlehem, through Rheem Manufacturing Co., (of which it owns 28.9 percent of the stock) not only divides the Pacific coast region with U. S. Steel, but also is a leading producer in the important Atlantic coast region, where it accounts for more than 40 percent of the steel drum industry. In addition, it is an important factor in the Houston-New Orleans region. All told, six leading steel companies now own more than 80 percent of the heavy steel drum capacity of the United States.

There are, of course, many other fabricating fields in which the effect of the forward acquisitions by the steel firms has not been as complete as in the steel drum industry. Among these is the steel stamping industry in which the steel companies have also entered to a significant though lesser extent. The steel stamping industry provides an example of what might be called "partial absorption" by the steel companies, as compared to virtually "complete absorption," represented by the steel drum industry. But even in these areas, the competitive position of the smaller firms which continue to operate has been seriously undermined by the effect of the acquisitions.

The steel stamping industry, which produces a great variety of parts for other industries such as automobiles, farm machinery, refrigerators, radios, and even kitchen utensils and toys, developed almost entirely in the hands of independent stampers. In recent years, however, the large steel companies have entered the field through forward acquisitions. In speaking before a meeting of the Cleveland District Pressed Metal Institute, Mr. Tom Smith, president of the Pressed Metal Institute was reported in Iron Age (April 29, 1948) to have stated that "the most serious problem facing the stamping industry is the accelerated encroachment through subsidiary organizations of a majority of metal producers into the stamping business." And a year later, on May 5, 1949, Iron Age, after noting that there was a general slump in the buying of stampings, stated that some captive plants of steel producers were reverting to the "prewar practice of letting out the tough jobs (to independent stampers hungry for business) and keeping simple work that takes a lot of steel."

The effect of this policy on the small independent stamper is obvious. His field of operation tends to be narrowed to the difficult jobs and even there he must compete sharply with the large stamper, perhaps becoming only a subcontractor dependent on such scraps of business as his larger competitors may turn over to him.

This problem of forward expansion by the steel companies becomes particularly acute when supplies are short. During such periods it is only to be expected that the steel companies will channel supplies of steel to their fabricating subsidiaries, which are in competition with independent fabricators who frequently are unable to obtain steel. During the recent postwar period when steel has been in tight supply, many independent fabricators have complained that there has been an increasing flow of steel to the fabricating subsidiaries of the steel companies; that, consequently, the proportion of the total steel supply available for small business has been correspondingly reduced; and that this development has been one of the principal factors behind the inability of small business to obtain steel. Typical of these

complaints was the statement made by Mr. Frank A. Duerr, general manager, Troop Water Heater Co., Pittsburgh, Pa., who testified before the Senate Small Business Committee of the Eightieth Congress as follows:

"Senator MARTIN. You state that you were informed by Jones & Laughlin last fall that they could not retain their contract with you?

"Mr. DUERR. Yes, sir. That was in their office, in their sales department.

"Senator MARTIN. And you state that it later developed, you learned, that the steel was to go to one of their own subsidiaries?

"Mr. DUERR. That is correct.

"Senator MARTIN. When did they acquire this subsidiary?

"Mr. DUERR. As far as I know—they told me during that conversation that they had acquired some of these plants in 1939 and others in the last year or two.

"Senator MARTIN. What does this particular plant produce?

"Mr. DUERR. Steel drums." (Hearings, pt. 7, p. 909.)

Similar testimony was offered by Mr. Arthur Boehm, secretary-treasurer, the Boehm Pressed Steel Co., Cleveland, Ohio, who stated:

"While I was talking to Mr. Boyd, of Jones & Laughlin, I inquired whether it has been a matter of policy with Jones & Laughlin, and the other big mills, not Jones & Laughlin exclusively, to limit production capacity. During the war, I recall that there was quite a bit of pressure from the Senate and the Government for increased capacity of the mills. In other words, steel capacity had been critical all through the war years, and the Government wanted the steel mills to put in additional production facilities.

"The answer then, by the big basic producers, was to the effect that no additional production facilities were needed. Existing capacity sufficed before the war. Why increase capacity now and have it idle after the war? Boyd said, at that time, Jones & Laughlin didn't anticipate the fact that it would take on additional subsidiaries of its own to supply. Jones & Laughlin had purchased the Draper Barrel Works at Cleveland, and a good bit of their hot-rolled pickled is going into the barrel works." (Hearings, pt. 6, p. 846.)

Mr. Frank R. Nichols, president, Nichols Wire & Steel Co., Davenport, Iowa, implied that the steel companies have shipped steel to their own subsidiaries in excess of the amounts permitted by the use of the so-called historical quota method:

"Mr. WIMER. Have you had any indication that the large integrated companies favor their own subsidiaries who produce wire and nails?

"Mr. NICHOLS. They most naturally would do so.

"Mr. WIMER. As far as tonnage quotas go?

"Mr. NICHOLS. Naturally.

"Mr. DICKEY. In other words, Mr. Nichols, you mean that the historical quota that there has been testimony about here, agreed to by the steel companies when allocations were lifted, hasn't necessarily held true in the wire and nail business?

"Mr. NICHOLS. It hasn't held true at all.

"Mr. DICKEY. And is it your opinion, or is it a fact, as far as you know, that they are channeling more into their own subsidiaries?

"Mr. NICHOLS. It is a definite fact, into their own subsidiaries and into their own finishing departments.

"Mr. DICKEY. Either a subsidiary or part of their own business?

"Mr. NICHOLS. Yes." (Hearings, pt. 17, p. 1897.)

The facts revealed in a report of the Senate Small Business Committee completely corroborate this type of complaint by small business. The facts clearly indicate that the proportion of steel output which was channeled to the fabricating subsidiaries definitely increased between 1940 and 1947. In the case of hot-rolled sheets, which is the principal steel product consumed by the fabricating companies that have been acquired, the share of the output going into the fabricating subsidiaries rose from 5.7 percent in 1940 to 10.5 percent in 1947. (Changes in the Distribution of Steel, p. 10.)

But even in so-called normal times, when steel is not tight, the expansion by the steel companies into fabricating fields constitutes a serious, potential danger to the maintenance of competition. It is only to be expected that the fabricating subsidiaries will be able to secure their steel at a lower price than their independent competitors. This would be particularly true in the event that vigorous price competition broke out between the independents and the fabricating subsidiaries.

Thus, whether steel is in tight or in normal supply, a serious problem is presented by the expansion of the steel producers into the fabricating fields. If the loophole is plugged in section 7 of the Clayton Act, that is, if H. R. 2734, which has already passed the House and is now before the Senate Judiciary Committee, is finally enacted into law, the Commission will be able to prevent certain types of acquisitions. Whether it will be able to prevent all of the types which create the particular problem that I have been discussing remains to be seen. At any event, however, as a result of the acquisitions which have already taken place, a problem now exists which must be regarded as a serious danger to the competitive system.

Who Is the Real Patriot—McCarthy or Tydings?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, a fearless editor, one Richard Lloyd Jones, of the Tulsa Tribune, has written an important editorial on the current investigation into charges made by Senator MCCARTHY against the State Department. The American people now realize that every effort will be made to white-wash the investigation by the partisan efforts of the Democrats on the committee. I include the editorial of April 15 at this point:

MORE PARTISAN THAN PATRIOT
(By Richard Lloyd Jones)

What's the matter with our country? Mr. TYDINGS, of Baltimore, is a good example of what's the matter with our country. The people of Maryland elected him to be a United States Senator. But in Washington he is just a Democratic Senator. He isn't working for his country. He is working for his party.

In the Hiss case we learned that our Secretary of State, most responsible position in the President's Cabinet, is not only a friend of a traitor but sympathetic with the fellow who operated with treachery against our country.

The Hiss case opened the people's eyes. Something is rotten in our State Department. So rotten they are desperate. They are trying to hide something.

One United States Senator, JOE MCCARTHY, of Wisconsin, had the courage to demand that the State Department clean out all who are unfit.

MCCARTHY is a Senator of the United States. TYDINGS is a Senator of the Democratic Party. He has obstructed the investigation which, as a United States Senator, he should insist upon.

Harry Truman, president of the Democratic Party, has locked up all the evidence that Senator MCCARTHY has insisted is essential to an honest investigation. What has the president of the Democratic Party got to be afraid of? If all of MCCARTHY's charges are without foundation, if they are all a complete fabrication, if they are all imaginary, why not unlock the files and prove the lily-white innocence of those about whom MCCARTHY has cast the cloak of suspicion. If these people were noble and pure they should quit their cussing and demand that their record be read.

If Harry Truman were a true President of the American people he would be impatient to prove Senator MCCARTHY's charges false and without foundation, or with equal impatience he would insist that the records be revealed that proved the truth of the accusations. Something is rotten in Washington, and the Democrats are afraid to lift the lid. It might let loose a bad smell.

There is no denying the fact that the President of the United States is hiding the facts. He is determined that the truth shall not be known. His fear of the truth is enough to convince any rational mind that there is a lot of dangerous truth in the charges of MCCARTHY.

We, the people, have the right to know the truth. It is time we branded as partisans rather than patriots chaps like TYDINGS who try to hold up to public contempt any man who tries to protect us from our enemies within.

United States Senator MCCARTHY has accused one Owen Lattimore of being at least sympathetic and cooperative with our enemy. What does this fellow Lattimore do? He blew his top like Vesuvius in eruption. He crossed the line of drawing-room vocabulary and grew violent with profane outrage. He can call MCCARTHY all the names he wants to, but the public is still aware of the fact that his records are in hiding. And those that are revealed are not good.

The public is aware of the fact that Harry Truman ordered the records locked up. Is the Democratic Party so afraid that more treason may be fixed on individual party workers that they have to lock up the records and bar the doors while the left-wing writers bawl out MCCARTHY because he is a Senator of the United States? Because he demands that the people be told the truth. And that is where TYDINGS falls down flat as a Senator of the United States. He is just a party Senator.

If TYDINGS is honest in his pretensions as a truth-seeker, let him read a book called Situation in Asia, published only last year and written by this Owen Lattimore, who MCCARTHY accuses of cooperation with and sympathy for our enemy.

Let Mr. Lattimore swear and fume like an epileptic, but here is his own written record, published in book form. Available on the book counters of book merchants who handle books of tainted patriotism.

"Wherever the Communists have taken over," writes this Owen Lattimore, "they have increased food production, and stabilized prices, successfully breaking the old cycle of reoccurring shortages and famines."

Well, now this just isn't true. Fifty million wretched people in Red China are now confronted by one of the worst famines in the world's history. The Russians took all the food away.

Whatever the leftist writers say in defense of our foes, however much they may abuse a patriotic Senator for searching for the truth, this one single written statement by this Owen Lattimore is enough to convict

him of Russian sympathies. This statement he makes is false. He pictures the greatest famine in history as a magnificent blessing bestowed upon 50,000,000 perishing people by the benevolent Russian bear.

And this is the man our Democratic Party President has selected to advise the American people as to their conduct and relations with the Communist marshals of human misery.

Does this excite the Democratic Senator TYDINGS? Apparently not. The Democrats' President, Mr. Truman? Yes. It excites him. He says, "Lock up the records and bar the doors and don't let them in."

Mr. Lattimore is the fellow who was sent to China 6 years ago with Henry Wallace. We were fighting the Communist invasion of China when he and Wallace went to look into the tragic affairs of the Chinese people. They returned to tell us that "we were backing the wrong horse in China."

That is procommunism. Sure, this fellow Lattimore's writings are tainted. They are full of Communist sympathies. In his book he holds that the Marshall plan should have been channeled through the United Nations so that Russia and her satellites might have participated in our relief subsidies.

Just last year this fellow Lattimore writes that he foresaw an inevitable demand that Japan break away from America in order to come to terms with Communist China. And he apparently viewed this as a wholesome trend and development. He said, "By withholding raw iron ore and supplying Japan only with pig iron, China would have absolute power to cut off the revival of Japanese war industry." And he did not seem to be alarmed at the prospect that this might leave Japanese industry at the mercy of a satellite of the Soviet Union. Quite the contrary.

In Mr. Lattimore's recent book he reports that he found "Asia turning to communism because progress made by the Soviet Republics of Asia has inspired awe and wonder."

The same people, he inferred, were turning against the United States because they didn't want to be used as cannon fodder.

As Congressman LAWRENCE H. SMITH declared the other day, "Uncle Joe couldn't have handled the subject better himself."

Any fellow who has put himself on record in his own writings as one who admires communism, praises it, and accuses us of being war mongers, deserves to be investigated. If MILLARD TYDINGS were a Senator of the United States he would join United States Senator JOE MCCARTHY in demanding that the president of the Democratic Party become the President of the American people and order the doors unlocked that admit to the secret chambers where seeds of treason may be sown.

Know Your Waterways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 21, 1950

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement from Marine News:

KNOW YOUR WATERWAYS
GREAT NATIONAL ASSETS

Harbors, channels, inland, and intracoastal waterways are vital to America, during either peace or war. Of 95 cities listed in the 1940 census with populations greater than 100,000, 62 are on harbors and navigable channels improved by the Federal Government, as are all navy yards. Regions and communities having facilities for low-cost water-borne commerce have great advantages over locations without them. Many areas now without water transportation can obtain it through vision and initiative. Every expenditure for navigation improvements is not only an investment in the development and growth of a community but also in the building of a nation.

MARINE NEWS,
GEORGE H. PALMER,
President and Publisher.
NEW YORK, N. Y.

Status of the ITO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 21, 1950

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial appearing in the New York Times of April 20, 1950. Coming from one of our vigorous and consistent supporters of international cooperation, this editorial should be of interest to Members of Congress, and particularly to members of the Foreign Affairs Committee. The editorial, in effect, suggests that there is no occasion for haste in the enactment of an extremely complicated and controversial document of more than 30,000 words. Many of its basic provisions, moreover, are identical with or resemble closely corresponding provisions in the Geneva agreement, of which this country is a member. In other words, we are already functioning under an international code of fair practices which it merely remains for the ITO to formalize, elaborate, and implement with permanent machinery..

In concluding, the editorial observes that "its long-term desirability should not be mistaken for short-time urgency."

The editorial follows:

STATUS OF THE ITO

Secretary Acheson yesterday urged early action by Congress approving American participation in the International Trade Organization (ITO), whose charter was agreed upon by the representatives of 54 nations at Habana in March 1948. This agreement, which is designed to provide a permanent code of fair practices in world economic relations, goes into effect, theoretically, on ratification by the governments of 20 of the signatory countries.

Actually, only 2 countries, Australia and Liberia, have ratified the charter to date. The others are marking time, Mr. Acheson told the House Foreign Affairs Committee, pending action by the United States. This wait-and-see attitude on the part of the other nations is easily understandable. In the first place, the ITO plan, while it was hammered out in its present form under the auspices of the United Nations, had its beginning in the United States. Specifically, it appeared first in the Anglo-American Loan Agreement, published December 6, 1945. Comprising an essential part of that agreement were proposals for the expansion of world commerce and employment, and the creation of a world trade organization to be attached to the United Nations. The first draft was the work of an interdepartmental committee of the American Government. It was recognized that a basic requirement was a charter setting forth the general rules under which trade should be conducted among the nations. That task was completed by stages between February 1946 and March 1948.

The second reason why action elsewhere has waited on that of the United States is equally obvious. It is generally recognized that whether the ITO stands or falls depends upon whether the United States, economically the most powerful Nation in the world, participates actively in its affairs. That is what Secretary Acheson meant when he said yesterday that it is up to Congress whether there will be an International Trade Organization.

Whether Congress will be convinced, on the other hand, that it is desirable to hasten ratification of the ITO is more debatable. It is no criticism of the basic idea behind the proposed organization to suggest that the order of priority with respect to the urgency of international economic legislation has undergone substantial changes since 1946, and even since 1948. The No. 1 problem in the months ahead is to develop a policy toward Europe for the period following the termination of the Marshall plan in mid-1952. And there are at least three measures which are of more immediate importance than ratifying the ITO so far as this purpose is concerned. These are: (1) action on the Customs Simplification Act of 1950, which is expected to come before Congress shortly; (2) planning for, and carrying out, the proposed "third round" of tariff negotiations, scheduled to be held later this year; and (3) reconciling the differences which are holding up action on the establishment of the European Payments Union. Of these three the first looms as perhaps the most important. It is based on the belief that imports to this country can be stimulated more effectively at this point by the elimination of customs red tape and the clarifying of rules and regulations than by even an actual reduction in rates themselves.

The ITO charter, it should be borne in mind, is an extremely complicated and controversial document of more than 30,000 words. Many of its basic provisions, moreover, are identical with or resemble closely corresponding provisions in the Geneva agreement, of which this country is a member. In other words, we are already functioning under an international code of fair practices which it merely remains for the ITO to formalize, elaborate, and implement with permanent machinery. It is not too much to say, perhaps, that the ITO represents the capstone of the postwar trade policy we have been seeking to build with the aid of the reciprocal trade agreements program, the Geneva agreement, and the World Bank and Fund. But at a time when there are so many legislative and administrative problems pressing for early action on the same front its long-term desirability should not be mistaken for short-term urgency.

The Party of Achievement and Confidence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER A. LYNCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 21, 1950

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me by unanimous consent, I take pleasure in including in my remarks a stirring address made in New

York City on April 19, 1950, by Hon. W. Averell Harriman, United States Ambassador at Large, on the occasion of the annual dinner of the New York State Democratic Committee at the Waldorf-Astoria. His remarks follow:

We are drawn together tonight by a great cause—the Democratic Party. It is a great cause, for in a realistic sense, it has come to be in our day almost synonymous with the cause of democracy.

The Democratic Party, I feel deeply, is the party of democracy, because it is the party of progress, of human freedom, and human security. It not only has the faith that these high objectives can be achieved; it also has the courage to take bold, decisive action to see that they are achieved. The Democratic Party not only believes that man is entitled to have dignity and freedom; it believes that these words do not have full meaning unless he can "eat regular," too. And our party is ready to take whatever steps are necessary to fight off those two great fears which beset our generation—the fear of want, and the fear of war.

I have seen our party operate at close hand in Washington and abroad for nearly 20 years. In 1933, I joined the ranks of those who went to work to clean up the wreckage left us by Republican policy. The Republican Party, responsible for the disaster of 1929, had remained down in a cyclone cellar for 3 years, waiting for the storm to die down.

When the Democratic Party took over it immediately started a program of action under the leadership of a man who believed in action—Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Ten years ago, when Nazi aggression was threatening to engulf the world, I joined the ranks of those who again responded to Roosevelt's leadership in facing the new peril from abroad.

Since then I have been in a position to see, in a number of different posts at home and abroad, how effectively the Democratic administration has dealt with threats to our national life.

To me, the Democratic Party is the party of confidence. It has confidence in the strength of a free people. It is not afraid to meet squarely any problem, no matter how great. It does not sit by complacently waiting for a problem to solve itself. It takes affirmative action before the problem overwhelms us. In Democratic leadership there is confidence, but not complacency. There is alertness to danger, but not fear.

For these reasons, I believe, the American people have rejected the timid and vacillating leadership of the Republican Party. Too many of its leaders are terrified of progress. It is forever looking fondly backward for safety. It squints timidly at the future, hoping that nothing new will ever have to be done. We are told that the elephant never forgets. I wonder why. Perhaps it is because the elephant dreams only of the past.

This kind of straddling and vacillating Republican leadership is present in our State—in the person of its governor. At one time Dewey claims to believe in the social objectives of the New Deal. At another time he condemns them as socialistic. At one time he ridicules the defense levels of airplane production set by Roosevelt; later he seeks to blame the Democrats for inadequate war preparedness. Originally he was partly isolationist, then he became partly internationalist—never quite sure—always seeming to wait for the polls of popular opinion before making up his mind where he stood. And finally, when he read the election polls of 1948, he evidently made up his mind the election was such a cinch that it was safer to take a stand on nothing—that is, nothing but two things. He was for "unity"; and he was for "Dewey for President." That wasn't good enough.

The American people turned to a fighting leader, a man who made his objectives clear—a man ready to look into the future with confidence and action. And that man is carrying on today with the same bold Democratic offensive. He does not wait for blows to strike us. He too goes out to meet them in the traditional way of the Democratic Party. Our party has confidence—and so have the American people confidence—in the leadership of Harry S. Truman.

It is a leadership of action to meet any and all threats. At home it is the leadership of the Fair Deal against poverty, disease, ignorance, intolerance, race prejudice—a fight continually to improve the American life. Abroad it is a leadership to support faithfully the Charter of the United Nations. It is a leadership to repel chaos, to help rebuild, to resist aggression, to unite all men of good will all over the world in the struggle against want and against fear. It is a fight for peace. It is a fight in which everyone of us here tonight, and every peace-loving American, plays his full part.

And to carry on such a fight abroad in the kind of world we now face, in the kind of cold war which imperialistic Soviet Russia has imposed upon us, we must have clear, firm, and consistent American foreign policies. We have such policies. They are not the policies of any one party. They are American policies.

It is the duty of the President to develop foreign policies which transcend all partisan considerations. That is exactly what he has done.

We Democrats recognize and respect those Republican leaders—such as Senator VANDENBERG and many others in the Senate and and in the House—who have put party considerations aside, and have helped to develop policies which are concerned only with the highest national interest and security. These have been called bipartisan policies, but Senator VANDENBERG has perhaps more appropriately labeled them unpartisan policies.

The ECA is an outstanding example of such a policy. After full debate, it was authorized by an overwhelming majority of both parties in the Congress. It has been administrated in a completely unpartisan way.

In the words of Senator VANDENBERG, "This working unity typified our finest traditions and our greatest safety in the presence of external hazards to all Americans, regardless of party. * * * United, we stand. Divided, we fall. I want America to stand."

Let us all here tonight pray that Senator VANDENBERG will soon recover from his illness, to continue to add his wisdom to the guidance of our country at this time.

The objective of American foreign policy can be expressed in various ways. In essence it is to attain peace with freedom and justice. But the desperate reality is that an aggressive, determined force is loose in the world today which has a completely different objective—to extinguish both freedom and justice.

The strength of our economy and the strength of our spirit will be the deciding factors in maintaining freedom and peace. On this, I hold three deep convictions:

First, that the American people must secure and broaden our own well-being at home.

Second, that the American people must give inspiration, assistance, and leadership, as partners, to the free nations of the world.

My third conviction is that if the American people do both these things, war can be avoided.

The policies of the Fair Deal work toward a dynamic and expanding economy with a steadily rising national income in which all can share. They are directed toward the eradication of injustices and intolerance against our fellow Americans of minority races and religions. They are designed to provide the kind of security and opportunity which gives each citizen a real stake in the material prosperity of his country.

Republicans have tried to argue that social security interferes with opportunity. We Democrats reject such narrow concepts. We believe that our country can achieve security for the people, and at the same time give greater opportunity to the individual—to more individuals.

Republicans are again doing their best to picture the social objectives of the Fair Deal as monstrous and terrible things which will swallow up our American freedom.

That's just the bunk! It is an uninformed, inaccurate reading of contemporary history. The truth is that the danger to freedom mounts when the economic system fails to feed, clothe, and house the great mass of the people at a decent level, when it fails to hold out the prospect of an improving standard of living for those willing to work hard enough to get it. If our experience during the past 30 years proves anything, it proves that the happiest hunting ground for fascism and communism is mass unemployment and human misery. It is the environment of economic security which strengthens freedom and renders it safe from the lies and the plots of the Communists.

Some Republican leaders and candidates seem to be looking upon certain recent elections in various countries as a kind of unearned increment for themselves—as evidence that the people in other parts of the world are turning back to reaction. These Republican politicians are evidently hoping that all they have to do is to wait passively by the ballot box here at home to get back into office. As usual, they are misreading political facts. Actually, the elections are encouraging to us of the Democratic Party. I have watched these elections at first hand. All of them reflect a definite trend away from the extreme left—from the Communists, from the fellow travelers and from the fellow wanderers. In general, they reflect a trend toward our kind of democratic belief. But let's not begrudge the Republicans their temporary delusions. They'll find out when the time comes.

When I speak of Republican leaders, I differentiate them from the rank and file of the Republican Party. Many of them consider themselves Republicans out of a natural sense of loyalty and tradition. But they vote for progressive candidates only—whether they are Democrats or Republicans. We welcome their support, and we must continue to be worthy of it by putting up forward-looking candidates and carrying on a program of progressive action.

The essential foundation on which we can wage a successful fight for freedom and peace is to make our society healthy, intelligent and economically secure, based upon a system of free enterprise which, together with Government, recognizes and discharges its social responsibilities to the whole people.

That is our preeminent task at home.

Abroad, we have been giving inspiration and assistance to the free nations of Europe—our partners in this fight for freedom and peace. By the Truman doctrine, by the Marshall plan and by the North Atlantic Treaty, we have already made long strides together in this fight. The development of the far-sighted concept of point 4 will strengthen the cause of freedom in the underdeveloped areas, and will expand the trade and prosperity of our own country and other industrial countries.

The free nations of the world are going to win this fight. I am confident of it—for two fundamental reasons:

One reason is that history and morality are on our side. The Kremlin proclaims the inevitability of the dictatorship of the prole-

tariat. Well, it is not inevitable. History does not teach the inevitability of tyranny. It teaches just the opposite. The whole stream of human development has been a successful struggle of mankind for ever-growing freedom. There have been many set-backs; but eventually dictatorships have been overthrown by the strongest of human forces, man's passionate desire for liberty. Liberty, not tyranny, is a man's birthright. The moral force of that birthright is our most powerful ally.

The second reason I am confident is that the material resources on the side of freedom are far stronger. The United States and Canada have about half of the heavy manufacturing capacity of the world. Including the free nations of Europe, the Atlantic community has at its command about 75 percent of the entire world's vital industrial capacity. We have access to the needed food and raw materials.

If the free nations of the North Atlantic—with all these resources—work together to improve economic conditions in the free world, if we all do our share in the development of the means of mutual defense, then the free world will be unbeatable.

Our partners in western Europe are steadily gaining economic health and democratic strength. Hunger has been driven out. When I went to Europe 2 years ago for ECA the people of France, for example, were living on a bread ration of only two-thirds of the ration given them by the Germans during the occupation. Today bread and most foods are no longer rationed. In western Europe, war-shattered industry is already producing well above prewar levels, and is continuing to rise. Trade is expanding, and most important of all, the fearful specter of inflation has been laid at rest. In 1947, when the Communist threat to seize control was most menacing, the prospect of the Marshall plan revived hope. Today, confidence has returned. That is why in country after country, as free elections have been held, communism has been rolled back.

No wonder Communists hate free elections, and no wonder they fight the Marshall plan.

The front line of the battle for freedom in western Europe has been the labor front. The Communist strategy—dictated from Moscow—was to gain control of the labor movement in order to destroy the free countries of Europe. With the failure of strikes called for Kremlin political objectives, the free labor movement has been strengthened. The present attempts of the Communists to use the trade-unions to prevent the unloading of American military assistance is again proving a boomerang. In the ranks of European labor, communism has suffered decisive set-backs.

I want to pay tribute to the vision of the American trade-union movement in helping the workers of Europe in their battle. The A. F. of L. and the CIO and the railroad unions have given effective support to the cause of freedom in Europe.

There is growing vigor in Europe. The same spirit that created the resistance movement during German occupation, is again alive. In traveling through Europe as I have, and in meeting the men who are leading the battle, I have become confident of the new hope and new vitality of our partners in Europe. There is the will to work, the will to fight, and the will to win.

Their decision to join with us in the North Atlantic Treaty meant setting aside forever reliance on appeasement or neutrality to maintain peace. This courageous decision stemmed from their belief—as we believe—that unity among the free nations is the greatest single deterrent to aggression.

But we must remember that hope and confidence in Europe naturally rests on faith in the firmness and consistency of American policy. It is bewildering to our friends abroad when, in the United States Senate, reckless and irresponsible charges are slung against those in important positions who are carrying out our foreign policy. People abroad do not understand, as we do, that these maneuvers are for personal publicity and partisan politics. This political persecution of individuals might be ignored if it did not play right into the hands of the Communists. It weakens confidence in us abroad, and there could be no greater handicap to the administration's efforts to stamp out subversive elements.

As Mr. Henry L. Stimson has said: "It should by now be wholly clear that indiscriminate accusations are doubly offensive; they damage the innocent and they help protect the guilty. For if the accuser is so stupid as to connect a man like Ambassador Jessup with communism, are not all such accusations made suspect?"

Others are following Mr. Stimson's leadership in denouncing these malicious tactics. Would there were more. Instead, there are some who, though unwilling to share responsibility with McCarthy in his indiscriminate tirade of unsubstantiated charges, are hoping to gather some political windfall out of them if they can.

The American people will see through these un-American political maneuvers. They know that no administration can possibly be friendly to Communists which has proposed and is carrying out with vigor the Truman doctrine, the Marshall plan, and the North Atlantic Treaty. The American people will repudiate those who are undermining for selfish purpose the confidence of other free nations in our country at this critical time.

I believe that if our foreign policies are consistently and vigorously carried forward and expanded in cooperation with our partners of the North Atlantic Treaty, we will develop an impregnable position of strength in western Europe and in other parts of the free world.

With life secure and healthy in the free world, I am convinced that pressures will begin to operate behind the iron curtain to break down the Kremlin control. When and how no one can predict. But there can be no doubt that the disaffection of Tito has resulted from the success of the Marshall plan.

Let there be no mistake: It will be a long and tough struggle, requiring present-day sacrifices by us and our partners—sacrifices which are in fact investments in the cause of peace and in the cause of freedom.

Early this month I was with Secretary Johnson and General Bradley at a meeting in The Hague of the defense ministers of the nations of the North Atlantic Treaty. I was struck by the determination shown by our associates sitting around that table. These men, representing their governments, mean business. They mean to do their share in developing with us an integrated defense force for mutual security.

The United States, the most powerful nation in the world, is helping to forge an association of partners whose strength will lie in its unity—whose strength is based on mutual respect and mutual confidence.

In sharp contrast, Soviet imperialism is seeking to create a world of nations subordinate to Russia—a world of satellites forced to do her bidding.

Russia itself is ruled by fear and is out to rule the world by fear.

Within Russia, the Kremlin is afraid of the people and the people are afraid of the Kremlin.

I remember one occasion in the summer of 1945 when General Eisenhower and I were invited to stand on Lenin's tomb as Stalin was reviewing a great youth sports parade in the Red Square. Standing next to Stalin, I looked around, and as far as I could see every window from which anyone could view the scene had been blocked or guarded. In front of Lenin's tomb and running the length of the square before the Kremlin, the Red soldiers stood rifle to rifle with bayonets in place to protect the Russian rulers from their people.

I have also seen how fearful the Russian leaders are of the people of their satellites. In January 1946 I was in Bucharest with the British Ambassador to negotiate with Vishinsky the carrying out of one provision of the Yalta agreement. This called for the participation of all democratic parties in the Rumanian Government preparatory to holding a free and unfettered election. This was one of the innumerable attempts to get the Soviets to keep their promises made at Yalta. One day, we were all invited to lunch with King Michael at his country place. My daughter and I drove out in a small car with a GI as driver and bearing an American flag. Through the countryside, there was friendliness—cheers for our flag. On the way, we passed one stalled cavalcade of seven huge motorcars (they were evidently repairing a blow-out). There were three cars in the front and three cars in the rear filled with guards. In the middle car sat Mr. Vishinsky. The American Military Mission to Rumania numbered only 100 officers and men; the Russians had 700,000 soldiers in the country at the time, but Mr. Vishinsky was not trusting to the friendliness of the Rumanian people.

The Kremlin is intent upon using fear to disrupt and paralyze, and ultimately to dominate the world—they use fear of war, fear of terror.

The association of free nations, on the other hand, is based on confidence and mutual trust—it is based on faith in democracy and in people, faith in each other. That is the way to meet Moscow's attempt to rule by fear.

In faith there is eternal strength; in fear, inevitable weakness.

It is the high purpose of the Democratic Party to continue to preserve that faith and confidence at home and abroad. That is a mission the Democratic Party has set for itself—and will fight to achieve.

But political victories, like liberty, have to be won over and over again. That is the essence and the strength of democracy. There are political victories that are going to have to be won this fall. Political victories, like liberty, cannot be taken for granted. We have to fight to win them. There is too much at stake at home and in the world to lose them now.

Five years ago last week, in a little white cottage at Warm Springs, Ga., President Roosevelt was preparing a speech to be delivered on the Jefferson Day of that year. He died before he could deliver it; but his manuscript has come down to us. The last words of that speech—in a sense his farewell message to us—were these: "To you and to all Americans who dedicate themselves with us in making an abiding peace, I say: the only limit to our realization of tomorrow will be our doubts of today. Let us move forward with strong and active faith."

To Roosevelt, to Wilson, to Jackson, to Jefferson, to all our great leaders of the past, we can say tonight: "There are no doubts among the true followers of the Democratic Party—your party, our party. We have faith, we have a strong and active faith. And we will move forward—we and all Americans of good will—to a realization of our aims: a secure and a good life at home; peace, security and international good faith throughout the free nations of the world."

Tax Revision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 21, 1950

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following letter by Mr. Harold Riegelman, distinguished New York lawyer, which appeared in a recent issue of the New York Times:

MR. COUDERT'S PROPOSAL—IT IS SAID TO BE AIMED AT GROWING CENTRALIZATION OF POWER

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The attack upon Representative FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR., in a letter to the Times of April 10 calls for comment.

The attack centers upon Mr. COUDERT'S dramatic proposal that the power to tax individual incomes be withdrawn by constitutional amendment from the Federal Government except for debt services and national emergencies (which presently include national defense) and that this power be reserved, with the exceptions above noted, to the several States. The dramatic aspect of the proposal is not that welfare and social services should be discontinued (which is not proposed) or that income taxes would necessarily be reduced: It is that the administration of welfare and social services would be transferred and restored to the sovereign States, and the resources of the State, including taxable incomes of their residents, would be made available to the States for those and other proper purposes.

This proposal is aimed at the great and growing centralization of power in the Federal Government and the difficulty of controlling at that remote level expenditures not of necessity national in character.

This purpose would be implemented, according to Mr. COUDERT, by charging the States with functions relating to the domestic well-being of their people and imposing upon the States responsibility for financing the administration of those functions under the observation and control of those who are immediately affected and who pay in taxes their cost.

Mr. COUDERT'S estimate of savings from elimination of existing duplications and dispensable Federal bureaucratic overhead and activities indicates the fiscal feasibility of this proposal. In this connection it is well to bear in mind that the period of authorized foreign aid at present levels will expire substantially before it is physically possible to complete the process of required Federal constitutional amendment; and if a national emergency subsequent to the amendment requires a continuance of foreign aid, such aid could still be financed as far as necesary by Federal taxation of individual incomes. The question of whether or not such a national emergency exists could be determined jointly by the President and the Congress.

Mr. COUDERT'S proposal, whether acceptable or not, has the merit of going to the very root of a trend toward centralization of government which many informed citizens and students of government regard as endangering our traditional political and economic system.

Mr. COUDERT'S subsequent resolution for the appointment of a nonpartisan commission to study revision of the Federal tax structure was designed to permit a careful and objective appraisal of the steps by which his principal objective could be accomplished in an orderly and prudent manner, consistent with our international obligations and those internal affairs which must be handled by the Federal Government if they are to be handled at all.

I believe the issue defined by Mr. COUDERT is of such grave importance that it should be studied and debated on its merits and not presented, as it was, merely as an example of propaganda serving to obscure or mislead the citizen as to activities of his Government.

HAROLD RIEGELMAN.
NEW YORK, *April 14, 1950.*

Peace in the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to direct the attention of my colleagues to the joint statement by president William Green, of the American Federation of Labor, and president Philip Murray, of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, issued by them on February 10, 1950, after conferring with our President Harry S. Truman. It is unfortunate that since that conference the reports indicate that the situation is getting worse rather than better. I sincerely trust that vigorous efforts on the part of our Government will soon bring this armament race to an end.

The statement follows:

PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST—A JOINT STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENTS OF THE CIO AND A. F. OF L.

In the name of the overwhelming majority of organized labor in America, we have today expressed to the President our firm support of the new democratic State of Israel, and our anxiety over the threats to this state and to the people of the Middle East through the heavy and needless armaments race now being undertaken by the governments of Egypt and other Arabic countries in the middle eastern areas.

From authoritative newspaper reports and other trustworthy sources of information, we are convinced that the objective of this drive toward militarism is a second war against the State of Israel.

We regard this development as a threat not only to the new democratic republic of Israel but also to the hopes of the American people for stability and peaceful progress wherever possible in the world.

Labor in America—both CIO and A. F. of L.—has long supported the reestablishment of Jewish sovereignty in Palestine. We took great pride in the prompt action of our Government in giving recognition and support to the new State of Israel, which is the fruition of centuries of Jewish aspirations and hopes. We have followed with close interest and approval the efforts of the democratic Government of Israel to achieve peace and progress for its citizens.

We have come to recognize the Republic of Israel as a bastion of our hopes for strengthening the democratic processes in the Middle East. We have maintained close and friendly relations with Histadrut, the splendid labor federation of Israel, which is accomplishing so much for the well-being of its members and for the new state as a whole.

We had hoped that after the conclusion of Israel's rightful struggle for national independence, it would be allowed to develop its human and natural resources in peace and with the cooperation of its neighbors.

The growing menace of renewed armed intervention by reactionary and unrepresentative neighboring governments—as reported in considerable detail in the press—has caused growing alarm.

This renewed military threat is being aimed at a state which is working more effectively than any other in the Middle East to bring its people higher standards of living, literacy, housing, and health. It has made tremendous strides in its first 18 months of experience, and great progress can be expected if peace is maintained throughout the entire region.

The effective advancement of living and cultural standards in Israel will inevitably bring improvements in the lives of millions of other persons in the Middle East—the great majority of whom live in ignorance, poverty, and disease. Indeed, Israel is ideally equipped to be a pivotal factor in developing the resources of the Middle East when President Truman's point 4 program, which we heartily endorse, is enacted into law and placed in operation.

Newspaper reports and other creditable evidence indicate that Egypt, Transjordan, Iraq, and the other Arabic countries unfriendly to Israel are receiving large supplies of armaments from the government of Great Britain. We appealed to the President to make appropriate representations on behalf of our Government to Great Britain to discontinue supplying these Arabic countries with instruments of aggressive warfare obviously designed for use against Israel.

We likewise appealed to President Truman, since the flow of arms to the Arabic countries still continues, to permit the sale of arms to the Israeli Government in order to meet the daily increasing threat to the security of the State of Israel. We see no reason why Israel should not be given the opportunity to purchase means of defense while the arms machinery of its neighbors is constantly increased, for obviously aggressive purposes.

At the same time, we have voiced to the President our hope for continued American support to help achieve a just and permanent peace settlement between the Government of Israel on the one hand and Egypt, Transjordan, and the other Arabic countries. We have expressed our strong belief that the Government of the United States should continue its reasonable and enlightened attitude concerning the position of Jerusalem to the end that the impracticable UN decision relating to Jerusalem shall be reconsidered.

We have likewise appealed to the President for additional financial support for Israel. That small and new state has admitted—during the 18 months of its existence—365,000 Jewish immigrants. They have been liberated from displaced-persons camps in Germany, the ghettos of Arabic countries, and the increasing discrimination of Soviet satellite nations. The $100,000,000 loan of the Export-Import Bank which the President so generously supported is now virtually exhausted. The assistance extended by American Jewry cannot entirely meet the immediate and overwhelming need.

We are hopeful that our Government will again support a new loan from the Export-Import Bank and the World Bank in order to make it possible for the state of Israel to cope with these manifold problems.

American influence and actions can help preserve peace and democracy in the Middle East and bring stability, progress and enlightenment to that part of the world.

As unionists and as believers in the continuance of the peace and in democratic opportunity, we trust that our Government will stand against further aggression directed at the State of Israel and its courageous enlightened people who, like we, are seeking to achieve a decent economy and a full utilization of the resources of nature for the benefit of mankind.

Address by T. Russ Hill Before the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an address delivered by T. Russ Hill, Detroit, Mich., at the opening of the Fifty-ninth Continental Congress, National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, at Washington, D. C., on April 17, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is an honor and a pleasure to be present at the gala opening of the Fifty-ninth Continental Congress, National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution.

This organization is remarkable in character, accomplishments, and steadfastness to the principles of the era from which your name is derived. Since the gulf between man and his past is widening with each generation, the dedication of your current activities to history, patriotism, and teaching is increasingly important to the Nation.

At the same time, you have a rather alarming responsibility, being one of the leading organizations of the controlling group in the Nation, its women. The women of America are the bulwarks of our democracy, particularly when they are realists instead of sentimentalists as far as men in public life are concerned.

Since women have the biggest stake in our Nation's economy and security, their responsibility is, therefore, alarming. So much so, that they cannot be content to sit in lecture halls and then merely wonder what they can do. Women are the strongest influence with which to resist the tide of destructive or misnamed constructive forces rising within the Union and attempting to submerge the free capitalistic system which is the Nation's strength and the guaranty of the people's freedom.

In this age of lunacy, greed, shallowness, fear, and decaying moral fiber, as in all periods of stress, the condition of the Nation's bulwarks determines its chances of riding out the storm and fixes the job to be done by its citizens aboard the ship. Furthermore, the realization that this stressful period is not unusual and that it had to be, increases the confidence required to do the job.

Unfortunately, the American people are very impatient when solutions are difficult. We become irritated, discouraged, and alarmed when we cannot wipe the slate clean with one swipe. It seems only yesterday that we were laughing at Mussolini, the clown; at Hitler, a little man with a funny mustache; and joking about how long the Russian 5-year plan would last. The smiles disappeared in a storm of anguish and the world paid a terrible price to ride it out. Still there is no peace within or without. Instead, the people are disturbed and fearful. America, the oldest pure democracy left, is agitated because of that fact. The impact of this era of upheaval has us nervous because we are so accustomed to solving things quickly and then having done with them.

Faster motorcars, faster trains, faster planes, faster ships, faster production, faster education, faster salvation, and even faster destruction of millions of people have not solved the problems of peace and security. On the contrary, they have bred frustration. We are regretfully realizing that we cannot snap our fingers and find a cure for cancer, heart disease, nor the social and economic unrest of the day, so we indulge in fits of fancy and fallacy. The answer is deeper and slower, but the answer can be found through the dogged efforts of you and millions like you in this Nation whose concepts are solidly American. Given the true facts, our people will find a true solution. Otherwise, there can be no strength in a democracy.

The issue in America is really between free capitalism and authoritarianism whether called socialism, fascism, or communism. All other names for either side are window dressing. It isn't liberty, freedom, free enterprise, or our way of life against authoritarianism. It is free capitalism which guarantees all of these and more. In fact, free capitalism is the only form of economic existence that has ever worked in any land and today democracies control two-thirds of the world's trade and most of its resources; yet disciples of collectivism, ofttimes refugees of failure in other lands, tinker with the workings of democracy.

Likewise, the opponent of free capitalism is not progressivism, social justice, equality for all, social security, a share of the wealth, or any other attractive phrases that are as old as history. The opponent is authoritarianism as exemplified by socialism, at least for the moment. Calling it by any other name does not change its objectives.

I am a believer, therefore, in free capitalism and the fact that the supporters of Marx sneer when they use the word increases my enthusiasm for free capitalism. I left a rural section of Kentucky at the age of 13 to get an education. As soon as college was behind me, I had to make some money. I was in debt for my schooling, so I became a capitalist as every wage earner on a business payroll is today. Later on, some other people who had the same idea, joined me in establishing a business. We made money, built other businesses, distributed merchandise that rendered a service to the public, donated money to many causes, employed people and paid good wages and dividends, paid substantial taxes, and served the communities in which we lived. I hope that every boy in America will continue to have that kind of an opportunity. If that is to be, those who believe in it must stand up for free capitalism. Free capitalism is no saint in white robes but it is by far the best child in the economic family. The blessings which God has showered upon it attest that fact.

Since free capitalism's means and methods built this Nation, put up and endowed its colleges, libraries and hospitals, erected and preserved its historical shrines, saved the world twice and is still carrying a major portion of that world, any American can openly endorse it with pride. It is worthy of your vigorous championing and the people need to be reminded of the same.

Furthermore, all Americans are capitalists except probably three classifications: the religious sect dedicated to poverty, the loafer and the criminal parasite, and the demagogic politician who creates nothing and lives off the money earned by taxpaying capitalists. So, you see, we have tremendous strength on the side of this Peck's bad boy. Uniting it is the job to be done. The people need to be reminded of both these facts.

I believe that can best be done by clarifying the issues. Those who believe in statism, in part or in whole, which I believe is socialism and a forerunner of communism, are probably as honest, zealous, and unselfish in their beliefs as those who champion free enterprise. Let the issue then be joined squarely and settled in the democratic way. This can be done by the people working for what they believe, voting for it (all of them, not 50 to 60 percent as in recent elections) and striving to put the future ahead of themselves or the stress of the moment. The immediate problem is not to stop Communists. I do not believe that communism can take over this country from within or without. The task of those who believe in free capitalism is to check the infiltration of socialistic trends and ideas into our presumably respectable institutions which are a major portion of the Nation's bulwarks. If that is done, I am sure that communism has no chance in this Nation.

Some educators tell us that mass education is the crime of the century against American youth. It is certainly obvious that cultural teaching, the foundation of the western world, has declined under mass education and that the intensification of specialized courses thereunder is teaching the student to battle, to acquire, but not to live. This educational process has been popularized. That destroys the basic virtues of cultural and patriotic citizenship. It creates fertile ground for socialization of the educational process under the guise of providing easy, elective educational opportunities for all. Such opportunities and such educational processes would not build citizens of democracies. To subscribe to that, it seems to me, is to overlook the historical fact that few if any students who have really sought an education in this country failed to get it because they were poor. Those who did not want it, though having ample funds, did not profit by the process of going through the motions of receiving it, and contributed little to the common good thereafter. Nationalization of education will not change that pattern. It will increase the waste and magnify means instead of minds. A sound, free educational process is essential to the continuance of free capitalism. Therefore, it is fertile ground for the cultivation of their ideas by those who oppose it. Miss Bentley, confessed former Communist spy, blames her being taken in by communism upon her failure to study American history, political science and civics, despite an otherwise expensive education.

The old line political parties, long bulwarks of the Nation, have also been softened up, both of them, by the blows of collectivism power groups. We have for some time witnessed both parties seeking votes through promising campaigns of unusual magnitude. There is no better example of the results of this course, it seems to me, than the laws that have been enacted under the impact of the pressure groups controlling large blocks of votes. The farm subsidies are probably the best known example of such because they can be seen, but the bait in other directions has been proportionately heavy.

In a limestone cave near Atchison, Kans., the Government has stored 112,000,000 pounds of dried eggs and 33,000,000 pounds

of dried prunes and raisins. That is enough to provide breakfast for 150,000,000 Americans. Free capitalism, mainly the women of free capitalism, paid for these twice. First with tax money to do the buying and storing. Second, in the higher prices that the same commodities cost when they purchased them.

Elsewhere there are 364,000,000 pounds of linseed oil—enough to make all of the paint that is used in America in 1 year; 182,000,000 bushels of wheat; 15,000,000 bushels of flaxseed; 89,000,000 pounds of wool and still other mountains of cotton, butter, flax, peanuts, soybeans, potato starch, dried milk, barley, dry edible beans and peas, corn, rice, rye, hay and pasture seeds, rosin, and tobacco, not to mention potatoes. Three billion dollars have been spent in these mountains of subsidies. The statistics are dry but the results are drier. CCC, of course, hoped to make a profit out of the investment, but lost $254,000,000 in the 12 months ended June 30, 1949, and is currently asking for $2,000,000,000 to keep going. Economists really have a bear by the tail when they attempt to extend the law of diminishing returns to all incomes down to the necessity point. It is not too difficult to tax profits and incomes for that purpose. It is a different animal when it is extended to farm products, education, and medicine, to mention a few.

Closely allied with this aid to the farmer and the bid for his vote is the quest for the labor vote upon much the same basis. Here again the desire for size has weakened the bulwarks of the Nation and made possible the infiltration of socialistic ideas and programs. Many industries busy with mass production neglected their masses. The leaders of those masses, now busy with extending their powers, are likewise neglecting their people. Some are actually, consciously or unconsciously, leading them into the corrals of regimentation. Human relations are in the arena with the labor law a political football. Collective bargaining has in many cases been reduced almost to the level of violence with viciousness indulged in on both sides of the table. Obviously, the country cannot continue strong under such pressures, especially when the advocates of either side are supported by the Government.

Men willing to fight and die for brick and mortar or for their selfish organizations are a sorry sight in a nation whose sons have been dying for the flag and whose shrines and the records of their deeds this organization has done so much to preserve. In this situation, we see men exchanging their liberties, their initiative, their heritage as freemen for theories—most of which are imported from countries now dependent upon the United States for support. This was manifested recently in Detroit when the press reported an official of a great union as telling a mass meeting of one of its striking members: "We are only asking for a little of what we produce. One of these days, when we are organized politically, we are going to ask for everything we produce."

Under slogans such as free speech, social justice, equality of all men, a fair return to all workers for their efforts, no discrimination of any sort, etc., socialistic measures gain ground and fasten themselves upon the people. The gradual encroachment of Government controls keeps step with taxing policies which are sapping the Nation's fiscal strength. The resistance strength of the strong is being steadily broken down through promises to the weak. Eventually, all will be weak, even the individual and industrial giants whose earnings are making the headlines now. The large earnings of such industries as the automotive are taken as criterions for all businesses and loud denunciations are voiced. The 1949 profit trend, however, was down in most industries as the drop in the tax yield to the Government will confirm. Measuring the take from these by the automotive yardstick will mean the death warrant for many.

You know, of course, that Britain's socialistic government, which the United States has largely underwritten, has not taken over all business—just credit, communications, civil aviation, transport, coal mines, electricity, gas, and medical services. That is enough to control any other business. The balance of "private" industry there now has the responsibility of trying to make enough money to pay the operating losses sustained by the industries under Government control. We are so well along the road of taxing individuals and corporations for funds with which to underwrite government projects that the inclusion of entire businesses in such projects would not be too difficult. A little more time and a few more votes and the job could be done and coal might be the starter.

Communism is the second stage of the struggle, not the first. The battle today must, therefore, be joined on the battlegrounds and not at teas, clubs, bridge and canasta sessions, or in summer colonies. The chief battlegrounds now, I believe, are the schools and colleges, the unions, the churches, and the polls on every election day. Before asking what you can do, check your interest and activity in the PTA, in college and university management and curricula, in labor relations, in church affairs, and in ward politics. Free capitalism must survive there if it is to survive. Donald Richberg said recently: "Higher taxes mean less money for individual spending; and more political controls mean less individual liberty." I believe it is as simple as that.

If war comes and it will come when Russia feels that she has enough with which to win (and this Nation should never let her get that far ahead), the miracle performed by industry in the last world war will be but a token compared with the requirements upon industry in the next one. For the sake of our salvation, I trust that free capitalism is still the economic system in this Nation when the shooting starts. It will be if the people who really believe in free capitalism push the spoons filled with the opiate of government hand-outs away from their lips and stand up. It will be if the same people openly and cleanly meet such charges as "capitalists, special interests, Wall Street, privileged class, reactionaries, and financial tycoons," all devised to cast suspicion upon the free capitalistic system and to arouse the people to the support of measures aimed at crippling it into impotence so the leaders of the opposition may take over. It will be if the same people show by the record where greed for power and greed for gain is truly to be found. Regardless of sectionalism, material worth of party affiliations, such people must come from the North, the South, the East, and the West, united in one purpose, the preservation of the Union through retention of its strength, free capitalism. If such are afraid of that term or of the mud that has been thrown upon it, then they will have no passion for the crusade. The flood of government, sincerely believed in by its advocates and slowly rising across the land, will engulf all, not merely the so-called vested interests.

The best people have been telling us for 5,000 years that there is something eternal in every human being. I believe that applies also to a nation where God is respected. Therefore, I believe that the Valley Forge shrine, the monuments of Gettysburg, and the white crosses in America and foreign soil will stir the people to make eternal the fruits of the sacrifices of those who performed the deeds which these monuments and markings symbolize. May Almighty God lead us in the fullest participation in the issues relevant to the preservation of such a heritage.

The Situation in Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GUY M. GILLETTE

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able radio statement delivered by the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] on April 20, 1950.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I can think of no undertaking which is more badly needed today than a study and reexamination of the entire situation as it has developed in Germany.

Five times—I repeat five times—within the last century Germany has been the starting point of aggressive wars. The last two of these wars threatened the very existence of western civilization. And all during the centuries before Germany was the scene and theater of almost endless wars which raged across the face of Europe, involving one country and then another in devastation and destruction.

Today the chief threat in the world is undoubtedly that of Soviet expansion and aggression. This should not blind us, however, to the importance of looking closely at the situation in Germany to see what is happening there. What is going on in this heart of central Europe. What has happened to our original war and peace aims for the German people? What has happened to our dreams of democratizing this unhappy land? What are the German people doing and thinking while the cold war rages around them?

We are all pleased that Germany is recovering from the economic wounds of the recent conflict. But if there is being recreated the same Germany that confronted the world 10 years ago, we are making another date with a terrible destiny for Europe and the world.

But I am not ready to pass my own judgment on this situation. I would like to know the facts. The American people should know the facts. A bipartisan commission such as we have proposed in the resolution submitted to the Senate last week will throw a searchlight of inquiry upon an area which is only vaguely illuminated in the public mind today.

If we forget the German people in our concentration on the battle for Germany, we may win the battle but lose the war—both the war that we fought and the war we may yet—God forbid—be called upon to fight.

History has an uncanny way of repeating itself. The resolution of which I am a coauthor is intended only to inquire whether the western German republic is a really new Germany or just the same Germany with a new facade.

The Current World Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, last Wednesday at a dinner sponsored by the Democratic State committee of New York, Ambassador Averell Harriman gave a very powerful and informative address on a number of subjects, political and international. Ambassador Harriman's analysis of the current world situation, as well as his analysis of the current political situation are well worth reading. I ask the unanimous consent of the Senate to insert this speech in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We are drawn together tonight by a great cause—the Democratic Party. It is a great cause, for in a realistic sense, it has come to be in our day almost synonymous with the cause of democracy.

The Democratic Party, I feel deeply, is the party of democracy, because it is the party of progress, of human freedom, and human security. It not only has the faith that these high objectives can be achieved; it also has the courage to take bold, decisive action to see that they are achieved. The Democratic Party not only believes that man is entitled to have dignity and freedom; it believes that these words do not have full meaning unless he can eat regular, too. And our party is ready to take whatever steps are necessary to fight off those two great fears which beset our generation: the fear of want, and the fear of war.

I have seen our party operate at close hand in Washington and abroad for nearly 20 years. In 1933, I joined the ranks of those who went to work to clean up the wreckage left us by Republican policy. The Republican Party, responsible for the disaster of 1929, had remained down in a cyclone cellar for 3 years, waiting for the storm to die down.

When the Democratic Party took over, it immediately started a program of action under the leadership of a man who believed in action—Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Ten years ago, when Nazi aggression was threatening to engulf the world, I joined the ranks of those who again responded to Roosevelt's leadership in facing the new peril from abroad.

Since then, I have been in a position to see, in a number of different posts at home and abroad, how effectively the Democratic administration has dealt with threats to our national life.

To me, the Democratic Party is the party of confidence. It has confidence in the strength of a free people. It is not afraid to meet squarely any problem no matter how great. It does not sit by complacently waiting for a problem to solve itself. It takes affirmative action before the problem overwhelms us. In Democratic leadership there is confidence, but not complacency. There is alertness to danger, but not fear.

For these reasons, I believe, the American people have rejected the timid and vacillating leadership of the Republican Party. Too many of its leaders are terrified of progress. It is forever looking fondly backward for safety. It squints timidly at the future, hoping that nothing new will ever have to be done. We are told that the elephant never forgets. I wonder why. Perhaps it is because the elephant dreams only of the past.

This kind of straddling and vacillating Republican leadership is present in our State—in the person of its Governor. At one time Dewey claims to believe in the social objectives of the New Deal. At another time he condemns them as socialistic. At one time he ridicules the defense levels of airplane production set by Roosevelt; later he seeks to blame the Democrats for inadequate war preparedness. Originally he was partly isolationist, then he became partly internationalist—never quite sure—always seeming to wait for the polls of popular opinion before making up his mind where he stood. And finally, when he read the election polls of 1948 he evidently made up his mind the election was such a cinch that it was safer to take a stand on nothing—that is, nothing but two things. He was for unity; and he was for Dewey for President. That wasn't good enough.

The American people turned to a fighting leader, a man who made his objectives clear—a man ready to look into the future with confidence and action. And that man is carrying on today with the same bold Democratic offensive. He does not wait for blows to strike us. He too goes out to meet them in the traditional way of the Democratic Party. Our party has confidence—and so have the American people confidence—in the leadership of Harry S. Truman.

It is a leadership of action to meet any and all threats. At home it is the leadership of the Fair Deal against poverty, disease, ignorance, intolerance, race prejudice—a fight continually to improve the American life. Abroad, it is a leadership to support faithfully the Charter of the United Nations. It is a leadership to repel chaos, to help rebuild, to resist aggression, to unite all men of good will all over the world in the struggle against want and against fear. It is a fight for peace. It is a fight in which everyone of us here tonight, and every peace-loving American, plays his full part.

And to carry on such a fight abroad in the kind of world we now face, in the kind of cold war which imperialistic Soviet Russia has imposed upon us, we must have clear, firm, and consistent American foreign policies. We have such policies. They are not the policies of any one party. They are American policies.

It is the duty of the President to develop foreign policies which transcend all partisan considerations. That is exactly what he has done.

We Democrats recognize and respect those Republican leaders—such as Senator VANDENBERG and many others in the Senate and in the House—who have put party considerations aside, and have helped to develop policies which are concerned only with the highest national interest and security. These have been called bipartisan policies, but Senator VANDENBERG has perhaps more appropriately labeled them unpartisan policies.

The ECA is an outstanding example of such a policy. After full debate, it was authorized by an overwhelming majority of both parties in the Congress. It has been administrated in a completely unpartisan way.

In the words of Senator VANDENBERG, "This working unity typified our finest traditions and our greatest safety in the presence of external hazards to all Americans, regardless of party. * * * United, we stand. Divided, we fall. I want America to stand."

Let us all here tonight pray that Senator VANDENBERG will soon recover from his illness, to continue to add his wisdom to the guidance of our country at this time.

The objective of American foreign policy can be expressed in various ways. In essence, it is to attain peace with freedom and justice. But the desperate reality is that an aggressive, determined force is loose in the world today which has a completely different objective—to extinguish both freedom and justice.

The strength of our economy and the strength of our spirit will be the deciding factors in maintaining freedom and peace. On this, I hold three deep convictions:

First, that the American people must secure and broaden our own well-being at home.

Second, that the American people must give inspiration, assistance, and leadership, as partners, to the free nations of the world.

My third conviction is that if the American people do both these things, war can be avoided.

The policies of the Fair Deal work toward a dynamic and expanding economy with a steadily rising national income in which all can share. They are directed toward the eradication of injustices and intolerance against our fellow Americans of minority races and religions. They are designed to provide the kind of security and opportunity which gives each citizen a real stake in the material prosperity of his country.

Republicans have tried to argue that social security interferes with opportunity. We Democrats reject such narrow concepts. We believe that our country can achieve security for the people, and at the same time give greater opportunity to the individual—to more individuals.

Republicans are again doing their best to picture the social objectives of the Fair Deal as monstrous and terrible things which will swallow up our American freedom.

That's just the bunk. It is an uninformed, inaccurate reading of contemporary history. The truth is that the danger to freedom mounts when the economic system fails to feed, clothe, and house the great mass of the people at a decent level, when it fails to hold out the prospect of an improving standard of living for those willing to work hard enough to get it. If our experience during the past 30 years proves anything, it proves that the happiest hunting ground for fascism and communism is mass unemployment and human misery. It is the environment of economic security which strengthens freedom and renders it safe from the lies and the plots of the Communists.

Some Republican leaders and candidates seem to be looking upon certain recent elections in various countries as a kind of unearned increment for themselves—as evidence that the people in other parts of the world are turning back to reaction. These Republican politicians are evidently hoping that all they have to do is to wait passively by the ballot box here at home to get back into office. As usual, they are misreading political facts. Actually, the elections are encouraging to us of the Democratic Party. I have watched these elections at first-hand. All of them reflect a definite trend away from the extreme left—from the Communists, from the fellow travelers, and from the fellow wanderers. In general, they reflect a trend toward our kind of democratic belief. But let's not begrudge the Republicans their temporary delusions. They'll find out when the time comes.

When I speak of Republican leaders, I differentiate them from the rank and file of the Republican Party. Many of them consider themselves Republicans out of a natural sense of loyalty and tradition. But they vote for progressive candidates only—whether they are Democrats or Republicans. We welcome their support, and we must continue to be worthy of it by putting up forward-looking candidates and carrying on a program of progressive action.

The essential foundation on which we can wage a successful fight for freedom and peace is to make our society healthy, intelligent, and economically secure, based upon a system of free enterprise which, together with government, recognizes and discharges its social responsibilities to the whole people.

That is our preeminent task at home.

Abroad we have been giving inspiration and assistance to the free nations of Europe—our partners in this fight for freedom and peace. By the Truman doctrine, by the Marshall plan, and by the North Atlantic Treaty, we have already made long strides together in this fight. The development of the far-sighted concept of point 4 will strengthen the cause of freedom in the underdeveloped areas, and will expand the trade and prosperity of our own country and other industrial countries.

The free nations of the world are going to win this fight. I am confident of it—for two fundmental reasons:

One reason is that history and morality are on our side. The Kremlin proclaims "the inevitability of the dictatorship of the proletariat." Well, it is not inevitable. History does not teach the inevitability of tyranny. It teaches just the opposite. The whole stream of human development has been a successful struggle of mankind for ever-growing freedom. There have been many set-backs, but eventually dictatorships have been overthrown by the strongest of human forces, man's passionate desire for liberty. Liberty, not tyranny, is man's birthright. The moral force of that birthright is our most powerful ally.

The second reason I am confident is that the material resources on the side of freedom are far stronger. The United States and Canada have about half of the heavy manufacturing capacity of the world. Including the free nations of Europe, the Atlantic community has at its command about 75 percent of the entire world's vital industrial capacity. We have access to the needed food and raw materials.

If the free nations of the North Atlantic—with all these resources—work together to improve economic conditions in the free world, if we all do our share in the development of the means of mutual defense, then the free world will be unbeatable.

Our partners in western Europe are steadily gaining economic health and democratic strength. Hunger has been driven out. When I went to Europe 2 years ago for ECA the people of France, for example, were living on a bread ration of only two-thirds of the ration given them by the Germans during the occupation. Today bread and most foods are no longer rationed. In western Europe war-shattered industry is already producing well above prewar levels. And is continuing to rise. Trade is expanding, and most important of all, the fearful specter of inflation has been laid at rest. In 1947, when the Communist threat to seize control was most menacing, the prospect of the Marshall plan revived hope. Today confidence has returned. That is why in country after country, as free elections have been held, communism has been rolled back.

No wonder Communists hate free elections, and no wonder they fight the Marshall plan.

The front line of the battle for freedom in western Europe has been the labor front. The Communist strategy—dictated from Moscow—was to gain control of the labor movement in order to destroy the free countries of Europe. With the failure of strikes called for Kremlin political objectives, the free labor movement has been strengthened. The present attempts of the Communists to use the trade-unions to prevent the unloading of American military assistance is again proving a boomerang. In the ranks of European labor communism has suffered decisive set-backs.

I want to pay tribute to the vision of the American trade-union movement in helping the workers of Europe in their battle. The A. F. of L. and the CIO and the railroad unions have given effective support to the cause of freedom in Europe.

There is growing vigor in Europe. The same spirit that created the resistance movement during German occupation is again alive. In traveling through Europe as I have, and in meeting the men who are leading the battle, I have become confident of the new hope and new vitality of our partners in Europe. There is the will to work, the will to fight, and the will to win.

Their decision to join with us in the North Atlantic Treaty meant setting aside forever reliance on appeasement or neutrality to maintain peace. This courageous decision stemmed from their belief—as we believe—that unity among the free nations is the greatest single deterrent to aggression.

But we must remember that hope and confidence in Europe naturally rests on faith in the firmness and consistency of American policy. It is bewildering to our friends abroad when, in the United States Senate, reckless and irresponsible charges are slung against those in important positions who are carrying out our foreign policy. People abroad do not understand, as we do, that these maneuvers are for personal publicity and partisan politics. This political persecution of individuals might be ignored if it did not play right into the hands of the Communists. It weakens confidence in us abroad. And there could be no greater handicap to the administration's efforts to stamp out subversive elements.

As Mr. Henry L. Stimson has said: "It should by now be wholly clear that indiscriminate accusations are doubly offensive; they damage the innocent and they help protect the guilty. For if the accuser is so stupid as to connect a man like Ambassador Jessup with communism, are not all such accusations made suspect?"

Others are following Mr. Stimson's leadership in denouncing these malicious tactics. Would there were more. Instead there are some, who, though unwilling to share responsibility with McCARTHY in his indiscriminate tirade of unsubstantiated charges, are hoping to gather some political windfall out of them if they can.

The American people will see through these un-American political maneuvers. They know that no administration can possibly be friendly to Communists which has proposed and is carrying out with vigor the Truman doctrine, the Marshall plan, and the North Atlantic Treaty. The American people will repudiate those who are undermining for selfish purpose the confidence of other free nations in our country at this critical time.

I believe that if our foreign policies are consistently and vigorously carried forward and expanded in cooperation with our partners of the North Atlantic Treaty, we will develop an impregnable position of strength in western Europe and in other parts of the free world.

With life secure and healthy in the free world, I am convinced that pressures will begin to operate behind the iron curtain to break down the Kremlin control. When and how no one can predict. But there can be no doubt that the disaffection of Tito has resulted from the success of the Marshall plan.

Let there be no mistake: It will be a long and tough struggle, requiring present-day sacrifices by us and our partners—sacrifices which are in fact investments in the cause of peace and in the cause of freedom.

Early this month I was with Secretary Johnson and General Bradley at a meeting in The Hague of the Defense Ministers of the nations of the North Atlantic Treaty. I was struck by the determination shown by our associates sitting around that table. These men, representing their governments, mean business. They mean to do their share in developing with us an integrated defense force for mutual security.

The United States, the most powerful nation in the world, is helping to forge an association of partners whose strength will lie in its unity—whose strength is based on mutual respect and mutual confidence.

In sharp contrast, Soviet imperialism is seeking to create a world of nations subordinate to Russia—a world of satellites forced to do her bidding.

Russia itself is ruled by fear and is out to rule the world by fear.

Within Russia, the Kremlin is afraid of the people and the people are afraid of the Kremlin.

I remember one occasion in the summer of 1945 when General Eisenhower and I were invited to stand on Lenin's tomb as Stalin was reviewing a great youth sports parade in the Red Square. Standing next to Stalin, I looked around, and as far as I could see every window from which anyone could view the scene had been blocked or guarded. In front of Lenin's tomb and running the length of the square before the Kremlin, the Red soldiers stood rifle to rifle with bayonets in place to protect the Russian rulers from their people.

I have also seen how fearful the Russian leaders are of the people of their satellites. In January 1946 I was in Bucharest with the British ambassador to negotiate with Vishinsky the carrying out of one provision of the Yalta agreement. This called for the participation of all democratic parties in the Rumanian Government preparatory to holding a free and unfettered election. This was one of the innumerable attempts to get the Soviets to keep their promises made at Yalta. One day, we were all invited to lunch with King Michael at his country place. My daughter and I drove out in a small car with a GI as driver and bearing an American flag. Through the countryside, there was friendliness—cheers for our flag. On the way, we passed one stalled cavalcade of seven huge motor cars (they were evidently repairing a blowout). There were three cars in the front and three cars in the rear filled with guards. In the middle car sat Mr. Vishinsky. The American Military Mission to Rumania numbered only 100 officers and men; the Russians had 700,000 soldiers in the country at the time, but Mr. Vishinsky was not trusting to the friendliness of the Rumanian people.

The Kremlin is intent upon using fear to disrupt and paralyze, and ultimately to dominate the world—they use fear of war, fear of terror.

The association of free nations, on the other hand, is based on confidence and mutual trust—it is based on faith in democracy and in people, faith in each other. That is the way to meet Moscow's attempt to rule by fear!

In faith there is eternal strength; in fear—inevitable weakness.

It is the high purpose of the Democratic Party to continue to preserve that faith and confidence at home and abroad. That is a mission the Democratic Party has set for itself—and will fight to achieve.

But political victories, like liberty, have to be won over and over again. That is the essence and the strength of democracy. There are political victories that are going to have to be won this fall. Political victories, like liberty, cannot be taken for granted. We have to fight to win them. There is too much at stake at home and in the world to lose them now.

Five years ago last week, in a little white cottage at Warm Springs, Ga., President Roosevelt was preparing a speech to be delivered on the Jefferson Day of that year. He died before he could deliver it; but his manuscript has come down to us. The last words

of that speech—in a sense his farewell message to us—were these: "To you and to all Americans who dedicate themselves with us in making an abiding peace, I say: the only limit to our realization of tomorrow will be our doubts of today. Let us move forward with strong and active faith."

To Roosevelt, to Wilson, to Jackson, to Jefferson, to all our great leaders of the past, we can say tonight: "There are no doubts among the true followers of the Democratic Party—your party, our party. We have faith, we have a strong and active faith. And we will move forward—we and all Americans of good will—to a realization of our aims: a secure and a good life at home; peace, security, and international good faith throughout the free nations of the world."

Rainfall in Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement prepared by me entitled "Wisconsin Rainfall Situation Satisfactory," together with a letter from Robert Taylor, director of the University News Service, and an article by Jerry Wollan.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WISCONSIN RAINFALL SITUATION SATISFACTORY

(Statement by Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin)

Mr. President, it has been my pleasure on many occasions to invite attention to the fact that the State of Wisconsin is America's dairyland, and is blessed by nature with a magnificent climate, beautiful scenic attractions, and splendid resources, of which any commonwealth could indeed be proud.

I have proven by factual records that my sincere praise of the attractiveness of my native State is no act merely of the pride of a Senator in his own State—which is only natural—but an accurate, objective attitude based on the facts in the situation.

As summer once more approaches, the thoughts of hundreds of thousands of Americans turn to tourist travels in Wisconsin, to leisure time enjoyment, to fishing and hunting, swimming, and just plain relaxing. Moreover, as summer approaches the full rhythm of agricultural production begins to really roll throughout America's dairyland. On our 175,000 model, well-kept farms, we are out to break new records in quality and quantity of agricultural items, particularly, of course, our dairy products.

Against the background of these facts, it was with considerable disappointment that we of Wisconsin have noted certain recent newspaper and magazine articles as to the alleged heavy loss of rainfall in the Badger State. It seems, Mr. President, that all sorts of gloomy and utterly unfounded predictions have been made to the effect that Wisconsin is facing a semiarid future. Naturally, any such news story or magazine write-up must bear the closest scrutiny, because the effect of those stories can be very harmful, both economically, sociologically, and psychologically. The alert University of Wisconsin News Service has, therefore, very promptly sent out to the Nation's press a documented refutation of the phony write-ups as to Wisconsin rainfall.

Mr. Robert Taylor, director of the University News Service at Madison, has conveyed to me conclusive scientific proof that the Badger State is very definitely not suffering a decrease in rainfall. Moreover, the Badger State has a bright future insofar as ground water is concerned, provided, of course, that we and for that matter everyone else, develop and use our resources intelligently on the basis of up-to-the-minute scientific data.

Ordinarily, Mr. President, I do not like even to give attention to phony write-ups by presenting their refutation, but I think that in this instance, the thoroughly scientific refutation so completely demolishes the fear-provoking propaganda that many constructive uses will be served by my colleagues noting the splendid proof cited by the University of Wisconsin News Service.

I ask unanimous consent, therefore, that there be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the text of a letter sent on April 13 to the Nation's editors by Mr. Taylor as well as the text of two articles by Mr. Jerry Wollan. The news service also sent out a splendid graph prepared by Professor Bryson, University of Wisconsin meteorologist—a graph which led the professor to conclude firmly that "there has been no significant change in Wisconsin rainfall." Were it possible to reproduce this graph, I would do so, but since this is not possible, I am merely asking that these three items be printed in the Appendix.

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN NEWS SERVICE,
Madison, Wis., April 13, 1950.

DEAR EDITOR: In December John J. O'Neill, science editor of the New York Herald-Tribune, made a survey of the national rainfall picture and came up with a statement that Wisconsin is losing more rainfall than any other State in the country and is facing a semiarid future.

In February an article of similar nature appeared in American magazine under the byline of Oscar L. Chapman, Secretary of the Interior. A part of this article dealing with Wisconsin was reprinted in the April issue of Readers Digest.

Such a charge has serious implications for an agricultural State like Wisconsin. Already, alarmed farmers have asked what to do and whether the charge is true. The same applies to hydroelectric projects for which loans are being sought.

If the charge is generally believed, officials feel that farm and hydroelectric loans may be difficult to obtain and that Wisconsin will be considered a poor risk for any type of investment which ultimately will be beneficial for the State.

An immediate investigation of the charge by scientists at the University of Wisconsin has resulted in an absolute denial that the State is suffering a decrease in rainfall. These scientists feel that the Chapman article figures were adopted from the O'Neill findings.

They flatly state that O'Neill is incorrect.

Enclosed is a series of two stories which present the actual picture of Wisconsin's rainfall situation as decribed by four competent authorities. The experts are Prof. R. A. Bryson, university meterologist; Lothar A. Joos, United States Weather Bureau meteorologist at the university; Ernest F. Bean, Wisconsin State geologist; and Frank C. Foley, United States Geological Survey.

These men definitely conclude that Wisconsin rainfall is not changing and that the State does not in any way face a semiarid future.

These articles are being sent you for your information and for publication if you so desire.

Sincerely,

ROBERT TAYLOR,
Director, University News Service.

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This is the first in a series of two articles on the Wisconsin rainfall and ground-water situation. It is presented in answer to recent charges that Wisconsin is suffering a severe rainfall decrease.)

(By Jerry Wollan)

MADISON, WIS.—The serious charge that Wisconsin tops the dubious national "honor" roll of States in rainfall loss has drawn explosive comment from scientists at the University of Wisconsin.

To the charge they say, "Hogwash."

"Wisconsin is not suffering any appreciable loss of rainfall," Prof. R. A. Bryson, University of Wisconsin meteorologist, emphatically declares.

First rumblings on the rainfall loss question popped up during the New York water shortage. John J. O'Neill, science editor of the New York Herald-Tribune, made a national survey on the problem and came up with figures which indicated Wisconsin had lost 3.84 inches of rainfall over the past 60 years and was facing the danger of becoming semiarid.

In February American magazine published an article under the byline of Oscar L. Chapman, Secretary of the Interior, which restated the same figures, and which was reprinted in Readers Digest. Wisconsin scientists feel that the Department has adopted the O'Neill findings.

These men—Professor Bryson; Ernest F. Bean, Wisconsin State geologist; Frank C. Foley, United States Geological Survey; and Lothar A. Joos, United States Weather Bureau meteorologist—were quick to see the impact such a charge would have on farmers and hydroelectric enterprises in the State.

They immediately went to their record books to check the published findings, and what they found led to the "hogwash" comment.

Here, according to the scientists, is the Wisconsin rainfall picture:

"Wisconsin rainfall records since 1890 show that the average annual total is 30.52 inches," says Joos. "The records also show that the average for the past 10 years is 30.61 inches, slightly more than the long-term average."

These figures hardly indicate rainfall loss, but let's look further.

In looking over the record one fact stands out—the large variations of precipitation from year to year.

As Professor Bryson puts it:

"The year to year rainfall in Wisconsin varies from about 21 inches to 41 inches, so let's look at average rainfall over 5-year periods.

"If we look at the 5-year average record from 1940 on, it looks like our rainfall is decreasing (see broken line of graph). But the previous 10 years record, during recovery from a national drought, looks like a big increase, and the 10 before that is normal.

"This certainly suggests that the changes we see are temporary, due to passing changes in the over-all weather pattern," Bryson points out.

The fluctuations in rainfall present an interesting picture. Wet and dry periods follow each other with amazing consistency and patterns over the years show considerable similarity.

For example, the record shows that two consecutive very wet or very dry years never have occurred. The year following a particularly wet or dry year always has rainfall in amounts closer to the normal range.

Even the periods of slightly wetter or slightly drier than normal follow a definite pattern. The records prove that Wisconsin never has had more than six consecutive years wetter than normal nor five consecutive years drier than normal.

Wisconsin scientists admit that over the past 60 to 70 years changes in rainfall can be found for many parts of the country. Several States have shown declining rainfall, particularly west of Wisconsin.

However, the experts firmly contend that the Wisconsin pattern has remained virtually the same.

O'Neill compared the years 1886–1909 (a 24-year period) with 1914–38 (a 25-year period). Taking the average yearly rainfall for each period and comparing them should show the amount of decrease or increase of one period over the other.

Bryson and Joos made this comparison and found the latter period averaged less than one-half inch less than the former.

Then they added 1910 to the first era to make each 25 years long. The answer showed a decrease of less than one-tenth of an inch.

The pair tried every method they could devise to find how O'Neill arrived at the 3.84-inch-loss figure. They never obtained an answer which corresponded even closely to his findings.

Bryson devised another way of determining the possibility of change. He laid out overlapping 5-year-rainfall averages on a graph, then compared the last 30 years with the first 30.

By superimposing one era on the other it is apparent that they follow each other closely. As Bryson says:

"It doesn't matter much which line is which because they practically fall on top of each other. This, to me, means just one thing: No significant change in rainfall."

To use another figuring possibility, that of comparing the last 10 years with 1891–1900 (a 50-year jump), results show that the last 10-year average is 30.61 inches, compared to a 29.49-inch average for the decade prior to the turn of the century.

"We know," Joos declared, "that it takes more than 1 or 2 years to make a serious drought. Wisconsin rainfall was below normal from 1929 to 1937, a period that included the most serious drought in recent United States history.

"Yet, 1938 brought Wisconsin the wettest year in 59 years of record. This wet period ended in 1945 and we now have completed the fourth year of below normal rainfall."

What then, in summary, is the Wisconsin picture? Bryson speaks first.

"The annual rainfall in Wisconsin is highly variable, but the average rainfall over the years has remained remarkably constant. Five or six wet or dry years may come together, but not more. Our records reveal that the annual rainfall, while fluctuating, has shown no appreciable downward trend."

And Joos concludes:

"Many people have tried to predict future rainfall cycles but such forecast of wet and dry years have not worked out well so far.

"But, we can determine from our past records whether or not there has been a downward trend in the Wisconsin rainfall pattern. Weather records since 1890 do not show a trend toward a drier climate in this State."

Both men join emphatically in saying:

"There are many ways of trying to determine the true rainfall picture. We have tried all the ways we can devise, and our evidence points to the fact that the figures advanced by John J. O'Neill and those appearing in the American article by Oscar L. Chapman are incorrect.

"Wisconsin, as of now, faces no danger of becoming semiarid through diminishing rainfall."

(EDITOR'S NOTE: This is the second in a series of two articles on the Wisconsin rainfall and ground-water situation. It is presented in answer to recent charges that Wisconsin has suffered a severe rainfall decrease.)

(By Jerry Wollan)

MADISON, WIS.—There is no general depletion of ground water in Wisconsin.

This announcement by scientists at the University of Wisconsin adds another clinching link to the chain of denial of recent charges that the State is facing a future semiarid condition due to diminishing rainfall.

Rainfall and ground water are closely tied in determining the State's true situation. There is a direct relation between groundwater levels and the amount of rainfall, according to Frank C. Foley, United States Geological Survey, in charge of ground-water studies in Wisconsin.

He points out that if the State is suffering decreased rains, levels of observation wells would fall and reflect the loss.

Levels in the shallower wells closely follow the wet and dry rainfall periods. During wet years the water levels are high, during dry years they are low. Seasonal fluctuations due to rainfall are much less, even unmeasurable, in artesian wells.

Records of shallow wells in Wisconsin were begun in 1934, during a severe national drought, and levels were extremely low. In 1935 the levels began to come up fast and climbed more or less steadily to 1945–46, when they hit their highest point. Since that time there has been a gradual drop.

This well-record picture is practically identical with the rainfall pattern.

What does this mean?

Foley explains that if Wisconsin rainfall has been decreasing as charged, then ground water in the State must also decrease in a like proportion, barring the normal fluctuations which occur.

"But," Foley declares, "our records show no general decrease in water levels. There is no general depletion of ground water in the State as a whole. This strongly indicates that rainfall, which is the source of ground water, has not decreased on the average."

There are points in the State, however, where ground water is a matter of concern. But the difficulties in these given areas easily can be explained.

In the Marshfield-Neillsville area, for example, the bedrock beneath shallow surface materials will not allow fluids to pass and does not hold water. Because of this geological factor there is a ground-water problem in this locality.

Milwaukee-Waukesha, Green Bay-Fox River valley, and Fond du Lac are areas where substantial drops in ground-water levels and artesian supply have been noted.

Why have levels dropped in these places? Here is what Foley says:

"These areas are heavy municipal and industrial users of water, much of which comes from the ground. Water consumption in the State, and particularly in these regions, has risen greatly because of increased demands of industry and the public during and after the war.

"Because of this continually increasing demand, the withdrawal of vast quantities of ground water has lowered water levels and taken water from storage more rapidly than it has been replenished in some areas.

"Heavy consumption is the real cause of falling ground-water levels in these localities."

Recharge of ground-water supplies at the source is quite constant. Of the State average rainfall of slightly over 30 inches yearly, about 10 inches runs off in the streams and rivers. More is lost through evaporation and transpiration and the remainder goes into ground water, Foley points out.

"Our problem is one of withdrawal, not of supply. We know this because in some areas recharge has kept pace with and even exceeded use.

"The State's ground-water supply is not dropping in certain areas due to natural causes. The causes primarily are man-made," he concludes.

Wisconsin's ground-water program is based on this premise. Scientists are not nearly so concerned about rains recharging and maintaining water reserves as they are about sensible utilization of what is already there and the stable amounts that are expected in the future.

State Geologist Ernest F. Bean sums up the problem this way:

"Continued State development depends on an adequate water supply, much of which must continue to come from the ground. Some control of ground-water withdrawal, in critical areas at least, is essential to afford equitable distribution and to protect present users.

"Some legislation already has appeared and conservation measures are to be encouraged.

"But I want to set the record straight. We do not urge conservation because diminishing rainfall is causing ground-water stores to decrease. The major problem is heavy use in localized areas, use so heavy that natural recharge is not capable of meeting these local demands.

"Wisconsin has a bright future so far as ground water is concerned, provided that future developments and uses are made intelligently and on the basis of adequate scientific and technical data."

This is the Wisconsin picture: Adequate ground-water stores despite recognized critical areas which are man-made. No long term or permanent drop in the amount of rainfall.

American Policy in Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GUY M. GILLETTE

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on American policy in Germany delivered by the junior Senator from Iowa last week.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The officers of the American Jewish Congress have done me a great honor in inviting me to participate in this meeting tonight. The purpose for which this meeting has been called has, of course, my full endorsement, and the spirit which has prompted so many of you to assemble here is a spirit for which I have deep respect and warm sympathy.

Furthermore, I am frankly delighted to have this opportunity to say a few things that I have wanted to say for a long time. I genuinely welcome this chance to take off my gloves, roll up my sleeves, and grapple with a few of the raw facts about what is happening to America and American interests in Germany today.

The sponsors of this meeting deserve the thanks of everyone, here and abroad, who is aware of the terrifying implications of resurgent German power. I congratulate you who have organized this meeting, as well as you who have come to Town Hall tonight in this demonstration of your high sense of citizenship. Perhaps we will all look back on this occasion as the beginning of a Nation-wide campaign to awaken the American people to the meaning of present trends in Germany and to the need for swift action to avert the impending catastrophe.

I am convinced that thoughtful people everywhere are increasingly apprehensive

over the crisis they see approaching in Germany and are increasingly troubled by all that they read and hear from that country.

For months we have been bombarded with headlines about Germany telling stories none of us ever expected to hear again. Let me read you a few of the kind of headlines that have appeared in the American press just in the past 3 months.

These are headlines of newspaper stories appearing in the New York Times, Herald Tribune and Washington Post in the first 3 months of 1950.

January 24: "Ruhr board found of little use now—With only an advisory role left, it is held in danger of becoming a white elephant."

January 28: "German nationalism rising to new climax—Soviet Russia has the power to turn it into a serious crisis at any time."

January 30: "Recovery figures distorted by Bonn—Allied sources say Germans altered industrial index to minimize gains.

February 6: McCloy wants full inquiry on denazification—warns Stuttgart officials; Americans in bribery scandal studied.

February 21: "East German Army of 45,000 men reported trained to aid Russians."

February 23: "Bonn speeds bill to end Nazi trials—Measure eliminating special courts passes its first reading in Parliament. Allied law is attacked. German speakers charge that top Nazis were acquitted while lesser ones paid."

February 24: "New Farben trust seen in Germany. Subsidiaries in Argentina and Spain are said to be tied to budding cartel."

March 2: "Limited atomic work allowed west Germans. Allied Commission grants research in fields of medicine and education."

January 28: "Bonn seen placing check on cartels. West Germans expected to let trusts operate but under rein by government."

March 5: "Russia is building new 'jugend'."

March 8: "SS men get homes of Hitler victims. Another scandal is revealed as United States authorities refuse to act on Nazis' release."

March 12: "German Rightists drawing together. Refugee groups in west also moving consolidation for political purposes."

March 26: "German Reds push 'action' campaign in western zones. Party line exploits Nationalist sentiment, aiming at small farmers and middle class. Inroads visible in Ruhr. Threat of agitation said to lie in drawing together of radical right and left.

April 6: "West strikes snag on trusts in Ruhr. Issue of future ownership sent to Foreign Ministers as Commissioners disagree."

April 8: "ECA says German revival is both 'rapid and dramatic.' "

Finally, from the New York Journal American, April 9, just a week ago last Sunday: "West Germans threaten direct deal with Soviet."

These are 15 or 16 typical headlines in American newspapers this spring. There have been hundreds of others like them. Is it any wonder that people who read these stories day after day are beginning to write to their Senators and Congressmen asking whether the Allies have already lost control of events in occupied Germany?

These reports, which have been coming to us in growing volume for the past year or more, have persuaded me that the time is now long past due for a general, public debate in every city, town, and village in this country on the question of where the present course in Germany is leading us.

On May 8, just 20 days from now, the world will mark the fifth anniversary of the Allied victory over the Nazi armies, the fifth anniversary of the second defeat of a German attempt to conquer the world. Many of us, too, will recall the inexpressible horror we felt when the Nazi murder camps were torn open and the whole world learned the full black record of the Hitler regime.

And many of those who survived that second German onslaught of this century will be asking, on May 8, whether the great war ending in 1945 was the last they will ever have to fight against a German army, or whether it was only another in a series of such wars, the next of which is already in the making.

That, my friends, is why I say that the time has come to find out what lies ahead in Germany.

In recent months we have been having a prolonged debate in the Senate on the disaster that has occurred in China. We have not yet had one on the disaster that may occur in Germany.

Perhaps there would have been no disaster in China, or at least not a disaster of such dimensions, if we had had enough informed public debate in and out of Congress before the conquest of China by the Communists, instead of afterward.

My own purpose, at this stage of developments in Europe, is to aid in generating such broad and active interest in the German problem that, this time, we shall have devoted so much attention to the approaching crisis in Germany that, no matter how it may turn out, there will be no one who can say we have failed to amass the facts, assess the alternatives, and reach a decision on a definite course before, instead of after, the explosion occurs.

My topic this evening is "American Policy in Germany." Unfortunately, I am not certain that the United States has a policy in Germany—or, to put it another way, I am not sure which of the steps we are taking constitute policy originally initiated by us, and which are counteractions taken hurriedly to meet policies laid down in the Soviet Union.

Also, I am as confused as many of you must be, by what seems to be a policy on two levels in Germany, one of verbal pronouncements, the other of actual deeds.

On the record of the last 5 years in Germany we are justified in concluding that all the occupying powers without exception have had a twofold approach to Germany: one represented by noble statements of intention, the other found in the record of their real actions.

Allied intentions were set down with great clarity at the end of the war: we agreed to transform Germany into a democracy and to prevent Germany's armed industrial might from every again menacting the rest of the world. This policy called for democratization of German society, denazification of German politics, decartelization, and deconcentration of German industry, and demilitarization of the German Army and the German state.

Without any knowledge of what went on between 1945 and 1950, a man picking up a newspaper this year, and glancing at headlines such as I have just cited to you, would have a clear picture of how far the Allies have all strayed from the intentions they all stated at the end of the war.

When the enormous gap between verbal pronouncement and actual achievement is called to official attention, of course—when it is pointed out that democracy is a facade in the west and a fraud in the east, when Nazis are shown to be climbing back into the seats of power, when cartels are found prospering under the benevolent protection of the German Republic, and when rearming of Germany is commonplace talk in high government circles on both sides of the iron curtain—when these conditions are pointed out, the official reaction is to blithely say: "Well, what do you expect? We had to rebuild a powerful Germany to stop the Communist drive toward the west."

This response suggests to me that in Germany, as in many other parts of the world, our Government has not yet any real policy worthy of the name, but rather a sort of reactor mechanism, set up to record what the Russians are trying to do, so that we in turn may attempt to stop them from doing it.

The Germans recognized the existence of this reactor mechanism very early after the war, and have played upon it for all it was worth. The mechanism works in the following way: If the Russians are trying to unify Germany, on the basis of resurgent nationalism, the Western Powers must do the same thing. If the Russians incorporate Nazis into their puppet regime in the east, that is excuse enough for ignoring denazification in the west. If the Russians are rebuilding a German Army under their control, then the western Allies must not hesitate long in rearming the German state in the west. So, our policy, if such it can be called, is a reflection of Russian policy.

There is only one sure winner in a game like this—the one who calls the cards—and the Russians, so far, have been calling the cards with increasing rapidity these past few months. They may soon call another in Berlin, if the reported Communist demonstration on May 28 takes place.

We of the west are condemned to lose one trick after another, as long as this sort of game continues. Until we have liberated our thinking from the almost hypnotic trance that has been caused by the rise of Communist power since the war, we shall never be able to seize the initiative—in Germany or anywhere else. We must, at the very least, liberate our thinking to the point where we can deal with the resurgence of Germany, not only in terms of the Russian threat, but in terms of Germany itself, its relations to its neighbors, and its place in our world. In fact, only if we succeed in this, can we ever hope to create the kind of Germany which will not end up in the Russian camp.

Until there has been the kind of widespread public debate on Germany that I am arguing, our Government will not be able to develop a real American policy for Germany; a policy that says what it means and means what it says; a policy that is no mere reaction to another policy made in Moscow; a policy that sets out to save for democracy, whatever can still be saved in Germany; and that neutralizes, if it cannot fully eliminate, the efforts of a resurgent Germany to drag the world once again into war.

Until there has been this kind of discussion, the Congress, the administration, and the people will be the victims of dubious pressure groups, special interest lobbies, and undercover manipulation on behalf of enemies of America in Germany.

Already the Germans are sending agents over here to carry out special missions behind the scenes. One of these agents came to my attention last December, and I tell you the story as a striking illustration of what is happening while public attention is diverted to other, more immediate issues:

I discovered last December that Adolf Hitler's top financial adviser, Hermann Abs, had slipped into New York on a visit reported to involve efforts to raise a substantial loan for the giant German cartel, the United Steel Works (Vereinigte Stahlwerke). During the several weeks Abs had been here before I heard about him, he had visited the following agencies in Washington: the Federal Reserve Board, the Treasury Department, the ECA, the International Monetary Fund, the International Bank, and the Bureau of German Affairs of the State Department.

Rather than for me to tell you what the Abs incident meant, let me read you a paragraph from the United States News, a magazine published in Washington by David Lawrence, in its edition of December 30, 1949:

"Under Hitler, Abs rose to be head of Germany's biggest bank, one that had a key role in financing Hitler's war machine, in plundering occupied Europe. Under the Allies, Abs was first vetoed for a top bank job, then allowed to manage the Reconstruction Loan Corporation, chief banker for German industry. Official explanation is that, since Allies

want Germans to govern selves, Germans must be allowed to choose their own officials. It's a calculated risk. To ex-Nazis, resurrection of big shots of the Hitler era is encouraging. To anti-Nazis, it begins to look as if they have been played for suckers. Antinazism doesn't seem to pay. It may even become dangerous once more. That's the trend in western Germany today. Allied officials are reluctant to admit it. Other observers see it clearly. It's already a major problem."

If it was a major problem last December, it is now becoming a major catastrophe. What will be the official explanation when the Nazis openly take over power in western Germany? What will be the official explanation when German cartels, refinanced by United States dollars, spread their tentacles throughout the western European economy? What will be the official explanation when gentlemen from the same political camp as Mr. Abs sign a pact with gentlemen from Moscow—and Allied policy all over Europe appears as the formless, amorphus, and shapeless thing that it actually is?

I, for one, am not going to wait to find out what official explanations for these phenomena will be. There are many in the Congress who feel the same way.

I am glad to announce to you that Members of both the House and Senate are taking action to bring the facts on Germany before the Congress and before the people as soon as it can be done. We are determined to get the full truth on the record.

Yesterday seven other Senators and I introduced a resolution requesting the establishment of a bipartisan Presidential commission of inquiry into all matters relating to American policy in Germany. Associated with me are Senators of both parties. You will be proud to know that both the Senators from New York, Senator IVES and Senator LEHMAN, are cosponsors of this resolution. The others are Senators HENDRICKSON, of New Jersey; PEPPER, of Florida; KILGORE, of West Virginia; DOUGLAS, of Illinois; and CHAVEZ, of New Mexico. And I understand Members of the House, including Representatives CELLER, JAVITS, and ROOSEVELT, of New York, and others from other States, intend to introduce similar resolutions this week.

We want to know, and we think the American people are entitled to know, the names, the real purposes, and the actual potential strength of all the antidemocratic political parties, groups, and movements active today in Germany; who finances them, for what hidden interests they speak, what are the connections among them, which ones are secretly fronting for the Communists in east Germany, which ones represent indigenous Nazi, pan-German, and other authoritarian forces, and which ones have outside connections with Fascist and Nazi elements lingering on in other countries.

Second, we want to know how far the recartelization of German industry has proceeded, which cartels and trusts are flourishing again, what power they exert over the German political scene, and what influence they have over the relations between the German Republic and other countries in the world.

In other words, we are interested in the extent to which German business has been reconquered by monopoly instead of being transformed into the sort of free, competitive economy which is essential to the functioning of political democracy.

We want to know, third, what, if anything, has been done to reform the German schools and universities, so that they teach democratic ideas and principles to the new generation of German children. We are asking, in effect, whether the German educational system has become an instrument for guiding German youth toward a free society or whether it has remained a machine in the hands of the old ruling elements to produce obedient and willing slaves of the army and of the state.

Fourth, we want to know how widespread is the use of militaristic, ultranationalistic, anti-Semitic, and other antidemocratic propaganda in the German press, radio, and cinema. We are interested in knowing who are the masters of the principal media of news and opinion in Germany today, and to what extent they are the same masters who dominated these media before and during the late war.

Fifth, we want to know what the real level of industrial productivity is, and not merely what the German industrialists are willing to tell the Allied control boards. We must know this if we are to judge the extent to which German war potential is being restored. We are also interested in the reappearance of German military or paramilitary organizations. What, for example, is the mysterious Bruederschaft, the brotherhood of former German Army officers, and what is its power and its aim? How many German generals are secretly working for the Soviet Union toward a day when a new totalitarian Russo-German Axis may be proclaimed to the world.

Likewise, who would be the men in control of any German military force the western Allies might be so foolish as to permit to be formed?

Sixth, we want to know how far Nazis and other enemies of democracy have repenetrated into the political parties and movements, into the courts, into the industrial and commercial life of the country, into the school system, and, last but not least, into the civil service of the new state, the bureaucracy which operates the day-to-day administration of the German Government. Is it true, as reporters have told us, that if the occupation ended tomorrow, Nazis would move back into every seat of power within 24 hours and purge every person who had in any way worked with the Allies in the past 5 years?

Seventh, we want to know the extent to which such prodemocratic elements as survived the Nazi terror have been prevented from taking active part in building postwar Germany. If we know the answer to this, as well as to the question of what strength such prodemocratic elements still have, we may be able to judge what hope there still remains of salvaging something of value in the country.

Eighth, we are interested in knowing what encouragement is being given the Germans to raise their eyes above the level of purely nationalistic aims toward participation in a broader association of free nations. There is plenty of evidence that they are being encouraged to join the Communist association of slave nations. There is also evidence that they are being asked to join a kind of western association that would have little in common with free society, and that might, in fact, end up with Germany in control of it, via the Ruhr and the Rhineland cartels. But we don't know how much effort is expended to lead Germany toward participating in, for example, the proposed Atlantic federal union or some other broad intercontinental group of free countries.

Ninth, we also seek to find out what has happened to economic power in Germany since the war. Has there been any shift of control over basic economic power into the hands of new groups in German society, or, on the contrary, has the same small feudalistic class of the same individuals, families and groups regained economic power that it exerted before the outbreak of war? Political power in Germany, it must be remembered, has always been secondary to economic power—hence, those who dominate the great blocs of economic power, especially in coal, iron, steel and other heavy industry, as well as those who control vast portions of the agricultural land, are inevitably the ones who rule the State above and outside the political parties and regimes. When we have the answer to this particular question, we will know how far we have succeeded or failed in our efforts to make Germany into a democratic country. If we find that economic power still rests in the hands of the same feudal group that has always held it, we will know that whatever democratic institutions, parties and constitutions we may have helped build will go down in total collapse the moment we are no longer there to prop them up.

Finally, our resolution asks the presidential commission of inquiry to determine whether or not ECA funds have been used to strengthen prodemocratic elements and tendencies in western Germany. As of April 2, 1950, Marshall plan authorizations to Germany had totalled $840,403,000. This year the sums allocated to Germany will be so great as to place her second in the receiving line after Great Britain. We must not allow ourselves to be enthralled by the handsome charts and graphs which the economists provide us, showing curves of production, comparison with the 1936 index, and so on.

What is crucial is what is being done with all this production, who is benefiting by it in terms of economic and political power, how will 11,000,000 tons of steel, 18,000,000 tons, or any number of million tons of steel in the Ruhr aid the growth of democracy in western Germany? We wish to know what will happen to German democracy if all those tons of steel are produced and distributed under the absolute control of the very same men, man for man, who produced steel for the German Army and the Nazi war machine.

These are questions which the sponsors of this resolution ask to have answered by a Presidential commission of inquiry, on behalf of the Congress and of the people of the Nation. Until we have those answers, we in the Congress cannot hope to legislate intelligently. Until the American people have those answers, they cannot instruct us, their representatives, how they think we should act in their interest. And, frankly, I do not believe that the executive departments themselves, including the ECA, the State Department, and the Defense Department, can plan and make policy intelligently without the answers to these questions before them at every step.

It is fatuous to assume, as some of our supposedly realistic policy makers seem to assume, that we don't need to worry much about what kind of German state exists in the west (so long as it isn't Communist), because we need German production and German manpower in the contest with Moscow and, anyway, we can outbid the Russians for Germany's allegiance wherever we have to.

I say it is fatuous, because great questions of international politics are not settled by bribery, no matter how defined. The rulers of Germany will make up their minds according to their own self-interest, as they see it. The real question is who are to be the rulers of Germany.

Responsible officers in our Government appear to understand very well the threat of communism in Germany and the nature of the Soviet bid for its kind of German unity. But do they recognize the threat of resurgent nazism in Germany and the nature of its bid for a Soviet alliance?

Are we even mentally prepared for a putsch by the sinister elements that have reemerged in western Germany—the cartel industrialists, the pan-German politicians, the feudal militarists, the Nazis, ex-Nazis, and neo-Nazis of every stripe? How will we deal with these elements when they have finally blackmailed the Allies into yielding full liberty of action to their German Republic? What will we do when they install a naked totalitarian

regime, smash the labor unions, organize a conquest of western Europe by cartel and political penetration, expel American influence from the continent of Europe—and then proceed to ally themselves in a gigantic totalitarian bloc with their supposed enemies, the Communists of the Soviet Union?

Today we do not have the information such as our resolution seeks to obtain. We must depend on newspaper accounts, magazine articles, and books. From these sources we are obliged to accept, for lack of contradictory evidence, a shattering indictment of the real, as distinguished from the verbal, Allied policy in the postwar years in Germany.

But, worse than the grisly farce of denazification, worse than the sabotage of the decartelization program, worse than the cruel rejection of the few German democratic elements left after Hitler, worse even than the abject capitulation to the most outrageous demands of German nationalism—worse than all these has been the complete refusal or inexcusable failure to undertake the most obviously necessary step of all: to set the stage for remaking the whole underlying social and economic structure of Germany by wiping out the powerful feudal basis from which Prussian militarism, industrial cartelism, pan-German aggression, and national socialism have sprung.

Because of this monstrous failure, we and the French and the British and the Russians all share the frightful responsibility for recreating the German menace. The occupying countries in 1945 had the power to save Europe from another German war. None of them has exercised that power. All Germany's neighbors know this. All Germany's neighbors again are trembling for their safety. They tremble all the more since they know that the menace this time may very well mean their subjugation not merely by German force, but by an alliance of a re-Nazified Germany with the Soviet Union—by another and far more fearsome totalitarian Axis.

The simple rule we have not yet learned is that the only allies of democracy are democratic people. Failure to transform Germany into a democratic society means that power reverts to the same elements that ruled Germany in the past. Failure to democratize Germany, as we said we intended to do, is the result of a complete misunderstanding of what had to be done to prevent a Soviet triumph in central Europe. We seem to have done all the wrong things, and none of the right ones. A day of reckoning will come over Germany, just as it came over China. I suspect that the resulting explosion in the United States will make the outcry over China seem like a pleasant afternoon tea. For in Germany it will be seen that we have not only lost the Second World War—that the Nazis rather than we were the victors—but that we have prepared the way for us to lose a third world war, if it comes.

I realize that I have painted a black picture tonight, blacker than some may believe it to be. But until evidence is shown me that contradicts what I have said, I cannot in honesty relieve the blackness by even a touch of gray.

Of one thing I am certain, however, and this thought I hope you will ponder at length. In all the years I have spent in public life, I have never seen the American people fail to be right on great public questions when all the facts were spread before them. In an issue as complex as Germany, covered over as it is by layers of propaganda from every conceivable source, it is taking the people of this country longer than usual to grasp exactly what is going on. When they do—and it is certain that they will—they will see to it that Washington hears from them in unmistakable terms as to what they want done. I pray only that their awareness will come in time for the effects of their thinking to be translated into action by our Government in its relations with the German state and the German people.

What the States Pay Out in Revenue and What They Receive in Return

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD, under leave to extend heretofore granted, two tables which I think will be revealing to the Members from the various States.

The first table shows the total internal-revenue collections by States and Territories, fiscal years 1940–49 in millions of dollars. The second table gives a summary of Federal expenditures by year and by State made as direct payments to States under cooperative arrangements and within States to provide relief and other aid, fiscal years 1940–49, inclusive, in millions of dollars.

The tables follow:

TABLE 1.—*Total internal revenue collections by States and Territories, fiscal years 1940–49* [1]

[In millions of dollars]

State	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944	1945	1946	1947	1948	1949
Alabama	17.1	25.8	67.4	142.4	248.0	253.9	239.0	244.3	276.9	259.5
Alaska	1.0	1.5	4.0	4.9	18.8	19.9	15.2	15.8	18.9	18.2
Arizona	5.1	6.2	13.5	33.5	69.0	71.3	76.2	76.0	83.8	82.1
Arkansas	8.5	12.6	29.0	54.7	92.3	98.5	102.3	109.0	121.8	115.9
California	315.3	405.7	755.7	1,411.3	3,371.7	3,722.5	3,369.4	3,144.4	3,103.7	2,955.9
Colorado	35.9	41.5	67.7	117.6	214.6	226.9	243.2	263.9	291.8	277.0
Connecticut	83.9	143.2	313.5	546.5	904.6	875.7	699.2	646.3	664.9	642.6
Delaware	79.9	134.4	208.1	315.3	417.7	466.3	403.0	323.6	308.2	306.2
District of Columbia	28.5	39.4	84.2	165.9	419.7	415.1	509.9	485.9	394.3	[2]
Florida	44.8	57.1	98.3	155.9	343.9	384.8	394.6	413.7	393.4	342.6
Georgia	37.8	52.3	102.3	199.0	386.1	419.0	405.4	410.7	439.0	403.5
Hawaii	9.9	14.0	32.4	76.5	150.8	174.0	141.6	106.3	108.2	91.2
Idaho	4.1	6.3	13.0	31.0	58.8	59.8	60.2	66.0	79.9	76.4
Illinois	427.1	609.3	1,096.1	1,880.7	3,231.8	3,766.3	3,545.7	3,447.1	3,785.8	3,569.8
Indiana	127.9	176.1	327.9	497.6	831.5	943.1	916.3	916.7	1,011.9	950.5
Iowa	25.2	32.9	67.2	137.7	293.2	321.2	318.3	348.8	446.8	407.9
Kansas	22.6	28.4	62.7	164.0	355.8	423.9	389.6	366.3	406.1	401.9
Kentucky	147.8	186.8	264.8	420.6	552.3	699.0	709.3	739.7	780.5	812.3
Louisiana	49.0	63.6	105.3	165.4	309.4	350.5	342.8	325.1	354.3	357.4
Maine	15.6	17.8	36.7	71.1	147.9	150.1	135.2	124.2	130.7	117.5
Maryland	104.4	140.8	230.7	422.7	710.4	848.7	722.4	678.2	752.0	1,068.1
Massachusetts	172.6	235.1	441.9	800.6	1,499.2	1,490.9	1,450.5	1,342.6	1,347.1	1,232.0
Michigan	287.2	497.9	788.0	1,188.0	2,370.6	2,579.8	1,970.1	1,779.4	2,252.3	2,564.5
Minnesota	68.5	88.4	149.0	306.7	576.6	652.0	600.0	612.2	706.2	669.0
Mississippi	6.6	9.3	24.4	48.9	88.2	91.1	92.9	98.3	106.8	100.7
Missouri	138.6	167.3	298.4	540.3	970.9	1,146.1	1,090.4	1,061.8	1,115.0	1,095.2
Montana	6.8	9.5	17.3	40.4	56.8	61.7	59.3	68.5	85.2	78.9
Nebraska	20.8	27.1	48.5	105.3	223.6	245.2	281.1	296.3	323.4	276.2
Nevada	4.4	6.7	11.6	21.9	35.7	33.9	38.4	42.8	41.8	38.1
New Hampshire	9.2	10.3	21.6	42.1	74.1	81.2	77.4	82.3	85.4	71.5
New Jersey	207.0	268.1	496.4	801.1	1,392.6	1,439.1	1,274.0	1,267.4	1,272.2	1,151.1
New Mexico	4.4	4.5	9.0	19.1	37.2	37.7	45.9	48.1	55.3	55.4
New York	1,053.3	1,469.9	2,583.3	4,348.4	7,409.5	8,261.5	8,114.6	7,723.9	7,975.5	7,427.2
North Carolina	329.2	393.9	490.8	672.4	892.3	875.0	1,092.7	1,183.0	1,238.7	1,166.7
North Dakota	1.7	2.5	6.1	15.9	34.6	41.5	44.1	50.3	69.2	61.7
Ohio	306.1	429.9	928.7	1,626.0	2,950.5	3,056.0	2,588.8	2,443.6	2,665.7	2,626.3
Oklahoma	57.7	78.7	112.1	156.8	271.2	307.3	290.7	300.0	368.5	418.8
Oregon	14.5	22.8	58.9	130.5	315.9	318.9	273.9	284.2	316.8	298.8
Pennsylvania	465.1	637.8	1,163.7	2,007.9	3,376.9	3,712.3	3,206.6	2,986.1	3,222.8	3,213.4
Philippine Islands	.4	.4	.2							
Puerto Rico	2.4	4.1	2.3	2.5	3.4	2.3	2.5	2.7	2.1	2.3
Rhode Island	27.5	43.9	85.6	156.6	256.9	246.3	225.9	216.3	236.2	214.8
South Carolina	11.0	16.7	48.0	105.9	173.9	181.6	181.3	178.3	207.5	205.0
South Dakota	2.1	3.1	6.7	16.6	37.4	38.0	45.6	51.9	76.2	64.1
Tennessee	35.6	47.4	92.4	162.1	303.7	335.2	324.6	338.8	359.1	333.2
Texas	132.4	178.2	312.9	536.1	1,037.4	1,152.5	1,074.3	1,085.7	1,285.1	1,381.2
Utah	10.9	14.3	23.7	45.4	85.9	84.6	81.9	84.2	92.2	90.7
Vermont	4.6	7.9	16.7	32.1	52.2	52.5	45.5	44.8	46.9	40.7

[1] Internal revenue collections include income taxes, estate and gift taxes, excise taxes, and employment taxes. Tax receipts are credited by the States in which the collections are made. Receipts in the various States do not indicate the tax burden of the respective States, since the taxes may be eventually borne by persons in other States.

[2] Separate figures no longer available. Included with Maryland.

TABLE 1.—*Total internal revenue collections by States and Territories, fiscal years 1940–49*—Continued

[In millions of dollars]

State	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944	1945	1946	1947	1948	1949
Virginia	224.6	284.9	399.4	563.5	830.5	823.1	751.9	739.0	768.6	770.3
Washington	31.7	54.5	126.2	287.0	605.5	625.7	543.6	484.4	514.2	488.8
West Virginia	22.4	33.5	59.2	99.6	179.3	191.3	192.4	196.7	236.7	242.7
Wisconsin	86.4	121.8	235.2	460.7	822.2	916.2	841.5	730.0	799.5	788.2
Wyoming	3.1	4.1	8.9	16.6	28.9	29.4	30.8	32.6	39.0	38.8
Total	5,340.5	7,370.1	13,047.9	22,371.4	40,121.8	43,800.4	40,672.1	39,108.4	41,864.5	40,463.1

Source: Annual Reports of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

TABLE 2.—*Summary of Federal expenditures by year and by State made as direct payments to States under cooperative arrangements and within States to provide relief and other aid, fiscal years 1940 to 1949, inclusive*

[In millions of dollars]

State	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944	1945	1946	1947	1948	1949
Alabama	84.3	72.8	64.9	63.6	34.3	26.7	21.3	30.1	133.4	133.9
Arizona	25.7	22.6	19.7	15.9	11.0	10.3	9.8	16.4	31.9	32.4
Arkansas	77.3	65.9	59.6	40.2	25.1	18.5	15.9	25.3	97.0	93.5
California	192.8	192.7	199.6	205.1	114.8	102.6	93.5	121.9	393.4	373.0
Colorado	61.2	50.8	43.5	34.3	29.0	27.2	25.2	30.7	78.0	80.8
Connecticut	33.0	28.6	37.0	33.8	11.9	9.7	9.9	13.0	57.2	52.5
Delaware	6.0	5.6	4.5	5.6	3.1	2.9	2.5	3.6	9.7	10.0
District of Columbia	53.9	62.9	53.5	43.5	11.8	8.5	7.8	10.0	44.6	49.2
Florida	47.4	45.9	52.5	34.2	29.9	25.6	21.6	30.0	105.7	111.4
Georgia	81.2	72.4	68.9	65.5	38.5	31.7	27.1	41.5	133.7	135.8
Idaho	36.7	30.0	22.9	16.9	18.4	11.8	11.7	16.8	32.5	30.6
Illinois	236.1	199.3	167.4	147.5	105.1	65.5	62.3	76.2	278.7	279.3
Indiana	106.9	85.0	82.6	74.4	48.7	30.0	27.4	37.4	112.9	109.7
Iowa	108.0	93.1	86.8	84.9	62.8	30.0	31.2	37.1	98.8	88.6
Kansas	75.7	67.5	67.5	70.3	52.8	25.2	20.8	33.2	70.2	60.9
Kentucky	64.2	62.0	54.7	34.7	26.2	23.7	22.7	34.5	104.1	91.5
Louisiana	74.1	62.7	57.0	39.4	37.4	26.7	32.7	33.3	106.3	150.1
Maine	18.6	17.3	17.3	19.5	13.1	7.6	7.4	10.5	31.5	30.1
Maryland	34.2	29.3	55.9	38.8	23.3	13.5	11.9	15.3	51.3	54.3
Massachusetts	115.5	99.0	84.6	57.3	32.8	29.8	29.5	40.4	177.8	165.8
Michigan	132.1	109.4	91.5	85.5	64.7	52.3	47.0	61.0	193.5	193.7
Minnesota	106.4	92.4	81.7	59.3	48.1	31.6	36.6	41.5	124.1	113.1
Mississippi	80.6	70.8	64.7	40.7	28.8	22.0	17.9	27.5	102.5	107.9
Missouri	124.8	106.7	93.9	74.1	54.1	42.4	41.3	57.3	189.2	178.9
Montana	45.5	35.6	30.0	22.0	20.8	15.9	16.0	17.9	33.1	31.8
Nebraska	78.6	68.3	58.6	50.2	42.4	25.2	21.0	28.7	56.1	49.1
Nevada	9.8	9.5	6.9	8.0	4.2	3.6	3.1	6.0	8.4	10.5
New Hampshire	13.0	11.8	14.3	5.8	4.0	3.8	3.7	5.0	20.3	19.4
New Jersey	90.5	80.8	65.2	33.2	21.9	17.7	16.9	22.6	114.5	110.6
New Mexico	30.3	26.7	21.5	11.6	10.4	9.5	10.1	14.1	31.7	32.3
New York	244.9	228.5	178.2	125.5	72.4	65.4	68.1	86.0	432.9	417.3
North Carolina	75.2	71.0	67.7	59.2	35.6	26.2	22.5	35.5	146.1	150.8
North Dakota	50.8	39.9	37.1	26.2	28.4	12.1	20.4	14.7	31.5	29.1
Ohio	188.4	160.0	128.6	116.6	76.1	55.9	48.9	63.8	237.0	226.5
Oklahoma	93.2	75.8	74.2	47.7	48.6	37.9	41.1	58.4	142.3	135.3
Oregon	44.6	39.0	34.6	66.0	25.9	24.5	18.8	25.8	63.5	67.0
Pennsylvania	211.8	200.5	183.3	107.0	63.1	54.2	48.0	67.9	359.3	355.9
Rhode Island	18.1	16.0	10.9	9.0	5.4	4.5	4.1	5.1	31.8	30.7
South Carolina	59.7	61.3	57.9	39.6	22.9	19.1	14.6	21.9	82.9	89.0
South Dakota	46.2	37.0	33.8	22.6	22.9	13.2	11.7	15.2	29.3	26.8
Tennessee	67.3	59.8	57.0	35.4	30.6	31.4	27.9	33.7	149.0	157.1
Texas	225.4	187.4	196.4	158.6	105.7	85.5	76.9	110.6	352.9	343.5
Utah	26.7	25.0	20.6	25.5	15.2	13.5	10.7	15.8	38.4	36.0
Vermont	9.2	9.4	6.8	5.6	3.3	3.3	3.9	5.4	16.7	16.1
Virginia	46.1	44.8	63.2	109.0	36.4	24.8	20.0	22.6	80.9	74.9
Washington	61.1	56.3	61.5	127.6	50.7	41.0	36.0	41.4	95.3	92.7
West Virginia	46.2	41.4	39.0	31.5	12.8	14.1	12.4	16.6	60.5	52.4
Wisconsin	93.9	78.0	64.0	43.7	32.9	28.6	27.7	35.6	99.9	101.7
Wyoming	19.6	16.7	12.2	8.7	6.9	8.2	8.7	11.6	19.7	20.0
Alaska	3.4	2.3	6.0	2.5	1.4	1.5	1.6	2.1	3.8	3.6
Bermuda							.1			
Hawaii	15.5	15.7	18.6	12.6	13.1	13.9	13.0	10.5	17.6	22.7
Puerto Rico	29.5	32.4	43.0	32.0	19.7	20.0	18.9	17.9	62.7	72.3
Virgin Islands	.7	.7	1.0	1.1	.2	.2	.1	.2	.9	1.3
Undistributed				.7	2.5	2.7	27.7	36.8	−26.0	−9.6
Total	3,922.3	3,476.4	3,225.6	2,729.7	1,762.1	1,353.4	1,290.1	1,694.1	5,551.1	5,493.7

Source: Annual reports of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Marshall Plan of Ideas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM BENTON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a three-column featured editorial appearing in the April 19 issue of the Christian Century, entitled "Marshall Plan of Ideas." This great magazine asks, "Does Congress really want a democratic world?" It endorses my resolution and calls for nothing less than a world missionary movement on behalf of democracy.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARSHALL PLAN OF IDEAS

The Marshall plan recently passed its midpoint. After 2 years of operation, it is obvious to any impartial mind that it is playing a significant role in European recovery. If that recovery fails, as it may, it will not be because of the Marshall Plan, but in spite of it. Europe still has a long way to go, but without American aid, given through what Mr. Churchill called "one of the most unsordid acts of history," it would not have made a beginning.

The success of the economic Marshall Plan has caused Senator WILLIAM BENTON to pro-

pose a "Marshall plan in the realm of ideas." The Connecticut Senator is the only Member of the present Senate who has served as an Assistant Secretary of State. Out of his 2 years' experience under Secretary Byrnes, he realizes more keenly than most Senators how intense is the battle now being fought between communism and democracy for the minds and loyalties of men. Senator BENTON is also one of the few Members of the senior legislative body who have worked in advertising, publication, and education. Out of this background he has developed a conviction that world public opinion can be influenced for good and has formed some ideas as to how to go about it.

This faith and know-how Senator BENTON sets forth in a resolution which he has introduced in the Senate. Recognizing that force, the threat of violence and the expenditure of vast sums cannot in themselves answer Communist propaganda, he proposes a global offensive in behalf of the ideas which express democratic principles and aspirations. It may be argued that his timing is bad, since the upper house seems determined to let the business of government slide while it plays politics with Senator MCCARTHY. But this fact may rebound to the benefit of a constructive proposal of this character when the upper house recovers its sense of duty and its perspective.

The world situation certainly demands that we take the lead in a greatly expanded program of information and education among the peoples of the world, who are not permitted to share the Senate's leisure and who are only mildly interested in its passions. James Burnham argues that point cogently in his recent book, The Coming Defeat of Communism. Believing that the Soviet structure of power is essentially vulnerable, he declares that it can be overthrown without war if the western nations use the means at their disposal, including a massive propaganda attack, to that end.

Senator BENTON'S proposal is confined to the development of a world-wide program of information and education. This can be done, he says, in six ways. (1) Our diplomacy must be geared to securing universal freedom of information. (2) We should greatly extend the support we give to the work of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization. (3) We should expand the Ofiice of International Information and Educational Exchange in our own State Department by increasing the number of educational films sent abroad, multiplying the number of foreign students brought to the United States, and setting up ways of a world broadcasting network. In these and other ways we should do everything possible to penetrate the walls of censorship which isolate the people under Communist control, as well as to reach others not yet overrun.

Senator BENTON seeks also (4) to increase the current efforts to promote democratic education abroad, especially in Germany and Japan; (5) to convene a conference of non-Communist nations to coordinate and improve their information programs; and (6) to establish a non-governmental agency to guide and inspire the efforts of the millions of private American citizens who might use their talents and resources and contact overseas in furtherance of the programs and objectives of this resolution. This is a bold and spacious conception, and it deserves serious consideration.

More than that, it deserves support in principle. If we are losing the cold war, as many believe, it is because we are losing the battle for the minds and loyalties of men. This is not because the conceptions of freedom and democracy inherently lack strength and liberating power. The contrary is true. Rather, it is in part, because, as Senator BENTON says, "day in and day out, in two score languages, in every medium of communication from a whispered rumor to a globe-girdling radio, everywhere from a remote Burmese village to the Security Council of the United Nations, the Communists play the same propaganda tune. * * * It revolves around five themes: (1) The United States is headed for a cataclysmic economic crash. (2) The rulers of the United States are Fascists, warmongers, and capitalists. (3) Although the rich of the United States are getting richer, everybody else is getting poorer, and there is starvation, unrest, and growing sympathy for the Soviet Union among the masses. (4) America's vaunted freedom is a fraud and our doctrine of equality is belied by racial and religious discrimination. (5) Our character is bad—we are culturally barbarous, money-mad, lawless, crime-ridden, and effete."

This Communist propaganda offensive is having a profound effect, particularly among the peoples of southeast Asia and Asia, who have not had first-hand experience with communism but have had such relations with colonialism. Walter Lippmann recently declared that "we are losing touch with the peoples of the world—with their fears, their hopes, their needs, their purposes, and their will to survive—and we are talking not to them but to ourselves, in a self-induced mood of defeatism and impotence, about how much we must distrust one another and our own better instincts and our own capacity to think and believe." We ought to make it a first consideration to recover effective contact with the peoples of the world. We should realize that this is essentially a missionary task in the field of politics. In its essence, democracy is the application to the relationships of men of true and morally right principle. As a political concept, it needs to be proclaimed with skill in the use of modern media of mass communication, with sacrificial zeal and convincing power. It has nothing to fear from Communist competition so long as men are in position to learn the truth and to make a free choice. It can rely on the truth, and the truth can always win over what Communists seek to justify as the historic lie if it is fearlessly and diligently proclaimed and defended.

Senator BENTON'S resolution, which is cosponsored by a dozen Senators of both parties, simply asks the Senate to endorse the outline of his proposal for a Marshall Plan in the field of ideas. It does not carry an estimate of costs and it is not linked with an authorization for expenditure. It would obviously cost a great deal more than the $31,000,000 which the Department of State is spending this year for its world-wide program of public relations. But if some action of this kind can contribute vitally to victory in the ideological contest which is now going on in the world, as it can, it deserves support. Even if the whole program is not approved by an economy-minded Congress, a part of it may be.

Today half the member nations of the United Nations practice some form of censorship. American influence is helping to break down these walls and it can do more. UNESCO, with a budget of only $8,000,000 a year, is making a significant contribution to world peace and security. It could do a great deal more if it were adequately supported, as the United States delegation to that body is urging. The few documentary films on American life which the State Department has distributed abroad portray, generally accurately and effectively, what life as we know it in this country actually is. What might it not mean if one-fourth of the population of the earth could see documentaries of this kind once a month. Foreign students educated in America have almost always been among our best friends abroad. An exchange program which would absorb 50,000 or 100,000 such students a year would make an incalculable contribution to world understanding.

An example cited by Mr. BENTON is worth pondering. "The ECA, under its technical assistance program, brought 600 people from European industry and agriculture last year to study our methods. Two among the 600 were influential Italian labor leaders. When these two had seen American labor-management relations at first hand, when they had seen that our workers share in the benefits of increased productivity and from the use of labor-saving machinery, when they had seen that competition is not without its economic value to our workers, they went back to Italy, pulled 700,000 workers out of the big Communist-dominated general trade union and launched an independent union."

America's task, we repeat, is nothing less than to organize a world missionary movement on behalf of democracy. Such an attempt does not imply that we have nothing more to do to make democratic principles more effective at home. It does not imply that the Christian missionary movement should become in any way organizationally entangled or involved in this essentially political effort. That indeed would be a grave disservice to the Christian church, which all concerned should seek to avoid. A world-wide missionary campaign on behalf of liberty and equality would have powerful effects among colonial peoples who are seeking the freedom which so many millions have gained in recent years.

It might even backfire to make our own underprivileged minorities demand a larger share of participation in the political and economic benefits which the majority have. Let it! A risk that the missionary always runs is that the creed he preaches will lay hold of his own life and revolutionize it to a degree he did not anticipate. If he wholeheartedly believes, he will not fear but welcome such an outcome. Does Congress really want a democratic world? Do we?

False Picture of United States Abroad Held To Antedate Red Efforts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM BENTON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by a distinguished foreign correspondent, Harold Callender, which appeared in this morning's New York Times. As Assistant Secretary of State, I used to point out that there was a great need for a United States informational and educational exchange program throughout the world—even, if, as I once put it, the Pacific Ocean were to open up and swallow the U. S. S. R., and communism were to be abolished from the earth. Misunderstanding and mistrust of the United States is deeply entrenched in many areas of the world, and is widespread even in England. The Communist propaganda has capitalized upon and exaggerated attitudes toward America and beliefs

about us, the origins of which go back for decades or centuries.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FALSE PICTURE OF UNITED STATES ABROAD HELD TO ANTEDATE RED EFFORTS—TRUMAN DISPUTED BY OBSERVERS IN EUROPE WHO SAY HATRED OF CAPITALISM IS PROBLEM

(By Harold Callender)

PARIS, April 23.—Upon reading President Truman's speech to the American Society of Newspaper Editors, now available textually, experienced observers here were surprised by the apparent disposition of the President and his advisers to assume that Communist propaganda was mainly responsible for the distorted views of the United States held abroad.

Calling for a campaign of enlightenment to counteract this propaganda, the President emphasized its exploitation of the desires for peace and for social justice on the part of the masses of Europe and Asia and the false picture it gave of the United States.

But it was pointed out that prejudices against the United States far antedate this propaganda, and that they derive in Europe from a long-standing hatred of what Europeans consider capitalism, from anti-American sentiments that have become traditional, and from a lack of understanding of current American foreign policy.

Communism did not create any of these rich resources that lie ready for use by its propaganda but it has adroitly utilized them, in the opinion of those who have given most attention to the question.

APPEAL TO OLD PREJUDICES

These observers consider that Moscow's propaganda would lose much of its sting were it not for its ability to appeal to old and deep-seated prejudices against the United States that exist in circles extending far beyond the wage-earning groups and that are still propagated by some on both the left and the right.

It is contended that in facing the problem of enlightening the world regarding the United States and its policies, full account must be taken not only of the picture of the United States drawn by Communist propaganda but of that which existed in European minds before the Communists started to work on them.

In the Far East the United States faces not merely or mainly Communist propaganda but profound fear and dislike of the west and its colonial encroachments, it is pointed out. This fear and dislike had spread over Asia long before Premier Stalin began to exploit them in favor of what he ingeniously calls popular democracy.

This fact is painfully familiar to the State Department, which for this reason has been urging the French to promise full independence to Indochina or eventual French withdrawal from that country. The Department realizes the handicap under which it labors in appearing to support a remnant of the former colonial rule of the west in Asia.

TWO OUTSTANDING KINDS

In much the same way the United States must contend in Europe not only with skillful Communist propaganda but with prejudices that may be called indigenous non-Communist and pre-Communist. The two outstanding kinds are the following:

First, a deeply rooted and long-cultivated anticapitalist sentiment among the wage earners. It reflects the low wages and bad housing long associated with capitalism as understood by these wage earners—that is, with European capitalism, a different species from the American. But European workers do not understand this distinction. To them the United States is the classic type of a capitalistic society of which they believe low pay is an indispensable attribute.

Second, equally deeply rooted and long-cultivated prejudices against the United States in the more fortunate classes, notably among many intellectuals who look upon the United States as a culturally backward country that has not caught up with—or is rapidly departing from—the high and unique civilization of Europe.

By playing upon these two types of prejudice, the Communists appeal not only to those who work hard for an ill-paid livelihood but also to many who live well and have leisure for the intellectual enjoyments that often include expression of contempt for the United States. Those who read the Communist press of western Europe know how skillfully this double appeal is made.

IGNORANCE, MISTRUST OF UNITED STATES

In France, where Communist propaganda has perhaps made the greatest headway anywhere in western Europe except Italy, its principal assets are the anticapitalism instilled during a generation or two by both Socialists and Communists, and a widespread ignorance and distrust of the United States in other than the wage-earning classes.

It does no harm to Communist propaganda when distinguished conservative writers, contributing to very conservative newspapers, take pot shots at the United States on other grounds—like the recent writer who proclaimed that the United States and the Soviet Union were both menaces for Europe because they were killing individualism by their mass production. He did not take the next logical step and say that western Europe should be neutral as between the two. But other writers did.

This was not Communist propaganda. But it was grist for the Communists' mill since the spirit of neutrality in western Europe would suit their strategy and injure that of the United States.

As for the economic assets of Communist propaganda, the Marshall plan has helped restore French production, and wages have risen to a level probably not far from that in 1938. The Communists have suffered as a result. But this wage level was not satisfactory in 1938 and is even less satisfactory today. So the Communists have plenty of ammunition left, as the French Government knows to its sorrow.

HAS ALIENATED WAGE EARNERS

On the economic side it appears that United States propaganda must contrast the American way of life not only with that of Russia but with that of western Europe, which has alienated wage earners from what they think is American capitalism.

As for the anti-American intellectuals, any counterpropaganda must meet their argument that the United States has abandoned European standards of culture based on individualism and the Latin heritage. It must counteract the picture, drawn in scholarly books and pictures, of the United States as a kind of highly mechanized barbarism.

Observers in Europe believe that United States policies need a lot of explaining too. Europeans are being asked to rearm in accordance with the North Atlantic Treaty. But neither governments nor the public quite see how this treaty is to guarantee against an invasion of western Europe. The French want to know how far and how long the United States will help them defend Indochina and how strong the United States intends that western Germany shall become.

After 1952—West Europe Faces Up to a Dilemma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GUY M. GILLETTE
OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a significant article by Harold Callender, appearing in the New York Times, entitled "After 1952—West Europe Faces Up To a Dilemma."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AFTER 1952—WEST EUROPE FACES UP TO A DILEMMA

(By Harold Callender)

PARIS, April 22.—Georges Bidault, Premier of France, made this week a proposal that had in it far more than met the eye.

It amounted to a suggestion for a reappraisal of the entire field of strategic, economic and political relations among the nations of western Europe and North America—those relations having become obscure, contradictory and in some respects unreal.

M. Bidault's proposal implied a reexamination of United States foreign policy—the major factor in all those relations—as it has been expressed in the Marshall plan, in the North Atlantic Treaty and in the planning, aspirations and slogans engendered by those two enterprises.

The purpose was to reconcile the aims of the Marshall plan looking to the economic recovery of western Europe and the aims of the Atlantic Treaty, which seem to threaten this recovery by necessitating expenditures on armaments that the European nations cannot afford.

To put it in another way, the urgency behind M. Bidault's proposal was the need to insure that the North Atlantic group of nations could avoid in coming years both inflation and depression, either of which would appear to confirm the Moscow thesis that the capitalist world was doomed.

BALANCE OF FORCES

The apparent confirmation of this thesis might frustrate the huge efforts now being made to maintain peace by a balance of forces and certainly would impair the ability of the western world to "create strength" in areas where it was necessary, as Secretary of State Acheson expressed it.

The economy of the western world is considered as important in the cold war as its military equipment. The dilemma is to determine how to ration resources and effort between the two. The conviction in western Europe is that this cannot be done on a national or even a continental scale, but it can be done only by North America and western Europe working together to an extent not yet envisaged in accepted policies.

Such was the meaning of the rather brief proposal of M. Bidault for creation of an Atlantic High Council to coordinate the defense, economic policies and politics of the Atlantic coalition.

These three subjects have so far been carefully kept apart and confided to different authorities, as if they were unrelated or only tenuously or incidentally related. French

logic has now linked them together as forming a single task that the western world will ignore at its peril. The French have lost much of their former power and political prestige, but M. Bidault's proposal shows they can still produce ideas.

Washington apparently had already foreseen at least some of these problems when President Truman appointed Gordon Gray to study what the United States could do after the end of the Marshall plan in 1952, to steady the trade and insure the solvency of western Europe.

It was thus recognized that the economic viability of western Europe, which it was once thought would result from the Marshall plan, would still be dubious and that the surplus production of the United States would remain a problem.

It was widely believed that the Marshall plan would enable western Europe to stand on its feet economically by 1952 and cease to be either an economic or a strategic headache for the United States. This was dangerously exaggerated conception, like some of the other arguments used to sell the Marshall plan to Congress.

One of these was that the plan would contribute to the unity of western Europe or its economic integration. Some United States officials have since regretted the use of these deceptive terms. For very little unity will result, and even if western Europe were fully unified, it would still face the balance of payments problem that Mr. Gray is to study.

WEAPON IN COLD WAR

While in Europe the emphasis was upon restoration of economic life with Marshall aid, in the United States the Marshall plan was seen increasingly as an instrument in the cold war. Perhaps it was considered a sufficient instrument in the beginning, since Soviet pressure was mainly exerted through the Communist parties within the European countries.

But soon the feeling developed that the economic arm of American foreign policy was not enough and that some military gesture by the United States was necessary. This feeling owed much to the Soviet blockade of Berlin in 1948. The North Atlantic Pact was the result.

The usefulness of the pact lay first of all in the fact that it involved or implied a United States commitment to go to war if western Europe were invaded, and in the idea that the United States alone appeared to have a stock of atomic bombs. The commitment remains, although some Europeans question it because it is implicit rather than explicit. The monopoly of the atomic bomb by the United States seems to have vanished.

Consequently, even those Europeans who do not question the immediate and active military aid of the United States in an emergency are constrained to wonder just how prompt and effective this aid would be. They see the Atlantic Pact as giving moral assurance but falling short of physical guaranties against invasion.

Washington, too, believes there should be something more solid behind the pact, since it has urged creation of defense forces in western Europe. The character and the distribution of these forces have now been fully planned on paper. But the Ministers of Foreign Affairs, Finance and Defense of Britain, France, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxemburg, who met in Brussels this week, apparently all agreed they could not possibly finance such forces, especially if at the same time they were to go on financing the economic recovery for which the Marshall plan had laid the foundation.

CONTRADICTORY TASKS

Thus the cold war has laid upon western Europe two contradictory tasks. Washington has been telling Europe for more than 2 years that it must hurry and recover because there would be no more dollar aid after 1952. But in recent months Europe has been told it must divert a large part of its resources in money, materials, and labor from recovery to defense.

It is still doubtful whether western Europe would be independent of United States economic aid by 1952 even if it had to pay for no armaments. Much would depend upon the trend of business activity in the United States in the next 2 years and upon Europe's ability to develop new sources to replace dollar imports.

But if, now, western Europe must finance defense production as well as normal production, no doubt remains. Western Europe will surely need American aid long after 1952.

This is why European officials began several weeks ago to say privately that the elaborate plans and calculations made pursuant to the Marshall plan, and the assumption of peacetime needs only, might soon have to be scrapped unless there were to be another Marshall plan after 1952—a Marshall plan that would still be an instrument in the cold war, but this time not an economic but a military instrument.

When the Marshall plan began, the great question was how much Europe could do, and should be obliged to do, for itself while receiving American aid. The same issue of self-help must arise if strategic imperatives cause the Marshall plan gradually to merge into a defense plan entailing the same kind—and probably much the same amount—of American aid for Europe.

Surveying this outlook, the French and other officials have suggested that western Europe would be obliged again to appeal to the United States, being as unable to finance its defense under the Atlantic Pact as it was to finance its indispensable imports for which the Marshall plan provided.

These were the culminating reasons for the conclusion that western Europe, being unable to live up to the slogans of the Marshall plan propaganda by attaining political or economic unity, much less defensive self-sufficiency, was justified in proposing that the common problems of Europe and the United States should be tackled on a wider scale and by different methods.

ALLIANCE UNDER SINGLE PLAN

The aim of the Marshall plan, in one sense, was to isolate Western Europe as an economic problem and to induce it to cure itself by becoming financially independent of the United States. The logic of the Atlantic Pact, on the contrary, is to link western Europe closely with the United States in one huge strategic region subject to a single plan.

The recovery sought by the Marshall plan and the security sought by the Atlantic Pact must be balanced one against the other. They are almost as closely related economically as mathematical coordinates. Moreover, they represent merely two aspects of the single problem of stiffening western Europe against hostile pressure.

Therefore, they should be recognized as fitting into the same context, Europeans contend. This context, they insist, must be that of the Atlantic Pact, not that of the Marshall plan.

The smaller context of western Europe chosen by the Marshall plan is regarded as having lost reality in the light of recent developments. The goals of western European unity are considered to have become both impossible and insufficient—impossible, because western Germany cannot be integrated with the rest of western Europe while Britain refuses to be; insufficient, because even if this integration were possible, western Europe would still be unable to recover and rearm herself at the same time.

Hells Canyon Project in Oregon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the RECORD a memorandum on the Hells Canyon project in Oregon, prepared by Mr. Albert C. Ullman, the very able president of the Hells Canyon Development Association.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HELLS CANYON DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION
COORDINATED PLAN MUST BE ACTIVATED

When the Senate on April 17 passed the omnibus rivers and harbors bill without the Interior amendment, a hard blow was dealt to the Pacific Northwest, but more particularly to the new coordinated development program in which the region has come to place so much faith. The implications of this action are so far-reaching and so serious in nature that it must gain the attention of everyone even remotely interested in basin development.

By carving the coordinated agreement vertically, projects in the area of Corps of Engineer operations are authorized, including the John Day and The Dalles Dams of the lower Columbia, admittedly long-distance objectives, neither settled in agreement nor projected on power studies of this decade. Projects in the jurisdiction of BuRec are not authorized, leaving out the Key Hells Canyon Dam and certain irrigation projects. Under coordinated agreement both agencies were to work. Under the Senate action one agency and all its projects in all its territory waits. Projects on the Bonneville Power Administration timetable are not authorized while projects not on that schedule have been approved. Needs have not been met; urgency has been ignored; areas have not been considered; coordination, planning, resource conservation, and political considerations have not been satisfied; half a program remains to be activated.

The Bonneville Power Administration schedule calls for the first generators of Hells Canyon to go into operation in 1956. There are many reasons for this high priority recommendation, among them:

1. Flood and river control in addition to power production are urgent, with Hells Canyon the major storage facility.

2. The power output of Bonneville and McNary will not reach maximum efficiency without Hells Canyon. Hells Canyon's installed capacity is 800,000 kilowatts but through its storage releases it will actually produce 1,069,000 kilowatts of system firm power.

3. The moratorium on projects interfering with migratory fish runs downstream places priority on Hells Canyon which is above all the major spawning tributaries. It would be unfortunate to again ignore the interagency fishing moratorium agreement of 1947.

4. The upper Snake area is in urgent need of major power for the development of phosphate and mineral potential; and the Northwest is in need of a dispersal of strategic installations, Hells Canyon being far interior and in new load centers.

This has been the first major test of the coordinated agreement development program and present action constitutes a defeat for that program. The interior projects were not argued on their merits but were rejected because of a jurisdictional dispute. In order to keep the spirit of the coordinated program alive the Bureau of Reclamation projects, especially the key Hells Canyon Dam, must be approved through separate legislation this session.

Continued orderly development according to proven plan is the great need in the Northwest today. Power for existing industrial needs and future industrial requirements, power for critical defense purposes, flood control to prevent a recurrence of the Vanport disaster, are factors that cannot wait. Hells Canyon is the next step in the studied timetable of development. This Congress cannot allow that timetable which is the heart of the coordinated planning to be thrown out of gear. A separate bill in this session authorizing Hells Canyon and urgent Bureau projects will bring that program back into focus.

ALBERT C. ULLMAN,
Hells Canyon Development Association.

The Hells Canyon Development Association is a nonprofit, nonsalaried organization composed of independent businessmen, farmers, and working people of Oregon and Idaho, financed through dollar contributions from its membership.

Continuation of United Nations Children's Fund

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, in a bill, S. 3420, recently introduced by the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and other Senators, including myself, it is proposed that the work of the United Nations Children's Fund go on. The New York Times of April 18 published an editorial in regard to this bill and this humane and worth-while activity. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD this editorial describing the work of the Children's Fund and urging support of S. 3420.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHILDREN'S FUND SAGA

The saga of the UN's Children's Fund since the end of the war is one of the proudest chapters of modern man's devotion to helping his fellow man. While international politics and partisanship have disrupted a score of the UN's specialized agencies—not excluding the fund, from which the Russian and Polish delegates recently took a walk—this group gets on with its planning, feeding, healing, with steadfastness and purpose.

In the past several months the saga of the Children's Fund has led it away from countries that are recovering adequately to help their own to new areas that are—some always were—in desperate need. Thus the emphasis is shifting to India and the Middle East, to the Far East, to underdeveloped areas in Latin America. Because of lack of government contributions, the Children's Fund has only been able to touch the fringe of the problem. But the marvel is that it has been able to surmount financial obstacles, that it has doggedly held to its nonpartisan program, spread itself thin when necessary, kept the life-giving milk and cod-liver oil and food flowing to the needy. Perhaps never was the worth of its achievements more dramatically seen than among the Arab refugees, who would have died by the thousands except for Children's Fund contributions.

The fund's vital work—at the individual level—must go on. This is the meaning of the excellent bipartisan bill just introduced by Senator TAFT to continue American participation in the fund for another year. The long-term programs and intelligence surveys that have been proposed are fine, but only if they are to be concurrent with active continuation of the Children's Fund work and are not intended to displace it. To continue that work the fund needs hard cash—from governments, from people with understanding hearts. The $25,000,000 appropriation still due the fund from this Nation should be made available without strings.

Unemployment Caused by Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the failure of the Truman administration to take action to preserve the jobs of hundreds of thousands of employees caused by an ever-increasing volume of imports is tragic. Imports of oil are closing coal mines, thus throwing the men who work in the mines out of employment. The railroad employees of the railroads that haul the coal are losing their jobs. The employees in our domestic oil fields are being thrown out of employment. All of this unemployment is spreading day by day, and it will continue until imports are decisively checked. I feel that there is a direct responsibility of the United States Government to take some action which will protect the oil industry of the United States from the threat which the Government itself has helped to create.

There is now a world surplus of oil. It is clamoring for outlet into our markets. The imports of crude oil and products have steadily increased. In 1949 the daily average of such imports was 642,000 barrels daily, which was 129,000 barrels daily more than in 1948. The increase was 25 percent. The average for the first 2 months of 1950 was 792,000 barrels per day.

During the war the United States encouraged the development of foreign producing and refining. Some of the assistance was necessary. Some of it was the result of influence wielded by officials of companies which held large concessions and which were faced with the necessity of spending large amounts of money. A notable instance was revealed in the investigation of Middle East operations by the Brewster Committee in the Eightieth Congress. A former official of the group of companies interested in Saudi Arabia testified that he acted to have Arabia added to the list of recipients of lend-lease, thus satisfying the demands for money which the King of Arabia was making on the companies. He sued his former associates and won a jury award of a million dollars for the use of his influence. The fact that a higher court set aside the verdict in no way disproved his claim that he had been instrumental in transferring a company's financial problem to the taxpayers of the United States.

Manpower, materials—every possible assistance was given to the same companies which import oil into the United States to expand their operations in the Middle East and in Venezuela during the war. With the end of the war the assistance continued in the form of approval of exports of scarce equipment and materials needed in the development of oil resources in the United States. In a long period of scarcity of such goods the flow of them for foreign use continued.

Then we entered the phase of the ECA. Assistance has been poured out lavishly to expand the oil producing and refining industry in Europe and the possessions, mandated territories, and countries under influence and control of European nations. The authorizations for the purchase of crude oil and products for the Marshall plan countries in the first 21 months of the plan's operation—to December 31, 1949—totaled $775,200,000. As the money went to the companies which produce and refine oil and as the world surplus of oil outside the United States is controlled by seven companies—five of which are United States corporations—it follows that there was, in effect, a subsidy of their operations by the people of the United States. The greater part of the oil supplied to Europe under the ECA operations was from the Middle East and Venezuela. The principal importers into the markets of the United States are the same companies which received the greater part of the ECA expenditures for petroleum and they have thus been aided in their plans for further expansion of foreign activities.

A measure of the growth abroad is provided in the production statistics for 1949, compared with the figures for 1947. The production of Venezuela increased 10 percent; Middle East (Iran, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, and Kuwait), 66 percent; Far East (British, Dutch, and American interests in the East Indies), 209 percent.

The production in the United States was 1 percent less in 1949 than in 1947.

In addition to the ECA expenditures for petroleum products, grants have been made for refinery expansion within the participating countries. The ECA statement as of March 10, 1950 was that refinery projects to the total of $160,850,000 in dollar and dollar equivalents had been approved; of this $23,782,500 were ECA dollars. In the 16 Marshall-plan countries the refinery capacity at the end of 1948 was 485,000 barrels daily. At the end of fiscal 1953, according to ECA reports, the capacity will be 1,041,700 barrels a day—more than doubled, taking into account only the existing capacity plus the completion of projects now under construction. And if the ambitions of those countries are realized, as ex-

pressed by their Organization for European Economic Cooperation are realized, the refinery capacity will be 1,315,000 barrels daily. ECA petroleum branch men have testified to the Small Business Committee of the House that they have attempted to prevent expansion to the figure desired by the recipients of ECA aid, but that they expected the final capacity figure would be more than 1,010,000 and under 1,250,000 barrels daily. It was their opinion that the lower capacity could be used in meeting Europe's needs.

United States companies are fully keeping pace with the expansion. Their capacity in Europe at the end of 1948 was 116,000 barrels a day; present construction will bring it to 303,000 barrels and if the OEEC long-term program is realized, they will have a capacity of 401,900 barrels daily at the end of fiscal 1953.

It is interesting to note that United States companies have been getting ECA money for refinery expansion. Peculiar as it sounds, the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, one of the corporate giants of the world, actually received from ECA $1,427,000 for the expansion of a refinery in France in which minor interests are owned by two other giants, Gulf Oil and Atlantic Refining, with some French ownership. In another instance, Socony-Vacuum Oil Co. got $850,000 in ECA funds for refinery expansion in France.

The oil industry abroad is being pushed and rushed to a condition of overexpansion. Already the effect is being felt in numerous ways. The "sterling area" countries—Great Britain's eight commonwealth countries—are reducing the allowed imports of "dollar" oil. Greater and greater portions of the European market are being taken by Middle East oil produced by British and Dutch companies and the American companies, confronted by their overexpanded and overstimulated producing and refining programs, look increasingly to the United States for market outlet.

Building a Better America by Perpetuating the Ideals and Teachings of Booker T. Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, approximately 3½ years ago, the House Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, of which I had the honor to be chairman, reported unanimously a bill for the minting of 5,000,000 Booker T. Washington memorial silver half-dollars to commemorate the birth and perpetuate the ideals and teachings of that great Negro leader, who did so much for the people of his race and contributed so much to better racial understanding.

These coins are being sold by the Booker T. Washington Birthplace Memorial, a nonprofit organization, for $1; and the premium on these sales is being used to establish trade and industrial schools for the training of Negro youth, thereby not only improving the economic status of the Negro but contributing greatly to our entire national economy.

The remarkable achievements of this organization in carrying out the objectives for which it was organized is fittingly described in the appended article by the noted Negro author, traveler, and public speaker, George S. Schuyler, which appeared in the Pittsburgh Courier, April 22, 1950.

I recently had the privilege of visiting the Booker T. Washington birthplace and the Trade Schools of Roanoke and want to say the work that is being done is a real inspiration to carry on similar work in other parts of our country where there is a substantial Negro population.

I trust that everyone reading Mr. Schuyler's article will send $1 to the Booker T. Washington Birthplace Memorial at Booker Washington Birthplace, Virginia, for one of these memorial coins and share the joy of helping those who are furtherest down in the economic scale to help themselves to climb the ladder to economic security.

The article follows:

VIEWS AND REVIEWS—SCHUYLER FINDS AMAZING TRANSFORMATION AT BOOKER T. WASHINGTON'S BIRTHPLACE

(By George S. Schuyler)

S. J. Phillips, of Booker T. Washington Birthplace, Va., is a good-looking, dark, middle-aged Negro who not only believes in the great American educator's philosophy of skilled industrial and business schooling, and "letting down your bucket where you are," but he is definitely doing something to put that philosophy into practice.

Before I met Mr. Phillips early this month, I only knew him by name and newspaper reports, and I had only the haziest notion where Booker Washington's birthplace was when I accepted his invitation to attend the memorial services there. I knew that he had promoted the Booker T. Washington memorial half dollar, but I was astounded to learn that this, the fifty-first special coin of its kind, had sold more than all of the other 50 authorized by Congress. Indeed, I learned it had sold twice as many, selling for $1 each, and it is still selling. I should think every Negro in the United States would want to own at least one of these coins, and obviously hundreds of thousands do.

It is not too easy to get to Booker T. Washington's birthplace. Going to Roanoke by airplane, train, or bus, it is necessary to motor some 20 miles over hill and dale through some mighty picturesque country before the isolated place near Rocky Mount, Va., is reached. It is a beautiful ride on a clear day, as Sunday, April 2, was.

I expected to find the log cabin where the great man was born whose bust now stands in the hall of fame, but the avenue lined with American flags, the gleaming new buildings, the scores of parked cars from all over the region and the hundreds of visitors in holiday mood were more than I had bargained for.

Benches were arranged for the outdoor ceremonies and there was a loudspeaker system. A new two-story, modern brick building, for dormitories and recreation draped with flags, was dedicated later that afternoon. There was the log cabin birthplace of the big man, draped with bunting and hung inside with mottos; and alongside it was the old well, now glorified with cement, stone work and a large tin bucket above which the well-known legend read: "Let down your bucket where you are." In the bottom of the bucket, covered by 2 inches of water, were many coins tossed in by admiring visitors. I learned that during 1949, over $300 was contributed in that manner.

It was evident soon that this memorial to a man who gave his country and the world a new concept of mass education was something more than a refurbished log cabin and a glorified well. This 600 acres of land had been bought from the white owners for $50,000. Planted acres number 250, while 30 acres are given over to orchards. In addition there are two tractors, four trucks, two station wagons, 12 automobiles, a couple of cows, some three dozen hogs, over 2,000 chickens, two poultry houses of the most modern design, a residence cleverly converted from an old barn, six tobacco barns, two other barns, a large new residence, an office building and the birthplace's own post office with an attractive young brown postmistress. When I was there the place was stacked with bags of mail incoming and outgoing. I hadn't known that there was a post office called Booker Washington Birthplace, Va.

In addition to all this, there is a night school, teaching trades, operated for the benefit of ambitious students from the surrounding countryside.

Unlike many rural communities, this one boasts electric lights and hot and cold running water.

All this has been accomplished since World War II.

Next day we drove into Roanoke to the Booker T. Washington Memorial Trades School which is located in four different buildings rented for the purpose. It was established by Mr. Phillips September 4, 1949, after the surmounting of various obstacles not the least of which was the opposition of some jealous Negroes. This school, whose 222 students are largely ex-service men, teaches bricklaying, carpentry, radio and television, beauty culture, and business skills. It is significant that already seventeen graduates in bricklaying and beauty culture have secured jobs.

Whether teaching motor mechanics, typing, or cabinet making, the young instructors seem to know their business. The workrooms were busy as beehives and yet everything was clean and orderly. I noted that the latest machinery and equipment was in use.

Well, it all adds up to something really inspiring, and it is a great credit to a dynamic man like S. J. Phillips and his devoted workers that all of this has been accomplished during a period when many people were wagging their heads and viewing the future with alarm.

Of course, there are some shallow pates who will say that Booker Washington's philosophy was good at a certain period, but is now dead. However, artisans and farmers who are well trained will always be in demand and will never know privation. One reason why the Negro has been "last to be hired and first to be fired" is because so few Negroes could do anything well that the economy wanted done. If there were a big group of highly skilled Negro craftsmen no one will argue that we would not be better off.

Every person should be highly skilled in at least one craft. Our great difficulty today, as in the past, is that we have tens of thousands of Negro so-called workers, urban and rural, who really do not know how to do anything well, except moan for security and Government freebies. Many cannot even shine shoes or do domestic work properly. How the picture would change if we had a few hundred more consecrated men like far-sighted S. J. Phillips of Booker Washington Birthplace, Va.

Alaska, Hawaii on Verge of Statehood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1950

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Gould Lincoln from the Washington Sunday Star of April 23, 1950:

ALASKA, HAWAII ON VERGE OF STATEHOOD—HEARINGS TOMORROW IN FINAL DRIVE TO WIN GOAL

(By Gould Lincoln)

Hawaii and Alaska, knocking at the door for statehood, begin tomorrow a final drive to attain their ends during the present Congress. Hearings on the Alaska statehood bill open before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and the committee has set May 1 for its hearings on the Hawaiian bill. Both measures already have passed the House. It begins to look as though the last barriers to statehood for the two Territories will be surmounted.

Although as chairman of the committee, Senator O'MAHONEY, Democrat, of Wyoming, is withholding final judgment, it is known he is inclined to favor statehood. In the Eightieth Congress the House also passed an enabling bill for Hawaii and Alaska.

The House Public Lands Committee reported one for Alaska. The determined opposition then of Senator BUTLER, Republican, of Nebraska, chairman of the committee, effectually bottled up the Hawaiian bill and it died with the Congress. Mr. BUTLER is now the ranking Republican member of the committee.

The admission of the two Territories would make the United States an even 50—would bring the membership of the Senate up to 100, and would add two or three Members to the House. It is 38 years since the two youngest States were admitted—Arizona and New Mexico. Five years earlier, in 1907, Oklahoma—the combined Oklahoma and Indian Territories—became a State.

TERRITORIES FOR MANY YEARS

The two proposed new States are noncontiguous territory of the United States. Both, however, have been Territories for many years. Hawaii was acquired by annexation through treaties approved by the Senate of the United States and by the Senate of the former Republic of Hawaii shortly before the turn of the century. Alaska was purchased from Russia in 1867. How wise that purchase was has been demonstrated many times—but never more so than today when the relations of the United States and Soviet Russia have settled into a cold war which may become a hot war at any time. World War II has emphasized Alaska's strategic value, and brought to memory Gen. Billy Mitchell's statement that: "He who holds Alaska holds the world."

Indeed, argument is made for statehood, for both Hawaii and Alaska on the ground that each is an important outpost, and that under statehood, each would become stronger.

Opposition to statehood for Hawaii, at least on the surface, has centered on reports of Communist infiltration and on the fact that the population has many large racial groups, particularly Japanese, which are foreign to the United States. Senator CORDON, Republican, of Oregon, a member of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, during the Eightieth Congress, made an extensive investigation of Communist activity and influence in the islands and reported that it constituted no barrier to statehood. Today, an inquiry into the same subject is being made by a subcommittee of the House Un-American Activities Committee, now in the Territory, and the findings of that committee may have definite bearing on final action regarding Hawaii.

HAWAII TRIES SHORT CUT

Hawaii recently has moved toward getting into the Union without the passage of an enabling act by Congress. It has elected delegates to a constitutional convention to write a constitution for the proposed State. When this constitution shall have been drafted, it will be submitted to the people of the Territory for ratification, and if the people vote for it, the constitution will be forwarded to Congress for approval, with a petition that Hawaii be admitted as a State. This is the second string to Hawaii's bow. Fifteen States have been admitted after such a procedure, when Congress failed to pass enabling acts in their cases. Two States, Kentucky and Vermont, as early as 1791, and two others, Idaho and Wyoming, as recently as 1890 acquired statehood through such congressional acts of admission, after drafting constitutions in the absence of congressional enabling acts.

This does not mean, however, that Hawaii will cease its efforts to obtain passage of the pending enabling bill. Under the terms of the bill, Hawaii, in any case, would have to draft a State constitution, and obtain approval of that constitution before it could be admitted.

The total land area of the Hawaiian Islands is approximately the size of Connecticut and Rhode Island combined. They are populated by more than half a million people. A report made by a subcommittee of the House Committee on Territories in 1946 showed that, ethnically, the population of the Territory in 1945 was 10,988 Hawaiians, or 2.2 percent of the total population; 61,422 part Hawaiians, or 12.2 percent; Puerto Ricans, 9,090, or 1.8 percent; 172,583 Caucasians, or 34.4 percent; 30,005 Chinese, or 6 percent; 163,300 Japanese, or 32.5 percent; 7,042 Koreans, or 1.4 percent; 46,464 Filipinos, or 9.3 percent; all others, 1,228, or .02 percent. The Hawaiians declined from an estimated 300,000 in 1778, when a British Navy captain, James Cook, visited the islands, to a little more than 10,000 today.

In 1820, 17 New England missionaries went to Hawaii and before many years, as the report of the House committee says, "the natives were converted to Christianity and made familiar with the ways of the west." At any rate, the period of American influence set in that was eventually to bring about annexation of the islands by this country. Hawaii previously had ceased to be a kingdom and become a republic. Texas is the only other example of annexation by the United States of an independent State. Texas, however, was immediately a State of the Union. There has been always an implication that Hawaii, also, was to become a State and many times in recent years the matter has been broached.

MAC ARTHUR, NIMITZ IN FAVOR

Gen. Douglas MacArthur has been quoted as favoring statehood for Hawaii on the promise that such a policy would definitely support his efforts in democratizing Japan. Admiral Nimitz, testifying as a private citizen, said he had great admiration for and appreciation of the complete and wholehearted cooperation the people of Hawaii gave to the war effort and that from a military and naval standpoint he saw no objection to the islands achieving statehood.

It has been estimated that well over 85 percent of the population of Hawaii was born in the islands and that 90 percent are American citizens. Not only did Hawaii have a commendable record during the Second World War, but also there was no sabotage or fifth-column activity committed there, according to the FBI.

The people of Alaska, like those of Hawaii, have asked for statehood through plebiscite. And while the population of this vast Territory is small—estimated to be from 95,000 to 105,000—it is larger than was the population of a dozen States when they were admitted. These States are Arkansas, Florida, Missouri, Nevada, Oregon, Wyoming, Minnesota, Iowa, Colorado, Montana, North Dakota, and Nebraska. In 1940 the population of Alaska, according to the census, was 72,524 persons. At that time 54 percent of the population was white as distinguished from the native stocks. Nearly one-fourth of these whites were born in Alaska. In the years since then the permanent population of the Territory has steadily increased. It is confidently predicted, too, that with statehood the population of Alaska will grow speedily—just as happened in other Territories.

LAND OF RESOURCES

The importance of Alaska to the United States does not rest alone on military considerations, although those are of great moment. Its great resources are still only partially developed. Fish, forest products, minerals, all have great futures in development of Alaska.

Alaska, it has been pointed out, has served a long tutelage in a territorial status. It belonged to the United States for 17 years before even a temporary form of government was provided. The first criminal code was not enacted until 1899, and the first civil code in 1900. Since 1912 Alaska has had its own legislature. However, within the limits of the organic act passed by Congress, Alaska has enacted progressive measures. It granted suffrage to women 6 years before the suffrage amendment to the Constitution was adopted for the United States.

One of the principal objections raised to statehood for Alaska now is that Alaska could not support the cost of statehood. Among the additional expenses the new State would have to bear are the salaries of the Governor and of the secretary of state; all, instead of part of, the costs of the legislature, the State court system, the fishery administration, and the care of the insane. As a State, Alaska would be permitted to borrow for State purposes, pledging the faith of the people of Alaska. This is a common practice among the States now. History, moreover, has shown that territories, when becoming States, have been able to meet their financial responsibilities.

HISTORIC CASES

The history of admission of Territories into the Union contains other hard-fought battles. There was a bitter row in Congress at the time of the admission of Arizona and New Mexico, under a joint enabling act. The act directed the Territories to frame State constitutions and placed upon the President—then William Howard Taft—the duty of approving these constitutions. Arizona wrote into its constitution the initiative and referendum, for legislation, and the recall of judges and other officers. President Taft could not stomach the recall of judges. So Congress was forced to put through another act, which in effect compelled Arizona to take the recall of judges out of its constitution in order to gain admission. The recall of judges was removed from the constitution and Arizona has never revived it, although, when once a State, it could amend its own constitution in any way it saw fit.

The debate in the Senate on the Arizona Constitution showed some of the Senators, in 1911, gravely concerned over the initiative, referendum, and recall. For example, Senator Heyburn, Republican, of Idaho suggested:

"Under this recall system, or under the initiative and referendum, there would not

be time to put in any wheat. There would not be any time for anything but politics. Elections would be the order of the day and all the great economic questions that we have been discussing would become of minor importance because no one would have time for anything except holding elections—elections for the purpose of nominating somebody for office, for the purpose of determining whether they should be recalled, only a few days to elapse between and then elections to determine whether or not the successors should be recalled—and so with the laws.

"Mr. President (of the Senate), men are going mad."

Awards for Fliers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 24, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Post of April 21, 1950:

AWARDS FOR FLIERS

The action of the United States Senate in voting unanimously for a resolution directing the Secretary of the Navy to confer appropriate posthumous decorations on the crew of the American airplane which was shot down by Soviet fighter planes over the Baltic Sea may be little consolation for the families of the lost men; but it at least indicates the high resentment in Congress and throughout the Nation over this incident.

One would have to search through the blackest pages of the history of the least civilized and most vicious barbarians to bring to light an incident of such barefaced treachery and cruelty as this Baltic incident. In the first place, our airplane was unarmed and the crew had specific instructions to keep away from the Russian frontier to avoid just such an incident as occurred. Secondly, we knew nothing about the loss of the plane for 4 days after it was shot down, and thus lost the precious time in which we might have been able to find the missing men. During these precious days the Russians obviously made no attempt to rescue the plane which, they reported to us, was last seen out over an open ocean after having been riddled with gunfire.

We still don't know, in fact, whether the Russians captured the crippled plane and are now holding our men as prisoners in a concentration camp. Certainly, in view of their whole attitude over the incident, this would not be beyond the bounds of possibility.

An article in a Moscow paper calling upon the United States to punish our officials for the responsibility of the crime would make it evident that the Russian Government intends to reject the note of protest and request for indemnity made by the United States Government.

What move we shall make if this is done, remains to be seen. Officials at Washington, it is reported, believe that the whole matter will blow over after a series of sharp notes on both sides, with the only result being a deterioration in our relations with the Soviets.

That may be. But the day must come when the American people, little as they desire another war, will not stand for any more pushing around by Russia. The day must come when we shall have to say to Mr. Stalin, "One more move on your part will be the last. From there on the bombs will start dropping."

Perhaps we moderns are too softhearted. Some 2,000 years ago, when Rome was being pestered by threats from Carthage, the Romans declared that "Carthage must be destroyed"; and they destroyed it so that it has never been heard from since.

Address by Hon. Wayne Coy at National Association of Broadcasters' Annual Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, Wayne Coy, Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, in a brilliant speech to the Twenty-eighth Annual Convention of the National Association of Broadcasters, at Chicago, on April 18, 1950, spoke truths which are basic to freedom of speech. I ask unanimous consent to insert that portion of his address in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The key to sleeping on a windy night involves your preparation to serve the public interest.

If you plan now to serve the real needs of your community, if you plan to make your station an indispensable part of your community's life, a source of leadership and aid in every civic project, a forum for the discussion of local issues, an institution where local talent can be heard and encouraged, then you will have gone a long way toward conditioning yourself for sleeping on a windy night. Such preparation will include new approaches, new formats, a renewed emphasis on imaginative planning.

Of course, some people profess not to know what the phrase, "public interest" means. Some people call it vague and ambiguous. But this is a form of skepticism and scoffing which does those who cannot discern what is the public interest no credit. The Commission has in one of its opinions quite properly pointed out the duty to operate in the public interest is no esoteric mystery, but is essentially a duty to operate a radio station with good judgment and good faith guided by a reasonable regard for the interests of the community to be served. Of course, there is no Government agency or broadcaster who can in advance hammer out, down to the last detail, a blueprint which will give the sensible answer to all of the innumerable problems which arise in the day to day operations of a broadcast station. And Congress has wisely foreseen that this is the case. For the scheme created by the Communications Act is that the licensee shall have and exercise the responsibility for devising a program service. The source from which that responsibility is to derive content and meaning is the community in which the licensee operates and which he serves with his station. The needs and interests of that community can be readily gleaned by one whose eyes and ears are open; they can be learned by one who is in touch with public affairs and who knows the background and interests and aspirations of the various groups which compose that community. The standard of the public interest is a requirement that the licensee keep his eyes and ears open to these needs and aspirations and interests. His ears must be attuned to the beating of hearts around him as well as the tinkle of the cash register. His eyes must be able to discern the genuine joys and sorrows of the people of his community. The type of judgment which will most readily reflect his awareness cannot readily be reduced to a rule or a statute or a code. The Commission has also pointed out that to take the licensee by the hand and show him the way through every vicissitude of daily operation would serve to stifle the very responsibility which the act is designed to foster.

Those who insist that they do not know what the public interest is may well be in earnest. But unless they show that they are able to find out what the public interest is, they are not fit to be entrusted with the responsibilities of a radio station license.

And can the licensee surrender his responsibility to anyone else? To the networks? Or to the advertising agencies? Or to time brokers? Of course not. In the eyes of the law, the licensee is the master of his station and he alone is accountable for what goes out from his station. He cannot by any means wash his hands of this responsibility.

The network rules were adopted and fought through the Supreme Court in order to free him from network domination and to help him become more of a master in his own house.

In planning how he is going to weather the transition period ahead of us, the broadcaster will want to reexamine his program practices.

For example, has he made a recent survey to determine if he is truly serving local needs? Is he making an affirmative effort to find out what the community needs are and how he can best serve them? Judging from our renewal applications, some stations are operating in a paradise where there are no problems of education, racial understanding, citizenship, health, housing, or recreation. But then if it were a paradise, they would at least have some local live talent. So it must be a desert they are operating in.

About all that some of them can chalk up as local live talent is the man who reads the news from the ticker. But now we are finding out that some of these new listings are open to question because the stations don't even subscribe for a news service. And "believe it or not" we have one applicant who includes in his modest, nay, minute portion of local live programing his "sign-on" and his "sign-off."

It is praiseworthy for a broadcaster to carry on elaborate network documentary on juvenile delinquency, or on housing, or on health. But what about the broadcaster's own community? Is he indulging in escapism by ignoring conditions right in his own front yard? The recent Analysis of Station Operating Costs issued by the NAB declares:

"One cannot emphasize too strongly that good programing, per se, will not continue to satisfy sponsors. Commercial radio is founded upon programs which appeal to the listening public and which sell merchandise."

My reaction to that is this: The American system of broadcasting—which is a commercial system—is not founded simply to appeal to listeners and sell merchandise. That concept completely brushes aside the valuable, the indispensable role in a station's total programing structure of the program that may appeal only to listeners and of itself may not sell one penny's worth of merchandise.

A forum discussion on a million-dollar bond issue for a new sewerage plant—an issue which is splitting the town wide open—might not attract a sponsor but it would have almost everyone in town listening in—and would be a major contribution by the radio station.

The weekly religious hour presenting various churches, carried by many stations, is usually not sponsored and yet it is considered one of the most appealing programs on the schedule.

Do these programs have to sell merchandise to build up radio? Do a President's messages in a national emergency have to sell merchandise to make them good radio? Of course not. They play a stellar role in keeping listeners in the habit of looking to their radio set for the most significant and most vital events of the day. Sponsored programs owe as much to them as they owe to sponsored programs. And that points up why a broadcaster cannot serve the public interest unless he has at his command a reasonable amount of sustaining time to allocate to such programs.

What is the broadcaster's responsibility to the public interests in regard to such matters as poor taste on the programs going out via his station into the homes of his community? And in regard to excessive and indiscriminate crime and horror programing?

It is assumed that the average broadcaster knows what is right and proper. He knows what he would permit or resent in his own home and that he should treat his listener's home as if it were his own. However, there is a growing revulsion against lapses of good taste and against excessive and indiscriminate crime and horror programing. The complaint is that these crime programs, including the pious "crime does not pay" programs for children do not pay in terms of child welfare, do not pay in terms of what they do to promote juvenile delinquency. If that is true, then they do not pay in terms of radio's future as an institution for community betterment.

But if a broadcaster is in doubt about how his practices affect his community, how can he approach his problem in terms of the public interest? No one expects the broadcaster to be all-wise, to be infallible. But it certainly is not unreasonable to expect the broadcaster to exercise due diligence. When he is in doubt on such matters as these, he can turn to outside help for advice. I suggest that he turn for advice to, of all people, his public. By doing so he will demonstrate a sensitivity to local needs and local conditions. It might be well to remember at this point that the public, as the feminine lead in a recent play said, "the public are getting better and better known all the time."

The broadcaster can turn readily to the parent groups, to the educational institutions, to the civic organizations, to the child welfare specialists, to the courts, the penal experts and recreational leaders of his own community. They will be glad to assist him in evaluating his handling of crime programs from the child-welfare standpoint.

When we reflect what veneration we give the old principle that "a man's house is his castle," we can appreciate what a rare privilege is accorded the American broadcaster. William Pitt put it eloquently:

"The poorest man may, in his cottage, bid defiance to all the forces of the crown. It may be frail, its roof may shake; the wind may blow through it; the storm may enter—but the King of England cannot enter; all his force dares not cross the threshold of the ruined tenement."

And yet today in almost every home in America one door—the radio door—is thrown open wide to admit the radio broadcaster and all his goodly company. Such open entree to the family fireside is enjoyed by no other medium. It carries with it a high responsibility. Abuse that privilege, shirk your responsibility for supervising the programs and the talent you take into these homes and you endanger a unique and trusting hospitality.

How is the public interest to be safeguarded in the handling of controversial issues? Obviously, a licensee employing a publicly owned radio frequency—a frequency belonging to all the people—must comport himself as a trustee. He is a trustee not for one faction of the public or the other—he is a trustee for all the people with many divergent viewpoints. So the standard must be fairness to all such viewpoints.

The Commission has repeatedly held fairness to all viewpoints must be observed if the public interest is to be served. This was reemphasized in the Commission's decision of last June permitting licensees to editorialize.

In that report we spelled out the broadcaster's affirmative duty to insure fairness in his editorializing policies. We said, in short, that the broadcaster who embarks on editorializing by presenting one side of an issue does not satisfy the public interest if he merely sits in his office and waits for someone to show up and demand time to present the other side. It is up to him to pick up the telephone or to put on his hat and coat and go out and make a conscientious effort to enlist some responsible representative of the other side.

Clearly, then, the American broadcaster's responsibility to his Government is to serve with intelligence, impartiality, and a high sense of good taste and decorum as a trustee for the radio frequency which his Government licenses him to use. I am impressed by the theme of this convention—the responsibility of the broadcasters in the many fields covered by your agenda. I cannot refrain from saying that I would be more impressed if the agenda of this convention also included sessions which would permit open discussion of (1) the problems of network affiliates in relation to network programing; (2) the problem of whether or not the broadcasters have an effective code and what can be done to improve it in the light of your responsibilities and how to implement it for the benefit of the industry and the public; (3) the problems involved in determining what constitutes the public interest and how to meet those needs. I think these are problems which will become more and more serious in the transition period through which we are now passing.

I realize that up to this point I have had very little to say about television except to give you the financial data based on the 1949 financial reports received by the Commission; to compare those statistics with the same statistics for 1948; and to give you their relationship to the total broadcast revenue and income picture for those years. I know that many of you would like for me to talk about the television freeze. What you really want me to tell you is when we will get out of the freeze and when you may be expected to receive your construction permit for a television station. I suspect that there is a great deal more about television which you would like to know and which you would be glad to get from me or anyone else.

Some of you have asked me whether or not you should get into television or when did I think television would become the dominant broadcasting medium of this country. I hate to disappoint you by not talking at great length about television today. I can only say this to you on the general subject; I have avoided a television discussion because, as you know by this time, I have tried to keep to the text given me by Judge Miller, and, because of the further reason that I do not want to disillusion you about my knowledge of television. However, I suppose you might as well know the truth now as any other time. A year has gone by since I last addressed this gathering. In that year I have learned a lot about television and I am even less certain of the answers to your questions than I was a year ago. I am even less certain about the time when we will get out of the freeze. I certainly hope—and let me repeat the word "hope"—that we get out of the freeze before the end of the year. I pray that it will be earlier. I do not predict when.

I believe that the statistics which I have given you today covering the operations of aural broadcasting and television reflect the interregnum in the growth of television flowing from the freeze. I cannot prove that to you by the figures I have given you nor do I urge upon you the thought that the figures for 1949 can be accepted as an index to what the future may bring. Frankly, I still believe that television will become the dominant broadcasting medium in this country and that it will occupy that position rapidly once the Commission and the industry have reached and accepted a solution to the problems which resulted in the current freeze on the processing of television applications. I know that the economics of network television programing will change considerably when more stations are available and more markets can be covered. I hope that when that time comes the networks will not be the only beneficiaries and that the individual stations will share in the improved economic position. I hope that it will result in continuously improved programs. But if that happens, the competition between television and aural broadcasting for audience and for the advertiser's dollar will become more and more severe.

Ladies and gentlemen, this twenty-eighth annual convention of the NAB takes place at a time of an expanding economy and at a time of readjustment in our way of life. We are in a period of higher living standards. The American people generally are demanding and, for the most part getting, better homes, better clothes, better education, better recreational opportunities.

As a most important part of this pattern, this Nation will require the strongest, most flexible, and most effective system of broadcasting that we can devise. I am convinced that we will need not only a national system of television but that we will need an able system of aural broadcasting.

To bring these two systems up to their highest mark of potential development will require all the ingenuity, the imagination, the vision, the courage, and the good will that both the broadcasters and the Government can muster. It will call for the maximum cooperation and understanding.

If we meet that challenge, then we together can build up this mighty instrument of broadcasting to meet the needs of our democracy.

Looking to the international scene we must recognize that the nations of the world are living in a time of danger. Suspicion, fear, and hatred threaten this uneasy peace.

In this hazardous situation, American broadcasting has a great role to play. National security is not solely the job of the Department of Defense or the State Department. Our first line of defense is an informed people who will act instantly and unitedly in any crisis. This is particularly true in a democracy where the citizens are the source of all power and the ultimate judges of our course of action.

Who is better equipped than the broadcasters to bring directly to every citizen in his home with true vividness the leading personalities of our times and the presentation of all viewpoints on the crucial issues of the day? Who is better equipped to provide every citizen with all the significant facts so that he can make up his own mind and perform his duty as a responsible citizen in a free society?

The service that broadcasting can render has a high survival value in these troubled times.

As we face the latter half of the twentieth century, no group in our society has greater power or potentialities for building and guarding America than the American broadcasters.

National Rice Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 24, 1950

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to the fact that the week beginning April 23 has been designated as National Rice Week. My district is one of the largest rice producing sections of the United States, and naturally, we are all interested in taking note of this week being set aside to call to the attention of the world what a fine, cheap, nutritious and palatable food can be found in this wonderful product. However, our production is nearly 50 percent more than the consumption in the United States, and we are making an effort to inform the United States that they should use this food. While rice is used in cereals and breakfast foods by our leading food manufacturers, if the people would inform themselves as to how to prepare the tasty dishes made possible by rice, I am sure that the consumption would be doubled in this country. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include the following editorials from the Opelousas Daily World and the Jennings Daily News, published in my district on the National Rice Week, as follows:

[From the Opelousas (La.) Daily World]

DOUBLY GOOD

The week beginning April 23 will be National Rice Week, a 7-day period which the rice industry devotes to a little special promotion in an effort to increase the use of its product. As we are sure all our readers know, rice is one of Louisiana's most important crops. Louisianans eat a great deal more rice per capita than is eaten in most other States, not out of patriotism but because they know more about rice and how delicious it can be when served in many different ways. We dare say National Rice Week hardly will crowd the cold war off the front pages, but if the extra advertising helps increase the consumption of rice, then all Louisiana will benefit as well as those who learn more about a very fine food.

Louisiana rice growers feel an urgent need to find a larger market in this country. They increased production, as did rice growers in other States, to meet the heavy demand in World War II when the Japanese controlled the large rice-growing areas of southeast Asia. Now these Asiatic countries have gotten back into the export market. They produce rice so cheaply that they are threatening to win back markets in Europe and even in Latin America, in spite of handling and shipping costs.

So the Louisiana growers and other American growers are hoping that Americans can be persuaded to give rice a fair try—that is all that will be necessary—and eat just a little more rice per capita. Let us all have an extra helping of rice in National Rice Week.

[From the Jennings (La.) Daily News of April 20, 1950]

RICE WEEK NEXT

Next week is Rice Week in Jennings, and, we trust, throughout the Nation.

The Jennings Association of Commerce has set aside the week and is urging rice menus on tables here and elsewhere, especially rice menus on the railroad dining cars.

It seems strange that we need to stress "Eat More Rice" in this rice bowl of America. Even in Jeff Davis Parish, which is second only to Vermillion Parish in rice acreage, we could eat more of our favorite grain.

We have seen feasts and banquets served here without a spoonful of rice. But that is beside the point. We need and must sell rice to the American housewife.

Our existence depends on it. The day is done when we could dispose of all our surplus rice to the poor nations of the world at big prices with Uncle Sam paying the bill. The poor nations which ate a lot of rice during the war, before and since, are growing their own needs and they have surplus also to sell.

That being the case, our direct attack, is an advertising campaign to make rice more popular on the American dinner tables. If cooks in the North, East and West knew how deliciously rice can be served, our troubles would be over.

But our first job is to teach Americans that rice is and can be a savory and a very delicious dish. The rice week appeal is not so pressing here where we all eat the cereal. But it is necessary that we start these weeks annually in America to popularize our rice.

They had an old saying if we could teach the Chinese to lengthen their cotten shirts an inch per person, there would be no longer a cotton surplus issue. If we could teach all Americans to eat as much as we do in Louisiana, there would be no longer any rice surplus problem.

Veto of the Natural Gas Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT S. KERR
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Political Veto," published in the Chicago Daily News of April 18, 1950; an editorial entitled "Kerr Bill Veto," published in the Cleveland Plain Dealer of April 17, 1950, and a letter written by Paul G. Benedum, of Pittsburgh, to the Pittsburgh Post Gazette, and published in the April 4, 1950, issue of that newspaper.

There being no objection, the editorials and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago Daily News of April 18, 1950]

POLITICAL VETO

President Truman's veto of the Kerr natural gas bill was politically smart. It may alienate powerful leaders of his party, but they have nowhere else to go. The voters, who had been sold on the belief that the bill meant higher gas rates, would have somewhere else to go, and the Republicans clearly meant to point the way.

It is significant of the misconceptions about the measure that most of the discussion of the veto revolves around its political aspects. Any merits of the measure itself are quite generally ignored.

President Truman himself contributed to that misunderstanding in his veto message when he referred to the "record of accomplishment under the present law." It was the present law that the Kerr bill was designed to retain—with clarification.

Mr. Truman shrewdly left the impression, so widely circulated elsewhere, that the Kerr bill was designed to free the independent gas producers from rate regulation to which they are already subject. That was not the case. Recent court decisions encouraged the Federal Power Commission to seek authority over the rates of interstate suppliers, but it had never been exercised.

Hence, when Senator DOUGLAS pulled the figure out of his hat that the Kerr bill would increase gas rates by $200,000,000 to $500,000,000 it was DOUGLAS the politician, not DOUGLAS the economist, who was talking.

Mr. Truman was doubtless influenced in his veto by the message urging him to do so signed by 18 large-city mayors. It is a safe guess that their information on the subject was largely a repetition of the charge that it would boost gas rates. They are against higher gas rates, as who isn't.

It is one thing to regulate a monopoly (and gas rates from fields owned by the pipe-line companies are quite properly regulated) but quite another to ride herd on the scores of independent producers who sell to the pipe lines.

It is the old story of price control, which seems to be eminently in the interest of the consumer, until it develops that it is not generating the increased production, which is the surest way to lower prices.

We believe Mr. Truman has chosen the wrong way to insure cheap gas. If the OPA principle didn't work on meat and clothing, there is no reason to suppose that it will on fuel.

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer of April 17, 1950]

KERR BILL VETO

It was not surprising that President Truman vetoed the Kerr bill, which was designed to prevent the Federal Power Commission from regulating the price of gas sold by independent producers to pipe-line and distributing companies.

The veto was expected because Truman long ago cast his lot with the CIO and the Socialist-Labor planners and spenders, who favor ever-increasing Government regulation over business and the lives of individual citizens.

This group had set up a howl that consumers would have to pay from $200,000,000 to $500,000,000 for gas annually if the Federal Power Commission were prevented from fixing the prices charged by the independent producers.

This charge was denied by the sponsors of the bill, who contended that freedom from Federal regulation would stimulate production, thus making gas available for consumers, and that competition would result in lower prices.

But Truman accepted the contrary view, which gave him an opportunity to pose as a friend of the consumers. This is an admirable point of view, if the veto of the Kerr bill actually will save the consumers up to half a billion dollars a year in increased gas costs at some indefinte time in the future and if it does not result in a curtailment of production and an eventual shortage of natural gas.

But if Truman really wanted to do something for consumers generally, something that would help them now and not merely avert a threatened price increase which might never materialize, he could reduce Federal taxes. Repeal of the wartime excise taxes alone would result in consumers saving more than a $1,000,000,000 a year immediately. These and other tax reductions, however, would require a reduction in Federal spending, to which the President is opposed.

The tip-off that Truman would veto the Kerr bill came last year when, after the Senate refused to confirm the reappointment of Leland Olds as chairman of the Federal Power Commission, the President appointed him to a higher-paying job which did not require Senate confirmation. Olds was one of the

leading advocates of extending the regulatory powers of the Commission, contrary to the intention of Congress when the Commission was first established.

The veto of the Kerr bill will have wide political repercussions in the Southwest. Its backers included two of Truman's most stalwart lieutenants in Congress, Senator TOM CONNALLY and Speaker of the House SAM RAYBURN, both of Texas. Both of them assured Congress the bill would not result in increased gas rates. RAYBURN, in particular, came down on the floor to tell his colleagues the bill would not raise gas rates one red cent.

Obviously the veto will not improve relations between the White House and Capitol Hill. This factor, however, probably did not enter into the President's calculations since he has long since abandoned any hope, if he ever had one, of getting his legislative program through the Eighty-first Congress.

[From the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of April 4, 1950]

THE PEOPLE SPEAK—HITS GAS EDITORIAL

EDITOR, THE POST-GAZETTE:

Your editorial appeal to President Truman to veto the Kerr gas bill (A Victory for Monopoly, April 1) is based entirely upon a violent assumption and a wholly unwarranted implication that has no basis of fact. In stating that the Kerr bill "exempts" independent natural-gas producers from the price-fixing authority of the Federal Power Commission, you convey the distinct impression that the bill strips the Commission of powers which it has been exercising.

The fact is that the Commission never has exercised any authority, rate-fixing, or otherwise, over independent producers of natural gas. The situation insofar as exercise of governmental authority is concerned will be the same after the Kerr bill becomes law as it always has been.

Your statement that the legislation will cost natural-gas consumers between $300,000,000 and $500,000,000 a year in increased rates borders upon the reckless and irresponsible. Actually, the annual gross return to independent natural-gas producers of all their production in the United States is only $75,000,000 annually. In the last 10 years, the average price of all commodities has increased about 66 percent, but in the same period the price of natural gas to the consumer has declined. And this decline came without any regulation whatever of independent gas producers by the Federal Power Commission.

While I do not feel called upon to defend Senator KERR, who is perfectly capable of taking care of himself, I do feel that your statement that he has sponsored this legislation because of self-interest is a blow that lands below the belt. Your editorial writer should have known that Senator KERR has publicly asserted time and again that all of the natural gas which he owns has already been sold under a contract that runs for many years.

Lest the same accusation be directed at the interests which I represent, let me say that four oil and gas companies with which I am identified in an executive capacity entered into contracts last year for the sale of their natural gas at prices that are fixed for the next 20 years.

The reason for the Kerr legislation is to clarify the original Natural Gas Act of some 12 or 13 years ago, in which the Federal Power Commission was given price-fixing authority at the well-mouth on gas produced by integrated companies which have their own pipe lines to transport the gas to market. It was plainly the intent of Congress to exempt independent producers from this authority, and the members of the Federal Power Commission, including the radical Mr. Leland Olds, so construed the act.

Some 10 years later there was a decision of the Supreme Court which Mr. Olds and two of his four colleagues interpreted as giving the Commission rate-fixing power over independent producers. Since Mr. Olds' involuntary retirement from the Commission that body has been divided by a 2-to-2 vote on this question. Consequently, it has never attempted to assert this authority. The Kerr bill merely reaffirms the original intent of Congress in language that is not subject to misinterpretation.

There is also involved the broad principle of governmental control over everything and everybody with all of the attendant confusion and Gestapo tactics that accompanied the late and unlamented OPA. The chairman of the National Petroleum Council, Mr. Walter S. Hallanan, phrased this most aptly last week when he observed that whenever the turning of a valve on a well in Texas or elsewhere has to await a directive from Washington this Nation will be in its dotage.

PAUL G. BENEDUM.

PITTSBURGH.

Curtailment of Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY P. O'NEILL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1950

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am concerned about the postal order reducing service in the postal department. The House has just awarded an increase in rates to the postal department, and almost immediately a reduction in service resulted.

I suppose all of my colleagues are receiving mail in protest to that order—in volume comparable to my own mail. Such mail, in protest, comes from persons and firms in my district in all walks of life; from the employee who must be discharged to the business house that needs all the mail service that it can secure to enable it to keep going efficiently.

My district, listing 22 percent unemployed, is on the President's list for areas in distress by reason of unemployment. Those now to be discharged will but swell that list unfavorably. Most of those so affected will be veterans; many of them 10-point disabled veterans. My community, therefore, needs the best of postal service to insure to it the maximum of employment.

My community needs the best of service to make it possible to keep our business houses actively at work.

The great International Correspondence Schools' home office is in the very heart of the community and we all know that the whole of its business is by mail. Any adverse effect upon that business which might affect employment would be bitterly felt—and would seem to be illogical and contradictory. That business was created and expanded upon full reliance of the very best in postal service. Such postal service has been expanded throughout the years and the business and employment has correspondingly expanded. Now, upon almost no advance notice, that service is now curtailed and reduced.

I am fully aware that the Commission created, and acting to bring certain reorganizations and economies in the Government, has included the Post Office Department as an agency which should make certain reorganizations effective. That Commission, popularly called the Hoover Commission, in no report suggests reduction in service. If the economies so suggested must result in reduced service, then it is my position that the Hoover Commission has made a grave mistake in its recommendations with regard to the postal service, and it should be quickly noted and immediately corrected.

It appears that the personnel of that Commission has completely forgotten about the small business that most of us are trying our best to hold, protect, and advance. Our communication systems have made this a great country and the largest factor in that group of services is the postal Department. Without it and its keeping abreast of the expansion and progress of our country, we stand to lose, become dormant and even go backward.

Our reliance upon the mail, and its privacy, speed, and accuracy, has in as large a measure as in any other agency made our country a working democracy. We can notify each other promptly of the material matters of our everyday life; relying upon its movement to guide us in the matter of important personal, business, and governmental decisions daily. No person should know this better than a Congressman who is guided daily by his volume of mail which is delivered many times each day. Without such service as we have heretofore enjoyed, all of us here in this session will suffer in the efficiency of our staffs and the respect and good will of constituents.

I respectfully request the serious consideration of restoration of the former service to all of my colleagues by full cooperation to that end.

Behind It All Is Moscow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an editorial appearing in the Washington Sunday Star of April 23, 1950, which, while carefully worded, clearly indicates, as I interpret it, that the time is rapidly approaching, if not already here, when, in our own national interest the United States should sever diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union and its satellite countries.

The editorial follows:

BEHIND IT ALL IS MOSCOW

The pattern of events in Czechoslovakia comes close to being a carbon copy of what finally led us last February to sever all diplomatic relations with Bulgaria. The Communist puppets at Prague have not yet demanded that we recall our Ambassador, but in the words of one of our Embassy spokesmen, "they are really turning on the heat against us now." In short, step by step, with obvious deliberateness, they are worsening their past bad behavior toward us in a manner that seems definitely calculated to drive us—as a self-respecting Nation—into a complete break with them, and not merely the retaliatory closing of their consular offices in Chicago.

Thus, besides ordering the expulsion of the director of the United States Information Service, they have demanded that we put an immediate end to all our USIS activities, on the ground that both the director and the service itself have been using Czech nationals for espionage purposes and as spreaders of propaganda hostile to the Prague regime. Simultaneously, our Embassy—as was the case last October, but to a lesser extent—has once again been accused of running a huge "spy ring," and six citizens of Czechoslovakia have just been "tried" for being members, two of them receiving sentences of death. In addition, a 20-year-old American student is reported to have been sentenced to 18 years in prison after having been "tried," along with 15 Czechs, on charges of spying.

All this has been accompanied by a new outpouring of anti-American propaganda. Of course, such propaganda has been fairly common in Czechoslovakia ever since the Communist coup 2 years ago, but now it has become particularly virulent, with our Embassy apparently the chief target. The situation is so reminiscent of events in Bulgaria that we may reasonably anticipate a series of additional acts directed against our representatives in flagrant violation of all the accepted standards of decent international intercourse. In the circumstances, no American should be surprised if one of these days there is a full break in our diplomatic relations with Prague. Nor should any one be surprised if much the same thing happens later on in such places as Hungary, Rumania, and Poland.

For there is every reason to feel that in Czechoslovakia—as earlier in Bulgaria—a systematic effort is being carried out to make it virtually impossible for us to maintain normal relations. There is every reason to feel, too, that the same sort of thing is likely to develop in due course among the other satellite countries. Just why this is so, just why these puppet regimes are going out of their way to alienate themselves from us, is not clear. The only thing we can be sure of is that Moscow is behind the whole ugly business. After all, the policy involved is not really that of the Czechs or the Bulgars or their fellow vassals; it is a policy laid down by the men of the Kremlin for some dark purposes of their own, perhaps to cut off every bit of contact between the free world and the oppressed or to cover up whatever new aggressive moves they may be planning behind the iron curtain.

Whatever the reason for it, however, there can be little doubt that this policy, if it continues, if it grows worse, will eventually force us to ask ourselves whether we can avoid a complete break with the Soviet Union itself. Certainly, when one considers such things as events in Czechoslovakia and incidents like the inhumane attack on our Navy plane in the Baltic, it is difficult not to suspect that the Kremlin, with malice aforethought, is doing its best to make the gulf unbridgeable between itself and us. The outlook for friendship could hardly seem bleaker.

American Society of Newspaper Editors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM CONNALLY

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two addresses delivered by Secretary of State Acheson before the American Society of Newspaper Editors last week. One was on the record. The other was off the record, but it has been released for publication.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE DEAN ACHESON, SECRETARY OF STATE, AT A DINNER MEETING OF THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF NEWSPAPER EDITORS, WASHINGTON, D. C., APRIL 22, 1950

Tonight I would like to discuss with you the thing that is most important to all of us: The well-being and happiness and security of the United States.

I ask you to put aside, for the moment, all considerations that are less important, to forget all differences of opinion that are less than vital, and to consider with me this most important problem of the security and well-being of our country.

We are faced with a threat—in all sober truth I say this—we are faced with a threat not only to our country but to the civilization in which we live and to the whole physical environment in which that civilization can exist. This threat is the principal problem that confronts the whole United States in the world today.

To understand this threat to our country and our civilization, we have to go back 200 years and examine the ideas on which the United States was founded. We could go back more than 2,000 years, to the very beginning of western civilization. For more than 2,000 years the ideas we inherited, and live by today, have been fought over, have been suppressed and have been reborn in the minds of men.

The adventurous people who settled the eastern shores of North America in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries brought with them certain ideas which had come down to them through the whole stormy history of civilization. The first of those ideas was freedom—freedom of the mind and spirit, the most dynamic and adventurous idea ever to seize the mind of man. It drove men—and it continues to drive men—to inquire into the relation between man and God; to study the nature of the universe; to explore the purpose of human society.

Every thought we have in our minds, every relationship we have in our private lives, every institution under which we live, all of modern science has been molded, and in many cases created, by the exercise of the freedom of the human mind.

The second principle on which this country was built is the idea of diversity. If you have freedom of the mind, you are bound to have diversity, and you are bound to welcome it. We welcome people who think differently from ourselves. We welcome people with new ideas. We will not be chained to ideas of the past. We resist conformity. We refuse to be crammed into a single narrow pattern.

These ideas, freedom and diversity, have survived and flourished here in the United States because we accept and practice a third idea—and that is tolerance. We say and we believe "My freedom, my right to be different, depends on yours. I can be free only to the extent that you are free too."

The only limitation we put upon the exercise of freedom is that each of us must use it so that others can have the same right. I must exercise my freedom in such a way that it does not interfere with your freedom.

So it is these great concepts that have underlain the whole development of our civilization, not as mere abstract thoughts but as the very life blood, the dynamic push, which has created the civilization we know.

The threat we are facing is to these great concepts. It comes from a system which denies every premise we hold valid.

Soviet communism does not permit diversity of ideas. Freedom, this doctrine says, is an evil thing. It says that people who exercise freedom of thought, people who dare to depart from the doctrine laid down in the Kremlin in Moscow are criminals. It puts such people behind bars or it puts them to death.

Now this threat of Soviet communism would be serious enough if it were just the old idea of tyranny that was challenging our idea of freedom. It is that, but it is infinitely more than that.

This fanatical doctrine dominates one of the great states in this world, a state which, with its satellites, controls the lives of hundreds of millions of people, and which today possesses the largest military establishment in existence.

That would be serious enough. But it is even more serious than that, because those who hold and practice this doctrine pick out our country as the principal target of their attack. From their point of view they pick it out rightly. It is our country, with its belief in freedom and tolerance, its great productive power, its tremendous vitality, which stands between the Kremlin and dominion over the entire world. We must not forget that it is we, the American people, who have been picked out as the principal target of the Soviet Communists.

Added to all this is the fact that these people use the great resources of modern science, particularly those that have to do with an understanding of the human mind, to pervert the human mind. They resort to every trick, to every insidious and brutal device to destroy what we think is essential—the self-respect of the individual, the integrity of his mind and spirit.

What do we mean when we say that our country is the principal target of Soviet communism? We mean that the Soviet authorities would use, and gladly use, any means at their command to weaken and to harm us. Although they have not thought it wise to use military force against us, they are trying other methods. One method is the attempt to confuse and divide the American people.

If the United States can be confused and divided; if it can be made to doubt the desirability of helping other free nations; if it can be brought to doubt the desirability of maintaining its own defenses; if we cease to be rational and resolute; if we can be brought to doubt one another—then we will be softened up. Then we will be too weak to stand up to Communist thrusts in other parts of the world, and too divided and confused to stand up to Communist infiltration at home. To create that situation is one of the main objectives of the people in the Kremlin.

They have another objective, which is to pick off members of the free community of nations one by one. They do that partly to add to their power. But they have another important purpose and that is to build up the idea that communism is inevitable, that it is the wave of the future.

They believe that that gives other countries a sense of fright and hopelessness. They think that if they can spread this idea of a Communist world closing in on us, then

we will begin to get rattled, and some people will move in one direction and others will move in another direction, and the United States will be torn apart.

The men in the Kremlin have another clear objective, and that is to change the balance of productive power in the world. At present, that balance is very strongly against them, but that would not be so if they could get control in western Europe and in Japan.

So I say to you, make no mistake about it: we are faced with a challenge and a threat to the very basis of our civilization and to the very safety of the free world, the only kind of world in which that civilization can exist.

Now in this situation we have a great many suggestions and proposals put forward by leaders of American life, and by citizens who are concerned, and rightly concerned, about the uneasy and troubled state of our world. It is a good thing that people are thinking about these problems and suggesting ways to meet them. The only point I want to make about these proposals is that while some of them are practical and others are not, no single proposal is the whole answer to our problems. No one of them is the answer because there is no one answer. There is no one solution to the problems I have described to you. There is no quick or easy way to subdue an evil force. There is no miracle that will make it disappear from the earth.

Having recognized this truth, we need not for a moment be discouraged or downhearted. We have open to us, and we are now pursuing, many lines of action that will meet the challenge confronting us. May I mention six lines of action.

Our first line of action, and this seems to me the basis of all the others I shall discuss, is to demonstrate that our own faith in freedom is a burning and a fighting faith. We are children of freedom. We cannot be safe except in an environment of freedom. We believe in freedom as fundamentally as we believe anything in this world. We believe in it for everyone in our country. And we don't restrict this belief to freedom for ourselves. We believe that all people in the world are entitled to as much freedom, to develop in their own way, as we want ourselves.

If we are clear about this, if we are full of passion about this, then we have in our hearts and minds the most dynamic and revolutionary concept in human history, and one which properly strikes terror to every dictator, to every tyrant who would attempt to regiment and depress men anywhere.

Why do I put a strong belief in freedom first in the order of an American program of action? Because it is fundamental, because the second line of action flows from it. As the President said to you so forcefully on Thursday, the United States must, with a thousand voices and with all the resources of modern science, preach this doctrine throughout the world. The world must hear what America is about, what America believes, what freedom is, what it has done for many, what it can do for all.

We must use every means we know to communicate the value of freedom to the four corners of the earth. Our message must go out through leaflets, through our free press, radio programs and films, through exchange of students and teachers with other countries, and through a hundred other ways. And this doctrine of freedom will carry conviction because it comes not out of the Government alone, but out of the hearts and souls of the people of the United States. Because it is the authentic voice of America, freedom will ring around the world. President Truman has told you of his plans for an expanded information program—a campaign of truth. I know we can count on your help in this, because the turning point in the whole information program dates from the action of this very association just 3 years ago.

Thirdly, it is not enough that one should have a faith and should make that faith articulate. It is also essential that we, and those who think like us, should have the power to make safe the area in which we carry that faith into action. This means that we must look to our defenses. It means that we must organize our defenses wisely and prudently, with all the ingenuity and all the methods in which we are best versed to make ourselves strong.

Every element of promise is present in our situation. We have the ingenuity; we have the productive power; we have the determination; we have the resources. But this is not a subject on which I am competent to dwell at length. The President's chief advisers in this field are our Secretary of Defense and our service secretaries, in whom we can have complete faith and confidence.

Fourthly, beyond faith and preachment and defense there lies the necessity of translating all of these into terms of the daily lives of hundreds of millions of peoples who live in this free world of ours. I am talking about the effort we are now making to help create a better material life for ourselves and for other people in many parts of the world.

One part of this effort has to do with setting in operation again the great workshops of the free world. Since the end of the war we have worked steadily at this problem and we have had a vast measure of success. The chimneys of these factories are smoking again; raw materials are moving into them; finished goods are moving out. Hundreds of millions of people see the specter of insecurity in their daily lives being pushed further back.

Another part of this effort to develop the economic conditions for freedom is to help create new workshops, new crops, new wealth in places where they have not existed before. That is the purpose of the President's program of technical assistance for underdeveloped areas, now before the Congress.

As you know, there are great areas of the world where people are living in a state of extreme poverty that is almost impossible for us to imagine. Millions of these people are not content any more to accept these conditions of poverty for themselves or their children. They are looking for a way out. That is a good thing. The will to change is half the battle. But the question is whether these people will choose a way out that leads to freedom. The question is whether they will move ahead in the free world with us. If we want them to move in the direction of freedom, we must help them.

It is as simple as that—but it is tremendously important to the United States, to our security and well-being. And so we must put a great effort behind this program.

Now while we are helping to get workshops going—old and new—and to get people producing in Europe and other parts of the world, we have to do still another thing. And that is to develop a sensible system of trade to exchange the goods which are being and will be produced. This free world of ours can't operate if people are cooped up within narrow national limits, if they are not able to move about freely and exchange their goods, their services, and their ideas and knowledge. Building up an orderly and free system of exchange is what we mean when we talk about expanding world trade. To develop a sensible system of exchange, we must push ahead with such things as the International Trade Organization, and reciprocal trade agreements.

We are going to have to make a great national effort, also, to get our own trade with the rest of the world into balance, to get out of the situation where we are selling abroad much more than we are buying and making up the difference out of the pockets of American taxpayers. Nobody here or abroad wants that situation to continue indefinitely. As part of the remedy we shall have to buy more from abroad, and that will demand a concerted national effort.

The fifth line of action is in the political field. In this political field we have so far only scratched the surface of what can be done to bring the free world closer together, to make it stronger and more secure and more effective.

There are many ways of organizing the free world for common action, and many different opinions on how it should be done. But I think it is important in this hour of danger to concentrate our minds and our energies on using the machinery we have at hand, on expanding it, and making it work. When you look over the field, you will see that we now have created a great deal of good machinery.

There is the whole machinery of the United Nations which we are continually learning to use more effectively. Within the framework of the United Nations we have other machinery, like the North Atlantic Treaty and the Organization of American States.

The free nations of Europe have banded together in the Council of Europe, in the Marshall plan organization, and in a smaller group known as Western Union. We can work with all of these organizations. We can use whichever is best suited to accomplish a particular purpose. What we need to do is to expand the machinery we have, to improve it, to use it with boldness and imagination, and, where necessary, to supplement it with new machinery.

Now our program of action would not be complete if I did not go on to a sixth field, and that is the area of our relations with the Soviet Union and the countries that have fallen under Communist control. In this field, as in our relations with the free nations, we have the machinery of negotiation at hand. In the United Nations we have a dozen or more conference tables, at which our differences could be thrashed out, where unfortunately the Soviet chair stands empty at the present time. We shall go on trying to find a common ground for agreement, not perfect or eternal agreement, but at least a better arrangement for living together in greater safety.

But one thing is clear. There can be no agreement, there can be no approach to agreement unless one idea is done away with, and that is the idea of aggression. And that word "aggression" includes not only military attack, but propaganda warfare and the secret undermining of free countries from within.

We do not propose to subvert the Soviet Union. We shall not attempt to undermine Soviet independence. And we are just as determined that communism shall not by hook or crook or trickery undermine our country or any other free country that desires to maintain its freedom. That real and present threat of aggression stands in the way of every attempt at understanding with the Soviet Union. For it has been wisely said that there can be no greater disagreement than when someone wants to eliminate your existence altogether.

If, as and when that idea of aggression, by one means or another, can be ruled out of our relations with the Soviet Union, then the greatest single obstacle to agreement will be out of the way. As the results of our actions become clear and the free world becomes stronger, it will, I believe, become progressively easier to get agreements with the Soviet Union.

These men, are the main lines of action by the Government and people of the United States in dealing with their present danger. Now you may be thinking, "well, that's the

story." But that is only the beginning of the story.

On several occasions lately, I have used the phrase "total diplomacy" to describe a method of dealing with our problems. Let me explain again what I mean by total diplomacy.

I mean, first, that there is no longer any difference between foreign questions and domestic questions. They are all parts of the same questions. When we consider any matter, whether it is the size of the budget or the amount of taxes we pay, or the regulation of our commerce or the regulation of immigration or military policy or foreign aid, it is all part of the same thing.

Every one of these things is a part of the problem of our national safety and every part of the problem is serious.

All the problems of the United States are related to the problem of preserving its existence as the kind of a country which we know and love.

When we understand this fact of the wholeness of our problem, then we must go further and act on our understanding.

In the last few years the President has developed methods by which all parts of the executive branch of the Government can be pulled together on all questions in the light of this total problem. Under the President's leadership—the State Department, the Treasury Department, the Defense Establishment, Agriculture, Labor, and all the others—have been brought into focus on the great problem of our national security.

There must also be a close working together not only between the Congress and the Executive but between both parties in the Congress and the Executive.

That does not mean that a strong opposition is not essential. It is. Our two-party system is inherent in our form of government. There is plenty of room for difference of opinion as to how this or that should be done. There is room for views strongly held, and wisely debated. There is room for criticism. But there is also room for a final consensus of opinion. We must work toward consensus of opinion; we must broaden the area of agreement so that the Congress and the Executive—both parties of the Congress and the Executive—will view every problem and deal with every problem as a part of the total problem.

What makes this possible is a common loyalty to our democratic institutions. We cannot use position or influence for the purpose of getting some personal or some partisan advantage without being disloyal to the institution of democratic government.

But more than the institution of democratic government is at stake. The threat, as I have said, is to our civilization, and each of us is a bearer of that civilization. And therefore each of us has a part to play in this total diplomacy.

Today the whole United States is acting before the world as its own representative. In the old days, relations between countries were carried on by diplomats. In the old days a man who held my office used to write out in beautiful script instructions to a minister who represented the United States abroad in London or Paris or Brussels or Peking. And those instructions where put on a sailing ship and they took weeks to cross the ocean. And the American Minister who received them put on his black knee breeches and he walked to the palace or the foreign office and he read what his Secretary of State in Washington had written, and that was the United States speaking to some government in Europe or Asia.

Now all that is changed. Today we all represent the United States. Everything that happens in this country can be flashed in a second to the uttermost reaches of the world. Today in a very real sense the United States represents itself to the world. The world hears speeches which are made in the Congress. The world hears what is said over our radio. The world reads what is said in our press. If there are acts or words of violence, discrimination and irresponsibility the world sees and hears them. If there are acts or words of justice, understanding and sober determination, the world sees and hears them also.

America speaks with a thousand voices. All the views of our labor leaders, our business leaders, our church leaders, our educational leaders, our leaders of women's and men's groups and clubs—all the things they do and say flash around the world. Everything that we do or say enters into the picture of America which is seen abroad. Foreign nations are continually watching to see whether the United States is cool, whether it is determined, whether it is strong, whether it will go through with its intentions. To make up their minds they look at everything which is happening in the whole country.

What will the world see? The thought that I want to leave with you is that each of us bears a measure of responsibility for the answer. Each one of us can make our country seen as it truly is—determined to do its part to carry the free world forward to strength and security.

EXTEMPORANEOUS REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE DEAN ACHESON, SECRETARY OF STATE, FOLLOWING HIS RADIO ADDRESS AT A DINNER MEETING OF THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF NEWSPAPER EDITORS, WASHINGTON, D. C., APRIL 22, 1950

There are several things that I should like to talk with you about. Before I get on with the matters which I think have some substantive importance, I should like to clear away some trash which has gathered about the Department of State.

Now, in doing this, I feel that I have a qualification which is so unique that it almost amounts to a disqualification. That is, that I know what I am talking about. I have given 10 years of my life to the Department of State, and before that I served in two other departments of the Government. During the course of that time I served on two commissions appointed by the President to study the operations of the Government of the United States. I have served under four Secretaries of State and under two Presidents. So I think I am entitled to say that I know something about the Department of State.

The first thing that I should like to say is in the nature of a categorical affirmation. I should like to say that never in its long and honorable history has the Department of State ever been in better shape than it is today.

The Department is manned today, as it has been manned in the past, by able, by honorable, by loyal, and by clean-living American men and women.

It is also a representative Department. People who serve in the Department are drawn from all over the United States.

There is no need for anyone to be defensive about the Department of State. What I want you to consider with me are facts.

First of all, when we are talking about this Department, let us look at its top command; let us see who the people are who are controlling and operating and directing the Department of State.

First of all, I don't have to tell you about the Under Secretary of State, Jim Webb. You know he comes from North Carolina. You know his record in the Budget Bureau and in the Treasury. You know what he did in organizing the Sperry Co. before the war, when it grew from a little place of 800 people to a great corporation of 30,000 employees. You know what he did in the Marine flying service.

But the important point that I want to bring out tonight is that I do not know any man in the entire United States, in the Government or out of the Government, who has a greater genius for organization, a genius for understanding how to take a great mass of people and bring them together; so that he pulls out of them all the knowledge and all the competence that they have; so that each person is doing what he ought to be doing; so that the whole efforts of this vast group are pulled together to get a tremendously powerful result. And that is absolutely essential in the Department of State.

When Thomas Jefferson started the State Department it had 6 employees, including himself. Today we have 19,000 employees all over the world, and all of those 19,000 are being pulled by Jim Webb into one great consolidated effort, through a top command.

The third ranking officer in the Department is George Kennan. I don't need to tell you about George Kennan. You have read what he has written. You know his record. He comes from Wisconsin.

One of the things to which I have agreed, with deep regret, is that George Kennan should have a year off. He went to work for the State Department when he was 22 years old, and he has never had any time off since. What he wants to do is go to the Institute of Advanced Studies at Princeton and have time quietly to think about things and then come back to us. I have agreed to it, reluctantly, but we shall have him again.

Then we go to another area of the top command, Assistant Secretary Jack Peurifoy of South Carolina. I don't need to tell you about him, except one thing, perhaps, and that is that in all the years that I have been in the State Department he has been with me. When he came to the State Department after he had been in West Point and had to leave on account of disease of the lungs (which, unhappily, I have come to know only too much about from one who is close to me) he very soon became my assistant. He is now the Deputy Under Secretary for Administration. He is in charge of administration. I shall come back to him again in a little while.

Then we have Jack Hickerson, of Texas, a Foreign Service officer of 25 years' experience, whom we have taken out of European affairs and put into something which we want to stress, and that is the work of the United Nations.

Then we have George McGhee, of Texas, a former oil man who worked with the Government through the war; who was in the economic part of the Government during the war, both in Washington and London, and back and forth a great deal of the time; who took charge of the administration of our Greek-Turkish aid; whom the President, at my recommendation, put in charge of our Near East and African work; and who, with incredible energy has now visited every one of the areas under his control. He has visited and talked with leading men of every country of the Middle East and has just returned from a long trip to Africa.

It would be foolish for me to tell you about Ed Barrett who came from Alabama. He belongs to your profession. You know him. You know the great job which he is doing in overseas information which the President has picked out for such vitally important concentration.

We have put into the far-eastern work Dean Rusk, of Georgia. He was our Deputy Under Secretary for Political Affairs, and we thought that the whole far-eastern matter was so critical that we would take our senior political officer and put him into that work.

Walton Butterworth, of Louisiana, who had been in that work, we put in charge particularly of working out some progress on a solution of Japanese matters, one of the most essential things that we must do. In him we have picked out an officer who has the

confidence of General MacArthur, who has worked with the Military Establishment, who is a man of superb integrity and courage.

In case you don't know as much about Walton Butterworth as you do about some of these others, I will remind you that he is the man who had charge of our economic warfare activities during the war in Spain and Portugal. It was he who was in that plane that fell into the river and broke apart at Lisbon; it was Walton who was in the sinking part of the plane in which most of the passengers were trapped; who broke the window through; who pushed his fellow passengers out of the window while the plane was filling up; who then got himself out, kept those who could not swim very well afloat, and helped them onto a wing that was floating. Finally, when the boats came out and picked them up after a very long time and Walton was taken ashore, what do you suppose he had in his hand? It was his brief case containing his secret papers. That is the type of officer we have in the State Department.

Then we have as our legal adviser, ranking with the Assistant Secretaries, Adrian Fisher, of Tennessee. And I note, as I go along here, that we seem to be loaded up with old-fashioned southern Communists—no doubt of the Cordell Hull, Walter George, Tom Connally type.

Adrian Fisher was a bomber navigator during the war; later Solicitor with the Department of Commerce; legal adviser to the Atomic Energy Commission, and now the legal adviser in the Department of State.

I suggest to people, in the interest of their own security, not to fool with Adrian Fisher. Not only was he a former bomber navigator, but he was a former captain of the Princeton football team. Charges lightly made about him might have serious personal consequences.

Eddie Miller, of New York, was born in Puerto Rico, brought up in Cuba, and then in New York. He speaks Portuguese and Spanish as easily as he speaks English. He is a former partner of Mr. Dulles. He has just returned from two trips to South America in which he has put our relations with the Southern Hemisphere on a basis on which I think they have never been before. They are on a sensible, sound basis of mutual advantage, and both they and we know that we both really mean business when we talk, and when we talk we want to talk business.

George Perkins of New York is a businessman of distinction, who had gone with Paul Hoffman and was working with him in Paris. Paul, with great generosity, let me take him to be in charge of our European affairs.

Willard Thorp of New York is in charge of economic matters. He is an economic expert; a former director of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce in the Department of Commerce; a former partner of Dun & Bradstreet.

Jack McFall of Colorado and Indiana has charge of our relations with Congress. He has spent 15 years as the assistant clerk of the Appropriations Committee of the House. If there is anybody who understands, and really understands deeply, the necessities of close relationships between the House and the Senate and the Department of State, it is Jack McFall.

Then in charge of a very important branch of our work, dealing with the new government of Germany and German problems, we have a regular colonel from the United States Army, Colonel Henry Byroade, who was lent to us by the Army—and whom I wish I could steal permanently for the State Department.

In charge of the planning staff is Paul Nitze of Massachusetts, former partner of Dillon, Read, a man who went all through the war and was awarded the Medal of Merit for his economic-warfare work.

In charge of our press relations, we have that old friend of yours, Mike McDermott—and you know what sort of a "Communist" he is.

In charge of intelligence work is Park Armstrong of New Jersey, a man who all through the war was dealing with this incredibly important business of the evaluation of intelligence. Don't for a moment believe that the important thing to do is to send someone out with rubbers, dark glasses, and a false mustache, to try to steal some paper or find out something. The important business is the evaluation of what you get, either by secret operations or, much more importantly, the material which just pours in on you. Secret material is a dime a dozen. We had, not so long ago, a most interesting and exciting paper planted on us by one of our enthusiastic friends abroad, and it caused a little flurry. But it was Park Armstrong's cool people who discovered in a short time that it was a phony from top to bottom and saved us from the obvious purposes of their planting it on us.

In charge of the great military program for which we and the Defense Department are jointly responsible, we had in Jim Bruce of Maryland. Now that he has resigned, Jack Ohly of New York is taking it over.

Now, we have also brought in Phil Jessup, Senator Dulles, of New York, and Senator Cooper, of Kentucky. You can imagine how helpful they would be in covering up all "subversive" activities.

Here in this top command, I say to you, we have men as distinguished, as able, as powerful and as vigorous as any of my great predecessors, from John Marshall to George Marshall, ever had in the Department of State.

Furthermore, we have carried out a reorganization which is based on these men being the operators of the State Department. They are not people who sit around and argue with one another. Each one of them is responsible for carrying out a job, and the policy under which he carries it out is worked out through the planning staff, with the cooperation of all of these men. The policy is laid down and they are given their authority.

I don't sit behind them and pull their coat tails or look over their shoulders. I am kept informed, by the central secretariat, of everything that happens. I am permitted to get in, if I wish to, before something is done, but I don't wish to do that. These men are too good. They cannot hesitate. They cannot be saying, "What does the Secretary think?" They know what the policy is, and they go out and operate. Then we post-audit the operations; we change the policy if it is not working, but they are given responsibility and they are well able to carry it.

So I say to you—this is something very, very important, and I suggest that you ask your correspondents in Washington whether what I say to you is true—that today, as rarely before in the State Department, there is no backbiting, there is no jealousy, there is no undercutting. You have an organization of people which is loyal to those within it, which is loyal to the President of the United States and which is loyal to the United States of America.

Let us turn for a moment to the career service. The career service, made up of the Foreign Service and the departmental offices, is equally in good shape. This is a service of men and women who are giving their entire lives to the United States, not for a few years, not even 10 years, as I have given, but their entire lives, from the time they are young men until they retire at the end of their service. They are giving their whole lives to the United States. They are competent, they are courageous, and they are devoted.

Only this past week, two of our missions were bombed. That is not a pleasant experience. Have any of you ever had it? Have any of you ever had a bomb tossed in the window of your house and had it go off and injure people? Two of our missions have been through that this week. Fortunately, no one was killed, but many people were hurt. Do these people want to come home? Do they say, "This is too dangerous"? Not at all. This is in line of duty. They know their duty. They perform it. It is quite likely that they may be killed, but there is no squeak out of them.

We have just had an officer home who had been held by the Chinese Communists for a year, many months of which he spent in jail, under conditions of incredible hardship and torture. At the direction and request of President Truman, he is going about the United States telling people of what was done to him. Does he ask to retire? Not at all. With great difficulty, we are keeping him in the United States doing this. He wants to go back to the most difficult area that we can find for him. He is not asking to quit. He is not asking for sympathy. This is his duty. He likes it. He wants to go into it again.

We have scores of our people who are now in Chinese cities which are being bombed by the Chinese Nationalists. Are they whimpering about it? Not in the least. They were ordered home because the President decided that was the wise policy. They were perfectly willing to stay there and take whatever came to them.

We have scores of people through southeast Asia who are in areas of hot war, Indochina, the Philippines, Malaya, Indonesia. Bullets are flying all the time. It is not a cold war in those areas; it is a hot war. And these men and their wives and their children are there, and they are doing their duty. They don't ask to be transferred. They know it is their duty, and they are performing it.

And in other places, in Africa and other parts of the world, we have men with their wives and children who are in situations of the greatest danger, so far as their health is concerned. They are living under very unhealthful conditions. If they are ill, they take their chances under the most primitive medical conditions. There are no schools. There are no oculists to take care of the children's eyes. There are no doctors to give them all the inoculations which your children take. None of those things are available. They don't complain. This is their duty. This is their life. All they ask is that occasionally they be transferred to some situation which is not quite so tough.

Then there are others who are behind the iron curtain, and there they are treated as criminals. They cannot have any association with anybody. They cannot have any of the ordinary pleasant relations that all of you have. Anyone who meets them or talks with them will be in jail the next day and possibly hang the day after that. They have to live in a little circle, seeing the same few people day after day after day. But that is their duty, and they are carrying it out.

Here, again, there are no schools. And if you have a toothache and you want to go to a dentist, you don't call up a dentist; you call up the Foreign Office, and the Foreign Office calls up the secret police, and the secret policeman makes an engagement and comes and sits right beside you in the dentist chair to be absolutely sure that the dentist does not take a message out of your tooth and give it to somebody else.

Those are the circumstances under which these people live.

I don't have to defend these people. There is no reason in the world why they need any defense.

I should like to suggest to you that you would find it a very interesting exercise to

try, in your papers, an open letter to these Foreign Service officers of the United States, who are now your front line of defense, who are serving you in these dangerous and difficult parts of the world. Explain to them the attacks which are being made upon them and upon the Service of which they are just as proud as you are proud of the profession to which you belong. Explain to them, if you can, what is happening to this country behind them. Explain to them why it was that during the war we had USO's and letter-writing campaigns and everything in the world for the soldiers at the front to show them that the country was behind them and recognized the sacrifice that they were making; and try to explain what is happening now when it comes to these soldiers, these people who are in the front line of the defense of their country. Explain that to them if you can. You will find it difficult to do.

That is the Department of State as it exists today.

It is not strange that efforts should be made to penetrate this Department. Efforts of that sort have been made throughout the history of the United States, and they are being made today.

In the past, these efforts have beeen made by professionals. But with the spread of this fanatical doctrine of communism, the old profession of professional spies is under competition from amateurs.

Now, this creates difficulty. We are familiar with the method of counterespionage and the security methods which we have used in the past to protect ourselves from professional spies. In the last few years we have had a new problem to solve—and we have gone about solving it.

There is a right way to solve that problem, and there is a wrong way to solve it. The right way to solve the problem is to go at it from the point of view of meeting the evil which confronts you and preserving the institution which you are trying to protect. The wrong way is one in which you do not meet the evil that you are attempting to meet, but you destroy the institution that you are trying to protect. Not only do you destroy that, but you destroy the faith of the country in its Government and its institutions. You destroy the faith of our allies in us and you delight our enemies. Those are the right and wrong ways.

The right way was set up by General Marshall in 1947 in the State Department. It was set up under the directive of the President setting up the whole loyalty program. I have never known a man I thought had a surer judgment about people than General Marshall has.

And General Mashall picked out Jack Peurifoy to take charge of the loyalty program in the State Department. He took charge of it. He worked at it through General Marshall's administration. When I came, it seemed to me that there was absolutely nothing better than I could possibly think of to do than to confirm Jack Peurifoy in that particular job. I did, and I have never had occasion to doubt that I did the right thing.

He is not trying to do all this by himself. He has a security staff under a former FBI agent, who is recognized as one of the ablest men ever trained in the service of the FBI. He has a staff of 74 investigators who carry on our investigation work. That is not the only staff that does it. Mr. Hoover's FBI cooperates fully in the whole process. By one method or another, all people who come into the Department and all those who are in it have gone through a thorough screening process. This is a process which is not based on the idea that all these people are crooks. It is a process which is based, first, on protecting the United States but, at the same time, protecting the individuals' rights, protecting their reputations, urging and permitting them to continue to serve the United States with enthusiasm.

Searching examinations are made, so that if we find anything which causes trouble in our minds, we then put it into another level of screening. It goes to the Loyalty Board in the State Department.

General Conrad Snow is the chairman of that board. He is an old-fashioned New Hampshire Republican "Communist," a man who, incidentally, is vouched for by Senator Bridges.

That board, and the people who work on it, have gone through every single case about which any doubt has arisen.

When they get through with it, whatever recommendation is made—whether it is that the man be cleared or that he is not cleared—the whole matter goes on again to the President's Loyalty Board, headed by Seth Richardson, a former Assistant Attorney General under President Hoover, with a group of associates not one of whom works for the Government of the United States. All of these people are private citizens who are giving their time, their effort, and their devotion to the Government.

That is the right way. The wrong way is to smear everybody's reputation; to make charges on the basis that, if one is not right, you try to find another one you hope will stick; to try to destroy the confidence of people in their Foreign Office and in their Government in one of the most critical hours of this Nation's history—to do all of those things, and to make it absolutely certain, as a result, that under no circumstances could you ever possibly find a spy in the whole place. It is as though you said to yourself that the best way to find a fire is to ring every fire alarm in the city; not that you know of any fire, but if you get all the apparatus out and have it wheeling around through the city, you might find one.

But I think what is going on is much madder and much more vicious than that. It reminds me more of that horrible episode in Camden, N. J., which happened not so long ago, when a madman came out on the street in the morning with his revolver. With no purpose and with no plan, as he walked down the street, he just shot people; one was a woman coming out of a store; a man with his wife in an automobile. That automobile happened to stop because the light turned red. The car ahead of him went on. The car behind him was not where the madman was. So the madman just walked up and shot everybody in the car, without sense, without purpose, without direction.

You remember, I am sure, that poem of Browning's called Caliban Upon Setebas. Caliban is talking about this horrible amoral god of his. He says that his god operates in the way that Caliban himself does on the beach. Along comes, says Caliban, a procession of crabs going down to the sea across the sand. And he says something like this: "I stand there and I let 20 go by. The twenty-first I pick up and tear off a flipper. I let three more go by. The next one I crush in order to watch it wiggle in agony on the sand," and so on. It is that degree of vicious madness which has been going on here.

Now, I don't ask you for sympathy. I don't ask you for help. You are in a worse situation than I am. I and my associates are only the intended victims of this mad and vicious operation. But you, unhappily—you by reason of your calling—are participants. You are unwilling participants, disgusted participants, but, nevertheless, participants, and your position is far more serious than mine.

As I leave this filthy business, and I hope never to speak of it again, I should like to leave in your minds the words of John Donne in his Meditations, in which he says:

"Any man's death diminishes me, because I am involved in mankind.
And therefore do not send to know for whom the bell tolls;
It tolls for thee."

The American Way—How We May Improve It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1950

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include an essay written by Louise Hinders, of Celina, Ohio, entitled "The American Way—How We May Improve It."

This essay was one of 12 winners among more than 75,000 essays entered in the annual American Legion, Department of Ohio, contest for high school students of Ohio.

The Legion, every contestant, and the winners in particular are to be congratulated on the project for 1950.

The essay follows:

THE AMERICAN WAY—HOW WE MAY IMPROVE IT

(By Louise Hinders, Celina)

The house we live in—the American way of life—has been built upon the Constitution of the United States. Through all the storms of one of the most disturbed periods in human history, the free Government of the American people has rested secure on the foundation of our Constitution. However, it is also very important that we put the spirit of this document to work in our everyday lives.

Democracy is many things. It is the things we do, the words we say, and the thoughts we think. It is also the way we act toward other people. Democracy touches every aspect of the life of our communities.

A nation's strength lies in the character of its people, in their willingness to sacrifice leisure, comfort, and a share of their talents for the welfare of the community. Why have we come to believe that the American way is a free ride, without the need for earning our way?

Probably the greatest single cause for poor citizenship can be traced to our declining sense of responsibility in the home, the school, and the community in which we live. Although many try to solve the problems on the national scene, few have the humility to start where citizenship counts—in our own home town.

Because the family is the basic unit of our society, it is there that responsibility begins. The state measures its true strength by the stability of family life among its families. No nation can be greater than its families.

Good citizens must first be good persons. School courses in civics and political science, and inspirational studies of the lives and works of political leaders, meet a practical need. But these alone never make good citizens. Virtue is the basis of good citizenship. It is best developed in a good home and where God is held in reverence.

Modern living has put the emphasis on selfishness and suffocated the instincts of good citizenship at the very source. The youth of today look upon their home merely as a shelter and a meal ticket. Boys and girls in high school must realize their responsibility to others than themselves. No one can begin too early to learn genuine friendliness, understanding and respect for all other members of a group, regardless of race, creed, or social opportunity.

Our American way will be greatly improved when boys and girls are taking an active part in their town—in its community center, in

the work of its Red Cross, and in its Boy and Girl Scouts. By so doing they learn to realize the importance of the ballot. They learn to choose their own leaders, they become interested in local government. Thus they gradually learn to realize the importance of their State and Federal Governments. Voting becomes not only a privilege but a solemn duty. In this way they can learn to couple duty with vision, courage with steadfastness, and practice with principle.

Faith in our form of government, strengthened by practical experience, will set aside doubts and fears, and will guide the youth of today most surely toward the realization of their dreams for a finer America of tomorrow.

Return of the Pony Express or Horse-and-Buggy Days, With Emphasis on "Buggy"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER E. BREHM
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 24, 1950

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, each mail coming to my office brings from 3 to 10 letters from constituents in my district stating their violent opposition to the administration's program of curtailing postal service.

The record will clearly demonstrate that I am in favor of economy and that I have so voted on each and every occasion. However, in my opinion, there are many false economy moves, and the present administrative directive wherein postal service is diminished does, in my opinion, furnish a perfect example of false economy.

In keeping with my stated intention during debate on this measure, I am including herewith the remarks referred to which in my opinion clearly demonstrate that if the present administration would accept and put into operation the recommendations of the Hoover Commission report, that this present drastic reduction in postal service would be unnecessary:

Reaction to the dramatic announcement, a few days ago, of "economy moves" ordered by the Post Office Department has been about as expected. The public is properly indignant at the reduction of residential mail deliveries from two a day to one, at the curtailment of post-office business hours, at the elimination of directory service in first-class mail and the other steps which will make the postal service less efficient. Reports from Washington say that the slash is likely to result in an increase of, perhaps, $30,000,000 in the appropriations for the Department.

The fact is that the Post Office Department's "economy move" does not remotely approach the real trouble or its causes. It chooses to attack the problem primarily through a program of inconveniences to the public which uses the mail service—and pays for it—and with the hope of doing no more than recoup some $30,000,000 of an estimated $500,000,000 deficit.

In this connection, it is informative to take a look at the findings and recommendations of the Hoover Commission with respect to the Post Office Department. The report says:

"(a) The administrative structure is obsolete and overcentralized.

"(b) A maze of outmoded laws, regulations and traditions freeze progress and stifles proper administration.

"(c) Although the Post Office is a business-type establishment, it lacks the freedom and flexibility essential to good business administration.

"(d) Rates have not kept pace with wages and other costs, and rate-making machinery is inadequate.

"(e) The service is used to hide subsidies.

"(f) Political appointments of first, second and third-class postmasters and certain other officials produces inefficiency and militates against the incentives of promotion.

"(g) Accounts are kept by the General Accounting Office outside the Department and are available to the Post Office for management purposes only after months of delay. Methods of budgeting and appropriation are entirely unsuited to a business of the size and character of the Post Office.

"(h) In recent times, except for a few years, the Post Office has operated at a loss * * * only the first-class mails, certain categories of foreign mails and the Post Office Savings System more than met their own expenses."

Some of the specific criticisms of the Post Office Department's inefficiencies (covered generally in this summary) are: (1) At this moment the Department has in service more than 10,000 vehicles the average age of which exceeds 15 years. (2) While 80 percent of the mail sorting could be done mechanically, according to the Hoover Report, this is still largely a hand operation. (3) Some of the rules governing accounting procedure go back to 1842 and others are 1840-style "modernizations" of methods set up by Alexander Hamilton in the days when men wore satin knee breeches and powdered wigs.

The clear implication of both the general and specific criticisms is that the Post Office Department is hopelessly out of date by present-day methods that could be made available under a thorough-going, nonpolitical reorganization; that the postal service could break even—or come a lot closer to doing so than at present—if the Hoover recommendations were put into effect.

As just one instance showing that the curtailment of service is not only an inadequate but also an unfair approach to the Post Office Department's problem, consider one item in the summary above—that first-class mail is the principal category which is now paying its own way at current rates.

Yet it is the users of first-class mail service who will suffer the most—by slower and less frequent pick-ups and deliveries, by less convenient office hours, by the elimination of directory service on letters which may have minor errors in address. In New York City alone 50,000 letters every day will be returned to senders or go to the dead-letter office under this ruling.

The protests from the public at the postal-service slash are justified. They ought to be bolstered by demands for a streamlining of the Post Office Department from top to bottom, in line with the Hoover Commission's findings. If this is to be done, there will be no need either to curtail postal services or to increase rates unreasonably.

A Fable About Potato Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 24, 1950

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include another Dave Kirk editorial from the Spokane Chronicle.

I think this editorial points out briefly and graphically the dangers in the so-called Brannan farm plan.

At a time when tax reductions are becoming mandatory, it is well for all of us to consider what the cost of any given legislative proposal might be. The worst feature of those presently advocating the Brannan plan is the complete vagueness of either the cost to the Treasury or the increase in the presently overloaded Federal pay roll.

The editorial follows:

A FABLE ABOUT POTATO PRICES

Once upon a time there was a farmer who raised too many potatoes. People just couldn't use all of them, so, naturally, they didn't buy.

"What'll I do?" cried the farmer. "I can't get as much for my potatoes as I used to get. A lot of them will ride over to next year and the surplus will hold the price down then, too. What'll I do?"

"Oh, that's all right," quoth a Government price-fixing agent. "We'll let the price fall naturally through the operation of the law of supply and demand. That way the consumer will get a break."

"But what about me?" asked the farmer.

"Oh, the Government will pay you the difference between the low prices and what you should have," came the answer.

"But where will you get the money?" queried the farmer.

"Ah, that's easy," said the Government price-fixing agent. "I'll just make a quick change into the make-up of a tax collector and go back to the consumer for the money. He'll never realize that he's paying for potatoes!"

Veterans' Hospitals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 24, 1950

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, this bill providing for the construction of certain veterans' hospitals, and enlargement of others, is meritorious and deserves the support of the membership of this House.

The report of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs makes plain in its report that this bill restores to the Veterans' Administration hospital construction program the approximately 16,000 beds which were cancelled last December at the direction of the President.

All of the projects specified in this bill have previously been approved and a need has been demonstrated for the construction of these hospitals at the places indicated and for restoration of beds in the hospitals sought to be reduced in size.

The entire matter has been thoroughly considered by the Appropriations Committee of both House and Senate. The independent offices appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1950 continues the authorization of the necessary amount for the projects enumerated in this bill. The authority, however, is purely discretionary, and with the experience of

the past, there is created a doubt as to whether any action will be taken to restore these projects, unless legislation of this kind is enacted. This bill requires that the construction program shall proceed.

The need for the hospitals has been so well established that further delay is unjustified.

The American Way—How We May Improve It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 24, 1950

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following winning essay of Robert Scheidt, of Van Wert, Ohio, in the American Legion contest:

THE AMERICAN WAY—HOW WE MAY IMPROVE IT

(By Robert Scheidt Van Wert)

This is the time for serious thinking—straight thinking. Great decisions must be made. Two contradictory forces are struggling for the minds and hearts of men. The same forces that ruined European civilization are mobilizing to repeat their work of destruction upon us. We can no longer refuse to recognize them. We must meet them and solve them in the traditionally American way.

The meaning and application we give the American way will determine our future survival and destiny among the nations of the world. The American way of living is the democratic way. It is because our Government is a democracy that we have freedom. Our freedom is largely responsible for our prosperity, and our prosperity has produced our high standard of living. We must do our share in maintaining this democracy which is the very foundation of our happiness and security. The citizen of a democracy can never rest if he wishes his country to remain free. "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty" is an old saying which has proved itself throughout the ages.

We must dismantle the powers of those who would destroy us and set about rebuilding our own system of Government. This is necessary if we are to save the American way of life.

We must remain free to denounce and correct the present imperfections of our Government. This kind of freedom is increasingly precious in the world of today.

If liberty is to be preserved in this country, we must not become overly dependent upon the Federal Government. Such an attitude is degenerative in the moral sense, tends to destroy incentive in the economic, and is socialistic in the political.

It is utterly opposed to the traditional American principles of initiative, self-reliance, and ambition.

We must progressively reduce those taxes which hinder saving and the expansion of business. We must conserve our national resources, raise our productivity, and distribute our goods for the benefit of all. But this must not be done at the expense of our liberties. Freedom must have first place in our loyalties—then economic security. There can be no lasting security in a nation without freedom.

Each of us must be active in public service. We must get a clear understanding of political issues and elect leaders who are statesmen, not rulers. For service to others is the true essence of liberty.

Our reponsibility to the future is the correct education of our children. They must be taught the true meaning of democracy and how to make it work.

Our whole philosophy of government is based on the fundamental principle of Christianity that the individual is supreme. Our Founding Fathers had faith to believe that a government whose constitution was based on the Ten Commandments and the principles of Christ could not fail. That faith has been justified. History has confirmed that belief.

At the time our forefathers were declaring that the Creator had endowed all mankind with rights of freedom as the children of God, there was being proclaimed in Europe a philosophy of agnosticism asserting that the rights of man came from the State. The greatness of America today comes from one philosophy, the distress of Europe from the other. Let us not forget the original ideals that made America great. They were bought at a high price.

Deep reverence for the democratic way needs to be kept alive in the American people. We shall survive and history will judge us on how well we continue to fulfill this great way of life—the American way.

Conduits for Electric Voting Machines Should Be Installed This Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN R. DAVIS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 24, 1950

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include hereunder a copy of a resolution unanimously adopted by the Philadelphia branch of the American Association of University Women. This organization has gone on record in support of the effort to prepare for the installation of an electric voting machine in the House of Representatives Chamber.

Regardless of what individual Members may think of the proposal to install such an automatic voting and recording device, the sensibleness of the proposal to install proper conduits while the Chamber is being extensively remodeled should appeal to everyone.

The text of the resolution follows:

Whereas, it is the right and obligation of each American citizen to know how each Representative has voted on vital issues; and

Whereas standing and voice voting systems used to save time required by record or roll-call votes prevent an accurate record of how legislators have voted; and

Whereas the present extensive remodeling of the Senate and House Chambers would permit easy installation of conduits for electrical vote recording apparatus; and

Whereas the extensive number of important issues before Congress necessitates the wisest use of valuable time by our legislators; and

Whereas 16 foresighted States and 2 foreign countries use electrical voting systems successfully: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the American Association of University Women, Philadelphia branch, support the bills (Senate Committee Resolution 50 and House Resolution 261) for the installation of conduits for electrical vote recording apparatus and the system of electrical voting by sending letters to the distinguished Senators from Pennsylvania, the distinguished Congressmen from the Philadelphia area, and to the sponsors of bills, Senators ESTES KEFAUVER and ALEXANDER WILEY and Congressmen CHARLES E. BENNETT and GLENN DAVIS.

Tennessee Sunday Observed at Historic Valley Forge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. PERCY PRIEST
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 24, 1950

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday the annual Tennessee Sunday was observed at Valley Forge in the George Washington Memorial chapel.

On that occasion, my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS] delivered a very excellent and timely address.

Under leave granted to extend my remarks, I desire to include that address in the RECORD.

The full text of the address follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, it is indeed a delight and a privilege to be with you here today. I have enjoyed immensely the beauty of this memorial service. I consider it a distinct honor to represent my State—the great State of Tennessee—on this occasion. I accepted with pleasure the invitation of the distinguished Governor of Tennessee, the Honorable Gordon Browning, to appear here as his representative and to participate in this service which marks the Twenty-sixth Annual Tennessee State Sunday at Valley Forge. I am sure that Governor Browning joins with me in extending greetings to all Tennesseans and friends of Tennessee here today.

The Tennessee State Society of the Colonial Dames of America and the Daughters of the American Revolution of Tennessee, under whose auspices Tennessee State Sunday is sponsored, are to be commended for their patriotic endeavors and their sponsorship of this annual and beautiful memorial service.

I must admit that coupled with my pleasure at being present on this occasion, there exists, on my part—situated as we are among these historic hills and in the shadow of this magnificant memorial to our fallen forefathers—a deep sense of humility. This is a spot where all rightly should feel humble—for here we are reminded of the valor and courage and steadfastness which made our Nation. All men should feel humility in the presence of greatness and manifestations of greatness. This is indeed a sacred spot and hallowed ground—it has become thus because of the great men and unswerving patriots who struggled here and gained for us our freedom and independence and set in motion our cherished American way of life.

This magnificent memorial—the Washington Memorial—is a thing of beauty and magnificence. It is a touching memorial and—so far as it is possible—it re-creates the atmosphere of Valley Forge—an atmosphere in which we may revere and honor the past—honor our great patriot leader, George Washington, and those patriot soldiers of the Continental Army of Valley Forge.

Valley Forge—and the trials and suffering here of General Washington and his Army—will ever be the symbol of darkness and

despondency and crisis through which our country has passed.

Valley Forge is, in addition, the symbol of a crisis overcome and a glorious victory attained. It is such a symbol because of the suffering at Valley Forge here experienced—and because of the courage and devotion to duty which this suffering called forth and which have never been surpassed in our history.

Valley Forge was first and foremost a military crisis, the like of which we have never since experienced—valient men were crying from hunger and despair. They suffered from the deadly cold that benumbed their limbs and dulled the will and spirit to battle of all but the most noble and ardent. Here men wept in despair for the suffering of their families who needed them sorely—men who had only their own inner fire of zeal and patriotism to tell them that their cause was just and righteous and that their duty and allegiance to this ideal overshadowed all else.

For doing battle and offering resistance to the enemy, this band at Valley Forge had naught. They had no fit weapons of warfare—save only the extreme cruelty of the unmerciful winter which, fortuitously, restricted also the opposing force. There were no reinforcements, no relief, no arms, no supplies—nothing.

Yet these men survived and rose to greatness and to victory. They overcame the crisis and made possible our Nation and its greatness.

Valley Forge was also a great spiritual and mental trial—a testing, so to speak, and in the cruelest form, of the will to freedom and liberty of the men who fought here. It was the depth of despondency for General Washington who was tortured alike by the suffering of his men, the lack of weapons—and the indifference of many of his fellow countrymen who little cared—or so it seemed—of what transpired at Valley Forge—or, indeed, of what happened to the brave and struggling cause of liberty for the Colonies.

It was a bitter cup for General Washington—a cup compounded of the basest and most destructive of all human instincts—treason, lack of faith, the will to give up the fight. Yet these men overcame the mental and spiritual trial. They survived and rose to greatness and to liberty for us all.

Victory evolved at Valley Forge over the forces of military might from across the sea and over the forces of discontent, suspicion, weakness, and discouragement from within. Victory came under the inspired leadership of Gen. George Washington—a victory which gave to the sons and daughters of the men of the Valley Forge army the greatest, most magnificent concept of human liberty that the world has ever known.

It is not possible to dwell upon the life of General Washington without the realization that the nobility and high qualities which he possessed in such great measure are the same qualities which, it seems to me, are needed at the present critical stage of our history. Tolerance, foresightedness, honor, profound and unswerving patriotism, and belief in the ideal of democracy—all of the qualities which were the lifeblood of our first struggles as a country are needed today perhaps more than ever. They are needed lest we permit the weakening of the priceless heritage of freedom which was initially gained at Valley Forge and which has come down to us and which we today enjoy.

We are here today free men, and proof that the dark hour of Valley Forge was turned by George Washington into a brilliant victory for freedom and democracy. We are the living proof of the strength of our way of life. We are the living proof that our country can survive and has survived the greatest misfortunes that may be possible.

We look upon past events—this display of heroism, steadfastness, patriotism—to gain courage to face the day and the future. This is true not only of nations but of individuals. The sure knowledge that we, either as individuals or as a nation, have come through the worst that can be thrown at us should give us confidence and faith in the future and our ability to meet other crises.

Following the victory at Valley Forge, and even before that date, my own great State, the territory that was destined to become Tennessee, was the scene of conflict and strife, the inevitable consequence of the westward march of civilization and progress. The establishment of the colonies into an effective free government set the example and pattern for development in the West. The descendants of Valley Forge participated in that great march of progress. They came by horseback to my State, carrying, in many instances, all their worldly possessions in a kit sack. They walked, trudged through unchartered wilderness or along meager paths toward the new land of opportunity which was Tennessee. They arrived by crude flatboats to establish homes upon the beautiful bluffs and amid the rolling and magnificent hills and valleys of my State. They brought with them the highest of virtues—courage, determination, independence, spiritual steadfastness, and adventure—and set about making new homes. They brought to Tennessee the rich heritage of Valley Forge—and Tennessee nurtured and has continued to nurture through the generations this sacred heritage.

The descendants of many of these brave men at Valley Forge and others with the spirit to venture and to conquer gave to Tennessee the name of the Volunteer State—meaning that the sons of Tennessee have ever stood ready and eager to take up arms in the defense of their country and the cause of freedom and liberty.

The State of Tennessee, whose day we observe and celebrate today, has produced its quota of courageous leaders and soldiers.

If it can be said that any man of our history has been the measure of Gen. George Washington, that man would be Andrew Jackson, of Tennessee, a great general and military leader and a patriot of still another crisis in another generation. He led the American forces of his day to many great victories and to new heights in the cause of liberty, freedom, and democracy.

During the period of growth and development of the great Southwest, it was under the administration of James K. Polk, of Tennessee, President of the United States, that a great western territory—Texas—was made a part of the United States and taken in as a sister State in the Union.

In still another period of conflict and strife, when brother fought against brother and State against State, it was Andrew Johnson, Tennessean and a southerner, who remained loyal to the Union and was chosen by President Lincoln to be his aide and assistant in cementing the severed ties of union. It was under Andrew Jackson that we began to emerge from a period described in history as the tragic era. We emerged into building and making of our country a more solid and a more perfect union, based upon the principles of freedom, liberty, and democracy.

We have had many crises since George Washington at Valley Forge, but always we have survived and become stronger as a people and as a Nation.

Today America stands at the height of its power and greatness—preeminent among the nations of the world. But today, more than ever before, it seems to me, that we must remember the inscription which is emblazoned over the portals of our Archives Building in Washington: "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

The poor band of patriots at Valley Forge was vigilant as their leader was vigilant. They withstood not only the great might of the enemy, but they withstood the destructive forces operating from within which would have divided them and defeated their cause.

I believe that the greatest of all temptations in time of trial is the temptation to give up the fight, to surrender the cause—to become complacent and unwatchful—and this is the most damaging and harmful force which can operate from within a nation such as ours—a Nation where liberty and personal freedom are so inherent and basic that they may be taken for granted and abused.

Liberty and freedom were bought at the price of hardship and sacrifice. They must be maintained by our citizens of today—each assuming his own responsibility. Freedom without responsibility degenerates—and may easily be lost.

America has arisen from a struggling imperfect Nation to the position of world leadership and responsibility and the test of today is whether we shall—and are willing—to arise and assume our rightful place of world leadership—to preserve our own way of life and hold out a light and a torch—an example of democracy to the peoples of other lands.

Standing here on this hallowed ground, fired with new inspiration for the future which we can properly gain from contemplation of past achievements—we may dedicate and rededicate ourselves to perfecting our future as a Nation in the family of nations, to maintaining our priceless heritage of freedom and democracy, and of insuring a continuing peace in the world based upon justice and honor.

We may remember that this great man—George Washington, and these men, his soldiers at Valley Forge—conquered because they had in them the spirit and determination for survival. They possessed the spirit that made them steadfast, not merely on an occasional great day, but day after day in the daily endeavor to do duty well.

How greatly needed today—and how necessary that we hold to the spirit of Valley Forge. And how truly wonderful that we can feel that in this new age—this age of atomic weapons—that we are still holding true to the spirit of the men of Valley Forge—men whose hands were frozen to the muskets raised in defense of their country and our national liberty. Yet, we must ever be mindful:

"That only men can make
A nation great and strong.
Men who stand for truth and honor's sake,
Stand fast and suffer long."

May the guilding hand of divine providence give to America such men in all future generations—such men as those who stood and fought at Valley Forge.

Public Purchase of the Brannan Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN R. DAVIS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1950

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on at least two separate occasions, mention has been made on the floor of the House, of the meeting in St. Paul held early this month under the auspi-

cies of the Production and Marketing Administration. The story was revealed in the Senate by Senator AIKEN of Vermont.

It seems clear to me, Mr. Speaker, that section 201 of title 18 of the United States Code has been openly and flagrantly violated. Even though that be not true, no one can deny that cheap, shabby politics has been resorted to by persons in responsible Federal office.

The editor of my home town daily newspaper, K. H. Koenig, of the Waukesha Freeman has written a pointed editorial entitled "Public Funds Used to Buy Brannan Plan." The Washington Star contained an editorial on the same theme entitled "Mr. Brannan's Hired Audience." I hope the Members of the House will take time to read both of these searching editorials on this shocking, brazen demonstration of lack of public trustworthiness.

The editorials follow:

[From the Waukesha (Wis.) Freeman]

PUBLIC FUNDS USED TO BUY BRANNAN PLAN

Dispatches from Washington this week, which told of two Senators charging that the United States Department of Agriculture is using funds to hire an audience for a political speech, are evidence of the extent to which the administration is going to force the Brannan farm plan on the country. It was brought to the attention of Senators HOMER FERGUSON and GEORGE D. AIKEN that on April 3 and 4 county committeemen of the production and marketing administration for Minnesota met in St. Paul. This was an annual meeting and a perfectly proper one, called for the purpose of developing an agricultural conservation program for 1951. These programs have been generally beneficial in all of the 48 States and to the national agricultural economy. But the incident to which the Senators object and the one that casts doubt upon the activities of Secretary Charles F. Brannan in his zeal to adopt his own pet farm program is a notice which was sent to the 5,000 community committeemen. Dated March 16, at St. Paul, it read, in part:

"The decline in farm prices has placed even greater emphasis on the price-support program which we in PMA are administering. We know you realize how controversial this subject has become. We feel it is extremely important for you community committeemen who represent agriculture at the grass roots, to have this chance to hear your Secretary who is making a terrific fight to maintain some measure of economic stability for farmers.

"Our production picture has changed since the war as it pertains to basic crops such as wheat and corn. With acreage allotments come diverted acres and we want to be sure that land taken out of wheat and corn this year will be put to the best possible conservation use as far as practical. We feel sure that giving you an opportunity to hear your administrator on this subject will give you renewed enthusiasm and a broader understanding of the problems which now confront us.

". . . travel allowance is being authorized for community committeemen who attend this meeting. I suggest that you bring others with you."

We see here the offer of the payment of mileage to 5,000 community committeemen so long as they brought a carload of neighbors with them. This was intended to make sure of a large attendance, since the meeting was not restricted to committeemen alone. The question might logically be asked, what right has the Department of Agriculture to pay $8 a day and expenses to 5,000 people to listen to the Secretary of Agriculture speak on any subject? The cost of the meeting must have been somewhere between $50,000 and $100,000. It is not quite clear where this money was to come from although it is logical to suppose that it would be taken from the funds allocated to the State of Minnesota for soil-improvement work. It would, of course, be easier to condone the expenditure of such vast funds if Secretary Brannan spoke on uses for lime, superphosphate, terracing, forestry work or other soil-conservation practices in that State. But Secretary Brannan spoke of none of these things, if we are to believe the news story next day carried by the St. Paul Pioneer Press. The Press reported that Brannan spoke to a record-breaking crowd of 8,000 persons on the Truman administration's campaign for the Brannan farm plan in the national elections of 1950 and 1952. To quote further, the Press reported:

"Battling shoulder to shoulder for the plan of free farm prices and production payments to maintain farm income were Secretary of Agriculture Charles F. Brannan, daddy of the plan, and United States Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, its all-out supporter. Senator EDWARD J. THYE could not come and sent his greetings to the crowd.

"First Brannan and then HUMPHREY assailed the present law's system, particularly as applied to perishable products like potatoes, eggs, meat, and milk, of backing up farm prices with a system of flexible supports that are made effective through Government buying. Both also assailed President Allan B. Kline of the American Farm Bureau Federation, as defender of the present system. The flexible system is so named because as supplies pile up, price support levels are lowered."

A full-scale political address and not a treatise on soil conservation is what the record crowd of 8,000 received for the thousands of dollars in Federal funds paid out that April day to assure an audience for the Secretary of Agriculture.

That brings up an interesting question for the farmers in Wisconsin. Mr. Brannan in recent weeks made two appearances in this State—one at Juneau and another in Milwaukee. At both he plugged his pet farm plan. At both he was applauded by Democratic candidates who are seeking posts in Congress next fall so that they can help adopt the Brannan farm plan. Were these two meetings also bought and paid for with soil-conservation funds? The farmers of Wisconsin and of America had better awaken to the threat they face of being socialized and nationalized along with other key American industries.

[From the Washington Evening Star]

MR. BRANNAN'S HIRED AUDIENCE

Senator AIKEN, backed by Senator FERGUSON, seems to have a sound factual basis for his charge that the Department of Agriculture has spent money illegally on a cheap form of politicking.

The charge relates to a 2-day meeting held early this month in St. Paul by the 269 county committeemen of the Production and Marketing Administration for Minnesota. In itself, the meeting was altogether useful and proper as a get-together designed to discuss conservation problems. Apparently, however, its closing session went far beyond that. According to Mr. AIKEN, it was broadened into a kind of Democratic political rally, with the Department of Agriculture undertaking to make an unauthorized expenditure in order to recruit a big attendance.

To support his point, Mr. AIKEN has produced a letter which one of the Department's PMA officials sent to all of Minnesota's 5,000 community committeemen (as distinct from county committeemen) urging them to go to St. Paul to hear a speech by Secretary Brannan. To make the trip particularly attractive the letter declared that anybody attending would be reimbursed for travel expenses and receive per diem pay. Since a large percentage of the people invited showed up at the meeting, the cost to the Department of Agriculture, according to Mr. AIKEN's estimate, must have been somewhere between $50,000 and $100,000. Conceivably, if the gathering had been wholly nonpolitical in character, such an expenditure would have been justified, but the evidence strongly indicates that the only thing that took place was a show in which Mr. Brannan and Senator HUMPHREY ridiculed the Republicans and whooped it up for Democratic farm policies, particularly the proposed Brannan plan.

In other words, the Department's outlay of money seems to have served no other function than to insure the presence of a large hired audience before which the Secretary and Mr. HUMPHREY played politics of a sort calculated to send the committeemen back home as missionaries likely to be helpful to the Democrats in the congressional elections. If there were no Federal cash or pressure involved, this sort of thing probably would be tolerable, but the truth of the matter is, as Mr. AIKEN has said, that there appears to be no authority (certainly, there should be none) which permits the expenditure of PMA funds for the purpose of which they were used at St. Paul. If the practice which was applied in Minnesota of spending public money to pay the expenses and per diem of farmers to listen to political speeches is followed in the other States the expense can be many millions of dollars, all of which must come out of appropriations which Congress made for legitimate farm programs.

On the point of legality, Mr. FERGUSON has expressed himself even more emphatically than his Vermont colleague. He has declared flatly that the expenditure on the St. Paul meeting should be acted upon by the Attorney General as a clear violation of a Federal statute (sec. 201 of title 18 of the United States Code) forbidding the use of appropriated money to influence legislation. His view is that the Secretary of Agriculture in effect hired an audience to listen to political speeches aimed at building up pressure to make Congress enact the Brannan plan for farm production payments.

It may be, as far as the law's technicalities are concerned, that Mr. Brannan can defend himself satisfactorily. Even if he can, however, the whole business will still smack of shabby politics.

Freedom and the Welfare State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, George Meany, the secretary-treasurer of the American Federation of Labor, laid several ghosts at the recent meeting of the League for Industrial Democracy in New York.

He dismissed reports that labor unions were no longer interested in the national health program by declaring that doctors as well as patients would be better off under the administration's proposed health program.

He stressed the need for a human welfare state as a bulwark of free society and denounced those who refuse to admit that both the New Deal and Fair Deal have helped to preserve free enterprise in this country.

And he pointed to social security and rural electrification programs as the kind of human welfare measures which will broaden, rather than limit, our individual and national freedoms.

With permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I attach Mr. Meany's speech:

Permit me to preface my remarks on freedom and the welfare state by admitting that I believe in both. More than that, I believe that both freedom and a state of welfare can and should be enjoyed by the American people at the same time.

So, I am sure, does our special guest—Senator LEHMAN—because his whole public career has been aimed at the achievement of those goals. That is one of the chief reasons why the labor movement has always regarded him so highly.

Of course, there is no such thing as a welfare state, neither here in America nor anywhere else in the world. To liberals, the welfare state is an ideal worth working for and fighting for. To the reactionary politicians who pounced upon the phrase for propaganda purposes, the welfare state was merely something to frighten people into voting against their own interests.

Fortunately, the great majority of the American people do not get panicked that easily. When an acorn pops down on the head of Chicken-Little TAFT and he starts crying, "The sky is falling," he may get some of the Byrds and the worrying Wherrys to run with him to tell the king, but the American people generally will not follow. They have more common sense.

A free government, like ours, was established in the first place not to rule the people, but to serve them.

The Government does not deprive us of any liberties by such services as workmen's compensation, bank deposit insurance, crop insurance and social security. The only compulsion in any of these programs is the payment of taxes for the insurance provided, and taxes always have been and always will be with us.

I am convinced that the American people are willing to pay still higher taxes for more adequate protection against economic disasters and for new programs, such as health insurance.

When the welfare state slogan fell flat, the reactionaries hunted around for a new phrase and came up with the "hand-out State." All of us who pay taxes for the extremely meager economic and social insurance which our Government, as yet, affords us realize quite clearly that we are not getting any hand-outs but are paying our own way.

But, speaking of hand-outs, it is somewhat surprising to me that our reactionary friends never do refer to the very considerable hand-outs which our Government has generously awarded to big business in the past and the heavy subsidies which it is still pouring out.

Was it a "hand-out State" when the Government spent millions to help the railroads build transcontinental transportation networks?

Was it a "hand-out State" when the Government paid heavy subsidies to American shipping so that an adequate merchant marine could be maintained against foreign competition?

Is it a "hand-out State" when the Government subsidizes the air lines through higher air-mail payments than are economically justified?

Is it a "hand-out State" when the Government deliberately takes a loss on second-class mail in order to help publications circulate more widely? Do you ever hear the newspapers and their friends in Congress complain about Government largesse when big business is the direct beneficiary?

The American Federation of Labor is, and has consistently been, a firm defender of our free-enterprise system. As a general policy, we do not believe it wise or prudent for the Government to invade the field of private business, wherever private enterprise is serving the public well. If any of the social-justice programs undertaken by the New Deal or the Fair Deal were actually damaging to private business, we would be among the first to object. But, has private business really suffered under the New Deal and the Fair Deal?

I am sure we can all remember back as far as 1933 when Franklin Roosevelt took office. Our financial structure on the brink of complete disaster; agriculture prostrate and the buying power of our people at the lowest point in 40 years; small business failures at an all-time high.

We didn't hear any arguments about statism or socialism from the great leaders of industry in those days. No; on the contrary, they flocked to Washington by the thousands with all sorts of proposals by which they hoped the new administration would save them from disaster. That they were saved by the prompt actions of that administration is a matter of history.

And how have the great captains of industry, who were the architects of our ruin back in the twenties, made out under the Fair Deal which they now so viciously condemn through their spokesmen—the Tafts, the Martins, and the Hallecks—in Congress?

I am not going to bore you with any long-winded analysis of the present position of big business. Let me simply quote from a report, just out, by the United States News, which is edited by David Lawrence. This special report appeared in the March 24 issue of that publication. Here is the quotation:

"American corporations, as a group, are rolling in money. In four postwar years they have invested $60,000,000,000 in new plant and equipment; they have increased other assets by $11,000,000,000; they have added $21,000,000,000 to reserves for depreciation, and they still have $40,000,000,000 in cash and Government bonds on hand.

"Never before was the financial position of the United States business so strong."

I think those figures tell the story. Today, the insurance companies, who so bitterly fought us every step of the way to prevent workmen's compensation and social security are making more money than they know what to do with. Today, the utility interests which tried every fair and foul means of blocking the rural electrification program are silently splitting up huge dividends from increased sales of electric power and electric appliances.

In the same way, I venture to predict, the American Medical Association, which is so frantically campaigning against health insurance, will be forced to admit, after it is enacted, that it was the best break the doctors of this country ever got, to say nothing of their patients.

This controversy over the policies of the New Deal and the Fair Deal is nothing new. It goes back to our very beginning as a nation. Simply stated, it is: Shall our political and economic policy be what the people want? Or shall it be what some superior guiding group may think is best for the people?

The present-day Bourbons of our country talk about statism, socialism, and the welfare state. To me, labels, with the exception of the union label, are more or less without meaning. I am for the greater welfare and security of all the people of this Nation. I believe that it is a proper function of a democratic government to strive for a better life for all its people, including those who work for wages. Put any label you desire on this effort for a better day—statism, New Deal, socialism, Fair Deal, or welfare state—I am still for it.

In your time and in mine, I am confident that the American people, by their own decision in free elections, will be able to achieve a greater degree of human welfare and security and will discover that their freedoms have been broadened, rather than curtailed. in the process.

Reduction in Mail Service Opposed by Congressman McDonough

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 24, 1950

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the proposal to reduce the postal service to one delivery a day in residential areas and proportionately in business districts will be strongly resented by the people of my district and the Nation as a whole. The delivery of mail by the postman is one of the most intimate and dependable contacts the public has with the Government. It is one of the few most appreciated and valued services which the heavy-burdened taxpayer receives for the high income tax he must pay.

Reduction in mail delivery will not only be a great inconvenience to the public; it will also create more unemployment, which is growing at an alarming rate.

The public has learned to appreciate the efficient and dependable postal service of more than one delivery each day, and they should not be made the victims of a reduction in this essential service while they are willing to pay for it.

Since the war excise tax of 25 percent on telegrams has not been repealed, the public has come to depend upon the frequent and efficient delivery of mail to serve their needs for speedy communication.

The unemployment that will result from this plan will be a severe shock to the morale of postal employees as well as to the public. Many World War II veterans will lose their jobs adding to the alarming increase in the unemployment ranks throughout the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I resent and oppose this attempt to make the public and the postal employees the victims of this plan, when at the same time we are spending billions of the taxpayers hard-earned money to rehabilitate and maintain foreign governments throughout the world where economy could be applied without reducing the essential and necessary mail delivery at home.

The reduction of mail delivery, especially in Los Angeles, will be a great inconvenience to the public because of our increase in population, and the unprecedented growth and expansion since the war.

We are proud of the fine services rendered by the Los Angeles Post Office, and we will resist and oppose any plan or attempt to reduce its efficiency, curtail its services to the public, or reduce the morale of its employees.

I have written a letter of protest to the Postmaster General which reads as follows:

APRIL 21, 1950.

Hon. JESSE M. DONALDSON,
The Postmaster General,
Post Office Department,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DONALDSON: In reference to the proposed order to reduce mail service to one a day in residential areas and a proportionate reduction of parcel post and mail deliveries in business districts, I desire to register my opposition to this proposed change believing that it will not bring about economy commensurate with the reduction in service and convenience to the public, and that it will increase unemployment.

I am confident that the public's reaction to your new order will be strong opposition, especially in the Los Angeles area with its tremendous expansion and increase in population.

In my opinion, the mail-delivery service to the public, which has become so appreciated and so efficient, should be the last place to economize in attempting to reduce the postal deficit, making the public and the postal employees the victims. I am confident that other means can be found in the Department to bring about economy rather than reducing the service in this manner to the public.

Very truly yours,

GORDON L. MCDONOUGH,
Member of Congress, Fifteenth District, California.

The American Way—How May We Improve It?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 24, 1950

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting an essay written by Mr. Charles Philip Bolin, of Mansfield, Ohio. Mr. Bolin is one of the winners of the annual essay contest sponsored by the Department of Ohio American Legion and the Auxiliary. Approximately 75,000 essays were written and 12 winners were chosen. Philip Bolin was one of that 12.

The title, Mr. Speaker, this year was "The American Way—How May We Improve it?" The work of this young man certainly merits the time of every Member of Congress to carefully analyze his recommendations.

I am indeed very thankful, Mr. Speaker, that the American Legion and the Auxiliary sponsor such a program and I am grateful that so many young people—the youth of today and the manhood and womanhood of tomorrow—will devote many hours of time and study in preparation of an essay of this type.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Mr. Philip Bolin, of Mansfield, Ohio, for his endeavors and his achievement, and I am happy to submit his essay for your consideration:

THE AMERICAN WAY—HOW MAY WE IMPROVE IT?

(By Charles Philip Bolin)

After the great debate had ended and Jefferson had completed drafting the Declaration of Independence, the Members of the Continental Congress signed one of the most important documents of all times. It and the Constitution, which was drafted 12 years later, cast the mold for the American way—the way of democracy.

The foundation of democracy is this famous phrase of Jefferson's. "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

The American way can be improved by studying these words in the light of today.

I. All men are created equal.

To improve our American way, we must believe that one American is basically as good as another, regardless of race, creed, or color.

We should support the civil-rights program that both political parties are backing.

We should each individually fight intolerance. When remarks are made intending to cast suspicion on our fellow Americans, purely on the grounds of race or color or religion, we should denounce them as un-American.

II. Men are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights.

Communism, nazism, and fascism all preach that the only rights the individual has are those given him by the state.

We, too, believe that if a man has rights, those rights must come from somewhere. Our forefathers taught that they come from God.

We must do a real educational job in the schools, in the churches, in our political parties and through the press and radio, as to the importance and rights of the individual. Since we believe that those rights come from God, we should strive to increase religious interest in America.

Long ago William Penn said, "Those people who are not governed by God will be ruled by tyrants." The founding fathers believed this so strongly they risked their lives to defend it. If we preach that same thought to all America we can overcome that active minority which is trying to sell communism and destroy the individual.

III. Life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

To improve the American way of life we should take additional steps to protect those rights, such as:

1. Better study of the causes of crime, and combined drives by educational and religious institutions to improve morals.

2. Active interest in the civil-rights program that our Government has started.

3. Greater interest by individuals in the poor and the unfortunate, so that the whole job is not left up to public agencies.

4. A program providing greater financial incentive to teachers who, after all, must carry a part of the responsibility of teaching children about life, the importance of liberty, and the pursuit of true happiness, as against mere pleasure.

IV. Governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.

We believe that government is for the people. We do not believe that the child is born for the state. The individual is the important thing.

The American way of life will continue and expand only if our fellow Americans believe it as strongly as did Jefferson, Washington, Franklin, and Adams. If Hollywood and the combined radio and television networks could plan a program assuring a certain number of motion pictures and broadcasts a year featuring plays built around this fundamental idea, much could be done to stir interest and enthusiasm.

To sum up, the way to improve the American way of life is to take seriously the slogan, "Freedom is everybody's business."

A Century of Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1950

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include, in part, a recent editorial from the Clinton Daily Item entitled "A Century of Progress," written by the editor, Mr. Orra L. Stone:

As we turned the calendar for March the picture was not pleasant with strikes across the country strangling production in basic industries, shackling communication and transportation, with the headlines screaming the news of trouble at the coal mines, with workers on welfare, freight cars standing idle and householders suffering from empty bins; with our gigantic steel mills notifying their customers "no coal, no steel" in the second quarter of 1950; with 10,500 dealers of one auto concern alone, employing more than 200,000 persons, idled by a strike, with more pay, less working hours, seniority, priority, slow-downs and pensions demanded; with millions of man-hours lost and billions of dollars wasting down the drain of chain-action walk-outs, coupled with delusion, confusion, personal and group hatreds, misunderstanding, political influence, bargaining and bickering, injunctions and law actions, union factual fights, referendums and negotiations, all seemingly the price of peacetime production.

And yet, at heart, the men and women who are parties to this apparently unending conflict are all good Americans—at least, almost all.

Sometimes it makes many Clintonians wonder if this is America after all, and to inquire if it is the fruit of two ghastly world wars in a single generation, or whether it is the concept our founding fathers who left us a heritage of freedom to be preserved and defended. We stop and ask are we doing justice to this land of opportunity?

The freedom of enterprise which guided Erastus Brigham Bigelow to sow the seeds of progress in our midst never visioned that his sucessors would be virtually handcuffed and victims of misapplied rights.

All of us admit that strikes are legal, but most of us question whether they are loyal to America when they throw this community and all others and the Nation's total economy out of gear. To many it seems they constitute the virus that is slowly poisoning the minds of men and women whose toil and skill are critically needed most in the struggle for world survival.

Neither this community nor the Nation at large can withstand the repeated impact

and shock of constantly recurring strikes which constitute positive proof of a crumbling strength for employer, employee, and America itself. Could it be that Moscow's fifth column is setting the United States up for that "Sunday punch"?

More and more we are awakening to the dangers of regimentation of any kind and detecting the evils of pitting one class against another and many believe it is high time that we Americans "stop, look, and listen" before our economy runs off the track and is wrecked completely.

Today employer and employee appear to be deadlocked in thousands of industries and stand impotent due to the peculiar phraseology in our laws governing labor relations and to technicalities, details, and misinterpretations of meaning.

Surely no progress can be attained without confidence between employee and employer and no pay checks, dividends, new products, or consumption of raw materials can flow steadily unless the convulsion of strikes is eliminated and employee and employer sit down to develop a set of "ground rules" for cooperatively working together.

The latest and biggest riddle seems to be the writing by Congress of the new ticket for social security, and until that eventuates no American employer knows what he faces and neither do the unions. This much appears to be certain, all of us must keep working while a better and firmer bridge of understanding is being built.

It is apparent to the man on the street that some evil influence is jeopardizing the sacred rights and privileges to earn an honest dollar by an honest day's work. It probably is of foreign origin at its root because it cannot be purebred American policy.

Great industries are imperiled, great cities are idle, purchasing power is frozen from coast to coast, with wives and children, the butcher, the baker, and the candlestick maker all feeling the pinch when the head of the household is not working.

Let's all stay on the job while employees and employers figure out a practical solution to the complicated problems of pensions and the like. Any other course spells disaster for all of us because losses now occurring will never be regained. Let's not let our Nation down.

We are advised that we are in a period of prosperity, but it seems strange that if at such a time the Government cannot live within its income, what will it do if we suffer a serious recession in business?

With a public debt of more than a quarter of a trillion dollars which is daily being added to we are informed that the interest alone on it is 5½ billions of dollars annually, a total more than all the expenses of Government in 1933.

To justify spending more than our income, some people allude to what the Government is doing for the little fellow, but it is well to look at what the Government is doing to the little fellow and to note that it is making the small man smaller. If the little fellow uses a telephone he pays a tax; if he travels by rail or bus his ticket includes a tax; if he buys gasoline for his car he pays a tax; if he goes to a baseball game he pays a tax, and if his children go to the movies they pay a tax.

If the program now proposed is adopted the average workingman will have to work 67 days each year to earn the money to pay his taxes to the Federal Government alone and that is what the Government is doing to the little fellow.

If the spenders really want to help the little fellow, they should allow him to keep more of the money he earns for his labor so that he can spend it as he pleases instead of having it taken from him and sent to Washington to allow bureaucrats to spend it as they think best.

Men intoxicated with power will never voluntarily surrender the power to spend the money of other people and the Government will not repeal a single war tax now being collected until forced to do so by public sentiment.

The Nation's plain trouble is debt and taxes and we cannot cure it by more debt and more taxes. The only way out is to cut current expenditures.

The so-called good old days were not so rough, at that. The first year Federal income taxes were slapped on the American public, in 1913, Uncle Sam snatched only $71,380,000 from our pockets and that sum is not enough to cover what the Federal Government blew in last year to support potato prices.

It is a vastly different picture that presents itself to this year's graduates of Clinton High School, and from other educational institutions as they enter upon their life work as go-getters, than that which faced the young people of this town, in 1900, when the semicentennial was observed.

That year, the Nation had a debt of $1,263,416,913 or a per capita debt for each man, woman, and child of $16.60 which was a prettier picture than that presented 30 years before, in 1870, when the national debt totaled $2,436,453,209 or $61.76 per capita.

The generation that came upon the scene between 1900 and 1930 saw its per capita share of the Nation's debt rise from $16.60 three decades previously to $315.45 but that was merely a bagatelle compared to the 1949 per capita debt borne by each of us which reached the astronomical height of $1,695.46 last year.

In 1900, Congress appropriated $698,912,982.83 to run the United States Government, but in 1949 Federal appropriations totaled $48,272,280,457.59.

The young men and women who step out of our schools, this centennial year, face a situation entirely different from that which was met by their parents and with the bleak fact before them that the United States will have no Marshall plan backed by a generous nation on either continent to help them.

They see many of the countries of western Europe and Great Britain, which have embraced socialism, unable to stand on their own financial feet with the very existence of these nations entirely dependent on the taxpayers of the United States.

The only hope seems to be that these young people will plainly discern that it will be prudent for this country to hold fast to its democratic system of government and to put our financial house in order and aid in warding off the concentration, in Washington, of the powers of local governments, including police powers and to halt the imposition of creeping but ever-advancing socialistic programs.

They must ever keep in mind that the people who came here from foreign lands in the beginning did not arrive to establish a government, but rather to escape the tyrannies of government. They did not seek security but rather an opportunity to enjoy the freedom of being let alone.

They cannot fail to sense that the spirit of self-reliance that inspired the early settlers of Clinton to exercise their initiative and develop the town, while preserving their independence, is being halted by too many persons who seek to lean on the Government and too many who are thinking more of security than they are of opportunity.

It is perfectly obvious to the generation now coming on the scene that to pay for the costly programs that have been adopted, with others planned, we shall have to borrow more money, and it is well for them to sense that if we stumble no Marshall plan aid or lend-lease will aid us, but rather we will all be on our own.

The new generation cannot but appreciate that we would not have an ever-expanding Government if the American people were conscious of the taxes they are now paying and surely they will recognize that when the Federal Government required employers to withhold income taxes from employees, the plan put the worker to sleep.

Ask any Clinton wage earner the amount of money he earns and he will tell you the sum of money he receives in his envelope or pay check and not the amount his employer actually pays for his services before Federal withholding taxes are deducted.

Excise taxes are so well hidden that their burden is not appreciated by the taxpayers and the coming generation can easily discern that the best-kept secret in the United States today is the program of excise taxes that hit every family from coast to coast every day in the year.

Such taxes, included in the price of everything you buy, exceeded $700 per family in 1948. The fact remains that only half of the Federal Government's revenues and less than 10 percent of State and local tax receipts flow from direct taxes on personal incomes.

The rest comes from taxes on business enterprises which, in turn, are passed along to the consumer in the form of higher prices. As a result, for all with annual incomes of $5,000 or less, which includes better than 9 out of every 10 persons, the hidden burden is heavier than the Federal income tax.

Taxes accumulate all along the way from the raw materials to the finished products on the store shelves and at that point many States and cities add a retail sales tax.

If you buy a pack of cigarettes you pay 11½ cents in taxes. If you purchase an auto you pay between $300 and $500 in taxes on a $2,000 car which is the big reason, according to the manufacturer, why the $1,000 auto is out of the question today.

The coming generation scarcely realizes that total tax collections in the United States today are now two and one-half billion dollars higher than in 1945 when this country was engaged in a global war and that four-fifths of the present tax collections go toward Federal spending.

The Boom Goes On

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. DEANE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1950

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, it was with a great deal of interest that I read the excellent editorial in the April 24, 1950 issue of Life Magazine. Under unanimous consent I insert this well-written editorial entitled "The Boom Goes On," as a part of my remarks, since it reflects, in my opinion, the general feeling that this great country of ours continues to move forward:

THE BOOM GOES ON—LIVING BETTER THAN EVER, THE UNITED STATES MUST NOW LEARN HOW TO LIVE

Two years ago, four years ago, the United States was hip-deep in a postwar boom—and the news today is that it is still smack in the middle of the same boom. The darned thing goes on and on and on. Mr. Sewell Avery of Montgomery Ward has been predicting the worst for years, but it is the hopeful Gen. Robert Wood of Sears, Roebuck who has made the money. Even that incredulous Mr. Faint Heart of the long boom period, the stock market, has at last decided that valor may be the better part of discretion. With high boom dividends going on and on and

on, market valuations of stocks have finally returned to the originally hopeful ground of 1946, even pushing through in certain key "industrials" to the highest averages since 1930.

Even with its new high, the stock market still has a long way to go before it can pose as an accurate register of the actual physical goods-and-services boom, which has been particularly terrific for the first quarter of 1950. As the President's economic advisers have recently pointed out, the country has been on the upsurge in practically everything. Personal incomes, swelled by the veterans' insurance refunds, have been at a new peak. People have been buying furniture, refrigerators, television sets at a pace never set before. The home building rate this year has hit an all-time high; a grand total of a million or more homes are scheduled for 1950. The steel production rate hums along at 97 percent of capacity. In Detroit they are busier than ever: nearly 2,000,000 motor vehicles rolled off the production lines during the year's first quarter, and this despite the crippling Chrysler strike. The boom has developed such a solid impact on all fronts that both the Federal Reserve Board and Secretary of Commerce Charles Sawyer see it rolling at least until 1951.

The conventional editorial response to all this would be to let the story carry itself—or at most to observe, truly and tritely, that all booms end sometime. You don't look a gift horse in the mouth, and you don't usually ask "so what?" of prosperity. Nevertheless, we can think of at least three points that ought to be raised, and we herewith raise them.

Most paradoxical of the points is that the boom, big as it has been, just hasn't been big enough. It has been big in production, big in consumption, and big in earnings in relation to market valuations of stock. But with population rising, with 4,000,000 currently unemployed, with 1,700,000 job-seeking college and high-school graduates coming on the labor market this year, and with business efficiency increasing (meaning that fewer workers are needed to do a given job), new enterprises just aren't being born fast enough to soak up the available manpower. An approach to the $300,000,000,000 economy is a must if the boom is to go on. But the $300,000,000,000 economy won't come into being unless Washington makes it more rewarding for a man to risk his capital. As we have said before, one way to stimulate the creation of the necessary new enterprises would be to end the present short-sighted practice of taxing dividends twice.

Our second point has to do with the relation of the internal American boom to the opinion of the rest of the world. People of other nations have doubted that the United States has the intellectual and moral power to sustain its part internationally. They have also been looking for a big physical bust in the United States for a long time now. But the boom, which is one of solidly built Oldsmobiles and Budd trains and Allis-Chalmers tractors and Frigidaires and Zenith television sets and Westinghouse generators, multiplied endlessly for five solid years, should be sufficiently tangible to convince anybody from Batavia to Zeebrugge that the United States has the sheer physical vitality to stay the course in the push to a better world community. As a matter of fact, some of the dividends earned on United States home production must push for investment outside the country—which means that Mr. Truman's point-4 program is physically there for any nation to take advantage of the moment it makes conditions attractive to United States investors. Even if the United States lacks something in foreign-policy brains, the United States boom is for export to any country that cares to use brains on its own.

The third point which interests us centers on the relation of means to ends. Americans in recent years have had fewer worries than other people about making a living. But do they know how to live? Or what to live for? These are still big questions, and they obviously haven't been answered. In many ways the United States people are a morally restless and unsatisfied lot.

They are, however, learning something, and their behavior during the boom shows it. Making all allowance for the different circumstances of today, the negative fact that the postwar boom has not be accompanied by the suicidal stock market splash of 1929 is some indication that Americans are a wiser and steadier people now than they were then. Other things about the boom atmosphere are heartening. No one has collated the statistics relating to such diverse things as the increase in churchgoing, the sale of china-painting sets at the 15-cent stores, the growth of art museums and local symphony orchestras, the number of people reading the great books, the popularity of garden clubs, the upgrading of the type of lecturer heard at Rotary luncheons, and so on. But if someone were to do this necessary statistical investigation, it just might prove that the United States citizen is learning what prosperity is for. He is at least beginning to learn that prosperity, once the primary needs of life are cared for, is only good as underpinning for the good life.

In 1929 the United States valued prosperity as an end and it disappeared. Are the American people really coming to value prosperity as a means to the larger good? We hope so, and we propose a toast: "Here's to prosperity—and here's to keeping it in its place."

Democratic-Dominated Congress Wins Do-Nothing Prize

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER E. BREHM
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1950

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, during the 1948 election campaign President Truman proceeded to lambaste the Eightieth Congress not only from coast to coast, but from center to circumference.

I felt, as many others did, that in his desperation for reelection he was making statements which in his more sober moments he would not have made. I felt that the heat of battle had perhaps raised his blood pressure and somewhat as a drowning man clutching for straws, that he in desperation was attempting to clutch and tear down the straw man which he was at the same time trying to build up. However, now as time has gone by and the heat of battle somewhat subsided and still Mr. Truman and some of his administration zealots continue to try and lambaste the Eightieth Congress rather than let it rest in peace, I feel perfectly justified in submitting the following article by Mr. Louis Bromfield regarding the present Eighty-first Congress:

President Truman and Democratic Chairman Boyle, both graduates of the Kansas City Pendergast machine, have been looking worried lately and they have reason to be as time and the record catches up with them.

Mr. Truman referred to the Eightieth Congress as a "do-nothing" Congress and the worst in our history. He demanded a Congress dominated by his own party and he got it. In comparison with the Democratic Eighty-first Congress, the Republican Eightieth Congress was a ball of fire. Mr. Truman's own Congress has not passed a single measure in his welfare state program and indeed nothing at all but the routine usual appropriations bills and one or two bills to take the taxes off oleo or admit some individual being held up by the immigration department.

One fact is certain—that Mr. Truman's existing Democratic Congress holds the world record for emptiness and unkept promises. The curious fact is that Mr. Truman and his Pendergast-dominated national committee have shown little inclination to get any of his emergency bills through both Houses.

Each time one comes up, the administration support of it seems to fade away and rumors follow that Mr. Truman and his friends do not really want the bill passed. They want to keep the issue open for the 1950 elections. Of course, this sort of tactic can go on forever, or until the Democratic Party is thrown out lock, stock, and barrel.

At the CIO convention in New Orleans, organized labor rose in wrath and demanded of Mr. Truman and Mr. Boyle that some of the promises which were used as Democratic campaign material in 1948 be brought before Congress and an effort made to get them passed. It may just be dawning on organized labor that Mr. Truman and his friends have been treating them as they might a local union in Kansas City, stringing them along on promises put off year after year, getting their votes and giving nothing in return.

The ugly incident of the murder of the two Kansas City bosses, Binaggio and Gargotta, who had virtually whipped the Pendergast machine in Kansas City, came at a most inopportune moment when the administration and the Democratic machine were doing their best to suppress or draw the teeth of the proposed congressional committee investigation of the Nation-wide corruption of the gangster and slot-machine mob.

The move to investigate came from one of the finest members of the Democratic Party, Senator KEFAUVER, of Tennessee; but Mr. Truman's and Mr. Boyle's cohorts have done everything to stop it or render it innocuous. Why? Some honest Democrats in Washington will tell you under cover that they are afraid of what will be revealed and the effect on the Democratic Party fortunes.

The Binaggio murder in Kansas City brings up a long-standing unsavory smell which the administration cannot shake off. It should never be forgotten that one of the first acts of Mr. Truman was to grant wholesale pardons to Pendergast stooges convicted by good American juries for criminal frauds having to do with voting.

A little later when a second investigation, deeply incriminating, came up in connection with Mr. Truman's Pendergast backing, the evidence, apparently unguarded, was stolen and destroyed and nothing came of it. The FBI was called off and the case was mysteriously hushed up. But the votes that were stolen were used to defeat Mr. Truman's own enemy, Congressman Roger Slaughter.

The situation smells and should not be tolerated either by the people of Missouri and Kansas City or by the people of the whole Nation. There is a curious parallel between Mr. Truman's loyalty to Tom Pendergast and Mr. Harding's loyalty to Harry Daugherty. Of the two, Daugherty was undoubtedly the less offensive.

In any case the whole record, as time catches up, should prove again that the greatest nation in the world cannot afford to find itself run by third- and fourth-rate men.

Teamwork in Soil Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1950

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have been very favorably impressed with the progress being made in tying down the soil and holding back the water in all 14 counties of my district.

A very interesting and informative report was sent me by my friend, Mr. Ted Turner, chairman, Adams County Soil Conservation District, which states they are now working out their program by small watersheds—each farmer working with his neighbors, taking in 9 or 10 farms at a clip, building terraces, grassed waterways, contouring, and other needed soil-conservation practices. It makes me feel good to know the farmers of my district are proud of their work. What they are doing for their land will not only give them a better living and make their farms more productive as time goes on, but this is the kind of thing that will make and keep America strong.

Turner's report tells how the State of Iowa is contributing $2,500 to assist their district in getting more soil conservation on the land. Also, it points out how the Soil Conservation Service is assisting them with guidance in planning farms and applying soil-conservation practices. Turner points out how the Extension Service and other farm agencies work smoothly with them in getting the job done.

Turner includes interviews he has had with two farmers in his district that hit the nail on the head. Not only are these farmers satisfied they are doing the right thing in conserving their soil, but they know why and they know it is money in their pockets. No one needs to worry about these fellows; they know a good thing when they see it. So that others can learn of the success in Adams County, the following is their report of progress:

CORNING, IOWA, *April 7, 1950.*

Hon. BEN F. JENSEN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. JENSEN: Enclosed is a copy of the 1949 annual report for the Adams County Soil Conservation District. I think you will find it interesting.

We will welcome any suggestions you may have that will help us get better land use in our district.

We also wish to thank you for any help which you have given us in the past and ask your continued cooperation in the future.

Very truly yours,

TED TURNER,
Chairman, Adams Soil Conservation District.

ADAMS SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICT (IOWA)—ANNUAL REPORT FOR 1949

Nineteen hundred and forty-nine was another good year for soil conservation in the Adams Soil Conservation District. Although our growth in interest and practice of soil conservation has not been phenomenal, still it has been steady and is increasing. A review of the statistics at the end of this report will give you a fairly good picture as to just how much progress has been made. Worthy of special mention is the fact that the Soil Conservation Service personnel in our district completed more field lay-out work in April than in any previous month in the history of our district.

We were also able to establish our first watershed-control demonstration this year. Conservation plans were completed with nine farmers living in the Lincoln Center watershed of Sin Creek. All of the 1949 crops were planted on the contour and six of the nine farms completed terraces during the first year. It will be very interesting to watch the developments on this watershed.

Spray Lee, one of our assistant commissioners and at that time also the newly elected president of the Farm Bureau, attended the district commissioner's short course which was held in January at Ames. Spray came back thoroughly pepped up. He made a full report of his schooling at a special meeting arranged for our commissioners, assistant commissioners, and their wives. In February we held a district commissioner's election in cooperation with the Extension Service at a county-wide meeting on fertilizers. I spoke a little about our district activities and Ralph Krenzin, extension specialist from the college, talked on fertilizers. Lester Watt, of Nodaway, was elected district commissioner for a 6-year term. He succeeds Paul Flowers who had so ably served the district since it's organization in 1943. Paul did not choose to run again this year.

The district continues to enjoy good working relationships with local groups and organizations. Also, the other county, State, and Federal agencies concerned with farm programs.

Educational work with schools in the district included talks on conservation and a tour of farms for the Corning eighth-grade pupils. Also, work with the vocational agriculture classes and Cub Scout packs. A plow terrace building demonstration was held for the GI farm training classes this spring.

The Corning Free Press has been very generous in their publicity on conservation projects. Conservation lost a very able and stanch supporter in the recent death of Mr. Gauthier, the local editor.

Radio Station KSIB at Creston has also been very helpful in their reports on conservation activities.

The Adams district submitted the Harry Reese, Tom Dougherty, and the Coleman-Flower farms as our entrants in the Omaha World-Herald contest. The final results showed that the Adams district ranked third in Iowa, with only 54½ points less than the winners. Our farms scored 2,836½ points out of a possible 3,000. We plan to be a winner next year.

We named Gene Schwartz, Ernest Blazek, and Kenneth Calkins to compete in the Goodyear contest. These men were honored at the Goodyear award dinner held in Des Moines.

Both of these contests showed the interest and concern for our most important resource, the soil.

Our district again cooperated with the three adjoining districts in putting on a four-county soil conservation field day and plowing contest. The program consisted of a tour over the Tom Dougherty farm, where we had our field day in 1948. This farm has made a lot of progress in 1 year's time and is an excellent example of what can be accomplished through conservation farming. The second part of the field day was the making over of the Frank Maharry farm which joins the Dougherty farm. The field day was well attended, and we feel very successful in showing how to do the job and also the results that may be expected.

L. L. Henderson held a husking bee type of field day on some of his land this fall. Six neighbors who regularly exchange work were invited in to build terraces, diversions, and waterways. There was considerable interest and we considered it a successful field day. Your district commissioners invite other neighborhoods to get together and work out their conservation construction. This system has much merit. Our technicians will be glad to work with you.

Kenneth King, working out of the Ames Soil Conservation Service office, recently assisted our district in the location of natural neighborhood groups. This proved to be very interesting. The theory is that if we can promote and develop soil conservation by working with natural neighborhoods, rather than individuals or artificial groups, we can expect to get more rapid and permanent soil conservation on the land. Mr. King demonstrated that it is possible to locate the natural neighborhoods; this we are going to try to do whenever possible. When some members of a group show interest in conservation we will promote that interest by working with the entire group.

One of the major developments in conservation during the past year was the appropriation of State funds for soil-conservation work in the district. In July our $500 and $2,000 budgets to the State committee were sent in for approval. These budgets have been approved and State money has already been used in paying for additional technical help, travel expenses of the commissioners and some of the expenses of our four-county field day. We feel that we are getting value received for this money. Our State legislature is to be commended for making this money available to soil-conservation districts and we feel a definite responsibility to you, our neighbors, to see that your money is well spent.

This year, to add a little variety to our report, I interviewed a couple of farmers to try and get their reaction to the services offered and being current given by the Adams soil-conservation district. The first interview was with Mr. Harry Reese, a master farmer, whose farm is located near Stringtown:

"TED. Harry, how long have you had your farm plan?

"HARRY. Since 1944.

"TED. What soil conservation practices are you using?

"HARRY. One very important one I use is a good rotation. This is a 4-year rotation using 1 year of corn, 1 year of oats, and 2 years of meadow.

"TED. How is this different than your previous farming?

"HARRY. Farming now seems so much easier since I have a definite guide to go by.

"TED. What happens to your rotation when the weather man causes you to lose a seeding?

"HARRY. That is no problem because when you are using a rotation with at least 2 years of meadow it is easy to hold that meadow over for another year when necessary.

"TED. Have you built any terraces or structures?

"HARRY. Yes. I have two terraces and a large pond which I built this past summer.

"TED. Harry, what are some of the benefits you have received from our Soil Conservation District?

"HARRY. They are numerous. Specifically, I have a soil map of my farm showing me just what types of soil I have and where they are located. It also shows how thick this layer of topsoil is, and what the average slope is in each field. Then I have my cropping plan which is a 5-year plan showing how I plan to operate my farm for the next 5 years. There is also space here to keep track of any special practices such as lime

and fertilizer applications. Then my fields have been rearranged so that the same types of soil are farmed together and also my fields are adjusted in size so that I have a balanced farming program giving me approximately the same acreage of crops each year. Besides this I got considerable help in my pasture improvement program.

"TED. How much better is your pasture now than before your renovation program?

"HARRY. There is no comparison. I now pasture at least three or four cattle on good pasture where before I had only one on a very mediocre pasture, mostly poverty grass.

"TED. How many head per acre now?

"HARRY. At least three head for the pasture season.

"TED. When do you turn in in the spring?

"HARRY. When the grass is 4 inches tall. This gives it a chance to get a good start.

"TED. What pasture mixture did you use?

"HARRY. Red clover, alfalfa, brome, ladino clover, and birdsfoot trefoil. Six months before seeding I put on 2 tons of lime per acre. At seeding time I put on 200 pounds of 0–20–0. The pasture had been thoroughly torn up with a spring-tooth harrow and a disc.

"TED. Would you care to make an estimate of the dollars per acre returns from this pasture in 1949?

"HARRY. A good cow will produce $50 per acre at current prices. This is much better than grain, and I'm building up my soil at the same time.

"TED. That was certainly better than trying to farm that particular field. Thank you, Harry. I'm sure hundreds of other farmers in our district could do as well with their pasture land."

Following is an interview with L. L. Henderson of Corning:

"TED. How long have you had a farm plan on your land, L. L.?

"L. L. About 4 years, I think.

"TED. What in your farm plan impressed you most?

"L. L. Knowing the different types of soil and how much of each was left on the land.

"TED. What can the average farmer hope to gain from a farm plan?

"L. L. With it he can make more efficient use of his land by knowing better just what he has to work with.

"TED. In what ways have you been benefited from our local soil-conservation district?

"L. L. In advice and technical help, always given very willingly. You've got a good bunch of fellows here. They take an interest in your farm just as if it were their own.

"TED. What would you suggest needs to be done to make our program more effective and to speed up the process of getting more conservation on the land?

"L. L. We need more educational meetings. It will take a series of meetings with the same group to get the job done.

"TED. What do you think about stewardship of the land?

"L. L. What do you mean?

"TED. I mean, do we have any obligation to preserve our farms for future generations?

"L. L. We certainly do. Just because we have a deed to our farm should not mean that we have the right to waste our precious topsoil. Unless the farmers come to realize this they will likely find themselves subject to a land-use program. Many of our other natural resources, such as oil, are already under Government restriction.

"TED. How can we get more farmers and landowners to regard their land as a trust?

"L. L. It will have to be through a process of education.

"TED. Thanks, L. L., for a splendid interview."

Apparently we have two well-satisfied customers among our district cooperators. I only hope that our district can render equally good service to all the farmers in the district.

Following is a brief report of the part taken by the agricultural extension service in soil conservation work as given me by the extension director, Mr. Homer Thiel:

"The agricultural extension service of Adams County and Iowa State College has assisted the work of the district in several ways.

"In line with common practice, the extension director has served the district as secretary, attending all meetings of the district commissioners except where other extension activities demanded his attention.

"With the beginning of consideration of new problems attending the most profitable use of the finances appropriated by the last legislature in Iowa, the extension director drove to Red Oak with the commissioners and work unit conservationist for an afternoon meeting.

"Robert Moorman, Ralph Krenzin, and Otto E. Hoffman of the State staff, appeared at the four-county field day in September, presenting information on corn-borer control, forages and weed-destroying chemicals, respectively.

"In April the extension director assisted Don Lovely, Ralph Waage, Erwin Birt, and Kingery brothers with contouring problems on their own farms, spending 2 days in all in the field with them. In all cases the men were instructed in locating contour lines. Four of the men were trained to operate and operated hand levels during the period spent with them. This assistance was given at the period of the peak load of local S. C. S. personnel.

"Assistance with publicity for the district was contributed by the extension director. Some of these releases appeared in the Adams County Free Press. Others appeared in the Farm Bureau World. Some of the features dealt with were: the structure on the Harry Reese farm, the L. L. Henderson Soil Conservation Day, the Sin Creek watershed area and other small incidental projects.

"Reports of accomplishments of the district were included in the account of agricultural activities of Adams County. This statement appeared in the annual agricultural extension report."

As previously stated, we feel that 1949 was a good year. We have every reason to believe that the year 1950 will be better.

ADAMS SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICT,
TED TURNER,
Chairman, District Governing Body.

Our Problem—Maintaining a Stable National Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, we hear much about maintaining a stable national economy, price parity, and we receive many communications criticizing the Government's policy of providing support prices for agricultural products. Many of the communications come from businessmen and commercial organizations, who apparently have forgotten the problems that arose affecting the financial security of business and the stability of our national economy during the depression years.

There has recently come to my desk a letter from the president of the Western States Meat Packers Association, together with copy of a resolution adopted by that association, which I have acknowledged with certain inquiries.

There is inserted herewith the correspondence mentioned above and the letter from the president of the Valley Packing Co., received in response to these inquiries:

APRIL 12, 1950.

Mr. E. F. FORBES,
President, Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., San Francisco, Calif.

DEAR MR. FORBES: Thanks for your letter of April 11, with the attached resolution referring to our Government policies affecting free enterprise.

Now, just what is the purport of your letter and the resolution adopted by your association? From your letterhead, it appears that you are president of the Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc.

Does your organization include in its membership the big meat packers? Under existing conditions, how do you propose to achieve and maintain a balanced national economy and parity of prices in our price structure? By what method do you propose to eliminate unfair trade practices and unfair competition? Do you have any plan to protect and safeguard free enterprise and small business in this country? Do you sanction the present exorbitant prices the consumer has to pay for barbed wire, farm implements, and the products of our manufacturers in general? Did you observe the effect on the business in this country when credit was withdrawn from the people engaged in our basic industries, particularly agriculture, with the result that these people lost their purchasing power? Do you want that to happen again? Do you advocate the abandonment of the principles of price parity by withdrawing the price support of agricultural products?

Inasmuch as you have set out to educate the Congress of the United States, we would like to have your answer to these questions.

Sincerely yours,

COMPTON I. WHITE,
Member of Congress.

WESTERN STATES MEAT PACKING ASSOCIATION, INC.,
San Francisco, Calif., April 11, 1950.

Hon. COMPTON I. WHITE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WHITE: The most important problem facing Congress is to decide whether the tested concepts of free enterprise and individual liberty are to be discarded by our Government and replaced by socialistic measures which fallaciously purport to provide security. Even if such security could be realized it would ultimately be at the expense of regimentation, loss of freedom, and a reduction in the standard of living.

Attached is a resolution on this subject adopted by the members of the Western States Meat Packers Association at its recent annual convention in San Francisco. We trust that the Congress may make the proper decision.

We feel that the purpose of the attached resolution will have been accomplished if it serves to remind Members of Congress of the dangers that underlie the new paternalistic philosophies that have been advanced in this country in recent years. Accordingly, no reply is necessary.

Thank you for allowing us to bring this to your attention.

Very truly yours,

E. F. FORBES,
President.

RESOLUTION OF THE WESTERN STATES MEAT PACKERS ASSOCIATION, INC., SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

There impends today a threat to our country and the freedom of its people which so menacingly overshadows the future that we, American citizens of all shades of political belief, feel it our duty to speak out in unmistakable terms.

This threat lies in the fact that our country—without conscious choice on the part of its people—is rapidly and unmistakably drifting toward the consummation of a false concept—the socialized state.

Tokens of this danger are everywhere and undeniable. The growing power and expansion of wasteful government; the colossal public debt; the heavy burden of taxation; the malicious attempt to substitute an artificial economy for the natural economy which alone can function in freedom; the gradual assumption by the State of financial responsibility for every hazard incident to life—hazards which should be personally met and borne by every human being who has the instinctive will to survive and the inherent impulse to be free; the arraignment of economic and social groups, one against the other, and numerous other conditions and proposals similarly inspired and equally false.

Government produces nothing and has no means by which to support these false and destructive theories except by exacting from its citizens the fruits of their labors. The course the Government is now taking, unless it is promptly reversed, must inevitably lead to national bankruptcy. In a vain effort to prolong a specious sense of security, more similar expedients will be applied until we become mere numbers in a completely socialized State: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., in convention assembled at San Francisco, Calif., February 23, 1950, reaffirm our solemn conviction that the future health, strength, and prosperity of our country depends on the reestablishment and maintenance of free and competitive enterprise and hereby pledge ourselves as individuals and as an association to work diligently and actively toward this objective and toward the defeat of the fallacious philosophies that are beguiling our country into socialism.

VALLEY PACKING CO.,
Salem, Oreg., April 20, 1950.

Hon. COMPTON I. WHITE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Before me lies a copy of a letter dated April 12, 1950, which you addressed to Mr. E. F. Forbes, president of the Western States Meat Packers Association. This was in reply to his letter of April 11, which accompanied a resolution adopted by the association on February 23, 1950, and Mr. Forbes sent me a copy of your reply because I happened to have the privilege of introducing this resolution to the convention.

I do not presume to speak for Mr. Forbes, nor as a member or officer of the Western States Meat Packers Association, but as a humble citizen and taxpayer I am indeed happy to make some observations in reply to your truculent letter.

First, as to the resolution—it is an exact copy of a resolution adopted by the American Cattlemen's Association at their convention held in Miami in January 1950, with the only changes being in the names of the associations, places of meeting and dates. I believe Idaho lays some claim to being quite a cattle State and I would suggest you contact some of the leading members of the A. C. A. in your State, and ask them what they meant by supporting such a resolution.

Frankly, Mr. WHITE, I cannot give the correct answers to all the weighty questions asked in the third paragraph of your letter. It is a safe assumption that the leading minds of our country are concentrated in the Congress, and even they have not come up with all the correct answers, when we face the fact that our deficit for the current fiscal year ending June 30 will surely run over $5,000,000,000. I lay no claim to being an economist, but common sense tells me that no one—whether it be an individual, a corporation or the Government—can borrow itself rich.

Now, Mr. WHITE, I do not believe the adoption of this resolution was any attempt to educate the Congress of the United States, but simply an effort to strengthen the desire of most Members of Congress to do a conscientious job for the welfare of all the people based on the fundamental principles that made this country great. Incidentally, speaking of education, have you read John T. Flynn's great book, "The Road Ahead?"

Sincerely yours,

G. F. CHAMBERS,
President, Valley Packing Co.

Ireland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 20, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following letter addressed by Mr. William J. Conlon, one of my constituents, to the editor of the Telegram-News, of Lynn, Mass.:

EDITOR, TELEGRAM-NEWS:

SIR: I have been a reader of your paper for over 30 years. Your paper has at all times given the true facts on all questions and upheld the rights of oppressed peoples everywhere. There was an editorial in the Boston Post of March 31 on Congressman FOGARTY'S amendment in Congress recently to withhold ECA funds from England as long as the partition of Ireland by England is continued, was true to the point. Congress has intervened in Italy, France, Greece, and Turkey and several other European countries and asked for a government by the people. Can any Congressman in the House of Representatives tell the public of the United States why Ireland is not entitled to a government by her own people? I am writing this letter, Mr. Editor, at a time when the United States Government is loaning millions of dollars in Marshall-plan funds to England, and what is England doing without having the diplomatic courtesy of telling us what is going on behind the British iron curtain? England is using these Marshall-plan funds to finance the Arabs against the Jewish State of Israel, because of oil fields involved in Arab countries. She is also giving thousands of dollars to Red Godless Russia in exchange for what? She had recognized Red Godless China. And in my native city of Belfast she is financing an illegal army of occupation in the city where I was born. And who, may I ask, knows what England is doing in northern Ireland than the man who was born there? I was born on July 22, 1890, at 116 Corporation Street, Belfast, Ireland, and I can prove this with my birth certification which I have in my possession.

The Irish people in Ireland are only asking for our assistance in getting the British authorities out of Ireland, as did the Honorable Benjamin Franklin, Washington's first ambassador, when he pleaded with Henry Grattan's Parliament in 1800. The Irish Government sent shiploads of foodstuffs and rebel generals to assist the young American republic in shaking off the British yoke that bound them.

Congresmen of the United States, why don't you reciprocate and assist a small mutilated country of only 32,000 square miles total area, 300 miles long, and 200 miles wide? Two governments in a country this size is a laughing stock for the world. Congressmen, demand for us a free and untrammeled election and this will settle everything.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM J. CONLON.

Hall Demands Donaldson Return Postal Service to People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 24, 1950

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 24, 1950.

Hon. JESSE M. DONALDSON,
Postmaster General,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DONALDSON: I wish to inform you of the indignation and disgust being expressed back home over your recent order to cut the services of the Post Office Department.

As one Member of Congress who has always voted for all funds necessary for efficient running of the postal service, I cannot condone or approve your action.

If the post office needs more funds, I am ready to vote for them. The American people must have their mail go through. This is one place in our Government where false economy would be tragic.

I refuse to agree with your contention that the users of penny post cards should be taxed 100 percent. I voted against this increase and will never go along with doubling this postage.

Millions of our citizens now depend upon the penny post card to get important messages to their loved ones and to carry on their necessary business affairs.

Thousands of our worthy religious, fraternal and small enterprise groups find the penny post card a necessary part of their programs and they should not be compelled to pay any more for mail service.

I have always voted for every pay raise the postal employees have received because I feel they are underpaid for the tedious work they perform. If more money must be had to pay them, we can afford to save somewhere else.

You ask me where we are to get the funds if you are not permitted to double the penny post card. I will tell you here and now.

I find that four daily newspapers in my district shipped out more than 31,000 pounds of postage-free material during 1949. This may seem small but the taxpayers had to pay the shot.

Moreover, these newspapers are getting rich from advertising. They are also using

their columns for smearing Members of Congress which is a far cry from news gathering.

Last year, the cost of handling the country's newspapers which went postage free, was $11,173,870. Nearly $1,000,000 more would have been received by Uncle Sam if these newspapers had paid for their free-in-county mailings.

A recommendation from you to make the newspapers pay their proper cost of having Uncle Sam carry their material would probably cause Congress to raise twelve millions more dollars to make up the deficit you claim your department is carrying.

I stand ready to vote for such a revenue raising scheme and I hereby propose this to help bring the Post Office Department out of the red.

Sincerely,

EDWIN ARTHUR HALL,
Member of Congress.

The American Way—How We Can Improve It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 24, 1950

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the American Legion of Ohio sponsored an essay contest among the high-school students of the State of Ohio, from which 12 winning essays were selected and the winners are here in Washington this week. The essay was on The American Way—How We Can Improve It, and I want to include the essay of James Altwies, of Tiffin, Ohio, one of the winners of the American Legion Essay Contest of Ohio:

THE AMERICAN WAY—HOW WE CAN IMPROVE IT

How can we improve the American way? There are many answers to that question. The best answer seems to be action. The old saying, Action speaks louder than words is a very true one. It is a very common fault to plan certain objectives, then do nothing about them.

One of our first endeavors should be to live in peace with our neighbors, those we meet in everyday life. We should all strive to better ourselves and our Nation. If there were a bond of love and unity among all men, not just in the material sense but also in the spiritual, our Nation would operate like a well-oiled machine under a trained mechanic. As a result the country would be rid of its most menacing enemy, communism. The object of this Godless organization is to break apart and divide the whole world so its force can move in and dictate as it sees fit. It is just selfishness and greed that causes international confusion, such as coal strikes which disrupt the world. We, the people, should do something about this and prevent our enemies from undermining our Nation with alarm and confusion. Besides relying on the Government, the people should start some action. They should screen the magazines and papers they buy and investigate the movies. These channels influence public opinion, since most people use these outlets for their daily recreation. Whether we know it or not, our enemies spread propaganda if we are not alert.

Besides our interest in our neighbor and our own welfare, we should voice our opinions of all public officials and see that they really serve the country; for after all freedom of speech is one of our foremost liberties, for which many of our ancestors died.

We students in school also have the obligation to improve the American way by getting a good education while we have the opportunity. We will then have a sufficient training to help operate our country later on. Perhaps the State could offer better inducements for a better education in the form of scholarships, contests, etc., as is done for athletics. This would encourage those who have no means for higher schooling.

Of course, the very first way to improve the American way lies right in our own homes—the Nation's outpost. We should live daily lives worthy of the name America. By obeying the laws of God and country, all citizens might eradicate from the daily papers the scandals that disgrace the American system. The divorce rate, considered the greatest in the world, is the downfall of the American home. If everyone is charitable and considerate of his partner, there would be no cause for this.

These are some of the solutions to the Nation's betterment. Our way of life has always been respected and envied by nations less fortunate. By talking less and living better everyday lives we can bring honor to our country before God and man.

Partition of Ireland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 24, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a resolution recently adopted by the Massachusetts State Boards of the Ancient Order of Hibernians and Ladies' Auxiliary:

Whereas the unjust partition of Ireland is a continuing factor of disturbance and distrust to the peace of the world; and

Whereas such partition, against the will of the people of Ireland, is also against the principles of justice expressed by the Constitution of the United States of America; and

Whereas such partition is against the best interests of the people of the United States, since Ireland, a divided nation, cannot take its proper place in the councils of the nations of the world; and

Whereas Ireland's absence from the North Atlantic Pact weakens the military defense of the United States as therein expressed and weakens the efforts of the United States to aid in the economic recovery of all Europe; and

Whereas Ireland's absence from the United Nations, to which the United States subscribes as a member, results from the veto of Soviet Russia, due to the hostility of Ireland to communism and its evils: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the State Boards of the AOH and Ladies' Auxiliary urge the Foreign Relations Committee of the House of Representatives of the Congress to report forthwith a suitable resolution expressing the sentiment of the people of the United States against the unjust partition of Ireland and demanding a plebiscite of the people of all Ireland on the matter of a united Ireland; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Foreign Relations Committee of the House of Representatives, to the President of the United States, to the Department of State, and to the members of the Massachusetts congressional delegation.

The Massachusetts State Board of the AOH and Ladies' Auxiliary: Rev. Michael J. Houlihan, Chaplain, Watertown; Paul E. Tierney, President, Somerville; Thomas C. Phillips, Secretary, Worcester; Hugh P. Caffrey, Organizer, Brockton; P. Frank Kean, Director, Brighton; William J. Ronan, New Bedford; Daniel J. Clifford, Watertown; Richard Fitzmaurice, Brockton; Mary Curran, Lynn; Mary Hurley, Belmont; Mary Kinsella, Salem; William P. Sullivan, Vice President, Holyoke; James P. McCarthy, Treasurer, Malden; Thomas H. Murray, Mission Chairman, Brighton; Thomas F. Hall, Sr., Pittsfield; Joseph P. McKenna, Methuen; Daniel F. Slattery, Norwood; Hugh A. Moriarty, Worcester; Helen Condrick, Weymouth; Kathleen Roche, New Bedford; Mary Gleason, Wellesley.

A true copy:

THOMAS C. PHILLIPS,
State Secretary.

The American Way—How We May Improve It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. VORYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 24, 1950

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to present to the House the prize-winning essay written by Miss Marilyn Reed, of Columbus, Ohio, on the subject The American Way—How We May Improve It? This essay was submitted in a contest sponsored annually by the American Legion, Department of Ohio. This contest stimulates patriotic thought and study by thousands of students. The 12 prize winners receive a trip to Washington. They were luncheon guests of Ohio Members of the House today in the Speaker's dining room.

Miss Marilyn Reed is an eleventh-grade student in Columbus, Ohio. Her essay contains food for thought for every one of us.

The essay follows:

THE AMERICAN WAY—HOW WE MAY IMPROVE IT

(By Marilyn Reed, Columbus, Ohio)

Our American way of life may be improved on home, community, and national fronts by a development of an enthusiastic sincere appreciation of our American heritage, its wealth of opportunity and fulfilment of ambitions. This may be accomplished by the education of our youth to the amazing advantage they inherit from their pioneer fathers, by publicity through newspaper, radio and drama, and lastly, by a country-wide revival of spiritual growth.

Too much of a "taken for granted" attitude has created a lethargy in our thinking habits. The youth of today, our citizen voters of tomorrow, should be taught thoroughly the rudiments of our Government. The construction of our Government, local, State, and national; the intricate functions of all three branches, judicial, legislative, and executive, should be as familiar to everyone as the list of last week's Hit Parade

tunes. Youth from the ages of 18 to 21 should be intensively trained to analyze the issues of the ballot, so that as they approach the day of suffrage privilege, they will enjoy the duty of voting as much as they enjoy receiving their diploma.

Our present way of life needs no radical improvement—it just needs a more thorough living of it. Americans are the best salesmen in the world. We cannot sell a product about which we know nothing; therefore, we need to gain as much knowledge of our freedoms as we possibly can, so that we can sell the idea to the world through intelligent living. Our newspapers and radio, our great outlet of the press freedom gives emphasis to the good, constructive principles of our way of life, through publicizing our agriculture, industry, trade, health programs, drama, and arts. With a little less emphasis on the sensational headlines, we can sell ourselves to the world, through knowledge of the good things of our freedoms.

Local, State, and national issues of the ballot should be the subjects of family discussions. As individual voters, we send our representatives to Congress; we are privileged to continue our contacts with them and to vigorously express our views on national and international questions on which they are required to vote. We, as men of the streets and voters, should express our views to our Congress on the crucial questions of present-day problems. Many of us neglect this privilege, yet criticize vociferously when the legislation does not please us.

Revival of spiritual growth will improve our way of life by shaping our thinking toward the original ideals of our forefathers, freedom of worship. This privilege, like the others, suffers from ennui and indifference. Beginning in the homes, spreading to communities, worship habits should be revived. Community sings, neighborhood socials, stimulated by church associations, will nurture our spiritual growth as communities. Good citizens make good communities, good communities make good nations. Closer relationship with our chosen religions will develop our sense of gratitude for our wealth of blessings in our way of life, our homes, churches, schools, farms, and industries.

In conclusion, our way of life may be improved by development of our initiative, to learn our government while young, to support it with our votes when we have gained that privilege, to teach it to those who will follow us, and to sell the whole idea to the world by exhibiting the happiness to be found in the American way of life and our freedoms.

Curtailment of Mail Deliveries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 24, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

APRIL 24, 1950.

The Honorable JESSE M. DONALDSON,
The Postmaster General,
Post Office Department,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DONALDSON: The instructions issued by your office on April 18, curtailing mail deliveries and reducing other types of essentail postal service, can scarcely be considered as anything but a distinct disservice to the American people. I, personally, am of the opinion that you have greatly exceeded the scope of your responsibility in issuing orders that have the effect of denying equal postal facilities to all families and all segments of business in the Nation.

During the discussion of chapter IV, H. R. 7786, pertaining to the appropriation for the operation of the Post Office Department for the next fiscal year, it was pointed out on the House floor that your Department was being cut approximately 1 percent, or $28,000,000, in actual expenditures. In your opinion, does an approximate cut of 1 percent justify the sweeping reductions in your services to the general public?

My attention has been invited to a statement you made before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives on January 16, 1950. You are quoted as saying: "I consider it of paramount importance to continue to give the public good service. Any economy campaign which would go so far as to destroy the present standards would bring on reactions that not only would nullify economy, but, in the end, would result in greater costs."

Do you still hold the same opinion as expressed in the above-quoted remarks made by you? If you do, how do you reconcile the cuts in service that your instructions of April 18 order? If you have had a change of heart since your testimony of January 16, may I suggest that you inform the Congress and the American public that you no longer consider "good service" to be of "paramount importance"?

Have you or your staff given any consideration to the excessive delay in delivery that might possibly result because the bulk of mail will be beyond the ability of the carrier to deliver in a one-delivery-a-day arrangement?

Postal employees in my district have advised me that sort of delay has been not uncommon for months prior to your April 18 orders. Your instructions will compound the seriousness of that type of situation.

I will appreciate any expression you care to give to the several questions posed in this letter. Your reply will assist in serving as a basis for my own response to the many inquiries and protests received from the business firms and individuals in my district.

Sincerely yours,

ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO,
Member of Congress.

Our Election Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 24, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include a very interesting article that appeared in the Lynn Telegram-News, Lynn, Mass., on Sunday, April 16, 1950, written by the very able and studious member of the bar of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Attorney Charles H. McGlue.

Mr. McGlue served for some time as the chairman of the Massachusetts State Ballot Law Commission and also as chairman of the Democratic State committee in that State. This item which deals with the system of proportional representation is one that is very close to the heart of the writer and is a subject matter with which Mr. McGlue is well acquainted. He has been an outstanding student of the primary and election laws, and the workings of that legislation in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts for a great many years. I know of no one who has a better insight on our election laws in Massachusetts than Mr. McGlue. Time and time again he has spoken and fought for legislation to improve those laws dealing with the conduct of our primaries and elections, and suffice to say he knows the weakness of some of our State laws. I submit this thoughtful article to the Members of the Congress for their study and consideration. Attorney McGlue's statement contains a great deal of material that could be effectively used to prevent the further decimation of Democratic majorities in our Democratic cities by the means of this communistic technique known as proportional representation and by the un-American system of plan E whereby minorities control majorities in cities:

DOES PROPORTIONAL REPRESENTATION PLEASE RUSSIA? IS PLAN E, PLAN EUROPEAN?

(By Charles H. McGlue)

"In all countries, even the freest, legal and peaceful in the sense that the class struggle is less acute in them, the time has fully matured when it is absolutely necessary for every Communist Party worker systematically to combine legal with illegal work.

"It is necessary immediately for all legal Communist Parties to form illegal organizations.

"The absolute necessity in principle of combining illegal with legal work is determined, not only by the sum total of the specific features of the present period, the period of the eve of proletarian dictatorship, but also by the necessity of proving to the bourgeoisie that there is not, nor can there be, a sphere or field of work that cannot be won by the Communists." (Dictator Nicolai Lenin, Communist leader, in his Thesis on the Fundamental Tasks of the Second Congress of the Communist International.)

MULLINS' RED SALAMANDER

In these days of "Reds" and "red herrings," it was rather surprising to me to find that a political writer of the supposed stature of William Mullins of the Boston Herald, would take time out from his prolific, political plottings in order to drag a "Red salamander" across the Old Bay State trail.

Of course, the politically wise realize that Bill Mullins is quite a master of creative fiction who does not hesitate to make up his own atmosphere and surroundings in order to give quasi-reality to a mere figment of his Gaelic imagination. His recent creation, the Red Salamander, in his latest interpretation work, McGlue's Blueprint of the 1951 Congressional Gerrymander, fell as flat as a flounder, if it is possible for a salamander to fall as flat as that.

"Ole Bill" was up to his old tricks of trying to scare the Republican Senators into line so that two bills most vital to the continuance of our American system of voting would meet defeat in the Massachusetts Senate.

IS MULLINS' FACE RED?

The two bills in question are house No. 2369, an act relative to the appointment of a city manager in cities having a plan E form of charter and senate No. 216, a bill repealing the laws authorizing the election of certain city and town officers by proportional representation. Both bills were awaiting action in the Massachusetts State Senate when "Ole Bill" did his stuff.

And what happened? House No. 2369, based on bill filed by the writer, House No. 1571, took its final reading in the senate by a vote of 23 yes to 16 no. Upon engrossment by the senate, it was sent over to the house of representatives for final enactment (it previously having passed successively through its three readings). It was enacted both by the house and the senate, and is now on Governor Dever's desk, where in all probability, it will receive gubernatorial signature on Monday next.

WHITTLING WITH WHITTIER

For some unknown reason, the chief opponent of this very sound and important piece of legislation was Senator Sumner Whittier of Everett. This bill (house No. 2369) removes the very unfair and un-American provision in the plan E city charters which prohibits all elected public officials in Massachusetts within 2 years of their election, from being selected for those juicy-job plums as city or town manager, ranging from $9,000 a year in Saugus to $20,000 a year in fair old Cambridge. Now, with the passage of my bill, any elected official is eligible at once for them, except a member of the city council during his term of office, or any other person who has within 2 years been elected to or served in any elective office in the city or in the county in which the city is located. So that today men like former Gov. Robert F. Bradford, former Lt. Gov. Arthur W. Coolidge, and former Governor and Mayor James M. Curley are eligible to serve as city or town managers in any city or town outside of their own county. This is democratic progress.

SENATE VOTES FOR BILL

Some idea of the effectiveness of the propaganda put forth by Bill Mullins and his Red Salamander, and Senator Sumner Whittier and his Whittling Theme (borrowed from an editorial in the Boston Herald of recent date) can be gleaned from a cursory glance at the 23 for, 16 against, roll call on this measure.

Five staunch GOP senators joined with 18 Democratic senators to give this bill an overwhelming endorsement. These five Republican stalwarts were Senator Ralph Lerche, of Northampton; Senator Ralph V. Clampit, of Springfield; Senator John D. Mackay, of Quincy; Senator Charles G. Miles, of Brockton; and Senator Charles M. Olson, of Ashland. No person can question the party regularity or patriotism of these representatives of the people.

PROPORTIONAL REPRESENTATION SHOULD BE OUTLAWED

On Monday next the Massachusetts State Senate will have up for consideration the question of passing to its third reading Senate No. 216, an act repealing the laws authorizing the election of certain city and town officers by proportional representation and preferential voting. This bill is sponsored by Senator Daniel F. O'Brien, of Cambridge; Miss Edna Lawrence Spencer, of Cambridge; and Charles H. McGlue, of Boston. This important piece of legislation has already received a majority vote in the State senate, and in all probability will be passed in the senate during this coming week and then sent to the house for action there.

PROPORTIONAL REPRESENTATION VERSUS UNITED STATES PRINCIPLES

Prof. Ferdinand A. Hermens, who is head of the department of political science at the University of Notre Dame, has made a very thorough study of the proportional representation system of voting. His analysis of its dangers and fallacies is well worth reading and is as follows:

"The system of proportional representation constitutes a denial of the very foundations on which our representative Republic is based. For the founders of this country representation meant integration; for the proponents of proportional representation it means fragmentation. The Constitution of the United States was established in the belief that it was the task of the people in elections to establish broad areas of agreement and to select the best man available to public office. Under proportional representation any coherent minority bloc of sufficient size can elect a member of a parliamentary body without attempting in the least to secure agreement with citizens belonging to other groups. For the men elected, it suffices to be the mouthpieces of such a bloc; they need not be the political leaders who can lead us all on the basis of our common devotion to the general welfare, and who, as James Madison stated in No. X of the Federalist papers, should be elected under the Constitution.

STRONG MEN OPPOSE PROPORTIONAL REPRESENTATION

"There has been no lack of men prominent in our political life who realized how deeply proportional representation threatens the very vitals of our Republic. Newton D. Baker, Woodrow Wilson's Secretary of War, belonged to them. He emphasized that 'proportional representation invites these groups (religious, racial, language, social, and other contentious minority groups) to seek to harden and intensify their difference by bringing them into political action where they are irrevelant, if not disturbing.' Senator ROBERT A. TAFT has expressed himself similarly in a talk given in 1924 while he was the Republican floor leader in the Ohio House of Representatives. He is known not to have changed his views in the matter. Senator LODGE stated on the floor of the United States Senate on January 25 of this year: 'Proportional representation is a means of reflecting every shade of popular opinion in a legislative body. It does encourage splinter parties, of course, and thus makes it more difficult for any dominant group to carry out a consistent policy. In a city council or a legislature there could be a perfect rainbow of parties. That is true in some European countries.'

"In American local government proportional representation has been an element of confusion. It has led to deadlocks in Cincinnati, in New York City, in Yonkers, in Cambridge, and in Lowell. It has, on several occasions, including the latest election in Cincinnati, had the result that more ballots were either invalid or exhausted than constitute the quota. As it was put after the latest election held in Wheeling, W. Va.: 'Old Man Invalid came out on the top of the poll.'

PROPORTIONAL REPRESENTATION HURTS MANAGER PLAN

"The city-manager plan, that splendid instrument of reform, has done magnificently in hundreds of American cities. About 900 of them now apply it. Wherever the majority system was used, the experience was, in the vast number of cases, that a satisfactory record was established, and opposition was nil. When manager plan was combined with proportional representation, there has been no end of civic dissension. After almost every election under proportional representation, dissatisfaction has manifested itself, resulting in many cases in attempts to repeal this system of voting. Millions of dollars have been spent needlessly on such controversies, which the traditional American system of voting would have avoided entirely.

"It should never be overlooked that the proponents of proportional representation in the United States propose it for local elections only in order to have it adopted later in State and national elections. This is clearly stated in the writings of the leaders in this field, such as in the concluding pages of Mrs. George H. Hallett's booklet entitled 'Proportional Representation, the Key to Democracy.' Nor have the proponents of proportional representation left us in doubt as to the consequences which might arise in our national legislative bodies as a result of the application of proportional representation. The book by Hoag and Hallett, for example, entitled "Proportional Representation," is, as shown on pages 114–117, clearly critical of the two-party system. It contemplates a situation in which Congress would be divided into minority parties, which would have to make decisions in a process of bargaining. They state: Such a situation, which might often occur under proportional representation is essentially a wholesome one. Thus, the House of Representatives would become representative in fact as well as in name. It is obvious then that representation is identified with fragmentation, which is welcomed.

PROPORTIONAL REPRESENTATION DANGEROUS DOCTRINE

"Where proportional representation leads us if applied to State and national elections can clearly be seen from its contemporary European record. The daily press has been reporting the scandals caused by Communists in the Parliaments of several European countries, in particular France and Italy, where they have produced the most shameful scenes in order to protest, among other things, against American assistance to their countries. These Communist Parties know very well that under the majority system the number of their members in National Parliaments would be reduced catastrophically, as it was reduced when in France the latest Provincial elections were held under the majority system. This gave to the Communists little more than 2 percent of the total number of seats in comparison to the nearly 30 percent which proportional representation had given them in the National Assembly. For this reason Communist Parties all over the world fight for proportional representation. If proportional representation favors Communists this is merely a logical consequence of its generally undemocratic character. It has favored Nationalists, Nazis, and Fascists in the past, and does so again at present. The small Nationalist groups which are at present causing so much turmoil in the German Federal Parliament in Bonn owe their seats to proportional representation. Without that system those parties and the new ones which have been formed or are about to be formed simply would have to be liquidated, and their voters would be induced to rally to the cause of more moderate and more responsible political parties.

"Proportional representation in Europe is, therefore, a threat to the objectives which this country pursues at the expense of billions under the Marshall plan and the military assistance program. If extended into State and national elections it would end the political stability which we have enjoyed under our two-party system. Its use in local elections is intended to pave the road to this goal. It is apt to dull our apprehensions as to the true nature of the threat to our institutions involved. It is also, as has been stated by such a prominent proponent of municipal reform as Dr. Don K. Price, one of the greatest threats to true progress in the improvement of local government in general, and to the progress of the city-manager plan in particular."

The above is the studied opinion of the world's greatest authority on this subject, Professor Hermens of Notre Dame.

FRAUD FACTOR IN PROPORTIONAL REPRESENTATION

The plan E system is a fraud on the voting public. It is based on the theory behind the European bloc system which combined with proportional representation produced Hitler in Germany and Mussolini in Italy. It is the same system that New York City repealed 2 years ago last November by a 2-to-1 vote in order to get rid of a system that elected

four avowed Communists or left-wing sympathizers to their municipal council of 23 members.

The public does not yet understand the communistic set-up of plan E and proportional representation. The fraud factor in this system has not yet been thoroughly exposed. The so-called reformers stress very much that proportional representation voting gives the voter a chance to express their choice of candidates by voting for their first choice, second choice, etc., ad infinitum et ad nauseam.

What these reformers do not stress is the fraud factor, the proportional represenation deception, that no matter how many choices a voter may make on his ballot, whether it be 2 or 86, the voter never votes for more than one councilor. He only votes once and for only one councilor. In other words, proportional representation takes away from every voter eight-ninths of his voting power and leaves him with only the right to vote for one councilor when 9 are to be elected. This is the so-called plan E and proportional representation fraud factor that relies upon religious and racial tensions to produce the results which are generally pleasing to the overlord of the Kremlin.

Plan E should be called plan European and proportional representation is a communistic device which, in reality, stands for the phrase "please Russia."

PROPORTIONAL REPRESENTATION REPEAL EDITORIALS

New York Journal-American, under date of April 3, 1947, wrote as follows:

"ABOLISH PROPORTIONAL REPRESENTATION

"The drive to abolish proportional representation as the means of electing our city councilmen should and will have the support of every fair-minded voter.

"How it got on the books in the first place is something that even the politicians are puzzling over now.

"Proportional representation has certainly proved itself the most disproportional system of representation that has yet been devised.

"It has forced down the throats of disgusted citizens two actual Communist Party members, and two more who are Communist wolves in sheep's clothing, masquerading under other party labels.

"Four out of a council of 23 members who consistently vote for governmental disruption and disharmony whenever the opportunity presents itself.

"Ninety-nine percent of New Yorkers are American voters who want no part of this wrecking crew and their foreign ideologies.

"The time has now come to rid the city government of representatives who do not represent the people.

"It won't take much of a push to put the drive over.

"So far proportional representation has cost the city $1,600,000, another factor which must not be disregarded in these years of billion dollar budgets.

"Once in a while politics and politicians can be constructive. The move to liquidate proportional representation is constructive politics."

Boston Evening Record, under date of November 7, 1947, said:

"LESSON FOR MASSACHUSETTS

"The emphatic rejection of proportional representation by New York City's voters should be a lesson for the people of Massachusetts.

"This complicated and confusing method of balloting was proven beneficial to Communists and for that reason, more than any other, it was abolished in the Nation's largest municipality after 11 years of trial.

"We do not want Communists and their ilk in our Bay State city and town governments.

"We have faith and confidence in the traditionally American two-party system.

"We therefore feel that New York City's commendable example will be generally followed."

Boston Daily Record, in its issue of November 25, 1947, stated:

"THE OUTLAWING OF PROPORTIONAL REPRESENTATION

"Several senators and representatives will ask the legislature to outlaw proportional representation and preferential voting in Massachusetts.

"These legislators are confident that this Commonwealth will be sufficiently practical and democratic to follow the good example of New York City, which repealed the proportional representation system after long and unsatisfactory experience with it."

Following the repeal, a few weeks ago, the New York Sun made this rather typical observation:

"'The Communists and their fellow radicals lost their foothold in the city government with the defeat of proportional representation.'

"There should be no foothold for Communists and their ilk in our Massachusetts city governments."

The Boston American on March 22, 1949, asked the legislature to repeal proportional representation in the following language:

"REPEAL IT

"The Massachusetts Legislature should welcome the opportunity to repeal proportional representation which Senator Melley's popular bill presents.

"The fact that this complicated method of selecting public officials has proved beneficial to Communists in New York City and other places discredits it for all time so far as most persons in this Commonwealth are concerned.

"With a cold war embracing so much of the civilized world and a hot war threatening, we cannot afford to risk the danger of having more Communists and fellow travelers in any branch or segment of the American Government.

"The legislature made a serious mistake when it sanctioned proportional representation a few years ago.

"The only way to remedy the unfortunate situations which have resulted from that mistake is to take proportional representation off the statute books."

The Boston Daily Record in its editorial column on March 11, 1950, made the following plea:

"LET'S STAY AMERICAN

"The survival of our democratic form of government and the very existence of our Republic demand the retention of the 1949 law banning proportional representation in all cities and towns of the Commonwealth except in the few which adopted this confusing method of electing officials before the prohibition was enacted.

"And it would be a good idea to get rid of this proportional representation thing in them, too.

"Election methods ought to be so simple that they can be readily understood by all the people.

"That is an elementary requirement of good government.

"A system of voting that baffles the average citizen cannot inspire his confidence, and it is neither honest nor honorable for anybody to contend that it will do otherwise.

"Our people must have complete faith in their Government and particularly in that of the cities and towns, which is closest to them.

"Furthermore, proportional representation has enabled Communists and fellow travelers to win election in many places.

"We do not want them to repeat their successes in Massachusetts, certainly not in this period of critically cool war.

"The United States became the strongest and best Nation on earth, because it trusted majorities and allowed them to determine the results of free elections.

"Instead of relaxing the ban on proportional representation, the Massachusetts Senate, which will take up the matter Monday, should, therefore, intensify it and make it more extensive and binding.

"Persons who are dissatisfied with the traditionally American election methods which gave us our greatest statesmen, including George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, and Theodore Roosevelt, may continue to clamor for the new-look system of balloting.

"But the citizenry as a whole will applaud Senators who refuse to yield to the pressure of minorities and splinter parties with their transient fads and fancies and obvious selfishness."

WHENCE AND WHAT IS PROPORTIONAL REPRESENTATION?

Proportional representation is a system of voting and counting votes, which was invented by an English schoolmaster on the theory that it would give minority groups individual representation in government. It was never adopted in England for the English. However, to make sure the Irish would never get together, the English Parliament shrewdly incorporated proportional representation in the constitution it forced upon the Irish Free State.

HOW PROPORTIONAL REPRESENTATION HAS OPERATED

Proportional representation was introduced in Italy in 1919, and in just a little over 3 years it had so disintegrated the political life of the country that the situation was ripe for a man on horseback, and Mussolini stepped in.

Hitler's rapid rise to power, aided and abetted and financed by major industrialists and big taxpayers in Germany, was even more clearly due to proportional representation than the triumph of Mussolini.

Austria was the next victim of proportional representation.

Proportional representation worked similar havoc in Greece, Czechoslovakia, France, and in the countries of eastern Europe which abandoned democracy and are now satellites of Russia.

WHY PROPORTIONAL REPRESENTATION IS DANGEROUS

Proportional representation is dangerous because it reverses the democratic principle of representative government by the majority.

Proportional representation is dangerous because it breeds dissension, fosters racial and religious antagonism, arrays class against class.

Proportional representation is dangerous because it destroys political unity by creating a multitude of political parties, all clamoring for more power and special privilege for their respective minorities.

Proportional representation ridicules "E Pluribus Unum" and rallies to divide and conquer. (Divide et empera.)

THE PROPORTIONAL-REPRESENTATION METHOD OF VOTING

This method is a lottery system of voting which favors organized minorities seeking their own advancement to the detriment of the majority and the city. A complicated system of counting votes whereby each voter elects only one candidate although he may have voted for several. The proportional representation method of voting is based on the theory that a proportionate number of people elect each candidate as compared with the American system under which the majority of the people elect all the candidates. Under proportional representation you vote for only one candidate and it is an impossi-

bility for your ballot to count for more than one candidate.

CONCLUSION TO CONFUSION

When Gov. Paul A. Dever signs house bill No. 2369 on Monday next, and the senate votes to send along senate bill No. 216 to the house of representatives, we may truly say that the elected representatives of the people of this Commonwealth are still on guard in the preservation of the historic rights of its citizens. It has been a long hard fight but victory is in the offing.

Plan E(uropean) and the P(lease) R(ussia) style of voting are on the way out in Massachusetts.

P(arlor-Pink) R(egimentation) won't happen here!

CHARLES H. MCGLUE.

Address by the President Before the Federal Bar Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 25 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the address of President Truman at the dinner of the Federal Bar Association on April 24, 1950, at the Statler Hotel, in Washington, D. C.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, distinguished guests, members of the Federal Bar Association, I am delighted to be at this dinner tonight, and to join in commemorating the thirtieth anniversary of the founding of this fine organization of Federal lawyers.

It would be hard for me to deny that I am friendly to lawyers. The record would speak against me if I did.

Six of the nine members of my Cabinet are lawyers. So are quite a few other top officials of the executive branch.

When you couple this with the fact that over half of the House of Representatives and about two-thirds of the Senate are lawyers, as well as all our Federal judges, of course, you can see that—so far as the Government of the United States is concerned—the legal profession is not just a passing fancy. It is probably here to stay.

Our lawyers have a primary responsibility in the maintenance of justice. This is particularly true of the Government lawyer, whose first devotion must be to the public interest. The public interest does not mean only the interest of the Government. It means also the protection of the rights of individual citizens.

Our concept of justice represents a basic difference between our system of government and that of the totalitarian states. Justice is the foundation of true democracy. Our system of justice preserves the freedom and dignity of the individual, and his right to think and speak as he feels and to worship as he pleases. It protects him in the assertion of his rights even against his own government. It makes certain that his assertion of those rights will be fairly considered and justly decided.

But there is in the world today a tyrannical force which does not recognize justice as we know it. It is a force which crushes the minds and bodies of those under its control, and seeks to enlarge itself by aggression and by false promises of freedom and economic security.

Wherever this force extends, there is no freedom of speech, no freedom of religion, no freedom even of opinion. The state is the all-powerful arbiter of men's words and acts. Human dignity and human freedom are meaningless.

Against this tyrannical force, which we know as communism, the United States stands as the great champion of freedom. Against this force, the United States has developed and put into effect a positive program to strengthen freedom and democracy. Our program is shaped to strengthen the United States and to help other free nations protect themselves against aggression and subversion.

Since the end of the war we have taken far-seeing steps, unprecedented in the history of the world, to help other free nations rebuild from the destruction of war and strengthen their democratic institutions. Our programs of foreign aid have made it possible for these free nations to resist Communist aggression.

The Greek-Turkish aid program, the Marshall plan, the North Atlantic Treaty, the military assistance program, and our support of the United Nations are major elements in our central policy to work for a peaceful and prosperous world. We have taken the leadership in aiding underdeveloped areas, and in reducing trade barriers between nations. We are keeping our military forces strong and alert, and we are giving meaning and strength to our joint defense arrangements with other countries.

We have done all this because it represents enlightened self-interest. We know that the greatest threat to us does not come from the Communists in this country, where they are a noisy but small and universally despised group. The greatest threat comes from Communist imperialism abroad, where the center of its military and economic strength lies. The real danger is that communism might overrun other free nations and thus strengthen itself for an ultimate attack against us.

But although communism is not a major force in this country, we are taking no chances on its becoming strong here. On the one hand, we are working to create conditions in the United States in which communism cannot possibly thrive. On the other, we are striking hard blows at Communist subversion wherever it is found.

We are vigorously pressing domestic programs to improve the standard of living of our people, to assure equal opportunity for all, and to promote their health and education, and their security and freedom. These programs were not specifically designed as anti-Communist measures. We would have had them even if there were not a single Communist in the world. Nevertheless, they are among the strongest anti-Communist weapons in our whole arsenal.

Communism has little appeal for people who are healthy, well-educated, prosperous, and free. Moreover, there are few things that will do more to prevent the Communists from winning followers in other lands than a demonstration by the United States that democracy truly means a better, freer life for everyone.

While we have been working to improve our democracy, we have been fully aware of the threat of Communist subversion within our own borders. Through the Federal Bureau of Investigation and our other security forces, through prosecutions in the courts by the Department of Justice, through our Federal employee loyalty program, and in many other ways, we have vigorously attacked Communists wherever their activities became a threat to our liberties.

There has been so much confusion recently about who is doing what to defeat communism in this country, that I think the record should be set straight.

This administration has fought communism with action and not just with words. We have carried on this fight with every law on the statute books, and we have recommended new laws when we found they were necessary and could be framed without impairing the very freedoms we are seeking to protect.

No known instance of Communist subversion, or any other kind of subversion, has gone uninvestigated.

No case where the facts warranted has gone unprosecuted.

We have prosecuted and obtained conviction of 11 top-ranking members of the Communist Party in this country. We have successfully prosecuted many other persons for crimes related to communism. We have also prosecuted and obtained conviction of a large number of alleged Communists on charges of contempt for refusing to testify before Federal grand juries or congressional committees.

We now have under investigation the cases of over 1,000 citizens to determine whether steps should be taken to revoke their citizenship on grounds involving subversive activities. One hundred and thirty-eight persons are under orders of deportation on grounds involving communism.

There is no area of American life in which the Communist Party is making headway. The Communists have done their best to penetrate labor unions and the Government, but they are being successfully fought on both fronts. Labor has been doing a splendid job of cleaning its house. In the Federal Government, the Employee Loyalty program has been an outstanding success, and Government lawyers have contributed greatly to that result.

I set up the employee loyalty program 3 years ago with two objectives in mind.

I was determined, as far as it was humanly possible, to see that no disloyal person should be employed by our Government, whether he was a Communist or a native American Fascist of the Silver Shirt or Ku Klux Klan variety. I was equally determined that loyal Government employees should be protected against accusations which were false, malicious, or ill-founded.

The loyalty program was drafted by able and experienced people to protect the security of the Government and to safeguard the rights of its employees. It is the first time in the history of this country that we have had such a program. The Communists and their friends, as well as some sincere idealists, say that it is too drastic. The false patriots and even some honest reactionaries say that it is entirely too mild. They want us to dismiss employees on the basis of unsupported charges. They actually resent the democratic safeguards of the loyalty program. All this confirms me in the conviction that it is a sound and effective program conceived and carried out in the American tradition.

The FBI, the agency loyalty boards, and the Loyalty Review Board have quietly and effectively carried out their job of protecting the integrity and security of our Government. The Loyalty Review Board is the central organization which directs the whole program. It is divided about half and half between Democrats and Republicans and is headed by a distinguished Republican lawyer, Mr. Seth Richardson, who served as Assistant Attorney General of the United States under President Hoover.

Under the supervision of this Board the loyalty program has rid the Government of all employees who were found to be disloyal—and they were only a tiny fraction of 1 percent.

Not a single person who has been adjudged to be a Communist or otherwise disloyal remains on the Government pay roll today.

The able men charged with carrying out the loyalty program know that keeping disloyal persons out of the Government is a business which must be done carefully and objectively. They know that the job cannot be done by publicly denouncing men as Communists without having evidence to support such charges, or by blackening the character of persons because their views are different from those of the accuser, or by hurling sensational accusations based on gossip, hearsay, or hunch. They know that no one whose principal concern was the security of this country would try to do it that way. They know that anyone who had information about Communist activity, and who placed the security of this country above selfish or partisan considerations, would turn that information over to the FBI, so that it could be properly investigated and the necessary action taken.

I have been surprised to see how much ignorance and misunderstanding there is about the loyalty program—even on the part of people who should know better. It has occurred to me that perhaps they do know better—that perhaps there is some element of politics in their accusations.

A large part of the hue and cry about the loyalty program has centered on my refusal to turn over to a congressional committee confidential loyalty files concerning individual employees. I have already stated several times the reasons why these files must not be disclosed. I want to restate them briefly now.

The preservation of the strictest confidence with respect to loyalty files is the single most important element in operating a loyalty program which provides effective security for the Government and justice for the individual employee.

The disclosure of these files would not only destroy the whole loyalty program but would seriously damage the future usefulness of the FBI. Information is given to the FBI in confidence, which the FBI has sworn to protect. Breaking the confidence would not only greatly embarrass and even endanger the informants involved but would gravely impair the FBI's ability to get future information from other confidential sources.

Opening these files would reveal FBI procedures and methods. It might reveal highly secret information vital to our national security and of great value to foreign nations.

Disclosure of the files would result in serious injustice to the reputation of many innocent persons. This is true because the FBI investigative files do not contain proven information only. They include unverified charges and statements, as well as mere suspicions, which, upon investigation, are found to be untrue.

If I should now open these files, I would create a precedent for future cases in which access to these files is demanded—and there would be many of them. This would completely destroy the loyalty program, since, as experience shows, it would mean an attempt to try all loyalty cases over again in newspaper headlines, although they had already been carefully considered and fairly decided by a bipartisan board of loyal and distinguished Americans.

This question of maintaining the confidential character of information which the President determines it would not be in the public interest to disclose is not new. It goes back to the beginnings of our Government. Washington, Monroe, Jackson, Cleveland, and Theodore Roosevelt are only a few of the Presidents who have taken the same position which I am taking.

Despite the historic precedents, with which I was thoroughly familiar, I gave the most careful consideration to the recent request of a Senate committee for access to the loyalty files. I obtained the views of Attorney General McGrath, Loyalty Review Board Chairman Richardson, and FBI Director Hoover before I reached my decision to deny this request. All three were unanimous in recommending to me in the strongest possible terms that I refuse to make the files available. The decision was mine and I made it. I am confident that no President, whatever his party, would have acted otherwise.

The Federal employee loyalty program has demonstrated that the United States has the most loyal civil service in the world. It is a splendid organization which I am proud to head.

Of course, in an organization as large as the United States Government it is always possible, despite the greatest precautions, that there may be a few bad individuals. We shall not for one minute relax our vigilant efforts to protect the security of the Government.

The present Attorney General and his predecessor have repeatedly asked that if any person has any information about the presence of any Communist in the Government it be furnished to them.

I now repeat that request.

If any citizen knows of the presence of a single Communist or other subversive person in any Federal job, let him furnish that information, and the evidence which supports his belief, to the Attorney General or to the FBI. Any information that may be furnished in response to this request will be promptly investigated and will be acted upon if the allegations are found to be true.

The fact of the matter is—because of the measures we are taking—the internal security of the United States is not seriously threatened by the Communists in this country. There are proportionately fewer Communists in this country than in any other large country on earth. They are noisy and they are troublesome, but they are not a major threat.

Moreover, they have been steadily losing ground since their peak in 1932, at the depth of our greatest depression, when they polled the largest number of votes in their history.

There is a right way and a wrong way to fight communism. This administration is doing it the right way, the sensible way.

Our attack on communism is embodied in a positive, threefold program:

One, we are strengthening our own defenses and aiding free nations in other parts of the world so that we and they can effectively resist Communist aggression.

Two, we are working to improve our democracy so as to give further proof, both to our own citizens and to people in other parts of the world, that democracy is the best system of government that men have yet devised.

Three, we are working quietly but effectively, without headlines or hysteria, against Communist subversion in this country whereever it appears, and we are doing this within the framework of the democratic liberties we cherish.

That is the way this administration is fighting communism. That is the way it is going to continue to fight communism.

Now I am going to tell you how we are not going to fight communism. We are not going to transform our fine FBI into a Gestapo-like secret police. We are not going to try to control what our people read and say and think. We are not going to turn the United States into a right-wing totalitarian country in order to deal with a left-wing totalitarian threat.

In short, we are not going to end democracy. We are going to keep the Bill of Rights on the books. We are going to keep those ancient, hard-earned liberties which you lawyers have done so much to preserve and protect.

If we all work together to maintain and strengthen our democratic ideals, communism will never be a serious threat to our American way of life. The example we set for freemen everywhere will help to roll back the tide of Communist imperialism in other parts of the world.

I have outlined for you my program against communism.

That is the way I have worked against it.

That is the way I shall continue to work against it.

I call on all fair-minded men and women to join in this good fight.

The Preservation of Private Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 25 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address entitled "The Preservation of Private Enterprise," which I delivered at the annual coal convention of the American Mining Congress, in Cincinnati, Ohio, on Monday, April 24, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PRESERVATION OF PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

To live in these midyears of the twentieth century is to be aware that civilization is passing through one of the great critical periods of history. The present epoch has, indeed, few parallels in the past. Today, under the pressure of dramatic and far-reaching changes in the technical, cultural, political, and economic dimensions of existence, men are conscious that the fundamental structure of society, the most profound bases of government and personal life are at issue. Confronted by challenges of such immense scope and gravity it becomes necessary to see clearly and steadfastly the aims and principles which underlie free economy and free government.

The anti-God ideology of communism now dominates the lives of 200,000,000 people in the Soviet Union, 100,000,000 people in the so-called satellite countries of western Europe, and 400,000,000 people in China. Leaders of the Soviet Union are applying constant pressure both in western Europe and in the Orient to expand their area of influence, with total world domination their ultimate goal. In that struggle a free and economically sound America is the hope of humanity.

The principal difficulty of democratic leaders in trying to reach an agreement with Soviet leaders to end the cold war stems from the fact that there is no fundamental premise of human rights and ethical conduct upon which the conflicting interests can agree.

Fortunately, there are certain fundamental premises which if not overlooked may readily be accepted by thinking and patriotic American citizens. Such a list would include the following:

1. Our conception of human rights and ethical principles is based upon the teachings of the Bible and the teachings held in

common by all the great religions of mankind.

2. The American system of competitive enterprise is unique in the world.

3. Private but properly regulated enterprise in a capitalistic system and personal freedom in a representative democracy are handmaidens, and if one be lost the other is doomed.

In selecting my topic today, the preservation of the American system of private enterprise, I had in mind the 8,000-mile trip I took last fall through 14 countries in western Europe, from Oslo on the north to Athens on the south, where on every hand I saw the debilitating effect of that misnomer called democratic socialism. I likewise had in mind the numerous measures presented to the Congress during the past 3 years whose ultimate effect would be to substitute the same type of socialism for American constitutional freedom and the American system of private enterprise.

The methods, the objectives, and the conditions necessary for the functioning of political freedom depend in their essence upon economic freedom. To recognize that the present era contains dangers which can jeopardize the framework of a free society is to realize that, in fact, there can be no genuine political freedom which is not sustained and nourished by the strength, the flexibility, and—most important—the legal institutions and practices of an economy of free, private, competitive enterprise.

The whole history of the last two centuries demonstrates with a certainty beyond cavil that where economic opportunity for initiative is blocked, where competition is stifled or suppressed by monopoly or governments, where the right to choose a trade or profession, or to move from one field of endeavor to another is nullified, the loss of political liberties becomes an immediate threat, and in time a most probable, even inescapable consequence. In the stark contrasts between the experience of this country and much of the rest of the world it is sharply apparent that many of the peoples who have lost their liberties already, or are struggling against odds to retain them, have been misled into a fateful error—the belief that it is possible to maintain political democracy and representative government in full vigor while yielding freedom of enterprise, and with it the power of control over their economic destinies. It is not possible for this to be done. Political and economic freedom are root and branch of the same tree.

How did freedom of enterprise originate, but as the mainspring of the struggle for liberty? Our American system of government, unique in that our Declaration of Independence said for the first time in recorded history that government derives its just powers from the consent of the governed and unique in the possession of a written Constitution in which without spelling it out the principle of private enterprise is firmly embedded, has some roots in the ancient culture of the Jewish people through whom the Ten Commandments and the principles of the Sermon on the Mount were handed down to us. He does not know his American history who does not know that our founding fathers were deeply religious, asking the Father of Light to illuminate their understanding and firmly believing that if a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without His notice a new and enduring republic could not rise without His aid. It has roots in the Greek system from which the name "democracy" was borrowed. It has roots in the culture of Rome which brought system and order into the realm of law and it sprang directly from the experience of the British people who had constantly enlarged the area of rights assured to the common man by Magna Carta.

But our American constitutional Government cannot be said to be the same as the governments from which it drew inspiration any more than the atomic bomb can be said to be the same as the various incendiary, fragmentation, or penetration bombs which were in use before it was developed.

Something akin to nuclear fission occurred during our struggle for freedom from the ancient doctrine of the divine right of kings. The ideal of liberty, of economic and political rights guarded by law, transformed a colony of empire into a citadel of democracy for the world.

The trigger which set off the chain reaction may be found in the words of Thomas Jefferson who wrote, in the Declaration of Independence:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

The preamble to the Constitution started with the significant words "we the people." There were some patriots, including Patrick Henry, who feared those words indicated too strong a central government but in spite of their protests a document whose drafting was guided by the hand of destiny was ratified. Ratification came, however, only after James Madison and others had promised that amendments would be offered which would perpetually prevent the Government from following the historical pattern of usurping the rights of the people.

In keeping with this promise, when the first Congress met in 1789 it approved 10 amendments which were adopted the following year. These amendments, which we know as the Bill of Rights, set the boundaries beyond which the Federal Government must not go in interfering with individual liberties and property rights. They mentioned certain rights specifically but concluded with the flat assertion that the enumeration of these rights "shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people," and the added statement that "the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited to it by the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

From the hurried survey which I have just given of the basis of our Government the fundamental truth stands forth that where, as in Europe, freedom of enterprise never achieved its full stature, political freedom has been correspondingly warped and inhibited. Even in Britain, where Adam Smith became the greatest spokesman for the "simple and natural system of economic liberty," the conditions of free competition were always circumscribed. As Lionel Robbins, the British economist, has said with reference to English experience, "Liberalism—is not a plan that has been tried and failed. It is a plan that has never yet had a full chance."

It may be said, indeed, that only in the United States at the time of its establishment was there a profound comprehension of the significance, even the identity, of freedom of enterprise with free political institutions. In this respect, the Government and Constitution formed by men with wide perspective and realistic vision were unique, and produced a society uniquely free, uniquely capable of growth, and now, almost the sole example of a nation able to meet its problems and master them with the strength of democracy and the support of a free economy.

Many eminent authorities agree that it is this quality of the work of those who brought a new nation into being which has been the major factor responsible for America's economic development. What is more, there is almost complete accord of opinion that it is the striking differences between this setting of American industry, with its free and competitive basis, and that of shackeled European industry, which have meant the great disparity between ways of doing business here and abroad. Moreover, these differences have spelled the perpetuation and increase of opportunity and constantly rising standards of living for the American people, and a tragic spectacle of bitterness, class conflict, deprivation of liberty, and the ultimate drift away from all freedom for the populations of Europe.

It is well to understand that the system of free enterprise and representative government have the same historic sources, and that in many basic respects American free enterprise represents as much of a contribution to the growth of civilization as does the American form of government. Thus, for example, a former Assistant Attorney General, a recognized student of the question, has said:

"The convictions which form the framework of the American economy rank high among the social inventions of modern history. It is no accident that the idea of free enterprise emerged from the age of reason. The same period which conceived and established political democracy was logically compelled to foster enterprise as the indispensable economic cornerstone of a free society. Before that time there had been neither political nor economic freedom for the great majority of mankind. Status, privilege, and power governed both the political and economic destinies of the ordinary man. To displace this feudal order and to construct the foundations of a democratic society required the determined efforts of several generations during the industrial revolution.

"At the outset it was realized that representative government in order to survive must rest upon the bedrock of political freedom, the ethical and legal equality of all citizens, and the integrity of a public interest which embraced every member of society. It was appreciated that the economic life of democracy must be rooted in the fertile ground of initiative, of equal opportunity, the right of choice in occupation, the guarantee that no artifice of exclusion would control the market, and the assurance that the economic interests of the public would not be narrowed by privilege.

"The essence of political democracy is the free election. The essence of economic liberalism is the free market. These freedoms are both the products of reason. Both are systems of liberty under law."

It is necessary to distinguish carefully both the economic and legal concepts involved in the relationships between Government and enterprise under the American Constitution and, in contrast, under the British and European types of government. It is possible, perhaps, to crystallize these facets of the problem by summarizing certain considerations:

First, there is a distinction between certain interpretations of laissez-faire and the freedom of enterprise as an organizing principle of economic activity.

Second, there is a distinction in theory and in fact between regulation and planning of economic activity.

Third, the American Constitution, as a system of checks and balances, contains safeguards against the loss of the right of enterprise which are not present in other constitutional systems, such as that of Great Britain.

Fourth, the principal characteristics of American industrial enterprise, both in its relation to governments and its functioning in practice are inherently, as well as historically, different from European industry.

Fifth, the approaches made toward problems arising from industrial change and industrial behavior must necessarily be distinct in the United States from the theories and assumptions derived mainly from European experience.

Sixth, both economically and politically, the American form of government and the American economy possess basic techniques and conceptions, grounded in tradition, law, and practice for the correction of undesirable effects or mistakes which are not present in European countries or in Britain, in fullest measure.

There is, it may be observed, a broad and mobile area produced by these premises of action which makes possible an adaptive adjustment, a moving balance in the relationships of government, industry, and labor under a free enterprise system which reciprocally strengthens and is dependent upon representative democracy. American industry as a whole is dynamic, the most highly advanced as it is generally the quickest to change where there are no barriers to innovation, of any comparable industrial complex in the world. This genuine spirit of achievement is reflected in the confidence with which American industry undertakes long-range and short-range improvement programs, from the development of a matchless machine-tool industry or the perfection of a new household appliance to the manufacture of the innumerable gadgets which change with every fancy of the consuming public. No other economy endeavors as does American enterprise to discover the desires and needs of consumers and to satisfy them. There is a respect for the individual, for the human personality, which permeates the free enterprise system to a degree not equaled by any other economy of the past or present.

American industry is always responsible and responsive, necessarily, both to law and opinion of the public. This point and counterpoint of incentive and reward for the assumption of risk, the acceptance of occasional loss, the impetus toward beneficial improvements and high standards of efficiency, behavior, and service, all subject to the legal and social scrutiny of conduct, are essential attributes of the free enterprise system. They are so central to its meaning that they can be said to converge with the meaning of free government. The loss of either one would signalize the loss of both.

At the outset of my remarks I referred to the spread of socialism in western Europe which is sapping the vitality of industry and gradually impinging upon the liberties of the people. I am convinced that western Europe could not have stemmed the tide of communism without the ECA aid and I am not convinced, notwithstanding marked progress in production, that western Europe will be self-supporting when our aid ends in 1952 in the absence of economic integration, which means the creation of a freer system of trade.

When the nations of western Europe and notably Great Britain to whom we are indebted for our first conceptions of the fundamental rights of man, chose to go down the road to socialism by nationalizing basic industries, there was nothing in the structure of their governments to prevent such action. Magna Carta does not say that the government shall not take over the railroads. The Statutes of Praemunire offer no court remedy to the owner of a steel mill who is reluctant to give it up to the government. The whole body of the common law contains nothing to prohibit nationalization of coal mines.

On the other hand, the Constitution of the United States does not authorize such actions and the Bill of Rights prohibits the assumption by the Federal Government of powers not delegated to it. The founding fathers had listened to the words of Thomas Jefferson who said: "In questions of power, then, let no more be heard of confidence in man, but bind him down from mischief by the chains of the Constitution." They framed a government designed to protect individual enterprise as well as personal liberties.

Certain concessions have been made in time of war on the theory that the Government can assume certain additional functions to provide for the common defense. But in time of peace the boundary protecting private enterprise has up to now been clearly, marked. Thus, when the Federal Government wanted to build roads, it was allowed to do so only on the theory that this was a reasonable extension of the constitutional function of providing for delivery of the mails. And, although action of the Government in building a steam power generating plant was upheld by the courts, this was done on the theory that it was to be used as an adjunct to the development of natural water resources and was not an independent business enterprise.

Today, however, we see constant efforts to push back the boundary line between government and business and we need to recognize that these efforts may constitute a creeping socialism, which can undermine the Constitution and do by indirection what cannot be done directly.

We are asked to approve a social security system which cannot be self-supporting and which ultimately would make all of our aged, disabled, and unemployed wards of the Federal Government.

We are urged to approve a system of Federal aid to education which would lead ultimately to Federal control over our school systems.

We are confronted with proposals for compulsory health insurance which would result in the medical profession receiving most of its compensation from the hands of the Government and which would rapidly lead to socialized medicine as it is practiced in Great Britain.

Under the deceptive label of civil rights, we are placed under pressure to approve a program which would permit Federal officials to supervise local elections and to pass on the competency of local law-enforcement officers and punish those whose actions were not approved. This program also would set up a bureaucracy which could intervene in the relations of employers and employees and which would deprive individuals generally of one of the most basic of their inalienable rights—the right to pick their personal associates. In fact, this proposed FEPC, to which I am now referring, would specifically violate at least half of the Bill of Rights amendments to our Constitution.

Such legislative proposals as I have mentioned constitute only one attack on our system of private enterprise. They would enable the Central Government to assume powers exercised by those earlier governments which we drew from but did not copy.

Another line of attack consists of the efforts of those who would invade the rights of the individual to obtain special privileges for certain groups or segments of our society. Sometimes this effort involves dependence on active protection by the Government and at other times it is based on the assumption that the Government simply will not interfere to prevent abuses.

For example, the Congress is asked to approve lending or other aid programs for housing which will make it possible for a small segment of our population to obtain shelter with less effort on their own part than is required of all the rest of the population.

We are asked to give exemption to labor groups from laws which have been established to prevent exploitation of the public by abuse of monopoly powers, regardless of the fact that when a Government permits a labor monopoly to abuse its powers one of two things necessarily results—the Government must then either permit industry to counter the labor monopoly force with an industrial monopoly force or nationalize the industry.

To be specific about that last point: Last summer the Senate Banking and Currency Committee authorized me to conduct an inquiry into the effects of economic power of labor organizations upon small business and consumers. Our inquiry was a general one but we gave particular attention to the problem as it was exemplified in the coal industry. The conclusion which we reached, and embodied in our committee report, was that the United Mine Workers, under the direction of John L. Lewis, were using their power in an attempt to control prices and production and that if this usurpation and abuse was tolerated, its unbridled use would spread from union to union and industry to industry and that Congress would never regain its narrowly circumscribed power to guide the economy consistently with the Constitution of the United States.

Studying the evidence given at this hearing, which amounted to approximately 1,000 printed pages, I concluded that the trouble came from the fact that a 1941 court decision had upset the balance between antitrust laws originally enacted for the protection of all the people and the Norris-LaGuardia Act which was designed to protect the struggling labor movement against improper use of injunctive powers by powerful corporations. I therefore introduced in the Senate my bill, S. 2912, which would not interfere in any way with legitimate collective bargaining but which simply said that when labor organizations made unreasonable use of their monopoly powers—which they still would retain—and in doing it restrained trade or commerce essential to the national economy, health, or safety, they could not hide from prosecution behind a court interpretation of the Norris-LaGuardia Act which was contrary to all previous decisions and contrary to the clear intention of the Congress.

I was told by many of those with whom I consulted before drafting this bill that it was too mild and would not adequately protect the public. I agreed that a prohibition against industry-wide bargaining would be more effective but said I wanted to try something which would at least offer some hope of protecting our private-enterprise system together with some chance of favorable congressional action. When hearings were held on my bill, however, it was denounced by labor leaders as a lynch-labor law—a shibboleth on a par with (or slightly below) a slave-labor law.

In view of this, I think I am justified in saying that in addition to being threatened today by big government and by big business, our individual enterprise system is threatened by the short-sighted policies of big labor. I say that as one who always has favored fair and generous treatment of labor but also as one who recognized the necessity of retaining the delicate balance on which our constitutional Government rests.

We need today to recall the words of Benjamin Franklin, who said: "They that give up essential liberty to obtain a little temporary safety deserve neither liberty nor safety," and the words of Daniel Webster, who said: "God grants liberty only to those who love it, and are always willing to guard and defend it."

Such a program involves a periodic review of the history of our own Government, a comparison of it with foreign governments that have failed, and a frequent recurrence to fundamental principles.

As a descendant of a Virginia family that furnished one signer to Jefferson's Declaration of Independence and three members of the Virginia Convention that ratified the Philadelphia Constitution I take a pardonable pride in the contribution made by colonial Virginia to the birth of a Nation. I want to see passed on to generations yet unborn those precious principles of political and economic freedom that were born of the brain and purchased by the blood of our founding fathers. But down through the ages comes the warning of the Hebrew patriarch Job, "Remove not the ancient landmark, which thy fathers have set." May that motto be inscribed upon the heart of every lover of American constitutional liberty.

Spreading Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1950

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therein an editorial which appeared in the March 30, 1950, issue of the Chickasha Star, published in Chickasha, Okla.

It will be noticed that a representative of the Department of the Interior has stated that within 10 years the Federal Government will operate a power system stretching from New Orleans to Seattle. This indicates the widespread encroachment of socialism in competition with private investment and private enterprise.

It is worthy of note also to point out that this statement is printed in a newspaper located in an area where public power apparently has the upper hand.

This editorial should be read by every Member of Congress. If public ownership is so desirable in one field, perhaps it can be justified in all others. The end of the trail, however, is the Russian philosophy of government and not the American.

The editorial follows:

THE TAIL WAGS THE DOG

A press dispatch quotes a Department of the Interior expert to the effect that within 10 years the Federal Government will be in a position to operate a power system stretching from New Orleans to Seattle. After that, the expert continued, it would be comparatively simple to tie in the Tennessee Valley Authority, and make the Federal system stretch from coast to coast. "All that's needed," he declared, "is congressional authority and money to build tie-lines should we need them." The irony and political duplicity behind this short press dispatch is beyond the comprehension of a lot of plain American citizens.

In 10 years, if the planners have their way, a basic industry will be nationalized and the Nation will be irrevocably advanced on the road to state socialism, despite the fact that there is no announced public policy sanctioning the program. On the contrary, available evidence indicates that the people in this country are opposed to it. Where they have had an opportunity to express an opinion they have indicated that ownership and operation of industry should stay right where it is—in the hands of private citizens.

But the day may not be too far distant when the private citizen will be forced to step aside—while countless do-good alphabetical Federal agencies harden into an interlocking administrative dictatorship. That is what has been happening in the case of the electric industry. At first there was the alleged "yardstick" of the Tennessee Valley Authority to measure the efficiency of the investor owned electric companies; then their evolved a conglomeration of schemes such as REA's BPA's, and SPA's. And now these scattered Federal projects are beginning to "cooperate" with each other to circumvent safeguards and restrictions imposed by Congress and to drive out of business the heavily taxed and regulated private companies.

As far as the electric industry is concerned, unless the "experts" timetable is upset, another 10 years will see the firm establishment of an unbreakable Government monopoly in this vital service. After the electric industry there would be other industries. That is the pattern. It is being carried forward under a false label without the express consent of the people.

Curtailment of Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1950

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

BINGHAMTON, N. Y., *April 20, 1950.*
Hon. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR ED: Probably no governmental function has become so essential over the years to the growth of our country and has contributed more to ease and facility of communication than our Post Office Department. It has become a symbol in our minds of utter reliability.

Wise as it is to encourage economy in governmental functions to work toward a drastic reduction in our present excessively high tax rates, it does not necessarily follow that the first drastic cut in expenditures should take place in so essential a governmental service as the post office.

Some of us wonder if the decision to curtail service in the Department came after every other avenue of economy had been explored, such as the high subsidies the Department makes to air and rail lines and (in many cases) the out-of-line high rents paid for working space and storage facilities. If this is not the case, then we can only assume that the order to cut services is a form of political pressure, and if that is the case everyone has a right to insist that the post office is one department that has been and should remain free of any taint of politics or political pressure. It is too vital a service to tamper with politically.

Even before this latest development, there seems to have been a gradual break-down of post-office service. We have had more smashed parcel post this year than ever before, the more noticeable since our volume has been less than for the same period 1 year ago.

There is one more item of importance I want to mention in this letter: the matter of employee morale. When morale is high our shipments are handled better. This is so true of any group of workingmen that I need not elaborate. The present curtailment order is going to lower the morale of postal employees when they compare the rigid conditions imposed on them in comparison to others in boondoggling Government bureaus. We all of us want and pray for economy but not at the expense of our most vital governmental department.

With kindest personal regards, and hoping to see you soon,

Very truly yours,

BURT
(Burton T. Wilson).

Selection of Unknown Soldier of World War II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1950

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am enclosing a self-explanatory and somewhat shocking editorial which recently appeared in the Santa Cruz Sentinel-News.

The policy of designating the Unknown Soldier of World War II is arousing a storm of protest throughout the country. I trust that my colleagues will give attention to the editorial and the newspaper article entitled "The Anonymous 8,000" and join me in an effort to change the announced policy of the Department of the Army with reference to the Unknown Soldier.

The editorial and article follow:

[From the Santa Cruz Sentinel-News of April 16, 1950]

DIGNITY IS LOST

In simplicity lies dignity.

The dignity of man should be preserved even in death.

Press dispatches from Washington last week described the process by which the Unknown Soldier of World War II will be selected. It becomes so complicated as to border on the ghoulish.

When the Unknown Soldier of World War I was selected, a body of an unidentified war veteran was disinterred in October 1921, from each of the four United States Army cemeteries in France. The caskets were taken to Chalons-sur-Marne, where a wounded and decorated veteran, Sergeant Edward F. Younger, selected one casket by placing on it a spray of white roses. The casket then was shipped to Washington to lie in state in the Capitol and then to be buried at Arlington National Cemetery November 11, 1921.

The unknown soldier of World War II will be chosen in historic Independence Hall at Philadelphia May 26, 1951, as a climax to the long-drawn-out process which will begin October 1, 1950.

There are 8,000 unidentified Americans who lost their lives abroad during the last war. Code numbers representing them will be placed in capsules on containers designated for each of the 16 permanent United States cemeteries and national cemeteries overseas. Six capsules will be drawn from each container. The first will be that of the "principal unknown" in a given cemetery, the remaining five will be listed as "alternate unknowns" in that cemetery in the order drawn.

Then from these will be selected six bodies to represent the Alaskan command and five

overseas theaters—Europe, the Mediterranean, Africa-Middle East, West Pacific, and Mid-Pacific.

The bodies drawn as "principal unknowns" will be exhumed and examined to make certain that there is no possibility of identifying them. Records available in each theater will be studied for evidence on the same point.

If the remains of the "principal unknown" in a cemetery fail to meet these tasks, they will be reburied. Remains of alternates will then be examined until one is found which meets all requirements.

The six unidentified dead representing the different areas will be taken to Philadelphia. There someone, as yet not designated, will select the Unknown Soldier of World War II, to lie in state in the Capitol and on Memorial Day in 1951 be entombed at Arlington.

The five unknowns who are taken to Philadelphia but not chosen will be returned to cemeteries overseas for reburial.

The process could mear the exhumation of at least 36 bodies, which already have been listed as unidentified and reexamination of which would benefit no one, least of all the memory of the man who gave his life for his country or the feelings of the families of the 8,000 unknowns.

As for the so-called requirements, surely all 8,000 have met all the requirements of God and man.

There must be a simpler, more dignified way to select one of the 8,000 to receive the country's greatest memorial honors.

Why not conduct the entire selection by the capsule method and exhume only the final designate?

Let the other 7,999 rest in peace.

[From the Santa Cruz Sentinel-News of April 20, 1950]

THE ANONYMOUS 8,000

(By W. F. Alder)

On October 1 of this current year will begin a labored process of selecting an Unknown Soldier of World War II for final interment in Arlington National Cemetery.

As now planned, this selection is to be a complicated procedure involving the exhuming of at least 36 of our unidentified war dead. Of these, six are to be selected and brought home. From that number, 1 will finally be chosen to represent or symbolize all of the 8,000 who now lie buried in overseas war theaters. The remaining five are to be returned to their overseas resting places and reburied there.

It is difficult to understand the ghoulish and devious thinking of those responsible for this involved plan.

Were all to be exhumed and brought home, here to be interred at our national shrine, it would be quite a different matter. But under this plan we propose to disturb the last resting places of 36 of our dead and go through a specious mummery over 6 men whose only sin was that of the supreme sacrifice of life and identity as well, in the service of their country.

Bring back 1 anonymous representative of the 8,000 by all means. But select him by drawing one numbered capsule from 8,000 identical in appearance and leave the remaining 7,999 in undisturbed slumber.

Spare this Nation the macabre spectacle of rejecting any one of them. What is this to be—a contest of elimination with homecoming as the grand prize? Staged with a showman's idea of stark drama and Gold Star Mother's suspense.

This is too sacred a service for theatricals.

As the Sentinel-News has already pointed out in a thought-compelling editorial—there is dignity in simplicity. And the graves of our dead must not be profaned.

The Unknown Soldier is a symbol of all 8,000. How better it would be to make his homeland shrine an all-embracing one. How better it would be to make it a factual composite of them all by bringing back from each of the 8,000 graves a cubic inch of the coverlet of earth spread over these nameless dead in one bronze urn filled with the grains of sacred soil reverently lifted from each grave and thereafter enshrined in a columbarium within the monument to memory raised at Arlington by a grateful people.

Unknown, the one is a symbol of them all. They served and died together in a common cause. Let us now bring their graves together, in reverent symbolism, to Arlington in hallowed rendezvous that we and our children's children may stand, conscious of their sacrifice, in silent, critical self-appraisal before them all.

Address by the Attorney General Before the Federal Bar Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 25 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the able and informative address delivered by the Attorney General, Hon. J. Howard McGrath, before the Federal Bar Association, on April 24, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, members of the Federal Bar Association, ladies and gentlemen, I deem it a high honor and a distinct privilege to be here this evening and to welcome you, Mr. President, in behalf of all gathered here and those whom the delegates to this national convention represent.

As you know, Mr. President, the membership of the Federal Bar Association is composed of men and women who are employed in the service of the United States and who are performing the work of a legislator, judge, lawyer, or member of a quasi-judicial body or commission; in short, all lawyers who participate in the business of Government.

Accordingly, the men and women who constitute this association are necessarily your coworkers and assistants in the important and significant task of governing the people of our country. And no segment of our citizenry is more conscious of your immeasurable burden than are the members of this association.

You are manifestly familiar with the contribution that the members of this association are making in that task. May I say in their behalf and as a member of their national council, that under your able leadership we pledge to increase our efforts and dedicate ourselves to the greatest extent possible to see to it that our democratic institutions, as they have been preserved to date, remain ever potent so that we may retain for all people those rights and privileges, opportunities, and benefits which make our country the greatest and most powerful on earth.

The role of the lawyer in Government service is significant. The lawyer plays a decisive part in almost every function which constitutes the Government of our United States. The service rendered by the lawyer to the Government reaches every branch of governmental activity. As in the past, the lawyer in the Government service provides the catalytic service which makes our democracy one where the rule of law is basic.

Many parts of the world today are in the throes of chaos and confusion. Fear fills the hearts of many in those areas. There no one dares prophesy the events of the morrow. Science and mechanical progress have narrowed the areas of the world. Men have been brought closer to each other. The changes in our social and economic life have added many difficulties to our problems.

It is recognized, however, that there can be no end to this tension until we learn the art of human relationship—the art of getting along with one another. We must adjust amicably the relations of mankind, their order, and their conduct in a world in which the goods of existence, the scope for free activity, and the objects on which to exert free activity are limited, and the demands upon those goods and those objects are infinite.

Today the whole mechanics of human government is undergoing a reexamination. Thoughtful people everywhere wonder whether democracy can bring peace and security to a troubled and distressed world. There are some who believe that democracy is decadent. Our vibrant, virile, and workable democracy is proof of the fallacy of this assertion. The most essential function of any government in the long run is the maintenance of law and order; the principal duty of any government is the protection of its citizens in the orderly conduct of their lives; and any government that is derelict in that respect is doomed. The government lawyer, as a member of the bench or as the ordinary attorney, is the guarantor of that security and can be truly said to be the maintainer of law and order.

We are now going through a transitory period of social and economic change. Human relationships have become more complex than ever. It is justice properly administered which will bring about a moral regeneration, which the world needs to achieve a lasting peace. The dislocations caused by the last war in our social and economic life, the tensions created in our foreign relations since the end of the war have brought a challenge to our genius and to our loyalty to the principles enunciated by our fathers who framed the Constitution: "To form a more perfect union, establish justice, and insure domestic tranquillity."

There are many political philosophies today; there are many schemes for the regeneration of society; panaceas and paradises of all dimensions are urged upon a worried humanity; but I submit to you that none will work unless equal justice and the majesty of the law is provided in that form of government. Our common-law doctrine of the supremacy of law and our insistence on the security of individual rights against any official unauthorized action is a gospel which we must preach to all and practice with sincerity and effectiveness.

There are systems of government in this world where the power of the state is supreme. We do not adhere, and never shall adhere to any theory of that sort. The greatest contribution that America has made to the science of government has been to provide a system which guarantees to every individual his rights not only against the executive, but against the entire state. There can be no democracy where the state is all powerful and the individual is of no account. This concept of the rights of the individual is challenged today as it has not been at any time in our history. It is not only threatened by foreign dictators, but by false philosophies and enemies from within.

The government lawyer has the responsibility and the duty of taking an effective and leading part in upholding and safeguarding the rights and liberties of individuals and

defending the majesty of the law. The government lawyer guides, counsels, and helps in the drafting of legislation so that the activities of men in their endeavor to get their demands is so ordered as to enable satisfaction of as much of the whole scheme of demands with the least friction and waste.

The wills of freemen in action are reconciled by a universal law giving a maximum scope for free activity to each, reconciling instincts in action, bringing about a maximum of happiness, satisfying the wants of each other so far as compatible with satisfying the wants of all. This is what the lawyer, and the government lawyer especially, must continue to do. The lawyer, as well as the judge, must serve as an agent of organized social control. The law has done much in the past for the science of society. It must continue to do so. History of civilization has demonstrated how law has operated to maintain and further civilization, how it has grown out of civilization, how it has adapted itself to new types of civilization; it must continue to do so.

The Federal Government in recent years has been given many new responsibilities involving the enactment of a great mass of legislation of far-reaching importance. Accordingly, the burden of law enforcement upon our Federal Government has increased tremendously. We, as Government lawyers and public officials, must be more alert today as to our responsibilities and opportunities than ever before. The great mechanism called the machinery of justice must be made to function more successfully. It must be made to serve an ever wider and in a more intimate fashion the needs of an influential and growing country like ours.

The world looks upon this country as the leader in the pursuit of a justice that will bring peace, tranquillity, and security. We, as law officers of the executive branch of the Government, by reason of our general experience at the bar and through our daily systematic appraisal of legal problems, can do considerable to promote the general efficiency of the application of our laws. In this manner we are fulfilling our responsibility, not only as lawyers, but as citizens of this great Republic.

Lawyers have always made tremendous contributions to the development of our country, spiritually, economically, culturally, not only in the domestic field, but also in the realm of international relations. Our task today is far more trying. It calls for more extensive knowledge, skill, vision, and effort. We have a great heritage as lawyers. Let us prove worthy of it and let us preserve it. The American system which has as its foundation the liberty of the individual and the equal opportunity to every man to enjoy rights and privileges with his fellow man, can be perpetuated only through our efforts. In this manner, Mr. President, can your watchword be fulfilled—the admonition of Thomas Jefferson when he said:

"That the flames of freedom kindled in 1776 and spread over the globe shall never be extinguished by engines of despotism."

With God's help and with the full cooperation of all citizens and with the sincere and renewed efforts of all those in Government service, we of the democratic world will see a new day when ancient bitterness and wrongs will be purged. We feel that humanity, conscious of its unity and strength, will march forward to a new opportunity. Out of the welter of blood, tears, and sweat now sweeping parts of the world, mankind with God's help will set foot on a brighter future and bring a better life. Our own country, by a strict adherence to its fundamental laws of fairness and justice, will serve the cause of universal peace. We must all have faith that things can be arranged on this earth to form a reasonable society.

There is yet love in this world. There is yet a sense of justice among men. There is a desire to render mutual aid. There is stored in mankind a reservoir of good intentions and pure thoughts. All that is required is the mechanism with which to effectuate these ideas. That is the hope of all peoples all over the world, and if we but keep our faith in the Lord and in His goodness to mankind, we shall be worthy of this blessing.

Ladies and gentlemen, I know of no one who has dedicated himself with greater zeal and effort toward the achievement of the ideals I have just described than your guest of honor this evening. I am delighted and privileged to welcome the President of the United States.

Our Far Eastern Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 25 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech on our far eastern policy, which I made yesterday noon before the Chicago Council of Foreign Relations, at Chicago, Ill.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, fellow Americans, in this day of the airplane and the atom, we must face the fact that both peace and war are global in character. If we are to help maintain a free world of free men, we cannot achieve our objective by closing the door to Communist aggression in Europe while the door is left wide open in Asia.

The families of American fighting men who died at Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, or at Iwo Jima and Okinawa, almost 4 years later, must wonder how it came to pass that the Soviet Union, in the Pacific war for less than a week against an enemy already defeated and asking for peace, could take our old-time friend and ally China, with its 450,000,000 people, into the Communist orbit.

The United States was catapulted into World War II because we would not allow the domination of China by Japan. Yet as we meet here today the Soviet Union has a vast new satellite with more population and natural resources than the satellites of eastern Europe put together and is on a springboard from which communism can overwhelm southeast Asia and endanger the Philippine Republic, Japan, India, and Pakistan. Can this Nation afford a diplomacy that loses that which our fighting men have won? Coalition with communism is no more workable in China or Korea than it is in Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, or Rumania. Communism is destructive of human liberty everywhere in the world. Last November in Chungking a Chinese official clearly put it to me in this way: "Senator, there can be no coalition with a tiger unless you are inside the beast."

Our Government has had ample evidence of the aims of international communism in China as far back as 1928. It was made clear in the meeting of the Sixth International that China and the Far East was to be given a high priority. I quote from the theses and resolutions of the Sixth World Congress of the Comunist International published under date of December 12, 1928:

"33. In China, the future growth of the revolution will place before the party as an immediate practical task the preparation for any carrying through of armed insurrection as the sole path to the completion of the bourgeois-democratic revolution and to the overthrow of the power of the imperialists, landlords, and national bourgeoisie—the power of the Kuomintang."

On January 7, 1947, Gen. George C. Marshall issued a statement relative to China which includes the following:

"In the first place, the greatest obstacle to peace has been the complete, almost overwhelming suspicion with which the Chinese Communist Party and the Kuomintang regard each other.

"On the one hand, the leaders of the Government are strongly opposed to a communistic form of government. On the other, the Communists frankly state that they are Marxists and intend to work toward establishing a communistic form of government in China, though first advancing through the medium of a democratic form of government of the American or British type."

Between these two dates and up to the present time there has been an abundance of evidence that the Chinese Communists were closely allied with the Soviet Union and with international communism. Despite this fact a vast amount of propaganda was directed at the American people by those holding positions in and out of government to the effect that Chinese Communists were in fact only "agrarian liberals."

The official position of the State Department and the Government was that we should wait for the dust to settle. It has now settled sufficiently so that the American people can clearly see the debacle that has taken place which jeopardizes the peace of the world and the security of the United States.

The Far Eastern Division and those who advised them from the outside or supported them from the inside have a great responsibility to the people of the United States and to more than 400,000,000 Chinese, living and dead, who are now behind the iron curtain.

To paraphrase Mr. Churchill: "Never have so few contributed so much to destroy the liberty of so many."

During the 5 years I have been a Member of the United States Senate I have supported our foreign policy in Europe and been critical of it in the Far East.

The general objectives of our foreign policy have been clear to the American people and to the Congress. We have sought to establish a system of international law and order so that the peace of the world will be secure for this and future generations. Yet with this worth-while objective in mind we were not so naive as to believe that all nations would forego the use of military power to enforce their will on others.

The United Nations, it was hoped, would not only be a world forum for discussion but would also be an effective instrument for collective security.

It has not yet been put to the test of acting against an overt aggression of armed troops of one nation crossing the borders of another. That test may come this year or next in Yugoslavia, Iran, Viet Nam or Burma.

We do know that the Soviet Union, by its abuse of the veto in the Security Council, has put the world on notice that there will be no hesitation in blocking effective United Nations collective security action against aggression by another veto.

It was for this reason that our Government and those of western Europe clearly recognized that Marshall plan economic aid to help rehabilitate war-torn Europe was not sufficient in and of itself. The fear of aggression restricted the recovery so necessary if

the free way of life was to have a fair chance for survival against totalitarian pressures.

Within the United Nations charter the Atlantic Pact came into being. By its terms an attack against one of the North Atlantic nations would be recognized as an attack against all of them.

Outside of the North Atlantic Pact, by resolute action, Greece was saved from being engulfed by communism; Turkey, Iran, and Korea were given the tools with which their independence might be preserved.

In China our post World War II policy has contributed to the debacle in that area of the world. For more than half a century our historic policy had been to encourage and support a free and independent China. Today's realities clearly mean that this must also be a non-Communist China.

Yet at Yalta in 1945, without consulting China our wartime ally and friend, we gave the Soviet Union a stranglehold on Manchuria. It was done without consultation with the American Congress or the American people. Playing a prominent part as an advisor to the American delegation at Yalta was Alger Hiss.

Our State Department urged a coalition with the Communists. The Government of the Republic of China quite properly refused. The United States placed an embargo against the shipment of arms and ammunition to the legal Government of China while at the same time the Soviet Army of occupation in Manchuria was turning over captured Japanese stocks of arms and ammunition to the Chinese Communist forces.

In July 1947 Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer was sent out to China on a mission. He wrote a significant report dated September 19, 1947, which contained a constructive program to save China from communism. That report containing information of great import, was suppressed for 2 years, and access to it was denied to Members of Congress.

Until quite recently some of those who helped shape our China policy were speaking of Mao Tse-Tung's followers as agrarian liberals. It makes little difference whether this fatal miscalculation was because of design or ignorance. The end result is no less damaging to the future peace of the world and the security of this country.

Our China policy has helped to undermine the Republic of China. While that government was with its back to the wall the State Department issued the China white paper. Never before had we struck such an almost fatal blow at an historic friend during its darkest hour.

During the last 2 years a substantial part of the help that the Congress voted as aid to the Republic of China has been delayed or nullified. This can be and has been amply documented. Even purchases, military and civilian, with Chinese funds have been obstructed.

On January 5 of this year the President announced that no further military assistance would be given to the Republic of China. We now know that this had been preceded on December 23, 1949, by a State Department memo to its officials overseas stating that the island of Formosa had no strategic value.

The interesting thing about that memo is that the State Department had no such advice from the Joint Chiefs of Staff, from Admiral Radford, commander in chief of our naval forces in the Pacific, or from Gen. Douglas MacArthur, our supreme commander in the Far East.

In fact, the statement ran directly counter to a State Department bulletin of June 3, 1945, which stated with reference to Formosa that "with the exception of Singapore, no location in the Far East occupies such a controlling position."

The difficulty with the State Department is that they have been more interested in China in saving face than saving freedom.

However. I do not want to spend too much time on the past.

Where do we go from here?

In California recently Secretary of State Dean Acheson made two significant speeches. If implemented, they furnish the basis of having a policy in Asia that will be consistent with our policy in Europe.

While the door to negotiation is left open, the Soviet Union must reestablish its diplomatic credit standing. There are too many pieces of paper floating around to warrant reliance on a new one until the others have been redeemed.

It is clearly underscored that aggression in Asia is of no less concern to the law-abiding nations of the world than it is in Europe or the Middle East.

The nations of Asia are given hope that those who are willing to help themselves to maintain their freedom will be eligible to apply for and receive various types of assistance from us.

Standing by itself, the speech of Secretary Marshall at Harvard on June 5, 1947, without congressional implementation (bipartisan in character), would not have bolstered for long a single tottering, war-weary government of Europe.

Nor will Secretary Acheson's speeches be more than a temporary whiff of oxygen until and unless implemented by the Congress.

Up to now there has not been the consultation with the majority and minority parties on far-eastern policy that there has been in recent years on our European policy. There has never been a bipartisan far-eastern or China policy during this administration.

As has been pointed out before such consultations must be on the "take off" and not merely on the "crash landings."

There is one great void in the speech of the Secretary of State dealing with our Asia policy. He treats the islands of Formosa, Hainan, Kinmen, Chosun and the Pescadores with their 8,000,000 people under the jurisdiction of the legal Government of the Republic of China as though they were ships which had been sunk beneath the waves of the China Sea and the Pacific.

Since Formosa alone has more population than either Australia or Greece, this is hardly realistic. Formosa is closer to the Philippines than the island of Luzon is to the island of Mindanao. It is hardly conceivable that this Government can now view with unconcern the moving of international communism off the Asiatic land mass on its first major island-hopping venture at Hainan.

An American missionary with years of experience in China recently said to me: "Senator, I cannot understand how Chiang Kai-shek can be the No. 1 target in the Far East of international communism and at the same time be the No. 1 target of the Far Eastern Division of our own State Department."

In China free people are staking their lives on keeping what is left of their country out of the Communist orbit. With some moral support and a limited amount of arms and ammunition they will be able to prevent international communism from moving off the Asiatic land mass out onto the strategic island of Formosa.

There has been a lot of misinformation relative to the amount of postwar assistance given by this Government to the Republic of China. The facts of the matter are that China, our wartime ally and long-time friend, has had less material assistance than any of the three wartime Axis partners—Japan, Germany, and Italy. Out of this lesser amount must be deducted a charge of approximately $600,000,000 for the transportation of their troops by American planes and ships subsequent to VJ-day. My authority for these statements comes from official Government reports which can be checked by any person having the desire for facts rather than for propaganda.

On December 18, 1946 President Truman issued a statement on United States policy toward China. As of that date this is what he had to say relative to the postwar period: "From VJ-day to the end of February, shortly after General Marshall's arrival the total was approximately $600,000,000—mostly in transportation costs. Thereafter, the program was reduced to the fulfillment of outstanding commitments, much of which was later suspended."

A great deal is made in some quarters of the vast quantities of military assistance which had been furnished to China in the postwar period through the war surplus sales to the Chinese Government. In this connection it is interesting to quote from the same statement of the President:

"It was imperative that this matter be concluded in the Pacific as had already been done in Europe, especially in view of the rapid deterioration of the material in open storage under tropical conditions."

A little further along in his statement the President has this to say:

"Aircraft, all nondemilitarized material, and fixed installations outside of China were excluded. Thus, no weapons which could be used in fighting a civil war were made available through this agreement."

The fact of the matter is that the help the Republic of China received in the postwar period was largely out of title four of the 1948 ECA Act passed by the Eightieth Congress. Of the total amount made available $125,000,000 was for military assistance. This particular provision was approved in April of 1948 and the first shipments did not arrive in China until October of that year after some of the crucial battles of North China and Manchuria had been fought. It is largely this equipment which is today making possible the defense of Formosa, Kinmen and Chosun Islands.

Out of this one-hundred-and-twenty-five-million appropriation provided by the Eightieth Congress, China received less military equipment than an equal sum of money provided out of larger Greek and Turkish aid funds. This is because the Chinese Government was put on a lower priority and had to pay replacement costs for their equipment while the same items were sent to Greece and Turkey at a fraction of their cost.

In the letter from Secretary of State Acheson to the President, dated July 30, 1949, transmitting the China white paper, Secretary Acheson has this to say in attempting to excuse our conduct at Yalta: "At Yalta, Marshal Stalin not only agreed to attack Japan within 2 or 3 months after VE-day but limited his price with reference to Manchuria substantially to the position which Russia had occupied prior to 1904. We, for our part, in order to obtain this commitment and thus to bring the war to a close with a consequent saving of American, Chinese, and other allied lives were prepared to and did pay the requisite price."

I wish to emphasize that this price we paid at the expense of China was done without her knowledge or consent and without the knowledge or consent of the American Congress or the American people.

Contrast this doctrine of expediency rather than principle with the statement contained in General Wedemeyer's report of September 19, 1947, which was not made available to the American Congress or the American people until the publication of the China white paper on August 5, 1949. In this report General Wedemeyer said: "The Nationalist government has consistently since 1927, opposed communism. * * * Today the same political leader and same civilian and military officials are determined to prevent their country from becoming a Communist-dominated state or Soviet satellite.

"Although the Japanese offered increasingly favorable surrender terms during the course of the war, China elected to remain

steadfast with her allies. If China had accepted surrender terms, approximately 1,000,000 Japanese would have been released for employment against American forces in the Pacific."

I cannot believe that history will be kind to those responsible for the betrayal of an ally at Yalta when contrasting it to a steadfast devotion to loyalties and principles shown by Chiang Kai-shek.

The imperative need of the moment is to determine whether a policy can be developed in the Far East which will save that whole area from falling into the orbit of international communism. No one should underestimate the complexities of the situation. Nor would it be realistic to ignore the fact that whatever action we take involves calculated risks. In my opinion, however, the risk of taking affirmative action to prevent the further spread of communism in Asia is far less than the risk of waiting for the dust to settle, revealing a billion and a quarter people and the vast resources of Asia allied with Soviet Russia against us and the free world.

There were risks involved in the Berlin airlift, there were risks involved in our aid to Greece and Turkey. Had we not taken those risks it is not unlikely that most of western Europe and the Middle East would today be under Soviet domination.

In China the Benedict Arnolds, the quislings, and the fair-weather friends have long since departed. The new cabinet of President Chiang Kai-shek contains many young and able administrators who are men of integrity.

The civilian governor of Formosa is K. C. Wu, graduate of Princeton with an outstanding record as wartime mayor of Chungking. The premier is Chen Cheng, a man of lifelong integrity and one regarding whom most Americans, including the late General Stilwell, have spoken most highly. The commander of the ground forces is General Sun Leh-jen, graduate of the Virginia Military Institute and a fighting soldier of the first rank.

Time does not permit me to name them all but I can assure you that they are as determined to maintain a China outside of the Communist orbit as we are to maintain our own freedom.

In developing a program for the economic and military assistance to the free nations of Asia, the non-Communist Republic of China should not and must not be overlooked.

To permit our tried and true friends of more than 50 years standing to go down the drain of communism while we concentrate on new Asiatic continental countries that have many more internal problems than free China has today, can hardly be the basis of a policy warranting the support of the Congress and the Nation.

It is not realistic to ignore the fact that the Republic of China has approximately 500,000 men under arms, 300,000 of whom are excellent soldiers. This total number is greater than the combined troop strength of Korea, the Philippine Republic, the United States of Indonesia, Siam, Viet Nam, Burma, Australia, New Zealand, Hong Kong, and the United States forces in Japan.

The island of Formosa is not needed by the United States as either an air or naval base. In the friendly hands of the Republic of China, it presents no problem to our own defenses.

In the hands of international communism the many Japanese-built air strips and the excellent harbors would drive a wedge into our Pacific defense line that runs from Japan through Okinawa to the Philippines. In unfriendly hands it would be a strategic loss that no competent military, naval, or air commander would or has overlooked.

We need a policy in the Far East and in China. We need it now, not a year from now, when we can do nothing but look back on what might have been done. When the China white paper was issued in August 1949, the Chinese were north of the Yangtze River and the Republic of China still embraced more than half of China's land area and almost two-thirds of that Nation's population. Many of us were urging a policy then that was consistent with our policy in Europe. We pointed out that while blocking the expansion of communism in western Europe our policy, or lack of it, in China was accelerating the spread of communism in that area of the world.

As far as the State Department was concerned, our voices were but cries in the wilderness. But slowly and relentlessly the American people have come to realize that after the great sacrifices of manpower and material wealth to win the war in the Pacific, our diplomats have lost the peace in that vast area of the world.

Once again I urge an affirmative policy. I sincerely hope that this recent talk of bipartisan consultation is not merely window dressing to quiet congressional criticism until adjournment.

Prior to the development of substantial criticism in Congress the Far Eastern division of the State Department was steering our China policy toward ultimate recognition of the Communist regime and its admission into the United Nations.

It is time we developed some new diplomatic techniques to combat the international conspiracy aimed at the destruction of human liberty throughout the world. The recognition of the Communist regime in China or its admission into the United Nations as a result of Soviet pressure would be as great a blow to free institutions and the ultimate peace of the world as was the pact of Munich.

Why am I so concerned? There has just recently come to my attention the text of a speech by Ambassador Loy W. Henderson at New Delhi, India, on March 27 (less than a month ago). He was officially speaking for this Government on far-eastern affairs. With reference to recognition of the Communist regime in China he said that it was our desire to wait "until that Government has given a clear indication of its intention to live up to its international obligations and to treat American diplomatic and consular representatives and other American nationals in a manner prescribed by international custom * * *."

What would such assurances be worth, if given? Have the Soviet satellites in eastern Europe treated either our diplomats or citizens with respect? Are our memories so short that we have forgotten the Angus Ward case? Why should we even consider recognition until the Communist regime has waited at least the same 2-year period that an American sailor and marine have been held in jail though their only crime was flying a mission for the Navy and being forced by engine trouble to crash land in the Communist area. Why should we contemplate at this time the opening up of the Chinese Embassy and consulates to additional Communist espionage and fifth column activity?

This Government should make it clear now that: (1) We have no intention of recognizing the Communist regime in China or in any other area of the world where such a regime takes over by force of arms unless the people themselves have a chance to select their own government under elections supervised by the United Nations. (2) We will actively oppose the replacement of the Republic of China by the Communist regime until the will of the people of that country can be adequately determined. Many who favorably contemplated communism as a theory now know that its practice of brutal destruction of human dignity, freedom of religion, speech, and press, and its undermining of the family institution and its obvious subservience to Moscow has destroyed any broad basis of support among the people of that country. (3) We should give the same kind of supervised aid to the Republic of China that we gave to Greece. The legal Government of China has requested such assistance and desperately needs it now. Are we to quiver and shake and continue to "fiddle and faddle" because the satellite Mao-tse or Stalin, the master, are displeased? The Kremlin was displeased at the Marshall plan, the Berlin airlift, the North Atlantic Pact, the arms implementation bill, and MacArthur's administration in Japan. (4) Our Government should serve notice on the Communist regime in China that until and unless they release W. C. Smith, chief machinist mate, United States Navy, and Elmer Bender, sergeant, United States Marine Corps, who have been held prisoners by the Communists for 18 months, until all of our diplomatic personnel are allowed to leave the mainland of China, unless all of our other citizens in China who desire to leave are allowed to do so, that we will enforce a naval blockade of the China coast to see to it that until and unless our American citizens get out that nothing that would contribute to the military or economic development of Red China gets in by sea from the United States, Great Britain, the Soviet Union, or any other nation.

Our secret weapon against any aggressor is not the plutonium or the hydrogen bomb whose secrets can be stolen from us by a Dr. Fuchs. Our real strength is that which Communists dare not steal to take to the Soviet Union or its European or Asiatic satellites. I refer to the liberty and the determination of a self-reliant people to be informed, make their own judgments, choose their own leaders, and having the ability to rally overnight if their free institutions are threatened from within or without.

This priceless ingredient, which we possess, the dictators understand less than they do the intricate blueprints of a superweapon. In itself our free way of life is a time bomb which will destroy any dictatorship once their people know the truth. This may explain the frantic lowering and sealing of the iron curtain. It should renew our determination to penetrate the darkness and bring renewed hope to millions who love freedom, yet find themselves temporarily behind the iron curtain, from the Elbe to the China Sea. Let us help freedom to become a dynamic force in the lives of men and women everywhere, not excluding those in the Soviet Union or any of its satellites.

If we show the same courage and common sense that motivated the men who sat in constitutional convention at Philadelphia and who traveled across the continent to settle in the West, there is no domestic problem that we cannot solve and there is no foreign foe that we need fear.

Foreign Relations and Domestic Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD L. LEAHY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 25 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address by my colleague the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], delivered at Providence,

R. I., on April 21, 1950, before the Brown University chapter of Students for Democratic Action, on Foreign Relations and Domestic Politics.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREIGN RELATIONS AND DOMESTIC POLITICS

Fellow Brown men and women, officers and members of the Brown University Chapter of Students for Democratic Action, I thank you for the opportunity you give me to address you. It is always a source of great satisfaction to me to have a part in any Brown function anywhere—but especially on the campus. This has been so ever since I came here as a callow freshman 67 years ago. It will be so till the end.

You have kindly let me choose my subject and I am choosing "Foreign Relations and Domestic Politics." This is a subject which has been forced on me during the last month and a half, because I am a member of a Senate committee of five appointed as a subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee. This appointment was made in accordance with a special resolution of the Senate. This resolution directed the committee "to conduct a full and complete study and investigation as to whether persons who are disloyal to the United States are or have been employed by the Department of State." I shall not discuss the charges made, nor the witnesses who have testified, nor draw any conclusions as to the final result of the Committee's work, since its work is not completed. I may, however, with propriety draw your attention to some aspects of the investigation so far as it has gone.

I hope I will be forgiven if I begin by something so unpopular and so old-fashioned these days as an understatement. It is this:

These are not ordinary times.

The times are witnessing a struggle between the free nations and peoples of the world and the forces of Communist totalitarianism. That struggle touches almost every area of the globe and also every area of the human mind. Free nations, free institutions, and free minds are under attack by a Soviet imperialism which would subject them all to its control and regimentation. In that effort at domination, every weapon of subversion, exploitation, and coercion is used—on nations and on individuals. These weapons are used ruthlessly, flexibly, cynically, and wih great skill.

The free nations, whose ideology is based on their view of the individual as an end in himself, must oppose this assault. They must prevent the principles and values that make them free nations from being eroded by the inner frictions that this outside struggle produces. This must be done because the strength of action and the strength of ideas on which our victory depends must come from our continuing dedication to the ideals of freedom. That dedication cannot in these times be limited to the form of oratorical Fourth of July affirmations. We must exercise that freedom—constructively and responsibly, as a member of the community of free nations. As individuals we must endeavor to safeguard our liberties without impairing them.

All this means that we in the United States today bear an enormous double responsibility. One aspect of that responsibility comes from the fact that our position of power and influence in the world today has conferred on us the leadership in the struggle against Soviet-led totalitarianism. The other aspect comes from the nature of that struggle—we must continue to preserve and to generate the values that will make for a victory of freedom.

What we as people think and say, decide and do, has a new and profound importance in the world, and it has inescapable consequences. These consequences will affect the lives of human beings all over the globe—in the present and in the future. The issues we confront, and the decisions we must make, are very grave. And they are not simple.

The issues of the day demand and merit great debate. They require cool and close attention. They require hard thought. They require a whole-hearted effort to inform one's judgment before judging. They require honesty of mind and purpose.

The last few weeks have produced a spectacle strangely and frighteningly different from the orderly debate and responsible deliberation which the times demand and which the American people have a right to expect. The Department of State and the Secretary of State—and, by innuendo, the President of the country—have been made the subject of a virulent campaign designed to cast doubt on their devotion to American and democratic principles, to question both their integrity and their capacity, and to suggest that they have a hidden affinity for a cause that is repugnant to the entire free world. Outbursts of name-calling, partly under the cloak of senatorial immunity, unsubstantiated accusations, irresponsible and sensational charges have wrought untold harm to the international position of the United States and to the cause of democratic freedom. We must have today a calm, serious-minded, and stable public opinion if foreign policy is to be responsibly formulated and firmly carried out. We have unfortunately seen the attempt to substitute in its stead government by hullabaloo. We must renew the attempt to create honest public understanding of what is at issue in foreign affairs today.

Responsible elements in what is sometimes called the loyal opposition have recognized that no narrow temporary advantage which might accrue to them from the distraction can outweigh the damage done, and have protested or stood uneasily apart from this performance. It would in itself be a sufficient alarming spectacle to see even a small element in the opposition party so little aware of the large responsibilities of the representatives of the people of a great democracy. How does all this look abroad? How does it look to our enemies? How does it look to our friends?

It may suffice to read one quotation from the report to his paper by a British correspondent in the United States:

"Thus we have the spectacle of a great Nation come to unique world power commendably telling itself that it must act with a new maturity and responsibility but in fact regressing with shocking speed into the duplicity, the phony toughness, the tattletaling, and the brutality of childhood without showing any of its compensating charm, directness, or naïveté."

I am not suggesting that we conduct our domestic arguments in hushed, prim tones for fear of what the neighbors will think. I am not suggesting that we relax the unending vigilance which the maintenance of our internal security demands. Serious charges must continue to be seriously and fully investigated. I am suggesting, however, that the world which looks to us for leadership, and the American people, have a right to expect that public concerns will not be exploited for private or partisan ends.

We all have a right to expect that the integrity and good sense of our public servants will not be called deliberately into question by politicians who seek publicity on false issues at whatever cost to the general good. We have a right to expect that no destructive attempt to discredit and confuse the conduct of foreign affairs will be made deliberately by those whose own views on foreign affairs have been rejected by the people at large.

These wanton efforts to besmirch, to confuse, these deliberate efforts to sow doubt about our Nation's leaders, make our world leadership a far more difficult thing. It is not easy at best. Even when viewed sympathetically by our friends abroad, these charges make us seem silly. At worst, these charges, and the heat with which they are pressed, the broad inferences with which they are coupled, suggest that our national leadership, and foreign policies do not command the confidence of the American people. They may suggest that our people are divided and confused; that our public understanding and public opinion is ill-informed, easily panicked, easily frightened. They may even suggest that democratic representative government, at moments when it faces its highest tests, can be easily deflected from the important tasks at hand by irresponsible outcries for purges and partisan causes.

Those nations who have not yet definitely alined themselves with the west, but who have looked to us for aid and comfort in their struggle against Communist domination, will see us now through clouds of suspicion and mistrust. If our plans for world peace and stability are to be effective, we must have their trust and their confidence. If our sincerity and capacity are called into question, which way can they turn?

The Communist world, we can be sure, will exploit the situation to the full. The Soviet radio and controlled press will diligently seek to create the impression that their system and philosophy is able to attract the loyalty of men in the high positions of their greatest antagonist—and that we have not the wit or the techniques to detect them effectively or keep them out.

The customary Soviet practice, when it plans an attack hot or cold on another government, is in advance to break down confidence in the established government. No Soviet agent could do more along this Communist line than is being done by those who claim they are acting from patriotic motives in making charges directly against our State Department and indirectly against our President.

The charges of disloyalty and the accompanying campaign to discredit our foreign policy are best refuted by examining our conduct of world affairs. What are the facts? What does the record tell us?

Recently as a member of a Senate appropriations subcommittee I revisited a number of countries in the Middle East and Far East to learn at first hand of conditions there—economic, social, and political.

Let's turn to the Middle East. Here is a strategic crossroads—here three continents join. The Soviet Union would control that vital area today if it had not been for the quick and vigorous action of the United States in giving economic and military assistance to Turkey and to Greece. The United States recognized the threat presented to all the free nations by the Communist drive to seize Greece. A plan of action was adopted based on the principle that has become known as the Truman doctrine. The State Department planned and carried out that program, in the early and uncertain days, when the outcome was dubious and the risks seemed very great. In many quarters that program was opposed not only because it was expensive, not only because it was a calculated risk—but also because in those days it seemed too anti-Communist.

The administration is responsible for the success of that program. And it has made a vast difference in the struggle between freedom and totalitarian communism. If Greece had fallen, Soviet communism would now front on the Aegean Sea. An outflanked Turkey would have had to surrender to Soviet control that dearly sought prize, the Turkish Straits. How far beyond that, into Iran, into militarily weak countries of the Middle East, would Soviet power now extend? But

the peoples of Greece and Turkey are still independent today; the eastern Mediterranean is open; the middle eastern countries still control their own destinies. This hardly seems the work of an administration riddled and dominated by Communists.

Some of us are worried now about Indochina. But do not forget that 2 years ago we were equally worried that communism would take over France and Italy. In western Europe, immediately following the war, there was chaos and depression of spirit. The Communist parties flourished in an atmosphere of despair. They worked eagerly to carry out Moscow's orders. We should not now be in any doubt about what those orders were. They were aimed at Communist control of western Europe. Freedom and democracy were in acute danger of being wiped out in western Europe—of being overthrown from within. Those who are entrusted with the conduct of our foreign relations saw the danger. And they saw what was required. The Marshall plan stands as a tribute to the foresight, the intelligence, and the devotion of the men who conduct our foreign relations. We are familiar with the results. The countries of western Europe, with our aid, have taken great strides toward recovery, toward security, toward confidence. They not only survive as free peoples; the membership of Communist parties has dwindled, and the aims of Communist parties have been exposed as the clear aims of Moscow. This hardly seems the work of an administration riddled and dominated by Communists.

When European economic recovery was threatened by fear of aggression, by the insecurity bred out of the sense that western Europe stood defenseless before Soviet Russia's military forces, we joined with 10 western European nations and Canada in a combined, integrated defense system for democracy on both sides of the Atlantic. In this development of our foreign policy the State Department was again the leader. And again, I find it very difficult to see in this evidence that it was animated by Communist sympathies.

And now let us turn to China—a subject which is closely related to the charges of disloyalty, and counter charges that the former are partly instigated by a Nationalist China lobby.

What is the record of the Department there? No one can deny that the Communist triumph in China represents a serious setback for the forces of freedom. The critics of our China policy claim that the outcome would have been different if our policy had been different. But none of these critics have been able to suggest now, and none did at the time, how we could have persuaded, or forced, the Chinese Nationalists to use wisely the large-scale assistance we gave them, or to accept the best advice we could proffer, or to institute the reforms that alone would have insured continued support for the Nationalist Government by the Chinese people. General Marshall's diagnosis has been proved correct; the remedies the United States offered were not accepted; if the mainland of China today is in the hands of Communists, it is because of the actions of Chinese Nationalists and of Chinese Communists and not of American Communists in our Government.

Our foreign policy has a consistent record of support for freedom and democracy. It has strengthened free nations against aggression and subversion. It has consistently sought to generate throughout the world the conditions in which communism cannot thrive. We have made continuing efforts to carry out constructive and creative policies such as our programs to expand world trade, to share the world's advanced technology, and to ensure freedom of information. These are potent proofs that our foreign policy deserves the support of the American people.

In the tremendous expansion of our foreign responsibilities since the Second World War began, those who conduct our foreign relations have had unprecedented demands laid upon them. We have needed as never in our history men of experience, men of intellect, men of imagination, men of courage, integrity, and the broadest human sympathy. The American people have been fortunate that men with these qualities have been forthcoming. We are especially fortunate that a public servant who possesses these qualities has been since 1941 almost uninterruptedly in a position of responsibility in the conduct of our foreign affairs, and that he is now Secretary of State. In the development of our foreign policies in these crucial times Dean Acheson has been a fellow traveler with such men as Mr. Hull and Mr. Stettinius, Mr. Byrnes and General Marshall. He must be charged with the guilt of association with them.

I think no man has brought to that position in recent years a richer background of training and experience in international affairs. He is a man who speaks his mind with conviction and clarity. He has shown that he understands in their widest scope the great issues of our day, and has the courage, the energy, and the wisdom to join in what must be the long, hard efforts of the American people to create a free and peaceful international order. I feel sure that under his leadership the Department of State is not merely free of Communist penetration; it is strong and competent to fight it.

There seems to be a general lack of appreciation of what has been done, and of what continues to be done, to insure loyalty on the part of the Department's employees. There has been, and there continues to function there a comprehensive, thorough-going machinery for discovering and eliminating security risks and disloyal employees, and to screen such persons from the ranks of applicants for positions. This procedure was instituted, under General Marshall, and has been vigorous and thorough, fair and just. When there is any doubt, that doubt is resolved in favor of the Government. Every employee is checked for security by the Department's own highly trained Investigation Branch, which has 20 regional offices throughout the country. Where a doubt of loyalty is involved, the case is referred to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, commonly known as Hoover's FBI for a full field investigation. The results of investigation are reviewed and evaluated by the Departmental Loyalty and Security Board (whose chairman by the way is a Republican). In accordance with the President's loyalty program requirements, the cases warranting a field investigation are post-audited by the Civil Service Loyalty Review Board. Any citizen who suspects any officeholder of being disloyal should inform the FBI of that suspicion and the facts on which it is based.

I think that the Department of State's record, its security procedures, and its leadership should convince us that the conduct of our foreign relations is not being sabotaged or subverted. I think we can regain the public confidence and public clarity that has been lost in recent weeks through shrill and reckless attacks on the security of our Government and the integrity of our public servants. And I think we may even learn some useful lessons from recent events, because similar tactics have been used in the past, and we should be on our guard against them in the future. We must learn that when someone cries "Smoke" we ought not necessarily to yell "Fire" and have a panic. It may be only a smoke screen, or even a fog. And we must learn that cold feet are less valuable than cool heads in fighting a cold war.

Decline in American Shipping

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 25 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, one of the major industries of the great port of Baltimore is shipbuilding and ship repair, and one of the major concerns in this field is the Maryland Drydock Co., of which Mr. George H. French, an outstanding leader of the industry, is president.

In view of the concern which I have frequently expressed here on the Senate floor and elsewhere regarding the low estate to which the United States merchant marine has fallen, it is worthy of note that in his annual report to the stockholders of the Maryland Drydock Co., Mr. French calls attention to the fact that the number of American ships actively in service was only 13 percent of the world total in June 1949. This was little more than one-third of the 36 percent of world shipping which had been represented by the United States merchant marine 3 years earlier.

As a result of the decline in American shipping, Mr. French's report further disclosed, there has been a sharp drop in volume of work done throughout the year. He noted the fact that the Federal Government "has no adequate policy concerning the merchant marine and its supporting industries," and he advocated a long-range program to rehabilitate the country's shipping and ship-construction industry.

I ask unanimous consent that the article appearing in the Baltimore Sunday Sun of April 23, 1950, concerning the Maryland Drydock Co. report, be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOTES DECLINE IN UNITED STATES SHIPS—FRENCH, DRYDOCK COMPANY HEAD, DEPLORES SHRINKAGE

(By J. S. Armstrong)

Steady shrinkage of the American merchant marine and its adverse effect on the domestic shipbuilding and ship-repairing industry received the attention of George H. French, president of the Maryland Drydock Co., in his annual report to stockholders.

Mr. French noted that the number of active American ships had declined to only 13 percent of the world's total in June 1949 from 36 percent 3 years earlier.

This continuous decline in the American merchant fleet, he said, means that there has been insufficient shipbuilding and repairing to maintain the industry at anything like the level said by the President's Advisory Committee on Merchant Marine to represent the minimum required for the national security.

LITTLE ON FOREIGN SHIPS

Strict dollar controls imposed on foreign ship operators by their governments have resulted in relatively little business being available on foreign ships, Mr. French also stated.

Devaluation of foreign currencies has aggravated this condition by making it advantageous for the operators of foreign ships to repair in foreign yards.

Our National Government, he further asserted, has no adequate policy concerning the merchant marine and its supporting industries. The most elementary appreciation of the logistics of modern warfare, including warfare in the atomic era, make it perfectly obvious that this Nation could not mount a successful offense against an aggressor without a merchant marine, a shipbuilding industry, and a ship-repairing industry, Mr. French said.

He referred to legislation known as the long-range shipping program, introduced in Washington by Senators O'CONOR, of Maryland, and MAGNUSON, of Washington.

SAYS IT WOULD HELP

If enacted into law, he said, this legislation will do much to provide the country with an effective maritime policy that should go far to remedy what is now a deplorable and dangerous situation.

As a result of the recently completed engineering survey, Mr. French expressed confidence that a long-range program would be put into effect designed to keep the port of Baltimore in a strong competitive position.

Attention was called to the enlarged ore-handling facilities which are either in the course of construction or definitely under contract.

Increased ore imports from Liberia and Venezuela over the next several years should result in greater port activity and additional ship-repair work, Mr. French said.

He said that Maryland Drydock, despite a sharp drop in business volume and sales last year, is in the best financial condition in its history. The company's balance sheet showed current assets on December 31 of $8,636,661, including $1,102,119 in cash and $2,500,000 in Treasury notes. This compared with current liabilities of $1,163,891.

Address by Hon. Herbert H. Lehman, of New York, at Democratic State Committee Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 25 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, last Wednesday, April 19, at a dinner at the Waldorf-Astoria, sponsored by the New York State Democratic Committee, I made some brief remarks concerning the function and role of the Democratic Party. I ask the unanimous consent of the Senate to insert those remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD:

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am delighted to be at this gathering of the faithful. I hail all my fellow veterans of political battles, past and present.

I greet also my distinguished colleagues from Congress. They honor us by their presence tonight, just as they have honored their party and their country by their consistent efforts in behalf of liberalism and democracy all these years.

But I address myself chiefly to the Democratic Party leaders and workers assembled here tonight. My message is mainly for you.

You men and women have helped make it possible for this Nation to be governed by and for the people during the past 20 years. You helped elect Al Smith as Governor of this State. You helped send Bob Wagner to the United States Senate. You helped give Franklin Roosevelt to his State, to the Nation, and to history.

I am happy to see among us many who were too young to vote for Al Smith and some who were even too young to vote for Franklin D. Roosevelt, either as governor or President.

A recent poll showed that of all voters coming of age since 1948, twice as many became Democrats as became Republicans. Of course, I will not vouch for the accuracy of any poll. But I think that this one reflects a significant truth. Let the day never come when this trend is halted. When our party—the Democratic Party—stops attracting the youth of this Nation, when the Democratic Party ceases to have the spirit of boldness and adventure which has characterized it for the past three-quarters of a century, then we will have reason to doubt ourselves and our party.

We claim to be, and we are, the party of the people. We are the party that represents the will of the people. We are the party which tries to translate the will of the people into the law of the land.

We can never fulfill our political mission by being reactionary. We can never fulfill our political mission by being timid and fearful. We will not fulfill our mission if we lose touch with the people—the plain people of the shops, offices, farms, factories, and small businesses who comprise the great majority of the body politic.

We represent labor. We represent independent business. We represent the farmers. But we are not a party of these interests alone. We are a party of all the people who desire progress in America, who want this country, and the whole world, to move forward, in an orderly manner, under God, to bring the greatest good to the greatest number of men and women, regardless of social position, of race, of religion, of color, or of creed.

We are a party of performance and of service. We do not merely run on our platform. We stand on it. The Democratic Party must continue to serve the people, on the national, State, and local levels, or our party will not survive the test of the polls. The Democratic Party is not an end in itself. It is the means by which the public will is translated into programs and into action. Should we ever forget this simple truth, we will cease to know the sweet taste of victory at election time. We will have forfeited our right to leadership.

In the sometimes artificial atmosphere of Washington these simple facts are sometimes forgotten. As I recall, this happens in Albany, too. But the people do not forget. The people know. They may be fooled for a time. But their judgment is sure in the long run. This is my faith and my creed. It is the faith and creed of the Democratic Party. I hope it will always be so.

The reactionaries and enemies of progress somtimes win temporary victories. But no party which loses its integrity, which forgets its responsibilities and which fails to recognize that the welfare of the people, and thus of the country, is its first concern, stays long in power, or deserves to.

The Democratic Party, under the leadership of that indomitable figure, Harry S. Truman, is in power in Washington today because of certain pledges made to the American voters 2 years ago. There was a question of interpretation of some of those pledges, in regard to something called the welfare state. Only 6 months ago the people of New York returned their verdict on this subject, too.

Today we are fighting for the laws and programs which we promised to the people. We are finding obstacles and difficulties in our way. On some fronts our progress is less than spectacular.

But the obstacles, however great, will not be able to stay the surging tide of the popular will. Neither the hysterical cries of the witch hunters at home nor the intrigues and designs of the Communists here or abroad will succeed in turning the American people and the American Nation from the course of progress, peace, and justice.

Our objectives are really simple. We seek to have our Government function in behalf of the people, to protect the weak against the tyranny of the strong, but to encourage the strong to utilize their strength in the public interest. We seek to give every man equal opportunity, but to leave the field open for each to have free play for his talents, and his thoughts.

This is my understanding of the welfare state. It is also the people's understanding. They will not willingly turn back to that state to which our Republican friends would like to return—the jungle state—that state in which the only law is that of the tooth and the fang, where the primitive code of the strong and the powerful prevails.

Just as surely as the sun sets over the Hudson, we will gain the goals we have set. We will carry out our pledges. We will provide those services which are needed and which the people cannot provide for themselves. We will provide expanded health services. We will provide adequate housing for persons of middle income. We will repeal the Taft-Hartley Act. We will assure the equality of rights of all American citizens, regardless of race, creed, or color. We will do that and much more too.

We may not wholly succeed this year. But in a few months the people will have a chance to speak again. If the Democratic Party continues to play its historic role—and I have every confidence that it will—the Eighty-second Congress will be a better Congress than the Eighty-first. And there will be changes in Albany, too.

We must have faith and patience. But above all we must have vision and courage. Holding fast to those qualities, we cannot fail.

Multiple-Purpose Project Data

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1950

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, in the Public Lands Committee we have before us an authorization bill for a fantastic program in central Arizona. While this bill calls for approximately $700,000,000 and all reports state that this will not be a completed project but will need additional reservoirs above to prevent Bridge Canyon Dam from silting up, it is estimated that the costs will be still greater.

The figures which I am submitting are merely to show that on the basis of record the final costs on projects greatly exceed the original estimates made by the Bureau of Reclamation.

U. S. Bureau of Reclamation—Multiple-purpose project data

Project and State	Original estimated cost	Present estimated cost [1]	Date of first construction appropriation	Total power capacity (kilowatts)	Date power available		Project completion date
					First	Final	
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Boulder Canyon, Ariz.-Nev.[2]	$126,500,000	$173,900,000	1930	1,332,300	October 1936	May 1954	June 1955.
Davis Dam, Ariz.-Nev.[2]	41,200,000	114,438,000	1942	225,000	November 1950	April 1951	June 1954.
Central Valley, Calif.	170,000,000	581,886,000	1936	815,000	June 1944	After 1956	After 1956.
Colorado-Big Thompson, Colo.	44,000,000	150,503,000	1935	177,400	May 1943	April 1953	June 1953.[3]
Fort Peck, Mont.[2]	5,732,554	16,250,000	1943				After 1956.
Hungry Horse, Mont.[2]	36,648,000	108,800,000	1946	285,000	October 1952	October 1953	June 1954.
Columbia Basin, Wash.	393,000,000	773,339,000	1934	1,974,000	April 1942	October 1951	After 1956.
Kendrick, Wyo.	20,000,000	25,000,000	1934	32,400	August 1939	August 1939	June 1955.
Riverton, Wyo.	9,500,000	21,813,403	1921	1,600	June 1925	November 1925	June 1954.
Shoshone, Wyo.	8,851,360	16,851,705	1904	10,600	April 1922	December 1948	June 1956.
Missouri River Basin—various	529,152,800	2,834,427,848	1946	1,130,200	May 1950	After 1956	After 1956.
Total	1,386,584,714	4,817,208,956		5,983,500			

[1] Differences between original and present estimated costs are due to the approved changes in project programs and changes in price levels.
[2] Projects for which irrigation is not directly involved.
[3] Project to be complete except for additional transmission facilities at present in a deferred status.
From p. 662 pt. 4 hearings before House Subcommittee, Interior Department Appropriations for 1951.

Licensing of Motion-Picture Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 25 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a newspaper article entitled "How Now, Senator?" written by Oscar Davis, and published in the Washington Daily News on Monday, April 24, 1950, in which a question is asked of me. In that connection I also ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD my reply to the question in the form of a letter to my colleague, the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

There being no objection, the article and the letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News of April 24, 1950]

HOW NOW, SENATOR?

(By Oscar Davis)

I note with considerable glee that Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, of Wisconsin, had at Senator EDWIN C. JOHNSON, Democrat, of Colorado, last Thursday concerning the Colorado Senator's proposal to license the motion-picture industry. Senator WILEY, ranking Republican of the Senate Judiciary Committee, minced no words in describing the brain storm of his Democratic colleague.

He warned that the proposed legislation was completely unconstitutional and could properly be described as a police-state monster. He emphasized his speech with the charge that JOHNSON's plan is a gestapo idea.

This isn't the first time that Senator JOHNSON has been smote in his own bailiwick. The two-time Governor of Colorado has come up with some statements that first amazed, then ired his fellow members. In March of 1944 he denounced the fourth-term campaign of President Roosevelt, saying, "History will name the fourth term, if it ever materializes, as the term of defeat and frustration."

In 1945, the Senator took a dim view of the Navy due to the development of the atom bomb. Every surface ship in the Navy became obsolete with the advent of the atomic bomb, he reportedly gloomily. Late in the same year he proposed that a loan to Britain be financed by a special bond issue which would pay off only if Britain repaid its obligation.

FAMILIAR PATTERN

Such bumbling has repeatedly marked the career of the Colorado ex-railroad section hand, whose personal background belies his political fumbles.

His life story has a trace of the Horatio Alger myth. Born in Kansas in 1884, Senator JOHNSON roamed across the Midwest—living for a time in Nebraska—eventually settling in Colorado when he was victimized by tuberculosis.

Always a scrapper—right or wrong—the Senator whipped this illness with the tenacity he had previously exhibited in performing such chores as baggage handler, telegrapher, train dispatcher, cowpuncher, school teacher, and manager of a milling cooperative.

He broke into politics in 1922 when he was elected to the Colorado statehouse. Never defeated, he served successively as lieutenant-governor, governor, and finally Senator.

However, in tangling with Senator WILEY and Hollywood the Senator from the Rocky Mountain State may have grabbed the tail of a tiger too unmanageable even for a husky Coloradan who is tall, raw-boned and as rugged as the mountains of his home State.

COMMON GROUND

Strangely enough the two senatorial combatants have a common background, both are of Scandinavian extraction, both are of Lutheran faith, both attend the generally unpublicized Wednesday morning breakfasts which are held in the Senate's private dining room, breakfasts which are devoted to a spiritual consideration of the problems of the day. Their main difference, apparently, is the definition of the word, morality. For reasons best known to himself, Senator JOHNSON has decided that Hollywood is immoral. His bill is scheduled for a hearing May 20. I'm willing to stick out this vulnerable neck and prophesy that even though the bill gets a committee hearing (and I doubt that) it will never come to a vote in Senate or House.

The more I attack this Colorado Senator, the better I like him. And I wish sincerely that he'd turn his apparently inexhaustible energy to problems which would better benefit this brave new land.

Hollywood is an easy and provocative target, a sitting duck, if you please. Senator JOHNSON's background indicates that he is not one to sling a load of buckshot at a cripple.

Let us hope that he holds his fire herein.

APRIL 24, 1950.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I have read with mingled curiosity and surprise your statement in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on April 20, 1950, with respect to S. 3237, a bill introduced by me dealing with the misconduct of performers in the motion-picture industry. Previously I had noted your insertion on March 15 on this same subject. Also I have studied your memorandum and legal analysis of the bill. These data clearly indicate your great concern lest the motion-picture industry be confronted by Congress with any question involving their transgressions. Since apparently you have elected yourself to be their defender our committee will welcome your appearance as a witness when the hearings open on May 15. Please consider this a formal invitation to be our initial witness.

You ask, with righteous indignation, "Why use a 100-barrel shotgun where a flit gun would do?" Since I have never hunted tigers with a fly swatter I cannot answer that primary inquiry. You go on to say, "If there was anything objectionable to it (Stromboli) the reel could never have entered our country, because the United States Treasury Department through its customs offices possesses powers to ban admission of morally objectionable items." Obviously, you miss entirely the dangers to American youth inherent in this film.

No film can be wholesome if the artists appearing therein have rotten and notorious private lives which have become public scandals. Read the display ads exploiting Stromboli. Nothing is said about the plot but everything emphasizes the leading lady and her director. All the advertising is built around them. They are the heroes and the pin-up idols for the youth of America and they are the models which shape the lives of America. This is the pattern used in motion-picture advertising.

I have before me an actual photograph of the billing of a motion-picture house in Colorado coaxing in customers to see Stromboli with huge banners reading: "Raging passion," "The star Bergman," "The inspired Rossellini," "The great lover," "Senators say it is red-hot lurid sex," "Rossellini says it's wonderful." This same type of inciting advertising appeared in nationally circulated magazines which go into millions of American homes. That sort of misrepresentation and repulsive exploitation by the motion-picture industry of the misconduct of its performers sounds like the come-on ballyhoo

of a cheap burlesque house. Has the motion-picture industry, second only to our churches and schools as educational influences, sunk to this low level with your warm approval?

No church would permit such inspired hopheads as Rossellini and Mitchum to occupy its pulpit; parents would be outraged if Lila Leeds and Ingrid Bergman were employed as teachers in our schools. But the motion-picture industry gives these derelicts the opportunity to teach and preach to millions. Glamorizing immorality cannot be defended. Bergman, thanks to the motion-picture industry, influences millions of lives where the ordinary teacher or preacher is limited to hundreds.

You say with great feeling, "Let there be a spontaneous moral crusade among our people led by our great churches, assisted by all devout people in the cinema themselves, and let this voluntary crusade be the answer to the problem of immorality in Hollywood or anywhere else." Such a crusade would be just dandy, but I don't hear the rumblings of one getting under way. Society would need no laws or regulations if crusades could save us.

Your noble solution would evoke only sneers from the cocaine sniffer Rossellini, the brazen Bergman, the marihuana jailbird Mitchum, and the extortionist Lila Leeds, all of whom the motion-picture industry extols and exploits. This industry has made it possible for these rotters to contribute to American juvenile delinquency. I am amazed that a statesman of your wide experience, wholesome attitude toward spiritual values, and great legislative capacity has no remedy against the exploitation of these notorious characters other than a "flit gun." Words alone will cure nothing. Furthermore, freedom of the box office to corrupt highly impressionable youth does not appeal to me.

I do agree with you, however, that Federal censorship is not the most desirable answer. No one in this Senate is more opposed to regimentation than I. However, the virtue of S. 3237 is that it presents the most drastic solution of the problem and permits full exploration of the legal and public interest questions involved. That is the underlying purpose of the Senate hearing set for May 15. Frankly, I have under consideration two other approaches which I am assured by able constitutional lawyers are not only sound legally but may prove more effective and would avoid obnoxious Federal censorship which is so repugnant to Americans. It would be so much better if the industry itself would recognize its own tremendous responsibilities to the people of America and do its own policing.

You suggest the motion-picture industry be given the opportunity to work out its own solution to this problem on a voluntary basis. I am all for that and the hearing which I am planning will make that its primary objective. Why, then, are you demanding that this hearing shall not take place? I cannot understand why a legislator should seek to cover up this stench. I am curious to learn why you are so worried and concerned over a Senate hearing on this subject. What disclosures do you fear? I have always believed that by bringing public welfare problems out into the sunlight of sober analysis a solution may be found.

Comforting as it might be to Rossellini, Hayworth, Bergman, Mitchum, Lila Leeds, et al., and their defenders, a learned dissertation on the constitutionality of Federal censorship will not be pertinent to the issue. Other legislative approaches not involving the constitutional questions you raise will be before us. We hope, therefore, you will devote your great talents to the problem of the exploitation of the immorality of private lives by the motion-picture industry for cash on the barrel head. This aspect of the problem is the root of the evil and should be faced squarely.

With great respect for your profound grasp of legalistic procedures, your evangelistic opposition to sin, and with gratitude for your interest and concern over the future of the motion-picture industry, I ask to remain

Faithfully yours,

ED C. JOHNSON.

Advertising of Liquor, Beer, and Wine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 25 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from Mrs. R. H. Sorensen, of Palo Alto, Calif., regarding ban on advertising of liquor, beer, and wine, together with an article on the same subject.

There being no objection, the letter and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: I recently read about your measure to ban advertising of liquor, beer, and wine. I think it is a very timely measure and should be given all the support possible to enable it going through Congress.

I, for one, am so tired of hearing the liquor shorts on the radio. These stations of the San Francisco Bay area seem to put the shorts between programs that the children are going to listen to and I resent that very much. Children shouldn't have liquor blasted to them every day over the radio. What is the country thinking of when they permit such a thing to be?

I also resent all the billboards along the roads the liquor companies place there.

I don't drink anything along that subject, however, I will grant the people that do, the privilege if they won't blast it at me and criticize me for not so doing.

I am tired of the worry every time we go out on the highway on the chance a drunken driver will run into us.

I sincerely hope that your measure will be adopted, especially where the radio is concerned.

Sincerely,

Mrs. R. H. SORENSEN.

LIQUOR CALLED BIG FACTOR IN MOST CRASHES

Liquor or intoxicants were contributing factors in 11,336 motor vehicle accidents—513 of them fatal—in California last year, according to a statistical summary disclosed today by the California highway patrol.

The summary was broken down further to show that drivers obviously drunk were involved in 161 fatal accidents and 3,709 nonfatal mishaps. The classification, "had been drinking," revealed 352 fatal accidents and 7,114 nonfatal accidents charged against those drivers.

In the general classification, "condition of driver contributing to accident," intoxicants were far ahead. Runners-up—but far to the rear—were drivers apparently asleep. They were involved in 67 fatal accidents and 1,004 nonfatal ones. Drivers fatigued or sleepy accounted for 37 fatal and 820 nonfatal accidents.

The figures are part of an over-all report of motor vehicle accidents in California in preparation by the statistical section of the highway patrol.

Problems of Social Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 25 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on April 15, I was present at the forty-fifth anniversary luncheon of the League for Industrial Democracy in New York City. One of the speakers on that fine occasion was Federal Security Administrator Oscar R. Ewing, who delivered a very powerful and stimulating address on problems of social legislation. I ask the unanimous consent of the Senate to insert Mr. Ewing's speech into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am glad to join with you in celebrating the forty-fifth anniversary of the League for Industrial Democracy. I am here, not only in my own behalf, but as the representative of the President of the United States. President Truman has asked me to bring you his personal greetings and good wishes, and to express his congratulations on your forty-fifth birthday.

The President was especially happy to know that Senator LEHMAN is receiving your citation for his public services in behalf of democracy here and abroad. No one could deserve it more. HERBERT LEHMAN is a great statesman and you honor yourselves in honoring him. The people of New York know and honor him—as Mr. Dewey found out back in 1938, and as one of Mr. Dewey's friends discovered only last fall.

And the secret of HERBERT LEHMAN'S statesmanship is not that he has been a politician but that he has been a Democrat—Democrat with a large D and democrat with a small d.

I have known Senator LEHMAN for a long time. I remember him back in the days of the First World War. I had gone into the Army and wound up as a junior officer in our infant Air Force. Not everybody, of course, was glamorous in the Air Force. Some were. They went over to France and piloted those little crates that were held together with baling wire. But there were less exciting assignments, too, and I found myself in Washington working on contracts for the Air Force. During those hectic months, I met a young man who had already made a healthy reputation as a businessman. He was a captain or a major, I believe, when I first met him, and he was on the General Staff as assistant director of purchase, storage, and traffic in the War Department, winding up as a full colonel. I don't know how well Colonel LEHMAN remembers captain Ewing, but I can assure you that Captain Ewing remembers Colonel LEHMAN very well. I remember his resonant voice, his unfailing courtesy, his ability to combine attention to detail with a rounded view of major problems, the strength that was concealed under his tact, his good humor, and his simple human grace. Colonel LEHMAN received the Distinguished Service Medal for his services in World War I, and it was as well deserved as the citation you have awarded Senator LEHMAN today for his outstanding achievements in the broad field of public service.

You have heard much about the public career of this great American. I think it may be useful to put this career in its proper perspective—as the historians will see it. During the past 30 years, four leaders

were primarily responsible for liberal legislation in New York State. You know the four men I mean—Alfred E. Smith, Robert F. Wagner, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Herbert H. Lehman. They transformed the politics of the Empire State. They brought democracy to life and made it work—the democracy of both the small and the large D. We in New York are not so self-conscious about native sons as people in some other States, but I think every New Yorker is proud of that foursome—Smith, Wagner, Roosevelt, and Lehman.

Today, HERBERT LEHMAN, alone of the four, carries on their tradition. He is bringing to Washington the sum of his wisdom, his judgment, and his statesmanship. God knows we have needed him in Washington. When I look at the sorry Senators of the irresponsible right—the McCarthys, the Wherrys, the Hickenloopers, and their ilk—I say, thank God for Senator LEHMAN.

We need him. We need him today for the short term in the Senate—and we need him even more tomorrow for the long term.

We need him because he is a man who is able to drive to the heart of the problems that confront our country. He is not terrified by the shrieks and slogans of the irresponsible right. When he was accused of favoring the welfare state, he acknowledged it with pride.

Back in the days of the Revolution, the British had a term of contempt for the colonial Americans who presumed to set up their own independent Nation. But the colonial Americans took the name to themselves. Sure they were Yankee Doodles, and they were dandy. I can remember, not so many months ago, when the Republicans were flinging the phrase "welfare state" at us as though it were an epithet of reproach. It has backfired in the same way that Yankee Doodle backfired on the British. Sure, we Democrats are for the welfare state—if by welfare state you mean better health for the American people, more education, greater social security, good jobs at good wages, protection against the hazards of unemployment and depression, civil rights, good housing at reasonable cost, and the whole broad program of President Truman's Fair Deal. If that is the welfare state, then we are for it, and proud of it. The American people are for it, and proud of it. And the Republicans have dropped the subject, so that today it becomes the theme, not of a Republican box lunch wake, but of a serious, dignified, important gathering such as ours today.

So the Republicans have now gone back to worrying about socialism. A few weeks ago they told that liberty versus socialism was the No. 1 issue before the country. Since nobody paid much attention, they have dropped its popularity to No. 10 on their latest list of abbreviated slogans. If it goes down any further, it will fall out of their 10-point platform entirely.

The cry of socialism is always a sign of the bankruptcy of conservatism in the United States. I am sorry the Republicans have sunk so low, because in our political system we must always preserve a strong two-party system—and that means we should encourage a healthy conservative minority.

But a conservative party is not healthy when it yells "socialism." It is very sick—made sick, perhaps, by the logic of history. A hundred years ago, those who opposed establishment of free public schools called them socialism. That was not conservatism; it was stupidity. In 1887, when Congress set up the Interstate Commerce Commission, the railroads all shouted "socialism." That was no conservatism; it was selfish stupidity. In 1913 the Nation's bankers let out the same cry when the Federal Reserve Act became law. And remember how the Wall Street brokers bemoaned the end of free government when the Securities Act of 1933 was passed, and how insurance companies howled "socialism" when the Social Security Act was passed. They were not being conservative; they were being stupid.

As you know very well, socialism means nationalization of production. Neither I nor anyone else in President Truman's Administration has the remotest desire to nationalize anything. On that, I can agree with the most reactionary member of the National Association of Manufacturers or of the American Medical Association. I believe with all my heart that our American system is the best that man has so far devised. But that does not mean it is perfect. That does not mean it has no defects which we are seeking to correct. And we want to correct them with the least possible disturbance to our society and our economy.

The conservatives may yell socialism at any suggestion for improvement. They may feel the hot breath of revolution with every proposal for change. But the most dangerous enemies we have to our American way of life are those very people whose emblem is not the eagle but the ostrich who refuse to recognize the defects that exist and who resist all efforts to take up these defects one by one and try to cure them. The surest way I know to encourage forms of government we do not like is to refuse to recognize and cure the imperfections in what we have.

What does this mean if practiced? For one thing, it means that we have the obligation to ourselves to expand our social-security program so that it covers the greater portion of our population, and to increase the benefits so that they are more in line with the cost of living in this year 1950. I am confident that the Congress will make such amendments in the Social Security Act during the present session, and I think this will mark a great step forward. I do not have to explain the philosophy of social insurance to this audience. You understand the principle as well as I do, and you recognize it as the only way in which our complex society can manage to build a floor on which people can stand when old age or death comes.

We have as a nation accepted this principle of social insurance in one field. We have yet to accept it in another—the critical field of insuring ourselves against the costs of medical and hospital care. Too many Americans are compelled to worry about the costs of such care when illness strikes. Too many Americans cannot afford to pay for the care they need. The only way to remove such worries is by adopting President Truman's program for a Nation-wide insurance system in which employers and employees would contribute to a fund out of which doctors and hospitals would be paid for the service they render.

We have as a nation accepted the principle that education should be free, universal, and supported out of tax funds. Since we have, as we should have, a decentralized educational system, operated by the State, this has thrown a heavy burden on the poorer parts of the country; and we must somehow work out a way of mobilizing the resources of the Nation to build and modernize schoolhouses, to increase the number of teachers as well as increase the salaries of teachers and to raise the level of our educational standards.

In every field—housing, labor legislation, conservation, utilization of great new sources of energy—we must build strongly for the future. We must have the positive approach.

It is good to see that a valiant champion of this positive approach, a man without venom but with a full heart and a courageous mind, is recognized for his public service. Senator LEHMAN, and all of you who are here today, agree on the goal that lies before us—the goal of a better, a safer, a happier America in a better, a safer, a happier world—a well-faring world, if you want to call it so. Our paths toward that goal may vary. But all who seek it are joined in the common cause and it is the cause that counts.

Orr Oil Well

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 25 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Wood County Democrat, of Quitman, Tex., dated April 20, 1950, which has to do with an oil well in that area. I call it to the attention of my fellow Senators.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ORR WELL FLOWS 223 BARRELS DAILY; YEAR'S MOST IMPORTANT STRIKE

(By Jacob E. Shoaf)

Unless the attitude of Washington politicians and officials change—the wildcatting spirit that caused affable Buster Orr to drill the new Pine Mills discovery well might well be broken.

Washington big wigs, who not only fail to condemn, but ofttimes go out of their way to encourage the importation of foreign oil, are slowly but surely breaking the back of the small independent operator. The independent operators are the ones that do the majority of the wildcatting. Not only is Washington failing to stop the encroachment of foreign oil into the domestic market—they are trying to take away the last incentive of the wildcatter—his depletion allowance. This little item is what many independent producers operate on—it allows them 27½ percent exemption on their income from oil and gas. When you take away the incentives of an athletic team to win there's hardly any use for them to play the game—likewise, when you take away the incentive of the wildcatter to spend his money on wildcat tests—you have to a large extent destroyed the independent oil operator.

Unless the incentive had been there it stands to reason that Mr. Orr would not have ventured into an area that had been condemned by most geologists. He was alone in the venture. Oil companies with acreage in the area refused to lend any assistance. He was wildcatting in the purest sense of the word.

Wood County friends of the Longview operator are preparing to urge the railroad commission to name the new discovery field "Orr Field" in honor of the wildcatter who risked money in the face of such tremendous odds. The fact that he won is encouraging—and all of Wood County is happy—but what is more important is the fact that this important development should be a signal for us to protect the things that made him have the incentive to go into the venture—that was the fact that he felt he could market the oil in a domestic market if it should produce and he stood a chance to make enough money out of it to search for bigger and better fields in the days that lie ahead—this is the dream and goal of every true wildcatter.

Communists in Government Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 25 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, last Sunday's edition of the Washington Post carried in its editorial section a very interesting article by a very fine writer and reporter named Alfred Friendly. This article discussed an individual who has been very much in the public eye recently, Mr. Alfred Kohlberg, whose activities are said to have had a powerful bearing on the present controversy in Congress concerning American policy toward China. Mr. Friendly's article presents a series of arresting facts concerning Mr. Kohlberg's activities, although the article, itself, is a very objective one. I ask the unanimous consent to have this article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAN BEHIND THE MAN WHO IS ACCUSING

(By Alfred Friendly)

One man's campaign—rejected and languishing—obtains a new lease on life and gets front-page play in the Nation's newspapers for 6 weeks running.

One man's accusations—thrown out 3 years ago by a jury of experts as irresponsible and not to be proved—becomes a central political issue in a national election campaign.

One man's views on foreign policy in the Far East—utterly at variance with those of four successive Secretaries of State—becomes the canon of orthodoxy for a large segment of a major political party.

One man—a private citizen, relatively obscure, and by his own admission without pretensions to being a scholar or (until recently) a statesman—finds Senators fighting his battles and a prestige-laden Senate subcommittee devoting most of its time for a month or more delving into his imputations, the most grevious political charges one man can make against another.

M'CARTHY'S KEY CASE

How come? How does it happen that Alfred Kohlberg, a successful New York merchant, but by no means an industrial giant or tycoon, could build up his charges to make them form almost the entirety of Senator MCCARTHY'S key case against Owen Lattimore?

Except for the testimony last Thursday of former Communist Louis F. Budenz, alleging that Lattimore was a Communist, the evidence presented by MCCARTHY was almost fully laid out years earlier by Kohlberg.

How did Kohlberg push his other charges, similarly rejected by the authorities in the field concerned, until they came to constitute a large part of the rest of MCCARTHY'S case? How did the whole come to win the support of the dominant TAFT-BRIDGES-WHERRY wing of the Republican Party?

Political historians of the future may provide the answers. For the present, though, the most that can be done is to recount some of the facts.

It is well known that, with the exception of Budenz's evidence just put on the record, Kohlberg provided MCCARTHY with the material for the case on which the Wisconsin Republican says he will stand or fall.

Less well known is that that material is, almost in toto, old stuff, dating from 1944–47. And almost entirely overlooked is the fact that the Kohlberg material has been thoroughly investigated and found wanting in proof.

The body that investigated and discredited those charges comprised more than 1,200 of the 1,600 members of America's most esteemed and scholarly research organizations on far-eastern affairs, the American Council of the Institute of Pacific Relations.

They voted, 1,163 to 66, that Kohlberg was talking through his hat. The precise words were that his charges were inaccurate and irresponsible.

The investigators were singularly authoritative. The IPR membership is in itself a roster of most of the outstanding Americans with the greatest knowledge and direct concern in far-eastern matters. They are university scholars, editors, writers, merchants, attorneys, industrialists, and bankers with immediate interest and operations in the Orient.

OTHER CASES COVERED

A look at the documentation in the long fight of Kohlberg with the IPR shows that it covered almost the identical ground that MCCARTHY is now replowing.

It included not merely the key case of Lattimore, but also almost all the information that MCCARTHY and his group have used to attack Ambassador-at-Large Philip C. Jessup.

Furthermore, in his fight in the IPR, through circular letters, pamphlets, and articles in magazines and papers, Kohlberg presented most of the data MCCARTHY has since used to attack State Department official, John S. Service.

Finally, there are indications that MCCARTHY'S attack against a fourth man on his list, State Department officer, Haldore E. Hansen, also came originally from Kohlberg material.

In the light of all this, it becomes worth while to inquire into the activities of Kohlberg and to look into the history and origin of the charges which, warmed over but unchanged in any essential, have become a new "topic A" in American conversation.

Who is Kohlberg and why did he undertake a burning crusade into which he has poured enormous energy and substantial sums of money? And what is he doing now?

Alfred Kohlberg, short, bald, and energetic, is a prosperous importer, much traveled in China. He deals in handkerchiefs, linens, and gloves. For many years he has conducted a large business—by his own figures, it grossed $1,500,000 a year—of farming out handkerchiefs and the like to cottage or home industry workers in China to be embroidered.

In his travels he has been a guest of Generalissimo and Mme. Chiang Kai-shek.

As early as 1943 he took up his cudgel against the IPR, of which he was a member. The fight became most intense in about 1945 and 1946 and reached its climax in April 1947, when his charges were overwhelmingly rejected.

His complaint was that the IPR, through the publications of its international body and those of its American Council, was aiding and abetting the Communists in China and undercutting Chiang and his Nationalist Government. He held that the IPR staff was heavily weighted with Communist writers, that they became dominant, and that they used the IPR to peddle the party line.

Budenz now says the same thing.

Kohlberg fought this campaign ever harder, and is still fighting it.

MAGAZINE WAS WEAPON

He put out circular letters in enormous volume. He wrote extensively for the magazine, China Monthly. He appears to have played a substantial part in organizing and supporting different Chinese research and study and publicity groups in this country.

He founded, in October 1946, the magazine, Plain Talk. It was primarily dedicated to an attack on communism in all its forms, but a heavy load of its articles was devoted to China policy.

It served, in fact, as Kohlberg's principal vehicle for his running fight in behalf of the Nationalist Government and in bitter denunciation of the State Department position on China.

He fought the IPR through his articles, his magazine, his letters. Finally, he went to court, engaged in a proxy battle and prepared a monumental document to support his accusations.

When he lost his fight in the IPR, he founded a rival organization of his own, the American China Policy Association.

By general report, right or wrong, he became a leading figure of the so-called China lobby. He had close association with prominent Nationalist figures in this country. Energetically, he brought his case to many Members of Congress.

His pamphlets began to be circulated by William J. Goodwin, until a few days ago the registered lobbyist for the Chinese Nationalists, and himself a man with unsavory past connections, especially with the Christian-front and pro-German movements.

Kohlberg donated $1,000 on one occasion to the campaign of Senator BRIDGES, Republican, of New Hampshire. BRIDGES has been one of the loudest congressional drumbeaters in the cause of Chiang Kai-shek.

In 1949, BRIDGES distributed from his office a report on China prepared at his request by Kohlberg.

Other Members of Congress seem to have made a habit of inserting various Kohlberg articles into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Some, in speeches on the floor, made addresses remarkably reminiscent of the line that Kohlberg plugs in his articles and associations.

Thus one finds former Representative Busbey, Republican, of Illinois, a great fellow for inserting Kohlberg and Plain Talk articles in the RECORD, making the first congressional attack on Haldore Hansen, in May 1947. The material seems to have been drawn from, or at least first brought to light in, Kohlberg material in his fight with the IPR.

Similarly, Representative LATHAM, Republican, of New York, started off an attack on Jessup in January 1948 with data that would point to Kohlberg as the source. In August 1949 Representative SMITH, Republican, of Wisconsin, inserted in the RECORD a Kohlberg letter bitterly attacking Jessup, and containing much the same material MCCARTHY used 8 months later.

Why Kohlberg's burning passion and unremitting fight?

The New York importer declined to give this reporter an interview last week (his stated reason was that the Washington Post had unfairly and inaccurately attacked him editorially), so his own explanation is not available.

To suggest that he is motivated by a desire to save his big business in China seems, to this reporter, to underestimate Kohlberg's character. His crusade must have cost him immense time that he might have otherwise have given his business, and it has clearly cost him large amounts of money.

Rather, it would seem that he has embraced a cause from reasons of principle and that his dedication is sincere.

ELEMENTARY LOGIC

From the accounts of people who have watched him, and, more demonstrably, from a reading of his articles, Kohlberg's point of view about China is simple—oversimple.

He seems to take the line that anyone who criticizes any aspect of Chiang Kai-shek's operations is thereby giving aid and comfort to the Communists. Anyone who

gives them aid and comfort must be following the party line. Anyone following that line is thereby an enemy of the United States.

Also, he seems now to be acting on the converse of that proposition: Anyone who fights the Communists must be, by that very act, a fine fellow.

Kohlberg, like McCARTHY, who has parroted his charges, has been a vigorous practitioner of the theory of guilt by association. He and McCARTHY insist a man can be judged by his associates. When that test is applied to Kohlberg himself, he does not fare very well. He is now in curious company.

Last October, he was guest at a dinner sponsored by the National Economic Council, an organization run by Merwin K. Hart, pro-Franco apologist in this country and known as anti-Semitic.

The guest list included many upstanding and a few outstanding Americans. But it also included, as might be expected, the elite of American Fascists, led off by Lawrence Dennis.

Kohlberg appears again on a list that included Hart and the notorious Joseph P. Kamp, head of the Constitutional Educational League, and who was convicted of contempt of Congress. His publications were recommended and sold by at least 10 of the defendants in the wartime sedition trial. Kohlberg's association was in connection with an affair for Theodore Aubert's International Anti-Communist Entente. This organization, founded before the war with Swiss headquarters, enjoyed the support of Hitler.

LETTERS TO TABLET

Last June, Kohlberg was vice chairman (and, from his letters, apparently a prime organizer) of a dinner for Paul Yu-pin, the Archbishop of Nanking.

Again, many good and distinguished people attended. The speakers were Gen. Pat Hurley and Senator McCARRAN (Democrat, Nevada). But the treasurer for the dinner was Robert M. Harriss, once indicted as an unregistered lobbyist and former financial adviser to Father Coughlin in his famous silver deals.

One of the sponsors of the dinner was Patrick Scanlon, managing editor of the Brooklyn Tablet, the Coughlinite paper which still remains faithful to the radio priest's line, which printed his blasts and which gives aid and comfort to the most intemperately reactionary elements on the American political scene.

For a man active in Jewish organizations and generous in Jewish charities, it is somewhat incongruous to find that Kohlberg has had published at least 10 letters to the editor of the Tablet, and has repeatedly received favorable mention in it.

OFFERED SERVICES

But incongruity (and false modesty) do not seem to bother Kohlberg. This most persistent and intransigent critic of American foreign policy wrote President Truman less than 3 weeks ago, nominating himself for the position of Ambassador at Large.

He said he thought it was time that the President give him the job to advise State Department people who lost the fight in China and were about to lose it in the rest of the world.

Kohlberg has admitted supplying McCARTHY material on Lattimore and Jessup. The admission was somewhat superfluous, since the previously available circumstantial evidence was convincing.

Lattimore's lawyers produced, when Lattimore testified before a Senate subcommittee in his own behalf, a double-column document showing that almost every one of McCARTHY's major specific charges against Lattimore and Jessup were previously stated by Kohlberg in one or another of his publications.

In many cases the language, and even the metaphors, were identical. McCARTHY had not chosen, apparently, to tamper with Kohlberg's distinctive prose style.

Even some of the witnesses McCARTHY has said he will produce against Lattimore seem to have been uncovered, or pointed to, in Kohlberg's earlier material.

DRESS REHEARSAL

But more important, and as mentioned above, all this material entered into the fight between Kohlberg and the IPR. The documentation connected with that battle reads like a dress rehearsal of the McCARTHY allegations.

Everything is there: Lattimore's associations and organizations; his writings and editing of the magazine Pacific Affairs, allegedly in a manner right down the Commie line; Jessup's alleged leading of the IPR in a campaign to smear Chiang and extoll the Chinese Communists; the asserted pro-Communist cabal in the State Department that forced the resignation of Ambassador Grew, that sold Chiang down the river, that deceived Stillwell and forced him to oppose Chiang, that set the stage for insinuating the Communists into the Government—all the charges and the line of argument used by McCARTHY in two major speeches and two major presentations to the subcommittee.

There is little point in going into details of the fight Kohlberg had with the IPR. He prepared a huge, 88-page document to back his case—using tactics of ripping passages out of context and of ignoring contradictory evidence that remind one precisely of McCARTHY's technique.

He claimed that the IPR slavishly followed, in its publications, the alternating honeymoon and hate attitudes of the Kremlin toward Chiang. To prove it, he quoted from less than 2 percent of the articles published in IPR during the period and less than .002 percent of the books it put out.

JESSUP AMONG FOES

The IPR made a devasting reply in a document that it circulated to its members. It showed that Kohlberg had simply ignored the overwhelming number of facts that did not support his argument.

The group that took Kohlberg on to answer his charge that the IPR was Communist-dominated was about as conservative as one could imagine, including a Wall Street lawyer from a high-collar firm, and a group of major American industrialists. But one of the group was Jessup, and apparently Kohlberg never forgave him.

The IPR is supported almost entirely by "fat cat" money—from the Rockefeller and Carnegie Foundations, and from large banking and industrial concerns. Kohlberg made much of the fact that $3,500 came from the Communist Frederick V. Field, and so has McCARTHY.

But to suppose that the IPR was bought by a sum of Communist money amounting to less than 2 percent of its budget, as against 98 percent coming from conservative sources, is as ridiculous as to suppose that an organization of the IPR's standing was bought by any money, regardless of the source.

AWARDED NAVY E

The IPR had and has the highest reputation for objective research. Its job is to provide a forum for views from all quarters about the Far East, and to conduct honest research.

The testimonials it has, in the form of doubled grants from the Chase and National City Banks, in the form of a Navy E award for its contribution to the war effort, in the form of its characterization by the Rockefeller Foundation as "the most important single source of independent studies" on far eastern problems and in the form of an 1163 to 66 vote, would seem to be answer enough to the accusations Kohlberg brought against it and such of its principals as Lattimore and Jessup.

Meeting of Americans and Russians at the Elbe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 25 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an eloquent statement by Mr. Joseph P. Polowsky, of Chicago, Ill., entitled "The Oath at the Elbe," recounting the meeting of American and Russian soldiers 5 years ago today, and recommending action by the United Nations, which first met on the same day, to commemorate these efforts for world peace. I also ask unanimous consent that a brief statement of my own be printed by way of introduction.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS, OF ILLINOIS

It was just 5 years ago today that the United Nations first convened at San Francisco. People of all lands, sick of the horrors of war, turned to it with new hope for justice and peace. While the years which followed have brought repeated and tragic disappointments of these great hopes, it is, nevertheless, fitting on this fifth anniversary that we recall them and renew our determination to make them realities.

On the same day, in 1945, soldiers of the America Army under Lieutenant Kotzebue made contact at the Elbe with the advance patrols of the Russian Army. One of the infantrymen in this group, Joseph P. Polowsky, of Chicago, Ill., has told in the brief but moving account which follows about the dramatic details of that meeting. As they viewed the human destruction of war, he recalls that the Russian and American soldiers took an oath "that they would do everything in their power to prevent such things from ever happening again—that the nations would and must live at peace." And Mr. Polowsky urges that the General Assembly of the United Nations recommend that April 25 be set aside as a day of commemoration for a peaceful world.

The statement by Mr. Polowsky represents the desire of the American people for peace, today as then. There are almost no Americans who want either war or aggression. It is probable that if the Russian infantrymen were free to speak, they would also join in this plea for peace. But whereas Mr. Polowsky and his fellow Americans have the freedom to speak, the Russian people do not. Therein lies one of the roots of our difficulty. The will of the people for peace cannot be expressed or made effective behind the iron curtain. It is, therefore, difficult almost to the point of impossibility to persuade the Russian rulers to act for peace.

We know now that it is no simple or easy task to realize the hopes of 1945 or to keep the pledge of the soldiers who met at the Elbe. Repeated vetos, boycotts, obstinate refusals of reasonable disarmament agreements, the aggressive extension of tyranny over one free nation after another, and continued violations of treaty pledges by the Communist leaders of Russia have destroyed the freedom of millions and threatened the world with another war. Despite all that, the United Nations has made some memorable gains, through its conciliators in India,

Indonesia, and the Middle East; through its trusteeship department for colonial peoples; through its specialized agencies on economic, social, educational, scentific, health, refugee, and judicial problems; and through the forum provided in the General Assembly for discussing conflicts in interest and creating world opinion.

Our national policy to strengthen the United Nations is clear. Our determination to hold fast in the cold war against aggressive tyranny is equally firm. To do this, we realize we must continue to be strong. No weak appeasement of the Communist tyranny will buy peace or freedom, and I know that is not what Mr. Polowsky is urging upon us. Existing programs of foreign economic and military assistance must be renewed. Point 4 and other new programs for the welfare and security of underprivileged peoples must be developed. We must within and alongside the United Nations develop those effective, supplemental agreements which will help to deter any aggressor by the clear promise of widespread, international resistance to any forces that move out to destroy free nations. And we must steadily seek to appeal to the Russian people for cooperation in our actions for peace, just as the soldiers at the Elbe 5 years ago joined in their oath that it should be done.

That it will take steady nerves, stout hearts, and our most highly trained intelligence is obvious. Every reasonable avenue for reaching agreements without appeasement must be explored. But the strength and integrity of the free nations must be maintained.

President Truman, on the occasion of the meeting at the Elbe, declared: "Nations which can plan and fight together shoulder to shoulder in the face of such obstacles of distance and of language as we have overcome, can live together and can work together in the common labor of the organization of the world for peace." And to the conferees at San Francisco he said: "We must build a new world—a far better world—one in which the eternal dignity of man is respected."

As we strive anew to attain these worthy objectives, I hope that the accompanying statement by Infantryman Polowsky will serve as an inspiration to all who read it and that his suggestion for the establishment of April 25 as a day of commemoration for international amity may have the fullest consideration as one means of enabling the people of every nation to speak out for peace.

THE OATH AT THE ELBE

(Statement by Joseph P. Polowsky, of Chicago, Ill.)

Five years ago today, on April 25, 1945—the day of the birth of the United Nations in San Francisco—six American soldiers crossed the Elbe River in a small boat, uniting on a common meeting ground the wartime Allied Armies of the east and the west.

The crossing of the Elbe River by the American Infantry patrol, led by Lt. Albert L. Kotzebue, joined together the United States First Army and the First Ukrainian Army of the Soviet Union, consummating a great Allied military endeavor. As the Allied Armies met at the Elbe River, the Allied Governments met at San Francisco to give birth to the United Nations.

On April 25, 1945, that majestic day of world history of the meeting of the nations as friends and brothers opening up a peaceful world, mankind, with its soldiers at the Elbe River, with its statesmen at San Francisco, showed itself in supreme dignity and devotion to purpose.

On the meeting ground at the Elbe River Maj. Anaphim Larianov and Capt. Vassili Medov of the Soviet First Ukrainian Army expressed the hope that April 25 be each year commemorated by the nations. April 25, 1949, on the fourth anniversary of the United Nations, the fourth anniversary of the meeting of the Allied Armies at the Elbe River, Ambassador Warren R. Austin, United States representative to the United Nations, wrote on behalf of the United States Government: "It seems to me important that we remember these two historic occasions, both of which should serve to inspire unceasing and successful striving for the maintenance of peace. * * * I wish to affirm my desire that appropriate means be found for its (April 25) being brought to the attention of the world each year." Ambassador Jacob A. Malik, representative of the Soviet Union to the United Nations, expressed similar sentiments on behalf of the Soviet Government. And the past and the present President of the General Assembly of the United Nations, Dr. Herbert V. Evatt and Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, have publicly endorsed the establishment of April 25 as a day of commemoration.

Five years ago today the soldiers of the world handed the oath of dedication and friendship, sworn in blood, on to the statesmen of the world met together at San Francisco. The United Nations has been entrusted with the obligation of taking the initiative in carrying forward every means of bringing us closer to a peaceful world. It must be the fervent hope of the nations of the world that the General Assembly of the United Nations, as it reconvenes in session, will approve a resolution to the effect that:

"The General Assembly recommends that each year on April 25 the United States and the Soviet Union commemorate, with appropriate ceremonies, the anniversary of April 25, 1945, when their armies at the Elbe River and their governments at San Francisco met as friends to help open up a peaceful world; recommends that other states members of the United Nations join in the commemorative ceremonies."

On April 25, 1945, addressing the delegates meeting at the birth of the United Nations in San Francisco, the chairman of the opening session said: "We approach our task humbly, but with united resolution. The prayers of the people of the world are with us. They are spoken in many tongues and in the words of many creeds. But they are as one voice, rising from the tragedy and suffering of war, in prayer for lasting peace. Thus fortified, and with the guidance of Almighty God, we must and shall fulfill the purpose for which we have come together."

Approaching their task humbly, but with united resolution, the soldiers grouped at the Elbe River on April 25, 1945, were also attempting to fulfill the purpose for which they had come together.

On the evening of April 22, 1945, an enemy engineer platoon, retreating westward, had blown the bridge over the Elbe at Strehla. A half hour later a civilian wagon train of some 200 old men, women, and children, streaming westward, and stopped by the blown bridge, had encamped for the night, huddled in a semicircle about the bridgehead. At 1 in the morning, April 23, 1945, the advancing Russians saw lights flickering at the bridgehead from a distance. Believing enemy military units were engaged for a stand, they bombarded the bridgehead with artillery.

At 11:30 in the morning, April 25, 1945—2 days later—Lieutenant Kotzebue's patrol reached the west bank of the Elbe at Strehla. Upon being recognized by the Russians on the east bank, the Americans prepared for a crossing. The only means available for the crossing was an old wooden boat moored to the shore. The Elbe, flooded by spring rains, was a swift running river. To avoid being swept downstream when making their crossing, the Americans moved the boat upstream in order to be swept by the river into a 50-yard remnant of the bridge jutting out from the east bank of the Elbe. Achieving their objective, the six American infantrymen raced over the remains of the span jutting out from the east bank, crossed the Elbe River at noon and were greeted by the Russians.

The greetings took place in the midst of some two hundred corpses of old men, women, and children. After the preliminary greetings, the Americans and Russians looked down at the bodies, and fragments of bodies—especially the body of a child with blue eyes and long brown hair clutching crayons in one hand and a doll in the other.

At this historic moment of the meeting of the nations, all of the soldiers present—Americans and Russians—swore that they would do everything in their power to prevent such things from ever happening again, swore that the nations would and must live at peace.

The time has come for the nations to reaffirm that solemn oath at the Elbe.

As one of the six American infantrymen to make the boat crossing over the Elbe 5 years ago, as one of the American and Russian soldiers to take the oath at the Elbe, I believe I voice something of the thoughts and feelings of all of us on this fifth anniversary.

I therefore join in calling upon the nations for a new birth of conciliation and friendship, that the oath sworn on the blood-soaked historic ground at the Elbe River shall not have been taken in vain.

The Owen Lattimore Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 25 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Rapid City Journal entitled "Not Disloyalty, Just American Tragedy." The editorial discusses a phase of the Lattimore situation which has not been as well publicized as some of the other features.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOT DISLOYAL, JUST AMERICAN TRAGEDY

What is the difference, in the end, to his country, whether a man betrays it, or by his teachings leads it to great disaster?

The former is the more heinous, but the latter, to the country, may be a greater calamity.

Owen Lattimore was not a top agent for Soviet Russia, as charged by Senator McCARTHY, but he was the author of 12 books, whose teaching helped the Communists to win China, perhaps all Asia. So thinks Time magazine.

Lattimore, says Time, paid "lip service" against appeasement of Communists in Asia, but his argument "was in effect a detailed program for appeasement."

The writings of Lattimore, according to Time in its issue of April 17, urged the United States to—

"1. Pull out of Korea.

"2. Forget Japan as a potential ally in Asia.

"3. Hurry up recognition and trade with Communist China.

"4. Divorce itself from America's European allies in the Far East, i. e., Britain, France, the Netherlands.

"5. Avoid local entanglements—meaning, presumably, military assistance to non-Communist nations—that might annoy Russia if and when the United States negotiates an over-all deal with Joseph Stalin."

This program sounds dangerously close to the Kremlin line.

Time does not say so, but the program probably looks to the average American like a proposal that the United States get out of China and let Russia do its worst.

"These ideas," thinks the magazine, "do not constitute a crime, and they do not constitute disloyalty. But it was nevertheless a tragedy that United States complacency about Asia allowed the ideas of Lattimore & Co. to have as much effect as they did."

Mental and moral poison is not so readily identified as the physical article, but it is often even more deadly.

Tribute to Thomas Jefferson by Harry H. Schlacht

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 25 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I believe that there are few, if any, Members of the United States Senate who have not become familiar with and devoted admirers of the patriotic editorials authored by Mr. Harry H. Schlacht, in the Hearst newspapers throught the Nation. These editorials are printed in the Milwaukee Sentinel in my own State, and in the newspapers of Mr. William Randolph Hearst throughout the Nation, where they have become hallmarks of great patriotic endeavor. These are not mere editorials in prose, because I think that they are more akin to the Psalmist songs of old—hymns of devotion to great ideals, hymns whose music sings in our ears and which are a delight to our eyes.

I have one such poem-hymn in my hands now. It was published in my own State and elsewhere throughout the Nation in tribute to the two hundred and seventh anniversary of the birth of the great American, Thomas Jefferson, a man of whom Abe Lincoln wrote:

The principles of Jefferson are the definitions and axioms of free society.

It was Woodrow Wilson who said of Jefferson:

The immortality of Jefferson does not lie in any one of his achievements, but in his attitude toward mankind.

And a great Member of the Congress, a great son of the South, Henry Clay, stated:

The name of Jefferson will be hailed with gratitude, his memory honored and cherished as the second founder of the liberties of the people.

Mr. President, I am proud to call attention to this beautiful editorial tribute paid by Harry H. Schlacht to Tom Jefferson—an editorial parallel to these quotations which I have just read.

In these days, when so many so-called sophisticated folks think that patriotism is old-fashioned, that love of the flag, love of the Constitution, reverence of great heroes of the past—that these aspects of devotion—are old-fashioned, I am glad that there are voices speaking out proudly like those of Harry Schlacht, and I am glad that they are published in so tremendous a medium, read by so many millions of devoted readers—the Hearst newspapers of the United States.

It may seem odd that a Republican should call attention to an editorial in praise of Tom Jefferson, who has been adopted in a certain sense by the Democrats as their particular hero, but, Mr. President, Tom Jefferson is a name and a symbol common to all Americans.

I ask unanimous consent, therefore, that the text of this lovely editorial be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THOMAS JEFFERSON: HIS INSPIRATION IS OUR BATTLE CRY

(By Harry H. Schlacht)

Stanch friend of Liberty,
In every American home
Thy memory is blessed.

Today we celebrate the two hundred and seventh anniversary of the birth of Thomas Jefferson.

His name is written on every heart. His name springs instinctively to every tongue.

Jefferson was the third President of the United States. He was the author of the Declaration of Independence. He was the author of the Virginia Statute of Religious Liberty. He was the father of the University of Virginia.

He opened the window into the soul of the multitude. He declared that "the same God that gave us liberty gave us life."

He was the father of our democracy.

He was one of the great humanitarians of his century. He was one of the foremost liberators of the human spirit. He was one of the outstanding exponents of Americanism. He was one of the principal architects of our Republic.

He gave liberty and its heroes the noblest document that ever came from mortal pen—the "Bible" of American freedom—the Declaration of Independence.

In the Declaration of Independence he wrote the words which became the bulwark of freedom; he wrote the words which set forth the fundamental truth that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed; he wrote the undying expression that in a free society every citizen is entitled to the inalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

The immortal words "All men are created equal" will yet find expression throughout the world.

These truths are the foundation stones of free government. These truths are the words of the apostle of man.

Behold our modern Moloch across the sea who seeks to destroy our democracy.

It was for democracy that humanity fought. Humanity will continue to fight until democracy holds sway.

Peace will not be attained until democracy begins her rightful reign o'er the world.

We have fought on many war fronts. We have given of our best blood. We have given of our hardest toil. We have given of our enormous wealth.

We did not receive or ask for one square foot of soil. We did not receive or ask for a single material gain.

We have a right to demand that for which we alone have made such a tremendous sacrifice—liberty for oppressed humans.

Let us all pray that humanity may march onward and upward; may attain to that highest goal—where all men shall recognize the brotherhood of man, where all men shall recognize the Fatherhood of God.

The wreaths on other brows may fall away, leaf after leaf, withered and faded, but time will add a greener freshness to the everlasting verdure of Jefferson's laurels.

To us he has passed the torch. It is our trust to keep it bright.

His inspiration is our battle cry.

Imports of Russian Furs, Nuts, and Crabmeat Protested

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1950

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an excellent article by Victor Riesel who points out that American workers are being forced to compete with forced Soviet labor. Imports of Russian furs, crabmeat, and nuts are threatening three great Pacific Northwest industries. The facts set forth in Mr. Riesel's article, which appeared in 154 of the country's largest newspapers, have already been called to the attention of Secretary of the Treasury John Snyder, who has the authority under a 1930 law to prohibit the importation of goods made by forced labor.

The article follows:

INSIDE LABOR

(By Victor Riesel)

If all the American dollars the Russians have were laid end to end today, they'd reach from some of our fancy fur shops, gourmet haunts and fashionable shoe salons to a Siberian slave camp cluster in Novosibirsk.

Sound bitter? All right, I'm bitter, though they tell me bitterness at dead line means ulcers inside the waistline. But this story that Soviet slave labor is killing United States jobs because a handful of American traders want to make a fast buck, is going to be told as swiftly as the information can be whisked into the country and authenticated. There are many of us who are sensitive over slavery and horrified that some United States merchants are buying stuff made by the living dead—only slightly removed from those human slag heaps our GI's found in Nazi camps at the war's end.

I find, for example, that the Director of United Nations Purchasing Department, which spends several million dollars a year, is now in Europe, bound sooner or later for Czechoslovakia and Russia. He's going to see how their prices stack up against those of our free European friends and the quotations of United States businessmen.

The UN director, World Brother Fred A. Mapes, is looking for floor coverings, radio

equipment, broadcasting apparatus, carpeting, office machinery, and furniture supplies—to equip that new, starkly utilitarian UN headquarters, a few streets from here on Manhattan's East River Drive. Mr. Mapes needn't worry about low prices in Soviet-land—the MVD can cut labor costs at any one of the 64 political prison labor camps which process lumber, or in the Morvda region wood-finishing plants, inside the barbed wire at Potma and Yavas. Furniture and floor coverings might not come so cheaply from free lands, but a lot of us would feel better if we sat on chairs in UN headquarters that didn't have blood mixed in the furniture stain. And, incidentally, the United States and free Europe could use the jobs those millions of dollars' worth of UN purchasing would create.

This next bit hurts to report, because the ladies in mink and silver fox are so lovely these early spring days. But they should know that some $55,666,000 worth of Soviet furs are being pumped into this country each year—skins of lovely little beasts who made the sad Soviet error of mooching in too close to the special slave hunting camps at Novoya Zemlya and the Island of Vaigach. So the political prisoners shot them, skinned them and thus set them free of MVD.

Once the liberated skins hit this country they did two things: They put United States fur breeders out of business. And they so undercut fur prices offered by other friendly and democratic nations that they hurt the economy of these free lands, which have depended on our market for the sale of their furs for years (at normal competitive prices). Result: Only a few years ago in Washington, there were more than 200 fox farmers doing a thriving business. Today—only three are left. And the 400 mink farmers (who breed the soft little animals) report, through their Congressman, that they "are still in business but how long (they) will be able to compete with these foreign importations is problematical."

Hardly a pleasant thought at a moment when jobs in the soft industries are disappearing.

Recently I reported that Soviet crabmeat was coming in directly from Siberian slave fishing camps. Now I'm informed that the Russians are offering United States importers an additional $20,000,000 worth of the delicacy at a price which no American canner can meet.

Result: One cannery in Bellingham, Washington, already has announced it will close in the face of Soviet competition—and the fishing industry, especially crab fishing, in New England (already depressed in spots by vanishing textile jobs), Maryland and the Pacific coast, is threatened by this slave labor competition.

Recently I reported that the Russians are shipping over huge quantities of walnuts, direct from Sovietized Manchuria. Now comes word that the USSR, selling the nuts at 42 cents a pound compared with the 62 cents American pickers get, is threatening to depress the entire nut market, which will be forced to compete with low-priced walnuts. Sound funny? Not to those who grow them or pick them for a living.

But all this at least is on the open market. Now the iron curtain sharpies are developing a new technique to nip us. Czechoslovakian shoe manufacturers turn out the footwear without any identification marks, ship them here, throw them into American boxes and sell them as American shoes. Result: Ask the skilled but jobless shoe workers.

I don't like to be technical. But all this is against the law: Right in Section 1307 of the Tariff Act of 1930 it says so.

"All goods * * * mined, produced, or manufactured wholly or in part in any foreign country by convict labor and/or forced labor shall not be entitled to entry at any ports of the United States."

Doesn't anybody care?

The Truman Program to Date

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1950

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent of the House I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the attached editorial from the New York Times, dated Wednesday, April 12, 1950, entitled "The Truman Program to Date":

THE TRUMAN PROGRAM TO DATE

Yesterday was the President's first full day back at his White House desk after a month of vacationing in Florida. Also, it was just about the halfway mark in this, the first session of the Eighty-first Congress. Quite logically, therefore, Mr. Truman made it his first business to review with his Congressional lieutenants the legislative developments of the last 3 months and to evaluate the prospects for the 3 months or thereabout that lie ahead before the session's adjournment.

Senator LUCAS of Illinois reported at the end of the White House conference that the President was pretty well satisfied with the progress of his program. Before Congress goes home for the summer, Senator LUCAS expects that it will pass the foreign economic and arms aid programs, increase social security benefits, reduce some excise taxes, extend rent control, and increase the borrowing power of the Commodity Credit Corporation. He believes, he told newsmen, that the President will get about 90 percent of his 21 government reorganization plans, and that Democratic leaders will make a determined effort to obtain action on a fair-employment-practices bill.

Even if these objectives are realized the administration would be settling for half a loaf, compared with the comprehensive program set forth by the President in his state of the Union message in January. Senator LUCAS apparently holds little hope of getting any action on such administration issues as the Brannan farm plan, health insurance, tax legislation, expansion of unemployment coverage and the ITO (International Trade Organization). As for repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act, that is admittedly further away than ever. "Everyone knows," said Mr. LUCAS, "that we are not even considering taking that up again this year. There is no point in going through the same debate we had last year. It would come out the same way."

On the basis of the record of the past 3 months, even the half a loaf would appear at this juncture to be a rather dubious possibility. Between January 3 and last Friday, when Congress recessed for Easter, 2,354 bills and resolutions had been introduced in the two Houses, of which 31 had become law or were awaiting the signature of the President. But of these 31 only 4 could be said to represent either important or controversial legislation. There were (1) the repeal of all Federal taxes on oleomargarine; (2) aid to Korea; (3) changes in farm acreage allotments for cotton and peanuts, and (4) revision of controls on natural gas. (An important bill liberalizing the Displaced Persons Act was awaiting reconcilation in conference.) Thus, with half the session gone, the administration has yet to achieve its first major legislative victory. On the other hand, some of its favorite proposals have been badly manhandled. Both the Senate and House voted to knock out of the housing bill the proposal to subsidize cooperative residential building schemes for persons in the middle-income brackets. The House produced an FEPC bill which was completely without teeth, while the Senate has thus far succeeded in avoiding a showdown on this issue.

These developments should not come as too great a surprise, however, the circumstances being what they are. In the first place, this is a congressional election year, which traditionally means a minimum of controversial or unpopular legislation. In the second place, the program of must legislation presented to Congress in January was far too inclusive for anyone seriously to hope that it could, or should, all be enacted at the present session. There has, as a matter of fact, been altogether too much inclination in the past 2 or 3 years to identify the volume of legislative production with the success of a given session. It is high time for de-emphasis of this concept. We welcome yesterday's statement by Senator LUCAS, therefore, that the Senate plans to confine itself to consideration of only about 8 of the administration's major legislative proposals between now and the end of the session. There is such a thing as trying to do so many things in a limited time that none of them is really done well.

Communists in Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 25 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Mundt-Ferguson Bill," from the Aberdeen American News, of Aberdeen, S. Dak., recommending the early passage of the so-called Mundt-Ferguson-Johnson bill, dealing with the thought that it is time to do something besides talk about Communists in Government.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MUNDT-FERGUSON BILL

Senator KARL MUNDT, Republican, of South Dakota, who scored a victory in his long anti-Communist campaign when Alger Hiss was convicted, is finding satisfaction these days in explaining the objectives of his bill designed to curb subversive activities in the United States.

Interest in the Mundt-Ferguson bill has increased with the attention directed upon communistic influences by the charges Senator MCCARTHY, Republican, of Wisconsin, has made.

Senator MUNDT had a Nation-wide audience for his explanation of the bill Friday night when he was interviewed by newsmen on a radio network program.

The bill undertakes to do four things:

To make unlawful a conspiracy to perform any act which would substantially contribute to the establishment within the United States of a totalitarian dictatorship under foreign control.

To require the Communist movement in the United States, in view of its foreign-directed character, to operate in the open rather than underground.

To cut the threads which bind the international Communist conspiracy together by restricting international travel of members

of the American section of the world Communist movement.

To protect the integrity of our Government by denying Government employment to members of the American section of the world Communist movement and by protecting the security secrets of the United States against agents of a foreign government or the Communist movement.

In an interesting comment on the Mundt-Ferguson bill the Washington Evening Star called attention to these questions:

Is the Communist conspiracy real enough to justify the enactment of such a measure?

Will the Constitution permit its enforcement if enacted?

The Washington newspaper offered its own answers which should be satisfactory to Senator MUNDT and fellow supporters of the bill. It concluded:

"The reality of the conspiracy is attested by the fact that we are spending more than $20,000,000,000 a year to defend ourselves against the Communists and to check their encroachments abroad. In that setting, it would be an absurdity not to do all that can be done to curb the Communists and their sympathizers in this country. Will the Constitution permit this? If not, then it follows that that document denies to Congress the power to adopt laws to protect the Nation against those who would use our constitutional liberties to destroy us. It is hard to believe that this is the case.

"It seems to the Star that Congress should make all possible improvements in the bill, and then pass it. After that, it can be tested in the courts. But it should not be permitted to die simply because some people think it is unconstitutional and because some others pretend to think so."

A Letter From Charlie Moore, a Real American, Former Governor of Idaho and Commissioner of the General Land Office

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, there is inserted herewith a letter recently received from the former Governor of Idaho expressing his views on national policies and present-day trends, for the consideration of my colleagues:

APRIL 20, 1950.

Hon. HENRY C. DWORSHAK,
United States Senate,
Hon. JOHN SANBORN,
House of Representatives,
Hon. COMPTON I. WHITE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIRS: For some time I have been contemplating writing each of you, but I realize your heavy duties and the memory of my own official life both in Idaho and in Washington, D. C., when I received so many letters and so many suggestions that I now hesitate to even write a friendly letter, much less make suggestions. However, neither age nor retirement from activity prevent me from keeping posted as well as possible—I read most everything worth reading—and as an American citizen I am still keenly interested.

For some years I have spent considerable time down here with my son who has been long an invalid from arthritis, and added to that this year I, myself, had to again submit to operations and was hospitalized for some time. I should be home in Idaho this time of year, but it will probably be at least a couple of more months before I can go.

Some of the things that run through my mind are so-called displaced persons. The records so far are a disgrace; I am wondering how long and to what extent this policy is to be continued. I am also wondering how long and to what extent we as a Nation propose to support the rest of the world. I know the general answer or what the excuse is; that it is necessary to keep the world from going communistic. What a fallacy. I can remember when as a small boy and more than 75 years ago, when assisting my father, a stranger came to our Missouri home and insisted that father attend a meeting in the cause of humanity and for the collection of moneys to educate the heathen Chinese. My father's reply was: "The Chinese are a much older nation than we; their ideas of religion, of living, and of their form of life was such that any contribution or suggestions from other sources would have little or no effect upon the life of the Chinese." How true this statement was, and more emphatic today than ever. I still remember Washington's advice in his Farewell Address: To beware of foreign entanglements.

Economically our great questions seem finance—debt, support of the world. How long can we carry the burden? England, France, and other nations have made it decidedly plain to us that regardless of how much money we spend on them they will pursue their usual way of life, and even if war comes with Russia that they will not decisively join us. I have no objections to France's system of high living, or to England's socialistic and communistic form of government, but I think it a shame for United States taxpayers to continue to even attempt to foot their bills.

Respectfully yours,

C. C. MOORE.

"Fancy Dan" Economics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 24, 1950

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent of the House, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the attached editorial entitled "'Fancy Dan' Economics" taken from the Daily Times, published in Mamaroneck, N. Y., Wednesday, April 12, 1950:

"FANCY DAN" ECONOMICS

Uncle Sam now has nearly a million pounds of butter in his refrigerator. He plans to buy more—many millions of pounds more. That is necessary to keep prices up.

A new law was adopted to cover cotton and peanuts. Already there are huge surpluses in each commodity. Now under the new law we shall have even larger surpluses, since this act authorizes planting of more acreage.

These are only three items in our national economy. But they are significant and, combined, they will extract hundreds of millions of dollars from the pockets of taxpayers and from the budget of housewives.

Because, the policy is in direct defiance of the law of supply and demand. It is a policy born of partisan politics, deliberately designed to rivet to the Truman administration the farmers' vote this fall. The taxpayers and consumers who foot the bill to pay for these votes are expected to forget, for such "Fancy-Dan" economics are difficult of layman comprehension, these politicians believe.

November will show if they are right in that belief.

Let's Have the Truth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD H. VELDE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1950

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Peoria Star, April 22, 1950, entitled "Let's Have the Truth":

LET'S HAVE THE TRUTH

Many Americans are engaged in the dubious practice of deciding the guilt or innocence of principal figures in the present State Department investigation. The interests of the Nation would be better served if public judgment were withheld, at least until all the evidence is in. Unfortunately, persons in high positions in Washington have been doing everything possible to sway public opinion one way or another before the evidence was heard.

One of the first noticeable results of Senator MCCARTHY's charges against Owen Lattimore was Secretary Acheson's nervousness. He was quick to disclaim all possible connection of the State Department with Lattimore. He admitted that Lattimore had been consulted on Far East policy, but did not want the public to think that Lattimore was an employee of the State Department or that he was the architect of Far East policy.

That was one of the first positive signs, to close observers of the Washington scene, that Senator MCCARTHY had something substantial and that the administration knew it.

The next sign was the obvious campaign, on a Nation-wide scale, to discredit Senator MCCARTHY by attacks upon his reputation. If the Senator had not had in his possession some important and damaging information, he would not have been made the object of such an intensive smear campaign.

We are not going to say or even hint at this time that Lattimore is guilty of the charges brought against him by Senator MCCARTHY, but we think it is not unfair to point out that Lattimore is receiving about the same frantic support that Alger Hiss received from the administration when he was accused of aiding Communist spies. We expect John Stewart Service also to be given administration protection. The pattern has been so well established that certain events can be predicted with almost certainty.

The testimony of Louis F. Budenz, once editor of the Communist paper, the Daily Worker, seems to have made Senator MCCARTHY top man in the Washington picture. Budenz named Lattimore as a former member of a Soviet spy cell and a person under Communist Party discipline. Since Budenz was the Government's star witness in the trial of 11 American Communist leaders, his testimony carries much weight.

But again we observe the irrational response to damaging testimony. Instead of accepting it as evidence to be weighed, Lattimore's friends immediately started trying to counteract it and discredit Budenz. These

things all too plainly indicate that in high places in Washington the primary goal is not to learn the truth about Lattimore but to save him.

The people, at least in this part of the country, want the truth, we think. And they are going to see glimpses of it, no matter what efforts are made to conceal it.

The Federal Dispensary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 24, 1950

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune for Sunday, April 9, 1950, titled "The Federal Dispensary":

THE FEDERAL DISPENSARY

The President wants to raise the level of unemployment-insurance benefits throughout the country. He wants all States to pay the same rates. At the present time each State determines the size and duration of payments but must meet certain Federal standards in order to participate in the tax-kitty which Washington disburses according to its idea of what each State needs for proper enforcement. The States may have different views, but they depend willy-nilly upon the largess distributed by the Federal authorities. Thus New York which pays a very high amount of the total tax collected for the Federal fund has consistently complained that it did not get enough back for proper investigation against fraudulent claims. The country spends approximately $70,000,000 just to administer unemployment insurance compensation in the States. A large part of the administrative expense is due to the difficulty of checking against fraudulent claims. There are apparently a number of people to whom present benefits are sufficiently attractive to cause them to evade work by one device or another.

Perhaps in some States the amount and duration of benefits is too low. In other States they may be too high. In some States the tax paid by employers has snowballed into such large reserve funds that the States have felt warranted in transferring from these funds to start disability insurance systems. The differences in economic conditions within the various States have been reflected in the benefits enacted into State laws. Certainly it is clear that a State whose economy is largely agrarian has a different problem from a State that is largely industrial. To take from the States the power to deal realistically on their intimate knowledge of their own unemployment problem is very dangerous.

The President's program will put all States on a common national schedule of benefits. In States where the real value of a dollar is relatively high, this national schedule will enormously increase the invitation to cheat, and hence the difficulty and expense of sound administration in the public interest. Even though the President at the same time urged that Federal laws concerning fraud and disqualifications should be strengthened, a uniform national standard approximately 20 percent higher than the present standards invites the very abuses of which he is apparently cognizant. But of even more serious import is the principle of the Federal Government determining a fixed standard for every State in the Union regardless of their economic differences and their local problems—a standard which the people affected will recognize as coming from the Federal Government. If the President's program is adopted we will have taken another long step toward making our people look to Washington as the dispenser of all social benefits. This is repugnant to the American tradition of individual and State responsibility.

The United States Treasury Has the Idle Money Metal Bought and Paid for if We Will Use It To Lighten the Excise Tax Load—Statement of Congressman White Before the Committee on Ways and Means

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, the war is over and has been for 4 years, but the American people are still forced to pay burdensome excise taxes on many of the everyday necessities of life.

While the people have been paying these excise taxes to support their Government, we have had a huge pile of money metal bought and paid for, sterilized and lying idle in the Treasury. The Treasury now has 167,376,637 ounces of sterilized and idle silver which can be turned into silver certificates amounting to $216,538,785 overnight and put into circulation in paying Government expense. Instead of using this idle money, we are required to pay excise taxes on such things as baby oil, talcum powder, telegraph and telephone tolls, and transportation charges.

Back in 1942, before the Treasury began to scatter our store of sterilized money metal by lease-lend gifts to foreign nations for their use as money, we had on hand in the Treasury 1,361,222,166.7 ounces of sterilized silver which could have been put in circulation as silver certificates and used in paying Government expenses amounting to $1,759,964,011.34; 410,814,344 ounces of this silver has been given to foreign countries to be used by them as money. These governments are pledged to return every ounce of this silver. With the idle money metal we have and the silver that will be returned to us now overdue, which can readily be converted into silver certificates—legal tender paper currency redeemable in silver dollars, why should we continue to carry this heavy load of excise taxes?

Following is the statement I made before the Committee on Ways and Means:

STATEMENT OF HON. COMPTON I. WHITE, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF IDAHO

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am Congressman COMPTON I. WHITE, of the First District of Idaho.

Before proceeding I want to take this occasion to thank the members of this committee for their courtesy in prolonging the hearings so as to give me a cchance to appear before the committee, now I feel as if I belonged.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. WHITE informed the chairman and perhaps other members of the committee that he had some suggestions along the line of monetary reform that he thinks would help us in solving our complex fiscal problems.

Mr. WHITE. Further along in my discussion I want to answer very definitely the question raised by Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. If you repeal the excise taxes, where are you going to get the money to make up the loss in revenue?

I come before you in support of the plan to repeal or reduce the wartime excise tax. We have to differentiate between these excise taxes that support our Government, liquor, cigarettes, things of that kind and I suppose they will not be disturbed. But the wartime taxes are working a hardship on our people and we have a lot of letters and telegrams from all over our State suggesting that now that the war is over these taxes be repealed.

I am going to read a short letter from a lady from Idaho Falls, as follows:

"We are in favor of repeal of excise taxes in their entirety on transportation, telephone, telegram, and teletype machines. Taxes on these services constitute undue hardship upon the produce handlers all over the country as they are the tools of our trade.

"Your favorable vote on the repeal of these taxes will be appreciated."

That is signed Rosa Cowlan. I just want to read two or three of these letters because I think they make a point. Here is another letter from Miss Myrtle Ayers, of Mullan, Idaho, which reads:

"As a citizen of the State of Idaho, I would solicit your help in repealing the excise tax.

"The reason I think it should be repealed is that this is a wartime tax and since we are no longer at war, there is no need for this tax.

"This tax is also discriminatory to business, and it is a drain on the poor people. They cannot afford to pay this tax for the articles they need.

"Cosmetics are no longer a luxury, they are a necessity for a woman. Baby powder and baby oils are not a luxury, therefore they should not be taxed. Most of the articles taxed now are necessities.

"I would greatly appreciate your help in trying to repeal this tax if it is at all possible."

Here is another letter from A. G. Stanger, of Idaho Falls, which reads:

"It looks as if there is a possibility, if an effort is put forth, to get these notions taxes eliminated, and certainly the time is long past due and these taxes should be done away with.

"If there is any reason in the world why we should pay a 25-percent tax on telephone tolls, Western Union charges on teletype messages, together with the nuisance taxes on such items as baby talc, and so forth, it is a mystery to the writer. These penalties that are being paid 5 years after the war is over are hindering us from doing business in a sane and sensible manner.

"We certainly urge you to exert every effort possible to see that these taxes are eliminated so that we can again operate on a basis that has a semblance of normalcy.

"Your efforts will be greatly appreciated by everyone in business from the State you are representing."

Now, answering the question of the gentleman from Pennsylvania. We have over in the Treasury 167,376,637 ounces of money metals, silver sterilized and set aside that is not being used in any way, that could be turned into $216,538,785 in silver certificates, good currency, the kind you are getting paid when you get paid for your services as a Congressman, silver certificates, getting $1, $5, and $10 denominations.

Only a part of this money metal over in the Treasury is sterilized, it's laying there idle while a large part of the silver bought under the same program is used in circulating silver certificates.

Mr. DINGELL. I agree with you on that.

Mr. WHITE. Sterilized money metal that is of no use. You have $2,000,000,000, do not forget that, in silver metal, or money metal, now in use every day in the form of silver certificates. There is not a man anywhere in the United States that gets a $1 bill and is not using $1 of silver because this bill is redeemable in silver money. It is good money and the United States dollar all over the world is good and we might just as well put that idle money metal in the Treasury, and the silver that will come back from Europe and put it to work as money in the form of silver certificates and do away with these excise taxes.

Why penalize the mother that uses talcum powder and baby oils in dressing her baby? Why penalize the girls and housewives that use toilet preparations? Why penalize the farmers and businessmen that use the telephone and telegraph services as their tools in conducting their everyday business and increase the cost of living by putting an excise tax on the movement of freight to raise tax money—while we are keeping $216,000,000 in money metal, that has been bought and paid for, idle in the Treasury?

It is unthinkable that we should tax talcum powder and baby oil. I do not think there is a man in this room but when he made his advent into the world his parents used talcum powder on his skin. Why should that tax be made when we have almost $1,000,000,000 over in the Treasury that has been laying there idle; it is not used to back silver certificates, just held there. Let us put it to work and that is the solution of this excise tax I am making to the committee. If we will take that 1,000,000,000 idle dollars we have in the Treasury and use it, we will be doing a thorough, business-like job.

I want to read into the record some information, as to what we have done with some of this silver. It is good enough to use as money over in Europe and good enough over in Asia but it is not good enough for us. The total amount of silver lend-leased to foreign governments, by countries, is as follows: Australia, 11,773,093 ounces; Belgium, 261,333 ounces; Ethiopia, 5,425,000 ounces; Fiji Islands, 196,364 ounces; Great Britain, 88,073,878 ounces.

I was just told by the Treasury that they put it in circulation not as $1.29 an ounce, which is the value of our dollar, but at $2 an ounce. Now they are gradually retiring this silver money and putting out paper substitutes but it was good enough to tide them over during the war in the emergency.

Next we have India with 225,999,904 ounces; Netherlands, 56,737,341 ounces; and Saudi Arabia, 22,347,431 ounces.

In all, gentlemen, 410,814,344 ounces of our money that is capable of being put into circulation in the form of these silver certificates, 1-, 5-, and 10-dollar bills, and that is what you get handed to you for your pay when you go to the Sergeant at Arms. That amount of silver is equivalent of $531,153,899 that could be put into circulation and take off these objectionable taxes.

All the silver that has been returned under lend-lease agreements amounts to 261,333 fine ounces, received from Belgium. Of all that list of countries that have our silver and circulated as money, only one country, Belgium, is returning it, and this comes to you from the Treasury Department, and I will be pleased to file it for the record. This is under date of January 18, 1950.

That is not all of the silver. Sales of Treasury silver under the Green Act at 71 cents per fine ounce, during the period from July 1943 through December 1945 amounted to 167,380,241 fine ounces. Sales of silver under the act of July 31, 1946, at 90.5 cents per fine ounce for the period August 1947 through December 1949 amount to 10,997 fine ounces.

The largest amount of silver loaned to Defense Plants Corporation, silver for nonconsumptive purposes during the war period amounted to 902,622,278 fine ounces. As of December 31, 1949, a total of 499,101,737 fine ounces have been returned to the Treasury.

I might say that about half of that silver is still out, money metal, if you please, that is good money in any nation in the world. There is a clamor for American dollars. They will take our silver certificates at full face anywhere, and we are not using this sterilized silver that is just as good as any of the silver we are using for money.

I just want to take a minute to correct one impression. Every Member of this Congress can have the Treasury bulletin that comes out monthly. Do you know what the Government has made on the silver-purchase program since 1934 when I was a member and helped pass that act? Do you know how much money the Government has actually made in profit? Talk about a subsidy to the miners.

Here is a table right here on page 51 and it comes under the date of January 1950. I am just going to read you the total of silver that has been put out, bought as metal, revalued in coin. You have made $833,600,000. In computing the silver, there are a lot of categories, but in dollars you have made since 1934, $833,000,000.

Mr. REED. Might I ask a question at this point?

Mr. WHITE. I will be free to answer questions but just let me finish.

Mr. REED. All right.

Mr. WHITE. The total that has been made in actual profit to the Government, is $1,098,100,000. Had they coined all the silver that I am talking about, lying idle, sterilized in the Treasury and the silver that is coming back from foreign countries, they agreed that every ounce of this silver loaned foreign countries is to be returned. If we had used all that silver as money, the potential before we commenced to send that away is $1,048,200,000 as shown on page 51 of the United States Treasury Bulletin for February. The figure I read you is in 1943. After we began the lend-lease they must not have expected to get it back because the table began to drop and today it shows only $124,300,000, a drop from $1,000,000,000. That is the record of the operation of your Treasury and our money system.

Remember the silver program and the Silver Purchase Act are the only monetary programs on which the Treasury makes a profit.

Mr. DINGELL. You mean it makes a profit on silver?

Mr. WHITE. Certainly

Mr. DINGELL. When the world price is 32 cents an ounce, and we are paying 97 cents and 92 cents, yet we are making money?

Mr. WHITE. Yes.

Mr. DINGELL. I would not pay 92 cents for something worth 32 cents on the open market.

Mr. SIMPSON. From whom did we make the profit?

Mr. WHITE. The miners who mined the silver.

Mr. SIMPSON. You said we made a profit?

Mr. WHITE. It costs 1 penny to make a $100 bill or $1,000 bill or $1 bill. You have the cost of the paper, ink, silk, and all that; that cost is 1 cent. You are going to tell me that when the Government prints that money for 1 cent and puts it out as $100 that that is not a profit?

Mr. SIMPSON. You were talking about a profit and I asked you from whom we made the profit.

Mr. WHITE. It is like anything else. If you raise onions or raise a cow and sell it for $100, the difference betwen the cost of producing and the selling price is the profit. If a miner brings silver out of the ground and sells it to the mint, the diffeernce between the price the miner receives for his silver and the value of the coin is the profit.

In the old days the handling of our money system, since 1792, when the first money law was enacted, we did not set any price on silver, we did not set any price on gold. We simply provided by law that when a man brought in his gold it was refined and the copper alloy was added and they did not even charge him for refining it, or adding the alloy. It was his gold and we stamped it indicating its weight and genuineness. In the case of silver when we had free coinage, taking it theoretically, we had scale balance at the mint and the miner when he came in put pure metal on one side of the balance and the people in the mint went to the bins and put standard silver dollars in the other side of the balance until the scales balanced. The miner took his silver dollars in payment for the silver and went about his business and the money was put in circulation.

The mint took its pure silver, added 10 percent copper and minted it and made the difference between the price of a dollar received by the miner for his pure silver as contrasted with the silver contents of the coined dollar and that in the aggregate totaled a large volume of profit.

Mr. REED. One question.

Mr. WHITE. I will be pleased to answer any questions.

Mr. REED. This is for information only; I am not familiar with this subject. When the Treasury buys the raw silver now, what form of money do they use in paying for that silver?

Mr. WHITE. It is in the law. The man simply brings in the pure silver and weighs in at the mint. The mint takes 30 percent today of that silver and gives him back 70 percent in dollars.

Mr. REED. That is the answer to my question. It was paid for with a bill from the printing press?

Mr. WHITE. You get paid with a check.

Mr. REED. What I am getting at is whether they pay you by check or with the bill? What you receive is the printed bill. The printing press does the business.

Mr. WHITE. Yes. We are always dealing with gold and silver which is money in itself and used all over the world. We simply use a paper credit token and you can issue a man an I O U and if he accepts it for its face, it is still a credit token.

Mr. REED. The foreigner can use the gold—our gold—which is good over there, but it is against the law for us to use here.

Mr. WHITE. It is against the law; yes.

This is the Silver Purchase Act of 1934. It was this committee right here, this chairman, who handled the Silver Purchase Act, because there was a tax feature in the silver bill. It went to this committee because it was a tax measure. Here is what it says:

"The Director of the Mint, with the consent of the owner, shall deduct and retain of such silver so received 45 percent as the seigniorage for services performed by the Government of the United States relative to the coinage and delivery of silver dollars. The balance of such silver so used, that is 55 percent, shall be coined into standard silver dollars at the same or any equal number of any other standard silver dollars shall be delivered to the owner or depositor of such silver, and no provision of law taxing such transfer of silver shall extend or apply to any delivery of silver to a United States mint under this section. The 45 percent of such silver deducted shall be retained as bullion of the Treasury or coined into standard silver dollars and held or disposed of in the same manner as other bullion or silver dollars held in or belonging to the Treasury."

There, gentlemen, is the essence of the whole act.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. DINGELL mentioned that silver is worth 30 cents. Where do you get that other idea?

Mr. WHITE. If the Government restriction on the movement and the price of silver were removed, price of silver would be higher than the coinage value of our dollar. With all the restrictions placed on silver by governments the world price is around 70 cents per ounce.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Did he mean that we could buy this silver in other countries for 30 cents an ounce?

Mr. WHITE. I think it is 70 cents on today's market.

Mr. DINGELL. I do not know the exact price.

Mr. EBERHARTER. As I understand your statement, if the United States Government should print $2,000,000,000 worth of paper money, there would be a profit of $1,000,000,000?

Mr. WHITE. Yes; if it printed certificates redeemable in silver dollars.

Mr. COOPER. We wish to thank you, Mr. WHITE, for the appearance and information you have given to the committee.

Mr. WHITE. I would like to say that I am not in favor of the reduction in mine percentage depletion and I would like to file these letters with the committee. I think that as long as this committee had the silver bill and put a transaction tax on silver I am asking that that be repealed. I think if you take off that little provision in the law silver will find its price level like any other commodity.

Mr. COOPER. We thank you for your appearance. You may turn in any letters that you want to file with the clerk.

Our next witness is Hon. FRANK A. BARRETT.

Congress in 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 24, 1950

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent of the House, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the attached editorial from the Daily Times, published in Mamaroneck, N. Y., Monday, April 10, 1950, entitled "Congress in 1950."

CONGRESS IN 1950

Just what, prior to the Easter recess, has Congress accomplished this year?

The displaced-persons bill, subject to reconciliation of minor differences between House and Senate, versions, has been passed.

The Federal taxes on oleomargarine have been repealed.

In agriculture, a half-baked plan for aid to "hardship" cases in cotton and peanuts had been adopted.

On housing, agreement has been reached between the two Houses on a measure which will expand the program but is without aid recommended for middle-class families.

And in foreign policy there is reason to expect agreement on European aid with only a moderate cut in administration requests. As for rearmament of our European friends, the outlook is favorable.

But in other fields, congressional accomplishments are meager. There is no taxation bill yet reported. The Truman civil rights program is apparently bogged deep. Federal aid to education seems roadblocked in the House. Rent control extension is not anticipated. Liberalization of social security is stalled in the Senate. Nothing is expected of the Truman appeal for compulsory health insurance. Selective service has not been extended.

Altogether, Congress in its 1950 session has passed little of what Mr. Truman promised. By contrast, the Eightieth Congress, which he called "do-nothing," was a beehive.

Clinton Centennial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 24, 1950

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to insert an editorial from the Clinton Daily Item:

Of course there are some people who believe that we must support a certain number of people in the Federal Government because there are not enough jobs to go around, but a vast amount of the hidden-tax money the Government is now spending could easily be spent by the very people from whom it is taken—by lower-income groups for milk, meat, and clothing; by middle-income groups for homes, furnishings, insurance, or college education; by higher-income groups for investments in new tools for industry.

Such money spent by individuals would create productive jobs for those now carried on the Government pay rolls.

No kind of spending benefits the Nation more than that used in increasing the productive capacity of the Nation.

Failing to realize that the people are paying the taxes many are easily led into clamoring for more Federal aids and into considering the United States Treasury as a Christmas tree. Lacking the adoption of any of the new programs urged by those in power, it is conservatively estimated that during the fiscal year ending June 30, next, the United States will spend between five and seven billion dollars more than the Nation's income.

If Congress adopts the new programs no man can prophecy how much the country will have to borrow, but all of us know that the next generation must pay it and that our greed for welfare and security will deny to our children the opportunities we enjoy and that they will have to pay for the folly of their fathers.

While it is true that the major part of our current increased expenditures go for national defense and foreign aid, this alone is not a satisfactory explanation of the vastly increased expenditures of the immediate past and the present because authentic figures show that in a single year we are spending $15,000,000,000 for the civilian domestic functions of the Federal Government which is making direct payments to 17,000,000 persons—one out of every nine of the population.

During World War II the military establishments employed one civilian to every five men in uniform but today they employ one person for every two in uniform.

The Federal Government is operating more than 50 corporations with assets exceeding $20,000,000,000, a group 10 times as large as the country's largest industrial corporation.

The coming generation now stepping on the scene cannot fail to realize that big government is growing bigger and that big government is more dangerous than big business.

Little governments can regulate big business and the United States Government can punish all who violate the laws against monopoly, but it is difficult to regulate big government.

Every true American hopes the coming generation, now facing the most critical financial condition in the history of this Nation may give us men who can find a solution to our dilemma other than to delegate more power in a central Government and one that will provide a turn to the right and end the appalling spectacle we now face in regimenting every individual.

Unless such a condition is solved the Communists may well say that they are the only ones who are really providing world leadership, that we are following in their wake and that they are riding the wave of the future.

The danger that faces the generation that will pour out of our local and national educational institutions, next June, is a disease that has proved fatal to many empires and great nations in the past.

It is the creeping paralysis that sets in with the inevitability of a law of nature when a government, however benevolent or well intentioned, embarks on a course of solving the individual's problem for him, of replacing individual Clinton in its infancy by state planning and state decree.

This kind of experiment has never succeeded and in all instances where it has been tried it has led, in the end, to moral, political and economic weakening, decay, and downfall.

Today it is a tragic irony that many men in high positions are advocating here these policies of statism which this country is fighting abroad, at enormous cost in money and effort.

We have accepted the responsibility of organizing the western world against communism which never reared its head in Washington until 1933, but which has grown like a fatal cancer in the intervening years until its sinister tentacles have fastened themselves on many of the leading departments of Government.

May the coming generation set the example here at home that we understand what that responsibility entails and that it has the strength and honesty to practice what we preach.

May our local citizens of tomorrow heed the words of former Postmaster General James A. Farley, who, only last month, soberly said that the present tax burden of the American people is about all they can stand and that unless we can find some way to check the enormous increase in the cost of government "we shall find ourselves living under a form of government which is utterly different from that in which we were born and under which our forefathers built a great country.

"We cannot, if we expect to remain a great and growing Nation indulge in an extension of the practice of deficit spending in times of prosperity such as these. An increase in our income taxes would probably yield less rather than more revenues. We must reduce our cost of Government and we must reduce it even if some people get hurt in the process.

"If we take the cost of Government in 1900," Mr. Farley said, "and compare it with the cost of Government for 1950 and then figure the same rate of increase for the next 50 years, our Government would cost six trillion dollars, or six times as much as the whole national income.

On that basis we would also have working for the Federal Government alone 20,000,000 men and women. The lesson of these simple figures is that, unless we find ways of reducing the cost of Government, it will soon grow so great as to consume not only everything that we have all saved, but everything that we call property, which is owned

by all of us. This is a very sobering situation.

In urging a decrease in Federal grants to States, Mr. Farley added: "The national Government took five times as much out of the State of New York in taxes as it returned and this is true of other States. If this trend of grants to States, now approaching $2,000,000,000 annually, continues, the States would gradually give up all of their responsibilities and the Federal Government would absorb them."

Every true American of today should ponder these warning words from so clear-headed a leader as Mr. Farley.

The only hope for the future of our Government, as many students and economists see it, lies in a return to sanity, with bluff and coercion given the gate.

The sands of emotionalism and hysteria seem to have pretty well run their course and that the era of one-man government which began March 4, 1933, and which in reality has been a dictatorship almost as definite in effect as that of an absolute monarchy, may result in a rebellion by overtaxed Americans, with class hatred and class consciousness lessened and the threat to the security of every man, woman, and child as represented by our unprecedented national debt now affecting the savings of all types from ownership of property to life insurance, ultimately averted to be supplanted by thrift and economy which previously made this Nation great and with the assurance that unconstitutional measures which are both uneconomic and antisocial at once abrogated.

The vast majority of Americans are united in the thought that they do not want to see the Constitution under which they have lived junked and it is evident that the time has arrived to turn back to it and to the concepts of the average citizen.

It is apparent that American taxpayers are doing some basic thinking these days, uncluttered by figures and political arguments, on the financial crisis of the United States Government. They know that government is primarily a spender and not a producer and that every dollar spent is wrung from taxpayers who, too long, have been supine and have withstood the ever-increasing waste of money which has been and is being contributed by the producers of real wealth.

Of course, government is charged with the performance of public services all of which cost money and which should be paid for by the people. There is no argument there, but from that solid ground it has been the immemorial habit of government to be lured into strange and sinister departures of thought and action.

Like any person who spends but does not produce and who has acquired the habit of meeting his bills by merely asking for more money, government invariably launches on an upward spiral of spend and tax, spend and tax more and more, to a vanishing point limited only by the ability or willingness of the people to pay.

The running faucet of extravagance is allowed to flow unchecked and instead of turning it off government then starts to mop up the floor in the hope of getting still more money to pour into the drain. The castigation by any government official of the taxpayer who legally and properly manages to avoid exorbitant and confiscatory taxes is merely a variation of the mopping technique and evades the fundamental question whether government is not obliged to manage well and thriftly, rather than to seek out new sources of income to sustain its prodigality.

It is infinitely easier to take in more money than to control habits of thriftlessness. Unlike the citizen who must make money before he can spend it, all government has to do is to squeeze the taxpayer harder and, failing, that, to create more money by debasing its value.

This plan has been routine for the past 17 years in Washington, but, like the citizen who spends more than he earns, Government can and does go bankrupt, dragging with it the taxpayer who thoughtlessly went along with the shadowy and impossible promises of spendthrift policies.

Never before in our history was it so timely or necessary to recognize these simple and obvious facts. Never before has it been so obvious that Government should recognize them and act upon them.

We face a type of freedom that, in the guise of humanitarianism, chokes the broad, vigorous private initiative that made this Nation great. It is a soft freedom, protected and cherished and is dangerous.

This precious democracy of ours, the greatest remaining citadel of individual independence, is being more easily undermined than many people realize.

May Clinton continue in its next 100 years to maintain its place in the sun as—

"A bright, cozy town of valleys and hills,
All thriving with schoolhouses, churches, and mills;
Where green drooping branches all arch over the street
And industry shines on the faces you meet,
Where houses are homes, where childhood is gay,
And order and honesty ever hold sway."

Home Builders Shatter All Monthly Records in March

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1950

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement issued by the Bureau of Labor Statistics in the United States Department of Labor titled: "Home Builders Shatter All Monthly Records in March—110,000 New Dwelling Units Started:"

HOME BUILDERS SHATTER ALL MONTHLY RECORDS IN MARCH—110,000 NEW DWELLING UNITS STARTED

March 1950 was the best home-building month in history, according to preliminary estimates of the United States Labor Department's Bureau of Labor Statistics. Builders started 110,000 new nonfarm dwelling units during the month, an increase of 30,000 (38 percent) over February and 40,600 (59 percent) over March 1949.

Well over a quarter of a million new dwelling units were put under construction during the first 3 months of this year. January, February, and March housing starts totaled 270,000 greater by 59 percent than the first-quarter volume for 1949. For the past 9 months, home builders have surpassed by an ever-widening margin, their volume for the same month in the previous year.

Home-building activity for the first half of 1949 was 6 percent under that for 1948, as measured by new dwelling units started. But the 100,000-a-month rate for the third quarter of 1949 brought the new housing volume up 13 percent above that for the same period in 1948, and by the fourth quarter it was 46 percent greater.

Final 1949 reports show a total of 1,025,100 new dwelling units started. Of that year's total, 4 percent of the new housing was publicly owned, compared with 2 percent in 1948.

The increased interest in apartment-house construction in 1949 was reflected by the proportion of units started in multifamily buildings. Units in two-or-more family structures comprised 23 percent of the entire total for 1949, compared with 18 percent in 1948. In the two other postwar years, 1946 and 1947, apartments accounted for about 12 percent of the yearly total.

There has been little change in the past 3 years in the proportion of new nonfarm housing begun in rural and urban areas, about 57 percent being started in urban places.

Of the houses started by private builders last year, 7 out of 10 were within metropolitan districts—that is, within the economic and social orbit of a central city or cities. In 1948 about two out of every three dwelling units started were in metropolitan districts.

Telegraphic reports of local building permits issued for new housing during March in principal cities of the country show an increase for all regions. All but a few of the cities showed increases in building-permit volume, with the greatest occurring in Los Angeles, Calif.; Boston, Mass.; Detroit, Mich.; St. Louis, Mo.; New York, N. Y.; Philadelphia and Pittsburgh, Pa.; Dallas, Houston, and Fort Worth Tex.; and in Milwaukee, Wis.

TABLE 1.—*Number of new nonfarm units started—1948, 1949, and 1950*

1948	931,300
January	53,500
February	50,100
March	76,400
April	99,500
May	100,300
June	97,800
July	95,000
August	86,600
September	82,200
October	73,400
November	63,600
December	52,900
1949	[1] 1,025,100
January	50,000
February	50,400
March	69,400
April	88,300
May	95,400
June	95,500
July	96,100
August	99,000
September	102,900
October	104,300
November	95,500
December	[1] 78,300
1950:	
January	[2] 80,000
February	[2] 80,000
March	[2] 110,000

[1] Revised.
[2] Preliminary.

The housing industry is continuing to make an ever-expanding record in the construction of new housing units both for sale and for rent, the latter on an increasing scale. Both will break the back of the housing shortage.

Now Is the Time To Find a Cure for Cancer and Heart Disease

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues the following article written by Dr. Floyd M. Green, medical director of the Columbus Mutual Life Insurance Co., of Columbus, Ohio. His comments are quite apropos on the very day when the House has been devoting most of its time to debate and action on the appropriations for health and research projects.

NOW IS THE TIME TO FIND A CURE FOR CANCER AND HEART DISEASE

(By Dr. Floyd M. Green)

The next time you get together with five men in a card game—it's a safe bet that cancer or heart disease will kill one of them. The next time your wife entertains the bridge club, take a look at the ladies there for two of the persons at each bridge table is "vulnerable" to heart disease or cancer.

It seems foolish doesn't it, that knowing it to be a dead certainty that out of every five people we meet or know three will fall victim to heart disease or cancer, we are still so complacent? Don't forget, however, that the "one" may well be you—or a loved one—the odds are not great—at the greatest three to five. That thought may cause you to say, "Well, can't something be done about it?" The answer is a positive "yes" if you and your family, your city or town and your State want to—enough.

One hundred years ago very little was known about scientific medicine. Research was almost unheard of. We have progressed very rapidly in our knowledge of diagnosis and therapeutics. The art of curing disease has taken great strides in the past decade. It is very certain. It is very gratifying to the physician to know there are drugs today that are nearly specific for a number of diseases, especially the infectious ones. The layman perhaps doesn't realize that these newly discovered drugs will, through their assistance, go a long way toward preventing the physician's hair from becoming prematurely gray. The basic factor of all this ingenuity is research. We all know from past experience that research is slow and painstaking.

Everyone has been extremely benefited by past medical research, especially research in the acute infectious diseases. The annual mortality rate in the United States has decreased 36 percent since the beginning of this century. Eighty-one percent of this decline can be accounted for by the decrease in the combined death rates for the diseases listed in the following table:

Cause of death	Rate per 100,000 estimated population		Percent
	1900	1943	
All causes	1,719.1	1,089.5	36
Typhoid and paratyphoid fever	31.3	.5	98
Measles, scarlet fever, whooping cough, and diphtheria	76.4	4.7	94
Diarrhea and enteritis	139.9	9.5	93
Tuberculosis (all forms)	194.4	42.6	79
Influenza and pneumonia	202.2	67.3	67

This table taken from 1946 annual report of the Life Insurance Medical Research Fund.

Please keep in mind we were unsuccessful in our attempts to control these infectious diseases until we determined the causative agents and their actions on body tissue and by proper therapeutic measures.

Research in bacteriology should be given credit for most of our success in resisting these infectious diseases. They are all produced by a specific organism.

Nevertheless should we be satisfied with the progress of speed of research today? For one, I am not. I am impatient, I believe. Research needs a shot in the arm. Why am I so intolerant of delay? I am impatient because 180,000 of your friends and my friends are dying each year from cancer. I am impatient because 500,000 of my friends and your friends are dying of cardiovascular disease (disease of the heart and blood vessels) each year. I am impatient because there are at present 7,000,000 cripples without crutches in the United States who are cripples because of heart trouble.

Are there more, less, or the same number of deaths from these two maladies than there were 15 years ago? Read your daily papers—look around among your friends and business associates. The answer is there for you to see.

Do not condemn or rebuke the researcher for this condition. Research men are performing wonders—almost miracles. I marvel at the extraordinary progress they are making with such limited facilities and finances. The research group of men and women have in common certain psychological characteristics not possessed by most of us. They have the knowledge, ingenuity, originality, and technical ability by which progress can be made if they are supported financially.

You do not see the researcher concentrating on the stock market, hoping to invest a few dollars and become wealthy in a short time. You do not see him spending hours studying real-estate values so that he can "get rich quick." On the contrary your researchers are a select group of individuals with one object in view and that is to discover something that will aid the suffering and alleviate physical distress.

Unfortunately most research men do not have the opportunity to put in full time on research. For example, Dr. Fleming noted 30 years ago that certain organisms would not grow in the presence of a certain type of mould and it has just been recently, within the past few years, that the real value of penicillin has been determined. No doubt the lack of funds for research permitted this wonderful discovery to be delayed 30 years.

Most of the grants-in-aid and fellowships are supported by endowments from philanthropic associations such as the Rockefeller Foundation, the Commonwealth Fund, the Carnegie Institute, the John and Mary Markel Foundation, and the Josiah Macy, Jr., Foundation. The grants from these foundations are a great help but are tremendously inadequate.

Most medical research problems today are conducted mainly by professors and teachers in medical colleges, teaching one-half the time and attacking research problems the other half. This is no fault of the researcher. He has himself and family to secure. Actually with most scientists medical research is an avocation.

It is not my intention to be critical, but, to me, there is one big factor which is hindering rapid progress in medical research. Research units are too widespread. We need concentration and we need full-time research men. For example, $588,127 was subscribed by 148 life insurance companies for research in cardiovascular disease. Grants have been placed in 43 medical centers, spotted through 21 States in our country, and a few in Canada. No doubt all insurance companies and the public will benefit greatly from this research, but it is safe to say far greater and quicker results could be obtained if these research men from 43 isolated medical centers in 21 States and in Canada could work together full time as one complete unit.

I realize this is the most that can be accomplished under the present circumstances. We should at once attempt to formulate some method of unification, if we expect to realize quick results. We should, if possible, solve these problems not in 20 years but in the next 5 years. Each year's delay means 180,000 deaths from cancer and a half million deaths from cardiovascular disease and several thousand more will become cripples without crutches.

Here is a plan that may be impractical and erroneous, but if it could be put into effect at once thousands that are living today will not die in 1951. Why not make this another Manhattan project, or, better still, a life-saving project? Convince our Government that this is an emergency, and a large appropriation is needed immediately for a new Manhattan project. If they will appropriate $1,000,000,000, which is just one-half of the amount expended in the development and perfecting of the atomic bomb, we will determine the etiology of cancer and cardiovascular disease and their cure in 4 years, which was the time required on the first Manhattan project.

Let's review the Government's action when they decided they needed a weapon to end the war in a few hours. They selected 96,000 acres of land at Oak Ridge, Tenn. They enclosed these acres with a high, impregnable, wire fense, and made it virtually an Alcatraz. Then they conscripted the majority of the world's leading scientists, among which were physicists, chemists, metallurgists, geologists, and about every type of "ist" known. They practically imprisoned these scientists and ordered immediate results. These were not part-time scientists. They were under pressure 24 hours a day. Never in the history of the world was such concentrated effort expended as on the Manhattan project. Considering that we know more about cancer and cardiovascular disease today than the fission experts knew about the bomb at its beginning, can you conceive what results would be obtained in determining the cause and cure of these diseases, if this kind of concentration and effort was applied to our problem?

It would certainly be wonderfully humane to eliminate enemies, Nos. I and II. You may well gasp at the cost. One billion dollars sounds like a staggering sum, and it is. However, let us break it down to the standpoint of Mr. Average Citizen. As of July 1, 1946, the United States Bureau of Census tells us that there were 91,634,472 potential voters in these United States and their possessions. I am recommending the expenditure of $1,000,000,000, just one-half of what was required for the development of the atomic bomb. If you think one billion is too much stop reading at this point.

Simple computation reveals that each voter would be taxed $10. This amount distributed over a period of 4 years would be about $2.50 per year.

Is there a voter living under the protection of the Stars and Stripes who has witnessed death of a near relative or friend from cancer or cardiovascular disease who would object to having his taxes increased $2.50 for 4 years, if he knew that as a result of this taxation the cure of cancer and circulatory disease could practically be guaranteed in that length of time? If so, I would be compelled to classify that voter as a selfish criminal and a traitor to his fellow men.

Some more computations which we can well afford to consider: Assume it would be possible to secure 500 properly selected research men. We must make our researchers an attractive, remunerative offer for their services and as a further inducement they

should be secured for the remainder of their lives. For example, if they were to be given a salary of $20,000 per year until the problem was solved completely, a matter of 4 years, then $10,000 per year for the remainder of their days, that would involve an amount of $40,000,000. If the average age of the researcher were 35 years, their expectancy would be 35 years, this security price of $10,000 per year would amount to $155,000,000. These payments would total $195,000,000 over a period of not less than 35 years, or an average of only $5,571,000 per year. It is my opinion, the average age of the researcher would be nearer 45 years of age. With the same computation at an expectancy of 25 years, the outlay would be $145,000,000. We started out to spend $1,000,000,000. We have $855,000,000 left. We must have housing and laboratory facilities, also equipment. My observation and information leads me to believe the Government has building centers constructed during the war which could be used for this purpose. I am wondering if all the buildings at Oak Ridge are being occupied. Would it not be a contrast if the Oak Ridge buildings could be used in aiding us to find a cure for cancer and cardiovascular disease, thereby preventing 750,000 deaths annually? It was here a weapon was developed and perfected to destroy lives at the rate of 300,000 in 5 seconds. What a contrast. It was here that the bomb was developed that according to military strategists saved the lives of 1,000,000 American boys, by eliminating the necessity of invading Japan. These 1,000,000 lives were saved at a cost of $2,000,000,000—$2,000 per life. The plan I advocate will save lives at a cost of $10 per voter.

Are you willing to enter into this humane project heart and soul by contacting by letter or word your Senators and Representatives and prevail upon them to see that the money is appropriated for this work?

We have two major problems confronting us. It is our first duty to take care of the patient who has been so unfortunate as to have contracted cancer or circulatory disease. We must attempt to cure or make comfortable these unfortunates and prolong their lives. Our second duty is to determine as soon as possible the etiology of cancer and cardiovascular disease and how to prevent them. We will never be successful in curing cancer and cardiovascular disease until we have determined the cause.

Personal knowledge is needed of all diseases pertaining to all ages. Our knowledge is just as good as our information and our information must come from one source and that is medical research. Therefore, medical research should receive substantial financial support not alone from philanthropic associations and life-insurance companies, but from our Federal Government.

Our problem with tuberculosis several years ago was a serious one and we were not successful in coping with tuberculosis until we found that a small germ-tubercular bacillus—was causing the trouble. Rapid and successful results were secured, once the cause was known.

The research which has been the basis of this improvement began 50 years ago. Are we to continue in a state of expectancy for 50 years before we arrive at a definite solution to the problem being discussed? Not if concerted action is taken and proper methods of combat are established.

When we think of cancer and coronary disease we picture someone belonging to the geriatric age. However, this is not true. Cancer and coronary disease are very prevalent in ages over 45, but they do occur in the young more frequently than we might suspect. As an indication of the truth, we will turn to a partial report of the Army Pathological Institute. One thousand post mortems were made on 1,000 young men apparently in excellent health between the ages of 18 and 45 who died very suddenly. The most common cause was coronary thrombosis. Several died of intracranial hemorrhage from congenital aneurysm. Why should young adults between the ages of 18 and 45 years of age develop coronary in such great numbers. I don't know—neither do you, nor anyone else—but, let's find the solution as soon as possible.

We quite often read in our magazines and daily papers of some very substantial donations given for the purpose of taking care of the ill and for research. This leaves a false impression with us. Medical research does not receive substantial financial support. In 1944, it was estimated that the public spent $3,000,000,000 for medical care. I have made an extensive search to see if I could determine the amount of money that would be available for medical research in 1947. My information shows it will be less than $5,000,000. We might compare this small sum with what was spent for liquor in the United States in the year 1946. The colossal sum of $8,000,000,000 was spent for alcoholic liquors. This means approximately $150 per person, over 21 years of age, was spent for alcoholic liquors in 1946. On the other hand, cancer and cardiovascular disease can be cured in 4 years at a cost of $10 per voter. Save a hang-over and save a life.

I feel somewhat chagrined when I think of the people in my home State spending one hundred and forty millions for alcoholic liquors and only donating a very few thousand for medical research.

We have just completed a national cancer campaign for the purpose of raising twelve millions for the alleviation of the cancer subjects and for the cure of cancer. The donors and everyone who aided in this campaign should be complimented. It is a great and worthy undertaking. The campaign in 1946 yielded ten millions. Sixty percent of this money remains locally. Forty percent is given to the national organization. Seventy-five percent of these donations is for the treatment of those who are afflicted with cancer and for the early diagnosis; 25 percent for research. The percentage that is allocated for research is very inadequate. With all our efforts, cancer and cardiovascular disease are on the increase. We must find the cause—not within 10 or 20 years—but in 4 years. I am optimistic enough to believe it can be accomplished, if we establish the proper methods. Let's do it and save thousands of lives.

Sixty percent of all deaths reported by insurance companies in the United States and Canada were due to cancer and cardiovascular disease. The total amount of these death claims was $816,000,000. In 4 years this would total $3,272,000,000. If, taking a pessimistic view this research project cut deaths from cancer and cardiovascular disease only one-third, this would cut the net cost of life insurance to the policy holder tremendously. Is that good business?

Let's pool all available moneys, organize and cure these enemies in 4 years—not 20 years. I know the philanthropic societies still want to take part. Insurance companies, I feel sure, will donate their share. Personal subscriptions no doubt are available.

The American Way—How May We Improve It?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1950

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the American Legion essay contest of Ohio had three winners in the Eighth Congressional District, and on behalf of Congressman SMITH, of that district, who is ill, I want to include in the RECORD the winning essays of Carol Schnarenberger, of Chatfield, Ohio; Louis Corwin, of Galion, Ohio; and Marilyn Bachman, of Marion, Ohio:

THE AMERICAN WAY—HOW MAY WE IMPROVE IT?

(By Carol Schnarenberger, Chatfield, Ohio)

Our American way is the best way to live, and we as good Americans should know and appreciate it. Our standard of living is higher than that of any other country, and we want it to stay that way. Everything is better here. But we must realize that there is always room for improvement, and some improvements are needed.

Communists, strikes, labor violence, crime and juvenile delinquency currently are of national concern. We cannot let more and more of our citizens become Communists, or whole cities be tied up by a strike, or homes and streets become no longer safe. These are only a few examples of some of America's problems.

The hope for improvement lies in the future citizens of America—the youth of today. If every child could grow up in a decent home, have plenty to eat and wear, use adequate recreational facilities, and receive wise education on how to live with others, we would not have to worry so much about crime, communism, and intolerance.

Slum clearance should be one of the first steps. We cannot expect those who are forced to live in overcrowded, dirty, insanitary, rat-infested tenements to become the best citizens. They've been given a bad start in life to have to live this way, and may naturally resent those who have had a better chance.

Another important procedure is to provide recreation for the youth. Parks, playgrounds, canteens, and clubs keep the future citizen off the streets, occupied with something worth while, instead of out getting into trouble.

Perhaps our greatest chance for improvement is through education—education for the youth, and for the older citizen. We cannot sit by and watch our liberties slip away from us through too many restrictions and rules. Too many people do not realize that this might be happening. Every person should be familiar with and know something about our Constitution, the Bill of Rights, and the "four freedoms." They should be taught how and why the American way came into being, and why it is best. They should know how to be a good citizen. Children should learn about our system of democracy through Government courses. There at school they should learn also to live peaceably with children of other races and creeds. The citizen should be continually reminded of his freedom through the use of newspapers, magazines, radio, television, and movies. If more people really understood just how fortunate they are to be American citizens, they would take more interest in their Government and in their part in improvement of the American way. Communism would lose its foothold, as people would realize how much better their own way is.

It is a high goal, and one every good citizen should strive for to keep our American way the greatest and best in all the world.

THE AMERICAN WAY—HOW MAY WE IMPROVE IT?

(By Louis Corwin, Galion, Ohio)

America is not just a country, but the people living in it, and the American way is the way of these people. Thus we can improve the American way by improving the people. For if we improve the people we improve the Government which is the

people; we better the way of living; we improve the way of thinking and in improving these we improve the American way.

The improvement, that is to say, enlightment, is education for them. If they are educated and given the power of thought and then are set to thinking they surely will find the answers. But can we honestly say that we are getting an education today? With crowded conditions and few teachers to teach all these pupils are we really getting an education besides the A B C's. Are we being taught to think and are we given self-reliance. Self-reliance itself is as important as thinking. As Emerson said: "To believe your own thought, to believe that what is true for your own private heart is true for all men—that is genius." We must rely on ourselves and our thoughts to improve ourselves and others for we are the American people and the American way is our way.

To solve the problems of others and of America a man must first know the facts and he must think about them. He can solve his problems and the problems of others not by what he has read, nor heard, nor what has been written by others but by what he thinks.

It is the opinion of many that too much emphasis is put on textbook knowledge. Many students today are at a loss when they graduate because they know only dates and names but they don't know enough about current controversial issues. The question then arises—should more emphasis be placed on controversial subjects. Controversial subjects are to form inquiring attitudes and to force the student to think independently. The student should have a factual background but he should go further in research before being able to make judgments and before forming any opinions. Before reaching a conclusion he should weigh the evidence. All this would be his own work and more knowledge would be gained by this type of education. Some of the controversial issues could be the press and the question of its printed truth, religious education in public schools or science such as the atomic problem, evolution, and interplanetary studies.

All this could improve education which in turn would improve the students who are future Americans. These students shall then be molded into the people who will shape America. What they accomplish and the way they accomplish it will be the American way.

THE AMERICAN WAY—HOW MAY WE IMPROVE IT?

(By Marilyn Bachman, Marion, Ohio)

Since 1789 the United States has had a democratic government under our great Constitution of the United States. Our democracy and our way of life have been defined as our respect for personality, our faith in education, our capitalistic system of business, our civil liberty, the personal freedoms and equality of status that we enjoy, our democratic institutions, and, best of all, the political democracy of our government.

Our country has learned because of its faith in education, that it can be an important factor in keeping a country democratic. Our schools, colleges, and universities through their American Government and political-science departments have taught young Americans to appreciate their Government and take an active interest in keeping it democratic.

Our capitalistic business system has no equal in the world today. The one way we can keep this great system is to promote good, clean, honest competition and free enterprise.

In no other country in the world do people enjoy as much personal freedom and equality of the masses as in the United States of America. We have been and will only be able to keep this freedom by respecting our Government and its laws and by not infringing upon the rights of our neighbors. All the people in this country stand on the same level while in some countries, India, for example, a caste system is still in practice although the government is trying to destroy it.

One of the keys to the understanding of democracy is found in our great respect for the human personality. This respect is dated from the Declaration of Independence which states "that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." We have extended this respect to every member of this democratic society of ours without regard to his birth, wealth, or social position.

Our civil liberties—freedom of religious worship, speech, assembly, press, and the right of petition—have been guaranteed to all. It is not only our privilege but our duty to exercise these rights to the fullest degree. A well-informed citizenry should be encouraged because our method of democracy depends on this very thing. It has been said by the late Justice Holmes that "the best test of truth is its ability to gain acceptance in the market place of ideas.

"The government of a democracy is at the same time the servant of the people, the guarantor of their liberties, and the agency for the advancement of public ends." Democratic control in the United States is exercised through universal suffrage and the active participation in the government of those who are being governed. Some of the political instruments used in our country are: The Constitution, regular elections, the secret ballot, proportional representation, the "check and balance" system, and many others.

I think that we can improve our democracy by exercising our privilege of voting, having a better informed public, promoting honest competition and free enterprise, by removing the racial discrimination in this country, and by improving our educational system constantly.

Israel's Second Anniversary of Independence

REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1950

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the State of Israel is now celebrating the festival of the second year of its independence. Those of us in the United States who have helped the Jewish cause in Palestine before the Jewish state came into being and also during the 2 years of its existence, are very happy on this aniversary of the rebirth of Israel.

Israel is still beset by many and difficult problems and still faces a long and hard road ahead. There are problems in absorbing and integrating the new immigrants which have been coming into Israel at the rate of about 200,000 per year. There are problems in connection with the economy of the country and standard of living of its people.

The most important problems however, at the moment, are the peace and security of the new Jewish state in the Middle East. Because of the intransigence of certain Arab leaders, Israel feels that its independence and its very existence is now being threatened. These Arab leaders have for some time been issuing threatening statements calling for a war of revenge against the State of Israel. When one of the Arab countries, Israel's immediate neighbor to the east, Jordan, recently entered into negotiations with Israel for a permanent peace settlement, the Arab League adopted a resolution forbidding its members to conduct individual peace negotiations with Israel.

While these threats on the part of the Arabs and their success in breaking up the peace efforts in the Middle East continue, Great Britain has been shipping large supplies of arms to Egypt and other Arab countries in recent months. According to the British, such heavy arms as jet planes, Sherman tanks, and heavy artillery are needed for maintaining internal order in the Arab countries.

When the attention of our State Department was drawn to the fact that large-scale shipments of heavy arms are going from Britain to the Arab countries, we were given the assurance that these arms are not intended for a renewal of hostilities against Israel. It is difficult to understand the reasoning in this case by our officials when we note how reluctant the Arab states are to discuss peace with Israel and how threatening their general attitude has become of late.

Arming the Arab States is not the way toward peace in the Middle East—and peace is what the United States desires most in that area at this crucial hour in world affairs. It should be the policy of our country to make clear to Great Britain and to the Arab countries that we cannot afford new bloodshed and turmoil in the Middle East, and that we cannot tolerate any aggressive acts against any country in the Middle East.

By so doing we shall, at the same time, assure Israel's independence and future existence. I am happy to extend my good wishes and felicitations to the people of Israel on their anniversary and to the Jews of America who join them in this celebration.

Declaration of the Israel Government on Second Anniversary of Israel's Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call to the attention of the House the following declaration of the

Israel Government on the second anniversary of its independence:

DECLARATION OF THE ISRAEL GOVERNMENT ON SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF ISRAEL'S INDEPENDENCE

A year of war, heroism, and victory during which the young Israel Defense Army withstood and overcame the armies of the Arab States—such was our first year of freedom. In the second year we were faced with the first phase of the realization of the ingathering of the exiles and the building and development of enterprises on a scale at a rate far greater than anything we had previously experienced since the beginning of our resettlement 75 years ago.

Nearly 400,000 immigrants have arrived in Israel since the establishment of the state.

In the past year the last Jew stepped out of the Nazi hell camps and the majority of Jewish refugees from the displaced persons camps in Germany, Austria, and Italy were absorbed in the homeland. The remnants of the dispersion in some European countries where our people were threatened with national extinction have been liquidated. The most ancient, oppressed of the Diasporas in the Arab world, Yemen, is in the process of liquidation.

More than 130 new settlements were established this year throughout the length and breadth of the state. More than 30,000 immigrants from many countries rooted themselves in the soil in various forms of agricultural settlements. An additional 50,000 children entered educational institutions in the state. More than 25,000 housing units for immigrants were built in all parts of the country.

During the year energetic measures were taken for strengthening our security and our defense forces; for the development of the state's democratic institutions and the realization of civic equality without discrimination against community or race; for the continual reduction of the cost of living; expansion of markets; increased labor proficiency; improvements in the quality of our products; full employment; increased industrial production; development of workshops and handicrafts; maintenance of an appropriate standard of living.

Israel was accepted by the United Nations organization during the year as a sovereign state with equal rights and duties in the family of nations; in the concert of nations, Israel's independent voice was heard for the first time in our history, speaking for the safeguarding of peace and the extension of justice throughout the world.

However, the road ahead is still long and hard.

Our enemies and opponents continue to threaten us, our very existence, our independence, and the borders of our state. The fate of world peace still hangs in the balance. The great majority of our people are still on foreign soil, many of them subject to racial hatred and spiritual extinction. Ninety thousand immigrants still live in camps in the homeland itself, not yet integrated into the framework of the productivity and national economy of our state. Our liberated homeland remains largely barren and wasteland, our national economy unstable, the volume of our imports greatly outweighing exports, and we are dependent on foreign currency products. We are still being weakened and divided by tendencies of lawlessness and division, fruits of dispersion and lack of independence.

But the toil of three pioneering generations was not in vain and we are privileged to witness the beginnings of deliverance. Let us rejoice in our festival of independence and let us gather our strength to realize fully and completely the vision of our deliverance.

Address by Hon. James M. Mead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by the Honorable James M. Mead delivered to the Harvard Club, Washington, D. C., at the Army-Navy Club of Washington, on April 15, 1950, with an introduction by President John H. Pratt, of the Washington, D. C., Harvard Club:

INTRODUCTION BY JOHN H. PRATT

Gentleman of the Harvard Club of Washington and guests, this will be the last meeting of our club until the beginning of the fall season which we will inaugurate either during the latter part of September or the first part of October.

It is always proper and fitting that our sessions should end on a very high note. We have had many able and distinguished speakers who have addressed us each Saturday for the last few months, and now we have saved for the last one of our very best speakers.

Our guest today has had a long and distinguished career. He has served his State and Nation faithfully and well. He began his active life in the railroad service and there he learned to fully appreciate and evaluate the problems which beset those who toil. As a result, throughout his entire political career he has always been a champion of the rights of the common man, as distinguished from those who have received or desire special privileges.

He served for a number of years in the Congress of the United States as Representative from the Buffalo, N. Y., district.

Then he became a member of the United States Senate from the State of New York, and as such, was a member of the so-called Truman committee which investigated war frauds. Upon the elevation of President Truman to the Vice Presidency of the United States, our speaker succeeded him as chairman of that most important committee. The work which he did in this position was most outstanding. Due to the irrefutable evidence which his committee unearthed, men in high places were convicted of fraud; furthermore, millions of dollars were saved our Government by the tireless efforts of our speaker and his committee.

Our speaker is now a member of the Federal Trade Commission and, although he has held this position but a short time, his indefatigable efforts, keen insight into the problem before the Commission, and his balanced judgment have made him a most valuable member to this great governmental agency.

It is with much pleasure and honor that I present to you the Honorable James M. Mead, of the Federal Trade Commission, who will speak to us on the Federal Trade Commission and the prevention of unfair business practices.

ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES M. MEAD

THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION AND THE PREVENTION OF UNFAIR BUSINESS PRACTICES

Mr. President and members of the Harvard Club of Washington, there is an old proverb to the effect that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. I shall talk to you today for a few minutes on the ways and means the Federal Trade Commission uses its ounce of prevention in the protection of free and fair competition in these United States. I think that the subject is important because the continued existence of civilization, as we know it, depends upon the strength of our domestic economy. The measure of the vigor of our economy is the extent of the freedom from unfair restraints enjoyed by the competitive forces of such economy. The prevention of such unfair restraints is the business of the Federal Trade Commission.

President Woodrow Wilson is one of the great statesmen and political philosophers of the twentieth century. After World War I it was his firm conviction that an effective league of nations would prevent future wars and permit the nations of the world to live at peace with their neighbors. It was his thought that when men of good will meet at the conference table and discuss their problems the result will be peace, and understanding. That dream would be true today if the representatives of the nations that sit at the international conference table were all men of good will.

The League of Nations was Woodrow Wilson's dream for the prevention of war. President Wilson had another dream and that was the prevention of monopoly, restraints of trade and the other unfair business practices which disrupt our domestic economy as wars disrupt the international economy. In 1913, President Wilson recommended to Congress that an Interstate Trade Commission be established. He stated in part in that message and I quote:

"The opinion of the country would instantly approve of such a Commission. It would not wish to see it empowered to make terms with monopoly or in any sort to assume control of business, as if the Government made itself responsible. It demands such a Commission only as an indispensable instrument of information and publicity, as a clearing house for the facts by which both the public mind and the managers of great business undertakings shall be guided, and as an instrumentality for doing justice to business where the processes of the courts or the natural forces of correction outside the courts are inadequate to adjust the remedy to the wrong in a way that will meet all the equities and circumstances of the case."

I should like to emphasize the President's words when he said that the Commission should be a "clearing house for the facts by which both the public mind and the managers of great business undertakings shall be guided." In 1914, Congress delegated to the Federal Trade Commission the authority in the field of unfair trade practices in interstate commerce to procure the facts and to keep the Congress, business, and the people advised so that disruptive influences of unfair restraints on commerce may whenever practicable be prevented.

In connection with the power of the Commission to make investigations and procure factual data Mr. Justice Jackson in an opinion recently delivered in *U. S.* v. *Morton Salt Company*, stated in reference to the investigatory powers of the Commission as follows:

"The only power that is involved here is the power to get information from those who best can give it and who are most interested in not doing so. Because judicial power is reluctant if not unable to summon evidence until it is shown to be relevant to issues in litigation, it does not follow that an administrative agency charged with seeing that the laws are enforced may not have and exercise powers of original inquiry. It has a power of inquisition, if one chooses to call it that, which is not derived from the judicial function. It is more analogous to the grand jury, which does not depend on a case or controversy for power to get evidence but can investigate merely on suspicion that the law is being violated, or even

just because it wants assurance that it is not. When investigative and accusatory duties are delegated by statute to an administrative body, it, too, may take steps to inform itself as to whether there is probable violation of the law."

When Mr. Justice Jackson compared the Commission to a grand jury he was speaking of the grand jury's power to investigate. In that field I believe the Commission has a great opportunity in this changing world. In the past it was an investigation made by the Commission of the meat packing industry and the report to Congress thereon that was largely responsible for the enactment by Congress of the Packers and Stock Yards Act. The utility investigation by the Commission and the report to Congress thereon was greatly responsible for the enactment of the Securities and Exchange Commission Act. These are preventive measures, that is, they prevent unfair restraints on our commerce rather than attempt to cure a disease.

Someone has said, "Preventives of evil are far better than remedies; cheaper and easier of application, and sure in result."

Mr. Justice Brandeis in a Commission case (*FTC* v. *Gratz* (253 U. S. 241)) decided in 1920, said that the Federal Trade Commission Act "undertook to preserve competition" and "the task of the Commission was to protect competitive business from further inroads by monopoly." He further stated that the Commission's "purpose in respect to restraints of trade was prevention of diseased business conditions, not cure."

The preventive measures of the Commission can be divided into general classifications, (1) the formal litigated cases; and (2) the informal cooperative proceedings and the economic reports.

The litigated cases are those instances in which the Commission, after the issuance of a complaint and subsequent hearings, issues its order requiring the party or parties to cease and desist from particular illegal practices. This is a very important part of the Commisson's work and is essential to balanced law enforcement. There always have been and perhaps always will be those who must be ordered to comply with the law and there must be sanctions to back up those orders. The Congress recently amended the Federal Trade Commission Act so as to make violations of Commission orders to cease and desist issued pursuant to such act subject to a civil penalty of $5,000 for each day of violation which continues over a period of time. This amendment puts more effective teeth into our legal, formal preventive machinery.

However, I want to emphasize our cooperative, informative, preventive procedures. Briefly, in addition to the economic reports which I have mentioned, these are the trade practice conference rules and the informal stipulations to cease and desist.

The trade practice conference procedure is unique in the history of law enforcement and has been developed by the Commission as a result of its many years of experience. Pursuant to this procedure members of an entire industry meet in conference under the supervision of the Commission for the purpose of drafting rules for the prevention of unfair practices by a whole industry and by the individual members as well. This concept is based on the same general theory as President Wilson's League of Nations and the present United Nations, and that is, when men of good will meet under proper guidance to discuss their problems, the result will be good for themselves and good for all of the people.

The possibilities of education and information in the use of these trade practice rules are great. The large corporations employ skilled attorneys to keep them abreast of the laws and decisions relative to unfair trade practices. The small-business man cannot afford this expense. Many of these small-business men have only a vague idea as to the functions and decisions of the Federal Trade Commission. The trade practice conference rules, however, expressed in terms of the nomenclature and the particular problems of the small-business man's industry supplies these individuals with valuable guides as to their own future practices. The effect of these rules in informing the businessmen and as a result in preventing unfair practices is immeasurable.

The rules are particularly valuable in establishing standards of nomenclature in an industry. To use a simple illustration, you have frequently seen shock-resistant watches advertised. Have you ever stopped to think what is the test of whether or not a watch is shock-resistant? Many honest manufacturers differed. The Commission held a trade-practice conference for the watchcase industry and among other problems this question of shock-resistant was settled. You will be interested in the result. Obviously in this industry the term "shock resistant" was not being used in an absolute sense. A watch suitable for ordinary uses would not withstand the shock of being dropped from the top of the Washington Monument. A shock-resistant watch however should withstand the shock of ordinary accidents, such as being dropped from a table. The ordinary table or desk is 3 feet high. So the test now used by the watch industry as to whether or not a watch is shock-resistant is: Will it withstand the shock of being dropped 3 feet from the top of the ordinary desk or table. The trade-practices rules so provided. It sounds very simple but it also makes common sense. It also settled a very troublesome question in the watchcase industry and gives the consumer deserved protection.

Another very useful procedure used by the Commission in preventing unfair practices is the acceptance of informal stipulation agreements from advertisers. In these informal stipulations the advertiser agrees to discontinue using certain false or deceptive advertisements. The lifeblood of our complex economy is advertising. With it we are informed of the wares of manufacturers in the 48 States and throughout the world. Without it our knowledge of commodities would be drastically limited to word-of-mouth information and would result in a much lower standard of living. To be socially and economically useful, advertising must be truthful. The Commission strives to keep it so.

Disraeli, the great English statesman, said that "Justice is truth in action." In the fields of law and economics, truth is facts, properly evaluated.

The basic concept of the Federal Trade Commission Act is that by the use of economic and legal procedures the Commission could gather, properly evaluate, and put facts into action and thereby prevent unfair restraints on our domestic economy. The Commission believes that we are fulfilling this concept, and as a result are serving the ends of justice.

With varied forms of socialism in recent years supplanting much of the system of private enterprise in the free nations of the Old World as well as in the lands down under—with the economic system of all the nations behind the iron curtain yielding rapidly to the Marxian philosophy of totalitarian rule, we must put our own economic house in order—keep it in order—and hasten the day when our esonomic and our political systems will prevail throughout the world and men everywhere will be free.

The UN After 5 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAY LeFEVRE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1950

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend by remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by John G. Rogers which appeared in Sunday's New York Herald Tribune.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is timely that we take inventory on what has been accomplished by the United Nations. When forming this organization 5 years ago, it was the hope of the American people that the United Nations would be the medium through which we would obtain universal and enduring peace. I think the average man is beginning to wonder whether this organization is effective and whether it will ever be able to accomplish the real purpose for which it was set up. Surely we all want universal peace and if the United Nations, because of the veto power, cannot function to this end, we should either make an effort to reorganize the UN or make a fresh start with a new workable set of rules.

The editorial follows:

THE UN AFTER 5 YEARS—CONFLICT OF RUSSIA AND WEST CONFRONTS WORLD AGENCY WITH LIFE-OR-DEATH CRISIS

(By John G. Rogers)

LAKE SUCCESS.—On April 25, 1945, the San Francisco Conference of 50 countries opened to give birth to the United Nations. Today, 5 years later, many a dream that soared at San Francisco has been roughly shattered and the UN is sprinkled with empty chairs—symbols of the Soviet walk-outs and the world's big political trouble, the Russian-Western split.

Today, 5 years later, Secretary General Trygve Lie is en route to Europe, and probably to Moscow, and the obsession of his mind is how to revitalize or save the UN. Today, 5 years later, even thoughtful and conservative UN delegates sometimes discuss the possibility that they are now witnessing the last days of the UN as it originally was meant to be.

How did it all happen?

The West says that Russian imperialism and refusal to be a friendly member of the world family is almost the entire cause. The Soviet Union says the cause is American imperialism and determination to use the UN only for its own purposes.

What can be done about it?

The UN itself probably can't do anything directly, or immediately, because the UN is no longer the big show in the political field. The big show is the one that has Washington and Moscow in the leading roles, one as hero and the other as villain, depending on how you look at it. In this imagery, the UN has the role of mutual friend, trying somewhat desperately to bring the hero and the villain into calm negotiation before a final curtain drops.

The converted Sperry gyroscope factory at Lake Success is the home of this mutual friend. The fact that this home exists as a possible place to bring the hero and the villain into negotiations is the UN's principal importance today with regard to the world's biggest political trouble.

Against this background, Secretary-General Lie is an interesting figure these days. The big, broad Norwegian, who used to be a labor lawyer, has leaped abruptly out of the role of mere administrator, to which he has more or less confined himself since 1946, and is attempting to use whatever influence he has directly in the political field to promote Russian-western negotiations.

He is now on the high seas headed for Europe. Just before he sailed, he went to Washington and told President Truman exactly how he thought things stand today, and then he undoubtedly asked the President for a similar estimate. Soon Mr. Lie will conduct the same business with Great Britain's Prime Minister Clement R. Attlee and French Premier Georges Bidault.

Then, he will decide while in Europe whether to go on to Moscow and go through the same routine with Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Y. Vishinsky and perhaps Marshal Josef Stalin, if he is available.

Mr. Lie says that if he does accomplish anything, the results won't become apparent immediately. By this he means that the very most he can hope for at the moment is to establish some groundwork, to plant some seeds that may flower into negotiations later.

When he returns, in mid-May or later, Lake Success will be able to make a fresh appraisal of the chances of diminishing the cold war. Mr. Lie usually keeps his own counsel on details of his conversations with governments, but he has no poker face and is always ready to tell truthfully whether his spirits are up or down. In this, he is a sort of human barometer of the world political outlook at any given time.

On any issue subject to the Russian-western controversy, there is not much to cheer about in the UN record of the last 5 years. Stalemate or walk-out or boycott or propaganda ad nauseum runs through this part of the record like muddy feet on a clean floor.

But you don't have to be a blind worshiper of the UN to find elsewhere in the record a good deal to cheer about. The UN stopped a war in Kashmir, between India and Pakistan, and has now persuaded the two to accept new mediation in the matter. The UN helped to goad the Dutch into an Indonesian settlement, and it was a referee that contained the Palestine war and then negotiated an armistice. UN pressure or surveillance probably helped to head off Communist grabs in Iran, Greece, and Korea.

On the social and economic side, the UN and its specialized agencies have scored big specific victories as well as done slow, plodding work with results to show clearly in years ahead. Mass feeding of children around the world, and mass care for Arab refugees made homeless in the Palestine war—these UN charities used some $200,000,000. A cholera plague was killed in Egypt. Fellowship exchanges are training new experts for a score of countries. Farmers get better seeds through the UN.

More than 725,000 European displaced persons got new homes overseas through UN efforts. Ecuador's earthquake area received emergency UN aid. The UN saves millions of cattle through inoculation for disease. Long-term projects are teaching backward countries how to develop their own resources. Two former Italian colonies in Africa are on the road to independence, and the UN is studying the future of a third. Nine new countries have joined the UN since San Francisco. Fourteen more are beating on the door, hoping the Russian western split will abate and let them in.

The UN trusteeship system keeps a sharp eye on the welfare of millions of persons living in non-self-governing areas.

The UN is justified in being proud of all of this. Taking the story back to the political field, this correspondent knows a man with faith in the UN who tells the following story:

A vaudeville performer was auditioning for a bored theatrical agent. The performer began by taking off from the stage and flying all around the theater and finally gliding back to a perfect landing on the stage. The bored agent said, "O. K., so you imitate birds. What else can you do?"

Too many people, according to the man telling this story, say coldly to the UN, "O. K., so you can stop little wars. What else can you do?"

Regulation of the Motion-Picture Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 25 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement prepared by me regarding an invitation by the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], chairman of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to appear before the committee and testify.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A RESPONSE TO SENATOR JOHNSON'S ILLUMINATING LETTER: ACCEPTANCE OF INVITATION TO TESTIFY BEFORE SENATE COMMERCE COMMITTEE

It is always a pleasure to hear from the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the able chairman of the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee. In the case of his "love note" of April 24, I found his comments more entertaining than quite a few motion pictures. He has a wonderful sense of humor, and I wish he would use it in approaching this problem.

Let me make the following points:

I SHALL BE HAPPY TO TESTIFY FOR FREEDOM

1. I shall be happy to testify before the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee, accepting his invitation to be the initial witness in defense of the freedom, not just of the motion picture industry, but the freedom of America's press against any gestapo or OGPU police-state system that anybody anywhere ever proposes.

2. I am delighted to see that Senator JOHNSON recognizes that "Federal censorship is not the most desirable answer." That is however, the most gigantic understatement I have read in a long time. Federal censorship is not only not the most desirable answer; it is no American answer whatsoever. Coloradans whom Senator JOHNSON so well represents prize their freedom as much or more than any other Americans, and the good people of Colorado (or for that matter, Wisconsin) do not need any gestapo censorship over what they read, what they see, what they hear.

WILL JOHNSON'S ALTERNATIVES BE CONSTITUTIONAL?

3. I hope that Senator JOHNSON'S alternative suggestions will indeed fulfill his statement as to legality and constitutionality—not infringing the freedoms guaranteed by the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

4. As a United States Senator, I say and I think the American people will agree, that as former chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, and now its ranking Republican member, I have a particularly strong responsibility to speak out against unconstitutional, illegal methods which would violate the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. I have a right to fight Senator JOHNSON'S cure-all, which is worse than the disease.

Immorality in motion-picture actors or anyone else is, of course, a shocking matter; it is no laughing matter. So Senator JOHNSON'S ideas have on their face a valid objective. In other words, the objective of promoting the highest possible morality, curbing juvenile delinquency, etc., is one that I completely share. As conveyed in my two statements in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I do not condone for 1 second immoral conduct, the breaking of the laws of God and man, or the commercialization of sin by disgusting, suggestive advertising.

However, I do not believe in anyone's misleading the American public into believing that there is allegedly nothing but sin in Hollywood. I will fight such a misleading propaganda drive just as for 12 years I have fought the phony notion that there is nothing but sin in Washington. Within the past several years a couple of Members of Congress have been convicted of illegal actions. But that is no reason why 531 Congressmen and Senators should be licensed, any more than movie actors should be licensed because of the sin of one or two disgraceful members of their profession. A United States Army general was convicted of breaking the law, but shall we therefore license every Army officer? Of course not.

5. My major aim has been to have the Congress concentrate on two great objectives in these challenging times:

CONGRESS SHOULD NOT PIDDLE ITS ENERGIES ON TANGENTS

(a) Preservation of America's internal and external security. The Constitution has given us the responsibility of promoting the national defense and it seems to me that any side excursions on all sorts of miscellaneous tangents at this time—tangents which can be best handled by the good sense of the American people and the able leadership of our churches—these legislative excursions are taking our eye off the main issue of our times.

We are in a cold war throughout the world, and unless we win it, we may be in a hot war; God forbid. Why then should we piddle our energies away on matters which can best be handled by private American citizens and their church leaders with the cooperation of such great voluntary organizations as the Legion of Decency?

(b) Our second great objective is to maintain America's checks and balances in Government and its freedom against every form of "ism." The lights of freedom are going out all over the world. As I proved in the legal brief placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on April 20, the licensing bill which Senator JOHNSON unfortunately introduced does the following:

HOW JOHNSON BILL VIOLATES UNITED STATES TRADITION

1. It would violate the first amendment to the Constitution.

2. It would violate the fifth amendment to the Constitution.

3. It would violate the sixth amendment to the Constitution.

4. It would constitute a bill of attainder because it is directed against a specific profession by requiring licensing of actors and producers. If Senator JOHNSON will look at the Bill of Rights, he will note that bills of attainder were prohibited by our founding fathers.

5. It constitutes an ex post facto law—another specific prohibition of the Constitution because it makes folks susceptible to an extra punishment which was not on the statute books at the time of the alleged commission of their misdeeds.

I am sure that our newspapers in particular, will not agree in this instance with

the distinguished Senator from Colorado because no American journalist would want to see any element of freedom of the press adversely affected. As pointed out in my legal brief, the Supreme Court in 1946 held:

"We have no doubt that motion pictures like newspapers and radios are included in the press, whose freedom is guaranteed by the first amendment."

UNCLE JOE STALIN RUBS HIS HANDS IN GLEE

Not only, therefore, does a gestapo licensing system violate the very freedoms which 440,000 Americans died in two world wars to preserve, but such licensing would cripple the very industry on whom we are placing a heavy reliance to win the cold war. Uncle Joe Stalin must be rubbing his hands with glee at the prospect that we in Congress might conceivably shackle the very industry that he fears most.

American motion pictures have brilliantly shown the world that we have shoes on our feet, autos in our garages, warm clothes on our backs, decent homes in which to live, wholesome food to eat, churches to worship in free, newspapers to read, radios to listen to, and freedom to grow.

The Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish churches of America prize the dignity of the individual—his freedom to grow. Let not the Congress take any action which threatens man's dignity and freedom under any guise.

Soil Conservation Districts Are Democracy at Grass Roots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 25 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in the April 21 issue of the San Marcos Record.

This editorial was published in central Texas, in an area that is ably served in its conservation work by the Guadalupe-Blanco River Authority. It applies equally, however, to the same important work being done throughout Texas, calling attention to an effective and efficient operation.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICTS ARE DEMOCRACY AT GRASS ROOTS

Soil conservation districts are democracy at the grass roots. That is why so many Texans are becoming more and more interested in them.

In these days of increasing governmental regulations, it is important for everyone—farmers, ranchers, and businessmen—to understand what districts are, who runs them, and what they do. It is easy to confuse them with one of the other agencies of the Department of Agriculture.

Under Texas law, soil conservation districts were organized by vote of the local landowning farmers and ranchers. They are run by their supervisors, who must be local, resident landowning farmers and ranchers elected to office by their neighbors. With no powers of taxation nor eminent domain, the supervisors' responsibility is to coordinate all efforts, public and private, to the soil conservation task. This coordinated effort is first developed on a district-wide basis by the local people themselves.

In every one of Texas' now 156 districts, covering nearly 90 percent of the State, there are programs and plans of work, developed and written by the home folks. They serve as a guide to each district's operation.

With its program and plan of work as a basis for action, the district's board of supervisors is ready to go to work. As a rule, all State and Federal agricultural agencies pledge their cooperation to the supervisors. The extension service and the department of vocational agriculture have a big educational job. PMA payments help landowners pay part of the costs of soil conservation. The technicians of the United States Soil Conservation Service, cooperating with the supervisors, make detailed farm and ranch conservation plans with the local operators on farms and ranches as directed by the district supervisors.

These farm and ranch conservation plans are the key to what many call the new agriculture. They are developed with the owner to suit his operating needs as well as those of the land. When all the planning is over, the results are put on paper, with a map, and all details are then agreed to by the owner and the board of supervisors.

Operating in accordance with these plans, farmers and ranchers are discovering that it pays to treat the land according to its needs and use it according to its capabilities. Production per acre rises and unit production costs are lower. Owners find, too, that crops are higher in quality.

These are things that consumers in general and all businessmen can understand.

Soil Conservation District Week—May 15 to 21—will give all Texans an opportunity to learn about this program of grass roots democracy that is going on in their midst.

Doff Your Hat to the Commies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1950

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, whether we like it or not, the fact of the matter is that we are literally taking our hats off to the Communists in this bloodless phase of the realistically cold contest of ideologies or what have you, and we are losing our shirts in the process.

With seemingly complete unconcern the administration travels its self-prescribed road of giving the jobs of American workers to slave labor corralled behind the impenetrable wall of Russian domination. The lower-tariff policy to which the administration is so rabidly addicted is gradually, but thoroughly, snuffing out our industries while helping to build those of an avowed and relentless enemy of the good old American system.

Has all semblance of sanity left the administration policy makers or is it just the endless chain of a program initiated by New Dealers to continue all possible assistance to Russia and her satellites without regard to the price being paid by American workers and the Nation as a whole? The powers in the majority are inclined to dismiss lightly this far-reaching and all-inclusive impact upon the Nation. They do not seem to grasp the meaning of the predicament in which they have placed both the American industry and its greatest mainstay—the American worker. Upon the manufacturer there has been placed the ever-present and ominous burden of bankruptcy; upon the worker the cruel and inevitable dislodgment from employment which is in turn followed by needless hardship for the family that he is so earnestly trying to bring up in the tradition of the American way.

The proponents of "gimme and give away" are guilty of a shameless take-away that is robbing our workers of their jobs.

In reply to the rising tide of protests against the current tariff policy which is killing the workers' opportunity to earn their bread, the administration is saying, in effect, "let 'em eat cake"—subsidized cake, that is, in the form of larger and more extensive unemployment compensation benefits. A more clearly obvious cover up could scarcely be imagined.

Each passing day sees newer signs of awakening by all segments of the populace to the folly indulged in by the administration in connection with its foreign trade hodgepodge.

Under leave to extend my remarks I should like to have included in the RECORD an editorial from the columns of the Catholic Transcript, Connecticut, of April 20, 1950, which sets forth some vital thoughts on this subject and certainly warrants wide and attentive perusal:

ABSURD AND INTOLERABLE

On Sunday the New York Herald Tribune publicized a situation which for some time has puzzled and troubled citizens of Connecticut. The metropolitan paper took a look at the city of Danbury, so many of whose people depend for their livelihood on the hat-making business. That business is not flourishing just now, with the result that large numbers of Danbury residents are either wholly unemployed or employed but part time. The effect of this condition is felt by the entire community and indeed has State and national repercussions, so close-knit is our economy.

One of the most frequently cited and strongly stressed causes of the unemployment in Danbury is unfair competition from hats made in Communist-run Czechoslovakia. These are brought into the United States in great quantity and undersell the domestic products. Where Danbury-made hats are priced to New York milliners at $25 to $30 a dozen, hats from Czechoslovakia are available to these milliners at $15 to $20 a dozen. And where hat imports from Czechoslovakia were in the amount of almost $41,000 in 1946, they jumped to the amount of almost $1,200,000 in 1949—an astronomical increase.

It is notorious that, wherever the Communists are in control, slave labor is the rule. This has been proved beyond the possibility of refutation: That slave labor is a fundamental and permanent feature of Communist economy, the very basis of that economy. The hats from Czechoslovakia can be sold for so little because made by captive and exploited labor. It is equally notorious that the warfare to the death which the Kremlin, with mastery over Czechoslovakia, is waging against the west and principally against the United States as the mainstay of the west, is ruthlessly fought with every

sort of weapon, the economic no less than the military and the political. It should, then, be just as notorious that the hats dumped into our market by Communist-run Czechoslovakia are a potent weapon for the Kremlin.

How? For one thing, the sharp decline in employment in Danbury means a sharp decline in taxes collected by the Federal Government; for example, income taxes. Taxes, that is, which are urgently required to finance the expensive programs both for national defense and for economic and arms assistance to the European nations on which we depend for containment of the Communist tide. Cudgel our brains though we will, we cannot see the tiniest grain of common sense in taking bread and butter out of the mouths of Americans and drying up a source of much needed Federal revenue, in order to give dollars to a member of the iron curtain bloc which aims at our defeat and extinction. This strikes us as a roaring absurdity.

For another thing, it is the dearest wish of the Kremlin that there be depression and discontent in the United States. Some measure of the first can already be seen in Danbury. The second is not yet noticeable on any big scale. But it could easily and quickly develop. Why anything of the sort should be tolerated when it stems from a readily curable condition of benefit only to the Kremlin, we cannot make out. It is a baffling mystery.

Danbury's troubles may not be exclusively attributable to the importing of hats from a Communist-run country, which is in effect an enemy country in the cold war, but they are unquestionably in part attributable to it. Sanity requires that this condition be righted, and at once.

The Guatemala Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of April 16, 1950:

THE GUATEMALA PROBLEM

Guatemala, one of the three problem children of the Caribbean who are already under formal reproof by the Council of the Organization of American States, has chosen to call attention to its backward political affairs in a curiously (and one would suppose unnecessarily) dramatic way. The American Ambassador, Mr. Richard C. Patterson, Jr., arrived in Washington at the end of March for a medical examination. It then appeared that some days before Guatemala had asked for his recall; the request had been an oral one, delivered through the Guatemalan Ambassador in Washington, without bill of particulars, and in what has been described as a friendly manner. But it was surrounded with rumor and allegation—that Ambassador Patterson's life was in danger, that he was interfering in domestic politics, that he was conducting a defamatory campaign against Guatemalan institutions, and so on—all seemingly generated out of the hot politics of Guatemala's current presidential maneuverings.

The State Department has properly and gravely rejected these unsustained oral representations; the Embassy at Guatemala City remains in the hands of a competent chargé and Ambassador Patterson remains, ostensibly at least, in the hands of the doctors. But American opinion, meanwhile, may well have been stirred to take a look at the Guatemalan institutions which the Ambassador is said to have attacked. It may, for example, look up the recent series of articles in which Mr. Fitzhugh Turner, a correspondent for this newspaper, described what is actually going on there. It was a reasonably complete and convincing picture of a small and potentially enormously wealthy country in the hands of a group of Leftist politicians, who have allowed their ranks to be heavily infiltrated by Communist sloganeers if not actually Moscow Communists, working up a fine little dictatorship of the officeholders on the well-tried basic recipe of battling Yanqui imperialism.

Along with this there goes an amount of assassination, filibustering and armed revolution which one once associated only with "banana republics" and which would seem to return Guatemala to that invidious and elsewhere forgotten classification. The United States could, of course, react against the insults which President Arevalo's regime, adopting the manners and the vocabulary of the Kremlin, has been flinging in this direction. We could dismiss the Guatemalan Ambassador, close our embassy in Guatemala City, remove the numerous missions which are trying to bring economic and educational progress to the little country, and so on. It is doubtful whether the situation either calls for or would be served by such a course. The Guatemalan regime is convicting itself sufficiently of backwardness and rudeness; and it is hardly necessary for the United States to provide its politicians with the electoral issues for which they seem so eager. The Organization of American States is certainly competent to deal with any practical issues that may arise. If the Guatemalan politicians meanwhile want to conduct themselves like a "banana republic" then a "banana republic" is what their country will become.

Regulatory Madness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 25 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, during the recent debate in the Senate on amendments to the Natural Gas Act, much was said about the role New England will play in the future of the growing natural gas industry.

Recently the Boston Herald, one of the outstanding newspapers of New England, published a very persuasive editorial discussing the fate of the Kerr bill. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be included in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REGULATORY MADNESS

President Truman by his veto of the Kerr bill declares for price control of natural gas. We shall soon have price control of coal. But while gas is to be controlled down, coal is to be controlled up. The Kilgore bill would prop prices for soft coal. The Kerr bill veto will permit the Federal Power Commission to hold down the price of gas. Two competing fuels, one regulated up and the other down.

Has Mr. Truman taken the right road to cheaper natural gas by his veto? Has he frustrated the wild plans of Oklahoma and Texas multimillionaires to live off 12,000,000 housewives with scanty pocketbooks, as the "liberal" Senator DOUGLAS contends?

We cannot believe anyone who says he certainly has or he certainly hasn't, for the economics are not that simple. But here are a few facts that make Mr. Truman's position seem more glittering than sound.

The price of natural gas, like oil and coal, is now unregulated. The FPC regulates the pipe lines that carry the gas and also the companies that both produce gas and operate the lines. But the 86 percent of the gas that is produced by the independent companies has been unregulated, and the Kerr bill would have insured that it remained so, against an evident intention of the FPC to take over control. So, if Congress sustains the veto, as seems likely, we shall have all gas going into interstate commerce regulated.

Mr. Truman fears a monopoly because once a pipe-line company builds to a gas field it has to take the prices set by the owner of that field, since pipe lines can't be shifted easily. Result, he implies, would be rocketing prices.

But someone didn't fully inform the President. No company spends millions building a pipe line to a gas field without making certain that the price of gas won't get out of hand. They aren't that simple in the industry. They make long-term-price contracts, and most gas today is already under 25-year agreements. The President is naive in thinking otherwise.

Competition is further limited, the President says, by the concentration of ownership of gas. It happens that 35 companies control 70 percent of the known reserves, and that among them are those horrible aggregations of capital—Standard Oil and Phillips Petroleum. (Horrible to the liberals.) But even if a single corporation held 70 percent of the reserves, it would still have to set a price that would lure consumers from the fuels they now use. It is like the monopoly of the railroads that no longer exists.

In fact, Mr. Truman's veto may have exactly the opposite effect he intends. It takes heavy capital to find productive gas fields, risk capital, for the danger of loss is great. Risk capital is scarce today, and the standard 6-percent return that regulatory agencies usually allow isn't enough to attract very much.

We now have known gas reserves for 30 years at the present rate of consumption. In 1955 the increased consumption will reduce those reserves to 9 years' supply—unless a sufficient incentive exists to expand exploration and production programs. The oil industry, without price control, has kept about 13 years' supplies in sight for the last 20 years, due to the operation of economic laws Mr. Truman would repeal. Control in gas is likely to mean less gas and higher prices. Less gas, incidentally, for national defense.

But whatever will happen by the President's veto, this passion for regulation is driving us into a kind of economic madness. If we keep coal prices up and gas prices down, what shall we do with oil? Already some of the oil companies with byproduct gas to sell scent a move in their direction, and they may deem it cheaper to burn their gas off than sell into regulation. If the gas price is kept down, the sick coal industry will have to turn up its toes, for price minimums won't save it.

We may as well make our choice now, either we stop our drift into regulation or we must just give up and regulate everything there is.

This Nation Should Honor Lieb for His Crusade That Saved the Government Over $36,000,000,000

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. KINGSLAND MACY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1950

Mr. MACY. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks of Mr. Jack Hunter, a comember of Amvet Post No. 19 in Washington with Joseph Lieb, and also pertinent articles which appeared in previous pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is unbelievable that this great Nation has done nothing officially to honor a young man whose efforts brought about measures that saved the American taxpayers an estimated $36,000,000,000.

It is a story that every citizen should know, but, unfortunately, because of greediness and jealousy the incidents behind this narration have never been fully or properly publicized.

On April 12, 1945, the Washington Star carried an Associated Press dispatch stating that the War Department had officially reported to Congress that because of the Renegotiation Act the Government had saved over $36,000,000,000 in rebates of excessive war-contract profits.

Here are some interesting facts behind this untold story:

Late in December 1940, Ray Henle, ace radio commentator, while he was the Washington correspondent for the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, sent a telegram to his editors regarding a certain sensational war-fraud case.

Mr. Henle sent this telegram after he had a discussion with Joseph Lieb, freelance writer, in Washington, D. C.

With the assistance of Sam O'Neal, who at that time was the Washington correspondent for the St. Louis Star-Times, later publicity director of the Democratic National Committee, the matter was brought to the attention of the Department of Justice.

On January 4, 1941, they made their first call upon the Attorney General, Robert Jackson, now a member of the Supreme Court; Wendell Berge, then Assistant Attorney General; and other Department officials.

This was followed up with other calls to the Department on January 9, 14, 15, 16, and 23, 1941. Nevertheless, the Justice Department refused to take any action on the case at that time.

When these negotiations proved fruitless Lieb sent the following letter to every Member of the United States Senate in the hope of bringing the case out into the open. The message read:

JANUARY 6, 1941.

MY DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: Several days ago I conferred with Department of Justice officials relative to profiteering and frauds in defense and war contracts. The Washington correspondent of the St. Louis Star-Times assisted me in presenting amazing evidence in connection with this matter.

It is becoming increasingly evident that the Congress should set up an investigating committee to watch over possible frauds against the Government, and I trust that you will give this suggestion your careful consideration and attention.

Should you care for further information, please advise. With many thanks.

Very truly yours,

JOSEPH LIEB.

Then Lieb followed this letter up with personal calls upon a number of Senators, including Harry S. Truman, now President of the United States.

Five weeks later—and this is important—on February 13, 1941, Senator Truman introduced his resolution calling for the creation of a defense investigating committee. This measure was approved by the Senate on April 1, 1941. Mr. Truman immediately became chairman of the committee that was soon to skyrocket him into national fame—into the Vice Presidency and then into the White House itself.

With fear that the statute of limitations would run out on war frauds, Lieb got a bill introduced, H. R. 4916, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, which called for the suspension during time of war or national emergency the running of any Statute of Limitations on prosecutions for Federal offenses. This bill was introduced on May 29, 1941.

He pleaded with several Members of the House Judiciary Committee, and finally on November 26, 1941, the long delayed hearing was held. The only witnesses were Congresswoman Jeannette Rankin, who introduced the bill, Mr. Lieb, and Mr. Alexander Holtzoff, Special Assistant Attorney General. The Justice Department opposed this piece of legislation complaining that it was too broad, but on January 28, 1942, after much agitation they submitted to Congress, H. R. 6484, applicable only to certain offenses. It became law on August 24, 1942, with the able assistance of Walker Stone, chief editorial writer for the Scripps-Howard newspapers.

Anticipating the passage of the bill the Department of Justice created a war-fraud unit and Federal grand juries began holding hearings.

Mr. Lieb continued his campaign demanding review of war contracts. The exposure of a number of cases caused the Congress to insert a clause in the supplemental national defense appropriation bill of April 4, 1942 permitting the renegotiation of war contracts.

Thus, came the savings of billions of dollars on taxpayers money.

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 10, 1943]

JOSEPH LIEB

(Extension of remarks of Hon. STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, in the Senate of the United States, Monday, May 10 (legislative day of Monday, May 3), 1943)

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD, a statement regarding the activities of Joseph Lieb which have contributed to the war effort.

Among Joseph Lieb's contributions to the war are work on four important and significant pieces of legislation, now enacted into law.

1. His work in connection with legislation dealing with war profiteering and fraud. On January 4, 1941, accompanied by a St. Louis newspaperman, he called upon Attorney General Robert Jackson, Wendell Berge, Assistant Attorney General and other Justice Department officials relative to the prosecution of a certain highly connected war profiteer. Other calls to the Department were made on January 9, 14, 15, 16, and 23. The story and background of this case has never been told and must remain anonymous until after the war. But it was this episode that inspired Leib to carry on a zealous campaign against war profiteering and fraud. Because of this case he urged the necessity for the suspension of the statutes of limitations covering such matters.

Over a period of time Lieb demanded the appointment of a congressional defense investigation committee.

On February 13, 1941, Senator Truman introduced a resolution to set up a defense investigating committee. This measure was approved on April 1.

On March 31, 1941, Representatives May and VINSON introduced their joint resolutions setting up a committee to investigate war profiteers. This resolution has a direct bearing to the previous mentioned Justice Department interviews. This is all that can be said at this time.

It was the sensational disclosures brought out by the House investigating committees that brought on the demand for the renegotiation of war contracts. But renegotiation action did not come until April 4, 1942, when a clause permitting such action was inserted in the supplemental national defense appropriation bill of that year.

Unfortunately, none of these committees possessed punitive power other than to expose and publicly reprimand. They held no other authority. Prior to the introduction of these committee resolutions Lieb pleaded for the suspension of the fraud statutes. In correspondence with many public officials he pointed out the fact that these statutes must be suspended to protect the Government's interest in the prosecution of war frauds. When the Truman and House investigating committees were set up he reminded Members of Congress that these committees were in many instances operating to the disadvantage of the Government insofar as the time elements of the statutes were concerned.

Several months later, on May 26, 1941, a bill was introduced to suspend the statutes. Because of this the Justice Department on February 5, 1942, created a special frauds unit, and Federal grand juries began hearings on July 15, 1942.

Approximately $3,000,000,000 have been saved because of this action. (Part of this story was related in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on November 12, 1942.)

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 27, 1947]

ORIGIN OF THE TRUMAN COMMITTEE

(Extension of remarks of Hon. Raymond S. Springer, of Indiana, in the House of Representatives, Monday, January 27, 1947)

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, last week the upper Chamber of Congress debated at great length the question of whether or not the famous Senate War Investigating Committee should be continued. After the debate came to a close, the Senate deemed it advisable to grant this committee an additional year in order to complete its investigation of the war period.

This committee has been in the public eye for several years, yet very few people know of the incidents that occurred behind the scene to inspire its creation.

It was this committee originally headed by Harry S. Truman that sent him skyrocketing into the Vice Presidency of the United States and then into the White House itself.

In this connection, it would seem apropos to state for the first time the genesis of this committee.

The story dates back to late in December 1940, when sensational information concerning a highly placed defense-contract profiteer came to the attention of Joseph Lieb, freelance writer of Washington, D. C.

Lieb took this matter up with Sam O'Neal, who was at that time Washington correspondent of the St. Louis Star-Times—now publicity director of the Democratic National Committee—and they decided to bring the information to the attention of the Department of Justice. On January 4, 1941, they made their first call upon the then Attorney General Robert Jackson, Wendell Berge, Assistant Attorney General, and other officials. They made other calls on January 9, 14, 15, 16, and 23, 1941. However, the Justice Department refused to take action on this case.

Nevertheless, Lieb sent the following letter to every Member of the Senate in the hope of bringing the case out into the open. The message read:

JANUARY 6, 1941.

MY DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: Several days ago I confered with Department of Justice officials relative to profiteering and frauds in defense and war contracts. The Washington correspondent of the St. Louis Star-Times assisted me in presenting amazing evidence in connection with this matter.

It is becoming increasingly evident that the Congress should set up an investigating committee to watch over possible frauds against the Government and I trust that you will give this suggestion your careful consideration and attention.

Should you care for further information, please advise. With many thanks.

Very truly yours,

JOSEPH LIEB.

This letter was followed up with personal calls upon a number of Senators, including Mr. Truman.

Then, on February 13, 1941, Senator Truman introduced his resolution calling for the creation of a defense investigating committee, and the measure was officially approved on April 1, 1941. Senator Truman immediately became chairman of the committee.

Fearing that the statute of limitations would run on the above-mentioned case, Lieb got a bill introduced, H. R. 4916, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, which demanded the suspending during time of war or national emergency the running of any statute of limitations on prosecutions for Federal offenses. This measure was introduced on May 29, 1941.

Finally on November 26, 1941, a long-delayed hearing was held by the House Judiciary Subcommittee and the only witnesses were Congresswoman Jeannette Rankin, who introduced the bill, Mr. Lieb, and Mr. Alexander Holtzoff, Special Assistant Attorney General. The Justice Department opposed this piece of legislation because it was too broad, but on January 28, 1942, after much agitation they sent to the Congress H. R. 6484, a bill to suspend during the present war the running of statutes of limitations applicable to certain offenses. This became law on August 24, 1942, and it was during this period that the Justice Department set up a war-fraud unit. From the exposure of a number of war contracts came the demand for the Renegotiation Act and the subsequent saving of untold billions of dollars.

Nashville Sermon Said Lacking in Political, Religious Realities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENDERSON LANHAM
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1950

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to insert my own remarks in the RECORD, I am including an editorial by Hodding Carter which appeared in the Delta Democrat-Times of Greenville, Miss., the Atlanta Journal, and other newspapers. The editorial is entitled "Nashville Sermon Said Lacking in Political, Religious Realities."

Recently I introduced into the RECORD an editorial from the Chattanooga Times which referred to this editorial by Hodding Carter. I am introducing this column by Mr. Carter with my full approval. It follows:

NASHVILLE SERMON SAID LACKING IN POLITICAL, RELIGIOUS REALITIES

(By Hodding Carter, editor, Delta Democrat-Times, Greenville, Miss.)

By unhappy coincidence I have read during Easter week a widely publicized sermon which in a good many respects strays as far from the philosophy of the Man whose resurrection the Christian world celebrates today as it does from the political and economic realities of our harassed world.

This sermon was preached last February by a Nashville minister. Many thousands of copies have been printed and distributed throughout the South. It is titled after, and is a sort of digest of the digest of John Flynn's best-selling book, The Road Ahead, which warns of catastrophic end results of the social welfare state.

FLYNN'S BOOK ONE-SIDED

I am not concerned here primarily with Mr. Flynn's book. There is value in it, though its usefulness is impaired by his personal hatreds, the one-sidedness of his attack upon England and his lumping together of good Americans of different opinions than his own into one over-all inimical category. Certainly all of us should be alert to the implications of the insensate welfare state. Certainly a minister has as much right as anyone to warn against national and world trends toward undue centralization of government and the dwarfing of individual rights and individual responsibilities.

But the case is not nearly so black and white as the Nashville minister makes it, nor is he fair in designating his scapegoats.

I am appalled by many of his charges and conclusions. For instance, in telling of the rise of socialism in England after the birth of the Fabian Society, a Socialist group, he enumerates the results of the first Liberal-Social coalition way back in 1905.

"This is when the New Deal struck England," he says warningly. "Out of Parliament came the 8-hour day, workmen's compensation, pensions, government housing projects, public payment of election expenses. Labor was delighted * * * the camel's head was now inside the free enterprise, democratic tent."

If the minister means that these long-ago English achievements were dangerous and undemocratic, he is talking poppycock. To the contrary, each of them when achieved strengthened rather than weakened democracy's hand, whether in England or in the United States.

Asserting that the Americans for Democratic Action "is about as democratic as Stalin," he bases the libelous charge on the fact that its membership includes men like David Dubinsky of the A. F. of L., Walter Reuther and James B. Carey from the CIO, Elmer Davis, Leon Henderson, Justice Douglas and Senator Frank Graham, the notable former president of the University of North Carolina.

And more poppycock. "A social planner in Washington differs not at all from one in Moscow or London," he proclaims. "They are all Socialists and therefore enemies of the basic liberties of men."

What he is saying, in effect, is that the courageous, freemen of the Socialist countries of Europe who live defiantly under the very guns of Soviet Russia are no better than the Red enemy against whom they stand allied with us. Were the Socialist Norwegians enemies of the liberties of men, those Scandinavian fighters who died while we in America prattled? Are the Socialist Swedes such enemies? And are social planners as such, enemies of the people simply because they dream of directed progress? Thomas Jefferson had a plan. So did Abraham Lincoln and Woodrow Wilson. Social planning does not necessarily mean socialism, and socialism, freely and democratically entered upon, does not spell communism.

DEATH BY THE H-BOMB

And one incredible sentence: "I would personally rather see my nation die cleanly under the H-bomb than rot away under socialism." This statement may make a big hit in some quarters, but not among people who have seen nations almost die under bombs; whether H or A, or just plain bombs; not among those who have seen war-crushed nations struggle to rise again in the only way they could—through government-directed action for which no private alternative existed. God grant that we never have to so rebuild; for if that dreadful day ever comes, there will no longer be anywhere else a more fortunate people, like ourselves today, who from a place of privilege and security can sneer at such collective effort as being socialistic.

It is sad that such words should be spoken upon a Sabbath or on any other day. It is sadder and more dangerous to American solidarity that its devisive message should gain such wide distribution. And it is saddist of all to recall how long ago it was that a Man moaned a broken-hearted prayer from a cross, asking His Father to forgive those who knew not what they did.

Congress Should Set the Example

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 21, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, for most of the time during the past 2 weeks the House has been debating the one-package appropriation bill which calls for a total of $38,859,000,000 to operate the Government during the coming fiscal year.

War with Russia is threatened. It is extremely difficult, if not impossible, for a bankrupt nation, a nation with unsound financial policies, to win a war, but there seems little disposition on the part

of the administration, or of the Congress, to put our financial house in order.

That the people want less Federal spending, that they want greater efficiency from those who hold public office, has been shown by the public support of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission.

That very few, individually, are willing to economize or to do more work for the same amount of money is shown by the opposition to practically every plan submitted to the Congress which promises either greater efficiency or economy but which adversely affects the individual.

Unfortunately the President, taking advantage of the present situation and of the demand for less Federal spending and a little more efficient service by Federal employees, has sent to the Congress some 21 reorganization plans.

Taking advantage of this situation, the Hoover label has been pinned on all of these reorganization plans, although some of them do not even promise either efficiency or economy.

The reorganization plans submitted by the President have been sent to the Committee on Expenditures in Executive Departments, on which I am the ranking minority member and of which, during the Eightieth Congress, I was chairman.

So far, whenever any of these plans which would give us a cut in personnel, require more work or a cut in compensation of Federal employees, has been presented, there has been vigorous and sometimes bitter opposition. Usually, the group appearing in opposition to any particular plan advocates the adoption of reorganization which will give economy and efficiency in the other departments but argues that reorganization in connection with the agency in which the witness is interested would be bad.

Recently, information was given the Congress that, during the current fiscal year—and the current year is classed as a prosperous year—we will be spending at least five, some say almost seven, billion dollars more than the Government takes in.

That situation is not only an absurd, but it is a dangerous condition. Especially is this true when some in authority are following a course which may involve us in a war before the year is over.

Remembering how we got into the last two wars, what war costs, not only in dollars and natural resources but in suffering and in death, and in justifiable payments to veterans, it would seem as though those in authority who are directing our foreign policy, would have the good sense to follow a course which would keep us out of war. That, lacking that good sense, judgment, and determination, they would, at the very least, set our financial house in order, cut out the unnecessary expenditure of every dollar; make every possible saving in order to strengthen our defense program.

Long ago someone said that charity should begin at home. Inasmuch as this Nation must economize if it is to avoid disaster, it is my opinion that the people's Representatives should set the example by the adoption of an economy program which would affect all Federal employees and office holders. Then they can rightfully and with good grace ask that others do likewise, take less instead of asking for more, work longer, work more efficiently, instead of demanding higher compensation, then loafing on the job.

A nation which continues wasteful and unnecessary spending, lowers the standard of production, permits a few individuals to paralyze essential industries and, on occasion, by strikes threaten the health, safety, and welfare of the whole nation, cannot hope either to win world war III, or, even if there be no war, continue prosperous and secure.

Port and Playground of the Southwest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 25 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from an article entitled "Port and Playground of the Southwest" which appeared in the April 12 edition of the Houston Chronicle.

This article, written by Mr. Don Hinga, gives an account of one of the most historic and colorful spots in Texas, Galveston Island, and of the people who figure largely in Galveston's place in the Southwest. I recommend it as a subject for enjoyable reading.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PORT AND PLAYGROUND OF SOUTHWEST

(By Don Hinga, Chronicle roving editor)

GALVESTON, April 12.—Steeped in history, with an impressive list of firsts, an island of gracious living and mighty industry, Galveston proclaims to the world that it is the "Port and playground of the Southwest."

There is no better way to sum up Galveston than that phrase.

You hear a lot of talk about the free State of Galveston, because its people have a knack of living and let live that makes the typical Galvestonion feel that there is no better place on earth to reside.

Drive around its oleander-bordered streets and you find plenty of evidence of this graciousness in the many beautiful old homes built during the past century.

Take a tour in the older section of downtown Galveston and you notice fine carvings on the doors and windows of old business establishments that further carry out this idea of beauty.

POPULATION GAINS

The city of Galveston covers 7.8 square miles and its population of approximately 80,000 shows a gain of 20,000 over the 1940 census count of 60,682.

Backbone of the industry that flourishes here is the sprawling waterfront whose 37 piers afford space for handling 45 Liberty-type vessels. Its 35 warehouses have over 5,000,000 square feet of floor space and its three giant grain elevators can store 7,500,000 bushels of grain.

The port of Galveston is the largest sulfur shipping port, in addition to handling vast quantitites of cotton, rice, raw sugar, ores, and concentrates and other products.

To give an idea of the teeming wharves, Galveston during the year ending December 31, 1949, shipped more grain than all the Gulf of Mexico ports combined, a total of 110,218,041 bushels. Its total vessel traffic was in excess of 6,000,000 tons each for the years 1947–49.

THORNTON RUNS DOCKS

Two years ago, the city of Galveston took over the wharves, which are operated by E. H. Thornton, as vice president and general manager. Thornton began his career with the Southern Pacific Railway in Houston.

A picturesque part of the water front that draws thousands of vacationists is the mosquito fleet of shrimp and fishing boats that take off with the dawn, to return heavily laden. Galveston offers the sports fisherman 51 types of edible salt-water fish.

Largest private industry in Galveston is the American National Insurance Co., largest in the South, with some $300,000,000 in insurance on its books.

Today, it is presided over by W. L. Moody, Jr., now in his eighties, who has spread an industrial and financial empire from Galveston Island until it reaches over the Nation, embracing banks, the national hotels, lands, and other properties.

MOODY IS RICH MAN

Moody is said to be one of the 10 richest men in Texas, but still keeps a tight hand on the reins of his business empire.

From his office in the American National Building, whose walls bear a large copy of the famed painting, the Gay Philosopher, Moody tells an interesting but brief story of how he got into the insurance business.

"How does a man get started in such a vast business?" he was asked.

With a wave of his hand and a twinkle in his eye, Moody replied:

"I was standing on a corner on Strand Street many years ago and two friends came up and asked me if I wanted to make some money.

"They had an idea of going into the insurance business and I said that I always liked to make money and so I did."

The growth and building of Galveston is tied up with the growth and expanding enterprises of several Galvestonians in addition to the Moodys.

FOUR KEMPNER BROTHERS

They are the Kempners, the Sealeys, the Hutchings and others who pyramided profits from warehouses and compresses and other water-front firms into empires that reach out over the United States.

The four Kempner brothers, Stanley, R. L., D. W., and I. H., have contributed mightily to the building of Texas as well as their native Galveston.

Their father, Harris Kempner, a Polish immigrant, worked as a day laborer to get together his railroad fare to Texas, opened a store in Cold Springs, fought in the Confederate Army and moved to Galveston following the Civil War.

When he died in 1894 he had put together "The House of Kempner," with interests in all parts of the State. So diversified was his career that the Kempners either bought, built, or operated eight Texas railroads, started irrigation projects all over Texas; organized banks in a dozen Texas towns.

BUILT HOTEL GALVEZ

The first rice for commercial purposes was planted on a Fort Bend County plantation of

the family, they built the Galvez Hotel, own the Sugarland Industries outright and seven-eights of the stock in the Imperial Sugar Co. Their compress and warehouse properties in Galveston comprise 8½ city blocks.

The eight members of the House of Kempner, four brothers and four sisters, Mrs. Henry Oppenheimer, San Antonio; Mrs. L. A. Adouex, and Miss Gladys Kempner, of Galveston, and Mrs. D. F. Weston of Cincinnati, have made no partition of the family's wealth down through the years, except division of profits from the many enterprises.

All differences of opinion have been settled by majority rule.

Their business activity has been matched through the years by a contribution to civic affairs.

I. H. IS ELDER STATESMAN

I. H. Kempner, the elder statesman of the clan, served as commissioner and mayor of Galveston and is credited with pulling the city out of the financial crisis that followed the 1900 storm when 7,500 persons lost their lives in hurricane winds and tidal waves.

In fact, I. H. Kempner and Rabbi Emeritus Henry Cohen are the only two surviving members of the storm relief commission.

The saintly Rabbi Cohen and the late Bishop Christopher Byrne have been the spiritual inspiration for the city for many years.

Throughout a life of selfless service, Rabbi Cohen has attained many honors. President Woodrow Wilson called him Texas' greatest citizen and the late Dr. Stephen Wise described him as one of the 10 outstanding religious leaders of the Nation.

RABBI IS SCHOLAR

A scholar who reads Hebrew and Arabic, French and German and Spanish, the rabbi has a simple philosophy.

"From the best in religions I try to take my philosophy of life," he says. "I would as soon preach on a text from Confucius as the Talmud if the truth is there."

Last September, when the rabbi retired after 61 years in the rabbinate, Bishop Byrne said:

"My old friend, Rabbi Cohen, is the best example of real humanitarianism I have ever seen. I have seen him in every room and at every bed in our hospitals. He brought messages of cheer and hope to all, regardless of race, color, and creed. He never asked who it was, but whether there was a need to fill."

The late Bishop Byrne, who administered the affairs of the Galveston Catholic Diocese in some 30-odd Texas counties, had a ready wit and an Irish brogue that was the delight of his thousands of friends.

AN AULD BARRACKS

A few days before his death, I talked with him about the Bishop's palace, one of the finest homes in Galveston, built by Col. Walter Gresham, lawyer and Congressman over half a century ago, at Fourteenth and Broadway.

"It's an auld barracks," the Bishop said with a twinkle in his eye and then proceeded to linger lovingly over the details of the three-story mansion.

He told of the five kinds of stone and marble that went into the home, of the carved lilies and birds on the doors and windows, the three different dates that are carved into the marble, of the griffon motif found through the house.

On the first floor there are five different kinds of wood in five rooms, oak, walnut, red and white mahogany, and pine, and how the work was so thoroughly done that there is not a crack in the lining up of the woodwork.

ARTIST OF NOTE

Mrs. Gresham was an artist of note and painted murals on the dining-room ceiling, tacked canvas on the walls of other rooms and adorned them with paintings, and in the basement covered the walls with marine scenes and marine-life pictures.

The home was a long time in being built for Gresham, as the bishop said, would have a flash of beauty in the day or night and tear out parts of the house and build them anew.

Another famous old home in Galveston is the home of El Mina Temple of the Shrine at 2328 Broadway. Built by Capt. J. M. Brown, a brick mason by trade who amassed a fortune in cotton, shipping, and other interests and put a fortune into his home, a show place for almost a century and the oldest brick home in Texas.

CARVED IN PARIS

Walnut in the valance crowning the windows was carved in Paris, and French artisons came to adorn the ceilings with friezes and panels in gold leaf.

His daughter, Miss Betty Brown, was also an artist and in the parlor there still hang tapestries she executed of statuesque ladies in flowing robes.

When Galveston surrendered to Gen. Gordon Granger and his Northern troops on June 18, 1865, the Confederate commanders laid their sheathed swords on a table in the gilded parlor and the trans-Mississippi Department of the Confederacy was at an end.

The Sealy home at Twenty-fifth and Broadway was designed by the celebrated architect, Stanford White, later killed by Harry K. Thaw in New York. It is another showplace, rich in history and beauty.

DAY OF ELEGANCE

All over Galveston you can find homes that have a touch of old New Orleans designs, grilled ironwork and cornices and cupolas of a bygone day of elegance.

One of the outstanding institutions in Galveston is the University of Texas Medical School, with an able faculty headed by Dr. Chauncey Leake, nationally known pharmacologist, the John Sealy Hospital, one of the best in the South, is another example of philanthropy of the builders of Galveston, the Sealy family.

Henry Rosenberg, another pioneer and early day mayor, has left his imprint on Galveston with the 150,000-volume Rosenberg Library and monument to the Texas heroes of the Revolution, a church, orphans' home, home for aged ladies, and a YMCA building.

WATER FOUNTAIN

He also installed water fountains and troughs throughout the city, where thirsty humans and animals could slake their thirst.

Rosenberg was president during the construction of the Gulf, Colorado & Santa Fe Railway, one of the most potent sources of revenue to Galveston through its $4,000,000 annual pay roll to the 1,000 Santa Fe workers in Galveston.

Others who took part in organization of the railway, which operates over 4,000 miles of trackage in Texas, included John Sealy and nephew George, Leon and H. Blum, W. L. Moody, J. H. Hutchings, R. S. and P. J. Willis, to name a few.

Galvestonians have been getting the news of the world from the same source for over a hundred years. The Galveston News, known as "The Old Lady of Mechanic Street," is the oldest newspaper in Texas, having been founded in 1842. It is ably managed today by David Leavell, also president of the Galveston Chamber of Commerce.

Every year about this time, the Greater Galveston Beach Association starts beating the tom-toms for its Splash Day, heralding the opening of the summer swim season. This year it will be held on May 7 and Drum Beater Christy Mitchell is telling all and sundry of the Texas Fiddler's Association annual meeting, which will be held on Splash Day, the hill billy jam season from noon to midnight, the coronation of King Neptune and his bathing beauties from all over the Southwest, 5-mile swim race in the Gulf, giant air show and a lot of other attractions.

GAY PLAYGROUND

Then it is that Galvestonians go all out to welcome the vanguard of the thousands who will dot the smooth white beaches with gay umbrellas, put up tents to stay overnight, crowd the midway attractions, kids will dig in the sand, and the old island that was once the headquarters of Pirate Jean Lafitte gets its gay title of "Playground of the Southwest."

Governors Speak Up on United States Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1950

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an exceedingly interesting article published in the New York Herald Tribune on April 23 and 24. On March 29, 1950, I introduced H. R. 7904, for the purpose of establishing a commission to "investigate and make recommendations with respect to the distribution of governmental functions and sources of revenue within the framework of our Federal, State, and local systems of government." Following the introduction of this resolution the New York Herald Tribune undertook a survey of the opinion of governors on this subject. This article is the result. The views expressed by the governors should alone be sufficient to persuade any doubting Member of this House of the importance of instituting such a tax survey as is proposed without further delay.

GOVERNORS SPEAK UP ON UNITED STATES TAXES—CALL FOR STUDY OF OVERLAPPING REVENUE FIELDS

(By Robert S. Bird)

(This is the first of two articles based on a poll of governors on current issues involving taxation and other relations between the Federal and State Governments.)

Most State Governors replying to a New York Herald Tribune poll believe that the growing conflict of responsibility between the Federal and State Governments urgently calls for high-level study on a nonpartisan basis. Some governors are worried about vast sums of money they say are being wasted now. Others see the entire Federal system as imperiled by the Federal invasion in State government.

They want Congress to act forthwith on proposals before it to set up an inquiring body composed of Senators, Representatives, and governors of both major parties. This group would analyze the whole tangle of divided functions in National and State housekeeping and find ways for ending the evils.

Many of the governors especially deplore the overlapping of taxation that compels citizens in some places to pay duplicate and even

triplicate levies on everyday goods and services. These governors demand a broad revamping of the tax structure—even to dividing up between the two kinds of government exclusive rights to collect different taxes.

Some governors put the blame on the Federal grants-in-aid system, a comparatively new development in American Government. This is the device whereby the National Government collects enormous sums in taxes in the 48 States and redistributes part of it through some 25 major public services such as aid to education and health, old-age and unemployment benefits. The Federal Government sets up its own standards and administrative requirements for these and usually makes the States match the Federal funds with an equal amount of their own money.

A few of the governors defended this aid system as a boon to State government, but others vigorously denounced it as a bureaucratic swindle, robbing the States both of their money and their right to self-government.

Twenty-nine governors replied to the Herald-Tribune poll. This asked, first, if they believed their States were getting a fair share of the Federal tax money collected from them; second, if they felt a segregation of tax sources was needed, and if so, how it should be made, and third, they were asked to make any other suggestions on the subject.

Nineteen governors said either that a thoroughgoing study of Federal-State relations was needed, or that they awaited such a study before forming an opinion. Thirteen said that a segregation of tax sources should be made, so that the Federal Government could have certain taxes exclusively for itself in return for keeping hands off other taxes that would be reserved exclusively to the States.

Seven governors said their States are not getting a fair share of the Federal money collected from them. Four said they were satisfied with the return. Seven offered no comment, sending word that they were not prepared, or too busy, or absent from their capitols.

In general, the replies dealt with two intertwined aspects of the problem—one, the waste, unfairness, or fairness of the tax mechanisms; the other, the pros and cons of grants-in-aid and its effect on State government. The divided opinions cross party lines to a greater degree than sectional lines.

Taking up the grants-in-aid aspect first, a majority opinion was expressed in the reply of Gov. William Preston Lane, of Maryland, a Democrat, and chairman of the National Governors' Conference. He presented the conference's view to the last session of Congress.

He said the first large-scale grants-in-aid program was started in 1914, with the agricultural extension act, and they have since increased until today a third of the total cost of local government is borne by the States, and about 20 percent of the cost of State government is paid by the Federal Government. Federal grants to States have jumped from $5,000,000 in 1910 to more than $2,000,000,000 today.

"This method, in operation, has extended public services throughout the country * * * has been responsible for establishing certain minimum standards of service * * * has raised standards of administration in many public services, and it has provided for some redistribution of resources from the States that have superior means to those that lack them," Governor Lane said.

"On the other hand * * * grants-in-aid has removed large areas of discretionary power from the localities and transferred them to the States, and from the States to the National Government."

Gov. Alfred E. Driscoll, Republican, of New Jersey, replied: "We are losing self-government in America and destroying our Federal system by the continued expansion of a pernicious system of so-called grants-in-aid."

Saying there is no question that all Americans want the best in public services, he asserted that "the question before the Nation is whether we are to have one or more agencies of government responsible for these services—each with a different administrative staff, each levying taxes for the purposes of supporting the services, divided responsibilities, and the inevitable conflicts that arise from divided responsibilities."

Gov. Thomas E. Dewey said that the amount of taxes taken from New York State by the Federal Government "has increased more than five times over and is currently more than eight times as great as the total of State taxes." "This," he warned, "is a very effective way for the Federal Government to impair the sovereignty of a State and deprive it of the finances with which to meet its own responsibilities."

The more conservative view was given by Gov. Adlai E. Stevenson, Democrat, of Illinois.

"All of us have profited from the Federal aid programs, but we all know that there must be some limits to extension of Federal aid," he said. "Those limits may well be determined by the taxpayers' pocketbooks more effectively than by frightened proclamations of States' rights."

Gov. Chester Bowles, Democrat, of Connecticut, defended the Federal aid program while agreeing a thorough review of tax relations is needed.

"The Federal Government exercises many of its present powers (and levies taxes to pay for them) simply because the States in general are unable or unwilling to provide basic services which a majority of the people believe are essential to their welfare," he said.

GOVERNORS CHARGE UNITED STATES TAX GRAB TO FINANCE WIDENING FUNCTIONS—SEE STATES AND CITIES IN SCRAMBLE FOR WHAT'S LEFT—SOME WOULD TRADE FEDERAL AID FOR CERTAIN LEVIES

(By Robert S. Bird)

(This is the second of two articles based on a Herald Tribune poll of governors on current issues involving taxation and other relations between the Federal and State Governments.)

The biggest complaint by State governors in their current fears over Federal encroachment on State government centers around the Federal grab for taxes, a New York Herald Tribune poll shows.

Taxes are caught in an ever-expanding vicious circle. The Federal Government is steadily widening its tax base year by year to finance its always extending functions, and the States and localities are left to elbow each other in a race for what's left.

Most of the governors who replied to the Herald Tribune poll on Federal-State relations said the time has come for the National and State Governments to stake out agreed and exclusive areas of tax sources.

WOULD TRADE AID FOR TAXES

A number of governors said their States would gladly forego a good measure of Federal aid if they could have certain taxes—say gasoline, amusements, or excises—all to themselves, without Federal interference. Then they would handle their own aid programs, they said.

No State in the Union is getting back in the form of Federal aid the equivalent of the Federal taxes collected within its borders. Some less-wealthy States are getting proportionately greater benefits than the prosperous States, but these complain just as loudly as the others.

In the South, Gov. J. Strom Thurmond, Democrat, of South Carolina, said "the tax system is a hodgepodge of overlapping duplication and injustices," and asserted that "if the usurpation of tax fields by the Federal Government continues unchecked it will inevitably turn our States into mere subdivisions or departments of the Central Government." He demanded a return to the States, exclusively, of all automotive transport tax sources, including gasoline, oil, tires, and tubes, together with the admission taxes.

Gov. Herman E. Talmadge, Democrat, of Georgia, said the Federal Government should leave to the States the excise and license taxes, and he attacked the Federal requirement of States to match Federal funds for grants-in-aid. "Grants-in-aid should be based on the need of the individual State rather than its economic ability to match available Federal funds," he said.

"My answer is 'No'," Gov. James E. Folsom, Democrat, of Alabama, said to a question whether Alabama was getting a fair share of Federal taxes.

SEES GOOD GOVERNMENT GAIN

Gov. John S. Battle of Virginia, another Democrat, said "the cause of good government would be benefited by the Federal Government's withdrawal from many fields of activity, leaving these to the States, which could more properly and efficiently administer them."

In New England, Gov. Sherman Adams, Republican, of New Hampshire, said his State's share of the Federal tax return seemed to be "unfair in certain instances such as education, river and harbor development, flood-control, and public-power projects," and he advocated giving excise taxes to the States in return for letting the Federal Government have the income tax.

In the Middle West, Gov. Frank J. Lausche, Democrat, of Ohio, complained that the National Government "has preempted most of the fields" and said Ohio is paying $27,000,000 in gasoline taxes alone to the Federal Government but is getting back only $18,000,000.

"Iowa is not receiving its share of Federal aid," Gov. William S. Beardsley, Republican, reported. He said "the field of gasoline taxation shoudl be preempted to the State" for road-building purposes.

Concurring in this view, Gov. Oscar Rennebohm, Republican, of Wisconsin, also said the National Government should yield to the States, at least in part, the tobacco and amusement taxes and keep for itself the automobile excises. He pointed out that Federal taxes in Wisconsin have increased by 1,600 percent over 1928, compared to a State-tax increase of 400 percent and a locality-tax jump of only 50 percent.

URGES TAX-SOURCE SEGREGATION

Speaking for the Northwest, Gov. Douglas McKay, Republican, of Oregon, also demanded the gasoline and admission taxes for the States, and in neighboring Idaho, Gov. C. A. Robins, Republican, said segregation of tax sources and "revision in all areas are necessary."

Gov. J. Bracken Lee, Republican, of Utah, found "there is no fair share left after the Federal Government gets through paying its army of employees who administer these (Federal aid) funds."

Acknowledging that South Dakota is receiving a fair share of Federal tax money, Governor George T. Mickelson, Republican, complained that "too much of every Federal tax dollar, regardless of its source, is used in Federal administrative expense; we send in a dollar and it comes back sixty-odd cents." He suggested this as a solution:

"Generally speaking, to every extent possible and feasible, the area of government which renders the service should levy the tax and collect the revenue to provide for it."

Gov. Lee Knous, Democrat, of Colorado, said: "The solution is most difficult because

of the diversity of the types of taxes upon which the various States rely for basic revenue."

"The principal source in some may be the income tax; in others, sales taxes; and in others, ad valorem taxes. Each of these systems has a historical background which has developed a delicate adjustment between the State and its local governments and subdivisions, and which cannot be abruptly disturbed."

GASOLINE TAX FOR STATES

But he advocated generally leaving gasoline taxes to the States, and possibly estate and gift taxes and luxury and admission taxes.

Governors of two desert States expressed concern over the Federal highway program. Gov. Vail Pittman, Democrat, of Nevada, said that while some fields of taxation should be left exclusively to the States, he believes "that Federal taxes on gasoline should not be repealed if the Federal aid-to-highways program would be endangered." And Gov. Thomas J. Mabry, Democrat, of New Mexico, added that "the sparsely settled States of the West must have Federal aid in road building if our road program is to be advanced in the interest of national travel."

Both houses of Congress have before them proposals for studying the question. Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY and 41 other Senators introduced a bill last March providing for study of the Federal-State question. In the House Representative FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR., Republican, of New York, offered a bill last month for a joint congressional and governors commission to study the issue.

Either of these bills, if enacted, would carry on the special study of the subject made by the Hoover commission, which reported that "Federal-State relations is the cardinal question of our Federal system of government."

Low-Priced Footwear Imports Menace Tyer Rubber

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 21, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the Evening Tribune, Lawrence, Mass., Thursday, April 20, 1950, by Raymond N. Maynard:

RUBBER TARIFF CUT ENDANGERS TYER CO.

(By Raymond N. Maynard)

In common with some 30 different small New England industries which stand to be affected by proposed United States tariff reductions, the Tyer Rubber Co. of Andover is a long-established local industry that will be seriously threatened through the importation of low-priced footwear.

Company officials and employees have recognized a definite threat to the continued operation of the Andover plant, brought about by a 50 percent reduction in tariff on waterproof footwear which was effected by our Government in 1947 and they are further disturbed at the apparent prospect that there may be a further reduction in tariff in footwear duties later in the year.

At a conference held in the plant office with other interested parties Tuesday afternoon, to decide on a plan of action, Wallace E. Brimer, general manager and treasurer of the company, stated that unfavorable weather combined with the increased availability of imported low-priced footwear are at least retarding customary early orders for domestic rubber footwear for next winter, as a result of which production there has been severely curtailed and the work force is down about one-third.

"The whole footwear industry," he said, "is disturbed by the 50 percent reduction in tariff on waterproof footwear which was effected by our Government in 1947, and more disturbed at the apparent prospect that there may be a further reduction in such footwear, plus a radical reduction in the tariff on canvas footwear, to be negotiated later in 1950. It is recognized that international trade is essential and that it is not a one-way street, so that we must buy abroad as much as practicable."

PROTESTS TO CONGRESS

"However, hand labor is a relatively higher factor in both waterproof and canvas footwear than in products such as automobiles and other hard goods and chemicals in the production of which automatic-machine processes can be used extensively. This factor enables foreign producers with low labor costs, in the absence of adequate tariffs on imports, to undersell domestic-footwear producers by as much as one-third to one-half.

"Management and employees have informed Senators and Representatives of the seriousness of this situation, urging a restoration of the higher tariff rates previously in effect on waterproof footwear, and protesting any consideration of further tariff reductions on waterproof or canvas footwear."

The seriousness of the situation also drew a statement from Alfred Demers, president of local 137, United Rubber, Cork, Linoleum, and Plastic Workers of America, CIO, in which he stated: "Local 137 has protested, approximately a year ago, to Congressmen and Senators about the low tariff on rubber footwear and fabric footwear coming in from Czechoslovakia. Japan is also sending over rubber and fabric footwear, and as a result of this, many of our members are out of work.

"I believe it is the duty of all civic-minded citizens, merchants, and businessmen to protest this low tariff rate. Local 137 of Andover has passed a resolution and sent it to all affiliated locals, the international union, and the national office of the CIO urging that something be done to save the jobs of the local members. Unless cooperation is forthcoming, more people will be out of work and this will affect the communities in which they live. I urge everyone to contact their Congressmen and Senators by letters or card protesting the low tariff rates."

PROTEST HOFFMAN PLAN

Nor does the proposed solution to the problem as suggested by ECA Administrator Paul G. Hoffman offer any comfort. His plan, as an answer to complaints by various industry and labor groups that the Marshall plan is bringing in a flood of foreign goods that is robbing them of their livelihood, has two parts: (1) Let workers thrown out of jobs by imports draw existing Federal-State jobless pay until new jobs can be found for them; (2) set up a program to train the workers for new jobs and retrain management to set up new industrial enterprises that could employ the displaced workers.

Present at the conference, conducted by John H. Kelly, assistant sales manager on footwear, were Vincent Treanor, president of the Andover Taxpayers' Association; George Winslow, town clerk representing the board of selectmen; Alfred Demers, union president; Jack Barry, executive manager of the Greater Lawrence Chamber of Commerce; and plant officials.

MARKET BADLY AFFECTED

On February 13, Mr. Brimer wrote letters to Congresswoman EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, Congressmen THOMAS J. LANE and JOSEPH W. MARTIN, and to Senators HENRY CABOT LODGE and LEVERETT SALTONSTALL informing them of the concern of management and employees over the threat of imported tennis shoes and rubber footwear from Japan and Czechoslovakia, respectively.

He stated that the canvas-topped tennis shoes from Japan were being displayed in New York then at prices which, even with the present 35-percent duty on the price of a comparable United States item, are a third or more under our prices, and the rubber footwear products apparently from Czechoslovakia with the present 12½-percent duty on the price of comparable United States items are about one-half our prices. Furthermore, the offerings indicate that the volume is on the increase to an extent which distinctly affects our whole domestic market.

He pointed out that the 1947 action which reduced the previous 25-percent rate of duty on rubber footwear to 12½ percent on the price of a comparable United States item has resulted in a most serious threat to the industry, and he understood there is a probability of similar action being taken to reduce by 50 percent the duty on imported tennis shoes, if not to completely change the import tariff to a lower percentage ad valorem on both tennis and waterproof footwear. If the latter action should be taken and the American selling-price principle should be eliminated, then unemployment in our industry and financial difficulties for the companies in it would be disastrous.

"The majority of our business is in the two types of products mentioned above," he wrote. "We employ normally about 1,000 in Andover, a town having a population of approximately 13,000 and we assure you that our situation is serious.

"We have suffered two full winters now without normal snowfall, our employment is down about one-third, and the prospect of waiting another 8 months for the rubber footwear season is bleak enough without the added threat of ruinous competition from imported products.

"Foreign competition from countries with much lower wage levels is particularly injurious in our industry where the percentage of factory wage and salaries is about 47 percent of total cost. The difficulties of competing with cheap labor increase as the importance of the labor cost increases in relation to total cost, and there are few if any industries in which labor plays a more important part relatively than in the rubber and canvas footwear industry.

"We urge that you use your influence to forestall any further reduction in tariff on these products and also to restore the rate of tariff on waterproof footwear to the 25 percent which was established in 1932, reaffirmed in 1937, and maintained until 1947 when it was cut in half."

Acknowledgment was received in all instances from the Congressmen and Senators, and the information was forwarded to the Department of State in Washington. As a result, replies received from Jack K. McFall, Assistant Secretary of State, were forwarded to Mr. Brimer.

NEGOTIATIONS THIS YEAR

The letter from Assistant Secretary McFall, contained the following information: "In stating that there is a possibility of reducing by 50 percent the duty on imported tennis shoes, Mr. Brimer no doubt has in mind the announcement on November 10 by the Department of State that the United States will participate in tariff negotiations under the framework of the general agreement on tariffs and trade beginning in September 1950.

"Up to the present time, however, no decision has been reached with respect either to the countries with which the United States proposed to negotiate at the next tariff conference or to the items to be listed for possible negotiations. The negotiations at this conference will be conducted in accordance with the Trade Agreements Act. Before entering into negotiations a notice of intention to negotiate will be published, together with a list of articles which it is proposed should be considered in such negotiations.

"It should be emphasized that interested parties will be given ample opportunity to express their views regarding those negotiations both by submitting formal statements to the Committee for Reciprocity Information and by testifying in oral hearings conducted by that committee. The views so expressed will be taken into consideration by the interdepartmental committee on trade agreements before making its recommendations to the President regarding the concessions to be granted and requested in the negotiations. At the present time the membership of the trade agreements committee includes representatives from the Departments of State, Commerce, Agriculture, Treasury, Defense, and Labor, the United States Tariff Commission, and the Economic Cooperation Administration.

"It is expected that the public notice mentioned above regarding the negotiations will be issued within the next several weeks. The Tyer Rubber Co. is being placed on the appropriate mailing list for the receipt of announcements concerning the negotiations.

"In mentioning the possibility of a change in the single American selling price principle, Mr. Brimer no doubt is referring to a provision in the Habana charter for an International Trade Organization which would require the abolition of the use of American selling price as a basis for determining the dutiable value of imported merchandise. The charter would require that dutiable value be based on the actual value of the imported merchandise and not on the value of domestic merchandise.

"However, it must be kept in mind that the charter would not require a change in the protective incidence of the duties presently based on American selling price, but only in the basis of value used. The proposal to eliminate the use of American selling price, which is presently used as a basis for dutiable value in only a few classes of merchandise, is being considered in connection with possible legislation to simplify customs procedures which it is expected will be submitted to the Congress by the Treasury Department.

"Mr. Brimer requested that you use your influence to restore the tariff rate on waterproof footwear. The only way that this can be done without violating our commitments under the general agreement on tariffs and trade would be through a successful action under article XIX (the escape clause) of the general agreement. All of the tariff concessions in the general agreement are subject to this article which permits a contracting party to withdraw or modify any concession if, as a result of unforeseen developments and of the concession, increased imports threaten or cause serious injury to domestic industry. If Mr. Brimer believes that his company has a good case for such action he may address a request for consideration of his case to the United States Tariff Commission, Washington, D. C.

"In order that the views expressed by Mr. Brimer may be made known to the various Government agencies concerned with trade-agreement negotiations, a copy of his letter is being sent to the interdepartmental Committee for Reciprocity Information, which in turn will bring it to the attention of interested officers in those agencies."

The American Way—How May We Improve It?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1950

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include one of the prize-winning essays from the American Legion annual essay contest in Ohio. This essay was submitted by Miss Patricia County, a freshman in Brilliant (Ohio) High School, and it is one of the 12 winners out of over 75,000 submitted in the State of Ohio. I think this is an indication that our young people are thinking about some of the problems facing this Nation, and with such thinking as is shown by this essay, I feel that the future of our country is in safe hands.

THE AMERICAN WAY—HOW MAY WE IMPROVE IT?

(By Patricia County)

In the seventeenth century freedom-loving people of the Old World, in order to escape tyranny of the rulers, began the hard journey to the new continent of America in order to enjoy freedom of religion which was denied them in their own country. The colonies so established were mostly self-ruled until the reign of King George the Third, in which the war of independence was fought and won by the Thirteen Colonies. It was then the foundation of the present American way of life was laid under the wise guidance of Washington, Jefferson, Franklin, and other leading patriots of that time. Freedom of religion, freedom of speech, and freedom of the press were guaranteed to all under the Constitution established at that time. People withstood all attempts of minority groups to establish so-called isms which would undermine all freedom established under our Constitution.

The American way is opportunity for everyone. It is having your abilities recognized, being given a chance to use them, a poor man becoming a millionaire. It is the illiterate becoming a man of letters. The American way is for men of different creeds giving their life belts to others of the ship and going down with it in harmony. Under the American way free schools, even for the poorest, were established for education, advancement, and culture. The American way means freedom.

The American way means freedom—but the question is, how can we improve it? It is true, our democracy is not perfect. It is not Utopia, so we must always be alert for new ideas to improve our way of life. We should exercise great care in our choice of lawmakers, shake off lethargy, and get out and vote to prevent minority representative elections detrimental to the welfare of the country. An important item is to find out whether the politician has any racial prejudice. If he does, he does not belong in office. Why not increase the salaries of elective officials so less people will be susceptible to bribes?

We should spend more money to improve our educational systems. Educate every American. Reach back into the mountainous districts; give them better facilities and more teachers. An educated nation is a progressive one.

Something vitally important at the present time is to rid our country of communism and racial prejudices. Racial prejudice will lead to more communism, and thence to great unrest within our Nation.

Youth centers should be established for our children. We must guide them in their leisure as well as their education. Teach them the right way to play and work and they will never lean toward the left.

There should be cooperation between labor and industry. Arguments should be settled by conferences instead of strikes which cripple our economy.

There are many more ways the American way of life can be improved. Let us always be on the alert, so we won't be heading down the road toward socialism. We don't want the Government taking care of us from the cradle to the grave. A welfare state is not for us. We want to think, act, and live a free life, to work as hard as we please, to get what we want out of life, to retain our human dignity, which is the heritage we have fought for—and for which we will continue to fight.

Veterans of Foreign Wars Oppose World Federalism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 24, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, enthusiasm for world federalism is diminishing. Recently Rhode Island and California have rescinded resolutions approving that movement. Out in front and leading the fight against the resolutions now pending, is the Veterans of Foreign Wars. National Commander in Chief Clyde A. Lewis is blazing away with all guns. His organization has just begun to fight.

Mr. Speaker, I am including an article from the current issue of Stars and Stripes:

VFW TO OPPOSE ONE WORLDERS—NATIONAL COUNCIL AUTHORIZES SPECIAL STAFF AND SPEAKERS' BUREAU TO FIGHT MOVEMENT

The Veterans of Foreign Wars will continue its campaign against all forms of world government by setting up a special staff, a speakers' bureau and an information center to keep the public alerted on the many schemes and plans which would have the United States join some form of federation which would eventually destroy our form of government.

This was the decision reached recently in Kansas City, Mo., by the VFW national council of administration.

"The VFW will not be able to establish a center as elaborate as that maintained by some of the proponents of world government, but the best job will be done consistent to the organization's ability to maintain such a project." Commander in Chief Clyde A. Lewis, of Plattsburg, N. Y., said following the meeting.

"We can not hope to spend sums like the United World Federalists, Inc., whose expenditures were close to $300,000 in 1949 to push their world government plan, nor will we have as highly paid national and regional material which they can use to spell out what these schemes would mean to us as a Nation," he continued.

Commander Lewis pointed out that the VFW has made available a pamphlet entitled "The Importance of Sovereignty to Assure

Freedom," in which there is enough general information upon which to base solid arguments against world government "schemers."

"We are determined that so long as overseas veterans are organized and have sacrificed so much around the world in life, limb and health, we shall continue to crusade for an America as our forefathers envisioned it. That means strict adherence to the Constitution of the United States; loyalty to the Declaration of Independence, and support to the United Nations through which we believe the world's ills can be solved eventually.

"We do not believe that by giving up any more of our sovereignty we can accomplish more than by sitting at a table with sovereign nations, working in cooperation to find ways to improve the peace of the world. We believe that through the Marshall plan and the Atlantic Pact we have gone far enough, and that by working in close harmony with these nations we can build up sufficient strength to discourage any aggressor nation."

Fertilizer Consumption Rapidly Increasing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1950

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, a newspaper article recently written by the distinguished Representative from Iowa, the Honorable H. R. GROSS, aroused my interest in a matter of vital concern to Iowa citizens.

I am surprised to know that the consumption of commercial fertilizer is increasing so rapidly in a soil known to be as rich and productive as the soil of the State of Iowa.

I am also surprised to know that a survey made by experts of the United States Department of Agriculture indicates that highly fertilized pasture lands may be the cause of the X-disease that has killed so many cattle, and forced some cattle men to give up the cattle-raising business.

The thing that shocks me most in connection with this matter is the fact that fertilizer money is being used to subsidize the research work of the Bureau of Plant Industry, and these gifts of fertilizer money are believed to be responsible for keeping the people in the dark as to why it is necessary to use so much fertilizer per acre, and how the excessive use of soluble nitrogen affects the health of both man and animals.

The purchase of the influence of public officials is a blow at the foundations of popular government.

I am strongly in favor of the appointment of a special committee to make a careful study of the extent of this corrupting influence, and the effect of present methods of fertilizer manufacture on the health of the people.

The Honorable H. R. GROSS rendered a service to the people of his State when he brought this matter to their attention in his newspaper articles in the Tripoli Leader, and other newspapers in that State, and he is to be commended for his interest in the welfare of the farmers.

Since the article in the Tripoli Leader throws considerable light upon this important matter, I insert it in the RECORD as a part of my remarks:

Congressman GROSS' statement reads as follows:

MAKERS' MALPRACTICE DOUBLE COSTS OF FARM FERTILIZERS—LETTER TO CONGRESS RAPS INDUSTRY FOR HIKING COST $250,000,000

(By Representative H. R. GROSS)

WASHINGTON.—Iowa farmers, who have more than tripled their use of commercial fertilizer since 1944 and who forked over nearly $16,000,000 for that product in 1949, probably will be interested in studying charges that it takes as much as two bags of fertilizer to do what one bag did in 1925.

The reason is not the soil or the farmer, but the fertilizer, according to sponsors of a bill that would regulate the registration, manufacture, labeling and inspection of fertilizer and fertilizer materials shipped in interstate commerce.

The charges are contained in the following portions of a letter written by William G. Holman, of 305 B Street NE., Washington, D. C., on March 14 to the National Fertilizer Association, and inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on March 20 by Congressman KEEFE, Wisconsin Republican, who introduced the bill, H. R. 3045, a year ago.

"GENTLEMEN: I have just read a statement by you in the March issue of the Fertilizer Review which reads as follows: 'We know from the price indexes that the cost of a ton of fertilizer is higher today than it was in 1925. The actual figure is—let's see—8 percent; a ton of fertilizer costs about 8 percent more now than it did 25 years ago.'

"A statement by Mr. O. V. Wells, Chief, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, United States Department of Agriculture, and published in the December 1948 issue of the Plant Food Journal, shows that your statement is far from being correct.

"Mr. Wells said: 'The Bureau of Agricultural Economics indexes indicate that fertilizer prices last fall were only 55 percent above the average for the prewar years, 1935–39,' and the Bureau probably did not take into consideration the facts that I shall bring to your attention.

"Namely, that the farmer is forced to use 50 percent more fertilizer per acre today than would be necessary if the fertilizer had contained the same proportions of water-soluble and organic nitrogen that it did prior to 1925.

"You failed to tell the public that prior to 1925, only one-third of the nitrogen in fertilizers was derived from water-soluble sources—such as nitrate of soda, and sulfate of ammonia—if we are to believe the source tags that appeared on the bags.

"The remaining two-thirds of the nitrogen was derived from organic sources, such as dried blood, fish scrap, animal tankage, and cottonseed meal.

"You probably know that Federal and State agronomists recommended these proportions, and believed that one-third of the nitrogen from quickly soluble sources was as much as the plant could take up before some of it was washed in the soil water beyond the reach of plant roots.

"You know that when fertilizer was made this way, the average consumption per acre was three to four bags—and it grew tobacco that made Buck Duke and Dick Reynolds rich and famous.

"You also know that soon after the enactment of the Webb-Pomerene Act, a few fertilizer manufacturers acquired control of the phosphate market—see Federal Trade Commission Report—and that soon after that they compelled other manufacturers to increase the water-soluble nitrogen content of the fertilizer to 65 percent, and to reduce the organic nitrogen content to 35 percent.

"The farmers complained about this radical formula change, and soon thereafter, the State laws were amended. These amendments permitted the manufacturers to increase the total nitrogen content of all fertilizers 21 percent, to take source tags off fertilizer bags, and to use almost unlimited proportions of cheap, water-soluble sources of nitrogen without letting farmers know that this was being done.

"The radical reduction in the organic nitrogen content of the fertilizer forced the farmer to use at least 50 percent more fertilizer per acre in order to get enough organic nitrogen to feed his crop to maturity, and this increased the amount of the farmers' national fertilizer bill $250,000,000.

"The record shows that the National Fertilizer Association was indicted and fined $9,000 in a Federal court in North Carolina for violations of the Sherman Antitrust Act, and for having exerted an undue influence on State lawmakers, and law-enforcement officials, and the attention of the Congress has recently been called to the fact that the fertilizer interests have been subsidizing the research work of the Bureau of Plant Industry.

"If I were in your place, and wanted the respect and esteem of the public, I would openly advocate the enactment of H. R. 3045 that will compel all manufacturers to be honest with the farmers; such a law would make it easier for State enforcement agencies to see that the farmer got an honestly made fertilizer, and would help to protect the health of the people."

Mr. Holman, writer of the above letter, has devoted himself to the fertilizer subject for years, and has served as consultant to a number of Representatives and Senators of farm States.

I would like to point out, in connection with his statement on the $9,000 fine under the Sherman Antitrust Act, that antitrust laws will never be properly enforced until prison sentences, instead of fines, are meted out to violators.

The Tidelands Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the Boston Sunday Post, Boston, Mass., April 23, 1950:

DOUBLE TALK

The tidelands bill, which would give give States control of tidelands for 3 miles offshore, has been reported out of the Judiciary Committee in the House with a somewhat surprising exception.

In the case of Texas the jurisdiction would extend 10½ miles offshore, and the reason given is that this exception was made because of the conditions under which Texas entered the Union. As a sample of silly double talk, that takes the all-time honors.

Of course, the reason for the 10½-mile limit which would be accorded Texas is that oil fields have been found that far out from the Texas shore line. Why not say so? Why pretend that Texas came into the Union with special privileges? It is this kind of foolish deception that does the greatest harm to democracy.

It is perfectly reasonable and logical for Texas to want to control, for tax purposes, oil lands which lie as much as 10 miles out in the Gulf of Mexico. It is a pity that George's Bank doesn't lie closer to the Massachusetts coast line, but it is a safe bet that the Commonwealth would exercise control of the fishing there—a control that is vitally needed.

National Modesty Week—Truman Takes Credit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 24, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the President has taken full credit for the wonderful state of the Union. Some newspapermen outside of Washington think he is a bit optimistic. My friend Tex Reynolds, a foremost journalist in Wisconsin and columnist for the Racine Journal-Times, recently expressed his views on this subject. I include his column of April 15, 1950:

BESTOWING THE CREDIT FOR SHAPE OF NATION IN WEEK OF MODESTY

This marks the close of National Modesty Week, observance of which was led by the President of the United States himself.

In setting the keynote for the week, Mr. Truman did a great imitation of a shrinking violet. He said this country is in fine shape, and frankly admitted that he deserves the credit. In fact, he came right out and claimed it.

Of course, there'll be nasty Republicans who'll say they are glad to give Harry the credit for what has happened in the last 5 years. For instance, the Government going into the hole so many billions of dollars that nobody can count the amount of the debt, hardly, to say nothing of figuring any way to pay it.

These same low-down critics of the Happy Haberdasher will allow as how he can have all the credit he wants for the agricultural situation. That is, for the surplus-potato deal, and the mountains of dried eggs, milk, wheat, etc., in the Government's hands, which were bought at high prices with the taxpayers' money, but which can't be sold without hurting the market, which is going to pot anyway, which is reducing the farmers' income, which they don't like. (I'd be in bad shape if I couldn't spell "which.")

Others will gladly bestow upon Missouri's favorite son all the credit he wants for current high income taxes that cause arthritis in practically everybody's pocketbook. Also for special war excise taxes on various items, such as war paint for women, telephone calls, railroad tickets, etc., though the war has been over for 5 years.

You'll find plenty of the aforesaid Republican-minded snakes in the grass who'll also say the Chief Executive can have all the credit for conditions within government itself. That is, for red herrings like the traitor Alger Hiss, and for Maj. Gen. Harry Vaughan, the big influence and percentage man.

Then there'll be those who won't deny Margaret's papa all the credit he desires for a shrinking dollar and growing prices so that when you take a $10 bill to the store, you don't need any market basket to carry what you can buy. In fact, you don't even need big pockets in your coat. Or if you want to buy big things, like automobiles, washing machines, refrigerators, etc., and you do it on time, you don't have to worry because you won't live long enough to pay the last installment anyway.

If Mrs. Truman's husband wants the credit for the shape of this country's foreign affairs, he can have that, too, many will agree. For example, the big drive to stop communism, financed by billions of American dollars, which partially succeeded in some parts of Europe, though not in others, while the Communists stepped out and grabbed the biggest hunk of Asia.

Also, some will maintain, the White House landlord can take the credit for our splendid military situation. That is, the rapid and wholesale decline in the strength of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, at a time when war is a possibility and our Government is talking tough to the Russians and telling the world that we can lick anybody.

Oh, there'll be some who'll say that no one man can rightfully claim credit for all this, even if he is President. They'll maintain that all this is the work of many people, which no single individual could possibly control.

But this line of thought is contrary to the whole purpose of national modesty week. During this great week, at least, common courtesy to the Nation's No. 1 citizen dictates that when, in all modesty, he takes credit for what has happened in this country, he should be allowed to keep it.

We Must Face the Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD T. MILLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1950

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, it is reported that the President, in his speech last night, gave assurance that no known case of Communist or other subversion in Government has gone uninvestigated.

All loyal citizens should be comforted by this declaration, but many of them would rest easier if they were confident that the investigations were of sufficient scope and thoroughness. Correspondence indicates doubts on the part of many level-headed Americans as to the wisdom of using nets designed to catch "red herring" in an effort to take sharks—even though the sharks are red too.

The President also stated in his speech: "There is no area of American life in which the Communist Party is making headway." That assertion would be more reassuring if the American people had recovered from the shock of the Hiss case, and of learning that the Russians had acquired our atomic secrets and other vital information through leaks from within American life.

Mr. Speaker, under leave, I include here an editorial by Mr. C. P. Ives, which appeared in yesterday's Baltimore Sun and which focuses attention on an important feature of our present difficulty:

A SYMBOLICAL QUESTION FROM SENATOR GREEN
(By C. P. Ives)

At the peak of Mr. Budenz' testimony before the Senate committee Thursday, the administration wheelhorse, Senator GREEN, of Rhode Island, was questioning the witness with considerable zeal.

Why, Senator GREEN wanted to know, hadn't the witness testified in behalf of the Government at the trial of the American Communist Politburo members in New York City last year?

"But Senator," said Mr. Budenz, "I was the chief witness for the Government; I spent 10 days on the stand."

Senator GREEN's question may well stand as a kind of small historic symbol. For the lack of awareness of the facts of life betrayed by the time-worn liberal from Rhode Island only slightly caricatures the official attitude of all the 1933 men on the whole question of communism since that date.

As it happens, indeed, there is a smack of the same flavor in a speech by another Rhode Island liberal, made the very night before the Budenz testimony. I refer to a New York City speech by Attorney General McGrath.

In this address Mr. McGrath once more denounced hysteria and witch hunting of the kind the executive branch has steadily (and sometimes rightly) attributed to Congress since the days of Martin Dies. He asserted again that the executive branch could be depended on to handle the communism issue.

Yet within a few hours Mr. Budenz was to testify in open hearing that only weeks after Senator MCCARTHY first raised his voice, had the FBI got information from him on Mr. Lattimore.

Think of it. Here is testimony, so far uncontradicted, that in this supremely important episode, the executive branch once more lay back and waited for a Member of Congress to stimulate testimony from the man long since established as the executive branch's own No. 1 informant on communism.

Personally, I find this statement of Mr. Budenz hard to believe as anything he said throughout his day on the stand. And yet in his behalf it may be said that Senator TYDINGS, in his rather frequent pre-Budenz statements on Mr. Lattimore, hardly hinted at anything in the FBI files of the sort finally adduced from the most obvious sources in these matters.

For was not Mr. Budenz an obvious source? Was he not a source indeed, rather demanding attention by executive officials alert not merely to defend the Republic but to protect innocent men against possible smears?

Let's see about that. Mr. Budenz talked first before the Un-American Activities Committee of the Congress in November of 1946. In that testimony he laid the finger on one Gerhart Eisler as the top Communist in the United States. Eisler was cited for contempt by the committee, fled the country and ended up as a functionary of the east German Communist state.

In March of 1947 and in August of 1948, Mr. Budenz put the finger on one Harold Christoffel before two congressional committees. Christoffel was tried for perjury and convicted.

In September of 1947, Mr. Budenz appeared against one Santo in a deportation hearing. Santo left the country under warrant of deportation.

An August of 1948, Mr. Budenz testified against one Reinicke, a Hawaiian school teacher. Reinicke was fired from his post.

On August 24, 1948, Mr. Budenz testified before Congress' Committee on Un-American Activities that though he didn't know the man personally, "Mr. Hiss was a member of the Communist Party." Hiss was convicted of perjury.

In September of 1948 Mr. Budenz testified against one Alexander Stevens in a deportation hearings; Stevens left the country under a warrant of deportation.

Finally, as even Senator GREEN now knows, Mr. Budenz was the warhead of the Government's case against the American Communist Politburo, spending 10 days on the witness stand. The jury convicted.

Despite this record, however, the Justice Department took no steps—so Mr. Budenz says—to squeeze everything available out of him. Not until Senator MCCARTHY spoke did the FBI get Lattimore statements from Mr. Budenz. Only now has Mr. Budenz agreed to name his final 400 concealed Communists to the FBI—and here by all means let him follow Senator GREEN's counsel and name his Government suspects first.

Nothing said here, of course, is meant to suggest in any way that the Budenz testimony (so much of it hearsay) on Mr. Lattimore is true.

What I mean to say here is that on the basis of a minor and so far uncontradicted point of Mr. Budenz' testimony it seems once more to have taken congressional protest (rude as it often is) to move the executive branch into an inclusive examination of alleged Communist infiltration.

In the New York address Attorney General McGrath warned against vigilantism. But everywhere in America heavy-hearted Americans know that the antidote to vigilantism (or worse) is faithful and emphatic discharge of their sacred oaths by the constituted authorities.

Our American Watch Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1950

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, before World War II—1931–35—47 percent of the American market for jeweled watches was supplied by imported watches from Switzerland, and 53 percent of the American market was supplied by our American jeweled-watch industries. In 1934 we signed a reciprocal-trade agreement with Switzerland. Later our American watch factories were retooled and converted for war needs, making precision instruments for the Army and Navy. Switzerland then took over the American market for jeweled watches to such an extent that by 1946 Switzerland supplied 86 percent of the jeweled watches sold in America.

Mr. Speaker, since 1941, when we entered the war, a total of 59,000,000 Swiss watches have been imported. During the 4 years—1945 to 1948, inclusive—an average of more than 9,000,000 Swiss watches were imported each year. This importation of Swiss watches under our reciprocal-trade agreement with Switzerland has seriously damaged our American watch industry. Today there are only three American jeweled-watch companies left in the United States, Elgin, Hamilton, and Waltham, and the Waltham Watch Co. is already bankrupt and in the hands of the receiver.

The serious question concerning the American jeweled-watch industry is the important part it plays in national defense. It is absolutely essential that a pool or reservoir of skilled watchmakers be maintained, to be drawn upon in time of war to make precision time instruments—chronometers, fire-control watches, time fuses, aircraft instruments, jewel bearings, et cetera—without which not a battleship nor a warplane can be operated, not a bomb can be dropped, not a rocket bomb fired until a delicate timing instrument to operate it has been installed. There is no source for the kind of skill needed to make these precision instruments other than the jeweled-watch industry. Yet our reciprocal trade agreement with Switzerland has almost destroyed our American jeweled-watch industry that is so essential to our national defense.

Switzerland has captured the world trade in jeweled watches. Even the American market has been taken over to the extent of 80 percent. Switzerland furnished practically all the precision instruments used by Germany in the last war. She also furnished most of the precision instruments used by our European allies. She could do this because she was a neutral in the war. Do we want to depend upon Switzerland in time of war for precision instruments? Dare we risk being dependent upon Switzerland?

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include a letter received from Mr. LeRoy A. Mote, secretary of the Elgin National Watch Co., and a clipping from the Elgin Daily Courier-News of April 17, entitled "Manufacturing Divisions, Watch Factory on 4-Day Week."

The letter presents a picture of conditions as they are today.

ELGIN NATIONAL WATCH CO.,
Elgin, Ill., April 19, 1950.

Hon. NOAH M. MASON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MASON: On April 1, we announced the laying off of approximately 300 employees in our plants at Elgin, Ill., and Lincoln, Nebr. This lay-off was about evenly divided between the two plants. In announcing that lay-off, we stated: "Because of the disruption of the watch market resulting from the extensive liquidation and sacrifice sales of Swiss watches which are being dumped on the market in great quantities, it has become necessary to reduce our production schedules." These liquidation sales that have been going on for the last 6 to 9 months, and which are now beginning to include nationally advertised brands have, indeed, had a serious effect upon the business of American watch manufacturers.

We now find that it will be necessary to even more extensively curtail our production schedules than we had anticipated some 3 weeks ago, and I enclose a clipping from the Elgin Daily Courier-News of April 17, commenting on the action that has been taken. The 4-day week schedule will be in effect for about 5 weeks, which is the time it will take to revise our production schedules and determine the full extent of the additional lay-off necessary to permit us to return to a 5-day week.

Had the State Department taken a realistic approach to the situation back in 1945–46, when we were before the trade agreements organization protesting the reduced rates of the trade agreement with Switzerland, much of this could have been prevented. Our approach to the trade agreements organization at that time was predicated largely upon our anticipation that this situation was bound to result from the flood of Swiss watch movements which were coming in during the war. As a member of the Ways and Means Committee, you are generally familiar with the efforts we have been making in connection with the tariff.

We, of course, have been closely checking on market conditions with our jewelry-store outlets, and it is quite evident that another factor which is contributing to the slowdown in sales at normal retail price levels is the continuance of the excise tax. Of course, the basic difficulty is the dumping of these Swiss stocks. However, since we know that the excise tax is also influencing the situation, we thought it advisable to call this aspect of the matter to your attention.

Yours very truly,
LEROY A. MOTE, *Secretary.*

[From the Elgin (Ill.) Daily Courier-News of April 17, 1950]

MANUFACTURING DIVISIONS, WATCH FACTORY ON 4-DAY WEEK

All employees of the manufacturing departments of the Elgin National Watch Co. went on a 4-day week work schedule today.

The sales department, however, will continue on a 6-day schedule and office employees, especially those who service the sales department, will remain on a 5-day week.

It was stated at the watch factory that the reduction of the workweek was necessitated by a slacking up of sales, which made it inadvisable to increase the inventory.

The curtailment of hours applies to the Lincoln as well as the Elgin plant.

What action the factory executives take at the end of the 5-week period will be decided by conditions as they exist at that time.

ITO Is Premature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, a Washington Post editorial on April 21 calls attention to Mr. Acheson's plea for adoption of the International Trade Organization charter. Hearings are now under way before the Foreign Affairs Committee. This is legislation that should not be considered, Mr. Speaker. The editorial clearly points out its weaknesses. I include it at this point:

ACHESON'S PLEA FOR ITO

It is a moot question whether the present ITO charter, for ratification of which Secretary Acheson is pleading, would be an effective means of removing obstructive trade barriers. There are too many escape clauses and qualifications, some of them applicable only for a so-called transitional period, and others of a permanent nature. Mr. Acheson admits, for instance, that, charter principles to the contrary notwithstanding, countries in balance-of-payments difficulties may be compelled to apply quota restrictions to imports owing to shortage of dollars or other foreign currencies. He also concedes that the charter does not—and cannot—remove all trade discriminations. Moreover, there are certain permanent exceptions to the commitments regarding trade policies—relating to national security, agricultural policy, economic developments, and regional preferences. For example, under the charter, quantitative import restrictions are permitted when their purpose is to insure enforcement of national measures designed to

limit domestic production or liquidate temporary agricultural surpluses. Admitting the necessity of these escape clauses, they raise the question whether much is to be gained by adherence to an elaborate code for the guidance of trading nations that is loaded down with qualifying reservations and exceptions to the general rules.

As a matter of fact, there is no expectation of attaining the long-range objectives of the ITO for some time to come. There is also considerable danger that the temporary escape clauses of the charter, if used over an extended period of time, might become permanent. In any case, so long as the ECA continues to provide large-scale aid for western Europe, the provisions of the charter will have very little effect on the character of international trade. Under existing conditions, therefore, it is, in our opinion, premature to press for action on a plan that is based on future hopes rather than immediate accomplishment. The case for deferring a decision is also strengthened because of the fact that the proposal to accept membership in the ITO has given rise to sharp differences of opinion among business groups, trade and civic organizations.

Coast Guard Reserve Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the Boston Herald, Boston, Mass., Saturday, April 22, 1950:

DEFENSELESS PORTS

Although it is our earnest hope that the omnibus appropriation bill will emerge from the House greatly reduced in size, we are obliged to give our support to one proposed increase. That is an item of $4,100,000 which the President requested for Coast Guard Reserve training and which the Treasury-Post Office subcommittee has unaccountably cut out of the bill.

This sum is considered absolutely essential for the proper maintenance of port security which is one of the wartime responsibilities of the Coast Guard. During World War II the Coast Guard had more men assigned to this duty in the ports of Boston and New York alone than it now has for all its peacetime duties everywhere. Obviously it must rely on its reserve to handle this vital function in the next emergency. Yet it has been denied all funds to train such a reserve.

Secretary of Defense Johnson, who has been notoriously penny-pinching in his allocation of available defense funds, has gone on record as "fully concurring" with the President's request for Coast Guard funds. "It is vital to national defense," he has said, "that a modest but fully trained force be in being to detect sabotage, supervise explosives loading, prevent waterfront fires and explosions, control the identity of waterfront personnel, etc."

That is good enough for us. If these vital functions are officially assigned to Coast Guard, then Coast Guard should be given the wherewithal to fulfill them. It is particularly unthinkable in these days of atom and super-atom bombs that our ports should be left to the protection of untrained and unorganized volunteers.

The reason for the failure to supply reserve funds up to now appears to be the purely technical one that Coast Guard is outside the Defense Department and requests until now have not gone through all the formally required channels. But in the event of a sudden attack upon our port cities, technicalities will not prevent disastrous loss of life and property.

We hope that the Coast Guard training appropriation will be restored in an amendment from the floor and that it will be part of the omnibus bill when the President signs it.

Farm Price Support Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN R. DAVIS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1950

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, there are differences of opinion regarding the highly publicized Brannan plan, whatever that may contain at this moment. There can be no reasonable difference of opinion, however, as to the responsibility of the Secretary of Agriculture to administer and effectuate the existing laws.

There are a substantial number of responsible farm leaders who fear that the present Secretary is deliberately mishandling the present farm program in order to make his own plan look good in contrast. The fears of one such farm leader, James C. Green, executive secretary of the Wisconsin Farm Bureau, are expressed in the following article from the Wisconsin State Journal of Madison, Wis.:

BRANNAN HANDLING OF SUPPORTS RAPPED—J. C. GREEN, STATE FARM BUREAU HEAD, SEES PERIL TO CO-OPS

A charge that Secretary of Agriculture Charles F. Brannan is mishandling the national farm price support program was made Wednesday by James C. Green, Madison, executive secretary of the Wisconsin Farm Bureau, in answer to a statement last week by Brannan claiming that the Farm Bureau is "undermining cooperatives."

"The Secretary's method of supporting dairy prices is damaging Wisconsin marketing cooperatives," Green said, "and it will destroy them if it is continued.

"LOSE CUSTOMERS

"It gives co-ops no choice but to sell to the Government, and thus losing their regular customers.

"This practice is making farmers dependent on government and seems intended to soften them up for the kind of direct subsidy that Brannan is talking about," Green declared.

"The Secretary is trying to discourage farmers from marking their own agricultural products."

He said Brannan should announce price supports for dairy products at terminal markets, instead of at shipping points in this country.

AID TO CO-OPS

Green said that would restore the function of co-ops as sales agencies for their farmer members and strengthen their position when the day of normal marketing returns.

He termed "shortsighted" the policy of accepting Government payments now in exchange for the commercial market outlets which the co-ops have built up over past years.

Support price of butter now 60 cents a pound is uniform throughout the country and makes no provision for freight, storage, or commissions, Green said.

SOLD TO GOVERNMENT

In consequence, many sales of dairy products are being made to the Government.

Green said he has written to Don Anderson, assistant director of the Dairy Branch of the Production and Marketing Administration (PMA) in the Department of Agriculture, urging that support prices be based on terminal markets.

The Farm Bureau is greatly concerned over the future of cooperatives, and contrary to what Secretary Brannan says, wants to see them expand instead of withering away under paternalistic Government interference," Green declared.

Menace of Imports of Shoes From Czechoslovakia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following communication and enclosure, that I have received from Mr. Maxwell Field, executive vice president, New England Shoe and Leather Association, Boston, Mass.:

NEW ENGLAND SHOE AND LEATHER ASSOCIATION,
Boston, Mass., April 24, 1950.

Hon. THOMAS J. LANE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LANE: Our association has sent its final communication to the Commissioner of Customs, Frank Dow, requesting that he act favorably on its petition that current imports of women's low-priced shoes from Czechoslovakia be investigated as a violation of the Antidumping Act of 1921. A copy of this letter is enclosed.

We earnestly request your approval of this suggestion, namely that you personally call on Commissioner Dow to urge that he approve this investigation on the basis that the necessary information cannot be secured in any other way than by an official investigation of a Government agency, such as the Treasury Department.

I personally will be in Washington tomorrow and Wednesday and will call you to learn your reaction to the latter suggestion.

With kindest personal regards.

Sincerely yours,

MAXWELL FIELD,
Executive Vice President.

APRIL 18, 1950.

Mr. FRANK DOW,
Commissioner of Customs, Treasury Department, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DOW: We greatly appreciate your informative letter of April 14, in which you have clarified several important questions with respect to the current status of women's low-priced shoes being imported from Czechoslovakia.

We wish to commend your Bureau for its speedy action in holding up the release from customs custody of all such shoes until they are legibly and conspicuously marked with

the name of the country of origin. A large number of the shoes now being sold at retail, that have come to our attention, have marks which are illegible and inconspicuous, so that your forthright action will help protect the interests of the American shoe industry.

Our association, as you know, filed on March 9 a formal petition with the Honorable John W. Snyder, for an immediate investigation of these imports as being in violation of section 160 (a) of the Antidumping Act of 1921.

In this communication, we advised the Secretary that it was very difficult for our association to present factual data of the production costs, or the wholesale or retail prices in Czechoslovakia of the same or similar shoes, as is required under the act. The reason for this is that these shoes are being produced in a nationalized industry behind the iron curtain, where this type of information is considered secret and severe penalties are meted out to any informants. Actually, our association has been formally advised by officials of both the United States Department of Commerce, as well as other Government agencies, including the State Department and the Department of Labor, that this information could not be furnished our association. It is self-evident, therefore, that these conditions prohibit more complete and current information being furnished to you, and this fact, we feel, justifies, more than any other fact, action by your Bureau in undertaking a formal investigation to prove whether there is a violation of the Antidumping Act, for it is only as a result of a Government investigation that the facts can be established, once and for all.

Our communication to Mr. Snyder was acknowledged on March 17 by W. E. Higman, chief of the Division of Classification, Entry, and Value, who advised that our petition had been referred to his office for a reply, and that "this matter is receiving consideration and, when a decision is reached, you will be advised." Mr. Higman has a complete file of our correspondence, and we respectfully suggest that this file be brought to your attention with this letter so that you may be fully advised of all the information which our association has furnished your bureau in support of its claim of suspicion of dumping of these Czechoslovakian-made shoes.

We advised Mr. Higman on March 24 that a former commercial attaché of the Czechoslovakian consulate in New York City, E. J. Hajny, had advised us that the rationed prices of women's leather shoes in the spring of 1949 were 400 to 500 koruna per pair, or the equivalent in dollars of $8 to $10 per pair. Presumably these shoes are comparable in selling qualities to the imported shoes, as they were also made of leather uppers and nonleather synthetic soles. Mr. Hajny informed us that the free market prices of these shoes during this same period was $35 to $40 per pair. He further informed our association, and we so advised Mr. Higman, that by December 1949 prices on the free market were lowered by 30 to 35 percent, and that rationed shoe prices were also decreased slightly, but not anywhere as substantial a reduction as for free market prices. This information can be verified by contacting Mr. Hajny at his home at 7035 Broadway, Jackson Heights, Long Island, N. Y. (Telephone Newtown 9-7400).

On March 27 we wrote again to Mr. Higman sending him several pairs of Czechoslovakian shoes, one stamped Kerrybrooke Casuals which is being retailed at $1.95 in Sears Roebuck's retail stores, as well as through their 1950 spring and summer catalog (see pair L on the bottom of page 90). The second pair was purchased from R. H. Macy in New York at $2.39 per pair. We stated at that time that in the opinion of shoe manufacturing members, these shoes represented unusual values and were superior even to comparable American-made shoes retailing at $4 to $5 per pair, as claimed in our letter of March 9 to Mr. Snyder. In this same communication, we enclosed an affidavit by a native of Czechoslovakia who now is employed in one of our member factories in Boston, by name Bernard Katz, in which he stated that he had in his possession a laced sandal type cemented shoe, with plastic sole and leather platform, for which his wife had paid 400 koruna, or $8 per pair last year. Several other pairs of women's leather shoes were mentioned in this affidavit, the original copy of which I am enclosing with this letter.

The value of both this statement, and that of Mr. Hajny, referred to above, is that from two reliable sources we have established the fact that cemented shoes with leather uppers and a leather wrap platform, and plastic soles, were sold in Czechoslovakia last year—and presumably are still being retailed this year—at prices equivalent to $7 to $8 per pair. It is our association's claim that for customs purposes, the shoes in question should be valued on the basis of these foreign value prices of similar merchandise offered for sale in the latter part of 1949—at the time when the imported shoes were shipped out of Czechoslovakia—which prices, so far as we know, are still in effect currently in that country.

As we have indicated in our letter to Mr. Snyder, the Czechoslovakian shoes that have been imported into this country were copies of American styles, based on American lasts and patterns and deliberately priced below their costs of manufacture in order to capture an important segment of the American shoe market. This action, in turn, has created great injury to many manufacturers in the American shoe industry, as well as having harmful effects on the full time or continuous employment of American shoeworkers employed in these factories. A number of New England shoe manufacturers have already written to you directly advising of the extent of injury which these companies have suffered as a result of the continued importation and sales of these Czechoslovakian shoes by large mail order, chain, and department stores throughout the country.

American shoe retailers are also being injured by these shoes which are being sold by a few competitors, because these competitors, with no requirement that they must list the country of origin in their advertisements or in catalogs, are promoting all-leather shoes at prices one-half or more under domestic prices of comparable American-made shoes, so that these afore-mentioned retailers are losing considerable business to their few competitors carrying these Czechoslovakian shoes.

The magnitude of the injury caused by these imports to American shoe manufacturers, their workers, and retail customers is best revealed by the following facts:

Imports of women's and misses' shoes from Czechoslovakia

	Pairs	Dollar value [1]
Total, year 1949	99,491	$101,413
1950—January	58,018	47,064
February	153,436	146,644

[1] These figures from U. S. Department of Commerce releases.

It is significant to note that the combined imports of January and February of this year of 211,454 pairs, valued at $193,708, is over double the total imports of 1949 and the average prices of these shoes, according to Government figures, is only 95 cents per pair. Our association respectfully points out that such a heavy increase in these imports confirms our statement to Mr. Snyder that over a million pairs of these shoes are expected to be imported in this country during 1950, and also that the declared prices on the import manifests constitute a suspicion of dumping in violation of the Antidumping Act of 1921.

We trust that the facts herewith submitted by our association, including the cost estimates in our letter to Mr. Snyder—see copy attached—and the evidence submitted to Mr. Higman, will warrant your issuance of notices of suspected dumping to the various appraisers, or the issuance of withheld appraisement because of suspected dumping, in compliance with the Antidumping Act of 1921.

May we again repeat our appreciation for the action of officials of the Bureau of Customs in their consideration of our association's formal petition. If you feel that additional information is necessary before you can make a final determination with respect to our association's claims that the Antidumping Act is being violated, please so advise us and every effort will be made to furnish this data promptly. We cannot help, however, reiterating our oft-expressed claims that factual information on prices of costs in Czechoslovakia today can only be obtained through a formal investigation by your Bureau under the Antidumping Act of 1921.

Yours very truly,

NEW ENGLAND SHOE AND LEATHER ASSOCIATION,
MAXWELL FIELD,
Executive Vice President and Secretary.

Removal of Postmaster at Bagley, Wis.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN R. DAVIS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1950

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, last week a Wisconsin postmaster Stanley Hall, of Bagley, with whom I attended college, was notified that he was to be ousted for inefficiency. It is quite obvious to the people of Wisconsin that Mr. Hall's inefficiency consisted of failure to contribute to the Democratic campaign fund. Rex Karney, fact-finding associate editor of the Wisconsin State Journal of Madison, Wis., wrote an excellent exposure story, accompanied by photostatic copies of the fund solicitation letter and the subsequent dismissal letter. It is interesting to note that thereafter there appeared in the hands of Democratic organizing committee officials—not in the hands of postal officials—letters of complaint regarding Mr. Hall.

A majority of the residents of Bagley have signed a statement testifying to Mr. Hall's efficiency and good service as postmaster. Wisconsin's senior Senator has demanded an investigation by the Postmaster General. And properly he should.

This entire sordid situation is well described in an editorial which appeared in the Wisconsin State Journal entitled "Rule of the Carpetbaggers." Its text is as follows:

RULE OF THE CARPETBAGGERS

The story of the Bagley postmaster who was fired from his job after refusing to contribute to the Democratic campaign kitty should surprise no one.

That fact that this postmaster, 39-year-old Stanley Hall, always had done his job well,

and that the majority of the residents of Bagley were willing to attest to that fact, has no bearing on the matter.

His sin was that he had the guts to stand on his hind legs and tell the political shakedown artists to go to——

That sort of thing isn't tolerated in Wisconsin Democratic politics. You toe the line. You accept, unquestioningly, the decisions made by the knee-pants brain trusters that have seized control of the Wisconsin Democratic Party through the medium of the Democratic organizing committee.

So you have a wife and 6 children to support?

Come across, boy. We would appreciate your contribution. The 1950 campaign fund must be assured.

Neither is the fact that Stanley Hall had been a lifelong Democrat, like his father before him, of any consequence.

Because the Democrats—the real honest-to-goodness Jeffersonian Democrats—no longer control the Wisconsin Democratic Party.

They have been frozen out by the tea party intellectuals, the remnants of the LaFollette Progressive machine, and some Socialists who haven't the honor or principle to admit that they are Socialists. The Democrats have been shunted aside and are supposed to show up only when the collection plate is passed or the votes are needed at the polls.

Incidents similar to the ouster of Stanley Hall will continue to happen just so long as Wisconsin Democrats continue to allow the present crop of carpetbaggers to run their party.

As long as the Miles McMillins, the Pat Luceys, the Horace Wilkies, the Andy Biemillers and their ilk run the Wisconsin Democratic Party, such happenings will be commonplace.

Keep the Issue in Sight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I am including an article that appeared in the Milwaukee Sentinel. It deals with the McCarthy charges against the State Department and I commend it to all Members:

KEEP THE ISSUE IN SIGHT

(Reprinted from the Tablet, official organ of the Roman Catholic diocese of Brooklyn)

Arthur Krock, well known journalist, and other Washington newspapermen, as well as Government officials, are surprised at the quantity and type of mail being received at the Capitol since Senator JOSEPH MCCARTHY has made his charges against the State Department.

Mr. Krock, his colleagues and officials think the Senator's charges are exaggerated, if not untrue, and maintain he has not as yet proven his pro-Red charges against even one State Department employee, or former employee, yet most of the mail from the American people seems to favor the Senator.

They undoubtedly wonder why this is so.

The reason the American people either accept or are sympathetic with charges against the State Department is twofold.

First, the people, by and large, believe the United States was betrayed or sold out in the recent war, and thereafter, to Russia.

The people were led to believe they were brought into the conflict in behalf of liberty and democracy, to vindicate the Atlantic Charter and the four freedoms, and to maintain the freedom of small nations against aggressors, and they observe today that despite their tremendous sacrifice of life, blood, armaments, matériel, and wealth there is more slavery, more dictatorial rule, more tyranny, and a greater threat of war than before.

They see in communism a greater threat than nazism, and observe that Russia has endeavored to fulfill to the letter her ideological promise of world revolution, destruction of liberty and all human rights, and international dictatorship.

Moreover, the American people know that at Quebec, Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam millions of people, whole nations and tremendous power, were given to Russia with the acquiescence of our representatives.

Americans then ask: Who betrayed our country, our principles, the cause for which we fought?

The people reason either our State Department must have been hand in glove with Russia, either Communist spies or friends of the Soviet dictatorship sold us out, or else our representatives were too stupid to know what Russia was up to.

In whichever case, they are waiting for the answer to this frightening situation of more tyranny and more war which now threatens civilization.

Did spies sell us out or were our representatives just unbelievably stupid?

Secondly, the American people read about the Hiss case.

They know how this seemingly sinister character, placed in the Government, then promoted to key positions and finally sitting alongside of the late President Roosevelt at Yalta and as former Secretary of State Stettinius' adviser at the formation of the United Nations at San Francisco, was convicted of perjury based upon his espionage activities.

Finally the people know that the present Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, not only refused to move against Hiss when he was carrying on his espionage activities but even after his conviction the Secretary refused to repudiate him.

Why wouldn't the people have sympathy for Senator MCCARTHY'S charges?

Why wouldn't they condemn the crowd that asserts these charges injure the prestige of the State Department, and the United States is injured abroad by such loose charges?

What gall.

Moreover, is it strange that the people refuse to accept the frantic denials of criticized employees that they are not Communists—when they know that many of Soviet Russia's best friends here have no membership card in the Communist Party?

In the midst of the Senator's attack someone added an even worse charge than he, namely, that the State Department had acted as a home for a colony of degenerates.

And the top security official of the State Department immediately stated that he had dismissed 91 of these perverts from the State Department.

Whether or not he got rid of all of them we are unable to say, but police officials in Washington on Tuesday stated that the capital had 5,000 of these offenders and 4,000 of them hold Government jobs.

What a shocking scandal, what a curse to put on the American people.

What an insult to the morality and decency of our Government.

What a threat to our security.

There is no reason to wonder at Senator MCCARTHY'S charges—exaggerated, poorly presented, premature or not—being supported, for the people have never had explained to them why and how the Soviet was permitted to capture and enslave one-quarter of the world and seemingly with our acquiescense.

The Tablet made a fair suggestion to President Truman when he assumed office in 1945.

It urged that he repudiate the secret Yalta agreements—many of which neither he, nor anybody else, save Alger Hiss, knew about at the time—and take full responsibility for whatever went on thereafter.

It then suggested that the President recreate the State Department and investigate everyone who had acted as a catspaw, if not an agent, of those who betrayed our Nation.

This was not done, although the perfect stooge then occupying the Secretary's post was dropped and later Henry Wallace was forced out.

The people have no confidence in the TYDINGS committee, or officials who consider Senator MCCARTHY—a former marine—the principal menace to our Nation while they are trying to protect and hide those who were pro-Soviet in their deeds, words, and activities.

What the American public wants to know is this:

Why was the United States sold out at Yalta and by whom?

Who put the likes of Hiss, Wadleigh in our State Department, Judy Coplon in the Department of Justice, and Harry Dexter White in the Department of the Treasury?

Who put the 91 degenerates into the State Department and who kept them there?

Who was responsible for the abandonment of China, the insane set-up in Germany, and the loss of liberty to Estonia, Lithuania, Latvia, Poland, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Rumania, Bulgaria, and Czechoslovakia?

Who decided Formosa has no strategic importance?

The exaggerations or misrepresentations—if they be such—of a Senator MCCARTHY, or the ridiculing of his charges by officials, newspapers and the radio, merely concern an effect.

The administration, and the administration alone, can answer to the people for the vicious results of policies which imperil the world.

Senator MCCARTHY is but a side issue, an individual who is endeavoring to blow the lid off a malodorous situation.

The threat to the United States is not so much the Soviet abroad as the pro-Soviet forces, and their defenders, in the United States.

Communist Infiltration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include the first of a series of articles that are to appear in the Washington Times-Herald by Mr. Frank C. Waldrop, on the infiltration of Communists and communism into our country and our Government.

And Mr. Speaker, I shall ask permission to insert all of these articles, as they appear, in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The first article follows:

BIGGEST STORY

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Mr. Westbrook Pegler is resting, incredible as that may seem. So for a while this space will be filled with a reporter's account of 20 years spent on one news story.

It is a story of everything from riots in the streets of Washington to the silent, deadly explosions of ideas in men's brains around the world.

It touches on, as chapters in passing, two fantastic world wars and the corrupting of American policy, both foreign and domestic. The shape of the story today has all of us calculating and wondering about another war yet more awful than the last.

It is the biggest news story of the twentieth century because it deals with events and decisions, words and thoughts that have had shattering effect on civilization and done immeasurable damage to the human race.

And in this placid, beautiful city of Washington, not in Moscow, were the decisions made that caused this biggest news story of the twentieth century to become what it is.

The story, of course, is of communism's rise from the cellars and jail cells of Europe to that which it is today.

This writer's connection is an account of that rise as noted by one American newspaper reporter who has only used his eyes to see and his ears to hear.

The details and the evidence are all of record here in Washington, D. C., in the Library of Congress, in the Department of Justice, in the Department of State, and in the intelligence files of the Army, Navy and Air Force.

The facts are nobody's guess. They are unshakable and they are dyed with the blood of millions of humankind.

Just so, they are also forever marked as the follies of men in public office who would not admit the facts, because those facts would show them wrong in their own willful judgments.

Some facts this running record will develop in detail, are these:

Communism is an international movement intended to conquer and rule the world. But that is not to say it can conquer, in the open.

As a matter of fact, it has more often run backward toward internal collapse, than forward. It has only been kept alive by help from outside.

That help, in the past 20 years, has been primarily American. The tax dollars of United States citizens and outright United States gifts from the rich and well-to-do are the real reason for world communism's establishment.

The Communist organization in the United States is not, and never has been, a political party contesting here in the arena of free expression for public acceptance. The masters of Communist action know very well they cannot win that way.

The Communist organization in the United States is an arm of the international conspiracy for power and it operates by any means, legal or illegal, to obey the orders it gets by regular courier service from Moscow.

Finally, communism is not and never has been, a working class movement. Its authors, leaders, and developers the world over have been invariably from the educated and well off, who turned to conspiracy and illegal violence for means to rule.

These statements just above are no longer very vigorously denied in Washington. They have been proved too terribly true. But they were just as obviously true 5, 10, and 15 years ago as they are this very hour.

And 5, 10, and 15 years ago these obvious truths were literally dangerous to utter in this very city of Washington.

People who did so had to be prepared for the most vicious kind of punishment.

This punishment was dealt them by the Communists in offices of power in the Government of the United States. Sometimes the Communists acted directly, sometimes through dummies.

How did the Communists ever achieve such power and influence?

This series begins to develop the record step by step.

It will deal with the idea of communism, and what that is.

It will go on with the basic "who, what, when, where, and why" of that idea in action, which is the only reason for saying that communism is the biggest story in the world today.

Second Anniversary of the State of Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHASE GOING WOODHOUSE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1950

Mrs. WOODHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert herewith a radio talk given over WNLC, New London, Conn., on the second anniversary of the founding of the State of Israel:

This week the new State of Israel is celebrating its second anniversary. A people with a long history and a great tradition, after tragic years of exile, have founded a new state. It is a homeland for the Jewish people, but it is more than that. It is the bridgehead of western civilization and of democracy in the Middle East, and as such it is an important factor in our hope for a world at peace.

In 2 years Israel has gone forward in a way which no purely logical forecast could have predicted. It has achieved to this remarkable extent because of the spirit of its people. They are imbued with a deep religious sense, with a deep purpose. They have a goal. Last fall as I watched the men and women in the streets of Tel Aviv I had a feeling of viewing a great crusade. The men and women showed determination and action. They had a purpose. Above all there is about them as we saw them at work in the streets, in the hotels, even in the recreation camps for the immigrants, an aura of happiness, a sense of people who had found their place in life.

In a very real degree Israel epitomizes a force which the world needs if we are to find peace. We must have a revival of a truly religious spirit. The great scientific inventions which have made possible modern industry and also modern warfare make it essential that we act in accordance with a genuine religion. I speak not of any sect, theology or dogma but of the idea of a power above and beyond man which inspires him with a purpose, with an ideal of responsibility to humanity, and of immortality achieved by fulfilling that responsibility.

Our lives are not our own. They are for the service of our group. The concept of the size of that group has been expanded by the scientific inventions which have all but eliminated time and space and have made the world so small.

The degrading results of the abandonment of religion by the Nazis, their wiping out of entire communities, the decimation of the people of the Jewish faith in Europe, have brought home to the Western World the fact that our culture, our entire way of life, has a deep religious basis. Where religion is lost, people revert to barbarism, and the actions of the leaders in control of the Soviets reinforces and emphasizes that realization.

Faith, a belief that life has a purpose, that we each have a responsibility toward making that purpose a reality not only for ourselves, not only for our immediate family, not only for the people of our country but for the people of the world, is essential, if we are to have peace and to survive as civilized human beings.

This deeply religious feeling of brotherhood, of the oneness of humanity, of the dignity and worthwhileness of the individual lies at the very core of American life. In days of prosperity and security it is likely to rest a bit below the surface, but in these days of doubt and insecurity we are feeling the need for its more open expression.

Nowhere have I seen it so happily expressed as in Israel. There it is evident in the faces and bearing of the men and women one sees hurrying through the streets of Tel-Aviv or at work in the shops and on the farms. Here is a nation brought into being after centuries of suffering, suffering which culminated in a threat of annihilation; brought into being by leaders who refused to see difficulties because they saw a goal which had to be achieved if their people were to be saved.

And the men and women who have followed the leaders, who have with the help of friends in America and elsewhere found their way through struggle and hardship from eastern Europe, from North Africa, from Yemen are imbued with the same deep feeling of a great religious crusade in which they are an integral part.

In Israel we have a vividly dramatic presentation of the idea of brotherhood, of obligation to one's fellows. We hear much of the achievements of Israel. Perhaps we should talk more of the difficulties which have been overcome by sheer will power, devotion, and hard work, and of the difficulties which are still present. The economic problem this new nation faces is intense. Never before has a nation invited immigrants to its shores in such numbers, percentagewise, when its resources were so limited, its agriculture and its industry so undeveloped, its housing so short, its government so new, its peace so unsure. The population of Israel has just passed the 1,000,000 mark. Of this million nearly 400,000 men, women, children, the old and infirm, as well as the young and strong, have arrived in the past 2 years. The leaders of Israel had promised a homeland to their people in need anywhere in the world. In spite of the difficulties they are keeping their promise and the door is open.

These immigrants include highly trained professional people from eastern Europe and also children from Yemen who have never before arrival in Israel seen a bed or worn a pair of shoes. Currently, the bulk of the immigration is of underprivileged people from North Africa and from Yemen. They have to be oriented in reception camps, taught Hebrew, prepared for work on the farms, jobs and houses found for them. The task is colossal.

Every possible help must be given this State of Israel in order that they may build a material basis for their structure now grounded so largely on faith and the will to achieve.

One great need is for private investment. Israel must have irrigation projects if the land is to support its growing population. American engineers have carefully prepared plans which are feasible. With water the land can produce in abundance. Already citrus fruits provide some two-thirds of Israel's exports.

There is need for more industry. To date industry has been carefully planned with emphasis upon producing articles which require relatively small amounts of imported materials. This is necessary because Israel must still import one-half its food and total imports are nearly seven times as great as its exports.

New idustries are being developed. American capital is helping in the construction of a steel mill. A tire and tube factory is being built, financed in part by American

interests. A company backed by several large American labor groups is prepared to construct $2,000,000 worth of housing.

This is just a beginning. The future of Israel depends on peace with the Arab states, in the development of a sound economy, and on the willingness of the United States and Great Britain to give the new nation—already a member of the United Nations—financial and political backing.

This help must be forthcoming. For these pioneers in Israel are serving not only their own people. They are serving all peace-loving and God-fearing people everywhere. They are building a bridgehead of democracy and humanitarianism in the Middle East where the heavy hand of tradition and of feudalism has so long held static living conditions of hunger, misery, poverty, want, illiteracy, and disregard for human life and for the dignity of the individual. Israel with its close ties with the west and its traditional background of the east is in a unique position. It is permeated with the spirit of democracy, with the gospel of botherhood, and of life with a purpose. Such people are the hope of peace, for peace cannot be built out of material things alone; peace comes only out of the minds of men.

So today peace-loving peoples can wholeheartedly offer congratulations to Israel on its second anniversary and give serious thought to further assistance in its great undertaking.

Is America Losing Its Way?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 24, 1950

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, under permission heretofore granted me by the membership of the House to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am enclosing a short editorial by one of the outstanding editors in my State, Mr. A. Q. Miller.

It is entitled "Is America Losing Its Way?" I commend it for your reading and thought.

IS AMERICA LOSING ITS WAY?
(By A. Q. Miller)

During the month of February each year the Nation's thoughts turn to two great Americans—George Washington and Abraham Lincoln—men with great minds, great visions and great souls, men who loved their country dearly and who gave it a full measure of their loyalty. The former is credited with having established the Union, and the latter with having preserved it.

Like others of our founding fathers, these two great Americans took the people into their confidence and discharged their duties with a singleness of purpose, placing the Nation's welfare ahead of personal and political gain. It was on this kind of foundation that America was built. For 160 years America stood like the Rock of Gibraltar—upright before the world, respected and honored, the symbol of democracy and the envy of the free nations of the earth. America taught that in a democracy people derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, and welded together a Nation conceived in liberty and developed under the philosophy of free enterprise.

Here for a century and a half, in such an atmosphere, was built a Nation with the greatest liberty and freedom, the highest standard of living of any nation on earth. It was in this atmosphere, with such lofty ideals, that our forefathers wrote the declaration of Independence, Constitution, and Bill of Rights, which was declared by some foreign governments to be the greatest Charter of Liberty ever penned by man.

Henry Clay declared he would rather be right than President. George Washington said the first duty of every American was to America, to do justice to all. Said Washington: "Let us raise here a standard to which wise and honest men can repair,"—"a government," Lincoln declared, "of, by and for the people, which should not perish from the earth." After the Civil War, out of his great heart, Lincoln said: "With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right, let us strive to finish the work we have begun and bind up the Nation's wounds."

It is a far cry across that century and a half of illustrious history to the present era of greed and p er politics. The country has been led down the primrose path to the brink of disaster by false leaders, ostensibly into the lands of milk and honey, upon promises of security if the people would give up some of their liberties, with the inevitable result that they are losing both their security and liberty.

Somehow America seems to have lost some of its ideals, patriotism, and love of country which in the early days animated individual citizens and inspired them to a greater national pride and spirit.

Our country and our world can well afford to turn their thoughts to such examples as George Washington at Valley Forge and Abraham Lincoln at Gettysburg.

Renazification and Remilitarization of Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1950

Mr. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an address which I delivered on Thursday evening, April 20, 1950, at a public meeting held at Mann School, Fifty-fourth and Berks Streets, Philadelphia, sponsored by the Wynnefield-Overbrook Committee To Stop the Renazification and Remilitarization of Germany and its affiliates, the Wynnefield Hadassah, and Jewish War Veterans, Post 148, of Wynnefield:

Ladies and gentlemen, I am always grateful for the opportunity to talk to you and discuss matters of mutual concern, and to this end such meetings as this serve an exceedingly useful purpose. I am interested in learning your problems and I am likewise anxious to acquaint you with mine, as I view them from the Nation's Capital.

Tonight it is my duty to report to you about one of the most unhappy subjects within our recent memory. It is not the war, but its aftermath and specifically its aftermath in Germany. We who had fervently hoped that the end of hostilities would herald an era of peace must now confront the fact that there is no peace. And there will be no peace until the western powers correct the tragic mistakes made as the result of their failure to keep faith with the war dead, the veterans of the great conflict and the millions of living and deceased victims of the Nazi reign of terror.

The continuation of the so-called cold war is a menace to world peace, but we likewise face another problem no less real and considerably more vexing in the western zone of Germany. This latter problem—the rebirth of extreme nationalism and remilitarization—is too often lightly dismissed with the declaration that "we are doing all that we can." But are we? Ladies and gentlemen, let us face the fact. We are not, and unless we rise to our responsibilities now, it may well be too late. To put it bluntly, the allied program in western Germany is destined to be a flat failure if the participating nations do not act at once to stop appeasement, stem the growing tide of nazism and implant the seeds of democracy in such a way that they will flourish and not be stamped out under the heels of Nazis who have been permitted to rise to positions of prominence and influence by wishful-thinking representatives of the triumphant western powers.

The failure of the west to denazify Germany is best summed up by the question of an unreconstructed nationalistic German editor who recently asked: "Who learns from whom?" Five years of occupation have taught us that if anything is on trial in Germany, the "defendant" is not the German nation, but democracy. Our foreign correspondents, qualified students of world affairs, and our wire services bring this lesson home to us daily in disturbing news reports. What do these dispatches reveal?

Here are but a few cases: Ludwell Denny in the New York World-Telegram reports: "Scores of new sheets have announced publication plans, and an estimated three-fourths are former Nazis. Among the old Hitler and Goebbels aids who are active again are Max Winkler, Herbert Cobaltsky, Othmar Best, and Max Willmay."

The Stuttgarter Zeitung discussing the British financial crisis writes: "It is very possible that Great Britain's value to America as an ally will soon sharply depreciate. This would be tremendously important for us Germans, because recent months have shown that it is a definite policy of the British foreign office to hold down Germany economically and politically. * * * If Anglo-American friction increases and Britain's situation becomes weaker, we may expect that America may assign an increasing importance to Germany's role on the continent and lend a more willing ear to German wishes."

In this city, the Philadelphia Inquirer editorially high lighted an unsavory aspect of the German situation when it reported: "A German town in which Nazi tendencies merit watching is Wolfsburg, in the British occupation zone. Wolfsburg was founded by Hitler in 1938 as the site of the Volkswagon automobile plant * * * It appears that there are strange goings on in Wolfsburg. The Nazi straightarm salute has been seen and the Horst Wessel song, Nazi anthem, heard. Furthermore, in a city election the Nazi-like Deutsche party polled a popular majority of 12,619 votes as against 7,800 by the social democrats and 4,009 by the Christian democrats. Later the two democratic parties swung together and with the aid—of all things—the Communists, kept the Fuehrerheilers from taking over. All of this should be a sharp warning, not only to the British, but to all other occupation forces, against a revival of Nazism either openly or underground."

These shocking disclosures are not new. They are not isolated cases. Reports on subsurface Nazi activities in Germany have been repeated time and again since VE-day.

Unquestionably much of the extreme nationalism which has come to the fore in Germany has been deliberately inspired by the Communists who are practicing their traditional policy of divide and conquer. The stakes in Germany are high. Let us not deceive ourselves: the Soviet union will not

spare any effort to reap the rich reward on the Rhine. Evidence of this policy was further substantiated last week in a communication from Major General Maxwell D. Taylor. He warned of the possibility of more disorders in Berlin. "These," he said, "can be instigated by Communists along the Soviet boundary or even well within the western sectors, where demonstrators can stage surprise raids from s-bahn or u-bahn stations. * * * The few incursions which have recently taken place have been small and have hardly justified the adjectives which have at times brought forth. However, there is quite likely to be an increase in the 'spontaneous' instigated disorders in the coming weeks. Some of these," General Taylor asserted, "may even become quite serious and may require stern measures. I feel sure that we shall meet any such situation with firmness. While there is no blinking at the evidence of a persistent Communist desire eventually to take over Berlin and to absorb it into the Communist-dominated eastern state, the desire will remain unfulfilled if we know determination."

The resurgence of German nationalism is a major threat to world peace, but it should also be recognized that its rise is not the exclusive fault of the Western Powers and that a lion's share of the blame can rightly be attributed to the Soviet Union in its quest for world domination.

It is no secret that the eastern regime, with its artificial boast of freedom from Soviet control, is being used to inflame nationalist passions in the western zone of Germany. The New York Post points up this fact in its comment that "The climax of the performance, according to the Russian script, will come when western Germany's mounting insistence on similar independence forces the United States to pull out before it loses every vestige of German support. In short, the Soviet Union has resolved that the only remaining German problem is not that country's possible future with fascism but whether the east or the west can succeed in luring the new Reich into a carefree love affair."

Ladies and gentlemen, the disgusting spectacle which occupies our attention in Germany sickens the heart of freedom-loving people throughout the world.

The war isn't over until the peace is won, and the state of affairs in Germany today is a far cry from peace. There can be no real peace when we continue to permit ourselves to be diplomatically boxed in a corner, surrounded by the threat of communism, a rebirth of nazism in its most despicable form, utter lawlessness, and the remilitarization of our unreconstructed enemies.

It is high time that the Western Powers redeem themselves in the eyes of the world, in the eyes of the veterans, in the memory of the millions of dead, including the 6,000,000 Jews gassed and starved and subjected to horrible agony. You know and I know that there can be no peace so long as thousands of victims of the Hitler reign of terror still stalk Europe homeless, uncared for and unwanted.

The fate of these tragic, persecuted people is the shame of the world. I cannot believe that any American in his heart would deny them hope, and the moral, spiritual, and financial support so necessary to reestablish themselves to their rightful position in the community of nations.

If anyone harbors any doubts to the effect that the Jews are no longer persecuted in Germany, I feel sure that this information will dispell them. A few nights ago, the following report was brought to my attention: A substantial number of Jews in the French occupation zone of Germany are receiving post cards, postmarked Frieburg, requesting them to "Report to the state crematorium for extermination," according to a dispatch appearing in the newspaper, Droit Et Liberté.

One such postcard, the account stated, addressed to Jews at Emmerdingen read:

"As you have reached the required age, you should report immediately to the state crematorium, portal No. 9, furnace No. 36, door No. 5 in order that your bodies may be burned. You should bring some firewood, coal, and a container for your ashes, which will be used for the manufacture of soap. You should close all pores and openings in your bodies so that your gases will not poison employees at the crematorium."

That, ladies and gentlemen, is but one sample of the type of revolting literature being distributed to Jews in Germany today. And some people still have the gall to say that the Jews are not being persecuted.

The solution of the German problem is a world problem and its solution is our collective responsibility. Governments are made up of people and we are all subject to human failings, but if we are alert to the dangers inherent in the German situation and continually make our will known to our elected representatives and Government officials our demands will be heeded.

Every week brings hundreds of letters to my Washington desk decrying the policies of the western powers toward the extreme nationalists in the western zone of Germany. Their writers have just cause to be alarmed, and yes frightened and fearful of the future. I can fully appreciate their concern. As a veteran I know the horror of war. As your Congressman I am intimately acquainted with the many tragic problems of Jews in all walks of life, and as your elected representative I have and always will do the utmost in my power to assist in solving these problems. Moreover I consider it a sacred obligation because I have fought for every legislative measure designed to stamp out Nazism and restore the right of people who have undergone intolerable racial and religious persecution. I might also add that your kind support and guidance has been an invaluable help to me.

But, ladies and gentlemen, one man, or one group of men, or one government cannot hope to solve the problem alone. Its solution depends upon a combined effort. As the foremost nation in the world today, I demand that the United States assert its leadership among nations and assume the responsibility of charting the course which not only will prevent Germany from ever being a menace to world peace again, but likewise secure once and for all time the inalienable rights of all people regardless of race or creed to enjoy the fruits of freedom without fear.

The road ahead is long and beset with many pitfalls. We cannot hope to proceed without making any mistakes. The important thing is that we correct those mistakes before they cripple our program. That we have made some progress is certain, but inevitably our attention was diverted to the crisis occasioned by the high-handed tactics of the Soviet Union. It is time that we concentrate our efforts on the matters at hand in Germany particularly as they affect the western zone. We will rise or fall according to our determination to carry out our sworn pledge to de-nazify the German nation so that it never again will constitute a threat to peace in our lifetime, and in the lifetime of our children. Anything less would be a betrayal.

I urge, with all the power at my command, that we prevent the election of former Nazis to public office, that we stop a remilitarization program, that we enforce law and order under heavy penalty, that we strengthen our program of preventing further territorial expansion by the Soviet Union in Germany and elsewhere throughout the world.

Furthermore, I recommend an expanded program of assistance to the persecuted racial and religious groups which have experienced the venom of Hitler and his sympathetic successors.

We must all have a hand in the great crusade to stem the tide of extreme nationalism and the remilitarization of an enemy nation that twice in our lifetime has attempted to enslave the world.

We cannot afford to give Germans weapons because they will be turned on us.

We are in a fight to spread the gospel of democracy and freedom as a substitute for nazism, fascism, socialism, and communism.

It is perhaps the most important fight of our time for if we lose it we will have lost everything. Let us not rest until we win.

Thank you.

America's Growing Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1950

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, America's No. 1 problem is our growing unemployment. While prosperity continues, and employment and production are high, these very facts may hide from us the growing paralysis of unemployment. The drop in joblessness of a half million from March to April may cause us to forget that in May and June, over a million and a half persons will be emerging from our schools and colleges and will be added to the list of job seekers.

I am inserting in the RECORD an excellent analysis of this situation by Dewey Anderson, director of the Public Affairs Institute, in a recent letter to the Washington Post.

I am also inserting an editorial that appeared on Sunday, April 23, in the Washington Post, commenting on Mr. Anderson's analysis. I commend both of these commentaries to my colleagues.

The matters referred to follow:

FALLING EMPLOYMENT: IS IT JUST A BOGEY?

(By Dewey Anderson, executive director, Public Affairs Institute)

Despite high levels of economic activity, unemployment persists, is becoming widespread, and causes Herblock's Uncle Sam to cast a disturbed eye on current economic curves.

What explains it all? In a nutshell, this country is experiencing serious and possibly critical unemployment which is rooted in a deficiency of effective private demand in relation to a rapidly growing potential of full-employment output.

Stripped of this economic gobbledegook, we just don't seem to be able to expand our private purchasing fast enough to take off the market all that our advancing technology produces.

So, new workers entering the labor force don't get jobs, and only a fraction of the million plus laid off since 1948 have been rehired.

Reverting to the more precise descriptions of economics and statistics, let's take a look at the facts.

Some people would have us believe that this unemployment scare is a bogey, that what we really have is a couple of distressed industries, textiles and coal, and a couple of distressed areas, New England and the Middle Atlantic States. Well, hard as it would be to solve unemployment even in these relatively circumscribed industries and regions, joblessness is not confined there.

Right now there are 43 so-called E areas, cities, and towns having such substantial labor surpluses that unemployment is running over 12 percent. Of the 100 major labor markets whose pulse the Government takes regularly, half were classified this January 1 as having substantial labor surplus with unemployment rates high above the national average of 7 percent. By comparison, January 1949 showed only 19 such areas, and in November 1948, when the downturn first started the number was only 9.

Of the 50 areas having substantial labor surpluses, 19 are located in the New England and Middle Atlantic States, 11 in the North Central States, 11 in the South Atlantic and South Central States, and 9 in the West. So, considerably over half of the areas suffering substantial unemployment are elsewhere than in the coal and textile regions.

Looking at the ratios between the insured unemployed to covered employment, we get a good measure of actual job losses. The latest available data are for the week ending February 11, 1950, during which Pennsylvania, Connecticut, and Massachusetts ranged from 6.1 to 6.3 percent against the national average of 7.1 percent. Outside of New England, however, 23 States had jobless ratios exceeding that of the States just mentioned. Half of this number had unemployment ratios ranging from 9.5 percent for Tennessee to 19.6 percent in Oregon.

A declining bituminous coal industry or the migration of textile plants from New England to the South create local employment problems. But they are not sufficiently significant in the national sense to characterize what is happening in the United States. Still confining our figures to the ratios between the insured unemployed and covered jobs, the following comparison of national averages for 3 years shows an unmistakable deteriorating trend in employment.

	Percent
Week ending Oct. 9, 1948	2.4
Week ending Feb. 12, 1949	5.7
Week ending Feb. 11, 1950	7.1

The last figure for February 1950, must be interpreted in the light of approximately 1,300,000 job claimants who had exhausted their job benefits by December 1949, and though they may still remain unemployed do not appear on the rolls. With the start of new benefit years in April, May, June, and July, it is likely that the ratio will rise further.

Some writers have tried to describe the current concern with unemployment as a bogeyman, because they point out that youth coming into the market for the first time is being absorbed faster now than, say, a year ago. The ratio of unemployed youth 24 years old and younger to total unemployment has dropped from 40 percent in February 1948, to 33 percent in February 1949. Point well taken and point fully proved. But is it?

In February 1948, there were 2,639,000 unemployed. Of this number, 1,020,000, or about 40 percent, were 24 years old or younger. But such young people in the labor force totaled 11,860,000. So, 9 percent of this youth group were unemployed.

Now take a look at the figures for February 1950, a year later. By that time unemployment had almost doubled, rising to 4,484,000. But while the number of youth unemployed had risen above the previous year to 1,550,000, their ratio did decline relative to total unemployment. However, the actual number of young workers in the labor force in February 1950 had fallen off by 140,000 while their rate of unemployment had risen to 14 percent contrasted with 9 percent a year earlier.

It is true that percentagewise all other age groups have shown greater relative increases in unemployment rates since 1948. But this is so because as early as 1948 youth was already experiencing great difficulty in getting jobs and had already reached high unemployment rates. Older workers had remarkedly lower unemployment rates and hence had a lower statistical base from which to climb.

How badly affected young people are by the current inadequacy of new job opportunities is shown in the first quarter of 1950 where males aged 14-19 are 16 percent unemployed, those 20-24 years old suffer over 12 percent unemployment, whereas in no other group in the labor force was unemployment as high as the national average of 7.2 percent. We conclude from all this that young people entering the labor market for the first time, or those with limited work experience are hit first and hardest on the downswing of the unemployment cycle. They are the most prominent element in the currently unemployed, although older, experienced workers have also experienced a sharp increase in joblessness.

Some people viewing the figures on duration of unemployment come to the too superficial conclusion that jobs keep opening up at a rapid rate and take workers off the unemployment line before they suffer severely. The facts that tend to support this view are: Currently about a third of those unemployed have been jobless for a month or less, while two-thirds have been unemployed for 10 weeks or less.

But take a look at these facts, too:

In October 1948 the number unemployed for 3 months or more total approximately 400,000. Since then there has been an unspectacular but steady month-to-month accession of long-time hard-core unemployed. In March 1950 the number unemployed for 3 months or more had risen to 1,800,000, more than 4 times the number 17 months earlier. In March 1949 17 percent of the unemployed had been out of work 15 weeks or more; a year later the percentage was 28. Here is hard-core unemployment manifesting itself both as a trend over the last 2 years, and in sufficient numbers to present a problem of national concern which cannot be shrugged off.

This becomes even more significant when one examines the most important employment sector of the economy, manufacturing. Here is the largest absolute user of workers, where the largest amount of wage income available for purchases is disbursed, and the sector which is most sensitive to changes in demand for capital and consumer goods. October 1948 represented the postwar peak in manufacturing employment, a total of 12.7 millions being at work then. By July 1949 (after seasonal allowances), production-worker employment had fallen by 1.3 millions, or almost 11 percent. Between July and September of that year a brief moderate upturn raised the total by 200,000, or less than 2 percent. Since then production-worker employment has remained relatively unchanged.

There is no evidence of expanding job opportunities, either in durable- or nondurable-goods manufacture. There is evidence that employers in durable-goods industries apparently prefer to increase hours of work rather than employment when confronted with a pressure for increased output.

What characterizes today's employment situation in manufacturing is a severe contraction in jobs, followed by a relatively extended period of stability—that is of stagnation. For only an expanding employed labor force in the production sector of the economy fits the needs for over-all economic growth required by an increasing population. Coupled with a marked rise in worker productivity, there is in prospect further reductions in employment unless there is an accompanying rise in effective demand, something which is not now in sight.

In testimony offered before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, in January 1949, we were constrained to observe that the dynamic expansion of the private sector of our economy apparently ceased as early as 1947. Since then, it has been primarily Government policy such as foreign aid, rearmament, housing subsidies, etc., which have supported the level of total expenditures upon which our employment has been sustained. Even with this unprecedented volume of supporting Government expenditures, there has developed a growing hard core of distressed unemployed workers not restricted to any geographic area, and a substantial growing body of young people for whom job prospects remain dim short of a greatly changed economic future not now discernible.

WASHINGTON.

[From the Washington Post of April 23, 1950]

NO ROOM FOR THEM

An article by Dewey Anderson, executive director of the Public Affairs Institute, appearing last Friday in the Washington Post provides convincing statistical proof that this country is confronted by serious unemployment. This unemployment is not confined to New England and the Middle Atlantic States, nor to a few distressed industries. It is Nation-wide, and is due chiefly to the fact that new jobs are not being created fast enough to take care of a rapidly expanding labor force.

Young people entering the labor market for the first time have been especially hard-hit; in the first quarter of this year, for example, 16 percent of male job seekers between the ages of 14 and 19 were unemployed as compared with a national average of slightly more than 7 percent. Furthermore, last March 1,800,000 people had been unemployed for 3 months or longer—more than four times the comparable number reported for October 1948. Here, Mr. Anderson notes, "is hard-core unemployment manifesting itself both as a trend over the last 2 years, and in sufficient numbers to present a problem of national concern which cannot be shrugged off."

The employment situation in manufacturing is especially disturbing, for a decline in numbers employed has been followed by comparative stabilization. Since the per capita productive output of workers employed by manufacturing industries has been rising, a further reduction in employment in this sector of the economy is in prospect in the absence of an offsetting expansion of industrial activity.

Mr. Anderson explains that the present unemployment is due to "inability to expand our private purchasing power fast enough to take off the market all that our advancing technology produces." But this explanation does not answer the question at issue: How to increase the effective demand for goods. Can it be done by systematic doses of inflation that, by raising prices, would encourage industry to produce more, employ more workers and put more money in the hands of consumers? Or is it possible to increase productive output and provide more jobs without resort to inflationary expedients?

This newspaper has suggested that the remedy for unemployment lies in creating new industries and lowering production costs so that existing industries can expand their markets and provide more jobs. But we confess that this advice is easy to give but not always easy or possible to follow. A statistician can sit down and figure out on paper how much this country is capable of producing and how much it must produce in order to insure maximum employment. For instance the President's Council of Economic Advisers estimates that to insure reasonably full employment by 1954 it would be necessary to raise output from the level of $258,000,000,000 (the 1949 figure) to $300,000,000,000 or more. Again, how is it to

be done? Can private industry be depended on to make wise decisions, or even to respond to urgings to expand production facilities? Is there any way of determining how much money needs to be spent on investment in production facilities? Do we know whether too much or too little purchasing power is going to investors or to consumers? Is there any assurance that an increase in purchasing power will be used to buy more consumer goods, or will surpluses of some commodities pile up—a condition that would result in reductions in the scale of operations and less employment?

These are only a few of the many questions raised by the specter of chronic unemployment. We do not know the answers, but we hope that public discussion of this vitally important subject will provide needed enlightenment.

Dedication of Restored McLean House at Appomattox, Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM B. FUGATE
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1950

Mr. FUGATE. Mr. Speaker, on April 16 in Appomattox more than 20,000 people gathered to dedicate the restored McLean House. As you know, the McLean House was where Gen. Robert E. Lee surrendered the Confederate Army to Gen. Ulysses S. Grant on April 9, 1865. The occasion was most colorful with all State officials present, including the Governor, Lieutenant Governor, attorney general, and members of the State senate and house of delegates.

Dr. Douglas S. Freman, the greatest historian living on Lee and the South, covering the period of the War Between the States, delivered the main address.

United States Senator VIRGIL CHAPMAN was present and spoke briefly.

Robert E. Lee 4th and Ulysses S. Grant 3d were present.

Our colleague, WATKINS M. ABBITT, Congress of the Fourth District of Virginia, was presiding officer.

Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the most fitting remarks of Congressman ABBITT on this occasion:

One week ago today, Sunday, April 9, was the eighty-fifth anniversary of one of the most significant and far-reaching events in the history of our great country. There is no date of more importance to us since the adoption of the Federal Constitution than April 9, 1865. On that Palm Sunday, Gen. Ulysses S. Grant, commanding the Federal troops, and Gen. Robert Edward Lee, at the head of the army of northern Virginia, met here in this country village where we are today assembled.

For a number of years prior to actual hostilities our county had become sharply divided in political philosophy as well as national outlook. Different problems confronted the two main sections of our country. The economic stability was different in the North from that of the South. Bitter feelings were aroused. Animosity was kindled, hard words were uttered, until finally war was almost inevitable between the two sections of our country.

This developed gradually into a shooting war involving principles and ideals of government with neither side willing or able to give in short of war.

In a general way we are all familiar with subsequent events relating to the War Between the States. Both sides felt strongly that they were fighting for principles that could not be sacrificed, for ideals that were just and right.

The patriotism, loyalty, and bravery of these armies have never been surpassed.

The war raged over a wide area and for four long years. Each side had their ups and downs. For a while high hopes of victory were beating in the breasts of the people of each side. Finally the tide began to turn and the southern cause appeared to be hopeless. Then followed that fateful Sunday, April 9, 1865.

General Grant in dictating the peace terms demonstrated his love for his country, his honesty of purpose, and his sincere belief in the future of this great Nation. General Lee in accepting the peace terms and in his farewell address to his men demonstrated his farsightedness, his wisdom, and his courage, as well as his belief in the future of our country and the position of the South in years to come.

The peace that was made between Generals Grant and Lee at Appomattox has been a lasting one. It has stood the test of time, as witness our presence here today to dedicate as one of our national shrines this historical peace house, which stands as a monument to a lasting peace between the two warring sections of our great country.

It represents the reuniting of a war-torn Nation; the welding together of a mighty people; the healing of a wide breach; and stands as an emblem of peace between our people as well as in memory of those great warriors who fought, bled, and died for principles they believed in and were willing to sacrifice their all in defense of them.

It is true that after the peace terms were signed a number of the people thought that a great cause had been lost, that a bitter defeat had been suffered, but I say to you today that as a result of that conflict and the peace that we commemorate here today, our Nation has developed into an even finer, greater, and better one than ever before. We realize that there are some things dearer than life itself, that where there is a struggle not everyone can win, but that where principles are involved man must follow his conscience and his heart.

On behalf of the people of Appomattox County particularly and the Commonwealth of Virginia in general I extend to you, and each of you who are here as well as those within the sound of our voices, a hearty and cordial welcome. We are proud of the privilege and opportunity of having you as our guests. We desire to extend to you every courtesy and consideration possible. We want you to feel at home, and if there is anything that you desire to know or need, please feel free to call on any of us to assist you at any time.

Address by the Ambassador of Ireland to the Fordham University Club of Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRIEN McMAHON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by the Ambassador from Ireland, Hon. John J. Hearne, to the Fordham University Club of Washington at the Mayflower Hotel last evening. This is the Ambassador's first address in the United States, and, as all Senators know, he is the first Ambassador from Ireland to the United States. The address is well worth reading.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I was greatly honored by the invitation of your president to address you on this occasion. It was the first invitation I received, after my appointment was announced, to address an American audience, and it gave me a particular personal pleasure to accept it. A few days ago I was most graciously received by the President of the United States when I presented my letter of credence. In coming to you this evening, I feel that I am reentering your capital through portals longer, although not more familiar to me than those through which I so recently entered. I shall always remember that my first public address in Washington was made to the members of the Fordham Club and shall always recall with happiness and gratitude the welcome you gave me in these first days as an earnest of the good wishes of your far-famed university for the success of the mission of the first Ambassador of Ireland to the United States.

A man's life, Mr. President, however carefully planned for its chosen tasks is, nevertheless, providentially designed, and, therefore, sometimes, deviously led by unexpected paths to its appointed labor. Thirty years ago I started my professional career as a lawyer with the laudable enough ambition of becoming a leading counsel at the bar of Ireland. My legal career did not end in that way. I did not become a leading counsel in Ireland; I became, instead, a leading case in Canada. That is why I am here. The Canadian people suffered me for 10 years or so; the Canadian Government feel, I believe, that their suffering was of much longer duration. When they could stand me no longer they looked around for somewhere to send me, and, as we had just declared a republic in Ireland, they put me quietly over the border into the Republic nearest to hand on this continent. As it was the Republic nearest of all to the heart of our own people the Government of Ireland endorsed my deportation and advised our President to accredit me to President Truman. As I say, a man's life, however carefully planned, is sometimes deviously led along unexpected paths to its appointed labor.

Our toastmaster has told you something about me prior to my first adventure in North America. He gave you an account of some mythical personage bearing no resemblance and certainly no relation to any living person. Mr. President and gentlemen, you will by now have realized the fact of the matter, namely, that Ireland carries her vast investment in international friendship in the most fragile of vessels.

I am greatly honored, Mr. President, and very happy to have been afforded this opportunity of addressing you in this informal way at this particular time on the subject of Irish-American relations. The establishment of an Irish embassy in Washington and of an American embassy in Dublin are events of exceptional significance and importance in the long story of the friendship between Ireland and the great American people. We all know that our relations do not depend upon formal diplomatic intercourse, that they are deeper and closer than any that can be defined in terms of treaties or pacts, and that they have survived and will outlive the vicissitudes of our separate fortunes. The long association of this great country with

my own constitutes a unique historical phenomenon. And it is because I feel that, taken together, the character, the intimacy and the permanence of our friendship is so stupendous a reality in international life that I refer to it in this first address in the Capital of the United States for what it is, for what it has been to us both and for what it may become to the world at large. I have not come to tell you the story of our people in their ceaseless pilgrimage across the globe. You know the part they played on the continent of Europe in that prolonged and prophetic twilight between the actual downfall of the pagan and the virtual enthronement of the Christian western world. You know how they stood sponsors at the birth of that France around which all Europe grew up and grew old, a role which our people were destined—I like to think predestined—to fulfil, again and again, in other ages, and in parts of the world then unknown. You recall how, later, here in this hemisphere, great Irishmen, deprived of liberty and justice at home, planned and labored with others to secure these priceless possessions, for those who came after, and did, in fact, secure them in the political systems of the two great democracies of North America. Tonight, Mr. President, I seem to stand at the end of a long procession of men and women of Ireland who came to you through all the years not as emissaries but as emigrants and who here found a refuge, a welcome, and a home. Was it any wonder that with a story beginning as one of compassion so deep on your side and of indebtedness so great on ours, was it any wonder that our people gratefully gave you of their best in the years that are gone: fathers of confederation, churchmen, administrators, statesmen, soldiers, judges, doctors, men of letters and of science, mining and railroad engineers, agriculturists, merchant princes, captains of industry, my voice gives out before my memory fails—nation builders all. I could go on and on down the line of the long procession of Irishmen which passes even to this hour into American history. But let me turn from this too reminiscent retrospect to the promise which the character of our friendship holds for all mankind today.

We have been passing through a period in which great changes have been taking place in many countries, including my own; a period in which the relations between States have become more than normally complicated by epidemic economic crises, and the whole field of foreign affairs profoundly affected by the oscillations of a seismic ideological upheaval. The experiences through which we have been passing have placed a great strain upon governments and parliaments in most countries, and have, in particular, imposed a heavy burden upon the shoulders of statesmen and other public servants responsible for the framing and execution of policy at home and abroad. Great, however, as the strain on individuals has been, the strain on the relations between particular nations has been greater still, and the strain on the structure of international society as a whole—if it remains a whole—greatest of all. In former times, the great episodes or periods of historical experience merged into each other by almost imperceptible differences, with but little discernible change, and no apparent rupture, from age to age. Today, by contrast, we are moving, not slowly and serenely through an easy transition, but swiftly and unsteadily through a rough and ruthless interregnum. We are all asking ourselves, or asking one another the question as to what will emerge at the end, whether, that is, we are at the beginning of a gradual transformation of human society or on the verge of a sudden catastrophic collapse of our civilization.

Mr. President, I am neither a historian, nor a philosopher, nor a statesman. One would need, I imagine, to be all of these to fully understand all that has been happening in the world in the incredible times in which we have been living, to sum it up, and to trace, through events and trends and tendencies, a pattern of things to come. Ordinary observers like myself, who have none of these qualifications, must approach the study of the international scene with whatever knowledge of history, or philosophy, or political science he has been able to pick up as he goes along, and to form his conclusions in the light of what he learns.

It seems to me, sir, that throughout all the changes we have been witnessing, certain long-standing phenomena persist which stand above and beyond them all, and which seem to possess inherently the character of permanence and, at the same time, the coherence of universal validity. All our lifetime we have been looking on at great experiments—which have now become an experience—in international cooperation. There was the League of Nations: there is the United Nations. The minds of contemporary statesmen have been spontaneously fertile of forms and methods, in general, of a technique of cooperation for world peace, and of designs for a framework of international order regulated by agreed constitutional organs. The relations between states were never so fully organized in a formal or technical sense as in our own time. And there has been a gradual delimitation of the field of interstate relationships not regulated by agreement. That is all to the good. We must, however, bear in mind that international relations cannot be defined as a technical science until we have arrived at some general agreement on a code of international law. I am contending, Mr. President, that the nations which are closest together are not bound by treaties or pacts or constitutional bonds or formal links of association. The Council of Europe was a natural and inevitable coming together of peoples separated by frontiers, differently constituted, but bound to each other by a common philosophy of life spoken in divers tongues, largely similar legal systems, and a historic inheritance of literature, music, and art, classically woven upon a mighty religious tradition into a continental civilization. Let me put it to you this way. What has mattered most to all polite peoples is the inner life of the nation and not the external form of the state. And what is going to matter to us most today, I mean to countries generally, is their internal rather than their external, that is to say, their intellectual and moral rather than their institutional relations with each other. It is in the light of that circumstance that the reality of Irish-American friendship is most clearly discerned and defined. To take the point a little further, if I am not venturing too far, let me add this. Ireland's exclusion from the United Nations whatever its intention has not effectively ostracised the historic Irish Nation from international society, as witness the recent raising of the status of Irish envoys in North America to the highest diplomatic rank. I am keeping to my thesis, Mr. President, and arguing that international relations have ceased to be institutional and have become ideological.

Let me come to it in another way. The historians have never been more industrious than in the past few years in the task of the interpretation of history and in the interpretation of the task of statesmanship. They submit three proposals for the solution of the problems by which we are confronted. They propose, first of all, the establishment of a world government. For myself, I am convinced that we cannot establish a world government in—to use a familiar American expression consecrated by two great American Presidents—a world community half slave and half free. Secondly, the historians suggest that, in the economic field, a working compromise should be formed between extreme capitalism and extreme socialism. Thirdly, they urge the reestablishment of the secular superstructure of society upon its original religious foundations. I, being a layman and not a historian, or a philosopher, or a statesman, would have begun with the third proposition.

I would have done so for the following reason. The bond of the relationship which exists between Ireland and Europe, or America, or Australasia and which survives the experience of the sometimes different interests of these widely separated regions of the world is the fact that the character of their peoples is formed upon a common pattern of life. They are united in a common intellectual tradition securely founded and forever transfigured in converging stories of classic ancestral glory. They are bound by ties of immemorial antiquity in the older, and of perpetual renewal in the younger countries of which I speak. Let us make no mistake about what that pattern of life has been. Let our universities make no mistake about it. Let them preserve the tradition of teaching young men and young women to distinguish fashion from good taste, money from wealth, interference from influence, notoriety from fame, pride from self-respect, speed from progress, respectability from worthiness, generally speaking the spurious from the genuine, and the temporal from the eternal. Let our statesmen make no mistake about it. Let them continue to keep the constitutional system square with the needs of civil society, that is, with man's moral welfare as well as his material well-being, so that the State can never again become, as it has become in so many countries, an instrument to undermine and destroy civil society. Let them see to it that in no nation now free will the State cease to be the minister and seek to become the master of a man's spiritual or social destiny. Let them have in mind that in the history of polite nations there is a moment in which the philosophy of life of a people passes into their national law. That, in the case of my own country, has, in circumstances of which you are aware, been a delayed development. It has not been happening in all democratic countries. Generally speaking democratic countries have stopped short at "the freedoms" as if they were the end, and not the beginning, of man's fullest development in civil society. Freedom of speech, freedom of association and assembly, and the others simply removed positive obstacles in the way of the full development of the human person in the civic or national or international communities to all of which he normally belongs. The placing of "the freedoms" as cornerstones in the democratic structure based it upon sound foundations. But the building itself remains to be completed, if not indeed to be begun. Western civilization is built upon certain social realities which have held it together and given it form, unity, and design; I mean, for example, the family, the sublime sacrificial dedication of marriage, parental and filial rights and obligations, private ownership of property in the context of these things, and in that of the integral human welfare of every citizen. These basic social realities still stand outside the framework of the national law: they have not become part of the organic life of the state. What has been happening is this:

The freedoms guaranteed in modern democratic systems to protect the social nature of the citizen as a human person have been taking the place of the prerogatives they were intended to protect. Instead of the whole philosophy of western culture passing into our laws and the emergence of a Christian democracy we have had the complete secularization of society in the modern political, economic, or social state. Marxism, remember, is not an oriental or an eastern European but a western social doctrine. If our civilization is to survive we must put it back upon its original foundations. Two

world wars have been fought in our lifetime to make the world safe for democracy. It does not need a third world war but it does need a mighty crusade to make democracy safe for the world. If, in that crusade our two peoples are associated in the years to come it will be a logical inference of our history and a fruitful consummation of our friendship.

Displaced Persons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELMER THOMAS
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I have a letter from Mr. Sam M. Myers which portrays the reaction of some of the displaced persons here in the United States. I ask permission to have the letter printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STILLWATER, OKLA., *March 9, 1950.*

Re Petro Muycn and wife and children (Anna, Stefa, Olga).

Hon. ELMER THOMAS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR THOMAS: Some time in December 1949, the above-named family arrived in Stillwater. Since that time I have built them a house, chicken house, etc., on a farm which I own about 4 miles north of Stillwater, Okla. I am now building a barn on this place for the family. Petro has been helping with the building and has also planted some 50 or more fruit trees and shrubs around his house and on the farm. These I purchased for him. I have also purchased him a cow, 2 young heifers, a sow and 7 pigs, 12 laying hens, some 50 other frying-size pullets, a buck and several doe rabbits. I have bought him stoves, furniture, groceries, utensils, lamps, and tools with which to farm and live. I have paid for garden seed, potatoes, and grain which I expected him to plant so that he would be more or less self-supporting, but I learn he is dissatisfied and wants to leave the farm and go to New York.

Now I do not object to his leaving me, for I am certainly getting the little end of the bargain. But I am told that these DP's who have been allowed to come to America are not permitted to occupy jobs or housing which an American might want, nor are they allowed to become public charges. If these people go to New York there is no question but that their condition will become worse, for they do not have the mentality nor the education to find any employment except in the sweatshops, starve, or become objects of public charity.

The Muycns came to me through the Ukrainian American Relief Committee, Inc., 54 DeLong Building, Thirteenth and Chestnut, Philadelphia, Pa. I was not required to sign any guaranty or post any money which I know is ordinarily required by the United States Department of Immigration in the case of other aliens. However, shortly after the arrival of the Muycn family the UAR, Inc. sent me a statement for their transportation from New York to Stillwater in the approximate sum of $208, which I paid by check.

It seems that the entire DP program has been very loosely handled. Stringent laws to control this influx of foreigners are necessary, in my opinion, or our standard of living will be driven to an all-time low. From my experience with these people I favor laws which will "freeze" them in a particular locality, preferably in the interior, in agriculture, perhaps—or in some field which is not in direct competition with organized labor. Thanking you for any consideration you deem advisable to give this letter, I am,

Sincerely,

SAM M. MYERS.

Contemptuous "Officers of the Court"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very fine editorial entitled "Contemptuous 'Officers of the Court'," published in this afternoon's edition of the Washington Evening Star. It purports to give the ideas of Solicitor General Perlman, who in a recent address spoke of the need for the lawyers of this country to purge their own ranks of those who by contemptuous conduct tend to breed disrespect for the courts.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONTEMPTUOUS "OFFICERS OF THE COURT"

Solicitor General Perlman touched on a subject of wide public interest when he called on the legal profession to purge its ranks of lawyers who, by their contemptuous conduct, tend to breed disrespect for the courts. The average citizen, reading of the activities of attorneys in some of the recent trials of Communist leaders and others, has been disturbed by the actions and words of a number of those "officers of the court." At the New York trial of 11 Communist officials, for example, it appeared that a deliberate effort was being made by defense attorneys to harass the judge, prolong the trial, and confuse the jury. The disgraceful antics of some of the lawyers and their clients have probably never been equaled in a Federal courtroom.

Mr. Perlman undoubtedly had this case, among others, in mind when he told the Federal Bar Association: "We have witnessed trials of criminal cases in the Federal courts in which lawyers have been punished with fines and sentences to imprisonment because of the contemptuous manner in which they conducted themselves, and because of tactics employed by them in violation of the orderly and proper performance of their duties as lawyers and officers of the court." The Solicitor General made the worth-while suggestion that the Federal Bar Association make a study of all such cases, with a view to initiating disbarment or suspension proceedings if such actions have not already been started by the proper bar groups.

And Mr. Perlman has made another good suggestion in the interest of maintaining the high prestige of the bar. He has asked the association to study also the question of disbarring lawyers who decline to answer congressional or grand jury questions on grounds of self-incrimination. That an attorney, like any citizen, has the constitutional right to take refuge in this technical maneuver is undeniable. But there is a grave doubt in the minds of many persons, including Mr. Perlman, as to the right of a citizen using this device to serve as an officer of the court. A lawyer, because of his important relationship to the machinery of justice, has heavier responsibilities as to his conduct, whether as counselor or witness, than those of the average citizen. When he fails to live up to those responsibilities, he should expect to forfeit his rights as a respected member of the bar.

Promotion of Tourism Can Supply Europe With Dollars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by me relative to the promotion of tourism in connection with supplying Europe with American dollars. I believe this statement will be very useful if studied by the ECA and if the ECA will take it to heart. I also submit the statement for the information of all Members of the Senate.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROMOTION OF TOURISM CAN SUPPLY EUROPE WITH DOLLARS

In the long run, the soundest basis for world peace is international understanding based upon good will between all people. Communism breeds on fear, suspicion, and misunderstanding, much of which would never arise if there were a wider understanding between those peoples in the western world who live by a code of decency and whose faith is based upon the dignity of individual men.

The nations of the western world are aware of this problem. Every day both jointly through UNESCO and individually they are taking measures in an effort to solve it. The State Department of the United States is very active in this field for many reasons—chief among them being the fact that our country has the most to lose from the disastrous conditions misunderstanding inevitably precedes.

In an effort to show the nations of Europe the ideals by which we live, we have done and are doing many things. The United States has encouraged and has given strong support to UNESCO. We have established the foundation for the largest exchange-of-students program ever undertaken in the world. Businessmen and diplomats, for example, are explaining the areas of this country they best understand to their counterparts overseas. In return, we have had many guests of the same nature. In every way, we seek to encourage the exchange of persons and information with other countries.

A further measure, and one which is often overlooked, for breaking down the barriers of ignorant prejudice between ourselves and our allies is tourism. Necessity restricts

the flow of international tourists in one direction right now. Ours is the principal country with citizens who have the time and means to cross an ocean. But this flow will serve because it will bring Americans and Europeans face to face.

If millions of citizens of the United States would travel abroad, understanding between peoples of the west would undoubtedly be greatly strengthened. In speaking in terms of millions of American travelers, you may think me more hopeful than accurate. But in this year of 1950 there is enough transportation available to carry more than a half-million United States citizens to Europe and return. The amount of space is increasing rapidly and the rates for it are coming down. Clearly an opportunity exists for the kind of travel international understanding demands.

From a standpoint of practical help to Europe, tourism has few equals. As our citizens go from country to country, they leave behind dollars which the world badly needs. In paying for rooms and meals, in buying foreign merchandise for their own use and as gifts, they help give other countries the means to partake in world trade. This lessens the need for recovery payments by this Government to others. The supply of dollars left in Europe, of course, will return to the United States through increased purchases of our exports.

In an article in the New York Times magazine, April 23, 1950, Joseph A. Barry, Paris Bureau manager for the newspaper, has this to say:

"Parliament refers fondly to the American tourist as Britain's biggest dollar earner; he brings in more than the textile industry, more than the export of whisky and cotton combined. By the aggregate, the same tourist spends more than $500,000 a day in France alone during the season. Entertaining him gives Switzerland one-seventh of her income. Next to the olive tree and the tobacco plant, he comes first in Greece. Without any qualifications, he is Ireland's leading source of foreign exchange. And so on, up and down the transatlantic coast and into the Mediterranean Basin."

These facts are, I believe, well known in the Senate. In drawing up the basic legislation on ECA, attention was paid to this specific topic. In authorizing the expenditure of billions of dollars for European recovery, it was the intention of the Congress to see that ideas as well as goods were to cross the Atlantic. The promotion of tourism was strongly urged not only in our committees but is written specifically into the act.

To date there has been no lack of material things sent to our friends in Europe under the Marshall plan. Shiploads of food, machinery, tools, seeds, and rolling stock have made a mighty contribution to the rehabilitation of an area left physically and morally devastated at the end of the war. In a few short years, Europe has had an unequaled opportunity to learn about the things Americans make. But full advantage has not been taken of an opportunity that is even more important—the opportunity to learn what Americans are.

Much of this laxity must be blamed directly upon the European nations. In entering the Marshall plan, they had full knowledge of its main intent—to give them the time and materials necessary for a new start. After that it was up to them to help themselves. Helping themselves economically certainly implies the attraction of dollars to their market places. Yet, though the tourist industry last year earned more money than any other for Marshall-plan Europe, to date it has suffered the most because of European neglect.

At present we are sending help to 16 European countries and it seems plain that every one of them could do far more to help themselves by attracting tourist dollars. What can these countries do to get the maximum benefit from the American traveler?

This question was partially answered the other day by one of the ECA nations. The first topic considered in the new British Parliament—after the political skirmishing was finished—was that of the American tourist. A member of the Conservative Party opened the debate by pointing out that Britain needed more medium priced hotels and more imagination by hotel management if it was to compete on equal terms with France and other countries for the tourist dollar. He went on to say, "Travel facilities are inadequate and expensive."

The gentleman was seconded by a member of the Labor Party—this topic being one of the few on which the two main parties in English politics agree. The Labor member described his country as a way station on the high road to high times in Paris. He pointed out that hundreds of thousands of tourists' dollars were being lost to that country.

Mr. Horace Bottomley, British Secretary for Overseas Trade, answered the criticisms by saying that the British Government realizes the importance of tourist business. "We are aware of the need to attract the right kind of tourists," said Mr. Bottomley. "We want to get at the middle classes, who are now traveling more than before and if we can appeal to them in any connection we shall do so."

I, for one, am glad to see that men of responsibility overseas are becoming aware of this problem. The answer, of course, to the problem posed by the British Secretary for Overseas Trade is to give the American tourist what he wants. That, as the Conservative member of Parliament points out, certainly includes medium-priced hotels with clean rooms, efficient service, and imaginative management. Such hotels are an asset to any country. They would serve its own citizens as well as attracting the American who now is discovering that it is an easy thing for him to go abroad for his vacation.

Foreign countries should also, it seems to me, make it easy for tourists to get around; to see not only the outstanding points of interest but also the people in all parts of their land. American farmers, for example, probably have just as much interest in French farmers and their methods as they do in French cathedrals. The cross-pollination resulting from such meetings will prove valuable to everyone in the world.

Tourism is an industry. As far as earning dollars is concerned, it is the most important industry in Europe. No industry can operate at maximum efficiency unless its plant is modern and in smooth running order. This truth holds for tourism just as much as it does for any other industry. It follows that for the sake of their own future, Marshall-plan countries would be wise to see that their tourist plan is up to date and designed to attract increasing numbers of American tourists.

If the intention of the Congress was to help promote tourism as a dollar producer for Europe through the Marshall plan, it might be wise to see how successfully this has been accomplished. What has been done to carry out the purpose of section 117 (b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948 which specifically says that the Administrator shall promote and develop travel by citizens of the United States to and within participating countries?

Many billions of dollars have passed through the hands of the ECA Administrators. So far as I have been able to discover, not one dollar of direct funds has been spent for the promotion of tourism. I have found that in November 1948 about $14,000,000 in counterpart funds was released at the request of Italy for this purpose. No other outlay of counterpart funds for tourism has come to my notice.

Of the $9,000,000,000 that have been appropriated to the Marshall plan so far, the expenditure for tourism represents less than two-tenths of 1 percent. It is of interest to contrast this with another figure: In 1949, American travelers to Marshall-plan Europe spent $164,000,000. This amount represents 32 percent of all dollars earned by the area last year.

Until the ECA has demonstrated that it really is interested in building up the one industry that shows tremendous possibilities in returning some of the American taxpayers' investment in European recovery, the Congress must assume that its purpose has been disregarded. While to promote tourism Congress has removed the 15-percent tax on overseas transportation, and raised to $500 the amount of duty-free goods a 12-day traveler can bring back, its vaster scheme is being nullified. Both ECA and the countries participating in the recovery program can promote tourism principally through the improvement of facilities for the service and comfort of visitors. Counterpart funds should be used liberally in the development of the tourist industry—Europe's best dollar generator.

Address of Roscoe Drummond

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 1950

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following excellent address of Roscoe Drummond at the recent conference of the American Society of Newspaper Editors in Washington, D. C.:

I am grateful for this opportunity to present to the American Society of Newspaper Editors this on-the-spot report of some phases of fighting the cold war. I do not know whether I have been invited as a former editor or as a present bureaucrat, but I know which I would prefer. From my vantage point it is evident that there is no group in the world more determined and more eager to get at the facts and to look at the facts than the American press.

The need was never so great as it is today to take a full and a fresh and a fearless look at the struggle that is going on in the world today and to determine, on the basis of the facts, the size of the effort which the United States will have to make in order to win. It is my deep conviction that if we do not win it we face a return to the Dark Ages.

For the past 9 months I have had a small share in fighting the cold war on the European front, and the central findings which I wish to lay before you today are these:

1. We are only just beginning to grasp the fateful nature of this struggle; we have not yet measured its magnitude or the size of the effort necessary to win it.

2. While the Communists may not want war, they do not want peace, and we of the democracies are letting them get away with murder by allowing them to succeed in preempting the cause of peace everywhere in the world. The Communists are not acting for peace in any capital, in any country, in any continent. The Communists are at war today inside every free country in which they have any sizable group; they are making war by attacking the peaceful processes of every parliament in every free country in which they have a political toehold.

3. Despite significant set-backs in Europe, the Communists have made perilous headway

in Asia; they show no signs whatsoever of giving up anywhere else in the world; they will not abandon their tactics until the free world demonstrates an impregnable unity and strength. We in the United States will not be acting to secure the safety of the Nation until we clearly calculate that there is no short cut to peace with aggressive communism, that winning a cold war, like winning a hot war, has its own priorities in expenditure and in sacrifice.

4. Finally, the free nations of the North Atlantic community must strengthen our political, our economic, and our military alliance of peace, and I think we have the right to look to the meeting of the North Atlantic Foreign Ministers in London next month as the occasion to do this.

While I have been in Paris I have received letters from a few in America who have suggested that all this talk about communism in Europe is a kind of boogeyman dreamed up by Government officials to scare the country into needless expenditure. I doubt if there are any here this noon who share that view and I will not offer arguments in answer. But for those who would like a thumbnail illustration of the size of the Communist gallstone which the French people have in their midst, let me cite these facts:

There are 166 Communist and 15 Communist-affiliated deputies in the 621-member French National Assembly. In the only national election held in France since the end of the war, the Communist candidates polled 28.6 percent of the total popular vote.

Under similar circumstances in the United States the following conditions would prevail: There would be 23 Communist Senators in the United States Senate; there would be 124 Communist Congressmen in the House of Representatives. There would have been 13,980,732 Communist votes cast in the 1948 Presidential election.

Political, economic, and social conditions in France are improved over what they were when the Communists emerged as the strongest single party in the country and in Parliament. But if you translated into American terms the present visible strength of communism in France—if you conceive of the conditions just described as existing in the United States—then you have the evidence on which to appraise whether French communism is an exaggerated bogy or a sombre menace.

When a few weeks ago the French National Assembly was preparing to register its majority verdict that Communist efforts to prevent the unloading of American military aid at French ports were acts of sabotage and therefore unlawful, the Communist deputies arose en masse, ripped off the tops of their wooden desks, started a bloody battle with their fellow members, stormed the speaker's rostrum and tried by violence to halt the parliamentary processes of their Government.

And this was not surprising. It is Soviet communism's planned strategy of war to break down the institutions of free governments. I quote to you verbatim from the Constitution and Rules of the International Communist Party.

Each Communist representative must remember that he is not a legislator bound to seek agreement but an agitator detailed into the enemies camp to carry out party orders.

"Communism repudiates the possibility of winning over of parliaments. Its aim is to destroy parliaments."

The Kremlin is not deserting its purposes. It melifluously talks peace to the unsuspecting and is making war on the free institutions and the free parliaments on which it can lay its deceptive hand.

Two weeks ago in Paris the French Communists held their first full-dress party congress since 1947; an enormous banner across the hall bore these meaningful words: "The true internationalist is he who is prepared unreservedly, unhesitatingly, and unconditionally to defend the U. S. S. R."

Along the spacious, busy Champs-Elysees the Communist Party exercised some of their shock troops and directed a few warm-up riots against Le Figaro because it didn't like what this newspaper was printing. During these abortive assaults on the Figaro offices, and the subsequent raids on news vendors, young Communists were to be seen in the passages of the nearby Metro receiving their orders from tough, hard-faced leaders and setting out to apply their commando tactics. Nothing too violent at this point, of course, just a little practice.

Greater violence and greater preparations for violence are taking place elsewhere. The preparations are in the Soviet zone of eastern Germany and there the Soviets are using methods which the Nazis employed such a few years ago. There are marching youths, mammoth mass meetings, appeals to militarism and the national front, violent abuse of opponents and frequent party purges. Despite their explicit pledge to outlaw German militarism, the Russians are today training a German army in the eastern zone in the guise of a police force.

Deliberate violence, political strikes, prearranged riots—these are the essence of Russia's attack upon the parliamentary processes of the unconquered free nations. They make up the strategy of the kind of war calling itself peace, which the Soviet Union is now waging. It is evidence of our failures—the failures of we of the west to join in an adequate imaginative information program, that, despite a record totally opposite to their words, Moscow continues to capture the headlines with peace offensives, peace appeals, and peace fronts.

You have heard it said that the Russians are not in a position to go to war. There is some truth in that, but I think we have only begun to see what a trivial, irrelevant, and deceptive truth it is. We are tempted to think that we have laid hold of quite a significant fact when we say that Russia may not want war. The real truth—and I venture to repeat it—is that while Russia is not likely to make war on any country, the Soviet Communists are today making war in every country they have not yet conquered.

These facts measure something of the nature of the struggle which the Soviet Union imposes upon America and the free world and they indicate something of the size of the effort which will be needed to win.

I believe that we can win. I believe that we are moving in the direction of winning. I believe that we are going to win. But I am convinced that it will take a total cold-war effort to do it and I believe that the American people will be ready and willing to sustain such a total cold-war effort—or in Mr. Acheson's phrase, "total diplomacy"—only as the nature of this struggle is truly and fully stated. There are no visible limits to the Soviet ambitions for world domination. It is to achieve that domination that Moscow is today making war in every country which it has not yet conquered. Unless the United States leads the free nations of the world in resisting this domination in defeating this attack—in winning this war calling itself peace—I do not believe that the America we know today can survive. That is the nature of the struggle which Russia has imposed upon us and it is only to the degree it is fully appreciated that America's leadership will be adequate.

That leadership, in association with our partners in western Europe, is already bringing results. There is much on the winning side of the ledger and some of it is this: The Marshall plan is successfully laying the foundation for recovery. In the wake of economic progress, the democratic governments of western Europe are showing new virility and new vitality. Politically, communism is being forced on the defensive in western Europe.

You are aware I am sure that in every national election in Europe since the Marshall plan took shape the Communists have lost voting support and they have lost parliamentary seats.

They have lost in western Germany, in Austria, in Belgium, in Britain. In Norway last fall the Communist Party representation in the Storting was obliterated. Before the voting there were 11 Communist members in the 150-member Norwegian Parliament. After the voting—the first since the Marshall plan—zero Communist Deputies in Parliament.

It is on the credit side that the recent British elections wiped out the two Communists and the five fellow traveler members of the House of Commons. One hundred Communist candidates, the largest number in British political history, stood for election in February and the British electorate rejected every one of them. Every single Communist candidate ran third; every single Communist candidate was defeated by both Conservative and Liberal opponents.

It is on the credit side that the French Communist press—there are 20 Communist daily and 97 Communist weekly papers in France alone—has lost 1,500,000 circulation in the past year.

It is on the credit side that the Italian Communist Party admits the loss of 200,000 workers from its rolls in 12 months.

It is on the credit side that both the French and Italian Governments are effectively standing up to the Communist threats and the Communist attempts to prevent the arrival of military aid and thereby to nullify some of the fruits of the North Atlantic Treaty.

All this means that when the free people of western Europe are given the chance to work and improve their standard of living, the majorities are rejecting communism every time, and at every opportunity. No wonder the Cominform was brought into being for the avowed purpose of keeping the Marshall plan from being realized. No wonder the Cominform hates free elections.

The Tito-Stalin feud which came to a head in part because the grass was being made to grow greener in western Europe is hurting communism on both sides of the iron curtain.

The tonic of Tito's independence is tending to spread to neighboring Communist-dominated peoples, who would also like to be independent, and to Communist groups further west. The Kremlin does not like it the least little bit. The reason that the Kremlin is horrified is that a deep and incalculable heresy is being developed within the Communist world. Moscow intends that communism everywhere should be run by and for the Soviet Union. Tito found that out when he tried to be only a Yugoslav Communist. He learned that he could remain in good standing with the Kremlin only by being a Soviet Communist in Yugoslavia. The heresy which Tito is now flaunting to the Communist world is the horrendous idea:

That there can and should be equality among the Communist Parties.

That there can and should be independence among the Communist states.

To the Kremlin dictate that "the true internationalist is he who is prepared unreservedly, unhesitatingly, and unconditionally" to serve the interests of the U. S. S. R. above all else, Tito has delivered a daring and resounding "No." Tito's successful assertion that Communist Yugoslavia can be independent of Communist Russia is one of the most valuable threats to Soviet imperialism operating in the world today.

To the extent that such doctrines are accepted by the Communist Parties outside Russia, the hopes of Soviet world domination would be seriously blunted. To the extent that the Communist Parties throughout the world refuse to be the obedient tools

of the Kremlin, as Tito is refusing to be, the power of Moscow to cause trouble around the world would be greatly reduced. Without endorsing communism in any form, let us help to strengthen Tito's independence and encourage the trouble he is causing.

Although more effective information measures need to be undertaken by the west I would not wish to leave the impression at all that we and our partners in western Europe are leaving the field to the Communists. A valuable program is being carried out by the State Department and the Marshall plan information activities, with which I am associated, are not negligible.

I report to you that the 2,000 daily newspapers in the Marshall plan countries, having a circulation of 110,000,000 Europeans, are publishing a total of 4,000 Marshall plan news articles on the average every week.

In the field of radio we are receiving cooperation from all the participating governments and at present Marshall plan radio programs are going out over Europe's networks in all languages and are reaching, according to our best evidence, approximately 40,000,000 out of the potential 100,000,000 radio listeners. We are producing radio programs for schools, labor, and women's groups. We are producing farm programs and family programs.

We are completing this spring a 12-month production program of 60 ERP documentary films. Marshall plan newsreel shots are now being regularly shown in the commercial theaters of Europe which have a weekly attendance of approximately 30,000,000 people.

In the interests of trying to find out as nearly as possible the different states of mind in Europe about the Marshall plan, we have utilized the best professional means of measuring public opinion in the different countries. European public opinion polls have shown this result: That more than four out of five Europeans show themselves aware of the Marshall plan; that from a quarter to a third of them have a detailed understanding of how the program works and can actually explain the operation of the counterpart fund. They show that, whereas 28.6 percent of the French voted to support the Communist Party line in 1946, today only 16 percent of the French people are following the Communist line in opposition to the Marshall plan.

This is the part of the evidence which suggests that the free world does have the capacity and the ammunition to win this deadly struggle and successfully to counter this war-calling-itself-peace. It doesn't mean that the fight is over. Far from it. It doesn't mean that the Communists are giving in. They are not. It doesn't mean that communism will not continue to be a grave menace until the free world has achieved such a unity and such a strength that it is secure against the conditions on which communism feeds.

The greatest danger of all prevails in Germany today. While the western allies are acting to give western Germany freedom and independence, Moscow is acting to fasten the Soviet police state upon the eastern zone. Germany is the major psychological battlefield on which this deadly struggle between the slave world and the free will be determined. Until that decision is clear—and it is far from clear today—and until Germany becomes a cooperating, not a domineering, partner in the community of western Europe, the outcome of this struggle will remain in serious doubt.

There is no easy panacea, there is no single policy, there is no one action which will be equal to winning this cold-war struggle.

It is not enough to say "throw out the spies and all will be well."

It is not enough to say "hold Berlin and all will be well."

It is not enough to say "complete the Marshall plan and all will be well."

Only the sum total of resolute actions will win this struggle. Remember that we are meeting with war in every country which aggressive communism has not yet conquered. It will take a total and sustained cold-war effort on our part to win. We must be ready, I believe, to put a priority upon our willingness to sacrifice for a total cold-war effort. There must be steadfastness and staying power in our decision.

Speaking as an individual, I would like to invite the American Society of Newspaper Editors to consider the merits of two proposals which I offer as additional and I believe, urgent measures for strengthening the weapons in the hands of the free world.

1. I suggest that we have reached the point when the Atlantic community needs and must lay its hands upon greater political unity and strength. To that end, may not the time be appropriate for creating a North Atlantic political council which, free of the veto, can discharge in the Atlantic community the responsibilities which the United Nations Security Council is prevented from discharging at Lake Success? Such a step is in line with the preamble and article II of the North Atlantic Treaty and would mean that the free nations, bound together in this alliance for peace, would be in continuous consultation and capable of taking constant action in the common welfare.

2. I suggest that we have already reached the point when it is urgently necessary to create and carry forward a common information program for the entire North Atlantic community. I would not mute but I would strenthen the Voice of America. I would not mute but I would strengthen the Voice of Europe, but beyond this, we need a united voice speaking on behalf of the free nations of the North Atlantic Pact. Such a step would be another tool in the hands of a North Atlantic political council and it could be brought into being by the negotiating of a North Atlantic information compact as an arm of the treaty itself.

As never before, Communist propaganda and Communist deception are directed against all the nations of the West and I propose it would be helpful for all the nations of the West to join to defeat this political warfare.

It is my hope that you will find these proposals worthy of your examination and discussion. I do not offer them in the expectation that they will be adopted out of hand, but I do believe that either these measures—or something better—are now needed. I submit them for your scrutiny and I am confident that discussion which you can precipitate will bring a sound answer.

A long and hard struggle may be ahead of us. I think we can win it. I think we have got to win it. But I have to report to you that, in my judgment, we are not yet exerting a total cold-war effort equal to winning it.

Fiftieth Anniversary Edition of the Anderson (S. C.) Daily Mail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in Dixie Business, commending my very good friend, the distinguished former United States Senator Wilton E. Hall, publisher of the Anderson Independent and Daily Mail, on his recent anniversary edition of the Anderson Daily Mail. It is my opinion that this is a masterpiece in anniversary editions, and I join with my good friend, Col. Hubert F. Lee, in his remarks about former Senator Hall on this edition.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HALL

Our good friend and former "boss," Senator Wilton E. Hall, publisher of the Anderson Independent and Daily Mail has brought out a fabulous 304 page special fiftieth anniversary edition of the Anderson Daily Mail which, as a top newspaper special edition expert, is a glory to behold. In 1925, we went to Anderson to persuade Senator Hall to keep the United Press wire service and in turn Hall talked us into staying with him as advertising manager of the Anderson Independent. The year we went with Editor Hall was one of the finest we have known. Although we were tied up with the selection of the South's 50 foremost business leaders, we are grateful for the invitation to help on the big special edition of the Anderson Daily Mail which friend Hall extended us. We still have the itch to get back into the special-edition field that kept us from starving during the depression days when Dixie Business was dragging financially. Maybe some of these days we will.

It was Wilton Hall who interested us in starting the Lee Press Syndicate in 1926 and it was he who furnished us reprints for our weekly mailing to client newspapers over South Carolina. It was patterned along the lines of the highly successful Gilreath Press Syndicate which the late Frank C. Gilreath, Sr., founded 40 years ago and which is still carried on by his able son, Frank C. Gilreath in Atlanta. We blow a silver trumpet for Hall and the Gilreaths for the helpfulness they have been to us in the years past.

Facts and Record, Natural Gas Act Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 1950

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, through the maze of propaganda, misinformation and misstatement of facts, the record clearly shows that those who voted for the Kerr amendment to H. R. 1758, clarifying the Natural Gas Act of 1938, were right and consistent.

When these facts are all brought to light, the consumers will see and understand the truth. They will appreciate the vote of those of the Congress who would not yield to pressure, propaganda, and "real" special interests, who obviously will be profited by the action of the President in vetoing the bill.

The consumers will ultimately find out, the vote for the amendment was in their best interest and an effort to give them cheaper fuel for their homes by bringing more and more natural gas to them and competing in the American way with

other fuels admittedly costing much more.

The record reveals that the vote for the amendment was the right vote in that it was sustaining the right of Congress to make legislative decisions.

When the facts and the record are considered so consistently, I frankly cannot see how the Supreme Court could hold otherwise than with the plain language of the act. It is true that the Court has not specifically held on this point but the purported action of the Federal Power Commission in announcing its intentions contrary to the law and the administration for 12 years makes this proposal right and necessary.

In order, Mr. Speaker, that the facts and the record may be considered together and that everyone may know the background, history, intention of Congress, and necessity of the amendment, under unanimous consent I insert herewith the provisions of section 1 (b) of the Natural Gas Act of 1938, exempting the production and gathering of natural gas, the history of the provision, clearly showing the intent of Congress, the first action of the Commission in 1940, 2 years after the enactment of the act, as to the intent of Congress; a restatement of the Commission through its staff as a result of its investigation in 1945, the action of the Commission, their recommendation and request in 1947, together with a letter from the chairman of the Commission urging the adoption of a bill at that time with the same identical purpose as the Kerr amendment and with a categorical statement that it was fully in accord with the legislative program of the President; the Commission's order No. 139 of August 7, 1947, restating their position and the intent of Congress when the act was passed; the statement of Speaker RAYBURN, who was chairman of the committee when the original hearings in 1936 were started by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, that resulted in the Natural Gas Act of 1938; the statement of Mr. PRIEST, majority whip of the House, and a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, who introduced the same bill at the request of the Commission in the last Congress; the statement of Mr. HALLECK, the majority leader of the House in the Eightieth Congress; a wire I transmitted to the President, April 4, 1950; and a statement carried in the Washington Post on Saturday, April 22, by Mr. Paul McBride, Arlington, Va.

The matters referred to are as follows:

PROVISION OF SECTION 1 (B) NATURAL GAS ACT, 1938

The provisions of this act shall apply to the transportation of natural gas in interstate commerce, to the sale in interstate commerce of natural gas for resale for ultimate public consumption for domestic, commercial, industrial, or any other use, and to natural gas companies engaged in such transportation or sale, but shall not apply to any other transportation or sale of natural gas or to the local distribution of natural gas or to the facilities used for such distribution or to the production or gathering of natural gas.

BACKGROUND AND HISTORY OF PROVISION OF SECTION 1 (B) AS TO INTENT OF CONGRESS

In 1936, when the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House of Representatives was considering H. R. 11662, which was a predecessor to the bill which finally become the Natural Gas Act, Mr. Dozier A. DeVane, then solicitor for the Federal Power Commission, referring to section 1 (b) of that bill, which was identical with section 1 (b) later adopted in the Natural Gas Act, told the committee:

"The bill makes no attempt to regulate the production or gathering facilities of a natural gas company, this function being purely local in character, nor is any attempt made to exercise control over distribution facilities."

At the same time, Chairman Lea of the committee asked this question:

"Well, when the supply company is brought before the Commission in an action to regulate its rates, and they say, 'We have got to pay so much for gas; we cannot control that price which they charge us and we have to charge a higher price delivered to the buyer,' does the Commission have any power over that?"

Mr. DeVane answered:

"No; not the price that is paid to the gatherer, to the man that produces it; that is binding if the transaction is at arm's length. If the transaction is not at arm's length, of course, its reasonableness may be inquired into, under the decisions of the Supreme Court."

Repeatedly similar statements were made both in committee and in debate on the House and Senate floors that the act only regulated the wholesale price of gas, this being the price charged for gas by the interstate carrier to the distributor. Nowhere is there any intimation in any proceeding before either the House or the Senate that the intention of the bill was to regulate the price paid to the independent producer and gatherer dealing at arm's length, but, on the contrary, this was expressly stated to be not subject to the act.

In 1940, 2 years after its enactment, the Commission held in the *Columbian Fuel Corporation case* (33 P. U. R. (NS) 3) that "it was not the intent of Congress to subject to regulation under the Natural Gas Act all persons whose only sales of natural gas in interstate commerce, as in this case, are made as an incident to and immediately upon completion of such persons' production and gathering of said natural gas."

REPORT OF COMMISSION STAFF FROM 2-YEAR STUDY, 1945

No subject relating to the administration of the Natural Gas Act has received greater attention throughout the course of the natural-gas investigation than the meaning and implications of section 1 (b), with reference to the exemption of the production and gathering of natural gas from jurisdiction under that section (p. 1 of their report).

It is evident from the testimony, indicating a widespread atmosphere of anxiety and uncertainty among State officials and the industries concerned, that this matter is in need of further clarification. A continuance of the existing disturbed situation is certain to interfere with the effective performance in the public interest of the duties of both the Federal and State regulatory agencies in their respective spheres, and it will also affect adversely the interests and actions of oil and gas producers, land and royalty owners, and the transmission companies which purchase gas in the field. It may be expected also that unless this issue is clarified the results will be detrimental to those who consume natural gas and to the efforts of conservation authorities to prevent its waste (p. 1).

COMMISSION REQUESTS THIS AMENDMENT

The Chairman of the Commission on June 23, 1947, advised this committee that—

"Under these circumstances, as we have stated previously, your committee may now wish to consider the adoption of an amendment to clarify this situation. Therefore we are submitting to you and your committee the attached legislative proposal, which is in accord with the Commission's interpretation that the Congress intended independent producers and gatherers to have a nonjurisdictional status under section 1 (b) of the Natural Gas Act, and is likewise in accord with previous rulings and determinations by the Commission regarding this matter."

Pursuant to the recommendation, our colleague on the committee, the Honorable J. PERCY PRIEST, of Tennessee, introduced H. R. 4099, which was proposed on the floor of the House as a substitute for the Rizley bill, but it did not prevail.

On July 10, 1947, the Honorable Nelson Lee Smith, Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, in pursuance to the request of the then chairman of our committee, our esteemed friend and colleague, the Honorable CHARLES A. WOLVERTON, advised the committee as follows:

"MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your request of July 9 for an early comment by the Commission regarding H. R. 4099, a bill introduced by Congressman PRIEST, of Tennessee.

"The Federal Power Commission urges the enactment of this bill at this time to make it perfectly clear that independent producers and gatherers of natural gas are exempt from the provisions of the Natural Gas Act and the jurisdiction of this Commission.

"The enactment of this bill would dispel the uncertainty regarding the status of such independent producers and gatherers which has been created following the recent decision of the Supreme Court in the Interstate case. Such action by the Congress now should dispose of this important and noncontroversial matter.

"This procedure would enable the Congress to defer action on the many other aspects of natural gas regulation involved in the complexities, uncertainties, and ambiguities of H. R. 4051 (the Rizley bill), to which we referred in detail in our statement of July 1 to you and the members of your committee. As you know, all these problems are being carefully analyzed by the Commission, in cooperation with all interested parties, in the natural gas investigation (docket No. G-580). A full report on this investigation will be submitted to the Congress for its consideration within the next few months.

"I am authorized to state that the position of the Commission in this matter is fully in accord with the legislative program of the President.

"Respectfully yours,

"FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION,

"By NELSON LEE SMITH, *Chairman*."

ORDER 139 BY COMMISSION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Before Commissioners Nelson Lee Smith, Chairman; Claude L. Draper, Leland Olds, and Harrington Wimberly.

Docket No. R-106

AUGUST 7, 1947.

In the matter of a rule to make the position of the Commission regarding the independent production or gathering of natural gas

ORDER NO. 139 SUPPLEMENTING THE COMMISSION'S GENERAL RULES INCLUDING RULES OF PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE—PART 03, SUBSTANTIVE RULES, GENERAL POLICY, AND INTERPRETATIONS

For the reason stated below, it seems appropriate and desirable at this juncture for

the Commission to adopt and promulgate the rule contained herein, which is designed to relieve any existing uncertainty regarding the Commission's position that it will not seek to assert jurisdiction over the sale of natural gas to interstate pipe lines by independent producers or gatherers.

Following the release in March 1947 of the staff report in Docket No. G–580 on this subject, entitled "Section 1 (b) of the Natural Gas Act with Reference to Production and Gathering," the Commission consistently therewith on May 27, 1947, issued a notice of proposed rule making in this matter. At that time, since there were prevalent many expressions of uncertainty as to the Commission's interpretation of section 1 (b) of the act with reference to the status of independent producers and gatherers of natural gas, and as to its intentions with respect thereto, it seemed evident that a formal administrative rule was necessary to affirm our belief that it was the intent of Congress to exempt such independent producers and gatherers when it enacted the Natural Gas Act in 1938.

During the first session of the Eightieth Congress which adjourned on July 27, 1947, various bills regarding this matter, as well as other important proposals for amending the Natural Gas Act, were introduced and considered by the Congress. At the hearings on these bills before the Senate and House Committees on Interstate and Foreign Commerce the Commission likewise stated its view that independent operators who produce or gather natural gas and sell it at arm's length to natural-gas companies subsequently transporting such natural gas in interstate commerce are exempt from the provisions of the Natural Gas Act.

Reference also was made at these hearings to the pending case before the Supreme Court of the United States in *Interstate Natural Gas Company, Inc.*, v. *Federal Power Commission*. The subsequent decision of the Court on June 16, 1947, addressed to the particular circumstances of that case which involved the operations of a natural-gas company subject to the act, immediately became the basis for diverse interpretations and agitations by interested parties, as to its implications regarding the jurisdictional status under the act of independent producers and gatherers.

In view of these circumstances, the Commission urged the immediate adoption of H. R. 4099, the specific and sole purpose of which was to make entirely clear the exemption of the independent production and gathering of natural gas from the provisions of the Natural Gas Act. This proposed amendment, however, was not enacted during the closing days of the session of the Congress which has just ended.

This brief review of developments in this matter has been presented so that there may be no basis for misunderstanding or continuing expressions of fear and uncertainty regarding this matter, which is noncontroversial. The Commission gives its assurance to independent producers and gatherers of natural gas that they can sell at arm's length and deliver such gas to interstate pipe lines and can enter into contracts for such sale without apprehension that in so doing they may become subject to assertions of jurisdiction by the Commission under the Natural Gas Act.

The rule herein has this specific purpose and is issued at this time because the Congress has not yet reaffirmed such exemption by amending the act. It is also our intention, in keeping with the position heretofore taken, to continue to recommend to the Congress that it take appropriate clarifying legislative action regarding this matter.

General public notice of the proposed rule in this matter has been given by publication of notice in the Federal Register on June 5, 1947 (12 F. R. 3679), and by mailing copies of such notice to all interested persons including States and Federal regulatory agencies.

All of such persons have been afforded an opportunity to submit written statements or briefs setting forth their comments, views, and suggestions with respect to this proposed rule.

Finding that such action is necessary and appropriate to clarify the meaning of section 1 (b) of the Natural Gas Act, the Commission pursuant to the authority contained in that act, particularly section 16 thereof (52 Stat. 821–833; 830; 15 U. S. C. 717–717w; 717o), hereby adopts and promulgates the following rule as a new section of Part 03—Substantive Rules, General Policy and Interpretations, of Subchapter A—General Rules, chapter I of title 18 of the Code of Federal Regulations, such new section to read as follows:

"SEC. 03.79. Jurisdictional Status of Independent Producers and Gatherers. The Federal Power Commission is of the opinion that it was the intent of the Congress that the control of production or gathering of natural gas should remain a function of the States and that the Natural Gas Act should not provide for regulation of those subjects.

"For the purposes of administering the Natural Gas Act, the Commission will construe the exemption contained in section 1 (b), to the effect that the provisions of the act shall not apply to the production or gathering of natural gas, as including arm's length sales of natural gas by independent producers and gatherers, made during the course or upon completion of production and gathering. The Commission, consistent with this construction, will not assert jurisdiction over such producers and gatherers who might be subject to jurisdiction solely because of such sales."

The interpretative rule hereby adopted shall become effective August 7, 1947. The Secretary of the Commission shall cause publication of this order to be made in the Federal Register, and further, shall serve copies thereof on all interested parties.

By the Commission. Commissioner Draper dissenting.

[SEAL] LEON M. FUQUAY, *Secretary*.

Date of issuance: August 15, 1947.

SPEAKER RAYBURN REQUESTS AMENDMENT

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, with my long record in this House of Representatives, starting way back, being a member of the subcommittee that wrote the Federal Power Commission Act, being a member of the subcommittee that wrote the Federal Trade Commission Act, and being the author of the Securities Act of 1933, of the Stock Exchange Regulation Act of 1934, and of the Utilities Holding Company Act of 1935, I do not think I could be accused of having any great desire to serve the interests over the people.

If I felt as my distinguished and beloved friend from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER] has indicated he feels, that the Federal Government should own and control all the natural resources of this country, then my position on this and much other legislation would certainly be changed.

We have been going along the other line for more than a century and a half, and our country has grown to be the greatest and the most prosperous country in the history of the world.

The difference between this amendment and the bill we passed in the House is simply this, practically nothing more or nothing less: As a concession to some people who said they wanted to carry on this thing and not make this final, the Senate amendment in which we are seeking to concur today, in addition to the bill that passed the House, says, "We are going to pass this legislation but we want to carry on the study to see whether or not passing this legislation we have done the proper thing."

In being for this bill, as I was when it originally passed the House and as I am now in favoring concurring in the Senate amendment, I have some pretty good company. The Federal Military Establishment was asked about this bill, and this is the guts of what they said, after all elements of the Department of Defense has studied it:

"Enactment of the bill will remove uncertainties now existing as to the extent of the application of the Natural Gas Act and will clarify its terms. Its effect should be to encourage the development of oil and gas resources and thus would be of benefit to the national security."

That is what our whole Military Establishment says about this legislation.

This bill simply says that the little fellow, who goes out and strikes some gas, is not going to be hauled up to Washington and tried before the Federal Power Commission, and that the independents in gathering, not in the transportation in interstate pipe lines or anything of the sort, shall not be placed under regulations that they would be in interstate commerce.

In my opinion—and I state this to you deliberately; I would not deceive you; you know that—this will not raise the price of natural gas to any consumer in the United States one red penny. I think this thing should be gotten out of the way. We should concur in this Senate amendment and then have this study and see where we go from there.

MR. PRIEST SPEAKS FOR AMENDMENT AS NEEDED AND CONSISTENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, because several references have been made throughout the debate in this Chamber last year and in the other body to the Priest bill, references showing that the Priest bill of 1947 is rather largely the same as the bill now pending with the exception of the Senate amendment providing for continuation of a study, I want to take a few minutes to point out one or two important considerations in connection with this bill.

Reference was made by my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON], I believe it was, to the Rizley bill that was before the Eightieth Congress. The Rizley bill was before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for quite a while. Extensive hearings were held. I was not for that bill; I thought it went too far. At that time the Federal Power Commission came before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. They came to my office and requested me to introduce a bill as a substitute for the Moore-Rizley bill. That request came also from the White House.

In a letter to the then chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON], the Federal Trade Commissioner said this:

"This is in response to your request of July 9 for an early comment by the Commission regarding H. R. 4099, a bill introduced by Congressman PRIEST, of Tennessee.

"The Federal Power Commission urges the enactment of this bill at this time to make it perfectly clear that independent producers and gatherers of natural gas are exempt from the provisions of the Natural Gas Act and the jurisdiction of this Commission.

"The enactment of this bill would dispel the uncertainty regarding the status of such independent producers and gatherers which has been created following the recent decision of the Supreme Court in the Interstate case. Such action by the Congress now should dispose of this important and noncontroversial matter."

The last paragraph of the letter reads:

"I am authorized to state that the position of the Commission in this matter is fully in accord with the legislative program of the President."

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Is it not a fact that the bill that passed the House last August, H. R. 1758, and the amendment that was passed by the Senate and sent over here, which is before the House at this time, is exactly the same thing and has for its purpose the exemption of independent producers and gatherers of natural gas where the sales are at arm's length?

Mr. PRIEST. Exactly, and that is the law as it has been in effect since 1938. This makes no change whatsoever. It says that a law which has been in effect for 12 years, during which time the retail price of natural gas has declined 12 percent, shall continue to operate on that same basis.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. Is it not a fact that if a driller were drilling for oil and found gas, that he would inadvertently find himself in the public-utility business?

Mr. PRIEST. Assuming that the Commission has the jurisdiction which some claim it does, but which the law does not give it, and which was made perfectly clear in all of the legislative history of the act.

MR. HALLECK URGES ITS ADOPTION

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I trust that we can have a little light on this measure as well as heat.

First, may I say that a bill similar to this, except the opponents of this bill say it went much further, was passed in the Eightieth Congress. It did not come to passage in the other body.

This bill is almost identical with a bill introduced by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST] in 1947 which was approved by the unanimous vote of the Federal Power Commission. It was approved by the Department of Defense. It was said by the Commission to be in line with the President's program.

In this Congress, the Eighty-first Congress, that bill was introduced by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS]. It was reported by the great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on which it was my privilege to serve some years ago. The bill was passed by the House of Representatives and went to the other body where an amendment has been put on, that again may I say quite respectfully from the standpoint of the opponents of the measure should make the bill better rather than worse.

What is the situation that is now before us? Simply this: Shall we adopt the amendment that was agreed to in the other body and be done with this matter, or shall it go on to conference? I say that under the circumstances certainly there is no reason that I can see why anyone who supported the bill before should not support it now.

Now, what are the circumstances back of this legislation? In 1938 legislation for the regulation of the transportation of gas in interstate pipe lines was introduced and brought to passage. I was on the committee at the time. I am making these brief remarks here because of the participation I had in that debate at that time. Here is what I said in connection with that legislation:

"In the past few years the interstate transportation of gas in large pipe lines at high pressure had been growing by leaps and bounds. Gas is brought from the producing areas in these pipe lines and sold at the city gates to the public utilities which distribute the gas to the consumers. It is obvious the distribution of the gas by the local distributing company is subject to State regulation and the interests of the consumers are protected by State regulation. However, the transportation of gas in interstate commerce in the pipe lines and its sale to the distributing companies for resale is not subject to State regulation, and as a result we have had a situation under which the price charged the distributing company at the city gate has been fixed wholly by the judgment, discretion, or action of the interstate company. It is charged that in many cases that price is excessive. This bill seeks to regulate those prices."

That is the reason I supported the legislation. Now, then, specifically the question is, Shall the Federal Power Commission extend its control to the production and gathering of gas? May I say at that point that if such control could be so extended, might it not as logically be said that the production and gathering of oil shall be controlled by the Commission as a public utility? Might it as well not be said that the production of coal in the mines shall be controlled by the Federal Power Commission as a matter of controlling a public utility?

The bill that we passed in 1938 specifically exempted by its terms the production and gathering of gas, written in after careful consideration.

A specific question was put to the great chairman of our committee, Mr. Lea, of California, who voluntarily retired from this body a year or so ago. He was asked specifically if it was designed to apply to the production and gathering of gas, and he said this: "The bill does not apply to the production and gathering of gas."

The Commission, may it be understood, has in the 12 years that this law has been on the books never asserted the right to control the production and the distribution of gas. No one ever thought they had any such power under the legislation. I do not think they have now, but as sometimes happens, there was a case in the Supreme Court a few years back, and there were certain words used in the opinion that were outside of the necessities of the decision that seemed to indicate the possibility that the Commission might have the power to invade this entirely local field, or such field as has heretofore been said by the Congress to be local, and assert the right to control the production and gathering of the gas. That is the situation that gave rise to the introduction of legislation similar to this in the Eightieth Congress. It is the situation that has given rise to the introduction of this legislation in this Congress, yes, to the adoption of the legislation by the House and the adoption of the legislation with one amendment that I have already referred to by the Members of the other body.

Now, then, I have beyond all of that, may I say, Mr. Speaker, a deep conviction, as I am sure all of you who have served with me know, that if, for instance, the right to regulate the production and gathering of gas at the source is to be invested in the Federal Power Commission, the Congress of the United States ought to make that decision. That power should be granted by the Congress of the United States. It is quite obvious it could not be obtained from any other source rightfully, and to attempt to apply the statute in a way that I say strains the statute is, in my opinion, not the way that the affairs of Government should be administered.

The gas is produced and gathered at the source, even as oil is produced or coal is produced. Then a pipe-line company buys it at arm's length from competing producers and puts it into the pipe lines. If it goes across State lines it is then in interstate commerce.

Until we passed the act of 1938 there was no power anywhere to regulate the price to be charged for that gas moving in interstate commerce, so to fill that gap, and that gap only, the Congress enacted this legislation.

Carried with that is the right in the Federal Power Commission to control the price of gas at the city gate, to see to it that the city is not charged too much for the gas. Then the matter of fixing the rate to the consumer as he pays it to the distributing company becomes a matter of local regulation. That is all there is to this whole business.

I say again, the Federal Power Commission never asserted this right. As a matter of fact, it specifically disclaimed it in 1947. The Court has not specifically held that it has the right. So I say again, it is simply a matter of clarification and a definite delineation of what was obviously the purpose and intent of the Congress of the United States.

COPY OF WIRE TO THE PRESIDENT BY MR. HARRIS, CHAIRMAN, PETROLEUM SUBCOMMITTEE

APRIL 4, 1950.

I want to strongly urge your approval H. R. 1758, Kerr amendment, Natural Gas Act, passed by House and Senate. Speaker RAYBURN, House Majority Leader MCCORMACK, Majority Whip PERCY PRIEST join in wholehearted support this bill. As chairman House subcommittee, Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, I am thoroughly familiar with this proposal. Committee reported it in my name as chairman, slightly amending original bill I introduced January 24, to fully conform with the purposes and intent of the FPC proposal introduced by Congressman PRIEST, a member of the committee 2 years ago and which was testified by the Commission to be in full accord with your, the President's program. It passed House in August as reported by our committee by a vote of 183 to 131. The Kerr bill as amended to conform to only the purposes and intent of the proposal passed the Senate. It was in different language but the same purpose only with an additional provision of a continuing study by the FPC on the subject in the public interest. The House agreed to the bill as amended by the Kerr amendment last Friday by a vote of 176 for it with 26 Members voting for the bill as passed the House in August being absent and not voting Friday.

This amendment, Mr. President, merely clarifies the intent of Congress when the original act was passed in 1938, to the effect that independent producers and gatherers of natural gas would be exempt from FPC regulations where sales by such producers and gatherers are at arm's length, at or prior to inception of interstate transmission or trunk lines of interstate natural gas companies. It conforms to the FPC order 139 issued August 1947, on being necessary because of confused interpretation Court decision in the Interstate case, June 1947.

This amendment, Mr. President, does not change any procedure or authority exerted in the history of the Natural Gas Act. It does not change the stated intent of the act when passed in 1938. It merely clears up a confused and uncertain status by court interpretation. Grave misrepresentations have been made to the effect it will increase cost of gas to consumers. This I respectively submit is gross misrepresentation. The history of the administration of the act shows the cost on a national average to consumers to gradually be reduced by 12 percent, during the 12 years of the Natural Gas Act administration.

I join with Speaker RAYBURN in confidently stating that this will not have adverse effect on the cost of gas to consumers. On the other hand, it will benefit consumers reducing their fuel cost by making more gas available to them.

The price of natural gas to consumers has steadfastly gone down and the cost of other fuels increased tremendously over the same period of time.

The contention that this is not competitive fuel, I respectfully submit, is in error. The competitive element is in the field where there are thousands of leases from which gas

is produced and the competitive element prevails in the usual business way as the big natural gas companies bid for it.

The FPC definitely has authority over rates at wholesale prices for resale and any grossly unfair or unusually high rates as in the past be prohibited by Commission. Furthermore, State utility commissions have regulatory authority over rates by distributing companies and can likewise continue to exert authority where the regulated monopoly business prevails. I urge your approval.

OREN HARRIS,
Member of Congress.

DEFEAT OF THE KERR BILL

Undoubtedly the Kerr amendment to the Natural Gas Act of 1938 was beaten in the final stretch by an ill-informed press, irresponsible columnists, and well-intentioned, but erring, municipal officials of America's largest cities who succumbed to inaccurate information and pressure from a major labor union that was interested to an extreme in keeping its large segment of coal miners in the pits of an ailing industry suffering from acute gas pains.

Quantities of natural gas most assuredly will be reduced the instant any manner of Federal regulation is exercised by the Federal Power Commission, for virtually all major independent producers have long-time contracts with transporting companies that can become nullified only if any Federal regulation of independents is begun. Wholesale cancellation of present contracts is a certainty in the event of FPC control, and less gas decidedly means higher gas prices to the consumer.

Independent producers generally have gas as a byproduct of oil drilling, and total sales in interstate commerce last year reached only $70,000,000. To maintain their independence, these producers in all likelihood will convert their natural gas into liquid gas, to fertilizer, or to carbon black, while supplies owned by natural-gas companies will be about all consumers can expect.

The Kerr bill was a wholesome one and its enactment into law would have changed nothing that has ever, or is now, in effect. It merely clarified a confusing passage of the Natural Gas Act of 1938 that the Federal Power Commission—and President Truman—urged the Eightieth Congress to enact, and the Priest bill, fully sanctioned by these men, was speedily enacted. It was virtually identical to the Kerr bill.

Later, however, under the leadership of Leland Olds, the FPC reversed its position by a 3-to-2 agreement. This same Mr. Olds was rejected by the most decisive vote the Senate has turned down a nominee in recent history when his term was to be renewed.

An even more controversial Moore-Rizley bill was adopted by the House in the Eightieth Congress, and the Harris bill was easily agreed to during the first session of this Congress. It was the Harris bill, amended by Senators KERR and THOMAS for the benefit of consumer protection, that the President vetoed last week.

It is strange, however, that every committee chairman in the Senate, with the exception of Senators CHAVEZ, NEELY, and TYDINGS, voted for the bill and strongly fought for its adoption. Even Senator BYRD and Senator TAFT gave their full approval to the measure, as did leaders in the House of Representatives.

Even after the Supreme Court ruled on the status of independent producers, all but one member of the Federal Power Commission joined in issuing an order—still in effect—guaranteeing this type producer freedom from fear of Federal regulation.

Upon this assurance, producers in the Southwest expanded their production and enabled transporters to bring this cheapest of all fuels to areas in all parts of the Nation—and at a price that has steadily declined for 12 years.

The Kerr amendment simply stated that these companies could continue in the future, as they have in the past, in running their own affairs. It further pointed out that in the event of unscrupulous price rises, an investigation would be made and results reported to the President.

Since 1938, if a transporter of natural gas owned producing wells, the entire process of production and transportation had been under the Federal Power Commission control. More than 75 percent of Chicago's natural-gas supply comes from wells owned by the transporter. Their rates have been and will remain under Federal regulation, but the mayor of that city cried out against the Kerr measure.

It is unfortunate, too, that the President found this pressure so great that he felt for political reasons he must reverse his past requests for such legislation and veto the measure.

PAUL MCBRIDE.

ARLINGTON.

Import Tax on Copper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 1950

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, President Videla of Chile, in effect, called for passage of H. R. 7151, the Patterson copper bill, at a luncheon in his honor yesterday in New York.

I believe that Congress should take due notice of his statement that reimposition of the tax would benefit no one in this country. The Chilean Nation has cooperated splendidly with the United States in the community of Pan-American countries, and a severe economic strain would result from restoration of the tax. Furthermore, the almost immediate effect upon employment in the brass industry would create a problem of great magnitude.

Action is imperative now if we are to head off these serious consequences.

President Videla's remarks on this subject are included in the following news story from the New York Herald Tribune for Wednesday, April 26, 1950:

CHILE PRESIDENT SEES MENACE IN COPPER TAX—SAYS RESTORATION BY UNITED STATES WOULD HURT HIS COUNTRY

President Gabriel Gonzalez-Videla, of Chile, said here yesterday that restoration of the United States import tax on copper would do severe economic and social damage to his country.

Addressing a luncheon in his honor at the University Club, President Gonzalez-Videla said that certain copper-producing groups in this country are advocating the resumption of this tax at a time when the United States is developing its plan of technical and financial aid to other countries and when American industry is in need of foreign copper.

The tax, he said, would benefit nobody in the United States and would do harm to its industries. However, he added, he had complete confidence a way out would be found to straighten out any difficulty between two friendly countries whose destiny it is to walk together through the years ahead whether of prosperity or reverses.

NO ARBITRARY EXPROPRIATION

Speaking of the friendly cooperation between North American capital and Chilean labor, he said that this kind of risky mining business can only succeed where laws offer complete guaranties of security to foreign capital and where foreign capital does not operate to take undue advantage of its power. He pointed out that there has never been a single case of arbitrary expropriation in Chile and said there will never be hostility of any other nature to capital or property.

President Gonzalez-Videla said the United States would be unable to face another foreign war if copper ingot were not forthcoming from Chilean ports. He praised North American copper concerns for setting aside a part of their profits to raise the living standards in the regions in which they operate, adding that these companies have surrendered positions of high technical and administrative responsibility to Chilean citizens.

TAX NOW SUSPENDED

The 2-cents-a-pound tax on copper imports has been suspended since the beginning of World War II but will become effective again after June 30 unless it is waived by Congress. The President of Chile spoke before more than 100 industrialists at the luncheon which was sponsored by C. Donald Dallas, chairman of Revere Copper & Brass Co.

Mr. Dallas said that Chile, because of existing legislation, is one of the few countries in the world to create a favorable environment for foreign investors. He added the hope that the much-needed copper from Chile "will always continue to flow freely into this country and that American industry and that of Chile will thus be mutually helped at all times."

Cornelius F. Kelley, chairman of Anaconda Copper Mining Co., said that without Chile's contribution to the last war, that conflict "could not have been fought as it was, won as it was, and the victory would have been of exceeding doubt." Calling the copper tariff a prohibitive restriction, Mr. Kelley warned that "in this time of tension we do not know how soon we may be put to the necessity of arming again as we have in the past."

Communism Versus Church

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS B. HELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 1950

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of April 25, 1950:

COMMUNISM VERSUS CHURCH

The struggle of Russian totalitarian communism against the various churches and against religion may be approaching a climax, at least in eastern Europe. The latest news

is of the vigorous counterattack on communism by sorely tried Protestant and Catholic churchmen in the Soviet zone of Germany. There is a still confused conflict in Poland, but clearly the situation is critical. The activities of the Czech and Hungarian Governments against the clergy and churches have filled many columns of news recently.

This whole struggle of east and west is throwing up some of the most profound spiritual problems in history. It would be a fatal mistake for western countries to think of the expansion and pressures of Soviet communism simply in terms of territories, countries, political forces, military threats, espionage, or propaganda. We are in the midst of a conflic as fundamental in its way as that of Christianity against the pagan world. Communism, like fascism, puts itself forward as a substitute for religion. In academic circles one hears much talk these days comparing in a technical or mechanical sense the spread of communism with the spread of Christianity in the first few centuries A. D. If there could be any basis for such comparison, it would only become possible through a failure of the democratic world to realize its danger and to make the truth about communism known. If communism really were a movement to spread brotherhood, peace, and the fair sharing of the world's goods, it would in the first place not be in conflict with many religious doctrines, and in the second it would not be Russian totalitarian communism.

The challenge we face is on two fronts. It is doctrinal in that Marxian communism is atheistic and materialistic, and it is political through the workings of the totalitarian system, which cannot countenance any force that is not completely controlled by the state. On the doctrinal side, communism is as much against Protestantism, Judaism, and Mohammedanism as it is against Catholicism. We hear so much about the attacks on the Roman Catholic Church in eastern Europe these days that we are apt to overlook the scope of the attack. It is another case of not asking for whom the bell tolls; it tolls for all of us.

A Prayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 26, 1950

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, increasingly nowadays it seems that we find in the daily prayers of the Chaplains opening our legislative sessions not only inspiration for moral and spiritual uplift but also material for sober thought and reflection to guide us as lawmakers in the discharge of our purely temporal duties. I find a splendid example of this in the instance of a recent prayer by the chaplain of the Massachusetts Senate, Rt. Rev. Msgr. Francis A. Burke, LL. D., and under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Wakefield (Mass.) Item of April 24, 1950, quoting therefrom with appropriate and laudatory comment:

A PRAYER

Prayers of the senate or house chaplains are more or less considered as routine each day and seldom win any mention.

There was one, however, last week which should have had first-page attention.

It was delivered by Senate Chaplain Burke in our own legislature.

He said, in part: "You cannot, without undermining public confidence, pyramid taxes, talk brotherhood, and practice prejudice, have so many on public pay rolls as to create too great a burden on the taxpayers, or contend in differences between the worker and the employer one side is always right and the other wrong. You cannot reduce the work hours per week beyond the ability of those to pay to absorb that additional economic responsibility. * * * You cannot have too much social security without begetting too much national insecurity. * * * Seeing one cannot spend what one doesn't possess, it follows that an unbalanced budget eventually leads to the cleaners."

Report of Projects Committee to Rivers and Harbors Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SID SIMPSON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 26, 1950

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD the following report of the projects committee, which was unanimously adopted by the recent Fortieth Annual Convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress held in Washington on March 23–25, 1950.

The permanent projects committee of the congress consists of an outstanding expert on water-resource problems from each of the major drainage basins of the United States. They serve without compensation of any kind whatsoever and bear all of their own expenses when coming to Washington and while here serving on this committee.

The committee's purpose is to assist the sponsors of projects in preparing and presenting their data, so that they may be placed in line for approval. The projects recommended by the committee and endorsed by the congress are vigorously pressed for inclusion in the Government's public-works program, and appropriations or allocation of funds sought therefor.

We are grateful to the members of this committee for their public-spirited service in an effort to assist the Congress of the United States and the governmental agencies charged with the responsibility for these public works, as well as the people in the areas to be served thereby.

The following are the members of the committee who served at its recent annual session:

NATIONAL RIVERS AND HARBORS CONGRESS,
PROJECTS COMMITTEE

Representative SID SIMPSON, of Illinois, chairman.

New England division: Larry M. Hess, executive secretary, Taunton Association of Commerce, Taunton, Mass.

North Atlantic division: Brig. Gen. James H. Stratton, United States Army (retired), consulting engineer, New York, N. Y.

South Atlantic division: H. H. Buckman, consulting engineer, Jacksonville, Fla., vice chairman.

Southwestern division: J. C. Murray, traffic manager and commerce counsel, Greater Little Rock Chamber of Commerce, Little Rock, Ark.

Lower Mississippi Valley division: Byron P. Lyons, chief engineer, Department of Public Works, State of Louisiana, Baton Rouge, La.

Upper Mississippi Valley division: Al Hansen, comptroller, city of Minneapolis, Minneapolis, Minn.

Missouri River division: Everett T. Winter, vice president, Mississippi Valley Association, Omaha, Nebr.

Ohio River division: O. Slack Barrett, president, Ohio Valley Improvement Association, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Great Lakes division: Harry C. Brockel, municipal port director, city of Milwaukee, Milwaukee, Wis.

North Pacific division: George E. Thomas, assistant manager, Washington, D. C., headquarters, Seattle, Wash., Chamber of Commerce.

Western Intermountain region: E. W. Rising, vice president, Southwestern Idaho Water Conservation Project, Inc., Boise, Idaho.

The report follows:

REPORT OF THE PROJECTS COMMITTEE TO THE FORTIETH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL RIVERS AND HARBORS CONGRESS

WASHINGTON, D. C., *March 25, 1950.*

Hon. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
President, National Rivers and Harbors Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In pursuance of the call of the president, your project committee met on March 23, 1950, to consider the projects submitted since the last session of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress. Hearings were afforded all who made appearance.

The committee at this session has examined 78 proposals embracing all resource improvements with which this congress is concerned, including navigable waterways, harbors, flood control, soil conservation, reclamation, and water conservation.

Of the proposals examined, this committee is convinced that 34 constitute projects sound in conception, needful, and sufficiently advanced in status to warrant endorsement, involving a total estimated cost of $622,576,590. Eight proposals appear to be without sufficiently advanced development to warrant project endorsement at this time, but are believed to be meritorious and entitled to further consideration by this committee, if and when additional information may be adequate to warrant an endorsed status. We find that on 29 proposals surveys have been authorized, but the reports on such surveys have not been completed, and we therefore recommend in these cases that the Congress request the appropriate authority to complete reports of its investigations and surveys as soon as practicable in order that action may be taken toward classification by this Congress. We find four proposals which on preliminary examination appear to be desirable and needful, and we accordingly recommend that engineering and economic investigations of survey scope be made in these cases with a view to developing projects for subsequent authorization. Of the proposals investigated, we find three are without

necessary data or sponsorship to enable the committee to reach a reasonable conclusion on their worth. However, we desire to give the applications sympathetic consideration, and, if possible, offer to the proponents the services of this congress in reaching a solution of their problems. We have, therefore, not classified these, but have suggested that the secretary communicate with the applicants concerned and request additional data upon the receipt of which further consideration will be given to their proposals.

Appendix A of this report sets forth in detail a list of all proposals and projects examined and the action taken thereon.

The committee desires to bring to the attention of all concerned the existence of a major omnibus flood-control and river-and-harbor bill. This bill, known as H. R. 5472, contains numerous items authorizing the construction of flood control and navigation improvements throughout the Nation. In addition, the bill carries authority for the Federal agencies concerned to conduct preliminary examinations and surveys in the interest of flood control, navigation, and allied purposes throughout many river basins. The bill has been passed by the House of Representatives, approved by the Senate Committee on Public Works, and is at present on the Senate Calendar. Enactment of this legislation will prove a valuable supplement to the existing river-and-harbor and flood-control law.

Your projects committee is well aware of the substantial and widespread benefits that are resulting from the construction and operation of flood-control structures throughout this great land of ours. These projects are providing a security never before known to a great many peoples who have previously witnessed the ravages of floods and experienced the miseries associated therewith. The improvements constructed in the interest and betterment of navigation have facilitated the growth of trade with other nations, developed water-borne commerce among the States, and strengthened the transportation system for the security and continued growth of the Nation. The picture is bright, flood-control and navigation improvements are constantly proving their worth, justifying the faith of the Congress of the United States in authorizing their construction. However, much hard work still remains to be accomplished to alleviate the needless suffering and hardships wrought by floods and to produce the best possible measures for the betterment of navigation.

Your committee again desires to make the recommendation that the National Rivers and Harbors Congress actively and forcefully foster the early completion of those projects essential to the future well-being of the Nation. In this respect it is essential that the Federal agencies concerned have sufficient funds with which to carry out the plans for the development of our water resources as approved and authorized. Therefore, Mr. President, your committee feels strongly that the Congress of the United States and all agencies concerned should be informed of the need for sufficient appropriations to carry on the work of project construction which has previously been approved, and which represents a prudent and far-seeing investment in the development of our natural resources, and to prosecute with diligence the work of investigation which is vital to the formulation of a sound and well-integrated program of river-basin development, and that not less than $10,000,000 be provided therefor annually. We further recommend that the amount of $53,000,000 recommended by the Bureau of the Budget for river and harbor maintenance be increased to $70,000,000.

Respectfully submitted.

SID SIMPSON, *Chairman.*

NOTE A.—A project which has been placed in class II, III, IV, or V by the committee may be reexamined from time to time upon due application and the submission of material supplementary information, with a view to advancing its classification; but no project will be reported upon by the committee more than once in each year.

NOTE B.—Attention is called to the fact that when a project is once put in class I—Endorsed, such status continues, and it is unnecessary to follow up at subsequent sessions with new applications. All projects "endorsed" by the Congress, upon the recommendation of the committee, retain their status until finally constructed, unless such action is rescinded by the Congress, and the Congress stands pledged to do everything possible to assist in reaching that goal.

APPENDIX A

(Letter "R" following the project number indicates revision of a previous application)

Class I—Projects endorsed

Endorsed: This means that the committee is convinced that the project is sound, needful, and sufficiently advanced in status, and should be promptly constructed in the will be reported upon by the committee more

Project No.	Name of project	State	Division
709-R-2	Upper Monongahela River modernization (Hildebrand and Opekiska Dams)	West Virginia	Ohio River.
722-R-2	Cape Fear River at and below Wilmington	North Carolina	South Atlantic.
736-R	Taylors Creek	do	Do.
744-R-2	Oregon Inlet and related channels	do	Do.
745-R-2	Masonboro Inlet	do	Do.
748-R	Craney Island disposal area	Virginia	North Atlantic.
779-R	Wallace Channel	North Carolina	South Atlantic.
784-R	Central Valley project	California	South Pacific.
804	Des Moines and Mississippi levee district No. 1	Missouri	Upper Mississippi Valley.
806	Connecticut River from Long Island Sound to Holyoke	Connecticut and Massachusetts	Northeastern.
817	New Cumberland locks and dams, Ohio River	Ohio and West Virginia	Ohio River.
818	Kansas River (flood control)	Kansas and Nebraska	Missouri River.
821	Susquehanna River, West Branch, reservoir system	Pennsylvania	North Atlantic.
824	Cache River Basin	Arkansas and Missouri	Lower Mississippi Valley.
825	Yadkin-Pee Dee Rivers (flood control)	North Carolina and South Carolina	South Atlantic.
826	Rocky Fork Reservoir (Paint Creek)	Ohio	Ohio River.
828	Mystic River, Boston	Massachusetts	Northeastern.
829	Tampa Harbor	Florida	South Atlantic.
830	Lake Worth Inlet	do	Do.
831	St. Augustine Harbor and vicinity	do	Do.
832	Arthur Kill, New York and New Jersey Channels, New York Harbor	New York and New Jersey	North Atlantic.
833	Savannah River	Georgia	South Atlantic.
834	Brunswick Harbor	do	Do.
835	James River, Richmond	Virginia	North Atlantic.
836	Cape Fear River, at and below Wilmington	North Carolina	South Atlantic.
838 (684-R)	Mississippi River, New Orleans to the Gulf of Mexico (Tidewater Channel)	Louisiana	Lower Mississippi Valley.
839	Sabine-Neches waterway	Texas	Southwestern.
840	Freeport Harbor	do	Do.
841	Galveston Harbor and Channel	do	Do.
842	Brazos Island	do	Do.
846	East Pass from Gulf of Mexico into Choctawhatchee Bay	Florida	South Atlantic.
847	Central and southern Florida flood-control project (first phase)	do	Do.
848	Canaveral Harbor	do	Do.
849	Intracoastal Waterway, Caloosahatchee to Anclote River	do	Do.

Class II—Projects classified as meritorious

Meritorious: This means that the committee believes that although the project is not sufficiently advanced in status to warrant its present endorsement, it is meritorious and open for further consideration by the committee.

Project No.	Name of project	State	Division
771-R	Burns Harbor	Indiana	Great Lakes.
781-R	Raystown Reservoir (Juniata River and tributaries)	Pennsylvania	North Atlantic.
790-R	Hudson River, improvement of, from Albany to New York	New York	Do.
795	Bayou Coden (channel dredging)	Alabama	South Atlantic.
809	Smiths Creek (Oriental)	North Carolina	Do.
819	Kalamazoo River and tributary, the Battle Creek River, at Battle Creek and vicinity (flood control).	Michigan	Great Lakes.
843	Farmers levee and drainage district (East Chandlerville levee project)	Illinois	Do.
844	Channel and harbor at Everglades, Collier County	Florida	South Atlantic.

Class III—Expeditious report on authorized survey requested

Expeditious report on authorized survey requested: This means that the committee believes the Congress should request the engineering authority to expedite the report of its investigation and survey of the project to the end that appropriate further action may be had thereon in regard to classification by the Congress.

Project No.	Name of project	State	Division
723-R	Cape Fear River above Wilmington (flood control)	North Carolina	South Atlantic.
725-R-2	Carolina Beach	do	Do.
727-R	Neuse River Basin (flood control)	do	Do.
728-R-3	Harbor at Morehead City	do	Do.
773-R	Waccamaw River	North Carolina and South Carolina	Do.
780-R	Little River Inlet	do	Do.
794	Bayou La Batre (channel dredging)	Alabama	Do.
796	Dauphin Island Bay (channel dredging)	do	Do.
797	Perdido Pass (channel dredging)	do	Do.
798	Fowl River (channel to Mobile Bay)	do	Do.
799	Waterway from Bon Secour Bay to Gulf via Oyster Bay	do	Do.
800	Au Gres River Basin (flood control)	Michigan	Great Lakes.
801	Kawkawlin River (flood control)	do	Do.
805	Saline River and tributaries (flood control and drainage)	Illinois	Ohio River.
807	Chowan River and tributaries (flood control)	North Carolina and Virginia	North Atlantic.
808	Neuse River (flood control), Smithfield to Wayne county line	North Carolina	South Atlantic.
810	Holden Beach (Brunswick County)	do	Do.
811	Hatteras Inlet to Hatteras	do	Do.
812	Cape Channel, Pamlico Sound	do	Do.
813	Pantego and Cucklers Creek (flood control)	do	Do.
814	Norfolk Harbor channel	Virginia	North Atlantic.
815	Thimble Shoal channel	do	Do.
816	Lambert Point anchorage	do	Do.
822	Baltimore Harbor and channels	Maryland	Do.
823	do	do	Do.
837	Mobile Harbor	Alabama	South Atlantic.
845	Apalachicola Harbor and channel to Gulf	Florida	Do.
850	Big Muddy River Basin (flood control)	Illinois	Upper Mississippi Valley.
851	Wabash River at Peru (flood control)	Indiana	Ohio River.

Class IV—Projects recommended for survey

Recommended for survey: This means that the committee believes that sufficient showing on behalf of the project has been made to warrant further examination in the form of an adequate survey by an appropriate agency of the Federal Government.

Project No.	Name of Project	State	Division
778-R	Lockwoods Folly Inlet	North Carolina	South Atlantic.
793-R	Cleves Flood protection project	Ohio	Ohio River.
803	Wisconsin-Fox Rivers waterway	Wisconsin	Upper Mississippi Valley.
820	Dana Point-San Clemente Harbor	California	South Pacific.

Rev. Philip Frederick McNairy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, recently my community suffered a loss when the Very Reverend Edward R. Welles, dean of St. Paul's Cathedral in Buffalo, N. Y., was designated as bishop of the Episcopal Diocese of West Missouri at Kansas City. Bishop Welles' transfer will cause him to be missed not only by the Episcopal Diocese of western New York but to all the people there who have grown to know and to love him.

Bishop Welles has achieved an enviable record in religious and civic matters. The affection with which he is held in the hearts of the people of Buffalo is proof of the splendid spiritual influence he has generated and nurtured among so many thousands. It is indeed a matter of great satisfaction to know that his strenuous labors so faithfully performed have been recognized and rewarded. While we shall miss him much, we rejoice in his elevation and wish him well.

Buffalo has indeed been fortunate in the choice of Bishop Welles' successor, the Reverend Philip Frederick McNairy, who has accepted the call to become the new dean of St. Paul's Cathedral. The Reverend Mr. McNairy has been serving as rector of Christ Episcopal Church at St. Paul, Minn., and has achieved a brilliant record.

I want to join the citizens of Buffalo in extending to the Reverend Mr. McNairy a cordial welcome and my very best wishes for a long and happy stay in my native city.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith two articles from the Buffalo Courier-Express, relating the details of these historic events:

P. F. McNAIRY WILL BE DEAN AT ST. PAUL'S—ST. PAUL CLERGYMAN ACCEPTS CATHEDRAL CALL

The Reverend Philip Frederick McNairy, 39-year-old rector of Christ Episcopal Church at St. Paul, Minn., will become dean of St. Paul's Cathedral here on August 1. The Right Reverend Lauriston L. Scaife, bishop of the western New York Episcopal diocese, announced yesterday that Rev. Mr. McNairy had accepted the unanimous call of the wardens and vestry of the cathedral.

The Reverend Mr. McNairy succeeds the Very Reverend Edward R. Welles, who will be consecrated bishop of the Diocese of West Missouri at Kansas City next Wednesday.

IMPRESSED BY HIS ABILITY

Bishop Scaife said he is "very happy" the Reverend Mr. McNairy had accepted the call.

"I have known him a comparatively short time but I have been impressed with his strength of character and his deep convictions so far as the place of the church in modern society and in the community are concerned," the bishop continued.

"I also have been impressed by his preaching ability, his forceful administration, and his ability as a devoted and consecrated pastor. I feel that he will be a splendid addition to the diocesan family and to the community at large."

Charles R. Wilson, 95 Oakland Place, senior warden of St. Paul's Cathedral, said last night he was very much pleased that the Reverend Mr. McNairy had accepted the call extended him.

"WELCOME" NEWS

John K. Walker, 21 Saybrook Place, junior warden at the cathedral, said news of the Reverend Mr. McNairy's acceptance was most welcome. Walker's comments were in a communication to his son, Charles W. Walker, 66 High Park Boulevard, Eggertsville. The elder Walker currently is vacationing on the west coast.

The Reverend Mr. McNairy told the Courier-Express by telephone from his St. Paul home last night that he is looking forward to the deanship of the cathedral here "as a tremendous opportunity of which I hope I am worthy."

He added that "I don't expect to make any radical changes at the cathedral. Those changes which I will make will be made with the consent of Bishop Scaife, the parishioners and vestrymen of the church."

The Reverend Mr. McNairy said he will return here Monday morning to have further conferences with Bishop Scaife and cathedral officials. He will remain here just for the day to dicuss matters of policy and plan a preliminary program for the Fall.

He added that his St. Paul parish will observe its centennial in May and "were it not for this occasion I would be able to assume my Buffalo duties much earlier than August 1st."

The Reverend Mr. McNairy said he will take up residence here before he becomes dean of St. Paul's Cathedral August 1st.

ACTIVE IN COMMUNITY AFFAIRS

The new dean has an enviable record as a clergyman and in community affairs.

His first clerical position was as head of St. Andrew's Mission at Columbus, Ohio, in 1934. From 1935 to 1940 he was rector of St. Stephen's Church, Cincinnati. He has been rector of Christ Church at St. Paul since 1940.

Since becoming rector of Christ Church, the Reverend Mr. McNairy has served as president of the standing committee of the Diocese of Minnesota, deputy to the general convention, chairman of the Department of Christian Education, chairman of the Department of Promotion, chairman of youth work, dean and director of the Carleton Conference, and dean of the St. Paul Deanery.

The Reverend Mr. McNairy's civic activities have included chairman of the Council of Social Agencies at St. Paul for 2 years, chairman of the St. Paul Council of Human Relations, a member of the Advisory Board of the YMCA and YWCA and a member of the Board of Directors of the St. Paul Community Chest.

RECEIVED AWARD

The St. Paul Junior Chamber of Commerce presented its annual award for service to the community to the Reverend Mr. McNairy in 1946.

The new dean was born at Lake City, Minn., on March 19, 1911. He was graduated from Kenyon College, Gambier, Ohio, in 1932 with a bachelor of arts degree. In 1934 he was graduated from Bexley Divinity School, Gambier, with the degree of bachelor of divinity.

The Reverend Mr. McNairy married the former Cary E. Fleming of Columbus in 1935. They have three children: Philip, 12, a student at Breck School, St. Paul; Judith, 10, and Patricia, 5.

BISHOP WELLES ENTHRONED IN KANSAS CITY—FORMER BUFFALO DEAN INSTALLED IN DIOCESE

KANSAS CITY, April 19.—The Very Reverend Edward Randolph Welles, former dean of St. Paul's Cathedral, Buffalo, today was enthroned as fourth bishop of the Episcopal Diocese of West Missouri.

The consecration combined a brilliant setting of church pageantry with the enshrined traditions of the solemn occasion. Church leaders in dark red, the liturgical color of the day, mingled with those in black, white, and purple vestments.

More than 700 persons in the Grace and Holy Trinity Cathedral here knelt as 12 bishops climaxed the ritual by the laying on of hands ceremony which stood as the symbol of a new member in the line of succession started when Christ sent forth the 12 apostles.

With the Right Reverend Henry Knox Sherrill, of New York, presiding bishop of the church, as celebrant and consecrator, Dean Welles was elevated to the position as the spiritual leader of 10,399 persons. He succeeds the Right Reverend Robert Nelson Spencer, who retired last October.

As the ceremony neared its end, Dean Welles rendered the oath of conformity, which read:

"I, Edward Randolph Welles, chosen bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the diocese of West Missouri, do promise conformity and obedience to the doctrine, discipline, and worship of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America. So help me God, through Jesus Christ."

TRADITIONAL CHANT SUNG

Then the traditional chant of Veni, Creator Spiritus (Come, Holy Spirit) was raised as the 12 bishops clustered around the 42-year-old bishop-elect and, simultaneously, placed their hands upon his head.

He then was given his bishop's mitre and his cape, which was of gold cloth with a dark red border. The Very Reverend Claude W. Sprouse, dean of the Grace and Holy Trinity Cathedral, handed the new bishop his crozier, or pastoral staff, and Dean Welles was enthroned on the cathedra, or bishop's chair. He wore also an amethyst ring, presented him earlier in the ceremony by his brother, Samuel Welles, of New York, and a pectoral cross, hanging on a chain around his neck. The ring had belonged to his grandfather, also Edward Randolph Welles, who was consecrated bishop of Wisconsin in 1874. Finally, with Dean Welles kneeling before the altar, Bishop Sherrill said:

"Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a bishop in the church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands."

Earlier, the ceremony had started with a two-block procession of church and lay leaders. It was a colorful gathering, with crucifers in red and white robes stationed along the long line which moved slowly into the gray stone cathedral. At that time Dean Welles wore a purple vestment and cap. He smiled with confidence as he took his place in the procession, flanked by his attending presbyters, Dean Sprouse and the Reverend Sewall Emerson, of Norwalk, Conn.

As the procession moved forward into the cathedral toward the chancel and altar, the choir, wearing white surplices over fuchsia robes, raised their voices in the words of the processional hymn: Jesus Calls Us O'er the Tumult of Our Life's Wild Restless Sea.

COMMUNION CELEBRATED

Bishop Sherrill then celebrated communion, with only the bishops and others having official part in the ceremony taking the sacrament.

Bishop Lauriston L. Scaife, of western New York, read the epistle, and Bishop Goodrich R. Fenner, of Kansas, read the gospel, from St. John. Prayers and hymns preceded the sermon by the Right Reverend Stephen Fielding Bayne, Jr., bishop of Olympia, Wash.

Faithful is not among the glittering words used in describing a calling, but it is the fundamental requirement for an Episcopal bishop or priest, Bishop Bayne said.

An Episcopal priest, rector, or bishop must be faithful as a teacher, as a shepherd to those in his care, and faithful to his Lord and the apostolic line, he said. Bishop Bayne is rated as one of the church's top preachers.

Many words are useful in describing a clerical calling, he said, such as adventure, opportunity, service, and vocation.

The life of a bishop is full of distraction and confusion, he said, but still he must be a teacher, in conference and controversy, alike.

A bishop must be faithful to those entrusted to his care, he said, as a shepherd, which entails two great temptations. One is to overlook the human and mortal phase of his "flock" and the other is to stay, with the ninety and nine because it is so much trouble to seek out the straying one.

The testimonials were offered next. William A. Moon presented the certificate of election, and the Reverend Earle B. Jewell presented the canonical testimonial of the convention.

The Reverend Edwin W. Merrill offered the consents of the standing committees, and the Right Reverend Everett H. Jones offered the consents of the bishops.

After Dean Welles had given his promise of conformity, Bishop J. Gillespie Armstrong, of Pennsylvania, said the litany for ordinations, with responses from those in the cathedral.

Bishop Sherrill, after offering a prayer, then proceeded to examine Dean Welles with a series of questions to establish his readiness to discharge his office according to the doctrines of the church.

After the ceremony, Bishop Welles returned to the chancel to bestow his blessings on members of his family and the congregation.

The 160 clergy and laity in the procession, including those taking part in the ceremony, filled the chancel at the forepart of the cathedral.

The Older Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 26, 1950

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, it has given me great satisfaction to note the favorable response from all over the country to my bill (H. R. 7571) to furnish an incentive for our older workers to keep on working and producing. In line with the generally favorable comment, I include herewith, under leave to extend my remarks, an editorial from the Boston (Mass.) Herald of April 17, 1950:

THE OLDER WORKERS

America is going to be stronger if it keeps its older men and women productive, rather than eagerly pensioning them off to idleness, as we are inclined to do. Instead of seeking new ways to support them at an increasingly early age, why not have Government supply the incentive to keep them at work longer? Early retirement is good neither for the individual nor for society.

Senator BRIDGES and Congressman GOODWIN have sponsored a bill to relieve those over 65 from paying the old-age tax if they choose to continue to work. This is a fair suggestion. But the great majority of retirements are not from choice; they are the result of arbitrary age policies set up by corporations. Some of the incentive should be addressed to them.

If the corporations were also relieved of the old-age tax on the pay of those over 65, there would be a small incentive to retain and hire older men and women. The lifting of the State unemployment tax on the pay of those over 65 would further assist.

It may take a little time for some legislators to realize it, but the best gift to a vigorous man in his sixties is a worth-while job.

Foreign Oil Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. M. G. BURNSIDE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 26, 1950

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert the following letter from Mr. H. R. Pinckard, of Huntington, W. Va.:

DEAR MORRIE: I have been out of the city and only received your telegram this morning.

As for foreign-oil dumpings, I have expressed by opinion frequently in editorials, one of which I enclose.

If this were simply a matter of foreign products displacing American, I would not be so dubious. Trouble is that mines are being closed because of markets lost to cheap foreign oil; and once they are closed and the "iron is pulled" (a mining phrase which

means to remove rails and other installations from the shaft) there can be no quick resumption of operations at that location.

Yet, we all know that oil shipments from abroad would be among the first imports cut off by war. Then converted customers would be thrown back on a fuel which could no longer be supplied in sufficient quantity.

In view of international uncertainties, it does look suicidal to put so much dependence on an undependable product—whose abundance at the moment is costing us heavily in wages, taxes, dividends, and human security.

Cordially,

H. R. PINCKARD.

Much has been said about the effects of foreign oil imports on the American coal industry. However, we have found that few people, even among miners and railroaders who are losing their jobs because of cheap oil being dumped in eastern United States ports, fully appreciate the gravity of the situation.

Here is an easy guide which may be applied to oil imports for ascertaining their effect on the coal and transportation businesses:

Every 4 barrels of foreign oil displaces 1 ton of bituminous coal. Every time 4,000 barrels of oil are dumped, one miner and one railroader lose their jobs. Remember those figures.

On this same subject I received the following letter from Mr. Arthur Downing of Logan, W. Va.:

MY DEAR MR. BURNSIDE: Many thanks for your wire of April 21.

You certainly did not make a mistake when you stated that big oil imports were hurting the coal business in West Virginia.

Hundreds of thousands of tons of coal have been displaced by the dumping of foreign residual oil on the eastern seaboard. This cheap foreign oil has pushed the domestic producers of such oil back from the seaboard and they are pushing for markets in the Middle West, thus displacing coal in this district's normal market.

There is one thing the Government should give some thought to, and that is that when a coal mine goes down it usually is gutted of all machinery, rail, copper wire, etc. It cannot be opened up again just overnight. If this country should ever go to war and a great many mines have been laying idle for a period of time, the country might find itself very, very short of fuel because its source of supply of oil would be cut off and coal then would become a necessity.

A tax on foreign oil which would put it on a price parity with coal is certainly not out of order. It is a must if the coal industry is to keep in shape to supply this country with fuel, as and when it needs it.

Your help and influence in this matter is sincerely appreciated.

Yours very truly,

ARTHUR DOWNING,
President, Logan Coal Operators' Association.

Sister Helen Madeleine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial paying tribute to an eminent Massachusetts citizen, the editorial being published in the Boston Post, Tuesday, April 25, 1950. I think it is well worth the attention of Senators.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SISTER HELEN MADELEINE

The courage of nuns is commonplace knowledge. These women develop a quiet confidence in God, to whom they have dedicated their lives. The result is that no enterprise is too difficult, no task staggering. Sister Helen Madeleine, dean of Emmanuel College since its founding 31 years ago, is a case in point. After those years of service when the ordinary college dean might seek retirement to a life of study or ease, Sister Helen Madeleine will journey to Japan to help open a new college there staffed by the Notre Dame nuns. She has had many honors since the doors of Emmanuel College opened. She has had the tremendous satisfaction of seeing the school, in its short span of years, become one of the leading Catholic educational institutions in the country, and one of New England's outstanding colleges for girls. Its success, though she would blanch at the statement, is mainly due to her great personality. It will never lose the impetus she has given it. She will be honored at a formal reception at the college next month and will leave for Japan in June. The accomplishments she leaves behind make her one of the great women in the history of Boston.

Two-Price Plan for Wheat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOWELL STOCKMAN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 26, 1950

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have had so many requests for an analysis of the bill H. R. 7245, providing for a two-price or certificate plan for wheat, which I introduced on February 9, 1950, that under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD a copy of an analysis of the bill. The two-price plan is recommended by the Oregon Wheat Growers League and endorsed generally by the farm organizations of the Pacific Northwest, who believe its adoption would greatly reduce wheat surpluses, since it would allow wheat to share the feed-grain market and find greater export outlets. It provides for parity for that part of the wheat crop used for domestic flour or other human foods, while the remainder of the crop would move into export and feed and industrial markets at competitive prices. The analysis of the bill is as follows:

SUMMARY OF H. R. 7245 FOR TWO-PRICE OR CERTIFICATE PLAN FOR WHEAT

WHAT IS INTENDED

A. How certificates would be issued to growers:

1. Each certificate would represent 1 bushel of wheat—60 pounds net weight, exclusive of dockage.

2. The value of each certificate would be equal to the difference between full parity price and the market price or loan rate (whichever is higher) as determined at the beginning of the marketing year. It could never exceed 60 cents a bushel and would remain constant throughout the marketing year.

3. Number of certificates each year would equal amount of wheat estimated to be used for all human food purposes in the United States.

4. Certificates issued to each farm would be that farm's share of the national domestic consumption for human food, allocated on basis of a percentage of the normal yield of the acreage allotments already established.

5. Certificates would be issued to producers in the form of drafts on Commodity Credit Corporation, cashable at local banks. They would be issued as soon as practicable after the amount of certificates has been determined. Payments would be made out of revolving fund described below.

6. Acreage allotments and normal yields would not necessarily be changed every year. Possibly revision every 3 or 4 years would be sufficient. Thus, allocation of certificates would remain constant for several years.

7. Growers would not ordinarily be required to seed within allotments in order to receive certificates. Thus, acreage allotments would be used chiefly to determine the number of certificates a farmer would be entitled to receive. In cases of large surpluses, however, it might be necessary to invoke production controls and in this event, farmers should be required to comply in order to receive certificates.

8. Loans would be at about the rate for corn but not less than 60 percent of parity as figured in act of 1948.

B. How certificates would be bought by processors:

1. The Commodity Credit Corporation would establish a revolving fund, administered through the Federal Reserve System. Growers would be paid out of this fund and collections from processors would be paid into it.

2. Processors would purchase certificates through member banks in the total amount required to cover sales of flour and other wheat products at the end of each month.

3. Purchases of certificates would be required on manufactured products sold in the domestic market using conversion factors as under the 1933–35 processing tax law.

C. Effects of this plan:

1. The price of wheat would be about the same as that for corn and other feed grains and would probably be above the loan rate most of the time.

2. Differentials and relationships would be determined by competitive conditions in the market.

3. Wheat would move freely into livestock feed, exports and industrial uses, and marketings would be relatively large. Feeding wheat to livestock would increase and more wheat would be available to processors of dairy and poultry feed.

4. Growers would shift out of wheat on farms where other crops would be more profitable than low-priced wheat. Incentive to maintain full wheat acreage would be less than with a high price support.

5. Mills would add the cost of the certificate to the cost of the wheat in figuring prices of flour, breakfast food, and other wheat products. The price of bread and other wheat products would thus reflect parity price for wheat. The cost of the certificate, however, could never exceed 1 cent per pound of bread. The total cost of wheat and certificates to processors would be no different than the present program which holds the price of wheat at about parity. Freedom of market movement under a low loan would be a big advantage to mills over the high loan program. Since mills would not need to buy certificates until after the flour is sold, they would avoid having additional money tied up in raw material between the time the wheat is purchased and the time the flour is sold.

Address Before National Milk Producers Federation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. M. G. BURNSIDE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 26, 1950

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following comments which I made to our delegation at the seventh congressional dinner of the National Milk Producers Federation on April 17 at the Shoreham Hotel in Washington. I hope this will be helpful, not only to the farmers of my district but to the whole Nation:

I believe our thinking, these days, should be along the lines of thrift and economy. Certainly no one can accuse the farmer of having the "gimmies." He wants to earn his way by the use of his brains and brawn. We should direct our efforts toward production in the fields where there are no surpluses. As fluid milk for instance. In two of the largest cities of my district in West Virginia, Huntington and Parkersburg, there is a real shortage of milk. A very clever magician has just produced, by good tricks, five liquids but it takes old bossie the cow to produce milk. There is, each year in my district, a fine market for early sweet corn. This is a fine field for increased production because if the farmer can market early roasting ears he can really clean up, and if he misses this early market, he can still use the corn for feed.

The establishment of a new wholesale market in Huntington will be of great value. Farming has formerly been a gamble but the increased use of science has eliminated some of the hazards. I have sent many thousands of scientific bulletins to farmers of the Fourth District, which I hope will be helpful. I call your attention to another matter that is not generally understood by the public. It takes a decline of 6 points in the price paid to the farmer for an item to cause a 1-point decline in the price to the consumer. The difference is due to the costs of processings, etc. These things are matters of importance, not only to the farmer but to all, regardless of our business or occupation, because what affects the farmer affects us all.

The Ban on Baseball Broadcasts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 26, 1950

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, with further reference to the remarks I made yesterday under leave to extend my remarks I should like to include an editorial from the columns of the Hartford Courant (Conn.) of April 25, 1950.

THE BAN ON BASEBALL BROADCASTS

The fury of the scorned woman has been equaled and perhaps surpassed. And that by the baseball fan in this vicinity, who has been denied the pleasure of listening to the broadcast of a major league game. The familiar cry, "Kill the umpire," is yielding to "Kill Happy Chandler," in annoyance at baseball's high commissioner.

If the air waves hereabout were not crackling with base hits Sunday, they were blue with fans blowing their tops. It seems that the Springfield club of the International League is against major-league broadcasts while its team is playing at home. It fears that fans might listen to the radio instead of watching the local game. Hence the new rule that no broadcasting outlets within a radius of 50 miles of the Springfield park may carry the games in Boston or New York or Brooklyn. The rule seems to be part of the agreement whereby baseball sells broadcasting rights to radio stations and to the sponsors of the broadcasts.

The details of the deal are not essential. The purpose counts. And that is to try forcing a bigger attendance at minor-league games. You may be sure of one thing. If baseball's moguls thought broadcasting cut attendance they would stop selling broadcasting rights. Perhaps a minor-league club does suffer slightly, but even that is doubtful. Our amiable Charlie Blossfield, of the Hartford Chiefs, has never invoked the broadcasting ban. When he has a good club the turnstiles click. When he doesn't, fans stay away. The real fan likes his baseball in the flesh.

Many of the complaints Sunday took an interesting slant toward the ban. Fans wanted to know if Chandler thinks he is Hitler or Stalin. How about their right to hear what they want to hear? Other fans swore that they wouldn't be driven into attending a game in Springfield just because they can't hear a major-league broadcast. John Fan just won't be kicked around.

The responsible parties in baseball and radio should reconsider the rule. Suppose the Courant, for the sake of getting a bit of advertising income from the Hartford Chiefs, agreed not to report games in other cities, or to exclude from its edition going to cities in the Colonial League all references to the Chiefs. What would the public think? This would raise the question of the freedom of the press. How free is radio when its outlets can be silenced?

Arming of the Arab States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS B. HELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 26, 1950

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

Hon. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR COLLEAGUE: I am taking this opportunity to express to you my deep appreciation, as well as my admiration, in your bringing to the attention of the State Department the alarming situation in the arming of the Arab states by Great Britain.

You performed a masterful stroke, which I am sure not only the Jews of this country and the Jews all over the world appreciate, but all peace-loving people owe you a debt of gratitude.

It was an impressive sight to see 32 Members of Congress united under your leadership in bringing to the attention of the Secretary of State, the Honorable Dean Acheson, the sentiments of these Representatives, non-Jews as well as Jews, from all parts of the country. In addition, six of the outstanding Members of the House, including the leader of the Democratic Party in the House, the Honorable JOHN MCCORMACK, who expressed their regret at not being able to accompany the delegation because of important prior congressional engagements, added their endorsement to the protest.

Among the Congressmen who went to the State Department were Republicans as well as Democrats who were anxious to join with you in protesting against the shipment of arms to the Arab States by Great Britain.

It was fortunate that you visited Israel and the Arab states last fall, where you could see with your own eyes and hear with your own ears what was going on. You very properly visualized the danger of a repetition of a war between the Arabs and the Jews, with all of its horrible consequences. Indeed, such a war in the Near East, as you indicated, might be the spark to start another world war.

I have heard many Members of the Congress express admiration for what you did on this memorable occasion, and therefore I personally want you to know how grateful I am to you for inviting me to join with others in calling on the Secretary of State in this connection.

You must also be aware of the fact that the press of the country gave a very favorable report of this visit to the State Department.

With kind regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,
LOUIS B. HELLER,
Member of Congress.

Rivers and Harbors Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 26, 1950

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under authority granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to submit the report of the resolutions committee which was unanimously adopted by the fortieth annual convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress held in Washington, D. C., recently.

The resolutions committee, of which I served as chairman, consisted of one delegate from each State, Territory, island possession, and the District of Columbia. The members gave careful and painstaking consideration to the matters before them and reached unanimous agreement thereon.

This convention was attended by 332 registered delegates from 42 States, Alaska, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia, as well as many others who failed to register, guests, visitors, and so forth. These delegates were from all sections of the country, representing both legislative and executive branches of the Federal Government; State, city, county, and other local governmental agencies and interested groups; commercial, waterway, flood control, and reclamation associations; agricultural, labor, industrial, and trade organizations, and transportation interests; with memberships totaling several millions.

We believe this unanimous expression of representatives of such different interests and pursuits is strong evidence of the general sentiment of the people of

the United States concerning the matters dealt with in these resolutions.

(The report follows:)

REPORT OF THE RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE TO THE FORTIETH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL RIVERS AND HARBORS CONGRESS, MARCH 25, 1950

FOREWORD

Fully cognizant of the fact that this Nation and its people cannot prosper in the absence of a productive economy stemming from wise development of our natural resources; and ever conscious of its obligation to keep its members and the American people adequately informed and to provide the guidance required to insure proper development and utilization of our water resources to serve the ever present and increasing needs of navigation, flood control, power development, irrigation, and related uses; the National Rivers and Harbors Congress at its fortieth annual convention, unanimously adopts the following carefully considered resolutions:

WATER AND LAND RESOURCES POLICIES

The National Rivers and Harbors Congress recommends to the Congress of the United States that it—

1. Establish a permanent commission in the legislative branch of the Government for the purpose of studying and making adequate research with respect to all matters concerned with the development, conservation, and utilization of the water and land resources of the Nation;

2. Authorize such commission to employ a staff, who by training and experience are competent to conduct the necessary research;

3. Instruct the commission to confer with official Federal and State agencies, and with other organizations, including engineering and industrial societies and water use associations, interested in water and land use and control;

4. Authorize and appropriate sufficient moneys to conduct the work of the commission; and

5. Instruct the commission on the basis of the study and research thus conducted, to recommend to the Congress, from time to time, policies and legislation for the future development, conservation, and utilization of the water and land resources of the Nation.

AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FUTURE WORK

The National Rivers and Harbors Congress is in full accord with the pending legislation in H. R. 5472 which provides for continuing a well-planned program of river and harbor and flood control construction throughout the Nation. The projects contemplated are sound, their economic value has been established and their submission to the Congress has received the approval of our highest office of review—the Bureau of the Budget. Notwithstanding the merits of this legislation its defeat in whole or in part may be desired by those who are unwilling to admit the potential disaster in a flood-swollen stream; in an unsafe channel; or in a city without electricity during a coal strike. We commend this excellent legislation, destined to foster our national economy, to the Congress of the United States for immediate adoption in the present session. Common sense dictates that it is necessary.

APPROPRIATIONS

The wealth of our Nation did not come about by accident. Its immense wealth was derived largely from our abundant store of natural resources and the prudent development of those resources. We cannot prosper in the future by accident but by continuing proper development of our land and water resources we will make a substantial contribution to continued prosperity. Our future rate of development of these resources and the future safety of our people from floods are contingent upon appropriations from the Federal Treasury. Requisite appropriations should naturally be consistent with our national economic conditions but should not be related to the economic status of other nations. Enormous expenditures abroad are becoming less and less popular with many of our people, especially to those who are depending on our Government to provide safety from floods. These are the facts that prompt us to urge the Congress to appropriate for Americans the funds which will permit the responsible agencies to develop our resources and build the vital protection works our people deserve. Now is the time to appropriate for expeditious advancement of these improvements.

BUDGET POLICY

The administration's policy of no new starts expressed in the budget message for fiscal year 1951 gives cause for alarm with respect to the future of river and harbor and flood-control improvements. The items for which money was budgeted were those already started with no provision for starting new projects regardless of necessity and economic justification. We can only conclude that this policy, regardless of the reasons publicly announced, eliminates the necessity for decision as to which areas should benefit first from new projects and should this policy continue our river and harbor and flood-control work will come to a standstill in 2 or 3 years. We believe such a policy cannot be accepted as being in the national interest, and we appeal to the Congress to remedy the situation now before the full effect of this budgetary restriction is felt throughout the Nation.

REGIONAL AUTHORITIES

The National Rivers and Harbors Congress is cognizant of the strategy of the valley authority proponents of concentrating on a Columbia Valley Administration in the hope that its adoption will provide another step in favor of similar administrations in all major river basins of the country. We are opposed now, and have been in the past, to the creation or extension of valley or regional authorities which are unjustified, unnecessary, and in opposition to our democratic principles. We are apprehensive lest complacency in this matter will permit the existing agencies to be removed from the field of natural resources development with detriment to the interests of the States involved and to the Nation as a whole. We cannot concur in the President's policy respecting regional administrations as enunciated in his state of the Union and budget messages.

HYDROELECTRIC POWER

The President of the United States in his State of the Union and Budget messages to the current Congress emphasized the need for increased production and transmission of hydroelectric power. This Congress has also long advocated increased production of power where its production comes from economically justified projects and is consistent with other purposes of such Federal projects. However, we reaffirm our position with respect to unnecessary competition with the private power industry.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS

We reaffirm our faith in the operations of the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army in connection with the planning, construction, and operation of Federal improvements for navigation, flood control and allied purposes. We are unalterably opposed to the transfer of these functions or of the Corps' organization to the Interior Department as recommended by the Hoover Commission or to any other agency. Careful and thorough examination of the criticism and recommendations of the Hoover Commission has shown such criticism to be based upon inadequate evidence, half truths, and even malicious falsification and its recommendations are consequently dangerously immature and fallacious. We find the charges of duplication and waste between agencies to be grossly exaggerated and in many instances absolutely groundless. We believe the Hoover Commission failed completely to weigh the national defense value of the present system; the economy of obtaining worthy public improvements and developing experienced military leaders at the same time; and, last but by no means least, the efficiency and excellence with which these functions have been performed for over a century. Under the circumstances we strongly urge that no reorganization of the civil functions of the Corps of Engineers be undertaken and we pledge our untiring effort to combat any such reorganization plan if proposed.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

The Department of the Interior through the Bureau of Reclamation has made notable progress in its continuing program for reclamation of the arid and semiarid lands of the 17 Western States. We commend the Bureau of Reclamation for this progress and encourage it to continue in the arid areas where the problems obtaining are unlike those in the humid areas of the Eastern States which have flood control and drainage under the Corps of Engineers as a primary consideration with irrigation as an incidental benefit. The acute problem in the arid western areas has required their concerted efforts in the past and will continue to do so in the foreseeable future. We have and will continue to advocate adequate funds for the Bureau of Reclamation to properly provide for irrigation in these western areas.

SOIL CONSERVATION

We are still confronted with dangerous loss of our cultivable soil and with silt destroying the efficiency of the navigation and flood channels of our streams. Fertile slopes are being covered with worthless subsoil eroded from hill lands and a detrimental soil deposit is being laid in the beds of the navigation and drainage arteries of the Nation. Notable progress has been made by the Soil Conservation Service but much remains to be done. We urge that funds for soil erosion control under the Department of Agriculture and for major drainage and channel improvements by the Corps of Engineers be made available so as to continue this highly important and beneficial work as rapidly as practicable.

TIDELANDS

We believe it proper that the several States of the Union be permitted to contribute to the economic prosperity of the Nation through ownership and development of the tidal lands within and adjacent to their boundaries. As long as the States and their people are denied this ownership the development of these resources is in doubt. We urge legislation to give to them that which appears to be theirs, making their rights subordinate only to the paramount right of the United States to continue with improvements for national defense, navigation, and flood control as now authorized or as may be authorized in the future.

A MENACE TO WATER-BORNE TRANSPORTATION

Our marine transportation industry has prospered under a system of free enterprise whereunder the rights of all concerned to make prices competitive has long been acknowledged. We believe this system will be jeopardized by a recent movement, on the part of several railroads, which would tax, by means of higher charges, one group of their customers for the benefit of others. The railroads allege that there is a necessity for relief from section 4 (1) of the Interstate Commerce Act for specific commodity rail rates much lower than rates for short hauls. The contention of the railroads that these rates are necessary to make them competitive with either existing or potential water competition is not compatible with the general

increase in rail rates since 1941 of 57 percent while barge rates have actually gone down. This move could contribute substantially to the annihilation of competition from water carriers since each successful rate case is used as a precedential argument for future cases. We appeal to the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to limit the degree to which the Interstate Commerce Commission can exempt rates under section 4 (1) of the Commerce Act. Only such legislation can assure a reasonable future for the water carriers of the Nation and a reasonable rate for the shippers along our waterways. Constant defense against such attacks alone is not enough—the help of Congress is essential.

AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE

The National Rivers and Harbors Congress reaffirms its continued active support of a strong and well-balanced American merchant marine immediately available in event of a national emergency and adequate to provide the shipping services essential to our business and agriculture. At present unfavorable economic conditions are being experienced in our coastal communities and harbor areas by reason of insufficient United States flagships for our armed forces in event of an emergency, commercial travel, and domestic shipping. Moreover, shipbuilding and repair employment has reached a low level. The Congress believes that assistance to the American merchant marine can be accomplished by sufficient Government interest to induce private capital and the maritime industry to expand the present facilities; by fair and adequate Panama Canal tolls, taking into account the actual cost of transiting merchant and military vessels and by according proper importance to the national defense value of the Canal; by reactivation and reinterpretation if necessary by the Congress of the statement of policy contained in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 respecting the equal importance of the American merchant marine to other components of our national defense structure.

FEDERAL BARGE LINES

The Inland Waterways Corporation is serving thousands of shippers throughout the Mississippi Valley area. Such service is essential to the trade, commerce, and continued development of this vital section of our country. It has been demonstrated that with modern equipment the Corporation can be operated without expense to the taxpayer. The acquisition of such equipment is essential for the eventual disposition of the system to private enterprise. Legislation is pending before both bodies of the Congress to provide additional authorization for funds to rehabilitate the Federal barge lines. Hearings have been held on this legislation in which representatives of the valley have testified in favor thereof. The National Rivers and Harbors Congress strongly endorses the pending legislation before the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States to rehabilitate the Federal Barge Lines, and requests that the Representatives in the Congress from the valley area use their influence to secure the speedy enactment of this vital legislation.

Curtailment of Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 1950

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks—this morning I received a letter from a constituent concerned with the recent order of Postmaster General Donaldson seriously impairing the postal service. With this letter was included a Purple Heart medal received by the writer in recognition of his service in the armed forces of the United States.

This letter points up the impact of the ill-advised and unwarranted order of the Postmaster General.

The people of the United States do not seek or desire impairment of postal service. Economy can be effected in many ways other than reduction in personnel. The order of the Postmaster General should be immediately rescinded or drastically revised.

The letter follows:

APRIL 24, 1950.

Congressman WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
Representative, Seventh Congressional District, Bergen County, N. J.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am one of the postal employees affected by the order cutting postal service. I have a wife and child and this order really hurts those in my position. Of course I am rather lucky, I will be allowed to work 3 days a week, but I guess this is in appreciation of the 3 years I spent in the armed forces of my country.

Now, sir, my problem is this: If I only work 3 days per week, how am I to pay my bills and feed my family?

I have thought of an idea to feed my family for a while. With this letter I am sending you a package which will contain a medal that the Government gave me and since I cannot eat it, I was wondering if you wouldn't send me some of the surplus food that you have in trade for it.

Thanking you for taking the time to read this letter, which I hope will be of some help to the millions of boys like myself, who gave up much of their time, and in some cases, all of their lifetime, to fight for this great and wonderful country, which I am now wondering whether or not is so wonderful after all.

Very truly yours,

CHESTER H. FORD.

Hail to the Lions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 1950

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, as a public servant interested in the activities and welfare of his constituents, it is always a source of pride for me to read of the accomplishments of the many civic-minded groups and civic-minded individuals who make up his constituency.

By their endeavors in behalf of their respective communities—these people demonstrate that they are ever ready, regardless of sacrifice or effort, to discharge their obligations as citizens of this great America. They realize that democracy is a two-way street—that the fruits of democracy cannot be enjoyed unless in turn we give to it of ourselves in full bounty.

In this wise they prove their Americanism. Through their deeds they advance Americanism and make America stronger. And, in the ultimate, these are the things by which we give expression to democracy.

The men of the Lions Club are, by their civic interest, performing a public service. I am particularly happy to salute the members of the Lions Club of Nutley who have been outstanding in their contribution to their community. For 25 years of real service—on their silver anniversary—I salute them.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial which appeared in the Nutley Sun of Friday, April 21, 1950, entitled "Hail to the Lions":

HAIL TO THE LIONS

Twenty-five years ago the Nutley Lions Club was created under the sponsorship of the Rutherford Lions. This week, as the town club fittingly observes its silver anniversary, the Nutley Sun hails with respect a record of a quarter of a century of constant service to the community which has marked the Lions activity.

By many accomplishments, the Lions have earned the respect and admiration of the town, but two have been outstanding: the annual award of an honorary symbol to the outstanding citizen of the year and the eyesight-conservation campaign which has done much to help school children take proper care of their eyes.

The local citizenship award has served, each year, to center the attention of the town on the generous, successful, devoted activities of some person whose efforts might otherwise go unacknowledged. In all its selections for the honor, the Lions Club has used excellent, impartial judgment. In its eyesight-conservation work, the Lions Club has completed a survey of the third and fourth grades in the town's parochial and public schools to ascertain whether or not the need exists for an orthoptic clinic. By such an effort, the Lions have underwritten an extremely useful service to the community.

Nutley's 47 Lions are part of an organization numbering 7,800 clubs and 40,000 Lions in 30 countries around the globe. Our Lions have made an indelible mark upon the life of our community.

Things That Do Not Add

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT C. BONNER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 1950

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial. Yes; I agree with the editor of the Elizabeth City (N. C.) Daily Advance. I want to see economy practiced and good administrative judgment shown by the Veterans' Administration, the Department of Agriculture, and all other Government departments and agencies. I hope the two instances of bad management as here shown will be corrected and not duplicated in any respect.

The editorial is as follows:

THINGS THAT DO NOT ADD

Congressman HERBERT C. BONNER, speaking last week before the Northeastern Firemen's Association in session here, called for the continued sharing of America's dollars and

resources with the people of Europe and declared that keeping up appropriations were necessary in order to keep war away from our door.

The Congressman urged his people to continue to bear with the Federal Government in its appropriations. Most of us, the Daily Advance believes, have utmost confidence in Congressman BONNER and we are willing to continue stringing along with the Government as far as is absolutely necessary.

However, in some cases it is hard to remain quiet when we read about money that is being wasted by the Government. One such instance came up last week when it was announced that the Army was going ahead with economy plans to close down its $5,000,000 540-bed Murphy General Hospital, occupying 93 acres in Waltham, Mass. It was only 6 years old and built of brick, but the Government had no further use for it. Meanwhile, 10 miles away in Boston, work was started on a new $10,000,000 1,000-bed hospital for the Veterans' Administration.

The question we would like to ask is why couldn't the Veterans' Administration use the $5,000,000 hospital no longer needed by the Army, thereby saving several million dollars?

Another item that merits the public's attention, especially in view of the Government's big money spending, was brought to light in last week's issue of Time. That article revealed that farmers could sell all of their corn to the Government for $1.48 a bushel; store it right on their own farms and then buy it back for feed at 65 cents a bushel. Under the plan the farmers had found a perfectly legal right to sell their corn and have it too and make as much as 83 cents a bushel in the bargain.

We agree with Congressman BONNER that the United States should do everything possible to share what we have with other countries but wouldn't it be a lot better if our Government would clamp down on needless expenditures as cited in the two cases above?

Being a little more economy minded in the right places might go a long ways toward providing funds for foreign aid. At least we wouldn't have to dig so deep into our pocket.

Miss Katharine Lenroot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD BOLLING
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 1950

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, Miss Katharine F. Lenroot, Chief of the United States Children's Bureau, was honored last week for her long and devoted service to children. Miss Lenroot's contribution in this field is an important and outstanding one and the award presented to her is certainly merited. I would like, therefore, to include in the RECORD the citation accompanying the Survey award, together with Miss Lenroot's acceptance speech, which have been called to my attention by the American Parents Committee:

PRESENTATION OF SURVEY AWARD TO MISS KATHARINE F. LENROOT, CHIEF OF UNITED STATES CHILDREN'S BUREAU, BY LEONARD W. MAYO, CHAIRMAN OF THE AWARD COMMITTEE, AT THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF SOCIAL WORK, ATLANTIC CITY, APRIL 24, 1950

Katharine Lenroot, in behalf of the committee appointed by the Survey, I am happy to present to you the Edward T. Devine Memorial Award and Plaque for 1950.

Born in Wisconsin, graduated by the Superior State Normal School and the University of Wisconsin, and recipient of the degree of doctor of laws from the latter institution, deputy industrial commissioner of Wisconsin, special agent in the Children's Bureau, assistant director of its Social Service Division, Assistant Chief, and since 1934, Chief of the Bureau, yours has been and is "an imaginative and constructive contribution to social work."

Recipient of citations and other honors both in your own and in distant lands, all bearing testimony to your untiring devotion to the children of the world, president of the National Conference of Social Work in 1935, and twice your country's delegate to the Pan American Child Welfare Congress, this award is made in recognition not only of your unceasing efforts to make more secure the lot of children and youth, but quite as much as a tribute to the unselfishness and the humility that has characterized your sensitive and skillful approach to the multitudinous problems that arise in administering a many-sided and complex program.

We are pleased to honor an eminent leader whose interest and concern are not limited by the bounds of the agency in which she works, but whose commitment is to all children, their families and their communities, and to all agencies which serve them, both public and private; a social worker who has brought distinction to her profession at home and abroad; and a person whose regard for spiritual values in these days has been amply demonstrated not only in active membership in her own church, but in her professional and official relations in the cause of children.

ACCEPTANCE SPEECH OF KATHARINE F. LENROOT, CHIEF, UNITED STATES CHILDREN'S BUREAU, AT PRESENTATION OF SURVEY AWARD

I recognize that this award is given to me not by reason of any individual contribution, but because for more than a third of a century I have been part of an organization and a movement dedicated to the advancement of human welfare through concern for and service to children and youth. Accordingly I accept this very great honor, not for myself, but in behalf of my colleagues past and present in the Children's Bureau and in public and private organizations concerned with children in our own and other countries. It is a special joy to accept this award from you, Mr. Mayo, because you have been for so many years a counselor and coworker and because of the leadership you are now giving in the Midcentury White House Conference on Children and Youth.

As never before, at this midcentury point recognition is being given to the importance of the child. We sense that if the second half of the twentieth century is to see victory in the struggle between totalitarianism and freedom, children and young people must be aided in every possible way to develop depth of insight, strength of character, and ability to relate themselves effectively with other people. It is for this reason that there has been such widespread interest and participation in the Midcentury White House Conference on Children and Youth, and in the international scene in the work of the United Nations and its specialized agencies in behalf of the child.

It is with very deep feeling that I associate this award with the survey and with the memory of Dr. Edward T. Devine. The story of the founding of the Children's Bureau begins with a trip to Washington by Dr. Devine and Lillian D. Wald to enlist the interest of President Theodore Roosevelt in the establishment in the Federal Government of a bureau concerned with the welfare of children and child life.

In looking back over the growth of the new profession of social work during the past 50 years, one finds Dr. Devine and the Survey, of which he was one of the founders, pioneering in social care work, education for social work, social research, community organization, social interpretation, and social reform. Having its roots in the local community, social work has come to be a matter of major concern to Government as well as to voluntary endeavor. It has begun to find its place in the development of national and international social policy, though its importance is only partially understood and its full contribution is yet to be realized.

The impact of social work upon people and civic affairs is both an individualizing and an integrating influence. It always views people in the light of the uniqueness of each individual and the relatedness of each to other persons. It has drawn upon the knowledge and skill of many different professions and disciplines, such as economics, sociology, law, medicine, psychiatry, and education. It has been profoundly influenced by religious concepts and motives.

Today we see that opportunity for the full development of each child's personality not only is a test of democracy, but also is the most important means we have for its preservation and further development. This can be accomplished only through personal dedication on the part of all citizens and an outpouring of personal and material resources for advancing our understanding of and service to children, beyond anything hitherto achieved in any country. In such a mobilization there must be the fullest possible utilization of all existing resources, both public and private, far greater development than we now have of citizen responsibility and citizen participation, and cooperative planning of a high order for the extension of such services and programs as may be required to assure every child his fair chance in the world.

Postal Cuts Indefensible

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 1950

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, far be it from me to criticize the distnguished Postmaster General. He is an outstanding, admirably equipped public servant, capable, experienced, and devoted to the interests of this Nation. He is faced by a heavy deficit in his Department for the year of over one-half billion dollars. Quite naturally he is energetically seeking ways and means to cut down the size of this deficit. However, the curtailments in service and personnel which have been ordered are, in my opinion, very unwise, unsound, and ineffective in remedying the situation confronting the Post Office Department. This great Nation cannot and should not take such a backward step. Postal business is greater than ever. The demand for postal service is greater than ever. The need for this service is greater than ever. It is unfair to the people of the country to deny them of this service. It is unjust to very many faithful postal workers to throw them out of work in such arbitrary, summary manner at a time when there is, as I have stated, greater need for their service than ever before.

The Congress is under a definite duty to act in this crucial matter. We can work for economy and a balanced budget. That is surely an obligation. We can also work for streamlining this Department, coordinating its activities, simplifying the administrative load. But we should not trifle with efficiency and adequate modernized service to the public. Obviously we should not trifle with the careers, the livelihood, the morale and well-being of our devoted postal workers of every grade and station. I personally feel that a great injustice has been done by promulgating this order.

It is for these reasons that I enter my militant protest against the order and urge the executive department to cancel it forthwith. In additon, I have joined with the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WALSH] in introducing a bill nullifying this unjust, ill-considered, inopportune decree, and I hope this House will move speedily to rectify a situation which is likely, unless remedied at once, to produce great dissatisfaction among the general public and lowered morale and reduced efficiency in the postal service.

I urge the House to be aroused to the need for immediate action and hope the order will soon be rescinded.

Terror and Misery in Czechoslovakia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 26, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, a most interesting and revealing article on the situation inside Czechoslovakia appeared in the April 17 issue of the magazine New Republic. The article is written by Dr. Hugo Skala, formerly chief of the economic section of the Czech Ministry of Finance, who now resides in New York. He describes a picture of economic disruption and disillusionment in Communist-dominated Czechoslovakia which should not escape the attention of freedom-loving people in this country and abroad. Dr. Skala's article is as follows:

THE TERROR IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA

(By Hugo Skala)

That there is serious trouble behind the iron curtain is now perfectly clear. Moscow obviously fears that the defection of Yugoslavia may be paralleled in greater or less degree in Hungary, Bulgaria, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, and Poland. In most of these countries purges are in progress; how thoroughly they are justified, even from Moscow's point of view, we do not know and perhaps shall never know. The Kremlin has treated individuals with cruel injustice in the past and is quite capable of doing so again. Among these purges none has been more severe or, probably, less justified, than that in my own homeland, Czechoslovakia.

To understand the background of this purge one needs to know the underlying economic facts which have had almost no publicity in the United States. The plain truth is that Czechoslovakia today is economically prostrate, because of the actions of the Communists before and after they seized power by a revolutionary coup. Her once flourishing foreign trade has almost disappeared, except for some exchange of products with the other satellite countries, which often results in giving Czechoslovakia goods of inferior quality and of types she does not need or want. When Russia ordered the Czechs to stay out of the Marshall plan, it was very nearly the final straw. Now she desperately needs a big foreign loan, but her political status is such that she is unlikely to get it.

When Czechoslovakia got back her freedom, in 1945, her economic situation was confused. Hitler had liquidated many of the Jews, and the Czechs, with understandable bitterness, expelled many of the Sudeten Germans, including 2,500,000 highly skilled workers. Because of these politics, and through war damage, titles to about two-thirds of industry became unclear, and restitution almost impossible. Even without much attention to ideological motives, nationalization of the large firms seemed a good idea. It was advocated by the Communists, who also persuaded the country to accept a rigid system of national planning.

The Russians were fairly popular at that moment; the Red Army, which had liberated the country from the Germans (the Americans fell back as the result of a high-level policy decision), was used by the Czech Communists for propaganda. The Czechs also asked themselves what have we got to lose? Their overseas trade had disappeared because of the war, even the trade (40 to 55 percent of the total) with Germany and through Germany to other foreign markets. Raw-material sources were cut off. When the Red Army left the Czechs indulged in a brief but reckless period of high living; the result was both a squandering of resources and a serious inflation. The 2-year plan of the Communists seemed attractive at the time; it was an important factor in their winning 36 percent of the votes in the 1946 election. This was the last free election Czechoslovakia was to have.

But in economic terms, the Communist scheme for a planned economy did not work. In fear of punishment, factory managers speeded up the production of goods, but they ignored both public demand and the problem of quality, which fell so low that soon the shelves were loaded with things people would not buy at any price. When the shops would take no more, the goods simply piled up in the factories, which turned into warehouses; there was nobody to turn off the spigot. Goods too bad to be bought at home were, naturally, too bad to send abroad. For policy reasons, the Czechs bought inferior cotton from Russia and India which was woven into fabrics which were unsalable even on the home market, where there was a critical shortage. Being short of iron and steel, the Czechs curtailed their exports of manufactured goods to Poland, in order to divert them to Sweden on a semibarter basis. Poland threatened reprisal, whereupon the Czechs gave the Poles steel products which had been earmarked for export to the Netherlands. The Netherlands then complained, and was given goods which had been ordered by the Swiss; and so on.

Production, which was based on prewar figures as to demand, could not adjust itself to realistic market requirements. People could not get clothing, paper, linen, furs, furniture, enameled ware, or many other things, even when they had the required ration vouchers. The factories were filled with unfinished heavy machiney unusable because each item lacked a few parts needed from abroad and unobtainable because of the lack of foreign exchange. Billions of bricks deteriorated from rain and frost, while housing construction was at a standstill through the shortage of pipes, steel, and timber.

The coal industry was injured by the mild winter of 1947–48, by the resumption of British deliveries to Italy, and by German reparations coal for France. Unsalable Czech coal lay on the ground in heaps and was damaged by the weather. Austria and Italy stopped buying; Switzerland transferred her purchases of coke to Germany. Nevertheless, the mines kept producing like the magic spring of the sorcerer's apprentice: coal was in the plan.

The East European Economic Council of Mutual Assistance is supposed to aid Czechoslovakia; but its resources are limited and its help is a sorry joke. In fact, under Russian direction, it is seeking to merge the Czechoslovak economy with that of Poland. The question can seriously be asked whether Russian policy is not to destroy the Czech economy in toto, in order to make sure that the country will remain subservient to Moscow's aims. It is interesting to note that no Czech has received any war damages or any compensation for the nationalization of his property. Nor has any money been freed, from the billions of crowns that were frozen.

In short, Czechoslovakia's present situation is about as gloomy as could be imagined. There are great stocks of unsalable goods, some of them only partly finished. Raw materials and foreign credits are lacking. Consumer goods are inferior and are bought only out of desperation. The people have lost confidence in the currency; while the legal rate for the crown is 2 cents, on the black market it is one-tenth of a cent. The ironclad grip of the Czech and Russian Communists prevents all freedom of thought or action; the terror is in full swing. The Czechs are sharing all the miseries of being a part of the Russian system; if there are any advantages, they have yet to discover them.

Oregon Is "Recarpeting" Vast Burn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 26, 1950

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Ellis Lucia, from the Washington Post of April 23, 1950:

OREGON IS "RECARPETING" VAST BURN

(By Ellis Lucia)

(Mr. Lucia is a frequent contributor to the Oregonian magazine and other publications, and in the past 5 years he has written numerous articles on the history and problem of the Tillamook burn.)

A family from one of the Plains States, touring Oregon for the first time, complained they couldn't see the scenery. There were too many trees in the way.

This tourist family would probably be amazed at what the people of the Beaver State have set about to do. Oregonians are digging into their pockets to spend $10,500,000 to plant more trees.

Oregon last fall raised the curtain on the greatest forest rehabilitation program ever attempted in a single area on the North American Continent. The Nation's leading lumber-producing State is being turned into a gigantic forest laboratory.

Such a project may seem at first glance to be about as senseless as buying another fur coat for a movie star. Yet under the surface is a different picture.

Timber stocks in Oregon have been depleted rapidly in the past few years. Millions upon millions of board feet were logged to help win World War II. The postwar de-

mand for lumber has kept mills humming at full speed.

However, a series of disastrous fires has been even a greater cause for alarm. Vast forest areas have been laid waste. Next to nothing was being done to reclaim these lands. The problem was brought home to residents of the northwestern part of the State after the war, when major mills cut their last logs. The timber simply wasn't in the hills.

The loggers and millmen moved to southern Oregon. Eugene and Roseburg are now the lumber capitals, for they are close to the last great timber stands within the continental United States.

Oregonians saw an ominous threat to their forest industry. In 1948, Oregon forests produced 7,000,000,000 board feet of lumber, 645,000,000 feet of plywood, and wood for 545,000 tons of pulp. The forests bring Oregon an annual income of $600,000,000. They employ 60 percent of the State's workers. There was reason to worry about the future.

As a result of action by the voters, the State last summer got into the tree-farming business on a large scale. The $10,500,000 forest rehabilitation program will attempt to reclaim 750,000 State-owned acres of poorly stocked or blackened timberlands.

Focal point of this undertaking is the 300,000-acre Tillamook burn, once one of the richest timber-producing regions in the world. Located in the northwestern corner of the State, it has thrice been ravaged by fire since 1933.

The big burn is a constant reminder of the State's dwindling timber reserve. Its proximity to Portland, Oregon's only metropolitan center, makes its ghostly bleached snags an eyesore to motorists driving to the Oregon beaches.

In the first fire alone, 12,500,000,000 board feet of top-grade timber were consumed. Ashes rained down on ships 500 miles at sea and to a depth of 2 feet on the beaches 30 miles away. Chickens went to roost in the middle of the day because of the darkness. Giant firs 400 years old were cremated.

Three thousand men couldn't stop it. Deer, elk, and other animals perished in the forest's game preserve. Fish died in the ash-choked streams. Flames reached to a height of 40,000 feet. The fire left Oregon $100,000,000 poorer.

SEED SOURCES DESTROYED

A few years later, in 1919, the burn exploded into flame a second time, and 225,000 acres of burned-over lands and 28,000 acres of green old-growth timber were ravaged. During the war year of 1945, fire cut loose a third time, crackling through 110,000 acres, threatening the watersheds of several towns, costing the lives of 3 men and destroying 10,000 acres of young trees and the last seed sources.

In the intervening years, private companies have done an amazing job of salvage. Nearly as much footage has been recovered as in original cruise estimates. Several million board feet are still being recovered daily. High lumber prices have made this salvage job economically profitable.

Yet today the Tillamook burn, still drenched by heavy coastal fogs which make trees grow, is a wasteland of stumps, snags, and brush. It is a powder keg in summer, an idle area too steep and rocky for anything but growing trees. The problem area is 500,000 acres. Every year this land lies idle costs the people of Oregon $1,800,000.

This is the area foresters hope to replant. Ground work was laid by the 1947 legislature, which passed a forest-research bill. A 5-cents-per-1,000 board feet severance tax was levied on logs. Sixty percent went to the State forest-products laboratory at Corvallis to further new methods of utilizing wood-waste products. Forty percent financed experiments in forest protection, management, and rehabilitation. Many planting experiments were carried out in the Tillamook burn, testing different types of trees under varied conditions. Tests also were concerned with combating tree diseases and rodent control.

SEEDING BY HELICOPTER

Under the new reforestation Act, work must be done entirely on State-owned lands. Mapping crews are determining the planting procedure to be used in different sections. Such surveys will decide whether seeding can be by airplane or whether hand-planting will be necessary. Much of the seeding will be done by helicopter.

An idea of the magnitude of the job may be conceived from this: One ton of Douglas fir seed will be required to restock 6,000 acres by direct seeding. Hand-planting will cost $20 an acre. It takes a man a full day to plant 680 trees. Aerial seeding will cost from $6 to $8 an acre. Snags must be felled to reduce fire hazards. Bids from private outfits are taken for snag-felling projects. The State purchases cone seed for the project from cone gatherers.

Roads must be built and corridors cleared for fire protection. An unchecked fire could undo years of tedious work in a few hours. Between 10,000 and 15,000 acres are being planted this year. The program will stretch over a 15-year period.

The first $300,000 in bonds has been authorized. Under the act, no more than $750,000 worth of bonds may be issued in any one year. The reforestation program will cover smaller devastated areas in addition to the Tillamook burn.

Nevertheless, the big burn is destined to become the Nation's top-ranking forest research laboratory. What is learned there will give new hope to other States with forest devastations.

Growth of Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD the second article by Mr. Frank C. Waldrop on the growth of communism in our country:

BIGGEST STORY

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

On January 19, 1930, a clerk by the name of Steve Katovis, on picket duty with strikers at One Hundred and Sixty-first Street and Union Avenue, the Bronx, New York City, was ordered to move on by Policeman Harry Kiritz of the Morrisania police station.

He refused. The policeman announced that unless Katovis obeyed this lawful order he would be arrested.

Thereupon a riot broke out. The policeman was beaten and his club taken from him. A detective, Donald Carey, attempted to help him and was knocked down.

Policeman Kiritz broke loose from his attackers, drew his revolver and fired in the air. The crowd kept coming, so he fired again and hit Katovis.

On January 24, 1930, Katovis died and on January 27 he was buried after a Communist funeral with 10,000 paraders marching from Union Square, Manhattan, to the cemetery in Queens.

Policeman Kiritz was absolved of blame by an official inquiry, on the ground that he had shot in pure self-defense.

A few days later a Communist-led mob marched on New York's City Hall and 400 policemen had to be turned out to keep order.

On May Day 1930 the Communists developed a crowd of 30,000 in Union Square and sharp on the strike of noon began rioting. New York City police on horseback, in riot wagons, in uniform and plain clothes, were their targets.

Women with hatpins jabbed the horses' bellies. Others screamed and tore their clothes as they accused "Whalen's Cossacks" of unprovoked assault.

And the plainclothes detectives slid 3-foot long shillelaghs out of their pants legs and began raking heads as a boy runs a stick down a picket fence.

"Whalen's Cossacks" scientifically split the seething mass into into workable detachments, and by 1 o'clock the riot wagons were full of bleeding, half-conscious cops, citizens, and Communist agitators who had not been expert enough to duck when the fighting started.

By 1:30 the people in Union Square were back at work. Most of them never knew why or how they had got mixed up in the terror and the screaming.

A great many were just office employees from nearby life-insurance companies who had been drawn by the bands, flag waving, and excitement generated by the skilled crowd-builders.

These had been assigned by Communist general headquarters to organize this May Day riot, which could be propagandized all over the world as a rising of the enslaved masses of New York.

While all this was happening, the writer of this piece was a breathless and fascinated observer, being introduced to and educated in communism.

When Steve Katovis started that riot in the Bronx and lost his life for it, nothing could have seemed less to me. I was a young reporter only a few months in New York.

My job was humble enough. I was a very junior rewrite man on the lobster shift, 12 midnight to 7 a. m., on the New York Evening Journal.

My salary was $65 a week, and considered fabulous, for one so ignorant and young.

Nobody felt more guilty about it than I. So I had developed the habit of spending as much time after working hours as I could in trying to learn the streets and sights and sounds and smells of Manhattan.

Then, when the awful eye of the city editor should fall on me at last in judgment, perhaps I could make him think me fit to keep.

And, of course, in the manner of boys, having such a superb and undeserved job on the Journal, I was pulling every possible string to get on another paper. As it happened, the New York World.

That in itself showed how little I knew, for the World was on its last legs and the Journal was full of bite and bounce.

But, anyhow, it happened that while I was mousing around the World one morning trying to see the city editor I heard somebody talking about the big doings that would come off next day in Union Square on behalf of the "martyred hero of the masses," Steve Katovis.

Such was the accident that led one reporter onto the biggest story of our times, the rise and growth of the Communist movement in world politics.

For as soon as I heard that something exciting was due in Union Square I laid my plans to horn it on it.

Just why the "martyred hero" had been "martyred" I had no idea. Communism was just one among a million million things of which I was ignorant.

One Hundredth Anniversary of Mittineague (Mass.) Congregational Church

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FOSTER FURCOLO
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 26, 1950

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Members of Congress will want to join with me in extending best wishes to the Mittineague Congregational Church which is celebrating the one hundredth anniversary of its founding this week.

The history of this church, located in West Springfield, Mass., is one of considerable struggle and covers a disastrous fire and a great amount of hard work over the years. The church has overcome all difficulties to attain its present high position in the community. It typifies the continuous effort of the American people to establish religion in our country, and I know that the Reverend Charles H. King, and his associates, will be pleased to know that during this week of their celebration, we extend to all of them every wish for future progress.

I am proud to acquaint the Members with the successful achievements of the fine congregation of this church, and I know you will all join with me in extending congratulations and good wishes on the one hundredth anniversary of the founding of the Mittineague Congregational Church.

Red Terror Is Spreading

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 26, 1950

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by M. F. Everett, from Catholic Action of the South:

RED TERROR IS SPREADING
(By M. F. Everett)

Further proof of the spreading of Red terror came last week in the trial of 10 religious in Czechoslovakia, in statements from outstanding American leaders, and in reports of an extension of religious repression in Poland.

The Czech religious, all national figures, received sentences ranging from 2 to 25 years' imprisonment, plus fines. Though the foreign press was forbidden to attend, it was learned that the procedure did not go entirely according to plan. Some of the defendants showed evidence of intimidation and torture. But one retained his faculties sufficiently to keep the carefully picked spectators in an uproar.

It was evident that the trial on charges of treason was rigged to put pressure on the hierarchy to take the oath of loyalty to the Red regime and to prepare the way for proceedings against the bishops, particularly Archbishop Josef Beran, of Prague; Bishop Joseph Mathocha, of Olomouc; and Bishop John Vojtassak, of Scepusio. Another key leader aimed at is the Praemonstratensian Abbot Bohuslav Jarolimek, of Prague. Two abbots and a Jesuit provincial were among the 10 just tried.

The trial was called "one of the most atrocious injustices of our days" by a Catholic daily in Rome. Speaking along the same line of Red aggression, Gen. George C. Marshall, father of the European recovery plan, wartime United States Chief of Staff, and former Secretary of State, emphasized that victory over Soviet Russia in the struggle for the mind of man is as "vital to peace and prosperity as any military campaign in history." He asserted that the reconstruction of Europe means not only material but spiritual and moral rehabilitation.

Warning against proposals to reduce the ECA to a mere relief affair, he declared: "Make no mistake about it. The chips are down. Unless we achieve victory, the great military and financial sacrifices of the United States may have been largely in vain." His words were echoed by other leaders.

In Poland the Communists are making further efforts to dominate the church. They are attempting to obtain signed agreements directly from the priests that will mean breaking off all relation with international religions. Among the conditions they are trying to force on the priests is that of recognizing the Reds' Caritas organization, which was set up to supplant the Caritas or charitable agency of the church.

Copies of a number of documents pertaining to the Reds' seizure of the Catholic Caritas were sent to United States members of the hierarchy by the Right Reverend Monsignor Edward E. Swanstrom, executive director of NCWC War Relief Services. They amplify NCWC news service reports about the matter and give the full background of WRS work in Poland. Since the program began in Poland in September 1945, 126 shipments were made to that country by WRS, a total of 17,853,572 pounds, valued at $6,255,347.63. These goods were distributed by Caritas in Poland to the people in greatest need.

Lack of space makes it impossible to reproduce the documents here. It is enough to note that the Reds have determined to throttle Catholic charitable activities, even at the cost of extensive aid to people greatly in need. They refused to allow a WRS representative to enter Poland after George Szudy was forced to leave for family reasons following 30 months' service. The relief program in Poland, because of Caritas, was one of the most efficient operations undertaken by WRS for the American hierarchy.

The American Council of Relief Agencies was notified by the Reds in Poland to liquidate the activity of these agencies by May 1, 1949, though the Communists offered to distribute further gifts. WRS continued to send shipments to Cardinal Sapieha, chairman of Polish Caritas. Finally, the Reds on January 23, 1950, ordered the seizure of Caritas and the placing of its program under state control. The government embarked upon a program of prosecution of Caritas personnel and named new officials, who were friendly to the Reds. A carefully planned campaign seeks to prove that embezzlement and sheer corruption dominated the work of Caritas.

WRS had to stop shipments to Poland. Hundreds of thousands of the poor, the sick, and the crippled who were dependent upon the charitable agencies of the church look with terror to the future. Perhaps the greatest charitable move in history, the gigantic work of WRS, financed through the generosity of Catholic Americans, was shut off abruptly in a great Catholic nation, Poland, because of Red persecution.

The Reds' satanic campaign is ready to sacrifice thousands of Christ's least ones in their insane hatred of religion. Let there be no mistaking of their intention or their action. It is either Christ or communism, and we must make our choice soon.

Communists in Universities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD H. VELDE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 26, 1950

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from Peoria Star, April 24, 1950:

COMMUNISTS IN UNIVERSITIES

T. R. McConnell, dean of arts and sciences at the University of Minnesota, told a group of educators in Chicago last week that there are not enough Communists in American colleges and universities to constitute any serious danger.

It is an interesting coincidence that an assistant professor of physics at the same university was named last September by the House Committee on Un-American Activities as the Scientist X who allegedly gave atomic secrets during the war to a man described as a Soviet agent.

Dr. McConnell's remark might be more significant after the Department of Justice has presented the Scientist X case to a grand jury, if the Department ever does.

Petroleum Imports Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 26, 1950

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, the increasing concern over the petroleum imports problem calls for immediate attention by Congress. It is not a long-range solution that is needed. It is a short-range remedy that must be applied if we are not to see conditions in the oil industry of the United States, in coal, and transportation and in many other lines grow progressively worse.

For many weary months the independents in the oil industry have been telling Congress of this rapidly growing menace to their existence. Volumes on volumes of testimony have been printed. The evidence has been compiled. It should not be necessary to keep on studying the question.

The State Department has professed deep concern because the British Government put restrictions on imports of oil from the dollar countries. American companies have been denied some part of the market they have supplied. The effect of this will be to compel a restriction of production by those companies in foreign fields—the Middle East and South America—or to increase imports into the United States. It was not the

latter point that worried the State Department. They probably will continue to say, as they have been doing, up to the moment that the last independent oil man is forced out of business here that no injury is being done.

The amount of oil involved in the British action is 75,000 to 100,000 barrels a day. That is insignificant when compared to the cut-backs in production in the United States last year. The direct effect of imports into the United States is apparent in the successive reduction of allowable production in the principal oil States. It is seen in the falling off of State revenues, as my good friends who represent the State of Texas can testify with great eloquence. It is seen in the loss in employment in the oil fields and the refineries of the United States.

My State of Pennsylvania is the pioneer oil-producing State of the Nation. The beginning of the oil-producing industry occurred in the district which I represent. After the passage of nearly 90 years, we still have a sturdy producing and refining industry in Pennsylvania. It is of great consequence to the economy of the State, the Nation, and the numerous communities where the oil industry exists.

The Pennsylvania-grade industry, famous for the production of high quality lubricating oils, is directly in the path of imported oil. I do not propose to wait until the industry is forced into idleness or liquidated. I ask for "short range" action; something which is immediate and productive of quick results. The Penn Grade industry produces superior quality lubricating oils but it produces many other products as well. Not all of a barrel of crude oil can be converted into lubricants, only a lesser part of it. The other products must have a market and it is this market that the cheaply produced foreign oils is taking away from a native American industry whose contributions to the American standard of living have been virtually immeasurable.

I read with amazement, amounting almost to unbelief, that the Secretary of State and the ECA Administrator had thrown out suggestions to the effect that injuries to American enterprise caused by the large-scale importing program which the Administration is actively working to bring about could be softened by Government loans. That American workers who lose their jobs because of imports could be given Government-financed training to fit them for other jobs. They were talking about imports generally. Oil now forms a substantial part of all imports. Oil is included in the thought of such a debasing program. American progress did not come through loans from the RFC and the creation of a large class of displaced persons, eager to work creatively but waiting on a Government job-placement bureau to give them assignments.

Bills are before this Congress to keep the home markets secure for our own oil. We have plenty and even a little too much right now. Our exports of oil shrink day by day, and we import far more than we sell abroad. Penn Grade refiners have testified that the operation of the ECA is drying up their once flourishing market in Europe for their lubricants. The door is being shut abroad and imports threaten them at home. This is no long-range program.

You are hearing from the coal industry and the coal miners on this same subject. The railroads and railroad employees are in this fight to preserve home industry. The independents in the oil industry told us long ago what the effects of unrestricted imports would be. They informed us month by month of conditions. Nothing was done about the increasing menace to a free economy and to the domestic oil industry. Instead, we have allowed a few men in the administrative branch to emphasize the welfare of a few giant corporations holding vast concessions abroad.

The people are being awakened to what is happening to them. How long must they wait and how severe must be their injuries be before we act?

Postal Service Curtailment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 26, 1950

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution recently passed by the council of the city of Medford, Mass., in form as offered to the council by Mayor Frederick T. McDermott:

CITY OF MEDFORD, MASS., *April 20, 1950.*

Whereas any curtailment of postal service in the city of Medford by the United States Post Office Department would be of the most undesirable thing that could possibly happen from any standpoint of reasoning; and

Whereas Medford at the present time is experiencing a period of rapid growth, both as a residential and business area resulting in a tremendous increase in valuation: Therefore be it

Resolved, That it be the sense of this city council that no decrease in postal service or reduction in the number of employees of the United States Postal Department could be compatible with the march of progress that is taking place in Medford in the past year, and the anticipated continued progressive trend in the next 5 years; and be it further

Resolved, That, because of the above stated facts, this council does hereby urge the United States Postal Department to retain the present delivery service and forego any sugestion of curtailing employment; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted upon its passage to the Postmaster General, Washington, D. C., and to the Representatives and Senators representing this district in Washington, for their consideration and action thereon.

In council, April 20, 1950: Passed.

A true copy, attest:

ODESSA E. RIVERS,
Assistant City Clerk.

Wise and Forceful Expressions of an Eminent Columnist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 26, 1950

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following articles by Lowell Mellett, from the Washington Evening Star:

[From the Washington Evening Star of April 18, 1950]

ON THE OTHER HAND—A REMINDER THAT LOCAL CRIME IS A MATTER OF LOCAL RESPONSIBILTY

(By Lowell Mellett)

Crime should be curbed wherever it raises its ugly head. The question is, Who has the duty to curb it? And the answer is, the Federal authorities when the crime is against the Federal statutes, the State or local authorities when the crime is against State or local laws.

Out of the present hullabaloo in Congress over crime in this, that, and the other city, there emerges a clear indication that some of our national lawmakers have forgotten this simple principle. Either that or they choose to disregard it for reasons of their own—the principal reason being political, the desire to score off the opposition party.

This is a dangerous tendency which if followed very far could prove disastrous to our democratic society. It could lead to that police state, which nobody wants on any terms.

WARNINGS GIVEN FREQUENTLY

Every competent Attorney General in recent times has warned of this danger. William D. Mitchell, now suggested by some as the ideal counsel for the Senate special committee to investigate crime, was Attorney General under President Coolidge. As such he called attention more than once to the unwisdom of unloading on the Federal Government the task of correcting evils that are purely local. Like those who have followed him in office, he was continually besought to send the FBI into one community or another where there happened to be dissatisfaction with local law enforcement. He resisted such demands. And this was at a time when the FBI was a comparatively small agency. Now that it has reached its present proportions, he doubtless would be even less disposed to permit its participation in local affairs.

And what is said here concerning the FBI goes also for the United States Congress. Aside from the principle of home rule and local responsibility, which should be sufficient, there is the fact that Congress has, and always will have, plenty to do without picking up the troubles of any particular community. The National Legislature is habitually behind in the business of national legislation. If it must have cops-and-robbers entertainment now and then to relieve the monotony of real work, there will always be a MCCARTHY or a HICKENLOOPER to provide it.

EXCELLENT SOUNDING BOARD

Once it is established that local communities can shift their responsibilities and shrug them off on Congress there will be no end to such proceedings. Some Congressmen will be happy to bring their domestic squabbles to the Capitol for airing. It is an excellent sounding board.

For one local community the Congress has long accepted full responsibility. It serves as the city council for the District of Columbia. This provides a situation that satisfies nobody, but nobody likes to give up authority and Congress has not yet been able to make itself let go of the District. So we have Congress stirred up for days at a time over scandals or alleged scandals in the Washington Police Department. Usually someone demands that the FBI take a hand and clean up the situation. Because of Washington's confused status as a Federal city such demands are not wholly illogical, but the FBI has managed for the most part to avoid involvement and, no doubt, if permitted will continue to do so.

But now that local crime is being made a national issue, something to be used in the coming congressional campaign, the temptation to call in the Federal police is almost overpowering. It is a temptation to be resisted, save where there is convincing evidence of law violation on a national scale.

[From the Washington Evening Star of April 20, 1950]

ON THE OTHER HAND—ABOUT A PALLBEARER WHO FOLLOWS A HEARSE THAT'S NOT GOING ANYWHERE

(By Lowell Mellett)

There has to be an explanation for the spirit of frustration among Republican entrepreneurs, even in face of the fact that the Democrats are not making a shining success of this session of Congress. The explanation could be the absence of the one sure-fire issue required by a party out of power. That issue is hard times. And we haven't got 'em.

Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., minority leader of the House, made a speech in Pittsburgh the other night, a speech filled with gloom. "Sickening to the patriot's heart is the orgy of waste, extravagance, and plain bad management encountered on every hand in Washington today," he said; "shocking waste, sinful waste, demoralizing waste of the people's substance."

He declared we've got to remove "the threat of socialization which hangs like a pall over the spirit of American thrift and industry."

PALL OVER PITTSBURGH

As he spoke there doubtless was a pall hanging over Pittsburgh, the smoke from the city's great blast furnaces, still roaring day and night despite the threat so disturbing to Representative MARTIN. The steel business continues to burst at the seams. Production last week represented 97.5 percent of capacity, the total output being within a few tons of the all-time record. The steel makers could hardly be worried by the situation and the buyers of steel obviously are not.

If a pun is permissible Joe found himself a pallbearer without a funeral.

And it's like that most anywhere he may go. In the words of Joe Livingston, eminent business analyst, "Good business is becoming a habit." Mr. Livingston finds confirmation in Wall Street, which he says is pronouncing the benediction with higher stock prices. But, he says, Wall Street is choosy, in a way that reflects business itself. The dominant characteristic of a boom, he says, unanimity with everything going up at once, is missing. The stocks that are advancing are the kind that are bought primarily by investment trusts, mutual funds, and banks for investment accounts. Wall Street is not having one of those 1929 speculative orgies that does nobody any good.

Two good Joes, MARTIN and Livingston, but they don't see alike. One can't see the other's pall—only the silver lining.

SOME MORE OF THE SAME

Some more of the same is offered by the President's Council of Economic Advisers. In its latest report to Congress the Council states that the production of goods and services had reached an annual rate of $258,000,000,000 during the first quarter of this year, a gain of almost $3,000,000,000 compared with the closing period of 1949.

Consumers' spendable income, meaning the money people have to spend after paying taxes, was up, reaching a new high rate of $181,000,000,000 annually, a gain of $1,200,000,000. But it isn't all being spent. People apparently are being reasonably prudent, since savings also are increasing.

Nor are the corporations able to join the ranks of the pallbearers. Their profits are running at an annual rate of $30,500,000,000, an increase of $1,000,000,000 over last quarter. The national income, or dollars earned in production, indicates an annual total of $220,300,000,000, according to the Council, a gain of $1,200,000,000 in wages and profits.

All this despite the tie-up in the coal industry, which showed its worst effects during 2 months of the quarter.

Maybe JOE MARTIN, a cheerful fellow by nature, should stop following a hearse that isn't going anywhere, and join the boys on the band wagon.

[From the Washington Evening Star of April 22, 1950]

ON THE OTHER HAND—WHEN DOES MR. ACHESON HAVE TIME TO THINK? WHAT KEEPS HIM GOING?

(By Lowell Mellett)

Two questions naturally occur to many people. One is, When does a man in the spot occupied by Dean Acheson have time to think? Beset, on the one hand, by the critical problems of a world in ferment, with explosive incidents happening or about to happen each day of the week, and on the other hand, by a calculated campaign of harassment intended to interfere with his work, when does he have time for the quiet meditation from which great decisions come?

The other question is, What keeps him going, in the face of the misunderstandings and misrepresentations that assail him at home and abroad?

SOMETHING HE HIMSELF SAID

The answer to the second question can be found, perhaps, in something Mr. Acheson himself once said. At the private services for Justice Louis D. Brandeis, following his death, the then Assistant Secretary of State spoke in behalf of himself and others who had served as secretaries to the Justice. As reported by A. T. Mason in his book, Brandeis—A Free Man's Life, Mr. Acheson's remarks included these sentences:

"We are the generation which has lived during and between two wars. We have lived in the desert years of the human spirit * * * years when the cry was, 'What is truth?' * * * These were years during which we saw in action his burning faith that the verities to which men had clung through the ages were verities; that evil never could be good; that falsehood was not truth, not even if all the ingenuity of science reiterated it in waves that encircled the earth. * * *

"But to him, truth was less than truth unless it was expounded so that the people could understand and believe. During these years of retreat from reason, his faith in the human mind and in the will and capacity of people to understand and grasp the truth, never wavered or tired. In a time of moral and intellectual anarchy and frustration, he handed on the great tradition of faith in the mind and spirit of man which is the faith of the prophets and poets, of Socrates and of Lincoln."

CONVICTION ON TRUTH

So it would seem that it is this that keeps Dean Acheson going—the conviction that truth must be expounded so that people may understand and believe, plus a faith in the will and capacity of people to understand the truth.

It explains why he has not yet wavered or seemed to tire in his efforts to expound the truth as he sees it; why he can appear day after day before the various committees of the House and Senate to discuss at length and in detail the wide range of matters that come within the purview of the State Department, responding readily to informed and intelligent questions and avoiding as best he can the pitfalls set for him by those having less than a friendly interest. Also it explains why he compels himself to meet with official and unofficial groups of all kinds for off-the-record quiz sessions. And finally why he takes on the burden of public speeches in Washington and elsewhere, despite the wear and tear on his physical strength.

As for when he has time to think—the Lord only knows.

Parenthetically it could be asked also, when does the Secretary have time to engage in the elaborate conspiracies against the welfare of his own country, with which, in effect, he stands accused by reckless and irresponsible practitioners of a certain kind of politics and a certain kind of journalism? For that one the said practitioners would prefer not to have any answer.

Mr. Speaker, let it be said in tribute to Acheson "that he may well stand before his God and Creator, guilty as charged, and take his chances than to stand before Him as will his calumniators with vile tongues in their heads."

Communist Enigma: Solution?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 1950

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, a contributed column in the Catholic Transcript, the newspaper of the Hartford diocese, probes the question of the Communist enigma. The editor, Rev. James M. Gillis, C. S. P., sets out in vibrant form premises upon which the prevalence of communistic activity may be based. Admittedly, no solution is given to the riddle of communistic adherence; but a thorough soul-searching on our part may enable us to determine the shortcomings of either religious teachings or democratic practices which allow our people to be ensnared in the delusory web of utopian existence through Communist philosophy.

COMMUNIST ENIGMA: SOLUTION?

(By the Rev. James M. Gillis, C. S. P.)

I have often confessed in this column that to me the spread of communism is a psychological riddle. Invariably after the appearance of such a confession I receive letters intended to do away with my perplexity. I appreciate the motive of the writers of those letters and I am in consequence thankful. But I still have to admit that for me the riddle remains unsolved.

Take, for example, a letter like this from an obviously intelligent and zealous lady in Albany, N. Y.: "You say that you do not understand why men and women are fooled by communism. There are many reasons:

"1. People are not curious enough. A man bet he could go out and get the signatures

of 50 men who didn't know what they were signing. He won the bet.

"2. Americans are too busy to make a study of communism.

"3. Too much is printed and not enough is condensed. I had to sacrifice much in order to find time to keep up on the current news of communism because things are happening so fast all over the world. I have two piles—one of clippings and one of books on communism. To get the facts I would have to spend weeks or months going over all of them. We need booklets with to-the-point facts.

"4. Atheists are pleased with the Communists' statement: Religion is the opium of the people.

"5. False statements impress the poor: Communists are working for peace, bread, land, higher wages and freedom from capitalism.

"6. Communists write letters; anti-Communists don't. Before the picture 'The Iron Curtain' was first shown, the Fox Co. received thousands of letters and telegrams protesting its being shown, and threatening the company, directors, and others. After the picture had been shown, over 8,000 letters and telegrams were received protesting the picture. Few letters were received commending the picture. When news commentators criticize Russia or communism, Communists write all the sponsors of programs and the radio broadcasting companies requesting that the speakers be taken off the air. They request their relatives and friends to join in their protests and to conceal themselves as members of any Communist organization.

"7. When bills are to be passed in legislature or any problem voted on, Communists flood the State Department with mail. Catholics do not show much action about such things.

"8. Many people are under the impression that Communists are fighting only Catholicism. This false impression alone draws many people to the side of Communist sympathizers.

"9. In every company, club, or organization there are Communists to spot sympathizers as easy prey for their organizations.

"10. People are betrayed into thinking they are joining a new political party. Mr. J. Edgar Hoover says it is not a political party but a treasonable and traitorous conspiracy.

"11. If Spain is 80–90 percent Catholic, why did outside foreigners convert many of them to communism and then murder their priests and nuns and burn down their churches? Italian Catholics, French Catholics, and millions of Catholics of other countries are much the same. There is weakness in Catholicism. There is strength in communism. Catholics have the feeling of contentment; they are sleeping. Many of our best churchgoers are ignorant and uneducated in their religion."

Evidently the writer of that letter had done some intense thinking on the cause of the spread of communism. I hope she will not be displeased if I say that her explanations don't go deep enough. The poor, she says, are fooled. But why? They have newspapers and radios. They must know brute facts about communism. Those of them who are Catholics have both information and exhortations from the Pope, bishops, priests—why do they remain ignorant?

My correspondent says further that Communists are articulate, non-Communists inarticulate; Communists active, non-Communists inactive. True, but again, why? In fact, the lady ends as I do with a "why?"—why are so many Spanish and Italian and French Catholics still on the wrong side? Yes, why?

Perhaps I may best put the problem in some words I wrote in the Catholic World for February 1947:

"Those to whom I put my question, How do you account for the welcome given to communism by intellectuals and nonintellectuals, hoi polloi and the hoity-toity alike; by actors, artists, novelists, historians, educators, labor unions, publishers of books and magazines, Congressmen, clergymen and members of a score or more of other assorted business and professions, give me reasons which, to be effective, would have to exist in combination but which normally exclude one another. My friends and informants speak of zeal, enthusiasm, a quasi-religious ferver, a need of something to take the place of the abandoned religion; a keen sense of the injustices done to workingmen in times past; mental, moral, spiritual restlessness and general discontent; psychopathic disturbances so widespread as to be epidemic; exhibitionism; sadism or masochism; desire for novelty; bitterness of soul consequent upon atheism; pessimism to the point of desperation; sentimental and emotional idealism; anger, envy, hatred in the heart of the have-nots; the ever present attraction of class warfare and racial conflict; demagogic leadership working through mob psychology. And so on. But not any one of the causes alone would suffice and the combination of five or six of them in one person seldom occurs. It may be that the many motives mentioned operate separately in different persons, but what has brought them together in the closely compact and wonderfully well-organized movement that is world communism?

"There—I submit—is the unsolved and perhaps insoluble enigma."

Should We Adopt the Federal FEPC?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES O. EASTLAND
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio debate on the American Forum of the Air program, between the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] on the subject Should We Adopt a Federal FEPC?"

There being no objection, the debate was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANNOUNCER. The National Broadcasting Co. presents the American Forum of the Air, founded 21 years ago by Theodore Granik and dedicated to the full and public discussion of all sides of all issues, coming to you from NBC Theater in Washington, D. C.

Now, here is your moderator, Theodore Granik.

Chairman GRANIK. Our great American democracy is proud of its many minority groups—millions of Catholics, Jews, Negroes, Mexicans, immigrants, and children of immigrants, all good Americans—but spokesmen for these minorities contend that many among them cannot get jobs and improve their standards of living because of unfair discrimination on the basis of race, color, or religion. Others, however, say that if these faults occur, they are faults of mind and heart, or of social inheritance, which can be eradicated only by education and example, that no law can be effective if it is not acceptable to the people affected.

With this very controversial issue confronting our Congress and our Nation, the American Forum of the Air asks, "Should we adopt a Federal Fair Employment Practices Commission," known as the FEPC?

Two distinguished Senators are here to give us their views. Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, former mayor of Minneapolis and now Democratic Senator from Minnesota; and Senator SPESSARD L. HOLLAND, Democrat, of Florida, former Governor of that State.

Now, Senator HOLLAND, would you start out our discussion by answering this question: Can we legally assure any citizen that in applying for a job he will not suffer discrimination because of his race or religion?

Senator HOLLAND. My answer would be no; not under under American law because such a law would attempt to control the thought processes, the mind, the objectives, the intentions of individuals, and that isn't done under American law. It is attempted under some kinds of ideology with which we have no common ground whatsoever, but not under our system of law.

In the second place, may I say that it cannot be done practically because it can never be done without the concurrence of the States and of the people, and it has already been shown in that part of the Nation outside of the South, leaving that out of the discussion for the moment, that 17 sovereign States have turned down FEPC, 8 have adopted a compulsory FEPC, and 2 a mere voluntary FEPC without strength. I call to your attention that the population of the States that have turned it down is twice that of those that have accepted it, and likewise that in California, the only place where it was submitted to popular vote, the people voted it down by 2½ to 1, and in every county in California they voted down FEPC. It cannot be enforced without popular support.

Senator HUMPHREY. My answer to the question is, of course, that a Federal law pertaining to employment practices can and should be adopted and that it can be enforced. I think that my answer is bolstered not merely by my own personal point of view but by the fact that there are 10 States in the Union that do have fair employment practices laws, eight of which are what I would call satisfactory, two of which are on the voluntary side. Besides that, there are a number of large cities. I would like to point out that in these large cities, such as the city of New York and the city of Chicago and the city of Milwaukee and the city of Cleveland and the city of Cincinnati, they have large minority groups, particularly large groups of American Negroes.

These cities have proven conclusively that a fair employment practices ordinance on a city level, with compulsion, does work. For example, recently the Des Moines Register Tribune made a survey of some 25 cities, and it found that out of these 25 cities where the cities had a fair employment practices ordinance, you did have employment of white-collar Negro workers, you did have employment of the minority groups, and that discrimination was being eliminated.

I would like to make this further observation, that it is entirely within the purview of the Federal Government to pass this kind of law. We have banned child labor; we regulate labor insofar as safety regulations are concerned. I don't think anyone has denied the constitutionality of a law that would affect employees in interstate commerce. So I say, frankly and candidly and with some conviction, that this law should be enacted, that it will work, and that it will produce the results which we have every right to expect.

Chairman GRANIK. Do you think it is constitutional, Senator?

Senator HOLLAND. I think it is clearly unconstitutional, but I want to address myself briefly to that portion of my distinguished colleague's remarks which had to do with the large cities. Admitted that several of the large cities do have FEPC Acts which are

local, I think it is interesting to note that in every case the States in which those cities have been located, in every case except the State of New York, have declined as States to accept a State of FEPC because they have not liked what they saw working out in the cities. That is true in Pennsylvania as to Philadelphia. It is true in Ohio as to Cincinnati and Cleveland. It is true in Illinois as to Chicago. And it is true in the State of my distinguished friend, Minnesota, where after a trial run in Minneapolis, it was knocked out in the State senate last year by 34 to 29, showing conclusively that the good people of Minnesota didn't like what they saw down in the main city, the city of Minneapolis.

Chairman GRANIK. Let's see what the former mayor has to say about that.

Senator HUMPHREY. I am very glad my distinguished colleague from Florida brought that up, because that opens up a new area of conflict. No. 1, the good people of Minnesota do like fair employment practices. No. 2, not only do the good people of Minneapolis like it—and they are all good people—but the city of Minneapolis was awarded the Nation's award for outstanding work in human relations. A city that only 5 years ago was described by Perry McWilliams as the second worst city in the Nation in terms of discrimination was last year at Christmas time given the national award on the part of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and on the part of the Conference of Christians and Jews, for outstanding work in the field of human relations.

Now let's go into the legislatures for awhile. I am glad my friend in Florida brought up the legislatures, because the legislatures in this country are the most unrepresentative bodies in America. The legislatures of the States have not been reapportioned, most of them, for 50 years. California has a need of reapportionment that is second to none. New York has a need of reapportionment. Ohio has a need of reapportionment. In other words, the State of Minnesota hasn't been reapportioned since 1910, when the city of Minneapolis had a population of some 200,000 people, and now it has 550,000 people.

To say that a legislature does not pass FEPC and, therefore, that it is wrong is no answer at all. Let the legislatures of the United States, of the several States, reapportion their States. Let those people who are hiding behind the cloak of minority rule come out and believe in majority rule.

Senator HOLLAND. I am sorry, Mr. Moderator, that my distinguished friend doesn't believe in the type of democratic government that prevails in the statehouse in Minnesota.

Senator HUMPHREY. I surely don't.

Senator HOLLAND. Nor that that prevails in the statehouses of the other fine States of this Nation. Suffice it to say that it seems to me it is a very clear and conclusive illustration that the people of his State, after having seen the project work for 2 years in his city, where he helped to establish it, would have nothing of it, but knocked it out. They didn't want it in Minnesota.

Let me say this, my friend referred to California. I remind him again that the sovereign people, the sovereign people to the tune of 2,250,000 voted in California, and they voted 2½ to 1 against any FEPC, and there wasn't a county in all that State but which showed a majority against FEPC.

I wonder how my friend answers that?

Senator HUMPHREY. Your friend will be delighted to answer it, but let us go back first of all to the State of Minnesota. I understand that the gentleman from Florida is telling me that the legislature of the State of Minnesota on this issue represented the people. Let's take a look at who represented the people. The Governor of the State of Minnesota was elected with an overwhelming majority. He happens to be a Republican Governor. He happens to stand foursquare for fair employment practices. He also went before the legislature and encouraged it. Who fought it? The Minnesota Employers Association. Who is the Minnesota Employers Association? Let me say the most conservative and, in fact, the most reactionary group in the State of Minnesota. Who else did they fight? They fought the Governor, they fought the junior Senator from Minnesota and the senior Senator from Minnesota. They fought everything out there that I can think of. Then they were able in a legislature that had not been reapportioned since 1910 to bottle this thing up in committee. Despite the fact that the Catholic church, the Protestant churches, every one of them, the Jewish synagogues, every one of the veterans' organizations, despite the fact that every trade union in Minnesota, both political parties, despite the fact that county after county resolution was for FEPC by State law, still the legislature didn't enact it. So my friend says apparently the people don't want it?

Senator HOLLAND. My voluble friend still doesn't explain why his own senate turned it down 34 to 29 and why his own house has declined ever to let it come out. I think that it is a very sound conclusion to draw that they didn't like what they saw in Minneapolis.

Chairman GRANIK. Let's go to Mississippi for a minute.

Senator HUMPHREY. Let's go to Mississippi, because it just so happens wherever the minority rules, wherever you have minority rule in this country, that is where you have this kind of situation.

Chairman GRANIK. May I quote from Governor Wright of Mississippi. He says: "Every American is a potential employer, a potential owner of a business, and in the development of any business any man who invests capital, any man who operates a business, must have the freedom to choose the type of employees he desires."

How do you feel about that?

Senator HUMPHREY. I think that is just wonderful, except that I do not believe any man ought to be discriminated against in employment because of his race, his color, or creed. This happens to be the anniversary, so to speak, of "fourscore and seven years ago," that Abraham Lincoln talked about, this year of 1950. This is the anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation, fourscore and seven years ago. Here is a country that has in its Declaration of Independence that all men are created equal. Here is a country that has in its Constitution the whole concept of the people of popular sovereignty, of the people ruling. Here we are at a point where we have an opportunity to give people a chance for what? For economic well-being. That is all we have been talking about. We are not talking about social habits or anything else. We are talking about a job. So what I point out very frankly is that America cannot afford to discriminate against people on the basis of such false factors as their religion. For example, the Catholics, and we discriminate against a lot of them. The Jews, the Mexicans, the Spanish, the Italians, the Negroes—they have been discriminated against in State after State and locality after locality, and forced to take substandard labor when they are equipped to do good jobs.

Senator HOLLAND. I am glad you took us South, Mr. Moderator, because I think we well disposed of the situation outside of the South. Better than two to one the States have shown they don't want FEPC.

In the States of the South, 15 States, nobody has even suggested FEPC. Because the great population of our whole area, both white and colored, is so very definitely against it.

My friend speaks about the Negroes with great volubility. But I want to remind him the 1940 census shows less than 10,000 Negroes in his State, with 2,750,000 people; whereas we have in the Southland between ten and eleven million Negroes, and we are living kindly with them, and they are happy to live there, and they are good, patriotic citizens, and they are not supporting the causes of communism, as are some of the groups that are supporting this same legislation, and that doesn't mean that everybody who supports it is in that group, of course, at all. They are good and sound and patriotic citizens.

May I call to the attention of the Senator that we are greatly disturbed in the Southland because of some developments which have occurred in this recent year? We know that there has been behind this effort, because it is in the President's Civil Rights Commission Report, that segregation is to be abolished. We know that they believe in social equality. The Senator himself in his testimony before the House committee testified that he believed in social equality. It has been terribly disturbing to the Southland to see, since this was last debated in the Senate last year, the two strongest leaders of NAACP, the executive secretary, Walter White, and the legislative representative, whom the Senator knows, after having divorced their Negro wives, married white women; and I tell you right now the feeling in the South on the part of the good white people and the good colored people, and we have millions of them, is that that shows we are trying to go in the wrong direction and we will have none of it in the Southland. [Applause.]

Senator HUMPHREY. Mr. Moderator, we are not talking about marital relations. We are not even talking about childbirth. We are talking about employment. May I point out in reference to the Negro population there are more Negroes in the city of Chicago than there are in any city or any one area in the South? There are more Negroes in the city of Chicago than there are in almost any State in the South. Yet in the city of Chicago, if you please, we have a fair-employment practices ordinance that works, and it works well. There are more Negroes in New York City than there are in almost any city in the South, in fact, in any city in the South, and yet fair-employment practices works well there.

I also want to say the innuendo of my colleague from Florida is not becoming to a distinguished representative in the Senate. [Applause.]

This is not communism. As a matter of fact, the one thing that is robbing us of our great moral weapon in this world today is the way we treat our minority groups in this country. I would remind my friend from Florida that whether or not some people in the South like this or not, the fact is that there are more colored people in the world than there are white. The fact is that some of the people in the South have denied people the right to vote, and we have poll-tax States, not in Florida. There are more people who vote in my county than in any city in South Carolina. There are more people who vote in my city than vote in any three counties in South Carolina.

I submit to you that we cannot afford to have American policy in a critical world situation dictated by the prejudices and the minority prejudices of a group any place in this country. The race problem is a fundamental international problem. We are losing face in Asia. We are losing it all over the world.

Chairman GRANIK. Senator HOLLAND.

Senator HOLLAND. I want to answer two of the statements of my good friend. First, with reference to Chicago, he was very careful to tell us about the Chicago FEPC, but he didn't tell us that the demonstration of what was done under it was unsatisfactory to both parties in the Illinois Legislature, and that both houses of the legislature knocked it out when it was proposed there in Illinois.

As to the second question, the question of what we are doing in the South, I think that what we have got to show in this Nation is that we will stand up for constitutional government and continue to offer the same brand of freedom and opportunity which we have offered throughout the history of the Nation.

I think the fact that most everybody else outside of this Nation and all the world wants to come here and settle with us and seem to be delighted to get here under our laws indicates that the people of the world think that we are doing a pretty swell job.

I want to say to my friend that insofar as the people of the South are concerned, they are making headway, white and black, on the basis of good will, on the basis of tolerance, on the basis of mutual respect and mutual understanding, and we don't like to be dictated to by the people who come from a State where less than 1 percent of their population is black or like the State of North Dakota, for instance, because one of its Senators has been very voluble, where the census shows 201 Negroes from that State. We think they don't know very much about the problem, and we would rather leave the problem to our own good people, both white and black, who are working it out in exceedingly good fashion and have come away ahead without the help of the rest of the Nation. Having a group just a few years ago, relatively speaking, turned over to them without resources, without education, without health, without even any of the property which would give them a chance, they have come forward in such a way that they are all proud of them, and insofar as the South is concerned, as whites and as Negroes, we are making progress and we are making progress together and we are asking that we not be disturbed in that progress by having passed the type of legislation such as this which will set us back 50 years on the path of progress and prosperity and good will. [Applause.]

Chairman GRANIK. How do you feel about that, Senator?

Senator HUMPHREY. I would like to ask my distinguished friend from Florida to get off the defensive for a while. We are not just talking about the South. We are talking about people, American people. We are talking about people who are more American than almost anybody, except the people who came over on the Mayflower, almost native Americans. In fact, we are talking about the American Indian, native Americans, if you please. Discrimination isn't a matter of Louisiana or Florida or South Carolina. It is a matter of Minnesota, North Dakota, New York, and Washington. We are not talking only about constitutional government, my good friend from Florida. We are talking about human rights. In this world today the issue of human rights is the number one issue. That is what our fight is with communism, who deny human rights. May I point out that every time Mr. Gromyko or Mr. Molotov wants to put an American representative back on his heels at the United Nations they do what? They bring up the way we treat our minority groups. When we proposed, for example, that we investigate the slave camps of Siberia, what was the immediate response? The immediate response was, "Let's investigate the poll tax, the lack of economic opportunity. Let's investigate the lynchings," if you please, "in parts of America." What did our Government representatives say? They said, "If that is the case, we had better have no investigation."

One more thing about the legislatures. My friend has been a Governor, and I want to repeat that there is no one area of government in the United States that is more lacking in true representation of the majority will of the people than the legislatures. The Congress of the United States is reapportioned every 10 years by the Constitution, by the census. The cities of the United States are reapportioned time after time by the will of their electorate. But the State legislatures, I repeat, in Illinois, in California, in Pennsylvania, in New York, have not had reapportionment for better than two generations, and they have disproportionate representation, because 50 years ago over 50 percent of the people of this country lived in rural areas. Today only 20 percent live in rural areas.

Senator HOLLAND. Mr. Moderator, I had begun to thing my friend was starting a filibuster——

Senator HUMPHREY. I was just following through on my friend from Florida.

Senator HOLLAND. But I am glad to see he is not.

May I say that I am a little surprised that my friend has frankly quoted here Mr. Gromyko as an authority on international affairs. Insofar as we are concerned, we don't regard him as such in the Southland, and I think in most parts of the Nation.

To the contrary, when Mr. Gromyko says something, we are inclined to suspect his motives because we found out that they have not had anything to do with the permanence or the prosperity or the welfare of the United States of America.

Senator HUMPHREY. I want to ask my friend from Florida this question: Does he think that the Catholic Church is wrong when it says we need a national FEPC? The National Catholic Welfare Conference? Does he think that the National Baptist Conference is wrong when it says we need a national FEPC? Does he think the Methodist, the Congregational, or the Presbyterian Church is wrong? Does he think the President's Committee on Civil Rights that represented every segment of the economy is wrong? Does he think the Democratic Party was wrong and that the Republican Party was wrong in their platform commitments on fair employment practices? Does he think, if you please, that every single religious group in this country, every one of the Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish groups, are wrong, and that the A. F. of L. and the CIO are wrong?

Chairman GRANIK. Let him try to answer, please.

Senator HUMPHREY. Or does he think, if you please, that the only people who are right are the people who have for years maintained a minority rule in many of their areas and denied people the right to vote in many of their areas and who have taken upon themselves to be the self-protectors of the American way of life?

Senator HOLLAND. I am glad to answer that question. In the first place, I don't think anybody has a right to speak for all those groups, except the two political parties, which I will mention in a moment. I know perfectly well, as one member of one of those groups, I have heard thousands and thousands of good Methodists express themselves who are not at all in accord with any such expression. I know, furthermore, that most of the gentle, well-intentioned, and kindly people who make that kind of expression haven't the slightest knowledge of the situation. They don't know at all that it involves bringing in an ideology which is entirely foreign.

Now with reference to the political parties, my friend knows as well as I do that the declarations in the two platforms have been nothing in the world but political, that they have been designed to secure minority votes in certain key States. They know that the complete lack of sincerity of both parties is shown clearly by the fact that they haven't done a thing in the abolition of segregation or in the abolition of discrimination right here in the Nation's Capital, where they have had complete control, regardless of whether it was Democrats or Republicans who were in the majority. It has been a political issue all the way through.

Senator HUMPHREY. I want to answer that. I want to say if my friend from Florida will get on the floor of the Senate on Tuesday when we meet and propose that we have a chance to debate civil-rights issues without a filibuster, without their threat of a filibuster, I will guarantee to him that he will find out that this isn't just a political promise. He will find out that the votes are there. But whenever we propose to bring up a single issue pertaining to civil rights, we are immediately confronted with a solid block of people who have specialized in the art of filibustering, not in the art of legislation but in the art of protecting minority rights with minority tactics.

Chairman GRANIK. Gentlemen, let me take a question from the audience. I see Miss Penuel has a gentleman who has a question. Go ahead, sir.

Question. Senator HUMPHREY, don't you believe that if FEPC is enacted in any State, it should be done by vote of the people?

Senator HUMPHREY. Are you asking me that question?

Question. Yes.

Senator HUMPHREY. No, I do not, because I believe in representative government. If that were the case, I would say if you are going to have a tax law, which surely affects everybody and FEPC affects only those engaged in interstate commerce, then let's abolish our legislatures or Congress and have a referendum. To be sure, FEPC should be enacted like any other law, like child-labor laws, if you please. It should be enacted like appropriation bills, like soil-conservation laws, by the will of the people as expressed through their representatives in the Government. That is my conviction.

Senator HOLLAND. May I say I am surprised again to find that my friend does not believe in the expression of the will of the majority, and he has taken exactly the same position which a Negro lawyer took before one of our committees, representing a union, when he complained of the fact that the great State of Pennsylvania in three successive sessions of the legislature had turned down FEPC, and said, complainingly, "The only way in the world we are going to get this thing done is down here in Washington. Please do it." In effect he meant, pass it whether the States want it or not and whether the people want it or not.

If that is sound democracy, then I don't know the meaning of the word.

Senator HUMPHREY. May I make this observation? We had a type of referendum on civil-rights legislation, because we had a group of people in the Democratic Party who walked out of a national convention, out of their own party, and they went out and created a new party. They called it the Dixiecrats. They put up a candidate, and the one issue of this Dixiecrat candidate was that he was going to have white supremacy; he was going to protect the rights of the white people. How many votes did he get in the United States of America? How many votes did he get?

Senator HOLLAND. I am glad that my friend raised that question because I don't happen to be a Dixiecrat. I stuck with the party, and I also stuck along with the Governor of our State, the six Members of the House, myself as one Senator—the other Senator was also of the same opinion, but for a different reason—all the Cabinet members, the members of the legislature, and so forth; and we, sticking with our party, carried our State, but I want to say to my friends we did that notwithstanding the fact that we were not in any sense for the civil-rights plank nor for the Taft-Hartley repeal plank, and we made that very clear in every community in our State. We could not have carried the State without taking that position.

Senator HUMPHREY. Do you think you could have carried it with Thurmond?

Senator HOLLAND. We didn't want Thurmond.

Senator HUMPHREY. I ask you, do you think you could have carried it with him?

Chairman GRANIK. May I take another question?

Question. Senator HOLLAND, do you support and advocate a voluntary Fair Employment Practices Commission law for your State? Senator GRAHAM, of North Carolina, has recently come out for a voluntary FEPC.

Senator HOLLAND. I don't understand that Senator GRAHAM is suggesting that at all for North Carolina. I understand that he is suggesting it for the Nation. There are ample numbers of set-ups here which could be approved by the South wholeheartedly by way of conciliation and by way of adjustment. One of our distinguished southern House Members from Arkansas has suggested a department in the Labor Department for that purpose alone, free from compulsion; but you can't ram this kind of thing in America down the throats of the great majority of the States of the Nation when 3 to 1 of them are against it at this time and when their people back them up in that position.

Chairman GRANIK. Senator HUMPHREY?

Senator HUMPHREY. I want to say I am happy my friend from Florida believes in FEPC. He just isn't quite sure whether he wants it sugar-coated or whether we wants it chocolate-coated. He says he believes in fair-employment practices——

Senator HOLLAND. He hasn't said anything of the kind, Mr. Moderator. He has said that he is perfectly willing to have a division of the Department of Labor set up to study this question——

Senator HUMPHREY. Oh; to study it.

Senator HOLLAND. To conciliate in this field, but without any power of compulsion whatsoever, because he believes those powers of compulsion are foreign to and incompatible with the American system of law.

Senator HUMPHREY. May I point out what Daniel Webster once said about a law without a penalty. He said it is nothing more nor less than an expression of good advice. It was a pretty great American who made that statement.

I repeat that in FEPC, as was testified to before the House Committee by every single officer—I want my friend from Florida to contest this, if he can. Every single officer of any Fair Employment Practices Commission, local or State, anywhere in the United States, who testified on the House bill, H. R. 4453, said that it should have compulsory measure within it. To be sure, which has not been brought out here, we emphasize adjudication, conciliation, education, mediation; and in the 2,000 complaints which have been brought to the attention of Fair Employment Practices Commissions in the United States today, not one has had to use compulsion in order to get compliance.

Senator HOLLAND. I was glad that point was brought out, because that shows perfectly clearly that the advocates of this bill are afraid to put it in court; they are afraid of its unconstitutionality, and they realize perfectly well also that it cannot work except in a State where it is approved by the people of the State. I want to recall to your mind also that we had it work in a situation of heavy employment instead of unemployment and depression. So there hasn't been a fair trial run, and there hasn't been an attempt at a run in a State that doesn't have a feeling of the majority of the people for it.

Chairman GRANIK. We wanted to take some more questions, but we have time only for summaries. Senator HUMPHREY, your summary, please.

Senator HUMPHREY. My summary is simply that it is thoroughly within the American tradition to guarantee to every American not only his political rights, but his right for economic opportunity. The fair employment practices bill that is before the Congress is one that is based upon the principle of education, adjudication, mediation, and conciliation, and it carries with it, as all effective American law does, penalties for that recalcitrant antisocial minority which will not abide by the decision of the majority.

I point out that 50,000,000 people already in this country are covered by fair employment practices legislation. I also point out that the major cities of the Nation, where the employment problems are acute, where there are plenty of tensions because of racial groups, have made FEPC legislation work. I further point out that all responsible groups in this Nation that represent the religious life of America and the political life of America are working in behalf of fair employment practices legislation.

Chairman GRANIK. I am sorry, Senator HUMPHREY, your time is up. Senator HOLLAND, your summary, please.

Senator HOLLAND. I point out that three to one of the States in the Nation don't want this, that 100,000,000 of the 150,000,000 people of the Nation have shown rather clearly that they do not want it, that the system is incompatible with our American system, and that we can't adopt it without doing great violence to the Constitution.

I point out also that insofar as the South is concerned, it has even graver doubts about this than the other phases of the controversy, known as civil rights, because of the attack on segregation and the effort for social equality, which is a part of this and which has demonstrated itself on the part of two of the outstanding leaders of the Nation within the last few months.

Chairman GRANIK. Thank you very much, Senator HOLLAND and Senator HUMPHREY.

Radio Address of Hon. John S. Wood, of Georgia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. M. (DON) WHEELER
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 26, 1950

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am including an address recently delivered by our colleague, the Honorable JOHN S. WOOD, of Georgia.

I cannot too strongly urge the membership of this House to read the following speech for it is on a timely subject and poses a serious question which this House must answer in the not too distant future.

Mr. WOOD'S speech follows:

Tonight I want to talk with you about the tremendous monopoly power that is now possessed by the great Nation-wide labor unions and that is, with increasing frequency, exercised by them in a manner that imperils the very health and safety of our Nation. We can and should meet squarely the issue raised by this union power. We will be playing with fire if we temporize on this issue any longer.

Let's consider for a moment the principles that are involved. In America we have always had an inborn fear of power, whether it be Government power or the power of private groups. Our constitutional system, that we first learned about in grade school, was designed so as to dilute Government power and to prevent too great a concentration of such power in any one Government entity. It was because of this inborn fear of power that the founders of our country, in creating the Federal Government, saved important powers of government to the States and to local subdivisions. It was because of this inborn fear of power that they provided for the separation of the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of Government and made each serve as a check on the other.

About a hundred years after the adoption of our Constitution, a new kind of power began to assert itself in the United States—a kind of power that unless checked would have completely destroyed freedom of opportunity in America and would have been able to dictate to the Government itself the terms on which it should govern. This new kind of power was the power of business monopoly.

In meeting the issue raised by this new power of business monopolies, Congress was faced with three possible alternatives:

1. It could ignore the power and let it overrun us.

2. It could permit the power itself to continue in existence and merely seek to control its exercise.

3. It could break up the power and prevent its resurgence.

We can be eternally thankful that Congress chose the last of these alternatives, and in our antitrust laws made the existence of monopolies unlawful and provided for their dismemberment.

Union monopoly power did not arise as an important force until after the enactment of the Wagner Act in 1935, and it was not until the war period a few years ago when it began actually to assert itself to an alarming extent. And it was the Government itself that nurtured the growth and concentration of union power. During the war the National War Labor Board developed the practice of making pattern determinations in labor disputes. These pattern determinations would cover all of the employees in a given industry, no matter how widely scattered throughout the country that industry might be, or how different the conditions affecting the various units in the industry. As a result of these industry pattern determinations of the National War Labor Board, the great Nation-wide unions began to insist after the war that employers bargain with the national union on an industry-wide basis, rather than with the local unions on an individual employer basis. The effects of such industry-wide bargaining became immediately apparent. When all of the employers in a given industry could not or would not accede to the union demands, the union would strike the whole industry at one and the same time. We can still recall vividly the serious Nation-wide coal strike that took place while the war itself was going on. And we can also still vividly recall the strike of the engineers on all of the Nation's railroads shortly after the termination of hostilities, but while the war emergency was still very acute.

Because of the danger to the national economy, and to the health and safety of the Nation, that resulted from industry-wide strikes in vital industries, Congress in the Taft-Hartley Act sought to give the public a means of protecting itself. In that act Congress authorized the President, whenever he should find that a Nation-wide strike in a vital industry threatened to jeopardize the Nation's health or safety, to apply to the courts for a court order stopping the strike for a period of 80 days.

The Taft-Hartley Act has been the law of the land for less than 3 years. And yet during this short period the President has invoked his authority under the act on no less than seven occasions. Let me emphasize this—on seven occasions since the early summer of 1947 the President has found that union monopoly power was threatening the health and safety of our Nation. And this does not take account of the serious Nation-wide steel strike last fall.

The last Nation-wide strike in a vital industry is still fresh in our minds. Through the dictatorial power of one man—John L. Lewis—the country was brought to the very brink of disaster. Because of this one man our courts were rendered powerless to enforce their decrees, and the President was compelled to ask Congress to give him authority to seize, requisition, and operate private property in peacetime in order to forestall economic collapse.

Our narrow escape from complete national paralysis as a result of this coal strike should give us pause—should make us reexamine whether the provisions that were devised in the Taft-Hartley Act to deal with emergencies caused by union monopoly are adequate. It is essential that we now take another look.

We are today facing precisely the same three alternatives that were before the Congress in the latter part of the last century when our country was threatened by business monopolies:

1. Congress can ignore the monopoly power of labor unions, and let that power overrun us and bring the Nation to its knees. There are those who call themselves liberals who seem to want this alternative.

2. Congress can permit the monopoly power of labor unions to continue in existence and merely seek to control the exercise of that power when it threatens great national emergencies. This alternative was the one that was chosen in the Taft-Hartley Act. It was a logical one to choose when the Taft-Hartley Act was under consideration in the Congress, for legislative bodies are reluctant to take more than one step at a time. But our experience under the national emergency provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act in the short 3 years the act has been on our statute books has taught us that we cannot effectively control the exercise of monopoly power. For when we permit monopoly power to continue in existence, it becomes so vast that it can make a mockery of whatever controls we devise, just as John L. Lewis made a mockery of the solemn decree of the court in the recent coal strike.

3. As the third alternative, Congress can break up the monopoly, and return the real control of labor unions to the American working men and women in the various communities throughout the United States who are union members. I earnestly believe that this is what we must do—and do soon—if we are to preserve America as the land of the free.

I have just this week introduced in the House of Representatives a bill that will accomplish this, and I want to discuss with you for a moment the provisions of that bill.

My bill would make it impossible for a labor organization to represent for collective bargaining purposes the employees of more than one large employer. And it would make it impossible for labor organizations representing the employees of different employers to conspire together with respect to their bargaining proposals or arrangements. Similarly it would make it unlawful for two or more employers to conspire together with respect to their bargaining proposals or arrangements.

I recognize very well that in the case of the small employer, the employees may be too few in number to have a separate labor organization, and for this reason the bill does permit labor organizations to deal with any number of small employers, provided the labor organization does not seek to represent more than 10,000 employees altogether.

If this bill should become law, labor unions would again flourish under local employee control, rather than being dominated by national or international labor organizations in which real control by the men and women who work is diluted to the vanishing point. And, since the collective bargaining with repect to every employer would be entirely independent of the collective bargaining in respect to every other employer, the likelihood of crippling industry-wide strikes in vital industries at one and the same time would virtually disappear.

The bill that I have introduced does not embody an idea that is original with me. The bill contains substantially the same provisions that were contained in the Taft-Hartley bill in 1947 as that bill passed the House of Representatives by an overwhelming majority—the provisions outlawing industry-wide bargaining. Unfortunately, the House provisions in this respect were rejected by the Senate, and thus were not included in the Taft-Hartley Act itself. But these very same provisions only failed of adoption in the Senate by one vote.

We cannot temporize with this problem any longer. We must frankly recognize that as long as we countenance industry-wide bargaining we shall be plagued year in and year out by industry-wide strikes that will prostrate the Nation's economy. Let's outlaw this pernicious practice now, and make it possible for the American working men and women who are union members to have a real say in the bargaining arrangements with their employers.

The Washington Dope Habit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Times-Herald:

THE WASHINGTON DOPE HABIT

Some dope addicts acquired their evil habit after having had the narcotic administered to them during the course of an illness. The victim continued to use the drug long after the disappearance of the need for it. It is the same with government.

For example, there is the Government support of farm prices. It was introduced during the course of the depression, when wheat fell to 40 cents, corn to a quarter, cotton to 3 cents a pound, and butter to 18 cents. There was no expectation that the Government would continue to hoist prices after wheat got back to, say, a dollar a bushel and other commodities sold at corresponding levels. But wheat now sells for $2.25, corn for $1.38, cotton for 32½ cents, and butter for 59 cents. Yet the Government goes right on using the farm-depression narcotic.

Or take the wages-and-hours law, of which the provisions relating to hours were the important part. It was directed toward sharing work when there were not enough jobs for all the carpenters, bricklayers, painters, and other skilled and unskilled workers. It, of course, created no new work. It simply encouraged large employers to use more people in doing it. This was done by requiring employers to pay penalty rates above a stated number of hours.

CONDITIONS NOW EXACT OPPOSITE

Once unemployment ended, the treatment for unemployment should have been stopped, too. But nothing of the sort took place. Throughout the war and the postwar boom, when the need was for more work from everybody, the Government went right on enforcing the law to penalize overtime.

There is the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. It was set up in the Hoover administration to make loans on good security to banks, insurance companies, railroads, farmers, industrial concerns, and State and local governments. It was developed to cope with a drastic deflation. It provided credit sources to sound borrowers who would readily have found lenders in ordinary times. It was an agent of inflation or, as F. D. R. said, "reflation."

The conditions which now exist are the exact opposite of those which the RFC was created to cope with. The country is in the midst of a vast inflation. There is an excess of credit. But the RFC goes right on administering the depression narcotic. Money is now so plentiful RFC has to take wild risks to compete with private capital sources. One of its postwar projects was the Lustron corporation, which was given $37,500,000. The enterprise has already defaulted on $22,000,000 of its obligations, and Carl Strandlund, the head of Lustron, says that RFC will be lucky if it gets 5 cents on the dollar.

Then there is rent control. It has continued for 8 years. Tenants were given the right to stay in the quarters which they occupied without increase in the amount that they paid landlords. The justification for rent control was that a war was on, and building materials and building labor were restricted for use in the production of things essential for the winning of the war. But the war ended 5 years ago.

Materials and labor are freely available for building purposes. Anyone who wants to build a house can do so. The Government is even stimulating home construction by the use of another narcotic, cheap credit. Yet the Government continues to enforce rent control, which was put into effect when home construction was discouraged or forbidden.

H. T. NOT INTERESTED IN ANY CUT-BACKS

Deficit financing is the fifth depression measure which comes readily to mind. Under the New Deal, after F. D. R. had been in office for a few months it became the declared policy of the Government to spend more than its income. The reasoning was that the Government's deficit would compensate for reduced spending. In periods of boom the Government was to spend less than its income. By means of a deficit in times of contraction and a surplus in times of expansion, stability was to be attained. There was no hesitancy about maintaining the deficit as a cure for the depression, but now we are in a boom. Yet the deficit this year will amount to $5,000,000,000, which was more depression medicine than the country ever was given during the depression.

There does not exist in Government the strength of purpose to stop a treatment long after the passing of the need which called forth its use. The flexibility of action which Government planners have in mind is not possible with an officialdom which keeps itself in power by the favors it can do, and the jobs it can provide.

Government agencies are sometimes transferred but, as Senator Borah once pointed out, are never abolished. The weakness in the Hoover report is that economy moves must originate with President Truman, who is no more disposed toward that than toward cutting his salary back to what it was in F. D. R.'s time.

Postal Penny Pinching

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 1950

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the

following editorial from the Boston Traveler of April 20, 1950:

POSTAL PENNY PINCHING

We feel like screaming: How can people be so stupid?

Costs have been rising in the Post Office Department as they have everywhere else. So what? That's no reason to rush off the deep end.

Here we have a fiscal problem which should be solved through fiscal means. Either the rates must be raised as the Postmaster General proposed, or some form of subsidy must be provided. The third absolutely unbelievable alternative—but the one chosen by the Postmaster—is to smash the postal service to smithereens.

Over the years the civilized world has come to take postal service for granted. No one remembers that the daily mail is the backbone of any communications system without which no nation could possibly survive. Not that the United States has ever been famous for really good postal service anyway. Several European capitals, notably London, far outshine us in that field. But suddenly, we who pride ourselves on our modernity have reverted to colonial customs. Cutting back mail service is like wiring a skyscraper with the latest devices and then saying you can't afford the bulbs. Demented!

If the slash sticks, all mail, including first class, will most likely be delayed 24 hours. What this will mean to business, to Government, to ordinary human relations is incalculable.

This type of administrative mismanagement confirms the worst fears of the "agins." We cannot allocate the blame for this mess with any accuracy. Both Congress and the Post Office Department appear culpable with Congress well in the lead. But if government—meaning the combined legislative and executive—can't even manage the Post Office Department decently, why on earth should anybody believe it could manage anything like a general health insurance program? Let the Democrats who voted against postal-rate rises or subsidies think that over.

The Republicans are always harping on efficiency. This curtailment can't help but slow the whole tempo of American economic life. Where were they on voting day?

The hue and cry has started locally already. We hope it mounts to a deafening crescendo. The cut-back must be rescinded before it has time to do real harm.

The Post Office is easy, gentlemen. How could you have muffed it so colossally?

When Congress Is a City Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD BOLLING
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 26, 1950

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Tuesday, March 21, 1950:

WHEN CONGRESS IS A CITY COUNCIL

As legislative bodies go, the National House of Representatives is notoriously inefficient. One reason is because its 435 Members must, at frequent intervals, stop their consideration of domestic and international issues and turn themselves into a city council. These are the days when they sit as aldermen for the District of Columbia.

At such time they argue with one another over daylight saving time for the National Capital and other purely local matters. According to the Washington Post, one civic organization in Washington has computed that Congressmen spent 3,000 hours last year on city-hall questions.

This makes no part of sense. A hangover of a time long since departed, when the District of Columbia was small and its business could be easily transacted, this city-council function should be turned over to a suitable administrative body. The transfer will be made belatedly if Congress will only approve the home rule bill for Washington.

But Congress cannot approve the bill until the measure is pried out of committee. Only 40-odd names are needed on the House petition to take the question from the committee and put it on the floor for action on its merits.

Are there any Missouri or Illinois Representatives who have not yet signed the petition? This is a chance for them to strike a sound lick for responsible government in Washington—and to free themselves for more pressing issues.

Our Domestic Mining Industry—It Must Be Protected If It Is To Be Preserved—Address by Paul B. Jessup

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 26, 1950

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, our last financial depression started with the loss of markets for agricultural products which soon extended to all branches of industry in this country. If we are to guard against future depression we must safeguard our domestic market for the products of our mines. There is submitted herewith a very interesting presentation of the problem affecting our mining industry by Mr. Paul B. Jessup, a prominent mine taxation expert of Wallace, Idaho:

TARIFF ON BASE METALS

INTRODUCTORY

For the benefit of those of you who might be as uninformed on the subject of tariffs as I was before the preparation of this paper, let me say that the definition of this work is simplicity personified. Tariffs are merely duties imposed upon the importation of goods by the government of the country where imported. The purpose of these duties may be simply to raise revenue for the imposing government or may be for the purpose of protecting its industries against foreign competition.

When one delves into the economic justification of protective tariffs he is treading upon more difficult ground. The arguments between the "free traders" and the "protectionists" have raged for centuries in the history of world commerce. In our own country they provided the distinguishing characteristic between our two principal political parties for a number of years.

To me the word "free-trade" has a curious fascination. It has all the earmarks of getting something for nothing, a utopian idea which appeals to many of us. Upon interrogating others on this subject I find a very anomalous situation to exist. I find that practically everyone in business is mesmerized by the word "free-trade" and thinks it a wonderful idea, except as it might deleteriously affect his own business. If there is any danger from this latter source he is a protectionist. This doesn't add up from a logical viewpoint, as in the aggregate it makes everyone free traders and protectionists alike, which self-evidently is a mutually inconsistent position.

Partial attempts have been made to reconcile these inconsistent positions through a device known as reciprocal-trade agreements. I am not going to complicate my subject or unduly prolong this discussion by going into this phase of the problem. Suffice it to say that reciprocal-trade agreements are merely an extension of the age-old practice of "you scratch my back and I'll scratch yours."

HISTORY OF TARIFFS

It might be well at this point to digress for a moment and briefly summarize the history of tariffs, particularly as applied to the two leading commercial nations of the world, England and the United States.

The history of tariffs in England discloses that during the period England was building up its industrial might it adopted a protectionist tariff attitude. When it reached its industrial peak Mother England was a free trader and profited materially by the latter policy. The United States has to some extent followed the same path. On the whole we were highly protectionist during the period we were building up our own industrial greatness. In recent years we have been leaning more and more toward free trade. I realize that the Democratic Party historically stands for free trade and is responsible for this trend. However, the fact remains, this has been the recent tendency in the United States.

THE PRESENT ZINC TARIFF SITUATION

The present tariff on zinc is 75 cents per pound. I can assure you that this is an extremely important figure. In fact, if it is not changed, it ultimately can mean the ruination of the zinc-mining industry in this country. If you do not believe this, your attention is directed to the fact that the present tariff on lead is 1.06 cents per pound. I do not need to tell you what effect this figure has had on our leading mining industry in the past few months.

The present tariff on zinc amounts to approximately 7 percent of the domestic price for this metal. In the two decades before the advent of World War II, the percentage of the tariff on zinc to the domestic price of this metal was greatly in excess of the existing figure. This naturally accorded the zinc miner considerably more protection than he now enjoys.

SHOULD WE BE FREE-TRADERS OR PROTECTIONISTS?

This question is more of theoretical interest than it is of practical significance.

Until we reach the "Buck Rogers" stage of a world state nations will adopt in whole or in part whatever of these conflicting philosophies that best suit their national interest.

Free trade exists among the various States of the United States because our Federal Constitution requires it. Unless human nature undergoes a radical change there will be no international free trade unless you have international government, which is an unlikely prospect in the immediate future.

WHEN ARE PROTECTIVE TARIFFS ECONOMICALLY JUSTIFIED?

A rabid free trader would accuse me of begging the question by assuming that any protective tariff is economically justifiable. However, it should be apparent that they are justifiable under certain circumstances in the present state of world affairs. Stated in another manner the question could be—when and to what extent should a government's tariff policy be protectionist? The answer would appear quite simple. It should be protectionist when and to the extent its national welfare demands it. The next question should be an obvious one. Does our national welfare demand that our

base metal mining be accorded tariff protection? It should be elemental to any thinking person that every possible protection, tariff and otherwise, should be given our entire mineral industry, whose products are essential to our economy both in peacetime and wartime.

PROTECTION IN THE EVENT OF WAR

The most rabid free trader would be forced to admit that base metals in ample quantity are essential to successfully wage a modern war. However, he may overlook the important fact that any weakness or deficiency in this respect may be the deciding factor in the decision of a possible aggressor to commence war against us. With this in mind it would be an invitation to national suicide to ever allow ourselves to get into a predicament where we are not assured of an adequate supply of base metals at all times.

Our free-trader friend might say that in the event of war we are adequately protected by the national stock pile of base metals plus the available domestic production. We might agree with him if he could accurately predict the duration of any such conflict and the amount of base metals necessary to wage it. However, we know from experience that any such prediction would be impossible. He might also say we can import whatever base metals we might need to supplement the national stock pile and our domestic production. This again may be wishful thinking. It assumes that foreign countries which may have the supply of such metals are both willing and able to transport the same to this country. For obvious reasons these assumptions may all be erroneous, and even if they materialized we might be using shipping space which could be used for other purposes. This could unduly prolong or lose the war for us. We cannot count on being as fortunate as we were in the last war with respect to the importation of base metals.

Consequently, our cheapest insurance against aggression is to make sure that we have an adequate supply of base metals within our borders to meet any emergency. The only way this can be accomplished is to supplement the national stock pile by a healthy and productive base metal-mining industry. We certainly cannot rely upon any source of such metals beyond the continental limits of North America, and we cannot be absolutely assured of this.

The importance of zinc mining in World War II can perhaps best be illustrated by the fact that the United States Government actually furloughed soldiers from the Army to go to work in the zinc mines to relieve the labor shortage created there as a result of drafting the young miners into the service. In the Coeur d'Alene district alone approximately 1,000 soldiers were furloughed for this purpose.

PROTECTION TO OUR DOMESTIC ECONOMY IN PEACETIME

Our free trader may be forced to admit his arguments against a protective tariff are not persuasive where a threat of war exists. However, he will insist that we are now in a peacetime economy where no threat of war exists, and the protective tariff is economically unjustifiable in that it causes artificially high prices to consumers and is deleterious to the recovery of world trade.

From a long-range standpoint these arguments are fallacious even assuming we could safely permit our domestic mining industry to close down because cheaper foreign imports were adequate to supply our domestic needs.

It is to the best interest of both the manufacturer and consumer in this country to have a healthy and productive domestic base metal-mining industry during peacetime. The United States proportion of world production of base metals is relatively large. The following approximated figures for 1948 are of interest. The figures on world production are more in the nature of a guess because no statistical information is available from the countries behind the iron curtain and Japan. Nor do the sources in which foreign production was secured indicate whether or not it includes secondary metal.

Year 1948	Lead	Zinc	Copper	Total
	Tons	*Tons*	*Tons*	*Tons*
World production	1,841,000	1,943,000	2,328,000	6,112,000
United States production	865,000	850,000	986,000	2,701,000
United States consumption	1,129,000	1,175,000	1,344,000	3,648,000
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
Percentage of United States production to world production	46.99	43.75	42.35	44.19
Percentage of United States consumption to world production	61.33	60.47	57.75	59.69
Percentage of United States consumption to United States production	130.52	138.24	136.31	135.06

It should be evident from the above tabulation that the United States production of base metals is a substantial contributing factor in keeping their price at a relatively low level. It by the same token provides the domestic manufacturer with a substantial source of his raw materials. If this production is cut off or materially curtailed the results are obvious. The manufacturer's source of supply would be impaired and the economic law of supply and demand would raise the price of the end product in the hands of the consumer. This condition could be greatly aggravated by the operation of foreign cartels if such a situation were ever allowed to come about. It could result in a severe dislocation of our domestic economy in peacetime which would be fearful to contemplate.

THE CASE OF THE LEAD MINER

We all know what has happened to lead mining, the companion of zinc mining. As a result of the low tariff on this metal, the United States has become the dumping ground for foreign countries, who, as a result of currency devaluation and the desire for dollar exchange, are shipping this metal to us. This has naturally resulted in a drastic decline in the domestic price for lead, and has caused the curtailment and shut downs of numerous lead mines in the United States. Ironically enough, our contribution of American taxpayers' dollars has helped bring this situation about. The advantage gained by foreign producers over domestic miners as a result of cheap labor, high-grade ore deposits, a low tariff, and Marshall plan assistance is bad enough without its being aggravated by currency devaluation.

We must bear in mind that what has happened to lead, can under certain circumstances likewise happen to zinc.

In view of what has occurred to our domestic lead mining we have no grounds for complacency. If this trend continues, it can prostrate our base metal mining in the United States. None of us would be foolish enough to allow our fire insurance to lapse on our home which was being endangered by a forest fire. Are we foolish enough to allow our best insurance against aggression to lapse by allowing our base metal mining industry to go to pot because of inadequate tariff protection?

Our national preparedness policy would hardly seem consistent. We are spending billions of dollars for national defense and are paying little or no attention to the condition of a basic industry, which, if not in a healthy condition in the event of a war, could mean the failure of all of our preparedness efforts.

ILLUSTRATED EFFECT ON MINING OPERATIONS

In support of the contention that it can happen here let us examine what occurs when metal prices sharply decline during a period when labor and material costs maintain a high level.

If the squeeze really hurts, the mine operator will discontinue mining areas where the grade of his ore will not carry the cost of extraction. If possible he will mine the better grade ore in the mine and quite often mine narrower widths to attain a higher grade. Along with this upgrading process he will endeavor to cut costs and increase labor efficiency. However, lower costs are difficult to attain when decreased volume of production results from constricted mining operations. Needless to say, only necessary development work would be carried on if he can make both ends meet. Exploration would come to a halt. If these methods fail he will try to ascertain whether his operating losses are greater than maintenance expenses on a shut-down basis. If they are he would shut the property down.

If enough mines are affected in this manner, the bind is then placed upon the smelters or reduction plants, which would have lost their source of raw material to process by the mine shut-downs. Ultimately the point is reached where it becomes economically unfeasible for the smelter to operate and it shuts down. The economic dislocations in the local communities affected by these shut-downs are obvious. With the shut-down of the smelter, some manufacturer or fabricator loses his source of supply. If he cannot secure his raw materials elsewhere or provide substitutes, it is only a matter of time before he likewise is forced to shut down. If this is carried to its logical extreme the end results of such a chain reaction are evident.

In this connection the free trader will say that before this extreme is reached the high price for metals will cause the mines to reopen and the domestic supply of metal brought into balance. To a certain extent this would be true. However, there are some important consequences that shouldn't be overlooked even if only our peacetime economy were at stake. Ore remnants in the high-graded mines would be irretrievably lost. Many mines once closed never reopen because underground conditions make it a staggering undertaking. In any event, underground production cannot commence like turning on water from a faucet. In the process what has been gained? The advantage of the temporary cheap metal to the manufacturer and the ensuing low prices to the consumer have been lost by the offsetting high prices resulting from domestic mining curtailments. Economic dislocations, unemployment, loss of skilled personnel, technical and otherwise, has resulted. Was the price paid for free trade worth its cost? In my opinion the arguments against a protective tariff for base metals are insignificant in comparison with those in favor of it.

CONCLUSIONS AND POSSIBLE REMEDIES

This paper is no doubt subject to the criticism of oversimplification. Time does not permit going into such ramifications as markets, substitute products, etc. However, one conclusion can be drawn which I believe is basically sound, namely, base metal mining in this country for our own national preservation must be protected, fostered, and encouraged.

Some suggested remedies to accomplish this objective are hereinafter outlined. There are no doubt others that are equally effective. However, the ones enumerated will certainly go a long way toward the solution of the problem.

1. Adequate protective tariffs should be put into effect immediately. The amount of the tariffs should be sufficient to accomplish the purpose desired. We know that existing tariffs are too low. The advantage of tariff protection lies in its uniform application. In this connection the sliding scale or graduated tariff advocated by Felix Wormser would appear to have a great deal of merit.

2. All restraints upon incentives to engage in metal mining, development and exploration should be removed, such as restrictive tax policies, restrictive public land policies and restrictive mine financing policies. The restraints mentioned are merely illustrative and are not intended to be exclusive.

3. If the enactment of adequate protective tariffs and the removal of restraints upon incentives to mineral production and exploration do not accomplish this objective, direct governmental subsidization of metal mining should be considered. The latter policy should only be adopted as a last resort after all other reasonable means have failed to provide adequate protection for our future national welfare.

4. Congress and the administration should be impressed with the importance of the problem from the standpoint of our national security, the welfare of our domestic economy, and the necessity of providing relief before it is too late.

Respectfully submitted.

PAUL B. JESSUP,
Vice President, Day Mines, Inc.

McCarthy's New Look

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 26, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks I am including an editorial from the Washington News as of April 22:

MCCARTHY'S NEW LOOK

It has seemed to some of us that Senator MCCARTHY was supporting his charges of Communist influences in the State Department with more noise than evidence. But it also has been apparent that a surprisingly strong segment of public opinion was rallying to his support.

Was the Wisconsin Republican beating the Communists at their own game, simply by outshouting them? Or was he the coincidental beneficiary of a ground swell of public resentment against official indifference to a very real menace to national security?

Whatever the explanation, we are convinced that Senator MCCARTHY himself is a factor to be reckoned with since hearing him present his case before the American Society of Newspaper Editors.

His speech was loaded with tough, pertinent questions which could not be laughed off. He was equally adept at answering questions directed at him. Asked why he hadn't named the Communists in the State Department, he said he would name names when the Department's files were opened to him, adding: "If those files proved that MCCARTHY was a liar, they would damn well be opened tomorrow."

That challenge may have to be answered the next time President Truman takes the stump. It's whistle-stop language.

The Senator cited the case of a man who allegedly was investigated 11 times by the State Department loyalty board before finally quitting and taking up active Communist Party work.

"Eleven times the President's loyalty review board lacked the guts to order the man fired," he charged.

That, too, is whistle-stop stuff.

There was the case of George Wheeler, now attacking American foreign policy from behind the iron curtain. Why was this man cleared for highly important State Department work in Europe? Why, indeed?

Dr. Philip C. Jessup has just been appointed head of the State Department's high policy board, which will map our cold war strategy.

"Why does he always join Communist fronts? Why not anti-Communist organizations?" Senator MCCARTHY asked, submitting photostatic evidence Dr. Jessup had been a member of five fronts. JOE MCCARTHY will not be alone in questioning this appointment, particularly when it is recalled that Dr. Jessup gave a character testimonial for Alger Hiss as lately as last year.

Whatever he may have lacked to support his charges at the outset, Senator MCCARTHY is picking up new ammunition and finding new targets as he goes along. It isn't all just old stuff, either, but material, reflecting upon persons now in Government service, which will question the integrity of the Government itself unless it is rebutted to the public's satisfaction.

Land of the Free

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 24, 1950

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial, Land of the Free, from the April 25 editions of the Washington Star:

LAND OF THE FREE

In this supposedly free country of ours, the case of Joe Dickmon is worth watching and remembering.

Dickmon is a Navy veteran with a wife and child to support. Coal mining is the only trade he knows, and he wanted to work 5 days a week instead of the three that had been decreed by John L. Lewis. So he called Mr. Lewis a dictator, and for that he was suspended for 6 months by his local union.

Nearly 3 months have gone by, and Dickmon hasn't had a day's work in all that time. Now, with his wife and child hungry, he has seen the light. He has apologized to his union and has asked to be permitted to work. He says that "common sense" tells him he was wrong in calling Lewis names.

We hear a great deal these days about the dignity of the human being. Our public men, our church leaders, our educators work themselves into a state of indignation when some poor soul is dragged before an iron-curtain court and forced to confess sins he never committed so that his family can eat and survive. But here in the United States, in this "free" land, a young man who has fought for his country can be forced to recant a wholly truthful statement as the price of being permitted to work, and it is passed by with a few paragraphs in the newspapers. If this can happen to Joe Dickmon, it can happen to any one of his fellow miners. Why is it that the articulate friends of the common man remain silent?

Mr. Lewis has expended a generous share of his king-sized vocabulary in denouncing the Taft-Hartley Act, which, if enforced, would have protected Joe Dickmon. Mr. Lewis says it is a slave-labor statute which has put the working man in chains. Many of our so-called liberals have joined in that phony outcry. But they can't think of anything to say about the case of Joe Dickmon.

Women and the Household Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 24, 1950

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I dare say that most of the women of America today are concerned each week or each month with a household budget. They know only too well how hard it is to provide their families with the necessities and at least some of the pleasures of existence on the amount of money they have to spend. Even more than their husbands, or their fathers or brothers, they are budget-minded. They understand the necessity of living within the family income.

For this reason, and some others, I shall talk about the Federal budget and the Federal taxes which are its sole support. After all, the Federal budget in a very real sense is like a household budget, and just about the same rules of common sense in spending should apply.

The other reasons why I shall talk on the subject of Federal taxes and the Federal budget involve the fact that Federal taxation and Federal spending have a tremendous and very direct effect upon the status of household budgets, and hence upon the welfare of the housewives' husbands and children—as to nutrition and health, dental, and medical attendance, and other factors equally important.

We shall proceed on the assumption that the Federal budget and wasteful spending by the Government are just as important to the housewives as are their own household budgets.

Everyone knows that President Truman, in the 5 years he has been in office, has spent more than all of the Presidents preceding him since the beginning of the Republic. Everyone knows, or should know, too, that since the day Franklin D. Roosevelt entered the White House, the only years in which the Federal Budget was balanced were those in 1947 and 1948 when Republicans were in control of Congress. It was in those years, too, that the only downward revision in Federal taxes was made in nearly 20 years.

Now why is it so vitally important that the Federal Budget should be balanced, and that tax relief should be given to the people? How would budget balancing and tax relief react favorably on the household budgets of the Nation? The answers are not hard to understand.

When the Federal Government spends in any one year more than it takes in through taxes, as it did this year to the tune of more than $5,000,-

000,000, the Government has to borrow to the extent of the deficit. This is done by the issuance of Government bonds and short-term notes. Husbands, fathers, or brothers, and perhaps some of the housewives, buy a portion of these bonds; but only a comparatively small portion. The banks get most of them, because through operation of various governmental controls, they are forced to take them.

The banks do not just lay away these bonds, and forget them except when they collect the interest, as private investors often do. By law the banks are required to carry these bonds in their reserves. But all banks are permitted by law to make loans to businesses and individuals up to a certain percentage of their reserves. The banks want to accommodate their customers. Therefore, as their reserves grow, by reason of the bonds forced upon them by the Government, they loan more and more money to those who need the money and presumably will be able to pay it back with interest.

But the banks do not hand greenbacks or silver through the teller's window to business and individual borrowers. What they do is to give each borrower a credit on the bank's books—a credit on which he can draw just as if it were actual cash. This, then, comprises what is called credit currency. It is nothing but a series of marks on the books, but it is money just the same. As the amount of this credit currency increases, the currency is inflated, exactly the same as if the Government printed a lot more greenbacks.

Thus as deficit financing by the Government progresses, inflation progresses along with it. There are, in effect, more dollars competing for all the goods and services for sale within the country. Prices go up automatically. The buying power of the dollars in each household budget decreases. You have to spend more dollars to buy the food, clothing, medical attendance; everything families need to keep them healthy, happy and protected from the ills that beset us all.

This is the most direct way in which failure to balance the budget affects the household budgets; unless, of course, you consider that deficit financing tends to create the need for higher taxes, since the borrowed money must be paid back some time. The more you pay in taxes, the less you have to spend for the things your families need; and this fact supplies the reason why taxes should be reduced. The less taxes you pay, the larger your household budgets, and the more your families can have and enjoy.

A little earlier I referred to wasteful spending by the Federal Government. The current "squandermania" of the Democratic Fair Deal administration is the sole reason for this year's $5,000,000,000 deficit and the prospect of one perhaps twice as large next year. National defense has nothing to do with it; neither has foreign aid. This country could afford all that is needed for national defense and for assistance to foreign countries, without any deficit, if a little common sense were used in eliminating needless Federal employees and duplication of effort in the tremendous Federal bureaucracy. If, in other words, the Hoover Commission recommendations were honestly put into effect, instead of being twisted to gain political advantage.

Just let me give a few illustrations of what I am talking about in this respect. At present it costs the Federal Government $11.28 to issue a check, even though the check is for only $1. It costs, more often than not, at least twice this much to buy some article of office equipment which would cost perhaps 50 cents if one were to buy it in a retail stationery store. One Federal bureau was recently shown to have bought office supplies sufficient to last for more than 100 years. Somebody must have gotten paid off on that one, or I am mistaken.

All of this wastefulness is bad enough, as you will grant; but it cannot hold a candle to the things proposed in President Truman's so-called welfare-state legislative proposals. These include the Brannan plan, which intelligent farmers oppose; compulsory health insurance, which is just another name for socialized medicine; unemployment compensation so great that most industrial employees would find it almost as profitable to be unemployed as to work at a job; social security on the scale of the crackpot Townsend plan; all these, and many others.

Has it ever struck you, Mr. Speaker, that behind all these proposals, which are advanced under the pretense of a tender regard for social welfare, there may be motives of an entirely different nature? Has it ever entered your mind that perhaps they are the proposals of a profligate, power-mad gang of political freebooters, who would impose upon all of us exactly the same kind of socialism that has led England to the brink of ultimate disaster? Has it occurred to you that by doing so they hope to entrench themselves in political power so strongly that never again can they be dislodged?

If you have not thought on these things, it is time to do so now. Anyone who spends much time in Washington knows them to be true. The Fair Deal administration, in fact though not in name, is a socialistic administration. Its aim is to bring socialism to the United States. Socialism, as you all know, is a form of government under which the government owns everything; capital, land, factories, homes, and stores, industrial equipment, everything. Under so-called Fabian socialism, as practiced in England, socialization of all private property is carried out gradually. In England it is being done largely at the expense of American taxpayers, through ECA and Government loans. How do you like that?

All the hullabaloo by Republicans in Congress over the manifest intention of the Fair Dealers to impose socialism on the American people is something far more than just politics, as the Fair Dealers would have us believe. Republicans in Congress, and a large segment of the conservative southern Democrats, see plainly the technique being used by the Fair Dealers; they see it, and it frightens them. The socializing technique is not hard to understand, if one has been reading the newspapers and listening to the radio over the past few years.

This technique consists of two parts; first, to persuade the American people that the Federal Government can do better for them the things they hitherto have done for themselves, and second, to tax the American people to the point where they have so little left that they cannot live without Government help.

Everybody is familiar nowadays with the Fair Deal policy of playing off one minority group of the electorate against the others. We see subsidized housing for the few at the expense of the many; we see special favors for some segments of organized labor and severe prosecution in the courts of another; we see tremendoous loans to a few favored businessmen, and what amounts to persecution for others. And we see attempts to regiment the farmers under the guise of so-called production payments, which in the end could be nothing but a dole.

Who is not familiar with the whole rigmarole of subsidies, grants in aid, compensation for this, that, and the other, until one person in every seven today receives money from the Government; much of it money that was not earned and to which the recipient is not entitled. This is the technique by which the American people are being conditioned to believe that the bureaucrats know best, and to accept Government hand-outs as a right instead of as charity.

Most of us are accustomed to think of taxes in terms of the Federal levy on our incomes, both individual and corporate, and in terms of property taxes on our homes and places of business. But these taxes, staggeringly heavy as they are, comprise only a part of the load. As many of us have learned recently, there is a whole field of Federal taxation about which Americans know little. Concealed taxes, we have heard them called. We know of them, but I doubt if few of us know their true extent.

These taxes are almost entirely Federal excise taxes on goods and services. Some of them have existed for many years, and have proved themselves warranted and far from being a burden on the people. Among these are the import duties, called tariffs, which over the years, and have proved themselves and American workmen from cutthroat competition in the American market by cheap labor and its shoddy products from abroad.

But during the war a whole brood of special excise taxes, not only on luxuries, such as furs and jewelry, but on necessities and on necessary services, such as baby powder, women's handbags and luggage, and such as freight charges, passenger fares, telephone and telegraph messages. Republicans are fighting to have these wartime excise taxes repealed, and it looks now as if they have at least, in part, won their point. The New Dealers now hear the protests of the people and are willing to "give" a little.

Miscellaneous internal-revenue receipts for 1949, comprised mostly of excise taxes and excluding customs receipts, amounted to about $8,300,000,000. The American people paid this immense total. For the most part the payment was made in the prices of goods and services

bought. For example, when the housewife last bought a handbag, some baby powder, or made a long-distance call, they were not told that the price they paid included a 20 or 25 percent Federal tax. Thus the tax was concealed from them, the person who actually paid it, so that the dealer, or manufacturer, or the telephone company could pass it along to the Government.

Now this passing along of taxes, which ultimately fall upon the consumer, is another factor in the tremendous burden upon the household budgets. Possibly the householder has failed to consider it. Nevertheless it eats up nearly 12 percent of the family income. Every tax paid by anybody, from the point of production of raw materials, through all the channels of manufacture and distribution, is passed along to the ultimate consumer. This is true also of services, such as rail, highway, and air transportation, communications, and even amusements, such as the movies. The average family of four, with an annual income or take-home pay of $1,800, pays about $267 in hidden taxes each year.

This is true because taxes are a part of production costs of all goods—automobiles, food, clothing, and everything else—and a part also of the costs of rendering services. If those who provide the goods and render the services should fail to pass the taxes along, they soon would be out of business. Therefore it is true that all taxes, in the end, fall upon the individual incomes of the Nation.

Corporations necessarily are not taxpayers, but tax collectors. Or they are taxpayers only in the sense that taxes reduce drastically the dividends they can pay to stockholders. But stockholders are ultimate consumers and taxpayers, too. Nobody wins, except the Federal tax collector.

Here are some figures to illustrate what I mean when I say that hidden taxes, including wartime excises, put one of the biggest dents in the household budget.

When the housewife bought a new Easter bonnet, 150 taxes were included in the price; all of them small, but big in the aggregate. I can make this clear by pointing out that when a woman bought a 21-cent quart of milk yesterday or today, she paid 13 cents for milk and 8 cents in taxes. She paid 75 cents in taxes in the price of the 3-pound dollop of ground steak you bought for $2.25. When a person bought a package of cigarettes, he or she paid 11½ cents in hidden taxes. The ton of coal delivered last week carried in its price at least $5 in taxes. If a person bought a Ford car recently, the price included $700 in taxes.

It would seem to me, from all I have outlined here, that the housewife can be no longer in doubt concerning the importance to them personally, of the failure this year and probably next to balance the Federal Budget. They must realize how disastrous for them personally is the wild extravagance of the Democratic Fair Deal administration. They must understand the technique by which the socialistic Fair Dealers are seeking to harness them and their children forever to the chariot of a ruling bureaucracy, and perhaps in the end to that of a dictator.

The Socialists in Government are busy, Mr. Speaker, teaching us at every turn that we can and must depend upon the Federal Government—big government—for our daily needs. They are busy trying to pauperize us, and thus make us helpless, through excessive taxation. You read in the papers recently that President Truman said any reduction in excise taxes must be made up by an increase in corporate taxes. But corporate taxes are passed along to us, as ultimate consumers; so what is the difference, whether excises are eliminated, if we have to pay just as much anyway? Truman has been called High-Tax Harry, with good reason.

Some Republicans in Congress have prepared a bill to limit the national debt to $257,000,000,000, down from the present statutory limit of $275,000,000,000. The debt now stands at $255,600,000,000. They hope thus eventually to put an end to the current "squandermania" of the Fair Deal Socialists of the administration and in Congress. Such a measure has no chance whatever of passage, unless and until people make themselves heard, with no uncertain voice. I think, indeed, such a measure has no chance unless and until a Republican Congress is elected.

A Proper Steel Inquiry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. KINGSLAND MACY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 26, 1950

Mr. MACY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Iron Age of April 6, 1950, written by Eugene J. Hardy:

THE FEDERAL VIEW—THIS WEEK IN WASHINGTON

Back in 1946 a war-weary Congress put its stamp of approval on the so-called Full Employment Act of 1946. That act, among other things, established the Senate-House Economic Committee, which was supposed to do away with partisanship in economics on Capitol Hill and to lift this most important facet of American life out of the political cockpit.

To say that the committee has failed in this objective is the understatement of the year. As a matter of fact, more bias, more prejudice, and more slanted thinking has come from the Democratic majority of this committee than has been seen around Washington since the days of the Temporary National Economic Committee.

Every now and then some Congressman proposes "an investigation to end all investigations." Such moves are a dime a dozen. Few of them are ever proposed with any other purpose than to gain publicity for the chairman of the investigating group.

Differing from the run-of-the-mill proposal, however, is a resolution (H. J. Res. 446) calling for a continuing study of the steel industry by a bipartisan commission. Its sponsor is Representative W. KINGSLAND MACY, Republican, New York, who is deadly serious about his proposal and says that its purpose is to "eliminate the multitudinous and overlapping investigations of the steel industry and provide the Congress with current, reliable information for its guidance in legislative matters."

This resolution came about as a result of the blueprint for a nationalized steel industry issued by the majority of the Joint Economic Committee, which is headed by Senator O'MAHONEY, Democrat, Wyoming, after that body held 4 days of hearings on last December's steel-price increases. Mr. MACY was alarmed at the biased implications of this document, particularly since his study of steel industry pricing practices during the "gray market" period in 1948 came up conclusions diametrically opposed to those reached by Senator O'MAHONEY and the Democratic members of the joint committee. The New Yorker has also studied the various reports emanating from a variety of congressional committees that have been probing the steel industry for several decades and was impressed at the wide divergence of views.

The bipartisan commission, Mr. MACY feels could do an effective job, largely because its chairman would not be a Member of Congress, but would be selected by the House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee. Two of the members would be appointed by the President of the Senate from the membership and the remaining two would be selected by the Speaker of the House also from the membership. One Member from each House would be from each of the two major political parties.

For the chairman's post, Mr. MACY envisages a man of the elder-statesman type, preferably with industrial and governmental experience, who can command the respect of both political parties.

The Commission would be empowered to hire experts and to draw on existing agencies of Government for staff personnel. In Mr. MACY's view, the members of the Commission would act as an administrative and interpretative body, evaluating for the Congress the information prepared by the staff.

In addition to conducting a continuing study of the steel industry the Commission would make special investigations, inquiries, and surveys relative to the steel industry as the Congress may see fit to request. In other words, the Commission would be sole congressional authority on matters relating to steel.

While the chances of approval for this resolution are slim during the present session of Congress, Mr. MACY is not going to let his proposal for a bipartisan Commission wither on the vine. He feels that by constantly keeping the issue alive and before the Congress, Senator O'MAHONEY and others who prejudge the facts might be a little more objective.

Still, there is some sentiment for studies and investigations being conducted along Canadian and British lines where the facts are developed in closed hearings without displaying the matter at hand in public before there is anything to go on. This was evidenced on the Senate floor last week during debate on the charges brought by Senator MCCARTHY, Republican, of Wisconsin, concerning Communists in the State Department.

Development of facts outside the political arena before reaching conclusions that inevitably have political significance is exactly what Mr. MACY wants to achieve. He is hoping for a single unbiased bipartisan source of information on steel which would halt the many conflicting reports that constantly flow from various congressional committees. Senator O'MAHONEY says that Government controls are needed, that the steel industry has

no regard for the public interest in fixing its policies, and that there is no competition in steel.

Still, by digging into reports on steel issued during the Eightieth and Eighty-first Congresses, "the steel subcommittee is opposed to the reimposition of wartime Government allocations and priorities upon the steel industry."

Subcommittee on questionable trade practices of House Public Works Committee, Eightieth Congress: After a 9-month investigation of steel "gray market," this group reported to Congress that "in spite of the rather general abuse leveled at the large steel producers of this country, they have, as a general over-all proposition, achieved excellent results from the standpoint of production and distribution." The committee found no evidence of disregard for the public in the industry's pricing policies.

Steel Subcommittee of Senate Small Business Committee, Eighty-first Congress: "The three classes of steel producers, integrated, semi-integrated, and nonintegrated, are in competition in the sale of finished steel and in many end products made from steel. When there are adequate supplies of pig iron, scrap, and raw steel the smaller producers can meet their powerful integrated competitors on a reasonably equal footing.

All of these committees conducted lengthy investigations before reaching their conclusions. Senator O'MAHONEY held 4 days of public hearings and announced his conclusions 5 weeks before the hearings opened. Could there be any better proof of the need for a Commission such as that proposed by Mr. MACY.

McNeil Island Penitentiary, Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1950

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include one of three stories dealing with the United States Penitentiary at McNeil Island in the State of Washington. This is the oldest Federal institution of its kind in the Nation. Mr. Ralph W. Cowden, the author of three stories concerning the Federal prison, tells of its founding and growth, and of the work done in attempting the rehabilitation of prisoners.

OLDEST FEDERAL PRISON ON MCNEIL ISLAND—PENITENTIARY SITE ACQUIRED IN 1870

(By Ralph W. Cowden)

McNeil Island was named by Captain Wilkes during his expedition of 1841 in honor of Capt. Henry McNeill, of the famous British steamer *Beaver*. Attempts were made to change the name, but it was restored in 1847, minus the one "l." Captain McNeill was a Yankee born in Boston in 1803.

After resisting the Hudson's Bay Company, in 1832, he sold his brig *Lama* to the company and entered its employ, where he rose to the rank of chief factor. On December 24, 1824, John Work, of the Hudson's Bay Company, wrote: "Embarked a little after 4 o'clock in the morning and camped at Sinoughton's, our guide's village, which is called Chilacoom."

One of the most famous pioneers was the first white resident of the island. Ezra Meeker staked a claim there just prior to his leaving in June 1853 to bring his wife and child from their first cabin home at what is now Kalama. After arriving at Steilacoom, he paddled the 3 miles to McNeil Island, but found no trace of his older brother, Oliver, nor of the cabin which was to have been built. He retraced his strokes to Steilacoom, found the boat which his brother had built, located their provisions, and took his family to McNeil Island.

Oliver, who had been working near Steilacoom, appeared, and they built a cabin 18 feet by 18 feet. It was only 7 feet in the highest place, as they ran out of logs, and a storm was expected. The cabin was located near the shore, in sight of Steilacoom, in the proximity of the present penitentiary shipyards. Norwich Man, an Indian, was one of their neighbors.

Meeker was something of a poet at heart, and the grandeur of the view from his cabin, with the sun rising from snow-hooded Mount Rainier, probably determined his location at McNeil. He had ample opportunity to select an ideal spot, as he and Oliver had spent several months touring the Puget Sound area with that in mind. For the greater part of a century, McNeil was the common overnight stopping-over point for travelers on the sound.

AIDED CARAVAN

In September 1854, the Meekers received word that his parental family were members of a caravan of immigrants in distress across the mountains. Ezra left his family under the watchful care of Dr. Webber who lived in Steilacoom and used his field glasses to check the cabin. Dr. Webber had an Indian woman make regular trips to check on the health and necessities of the family.

Meeker took the short-cut over Natchez Pass, and guided the desperate party back over what has become Washington's historical road No. 1. So McNeil Island is rightfully the terminus of this route. Many hazards were overcome on that famous journey. Wagons were lowered over sheer precipices after shooting precious cattle to obtain rawhide. Tunnels were excavated under huge fallen trees to let the wagons pass.

Ezra tried to convince his father to file a claim here, but was overruled, as the elder Meeker thought the soil was too light. He persuaded Ezra to settle some 4 miles from Fort Steilacoom. Ezra makes mention of his brother's claim to Anderson Island, but the only Meeker claims recorded in Olympia prior to statehood were:

Ezra and wife, Fern Hill, 1885.

Jacob R. and wife, Tacoma, 1855.

O. P. widow and heirs, Parkland, 1855.

Thus it appears that Ezra's claim on McNeil Island was never filed.

Steilacoom at that time was the largest city in Washington, and was the fur-trading and lumber center of Puget Sound, as well as the county seat of Pierce County. It was not uncommon to see ships of half a dozen nations moored in her harbors at one time. Capt. Lafalette Balch founded the town in 1850 by erecting a store and trading center. Settlers had lived in the area for a number of years despite protests from the Hudson's Bay Company, Nicholas DeLin built a barrel factory, a sawmill, a brewery, and a salmon-packing plant there between 1852 and 1854. Shipbuilding became a principal industry.

Balch was a member of the council in the first Territorial legislature, but was a poor politician. Plans for removing the capitol from Olympia to Steilacoom were discussed all during the session, but Balch felt so sure of his game that he did not press for vote before the recess. Mr. Denny says that a clear majority was in favor of it in both houses. Balch offended other members, and when the legislature reconvened, he had lost his majority. Another serious blow came to Steilacoom when the Northern Pacific Railway decided that its terminus should be in Tacoma, instead of the former city. Tacoma grew rapidly and the county seat moved there.

The first issue of the Steilacoom Republican, in 1857, announced the following then-prevailing prices: beef, fresh, 15 cents per pound; pork, 12½ cents; butter, 63 cents; coffee, 18½ cents; sugar, No. 1 China, 17 cents; No. 2, 15 cents; whisky, $1 to $2 per gallon; brandy, $2; lumber, $11 and $12; shingles, $6.

School district No. 51 was organized in 1888 and a part of the original building is still in use. Two terms of school were held in the Anderson residence just above Julian's store before the building on the school section was erected. (The plant and grounds had a recent face lifting and a new community house, including school, is now under construction.) A second school district, No. 103, was organized in 1905, and a junior high school was incorporated the following year.

TERRITORIAL JAIL

Congress made provision for the erection of a territorial jail, which was to become the first Federal penitentiary, by an act of January 22, 1867. In 1870 the agent of the attorney general delegated to choose the place for this penitentiary was compelled to journey via steamer to the Isthmus of Panama, traverse the treacherous jungles to the Pacific side and take a steamer to San Francisco. There he boarded another vessel which carried him to Portland, where he changed to a sternwheel river steamer for passage to what is now Kelso. From that point he traveled by stage to Olympia and thence to Fort Steilacoom via bateau, a flat-bottom boat of the period. Fort Steilacoom was then a thriving village and now is the site of the Western Washington Hospital.

The agent of the Attorney General, following his arrival, consulted with the Federal judges of the area, then holding court in Washington Territory, as to a proper place for the proposed penitentiary. Citizens of the Territory were appointed to select a suitable site. They worked to favor Steilacoom by locating there, but the claims of the Puget Sound Agricultural Company, a subsidiary of the Hudson's Bay Company, to all lands in that vicinity, had not been fully adjusted. A Mr. Gove, who was half owner of what is now Ketron Island, offered to sell his portion of that island to the United States for a nominal sum. It was deemed necessary that the entire island should be acquired, and the owner of the remaining acreage was brought into the negotiation. This owner, a lady living in California, demanded a sum for her half which was deemed exorbitant. Efforts to persuade her to take a lesser price for her holdings failed, and the negotiations fell through.

At this critical point came a settler from McNeil Island who offered to give the Attorney General's representative a tract of land, approximately 27 acres, which now is the site of the main buildings of this prison. Perhaps the search for an available island had been an onerous task and had exhausted the patience of the judges who were very busy officials in those days—in any event the offer was accepted and, to make the transfer binding, the sum of $100 was paid in exchange for the deed. The deed covering the site of the present penitentiary was registered in what was then known as New Tacoma, Pierce County, Washington Territory, on September 17, 1870, and conveyed 27.27 acres of land from James Emons Smith to the United States of America. This acreage constituted the entire penitentiary site until 1904 when additional land was acquired as well as easement of tidelands from the State of Washington.

In this connection it is interesting to note that what is now the site of the ball diamond (Babe Ruth Field), the laundry, powerhouse, cannery, and fire station, was an arm of the sound with a depth of approximately 11 feet

at low tide. This was filled in during the years of 1905–06 and added considerable acreage to the institution but deprived it of what might have developed into a perfected cove which would have been eminently suitable for docking facilities.

The contract to construct the first buildings was let to Issac Ellis of Olympia, in April 1873. His bid was for $37,800 and the contract called for the erection of a cell house of brick and stone with wood roof to contain 38 double cells; and an adjacent frame building which was to house the guard force consisting of two men, and an occasional woman prisoner. There were three at one period in the entire history of the institution. An enormous spring was one of the considerations that led to the choice of the site.

OREGONIAN FIRST PRISONER

There is a slight variance of opinion as to when the first prisoner was received. Records available show that prisoner No. 1 was a half-breed born at French Prairie, Oreg. He received a sentence of 20 months for selling liquor to the Indians and was admitted to the penitentiary on May 29, 1875. He was delivered by United States Marshal E. F. Kerney together with two other prisoners. During the remainder of that year only seven additional prisoners were received.

Many famous names in the legal annals of Washington Territory are to be found in the early record books of sentencing judges. Chief among them is that of Melvile W. Fuller, then United States circuit judge and later Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States. The names of Judges Hoyt, Green, Wingard, Turner, and the famous (Hawkeye) Lewis occur with frequency. Their sentences were more often than otherwise severe, even as compared with modern sentences and the offender who sold liquor to the Indians was most severely dealt with. The majority of prisoners incarcerated in the penitentiary in the early days of its existence seemed to have been what was known as squaw men, mostly French half-breeds.

During the early days of the prison the officer in charge was the United States marshal for Washington Territory. Again many names appear which were famous in the annals of the early Territorial history. Among them are Charles Hopkins, the elder, and his son C. B. Hopkins. Tom Brown and James Drake were also early Federal peace officers in the Territory. During the term of United States Marshal Brown all fees were abolished and that official was placed on straight salary basis. Federal courts were held in various sections of Washington Territory at stated intervals and it was possible for the marshal to be in attendance at practically all of them. Frequent entries in the old record books show that the United States marshal not only appointed the guards for this penitentiary but delivered prisoners and witnesses for safekeeping.

Many colorful pages in the early history of Washington Territory are revealed in the old penitentiary records. The famous case of the sailing ship *Challenger* appears, in which the captain and two mates were accused of brutality to the crew. The record shows the admittance of the mates pending trial and of the crew as witnesses. Nothing is shown which would indicate that the mates and crew were kept separate but the record does show that one of the crew was later convicted of perjury. The captain was finally acquitted and the two mates received sentences of 5 years and 6 months and 4 years and 9 months, respectively. One of the mates was later unconditionally pardoned by President Cleveland.

EARLY DAY STEAMERS

Prisoners were transferred to and from Port Townsend, Olympia, Seattle, and New Tacoma via sternwheel steamers, many of them the property of the Oregon Steam Navigation Co. Many of these boats, famous in the history of Puget Sound navigation, appear in the records as making McNeil Island a regular port of call. Some of them were the *Fair Messenger, Multnomah, George W. Hayward, Zephyr,* and *Rip Van Winkle.* In this connection Capt. Neil Henly recounts the fact that many times it was impossible to land prisoners from the steamers by small boat and that the marshal in charge was compelled to take them to Olympia and make the return trip to McNeil. Once on the island the same difficulty was often experienced in leaving; the marshal being compelled to remain as guest of the guards for several days at a time when the sound was particularly rough. Captain Henly very nearly lost his life in one attempt to reach Steilacoom in an open boat during the period.

In classifying new arrivals at the penitentiary many novel rules evidently were followed. In recording the religion of prisoners, the Chinaman invariably was classified as a heathen. Many odd and descriptive names appear, such as Blackbeard Indian, presumably for want of an interpreter or more accurate records. The sentences recorded during the first year of the institution's existence ranged from 7 years for manslaughter to 30 days for selling liquor to Indians.

Witnesses in default of bail, also were confined at the McNeil Island Penitentiary as well as all men waiting action at the hands of the grand jury or pending trial. From the day the prisoner was received a policy of hard work was followed in which all prisoners participated, regardless of the fact that they were witnesses, awaiting trial, or under sentence of the court. It would appear that a similar policy was maintained concerning visitors. The prison log for October 4, 1878, contains the following notation: "The weather is bad most of the time now, Snohomish Peter's wife, mother, and daughter arrived today. The weather is so bad they are all confined to the prison for the next few days, cutting and piling firewood whenever the weather permits."

The Attorney General provided no money for other than actual expenses for food for prisoners and clothing for men serving sentences. Tobacco was not supplied and as the majority of prisoners were penniless it became necessary to devise some means whereby funds could be provided for the purchase of tobacco and other small necessities, such as soap and matches. Captain Henly, who was appointed as a guard January 11, 1883, recounts that a plan was at last formed whereby timber was purchased and shingles made by the prisoners. These shingles were sold and the price of the timber was deducted and the remainder of the proceeds were applied to a prisoners' fund. The net results were small but the work kept the prisoners busy and well supplied with tobacco, also out of mischief.

During the administration of United States Marshal C. B. Hopkins in 1905, the penitentiary was turned over to the Attorney General to be administered directly by him through a warden of his appointment. At approximately the same time a report of the Attorney General then in office announced that the United States penitentiary at McNeil Island would be used as a place of confinement for all Federal prisoners sentenced on the Pacific coast and in Alaska. This policy was carried out and it soon became necessary to add both acreage and housing facilities. To meet this demand the present No. 2 cell house was erected in 1907 containing 66 double cells. This added accommodation was erected and continually taxed to its capacity until the erection of an additional cell house was completed in 1921.

MARSHAL BUSY MAN

Captain Henly, who was an officer of this prison for many years, and in 1882 a deputy United States marshal, is authority for the statement that the marshal of those days did not have an office but that his headquarters were wherever he happened to lay his hat, or in his hotel room. In fact, prior to the abolishment of the fee system, it was the custom for the marshal personally to serve papers, make arrests, and deliver prisoners to both the various ports and to the penitentiary, as necessity required. In this manner he saved the employment of numerous deputies with whom he would have had to share his fee.

The captain's reminiscences of the penitentiary in early days are varied and interesting. For a long time another guard and himself were in full charge of all prisoners confined here, numbering as many as 30. The cellhouse had a wooden roof which offered but little resistance to a prisoner determined to escape; therefore, when the prisoners were not locked in their cells they were out in the field, working in the garden or making shingles.

The only means of communication with Steilacoom was by rowboat and as Captain Henly was usually called upon to furnish the motive power for its operation, he decided that a sailing vessel would afford a solution to his particular difficulties. He enlisted the assistance of the two deep water mates confined and constructed a sloop of some 30 feet in length which proved successful from every standpoint. Later with three Federal judges who had completed an inspection of the institution, the captain negotiated the 3 miles between the penitentiary and Steilacoom in 18 minutes with a spanking breeze. In later years Captain Henly constructed three power boats which have seen much service at the institution. Captain Henly remained in the prison service until 1923.

Charles Julian came to McNeil in 1882. He cleared land, built roads and had the postoffice of Gertrude established. He duplicated, in a larger way, the work of Bengt Johnson on Anderson Island. Julian's Bay later came to be known as Still Harbor. The only earlier homesteaders on the island at the time were the Charles McCain and John Holmes families. But there was an influx of pioneers a short time later. Gustov Nelson came in 1886, working in a brickyard, and later bought and improved a farm. Peter Goldseth settled just west of the penitentiary site, and his wife Margaret became the first "Bee" postmaster. J. P. McCain operated the first store on the island, which was located on a corner of the penitentiary tract. Other early residents included the Grossmans, Ben Harriman, Joe Floyd, the Cammons, the Knox family, and the Wards. Eric Ryberg bought a timber tract in 1890 and donated land for the cemetery site. A Swedish Lutheran church was established on the island in 1897.

McNeil Island Penitentiary, Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1950

Mr. TOLLEFSON, Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the second of three stories written by Ralph W. Cowden on the founding and development of McNeil Island Penitentiary in the State of Washington:

BIG GROWTH MADE BY MCNEIL PENITENTIARY—ENTIRE ISLAND NOW BELONGS TO PRISON

(By Ralph W. Cowden)

McNeil island is the site of the oldest Federal prison, but it has kept abreast of the times in improvements, and in aims it is excelled by none.

Three quarters of a century ago, it was a Federal jail for prisoners in the newly organized Washington territory. The inmates were mostly prisoners who had become involved in illicit traffic with Indians, and seamen who had run afoul of the law. Prisoners, as well as supplies, were brought to the island via rowboat, and for many years the bath line took place in a wooden barrel, in water heated over hot rocks.

In 1924 the penitentiary had grown to be an institution of some 400, but was simply an overcrowded place of detention located on the original 27 acres of land. The dining room, No. 2 cellhouse, the laundry and heating plant are the only remaining buildings of that era. Part of the laundry building was then used as a dormitory, and wood was the only fuel.

The institution was becoming cramped when in 1926, State Senator Homer T. Jones facilitated the transfer of the local school section to the penitentiary holdings. The penitentiary farm, in its present location, thus came into being in 1927.

The whole of McNeil island encompasses an area of about 7 square miles. The island is situated in Puget Sound, 15 miles from Olympia, the State capital, and equidistant from Tacoma. The town of Steilacoom, on the mainland, is about 3½ miles from the island. Prison boats make regularly scheduled trips to this point, carrying passengers and mail. Special trips are made to Tacoma and Seattle for freight, as well as to Steilacoom.

BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

The normal capacity of the main institution is 900 men, and the present population is 1,102. Living quarters for inmates are provided in three cell blocks, an honor dormitory, and an admission and orientation unit. The modern hospital has a capacity of 80 beds. The 700-seat auditorium, built by the inmates, is one of the finest in the Federal prison service. The main kitchen is undergoing extensive renovation.

The power plant is being enlarged and modernized. A Diesel motor of 800-kilowatt capacity recently was installed, and preparations are well under way for installing a new 1,200 kilowatt turbine. The other buildings are used for various purposes, such as administrative offices, school unit for both academic and vocational classes, chapel, library, laundry, cannery, shipyards, and shops of various kinds.

The old system of securing water from deep wells and springs was discontinued in 1937 when the Butterworth Dam and Reservoir was completed and the pumping system put into operation. All of the water from Eden Creek is filtered and pumped either to the camp, which has two steel tanks, of a total capacity of 550,000 gallons, or to a concrete reservoir above the main institution which has a capacity of 680,000 gallons. A second dam is now being completed, which will insure an adequate water supply for domestic, institutional, irrigative, and industrial uses. The lake so created will cover 100 acres.

M'NEIL CAMP

McNeil Island camp supplanted the penitentiary farm in 1943, and has a normal capacity of 250 inmates. About half of the commitments to McNeil camp are short termers from the courts, and half are received by transfer from the main McNeil institution. Population during the past 4 years has ranged from 280 to 355. The two institutions are most closely integrated. The camp furnishing a large proportion of fresh food, and the main institution furnishing services not available at the camp.

Prior to the war, the penitentiary had maintained a farm population of 90 to 150 inmates, who worked at the farm and were housed and fed there in a modern dormitory consisting of three squad rooms housing 50 men each. The original dormitory and culinary unit and office space comprises the heart of the present unit. There are now three additional cottages of the wartime surplus variety which house 50 men each.

The future holds some very interesting possibilities for the camp at McNeil Island. Orchard and berry development will play an important part in the farm economy and should contribute substantially to the cannery operation as well. Continued land development as recommended by the Soil Conservation Service will contribute to the self-sufficiency of the dairy through more abundant pasture and hay, and enable the establishment and operation of an economical beef venture. Close cooperation with the cannery will enable conserving surpluses. Timber operation will someday become important. The various elements should blend into a closely woven program to give the balance and unity a prison farm should have.

The farm has slightly less than 1,000 acres of cultivated land out of a total of 4,409 acres. Of this total, perhaps 2,000 acres can best be considered forest land, since a fine stand of young fir is general. A recent soil conservation survey indicates about 600 acres favorable for production may be cleared and put into cropland. Land clearing provides productive winter work for the inmates and is a stabilizing influence on the work program. Practically all the acreage yet to be reclaimed will be devoted to pasture, forage, and small-grain production.

BIG ORCHARD PLANNED

The orchard and berry program is quite ambitious, with 300 acres devoted to this feature. Two hundred acres of this total are in young orchard that will need several years to reach full productivity. At that time about 65 acres of old orchards, scattered about the island, will have passed their usefulness, and will be removed. This will leave a solid block of over 200 acres of productive fruit to effect the maximum operating economy. This orchard can be irrigated with facilities now available. Trees being grown include apples, peaches, prunes, sweet and sour cherries, pears, and apricots.

The garden operation is quite sizable, with up to 80 acres devoted to it. Most of this is irrigated as needed with portable equipment from permanent underground installations. The chief handicap to the garden operation, is unfavorably contoured land, a condition to be improved by clearing and developing adjacent areas.

The hog and poultry features provide pork and eggs to fill institutional requirements. Yearly pork production is around 500 head.

The dairy unit on McNeil Island has developed from a mediocre beginning to a herd of 67 high-grade milking cows. The first bulls with any important background that were used were loaned by the Department of Agriculture, and came from the Huntley, Mont., experiment station. In 1940 a bull was purchased from Carnation Farms and since that time several others have been obtained from the same source. Then, too, three bulls were supplied from other institutions—one from LaTuna and two from Terre Haute.

In 1940 the herd reached its highest average production, and was at the top of the list for institution dairy herds.

During the war years and since, production has been declining, due to the feed situation and shortage of money for purchases of feed. The only purchased animals in the herd have been the bulls, until recently, when, through the efforts of Director Bennett and Warden Squier, nine purebred heifers were purchased from Carnation Farms.

INDUSTRIES OF PRISON

Prison industries comprise four units: A cannery, a furniture-repair shop, a pallet shop, and a shipyard. A year-round average of some 20 percent of the inmate population is employed in this work.

The largest of the industries is the cannery—both in number of employees and in investment. Approximately 67,000 cases of canned goods have been prepared during the past year. The major part of this pack has been for the Army, and the balance has gone to other institutions and other Government agencies.

The cannery is in operation about seven and one-half months of the year, and work is maintained on two shifts for a considerable portion of that time. In off-season, only one-fourth as many men are employed in maintenance and repair work and in shipping.

The pallet shop, which entails the second largest industry, is presently working on an Army contract. This is operated on a piecework basis and peak production is 685 pallets in 1 day. Twenty-five thousand, four by six-foot heavy equipment pallets, have been completed in the past 6 months, involving the using of over 2,000,000 board feet of lumber and a large quantity of hardware.

The United States penitentiary at McNeil island, commonly known as the "prison without walls," is a laboratory in prison reform.

Prior to 1900, most Federal prisoners were boarded out in county jails. In 1932, with the creation of the Federal Bureau of Prisons, the present program was inaugurated by which prisoners are committed to specific institutions in accordance with their age, the nature of their crime, and previous criminal history; thus was launched the current treatment program looking toward the release of all persons convicted in United States courts.

COMPOSITE M'NEIL PRISONER

A composite type of McNeil island prisoner would show him to be a native-born American, 33 years of age; five feet, seven and three-quarters inches tall and weighing 153 pounds. His physical condition is fair, though his teeth need attention and he will probably elect to have several minor operations performed during his incarceration. He assuredly will gain several pounds before his departure. He is a Protestant who has not attended church in years, and will do so only on a few special occasions while in prison.

He completed the seventh grade in school and will undertake a considerable plan of education while in prison. Surprisingly enough, he will complete a satisfying large proportion of his educational aims. He planned to do a considerable amount of heavy reading after his first inspection of the library but he somehow never does; perhaps three times weekly he will draw works of fiction and his favorite magazines, and let it go at that.

Our average prisoner is married and has fathered one child, though he probably had become semiestranged from his family during the course of his criminal career. He intends, however, to return to his family upon release. His parents are alive and he maintains closer and more uniform contact with them than he did when at liberty. His correspondence has come to assume much importance to him in prison, and he derives his greatest pleasure from his contact with the outside world, receiving about seven letters per month and writing somewhat less than that number.

He was convicted for violation of the Dyer act (he took a stolen car across a State line), was sentenced to 15 months, and thinks his

sentence was pretty severe. He has had one previous conviction for a similar offense and a number of arrests for such misdemeanors as juvenile delinquencies, traffic violations, drunk and disorderliness, et cetera. In the present offense, he pleaded guilty in expectation of clemency, but now believes he might have won an acquittal had he stood trial. He spends a considerable amount of his time pondering his case, wondering if he has grounds for a writ. He will probably not make parole, but will serve 12 months of his sentence, having earned the remaining 90 days as good time for satisfactory behavior. He has an even chance of earning extra good time or money by being assigned to industries, by being recommended for meritorious good time for doing his job especially well, or by being transferred to the McNeil camp.

FEARS TIME LOSS

His disciplinary record in general is good. He affects an elaborate disdain for punishment, actually fearing the loss of his good time more than any other form of disciplinary action. He feels that it is incumbent upon him to express a good-natured cynicism of the prison's administrative policies, while as a matter of fact he is somewhat respectfully impressed by what is being done for him and his mates.

As an individual proven unequal to the obligations of established social order and undismayed by the opinions of his free-world neighbors, he presents an interesting anachronism in the intensity with which he covets, even woos, the respect of his fellow-prisoners. It might be said that the desire for acceptance by his cellmates and companions is a dominant, even a determining factor in the manner of adjustment he is able to make during his prison career.

He spends $4 per month in the commissary, rolls his own cigarettes with issue tobacco, gets by with one razor blade a week. He purchases his own toothbrush—not because the institutionally issued brush isn't good enough, but because it makes him feel more like an individual to have bought his own. He carries a dollar watch; this and a metal nail clipper and a moderately priced fountain pen constitute the extent of his personal estate as a prisoner.

He plays softball and handball, and does nothing at all in alternate, sporadic spurts. He is an inveterate spectator at institutional ball games and at boxing cards. He roots vociferously for the outside team and razzes the federals—but really hopes they will win. He plays dominoes with his cellmates the first part of his sentence and becomes heartily sick of the game before his term is half served. Because of the availability of facilities, he takes more exercise of various sorts than he has since he was a boy; more than he ever will again.

PROUD OF JOB

Our average prisoner is an easy prey for rumor. He will pass on the wildest kind of a story, and yet is impervious to sounder and more conservative information. He exaggerates his exploits and escapades, and sometimes comes to believe the propaganda himself. He works harder in prison than he has ever done previously in life and finds that he likes it. Often he becomes intensely proud of the particular job which is his and is equally quick to resent either interruptions or the disparagement of his fellows. He does good work on his job and takes a somewhat overprotective pride in the importance of his contribution.

He has had few, if any, lodge or club affiliations; he once carried life insurance, but allowed it to lapse, and now possesses little if any property in the outside world. When he arrived at McNeil he brought with him about $15; he receives an average of $4 per month from relatives during his stay.

Though he may be superficially callous, cynical, and without grace, he is actually and inwardly well-meaning, fairly aware of his own shortcomings, willing to be set in the right direction, and eager for a better existence. While he would be the last to admit it, except perhaps to himself, he would like to become what he calls a "square john" and, given the opportunity, would likely become one.

Personally, he is definitely sure that this is his last taste of prison life, and he is no less assured that the life to which he is to be released is a glamorously happy, contented mode of existance.

Unless he takes advantage of the opportunities made available to him in prison, however, he will find himself on the wrong side of the odds, which show that he has more than a 50–50 chance of returning to the fold within 5 years.

McNeil Island Penitentiary, Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1950

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the last of three stories written by Ralph W. Cowden on the founding and development of McNeil Island Penitentiary in the State of Washington:

MCNEIL PRISON HELPS INMATES RENEW HOPE—ERRING MEN GIVEN CHANCE TO REFORM

(By Ralph W. Cowden)

All during the time of its growth and development, the United States penitentiary on McNeil Island has kept abreast the latest methods for the treatment of prisoners with the purpose in view of enabling those sent there to assume responsible positions in society when they are released.

The resocialization of men and women convicted of felonies is no mere matter of incarceration. In the distant past, prisons were exclusively punitive institutions, and the correction and readjustment of the individual was the responsibility of the individual. When a man erred, the law seized him, chastised and branded him, hoped that he and other incipient malefactors would be taught a lesson thereby. His period of isolation rarely had any effect upon him other than to make him a hardened criminal, and apparently had no effect upon prospective offenders. It tended to make the prisoner bitter, mean, and vicious; or bitter, mean, and sly.

An exhaustive study of the situation has been made by leading thinkers and writers during the last three-quarters of a century, and their generalized conclusions are that, to begin with, better-than-traditional types of personnel must be made available to prison work. This was accomplished. Next, living quarters and conditions had to be improved for the men. This is being accomplished, and the Federal Government, with its heavy investment in security institutions, has led the way in adapting old-type structures to more modern beliefs; and in its construction of the past decade has set dramatically progressive standards for the rest of the Nation and the world.

HANDICAPPED AT FIRST

The third factor, treatment, has offered the greatest possibilities and has received the least development. Work and schooling were the first manifestations of activities designed to help the inmate become a better man or woman. Later, embryonic forms of social service made their appearance. The movement was at first handicapped by lack of sound information, by political sabotage, by the misguided efforts of some of its early progenitors, and by public unwillingness to regard improvements on the incarceration principle as anything but faddistic coddling.

In time, however, the importance of an effective treatment program was properly evaluated, and subsequent progress has been rapid and sound.

The Federal Bureau of Prisons has made impressive strides in this direction. Freedom from political fluctuations and the leadership, during crucial inceptive periods, of such men as Sanford Bates, James V. Bennett, and others, has facilitated a slow, gradual, but steady and sound growth of the so-called treatment program. In this category, the bureau has specialized in what might be called a "technique for understanding the individual in the light of his own, as well as society's, best interests." This procedure has necessitated a considerable amount of individual research, a vast computation of records, and an extensive expenditure of time for interviews, correspondence, and other varied, related considerations, but it has paid heavy dividends in better institutional procedures and improved release programs.

The separate phases of the treatment program which the Bureau of Prisons carries on in the interest of both society and the individual in prison are briefly treated under the following headings:

SOCIAL SERVICE

In the Federal institutions, social service is a carefully formulated procedure of dual nature. It serves society and the individual by building up a complete and comprehensive fact picture of the inmate. It serves the individual by performing for him the services which, as a prisoner, he cannot perform for himself. It counsels him on matters of his personal life, it obtains relief and redress for him where these seem indicated, and it acts as intermediary for his dealings with the outside world.

Soon after the inmate arrives at the institution to which he has been committed, he is assigned to a specific social worker who becomes his official intermediary in dealing with the institution or the outside world, such as correspondence with nonrelatives, legal matters, litigation, divorce, and business or financial adjustments. Assisted by the information in the inmate's central file and by not infrequent interviews the social worker comes to know his client, to understand his problems, and to gain insight into his character. In this way, the best possible effect is gained for relationships and attitudes between the institution and the individual.

When the time comes for the inmate's appearance before the parole board, the social worker assists him in preparing his parole plan, which means that he helps him clarify the pattern of life to which he hopes to return, helps him with employment arrangements, helps him to select and secure a satisfactory parole adviser, and assists him in other ways in the formulation of a tentative plan of life that will prove acceptable to the parole board.

One of the principal functions of the social worker is the formation of the dossiers which are the basis for the classification program.

CLASSIFICATION PROGRAM

As has been indicated in the foregoing, treatment is the keynote of Federal penology. Men and women sent to Federal institutions are accorded the specific treatment which meets their needs. In order to formulate and administer this treatment, proper diagnosis must be made. Such diagnosis, in advanced penal practice, is known as classification.

Classification clinics, an integral phase of penal procedure, form the basis and the springboard for all effective rehabilitation.

All committed inmates are, through successive interviews with the social-service unit, exhaustively investigated. Their entire lives are keenly scrutinized for incidents or trends of a revealing nature. Former employers are contacted, relatives, officials, welfare agencies, former wives—all of these are enlisted in the project of creating a complete understanding of the individual. To this mass of information is added the reports and opinions of the chief medical officer of the institution, the psychiatrist, the educational supervisor, and other specialists. All this data is assembled, welded into a coherent entity by the classification section, and presented, within a period of about 30 days, to the institutional classification board.

The committee, composed of the warden, associate wardens, chief medical officer, psychiatrist, supervisor of education, chaplains, and social workers, studies the dossier or admission summary, interviews the individual, and decides upon a pattern of treatment that literally becomes the blueprint for the subject's readjustment to society. Such a pattern is known as the inmate's program, and is not changed in any respect without recourse to the classification clinic.

Factors which the classification board consider are: (1) Custody and supervision; (2) transfer to another institution more suitable to the inmate's needs or requirements; (3) social service; (4) medical and neuropsychiatric treatment; (5) employment and vocational training; (6) education; (7) religious training, and, (8) recreational program.

For instance, it may be indicated that he be programed for a heavy course of education to develop abilities that appear to be incipient. Medical or psychiatric therapy may seem indicated. In these and many other details, the nature of the treatment to be accorded the individual is set up in this fashion and by this committee.

From time to time during the inmate's sentence, when changes of program are required, reappearances before the board are scheduled. Reconsideration may obtain because of the inmate's request or upon the suggestion of one of the board members. Before such recommendations are made, a progress report, detailing information not developed at the time of the first hearing or a change in the subject's attitude or status, is formulated for the use of the committee. Reclassification is frequently ordered after an inmate has applied for parole and been denied.

EDUCATION

No Federal prisoner needs to leave here unimproved mentally. There are day and evening classes, and vocational classes with opportunities for both theory and practice. And there are cell-study, or correspondence courses.

The educational staff is made up of highly trained officers who are specialists in adult education. The civil-service standards are high for any Bureau of Prisons appointment, since leadership qualities are required in every phase of the work. University graduates are not uncommon among the custodial force and a goodly percentage of the new employees served as officers in the last war. The high standards set by the bureau are raising penology to a professional status.

The major objectives of the bureau with respect to education of prisoners may be summed up as follows:

(a) The education of illiterates and semi-illiterates.

(b) Opportunities for those who have had little formal education to make up for voids in their education background.

(c) Practical trade training for the unskilled.

(d) Provision for "special subjects" (languages, commercial subjects, navigation, et cetera).

(e) Correspondence courses for those who cannot attend classes or who wish to study technical courses not offered in the curriculum.

Vocational training gained an impetus during the war and has hardly slackened. Men so assigned are given practical on-the-job training, and have regular classroom work as well. A few of the subjects listed under this heading include carpentry, plumbing, electricity, machine shop, auto repair, baking, and cooking. And many supplement their work with correspondence studies. Visual education also has an important place.

Religious instruction and services are essential functions of the rehabilitation program. There are full-time Catholic and Protestant chaplains.

The hobby shop affords an opportunity for avocational talents and has developed some highly skilled techniques. Fly tying is the most popular activity, and excellent work is turned out also in leathercraft, woodwork, and in plastics.

The range of intelligence of Federal prisoners parallels very closely that of civilians on the outside, and the ratio of mental disorders is approximately the same, about one-half to three-fourths of 1 percent; however, the rate of subnormal in Federal prisons is about 18 per thousand, while the general population rate is 7 to 11 per thousand. Seven percent use alcohol to excess and 5 percent are addicted to narcotics.

In recent months music has played an increasingly important part in leisure-time activities. There are currently three organizations of this nature making use of the auditorium and stage in rehearsals for vocal and instrumental performances, and all are under the supervision of a correction officer who has a background in music.

Debating and dramatics are also in a period of intensified expansion. For the most part, local talent meets local talent, but occasionally provision is made for visitors to come to the island of an evening to match talents with local boys.

Under the jurisdiction of the supervisor of education also comes the administration of the library and the manyfold morale stimulative and recreational activities.

RECREATION

Wholesome, balanced recreation has a most important contribution to good morale. Every effort is made to afford prisoners with means and opportunities for healthy recreation. The program is broad enough to cover the need of the younger, more active men, and still afford an opportunity for a variety of activities of a less strenuous nature.

A spacious and well-equipped gymnasium affords opportunity for a multiplicity of activities, even during the winter months. A well-directed leadership insures participation by practically all who so desire.

Outdoor activities include baseball, softball, handball, football, tennis, weight-lifting, bag-punching, basketball, horseshoe pitching, and many others.

JOB PLACEMENT

Realizing that a prison program of training in preparation for release to a better life in the free world was useless unless the man was able to find gainful employment upon his release, the Bureau of Prisons in recent years has set up an employment-placement office in several of its institutions spotted in various sections of the United States. Since 1944, McNeil Island has had a unit of this service designed to assist into free-world employment men who were unable to make the proper occupational adjustment on their own initiative.

The relationship between the job-placement service and businessmen or employers is one of frankness and hard-headed common sense. The prospective employer is offered men with qualifications that he can use, and is shown how these men could be valuable. With the inmate's consent, the prospective employer is furnished a complete description of the man the placement bureau wishes to sell him, an abstract which includes his picture, dressed in civilian clothes, and all details of his training as well as the facts of his criminal career. The job placement bureau enjoyed immediate and growing success despite handicaps with which it was faced.

Not in every case is the employment office able to secure satisfactory employment for releases, nor do a majority of the men released seek the aid of this service. During the time this office has been in existence, complete authentic records as to the number of men who have sought its services is not complete, but records which indicate that in the five and a half years that this service has been available, a total of 637 men have had jobs secured for them immediately prior to their release to the free world.

Keep the Air Waves Free

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I believe it is generally agreed by the Members of Congress that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD should not be used by a party to a pending law suit as a forum in which to present his one-sided view of the case. Yet we find in the Appendix of the RECORD on page A2826 the insertion of a statement by one Hugh Fulton, counsel for George A. Richards, who is currently involved in a hearing before the Federal Communications Commission on the matter of renewing licenses for three important radio stations owned by him.

Needless to say, Mr. Fulton's statement is nothing more nor less than a piece of special pleading without any pretense to objectivity or balance. It deprecates and disparages the testimony of the Government's witnesses, reflects on the integrity of the Government's counsel and it assails the FCC for having the temerity to bring charges against Mr. Fulton's client.

There is no doubt in my mind that if this hearing were judicial rather than administrative in character, Mr. Fulton's conduct in preparing this statement for publication would constitute at least a violation of the code of ethics which Fulton, as a lawyer, is sworn to observe. More than that, in a judicial proceeding it would be contempt of court.

In the interest of fairness, I am undertaking to present the real issues in the case which Mr. Fulton has deliberately evaded so that the account in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will truly be balanced.

In 1948, the Radio News Club of Los Angeles, a professional association of radio newscasters, filed charges against George A. Richards, owner of Station KMPC in Los Angeles, alleging that Richards had threatened to discharge news reporters who refused to distort the news in accordance with his wishes and that on at least one occasion he did discharge a news reporter for failing to present the news as directed by

Richards. After preliminary investigation, the FCC ordered a hearing on the charges and directed its trial examiner to report on the following issues:

1. To determine the extent, if any, that G. A. Richards issued instructions or directives to officers or employees of said licensees—

(a) To present news broadcasts in a manner designed to give a biased or a one-sided presentation of the news;

(b) To broadcast as news, items which were not known to have any basis in fact concerning particular issues or persons;

(c) To broadcast editorials of daily newspapers as news items without identification of such editorials as such;

(d) To discriminate in news and other programs in favor of particular political causes, groups, or candidates as against the interests of other political causes, groups, or candidates;

(e) To discriminate in any manner in the programing of Stations KMPC, WJR, and WGAR, in favor of the private, political, social, and economic views and interests of G. A. Richards.

2. To determine the extent, if any, officers or employees refused to carry out instructions or directives, if any, of the nature specified in Issue No. 1, and what disciplinary action, if any, was taken or caused to be taken by G. A. Richards against any officers or employees who may have refused to carry out such instructions and directives.

3. To determine the extent, if any, the facilities of said stations, or any of them, have been used to carry out said instructions or directives.

4. To determine, in the light of the information adduced pursuant to Issues 1, 2, and 3, above, whether the licensee corporations are qualified to continue as licensees of stations KMPC, WJR, and WGAR.

Hearings opened in Los Angeles on March 23 and counsel for the Commission presented 23 witnesses who testified that they had been ordered by Richards to slant and distort the news against political groups, religious groups, and one of America's greatest families. There is no need to prejudge this evidence, but I cannot escape the feeling that if this evidence is, as charged by Fulton, thin and unsubstantial, Fulton would not be trying the case in the newspapers and would not be so worried about putting his own client and witnesses on the stand.

I have confidence that the FCC will try this case fairly and decide it fairly, in accordance with its rules and the applicable law. I should like to add as an example of objective analysis of the case the following editorial from the New York Times of March 18, entitled "Freedom of the Air Waves," and a news story from the Hollywood Reporter of April 4, quoting a resolution proposed by H. V. Kaltenborn and adopted by the Association of Radio News Analysts:

FREEDOM OF THE AIR WAVES

The Federal Communications Commission opened hearings in California this week to determine whether broadcasting licenses will be renewed for George A. Richards, owner of three of the country's most powerful radio transmitters, including KMPC in Los Angeles. Mr. Richards is accused of ordering news broadcasts over KMPC to be so grossly distorted that doubt has been cast on his fitness to hold a license to operate a radio station.

Judgment must be withheld on the merits of Mr. Richards' case until all the evidence is in; suffice it to say that his attorneys deny the charge and maintain that he faces revocation of his licenses because of his anti-administration political views.

The importance of the case lies in the question whether or not the FCC has the right to deprive Mr. Richards of his license, granting the assumption that all the charges are true. It lies in the question whether this would or would not constitute censorship over the expression of political views. This newspaper (which is also the owner of a radio station) believes that, if the charges are proved, the FCC would be justified in refusing to renew the license.

Use of the airwaves for an expression of an opinion or any other purpose is fundamentally different from the point of the printing press or of a soapbox on the street corner, because there is a definite physical limitation to the number of wave bands and the strength of transmitters which can be employed for radio broadcasts if hopeless confusion of sound is to be avoided. This is a unique characteristic of radio, as the Supreme Court has noted. It forms the proper basis for at least a minimum degree of Federal control.

The question then becomes: to what extent shall this control be exercised, particularly in respect to political controversies? Broadly speaking, the FCC's attitude is that radio stations have the duty of providing equal time for the presentation of both sides. That seems fair enough. But the Los Angeles case presents a new wrinkle, or at least one that has not yet been ironed out. Here the broadcaster has been accused of presenting a political viewpoint disguised as news. While it has been clearly established that "opinion" on the air shall be answered with an equal amount of time for "counter opinion," what does one do when it is offered not as opinion at all but under the cloak of news? To us, the logic seems inescapable that the purveyor of this form of radio "news" is offering goods under false pretense and is not operating his station in the public interest, which is one of the standards established in the Communications Act. We see no reason why the FCC should not in such a case deny him a license, which could then be granted some other applicant more fit to hold one. Obviously the evidence would have to be unmistakable that the deception had been practiced willfully.

It would be silly to deny that many newspapers are guilty of disguising opinion as news every day. Why, then, do we not advocate that they be deprived of the right to publish? We think the answer has already been given. While, of course, there are financial barriers, there is no insuperable physical barrier to the establishment of a newspaper. Anyone can start one if he has the capital, and if not he can publish a broadside or a pamphlet. But the radio waves are limited; and the licensee is of necessity not an entirely free agent but the holder of a special privilege which requires a corresponding degree of restraint enforceable through police action on the part of the FCC acting under Federal statutes as interpreted by the Supreme Court.

NEWS CLUB COMMENDED ON G. A. RICHARDS STAND

NEW YORK.—A resolution proposed by H. V. Kaltenborn of the Association of Radio News Analysts was passed yesterday in praise of the Hollywood Radio News Club for its censuring stand against G. A. Richards' slanting of KMPC news. The resolution read:

"We hereby go on record in support of the efforts of the Radio News Club of Hollywood in trying to secure the presentation of full unbiased news reports. We also endorse any action that will tend to preserve the right of competent news analysts to digest, and interpret the news."

Let me make this clear. I have no interest in this proceeding or in any other proceeding before the FCC. I believe that the Commission was not only entirely justified in instituting that proceeding, but was required by law to do so.

Freedom of thought and of expression requires the elimination from among the radio licensees, of any person who is found guilty of the charges alleged.

No one has the right or the privilege to use the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to browbeat, picket, or threaten any governmental agency while acting in a quasi-judicial capacity.

No one should be accorded the privilege of poisoning the air with opinions, good or bad, under the false guise of news.

Keep the air waves free, free to broadcast news and opinions, but honest and fair and free from poisonous propaganda.

Marshall Plan Aid After 1952?—Yes and No

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am including as part of my remarks a statement by the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] and myself on the question: "Should Marshall plan aid be continued after 1952?" Both statements appeared in the New York Daily Compass on Monday, April 17, 1950:

SHOULD MARSHALL PLAN AID BE CONTINUED AFTER 1952?

YES: URGES FORMATION OF COMMISSION TO STUDY EXTENSION BEYOND 1952

(By Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, Republican, Michigan, Committee on Foreign Relations)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following is the text of the widely discussed letter from Senator VANDENBERG to Paul G. Hoffman, ECA Administrator, which was released to the press a little over 2 weeks ago.)

As you approach your second ECA anniversary next week, I am conscious that you took this critical assignment, in part, as a result of my insistent urging. It is a source of profound regret to me that illness prevents my active participation in current decisions which mean infinitely much, in this connection, to American security and to free peace in a free world. The least I can do is to take advantage of this occasion to say that, in my humble opinion, you and your ECA associates, at home and abroad, have rendered incalculably vital service to our country and its indispensable leadership for liberty. You have paid off in current dividends of freedom.

ECA was launched as an unpartisan enterprise—established by a Republican Congress in full and free cooperation with a Democratic Executive. This working unity typified our finest traditions and our greatest safety in the presence of external hazards to all Americans, regardless of party. You have clung tenaciously to this unparti-

san concept in your administration of ECA. As one citizen to another, I thank you for this service from a grateful heart. United, we stand. Divided we fall. I want America to stand.

It was inevitable that there should have been disappointments in the evolution of these unprecedented programs—as you have been among the first to stress. There is understandable and legitimate debate in many of these aspects. It is our duty, under these programs of self-help and mutual aid, to be as frank about the liabilities as we are about the assets. You would be the last to say that ECA is untouchable.

Western Europe has not moved ahead adequately with the economic integration which is essential to its permanent recovery, including western Germany. There must be sharp improvement in these trends. We confront increasingly obvious limitations upon the domestic resources which we can safely and wisely commit to over-all foreign aid. Furthermore, these resources can no longer ignore or minimize the impact of Communist aggression in the Far East. This is not your problem, but the problem of Congress and the Executive. These are essential subjects for judicial congressional survey in that same factual spirit which must continue to strive to put our country first in our considerations.

But it is equally true that our overriding need is to clearly understand the victories we have won in this cold war, and how we won them; to realize, thankfully, that we have succeeded in helping establish vital zones of freedom where independent governments have survived aggression and subversion which, 2 years ago, threatened to isolate us in an ominously communized world; in a word, to avoid getting so close to the trees that the forest is obscured.

The ECA smoked out Soviet Russia's sinister plan for world dominion—always aimed finally at us. It set up a new type of peaceful cooperation between independent peoples seeking not conquest but honorable survival for liberty under law and for the aspirations by which free men live. It built peaceful sinews into the precious hopes of the United Nations, and of the subsequent North Atlantic community and the peaceful dedications of America. It has made inevitable mistakes which must be rectified. But its tremendous vindication stands clear as crystal on the 1950 map.

In all candor can it be sucessfully denied that ECA has been substantially responsible for reversing the corroding gloom which theatened western civilization 2 years ago, and which might have brought the iron curtain to the very rims of the Atlantic but for this brave adventure? How much is that worth, in liberties and lives and dollars, to our own United States? How much?

Let us not ignore any of the lessons we have learned—emphatically including the lesson that we, and our friends, are engaged in a struggle that is epochal in nature and global in design—emphatically including the lesson that free nations must continue as free nations to work together in closest, practical harmony for the effectual defense of their mutual heritage.

I venture this suggestion. I was one of those who insisted that ECA had to be preceded by the studies of the Harriman Commission, mobilizing the best brains available for consultation, to determine what role is wisest and safest for America, for her own self-interest, in facing the threats of postwar crisis. The ECA was the result. As we approach the statutory end of ECA in 1952, I think it would be well for another such commission, equally unpartisan and equally impeccable in character, to resume independent, advisory studies of our new responsibilities as the world's largest creditor nation and the world's spearhead in the quest of dependable peace. * * *

NO: ECONOMIC INTEGRATION MUST PRECEDE ADDITIONAL UNITED STATES AID

(By Representative LAWRENCE H. SMITH (Republican, Wisconsin), House Committee on Foreign Affairs)

Senator VANDENBERG's statement that Marshall plan aid should be continued beyond 1952 is premature and open to serious question. It is an invitation to recipient countries to rely on the United States for assistance far into the future. It is bad advice. Advocacy of assistance beyond 1952 at this time creates a situation that will be embarrassing to Congress when the present plan expires. Senator VANDENBERG has, in my opinion, rendered a disservice to the people of the United States by prematurely assuring European countries they may expect aid beyond 1952.

When the Marshall plan was first adopted the theory was that our aid should be for the sole purpose of economic rehabilitation. There was a common desire to make the war-torn countries self-supporting by restoring domestic economies to a level comparable to that of the United States in 1952. That was the objective set out in the OEEC report. The fact is that in 2 years of Marshall aid, all of the countries have gone far beyond their prewar level of production, to such a.. extent that in some lines their industrial products are highly competitive with our own. It cannot be denied that their goals have been reached.

The ECA Administrators have always looked beyond the day when economic rehabilitation was an accomplished fact. They have contended that the western European countries should strive for economic integration and for political unification. They have said there could be no real recovery in the absence of those goals. Mr. Paul Hoffman will admit that Europe today is a long way from reaching those objectives. One would assume these countries would be anxious to work together, but even the future is not too hopeful.

Nationalism is on the increase in Europe. That trend is rampant in England. The same is true in Italy and France. Advocates and supporters of the ECA program dreamed of great advantages to the countries of Europe by making them into one big market. They are disillusioned when they view the spirit of nationalism that has developed. They saw the benefits of a vast commercial market where mass-production methods would increase output far beyond a prewar potential, with the result that standards of living would rise to a level comparable to our own.

The present industrial patter, however, is based on nationalistic economies. Industries are propped up to keep them going regardless of their inherent economic disadvantages. Every country in Europe wants a modern sheet steel mill so that it can be self-sufficient in the production of steel goods for its national defense and domestic needs.

Administrators of the present program know what should be done. Mr. Hoffman has spoken frankly about the problem. He wants an integrated economy, yet only a small measure of success has been achieved toward long-range objectives. The outline for integration is clear. All restrictions on the movement of goods and capital across national boundaries must be removed or Government subsidies must be eliminated. Finally factories must be built and operated by private individuals which will insure economy and maximum production.

Political unity is an important part of the program but it is not the function of the United States to impose any such condition upon the ECA countries. The will to do so is up to them.

It is clear to me that American dollars are not the solution to European recovery and integration. Before 1952, the recipient countries must show that they intend to achieve the long-range objectives which they admit are necessary.

In the hearings before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, Mr. Hoffman made it clear that certain things had to be done in western Europe before those countries could expect additional aid. In fact, he was so sure that a new approach was necessary that he had written into the law a provision to earmark $600,000,000, which sum would be set up as a fund to be used as an incentive for these countries in attaining economic integration. He has called this fund the European Payments Union and he says this about it: "To be successful you have got to bring these people along to where they finally make up their minds that this is hard to do but they are going to do it."

I repeat, assistance after 1952 must depend upon the accomplishments of the recipient countries toward economic and political integration. The completing thought is that this is a job these nations must do themselves; they cannot expect American dollars to do it. Senator VANDENBERG has put Congress on the spot.

The National Association of Evangelicals of the United States Organizes To Fight Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY J. LATHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 1950

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, today I received an announcement from the National Association of Evangelicals, which I want to insert in the RECORD, to the effect that it is organizing to fight communism. It is highly gratifying to know that these splendid Americans have been aroused to action. I note also that Dr. Frank B. Gigliotti, a familiar figure in this city, is a delegate to the National Conference to be held in Chicago. Dr. Gigliotti has a long and honorable career in promoting Americanism, both in fraternal and church circles. He is tireless and a crusader for truth, honesty and eternal loyalty to God and Country.

The announcement follows:

THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF EVANGELICALS OF THE UNITED STATES

The National Association of the Evangelicals of the United States, representing a constituency of more than 10,000,000 Protestants, met in Indianapolis, Ind., April 19, 20, 21. Upon its adjournment, the organization instructed its commission on Christian action, composed of Dr. Frederick C. Fowler of the Knoxville Presbyterian Church, Pittsburgh, Pa., national president of the National Association of Evangelicals; Dr. Frank B. Gigliotti of Lemon Grove, Calif., national vice chairman of the commission; Dr. Clyde Taylor, secretary of affairs, of Washington, D. C.; and Dr. Douglas Scott, of Washington, D. C., to take every means at the disposal of the commission to combat all forms of communism, regardless of the name it masquerades under, and to make proper representation in contact with other Christian bodies and national patriotic groups to eradicate this social cancer from among the children of men.

The National Association of Evangelicals went on record sustaining the principle of

private property, and free enterprise. It further instructed the members of the commission on Christian action to carry on a program of education in the principles of Christian social and moral ethics so that the membership at large—who are members of the association, and other citizens throughout the Nation—might know of its position; for it was said, "There is only one way given amongst men whereby they might be saved, and that is, Seek ye first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness, and all these things would be added."

The association went on record condemning the pampering of those that would destroy this Nation as a Christian sovereign people, and would substitute in its place an alien philosophy contrary to Christian principles. Dr. Fowler and Dr. Gigliotti were delegated to be the representatives of the National Association of Evangelicals at the national conference to be held in Chicago May 13, 14, and to cooperate with the 70 national organizations under the sponsorship of the American Legion in framing a program that would alleviate some of the problems that we're facing and work out methods to combat materialistic, atheistic communism that is attending to inseminate its doctrine among our people and the people of the world.

Very truly yours,

CLYDE W. TAYLOR,
Secretary of Affairs

APRIL 26, 1950.

Our Majority Leader

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the Lynn Telegram-News, Lynn, Mass., Sunday, April 23, 1950:

LEADER MCCORMACK LEADS AGAIN

House Majority Leader JOHN W. MCCORMACK again displayed the same quality of leadership in the present Red Russia crisis as he has always shown in matters of legislation and other national emergencies.

On Friday last, Congressman MCCORMACK (Democrat, of Massachusetts) declared in Washington at a press conference that the United States should recall the American Ambassador to Moscow or break off diplomatic relations with Russia in retaliation for the insulting attitude of the Soviet Union.

In a withering attack upon the tactics and attitudes of Red Russia toward the United States and its citizens, forthright leader JOHN MCCORMACK blasted communistic, atheistic Russia in these words:

"I have felt for a long while that the time was rapidly approaching when the United States and other free nations could no longer tolerate the insulting attitude of the Soviet Union and its complete disregard for international law.

"Such constant disregard by the Soviet Union calls for firm action on the part of the United States. It seems to me that the time has arrived when we should either call back our ambassador for a long period of consultation or break off diplomatic relations with Russia."

The ringing words and the stinging rebuke that our Congressman MCCORMACK administered the Soviet leaders for their arrogant rejection of the American demand for indemnity for the loss of an unarmed United States Navy plane, reparations for the lives of 10 American fliers lost in this wanton Russian attack, and proper apologies to this country for this needless attack upon American sovereignty, brought pride again to the hearts of all true Americans.

In typical McCormackian style, the House majority leader timed his blast so as to obtain the greatest value from his speech. We, in Massachusetts, are proud of JOHN W. MCCORMACK. His leadership is effective always. He is a leader who leads. He is a statesman who never fails to sense the need and the time for a statesmanlike utterance.

As long as our Nation has men like Congressman MCCORMACK in the pilot-house, we are confident that our Ship of State will sail serenely through all the shoals and quicksands that beset us through the trickery and treachery of Soviet Red Russia and her satellites.

The Orders of the Postmaster General Curtailing Postal Service Should Be Rescinded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

April 26, 1950

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, the orders of the Postmaster General, curtailing delivery and other essential postal services, to take effect July 1, 1950, would completely demoralize the entire postal service, and are causing the American people much concern.

I sincerely believe that it is to the best interests of the Nation's economy and our people, that the orders be rescinded at once. I have accordingly written the President and the Postmaster General to that effect, urging such rescission. I am inserting copies of my letters in the RECORD, so that the Members of this House may know of my action.

APRIL 25, 1950.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am very much perturbed over the instructions contained in the Postal Bulletin of April 18. The orders of the Postmaster General, which I understand are to take effect July 1, 1950, would, in my opinion, have disastrous effects upon the people and the economy of our Nation.

We have always looked upon our postal service with pride. It has rendered excellent necessary service through the years. It is the one governmental agency which has served all the people in such a way that they have come to rely upon it in their everyday lives. The Postmaster General's orders would reduce the postal service to an inferior agency; delivery of mail would be restricted; business would suffer; magazines, upon which our people rely and look forward to receiving, would be delayed. Parcel post deliveries will also be cut. We know that this program will also mean the reduction in force of postal employees.

There seems to be no justification for this destruction of our fine postal system. Our postal employees deserve commendation—not threats to their livelihood, when we consider the fine record they achieved during the fiscal year 1949. A great many stayed loyal to their post office jobs during the war, instead of turning to private industry, where much higher pay was offered.

The American people as a whole are aghast at the idea of curtailing the service in the Post Office Department. They are raising their voices in protest and are demanding that the Postmaster General's order be rescinded. I respectfully ask that you listen to their pleas, and that you will decide in their favor.

With kindest personal regards.

Sincerely yours,

ISIDORE DOLLINGER,
Member of Congress.

APRIL 25, 1950.

Hon. JESSE M. DONALDSON,
Postmaster General,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DONALDSON: I am writing to protest the instructions contained in the Postal Bulletin of April 18. Your orders, which I understand are to take effect July 1, 1950, would, in my opinion, have disastrous effects upon the people and the economy of our Nation.

We have always looked upon our postal service with great pride. It has rendered excellent necessary service through the years. It is a governmental agency which has served all the people in such a way that they have come to rely upon it in their everyday lives. Your orders would reduce the postal service to an inferior agency; curtailment of mail service would cause much hardship to people and business; our postal employees would suffer through changes in work and reduction in force.

There seems to be no justification for this destruction of our fine postal system. Our postal employees deserve commendation—not threats to their livelihood, when we consider the fine record they achieved during the fiscal year 1949. A great many stayed loyal to their post office jobs during the war, instead of turning to private industry, where much higher pay was offered.

The American people as a whole are aghast at the idea of curtailing the service in the Post Office Department. They are raising their voices in protest and are demanding that your order be rescinded. I ask that you reconsider, and that you retract the order which I feel is unnecessary, and which will cause untold harm.

Sincerely yours,

ISIDORE DOLLINGER,
Member of Congress.

Common Sense About the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, 2 days ago more than two score Members of this House extended greetings to the State of Israel on the second anniversary of its independence. Many of us, in our remarks, pointed out the serious and threatening situation in the Middle East which has arisen as a result of Britain's arming of the Arab states and the recent actions taken by the Arab League in its efforts to undermine the peace of the area and renew its war on Israel.

That same day King Abdullah of Jordan defied the Arab League by annex-

ing the Arab section of Palestine, contrary to the wishes of the Arab League. Only a few weeks ago King Abdullah was on the verge of signing a permanent peace agreement with Israel, when he was stopped by the Arab League through the use of threats and coercion.

The Arab League is playing a nefarious role in the Middle East. I think it is time for the United States and Britain to bring an end to its discredited career in which it excelled as a complete failure and an instigator of bloodshed. I desire to draw the attention of my colleagues to an editorial in the Washington Post today, which is an excellent commentary of the situation in the Middle East, and especially the miserable role of the Arab League. The editorial is as follows:

FULL CIRCLE

It has always been our feeling that Jordan's King Abdullah and the Israelis, if encouraged to do so, would have been able to compose their dispute over Palestine. This at last has been accomplished by the two parties acting alone—but not before gallons of blood have been spilled, the United Nations undermined, Arab-Jews relations embittered, and nearly a million Arabs made homeless. The announcement has just come out of Amman, Jordan's capital, that on Monday the King formally annexed Arab Palestine and the old city of Jerusalem. Thereby Abdullah thumbs his nose at two institutions: The United Nations and the seven-nation Arab League. When the fighting over Palestine had subsided, with Abdullah's Arab Legion and the Israelis sharing Jerusalem, the United Nations, which had let the two fight it out, blandly proposed an international regime as if nothing had happened. As for the benighted Arab League, this group, at its recent conference in Cairo, sought to prevent any disposition of Arab Palestine. It threatened sanctions against any member that took over part or all of Arab Palestine. It further required a return to the partition boundaries of 1947—that is, the General Asembly's resolution which it has all along rejected—as the basis of peace talks with Israel. The decisions would be funny if they did not hide tragedy; time doesn't stand still with the Arab League, it goes back, and the wonder grows that its antics are taken at all seriously.

Yet this has always been the attitude of the nineteenth century British Colonial Office, to whose initiative the Arab League owes its creation. The league was supposed to be a bulwark of the British imperial interest against change as well as communism. It was always more myth than reality. Yet British agents continue to throw dust in the British Government's eyes about its power and solidarity. In the very last debate in the House of Commons Mr. Bevin lavished praise upon this model of impotence and intransigence. The British temperament, however, is not given to treating fiction as fact, and the London Times has just administered a resounding rebuke to the Government for impeding peace-making in the Middle East by shoring up the pretensions and sharing the blind reaction of the Arab League. The only sensible policy, the newspaper says, is Jordan's, namely, to reach a comprehensive understanding with Israel. And the only sensible policy for Britain is "to seek a real understanding among all the countries concerned—including Pakistan, Persia, and Turkey, as well as the Arab States and Israel—instead of looking to the Arab League alone to discharge responsibilities for which its narrow basis and restricted outlook quite unfit it."

Would that all this had been said a long, long time ago. Lack of attention to realities has characterized policy toward Palestine since the onset of the reference of the controversy to the United Nations. The noxious Grand Mufti (who turned up as the evil genius behind the scenes at the Cairo Conference) was regarded as the spokesman for Arab Palestine, his Arab Higher Committee was treated at Lake Success as authority, and the Arab League was looked upon as a combination of martial nations capable of leading a jihad, or holy war. This is the policy that precipitated the blood bath in Palestine. And now the Arab League, flapping a whisk broom as ineffectual as Mrs. Partington's, is gesturing to turn back the clock, and demanding a collective peace with Israel on the basis of the United Nations partition plan of 1947. This it could have had in 1947, but the intervening war has created a new set of actualities, and peace terms, even the UN plan for the internationalization of Jerusalem, must correspond with these actualities. King Abdullah, long frustrated in world capitals in his quest for a practical solution, has now recognized them. His is an act of courage that should be backed in London by stopping its arms traffic (with which alone the Arab League retains the slightest prestige) and in Washington by ending its schizophrenia on the Middle East, and at Lake Success by a withdrawal of the resolution on Jerusalem.

Address of Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HOWARD W. SMITH

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 27, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, anniversaries of recent occurrence have recalled the name of Thomas Jefferson and his many services to the United States. The sesquicentennial celebration of the establishment of the Library of Congress has stressed our continuing indebtedness to him for this great source of intellectual enlightenment. The celebration of Jefferson's own birthday, April 13, 1743, elicited many tributes to the many facets of his genius. I know of no tribute that has so succinctly expressed our general indebtedness to this great American than the one paid by Hon. Louis A. Johnson, Secretary of Defense, at the founder's day celebration of the University of Virginia.

Mr. Speaker, the University of Virginia is Jefferson's own creation. He was its founder and its architect, and he remains the inspiration for the progressive spirit not only of that great university but of other great universities throughout the Nation. Thomas Jefferson believed in education, because he believed that education is a guaranty of democracy, and he believed in democracy because he believed in the people.

It was appropriate that Secretary Johnson, in whose able hands has been placed the responsibility for our national defense, should have quoted from a letter of Thomas Jefferson this statement:

I am persuaded myself that the good sense of the people will always be found to be the best army.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my great faith in the ability and the wisdom of Secretary Johnson, faith indicated by the President himself in his selection of Louis Johnson for his tremendous responsibility. There are many who have attacked him and his program of economy, because they fear he has weakened our defense instead of strengthening it. It is my opinion that such detractors of Louis A. Johnson fail to understand his program of economy and of defense, and fail likewise to share his faith and the faith of Thomas Jefferson in the people.

Our defense plans—

Secretary Johnson said in his stirring address at the University of Virginia—

are not rigid. They are not the laws of the Medes and Persians. They are flexible and adaptable to changing conditions. They are under constant study and review. If we become convinced that our present means are insufficient to meet the exigencies of the day and the probable threats of tomorrow, we shall not be too humble to ask for more; and if we find them more than adequate, we shall not be too proud to ask for less. We shall always seek for truth and we shall take fitting means to meet the truth.

Secretary Johnson is no advocate of a static defense, a static system of education, or a static democracy. The motto on the great hall of the University of Virginia, a verse from the greatest of all books, assures us that if we—"Know the truth* * * the truth shall make (us) free." Secretary Johnson said:

Today in a dynamic world we have reached the pinnacle among nations. We shall retain that leadership only so long as we use the brains and the brawn with which we have been endowed in a way so as to be fully prepared to deter aggression in the first place, to defend ourselves, if need be, and to defeat an aggressor, if he forces war upon us.

Mr. Speaker, more significant, however, than Secretary Johnson's statements about our military defense, and how we shall maintain it, are his words about the more inclusive defense we must maintain if we are to continue to enjoy our democracy in peace. It is in such words that he rises to the wisdom of Jefferson, and to the stature of statesmanship. I wish to quote one more paragraph from this heartening speech that does so much to reassure us about the security of the United States, and the strength of our democracy. Secretary Johnson's words are:

We shall win the struggle to rally humanity for freedom not by any matching of man for man, gun for gun, tank for tank, or plane for plane; not by playing our opponents' game and wrecking our economy through spending ourselves into a depression; and not by giving up our cherished democratic institutions for reactionary militaristic experiments in the regimentation of society. We shall win by proving ourselves qualitatively stronger, in ingenuity, in spirit and in muscle, than any who may contemplate to challenge us. We shall invest prudently in our defense and we shall make every dollar bring a maximum return in protection. We shall stand by our friends overseas. We shall give them economic and military aid to the fullest extent possible when there is a reasonable chance of some favorable gain in the form of more effective mutual defense. We are determined to be strong,

for peace today can be achieved only through strength.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and insert the text of this stirring address, so truly in the spirit and the tradition of Thomas Jefferson, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The address by Secretary Johnson is as follows:

(Remarks by Hon. Louis Johnson, Secretary of Defense, Founder's Day, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Va., Thursday, April 13, 1950)

About 10 days ago I flew back to the United States from the Netherlands. There, at The Hague, I represented the American people at the third meeting of the Defense Committee of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

This was a meeting of equal partners with equal votes, each ready to contribute in accordance with his capabilities toward the strengthening of our common defense. As the strongest of the partners and the one in the best position to help in this vital need, the duty and the responsibilities of leadership in this undertaking on the request of all nations concerned devolved upon the United States. This trust we accepted wholeheartedly in the spirit of a brother more fortunately situated who was eager and determined to work to the utmost of his ability with the other members of the family toward the common aspirations of security, peace, freedom, and prosperity.

As I contemplate the present position of the United States as a leader in the family of nations, there comes to my mind a little known chapter of American history of a visit to the Netherlands in 1788 by the founder of our university whom we have come here to honor today. Then the situation was reversed. The Netherlands nation was strong. We were woefully weak. We had come out of a victorious war with our economy crippled, our finances strained, and our credit shattered. We were operating under the loose Articles of Confederation. The Federal Constitution had been framed but not yet adopted. Our power to raise money was not clearly defined. We desperately needed the sympathy and the help of the Dutch people. We needed funds to tide us over the next critical year or two.

It was under such circumstances that Thomas Jefferson came to Amsterdam to negotiate a loan with the Dutch for 1,000,000 florin, or about $400,000 in the American currency of that day. It was not a big loan, not even for those days, but it was definitely needed by our young country. The Dutch listened to the sincere pleas of Thomas Jefferson and extended credit to our new Nation. About a month later our founder was able to write of his journey to the Netherlands in these terms:

"I had the satisfaction to reflect that by this journey our credit was secured and the new Government was placed at ease for 2 years to come."

I sincerely hope that the results of our March meeting in The Hague in 1950 will give the Dutch people and all of our European friends the same kind of strength, encouragement, and faith that our infant Republic gained as a result of the visit of Thomas Jefferson to Amsterdam in March 1788.

Thomas Jefferson, the "father" of our university, was born on April 13, 1743. In commemoration of that historic event which has meant so much to the hopes and the aspirations of all of mankind, we, his sons and his admirers, have assembled here on this Founder's Day again to express our deep respect for him as a man, our abiding faith in him as a great apostle of democracy, and our heartfelt gratitude to him as an earnest and progressive college president.

Thomas Jefferson, the man, was the Virginia gentleman in the full sense of the word—human, gallant, gracious, generous, hospitable, tolerant, and courageous. He fully comprehended the true significance and the responsibility of noblesse oblige. He devoted himself wholeheartedly to the welfare of his fellow man.

Of Thomas Jefferson the great liberal spirit, there is little that can be added by us to his own great expressions in the Declaration of Independence that he wrote, to the statute of Virginia for religious freedom that he sponsored, and to the Bill of Rights whose inclusion in our Federal Constitution he inspired.

Thomas Jefferson believed in democracy. He knew "no safe depository of the ultimate powers of society but the people themselves." Neither the excesses of the Shay's Rebellion nor of the French Revolution shook his faith in the common sense of the common man. He fully understood the vulnerabilities as well as the strength of democratic government and democratic institutions, but in his sound, logical, and informed way he never faltered in his firm conviction that the surest road to human happiness was paved with the inalienable rights of man.

In times of stress, we find there is sometimes a tendency on the part of some people to lose faith in the democratic process. They say that a democracy debates while a strong ruler decides. They point out that in the name of freedom of speech endless discussion obstructs positive action. They maintain that under the cloak of a free press irresponsbile writers harass and abuse men in public life, and often thwart them in their honorable efforts. These criticisms of democracy are not modern twentieth century developments. Some of our own forefathers had similar misgivings, and, particularly about the ability of a democracy to face a grave crisis. It therefore is not surprising that some of their children may sometimes harbor similar doubts today.

A study of American history, however, and, especially of our successful experience in World War II, should prove conclusively that a democracy can act with vigor under stress and can come out victorious with its institutions unimpaired.

Today we are engaged in what is popularly described as a cold war, and I am confident that the same good sense of the American people under a leader in the Thomas Jefferson tradition, our President, Harry Truman, will continue to prove the innate strength of our American democracy in the face of any storm.

We shall win the struggle to rally humanity for freedom not by any matching of man for man, gun for gun, tank for tank, or plane for plane; not by playing our opponents' game and wrecking our economy through spending ourselves into a depression; and not by giving up our cherished democratic institutions for reactionary militaristic experiments in the regimentation of society. We shall win by proving ourselves qualitatively stronger, in ingenuity, in spirit and in muscle, than any who may contemplate to challenge us. We shall invest prudently in our defense and we shall make every dollar bring a maximum return in protection. We shall stand by our friends overseas. We shall give them economic and military aid to the fullest extent possible when there is a reasonable chance of some favorable gain in the form of more effective mutual defense. We are determined to be strong, for peace today can be achieved only through strength.

But above the physical prowess of our arms there will always stand the innate spiritual quality of our people and their faith in our democratic institutions. That faith was best expressed in a letter by Thomas Jefferson as follows:

"I am persuaded myself that the good sense of the people will always be found to be the best army."

In the same letter that he expressed such faith in the American people, Thomas Jefferson went on to pay his respects to the freedom of the press.

"The basis of our Government being the opinion of the people," he wrote, "the very first object should be to keep that right; and were it left to me to decide whether we should have a government without newspapers, or newspapers without a government, I should not hesitate a moment to prefer the latter. But I should mean that every man should receive those papers, and be capable of reading them * * *."

Such was Thomas Jefferson's faith in the free opinion of mankind. Coupled with this, he was a firm believer in extending and improving facilities for education.

To the memory of Thomas Jefferson, the educator, and the founder of this great university, we have around us physical testimonials in brick and mortar that he personally planned, and a liberal tradition of scholarship, honor, and truth upon which he so stanchly insisted.

Were Thomas Jefferson to return to us today he would be pleased to find in Dr. Colgate Whitehead Darden, Jr., a worthy successor—an outstanding leader who administers this great university in the full spirit of its founding father.

As for the students of our day, I doubt if Thomas Jefferson would find any to excel him in his capacity for work and play. He could read latin, Greek, and French. He was equally at home with higher mathematics and natural sciences. With it all, he always seemed to find time to ride, and dance, and sing. His versatility continued after graduation and his all-around capacity gained him great renown. One of his early biographers described him in his thirties as a gentleman "who could calculate an eclipse, survey an estate, tie an artery, plan an edifice, try a case, break a horse, dance a minuet, and play a violin."

Nor did the education of Thomas Jefferson stop with his college days. In fact, it never stopped. He would have applauded the present educational program of our armed forces for we, too, work on the theory that study does not end with graduation from college, that a diploma from West Point or Annapolis is but the beginning—a first step to qualify a junior officer for advanced training and higher learning.

Thomas Jefferson was deeply interested in the education of military men, and in a sense West Point shares with our own university the claim upon him as its founder. It was he who selected Jonathan Williams to head the institution when the Military Academy was only in the discussion stage. It was he who chose West Point as the site for the Academy. It was upon his insistence that the organic act setting up the Military Academy was passed by the Congress. He interested himself in the selection of the faculty at West Point and was responsible for the choice of Ferdinand B. Hassler, a distinguished Swiss national, to head its mathematics department.

Toward the end of his administration we find Thomas Jefferson pressing for an expansion of the Military Academy and considering its removal to Washington where he hoped "it may render its benefits common to the Naval Department." Evidently Jefferson, even in those early days, was already thinking in terms of cross-service between the

Army and the Navy, and perhaps even of unification itself.

In later years when it was proposed to give to his portrait a place "among the benefactors of our Nation and of the establishment of West Point in particular," Thomas Jefferson modestly wrote as follows:

"I have ever considered the establishment (of West Point) as of major importance to our country, and whatever I could do for it, I viewed myself as performing a duty only. The real debt of the institution is to its able and zealous professors."

In those days the defense of the United States was based on a series of strong forts commanding strategic approaches to our vital areas, and a small mobile force of foot troops, augmented by some cavalry and supported by some artillery. The need for post graduate education either in civilian colleges or even within the services was not fully recognized, though a beginning was made in 1824, 2 years before Jefferson died, when the artillery school was established at Fortress Monroe in our own Virginia.

Today, life in our armed forces is a succession of schools in army posts, on air bases and aboard ships. Officers and enlisted men are continually studying the arms and equipment entrusted to them and learning how to use them to best advantage. The heart and the core of this educational system are the officers and the noncommissioned officers; and to enable them to teach others, they first must learn themselves.

They must learn the tactics and techniques of their own services. They must understand their own capabilities and limitations and those of their sister services. Many of them must qualify for duties in the strategic field which are predicted on the ability to handle problems common to two or more of our services, and to carry out unification missions for the Army, Navy and Air Force. Above all else, officers must be leaders; and they are not always born. Courses in leadership, therefore, are given great emphasis. Our enlisted men with their innate intelligence and practical sense, with their loyalty and their spirit of bravery, are entitled to the best in leadership and we are determined that they will get it.

Leadership in modern war is more than drawing sword and fearlessly galloping off at the head of a troop, though there still is no substitute for that type of courage when necessity demands it. Leadership normally begins with a sense of confidence born out of knowledge and experience, and our armed forces are engaged in seeing to it that its officers acquire both these prerequisites.

Let us see, for instance, how the Army educates its officers. First, a new second lieutenant goes to a basic officers school for courses in subjects common to the Army as a whole. Then he goes to an Infantry, Artillery, Armored Cavalry, or similar school to become indoctrinated in the basic subjects of his branch. Later he attend an advanced school. If he proves particularly outstanding, he may be selected to attend the advanced school of another branch. Sometime between his 7th and 15th year of service he becomes eligible for a course at the General Staff College, and beyond that there is the War College.

From then on, outstanding officers compete with other exceptional men for an opportunity to attend schools conducted on a joint Army, Navy, and Air basis. There is the Armed Forces College, the Industrial College of the Armed Forces and the National War College.

The Navy and the Air Force provide similar educational programs for their officers. All three services send a considerable number of men to civilian colleges and universities for specialized training where many of them qualify for masters' degrees and some of them become doctors of philosophy or science. Right here at the University of Virginia there are 26 Army men studying medicine, law, nuclear physics, international relations, and military geography. There are eight air officers taking up law, political science, physics, and psychology. The distribution among the universities is Nationwide. Let me give a few examples.

Navy men are studying engineering at Michigan, MIT, Princeton, Lehigh, and California. There are Army men studying communications at Illinois, electronics at Pennsylvania, guided missiles at Johns Hopkins, physics at Chicago, journalism at Missouri, law at Harvard, and public administration at Syracuse. And the Air Force has students at Ohio State, Stanford, Wisconsin, Washington, and Yale. These lists are far from complete. I would not have the time to give you all the colleges and all the courses. I hope I have given you enough, however, to indicate the scope and the variety of education followed by the men in the armed forces.

Those who have graduated from the service, GI alumni of the Army, Navy, Marines, and Air Force, are taking full advantage, by the thousands, of the opportunities offered them by a liberal and appreciative Government to continue their studies interrupted by war. There are many of them right here at the university. They will be found on the campus of practically every one of our colleges. Their experience in uniform has given them an added stimulus to learn and a deeper realization of the value of an education for service, both in war and in peace.

There is one aspect worth especial mention at this time. Among those receiving specialized training there are 575 officers of the Army, Navy, including the Marine Corps, and the Air Force, attending business management courses in our universities. That fact illustrates our determination to train our officers to place our military procedures on a business basis—to make every dollar of our appropriation bring us a dollar's worth of defense.

The sole justification for our armed forces is their ability to defend their country. Second only in importance is the requirement that they operate on an efficient basis. Our educational program aims to train men toward the realization of both essential objectives.

Today, in a dynamic world, we have reached the pinnacle among nations. We will retain that leadership only so long as we use the brains and the brawn with which we have been endowed in a way so as to be fully prepared to deter aggression in the first place, to defend ourselves, if need be, and to defeat an aggressor, if he forces war upon us.

I have every confidence in our ultimate success. We shall face facts as they are and shall fit our defense plans and our manpower and munitions requirements to meet them. Our defense plans, however, are not rigid. They are not the laws of Medes and Persians. They are flexible and adaptable to changing conditions. They are under constant study and review. If we become convinced that our present means are insufficient to meet the exigencies of the day and the probable threats of tomorrow, we shall not be too humble to ask for more; and if we find them more than adequate we shall not be too proud to ask for less. We shall always seek for truth and we shall take fitting means to meet the truth.

As an alumnus of this great university I have never lost sight of the quotation from St. John inscribed in Greek here above the columns of Cabell Hall.

"Know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."

Address by William C. Bullitt at the Yale Law School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an address delivered by the Honorable William C. Bullitt at the Yale Law School on April 13, 1950, under the auspices of the Pierson College International Relations Club.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Forty years ago when I was a student at Yale we were all obliged to go to compulsory Sunday chapel—which often meant returning to New Haven by the milk train from parties in New York. Our pain was eased, however, by President Hadley. The visiting preachers would invariably ask him how long they should preach. Hadley invariably would reply: "Your time is, of course, unlimited; but the oldest Yale tradition is that no souls are saved after the first 15 minutes."

At the risk of saving no souls at all, I shall take more than 15 minutes because I want to try to give you an over-all picture of the world situation. When you complete your studies you will step onto a field of battle. All of us wish that were not so; but it is so. And you had better know now what you will face.

Why isn't it reasonable to believe that if we display enough good will we can reach an agreement with Stalin that will give peace to the world? After all, the Soviet Union contains a sixth of the land surface of the earth. It is sparsely populated. It could be developed as our own country was developed between the Civil War and the First World War—peacefully, with a constantly rising standard of living for all its inhabitants. Why doesn't that happen? Isn't the trouble with ourselves? Isn't the Soviet Government afraid of us—legitimately afraid of us?

It is not. The Soviet Government knows better than any other government in the world the exact state of mind of the American Government and the American people. It has plenty of agents and sympathizers in our country to give it the facts, and there is no better informed group of men in the world than the Politburo. The leaders of the Soviet Union know as well as we know that we desire to live in peace with all nations.

One day in 1934 when our Government was attempting to establish cordial relations with the Soviet Government—hoping that a combination of the forces of Great Britain, France, and the Soviet Union might prevent Hitler from making war in Europe and the Japanese militarists from pushing further into China—a number of commissars were having a drink with me at our embassy in Moscow. I showed them the Soviet second reader. In it was a chapter entitled "America." At the head of the chapter was a drawing of starving children working at factory machines in a cellar, while on the floor above fat, bejeweled women and fatter men danced jazz. The text read: "America is a country where children of workers and peasants are forbidden to get an education. They

are forced to work all day at machines in dark cellars, and get nothing to eat but bread, while the rich dance over their heads." I asked the commissars how they expected to educate leaders for the Soviet Union if they taught their children such lies? They laughed and one of them replied: "Have you ever found any one of us that doesn't know the facts?" I answered that I thought they were better informed than the members of any government I knew. The commissar then went on: "It will always be so. We shall educate in special schools leaders who will know the truth, but as for the rest—we shall teach them exactly what it is in the interest of the Soviet Union for them to know."

Stalin and the members of the Politburo have no fear whatsoever that they will be attacked by the United States. They know the facts. The tremendous trumpetings of anti-American propaganda in Soviet schools, plays, movies, books, press, and radio are merely means to drive fear and hatred into the ignorant in order to make them docile instruments of Stalin.

From 1941 to 1947 we tried to appease Stalin. Hopefully we gave him everything he asked. We failed. His appetite remained as great as ever. We failed to appease him then, and we would fail now if we should try again to appease him. We cannot develop friendly relations with the Soviet Government as we could develop such relations with a normal government because we are facing, not a normal government, but a clique of men who, by their own will, deliberately and consciously, have chosen to declare themselves the enemies of all peoples that live in freedom. They are the high priests of a fighting faith which requires of its adherents conquest of the world. The Russian people, who capable of performing prodigies of good, are driven by that privileged and persecuting clique to prodigies of evil. In 1939, Stalin ruled 170,000,000 persons. Today he controls 800,000,000—more than a third of humanity. His objective is conquest of the entire human race. He will not stop. He can only be stopped. We cannot get off this planet. We shall have to stop him or submit to his rule.

To believe that is still possible to appease Stalin, it is necessary to be ignorant both of Soviet history and of the doctrine which inspires the actions of the Communists.

The Communist creed teaches that establishment of Communist dictatorship throughout the earth and abolition of private ownership of the means of production will erase all envy, hatred, and malice from the human heart. It promises that the state will then wither away and that all men will live without a state in perfect happiness. In the name of science, the Communists teach this fantastically unscientific creed to the peoples they control. They educate their children to live by this faith and, if need be, to die for it. A large percentage of the young in the Soviet Union and the Soviet satellite countries have no other creed taught them. So they have faith in the Communist creed and give their lives for it, believing that they are fighting to emancipate all humanity from all evil.

Since the Communists believe this, they are convinced that the highest present moral duty of man is to achieve Communist world dictatorship. This supreme end, they hold, justifies all means for its achievement—all means including the pledged word given and broken, character assassination, torture, murder, and war. They revere the words which Lenin wrote: "It is necessary * * * to use any ruse, cunning, unlawful method, evasion, concealment of truth." They hold as gospel truth his portentous statement: "* * * it is inconceivable that the Soviet Republic should continue for a long period side by side with imperialist states. Ultimately one or the other must conquer. Meanwhile a number of terrible clashes between the Soviet Republic and the bourgeois states is inevitable."

There is not the slightest evidence that Stalin disbelieves in this doctrine which now bears his name as well as the names of Marx and Lenin. Even if he should disbelieve in it, he could not abandon it. For the Marx-Lenin-Stalin creed is the fighting faith which holds the Communists together. Without it the Soviet Union and all other Communist states would disintegrate. Stalin must and will continue to try to conquer the world.

No vice in international affairs is so fatal as the vice of wishful thinking. If we continue to believe that we can appease the unappeasable, we shall not survive. We cannot turn a tiger into a cat by stroking it.

In our short history, we have never had to face any problem as complex as the problem of this Communist assault. The western world once did face a similar problem. The fighting faith of Mahomet overwhelmed the Christian states of the Near East and North Africa and Spain, and the Moslem forces were not stopped until they reached Tours on the Loire not very far from Paris. I do not wish to compare the Moslem religion, which is a noble one, to the Communist creed, which is satanic; but I do wish to point out that in the hundred years between Mahomet's death in 632 and the defeat of the Moslems by Charles Martel in 732, country after country fell before the fighting faith until it seemed that it was irresistible.

The Communist attack is no more irresistible than was the Moslem attack. But to meet it successfuly, we shall need the same faith and courage that the Christians had at Tours. Furthermore, we shall need wisdom. We shall have to be wise in time. And there is not much time. We shall have to grow up quickly, for the burden of defeating the Communist attack has fallen on us at a moment when we are intellectually ill-prepared to carry it. We have always been so occupied with our domestic affairs, so happy in our own continent, that few Americans have taken any long-continued interest in foreign affairs. In consequence, our foreign policies have often been not expressions of our vital interests, but mere spasmodic reactions to the demands of domestic political expediency. The few Americans who have devoted their lives to foreign affairs since 1914 are so exceptional as to be almost oddities. As a nation, we are amateurs in the foreign field. Our leaders play by ear or by hunch. Stalin sits in the Kremlin with the members of his Politburo who compose his general staff for conquest of the world and plans his advances on a world scale as carefully as the commander in chief of an army plans his attacks. Our Government has never prepared an over-all plan of political, economic, and military defense for ourselves and the rest of the free world. Indeed, our administration has not even understood that such a plan is vital. It is not so long ago that President Truman said "I like old Joe."

What should we be doing?

Can we stop Stalin without war? It is not impossible but it will not be easy. For Stalin will not stop unless we keep him constantly confronted by superior force and unless he knows that we will use that force against his direct or indirect aggressions. To stop Stalin without war we must, therefore, have both the superior force and the will, if necessary, to use it.

Do we have the superior force? In 1945 we had the atomic bomb and the world's greatest air force to carry it. Our industrial plant was intact. China, the key to all Asia, was our ally. Stalin had no atomic bomb and no long-range bombing planes. His industrial plant was, in large part, worn out or destroyed. Compared to the Soviet Union we were overwhelmingly strong.

Today Stalin has China as an ally. He has atomic bombs and at least 350 long-range bombers capable of carrying them to any spot in the United States. We have no radar warning net to detect the approach of his planes. We have only a fraction of the number of pursuit planes needed to make effective use of a warning net. The authoritative Finletter Commission in 1948 recommended as a minimum for national security 70 air groups. We have 44. Stalin's total air force outnumbers ours by about 3 to 1. His annual production of war planes is about 3 to our 1. He has 125 army divisions to our 10—among them, 30 armored divisions to our 1. In addition, he has approximately 270 submarines—about 30 of which are of the latest type against which we have not yet produced effective counterweapons. Furthermore, thanks to his agent Fuchs who transmitted to him all our secrets for production of both A-bombs and hydrogen bombs, he may be ahead of us in production of H-bombs.

Moreover, the whole of western Europe is without defense, and everyone in western Europe knows it. Its cities cannot be protected against Soviet atomic bombs except by our Air Force, which today is not strong enough for the task. To oppose the 125 Soviet divisions, the French have 6, the British say they can furnish 1, the Belgians 1. To have a chance to stop the Red army for a few months, the European democracies would need from 50 to 60 divisions. Modern equipment for such a number of divisions would cost from $10,000,000,000 to $20,000,000,000. And military authorities agree that no western European defense system can be effective unless both the western Germans and the Spaniards are included in it.

The balance of military force is swinging so rapidly to the Soviet side that some officials in Washington who have access to secret information believe that Stalin will attack us this autumn. They argue that by August 1950 he will probably have 50 A-bombs—enough to destroy our great cities and our atomic production plants, and thus prevent effective American counterattack. But my belief is that Stalin will not launch shooting war until he is certain that he can defeat us easily. He is a cautious and crafty leader who strikes only when he feels sure of quick victory. This autumn, his first surprise attack might not be successful. We would probably be able to strike back effectively. Therefore, it seems likely that he will not start bombing this year but will go on increasing his military strength faster than we are adding to ours, and seize more peoples, resources, and strategic areas, until he feels that his power is irresistible. We are allowing time to run on his side. And he knows it.

Unless we strengthen quickly our own military forces and those of our allies and prevent further Soviet aggressions, we shall throw away our last chance to keep Stalin confronted by superior force—and shall throw away, therefore, our last chance to stop Stalin without war.

We shall not even be able to defeat Stalin in war unless we build up our strength and that of our allies faster than Stalin is building up the strength of the Soviet Union and its satellites, and unless we stop further direct or indirect Communist aggressions.

At the present moment the Communists are advancing by open warfare in Indochina. If we let Indochina fall, Burma, Siam, and British Malaya—with its vast production of rubber and tin—will also fall. Then it will be India's turn.

At another point, the Communists are making small attacks preparatory to a great attack. The Chinese Communists for some time have been attempting to seize small islands on the way to the great strategic island of Formosa. Formosa is still being

held by the Chinese Nationalist Army which, some weeks ago, gave proof of its good morale by seizing a port on the mainland. If the Chinese Communists should capture Formosa, Stalin's forces would be within 250 miles of the northern Philippines. It was from Formosa that Japan attacked and captured the Philippines. Our Joint Chiefs of Staff, headed by General Bradley, pleaded with President Truman to send munitions and equipment, as well as economic aid to Formosa, and a few American officers to advise regarding defense. Secretary of State Acheson opposed our military leaders, and persuaded President Truman to decide that we would continue to do nothing to prevent the fall of Formosa. That is our present policy. For the Philippines, the Department of State is preparing another Bataan.

In the Near East, Iran, with its huge oil production, which plays such a large part in British economic life, is again threatened by Soviet-directed revolutionaries of the Tudeh Party. They have a fertile field in which to work. The poverty among the peasants of Iran is so grinding that they are close to revolt. Unless the Government of the United States moves rapidly to alleviate the suffering in Iran, Stalin may soon add that ancient country to his long list of satellites.

These, for the moment, are the areas in Asia where Stalin is pressing his advance strongly. But even in western Europe he is undermining our friends.

In Italy, more than 20 percent of the workmen are unemployed, and the Communists, who gathered one-third of the votes at the last elections, are gaining in strength.

In France, the government is far weaker than any French Government before the Second World War, and its entire apparatus is riddled with Communists. Even the head of French atomic research is a Communist.

Great Britain is staggering toward another financial and economic crisis.

Western Germany, under the pressure of unemployment, is beginning to listen to the Soviet propaganda which says: "Side with the United States and you will have unemployment, underfeeding, shortage of raw materials, a divided country and, finally, Soviet atomic bombs on your cities. Side with the Soviet Union and you will have all the wheat and raw materials you want, no unemployment, and a united Germany including the part that is momentarily Polish." Pastor Niemoeller, much admired by Americans, has now declared himself in favor of a united Germany even at the price of Communist rule.

When we began to give Marshall plan aid, and when we signed the Atlantic Pact, our object was to make western Europe a strong ally. We have succeeded only in keeping alive 17 picturesque, competing countries which cannot feed or defend themselves. If they would unite their economies by entering a European federation, they would be on the path to strength. But their governments refuse to take any serious steps toward federation. And our Government is making no effective effort to move them toward federation. They feel confident that, even after 1952, we will not stop our doles to them. And, indeed, we do not dare to stop for fear that they will all collapse into the hands of Stalin and be organized as Soviet satellites for his final attack on us.

What, then, is the real state of our defenses against Soviet aggression? Our own military strength is falling behind the growing military strength of Stalin. Asia is slipping into Stalin's hands. Western Europe is defenseless. The Soviet atomic bomb threat to our homes, our families, and our country is increasing each day. The Communists are advancing. We are retreating. They are on the offensive. We are on the defensive. No war, hot or cold, was ever won by forces which remained on the defensive.

Why are we on the defensive? Why has our Government failed to defend our vital interests?

Because American foreign policy since 1941 has been a supreme triumph of Soviet psychological warfare. In 1941 our Government was bamboozled into treating the Soviet Union as a peace-loving democracy and the Chinese Communists as mere agrarian reformers who have no connection with Moscow. Our Department of State forgot that the Soviet Government was a predatory totalitarian tyranny and that the Chinese Communists were agents of Stalin. In 1941 the Soviet Government was in desperate straits. Thanks to our aid—$11,000,000,000 worth—it survived. Today, Stalin controls more than a third of the human race, and we are not sure that we shall survive. The measure of our foreign policy is the fact that in 1939 Stalin controlled 170,000,000 people, while today he controls 800,000,000.

Apologists for the Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam agreements have used many words in an attempt to prove that what was wrong was not the agreements themselves but the failure of the Soviet Union to carry out the agreements. This is as if a banker, who had been appointed trustee of the fortune of a child, should place the funds entrusted to his care in a Ponzi get-rich-quick scheme and then, when the money was lost, plead that the trouble was not with the trustee—who accepted Mr. Ponzi's promise to pay 200 percent per year—but with Ponzi's failure to carry out the agreement. The people of the United States hire officials to work in the Department of State because they need experts to handle complex world questions. The officials of that Department are trustees of the vital interests of the American people, and the most contemptible excuse that can be offered by or for them is that they meant well but were played for suckers.

To explain the sacrifice of the vital interests of the people of the United States by our National Government, it is not necessary to conclude that our Department of State is filled with Soviet agents. We know that there have been some in influential posts. But most of the damage has been done by naive dupes of Soviet psychological warfare. We still have in office, in Washington and throughout the world, duped officials who have not been Soviet agents but have served the Soviet Government as effectively as if they had been Soviet agents.

In our Army, a general who loses a division through incompetence is court martialed. In our Department of State, men who throw away whole countries are promoted. They have a vested interest in their own mistakes. They cannot detach themselves from their past or their friends—even though those friends turn out to be Soviet agents. In any parliamentary democracy a minister of foreign affairs who had tossed a great ally like China to Stalin would have been dismissed from his post. Mr. Acheson remains Secretary of State.

There is a great moral difference between traitors and Soviet dupes. It is the same difference that is recognized in law between a man guilty of murder and a man guilty of manslaughter. In the case of manslaughter, there is no intention to commit the crime. But in both cases the victim ends up dead. If our President continues to keep as advisers on foreign policy men who have played a part in the sacrifice of our vital interests from 1941 to the present time, we shall have small chance to survive.

Perhaps it is difficult for you to feel profoundly that all you care about may be destroyed. Have you ever thought how many great civilizations have been totally annihilated? Have you thought of the Athens of Pericles and of the Roman Empire? Of all the great cities of Syria and north Africa where today stretch only lonely sands? Have you understood that a similar extinction may come, and come soon, to the whole Christian civilization of Europe—and may come to us here? This is hard to believe, but it is so.

Under these circumstances, what should we do? Let us remember two facts in approaching the problem of our foreign policy:

First, let us remember always to distinguish between the Russian people and the Soviet government. There can be no peace on earth so long as the Russian people and the peoples of the Soviet satellite states are driven by men who prefer a murderous doctrine to the "plain exigence of charity." In the year 1830 the Poles in revolt against the tyranny of the Czars inscribed on their banners a phrase addressed to the enslaved Russian people: "For your freedom and ours." We should approach the Russian people in the same spirit. However hard it may be, we must make the Russians comprehend that we stand for their freedom no less than for our own, since in our battle against the Communist dictator the Russian people must be our final allies. We have had freedom for so many years, we have lived so long in Christian civilization under a Bill of Rights honestly enforced, that we are apt to forget that the idea of freedom is the most explosive force in the world of politics. Freedom is an atomic bomb in the field of ideas. All men hate to live under the eye and hand of an omnipotent secret police. Tyranny, whether it be called by the name of communism, fascism, or by any other name, is loathed by all normal men and women. And however absolute may be today the grip of the Soviet dictator on his subject peoples, that grip can and will be ended eventually by the idea of freedom.

Second, let us remember always that many years will elapse before the peoples of the Soviet Union and the satellite states achieve freedom and that, throughout those years, we and the other free nations will be in danger of extinction unless we keep the Soviet Union constantly confronted by superior force. If any one of you is morally disturbed by that idea, let him remember that the most legitimate use of force on this earth is to hold the field to permit the growth of moral ideas.

Within the framework of these general conclusions, what should be our foreign policy?

1. To build up our military strength faster than Stalin is increasing his military strength.

2. To achieve the federation of western Europe and give adequate arms to that federation.

3. To stand up with force to the threat of the Communists in eastern Germany who have announced that on May 28 they will march 500,000 youths from east Berlin into west Berlin.

4. To give far greater aid than we have been giving to resistance forces in all the Soviet satellite countries.

5. To help the Albanian exiles rescue Albania from the Communists, and thus give new spirit to all the enslaved peoples behind the iron curtain.

6. To give adequate and effective economic aid to Iran.

7. To prevent Communist conquest of Formosa.

8. To help the Annamites and the French throw the Communists completely out of Indochina.

9. To insist that the UN—now paralyzed by Soviet veto and boycott—function as if there were no Soviet boycott.

These are but a few of the obvious steps that we must take immediately if we are to wrest the offensive from Stalin.

Won't such a policy be terribly expensive?

Of course it will be. Each one of us will have to make sacrifices—genuine sacrifices that will be hard to bear. We have allowed

Stalin to acquire such strength and to take over such races, resources, and strategic positions that nothing short of the full efforts of the American people will suffice to stop him. We are not technically at war; but we shall have to live and work as if we were at war.

We know what happens to a people that refuses to face—in time—a mortal danger. Yet today our Government is behaving as the French Government behaved from 1936 to 1939. In that period when the Germans were preparing for war and working 60 hours a week, the French cut their working hours to 40 a week. When the Germans were producing 700 planes a month, the French cut their plane production to 50 a month. They did this for the same reason that we are now reducing expenditures for our military forces and for aid to our friends throughout the world. The people of France, like all other peoples, wanted a higher standard of living and leisure. They did not realize that a higher standard of living and leisure would soon give them a higher rate of dying. In 1940 Hitler destroyed the independence of France. We restored the independence of France. There is no nation standing behind us to restore our independence.

It may be difficult for us to persuade our Government to change its present policies. President Truman has staked his political future on a program of hand-outs for crop support, housing, education, and other projects which appeal to groups of voters. To get more tax money for the hand-out program which produces votes, he has cut down the defense program which might produce survival. Our tax money is being used to buy surplus potatoes instead of jet planes. It will not be easy for him to change his course; but our best hope lies in the fact that he is a patriot. If we can let him know that henceforth we want to hear from him not what we can get from our country but what we can give to our country, we shall make it easy for him to take the course which will enable our Nation to survive.

The burden of decision is on our President. He, by our Constitution, controls our foreign policy. He commands our armed forces. If he is to act in time to save our country from conquest by Stalin, he will have to change his thinking quickly. He will have to experience something like the transformation which Saul experienced on the road to Damascus when "there shined about him a light from heaven," and he became Paul the Apostle. We should hope and pray that a light from heaven will fall on President Truman; but we should also try to shed upon him a light from the public opinion of Americans who do not want to live soft for a few years and then be conquered, but do want to live hard and keep their country free.

Seaway Project a Threat to Philadelphia and United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Seaway Project a Threat to Philadelphia and United States," published in this morning's Philadelphia Inquirer. It deals with the subject of the St. Lawrence seaway.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEAWAY PROJECT A THREAT TO PHILADELPHIA AND UNITED STATES

In the light of the dubious over-all value of the St. Lawrence seaway project, to say nothing of the unquestionably bad effects on many sections of the country, including Philadelphia, Secretary of State Acheson's statement that action on this scheme is overdue is wholly unconvincing.

Acheson dutifully appeared before the House Public Works Committee to support President Truman's plea for approval of the seaway project, and added that it was necessary from the economic and defense standpoints, and to improve harmonious relations with Canada as well.

But Acheson, like so many others who have plugged this idea for more than half a century, failed completely to answer the objections that it would be too costly, that its defense value would be negligible if it had any at all, and that it would entail inevitable dislocations among important segments of the American economy.

It has been pointed out before that one bomb placed on one of the 50 proposed locks could bottle up the whole navigation system envisioned in these plans. Yet the locks would be essential if the St. Lawrence River were to be opened to navigation so that oceangoing vessels could go all the way to the port cities of the Great Lakes.

It has been shown, too, without successful contradiction, that this seaway would be shut down by ice for 5 months or more every year. And it has been demonstrated that the cost, now estimated at $800,000,000, would not end with the seaway project. Additional dredging of Great Lakes harbors would be needed, and there would be other costs.

But the most important objection is the disastrous effect of this scheme on American seaports. Philadelphia, along with New York, Boston, Baltimore, and other cities, would suffer severe losses by the proposed diversion of freight. The Pennsylvania Railroad and other railroads would incur new hardships which might impair their effectiveness in times of national emergency.

Acheson hasn't met these objections. The only action which is overdue, in the opinion of most Americans, is a decisive vote by Congress to reject, once and for all, this perennial effort to commit the United States to a wasteful project whose damaging effects would far outweigh its claimed benefits.

If World War III Comes, It Started With the Line That Chinese Communists Are Just "Agrarian Reformers"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 27, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Edgar Ansel Mowrer:

AVERAGE FELLOWS NOT WORRIED OVER WAR; EXPERTS TROUBLED

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

All over our vast and flourishing country little groups of earnest people are talking about the possibility of war.

This is not the kind of war scare which we have become used to since 1945 when the Soviet Union went berserk and started threatening the civilized world. Those scares affected average citizens. Students of world affairs were skeptical. Even during the Soviet siege of west Berlin which we broke by the airlift, American officials, ex-diplomats and specialists were not alarmed.

Now it is just the opposite. The average fellow does not seem to be much disturbed by the trend of international affairs. The specialists are worried. Recently one such specialist warned me to make no mistake, since we are already in a military situation.

An American ex-diplomat of great experience told me he was convinced that the Russians will never let us rearm western Europe. He thought they would force the issue in about 18 months. Another even higher ex-official, thought the show-down might come within 6 months.

The reason, generally speaking, for this pessimism is the boldness of recent Soviet diplomatic moves and provocations of the latter. The shooting down of the American Navy plane over the Baltic was merely the latest. The tone of the Soviet diplomatic protest over the alleged establishment of a democratic naval base at Trieste is another.

Another reason is the stubbornness with which the Soviet Union is now charging its adversaries with planning war. The latest of these made over the Soviet home radio service on April 18 charged the harmless Council of Europe with plotting aggressive war. The Soviet home service, be it noted, is addressed not to the outside world but to the Soviet peoples. This broadcast looked like part of a campaign to prepare the population for international trouble.

All totalitarian regimes, from Hitler and Mussolini to Stalin and Franco, have a habit of accusing the adversary of preparing to do exactly what they themselves are planning.

A-BOMB FEAR

But behind the current uneasiness in the minds of those Americans closest to international affairs is more than reaction to the Kremlin's latest outbursts.

It is the conviction that the acquisition of the A-bomb and of vast China has for the first time give the lords of the Kremlin enough power to wage an offensive war if they choose. It has been known for some months—and repeated in these columns—that the Russians are rearming on a scale far larger than President Truman and Secretary of Defense Johnson have planned for us—that they are, in sort, outstripping us.

WAR NOT NECESSARY

Personally, I do not believe that war is either imminent or necessary. The reason is that the non-Communist nations still have vastly greater potential strength than the Communist bloc, provided we organize it.

But one thing has to be admitted. Without the A-bomb and China, the U. S. S. R. would not today be defying the armed might of the United States by shooting down our airplanes.

Which brings me back to the drama that has been going on before the Senate committee in Washington these last weeks.

Owen Lattimore has taken oath that he is not and never has been a member of the Communist Party or a Communist sympathizer. Louis Budenz, former editor of the Communist New York Daily Worker, has sworn that Lattimore had been described to him as a top American Communist authority on Asiatic affairs. He claims that Mr. Lattimore was a member of a Communist "cell" active within the Institute of Pacific Relations. I have never met Mr. Budenz and have only a casual acquaintance with Mr. Lattimore.

I do, however, know one thing which is to me more important than whether Mr. Lattimore is or is not connected with the Communist Party. That is, that both Mr. Lattimore and the Institute of Pacific Relations have advocated policies which, in my judgment, have resulted in the Soviet acquisition of China that may be a cause of war.

This policy, as Mr. Budenz pointed out before the Senate, started with passing off the Chinese Communists as "Agrarian reformers." A flat lie if there ever was one. A second phase was designating the Nationalist Government of China—our wartime ally—as "feudalists" while painting the Chinese Communists as "democrats." From this followed logically the policy of withholding arms from the "feudalists" until they did what Washington wanted. A lot of bright American writers fell for this line.

By 1945, according to these people, the Nationalist Government was the "war party" and the Communists the "peace party." What more logical than for General Marshall to try to compel the "war party" to form a coalition with the "peace party?"

Shortly after the Communists began to win the civil war, the line changed again. The "agrarian reformers" had to be acknowledged as Communists all right. But they were not necessarily the tools of Moscow. I actually heard a leading member of the council on Pacific relations tell an uninformed audience at Cleveland, Ohio that if the United States would only be friendly to the Chinese Communists, sell them what they needed on their terms and break off relations with the Nationalists, these Communists would prefer us to the Soviet Union and in case of war, fight on our side against Moscow.

The United States Government went some distance along this line in the blithe hope that Mao Tse-Tung would turn out to be a Chinese Tito.

Mao didn't. The Chinese Communists became Moscow's right bower. They now control all of China but two islands and Moscow becomes insolent toward the United States. Do the advocates of appeasement in the Far East change?

By no means. Mr. Lattimore advocates our throwing South Korea to the Communist wolves and under no circumstances aiding the "feudalists" to maintain themselves from Formosa. Tomorrow some bright American reformer may advocate letting Ho Chiminh take over Indochina.

Why stop there? Why not help the Communist to liberate Thailand and Burma, Indonesia and the Philippines, Malaya, and even India? Aren't there "feudalists" in all these countries?

If the war that such expansion encourages then comes, we can console ourselves with the thought that it can be traced back to a policy that began by calling the Chinese Communists "agrarian reformers" and ended by giving them Asia. Or can't we?

Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD testimony I presented this morning before the Committee on Banking and Currency on the subject of rent control.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN, OF NEW YORK, ON RENT CONTROL BEFORE THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

As the members of this committee know, I have introduced S. 3464, a bill to amend and continue the present Rent Control Act for 2 years and to provide on orderly decontrol procedure. With the permission of the committee, I propose to discuss the details of my bill, but first I wish to make a short general statement on rent control.

I would like, first of all, to make known to the members of this committee what I believe to be the wishes and the needs of the country today, namely continued protection against the possibility of unjustified rent increases and inflationary influences on the national economy.

The theory of rent control, as I understand it, is to protect tenants from unfair exploitation in the cost of shelter, while protecting landlords in their right to have an adequate rent, and, over-all, to protect the economy of the Nation from an inflation based on a shortage in rental housing.

It is asked why we continue to control rents when controls over other segments of our economy have been eliminated. The answer to that question is not difficult. Rent controls are maintained because housing is the one commodity people cannot do without—it is the one commodity for which people cannot find a substitute, and as a single commodity, it takes a larger portion of the average monthly wage than any other.

Another argument advanced against rent control is that the landlord should be entitled to a fair rent. I agree. But in the same breath, I want to stress that the history of rent control shows that administration policy has been to grant rent increases whenever justified and also to decontrol completely those areas in which housing shortages no longer exist.

In support of this statement, the records of Housing Expediter show that during the past year, three out of every four landlords who applied for a rent increase received it. It has been said that anyone who could write could get a rent increase. I do not approve of that practice, but it has been rather general. The increases granted averaged 17.8 percent. During all this period, the Housing Expediter has had landlord-tenant consultants available and on the job throughout the country. It was the duty of these consultants to provide information and assistance on applications for rent adjustments and to aid in the preparation of these applications. It seems evident that all landlords who could or can justify a rent increase neither were nor are handicapped in applying for an increase. My information is that too many increases were granted, although it is more than likely that some few landlords are still receiving rentals which are unjust to them.

A third argument advanced against rent control is that it is socialistic and is contrary to the American way of life. Those who advance this argument want to end rent control as of this minute, completely and conclusively, without regard to the untold suffering and human misery such a termination would cause. I say that our present situation is not one which calls for such drastic and shocking action. I agree that we should bring rent control to an end as soon as possible, but we should not endanger the national economic structure by doing this before the housing conditions are such that this can be done without inflicting severe hardships upon vast numbers of our people.

NEED FOR RENT CONTROL

Mr. Chairman, your committee will undoubtedly be told that rent control should be eliminated because the need for it no longer exists. The facts and figures available to us completely refute such a claim. At the present time, rent control affects the rents on 11,000,000 units and protects about 38,000,000 people. On May 1, 1950, the State of New York will assume State control of rents and before June 30, 1950, the States of Alabama and Virginia will no longer be subject to Federal controls. Parenthetically, I may say that I understand there is a deep uneasiness over this situation in the county of Arlington and the city of Alexandria near Washington. In these areas live thousands of the employees of the Federal Government. Drastic rent increases will wipe out the benefits of recent salary increases granted to these Federal employees.

It is my prediction that even though rent control is discontinued in these two counties of Virginia, the District of Columbia will continue to have adequate protection. We will then find Federal employees working side by side, earning exactly the same salary, one paying a fair rent and the other paying whatever the traffic will bear. Certainly such a situation is neither fair nor in the public interest. On June 30, 1950, after the withdrawal of New York, Alabama, and Virginia, Federal rent control will still affect 8,375,000 units and protect some 29 million people. Certainly by reason of magnitude alone, this control can qualify as an urgent Federal responsibility to be met with Federal action.

For the past year the decontrol of rents was possible by any city, town, or village, by any State, by any local rent advisory board and by the Federal Housing Expediter. By these means a total of 791 decontrol actions have decontrolled 3,213,800 units since April 1, 1949. Almost a quarter of the total 16,000,000 units which were originally under control were decontrolled in the past year. Certainly this proves that the process of decontrol is progressing at a satisfactory rate. But as of June 30, 1950, there will still remain the major problem of rent control in each of 63 cities with a population of 100,000 or more, located in 40 States.

I have been much concerned with the problem of rent control, especially in my own State. I have already said that the New York State law will go into effect on May 1, 1950. There are, however, certain aspects of that State law which to my mind are far from satisfactory. It was with those defects in mind that I planned the bill which I introduced on the 21st of this month. Moreover, it appears that there is some question of the constitutionality of the New York State law. To permit the Federal law to expire under such circumstances would be an offense against the people of my State. But I am also deeply interested in the welfare of all the people throughout the United States.

With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I would now like to describe the major points of my bill, S. 3464, and give briefly the reason for the inclusion of those major points.

I. S. 3464 extends rent control and the veteran's preference provisions of the present law for 2 years. I have said that I am seeking an orderly transition from a system of controlled rents to one of uncontrolled rents. In our larger cities such as New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, and Los Angeles, such an orderly transition cannot be accomplished in 1 year. That fact is recognized even in the New York State law which also terminates rent control on June 30, 1952. Also I feel it is far safer to have at hand an authority which may not be needed than to suffer from lack of it.

II. Section 201 of my bill provides that housing units completed on or before the date of enactment of this bill will be placed under controls. Maximum rents for these

units would be equal to rents on comparable controlled units, giving due consideration to the increased costs of construction.

I recognize that this has the possibility of working a hardship on some landlords, although I think under the terms of my bill, the Housing Expediter would be given sufficient discretion to prevent such hardships and to make due allowance for the increased costs of construction of these new buidings.

I recognize also that these buildings were constructed on the basis of being exempt from rent control. Yet, it is likewise true that most of the older buildings were likewise constructed on the basis of being exempt from rent control.

The fact of the matter is that most of these units were built with Government FHA financing. I have read numerous reports and analyses indicating that excessive and even shocking rents are being charged in these new units. Since these units were constructed in large part with Federal funds, it seems perfectly proper for the Federal Government to move in at this point and insure that the owners shall not make excessive profits at the expense of the public whose taxes have made this construction possible.

Nevertheless, I do not pretend to insist that this provision represents a black and white case. I think it is a desirable provision. But I think a satisfactory rent control law could be written without it. It has some features concerning which I am not comfortable, but I know of no other way to achieve the purposes which I have in mind.

III. My bill provides for pegging rents at the level of March 1, 1949, and is, in effect, a roll-back to that level. Yet it is only a roll-back for rents which have risen grossly, unfairly, or improperly above the level of March 1, 1949. Rents which have risen as a result of improvements in accommodations or services are approved. Rents which have risen as a result of decrease in net operating income are approved. But all increases in the latter category are limited to 15 percent. My bill also authorizes decreases in rents by action of the Housing Expediter, where gross inequities are found or where rent increases have been imposed through fraud or misrepresentation.

IV. But while I propose to strengthen the controls on rents which should be controlled and to roll back rents which have improperly risen in shortage areas, I also propose new standards for the orderly decontrol of rental areas, and new inducements for decontrol in areas where control is no longer needed.

Under the present law, the State, or the local government, or the Housing Expediter may decontrol areas under their respective jurisdictions. But a State in whose rural areas control is no longer necessary has no means whereby it can practicably retain control in its larger cities. Most States thus choose to either continue to remain under Federal jurisdiction or to decontrol entirely, exposing the cities within their borders to unfortunate hardship.

My bill permits the Federal Housing Expediter to retain control over a portion of the units—the low-rental units—in any area in which the housing shortage in the other categories eases up.

My bill permits a State to decontrol and yet retain Federal controls of the large cities within its borders.

My bill permits a city, village, county, or any other local unit to be recontrolled, after being decontrolled, on a finding of hardship, or an application by the governing body of such a local unit.

My bill authorizes the Federal Government to recontrol large cities which have passed under State control but which have subsequently been decontrolled by State action. In such cases, it would take an affirmative request by the governing body of the city in question to authorize the Federal Government to recontrol.

This provision is aimed at situations like the recent development in my own State.

Under these provisions, States and localities will be quicker to decontrol, knowing that if hardship develops, they can again come under the protecting arm of Federal rent control.

Altogether my bill presents a framework whose emphasis is on control but whose purpose is to encourage dencontrol in areas and for categories of rental units over which control is no longer necessary. I cannot emphasize too strongly and too often that my purpose is to protect the groups and the areas which need protection and to see removed the hand of Federal controls from every area and every unit where it is not socially and economically essential that such control be retained.

My bill provides criminal sanctions for violation of the rent-control laws or regulations. My theory is—and it is supported by experience in a wide variety of fields—that a law without teeth invites violations. I think that our experience in the last year with the Federal rent-control law amply bears this point out.

There are two other noteworthy provisions in my bill which I think should be retained in any rent-control law which is enacted by the Congress. One is a provision prohibiting the conversion of a rental dwelling unit to comercial uses, except where no rental dwelling shortage exists. Sufficient discretion is left to the Housing Expediter to make this provision flexible and practicable.

The second is a provision which would prohibit the denial of unoccupied controlled housing to would-be renters on the sole ground that they have children. I think this is an important provision. I think that the present practice of denying rental accommodations to families with children is antisocial and deeply unfortunate. My bill provides sanctions to back up the intent of the law. I recognize that this provision will be difficult of enforcement. Yet I believe that it should and must be included in the law as a declaration of national policy.

This, Mr. Chairman, sums up the more significant provisions of S. 3464. As I have said, I have no special pride in this bill. I prefer to regard it as my contribution to the consideration which the members of this committee are giving to the subject of rent control. My sole purpose here today is to present to this committee my arguments for asking that a fair and reasonable rent-control law be enacted and that tenants, especially low-income tenants, be granted the protection they so urgently need.

I am submitting for the record a copy of S. 3464 with some minor substantive changes and clarifying amendments indicated thereon. I propose to introduce a clean bill today which will include these changes.

Happenings in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, program No. 23 in the series "Happenings in Washington," which I have been presenting from time to time.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My fellow Pennsylvanians, this is ED MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital, and bringing you another discussion of happenings in Washington.

President Truman, recently back from his month-long vacation in Key West, is busily preparing for his forthcoming nonpolitical swing through many parts of the Nation.

So, down here in Washington, the period between those two events seems to offer an ideal opportunity to take stock.

It gives us a chance to weigh the administration's promises and the accomplishments of the Eighty-first Congress.

The Eighty-first Congress, you remember, came into power in January 1949. It is now more than half way through its second session. It has only about 3½ months more to go before the adjournment date provided by law.

It is a strong Democratic Congress. Let us see what it has done to redeem the promises of the leader of its party.

But, first, I want to remind you that, in 1948, Mr. Truman called the Eightieth Congress a do-nothing Congress. He said it was the second worst Congress in our history.

You will remember also that he summoned the Eightieth Congress back into special session in the summer of 1948 and demanded that it put through a long list of must legislation.

The President said Congress could certainly put through all the bills in 2 weeks.

It couldn't, and of course, it didn't.

In the elections of 1948 the people gave him a Democratic majority in the Senate and an overwhelmingly strong Democratic House. This Congress was in session for 7 months last year. It has been in session about 4 month of this year, so far.

And, you will be interested to know, it has not accomplished in all those months what Mr. Truman insisted in 1948 any Congress should be able to do in 2 weeks.

Let us look over some of the results.

The President demanded higher taxes. He will not get them.

Instead the people will get some reductions in the war-time excise taxes we are still paying.

The Democratic majority in Congress has rejected his tax-increase proposals and is substituting the excise-tax reductions recommended and fought for by the Republican minority in Congress.

One of the finest accomplishments of the Eightieth Congress was its enactment of the Taft-Hartley law. Let me remind you that it was passed over the President's veto. Next to the fact that the Eightieth Congress gave the Nation its only 2 years of balanced budgets in the past 20 years—I am proudest of the fact that it passed the Taft-Hartley Act.

President Truman called it a slave-labor law and promised it would be wiped off the books.

He demanded its repeal in this Democratic Congress—but Congress, with a strong majority of his own party, has flatly refused to obey his orders.

Now the President has tried in another way to circumvent this law and to cripple it.

One feature of the Taft-Hartley Act is that it provides a strong, independent general counsel for the National Labor Relations Board, so that the Board which sits as judge and jury should not also be an enforcement and prosecution arm.

The President sent to Congress a series of 21 reorganization plans, most of them in line with administrative recommendations of the Hoover Commission.

One of President Truman's plans, No. 12, provides that the independent office of general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board be abolished and that its functions be transferred to the chairman of the Board.

Now, many people have been led to believe that this proposed change was recommended by the Hoover Commission.

Actually the Hoover Commission made no such recommendation. And, recently, in a letter to a Member of the Senate, former President Herbert Hoover wrote—and I quote:

"So far as I recollect, this subject was never discussed by the Commission. There was no recommendation in the Commission's reports to Congress."

That, my fellow Pennsylvanians, is in a letter from Mr. Hoover, himself, the chairman of the Hoover Commission. He makes it plain that the Commission not only did not want the office of the general counsel abolished, but that it never even discussed the subject.

Many who have been watching this situation are under the impression that President Truman's political advisers sought to put one over on Congress and the Nation by slipping this scheme across with authentic recommendations of the Hoover Commission.

I don't think Congress will let him get away with it.

Mr. Truman's Congress has refused to give him the Brannan plan which would place the farmers of this country under complete control by the Federal Government.

Congress has pigeonholed the Truman demand for socialized medicine, the extravagant and discriminatory so-called middle-income housing measure, and the controversial Federal-aid-to-education plan which would result in Washington dictatorship over the State and local school systems.

Mr. Truman demanded fair-employment legislation. Last January, you will recall, the Democratic leadership announced that the FEPC bill would be the first one to be brought up in the Senate this year.

It wasn't brought up then. Now, 4 months later, it still has not been brought up.

But the House did pass an FEPC bill. That bill, the only legislation of its kind to pass either branch of Congress, is a Republican measure, introduced by a Republican and backed by an almost solid block of Republican votes in the House.

What is more, neither the President nor his Eighty-first Congress has made a single, genuine move to trim Government spending down to income or to prevent this Nation from plunging deeper and deeper into debt.

In the last 20 years there has been only one Republican Congress—the Eightieth Congress. And in the last 20 years, during the lifetime of only one Congress—the Eightieth Congress—has the Federal Government's spending been kept down to the level of its income.

And so, my fellow Pennsylvanians, I am moved to wonder about this:

When Mr. Truman goes out on the road again in May, to tour the Nation and make speeches, will he denounce his Eighty-first Congress for its failure to give him the legislation he has demanded?

Will he call it a do-nothing Congress and the worst Congress because it has failed to accomplish in a year and a half what he insisted the Eightieth Congress could do in 2 weeks?

I wonder, my friends.

Let us watch and see if he repeats on this nonpolitical expedition the same program and the same promises that he offered when his trip was frankly political.

In my broadcast 2 weeks ago I discussed our social-security system. I explained how, as a member of the tax-writing Senate Finance Committee, I believed the system should be improved so that the wage earner would not be taxed twice for his old-age insurance benefits.

Now, speaking again as a member of the Senate Finance Committee, I think we should provide a change in our tax laws * * * a change to give substance to the constitutional provision that our taxes must be applied uniformly.

I have in mind an elaborate function held not long ago in Washington—the Jefferson-Jackson Day $100 dinner of the Democratic Party—at which President Truman was the principal speaker.

Five thousand persons paid $100 apiece to see and be seen at this dinner, at which the political speeches were intermingled with big-name entertainment by prominent figures in the theatrical world.

Now, under our Federal law, dinners with entertainment for which an admission charge is made are subject to a tax of 20 percent—private dinners as well as those open to the public.

By all the rules of the game, this dinner should have been taxed.

The $500,000 paid for tickets to this dinner should have brought $100,000 in taxes into the debt-ridden Federal Treasury.

Indeed, there was a strong precedent for it. Only a short time before there was a huge Lincoln Day affair in Washington, held, of course, by the Republicans.

You may remember something of that affair. Intermingled with the speeches were several acts of big-name entertainment—just as at the Jefferson-Jackson dinner.

Something else you may recall about the Lincoln Day affair was that the tickets cost $1 apiece. Box suppers were provided at a cost of another dollar each. That was all.

But because of the entertainment the Bureau of Internal Revenue decided this dinner was subject to the 20-percent Federal tax.

So, instead of $1, the admission price was $1.20, of which 20 cents went to the Government.

But those in charge of the $100 Jefferson-Jackson dinner decided not to pay the tax.

They declared that the dinner was free—that there was no charge at all. Instead, they claimed 5,000 men and women had generously contributed $100 each to the party and had been invited to attend the dinner free.

The Bureau of Internal Revenue accepted that tricky explanation with a straight face and handed down a formal ruling to the effect that the 20-percent tax need not be paid.

That ruling cost the Nation $100,000 in taxes—but it did save the jobs of the top executives in our Federal Bureau of Internal Revenue.

Therefore, I say we need a stiffening of our Federal tax laws to prevent discrimination of this kind.

Just suppose, that some of you went out to a place to dine—a place which offered entertainment.

Suppose you refused to pay the 20-percent tax on your check.

Suppose you argued that the dinner was free and that you were merely contributing the price of the check. Suppose, even, that the proprietor of the restaurant agreed with you and said he gave you the dinner free.

Do you believe the Bureau of Internal Revenue would believe either of you? Or would it serve notice on both of you—pay up in accordance with the law, or you'll both go to jail.

The Constitution of the United States very clearly states that taxes must be uniformly applied.

The avoidance of the tax in the $100 dinner indicates that there are discrepancies and favoritism. And you, as law-abiding citizens, should call upon Congress to correct this situation and to insist that the law be enforced without fear or favoritism.

I insist that if the man who can afford to go to a $100 dinner with entertainment need not pay a tax, then the man who goes out for a $4 or $5 dinner with entertainment should not be required to pay a tax.

And the person who goes to a movie for entertainment should not be required to pay a 20-percent tax either.

This is ED MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital. I will be with you again in 2 weeks. Thank you for your attention.

McCarthy Versus Reds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Lawrenceburg Press, of Lawrenceburg, Ind., on April 20, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOME VIEWS ON MCCARTHY VERSUS REDS

So much name-calling has taken place in the MCCARTHY against State Department pinks campaign. It may be useful for us to discuss the situation without heat, as it appears to an observer only moderately informed about our Government, as most of us are.

First, let us note that the argument for hushing up all public discussion of Reds and pinks in the State Department is far from the American ideal of citizenship responsibility. It smacks of a taste for the secret conclave and dictatorial directness. Hitler and Stalin have given examples of certain practical advantages in this system, but this Nation has chosen another course.

Senator MCCARTHY may have been much too far reaching in his original statements. At this time, before the show-down, it seems to be assured to the minds of most interested citizens that this is the case. His changes in position have given his opponents some comfort. Though the shocking degree of antiespionage weakness first alleged may no longer obtain, the Alger Hiss conviction and other generally believed statements seem to lay bare a condition calling for some official recognition. Steps to reassure Americans at home and abroad, and even other nations, seem to be indicated.

Little new danger to foreign policy lies in investigation and open discussion. There is a much more lively threat in the fact that those directly responsible for our policy on the highest level, loudly persist in shutting their eyes to any hint, or even proof, of Red infiltration among their own advisers. We have already seen the red herring sneer rebuked by the sentence of Alger Hiss as a Russian spy. That experience alone should and would warn normally reasonable men against this peril.

Though steps have been taken with public fanfare to clear out a nest of moral degenerates in the Department, the public has not been able to discern that any corrective action has been taken against subversives and unsympathetic helpers handling state secrets. The public in this representative Republic is entitled to that knowledge and assurance. Other nations with modern espionage must have known all along what is taking place, and a hush-hush attitude can confuse no one but a few million voters in the precincts far from Washington.

State and other responsible administrative speakers have pointed out danger of

damage to our foreign policy from the give and take of American-type discussion on this subject. Of course, this could have been largely prevented by preserving the bipartisan foreign policy that President Truman sponsored in his first year or so, his honeymoon, before he swung into what became his stride.

Even under the normal loyal opposition system which now obtains in foreign affairs, as well as internal matters, there would be much stronger policy in calmly facing whatever facts are available and conducting a quiet house cleaning, than in risking the reaction of shouting down investigation and refusing information pertinent to it. (We refer to loyal opposition above as the duty of the minority in Congress loyal to our Government principles in general, but opposing whatever seems improper in the manner of their operation.)

It seems to this writer after considerable weighing and balancing, that the State Department may already have done more damage than any such adverse publicity could cause (1) by acting on the advice of at least one fellow traveler; (2) by backing down from Commie advances within the Department and in China; (3) by winking at the theft of secret papers for Commie pay. Who is wrong, the erring officials who lay themselves open to criticism, or the critic who seeks to correct the error in the orthodox official way?

While on this subject, it may be germane to consider a broader aspect of our foreign policy, for which are held fears arising from the McCarthy charges. It is generally believed that the Marshall plan, expensive to every taxpayer, has helped to keep weak nations out of the arms of all-promising dictators. Our money is internationally popular. Our Nation and foreign policy are not thought to be so popular among other governments. Perhaps the State Department could better promote United States standing among nations than by publicly defending the records of its personnel, or bickering over who is paid to advise or who merely gives free advice that becomes policy.

If we were invited to prescribe for our ailing foreign policy (an invitation that we'll not sit and wait for) we'd suggest the need for making up again a working bipartisan team, and not just a token gesture. We need all the brains available, and in foreign matters there is a maximum number of votes in simply the fact of success, by whatever process gained.

The losing record in the cold war might be reversed if the United States played a more forthright if less agile part as one of the two great opposition powers. We have appeased begged issues, entered secret deals in violation of treaty, sold out small nations. We have done everything but lay down principles and stand up to them. This course has been followed at least since Yalta and probably before. We have been represented by Tammany and Pendergast politician-type thinking instead of statesmanship. Our present international ills may be seen by the long view of history to be founded partly on the two decades of war by the administrative branch of our Government upon the legislative branch, and upon the responsibilities of the States and the freedoms of the citizens.

Perhaps it would be well for administration to seek less responsibility for legislation and judiciary, and try to concentrate on doing its own proper work with more finished grace. It conceivably could be that what this country needs now in its internal and external messes is to straighten up and fly right.

The old recipe "treat 'em rough and tell 'em nothing" is poor policy in a representative republic. We have about run out of emergencies to justify it, and in any case we are losing our taste for rough treatment.

PMA in Farm Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "PMA in Farm Politics," written by Alfred D. Stedman, which appeared in the St. Paul Sunday Pioneer Press on April 23, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PMA IN FARM POLITICS

(By Alfred D. Stedman)

An editorial wave of criticism of the April 4 farm meeting in St. Paul goes rolling on. The charge is that a paid and captive audience was assembled at public expense to hear political addresses by Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY and Secretary Brannan. Up to 2 days of $8 per diem pay and travel were authorized for those who attended among the 4,500 Minnesota community and county committeemen of the Production and Marketing Administration (PMA). Editorially alleged are evils of regimentation, propaganda, and politicking at Federal expense, which is estimated all the way up to $150,000 and which might run considerably under half of that.

Does this criticism reflect genuine concern over a real problem and an aim to help the farm program avoid repetition of mistakes? No doubt some of it does, but that's far from being the whole truth of it.

For behind the present dispute there lies an untold story that's factual, fascinating, and full of meaning. It's a story of experience of the Federal farm program with politics and safeguards, first under the old AAA and then under its successor, the PMA.

The nature of the farm depression tended all along to push agriculture into politics in its broad sense. For the farmers found themselves an intensely competing group in a highly organized economy. The farm program's aim was to afford enough concerted action to prevent unbridled competition among millions of farming units from wrecking farm prices and ruining farm soil. In order to get their program, the farmers had to move up alongside of organized business and organized labor in the resort to political action.

But a farm plan, when once adopted, doesn't run itself. Until a system of administration is created, plans of price and soil protection, acreage controls, grain storage, and crop insurance are just paper plans. So the elected three-member township and county committees were established. They have a real, and not merely advisory job. They actually operate the program for the farmers who each year elect them. They are the program's administrative foundation.

And forces pulling these committees toward politics in their partisan sense became increasingly apparent. These included business and later partisan attacks on the program. Backers in both parties were thrown on the political defensive.

The dangers, including loss of public confidence, of diverting the farm program into partisan or extra-legal byways became increasingly apparent. An early left-wing attempt to convert AAA into an instrument of social change was blocked by Administrator Chester C. Davis. The leftist coterie was ousted in the AAA purge. In 1935, a congressional storm over a farm committeemen's march on Washington was stilled by a full report to Congress and by the good conduct and high caliber of the committeemen. In 1940, some AAA officials were fired by Davis, then War Food Administrator, for partisan activities.

Into the farm laws and regulations that were drawn with advice of Congress and the farm organizations, went safeguards that stand today. Thus the annual elections of committeemen are without any party designation. Acceptance by a farm committeeman of a political campaign post in any party requires his separation from the farm committee. So farm committeemen cannot lawfully use their positions to play machine politics. And the farmers, through their voting power, have in their hands a weapon to stop at the grass roots any offensive politicking.

The funds to pay for the holding of meetings, either local or State-wide, are appropriated by Congress. Expense accounts must be submitted to the General Accounting Office for audit before payment. Thus the actual cost of the St. Paul meeting cannot be known until the expense vouchers are in. The meetings are generally necessary in the big job of informing committee men and farmers about the program.

Though the Humphrey and Brannan talks here this time were a basis of the political accusations, 11 other talks during the 2 days devoted to program details and the entire State-wide meeting in St. Paul in February 1948 drew no fire. The committeemen this time couldn't tell Brannan or Humphrey what to say, couldn't know that Senator THYE would be unable to speak, and came as in the past to hear and consider whatever might be said.

Yet it is evident that safeguards alone aren't likely to solve what's really a continuing problem. For as this year, future speakers will be uncensored. The step from talking agriculture to talking politics will continue to be short. No matter what party is in power, the leaders will be tempted to play up to these committees. So farm program judgment and self-discipline will ever be a need. Alert and fair criticism from the press can be a useful spur to the program to watch its step. Taking advantage of such constructive criticism, the program can emerge stronger than before. So that would be O. K.—if it were all the story.

But the crusade has now swept far beyond such aims. Attacks are centering increasingly on the committeemen, with fewer honeyed compliments tucked in. If possible, the committees are to be discredited and displaced.

The Minneapolis papers, at the pitch of the assault, editorially compared the farm committeemen to the odorous, corrupt, and at times criminal Pendergast machine with its wardheelers and musclemen. The letters PMA, the editorial quoted, "really used to mean Production and Marketing Administration, but now a better name for it is—Pendergast machine in agriculture." In the light of the truth, doesn't that rate as a most unfair and unwarranted slur upon the committeemen and the farmers who elected them? It goes along with a one-sided presentation of the farmers' status as to income, which in fact has again sunk per person to less than half the average income of nonfarm people.

And now at last the Minneapolis papers have come to the point. That's a demand for a big shake-up in farm committee work. It revives an old scheme for stripping away the PMA committees' soil-and-acreage job and transferring the remnants to the Soil Conservation Service's slow and limited farm-by-farm engineering operations. It is clear that if the PMA committees are discredited and their powers transferred or erased, the

farm program's administrative force will be hamstrung and that the program itself may fall.

Thus a Nation-wide campaign that's on right now in some magazines and newspapers for knocking out the farm program is being helped along by the extreme phase of the anti-FMA crusade. If that should win, perhaps a parallel campaign to dispose of the cooperatives can also win. Then if the usual postwar conditions should bring farm depression back again, agriculture would be just about defenseless. The process of building immense city fortunes out of farmers' helplessness could be resumed. And the great political issue of the future could be once again, not the existence of a farm program but the lack of it, with oncoming farm controls making those of today look conservative.

But maybe Congress, the farmers, and people generally won't want to take the risks of this. Maybe they will want to keep and improve for future use the PMA, the farm committees, and the farm program.

The Meaning of the New Wage-Hour Rules

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 27, 1950

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address delivered before the Detroit Bar Association and the Industrial Relations Institute of Wayne University by Howard J. Anderson, assistant managing editor of Labor Relations Reporter, published by the Bureau of National Affairs, Inc., Washington, D. C. Mr. Anderson's talk is the best short treatment of the practical problems presented by the amendments to the Federal wage-and-hour law which has yet come to my attention.

For many years, the Bureau of National Affairs has been publishing factual reports and books for professional and business use. Mr. Anderson has specialized in matters relating to the regulation of wages and hours and is well qualified to present an unbiased, authoritative and realistic analysis of the new rules.

For nearly 12 years, the Federal wage-and-hour law has played an important role in the Nation's business and industrial planning. After several unsuccessful attempts, the Eighty-first Congress succeeded last fall in rewriting—and I hope clarifying—some of the major provisions of that law.

How successful we have been will be difficult to ascertain until the courts have interpreted some of the new phrases we used. A law which has as broad a sweep as this one may easily become quite complex. It is unlikely that any two industrial plants follow exactly the same practices with respect to wages, hours, and overtime pay. And it is difficult to establish any rule which may be applied Nation-wide without upsetting some practices of long standing.

THE MEANING OF THE NEW WAGE-HOUR RULES

When you discuss a subject as complicated as the Federal wage-and-hour law, it is difficult to avoid becoming either an advocate or a critic. The long and bitter struggle which preceded the adoption of both the new white-collar regulations and the amendments to the law itself only mirrored the conflicting opinions as to the law and its objectives.

To some groups, it represents a desirable and necessary part of the economic structure. They view it as a shield against the blasts of a depression, insurance against unfair wage competition for the employer, and a guaranty of adequate wages for the employee.

To others, the law appears to be a needlessly complicated and harsh set of regulations—the bane of the small businessman and a booby trap whose hidden meanings often spawn windfall payments.

But no mattter how you regard it, the Wages and Hours Act is an established law of the land—and has been for nearly 12 years. Its basic provisions have been sustained by the highest court. Its requirements are reflected in pay and employment practices throughout the country.

It is my purpose, therefore, to shun the role of either an advocate or a critic. I shall concern myself only with the questions of who, what, and how—who is subject to the law, what its provisions require, and how these requirements are enforced. To paraphrase Tennyson, I shall not attempt to reason "why."

RULES ARE MORE COMPLICATED

But even forgetting questions of social or political desirability, the wage-hour law is still a difficult subject. The rules it imposes are far from simple. There are problems within problems, exceptions to most of the rules, and exceptions to some of the exceptions.

The complexity is the result, in part, of difficulties inherent in any attempt to regulate wages, hours, and employment practices on so broad a scale. Pay and employment practices to which the rules must be applied vary from industry to industry and from plant to plant. A rule which may be applied with little trouble in one plant may upset practices of long standing in another.

There is a second, and perhaps equally important, reason why the rules are complicated. Both the original law and the amendments adopted last October are essentially compromise measures. The same is true, but to a lesser degree, of the new white-collar regulations. No single group can take credit for all the provisions. It was a matter of give and take all the way.

Those who advocated a higher wage floor, for example, achieved their goal at the price of concessions on coverage. Those who wanted to clarify the requirements as to overtime pay had to accept hobbling qualifications. At one point, the fate of the entire amending measure turned on a single vote in the House Labor Committee.

ATTENTION NOW ON COURTS

This necessity for compromising on key points led to the inclusion of many ambiguous words and phrases. The meaning of these will not become clear until the courts have had ample opportunity to construe them.

Moreover, the obstacles encountered in reaching agreement on both the amendments and the white-collar regulations make it extremely unlikely that any further substantial changes will be made for some time. Not a single proposal to amend the law has been introduced in the current session of Congress and, for the first time in several years, the Wage-Hour Administrator's annual report to Congress contained no specific recommendations for changing the law. The rules which became effective on January 25 are the ones you will have to live with for many years to come.

With these observations as a background, let us turn to the questions of "who," "what," and "how."

I. WHO IS COVERED BY THE LAW

In reaching a decision as to whether an employee is entitled to the minimum wage or overtime compensation required under the law, you should obtain answers to these questions:

First. Is he engaged in interstate commerce, the production of goods for interstate commerce, or an occupation or process closely related and directly essential to such production?

Second. If so, does he come under any of the numerous exemptions from the act?

The rules with respect to both of these questions—general coverage and exemptions—were substantially changed on January 25. A new "closely-related and directly-essential" coverage test was adopted for "fringe" production workers. Several new exemptions were added; many of the old exemptions were revised. And more important for the great majority of employers, the rules which govern overtime-pay rights of five classifications of white-collar employees were altered in many important respects.

EXEMPTIONS AND "FRINGES"

While many of these exemption and coverage changes are limited in their effects to a single industry, there are some which cut across industry generally. The most significant of these are the new rules for the exemption of executive, administrative, and professional employees, and the new coverage test for fringe production workers. These are the ones I will discuss.

The new coverage test for fringe production employees is one of the many ambiguous phrases included in the law by dint of a compromise. Its exact meaning will have to be determined on a case-by-case basis, and the number and types of employees who have been removed from the law's coverage thereby will likely not be clear until many test cases have been carried through to final settlement in the courts. Suppose we examine this new test briefly before going on to the more important white-collar rules.

Under the original wage-hour law, an employee was covered if he was engaged in interstate commerce, the production of goods for interstate commerce, or any occupation or process necessary to such production. This last, or necessary, clause has been deleted.

Now, so-called fringe production workers are subject to the law only if they are engaged in "closely related processes or occupations directly essential" to the production of goods for commerce. What did Congress mean by these terms "closely related" and "directly essential?" How do they narrow coverage as interpreted by the courts under the old "necessary-to-production" test?

Even before the new language was adopted there was disagreement among its congressional draftsmen as to its exact meaning. The two extremes in interpretation were presented by Senator PEPPER and Congressman LESINSKI, on the one hand, and Congressman LUCAS, on the other.

WHO IS "DIRECTLY ESSENTIAL"

According to the Pepper-Lesinski interpretation, the new "closely-related and directly-essential" test does not radically revise the law's coverage, as interpreted by the courts in the past. Except for the few groups of employees specifically named in the House Managers statement, they argued, the amendment does not alter the status of any employees who had already been held subject to the act. It merely draws a precise line beyond which the courts may not go in determining whether additional employees are covered.

This interpretation had the backing of the Labor Department's attorneys and will likely be found in the new interpretative bulletin on the law's coverage. This bulletin, I have been told, will be out shortly.

At the other extreme was the view expressed by Congressman LUCAS. The Texas Congressman, who was the original sponsor of some of the amendments which were finally adopted, told the House that the new words "directly essential" connote "indispensable." And he can find some support for this interpretation in the Webster Dictionary's definition of "essential." As one of the meanings of "essential," the dictionary gives "important to the highest degree; indispensable." The only thing wrong with this view is that the words "directly essential" were substituted for "indispensable" in the conference committee because they were believed to have a different meaning.

With even those who drafted the new test disagreeing as to its meaning, it does not appear safe to go beyond the specific guides set out in the House Managers Statement—at least until the courts have handed down some rulings. The managers statement lists about seven types of "fringe" employees who would no longer be covered by the act under the new test and five types who would still be covered.

Among those still covered, according to the statement, are the following:

1. Maintenance, custodial, and clerical employees of manufacturers, mining companies, and other producers of goods for commerce, whether employed by the company itself or by an independent contractor.

2. Employees who maintain or repair buildings in which goods are produced for commerce.

3. Employees who make, repair, or maintain machinery or tools and dies used in the production of goods for commerce.

4. Employees of public utilities furnishing gas, electricity, or water to firms manufacturing, mining, or producing goods for commerce.

The employees removed from coverage, according to the managers statement, are those engaged in a few very specific types of work such as providing residential, eating, or other living facilities for factory workers, cleaning windows or providing exterminator service in factories under contracts between their employers and the manufacturers, or producing fertilizer for sale to local farmers who also sell their products locally.

The distinctions between those employees still covered and those removed from coverage are difficult to perceive in some instances. It looks as if there will be a field day for the lawyers.

WHITE-COLLAR EXEMPTIONS

It is hard to overemphasize the importance of the new white-collar regulations. Nearly 2,500,000 employees are potentially exempt under the rules they establish. And such employees may be found in all sizes and types of establishments from the largest manufacturing plant to the smallest local bank.

To qualify for exemption under the Administrator's regulations, executive, administrative, and professional employees must satisfy requirements as to salary, duties, and responsibilities. One of the most frequent mistakes made by employers is to assume that an employee is exempt merely because his title sounds right and he satisfies the minimum-salary requirement.

Titles do not determine an employee's status under the regulations, and the salary requirement is only one of a series which must be satisfied before an employee may be regarded as exempt.

HOW TO CHECK FOR EXEMPTION

However, in checking an employee's exempt status under the regulations, the logical starting point is his salary. For an executive, the minimum salary is $55 a week. For administrative and professional employees, the minimum is $75 a week. But if an employee in any of the three classifications is paid $100 a week or more, he may be qualified for exemption under new streamlined requirements.

These streamlined requirements should make exemption much easier to support for high-paid white-collar employees. For one thing, they suspend the difficult and strict limitation on the amount of nonexempt work the employee may perform. An important point to remember, however, is that mechanics, craftsmen, and other non-white-collar employees cannot qualify for exemption, no matter how high their pay may be.

In addition to receiving the minimum salary, an exempt executive must be paid on a salary basis. Administrative and professional employees must be paid on a salary or fee basis. The Administrator's interpretation of the phrase "on a salary basis" poses some of the most difficult problems under the regulations.

This phrase, the Administrator explains, means that the employee must receive his full salary—a predetermined amount constituting all or part of his compensation—for any week in which he performs any work, without regard to the number of days or hours worked. In other words, the predetermined amount which constitutes his salary may not be subject to deductions, either for disciplinary or other purposes.

In the ordinary situation, an employer will provide paid vacations and sick leave for executive, administrative, and professional employees. How does this rule apply in such a situation? May the employer penalize an exempt employee for excessive absences during a week by deductions from his paid-vacation allowance?

KEEP THESE POINTS IN MIND

In answering such questions, you may find it helpful to keep the following rules in mind:

First. The exempt employee must receive his full salary in any week in which any work is performed. There are exceptions to this rule only in the first and last weeks of employment. Failure to pay the full salary in such weeks is not regarded as inconsistent with payment on a salary basis.

Second. There is no requirement, however, that the employee be paid his full salary, or any amount for that matter, in a week in which he does no work.

Third. There is no prohibition on deducting from an employee's vacation or sick-leave credits for absences. Just be sure the employee gets his full salary when he works during a week.

Finally, if an employee is not paid his full salary in a week in which he does some work, even a few hours, the exemption may be lost for all weeks, not merely for the week in which the deduction is made.

The practical solution to compliance with these rules would appear to be to make absolutely certain that an exempt employee has no time off without pay in any workweek in which he does any work. If the employee works as much as an hour, he will have to be paid the full salary to preserve the exemption.

Perhaps a few examples will help in clarifying the application of these rules.

First. Suppose an employee is absent for 1 day during a week and the employer makes a deduction of 1 day's pay from his weekly salary. The exemption would be lost, since the employee performed work during the week and did not receive his full weekly salary.

Second. Suppose the employee is absent 1 day and the employer pays him the full salary for the week but deducts 1 day from the 2 weeks of paid vacation to which he is entitled. Since the employee receives his full salary for that week, the exemption would not be impaired thereby. When the employee later takes his vacation, he would be given paid vacation of 1 day less than the full 2 weeks. But the exemption would still not be defeated during the short vacation week if the employer does either of the following: (a) Requires the employee to work 1 day during the week and pays him his full salary or (b) permits him to have the entire week off but pays him for 1 day short of the full week. In the first case, the employee would be paid his full salary for a week in which he worked 1 day; in the second, payment of the full salary would not be required, since the employee did no work during the week.

Third, suppose an employee has exhausted the paid vacation and sick leave to which he is entitled and then takes a day off during the week. If the employer made a deduction from his salary for the absence, the exemption would be impaired.

To sum it all up, no deductions from pay should be made in any week in which the employee does any work. But deductions may be made from vacation or sick leave so long as you avoid a situation in which the employee gets less than his full pay in a week in which he works.

DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

After deciding that the employee meets the salary requirement for one of the three exempt groups, you should next examine his duties and responsibilities to determine if they jibe with the requirements of the regulations.

The definitions of all three classifications—executive, administrative, and professional—now contain a primary-duty test. And an understanding of these tests may help you immeasurably in distinguishing between the different exempt groups and in applying the other requirements for exemption.

For an exempt executive, the primary duty must be the management of the enterprise or a customarily recognized department or subdivision. In other words, the exempt executive group is composed of bosses—those who manage and supervise the operations of a plant or department, those who direct the work of other employees.

For employees in the administrative classification, the primary duty must be the performance of office or nonmanual field work directly related to management policies or general business operations of either the employer or the employer's customers. In addition, the exempt administrative employee must perform work of one of three specific types—first, the type performed by such employees as executive and administrative assistants to a boss; second, the type performed by such staff employees as tax experts, insurance experts, investment consultants, wage rate analysts, and so forth; or third, the type performed by employees who perform special assignments such as traveling auditors, traveling inventory men, and certain types of field representatives.

Finally, employees in the professional group must have as their primary duty the performance of work of one of two types—first, the type performed by employees in one of the traditional or new professions which requires knowledge of an advanced type such as is acquired by a prolonged course of specialized instruction and study; or second, work of an original and creative character in a recognized field of artistic endeavor—the theater, for example.

If you keep these basic distinctions between the various types of exempt work in mind, it will help you in applying the other tests with respect to duties and responsibilities. Of these other tests, the two which will likely prove the most troublesome are those relating to the discretionary powers of the employee and the so-called non-exempt-work tolerances.

WHO EXERCISES "DISCRETION"?

The test relating to discretionary powers is phrased differently for each of the three classifications. The executive must customarily and regularly exercise discretionary powers. The administrative employee must customarily and regularly exercise discretion and independent judgment. Finally, the professional employee must perform work which requires the consistent exercise of discretion and judgment in its performance.

The Administrator's explanatory bulletin on the regulations may give you some valuable guides for determining the degree of discretion and judgment which must be exercised to qualify an employee for exemption. It points out, for example, that the exercise of discretion and judgment must be distinguished from the mere application of skill and procedures. And it gives several examples to illustrate the distinction.

It points out, for example, that you have to distinguish between the application of skill and procedures by a grader of logs and the discretion and judgment exercised by a customers' man in a brokerage house.

When it comes to what is meant by "customarily and regularly," the bulletin appears only to compound the confusion. This phrase, the bulletin states, signifies "a frequency which is greater than occasional but less than constant."

TOLERANCES FOR NONEXEMPT WORK

More exemption claims have been defeated because the employee exceeded the nonexempt-work tolerance than for any other reason. In brief, these tolerances impose a 20-percent limit on the amount of nonexempt work an exempt employee may do each week.

The new regulations both clarify and liberalize these limitations. The changes made are these:

First. What is meant by nonexempt work is clarified by relating it directly to the exempt work the employee performs. Nonexempt work for an executive, for example, is that which is not directly and closely related to the performance of his exempt duties. More important, numerous examples are given of work which might be regarded as exempt for certain employees. You may find these examples in the explanatory bulletin.

Second. The 20-percent limitation on the amount of nonexempt work which may be performed is now stated in terms of the employee's own workweek, not the workweeks of nonexempt employees. As a result, the amount of nonexempt work an employee in these classifications may perform will increase as his weekly hours increase. If an executive works 40 hours, for example, his nonexempt work would be limited to 8 hours. At 60 hours, the non-exempt-work tolerance would be 12 hours.

WATCH TITLES AND JOB DESCRIPTIONS

It is no secret that these white-collar exemptions are difficult to apply. The variety of jobs within their range is almost endless. And the requirements are not simple. If, however, you are called upon at any time to check the status of employees under the new regulations, you may find the following suggestions of value.

First. Be careful about titles. A title or classification does not determine an employee's status. It is his work, responsibilities, and salary which are controlling. If you are an employer, however, do not bestow titles in such a way as to hurt you. If you have an employee with important responsibilities in the care of plant and grounds, call him a superintendent of buildings and grounds, not a head janitor.

Second. Do not rely on a job description prepared by the employee himself. Duties or functions may be blown up or watered down, depending on the purpose.

Third. Watch the rule on deductions from salaries. Avoid any situation in which an employee has time off without pay in a week in which he works. He must receive the full salary in any week in which he performs any work.

Fourth. Don't assume that an employee is not exempt merely because he does not satisfy the exemption tests for one classification. Check his duties and pay against all the definitions.

Finally. If you are given the job of checking the status of any substantial number of employees, prepare a checklist of questions to ask each employee with respect to his salary, duties, and responsibilities. And file the information you obtain. It may be valuable later on.

II. WHAT THE LAW REQUIRES

Once you have determined that an employee is subject to the law, it then becomes necessary to find out what it requires in the form of minimum wages and overtime compensation.

So far as the minimum wage is concerned, the problems are not too many nor too difficult. The minimum is a flat 75 cents an hour. There is no escalator provision for raising it to higher levels.

MINIMUM WAGE PROBLEMS

When it comes to putting the minimum into effect in a plant, however, there are a few practical considerations to bear in mind. It is important, for example, to know whether compliance will be determined on the basis of each hour, each workweek, or some longer period.

For employees paid hourly or piece rates, the single workweek will still be the standard. If the average hourly earnings for nonovertime hours in the workweek are at least 75 cents, the minimum wage requirement will be satisfied for that week. The Administrator does not, however, permit any averaging of earnings for such employees over a period longer than a workweek. Nor does he permit an employer to set an hourly rate below 75 cents where the employee is paid solely on an hourly-rate basis.

For salaried employees, there is an exception to this rule. If the employee is paid a semimonthly or monthly salary, the Administrator will recognize a regular monthly salary of $130 or a regular semimonthly salary of $65 as meeting the requirements of the act for workweeks of no more than 40 hours.

If the minimum wage were to be applied on a strict workweek basis to such employees, there would be some pay periods in which the $65-semimonthly or $130-monthly salary would not yield an average of 75 cents an hour. Suppose, for example, an employee working a 40-hour week is paid on the first and fifteenth of the month. For some pay periods, that salary will cover only 80 hours; for others, it will cover as many as 96 hours. Over the year, the payment of $65 each pay period would yield an average of 75 cents an hour. But in a half month having 12 workdays, it would take a payment of $72 to net the employee 75 cents an hour.

The Administrator's special rule for such employees obviates this difficulty.

Two other problems with respect to minimum wages deserve special attention before we leave the subject.

First. The problem of training learners under the increased-wage floor is apparently more serious than had been anticipated. Nearly 3,000 special learner certificates permitting a training rate below the minimum have been issued since the first of the year. To obtain such a certificate, the employer should be able to show that experienced workers are not available for the jobs, that the minimum wage is so burdensome that learners would not be hired without an exemption, and that the job is a skilled one requiring a definite learning period.

Second. If you contemplate doing Government work, you should take into account the likelihood that even higher minimum rates may soon be required for work on Government contracts. The Secretary of Labor has asked Congress for $536,000 to finance a program of revising minimum-wage determinations under the Walsh-Healey Act. And his goals are far above the 75-cent hourly minimum established under the Wages and Hours Act.

OVERTIME PAY

Ever since the act was first adopted in 1938, the problem of figuring overtime pay has been particularly difficult. Now you have a set of statutory guides to assist you in making these computations. These guides may be found in a revised and considerably expanded section 7 of the act. Moreover, the Administrator has set out his views as to the meaning of the new provisions in a detailed bulletin covering nearly 50 pages.

Under the revised section 7, as under the original law, hours in excess of 40 a week must be paid for at time and one-half the employee's regular rate. According to a long line of Supreme Court decisions, this regular rate must generally be figured by the averaging method.

Total weekly pay, excluding true overtime premiums and a few other extra payments, should be divided by the number of hours worked during the week. If the employee is paid a flat weekly wage or salary for a fixed number of hours, the divisor should be the number of hours in the fixed or regular workweek.

CHANGES IN AVERAGING RULE

For the great majority of employees, this averaging rule, with some modifications, will still determine the regular rate. The amendments do not rescind the rule. The changes they make are these:

First. They considerably enlarge the category of payments which may be excluded before total weekly pay is divided by weekly hours to determine the regular rate.

Second. They add to the list of true overtime premiums which may both be excluded in figuring the regular rate and deducted from the amount due as weekly overtime under the law. Now in this group are weekend, holiday, day of rest, and premiums for work outside certain clock-pattern hours—premiums which had been considered a part of the regular rate under the Supreme Court's overtime-on-overtime decision.

Third. They expressly sanction three exceptions to the averaging rule—a so-called Belo contract, an employer-employee agreement fixing a regular rate substantially equivalent to the employee's average hourly earnings, and an agreement to base the overtime pay of pieceworkers and employees paid more than one rate in a single week on the basic rate paid during the overtime hours.

Fourth. They liberalize the requirements for obtaining partial overtime exemptions under so-called semiannual and annual wage agreements.

The Administrator's views with respect to these changes are set out at considerable length in the new interpretative bulletin and regulations he has issued. There are three points, however, which deserve special attention at this time. These relate to what the Administrator describes as pseudo-percentage bonuses, so-called Belo contracts, and premium payments for holiday work.

BONUSES AND PREMIUMS

For some time, it has been the general impression that so-called percentage bonuses—those paid as a percentage of total earnings, including premium overtime pay—were safe. It was believed that they clearly included an overtime allowance and thus would have no effect on regular rate or overtime computations.

But the Administrator's new overtime bulletin and profit-sharing regulations do not go this far. While the Administrator recognizes that percentage bonuses ordinarily will not increase overtime liabilities, he points out that there are certain pseudo-bonuses which must all be regarded as regular wages, even though paid as a percentage of total earnings.

As one example, he cites an hourly rate plus group commission pay plan for salesmen. The commissions are part of the regular rate, he states, and the fact that they are paid as a percentage of total earnings will not alter the situation.

Although it is not specifically so stated, it does not appear likely that the Administrator will recognize an overtime allowance in a percentage bonus paid under a so-called cost-saving, production-saving, or Scanlon type of plan, such as was upheld in the Macklin case before the amendments were adopted. The amounts paid under such plans are directly linked to group production and for that reason may be regarded as part of the regular rate.

GUARANTY WAGE CONTRACTS

Although the type of guaranty wage contract which has become known as a Belo contract was twice upheld by the Supreme Court, the Administrator has always regarded the Court's ruling as a narrow pronouncement limited to the exact facts involved in the Belo and Halliburton cases.

Under the new section 7 (e), express sanction is given for contracts of the Belo type, provided they meet very specific and strict requirements. The requirements are these:

First. The contract must be either a bona fide individual employment contract or a collective-bargaining agreement. It need not be written.

Second. The duties of the employee must necessitate irregular hours of work.

Third. The contract must specify a regular rate of pay not less than the 75-cent hourly minimum and compensation at not less than one and one-half times that rate for all hours above 40 in any workweek.

Fourth. The contract must provide a weekly guaranty which covers not more than 60 hours based on the regular and overtime rates specified in the contract.

There is a feeling around Washington that few contracts will get by under the interpretation the Administrator is giving to these requirements. In his overtime bulletin, for example, he emphasizes that the regular rate specified in the contract must actually operate as a regular rate. In other words, the employee will have to get more than the weekly guaranty in a substantial portion of the workweeks so that the specified regular rate may actually be used to figure pay. Moreover, he adds, the weekly guaranty must be a real guaranty—it must be paid in full in all workweeks, however short, in which the employee performs any amount of work for the employer.

In a brief filed in the Antonio Roig case now pending before the Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, the Administrator points out that the rules must be applied on the basis of the hours, duties, and pay of each individual employee.

If you plan to use a Belo contract, therefore, the best advice I could give you would be to make absolutely certain the contract is in exact accordance with the standards specified in the law. Moreover, the guaranty should be set low enough that the employee's pay will exceed it in a substantial portion of the workweeks. There are, however, many good reasons for avoiding such contracts entirely.

HOLIDAY PAY

Among the new overtime premiums—those which may be excluded in figuring the regular rate and, in addition, offset against overtime pay due under the law—are premiums of at least an extra half time paid for work performed on a holiday.

In applying this new provision, you must ignore the pay which an employee receives for the holiday whether he works or not. Payments for time not worked are not part of the regular rate and, in addition, cannot be credited against overtime pay. If, for example, the employment contract provides for 8 hours' pay for an unworked holiday plus an additional straight-time pay for each hour worked on the holiday, you would ignore the 8 hours' idle-holiday pay in applying the new rule. Since the employee receives only straight-time pay for working on the holiday, there could be no credit against statutory overtime. The first straight-time pay—that the employee would get even if he didn't work—would be excluded in figuring the regular rate as pay for time not worked. The extra straight time for working on the holiday would be included in figuring the regular rate. Neither could be credited against overtime.

The rule is different, however, where the employment contract and practices make it clear that an entire holiday payment is compensation for working on the holiday. In such an event, the initial straight time would be included in figuring the regular rate. Any amount of an extra half time or more paid in addition to the straight time could be excluded in figuring the regular rate and credited against overtime pay due under the law.

The point to remember is that the holiday payment which may be excluded from the regular rate and offset against overtime due under the law is a premium of at least an extra half time paid for working on the holiday.

With this brief review of a few of the key overtime problems, let us go on to the final question of how the law is enforced.

III. HOW THE LAW IS ENFORCED

When the amendments to the law were adopted last October, the Administrator gained his long-sought express authority to collect back wages owed to employees under the act. The authority was hedged with so many new restrictions, however, that it is not certain that the Administrator actually gained much.

As thus amended, the law now provides for the following legal actions to enforce its requirements:

First. The Administrator may sue to collect unpaid minimum wages and overtime pay due the employees, provided the employees request the Administrator in writing to bring the suit and the case does not involve an unsettled issue of law.

Second. The Administrator may sue for an injunction to restrain an employer from violating the law.

Third. The Justice Department may bring criminal actions against "willful" violators.

Fourth. Employees themselves may sue to recover back wages due them under the law plus an equal additional amount as liquidated damages.

No change was made in the good-faith defenses or 2-year statute of limitations for wage suits, as provided for by the Portal-to-Portal Act.

WATCH HOW POWERS ARE USED

As is often the case, the exact enforcement powers which the Administrator has may not be nearly so important as the manner in which he exercises them. Some hints as to the Administrator's plans may be found in the budget requests for the coming fiscal year.

To enforce the new minimum wage and overtime requirements, the Administrator is asking for additional funds totaling nearly $3,000,000. This would permit an estimated 60,000 or more inspections during the 1951 fiscal year. In other words, the Administrator plans to inspect 1 out of every 10 establishments covered by the act during the course of the year. This is almost double the number inspected last year. And inspections by the Division often bring a flood of employee-wage suits in their wake.

A FEW SUGGESTIONS

With these increased enforcement activities in prospect, it is more important than ever for the employer, the attorney, and the union officer to know the answers to the questions of "who" and "what" under the law. I have tried to focus your attention on a few of the problems you will encounter. There will be many others, and few of them will be simple.

In dealing with these problems on a day-to-day basis, you may find it helpful to keep these suggestions in mind:

First. If there is some doubt as to an employee's right to the minimum-wage and overtime payments under the law, check his status both under the rules governing basic coverage and those for the specific exemptions.

Second. In applying the most important of the exemptions—those for white-collar employees—remember that exemption depends on the salary, duties, and responsibilities of the employee, not on his title or salary alone. And don't forget the rules on deductions from salaries.

Third. Remember that earnings of hourly paid and piece-rate employees may be averaged over a workweek—but no longer period—in determining compliance with the minimum wage.

Finally. Be wary of any painless rigs for complying with the law's overtime requirements. The overtime provision is now long and detailed, and methods of payment not specifically sanctioned may be very costly in the long run.

Our Confused Present and Uncertain Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in the April 22, 1950, issue of the Ave Maria, the publication of Notre Dame University.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

For some time now the people of the United States have been worried about the confused present and the uncertain future of our country. There seems to be lack of stability and definiteness in the direction and management of national affairs. Our leaders seem less concerned with the people who make up this Nation than with projects that will likely assure political continuity in public office. And you are not at all sure that some of the projects will assure continuity.

We the people are often referred to as dumb by men who affect penetration and a far-seeing vision. As a matter of fact the American people are not dumb. They are miraculously patient with sometimes very muddled situations. Were they not they might start a revolution. But they still think that America is the people's country and ex-

press their revolution constitutionally at the polls.

Why didn't they in a few recent elections? Because the two major political parties that selected candidates for the top office in Government did not offer them a very wide margin of choice in candidates and in the national and international politicies which these candidates announced and defended at the hustings.

There was not much of a convincing nature about meeting the problems of the homeland; not much emphasis on lessening the load of taxation; or if there were, it was forgotten after the election. There were rumors about socialized medicine and socialized projects under other heads. Communism was challenged somewhat but not as a serious threat—at least not here. One candidate ran for President as a more or less Communist suspect. That was one definite issue—one of the few—which faced the voters. The returns showed definitely that the American people of both parties do not want either an all-out or a modified communism.

You do not know just how factually President Truman, the House, and the Senate have returns on the outlooks and feelings of the American people at this moment. But they should know, and perhaps they do know, that not within the memory of anybody now living has the down feeling been so apparent and so persistent as at this time. The people are not just angry, although they are angry too. They are mentally and emotionally depressed. And no funny story is successful in lifting the depression.

Frankly, they do not know where the country is going or why. They were dangerously near a complete coal shut-off. They had to beg for rationed coal at a price higher than the present high price. Coal dust became as precious as gold dust. Coal operators and John L. Lewis got into a strangle hold and would not untie. And Washington told the country there was no coal emergency. People began to wonder when an emergency is not an emergency.

Communist spies in and out of Government are discovered and brought to trial. They and their lawyers are challenging and arrogant; men high in Government station, paid by the people to maintain the America of tradition, appear in court to testify to the good characters of known spies; a Cabinet member asserts boldly he will not turn his back on a former Government employee accused of perjury to conceal his subversive activities. The effort to discover and prosecute spies was classified under the red herring trope.

Taxes, taxes, taxes; projects, projects, projects; and money loans to Communist Tito who persecutes, jails, and kills people because they believe in one God the Father Almighty. At this moment people are convinced that American political planners should give much more thought to American homesteading.

The Workings of Governmental Agencies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, during the past several months I have received countless communications from our people living in Minnesota and the upper Midwest desiring to know something about the workings of our Government agencies.

In an effort to supply this information I enlisted the help of the Minnesota Arrowhead radio network and Mr. George E. Reedy, well known radio personage, and the Washington representative for this network, in airing a program called Know Your Government. This program featured heads of a number of Government agencies who carried the story of their agency's functions direct to these people via the Arrowhead network.

The response has been excellent. Several inquiries have been received from radio stations throughout the United States expressing a desire to carry a like program. Several Senators and Congressmen have asked me for information concerning this series of programs with the idea of using the same idea in their localities.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article on the subject which appeared in the St. Paul Pioneer Press on Saturday, April 22, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE AREA TOLD HOW UNITED STATES OPERATES

WASHINGTON.—Senator HUMPHREY, Democrat of Minnesota, is aroused by what he calls criticism of Government agencies and the people who work for them. He's trying to do something about it.

As a member of the Civil Service Committee, he says he's learned that hundreds of Americans don't understand why the Federal Government is as big as it is and includes so many different branches.

(On March 2, the Federal pay roll contained 1,948,900 employees, not counting the military, the lowest it's been since 1942.)

OFFICIALS SPEAK

HUMPHREY says the American people should have more chance to get educated on Government activities.

So he and George E. Reedy have worked out a "know your Government" radio program. Reedy is Washington representative of the Arrowhead radio network, serving northeastern Minnesota and western Wisconsin.

Every Saturday afternoon people in that area can tune in on the 15-minute program.

They'll hear people like Dr. Roy Peel, head of the Census Bureau; James Mitchell, president of the Civil Service Commission; Raymond Foley, Federal Housing Administrator.

The series of broadcasts, recorded in Washington, started April 1. They will probably stop some time in June, when school lets out, and take up again in September.

"People have a right to know where their tax dollar goes, and why. This may help them find out," HUMPHREY says.

After delivery over the Arrowhead network, the discs are available to schools and colleges.

They are in the form of questions and answers, with Reedy asking and a top Government employee answering. They don't avoid controversial issues.

TIME IS FREE

During Mr. Peel's broadcast, for instance, Reedy asked why the census takers had to go into the question of personal income. The income question has been called an infringement on liberty.

Dr. Peel replied "that information is of vital importance to business in serving markets. The answers measure purchasing power."

The program is billed as a public service and the time is free. Humphrey gets a note of thanks for his help in making the program possible at the end of the 15-minute show.

Humphrey's secretary, Bill Rasch, who helped work out the details, said response to the program has been very good so far.

He said a couple of other Senators have already asked about the idea.

Next winter, Rasch said, "Reedy hopes to get Secretary of Defense Johnson, Secretary of the Interior Chapman, and FBI Director Hoover on the air."

Tribute to Lt. Gen. Alvan C. Gillem by Hubert Lee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH McKELLAR

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask permission to have inserted in the RECORD an editorial paying tribute to Lt. Gen. Alvan C. Gillem, a Tennessean, who will retire as Commanding General of the Third Army in September. The editorial was written by Hubert Lee, and appeared in Dixie Business, published at East Point, Ga.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIS WEEK

(By Hubert Lee)

Lt. Gen. Alvan C. Gillem, Jr., commanding general of the Third Army, will retire in September at Fort McPherson where, 40 years ago, he served as a buck private.

The Nashville, Tenn., born soldier played a major role in winning World War II just as he did during the First World War.

General Gillem is known over the world, wherever military men gather, as the soldier's general.

In all the years he has never forgotten that he was a buck private. His own idealism and belief in the dignity of the profession of army, whether the lowest recruit or high rank, has been an inspiration to many men in the Army. The welfare of the men in the ranks comes first with General Gillem, for he knows his officers and noncoms can look out for their own welfare. Such a soldier, too, was Gen. John J. Pershing, known affectionately as Black Jack. And Gen. J. Lawton Collins, who hails from New Orleans, and many another.

It took him 30 years to reach the rank of brigadier general and with the one star on July 12, 1941, the veteran infantry officer was given the command of the Third Armored Division. On January 17, 1942, less than 2 months after Pearl Harbor, General Gillem activated and took command of the famed Second Armored Corps. From August to October 1942, he commanded the Desert Training Center and General Gillem directed the first United States Army maneuvers held solely for armored and mechanized troops.

Sewanee's gifted soldier found his training and leadership in great demand, for on May 14, 1943, he was placed in command of the armored force and became commanding general on July 2, 1943, of Armored Command. In 1945 he was promoted to lieutenant general. General Gillem commanded the Thirteenth Corps in the European theater of operations.

With peace treaties signed, there was still no thought of retirement for General Gillem.

His old friend, Gen. George C. Marshall had need of his knowledge and experience and good judgment and General Gillem was called to China as General Marshall's assistant on a special presidential mission in an effort to end that nation's troubled and strife-torn woes. In China, General Gillem commanded the China theater, United States Forces in China.

In 1947, he returned to the States and assumed command of the Third Army at Fort McPherson where he has made an unforgetable record for the Army. The Third Army today is regarded at the Nation's best.

What a fine thing it would be if at least one soldier from every outfit General Gillem has ever served in or commanded could be assigned to march in review when the Guard of Honor is reviewed for the last time in September at the retirement ceremonies.

There would be thousands, both in and out of the uniform, who would like to have that privilege.

A man can't be a good soldier for 40 years without making a mark on the lives of many others. General Gillem's mark is imprinted on thousands who have come in contact with him the past twoscore years and who sought to emulate the quiet dignity and leadership of the soldier's soldier.

In retirement, he will continue to be a great influence in and out of the Army. Many an officer in a tight position will ask himself, "What would General Gillem do in this situation?" And many an enlisted man will hope that perhaps he too will follow the example of General Gillem and climb to the top in his chosen profession—the profession of arms.

The St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on Tuesday, Secretary of State Dean Acheson testified before the House Public Works Committee on the St. Lawrence seaway and power development project. I ask unanimous consent to have his testimony printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Gentlemen, the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and the development of the power potential of the international rapids section of the St. Lawrence River are both vitally important to the economy and defense of the United States. In the consideration, however, of the importance of these projects to the United States, a subject which will be fully developed before this committee by other witnesses whose functions it more immediately concerns, we must not overlook the fact that both of these projects are of equal concern to Canada. Canada, like the United States, has a vast, midcontinent area, which needs to be connected with European markets at reduced cost. Canada, like the United States, has an eastern area which is deficient in low-cost power, and in which the deficiency is hindering the growth of industry. In Canada lies iron ore which needs to be transported to the steel mills of the United States. The building of the seaway and the development of power are as essential to the economy and defense of Canada as they are to the economy and defense of the United States. And because those measures which make Canada more prosperous and better able to defend itself add also to the prosperity and security of the United States, so the proposal now under consideration becomes doubly important to the United States.

The extent of the mutual dependence involved in this partnership is indicated by the fact that United States exports to Canada are valued at about $1,800,000,000 annually, an amount three times as great as exports to our next best customer, the United Kingdom. Our trade with Canada, both imports and exports, composed about 18 percent of our total foreign trade last year.

Since, therefore, the construction of the seaway and of the power project are of equal importance to Canada and to the United States, and since neither project can be constructed without the joint action of both countries, our action on this measure cannot fail to have an immediate effect on the international relations between the two countries. If we adopt the resolution, Canada and the United States can go forward together in this joint venture for their mutual benefit, and our already happy relations will be made happier; if we refuse to cooperate, there will be disappointment and justifiable criticism on both sides of the border. It is my function as Secretary of State to point out to this committee the importance of the resolution from the point of view of our international relations with Canada.

This committee is aware of the upward progress of friendly relations between the United States and our great neighbor to the north over the last 150 years. From the bitterness of the Revolutionary War to the partnership of the Second World War, the course of friendship has not always been smooth. The Treaty of Paris in 1783 led to innumerable disputes over the international boundary, which were only terminated by the Webster-Ashburton Treaty of 1842, and the establishment of the International Boundary Commission in 1908 and 1925. This was not the only Commission which has helped ease the natural frictions of a common boundary of over 3,000 miles and two economies which do not respect national boundaries. The Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909, which I shall refer to again, established the international joint commission to handle problems relating to utilization of boundary waters. The halibut and sockeye salmon commissions, set up in 1923 and 1930, supervise the great fisheries of the Pacific coast.

This relationship has proceeded also in the field of national defense. The Permanent Joint Board on Defense established in 1940 to consider joint military problems, was followed by the Hyde Park agreement of 1941 for joint mobilization of economic resources. The efforts necessary to achieve victory during the war enlarged tremendously the recognized area of common interests, and as recently as 1947 the two governments agreed to continue the military cooperation of the war years. In the international field, common ideals, as well as common interests, have tended to cause the United States and Canada to seek similar objectives. Together they have striven to fashion the United Nations into an adequate safeguard for peace, and when supplementary measures seemed needed, these two nations took the lead in fostering the Atlantic Pact.

Thus, the partnership with Canada is of the utmost importance to the United States. Approval of this resolution would authorize the United States and Canada to undertake cooperatively the management on a large scale of this jointly-owned water resource for the welfare of both nations and would further strengthen the partnership between the two countries.

The boundary waters between the United States and Canada have been the object of a series of agreements and treaties between the two countries. The reason why the proposed public works involve the international relations between the United States and Canada is that they concern boundary waters. For over 100 miles from Lake Ontario to the Province of Quebec, the St. Lawrence River is boundary water. From that point it flows through Canadian territory for over 1,000 miles to the Atlantic Ocean. It is available for deep-water navigation connecting the thousand miles of the Great Lakes system with the ocean. It has been the care of the Department of State, ever since the founding of the Republic, to maintain by treaty reciprocal rights of navigation for American citizens, not only through the 1,000 miles of the Great Lakes system, and these 100 miles of boundary waters, but also over the 1,000 miles of Canadian waters to the sea. These rights were secured by treaties between the United States and Great Britain or Canada in 1794, 1854, 1871, and finally 1909. Furthermore, since the 46 miles of the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence lie within these 100 miles of boundary waters, the great power potential that lies in the drop in elevation over this stretch can be utilized only through international agreement.

Of these treaties I need refer in detail only to the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909. This treaty is important in relation to the pending agreement because it affects the use of the St. Lawrence in both of its aspects—as a seaway and as a source of power. The treaty provides that the navigation of all boundary waters shall forever continue free and open, for purposes of commerce, to the inhabitants and vessels of both Canada and the United States. This same right of navigation was extended by the Treaty to all canals connecting boundary waters, or which may be constructed on either side of the line, such as the MacArthur Lock at Sault Ste. Marie, between Lakes Superior and Huron, the Welland Canal, connecting Lakes Erie and Ontario, and the seaway at the rapids of the St. Lawrence, which is the subject matter of the seaway half of the proposed project. This treaty, taken in connection with previous treaties, opens to the equal use of both countries what will be one navigable seaway, over 2,000 miles in length, from Duluth, Minn., and Chicago, Ill., to the Atlantic Ocean.

I have said that the treaty of 1900 affects the use of the St. Lawrence in both of its aspects, as a seaway and a source of power. In addition to assuring perpetual rights of navigation to both parties, the treaty provided that no uses, obstructions or diversions of boundary waters might thereafter be made on either side of the line, which affect the natural level or flow of the waters on the other side of the line, without resort to certain procedures. The treaty set up the International Joint Commission previously referred to, to pass upon such cases, but it also provided that such uses, obstructions or diversions might be made by special agreement between the parties. In other words, under the treaty of 1909, the development of the power potential of the international rapids section, as well as the construction of the seaway through the section may be accomplished through special agreement between the United States and Canada.

The project for the completion of a Great Lakes-St. Lawrence deep waterway by mutual agreement between the United States and Canada was first considered by Congress in 1895, and has since been the subject of numerous conferences, commissions and reports. A treaty was signed on July 18, 1932. This treaty differs in many respects from the agreement we are now considering, and I will not need to go into its details. In brief, it provided for the construction of

a waterway, not less than 27 feet in depth, by a St. Lawrence International Rapids Section Commission, of 10 members, 5 appointed by each country. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee reported favorably on the ratification of this treaty, but although it received a majority in the Senate in 1934, it failed of a two-thirds vote.

The present St. Lawrence seaway and power project was agreed upon by Canada and the United States on March 19, 1941. A resolution approving the agreement was favorably reported by the House Rivers and Harbors Committee in November 1941. In February 1946 I appeared before the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate as Under Secretary of State, in support of Senate Joint Resolution 111 then before that committee and urged its approval. That Senate committee, and a subsequent committee of the Eightieth Congress, reported favorably on legislation corresponding to the legislation now before this committee and indicated its opinion that the 1941 agreement and the legislation were based on sound constitutional grounds.

The objective of the 1941 agreement is an equal division of the water available for power, and the construction of a deep waterway. The plans and specifications are to be prepared, and the work allocated between the two Governments, by a Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin Commission of not more than 10 members, appointed equally by each Government. Plans and specifications must be approved by the Governments, and the work so allocated that each Government constructs the work within its own territory, or an equivalent proportion of the whole works. The Commission is to supervise construction and the Governments agree to construct the works allocated to them.

House Joint Resolution 271, which we have before us, approves this agreement of 1941, with the exception of three articles in whole or in part, and authorizes the President to fulfill the undertakings made on behalf of the United States in the agreement, on receipt of satisfactory evidence of the approval of the agreement, subject to the exceptions, by reciprocal or concurrent legislation of Canada.

The agreement provides a completion date not later than December 21, 1948. It is clear that a new date must be fixed for the completion of the construction. The original date, 1948, afforded a period of 7 years for construction. On the assumption that similar engineering considerations still prevail, it would seem reasonable if the Congress by amendment of the resolution should provide a new date for completion, 7 or possibly 8 years after the agreement goes into effect.

Two of the three articles contained in the agreement of 1941 which are specifically excepted from the approval of the Congress by the present resolution deal with matters which, as the Senate has indicated, may be more appropriate for a treaty than for an executive agreement. The first of these, article VII, was in substance an agreement that the rights of navigation accorded under existing treaties should be maintained notwithstanding provisions for termination contained in such treaties. Considering the number of years that these treaties have now run without termination, and the close relations between Canada and the United States, both economic and in matters of defense, it is quite unthinkable that they would hereafter be terminated. However, the Department of State is prepared to negotiate with Canada a treaty on this point, as is suggested in section 2 of the draft bill before you.

The other of these two articles omitted in the resolution, article IX of the agreement, referred to Niagara Falls and River. This article is quite properly omitted, since a treaty with Canada on the subject of Niagara has recently been signed.

The third omission, article VIII, paragraph (c), is of even less moment. It provides that if either country should authorize diversions of water from the Great Lakes system, other or greater than those permitted on January 1, 1940, the Government of such country would give immediate consideration to the representations of the other. If satisfactory settlement were not possible, the article provides for an arbitral tribunal. The particular dispute envisaged by the article related to possible future increase in the diversion of Lake Michigan waters through the Chicago drainage canal. The issue as to the Chicago drainage canal was settled by the decision of the Supreme Court in *Wisconsin* v. *Illinois*, in April 1930, which enjoined the objectionable diversion. The International Joint Commission has complete jurisdiction over diversions of boundary waters in general, and both countries have regarded with satisfaction the exercise of that jurisdiction by the Commission. Because of these facts, it is believed that this provision for a special arbitral tribunal is unnecessary.

The present legislation also adds a provision that is not contained in the 1941 agreement; namely, a provision for tolls, or the self-liquidation of the new navigation portion of the project through the collection of charges on shipping which uses the new seaway facilities. The resolution provides that the President shall negotiate a further agreement with the Government of Canada defining, within limits also stated, the rates of charges to be levied for the use of the seaway facilities. This new subject matter has been discussed with the Canadian Government and we have been informed that the Canadian Government is prepared to agree to the principle of making the St. Lawrence seaway self-liquidating by means of toll charges, subject, however, to the conclusion of arrangements satisfactory to both Governments for the implementation of this principle. The Government of Canada has been fully advised as to the provisions of the present legislation, including both the deletions from and the addition to the agreement of 1941. This Government has no reason to believe that satisfactory agreement cannot be worked out on these matters, and I am confident that this will be done.

I have not stressed the many economic benefits that will accrue to the United States from this project. That is not my role. I do wish to say, however, that I believe these benefits are of sufficient importance to warrant the contemplated expenditures at this time. The creation of a great inland waterway would enable goods originating in the midcontinent area, shared by both Canada and the United States, to be shipped to European markets at reduced cost. It would make possible the shipment of iron ore from the Quebec-Labrador area of Canada. The low-cost power provided would materially reduce the acute shortage in both northeastern United States and southeastern Canada.

Both the seaway and power developments would enhance the defense potential of Canada and the United States. This was pointed out by the Joint Chiefs of Staff in 1946. In May 1947, the Permanent Joint Board on Defense, United States-Canada, of which I was a member, said:

"The Board considered the significance of the St. Lawrence seaway project from the point of view of the joint defense of the United States and Canada. It was recognized that the completion of a deepwater navigation route from the sea to the heart of the continent would provide additional facilities for the movement of ships and essential supplies in wartime and would also make possible the construction of ocean going vessels in inland areas. Furthermore, the new source of power made available by the St. Lawrence project would greatly increase the defense potential of the two countries. It is, therefore, the view of the Board that the early completion of this long-delayed enterprise on a cooperative basis satisfactory to both governments would directly contribute to the security of the North American Continent."

The prosperity of the United States and the ability to arm for our own defense has been a result of the development of our natural resources. The long-overdue development of one of the world's greatest waterways and power sources by Canada and the United States will further expand the economies of both countries, thus increasing our joint peacetime prosperity and the ability to defend ourselves successfully.

I urge the committee to report the resolution favorably.

Detroit Jewish Community Marks Centennial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. O'BRIEN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 27, 1950

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article from the Jewish News of Detroit commemorating the one hundredth anniversary of the Jewish community of Detroit:

From the traditional Minyan in 1850, Detroit Jewry has grown to a community of nearly 100,000 people. It now rates a place among the seven largest Jewish centers on this continent, together with New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, Boston, Los Angeles, and Cleveland.

Although there is a record of Jews who had lived in Detroit as early as the year 1763, the history of Jewry as an organized community in Detroit did not begin until 1850.

Since Jewish tradition designates that a "minyan"—a group of 10 men who are at least 13 years of age—is required for the holding of congregational services, the "minyan" has become the symbol of community organization.

THE FIRST MINYAN

It was not until the beginning of 1850 that the number of Jews in Detroit grew to the traditional "minyan." Their predecessors, included Jewish traders who probably were among the first arrivals at the trading posts along the Great Lakes. At the time of Chief Pontiac's conspiracy in 1763, two Jews, Levy and Chapman were captured by the Indians. Old records show that Chapman settled in Detroit and lived here until 1796.

Another Jewish pioneer, Solomon Ben Isaac Halevi, who lived in Detroit in 1783, is mentioned as a witness in a matrimonial case before the Beth Din—the Jewish Court—of London. Names of other Jews in the early Detroit records, prior to the formation of the Detroit Jewish community, include: Isaac Moses, whose name appears in the 1798 and subsequent records of the first Masonic Detroit lodge; A. J. Solomon, who was, en route to Mackinac, among the 10 passengers whose names were listed in the Gazette of June 17, 1820, as satisfied with the "arrangements and accommodation" of the steamer *Walk on the Water;* Louis Benjamin, a merchant who may have been Jewish, who was, according to Michigan Territory records awarded a lot in Detroit to indemnify him for losses in the fire of 1805; and, according to

the records of the common council, an Alex Cohen was on the pay roll for grading a street in 1835.

THE FIRST SETTLERS

In the first directory to be published in Detroit, in 1837, there was not one name among the 1,100 that was certainly Jewish. In the second directory, published in 1845, there were only two Jewish names—Solomon Bendid and Moses Rindskoff. In the directory of 1850, in spite of the marked increase in Detroit's population which then numbered 21,000, there were only three Jewish firms and five individuals listed: S. and H. Bendid & Co., dry goods; Silberman & Hersch, cigar manufacturers; S. Freedman & Brothers, dry goods; Alex Grunwald, Leopold Rappenkeimer or Rappenheimer, fancy goods; F. E. Cohen, portrait painter; Solomon Cohen, pedlar.

Detroit Jewry's history began in 1850 with the coming to Detroit of Isaac and Sophie Cozens who were followed by other Jews, mostly from Bavaria. Available documents show that among these first settlers were the following pioneers who assisted in the establishment of the Detroit Jewish community: Amberg, Bresler, Franke, Friedlander, Heineman, Hirschman, Kanter, Lang, Newman, Proll, Schloss, Sloman, and Springer.

FORMATION OF BETH EL

Eager for religious services, Mr. and Mrs. Cozens converted their home on Congress Street into a synagogue and Sabbath services were held there regularly until September 22, 1850, when the founding group organized itself into the Beth El Society which served as the beginning for Michigan's first Jewish congregation—the 100-year-old Temple Beth El of Detroit.

Joseph Newman was temporary chairman of the newly-formed Beth El Society. Later, Jacob Silberman—to whom went the distinction of being the founding president of Temple Beth El, was chosen the first head of Detroit's first community organization. Marcus Cohen, who came here early in 1850, was the first acting spiritual leader of the congregation until, later that year, he brought from New York his friend Rabbi Samuel Marcus who served the small synagogue as rabbi, cantor, and schochet. Rabbi Marcus served here until 1854 when he fell as one of the victims in the cholera epidemic of that year and was buried in the first Jewish cemetery, the half-acre plot that was acquired by Beth El in 1851 for $150 on Champlain Street in what is now the city of Hamtramck.

SHAAREY ZEDEK ORGANIZED

For 11 years, Beth El was Detroit's sole synagogue. A hall was rented as a place of worship on Michigan Grand Avenue in 1859. In 1861, property for a synagogue building was purchased on Rivard Street. It was the old First Methodist Church near Congress Street. This house of worship was dedicated on August 30, 1861, by Dr. Isaac M. Wise, of Cincinnati, founder of the Reform Jewish movement in America. The tendencies of Beth El congregation towards reform practices created a rift in the synagogue and a group of members withdrew to form, in 1861, Congregation Shaarey Zedek, which today is considered one of the leading conservative synagogues in America.

From the handful of Jewish settlers in 1850, the Jewish community of Detroit has grown in the 100 years of its existence to a community of nearly 100,000. There are two Reform congregations—Temple Beth El and Temple Israel; three conservative synagogues—Shaarey Zedek, Bnai Mosche and Northwest Congregation, and 35 orthodox synagogues ranging in memberships from as small as 25 to as high as Bnai David's 650.

TEMPLE BETH EL'S RABBIS

A number of distinguished men served Temple Beth El as rabbis. Samuel Marcus was followed by the following rabbis: Liebman Adler, 1854–61; A. Laser, 1861–63; Isidore Kalisch, 1863–64; Elias Eppstein, 1864–69; Kaufman Kohler, who later became president of Hebrew Union College, 1869–71; Reverend Greenblatt, 1871; E. Gerechter, 1871–74; Leopold Wintner, 1873–76; Henry Zirndorf, 1876–84; Louis Grossman, 1885–89; Leo M. Franklin, 1899–1948. Dr. B. Benedict Glazer, the present rabbi, has Sidney Akselrad as his educational assistant.

Rabbi Judah L. Levin, father of Prof. Samuel M. Levin, of Wayne University, was among Detroit's most distinguished orthodox rabbis. Rabbi Leon Fram is spiritual leader of Temple Israel. Harry C. Levine is president of Temple Israel.

SHAAREY ZEDEK'S RABBIS

Dr. A. M. Hershman, rabbi emeritus of Congregation Shaarey Zedek, whose present rabbi is Morris Adler, is one of America's most distinguished scholars. He has served this community for 45 years. Rabbi Benjamin N. Gorrelick is Shaarey Zedek's educational director.

The following served as presidents of Temple Beth El since its founding: Jacob Silberman, 1850; M. Hirschman, 1859; Emanuel Schloss, 1860; Simon Freedman, 1861–65; D. J. Workum, 1866–68; Simon Heavenrich, 1868–74; Martin Butzel, 1874–78; Seligman Schloss, 1878–81; Julius Robinson, 1881–91; Samuel Heavenrich, 1891–93; Julius Freud, 1893–97; Louis Blitz, 1897–1905; Samuel Heavenrich, 1905–07; Henry M. Butzel, 1908; Bernard B. Selling, 1909–12; Benjamin L. Lambert, 1912–13; Louis Welt, 1912–13; Bernard Ginsburg, 1918–19; Isaac Gilbert, 1919–23; Adolph Finsterwald, 1924–25; Milford Stern, 1925–29; Melville S. Welt, 1930–32; Israel Himelhoch, 1932–36; Morris Garvett, 1936–39; Harry C. Grossman, 1939–41; Joseph M. Welt, 1941–44; Leonard T. Lewis, 1944–47; Dr. Herbert I. Kallet, 1947–49.

Nate S. Shapero, president of Cuningham Drug Co. and a prominent civic leader, is the present president of Temple Beth El under whose leadership the congregation is preparing to celebrate its one hundredth anniversary.

Harry M. Schulman is the present president of Congregation Shaarey Zedek. The past presidents of Shaarey Zedek include the following: Hiram Kranshaur, Max Hertzberg, Reuben Mendelsohn, Louis Blumberg, Aaron Simon, and Samuel N. Ginsburg, all of whom served from 1862 to 1902; William B. Saulson, 1903–08; David W. Simons, 1908–20; Joseph Wetsman, 1920–21; Louis Granet, 1922–23; Robert Marwil, 1926–28; A. Louis Gordon, 1929–32; Isaac Shetzer, 1932–34–38–40; Maurice H. Zackheim, 1924, 1935–37; Morris H. Blumberg, 1941–43; Harry Cohen, 1944–47. Two leaders served as chairmen of the Shaarey Zedek board of directors; Harry B. Keidan, 1923–24; and Abraham Srere, 1925–1926.

The other two conservative congregations, their rabbis and presidents, are B'nai Moshe, Rabbi Moses Lehrman, Theodore M. Curtis; Northwest Hebrew Congregation and Center, Rabbi Jacob E. Segal, Ira G. Kaufman.

ORTHODOX SYNAGOGUES, RABBIS

The existing orthodox synagogues, their rabbis and presidents (in instances where there are no rabbis only the presidents are listed) are:

Adas Yeshurun, Rabbi Leo Goldman, Meyer Freedman; Ahavath Achim B'nai Abraham, Albert Burke; Anshe Bereznitz, Nathan Rose; Beth Aaron, Rabbi Pinchos Katz, Dr. Marvin Last; Beth Aaron v'Israel, Sol Lapinsky; Beth Abraham, Rabbi Joseph Thumin, Rabbi Israel Halpern, Louis Ellenbogen; Beth Itzchock, Rabbi Jacob Hoberman, Isidore Rosenthal; Beth Joseph, Abraham Walter; Beth Moses, Rabbi Gerson Frankel, Emil Kahn; Beth Shmuel, Rabbi Joseph Rabinowitz, Isador Rosenberg; Beth Tikvah, Rabbi Leizer Levin Jerome Kagan; Beth Yehudah, Harry Stolsky; Bath Tefilo Emanuel, Rabbi M. J. Wohlgelernter, Jacob Shevitz; B'nai David, Rabbi Joshua S. Sperka, Joseph Gorman; B'nai Israel, Jacob Lesser; B'nai Jacob, Sam Rosenberg; B'nai Zion, Rabbi S. Gruskin, Morris Snow; Chesed shel Emes, Sam Nelson; Cong. Dov Frenkel, Max Kaplan; Ezras Achim (Turover Temple), Rabbi David Bakst, Isadore Sesnick; Gemiluth Chasodim, Rabbi Leopold Neuhaus, Max Marx; Mishkan Israel, Rabbi Isaac Stollman, Philip Stollman; Mogen Abraham, David I. Berris; Nusach Ari, William Axelrod; Shaarey Shomayim, J. L. Berman; Shaarey Zion, Rabbi Leo Goldman, Benjamin Assik; First Hebrew Congregation of Delray, Sam Klein; Young Israel branches, Rabbi Samuel Prero, Samuel W. Platt, Alter Greenbaum.

In addition to congregational schools Detroit has two Yeshivoth (theological schools)—Beth Yehudah and Chachmey Lublin; the United Hebrew schools, whose nine branches have a daily afternoon school attendance of 1,200; Farband, Sholem Alechem and Arbeiter Ring schools.

Detroit's Jewish Welfare Federation, an affiliate of the Community Chest and United Foundation, is the central fund-raising body for local, national, and overseas philanthropies and educational movements. Its president is Julian Krolik. The Jewish Community Council supervises the civil-protective and community relations programs for Detroit Jewry. The Zionist movement, B'nai B'rith, and the Jewish War Veterans are the leading community organizations next to the organized synagogue functions.

Fifty Years of Philippine-American Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 27, 1950

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Vicente Villamin from the Manila Bulletin of March 27, 1950:

FIFTY YEARS OF PHILIPPINE-AMERICAN TRADE

(By Vicente Villamin)

From 1900 to the beginning of 1950 the Philippine-American trade rose from about ₱10,200,000 to ₱1,300,000,000, or 130 times.

During that same period the Philippine trade with all other countries rose from about ₱95,400,000 to ₱411,000,000 or 4⅓ times.

From 1900 to the end of 1941, when the Pacific war started, the Philippines bought a total of ₱3,908,505,352 worth of goods from the United States and sold to that country a total of ₱5,545,057,251 worth.

That left a balance of ₱1,636,551,899 in favor of the Philippines. That amount, or most of it, went into the very warp and woof of the economy of the country, expanding it to that extent.

Based on the median population during that 41-year period, that favorable balance meant an acquired ₱130 for every man, woman, and child in the entire country. That amount is small, but it worked in an incredibly big way.

If the ₱130 changed hands five times a year, it rendered the service of a total of ₱560 a year. Every person who handled it along the line received benefits from it. In 41 years it rendered the service of a total of ₱26,650.

The turn-over or changing hands of money is called the velocity of the monetary circu-

lation. The velocity of five is a conservative estimate for the Philippines, but even at that rate it will be seen how a seemingly small sum, per person, added to the total wealth of the country over the ordinary exchange of buying and selling becomes the main economic element in the permanent material progress of the Filipino people.

Benefits arising from trade mean a great deal more to a country than outright monetary hand-outs or gifts. They are earned through work and employment. And they continue and increase as the worker acquires more interest and efficiency.

In the past the Philippine-American trade was the prop of the Philippine economic structure. In the future it will continue that vital role. It is of supreme importance therefore, that nothing is done now to impair that trade permanently.

There is nearly half a century of history back of the trade relations between the Philippines and the United States. A review of its high lights will show the consistent encouragement given by the United States Government to build up the Philippines materially by admitting Philippine products to the United States, at the beginning, partially, but later, completely duty-free.

The Philippines was thereby given the immensely valuable privilege of selling products freely in the best market in the world—the market that every country on earth aspired to enter, paying the high-tariff duties. The United States was actuated by the desire of assisting the Filipino people to achieve a higher standard of living.

When American occupation of the Philippines began on August 13, 1898, almost immediately the American military authorities examined the country's foreign trade. On August 20, a week after occupation day, the Manila customshouse was opened for business.

Philippine-American trade from occupation day to March 8, 1902, was on a foreign basis. Imports and exports between the two countries paid the tariff duties provided for by their respective tariff laws.

Excepted, however, from payment of duties in the Philippines were the Spanish goods ordered or purchased before the Spanish-American War broke out and the supplies and materials for the use of the American armed forces of occupation and for the Philippine insular government. General Orders No. 10, October 26, 1898, abolished the exception as to Spanish goods. But the exception as to the supplies for the American Army was not abolished until August 6, 1909.

Imports from Spain were afterward defined under the Treaty of Paris, dated December 10, 1898. By virtue of its article 4, the United States agreed "to admit Spanish ships and merchandise to the ports of the Philippine Islands on the same terms as ships and merchandise of the United States for a period of 10 years from April 11, 1899." Up to March 8, 1902, therefore, during which the Philippine-American trade was on a foreign basis, the treaty provision did not benefit the Spanish ships and imports.

The Philippine exports to the United States during those early years were as follows: ₱5,921,702 in 1900; ₱9,092,584 in 1901; ₱22,951,896 in 1902. They totaled ₱37,966,182 for the period of 3 years.

The Philippine imports from the United States were as follows: ₱4,306,396 in 1900; ₱7,068,510 in 1901; ₱8,306,348 in 1902. They totaled ₱19,681,254 for the 3-year period.

Thus the Philippines registered a favorable balance of ₱18,284,928. This favorable balance was to continue unbroken except for a period of 4 years, 1910 to 1913, until 1941.

That balance was enhanced by the expenditures of the American armed forces in the Philippines. Those two items together gave the Philippines a good start in her economic development.

As early as 1901 the question of whether Philippine products had to pay duty in the United States was brought up in what had come to be known as the Fourteen Diamond Rings case. In that case the United States Supreme Court ruled that since, under the Treaty of Paris, the Philippines had been ceded to the United States and had come under its sovereignty, it had ceased to be a "foreign" territory in the contemplation of the tariff law and that, therefore, the Tariff Act of 1897 was not applicable to Philippine imports to the United States. The Court added that the Congress had the absolute and plenary power to pass laws regulating the tariff relations of the Philippines with the United States and foreign countries. This decision was subsequently reaffirmed in other insular cases.

At this point, it is relevant to mention that civil government had been established in 1901 and William Howard Taft was appointed civil governor. He functioned with a governing body called the Philippine Commission, with both American and Filipino members, the former being in the majority. A survey commission under President Jacob Gould Schurman of Cornell University went to the Philippines in 1899, followed by another headed by Mr. Taft. Both commissions recommended the establishment of a civil government. The Philippine Commission was sole legislative body until 1907, when it functioned concurrently with the Philippine Assembly, composed of elected Filipinos. The commission was abolished under the Jones Act approved by Congress on August 29, 1916.

Acting under the Spooner amendment to the Army Appropriation Act of March 2, 1901, the Philippine Commission enacted the Philippine insular tariff law of Sepetember 17, 1901. There was a question as to the validity of the action of the Commission, but the question was passed over by Congress reenacting the law in bills introduced by Senator LODGE and Representative PAYNE.

A discussion of the Philippine import tariffs from 1898 to 1909 is pertinent here. The first tariff was that annexed to the Executive order of the President of the United States of July 12, 1898, which was an adaption of the prevailing Spanish colonial tariff. The next was the one proclaimed by the Philippine Commission on September 17, 1901, which was reenacted by Congress in the act of March 8, 1902. That was followed by the act of Congress of March 3, 1905, which was amended on February 26, 1906.

Under those tariffs, until August 6, 1909, American goods entered the Philippines on the same basis as foreign goods, that is, they were not exempted or given a reduction despite the reduction given the Philippine goods under the act of March 8, 1902. The idea was to help the Philippine insular government to raise more revenue.

The Philippine Commission did not lose time in asking Congress to open the American market to Philippine products. It suggested that those products be exempted from at least one-half of the duties in the United States Tariff Act of 1897 (the Dingley tariff). It had the advice in this connection of two Filipino members: Jose R. de Luzuriaga, a sugar planter, and Benito Legarda, who was interested in tobacco and distilling industries.

At that time, and for many years before American occupation, the bulk of Philippine exports to the United States consisted of manila hemp (abaca), which was subject to export duty in the Philippines. The system of export duty in the islands was completely abolished by the act of Congress of October 3, 1913.

There was opposition in the United States to the unrestricted duty-free imports from the Philippines, the same opposition that made itself manifest in later years when Philippine legislation was under consideration in Congress. American sugar and tobacco interests expressed alarm at the prospect of competition from the Philippines and urged that no concession be given under the tariff act of 1897.

The House considered a bill providing for the continuation of the full duty with slight modifications. But the Senate passed a bill giving Philippine products a reduction of 25 percent. The House went along with it and the act of March 8, 1902, the first preferential legislation in favor of the Philippines, was enacted.

This act provided also for the postponement of the application of the United States coastwise laws to the Philippines. That meant that ships of all countries could go in and out of Philippine ports on the same conditions as American ships. There was then a shortage of American bottoms and the application of the coastwise laws would have had the effect of driving Philippine trade to foreign countries from the United States. The coastwise laws have never been made operative in the Philippines.

Also provided in the act was that all customs collections in the United States on Philippine products, the 75 percent of the tariff duties, shall be turned over to the Philippine insular government for its use for the benefit of the Filipino people. This generous provision was the beginning of a consistent policy which was to mean in later years a most substantial assistance to the Philippine government, in fact, it provided most of the funds which wiped out the great deficits of that government to the present day.

Not satisfied with the 25 percent reduction under the act of 1902, friends of the Philippines in Congress—and there were many even then—worked for greater reduction. The Cooper bill, providing for a 75 percent reduction in the 1897 tariff rates passed the House of Representatives on December 17, 1902, but failed to reach a vote in the Senate. The Payne bill, with the same provision, was introduced in the House and approved on January 16, 1906, but likewise failed to reach a vote in the Senate.

There was a strong opinion developing in Congress that if the Philippines was going to remain under the American flag it should receive a tariff treatment that its nonforeign status warranted that is that Philippine imports should be admitted free of duty. There was also a great desire to accelerate the material advancement of the Filipino people by encouraging them to produce more for the American market, which paid the best prices in the world.

At this point, it is pertinent to discuss two developments in Philippine-American relations: (a) The first Philippine organic act and (b) the monetary and coinage system, both done by Congress. They affected materially the trade and economy of the Philippines.

The first Philippine organic act was enacted by Congress on July 1, 1902. It incorporated almost verbatim the Bill of Rights in the United States Constitution, thereby investing the Filipinos with civil liberty. It was the beginning of the American policy of extending increasing power to Filipinos to govern themselves, culminating with the declaration of complete independence on July 4, 1946.

The act, besides providing the coinage of money, approved the action of the President of the United States as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy in issuing the Executive order of July 12, 1898, directing the collection of tariff import duties in the Philippines. It also granted authority to continue and regulate and control commercial intercourse with (other countries) and within the Philippines whenever the sovereignty and authority of the United States encounter armed resistance.

On March 2, 1903, Congress passed an act establishing a standard of value and a more complete coinage system in the Philippines. This step greatly helped the trade of the Philippines because it stabilized its currency position by tying up the Philippine peso to the American dollar in the ratio of 2 persons to $1. This tie-up will continue to 1974 unless in the meantime the Philippine Government modifies it with the agreement of the President of the United States.

In Washington, interest in the establishment of a Philippine-American free trade was increasing. In 1909 the President of the United States called Congress to a special session to consider a general revision of the tariff. During the long discussions in both Houses the tariff policy toward the Philippines was taken up.

The dominant purpose was to help the Philippines. There was no thought then, as there had been no purpose thereafter, to institute the tariff assimilation of the Philippines in the American tariff system. The United States did not apply against the Philippines, for instance, the antidumping, countervailing, contingent duty, or the flexible provisions in the United States, and it gave up the right in the Jones Act of 1916, subject to the approval of veto of the President, to pass import tariff laws for the Philippines.

While the possibility of a Philippine-American free trade was under discussion, the Congress had before it a resolution of the Philippine Assembly, which came into existence in 1907, opposing the duty-free entry of American goods in the Philippines except on a very limited scale on the ground that it would reduce the government's revenue.

The political question of independence from the United States got involved in the free-trade discussion when the Philippine Assembly declared that "the duty-free exchange of products between the United States and the Philippines in the long run would be highly prejudicial to the economic interests of the Philippine people and would create a situation which might delay the obtaining of its independence." Thus was when the conflict between politics and economics was inaugurated in the thinking of Filipinos. Those who were in charge of politics dominated the situation completely and only few Filipinos had the hardihood to oppose them or even to propose the synchronization and harmonization of political and economic considerations.

The Philippine Commission disagreed with the attitude of the assembly, but both of them favored the duty-free admission of Philippine products into the United States under certain restrictions as to quantities.

When the Tariff Act of August 5, 1909, was passed, its section 5 provided for duty-free entry of Philippine products with quantitative limitations and restrictions. This was a long step forward to complete, unrestricted free trade between the two countries which was to come in 1913.

At this juncture, it is relevant to set forth the progress of Philippine-American trade under the 25 percent exemption—the period from 1903 to 1909.

The Philippine exports to the United States were as follows: ₱26,142,852 in 1903; ₱23,309,936 in 1904; ₱29,680,814 in 1905; ₱23,738,578 in 1906; ₱20,658,774 in 1907; ₱20,901,510 in 1908; ₱29,453,026 in 1909.

The exports totaled during the 7-year period ₱173,885,490, and imports totaled ₱71,236,914. The balance in favor of the Philippines amounted to ₱102,648,576.

Attention is again directed to the favorable balance of trade. It was increased by the greater expenditures of the different units of the American Government in the Philippines.

Under the tariff act of August 5, 1909, above-mentioned, Philippine products were admitted duty-free in the United States with the following limitations: 200,000 long tons of sugar, 150,000,000 cigars, 300,000 pounds of wrapper tobacco, 1,000,000 pounds of filler tobacco. Rice continued to be dutiable. The maximum limitations were never reached, and the Philippines imported instead of exported rice. Coconut oil was not then an important exportable commodity and copra was on the free list in the United States.

At that time there were no absolute quotas and the Philippines could have exported to the United States amounts over the limitations by paying the full duty. Since, however, the American tariff rates were then very high and since Philippine production was not yet quite developed, the quantitative limitations did not work against the industries as they then existed, although it did not give encouragement to their expansion. This later feature was the purpose of the limitations.

In section 5 of the act the following important provisions were set forth: (1) That the Philippine Government shall impose a duty equal to that imposed by the United States on sugar and tobacco in any form entering the Philippines from a foreign country, (2) Philippine products to be duty-exempt must not contain more than 20 percent of their value in foreign materials, (3) there must be no draw-back of customs duties on articles to be admitted duty-free, (4) and they must be by direct shipments to the United States.

The foregoing requisites had for their purpose to prevent foreign products from entering the United States duty-free, or partially so, by way of the Philippines, thereby circumventing the United States tariff law.

After hardly 4 years of the operation of the tariff act of August 5, 1909, the Underwood tariff of October 3, 1913 came into existence, which instead of helping the sugar industry disturbed it and stopped its expansion.

This tariff act removed all quantitative restrictions on all Philippine products entering the United States. Up to that year the maximum amounts permissible under the 1909 tariff act had never been even approximated. The movement for political independence became more pronounced and it must have been generally realized that the granting of independence would place the Philippines outside of the United States tariff wall and, therefore, its products would have to pay the high tariff duties, and that would make those products less lucrative if they could be produced at a profit at all.

The political separatist movement militated against the expansion of Philippine industries and exports to the United States. The result was reflected in Philippine-American trade during the 4-year period, 1910–13, during which the Philippines registered an adverse balance.

The Philippine exports to the United States were as follows: ₱34,483,450 in 1910; ₱39,845,254 in 1911; ₱45,764,014 in 1912; ₱32,868,036 in 1913.

The Philippine imports from the United States were as follows: ₱40,137,084 in 1910; ₱38,313,974 in 1911; ₱48,612,020 in 1912; ₱53,352,522 in 1913.

The Philippine exports to the United States for that 4-year period totaled ₱152,960,754, and the imports totaled ₱180,415,600.

Thus there was an unfavorable balance against the Philippines of ₱27,454,846. By that time the Filipinos developed more wants and a taste for American goods and they used their past favorable balances to make purchases in the United States. Their purchasing power should have gone hand in hand with that development, but it did not.

It was expected that the Philippine sugar industry was going to expand under the Underwood tariff because it eliminated the quantitative limitations. But it did not, and for a good reason. The reason was that paragraph 177 of that tariff act provided that on and after May 1, 1916, sugar entering the United States from any source, foreign included, shall be free of duty. Thus sugar from low-cost foreign countries, like the then Netherlands East Indies, would be admitted to the United States duty-free and wipe out competition. The Philippines could not have competed in the American market in that situation.

The free-sugar provision was a blow to the sugar industry in the United States and in its Territories and possessions, like Hawaii and Puerto Rico, especially the former. It effectively stopped more sugar production in the Philippines and postponed the modernization of the industry there.

Congress was bombarded with petitions and protests against the provision from American domestic sugar producers, who enlisted the cooperation of farm organizations and other influential groups. On the other side were the Cuban-American and the Cuban financial and sugar interests. The latter had even then possessed great weight in the sugar tariff deliberations in Washington, and the Philippines had felt that weight in various and sundry forms in later years and, possibly, even today it has not been put away permanently.

Finally, on April 27, 1916, Congress passed an act repealing paragraph 177 of the Underwood tariff of 1913, and the Philippine sugar industry heaved a sigh of relief, together with the American domestic producers.

The next legislation affecting Philippine trade was the Philippine Autonomy Act passed by Congress on August 29, 1916. It was popularly known as the Jones law, which made the Philippines almost completely self-governing, with a legislature composed of a senate and house, the former taking the place of the old Philippine Commission. Under the inspiration of the law's preamble, the agitation for "immediate, complete, and absolute independence," for the Philippines was pushed strongly and dramatically under Mr. Quezon and Mr. Osmena, then the two foremost leaders of the Filipino people.

The Jones law gave the Philippine Government the power to enact tariff laws affecting foreign countries (not including the United States, of course) on condition that before such laws went into effect they should have first the approval of the President of the United States. A disapproval would kill such laws. The reason for that condition was that a tariff law might cause international complications and the United States was still responsible for the Philippines internationally. The Philippine-American trade relations continued to be governed by the acts of Congress.

The Philippine Government was prohibited under the Jones law to impose export duties, a policy in line with the provisions of the United States Constitution. And another provision limited the borrowing power of that Government to $15,000,000 (₱30,000,000) exclusive of the friars' land purchase bonds of about $4,000,000 (₱8,000,000) and the sum not to exceed 7 percent of the aggregate tax valuation at any time of cities, provinces, municipalities, and other governmental instrumentalities.

At this point, the Philippine-American trade during the 3-year period from 1914 to 1916 should be inserted.

The Philippine exports to the United States were as follows: ₱48,855,420 in 1914; ₱47,306,422 in 1915; ₱71,296,265 in 1916.

The Philippine imports from the United States were as follows: ₱48,022,802 in 1914; ₱52,762,138 in 1915; ₱45,267,329 in 1916.

The Philippine exports to the United States during that 3-year period totaled ₱167,458,107, and the imports totaled ₱146,510,286.

The Philippine favorable trade balance amounted to ₱20,947,821 for that short period.

Following the tariff act of 1913, two tariff acts were enacted by Congress. They were the acts of September 21, 1922, and June 17, 1930. They did not introduce important changes insofar as the Philippines was concerned.

World War I had its full impact in 1916, 1917, and 1918. The shutting off or disruption of comparable industries in combatant countries gave impetus to the sugar, coconut oil and other industries in the Philippines. The foreign trade of the Philippines with the United States increased considerably. Big profits were made, prosperity was upon the land, and industries were built and modernized.

In the Tariff Act of 1921, the preferential rate on Cuban sugar was increased to 1.60 cents (U. S.) per pound, to 1.7648 cents under the Tariff Act of 1922, and to 2 cents under the Tariff Act of 1930. The effect of these increases was to give Philippine sugar higher tariff advantage.

The tariff preference to Philippine coconut oil admitted to the United States was first provided in the emergency Tariff Act of 1921. Oil, nondeodorized and unrefined, of foreign origin was charged an equivalent duty of 2.67 cents a pound (20 cents a gallon), which gave the Philippine product that much advantage over its foreign competitor.

Shredded coconut (desiccated) from foreign sources was imposed a duty of 3½ cents a pound, an increase of the then prevailing duty of 2 cents. This gave further encouragement to the Philippine desiccated coconut industry. But despite that it found it not easy to compete with the older industry in Ceylon.

The rates on shell buttons, straw hats, cotton embroideries, and Manila fiber cordage were increased under the 1922 tariff act, all of which helped the Philippine comparable products.

Under the tariff act of 1930 the rates on cotton embroideries, Manila fiber cordage, and certain tropical nuts were increased; and copra-oil cake and meal were taken off the free list and made dutiable. All of these changes were calculated to redound to the advantage of the Philippines.

It was not until March 24, 1934, that Congress passed legislation profoundly affecting Philippine-American trade. This act was the Philippine Independence Act, popularly known as the Tydings-McDuffie Act.

The Philippine-American trade from 1917 to 1934, a period of 18 years, is inserted at this point.

The Philippine exports to the United States were as follows: ₱126,468,717 in 1917; ₱178,293,837 in 1918; ₱113,305,384 in 1919; ₱210,432,525 in 1920; ₱100,713,586 in 1921; ₱128,223,201 in 1922; ₱170,094,046 in 1923; ₱194,627,805 in 1924; ₱218,089,883 in 1925; ₱200,006,430 in 1926; ₱232,076,500 in 1927; ₱231,171,751 in 1928; ₱248,930,946 in 1929; ₱210,684,122 in 1930; ₱166,844,793 in 1931; ₱176,069,238 in 1932; ₱193,058,032 in 1933; ₱196,276,383 in 1934.

The Philippine imports from the United States were as follows: ₱75,241,295 in 1917; ₱117,649,222 in 1918; ₱150,982,829 in 1919; ₱184,579,556 in 1920; ₱148,260,030 in 1921; ₱95,476,651 in 1922; ₱100,705,070 in 1923; ₱120,797,206 in 1924; ₱138,595,166 in 1925; ₱143,151,236 in 1926; ₱142,956,594 in 1927; ₱167,716,135 in 1928; ₱185,185,917 in 1929; ₱156,366,057 in 1930; ₱124,279,366 in 1931; ₱103,005,088 in 1932; ₱87,582,513 in 1933; ₱109,375,368 in 1934.

The Philippine exports to the United States during that 18-year period totaled ₱3,295,367,179, and the imports totaled ₱2,351,905,299.

The favorable balance of the Philippines during that period amounted to ₱943,461,880, or an annual average of more than ₱52,400,000.

The independence act of 1934 created the Philippine Commonwealth, which was to become the independent Republic of the Philippines on July 4, 1946.

Under this act changes were introduced in the trade relations between the Philippines and the United States as a preparation for their political separation.

Its section 6 set forth these changes and conditions. The imports into the United States of three Philippine products were limited in quantities as follows: 50,000 long tons of refined sugar; 800,000 long tons of unrefined sugar; 200,000 long tons of coconut oil; and 3,000,000 pounds of cordage.

After the first 5 years, beginning with the inauguration of the Commonwealth, the Philippine Government was directed to impose and collect export duty on all articles shipped to the United States free of duty in that country at the rate of 5 percent of the United States duty on the sixth year, increasing progressively every year by 5 percent until, the ninth year, the rate reached 25 percent.

The duty thus collected was, by provision of the act, directed to be placed in a sinking fund to be used solely for the payment of the principal and interest of the bonded indebtedness of the Philippine Government, the provinces, municipalities, and other governmental instrumentalities.

It was provided in section 13 that after the independence of the Philippines was promulgated the trade relations between it and the United States should be on a foreign basis, that is as before March 8, 1902. But it also provided that at least 1 year before independence there should be a conference held between Philippine and American representatives, appointed by their respective presidents, for the purpose of formulating recommendations as to future trade relations between the United States and the Philippine independent republic.

Such a conference was called. A joint Philippine-American preparatory committee was created. It held hearings in the United States and the Philippines. Then it submitted a voluminous report.

The recommendations of the committee were embodied in a draft of a bill submitted by the Roosevelt administration to Congress. The appropriate congressional committees held long hearings on the bill. But in the end Congress did not act on it and the bill died a natural death. A period of nonaction on the postindependence trade relations between the two countries followed, continuing until the Pacific war came on December 7, 1941.

After the enactment of the Independence Act on March 24, 1934, several changes in the trade relations occurred, but they did not alter basically the general economic plan of the act.

The Jones-Costigan Sugar Act of May 9, 1934, authorized the imposition of definite limits on imports called absolute quotas. Imports over the quantities provided for, although prepared to pay the full duty, was forbidden. The Sugar Act established the quota plan applicable not only to the Philippines but to all domestic-producer areas, with the addition of Cuba, which, though a foreign country, had a preferential tariff arrangement with the United States for nearly 50 years.

The United States revenue act of May 10, 1934, as modified in some particulars by the revenue acts of 1935 and 1936, provided for the imposition of a processing tax of 3 cents (6 centavos) a pound on coconut oil expressed from Philippine copra either in the Philippines or in the United States. The amount collected was turned over to the Philippine treasury. This collection proved to be one of the great sources of Philippine revenue. The legality of the transfer of this fund to the Philippine treasury was contested in the United States Supreme Court by users of coconut oil, especially the American soap industry, but the court upheld its legality.

The cordage act of June 14, 1935, provided for an absolute quota of 6,000,000 pounds of cordage a year duty-free, or two times more than the quantity permitted in the independence act. It was for a period of 3 years, but the President of the United States was authorized to extend it for a period of 3 years or more, subject to its acceptance by the President of the Philippines.

At this juncture, it is relevant to insert the Philippine-American trade for the 7-year period from 1935 to the end of 1941, when the Pacific war was already raging.

The Philippine exports to the United States were as follows: ₱166,308,071 in 1935; ₱238,531,723 in 1936; ₱274,727,551 in 1937; ₱243,302,378 in 1938; ₱259,059,324 in 1939; ₱258,307,567 in 1940; ₱277,182,925 in 1941.

The Philippine imports from the United States were as follows: ₱109,428,441 in 1935; ₱123,708,995 in 1936; ₱127,330,759 in 1937; ₱181,576,754 in 1938; ₱167,382,653 in 1939; ₱210,373,935 in 1940; ₱218,954,462 in 1941.

The Philippine exports to the United States during that 7-year period totaled ₱1,717,419,539, and the imports from the United States, ₱1,138,755,999.

The Philippine favorable balance amounted to ₱578,663,540, or a yearly average of about ₱82,500,000.

Philippine-American trade was suspended during the war years, 1942 to 1944.

During the war Congress considered several bills relating to the Philippines, although it was under the control of the Japanese army of occupation. Such was the absolute confidence in the ultimate victory over the Japanese and their expulsion from the Philippines. A bill provided for the independence of the Philippines in 1942—a psychological counter action to the granting of independence by the Japanese—was introduced, but did not become law. Another bill which had to do with military bases was passed. And another bill was approved suspending the Philippine Constitution so the incumbent president and vice-president could continue in office, although their terms uder the constitution had already expired.

Soon after the war the question of the post-independence trade relations between the Philippines and the United States was taken up by Congress. An administration bill was sent to the appropriate congressional committees. Exhaustive hearings, mostly executive, were held. After earnest debates on both floors of Congress it was passed on April 30, 1946, and it became known as the Philippine Trade Act of 1946. On the same date the Philippine Rehabilitation Act, providing for a system of payment of war damages, was passed.

Under the trade act, which is now in operation, the following absolute quotas are provided:

From January 1, 1946, to July 3, 1974, the Philippines can export to the United States annually 952,000 short tons (the equivalent of 850,000 longs tons), of which 56,000 short tons (the equivalent of 50,000 long tons) may be refined sugars, 6,000,000 pounds of cordage, 1,040,000 of rice, 200,000,000 cigars, 6,500,000 pounds of scrap and filler tobacco, 200,000 long tons of coconut oil, and 850,000 gross of pearl buttons.

All those articles, as well as other Philippine articles, will be duty-free, and at the full quota to July 3, 1954. After that date all articles from the Philippines with the exception of the above-named commodities, whose restrictions are provided for, will become subject to graduated duties, beginning with 5 percent of the prevailing rates until they reach 100 percent in 1974.

The seven Philippine products listed above are divided into two groups. Sugar, cordage

and rice will not decrease in quantity to 1974, but will pay the graduated quota of 5 percent. Cigars, scrap, and filler tobacco, coconut oil and pearl buttons will not pay the graduated duty, but their amounts will decrease progressively by 5 percent.

The reason for the difference in the treatment of the two groups is that the first group has relatively low tariff rates and the second group has such high tariff rates that in a few years they would not be able to produce at any profit at all. The official record of the hearings before the Committee of the Ways and Means of the House of Representatives will show that it was the author of this article who suggested that idea to the committee.

It should be noted that, because absolute quotas are granted, the Philippines is permitted to export to the United States quantities over the duty-free amount, but within the quota, after the progressive quantitative reductions, by paying the full duty.

It is provided that if the Philippines should export a new product that comes into substantial competition with a like article produced in the United States the President may impose a quota on it after an investigation by the Tariff Commission.

The trade arrangement, as well as other matters in the Philippine Trade Act of 1946, is now set forth, by the act's provision, in an Executive trade agreement between the two countries.

The trade agreement can be terminated on 5 years' notice for any reason whatsoever. It can also be terminated on 6 months' notice if either party adopts or applies measures or practices which would operate to nullify or impair any right or obligation provided for in the agreement.

There are also provisions to the effect that, if the President of the United States finds that the Philippines is in any manner discriminating against citizens of the United States or any form of United States business enterprise, he may suspend the agreement in whole or in part and, if the discrimination does not cease, he may terminate the agreement.

There are two vital provisions in the trade act that are pertinent to set forth as they affect, both directly and indirectly, the Philippine-American trade and economic relations. They are as follows:

Section 341, part 5, title III (being art. VII of the trade agreement) "The disposition, exploitation, development, and utilization of all agricultural, timber, and mineral lands of the public domain, waters, mineral, coal, petroleum, and other mineral oils, all forces and sources of potential energy, and other natural resources of the Philippines, and the operation of public utilities, shall, if open to any person, be open to citizens of the United States and to all forms of business enterprise owned or controlled, directly or indirectly, by United States citizens."

That provision, in a somewhat modified form which somewhat changed its meaning, was incorporated as a provision of the Philippine Constitution. It was called the "parity law," which caused a division among the voters when it was submitted to a plebiscite. The provision placed Americans on the same basis as Filipinos under it. The writer contended that the word "person" in the clause "if open to any person" referred, not to a Filipino necessarily, but to any person at all, who may be a foreigner. If that contention was correct, then the provision was placed there solely to protect American citizens from discrimination in favor of foreigners. But it was evident that the intent of Congress was to place Americans and Filipinos on an equal or parity basis, and so that interpretation stands, particularly after the modified wording of the provision was made a part of the Philippine Constitution.

The other provision of the trade agreement that has to do with Philippine-American trade and finance follows:

Section 342, part 5, title III (being art. V of the trade agreement) "The value of the Philippine currency in relation to the United States dollar shall not be changed, the convertibility of pesos into dollars shall not be suspended, and no restriction shall be imposed on the transfer of funds from the Philippines to the United States, except by agreement with the President of the United States."

This provision, like other provisions in the act, will be in force until 1974. Thus the dollar-peso ratio of 1 dollar to 2 pesos which was established by Congress in the act of March 2, 1903 will last for 71 years. This arrangement is the only instance where the United States has agreed to tie up its currency with that of a foreign country, for indeed the Philippines became a foreign country on July 4, 1946. That fact gave stability and soundness to the Philippine peso qualities which are possessed by only a few of the currencies of the world.

The provision was modified when on December 9, 1949, with the agreement of the President of the United States as provided therein, a series of orders were issued by the Philippine Central Bank placing restrictions on the transfer of funds from the Philippines to the United States. This action, which did not become known to the public until the day of its promulgation, caused consternation among bankers, businessmen and the general public.

The announced purpose of the restrictions is to conserve in the Philippines the dollar assets, which was reported to be going out of the country faster than the inflow of funds. They complement and complete the control imposed by the Government on articles described as luxuries or nonessentials. The commodity control has the added purpose of encouraging the creation of local industries and the investment of funds in local enterprises.

Both the fund and commodity controls are working hardships on business and persons, but it is contended that they are essentially temporary, although they would not be so if they are continued for too long a time and if they are made more restrictive and complicated. They have already caused business retrenchment and labor unemployment. It is generally hoped that the Government will find its way clear to working back to normalcy after it has achieved to a reasonable degree its purposes in instituting the controls.

It would be useless effort to attract American capital to the Philippines to operate under a regime of controls. It would also make the Philippines less ideal for the inauguration of President Truman's point 4 program of extending financial and technical assistance. The simple reason is that when there were no controls the Philippines was that much different from and carried that much advantage over other countries, where American investments and enterprises are so hemmed in and harassed by restriction orders and controls, such as the Philippines has started to do herself. It is, therefore, of supreme importance, if American investments are desired for the Philippines, to go back to normalcy as soon as practicable. It is expected that if the controls have not gone too far and have not disrupted the country's business too much they will have created more stable conditions in the country.

There is expectation in some quarters that the Philippine Government may devalue the peso. High Government officials have denied that such would be done, but such denials are always subject to withdrawal. The devaluation would take the form of depreciating the peso so that a dollar would be equivalent to 3, 4, or 5 pesos. Under article V of the Philippine-American Trade Agreement, cited above, the dollar-peso ratio can be changed "with the agreement of the President of the United States." If it were known by the public that the President was considering a request from the Philippine Government for him to agree to the peso devaluation he would undoubtedly receive many protests as well as some approvals. It would be sound policy to have the question discussed by the public before the devaluation is effected. It would be unsound policy to put it through otherwise. The matter is too vital to keep the public, upon which it is to be imposed, out of it.

In recapitulation, the main purpose of the fund and commodity controls is to maintain a healthy balance in the international exchange of debits and credits as established by the relative positions of imports and exports of goods and the inflow and outflow of funds. Since the war the Philippines has been buying from the United States and other countries much more than she has been selling them. That is the cause of the imbalance, and that is what the controls are intended to rectify. It is obvious that there is a necessity for the Philippine Government to determine a general median level on which the international debits and credits will be maintained. The present postwar level, maintained as it is artificially by the inflow as well as local availability of monetary windfalls and funds which are not payments for exports, is unnaturally high, and to maintain it would require drastic action that would upset the country's economy. At the same time, the prewar level was too low, for prices of export commodities have since gone up, industries are being rehabilitated, there are more business and the national income has increased several times over. The determination of a reasonably maintainable median line on which to rest the debit-credit international balance is an essential move to rationalize the controls and make them serve their purposes effectively to the benefit of the country. That median level will be somewhere between the prewar low and the postwar high.

Immediately after the war ended contracts were signed between the Philippine Government and the United States Commodity Credit Corporation by which the former obligated itself to give priority in sales and exports of hemp and copra to the United States for the use of industries. The contracts also provided for ceilings on prices. The idea was to assure the demand for those products in the United States.

The prices of the two commodities went up. But the prices of copra went much higher relatively. Besides, there was plenty of copra, for the Philippine coconut plantations hardly suffered from the war. But the hemp plantations were neglected and a great part of them depleted.

Soon the demand for hemp and copra, especially the latter, from foreign countries grew and those countries offered better prices than what the contracts provided as the maxima. It was estimated that those contracts have cost the Philippine copra producers at least ₱100,000,000 for not being able to sell to the highest buyers outside of the United States. Upon the petition of Filipino hemp and copra producers the contracts with the Commodity Credit Corporation were rescinded even before their expiration dates with the consent of the corporation.

Philippine-American trade since the war ended, covering the period from 1946 to the beginning of 1950, deserves separate treatment because of the special and extraordinary elements that entered into it.

The 1945 trade was for its later part only, for after the cessation of the war there was very little overseas activity in exports, although the imports were substantial out of necessity. That trade amounted to ₱50,974,435, of which ₱457,965 represented exports and ₱50,516,470 imports. Most of the im-

ports consisted of relief supplies, food, medicine, and other urgently needed articles.

Philippine-American trade from 1946 to 1949 amounted to ₱4,484,392,556. Of this amount, ₱3,314,735,611 represented exports and ₱1,169,656,000 imports.

The balance against the Philippines during that 4-year period amounted to ₱2,145,079,611.

Before discussing the significance of this unfavorable balance, which is enormous, it is well to break down the import-export figures by years. The 1949 figures are subject to later revision, but they would not register substantial change, so for the purpose of the present discussion the statistical variations will not be material.

The Philippine exports to the United States were as follows: ₱76,870,839 in 1946; ₱306,466,925 in 1947; ₱421,604,939 in 1948; ₱364,700,000 in 1949.

The Philippine imports from the United States were as follows: ₱515,029,797 in 1946; ₱882,150,594 in 1947; ₱941,755,220 in 1948; ₱975,800,000 in 1949.

The totals are given above, and so is the unfavorable balance against the Philippines.

The fundamental question at once arises: Was the Philippines impoverished, on the basis of her normal economic position before the war, by the unfavorable trade balance with the United States of over ₱2,145,000,000 since the termination of the war?

The definitive answer is no. The fact is even after that amount is deducted from the postwar acquired monetary and matériel assets the Philippines would still have between ₱1,000,000,000 and ₱2,000,000,000 more left. Where is that money? It is all over the country in cash, matériel, and more diversified business enterprises. Some of it is deposited, yes, by Filipinos in the United States and elsewhere outside of the Philippines.

The existence of that enhanced wealth is manifested, among other evidence, by the increase of the national production and income from around ₱1,000,000,000 before the war to approximately ₱3,500,000,000 after the war, the bulk of which is extant today.

The point is that the Philippines was not impoverished by the unfavorable balance.

The Philippines was able to import an enormous amount of goods from the United States because of the monetary assets she piled up from receipts of financial assistance from the United States, veterans' benefits, and war-damage payments made by the United States, war surplus given by the United States, and the great expenditures made by members of the American armed forces during and since the war, as well as disbursements during that time by the United States Government outside of the items outlined above.

While the payment was made partially out of exports to the United States, as the statistical tabulations in this paper will show, the bulk of the payment was made out of the "invisible assets" set forth in the foregoing paragraph. And, for the purpose of emphasis, it should be stated that after that payment is made there is a sizable amount more of those assets remaining in the Philippines.

If there are those assets still, why does the Philippine Government have to go out and borrow money from the United States? The answer is that the Filipino people are not yet habituated and trained to lend their money to their Government by buying Philippine Government bonds and certificates. To them 4 percent, or even 10 percent interest a year on investment is far from attractive. They are still in the pawnshop and usury stages insofar as profit and interest on capital are concerned.

The Philippine Government, with its commodity control, and the Philippine central bank, with its fund control, could project themselves into the immediate future and inspire the Filipino people to invest in their Government, which means investing in their country. This is a great and fundamental public relations job for the Government to do. Sooner or later it will have to do it if it is to embark upon its plan of a total economic mobilization program buttressed by a regime of rational austerity.

The Philippines is a rich country in natural resources. There is a great people that will soon number 20,000,000, who are ambitious to achieve greater progress and the modern democratic way of life. Expanding its economy, modernizing its productive apparatus, training technical workers, and putting more people to work—they constitute the challenge to the governmental, intellectual, civic, and economic leadership of the Filipino people.

With its internal economy expanded, modernized, and rationalized, the Philippines will continue its trade with the United States, the best and greatest market in the world. The present trade relations may be extended indefinitely. Those relations, it must be clearly remembered, are only a part of the intimate, vital, and fundamental relationships which the two countries now maintain. Those relationships grew out of their half century of friendship and collaboration—relationships that are today the bulwark of the economic welfare and the international security of the Republic of the Philippines.

Foreign trade of the Philippines: 1899–1946

Year	Total trade (pesos)	Per capita trade (pesos)	Total imports (pesos)	Total exports (pesos)	Imports from the United States (pesos)	Imports from other countries (pesos)	Exports to the United States (pesos)	Exports to other countries (pesos)
1899	68, 079, 136	10. 16	38, 385, 972	29, 693, 164	2, 706, 172	35, 679, 800	7, 870, 510	21, 822, 654
1900	95, 708, 304	18. 95	49, 727, 558	45, 980, 746	4, 306, 396	45, 421, 162	5, 921, 702	40, 059, 044
1901	109, 331, 648	15. 58	60, 324, 942	49, 006, 706	7, 068, 510	53, 256, 432	9, 092, 584	39, 914, 122
1902	124, 028, 140	17. 28	66, 684, 832	57, 343, 808	8, 306, 348	58, 377, 984	22, 951, 896	34, 391, 912
1903	132, 416, 260	17. 34	67, 622, 768	64, 793, 492	7, 674, 200	59, 948, 568	26, 142, 852	38, 650, 640
1904	117, 454, 462	15. 33	59, 155, 462	58, 299, 000	10, 197, 640	48, 957, 822	23, 309, 936	34, 989, 064
1905	127, 010, 648	16. 49	60, 101, 100	66, 909, 548	11, 179, 892	48, 921, 208	29, 680, 814	37, 228, 734
1906	118, 093, 320	15. 21	52, 807, 536	65, 285, 784	8, 955, 772	43, 851, 764	23, 738, 578	41, 547, 206
1907	127, 103, 354	16. 20	60, 907, 620	66, 195, 734	10, 135, 076	50, 772, 544	20, 658, 774	45, 536, 960
1908	123, 574, 384	15. 51	58, 372, 240	65, 202, 144	10, 203, 672	48, 168, 568	20, 901, 510	44, 300, 634
1909	132, 017, 512	16. 30	62, 168, 838	69, 848, 674	12, 890, 662	49, 278, 176	29, 453, 026	40, 395, 648
1910	180, 695, 648	21. 98	99, 438, 722	81, 256, 926	40, 137, 084	59, 301, 638	34, 483, 450	46, 773, 476
1911	185, 723, 068	22. 14	96, 048, 814	89, 674, 254	38, 313, 974	57, 734, 840	39, 845, 254	49, 829, 000
1912	233, 182, 402	27. 19	123, 335, 802	109, 846, 600	48, 612, 020	74, 717, 782	45, 764, 014	64, 082, 586
1913	202, 171, 484	23. 01	106, 625, 572	95, 545, 912	53, 352, 522	53, 273, 050	32, 868, 036	62, 677, 876
1914	194, 556, 574	21. 57	97, 177, 306	97, 379, 268	48, 022, 802	49, 154, 504	48, 855, 420	48, 523, 848
1915	206, 250, 375	22. 25	98, 624, 367	107, 626, 008	52, 762, 138	45, 862, 229	47, 306, 422	60, 319, 586
1916	230, 867, 040	24. 19	90, 992, 675	139, 874, 365	45, 725, 346	45, 267, 329	71, 296, 265	68, 578, 100
1917	322, 802, 674	32. 81	131, 594, 061	191, 208, 613	75, 241, 295	56, 352, 766	126, 468, 717	64, 739, 896
1918	467, 587, 387	46. 06	197, 198, 423	270, 388, 964	117, 649, 222	79, 549, 201	178, 293, 837	92, 095, 127
1919	463, 513, 756	44. 89	237, 278, 104	226, 235, 652	150, 982, 829	86, 295, 275	113, 305, 384	112, 930, 268
1920	601, 124, 276	57. 54	298, 876, 565	302, 247, 711	184, 579, 556	114, 297, 009	210, 432, 525	91, 815, 186
1921	407, 907, 793	38. 21	231, 677, 148	176, 230, 645	148, 260, 030	83, 417, 118	100, 713, 586	75, 517, 059
1922	351, 561, 885	32. 22	160, 395, 289	191, 166, 596	95, 476, 651	64, 918, 638	128, 223, 201	62, 943, 395
1923	416, 505, 474	37. 34	174, 999, 494	241, 505, 980	100, 705, 070	74, 294, 424	170, 094, 046	71, 411, 934
1924	486, 711, 115	42. 67	216, 021, 790	270, 689, 325	120, 797, 206	95, 224, 584	194, 627, 805	76, 061, 520
1925	537, 220, 077	46. 05	239, 465, 667	297, 754, 410	138, 595, 166	100, 870, 501	218, 089, 883	79, 664, 527
1926	512, 366, 624	42. 93	238, 597, 984	273, 768, 639	143, 151, 236	95, 446, 748	200, 006, 430	73, 762, 209
1927	542, 851, 113	44. 45	231, 702, 943	311, 148, 170	142, 956, 594	88, 746, 349	232, 076, 500	79, 071, 670
1928	579, 422, 888	46. 36	269, 313, 796	310, 109, 092	167, 716, 135	101, 597, 661	231, 171, 751	78, 937, 341
1929	623, 214, 234	48. 72	294, 320, 549	328, 893, 685	185, 185, 917	109, 134, 632	248, 930, 946	79, 962, 739
1930	512, 520, 162	39. 14	246, 185, 907	266, 234, 255	156, 366, 057	89, 819, 850	210, 684, 122	55, 650, 133
1931	406, 801, 585	30. 30	198, 357, 437	207, 944, 148	124, 279, 366	74, 078, 071	166, 844, 793	41, 099, 355
1932	359, 560, 466	26. 19	158, 812, 063	200, 748, 403	103, 005, 088	55, 806, 975	176, 069, 238	24, 679, 165
1933	355, 976, 981	25. 33	134, 733, 905	221, 243, 076	87, 582, 513	47, 151, 392	193, 058, 032	28, 185, 644
1934	399, 706, 432	27. 78	167, 230, 359	232, 476, 073	109, 375, 368	57, 854, 991	196, 276, 383	36, 199, 690
1935	374, 922, 200	25. 45	171, 070, 431	203, 851, 760	109, 428, 441	61, 641, 990	166, 308, 071	37, 543, 698
1936	497, 611, 550	32. 99	202, 257, 635	295, 352, 915	123, 708, 995	78, 548, 640	238, 531, 723	56, 822, 192
1937	551, 990, 587	35. 74	218, 069, 193	333, 921, 394	127, 330, 759	90, 738, 434	274, 727, 551	59, 193, 843
1938	559, 236, 712	35. 36	265, 235, 371	294, 001, 341	181, 576, 754	83, 658, 617	243, 302, 378	50, 698, 963
1939	560, 914, 120	34. 64	245, 129, 974	315, 784, 146	167, 382, 653	77, 747, 321	259, 059, 324	56, 724, 822
1940	581, 311, 589	35. 06	269, 462, 542	311, 849, 047	210, 373, 935	59, 088, 607	258, 307, 567	53, 531, 480
1941	593, 452, 761	34. 56	271, 182, 780	322, 269, 931	218, 954, 462	52, 228, 318	277, 182, 925	45, 087, 056
1942–44 [1]								
1945	59, 211, 364	3. 14	57, 867, 195	1, 344, 169	50, 516, 470	7, 350, 725	457, 965	886, 204
1946	720, 091, 530	37. 33	591, 716, 481	128, 375, 049	515, 029, 797	76, 686, 684	76, 870, 839	51, 504, 210
1947 [2]	1, 553, 797, 312	----------	1, 022, 700, 608	531, 096, 704	882, 150, 594	140, 550, 014	306, 466, 925	224, 629, 779
1948 [3]	1, 774, 819, 524	----------	1, 136, 409, 068	638, 410, 456	941, 755, 220	194, 653, 848	421, 604, 939	216, 805, 517
1949 [4]	1, 711, 988, 948	----------	1, 190, 753, 217	521, 257, 731	----------	----------	----------	----------

[1] Japanese occupation.
[2] Source: Yearbook of Philippine Statistics, 1946.
[3] Source: Reports of the Philippine Bureau of the Census and Statistics.
[4] Source: Tentative Figures Released by the Philippine Bureau of the Census and Statistics.

South Carolina Highways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 27, 1950

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, anybody who has ever traveled the highways of the Nation knows what it means to have modern highways. The wealth of a State does not signify its ability to reflect good highway engineering and progress, nor does the size of the State determine its highway consciousness.

South Carolina, which is comparatively small from a standpoint of wealth, ranks first in the Nation in highway construction. No State in the Union has more miles per capita of farm-to-market highways than does South Carolina. This is no accident. We planned it this way over a quarter of a century ago. That is the reason South Carolina ranks No. 1 in the Nation today in keeping its citizens contented in maintaining a high level of accessibility to every nook and corner of its wonderful and historic past.

The people in South Carolina are contented to live there because the government of South Carolina gives back to the people their proportionate part of taxes in services and more highways. The facts here presented in the RECORD were prepared for me, on this subject, by the Highway Department of South Carolina. Our highway commissioner, the Honorable Claude McMillan, is the brother of our distinguished colleague in Congress, the Honorable JOHN MCMILLAN, who so capably presides over the Committee on the District of Columbia, and who is also member of the Committee on Agriculture. We are proud of our highway commissioner and the magnificent associates he has, both in law enforcement and in highway construction and maintenance.

In traveling over a particular territory by automobile, the enjoyment that one derives is determined mainly by two factors, the scenery and the condition of the roads.

In both of these respects South Carolina ranks among the best in the Nation. Nowhere can there be found more magnificent gardens, beautiful early American architecture, and points of historic interest. Nowhere can be found more abundant and finer scenery than along the highways of South Carolina's low country and in the hills and mountains of the up country.

It is South Carolina's highways, however, that makes enjoyment of this scenery possible. Those of you who have had an opportunity to visit the Palmetto State and ride along the countryside will agree that nowhere in the Nation is there a finer system of highways. Some idea of this development may be had from the many additions and improvements in the highways since 1920, when the South Carolina General Assembly passed an act providing for the State system. At that time there were 3,047 miles of road in the State system, only 26 miles of which were hard-surfaced. As of October 31, 1949, there were 20,569 miles, of which 10,868 miles, or 52 percent, were hard-surfaced. All excepting 375 miles of the State's primary system—totaling 8,411 miles of highways—are hard-surfaced. On our secondary system, composed mostly of feeder routes and consisting of a total of 12,158 miles, a total of 2,831 miles were hard-surfaced as of October 31, 1949.

Progress in the planning and development of the State's system of highways has been relatively steady since the inception of the highway department. However, we can point with real pride to the manner in which we have kept pace with other States in recent years, in many cases excelling.

In 1948, for example, South Carolina stood first in the Southeastern States, and only fourth in the Nation, in the number of miles of road on which construction contracts were awarded. A Bureau of Public Roads compilation for the year—the last for which accurate totals are available—shows that during the 12-month period, contracts on 1,812 miles of South Carolina highways were awarded. This total was included in 324 projects, the largest number in the Southeast, and the ninth greatest number in the Nation. These projects involved an expenditure of $22,300,000, the fourth greatest total in the Southeast, and the eighteenth largest in the Nation—a very important comparison when South Carolina's relative geographical size and per capita wealth is considered. At this writing figures on construction for all of 1949 have not been compiled. However, during the first 6 months of the year, South Carolina awarded contracts on 664 miles of road, putting the State in thirteenth place in this respect for the entire Nation. This work was included in 92 separate projects, costing $6,939,000. These projects, of course, do not include the maintenance work and relatively small projects which the highway department completed with its own forces.

Approximately $242,000,000 have been invested in South Carolina's highway system over a 30-year period.

South Carolina's highway program is financed mainly by a gasoline tax of 5 cents, supplemented by Federal-aid allocations. One cent of the State's 6-cent tax is allocated to counties. Further development of the system is limited only by revenue received. Many needed projects are now under way, others are planned for the immediate future, and still others are included in the department's long-range program extending many years into the future.

How has South Carolina been able to accomplish so much—in fact to take her place with the best in the Nation—with so little? Planning and a good legislative program setting up a sound financial structure, coupled with efficient administration, has furnished the impetus to bring a dream into reality.

Those who have never traversed South Carolina's magnificent highways have in store a real treat.

Committee on Un-American Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BURR P. HARRISON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 27, 1950

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, I had the honor recently to serve as a member of a subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities which conducted hearings in Honolulu with respect to Communist activity in the Territory of Hawaii.

These hearings were held at the invitation of the Territorial legislature. With the memory of the Pearl Harbor catastrophe still vivid, the people of the Territory were disturbed by indications of well-organized and extensive underground Communist plotting.

The proceedings of the subcommittee attracted widespread public attention in the islands, but they were conducted in a spirit of moderation and decorum that made a profound impression—one of enhanced respect for the efforts of the committee as a whole, and, indeed, for the Congress of the United States.

When the hearings had been completed the subcommittee, and the citizens of Hawaii, had a sharply defined picture of the extent to which Communists had infiltrated the labor organizations, the political councils, and even the governing bodies of a Territory that continues to have a key position in our defense scheme.

To my mind, the members of the subcommittee may claim only a small share of such credit as may accrue from this investigation. The largest portion certainly belongs to the distinguished chairman of our committee, the Honorable JOHN S. WOOD, of Georgia.

While he refrained from appointing himself to the subcommittee, our honored colleague directed the careful planning which preceded the hearings. With his abiding abhorrence of sensationalism and his conscientious attention to the responsibilities of his chairmanship, Judge WOOD provided the balanced approach to this inquiry, which proved notably productive.

Under the leadership of the gentleman from Georgia, the committee has been earning its way as a servant of this House. During this Eighty-first Congress, it has placed under investigation a number of matters of the highest importance to the continued security of the United States. In these days of tension and fear the citizens of the Nation must be given sound basis for confidence in the instrumentalities of their Government that are striving to uncover and stamp out subversion. The Committee on Un-American Activities has merited this confidence as guided by Judge WOOD.

I know that many of my colleagues will learn with regret, as I did, that he will not be without opposition for renomination. While his continued tenure in this House is being contested by a gentleman of undoubted sincerity and promise, I have the deepest conviction that to

oppose Judge WOOD at this time is to do a real—if unwitting—disservice to the people of his district and of the Nation.

Now, above all other times, continuity of leadership in such a vital agency as the Committee on Un-American Activities is essential. Judge WOOD has supervised inquiries into dangerous nests of subversion in two areas that are of critical importance to national security. The committee cast a withering spotlight on the foul growth of Communist cells in the vital Pittsburgh industrial area—a major part of the arsenal of democracy that our enemies fear. And, now, it has thrown revealing light on Communist efforts to take over that Pacific bastion—Hawaii.

I hope that some way may be found to acquaint the good people of Judge WOOD's district in Georgia with the breadth and value of his service on the committee and in this House. His colleagues need his counsel, and the Nation cannot spare from among the guardians of its security one of such integrity and capacity.

Two Hundredth Anniversary of Jewish Community in Charleston, S. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 27, 1950

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, the Jewish community of Charleston, S. C., is celebrating its two hundredth anniversary. This is no accident. The Jewish community of this fine city is one of which we are all proud. From its very beginning it has become an integral and indispensable segment of our entire community life.

All people of Charleston, Christian and Jew alike, celebrate with them this day for this long and magnificent history, which is signified by the splendid landmarks as a part of what we call America.

I enclose, herewith, an editorial on this great achievement from the oldest daily newspaper in the South, our own local paper, the Charleston News and Courier under date of March 25, 1950.

[From Charleston (S. C.) News and Courier of March 25, 1950]

The two hundredth anniversary of the Jews of Charleston will be a celebration of more than local significance. It will be an event with meaning for more people than the Jews of the United States, for more people than all the Jews in the world. It will carry a message of universal importance, a message of tolerance, of good feeling among men, of mutual respect among peoples with different backgrounds who have lived together in this city for two centuries in peace and amity and esteem.

In a time when race consciousness and discrimination and all the other epithets are hurled by agitators with little understanding and no sympathy, here stands an example of good will. The good will dates back at least two centuries, 16 years before the Declaration of Independence, when Congregation Kahal Kadosh Beth Elohim was founded. And good will lives today, not only in this same congregation, presided over by a descendant of one of those founders, but in other phases of life in this community.

The Jews of Charleston from the beginning have been accepted as individual men and women. They, in turn, have not huddled together as a close-knit group. Among them have been distinguished figures, contributors to the common welfare. Their stories will be told in the coming months leading up to the bicentennial program next fall.

Freedom of religion, freedom from hatred have been the rule, not the exception in the history of the Jews of Charleston. This is the message that will be told to the world in the bicentennial at Charleston.

Maiden Form Brassiere Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. M. G. BURNSIDE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 27, 1950

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, because West Virginia will always be grateful to the Maiden Form Brassiere Co. for bringing its industry to our State, I am glad to take this opportunity to extend the congratulations of my constituents on the recent expansion undertaken by this splendid company.

This company started off from a one-room outlay until now, I understand, it is the largest of its kind in the world, with extensive markets in over 50 countries of the world. The establishment of branch factories in the cities of Huntington, Clarksburg, and Princeton during the early forties resulted in increased commerce for each city by placing its factories in West Virginia.

They wisely located close to a raw product—nylon. Nylon, one of the splendid products of West Virginia, has been one of the reasons why this company has been able to develop a world-famous product. This splendid company employs more than 3,000 of our fine citizens.

In a distraught world like we have at this time, it is indeed one of the greatest pleasures that a Member of Congress can express when he states that this company has excellent labor relations, and I do not think they have ever had a labor dispute.

This company is well known for its program of employee, hospital, medical, and surgical benefits as well as social and athletic activities. A startling statement to make at a time when we are discussing surpluses, it is indeed a pleasure to say that this business establishment has never had to lay off any of its employees because of small orders. It has the remarkable record of ever expanding. I understand from the company that its employees have been most cooperative in contributing to their splendid record. I know the employees in Huntington make up an excellent segment of our population.

It is the wish of the people of West Virginia that the Maiden Form Brassiere Co. continue to prosper, expand, and share the bounties of a profitable business.

The Economic Protection of Water Transportation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OREN HARRIS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 27, 1950

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by J. W. Hershey:

THE ECONOMIC PROTECTION OF WATER TRANSPORTATION

(By J. W. Hershey, vice president, Butcher-Arthur Inc., Houston, Tex.)

My pleasure at being honored by an invitation to speak before you is confined only by my hesitancy to presume for myself any competence or qualifications to shed light on my topic for the benefit of an audience of such eminent and distinguished character. My temerity in essaying to do so springs from my firm belief that the importance of the topic itself may extenuate the deficiencies of the speaker.

When Senator MCCLELLAN asked me to speak, he at the same time suggested the title "The Economic Protection of Water Transportation." From his choice of subject, I have assumed that among those present today there is a universal recognition of the fact that cheap water transportation, a right enjoyed with some interruptions since prior to the birth of the Federal Constitution, for which this Nation went to war at least three times, and which has rightly acquired over two centuries a character of inalienability is now being menaced by forces and perils which must be confined. My remarks will be confined primarily to inland waters, not through any deprecatory attitude concerning harbor and coastwise shipping, but because whatever qualifications I have relate primarily to transportation on inland rivers and canals.

To dispel any disposition to regard these perils as more imaginery than real, permit me to recall to mind an era long past during which inland water transportation in this country rose to staggering proportions, and yet within a few decades of the peak of its prosperity declined to almost nothing.

From 1834 to 1849, a period of 15 years, the increase in the number of steamboats in the Mississippi River amounted to almost 400 percent, and in 1849 there were approximately 1,000 steamboats plying the Mississippi-Ohio Rivers having a total tonnage in excess of 250,000 tons. In fact, by 1842, the steamboat tonnage of the Mississippi-Ohio system had grown to exceed the entire merchant fleet tonnage of Great Britain by more than 40,000 tons and was equal to more than half of the registered tonnage in the United States. The years from 1842 to the Civil War represented the halcyon days of the river packet. During this period the steamboat tonnage of the Mississippi Valley, exclusive of New Orleans, was 15,000 tons greater than that of all the Atlantic ports.

The demise of this era was brought about, as everyone knows, by the advent of the great American system of railroads which promptly seized upon the obvious weapon in order to drive steamboats off the river, of a joint, calculated program of forcing river rates below the cost of the not-too-efficient steamboat through the use of disproportional and discriminatory freight reductions along water-paralleling routes. There was no defense against the attack, particularly in view of the fact that the waterway at this period was one which was subject to seasonal interruptions of traffic

owing to the virtual absence of channel improvements, systematized markings, dams, and other aids. There being literally no lower limits to rail-rate reductions, so long as the rail carriers could levy a tax on landlocked shippers through monopolistic high rates, the long-haul river packets were quickly liquidated.

The next renaissance for commercial river traffic of sizable proportion originated somewhat prior to 1880, with the increased coal mining in areas contiguous to the Alleghany and Monongahela Rivers. The towboat and barge began to evolve at this time, and prior to the close of the nineteenth century there are recorded coal tows as large as 67,000 tons. The railroads met this competition again with the establishment of low water paralleling rates so that as a result, at the time of the First World War which made its severe challenge on American economy, the rivers were basically stagnant except for some short-haul operations. This emergency so clearly demonstrated the need for a dependable inland waterway system that in 1920, the Congress authorized Federal Barge Line for the purpose of the development of freight transportation on the rivers and authorized the creation of a system of dams on the Ohio. At the same time that these developments were taking place, a rapidly enlarging requirement for tremendous movements of bulk commodities had to be met, flowing for the most part from the South and the West to the North and the East. Petroleum, ores, sulfur, and coal made up the bulk of this traffic as it does today, accounting in present times for more than 90 percent of the total inland water traffic of the Nation. Technical developments accompanied the surge of bulk commodity movement implemented by the application of the screw propeller and Diesel engine in lieu of the steam-powered side- and stern-wheeler.

This review of the past brings us up to the present situation where a basically healthy inland domestic water economy has become an indispensable factor in the American way of life, contributing to the abundance of goods here equaled nowhere else in the world. The menacing forces which have twice in the past nearly obliterated river traffic are just as real, just as dangerous, and much better disguised today than they have been in the past. These influences take multiple forms, sometimes they are difficult to recognize. Yet, the design of the attack, the tenor of the propaganda, and the speciousness of the arguments stem from one basic source, the railroads, and their protagonists are often misguided and, unfortunately, usually misinformed completely on the subjects of competitive service and cost between rails and water and the mass benefits of cheap water transportation.

The Congress of the United States early recognized the need for moderating and directing the tremendous power which the rails had to favor one shipper at another's expense and to levy a war-fund from interior shippers to destroy water competition. The abusive use of monopolistic power by the rail carriers had not gone unnoticed, and as early as 1887, an act to regulate commerce had been passed to insure just and reasonable rate structures and to prevent discriminatory practices. The Interstate Commerce Commission was established to carry out these objectives. However, a series of unfavorable court decisions left the Commission with little power. Its prerogatives were broadly enhanced, however, by the Hepburn Act of 1906, and the Transportation Acts of 1920 and 1940, which latter act provided specifically for the preservation of the inherent advantages of each type of transportation. Over a period of years, therefore, Congress has given the Interstate Commerce Commission a number of mandates. One of these, and probably the most basic, is that regulation of the different types of transportation shall be done in such a manner so as to preserve the inherent advantage of each.

Another specific mandate is that rates of carriers shall not be less for long hauls than for short hauls. Under these mandates the river carriers have enjoyed some, though inadequate, protection. The deficiency of this protection has largely resulted from an avenue which has been left open through which the purposes of the long-haul, short-haul provision of the law has been, and is now being continuously frustrated. This avenue originates under the so-called fourth section provision granting the Commission the power to suspend certain of the long-haul, short-haul, and other antidiscriminatory provisions when necessary to meet water competition. The net effect of these regulations has been to provide an umpire with conflicting rules of the game. There is no limitation which clearly prevents the railroads from instituting rates which are noncompensatory, and which in many instances, are far below their actual cost. In a recent suspension proceeding involving a rail rate on the movement of a bulk commodity down the Mississippi River, the railroads offered testimony which purported to show that the proposed rate was reasonable because it returned the marginal fuel cost of the additional traffic. Several questions and answers in this proceeding are of interest as elucidating the railroad position.

Question. Let me ask you, as an expert, what is your position in view of your railroad and other railroads appealing to this Commission for general increases that you should be permitted to reduce rates to meet private (water) carriage regardless of the consequences?

Answer. Oh, yes; I testified, and I tried to emphasize, that we will, and we are rather positively assured that if this rate is not going to be permitted to become effective, we are going to lose money. We have got to have traffic to make the revenue.

Question. Regardless of the rate?

Answer. Regardless of the rate.

In other words, we have the railroads testifying that they do not want to lose the traffic even though the rate might be below their actual cost. In this same case, in answer to questions under cross-examination as to whether individual items of cost had been included in determining the rate, the railway witnesses answered in the negative with respect to the following type of costs: Dispatch trains, station employees, weighing, inspection and demurrage bureaus, station supplies and expenses, yard master and yard clerks, telephone and telegraph operations, insurance, legal expense, overhead, and maintenance.

Between January 11 and February 15 of this year alone rail carriers have attempted to reduce 15 different rates, an average of almost 3 a week, allegedly to meet inland water carrier competition. These reductions range from 20 to as much as 50 percent, and in some instances the proposed reduced rate is less than 2.5 mills per ton-mile. These reductions have been requested during periods when the railroads have had general rate increase applications before the Commission. Between June 30, 1946, and December 29, 1948, the rail carriers received seven general increases in freight rates for a cumulative total of more than 51 percent, a large portion of which must have been dissipated in so-called individual competitive rate reductions. During this same period the average inland water rate was reduced by no less than 20 percent, largely through greatly enhanced design of floating equipment and the use of more effective, greater horsepower Diesel engines. Certainly, the comparison suggests that some of the ills of the railroads which they would attribute to unfair water transportation might be cured by a dose of better management.

No quicker or positive death sentence can be imposed on water transportation than to permit rail carriers to haul at less than cost commodities available for water traffic. The inherent advantage of water transportation can in this fashion be utterly destroyed by one Government agency, thereby rendering unproductive the taxpayers' own capital investment of over $2,000,000,000 committed to the Nation's inland marine system. The Government should not for the sake of any one agency of transportation invent and apply to its competitors either regulation or burden on the theory of handicapping all in the race.

In my opinion, and I believe there is a growing sentiment supporting it, some immediate remedial legislation is necessary which will limit the right of the Interstate Commerce Commission to grant so-called fourth-section relief, as well as to permit rates of any carriers, under any circumstances, which do not yield a fair rate on a basis of accounting whereby each unit of traffic bears its proper share of the over-all sum of the total-cost factors. It is not my purpose to discuss a formula but an alternative principle might also be included which would limit the rate so that it could be no lower than a reasonable percentage of the average ton-mile revenue of the carrier allocated to hauls and commodities of similar character. Not to admit such a principle is in effect to deny any relationship between cost of service and justness of the rate. It is my belief that therein lies a necessary course if the domestic water transportation industry is to achieve stability and security to a degree where it will never be found wanting in time of emergency.

It is well for us to direct our attention to some of the charges which have been directed against the water carriers by its competition. Leading the list of the various types of invective constantly thrown at the water carriers is the hue and cry about subsidy. It is to be hoped that the various spokesmen and associations for the water industry will soon publicly take steps to rebut statistically this charge of unfair advantage. The billions of dollars of real-estate value which have been granted to the railroads by Federal and local governments would far outweigh that portion of the Government expenditure on waterways which can properly be allocated to navigation. It is well known that many of the western and southwestern railroads have in past years derived more profit from the return of minerals alone, inherited by the railroads through land grants, than their net income from traffic. Certain tax immunities of the railroads should be studied and the facts brought to the attention of those who are now bombarded by the charges against which water carriers must defend themselves. The mail contracts would be a further fitting subject for research. The amount of actual traffic performed under very advantageous tariffs for the Government itself would be of more than casual interest.

The unfairness and distortions in many of these charges is illustrated by a railroad-sponsored statement which appeared this month in one of the leading business magazines whose circulation is claimed to be primarily among business executives, complaining at the wasteful expenditure of Federal funds for navigation and citing that it cost TVA about 3.45 cents per ton-mile to provide free navigation facilities from 1934 to 1937 while the rail freight rate during that time was about 1 cent per ton-mile. Let us examine this statement. In the first instance, it should be patent to the dullest elementary-school student that money spent to open up a new waterway cannot possibly result in an immediate surge of traffic in the period immediately following its inception as a usable channel. Factories will and are

being built, the flow of commodities is being changed. New terminals are being erected and broad-scale studies of industry are being made which would never have been contemplated were it not for the fact that the inland channel has become a reality. It would be necessary, if the problem were to be approached in this vein, to take a period of at least 25 years following opening of a new waterway in order to count its cost in terms of ton-miles. It is also interesting to observe in this instance that the sharpshooting has been directed at the TVA, a project completely unique and dissimilar to all other waterways since it was created by a specifically appointed regional authority whereas customarily waterway projects are planned, authorized, and constructed project by project by the United States Army engineers and the Congress of the United States. I have been closely connected for many years with projects which I have felt would be of benefit to shippers, communities, and, to be frank, my own business; and it has been just as difficult to obtain appropriations of Government funds for a specific project as to make the necessary showing to finance a private project through bankers and investment companies. Attention to the economics and the rate of amortization of Government investment in water projects on the part of the Army engineers, Bureau of the Budget, and the legislative branches of the Government has been at all times extremely pointed and rigorous.

Another charge which has recently appeared publicly is that there is no justification for expenditure of public funds for improving and maintaining waterways on the basis of national defense because during World War II traffic on the inland waterways proved incapable of expansion at a time when needed. The truth about this situation is that from 1939 to 1944, this latter year being the peak year for war-stimulated traffic, the burden of the Ohio River in ton-miles increased 106 percent, the Mississippi 102 percent, and the Gulf intracoastal waterway 436 percent. This record is all the more remarkable because the increases came at a time when the river transportation industry was operating at a very high-load factor and, unlike the railroads, there was not the opportunity of expanding operations through the introduction into use of a large amount of equipment theretofore idle.

Another claim recurringly directed to the domestic water industry is that the benefits of the system accrue solely to a few large shippers. The rebuttal of this argument need not be labored at great length as it is perfectly apparent that when basic materials such as oil, steel, iron, ore, limestone, and coal move in quantities measured in billions of ton-miles on inland waterways, there is not a man, woman, or child in the confines of the United States who is not benefited by the Nation's inland waterway system through the medium of lower costs for what he or she purchases.

However, to the corollary charge that there are no privately owned barge lines given full common carrier service on the inland waterways, the barge line operators must look long and hard at what their just responsibilities are to the public whom they are charged with serving with the Government a participant in their right-of-ways. It is true that well over 95 percent of all the traffic which moves on the inland waterway system moves in quantities of greater than 500 tons per unit. It is also true that there is a genuine need for the distribution of the benefits of cheap water transportation among the shippers of quantities at least in the carload category. Efforts are being made at this time by certain inland waterway carriers to broaden the scope of their operations as well as their operating authority so as to offer to the public a carload barge service with considerable improvement in technique as compared with the conventional multiple handling, single package methods. It is to be expected that industry will recognize the need for this type of service and that the various regulatory authorities will go to whatever end is necessary to liberalize the granting of sufficiently broad operating authority so that those carriers who are willing and able to undertake to extend their service so as to include thousands of smaller shippers may have the proper assistance in doing so.

It is not to be expected that water carriers would rush headlong into the carload and less-than-carload business with the ever-present menace of noncompensatory rail rate reductions, when these same carriers have as yet no adequate protection as to rate structures on barge-load traffic in which by every dictate of good business judgment they should be secure because of the large difference in the cost of rendering the service.

In summary, then, there is a challenge which must be boldly met. It will not suffice to meet it simply through a greater degree or amount of regulation. True, the loophole in the long- and short-haul provisions must be plugged. Yet this will not in itself assure to the inland water industry health or security. The industry itself must broaden and diversify both the type of cargo carried, and the classes of shippers which it serves. When the citizens begin to consider the great waterways as their own, they can be stirred to defend it. When the small-store owner and jobber and the little manufacturer use it, they will not so easily fall victim to the extravagant publicity of the forces opposing water traffic. It is high time, too, that the shipper from Chicago to Denver be invited to inquire why he should subsidize his neighbor in St. Louis shipping to New Orleans by rail.

With a minimum of enlightened regulation, the continuation of the Corps of Engineers' use of a conservative economic yardstick, and the acceptance of that measure by the legislatures, the privately owned water carriers can extend the copious bounties of the Nation's inland channels to new communities and can distribute their benefits to multitudes still deprived of this great resource.

Secretary Chapman's Address to American Zionist Council Celebration of Israel's Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SIDNEY R. YATES
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 27, 1950

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday April 23, 1950, at a gathering sponsored by the American Zionist Council at the Hotel Astor in New York City, a huge throng of people joined together to celebrate the second anniversary of the declaration of independence of the State of Israel. The principal speaker of the evening, Secretary of the Interior Oscar L. Chapman, delivered a most stirring address, one which will do much to make even stronger the firm bonds of friendship between our Nation and the new State.

Hon. Eliahu Elath, Israeli Ambassador to the United States, also participated in the proceedings, and in a moving statement, acknowledged the close and friendly relationship between Israel and the United States.

Mr. Louis Lipsky, president of the American Zionist Council, presided over the occasion and contributed greatly in making the event an outstanding success.

Mr. Speaker, I take pride in presenting the address of Secretary Chapman to the membership of this House:

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR OSCAR L. CHAPMAN AT THE SECOND ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION OF THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE OF THE STATE OF ISRAEL, UNDER THE AUSPICES OF THE AMERICAN ZIONIST COUNCIL, NEW YORK CITY, APRIL 23, 1950

I am happy for the opportunity to be with you on this historic and moving occasion. It is an honor to be your guest at this second anniversary celebration of the declaration of independence of the State of Israel.

A declaration of independence has a rich and revered meaning to the people of America. The story of the founding of a democratic government for free men is one we all understand, and it is a story that never fails to warm our hearts and stir a great pride within us. For we too once established a new Nation, and we have seen the promise of democracy fulfilled.

It is not given to many people or to many generations to see a new nation rise. Israel stands as a new symbol of people's determination to exercise their rights to freedom in a world where attempts to shackle men's spirits through ruthless repression and hardship grow increasingly bolder. Those courageous and high-minded people who created this new democracy during a period of vast social change, have taken the lead in the establishment of a nation wherein the rights of the individual and the dignity of man are supreme goals.

The new nation, Israel, has turned on the light of democracy in the Middle East, and free men and women are growing strong in its rays.

President Truman has followed closely the achievements of Israel in the fulfillment of democracy for its people, and he is deeply interested in its progress. He understands the problems which the founders of the new nation have encountered and I know he feels a great satisfaction for the substantial accomplishments Israel has made during the last 2 years. He regrets that it is impossible for him to bring his greetings to this celebration in person. He has directed me to deliver his cordial good wishes for the continued growth and well-being of this new democracy as it strengthens the cause of brotherhood and peace.

The birth of Israel is a bright chapter in the history of mankind. The war for its independence was not won by superior military might alone. The people of this new nation won their independence by superior moral force. They won because they were fighting for the thing that is dearest to men—freedom. Battling against tremendous odds, they gained the sympathy of the world because they were fighting for a cause that was right in the eyes of the world.

Israel's struggle was for the right to dwell in peace, for the right to live amicably with its neighbors, and for the right to achieve prosperity and security for its people.

The first Jewish state in 2,000 years was fighting for the right to open its doors to those who wanted to come, to put into practice that everlasting Jewish belief that no man in need should be turned away from the door.

The moral forces that supported the labors of those who brought Israel into being are continuing to strengthen the people in their many works of progress as a nation. The doors have indeed been opened wide. Since the birth of Israel on May 14, 1948,

the new state has welcomed a great inpouring of persons from all over the world. These are the children and the men and the women who were homeless, or broken, or in danger. Israel has received them, and is rebuilding their strength and their self-respect. In so doing, it builds its own strength, and its respect among the nations steadily increases.

The American Zionist Council, and the organizations which it comprises, have demonstrated the finest type of vision and leadership in their work to assist the development of Palestine and the creation of Israel. You have given of your knowledge of modern techniques in area development, and you have provided generously capital necessary for economic functioning of communities, agriculture, and industry. You have helped with the education of children, and with the establishment of health facilities.

I am sure that we all acknowledge freely, however, on this second anniversary of Israel's independence, that the highest tribute is rightly rendered to those citizens of Israel who have identified their daily living with the difficult problems of that area which is now their nation. The people of Israel, including those who have migrated to it, have made astonishing contributions. Their initial capital investments have become capital producing enterprises, and their progress in agriculture, industry, health, and sanitation has been highly gratifying.

The people of Israel have applied modern methods of irrigation to unproductive land, and have made it arable. Modern machines and technology have created a diversified industry where no modern industry existed before.

The institutions already established in this new land are the institutions of a democratic people. Because this is true, the citizens of America are attached to Israel with a close bond. Israel has indeed joined the honorable group of nations in which the lives and the security of men and women are the foremost goal. Like those nations, Israel yearns for an unbroken peace as it plans the years of its future. Like our own people, its people seek only an uninterrupted opportunity to develop their land, to insure their well-being for the coming generations.

The bonds that link the people of the United States and the people of Israel are strong also because of similar social and political manifestations at work during the birth-periods of the two nations. The Declaration of America's Independence, and the establishment of our Nation, occurred during an eighteenth century period of social change marked by popular unrest over institutional patterns sprung from a bygone era of lords and monarchs. The people of the United States were the first to proclaim the new liberalism, to fight for their freedom, and to embrace the new democracy. For many decades the other countries watched our progress with considerable misgiving.

Israel is the symbol which has emerged from the vast social unrest which is being felt throughout the world following the upheaval of two great wars. The older patterns of imperialism and national paternalism are being challenged widely in the middle of this fast-moving century of great technical advances, as people sense their ability to provide their own leadership in the development of their society and their economy in the modern world.

It was on this subject of social change and the increasing recognition of human rights that Secretary-General Trygve Lie spoke with such clarity in his address in Washington in March. In referring to the signing of the Charter of the United Nations in 1945, he said: "* * * during that brief span of 5 years the words of the United Nations Charter on human rights and freedoms for individuals and on equal rights and self-determination for nations have been proved by events to reflect more accurately the most fundamental forces actually at work in the world than any of the slogans of the cold war."

He reminded us that, since the signing of the Charter, these countries have gained their independence: the Philippines, India, Pakistan, Burma, Ceylon, Jordan, Israel, Nepal, and the United States of Indonesia. He emphasized his conviction that "the rise of the dependent peoples, and the human rights movement will, in the long run, have far more significance and give rise to greater events in the second half of the twentieth century than will the present ideological struggle."

In facing this challenge of social change, the choice of the people of Israel, their minds still seared by the sufferings of their coreligionists in other nations, has not been the choice of vengeance and tyranny. It will be an everlasting tribute to the nobility of mankind that Israel chose democracy and the equality of men as the way of life for all of its people.

The United States Government was proud to recognize this new democracy on the day of its establishment. The United Nations accepted Israel's membership before a year had passed.

On this second anniversary, it seems to me that, among the problems of the future with which Israel must deal, there are two which overshadow all others.

The first of these relates to Israel's continued internal development in the years ahead. The opening of the doors to those who wanted to come out of oppression and homelessness has moved the emotions of the world. To Israel it has brought vast problems of practical living, problems which that small nation has made amazing progress in solving. Much remains, however, to be done.

The people of America know of Israel's need for housing, for farm equipment and supplies, for the materials of sanitation, for school buildings, and for industrial equipment. We have given some assistance in helping to deal with these needs.

From the late 1880's until the creation of the new nation, 300 farm settlements were begun in the Holy Land. From May 14, 1948, to the beginning of 1950, 174 new settlements have sprung up from Galilee to the Negeb, from Dan through Beersheba south to Elath. Many of these settlements were started with farm machinery bought in the United States through a loan of $100,000,000 from this country.

Israel has demonstrated the practical uses in improving the lives of people to which loans from this Nation have been applied. I should like to see the United States grant another loan to continue the great work of reclaiming Israel's desert, and to make it possible for Israel to receive new immigrants, providing them with homes and jobs and security in the future.

The continuing progress of this new democracy will be largely dependent upon water, and the United States Department of the Interior has accumulated much experience in reclaiming arid lands. The information we have gained in such areas as the Southwest which is climatically similar to Israel and in such developments as the Missouri River Valley and the Central Valley of California will unquestionably be of great service to technicians in Israel. The Department has engaged in discussions with some of these technicians on new advances in our knowledge of reclamation, and the Department's engineers have visited Israel to study the possibilities of river development on the Jordan, some even before the advent of the state.

These discussions have been helpful to the department I represent, and their benefits have been mutual to the two countries. For example, we are studying with interest a process being worked on by a member of the faculty of the Haifa Institute of Technology for more effective utilization of the morning dew in crop production. It is my hope that we shall be able to send more American scientists and technicians to Israel in the coming years.

Our National House of Representatives on March 31 took a step important to our Nation and to the world when it passed a bill to implement the President's point 4 program for assisting underdeveloped world areas. In the President's own words, this program is designed "for making the benefits of our scientific advances and industrial progress available for the improvement and growth of underdeveloped areas. * * *" It will lend technical assistance from this Nation to the free peoples of the world in their efforts to produce more food, more clothing, more materials for housing, and more mechanical power to lighten their burdens.

This plan for the progressive development of peoples in the way of democracy offers bright promise. Israel has already moved forward in the spirit in which the point 4 program is conceived.

The expansion of production in underdeveloped areas, as in Israel, will go hand-in-hand with the development of new and expanding markets in world commerce, and the creation of these new markets will benefit this Nation. For us, it will mean also new sources of the raw materials on which our economy depends. Further, it will narrow the economic gap which exists between the United States and the rest of the nations of the world, and it will help to eliminate the high degree of economic imbalance which retards the growth of democracy and impedes international harmony.

The people of Israel have found out what kind of technical assistance and capital investment envisioned in the point 4 program can mean in building a stronger democracy, and we in the United States have seen, in Israel, the benefits in the stability of international relations that derive from this kind of cooperative economic effort.

The second great problem for Israel is the overshadowing problem confronting all mankind—the maintenance of peace in the world.

It is given to us to be standing tonight in one of the strongest currents of social change in the world's history. The peoples of the world who yearn for life and security are scrutinizing those political institutions and social patterns which have long been traditional with them. They are inquiring, with increasing comprehension, whether those institutions and patterns can continue to provide stability and peace. They are making decisions which carry tremendous significance for us all.

Israel is an evidence of this new search, even as are Indonesia and India. Some of these decisions made by other nations are applauded by the people of America because they guide men and women toward the way of democracy. Others are hateful to us because they lead people backward to enslavement, cruelty, and hopelessness.

Because of this world-wide social stirring, citizens of the United States themselves are today called upon for decisions more grave than any in our history. As the forces of decency and freedom contend with those who would draw men and women into servitude and degradation, our decisions cannot be postponed.

It will avail us nothing to stand in fear or writhe in confusion as we witness social and political changes, and vacillate in our decisions, for in so doing we mistakenly cause some of the world's peoples to think erroneously that democracy is weak and that its citizens are torn by dissension and conflict. We know that this is not so, but we shall have to decide whether others in the world are going to witness in our Nation the

strength and promise of a united democracy which is vital in the lives of men wherever its roots are allowed to grow.

We have joined in the Council of Nations because we have learned that the causes of war will never be obliterated by nations acting alone, and because we are sickened by the waste of lives and resources that war has required. We have supported strongly the United Nations, and we know that organization has woven a fabric of international order and rightness which will not easily be torn apart. As a people, we have gone further. We have determined that nations ravaged by war shall prosper again, and we have offered gladly of our abundant possessions that they might do so.

But the struggle to ally this Nation with the forces of world decency and order still depends upon the continuing decisions of the people. There are still those among us who would have us remain aloof from the world's problems, or participate in the world's councils only when it would mean immediate profit to ourselves. Lately they have been speaking more loudly and more boldly. Do these men and women not realize that, without world security, there can be no security for our Nation? And that world security will never be achieved unless we help to achieve it?

The people of Israel know that terror and suffering can never be erased from the earth unless nations act in concert to bring such a thing to pass. The American people know it, and the integrity and soundness of their past decision must not be made questionable by men of little faith, or by those who move from motives of ignorance or profit.

It was at the dedication of a cemetery for the dead of the Marine Corps on Iwo Jima that Chaplain Roland Gittlesohn delivered a short and moving sermon that will live forever in the hearts of those who abhor war. This noble speech gave us this warning: "We shall not suppose, as did the last generation of America's fighting men, that the victory on the battlefield will automatically guarantee the triumph of democracy at home * * * when the last battle has been won there will be those at home, as there were last time, who will want us to turn our back in selfish isolation on the rest of organized humanity and thus to sabotage the very peace for which we fight. We promise you who lie here to build the kind of world for which you died."

The prophetic words of Roland Gittlesohn have come true too quickly. Strange as it may seem to thoughtful men, the ravages of total war are easily forgotten, and the terrible fate of men in a war of atom and hydrogen bombs is like some nightmare which we hope never to experience. Once again we hear the voices of protest over the cost of assisting other nations, and the smug conclusion that the world is too big for America to really save. And once again we are urgently cautioned by myopic men, who forget the cost of war and the cost of a huge military machine, that our small help to nations seeking peace and security will bankrupt us all. Do they sincerely believe that we can save ourselves, while the world explodes around us?

Once before in our history we had the opportunity which confronts us now. How tragic it was for the world that an effective League of Nations for which President Wilson crusaded was not established after the First World War. Equally tragic it would be if a second great world war failed to convince the world that the Wilsonian dream of international cooperation is the only route to permanent peace.

To the people of Israel, living in the cradle of civilization, I can give this message. The United States Government congratulates you on your achievements in the cause of democracy. We shall stand firm in our determination to strengthen the pathways of collaboration among nations for the maintenance of a peace that will let you, and other countries, and ourselves, grow and prosper. For Israel and her neighboring nations, there must not be a second round of warfare. The moral forces of this Nation must be directed to the outlawing of such a possible conflict before it starts.

Israel is bringing democracy to the Middle East. For the first time in the history of that area, women go to the polls. Arab women, some of them still veiled, vote for Arab representatives who sit in the Israel Knesset. In that highly democratic body, surrounded by lands in which women have only begun to attain rights, women representatives help to make the laws of the land.

The people of Israel, and the people of America, will not share in the ideas of those who believe that the life of majorities may best be advanced by sacrificing the basic rights of minority groups. Ignorance, fear, hatred, and intolerance are the tools of those who would undermine democracy for the totalitarian state, either of the right or the left and who would establish a philosophy directly contrary to our way of life.

If democracy is to live, its privileges must extend to all citizens. It is from the sharing of these rights that its strength is derived.

We must make democracy shine as a living thing in the eyes of men and women everywhere. We in this Nation shall not allow confusion to slow our footsteps, or momentary political divisiveness to benumb our spirits. Like Israel, we shall go on building the security and well-being of our citizens, and, as we did for the triumph of war, we shall contribute of our minds and bodies for the cause of peace.

It is interesting, as it is timeless and timely, that the day-by-day greeting in Israel is "Shalom." It is a constant reminder of the goal of nations. The moral strength that built Israel is the kind of moral strength that the nations will require to banish war from the face of the earth. Let us stand together in this battle for peace.

Agriculture Conservation Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 27, 1950

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest conservation jobs now being carried on is that of crop rotation as practiced by the agriculture conservation program of the Production and Marketing Administration. A fine example of the work being done is a report for 1949 of the Madison County, Ark., group headed by George W. Reeves, ably assisted by James M. Parker, Dewey Harris, Artsil Hunter, Veda Tassey, and Grace Bunch. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert that report.

ANNUAL REPORT, 1949, PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION, MADISON COUNTY, ARK.

INTRODUCTION AND ORGANIZATION OF PWA

The Production and Marketing Administration is a Government conservation program administered on the county level by democratically elected farmers. These farmers are elected in each community each year to work with the county committee, who are elected each year by a delegation of farmers, who are elected by all farmers in the community to serve in this capacity and incidentally all of the delegates in our county are chairmen of the various community committees.

These men (all farmers) are directly responsible for the program and administration of the PMA in Madison County:

COMMUNITY COMMITTEEMEN

Roy Vanhook, Clifty, Ark.; Fred Todd, Clifty, Ark.; Joe Worley, Eureka Springs, Ark.; Frank T. Hudson, Huntsville, Ark.; Bailie Wiggins, Alabam, Ark.; Ted Slavens, Huntsville, Ark.; Frank Dillahunty, Huntsville, Ark.; Paul Flanagan, Fayetteville, Ark.; Paul Stanphill, Hindsville, Ark.; T. T. Counts, Drakes Creek, Ark.; E. B. Shofner, Wesley, Ark.; Alfred Bell, Wesley, Ark.; Jason Jones, Huntsville, Ark.; W. A. Little, Kingston, Ark.; Henry Bryant, Boston, Ark.; Joe Myers, St. Paul, Ark.; L. O. Combs, Combs, Ark.; W. L. Gabbard, Crosses, Ark.; Bruce Rogers, Japton, Ark.; Hugh Stroud, Aurora, Ark.; O. A. Sanders, Witter, Ark.

COUNTY COMMITTEE

James M. Parker, chairman; Dewey Harris, vice chairman; Artsil Hunter, regular member; George W. Reeves, county administrative officer; Veda Tassey, chief clerk; Grace Bunch, clerk.

It took the combined efforts of all persons whose name appears above plus the help of approximately 1,300 other farmers to accomplish the results shown in the remainder of this report.

JAMES M. PARKER,
DEWEY HARRIS,
ARTSIL HUNTER,
Members Madison County PMA Committee.

Name of practice and number of farms carrying out practice	Extent	Practice value
Applying 20 percent superphosphate (964) pounds	2,686,908	$21,495
Applying 50 percent potash (142) pounds	43,263	649
Applying ground limestone (27) tons	640	1,312
Controlling weeds in permanent pasture by mowing (726) acres	9,933	4,966
Establishing permanent pasture by sodding Bermuda grass (69) acres	130	780
Establishing and improving permanent pasture by seeding:		
Kentucky 31 fescue (13) pounds	377	188
Bermuda grass (4) do	37	18
Bluegrass (30) do	1,232	370
Orchard grass (497) do	63,174	12,639
Ryegrass (44) do	5,300	318
Redtop (66) do	2,536	380
Crimson clover (2) do	90	13
Ladino or white clover (28) do	505	252
Lespedeza (annual) (747) do	160,031	12,802
Contour farming intertilled row crops (15) acres	134	67
Summer cover crops (182) pounds	38,920	2,612
Winter cover crops (29) do	3,540	431
Terraces (3) feet	3,280	39
Constructing ponds for stock water (21) yards	27,343	2,187
Developing springs for stock water (10) feet	699	349
Cover of small grains (42) pounds	20,407	409
Cover of ryegrass (6) do	630	38
Harvesting legume or grass seed (30) acres	206	515

21 stock ponds were constructed on farms in Madison County during 1949.
12 springs were developed the county in 1949.

AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM, 1949

PARTICIPATION

Number of farms in the county	2,865
Number of farms participating in the 1949 ACP	1,321
Percent of participation	46

ACP FUNDS

County allocation	$53,141
Total amount earned	62,820

OBJECTIVES OF THE ACP

The agriculture conservation program is designed to assist farmers in conserving the

soil through grants of certain conservation materials and cash payments for carrying out approved practices on their farms. The reason for these payments by the Government is to assure the public; business people, laborers, and white collar workers, as well as farmers, the standard of living that they may hope to have in this generation and generations to come.

This can only be accomplished by maintaining and improving the fertility of our soil and this is the reason that we feel it is the responsibility of all people in all walks of life to help reach these objectives by lending their moral support with the assistance by the Government, since we all know that our soil is the bases of our economy from the smallest farm to the greatest nation.

We as a committee of farmers believe that the purpose of the ACP is sound and that we are slowly but steadily moving forward in our combined efforts to reach the goal of ACP which is reflected in this report of participation in, and accomplishments of Madison County PMA.

1949 PMA PERSONNEL, COUNTY COMMITTEE

James M. Parker, chairman; Dewey Harris, vice chairman; Artsil Hunter, regular member; Paul Flanagan, first alternate; Ted Slavens, second alternate.

COUNTY OFFICE PERSONNEL

George W. Reeves, county administrative officer; Veda Tassey, chief clerk; Grace Bunch, clerk.

1949 FINANCIAL REPORT OF ADMINISTRATIVE FUNDS

County committee	$1,393.00
Community committee	2,976.50
County office employees	6,747.42
Field officer	30.00
Travel expenses	257.67
Office overhead	570.83
Total expenses	11,975.42

PROGRESS OF PMA AGRICULTURE CONSERVATION IN MADISON COUNTY, 1942–49

Farmers of Madison County have gone a long way in the past 8 years toward getting their farms up to a standard of production, that they should have in order to provide a desirable standard of living, by cooperating with the agriculture conservation program in the county, in developing more and better pastures by seeding adapted pasture grasses and legumes, using phosphate, lime, and other essential minerals recommended by PMA (AAA) where a part of the cost of material and seed was paid by the Government, usually about 25 to 50 percent of cost of the practice. The remainder being paid by the farmer.

The same is also true in the development of meadows by proper fertilization and erosion-control methods, use of better selection of adapted meadow grass seed, a part of which was paid by the Government. For instance, in 1942 farmers sold approximately 4,745,000 pounds of milk, in 1949 they sold approximately 18,250,000 pounds of milk, or an average annual increase of 1,688,125 pounds.

At $3.50 per hundredweight average price paid for whole milk over the past 8 years, would show an average net increase of $59,483.50.

The production and sale of beef cattle has increased in number—40 percent from 1942–49, or from 16,000 head in 1942 tot 22,400 in 1949. By valuing the increase at $100 per head, which is very conservative, would show a net increase per year of $80,000.

Crop production per acre shows a 50-percent increase over the 8-year period 1942–49. However, we also show a decrease of 30 percent of land being planted to row crops over this 8-year period. The decrease in acres planted to row crops is due to the trend of farming practices changing from row crop farming to livestock, and we contribute the per acre increase yield to a better plan of crop rotation and carrying out of soil-conservation practices.

Banks of Madison County show an average increase of deposits by farmers of $125,000 per year.

It is the opinion of different businessmen in the county that at least 35 percent of all increase production and income is directly due to the PMA program in the county through the use of funds appropriated by the Congress to assist farmers in developing the above standard of living and to strengthen the Nation's economy by producing sufficient food and fibers to feed and clothe the people of the world.

All practices carried out on farms reported in Madison County and the assistance paid by the Government through the PMA is shown in this report.

The following table shows the average annual increase in livestock and livestock products over an 8-year period 1942–49 and the cash value of the increase production which is chiefly due to practice payments to cooperating farmers through the PMA.

Increased production 1942–49—assistance by Government—average annual increases, value of increases, and final results

Year	Dairy production	Beef cattle	Hogs	Sheep and lambs	Bank deposits
	Pounds				
1942	4,745,000	16,000	1,500	500	$600,000
1943	6,674,282	16,891	2,000	571	----------
1944	8,603,564	17,782	2,500	642	----------
1945	10,532,846	18,675	3,000	713	----------
1946	12,462,128	19,566	3,500	784	----------
1947	14,391,414	20,457	4,000	855	----------
1948	16,320,696	21,348	4,500	926	----------
1949	18,250,000	22,400	5,000	1,000	1,600,000

Year	Value of increases	Percent of increase due PMA	Value of increase due PMA	Government assistance
1942	----------	----------	----------	$31,433.00
1943	$172,739.28	35	$60,458.75	47,601.00
1944	172,739.28	35	60,458.75	75,806.00
1945	172,739.28	35	60,458.75	46,154.00
1946	172,739.28	35	60,458.75	53,737.29
1947	172,739.28	35	60,458.75	73,625.62
1948	172,739.28	35	60,458.75	28,287.00
1949	172,739.28	35	60,458.75	62,826.00
Total	1,209,174.96	35	483,670.00	419,784.24

Basing-Point Bill, S. 1008, Threat to Independent Truckers—Railroads Propose Rate Slash To Meet Trucking Competition—Trucking Operations in Steel and Cement Increasing Rapidly—S. 1008 Would Again Lash Basic Commodities to Rails—Opposition of American Trucking Associations, Inc., to S. 1008

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 27, 1950

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the New York Journal of Commerce for April 19, 1950, carries the headline "Truckers set to fight if rails cut steel rate." If the basing-point bill, S. 1008, is enacted into law, it is my belief that there will be little for the truckers to fight about. Truck and water transportation has come into its own since the outlawing of the basing-point system by the Supreme Court in its decision in the Cement case on April 26, 1948. Since that time, the Federal Trade Commission has brought at least two actions against cement companies for making price differentials for truck delivery from cement mills. Since the Cement decision, the consumer has had a break through enjoyment of lower transportation costs on our heavy, basic commodities by the use of water and truck transportation. Because the artificial basing-point system was not in effect, the savings in water and truck transportation have been to the consumer. The steel and cement trust in particular, because of the Cement decision, have been unable to pocket millions of dollars of phantom freight by charging the all-rail freight to destination when shipments were made by water or truck transportation.

HECTIC TARIFF WAR PREDICTED

The Journal of Commerce article goes on to say: "Highway truckers warned of a rate war 'of tremendous proportions' with eastern railroads today as a railroad spokesman called for tighter Government regulation of trucking operations. The intensity of competition between the two groups showed up at separate hearings before the Interstate Commerce Commission and a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Interstate Commerce Commission" (Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce).

TRUCKERS WILL BE ELIMINATED IN STEEL HAULAGE IF S. 1008 PASSES

The "rate war threatened" will be meaningless if the basing-point bill is enacted into law. There will be no necessity for railroads to cut rates on iron and steel 25 percent, or any other percentage. There will be no need for the Association of Highway Steel Transporters to worry about an increase in trucking rates, should S. 1008 become law. If S. 1008 does by any means become law, the rail rate from mill to destination would henceforth apply to steel shipments, just as it did prior to the Cement decision in April 1948. Any trucking of steel from the mill which would take place in the future would be for the direct benefit of the steel trust and not for the benefit of either the trucker or the consumer of steel. These facts on the basing-point system would also apply to water transportation. The record shows that in the Tennessee Valley area shipments of steel by water have gone from a mere 1,000 tons annually to more than 50,000 tons, with a direct saving to the consumer of more than $500,000.

TRUCKERS HAVE BEEN AWARE OF THE EFFECTS OF S. 1008 AND THE BASING-POINT SYSTEM

When small-business organizations were unable to secure a hearing on the basing-point bill, the House Small Business Committee held hearings on Small Business Objections to Basing-Point Legislation, particularly S. 1008. These hearings were not extensive and were not as exhaustive as had been planned, because the O'Mahoney bill was brought to the floor of the House, after clearance

with the Rules Committeee, almost immediately after the hearings of the Small Business Committee began. During those hearings, however, the committee heard Edgar S. Idol, general counsel of the American Trucking Associations, Inc., who pointed out in his testimony the fact that cement mills refused to permit delivery by truck and that, even on hauls much to the advantage of the consumer, the cement trust forced shipment by rail.

Is it any wonder that the lobbyists for the railroads, for the Cement Trust, for the Steel Trust, and for many other monopolies in this country are tramping through the Halls of Congress. Pitted against this array of money, small business has been fighting for its very life. Small business has fought a good fight to preserve and strengthen the antitrust laws. Small business has fought for the enforcement of the antitrust laws, and I believe the 300,000 or more independent truckers in the United States represent a type of business which should be protected as well as any other small business.

NOW IS THE TIME FOR THE SMALL, INDEPENDENT TRUCKER TO AGAIN PROTECT HIMSELF BY OPPOSING PASSAGE OF S. 1008

Evidently the trucking industry, as the Journal of Commerce tells us, is in a position to fight a rate war of tremendous proportions. The fact that the trucking industry is willing and ready to fight the money-controlled management group running the eastern railroads is indicative of the value of steel haulage to the trucking industry; but, as pointed out above, it seems to me any fight would have been in vain if all steel shipments are again predicated on rail freight rates. If steel shipments are all based on rail freight rates, would there be any reason why the railroads would desire to cut freight rates to meet truck competition in the handling and hauling of steel? If the rail rate had to apply on all shipments from the mill to destination, regardless of method of transportation, what difference would it make to the consumer how the steel was hauled? In fact, under the basing-point system, which S. 1008 will revive, the shipper calls the shots, regardless of the method of transportation.

Strings of barges loaded with many thousands of tons of steel will float down the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers from Pittsburgh and will unload at various vantage points, with all the benefit of water transportation accruing to the steel mill. The consumer will get none of it. The contract water carrier will get no advantage from such shipments. The same is true of heavy movements from the mill by truck under the basing-point system. The rail rate will prevail so that the trucker, if he gets any business at all, will handle shipments at a price the steel trust is willing to pay. It will make little difference to the consumer, in most instances, whether shipments of steel from the mill are by rail or truck, because the consumer will pay the same freight charges, namely, the all-rail rate, in either event.

I sincerely hope that, before it is too late, the 300,000 independent truckers, most of whom are small-business men, will again make their voices heard in opposition to S. 1008, the basing-point bill, the antitrust-law-destroying bill, the bill which emasculates the Federal Trade Commission Act and the Clayton Act as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act. It is well, I believe, to include in this statement the testimony before the Small Business Committee of the representative of the American Trucking Associations—(Pages 102–107, Small Business Objections on Basing-Point Legislation, Particularly S. 1008)—the statement of Edgar S. Idol, general counsel for the American Trucking Associations, Inc., follows:

STATEMENT OF EDGAR S. IDOL, GENERAL COUNSEL, AMERICAN TRUCKING ASSOCIATIONS, INC.

Mr. IDOL. My name is Edgar S. Idol, and I am general counsel for American Trucking Associations, Inc., the national association of the motor-carrier industry. We are a federation of State associations, each of which includes in its membership all types of motor carriers, both private and for hire.

Our industry is made up almost entirely of small operators. There are approximately 300,000 for-hire carriers in the country, most of whom handle business locally within cities or are agricultural operators. There are only 24,000 regulated by the Interstate Commerce Commission. That is a very sizable number to make up the transportation business.

Of that group only about 11 percent have revenues that run as much as $100,000 a year, the basis for the Commission's classification of class I carriers. Even among that relatively small group, only a handful have as many as 500 employees, and I would say all of them would be classified as small business generally.

We have made no general study, Mr. Chairman, of the matter being considered by this committee, the basing point pricing, as a general proposition. We have, however, had our attention directed by a number of complaints from our members to one situation which we want to bring to the attention of the committee. That is the inability of motor carriers generally to obtain any business in the handling of cement. The history of the transportation of cement is well covered in the findings of fact issued by the Federal Trade Commission in the Cement case, its Docket No. 3617. They spend some six of eight pages in covering that subject. I briefed it in my statement to your committee.

Trucking over the highways generally commenced about 1920 in this country, and at that time cement mills generally would sell cement at the mills to any purchaser who wanted it and would allow it to be transported by any means that the purchaser desired.

The purchasers who began using trucking quickly found they had a very substantial advantage in a good many respects. They sometimes found trucking more efficient for hauls say to 25, 50, or 75 miles of the mill. They found they could pick it up at the mill at the mill price and get it to destination at a cost considerably lower than moving it from the mill by railroad to a siding, there unloading it, and making delivery.

Cement mills, however, very soon found out that their basing point pricing structure was being completely disrupted by this practice. It is not difficult to see why that would be so. Quoting from the Federal Trade Commission's Finding No. 11 covering this matter, the Commission said this:

"One development has been the desire of some dealers, contractors, and other purchasers to utilize motortrucks for the transportation of cement from respondents' mills or warehouses to destinations within a reasonable distance. It is obvious that if a purchaser is allowed to take delivery at the mill in trucks owned or controlled by him, the seller loses control of the destination price."

They decided to do something about that. The actual reason why it was done is covered very clearly in a questionnaire transmitted by Professors Clark and Burns in the course of a study which they undertook for the Cement Institute. I have cited in my statement very briefly two of the statements made. They were these. The first complete statement made by the Lehigh Portland Cement Co. was this:

"The manufacturer striving to figure his prices on indeterminate and fluctuating trucking rates, and to meet the equally fluctuating and indeterminate rates from his competitors' plants, quickly found himself engaged in blind, reckless, and destructive competition.

Statements along the same line were made by five other companies quoted to Professors Clark and Burns in the study made for the Cement Institute. That situation did not last too long.

It developed during the 1920's, and early in the 1930's a change was made. The Federal Trade Commission treats that at some length and summarizes the evidence as follows:

"The effect of trucking on prices and distribution was the motivating cause of respondents' action with respect to trucking cement."

Now, the action which those companies took was in two or three forms. Again quoting from the Federal Trade Commission's finding:

"One of the earliest restrictive steps taken, as shown by the record, was the addition of a 15-cent-per-barrel charge to the mill base price for delivery to trucks at the mill."

On July 25, 1929, the sales manager of Penn-Dixie wrote to the then president of that company as follows:

"The plan is being developed to improve the trucking situation, particularly in the Lehigh Valley. I understand this morning that the plan as now contemplated puts in a minimum price f. o. b. destination of $2.44 cloth and a price f. o. b. trucks at all mills in the Lehigh Valley and New Jersey district of $2.40 cloth."

That means, regardless of the freight price at the mill, there would be a differential of only 4 cents a barrel in the price at which the mill would deliver to a truck at its platform and the price at which they would deliver anywhere, paying the rail freight. The conclusion is obvious.

The difference of 4 cents a barrel is not enough to cover any kind of trucking cost, and it operated to completely eliminate the use of trucks, whether they were more efficient, less expensive, or more suitable to the purchaser's demands or for any other reasons.

Two or three pages of the Federal Trade Commission's finding are devoted to the steps taken to put this policy into effect throughout the country. The rules of putting it into effect are summed up by the Commission as follows:

"Of 116 mills"—which were studied by the Commission—"85 reported no trucking permitted."

This again is from the study made by Professors Clark and Burns for the Cement Institute, which was concluded about 1937. To repeat:

"Of 116 mills, 85 reported no trucking permitted whatever; 8 reported trucking permitted at a price penalty; 5 reported trucking permitted at the full rail destination prices."

That is not clear to me, but I assume it means that full rail destination price was charged at the mill.

"One mill reported trucking permitted on the basis of destination price at the mill at times. At other times base price plus 25 cents per barrel penalty. Four mills reported trucking permitted but limited to certain points."

Generally within just a single county, I believe that was.

"Six reported permitted at destination prices less actual freight. Only seven reported permitting trucking on the basis of the mill price without any restriction."

This subject was fully explored by the Federal Trade Commission and those were the results which they found. The order which they made in this case and which has been upheld by the Supreme Court will, in our opinion, when it is fully enforced, make truck service available to those purchasers who desire to use it.

The order specifically provides that cement mills must not refuse or decline to allow purchasers to provide transportation by any means at any cost or to any place they may desire. The enforcement of that order of the Commission is not effective in its entirety.

In a case recently called to our attention the contractor wanted to use motor carrier service for hauling cement from the plant of the Universal Atlas Cement Co. at Hudson, N. Y., to a road project only 29 miles from the mill.

The mill refused to make deliveries to trucks under any conditions. They insisted that the cement be taken from the mill by rail, hauled to a rail siding, and the nearest they could get was 20 or 30 miles rail haul before they would make delivery to the contractor or to his trucks or to anybody else that wanted to get it. From there, the closest rail siding, it still had to be hauled a distance of some 12 miles by road before it could reach the site of the construction project.

The cost of that was bound to be almost double, in my opinion, the cost of handling direct from the mill to the site. It increased the cost of the highway to the taxpayers generally.

Mr. KAUFMAN. The real reason is that on the basing point system, to make it work it has to be a delivered price.

The CHAIRMAN. And a railroad price.

Mr. IDOL. And a railroad price, a fixed, determinable price.

Mr. KAUFMAN. Even though that price is artificial to the extent that it reflects phantom freight or absorption of freight. In other words, it may not represent actual freight but nevertheless they arrive at a price which is a fixed delivered price; is that correct?

Mr. IDOL. That is right, and the cement mill must control that price.

Mr. KAUFMAN. That is right, so that if the purchasers, whether nearby or far away, would call for the cement at the actual selling point, it would destroy the whole system.

Mr. IDOL. Yes.

Mr. KAUFMAN. Because then a mill would have to sell at its actual mill net price.

Mr. IDOL. It actually did destroy the system during the twenties.

Mr. KAUFMAN. Certainly, the delivered-price system under the basing-point system destroys that whole possibility of getting that price as a mill net price; is that not so?

Mr. IDOL. That is correct.

Mr. KAUFMAN. And if your trucks, with a basing-point system operating could actually take the cement at the place where the cement is made, you destroy the whole system, the basing-point system.

Mr. IDOL. That is correct, unless the mill itself can control the price to be charged the purchaser for that truck transportation.

Mr. KAUFMAN. Oh, yes; by adding penalties or what not.

Mr. IDOL. That is right.

Mr. KAUFMAN. So, then, we have here an example, if I understand it, whereby the cement people, to carry out this system of delivered prices, based on artificial phantom freight and absorptions of freight, actually change the economics of the situation so that they insist that deliveries shall not be made by the most economical methods available; is that correct?

Mr. IDOL. That is correct.

Mr. KAUFMAN. And now, of course, under this basing-point system we have other economic disadvantages such as cross-hauling, steel moving one way and then moving back another way, another economic disadvantage, and we have had testimony—I do not know whether the testimony has been developed here yet but it has been shown in many other places—testimony indicating regional underdevelopment whereby one region is favored over another, even though the region might be fully capable of producing cement or producing steel.

Now, I want to ask you this: Would it be fair to rank this discrimination against trucks as an economical method of transportation, with these other discriminations that have been testified to here and may be testified to later on?

Mr. IDOL. Well, we do not think it is. We think it is highly improper.

Mr. KAUFMAN. You think this discrimination is highly improper?

Mr. IDOL. We certainly do. I might say "improper" is not a very good word for that. We think it is uneconomic as a general proposition.

Mr. KAUFMAN. Supposing we shall be able to show in these hearings later on—I know we will, because there is no question about the facts—that water transportation is discriminated against in the same way, that where, in many situations, the cement or even the steel could be transported by water much more cheaply than by any other way, that nevertheless, they want to make the basing-point system work, the basing-point system using only rail rates, and the water transportation is ignored completely and is not used, or even if it is used, the purchasers are charged the same as rail rates; would you regard that as a discrimination alongside discrimination against trucks?

Mr. IDOL. I think there is no question about it being discrimination. As a matter of fact, I believe that point is made in the Federal Trade Commission's finding in this case. There is one portion of it somewhere that refers to the fact that rail transportation was, by agreement, used exclusive of any other form.

Mr. KAUFMAN. That is correct.

Mr. IDOL. I do not find a quotation offhand, but I am sure it is there.

Mr. KAUFMAN. I am quite sure there is a reference to that in your Cement Institute case. The facts are developed very fully in many other forms.

I did not mean to interrupt you.

Mr. IDOL. Well, I have almost covered my ground, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. You were down near the bottom of page 2, I believe.

Mr. IDOL. Yes.

We have this situation now: Inquiries from carriers in Pennsylvania and New Jersey have reached us which indicate that mills in those territories, as well as this one particular mill in New York, are still following the policy of refusing to make truck deliveries.

We have, however, had reports from other territories, particularly Wisconsin that I know of, indicating that since the Cement case decision, mills have changed their practice, and are now routing traffic by either truck or rail in accordance with the purchaser's desires.

I have discussed this matter in behalf of our association with counsel for the Federal Trade Commission. They tell us that they have under consideration the examination of whether or not the small cement companies are complying with the outstanding order in the Cement case. We think that a refusal of the type we find in New York is in all probability a violation of the Federal Trade Commission's outstanding order.

We think that the Federal Trade Commission will be able to eventually enforce compliance with that outstanding order under the law as it now stands. But if the amendment here proposed to the Federal Trade Commission law is adopted, we think it very uncertain whether purchasers will ever be able to demand truck service or any other type of service except rail service.

Whether it is efficient, economical by comparison with rail service or not, I think it is highly questionable whether under the language here proposed any truck line would ever handle any cement.

The language as we understand it says that basing-point prices are all right. The cement company which establishes and has—I assume without any doubt that they will return to regular basing-point pricing practices if the law is passed—any single company then, I do not believe it would require any conspiracy for a company to decide that it could not enforce its own basing-point pricing unless it used rail service exclusively, and I can see no way in which the practice could be attacked.

Baltic Incident

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 20, 1950

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, the Herald Tribune of April 23, 1950, published a letter which deals with the disappearance of the American plane over the Baltic.

I am inserting it in the RECORD, because it so succinctly points out the basic differences between the democratic and communistic way of life.

THE BALTIC INCIDENT

To the New York Herald Tribune:

The Baltic incident brings into focus the essential difference between the American way of life and that of Soviet Russia.

The disappearance of the Privateer plane brought about a great search in which scores of American, Danish, Swedish planes and ships participated. They did so in the hope that some of the airmen might be found alive.

It is significant that not one Russian ship or plane participated in the search. The Soviet Government did not even offer to lend any help in finding the flyers.

We know what would happen if a Soviet plane fell into the sea off the coast of America. Whether it disappeared off Alaska or near Iceland, Newfoundland, Bermuda, or Cuba would make no difference. Within minutes our Coast Guard would be rushing to the scene. The United States Navy and the Air Corps would immediately institute rescue operations. Planes and ships would be directed to the area to search for and pick up any possible survivors.

Herein lieth the basic difference between the democratic and communistic way of life. Americans, true to their religious heritage, are human beings; they have compassion, love, and mercy in their hearts. When a man is down, even though he is an enemy, the American tradition of sportsmanship requires that help be given to the fallen.

But not so with the godless Communists; there is no mercy in their hearts. They seem to be void of the basic elements of humanity. The least that could have been expected of the Soviet Union was an attempt to help find

the missing fliers. But even a gesture in that direction was lacking.

A further revelation of the Soviet mind can be gleaned from the Russian note of protest, which said that a Russian fighter plane fired at the American plane and it disappeared. It is logical to believe that the Soviet Union knows whether the plane was shot down and whether it crashed into the sea, with the loss of all on board.

The Soviet Government could have given a definite statement as to the fate of the airship. This would have saved the families of the missing airmen great mental anguish. It would have saved a fruitless search in which so many planes and ships participated at such great cost. But the Communist mentality is one which delights in giving misleading information. It has no capacity for human understanding, compassion, and love.

The Baltic incident should convince every American of the gulf that divides the American way of life from that of Communist Russia. There should be no doubt as to the superior values of our democracy, our freedom, and the God-given gifts of humanity, love, and brotherhood which have become part of our daily expression of the American way of life.

Rabbi ABBA ABRAMS.

NEW YORK, *April 21, 1950.*

Easy To Understand Why Communists Regard Lattimore as "One of Our Men"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 27, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Dorothy Thompson, from the Washington Star of April 25, 1950:

It has been suggested that because I have criticized Senator MCCARTHY'S approach to Owen Lattimore, I am supporting Mr. Lattimore. Such is not the case.

I think Mr. Lattimore is not a Communist. But the policies he has advocated certainly cannot be described as anti-Communist. His words seem to reveal him as a non-Communist, whose policies fit in almost exactly with Russia's plans for the organization of Asia, and the attitude America should take toward it. If the Communists, therefore, should think him "one of our men," it would not be surprising.

RECOMMENDATIONS MADE

Mr. Lattimore addressed the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences in Philadelphia on April 15. There he made the following recommendations:

(1) Allow the United Nations, without American support, to unseat the Chinese delegation and seat a new one, representing the Communist regime, the United States waiving its veto, but not granting diplomatic recognition.

(2) Return United States policy to the classic definition of favoring the territorial integrity and undivided political sovereignty of China, and show friendliness toward the entire Chinese people, in contrast to Russia who might deal with and favor one political party.

(3) Abandon the anti-Communist government on Formosa, whose bombing of coastal areas is focusing Nationalist feeling in China against the United States. Mr. Lattimore expanded the idea that if the raids on the Chinese mainland were abandoned the Chinese Nationalists would not permit the Russians to construct an air base at Shanghai.

(4) Give aid, of the point 4 kind, via the United Nations.

Hitherto, Mr. Lattimore has advocated (5) abandoning South Korea.

Now, this adds up to recognizing that the only nation of white men with a mission in Asia is Russia. I don't know what more the Soviets could wish us to do.

If (1) we withhold recognition from Red China while permitting it a seat on the UN Security Council, we are inviting Chinese Communist delegations to New York, under diplomatic immunity, without any diplomatic advantages for the United States in China, where some 2,000 Americans are being kicked around with impunity. We are to relinquish our veto for no quid pro quo, Russia continuing to keep several nations out of the UN.

HOW CAN IT BE DONE?

If (2) we stand for the undivided territorial and political integrity of China, regardless of how it is achieved or maintained, we commit ourselves to opposing any Chinese groups or territories which may find means to break away from the Mao-Russia axis.

Just how the United States can show friendliness to the Chinese people except through their government is impossible to envisage.

The abandonment of Formosa (3) means it will be taken by the Mao government regardless of the will of Formosans. And if Formosa is to fall by default, of course, the Communists won't need to build an air base on Shanghai.

(4) and (5) mean we will finance our enemies and betray the South Koreans.

As to an Asia for the Asiatics program, there is a curious inconsistency in Mr. Lattimore's past. This country precipitated the war with Japan by refusing recognition of a special Japanese interest in China, by supporting Chinese resistance, and by opposing Japan's program to organize the Far East through pro-Japanese governments. Logically, Mr. Lattimore should then have been against American intervention. But he wasn't.

Now, why should he apparently think it better for the United States to accept a Russian far-eastern fait accompli than a Japanese hegemony?

Injustice in Federal Retirement Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 27, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, from the Honorable Benjamin P. Epstein, judge of the circuit court of Cook County, I have received a letter which I am sure will be of interest to my colleagues and will prove helpful in eliciting a bipartisan support for S. 2640 when, and if, that measure reaches the House. Judge Epstein has been my close friend for many years. At the time of his election to the circuit bench of Illinois he enjoyed one of the largest Federal practices of any lawyer in the history of Chicago and his standing among the great Federal practitioners of the Nation was firmly established. To accept service on the bench he made a large financial sacrifice.

It speaks the character of Judge Epstein that he has not forgotten the fine public service of an agent of the Interstate Commerce 36 years ago. Judge Epstein has taken the time to interest himself in the case of this former Federal employee, now retired, who with others suffers an injustice under our retirement law. I earnestly urge the thoughtful reading of Judge Epstein's letter, which follows:

CHICAGO, *April 24, 1950.*

Hon. BARRATT O'HARA,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Back in the good old days of 1914 when Mike Igoe (Hon. Michael L. Igoe, judge of the United States District Court, who rendered distinguished service in this body as Representative at Large from Illinois) and myself were assistant United States attorneys, we had the occasion to work with one Pearson Marsh, now residing in our district at 4940 East End Avenue, Chicago, and at that time one of the most efficient agents of the Interstate Commerce Commission of the United States.

On June 30, 1948, after 53 years of service with the Interstate Commerce Commission, Marsh retired. I doubt if there are many servants of the Government who have this long period of service. Marsh could have retired in 1945 with his 50 years of service rendered, but because of the urgent need of his services at that time, he agreed to stay over, and did stay for three additional years.

When he retired in 1948 there was available to him, under the retirement laws of the United States, the option to receive a pension for himself during his lifetime only and without survivorship, or an option to designate his wife, Ellen, as survivor, the benefits, in case of his death, to accrue to her, for and during her lifetime.

In 1948, when Marsh made his election as to his choice of retirement pension, he was very ill, having been confined to his bed for many months. Without the advice of counsel and the benefit of discussion with his friends, he designated only a pension for himself, to be payable during his lifetime, without any protection to his present wife, now about the age of 65 years. I believe Marsh, at this time, is about 75 years old.

When he recovered from his illness some 7 months after making his election, and realizing the significance of his action, he tendered back the sum of money that represented the difference between the two pension allowances, and asked that the benefit of the retirement law be made available to his wife in case of his death. By reason of the fact that the then Civil Service Retirement Act (I believe it is 5 U. S. C. A. et seq.) provided that the election of the option for retirement pension must be made at the time of the retirement, the governmental authorities (I believe the Civil Service Commission) rejected his tender and refused to allow him to make a change, for the benefit of his wife Ellen, in the event of his death.

I understand that some short time ago Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON from South Carolina introduced a bill in the Senate, S. 2640, to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act mentioned, supra, this for the purpose of relieving hardships such as has occurred in the Marsh case. I have been informed that the effects of this bill, if passed, would be to enable a few public servants with the fine and long record of service, such as Marsh, to obtain relief.

I am therefore writing to you in the hope that should this legislation come before your branch of the Congress of the United States, you will see fit to support the legislation proposed by Senator JOHNSTON, so that this

grave injustice to Mr. and Mrs. Marsh will be corrected. I could say more about the unusual and distinguished character of service that Marsh has rendered to the Interstate Commerce Commission during the period of time that I have mentioned, but I am sure you will hear about it from other sources.

I trust that I have outlined to you sufficient of the matter so that you can form an opinion as to the propriety and justice of the legislation proposed.

With my kindest and most cordial regards, I am, as ever,

Sincerely yours,

BENJAMIN P. EPSTEIN.

Fine Words Can't Abate Red Menace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 27, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I include in my remarks an article by Ivan H. Peterman, editorial writer for the Philadelphia Inquirer, which appeared in the April 25, 1950, issue of this paper, as follows:

Secretary of State Acheson's urgent call for national unity and a strengthening of the free nations' front against communism indicates belated awareness from an office which long ago should have set the shining example.

For more than a year, in fact since he succeeded the tired George C. Marshall in that pivotal post, Acheson and his liberal-pink-Red advisers, including such as Alger Hiss and the Far East section of the State Department, have been pursuing anything but the policies he advocated before the American Society of Newspaper Editors. If the United States is today in a bad jam, let the Secretary review the mistakes in policy, judgment, and action which greased the skids under China, weakened the United Nations, and encouraged the Soviets to the verge of undeclared shooting war.

Lest anyone say these be generalities, let us take up the recommendations on critical points by the Secretary:

Preparedness and security: Although Mr. Acheson now calls for "prudent organization of our defenses," the administration has been lax in this respect on many occasions. It has kicked our military, naval, and air leaders around so that until the last few weeks they have been afraid to raise their voices. State Department spokesmen, not qualified military experts, told Congress that Formosa was strategically unimportant, and suggested Mao Tse-tung was a potential ally, so let's not offend him by helping Chiang. And every eager beaver in the State Department has battled fiercely to defend the sabotaging, Red collaboration that has lost China to the Kremlin.

It is also to be remembered that on Acheson's own January advice "not to offend Asiatics" (Press Club speech), our defense forces have been repeatedly humiliated and set upon, unable to strike back.

This cowardly policy on the part of a great power, if you want the brutal truth, Mr. Secretary, was the invitation Moscow needed to send its aviators out to kill 10 unarmed American fliers over the Baltic.

Americans need not worry about such totalitarian thugs, if the directors of national policies would stop handcuffing brave men who are only too willing to protect United States interests.

Political action: The Secretary's call for boldness and imagination in utilizing United Nations, the North Atlantic Treaty, Council of Europe, etc., is also open to cynical response. Why hasn't he shown some?

It so happens the Acheson regime left UN agencies to wither, preferring unilateral action since the Paris Assembly in 1948. Washington has undermined, ignored, deserted, and doubled-crossed its UN friends and even its own UN delegation on several occasions.

Meanwhile, the God-given opportunity to put UN to work without Soviet obstruction has been wasted. Instead of working together during the Soviet walk-out, the United States and its friends sat around Lake Success like diplomatic morons, bewailing Russia's absence.

At the moment Trygve Lie, long Moscow's man in UN, with his assistant, Konstantin Zinchenko, the former chief censor in Stalin's government, are rushing to Russia to try to abate the cold war. Why didn't the free nations act free and intelligent this past winter, and show some of the boldness and imagination when they had the chance? Why didn't Mr. Secretary show up once or twice, and give them a cue in that direction?

East-West relations: Again emphasizing the availability of UN council tables for effecting some methods of getting along with Russia, Mr. Acheson indicates a continuation of the modus operandi supposedly achieved at Paris last June. That was on the Berlin blockade. But what did we gain by that settlement? Only another Berlin stalemate, today threatened by a German Youth drive to take the city—under Red auspices and direction.

In the meantime, we have frustrated and alienated the friendly West German Government at Bonn. Is that showing the political-economic military shrewdness we need? No, Mr. Secretary—fine words make fine sounds. But bold actions and sincere deeds go much further to save this Nation.

If There Is To Be Real Unity in America the Administration Must Change Its Tactics or the People Must Change the Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 27, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Cleveland Plain Dealer of April 24, 1950:

WHAT'S WRONG WITH THE SPIRIT OF AMERICA?

"Something has gone wrong with our Nation, or we should not be in our present plight and mood. It is not like us to be on the defensive and to be fearful. That is new in our history. * * * What we lack is a righteous and dynamic faith. * * * There is confusion in men's minds and a corrosion of their souls."

Thus wrote John Foster Dulles in his book published last week entitled "War or Peace."

A review of some of the events beginning with the 1948 Presidential campaign may throw some light on what it is that has gone wrong, that has caused us to be fearful, that has bred confusion of the mind and corrosion of the soul.

In 1948 Gov. Thomas E. Dewey was confident he had the election in the bag. So, instead of calling attention to the shortcomings of the administration he was seeking to succeed, he based his campaign on a plea for unity of the American people in their efforts to solve the problems confronting them and the world. He saw correctly that his tasks would be simplified if he could assume the Presidency unhampered by any dissension of his own making.

But President Truman refused to let the election go by default. Employing the tactics of desperation, he appealed to class interests and prejudices and unexpectedly walked off with the prize.

That campaign was the death blow to the political unity the American people had achieved during the war. The coup de grace was administered by Truman himself when the administration used its vast influence to bring about the defeat of John Foster Dulles, one of the chief architects of the bipartisan foreign policy, in the 1949 New York senatorial election. The debacle in China finally convinced the American people that bipartisanship had existed in name only.

Now it is the Truman administration which is calling for unity, as the world situation becomes more desperate. Dulles and John Sherman Cooper, both Republicans, have been named special advisers to the State Department. Truman has promised to consult with Republican Members of Congress and to solicit their views and to take them into serious account in both the formation and implementation of our foreign policy.

Further than that, Secretary of State Dean Acheson is now calling for unity and bipartisanship on the domestic as well as the foreign front.

"There is no longer any difference between foreign questions and domestic questions," he told the American Society of Newspaper Editors in Washington. "They are all parts of the same question" involving the "great problem of our national security."

These are brave words, but do they mean that all shades of political opinion must accept the Socialist-labor philosophy and program of the Truman administration or be damned for jeopardizing national security?

There can be no real unity in foreign affairs as long as the administration not only refuses to confess its error in its policy toward China, but defends a policy which coincided with the Communist Party line and stubbornly refuses to "turn its back" on those who promoted it.

There can be no real unity in domestic affairs as long as the President advocates give-away programs to attract votes, as long as he supports special privilege for labor leaders and denounces as the seekers of special privilege those who would save their businesses from being destroyed by Government competition or excessive taxation, as long as he lambastes Congress for refusing to enact the socialistic programs he has repeatedly recommended.

There can be no real unity as long as the administration continues to engage in the utterly immoral and unnecessary vice of spending more than it takes in, as long as it continues to give encouragement to the creeping inflation which is robbing everyone of his savings and future security.

Even as the administration talks of unity the President is preparing to depart on a nonpolitical cross-country tour at public expense, the purpose of which is to put the heat on Congress and stir up more disunity.

God knows this country needs to be united. It needs to acquire a righteous and dynamic faith, as Dulles wrote, in its institutions and its way of life. It needs to regain confidence in its spiritual heritage. And it needs to regain confidence in the Government and the men who are running it.

But unity will not be achieved by trying to browbeat the people into accepting socialism under the threat that failure to do

so will mean losing the cold war or getting involved in a shooting war.

If there is to be real unity, the administration must change its tactics or the people must change the administration.

Address of Hon. Don Wheeler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN S. WOOD
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 27, 1950

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address of Hon. DON WHEELER of Georgia:

ADDRESS OF HON. DON WHEELER ON RADIO STATION WSB, ATLANTA, GA.

Ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience, it is a pleasure to be again afforded the opportunity of speaking to you through the facilities of this great radio station. There are a great many subjects which clamor for attention but the shortness of time allowed me will prevent me from developing any one subject thoroughly, therefore, I shall confine myself to a few hurried impressions of the current scene in Washington.

One of the most alarming things about the whole legislative picture in Washington is the inability of our Government to balance the budget. This situation would not be so alarming if we were out of debt, but, in view of the fact that we are in debt to the tune of nearly $260,000,000,000 makes the appropriation of every dollar a matter of extreme importance. This situation has caused me to determine my vote not on the basis of whether a project is worth while but on the basis of whether it is absolutely necessary, and it is my firm belief that voting in this manner is the only way in which our budget will ever be balanced. Hardly a week passes in Congress but that a bill is brought up for passage which provides for some worth-while project—it must have some merit or it would never reach the floor for a vote—but when the vote comes, I am constrained to ask whether the project is absolutely necessary to the welfare and safety of this country. Whether the bill provides for spending $1,000, $1,000,000, or $1,000,000,000, I do not vote for it unless I am convinced that it is necessary.

Too many people in this country seem to feel that all the Federal Government has to do in order to get money is to have someone in the Treasury Department press a button and print the amount of money required. If this were the way wealth is created we could all be rich, but the fact of the matter is that the only way the Federal Government can get money to spend is by either collecting it in the form of taxes or by borrowing it. The American people are now being taxed to the tune of over $40,000,000,000 each year and we have borrowed until we are nearly $260,000,000,000 in debt.

In spite of the fact that we are taxed to the tune of over $40,000,000,000 annually and in spite of the fact that we are nearly $260,000,000,000 in debt, certain pressure groups in this country continue to press upon the Congress legislation which will, if enacted, either increase the tax burden or further increase the debt which our children and grandchildren will have to pay. Nearly every American citizen seems to want the Government to quit spending so much money and they want great numbers of Government employees fired, but when you get down to cases you invariably find that they want us to quit spending money on everyone else except the particular group of which they are a part and they want us to fire all the employees except, "me and my wife, John and his wife—us four, and no more." This is the sort of thinking on the part of the American public which has resulted in the present deplorable fiscal situation. Of course, this sort of thinking is only indicative of the prevalent philosophy which holds that the Government owes everyone a living. Another way of expressing this philosophy is to say that your neighbor owes you a living for it is your neighbor who will pay the taxes to provide the security which you demand of Government.

Pressure groups must have a "horse to ride" or a cause to espouse if they are to maintain their existence. Every time the Congress meets these pressure groups come before it through their spokesmen and present their legislative program and demand that it be enacted. The welfare of the country becomes secondary to the welfare of the particular group these spokesmen represent. When they have presented their programs it is all too often true that the Congress, fearing political reprisal, will pass the legislation espoused by the pressure group. Once the pressure group gets what it wants for one year, they immediately start to work on fresh demands to be made on the Congress the following year, and so we go with no place where politicians can find courage to stop.

To aid and abet the pressure groups in their sometimes unreasonable demands, we have the executive branch of Government headed by the President who tells the people that if the Congress would only furnish him with the money, he would take care of all their desires and that in addition to taking care of all the wishes of the American people, he would care for all the wishes of all the other people in the world.

In speaking of taking care of all the people in the world, it must be realized that we cannot any longer live to ourselves alone in the modern world. Modern communications and transportation have made isolationism foolish but they have not made it true that the American taxpayer must furnish housing, food, clothing, and medical attention to all the people of the world. We cannot finance the whole world and at the same time provide security for ourselves.

If the Federal budget is ever to be balanced, the American people must begin to realize that there is no such thing as something for nothing and the Congress must reflect this thinking in the action it takes on the various projects which call for the spending of the taxpayers' money. We must also begin to realize that for every degree of so-called security that is obtained from Government, a commensurate degree of individual liberty must be given up in exchange. Thank you for listening.

Tax Freedom Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT A. MEYER
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 27, 1950

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, April 28, will be a day of liberation for the American taxpayers. In commemoration of this event, I have today introduced the following concurrent resolution:

Whereas postwar spending is continuing at an unprecedented rate so that the national debt now stands at $255,588,544,106; and

Whereas the Federal spending budget for 1951 has been set at an additional $42,439,000,000; and

Whereas this represents a direct obligation on the average American wage earner whether he or she pays in direct or indirect taxes; and

Whereas it requires one-third or 32 cents out of every dollar a man or woman earns to support present profligate expenditures; and

Whereas this means every salary and wage earner actually works for the tax collector for the first 117 days of each year before he or she can call his or her money their own; Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that April 28 be observed and designated as Tax Freedom Day marking the first date from January 1 when a man can call his dollar his own; and be it further

Resolved, That April 28, designated as Tax Freedom Day, be symbolized as a day of relief throughout the land with such demonstrations as may seem appropriate, including a prayer for deliverance.

Mr. Speaker, I am informed a similar resolution is today being introduced in the other body by Senator BRIDGES and Senator TAFT.

The St. Lawrence Seaway Costing Over a Billion Dollars Would Be Unusable for 6 Months Out of Each Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 27, 1950

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith an article from the April 23, 1950, issue of the Cleveland Plain Dealer showing that the Great Lakes are at the present time ice-blocked and will not become navigable before May 7 or May 10.

Those who are advocating the construction of this economic monstrosity known as the St. Lawrence seaway are prepared to spend the money of the American taxpayer for a project that can only operate for 6 months each year.

The article referred to is as follows:

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer, April 23, 1950]

FIGHTS LAKE SUPERIOR ICE FOOT BY FOOT—CUTTER IN TOUGH COLD WAR; ORE SHIPPING ABOVE SOO BY MAY 1 UNLIKELY

ABOARD U. S. S. "MACKINAW", LAKE SUPERIOR, April 22.—Battering the stubborn Lake Superior ice barrier, then backing up to batter it again, this powerful Coast Guard cutter is using all the tricks at her command to blaze a path to the iron-ore docks.

Ice in all the crazy forms nature can devise is making this cold war veteran fight for every foot she gains. Windrows extending from 30 to 40 feet under water and rising 10 feet above it strike back for mile after mile. Solid blue ice 24 inches thick, topped by

heavy-crusted snow, starts where the windrows leave off and provides stanch opposition, too.

The bigger windrows (long rows of jammed ice) bring the icebreaker to a complete stop again and again. Then, if she can, the ship backs up for another attack. Sometimes, however, her bow becomes wedged and she cannot move.

ROCKED OUT OF TRAP

Then the "heeling" system is brought into play. Water in the wing tanks is shifted from one side of the ship to the other at the rate of 400 tons in 3 minutes. This rocks the cutter out of the trap as her six Diesel engines, providing a total of 10,000 shaft horsepower, are turned on full speed.

The bow propeller, 15 feet below the water line, whose main purpose is to suck water from under the ice, got jammed in the giant windrows several times today, cutting out the motor.

All this adds up to bad news for vessel operators, and indicates there will be no early resumption of large-scale iron ore shipping from Lake Superior.

Experienced officers of the *Mackinaw* say that from the present outlook shipping through the Soo locks by May 1 will be impossible. They contend that each vessel which tried to make the passage to the lake head now "would require an individual *Mackinaw.*"

FOUR MILES IN TWO HOURS

It may be impossible to open the traffic lanes before May 7 or 10, according to these men, and even then, unless favorable weather intervenes, the war against the ice menace may have to be continued.

Illustrating the fierce battle nature is waging is the fact that for a stretch abreast of Grand Island this morning the best speed the *Mackinaw* could make was 4 miles in 2 hours.

Unexpectedly, Whitefish Bay, which had been reported heavily windrowed, provided little opposition. It was covered with 15-inch blue ice and contained hardly any windrows worth mentioning.

Opposite Whitefish Point a wide expanse of open water stretched a welcoming hand. It was only an insidious gesture, however, for from that point on the going became rugged with deep, stone-wall windrows. Only a few leads (narrow stretches of open water) and wide-open areas have been encountered so far.

The weather does not hold much promise. The temperature dropped to 20° in the night and formed new 1-inch skim ice in places which formerly had been clear.

Instead of going direct to Duluth, as had been planned, the ice breaker is proceeding to Marquette to break out the harbor there.

Pushing slowly through this arcticlike land of nowhere is an eerie experience. The only traces of human activity so far encountered on the lake were the hoof prints of a horse and the track of a cart leading to a 30-foot pole. The pole had been used by herring fishermen in threading a net between two holes in the ice. The fishermen are not happy that the navigation season is near. They have been making large catches.

Biggest Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 27, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include in the Appendix the third article by Mr. Frank C. Waldrop on the growth of communism in our country:

Some Americans got to know communism in college. Some in the Department of State. A very few, for communism is not a working-class movement, found it in factories and shops.

I met up with communism at a funeral.

A Communist agitator named Steve Katovis was killed in a riot in January 1930, as I was setting out to learn the reporter's trade in New York City. I happened by accident to hear that the Communists intended to make propaganda of Katovis' alleged martyrdom.

I knew as little about Communists or the Communist cause as I did of Katovis himself, an obscure and now utterly forgotten instrument of a conspiracy against civilization.

But the brief word going out ahead of his funeral sounded to a reporter's ears like excitement, action, and drama, in the streets.

So early on the morning of January 27, 1930, as soon as I had finished my work, I headed for Union Square, a dank, drab, dismal place in those days and little better even yet.

Many shops of the neighborhood had foreign signs and newsstands had about as much for sale in other languages as in our own. To a boy from the inland United States of America, it was all exotic, odd, and interesting without being attractive.

One of the seediest and shabbiest buildings on Union Square was, if memory serves accurately, about 5 stories high. It had a rusty, peeling coat of red paint on all the woodwork, doors, and window trim. A sign said that it was the establishment of the New York Daily Worker.

People were streaming in a side door as I arrived, so I just followed the crowd in and up on the elevator.

There in a bare, ugly room, was an open coffin. On the walls were large portraits, in steel engraving of men with bushy beards, bald domes, and out-of-date clothes. I wondered who they were.

At the head of the coffin were two flags, one of the United States of America, and the other, blood and flaming red. Two men stood by the flags and two at the foot of the coffin.

They were in brown uniforms, their peaked brown caps had a red star, dead center. And they stood at attention, looking grimly through and past the slowly circling line of people. Katovis, small and blank of features, lay with his hands folded. He, too, was dressed in a brown, red-tabbed uniform.

After 20 years, this scene is still vivid in my memory. For it was so utterly unexpected, so alien and so shrewdly put together by the experts who knew exactly what they were doing.

I had not any inkling, as I went into that building, of what to expect inside.

But from the moment I had come to Union Square the electric currents that are born in any reporter who likes his work, had begun to come alive.

All the queer faces, the sudden movements of young men motioned to by old men, the switching girls with brassards on their drab clothes and carrying bundles of freshly printed handbills, who were taking up posts along the pavement—all these things signaled that something really big was on, that day.

And then to go inside and be carried through that fantasy, completely out of any world I had ever known, had me on the alert and recording every sensation and event for my life's recollection.

I could not possibly have known then, that the bushiest beard I saw on the wall was that of Karl Marx, a crazy man whose crabbed scribbling in the British museum almost 100 years before that morning had already set off a train of disasters that I, as a reporter, would spend so much of my career trying to understand.

I was soon to learn that those bleak, cold walls and all that shabbiness were not the marks of communism's poverty in America. They were actually careful details of stage management, the disguise of a revolution out to rule the world and as just one element in its strategy, wearing the cloak of a "working class movement."

Outside the Daily Worker building, I felt and saw the people being herded skillfully into place.

Then came the bands and the flags, every time a United States flag paired with a Red one, and the red ones edged with gold fringe, huge and sagging out, carried mostly by girls, sailors in uniform and occasionally by a ragged, hollow-cheeked man without a hat, who all but groaned and rattled chains.

It was magnificent drama. I did not know then, but was not long in finding out, that among these seeming children of the poor were millionaires, doctors, professors, and debutantes.

There were also several Moscow-trained experts in the management of mobs, who had literally gone to a university of revolution. They knew what they were doing.

Should We Change the Way We Elect Our Presidents?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 27, 1950

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial appearing in the Saturday Evening Post of April 29. The Post indicates a clear preference for the Coudert amendment over the Lodge-Gossett amendment.

Under the present system of electing a President of the United States, there is always the possibility that the winner will lack a majority of the popular vote. This has happened, notably in the first election of Woodrow Wilson, when Theodore Roosevelt's third party was in the field, and in the election of Rutherford B. Hayes in 1876. Since the president is elected by States, a President who squeezed in by a whisker in the more populous States, while losing other States by an ample margin, could lack a popular majority, but nevertheless be elected.

This rather remote possibility has always bothered some people; and right now the question has reached a level of interest sufficient to account for the introduction in Congress of the Lodge-Gossett amendment, which attempts to correct the situation by dividing the electoral votes for each State in direct proportion to the popular vote cast.

Blanchard Randall, a Baltimore businessman and distinguished Maryland Republican, has pointed out some of the flaws in the Lodge-Gossett amendment by means of an interesting analysis of the effect of the scheme proposed. Mr. Randall undertakes to show what would have happened if the scheme had been in effect at various times in the past. He declares that if this system had been adopted before 1896, "Mr. Bryan would have been elected President by about four and one quarter electoral votes over President McKinley and several minor candidates, although Bryan was given only 46.7

percent of the popular vote and McKinley received more than 51 percent of all the votes cast. * * * Again, in 1900, history tells us President McKinley was reelected over William Jennings Bryan. McKinley received 7,219,000 votes and 292 electoral votes, against Bryan's 6,358,000 popular and 155 electoral votes. However, had the proposed amendment been at work, Mr. Bryan would actually have been elected again, this time by about one-third of one electoral vote, despite the fact that Bryan carried only 17 of the then 45 States and despite the fact that about 8 voters out of every 15 said they wanted McKinley."

The reason for this, of course, lies in the advantage which the less heavily populated States, particularly in the one-party South, would have over the larger and more closely contested industrial States in the North and East. Mr. Randall poses a hypothetical case: "South Carolina generally votes about 90,000 for the Democrat and around 5,000 for the Republican. Under the new amendment the Democrats would get about seven and a half electoral votes, while the GOP would get about one-half of one electoral vote. Now look at New York, with nearly 6,500,000 votes. Suppose the Republicans carry New York by 85,000 votes, the same margin given the Democrats in South Carolina. The new amendment would give the Republicans about twenty-three and three-quarters electoral votes and the Democrats twenty-three and one-quarter electoral votes, a net margin of only one-half of one electoral vote. * * * In other words, under the Lodge-Gossett system, 1 South Carolina vote is worth about 14 New York votes." Senator TAFT estimates that the GOP would have to poll 53 percent of the popular vote to win a Presidential election.

Another approach to electoral reform is made in the Coudert amendment, which proposes that we go back to one of the original proposals made before the Constitutional Convention of 1787—namely, that Presidential electors in each State be selected in the same way that the State elects its Members of Congress. Thus in all but a few States where Congressmen are elected from the State as a whole, one Presidential elector would be chosen in each congressional district, with two elected "at large" to match the two United States Senators. The effect of this would be to divide the vote for President in each State substantially as it is divided in the congressional elections.

There are certain advantages to this suggestion. For one thing, it would have the effect of confining the power of the machine-dominated cities to a few congressional districts. Thus the radical American Labor Party, which now holds a virtual balance of power in New York State, would hold sway mainly in New York City, where the overwhelming majority of its constituents reside. Furthermore, its ability to influence the policies of the major national parties, because of its balance-of-power position in pivotal New York, would be ended.

The trouble with most discussions of plans to reform the electoral system is that few advocates are interested in whatever principle is involved, but only in how a new arrangement would affect the fortunes of this or that political group. However, the Coudert amendment does have the merit of practicality without the dangers to the Federal structure inherent in the Lodge-Gossett proposal, which is actually a step toward lumping together of the national popular vote. Fortunately, no such system can be adopted, since the smaller States would refuse to ratify the amendment. The Coudert idea might have a chance.

Anyway, no change in the electoral system is so urgent as to justify legislation until the whole matter has been thoroughly studied.

Home Rule for the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 27, 1950

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a statement I made last night in addressing a group of citizens in Washington Highlands on the matter of the pending home-rule legislation. It was a privilege to be on the same program with the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER]. I am making this available because in my decision to make this statement I am expressing a conviction which, as I indicated, I held for many years prior to coming to Congress and which has been deepened by my personal observation of the situation as it exists here. I do not mean to say that this is a condition prevailing exclusively in the Capital City, but I am reasonably confident that most of my colleagues would agree that it exists to a greater degree here than in practically any other community in this country. I do not have any idea that this expression of opinion is likely to have any real or lasting effect upon the attitude of those who choose to lend themselves to constant attacks on Congress as an institution but, at least, I hope it will stimulate thinking on the part of the reading and listening public both here in Washington and elsewhere.

The point I want to make is a matter of long-standing conviction, even before I became a Member of Congress. I know, as you know, that a group of 435 men and women in the House and 96 men and women in the Senate could not truthfully or accurately be portrayed as a bungling, ignorant, even venal assembly of American citizens. I know and you know that a number of editorial writers, and particularly certain talented cartoonists, newspaper columnists, and radio commentators have established a lucrative living largely based upon continuous public ridicule of Congress as an institution. I know and I believe you know that no greater disservice to our democratic institutions could be done than has been done by much of this. I realize that when we come here as Representatives of our constituents we are fair game for these men and women, and I do not think that most of us are oversensitive about their guerrilla campaigns. Yet, I doubt if any group of 531 men and women in this country are collectively more sincerely devoted to the best interests of this Nation than that group. Certainly there is no harder-working body of American citizens, and I have been associated with a great many sincere and patriotic Americans in one or another organizations to which I have been glad to devote any ability I possessed. Yet you good people here in Washington present your case to our committees, work unceasingly for ultimate victory, and, whether you realize it or not, find yourselves confronted almost every morning with a clear example of this kind of ridicule. I do not know whether you appreciate the handicap this presents to your friends in Congress when they make earnest efforts to prevail upon their associates to join in this effort to bring this problem to a final vote, but I have repeatedly pointed it out to my friends in the District who have your project very close to their hearts. You may have noted that I stressed the word "morning." I have done so advisedly, for I think our greatest offender appears in one of our morning papers. I would not excuse certain columnists among our evening papers, for I think they must bear a fair share of the responsibility.

This all brings me to the suggestion that you who are close to this problem and have devoted so much of your time to its fruition might well devote an increasing amount of your time to the attitude of your outstanding newspapers. I am convinced that if they would be willing to declare temporarily a moratorium on what is, in the minds of most Congressmen, a vicious and unprincipled attack upon Congress as an institution, it would make the task of your friends in Congress in connection with this issue a far easier one and probably one which we could solve. I am not arguing that any individual should not have a full right to express himself or herself as he or she wishes in any editorial, cartoon, column, or radio comment. I have far too high regard for the great majority of these able and responsible people who shape public opinion. But I am saying to you here and tonight that the most effective enemies in connection with fair consideration of this proposal are not those who have been characterized as Dixiecrats or associated Republicans in some kind of an undefined coalition but, rather, these brilliant people who consciously or unconsciously, devote their talents to an unceasing campaign of ridicule and have, in fact, in too many instances prevented fair-minded Members of the House who would otherwise join in our effort to bring this matter to a vote from signing this vital discharge petition. I realize that it may seem funny and is, undoubtedly, profitable to portray every Member of Congress as a pot-bellied, chin-whiskered fool, but I suggest to you that you will not find in the membership of the House and Senate any single person who remotely resembles that conveniently inaccurate picture of American public servants unless you resort to Pravda or some other silly organ behind the iron curtain.

Our Merchant Marine Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. HART
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 27, 1950

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I

include the following address of Hon. HERBERT C. BONNER, of North Carolina:

OUR MERCHANT MARINE PROGRAM

(Address of Representative HERBERT C. BONNER, of North Carolina, member, Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, before the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, March 24, 1950)

It is a real privilege to address the distinguished membership of the National Rivers and Harbors Conference. My keen personal interest in your work is intensified because of its vital bearing on the Atlantic seaboard congressional district which I represent. Also, as a long-time member of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I know of your great contribution to the American merchant marine. By constantly striving to maintain and improve the terminals and highways of water-borne commerce, to promote public interest in the commerce potential of our ports, and to develop new facilities and modernize old ones to accommodate our ever changing industrial pattern, you render an invaluable service.

It has been suggested that I speak briefly about our merchant marine. The subject is very close to me. I share with all Americans justifiable pride in the wart-time accomplishment of our maritime industry. Its immediate postwar prosperity has been a source of gratification to me. I now contemplate with deep concern its decline from its proper place as an integral part of the commerce which is the lifeblood of Americans.

It is not my intention to disparage the efforts of those now in the forefront of the fight for an American merchant marine second to none. Nor do I minimize the difficulties. The facts are too well known to all of us. For many years before World War II, American-flag ships were carrying only a small part of our products to foreign markets. Eminent in international economics, we had become mediocre in the transportation adjunct to our world trade. Most American tonnage was engaged in domestic trade—a protected trade, free from foreign-flag competition, and economically sound because of higher costs of land transportation. It was a far cry from the days of the clippers, when much of the war-born commerce of the world loaded and unloaded from ships flying the American flag.

Prewar conditions were but a continuation of the decline of the American merchant marine. The causes are clearly recognized. Our maritime industry, operating in international trade routes, meets a front of competition not experienced by other major American industries. Lower foreign wages and living standards, and the apathetic acceptance of them by workers, alone give foreign competitors an advantage. Any reduction of our own standards to meet those has, of course, been summarily rejected. On top of that, national combines and international cartels, extraordinary political controls, subsidies and rebates and the like, and all manner of devices have been contrived to gain foreign mastery of world shipping. Taken all together, these factors have tended to outweigh any superior American production and operation. To combat the stifling effect on American shipping, legislation was enacted in 1916, in 1928, and again in 1936. The dangers were seen, but much was left undone with the advent of World War II.

The outbreak of World War II delivered all our tonnage to the war effort, transferred our domestic trade to land facilities, and created the largest shipbuilding program in the world's history.

At the close of the war we were the leading maritime power simply because we had control of the world's supply of ships. Under the Ship Sales Act of 1946, we set out to rehabilitate our privately-owned merchant marine. Also, we undertook to restore the economy of allied maritime nations by selling them more than a thousand ships. To facilitate the transition from war to peace we chartered as many as 1,500 vessels at a time to American operators. The need for our products abroad promoted an unprecedented boon in American-flag shipping.

There has been a marked leveling from the abnormal era of 1946 through 1948. Prewar maritime nations are returning to the oceans in ships larger, more modern, and swifter than ours. All of the prewar disadvantages face the American merchant marine, and others have been aded. For one example, domestic water-borne commerce has been unable to put on the market an economically sound service because it no longer enjoys its favorable prewar position in respect to land transportation.

Deterioration of domestic tonnage is shown by a simple comparison of figures. In 1939 there were 468 dry cargo bottoms and 304 tankers—a total of 772. In 1947 there were but 98 dry cargo bottoms and 218 tankers. Traffic now moves by rail which could be handled adequately and economically by water carriers. The rail traffic moves at water-compelled rates, often at a loss to the railroads. The water carriers lose the business which might be profitable to them. No carrier gains, all of them lose, and there is a consequent economic loss to the public.

This comparatively new and serious condition in domestic water-borne commerce constitutes a separate part of the overall problem. That commerce gave substantial savings to domestic shippers. Its benefits, extended hundreds of miles inland by joint and combination rail-water rates, were passed on to a large segment of the public. Many great industrial centers depended largely on coastal and intercoastal water commerce. Reduction in that commerce is detrimental to them. Finally, domestic shipping, constituting a large defense reserve for World War II, should be restored for that reason if no other.

I submit this proposition as beyond dispute: That there shall be an American-flag merchant marine adequate to our commercial needs and the national security. President Roosevelt, urging enactment of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, aptly stated this overruling necessity. The reasons given were short, but conclusive, and are embodied in the law. They are:

1. In time of peace foreign subsidies, shipping combines, and other restrictive or rebative methods prejudice American shippers. Fair competition can be assured only by American-flag tonnage sufficient to carry a reasonable part of our foreign commerce;

2. A neutral America could be seriously crippled, in case of a major war, for lack of bottoms to carry on its peaceful foreign trade; and

3. If the United States is involved in a war, American-flag ships are needed for naval auxiliaries and necessary foreign intercourse.

These reasons are of even greater force and effect today. The need for an adequate merchant marine now is far more pressing, and the impediments more troublesome, than they were in 1936. To accomplish our objectives is a critical and perplexing problem. Each of us has much at stake in the solution. The Congress and the President, maritime industry and labor, and shippers and tradesmen are directly concerned. More important, the public stands to profit from a wise program, or suffer from the lack of one.

It seems to me that certain political and economical factors govern our approach to the problem. All of them must be kept clearly in mind to set a course of action.

First of all, our system of free enterprise is the framework to build upon. It is the foundation of our national strength, the political and economic concept that has brought us to world leadership. The best prospect for a healthy and progressive merchant marine is one privately owned and operated, so far as possible. It should be our ultimate purpose, regardless of any obstacles. I think its attainment is entirely possible, even in these times. That is attested by the successful operation of some of our largest shipping companies, without direct Government aid.

At the same time, progress toward our objectives must go hand in hand with maintenance and improvement of our standards of living. Industry is entitled to a fair remuneration, labor to a fair wage, and the public to a fair share in the resultant benefits. Each should bear its part of the burden, but none should profit unfairly at the expense of any other.

At the outset, also, the relationship of the Government to the merchant marine must be made clear. Whether and to what extent there will be Federal aid to private ownership, or active Federal participation, is dictated by the public interest and none other. No dollar of taxpayers' money may go to line the pockets of individuals or special interests, or groups of them. Nor may public funds be to foster inefficiency and incompetence.

It would be particularly unfair to the Government, the American people, and the shipping industry itself, if the Government were forced to pay exorbitant prices when, by reason of national emergency, it has no alternative but to requisition privately owned ships. This was the intent of the Congress, of course, when the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 was enacted. However, from a review of experience in World War II, it appears evident that even greater and more specific safeguards must be provided in new legislation, to prevent the accumulation of unjust profits flowing solely from the existence of an emergency.

Federal assistance should be only to the extent necessary to bring the merchant marine to the size and quality essential to the national welfare and security and keep it there. This may be done, in accordance with the principles already stated, by three methods: First, by placing our merchant marine on a fair competitive basis in essential foreign trade routes. Second, by protecting it from discriminatory practices in domestic trade; and third, by paying the cost of national defense features not fully useful in commerce. Government ownership should be limited to cases where the national security or the nature of the service preclude private ownership.

Federal regulation should not be so stringent as to unduly hamper legitimate efforts of private enterprise to develop profitable business. There should be all freedom of action, incentive and initiative needed by private industry and consistent with the public interest. This is necessary to build up business in a highly competitive field and by effective private operation, to keep the cost to the taxpayer at a minimum.

To accomplish our several objectives, without sacrificing any, is a tremendous task. But, though perhaps discouraging, it is by no means insurmountable. Careful study, wise judgment, vigorous action, and constant vigilance are needed. A concerted, joint effort of all concerned can bring success. Management, labor, and Government must cooperate fully for maximum results. Antiquated, costly methods must be brought up to date or discarded. New and better methods and techniques must be devised and utilized. Greater efficiency and economy must be developed in the construction and operation of vessels and port facilities, in other shoreside activities, and in all phases of the industry. Training of personnel should be emphasized, with special reference to continuing replacements. Regular, reliable, and reasonable services should be planned and put into operation. We must realize on the superior potential of American industrial genius and the inherent skill and

ingenuity of the American worker. In short, all must put a shoulder to the wheel. Only then can we reach our goal without sacrificing our standards.

The House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee is charged with responsibility for maintaining and developing American-flag shipping, and is well aware of the many problems. In the discharge of that responsibility, it is keeping in close contact with all segments of the shipping industry. Exhaustive consideration has been, and is being, given the needs of the American merchant marine. Extensive hearings have been held. Representatives of Government, operators, labor unions, shipbuilding and repair industries, and other interests have discussed the problems at great length before the committee. As a result of these studies, it is the sense of the committee that substantial changes in the law are needed, so that our obligation to the national commerce and security may be fulfilled.

Legislation has been reported, and some is still pending before the Committee, which should go far in meeting current problems, although it may not be a complete remedy. The committee is genuinely interested in developing the means and methods of establishing and maintaining an adequate American merchant marine. It is working constantly, and in close cooperation with the rest of the Government, private, industry and labor, to formulate and have enacted a sound and farsighted program for the maritime industry. The committee realizes that the problem is not a static one and is alert to meet changing conditions. It is mindful of the probable cost, and determined to protect the Government while at the same time helping American shipping where American shipping is unable to go forward. I know that American shipping and allied interests are eager to help solve our problems. As an advocate of a strong American merchant marine, I welcome your support in the determination of a sound policy, and your criticisms and suggestions toward that end.

Resolution of Ancient Order of Hibernians, East St. Louis, Ill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 27, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a resolution adopted by the Ancient Order of Hibernians, Division 1, East St. Louis, Ill., concerning in opposition to the partition of Ireland:

DIVISION 1, ANCIENT ORDER
OF HIBERNIANS IN AMERICA,
East St. Louis, Ill., April 24, 1950.

Hon. MELVIN PRICE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At a special meeting of the Ancient Order of Hibernians, Division 1, East St. Louis, Ill., the following resolution was drafted and unanimously adopted:

"Whereas the Government of Great Britain, in violation of the rights and contrary to the wishes of all of the people of Ireland and their descendants and friends in the United States, as expressed by their Parliamentary Assembly in Westminster, has taken six of the counties in the Province of Ulster, an inherent part of Ireland, and fraudulently annexed them as a separate state under the flag of Great Britain; and

"Whereas Great Britain, against the expressed wishes and desires of the Irish people and in violation of all of the principles of a free people, continues to dominate and govern these counties: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That we, descendants of Irish forefathers, declare ourselves to be unequivocally opposed to the British domination imposed on the free people of these six counties in violation of all of the basic principles of the United Nations and of a true democracy; and

"Whereas England, by this action, has proven herself unworthy to participate in any discussion pertinent to the future of any freedom-loving people; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That we uphold the inherent right of free people to determine their own method of government independent of the dictates of any power-hungry or subsidizing nation."

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM F. KEELEY,
President.
THOMAS P. O'BRIEN,
Vice President.
CORNELIUS O'SULLIVAN,
Recording Secretary.
JOHN MONGAN,
Financial Secretary.
PATRICK SHEAHAN,
Treasurer.

Attacks on Big Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 27, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Evening Star:

GOVERNMENT GROUP SEEKS RUIN OF BIG BUSINESS, FAIRLESS SAYS

HEAD OF UNITED STATES STEEL HITS FEDERAL CRITICS IN BITING PHRASES

Benjamin F. Fairless, president of the United States Steel Corp., made a bitter attack today on "powerful" groups in Government which he said seek to dismember American business.

Declaring that all American industry is on trial "because it has served the public too well—because it has pleased too many customers and has built the greatest industrial Nation on the face of the earth," Mr. Fairless said:

"Successful service to the Nation now strangely seems to be the signal for the political punishment of those who performed it."

He said those people intent on "dismembering business" are "the most dangerous reactionaries of this twentieth century."

Mr. Fairless' views, bitingly phrased, were addressed to a House subcommittee investigating the steel industry.

His statement was one of the strongest to be made before congressional critics of big business and bristled with such phrases as "unsound and dangerous notions" and "jet-propelled flights of fancy."

Mr. Fairless told the committee that United States Steel "is successful, it is profitable, it is efficient, and it is a large enterprise."

"These are the simple facts and I am proud of them."

But he declared there are within the Government "powerful agencies and groups which hold that all this is wrong. They hold that there is something inherently vicious in bigness, and growth and success."

Some of these groups, he said, would break up successful business enterprises "even though the high quality of their service to the public is unquestioned."

Others would put arbitrary limits on business size, he went on. And some would subject business to utility regulation by Government bureaus.

WOULD TURN BACK THE CLOCK

"By dismembering business, they would turn back the clock to the horse-and-buggy days of 50 years or more ago, and would try to squeeze a modern, dynamic, efficient America once more into the puny production patterns of industrial childhood.

"Or, by subjecting American productive enterprise to the deadening hand of political regulation, they would borrow from the old world the dismal economic philosophies that have led most of Europe to desolation and despair.

"They would substitute governmental regulation for competition and political pressures for Government control."

Mr. Fairless said the Nation needs big business as well as small business. They are interdependent, he declared, despite the attempt of statistically minded theorists to create economic class distinctions.

He called a myth the charge that U. S. Steel possesses monopoly powers enabling it to restrict competition.

"The fact is," he told the committee, "that when U. S. Steel was created in 1901, it produced 66 percent of all the steel then made in America—twice as much as all of its competitors put together. Today it produces only 33 percent of the Nation's steel.

"True, U. S. Steel's production has grown greatly during the half century, but its competitors have grown nearly four times as much," he added.

Anniversary of Founding of Nation of Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER A. CHESNEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 27, 1950

Mr. CHESNEY. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, April 24, Jewish people throughout the world rejoiced over the celebration of the second anniversary of the founding of the infant nation of Israel. Is this really an infant nation—or is it a rebirth of the nobility of the Jewish race? Is it not also a tribute to the determination and courage of that people to be once again among the brotherhood of nations? To raise its head once more as a free unshackled race? To live once again without the fear of oppression and limitation?

Anything that is worth possessing is worth fighting for, and, certainly, this is borne out by the history of the struggle of this valiant race. It has not been a short struggle and even though the rest of the world believed that there was no longer any hope for the dreams of the Jewish people, there appeared, once more, a spark of life in this seemingly lost cause. Through almost 19 centuries the fight has progressed. If their dreams were a little late in being fulfilled, it cannot be said that this delay

was due to the lack of a desire for freedom on the part of these people. While they were carrying on their own struggle for freedom, they were also helping others to obtain this most precious of human destinies. I do not need to recall to our minds the help given us by Jewish people when we were suffering the birth pangs of our Nation at Valley Forge. When the Congress of our own country had failed to retain faith in our cause, we received encouragement—and more important—the necessary equipment from Jewish patriots who devoted their fortunes to the foundation of our country and enabled us to secure our freedom.

I believe that this second anniversary of the founding of the Jewish nation of Israel should be a source of encouragement to all free people. It is, most surely, an indication and proof that perseverance, faith, and devotion to the cause of freedom can never be defeated.

Rubber Footwear Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 27, 1950

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to present further comment pertinent to the disastrous trade policies being followed by this administration.

New England has long been the "whipping boy" of those who determine Federal policy. Agricultural subsidies have benefited the Midwest to our detriment; public-power policies have aided the South and the West to lure industries from our region. New Englanders are considered to be second-rate citizens of this Nation. Foreign-trade policies have been set by those interested in the free trade of agricultural products—without regard to the effect upon the industrial East. We are now beginning to reap the harvest of unemployment sown by the seeds of free trade.

The architects of so-called reciprocal trade were far more concerned with the export, under favorable conditions, of cotton, tobacco, and allied products, than with the possible importation of slave-labor goods to compete with those manufactured by Americans.

Too long have honest men been cowed by the label of "protectionists" and "isolationists"; therefore unwilling to take up the cudgel for the interests of their fellow Americans.

No amount of subterfuge by the administration can mask the grand design; further cutting of tariffs as concessions to foreign nations. It seems that we always concede at international conferences. Perhaps our people would fare better if Congress refused to appropriate travel expenses for State Department employees. At least no jobs would be threatened by stay-at-home diplomats.

Administration apologists are now attempting to carry water on both shoulders in Connecticut. On the one hand, they promise citizens confronted with the loss of employment that they will give every consideration to the problem of increased unemployment through importation of foreign-made goods, and, on the other hand, these apologists state that no harm is being done by Democratic foreign-trade policies. Statistics are quoted showing a drop in the importation of canvas footwear from Czechoslovakia in the past 2 years. In reality, no one has stated that our difficulties are attributable to this source. The imports of waterproof footwear from the Russian satellite of Czechoslovakia are responsible for production cut-backs in Connecticut factories. Far more serious are the threats posed to this entire industry by proposals to abandon the American selling-price principle, and further tariff cuts which may take place after the September trade-agreement meeting in England.

These apologists seize upon the oft-quoted statement included in every communication received on this subject from either the State Department or the Tariff Commission, to the effect that if increased imports threaten or cause serious injury to domestic industry we may withdraw from the agreement. This is the escape clause which allows the United States to cease being a party to its own funeral after the corpse is embalmed. We do not want American industry saved after it is ruined—but before that time.

The issue is a simple one; are we to continue this foolhardy course of granting concessions to slave labor nations, or are we to help protect the jobs of Americans, and assure an adequate living for their families? If this is protectionism, count me in.

As evidence that many others have grasped the true significance of this problem, I present material showing the increasing concern with irresponsible importation, in the form of a resolution adopted by the Greater Naugatuck Industrial Council, CIO; an editorial from the Catholic Transcript of April 20; and an interesting excerpt from the United States News and World Report of April 28.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT APRIL 18, 1950, MEETING OF GREATER NAUGATUCK INDUSTRIAL UNION COUNCIL, CIO, P. J. GALLUCCI, PRESIDENT

Whereas the importation of rubber footwear, tennis shoes, and allied products from Japan and Czechoslovakia is rapidly increasing in volume; and

Whereas this influx of these low-priced products is undermining the rubber-footwear industry in the United States causing extensive layoffs and loss of jobs of our union members, with the resulting loss of income and purchasing power; and

Whereas the present tariffs are inadequate to protect the jobs, incomes, and purchasing power of our American workers and union members: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Greater Naugatuck Industrial Union Council, representing more than 7,000 employees in Naugatuck, Conn., go on record as being unalterably opposed to any further reduction in tariff on rubber footwear and allied products which would inevitably result in widespread unemployment and great distress amongst the employees in the rubber footwear industry in the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That the Greater Naugatuck Industrial Union Council, CIO, go on record as favoring immediate and firm action by the Government to provide full employment for all of the more than 20,000 people (men and women) in the rubber-footwear industry in the United States including the immediate restitution of the protective tariff laws of 1932–49; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be immediately forwarded to the House of Representatives, the United States Senate, and individual copies sent to all Congressmen and Senators from the State of Connecticut, to the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Commerce, and the President of the United States.

[From the Catholic Transcript of April 20, 1950]

ABSURD AND INTOLERABLE

On Sunday the New York Herald Tribune publicized a situation which for some time has puzzled and troubled citizens of Connecticut. The metropolitan paper took a look at the city of Danbury, so many of whose people depend for their livelihood on the hat-making business. That business is not flourishing just now, with the result that large numbers of Danbury residents are either wholly unemployed or employed but part time. The effect of this condition is felt by the entire community and indeed has State and national repercussions, so close-knit is our economy.

One of the most frequently cited and strongly stressed causes of the unemployment in Danbury is unfair competition from hats made in Communist-run Czechoslovakia. These are brought into the United States in great quantity and undersell the domestic products. Where Danbury-made hats are priced to New York milliners at $25 to $30 a dozen, hats from Czechoslovakia are available to these milliners at $15 to $20 a dozen. And where hat imports from Czechoslovakia were in the amount of almost $41,000 in 1946, they jumped to the amount of almost $1,200,000 in 1949—an astronomical increase.

It is notorious that, wherever the Communists are in control, slave labor is the rule. This has been proved beyond the possibility of refutation—that slave labor is a fundamental and permanent feature of Communist economy, the very basis of that economy. The hats from Czechoslovakia can be sold for so little because made by captive and exploited labor. It is equally notorious that the warfare to the death which the Kremlin, with mastery over Czechoslovakia, is waging against the West and principally against the United States as the mainstay of the West, is ruthlessly fought with every sort of weapon, the economic no less than the military and the political. It should, then, be just as notorious that the hats dumped into our market by Communist-run Czechoslovakia are a potent weapon for the Kremlin.

How? For one thing, the sharp decline in employment in Danbury means a sharp decline in taxes collected by the Federal Government, for example, income taxes. Taxes, that is, which are urgently required to finance the expensive programs both for national defense and for economic and arms assistance to the European nations on which we depend for containment of the Communist tide. Cudgel our brains though we will, we cannot see the tiniest grain of common sense in taking bread and butter out of the mouths of Americans and drying up a source of much-needed Federal revenue, in order to give dollars to a member of the iron curtain bloc which aims at our defeat and extinction. This strikes us as a roaring absurdity.

For another thing, it is the dearest wish of the Kremlin that there be depression and

discontent in the United States. Some measure of the first can already be seen in Danbury. The second is not yet noticeable on any big scale. But it could easily and quickly develop. Why anything of the sort should be tolerated, when it stems from a readily curable condition of benefit only to the Kremlin, we cannot make out. It is a baffling mystery.

Danbury's troubles may not be exclusively attributable to the importing of hats from a Communist-run country, which is in effect an enemy country in the cold war. But they are unquestionably in part attributable to it. Sanity requires that this condition be righted, and at once.

[From the U. S. News and World Report, April 28, 1950]

Russia is preparing to assume full control over Czechoslovakia's trade. A new trade treaty has been negotiated, ostensibly giving the Czechs what amounts to a $200,000,000 gold credit, but actually making Russia the broker for almost all of Czechoslovakia's export trade. The Russians get power to market Czech products and determine the share of the proceeds the Czechs will receive.

Fair Deal Tough on GM Officials? Not by $8,000,000

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 27, 1950

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the newspaper Labor of Saturday April 29, 1950:

FAIR DEAL TOUGH ON GM OFFICIALS?—NOT BY $8,000,000—HUGE BONUS EXPLAINS WHY THEY'RE SO ANXIOUS TO CUT TAXES ON RICH—SIXTY-ONE SHARE GIANT MELON—DISCLOSURE MAKES COMPLAINTS HARD TO UNDERSTAND—WHAT DO THEY WANT?

A move to limit income taxes is becoming the rallying cry for all kinds of lobby and propaganda groups in an effort to weld them into a single body bent on upsetting everything that the Fair Deal stands for. Their often-repeated complaint is that Fair Deal spending and socialism are ruining the country.

Some of the loudest complainers, and the heaviest contributors to the propaganda groups, are officials of the giant General Motors Corp. After General Motors reported record profits of $656,000,000 in 1949—the largest ever made by any corporation in a single year—many people began to wonder what they were complaining about, and how much it would take to satisfy them.

WHY THEY WANT TAX CUT

This week it became clear why they are so interested in efforts to put a limit on income taxes. For 61 top officials of the company were disclosed to be sharing a huge bonus melon for 1949 of better than $6,000,000 in cash, plus 24,333 shares of the company's stock, worth nearly $2,000,000 at present prices.

Uncle Sam, of course, will get quite a chunk of that in income taxes, but the company arranged to pay it in five annual installments to help the officials keep out of the upper brackets, so they can keep as much as possible.

The announcement certainly is not going to help their propaganda about the Truman administration making it tough for business to get along.

The bonus action had to be made public under regulations of the Securities and Exchange Commission, which requires that such information be given to stockholders. It was contained in proxy statements mailed to the company's 400,000 stockholders with notice of the annual meeting to be held in Wilmington, Del., May 19.

Charles E. Wilson, president, topped the list, with a total of salary, bonus, and director fees for 1949 of $586,100, which suggests that he has not suffered greatly from the Fair Deal. His salary and fees totaled $201,100, and the bonus was $308,021 in cash and 1,243 shares of stock. The shares were given an award value of $76,979, although at present market prices they would bring more than $100,000.

Next behind him were three executive vice presidents: Albert Bradley, who gets $511,225 all told; Harlow H. Curtice, $496,100, and Marvin E. Coyle, $496,000.

Open House at Kings Point

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY J. LATHAM
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 27, 1950

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an excellent editorial from the Long Island Daily Press, pointing out the need for a strong merchant marine and for continuing without restriction the facilities for training capable merchant marine officers at Kings Point Merchant Marine Academy on Long Island:

KINGS POINT

The United States Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point in Great Neck is holding open house next Sunday, providing an opportunity for Long Islanders to become better acquainted with this impressive service institution.

Kings Point is as important to the well-being of the Nation as is West Point or Annapolis, yet it has not attained the rating accorded these Academies in the public mind. The reason is probably that Kings Point is many years younger than either the Army's or the Navy's officer-training schools.

If many more Long Islanders realized the importance of the Kings Point institution, and were familiar with what it is accomplishing in training officer personnel for the merchant marine, it is probable it would have far less trouble obtaining the financial backing in Congress which is necessary if it is to continue in existence.

Year after year attempts are made at Washington to pare down the Academy's fund allocations, to reduce the allotments for its students, and otherwise curtail both its activities and its prestige.

Such attempts arise plainly because of a lack of understanding of what the Academy does in training competent officers for the merchant marine in peacetime and building up a reservoir of sea officers for war emergencies.

A strong merchant marine is a key to prosperity in commerce and industry in peacetime. It is indispensable to our fighting forces in wartime. It is as necessary to the safety of the Nation as either West Point or Annapolis.

No rational person would think of curtailing officer training at either of the older service academies, but there seems to be no hesitation to restrict the training at Kings Point.

The Merchant Marine Academy needs public support. It can grow and continue strong, or it can easily be restricted and hampered in its development because of a lack of public knowledge of its importance.

The open house at the Academy will give Long Islanders an opportunity to see for themselves what is being done there.

Where the Menace to Freedom Lies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 27, 1950

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Bruce W. Knight, from the Readers' Digest:

WHERE THE MENACE TO FREEDOM LIES

(Condensed from Dartmouth Alumni Magazine)

(Bruce W. Knight, professor of economics, Dartmouth College)

The greatest public issue before Americans today is pseudo-liberalism—false liberalism, phony liberalism, the pretended pursuit of liberal ends by means which lead in the opposite direction. In other words, are we to have liberalism or are we to have a wretched counterfeit in the form of state paternalism?

State paternalism is precisely what a large and articulate group of self-styled "liberals" is working might-and-main to wheedle or even force us to accept. In the group are Government officials, administrators, and academicians—particularly social scientists, would-be social scientists, and "cause" preachers making a noise like social scientists. Toward these persons, as persons, I bear no ill will. I suppose they mean well. I sympathize with the esthetic impulse which prompts them to give us something more lovely than the facts of life. Nevertheless, more is needed to qualify them as authorities on the attainment of human welfare. No doubt the stork legend is artistically preferable to the truth about babies, but it is hardly to be recommended as an approach to regulating the supply. It is toward the paternalist, as such, that I am hostile, because I am convinced that he, rather than the avowed Red who knows what he is up to, is the most dangerous foe of personal freedom.

Liberalism is essentially an attempt to solve the greatest of all minority problems, the plight of the individual person in a world organized or disorganized by human institutions. Here a great deal of metaphysical nonsense can be avoided by facing the simple fact that you are you and nobody else, and that you want to be yourself as fully as possible. Society is an excellent thing for certain purposes, but it is also a conspiracy against the real you. Liberalism tries to retain society's useful results while minimizing its infringement on you. The primary postulate of liberalism is freedom of the individual for self-development and self-expression. Hence any attempt by authorities to restrict this freedom unnecessarily, by controlling the individual in either his internal adjustments or his external relations, is to be resisted.

A liberal society is not an organism in which the parts are to be controlled in the interest of the whole. Since its fundamental interest inheres in the parts, the individual persons, its objective is not control at all but voluntary agreement.

American liberalism is mainly a heritage from England. Its chief elements are the politics of democracy and the economics of the free market. More broadly, it is a difficult combination of majority rule and individual rights.

From its essential nature follow these propositions:

Independence: The people cannot exercise real self-government unless they think independently. They must not permit their conceptions of public issues to be determinded by agencies of the state.

Individualism: Majority rule must leave the individual as free as possible from the feeling of official coercion.

Compromise: If voluntary agreement is to prevail over social control, the art of compromise is essential, and to it, in turn, a spirit of tolerance is necessary. No person or group must insist on an exclusive interpretation of what is right or best for the people.

Diffusion: Since, as Lord Acton put it, "power tends to corrupt and absolute power corrupts absolutely," power must be diffused. It must not be concentrated geographically, or in the hands of any one branch of Government, such as the executive.

Conservation and progress: We cannot make progress, enlarge personal freedom, except by conserving what we have and building on it. Liberalism is necessarily conservative in its selection of means. It is undermined by attempts to substitute rapid structural changes for natural growth, since such changes require the people to surrender so much power to the Government that they cannot control the Government, that is, govern themselves.

Economy: Liberalism cannot survive without a reasonably sound free economy, or one having what the people regard as reasonable rights of private property and reasonable stability.

If this is liberalism, as I believe it is, advocates of state paternalism—for which the welfare state is another term—are not liberals. Let us consider briefly certain marks by which they may be identified.

The paternalist is a tireless espouser, notably before groups of women, of raising more and more revenue for expenditure on the underprivileged, particularly if the revenue is supposed to come from State rather than local taxes. He not only aches vocally for social justice but is very intolerant of anything save the welfare state as a means to it. If you happen to believe that a distention of governmental power is not the liberal answer to private abuses of power, he calls you a reactionary. He prefers to overlook the fact that the paternalist in government takes something which is not his and redistributes it among a larger number of voters.

The paternalist typically advocates more centralization of power, not only in the Federal Government but also in the executive branch. For how else, he reasons, can you get a sufficient "rain of laws" to penetrate the parched soil of social injustice? Do not the ends justify the means? It logically follows that the Federal Government must collect and expend larger and larger fractions of the national income to support more and bigger agencies for social control.

He employs the piecemeal technique of Hitler, presenting his program in dramatized bits so that the expansion of expenses, burgeoning of government and contraction of individual freedom will not be noticed till too late.

Nowhere is American liberalism more kicked around, stood upside down, and turned inside out than in the field of economics. Nor should this prove surprising. The economy is a strategic sector at which to launch the assault on individual freedom. Moreover, our economy is peculiarly vulnerable to attack. It will have enough trouble to stand without the persistent efforts of bogus liberals to push it over by misrepresenting its character.

Any available alternative to the free market necessarily involves a tremendous loss of individual freedom. Apart from anarchism, which is obviously unworkable, the only real alternatives are authoritative systems in the form of communism, fascism, or democratic socialism. The first two of these require no discussion here. For democratic socialism, of which the welfare state is one variety, only two possible outcomes are probable enough to be worth talking about. First, if it remained democratic, it would become a colossal racket. With practically all wealth being Government wealth, and practically all income Government income, Government officials would have approximately five times as much as now with which to promote their causes, especially the cause of keeping themselves in power. Second, and largely because of its having become the first, it would cease to be democratic.

The paternalist employs other tricks to misrepresent our economy. He exaggerates the importance of private monopoly, bad though some monopolies are. He overlooks the foremost father of monopolies, the Government itself. He assumes that the evil of monopolies would be reduced by having one huge monopoly, the Government.

Our worst offender against freedom of the market is the Federal Government itself. The tariff alone has probably done more economic damage inside and outside America than all our industrial monopolies combined. Further, government has been the foremost abettor of internal monopoly. It has used import duties, quarantine regulations, currency manipulation, and the like, to keep firms out of the market. It has shut out substitute products by such means as the outrageous tax on colored margarine. It has restricted output directly in its farm program.

Yet the paternalist proposes to cure the evils of monopoly by making the Government a far bigger monopolist than it already is. The chief argument for this course is that monopoly is "inevitable," and must therefore be public rather than private. If half the energy now devoted by the state to promoting monopolies and then trying to control them were given instead to freeing the market and keeping it free, the output of welfare and liberalism would be far larger.

There may be something to be said for the candid espousal of communism or fascism by persons who really believe that liberalism is washed up. But there is no honest justification for the brazen posing of state paternalism as the one and only liberalism. If one honestly believes in socialism, let him say so, and call it that, and explain why. But don't call it liberalism.

Winston Churchill has said: "Of the difference between socialism and communism I said a good many years ago that a strong dose of either socialism or communism would kill Britannia stone dead, and at the inquest the only question for the jury would be: Did she fall or was she pushed?"

Changes Needed in Electoral Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 27, 1950

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I have noted a meritorious editorial from the pen of Marion Gaines in the Pensacola News-Journal. It gives deserved support to the Gossett amendment for a revision of the electoral college system of electing Presidents. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the editorial, as follows:

CHANGES NEEDED IN ELECTORAL PLAN

Political dopesters have not been optimistic about the prospect for House approval of the proposed constitutional amendment to revise the electoral college system of electing Presidents. It would automatically divide the electoral vote of each State among Presidential candidates according to the popular vote in the State. Under present customs, each State's votes are cast in a block for the candidate receiving the highest vote. With this change the electoral vote, which actually determines the election of a President, would follow the popular vote State by State, and the system would more nearly approach the election of Presidents by popular vote.

An unfortunate feature in the consideration of the proposal is that argument seems to center on the question of how the change might affect the immediate political fortunes of one party or the other. Naturally this tends to obscure the questions of whether the proposal would be in the interest of the whole people, and of whether the change might be made still better by throwing out the electoral vote system altogether and electing Presidents by direct popular ballot.

If the matter is debated solely on the basis of the national good it is hard to see how any defensible stand can be taken for keeping the present system. The question to be decided then is not whether or not to make a change, but what kind of change should be made.

Un-American Activities Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. WOOD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 27, 1950

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Whereas there is a need for a rededication to the principles and ideals upon which our Republic was founded; and

Whereas the devotion and allegiance of each citizen and organization to these principles is essential to the perpetuation of our Republic and to the continued growth of freedom and economic opportunity in America; and

Whereas there are individuals and organizations dedicated to the overthrow of our Government by force and violence; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States, through its House Un-American Activities Committee, is engaged in exposing communism and Communists, whereever to be found in the United States; and

Whereas said House Un-American Activities Committee has been engaged in conducting a hearing on Communist activities within the Territory of Hawaii since April 10, 1950; and

Whereas said House Un-American Activities Committee is performing a public service in the cause of patriotism, Americanism, and is performing a further public service in exposing the degree of communistic infiltration present in the Territory of Hawaii, which said exposing of communism and Communists tends to defeat their effectiveness in our community: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by Honolulu Post, 1540, of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United

States (a veterans' organization chartered by the Congress of the United States), That said House Un-American Activities Committee be commended and congratulated for its excellent work in the community in the cause of Americanism, patriotism, and to the end that the ideals and liberties we cherish so dearly may be perpetuated forever; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the House Un-American Activities Committee, the President of the United States, the Speaker of the House, the President of the Senate, and our Delegate to Congress.

Submitted by Hyman M. Greenstein, national deputy inspector general, VFW, past commander, Department of Hawaii, VFW, past post commander, Honolulu Post 1540, VFW.

Explorer Before Boone Was Not First Briton in Kentucky

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL D. PERKINS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 27, 1950

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD a story written by Mr. Gerald Griffin, staff correspondent of the Louisville Courier-Journal of April 24, 1950, on Dr. Thomas Walker:

EXPLORER BEFORE BOONE WAS NOT FIRST BRITON IN KENTUCKY—BARBOURVILLE TO PAY HOMAGE TO DR. WALKER

(By Gerald Griffin)

BARBOURVILLE, KY., April 23.—The man Barbourville and its environs will honor in its bicentennial celebration the coming week end was no mythical figure, no Paul Bunyon of the Cumberlands, but a real historical character—Dr. Thomas Walker.

Ancestor of many Kentucky and Virginia families, Dr. Walker antedated Daniel Boone into the land beyond the mountains by almost 2 decades. But even at that he found initials carved on trees indicating that other English explorers had preceded him.

NAMED CUMBERLAND RIVER

Two things prevented Dr. Walker's name from being as well known today as that of Boone. First, he turned back when he was within a day or two of reaching the rolling plains of the Bluegrass region. And second, what is now Kentucky still was a forbidden region, claimed by both the English and French, for that important matter had not then been settled by the outcome of the French and Indian War which sputtered along from 1755 to 1763.

But Dr. Walker and the intrepid explorers who accompanied him through Cumberland Gap in 1750 left their imprint by the name "Cumberland," which he gave to the river of that name. And, according to the History of Kentucky written by Judge Charles Kerr, Lexington, who died recently, he named the Levisa Fork of the Big Sandy River.

A surveyor in the romantic heyday of surveyors, and of necessity a fearless explorer, Dr. Walker was born January 15, 1715, in King and Queen County of the colony of Virginia, a loyal subject of the English King.

When he died, November 9, 1794, at Castle Hill, his home in Albemarle County, near Charlottesville, in the State of Virginia, he was a citizen of the lusty young United States of America, and a neighbor of Thomas Jefferson.

RECORDED EXPLORATIONS

While yet in his early thirties, Dr. Walker had gained recognition as a surveyor, as had George Washington, and in 1748 accompanied Col. James Patterson on a tour of inspection into southwestern Virginia. But this party made no attempt to cross the mountain barrier then recognized as the western rim of colonial Virginia.

Dr. Walker kept methodical records of his exploration activities and modern historians have delved into them in looking into early pioneer times.

His knowledge of the western country frequently was utilized by the colonial government which, on several occasions, sent him to conclude treaties with the Indians. And it was not the Indians who gave him trouble on his famous Kentucky journey—they let him strictly alone—but a bear that wounded one of his companions, and a snake that bit one of his horses on the nose.

MADE TREATY WITH IROQUOIS

Dr. Walker's most celebrated Indian treaty was the one at Fort Stanwix, N. Y., in which the English gained title to the lands south of the Ohio River including what is now most of Kentucky. The other party to the treaty was the Iroquois Tribe.

As a prelude to his hazardous invasion of the lands which later became Kentucky County and a long time later, the Commonwealth of Kentucky, Dr. Walker entered into a contract with the Loyal Land Co. on December 12, 1749. The company had title to 800,000 acres west of the Cumberland Mountains and it became Dr. Walker's job to explore it for possibilities of settlement.

With five intrepid companions, all mounted, two pack horses, and a few hunting hounds, Dr. Walker set out from his home near Charlottesville, now home of the University of Virginia, on March 6, 1750. His companions were Ambrose Powell, William Tomlinson, Colby Chew, Henry Lawless, and John Hughes.

TELLS OF HUNTING

Several months later they were back home with a none too glowing report of the western country except for the hunting, a tally of which ends the Walker log:

"We killed in the journey 13 buffaloes, 8 elk, 53 bears, 20 deer, 4 wild geese, about 150 turkeys, besides small game. We might have killed three times as much meat if we had wanted it."

The Walker party, after stopping with a few settlers along the way, passed through what is now known as Cumberland Gap—later publicized by Boone—April 13, 1750, and pierced the mountain chain now known as the Cumberlands. But there is no absolute record that Dr. Walker named either the gap or the chain. In his journal he refers to the Cumberlands merely as the "steep ridge."

But 4 days later he discovered and named the Cumberland River, from which the mountains and the gap probably got their name. He named the river after William Augustus, Duke of Cumberland, son of King George II and Queen Caroline.

Following the Warriors' Path of the Indians, later followed by Boone and the pioneer settlers, he forded the Cumberland just below the present site of Pineville—Cumberland Ford—where the Iroquois are believed by some historians to have thrown back other tribes. That was between 1700 and 1750 in the Iroquoian conquest of the Ohio Valley.

Near the present site of Barbourville the party divided, some of them, with Dr. Walker, continuing southwestward and the others remaining to build a log cabin, 8 by 12 feet, clear a little patch of land, and plant corn and peach stones.

FOUND CARVED TREES

It was on this trip away from the base that Dr. Walker found the initials carved on the trees. Also, from a high point, he could see nothing but thickets of laurel and decided to change direction. He returned to his base, April 28 to find the cabin built near an abandoned village, possibly Cherokee, of several Indian-type cabins grouped around a mound 20 feet high and 60 feet wide at the top.

The exact site of the cabin built by the Walker group is a matter of debate among historians, but they usually agree that it was the first built in Kentucky by English-speaking people. At any rate it was somewhere within a few miles of Barbourville.

Without waiting for their corn to grow, the party pulled out from the base and made their way to the mouth of Station Camp Creek, where it empties into the Kentucky near Irvine. Just a couple of days more on the way west and they could have taken home a more encouraging report—they would have reached the great meadows of the Bluegrass—but here they turned toward the northeast.

CAMP NOW IS SALYERSVILLE

Continuing through the wilderness, the party camped June 3 where the courthouse now stands at Salyersville and named the Louisa River which, according to Judge Kerr, later became known as Levisa Fork. They named it for Louisa, sister of the Duke of Cumberland.

Then they passed over the present site of Paintsville and made their way back to Charlottesville.

That celebrated journey took place 200 years ago, 26 years before the United States was born and Kentucky County of Virginia was created. And it was several years before the rebel and surly Cherokee chief, Dragging Canoe, told Judge Richard Henderson and Boone at Sycamore Shoals:

"You have bought a fair land, but there is a cloud hanging over it; you will find its settlement dark and bloody."

Michigan's Miracle Mile

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. POTTER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 27, 1950

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Speaker, the American people are prone to overlook one of the greatest engineering installations in the world which is located at Sault Ste. Marie, Mich. If anything should happen to the locks at Sault Ste. Marie, our national economy would be greatly hampered. It is through these locks that over 80 percent of our iron ore moves from the upper Great Lakes to our great industrial centers.

Our military has designated the Soo Locks as one of our prime defense areas. Time and time again, I have called upon the Secretary of Defense to more adequately protect this vital zone by establishing a permanent military installation at Sault Ste. Marie. It is no military secret that the Army finally plans on stationing an antiaircraft battalion at the Soo but no permanent base has been established. Even though the Fifth Army Corps has constantly recommended to the Pentagon that permanent facilities

be constructed, we have been unsuccessful in securing this vital installation.

I include at this point of my remarks an article written by Norman and Madelyn Carlisle titled "Michigan's Miracle Mile," which appeared in the May 1950 issue of Coronet magazine:

MICHIGAN'S MIRACLE MILE

(By Norman and Madelyn Carlisle)

THE FABULOUS SOO, A MARVEL OF ENGINEERING, IS THE BUSIEST CANAL IN THE WORLD

There is a stretch of water in northern Michigan, on the United States-Canadian border, that provides one of the greatest nautical shows on earth. Nature designed it as a spectacular set of violent rapids in the St. Marys River, which connects Lakes Superior and Huron. Human ingenuity turned it into an engineering marvel, the world's busiest canal, through which passes more cargo than goes through the Panama, Suez, and Kiel Canals combined.

Yet Michigan's miracle mile, the fabulous Sault Ste. Marie—generally known simply as "The Soo"—piles up this record in only 8 months annually, while the others are open year-round.

The area occupied by the canal and its famous locks has well been called the most important mile in America. Without the Soo, our economy would be disrupted, factories would be forced to move, great industrial centers like Pittsburgh would shrivel, the price of hundreds of products you buy would soar.

Strangely enough, the Soo is perhaps the least-known of modern engineering achievements. Spectators are astonished at the speed with which vessels are raised and lowered, so that a ship which has been towering far above them has, in a few minutes, dropped so low that they are looking onto its decks.

The Soo is really a set of gigantic water elevators which overcome the 22-foot hurdle presented by the fact that the level of Lake Superior is higher than that of Huron. Ships go through the locks on an average of one every 18 minutes, 24 hours a day—except when Old Man Weather steps in.

The Soo has a long and colorful history. Two years before the Pilgrims landed at Plymouth Rock, a young French explorer, Etienne Brulé, stared in amazement at the falls in the St. Marys River. Father Marquette established a mission there in 1668.

To this isolated 200-year-old town, there came in 1852 Charles Harvey, a determined young man from New England. He had no idea that his visit would help to change the history of America, for his purpose in coming was simply to sell weighing scales for the E. T. Fairbanks Co.

Young Harvey never got a chance to sell scales. Stricken with typhoid, he lay desperately ill for weeks. While he was recovering, he had time to talk to bearded prospectors who had come in from the upper peninsula wilderness with important news.

Copper and iron—huge deposits of it—had been discovered. The metal was desperately needed for America's growing industry. Yet young Harvey sensed that this mineral treasure-trove lay useless, because there was no way to transport it to civilization.

Except for one cruel joke of nature, it could come down the Great Lakes in ships. But Lake Superior was almost 22 feet higher than Huron, and the link between was the violent St. Marys River.

As soon as Harvey was able, he rushed back to his employer, Erastus Fairbanks, and audaciously proposed organizing a company to build a set of locks on the St. Marys River. He himself would direct the building. Young Harvey was so persuasive that he induced the hardheaded New England businessman to organize the St. Mary's Falls Ship Canal Co.

There were vast obstacles in the way of completing such a project in a remote wilderness. Stone for the locks had to come from far down on Lake Erie, wrought iron for the lock gates all the way from Pennsylvania. The nearest telegraph office was 450 miles away, in Detroit; letters to Harvey's financial backers in the East took 6 weeks for delivery.

Yet he wasted no time worrying about problems. Two days after he arrived with 400 men in June 1853, he had shelters built for them and personally turned the first spadeful of earth.

The first winter was a white nightmare. Temperatures stayed at 35 below, day after day. The workmen grew numb with cold, in spite of huge bonfires. At each runway Harvey had a watcher whose job consisted of rubbing snow on any man whose face was turning white with frostbite.

The spring following the second winter a new and treacherous enemy struck. Cholera.

Harvey saw the whole undertaking ending in wretched failure if his men fled the dread epidemic. Calling together his most trusted workmen, he told them that the truth must be concealed from the others. Each morning his lieutenants gathered and carried away the dead for burial deep in the forest. The rest of the crew never learned that 200 men died before the epidemic at last abated. Somehow they kept going, driven by the lean, insatiable Harvey, who was determined that the locks should be completed before the ice broke up on the Lakes. He won his battle. In April 1855 the waters of Lake Superior flowed into Lake Huron through the new canal, and in June the first ship was locked through. The fabulous Soo had become a reality.

Harvey's burning faith that the Soo Canal would mean a new era for America had been vindicated. Today, to handle the more than 100,000,000 tons of cargo that move through it each year, the Soo has three great locks, in addition to the Poe lock, which replaced the original Harvey lock in 1896. Through these great devices passes an endless parade of Great Lakes shipping, the very lifeblood of American commerce.

The colorful pageant includes giant 600-foot ore boats, which may carry as much as 20,000 tons of ore; huge, bulging grain carriers, often loaded with half a million bushels of wheat; sleek, black oil tankers; trim private yachts, and sometimes even rowboats or canoes. Any craft, no matter how large or small, has the privilege of going through the locks without payment of any kind.

Although it is run by the United States Army engineers, there is no sign of military activity at the Soo. The man who bosses this bustling enterprise is a soft-spoken civilian engineer, Clifford Aune. From the administration building, he directs the 325 employees who handle the job of running the locks. The enterprise costs the United States only $1,000,000 a year, a sum so modest that shipping experts describe the Soo as "Uncle Sam's biggest bargain."

Smooth as the operation of the locks may be, the men at the Soo never forget that as long as human beings run the ships there is always a chance of error.

They remember what happened in 1909 at the Canadian locks. Two down-bound ships, the *Crescent City* and the *Assinaboia*, had just entered the locks. Approaching from down river was the *Perry G. Walker*, which the lockmaster ordered to wait. Instead, she kept on coming, straight toward the gates which towered above her, and behind which were millions of gallons of water and two huge ships.

Spectators watched in horror as the distance between the *Walker* and the gates narrowed. There were shouts from the men on her own decks, and a frantic clanging of bells in the engine room. Still the ship kept coming on. With a rending crash her prow smashed into the gates, ripping them from their hinges. With a roar, a wild torrent of water rushed out, carrying with it the two ships which had been in the lock.

There was a melee of ships and water, from which all three craft emerged badly battered. Fortunately, no one was killed, but so great was the force of the water that both upper and lower gates of the lock were carried away.

To the 10,000 Great Lakes seamen, the Soo means news from home, books to read, a mid-voyage contact with land in a swift 7-day round trip that takes them from Duluth to Cleveland and back.

Here at the Soo is the unique canal post office that stays open 24 hours a day. When a ship enters the locks, her skipper, mate, or a seaman scrambles ashore and rushes to a gray stone building that houses the post office. Here he will find a fat packet of mail awaiting him, the clerks having been informed hours in advance that this ship was coming in.

It is one of the curiosities of the Soo that the man who climbs down the ladder of a Huron-bound ship will also climb down to get back aboard. During the comparatively short time the sailor has been ashore, the ship has been lowered until it is below the ground level.

The Soo becomes a knot of tension in the long line of navigation late in November, when the ships are making their last runs, their skippers praying for a few more hours of good weather and open water. They are racing with winter, and they do not always win. Sometimes the ice closes in on scores of ships above and below the locks.

Wind, too, can be a stern enemy of ships and men. One fall afternoon in 1948, it was howling at close to 60 miles an hour with all the makings of big trouble. It came, soon enough. Through the flying spray, men at the lock level saw two ships headed straight for the same lock at an angle that indicated a disastrous crash.

From his knowledge of incoming craft, the lockmaster high in his tower knew there shouldn't be two ships there at all. Trying to pierce the black wall of flying water, he made out that what the man on the runways had seen was really just one ship, swung in across the lock.

Still, the situation was desperate. The ship, now discerned to be the *Ralph Watson*, was unable to overcome the force of the wind and get swung straight into the lock. Obviously she would need tugs.

For six tense hours the great ship lay there straining, until enough tugs could come upriver and be locked through to join her in the titanic battle with the wind. Eventually they freed her and she steamed through with no damage to ship or locks.

The sturdy men of the Soo had won another victory over the elements. Once again the long ships were free to pass through the busiest water mile in America.

Water, Our Most Precious Natural Resource

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 27, 1950

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, the Nation is becoming increasingly aware of the absolute necessity of water conservation and the insuring of an abundant supply of fresh water for ourselves and our posterity.

Important light on the problem was shed by the Honorable Guy C. Jackson, Jr., president of the Texas Water Conservation Association, in an address before the recent meeting of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress. For the information of the Members of Congress and others interested, I take pleasure in placing in the RECORD a copy of Judge Jackson's address:

WATER—OUR MOST PRECIOUS NATURAL RESOURCE

There is no more important basic problem confronting the people of Texas today than the problem of developing, conserving, and beneficially utilizing, its limited, but replenishable water resources, in the interest of further agricultural, municipal, and industrial expansion and the economic welfare of our citizens.

According to the United States Geological Survey, the water demands in Texas increased over 7,000 percent between 1890 and 1940, while the population of the State increased only 287 percent. Within the past 10 years, industrial plants costing more than $1,000,000,000 have been erected in Texas. Synthetic rubber, magnesium, nylon, paper, steel, furniture, food products, airplanes, various chemicals, and many other products are now being produced in quantity. Also, within the past 10 years, more than 1,000,000 acres of land in Texas have been provided with irrigation water for the first time, thereby expanding Texas' irrigated acreage to more than 2,884,000 acres in 1949, about 54 percent of which is irrigated from wells. With this increased development the daily water demands are exceeding the unregulated flow of Texas' rivers. Withdrawals of ground water are beginning to lower the water table at an excessive rate in some areas. It is estimated by the Texas board of water engineers that there is being used in Texas an average of about one and a half billion gallons of ground water per day for irrigation, industrial, and municipal use.

To give an example of the increased use of underground water for irrigation on the high plains alone, I quote from figures given by the United States Geological Survey as follows: "In 1937 there were 1,150 wells on the high plains irrigating 160,000 acres of land. In 1947, 10 years later, there were 7,375 wells irrigating 950,000 acres of land, and I am informed by the same source that more than a million acres are now under irrigation in that area.

During the past 2 years many of our cities and towns were forced to ration water and many of them passed ordinances prohibiting the watering of lawns and the washing of cars. Some had to haul water for domestic purposes in railroad tank cars. To give you one example, the city of Coleman, in west Texas, had water shipped in for a period of 20 months.

During this same period there were shortages of water for irrigation purposes and several irrigation districts and canal companies had to refuse water for lands that otherwise would have been irrigated.

Within the broad expanse of Texas, with 10 major river systems, the average annual rainfall ranges from less than 9 inches at El Paso to 55 inches near the Louisiana line. Thus, there is in Texas, between humid east Texas and arid west Texas, all the water problems that can confront any people. In 1917 the people adopted the "conservation amendment" to the Texas constitution, section 59 a, b and c of article 16, declaring "The conservation and development of all of the natural resources of this State, including the control, storing, preservation and distribution of its storm and flood waters, the waters of its rivers and streams, for irrigation of its arid, semiarid, and other lands needing irrigation, the reclamation and drainage of its overflowed lands, and other lands needing drainage, the conservation and development of its forests, water and hydroelectric power, the navigation of its inland and coastal waters, and the preservation and conservation of all such natural resources of the State" to be "public rights and duties", and commanding the legislature to "pass all such laws as may be appropriate thereto". Following the adoption of this amendment, the Texas Legislature passed enabling legislation providing for the creation of local conservation and reclamation districts, water control and improvement districts, etc., for constructing works for irrigation, municipal and industrial water supplies, most of which were for direct diversion from unregulated streams, and very few dams were constructed for storing storm and flood waters.

By the early 1930's it had become increasingly apparent that if Texas was to continue to expand industrially and agriculturally, and if its cities and towns were to grow in population, steps would have to be taken to store the storm and floodwaters wasting into the Gulf of Mexico from Texas streams, which is estimated to be 80 percent of the average annual run-off. In compliance with the mandate contained in the conservation amendment to the constitution, the Texas Legislature created, by special acts, 31 conservation and reclamation districts and river authorities, embracing practically all of the several watersheds in the State, and having for their purpose the control, development, conservation, and utilization of the waters of the rivers and streams within their respective boundaries for irrigation, industrial, municipal, hydroelectric power development, navigation, and all other useful purposes and for flood control.

I will mention a few of these to show what is being done in Texas to develop our water resources.

The Lower Colorado River Authority, embracing the 10 lowermost counties in the Colorado River, Tex., watershed, has four dams and reservoirs in operation with a combined capacity of 3,000,000 acre-feet of water and has two more under construction, the cost of which is being paid from the sale of revenue bonds and no funds will be requested from the State or Federal Governments.

The Brazos River Conservation and Reclamation District has one dam and reservoir in operation with a storage capacity of 724,700 acre-feet. The district is planning to start construction within the next few weeks on three other dams and reservoirs to be paid for from the proceeds of revenue bonds with no aid from the State or Federal Governments.

The Lower Neches Valley Authority is the largest distributor of water in the Southwest. During the rice irrigating season, the authority sells and distributes 500,000,000 gallons of water daily for irrigation, municipal, and industrial purposes. The Corps of Engineers propose to construct four dams and reservoirs on the Neches River and tributaries, one of which will be completed this year. The authority is contributing $5,000,000 toward the construction of two of the dams and in return will receive waters stored in them.

The Central Colorado River Authority has constructed more than 1,000 small dams on tributaries of the Colorado River in Coleman County. The Corps of Engineers has completed a flood control and water conservation dam on Hords Creek, a tributary of the Colorado River. The city of Coleman, which hauled water for 20 months, contributed $100,000 toward the construction for the purpose of having approximately 6,000 acre-feet of water stored for its use.

The Upper Colorado River Authority has agreed to purchase the conservation storage in the Corps of Engineers' North Concho River flood-control project near San Angelo, Tex.

In addition to the above-mentioned dams, the Corps of Engineers now have under construction four dams on the upper reaches of the Trinity River watershed near Dallas and Fort Worth; two on the Brazos River watershed and one on the Sulphur River near Texarkana. The city of Dallas has purchased the conservation storage in the Garza-Little Elm Dam and Reservoir, in the Trinity watershed for $5,000,000. The Park Cities, adjoining Dallas, have also purchased conservation storage in Grapevine and Garza-Little Elm Reservoirs.

Several cities and towns have voted bonds for the construction of dams and reservoirs for supplemental water supplies.

Private capital has constructed two dams in Texas, one near Longview in east Texas, and one near Colorado City in west Texas.

All this recent development was brought about through the coordinated efforts of all interests working together toward a common goal, by and through the Texas Water Conservation Association, a State-wide organization representing the five major classifications of water use: Irrigation, municipal, industrial, navigation, and river authorities. The classfication "river authorities" includes all those districts and authorities created by special acts of the Texas Legislature.

The government of the association is vested in a board of directors consisting of 35 members, 7 each, from the 5 classifications of water use represented. The members of the board are selected by representatives of the several classifications of water use.

The association has as its primary purposes the promotion of the continued improvement and development of the State's rivers, harbors, lakes, and water and land resources, and the investigations and approval of practical and economically feasible projects throughout the State. It actively supports and advocates the orderly development and conservation of our soil and water resources for purposes of flood control, navigation, irrigation, and all beneficial uses.

It provides a forum for the discussion of all problems relating to land and water development, conservation and use, serves as a clearing house for coordinating the activities of local agencies, groups, and organizations, and affords a means of securing united action by all the interests concerned with the various phases of land and water conservation and utilization.

The association maintains permanent headquarters in Austin under the direction of a full-time general manager. From its offices, by regional meetings of its executive board, through its news bulletins, the daily press, and its officers and directors, the association keeps constantly before Congress, the Texas Legislature, State and Federal officials, bureaus and departments, and the public the need for water and land development, conservation, and utilization for the public benefit.

In adopting the conservation amendment to the Texas Constitution in 1917, the people of Texas commanded the legislature to recognize the State's responsibility in developing and conserving our water resources and to do something about it. The legislature has done something about it in a limited way, but there remains much to be done.

There are many conflicting and ambiguous provisions in the present Texas Water Code which must be clarified and unified in order that the water users, the board of water engineers, and the courts may know the intent of the law. In other words, our water code must be revised and brought up to date, based on present-day experiences. The regular session of the fifty-first legislature created a water-code committee to study this subject and make its recommendations to the fifty-second legislature.

At the last regular session of the Texas Legislature there was introduced Senate Joint Resolution No. 3, proposing an amendment to article III of the Texas Constitution by adding a new section to be known as

section 49c, creating a Texas Water Conservation Project Board and providing for the issuance by said board of not to exceed $200,000,000 in bonds as an obligation of the State of Texas for the purpose of creating a fund to be known as the Texas Water Conservation Projects Revolving Fund, which bonds were to be sold from time to time to make funds available for such projects as might be specifically authorized by the legislature after official reports had been submitted by the Texas Water Conservation Projects Board and the Texas Board of Water Engineers, showing such projects to be self-liquidating.

Texas and the other States of this Union are going to have to accept their responsibilities in the development, conservation, and utilization of their water resources or surrender their rights to the Federal Government. There is no substitute for water and the people are demanding that the waters now flowing to waste without any beneficial use be conserved and made available to meet their ever-increasing demands. If the existing State and Federal agencies don't do it, the people will finally surrender to a Federal valley authority.

There is now pending before the Congress of the United States several bills for the creation of Federal valley authorities or administrations such as the Columbia Valley Administration, the Missouri Valley Administration, and others including an omnibus bill to create some nine Federal conservation authorities blanketing the entire United States and placing all Texas rivers and streams under the Arkansas Valley Authority extending from the Missouri River Basin to the Rio Grande.

The pending bills are not basically different. However, under the omnibus bill, H. R. 894, by Representative RANKIN, of Mississippi, the President would appoint an administrator for each authority, thus placing nine men in control of the people and resources of the Nation, whereas under the Columbia and Missouri Valley Authority bills he would appoint three directors for each authority, giving 27 men complete control of the resources and economy of the Nation.

These authority bills provide for the complete regimentation of the people, resources, and industry of the country. They are socialist to the core and can lead to nothing less than dictatorship. Under the Columbia Valley bill, the Administration, the three-man board of directors, would establish the maximum size of farm units within each project for the reclamation of lands—but no farm unit shall contain more than 160 acres or less than 10 acres of irrigable land. No benefits from such projects could be made available to owners of lands whose individual holdings exceed the maximum area unless the owners agreed to sell the acreage in excess of the maximum at an appraised value approved by the Administration.

The Texas Water Conservation Association has consistently opposed the creation of Federal valley authorities on the following grounds:

1. They are undemocratic in denying the people affected an effective voice in the formulation and development of programs for the utilization of their resources.

2. They create confusion and chaos in the development and operation of programs which can be made to function in a satisfactory manner.

3. They will jeopardize every established water right within their reach and initiate interminable litigaton.

4. They will tend to upset and unduly hamper and restrict the traditional freedom of the social, cultural, commercial and industrial life of our citizens.

5. They will remove direction and governmental control over local matters from the communities where such matters arise, and will render more difficult the solution of our problems whether by authorities or by the courts.

6. They will destroy the sovereignty of the States in matters vital to the preservation of our form of government and in complete negation of the principles upon which it was founded. The exercise of such powers of control by a central government will make effective a program of planned economy and a definite change in the American system to an experiment in state socialism.

Potato Marketing Agreement for the New England States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 27, 1950

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter I received this morning advising me of the recent decision of 85 potato growers in Hampden, Hampshire, and Franklin Counties in Massachusetts not to participate in the potato marketing agreement for the New England States and listing the reasons for that decision.

I believe this decision and the reasons given will be of very real interest to all of my colleagues who are concerned about the development of a program for agriculture which will meet with general approval.

The letter follows:

NORTHAMPTON, MASS., *April 25, 1950.*
Congressman HESELTON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Last week 85 Hampden, Hampshire, and Franklin County potato growers went on record as opposing potato marketing agreement for the New England States, excluding Maine. Listed below are reasons why they opposed the order.

A. Expense of administration, inspection, and policing the area, which would be levied on the growers.

B. Lack of expensive sizing equipment which is necessary under such an agreement when size restrictions are imposed as in Maine.

1. Under such a proposed program small farmers would be forced to sell their crops to dealers who have these expensive grading facilities.

2. In this area the standard practice has been for growers to grade and sell their own crops.

C. Lack of definite information in proposed agreement as to how much an order would affect the grower.

1. Too many decisions are left to an area committee and the Secretary of Agriculture to make after the agreement is in effect.

D. Growers feel that excessive Government regimentation and intervention in business is against the principles America was built on.

We have sent a similar letter to Congressman FURCOLO. We hope that by contacting you, you will have a better understanding how Massachusettes potato growers feel toward the proposed marketing agreement.

Very truly yours,
STANLEY N. JASKOLKA,
Chairman.
EARLE M. PARSONS, Jr.,
Secretary.

Bill To Stabilize Duties on Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 27, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today providing that any change in import duties previously determined by customs authorities shall apply only to future imports and not be made retroactive to items which have already been imported or in process of importation.

By amending the United States Tariff Act of 1930 by this bill, manufacturers and businessmen in this country will be encouraged to increase their imports from foreign countries thereby improving our trade relations with those countries and bolstering their economy at this crucial period in world affairs.

By the way of example, let me cite to you the case of an American firm which imported 2,600 wooden cases from Canada in the latter months of 1949 at a stipulated import duty approved by United States customs officials. In December 1949 the importer was informed that the cases had been reclassified, the import duty was increased to a point which no longer made importation profitable, and the increase was made retroactive on the 2,600 cases previously imported.

In my bill I aim to establish as a legal fact that when once a classification has been made by the proper United States authorities at a customs port of entry, that decision should be final and the importer should not be subject to retroactive increased duties imposed by subsequent reclassifications. When a business firm or manufacturer figures out what it can import with Government sanction, that trade relationship should not be disrupted suddenly and without forewarning. We are trying to build up our imports from abroad and not to disrupt them completely.

In connection with the problem of world trade and the question of imports from abroad without hurting American producers, I desire to call the attention of my colleagues to the following article which appears in the United States News and World Report, April 28, 1950, which is of great timeliness:

WANTED: TRADE STIMULANT TO FOLLOW MARSHALL PLAN

(Worries over the end of the Marshall plan already are bobbing up in Washington. Problem is to help Europeans sell more and buy less on the American market without hurting United States producers. Tariff cuts, sales campaign, etc., are under study. But they won't be enough to guarantee that Europeans can pay their way without more United States aid.)

How to ease the shock from ending of the Marshall plan in 1952 already is giving the United States a new crop of problems. That shock, if it comes, will result from a drastic cut in our exports and a possible rise in our imports.

The problems are of several kinds. Some businessmen and farmers selling in the domestic market are worried because a new

round of tariff cuts is soon to be undertaken. Other businessmen and farmers whose products go into export are afraid of losing business when Europe no longer has Marshall plan dollars with which to buy. And Government officials are concerned over what will happen if Europe cannot obtain essential goods from this country.

Both Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG (Republican), of Michigan, and Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON (Democrat), of New Mexico, are urging that a special commission be set up to deal with the problem on a bipartisan basis. President Truman is giving attention to it also. He has named Gordon Gray, former Secretary of the Army, as a special assistant to define the problem and recommend a further course.

Tariff cuts to be offered by the United States in talks with 17 countries at Torquay, England, beginning in September, will have a bearing on the problem, but probably not in a major way. These reductions, by themselves, are not expected to bring in enough more imports to come anywhere near balancing United States foreign trade.

The list of 2,500 products on which cuts will be discussed includes pottery, passenger autos, chemicals, textiles, toys, whisky, wines, chinaware, watches, clocks, cutlery, lead, zinc, nickel, oil, cattle, sheep, wool, fruits, filberts, certain kinds of cheese, and many other articles.

Business and farm groups affected are strongly objecting. Manufacturers of watches, pottery and textiles, nut growers, and coal and oil companies were among the first to protest.

Actually, the concessions that are granted to other countries are likely to be less sweeping than those made in the two earlier rounds since 1945, when Congress authorized tariff reductions of as much as 50 percent. On the average, the rates have been reduced only 22 percent and theoretically could go down another 28 percent, under the law. In many instances, however, the full reduction that is considered practical, from a political and economic standpoint, already has been placed in effect.

A search for other ways to meet the "dollar gap" problem, therefore, is being made. Europe now spends around $4,000,000,000 more a year than she earns. That's roughly equal to the amount of the Marshall-plan aid. Even when that aid ends, Europe's dollar shortage will still be from one and a half to two and a half billions, unless a solution can be found.

Paul G. Hoffman, head of the Economic Cooperation Administration, says that, to earn the dollars she needs, Europe will have to sell $400,000,000 more of competitive goods in this country.

Such an import flow cannot easily be brought about. As an example of what might happen, the case of textiles is used by officials. Suppose that, as part of the $400,000,000, textile imports are increased by $75,000,000 a year. The question is asked: What would be the effect on the United States textile industry—on the workers it employs, on the capital invested in it, and on the communities dependent on it?

In the studies soon to be initiated by Mr. Gray and others, the probable effect on various United States industries of bringing in competitive imports is to be surveyed. These studies also will explore ways of encouraging European countries to sell in the United States more goods of types that will not be upsetting to industry in this country.

Alternative courses of action for the United States, in the event that imports cannot be increased to the extent urged by Mr. Hoffman, are to be weighed.

Stopping Marshall plan aid to Europe in 1952 and putting nothing in its place could bring a decline of two or three billion dollars a year in United States exports, officials say, with especially severe blows to producers that are dependent on the export market. Growers of cotton, wheat, and tobacco and manufacturers of such articles as machine tools, motor trucks, tractors, farm machinery, and office appliances would be hurt. At the other end, European countries suddenly deprived of essential goods from the United States also would be hard hit.

To avoid a drastic decline in exports, new ways of getting dollars into the hands of foreign countries, so that they can continue to buy United States goods, are being studied.

In some circles, the military aid program is looked upon as a successor to the Marshall plan. That program, however, while helping to maintain employment in the United States, does not provide Europe with dollars that can be spent in this country for ordinary commercial goods.

The only answer for the United States that can dodge painful adjustments, of the type that would be forced by greatly expanded exports or sharply reduced imports, appears to lie in big-scale foreign investment. This can take the form of public or private loans, possibly geared in with the Government's point 4 program of technical aid for development abroad.

Any dollars sent to Latin America or southeast Asia, the exports explain, are likely to find their way to Europe before returning to the United States. Those dollars can help to bridge Europe's dollar gap, bolster United States exports, and lessen the pressure for a sudden increase in United States imports. The net result can be an expanded total of world trade, in which many nations will share.

Some such long-range program of investment, therefore, seems certain to engage the attention of any bipartisan commission that Congress or President Truman may set up.

Let Us Support the United Jewish Appeal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 24, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to direct the attention of my colleagues to the following editorial which appeared in the New York Journal-American and other papers throughout the country:

LET US SUPPORT THE UNITED JEWISH APPEAL

(By Harry H. Schlacht)

Our toast to Israel—
Shalom Uvracha!
Peace and blessings!

We salute the second anniversary of the State of Israel. We hail the historic event with resolution and hallelujah.

Two years of glorious achievement. Two years of glorious fulfillment.

Let us celebrate this happy occasion with a solemn pledge of continued support to the United Jewish Appeal.

This is the hour of destiny and opportunity that will stand out boldly in Jewish history.

No true Jew, no true Christian, no true American can stand apart from the campaign of the UJA.

To feed the hungry, to clothe the naked, to provide hope for the downtrodden and dispossessed, represent the highest ideals of Christianity, of Judaism, and of Americanism.

Hashomer ahi anohi? "Am I my brother's keeper?"

Americans of all faiths are solidly behind the UJA in the building of a new democracy, in the rescuing of Jews from inhumanities.

Without the UJA, European Jewry might not have survived the horrifying destruction under Hitler. Without the UJA, the 2,000-year-old dream of the Jewish state might not have been realized.

The UJA presents the greatest reconstruction program in the history of world Jewry.

It seeks to rebuild and readjust the lives of the victims of persecution. It seeks to bring the blessings of brotherhood to those on whom the tortures of war inflicted the most dreadful toll.

Through the UJA, thousands of uprooted persons are leaving the isolated existence of DP camps, ghettos, and way stations throughout the world.

They are finding their roots again and live as men.

This has been accomplished by the UJA.

The people of America must support this Godly enterprise. The UJA efforts are primary in the program for Jewish survival.

There are still thousands of sick, helpless Jews in Europe.

They remain precariously suspended between life and death. They face the terror of starvation and ignominy.

The problem of saving the last remnants of European Jewry is one of the most important questions facing the architects of the new world.

The decision rests with us.

By our devotion, by our selflessness, by our generosity, we can make 1950 a year of opportunity for oppressed Jewry.

Let us all support the UJA. Let us all support this humane cause.

Let us demonstrate the greatness of the American heart. Let us give for the sake of our immortal soul.

Our deeds determine us as much as we determine our deeds.

God bless UJA.
God bless Israel.
Shalom.

A Celebration Tomorrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 27, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Times-Herald in an editorial today calls attention to a fact that all our people should understand, and especially all Members of the Congress. It points out that the average salary and wage earner in this country works 117 days a year to pay the tax collector. Tomorrow is the one hundred and seventeenth day and it should be a day of rejoicing; a day to celebrate. As part of my remarks I shall include the editorial at this point:

TOMORROW'S THE DAY

Since January 1, the average salary and wage earner in this country has worked 117 days and every cent he's earned must be paid the tax collector. So, tomorrow for the first time this year he can call his salary his own.

We think such an occasion should be marked by a special observance in the hope of stopping the flood of Government spending which might increase the number of days we'll have to work for taxes next year to 120 or 140 days.

TAXPAYERS NEED HELP

The national debt today has reached $255,588,544,106.81. The administration plans to spend $42,439,000,000 in 1951. Such a budget will increase the debt by another four or five billions.

In order to meet this huge expense you must pay direct and indirect taxes such as 8 cents on a quart of milk, 18 cents on a can of baby powder, $2 on your telephone, $3,000 on a new house, 70 cents on a shovel, and $3 on a pair of shoes.

Congress could make it a real celebration tomorrow. For a starter it could cut down the 1951 budget until it balanced and then wipe out the excise taxes put on the American public as wartime emergencies. How about it?

Old-Age Assistance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 27, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by George H. Pauley, of Buffalo, N. Y.:

THERE IS AN ANSWER
(By George H. Pauley)

What is the answer to the greatest and most important question confronting our legislators, economists, and statisticians today? That question which also has the labor leaders, the bankers, the great industrial tycoons in a quandary. The question of what to do about our aged citizens.

The article entitled "Don't Kid Yourself About Pensions" written by Nat. S. Finney and appearing in Look magazine under date of March 28, 1950, is the most dour, pessimistic picture of the subject that anyone could conjure up.

Mr. Finney goes to great length to minutely describe the most obvious and simple facts known to anyone who has given the matter the most casual consideration. But, he has failed to offer anything of a constructive nature; nothing that has a slight semblance of a solution to this important problem. The concluding paragraph of Mr. Finney's article states: "The country is still a long way short of finding a way to divide production in a way that will honor the fair claims of the old folks."

To that I would say: Only so far short as a self-seeking group in our legislature deliberately keeps it for political purposes. But I am in full accord with the writer in his choice of the last six words in that paragraph: "Fair Claims of the Old Folks."

The millions of words written by hundreds of writers, some famous, some just mediocre, all simmer down to the same basic facts. Our great American medical and industrial scientists have produced a Nation of high industrial productivity as well as great longevity. This of course is a very desirable condition, insofar as every industrialist and every worker is desirous of producing more and earning more in order to procure more of the world's goods for himself; and likewise, whether prince or pauper, a long life is a very desirable ambition. The only thing wrong with this picture is the fact that modern, mechanized industry cannot use all available manpower; leaving about 11,000,000 oldsters without means of earning the necessaries of life.

Some of our legislators and economists have not kept abreast of the times; too many of them are still thinking in terms of 1880. Secure in their smug offices with salaries of fifteen to twenty-five thousand dollars a year, they have no idea how the average American taxpayer lives.

Plain evidence of this fact is found in the present so-called social security law, with its $10 minimum; not enough to buy a half ton of coal and help pay John Lewis' salary and pension.

Various writers quote the billions of dollars in savings held by the savings banks; but no one has broken down the figures to find out how much of this money belongs to the worker with family in the $3,000-a-year and downward class. Perhaps we would find that to be a nonexistent sum.

Regardless of how many words may be spoken or writen on this subject, pro or con, these facts remain, we still have 11,000,000 citizens past 65 years of age, wholly or partly dependent upon others for support; owing to facts beyond their control, among which being 30 years of heavy income-tax payments which have siphoned off their potential life savings.

Also, industry-paid "free" pensions are obviously impractical.

The present Social Security Act is immature, inadequate, and impractical. Pensions paid out of current Government revenue are highly impractical and unsecured, insofar as any hostile Congress could refuse to appropriate the necessary funds.

But there is an answer, just as America has always found an answer to any question: First. Abolish all income tax on wages or salaries under $3,000 per annum. Second. Spread the cost of pensions equally between employer and employee. Third. Pay pensions of $100 per month to all workers at age 65, $150 to husband and wife when wife reaches age 60. Fourth. Abolish title 1 of present Social Security Act, placing all on an equal basis. Fifth. Stop fooling around with 1 percent or 1½ percent of pay roll as a tax base, and make all contributions uniform. For example: Tax all employees $2 a week, all employers paying $2 per week per person, thus placing all employees on an equal tax basis as well as on an equal benefit basis. Sixth. Begin paying to the present crop of oldsters at once, thus placing the system on a pay-as-you-go-basis. And last, but not least, abolish the pension question as negotiable between labor unions and employers. Place the responsibility where it rightfully belongs, with the Federal Government.

APRIL 18, 1950.

Electricity and the Valley's Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 28 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, there is now pending both in the Senate and the House a bill proposing the inclusion of the Cumberland River Valley in the TVA. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix an address by Gordon R. Clapp, Chairman of the Board of the Tennessee Valley Authority, delivered at the fourth annual meeting of the Tennessee Valley Public Power Association on April 20. In this address Mr. Clapp does not specifically mention the matter of including the Cumberland in the TVA, but his speech sets forth in very definite terms the necessity of finding additional hydroelectric power if this important section of the country is to continue its economic development.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ELECTRICITY AND THE VALLEY'S FUTURE

(Address by Gordon R. Clapp, Chairman of the Board, Tennessee Valley Authority, fourth annual meeting of the Tennessee Valley Public Power Association, Nashville, Tenn., April 20, 1950)

On March 20 an important and significant event took place at Wilson Dam, Ala. The eighteenth generator, recently installed in the Wilson Dam powerhouse, started to produce electricity as a part of the TVA system. This unit—No. 18—completes the original and presently planned installations at this place, bringing the total capacity of the Wilson Dam to 436,000 kilowatts.

In 1925, when Wilson Dam was completed as a belated World War I project, it was viewed by many as a "white elephant," by others as a coveted prize—if bought for a dime on the dollar. In 1928, and again in 1930, Congress (Republican at both times) passed bills to establish something like the TVA to start where Wilson Dam left off and turn the whole Tennessee River system to public benefit. Both times the enactments were vetoed. In 1933, when TVA was established by the Congress and the President, Wilson Dam was turned over to the TVA. The powerhouse contained eight units with a total capacity of 184,000 kilowatts. Beyond these eight units stretched the long unfilled floor of the powerhouse—room for 10 more units. Today the full complement of 18 units—436,000 kilowatts is at work.

Unit No. 18 at Wilson Dam, changing the power of falling water into electric energy for farms, homes, and factories, is today a symbol of the development of a whole region, adding the growing strength of its rich natural resources to the betterment of the American standard of living.

Those who said, and honestly believed, the Tennessee Valley did not need or could not use more electricity were men with too little faith.

Those who once labeled Wilson Dam as a "white elephant" should now have red faces.

Behind this recent event at Wilson Dam is a story familiar in its general features to most of us here in the Tennessee Valley and to many outside the valley who understand and applaud and support the course of development the Tennessee Valley has pioneered in the past 17 years. You, the distributors of TVA power, in partnership with your consumers and the TVA, have made Wilson Dam and the whole Tennessee River system an asset of great value.

Let me recite some of the facts of which unit 18 at Wilson Dam is an appropriate and dramatic example.

These facts are an old story to all of us here but the passage of time and the pressing problems of today's responsibilities sometimes dim our perspective. It is good to look back occasionally along the road we have come to give us energy and direction for what can be done in the future.

Before 1933, Wilson Dam produced, in an average year, less than one third of a billion kilowatt-hours; in the single fiscal year of 1949 alone more than 2,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours were produced. This increase could not and would not have happened except for two things:

1. Dams built upstream and on the tributaries steadied the flow of the river, thereby providing more water the year round to operate more turbines more of the time; the minimum stream flow at Wilson Dam before TVA was less than 5,000 cubic feet per second. With the present system of TVA dams, this minimum stream flow is more than five

times greater. Before TVA primary power at Wilson Dam was about 39,000 kilowatts; with upstream storage and additional units it is now 159,000 kilowatts.

2. The region has demonstrated what the founders of the TVA believed—produce more electricity, distribute it at low rates, people will use more electricity, efficiency of the power investment will increase, and the area served will be able to grow and develop. A more efficient river for flood control, navigation, and power would have been a luxury if the people of the Tennessee Valley had been slow to use the electricity this development made possible. You and the consumers you serve and the Nation's requirements of war and defense have kept the TVA busy keeping up with the growing demand for electricity. And that electricity has helped to transform the life, living, and strength of a region vital in the Nation's economy.

In the field of electric energy the moral of Wilson Dam should be clear—put a white elephant to work, feed him well, and he will more than earn his keep. Today, Wilson Dam as part of a whole system devoted to flood control, navigation, and power is helping to earn the 4-percent return the TVA power system has averaged since 1933.

Let's review for a moment the growth of the TVA power system and the area served by the distributors of TVA power.

In 1933 the area now served by the TVA used 1,500,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity. In 1949 the TVA system supplied more than 17,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours.

In 1933 most of the electricity distribution agencies you represent did not exist. By 1945, the last year of the war, your municipal and rural electric cooperative systems distributed three and one-third billion kilowatt-hours to your consumers; by last year that had almost doubled to about 6,500,000,000 kilowatt-hours. Our forecasts of your requirements based upon a conservative projection of your past and present rate of growth estimate your loads will almost double again by 1954 to 11,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours.

In 1933 the area now served by the TVA had less than 300,000 consumers of electricity. The number now exceeds 1,000,000.

In 1933, 15,000 farms, or about 3 percent of the region's total, had electric service; now more than 300,000 farms, or 77 percent of the total, have electricity.

During 1949 rural lines were extended to as many farms every 60 days as the total number reached in all the years prior to 1933. The rural electric cooperatives, the REA, and the municipal distribution systems have all contributed to this achievement.

The rural cooperatives and the municipal distribution systems put $56,000,000 into new rural and urban lines and substations last year.

Your consumers bought more than $100,000,000 worth of electric appliances in 1949.

The average residential use in the TVA area is now 70 percent higher than the average for the United States.

And so I could go on. But you know the story; it is the cumulative total of what is happening in individual areas served by the 145 locally owned, business-managed, tax-paying municipal and rural electric cooperative distributors of TVA electricity.

There is one more set of figures I must include. They dramatize the responsibility of your systems and the TVA and our joint opportunity to serve the continued growth of this great region.

From Wilson Dam in 1933 to Watauga Dam in 1949 new records of power production and use have been set only to be surpassed. Last June (1949) the TVA power system, including Alcoa's dams and Dale Hollow, the first of the Army engineer projects on the Cumberland, registered an installed capacity of 2,747,092 kilowatts. By June of this year it will reach 2,997,610 kilowatts. Additions now under way, to be completed between June 1950 and January 1954, will add 1,297,400 kilowatts. This includes the first four units of the Johnsonville steam plant, the Army engineers' Center Hill and Wolf Creek Dams on the Cumberland. It also includes the new TVA steam plant begun this month at Widow's Creek in Alabama, to add some of the power required for the expanding atomic-energy program at Oak Ridge, Tenn.

These additions will bring the total TVA system to 4,295,000 kilowatts by 1954.

But even that will not meet normal and emergency requirements forecast for that time. Pending now in the appropriation bill for 1951, as reported favorably by the House Committee on Appropriations, is a program that would begin two more dams, the Boone and Fort Henry projects on the Holston River in east Tennessee, and also provide an additional unit at Fontana Dam in North Carolina, and two more units at the Johnsonville steam plant in west Tennessee. This pending program would add 395,500 kilowatts to bring the total system to 4,690,510 by January 1954.

In 1933 opponents of the TVA and men of little faith said 1,500,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity was enough; TVA would just add more idle white elephants to the much-debated Wilson Dam. Today, the 17,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours available in this region are not enough, though it is far beyond the highest level of power production TVA met during World War II.

By 1954 the TVA system will be capable of producing more than 25,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours. But even then the system will not have reached the end of its growth. The supply of electricity must grow so the region can grow. More power from the tributaries of the Tennessee, more generating units in the remaining empty stalls of our powerhouses, and every bit of power the Cumberland can develop will be necessary. More steam units will be needed. Our goal is to accommodate normal growth and to be prepared for whatever emergency the future may bring.

You and the TVA are in a great public business enterprise, to be sure. The success of our stewardship is measured by the standards of prudent investment, efficiency of operation, and our achievement of low costs in supplying an essential public service. But we could succeed on that score alone and still fail in our assignment. The success of our joint effort will and should be measured by the effect more electricity has upon the growth of this region, the energies and vision of its people in making electricity more useful in a soil-conserving agriculture, more livable communities, more economic opportunities. Our success in these things will affect profoundly the contributions this region makes to the Nation and the world. On the basis of these measures of success we can look back upon the first 17 years without embarrassment.

We can do even better in the years ahead. We cannot relax in our task while nearly one-fourth of the farms of the area do not yet have electric service. Plans and construction programs of the 145 distributors of TVA power will soon add most of those not now served. Achievement of this goal is one of our most pressing obligations.

We cannot relax in our joint determination and pledge to reduce rates to the domestic and rural consumers to the lowest practicable level. Investment in construction of new distribution facilities is making heavy demands upon the earnings of many distributors and that is delaying rate reductions in some instances. But we should not lose the vision and faith we jointly demonstrated when money was borrowed to get electric service into the hands of the consumers through their cooperatives and local governments. The faith that achieved the service we now represent has been confirmed and more. Consumers of today have a right and good reason to look forward to lower retail rates as old indebtedness is paid and earnings grow. In many instances you are prudently financing system expansion by new bond issues, thereby equating present consumer obligations with the present benefits that come from low rates.

Among the 145 distributors, 33 now apply resale rate schedules below the original low schedule introduced in the 1930's when our present partnership with many of you began. Continuation of the trend toward lower retail rates in the Tennessee Valley is one of our most important and prudent objectives in the years ahead. TVA is trying to do its part in this by holding to its wholesale rate costs, despite the increased costs of heavy construction, and the development of additional sources of hydro power in multipurpose projects that cannot match the unusual economy of the basic hydro system thus far installed.

The margin between the TVA wholesale rate and the retail schedules of the distributors offers opportunity for retail reductions in many instances as loads and earnings grow.

The success of our effort in these respects will demonstrate, as it has thus far, the wisdom of the Congress and the President in directing the TVA in its sales of power to "give preference to States, counties, municipalities, and cooperative organizations of citizens and farmers, not organized or doing business for profit, but primarily for the purpose of supplying electricity to its own citizens or members."

Our joint responsibility to meet and service the power requirements for this region's full development is not yet satisfied, nor will it be in our lifetime. We are pledged to continue to demonstrate what this valley has proved so conclusively—energy, mobile energy in greater abundance, used more efficiently, and available to all in the area who want and can use it, is a minimum requirement for a strong region; it is an essential ingredient for an ever-increasing, self-supporting standard of living.

Proposed Regulation of Motion-Picture Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 28 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement prepared by me congratulating the motion-picture industry on the suspension of hearings on the licensing bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRATULATIONS TO MOTION-PICTURE INDUSTRY ON SUSPENSION OF HEARINGS ON LICENSING BILL

I read with delight the news that the hearings scheduled for May 15 relative to the proposal to license motion-picture actors and actresses have been called off. I congratulate the distinguished chairman of the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee, Mr. JOHNSON, for having conferred with the outstanding leaders of the motion-picture industry and with Mr. Eric Johnston, of the Motion Picture Association of America, relative to a voluntary solution of this problem.

I am sure that the executives of the cinema who conferred with Senator JOHNSON will be adequate to the challenge which now faces them to implement the voluntary Motion Picture Code so as to prevent the recurrence of certain types of objectionable practices relating to the exploitation of immoral conduct.

I think that it is a wonderful thing that these leaders of the cinema mentioned by Senator JOHNSON in his statement of yesterday afternoon (as printed in the RECORD on p. 5882) should have come to Washington in order to help find a solution to this problem, thus helping the Senate avoid the alternative of what I felt to be unnecessary hearings on unconstitutional legislation.

I think that the able Senator from Colorado displayed splendid judgment and good sense in his decision of yesterday. I think, too, that he is to be applauded for his noble moral standards which prompted him to begin activity on this issue. The fact that I disagreed with him on the specific proposal which he made because of what I felt to be its illegality does not for one moment alter my tremendous admiration of the profound depth of Senator JOHNSON'S spiritual convictions. We certainly need more of that type of righteous, moral belief.

To me, the decision to cancel out these hearings, at least temporarily, is a triumph for the American system of voluntary consultation and agreement as contrasted with the alien idea of compulsion. I think that this voluntary principle will indeed be tested as the industry gets down to the problem of actually improving its code. Some of the very small firms in the industry have in particular, according to all accounts, been guilty of breeches of good taste and this situation must be corrected insofar as they are concerned or for that matter, insofar as any large company is concerned.

Correction of those breeches will probably not be easy; a meeting of the minds in a democratic Republic such as ours may as a matter of fact, be very difficult at times. But that does not alter the necessity for our faith in democratic consultation around the conference table.

Right now, the industry is still plagued by the 20-percent admissions tax on which relief seems to be only slowly coming through lengthy tax-revising procedure in the House. Moreover, there are other serious problems facing this important industry. Most important, however, a milestone in industry freedom has been reached thanks to patience, tact, and understanding all the way around.

Throughout my efforts on this matter, beginning with my statement in opposition to the licensing proposal, which may be found in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page A1916 and as recorded in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages A2833 and A2981, respectively, it was my sincerest hope that a voluntary solution would be found, and at long last real progress has been made. Congratulations are therefore indeed in order to the American system of discussion and voluntary agreement.

National Association of Wheat Growers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 28, 1950

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I herewith include a copy of a speech which I made at Kansas City, Mo., on Friday, April 21, on the occasion of the organization of the National Association of Wheat Growers:

I am happy to be here today on the occasion of the organization of the National Association of Wheat Growers. I regard this as a most important meeting. Ours is the greatest wheat-producing Nation on the globe, and wheat production is a better than $2,000,000,000 industry. It is one of the most important of our crops. It is the world's greatest food grain, in many ways the most important of all food products. In recent years American wheat has meant more than that. It has saved uncounted millions from starvation, it has served as an important instrument of our foreign policy and has been our most effective weapon in the cold war. The westward progress of communism was stopped in its tracks—not by airplanes or battleships or bayonets, not by negotiations and diplomacy—but by wheat grown on the farms of America. This is typical of the story of wheat throughout the ages. It has won and lost wars; it has made and unmade empires; and world trade in wheat has always been the most important of all international transactions. This Nation is indeed fortunate in including within its boundaries the greatest area of good wheat land ever possessed by any nation. Whatever the occasion when people talk about wheat, they are discussing no mean subject.

Here in this country at the request of the Department of Agriculture and as a part of our war effort, American farmers increased the production of wheat from an average of about 750,000,000 bushels per year before the war to an average of approximately 1,200,000,000 bushels per year for the 6 years ending in 1949. During this same period, when the whole world needed and demanded more food, our Nation was the only one which was able to substantially increase its wheat production. The rest of the world either stood still or made very slight contributions to the increased need for food. Every bushel of wheat from these better than billion-bushel crops which we have produced during the last 6 years has been needed, and although we hear much talk of wheat surpluses now, our carry-over on next July 1 will not be large when world conditions are considered. We must remember that there are over 200,000,000 more people in the world today than there were before the war. There are that many more mouths to feed, although, sad to say, even with our increased production there will not be enough to feed these hungry mouths, even if there existed sufficient buying power and an effective means of distribution.

For it is a fact that in spite of the increase in world population and greater international need, trade in wheat is falling off and may perhaps fall off more. The decrease in the present marketing year as compared with the previous year is about 10 percent, and certainly we can expect further drops when the ECA expires and we no longer are financing food exports to the Marshall-plan countries. Along with this, we are faced with the fact that Germany has been admitted to the International Wheat Agreement and in the future will secure its supplies through that source rather than through the United States Army, which means that to some extent we will have to share this market with other countries in the International Wheat Agreement. Although not yet admitted, Japan has applied for admission to the International Wheat Agreement, and presumably, if she is admitted, this will reduce the quantity of wheat which we send to that country. Up until the present our per capita consumption of wheat for human food has been declining, and with large stocks of feed grains available and with wheat-support prices considerably above feed prices, there appears to be no immediate opportunity to increase the consumption of wheat for livestock feed.

In my opinion this meeting is long past due. I cannot at this time recall any group of producers in this country as important as the producers of wheat, who are still unorganized. I do not care in what field you may go, you will find that in this country producers, processors, and distributors of all important and many unimportant commodities are thoroughly organized. If you will take a look at the telephone directory in the city of Washington, you will find listed there the names of several hundred commodity groups having Washington offices. This is to say nothing of those who have their headquarters in other parts of the country. In the field of wheat, we find that distributors and processors are thoroughly organized. The grain trade is organized through the National Grain Trade Council. The millers have the Millers National Federation. The bakers are thoroughly organized nationally with two groups, one representing the wholesale bakers and the other the retail bakers. And yet the most important group of all in connection with wheat has been up to this moment entirely unorganized on a national basis.

Confining ourselves to the field of agriculture, let me point out that the producers of almost every other agricultural commodity are organized on a national scale. Take the field of livestock. Almost every State has one or more State-wide general livestock organizations, to say nothing of all the State and National breed organizations. On a regional scale, livestock producers are organized into groups like the American National Livestock Association, representing the Great Plains and Rocky Mountain areas, or the Texas and Southwestern Cattlemen's Association, covering the southwest part of the country. In the Corn Belt, the livestock feeders have their organizations. In the field of dairying there is a great national organization known as the National Milk Producers Federation, and there are dairy organizations in many States, such as the Dairymen's League in New York and the Land O' Lakes Creameries in Minnesota and adjacent States.

There is the California Fruit Growers Exchange, representing the citrus industry of that State. The Florida citrus producers have a similar organization. There are organizations of the deciduous fruit growers and of the various types of nut producers. There is the National Wool Growers Association, with many State wool associations. The baby chick hatcheries have a national organization known as the International Baby Chick Association, the headquarters of which are here in Kansas City. The sugarbeet producers are organized. There is the American Soybean Association, representing the producers of that commodity. There are the hop producers and the raisin growers and hundreds of other organizations representing agricultural producers from the local to the national level. Every one of them, I am sure is rendering a service to those whom they represent, and in most cases rendering a service to the public as well. It is strange that wheat producers, who are ahead of most agricultural groups in keeping up to date on production methods, have failed up to this time to see the advantages of a national organization.

There are some, perhaps, who feel that the general farm organizations are in a position to speak for wheat producers, but these organizations are no more able to speak for wheat producers as such than they are to speak for livestock producers or soybean producers or any other commodity group. Evidently the members of other organized commodity groups feel that it is of value to them and have their own organizations. I would not for a moment minimize the value of the great national farm organizations. They perform a real service to agriculture.

but their field must necessarily be broader than that of any commodity group, and in any situation where there may be a conflict of interests between commodities, they of course cannot take a position. The general farm organizations have their field, and it is an important one, but in my opinion there will always be a need for commodity organizations.

I represent a great wheat-producing district in Congress, and during my service there the fact that wheat producers have had no organization to speak for them has frequently been brought to my attention. As an instance, I might mention the difficulty which the Committee on Agriculture had last year in securing an expression of opinion from wheat producers when it had under consideration changes affecting acreage allotments and marketing quotas on all of the basic commodities. I was asked by the chairman of the committee in charge of the hearings to see that wheat producers were represented. Of course, the general farm organizations were invited and appeared, representing all farmers, but I had a real problem when it came to securing witnesses representing wheat producers at those hearings. It was easy in the Pacific Northwest, where there are State organizations. It was possible to secure representatives from western Kansas through the Western Kansas Development Association, but from there on out it appeared that wheat producers as such were completely unorganized, even on a State or local basis. I made every possible effort to have representative wheat farmers come to Washington. I wrote letters to individual producers, whom I thought might be interested. Through the press the committee invited all wheat producers to come to Washington and testify, but, of course, all who came pursuant to these general invitations could speak only for themselves. They did not have behind them the collective wisdom, judgment, and experience that they would have had if they had been representing State or national wheat-growers organizations. The result was that the committee got many diverse and varying individual opinions, many of them in conflict with each other, and when the hearing was ended, with the exception of the presentations made by the small number of State groups I have already mentioned, the committee simply had before it a number of suggestions, many of them no doubt good, but no real information as to the general opinion of wheat producers throughout the country on the problems in question. How much more helpful it would have been to the committee and to the Congress generally if there had been a great national organization representing the wheat growers of this country and authorized to speak for them on important problems affecting their industry.

But, of course, specific legislative questions are only one of the important matters of interest to wheat producers which may come up in Washington. There are many phases of our international policies which directly or indirectly affect the production and marketing of wheat, especially in these times when so much international trading is under Government control. I recall that last year, when the International Wheat Agreement was under consideration, representatives of the general farm organizations, the grain trade, the millers, and a number of Members of Congress were called into consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture and members of the group which were to represent this country at the conference which was to work out the agreement. I am sure that the interests of wheat producers were represented there indirectly, but it is a fact that there was no one present directly representing this great $2,000,000,000 industry.

Right now an important question is pending which involves wheat and international policies. It arises out of the fact that an American milling company is building flour mills in Cuba with the understanding that the tariff on wheat will be repealed. At first thought, that might not sound like such a bad proposition as far as American wheat producers are concerned, but the rub is that under our present preferential treaty with Cuba, American wheat is entitled to a preferential tariff rate and can therefore successfully compete with wheat from Canada and other countries. The purpose of the preferential treaty was to give our producers access to Cuban markets and to give Cuban producers a preference in our markets. Cuba still has this preference in the markets of this country, particularly important, in the case of sugar, but I am told that if the tariff on wheat is repealed, it will mean that Canadian wheat will displace American wheat and flour in that country. I think that question is one to which this organization might give some immediate concern.

In view of the fact that such a large proportion of our wheat exports at present are being made under the ECA program, the policies of that organization are very important to wheat producers. Last year the ECA made available $175,000,000 to the United Kingdom with which to purchase Canadian wheat. Otherwise those dollars would have been spent for wheat or other products in this country. I am not raising the question of the wisdom or folly of the action taken. There are two sides to it, but I am simply pointing out that it was something which was of great importance to the wheat producers of this country and one in which a national wheat organization would naturally be interested.

Whether we like it or not, the future of the wheat growers of this country will depend in a large degree upon Government policies. That is true of every industry. For many years there have been farm programs relating to wheat, and whether or not these particular programs are continued, there will always be many ways in which the Government will touch the business and productive operations of wheat producers. The question of what kind of a farm program we are going to have, as applied to wheat, is of course of paramount importance. With the rising opposition to farm programs generally, it behooves the producers of wheat to give consideration to a program which will be self-supporting, and which will enable us to compete in the export markets. Aside from legislation there will constantly be questions arising which relate to details of programs and policies. Right now there is under consideration in the Department of Agriculture the matter of changing the rate of storage allowances on wheat under the price-support program. The grading of grain is a regulatory activity of the Government, and any changes which may be made in that program are, of course, of intense interest to wheat producers. Freight rates are another matter in which the Government exercises regulation and control. One could go on and enumerate many other Government functions which are of vital interest to wheat producers, and in the solution of which producers should have a voice to present their viewpoint and interests.

In the next few years, there will be hundreds of decisions made by the Government affecting wheat growers and their business. Who is going to decide these questions? How do we know they will be decided right? Are they going to be decided by Congress, very few Members of which have personal knowledge of the problem, or the time to study it? Are they going to be decided by men in Government agencies, who may have an entirely different viewpoint from that of farmers, and who may be quite unfamiliar with the problems involved? Many important decisions vitally affecting farmers may be made quite incidentally in connection with the consideration of questions which only incidentally relate to agriculture. For instance, our foreign-trade policies may have almost as much effect upon the welfare of wheat producers in the next few years as anything which might be done directly under Government programs.

Let me make it clear that I do not believe this organization should be what is commonly known as a pressure group. It should be the voice of the wheat growers of the country; yes. It should be in a position to speak for them in matters which affect their welfare and the general welfare of the country, as it is affected by wheat production and marketing. It will be a voice which, in my opinion, can be very helpful by keeping legislative bodies and Government agencies informed and advised as to the problems of wheat producers and the relationship between those problems and the economic and social problems of the Nation. I know it is only in that spirit and from that standpoint that the wheat growers of this territory want to be represented by such an organization as this in the determination of governmental policies.

But governmental policies are only one of many fields in which an organization of this kind can work. When I think of the potential good which can come from this organization, my mind turns at once to the field of research. I do not for a moment discount the great achievements of agricultural research in recent years, and yet, as a matter of fact, compared with its potentialities and compared with industrial research, very little has been done. I think it should be made clear that taking into consideration the funds which have been available, marvelous results have been secured. But when it comes to research, industry spends a hundred dollars where agriculture spends one dollar. Industry spends these tremenodus sums of money for research because it knows that research pays. We know that research pays in agriculture also. The difficulty is that whereas large industrial concerns and organizations have the funds with which to carry on research, 6,000,000 farmers over the country have no way of carrying out research projects as individuals, and no way to carry them out at all without organization. In the past practically all of our agricultural research has been done by Government agencies, in the main through the Department of Agriculture and the land-grant colleges. Under the Research and Marketing Act, provision is made whereby the Government might cooperate in research with private organizations. The Far East Grain Mission, which I am sure is familiar to most of you, is an example of a cooperative effort under the Research and Marketing Act, between the Department of Agriculture and a State organization of wheat producers. There can very well be other cooperative efforts along this line, and if the organization and the funds are available, there will no doubt be much additional research carried on, both independently and in connection with our land-grant colleges and other Government agencies.

The need for such research is evident everywhere, both in the field of production and marketing. We all have in mind, I am sure, that there is much which can be done in production research along the line of better varieties. Much has been accomplished in recent years on this, but all of us know that more can and will be done if funds are available. In a large part of the wheat-growing area of the country, there is much need for research on alternate crops to stabilize and balance agriculture in those areas. There is so much yet to be learned about plant diseases. Last year the mosaic disease was a factor in reducing wheat yields in large areas. We have accomplished much in breeding disease-resistant plants and in methods of attacking disease, but every scientist will tell you that the work along these lines has only begun. We need more

study also in the field of eradicating weeds and other plant pests.

The present infestation of green bugs over a large part of the Southwestern Wheat Belt brings to our mind the need for more work along the line of eradicating insect pests. There are questions of land use and the control of wind and water erosion in which there is still much to be done in the field of research.

We need continued and expanded research in storage and transportation problems. Weevil control is an instance. We need to study and develop information with reference to the grading of wheat and other grains, and our jerry-built system of transportation rates is a subject upon which much research can be expended.

Nowhere is research more important than in the field of marketing. In spite of the world's shortage of food, in spite of undernourishment, even among people who are supposedly well fed, wheat producers are faced now with the problem of reducing their production unless new outlets can be found. We are all familiar with the fact that there has been a steady decline in per capita wheat consumption in this country for the past 40 years. If per capita consumption today equaled that of 40 years ago, we would consume in the United States for human food this year 750,000,000 bushels of wheat, instead of approximately 500,000,000. There are a number of reasons for this decline, but certainly one important reason is the failure of those who produce, distribute, and process wheat to properly advertise the value of their product, and to market it in such a form as to get an adequate response from the buying public. The splendid reception which has recently been given in Kansas and some other States to the new type of bread containing 16 percent more wheat illustrates the fact that the public will respond to a tasty and improved product. It is yet too soon to see how far-reaching the results of this development may be, but it is an illustration of the fact that there are possibilities until recently unexplored for expanding consumption. If any project of this kind is to succeed on a national scale, it must, in my opinion, have the backing of a great national organization, such as is being set up here.

We know what the meat industry has done in expanding consumption of its products through judicious and skillful advertising. We know what has been done by the citrus producers and others in expanding their market outlets. These groups have been able to accomplish much, because they were organized. What they have done wheat producers can do. But the expansion of wheat consumption as human food is only one field in which we should be working. Certainly there can be some increase in consumption for livestock feed. There should be research in the utilization of varieties of wheat which are good from the standpoint of the producer, but which are not satisfactory to the milling and baking industry. We must explore all the possibilities in the way of industrial uses.

But the field which has the greatest immediate possibilities in enabling us to avoid drastic production cuts is the field of exports. We are not doing so badly now when the ECA program is in effect, and under which our taxpayers are financing exports to the Marshall plan countries and to other nations within the scope of our foreign-assistance programs, including Japan, Korea, and what remains of Nationalist China. The world needs, and will continue to need, every bushel of wheat we can produce in this country, but if we are going to dispose of it after our foreign-aid programs end, as end they must, we are going to have to meet competition from other wheat-exporting countries, in all of which wheat prices are lower than in this country, and we are going to have to find some way by which the importing countries can pay for the wheat which we send them. This gets us into the field of foreign-trade policy and international financing.

Much more might be said, but this is enough, I am sure, to indicate the great field which exists for research in expanding our outlets for wheat and its products. It indicates also the necessity for organized effort. I do not mean to imply that a national organization would necessarily want to cover the entire field of research. Much can and will be done by organized State and local groups working with the land-grant colleges and other governmental agencies. But all of the matters which I have mentioned can be accomplished only through organization, either at the local, State, or National level, and the inspiration and push for work of this kind must be furnished by a national organization.

This organization represents an effort on the part of farmers to help themselves as distinguished from too much dependence on government. I believe it will be of assistance to the wheat producers of this country. I believe it will be helpful to those who in this country and throughout the world are engaged in the distribution and processing of this, the most important of all food products. But my interest in the matter would be far less did I not also believe that the National Association of Wheat Growers can make a real contribution to human welfare here and abroad. I say this because it is my firm conviction that out of this organization will eventually come more efficient production and wider distribution of the world's most essential commodity, the result of which will be to expand the consumption of a nutritious food, diminish hunger, promote the well-being of millions of distressed people, increase international friendship, and advance world peace and prosperity.

The Republican Party and the McCarthy Investigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 28 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent and penetrating article by Miss Doris Fleeson, commenting on the political and moral significance for the Republican Party of the current investigation into the State Department.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPLOITED BY EXTREMISTS—BATTLE FOR SOUL OF GOP IN MAKING WITH GROWING INFLUENCE OF MCCARTHY

(By Doris Fleeson)

A real battle for the soul of the Republican Party is in the making.

In the face of statements by Senator MCCARTHY that "Wait 6 months and you'll see the results of what I'm doing," thoughtful Republicans are saying that the show-down between the differing GOP factions cannot be long delayed. This group includes governors and private citizens as well as ringside observers of the gravitational pull which Senator MCCARTHY is exerting upon the GOP.

What Senator MCCARTHY is talking about is no riddle. He thinks that his charges are going to be the great Republican campaign issue this fall. He is cocksure that they will elect Republicans and return control of Congress to them. Then the party will be grateful to him and he will have that national stature, that leadership for which he so ardently longs.

BOUNDLESS AMBITION

Wisconsin editors broke the news last week to their fellows that Senator MCCARTHY's boundless ambition includes the Presidency. He has often said at home, they related, that he will be the Nation's first Catholic President.

Republicans who believe that the means used by Senator MCCARTHY are in direct conflict with the party's basic Americanism foresee a bitter struggle for control, perhaps a deep and permanent schism. Some are still hoping that time will diminish the pressures; others think the pressures are already mounting to the point of inevitable conflict.

One of the party's major figures paid a little-noticed visit to the Capital recently. He strongly condemned Senator MCCARTHY'S tactics which he feels gravely injure the country but admitted that not all his associates took that view. Republicans, he went on, had never had the fight they must have to determine where they stand. He said that so far they had always at the last moment glossed over their difficulties but they could not get away with it again and should not, even if they could.

This Republican can command national attention when he chooses to speak out. He also has a pretty fair idea now, he thinks, of who will be on his side.

LINE-UP AFTER PRIMARIES

The Republican line-up will begin to be more evident to the public after the primaries are over. If Senator MCCARTHY can keep his charges alive—as he clearly intends to do and probably can—the Democrats expect to make it impossible for a Republican candidate to evade taking a stand.

The irony of this is that it is hardest on those Republicans whom Democrats most admire. The GOP extremists, having nothing to lose, can exploit the MCCARTHY charges to the utmost. Others must risk alienating any MCCARTHY admirers while gaining a me-too label. Meanwhile, they point out, independent voters are likely to play safe and run off to the Democrats.

This problem of the Progressive Republican is capsuled here by one wit in the query: Are Republicans really necessary? Many liberals feel that the anti-MCCARTHY kind are and desire to help them.

Actually the usual iron law applies—they must help themselves. It is theirs to decide when to rebel against the growing MCCARTHY influence. The Senator from Wisconsin clearly will not help them by subsiding quietly.

Tribute to Hon. Paul H. Douglas, of Illinois, by Walter Locke

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 28 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a column written by Walter Locke, editor of the Dayton Daily News, which describes the personality

and problems of our colleague the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] as he carries on his noble effort to be a conscientious Member of the Senate.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRENDS OF THE TIMES

(By Walter Locke)

A "JUNIORITY" SENATOR—THE UPSET HE CREATES

WASHINGTON, D. C.—The good farmer never lets his livestock breed run down. The prices the livestock growers will pay for the exceptional animal needed to build up their flocks and herds forever make us stare.

New blood, better blood to build more milk or beef or mutton or eggs—this is a farmer's must.

Congress distributes its powers by seniority. Where the baseball manager sends his sore-armed pitchers to the minors, Congress promotes its ancients to ever-increasing authority. The younger Members are ordered to the rear. The ancients occupy the committee thrones.

The cynical call it the system of senility.

Congress, overburdened with increasing work, has lost favor with the people. They voted in 1948 against the Eightieth Congress. They are as likely this 1950 to vote against the Eighty-first. Do they grow weary of the ancients dominating there? Congress, like the farmers' herds, needs new blood.

PAUL HOWARD DOUGLAS was born in Salem, Mass. (old witch-hunting town), in 1892. That makes him now 58. He graduated from Bowdoin College, in Maine. He studied at Columbia and at Harvard to make the highbrow that was to be.

He became a teacher of economics—Reed, Illinois, Washington, Amherst, Chicago U. Highbrow? The world round was also a book to read. Behold him a Chicago alderman. Came the late war. He enlisted in the marines, rising to a captaincy and emerging alive but with a crippled arm.

The books rolled from his pen, books showing immersion in modern economic problems—wages, apprenticeship, the worker in the modern age, controlling depressions and on and on and on.

In the Senate the other day the pork barrel was rolling prosperously along.

The pork barrel is a revered institution among the Congressmen. The statesmen gather round with their appeals to Santa Claus. The process is simple: You vote the money for my locality and I'll vote for yours. It is called logrolling.

The pork barrel is the piled-up spendings which the process makes.

Many of the appropriations are justified. To get the good ones through, it is necessary to include many not so good.

This latest pork barrel was rolling gaily along when a tall back-seat Senator with a shaggy mane stood up. "Halt," he cried.

The consternation was like that when Oliver, in Dickens' story, asked for more. Only here was someone asking less.

By some strange chance this Chicago alderman, this highbrow scholar who had written books and fought as a captain of marines had wormed his way into the Senate of the United States.

It was one of the amazements of the amazing 1948 election year: the Illinois that had sent to Washington Senator Curly Brooks had given a blazing majority to PAUL DOUGLAS for Senator. (Strange, the divagations of our States in the choosing of Senators. The Nebraska that gave George Norris to his country presents KENNETH WHERRY now. The North Carolina of the ineffable "Fish Eggs" Reynolds blesses us with FRANK GRAHAM now. And Wisconsin. It was "Fighting Bob" La Follette 30 years ago; it is "Jumping JOE" MCCARTHY now.)

There stood the stranger Senator from Illinois calling halt to the rolling barrel.

New blood, clearly, had descended upon the seniority-ruled Senate of the United States.

How do you stay in the United States Senate long enough to grow powerful by grace of seniority? There are various ways.

Some Senators have so succeeded by the sheer greatness of their minds and hearts.

Such greatness is sadly rare. More have succeeded by two particular devices. First, talk economy, then pack the pork barrel well with public money for the local elements. (Santa Claus did not begin with WPA. He had radiated the pork barrel for decades before social security.) This combination of waste and economy is often unbeatable.

The freshman Senator from Illinois, calling a halt on the rolling pork barrel, was striking at the very thrones of many a seniority Senator.

Did he succeed? Of course not. The barrel rolled right on over him, 50 Senators to 16. But on it, as it rolled, there were blood spots that would not out—the new blood that had found its way into the Senate from, of all States, hard-boiled, big-bossed Illinois.

There came another Senate day. It wasn't the barrel rolling now, but a steam roller on its way. Mighty hands, well backed by seniority, were pushing the Kerr bill, the gas bill, through.

Down the Senate aisles came this same tall Senator with the greying, bushy hair, with a trail of charts following him. He set his charts where all the world, not only the Senate, could see. They showed what the Senator held the bill would cost the people of America.

For hours he fought there. Did he win?

The machine rolled right on over him.

Again the blood spots—the new blood the people of Illinois supplied. The country saw. The President vetoed the bill. The shocking economist from Illinois went on to his war on the basing point, instrument, he says, of monopoly.

A radical? This new blood is conservative as a farmer on his paid-for farm. He is for competition in industry. Coal? He is stumped. Competition there has seemed to fail; but he wants no more government control of prices than cannot be escaped. The farmers cannot be left to fail, but that problem is yet to solve.

No socialist here, this easy old shoe of a Senator, but just a Democrat (little d). No better new blood, the press galleries say—and who has more chance to know?—has impinged on the seniority Senate in many years.

Why Have a Loyalty Program?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 28, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in this land of liberty and freedom why should it be necessary for the President to establish loyalty boards to inquire into the patriotism of some Government workers? That is the theme in an article today by George Sokolsky appearing in the Times-Herald. I commend it to the attention of every Member and I include it at this point in the RECORD:

THESE DAYS

(By George Sokolsky)

In recent months, we have been moving into a pair of hysterias. One is the war hysteria, which is very bad indeed. This started when it was discovered that Klaus Fuchs had been stealing our atomic secrets since 1942 and we did not know it.

The other is the hysteria of distrust arising out of the Hiss trials. While we should ferret out every traitor and spy, there is no need to get hysterical about it. Actually it should be an ordinary police job.

About all this, the question arises: Why should there be a loyalty program? Why should there be a need for a loyalty program? Why should there even be a suspicion that American officials might be disloyal? Is it not shocking that this country should feel called upon to appoint a loyalty board to investigate its own employees?

In the mesh of accusation and defense, is that not really the question that should be asked? For what has happened to us, to our children, that loyalty is not taken for granted, and correctly taken for granted?

President Truman made a speech on the loyalty program which he instituted 3 years ago. Then he repeated, 3 years ago. When he instituted that program, did he ask himself or his advisers: What corrupting virus has eaten into the hearts of our people that their government needs to worry about the loyalty of those employed in the government? His institution of that program was a tacit admission of its need.

The President appealed to the people to notify the FBI or the Department of Justice if they have evidence of disloyalty.

Well, Whittaker Chambers in 1939 brought his case to the office of the President of the United States when he spoke to Marvin McIntyre, who relayed him to Adolf A. Berle Jr. From 1939 to 1948, that story lay dormant.

Then the House committee on un-American activities revived it. Were it not for Congressman NIXON, of California, nothing would have come of the Whittaker Chambers charges against Alger Hiss. NIXON pushed that one and deserves the credit for it.

The President himself called the Hiss case a "red herring." Chambers was violently abused. NIXON persisted. Finally, when the pumpkin papers came on the scene, the Department of Justice prosecuted Hiss and won a verdict.

But it took nearly 10 years after the first charges for the case to be brought.

Similarly the Amerasia case has been dormant from 1945 to today when it is being reopened by a congressional committee.

The spying thief, Arthur Adams, ran about this country, trailed by the FBI and newspaper reporters. He was almost an open spy, so many persons were trailing him and trailing his trailers.

But Arthur Adams got away.

I can mention other cases, but you must be as weary of the repetition as I am. What I ask is a fundamental question that must some day be answered: How did it happen?

Until that question is fully answered, the people will remain suspicious. The President, in his speech, made the point that some of the loyalty charges are political in nature, aimed at the 1950 and 1952 elections. I suppose there is truth in that, just as his defense was obviously of a political nature. Unfortunately, politics gets into everything.

But that is really not significant. It dodges the central issue, which is: what has happened in our land that any persons, even 10, even 3, even 1, can serve in vital agencies of Government and be disloyal to the United States?

The President also made the point, in effect, that all disloyal persons in Government employ have been found and have been dismissed. The President cannot know

that to be true nor can anyone else. Would not anyone have said, at any time before all the fuss was made, that there were no disloyal persons in our Government?

And how do we define loyalty? Let us try a simple definition:

Any American whose relations, connections, partisanships, or associations impels him, whether out of conviction or for base reasons, to serve the interests of another country, ought not to be regarded as loyal to the United States for purposes of holding public office.

That yardstick could, with safety, be universally applied.

Report on Program for Flood Control and Related Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 28 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, recently our distinguished Chief of the Corps of Army Engineers, Maj. Gen. Lewis A. Pick, delivered an able report on the program for flood control and related work of the Federal Government at the annual meeting of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY MAJ. GEN. LEWIS A. PICK, CHIEF OF ENGINEERS, BEFORE THE NATIONAL RIVERS AND HARBORS CONGRESS, WASHINGTON, D. C., MARCH 24, 1950

One year ago I had the privilege of addressing you. The occasion was one of my first public appearances after becoming Chief of Engineers. In the 12 months that have elapsed since that date, my duties have called for appearances and addresses before many groups in many different cities.

On all these occasions, I have stressed the same basic theme: land and water. Where properly developed, conserved, and used, these essential resources form the basis for continuing and prosperous civilizations. Where neglected, they lead inevitably to disaster. And if the neglect is persisted in, to inevitable extinction. Such has been the history of past civilizations.

Today, my theme is the same; for the state of our national development and the times in which we live, make our land and water and their conservation and maximum utilization of far-reaching importance.

They are important in the maintenance and progressive development of our economy. And they are important in assuring that our economy will be able to perform its vital share in the carrying out of America's policy of seeking a lasting and untroubled world peace.

This is a goal which the National Rivers and Harbors Congress has long advocated. It is a goal which I am pleased to know you are continuing to foster with undiminished vigor. It is a goal worthy of the best efforts of all of us.

Before amplifying further on this favorite theme of mine—and yours—I should like to make just a few brief observations on the current operations of the Corps of Engineers. They are, of course, an integral part of the over-all land and water program of the Nation.

It is gratifying that the postwar resumption of Federal river and harbor improvements and flood-control work has been expanded year by year. The program is now the largest single Federal public works activity.

Current appropriations for this program are the highest in our history. Congress voted $635,500,000 for civil works of the Corps of Engineers in fiscal year 1950. The larger share is for flood control. River and harbor improvements receive $198,000,000.

As you will recall, there was considerable discussion in Congress last year concerning unobligated balances. I should like to report that we now have worked out a realistic program for fiscal year 1950—a program that will require the obligation of all available funds by the end of this fiscal year.

Eighty-one percent of the total 1950 appropriation is being devoted to construction work. These construction funds are for 258 projects, located in a majority of the States, the District of Columbia, and Alaska.

The objectives we seek require investment of sizable public funds. Consequently a considerable part of our work is devoted to the preparation and furnishing of studies necessary under the procedure which leads to the appropriation of public funds. The appropriations are not regarded as ends within themselves, however, but as necessary means to achieve the desired end results. Our function is to translate these annual appropriations into completed, functioning projects, providing their benefits for the Nation.

In this effort we are making progress. The river and harbor program—which was begun by Congress under the Corps of Engineers in 1824—has gradually expanded, until today there are more than 27,000 miles of improved channels, 400 locks and dams, and more than 200 harbors completed and actively maintained. These completed projects exceed similar improvements anywhere else in the world. They are an important segment of the national transportation system. They have helped to make possible the current all-time high marks being recorded in the Nation's water-borne commerce. They are an essential element in American security.

Flood control is a more recent activity of the Federal Government. But here also we are making great progress. No major flood has blighted the lower Mississippi River Valley since the initiation in 1928 of the Federal project there. This project, now about 60 percent complete, has already yielded benefits aggregating nearly $5,000,000,000—or about eight times the project's cost to date.

In the general flood-control program, initiated in 1936, the Corps of Engineers has placed in operation approximately 200 local protection projects and more than 60 reservoir projects. In the short time these projects have been completed, they have prevented flood damages far exceeding their total cost. And they will continue for many years to provide protection to property and prevent loss of human life.

In accordance with national policy, Corps of Engineer dams and reservoirs are, wherever feasible, designed and constructed as multiple-purpose projects. At many of them hydroelectric power is being developed. In the current fiscal year power production has been initiated at the Allatoona project, Georgia, and existing facilities have been expanded at the Norfork project, on the Arkansas-Missouri line, and at the Denison project, on the Texas-Oklahoma line. Power production will be initiated shortly at the Narrows project, in Arkansas. These facilities, together with others scheduled to come into production, will help in meeting the Nation's pressing need of more electric power.

Our reservoirs also provide other benefits which, although incidental, are none the less real. The American people are making increasing use of our completed reservoirs for recreational purposes. Water also is being stored at many of them for municipal and industrial purposes, to supplement existing inadequate normal supplies. Where feasible our reservoirs are storing water for use in irrigation projects. Fish and wildlife facilities are being promoted. Pollution abatement is being helped.

Yes, these projects serve a wide range of beneficial purposes. They are steadily being supplemented by other projects, and there will be a much greater contribution to the national welfare when the presently authorized program is completed.

Of course, work of this type can never be completed fully, as long as America continues to grow. To meet the continuing needs, we are constantly conducting investigations of proposed new improvements, and sending our recommendation to Congress. At the present time, the House has passed, and the Senate has before it, a new omnibus bill. This bill—in its present form—authorizes new flood-control and river and harbor projects which, in our studied opinion, are needed under any comprehensive program.

Other Federal agencies have extensive studies and plans that are a part of the over-all Federal program to develop, conserve and effectively use the Nation's land and water resources. Together with the program of the Corps of Engineers, they represent a splendid start in our efforts to use America's land and water resources to the very best advantage.

But it is only a start.

For this is an industrial Nation. It is a Nation in which we deal in big things. We haul increasingly large cargoes, and to meet the demand for increased transportation facilities, we have had to go back to the rivers. We have gone back to the waterways, and their development to permit use of larger and larger tows which, under modern engineering methods, have made significant changes in the whole economic structure of the country. There are many channels today reaching far into the country upon which deep-draft carriers move to ports where industrial processing of the cargoes takes place. In fact, with more and more development of our navigational structure we will approach the most economical balance between all forms of transportation, and hence the most economical business structure possible.

In the early history of our country the harbors along our coast were adequate to meet the needs of the day. But our Nation progressed; and we progressed as a people, our demands and needs for improved equipment increased. Fortunately, the American people had vision. Fortunately, there were people who—as have you—had the vision to see a future that was possible through basic improvements of the country's natural resources. They had the vision to appreciate the importance of a sound plan of major harbor improvements, and they had the sound business sense to know that the development of these harbors was a national responsibility. Consequently, for a century and a quarter the Corps of Engineers has been charged with the responsibility of providing this country with a system of harbors adequate to the needs which spring from the progress of a growing nation.

Today, the United States—and civic-minded leaders such as your active group—can take justified pride in our harbors—more than 200 of the finest harbors in the world.

Our system of harbors is, in my opinion, among the greatest assets that the people of the United States possess. And these harbors are here to stay. Yet, they are necessarily going through a continuous change. For example, when I was assigned to the New Orleans district in 1925, the average draft of the oceangoing vessels at that time was 25 feet. Yet, in the relatively short period

of time since then, the average draft of ships that come into our harbors has increased to 28 feet. Think of the enormous amount of tonnage added to our shipping by the deeper draft.

Today, we are improving channels at strategic points throughout our coastline. Today, we are talking in terms of 36, or 40, or 45 feet as required by traffic demands. In the future, I might predict, we will be required to provide up to 50 feet. The thing to do—and the thing we are doing—is to make our navigation channels deep enough and wide enough, and to have them ready when we need them most.

The United States has become known the world over as a great building nation. Yet we know that only the framework has been laid to date for the real building of America. This great country of ours, the greatest agricultural and industrial country in the world, is only on the verge of the greatest building era ever known. But we must build solidly. We must build on two basic potentials—water and soil. With these two potentials protected, controlled, developed, and put to work for the benefit of all the people—and for the benefit of making—we have a solid foundation for uninterrupted national growth.

If properly taken care of, our soil and water will never be used up. There are areas in the world today where people have been farming land for more than a thousand years, and that land is still good because they have taken proper care of it. Yet there are other areas in this world—vast areas—where the people once developed great nations and a great culture. But they forgot the soil and the water. And in these areas today there is nothing but sand and waste.

Unfortunately, all of these areas are not in distant lands. For there are today areas in the United States that have already been changed from agricultural areas into waste lands. Areas where the land once was fertile and good, but was badly treated. It gullied; it washed away; and once land washes away it is a difficult and costly job—and sometimes an impossible one—to restore it. We must stop this needless, heedless waste.

The other great natural resource on which we must build is water.

Our water in the United States is limited. It is becoming daily more evident that in some areas there is too little. In other sections, water has become a great destructive force because we have built our cities on the rivers, and our great farming industry is in the fertile valleys of our streams.

An example in the great Missouri River basin which Thomas Jefferson, as President of the United States, had purchased for $15,000,000. Today along the Missouri River there is more than a billion dollars' worth of industrial development scattered from St. Charles in Missouri through Kansas, Nebraska, Iowa, the Dakotas, and on into Montana. And this billion-dollar development is right on the banks of the river because the river afforded the early settlers and the later industrialists essential transportation and water power.

To conserve our water resources and to safeguard great industrial developments, the Congress of the United States in 1936 passed the first National Flood Control Act. This legislation can, in my opinion, go down in history as one of the most progressive steps in the building of this country. This act, together with subsequent legislation, provided sufficient authority for us to do everything necessary to control, to conserve, and to put our water resources to work for the American people. Today, as I have said, flood hazards are being eliminated and water is being put to its multiple uses in almost every river basin in the United States.

Simultaneous with controlling floods, we are today increasing and making more efficient the American network of inland waterways. No group knows better than do you that these waterways are essential to our transportation system and to our industrial and agricultural way of life.

We must transport raw products, minerals, and other materials to the great processing centers which lie inland from the coast. And we must transport the finished products of these great industrial centers to our own markets and to the seacoast for transportation to markets of the world. We urgently need all the transportation facilities possible to obtain. We need the railroads, the highways, the air lanes. And we urgently need, too, the slower-moving water-transportation routes which carry great bulk shipments at low cost.

We also must have the proper facilities in this country to distribute our agricultural produce—as well as our industrial products—so that the people can maintain the highest possible standard of living. I have seen famine in India because there was no means of distributing food. I have seen people die in India by the thousands from starvation, while in the adjoining provinces there was plenty of food. But it couldn't be transported.

But here I should like to remind you of the additional benefits which can be—and are being—achieved through well-planned navigation and flood control work. In controlling water, we impound it in the areas where it can be economically captured and stored in great reservoirs—and put it to work.

Our modern society requires a tremendous amount of water. There has been an amazing increase in our per capita consumption. The new uses required by new industries take enormous amounts of water. Personally, I was amazed at how much water it takes to run an air-conditioning machine—and we have just begun to develop and use air-cooling devices.

I am often asked, "What is the outlook for this country?", and I always reply that the outlook for this country is just what we make it. If we have foresight; if we conserve and protect the land; if we develop and utilize our water resources, this Nation can go forward to a high destiny that I doubt any of us here today can envision.

However, there will come a time when certain minerals necessary to our industrial progress will be depleted and we will be forced to bring them in from other sources in the world. So long as we have our harbors; so long as we have our inland waterways for low-cost bulk transportation we can do this without detriment. But if the time ever comes when this Nation is called upon to import not only the raw materials for manufacture, but also the food to supply our expanding population, then we will have become a decadent nation.

Let us continue to build for the future—let us continue to build solidly and soundly by conserving and developing, and by the proper and wise utilization of our two greatest potentials—soil and water.

Whitewash Incorporated?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 28 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in the Indianapolis Star on Thursday, April 27, 1950. It is entitled "Whitewash Incorporated?"

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHITEWASH INCORPORATED?

[From the Indianapolis Star of April 27, 1950]

Two reporters who covered the Alger Hiss case have written a factual history of the affair entitled "Seeds of Treason." It gives a graphic account of the tribulations of Whittaker Chambers, the accuser. Chambers first was ignored, then reviled and virtually subjected to trial himself before truth was established.

The same sort of thing is going on now as Senator JOSEPH MCCARTHY seeks to prove his charges of Communist influences in the State Department. He has been refused any sort of cooperation from the administration. He has been personally abused by the President in terms rarely used by Presidents. He has become the target of every Communist, pro-Communist, and parlor pink in America. He has been hamstrung at every turn by the very committee which is supposed to be investigating his charges.

A new low was reached Tuesday when the Senate committee barred Mr. MCCARTHY from hearing his own witness, Louis F. Budenz, testify in secret. What's going on here anyhow? JOE MCCARTHY is a United States Senator, isn't he? His charges are supposedly being checked by fellow United States Senators, aren't they? Why then should he be subjected to such high-handed treatment as this?

Such tactics lend support to the fiery charges of Senator WILLIAM E. JENNER, of Indiana, that the Red probe is being directed by "Whitewash Incorporated" and that Mr. MCCARTHY is being forced to do the job the committee should be doing.

JOE MCCARTHY has made some seemingly wild-swinging charges. They should be easy to disprove—if they are untrue. But the Truman administration is not going to prove anything by pulling every dirty trick in the book to prevent the truth from emerging. That's the way they tried to shut up Whittaker Chambers.

Spiritual Aspects of Our Democratic Faith—Easter Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 28 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues the commentary of an illustrious radio commentator, Mr. Charles Collingwood of Columbia Broadcasting System. His Easter message served to inspire and challenge me. It set forth in clear and unequivocal terms the problem that faces our Nation. The emphasis upon the spiritual aspects of our democratic faith should evoke a renewed declaration of our firm determination to maintain at all costs the principles of liberty and the dignity of man.

I ask unanimous consent to have my remarks and the commentary of Mr. Collingwood printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the message was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(By Charles Collingwood, Columbia Broadcating System commentator, April 9, 1950)

Today is Easter, a day held by learned theologians to be the principal festival of the Christian year. The holiday of Easter goes back a long way. Its English name is a survival from dim Teutonic mythology. Its French name, Paques, comes from the Hebrew word for Passover, and, indeed, the Christian festival is a continuation of the more ancient Jewish Passover, the celebration of the liberation of the Jews from the Egyptians; and that, if one cared to, could be traced still further back, for, as long as man has been able to distinguish the seasons, he has devoted special attention to the coming of spring and he has clothed that event with happy symbolism. When the winter has gone and the time of the singing of birds is come and the voice of the turtle is abroad in our land, men have always looked at the world with new eyes. Easter is a time when things are getting better. The earth gives visible evidence of that. It's a time of hope. It's a perpetually renewed assurance that things will get better.

The world has never stood more in need of that assurance than it does this Easter, or so it seems to us. The world is old, and there must have been many other Easters when it seemed that man was sore beset, and the wisest could not be sure how it would all end. But to any generation it usually appears that its own time is the climatic one, where all the forces of history have converged to enforce a special peril. Still, we who are living through this present period have unprecedented reasons for the conviction that we face a more deadly challenge than those who came before us. We have perfected what the scientists tell us is an instrumentality quite capable of destroying humanity. Man, as a form of life, possesses the means of his own suicide. This has never been true before. It would have been a long, messy business to kill ourselves, all of us, by the means we used to command and men would soon have sickened of the attempt. But the thing about the atom bomb is its neatness and dispatch, with no particular trouble we could apparently turn the whole world into one great, relatively efficient gas chamber. And the frightening thing is that now we have this instrument of suicide, we are not at all sure that we are fit to be trusted with it. There is just a chance that we may be foolish enough or ignorant enough or rash enough to use it. That is the measure of the danger that faces us this Easter, and why we may be pardoned for thinking that our contemporary predicament is more fearsome than any the world has ever faced.

And so the old, old Easter message of hope, the promise that things will get better, has a special poignancy for us this year. But where is the hope, and how are things to get better. This Easter season I have been hearing and reading what the men of God have to say on this, for Easter is important to them, and they have meditated much on its meaning. They have said much, and much is well said. Cardinal Spellman broadcast a message to the people who live behind the iron curtain. He told them that the message of America is the same as the message of Easter: "With its triumph of life over death, equity over injustice, glory over shame—the spirit of Easter, with its promise of renewed hope, renewed faith, and renewed life." The presiding bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church, Bishop Sherrill, said "remembering the heroism and self-sacrifice of Calvary, Christians will view our distraught and fearful world with open eyes, and then strive to do something about it." The columnist, Marquis Childs, has quoted a sermon by Bishop Angus Dun in Washington Cathedral. Bishop Dun said, "We shall pray that America may be strong, strong in arm and strong in courage. Let us still more pray that America may enter into the blessedness of the peacemakers. That," said Bishop Dun, "can only be if we are delivered from our infantile egotisms, our delusions of superiority, from the love of ease and softness. We live in a dark time," he said, "but not as men without hope. 'Earth might be fair,' yes, even now, it might be fair."

I have quoted at such length from these three churchmen, because it seemed to me that they were all saying much the same thing, making a point that may well bear repeating this Easter day. And that is this: that dark as are these times, the message of Easter is still valid. There is hope. Things can get better, but not through an easy miracle. The hope of better things, say the churchmen, depends on us. We must view our distraught and fearful world with open eyes, says Bishop Sherrill, and then strive to do something about it. It is not going to be easy, says Bishop Dun, we must be delivered from our infantile egotisms, from the love of ease and softness.

It is up to us, it seems to me, these men of God are saying. There is hope today, as there has always been, but it depends on us whether that hope is to be realized, and it will take work and sacrifice and patience and understanding to realize it.

It would have been easy for these religious leaders to have taken a different line and to have said: "Don't worry, it's all going to come out all right; the hope of peace that is so much a part of Easter will be realized. All will be well." But they didn't. What they said, in effect, is that there will only be peace if we deserve it, and the peace we get is the peace we deserve.

This, in a way, is the same message our secular leaders have been hammering home of late. Secretary of State Acheson has been trying to get his voice heard above the clamor of advice and denunciation to say that the end of the cold war isn't just going to happen—it will have to be worked for, and it won't be easy. That's never a popular thing to say, and maybe the churchmen have a better chance of getting heard than the politicians. People would always rather hear that there is some simple, cheap, and immediate solution to our problems. They would like to hear that we have nothing to worry about because we have the biggest and best atomic bombs to protect us, or that we'll always come out on top because we are so much more inventive, ingenious, and industrious than other people, or that everything will be solved if we get the Communists and fellow travelers out of the Government, or it would all fixed up if Harry Truman and Joe Stalin would only sit down together, or that Joe Stalin is getting old, and if we can get by until he dies then Russia will be so absorbed in the resultant struggle for power she won't bother us any more, or any number of other comforting propositions, people would rather hear, would rather hear than the grim and challenging doctrine that there aren't going to be any miracles, or any simple solutions, and that if we get ourselves out of this mess it will only be by stripping away our delusions and working as hard as we can to bring about the kind of world that's safe to live in.

But there are voices raised this Easter for a return to that toughness of spirit and that militant and positive affirmation of our spiritual beliefs that have always been a part of the Easter message. I say spiritual beliefs, I don't mean religious doctrine. I mean the belief in the triumph of life over death, equity over injustice, glory over shame, of which Cardinal Spellman spoke. Those are spiritual beliefs. They are the spiritual content of the way of life we are seeking to defend. They are the reason we want to win the cold war. Ultimately they are the reason we don't think we could possibly live under the system we are fighting.

Now we live in a time when the old values seem less certain than they did. We live in a time in which the dominant note is anxiety. The stakes are so much higher than they have ever been, the dangers so much greater, and we ourselves are so much less sure of ourselves and of the things we live by. Out of our uncertainty and fear has come distrust of each other. This McCarthy business, which I wasn't going to talk about, is not an isolated nor an accidental phenomenon. It is a symptom of our distrust of each other. It is something else, too. It is a symptom of our instinctive desire to find an easy way. If we could only blame all our troubles on the Communists, then how simple the solution—just get rid of the Communists.

But, as Easter comes again, and the earth gets green with the promise that things will get better, and the birds sing and the churches fill, and the Federal Reserve Board statistics show that people bought as many new clothes as they did last Easter (which may also be taken as a sign of faith). There are voices raised in the churches as they have been raised outside to say that it still depends on us, as it always has. That we will not be delivered from our troubles by miracles, but by our own efforts. That there isn't any easy way, and no point in kidding ourselves that there is. As Bishop Sherrill said, we must view our distraught and fearful world with open eyes, and strive to do something about it. And we must renew our belief—not in any particular religion—but in the broad, underlying principles which sustain our way of life. As John Stuart Mill once said: "One person with a belief is a power equal to 99 others who have only interests." Easter, with all the layers of meaning with which we have invested it, is as good a time as any to take a look and see whether we are really approaching our problems in this spirit.

France—A Case Study in Marshall-Plan Recovery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 28, 1950

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following splendid address of Barry Bingham at the recent meeting of the American Society of Newspaper Editors:

FRANCE—A CASE STUDY IN MARSHALL-PLAN RECOVERY

(Address of Barry Bingham, Chief ECA Special Mission to France, before the American Society of Newspaper Editors, Washington, D. C., April 22, 1950)

The Marshall plan has been operating in Europe for 2 years. I want to give you some indication of the progress made in that period and the problems we now face. I am going to talk mostly about France for two reasons: it is the country whose record I know best after nearly a year as head of the ECA mission there; and it is easier, I believe, to report this tremendous story in terms of one nation. Practically everything I say about France can be applied in a general sense to the 16 other Marshall-plan countries. They vary tremen-

dously, but they suffered from a common illness after the war's end and they have responded heartingly to one major form of treatment.

To measure success, it is necessary to identify the exact purpose of our effort. Just what are we trying to accomplish in France? Many people give a simple answer: We are trying to stop communism. That answer to me is much too limited and much too negative. General Marshall, in his celebrated Harvard address in 1947, did not call for a crusade against communism. What he proposed was this, in his own words: "It is logical that the United States should do whatever it is able to do to assist in the return of normal economic health in the world, without which there can be no political stability and no assured peace. Our policy is directed not against any country or doctrine, but against hunger, poverty, desperation and chaos."

This is the way I see our goal: to help make France once more a stable, prosperous, independent nation. This is no negative or limited objective. We are not aiding France's recovery simply because we Americans want to limit the power of communism. We are helping French people to make their own country strong again, a campaign in which every loyal Frenchman can share. Of course, as everybody knows, a country where people have food and work and hope for the future is a country where communism loses its power. That is the inevitable result of French recovery. But the primary purpose is to make France strong. If we succeed, we will thereby make communism weaker, but the job of helping France get back on her feet would be well worth doing if communism did not exist or if Soviet Russia were a friendly state.

After World War I, America willingly spent money to feed Belgian children, as an act of simple charity. The job we have tackled after World War II starts from that point and spreads out to far wider horizons. We fed people in western Europe in the first year of the Marshall plan, because they had to eat and gain strength for their giant effort of recovery. But that stage is long past in the rapid drive in France. Now the ECA dollars are used to revive the agriculture and industry of the nation, so that Frenchmen can earn their own way once more in the world.

Here is what we have spent in France: Nearly a billion dollars the first year of ECA; nearly seven hundred million the second year; for the third year we have asked Congress to appropriate five hundred millions for France. Look at the downward rate of those figures: a billion, seven hundred million, five hundred million. That tells the story of progress under the program in France. Each year the nation gains more strength and more ability to cover its own dollar needs. For the last Marshall-plan year we will probably ask about three hundred and fifty millions for France.

Every dollar that America has given to France has been matched by the French people with an equivalent sum in francs. All these francs have been placed in the bank in a separate fund called the counterpart fund. That money can only be spent by the joint agreement of ECA and the French Government.

Here we have two big piles of money, then, to expend for French recovery, a dollar pile and a franc pile. How have we spent them? Well, we did not go into France with a plan designed in America which might not have applied at all to French conditions. The French had a basic program for reconstruction and investment, designed by Frenchmen for the needs of their own country. The Monnet plan was devised back in 1946 by some of France's ablest financial brains, as the most effective and economical way to buy recovery. It is the plan the French adopted and started to carry out after the war. They strained their resources to the utmost. They liquidated some $2,000,000,000 in foreign assets. The plan looked good, but the money began to run out. By the winter of 1947 French industry was gasping for raw materials, unemployment was spreading, misery and hopelessness gripped the nation. In such a situation liberty and free institutions are always marked for the first victims.

Then the Marshall plan started in April 1948. American technicians began a searching study of France's economy in all its aspects, and that study continues every day as the program develops. Money was pumped into the economic bloodstream of France, just as plasma is pumped into the veins of a desperately ill patient. Pretty soon health and vigor began to return. The patient is now on his feet and working hard for his own recovery. We are not going to send France a bill for the cure. We are donating our services, which no other nation in the world could have given. Our reward will be a strong and stable ally on the democratic side of the world.

The dollar cure has been administered in this way: At first, large sums were spent for wheat, fats, and other food products, to restore the energies of the French people. During the past year, however, almost all the dollar funds have gone for these purchases: Machinery for French industry, to modernize production and lower costs; equipment for French agriculture, to mechanize the farms, to increase the crop yields and enable the nation to feed itself; raw materials, notably cotton, petroleum, and nonferrous metals, along with hundreds of other needed items. It is interesting to note that of all these Marshall-plan dollars spent, 75 percent have been spent directly in the United States and another 12 percent in Canada and other countries of North and South America. All the dollars spent under the Marshall plan flow back eventually to the United States. Any country which receives payment for its products in dollars turns around and spends those dollars here in the United States, for every nation in the world has dollar needs beyond its dollar resources.

Along with the dollar cure has gone the franc cure, the careful use of the counterpart fund to buy a permanent recovery. The largest share of counterpart has gone to the production of electrical energy. Shortage of electric power had long been a serious bottleneck in French industry. Many plants closed down for portions of each year when power was short, throwing thousands of people out of work. The use of counterpart funds under the Marshall plan gave France an opportunity to tackle this problem on a really big scale. Giant dams on France's waterways and thermal plants at the mouths of coal mines have already increased the nation's supply of electrical energy by 50 percent. By 1952 it will show an increase of more than 100 percent over the prewar level. Think what that means. When you more than double the electric power a nation has at its disposal, you add great new wealth for the whole future.

A lot of counterpart has been used to restore the railroad system of France. Some very skillful pilots of our Eighth and Ninth Air Forces had made that system a primary target in the last year of the war. They did a thorough job. Practically every important station, marshalling yard, junction point, and railway trestle in France was knocked down by either the Germans in 1940 or by ourselves and the British in 1943 and 1944. A modern country without a working system of communications cannot survive. The French have built nearly all of theirs back. In the process of bombing which France took in turn from both sides in the war, 1 building in every 22 was totally demolished. That job of restoration is slower, but the French are spending the franc equivalent of $350,000,000 on housing this year, 22 percent of their investment budget.

The coal mines have been restored and modernized by counterpart. This year French coal production beat every previous year except 1929.

A nation's financial affairs are not usually dramatic. There is real drama, however, in what has happened to the French franc in the last 2 years. The franc was desperately weak at the begining of the Marshall-plan period, and it continued to sink through the time of the Communist-dictated coal strikes in the fall of 1948. There was a time when the black-market rate on dollars in Paris was 70 percent above the legal rate. Then the franc began to strengthen. Today the currency black marketeers are out of a job, for they cannot offer a rate that beats the official exchange.

Only people who have lived in Europe can know the danger of a runaway inflation. They have seen currencies debased to the point where it takes a wheelbarrowload of money to buy a loaf of bread. Such a ruinous inflation threatened France at the start of ECA. Each year since the end of the war, wholesale prices have jumped 50 percent or more over the preceding year. Then the Marshall plan took hold. In 1949, wholesale prices in France rose only 1 percent over 1948. You should see that one on a graph. The line shoots upward as though it were going through the roof. Then suddenly, about December 1948, it levels off and does no more climbing.

As conditions grew stable again in France, it was possible to end all rationing. The last ration tickets were torn up at the end of 1949. I was interested to note that the 2,000 people who were dismissed from the ration board offices as they closed their doors were transferred to the tax-collection system, to improve the collection record.

I hate to use a lot of figures in a speech. They have a kind of soporific effect on audiences, the same effect lettuce leaves are said to have on rabbits. I'll risk only a very few more figures, and I'll cut those off when I see people nodding in the back row. But here is one I must give you: Industrial production in France is now running 30 percent ahead of 1938. In agriculture, the French are almost back to prewar production, which means that they are very nearly self-sustaining on food products. They increased their exports to other countries by 40 percent in the year 1949. In the same year they sold more to every trading area in the world than they bought, with the great exception of the dollar area.

None of these accomplishments could have been achieved without the aid of America through ECA. But it takes more than dollars to produce such a result, just as it takes more than medicine to cure a sick patient. We could have poured 10 times as much money as we have poured into France without buying an ounce of genuine recovery. The French could have used it to make temporary improvements in the standard of living, which would have been politically popular with a lot of French people, but 1952 would have come and the bubble would have burst. Instead, the French have persisted in using their ECA resources to make permanent gains in the productive capacity of the Nation. No; this job has not been done the easy way. Recovery has been bought for the full value of every dollar and franc. ECA has insisted on that kind of expenditure, but the French themselves have never deviated from such a purpose.

Many Americans who come over to France ask me if the French are really working to help themselves. They see Paris night clubs, some expensive restaurants and hotels, and a way of life that entails a certain amount of sitting in the sun at sidewalk-cafe tables. That is about all I had ever seen of France

until I went to work there last June. I had a good many notions shared by most American tourists, and I have had to go through the painful process of divesting myself of some easy prejudices about France. The French Nation simply cannot be judged from the Ritz Bar in Paris. I find that French people do say "Ou-la-la," as they always do in American novels and movies. But they also, as a Nation, pay rather heavy taxes, which comes as a shock and surprise to most Americans. The French put up 30 percent of their national income in taxes this year, as against 23 percent in the United States. I still think their tax structure is unjust because it falls too heavily on certain groups of people and too lightly on others, including farmers and small shopkeepers. But I can only argue now for a more equitable distribution of the tax load and better collections in France—not for higher over-all taxes.

Getting back to tourists, my advice to them is always to get out in the country and see what the French are doing for themselves. Almost every town and village is alive with activity, even the ones like St. Lo which were knocked flat during the war. About 120,000 tractors are at work in French fields, where only 25,000 could be found in 1945. The ports of France are dramatic exhibits of recovery. Harbor installations were 70 percent destroyed during World War II. Today the French ports are completely restored and handling 10 percent more traffic than they could take care of in 1938. That job has been done by the French with French francs. The dollar aid has amounted to less than half a million, all for some port equipment at Marseilles.

I have painted an optimistic picture of France. I can't paint it any other way when I know what I do of the results achieved in 2 years. However, there are some very dark spots on the canvas. One of the most serious is a continued political instability. No French Government these days has the solid support of the nation. Every Government move must be made cautiously, as an acrobat slides along a tightrope, when what is needed is bold and sweeping action. The fiscal policies of France need a major adjustment. French industry requires an entirely new approach, not an abandonment of self-interest, which is impossible, but a realization that enlightened self-interest demands these two basic changes: giving the workers a better share of profits, and exposing French industry to the healthy fresh air of competition.

These problems I have mentioned will be terribly hard to solve. There will only be a chance of working them out in a climate of national confidence. We wrestled with fear in the first year of the Marshall plan in France, and we still know that fear is our strongest adversary—fear of another war, fear of unemployment and starvation, fear of American withdrawal from the ramparts of western Europe, where the fires of the Kremlin camp can always be seen burning.

So terribly much depends on us here in America. We have done a generous and a highly intelligent job in financing an unprecedented program of aid such as the Marshall plan. We can count many solid and satisfying results. Of course, we will never know exactly what evil events we avoided by making this effort. It is practically certain, however, that we forestalled a Communist political victory in Italy and France. Think what that would have meant. Without the loss of a single Soviet soldier, without a declaration of war or the dropping of a bomb, Moscow would have spread its control to the Atlantic Ocean. Our military forces in Germany and Austria would have been totally surrounded. What a cheap victory that would have been for the Soviets. And what a costly one for us. In such an event, I am certain that we would now be spending far more billions of dollars for additional military preparation than we are spending today for the constructive purpose of recovery in Europe.

Now, however, we must look to the period beyond 1952, when ECA comes to an end. Once again we are faced with a set of momentous decisions, affecting the future welfare of our country and the peace of the world. I will speak only of the economic decisions today. They center around the tough problem of Europe's continuing dollar needs.

The Marshall plan has given the nations of western Europe a unique opportunity to set their houses in order. They are making good use of that chance. But the very success of the program, the upsurge of production in industry and agriculture, has brought us suddenly face to face with a larger and deeper-rooted dilemma. The Economist, of London expressed the problem very effectively, as follows: "The change in the relationship between the old industrial nations and the new industrial giant in the New World has been on the way for the last 30 years. The wars have accentuated but not caused the trend. It has been masked since the end of the conflict, in part by American generosity, in part by the world's desire to buy anything it could at any price. Now the underlying maladjustment between Europe and America is emerging like a reef hidden for a time under a spring tide."

That reef may wreck the ship of recovery, and its next victim may be the ship of peace. What is the nature of this jagged obstruction? The easiest way to explain it is to look at the import and export figures of the United States. We are exporting this year about $6,000,000,000 more goods than we are importing. That trend has been going on for years. Since 1914 this country has sold to the rest of the world about $105,000,000,000 more than it has bought. And who has paid for those gigantic sales? To a large extent, it is we ourselves, the taxpayers of the United States. We have covered more than $80,000,000,000 of that $100,000,000,000 excess by loans and free gifts to foreign nations.

For a long time we have boasted of what we have called our favorable balance of trade, whereby we sold more than we bought. It is no boasting matter now. It is high time we came to realize that the United States is no longer a debtor nation, struggling to establish its export markets. We are the overwhelming creditor nation of the world today. We dominate the markets of the earth. Every nation has an insistent demand for American goods. There is only one limit to our sales—the dollars these countries have with which to buy our products. For years we have followed a course of passing the dollars along to foreign nations from the pockets of our own taxpayers, so that those nations can finance their purchases from us. Do we want to go on doing that? Or isn't it time to take a good, hard look at the situation and chart a new course?

Again I will take France as an example, to illustrate a much more widespread condition. We have exhorted the French without ceasing to increase their dollar earnings, so that they can pay for their dollar needs after 1952. There are two major ways for them to earn dollars—by selling us their exports, or by earning dollars from tourists. We are pushing the French toward a maximum effort by 1952. The plans call for doubling the amount they made from dollar tourists in 1949, and almost doubling their dollar sales of exports. Both goals require a tremendous effort, but I personally think the French can achieve them. Yet even with that sort of effort, France will still have a dollar gap of about $150,000,000 in 1952, to the best of our calculations. In other words, France will spend every dollar she can earn to buy American products, but she will still run short of her dollar requirements by $150,000,000.

How shall we Americans deal with that situation? We have three alternatives as I see them. We can keep on supplying France with the needed dollars from the pockets of our own taxpayers. Nobody likes that alternative. We Americans don't want to keep on giving away money, and the French don't want to go on receiving it as a gift. They would much prefer to earn it.

The second alternative is for us to sit tight and let France go without her $150,000,000 of dollar needs. That policy would have two immediate effects. American producers of machinery, cotton, petroleum, copper, and hundreds of other products would lose a substantial market. France at the same time would suffer a crippling blow to the economy we have worked so hard to help rebuild. For example, the textile industry is the biggest employer of labor in France. The cotton textile factories of France have operated with 70 percent of their raw cotton paid for by Marshall-plan dollars. Reduce that supply to any large extent and the textile mills would begin to shut down, thousands of Frenchmen would be thrown out of work, and the cycle of recovery would begin to reverse itself. Who would stand to gain? Only the Communists.

The third alternative for the years beyond 1952 is for us to let France earn her dollar needs by our buying more French export products. That is not an easy solution. Nothing as important as that is easy in the world we live in today.

Many of France's leading exports do not compete directly with anything produced in America, yet we handicap them with high tariff rates. It is true, of course, that we have reduced the general level of our American tariffs in recent years. However, let's take a look at our present tariff rates on some of the leading items which France exports to us. Nobody in the United States is producing hand-made lace. Yet the United States tariff on lace runs from 30 percent up to 75 percent of the original value. The high-quality kid gloves of France, which again are not produced in America, pay a minimum of 40-percent duty. Women's evening bags of the special types American women like to buy in Paris must hurdle a tariff of 30 to 60 percent to get into the American market. Just who are we protecting in the United States by these particular high tariff rates, and why?

Some French products would compete directly with American goods if we lowered our tariffs and let them in. Yet how small that competition would actually be. If we allowed France to earn the additional $150,000,000 she needs from increased exports after 1952, the amount would represent only about one-tenth of 1 percent of the wholesale value of America's own production, which is running at about $150,000,000,000 a year. That is a very small drop in a very big bucket. An increase in our foreign purchases by about $1,500,000,000 a year would close the dollar gap for all of western Europe.

I cannot help but see this problem in terms of France and of my own native Kentucky. The tobacco growers of my State have long had a prosperous export market in France. The sale of that tobacco is important to every business enterprise in Kentucky, including the Louisville Courier-Journal and Times. The French have a strong preference for American tobacco. Their purchases of American tobacco are limited by only one factor: the limit on the dollars they have to spend. Right now the French are trying to cut down on their buying of American tobacco, much against their will, and are seeking to substitute Turkish and Egyptian tobaccos, which French smokers do not like nearly so well. This change is regarded as

a grim necessity in view of that dollar gap of $150,000,000 that is looming up in 1952.

The whole situation seems to me to point an obvious moral. It would be so sensible for Kentucky people to buy more French products, so that the French will have dollars to buy more Kentucky tobacco. It is a simple equation. It sums up, in my mind, the whole point of western Europe's need and America's best interest.

These are the three alternatives for 1952: We can support the French with American tax money; or we can abandon the French, risking a Communist victory and loss of an important market for our farms and factories; or we can lower our tariff barriers to a reasonable degree and buy from France, so that she in turn can buy what she wants and desperately needs from us. When I say France, I might just as well say western Europe. That is the shape and size of the problem.

I have been very happy to see the concern which this great and difficult problem is beginning to arouse in America. President Truman, as you all know, recently appointed Gordon Gray to study the vast imbalance of America's imports and exports. Mr. Gray will come up with a report which may well become a historic document. He will give it all the force of his high reputation and prestige. If he and his associates get into a detailed study of our tariff structure, I am convinced they will find many strange anomalies. They will discover that in many instances we are protecting industries that no longer need or desire protection, and even industries that no longer operate in this country today.

But how much consideration will the Gray report and the problem it attacks receive from the great American public? The answer to that question will depend very largely on you people in this room today. The average citizen does not like to wrestle with material that contains such foggy phrases as balance of payments and that sort of thing. Yet this dilemma which faces America and the world affects every one of our citizens, and it can be explained to the great majority of Americans if it is broken down into simple terms. We should not wait for the Gray report. The time to start this vital campaign of information and understanding is now.

That is a job for American journalists. I believe a great many of you will agree that our country has a thorny decision to make, and not much time to make it. We all know that Congress can never make such a hard choice on its own. Action in Congress can only come when the American public understands the problem and dictates its choice.

We are always proud to talk at these meetings of our freedom of the press in America. This organization has never balked at the idea that freedom entails responsibility in journalism. It seems to me that our free press has a powerful responsibility to bring the facts of life about foreign trade to their readers, with all the simplicity and force we are able to command.

If we ignore this problem or try to shove it under the rug, I foresee a dangerously bad period in international relations in 1952. The nations of western Europe will be forced to discard the Marshall plan crutch without yet being able to walk by themselves. Their people will suffer a sudden return of discouragement. Since human nature works as we all know it does, the people of western Europe will feel let down by the United States. Gratitude may quickly turn to resentment as hope dissolves in despair. What a glorious opportunity for the Communists!

At the same time, we must foresee a violent reaction on the part of the American people if they are not fully informed of this 1952 crisis and given a chance to deal with it in advance. We, too, will feel a surge of resentment. The American public, tragically lacking a full understanding of the situation, will complain that the Marshall-plan countries have spent billions of our dollars without managing to achieve recovery. Recriminations will fly on both sides. Such a situation would divide the democratic world. We must not and cannot risk such a division in the face of a united enemy.

I firmly believe that the long-term recovery of western Europe depends on the decision the American public will make on the issue of foreign trade. Recovery spells a real chance for peace. Failure to recover spells misery, chaos, and the triumph of communism in Europe. Who can fail to see that the next step might well be war, and a war which the United States would not be certain to win?

The free press of America can give the American people the vital knowledge necessary for them to make a free choice on this vital subject. Whether you agree with my conclusions or not, I plead with you to give your readers the basic facts and let them make an informed decision.

Veto of Natural-Gas Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 28 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the April 24 issue of Trainman News, the official publication of the Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen. This editorial commends President Truman for his recent veto of the Kerr bill to amend the Natural Gas Act.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THANKS, MR. PRESIDENT

President Truman came through admirably for the people when he vetoed the Kerr bill to exempt independent natural-gas producers from Federal regulation.

Although the gas interests protested wildly that the measure would not increase the bill to consumers, we felt they did "protest too much." Too much money was spent for its passage and too much lobby pressure was exerted for it to be a matter of principle only. Somewhere down the line the gas interests expected to strike pay dirt. That somewhere was probably a rate hike after the congressional elections, so that the "wrong" votes on the Kerr bill could not hurt the Congressmen's getting back into office.

The newspapers are now saying that labor dictated to the President and that he followed its wishes for political reasons. The fact is Mr. Truman followed the wishes of a majority of Americans (including countless mayors, many governors, and thousands of public-spirited people in no way connected with labor) who didn't want to be bilked by the gas producers. If this is playing politics, it's the brand that we approve of, for its protecting the interests of all.

If the gas companies planned no rate rise, then they're not out a sou—and the public is safe from an unwarranted gouging.

We say, thanks, Mr. President. We predicted you would not forget the people—and you didn't.

Valedictory Address of Eugene F. McGarvey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 28, 1950

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address, I am very glad to call to the attention of my colleagues a really extraordinarily able valedictory address given by Eugene F. McGarvey.

Mr. McGarvey is graduating from the Stevens Institute of Technology in New Jersey in the class of 1950 and it is most refreshing to learn his point of view toward the great questions of the day. He is warning his fellow graduates to break away from the idea of expecting their Government's aid during their lives and urges his classmates not to think too much of economic security but to strike out on their own with faith in the future and determination to take a chance in the world.

His address is full of good advice and I hope it will be widely read.

(Valedictory address by Eugene F. McGarvey, Stevens Institute of Technology, Hoboken, N. J.)

A recent article in a well-known magazine has a point of interest which should be read by every college graduate this year. It is based on an account taken from Governor Bradford's history of the Plymouth Bay Colony.

When the Pilgrim Fathers landed in Massachusetts, it seems they first established a collective system of production and distribution. The common produce of the settlement was pooled in one storehouse and then later rationed to the individual settlers.

From the very start, this system proved to be a complete failure. The Pilgrims' collective effort, far from providing security for all, produced no more than a starvation diet for any individual. Soon faced with a bitter famine which threatened to follow a continuation of this plan, Governor Bradford was forced to take a new tack. As he relates in his history, he decreed "that they should set corne, every man for his own perticular, and in that regard trust to themselves. * * * And so assigned to every family a parcell of land."

The results, of course, were highly gratifying. Now that each one had to provide for himself, the entire settlement took an added incentive to its work, and shortly thereafter Governor Bradford was able to write, "the effect of their perticuler planting was well seene, for all had one way and other pretty well to bring the year aboute, and some of the abler sorte and more industrious had to spare and sell to others, so as any generall wante or famine hath not been amongst them since to this day."

The moral of this story would seem to need no elaboration.

This year the colleges throughout the country are graduating a class of 1950, which, together with its predecessor of last June, has been stigmatized probably as none other before. The class of 1950 is the group that wants security with a broad, bold, capital S. Several prominent magazines have printed surveys proclaiming this fact to its readers; personnel directors have already taken the fact as granted. And these people base their

claims both on personal observation and on the statistical results of college campus polls.

"Gone," they will tell you, "is that classic seeking of a chance to take a chance." The youth of 1950 has turned his back on the free enterpriser and on what at one time was considered the great American dream. As one manufacturer put it, "I never saw a bunch that so wanted to make the free enterprise system work, but they are interested in the system rather than the individual enterprise. They will be technicians—not owners."

Now there are several obvious reasons why this charge is being made against the 1950 group. The college senior of today still averages 2 or 3 years older than his prewar counterpart. Close to 70 percent of the graduates are veterans, many of whom feel they have had sufficient adventure for any one life. There are 30 percent married, who of necessity must limit their risks.

The 1950 graduates as a Nation-wide group are also said to be overspecialized and hence not equipped to take a chance. And mixed in as a leaven is the current fad for an ever-and-ever-increasing amount of public security.

Whatever the reasons, the truth is that the current graduate is none too anxious to strike out on his own eventually, but is looking for a snug job that will pay dividends in safety and lifelong tenure. He will be perfectly content to work for someone else—preferably a very large concern. He desires a vast amount of training, but not as a jumping-off point to his own enterprise. In short, he lacks faith in the future and wants, above all things, economic security.

This is the picture painted of us on the eve of graduation. Whether for the most part the members of the class of '50 will actually live their lives along these lines remains to be seen. It is not too late, though, to sound a note of warning against this indicated trend.

When the businessman claims that the new generation does not care to take a chance, he is thinking in terms of economic risk-taking solely. The danger, however, strikes much deeper than that. This security mentality—that feeling that "Well, I don't have to do it myself; it will be done for me"—can, if given the chance to grow, pervert our entire approach to life.

No, it is not only that the class of '50 may not take risks in the realm of business—but that in our everyday lives, in our engineering work, and in the social life of our community, we may become sterile of all originality. The real threat is not just the passing of enterprise from the economic field—it is the possible loss of incentive in our whole field of living.

Economic security is surely a strong drive in a person's life. But if we are to allow a fear of the future to completely order our lives, to limit the growth of our personalities, and rob our every opportunity, then security on these terms is indeed a hollow triumph. For in the end we shall have secured nothing of lasting value and lost much that is worth while in life.

First of all, complete security is an illusion. In this respect it might be likened to the idea of perpetual motion. Both of these concepts would be wonderful, if they worked. But in practice neither does.

More often than not as a result of his Maginot-line mentality, the most insecure person is the one who is forever playing safe. An unfailingly increased security is purchased only at the loss of some basic human freedom—which is too high a price to pay for a mirage.

Second, a generation that is security-conscious is in some serious degree refusing to make the act of faith without which effective living is impossible. In its members there can be little of that lust for life and experience of the joy of living, little of a sense of wide horizons or worlds to conquer.

And, finally, a generation that has been raised on security is in a poor psychological position to survive the inevitable shocks of life, no matter what is done to insure everybody against all conceivable contingencies. A crutch is well-suited to a lame person, but if he persists in its use once he is healed, he remains in a sense always lame. Security is just such a crutch.

In the final analysis, the only safe guide to security—security of integrity—lies in the determination to pursue what seems to be a right course of action, regardless of the hazards involved, being fully aware that you may fail, but that the only real failure is the refusal to venture.

At the other extreme it would be very foolish to think that we can all hop into a snug spot aboard the free-enterprise caravan and just free-wheel to security. Like any vehicle, the American system needs a motive force—and we are all, everyone of us, counted on for the drive to make it go. The Pilgrims found out before it was too late. Will we?

Germany: Time Bomb of Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 28 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the leading article in the May issue of the American Mercury, "Germany: Time Bomb of Europe," by Henry C. Wolfe. Mr. Wolfe, author of The German Octopus, Human Dynamite, and The Imperial Soviets, got his first close-up of the U. S. S. R. in 1922 as a member of the Hoover Commission. He has made several notable forecasts. In the American Mercury for July 1939, he predicted flatly that Hitler was going to war, and told why. In other magazine articles, he forecast the Nazi-Soviet deal and the German attack on Russia.

This article should awaken the American people to the frightening possibility that Stalin's time bomb in Germany may go off, resulting in a new unholy alliance between the Soviets and the Germans. As Mr. Wolfe points out in the opening of his article, "We have been losing the battle for Germany."

I feel the time has come for the Congress to establish a bipartisan commission of inquiry to go to Germany and ascertain the true facts about the situation. A resolution calling for such a commission was presented in the Senate on April 17 by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], several other Senators, and myself.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GERMANY: TIME BOMB OF EUROPE

(By Henry C. Wolfe)

I

We have been losing the battle for Germany. If we lose Germany to the Kremlin it will be a defeat even more catastrophic than the loss of China. The situation in Germany today, in relation to the East-West struggle, is about where the situation was in China in 1947. Time is running out on us and running out fast.

If we lose Germany we stand to lose Europe, the Middle East, and Africa. We shall be forced back on the Western Hemisphere with the global balance of power heavily weighted against us. We shall find by that time that we have few allies left who can give us political and material support. Having lost the cold war, we shall then be locked into a defensive position that will be inordinately expensive, yet can give us no security.

Few Americans realize what is at stake in Germany, but the men in the Kremlin, masters of "Realpolitik" do. Since they seized power in 1917, the Soviet leaders have understood the important role that Germany plays in their drive for world domination. They have looked hungrily at German industry, especially in the Ruhr. They have realized that if they had use of the Reich's advanced technology, central strategic position, and organizing genius, they could quickly dominate Europe and strike out at other continents. Moreover, the Russians fear German military power, unless it is teamed up with their own. These were some of Stalin's reasons for making a deal with Hitler in 1939.

As for the Germans, there has been strong pro-Russian sentiment in certain circles since the days of Bismarck. It is sentiment based on stark self-interest—based, in other words, on the premise that when Germans and Russians work together, the Germans prosper and wax powerful. According to pro-Russian Germans, when the Germans have fought the Russians catastrophe has been the payoff, and they have two World Wars to prove it. They point to the first Rapallo Treaty (1922), when the pariah Germans and Russians, meeting on the outskirts of the Allied Conference in Genoa, circumvented Allied diplomacy by making a deal between themselves. This move was immensely popular in both Germany and Russia.

After the Nazis came to power, the eastern orientation was interrupted. But there were still powerful influences at work in Germany, especially in the Reichswehr hierarchy, to promote close relations with the U. S. S. R. Dr. Karl Haushofer, the geopolitical expert, and his followers constantly advocated a policy of alliance with the Soviets. Even among the Nazi leaders there were enthusiasts for the eastern orientation. Such an enthusiast was Erich Koch, gauleiter of East Prussia. In Koenigsberg 14 years ago, he explained to me his reasons for advocating a Russo-German alliance:

"The Reich and the Soviet complement each other. A combination of Russian manpower, land mass, and raw materials, with German industry, technological skill, and organizing ability, would constitute the world's greatest power center. The rulers of this combination could dominate the world. It would be economically advantageous for both partners. From the military angle, the alliance could bring overwhelming force to bear at any point on its long periphery. No other coalition could cope with such military-economic dynamism."

Hitler's stupid attack on the Soviets wrecked the pact of 1939, but left the motivations for the pact intact. Throughout the Reich-Soviet war Stalin carefully concentrated his propaganda offensive against the Nazi leadership. He took pains to point out that he believed Germany should endure. He did not associate himself with the West's extreme plans for the permanent destruction of German power. In outwitting the West at Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam it was his aim to cut Germany in two, the better to get control of the whole. With reference to Europe, his aim was to separate the industrial west from the food and raw materials of the east. The over-all strategy was formulated to make the west's economic recovery extremely difficult, if not impossible.

Since the end of the war, Stalin has continued his courtship of the German people.

He has cast himself in the role of champion of German unity, protector of the Germans against rapacious western imperialism. Constantly stressing the tradition of Russo-German friendship and common interests, he has told the citizens of the eastern and western zones that Germans and Russians together have "the largest potentialities in Europe to complete great actions of world significance." A Russo-German alliance—a third Rapallo—would certainly be an act of world significance. Consequently, every postwar Russian policy in Germany has been part of the plan to win that nation as an ally, either as a Communist satellite or as a nationalist state. The Kremlin's maneuvers have sometimes wavered between the creation of one or the other form of government, but the original goal has never changed.

II

The West, on the other hand, has lacked a German policy. The three western partners—Britain, France, the United States of America—have not only failed to pull together, but have opposed one another on various issues relating to Germany. But their greatest stumbling block has been complete failure to understand the German problem. As for the American attitude toward Germany, it has shifted from the early treat-'em-rough tactics to the current theory that if we shovel enough dollars into Germany everything will come out all right. Paired with this pleasant delusion is the assumption that the Germans hate the Russians; therefore, they are our allies and will, if need be, fight for us. A corollary to this wishful thinking is the argument that we should build up a new German army.

Washington's failure to formulate a long-range policy has been a heavy drag on the men trying to govern our zone in Germany. Not only that, but, with some notable exceptions, we have been handicapped by poor administrators, by the bad conduct of American personnel, and by the black-market activities of the personnel and their dependents. Above all, Americans in Germany have been notorious for their indifference toward German history, culture, economics, and politics. Many Germans regard us as cultural inferiors. None of this has helped American prestige. And the prestige counts heavily in the east-west struggle.

In contrast to America's bungling, the Russians have skillfully made use of two main forces: the German Communist Party and certain extreme right-wing circles. Either of these forces may win Germany for the Kremlin; at any rate, they complement each other. Since World II, the Soviets have worked to build a strong Communist Party in Germany. At present, they control the government of the eastern zone, and have organized a Communist-controlled German militia and a regular Communist Party. Although a Communist fifth column is always a convenient instrument for the Kremlin, there are at least two reasons why the extreme left may not be Stalin's most effective instrument in Germany. One is the limited appeal that communism has among Germans. The other is the potential danger of Titoism in German communism.

The German extreme right may therefore serve the Kremlin's plans more effectively than does the extreme left. The reactionary rightist group is made up of big industrialists, militarists, neo-Nazis, journalists, and refugees. These men see Germany once more a world power, as Russia's ally. They are the political heirs of Bismarck, von Seeckt and Haushofer. Most of them work behind the scenes, but two of them—Count Rudolph von Nadolny and Dr. Andreas Hermes—are playing a more open part in the campaign for a third Rapallo.

Von Nadolny, an aristocrat, a professional diplomat who was once ambassador to Moscow, has spent much of his life working for a Russo-German coalition. Although he is undoubtedly personally opposed to communism, he believes that Germans and Russians, regardless of their politics, should cooperate. Like the late Dr. Haushofer, he believes that Russia is the great heartland essential to world empire. The Germans and Russians, he believes, are the "dynamic peoples" destined to destroy the effete western nations and rule the world. His supporters in Germany have various backgrounds, but all of them—the jobless professors, the refugee junkers from East Prussia, the former Nazi SS officers and Ruhr industrialists—are dazzled by the grandiose prospects inherent in a Russo-German coalition.

Von Nadolny's home in Berlin is the center of this movement. He commutes back and forth between the Soviet and western zones, meeting with small groups, usually in private homes, and promoting the idea of a Russian alliance that will gain world power for Germany. One of Nadolny's agencies in the western zones is the notorious Nauheim circle. More and more of the Nazis and nationalists are coming over to the movement. Von Nadolny and his collaborators are working to discredit the moderate Adenauer administration, to stir up hostility against the western nations, and to prepare for der tag.

A factor that contributes to the success of the von Nadolny movement is the economic compulsion in the western zones. It is true that there has been considerable recovery during the past 5 years. But the housing situation is very bad, there are some 2,000,000 unemployed, and the western zones are unable to cope with the 8,000,000 to 10,000,000 German refugees from Eastern Germany, Poland, Czechoslovakia and other countries. Many of these unfortunate people live in misery. Their bitterness against the Russians who drove them out of their homes is matched only by their bitterness against the Western Powers. As with most other Germans, the refugees' fear of the Russians has not made them like the Western Nations. Moreover, they are deeply stirred by Soviet propaganda to the effect that a Russo-German alliance, with its promise of territorial changes, will give them back their homes. The leaders of the von Nadolny movement now view the millions of refugees as a vast reservoir for recruits.

In dealing with the Germans Stalin holds two aces. One is the potential restoration of the Reich's lost provinces, i. e., all of East Prussia and Upper Silesia, most of Lower Silesia and Pomerania, and a big part of Brandenburg. Germans of all classes, except the most fanatical Communists, are determined to regain these eastern lands. In this matter, the Western Powers can do little to help them. But Stalin can—whenever it suits his purpose. The installation of Marshal Rakossovsky as the real ruler of Poland looks like a move to keep the Poles in line when the Kremlin wants to shift frontiers again. True, the Poles and Czechs would resent a move to restore land to the Germans. But neither the Poles nor Czechs could now offer any effective resistance. In any case, Stalin would sell them out for the grand prize of Germany.

The Saar question, too, is grist for the Soviet propaganda mill. The Kremlin exploits it to poison relations between the French and the Germans. Neues Deutschland, the Soviet-zone Red newspaper, tells the Germans that friendship with the U. S. S. R. is "the only way to regain the Saar."

Stalin's other ace is the mirage of prosperity. Through his German allies in both rightist and leftist camps, he is promising the Germans a great economic boom if they will sign up with him. He holds out the bait of enormous markets for manufactured goods in the satellite states, in the Soviet Union itself, and now in Red China. The Germans are told that there is an unlimited market for their heavy machinery, chemicals, artificial rubber, railway equipment, and electrical goods in the East, but no markets at all in the West.

In this connection the Kremlin harps on that most sensitive of themes, the Western policy of dismantling. This Allied program, the Soviets charge, illustrates the West's vindictiveness, indicates its intention to keep Germany from competing in world markets, proves its determination to destroy the German people. Such propaganda finds ready ears among the refugees, unemployed workmen, the middle class—in fact, among Germans in all walks of life. The West is offering little to counteract it.

III

Another high card in the Soviet hand is the cause of a unified Germany. Here again the appeal sweeps right across the political arena from extreme left to extreme right. Pastor Niemoeller probably spoke for a good many Germans last December when he declared that his compatriots would rather take the risk of living under a Communist dictatorship than continue to have their nation cut in two by the East-West war. From the beginning the Kremlin has carefully fostered the legend that the U. S. S. R. alone champions a unified Germany. To give the legend substance, the Kremlin has set up in its zone a stooge regime, the German democratic government. This outfit, with a so-called foreign minister, professes to speak for all Germany.

In the same breath with the question of unity comes the problem of Berlin. To most Germans, after all, this city is the capital of their fatherland. No other city begins to have Berlin's sentimental hold as the center of government. Thanks to western naïveté, the former German capital lies deep in the Soviet zone. The 2,250,000 Germans in the three western sectors of the city are cut off from the western zones, but their resistance to Soviet pressure has been admirable. Led by their fearless mayor, Ernst Reuter, they have consistently stood by the west against the east. In the city elections of December 1948, they voted anti-Communist by almost 87 percent. Moreover, their German officials have had to contend with kidnapings by the Soviet-controlled east zone police and with constant threats to their own safety. Standing on the boundary of the western sectors, Gerhart Eisler recently warned them: "We are keeping a diary that contains notes on everything you are doing over there."

For our part, to be sure, we carried out the heroic and expensive airlift to keep Berlin's western sectors supplied despite the Soviet blockade. Western prestige zoomed in Germany and throughout Europe. But since the blockade we have been making what appears to be at least a partial withdrawal. Many American officials and their families have left Berlin for the western zones. In the western sectors of the former capital, unemployment is growing at an alarming rate. As Soviet pressure and threats of violence are stepped up, many Berliners wonder if the west is preparing to pull out entirely. If we stay, we do so under increasingly difficult conditions. If we leave Berlin, Germans will consider it a signal that we are beginning a wholesale retreat from Germany and Europe. The consequences would certainly be disastrous.

When the situation in China was speeding toward a crisis, we sat back and waited for the dust to settle. If we wait much longer in Germany, the dust will settle on a Soviet empire extending from the Rhine to Hong Kong. As Drew Middleton wrote in the New York Times: "If the Russians get Germany—and with her the Ruhr—the United States can forget about the Atlantic Pact and military aid and look to the radar defenses of Detroit, New York, and Pittsburgh."

At this late hour what can we do? The minimum is a threefold program that should get under way at once: (1)

Strengthen the middle parties in Germany; (2) launch an efficient propaganda offensive to enlighten the Germans about American democracy and Soviet imperialism; (3) start the job of integrating Germany's western zones into western Europe. That is a large order, which cannot be filled just by appropriating a few billion dollars and appointing a few new committees and administrators. It calls for the best brains we have and for the wholehearted support of Congress and American public opinion. Nothing less can save a rapidly deteriorating situation.

The first of these projects got off to a start last December at the London meeting which organized the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions. American labor leaders participated. The ICFTU could be an effective arm of the west in supporting the German middle parties against the extremes of right and left. Furthermore, the British, French, and American Governments could strengthen the German moderates by making it clear that the west is determined to stay in Germany until the whole problem is solved. Let it be known that there is no future in western Germany for those who are ready to jump on what they think is a totalitarian bandwagon. Make it plain that we are going to stand by our friends in Germany against any power that tries to enslave them. That line would help stiffen the spines of the moderates.

A far stronger propaganda offensive is indispensable to counteract the steady stream of Soviet falsehood against the west, especially against the United States. We must drive it home that the Soviets are not going to raise the German standard of living higher than the low Russian standard. We should expose the Soviet looting of their own zone. We have to show that democracy has dynamism, that the west is a realm of opportunity. Contrast the declining scale of living in the Soviet satellite states with that of the western world. Play up democracy by means of billboards, moving pictures, trade fairs, and pageants. In other words, dramatize our story effectively.

Unless western Europe draws together, it is doomed. Unless a united western Europe integrates Western Germany into its system, the German problem can never be solved. The answer probably rests mainly with Britain, for if Britain stands aloof from European integration, France will naturally fear that Germany would dominate any western European federation. All western statesmen can at least be sure of one thing: if Germany is not brought into the western fold, she will be drawn into the eastern empire. For the states of western Europe there is only one choice—integrate, or go down one by one, like the nations of eastern Europe.

We lost China, but we do not need to lose Germany and Europe. No effective course of action will be cheap or safe. But lack of action will inevitably bring about the collapse of our entire European defense perimeter. Are we to sit back and let Stalin's time bomb in Germany go off?

Bureaucracy, the Overshadowing Menace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 28, 1950

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article by Mr. Charles W. Noonan, of Schenectady, N. Y., entitled, "Bureaucracy, the Overshadowing Menace":

BUREAUCRACY, THE OVERSHADOWING MENACE
(By Charles W. Noonan)

If the conduct of the human race, since the earliest recordings of it, has been anything near like the historians have pictured, the civilizations of the past, each in their turn, decayed and collapsed solely because of their building up of bureaucracies—tax financed job holders—who held for themselves the power to tax, and taxed and increased taxes till their peoples found it did not pay them to produce or own anything, and acted accordingly.

The aftermath of those collapses has always been a period of barbarism: with mankind obliged to begin his upward struggle all over again from scratch. Those periods of barbarism are generally known as "the dark ages."

Both the capitalist and the Communist civilizations—the two predominating civilizations of our time—are, and for sometime past have been, building up bureaucracies at a tremendous speed. If those civilizations are permitted to continue in this regard, the outcome, if history is any criterion to go by, is bound to be their eventual downfall, followed by the usual age of darkness with its many and varying discomforts of succorless infantile growth.

To educate the people to heed this situation—to recognize the danger it is ever laden with—is not as easy a matter as one might suspect, especially in view of their feeling that they may at any time be exposed to the other great forces of destruction that are now being built so rapidly all around them. With things as they are today, the unleashing of those other great forces—the atom bomb, and the hydrogen bomb (if that bomb is perfected)—the possible reduction of the race and the lessening of its ability to move forward and upward as a consequence, should not, by any means be minimized. The unleashing of those bombs, however, like the unleasing of poisonous gas, is a restrainable matter: their use can, and by mutual agreement will, sooner or later, be outlawed as weapons of war. The people's fear and horror of retaliation will force such an agreement and keep it in force. Even the TNT bombing of noncombatants, cities and other properties outside of the fields of battle, is not an unforeseeable content of such an agreement.

The restraining, prevention, or reversion of the trend to bureaucracy is, on the other hand, not so easily accomplished. Bureaucrats, as a class, have never yet been known to voluntarily or involuntarily give up their easy mode of life and retire to the less inviting but natural means of making their living by production of life's necessities. Associating, as a rule, with their own kind, and never heeding the admonitions of others, they pursue their usurped prerogatives without any sympathy or solicitude. They insist that the safety and welfare of the people require more and still more tax financed activities; they see to it that those activities are realized; they hold for themselves the power to tax, which, says an old proverb, is "the power to destroy"; they increase their own salaries and accommodations to higher and still higher levels as time goes on; they keep continuously adding to their personnel for the power it gives them to do so; they add to the tax load year after year to meet their ever growing expenditures, without any qualms or abatement, regardless of how it destroys the people's incentive to work and harvest and own; they see nor hear nor recognize no signals of danger to their civilization as a result of their existence, their power, and their covetousness; they just stick to their fort till their fort and the civilization they live in collapses.

Is there anything that can be done to prevent this impending catastrophe? There is But there are obstacles in the path which are not easily surmounted. There are no great undertakings, however, that do not have obstacles of some kind to surmount. In this case the first and probably the most difficult one will be the educating of the masses of the people to see the existing deadly danger to the security of their offspring; also to see the power that is theirs to eliminate this danger. To accomplish this would seem to be the task of the press, the radio, the writers and distributors of pamphlets, and the masses themselves as they become awakened to the situation. This, obviously, would not be an easy task; but, when considering the greatness of the ultimate aim to be realized, as well as the danger to the security of future generations including the offspring of the controllers of those forces of education themselves, the task, sooner or later, will be undertaken and judged by those forces as worthy of great effort, and, if necessary, no little sacrifice.

Once awakened and the masses will rise to the situation: They will see to it that all the local, State, and National tax-financed nonessential public activities are eliminated; they will see to it that the power to tax will be taken out of the hands of the bureaucrats and placed in the hands of independent local, State, and National tax assessors, collectors and budget assigners whom they—the masses themselves—shall make provision for; they will see to it that the essential public activities are not overcrowded, or padded with friends and wheelhorses of politicians and legislators; they will see to it that the bureaucrats are confined to administrative functions only; and all to the end that civilization and the security of their offspring shall be saved and that there shall be "government of the people, by the people, for the people."

Right Way To Oust the Disloyal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 27, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of April 25, 1950:

RIGHT WAY TO OUST THE DISLOYAL

There is, as President Truman told the Federal Bar Association, a great deal of ignorance and misunderstanding about the Nation's loyalty program. Nothing else could explain the confusion and dissension that has trailed Senator MCCARTHY'S campaign against the State Department.

The President told, in detail, about the loyalty program and how it operates to clear Communists out of Government without headlines or hysteria and within the framework of the democratic liberties we cherish.

If Americans will note the President's words, they will understand how unnecessary, how unfair, and how out of line with American principle is the kind of campaign that MCCARTHY has conducted.

The loyalty program was set up 3 years ago. It is carried out by three groups, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, loyalty boards in each governmental agency, and the over-all nonpartisan Loyalty Review Board.

Each Federal employee must pass the scrutiny of the loyalty boards. Every applicant for Federal employment is checked. There

is constant screening and checking. If an individual changes jobs, advances to a higher position, is seen in company of questionable outsiders, is charged with suspicious behavior, the machinery of investigation goes into motion again. A Federal employee, particularly in such a department as that of the Secretary of State, is under constant (and necessary) surveillance today such as few free Americans would tolerate.

President Truman said the loyalty program has been an outstanding success and no one has yet offered evidence to the contrary. He said there does not remain in Government employ today one person adjudged to be disloyal. He admitted it was possible that there could be individuals who have escaped the net, in an operation as large as that of the Federal Government. He urged citizens, if they know of a single Communist or other disloyal person in any Federal job, to notify the FBI or the Attorney General immediately, so that the charge may be properly investigated.

It would seem to us that the American people, with their fierce devotion to justice and fair play, would agree with Mr. Truman, members of the loyalty boards, and the Members of Congress who approved the loyalty program, that this kind of careful and objective approach is the right one for this Nation. It is one that eliminates the disloyal and, at the time, protects the loyal Government employee from false, malicious or ill-founded accusations. It is the democratic way to deal with subversion, rather than the Russian way.

As President Truman said, in words that should be applauded by the American people:

"We are not going to turn the United States into a right-wing totalitarian country in order to deal with a left-wing totalitarian threat."

Awarding Posthumous Decorations to Crew of United States Navy Privateer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 21, 1950

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, I cannot lay aside the opportunity to follow the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, Mr. VINSON, in seconding the resolution presented by him authorizing appropriate posthumous decoration of the officers and crew of the American plane deliberately destroyed on April 8, 1950, by the Soviet Union. His remarks in presenting the resolution eloquently and feelingly reflect the sentiments of every Member of Congress in extending to the families of these 10 splendid young Americans the condolence of the people of the United States.

It is a shock to the sensibilities of all peace-loving people to realize that such an outrage could be perpetrated. Perhaps it is, after all, a part of the inscrutible plan of the God of Nations to cause the hearts of this people to be saddened by such a dastardly event and allow these young heroes to be sacrificed in order that the incident may become a turning point in the relations between the United States and the Soviet Union.

We have known for a long time that in this cold war we are dealing with a nation which recognizes only one language, and that is the language of force.

These young men of the United States Navy privateer gave their lives in the performance of duty over the waters of the Baltic. In recognition thereof, let us gravely recollect that we too have a duty to perform.

I shall vote to pass the Vinson resolution in the hope that it will cause us all to face the uncertain future with an even firmer determination that there is no higher purpose challenging us today than to make sure that whatever we do we keep America strong.

Honorable Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 28, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I am including an editorial from the Washington Times-Herald as of this date:

HONORABLE AMERICANS: II

As we noted on Wednesday, Secretary Acheson's vituperation of Senator MCCARTHY because of the Senator's efforts to expose Communist influence in the State Department deserves inspection in the framework of his actions in the Hiss case.

The Secretary calls his flock honorable, loyal, and clean living. He and a host of other New Dealers and internationalists said all this, and more, in behalf of Alger Hiss, now under sentence of 5 years.

The procession of New Dealers in the Hiss affair got under way on August 3, 1948, when Whittaker Chambers told the House Committee on Un-American Activities that Hiss was part of a Communist cell in the administration and had stolen Government documents for Soviet spies.

In the same cell Chambers listed Lee Pressman, who had gone on from the New Deal to become general counsel of the CIO; Nathan Witt, former Secretary of the National Labor Relations Board; John Abt, a former attorney for the Labor Department; Henry Collins, a State Department official, and Harry Dexter White, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, the supposed author of the Morgenthau plan for a harsh peace in Germany and architect of the Bretton Woods world bank and monetary fund.

NEW DEAL PARADE

When brought before the House committee, all but White refused to answer questions on the ground that they might incriminate themselves. White denied he had ever worked with the Communists, then went home and was found dead 3 days later, reportedly of a self-administered dose of a heart stimulant.

Later, at the second Hiss trial, Chambers testified that White had been a source of information for the Soviet espionage ring and identified one paper in evidence as having been received by him from White.

After Hiss' conviction last January, Representative RICHARD M. NIXON of the House committee stated that he had had in his possession since December 1948, numerous papers in White's handwriting which Chambers had received from White. These, incontrovertibly, betrayed official secrets.

While Hiss and other New Dealers squirmed to evade the accusations that they had served Russia, one former State Department officer came forward at both of the Hiss trials and blandly confessed from the witness stand that he had stolen documents for Soviet espionage.

This was Henry Julian Wadleigh, educated at Oxford, the University of London, and the University of Chicago. The statute of limitations had run on any charge of espionage; so he could not be prosecuted.

Still another New Deal figure, after being drawn into the inquiry, made an even more mysterious exit than White. Laurence Duggan, who had gone from the State Department to the post of director of the Institute of International Education, a Carnegie agency, had been listed by Whittaker Chambers in 1939 to Assistant Secretary of State A. A. Berle as in a special category of the Communist apparatus—not a party member but maintaining a special liaison with the Communist underground through Mrs. Hede Massing, ex-wife of Gerhard Eisler, former No. 1 Communist agent in the United States.

In December 1948, shortly after being sought out by the FBI, Duggan was found dead beneath the window of his sixteenth floor New York office.

At the first trial of Hiss, two Justices of the Supreme Court, Felix Frankfurter and Stanley Reed, appeared in the role, unprecedented for men in their positions, of character witnesses for Hiss.

The trial judge, Samuel H. Kaufman, who had been elevated to the bench after participating in the Pearl Harbor whitewash as cocounsel of the investigating committee, sprang down from the bench and welcomed them to the stand with a fervent handclasp.

Among other character witnesses for Hiss were Philip Jessup, a ranking adviser to Secretary Acheson, named by Senator MCCARTHY as having a peculiar affinity for Communist fronts; the Governor of Illinois, Adlai Stevenson; Judge Charles E. Wyzanski, of Federal district court, Boston; Judge Calvert Magruder, of the circuit court of appeals, Boston, and Francis B. Sayre, former Assistant Secretary of State and Commissioner to the Philippines.

BACKERS FOR HISS

Others from the State department who rallied around as character witnesses were Dr. Stanley K. Hornbeck, G. Howland Shaw, Dr. Harry C. Hawkins, Frank E. Duvall, Joseph C. Green, and Charles F. Darlington. John W. Davis, Wall street lawyer and Democratic nominee for President in 1924; Charles Fahy, former New Deal solicitor general; Dr. James T. Shotwell, Hiss' successor as president of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace and an indefatigable promoter of the internationalist cause for more than 30 years; Clark M. Eichelberger, director of the American Association for the United Nations, and Gerard Swope Jr., counsel for International General Electric Co., testified to Hiss' character at one or both trials.

Mrs. Roosevelt put in at least two courtroom appearances during the first trial and published accounts clearly intended to sway sympathy toward Hiss, whom she had already characterized in print as one of the "good people."

John Foster Dulles, Governor Dewey's adviser on foreign affairs, who had been permitted to sit in since 1944 as a Republican observer in the workings of the "bipartisan" foreign policy, was a witness at both Hiss trials.

He was one of the trustees of the Carnegie endowment who had decided Hiss was just the man for the president of that internationalist outfit and plucked him out of the State department in 1947.

Assisting Dulles in the selection as members of the executive committee of the Carnegie organization were Arthur A. Ballantine, Wall Street lawyer; Francis P. Gaines, president of Washington and Lee University; Earl G. Harrison, Philadelphia lawyer; David Rockefeller; Eliot Wadsworth, Boston capitalist; and W. W. Waymack, Des Moines editor and former member of the Atomic Energy Commission.

The late Nicholas Murray Butler, former president of Columbia University and of the Carnegie endowment, also had a hand in picking Hiss.

In his own recital, Hiss, in effect, summoned as character witnesses Mr. Roosevelt, Harry Hopkins, General Marshall, Admiral Leahy, Senator Vandenberg, the lead elephant in the GOP bipartisan foreign-policy procession, and Harold Stassen, the always-available candidate for the Republican Presidential nomination.

Hiss, in fact, could have got just as good a character from just as many people as any of Mr. Acheson's honorable, loyal, and clean-living State Department stable of the moment. The New Dealers never peach on a pal, nor, to use Mr. Acheson's phrase, turn their backs on him even after he has been sentenced for betraying his country.

Wards of the Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1950

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an article entitled "Wards of the Government" delivered by Dean Russell, of Billings, Mont., on January 20, 1950:

WARDS OF THE GOVERNMENT

The constitutions of former American slave states generally specified that the masters must provide their slaves with adequate housing, food, medical care, and old-age benefits. The Mississippi Constitution contained this additional sentence:

"The legislature shall have no power to pass laws for the emancipation of slaves * * * [except] where the slave shall have rendered the State some distinguished service."

The highest honor that Mississippi could offer a man for distinguished service to his country was personal responsibility for his own welfare His reward was freedom to find his own job and to have his own earnings, freedom to be responsible for his own housing, freedom to arrange for his own medical care, freedom to save for his own old age. In short, his reward was the individual opportunities—and the personal responsibilities—that have always distinguished a free man from a dependent.

What higher honor can any government offer?

THE RIGHTS OF A SLAVE

But many present-day Americans are trying to avoid this personal responsibility that is freedom. They are voting for men who promise to install a system of compulsory, government-guaranteed security—a partial return to the old slave laws of Georgia that guaranteed to all slaves the right to food and raiment, to kind atention when sick, to maintenance in old age. * * * And the arguments used to defend this present-day trend toward the bondage of a welfare state are essentially the same arguments that were formerly used to defend the bondage of outright slavery.

For example, many of the slave holders claimed that they knew what was best for the slaves. After all, hadn't the masters rescued the slaves from a life of savagery? The advocates of government-guaranteed security also claim that they know what is best for the people. Many of them argue in this fashion: "After all, haven't the American people conclusively shown that they are incapable of handling the responsibility for their own welfare?"

Many of the slave holders sincerely believed that the dumb, ignorant slaves would starve to death unless their welfare was guaranteed by the masters. And the advocates of compulsory security frequently say: "Are you in favor of letting people starve?"

MOST PRECIOUS OF ALL

But as proof of the fact that personal responsibility for one's own welfare brings increased material well-being, consider the emancipated slaves. Among them, there were old and crippled and sick people. They had no homes, no jobs, and little education. But—most precious of all—the former slaves were responsible for their own welfare. They were free. They had the privilege of finding their own security.

Now compare the remarkable progress of those former slaves to the lack of progress of the American Indians who were made wards of the Government; who were given state-guaranteed "security" instead of freedom with responsibility. In 1862, most American Negroes were slaves. Today they are about as self-supporting and responsible as other American citizens. Meanwhile the Indians as a group have become less self-supporting and more dependent on Government aid. It has been claimed that many thousands of Indians will actually die of starvation unless the Government feeds them. If this is true, why is it so?

CARETAKERS

There seems to be no scientific basis for calling the Indians an innately inferior race. As has been proved by the success of many individual Indians, they have just as much capacity for understanding and advancement as the Negroes and the so-called Nordics. But today there are more than 12,000 Federal employees directly "taking care" of the 233,000 reservation Indians who are still classified as wards of the Government. The number of Government caretakers for the Indians has been steadily increasing over the years. As a result, the reservation Indian is becoming less self-sufficient and more dependent upon what he calls the great white father in Washington.

Instead of freedom, the Indian has Government-guaranteed security. Instead of individual responsibility, he has a Government bureau to handle his personal affairs. There are special laws governing his right to own land and to spend tribal money. Under that system of bondage it should surprise no one to find that many thousands of Indians have remained uneducated, hungry, diseased, and mismanaged.

THE ONLY SOLUTION

The only lasting solution is for the Indians themselves to handle their own affairs on the basis of individual freedom and personal responsibility. If this is not true, then the blessings of freedom would appear to be fanciful myths. But for some queer reason, we Americans seem to believe that just because our pioneer fathers once subjugated the Indians, we in turn are obligated to keep them in the bondage of Government security. As a result, the Indian has the status of a ward instead of a citizen. Instead of being a responsible person, he is a dependent.

And in a like manner, if we free Americans continue to turn to government for our security, we too will surely become dependent wards instead of responsible citizens. There will be a Commissioner to control our personal affairs and our individual responsibilities. Instead of calico and blankets, we may be promised a hundred dollars every month. But since the principle is the same in both cases, the results will also eventually be the same.

A RETURN TO BONDAGE

The advocates of this compulsory security honestly seem to believe that most Americans—including the Indians—are too ignorant, or lazy, or worthless to be trusted with their own destiny; that they will literally starve in the streets unless their welfare is guaranteed by a benevolent government. However good their intentions may be, these disciples of a relief state are demanding that they be given the power to force mankind to follow their plans. In the name of liberty they advocate bondage.

This is true because the persons who receive support from the state are thereby led to expect—and then to demand—more support from the state. They become dependents. Thus they enter into a form of bondage. They lose their individual freedom of choice to whatever extent the state assumes responsibility for their personal welfare. In time, as is now the case in the welfare state of Russia, the people become completely subservient to the state. In effect, they become slaves of the benevolent government that has promised to solve all of their personal problems for them.

Admittedly, this is not the intent of the planners. Apparently, most of the advocates of Government paternalism really believe that they are able to know and to do what is best for all of the people. Most of them may honestly desire to help the people. But their efforts always result in some form of bondage. For example, the leaders of the Labor government in Britain probably never even dreamed of bringing compulsory labor to its supporters. Yet that is what they did. In England today the democratically elected leaders can—and do—force persons to work where the government decrees they are most needed. And if the person objects to his government's decision, force is used to make him conform.

THE ROAD TO HELL

In Russia we find another example of the fact that good intentions are no guaranty of freedom. For instance, in the beginning Lenin and Stalin probably had no desire whatever to bring slavery to Russia. Their announced plan was to free the Russian people from the slavery of an all-powerful government. But look what happened.

We Americans of today are following this same path toward the bondage of a welfare or slave state. Just as the law once guaranteed adequate medical care for American slaves, so a law to guarantee adequate medical care for all Americans is being demanded today. And who will determine what is adequate medical care for a person? Not the person, but the Government official who has the authority.

And jobs? Of course the Government can guarantee every man a job—just as every slave was guaranteed a job; just as every Russian is guaranteed a job. But it is impossible, of course, for the Government to guarantee everyone a job of his own choosing. Some persons must be guaranteed the scavenger jobs. They may not like it, but dependents have little choice.

THE ONLY HOPE

It is true that many citizens in this country are old and crippled and sick and homeless. Possibly some of them are jobless through no fault of their own. The same conditions existed during our Revolutionary War. But our ancestors knew that their only hope for permanent security lay in their own individual efforts. They knew that the main purpose of Government should be to

protect whatever security the people were able to attain individually or in voluntary cooperation. They knew that electing or appointing a man to public office cannot endow him with wisdom; it can endow him only with power. Thus they took no chances on this power of Government being used to encroach upon their individual liberties and their personal responsibilities. In advance, they put positive restrictions on all officeholders. And as a final guaranty of freedom, they specified that any powers not expressly given to the Federal officials were to remain with the individual citizens and their local governments.

THE USE OF FORCE

The American Constitution naturally did not list virtues—such as compassion, charity, and respect for one's fellow man—as functions of Government. The statesmen who founded our Government knew that all virtues are purely personal and voluntary. It is utter nonsense to imagine that a person can be forced to be good. Government can and should use force to punish a person who commits a crime. But this same force cannot be used to create kindness and compassion within the mind and heart of any person.

Thus the authors of our Constitution left compassion and charity—aid to the unfortunate—on a strictly voluntary basis. They designed a form of government based on individual freedom, personal responsibility, and equality before the law for all citizens. Wisely, they made no attempt whatever to separate freedom of choice from the resulting reward or punishment, success or failure. Since they recognized the absurdity of passing laws to protect a person from himself, they left all citizens free to make their own decisions concerning their own personal welfare. From all viewpoints, including that of material security for the so-called common man, those decisions concerning the proper functions of government proved to be the most effective that the world has ever known in this field.

BREAD AND CIRCUS

If this state-guaranteed security idea were new, it might help explain why so many people insist on trying it. But it is not new. It was written into the code of Hammurabi over 4,000 years ago. In one form or another, it has been tried time and again throughout history—always with the same result. In the Roman Empire it was called bread and circus. More recently, Karl Marx called it socialism. He believed that the state should take from each according to his abilities and give to each according to his needs.

Marx said that it was the duty of government to provide all people with adequate housing, medical care, jobs, and social security. Word for word, the advocates of Government security in this country are saying the same thing today.

And just as the Russians are enslaved to a welfare state, so this country is being carried into bondage by accepting the same false principle. Just as force is used in Russia to make the people conform to the security laws designed for their own good, so we also are now forced to submit to American security laws designed for our own good. And just as the Russian state punishes any objector, so the American state will now imprison us if we refuse to conform.

ENEMY OF THE STATE

If you doubt that compulsory socialism has gone to the extreme in this country, just test it, for instance, by refusing to pay the social-security tax that is taken from your salary. The Government will do the same thing to you that it did to the owner of a small battery shop in Pennsylvania who balked at the idea of compulsory social security. First, the state confiscated his property. Still he refused to obey. Then the state preferred criminal charges against him. And in January of 1943, the Government gave him the choice of conforming or going to prison as a criminal—an enemy of the state because he refused to pay social security. He paid. And his 6 months prison sentence was suspended.

Next may come total Government housing—for our own good, of course. Then the state will assign us so many square feet of adequate living space. This is true because, under complete state ownership of housing, there is no other way that Government can do it. We may ask for more space, a different location, better service, or a choice of neighbors. But we already know the Government's answer. Even today, a person has no real choice when he lives in Government housing.

Next may come full employment with Government-guaranteed jobs for everyone. A person will say, "I don't want this job.' And as happened under England's program of government-guaranteed full employment, the American welfare state will also answer: "We will put you in jail as a criminal unless you work at your assigned task."

Along about then, the advocates of Government-guaranteed security may begin to understand the inevitable results of their ideas. They may realize that it is power that makes a dictator, and not what he's called or how he's elected. When that fact has become obvious to everyone, the advocates of compulsory security will then exclaim: "But we didn't mean this!" It will be too late to turn back at that point. Just as the night follows the day, so government aid to the individual is followed by government control of the individual, which necessarily means government force against the individual.

NO EASY WAY

Fortunately, it is not yet too late for America to turn away from the evil that is a welfare state; a slave state. But, unfortunately, there is no simple or easy way to do it. Both major political parties—along with the smaller ones—seem to be trying to outbid each other by promising more Government housing, more social security, more free medical care, more Government welfare projects, and more special privileges to various groups and interests.

Most of our movies, magazines, newspapers, and radio programs generally endorse—directly or indirectly—the idea of some form of Government-guaranteed security. Even the few objections seem to be aimed mostly at poor administration instead of a recognition that the theory is wrong in principle.

And, whether we like it or not, many of the instructors in our schools and colleges are teaching the desirability of the relief state, the planned economy, and Government ownership in general.

GOLDEN RULE REJECTED

Finally, even some of our church leaders are teaching that the force of government should be used to make people charitable and good. Some of these Christian leaders seem to have forgotten that the principles of the Good Samaritan and each individual doing unto others as he would have others do unto him are voluntary principles. In many cases, these principles have now been discarded for this evil slogan: "It is the duty of government to care for the sick, to feed the hungry, to aid the unfortunate, and to build houses for those who need them." Probably one of the main reasons for the declining influence of the church is that the church is defaulting on many of its own responsibilities by turning them over to government. Many of our church leaders are rendering unto Caesar that which does not belong to Caesar.

But the politicians, periodicals, schools, and churches generally reflect the opinions of the persons who support them. Thus the final decision rests on the attitude of each individual American. If enough of us accept the degrading idea of a welfare state—a relief state, a slave state—the process will soon be completed. But if enough individual Americans desire to return to the personal responsibility that is freedom, we can have that too.

THE CHOICE IS OURS

Before choosing, however, consider this: When one chooses freedom—that is, personal responsibility—he should understand that his decision will not meet with popular approval. It is almost certain that he will be called vile names when he tries to explain that compulsory government security—jobs, medicine, housing, and all the rest—is bad in principle and in its total effect; it saps character and strength by encouraging greed and weakness; it destroys the individual's God-given responsibility for self-help, respect, compassion, and charity; in some degree, it automatically turns all who accept it into wards of the government; it will eventually turn a proud and responsible people into cringing dependence upon the whims of an all-powerful state; it is the primrose path to serfdom.

No, the choice is not an easy one. But then, the choice of freedom never has been easy. It never will be easy. Since this capacity for personal responsibility—freedom—is God's most precious gift to mankind, it requires the highest form of understanding and courage.

Surrendering Our State Sovereignty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 24, 1950

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, just how the American people are surrendering the sovereignty of the States through the medium of international agreements having the force and effect of treaties, was well illustrated last Tuesday by a decision in the Federal district court of appeals in Los Angeles.

The issue of sovereignty was raised in a case under California's alien land law in which a lower court had ruled that a Japanese could not keep property purchased more than 40 years ago, because he was ineligible for citizenship under the laws of California. The court of appeals held that the United Nations Charter is a treaty between the United States and other United Nations members.

Now, the Constitution of the United States, article VI, provides:

This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby; anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding.

The decision of the Court of Appeals of California said, in part:

The (United Nations) Charter guarantees universal respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all, without regard for race, color, or religion. Because the alien

land law discriminates against Japanese concerning ownership of land, its restrictions are untenable and indefensible.

This decision should be a warning to the people of the United States that not only State but Federal sovereignty may be surrendered if our Government joins in the many international organizations now being set up under the United Nations, or to be taken into relationship with the United Nations under article 57 of the Charter.

This California decision should warn the American people and their legislative representatives to look well before they leap into any new schemes for world-wide control of trade and similar proposals. Our sovereignty is too sacred to be lightly tossed away for a mess of international pottage.

Charles Hamilton Houston

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 28 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on April 22 a great American, Charles Hamilton Houston, died at the age of 54 years. Mr. Houston, a prominent attorney in the District of Columbia, was one of the strongest champions of civil rights in America. A native of Washington, he was a graduate of Amherst College and of the Harvard Law School. He was the first Negro to be an editor of the Harvard Law Review and the first Negro to be awarded the degree of doctor of juridical science by the Harvard Law School.

Mr. Houston, as a public servant and as an outstanding representative of his people and of all Americans, achieved his greatest distinction as an advocate of equal rights for all Americans regardless of their race, color, or creed. From 1929 until 1935 he was vice dean of the School of Law at Howard University. He was special counsel for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, a vice president of the American Council on Race Relations, and in 1944 he was appointed by President Roosevelt as a member of the President's Committee on Fair Employment Practices.

Mr. Houston was a distinguished son of a distinguished father who himself has had a notable career in the law and as a servant and a leader of his people.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial published in the Washington Post for Tuesday, April 25, 1950, paying tribute to Mr. Houston and his career.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHARLES H. HOUSTON

Within the professional lifetime of Charles H. Houston, a profound and significant change took place in the emancipation of American Negroes. He was one of the principal architects of this change. His great gifts as a lawyer were devoted from the beginning of his career to an unremitting battle to win for Negroes genuine equality before the law. Formidable statutory barriers of discrimination on grounds of race crumbled under the skill and stubbornness of his onslaught. It is a tragedy that he could not have lived to see the final victory of the cause he championed and did so much to win.

An outstanding student at the Harvard Law School—he was the first Negro editor of the Harvard Law Review—and later vice dean of the School of Law at Howard University, he served as special counsel for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. He led the successful appeal to the courts in the restrictive covenants cases culminating in a decision by the Supreme Court 2 years ago that such covenants are unenforceable by either State or Federal courts. And he was in the forefront of the effort to secure equal educational opportunities for Negroes in State universities. Whites no less than Negroes must mourn the death of this crusader for a principle that lies at the heart of American democracy.

Visitation From Filipino Veterans of World War II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 28, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, from a letter received from Terry Magtangol Adevoso, national commander of the Philippine Veterans' Legion, I learn that during the present session of the Congress a delegation of the Filipino veterans of World War II is to come from the islands to visit with us here in the Capital at Washington. I bespeak for them the most cordial of welcomes. For these veterans who stood loyally and valiantly in perilous and uncertain days side by side with Americans from many States of the Union there ever will be deep in our hearts a warm affection.

For many years prior to World War II I was closely associated with the fine young men and women who constituted the Philippine colony in the city of Chicago. There at that time were some 5,000 in the group, and I felt that from their association with us in the routine of the daily living of our lives together in a democratic atmosphere would come a bond of closer understanding which would serve the common interest of both the Filipinos and the people of the United States when troubles in the Orient should involve us. I need not say that no one was more thrilled and gratified than was I by the manner in which the Filipinos did prove their understanding of and their friendship for us when trouble did come and Pearl Harbor had left us with our backs to the wall.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, that when a boy of 16, returning from the siege of Santiago in Cuba, I was prevented from reenlisting for service in the Philippines by an illness which seized me in the fever-plagued camp in Cuba after the surrender and from which the remnant of the American invasion army was saved only by the famous "round robin" of "Teddy" Roosevelt and in which Col. James Hamilton Lewis, later to serve with such brilliance as a United States Senator from Illinois, joined at risk of military discipline and court martial. But my tentmate and buddy, another boy of 16, did go to the Philippines and shortly thereafter fell in action. For more than half a century his body has reposed in Philippine soil. My lifelong interest in the people of the islands I have wished to be something in the nature of a small memorial to this boy soldier of America with whom I served in the storming of Santiago.

With my colleagues who served in World War I and World War II, I shall give warm welcome to the veterans from the islands when they come to Washington.

The letter of Commander Adevoso follows:

PHILIPPINE VETERANS' LEGION,
Manila, Philippines, March 9, 1950.
Hon. BARRATT O'HARA,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: The Philippine Veterans' Legion, a national organization of Filipino veterans of World War II is, with the blessings of our people, sending in the very near future a mission to Washington, D. C., to seek the passage of the Kearney bill.

The Kearney bill, as we have been informed, provides for educational benefits and mustering-out pay to Filipino veterans and burial expenses to war widows and dependent parents of Filipino deceased soldiers. The passage of the Kearney bill would be a great relief to Filipino ex-servicemen, war widows, orphans, and indigent parents.

We Filipino veterans feel that we can count on your support, knowing as we do that you are also a veteran.

Perhaps, it is needless to say, deeming it to be a common knowledge that on this side of the Pacific we are very much left out. Our men, during the fighting, were promised equal postwar treatment with their American brother in the same foxhole, only for them to find out after the war was over that they are out as far as readjustment benefits are concerned. We all feel, therefore, that we should let you know that as fellow defenders of the ideals of democracy and the democratic way of life who fought under an American commander, on American soil, for the American flag, and against a common enemy, we have not been treated justly. We also feel that the enjoyment of benefits that the Kearney bill would make possible for us in a certain measure, would be only an act of justice on the part of the American people and Government. We believe that we are not fighting for anything unreasonable, but that which is rightly due our veteran.

We trust, that not only do you see the justness of our claim, but that you sufficiently appreciate it to want to help us.

We hope that the members of the mission after their arrival at Washington, D. C., will benefit from whatever help you may be able to extend to them.

Allow us to extend to you the warmest regards and best wishes of 330,186 Usaffes and recognized guerrillas and 106,502 war widows and indigent parents.

Very sincerely yours,
TERRY "MAGTANGOL" ADEVOSO,
National Commander.

Donaldson Order a Fraud

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 24, 1950

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, Many Congressmen are in agreement that the spectacular order of Postmaster General Jesse Donaldson to fire thousands of postal workers and to lay off other thousands in an apparent economy move was nothing but a cleverly-designed political tactic to make it seem that the administration is trying to promote efficiency in Government.

The order proves just the opposite. If Mr. Donaldson and the Trumanites want to promote efficiency in the Post Office Department—a highly worthy purpose, most every one agrees—they should follow the careful recommendations of the Hoover Commission. Instead, Mr. Donaldson and his advisers have sniffed disdainfully at the Hoover reforms and steadfastly have refused even to endorse them.

It is a matter of cold fact, provable by figures, that the Post Office could save from one-fourth to one-half billion dollars by putting the Hoover reforms into effect. Instead, Mr. Donaldson hastily pulls some reforms out of his own hat and wants citizens to believe that these reforms are to promote efficiency.

The Donaldson order will promote inefficiency. It will promote a more disgruntled postal service. It will promote a more disgruntled citizenry. It will save very little, compared to what could be saved. The postal workers have fought and won increases in pay, fairly and legitimately. Now, many of them will be robbed of any pay, through Mr. Donaldson's shenanigans.

Voice of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 21, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, May 1 marks the first anniversary of the use by the Voice of America of Martin Block's international make-believe ballroom program. The use of this program by the Voice of America was in response to numerous requests from overseas listeners for broadcasts featuring popular American music. The anniversary will be signalized on the Voice of America by a special 1-hour program. There is appended a statement obtained from the Department of State describing this program:

Mr. Block volunteers his services, recordings, and facilities for the International Make-Believe Ballroom, which is beamed by short-wave to Europe, Latin America, and the Far East, and is sent in the form of transcriptions to numerous USIS outposts for use by local radio stations in those areas.

The program is designed to popularize not only America's music, but also the American way of life and the freedom with which American singers, composers, and artists live and work. It is also designed to complement and balance the talks, commentaries, analyses, features, and news with which the Voice of America schedule is weighted.

The International Make-Believe Ballroom has been a popular one from the start and has attracted thousands of letters from all parts of the world, including some from behind the iron curtain.

It has become one of the most popular English language programs broadcast by the Voice of America. The program is 30 minutes weekly, and is divided into two parts. In the first, Mr. Block plays the latest music releases and, in the second, he plays requests from overseas listeners, mentioning their names. The format of the show is similar to the domestic version of "Make-Believe Ballroom," except that more attention is given to background material about the music, composers, and musicians.

Since the International Make-Believe Ballroom started, Mr. Block has never failed to produce the weekly show, despite illnesses and the pressure of his own career.

The first anniversary will be characterized on the Voice of America by a special 1-hour program, which will include congratulations and greetings from some of America's leading performers.

What Alaska Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 26, 1950

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, many years ago, I read a report of the Department of Agriculture that Alaska was capable of supporting a population comparable with the combined population of the Scandinavian countries of Sweden, Norway, and Finland. I believe that was before gold was discovered in the Klondike and at Nome.

Since then, Alaska has come in for considerable attention by the Federal departments with the result that little in the way of real development has been accomplished.

Gold miners never do much in developing any country. Their motive, in the past, has been to get into a country, get the gold, and get out.

One of Alaska's most valuable resources is its timber. Withdrawing Alaskan timberlands from settlement to put them in forest reserves has greatly retarded the development of the Territory. If there is any resource that has sustained the settlers that went up on the public land in this country and built up the communities of our Nation, it was our stands of timber on public land. If there is anything that sustains the Finnish people today, it is the utilization of Finland's timber resources.

Alaska needs transportation. It needs roads and settlers. It needs a liberal policy by the Federal Government in assisting the settlers to go upon and own their lands and homes, and encouragement to use Alaska's natural resources, including Alaska's stands of timber.

Let us remove the blocks holding Alaska back and let the great commonwealth roll forward in its development as the forty-ninth State in the Union.

There is inserted herewith for the consideration of my colleagues an appeal to the President by the people of Hot Springs, Alaska, for the continuation and protection of their indispensable air transportation by the so-called bush pilots:

MR. PRESIDENT, WE ARE LOSING FAITH

For decades, we who live in Alaska have been doing our best to develop the resources of our great Territory and to expand the economy of our northland. We have been doing all in our power to build a good American civilization up here in these northern latitudes.

WE WERE INSPIRED

We were tremendously inspired when you sent special messages to Congress urging a great program of development in Alaska. We were very happy when you pointed out the opportunities for permanent settlement in the Territory. We knew we had a friend in the White House when you urged immediate statehood for Alaska—equal rights under the American flag for us living up here. We knew that you had an accurate picture of Alaska's strategic importance when you championed an impregnable over-the-top defense.

With your sponsorship, we had high hopes for the rapid growth of our Territory. But one agency of our Federal Government is completely nullifying your program for Alaska. This agency is hamstringing, stifling, and thwarting progress and growth in the Territory.

This agency is the Civil Aeronautics Board. As far as Alaska is concerned, the CAB is doing exactly the opposite of what was intended in the act of 1938 under which the CAB was sworn.

THE CAB DESTROYS

In Alaska, the CAB is killing off the bush flyer so vital to the economy of our hinterland.

In Alaska, the CAB is doing a miserable job of dealing with the problems of the intra-Alaskan air carriers.

The CAB has publicly announced that it is determined that the nonscheduled, low-cost air carriers between the States and Alaska—upon whom we depend for more than two-thirds of our food, supplies, and merchandise—shall be wiped from the skies.

Though we have been trying, for years, to get more scheduled air lines between the States and Alaska, the CAB says, in substance, that this is not necessary, that additional service would not be in the public interest.

It is this type of unrealistic thinking on the part of the CAB that clearly shows the Board's lack of understanding of the problems of the Territory. Is it any wonder, Mr. President, that we in the Territory call the CAB "the low man on the totem pole"?

The Alaska Territorial Legislature sent a memorial to the CAB stating that this agency was working 100 percent against the best interests of Alaska. Where did it get us? Nowhere.

Chambers of commerce from one end of Alaska to the other have expressed their disapproval of CAB policies. The Alaska Development Board, merchants' associations, community clubs, government agencies, the clergy, countless individuals, the persecuted pilots themselves and even native tribes have all protested to the CAB—but without avail.

In our own case, Mr. President, in our own village of Hot Springs, Alaska, the CAB arbitrarily, and without adequate hearing, denied our local air line the right to carry

United States mail. The CAB gave the certificate to a large company which had never served our town. It meant nothing to the CAB that Lon Brennan and Bob Byers had served us faithfully and honestly for more than 10 years, that they had helped us build up our hinterland economy so that all of us were making a pretty good living. It meant nothing to the CAB that this bush company would not be able to survive the competition of an air line guaranteed a profit and receiving a subsidy from the United States Treasury.

Never had a member of the CAB, while in office, ever come to Alaska to find out first hand, our needs in air transportation. Never had even an Alaskan employee of the Board been to our area to see how much we depended on Lon Brennan and Bob Byers for our basic economic needs. Yet the CAB, sitting in Washington, handed down a decision which, if allowed to stand, will kill the economy of our area.

We have lost all confidence in the CAB, Mr. President. Our last hope was dashed last November when a member of the Board made a swift 10-day trip to three cities of the Territory. We had high hopes that he would make an effort to understand our air needs. But he came to tell us, and not to listen. He refused to talk with two-thirds of the persons who asked to talk with him. From our standpoint, his trip was a dismal failure.

FACT-FINDING COMMISSION

Mr. President, we Alaskans petition you to appoint a Presidential fact-finding commission of at least five impartial and unbiased minds. We ask that this commission come to Alaska to hold hearings on the air needs of Alaska, to talk formally and informally with our citizens on what kind of air policy will best serve the needs of a growing country, what kind of policy will help—not hinder—the over-the-top defense program.

This fact-finding commission should represent the Federal Government and the public in the broadest sense. The commission members should have a hearty sympathy for the problems of the frontier. They should be willing to listen to the little man—the American pioneer in Alaska who stakes his bank roll on a chance to pull himself up by his bootstraps.

Mr. President, we want a fair deal in Alaska. We want a fair deal for Lon Brennan and Bob Byers in our own backyard. We want a fair deal for all other bush pilots in the Territory. We want a fair deal for the nonscheduled air carriers between the States and Alaska. We want a fair deal for the intra-Alaskan carriers. And we believe we are entitled to more scheduled service between Alaska and all parts of the States.

Mr. President, the citizens of Alaska ask your cooperation. Give us, for the economy of the Territory, an air industry free from the paralysis of the CAB, and we shall forever be grateful.

CITIZENS OF HOT SPRINGS, ALASKA.

Invocation at Jackson-Jefferson Day Banquet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 28 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the invocation delivered at the Jackson-Jefferson Day banquet at Denver, Colo., by the Rt. Rev. Msgr. John R. Mulroy on April 20, 1950. Many who heard it rejoiced in its excellence. Therefore, I wish to give others the opportunity of profiting from it.

There being no objection, the invocation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INVOCATION

O God, Our Father, behold this assembly of Thy children who invoke Thy Name and ask for Thy blessing. Tonight they deign to begin this rally by calling on Thee, in adoration, love, and thanksgiving. You have bestowed many blessings upon them in the years just passed. They have been instruments in the sharing of those blessings by many citizens and many nations. Therefore, they say with the psalmist, "Non nobis, Domine, non nobis sed nomins tuo da gloriam"? "Not to us, O Lord, not to us, but to Thy Name give glory."

Tonight we thank Thee for Thy many gifts, that we may be worthy of their continuation in the future. We ask Thy benediction for all here assembled, not only upon the food they eat, but upon all the thoughts, desires, and resolves that they here make.

We are aware of our shortcomings. We know that as with some of Columbus' men, false lights appeared on a shadowy shore, as gleaming cities of the mirage allure the weary travelers with visions that cannot endure, so the false philosophy of heaven on earth has led some of us astray. Disillusion them tonight, O good God, by words of wisdom from their leaders, bring them the blessings of harmony in speech and honesty in action. May the sense of accountability to Thee, O kind, but just God, return to those who have forgotten it. May all of us realize that success and honor bring duties and responsibilities and that in our fair land, stewardship is weighed in the balance of our fellow citizens. Ultimately, honesty and unselfishness tip the scales.

Bless in particular, tonight, our honored speaker and his distinguished confreres in national and State affairs. May they have courage, confidence, and good health to continue their good deeds so many of which go unrecognized and unrewarded. May they keep our ship of state as a true vessel of Thy election, O good God, to bring justice, mercy, and charity to all mankind. Be with us now and always that we may not lose the keys of Thy kingdom on earth and in Heaven. Amen!

Time for Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 28, 1950

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I include a radio interview on the Time for Defense program between Gen. J. Lawton Collins, Chief of Staff, United States Army, and Mr. Lyle C. Wilson, chief of the Washington Bureau, United Press, on April 25. In this interview, General Collins deals with national defense from the Army viewpoint; and his timely and very informative remarks follow:

General COLLINS. It is a pleasure to be back on the Time for Defense program, which is performing a great service in giving the American people facts about their national defense. It is even more of a pleasure to introduce our guests for this evening, Mr. Lyle Wilson, chief of the United Press Washington Bureau for the past 16 years and a keen student of our many and complex problems of security. We are happy to have you with us tonight, Lyle.

Mr. WILSON. Thank you, General Collins. I have some questions, the first of which concerns the state of readiness of our armed forces, and about which there has been much discussion recently in the press. Could you tell us, just how ready is the Army today?

General COLLINS. Mr. Wilson, we have a small Army but a good one. During the war, we had 90 combat divisions, all but one of which saw action. Today, we have only 10 divisions at reduced strength. Our units are equipped principally with World War II equipment, most of which is about 7 years old. However, we do have some units—the Eighty-second Airborne Division at Fort Bragg, N. C., for example—which are ready right now to move to any spot in the world in case of emergency. For the entire Army, however, I can summarize by saying that with due consideration for strength restrictions add certain deficiencies in equipment, our units, if attacked, would give an excellent account of themselves.

Mr. WILSON. Well, thank you, you answered up on that one. Now, let me ask you this question. What, in your opinion, have been the Army's most noteworthy postwar weapon developments?

General COLLINS. Some of our most noteworthy postwar weapon developments have been in the field of defense against air attack. Because new developments in aircraft are rapidly making our conventional antiaircraft guns obsolete, our problem has been to develop new weapons to combat the high-flying, fast bombers that may be used to attack the United States. I am happy to tell you that the Army is making genuine progress in this field. Naturally, the details of these weapons will have to remain secret, but I think that the American people ought to know as much as possible about what they can expect from the Army as far as protection from air attack is concerned. For example, the Army has in the advanced stages of development new antiaircraft rockets, which will be relatively inexpensive, and which we are confident will be able to destroy planes at altitudes above 60,000 feet.

Mr. WILSON. Pretty high.

General COLLINS. Yes, indeed. That's far in excess of the capabilities of present-day bombers.

We also have an antiaircraft guided missile which gives promise of destroying attacking planes at even greater ranges and with even greater accuracy.

Another problem which plagued us during the war, and which has been intensified since, is how to defeat potential aggressor armies that have vast numbers of tanks. We now feel that we are well on the way toward producing a weapon of radical design that can fill this need, and which may, in fact, change the whole concept of tank warfare.

Of course, the principal limitation in the development of all of these new weapons is the availability of funds, because we can never get as much money as we feel we need. But I can assure you that the Army is getting the utmost out of every dollar it spends for research and development. In its efforts to provide these new weapons, the Army has engaged outstanding civilian

scientists and industrialists who are doing a splendid job in helping us.

Mr. WILSON. That's encouraging. Now I would like to discuss with you one of the basic concepts of the Army system. The other day I read a fine compliment to your organization, in Mr. Alfred P. Sloan's autobiography, in which he stated that when he became President of General Motors he developed a General Staff similar to the one used in the Army, organized, you know, on a functional basis. That is certainly a tribute to the Army when you consider that management efficiency and economy have always been vital to American business. General Collins, just what is the Army's General Staff Corps? Is it composed entirely of generals, for instance? Is it an elite corps? Just what is it?

General COLLINS. No, Lyle. It's not composed, fortunately, just of generals. The General Staff is not an elite corps. Officers serve on the General Staff for several years and then leave it to go back to duty with troops. We have them do this because we feel that our officers must have broad experience in both staff and command duties. As a matter of fact, command of troops, in my mind, gives more real satisfaction to officers than any staff duty would. But to get back to your question, however, the Army General Staff had its origin in the Army's own unification controversy about 50 years ago. In the early nineteen hundreds there was a tremendous amount of duplication and conflict in the Army, all at the expense of the taxpayer. This was caused by independent and separate acts of various chiefs of Army bureaus who were frequently in opposition to one another. Mr. Elihu Root, the then Secretary of War, decided that we had to put a stop to it. So he established a General Staff in 1903. It was to be a group of men serving the Secretary of the Army and having general cognizance of and coordination responsibility over, broad fields of Army activity. The members of the General Staff do not make decisions or exercise command; they merely recommend to the Secretary and assist him to perform his many complicated duties.

Mr. WILSON. Well, that's what they do, all right. But where is it, and does this General Staff exist only in Washington?

General COLLINS. No. This system begins in the Army, as a matter of fact, down in our battalions, and as you know, the battalion is the basic combat unit of the Army. The battalion commander has a small staff, consisting of a personnel officer, the S–1, who assists in all personnel matters; an intelligence officer, the S–2, who correlates all the information about the enemy that is coming in from various sources; the S–3, who assists the battalion commander in issuing tactical orders, and in planning and training; and, finally, he has an S–4, who coordinates all logistical matters, such as supply, transportation, and evacuation of the wounded. This small battalion staff is really a miniature version of the General Staff.

Mr. WILSON. May I interrupt, General? Are you using the word "general" as a generic term or as a military term?

General COLLINS. Well, if I remember what generic means——

Mr. WILSON. I'm not sure I do. It's a wonderful word.

General COLLINS. Well, as I understand it, the term means truly general in character. In other words, the simplest meaning of the word "general." It has no particular significance in relationship to generals of the Army.

Mr. WILSON. No stars?

General COLLINS. No stars involved in it at all. It really applies, then, to a staff which has general fields—broad fields—of activity. For example, a step above the battalion commander is the regimental commander, who has a broader responsibility since he commands three battalions. The regimental commander needs a staff with the same basic functions as the battalion staff. Similarly, the larger units—divisions, corps, and armies—need considerable staffs. And, finally, when you get to the Department of the Army here in Washington, you find exactly the same system which we have paralleled in our units in the field. However, above the regiment, the staff officers are no longer called S–1, 2, 3, and 4, but rather G–1, 2, 3, and 4, although they have similar duties.

Mr. WILSON. What about these sensational charges, General, that we have seen made from time to time against the Army General Staff and how it was going to take over the country?

General COLLINS. Frankly, we don't think anybody is greatly concerned about such a charge. Actually such charges are ridiculous. The General Staff does not have any power of its own, even inside the Army, let alone in any other organization of Government. It can only make recommendations to the Secretary of the Army or the subordinate commanders in the field. It never has had any command function and never should have. The Army has always been—and we in the Army feel it always should be—definitely subordinate to civilian authority.

Mr. WILSON. It seems that this similarity existing betwen the staffs of your smaller and larger units would have outstanding advantages both in peace and war.

General COLLINS. Well, it definitely has Lyle. It is a perfectly magnificent system, productive of great economy of effort, minimum duplication, and maximum of efficiency. The fact that we have it as a uniform system throughout our Army permits our young officers to gain experience in using it as they move along in the chain of command. So when they move from the battalion to the regiment, they do not have to learn a new staff system. It is the same one they are already familiar with. It's uniform throughout the Army. It is valuable also when units pass back and forth between various commands in time of war. When a new division joins a corps, for example, the corps commander does not need to explain what his system is to the division commander. During the war, for example, I had 22 divisions pass through my seventh corps. They went in and out without causing a ripple. We all talked the same language, we all followed the same system. This uniformity of procedure is tremendously important in peace, and is even more important in war.

Mr. WILSON. Sounds good, so let me ask you this, General: Once selected, do officers always stay on the General Staff?

General COLLINS. No, Lyle, they do exactly the opposite. Because we feel that they should spend most of their time out in the field, broadening their experience by gaining first-hand knowledge of troop problems, we detail them for a tour of only 3 years on the General Staff, and then send them back to the field to some other type of duty. In this way, we get well-rounded officers with balanced staff and field experience. This practice is a part of Army career planning for officers.

Mr. WILSON. Well, General, I must say that your explanation has certainly cleared up a lot of things. Now I hope we have time for this one last question: I have often heard it said that one of the first Communist objectives in case of war would be the industries of western Europe. If this were true, how would it affect the character of a war that we might have to fight?

General COLLINS. Well, I certainly agree that western Europe is one of the great industrial areas of the world. And, undoubtedly, it would be a great prize for any aggressor and would be a very important consideration in the plans for defense that we are formulating with our friends in western Europe. The campaigns that might have to be fought to defend this area are certain to be greatly influenced by the geography of the area and the capabilities of potential aggressors. We know that the police states have the greatest land armies in the world and are extremely strong in armored divisions, which are capable of fast, offensive thrusts across the land. Undoubtedly any campaign that they would launch would result in a great land and air battle in northern Europe. In my judgment it would require land forces—armies—supported by tactical air forces to stop them.

It is our fervent hope, of course, that with our Marshall plan, the North Atlantic Treaty, and the military-assistance program—backed up by our own military preparedness—we can prevent this battle from ever taking place.

Notable Radio Broadcast by Rear Admiral Swanson, Surgeon General of the Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 28, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as supplementing the informative, illuminating, and valuable remarks of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON] in this Chamber on Wednesday, April 26, 1950, and appearing on pages 5818–5819 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that day, I wish to call to the attention of the House and of the country the outstanding contribution of the National Naval Medical Center at Bethesda, Md., to the health of the members of the armed services and their families, and also, to an extent not generally known, through extensive and fruitful research, to the health of the entire country.

In this connection I am inserting by leave unanimously granted the full text of a radio broadcast prepared for Quorum Call, the weekly radio program of the Illinois Congressman, which is broadcast over WCFL in Chicago and other stations in the Middle West. I am sure that the Membership of the House will find most interesting the remarks of Rear Adm. Clifford A. Swanson, Medical Corps, United States Navy, the great Surgeon General of the Navy. The text of the broadcast follows:

Representative O'HARA. Admiral Swanson, visiting at the National Naval Medical Center at Bethesda, Md., I have been greatly impressed by the high-level efficiency of Navy hospital management. I appreciate that civilian hospitals have many problems and that as a whole they are doing a magnificent job. However, I am informed that sometimes the cost of hospitalization is greater than the average American family can afford, without serious inroads into savings. For this reason many patients may not be hospitalized, and many others may go to the hospital tardily and leave before it is quite prudent. I would say that it is a subject in which all the American people, including certainly the doctors, are keenly interested. We all are concerned with insuring adequate medical services and with

advancing the health and welfare of the people. Of course, there are differences of opinion on matters of procedure to achieve these worthy objectives. I would like to get from you, and I know our listeners would be tremendously interested, a general idea of how the naval medical and hospital service works. That, it seems to me, would be an intimate, close-to-home contribution to the modern concept of the progress of health administration and improved welfare through the miracles of modern medicine. In a way, Admiral Swanson, what we have in the armed services, and have enjoyed since the earliest days of the Republic, is a highly organized, efficient practice of medicine. There has always been the warmest cooperation between the civilian physicians and the Medical Corps of the armed services with mutual benefits. Indeed, I have heard it said that the one clear victory we won in World War II, and that was a victory in which all the world shared, was the victory over disease. That is, that medical science, both preventative and curative, under the spurs of the necessities and emergencies of the great war, and under the direction of men like yourself who had devoted your lives to the field of military medicine, and with the unselfish and invaluable cooperation of the civilian medical profession, made in a space of 4 or 5 years a progress never before in all the history of the world even approached in its extent and magnitude. I wonder, Admiral Swanson, if you would care to comment on that accomplishment? Is it true that because of this constructive progress of medical science during the trial and stress of a devastating war the life expectancy of human beings the world over, human beings born after the war was over, will be materially extended?

Admiral SWANSON. Yes, Congressman O'HARA, war is always a stimulus to advances in the field of medicine and surgery. Military surgeons achieved results in World War II never before equaled in military or civilian medicine. For example, out of every 100 men wounded, 97 survived, a mortality rate of 3 percent as compared with a mortality rate of 11.1 percent in World War I. Although in previous wars deaths from disease always outnumbered deaths from enemy action, in World War II, for the first time in history, that ratio was reversed. In the First World War, one out of three patients with meningitis died, while in the late war only one out of 22 died. The mortality rate for lobar pneumonia in World War I was 12 percent, while in World War II less than 1 percent died; deaths from measles were reduced from 8 per 1,000 to five-tenths per 1,000, and deaths from erysipelas were reduced from 20 per 1,000 to seven-tenths per 1,000. In all wars previous to World War I typhoid and typhus killed thousands, but during the entire period of the late war there were only 3 deaths from typhoid fever and 19 from typhus fever among the 5,000,000 men in the Navy and Marine Corps.

I remember this statement by Sir Thomas Albutt of England made in the past century: "I would remind you again how large and various was the experience of the battlefield and how fertile the blood of warriors in rearing good doctors."

Of course, our World War II record was not achieved by military doctors alone, but by the combined efforts of the regular members of the Medical Department, along with thousands of civilians in uniform, hospital corpsmen, nurses and dentists, and civilians not in uniform.

Both the combatant and medical units of the Navy wage war against enemies. However, the enemies against which the medical profession wages war are ever present in the form of the host of diseases as well as the many pitfalls and hazards which are ever increasing as the result of civilization's progress. The combatant units march under the banner of Mars and must have as their cardinal mission the dubious glory of slaying human beings. The medical forces march under the banner of Aesculapius and have as their cardinal mission the solemn duty of salvaging and saving.

War does indeed promote medical progress, but of course this is not an argument in favor of war as a means of solving the problems of medicine, such as finding the cure for heart disease or cancer or the other diseases we do not now understand.

Representative O'HARA. Thank you, Admiral Swanson, for that heartening contribution. I think this is something that our American people should know a little better than they do. While the primary benefits of the medical services and hospitals of the armed services go to service personnel and their dependents, indirectly all of us everywhere benefit to the extent of having materially increased our life expectancy. Before we leave that phase it might help our listeners to a better understanding of how this work in the interest of all of us is still a vital part of the medical program of the armed services by telling them something about the National Naval Medical Center and the activities of Rear Adm. M. D. Willcutts, his administrative assistant, Lt. Comdr. C. L. Crawford, and the other members of the staff.

Admiral SWANSON. The National Naval Medical Center at Bethesda is one of the greatest institutions of its kind in the world. Commissioned and dedicated in 1942 by President Roosevelt, it has grown into a powerful institution devoted to care and treatment of naval personnel, their dependents, Members of Congress, veterans, and others. It includes a naval hospital; a medical school and a dental school for postgraduate training of Medical Department personnel; a school of hospital administration for training of officers and corpsmen; and a medical research institute.

We are proud of the prestige attached to the Bethesda professional staff in all its specialized aspects. We are proud of the advanced training in atomic medicine we are giving here to Regular and Reserve officers. We are particularly emphasizing our research program under the counsel of a distinguished civilian scientist, Dr. Kenneth Cole. The professional competence of our physicians and dentists will increase as research adds to our professional knowledge. At the same time we are keeping abreast of the medical aspects of warfare in order to give the maximum support to naval combatant units in case of another emergency.

Representative O'HARA. Now, this leads, of course, to another subject. You mentioned it the other day when we were chatting, and it made a deep impression on me that one as busy as yourself as the Surgeon General of the Navy, the executive and responsible head of a great system of medical services, studies, and research and of some of the best hospitals in the world nevertheless found time to participate actively in world discussions of the subject of the effect of population concentrations. That is not exactly a related subject in a strictly medical sense, but certainly there is a cause-and-effect relationship. That is, as your profession of medicine more and more solves its problem of combating disease the greater and greater becomes the problem of the economist—population concentration. Sometimes we hear it said that in this complex civilization of ours there is too much planning, that we ought to go back to the simple primitive formula of just letting things work themselves out. That's what the Indians in North America did—let things work themselves out—with the result that when a hard winter came they weren't prepared and died off so rapidly that there certainly wasn't any population concentration problem among them. So unless we had planning now and coordination among the keen brains in all activities we would only get rid of one headache by taking on another. That's why I think it is so illuminating to stress your interest in the problem of population concentrations. What you are doing, with civilian doctors and scientists in the service of the people, is to increase the population of the world by removing the causes of plagues and finding new cures for diseases. I suppose, Admiral Swanson, that while your work primarily is in the field of physical ailments you feel that you do have an interest, and a related interest, in the field of economic ailments, inasmuch as you do not wish to see your work in increasing population undone by a growing spread of malnutrition and starvation. I know our listeners, Admiral Swanson, would appreciate hearing from you your views on this problem of population concentrations and how you as Surgeon General of the Navy have accepted it as your duty to the American people to participate in its study.

Admiral SWANSON. Congressman O'HARA, you have raised a question of great interest to me. I believe that doctors must collaborate with economists, political scientists, diplomats, psychologists, and religious leaders in solving world problems and domestic problems.

I believe that by making additional areas of the world available for settlement by use of medical science and industrial technology we can help solve political problems which are too difficult for diplomacy alone. Some of the conflicts and discontent in Europe, the Middle East, and Asia can be resolved if a part of the population migrates to new frontiers where century-old prejudices and conflicts can be forgotten. We can use science to solve at least some political problems by providing the means to make new areas livable.

There are now sparsely settled areas in South America, Africa, Australia, Siberia, Indonesia, Arabia, and Canada To make them livable science must help supply the technical know-how for irrigation, sanitary engineering, scientific agriculture, and protection against certain diseases, along with general medical knowledge. We can contribute especially in the field of tropical medicine to make some torrid zone areas available for utilization. I visualize considerable movements of population from politically contentious and relatively overpopulated areas to presently underdeveloped parts of the world, with the help of science and particularly of medical science. The latter scientific aid can be given under both private and governmental auspices.

We do not need to be concerned now with increased populations and the increased power of some nations which will result from medicine's reduction of mortality rates. Politically we shall create hosts of friends for the United States by sharing our medical knowledge. The balance of power will remain on our side. We shall of course also advance our own interests in health by reducing disease abroad. In an air age we shall become able to travel with relative health safety everywhere, and make less likely the spread of communicable disease to our own people.

Moreover, we shall improve the economic status of other people by increasing their capacity to produce and thus enhance their ability to buy the products of American industry.

As to your specific question regarding population concentrations—Thomas Malthus wrote early in the last century that population increases geometrically while food supply increases only arithmetically. He therefore predicted eventual starvation for millions. His predictions have not materialized as yet. However, if we look to the future, his fears as to an inadequate food supply and insufficient living space would appear to be genuinely warranted. Medical

science has indeed contributed to the great increase of population; but it can also contribute indirectly to increasing the food supply to care for a larger population. The world now tills about 3,500,000 square miles. Agricultural economists say this can be at least doubled to feed more people who live longer. But a great effort by engineers and doctors will be needed. Increased world productivity, especially in the sparsely settled areas, depends on improving the agricultural methods and the health of people who are to produce what is needed. In this connection I might note that the Navy distributed vaccines in the Middle East to stop the cholera epidemic there several years ago, and thus helped the population back to some degree of stability and economic progress.

It has been said that when the British took up the white man's burden and built their empire they brought the native colonial peoples trousers and Bibles. If the United States should contemplate a free United Nations empire, it might instead bring to the imperial citizens inoculations, vaccines, and medical books. Certainly these gifts will be better received than the OCPU's and the Communist loyalty forms which the Kremlin is trying to distribute in Prague, Warsaw, and elsewhere. An American abroad as a governmental or private doctor will not be received as an imperialist. The Navy Medical Department sees any local medical emergency abroad, where naval ships may happen to visit, as an opportunity to offer such medical aid to the population as is feasible and thereby immeasurable good will may be inculcated.

The record of American medicine under General MacArthur's administration in Japan is impressively illustrative of the tremendous benefits which can accrue from the employment of basic health measures. During the first year of American occupation, that is in 1945 and 1946, there occurred in the Japanese Empire 21,000 cases of smallpox. Under the direction of the Surgeon General of the Army, General Bliss, the most colossal mass vaccination of a people ever undertaken was consummated when 78,000,000 Japanese were vaccinated against smallpox in a single year. Following this vaccination the incidence of smallpox in 1 year dropped from 21,000 cases to 20 cases.

Under the public-health program implemented by the United States Army in Japan, diarrheal diseases have been reduced from 450 per thousand to 40 per thousand. Typhus fever and other communicable diseases have been correspondingly reduced and as a result of our conquest of disease there, during the past few years the average life expectancy among the Japanese has been increased from 37 to 39 years. Thus does it appear obvious that Japan is on its way to a realization of a higher state of health than it has ever known.

Another illustration of the effectiveness of the know-how of American medicine was that demonstrated in Egypt several years ago in connecton with the epidemic of cholera which broke out there. Hospital Corpsmen of the United States Navy went into the cholera infested areas and by spraying DDT and killing myriads of flies, a major vector in the transmission of cholera was eradicated. The American contingent in Arabia connected with ARAMCO, or the American Arabian Oil Co., has carried inestimable good will to Arabia by providing medical coverage for natives and Americans alike in the areas occupied by that company.

Representative O'HARA. Admiral Swanson, I think from what you have said our listeners will get the impression which I have so strongly of the broad scope of what we are accomplishing in the field of public health medicine which we have in the United States, on a limited scale, in the Medical Corps of the armed services. The doctors are medical career men. I have seen them at the hospital at Bethesda, which wouldn't have its reputation as one of the best hospitals in the world unless the surgeons and physicians were, as everyone recognizes, men who would command the most lucrative practices in civilian life in any community. Compared with what they could earn in civilian practice their salaries are meager even to the point of being niggardly. Yet I have never seen in any of them, or heard of, any complaint. To the contrary, there is a definite professional dignity and pride, a rare enthusiasm as though relief from the necessity of keeping books running an office and the administrative chores of the commercial end of private practice, which served to concentrate their interests in the field of pure medicine. Now, this is interesting to me because I have never believed that man needed the spur of monetary reward to do his best work provided he did have opportunity for professional growth and a reasonable degree of individual and family security. It may be an old-fashioned idea, but I am sure it is sound and that you in the Medical Corps of the armed services prove its soundness in a modern world, that in the professions a practitioner may do excellent work and achieve professional contentment even without a monetary incentive. What from your position of preeminence in this field is your view, Admiral Swanson? How many surgeons, physicians, dentists, and other professionals do you have under your jurisdiction, and in this time of doctor shortage do you have any difficulty in providing replacements?

Admiral SWANSON. I agree, Congressman O'HARA, that the major attraction to any good doctor is the privilege of practicing his profession. I believe especially that military medical practice, which involves the saving of life while others are endeavoring to destroy it, is the noblest profession of man. Of course, we need to stimulate many of the professions, not merely the medical, toward achievement by supplying rewards over and beyond the monetary ones. As for our Navy doctors, they are soundly motivated by professional pride and the opportunity for public service, as well as their military pay, retirement benefits, and security of family. The majority of civilian doctors, I am sure, are equally motivated by nonmaterial rewards.

We now have in the Medical Department 3,081 medical officers, 971 dental officers, 618 Medical Service Corps officers, 2,069 nurses, 194 warrant officers, and 17,239 hospital corpsmen. The Navy Medical Department also includes thousands of civilians without whose loyal and invaluable support the Department could not function. They are, in fact, working for their own Navy the same as we are working for their and our Navy.

We have had difficulties in securing enough doctors to meet our needs, incident no doubt to a natural antipathy for the armed services which follows all wars but today our situation is relatively satisfactory. The increasing rate of application for appointment to the Medical Corps of the Navy is definitely encouraging. We believe we are today offering opportunities to young doctors in Navy medicine that are unsurpassed.

Representative O'HARA. As a midwesterner, Admiral Swanson, I hope I'll be excused for a bit of sectional pride in the fact that you, the Surgeon General of the Navy, come from Michigan, Rear Admiral Willcutts, the commanding officer of the National Naval Medical Center, comes from Indiana, and Rear Adm. F. C. Greaves, the commanding officer of the United States Naval Hospital at Bethesda, until promoted and transferred, comes from Iowa. But I guess Rear Admiral Willcutts, veteran of a hundred historic sea combats, expressed it for all of us, no matter what State we come from, for the Army, Navy, the marines, and all of us when looking out of the window here at the Stars and Stripes floating on the flagpole in front of the National Naval Medical Center said with the rapture of one seeing it for the first time: "It's the most beautiful sight in the world, our Stars and Stripes." And in the spirit of unity symbolized in that flag the country may be sure the Army, the Navy, the marines, and the Air Force will continue to go on as a great team devoted to the sacred task of securing from all its enemies these United States of America and the way of life of a free people. Admiral Swanson, how are the postwar programs of the medical corps of the armed services progressing?

Admiral SWANSON. The Navy has collaborated, coordinated, and consolidated in a significant measure with the Army and Air Force. However, in accordance with both the letter and intent of the National Security Act, we have retained the identity and integrity of the individual services.

The Navy has a director of medical services in the Office of the Secretary of Defense who is charged with general policy, direction, and coordination of medical services for the three military departments.

We are developing experience with joint Army, Navy, and Air Force staffing in a number of medical institutions. At the Tripler (Army) hospital in Hawaii there are Army, Navy, and Air Force doctors, nurses, and corpsmen, or other technicians, and patients of all three services. We have joint staffing of military hospitals at St. Albans, Norfolk, and Panama. At present we have 426 Navy patients in Army hospitals and 617 Army patients in Navy hospitals.

I should like to point out that the three services were founded on different concepts and have divergent specialized missions. We must, for example, give specialized medical support to submarine and amphibious warfare, many aspects of which have no counterpart in our sister services. We cannot logically merge the three medical services unless, as is unlikely, the operating forces of the three services are combined.

We should like to have a uniform promotion system so that when we conduct joint hospitalization, our Navy medical officers will have the same or equal promotional opportunities as the Army and Air Force officers who serve with them.

I believe the Navy has one peacetime mission which the Army, except when it assumes the role of an occupying force, does not particularly share; this is to sell democracy to the rest of the world. It is essential for those engaged as agents of their government in foreign countries and in the ports of those countries, to know the foreign policy of their home government. The mission of acting as ambassadors of goodwill and purveyors of democracy to the rest of the world, is an especially compelling reason for the maintenance of a peacetime Navy. The medical forces of the Navy can disseminate more goodwill in the form of the dispensation of health aids to needy nations abroad than can ever be realized from all the shot and shell that was ever manufactured.

The people, the lawmakers, and shapers of our destiny, should not lose sight of the fact that the Nation's Army, Navy, and Air Force, in peace as well as in war, have important missions to fulfill; and that the dictates of logic and clear reasoning bespeak the indication for their individuality in time of peace as clearly as for their unity in time of war.

Representative O'HARA. Admiral Swanson, there is one more service the Medical Corps of the armed services is rendering the Nation which I think has never been fully understood by the American people. There are over 500 Members of the Congress, the great majority being in the House of Representatives, where if a vacancy occurs there must be a primary and a general election to fill

the vacant seat, which takes considerable time, and meanwhile the people of that district have no representation. It is, therefore, not primarily for the personal advantage of the Members of the Congress, but to assure equal representation in the Congress, as intended by our Constitution, and to prevent long absences from illness or vacancies because of deaths, that the armed services are providing certain health services and hospital facilities to the Members of Congress. As it is, the average number of deaths at each Congress is slightly over 13, an unusually high rate of mortality due to the fact that during the sessions the demands in time and strength upon the average Member are back-breaking and the temptation is, of course, to overwork excessively. I am told, Admiral Swanson, by those in position to know that the number of congressional deaths would certainly have been doubled and serious prolonged illnesses many times multiplied but for the magnificent work of a preventive nature and of medical consultation done by the Surgeon General of the Navy through Admiral Calver, for 20 years the physician to the Congress. Admiral Calver and the Navy deserve the thanks of the Nation for keeping the Members of the Congress on their feet under tremendous strain and thus effecting great savings to the American taxpayers in the way of the large expenditures which would be necessary for special primary and general elections as well as protecting our constitutional concept of equal representation by keeping all Members on their best feet physically and at the maximum of their strength. When Members of the Congress require hospital treatment, usually for very brief periods, they are sent to naval or Army hospitals, but the point I would wish to get over is that for this service the Members of Congress pay from their own pockets.

What Price Safe Harbors?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT HALE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 28, 1950

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Portland (Maine) Press Herald:

WHAT PRICE SAFE HARBORS?

Maine people who can boast about Portland's admittedly superior harbor have cause to be concerned about a little side show being staged in Washington over $4,100,000, a small amount these days. It's money the Coast Guard wants, and we find ourselves partial to their argument.

In mobilization plans the Coast Guard, which in wartime becomes an administrative part of the Navy, is charged with internal-port security. It's the Navy's job to decide who should get in, the Army's to keep out undesirables, and the Coast Guard's to see that what goes inside a vital wartime harbor is not contrary to war aims.

The Coast Guard leaves that kind of work up to its Reserve, and right now the Reserve consists of a lot of papers in Washington with names written on them in neat columns. That's where the $4,100,000 comes in. The Coast Guard wants to make a stab at training the Reserve it may sometime need to send to Portland and other harbors to insure the kind of security we're talking about.

The Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marines have stout Reserve programs. And there is the National Guard. After that, in a very vital service, there is that stack of papers in Washington. The Secretary of Defense wants it; the Secretary of the Navy wants it; so does the Secretary of the Treasury, who is the peacetime Coast Guard boss.

The appropriation was knocked out earlier by a House subcommittee action. Reason given: economy. There's a good chance an amendment to replace it will be offered this week.

This is to suggest Congressmen consider what kind of economy they'll get if a pile of papers is turned loose to establish port security.

Biggest Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 28, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD the fourth article by Mr. Frank C. Waldrop on the infiltration of communism in our country:

BIGGEST STORY
(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Secretary of State Acheson talks a ferocious war against communism, these days, now that any fool can see what goes on, both abroad and in Washington, D. C.

Suddenly, now, it is popular with all his kind to rip and roar against Stalin with exactly the same language and ineptitude the same exact gang used against Hitler.

A long time ago, W. Shakespeare noted the weakness of giddy minds for foreign quarrels which serve so well to divert attention from ills at home.

Acheson and friends are full of furious objection to the spectacle of communism in Czechoslovakia, China, Rumania, and other such far-away places.

But what have they ever done to understand and put logs in the way of communism here?

Americans who have done their homework on the case of communism can understand, for example, the difference between testimony sworn under oath to the Senate committee by Louis F. Budenz, and testimony by Dr. Bella Dodd or Earl Browder.

Budenz is a former managing editor of the New York Daily Worker, the leading newspaper of the conspiracy against civilization on these shores.

To have held such a position, Budenz had to be an important figure in the Communist cause.

But today Budenz is a church-going citizen and professor at Fordham University, one of the most sedate and dignified of all American schools.

Fordham does not hire ex-Communists on speculation, in the mere hope of their reform.

More than that, Budenz has been the chief witness of the United States Government in its most important court actions against communism.

Such are the things to consider in judging how much to believe him as a witness.

On the other hand, Dr. Bella Dodd is an exmember of the national committee of the Communist organization who did not resign or repent, but was fired by her superiors.

Why? She says she is the victim of character assassins. Who? Well, certainly anybody who has done his homework knows that means character assassins from within communism, not from without.

The Communists regard the rest of all the world as enemies with whom they are at war and who must be conquered.

They do not listen to the outside world for advice or usage of their own membership.

So Dr. Dodd is not one who has quit communism. She is complaining because communism quit her. She has not renounced the Communist doctrine, to conquer by any means, legal or illegal, but to conquer.

In her class falls also Earl Browder, once secretary and spokesman of the Communist conspiracy in this country. A switch in Kremlin tactics in 1945 resulted in his downfall. Has Browder repented?

This writer once asked Browder pointblank how he would like to be a Communist again.

He answered:

"I am a Communist."

That, after he had been ridiculed, denounced, and expelled from the conspiracy, and all Communists who had a good word to say for him, expelled along with him.

Remember, Communists hold our laws do not bind them in any way. What good is the word of a Communist, therefore, or the word of one who thinks himself a Communist?

As indicated earlier in these articles, this reporter began to learn about that 20 years ago, as an eyewitness to a massave Communist propaganda exercise in New York.

The incident was the funeral of a Communist killed in a street riot. The commanders of the propaganda exercise were then whipping up excitement in the streets because:

1. They believed then, as they do today, that human behavior can be predicted with scientific accuracy, through understanding of what they call scientific Marxism.

2. Their analysis of the times in 1930 was that the hour for open revolution in the Western World had struck.

So they were building up a series of shock stages to bring down authority and literally seize the people and property of the United States of America, by force.

Thus, in New York City 20 years ago, I saw how ruthless are the mind and will of communism, just as the years following showed evidence that the Communist mind is ignorant of good judgment.

The incredible but very real parallel is the misjudgment of communism by people like Secretary Acheson. Or is it that?

To evaluate, you have to look somewhat into the political seduction of our age, called scientific Marxism.

Resolution Calls for Report on Pine Ridge Land Taking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 28, 1950

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I have long been interested in the activities of a group which called itself the Pine Ridge Bombing Area Group. It was composed of former Indian owners of land condemned by the War Department for use as an aerial gunnery range in time of war. The area condemned comprised a good part of the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation in South Dakota.

Here was a group of Indians, wards of the Government, who had their lands taken from them without benefit of an

opportunity to show their actual losses occasioned by such taking. In some cases, the owners were told that they had to remove in 30 days because the Japs were coming. In other cases, threats directed to those who might resist caused a hurried massed exodus in which many personal effects were left behind.

In cases where the owners had received old-age assistance, "old-age liens" came in and took the low price paid for the land, without the owner ever seeing the money, as repayment for previously given old-age assistance.

All of this looked to me like another "forced patent" situation. In the Seventy-eighth Congress I was successful in getting passed legislation which would reimburse ward Indians for State taxes paid on land which had been patented without their consent.

In this case it seemed to me the Government again caused the sale of this land without the consent of the individual owners and the subsequent confiscation of the sale price for previously given old-age assistance amounting to "forced patents" in every sense of those words. The same idea applied to the other cases in which no opportunity was afforded to show losses and damages over and above the bare appraised price which no Indian was given the right to contest.

Accordingly, I introduced H. R. 6664 to correct these injustices. A subsequent hearing on the bill resulted in the drafting of a formal resolution by the Subcommittee on Public Lands requesting the Secretary of the Interior to look into the matter and report back to Congress. The resolution follows:

Whereas during the years 1941, 1942, and 1943 the War Department found necessity for taking and took certain lands belonging to the Pine Ridge Sioux Tribe of Indians of South Dakota or to certain individual members thereof; and

Whereas it is questionable whether all legal, equitable, and cutomary rights were given to the owners in the taking of such lands by the United States Government; and

Whereas the proceeds received for the taking of such lands caused the removal of many such owners from the rolls of old-age assistance, which assistance they were otherwise entitled to by virtue of existing State and Federal laws; and

Whereas the proceeds received by many such owners were made subject to old-age assistance liens, thereby depriving them of their property through no fault of their own: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Public Lands Committee of the House of Representative of the United States of America request the Secretary of the Interior of the United States to make such investigations, surveys, and studies as he deems necessary to enable him to make a full and complete report, with recommendations based thereon, to this committee in regard to the following:

(1) The facts and circumstances surrounding the taking by the War Department of certain lands belonging to the Pine Ridge Sioux Tribe of Indians or to certain individual members thereof during the war years of 1941, 1942, and 1943.

(2) The procedure used by the United States Government in the taking of such lands including information as to the following:

(a) Legal rights given to such owners by the United States Government in the taking of such lands.

(b) Basis and method of appraisal followed in determining value of such lands.

(c) Opportunity given each allottee for a court determination of value of land taken, and opportunity given each individual allottee to be heard directly on the evaluation of his tract.

(d) Consideration given in the appraisal of improvements on lands taken.

(e) Consideration given in the appraisal of lands taken to such assets as water, water rights, timber, minerals, etc.

(f) Variance between value paid for Indian-owned land and white-owned land taken by the Government.

(g) Variance between value paid to owners, white or Indian, who contested condemnation proceedings in court and those who accepted Government appraisal.

(h) Reservation of mineral rights on State school lands as compared with nonreservation of such rights on Indian-owned land.

(i) Duty of the Secretary of the Interior to protect and reserve mineral rights on Indian lands taken by the Government.

(j) Consideration given to relocation and resettlement of allottees whose lands were taken.

(k) Use of unfair or unethical methods in obtaining consent of owners to appraised value and resulting possession of land by the Government.

(l) Consideration given to tribal property rights and their reestablishment.

(3) The effect of the State social-security law upon proceeds received by such owners, including information on the following:

(a) Results of such owners' receipt of proceeds from sale of such lands with respect to benefits under State and Federal social-security laws.

(b) Old-age-assistance liens that attached to proceeds received from sale of such lands.

(4) That, if such owners did not receive just and adequate compensation for lands taken; that measure of damages which would adequately compensate them for the lands taken, including costs in removal to another location, and complete assimilation.

(5) Comparison of present status of both tribe and allottees with status before lands were taken by the Government; be it further

Resolved, That the said report and recommendation, together with the supporting data on which the same is based, be made available to the Public Lands Committee of the House of Representatives as soon as practical, but not later than the opening day of the first session of the Eighty-second Congress.

The American Way—How May We Improve It?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. POLK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 28, 1950

Mr. POLK. Mr. Speaker, the American Legion, Department of Ohio, sponsors annually an Ohio high-school essay contest on some subject of public interest. This year the subject was the American Way—How May We Improve It. Approximately 75,000 essays were submitted. Out of this number 12 were selected as winners and the 12 high-school students who wrote them were awarded a trip to Washington.

Last Monday it was my privilege to have luncheon with the prize-winning Ohio essayists. To meet these young people, to see their bright faces and listen to their keen, intelligent comments on the state of our Nation, was to feel that the future of America is in good hands. To read their essays gave positive proof of that feeling.

One of the winners this year is Mr. Daniel Bercik, a student at St. Mary's High Schcol of Portsmouth, Ohio. To be able to write a prize-winning essay in this State-wide contest is an indication of outstanding ability and excellent teaching. Daniel Bercik's essay would be a credit to any American. For a ninth-grade student, a high-school freshman, it is doubly remarkable.

I wish to congratulate Mr. Bercik and his teachers at St. Mary's High School upon his success in this contest. I believe his essay is worthy of the consideration of the Members of the House.

It is as follows:

THE AMERICAN WAY—HOW MAY WE IMPROVE IT?

"I Am an American." Can any one of us grasp the full meaning of these few words? Whether uttered here or in any of the far corners of the earth, they claim the person making the statement as being a member of our democracy.

This country had its origin in greatness. It was founded by men—great men, whose inborn instinct of freedom was insuppressible. It continued to thrive on the energy and thought of hardy pioneers whose love of freedom was unvanquished. These men of vision wanted the right to worship as they pleased and the right to speak and act without having to fear the consequences. To obtain these freedoms they were willing to go to any length, even to death if necessary. As enthusiasts for a new way of life, they were bound together by indissoluble bonds and united in one cause, that of liberty—liberty not only for themselves but also for the coming generations who would be the freemen of tomorrow.

To maintain this noble heritage, it behooves each of us to strengthen our forces in a common cause. We must be willing to sacrifice; we must be willing to fight even as our forefathers fought to keep the American way free from the onslaught of prejudice, bigotry, and racial differences that are constantly threatening to engulf it. This is the sacred duty of every loyal and progressive American.

To overcome the trials that lie before us, all must follow in the footsteps of our worthy predecessors. Our enemy today is not the enemy which our sires fought. It is not the oppressions of a cruel mother country nor the tyrannical impositions of evil lords, but it is, instead, the infiltration into our Government of aliens bent in belief and activity on the destruction of our democracy. Communism, socialism, and all the other isms generate ruin to the easy flow of democratic living, unless watched and checked with the precision of the stalwart fathers of our country.

We, the children of today, will be the Americans of tomorrow. Every generation has had its great problems to contend with. Because today's problems are especially great and vital, it is our pride and duty as American youths to provide ourselves with an education that will be our strength against aggressive forces. The basic battle plan of our present enemies is to utilize ignorance; they prey first on the stupid people of the world who have not the common sense to oppose them. Working for a foreign power or for personal gain, they first aim to dupe the common people by telling them of the Utopia that will supposedly be theirs if they merely join them. If this strategy fails they go underground and there with a surprisingly small force do unprecedented harm.

There they dig at the very root of democracy to undermine it.

A menace like this cannot be allowed to gather strength. Its very beginning must be stamped out. As Americans, we demand united action against a common enemy. First we must arouse a conscious realization of our present well-being and security under the American way of life. Then, inspired by the strength of it, we will triumph even as those before us triumphed. We will allow no evil to threaten the heritage we have received. With our enemy grounded, we will build a bigger and better future for the American way.

Reserve Officers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 28, 1950

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I include the brilliant address made by Gen. J. Lawton Collins, Chief of Staff, United States Army, at the Louisiana State convention of the Reserve Officers Association of America, held at Shreveport, La., on April 21, 1950. The address follows:

Deeply ingrained in our national philosophy is the concept that it is the responsibility of all citizens to defend this Nation in time of danger. It had its origins in the resoluteness of the minutemen of Lexington and Concord who first displayed the courage that has been the inspiration for our preparedness ever since. The threats to their security were so immediate and so real that they found it necessary for all to integrate into their peacetime pursuits an individual defensive posture. Our problems today are not too different from theirs—with one exception—the dangers to our way of life are more complex.

The minuteman concept is, of course, a defensive philosophy, and that is as it should be. The small Army that we have always maintained in peacetime could not possibly be considered a force for aggression. And our civilian components—our Organized Reserve Corps and our National Guard—are patently defensive forces. Our Army, composed of these three components, is—and always has been—nothing more than an organization to defend our homes against the initial onslaught of an aggressor, to provide a continuous examination and research into new techniques and weapons of war, and to form the nucleus for rapid expansion in time of emergency—and thereby to act as a deterrent to aggression—a force for the prevention of war.

I recently heard the charge that the Regular Army wanted to do away with the Reserves. Any clear-thinking American—whatever his profession—could not seriously believe such a charge.

For we have always considered ourselves in the United States as having one Army, made up of several components. Each component complements and strengthens the others and all are vital to our national security. An officer recently described this relationship as eloquently as I have ever heard it. He said that there are in the American community today three groups of our citizens who are deeply interested, and who participate actively in our Army programs: First, those who devote full time to active military service—the professional soldiers who constitute the Regular Army.

There is another group of men who do not devote their entire time, and who do not make a full-time career of the Army, but who can devote a large part of their time to national defense. These are the members of the National Guard.

Then there is still another group of persons in civil life who do not have the time that guardsmen have to give, but who still want to take an active part in national defense. Our Organized Reserve Corps offers these men a means by which they can contribute to national preparedness.

Whatever their degree of participation, all three of the components constitute one Army. That is the reason why, in our recent presentation of the Army organization bill to congressional committees, we have asked that there be only one term to designate our Army, and to do away with any differentiation between the terms "United States Army" and "Army of the United States."

The rapport between our three components must be of the highest order, and we must keep it that way. That is the reason why I have taken such an active interest in our new Organized Reserve program, and why I have personally presented it to the Secretary of Defense, to Congress, and to the President.

So many of you here today fought in World War II, and have kept up with international affairs, that it seems redundant for me to tell you what has happened since 1945. But to place what I have to say about our new Reserve program in proper perspective, I propose to go back to the end of the war.

At that time, as you know, things were confused—both nationally and internationally—as far as military policy was concerned.

We all thought we were entering upon a period of world peace, and so we did a very natural thing: We demobilized the finest Army, Navy, and Air Force that the world had ever seen. We did not have unification as we have now, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff had not agreed upon any firm unified defense plan for use in the event of an emergency.

It was in that atmosphere that the section V committee, consisting of regulars, guardsmen, and reservists, reviewed the Reserve and National Guard program with a view to coming up with a new postwar program.

In the confused international atmosphere that I have just described, these men were working in the dark, and yet they had to devise a plan under which we could operate until world conditions crystallized. They did recommend a plan which was later adopted, and under which we have been operating for the past 3 years. The plan they formulated in 1945 contemplated about 1,000,000 men in ORC units, plus an undetermined number of individual reservists who would be needed in the event of an emergency in all components of the Army. The plan they proposed was based upon a concept of a mobilization force that would require a great many divisions in the first year of war. It also assumed the availability of ample funds and a constant flow of trained manpower from the operation of the universal military-training program. Although the plan met certain obstacles, I feel that it made reasonably satisfactory progress. Some 11,000 units, company size or smaller, and 3,000 trainng units were organized, and approximately 120,000 officers and 90,000 enlisted men were actively participating in the Reserve program.

The major difficulties we encountered in the implementation of the plan were the magnitude of the program and the lack of facilities. The very scope of the program inhibited adequate planning and supervision of training. This was further complicated by the inability to provide adequate armory space which in turn limited the amount of equipment that could be placed in the hands of units. Naturally, those limitations adversely affected the recruitment of enlisted personnel.

Also, events caught up with that program. We gained a better understanding of the international situation; we adopted unification; we obtained definite strategic plans approved by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and Congress saw fit not to pass a universal military training bill.

In light of these new developments, it became obvious that our initial postwar Reserve and National Guard programs had to be revised and brought into consonance with the strategic requirements established by the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The matter of funds is a factor I cannot emphasize too much. We must realize that a fine balance must be struck between military requirements and the needs of our domestic economy. That is our real dilemma—how to maintain a reasonable military posture and yet not spend ourselves into economic collapse. Our Nation is not at war—but neither are we really at peace, for we must prepare for a war that may be thrust upon us—and yet we are doing this while trying to conduct business as usual in the sincere hope that war will not come.

While we are in a period of twilight—this quasi-peace, the police states of the world are in a period of quasi-war in which they are feverishly increasing their strength economically, politically and militarily. They have been increasing their advantage in land forces, while at the same time rapidly developing their air and sea forces.

Meanwhile, within our own armed forces, we have had to make radical adjustments. With prices and development costs of new equipment rising, we have found it difficult to conform to the real limitations that our national economy imposes. However, I feel that real progress has been made, and is still being made, toward providing effective defense within our means. Every proposed defense activity must be evaluated on the basis of its relative importance and its estimated minimum cost, because we cannot hope to provide absolute security within the means available to us. Therefore, economy was a very real consideration in the preparation of the new Organized Reserve program.

In the preparation of the program, the current plans of the Joint Chiefs of Staff were the controlling factor. The concept of our requirements for the first year of war has been materially modified since 1945, and includes Regular Army and National Guard divisions which depend upon the Organized Reserve Corps to provide many of the auxiliary combat support units, the great bulk of service support units, and individuals required for early mobilization.

Modification of the over-all strategc requirements has also affected the peacetime objective of the Organized Reserve Corps program. In order to provide a program that would conform more realistically to known requirements, to estimated manpower potential, and to current and projected budgetary capabilities, a complete restudy of the Organized Reserve Corps program was initiated in July of 1949, and completed during November of the same year.

The organization established under the new program includes the Active Reserve, the Inactive Reserve, and the Honorary Reserve. The Active Reserve has two parts, the Organized Reserve and the Volunteer Reserve. The Organized Reserve consists of personnel in units, plus those individuals needed upon mobilization in the units and staff agencies of the Regular Army. The Volunteer Reserve consists of individual officer and enlisted fillers for the Army; the terms "Inactive Reserve" and "Honorary Reserve" are self-explanatory.

The first step in the reframing of the ORC program was to insure that in peacetime,

only those units absolutely necessary for early mobilization were maintained. In general, the restudy indicated that our former goals were substantially correct as a long-term requirement for the first 2 years of war and would approximate 1,000,000 officers and men in units.

The restudy also indicated that a desirable peacetime Organized Reserve would approximate 625,000 individuals and a minimum Organized Reserve of approximately 367,000 officers and men. This last figure would necessitate maintaining all ORC units at 100 percent officer strength with enlisted personnel at cadre strength. The Regular Army reinforcements would be maintained at 100 percent officer and enlisted strength and the 25 cadre divisions at cadre strength. This organization includes some 9,000 units.

In addition to the requirements for personnel in units of the organized portion of the Active Reserve, there must be available on M-day some 130,000 officers and 200,000 enlisted men to reinforce units in being. These individuals constitute the Volunteer Reserve, and are of necessity in the last priority for pay purposes.

In this connection, I might add that the President's budget message in 1951 contemplates no pay for individuals presently in training units. In the present program, such individuals correspond to personnel in the Volunteer Reserve and, if the provisions of the 1951 budget directive are maintained in subsequent years, will be on a non-pay status.

As far as the organization of units is concerned in the new program, it is proposed that there be but one required type unit, the cadre type, with provision for advancement to fully organized status if funds permit of all units except the 25 cadre divisions. This change simplifies the program, and meets our minimum mobilization requirement for ORC unit organization.

One important feature of the new program in regard to units is the carefully considered requirement that they attain a prescribed strength within a definite period of time. Failure to do so would necessitate relocation of the unit in question to a more favorable locality. We feel that this requirement is a good one, for not only will it encourage Reserve commanders to keep their units above certain minimum strengths, but it will also insure realistic effective units in localities that can support them on a volunteer basis.

Certainly any sound program for the ORC must provide for the progressive, professionally efficient training of individual Reservists. For this purpose, the new program proposes to establish ORC schools on a nation-wide scale, in geographical areas as accessible as possible to Reservists. These schools will utilize instructional materials of the Regular Army service schools, and provide training which is designed to prepare the reservist for his duty in the event of war, retain his interest, and give the Government greater returns for every dollar invested in the program. These schools will utilize existing governmental installations as far as possible. It is estimated that 334 such schools will be required. We have presently available 275 installations suitable for this purpose.

One of the most difficult problems we have had to face in the Organized Reserve Corps since the end of World War II has been the promotion of reservists. As you know, the terminal promotions that were made at the conclusion of the war produced a top-heavy grade structure. Also, the establishing of retirement privileges has materially reduced the rate of volunteer attrition. The combination of these two factors has slowed down promotions.

Under the new program, this situation will be considerably improved by establishing a stable organization in the Organized Reserve, and a firm strength requirement in the Volunteer Reserve. With these factors established, the Department of the Army is able to formulate an equitable promotion system which provides for advancement and reasonable attrition. Of course, implementation of the system will be so phased as to protect, as far as possible, the interests of the individual, and the full effects will not be evident for several years.

As I mentioned earlier, the major obstacle to rapid growth of the Organized Reserve Corps has been the lack of adequate unit facilities. I believe that this difficulty has been considerably alleviated by the new program. The reduction in the number of units and increased construction of semipermanent type armories will provide the necessary facilities.

Another problem we had to consider in our new ORC program was equipment. Experience has shown that although equipment is available for issue to Reserve units, the unit commanders have, in many instances, been reluctant to accept it because they lacked adequate storage facilities. The provisions of adequate facilities should overcome this problem.

In general, we have sufficient equipment on hand to meet our minimum training requirements, although in certain specific categories, there have been—and still are today—troublesome shortages. Of course, these shortages are not unique to the Reserve program, but are common throughout the entire Army. I have been devoting considerable time lately to the study of Army equipment problems, and hope that as time goes by we will be able to solve them.

The cost of the new program is greater than that of either fiscal year 1949 or 1950. And although we have established several plans for the implementation of the new program—a 3-year, a 5-year, and a 7-year program—the attainment of the objectives outlined in each of them is dependent upon the availability of funds.

Because it is closely allied to our Organized Reserve Corps program, I would like to say a word about the Reserve Officers' training program. At present, our ROTC program is geared to produce 22,000 reserve officers a year. These are not solely for the Reserve Corps however. We need Reserve officers on active duty in the Regular Army, and we need this source of new officers for the Regular Army itself. We count upon getting roughly 25 percent of our Regular officers from the ROTC, both from honor graduates, and from competitive tours of active duty. In this way, the ROTC program is a very important part of our plan for broadening the base of the Officer Corps of the Regular Army, as well as producing officers for the Organized Reserve Corps and the National Guard.

In closing, I would like to summarize the advantages of the new ORC program. With simplified organizational structure and forced progression of units, we expect to have more units actually in being than we had under the old program. With simplified reporting procedures, we will be kept fully aware of the forces available in the Organized Reserve Corps, and of their state of proficiency. Given that information, we will have a sound basis for estimating and supporting fiscal and equipment requirements, and for planning realistic training that will stimulate the interest of those who participate.

This is a program which I am confident will ensure that the ORC will continue to furnish the reserve strength that has long been one of the bulwarks of our national security.

Inherent in our way of life is the potential to survive in a world threatened by a predatory philosophy backed up by unprecedented military forces—forces that we could not match for long without curtailing the very freedoms we seek to preserve. It is a unique quality of democracy that it inspires its citizens spontaneously and voluntarily to integrate into their peacetime pursuits, the development of the leadership and technical skills that we can draw upon in time of danger. The complexity of modern war precludes our doing this in the simple manner of the Minute Men of 175 years ago, but our present-day civilian components programs provide the opportunity for their modern counterparts to develop—in the manner of their own choosing, and to the extent of their time and ability—the forces we would need if another terrible conflict should occur.

The Most Dangerous Ism in the World, "Because"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THURMAN C. CROOK
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 28, 1950

Mr. CROOK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article written by Richard S. Kaplan, historian and service officer of the Gary Memorial Post, No. 17, American Legion, as reprinted from the Hoosier Legionnaire, March issue, by the Labor Beacon of Michigan City.

We shall all do well to take cognizance of this veterans' philosophy so admirably displayed in Because.

The article follows:

BECAUSE

Day by day, my heart has been growing heavier and heavier, and inside of me I've been getting sicker and sicker. Reading the audacious boasts and pledges of the leaders of the Communist Party in the United States, most of whom are now on trial before Judge Medina, that in the event of a war between the United States and Russia, they will support and aid Russia, simply nauseates me.

How in the name of heaven can men possessing the brain of an ant live in these United States and support the ideologies of communistic Russia? As a democracy, why should we continue to harbor, protect, and tolerate these disloyal creatures?

Why do I feel so bitter about these men and all of their ilk? Because I love America, love these United States with all my heart and with all my soul. Why do I love my country as I do?

Because my father (God rest his soul) came here from Russia as a young man, fleeing from persecution and Czarism. He had nothing but his hands, his mind, and a will to learn and work. He found both here.

Attending night school (at no cost to him) he learned the English language and the history of this country. He was given the chance to earn his living without let or hindrance, the whole world before him handicapped by nothing and no one other than his own will and ability.

Because, given the chance, my father was able to own his own little business, practice his religion in his own temple, and raise four children to manhood and womanhood.

Because those four children were given a free education, a chance to obtain college educations, a chance to travel and know this country.

Because all through our lives we went to bed at night safe and secure in the knowledge that police were in the streets, not to knock at our doors, not to search our homes or to grab any of us and throw us, willy-nilly, into a dungeon—but to protect us against evildoers. Asleep or awake, each of us knew

that the power of our town, our country, State, and Nation was behind us, watching over us, protecting us like a loving mother ready to spring at the throat of any who would harm us and to avenge an injury to us through its police and courts.

Because in spite of my religion (or because of it), I was able to achieve an honored profession and, like my parents, bring my daughter and grandchild into this world blessed and protected by the same country.

Because, when my father—an orthodox Jew—died in Allston, Mass., he was carried to his grave by 10 pallbearers—police officer friends of his in life—all Roman Catholics, came to say their last farewells to their friend.

Because I was given an opportunity to serve my country in time of peace and in the armed forces in time of war, not because I was forced to do so, but because I wanted to do so.

Because none of the events and conditions above presented could have occurred in Communist Russia, where the individual is but a grain of sand to be blown hither and yon by the faintest breath of the Politburo and its stooges, where the state is god and all, and where the individual is but a servant of the state. Because communism is the drug that destroys the very soul of man, dwarfs the mind of man, and leaves him a pliable tool.

Because, having known freedom all my life, I treasure it; and freedom is an unknown thing in communistic Russia, or any country dominated by communism. Anything or anyone who would take away my freedom—freedom of thought, freedom of worship, freedom of expression, freedom to live my life as I wish to live it, so long as I do not hurt my fellow man—I repeat, anything that would destroy that freedom, I hate with all the hatred in my heart.

Because communism, evil thing that it is, will, if allowed to spread and grow in this country, destroy the breath of life as we Americans know it. And though the stooge leaders of communism in this country don't realize it, they, too, will be destroyed, for they will outlive their usefulness to the communistic state, and communism has always preached that that which is not useful to the state must be destroyed.

If my father were alive today, he would say, as he said 100 times over in his life, "There is no greater or better country in all the world than the United States. I know. You who were born here don't appreciate a good country. I've seen the sleet and the storm and the rain. I can appreciate the sunshine—represented by the United States."

Let us all say amen to his words.

To those who prate of their love for communism, all I can say is, "I pity you. May I, however, suggest that we in the United States can spare your presence here. Go join the country you love so much; practice your communistic ideology there. We want no part of it here."

I love my country.

I hate and fear communism, because it has brought fear where only love existed before.

Air Age in Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 28, 1950

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, in the first session of this Congress, I introduced House Resolution 363 which called for an expression of interest on the part of the Congress in the development of an aircraft suitable for agricultural purposes. Such an undertaking is being conducted by the A. & M. College of Texas with the help of the Civil Aeronautics Administration and the Department of Agriculture at College Station, Tex.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article entitled "Air Age in Agriculture" which appeared in the magazine section of the Houston Chronicle of Sunday, April 23, 1950:

AIR AGE IN AGRICULTURE

(By John Furneaux)

Another Eli Whitney of the cotton industry or Cyrus Hall McCormick of the grain fields may be in the making at Texas A. and M. this year.

There a dozen specialists are working night and day in an effort to perfect an airplane which may revolutionize dusting, spraying, fertilizing, and seeding from the air.

Whitney's gin actually made the cotton farmer of the South. McCormick, with his improved reaper, pointed the way toward prosperity for the grain farmer.

And to the farmers of the Nation, and Texas in particular, such a plane as the A. and M. men are now designing may mean dollars in the bank, T-bone steaks on the table, and Cadillacs in the garage.

Fred E. Weick, aeronautical engineer in charge of the project, admits that the airplane's use in agricultural projects isn't new.

But it is Weick's intention to perfect a plane which will do what none other before it has accomplished—a plane embodying the characteristics of the slow-flying crafts of years ago as well as some of those of superspeed jets which streak above the earth at unbelievable rates.

When the experimental plane is finished and perfected manufacturers will then be able to produce the craft for vital agricultural work.

Helping Weick with his task, besides the A. and M. experts, are representatives of the Civil Aeronautics Administration, the United States Department of Agriculture, and the National Flying Farmers Association.

To do what the researchers at Aggieland are hoping for, the plane must have adequate maneuverability, good visibility, excellent rate of climb, correct distribution by hopper placements, safety, and must be easy to repair.

"Some of the planes now in use have these qualities to a degree, but not to the extent we seek," Mr. Weick says. "And, it takes all of them in their proper balance to attain the field distribution we are shooting at."

"It's a big order," admits Weick, a genial 6-footer who practicaly grew up in an airplane. "And it must be understood that we are purely researchers. We are not promising anything. We are merely hoping to accomplish what we have set out to do."

That Weick knows his business can hardly be contested when one looks at some of his previous accomplishments. He designed and developed America's first two-control plane, the Ercoupe; he is credited with the design and engineering development of the low-drag cowling for radial air-cooled engines and the design of the first "spinproof" airplane.

He is a member of many national committees in the field of aviation. Included are the aerodynamics committee, the industry consulting committee and the propeller subcommittee of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics; the Guggenheim Medal Board of Award, Collier Trophy Board of Award, chairman of the contest board of the National Aeronautics Association, the nonscheduled flying advisory committee of the Civil Aeronautics Administration.

He is a fellow of the Institute of Aeronautical Sciences and in 1945 received the Sylvanus A. Reed award presented by the institute. The following year he was the recipient of the Fawcett aviation award.

Actual work on the undertaking started last August. Since then, the preliminary design of the "workhorse" airplane has been completed and construction started.

A "mockup" of the center portion of the fuselage, including the pilot's compartment, hopper and wing center portion, has also been constructed. By doing this, the men are better able to visualize the design layout for this vital part of the assembly.

Weick candidly admits that the plane will not be a thing of beauty. Rather will it be an "ugly duckling," as he expresses it, with utility the paramount objective.

The low wing of the monoplane will be very thick to provide adequate hopper space, and will spread some 40 feet to obtain a low operational speed and quick take-off. The plane will carry a 200 horsepower engine which is expected to provide for a cross-country cruising speed of 90 to 100 miles an hour.

More important, however, than its cruising speed is accomplishment of the actual work at hand—dusting or spraying, seeding or fertilizing more efficiently—and to do this, a plane must be able to fly at comparatively slow speeds.

"We are shooting at a speed of only 45 miles per hour with a normal load," Mr. Weick says, "This will be invaluable, we feel, in getting more efficient distribution. Agricultural experts will have a lot of work to do after the plane is in operation, however, measuring just how efficient it is."

Planes flying as low as 3 or 4 feet above ground obviously constitute a hazard for the 3,000 to 5,000 fliers who are today dusting, spraying, and doing other agricultural jobs. And it was to many of these pilots, their companies and other experts that the A. and M. men went before work was started at College Station.

From the hundreds of comments they made, the complaints they registered about present-day equipment, and their ideas about the plane they "would like to have" came the plans which Weick and his associates are attempting to put into effect.

"A wide view forward and down is important in low altitude dusting and spraying, for example," says Mr. Weick. "The pilot has to clear fences and trees as well as make turns at low altitude at each end of the swath. A good view in the direction of the turn, therefore, is imperative.

"Just as necessary for efficiency is a clear view to the rear in order that he may note the effectiveness of his work. It was mainly for these reasons that we selected a low-wing monoplane."

Hopper location in the new plane may be in the wings, or in the plane's center section, and both locations are to be tried. Every pass over a field must count, and proper distribution is a must if the airplane is to do its work successfully.

Two things had to be considered besides this, however, in determining the hopper placement. Many dusts are highly corrosive and can damage metal plane parts, so hopper surfaces are to be treated with special corrosion-resisting compounds.

If you mix engine exhaust fire with some of the highly flammable dusting compounds, trouble is not only sure, but quick. Plans for the new plane include placement of the exhaust over the low wing. As the distribution system is underneath, Weick fe ls the fire hazard may be surmounted.

For vision's sake, the plane's cockpit normally would be placed as far forward as possible. But, for safety's sake, it should be as close to the tail as feasible.

To accomplish both factors, Weick and his associates plan on placing the cockpit high

in the center of the fuselage, above the trailing edge of the wing and behind all loads, which should absorb much of the shock in the event of a crash.

From the super-fast jet planes of the stratosphere Weick borrowed the seat for his experimental plane. This seat is so arranged that it may be moved up or down by a control lever. This will be particularly advantageous to the pilot when he is actually working at his task, for in the up position visibility is greatly increased.

From the fighter plane, he borrowed a shoulder harness which allows freedom of movement for the pilot, but has an inertia reel that locks in the event of a crash. The pilot's body is then held rigidly in position. The new plane also will have its instrument panel farther forward than is customary, to prevent the pilot from striking his head on it in the event of a crash.

A rigid pilot's headrest will provide a protective turnover structure, and guards will be placed in front of the open cockpit to deflect wires and branches over the pilot's head.

If the landing gear of the plane should come in contact with wire fences or telephones wires, a special, sharpened leading edge of the supports will cut the wires rather than allow the plane to become entangled.

A. and M., with its 39 agricultural experiment stations, was a logical choice for the plane experiment, for after the task of developing it is completed it must be field-tested and the results tabulated.

Engineers and funds for the plane are being provided by the CAA, while the United State Department of Agriculture is providing its research facilities and the advice of its plant and insect experts.

"The end of the year may see the plane in the air for the first experimental flights," Mr. Weick says. "But it may be some time after those initial flights before we are ready to get to work on the second phase of our project, that of actually plotting results in the field."

Meanwhile, Weick is getting in some personal flying time daily.

Every morning he climbs into his silver monoplane at the small airport at his home and flies the 2½ air miles to A. and M.'s Easterwood airport where the project is being conducted.

Morning mail for the Weick family is delivered by the engineer at lunchtime via the same plane. Back to work after lunch and home again each night in the plane is standard routine for Weick.

"It's monkey business, I guess," the 6-footer says. "But, after all, I have to practice what I preach, don't I?"

REFRESHING WORDS IN CONGRESS

In these times, when the people are being soaked for burdensomely heavy taxes to finance a Washington orgy of waste, it is refreshing to hear a Member of Congress speak as Representative A. L. GOODWIN, of Massachusetts did on the floor of the House one day this week.

It is regrettable that more Members of Congress are not speaking in the same fashion about the opportunity and need for reducing the cost of the Federal Government.

"We all know," Mr. GOODWIN told his colleagues, "that there are many duplications and overlappings in the administration of government, and we all know that waste and extravagance is ever present.

"We also know that practically every governmental department and agency is overstaffed * * *.

"I know of no way to economize except to economize. I know of no way to cut expenses except to cut. I feel that the temper of my own people is such that they will not be satisfied with my representation of them in Congress if I preach economy and fail to practice it * * *.

"I propose to be consistent and vote for every reasonable saving which can be made.

"I know of no other way in which I can demonstrate that I have been sincere when I have warned my people back home that we are headed for national financial disaster unless we can call a halt in reckless Government spending and do it now."

There must have been those among Congressman GOODWIN's colleagues who squirmed guiltily at the sound and shock of his words. For what he said (whether so intended or not) has the quality of a sharp dressing-down for the element on Capitol Hill which never gets any closer to economy than lip service brings it.

At no other time in the history of this country has there been greater need for sound economy in Federal Government. Yet in spite of this fact, the cause of economy is being treated with more lip service on Capitol Hill in Washington today than ever before.

The Nation's taxpayers, unjustly burdened to foot the bill of Washington's spendthrift didoes, see a great deal of congressional shilly-shally about economy. In far too many instances, a declaration of interest in reducing waste is followed up by votes to hand out money for bureaucrats to waste.

In short, too many in Congress are giving economy the lip-service treatment—declaring themselves in favor of economy but failing to stand up for economy when the showdown arrives.

Refreshing Words in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 28, 1950

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, many of us acknowledge to a profound sense of futility in attempting to have put into practice what so many of us have been so diligently preaching, namely, the critical necessity for reducing Government expenses. I have been pleased to note that the Mobile (Ala.) Press-Register has editorialized along this line and I include herewith that editorial under leave to extend my remarks:

Centenary College, Shreveport, La.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 27, 1950

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, down in Louisiana, in the Fourth Congressional District, which it is my privilege to represent in Congress, today the people are celebrating the one hundred and twenty-fifth anniversary of the founding of a great institution—Centenary College of Louisiana. This college was established at Jackson, La., and through the years it has developed and grown and continued to function as a great beacon light of higher learning in the United States. It is one of the oldest institutions in the country; and it is the oldest in the State of Louisiana, in point of service.

As a proud citizen of Louisiana and of the Fourth Congressional District, I extend my sincerest congratulations to the trustees, president, and faculty of Centenary College of Louisiana upon reaching this notable milestone in the long tour of active educational leadership in service to the people of the United States. Through the years, benefactors, leaders, and teachers of Centenary have shown brilliant moral leadership and service to the Nation. Throughout these years they have exemplified the admonition taken from the Scriptures, "Go ye therefore and teach all nations."

The history of the college—the oldest west of the Mississippi River—has been a unique one. Beginning and operating as a State-supported school for 20 years, then as a college under the sponsorship of the Methodist Church, the institution has survived the vicissitudes of the years, including three great war catastrophes. Through the devotion and fortitude of dauntless and sacrificing friends, the college survived the poverty and difficulties resulting from the War Between the States. Of the Centenary students who joined the Confederate Army, it is said that every member of the senior class gave his life for the southern cause. In these formative years, Centenary College was builded by hard-working, earnest American leaders, who entertained the belief that education should be broad and refining and tolerant.

In the early part of the century, the college was moved to Shreveport, La.—an honor and distinction to this city which its citizens fully appreciate. We of Louisiana, and the Fourth Congressional District, are proud of the sons of Centenary who have filled the highest positions in our State with credit and distinction. Centenary's contribution, however, rests not only on the achievements of her sons and daughters. The people of Shreveport realize the importance of Centenary College to the community, and are justly proud of the enriching contribution it has made both to the State of Louisiana and the Nation. We are grateful for men like Dr. George S. Sexton, who steered the college through some of its most trying times. His hope and dream of seeing a financially strong Centenary College is now being realized.

On this one hundred and twenty-fifth anniversary, Centenary College has many things to make it proud. Both its faculty and students have won recognition in scholastic attainments, responsible citizenship, and Christian leadership. Centenary has a faculty whose ability and educational leadership is not surpassed by that of any school of its size. Graduates of this great school have been recognized by the institutions of the country for their preeminent ability and influence.

Centenary College's first 125 years have been filled with the sorrows of three shattering wars as well as the joys of peace. Today she stands as a living symbol of American ideals. She faces a

richer future than her founders ever dreamed of—a future of leading our young people along the paths of truth; of impressing them with honesty and integrity in their lives as well as in their thinking; and of inspiring in them confidence, fortitude, and patience in order that they—tomorrow's leaders—may measure up to the responsibilities of our increasingly complex civilization. This beacon light of learning on the banks of Red River in Louisiana has made a real contribution to our society throughout its history—an even greater future is within her grasp.

The Power To Destroy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 28, 1950

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Hearst papers from coast to coast on April 4, 1950:

THE 1950 CAMPAIGN

III—THE POWER TO DESTROY

It was John Marshall who cemented into our jurisprudence the admonitory maxim—"The power to tax involves the power to destroy."

In the case before him, the great Chief Justice was concerned with a State tax levied upon a Federal institution.

Wisely he held that a State could not be permitted to tax a national institution out of existence.

What would John Marshall say today of the disquieting fact that State and local government are in the course of being extinguished by Federal taxation and Federal bribes?

Originally, and, of course, before there was a socialistic confiscatory income tax, the United States Government financed itself sufficiently out of customs duties and a few excises.

Virtually all other tax sources belonged to the States and their political subdivisions.

The unlimited income tax introduced the evils of unlimited Federal spending.

And to feed the increasingly ravenous Treasury, the Federal Government began to invade—in effect, to confiscate—tax revenues that were necessary for State and local government.

Moreover, to make the thievery palatable, or better said to buy the unsuspecting people's assent, the Federal Government adopted the trick of sending back to the States, and in some instances the communities, part of the money which the Federal tax collectors had taken away from them—itself reserving the rest for its own support and purposes.

This reallotment was called Federal aid, and a little of it was justifiable.

But it has grown into an enormous racket which, unless checked, will surely enslave the States and make this country a total bureaucracy.

According to Representative FREDERIC R. COUDERT, Jr., of New York, the Federal Government takes in billions of dollars from the States and sends only a portion of it back—to do things that the States could do "better and more economically" for themselves.

For along with the Federal rebates goes Federal control, steadily diminishing the areas of State and local self-government.

And the political wastage is tremendous—approximately $5,000,000,000 a year simply disappears in bureaucratic legerdemain.

In its noteworthy statement of principles the congressional leadership of the Republican Party proposed the only remedy for the dangerous condition.

It proposed a nonpartisan commission to survey the whole field of taxation, and to recommend a sensible redistribution of governmental functions and sources of revenue among Federal, State, and local governments, so as to secure the sovereignty of the several States with as much decentralization as is compatible with the national welfare.

As one of the party leaders, Representative COUDERT has introduced legislation, giving this Democratic Congress an opportunity to act.

Unless the Congress does act, the question should be made a prime issue in the 1950 campaign.

The Republican slogan is Liberty Against Socialism.

And—

"The surest way to socialism," Representative COUDERT warns, "is excessive expenditure and destructive taxation."

Farmers on the Auction Block

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHAUNCEY W. REED
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 28, 1950

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Batavia Herald, of Batavia, Ill., which appeared in its issue of April 21, 1950:

FARMERS ON THE AUCTION BLOCK

Further evidence that our approach to difficult problems these days is from the auction-block standpoint was given Monday evening by Allan B. Kline, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, addressing the annual farmers' dinner of the St. Charles Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. Kline, in a masterful address, described present-day conditions of the American farmer, the legislation that is now on the statute books, how it got there, and what the federation believes should be future policy in keeping with the general American economy.

At the moment there are two camps in the thinking being done about a farm program. Mr. Kline and his Farm Bureau Federation are in one camp; Secretary Brannan, of the Department of Agriculture, is in the other camp. Mr. Kline emphasized the difference in the philosophy of the two groups, and their approach to a stable farm policy.

Both groups seem to understand that the present system of high-farm supports with its destruction of foods is never going to win acclaim from the rank-and-file citizen. Mr. Kline believes passionately in the freedom of the American farmer, and the Federation is proposing a support program that gets away from the present 90 percent of parity to a more elastic formula that will follow crop productions closely.

Secretary Brannan has trotted out what is generally known as the Brannan plan, modeled closely after the program for farmers that England has had for some years, and which we understand is not only costly but has already deprived the English farmer of much of his independence and freedom. Under this plan the farmer would continue to get the high supports of present-day legislation, the consumer would buy the products in the market place at a low price, and the American taxpayer would pay the difference between the two systems.

The farm bureaus resent Secretary Brannan's open lobbying for his plan. Brannan is swinging wildly, hitting in the clinches, and using every device known to entrenched officialdom to further support for his Brannan plan.

Mr. Kline made it very clear Monday evening that Congress, and Congress alone, makes the laws, that the administrative branch of Government—that includes Secretary Brannan—has only one job to do, and that is to carry out and administer laws passed by Congress. Mr. Kline stressed the imperative need for high-class men in Congress, and an end to politicians on the Hill who vote subsidies to farmers or any other powerful group in exchange for votes at the polls. The problems of today are too serious, said the farm leader, to continue a system of auction-block legislation, that we must have a new approach, an approach from the standpoint of the national welfare, and not from the selfish welfare of any pressure group.

In a radio-telecast program Sunday afternoon Secretary Brannan, speaking from Washington, stated that Kline, in opposing his program, is "Talking through his hat, as usual." He evidently feels that Kline doesn't know what he's talking about. In his Fox Valley appearance Monday night, Mr. Kline gave every impression that he is a remarkably well-informed man. He talked like a real statesman. He seems much more interested in how farmers eat, rather than how they vote. We are inclined to think that he is much closer to solid ground than is the Secretary, and we believe American farmers think so.

The St. Charles Chamber of Commerce is to be congratulated for having brought to the Fox Valley such an outstanding man at a time when there is much confusion in our thinking on the all-important subject of farm legislation.

A Pay-as-You-Go Proposal for Pensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 28, 1950

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of Emily Cuyler Hammond before the Senate Finance Committee, March 23, 1950:

Mr. Chairman, my name is Emily Cuyler Hammond. I am here as a private, individual American, representing no other individual or group, to testify against H. R. 6000 on the basis of 19 years' study of social security at home and in Europe. I am at present preparing a book on security or freedom in America.

Mr. Chairman, I shall give you, if I may, first a résumé of the rather unique experience from which I draw my conclusions; second, the reasons I believe the Social Security Act to be a misnomer and H. R. 6000

to offer no real security; and, third, an outline of recommendations for a self-supporting, pay-as-you-go, American pension program.

In 1931, when the depression posed the question of what to do about those who could not take care of themselves, I went to Germany, on my own account, to investigate the whole field of social security from the point of view of the individual. I chose Germany because, since Bismarck started the social insurance movement back in 1883, the country had had time to assimilate its benefits; and the principle of insurance, it seemed to me, was more consistent with American tradition than the dole. I confidently expected to find the contributory German system a shield to human dignity as against the humiliation of public relief.

WEIMAR WELFARE REPUBLIC

After studying the Bismarckian social insurances at the University of Heidelberg, I made an investigation of those laws in operation in a number of the great industrial centers, in cities, small towns, and rural areas. I interviewed government officials in charge of the various programs on the Reich, province, and municipal levels; and inspected their institutions, hospitals, low-cost housing projects, work-relief projects, work camps, or whatever. I talked to politicians, doctors, employers, and labor leaders. Most important of all, I talked to people covered by the laws. Wherever possible, I lived in workers' houses or in the home of some other Reich beneficiary or pensioner—because I wanted to find out the impact of these insurance laws on the individual German.

BUYING OFF THE OPPOSITION

The first thing that impressed me as significant was that German social insurance was insurance in name only. In reality it was a money-raising device on the one hand and a Reich-subsidized hand-out on the other, given and taken as a right in exchange for freedom of action. Government officials looked upon "das volk," as unable to take care of themselves. Generally speaking, they assumed that the more Reichsmarks they were able to dispense in subsidy to industry and agriculture and in benefits to the people, the less trouble there would be. As Bismarck had introduced social insurance to buy off labor revolt spearheaded by the Socialists, so Weimar's social-democratic and successive leftist regimes liberalized social insurance in an attempt to buy off Communist or Fascist revolution. In 1931 and 1932, Bruning's center party was caught holding the bag.

The vast majority of the Germans with whom I talked, concerned with the administration of the so-called social insurances—with a few notable exceptions—expressed their own selfish interests. The enormous, bloated bureaucracy whose members owed their jobs to the system was for it at all costs. The higher the official the rosier the glasses through which he viewed the welfare state.

PRESSURE-GROUP MOTIVES

Employers were divided and profoundly disturbed. For the most part they clung to the belief that social insurance was the purchase price of labor peace—and cheap at that, if it gave value received. But with the depression, the increasing burden of the republic's insurance and welfare taxes had become so intolerable as further to reduce over-all production and everybody—employers, employees, and beneficiaries—had smaller pieces of the pie.

Desperate employers watching the growth of communism in their factories, among the ranks of the unemployed, and in the Reichstag, and listening to a mountebank promising to put the ancient German gods to work to start the wheels of production again, committed the crime of backing Adolf Hitler.

Labor leaders, who had abdicated their effective power by advocating Reich responsibility for the workers' welfare, boasted that it was really trade-unionism that had brought the social insurance into being, complained that the government was not doing enough, but had no solution to offer as to how it might do more and remain solvent.

All these donors of social security deluded themselves on the people's reaction. The people, the beneficiaries of so much for so little, reacted quite differently from what was expected of them.

FREEDOM FOR SALE

During those last years of the Weimar Republic's existence, the average German, I discovered, was not a free human being whose dignity was protected by his alleged insurance right to assistance in case of ill-health, unemployment, disability, or old age. He was a state serf, cringing and conforming in the presence of officialdom; carping and cheating behind the back of the law; doing the minimum required of him; devoid of personal initiative; incapable of independent reasoning; blaming the government for everything that went wrong. And no wonder.

The average German under the Weimar Welfare Republic, did not have to think for himself or plan for his future. He was dependent on the fatherland directly or indirectly for his vocational training, for his employment and unemployment compensation; for his, his wife's and his children's health; for any accident or disability that might befall any of them; for his old age; for his burial; for his survivors.

Having to make few important decisions for himself in day-to-day life, he would hardly be expected to know what to do in time of crisis. Just as his wife and his children could have little respect for the husband and father who ran to the government for every need, so in turn he could have litle faith in the paternalistic state unable to solve its own problems. The fatherland's various social insurance funds had been broke so often that the fiction of reserves was no longer taken seriously. But when the government exhibited its innate weakness by ruling by edict, the confused and harassed serf naturally turned to whomever most convincingly promised him a way out of his dilemma.

POLITICAL TRICKS COME HOME TO ROOST

Mr. Chairman, I am convinced that Bismarckian social security in its political deceit, basing rights on token contributions, robbing the people of initiative and responsibility, reducing production by back-breaking taxation, necessitating ever more centralized government controls, was the essential underlying cause of the failure of the Weimar Welfare Republic—and incidentally of Hitler's rise to power.

In December 1933, after making a comparative study of security under the Nazis, I came home, and in August 1935 witnessed, to my horror, my country following in the footsteps of Germany, embarking on a course I felt to be fraught with disaster. The Social Security Act was sponsored by men and women wanting to do good by their fellow men. Yet there seems to be not the slightest question of the wisdom of adopting a foreign concept or of copying a foreign system in extravagant detail which, however utopian it sounded in theory, had been proved in practice to be economically unsound. Whenever I brought up the point of the collapse of the Weimar Welfare Republic, the answer was: "Oh, that could only happen in Germany. The Germans are sheep. It couldn't happen here—or anywhere else."

SAME CAUSE, SAME EFFECT

In July 1937, I went back to Europe and from that time until the war brought me home again, I made a comparative study of social security in its social, economic, cultural, collective, and political aspects in France, Germany again, Poland, Austria, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Switzerland, Italy, Albania, and Greece. Everywhere, I found that the same cause resulted in the same effect: To the extent that a government took responsibility from the individual through social security, to that extent the individual had lost his personal freedom and initiative. Social security was the barometer of dictatorship.

Since the war, I have made surveys in a number of States, to gather material for my book. Wanting to estimate the effect of Bismarckian social security on the individual American, I have talked to beneficiaries in their own homes, usually by a random ringing of door bells in working-class districts. After allaying the initial dreadful suspicion that I might be a social worker coming to spy and after taking an oath that I would never divulge identity, I have encountered remarkable candor.

Although Europe was suffering varying degrees of depression when I made my studies there, and we have been enjoying relatively high employment here, nevertheless I have the uncanny feeling that I am redreaming an old dream. There is the same sneering at the government for not giving enough, the same boasting of chiseling with the easy "Everybody else gets away with it, why shouldn't I?"

But there is a difference. There are still Americans who would rather suffer hardship than either undergo a needs test or cheat to get something for nothing. There is also a healthy questioning as to whether the law itself is not unjust and whether, after all, it would not be better to exchange alleged future security for an honest dollar.

INSECURE DEMOCRACY

I am opposed to the present Social Security Act and to H. R. 6000 because OASI is un-American economically and ideologically. It will lead to statism here as it did in country after country in Europe—unless it is stopped now. Mr. Chairman, I submit, we cannot enact laws which undermine individual responsibility and expect to survive as a free people.

I shall not dwell upon the fictitious OASI fund; the fact of double taxation, the burden on industry passed on to the consumer in inflationary prices; the expense of an expanding bureaucracy tending unnecessary wage records; or the precariously mounting costs of H. R. 6000. I should prefer to concentrate on the effect of the injustices of the act on the individual American.

UNJUST LAWS MAKE DISHONEST PEOPLE

OASI is dishonest in principle and performance. Its avowed purpose is to protect the dignity of the individual. It proceeds to try to fool the individual into believing that, by its compulsory contributions, he is paying his own way for security and old age. This is not true. The people in increasing numbers know it. And their dignity is not protected by the pretense. On the contrary.

There is neither dignity nor justice in a $20,000 windfall—a hand-out from the public purse—to a $50,000-a-year executive employee. And the same goes for the hand-outs right on down the line to the unhappy compulsory contributor who misses "insured status" by half a quarter and has to undergo a needs test to qualify for assistance.

According to the Federal Security Agency, at the end of 1949, of the 80,400,000 persons who had contributed into OASI, 36,700,000 did not have insured status. Even under the wider coverage of H. R. 6000, "fifteen or so million" of the gainfully employed will remain uncovered—not to mention those who will lose or never acquire "status."

UNFULFILLED PROMISES

In other words, OASI fails of its purpose: As a hand-out, it undermines the self-respect of those who can save for themselves and offers no protection to those who need it most. This creates doubt in the minds of many people as to the justice of the law. Why, they ask, should some who have worked diligently all their lives, have to undergo the indignity of a needs test, while others may receive windfall benefits whether they need them or not? Why should contributions ever have to be forfeited? Why should the Government want anyone to stop working?

Mr. Chairman, we cannot have unjust laws and honest citizens.

LET UNCLE SAM DO IT

Public assistance, financed by Federal grants-in-aid, is deplorable for three reasons: (a) the needs test; (b) dangerously increasing costs; (c) dangerously increasing Federal penetration in a field I believe the fathers of our country never intended the Federal Government to enter.

I take it to be axiomatic that in a free society the individual earns his own bread and butter. When the individual fails, his family looks out for him; when his family fails or he has no family, his church or his community takes over; when his church and community fail, the State takes over; and when the State wants more money, it cries to Washington. The number of representatives of State agencies who have come here professing a desire for more grants-in-aid, is an indication of the failure of the family, the church, the community, and the State.

The more Federal money made available for the needy, the more needy there will be. Eventually, the more there are depending upon the Federal Government, the less Federal money there will be. There will come a day of reckoning, as there has come to every other welfare State in history—unless, of course, we stop letting Uncle Sam do it and do it ourselves now.

We Americans as individuals have already delegated too many of our prerogatives. The delegation of love of our neighbors and of kindness to our neighbors' crippled children and other disabled members of our communities is, in fact, impossible. Love and kindness cannot be reduced to a benefit formula, nor to a price of living budget. Assistance should stay with the local community and receive not a penny of Federal aid.

UNDERMINING INDEPENDENCE

The H. R. 6000 redefinition of employee and proposal to include the self-employed under OASI would only undermine the independence of that many more of our citizens and hasten the day of an American welfare republic.

Disability allowances as proposed by H. R. 6000 would bring the Federal Government into private homes in an unconstitutional manner, and constitute strike one to socialized medicine.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Mr. Chairman, because I do earnestly believe that we as a nation are well on our way to losing our birthright of freedom, lured by the illusion of security, I respectfully ask your committee's consideration of the following recommendations:

I. That the present Social Security Act be repealed in its entirety.

II. That the present Social Security Act be replaced by an honest responsible pay-as-you-go system under which:

A. Every American citizen would pay an income tax of 3 percent on the first $5,000 of income, without exemptions, for aid to the aged.

B. Every American citizen at the age of 65 would receive a flat amount, tied to the changing cost of a bare living—$35 a month to start—without a means or a work test.

C. State and local agencies would have the responsibility of caring for the disabled for orphans and children in broken homes; and of subsidizing especially needy cases of aged.

D. The individual would have the responsibility of saving—by whatever means he saw fit—for his old age and his survivors. He would be free to work as long as he is able, to contribute to his own and his neighbor's fuller life.

III. That a special commission be appointed to make an exhaustive study of the costs of a universal, nondiscriminatory, democratic pay-as-you go system of aid to the aged; and of the possibility of keeping both the necessary taxes and payments down to the State level. It is true that State income tax set-ups would complicate the problem of interstate payments. But so is democracy more complicated than dictatorship.

OPPORTUNITY FOR SECURITY

Cutting through the thickest of complexities of OASI—the benefit formulas, the qualifications, disqualifications, inadequate contributions, increment factors, windfall benefits, innumerable discriminations, and who has a right to what—our problem is simply this:

We want to make decent provision for those who cannot take care of themselves, without undermining the responsibility and initiative of those who can. There is a very fine line which divides too much from too little assistance. Too little means poverty, disease, death. Too much means serfdom. It saps individual self-respect and initiative, breeds indolence, and eventual revolution from the right or the left. The small tax credit I suggest for all American citizens at the age of 65 would serve as a margin of error. It would be a first line of protection for those who had little or nothing. It would eliminate the temptation to cheat and to beg for more and more and more from the Government because the working and producing taxpayers in a pay-as-you-go system would always outnumber the voting recipients. It would not undermine incentive to work or to save but would return responsibility to the individual where in a free country it belongs. In the long run it would be cheaper, more efficient, more equitable and more democratic.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my appreciation and thanks for the privilege of appearing here today.

Eliminate "Iron Curtain" in Northern Ireland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 21, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article by Thomas Dorgan, clerk, Suffolk Superior Civil Court, which appeared in the Boston Traveler, Boston, Mass., Tuesday, April 25, 1950:

DORGAN DEMANDS FREE IRELAND—URGES STUDY BEFORE FURTHER AID TO GREAT BRITAIN IS GRANTED

(By Thomas Dorgan, clerk, Suffolk Superior Civil Court)

The amendment proposed by Congressmen FOGARTY, LANE, MANSFIELD, KEATING, DOLLINGER, and JAVITS to House bill 7797 provides that before we furnish any more economical assistance to Great Britain, we should carefully examine the iron curtain in the north of Ireland which was placed there by that self-styled defender of freedom and liberty—Great Britain.

The question is asked by all sincere, peace-loving, democratic people, "What is this iron curtain? We thought the Kremlin conspirators were the only ones who had an iron curtain." Well, it is the mutilation, or cutting up, of one of the homogenous nations in the world.

Ireland was always regarded as one nation, clearly defined and bounded by the hand of God. Even before the Christian Era, Ireland was recognized as a single unit and that unit has survived for thousands of years.

In 1914, at the beginning of World War I, Premier Asquith of Great Britain promised the Irish people, in return for their assistance during the war, absolute home rule at the end of the war. Great Britain took the field in World War I for the freedom of small nations. Premier Asquith said, "We are fighting to vindicate the principle that small nationalities are not to be crushed by the arbitrary will of a stronger and overmastering power."

Because of Premier Asquith's pledge, 300,000 Irishmen went to war and over 50,000 of them were killed in battle. But, after the war was over, Ireland was given the old harpoon by one of the greatest quarterbacks England ever produced—Lloyd George. For instance, this was one of Lloyd George's deceptive plays. In a lateral communication by quarterback Lloyd George from the famous T-formation, to Sir Edward Carson, a notorious British Tory from the north of Ireland, sent from Whitehall on May 29, 1916, he said, "We must make it clear that Ulster does not, whether she wills it or not, merge in the rest of Ireland."

CHARTERS FLOUTED

Such a statement might be expected from the Kremlin conspirators but not from the self-styled peace-loving and liberty-loving Great Britain. In World War II, people were led to believe that they were brought into conflict for the salvation of civilization and in behalf of liberty and democracy to vindicate the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms," and to maintain the freedom of small nations against an aggressor or any other tyrant. We know now that the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms" were just simply words. There is, at the present time, more slavery, more dictatorial rule than ever in the history of mankind.

If other nations, and there have been plenty, pleaded for help from America—it was graciously given. Why, then, not Ireland's cause? We must not forget that millions of young men and women of Irish descent were led to believe when they took the field in World War I and World War II that liberty and freedom would be granted to all nations, whether big or small.

Just imagine, even though Ireland was strictly neutral in World War II, over 275,000 Irish volunteers went into the army, navy, and air force of Great Britain. No such percentage of nondrafted men offered themselves for any other country in the world. And for the information of Sir Basil Brooke, the Tory Premier for the north of Ireland who is now paying us a visit, the southern part of Ireland received 12 Victoria Crosses from the British Government. This decoration is equivalent to our Congressional Medal of Honor. Irish heroes also received thousands of other decorations from the English Government—and this is all part of the record.

It is also a matter of record that there was no conscription in the English-dominated counties in the north of Ireland, and the only Victoria Cross awarded in that part of the country was given to an Irishman—not a Tory.

The only way to crystallize public opinion on this important resolution is to contact your Senator and Congressman by telegram or letter asking them to record themselves in favor of this bill at the hearing Friday before the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, JOHN KEE, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C. Explain in your telegram or letter that you think the flow of American taxpayers' money to Great Britain should be stopped until such time as the iron curtain in the north of Ireland is eliminated.

Thomas H. Buckley, commissioner of administration at the state house and president of the American League for an Undivided Ireland, will represent Massachusetts.

American Security at Midcentury

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 1 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, on Saturday evening, April 29, 1950, at the forty-fourth annual meeting of the American Society of International Law, Administrator Paul G. Hoffman of the Economic Cooperation Administration delivered an address entitled, "American Security at Midcentury." Mr. Hoffman's appraisal of his country's position among the nations of the world, his reflections on America's leadership and her aims as they are inspired because of the responsibilities of that leadership, make his remarks not only timely, but of universal interest. I therefore ask that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN SECURITY AT MIDCENTURY

(Address by Paul G. Hoffman before American Society of International Law, Washington, D. C., Saturday, April 29, 1950)

The theme of your meeting—American security at midcentury—brings us face to face with a question of overwhelming significance not only to America but to the entire world.

In the past 2 years I have visited many countries. I am here to testify that all the free world today feels that its security is dependent upon the United States. The eminent Harvard historian, Dr. Arthur M. Scheslinger, recently said that the most important development of the first half of this century was the reluctant acceptance by the United States of world leadership * * * our emergence as one of the two world powers fated to shape the future of mankind.

I hope Dr. Scheslinger was correct in stating we have accepted our new responsibilities. Assuming that he is correct, I know that he is also right in stating our acceptance was reluctant. Few of us welcome our new responsibilities. Few of us enjoy them. Not all of us even now entirely grasp the fact that we must accept them and handle them wisely or let the fate of the free world be decided by Communist Russia.

That is one side of the coin. I suggest that we in America turn the coin over and take a look at the other side—a new look at the rest of the free world.

The day is past when American security can be preserved by American action in America alone. The time has come when we must stop thinking about the free nations of western Europe and the other free people of the world as charity cases. We must start and start now thinking of them as vitally necessary allies in this titanic struggle between the slave world of the Kremlin and the free world.

There can be no American security in midcentury unless there is security for the other nations of the free world.

In view of the fact that the United States has been cast for such a vital role in this struggle with the Kremlin, the first question we should ask ourselves is, How strong is America?

Strength, of course, cannot be built in a day. It is the result of growth. It is my belief that America has been growing steadily stronger during the past 50 years to a degree hardly realized by our own people.

To be sure, the general inclination, both here and in the rest of the world, is to look back on the first half of the twentieth century with a shudder. No less a personage than Winston Churchill, speaking at the midcentury convocation at MIT referred to this terrible twentieth century. Theologians, philosophers, novelists and politicians have echoed that sentiment. The welcome the world gave 1950 sounded more like a wake than a celebration.

It is true that terrible things have happened. A world-wide depression brought hardship and misery to tens of millions. Two of history's most devasating wars left vast areas of the world's surface in ruins. And peace, a secure peace, has eluded us.

Terrible, yes, and terrifying, but that is not the whole story. If you will accept as the basic criterion for progress the enhancement of opportunities for men, as individuals, to grow and develop, materially, intellectually, and spiritually, a good case may be made for the period as the most fruitful in history. And that is the only criterion we dare use. A nation is only as strong as its people are strong.

Using this test, America's past 50 years shape up remarkably well. The first half of the century has brought a great enrichment of opportunities.

Let us take a quick look at what has happened.

In 1900 the material benefits of our economic system were largely limited to those born on the right side of the tracks. The vast majority of other people led very austere lives.

Today there isn't any other side of the tracks. Millions enjoy comforts and conveniences unknown even to the most fortunate 50 years ago. Not too long ago Fortune magazine directed an inquiry to thousands of persons throughout America asking to what class they thought they belonged, upper, middle, or lower. Almost 90 percent rated themselves as belonging to the middle classs. I doubt if at any time in history there has been a country in which so small a percentage of the people considered that they belonged to the upper or lower class.

Opportunities for great numbers of people to achieve material benefits from any economic system are largely the results of the capacity of that economy to produce and distribute wealth. In that respect these 50 years in the United States have seen the most startling progress in the history of man. We have become the richest, most productive nation on the face of the earth.

And how did we do it? Well, between 1900 and 1950 we steadily increased efficiency of production. We used more and more machine power. We invented work-saving machines and became skilled at using them. Year by year we made better and more goods at lower costs.

With mass production came mass marketing and mass consumption. The individual's opportunity to enjoy the material benefits of our expanding economy increased enormously. The national income, in dollars of the same purchasing power, soared from $50,000,000,000 to $225,000,000,000, an increase of 450 percent. In the same period our population rose from approximately 75,000,000 to 150,000,000, an increase of only 100 percent. In the manufacturing industries, wages increased from about 20 cents to $1.40 an hour. The number of jobs went from 27,500,000 to about 60,000,000.

Intellectually the enhancement of educational opportunities opened the door to a fuller life for millions. Sumner Slichter of Harvard recently said that few periods in the world's history had made more rapid progress in breaking down the barriers to education. Back in 1890, to use some of his statistics, only 1 out of 14 children between the ages of 14 and 17 was in school. In 1945 the proportion had grown to four out of five. The number of high-school graduates has increased about 13 times as fast as the population and the number of college graduates six times as fast.

It is not so easy to gage spiritual matters since they are at once the most important and most intimate part of any individual. But surely it can be counted as a spiritual gain that we have passed from a smug disregard for social conditions to a lively awareness of our responsibilities toward our fellow men.

Back in the early part of the century it was rare indeed for anyone even to advance an argument that there should be equality of work opportunities for all, regardless of race, creed, color, or sex. Today, whatever our practices may be, we, at least, concede the validity of that concept. And our children accept it without reservation just as they accept as a fact of life the brotherhood of man.

And underlying all this progress is the determination of our people that our Government should be one of laws, not of men. That, of course, is fundamental. To quote the distinguished British political scientist, Sir Ernest Barker, "it is * * * the foundation of foundations. When you have the rule of law, the individual knows where he is; he knows where he is today and where he will be tomorrow."

That is my case for America * * * America strong and growing stronger.

Now let us take a look at Europe.

I can speak with authority only of the nations we are serving * * * the free nations of western Europe. To help in the restoration of their strength has been ECA's particular assignment over the past 2 years.

General Marshall, himself, gave a report on the progress of the program recently, stating that "a near miracle has been accomplished." I will not quarrel with so distinguished an authority.

Translating that "near miracle" into hard facts, we find that, in the past 2 years, industrial production in western Europe has risen to 20 percent above prewar. I use the phrase carefully when I say that what has been accomplished here is spectacular. The remarkable speed of the recovery pace can best be appreciated if we remember that after World War I, in which the destruction of industrial facilities was much less than in World War II, it took these same countries 7 years to restore levels of prewar output.

Agricultural production as a whole has been brought nearly to the level of prewar and, given favorable weather conditions, will reach the prewar level this year or exceed it.

This means, in human terms, that the western Europeans today have a generally adequate diet, that they can feed and clothe their children and that they are at work.

And they are working hard. * * * A fact which the production figure dramatizes.

But a near miracle is not enough. We will need a full sized miracle to complete the job. In my opinion, it can be brought about but only if the European people are given an opportunity to realize on their full potentialities.

Let us look back.

Until the turn of the century Europe was the undisputed center of world trade and commerce. The conditions in which Europe's modern economy grew great were a substantially free trade throughout Europe, a free movement of labor, and a substantially free movement of capital. Because Europe was, in effect a single market, within the limits of the then-existing knowledge and techniques full use was being made of Europe's resources. Competition exercised a relentless pressure on costs, and stimulated a continuous search for new and more efficient methods of production.

As a consequence of these benign conditions trade among the countries of Europe and between Europe and the world increased geometrically. Wealth grew so rapidly that European capital flowed out in a great stream to high-yield, productive enterprises throughout the world, stimulating still further demand for European manufactures. And with minor exceptions, there was real peace among nations.

For 50 years—up until recently—Europe has been in the process little by little of destroying these conditions of its economic greatness. The break-down of the European security system that accompanied the rise of German power late in the last century drove the nations of Europe to increasing political and economic nationalism. The nationalism was intensified after the First World War as each nation sought to solve the problems of economic reconstruction along lines of national self-sufficiency. Tariff barriers were raised to heights theretofore unknown.

Then came the world depression, and instead of attacking the problem of growing poverty by cooperative measures, each nation in Europe tried to solve it by beggaring its neighbor. Tariffs were no longer sufficient. The absolute trade restriction came into being in the form of import quotas and exchange controls. These rigidly determined the amounts of goods that could move in international trade, and sharply reduced the influence of the competitive process on the flow of trade.

It was only behind absolute trade barriers that Hitler was able to create a synthetic gasoline industry and a synthetic rubber industry. It was only behind the most rigid trade barriers that Hitler was able to convert the German economy from the production of butter to the production of guns. If the European economy had been integrated, with its resources used in the most efficient manner, with trade flowing freeing from one unit to another, neither Germany nor any other country would have been able to put itself into a position to sustain an effective attack on its neighbors.

This strangulation of intra-European trade over a long period by artificial trade restrictions practically eliminated competition in Europe's basic industries, thereby destroying a fundamental condition of increasing productivity. It caused a deficient and inefficient use of Europe's resources. And, finally, it provided a barrier behind which an aggressor twice prepared for war against its neighbors.

These were the facts and this was the situation confronting the western European nations when, with our help, they began their recovery drive.

This is the background of ECA's insistence that economic integration is a "must" if western Europe is to regain her economic strength and to stand on her own feet, independent of extraordinary outside * * * our * * * assistance.

The goal we and the western Europeans have set is the building of a single market of 275,000,000 consumers in which the goods and services produced by mass production can move freely and in which the people can enjoy a high and rising standard of living.

Then, and then only, will they be completely immunized against the false appeal of communism.

There are, of course, other factors essential to the restoration of western European strength. The "dollar gap" must be brought within manageable proportions and here we, in America, have a contribution to make beyond just material aid and advice. We must accept the hard fact that we must sell less and buy more from western Europe. There is little appeal in such a program but it is the only alternative to continuing our aid at heavy cost to the American taxpayers—or letting the European economy collapse at a heavy cost to our hopes of winning in the present struggle to preserve the free world.

We in ECA are fully aware of the difficulties involved in attaining our goals. To again quote General Marshall the 2 years before us—those between now and ECA's termination date—will be the most difficult of all.

But, looking at America, I see not the slightest reason for discouragement. We can and will attain the goals set for the Marshall program. We can and will win the cold war once we understand its significance.

This is a new kind of war. It is essential that we understand that, too. We are inclined, I am afraid, to think of wars exclusively in terms of shooting. Modern war is fought on four fronts—economic, informational, political, and military.

We are just learning how to fight on these first three fronts. And our methods, I am deeply convinced, are appropriate to our goal—an enduring peace in which all men live in decency and dignity.

On the economic front we have provided food to relieve hunger. We have provided tools to make work possible. We are teaching modern methods in order that modern tools may be used effectively.

On the information front we are fighting lying propaganda with truth and nothing but the truth. From the outset our goal has been to tell the Marshall plan story so that each European—and each free citizen—would understand his stake in the recovery effort. We have sought in every way possible to get the truth to the peoples concerned. We are contributing to the rebuilding of confidence and hope. Our goal is people who are free and strong.

On the political front—well, the western tradition, for all its heresies, has had one constant feature, its concern with freedom. Their physical strength restored, I do not think we need fear the political surrender of the western Europeans.

This is the kind of war we can afford to fight. We cannot afford not to fight it. The full 4 years of the Marshall plan will cost us something less than $15,000,000,000. What it would cost to fight a cold war in southeast Asia I do not know. I do know, however, that it would be a comparatively modest figure, and I do know we cannot afford not to spend it.

The kind of war we cannot afford to fight is a shooting war. Former Secretary of the Army, Gordon Gray, said, not so long ago, that World War II will have cost the United States $1,300,000,000,000 before the last due bill has been met. What world war III would cost no man can say. We might well pay for it in the total destruction of our civilization.

The free nations of western Europe cannot win this struggle alone. They need our aid and comfort, but it is also true that we need them. Long ago, the poet, John Donne, said that no man is an island entire unto himself. That can be said with equal truth of nations. Today, America is strong, prosperous, blessed above any nation on earth. But she is not an island entire unto herself.

The security of America—the security of our friends and neighbors overseas—calls for the drawing together of all the free nations, economically, militarily, and politically.

Together, but only together, we can win this cold war and build a peace so strong and enduring that no aggressor of today or potential aggressor of the future will dare to violate it.

Cooperative for American Remittances to Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 1 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by the Governor of the State of New York calling upon the people of the State to join in the observance of CARE Week, which is the period from May 1 to May 7, inclusive, in recognition of the very important humane activity which has been and is being carried on through the Cooperative for American Remittances to Europe, better known as CARE.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXECUTIVE CHAMBER,
Albany, N. Y.

STATEMENT BY GOVERNOR DEWEY

It is inspiring to know that the people of our country have sent more than $100,000,000 worth of food and other articles individually to the people of war-torn countries in the past 4 years through the Cooperative for American Remittances to Europe, better known as CARE. The packages sent include food, blankets, clothing, and books. They have been sent not only to Europe but also to the Philippines, Korea, Israel, Pakistan, India, Japan, in fact to all areas which suffered from the ravages of the war.

This generosity has been of an entirely voluntary nature and is exercised aside from the large sums we have contributed as a nation for the rehabilitation and recovery of overseas countries, on the Government level. CARE enables us as individuals to make these gifts as a matter of direct and personal help and as the expression of our friendship.

To call attention to this important humane activity, the period of May 1 through May 7 is being observed as CARE Week. I am sure the warm-hearted men and women of the State of New York will join in this observance with special response to this appeal.

Hon. Herbert Hoover's Suggestion About Reconstitution of United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 1 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, the recent suggestion of former President Herbert Hoover that the United Nations be reconstituted without Russia and her satellites has raised, and will continue to arouse, considerable discussions.

There was a very splendid study of the Hoover suggestion in the Baltimore Sunday Sun of yesterday, written by Mr. John W. Owens, which, because of Mr. Owens' long experience in the field of journalism, and his wide knowledge of matters of which he writes, will command respect and attention far and wide.

I ask unanimous consent that the article by Mr. Owens be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Baltimore Sunday Morning Sun of April 30, 1950]

RACE BETWEEN IDEAS AND HARSH EVENTS

(By John W. Owens)

Whether or not the United Nations shall be reorganized without Russia and her satellites, as suggested by Mr. Hoover, probably will depend less upon opinions than upon events. There is wide diversity in opinions.

Some men of wide experience and of unchallenged devotion to the cause of peace think advantages of the United Nations as now organized outweigh disadvantages. Apart from various achievements, which they count as material, though far short of the goal which was set in San Francisco 5 years ago, these men think the United Nations provides a forum which is as valuable in world debate to the West as it may be to the East. They also cling to the hope that out of the nonshooting war will come ultimately some kind of balance between West and East and they think that in that hoped-for hour of balance the United Nations as now organized may provide a meeting ground for settlements. Bordering all such theories are various ideas of union or federation of nations, some limited to the West and some more ambitious, which could, in theory, be adjusted to the framework of the United Nations. And, of course, there are opinions in the west of Europe which are not by any means at one.

There could be prolonged argument between men who hold such ideas and those who would follow Mr. Hoover's opinion that direct, swift action should be taken in reorganization of the United Nations without the Communist states. But, in existing conditions in the world, events may on any day decide for the United States and the West, not only what they should do in organization, but what they must do. In putting the Marshall plan through Congress, the Italian election of April 1948, and the danger that Italy would go Communist in a popular vote, was worth many many speeches in explanation of General Marshall's program. Russian pressures accelerated adoption of the Atlantic Pact. Russian pressure almost overnight converted a skeptical Congress into one vigorous in provision of arms for Europe. Conceivably, events in Berlin in May could make decisions for the West about the United Nations. And another crisis may lurk behind that expected in Berlin.

With the germ of Mr. Hoover's idea, doubtless millions of people in the United States mentally grapple every day in the midst of indescribable confusion. The germ is this question: How to build close, firm unity in the West? Call it regional cooperation or union or federation. Organize it inside the United Nations or outside. Continue to hope for peace with Russia or prepare for war with Russia. Short of war, count upon ultimate balancing of relations with Russia or count upon continual matching of armed strength. Whatever the wrappings, doubtless millions of people daily grapple with the question of ways and means in establishing unity in the West—hoping rather desperately that they may have opportunity to hammer out conclusions before events take the question out of their hands.

In the first place, the necessity of such unity speaks for itself. If there were absolute unity there would be no assurance that on some fine day Russia would not send her armies into the west of Europe and take her chances on what we could do to her own cities in retaliation. But, up to this time, Russia has not taken this course. Possibly she thinks she has done too well without war to invite risks. But as Russia maps her course there can be little doubt that she would be impressed if close, firm unity could be achieved in the West. On top of what has been done in hurried measures of cooperation—in adoption and execution of the Marshall plan, in formulation and development of the Atlantic Pact and its military corollary and in virtually daily exercise of imponderable habits of consultation—the attainment in actuality of close, firm unity of the west would become a major fact in Russia's calculations. She would face, not an array of allies who are still awkward in common action, but a coherent force which would be capable of decision.

In the second place, such unity would give some promise of reducing the burden which the United States carries—relatively, if not absolutely. There never was reason to think that, once the world became divided, the United States could escape the burdens of being the principal treasury of the West and the principal arsenal. In the months immediately following adoption of the Truman doctrine 3 years ago, great numbers of people seemed to think that we could throw down the gage of political warfare to Communist Russia and then go in for business as usual and politics as usual. Billions piled on billions for national defense and for military and economic aid to allies have dissipated that delusion. But we are entitled to think that, if nationalistic divisions of the West could be subdued in an actuality of unity our partners would gather enough strength and confidence to reduce, at least, our relative responsibilities as treasury and arsenal.

The reason that millions in the United States grapple with this question of unity and see only modest progress—while events rush ever onward—is that deep-rooted national barriers seem at times almost insurmountable. Take one illustration. There can be but scant hope of close, firm unity if nations of the west are engaged in economic warfare among themselves. All political, social, religious, and racial divisions could be subdued in principle, but unity would fail if there were economic warfare. At that point another question appears. How are the nations to live in economic unity if they keep tariff walls? Specifically for Americans: How are nations in Europe to live in unity with us if, after we stop giving grants, we refuse to allow them to sell us as they buy? Some day, if time is left us for rational decision, we may discover that we must make broad adjustments in our industrial life—perhaps with governmental aid—in order to achieve the economic unity, which is essential to the whole unity of the West, which is essential to our safety.

Reply of the Brooklyn Tablet to Mr. Friendly's Article in Washington Post

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 1 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, last week I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article from the Washington Post, written by Mr. Alfred Friendly, dealing with the activities of a Mr. Alfred Kohlberg in connection with our China policy and the current controversy concerning that policy. In the body of that article there was some reference, which escaped my notice at the time, to the Brooklyn Tablet, a publication of the Catholic diocese of Brooklyn. I did not and do not now vouch for the accuracy of Mr. Friendly's remarks, nor can I vouch for the accuracy of articles printed in the Tablet or in any other newspaper. But I know Mr. Scanlon, the editor of the Tablet, to be an extremely able newspaperman. In comment on Mr. Friendly's article, Mr. Scanlon wrote a letter to the editor of the Washington Post. The Post printed that letter on April 28. I ask unanimous consent to insert Mr. Scanlon's letter as printed in the Post in the Appendix of the RECORD, so that I may be, as I desire to be, perfectly fair to all persons.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLET'S ANSWER

Alfred Friendly in your issue of April 23 misrepresented in an intolerant manner, the Tablet, the official publication for the diocese of Brooklyn, which comprises one and one-quarter million Catholics.

Mr. Friendly asserts I was a sponsor for a dinner given to Archbishop Yu-pin, of China, in the Hotel Commodore, New York. What was wrong with that? I am willing to be a sponsor for any bishop of my church and particularly for one being persecuted in his own country by tyrants.

Your writer asserts the Tablet follows the Father Coughlin line. Father Coughlin has been out of public life almost 10 years; I have not seen him in 15 years and only occasionally hear of him. What is the Father Coughlin line? I do not know what it is or if any exists. But I believe the name of this priest, who has been out of the limelight so many years, was used by your reporter as the same sort of smear attack the Soviet exercises when it desires to manifest its antipathy to champions of human rights.

Your writer states the Tablet "gives aid and comfort to the intemperately reactionary elements on the American political scene." While the same charge has often been made in the Daily Worker, it's new to find it in the Washington Post or any representative

American publication. We are curious to know who Mr. Friendly considers the intemperate reactionary elements to whom we give aid and comfort. Of one thing you may be sure, it is not the group who put Alger Hiss, Judy Coplon, and 92 perverts on the Federal pay roll.

PATRICK J. SCANLON,
Managing Editor, the Tablet.
BROOKLYN, N. Y.

Proposed Extension of Federal Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY P. CAIN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 1 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency has just concluded a week of hearings on the Federal rent-control-extension question, and the House Committee on Banking and Currency will begin companion hearings on Monday of next week. In an effort to provide both committees with information and opinions in support of letting the 1949 Rent Control Act expire on its termination date of June 30, 1950, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD three letters which have recently come to my desk. The mayor of Salt Lake City relates the benefits which came to a relatively large American city after decontrol. The other two letters were written by American veterans who are entitled to an opportunity to speak for themselves.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SALT LAKE CORP.,
Salt Lake City, Utah, March 22, 1950.
Hon. HARRY P. CAIN,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: My attention has been invited to the prospective discussion on the theme, Should Federal rent control be continued? in which you have been invited to participate.

It occurred to me that you may appreciate hearing our point of view at Salt Lake City was one of the so-called larger cities to decontrol. Our population at this time in the metropolitan area numbers about 200,000.

Decontrol took place the first part of August 1949. Immediately, as controls were removed, there seemed everywhere to be a release of the restraints that, I sincerely feel, for years, has reacted negatively against all property ownership. I realize that such a statement may be of little value to you as it is just one of the intangibles. However, maybe I can translate this reaction into something more helpful.

From August 1, 1948, to March 1, 1949, there were 1,039 building permits issued. During the same period from August 1, 1949, to March 1, 1950, there were 1,222 building permits issued or an increase of 17½ percent since decontrol. However, for January and February of 1950, there were 290 permits as against 165 for the same 2 months in 1949, or an increase of 75.7 percent so far this year.

In the matter of real-estate sales, the activity of the last 5 months of 1949, when controls were lifted, was 261 sales greater than during a comparable period in 1948 when controls were on.

Our over-all rent increase on the basis of dollar average has been $6.48, according to our Bureau of Labor Statistics report.

You can imagine the relief to the mayor's office the removal of controls has been. Our setting up of a rental housing office met the issue. The employees were busy in that office for the first few weeks and then it tapered right off. It was soon apparent that by far the large majority of callers were simply shopping around.

This past week one of our largest operators voluntarily reduced the rentals in one of his largest and finest medium-priced properties $10 per apartment.

Several important apartment properties are now in the late planning stage and some are well on the way in construction. There are also many lesser undertakings in the apartment field which will help us appreciably to meet the rental issue.

The greatest relief which has come to this office is the cessation we now enjoy from evictees pleading for help. In 1948, for instance, there were 369 eviction notices and 27 writs of restitution. In 1949 the evictions had dropped to 307 and the writs of restitution had declined to 22. The great showing of decrease, however, is being noted this year. For the months of January and February of this year there were only 19 eviction notices as compared with 49 for a comparable period the year previous under control.

The outstanding feature of this entire achievement is the return to a more cordial feeling between our citizens, owners and renters.

The dire forebodings which were predicted as to happen to me have not transpired.

We are living and working under the American manner fully grateful for free private enterprise which, incidentally, is the only enterprise in our beloved country which is self-sustaining.

If this modest statement seems to you significant, in any way, you are at liberty to use it.

Very truly yours,

EARL J. GLADE,
Mayor.

NEW ORLEANS, LA., *March 28, 1950.*

DEAR SIR: I am writing you this letter in reference to the coming rent-control hearing.

We bought a piece of rental property 2 years ago and have invested $11,000 on various improvements to date, however, our OPA approved rent at present is $20 per month less than the 1943 ceiling on this same property.

I am a totally disabled veteran of World War II and have invested all our savings including the loan provisions of the NSLI and private loans in these improvements. If it were not for my retirement pay we would not be able to pay taxes and keep this property going on the present rents allowed by the Housing Expediter.

We therefore urgently request that you vote against any extension of rent control.

Any of the above facts can be substantiated by myself or the local rent office.

Sincerely,

C. L. EDWARDS,
Lieutenant (Junior Grade) USNR (retired).

Hon. HARRY P. CAIN,
Senator, State of Washington,
Washington, D. C.:

May I introduce myself? My name is Richard Lenington. I am 31 years of age, married, a veteran of World War II, with 4 years' service in the Air Force, and 22 months of overseas duty in the South Pacific. I work in the property-management department of White & Bollard, Inc., in Seattle, and live in an apartment under rent control. I am writing to you because I feel that in my job I have an excellent opportunity to see the actual workings of rent control and yet I am not a property owner and my opinions are not formed by any prospect of personal gain. I am in truth a married veteran with the usual problems and hopes of all veterans, and my job is a means of a livelihood as is any other veteran's. The facts and opinions I offer are honestly given and I sincerely believe without prejudice, except as a citizen of the United States who is an advocate of private enterprise and personal liberty.

I am against rent control, and I shall try to explain my reasons for this stand.

As a veteran I object, because I believe it works against the best interests of the veteran in spite of the stand of the VFW in favor of rent controls. In the years since the beginnig of the war low-rent housing has been taken over by people who were not required to give up their homes in the defense of our country. Rent control has enabled and has, in fact, forced the continuance of this condition. People who have their housing subsidized, which rent control in truth provides, naturally will not move nor can they move because the law of housing turn-over has been practically nullified.

Many apartments and other rental units are now occupied by people who are not normally renters. They have been able to sell their houses at high prices and by influence, exclusive listings, etc., have been able to secure low-cost rental accommodations to tide them over until the price of houses decline and they buy back at lower prices and thus make a tidy profit. The veteran who has no influence or an exclusive listing to offer has no opportunity to compete for the few vacancies that do occur. Instead, he is forced to buy the house at the high price in order to find a place to live.

I have friends that are veterans who would gladly pay a nominal increase in rent if these lucky people who would not consider such an increase as good business would again own their homes instead of renting. The same condition existed in the automobile business under OPA, when the dealers required a used car as a trade-in as a price for buying a new car. If the veteran didn't have a used car to turn in, he didn't have much chance to buy a new one.

I have people come in and tell me that they have, for example, a two-bedroom apartment which is much too large and they would like a small one in another location. Others have small ones which they would gladly give up for a larger one. With the freedom of movement, available if economic laws were allowed to function, these adjustments would take place of their own accord.

I have painters, carpenters, appliance dealers, etc., call on me every day seeking business. I have tenants who would gladly pay more rent if they could have their unit decorated or new appliances added, or the outside painted, or better service, all of which provides employment. Under rent control these two demands are not allowed to function. Millions of dollars of business are lost every year, because if you miss a year of decorating, you can never make it up. I don't know how long some buildings can go without proper upkeep, but I do know that many have eliminated several complete decoratings that would normally occur.

Landlords are not as a rule large property owners. We all know that thousands of landlords only own from one to three units. They are, in fact, in the majority. When people talk about landlords who do not suffer under rent control they certainly are not considering the small operators, but rather,

the large ones who perhaps can afford to let their buildings depreciate in order to show a profit. I have seen many houses and duplexes where the loss of 1 month's rent uses up an entire year's profit. These factors are not a primary concern of mine in this issue, however, because I believe this to be a risk of any business, but I do feel that a great injustice is being done to the small property owners when such statements are made.

My next point applies to Seattle because this is where I know the facts. I have found it necessary to advertise for as long as 3 weeks to rent a duplex that rents for $50 a month. This also applies to apartments that rent for $30 and $40 per month. The reason? They are located too close to the colored district. Certainly, I have received 10 to 30 calls per day for these units but how can anyone claim there is a housing shortage if the units are not taken because of location. The price charged for the units is not the reason because they are under rent control and the same units located elsewhere that rent for $57 rent with no trouble. When renters in this bracket object to location I cannot believe that a housing shortage exists any longer.

I further have been running as many as eight vacancies per month for brand-new duplexes which have ranges, refrigerators, de luxe Bendixes, full basements, landscaping service and complete maintenance. Admittedly, the rent of $77.50 per month is rather high, but the facilities offered are excellent. The prospective tenants for this class of rental are able to shop around and are able to be extremely choosy. After each vacancy we are forced to completely decorate the apartment, which is as it should be. The rent on these units will soon have to be lowered to under $70 to meet competition which would indicate to me that there is no longer a real shortage of housing.

If rent controls were lifted I am convinced that the so-called shortage would soon fade into oblivion. In fact, I sincerely believe that rent control in effect does a favor for property owners that they fail to appreciate. It practically eliminates turn-over and the cost of continued decorating. Good service and clean apartments are not necessary because normal competition is eliminated. It is becoming common knowledge among management men in Seattle that the honeymoon is over and those of us who have any property to rent other than the very best or extremely low-priced units are finding rental and collection problems quite prevalent.

The only justification I can see for the belief that continued rent control is necessary is fear—fear for their jobs on the part of the employees of the Housing Expediter and fear through lack of knowledge on the part of the rest of the advocates of such control. The union men in this city who are in any way affected by the operation of rental units will tell you privately that they know that the need for rent controls is past but that the policy of their parent organizations guide their public utterances and for some reason the word has come down to oppose decontrol. Therefore, they are afraid to say what they know is true.

If the administration fears that decontrol and the resulting competition in the rental business will destroy the rent scale of the "608" apartment loans, let them say so, but to talk about chaos and shortages as a pretext for continued controls is not fair to the American people. Any shortage that exists is caused by the very existence of rent control and even then is a very minor thing. This fact can be proved to anyone who cares to investigate without bias.

Senator, may I compliment you on your stand on this issue. You know the facts as well as I do and better. For my part, I have merely tried to explain the thing as I see it every day in the actual business of renting. I know that it's hard to make others believe the truth when so many powerful forces in government seem to have made up their minds that political expediency demands that they support this false cause of rent control.

The many people who will be provided with work decorating, remodeling and producing needed appliances and fixtures for our neglected rental units support you. The thinking tenants and prospective tenants who want a decent place to live or a competitive chance to find a place to live support you. Property owners who want the chance to improve their buildings and manage their businesses in the American way support you. The real-estate firms and salesmen who want to sell homes to people who should be owning their own homes support you. The veteran who would like to take the apartment vacated by such people support you, in spite of the dictates of some politically-minded clique who claim to speak for the veterans.

Socialistic-minded individuals and groups will oppose you. Big unions who for some reason unknown to me, think that stifling a large sector of prospective jobs is good business will oppose you. The administration, which is guided by political expediency and has a pyramid of interests to protect, will oppose you. Senator, believe it or not, some property owners who fear competition, renting costs, increased maintenance and decorating costs and who know that decontrol will bring back the many problems of renting units under a free economy, will offer opposition by the very fact that they will not give you active support.

I believe the cause is just. I believe in the wisdom of the people and their elected representatives. I believe that because ours is a free society and because competitive business will always bring better results than a controlled economy, your fight will be a successful one. I wish you Godspeed.

Very truly yours,

RICHARD LENINGTON,
Seattle, Wash.

Strengthening the Spiritual Values of American Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 1 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a memorandum which I have received from C. E. B. Ward of the League for the American Home, Inc. Mr. Ward is a prominent religious leader who is asking to impress upon American parents the fact that after all the American home and the American church should work inseparably in strengthening the spiritual values of our democracy.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALERTING THE CLERGY

Alerting the clergy is an appeal to the clergy of all faiths for a Nation-wide crusade for daily Bible reading and prayer in America's homes.

The appeal is addressed to the clergy, the spiritual heads of the church and Nation, to whom the public looks for spiritual guidance. Without whose active, expert leadership, Nation-wide observance of family devotions is hardly possible.

The appeal is based on the conviction that daily Bible reading and prayer in our homes would unlock and develop untold latent spiritual potentialities. Release the most dynamic force the world has known. Power for implanting faith in our children, reviving the church, building the character necessary for citizenship in a democracy. Power for preventing juvenile crime, divorce, immorality, irreligion. Power to create sufficient moral force to enable us as a Nation to implement our full responsibility in international leadership for creating and maintaining peace on earth.

Such stupendous, miraculous results inevitably follow the simple practice of daily Bible reading and prayer in our homes because it means reaffirmation and rebirth of obvious, fundamental principles which made us a great Nation. Truisms learned in childhood, tested through experience, common sense, psychology, and the Bible, but forgotten, buried by neglect, materialism, and trivialities.

For this conviction we suggest four obvious reasons:

Homes are the divinely created human welfare agents.

Religious instruction of the child is primarily the parents' prerogative and responsibility.

The child has the same capacity for the spiritual as for the material.

The dynamics of diminutive forces.

I. HOMES ARE THE DIVINELY CREATED HUMAN WELFARE AGENTS

God set the solitary in families

Dr. E. Stanley Jones' personal message given me for America, calls the family the most nearly perfect cooperative social unit, therefore nearest the kindom of God.

Roger W. Babson believes a father and mother of character living normally together with their children do definitely more in making a strong nation than Presidents, governors, legislators, educators, or clergymen * * * and settle the character and destiny of the child for time and eternity.

Lin Yutang asserts that the final test of any civilization is the type of husbands and wives and fathers and mothers it turns out.

A Japanese Buddhist after touring America's scenic wonders declared, "The 'it' of America is the American home."

In theory Americans give top priority rating to homes. Out of 40,000 personal interviews with representative Americans for a cross section of public opinion and for expert counsel, not a dozen dissented from our thesis concerning the supreme importance of home values. This truth was taken for granted. "You don't need to sell us on this idea" was heard everywhere.

But unanimity of opinion does not mean alert, concerted action to strengthen the place of America's homes in the modern social order. There is a lack of adequately organized public effort on behalf of right functioning home life. The overwhelming weight of public support is given to countless welfare agencies scattered over the country. For example, of $52,500,000 contributed 1 year by 122 leading American foundations to charitable, educational, and philanthropic institutions, not $1 was recorded as given to any movement definitely working for more stable home conditions.

Yet, the New York Times editorial warns, "Without homes, the primal source of all health and education, the billions of philanthropy must be powerless. Better give the home a chance than spend increasing billions trying to correct errors that might have been avoided if only 5 to 10 percent of money lavished on institutions were invested in homes."

Men create an ever-increasing number of agencies—institutions. Some are indispensable for organized community effort to meet existing social conditions. Others, sincerely—though futilely—attempt to substitute for the home's tragic failure.

Institutions reclaim—homes prevent

A clear cleavage exists between institutions and homes. Institutions heal, cure, restore, and reform; aid the sick, the poor, the neglected, and the delinquent. Institutions deal with youth, usually en masse, through agents, on a secular level, using reclamatory methods. In families, parents personally care for their own children individually from infancy—and if homes are religious, in a spiritual atmosphere—for the prevention of social ills.

Decades ago, Amiel in his journal pleaded for keeping pure the human stream of 80,000 newborn babes daily pouring sweetness into the world's corruption and defilement.

To keep clean this increasing stream of newborn innocence is better, faster, safer, cheaper, and more thrilling than later in life to wash out disease, immorality, unbelief, and crime. To homes, especially to mothers, belongs this fascinating preventive role. Upon the clergy rests a unique responsibility and opportunity for directing the execution of this high service.

It is significant that the United States Department of Labor reports "an almost complete breakdown of hitherto approved methods, painstakingly worked out" for meeting the needs of youth.

The family as God and Nature created it, when prepared for its task, seldom if ever fails in its unique service. Train up a child in the way he should go and when he is old he will not depart from it. Homes fail when inadequately equipped or when lax in performance of duty.

A notably successful home experiment

The 100 percent effectiveness of spiritually inspired homes was demonstrated over a period of 18 years in 20 specially created small-unit Marvel House homes with 2,600 teen-agers of all social strata, 30 nationalities, and 10 major religions whom Mrs. Ward mothered as her own sons. This proved J. Edgar Hoover's reiterated assertion that "The only solution for delinquency is old-fashioned homes, religion—and family prayers."

A large percentage of these youths were headed for or had actually come under the courts as so-called delinquents. Only one is known to have come afterward under court jurisdiction. All had been hazy regarding their future. Nearly all found their vocations. Few had had any previous religious training or cared to attend church. However, all participated voluntarily in our daily family prayers, and most of them became Christians.

J—— caught the spirit of work. I——, gifted as humorist, cartoonist, and actor, found his niche. F—— was groping, though fitted by nature and choice for scientific research. C—— shook off the gang whose whistle had sent him out nightly on criminal raids. M—— learned how to pray—could not sleep until he had said his prayers. Hell's Kitchen boys begged for a beating rather than be suspended from Marvel House home privileges.

Youth, from many nations in the First World War, never ceased wondering at the spirit of unity and brotherliness among themselves while their fathers and brothers were fighting each other in many lands. Marvel House homes welded them into one family, and prepared them for American citizenship.

Hundreds of letters from the boys express gratitude and attest these home values. W—— from Texas: "So you wrote me while on your back sick in bed. If I could get a letter like that to begin every day it would keep my mind off of other things that seem to bring on trouble." K—— from California: "If there were more people like you, Mrs. Ward, there would not be so much crime. If only I had taken your advice." D—— from Panama: "You treated me like a mother. I read more of the Bible now. Your sweet home led me to accept Christ." R—— (to his mother in India): "Here we are from different countries equally housed and taken care of by these noble hearts, Mr. and Mrs. Ward, God-fearing and duty-loving. We are constantly reminded of the supremacy of religion over the bustling materialism of the west." M—— from Egypt: "When I went out of the gate in the morning the weight and hardness of the city (New York) settled upon me, but when I returned at night, as soon as I came through the gate, the brightness and cheer and joy of the home drove away all the depression. My lovely days in Marvel House under your care passed too rapidly, as if they were dreams, happy dreams." S—— from Palestine: "I will always remember your splendid home. My parents are very grateful for all your kindness to me during my stay in New York." E—— from Iowa: "Who could picture a jollier family than I witnessed at dinner that last Sunday in Marvel House? It has stayed with me ever since."

Under proper home influence, boys were often so completely changed in a few days that even their own mothers did not know them.

If one consecrated mother with meager help could transform the lives of 2,600 teen-agers in spiritually inspired homes, 25,000 devoted mothers, trained for preventive service in the home field, could turn back the growing tide of America's juvenile crime.

Homes, through which every person comes into the world, are the universal welfare agencies. The perfect media for meeting the needs of youth. The church's most hopeful field of service and its inexhaustible source of supply. The yardstick of our American way of life. The place where America will hold its rendezvous with destiny.

To provide homes for neglected delinquent youth, to prepare youth for marriage and parenthood, to help parents to realize that what they do, teach, live, think, and feel in their 40,000,000 homes means more to the future of our children, to the Nation, and to the world than the total contribution of all institutions combined: This is to render a major service, because it is God's and nature's human welfare plan. And it works.

II. RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION OF THE CHILD IS PRIMARILY PARENTS' PREROGATIVE AND RESPONSIBILITY

The church in thy house

Unless parents assume their spiritual responsibility we can scarcely expect children's feet to turn toward God or the church.

Proclaimed on page after page of Holy Writ is the spiritual accountability of parents. "The father (family priest) to the son shall make known Thy truth." "These words shall be in thine heart and thou (parents) shalt teach them diligently unto thy children, and shalt talk of them when thou sittest in thine house and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down and when thou risest up * * * lest thou forget the Lord * * * lest He destroy thee from off the face of the earth." Godlessness and disaster inevitably follow parental neglect of this minutely detailed duty. The church's major role is to encourage and guide parents in assuming their share of spiritual care of their own children.

A statement asserts that if America ever falls it will be for lack of Godly homes. A governor warns that without religion no nation can survive and then reminds us that there are no less than 17,000,000 American children receiving absolutely no religious instruction. An estimate sufficient to shock the most complacent into prayerful action.

Home evangelism

The official statistician of a great Protestant denomination reports that in a recent year only 60,000 members were received into that denomination by confession of faith. In that year there were 9,000 ministers, 51,000 spiritual lay leaders, nearly 2,000,000 members, 1,500,000 Sunday-school scholars, a current budget of $33,000,000, property investment of $500,000,000, and half a million sermons delivered.

If not a Sunday-school lesson had been taught, or a sermon preached, but Christian parents had faithfully met their spiritual obligations to their children in the home, many more than 60,000 persons would have professed faith. A mighty influx of believers into churches of all denominations would follow the complementary functioning of church, Sunday school, and homes in a great, coordinated effort.

The Wall Street Journal states that "what America needs more than railway extension, western irrigation, low tariff, bigger cotton and wheat crops is a revival of religion. The kind that father and mother used to have * * * that counted it good business to take time for family worship each morning right in the middle of wheat harvest."

A professor of Christian education in a great American university estimates that of over 46,000,000 Protestants there are not 6 men or women giving full time to Christian parent or Christian family-life education. And that not one of our Christian colleges has set aside a single professor for full-time research and instruction in family religion.

After my address in a school devoted solely to preparing students for Christian service, the Dean announced "This is the first time in the history of this Christian school that fitness for Christian service in the family has been stressed, or even mentioned."

Religious instruction in the home—"precept upon precept, line upon line, here a little and there a little"—must not be disproportionately appraised as a mere or doubtful adjunct to Sunday school and church, but rather as the prime factor for spiritual rehabilitation. The "stone which builders rejected must become head" of our welfare structure. As the Spanish proverb has it, "An ounce of mother is worth a pound of clergy." Reinstating the mother in her sacred position at the source of life, spiritual as well as physical, lays a foundation on which later the clergy builds.

A Chicago pastor, who aggressively promoted spiritual home life, increased church attendance more than 300 percent, not by becoming three times as eloquent, but by introducing daily observance of family devotions into 90 percent of his membership. By conditioning all members of families toward religion and the church, his young people largely cut parks, movies, and Sunday games. He now preaches to three packed houses every Sunday, instead of one partially filled.

A New York City church, founded on a pledge taken by every family to read the Bible and pray daily, now ranks high in membership of that denomination in the city.

Auditorium, gallery, and basement are crowded Sunday morning and evening in a Miami church whose families are pledged to say grace at meals, read the Bible, and have prayer daily.

Native Christians of India and Burma, replying to a 10-point questionnaire regarding what most helped spiritual life of the church and the individual, invariably replied "Family prayer every day in every home."

A most hopeful and necessary service is to aid parents in 40,000,000 American homes to assume their share of spiritual responsibility for their own children. Godly homes assure successful churches and a stable democracy.

III. THE CHILD HAS THE SAME CAPACITY FOR THE SPIRITUAL AS FOR THE MATERIAL

Thy children shall be taught of the Lord

From a child Timothy knew the Scriptures. Samuel served in the Lord's house, receiving and transmitting a profound spiritual message, though he "did not yet know the Lord."

The head of the New York Psychological Center asserts that the strategic time is when the child is too young to understand but not too young to accept—wax to receive but marble to retain. That period from infancy through early childhood when, without clearly defined knowledge, it unconsciously absorbs the world around it, subconsciously pigeonholing it for later understanding and use.

The White House Conference on Children in a Democracy agreed that the emphasis should be shifted from adult education and from adolescent youth to early childhood. This is in line with modern psychology which teaches that the permanent bent of a child's life is determined before it is 2 years of age. Adolescent problems are solved in the cradle.

The second word heard from restless, fretful, crying 1-year-old baby girl was "ni pa" (nice prayer) when Grammy lovingly prayed that she might be quieted and go to sleep. That baby girl, now 10 years old, prays earnestly for Grammy's Nation-wide work for America's homes.

When Grampa visits his home, his 2-year-old grandson brings the Bible asking to hear read the story of the men in the fiery furnace. One asks: What can a 2-year-old understand about captives thrown into a furnace and a fourth walking with them, like unto the Son of God? But repeatedly exposed to spiritual truths, he slowly absorbs their meaning and comes gradually to believe in a higher power always ready to help. Thus, early spiritual influence and training preempt children for God and church. Fortify them against temptation. Persist through mature years. Give permanent shape to character. Ramify finally into all phases of our American way of life. Crystallize it into Christian civilization.

Dr. John R. Mott gave me this special message, "You can't overestimate the importance of early religious influences and training in the home. Tell America Dr. Mott said so."

Challenging a general belief that institutions of higher learning undermine faith of undergraduates, Dr. Lowell, ex-president of Harvard, told each incoming freshman class "No university can take away the religion a child gets at its mother's knees."

A village pastor observed wisely: "While formal religious guidance comes later in life through pastor, Sunday-school teacher, or friend, unconscious religious influences stem from the home. Without them in early childhood in the home, youth are not likely to seek formal religious guidance offered later by the church."

Save one generation of children and you have saved the world. Childhood represents divine timing.

IV. THE DYNAMICS OF DIMINUTIVE FORCES (DEMONSTRATED BY A WISE PROVIDENCE) THAT NO FLESH SHOULD GLORY

The atomic age has focused attention on the tiny, the little valued, the oft discarded. Mud packs for beauty. Oil of earthworm for healing. Bread mold for manufacturing penicillin. Electrons of speed. Atoms for power.

God also "hath chosen the foolish, weak, base, despised." "The widow's mite. The lad with five barley loaves and two small fishes. Moses' rod. The cruse of oil. Two agreed. One chasing a thousand, two putting ten thousand to flight. The second mile. The other cheek. Faith as a grain of mustard seed." Ideas, ideals, freedom, liberty, truth. Value of the individual, the child, the parent, the home. And the power of the much neglected practice of daily Bible reading and prayer in the home for the spiritual rehabilitation of the church and Nation.

A builder of Oak Ridge and developer of the atom estimates that 1 pound of atomic energy is equal to 1,500,000 tons of coal. So might 1 pound of preventive spiritual energy, generated in early childhood by parents in the home, be equal to 1,500,000 tons of curative, secular institutionalism applied later in life.

Victor Hugo wrote, "Nothing is so powerful as an idea whose time is come." The time is come again for all clergy and churches to promote with the utmost urgency the divine idea that spiritually inspired homes are powerful agents for reempowering the church, saving our youth and our civilization.

An appeal to entice angels

Forty million humble homes with a high potential. Multitudes of parents desperately needing aid in teaching their children to love and serve God. Myriads of innocents capable of receiving and retaining the divine imprint. Our own flesh and blood awaiting a parent's magic, spiritual touch. This is an appeal to entice angels.

Available helps

Ample family helps are published by all denominations, Bible societies, Federal Council of Churches, International Council of Religious Education, many groups and individuals.

The League for the American Home and Marvel House also are eager to aid through (1) free literature; (2) Method of Procedure for the Church (10 cents per copy), which stresses the importance in every local church of a home committee selected from its most consecrated members to study spiritual home conditions, needs and methods, formulate a practical, workable program and patiently undertake its execution, thus relating the church in a businesslike manner to the home problem; (3) speakers' bureau (expenses only); (4) conduct of conferences, forums, rallies, broadcasts, syndicated press articles, house-to-house visitation; (5) family prayer circle covenant, "Recognizing the tremendous power of a spiritually inspired home, as a member of the family prayer circle I will do my best for the spiritual welfare of my family, to inaugurate and maintain regular Bible reading and prayer in my home—daily if possible."

The Bible is in more homes today than is any other book. Most of it is written with such simplicity and clarity as to require little or no learned exposition. It is a "sword, lamp, light, guide, abideth forever." "He may run that readeth." No high I. Q. is necessary for understanding. Any father and family may worship with a psalm, parable, miracle, narrative, biography, even a single verse, and find inspiration, guidance, comfort, cheer for the day. And simple prayer produces amazing results: "Before they call I will answer, and while they are yet speaking I will hear."

This family-bible-prayer crusade involves no obligations on the part of the clergy save that imposed by conscience and accountability to God and to parishioners. Its importance merits—

1. Strong and repeated emphasis upon spiritual home values, in sermons and religious-education programing.

2. Pastoral planning to the end that some of the church's program has the specific purpose of reminding and equipping parents for their peculiar function and responsibility to create a religious home environment.

The League for the American Home, Inc., with headquarters at 1214 Carnegie Hall, New York City, invites the clergy to share with it plans which they have found successful in dealing with this problem. It also welcomes both suggestions and inquiries concerning its program.

Biggest Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 1, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD to include the fifth article by Mr. Frank C. Waldrop on the infiltration of communism in our country.

BIGGEST STORY

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

There is a Communist college of revolution running wide open today at 575 Sixth Avenue, New York City. It has regular classes, teachers, and textbooks. It is called the Jefferson School of Social Science.

A few days ago this writer dropped in there to see how things were getting along, and in a matter of minutes used up a $20 bill collecting samples of current publications the faithful are required to buy.

The Communist organization in the United States raises a great deal of money through the writing trade. Indeed, writing and printing are basic weapons with which the conspiracy recruits and disciplines its membership.

The word factories of the conspiracy produce books, plays, magazines, pamphlets, weekly and daily newspapers, tracts, handbills, and leaflets in an endless stream.

Most of these are manufactured in New York City, and the thinking that goes into them largely centers in that school of revolution above-mentioned.

But the production is not limited to New York alone. Nearly every large city in the United States of America has a production of its own that takes the New York manufactures and reworks them for local coloration.

Those without local plants at least have sales outlets, showing Communist thought-control at prices ranging from 2 cents an item up to $10 and $12 sets of collected works of approved writings.

Nothing happens in the worlds of art, literature, science, or government, that is allowed to pass untreated by the Communist discipline. For the masters of communism are wise in their way.

They thoroughly understand that man is a thinking animal. He cannot be trusted, left on his own, to stick to a single line of approved action. His natural instinct is to invent variations to suit himself.

And since it is, beyond everything else, well understood by the Communist masters that they cannot operate and manipulate people who think for themselves, the word factories work night and day producing Communist versions of thought in all its infinite variety.

The faithful are bound by the fundamental laws of their faith to believe nothing except these Communist interpretations of everything from jazz music to biology, from fiction to astronomy. Indeed they are to read nothing else if that can be avoided.

Thus from cradle to grave the mind of the Communist has a path laid out for it, and strictest orthodoxy is enforced.

This is extremely important to know in all your dealings with Communists. They have a rigid conception of mortal sin and they live by it. Therefore if you know their conceptions of sin you can judge pretty closely how they will behave in any set of circumstances, whether in war or in peace.

To a Communist, mortal sin is involved in any word, thought, or deed, done in violation of the science of Marxism. This science governs Stalin as surely as it governs the silliest sophomore in the Jefferson School of Social Science above-mentioned.

The spy who steals atomic secrets for Russia, the State Department officer who betrays his oath of office, the witness who refuses to answer a Senate committee, the college teacher who perverts American history, the girl in the street who carries a libelous placard, all these are bowing to the science of Marxism.

As long as that science rules them, they cannot be reached by appeals to traditional instincts of human decency.

Mr. Roosevelt and his advisers at Yalta demonstrated that all too well.

They hadn't done their home work on communism, even then after all those years of experience with the Communists here in Washington.

That is, you can only say ignorance was the source of error if you subscribe to the charitable theory that Mr. Roosevelt didn't mean to do in world politics what he had been doing in the domestic affairs of the United States of America from 1933 onward.

And that, as the public record shows, was to let the Communists, and him knowing it, move into seats of power in our Federal Government.

The science of Marxism is governed by one basic rule. It is that there is not room on earth for those who would live and let live. The law of life for those who are governed by the Communist idea is to conquer by any means at all, but conquer.

That law dominates every Communist every day in every way, no matter what he says or what he does to the seeming contrary.

The charity offered Roosevelt is that he thought he could make a deal with Stalin. He was wasting his time, if he thought that. The man with whom he would have had to deal died in 1883 and he was not interested in deals with anybody on any subject.

He was the author of this science aforesaid, and he caused trouble in the world.

It is a remarkable feat that one man has been able so to bewitch so many.

Biggest Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 1, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD to include the sixth article by Mr. Frank Waldrop on the infiltration of communism in our country:

BIGGEST STORY

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

A man can be crazy and yet upset the world. Several have done that in recent times and the result is that mankind is upset today worse than ever before in any age.

Were these men really crazy? Well, take the case of Hitler.

In World War I, this backwoods Austrian was a low and obscure corporal of little education and less experience. Twenty years later, though, he was master of Germany. Yet that was not enough and so his behavior ran on beyond the reach of common sense and reason carrying millions with him.

How do these things happen? Nobody really knows. Was Hitler crazy? There can be no doubt. A man is crazy when he thinks and acts, no matter how ably, from a point of view that everybody else knows to be without any foundation in fact.

As Hitler demonstrated, a man can be very shrewd and potent, even though crazy. His thinking machinery may be powerful and smooth.

It just runs the wrong way.

The curious and disturbing thing is that such crazy men can exert so much influence.

How? Well we all know when we think about it that deep in the nature of mankind there lies a passion for order and the settlement of all problems that beset us in this life. This might be called the instinct of a place for everything and everything in its place.

And this instinct is at endless war with another passion even deeper in the nature of man.

That is the passion for free individual experience and self-made decisions.

The human race survives and triumphs over trouble by keeping those two passions, one for freedom and the other for order, in eternal conflict.

Neither ever completely wins and neither ever wholly loses. And so we get along.

But on occasion there comes some man who symbolizes one or the other of these instincts so powerfully that millions go along with him.

Then, if we are in an unlucky age, it turns out that the leader is not sane and calm, like George Washington, but insane and unreasonable, as with so many politicians of our time.

The crazy men of modern times have had one thing in common. They have been fascinated by this idea of order.

The short title in politics for this is socialism. Under socialism, the problems of life are all to be swept away.

Therefore, hand everything over to the Government, which will own and run the means of production impartially, and with the same impartial justice hand back the fruits to each according to his need.

Pretty? Ah, yes, if you are crazy enough to overlook the jagged edges and dismiss as mere detail the multitude of exceptions to the rule. Hitler was one who held the details unimportant. He was a good Socialist.

In fact, he founded a political movement revolutionary in character and ruthless in deed, titled "The National Socialist Party."

But Hitler's socialism, itself modeled on the socialism of another crazy man of our upset times named Benito Mussolini, was not the passion for order carried to its utmost extreme.

The last word in that line is "communism," the claim that not only can everything be placed and everybody's needs be met with full satisfaction to all, but that even the Government itself can be "withered away."

The whole of life will then be automatic, self-satisfying, and the whole world peaceable, prosperous, and populous.

Who could possibly fall for it?

Well, on May 5, 1818, there was born a son, christened Karl Heinrich Marx, to a lawyer of Trier, Germany.

Karl Heinrich Marx grew up to believe that communism could be impressed upon our many-talented race. But only, he decided, after a few preliminaries were out of the way.

These preliminaries he made clear and simple, as follows:

"You will have to go through 15, 20 or 50 years of civil wars and international conflicts, not only to change existing conditions, but also to change yourselves and to make yourselves capable of wielding political power."

Thus a man could calmly suggest that the world be plunged into 50 years of war on the mere off chance that he could be right about the profits that might fall in an age unborn.

His malignant influence survived his life and ultimately penetrated the Government of the United States itself.

Biggest Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 1, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD to include the seventh article by Mr. Frank C. Waldrop on the infiltration of communism in our country.

BIGGEST STORY

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Government is not mere advice, said George Washington. It is authority with power to enforce its laws. It is obvious, therefore, that people who are going to be governed by others had better take care to see what the laws are, who will enforce them, and how.

Since time began there have been among us some who cared more for the exercise of authority and the enforcement of their own brands of law, than for anything else.

And when such people are out of authority they may well promise the whole earth and all that's in it to whoever will give them authority.

Americans who have been awake and alert these 20 years past know something about promise and performance in politics. We have known a man to run for President in 1932 promising peace less government, and lower taxes, ideal notions in any age. But what was the performance?

Karl Heinrich Marx, the lawyer's son from Trier in Germany, went up to Berlin in the fall of 1838 as a university student. Europe was flowering at that moment into a time of light and progress.

Just a little while before, a revolution had gone off in America, organized by a band of colonists who had asked no more than the right to look after themselves under the general rule of the least government is the best government.

That American Revolution, the only one in history that ever worked out according to plan, had been followed by another in France, so fierce and bloody as to horrify the world.

Why? Because the French revolutionists were not satisfied with the idea of least government. They wanted to make all obedient to a rigid rule of state.

Karl Marx, as many another after him, was sure that the French Revolution should have worked. The flaw was not in the idea but in the acts.

The oldest mantrap of philosophy is that of saying an idea is "right in theory but just lacked in execution." If a theory is right, why doesn't it work under test?

Anyhow, Marx was a son of the well-to-do, of respected parentage and not suffering from the lack of material things, when he landed in Berlin. He chose philosophy as his career.

And out of philosophy he moved to politics.

His philosophy was bunk, as see below, and for that matter his politics got him no place either. But just the same Marx died con-

vinced that he alone possessed the keys to the kingdom of heaven on earth, thusly:

1. Man is an animal, nothing more. He came from nowhere, he goes nowhere. Religion, therefore, is a fraud conceived by some men to deceive others.

Just how this remarkable fraud has survived so many human follies and why it comes back after every attempt of mankind to escape it, no Marxist has made clear to this day.

2. Other frauds listed by Marx were the home and family, the schools, governments, businesses, and industries of the world. Like religion, all these really are "agin" nature and do more harm than good.

In short, the world as is, can be called a mere jungle, calmed by no hope of self-improvement, because it is all a conspiracy of the rich against the poor.

3. Therefore, since the poor are many and the rich are few, the obvious thing is for the poor to rise against the rich through force and violence, and rule the world.

But this, of course, would be a complicated business.

So in order for the theory to work right, the poor must surrender their political education, direction and action, to a single, small but carefully trained, officer corps.

This command force would, of course, have to do some nasty things but as soon as the bloody business could be ended the officer corps would readily and freely commit harakiri.

This intermediate period of getting things organized, Marx called "the dictatorship of the proletariat." And the officer corps we know today as the Communist organizations of the world, all commanded from a single headquarters in an ancient palace of Moscow, Russia, called the Kremlin.

Now, anybody looking in a common-sense way at the Marxist analysis of the world, can see its imbecilities and shortcomings. And Europe, in the nineteenth century with the horrible example of the French Revolution to consider, was particularly having none of it.

Marx died embittered, lonely and frustrated. He was buried in London, where he had spent most of his adult life calling for the revolution that would not come.

His early followers and believers were as futile as he. Had it not been for the follies of the German general staff and two residents of the United States of America, Marxism would not be the issue in the world it is today.

Control of Forest Insect Pests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK A. BARRETT
OF WYOMING
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 1, 1950

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, when the conference report on the urgent deficiency bill was before the House, I called attention to the fact that spruce bark beetles were destroying thousands of acres of fine spruce stands in the Roosevelt National Forest in northern Colorado and in the Medicine Bow National Forest in Wyoming. I called attention also to the fact that the mountain pine beetle was attacking the lodgepole pine in the Jackson Hole area as well as in Idaho and would destroy much of the scenic beauty of that area.

I am hoping that the deficiency committee will report out an item on the next deficiency bill to provide funds to carry on the fight on this infestation in time for work this spring. Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I insert with my remarks an editorial by Mr. Bob Cruzen, the editor of the Laramie Boomerang, in the form of a letter to Hon. JOHN TABER on this subject matter. I may say, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Cruzen is one of the best-informed writers on this matter:

HOUSE URGED TO APPROPRIATE $4,500,000 FOR PEST CONTROL

(By Bob Cruzen)

Representative JOHN TABER,
Member of the House Appropriations Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. TABER: I am writing you an open letter in regard to amendment 13 to H. R. 7207, a bill making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes.

This amendment, which pertains to the control of forest-insect pests, was reported in disagreement by your committee of conference in House Report 17941.

ACTION IS CHALLENGED

As you will recall, Representative CLARENCE CANNON, Democrat, of Missouri, made public a statement in lieu of a report on March 20, 1950. It was at this time, that Members of the House representing States in the Rocky Mountain and far West areas, challenging the actions of your group in reducing the amount of appropriations needed to fight forest pests which are now destroying thousands of acres of our best timber.

Representative FRANK BARRETT, Republican, of Wyoming, pointed out to your group that the conference report indicates that nothing has been appropriated for the protection of pine and spruce beetle infestation in Wyoming and Colorado.

As I understand it, your committee has begun work in preparation for the next deficiency bill and at a later date our western Representatives will again be heard on this issue. However, forest officials and entomology experts in this region agree with Representative SANBORN of Idaho who told your committee that "there is just one time to treat these beetles, and that is in the spring of the year."

Mr. SANBORN, in commenting on funds for this project, added that "the sum should be adequate to take care of the total operation," and pointed out that "it is absolutely worthless to do a partial operation."

WASTED FUNDS

He further stated that "if the sum that is being suggested in this amendment, which is only $750,000, were scattered out over the various projects that need attention, the money would be wasted." "However," he concluded, "if an adequate sum of money were appropriated in this amendment, then the situation would be met and this valuable timber could be saved which otherwise will be lost."

GRAVE CONCERN

The fact that your conference committee has seen fit to eliminate desperately needed monies to fight beetle infestation in the western mountains, is cause for the gravest concern here in the Rocky Mountain region. The facts presented to your group by Representatives HILL and ASPINALL of Colorado, Representative BARRETT of Wyoming, Representatives SANBORN and WHITE of Idaho, Representative D'EWART of Montana, Representative CASE of South Dakota, Representative HOLMES of Washington, Representative MANSFIELD of Montana, and Representative ANGELL of Oregon are far from exaggerated.

Authorities on the subject of beetle infestation have told us that this is one of the worst epidemics in the history of the West. After viewing the damage done by the spruce beetle in the White River and Routt National Forests of northern Colorado, it is increasingly apparent to residents of southern Wyoming that our lush forests are in immediate danger of becoming seriously infested.

Representative CANNON'S statement that the deficiency bill "is intended to carry only urgent deficiencies appropriations where extreme need exists," leads me to believe that your committee has ignored the facts presented by your congressional Representatives. How much greater can a need be before action is forthcoming?

IMPORTANCE OF FOREST

Our forest lands are of vital importance to the West. We depend upon the forest for many things. Timber for industry, timber to protect wildlife, and timber to provide recreation.

Mr. ASPINALL, Representative from Colorado, was not only speaking for the residents of his State but for the entire region when he told Representative CANNON that "I especially support the proposed expenditure of $4,500,000 in addition to the amount now available which is needed presently in five of the Western States."

In this country, Mr. TABER, we are extremely concerned over the current beetle epidemics.

Because of congressional apathy, 3,000,000,000 feet of board measure—Englemann spruce and lodgepole pine—have been killed to date in the forests of northern Colorado. The value of this stumpage alone has been estimated at $7,000,000. At the present time, spruce timber along the Wyoming-Colorado border is threatened in the amount of $11,040,000. The total of all timber now threatened in our area is valued at $490,200,000. This, of course, represents stumpage alone and does not include the loss in salaries, wages, and services of the lumber industry if this timber were manufactured into lumber and other forest products.

Is it any wonder, then, that peoples of the West take a dim view of penny-pinching congressional committees which balk at spending $4,500,000 to save many times that amount of valuable timber?

TIME IS NOW

The time to start this war on beetles is now—this spring. In fact, the whole program should have been launched several years ago. The Forest Service has been waging a continuous war on insects but it takes money to get the job done. This is not the time to criticize the Bureau of Entomology for inefficiency. It is a time for immediate and drastic action.

If the Bureau was at fault, as some claim, then it should be held responsible. But let's get this project under way now and take care of the Bureau later.

Regarding our immediate problems in northern Colorado and southern Wyoming, the regional forest office has stated:

"If any control work is to be done, this year is the time to start. There will be need for control work for two more years in addition to 1950."

As I understand it, your committee will pass a verdict on the required $4,500,000 forest-pest control appropriations bill early next month. In the interests of the five Western States, I earnestly request that your committee give extremely serious consideration to the above-mentioned sum.

Sincerely,

R. B. CRUZEN,
Managing Editor, Laramie Republican-Boomerang.
LARAMIE, WYO.

Brannan Plan Discriminatory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 1, 1950

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, there is a widespread feeling throughout the country to the effect that, if the Brannan plan is as good as its sponsors say it is, it should be expanded. A good many people apparently feel that in its present limited form the plan is discriminatory. These people feel there should be a universal Brannan plan.

As an example of this grass-roots demand for a nondiscriminatory Brannan plan I desire to call attention to the enclosed letter to the editor which was published in a recent edition of the Hutchinson (Kans.) News Herald. Under leave the extend my remarks, it is included herewith:

HOTEL BRANNAN

The Brannan farm plan does not go far enough. Let's apply it to other industries. Let's have a Brannan beer joint where we can get a large mug of beer for a nickel. We need a Brannan hotel where we can get an old-fashioned square meal for 15 cents. And we should have a Brannan barber shop where we can get a shave and haircut for two bits. Then let the Government send the beer dealer, the barber, and the boarding-house lady a subsidy check for the balance. John can pay the bill. John Q. Taxpayer has lots of money. He likes it, I guess. At least, he voted for much of the New Deal gimme stuff.

MILO C. BILYEN.

LIBERAL.

Contribution of Capital to American Standards of Living

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH BUTLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 1 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very excellent editorial entitled "Capital Punishment," from the April issue of the magazine Partners. The editorial very effectively expresses the idea that American workers enjoy an improved standard of living, not only because of organized labor's long and patient crusade, but also because of the incentives of American capitalism, that is to say, free enterprise.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

Many a labor leader, sincere and otherwise, would lead us to believe that everything the American worker enjoys today has come to him solely as a result of the rise of organized labor, and that each and every gain has been registered in the face of stubborn resistance on the part of organized capital.

Such a presentation as this is more rash than rational, and to fall for it is to carry forward in our minds a badly distorted picture of the actual facts. This none of us can very well afford to do in these days when the survival of our American economy depends upon mutual understanding and harmony between the partners of industry—the worker and his employer.

Certainly the unions have played a prominent part in elevating the social and economic status of the worker—particularly the organized worker. But to run away with the notion that the unions have managed the job single-handed is to labor under a decidedly false impression.

CAPITAL'S CONTRIBUTION

The standard of living of American labor has steadily increased with the years, first of all, because of the progress of American industry—because of capital investment in technology, plant capacity, and marketing facilities. It was the development of the mass-production technique by capitalized industry which, first of all, enabled management to pay labor higher real wages. With mass production of goods came increased purchasing power, to the worker in particular—in the form of more dollars with which to acquire lower-priced commodities.

Here, then, is a highly significant contribution to the economic welfare of the working man—and one which enriched his home life, not as a result of militant unionism, but rather as the free result of capitalistic vision, ingenuity and enterprise. No union, we should remind ourselves, played any part in the development by Henry Ford of a low-priced automobile—nor was any demand of labor behind his historic move to establish a $5-a-day minimum wage for his workers at a time when the average wage for the industry was somewhere around $1.50 per day. As a matter of record, the vision of Ford, the capitalist, exceeded the vision of any of the labor leaders of his day—for, as a pioneer mass producer of automobiles, he saw in his workers, not only so many production hands, but likewise so many potential customers for his product.

Thus, here as elsewhere, before the cart must go the horse—and before we strike off a medal to pin on the breast of organized labor, we must strike off one of equal size and brilliance to pin on the breast of its partner in bettering the lot of the worker. Certainly it is a foregone conclusion that, lacking the benefit of mass-production machinery and technique, there wouldn't be enough cars produced to reach the members of Walter Reuther's auto workers' union, no matter how loudly Walter might shout and pound the table at contract-making time. Nor is it likely that Phil Murray, without the facilities and know-how of the steel companies, would be able to turn out enough metal—for all his million members—to supply the mousetrap industry.

THE CASE OF SHORTER HOURS

What is true of increased purchasing power in the hands of the workers is likewise true of today's gift to them of increased leisure hours in which to rest from toil and exert that purchasing power. Too many labor leaders would create the impression that it was they and they alone who were responsible for the 8-hour day and the now generally accepted 5-day week.

But here again they spout just so much hog wash. For no labor leader, no matter how powerful, is capable of striking pay days from the calender—unless his particular industry is already equipped with labor-saving machinery efficient enough to pay for lost hours of production. Shorter working hours are the direct result of longer machines, and here again chief thanks must go to capital and the management of industry for having provided, through their own ingenuity and incentives, the sound economic wherewithal. Minus the intricate mechanization of the modern shoemaking industry, all the cobblers in the land banded together in a single union couldn't shorten their hours of effort without at the same time shortening their livelihood.

All along the line we find the same situation—labor and management combining to lighten their mutual burden and to provide for their mutual gain. It is at no point a solo performance; everywhere it is a case of partners at work. Capital, through the agency of management, provides the ingenuity, the know-how, the savvy to create labor-saving devices; labor, through the agency of its unions, steps in to claim a fair share of the saving for itself. And from labor, by means of suggestion plans and promotions, the ingenuity and know-how which resides within its ranks is handed up to management in a never-ending stream.

That is the true picture of American industrial development—and it is not the picture of a monopoly.

THE HUMAN SIDE OF CAPITAL

Indeed, we should be taking a shallow view of things were we to attribute the gains of the American workingman solely to the efforts of his union leaders. Worse, we should be lacking in what by this time should be common knowledge. For the record is replete with the names of businessmen and firms whose contributions to the welfare of the workingman have both antedated and outrun all union demand:

The Endicott Johnson Shoe Co. didn't improve working conditions and provide for their workers' security as a result of union pressure. Nor did James F. Lincoln, president of Cleveland's Lincoln Electric Co., develop his spectacular system of incentives because some labor leader stood over his head with an ax. The Bettendorfs, of Iowa, didn't open their coffers to their workers, when times got tough during the depression, because some union presented them with an ultimatum. Nor did Kohler, of Kohler, Wis., build a workers' paradise in response to union demand. Nor did Hershey, the chocolate king. Nor did Hormel, the meat packer. Nor did any of a tremendously long list of progressive industrialists advance the cause of their workers because union leaders shook a stick at them. In each and every instance, the impulse sprang from the heart; and in each and every instance, the result was a well-thought-out experiment in industrial partnership.

THE MEANING OF CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

Unions in this country have grown strong, and this is as it should be. But this fact gives them no license to let their strength run away with them. Along with numerical strength, they must grow in moral and intellectual stature, as well. They must learn to give credit where credit is due and they must learn to appreciate that, being in themselves an expression of the spirit of free enterprise, they can exist only in a climate of free enterprise.

I doubt that even the meanest union leader of non-Communist stripe would wish upon his membership the political conditions which in Socialist and Communist countries make of all unionism a farce. But the trouble is, all too many union leaders, knowingly or not, are paving the way for a new order wherein the tyrants of socialism will rule the roost. This being true, it is essential that each and every American labor leader who is in any way true to his calling should somehow be made to appreciate the disastrous effect of this unending harassment of capital by union word and deed. Labor's organizations, from the bottom to the top, must learn before it is too late that the

capitalistic system of free enterprise is the only system in the world where unionism itself, as such, can remain free and that for their own good, if for no other, this unfair punishment of capital must cease.

The labor leader who preaches hatred against the employer, withholds the true picture of capital management's partnership with labor and promotes nation-wide strikes and slow-downs—chiefly for the purpose of asserting his own leadership—is a menace to the cause he espouses and a cruel traitor to his membership. For his actions in effect contribute to social conditions which can spell the end of free unionism.

Unreasonable demands, vengeful strikes and slow-downs and monopolistic pressures in general add up to mortal economic sin—and here, as elsewhere, the wages of sin is death.

In a Socialist state, free unionism soon perishes on the scaffold of social planning. Thus, also upon organized labor itself the final effect of unfair punishment of capital is capital punishment.

Frankly yours,

MAURICE R. FRANKS,
Editor.

Why Farmers Should Vote in the Primary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. JENISON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 1, 1950

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, it is common knowledge that one of the greatest threats to the survival of Government by the people, as Americans know it, is the unfortunate apathy of too many of our citizens toward the responsibilities of citizenship. This is particularly apparent on election day, and notably so in primary elections when the people themselves have an opportunity to choose the candidates for public office.

It is evident that something must be done to get a higher percentage of the voters to accept their responsibility by going to the polls on every election day. One organization trying to do something constructive about this problem is the Illinois Agricultural Association. Through the various county farm bureaus in its organization, the association promoted an essay contest among school pupils to stimulate interest particularly in the importance of voting in the primary election recently held in Illinois. This program met with success in a large number of counties and notably so in Jasper County. There the Jasper County Farm Bureau had a large number of essays offered, and in addition, Harry Shumard presented an original cartoon which was published in the Mentor-Democrat, Jasper County newspaper published at Newton.

Winner of first place, most remarkably, was an eighth-grade student. Marilyn Ragsdale, a pupil at Wheeler School, of which Delbert Birch is principal, wrote an essay revealing such a mature appreciation of the land in which she lives that, under permission granted to extend my remarks, I am including it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Young Miss Ragsdale is the daughter of Sam Ragsdale, farmer and rural mail carrier of Wheeler. Her prize-winning essay, as published in the Mentor-Democrat and in the Newton Press, follows:

WHY FARMERS SHOULD VOTE IN THE PRIMARY
(By Marilyn Ragsdale of Wheeler School, eighth grade)

The aim of the primary election is to give us, the people of the United States of America, the chance to nominate for public office, the man we think will fill the position best. The primary election has not proved a remedy for all the ills of party politics, but it offers an opportunity to defeat the unfit candidate or to nominate one who is better fitted.

Our American men have fought and died so that the American people might have freedom of the polls. Therefore, we should take advantage of this and vote. The farmer, who feeds and clothes the world, is just as good as the politician, the Senator, and the Congressman. Let your vote count for the man you want.

In Jasper County, every man is guided only by his own mind, his own conscience, and his own sense of what is right. He goes to the polls, not because one candidate offers $10 for his vote, but because he knows what he wants, and he intends to do something about it. If you and you and you continue with your indifference toward governmental affairs, soon these elections will be run by one party boss, and by something like dictatorship, simply because you, the voters, refuse to respond to your duty and obligation.

A man in our community, whom we shall call Farmer Brown, is one of our foremost citizens. He is a school director and a member of the church board, a land owner, and a taxpayer. However, when primary election rolls around, Farmer Brown can be found in his fields or barnyard, refusing to go and cast his ballot. "All foolishness," he calls it. He neither knows nor cares of the results, because to him it is "all foolishness." Foolishness. Is it so foolish for the people to want to elect the officials to govern their country, State, county, and township? No, it is not. Farmer Brown cannot truthfully be called a good citizen until he has fulfilled his obligation to his country.

It doesn't take much gasoline, sweat, and shoe leather to go to your nearest town house or community center and cast your ballot, and you will only be doing yourself a favor, and your duty to our country.

Farmers, this is a challenge to you. Your voice is the voice of America. Let it sound forth for what you want and stand for.

Go to the polls this April 11. Let your conscience be your guide and vote your own choice; yes, vote.

As you go, bear in mind this poem:

I am only one,
But, I am one;
I cannot do everything,
But I can do something.
What I can do,
I ought to do,
And what I ought to do,
By the grace of God,
I will do.

Program of Army Chemical Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 27, 1950

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, one of the Nation's most distinguished soldiers, now head of the great and important Army Chemical Corps, recently made an interesting speech containing much valuable information about the work of that organization and its strategic place in the country's defenses.

I urge its careful reading by the Members of the Congress. It follows:

ADDRESS BY MAJ. GEN. ANTHONY C. MCAULIFFE, CHIEF, ARMY CHEMICAL CORPS, AT THE ONE HUNDRED AND SEVENTEENTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN CHEMICAL SOCIETY, DETROIT, MICH., APRIL 17, 1950

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, gentlemen, in gathering here this evening, we are paying tribute to the extremely fine spirit of cooperation which has existed between the American Chemical Society and the Chemical Corps since its foundation.

I welcome this opportunity to meet such a distinguished group of scientists.

Dr. Volwiler suggested that my talk be sufficiently broad to appeal to the interests of you gentlemen representing every phase of the chemical industry.

Since I am a newcomer to this field, I would like to confine my remarks to an examination of the over-all program of the Chemical Corps. I will try to give you a comprehensive picture of our mission, its technical objectives, the goals of our mobilization-planning program, and the extent of civilian assistance in the so-called unconventional fields of warfare.

Biological, radiological, and toxic chemical warfare are usually considered together because they are all aspects of unconventional warfare. They also have many common characteristics.

Incendiaries rained fire and destruction on the Nazis and the Japs. Flame-throwers smoked out the enemy wherever he was hidden. Smoke screens effectively concealed our beachhead operations, ports, river crossings, and troop concentrations on all battlefronts of the world. These weapons are all subject to further improvement.

Biological and radiological agents as weapons are as yet unproved in warfare. Evidence indicates that other nations have experimented with new and untried forms of toxic chemical warfare.

We cannot disregard, therefore, the potentialities in these fields. The United States must be adequately equipped to carry on this type of warfare, if the threats to its security come out into the open. And what are these threats?

Events, since our final victory in the recent war, indicate that the road to permanent peace is no longer paved with good intentions. A few years ago, we thought that international harmony, peace, and good will would be reestablished throughout the world.

When, and if, the cold war becomes hot, we must be prepared to retaliate with everything at our disposal.

But the military concept of annihilating the enemy's military might and destroying his industrial potential has radically changed since the end of the recent conflict. The speed of our scientific progress demanded that.

We in the Chemical Corps believe that the weapons developed or now being developed by us provide an opportunity, at the smallest logistical cost, to reduce a potential enemy's will to resist and thereby obtain victory without the destruction of his economy.

We have no quarrel with the peoples of a nation. We have no desire to destroy their national life or their economy.

But we do want the members of the community of nations to be peaceful members of that community.

I do not believe that the United States would be the first nation to use the weapons we have been talking about. Our use of them would be purely retaliatory. Events of the past war proved that our preparations for

gas warfare, in all probability, deterred the enemy from their use.

So, let us be ready to defend ourselves—our country, our homes, our industries, and our democratic way of life—with all the weapons at our disposal.

Do not forget, however, that during the recent conflict we had time to prepare. We won't have time again on our side.

If, despite the grace of the Almighty, the cold war should become hot, we must be prepared to combat whatever weapons are directed against us.

And that is the reason for our unique mission in the unconventional fields of warfare.

MISSION AND OBJECTIVES

The mission of the corps can be explained in very few words. Our over-all mission is to study and to investigate all phases of chemical and biological warfare and radiological defense. We are responsible for providing technical supervision of Army-wide training in these fields. We are also responsible for developing, manufacturing, procuring, and supplying matériel and equipment pertaining to these types of warfare, except for any function which has been assigned to other agencies.

However, it is the technical objectives in each of these fields which we are primarily concerned with this evening. Now what are these objectives? I will clarify each one as we go along.

Our technical objectives are assigned by the Research and Development Board and the General Staff of the Department of the Army. This Board coordinates the over-all projects of the Department of Defense, and assigns a priority to each objective.

Within the over-all program of research and development labeled A, B, C—atomic, biological, and chemical—warfare, the corps is developing agents, munitions, materials, and techniques as defense against these highly toxicological forms of warfare. Since these fields are similar in many respects, the efforts in each field are closely integrated in the interests of economy and efficiency. Our primary aim is to develop materials and techniques which are common to all fields whenever possible.

RADIOLOGICAL

In the field of atomic warfare, the Chemical Corps has primary responsibility for developing defensive measures against the use of atomic weapons and radioactive materials. These could be used by a potential enemy to produce death or casualties in man, animals, or plants, or to render areas uninhabitable through the use of such weapons.

The Corps has undertaken three separate research and development programs in this field. First, the development of chemical means of detection and measuring radiation; second, the development of decontamination procedures for use in case of atomic attack; and third, development of individual and collective means of protection against atomic attack.

Security regulations, however, prevent a more extended discussion of this particular field. I might mention in passing, that the Corps is offering extensive training in radiological defense to all members of the Department of Defense team. The recent disclosure that atomic energy can be released by other nations has placed increasing importance upon this part of our program.

BIOLOGICAL

In the field of biological warfare, or BW as it is popularly known, the Corps has been assigned full responsibility within the Department of Defense, for all research and development projects.

Our primary objective is to investigate all methods and equipment which can be used by a potential enemy, of living organisms, toxic biological products, and chemical-plant regulators to produce death or casualties in man, animals, or plants.

Our work in this field consists of research and development on new and improved methods of analysis and detection, decontamination procedures, and the protection of personnel, animals, and plants against these agents.

At the present time, educational institutions and scientific research centers are also conducting research in this field under special contracts with us. In addition, the Air Force and the Navy are continuing their war-time collaboration with us in these fields.

The United States Public Health Service, the Department of Agriculture, and such national organizations as the Red Cross and others maintain close watch on public health statistics which may prove of value in the study of civilian defense aspects of BW.

Now, what are we accomplishing under this program?

Basically, our research includes identifying every type of disease-producing germs which could possibly be used to spread disease and infection among the civilian population. This also includes those organisms which could be used to deplete our food stocks and meat supply.

In this connection, I would like to point out that many of the popular articles appearing on the subject of BW, have been inaccurate, misleading, and highly sensational.

One article, for example, states that 1 ounce of a particular biological material could kill 200,000,000 persons.

Such fantastic statements have no factual basis in the light of present knowledge. It is not even certain that an epidemic of significant proportions could be produced at will.

Despite these conjectures, certain very basic steps have been developed in civilian defense measures for the control of natural outbreaks of disease and the protection of our crops and animals.

These measures include the prompt identification of BW agents, adequate public-health measures, and proper sanitation control procedures to limit the spread of such agents. Prompt medical treatment should minimize their effects. Now what does this mean? Let me illustrate by an example.

Many of you may recall that in the spring of 1947 a Mexican visiting New York City died in Bellevue Hospital of smallpox. Nine more cases and two more deaths from this same disease were reported shortly thereafter..

The public health authorities of this sprawling metropolitan city of over 11,000,000 persons took immediate precautionary steps to check and prevent further spread of this disease. Within a month more than 6,000,000 persons received smallpox vaccination. As you can easily surmise, the disease was promptly checked.

Here is a concrete example of coordinated action on the part of public health authorities and the military which supplied much of the serum. In wartime such an outbreak could be the result of sabotage.

Lack of preparedness in this field could cause entire cities to be laid low. To be prepared for any eventuality is, therefore, one of the primary objectives of this program.

By contrast, let us see what measures have been developed for the protection of our food and meat supply.

Extensive research has been carried on in these two fields since disease-producing organisms could be easily spread by sabotage. To counteract this possibility we have studied the effects of thousands of biological and chemical agents. We have recorded their effects on the growth of plants, on checking obnoxious diseases, and on increasing the productivity of the soil.

With respect to our meat supply, a joint United States-Canadian commission has achieved significant results in the control of livestock diseases of importance to both countries. We have established the immunity of livestock to certain biological agents. Great advancement has also been made in the treatment of certain infectious diseases of cattle.

These measures, as you can see, are all defensive. They must be made in advance of any possible use of biological warfare agents by a potential enemy. It is only in the continuation of our research in this field that an adequate defense against their use can be assured.

CHEMICAL

In the field of chemical warfare, our objectives are to carry on research and development on new and improved methods and techniques of toxic and nontoxic chemical warfare.

It is the considered opinion of many experts that toxic warfare was not employed by the enemy, during World War II, largely because we were so well prepared to defend ourselves against its use, and to retaliate.

Let us not overlook the significance of the Axis' failure to use this form of warfare in spite of their careful preparations.

During the Nuremburg War Crimes Trials, Admiral Speer, the German war production expert, testified that two of the newer German war gases were still being produced as late as November 1944. The Japanese ceased war gas production in September 1944, but only because they relied upon the Allied pledge not to initiate gas warfare.

There is no doubt in my mind that the Axis knew our capacity for meeting any challenge in the chemical warfare field—and refused to accept the gauntlet. That we were so well prepared is due in large part to the supreme industrial efforts of the chemical industry which you gentlemen represent.

With respect to further work in this field since World War II, it is a well-known fact that many German scientific experts on toxic chemical warfare are being exploited by Soviet Russia.

It must be assumed, therefore, that we are not the sole possessors of the offensive and defensive secrets of the new nerve gases.

Our research in this field is directed toward keeping us abreast of the latest developments. We are seeking to perfect all methods and techniques for the detection, decontamination, and the protection of personnel and animals from these new agents.

The incendiaries, flame throwers, and screening smokes so widely used in smashing the enemy on all battlefronts of the world, were often vital in the successful prosecution of the war. The sterling contributions of your industrial organizations materially aided the corps in accomplishing its world-wide mission, and are now part of the corps' official history.

We are continuing to make considerable progress in the development of new materials and techniques of nontoxic chemical warfare.

Now how do we publicize the findings of our scientists in these fields?

Chemical Corps policy permits our scientists maximum freedom in the publication of their research findings within the limits of military security. They are encouraged to present abstracts of their work to the scientific world. Their talks and papers are presented before military, scientific, and educational bodies, associations, and other interested groups.

Their articles appear in the leading military, scientific, and industrial publications. All these groups thereby collaborate in disseminating, for the benefit of the entire Nation, as well as the scientific world in general, the combined results of military, scientific, and industrial research. To date, for instance, over 200 papers on biological warfare alone, have been cleared for publication.

EVALUATION OF RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

This examination of our mission and the technical objectives of our research and development program would not be complete unless we evaluated it.

I could shoot off a lot of words about how important the program is to us. But it would not mean much to you gentlemen, who have heavy investments in industry, unless we spoke in terms of dollars and cents.

Since VJ-day, we have spent increasing sums on this program. In 1946, for instance, the first year following wartime cutbacks in this field, we obligated more than $6,000,000, or somewhat over 10 percent of the corps' total budget.

From 1947 to 1949, these obligations rose to more than 33 percent of our total budget. In this fiscal year of 1950, we plan on obligating over 39 percent, or more than $12,000,000 of our total appropriations to carry out the corps' research and development responsibilities.

A substantial portion of these obligations is, as you gentlemen know, obligated under various types of research contract with your research institutions and industrial organizations.

You can visualize the tremendous importance we place on your continued collaboration in assisting the corps to meet its objectives. But research and development alone would be worthless unless coordinated with our industrial and mobilization planning responsibilities.

INDUSTRIAL MOBILIZATION

Industrial mobilization became a separate program under the jurisdiction of the Munitions Board by the provisions of the National Security Act of 1947.

The program is primarily concerned with the allocation of industrial capacity on a priority basis, to all members of the Department of Defense Team. Operating Annex No. 47 of the Munitions Board Manual entitled, "Allocation of Private Industrial Capacity for Procurement Planning of the Armed Services," governs such allocation.

These documents have been given wide distribution by the Munitions Board and I am sure that you gentlemen are familiar with them. Comprehensive policies established by the Board, are set forth to govern every phase of industrial mobilization and procurement planning.

These policies govern the distribution of industrial capacity, when it is converted to war production, among the several military services. Through advanced planning, the Board hopes to assure the most effective utilization of the Nation's resources in an emergency.

The outstanding features of the plan are the standardization of specifications and the allocation of purchase authority of technical equipment and end items of common use. These are to be procured by a single agency, or purchasing authority.

In other words, the Chemical Corps would be authorized to procure all items for chemical warfare under these regulations and policies. Such procurement authority would include procurement of chemical warfare material for all branches of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force.

The industrial mobilization plan of the corps seeks to assure for the corps certain definite levels of industrial production capacity to meet the corps' requirements for any future M-day.

Our limited arsenal production will enable us to carry the ball until industry converts to war production. Industry then carries the ball augmenting arsenal production in accordance with our procurement planning program.

PROCUREMENT PLANNING

Our procurement planning program has been set up to meet the corps' obligations for definite levels of supply and equipment. These will be required for the execution of the corps' responsibility in the over-all strategic plan of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Requirements are computed on the troop basis for mobilization.

It must be pointed out, however, that the Munitions Board is not making any definite allocations of private industrial capacity at the present time. It is, therefore, up to the technical services and allied industries to get together in preparing joint plans based on past experiences and procedures in the solution of common problems.

Now what does this mean to the industries which you gentlemen represent? First, let us examine the various categories set up by the Board; and secondly, what part of the Corps' budget is being set aside to carry out this planning?

The entire field of industrial mobilization and procurement planning is broken down by the Munitions Board into four main categories. These are (1) maintenance of standby plants; (2) acquisition and maintenance of machine tools and manufacturing equipment which are difficult to obtain in an emergency; (3) planning studies and preparedness measures undertaken by industry, through special contracts, to develop, or preserve industrial know-how; and (4) planning within the Department of the Army. The cataloging and standardization of spare parts program is also considered an integral part of the foregoing.

The Chemical Corps has expended increasing sums on its part of the over-all program which was established as a separate project, under its own appropriation, in 1947.

In 1948 for instance, we obligated almost one and three-quarters million dollars; in 1949, more than two million, seven hundred thousand. For this fiscal year 1950, we have an estimated obligation of over $4,000,000 to carry out the corps' procurement planning responsibilities.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Now what are our accomplishments to date? I will touch on only two of the main categories to give you some idea of our over-all progress in the plan: Categories 2 and 3.

Under category 2, we are holding in reserve machine tools and manufacturing equipment with an estimated value of almost $20,000,000. These reserves comprise approximately 10,000 items of special production equipment, in addition to 31,000 items of inspection equipment.

These items must all be preserved in a serviceable condition for immediate use in an emergency. The corps is, therefore, continuing a program of inspection verification, preservation for storage, and periodic surveillance of these items.

Under category 3, "Planning studies and preparedness contracts with industry to preserve industrial know-how," the corps is seeking to solve one of its most difficult procurement problems.

Many of you gentlemen know that over 90 percent of our items are strictly military in nature. They have no civilian counterpart. In some cases industry has never produced any of our newly developed items. Others have never been produced in the quantities required by the mobilization plans of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

To meet our responsibilities in this connection, we are maintaining preparedness contracts with industry, in order to preserve and to further develop, industrial know-how as contemplated by the Munitions Board.

These contracts, whose limits are set by regulations, are of three types depending upon the degree of progress in the over-all plan.

Phase I contracts are of the general exploratory type by which industry conducts general exploratory work on an idea for the corps.

Phase II contracts involve a more advanced stage in which planning, engineering, and development of an idea are initiated. Phase III, or the education production contract, involves the limited production of an item in pilot plant models.

Thus, the over-all picture involves the preparation of manufacturing floor plans, plant layouts, and flow sheets. It includes assembling operational data on all elements of production from the receipt of raw materials to the final packaging of end items.

Through these preparedness contracts, we are obtaining vital production know-how. By means of these preliminary investigations, we are able to plan and prepare with industry for future emergency production.

I would like to emphasize at this point, that our industrial preparedness measures with industry have already reduced production lead-time, on some items, by many months. We hope to reduce this lead-time still further.

CHEMICAL PROCUREMENT DISTRICTS

How do we administer the program and maintain contact with industry?

The corps' industrial mobilization and procurement planning program is administered through six chemical procurement districts with headquarters in Boston, New York, Atlanta, Chicago, Dallas, and San Francisco.

These districts are responsible for all industrial mobilization and procurement planning functions within their respective areas. Although their functions are purely advisory at the present time, they will become active procurement districts in an emergency.

These offices maintain contact with industry on procurement planning activities of the corps. They collaborate with industrial-plant managers in the preparation of production plans for the manufacture of specific items in designated plants. These plans cover the procurement of end items and of subassemblies and other component parts of Chemical Corps matériel for use in our manufacturing arsenals.

These districts also assist in the administration of our various types of procurement planning contracts.

Right here I would like to call your attention to the fact that it is not necessary to contact any middlemen to do business with the corps. You can get all the information you need by contacting us directly.

If any of you gentlemen should desire information regarding our procurement plans within the jurisdiction of the Chicago chemical-procurement district, comprising 13 Midwestern States, please direct your inquiries to the commanding officer of this district at 226 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago 6, Ill.

That office is responsible for all procurement and procurement-planning functions within this area.

If any of you gentlemen are from other sections of the country, please contact your local chemical-procurement district office, or drop a line to the Chemical Corps Procurement Agency, at Army Chemical Center, Edgewood, Md. They will be glad to furnish you with all the desired information.

If any of you would like to contact me in Washington, my door is always open. I will be glad to welcome you at any time.

CIVILIAN ASSISTANCE

I would like to extend my thanks at this particular point to all those scientists and technologists assisting me in carrying out the many responsibilities of my office.

As I previously stated, I am not a scientist. I am a field soldier appointed to do a tough job. I need your advice and assistance, and I encourage your further collaboration.

I wish to extend my sincere thanks to the board of directors, to Dr. Walter Kirner, and to other members of the committee advisory to the Chief, Chemical Corps, and to the members of all the committees of the American Chemical Society. I would like to assure you that I am familiar with the extent of your aid to the corps since its creation as a permanent branch of the Army in 1920.

I also wish to thank Dr. W. Albert Noyes, Jr., former chairman, and Dr. H. F. Johnstone, present chairman of the Research Council of the Corps, as well as other committee members, for their splendid and continuous cooperation.

I believe that our example of seeking to achieve common goals in joint endeavors could very well serve as a model of unification between industry and the military services.

It is my personal feeling that in these committees I have a group which can deal effectively with all phases of our unconventional fields of warfare, and that they can serve as the nucleus for rapid expansion in an emergency.

SUMMARY

In summing up this over-all survey of the Chemical Corps' program, I have attempted to point out the various aspects of the unconventional fields of warfare which are our responsibility.

We have looked into the research and development and industrial mobilization and procurement planning programs. We have also examined some of our accomplishments.

But this is just the beginning of our efforts, for our joint endeavors must be aimed at solving our common problems for mobilization readiness.

When, and if, the potential threats to our security become active, there won't be time to prepare as in the past.

Our mobilization readiness requires, therefore, intensive planning between industry and the corps to assure the rapid execution of our mobilization responsibilities. It likewise requires full knowledge on the part of industry as to where it fits into the overall program.

In an emergency, industry must be ready to shift immediately from peacetime operations in order to guarantee its allocation of raw materials, and to prevent its labor force from being drained away to essential production.

In the final analysis, the very existence of your organizations may depend upon your mobilization preparedness.

On the basis of past experience, I know that you members of the chemical industry will do your share in assisting the Chemical Corps to accomplish its mission.

Preparedness of both industry and the military is a tanglible form of insurance in this highly scientific day and age. Our preparedness plans may one day prove to be the deciding factor in maintaining our democratic way of life.

Them Good Old Horse-and-Buggy Days

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. STIGLER
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 1, 1950

Mr. STIGLER. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I received an original poem from one of our former colleagues and my very good friend, the Honorable Jed Johnson, who represented the Oklahoma Sixth Congressional District for many, many years with distinction. He is now rendering outstanding service as one of the judges of the United States Customs Court of New York City. As part of my remarks, I include his poem entitled "Them Good Old Horse-and-Buggy Days":

THEM GOOD OLD HORSE-AND-BUGGY DAYS

Often I think of the modest farm home,
Down in the heart of Texas,
Of my pioneer parents going there alone,
Thoughts of their courage perplex us.
In their first twenty years,
Amid laughter and tears,
Ten brats to their union they bore,
With crop failures and droughts,
And ten hungry mouths,
They kept the old wolf from the door.
Ours was a simple way of life,
Back in the days of old.
Though crowded for room,
There was little strife,
We were happy without silver or gold.
For movies we had God's sunset rays,
For television an evening star,
And in those horse-and-buggy days,
No question who drove the car.
No scary radio skits of nights,
No crime plays filled the air,
No modern homes nor electric lights,
No Bergman pictures there.
Though things were not so very fine
In the days of yes-ter-year,
The kids all hit the hay at nine,
No atomic bombs to fear.

For country lads there were loads of fun
With a coon-hunting dog and a big shotgun,
We had scads of things not seen in town
Like pecans and walnuts thick on the ground.
Like old Chambers Creek brimming full of fish,
Like a fine swimming hole, all a boy could wish.
Like birds and squirrels chirping away at me,
Like a rabbit or a possum in every hollow tree,
Like wild blackberries growing all around,
Or like finding a bee tree while clearing new ground.
Like wild grapes covering the old hackberry tree,
Yes, 'twas a wholesome life and how carefree!

For readin', writin', and 'rithmetic,
To a one-room school we went.
If the teacher had no hickory stick
For an elm or willow he sent.
To the Johnson home no liquor came
For dared we take a cigarette,
To drink or swear would blight our name,
The thought lingers with us yet.
The Bible was our daily guide,
Our motto the Golden Rule.
Although 'twas most an hour's ride
To church and Sunday school,
The Johnson clan was there on time,
Excuses did not avail,
Though we be ill or feeling fine,
The Lord we could not fail.

Could I turn back the hands of time
And be once more a lad,
I'd choose the same sweet Mother o' mine—
Also the same dear Dad.
No bonds or stocks or cash they left,
Except sweet bonds of love,
But by no means were they bereft
Of riches that count above.
The heritage handed down to me
Cannot be bought with gold.
Their high ideals, once hard to see,
Give me courage to be bold;
To go to bat for things worth while,
As Dad and Mother used to do;
To do my utmost with a smile
And to my God be true.

The Devoted Sisters of St. Ann

REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 1, 1950

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I bring to the attention of my colleagues in the House the one hundredth anniversary of the founding of the famous religious order of the Sisters of St. Ann, whose headquarters in the United States are located in my district in the beautiful city of Marlboro, Mass.

The observance of the anniversary was celebrated last week with religious and civil ceremonies in this country and Canada, which will continue until next September. Among the high lights of this observance will be the visit to Marlboro next fall of Eugene Cardinal Tisserant, a native of France, who is Bishop of Porto and St. Rufina in Italy. For many years, Cardinal Tisserant has maintained a deep and active interest in the progress and work of the Sisters of St. Ann and about a year ago he was designated by Pope Pius XII as the Roman Protector of the Community of the Sisters of St. Ann.

I am distinctly honored and privileged to have the opportunity today to pay my own humble tribute to the outstanding, magnificent work of the Sisters of St. Ann in the fields of education and teaching, hospital care of the sick and afflicted, and missionary activities in foreign lands. From the small group of five young French-Canadian girls banded together 100 years ago in the common cause, the religious community of St. Ann has grown to more than 3,000 devoted sisters scattered over the world in 100 religious establishments. The Sisters of St. Ann carry on their work in colleges in Canada and the United States, parochial grade and high schools, novitiates, hospitals, dispensaries, and missions located in Haiti, Alaska, and Japan.

The Mother House of the order is located in Lachine, Quebec, and the Provincial House for the United States is at Marlboro where the Sisters have two schools, Anna Maria College and St. Ann's Academy, which provide college and high school classes for girls. In addition, the Sisters are in charge of St. Anthony's Parochial School, providing grammar school instruction for the children of St. Mary's parish, a French-speaking parish in Marlboro. Parochial schools are conducted by the order in several other communities in my district.

Founder of the Sisters of St. Ann was Miss Sureau Blondin, a Quebec school teacher, who first broached her dream of a religious teaching order to four young friends in the small community of Vaudreuil in Canada. These five sisters received their religious vows on September 8, 1850, in the parish church at Vaudreuil and within 3 years this small nucleus had grown to 22 teaching sisters, 6 novices and 6 postulants. Today, many recruits annually take vows in the order, now numbering some 3,000 members. As a further indication of the order's growth, the Sisters, during 1949-50, taught some 29,000 students and treated more than 20,000 persons in the community hospitals and over 6,000 in the dispensaries.

The Sisters of St. Ann first entered the mission field in 1858 and now maintain hospitals, schools and missions in British Columbia, Alaska, Haiti and Japan. The order has been recognized for its good work in Alaska where the community has institutions at Juneau, Koserefsky in

the Yukon, Nulato, an Indian village near the Arctic Circle, and Skagway, among others. At the request of the United States Government, the Sisters assumed direction of a sanatorium for tubercular natives at Skagway.

The Sisters carried their missionary activities to Japan where a commercial high school and grade school were established in Omuta in 1934 and 1935. At the outbreak of the war, the schools were demolished by the Japanese and in 1942 the Sisters were sent to a concentration camp and subsequently repatriated the following autumn.

Conspicuous ecclesiastical honors have been conferred upon the order and the present Superior General of the Sisters of St. Ann. The Reverend Mother Mary Leopoldine, who has held that post for 24 years, holds the pontifical medal, Pro Ecclesia et Pontifice, presented to her last year by Pope Pius.

In attendance at the anniversary observance were the Most Reverend Richard J. Cushing, Archbishop of Boston, and the Most Reverend John J. Wright, bishop of Worcester, who headed the list of religious and lay officials scheduled to pay well-deserved tribute to the Sisters of St. Ann on the occasion of the one hundredth anniversary of the founding of the order. These illustrious and brilliant church leaders, so endeared to Massachusetts by their presence and their eloquence, would render impressive testimony to the noteworthy achievements of these self-effacing, self-sacrificing, and noble women.

A nation is rich indeed that shelters and protects within its borders groups like the zealous sisters of St. Ann whose superb faith in God, whose unselfish labors for the poor, the weak, and the fatherless, whose unceasing works of mercy, charity, and love reflect an ever-present light of inspiration and hope to lift up and give heart and strength to despairing humanity.

I extend my heartiest congratulations to the Sisters of St. Ann on their one hundredth birthday and express the hope that their future success and accomplishments may be increasingly beneficial. I wish for them continued happiness in their lives of devotion and sacrifice in the years to come. Above all, I thank them for their many contributions to the welfare of the people of my district, the State, and the Nation, and the cause of suffering humanity.

Extend Federal Rent Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SIDNEY R. YATES
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 1, 1950

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of April 22, 1950:

EXTEND FEDERAL RENT CONTROLS

President Truman has asked Congress to extend for another year the Federal Rent Control Act which expires on June 30. He marshals the reasons for this extension very convincingly.

There is, he says, still a serious shortage of housing in many places. The shortage is most acute in housing which families with incomes under $300 a month can afford. Citing what has happened in areas already prematurely decontrolled, he argues that unless the Federal law is extended, rents will skyrocket, especially for those least able to meet unjustified increases.

His proposal is that the law be extended for the 8,000,000 units which will still be under control at the end of June and that the present policy of permitting justifiable increases be continued.

It seems to us that Congress will be wise to follow the President's desires in this matter, even though Federal controls are of no further direct interest to us here in Wisconsin.

Wisconsin's own rent control law, which superseded Federal law, also expires in June. We cannot return to Federal control and only a special session of the legislature could extend our own law. So, whether or not Congress reenacts the Federal statute, decontrol will come in Wisconsin on June 1.

What our experience will be remains to be seen. Many renters will be secure until the end of the year, because of leases which run through December 31. There are, however, hundreds, particularly in the low-rent brackets, who do not have this protection. Unless a considerable amount of low-cost housing is built in the next few months, we are therefore likely to find that, while high rents remain relatively stable or even decrease slightly, rents will rise sharply for the lower priced units, which are still in wholly inadequate supply.

In other words, we are likely to follow the pattern which the President fears will strike the whole country if Federal controls lapse. We will have a landlord's market, and what happens will depend to a degree on the landlord's conscience.

McCarthy's New Look

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 1, 1950

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to the following editorial from a recent issue of the Rocky Mountain News of Denver, Colo. It presents an interesting comment on the current investigation of the charges of Senator MCCARTHY of the Communist infiltration in our Government and the menace of these radical individuals who have crept into top-flight policy-making positions in the State Department and other Federal agencies.

The editorial follows:

MCCARTHY'S NEW LOOK

It has seemed to some of us that Senator MCCARTHY was supporting his charges of Communist influences in the State Department with more noise than evidence.

But it also has been apparent that a surprisingly strong segment of public opinion was rallying to his support.

Was the Wisconsin Republican beating the Communists at their own game, simply by outshouting them? Or was he the coincidental beneficiary of a ground swell of public resentment against official indifference to a very real menace to national security?

Whatever the explanation, we are convinced that Senator MCCARTHY himself is a factor to be reckoned with since hearing him present his case before the American Society of Newspaper Editors.

His speech was loaded with tough, pertinent questions which could not be laughed off. He is equally adept at answering questions directed at him.

Asked why he hadn't named the Communists in the State Department, he said he would name names when the Department's files were opened to him, adding: "If those files proved that MCCARTHY was a liar, they would damn well be opened tomorrow."

That challenge may have to be answered the next time President Truman takes the stump. It's whistle-stop language.

The Senator cited the case of a man who, he said, was investigated 11 times by the State Department Loyalty Board before finally quitting and taking up active Communist Party work.

"Eleven times the President's Loyalty Review Board lacked the guts to order the man fired," he charged.

That, too, is whistle-stop stuff.

There was the case of George Wheeler, now attacking American foreign policy from behind the iron curtain. Why was this man cleared for highly important State Department work in Europe? Why, indeed?

Dr. Philip C. Jessup has just been appointed head of the State Department's high Policy Board, which will map our cold-war strategy.

"Why does he always join Communist fronts? Why not anti-Communist organizations?" Senator MCCARTHY asked, submitting photostatic evidence that Dr. Jessup had been a member of five fronts.

JOE MCCARTHY will not be alone in questioning this appointment, particularly when it is recalled that Dr. Jessup gave a character testimonial for Alger Hiss as late as last year.

Whatever he may have lacked to support his charges at the outset, Senator MCCARTHY is picking up new ammunition and finding new targets as he goes along.

It isn't all just old stuff, either, but material reflecting on persons now in Government service, which will question the integrity of the Government itself unless it is rebutted to the public's satisfaction.

Sister Helen Madeleine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 1, 1950

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the following editorial from the Boston Post concerning Sister Helen Madeleine of whom Boston is extremely proud:

SISTER HELEN MADELEINE

The courage of nuns is commonplace knowledge. These women develop a quiet confidence in God to whom they have dedicated their lives. The result is that no enterprise is too difficult, no task staggering. Sister Helen Madeleine, dean of Emmanuel College since its founding 31 years ago, is a case in point. After those years of service when the ordinary college dean might seek retirement to a life of study or ease, Sister Helen Madeleine will journey to Japan to help open a new college there staffed by the Notre

Dame nuns. She has had many honors since the doors of Emmanuel College opened. She has had the tremendous satisfaction of seeing the school, in its short span of years, become one of the leading Catholic educational institutions in the country, and one of New England's outstanding colleges for girls. Its success, though she would blanch at the statement, is mainly due to her great personality. It will never lose the impetus she has given it. She will be honored at a formal reception at the college next month and will leave for Japan in June. The accomplishments she leaves behind make her one of the great women in the history of Boston.

Reopen Army-Navy Hospitals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 1, 1950

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, the order closing many Army and Navy hospitals at this time is a great mistake. It cannot possibly be justified in the light of the needs of our servicemen, their dependents, and our veterans.

To the credit of this House, the eminent and distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] and his able Subcommittee on Armed Services has not only protested this action and demanded its cancellation but has also conducted a very penetrating investigation into the general situation projected by the arbitrary closing of these hospitals.

The facts already brought out by this inquiry are astounding in many respects. For example, the committee has disclosed that the economies claimed for the order are largely illusory. It is shown conclusively that money saved in one way will have to be spent in other ways and that the net effect of the closings may well in the end constitute larger cost and expense to the Government.

It also appears that medical and hospital service to our armed services personnel and their dependents and veterans of certain categories would be unreasonably and harmfully restricted. For example, the closing of Murphy General Hospital at Waltham, Mass., and other closings would mean that the only Army general hospital east of the Mississippi River remaining available for service men and women of the entire eastern seaboard would be the Walter Reed Hospital at Washington, D. C., an institution already besieged by many service personnel who are unable to secure admission and who, regardless of the seriousness of their condition, in most cases, have to wait long periods to obtain proper medical care to which they are entitled by law.

The very able, gracious, and distinguished gentleman who represents the district where Murphy General Hospital is located [Mr. DONOHUE] must be greatly commended for his persevering and unyielding efforts to keep this fine institution open. Because of the high regard in which he is held in this House and the confidence which our colleagues have in his judgment, many Members, including the great chairman of the Armed Services Committee [Mr. VINSON], have joined him, as I have done, in appealing to the Secretary of Defense to save this and other hospitals. There are some indications that these repeated appeals may receive some consideration.

Such orders do violence to both the hospital and the present well-merited drive for economy. No economy measure that does not have public opinion squarely behind it can be sustained in the long run. The public is outraged by attempts of the Department of Defense to sweep aside hospital facilities provided by Congress for the armed services.

I hope that the Department of Defense, which has so unwisely, so unsoundly, and so hastily moved in those matters, may soon be persuaded by the logic and facts of the real situation as it unfolds and promptly cancel the closing orders. Otherwise Congress must act by considering changes in certain basic laws which many people think repose too much power in the hands of the Department of Defense. That is a most vital question to which I propose to give my closest attention.

Meanwhile, Mr. Secretary, I respectfully appeal to you to revoke the order closing service hospitals.

New York's Example on Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SIDNEY R. YATES
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 1, 1950

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Louisville Courier-Journal of April 12, 1950:

NEW YORK'S EXAMPLE ON RENT CONTROL

Should rent controls be extended beyond June 30, when the present Federal law expires? President Truman has asked—though not very loudly as yet—that Federal ceilings be extended another full year, but Congress has not even done much talking about the controversial subject so far, and opponents of rent control say they have enough votes to kill it, when and if.

That may be true. The real estate lobbies have done their usual effective job in Washington. Many Congressmen are sincerely convinced that there is no longer any need for Federal ceilings.

But we are willing to bet a political dollar that a good many Congressmen who vote against extension of rent control this spring will find themselves at the short end of the balloting next fall. And our hunch is not based on any mastery of the conflicting sets of statistics put out by those who say that the public interest requires extended control or by those who say that it does not, or even by the evidence that where controls have been lifted rents have jumped 20 to 100 percent over controlled standards.

Our hunch is based on nothing less than the action by Gov. Thomas E. Dewey and his Republican legislature in New York. The city of New York had already passed local rent control legislation to backstop the progressive postwar weakening of Federal acts, but this was not enough, politically or practically, for State Republicans. Faced with the possibility that Federal controls would expire this June, the Republicans put through a bill transferring residential rents from Federal to State control effective May 1. And Governor Dewey, praising this measure to the detriment of a Democratic bill lost in the shuffle, signed it with the pointed observation that the new law freezes virtually all rents until March 1951, while the Democratic formula would have permitted immediate increases.

New York isn't exactly typical of the rest of the country, but on rent control, we suspect, Tom Dewey's pulse-feeling would do for a good many other States as well. The economists say our boom-rate buying is likely to continue through 1950, and if rents, long recognized as the classic inflationary item in all booms, are allowed to zoom skyward, millions of Americans are going to be subjected to ruinous pressure. New York Republicans have shown a proper apprehension that such pressure, aside from its economic results, might yield political dynamite.

John S. Service—His Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 1, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as usual Mr. Henry J. Taylor is rendering a patriotic service in pointing out the record of John S. Service as a high-ranking diplomat in American foreign service. On March 20, 1950, in a Nation-wide broadcast he related some facts about this man. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the broadcast referred to:

SUBJECT

Mr. Taylor, you attended the Alger Hiss trials, and reported on them. You have been working on the case of Diplomat John S. Service ordered back this week from India for review of his loyalty record. Most of us have never heard of John S. Service.

Mr. TAYLOR. The same forces for protection which closed in around the then unknown Alger Hiss are now closing in around John S. Service. All of which makes me leery. For I love this country as you do. But it is being eaten out from within.

STATE DEPARTMENT OFFICIALS BLEED

Just as Secretary of State Acheson promptly bled for Alger Hiss, so the Deputy Under Secretary of State now promptly takes it upon himself to announce—and I quote—that "the sympathy and good wishes of the entire State Department go out to John Stewart Service."

Why all this stir of defense, this bleeding, because John Stewart Service is to be questioned? Who is he?

Let me give you some first-hand facts I obtained from a man Service worked for—the United States wartime Ambassador to China, Patrick J. Hurley. I verified and confirmed these facts over the week end, with Mr. Hurley himself.

I first met Alger Hiss at the Dumbarton Oaks international conferences some months before I ever heard of John S. Service. This was in 1944.

CHUNGKING DOUBLE-CROSS

When I did encounter this man Service I was in China. There, toward the end of the war, I was with Ambassador Hurley at Chungking.

Hurley told me then that State Department officials in his own American Embassy staff—and he named them—were, in his opinion, double-crossing him with Stalin's stooges, the Chinese Communists. He said they were trying to put American policy into the Communist camp.

I can see him now, pacing the floor of his Chungking house, a worried and frustrated patriot. Behind the closed door he named these men to me, one by one.

Among others, he named John S. Service. Now remember, this was in 1945. That was nearly five long and fateful years ago—fateful for the security of your land and mine, our homes, our future, our very lives.

ELEVEN COME HOME

Shortly after I left him, Hurley ordered back to Washington from China 11 embassy officials who, in his opinion, were so cosy with the Communists that he pulled them out. John S. Service was included in this group.

This is what Hurley said about them, publicly, in the New York World-Telegram, on November 28, 1945: "Most of them have continued to side with the Communist armed party and, at times, with the Communist imperialist bloc, against American policy."

But Mr. Hurley, as you recall, was smeared at once by all the political forces of protection. He was given a cold shoulder by highest State Department authorities, including Mr. Dean Acheson. Then came the famous saying, "It's all a red herring."

Yet you see how truthfully and courageously Ambassador Hurley spoke—albeit how thanklessly. For today's whole outcome was foreseen and foretold by Hurley and others five long years ago. But nothing was done to save us.

THE ROYAL WELCOME

As for the men Hurley threw out, what happened to them when they got back to the State Department in Washington? Let's be exact about this.

John D. Davies, one of the eleven, was appointed to the top planning board of the State Department, which is the brain trust for American foreign policy. Davies was given the job of calling the American signals about China—and at the top policy level. He was then sent to our Embassy in Russia along with Horace H. Smith, whom Hurley also threw out.

Arthur Ringwalt, also sent back by Hurley on suspicion of procommunism, was made Acting Chief of the China Division in Washington.

Who were appointed assistant chiefs? Two more of the very same 11 men Hurley threw out in the same bunch, Edward E. Rice and Fulton Freeman.

You have seen what has happened to us in China since then—as well as in Moscow and throughout the world. Yet we talk now about total diplomacy in the hands of the same leaders.

Stalin must be laughing at us. Total diplomacy? Whose diplomacy is it we have—his or ours?

Now we come to John S. Service. Here are the facts. Please listen carefully, if you fear America's position in a next war.

First, Ambassador Hurley told me that John Service had already been relieved of his duties once in China, and sent home, by Supreme Commander Lt. Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer, another fine American. Nevertheless, State Department officials in Washington sent John Service back to China, through another channel, to the Communist area of Yunnan—by bypassing Wedemeyer, and without the knowledge or consent of Ambassador Hurley.

THE WHITE HOUSE INTERVENES

Ambassador Hurley told me that, when he discovered this, he went to the White House and protested to President Roosevelt. Remember, all this is news. He produced letters John Service and others had written, reflecting their views. May I say that the Senate and the American people should read those letters and reports now, while the bleeding is on.

President Roosevelt authorized Hurley to send such characters home. So Service was sent home for a second time.

When Service reached America, he was arrested by the FBI. He wasn't just questioned by the FBI. He was arrested by the FBI, as Mr. J. Edgar Hoover would verify to you. For J. Edgar Hoover is not afraid of anybody. That's what makes him a great American.

THE WHITEWASH TREATMENT

Service was brought before a grand jury, but he was let off—although the claim is made that his FBI record was never fully presented to the grand jury by Government attorneys. A State Department whitewash quickly followed.

Then what happened?

Was Service detached from policy decisions? Well, hardly. After all this, Service was assigned to Japan to tell General MacArthur, of all people, how to negotiate with Russia. General MacArthur reportedly rejected Service.

But Service showed up in Japan anyway, on some kind of authority from the State Department. Then, after Mr. Acheson became Secretary of State, Service was actually boosted even higher.

Today we have John S. Service on the way to high official duties in India, a critical place in our problem of communism.

WHO WAS HOLDING THE UMBRELLA?

The question arises: What mysterious power has protected his record? After five long years since the charges of 1945, and after 13 months of latest so-called study, the Loyalty Review Board of the Civil Service Commission now states that it does not feel it can give John S. Service "loyalty clearance."

He is asked to come home for the purpose of giving personal answers—no more than that at this stage. But why have the FBI record on John S. Service, and the China and Moscow background, and his FBI arrest been treated by protectors as if they didn't exist?

Certainly something has gone frightfully, tragically, terribly wrong with our security measures, even if our own officials will not admit it. For it has already been shown in court that we do have traitors working in our Government.

Blindness to the Communist strategy has already cost us Asia. It can cost us the world. It can cost us the United States. It can be a question of life and death to our Nation in the event of a surprise war—unless we wake up and insist that America's safety is more important than anybody's refusal to let the chips fall where they may—and there is no time to lose.

Centennial Speech at University of Utah

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REVA BECK BOSONE

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 1, 1950

Mrs. BOSONE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following centennial speech, February 28, 1950, by A. Ray Olpin, president, University of Utah:

Governor Lee, President Smith, Mayor Glade, distinguished delegates, members of the board of regents, members of the faculty, students, ladies, and gentlemen, there are times when the office one holds places him in a difficult position. I find myself in such a position today as I attempt to respond to the eloquent tributes paid to the University of Utah on this, its one hundredth birthday, a milestone not yet achieved by any other State-supported university west of the Missouri River.

I am fully conscious of the fact that the enviable position held by this educational institution is the combined result of wise planning by the founding fathers, sound guidance by governing boards, superior instruction by competent teachers, and the intelligent leadership of former presidents, three of whom are present and participating in this centennial observance. Moreover, the distinction achieved by this school reflects the loyal and generous support of generations of citizens motivated by a conviction that man cannot be saved in ignorance.

Yes; there have been some persons in the past as there doubtless are some today who feel that Utah's institutions of higher learning are outgrowing the State's ability to support them, what with twice as many students enrolled here for each 1,000 population as in a typical State. But I can find nothing in the history of the University of Utah that would indicate that the university has developed more rapidly than, or out of proportion with, the plan envisioned by its founding fathers. Else why did the regents, following their very first meeting March 13, 1850, stake off a rectangular area of more than 560 acres, including the plot we now occupy, and set it aside as the campus on which the university was to grow?

Although these plans for physical growth received a temporary setback in 1862 when the United States Army appropriated all of the land for a military reservation, named by President Lincoln after his political opponent, Stephen A. Douglas, some 460 acres of this army post have reverted to the possession of the university, thanks to three separate acts of Congress and opportunities opened up by the Surplus Property Act. Even so, the campus today is 100 acres smaller than it was a century ago.

If it were not the intention of the original planners to establish and foster here a great and varied university, with low tuition, why do you suppose the first chancellor heralded through the printed page the following message to the people of Great Britain on October 1, 1850:

"This institution is needed to meet the wants of thousands that annually emigrate to this Great Basin. The immigrants and outcasts of all nations will here find an asylum of safety and a nursery of arts and sciences available upon the cheapest terms. It is neither arrogant nor extravagant to say that this institution is forthright prepared to teach more living languages practically than any other people on the face of the earth. Whatever is valuable in the laws and usages of nations or in their antiquities; whatever in the structure of diversified languages or in practical mechanism; whatever in the fabric of governments or in domestic sociality or in morals can be gleaned that is valuable, we venture to say unhesitatingly will be copiously poured into the lap of the institution. Graduates of colleges and students of law, medicine, and theology may here receive weekly lectures gratis. No person will be denied the benefits of the university for want of pecuniary means."

Or, why should Gov. Brigham Young, at about the same time, announce with exuberance the arrival from England of a shipment of goods that included "an excellent

telescope, microscope, globes, chemical tests, and mineralogical specimens, all of which are most valuable acquisitions in promoting scientific research" and that the books of the Utah library had "been unpacked in good order, great variety, and of a choice selection."

Now, remember—those published statements were not made by professional educators living in erudite communities. They issued from pioneers in western frontier country, so far removed from the National Capital that news of the signing on September 9, 1850, by President Fillmore of the Organic Act creating the Territory of Utah did not reach Salt Lake Valley until 4 months later. Actually, the authors of those philosophies of education had been in this valley but 2½ years when the University of Deseret, as this institution was then called, was incorporated. Immigrants from the world over were even then still arriving from the Midwest, East, and European countries on foot, wearily dragging their limited belongings behind them in handcarts.

There can be only one explanation of this enthusiasm for higher education, namely, a conviction that it would lend security to both government and religion. Most of the early settlers, as is well known, were converts to Mormonism, and the saving graces of education constituted a basic tenet of the Mormon religion.

With Brigham Young, whose own formal education was limited to 11 days of classwork, higher education was almost an obsession. As Governor of the Territory he pleaded with a less sympathetic legislature for meager appropriations from a near-bankrupt treasury, and failing in this effort took steps to petition the Federal Government for financial assistance to keep the doors of the university open. In 1852, the United States Congress was memorialized for $24,000 to be invested in some productive fund, the proceeds of which would be applied to the support and use of schools.

In the light of current-day fears of so-called socialized education, it is surprising to learn that such a rugged individual as Brigham Young should seek help from Washington. It serves to remind us that Federal aid comes into the scheme of school financing when local units of government fail to meet their obligations. The Federal grant was never made and the University of Deseret closed its doors for 15 years for want of funds, although regents were regularly appointed and met to consider the problems of the public schools.

Even after the university reopened for classwork under the very competent and inspiring leadership of Dr. John R. Park, to whom every alumnus and student here today owes a debt of gratitude, there were times of near financial starvation. Particularly trying were the years when unsympathetic Territorial governors vetoed legislative appropriations. The university's growth was assured, however, and today there are 500 times as many faculty members and students as there were in 1850. Even the campus, though still a little smaller than it was initially, could well be ample for all buildings that may be contemplated during the next 100 years.

Historically speaking, 100 years is a relatively short interval of time. It seems much longer when we are living in that period or when it is characterized by many major events. The century just ended seems surprisingly long because so many momentous happenings occurred during that period of our Nation's history. Actually, the past century embraced five-eighths of the period during which Americans have lived under the protection of the United States Constitution. In order to get properly oriented, we might well remember that more generations of people have lived and died since this university was founded than lived and died under the American flag prior to that time.

At the time the university was founded; that is, at the opening of the century just ended, human bondage was common in many parts of the United States. Two important events were yet to happen before this practice was to be fully abolished. The first was the Civil War, still a decade off, and the second, the technological and industrial revolution, still a quarter of a century in the future. Reliable records indicate that the first of these two events was anticipated by the founding fathers but it is doubtful that any of them even guessed that the 10 years 1876–86 would witness the birth of the telephone, the first successful arc lights, the first really commercial dynamo electric machinery, the first practical gas engine, the phonograph, the electric furnace, the incandescent lamp, electric traction, electric transformers for the use of alternating-current machinery, electric storage batteries, synthetic indigo, alloy steel, steam turbines, gas engine-propeled road vehicles, nitrogen fixation, and the introduction of rare earth gas mantles as a means of illumination. Four of these inventions—the telephone, the incandescent lamp with its closely associated AC and DC dynamo electric machinery, the practical high-speed gas engine, and the chemical processes which underlay the synthetic production of indigo—were the foundation stones on which have been erected four of the world's greatest modern industries. These have been followed by airplanes, radio, television, and a multitude of other important developments, all greatly extending our faculties for acquiring information of cultural and practical value and all multiplying our capacity for work. Human slavery was now outmoded. Each and every man, woman, and child now has at his or her command, merely by pushing a button or pulling a lever, literally hundreds, if not thousands of mechanical and electrical slaves.

That the world could change so rapidly in three-quarters of a century is a tribute to both the power of science, which underlies these developments, and man's ability to apply science. The inventions mentioned above could well be labeled byproducts of higher education. At the same time, by their very nature, many of them were destined to revolutionize teaching methods and social relationships in the civilized world. They could not help but exert a greater influence on education than any developments of previous history. For, were not distance and time now virtually eliminated? People could be brought together, though scattered in all parts of the world, in personal converse as though sitting across the table from one another.

But, valuable as was this new found ability to rapidly interchange ideas, it also posed problems for educators which have not yet been solved. For one thing, the intimate and exclusive relationships between teachers and pupils have been broken down. The teacher no sooner relaxes his or her influence on the student at the end of the school day than someone, more often than not some unprofessional, prejudiced employee of a social pressure group or merchandising firm, takes over for the rest of the waking hours. The privacy of the home is invaded to the point that even the parents' influence on their children is weakened.

In order to better understand the impact on society and education of the scientific and industrial developments of the past century, let us contrast the pattern of living at the beginning and end of that century.

In 1850, people rose early, worked hard, retired early. Most of them owned their own means of making a livelihood; built fences around their property rather than laws around their jobs, as at present. Craftsmen learned their vocational skills as apprentices. There were no sharply defined class distinctions. Blue-shirted workers as well as white-collared executives considered education an adornment, and courses were offered which would add knowledge to all alike and which would train people in clear, straight thinking. Entertainment was self-made, not commercial. Reading was confined mostly to the Bible and to the classics. Families were closely knit because the members spent so much time together. Strangers in a community were usually welcome visitors because they served as sources of information.

A person was free to formulate his own philosophy and to strive to make the world what he thought it should be. The schools and churches had no great competitors in their efforts to develop the minds of young and old alike. The teachers, therefore, occupied a more elevated position and congregated around themselves many enthusiastic disciples. These students had little else to do after they left their instructors than to meditate on the day's teaching and experiences, concentrate on preparations for the morrow, and contemplate the significance of all. Yes, they even had time to supplicate for supernatural aid in making the world a better place in which to live.

Now, in 1950, we find that the days are so full and life is so busy that man can find little time for meditation, concentration, and supplication. We find we no longer have days and nights; we merely have longer days. At the flip of a switch any room in our house takes on the brilliance of noonday. Street lights in the cities and headlights on automobiles provide complete and safe means of moving about out of doors at night. Hard-surfaced highways instead of muddy roads make it possible for us to chase around in every direction at dangerous speeds, riding comfortably on pneumatic tires in heated vehicles. On nearly every corner we find motion-picture houses or some kind of commercial recreation or entertainment where someone leads or directs our thinking. We are even induced to visit these places because of propaganda which reaches our ears via radio and our eyes via the press.

Actually, we spend so little time at home that we feel a bit uncomfortable at being there. But we relieve our concern at this confinement by turning a dial and tuning into actual happenings going on all over the world. We listen to speeches as they are being delivered in an effort to control the minds of the listeners. Or we pick up one of the scores of newspapers and journals which are competing so strenuously for circulation that they devote considerable space to writing columns that will please rather than stimulate thinking. And then, if we stay at home we can now have piped into our very living rooms by television special entertainment in its various forms, ranging from faked wrestling matches to sporting events, to fashion shows, to sex stories, to wild-west shooting battles, and so on. Even our children in their tender ages, when they are too young to be permitted to go out in the evenings alone, can sit at home, turn a dial, and have all of the worries of the world, the vices as well as the good things, brought vicariously to them.

In the modern world we find ourselves so concerned with mensuration and calculation that we have little time for meditation. The importance of concentration has been lost in our concern over compensation. But, more lamentable still, our leisure is dominated by propaganda which, if nothing else, is entertaining advertising of patent cureals for every drudgery and ailment. We are told we can purchase security in every form. We develop a feeling of self-reliance and an attitude of self-sufficiency. We find growing within us an air of sophistication which is not conducive to supplication. Pride replaces humility. We are led around by the tinsel of artificiality and commercialization. If the trend continues, we will soon develop a generation of puppets who can be maneuvered this way and that with ease by a

few propagandists striving to control the minds of men.

Well, what are we going to do about the situation? One thing is apparent. The problem is no longer one for educators alone. It is one for society, for you and for me as parents and citizens of a free community. After all, the time spent by the pupil in the schoolroom is but a small part of the day and but a fraction of the year. It is probably the influences on the child outside of school hours that are our biggest concern The battle for the minds of men seems to become more intense as the day progresses into night.

I am sure the schools and universities will do their part. They can and should do everything within their powers to develop within their students the methodologies of independent and objective thinking, a type of teaching stressed by the founders of this great university. It is possible that this will provide the best insulation against the propaganda of pressure groups. Perhaps the schools can help improve the quality of the commercial entertainment to which youth is exposed, but in this we need the cooperation of all parents and civic organizations. We will continue to be bombarded with whatever we demand and whatever we are willing to tolerate.

May we all work together in the century ahead to see that the great liberalizing forces ushered in by the technological revolution of the past century are directed in constructive channels for the enrichment and betterment of the lives of all. As president of a university which today commemorates the first century of its service to the people of this State and this Nation and begins the second century of such service, I pledge our efforts and resources to that goal.

Prescription for Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 1, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call the attention of my colleagues to the article entitled "Prescription for Small Business," written by Herman Limberg, which appeared in the April 1950 issue of Systems. I have known the author for many years as an able economist. He is now an instructor in management, systems, and procedures at New York University and at the City College of the City of New York. The article is very timely:

PRESCRIPTION FOR SMALL BUSINESS

(By Herman Limberg)

A BASIC DIET OF SCIENTIFIC MANAGEMENT OFFERS A FORMULA TO HELP THE SMALLER ORGANIZATION CONTINUE TO GROW IN A HEALTHFUL ENVIRONMENT

Because of its recognized importance to the national economy, small business has received considerable attention and study in recent years. Both private organizations and Government agencies have sought to provide a healthful environment in which small business can continue to grow and flourish.

In June 1947, the Committee for Economic Development published a report which should be cherished as a bible for all small-business men. Entitled "Meeting the Special Problems of Small Business," this report revealed that 98 percent of the firms operating in this country are small businesses. "They are," said the report, "the foundation upon which our whole system of business enterprise is built."

To prescribe for the soundne s and good health of this vital segment of American enterprise, the CED diagnosed the ills which usually beset small business and grouped them into three categories: management, financing and taxation, and competitive opportunity.

The most significant finding of the CED study was that the number one problem of small business is management. More failures are due to lack of skill in running the business than to any other single cause. In this statement lies the key to the successful operation of any small business.

SCIENTIFIC MANAGEMENT

Management—scientific management—is even more vital to the success of small business than to big business, since the margin for error (if there is any at all) is substantially narrower in the operation of small business. Nevertheless, the basic cause of distress of many small businesses is a chronic allergy to the implications of scientific management.

The alleviation of the number one problem of small business is not only the prime essential for a sound framework for profitable operation, but is the basic requirement for effectively solving the problem of financing and taxation and meeting the challenge of competition.

There is nothing esoteric in the practice of scientific management. In fact, it is the practical application of common sense, with which most small businessmen are vastly endowed. It involves, in substance, the determination and clarification of business objectives; the compilation, analysis, and interpretation of all pertinent facts and figures; the development of plans for the efficient and economical attainment of stated objectives; and the establishment of effective controls for the direction, coordination, and integration of the enterprise toward the realization of plans and objectives.

COST CONTROLS

A major factor in scientific management is the establishment and maintenance of cost controls. Small business often risks its survival either by incurring unduly high costs or by indiscriminately slashing costs. Since costs are one of the vital links in the management chain, scientific determination of cost requirements, in the light of stated objectives, and effective control of obligations and expenditures on a continuing basis, are essential.

Improperly conceived reductions in costs often beget results more costly than those desired. Reductions in personnel may lower morale and productivity. Reductions in services to customers, advertising, and quality of products may adversely affect existing markets. Reductions in quantity and quality of purchases may result in higher buying costs as well as production costs. Reductions in office and administrative costs may adversely affect all internal and external relations with which the business enterprise is concerned. It is evident, therefore, that the proper planning and control of costs are essential elements of scientific management.

To meet the No. 1 problem of small busness and to insure the strength and vitality which small business needs to grow and flourish, the following prescription for scientific management is offered:

1. Clear definition by top management of its objectives and policies and their communication to all employees.
2. Establishment of quality standards for personnel, customers, sources of supply, as well as for materials, equipment, and supplies.
3. Establishment and maintenance of adequate quality controls.
4. Establishment of quantity requirements and standards for personnel, customers, sources of supply, materials, equipment, and supplies.
5. Establishment and maintenance of adequate quantity controls.
6. Maintenance of good public relations with employees, customers, sources of supply, and the public in general.
7. Insistence upon giving and receiving fair value in every business operation and transaction.
8. Establishment and maintenance of an organization of competent, well-informed, well-directed, well-trained, and properly motivated people.
9. Provision of adequate facilities for efficient and economical operations.
10. Establishment and maintenance of efficient systems for recording, compiling, analyzing, intepreting, and reporting essential data and facts upon which to base policies and plans and evaluate performance.
11. Establishment and maintenance of adequate controls for effectuation of policies and plans.
12. Daily follow-up to ascertain progress and results, and to determine the needs for possible revisions or adjustments in plans, policies, or procedures.

The foregoing prescription embodies the fundamentals of scientific management. It is not guaranteed as a panacea for all the ills from which a small business may suffer. It is, however, offered as a basic diet without which the slightest infection may be fatal.

Responsibility for good management must be borne by the individual enterprise itself. Furthermore, to quote the CED report: "There is a responsibility that each businessman act so as to strengthen the free-enterprise system. It is a responsibility he owes to the system in which he believes."

Closing of the Van Nuys-Birmingham Hospital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I should like to add to the picture of the veterans' hospital situation in California which was described in my remarks of March 14 and April 18.

The Paralyzed Veterans' Association, of Van Nuys, Calif., has a particular stake in the Birmingham Hospital and the Public Law 702 homes of its members. Their case against the closing of the hospital and the removal of the hospital facilities to Long Beach is given very forcefully below in a recent letter from Ted Anderson, executive secretary:

PARALYZED VETERANS ASSOCIATION,
BIRMINGHAM HOSPITAL,
Van Nuys, Calif., April 21, 1950

Representative HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. DOUGLAS: I am writing you in reference to a proposed plan of the Veterans Administration to move Birmingham Hospital to the naval hospital in Long Beach. Though we are not located in your congressional district, I know of your interest in veteran affairs, and particularly disabled veterans.

I believe you are acquainted with Public Law 702, which provided Federal grants of $10,000 for specially adapted wheel-chair homes for service-connected paraplegics.

Under this law, nearly 100 of our 450 membership have built their special homes (with ramps, lowered closets, wide doors, extra wide halls, etc.) near Birmingham in the San Fernando Valley. Another 100 are in the process of building, or have acquired valley property with that intention.

It is absolutely necessary for paraplegics to live near a VA paraplegic center for indispensable periodic medical treatments and supplies.

These Public Law 702 homes represent more than $1,000,000 invested by the Federal Government already. It is also a million-dollar investment for us paraplegics. I think you can readily see why we are so worried about the proposed move to Long Beach.

Birmingham is the only VA paraplegic center west of the Mississippi. Many of our members are men who have transferred here from the eastern centers in New York, Chicago, etc. They moved to the San Fernando Valley to live in the warm, sunny climate so vital to paraplegic health.

Long Beach is cold, foggy, and terribly oil-smelling, as you well know. The warmth and nice climate of the San Fernando Valley is perfect for the comfort of the paraplegic injury.

Doesn't the health and financial welfare of 450 combat-injured paraplegics warrant consideration in any proposed move of an established VA hospital?

Many of our members have invested in businesses which can be operated in a wheelchair.

A move to Long Beach would mean a complete disruption of the educational program of 60 paraplegics in our association attending U. C. L. A.

So, you can see the picture: Sell our specially adapted homes at great financial loss, uproot all our business ties, destroy the educational program—and move from the sunny San Fernando Valley to the fog and oil wells of Long Beach.

Are we to become a group of Government transients who must move every time the VA decided to change the paraplegic center location?

If this move is made, it will be the grossest injustice to California paraplegics.

We are asking your aid and support in preventing any such movement. We want only to live in our own homes—homes which are built especially for us.

I would appreciate hearing from you, and whether you think the change will be made.

I remain,

Cordially yours,

TED ANDERSON,
Executive Secretary,
Paralyzed Veterans' Association.

Mr. Speaker, in addition, I have continued to receive many individual letters, as well as resolutions against the closing of the Van Nuys Birmingham Hospital from interested organizations, similar to the one that appears on page A2769 of the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I shall not here again quote the resolution but merely list for the attention of my colleagues in this body the names of nine additional organizations and their officers which have gone on record against the closing of these needed veterans' hospital facilities in California: Kiwanis Club of Van Nuys, Calif., E. M. Lambert, president, F. Haworth, secretary; Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Glendale Post No. 1937, Glendale, Calif., John W. Fellows, commander, Norman White, adjutant; VFW, Pvt. Oliver L. Sylva, Post No. 5387, Sundland-Tujunga, Calif., Lawrence L. Groll, commander, W. C. Nelson, secretary; VFW, Pvt. Oliver L. Sylva, Post No. 5387, Ladies Auxiliary, Vivian Leafdale, president, Bertha Garrett, secretary; Catholic Daughters of America, San Fernando, Calif., Angie Fusano, president, Lucile M. Mahon, secretary; I. O. O. F., San Fernando Rebekah Lodge, No. 348, San Fernando, Calif., Evelyn Harmon, noble grand, Margaret V. Moye, recording secretary; Fernangles Civic Association, North Hollywood, Calif., Ben Gotter, chairman public relations committee, and Messrs. Erskine, King, Carson, and Maddox, committee members; Canoga Park Chamber of Commerce, J. H. Fraser, president, Ralph D. Dyer, secretary; Sherman Oaks Chamber of Commerce, Sherman Oaks, Calif., K. P. Crater, president, William C. Keim, secretary.

Hon. Barratt O'Hara

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES V. BUCKLEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 28, 1950

Mr. BUCKLEY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Members of Congress will want to join me in extending best wishes and congratulations to our distinguished and worthy colleague, the Honorable BARRATT O'HARA, Representative from the Second District of Illinois, on this occasion of his birthday anniversary.

As a gesture of my sincere appreciation of the fine background, and broad, noteworthy experience which Mr. O'HARA brings with him to the Congress, I wish to acquaint the Members of the House with a short résumé of the life and works of the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. O'HARA, a senior in years of service in the cause of liberalism, is a veteran legislator from Chicago. Long a champion of organized labor, he served in 1913 as Lieutenant Governor of Illinois and spent years in the Illinois State Senate. There, as chairman of the wage committee, he conducted an investigation of low wages paid women workers in stores and factories which attracted national attention and led to the passage of the first State minimum wage law.

For a number of years he was a trial attorney for some 10 or more Chicago labor unions and for 5 years he made the remarkable record of speaking nightly over WCFL, Chicago Federation of Labor radio station, presenting the viewpoint of organized labor on all public questions. For his long record of activity in behalf of labor, he was selected to oppose Richard B. Vail, whom he defeated.

Congressman O'HARA has a colorful background. He joined General Shafter's army in Cuba at 16, the youngest American soldier in the attack on Santiago on July 1 and 2, 1898, in which one of his comrades was the late Theodore Roosevelt. At 30 he became Lieutenant Governor of Illinois and also served as labor's representative on the late Redfield Federal Board of Inquiry into the tragedy of the steamship *Eastland*, which overturned in the Chicago Harbor, taking hundreds of lives. At 34, Mr. O'HARA took over the organization of the famous D. W. Griffith's motion-picture studios, and a year or so later was again in the Army in World War I, in which he served in the Twelfth and Eightieth Divisions. Following the war he practiced law in Chicago and was defense counsel in more than 200 murder trials. In 1939 he was special attorney with William Secton for the city of Chicago in traction litigation which ended with a comprehensive unified system of local transportation.

Mr. O'HARA, during his colorful past, at times was engaged in newspaper work. He has been sports editor of the St. Louis Chronicle and Chicago American; he has also been cable editor of the Chicago Chronicle, Sunday editor of the Chicago Examiner, and editor in chief of the Chicago Magazine. He is also author of several books, including a history of the United States Constitution entitled "Who Made the Constitution"—with coauthor Marie Crowe. He is also active in veterans' organizations, including the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the Chicago Press Veterans Association.

I am proud that I have had the opportunity to acquaint my colleagues with this splendid record of achievement of the gentleman from the Second Illinois District in his long and honorable career in public service to his State and the Nation. I know you feel, as I do, a deep sense of pride in sharing this happy occasion of the birthday anniversary of our good friend, BARRATT O'HARA.

Blabbermouths in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 1, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Billy Rose, in his syndicated column entitled "Pitching Horseshoes," calls attention to a Washington practice which should be stopped. There are too many experts in this city who, with a few drinks under their belts, tell all they know. I commend this article to all Members of the House, as follows:

HON. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: It may interest you to know that there's a man in New York who knows exactly how many atom bombs we have, exactly where they're hidden, and exactly how they're guarded. What's more, he is connected in no way with the Atomic Energy Commission, the Army, Navy, or any other branch of the Government.

With your patience and permission, I'd like to tell you about him.

Not long ago, this man—the editor of a national magazine with more than 15,000,000 readers—went to Washington on routine business. The day he arrived he was invited to a dinner party in Georgetown, and over

the postprandial brandy he got into a bull session with several members of the military and bureaucratic elite.

When the subject of the atom bomb came up, a high-ranking official laughed. "Don't worry about our A-bombs," he said, and then, without prodding or prying, he proceeded to tell the editor and the other guests precisely how many bombs we had, where they were stored, and the security measures in force in the area. At the end, the drinky-talky notable smiled as if to say, "You folks didn't know what a bright boy I was, did you?"

The editor, an old friend of mine, told me the story a couple of days after he got back to New York, and I've been using a lot of barbiturates ever since.

He's a zipper-lipped citizen who edits his thoughts as carefully as his copy, and I believe him when he says that Washington is currently a-busting with blabbermouths who, at the drop of a daiquiri, blurt out top secrets with only a prefaced "This is off the record" to tidy up their consciences.

Fortunately for us, this magazine man is not apt to talk out of school or turn, but it stands to woeful reason that if he can come away from Washington with this kind of information a lot of other people can too—including those who cash their pay checks in the First National Bank of Moscow.

In this day and dilemma, Mr. President, government by gossip can easily mean the end of government by consent, and from where I sit and tremble, it's high time you pressed a few buttons and initiated some big scale tracking and cracking down.

If heads must fall, then let them fall—and if you want to take that literally, it's all right with me, not to mention 150,000,000 other Americans who don't own a bomb shelter or a lead-lined tuxedo.

Respectfully.

BILLY ROSE.

P. S.—It may further interest you to know that, according to a recent estimate, the per capita consumption of hard liquor in Washington is greater than that of any other town in this country.

Brannan Farm Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 1, 1950

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, since Secretary of Agriculture Brannan is touring the country in an effort to put over his Brannan farm plan, I think the farmers should examine it very carefully.

First, the demand for this bill has not come from the farmers. It came from the CIO labor leaders who figured this scheme out to give those in the big cities lower food prices through subsidies paid out of the Federal Treasury to the farmer on about two-thirds of his products. The farmer would doubtless be criticized for accepting the subsidy, while those living in the cities would get the benefits to help pay a part of their grocery bills.

IT IS A POLITICAL PLAN

It is a political bill which has great appeal. It says to the farmers, "The Government will guarantee you a high income"; and it says to labor and the consumer, "We are going to give you low-priced food." That comes mighty close to utopia, if it is true.

WHO WILL PAY IT?

Uncle Sam. And the only money Uncle Sam has is what you and I give him through taxes. That means every farmer, every consumer and all of us will have to pay higher taxes to get the money to carry out this gigantic spending operation.

WHAT WILL IT COST?

The Department of Agriculture of Illinois has said, "It will cost as much as the total Federal budget before the war." That was about $10,000,000,000 a year.

This Department also estimated the Brannan plan for hog supports alone might cost $700,000,000 annually. The American Farm Bureau says on milk alone it would cost $2,480,000,000 annually.

This cost is only on two products out of many. A study of the bill indicates it would cost $10,000,000,000 annually.

CAN FARMERS DEPEND ON CONGRESS?

One of the great dangers to the farmer in the Brannan plan is that each Congress has the power to appropriate, or not appropriate, the money to carry out the plan.

Suppose any Congress in the future would say, "With a $267,000,000,000 debt, and a $10,000,000,000 deficit, we cannot appropriate over $4,000,000,000," when $8,000,000,000 or $10,000,000,000 is necessary. The farmer would be ruined and left holding the sack.

It is dangerous for the farmer to be put in the position where he must depend on the action of Congress for many billions of dollars of his income. To swap the present support program, which is the result of the best thinking and study for many years of the ablest farm leaders in the Nation, and the ablest members of the Agriculture Committees of the Congress, for such an untried scheme would be a tragic gamble on the part of the farmers and the Members of Congress.

BETTER IMPROVE PRESENT PROGRAM

If we are to have any farm program, it would seem wise to retain the best policies of the present program and try to improve upon it for the future. A prosperous agriculture is so important to the entire economy of the Nation that its program must be built on sound and proven policies, and not be sacrificed on the political altar of any party.

FINES AND JAIL SENTENCES

The bill contains 15 pages of penalties against farmers who violate its regimentation and controls. Here is a sample of just one of many sections:

"It provides that all farmers must keep such books and records and make such reports as may be required by the Secretary; and that if they fail to keep these reports and records they will be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction fined not more than $500. And if they make a false report or record they shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction fined not more than $1,000 and imprisoned for not more than a year."

If this bill ever becomes a law, we may have to have more farm bookkeepers, or bigger jails.

Why I Am Proud To Be a Mississippian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 1, 1950

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include herewith an article written by the very capable and genial editor of the Summit (Miss.) Sun, Mrs. Mary D. Cain, entitled "Why I Am Proud To Be a Mississippian":

WHY I AM PROUD TO BE A MISSISSIPPIAN

(By Mary D. Cain)

To ask me why I am proud to be a Mississippian is like opening giant floodgates; once I get started talking about why I am proud, an effort to stop me is comparable to trying to dam such waters.

Proud to be a Mississippian? Of course I'm proud! I'm a Mississippi woman and if there is anyone in the world who has a right to be proud of her State, it's a Mississippi woman. The Elizabeth Female Academy at Washington, Miss., was the first school in the United States to confer degrees on women; the bill for the establishment of the first industrial college for women was drafted in Claiborne County; MSCW is the oldest and one of the largest State-supported schools for women in the United States; Mississippi was one of the first governments in the world to recognize the right of married women to own property. Today Mississippi grants to her women citizens every right and privilege she gives her men with the exception of jury service and the right to examine banks. These rights are in the making, I feel confident.

Yes, I am proud to be the daughter of a State that has been so kind to its women, helping us to achieve full stature as citizens, but it goes much deeper than that.

ANGLO-SAXON HERITAGE

We are credited with more race prejudice in Mississippi, I suppose, than almost any State in the Union; largely because we are so proud of the pure Anglo-Saxon strain that runs through us * * * a heritage that we jealously guard. But because we believe in segregation it need not be assumed that we are failing to do our part for our Negroes. I recall with pride that Mississippi was the first State in the Union to provide an agricultural and mechanical college for her Negroes; over at Mound Bayou, Mississippi has given the Nation the first example of Negro self-government. True, we haven't given our Negro citizens all we would like to, but people who criticize are forgetful (or ignorant) of the fact that we have come a long way with them since the days of the Civil War when our beloved State lay prostrate and almost helpless. And we did it without any Federal help. We had no Marshall plan. We are still self-reliant; we still want no Marshall plans.

Over at Itta Bena we are establishing a new Negro college which will do much to develop better Negro teachers. At Alcorn and Jackson Colleges, budgets have jumped proportionately with those of our white institutions of higher learning, and salaries compare favorably. Negro schools which have the support of religious denominations are doing an excellent job in the State; agricultural high schools for our Negro youth are among the foremost in the Nation; and the work of our Negro county agents and home demonstration agents further give the lie to loose statements concerning the status

of the Negro in Mississippi. True, our Negroes still have a long way to go, but I am proud of our Mississippi Negroes for having come so far in so short a time, and of Mississippi's white citizens for dealing with them so sympathetically and in such understanding of their cultural lag. Somewhere in my Sun file is a list of the prominent Negro educators who were trained in this State but who took their talents to greener fields and today hold high positions in the educational worlds of other States. Somehow, I always feel (because service is the only excuse I have ever seen for living and the field here is so wide) that these men and women have let their people down by not staying here to help in elevating the educational and cultural standards of their race. Maybe I'm wrong, but that's the way I feel.

EDUCATIONAL LEADER

Because of our Negroes and their cultural lag, we are said to be at the bottom of the scale in the field of education, but no one can deny that Mississippi spends a larger percentage of tax income on education than any State in the Union. And we have more young men and women in college, in proportion to white population, than any State in the Union. It is our boast that Warren County had the first consolidated high school system in the world and that today, at Crystal Springs and Cleveland, we boast the world's two largest consolidated schools. Our Ole Miss school of law is the fourth oldest State-owned law school in the United States and our State library at Jackson is said to have the third largest collection of law books in the Nation. Our daily and weekly newspapers compare most favorably (maybe I'm partial, but I really think we have an edge) with those of other States, and at West Point we boast that we have the smallest town in the world with a daily newspaper served by full leased A. P. wire. And, despite the position we have been given on the scale, we have more authors and poets who are nationally and internationally known than perhaps any State in the Nation. As Clayton Rand once said, "We don't read books * * * we just write 'em." At any rate, we look with pride to the long and challenging list of renowned Mississippi authors and poets.

And mark this with pride when other States boast of educational achievement: Mississippi was the first State in the Union to establish institutions for our deaf, dumb, and blind.

This is far too long already, but how can I forego the pleasure of boasting of our long line of distinguished statesmen, our orators, who have long fought for the American way of life? And how can I relinquish the delight of expressing my feeling that today Mississippians stand in the forefront of those who are fighting for restoration of constitutional government to our beloved America? Our statesmen, our orators, are still among us.

Mississippi's public health service program is recognized as the foremost in the Nation, and Harrison County has the oldest public health unit in continuous operation of any county in the United States. We have pioneered in so many fields, but lack of space forbids that I go into this.

Mississippi has so many things that are the largest in the world: cotton plantation, tung-oil plantation, clay-made filter factory, apiary, tomato center, pecan nursery—so many things in which we take the lead here in the South—a stone, marble, and granite industry, our cheese plants, our infants' garments factory, our oyster banks off shore from Pass Christian. Eighty percent of the Nation's shrimp supply is caught by Mississippi fishermen and is shipped and packed by Mississippi workmen.

Mississippi has over 4,000,000 acres of land under lease for gas and oil production and today we are booming in this respect; the strides made by industry under our balance agriculture with industry program have commanded the attention and respect of the entire Nation. We have one of the finest systems of paved highways in the Nation, and it is growing steadily.

We have the most perfectly preserved of all the major battlefields of the world at Vicksburg; the first monument raised in the South to honor our Confederate dead was at Liberty; Memorial Day had its origin at Columbus, Miss. The First Mississippi Regiment is the only one that has participated in every United States war since 1798.

Need I go on? The list is endless. In giving reasons for my pride in being a Mississippian I could exhaust both myself and my readers, but never my subject. Mississippi may have her critics—and she does have some bitter ones—but you will never find me among them. Considering the fact that we had so much prior to the Civil War (12 of the United States 75 millionaires lived in Natchez, Miss., and our whole State boasts a cultural background) and that we have had to battle every inch of the way to our place in the sun which we enjoy today—a place of which every Mississippian has a right to be proud—I offer no apology for my State. It has my complete loyalty, my affection, my understanding, and all of my pride.

Point 4 Screwball Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 1, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as a part of my remarks I include an editorial by Robert Bliss, editor and publisher of the Janesville Gazette, Janesville, Wis., regarding the point 4 program and the American taxpayers' responsibility in the underdeveloped areas which I think is excellent:

POINT 4 SCREWBALL SPENDING

The peculiar thinking of some of our Washington long-hairs tickles one's curiosity as to how they arrive at their spending hallucination. For example, thanks to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the President's dreamy point 4 program is being amended—but not enough.

The wild guarantees of private investments abroad did not deter the House from passing the bill. It would allow private investors to keep the profits they make abroad but would saddle the American taxpayer with any losses. Does that make sense?

The House bill had Secretary of State Acheson's approval in these words: "Protection from some of the risks—to foreign investment—cannot be provided by treaty no matter how sincere the intentions of the participating governments. Therefore, a bill has been introduced (to guarantee and insure private investors) specifically against expropriation, confiscation and seizure, and against inability to convert local currencies."

The foreign governments may try, but they are often completely unable to prevent seizure of American property or forbid conversion of currency. We recall how often governments have been overthrown. But Secretary Acheson would have Mr. and Mrs. American taxpayer make good such losses.

How far will $45,000,000 go in this kind of thing? Chairman CONNALLY, of the Senate committee expects it will be only a starter.

One wonders where there may be an end? The ECA (European Recovery Administration) should be terminated by June 30, 1952, but Administrator Paul Hoffman doubts if expenditures for foreign aid can be held below $2,000,000,000 annually.

Are American taxpayers ready to subsidize point 4—underdeveloped areas everywhere? We are ready to help with our know-how, but some officials in Washington soon should learn that the United States does not owe the rest of the world a living, nor can it build TVA projects on the Nile or Euphrates or any other foreign river—nor should it. Such talk is pure nonsense. Even if it were possible, the peoples we set out to help by our paternalism could not take advantage of our spendthrift lunacy.

From illusions of point 4 issued by the Foundation of Economic Education, Irvington, N. Y., we learn:

1. Point 4 proposals parallel American Communist proposals of 1944.

2. Capital diverted under point 4 would not flow into such projects, would simply shift from private to government or socialistic projects—it would not add to capital.

3. We cannot get wealth by giving wealth away. What capital development we give away will decrease by that much our own capital.

4. Point 4 projects are no more practical than the Lustron house loans or the British peanut fiasco—Britons subsidized peanut growing in Africa, but it would not work—money was wasted.

5. We already have the financial means to back point 4 progams in the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and Export-Import Bank.

6. Government hand-outs to foreign countries will no more build sound recovery than it builds self-supporting citizens in this country. It is the opposite of what experience has already taught us.

Lending our know-how to countries which want to rebuild is one thing. Spreading gold before unfortunate peoples who have not the skill or desire to use it for their benefit is pure waste.

Generoso Pope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 1, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the city of New York today is mourning the loss of another great American. Generoso Pope was the owner and publisher of Il Progresso, an Italian-language paper in the city of New York, which under his guidance was in the forefront in teaching democracy and the American way of life.

He arrived in this country 49 years ago, a poor immigrant boy, but by dint of his own efforts, taking advantage of the opportunities of this great land of ours, he educated himself while earning a livelihood, and then went on to reach great heights in the business and public life of our community. He was an outstanding businessman, a great philanthropist, and a leader in civic life. Having learned his lesson of American democracy so well, he successfully lead the fight against communism in his native Italy.

The country has lost a good citizen.

Congressional Secretaries Get First-Hand Knowledge of Cotton Exchange

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD
OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 1, 1950

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, the Congressional Secretaries' Club, which was formed about 15 years ago to promote better relations between our congressional offices and the departments of government and to provide an increase in knowledge for our office staffs in many fields with which we are concerned, visited the New York Cotton Exchange over the last week end and learned at first hand of the operation of this great commodity exchange.

The visit to the Cotton Exchange was a part of the program of the club's annual New York trip, which usually fulfills the club tradition of carrying on an educational as well as a social program. After attending a briefing session at which our secretaries met officials of the exchange and heard addresses by Mr. Charles B. Vose, president of the New York Cotton Exchange, and Mr. Perry E. Moore, its vice president, they were taken to the floor on which the trading pit is located and there witnessed the last hour of trading.

Since the remarks of Mr. Vose to the congressional secretaries so clearly explain the functions of the exchange, I wish to include them here:

ADDRESS BY CHARLES B. VOSE, PRESIDENT, NEW YORK COTTON EXCHANGE

Ladies and gentlemen, I am delighted to have this opportunity of welcoming this congressional secretaries group to New York, on behalf of the members of the New York Cotton Exchange.

It gives us an opportunity to become personally acquainted which is, indeed, a pleasure.

From another point of view, there is the fact that so frequently we all suffer from a lack of personal acquaintanceship and also from a lack of knowledge of each other's efforts and endeavors.

It is grand that your visit will remedy both of these situations and as our program for you includes a visit to the trading floor of the New York Cotton Exchange, you will then see, first-hand, the actual operations of our exchange and meet more of our members.

Unfortunately, there is much misconception and a real lack of information concerning the broad aspects of the part played by commodity exchanges in the production, marketing, manufacturing, and distribution of the Nation's agricultural products and, as a result of this unfortunate situation, it frequently happens that the commodity exchanges become whipping boys for varying events, for which they are neither the reason nor the cause.

As you all know well, lack of understanding sometimes lends itself to misapprehension and particularly is this evident in the case of our legislators who, on the face of it, could not be expected to be trained in and to understand all phases of national business.

It is, therefore, particularly pleasing to me to have this opportunity of attempting to briefly portray for you the utility of and the necessity for the cotton exchange, in the hope that this better understanding on your part will be enlightening to those who are called upon to cast their vote on all types of farm legislation, tax matters, and on kindred bills which affect such a large percentage of the national farming and industrial population.

How important the proper functioning of the cotton markets and the cotton exchanges are to you may be shown by the fact that there are 1,500,000 persons growing cotton in America, in some 18 States, from coast to coast, and that for many of these States cotton is the principal cash crop and source of wealth. Cotton manufacturing employs over 500,000 workers from Maine to Texas. There are over 1,000,000 people employed in the garment trades where cotton still outranks its closest competitor in yardage by 5 to 1. In addition to farmers and mills, there are banks, merchants, shippers, oil crushers, wholesale, and retail traders and other elements of our economy having a vital interest in cotton. One way or another it has been estimated that about 1 out of 10 of our population are directly or indirectly affected by cotton in their livelihood. So omnipresent is cotton in our affairs that it is clear without further illustration that free enterprise and cotton go hand in hand, and that they stand or fall together.

Fundamentally cotton merchandising does not greatly differ from that of other goods sold without benefit of a futures exchange. If you were a drygoods retailer needing goods, you would negotiate with your regional wholesaler, or perhaps with one of the larger converters or fabricators or a mill sales organization. You would look over the styles and qualities offered, weigh the price quoted, and by private trade, purchase to your best advantage.

Similarly, if you were a mill buying cotton suitable for making print cloth or bedsheeting from a cotton merchant, or if you were that merchant buying various kinds of cotton from a primary dealer, you likewise would negotiate your purchase, by private trade, and to your best advantage, with no shouting or fanfare about it.

Let us now see how this phase of the industry is related to the futures market. Amid the towers of lower Manhattan, we find the cotton exchange building with a great three-story room on its top floor where all trading is conducted. There is a ring in its midst around which many brokers are congregated. They are shouting bids and offers at each other. The clamor at first seems unintelligible, but we soon find great amounts of cotton are changing hands. As each trade is made, reporters flash it by finger signal to a rostrum near the ring. Operators there telephone it to men who chalk up every trade, its time and price, on great blackboards, or telegraph it wherever in this country or abroad the price of cotton is important to business people. We find also that the orders to buy and sell that brokers are executing are flowing to them from telephone booths all around the room and telegraph offices on the floor.

Closer inspection shows us that this speed of transactions in cotton is possible for just one reason. Every order is for 100 bales, called a contract, or for multiples thereof. Also there is no haggling over qualities of cotton, for every contract is based on Middling 15/16 inch, although when the cotton matures it is the privilege of the seller to deliver certain other grades and staples, with the price adjusted to actual differences of value as then reported by the Department of Agriculture. All trading in cotton futures is for delivery at later dates. Thus a sensitive, fluid, market results since the brokers who represent buyer and seller have only to agree (1) on the price, (2) month of delivery, and (3) on the number of contracts, that is—whether 100 bales or a multiple thereof. As a result of the constant flow of business, price changes are close, and normally whether rising or falling values change but one one-hundredth of a cent between transactions. A final thing we learn is that in the vast majority of cases a purchase and/or sale of cotton on the exchange, for later delivery, is usually liquidated by resale or repurchase.

What is the reason for this exchange and what does it contribute to cotton marketing?

The answer lies in the nature of cotton itself. Cotton is a vast enterprise. Millions of bales are grown annually. Wind, rain, drought, sun, insects, temperatures, and Government policies all affect the supply. A host of factors, on the other hand, affect demand. Ownership of cotton thus involves tremendous capital risk. Again cotton is harvested in a few months, but it is consumed throughout the year. Someone must buy it and hold it until the spinner needs it. Without the New York cotton exchange and like institutions, a merchant would have to buy cheaply from growers and sell dearly to mills, adding a high mark-up, because of the many occasions when his market judgment would be incorrect and therefore he would have to bear great losses.

Instead, cotton merchants as well as mills and many other handlers protect their cotton transactions by the method we call hedging. Simply illustrated, the merchant buys cotton from time to time, acquiring a stock for mill requirements, which will show up later. As he makes these purchases of the actual cotton, he sells corresponding amounts of cotton futures contracts on the exchange. He thus hedges, or offsets, the inherent risk of price change while he is waiting for a customer. If prices rise, the actual cotton he put in stock will be worth more, but the futures contracts he sold will also reflect the higher price, so that the gain on the actual cotton will be offset by the loss on cotton futures. If prices fall, the loss on his stock of cotton will be offset and insured by a profit in the cotton futures.

Now that may sound like profitless prosperity, but let me assure you it is not. The merchant has gotten rid of his big risk of major price change. He can now assort his cotton into the exact qualities he expects mills to require, thus performing an essential service, and he will profit according to the judgment and merchandising ability he shows in selling particular qualities to the mills.

He has thus avoided speculating in a volatile commodity. He has done a useful merchandising job. His profit is one of selling skill, not of luck or chance. He can do a bigger business. His credit is good at the bank. His profit margin frequently is one of the narrowest in all commerce. He can pay more for cotton, and charge less for it, than if he had to shoulder the whole risk of price change over extended and uncertain periods of time.

The hedge system, in this and other forms, is used by many people, buyers and sellers of cotton, merchants, mills, and others. There are hedges sold and hedges bought, transactions offsetting cloth business as well as cotton business. In this brief talk, we cannot enter into a detailed study of this long-established and highly efficient method of doing business. But we must point out one important factor.

It is readily seen that buying and selling orders from merchants and mills will hardly coincide in time and quantity. Again the essence of futures is that both buyers and sellers seek to insure themselves against price change, and the insurance must be readily available whenever wanted and whether or not the individual is ready to act now or a week from now. Cotton mills furthermore cannot be expected to insure merchants, or

merchants to insure mills. There must be another source of capital ready at all times to accept the risks which the trade interests desire to minimize. We thus find a class of traders in futures who are speculators or investors, constantly trading in hope of personal gain. Their activity helps to absorb and to underwrite the price risks which cotton men and textile men wish to eliminate.

Needless to say speculation is meticulously regulated by the exchange. A careful check is constantly kept on speculative dealings. Any tendency to excess is corrected promptly. For the exchange recognizes that it operates in the interest of the trade and that only to the extent that speculation provides the risk capital necessary to serve the trade's hedging needs is speculation economically justifiable. The record testifies to the value of properly controlled speculation, and to the success of the exchange in controlling it.

As I said at the outset, cotton is a bulwark of our economic liberties. Freedom of enterprise, freedom of opportunity, go with a soundly functioning cotton industry. The speculator plays an important role in helping to create and maintain broad, fluid markets. Every business involves risk, but the exchange provides means of eliminating great risks from the operations of those in the cotton industry who use these facilities by transferring the risk to insuring speculators.

With time so limited, it does not seem possible to go into technicalities as my sole purpose was to illustrate to you the necessitous role played by the exchanges in the movement of agricultural products.

Before closing, however, I would like to merely say that when referring to speculation, it should never be forgotten that there is speculation in buildings, there is speculation in homes, there is speculation in real estate or, in other words, there is speculation in every form of our national existence and it will so continue as long as we are fortunate enough to remain in a free economy where venture capital can be used according to the dictates of one's own free will.

I am very happy to have had the pleasure of seeing you, making your acquaintance, and attempting, with these few remarks, to bring to you a clearer understanding of the functions of the commodity exchanges in general, and the New York Cotton Exchange in particular.

Hoover UN Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 1, 1950

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Walter Trohan, from the Washington Times-Herald of May 1, 1950:

HOOVER UN PLAN RECALLS TRAGIC DEALS

(By Walter Trohan)

Former President Hoover's proposal for reorganization of the United Nations without Communist nations in it has served to emphasize New Deal and Fair Deal playing ring-around-the-rosy with the Soviets since 1933.

As President, Hoover had refused to recognize Russia and in 1941 he warned the American people that collaboration with Joseph Stalin to bring freedom to mankind was a gargantuan jest. Last Thursday night he told the Nation's editors he used the wrong adjective, "I should have said tragic."

Hoover noted that Soviet Russia has violated more than 35 solemnly signed agreements in a dozen years and instead of expanding liberty the Reds have enslaved a dozen nations and 600,000,000 human beings.

STARTED BY ROOSEVELT

Many observers have traced the rise of Soviet Russia as the No. 1 threat to civilization and liberty to democratic acceptance of communism and Communist programs in the dizzy international whirl of the last two decades.

Until President Roosevelt entered the White House the American Government had refused to recognize the Communists. Republican administrations had refused to recognize a nation ruled by men who relied upon mass murder for power and who boasted of bad faith as the keystone of their foreign policy.

EXTENDED HAND TO STALIN

In 1933, against the advice of many members of his party and over Republican protests, Roosevelt extended the hand of fellowship to Josef Stalin. He gave a cordial and friendly welcome to Soviets as members of the family of government leaders.

Maxim Litvinov, Soviet Commissar for Foreign Affairs, was welcomed into the White House in the Christmas holidays. The American people were treated to a radio play in which the Russian husband and family telephoned seasonal greetings to his Moscow family.

Persons who attempted to warn against the Soviet dangers were ridiculed and smeared. Notable among these was the late Dr. William E. Wirt, of Gary, Ind., who revealed that insiders in the New Deal regarded Roosevelt as the Kerensky of an American revolution.

Two years later the American people were given the inside story of the recognition, which revealed Litvinov as boasting he had put one over on the President. Dr. David H. Dubrowsky, former director of the Soviet Red Cross, who was living in the Soviet Washington headquarters at the time Litvinov returned from the White House after reaching the agreement, told his story to the House Un-American Activities Committee.

Dubrowsky said Litvinov entered rubbing his hands with glee and reported, "Well, all is in the bag; we have it."

"They [President Roosevelt and Secretary of State Cordell Hull] wanted us to recognize the debts that we owed them, and I promised we were going to negotiate, but they did not know we were going to negotiate until doomsday," Litvinov continued, according to Dubrowsky.

LITVINOV SARCASTIC

"The next one was a corker. They wanted me to give them freedom of religion, and I gave it to them. I was very much prompted to offer that I will collect all the Bibles and ship them out to see them."

Dubrowsky also said that Litvinov regarded the promise not to propagandize in the United States as not worth the paper it was written on because it was a promise made to a bourgeois state.

The propaganda pledge was almost immediately broken. In the summer of 1935 Roosevelt was moved to protest. Stalin ignored the protest, and Roosevelt did nothing.

The Roosevelt recognition shed respectability over the comrades. Earl Browder, general secretary of the Communist Party in America, was able to report to Moscow that the New Deal had thrown its doors open to the party, that the New Deal was a collectivist enterprise in which capitalists were being hunted down and that the profit system was being destroyed in America.

RED HELP FOR F. D.

On the eve of the second term election, Comrade George Dimitroff, keynoter of the Third International meeting in Moscow, which ended in August 1936, threw party support behind F. D. R. in the American presidential campaign.

Dimitroff urged that "the Communist Party should support the election of President Roosevelt, because his defeat might enable forces now opposing our forces to give us a body blow."

Similar sentiments were expressed by Reds in this country. Eight years later Reds claimed their support elected F. D. R. to a fourth term.

From 1934 to 1939, according to Dmitry Z. Manuilsky, member of the executive committee of the Communist International, the Communist Party was able to increase its members, after the recognition, from 20,000 to 90,000. Each party member he emphasized was a responsible leader of 15 to 20 fellow travelers. This meant the New Deal had encouraged recruitment of 1,050,000 Communist followers in 5 years and that in 1939 a total of 1,350,000 Communist Party liners were active in the United States.

RED INFILTRATION

Many came into the Government. Records of the House Un-American Activities Committee showed that the White House repeatedly sidetracked and disregarded evidence of Communist penetration into the Government.

In Washington love feasting with Stalin was excused on the ground that Stalin was an enemy of Adolph Hitler. In 1939 Stalin pulled the rug out from under these apologists by negotiating the pact with Hitler that started World War II.

Mr. Roosevelt in the White House was silent on the pact. Russia invaded Poland with Hitler. The White House still was silent. Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania were invaded by Stalin. Mr. Roosevelt in the White House was still silent.

Stalin threatened Finland. Roosevelt expressed hope that Stalin would not impair Finland's independence. On November 29, 1940, the Soviets invaded Finland.

ROOSEVELT'S EXCUSE

On December 29, 1940, Roosevelt used Russian aid to Germany as an excuse for American aid to Britain, saying "it is no more unneutral for us (to send aid to Britain) than it is for * * * Russia and other nations near Germany to send steel and oil and other war materials into Germany every day of the week."

On February 10, 1940, Roosevelt uttered his strongest condemnation against the Soviets. He harangued the American Youth Congress against the absolute dictatorship of Russia and was soundly booed by members of the organization, which was labeled as a Communist front in Congress.

In April 1941 the Soviets, undisturbed by expressions of American disapproval, sought to strengthen their position by entering into a nonagression pact with Japan. Negotiations with this end of the Rome-Berlin-Tokyo axis were in progress when Hitler attacked Russia June 22, 1941.

Roosevelt's condemnation of Russia's absolute dictatorship and wanton disregard for law were forgotten overnight. Russia became a noble democratic defender of freedom against Nazi aggression.

Another to join in praise for the Soviets was Wendell Willkie, GOP candidate for President in 1940, who won the nomination through machinations of the White House with Wall Street internationalists. Willkie was an ostensible opponent of White House foreign policy in campaign speeches, but had secretly assured internationalists he was with them if he should be elected. He joined with the White House after the election and dismissed his criticisms of New Deal foreign policy as campaign oratory at a Senate hearing.

After Pearl Harbor the chorus of adulation for Russia swelled into an oratorio which drowned out things American.

WHITE HOUSE AIDED HISS

There was only one jarring note in the great friendship and that came from Moscow. The Reds demanded a second front and ignored the dying of Americans in the Pacific, Africa, and Italy. Russian propaganda made it appear the Soviets were fighting alone.

At Tehran President Roosevelt played up to Stalin at the expense of Churchill at various conferences and festive occasions where drinks flowed freely. The official picture of the conference reveals Stalin wearing a cat-swallowed-the-canary look, Roosevelt as worn but pleased with himself, and Churchill as seething with inward fury.

At Yalta the wooing of Stalin went even further. Roosevelt continued the secret agreements and understandings which gave the Soviets a chain of satellites in eastern Europe and paved the way for extension of Soviet influence in Asia.

Prominent in the Yalta Conference was Alger Hiss, then in the State Department. Hiss is the convicted perjurer spy, revealed in the testimony of his accuser, Whitaker Chambers, to have been a member of the Soviet spy ring in Washington for years.

Hiss was secretary general of the United Nations founding conference at San Francisco in 1945. He owed his appointment to the White House. Later he was named president of the Carnegie Foundation through the sponsorship of John Foster Dulles, foreign policy adviser to Governor Dewey, twice GOP Presidential candidate.

ASSERT HISS WAS LOYAL

Defenders of Hiss have said that if he did turn over secrets to the Soviets, he did so because of Roosevelts' cooperation with Russia. Friends say Hiss was loyal to Roosevelt in helping an ally.

Hiss' friends include State Secretary Acheson, his State Department associate, who said he would stand by his friend even after Hiss was convicted as a spy-perjurer.

Hiss was only one of the officials linked to Russia. Government and congressional investigators have disclosed that their files contain evidence reflecting on the loyalty of more than 2,200 Federal officials and employees. More than 500 of these were reported to occupy key posts with access to confidential information of high interest to the Soviets.

There has been a long chain of sudden deaths, suicides, mysterious deaths, and strange accidents in the New Deal high command. Many of these have befallen officials linked to the Communist spy disclosures or to various failures of American policy in dealing with the Reds.

Roosevelt and President Truman repeatedly balked investigation into Communist penetration. Mr. Truman, who ratified the concession made to Stalin at Yalta in the Potsdam conference, began as an enthusiastic follower of the land-Russia policy.

Before his nomination in 1948 Mr. Truman told an audience "I like Joe Stalin." He described Stalin as a gentle soul, a prisoner of the Politbureau.

Since that time Mr. Truman has switched his position to anti-Soviet. Political observers have speculated that he hopes to win re-election in 1952 by keeping the cold war crisis alive.

BROWDER AND NEW DEAL

Browder entered into wholehearted cooperation with the New Deal. After the defeat of Germany and Japan, Browder was removed as party leader, which signaled the end of Communist cooperation with the New Deal and with capitalism. During the war capitalists joined hands with New Dealers and Communists in promoting internationalism.

In the trial of Harry Bridges, west coast Communist labor leader, it was revealed that Washington intervention had prevented his deportation. It was said that Bridges would never have been prosecuted had Roosevelt lived.

After the death of Roosevelt Red propagandists called for bringing American soldiers home immediately to ward off any possible check of Red aims. In complete submission to the Reds the Allied zone in Berlin was left without any avenue of approach, which later forced the costly airlift.

There Seems To Be Much Iron Ore Near the Minnesota Mesabi Range, After All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 1, 1950

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, those who are advocating the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway are now using the shortage of iron ore in Minnesota as a reason why this billion-dollar project should be built.

According to an article in the April 14, 1950, issue of the Vindicator-Telegram of Youngstown, Ohio, there seems to be a lot of iron ore left on the Mesabi Range in Minnesota.

The article referred to is as follows:

THERE SEEMS TO BE MUCH ORE NEAR MESABI RANGE, AFTER ALL

(By John W. Love)

About the time we began talking of a possible shortage of iron ore in the Lake Superior district several years ago, lofty gentlemen in the ore business allowed that iron would probably be found there as fast as it was needed.

The inference by us outsiders was that the experts had notions where the ore lay but didn't want to uncover it too fast, on account of the land taxes.

Much furious exploring has been going on since then, however, a lot of sloshing through muskeg and jungle, and ore has been turned up in hundreds of millions of tons total in Labrador, Venezuela, Mexico, and other places.

ORE TO BURN

But the lords of Lake Superior may have been right the first time, even though they or others got pretty nervous later. There may be enormous quantities of yet-untouched hematite not very far from where it has been taken out for nearly the last century.

Hints have been drifting down from the Northwest concerning magnetic indications of large ore beds in Minnesota, and of great deposits in the Steep Rock property back of the Canadian shore of Lake Superior.

It is at least imaginable that by the time the Labrador ore is coming up a St. Lawrence seaway and Venezuelan ore by the port of Baltimore, iron will be in sight in as large a quantity as ever in the Superior district. Considering all the places where ore has been found, it may yet run out of the Western Hemisphere's ears.

DOODLEBUG FINDS IT

Reports from Minnesota concern the revelation of two potential iron formations, one in the northeastern part of the State, the other in the west central. Federal and State geologists have been cooperating in an aerial magnetic survey since 1947.

The word now is that something of significance lies buried under the glacial drift in a belt extending 30 miles across northern Itasca County, west of the Mesabi Iron Range, Likewise in a belt of 80 miles length and up to 10 miles width in Otter Tail and Becker Counties. The existence of ore has been known there for many years, but it lay too deep. The geologists have been using the magnetometer, or "doodlebug," carried on the end of a cable from a plane. More reliable exploration by drill is likely to follow.

ANOTHER 300,000,000 TONS

Steep Rock Iron Mines of Steep Rock Lake, Ontario, and Cleveland (C. S. Eaton, the chairman) has been drilling around on its own property, and so has Inland Steel of Chicago on a leased portion. In two main ore bodies indications were found some time ago of the presence of something like 200,000,000 tons. Exploration on the Inland concession during the winter is said to suggest another 100,000,000 tons.

The Inland Steel geologists and their crew spent several weeks running diamond drills on the ice of Steep Rock Lake. The lake itself is about 250 feet deep, and the drills have been going several hundred feet beyond the bottom Reports are that the ore runs 50- to 68-percent iron and to be spread over enough area and depths to indicate the total tonnage mentioned. The lake itself would have to be pumped out, of course, and that would take some months.

Thus, ore in considerable quantities exists in three segments several miles apart. The twisted lake is 15 miles long, and its shape is roughly that of the ore body which Joseph Errington claimed in 1940 that he had outlined. I met Errington at that time, before any Americans were interested, and he said high-grade iron was to be found along its entire bottom.

If the ore body were as long as Errington thought it was and as wide and thick as it has shown to be in spots, then a billion tons is not beyond the possibilities. All this is highly conjectural, of course, but no more so than the possibilities the doodlebug has turned up in Minnesota. Hence the notion that the Northwest might yet disclose enough ore to run us several decades longer than we'd thought.

Mexican Seizure of American Fishing Vessels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 1, 1950

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I am in complete agreement with my distinguished colleagues, Mr. LANE and Mr. NICHOLSON, and others, who have so ably protested in the House the recent unwarranted seizure of American fishing vessels in Mexican waters.

I am not informed officially as to all the facts and circumstances of these seizures, but from the information at hand it seems to me that a grave offense against international law has been committed by Mexican officials.

It is stated that the vessels in question were wrongfully apprehended and seized while they were engaged in shrimp fishing about 8 miles off the Mexican coast.

This point is clearly outside the established international limit and I know of no treaty or convention which prohibits fishing by Americans in these waters.

I am forced to conclude, therefore, in the absence of evidence to excuse or justify these acts that they were entirely illegal, wrongful, arbitrary, and high-handed violations of law, of comity between nations, and a serious blow to the mutual respect subsisting between Mexico and this Nation.

I eagerly join in the vehement protests against this outrage and urge this Government to institute immediate action to submit formal protest to Mexico, demanding explanation and redress, full compensation in damages, and assurance that these acts will not be repeated.

Address of Hon. Herbert Hoover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 1, 1950

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am greatly honored in receiving the permission of the House to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include the recent speech by our only living ex-President, Herbert Hoover. This address was made by Mr. Hoover before the American Newspaper Publishers Association on April 27, 1950, and was of such significance that President Truman is reported to have telephoned him his approval immediately on its conclusion. That in itself is most unusual and significant, but the speech is even more so. It contains sound reasoning and reveals what is in the hearts of men and women everywhere who are lovers of freedom and who yearn for peace. I believe it to be one of the most significant utterances of our times and that it will command the attention of the whole world in its effort to seek a way out of this cold and profitless era in which there is no peace.

The great respect and affection in which Mr. Hoover is held by his fellow countrymen adds immeasurably to the force and potentiality of his words. There is no man living today who is more highly esteemed for his sincere love for his country and his many unselfish contributions to the benefit of mankind. I hope that my colleagues will read and reread this notable speech and thereby gain in their thinking about peace.

ADDRESS BY FORMER PRESIDENT HERBERT HOOVER TO THE AMERICAN NEWSPAPER PUBLISHERS' ASSOCIATION

It is a great honor to address the editors and publishers of the United States. You are the most powerful of all influences in our country.

My subject on this occasion arises from my suspicion that the world in its tumults has abandoned most acceptance of history as a guidepost.

There are plenty of voices about but the voice of experience seems to have become stilled.

I have had to do with the boiling economic, social, and political forces during two world wars and their aftermaths. I propose for a few moments to add some of the voices of world experience into the present clamor. I shall explore four samples, one each from the economic, social, political, and international field.

ECONOMIC EXPERIENCE

In the economic field there are many shrill voices proclaiming that our American economic system is outmoded. They say it was born of undesirable parents, such as American individualism and a French lady, named laissez-faire. They accuse the ghost of Adam Smith as having had something to do with the matter. They concluded our system is of the jungle or dog-eat-dog variety.

It might be observed that the alternative offered us is a drink mixed by three different ghosts. That is, the shade of Karl Marx with his socialism. The shade of Mussolini with his dictated and planned economy. The spook of Lord John Maynard Keynes with his "operation cuttlefish" comprising managed currency, peacetime inflation by deficit spending, and perpetual endowment for bureaucrats. And we have contributed an American ideology of give-away programs. It might be called the ghost. However, the handiwork of the ghosts and their auxiliaries furnish you most of your page 1.

I am not going to repeat the old and valid defenses of the American economic system; I may mention that in recent years we have taken strong drinks from the three "hants" I have mentioned, and from the new generosity, all mixed with varying amounts of pure water from the American system.

THE ECONOMIC REVOLUTION

Be all that as it may, my purpose here is to call your attention to a less obvious world experience.

Sixty years ago our American system was divorced from the laissez-faire lady. We started proceedings in 1887 when we created the Interstate Commerce Commission, thereby initiating the control of natural monopolies. But far more revolutionary was the Antitrust Act of 1890.

Western Europe never has had effective antitrust laws. To the contrary, there grew up in those countries a maze of state-favored private trade restraints, combinations, trusts, and cartels. This form of economic organization sought profits by fixing prices and by control of production and distribution.

Under our revolutionized American system, competition remained the restless pillow of progress. It had to seek profits from improved technology and lowered costs of production.

In time, western Europe, without the full pressure of competition, lost much of the impulse to improve methods and equipment. Plants became obsolete; standards of living stagnated.

OUR SYSTEM DYNAMIC

In contrast, our technology with 100 times as many inventing laboratories and a thousand times more trained technicians has steadily improved its tools. Our standards of living increased with cheaper costs and more goods. Our system was dynamic; theirs was static.

Finally western Europe with its obsolescent plants, its inability to compete in world trade except at the expense of labor was desperate. It took to hard drinking of the potions from the shades of Marx, Mussolini, and Keynes—plus the new generosity.

Our American system continues to produce despite periodic indulgence in these drinks. It does it despite two world wars, innumerable interferences with incentives and a Government take of 60 or 70 percent of its savings. It still retains the dynamic power to provide the greatest and widest spread of comfort to our people that the world has ever known. That is, if we would join Alcoholics Anonymous and quit mixed drinks.

Lest any dangerous thought flash through your minds, I am recalling this experience exclusively to you as publishers and editors.

EXPERIENCE IN SOCIOLOGY

Now lest someone think all this is economics without humanism, I offer an experience on the social side. It is punctuated today by the siren voices calling for security from the cradle to the grave.

Security from the cradle to about 18 or 20 years of age, and from about 65 to the grave, has always been sacred to the American people. The training of our children, the care of our aged and the unfortunate have been a part of our system since the founding of the Republic. It is part of our civilization. The governmental part, however, needs some repairs.

But the voice of experience which I wish to recall relates to the idea of security for the middle group—say, from 20 to 65 years of age. We have less than 70,000,000 providers in these groups, and they must provide for 80,000,000 children, aged, sick, nonproductive Government employees and their wives. It is solely from the energies of this middle group, their inventions, and their productivity that can come the support of the young, the old, and the sick—and the Government employees.

SYSTEM CAN BE DESTROYED

Unless there is the constant pressure of competition on this group between 20 and 65 plus the beckoning of fairies and rewards to simulate incentives and work, the children and the aged will be the victims. This middle group can find its own security only in a free but tough system of risk and self-reliance. It can be destroyed by taxes and the four mixed drinks.

Experience calls sorrowful confirmation of all this. My recollection is that the Lord remarked to Adam something about sweat.

Be that as it may, there is convincing evidence from the British experience of trying to include the middle group in blessed security. Their incentive to sweat has diminished under that illusion. The needed leadership of the middle group in production and distribution is being destroyed. Otherwise they would not need lean on the new generosity.

There are also some lessons of experience to be had from Russia where the grave is close to the cradle. And 15,000,000 people are compelled to work in slave camps under the whip.

The voice of experience also calls loudly as to organization of the political field. In 1938, I spent some months on the Continent inquiring how come 15 new democracies after the First World War had failed.

The downfall of the representative governments was due in part to the drinks compounded by the three ghosts. But there was another step in their arrival at chaos, which contains a potent experience for America.

There had grown up in their legislature a multitude of splinter parties. There were all the way from 5 to 15 of them. In consequence, there was no responsible majority. Governments were driven to improvised legislative coalitions, which could only agree upon negative policies and give-away programs. In each coalition small foreign-controlled tricky groups played a part. In confusion and despair, their peoples welcomed the man on horseback.

TWO MAJOR PARTIES NEEDED

Even though old-time religion, it is worth repeating that the preservation of representative government requires two major political parties.

I am not going to deliver a history of the rifts between major parties in the United States. So you may relax. I might mention that once upon a time, say for about 60 years,

the members of both of our major political parties were, in large majority, liberals in the nineteenth century sense. They quarreled mostly over the tariff but not over ideologies.

However, since Lenin's implication that the hermit crab, by seizing the shell of another animal knew his business, the term "liberal" has lost its soul. Its cheerful spirit of less power in government and more freedom of men has passed to the world beyond.

Nor am I going to try your after-dinner souls with ideological definitions—not even of statism. That definition has already been made instinctively by the common tongue of all nations where free speech still has a part in their proceedings. That effective but perhaps unrefined definition is "right wing" and "left wing."

PARTIES REORIENTED

The point I am concerned with here is that from the ideological tumults stirred by three shades and their helpers, our major American political parties have been in large degree reoriented into these new compartments of right and left.

I do not charge the real Communists to the American left wing. They are agents of a foreign government.

If a man from the moon, who knew the essentials of representative government, came as a total stranger to the United States, he would say some obvious things within the first week or two.

He would say to the Republican Party: There is no room for you on the left. You must be the party of the right, or you will split into ineffective factions.

And with equal emphasis he would say to the Democrats: Your die is cast. You are the party of the left, or you will likewise split into futile factions.

He would say to some members of both parties: You are not in your proper spiritual homes.

He would say that in all this ideology tumult, if there cannot be a reasonably cohesive body of opinion in each major party, you are on a blind road where there is no authority in the ballot box or in government.

He would say that if you want confirmation look at 15 European countries where representative government was torn to shreds.

IN THE INTERNATIONAL FIELD

I need not remind you that our page 1 international issue is Communist Russia. There are seven phases of this experience which I must recall before I come to a proposal of action.

The first phase of experience with Russia began under the czars. Since Peter the Great they steadily have expanded their reach of empire over the largest land mass in the world. Their method was that of a burglar going down a hall. If there was no one in the first room, he took everything including the doorknob. If he found someone in the second room who protested, he weighed the strength of the protestor and might leave part of the furniture. If he found an armed man in the third room, he closed the door and waited.

Lenin and Stalin added a new apparatus for the robber. They now make the man in the second room a party member and rob him later and by degrees. They now put the armed man in the third room asleep with a nonaggression pact or a promise of peace. Thus, he neglects his weapons. In any event they steal his secrets.

The second phase of this experience with Russia was a period of 16 years during which four Presidents and seven Secretaries of State opposed our having any relations with this malignant Government. Their attitude was that when our neighbors are living a life of spiritual and other disrepute we do not attack them. But we can hold up standards in the world a little better if we do not invite them into our homes by so-called recognition.

LEFT-WINGERS HAD WAY

The third historical phase arrived when our left-wingers had their way in our relations with Communist Russia. They produced the recognition of the Soviet in 1933. They produced the alliance with Russia in 1941. They produced the appeasement of Russia in western Europe until its reversal by President Truman and Secretary Byrnes in 1945. I will not join in the explanations about China. Up to now there is agreement on only one point. We lost the game—400,000,000 to nothing.

Many of our left-wingers were not consciously doing all this. They were just trigger-happy to anything new in ideological life.

Lest anyone think I am a recent convert in these, I may cite that just 9 years and 63 days ago I warned the American people that collaboration with Stalin to bring freedom to mankind was a gargantuan jest. I used the wrong adjective. I should have said tragic. For a result, instead of the expansion of liberty, we witness a dozen nations and 600,000,000 human beings enslaved.

The fourth phase of this experience was that Soviet Russia has in the last 12 years violated more than 35 solemnly signed agreements.

NOW A PROPAGANDA FORUM

The fifth phase of this experience has been with the Communists in the United Nations. That Charter for which we hoped so much contains lengthy pledges to the independence of nations, to human liberty, and to nonaggression. About a dozen provisions of that Charter have been violated either in spirit or in letter by Soviet Russia. The Kremlin has reduced the United Nations to a propaganda forum for the smearing of free peoples. It has been defeated as a preservative of peace and good will.

The sixth phase of this experience is that we now find ourselves in an expensive and dangerous cold war. We conduct the battle with subsidies to beguile peoples to rectitude from internal communism. A year ago we made the Atlantic military pact. The expressed hope was that although there was no commitment to go to war these nations would build up their own arms to adequately defend their own rooms. In persistence to an old habit, we are taking up the check.

In the meantime we learn that our first defense—the atomic bomb—has been stolen from us.

The final phase of our experience with Russia is the belated realization that this is not one world but two worlds. The one world idea seems to be lost in the secret files.

One world is militaristic, imperialistic, atheistic, and without compassion. The other world still holds to belief in God, free nations, human dignity, and peace.

SHOULD TAKE COLD LOOK

Now to come to the point of all this. The American people ought to take a cold and objective look at this experience before we go any further.

The look should be directed to the fact that more and more the burdens of defending free men and nations are being thrust upon the American people, who are only one-sixth the population of the globe. We are becoming more and more isolated as the sole contender in this cold war. We are steadily losing ground because the non-Communist states are being picked off one by one or are compromising with the Communists. Our countrymen are in a fog as to what, where, and when all this leads to.

What the world needs today is a definite concrete mobilization of the nations who believe in God against this tide of Red agnosticism.

It needs a moral mobilization against the hideous ideas of the police state and human slavery. The world needs mobilization against this creeping Red imperialism. The United States needs to know who are with us in the cold war against these practices, and who we can depend on.

CALLS FOR REORGANIZED UN

Therefore, I have a proposal to make.

I suggest that the United Nations should be reorganized without the Communist nations in it. If that is impractical, then a definite new united front should be organized of those peoples who disavow communism, who stand for morals and religion, and who love freedom.

This is specifically not a proposed extension of a military alliance or any color of it. It is a proposal based solely upon moral, spiritual, and defense foundations. It is a proposal to redeem the concept of the United Nations to the high purpose for which it was created. It is a proposal for moral and spiritual cooperation of God-fearing free nations.

If the free nations join together, they have many potent moral, spiritual, and even economic weapons at their disposal. They would unlikely ever need some weapons. Such a phalanx of free nations could come far nearer to making a workable relation with the other half of the two worlds than the United States can ever do alone.

COULD KEEP AGENTS OUT

By collective action we could much more effectively keep their conspiring agents and bribes out of all our borders and out of our laboratories.

It may be the non-Communist world is not willing to take such a vital stand. At least it would clarify what we have to do.

The test I propose is the logical and practical method of total diplomacy. It would make diplomacy dynamic and lessen the dangers of the American people. All this may give pain to some people. But by their cries ye shall know them.

My friends, I am not disheartened by all this recall of disturbing experience. We must retain our faith in western civilization. In support of that faith we are perhaps a slow but a resolute and intelligent people. We have the greatest organ of education known to man—a free press. You can dissolve much of our confusion and frustrations.

And in rejecting an atheistic other world, I am confident that the Almighty is with us.

The Late Dr. Charles R. Drew

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 1, 1950

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, the tragic death in an automobile accident on April 1 cut short the career of one of this country's most distinguished citizens, Dr. Charles R. Drew, chief surgeon at Freedmen's Hospital and professor of surgery at Howard University. The contributions which he made in the fields of medicine and science were many, and he achieved international reknown for the pioneering work he did in connection with the development of blood plasma—work which incidentally won for him the directorship of the first plasma division in 1941 and also the honor of being the first director of the American Red Cross blood bank.

A Negro himself, Dr. Drew worked unceasingly to train other Negro surgeons, and the success of his efforts is attested to by the fact that more than half of the Negro surgeons who have been certified by the American Board of Surgery studied under Dr. Drew.

An Amherst College graduate in 1926, he received his medical degree from McGill University in Montreal, Canada, in 1933, and served as resident doctor at the Montreal General Hospital until he came to Howard University as an instructor in pathology and an assistant in surgery in 1935. In 1938, he was awarded a Rockefeller fellowship in surgery at Columbia University, where he received his doctor of science degree in 1940. He was the recipient of the Spingarn medal in 1943—an award for distinguished service given annually by the National Association for Advancement of Colored People.

Dr. Drew was a member of the board of directors of the district chapters of the National Foundations of Poliomyelitis and of the American Cancer Society. He was a member of the board of trustees of the National Society for Crippled Children, and was chief of the surgical section of the National Medical Association.

It is always deeply distressing whenever a career of selfless service is brought to an abrupt and accidental end. This is particularly true in the case of Dr. Drew, whose humble and competent approach to whatever problems he was faced with made him respected and admired by all who knew him.

Justice for Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 1, 1950

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech by Judge Blair F. Gunther, supreme head of the Polish National Alliance of North America, on justice for Poland, together with an introduction by Attorney Martowski:

INTRODUCTION BY ATTORNEY MARTOWSKI

The most alarming tension confronting the American people is caused by the spread of communism throughout the world. Probably not many of us do realize that the appeasement policy of our diplomats at Yalta, Tehran, and Potsdam, has helped Stalin to dominate two-thirds of Europe and most of China and become a threat to our security and world peace. Whether we yielded to Stalin by sheer ignorance of Russian history, confused thinking, or unfamiliarity of Communist methods; or whether our own Communist sympathizers, skillfully planted in the important governmental departments, have misguided our actions we are paying dearly for the colossal errors committed at the highest levels of our officialdom. Gradually we have recognized our blunders and in order to correct them, at least in part, we are now spending billions of dollars for the Marshall plan, Atlantic Pact, and the rearmament of western democracies. We are becoming more aware that communism is based on atheistic materialism with its totalitarian regime enslaving common people. God is set aside and with Him the basis of morality. The dignity of human beings, the inalienable rights to life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness, are replaced under communism by the police state abrogating all rights and privileges. This brutal ideology is infiltrating even the United States. Within our gates the fifth column is plotting the destruction of our Government. This fifth column is becoming more bold, more aggressive, and more effective than ever before. So that today even the safety of America is at stake in the face of a cruel, stealthy, ruthless, and clever Asiatic enemy with his agents operating in our midst. But more on the subject of communism will be given by our distinguished speaker, Judge Blair F. Gunther. He was born in Hasting, Pa., son of a coal miner. He graduated from the Kanty Preparatory School and received his LL. B. degree from Duquesne University in 1927. From 1935 to 1938 Mr. Gunther was deputy attorney general. He was appointed to the bench in 1942 and was elected in 1943 despite a Democratic landslide. Judge Gunther is supreme head of the Polish National Alliance of North America, a fraternal organization having over 300,000 members in the United States. He is chairman of the board of trustees of the Alliance College and is the national chairman of the American Resettlement Committee for Displaced Persons. For the fifth consecutive time, he was elected chairman of the Polish-American Congress of Western Pennsylvania. It is with pleasure that I present now the recorded address of Judge Blair F. Gunther of the Allegheny County Court. Judge Gunther.

JUSTICE FOR POLAND

(By Judge Blair Gunther)

I am very happy to speak to you under the auspices of the Polish-American Congress, of western Massachusetts, and especially upon the invitation of my dear friend, Dr. Karol Smolczynski, who has done so much for our country and in the interests of Poland.

I am very happy to speak on a subject that is of interest to many of us—the demoralization of communism and its designs on the world. Let us today in this season of Lent start appeasing God instead of appeasing Joe Stalin, if we are to avert another world war. In the words of one of our distinguished clergymen in western Pennsylvania, who is also a spokesman for the Polish Congress, "The demoralization is gaining ground especially among the young people of our country." The Communists today try to show how it satisfies for a while the seeking and longings of man which we know that only God can satisfy. They try to point out how it offers a temporary substitute for the religious cravings of men.

Today I'd like to note two things in particular in which communism imitates Christianity: First, its demand for blind faith; second, its perversion of the Golden Rule. First, it denies God in all things because there are some things which they cannot see, taste, or touch, and they cannot verify by sense experience. In short, the Communists want to throw out all faith which, as we know, is defined as a virtue by which we believe in God and the things which He has revealed, for it is He who has redeemed us, and He cannot be deceived. And yet communism itself demands blind faith. In fact, today we are living in an age of unprecedented faith. The materialists—the best known of whom are Marx and Lenin—hold out the promise of heaven on earth. Of course, they also point out that this heaven on earth will come after a somewhat bloody revolution.

It has its own stake in martyrism. Saints are canonized in Moscow faster than in Rome because in Rome they are more cautious in bestowing sainthood.

There are many sects and denominations that believe in communism. Its head is Joseph Stalin. Since this religion is so great in power and persuasion, it declares that this head is the supreme pontiff and he is infallible. Now you see by comparison the Communist laughs at Catholics who accept the Pope as Christ's successor, who speaks infallibly on faith and morals. Yet, they declare the same about Joe Stalin. If the Catholic denies the authority of the Holy Father, he is a heretic. If the Russian denies Joseph Stalin's authority and infallibility, he's a dead duck. The Communists mock the Christians for accepting the incarnation and ridicule our belief in the miracles of Christ at Lourdes, but the disciples of communism believe many more mystical propositions and miracles. For instance, it believes that man, or as he likes to call him, the common man, lives by bread alone and that only when his stomach is full is he supremely happy. He passionately believes that all will be good and peaceful when each man will have two cars in every garage, two chickens in every pot, and two pairs of legs on every chicken. Men are still unhappy and still behave terribly. Now, don't ask him why it is that men who have all these things are unhappy. He will answer this: No man will be good unless all men can have everything which, judging by human nature, can never come about.

The same thing may be wrong in Moscow and right in America. Don't ask a Communist why it would be suicide for a Russian to strike at Moscow, but it is right for an American to strike against bad working conditions, or why freedom to disagree with the press is a human right for a Communist here, but a mortal sin and a crime in Russia. Or why it is superstitious to make the sign of the cross in memory of Christ who was crucified, but all right for a Communist to make the sign of the clenched fist in front of Lenin's tomb. The truth about the religion of communism is that it is, of all the heresies, the silliest and most irrational. It demands more acts of faith. The Communists expect more miracles from Stalin than the Christians expect from their own God. They say that communism is a Christian heresy. It is not, strictly speaking, since it denies all Christianity completely, while most of the sects that have sprung up in the shadows of the cross in western civilization during the past thousand years are heresies of the Church founded on some article of belief or dogma which they feel have been neglected. Now, in our western world, what has needed emphasis for the past 200 years was certainly the Golden Rule. The second part of the great commandment "Love thy neighbor" and this neglect of the brotherhood of man was noted by Karl Marx and taking this commandment, disregarding all else, he made a religion. Of course, he made one slight change which resulted in the complete destruction of that great commandment. The Christian commandment of love of neighbor was based on the commandment "Love thy God," although Communists thought you could have the brotherhood of man without the love of God. Man did not create God, but God created man. But Karl Marx did succeed and will succeed as long as Christians exploit their neighbors and trample on human rights. Even here in America, theoretically a Christian nation, there still is much despair, degradation, oppression, crime, and misery. We have forgotten Christ's commandment to love one another. Against our terrible social crimes we have a right to protest. But to destroy our Government, to attempt to change human nature by murder and robbery, this would bring

about a revolution. This is not the American way. This is the Communist way.

Here in America the Communists put us American Christians to shame. We don't always do as we believe, but the Communists, in this sense, believe in brutality involving the liquidation of human beings. Now, we are not advocating that doctrine. What we are trying to say is this: Let us act the way we believe, let us practice what we preach, bring real equality according to the individual merits and practices. Let us act as we say that there is a just God who will reward the good and punish the evil.

The Communists say, "All hail to the new world religion, all hail to its messiah, Lenin, all hail to its prophets, Marx and Engels, all hail to the supreme pontiff, Stalin." Communism does not promise the kingdom of God nor life hereafter, but it tries to hold out a hope of paradise on earth. Instead of a Bible, men are asked to accept the hammer and sickle. Men who have rejected God get on their knees and, turning their eyes to the east, mock God in their prayer. "Our father who art in the Kremlin, Stalin is thy name. May your will be done in Budapest, Prague, and Washington as it is in the Kremlin."

Investments in Human Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 1, 1950

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD a speech given by John L. Thurston, Assistant Administrator for program of the Federal Security Agency, before the Association of Credit Unions of the State of Michigan, April 22, 1950, entitled "Investments in Human Resources." This speech sets forth in a clear and enlightened manner the merit of our basic investments in the preservation and development of human happiness and effectiveness:

INVESTMENTS IN HUMAN RESOURCES

(By John L. Thurston, Assistant Administrator for program, Federal Security Agency)

I am pleased to be here tonight, for three reasons. First of all, I am glad to address the Michigan Credit Unions as a member of the Federal Security Agency partnership. The Bureau of Federal Credit Unions, now about to complete its second year in the Federal Security Agency, is the newest addition to the FSA family—and we are very enthusiastic about our new member.

As I was leaving Washington, Claude Orchard, Director of the Bureau, asked me to convey his personal regards to the Michigan Credit Unions and to tell you how proud we are at headquarters over the progress which Federal Credit Unions have been making here in Michigan.

I understand that there are 320 operating credit unions in the State of Michigan with assets of more than $12,750,000, and that more than 180,000 residents of this State are members of credit unions. This represents a marvelous growth in the last few years. I know these people are adding to the financial security of their families through participation in the voluntary, self-help activities of their credit unions. Promotion of thrift is a constructive influence in our economy, and protection from excessive interest rates increases the purchasing power of working people. I am glad that the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions is a part of the Federal Security Agency.

Second, I came here to Detroit because I am always pleased to have an excuse to come home again. I was born in this State—at Grand Haven—and spent most of my youth in Benton Harbor, which is my legal residence. There is something satisfying about coming back to your home State, and I am always glad to have the chance to do so.

In the third place—I am glad to be here because I think I have something to say. Something which is not particularly new or startling but which is of fundamental importance, and which is not always widely recognized. And I have a feeling that what I intend to say tonight will be understood and appreciated by this particular audience. Credit unions combine two great virtues: the virtue of self-help and the virtue of mutual aid. Members of credit units know that the Lord helps those who help themselves. They also know that the Lord helps those who help each other. Added to these virtues of self-help and mutual aid is the factor of foresight. You prepare against the rainy day and afford protection for him on whom the storm descends without warning. Perhaps as clearly as any other form of investment, credit union funds are directly invested in human resources and human welfare. I therefore do not apologize tonight for speaking to you in a rather serious vein on the subject, "Investments in Human Resources."

I

At the outset, I should like to state two extreme points of view, for the purpose of rejecting both. No one present tonight would make the error of putting me or himself in either of these categories I am about to describe; but I have learned from experience that it is sometimes useful to say clearly what one does not mean, in order that one is not misquoted or misinterpreted.

Not so very long ago, it used to be generally accepted that public expenditures were nonproductive. Farmers and manufacturers and laborers produced the food, clothing, and shelter for mankind. Professional people produced the services. These were said to be productive. Money put into farms, factories, transportation and communication, office buildings and the like—that was productive investment. But money put into paying for teachers, judges, policemen, legislators, and prisons—that was another story. Public expenditures didn't produce anything, it was argued. Public expenditures were merely that much taken out of what the economy produced. Everybody was poorer by the measure of every dime that went into the public coffers. That was a fairly common assumption 50 years ago—and there may be a few alive today who hold that view.

According to this philosophy, the best public expenditure was the smallest that could possibly be made. Prisons were good enough if they prevented the escape of criminals. Mental hospitals were to keep patients out of harm's way, and from harming others—at the least possible money cost. School teachers should be paid the minimum going rate, with no frills and folderol added; no foolishness like manual training and domestic science and art and music and citizenship.

This negative philosophy even extended to industry. What was the point in putting safety guards on machinery, merely to prevent accidents? The point was to get goods produced in largest quantities with minimum cost. To set safety standards by legislation, and then to establish a corps of government inspectors to swarm through the factories to enforce those laws, was held to be one more example of nonproductive government expenditure.

Now experience has long since demonstrated the fallacy of the negative notion of government expenditure—to most of us, at least. In the field of industrial safety, for example, industry itself has learned the lesson so well that it pretty generally tends to keep well ahead of the minimum standards established by legislation. Recently the National Association of Manufacturers asked about 2,000 plant operators what their savings were, due to the establishing of medical and safety departments. Practically all of them reported that these projects were paying off handsomely. Here are the average reductions they reported:

	Percent
In occupational disease	62.8
In absenteeism	29.7
In compensation costs	28.8
In labor turn-over	27.3

As this lesson has become clearer with the passing of the years, resistance to wise Government expenditure in programs of industrial health and safety has disappeared. Instead, we find today that there is the closest working cooperation between Government and the general public, including management and labor, in pushing programs of health and safety in industry. All have learned that it pays off handsomely.

Much of the same thing is true in other areas. Enlightened people no longer think of prisons just as places to lock up criminals at minimum expense. Though we still have a long way to go, we really believe that they should be what the newer name says: "institutions of correction." And our thinking today goes even beyond correction—our current concern with juvenile delinquency puts the accent on prevention. Experience has proved that the supervised playground turns out better citizens than the alley gang.

Education is one of the crowning examples of the passing of the negative notion of public expenditure. A century ago, as the idea of universal free compulsory schooling was battling to win its way, there were those who condemned the whole notion as socialistic and dangerous. "What," they cried, "would you tax one man to pay for the education of another man's child?" But a century of the common school in America has demonstrated its value so conclusively that no responsible voice attacks the basic idea that it is wise to put public moneys into public schools for all the children. It pays off, in better citizens, better producers, finer people. It pays off, too, in dollars and cents, as any comparison of the man-hour productive efficiency of an educated labor force with an uneducated labor force shows.

These examples only begin to suggest the reason why most of us have cast aside the ancient error that Government expenditures are parasitic and unnecessary. I shall say more, a little later, about the way in which public investments in human resources pay off. All I have said up to this point is that we are no longer confronted with the erroneous assumption that public expenditures are unproductive. We now know that they are productive. Just how productive they may be is a matter to which I shall soon turn.

But before doing that, I must disassociate myself from a second error which occasionally appears in private and public discussions. Once in a while one meets some starry-eyed person who sees the truth that public expenditures pay off, and who goes on from there to indulge in wild and speculative schemes of dangerous proportions. They are like the housewife who listened to a fast-talking salesman's claim that the gadget he was peddling would cut her housework in half. "Oh," she said brightly, "then I'll take two of them and cut out all my housework." Just because public investment in human resources pays off, it does not follow that a limitless multiplication of that expenditure will be desirable for the individual, or will be in the national interest.

We must disavow this extreme just as clearly as we deny the assumption that public expenditure for human welfare is unproductive. We shall do well to recognize that public investment, like any other investment, must be wisely made and guided by the rules of reason. This is a hard-boiled, realistic approach to the problem of human welfare. It supports all the finer ideals of humanity—and it keeps its feet on the ground as it moves forward.

With that perspective, let's turn to the question of what public investments in human resources actually cost—and who pays for them. Do we put more into them than we get out of them? Do public investments represent a total waste, or a partial waste, or a net gain? What is the balance sheet?

In general, I think we can say that much depends on what sort of public investment we are talking about, and the degree of adequacy of that investment in the light of the need it tries to meet.

If a man's roof is leaking, it will pay him to invest in more pots and pans to put in the attic to catch the drip. That saves the plaster and paint in the floors below. Even the minimum sort of public expenditure in picking up the pieces of wreckage left by the processes of history has a monetary justification of a sort. Property values are higher and people rest more securely when everyone feels that the police system is doing an adequate job in restraining crimes of violence. The general economy has greater stability and continuing purchasing power when there is adequate unemployment insurance and when social security for the aged maintains the purchasing power of the older segment of the population. A sick man who gets well quickly is a better producer than one whose absenteeism is high because of recurrent illness.

But any wise householder knows that it is better to fix the roof than to run around the attic with pots and pans every time a shower comes. Whether he will put on a slate roof or use shakes or shingles or asphalt and gravel will depend on a lot of factors of judgment and pocketbook. But he knows that a tight roof is better than a leaky one, that a tight roof pays off. From year to year he cannot point to exact financial returns on a good roof; but he can know that he has not had to plaster the back bedroom after every spring rain.

So it is with these investments in human resources. Certainly we shall never see the time when there will be no leaks in the roof, when we shall never need to spend something to help the afflicted and the unfortunate. But we also know that the wisest expenditure is that which reduces to the minimum the number of pots and pans we have to keep in the attic of the Nation, a policy which keeps the roof as tight as possible.

Take it in the health field, for example. Every year the Nation loses a sizable sum because of short-term illness, incapacitation, and partial disability. Estimates for 1947 put the figure as high as $27,000,000,000 a year which the productive economy loses from these three causes alone. I pass over the loss of production which comes because of the premature deaths of workers, estimated for the same year at about 27,000,000 life-years annually, a loss of around $11,000,000,000 in production and wages each year through premature death. That is over and beyond the direct losses from underproduction by the living.

Now, put over against this annual loss the figure of what we spend for medical and health services. We are losing more than twenty-seven billions, about 10 percent of the annual production, because of poor health; but in 1947 we spent only about eight and one-half billions, about 3 percent of the national product, for medical and health services. That included all funds, private and public, spent on medical and health services. Private individuals and organizations spent by far the largest share of this—six and one-half billions. All governments—Federal, State, and local—together spent less than two billions for medical care and prevention, including all research and including expenditures for veterans' health programs. That's an over-all view. Now look at a few specifics.

Cancer

The report of the Hoover Commission's task force on public welfare calculates what might happen if an adequate program of treatment of cancer were introduced. Without waiting for any further progress in research, merely using what we now know about cancer, the task force report concludes that more than 95,000 premature deaths could be prevented every year if the services and facilities in the best cancer-control centers were available throughout the country. The Hoover report cites a study for one State which shows that about half of the cancer patients are under 60 years of age. And it concludes "a very considerable number of productive years may be saved by the widespread application of known cancer-control methods. As research improves the results of treatment, the outlook will undoubtedly improve further."

Tuberculosis

Today we know how to control tuberculosis. But we are not doing it. Tuberculosis takes a wage earner away from his family and away from his job for years. In addition to his loss in earnings, it costs a lot for medical care and family maintenance (often borne by the community). And we still have a half million cases of tuberculosis in the country. The expenditure today of a little more effort and money would save literally millions of dollars in the future.

Malaria

Everyone knows the dramatic story of the conquest of malaria and the building of the Panama Canal. Nearly the same thing is now true in this country. Only a few years ago, malaria was a direct cause of poverty in the United States. Malaria time is farming time. This disease puts people to bed when they need to be out in the fields, causing suffering in families, in whole communities, in whole States. People are kept poor when they cannot grow the crops. And people who have the malaria parasite in their blood are too tired to care if their crops are bad or their houses are run down. Malaria makes them poor in pocketbook and poor in spirit. Before the war it was estimated that malaria cost the Nation approximately one-half billion dollars annually in lost production in the 17 Southern States alone. But we are no longer merely putting rusty kettles and pails under that leak. The last knockout campaign, for which Congress has appropriated an average of about nine million dollars a year, is proving even more successful than expected. The complete elimination of malaria is in sight. The successful control of malaria has undoubtedly contributed greatly to the economic and cultural progress of the South which we have witnessed in recent years.

We might go on through a long list of diseases—typhoid fever, tetanus, smallpox, meningitis, plague, yellow fever, the venereal diseases, and cholera. The story, based on experience with the armed forces, is substantially a repetition of what we have just been saying about these other great scourges of mankind. In a study of the white males from 20 to 65, the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. estimates that nearly 4 years could be added to working life expectancy at age 20 and that, for this entire group, the elimination of premature death through the control of the 15 major causes of deaths would add 178,500,000 working years to the labor force.

Do we need any more argument to convince us that the Nation would be healthier, stronger, and more prosperous if we stopped thinking in terms of catching the drip under the leaks and began to act in terms of more effective protection?

Another field in which investment in human resources pays off, and one in which the actual dollars and cents pay-off can be demonstrated with startling clarity, is the work of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, in the Federal Security Agency. Here are some facts:

If we do not rehabilitate a dependent person, it costs us, in public funds, anywhere between $500 and $1,400 each year to maintain that man and his family at a minimum level of subsistence. That cost goes right on, year after year. But instead of that, we can spend an average of $445 a year to rehabilitate a man and pay it only once. That man then removes himself and his family from the public-assistance lists—becomes a wage earner and family supporter; and within 5 years he has paid back through income tax alone, the total cost of his rehabilitation. Over the average life span of rehabilitated persons, every one of them pays back, on the average, directly to the Federal Government, in income taxes, ten times as much as it costs to rehabilitate him. In 1949 alone, the wage production of persons rehabilitated increased from $17,000,000 a year before rehabilitation to $93,000,000 after rehabilitation.

These dramatic demonstrations of the net returns that come through medical and health services and rehabilitation are matched by no less dramatic facts from many other fields of public investment. Just as a vast system of feeder roads, built mainly at public expense, is essential to the productive capacity of the Nation's farms; just as the industrial and agricultural potential of the Tennessee Valley has blossomed with the coming of electrical power and flood control, accompanied by wise programs of soil conservation and education; just as our great system of free elementary and secondary schools has given us a literate and intelligent people whose productive capacity has gone into the building of a nation strong and prosperous beyond anything that previous history or contemporary experience in other countries could dream—just so, the time has come to give clear and explicit recognition to the public and private benefit derived from investments in human welfare of all kinds.

We have long recognized that it is wise policy to replenish and renew our natural resources. Experience with the dust bowl of the 1930's in our great Southwest, with the denuding of our mountains by the timberman's axe, of the polluting of our streams and the decimation of wildlife—these experiences have taught us that mankind prospers only as natural resources are renewed at least as rapidly as they are consumed. Investments in human resources also pay off. But let me be clear that the case for such investment by no means rests solely on dollars and cents. Quite the contrary. The salvaging of human dignity which comes through every good deed of human sympathy is beyond money value. A genuine concern for one's fellows is firmly rooted in American tradition, and its fruits are of incalculable value. The quality of American life is better because of the spiritual heritage, which stresses this concern. And the quality of every community is better because hospitals and schools and playgrounds and libraries have been built and staffed and supported. Investments in human resources—in the dignity and worth of every human being—is beyond price or profit. The fact that they do pay off is not a justification. It is an additional dividend.

At the same time, these facts as to the economic value of this dividend provide an important perspective on the question of who pays for these investments.

Some people might put it this way—that Government investments in human resources

pay for themselves. That is true as far as it goes. But it is not the whole truth. It is also true that private investments in human resources pay for themselves—a fact to which every field of private business will testify.

For myself, I would prefer to put it this way: Wisely planned investments in human resources, both private and public, not only lift the quality of life by salvaging and preserving the dignity of man in the face of an impersonal society; these private and public investments pay off, too, through the strength and happiness and leisure and enjoyment of the people, and through the undergirding of our American way of life. And rightly planned, these investments in human resources also pay a rich dividend in dollar values– both through increased productivity and through saving great money losses which would have to be borne by the general public if these investments were not made.

II

It is one thing to say that investments in human resources pay for themselves. It is another thing to inquire as to the source of the funds for this investment.

In reality, the total amount invested in human welfare comes from one ultimate source, and only one: It comes out of what is produced. The funds invested in human resources are a charge on the gross national product. This is as it should be, because the return on these investments show up in exactly the same place—as increases in the gross national product. Investments in human resources are paid out of the national product, just as they, in turn, pay off with an increase in that product.

The flow of these funds for investment resources is principally through three channels: (a) Individual spending and donations are out of personal income; (b) corporate spending and donations out of corporate income; and (c) public spending out of tax revenues. Sometimes the investment is a personal one, as when a man sees his dentist regularly at his own cost, or when he gives to the community chest out of his personal income. Sometimes the investment is corporate, as when a company introduces measures of industrial health and safety or adds a pension plan or community recreation facilities to its operating budget. Both individuals and corporations contribute to the support of the voluntary and private philanthropic agencies and institutions which have played an important part in bringing this Nation to its present high level of well-being.

And I wish to leave no doubt in anyone's mind as to my attitude toward private philanthropy in its investments in human resources. The remarkable story of philanthropic effort in this Nation is one of the finest chapters in American history. It is the story of wise and expanding investments in human welfare, and its pay-off is undeniable. Every investment through private philanthropy, to the extent that it is a wise investment, means not merely the salvaging of the individuals benefiting from the philanthropy but also the enlargement and enrichment of the whole economy of the people.

But the total capital investment in human welfare cannot come exclusively through private and corporate donors—and even if it could, there are sound reasons why they should not be expected to carry the whole load. What private enterprises or philanthropies should or could undertake to rid the Nation of malaria? Many important investments in human resources and human welfare call for concerted action throughout a whole community, a whole State, the entire Nation. Sometimes these activities involve the use of the police power of the Government (as in controlling the pollution of water and air). In most cases they call for the kind of combined operations which can only be achieved through the full cooperation of all private and public agencies concerned.

Consider, for example, how far along we would be in education in this country if universal free compulsory schooling had not been adopted. We would still be in the days of the private tutor and the private academy for the children of the few, while the children of the many continued in illiteracy and ignorance. At the same time, our great private schools and universities are invaluable to sound education; thus public and private together further our national welfare. Where would transportation be today if local, State, and Federal Governments had not invested huge sums in free public highways? Motorists would be stopped at every crossroads to pay another toll, and our roads would be today where canals were a hundred years ago. It is not enough that a man patches the roof over his own particular bed, if he permits it to rain on the pantry and the parlor which others use as well as he, yet, since all will benefit from having a dry roof over the entire house, ought not all to share in putting on a good roof?

This, then, is the justification or public investment in addition to private investment in human resources: (1) sometimes the job is too big for private endeavor to do without public aid; (2) sometimes the job calls for the doing of things which only Government can do; and (3) since everybody benefits, it is only fair for everybody to share in the support.

There is a good deal of interest these days in the notion of a capital budget as it interprets the meaning of public expenditures for enduring purposes. It is argued with some cogency that the only fair way to interpret the total expenditure of Government is to divide that expenditure between the items which represent current operations and those which represent long-term investments. It is silly, for example, to put the entire costs of the Grand Coulee Dam into the budget for the years bracketed by its period of construction. Any wise industry takes its capital investments and sets up accounts which amortize the value of that investment over the life span of the capital goods purchased. Should not wise Government policy also begin to speak of the enduring investments which are annually paid for out of each budget, and let the investment itself be charged over against the life span of the capital goods which are purchased? And if there be any merit in that suggestion, then I am ready to urge a corollary which is at least as important. The same principle applies to investments in human resources. Funds invested in human welfare can properly be thought of as investments which pay back their returns over the life span of the people who benefit. Just as surely as a farmer's tractor which costs him $800 and lasts 8 years actually costs him only $100 a year for capital investment, so also $445 invested in the rehabilitation of a disabled worker who thereby becomes a productive worker for 30 years costs less than $15 a year over the life span of the man in whom that capital is invested.

Take education. Would anyone question that the money invested in a child's schooling pays dividends? And should the total cost of education be charged against the 12 to 16 years of school attendance—or against the whole lifetime during which the individual—and society—reap its benefits? Our investments in future scientists and skilled workers—and alert citizens—are as truly fundamental investments as our investments in highways and hydroelectric power.

My argument can now be summarized in a single sentence: Investments in human resources come out of the total national product, flow through both private and public channels as they are invested in human beings, and in turn pay off in an increased national product as well as in human happiness and effectiveness. These are what I term basic investments in human resources.

I am quite ready to leave entirely to the area of what is debatable any questions having to do with how much should be invested at what time in which human welfare enterprise. The free play of debate and discussion in the light of what research and experience uncover is the only means which a democratic people should employ in planning and making their investments in human resources or natural resources. But what I am unwilling to leave in the doubtful limbo of the undiscussed is the matter on which we have been speaking tonight. Investments in human resources are investments which (a) come out of the total national product and (b) feed back into the total national product at least as much as they cost—and usually much more than they cost—and can properly be considered as hard-headed, long-term investments.

III

I do not contend that the full justification of this investment can be measured in dollars and cents. On the contrary, at every step of my argument I have insisted that there are other dimensions which are primary and basic, and that the money return is simply an added dividend.

I am one of those—and there are many of us, both in and out of Government—who believe deeply in the practice of self-help and mutual aid, as these have come down to us through the Judeo-Christian tradition. I would be prepared to defend investments in human resources even if they did not pay off financially. It would be a strange kind of concern for one's fellows which would check each generous impulse with a prudential caution—just as it would be a futile concern which would debase each generous impulse into an empty day dream.

The practical argument in behalf of these investments comes, actually to this: bread cast upon the waters returns after many days—an ancient truth which we have on the best authority. Deep in the wellsprings of humanity is a noble impulse of human worth and human dignity on which we must and can rely, if our children are to realize the full stature of their heritage.

Address of Rev. George S. L. Connor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FOSTER FURCOLO
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 1, 1950

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, I thought the Members might be interested in the following address of welcome to Most Reverend Christopher Joseph Weldon, delivered by Rev. George S. L. Connor, on behalf of clergy, in Hotel Waldorf-Astoria, New York City, on March 24, 1950:

It is indeed a privilege to be permitted to say a brief word on this happy occasion for the priests and people of the diocese of Springfield. If a man would travel from New York City east and north through Connecticut he would come to the historic State of Massachusetts. If he entered that section nearest to New York he would find himself in a lovely country known as western Massachusetts. This is a land of thriving cities, historic towns, green meadows, rolling hills, winding rivers and purple-tinted mountains. There is in it a quiet beauty

and a refined magnificence that only the hand of God could bestow. In the north where the Green Mountains of Vermont cast their shadow over the verdant fields of Massachusetts, the majestic Connecticut flows gently on her course. A traveler following that river south, could see some of the strength and beauty of the diocese of Springfield. Greenfield, the gateway to the Mohawk Trail would be his first stop. He would find there broad streets and spreading elms, green fields and colonial homes, but he would find there too a vigorous church, with magnificent school, and a Catholic hospital caring for the sick of this lovely section. Below Greenfield the river feeds a farm land second to none in the East. Great fields of tobacco and onions line her banks and stretch off to the rolling hills in the distance. A sturdy Polish people with the background of their Christian faith has gradually taken over these farms from their Yankee neighbors, and the historic towns of Deerfield and Hatfield and Hadley know now the sound of marching feet on the way to Catholic worship. Still following the river our traveler would come to the beautiful city of Northampton. This is the center of a section, where education is a business, and where the renowned colleges of Smith, Mount Holyoke, Amherst, and University of Massachusetts cater to the youth of this land. The church is standing guard there, striving earnestly to protect the sound principles of Christianity in a youth that needs this protection. She stands there not in the spirit of apology or defense but with an aggressiveness that makes even the scoffer stop and investigate. And because the truth is in her she is winning converts from a group that ridiculed her claims because, though scholars, they never knew the beauty of her doctrine.

Still the river rolls on toward the sea. Her banks grow farther apart, her descent becomes more rapid, she develops more power as she rushes into Holyoke to turn the wheels of industry in a city that will make our new bishop proud and happy. Nestling along the banks of the majestic Connecticut she has imbibed into her spirit some of the grandeur and grace of the river that enfolds her. She has a heart to love and a will to do, and these she has used most effectively in producing a way of life that marks her distinctly as a genuine Catholic city. She has magnificent churches, many of them; a Catholic school population larger than the public-school enrollment, hospitals, day nursery, two old people's homes, two orphanages, a mother house of the Sisters of Providence, and many other evidences of a faith that is deep and productive. The faith has been well planted in Holyoke.

Just below on the other side of the river lies the city of Chicopee, the home of the first Catholic school in our diocese, and the site of our Diocesan College of Our Lady of the Elms. Chicopee is a city composed of Poles, French, and Irish, with a few Yankees thrown in to keep the peace. The churches there are numerous, the schools strong, the faith deep, and the Catholic way of life the accepted rule in a city where three-fourths of the population claim allegiance to our church. As you stand in Chicopee on the banks of the Connecticut you look across to the thriving town of West Springfield. It is a lovely rambling town clinging for miles to the river's bank and quietly surveying the activities of her busier neighbors on the other shore. West Springfield is served by four progressive parishes, but West Springfield serves the whole diocese by the prayers of her cloistered Dominican Nuns and by the incomparable work of the Bishop O'Leary retreat house conducted by the zealous Passionist Fathers.

Two bridges lead from west Springfield to the heart of the Episcopal See. Springfield is known as the city of homes. It is a good name, and we trust always she may live up to it. Springfield is a good place in which to live, and we know that Bishop Weldon will find there a home in the truest sense of that word with all the joy and comfort that only a real home may bring. Springfield is a center of industry and commerce but with a background of culture and refinement that makes living there a delightful experience for one who seeks the good things in life. No more about Springfield for a new bishop soon finds out all there is to know about his Episcopal city.

But is there no more to the diocese of Springfield? Oh, yes. If you journey directly westward from the Episcopal city you will enjoy an experience that has thrilled many who have traveled broadly in this glorious land of ours. Eight miles from Springfield you will find yourself in the hustling city of Westfield. It is not big in population, but it is big in spirit, where people of many nations have joined forces to make a community where living is good. The church is there, too, speaking many languages, but teaching one doctrine, the saving doctrine of Christ's divine revelation.

Still traveling westward you come to the foothills of the Berkshires, and soon begin the climb up Jacob's ladder. And as you climb you readily see a striking resemblance to the ladder of Jacob's dream. For the rugged beauty of the mountains, the tumbling waters of the onrushing streams, the myriads of majestic trees piercing the heavens, the whole scene flooded with a greenness greener than anything this side of Ireland, gives one a foretaste of the heaven, where the scriptural ladder terminated.

From the summit, 2,300 feet above sea level, you may feast your eyes on the beauty of the Berkshires unfolding before you. Down in the valley how eagerly you seek out the secluded grandeur of Lenox, the soft beauty of Stockbridge, the entrancing loveliness of Great Barrington, and the arresting peace of all the towns nestling so gently at the foot of the Berkshires. In all these towns churches as beautiful as the hills that enfold them minister to the needs of a devout Catholic people, while the great religious orders taking over the elaborate estates of the rich have skillfully turned them to the works of religion.

Turning north at Lenox this road takes you through a vista of enchanting scenery until suddenly it bends and there below you is the city of Pittsfield, the heart of the Berkshire hills. Pittsfield is an unusual city. Today she is highly industrialized, her marts of commerce are busy, and yet she retains some of the quiet elegance, the rustic charm, the inviting friendliness of the days when the horse and carriage with pomp paraded down her aristocratic, elm-shaded South Street. The catholicity of Pittsfield, like the city, is unusual. The people are friendly, cooperative, and highly progressive. Parishes there have multiplied very rapidly, schools have been built, a magnificent Central High School crowning them all, a modern, perfectly equipped St. Luke's Hospital cares for the sick and infirm, and a Catholic Community Center caters to the recreational and social needs of the people. Pittsfield is a progressive city.

The last leg of the journey takes you northward. Skirting the mighty Greylock Mountain you pass through the Catholic town of Adams with her three splendid parishes, and come to the city in the mountains, North Adams. This is a rugged city for the mountains dip down almost to the main street, and the people in it are rugged. They have four excellent parishes with three schools and a central high school where the Sisters of St. Joseph have been training the youth of several generations. A step out of North Adams and you are in Vermont. A step on the other side and you are back in New York. This is the end of your journey. This, Bishop Weldon, is your diocese. It is a good diocese with a fine historical background, and many of us love it sincerely. Because we love it we are happy today to welcome as our new bishop the excellent choice of our holy father, Most Reverend Christopher Joseph Weldon. We can't do much for you today except to proffer our obedience and our love. These we give you gladly with the assurance that you will have a long life as bishop of Springfield. We have an unique pattern for our bishops there. We treat them so kindly; we make their living so pleasant; we remove so many difficulties from their path that they live many, many years to preside over the destinies of our diocese. In our 78 years as a diocese only three bishops have occupied the episcopal throne. Patrick Thomas O'Reilly served 22 years. Thomas Daniel Beaven directed us for 28 years, and our late beloved Bishop, Thomas Mary O'Leary was with us for 28 years. This further fact is worthy of comment, we kept all of them so well so long that an auxiliary bishop never lived in the confines of our diocese. Be of good heart, then, Bishop Weldon. Your stay with us should be long and happy. We are receiving you in the full flower of your young, vigorous, manhood. Your every movement gives indication of a healthy body and a contented mind. We like you that way, and a loyal clergy, a zealous sisterhood, and a devoted laity will do everything to keep you as you are, a noble successor of the 12 apostles of Christ.

Your record is known to us. We have been thrilled by your achievements in the priesthood. Your service in the Navy of our country has won the admiration of all. By the favor of His Eminence, Cardinal Spellman, I was charged as vicar delegate in the Military Ordinariate to visit at their posts all the chaplains of New England. On one occasion I called at the naval air station at Quonset Point, R. I. Did you ever visit Quonset Point? It is the station de luxe of the Navy. It is the aristocrat of the air force. It has an officers' club that would do justice to any institution in the land. We met there the chaplain in charge. He was an upstanding, intelligent, vigorous young priest, who organized skillfully the spiritual activities under his control. He understood perfectly why he was in the Navy and he permitted nothing to interfere with his work as a priest. The type of priest in the service was universally good, but in my memory two stood out above the others, and one of them was Christopher J. Weldon. This estimate of his worth was later confirmed by the commanding officer of his ship, who termed him "the ideal chaplain of a fighting ship," and the Secretary of the Navy, who stated that "his outstanding record in the Navy as a wartime chaplain was a noteworthy one."

The thought of service seems to have permeated his whole life. Everything he has turned his hand to he has done well, and his hand and his heart have been turned to many things. His priesthood is the dominating factor of his life. It so consumes his being that the days seem too short to carry out its divine mission. A bishop is the servant of servants, and what an ideal bishop this man will be, who has made service the driving force of his life. His best friend communicating with me has said, "wherever he might serve that area will profit by his service, and come to glory in his complete dedication to the cause. I am glad and proud that this will be in Springfield." Thus spoke his best friend, and thus we speak. We are glad and proud that Springfield will be the object of his loving care, and that ours shall be the joy to glory in his complete dedication to our cause. In return we promise him the undivided support of priestly men, and the prayerful service of many priests.

Our bishop—ad multos annos.

The Late Generoso Pope, Sr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 1, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, it was with great sorrow that I learned of the death last Friday of Generoso Pope, Sr., and I want to join with many of my colleagues in paying tribute to a truly great man.

Gene Pope's passing brings to an end a colorful, dynamic, and distinguished career. He came to America from Italy a penniless young immigrant and secured a job as water boy with one of the construction companies in New York. Through diligence and hard work he rose to the top through the ranks, became a construction superintendent, and later established his own construction company.

In the 1920's he purchased the Il Progresso Italo-Americano, which, through his guidance, became the largest Italian-American daily newspaper in the country.

As a publisher and editor, with clarity and forcefulness he made known to the people of America his thoughts upon social, economic, and political problems. His was never a doubting voice. He was a positive character, sure of the rightness of his convictions, and loyal always to them.

Throughout his lifetime countless individuals were the beneficiaries of his works and America is likewise the real beneficiary of his good deeds.

Progress is not automatic. The world grows better because people wish that it should and because they take the right steps to make it better. Gene Pope played his full part in the destiny of America. He was known for his outstanding citizenship and his many philanthropic works.

He was the masterful advocate of many humanitarian, educational, political, and religious causes and exerted wide influence. We respect him for his undaunted courage and the energy and devotion with which he championed all just causes.

He was loyal to the very core of his being, loyal to his friends and family, loyal to the country which gave him birth, and loyal to his adopted country which gave him opportunity.

He recognized the fact that he owed much to America and made a magnificent individual contribution to the inspiration, the courage, and the strength of his adopted land. In turn, America owes much to men like him who, by giving of their best energies and talents, have done much to guarantee its future existence not only as a free country for Americans but the hope of the freedom-loving people of the entire world.

Not only will the Italian-American people miss him—all America will mourn him. It was my privilege to know him personally, and to know him was to love him. His death is a personal blow to me.

To his widow and his family, I extend my sincere and heartfelt sympathy in their great sorrow.

The World's Monetary Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 26, 1950

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, there is inserted herewith an interesting and illuminating article on the problems confronting our country and I may say the other nations of the world by Mr. Frank Lilly, prominent mining statistician of Spokane, Wash. Mr. Lilly's article follows:

THE WORLD'S MONETARY PROBLEMS

Problems! Problems! Problems!—they abound throughout the world. There are problems of war, problems of peace. There are problems of overproduction and surpluses. There are problems of shortages and starvation. There are Communist problems, Socialist problems, health problems, and disease problems. There are social problems, racial problems, and political problems. There are labor problems, industrial problems, and housing problems. There are defense problems, offense problems, tax problems, debt problems, economic problems, etc., and almost ad infinitum.

When thoroughly analyzed, all of the major problems largely resolve themselves into monetary problems. Wars cannot be waged without money. Peace cannot be attained or maintained without money. In fact, one may say without fear of successful contradiction that monetary problems are at the root of wars, and a corollary of this fact is that peace can be established and maintained only by an honest monetary system.

No one can deny that most of the health problems of the world could be solved, or at least ameliorated, with money. Money would solve most of our social problems and even some of our political problems. In fact, money is in itself a good and positive force; it is only the greed for money ("love of money") and the greed for the power that money gives that is evil.

The essayist Swift said that "Money should be in the heads of men and not in their hearts." I interpret this statement to mean that money is a proper subject for thinking and not for feeling. Unfortunately, most of the things that people believe they know about money are really what they feel about it.

A little boy from the city slums was spending a few weeks at a summer camp under the direction of a social worker who, one day when some baby chicks were hatching, pointed out how wonderful it was that the little chicks had been given an instinct with which to solve the problem of getting out of their shells. The little boy's comment was: "Yeah, but the big problem is how in hell did the chicks get into the shells."

Therefore, before discussing the way out of the world's monetary problems, I propose that we first consider how we got into the shell.

LOOKING BACKWARD

Briefly reviewing world history, you will recall that, beginning with Greece, or, further back with Assyria and Babylonia, and coming on down to the present, the great nations have thrived up to the point where they became greedy and sought by war to grab the wealth of their neighbors. All of them succeeded to an extent, but, in the end, the wars they waged finally plunged them into the debts that destroyed them.

Debts and the Devil are the two greatest negative forces in the world. Debt, because it is negative, enslaves men and brings decay to civilizations and death to nations. A man who is in debt is, in effect, a slave to his creditors and slavery fosters injustice. Debt is, substantially, synonymous with danger, disaster, dishonesty, disease, decline, dissipation, and death.

The D-bomb of debt is a far greater danger to the world than the A-bomb or the H-bomb. The A-bomb can, of course, kill in units of thousands and possibly the H-bomb could kill in units of tens of thousands. The D-bomb can kill the souls and destroy, through the slow death of its moral fiber, the millions of the greatest of nations.

This bomb destroyed Greece, and when Rome plunged into debt, it, too, was doomed. The Roman Government, by the way, resorted to every monetary device known to the modern banking system, including the fixing of prices, wages, etc. and resorted to every financial trick that in recent years has been used throughout the world in an effort to manage its monetary system, but to no avail.

Thinking men of that day saw the dangers of inflation, deflation, and managed currency, but the demagogues and do-gooders prevailed, and finally, when people would no longer accept the dishonest money which had been created out of and on its debt. Rome fell and plunged the world into 600 years of darkness because there was no honest money with which to maintain the industrial and cultural elements essential to civilization.

Until the time of Nero, Roman money was honest, hard money, principally in the form of the 99-percent pure silver denarius, but there was not enough silver denarii and gold to provide the honest money that the Roman Empire, which was being expanded by wars, needed to meet the mounting debt. Therefore, as in our day, currencies in the form of credits issued in exchange for a debt, were utilized.

The time came, during the reign of Diocletian, when it took 1,440 of these promissory denarii, or the equivalent of $216, to buy a pound of steak. The hoarding of gold and silver had started in the meantime and metal money all but disappeared. Finally, after the more prudent Romans had converted their currency into bullion, real estate, jewelry, and anything else that had concrete value, the debt-based Roman currency went the way that was subsequently followed by the paper currency of Kubla Khan in China, the continental currency in the United States, the assignats in France, the mark in Germany, and so forth.

TODAY'S WORLD DEBTS

What is the debt situation as it exists in the world today? Almost unbelievably, most of the nations of the world are in debt, the United States most of all. In 1914, before the First World War, the public debt of the United States was only a little over a billion dollars. Today it is over $255,000,000,000. In other words, our debt is now over 250 times as much as in 1914. The debt of France is 56 times what it was in 1914. Canada's debt is 32 times; Great Britain's debt, 35 times; Australia's, 8 times; India's, 4 times; and Mexico's, 3 times.

In comparison with 1938, the United States debt has increased six and one-half times; France's, five times; Canada's, five times; Great Britain's, three times; Australia's, two times; and India's, two times; Mexico and

Venezuela, on the other hand, have reduced their debts.

There is a fallacy in the widespread assumption that because the debt of the United States is largely owed to its own people, it is not really an important matter. This fallacy can best be appreciated when we reduce the situation to a family basis. One or more members of a family may borrow from other members of the family, including cousins and other relatives but if, for any reason, these debts are not paid, someone loses. We all know how often this happens in the best of families and with the best of intentions on the part of the debtor.

There is a great deal of fuzzy thinking about debts because too often both the creditor and the debtor tend to think of the debt as an asset. Sam had loaned Rastus $20, for which he received a note. Time passed, as it will, and Rastus had made no payment. Finally Sam collared him and said, "Now Rastus, if you don't pay this note, I'se gwine tear it up." To this threat, Rastus indignantly replied, "You all tears up my note and I'se gwine to have the law on you."

Our national debt far exceeds the total assessed value of all the taxable property in this country. The per capita debt is approximately $1,700. Note in this connection that if you now own $1,500 worth of Government bonds, you are, nevertheless, approximately $200 in debt.

It is beside the point that the first World War and the Second were inevitable and that the greater part of the debt was justified by the circumstances. The important point is that the debt must, in the end, be paid or repudiated. Incidentally, it cannot be paid in a currency created by debt because that would amount to piling Ossa upon Pelion, compounding the debt.

It is elementary that the value of a note or a bill is not in the debt involved, but lies in the ability of the debtor to fulfill the promise to pay. And this is true not only for individuals but also for nations.

Without the shadow of a doubt, the American Colonies intended to pay the currency they authorized and obligated themselves to pay, but they could not do so and the continentals became worthless in spite of the fact that by law they were legal tender. In the autumn of 1779, Congress spurned the idea of repudiation as ridiculous but less than five months later it undertook to redeem the continentals on the basis of 40 paper dollars for one silver dollar—and failed.

The founding fathers, aware of the dangers inherent in paper promise-to-pay currency, expressly stipulated that United States money should be gold and silver coins, and delegated to Congress the power to regulate the value thereof. Thus, only gold and silver coins comply with the monetary provisions of the United States Constitution.

THE WAY IN

How did it happen that we got our present "shell" of debt-based currency notes and bills system in which it is illegal for a citizen to possess either gold coin or bullion, and in which silver is given minor role to paper currency? The answer is, debt, primarily created by war and, incidentally, by political expediency.

Actually, the monetary situation in the United States today is strikingly similar to what it was in Rome when Rome was lured away from honest hard money into the managed soft currencies that resulted in inflation, deflation, debt moratoriums, interest cancellations, bank holidays, land banks established to help the farmers—and finally disaster.

War-debt currency is tainted with blood and tears because it is the ill-begotten child of Mars. Such currency is dishonest in that it exacts an indirect and hidden tax by reason of the fact that it is based upon an interest-bearing debt.

In connection with our Federal Reserve notes, Congressman COMPTON I. WHITE points out that the way in which this currency is created is "fine except for the taxpayer. * * * The Government puts up its bonds that bear interest in exchange for Federal Reserve notes that do not bear interest." Incidentally, it is not generally recognized that the Federal Reserve banks are not Government agencies.

Debt-based currency is good only for spending and for loans upon which to collect interest; it is not sound saving money because it has no intrinsic value. Such currency is only a medium of exchange and a measure of price; it is not real money because it lacks storage of value, which gold and silver money provide.

Gold and silver are fundamental and universal forms of wealth. They were created and stored in the bosom of the earth by the Almighty and can be obtained only by the sweat of man's brow. Either in the form of coin or bullion, they are forms of wealth whose value cannot be wholly destroyed, even by fire. Gold and silver money is honest money because it provides a permanent storage of value in addition to serving as a medium of exchange and a measure of price.

In this connection, one should bear in mind that no business, no form of insurance, no social security can be considered safe unless money is sound. No substitute can be as good as the thing for which it is substituted. The fact that debt-based paper currencies are being widely used as a substitute for hard money does not make them money. A wooden leg is not the same thing as a blood, bone, and muscle leg. You can walk with a wooden leg, but you can't run very fast nor jump very far if, in a pinch, you need to do so in order to protect yourself against an accident. Debt-based currency is a wooden leg.

The contention that confidence makes paper debt-based currency the equal of hard money is at best a half-truth for, in any event, it applies only as long as confidence is maintained. Confidence is a mental attitude and may or may not be justified by subsequent events. The Germans were, up to a certain point, confident that they would win the recent war, but—

DEBT-BOMB EXPLOSIONS

The Roman Empire's D-bomb finally exploded in a chain reaction of inflation-deflation-repudiation that plunged the civilization of Europe and Asia Minor into almost total darkness. No nation can long endure when there is no inducement for it to labor and produce and store away in honest money the fruit of its efforts.

Kublai Khan and his Mongol army came close to conquering all of Europe, but his debt problem, which he attempted to solve with paper notes, conquered both him and the huge Chinese Empire that had, during the thirteenth century, grown into the world's major power. Debt-based currency brought inflation, which, in turn, was followed by deflation and repudiation.

During a period of 200 years, up to 1780, France defaulted 56 times. Complete repudiation came in 1796. By frequent recourse to devaluation of its present currency, finally down to a mere fraction of what it was at the beginning of the First World War, another repudiation has been avoided. Germany's repudiation was, of course, complete; its paper currency finally becoming worth less than the paper on which it was printed. Czarist Russia's paper currency obligations were also completely repudiated. Note, however, that the value of German, French, and Russian gold coins have, in the meantime, more than doubled, even in terms of United States currency.

GOLD VALUE INCREASES

England has met its major debt crises by increases in the measuring value of gold in its monetary system and/or devaluations which, in effect, have given gold a higher working value in the country's economy.

In England, gold was priced at the equivalent of $4.05 an ounce around the middle of the fourteenth century. Approximately a century later, the price was more than doubled to approximately $10 an ounce to offset the debt incurred during the War of the Roses. By the time of Henry VIII, debts had again increased and the price of gold was raised to nearly $15 an ounce. The debt of the Marlborough wars brought on an increase to $24.33 an ounce. This figure proved to be a little higher than necessary and the price reacted to around $21. Following the Napoleonic Wars, the price advanced to above $24 and was finally pegged at $20.67 an ounce on a 16-to-1 basis with silver, which was ample at the time because silver was also an integral part of the monetary system with a fixed price of $1.25 an ounce.

The chain reaction of the D-bomb is illustrated by the events that followed the First World War. Great Britain was forced off the gold standard in 1918 and by 1920 the price of gold reached $27.49 an ounce in the free market which was then permitted in London. In 1925 the gold standard was restored on the basis of the old $20.67 an ounce, but, as this figure was not realistic in relation to the debt, Great Britain was again forced, in September 1931, to abandon the gold standard and by 1933 the gold price was higher than ever, at $30.38 an ounce.

In the meantime, Germany had liquidated its debt by repudiation, and France had devalued the franc both in terms of sterling and the dollar. Then, inasmuch as gold had a higher purchasing value in terms of foreign currencies than the United States price of $20.67, gold began to flow out of the United States. The final result was depression and the so-called bank holiday, which forced the United States off the gold standard despite the fact that the price of gold was increased in 1934—at least 2 years too late—to $35 an ounce.

Germany's "D" bomb exploded despite the World Bank, League of Nations, Dawes plan, Young plan, and United States aid. This explosion spread by chain reaction, so to speak, to every other country in the world, finally hitting the United States with the most disastrous depression of modern times.

Then, because all of the leading nations failed to recognize the dangers inherent in soft debt-based currencies and overlooked the fact that there is no substitute for honest money, the stage was set for World War II.

History repeats itself because each generation of mankind tends to make the same mistakes. Thus, history has been repeated in the post-World War II inflations that have wound up with repudiation in Hungary and Greece and the devaluations that have, to date, occurred in every leading country of the world except the United States and Switzerland. Because Switzerland's money is backed 100 percent with gold, devaluation can be avoided there, but can the United States do so—that is the question and the problem:

The fact that we have more gold than all other countries combined is offset by the fact that our debt is proportionately much larger and our monetary requirements enormous. Past experience has shown that a national debt should not be more than four times larger than the value of the gold supply, and the paper currency and check credit supply should not be more than 60 percent greater. Actually, this country's national debt is ten times larger than the value of our gold at $35 an ounce, and its paper currency and check credit supply, 500 percent greater.

WHAT TO DO?

We can take a page out of history and give gold a larger measure of value or, in other

words, give it a price that will enable it to do more work in the monetary system. This is a tried and proven method that makes sense. The past has demonstrated time and time again that a monetary system consisting of debt-based currency is doomed to failure. Such currency is at best useful only under fair weather conditions; when the rains come the shifting sands on which it is built give way and the house falls apart.

There is no point in being married, so to speak, to a $35-an-ounce price any more than there was to the $20.67 price, or any of the still lower prices of past history. We couldn't hold the price of bread to 5 cents a loaf; why should we expect to be able to hold gold at that equivalent? We cannot, in fact, do it, and we run grave risk in trying to do so: Depression and/or repudiation.

We know what happened when Great Britain devalued its currency in 1931—that country got a large part of our gold because the gold had greater buying power in that country—$30.38 there as against $20.67 here. Great Britain's devaluation in September of last year gave gold a $60.79 measure of value in that country as compared with $35 here. No wonder our exports have declined and our imports increased. And the end of devaluation is not yet, for England and the sterling-bloc countries need more gold—lots of it.

As a matter of fact, since last September 41 different countries have by devaluation increased the measure of gold in their currencies in order to get more gold into their monetary systems.

Russia devalued its currency 90 percent in the latter part of 1947. Then on March 1 of this year Russia revalued the ruble in terms of gold, not at the old rate of $35 an ounce (since she did not have enough gold to make that practical), but realistically, by increasing its measure of value upward to the equivalent of $79.10 an ounce. Obviously, it does not require as much gold at $79.10 an ounce to provide currency backing as it does at $35. And because gold obtained at $35 an ounce in trading with us has a buying power of $79.10 in Russia, that country will get the gold and the trade of its ruble-bloc countries and also, in all probability, some of our gold, as Great Britain and the sterling-bloc countries have been doing since their devaluations of last September.

This country avoided repudiation of United States notes following the Civil War only for two reasons: (1) Approximately half the debt was wiped out by repudiation of Confederate currency; (2) mining development of the West was encouraged by a free market and higher prices for gold and by the Government, especially President Abraham Lincoln, with the result that the new gold and silver produced was soon sufficient to provide for redemption in honest hard money.

To debts which this country incurred in two world wars have now been added the burden of unpaid debts owed to us and our aid to foreign countries. There is no chance this time that the mines of the West can produce the enormous amounts of gold and silver that we need, even if mining were encouraged instead of being, as it is, discouraged and restricted.

The inherent power of gold properly measured and utilized is the only sure solution for the world's monetary problems which, when solved, will in turn provide a solution for most of its other major problems, and while Congress delays in regulating the value of gold upward as an initial step toward reestablishing honest constitutional money, the United States is going deeper and deeper into debt with more and more debt-based currency.

As for a solution to our debt problem, there are only two ways out of the present situation: (1) Ultimate repudiation; (2) a realistic revaluation of gold at a figure that will give it the larger measure of value needed to provide an honest monetary system based on hard money. Repudiation? No. A larger measure of value for gold? Yes. We can and should take the path of honest money. Will we do it?

National Science Foundation Act Among Great Accomplishments of the Eighty-first Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 27, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, among the accomplishments of the Eighty-first Congress, the importance of which will come greater and greater into realization with the unfolding of the future ahead, was the passage of the bill establishing a National Science Foundation.

With ours the responsibility of world leadership, and the fountains of basic science in the Old World upon which we had drawn dried up and no longer available to our need in the application thereof, it was imperative that we provide here in the United States a source of knowledge in the realm of basic science keeping us ever ready while in the today to step, prepared, into the tomorrow.

The fact that the heads of our great universities, I believe without exception, and our eminent scientists and educators generally, united in urging upon the Congress legislation establishing this Foundation is sufficient to show its importance. Briefly, it was a matter of making provision, and immediately, for the creation of a well of basic science in the United States or of starting on the slip backward as scientific progress might advance elsewhere and we were outdistanced.

As the Representative of the Second District in Illinois, wherein is located the University of Chicago, having on its faculty so many scientists of world-wide renown, I felt there devolved upon me in the faithful representation of my constituency the duty to support this measure not merely by my vote when it reached the floor of the House but also by all honorable means open to me prior to the reporting out of the bill.

DR. GERARD'S PRESENTATION HELPS

Thus, on June 9, 1949, I requested and was granted unanimous consent to include in my extended remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the address of Ralph W. Gerard, professor of physiology at the University of Chicago, delivered at the St. Louis, Mo., meeting of the American Association of University Professors. The forceful presentment of the arguments for a National Science Foundation in the article by Dr. Gerard, as printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 95, part 14, pages A3635–A3637, as part of my extended remarks, I feel, was most helpful in creating among many of my colleagues an intensified interest in the pending legislation.

THIRTY EMINENT EDUCATORS SPEAK

On July 5, 1949—see extension of my remarks on pages A4275–A4276, volume 95, part 15, of the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—I again called to the attention of the House the importance of the measure establishing a National Science Foundation. I included in my remarks excerpts from letters favoring the Science Foundation received from 17 eminent scientists and educators in the Second District of Illinois and the names of 13 other scientists and educators of high standing in my district who had written me in like manner.

LOYALTY OF SCIENTISTS

In my remarks on that day—July 5, 1949—I said, as bearing upon provisions which had been suggested in the name of national security but which many thought were carried to the extreme of unnecessarily casting a reflection upon the unquestioned loyalty of our scientists and educators:

> The question that will be presented to us is not, I think, one that relates to national security. If it were such, I of course, would support the provision. In two wars, in one just passing 15, and in the other past draft age and the father of four children, I think that my loyalty to country was placed where never it could be an issue.
>
> But I do not believe that we strengthen the security of country by placing our scientists and our educators in the category of suspicious persons. The greatness of America has been that in America free men have enjoyed freedom of thought. We wisely have accorded to all citizens the presumption of loyalty to the same extent that we have presumed them to be law abiding. Under the orderly processes there is a procedure to be followed when there is violation of the criminal laws, and this procedure has always protected us against the criminal acts and conspiracies of those who would use, or advocate the use of, violence in the overthrow of Government.

DEBATE ON FLOOR OF HOUSE

On February 27, 1950, the National Science Foundation bill being under debate in the House, I spoke in its support and stated that I had received over 100 letters from the distinguished members and great scientists of the faculty of the University of Chicago who were united in saying that there was no legislation pending that, in their opinion, was more necessary to continue the predominance of the United States in industry as well as in science and to assure its security. Yielding to the distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER], the following colloquy took place, as reported on pages 2413–2414 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, February 27, 1950:

> Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?
>
> Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.
>
> Mr. CROSSER. Does the gentleman know that the president of Harvard, the president of Cornell, the president of Columbia, and the presidents of any number of the other big institutions that rank with the institution which the gentleman from Illinois referred have been begging for this legislation?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I thank the gentleman from Ohio for his contribution in making it perfectly clear that the great educators of the Nation are pretty thoroughly in accord in their endorsement of the plan for a National Science Foundation as set forth in the measure before us.

THE SMITH AMENDMENT

On February 28, 1950, an amendment was offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] which I understand was hastily drawn by the author during the heat and excitement of a debate which had carried into the evening and which was adopted without the careful study which, under ordinary circumstances, it would have received. In fairness to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia I wish to say that I do not believe it was his intention that the amendment offered by him should have gone as far as it did in according to the FBI the authority not merely of investigation but of passing judgment.

I, with a few others, voted against the Smith amendment, but on March 1, 1950, when the National Service Foundation bill, as amended, came to a roll call on first passage, I voted affirmatively. The bill was passed, 247 to 126, as shown by the roll call appearing on page 2603 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 1, 1950.

DANGER OF POLICE STATISM

But before voting for the bill, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] and I, in speeches from the well of the House, pointed out the unprecedented lengths to which it appeared on careful study and analysis the Smith amendment would carry us in the direction of a police state. The gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] and I stated that we would vote for the bill with the expectation that the conferees would eliminate the objectionable features of the Smith amendment, but if the bill came back from conference with the amendment we would vote against the bill.

In my remarks from the well of the House I said, as reported on page 2581 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 1, 1950.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. * * * yesterday in committee I voted against the Smith amendment, and in so voting I was responding to the sentiment of the good, patriotic people of the district I represent.

This amendment would go further in the establishment of a police state than anything that has been suggested up to this time by the most rabid advocate of police statism. It does not end with ordering a police investigation of every person applying for a scholarship. It goes much further—to hitherto unheard-of lengths. It gives the investigating police the power to exclude the applicant on a police finding, without hearing and without judicial review, that such applicant, in the opinion of the police, is not loyal. I am sure that Mr. Hoover of the FBI would be the first to say that such power—the power both to investigate and to pass judgment—should not be vested in his or any other policing body.

Furthermore, the Smith amendment makes ineligible any applicant who at any time, whether with knowledge and disloyal intent or not, belonged to an organization which the Attorney General later declared subversive.

When hysteria goes to the extreme of making the billy of the policeman the crosier of benediction, it is time that we got back to common sense and the good, old-fashioned sort of American patriotism.

PUBLIC SENTIMENT AROUSED

The dangerous lengths to which the Smith amendment would carry the policing power—far beyond its proper and legitimate field—far beyond what the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD], and I felt strongly Mr. Hoover of the FBI would wish and approve—immediately following the remarks in the well of the House on March 1, 1950, referred to, became the subject of wide discussion in educational circles and in the editorial columns of the newspapers of the Nation. The Washington Post, I might add, is entitled to a large measure of credit for the intelligent manner in which it gave both editorial and news coverage to a matter which so vitally affected the very fundamentals of our democracy.

OPPOSITION OF SCIENTISTS

In the extension of my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—see pages A1810–A1811—I included a letter from Cyril Stanley Smith, director of the Institute for the Study of Metals, University of Chicago, which sets forth in clarifying manner the sound objections of the scientists and educators of the Nation to the Smith amendment.

On March 13, 1950, I extended my remarks to include an article by Clifford Grobstein, vice chairman of the Federation of American Scientists—see page A1863 of the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—and on March 28, 1950, included a letter from Joseph E. Mayer, of the faculty of the Institute for Nuclear Studies of the University of Chicago. On that occasion, I said, as reported on page A2268 of the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, among the scientists and educators of the Nation, as I have remarked on other occasions, there is a strong feeling that the great promise held forth both to our industrial development and our security by the National Science Foundation bill is sadly dimmed by the Smith amendment. This feeling is growing, and I am sure my colleagues would wish to give the subject further study in the light of the intelligent and well-considered objections raised in so many quarters of unquestioned loyalty.

REPORT OF THE CONFEREES

On April 26, 1950, the conferees filed their report, which appears on pages 5828 to 5834, inclusive, of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under that date, and on April 27, 1950, the House agreed to the conference report. Concerning the amendment which he had offered and which had been adopted—although not by unanimous vote—the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] said, as reported on page 5907 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 27, 1950:

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. * * * It was hastily drawn. It was subject to the objection that it required the FBI to evaluate as well as secure the information. I am glad to be corrected in that respect. I think the language now adequately covers what I had in mind, and I am very happy that the conferees should have worked the matter out as carefully as they have.

I wish to join, Mr. Speaker, with my colleague from Virginia in complimenting the conferees on returning to us a bill for which all of us who support the establishment of a National Science Foundation could vote with that good conscience which is possible only when in our voting there is no violence to the fundamental principles of our individual convictions. I would compliment also the gentleman from Virginia on his forthrightness and honest frankness in stating that the amendment, having been hastily drawn, went further than he had intended and that, his attention being called to it, he was glad to be corrected.

DANGER IN COLD-WAR HYSTERIA

No one in this body, I am sure, wants in our United States of America a police state. The danger we face is that in the period of a cold war the hasty consideration of measures conscientiously proposed in the spirit of loyalty and patriotism for reasons of security nevertheless may result if passed without calm and poised consideration in destruction of the very rights and liberties we seek to preserve. A cold war is characterized as a war of nerves. May I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that in the Congress of the United States we well may continue to exercise an eternal vigilance against the infiltration into this Chamber and into our deliberations of that hysteria to be expected when nerves are unstrung and cool judgment is dethroned. The best proof to the country that calm reasoning, and an honest attempt by all Members to reach common grounds of understanding, prevail in this Chamber over hysteria is furnished by the manner in which the disputed phases of the National Science Foundation bill were worked out to the general satisfaction.

EXCERPTS FROM FORD LETTER

I commend to the country, and especially to the scientists and educators who were so much concerned, a reading of the full text of the conference report which is to be found on pages 5899–5906, inclusive, of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 26, 1950.

Chief of the objections to the Smith amendment voiced by me in my remarks from the well of the House on March 1, 1950, prior to the vote on the bill as amended, were, first, the amendment gave to the FBI the power not only to investigate but to pass judgment, an extension of authority which I expressed the opinion Mr. Hoover would not wish or approve; and second, it made ineligible for scholarship any person who at any time, whether with intent or not to join in disloyal activities, had belonged to an organization later declared by the Attorney General to be subversive.

On these points the letter of the Honorable Peyton Ford, the Assistant to the Attorney General, which was adopted by and included in the report of the conferees, stated:

Concerning point 1:

To place the Bureau in the position of an evaluating agency regarding the loyalty of persons affected by this legislation is fraught with peril, not only to the Bureau itself, but also to the country at large. In the opinion of the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation (Mr. Hoover), with which I

agree, such legislation would constitute a clear departure from accepted fundamental theories of American Government and lay a foundation of criticism of the Bureau as a state police organization.

Concerning point 2:

It is also to be noted that the amendments, in precluding the employment of, or the awarding of a scholarship to, any person who has at any time been a member of any subversive organization seeks to deny to the Foundation the services of many Americans of unquestioned loyalty to the United States and its form of government who innocently joined a so-called front organization with the highest motives and who withdrew their membership from such organization upon their first suspicion of its subversive character. * * * This amendment would unjustly penalize many completely loyal Americans who innocently joined such organizations and would, in some measure, tend to defeat the carrying out of the purposes of the act. * * * This opportunity (in the showing of innocent membership) to defend oneself in a manner consistent with American concepts of justice and fairness is lacking from the amendments.

I am happy, Mr. Speaker, that the contentions first raised by me in my address to the House on March 1, 1950, and in which the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] joined, were upheld by the conference committee.

A NOTABLE PUBLIC SERVICE

In closing I wish, for myself as well as for my constituents among the scientists and educators on the faculty of the University of Chicago and elsewhere in my district, to express to the distinguished majority whip of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST], appreciation of and compliment on the great public service he has rendered in assuring the future of science in the United States and all the developments in industry, in medicine, in national security, and in the cultural arts which start in the well of basic science. The gentleman from Tennessee may well be proud that the National Science Foundation Act bears his name and the imprint of the months of hard work he gave in its behalf.

UN Should Be Rebuilt or Scrapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 1, 1950

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the New Hampshire Morning Union of April 29, 1950, entitled "UN Should Be Rebuilt or Scrapped." The Union is published in Manchester, N. H.

UN SHOULD BE REBUILT OR SCRAPPED

In his address before the American Newspaper Publishers Association, former President Herbert Hoover stressed a note that should be given prompt attention by our national leaders. Mr. Hoover proposed that the United Nations should be reorganized without the Communists, and that if this proved impractical, then a new united front should be established among those people who disavow communism and stand for morals and religion and who love freedom.

That position is held by this newspaper, and it is encouraging to have it advanced now by our ablest elder statesman. There is no doubt whatever that the United Nations as it exists today is washed up and a hindrance, rather than a help, to world understanding. Soviet Russia has slugged every constructive move the agency has made and has used it as a cloak to its aggressive designs. It has been employed chiefly by the Soviets as a propaganda forum for smearing free peoples.

The time has come when this kind of thing should be stopped. There has been some talk about abolishing the veto, the weapon by which the Soviets have carried out their tactics of obstruction. But this is not enough. The real fact is that the one-world idea has gone into the discard. Instead of one world in which it was hoped the United Nations would be able to establish peace, we have today two worlds irretrievably split in their objectives. One of these worlds, as Mr. Hoover so well said, is militaristic, imperialistic, atheistic, and without compassion. The other still holds to belief in God, free nations, human dignity, and peace. It is folly to believe that these two worlds can be brought together in a world peace organization. The time has come when the nations that believe in God, freedom, and human dignity, must mobilize against Red atheism, Red imperialism, the hideous practices of the police state, and human slavery, if they and the principles for which they stand are to survive.

Members of the Secretariat of the United Nations will fight to justify the continuance of that organization. They want to keep their jobs. But the United States cannot afford to hand out millions of dollars to pay the bulk of the expense of a defunct and futile organization, whose perpetuation in its present form constitutes a cloak for the godless, grasping, perfidious Soviets to use for their purposes.

Western civilization is at the crossroads, faced with the question of survival. The time has come for all nations that believe in morals, religion, and freedom to stand together and be counted. Such an alinement, as Mr. Hoover said, could be invincible if it is made in deep earnestness. In any case "by their cries ye shall know them." We cannot afford to entertain longer vain dreams and fatuous hopes about world peace and cooperation while the foundation of our very lives is crumbling away. Free, God-fearing peoples must unite in their own defense against the ruthless forces of anti-Christ or see themselves destroyed.

Tariff on Imports From Communist-Dominated Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 1, 1950

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to have the RECORD show that affirmative action was taken by Post 17, American Legion, of Naugatuck, Conn., in protecting reductions in tariff on imports from Communist-dominated areas of the world.

The letter setting forth this action follows:

AMERICAN LEGION,
NAUGATUCK POST, No. 17,
Naugatuck, Conn., April 24, 1950.

Congressman JAMES T. PATTERSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PATTERSON: Naugatuck Post, No. 17, American Legion, Naugatuck, Conn., home of Charles Goodyear and the pioneer rubber town of the world, protests against any American law, regulation, or agreement now existing or under consideration which affects favorably in any way the importation for competition with American products of any rubber products manufactured un-American—in fact, anti-American standards in Czechoslovakia or any other area dominated by the Russian communistic government. This post is strongly opposed to any such trade arrangements not only on the general principles affecting the interests of the rubber industry and the rubber workers of Naugatuck, but also because the post believes the United States Government should not make any concessions to Russian communism compromising the livelihood or other interests of American industry and workers.

Very truly yours,
CHARLES CLARK, *Commander.*

For Whom Do the Bells Toll?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL J. KILDAY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 1, 1950

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I incorporate into the RECORD an original oration written by Miss Gay Zedler of box 465, Luling, Tex., who won the oratorical contest sponsored by the women of the Pan-American Round Table at the Battle of Flowers in San Antonio recently.

In my judgment Miss Zedler has made an outstanding contribution in so well expressing the thought that out of the conflict between the Latin-American and Anglo-Saxon that occurred on Texas soil today comes forth the movement to cement friendly relations between the peoples of the United States and the peoples of Latin-America.

Her oration follows:

FOR WHOM DO THE BELLS TOLL?

Listen with me to the cathedral bells in San Antonio de Bexar, magnificent city of missions:

"Spain and France sowed every sentient clod with brave romance
The cloven hoofprint of the buffalo
Outlined its course three centuries ago."

Planting the holy rugged cross on the site where a hamlet was soon to arise, the "Conquistadores and their followers pressed on sternly toward empire in the fabled west." But following in their footsteps came the penitential Franciscan monk, with holy urge, barefooted, at his waist the knotted scourge, whose lonely, self-sacrificing work was to make possible San Antonio, Tex., most picturesque city whose past is pregnant with dramatic action, romantic appeal, and heroic sacrifice, no city in the Nation can match its charm and historic interest. Here in the

fiesta city are a happy blending of two cultures, a harmonious mingling of two races and a concerted effort to preserve the best of Latin civilization.

The first officially recognized civil settlement in Texas was the villa of San Fernando, settled at the order of the Spanish King in 1731 by 10 families from the Canary Islands. Symbolic of their Old World culture is the historic San Fernando cathedral which these families built in 1738. The names of these Spanish settlers are familiar to the ears of San Antonians today and within the sacred walls of the cathedral still worship direct descendants of its builders. San Fernando cathedral became the social and civic center of San Antonio. From its tower rang the bells which called strong men, booted and spurred to repel Indian raids. The parochial bells of the cathedral joyfully proclaimed the coronation of a sovereign, gravely tolled the death of a ruler, or pealed a glad welcome to illustrious visitors. The cross on the dome of San Fernando is today as it was in yesteryear: the golden milestone from which San Antonio measured all distances and the bells of San Fernando echo sweetly as in the days of long ago.

But today the tolling of the bells is more than a call to worship, it is a call to remember the conflict that in the shadow of the cathedral spilled and mingled the blood of the Latin-American and the Anglo-Saxon. A call to awaken in the heart of every Texan the realization that out of this conflict was woven a strong and durable fabric for lasting peace, a fabric woven from the fiber of the souls of strong men, both Latin and Anglo-Saxon; a fabric dyed in their lifeblood, mingled with the tears of their noble women.

It is fitting that San Antonio de Bexar, the city of the cathedral bells, should be the birthplace of a movement to cement friendly relations between the peoples of the United States and the peoples of Latin-America. A movement unique in the annals of man's everlasting search for peace.

This foresight was given over a generation ago to the brilliant mind and generous heart of a Texas woman, the beloved Florence T. Griswold—founder of the pan-American round table. Remembering the Arthurian legend that only at a round table could all be equal in precedence, and peace and harmony thus prevail, her's was the vision, the foresight and the wisdom which called together in round table a group of Texas women whose ancestors had spilled their blood for Texas independence, to form a nucleus for drawing together the women of the Americas.

In recognition of the principle that when the women of a country unite on a firm foundation of mutual understanding and trust, coupled with unanimous concerted action, the men of that country cannot long misunderstand one another; the pan-American round table was founded.

The round table is convinced that through education and not through legislation will the ultimate aims of the organization be attained. With this conviction, the round table views with interest the educational systems of the Latin-American countries, and points with pride to the fact that San Antonio, the city of its origin, is also a pioneer in the educational field.

Pan-Americanism is one of the natural phases through which the Western Hemisphere must pass in its onward progress toward that unity of western ideals which will inevitably make of this continent a solidified front for the defense of democracy.

Just as truly as that the Cathedral of San Fernando was built in the shape of a perfect cross, just as truly as the bells from its tower ring out the same sweet tones they rang in years of old, just so truly is the spirit of pan-Americanism ringing in the ears of the Western Hemisphere, pervading its general structure, revitalizing interrelations among its countries.

With the trend in that direction it remained for some one potent element to organize and direct the forces that will ultimately bring about a workable basis upon which to predicate a union of western nations.

Womanhood knows not national boundaries. Motherhood is a universal concept, and womanhood is a logical ground on which a representative proportion of the constituent members of any nation, or group of nations, may find a meeting point. Logical it is therefore and economically sound that women should marshal their forces and group themselves into an organization that has for its objective provision of mutual knowledge, understanding and friendship among the people of the Western Hemisphere, to develop closer ties between those nations whose interdependence and solid front would create a formidable barrier against foreign aggression and make of them a world power for peace.

On April 14, 1935, in Laredo, Tex., on the International Bridge, there was unveiled a Pan-American good-will marker. Lighted by rays of a perpetual light the marker will ever be a reminder to all passing between these nations of the pan-American aim. This marker, dedicated as it is to the womanhood of all the Americas, bears the hopes and prayers of its donors that it may worthily represent them in the promotion of peace and good will among the nations of the Western Hemisphere, thereby fulfilling a prophetic rather than a commemorative purpose.

Although the organization of round tables has spread from San Antonio throughout the Americas, the spirit of pan-Americanism must not be confined to the limits of this exemplary organization. Every Texan who thrills with pride at his glorious heritage, who participates with joy in the commemorative battle of flowers, must seat himself at the round table of pan-American brotherhood and understanding, that the bells of San Fernando may toll never again for bloodshed but for everlasting peace.

In the words of John Dunne, "Send not to know for whom the bells toll, they toll for thee and for me."

GAY ZEDLER.

Mr. Hoover's Proposal for United Nations Reorganization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 1, 1950

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include an editorial, entitled "Hoover's Plan," which appeared in the April 29, 1950, edition of the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram.

Former President Hoover's proposal to reorganize the United Nations has undoubtedly excited wide interest and reflection. These wise and practical comments, from the Telegram, on his suggestion are well worth reading.

The editorial follows:

HOOVER'S PLAN

There can be no doubt that former President Hoover speaks the grim truth that the free peoples of the world need a new and dynamic and united front against the "creeping Red imperialism." His criticisms of Soviet purposes and Soviet actions are not in any way exaggerated. He has the record to back him up. But it is a highly debatable question as to whether it would be wise just now to try to reorganize the United Nations with the Communist countries left out. That was the radical step which Mr. Hoover proposed Thursday night in New York when he addressed the Bureau of Advertising of the American Newspaper Publishers Association.

Mr. Hoover recalled that he had warned the people 9 years ago that cooperation with Stalin would be a "gargantuan jest." Five years ago, however, Mr. Hoover said this: "Russia has again, and I hope forever, demonstrated by her gallant armies * * * that she is impregnable." At that time, in April 1945, Mr. Hoover also said that he believed "that with collaboration between the great centers of power in Washington, London, Paris, Moscow, and Chungking that peace can be developed in an atmosphere of good will and understanding."

That's what virtually everybody was saying then, on the eve of our victory in Germany. They said the same thing when the Charter of the United Nations was being drafted at San Francisco, and after the surrender of Japan, and during the first few months of the existence of the UN. Even the realistic Mr. Churchill had faith in Soviet purposes—at first.

With all respect to Mr. Hoover, his own record in foreign affairs does not in itself make his voice a supremely authoritative one at the present moment. When he was President he made much of the Kellogg Treaty and he and Secretary of State Stimson evolved the nonrecognition doctrine. Those instruments were valueless—utterly useless in curbing the Japanese and other aggressors. Also, Mr. Hoover persistently opposed President Roosevelt's foreign policy, from Munich to Pearl Harbor.

Five years ago, and a little later, Mr. Hoover was not talking about the menace of Russian imperialism or of communism. That is nothing against him. The Russian conduct after the war came as a disagreeable surprise to countless Americans. Mr. Hoover did, however, make a keen and farseeing remark 5 years ago when he said that the big five veto practically "puts all the great military powers out of reach; and world wars are not started by small nations."

Herbert Hoover was thus one of the first American leaders—perhaps the very first—to recognize a fundamental weakness in the UN Charter. But that fact is not proof that he is necessarily right in saying that we should seek to reorganize the UN without the Communist nations. Neither does it prove that Mr. Hoover's new proposal is unwise, merely because some of his measures failed in the past.

This proposal cannot be settled in terms of Mr. Hoover's record. It needs to be fully argued, not only by the critics of the UN but also by its supporters.

There Shall Be No Retreat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 1, 1950

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the Rec-

ORD, I include the following keynote address of George Warren:

THERE SHALL BE NO RETREAT

(Keynote address of George Warren, South Carolina Democratic Convention, Columbia, S. C., April 19, 1950)

Today, in America, aye, in the world, freedom is the major issue. Amidst the complex problems facing the people of this country now, the maintenance of liberty stands out as the dominant problem. Never before in recorded history was there more need for an intelligent approach to the solution of these problems.

Our people thought that they were secure in the enjoyment of their liberty and freedom under the best Government in the world, and that the talk about "eternal vigilance being the price of liberty" was a catch phrase coined for the guidance of our forefathers—not us. And many people still are thinking similarly.

But the world is on fire with tyranny in the form of communism and socialism, and in America we have a creeping socialistic revolution in progress which, unless stopped in its development, will engulf this Nation and destroy our Government and the American way of life.

So again I plead for the preservation of our Constitution, the continuation of our dual form of government with its proper balance of powers between the States and the Nation; and with all the force at my command, I condemn encroachments upon the powers of the States by either Congress or the President, in whatever form, whether by enactments of law, by usurpations, or oligarchy masquerading under the banner of democracy.

Two years ago the democracy of South Carolina in convention assembled, calmly and without passion or prejudice, mapped out a course it would pursue, declared its platform and principles and directed its officials as to its policies. And in pursuance to its declarations the chairman, the executive committeemen, its delegates to the national convention, and its other officials have faithfully, honestly, and fearlessly carried out those policies and principles. Those officials were at times booed and heckled and subjected to rebuffs in the performance of the tasks assigned them. In the discharge of their duties those representing the party—State executive committeemen and county chairmen—were hailed into a Federal court and actually in so many words threatened with a Federal prison. What shall we tell these men who have acquitted their stewardship with honor and faith? Shall we repudiate their actions? Shall we turn our backs upon them and disclaim our own directions? By the immortal God who made me, I am sure I speak the sentiments of the noble people, the proud people of this State, when I say to them, "Well done, good and faithful men. From the stand you took there shall be no retreat."

And those words, "no retreat," should be the keynote of this convention.

All that we say and do here today can be put in concentrated form. All people of all parties can know exactly what our keynote is and exactly where we stand. In just two words that keynote is no retreat.

At our last convention and subsequently the South Carolina Democratic Party demonstrated to the Nation and to both Republican Party and National Democratic Party that this State was no longer "in the bag," that our people could still exercise independence of action on matters of broad policy, that by a concert of action the people of the South could actually become the balance of political power in national elections, and that we are now a factor to be considered both in party councils and national elections. I cannot picture any political party in a national election deliberately turning down electoral votes which may constitute the difference between success and failure in a country-wide election. I very much doubt that any future representatives of this organization will meet with the treatment accorded your delegates at Philadelphia last election year. Nor do I think that our presentation of the ideals and principles of government will again be jeered and hooted in a national convention. After all, national committees and national party chairmen, and even candidates for President and Vice President are looking for electoral votes. If they want our votes it is pretty certain we at least will be permitted to take part in party councils and espouse the policies and principles of government in which we believe. Our stand of 2 years ago publicized great principles and concepts of government and focused the attention of the people of the country in an emphatic way upon the inroads of socialism upon the body politic and upon the national economy. At a time when both of the great political parties—and their respective candidates—were vying with one another to see which could outdo the other in advocacy of a totalitarian state, a police state, a socialistic state, a poorhouse state, our voice was the real voice of America sounding a clarion call to preserve our constitutional form of government, to sustain our traditional way of life and battle the evil forces of socialism. And while we did not elect a President, we won a great victory, because in the minds of the people of America we planted the thoughts that even now are blocking socialistic programs. The thinkers of America are saying, "Thus far you have gone. No further shall you go." Today in America our fight has the Reds and the pinks on the run. Let's keep them running. Let there be no retreat.

In May 1948, awakened to the need of militant action to stem the onrushing tide of socialism which threatened (and still threatens) free America, the democracy of this State calmly and dispassionately declared its platform of principles which for decades had been the cardinal foundation of the Democratic Party of this Nation. We claimed then, and I proclaim today that the members of the Democratic Party of South Carolina constitute the defenders of true democratic principles, the opponents of totalitarian rule, supporters of constitutional government, and preservers of the ideals and concepts and traditions revered by our party for generations past. Succinctly and precisely we took our stand and proclaimed it to the world. No misunderstanding could possibly exist about where we stood. Nothing has happened in the past 2 years, so far as I know, that would cause us to change or to consider that we were wrong then; unless there are those here whose social concepts and election law predilections follow those of a Federal judge of this State who, deserting the doctrines of his forefathers, advocates outside interference and Federal force to impose his will upon a people once free.

It is true we have had court orders. But undying principles cannot be changed by order of a court. It is true we have had a few hand-outs from Washington—very few—and we may get back some part—a small part—of the Federal taxes we pay in the form of grants or benefits. But these hand-outs or grants—a mess of pottage—cannot buy the souls of a free people. The trend toward socialism has been accelerated some since then. The need today is perhaps greater for us to maintain and declare and militantly defend those principles, ideals and concepts and traditions. We cannot lightly brush aside the threat of a socialistic state.

Socialism inevitably leads to tyranny. Take the case of Russia. Those who started the break from Czarist tyranny were old Socialists. They fought tyranny, but when socialism was set in motion it grew into the most tyrannical government in human history—present-day Russia.

This country was settled by those fleeing from tyranny and established to free us from tyrannical rule. Today it is our bounden duty to hold the line for the American way of life. First, we should recognize the presence of a creeping Socialist revolution and make our leaders not only recognize that fact but put a stop once and for all to any further advance to socialistic laws and economic trends. We are the sovereign people. Let's make the Congress and the judiciary and the executive of our Government get back to the Constitution and to the Declaration of Independence and the American way of life.

We told the world of our ideals and principles; on the ramparts of American life we hoisted our flag. We maintain the same ideals and principles today. If you will join me, I say, "There let it wave, and long may it wave." We make no retreat.

The people of America do not believe in socialized labor. They do believe in collective bargaining, the right of the laboring man to join together for the benefit of himself and his fellow laborers for their mutual benefit; they believe in individual freedom; and the people of America believe in free labor—not slave labor. When any party or the leadership of any party attempts to herd the working people of this country into the corrals of a socialistic order, then is the time for warnings to be sounded. South Carolina democracy today should tell the laboring people of America and their organizations that heed should be given to the signs of the times—the gradual drift of the United States into socialism which will embrace labor as well as business. The examples of Nazi Germany, Fascist Italy, and Communist Russia disclose accurately where the laboring man will stand under socialism.

The people of America do not believe in socialized medicine. They do believe in governmental public-health activities to the extent that such shall preserve freedom of our people to choose their own doctors and hospitals and medical care and shall not interfere with the freedom of our surgeons and doctors to practice where, when, and for what they please under the regulatory power of the States to prescribe their qualifications. Socialized medicine is directly opposed to the fundamental concepts of Americanism. South Carolina democracy today should tell the people of America that the time has come when these concepts of government are endangered and that the creeping progress of socialism will be advanced unless strong efforts to curb that progress are made. Do I have to give examples today of the dire results of socialized medicine? Look to any country where it has been tried.

The people of America do not believe in socialized business. They believe in free enterprise and individual initiative. When any leadership of a party or any government advocates laws or enactment of laws aimed directly at doing away with those beliefs, the time has arrived for the business people of the Nation to put forth every possible effort to prevent socialized business. In view of the trend of our National Legislature to regiment the Nation's business and circumscribe free enterprise and individual and corporate initiative, the Democratic Party of South Carolina should send out a call to the business people of America to combat with all of its force the advancing march of socialized business.

The American people do not believe in a socialized state. They believe in democracy as that term is defined by the acts of the founding fathers of this country. When any party or its leadership or any official of our governmental set-up would, by act or

deed, send America down the road to socialism, a time of danger has arrived, and the Democratic Party of South Carolina should speak out to the people of the Nation words of warning with a call to join us in safeguarding and perpetuating the representative democracy under which for nearly two centuries we have lived in happiness and prosperity.

Voicing the feelings of the great people of this State, I say that South Carolina's democracy views with alarm these signs of a drift away from fundamental Americanism, and with all of our resources we dedicate ourselves and our party to combat socialism. We are doing this today; we should do this in all party councils elsewhere and everywhere in the future. With sincerity we feel that the salvation of our Government depends upon setting up a road block in the path of socialism. We call on the national Democratic Party to join in that effort, and all true Americans everywhere to do likewise. The fight transcends persons and parties. So today South Carolina democracy gives to the Nation a motto all can well adopt: Fight socialism.

Everyone everywhere knows that if an individual spends more than he makes over a period of time he will go broke, and if a business spends more than it makes over a period of time, it will wind up broke. It does not require an economic expert to know that when a government spends more than it takes in, such government over a period of time will go broke. (Let me interpolate here that it seemingly does require an economic expert to decide otherwise.) Therefore, when it appears that the United States Government or a State government undertakes over a period of time, in a time of peace, a planned system of deficit financing, it embarks upon dangerous seas, and we would not be true to our concepts of honesty if we withheld our disapproval of any such program. Today the democracy of South Carolina should view with alarm and condemn deficit financing, and our Representatives in the Congress and the State legislature should be told of our views.

In line with our views, those truly representing the South in the Congress many times find themselves alined against legislative proposals of the present national administration. On this account we are called conservative, and even reactionary, although in fact we are the true liberals, in the traditional meaning of the term. Because we have dared to fight for the historic doctrines and principles of the great Democratic Party, we have been referred to as Dixiecrats by the hatchet men and character assassins of the motley crew who have temporarily captured our party. The term "Dixiecrat" is nothing more nor less than a smear word, designed to obscure the unanswerable logic and reason of our stand by a base effort to create sectional prejudice. We repudiate the term and proudly reaffirm our faith in and adherence to the traditions and beliefs of the great Democratic leaders and standard bearers who have gone before us.

It is true that we have not blindly followed radical proposals or radical leadership. If a party or a person advocates measures or men which we regard as un-American or socialistic we would be craven cowards to forsake our ideals. We fought within the national party for States' rights, under whatever name called. Within the national party we battled for State sovereignty, free enterprise, local home rule, and for the preservation of constitutional government. We waged that fight in the national convention after first telling the national committee that we would not abandon the old-line Democratic principles and ideals carried in the platforms of the party for many, many years. There was no misapprehension of our stand when we participated in the convention at Philadelphia. In the following national election we invoked and exercised our right to vote for the preannounced program. We carried our fight to that election and established to all and everyone that the Democratic Party of South Carolina stands for State sovereignty, home rule, and constitutional government. We maintain that should the national party tell us to stick our heads into the fires of socialism we do not have to obey such a demand. We still possess freedom and are not abject slaves to the forces of evil that would shackle us to a socialistic order. And from that stand I say there should be no retreat.

The older members of our party know why the dual form of government here was adopted, with the States, originally separate and independent republics, surrendering certain rights to the Federal Government and retaining and reserving all other rights to themselves. However, they should tell the large number of new voters of the great purpose of the founding fathers, which was to create a government of divided powers to prevent autocratic rule, to prevent tyranny, to prescribe home rule or local self-government, to preserve for posterity that freedom and liberty which they had bought and paid for in human blood. The old and new members of our party should remember the conception of George Washington that the balanced powers constituted a system of "reciprocal checks" which was necessary; should remember that Jefferson said that "support of State governments in all of their rights" was the "surest bulwark" against antirepublican tendencies and that Franklin Roosevelt said. "We are safe from the danger of any departure from the principles upon which this country was founded just so long as independent home rule of the States is scrupulously preserved"—and he added, "and fought for whenever it seems in danger."

Until recently the old Democratic Party has followed the States' rights line, and but for a few of the ilk of Humphreys we think would have followed the States' rights line 2 years ago.

The South Carolina Democratic Party adhered to the States' rights line 2 years ago. From that commendable stand for the preservation of our great form of government there should today be "no retreat."

Those in high places have brought about bloc government in the place of party government in this country through their bartering for votes of one kind or another. In pursuing this policy, they have cynically sought to stir up the fires of racial and sectional prejudices. Two years ago, we knew that there were those in the party who advocated the enactment of laws such as FEPC, removing all separation of the races in our places of business and other laws removing all separation of the races in schools and colleges. We found that there were those who by executive edict would integrate the white and Negro races in the armed forces. But until recently we never thought any Democrat would declare that any and all separation of the races constitutes discrimination and is unlawful. Such has happened.

Article 3, section 33, of South Carolina's constitution says "The marriage of a white person with a Negro or mulatto, shall be unlawful and void." There are those who even approve intermarriage of whites and Negroes, and contend for the annulment of this provision of our constitution. For the record let it be said that in Columbia at high noon on April 19, 1950, the keynoter of the Democratic convention with all of the emphasis at his command said that the Democrats of this proud State repudiate any such principle, frown upon any such efforts, and militantly declare our intention to uphold our State constitution.

We do not believe that the informed Negroes of this State advocate doing away with the constitutional provisions against intermarriage, or the abrogation of separation of the races.

For many years the white and Negro races have lived in South Carolina in peace and harmony. The better elements of both races have worked hard to improve the lots in life of both races. Great headway has been made by both. Both want to preserve the racial purity of each. Outside agitators, for purely selfish political reasons, seek to stir up racial prejudices and animosities. We condemn such efforts and declare our belief that social and educational separation is not discriminatory. On May 19, 1948, the South Carolina Democratic Convention in its platform and its principles said: "We believe in the social and educational separation of the races." From that stand there shall be no retreat. We have been insulted with a civil-disturbance program, erroneously labeled a civil-rights plan. We were outraged by the threats of "force bills" which violated our conceptions of freedom as guaranteed to us under the Constitution. All separation of races is sought to be declared discrimination; even our laws respecting intermarriage of whites and Negroes being threatened with annulment. And those insults and outrages are still being heaped upon the people of the South. These things have happened before. Our political institutions have been assailed before. We have faced perilous ordeals before. Bayonets of Federal soldiers have been crossed over our ballot boxes in the past. But never yet have our heads been bowed in shame; never yet have we truckled even in defeat.

And though we may be deserted by an errant national party leadership, and Federal courts attempt to control our elections, yet we face the problems confronting us with courage and faith that right and justice will finally triumph. Under God, the author of liberty, we still stand for the individual freedom and personal dignity of the American citizen.

Education on Radio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 2 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by me at the television dinner sponsored by the Association for Education on Radio, University of Pennsylvania Museum, April 20, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY UNITED STATES SENATOR FRANCIS J. MYERS AT TELEVISION DINNER SPONSORED BY THE ASSOCIATION FOR EDUCATION ON RADIO, UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA MUSEUM, APRIL 20, 1950

Like many parents who have a TV set in their home, I'm forced to admit that my children are the television experts of the family. The children sold me on television over 2 years ago, and at that time, my son—then in junior high—was prepared to explain to me, his not too up-to-date father, just how television worked.

I strongly suspect this has pretty much been the experience of most families who

have bought, or are thinking of buying, a television set.

So, with several years of experience in looking and listening to their credit, my children are old hands in terms of the lively young television industry. From time to time, I've heard some spirited dinner table discussion of some of the fine programs the children have seen and heard on TV, and from these and other discussions, I've gathered that some splendid work is being done right here in Philadelphia in television programming.

I must admit, however, that much of my information about this is second-hand—because my work in the Senate keeps me away from Philadelphia most of the time—and as a matter of fact, I've probably participated in almost as many television broadcasts as I've actually seen.

I got a real eye opener several months ago on Philadelphia television developments when Miss Martha Gable of the Philadelphia board of education sent me quite a bit of material describing the education shows that have been worked out jointly by our local television stations and school officials.

As I say, I was aware that something of this sort was going on from what others had told me, but I had no idea that anything so comprehensive and significant was being developed right here in Philadelphia.

The story which emerged from reading the material Miss Gable sent me indicates that Philadelphia is playing a leading role in evolving a vital and all-important new educational and informational technique. Moreover, it was quite apparent that a great many people were working together to make these new programs possible.

The managements of the local television stations have given freely of their time, imagination, and other resources. Teachers and officials of all our schools—public, private, parochial—have worked hand in hand with the stations and with each other. School children themselves have been very much involved, both as participants in the programs, and as the audience for whom the programs were intended. Too, several large manufacturers of television sets have lent equipment to schools, and the parent-teachers associations have assisted by raising funds for the purchase of TV equipments to bring the programs to more of the children.

Now I'm extremely proud of the trailblazing work which has been done here at Philadelphia in utilizing the assets of television to further education and promote better understanding among our people.

Without question, there has never been a time in our past where the American people have needed to know as much about as many things as they do today. The complex life that all of us share in this year of 1950 is too involved merely to let matters take care of themselves. It is imperative that we—as a people—know where we are, where we are going, and where we want to go. We no longer can afford the luxury of letting things grow like Topsy.

In this age where men themselves may travel at the speed of sound—where we can communicate with one another at the speed of light—the man on the street needs far more facts to pass sound judgment on the issues that must be met to keep democratic institutions alive.

It is a real blessing that the same kind of technical advancement which has complicated our lives so much has, at the same time, provided us with extraordinary means of acquiring information. Radio and television provide us with ringside seats at the great events of the day. Within a short space of time thereafter, the same events are recapitulated in our newspapers, newsreels, and magazines, and in the long run, books run off on giant presses furnish us with permanent records and assist us in fitting events into sensible historical perspective.

No one underestimates the potential of television as the newest addition to our fountainhead of information sources. It is taking an important place in partnership with our other communications and shares with them the dual responsibility of furnishing us with enjoyment and with information which we must have to meet the future.

Returning for a moment to the educational programs that have been developed locally here in Philadelphia, I was particularly gratified to notice the extent to which information about world affairs had become a part of these telecasts. I recall seeing names of foreign students who described life in their countries, and of newly arrived displaced persons, and others which referred in some fashion or another to events and places beyond our shores.

Because world peace is the central issue of our time, I think this sort of program is of particular significance—not only for our children in school, but for everyone—and I want to enlarge on some of the factors which seem to me so essential to an understanding of the world problems which confront us today.

As a nation, America has done a lot of growing up in the past 10 years or so. Without doubt, the biggest single obligation we've undertaken—in our recent history, at least—is that of assuming our share of the responsibility for world peace. And by shedding our former policy of isolation, we have undertaken a vast new job which requires us to come up with solutions to problems which had never previously been of much importance to us. With the coming of our new international responsibilities, we've had to think in new terms, and unlearn many modes of thinking which were adapted to the policy of isolation.

This is not an easy job to do—and all things considered, I believe we have shouldered our load and have met our new problems in a mature and straightforward fashion. We must remember that we broke with the past when we repudiated isolation. But the break was clean, and it was wholeheartedly supported by the overwhelming majority of our people. It's true there are still a few who urge us to let the rest of the world go hang—but I'm satisfied this is a minority which is growing steadily smaller as we continue to go forward with the job of peacemaking.

But isolation, as a matter of national policy, served the best interests of America for a substantial part of our national history. Broad oceans insulated us from the recurrent strife of Europe and Asia, and by turning our backs on the troubles of the rest of the world for a hundred years or so we kept ourselves busy and grew great in expanding our Nation across the continent. And by the close of the nineteenth century the United States had become a factor of wealth and resources to be reckoned with.

But the policy of isolation—so useful in frontier days—had the rug pulled out from under it by science. Not all at once, but gradually and steadily. Transportation did it. The nineteenth-century developments of power through steam, electricity, and the internal-combustion engine shrank the size of continents and pulled them closer together as ocean vessels grew larger, faster, and began to use steel hulls. Whether we liked it or not, the nations of the world were being brought together.

The airplane was really the last straw so far as isolation was concerned. Even at the close of World War I the potential of the airplane was not real enough to convince a majority of Americans that the world's troubles were our troubles, too. We turned thumbs down on the League of Nations, and said in effect, if isolation was good enough for grandma, it was good enough for us. And even those nations which joined the League weren't prepared to think in terms of working cooperatively on an international basis. National jealousies were, if anything, stronger at the time of the Versailles Treaty and in the years which followed than they were prior to 1914. War does things like that to people and nations.

When the prosperity bubble burst here in the late twenties and the ever-darkening night of depression settled upon us, we were too preoccupied with our own troubles to pay much attention to the fact that we weren't alone in our misery. The depression was world-wide—and as a nation we failed to realize that the American economy had become so linked to that of large parts of the world that even depressions were no longer isolated affairs.

The totalitarian dictatorships which spread their evil through the depression years and finally plunged the world into a second great war within a quarter of a century were the ones who exposed to everyone the fallacy of isolation. By the time World War II drew to a close in 1945 the American people recognized that if we could take our armed forces to Europe and into the far reaches of the Pacific and on to the Continent of Asia itself—and there achieve victory—others might some day bring war to us across those same oceans.

No wonder we were ready to repudiate isolation by 1945. No wonder our participation in the United Nations was so overwhelmingly acclaimed by the same people who, 25 years earlier, could not be convinced that a League of Nations was necessary to world peace.

The Russian delegates in the United Nations soon made us realize, however, that the Communists had their own schemes for world peace—schemes which would carry out their long-announced plans for world communism. With the economy of Europe tottering, the Russian veto fell across every measure to come before the UN which offered to bolster Europe's foundations, and judging from Communist tactics in eastern Europe, it was apparent that Russia sought the domination of all of Europe without firing a shot. The Communists were counting on the democracies to collapse, and they expected Communist dictatorships to rise up from the wreckage.

To save Europe, something had to be done, and done fast. In rapid succession, interim aid program was created to furnish American food to a starving Europe. The Truman doctrine was born to aid the Greek Government in stamping out Communist-led guerrilla warfare and to strengthen Turkey against Russian threats of aggression. Just 2 years ago this month, the first of the Marshall plan shipments began to flow across the Atlantic to aid the western European democracies in getting back on their feet. Last year, the Atlantic Pact was signed, and the nations of the North Atlantic community pledged themselves to stand united against any threatened aggression. Last month the first supplies crossed the Atlantic under the military assistance program which is designed to furnish the additional arms the Atlantic Pact nations will need to make good their pledge of mutual defense.

These programs are stopping the spread of communism. Europe is getting back on its feet with its industry well above prewar levels, and progress is being made at reducing the trade barriers which have hampered Europe's economic development for the past half century. Peace has been restored in Greece, and Turkey is much better prepared to call any Communist bluff hurled at her. The Marshall plan still has a big job ahead—in fact, a job which will cost an estimated $3,000,000,000 in the coming year. But Mr. Paul Hoffman, whose splendid

leadership and vision have had so much to do with the success of the Marshall plan to date, feels that the program is ahead of schedule and that we can safely afford to reduce ECA spending to the $3,000,000,000 level this next year. He adds the precaution, however, that the figure cannot be reduced below that amount without endangering all the good which has been accomplished thus far.

We have much more work ahead of us on the world front. But I am confident that we possess the intelligence and the ability to do the job. In large areas of the world, great masses of people live at primitive, starvation levels. The Communists have already made overtures to them, promising them pie in the sky through dictatorship. There is, however, as we all know, an honest solution to the problems of the people who live in the underdeveloped areas of the world—a solution which does not hold out the empty promise of security through dictatorship.

The solution I have in mind is to be found through the point 4 program which is now pending in Congress. Under point 4, American technical know-how will be one of our major exports. We will furnish, through the United Nations wherever possible, trained technical assistance which can aid the backward nations in improving their agricultural methods and in laying the foundation for industry. The experience we've had in this sort of work under the Marshall plan has demonstrated its effectiveness, and in addition, has taught us a great deal about that problem.

Another phase of point 4 will encourage the investment of American dollars in the underdeveloped areas by insuring the investors against political risks of loss through changes in policies of the countries in which the investments are made—and the countries which will participate in point 4 will give their assurance through treaties that they will safeguard the investments of foreign capital which goes in to promote industrial production.

Point 4 promises to be a major vehicle in meeting the Communist threat in such areas as the Middle East and the Far East.

Another grave problem as yet unsolved lies in the fact that the atom, now harnessed by science, has yet to be harnessed politically. Once more, it is Russian opposition which has stalemated things—this time by the Soviet refusal to permit free international inspection, which is of course essential if international control of the atom is to be achieved.

We have, on the other hand, met and mastered other difficult problems in carrying out our international responsibilities in this postwar period, and I am quite confident of our ability to do so in the future.

I do not underestimate the magnitude of the job ahead. We have, up to this time, faced the world united in our desire to cooperate in helping the world achieve peace and freedom under democratic institutions. We cannot turn back the clock. We cannot retreat to isolation. We cannot permit our foreign policy to tumble into the political arena. Our foreign programs have been shaped on a bipartisan basis up to this point—and responsible members of both major political parties have redoubled their efforts to keep foreign policy on that high plane as the isolationist remnant in Congress and elsewhere have sought to undermine bipartisanship by trying to stampede and divide us.

I am very proud that America has accepted the mantle of world responsibility in a spirit of dignity, sincerity and devotion. We have been willing to settle world problems squarely on their facts and merits. So long as we continue to conduct ourselves thus—so long as we continue to inform ourselves as fully as possible and think clear-headedly—I have no fear for our future.

Freedom and the Welfare State—Citation From League for Industrial Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 2 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], entitled "Freedom and the Welfare State," which he delivered on the occasion of the forty-fifth anniversary of the League for Industrial Democracy, at the Hotel Commodore, New York, N. Y., on April 15, 1950, together with a citation to him by the League for Industrial Democracy.

There being no objection, the address and citation were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FREEDOM AND THE WELFARE STATE

(Address by Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN at luncheon on the occasion of the forty-fifth anniversary of the League for Industrial Democracy, Hotel Commodore, New York City, Saturday, April 15, 1950)

I feel deeply honored today at this forty-fifth anniversary luncheon of the League for Industrial Democracy to receive the league's citation for public service in behalf of a more democratic world. I particularly appreciate this citation because of your organization's long and consistent record of devotion to the ideals and the achievement of a more democratic Nation and a more democratic world.

I cite the words of the honorary president of this organization, that beloved philosopher, Dr. John Dewey, who defined the goal of the LID as the creation of a democracy that shall be a living reality in every aspect and reach of our common life. And what do we mean by "democracy?" Another great contemporary of ours, the Reverend Harry Emerson Fosdick, put it this way. "Democracy," Dr. Fosdick said, "is based on the conviction that there are extraordinary possibilities in ordinary people." I know that your organization is dedicated to that conviction.

The title of my remarks today is "Freedom and the Welfare State." I can think of no more appropriate audience than this for such a discussion. The League for Industrial Democracy, in striving for almost half a century to promote industrial democracy, has been working at the same time in behalf of both freedom and the welfare state. Your ideal as well as mine is a nation conceived in freedom and dedicated to the welfare of all the people. But that ideal is no innovation of ours. We are not its original sponsors. One hundred and seventy years ago the welfare state concept was translated into the basic law of this land by the founders of the Republic. This concept was set forth in the preamble of the American Constitution. The object of our Federal Union, the Constitution states, is "to establish justice, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and to our posterity." Hence, the founding fathers were the ones who really originated the welfare state. And in many lands, long before our Nation was born, courageous champions of human liberty were working toward this same ideal.

"Democracy," said one of the world's greatest men, "arose from men's thinking that if they are equal in any respect, they are equal absolutely." Those words were written more than 2,000 years ago by a Greek named Aristotle. Those words define the welfare state as much as any phrase of Franklin D. Roosevelt or Harry S. Truman.

It has become fashionable in circles of political reaction to attack the concept of the welfare state as being prejudicial to individual liberty and freedom. These reactionaries view with fright and alarm the current and proposed activities of government in the fields of housing, health, and social security.

"These are steps on the road to communism," the alarmists cry. But these same men uttered the same cries in the same tones of fear and outrage when President Roosevelt proposed the Securities Exchange Act, the Fair Labor Standards Act, the Holding Company Act, the Federal Deposit Insurance Act and many other pieces of legislation which even reactionaries would not dare to attack today. The same cries were raised when Woodrow Wilson proposed the Federal Trade Commission Act in 1913 and when the Railway Labor Act was first placed on the statute books in 1926. I could cite laws and programs by the score enacted over the violent opposition of the reactionaries—laws and programs which were assailed as communistic at the time—but which are now accepted even in the most conservative circles.

This cry of state tyranny has been raised during the last half century whenever the community has attempted to interfere with the right of a few to destroy forests, exploit little children, operate unsanitary and unsafe shops, indulge in race or religious discrimination, and pursue other policies endangering the health, safety and welfare of the community. These few have completely ignored the fact that, when their license to exploit the community was restricted, the freedom of the many from ignorance, insecurity, and want—the freedom of the many to live the good life—was measurably enhanced.

I do not believe that our Federal Government should seek to assume functions which properly belong to the individual or to the family, to the local community or to free organizations of individuals. But I do believe that our Federal Government should and must perform those functions which, in this complex and interdependent society, the individual, the family, or the community cannot practicably perform for themselves.

Today we in America and in the entire freedom-loving world are confronted with a world-wide threat to that principle which we hold most dear, the principle of individual dignity and of individual freedom. For the preservation of that principle we are willing to dedicate our lives, if it should prove necessary. But while this is a threat which we face on the world front, we face another danger here at home. That is the threat to our freedom from those within our own country who would identify individual freedom with special privilege. Any move to diminish privilege, to stamp out discrimination and to bring security to our citizens is branded by these people as un-American.

Not so long ago an American political leader said that the governments of the past could fairly be characterized as devices for maintaining in perpetuity the place and position of certain privileged classes. The Government of the United States, on the other hand, is a device for maintaining in perpetuity the rights of the people, with the ultimate extinction of all privileged classes. Was it some Communist, some irresponsible radical or reformer who made that statement? No, it was not. It was the late President Calvin Coolidge in a speech at Philadelphia in 1924.

It is my firm belief that the extinction of special privilege is an essential and basic program of the welfare state. Today the forces

of special privilege provide the chief opposition and raise the wildest cries of alarm against economic security for all.

In addition to the forces of special privilege who are opposed, on principle, to all social legislation, there are some who, while paying lip service to liberalism, claim to be troubled by the expanding scope of government in its direct concern with the welfare of the individual citizen. These people, while conceding merit to the specific programs of the welfare state, and while approving the welfare state programs of the past, join with the forces of privilege in contending that if the Government provides any further services, it is moving in the direction of totalitarianism.

In my opinion these men of little vision have lost sight of the most important—and to me the most obvious—truth of our times—that a government which has secured the greatest degree of welfare for its people is the government which stands most firmly against totalitarianism. The critics of the welfare state do not understand this simple fact. They spend their time looking for Communists in and out of government and at the same time attack those measures which would deprive Communists and would-be Communists of their ammunition—and of their audience. The measures which would provide for the welfare of the people are the surest weapons against totalitarianism.

The Communist International, its leaders, and their philosophy, have been responsible for many designs which we in the democratic world consider the quintessence of evil. Certainly the suppression of basic rights—the police state and the slave-labor camp—constitute the most repulsive and obnoxious way of life we can imagine.

But, as a liberal, I have a special resentment against the Communists. I feel that one of their greatest disservices to the cause of human progress has been their identification of economic security with the suppression of freedom. It is their claim that in order to achieve the solution of the economic needs of the many, it is necessary to curb the freedoms of all. They say, in effect, that you cannot have a full stomach and a free mind at the same time.

I reject this concept. I reject it as being the ultimate in reaction. This is but another demonstration of the basic affinity between Communists and reactionaries in their thinking about man and his problems. Both groups believe that a nation of freemen cannot possibly conquer the scourges of hunger, disease, lack of shelter, intolerance, and ignorance. And they both have much to gain if they convince enough people that freedom and security are incompatible.

It is a strange paradox that the same conservatives and reactionaries who pose as champions of national security express the greatest antagonism toward individual security. Most of us readily acknowledge that the nations of the world cannot be free if they are not secure. It seems equally logical to me that individuals cannot be free if they are beset by fear and insecurity. To my mind the welfare state is simply a state in which people are free to develop their individual capacities, to receive just rewards for their talents, and to engage in the pursuit of happiness, unburdened by fear of actual hunger, actual homelessness, or oppression by reason of race, creed, or color.

The fear of old age, the fear of sickness, the fear of unemployment, and the fear of homelessness are not—as some would have us believe—essential drives in a productive society. These fears are not necessary to make free competitive enterprise work. The fear of insecurity is rather a cancer upon free competitive enterprise. It is the greatest threat which confronts our economic system. I hasten to add that I believe in free competitive enterprise. I believe it is the best system yet devised by man, but it is not a goal in itself. It must always serve the public interest.

We have had 20 years of the New Deal and the Fair Deal. Who would say that the American worker, the American farmer and the ordinary American businessman is less free than he was 20 years ago? Actually, freedom in the true sense flourishes more generally and more widely today than ever before in our history. The worker, the farmer, and the businessman have vastly more freedom than they ever had before. They are freer to enjoy the fruits and benefits of a productive economy and a full life. But they are not yet free enough.

We are still far from the goal we seek. Insecurity still haunts millions. Inadequate housing poisons the wells of family life in vast numbers of cases. Inadequate schooling handicaps a great segment of our people. And the fear of sickness and old age still clutches at the hearts of many, if not most, of our fellow citizens. Until we solve all these problems and quiet all these fears, our people will not be truly free.

This must be our goal and purpose, to set our people free, to win for them, and with them, the fullest measure of freedom which can be secured in a dangerous and dynamic world. Toward this end the welfare state is a means. It is not, in itself, an end. My efforts are pledged, as they always have been, to work with and for my fellow men to achieve security and equality of opportunity. Let us strike hard at the shackles of fear and insecurity. Our goal is freedom and fulfillment. With faith in mankind and confidence in the rightness of reason, we press forward together toward this goal.

CITATION BY LEAGUE FOR INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY TO HERBERT H. LEHMAN, UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK

APRIL 15, 1950.

For over a generation, you have been an outstanding leader in the battle for racial and religious equality, economic and social welfare, and the enlargement of human freedom, here and abroad.

For 10 long years, as Governor of the State of New York, you carried out, ably and devotedly, the liberal tradition of your distinguished predecessor, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and placed upon the statute books a volume of noteworthy labor and social legislation.

On the completion of your decade of service as chief executive of the State of New York, you threw your magnificent energies into the task of saving from starvation, through the UNRRA and other public agencies, tens of thousands of victims of war and dictatorship throughout the world.

Last year, in your race for United States Senate, you made it crystal clear that only under a democratic welfare state could maximum freedom be assured to the plain people of our Nation.

During the present session of Congress, you have been in the midst of the good fight to make our National Government increasingly responsive to the needs of the people, and to render it a source of help and inspiration to the downtrodden of other lands.

In recognition of your public services to the Nation and to the world, the board of directors of the League for Industrial Democracy dedicated to increasing democracy in our economic, political, and cultural life, expresses its deep gratitude to you, and wishes you many years of continued service in the cause of economic security and human freedom in the challenging years ahead.

JOHN DEWEY,
Honorary President.
CLARK STURN,
Chairman of the Board.
HARRY W. LAIDLER,
Executive Director.
JOSEPH SCHLOSSBERG,
Treasurer.

Proposed Rent Control Extension

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 2 (legislative day of. Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by me before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency on Wednesday, April 26, in support of rent-control extension.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR FRANCIS J. MYERS, DEMOCRAT, OF PENNSYLVANIA, BEFORE SENATE BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE ON WEDNESDAY, APRIL 26, IN SUPPORT OF RENT CONTROL EXTENSION

My statement this morning will not be detailed. No startling claims remain to be made, no completely unsuspected facts to be explored on this question of rent control extension. The point is—simply—that the arguments which made rent control extension an absolute essential to the Nation's economy last April are still true today to only a slightly less degree.

First and foremost, the fact remains that there still exists in a great majority of the communities in our country an extreme housing shortage. Any rent control extension hinges primarily on this point. And if someone can prove to me that this housing shortage no longer exists, I shall be more than willing to do everything I can to call off this whole thing.

But when those who claim the shortage no longer exists begin presenting their facts and figures, I don't want them to include completely uninhabitable quarters merely because the roof hasn't fallen in completely, or because the holes in the floor are still small, or because three walls are still standing.

No, I am not interested in classifying such structures—and I use the term loosely—as inhabitable rental units available for a tenant. Certainly too many people in this country of ours are forced to live in such dwellings now. And certainly too many people will live in such dwellings in the future—particularly if rent controls are lifted now. But I am of the firm conviction that the Congress of these United States must not make itself a party to such shameful conditions. These uninhabitable quarters—which are in fact inhabited—represent a threat to our national economy, to our national health, to our national moral standards. Perhaps some of you read in this week end papers in Washington the results of a study made by the Washington Housing Association to determine the effect of slum conditions on the health of children. It was found that out of the 211 families studied, 26 percent of all children under 12 years of age required hospitalization in the past 2½ years.

And when those who now come forth and say a shortage no longer exists show their facts and figures, let them not include dwellings many of our people cannot afford. We must be realistic about this problem of insufficient housing. We simply cannot go to the people of the United States and say "Look here, there's a beautiful new apartment right across from the park and it's half empty now. If you need a place to live, why don't you move in? The rent's only $110 a month."

It must not be, therefore, the policy of the Government of the United States to encourage people to spend more than they can afford in order to have a roof over their heads.

All right then, let us take a look at the information I have which leads me to believe a severe housing shortage still exists. I have in front of me a table summarizing certain recent studies of the Bureau of Labor Statistics giving the over-all vacancy rate and the habitable rental vacancy rate in many of the most important cities in the United State. Pittsburgh, perhaps the most important production center in the country, had, in January 1950, a habitable vacancy rate of 0.4 percent. Memphis, Tenn., had in December 1949, an over-all vacancy rate of 2.3 percent and a habitable rental vacancy of 0.6 percent.

This marked difference between the vacancy rate and the inhabitable rate in Memphis illustrates what I was referring to earlier when I said we must not consider such substandard dwellings in determining the lack of, or presence of, a housing shortage. The results of studies in the other 25 cities show, generally, the same low vacancy rate as Memphis and Pittsburgh.

To determine the housing situation specifically in Pennsylvania, I have studied the reports made for 14 of the areas still under control in my State. The picture was a consistent one—an extreme housing shortage, particularly for those in the lower income brackets.

Let us take a few examples. In Bethlehem, a city of about 70,000, the local government runs a trailer camp of 119 trailers. As of about a month ago, all the trailers except two were completely occupied and there was a waiting list of 274 applicants, 212 of which were veterans. These trailers house approximately 420 people—adults and children.

In Pittsburgh, the housing shortage is particularly acute. The administrator of the Pittsburgh Housing Authority estimates that about 35,000 homes are needed for low-cost housing to meet the demand. As of January 1, 1949, a total housing need of 51,000 units for Allegheny County was estimated by the Allegheny Conference on Community Development. This included the excess of families over dwelling units and an estimated needed 4 percent vacancy reserve considered normal, but it did not include 41,000 accommodations reported as dilapidated and beyond repair in this area. The total of 51,000 moreover, is hardly affected by the 1949 volume of building which was 1,842 for the city of Pittsburgh only. Furthermore, with several large industries scheduled to move into Pittsburgh in the near future—General Motors and Continental Can Co. among them—and with expansion being planned by such companies as Jones and Laughlin Steel Corp., and the H. J. Heinz Co., an increase in population for the Pittsburgh area is now predicted. And such a population increase can mean only continued shortages in housing.

The Philadelphia picture is not as gloomy at Pittsburgh's, but it certainly is far from encouraging. The Philadelphia Housing Authority estimates that the city requires approximately 84,000 additional low-rent housing units. There is an almost total absence of vacant accommodations in the city in the rental ranges of under $60 to $65 per month. The maintenance of the temporary housing of almost 4,000 units now under the Philadelphia Housing Authority is becoming more and more difficult, and the executive director of the authority warns that some or all of the units may have to be removed before the housing shortage has been conquered. This would, of course, add to the needs of the city.

It is true that a Philadelphia ordinance of August 1947, provides that "as and when the Federal Government shall relinquish control * * * the rents of such accommodations shall be stabilized as of the date of such relinquishments." But communities in the Philadelphia metropolitan area would obviously not be protected by the Philadelphia ordinance. This would create some difficult problems since for housing purposes, demand and supply do not stop at the city boundary. Furthermore, it seems to be the prevailing opinion that the city ordinance would be declared unconstitutional because of definite limitation on the city's powers granted under the State constitution.

The hardest hit area employment-wise in Pennsylvania is the Scranton-Wilkes-Barre area. And to call the housing situation in this area shocking is to use strictly mild language. In 1949 there was not one bit of new construction for sale in Scranton, and the grand total of two units were constructed there for renting purposes. This * * * in a city of 145,000 population. The city treasurer is quoted as saying that "the housing shortage has resulted in many families trying to occupy condemned city properties held for taxes by the city of Scranton. In some cases we have felt sorry for them and have allowed them to occupy these premises in return for repairing them, but they are not fit to live in."

The Scranton Housing Authority estimated that 41 percent, or 9,000 of the city's tenanted homes, are substandard. And chamber of commerce officials have indicated that the housing shortage has seriously affected their attempts to bring new industries into this hard-hit city.

In neighboring Wilkes-Barre building activity is even less than in Scranton. There has been no new construction for sale or rent in the city of Wilkes-Barre, a city of 90,000 population, in 1949.

The picture is the same throughout the State. Lancaster is one of the most congested areas in the United States, with 65,000 people jammed into an extremely small space. The decontrolled rents in Lancaster remain high, one strong indication that the demand for housing has not been reasonably met. A study made of Chester by the University of Pennsylvania reveals that 31 percent of the dwellings are substandard. In McKeesport, an important industrial center about 15 miles from Pittsburgh, only 41 permits for new residential one-family units were issued in 1949, though the city has a population of about 60,000 people. Allentown needs in the neighborhood of 1,300 to 1,500 rental units at a range of between $38 to $50 per month, according to city housing officials. The Housing Authority of the City of Erie has a waiting list of over 2,000 families.

Letters I have received from people pleading for the extension of rent control tell the same story as these studies, but in a much more heart-breaking way. Here's one from a Philadelphia mother:

"I am a mother of two children. As a result, I am forced to live in the slums. For, like many, I am in the lowest income group. No one seems to want to rent to tenants with children. The few who might, ask rents beyond our means. The housing projects refuse to rent to separated families. It is certainly not my fault that my husband chose to desert his family. After rent, I have little for food and other necessities my children require. Yet if they grow up to be unhealthy citizens, I certainly will be blamed.

"Under the rent-control law, I have some protection. Those who claim this bill to be one-sided are wrong. Those landlords who are justified in increases certainly must get them. Only this morning I received notice of an increase. In my particular case, I don't think an increase was justified. Yet this increase was not entirely unfair. The landlady requested an increase of over 50 percent. This percentage, of course, was not granted. Can you imagine what would have happened, however, if the rent-control law was nonexistent? I know. Many persons like myself would be living in the streets."

The following letter from an Erie tenant gives some clue as to what the rent increases will amount to in case of decontrol in that highly important industrial center:

"My present lease contains a clause to the effect that at the expiration of rent control the rental will be increased 50 percent over that which we are now paying. If other rental units were available, this condition would not be so bad, but in the circumstances the tenants are at the mercy of the landlord."

These reports, studies, and letters have convinced me that a shortage still exists. I am willing to listen to the proof of those who would challenge this conclusion, but I sincerely doubt that they can come up with anything remotely close to substantial evidence.

In addition to the fact that a shortage does exist, we must remember that a tight law—a law like the one in effect during the war years—simply does not exist today. New construction is not under controls. Converted structures are not under controls. Today, if a landlord presents a reasonable case in applying for rental increases, he must be granted such increases. In the past year, the Office of the Housing Expediter has approved 76 percent of requests for increases. And the increases granted have averaged 17.8 percent.

Mr. Woods, in his testimony on Monday, went over some of the many grounds for granting rent increases. I might say at this point that the Housing Expediter's office has probably been much too agreeable in authorizing increases. They certainly cannot be accused of being too tough. And I think I should indicate at this time my conviction that if Congress had not been in such a hurry to remove controls from certain types of construction we would not face today the problems raised by many landlords who honestly feel that they are alone in their failure to cash in on the temporary gravy-train which is the inevitable byproduct of inflation.

Let us talk now about the present methods of decontrol under the Rent Control Act. Admittedly I opposed the local option provision when it was first proposed for the Rent Control Act of 1949. I felt that Congress, by adopting such tactics was trying to avoid its responsibility. But local option does have the merit of letting the folks back home decide for themselves what protection they wanted against sudden rental increases. And I think the fact that so few cities or States have exercised the option is indeed indicative of the conviction of most of the country that rent controls are still necessary. Perhaps I can make my point most effectively by reading from a February issue of Headlines, the weekly newsletter of the National Association of Real Estate Boards:

"* * * If we get Federal decontrol on next June 30, it will be because rent decontrol actions are rolling up so fast that Congress will be persuaded to let the Federal law die. If, at the end of a year of local option, only one-fifth of the total number of rental units has been decontrolled, then Congress will say, 'Okay, Mr. President, we'll grant your request for another year of Federal control.' * * * Here's the tale in a nutshell: National rent decontrol depends on what your board does or has done to get rid of rent control in your town. Now is the time for action on your community."

I read this article because it illustrates the fact that real estate interests recognize the importance of the local-option provision as a test of whether the people back home

really want rents decontrolled. As a matter of fact, according to Mr. Woods' testimony Monday, there has been a marked decrease in the number of decontrol actions in recent months. Mr. Woods assigns as the reason for this the fact that most communities which no longer needed controls had already lifted them—that those remaining felt the urgent need of some sort of brake on rentals.

The results of the study made by the Bureau of Labor Statistics on the effects of decontrolling in certain important communities throughout the country have already been given the committee. I know you share my feeling that the study indicated our present economy would suffer a real jolt if controls over rentals were withdrawn this June 30. I do think—with regard to the Bureau's study—that two points can stand frequent repeating: (1) That the communities included in this study all supposedly no longer needed rent controls, and (2) that the increases were highest, percentage-wise, for those in the lowest income brackets.

I introduced yesterday a substitute for the original rent control extension bill I cosponsored with the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois. This substitute is the same as the present bill with one small—but I think highly important—addition. For under my substitute bill, rent decontrol and rent recontrol becomes a two-way street. As you know, under the present bill, the Housing Expediter can only order recontrolling when he has originally ordered the decontrolling. If the decontrolling, on the other hand, is done either by the local or State governments, there is nothing either the Housing Expediter or the people in the affected communities can do to reinstate once again the badly needed rent controls. By my bill, any community—no matter how it was decontrolled—can again be put under the Federal law if the people in the community think such a step is necessary. This would be strictly a local proposition, and no one in Washington or in any regional office would make the decision. We would thus have available some safeguard, some last resort if people faced overnight outrageous increases they could not meet.

As to this question of whether rent control still remains to a major degree a Federal problem, I would like to answer an emphatic "most certainly the administration of a rent-control law is an obligation of Congress." I cannot understand the reasoning used by those who say the whole thing must be turned over to the States. Are they trying to make us believe, for example, that what happens to the economy of the manufacturing cities of our country—most of them still under control—cities like Pittsburgh—isn't reflected in the economic picture of the whole country? Are they so blind to the facts of life that they fail to realize a loss in real wages to a laborer in Pittsburgh will probably be reflected in an attempt at obtaining increased wages at the first opportunity. The average worker in the General Electric plant in Erie is reported to receive about $53 a week. If his rent suddenly skyrockets from $50 to $75, don't think for a moment that come the next contract negotiations time he won't be out asking for a wage boost to even up the score.

There are other reasons, of course, why rent control remains at this time a Federal problem. The Federal Government has the experienced personnel to handle such a setup. The Federal Government has an adequate law, with the necessary interpretations of that law. Probably the most important factor in this problem is the proposition so frankly discussed by Governor Bowles, in his testimony before this committee on Monday. He pointed out that the great majority of the State legislatures are dominated to an out-of-proportion degree by the rural areas in the States. Though the cities in most States represent the bulk of population, all too frequently legislation aimed at helping the population centers just does not stand a chance in a State legislature. And such would probably be the case with regard to State laws on rent controls.

I want to thank the members of this committee for the attentiveness they have showed me this morning. I know that the idea of working out once more an adequate rent-control law holds no great attraction for you. We all had hoped that by now the need for such legislation would have evaporated and that the housing shortage that has plagued our economy all these years would have disappeared. But, unfortunately, gentlemen, that shortage is still with us.

And I can truthfully say I feel the Congress of the United States would be making a tragic error if we permitted the end of Federal rent control within the next few months.

Shall We Give Free Rein to the Enemy in Our Midst?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 2 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Shall We Give Free Rein to the Enemy in Our Midst?" as published in a recent issue of the Rapid City Daily Journal, Rapid City, S. Dak., which supports the efforts of the Mundt-Ferguson-Johnston bill to both expose and curtail the activities of those subversive organizations which seek to establish a conspiracy against the Government of the United States.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHALL WE GIVE FREE REIN TO THE ENEMY IN OUR MIDST?

In a speech to the Federal bar association Monday night Harry Truman, President of the United States, chief executive officer of the Nation, said:

"There is no area of American life in which the Communist Party is making headway—except in the deluded minds of some people."

Mr. American Citizen, whatever your partisan hopes and beliefs may be, do you believe that statement?

Do you believe that Communist thinking has not made serious headway in this country? Do you believe that it is not now boring from within, with the most cunning malevolence and the utmost persistence?

Do you believe that the Hisses, the Coplons, the Klaus Fuchs did not do this country very great injury?

Do you believe, as the President says, that "not a single person who has been adjudged to be a Communist or otherwise disloyal remains on the Government payroll today?" If you so believe, are you sure that no such person who has not been so adjudged, may not still be there?

Do you believe, as the President implies, that there is today no threat of communism within this country?

Conspicuously Senator KARL MUNDT, of South Dakota, has been fighting communism and subversive interests within this country and beyond its borders. He is one of the authors of the Voice of America, taking to the Russian people the true purpose of the American people, showing them the American way of life, so free and full compared to their own.

Today Senator MUNDT is one of the authors of the Mundt-Ferguson bill in the Senate, a bill designed reasonably to curb communism in this country.

That bill in substance passed the House overwhelmingly in the Eightieth Congress. It has now been favorably reported in the Senate from the Judiciary Committee by a vote of 12 to 1.

The bill has been written and rewritten, revised and re-revised, studied with utmost care from every angle in order to obtain a working act that will adequately restrain communism and yet not interfere with the fundamental and constitutional right of the people to freedom of opinion, speech, and action.

Communists, naturally, are violently opposed to the proposed act. But there are also others, some undoubtedly sincere, others perhaps not so sincere.

Those who oppose the regulation by law of subversive activity in this country say that the Mundt-Ferguson bill is unconstitutional, that it will abridge the right of free speech and free assembly, that it will establish guilt by association, whereas guilt should be a personal matter; that it is so vague that an offender would not know when he was violating the law, and that it violates due processes of law.

This bill has been much discussed in the press, and by commentators on the radio. The Washington Star, in a thoughtful recent analysis of the bill, gave this answer to the objections we have briefly named:

"These are points on which well-meaning men can and generally do differ when any such legislation as this is under consideration. In the Star's judgment, the criticism is not sound. The bill, of course, will be carefully debated in the Senate. If the language can be made clearer, if more safeguards can be devised without vitiating the bill, that should and undoubtedly will be done. But it should be kept in mind that the lines on these issues are firmly drawn. What most of the critics really object to is not the form of this particular bill. They will oppose any measure designed to achieve the same objectives and containing the necessary teeth. So the essential questions are whether the Communist conspiracy is real enough to justify the enactment of such a measure, and whether the Constitution will permit its enforcement if enacted.

"The reality of the conspiracy is attested by the fact that we are spending more than $20,000,000,000 a year to defend ourselves against the Communists and to check their encroachments abroad. In that setting, it would be an absurdity not to do all that can be done to curb the Communists and their sympathizers in this country. Will the Constitution permit this? If not, then it follows that that document denies to Congress the power to adopt laws to protect the Nation against those who would use our constitutional liberties to destroy us. It is hard to believe that this is the case."

We think the Washington Star's position is further well taken when it suggests that all possible further improvements should be made in the bill and then acted into law and its validity passed upon by the courts. "It should not be allowed to die simply because some people think it is unconstitutional and because some others pretend to think so." * * *

It is true, as President Truman said to the Federal bar Monday night, "that the greatest threat does not come from Communists within this country."

It is true, also as he says, that Communists are "a noisy but small (comparatively) and universally despised group" in this country.

But the President does a disservice to his country when he makes light of them. They have already betrayed valuable American defense secrets to the enemy. They have already, over a period of years, given the detailed secrets of the atom bomb to Russia. They infiltrated into the Government in numbers, attempting to corrupt American policy at its source, and to betray it, with all the cunning of the unscrupulous purpose of aggression which dominates them. Worse, far worse, they have instilled the poison of communism into American schools and colleges and into a shocking number of American minds.

Card-carrying Communists may be hard to put the finger on, but communist workers, sympathizers and fellow travelers, hidden or avowed, have been and are in many walks of American life, and some of them have been found in high places. We still nourish such vipers in our breast.

Is America so indifferent to the communist dangers from within, or so weak and unresourceful, or so chocked with partisan selfishness that it will not fight except with shot and shell and the blood of its sons?

Confusion as to Subversive Activities Investigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 2 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Confused Press," from the Maynard News, of Maynard, Minn.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CONFUSED PRESS

NEW YORK, N. Y. (from the Minneapolis Star-Tribune, April 25, 1950).—William Dwight, general manager of the Holyoke (Mass.) Transcript-Telegram, said today that "clever propagandists" are using newspapers "to put their subversive ideas across."

Dwight was among the speakers at the first session of the convention of American Newspaper Publishers Association. He was chairman of the session devoted to publishers of newspapers with from 10,000 to 50,000 circulation.

He urged publishers and editors to resist the propaganda of pressure groups.

"We print columns of propaganda," Dwight said, "under the guise of news advocating those things which we know threaten to destroy us. We justify it on the basis that we are broadminded and want to give both sides of the story.

"If we only would give both sides of the story. Instead, the clever propagandists are using us to put their subversive ideas across while many of us stand by silently."

The editors of the Minneapolis Star-Tribune are in an embarrassing position. For the past 6 weeks they have been slanting headlines, writing editorials, and in every way possible defending the character, reputations, loyalty, and personal honesty of Owen Lattimore, and others who have been named by Senator McCARTHY as having Communist affiliations. The crowning insult to the fighting Senator from Wisconsin was a cartoon published in the Star a few days ago, picturing him in a clown's suit, being pulled off the stage with a long hook.

In addition, Star-Tribune columnists, such as Drew Pearson, Mrs. Roosevelt, and Marquis Childs, are carrying on a campaign of belittlement, smear, and misrepresentation against McCARTHY which is not honest or justified.

The testimony given by Budenz is not sufficient to convict Lattimore, because to this date it is one man's word against another. Only the naive would discount the Budenz testimony, because his past record demonstrates that when he "puts his finger" on a Communist the courts ultimately prove him to be right. His collaborating evidence was responsible for the conviction of Gerhart Eisler, Alger Hiss, and the 11 United States Communist Party officials. If the Lattimore case falls into the same pattern there is a good chance that Lattimore will be convicted for perjury and possibly treason.

The Star-Tribune editors now recognize the seriousness of the Budenz testimony, and their comments on the case Friday morning of last week were less arbitrary than were their previous editorials against McCARTHY. Their present reluctance to believe the worst about Lattimore can be summarized in their own words:

"What shall we believe? When it is Budenz' word against Lattimore's, where shall the confused mind go for reassurance?"

There are "confused minds"—but whose? Most of the public is confused because of the anti-McCarthy propaganda that has been hurled at them through the press and radio. However, how about the minds of the men in the editorial offices who are supposed to think things through and come up with the right answers? Wouldn't it be fair to say that the confusion originates in those editorial minds and is transmitted to the public?

To the editorial inquiry, "* * * where shall the confused mind go for reassurance?" may we humbly suggest the following advice to the owners of the Star-Tribune?

1. Dismiss the editorial writers who cannot distinguish the difference between civil-rights issues and honest efforts to clean out of Government the subversive radicals who may or may not carry membership cards in the Communist Party. (Alger Hiss did not carry a card.) Hire writers who will more accurately reflect the good judgment and patriotic philosophy of the president of the two newspapers, Mr. John Cowles.

2. Discontinue the publication of the Drew Pearson column. His record over the years has proven him to be an unreliable, sensational keyhole reporter, who has consistently been the hatchet man for the extreme left wing of the administration. His smear attacks against public officials who won't play ball with the left-wing clique and against Members of Congress who try to expose radicalism in high places should disqualify him as a contributor to the columns of respectable newspapers like the Star-Tribune. Mrs. Roosevelt and Marquis Childs adequately represent the philosophy of the New Deal and the Americans for Democratic Action.

3. Give your readers a chance to read the other side of the story by adding the column of George Sokolsky and using more of the material released by David Lawrence of the United States News and World Report.

These suggestions are being made in all seriousness and without malice.

Proposed Curtailment of Mail Deliveries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 2 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a release by me on April 28 regarding the proposed curtailment of mail deliveries.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MYERS CALLS POSTAL CUT-BACK "ILL-CONSIDERED"

PHILADELPHIA, April 27.—United States Senator FRANCIS J. MYERS (Democrat, Pennsylvania) took issue tonight with the Post Office order to curtail mail deliveries, calling it "an ill-considered move—made without any study of the hardship it would cause—and one which would probably cost more in the long run than it purports to save."

The Pennsylvania senior Senator, assistant majority leader of the United States Senate, addressed the Tri-County Postal Meeting tonight at the Drexel Brook Inn.

"As a matter of fact," Myers said, "no one seems to know just what the order means. I have seen estimates that 10,000 postal employees would be laid off—but that is about the only concrete number I've seen. There doesn't seem to be any agreement as to how much this move is supposed to save—and no one seems to have any idea whether the need really exists for more than one mail delivery daily.

"Apparently the Postmaster General got pressured into this by the House Appropriations Committee. The committee announced point-blank that it would not recommend the funds necessary to operate the Post Office next year—and in short, told the Post Office to cut deliveries to help make ends meet.

"Well, cutting mail deliveries—without paying the slightest attention to whether the present service is needed—is not any solution to the postal deficit. An impulsive move of this sort is a slip-shod way to do business, and I am dead set against this sort of procedure. The committee, in forcing the order, didn't hold any public hearings to get the facts—and it didn't suggest that any effort should be made to get the facts before the cut-back went into effect. In short, all it said was that the cut should be made—and the damage determined later.

"Last year—as all of you know—there were some changes made in reorganizing the Post Office Department along some of the lines suggested by Hoover Commission recommendations. The 21 newest reorganization plans submitted to Congress by President Truman propose several more reorganization changes—and though some of the changes have met with a bit of opposition, the Reorganization Plan No. 18, which was the subject of some controversy, received a favorable endorsement just the other day from the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and at present there is no indication that a move will be made in the Senate to block the plan.

"The important point to keep in mind about the Post Office—and this goes for any Government function—is that we must stick with the merits of the issue; we must get the facts; and we must avoid fly-by-night efforts to achieve 'economy' by hastily conceived moves such as the order to cut postal service."

The Critical Condition of the Maritime Industry and Its Effect on the Pacific Northwest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 2 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a memorandum entitled "The Critical Condition of the Maritime Industry and Its Effect on the Pacific Northwest," submitted to me by Mr. Homer T. Shaver, of Portland, Oreg.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CRITICAL CONDITION OF THE MARITIME INDUSTRY AND ITS EFFECT ON THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST

(By Homer T. Shaver)

Very few of the general public and especially the taxpayers who pay the bills realize the investment that they have in waterborne commerce in the United States. They generally take it for a fact and feel that it is the other man's burden, not theirs. This not only applies to the citizen who does not come directly in contact with it, but also to the man who is in the business and the employees of the maritime industry who are responsible for its production.

In confining ourselves locally to the Pacific Northwest the amount of money invested by the taxpayers in the different ports of the States of Oregon, Washington, and Idaho in terminals on both rivers and harbors will run considerably over $63,000,000. Certainly it is about time that the people who are paying the bills and their representatives in both Congress and State legislatures should have this fact brought to their direct attention. The public has the investment and the men representing them in public life should realize that it is their duty to protect that investment. Outside of this public capital invested in terminals, there are other millions invested by private owners in like terminals and the same obligation by our legislators should apply to them as well as the public ports. To arrive at the full use and benefit of these facilities that are installed on rivers and harbors, it has also been necessary to invest both public and private capital in the construction of water transportation systems; such as: the off-shore, coastwise, and intercoastal vessels and last, but not least, the inland water carriers.

TERMINAL OPERATOR

From the standpoint of port interest, marine terminal facilities whose continued operations are predicated upon the commercial movement of maritime shipping are finding economic survival difficult. Major port facilities, as I have stated before, require large investments. They have large overhead costs which cannot be justified unless they earn regular revenues from a normal shipping service. Also the commodity movements upon which these terminals depend for revenue present a serious question to public and private terminal operators. In fact, the economy of the Pacific Northwest is affected by the situation that exists today as far as the maritime industry goes and will become further intensified unless measures are taken to restore that which has been lost. The loss of steamship service, coastwise and intercoastal, not only affects the public and private terminal but also a large part of our laboring public engaged in the maritime industry; such as: stevedores, warehousemen, and allied trades.

STEAMSHIP LINES

The situation that the offshore, intercoastal, and coastwise steamship operators find themselves in at the present time is more serious than the general public seems to realize. Due to the enormous increase of costs of operation piled upon steamship operators in the last few years, they find themselves in the position of not being able to obtain sufficient revenues to even pay for the operating costs. The postwar adjustment that was necessary to be made has been the worst ever faced by the steamship industry. Mounting costs, constant crippling strikes, low-cost foreign competitors, and depressed noncompensatory rates by railroads have practically eliminated some steamship operations entirely.

There are some foreign trade lines that now enjoy a superior competitor position with good earnings, a large fleet, an adequate backlog of tonnage but the domestic trades now must have public assistance. Domestic and offshore maritime commerce is absolutely essential to the welfare of the Pacific Northwest for the protection of its investment in terminals and for its economic survival, and we certainly cannot overlook the fact that here again the taxpayer, through the Federal Government, is vitally interested in the capital that he has invested in the maritime fleet and as far as our public representatives go, the investment of the private shipowners is just as important.

INLAND WATER CARRIERS

The inland water transportation industry, up until recent years, has received very small recognition in the part it plays in the transportation system of the United States. Our Federal Government has millions invested in its own barge lines and also through loans from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to private owners. The total investment of inland water carriers alone in the Pacific Northwest on the great Columbia River and its tributaries and our harbors and sounds runs well over $20,000,000.

The inland water carrier is an integral part of maritime commerce in feeding and receiving cargo from the steamship lines as well as other forms of transportation, the motor carriers, and is the connecting link in many port facilities. Few of us realize that the accumulated capital investment by the United States for developing its inland water systems and coastal areas, not including navigational aids, up until 1945 had reached a total figure of $1,266,000,000. These figures, no doubt, are impressive but when apportioned among the 156,000,000 inhabitants Nation-wide, the investment has returned benefits in economic transportation plus property protection through flood control far in excess of the expenditure.

In specifically confining ourselves to the Columbia River system the growth of our inland water industry especially from Portland, Oreg. to Pasco, Wash. shows an increase in total tonnage from 635,400 tons in 1932 to 3,582,700 tons in 1947. These figures seem to show that there is a clear justification for the investments of the Federal Government in our inland waterways in the Pacific Northwest and also our public terminals.

The Pacific Northwest is doubly blessed in the possession of enormous territorial areas in its hinterland, rich in mineral deposits, grazing and agricultural resources with this entire area served by the Columbia River system. This waterway offers the finest, safe, and economical system of transportation permitting the development of this great area of natural resources. This requires the use of suitable and economical facilities for transportation and our inland water system is the most economical known.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

In times past there has been national agitation against subsidies for the construction and maintenance of services for maritime commerce. The general public seems to lose sight of the fact that the maritime industry is absolutely necessary for our national defense. This should be self-evident to our men in public life in light of the record of our domestic fleet and inland water carriers in World War II. Our merchant marine and Great Lakes fleet bore the first brunt of the war providing us with shipping capacity at a time when our national security hung in the balance. Ships were readily available, manned by experienced crews and furnished our first line of defense until the shipbuilding program got into full swing. What would have been the situation in the United States after Pearl Harbor if there had been no intercoastal, coastwise, and Great Lakes fleet? National disaster would have ensued.

In our own Pacific Northwest there is little known of the magnitude of water transportation during World War II on the Columbia River by the inland water carriers. If it had not been for the barge lines taking over the entire gasoline supply program for the Army and Navy Air Corps, when there wasn't enough tank cars available, the program would not have been accomplished. In doing this the inland water carriers overcame tremendous navigation hazards and invested an additional $11,000,000 in new equipment—gambling on the future.

Still there are people in the face of the war record of the maritime industry who would put their heads in the sand and gamble with the national security by arguing that domestic shipping has served its role in our national development; that railroads need the traffic; that the water-borne shipping should go the way of the horse and buggy. These people are willing to gamble the country's security for the sake of profit and for the sake of monopolistic control of transportation by one form of transportation only, little realizing that in the end they are asking for complete Government acquisition.

It has been repeatedly stated by our top military authorities that an adequate merchant marine and inland water-carrier service is essential to our national defense and that the Navy and Army programs could not function without them. No detailed discussion on this point should be necessary.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION REGULATIONS

The Transportation Act of 1940, part III, vests in the Interstate Commerce Commission the duty of regulating water carriers engaged in interstate commerce. Under parts I and II, of the ICC Act, they already have the power of regulating railroads and motor carriers. Under part III, the Commission is charged with the duty of setting up a national transportation policy of coordination so as to best serve the shipping public and to preserve the inherent advantages of each form of transportation without unfair or destructive competition.

It was hoped that this act would provide a solution to the ruthless rail-water competitive problem as it did for the railroads when this act was originally passed. After 8 years of operation under this law, the situation has deteriorated steadily and in fact has reached the point of the present crisis.

While the Maritime Commission is charged with construction and operation of maritime fleets and their services, it has taken encouraging steps in initiating an investigation of rail-water rate structures, but it has no control over the domestic trades. It can merely recommend or appeal to the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Unless the ICC takes immediate appropriate action to terminate this ruthless competition through noncompensatory rates and to restore a reasonable balance between rail and water service in accordance with its duties as charged in the law, it will be absolutely necessary for our legislators in both Congress and the different States to pass a mandate of a character which will permit water-borne commerce to live. It can neither operate nor exist under present conditions. Congress has recently appointed a committee to investigate the noncompensatory rates of railroads and also the operations of the ICC, but unless this matter is kept before the committees it will just die a natural death.

RAILROAD COMPETITION

The present situation of our entire water-borne transportation system is due to abuses of long standing. For many years, it has been progressively undermined by ruthless, railroad competitive practices. This is not a mere accusation but a condition which has been recognized in official reports of the Interstate Commerce Commission and other authoritative agencies. The domestic carrier can never hope to renew service under present operating costs when depressed rates in effect, at the present time, by the railroads which in many cases are noncompensatory to the railroad itself keeping him from receiving sufficient revenues to operate and pay his costs of operation plus a reasonable profit.

A full investigation will show that where the ICC has allowed an increase in rate for railroads that they were only increased where they were not in competition with water carriers. Applying this practice to our Pacific Northwest, every time an increase is allowed by the ICC on a percentage basis, it places the Pacific Northwest in a more unfavorable position in the form of transcontinental rates from the Middle West to the Pacific Coast. Every percentage increase on a long haul makes it cost more to lay cargo down in Pacific Northwest ports moving across the Pacific so that the off-shore carrier who now comes into the picture finds his cargo tied up and being diverted to the east coast or the Gulf ports. This immediately dries up revenue for off-shore operators as well as the terminal operators and affects our whole economic system. Therefore, it resolves itself down to this: Present depressed rail rates are an effective barrier to the increase of water rates and the water carriers are thus unable to recapture the added cost of operation under present inflated conditions. The railroads through the maintenance of depressed rates have made it impossible for water lines to operate on a compensatory rate basis. As long as this situation continues, our maritime commerce of the Pacific Northwest is in a hopeless position.

REMEDIES

Innumerable official studies and public hearings are available outlining the handicap concerning water-borne commerce in the postwar years. It would be superfluous to undertake here a detailed discussion of all these problems, the nature of which is well known to our Maritime Commission, Interstate Commerce Commission, various congressional committees and State legislative committees. In considering the rehabilitation of water transportation we must recognize the factors of inflated initial costs of construction and inflated operating costs and a depressed rate structure which makes it impossible to operate at a profit.

As we see it, there are two possible solutions to the water transportation problem:

1. An adequate adjustment of the rail-water rate controversy by the ICC taking immediate appropriate action to terminate this ruthless competition and to restore a reasonable balance between rail and water service in accordance with its duties as charged in part III of the ICC Act or if it fails to do so, direct congressional action by Congress or State legislatures to put through a legislative mandate of a character which will permit water-borne commerce to live. This adjustment, either by ICC or legislative action, should once and for all solve the problem of the railroad practice of instituting noncompensatory rates on water competitor traffic merely for the purpose of holding this traffic to the railroads even though at a loss.

2. Another possibility for the rejuvenation of water transportation would be a public recognition that maritime commerce is essential to the national defense and that it should be maintained by the Government at whatever the cost. This would imply subsidies in the form of favorable charter conditions or underwriting by the Government of operating losses. Under our form of democratic government, I do not believe that any of us would choose this as the final solution.

However, in reviewing the last possibility the Merchant Marine Act was enacted at a time when the merchant marine was unable to compete with foreign operators and construction and operating subsidies were provided to overcome this and to assure that the American fleet would continue to ply the seas. Recent statistics have shown that this subsidy for both construction and operation has returned more and cost the taxpayer less than any other subsidy provided by the Federal Government.

Our domestic commerce would, under this plan, have to have the same public assistance as our off-shore operations. Naturally other forms of transportation would publicly oppose any such suggestion contending that it would be discrimination. However, other forms of transportation are forgetting the fact that they are discriminating against the general public and the shipper when they are carrying cargo at a loss where competing with water carriers and then charging an excessive rate where there is no competition. If domestic water commerce is essential to national defense, then the cost should be carried on as one in the face of our national security program.

The American people, whether they know it or not, have a tremendous stake in their water-borne commerce and in their ports and harbors. The Nation has no cheaper form of transportation and this same transportation has always been a great leveller from high rates from other forms of transportation. It has for a great number of years acted as a cover over excessive rates. Its contribution to the national welfare in economy in both war and peace cannot be challenged.

As we have said before, there is a great national investment in navigation equipment, harbor improvements, and terminal facilities, the full benefits of which cannot be realized unless it is fully restored and protected by either ICC action or legislative action both through Congress and our State legislators.

Poll of Minnesota Farmers on Continuance of Egg Supports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 2 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, one of the most vital issues facing the farm community is that of the price-support program. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the Minnesota poll of April 23, 1950, which was taken on the basis of a State-wide sampling of farm opinion. The poll has been conducted for several years, and has a record of reasonable accuracy insofor as the sampling of public opinion is concerned.

The poll reveals that on the question of whether or not the principles of the Brannan plan should be applied to egg producers, 63 percent of Minnesota farmers said they would like to see it tried, and 26 percent said they were opposed to it.

So I ask unanimous consent that the poll may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the poll was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE'S FARMERS STRONGLY FAVOR CONTINUED FEDERAL EGG SUPPORTS

Farmers throughout Minnesota tend to favor corn acreage allotments and potato production controls, and they strongly advocate continued Federal support of egg prices, a State-wide sampling of farm opinion by the Minnesota poll indicates.

Three out of every five farmers questioned in the survey also say they would like to see the Government try out a plan for letting market conditions set egg prices, with the Government making payments to egg producers if market prices prove too low to yield a fair return to them. This would be in effect the Brannan plan approach to the problem.

A representative cross section of farm men and women in all parts of the State was interviewed in the survey. Results show that 38 percent of the farmers in the sample grow corn for market, 77 percent sell eggs, and 10 percent grow potatoes commercially.

Interviewers asked first:

"Are you personally for or against acreage allotments this year on corn production?"

The answers:	*Percent*
For allotments	45
Against	32
Qualified	1
No opinion	22
	100

Under corn acreage limitations announced in February—the first in more than a decade—Minnesota's commercial corn acreage this year will be 24 percent less than the 1949 corn acreage.

Farmers who grow corn for sale are more in favor of the acreage allotment program than are those who grow corn for feed, according to the survey results.

Another question was:

"Do you think the Government should or should not continue to support the price of eggs?"

The replies:	*Percent*
Should	75
Should not	15
Qualified	1
No opinion	9
	100

Seventy-eight percent of the people who sell eggs on the market endorse Federal price support, as compared with 63 percent of those who do not market eggs.

Those answering that the Government "should" continue to support egg prices were asked:

"How do you think the Government should support egg prices?"

Some suggest a support program based on egg quality—"so that good eggs get the best prices." Others favor Government purchase of surplus eggs, or "setting a minimum price," or "basing the price on the cost of

feed." Twelve percent think "the present method is all right," with the Government maintaining prices through arrangements with egg-drying plants.

More than two out of every five farmers who favor egg price support say they have no ideas to offer on how that should be done.

All farmers were asked:

"What would you think of this kind of plan? Let market conditions set the price of eggs, but have the Government make payments to the egg producer if the market prices are too low to give them a fair return. How does that strike you—would you like to see that plan tried, or would you be against it?"

The answers:	*Percent*
Like to see it tried	63
Against it	26
Qualified	1
No opinion	10
	100

A Bigelow farmer commented, "That sounds like Brannan's plan, and I wouldn't be in favor of it," and a Lake Elmo farmer said, "I'm against all Government payments." But a Winthrop farmer believes such a plan "would be fairer—all could make a living," and a Pine River farmer said he would favor trying out the plan if the "fair return" were based on the cost of production.

The final question was:

"Do you favor or oppose production controls for potatoes?"

The replies:	*Percent*
Favor	49
Oppose	22
Qualified	1
No opinion	28
	100

The relatively few commercial potato growers questioned in the survey were evenly divided in their opinions on the question of production controls, but among other farmers there was a vote of more than 2 to 1 in favor of such controls.

News Letter by Senator Myers to the People of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 2 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a Washington News Letter dated April 20, 1950, written by me, being a personal report to the people of Pennsylvania.

There being no objection, the news letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON NEWS LETTER—A PERSONAL REPORT TO THE PEOPLE OF PENNSYLVANIA

APRIL 20, 1950.

Coal is having its troubles—and to important coal-producing States like Pennsylvania, the sweeping changes that have taken place in our fuel tastes in the past 30 years or so have a vital significance in terms of employment and industrial growth.

Questions of grave national concern arise from our fuel developments. I have recently introduced Senate Resolution 239 to authorize gathering all the facts about fuel in order that a national fuel policy may ultimately be worked out. To establish this policy, we must know—

Our energy requirements for the foreseeable future in terms of needs for an expanding peacetime economy and for security in event of war.

What fuels are best adapted to meet our energy needs—considering costs in terms of available resources—and the possibilities offered by research.

How much we can rely upon fuel imports in event of war, recalling our wartime power shortages, and the difficulty of bringing in materials from abroad.

We must have an abundant supply of energy at reasonable prices. This is fundamental, and every phase of our national life depends upon energy—energy to produce, to transport, to heat and light our homes—in short, energy for everything.

Our national energy needs have jumped 70 percent since World War I. But, though our needs have sky-rocketed, coal has steadily played a smaller role in supplying them. The recurrent labor-management disputes in coal are the symptoms, not the cause, of the changes which have taken place since World War I. Here are a few comparisons:

Coal furnished 82.3 percent of our energy in 1918—but by 1949, only 38.5 percent came from coal—anthracite production last year was 50 percent less than in 1918—and bituminous output in 1949 was only 75 percent of the 1918 production.

Petroleum supplied 10.9 percent of our energy in 1918—and 37.4 percent last year.

Natural gas rose from 3.6 percent at the end of World War I to 19.1 percent in 1949.

Water power, still a small fraction, climbed from 3.2 percent to 5 percent in 1949.

There isn't an easy answer to explain these big shifts. The following points, though the list is far from complete, are involved in the picture:

Vast new energy markets have developed that rely on liquid fuels—the automobile, the truck, and the airplane are notable examples.

Pipe lines carry energy in the form of oil and gas at far lower costs than are possible through the costly handling of coal by rail and water.

Labor costs for coal are far greater than for oil and gas. Once an oil or gas well is drilled, the product is pumped from the earth or flows out under its own pressure. Every ton of coal must be dug—a job which, despite big mine safety improvements, is still difficult, dirty, unhealthy, and costly.

Oil imports are capturing important industrial markets which formerly used coal, and while it's true we still export nearly as much oil as we import, the recent rise in oil imports has cut directly into coal markets.

Profits in oil and gas have been much higher, permitting far more research—and heavier capital investment—which have lowered oil prices.

Determining a national fuel policy will be a complex job. Facts about particular fuels are frequently contradicted by other fuel suppliers, and comparisons are difficult. Coal makes up 95 percent of our known fuel reserves, so our much more limited supplies of oil and gas raise questions of conserving our resources. Energy must be available at reasonable prices or our economy will falter—and our economy must expand to meet our goal of full employment.

My resolution tackles the necessary job of finding the facts we must have to meet the future. When we know what our future energy needs will be—and where the energy will come from—we have the basis for determining policies which will lead us to still higher living standards, full employment, and much stronger foundations for our free-enterprise system. A big and needed task is ahead, but it must be undertaken now as a matter of national welfare.

FRANCIS J. MYERS.

Commendation of Senator Wiley by Wisconsin Weekly Newspapers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 2 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, we are all familiar with the fact that the weekly newspapers of America are one of the most vital information links between the Congress and the American people at the grass roots of the Nation. The weekly papers provide indispensable services to folks at the grass roots, keeping them in contact with developments in their own community, in Washington, and throughout the world.

In this connection, I was delighted to note in two weekly newspapers of Wisconsin—the Waupaca County Post and the Clintonville Tribune Gazette—published in the northern part of the Badger State an editorial message in praise of the senior Senator from America's dairyland. I think that this editorial published in these two affiliated papers voices the judgment not only of many other Wisconsin weekly newspaper editors, but of daily editors and of the people of Wisconsin as a whole.

I ask unanimous consent, therefore, that the text of this fine and well-deserved editorial as published in the April 27 issues of the Clintonville Tribune Gazette and the Waupaca County Post entitled "WILEY Alert for Wisconsin" be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILEY ALERT FOR WISCONSIN

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY deserves to be congratulated on his alertness in protecting and advancing the interests of Wisconsin in Washington.

The Senator now is engaged in a campaign to force the Department of Agriculture to step up milk research in order to counteract the damage which the Democratic Congress did to the dairy business by passage of the oleomargarine bill.

The Department, he discovered, spends four times as much money for cotton research as for dairying, yet dairying is the farmer's greatest source of income.

"Some observers have called the present Democratic administration peanut and cotton crazy, judging from the constant emphasis of the administration (dominated by southerners) on expanding cotton and peanut production," said WILEY.

The recent farm bill signed by President Truman, the Wisconsin Senator points out, is a fantastic measure to increase farm and peanut acreage, especially, at the expense of the entire Nation.

Senator WILEY also is seeking removal of barriers to certification of Wisconsin and Minnesota milk for interstate shipment, as a means of aiding farmers in expanding their markets.

Another pet project of the Wisconsin senior Senator is authority for an inventory of the forest resources of our State. He has found that the many wood-using industries of the State will be glad to cooperate with the governmental forestry agencies in this task.

Because Wisconsin is a self-reliant State, her Senators and Representatives in Congress are not called on as frequently as those from many other States to plead for special interests. Some of our Western States are almost wholly dependent upon the Federal Government, which owns much of the land in them.

In making a vigorous fight against the oleomargarine bill and in promotion of the dairy and other Wisconsin industries, however, WILEY has found a field in which he can rightly claim a square deal for his State. In any event, he seems determined to champion Wisconsin causes most vigorously in Congress.

Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARRY P. CAIN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 2 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Washington probably receives as much mail on the question of Federal rent control as does any other Member of the Senate. Citizens write to me from every State in the Nation about their views, and their letters find a very warm welcome. Because both the Senate and the House of Representatives are presently considering whether Federal rent control ought to expire on June 30, 1950, or be extended for a further period, I wish to share some of my mail on the rent-control subject with my colleagues. Those who wrote the letters are not my constituents, but I gladly seek to provide them with an opportunity to be heard. I believe their observations to be valid and deserving of consideration. I ask unanimous consent that these letters be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 26, 1950.

Hon. HARRY P. CAIN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Knowing of your good works and of your interest in the rights of property owners, we thought you might like to read the enclosed article on rents in politics.

All our lives we have been good little Democrats but since the Democratic Party is leaning heavily toward socialism, we, the De Leuws, are determined to be Republicans from here on in.

Sincerely,

HELEN M. DE LEUW.
ANDREW J. DE LEUW.

[From the Los Angeles Times of April 25, 1950]

RENTS IN POLITICS

Rent control is now out of the realm of economics and into that of demagogic politics. This is made evident by recent utterances by President Truman and his stooge and supporter, Governor Bowles of Connecticut.

Truman says that millions will suffer because of a wave of exorbitant rent increases if rent control dies June 30, while Bowles weeps for industry and business with the declaration that tenants will have at least $1,500,000,000 less to spend if rent controls expire.

Both are talking for Buncombe County, without the slightest sincerity or intention to be accurate.

Taking Bowles' statement first, if tenants will have $1,500,000,000 less to spend because rents go up, then landlords will have $1,500,000,000 more to spend and the net effect on the economy will be nil. Bowles must be aware of this enormous hole in his argument, but thinks the public is too dumb to see it.

As for H. S. T., he likewise knows better. The decontrols already put into effect in large areas have caused no appreciable hardship. There have been no, or at least very few, exorbitant rent boosts.

That there would be hardship to tenants is not a certainty but speculation; while the hardship to property owners who are losing money with rents frozen at depression levels, while taxes and all other costs have pyramided, is a certainty.

Meanwhile rent control, present and prospective, hangs over the rental building situation like a dark cloud. Even though new construction is not currently controlled, investors fear it may be.

The politicians want rent control for one reason: They think there are more tenant voters than landlord voters.

WILLIAM H. MAXANT,
ATTORNEY AT LAW,
Chicago, Ill., April 26, 1950.

Senator HARRY P. CAIN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAIN: I understand that you are in favor of abolishing rent control, and I want to tell you that I appreciate it. I think that rent control was needed up to this time, but to continue it any longer is just political selfishness.

Many Senators and Congressmen are unable to face this issue honestly and do not mind stepping on the feet of some people and injuring them unjustly, just to help other people.

Run-away exploitation by landlords would have been possible a couple of years ago, but today there are places available in sufficient quantity to at least limit landlords from becoming foolish and charging exorbitant prices. But certainly you know that a landlord is entitled to 15 percent or 20 percent increase in view of the tremendous increase in taxes and other costs which have limited the income from rental units to a point where people dependent upon them are often in severe straits. And how shall they keep their buildings up to date?

Thank you for your cooperation.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM H. MAXANT.

P. S.—Please balance the budget. And stop deficit spending. Defeat the President's Reorganization Plan No. 12. Don't surrender our freedom by spending us into slavery, please.

A. B. AYMARD,
Memphis, Tenn., April 17, 1950.

Senator HARRY P. CAIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAIN: Along with several million other native-born decent American citizens, I want to congratulate and commend you for the efforts you are making to forever remove from our United States some of the communistic things that are fast destroying this grand Nation.

I am now 65 years of age. Over a period of 45 years I have pinched a few pennies from every dollar I have ever earned and placed these savings in a little rent property for my old age security.

Like millions of others who have followed this course, I now find my working capital liquidated, my property unsound physically due to inability to maintain it properly under this un-American, communistic, Socialist-labor rent control law.

People need roofs under which they may install the equipment for cooking these highly inflated potato and other farm products, but the people who have supplied these roofs have been sliced off from our economic structure, singled out for complete bankruptcy and destruction, discriminated against by our own Government and left to struggle single-handed and in despair at a time when the revenues from their properties is sorely needed.

The statements made by some of the housing expediters and broadcast over this Nation, that to remove this communistic rent control would upset the economy of this Nation, are grossly overstated and the scarecrow of economic chaos, broadcast in this same connection recently, are absurd and distasteful to the thinking people of this Nation. On the face of the fight being made to perpetuate these men in office and continue this needless waste of public money it is my personal opinion that a wedge is being driven into the solidarity of this Nation that will be far-flung unless immediate relief is had.

The property owners form the vertebras of this Nation's backbone. They realize that their wares will have to go through decent channels of competition and price.

More power to you.

Sincerely,

A. B. AYMARD.

ST. LOUIS, MO., *March 7, 1950.*

Senator CAIN,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: As small property holders, my husband and self appreciate and commend very highly the stand you are taking on rent control. We just happened to catch your radio talk last Friday night. We have a run-down 6-family apartment which represents 10 hard years of self-denial and sacrifice and with rents frozen at a depression level it seems impossible to make any headway. Last year we spent $1,400 more than our income on the place and when we asked for an increase, it was denied and the rent-board told us we made 20 percent. It is our understanding anyone that received a 15-percent increase will not be granted more.

How any fair-minded American can condone such actions is more than we can understand. Our tenants with their 1950 salaries can afford new cars, fur coats, and televisions, while we must continue to skimp to pay the coal bill which has almost tripled since we bought the place. Our place is becoming more and more run down and there is nothing left over to pay for more than just the absolute essentials.

Please keep up your good fight.

Sincerely yours,

MILDRED K. SCHALL.

DENVER, COLO., *March 10, 1950.*

Hon. HARRY P. CAIN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Once again comes June 30, with its rent control extension problem, discriminating against property owners throughout these United States.

As owners of a small apartment, we desire to solicit your further efforts in behalf of freedom, by allowing the rent control law to expire this year on its expiration date, June 30. We appreciate your support in the past and know that you are right in trying to aid the property owners in their present struggle to regain the right to manage their own businesses, which they have built through the years by hard work and good judgment.

As taxpayers, we believe, that the expensive and expansive pay-roll set-up that the OPA rent control maintains in the cities in the United States and in Washington, D. C., is now a needless extravagance.

Ending rent controls would be an excellent way to start balancing the budget. It would be a boon to business in many ways. We hope that you will continue to do whatever possible to give the property owners of America the relief to which they are entitled, from a law that, in peacetimes, has no place in our American way of life.

Very respectfully,

JAMES G. PERISHO.
(Mrs. J. G.) MABEL H. PERISHO.

THE HURDS,
Williamsport, Md., March 3, 1950.

DEAR SENATOR CAIN: Just finished listening to Meet the Press. Several times I have heard you concerning rent control and I admire your courage. There are 20 families living in my various properties and although I have mortgages totaling $10,000 and notes totaling $3,000 I have lowered some rents and intend lowering others in near future because I want to be fair to my tenants.

I do dislike the Government telling me what to and what not to do with my properties which I labored so hard for 40 years to obtain. I am a retired retail merchant 58 years old and due to several permanent ailments cannot attend to daily routine of business.

I live on rent income and even though I am sending my son to college to secure the needed education in order to meet the world, I do not intend raising my rents one cent, control or no control. Just would like to attend to my own business.

True, I am not one of your constituents and I have never written or spoken one word concerning rents to my own Senators TYDINGS and O'CONOR or my Representative BEALL (Republican) for I did not wish to attempt to influence them but I think so very much of you for your "spunk" I just felt like letting you know it, for which I beg your pardon knowing you receive plenty correspondence due to the long distance from your State of Washington to Washington, D. C. I am a registered Democrat but it did not and will not do H. S. T. any good. My best to you and yours,

WILLIAM S. HURD.

VENTURA, CALIF., *April 14, 1950.*
Senator HARRY P. CAIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAIN: I wish we, the people of America, had more men like you in Washington to represent us. If Congress could just realize what rent control has done to the morale of the landlord, and how hopeless our future seems since Truman and Congress have decided to go into the housing business.

I am 66 years old, a widow, and worked, saved, and put all my life savings in a few houses, trying to be self-supporting in my old age. But now you feel like the thing to do is sell everything you have, squander the money, and get on the old-age pension, and be under the Government support, as the present set-up wants to kill all free enterprise. All other price control has been canceled. Rent control now amounts to confiscation of the prosperity of a single class, landlord, for the benefit of another class, tenants, without any public purpose, and with no public benefit. The vast majority of the cases, the income of the tenants whose rents have been frozen, and are still frozen after war has been over 5 years, their incomes have doubled, and in many cases, trebled. They can well afford to pay higher rent. My income for 5 years on 6 houses, 4 and 5 rooms and furnished, has been $160. I did some repairs and leased them, and now get $180. My tenants all made three times that, but still they must have cheap rent. My taxes have doubled, all labor, paint, maintenance, every item has trebled in price. You vote subsidies to keep food prices up, and we pay taxes to pay Tighe Woods $22,000,000 a year to rule landlords as they see fit.

Give us back prosperity without any string tied to it. Give us home rule, our free enterprise. Get us out from this Communist principle. I do not see why there is so much fuss made in Washington about communism, and still keep rent control. May God help you to be heard.

Rent control must die.

Sincerely yours,

SARAH ELLEN GRAY.

FARGO, N. DAK., *April 14, 1950.*
Senator HARRY CAIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Wish to thank you for stand you are taking for a fair deal to the landlords.

On April 1, 1949 the new law was drafted by Mr. Tighe E. Woods, to give the landlords a fair deal as those operating one to four rental dwelling units will be allowed rent increases if their net operating income is less than 25 percent of gross income in such cases rent will be hiked to a 30 percent.

Wish to have Mr. Tighe E. Woods, explain to you why he does not live up to his promise he drafted.

On January 1949 we put our saving in this house located at 703 Thirteenth Street, South Fargo, N. Dak., and made it into a 4-family apartment, a kitchen in each with city gas stoves and refrigerators.

My net income is $177.90 for the 12 months not including the $605 interest on this house, as this does not go on the expense. Your Fargo, N. Dak. area rent director, Mr. A. H. Kurth, orders me to refund to the tenants $400. I asked your director, Mr. Kurth, regards to the 30 percent I have the right to as drafted. His answer was that they are not going by the drafted law on net income percentage.

Your Mr. Tighe E. Woods stated you want more housing as there is a shortage.

Who wants to buy or build while the Federal rent lids are on when your Fargo, N. Dak. area rent director, Mr. A. H. Kurth, dictates without facts or figures for a test year, and force me to operate at a loss?

My gross income, etc., for the above from February 1, 1949 to January 31, 1950: Total income, $3,027.47; operating expense, $2,849.57; net income, $177.90.

You are free to use this letter as you see fit, I remain,

Yours sincerely,

L. W. JANSEN.

Senator Myers' Reports to the People of Pennsylvania—No. 23, No. 24, and No. 25

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 2 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD three radio addresses by me to the people of Pennsylvania, the 23d, 24th, and 25th in the biweekly series, on April 3, April 17, and April 30, 1950.

There being no objection, the broadcasts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF TRANSCRIPTION BY UNITED STATES SENATOR FRANCIS J. MYERS OVER PENNSYLVANIA RADIO STATIONS, WEEK END OF MARCH 31–APRIL 2, INCLUSIVE—NO. 23 IN BIWEEKLY SERIES

Well, you're going to be counted.

But that's no real surprise to you, because for the last month or so, there's been a lot in the papers about the 1950 census. Probably most of you have read some of the stories or discussed this with your friends, and it's entirely possible that you know one or more of the 140,000 people who are going to help Uncle Sam tally our population.

What some of you may not know is the fact that this census of the American people is required by our Constitution. Actually, the original purpose of taking a census once every 10 years was to determine the number of Members each State was entitled to have in the House of Representatives.

Our founding fathers, in addition to the many other problems that confronted them, spent a long time working out a method for representing each of the Thirteen Colonies in our Legislature. The largest of the Colonies felt that each colony should be represented in proportion to its population. The smallest ones naturally objected to this on the grounds that the large States would simply snow them under if representation was based on population.

So the inevitable followed. A compromise was reached that satisfied everybody. It was decided to have two Houses in the Congress, as you know. In one of these two Houses, each State was to have two representatives, regardless of its population. This body became our Senate, and to this day each of our 48 States has two Senators.

The House of Representatives, on the other hand, answered the criticism of the larger States, by providing that the membership in the House would be apportioned according to population. Even here, however, there was one more qualification. The Constitution required that every State, however small, should have at least one Representative in the House.

So the census got started under a constitutional mandate to count our population once every 10 years in order to readjust things so that each State was properly represented in the House. The first United States census took place in 1790, just a year after the First Congress had assembled. By comparison with the elaborate affair that is planned for 1950, the census in 1790 was a pretty crude business. The census was conducted by 17 United States marshals, who were, in turn, assisted by 600 clerks and interviewers. They took their information down on little scraps of paper, and when the job was finished they found that the population of the Thirteen States had reached the magnificent total of 3,929,214 people. In 1940, just exactly 150 years later, the population of the United States was found to be 131,669,275. Based on that 1940 finding, the apportionment of the 435 Representatives among our 48 States was completed by 1944, when elections were held for the Seventy-ninth Congress, and thus the Seventy-ninth, the Eightieth, and the Eighty-first Congresses have been selected on the basis of the populations of the several States of 1940. New York, being our most populous State, has a total of 45 Members of the House of Representatives. In other words, more than a tenth of all our Congressmen come from New York alone. We in Pennsylvania have 33 Congressmen, since our State in 1940 was second largest. Four States, including our neighboring State of Delaware, have only one Representative each. For these 4 smallest States it is interesting to note that their representation of

2 Senators out of the 96 is overwhelmingly out of proportion with the ratio of 1 Congressman to 435. It is just such a result as this which caused our founding fathers to establish two Houses of Congress as a safeguard to the rights of people in every State.

I've already indicated that the 1950 census will be a very elaborate affair. We plan to do far more than count noses. The Bureau of Census has estimated that our 1950 population will be somewhere around 150,000,000 people, and in order to do the work of counting the number exactly the Government is hiring 140,000 people whose job it will be to call at your home to make sure you are counted.

It may interest you to know that we are going to count our population as of the 1st day of April 1950. Thus, a baby born on or before April 1 of this year will be counted, but if the child is born after that time he will not be counted, even though the census taker hasn't yet called at your home. By the same token, if a person dies before April 1 he will not be counted, but if he is alive on that day and dies April 2 he will nonetheless be counted in the census, regardless of whether or not the census taker has called by that time.

Now if the Census of 1950 were confined merely to counting noses, it certainly wouldn't be much of a job, and it certainly wouldn't require the services of 140,000 people. There has, over the past hundred years, been a steady change in the type of information acquired by the census-taker. Back in 1850, the census-takers were required to ask personal questions like "Are you a pauper?" "Are there any idiots in this household?" and "How many of your relatives are convicts?". I think you can understand why questions of this sort were resented and later dropped. By 1880, the census-takers were asking questions about our health; for example, determining the number of people who were crippled or disabled or ill, and for the first time there were some questions asked in that year of 1880 about unemployment. Still later, more questions were added to shed more light on our economic life. There were questions about the number of telephones, whether you owned or rented your home, how much you paid for rent, and in 1940 every person above the age of 14 who made less than $5,000 a year was asked to state the exact amount. Persons who made more than $5,000 annually in 1940 simply reported that their income was above that level, and let it go at that.

This year the census-takers are going to ask some more detailed questions about income. They don't intend, however, to ask everyone the income questions. One person in five over the age of 14 will be asked his income. If he makes over $10,000 a year, he will simply state that as a fact and he will not have to give the amount. Those who make less than $10,000 will be requested to list in detail the various sources of their incomes. However, there aren't any names involved in taking this income information, so you have absolutely nothing to worry about if you're afraid the information would be misused, or turned over to the neighbors for gossip purposes. The facts about your income, if you happen to be one of those asked, are reported separately on a confidential form, and if you like, you can even fill out the form after the census-taker leaves, and mail it in later, so long as you do mail it in.

Now why on earth is the Government going to ask you all these questions about the number of years you spent in school, the money you make, where you were living a year ago, whether you've ever been in the armed services, and so forth? Well, as a matter of fact, this information is being requested because the census provides us with the clearest picture of America that we have. Much of the information that will be collected in the census has been requested by businessmen to give them a better picture of their markets for various products in terms of the amounts of money the family has to spend. As an illustration of this, a manufacturer who discovered that almost no family under a certain income level bought the kind of product he made, might well decide to come out with a cheaper model in order to enlarge his business.

A great deal of the information that will be gathered in the 1950 census will prove extremely useful to State and local authorities interested in matters like building new schools, playgrounds, public-health facilities, etc. They will rely upon census information to give them a picture of the number of school-age children that they can expect 3 years or 5 years from now, basing their estimates on the local birth rate, and the increase in the number of children now below school age. These same local authorities will also be interested in the income information from the census, because it will give them a better knowledge of their community's resources compared with State and National averages.

So I think you can see the importance of giving the census-taker the most exact information possible. I know all of you, at one time or another, have got into discussions and arguments, comparing your section of the country with some other section. And about the only real source of information you have for settling them is by turning to the facts set forth in the census reports. In fact, a great many of the statistics that you see quoted every day in your newspapers are based directly on information found in the census reports—the average family size, the number of families, number of people living on farms, the number of women at work, the number of homes with electricity, etc.

So once all this census information is collected and published, as it will be by 1952, it will provide the foundation for all the economic and social studies that will be conducted in America for the next 10 years—studies that are useful alike to private industry, charitable organizations, farm and labor groups, and officials of all levels of Government carrying out their duties as public servants.

So your census-taker isn't being nosey in coming around and questioning you. He's gathering facts that will allow us to draw an accurate picture of America, and every one of us will benefit from this new knowledge. You and your family won't appear by name in any of the 50 volumes that will ultimately be published to summarize the 15,000,000,000 facts that will be collected in the census. You'll be in the census all right, but you'll appear there in the form of statistics that will describe your family and all the other 40,000,000 families of America.

The chances are the census taker who visits you will be a woman, but this isn't necessarily so. I might point out in connection with the census taker that he or she is under oath to keep in absolute confidence everything you tell him. In fact, if the census taker violates this oath, he is apt to spend up to 2 years in prison or might find himself subject to a $1,000 fine. This wasn't always the case, however, in the past, and for the first few times that the United States took a census, there were some pretty serious violations of confidence, but it's been many, many years now that the census taker has been required to treat as confidential the information he gathers.

As a matter of fact, it's illegal for anyone to refuse to answer the questions asked by the census taker, and anyone who does turn the enumerator away without answering the questions is liable for a $1,000 fine or a prison sentence. The truth of the matter is that this provision in the law is more or less meaningless, because people have always cooperated very well with the enumerators. Even when they are busy, most people seem to enjoy answering the questions and view census taking as being sort of a quiz that they're all prepared to answer. This is perfectly understandable, because after all, the questions you will be asked all concern the things you know about, and most of them are things that no one else is prepared to answer for you.

So sometime in the course of the next couple of weeks you'll have a visitor who has a lot of questions to ask. Perhaps if you're living on a farm, it may be as late as the end of April before the census taker gets around to you, but Dr. Peel, who is the Director of the Bureau of Census, estimates that most of the questionnaires will be completed by April 15. So I urge you to cooperate, as I know you will, because the census is really important to us all.

By the 4th of July the Census Bureau will give us a provisional estimate of our 1950 population, but when you stop to consider that 15,000,000,000 facts must be tabulated and compiled in different tables, you can readily appreciate why it will be late in 1952 before the job is finished.

Your part of that big job comes up within the next 2 weeks, and after that, we'll have to wait until 1952 to see what we look like.

TEXT OF TRANSCRIPTION BY UNITED STATES SENATOR FRANCIS J. MYERS OVER PENNSYLVANIA RADIO STATIONS, WEEK END OF APRIL 15–17, INCLUSIVE—NO. 24 IN BIWEEKLY SERIES

I'd like to discuss on this broadcast two recent pieces of legislation which, though they haven't made big headlines, will mean a great deal to many Pennsylvanians.

Last week, the Eighty-first Congress completed action on its second major housing bill. Most of you are probably familiar with the public housing law passed last summer, but before going into the details of the 1950 law just passed, I'd like to summarize some of the developments under the 1949 act.

Thus far, as a result of the 1949 law, seven Pennsylvania communities have been allocated about $13,000,000 in direct grants for slum-clearance and urban-redevelopment projects. In addition, almost 23,000 low-rent public housing units are scheduled for construction by 35 local housing authorities in Pennsylvania by the middle of 1951, as part of the 6-year program to furnish adequate housing for 810,000 American families whose incomes are in the lowest-income brackets.

The farm home loan section established under the 1949 housing act has perhaps been the biggest success of all. To date, $2,000,000 have been distributed in Pennsylvania to farm owners in the form of long-term, low-interest loans and grants to enable farmers to rebuild run-down buildings, put up new structures, and in general, get their farms back into the black. I had the privilege, several months ago, to present the first of these farm-loan checks to a young veteran and his wife who lived near Lewisburg—and I know that he, and many others, are finding this farm-loan program of great value in getting their farms on a sound economic footing.

Now the new Housing Act, just passed last week, make comprehensive additions to our housing programs. For one thing, a number of changes have been made in the FHA mortgage-insurance program to encourage construction of housing for families who can afford to pay only $50 to $70 a month for a place to live. The new changes in the FHA program are designed to get on the market soundly constructed housing at costs that just aren't to be found today. For one thing, the new bill visualizes the construction of two-bedroom houses that can be purchased with down payments as low as $350, and with monthly payments of about $50.

The 1950 act just passed will also encourage construction of apartments with two

or three bedrooms—recognizing that in recent years there has been a tendency to build rental apartments entirely too small to house a family.

The new bill should also be a big help to many of the veterans who haven't thus far been able to get GI loans for their own homes. As of the end of this year, the veteran will no longer be required to get a combination of a GI loan and an FHA loan to build and buy his home. Henceforth, he will be able to get a single GI loan at 4 percent covering 100 percent of the value of his house up to $10,000. And if the veteran is unable to borrow the money at 4 percent from private sources, he will be able to get it in the form of a direct loan from the Government—though as a practical matter, I seriously doubt that the direct Government loan feature will be widely used, simply because I'm sure that our banks and other private lending organizations will make the money available under the new GI loan insurance program. And incidentally, widows of veterans who died from service-connected injuries will be able to participate in the GI home loan program. This is the first time in which the GI privileges have been extended to their widows, and is the result of an amendment which Senator McMAHON, of Connecticut, and I submitted.

Another and very important new feature in the housing bill just enacted is the $300,000,000 housing loan program for colleges and universities. This is the first peacetime aid to education bill ever passed by Congress, and both State schools and private, nonprofit colleges and universities will be able to borrow direct from the Government for student and faculty housing construction. The loans to the schools may run for a period of 40 years at an interest rate of 2½ percent, and it is estimated that college students living in dormitories that will be constructed under this program will be able to save as much as $170 a year in school housing costs. So, as you can see, this should be a big help to families who plan to send their children on to college in the future.

If you want further details about the new housing act, I urge you to write me, Senator FRANCIS J. MYERS, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C., and I shall be happy to send some additional information to you.

Well, so much for housing.

Perhaps some of you noticed that the Senate had a regular field day April 5 in voting on the displaced persons bill. I must confess that by midnight of the fifth, there wasn't a single Senator who could remember another day quite like it. But before telling you what happened between 2 p. m. and midnight on April 5, I'd like to tell you a bit about the background of the DP legislation.

The initials DP—standing for displaced persons—entered the world's vocabulary in the closing days of World War II. You will recall that Adolf Hitler developed, over the course of a dozen years or so, between 1933 and 1945, a number of methods for making people miserable—and it's pretty hard to say which of his many devices was the worst. Certainly he refined the art of operating concentration camps, and we're still shocked to remember his death camps like Belsen and Dachau where human beings were burned like firewood.

But another trick Hitler developed was in an effort to solve his wartime labor shortage by uprooting people from all of conquered Europe and dragging them off to Germany to work as slave laborers. These were among the first of the displaced persons, although there were other hundreds of thousands made homeless by the advancing armies of Germany and Russia.

Thus, by the termination of World War II there were more than a million DP's, exiled and homeless, floating around in Europe. The problem of resettling them was one of international importance if peace and stability were to be achieved in Europe.

To resettle this group of a million or so uprooted people, the International Refugee Organization was formed, and by 1947 the IRO had special camps established throughout central Europe in which, for the time being, the refugees were housed and fed until a way could be found for resettling them.

Of course, the resettlement job was badly complicated by the fact that the Communists were spreading their political control over the countries of eastern Europe, and pretty obviously, a tremendous number of the refugees from eastern Europe either could not return home, or did not wish to do so.

It was possible, however, for more than 100,000 DP's to return home—they being, for the most part, those who lived in the countries of western Europe that were still outside the Communist orbit. In addition to those who returned to their native countries, about 800,000 other DP's have immigrated to new lands, 140,000 have entered the United States under the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, and the rest have gone to Israel, Great Britain, Canada, Australia, France, Belgium, the Netherlands, and several of the South American countries.

In the postwar years, Communist activities behind the iron curtain has created another kind of DP—that is, people who were forced into exile by the Communists as a result of political and religious persecution. But these postwar DP's, like the wartime DP's before them were also victims of totalitarian oppression.

In the spring of 1948, Congress enacted the displaced persons law which has enabled America to play its role in settling the international refugee problem. There was a bitter controversy over the legislation at that time, particularly in the Senate. The opposition to the bill came from a handful of Senators who took the position that the DP was a European problem, and that America had no business opening its doors to a bunch of foreigners. To many other Senators, that attitude made no sense whatsoever, because America has traditionally been a home for the oppressed, and from our earliest colonial history, people have come to the New World to find hope and freedom denied them elsewhere.

But, as I say, there was a lot of controversy over this point, and the 1948 DP law was pretty much of a compromise that had many contradictions in it. Opponents of the legislation managed to insert into the law many restrictive provisions which made the act very difficult to administer, and which, furthermore, discriminated badly against many groups of people.

I will say, however, that despite the many discriminatory provisions, the 1948 DP law was made to work surprisingly well. The primary reasons for this lay in the fact that hundreds of thousands of Americans pitched in to help out in every way they could to bring DP's here, and private charitable groups—Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish alike—joined hands, and with the help of the Displaced Persons Commission itself, and the cooperation of State and local officials, a miracle was accomplished in bringing in 140,000 DP's under the 1948 act.

By the end of 1949, however, the restrictive provisions of the law hampered the operation of the DP program seriously. In a very short time, the number of incoming DP's dropped from 18,000 monthly to a third of that number. This situation had been foreseen, and the House of Representatives had, in June of last year, passed a new DP bill which corrected the bad mistakes in the existing law. In the Senate, though, the House bill bogged down. Opponents of the DP program charged that a great many undesirable people were coming in as DP's, and that there had been a great deal of fraud in the administration of the program.

Senate committee hearings dragged on and on, and by March of this year, the DP program was just about stalemated by the delay. Those of us who felt that the law had to be revised and made workable did everything we could to bring the DP bill to a vote and get the program back in operation.

As the evidence piled up in the Senate committee hearings, it became increasingly apparent that the charges of fraud were not supported by the facts, and that all the charges leveled at the DP program had been raised for no other purpose than to delay action on the bill.

It's true, of course, that the evidence did disclose a tiny handful of DP's who hadn't worked out. There were a few who were lazy, and a few who couldn't get along with the Americans who sponsored them—though it wasn't always clear whether the DP or the sponsor was at fault. Most significant of all was the fact that no evidence showed any basis for believing that potentially subversive people were coming in under the DP program.

So it was clear that the way to handle the very small group who hadn't got along well was to give them another chance, or deport them if they didn't work out. This was especially true when you consider that, except for this small group, the other 140,000 DP's were proving themselves to be splendid people.

Finally, on April 5, we were successful in bringing the DP bill to a vote in the Senate. Voting started at 2 p. m. Opponents of the bill had lined up an impressive array of crippling tactics—tactics designed either to delay passage, or to give us, once more an unworkable bill. Between 2 p. m. and midnight of April 5, the Senate voted on more than 120 separate amendments to the DP bill before it was finally passed.

I will say, however, that during this 10-hour period, almost the entire Senate stayed on hand for the voting. It was clear from the first vote at 2 p. m. that those of us who had fought so long to get a good DP law were in the majority, and our only problem was to stay at our job and beat off the amendments. The opponents, on the other hand, were counting on us to give up in disgust rather than sit for 10 hours or longer just to get a good bill.

Well, the result was a splendid bill as it left the Senate—and a real victory for international cooperation. All told, the bill as it passed the Senate authorized the admission of nearly 420,000 refugees in the period between 1948 and 1951. Among them, nearly 55,000 German ethnic expellees under the amendment submitted by Senator DOUGLAS and myself, and 5,000 refugees from the Yugoslav sections of Venezia Giulia, as a result of an amendment submitted jointly by Senator IVES and myself.

The new DP bill owes its existence to the splendid bipartisan cooperation of the Republicans and Democrats who worked so closely together in getting a good bill through. And in the important business of winning the cold war—of preserving democracy and freedom on earth—every American should be proud, not only of this bill, but also of the fine bipartisan cooperation which its passage reflects.

TEXT OF TRANSCRIPTION BY UNITED STATES SENATOR FRANCIS J. MYERS OVER PENNSYLVANIA RADIO STATIONS, WEEK END OF APRIL 28–30, INCLUSIVE—NO. 25 IN BIWEEKLY SERIES

The Post Office Department has been in the headlines recently, and I thought I'd devote some of this broadcast to a bit of post-office history.

Benjamin Franklin, in addition to his many other accomplishments, became—as you know—the father of our postal system. This came about in 1775, the year before we declared our independence from Britain. A few years later, our founding fathers included the operation of the postal system

as one of the duties of the Federal Government, and spelled this out in the Constitution itself.

In the earliest days of our Republic, the Federal Government merely undertook to carry the mail from one State to another—and left to each State the task of distributing the mail. This didn't work out particularly well, and before 1800, Congress authorized the Post Office to distribute mail between communities within each State. It was about this time, too, that it was decided, as a mater of national policy, that mail should be delivered to people who lived out on the frontiers—and because the distances involved were frequently great, and the volume of mail was usually small, this proved to be rather expensive. As a result, Congress felt it would encourage the development of the country if postal rates were kept down, and thus it came about that things like the Pony Express—which operated at a loss—were supported directly by the Government as a matter of public interest.

So, almost from the start, the Post Office was never consciously intended to make a profit. On the other hand, it's always been our policy to keep postal losses at a minimum—and the question usually boils down to a determination of what phases of the postal operation should be continued at a loss.

As a matter of fact, the Post Office has actually made money in 15 of the past 100 years—not much—but a little bit. Recent years postal subsidies have grown larger for a number of reasons. For one thing, mail rates have stayed down much more than have prices generally—and for another, there has been a big increase in the use of certain classes of mail that are handled at a loss by the Post Office.

One of the big money-losers for more than 50 years now has been rural free delivery. RFD, as rural free delivery is known, was inaugurated in the Democratic administration of President Cleveland, back in 1896. Prior to that time, rural people were forced to go into to town for their mail—or hired someone to deliver it for them. RFD was certainly a good idea, because it gave the farm and other rural people the same opportunities that city people had where use of the mails were concerned.

Now here are some interesting facts about various kinds of mail, and some of the special things our postal service helps us provide. For one thing, the Post Office makes money on the ordinary 3-cent stamp—the so-called first-class mail. The profits on first-class mail last year amounted to more than $82,000,000.

The 6-cent air-mail service is a money-loser. On the other hand, air-mail subsidies have had a lot to do with the growth and development of our air lines. For years, when the commercial air lines first got their start, the air-mail subsidies were an important part of the revenue they received. It's true, of course, that many people have criticized the air-mail subsidies, but when we stop to consider today that the experience gathered by our commercial air lines in the 1930's gave us a tremendous advantage in developing our air power in World War II, the mail subsidy was a small price to pay.

Parcel post operates at a loss, too. Not a big loss, considering the volume of business handled, but it does come to $73,000,000. The biggest Post Office deficits are run up by our so-called second- and third- class mailing permits. These permits, you may recall, allow special rates to newspapers, magazines, periodicals, books, and so forth that are shipped through the mails. The question is frequently asked why Congress doesn't increase the rates on publications of various sorts.

The answer to that is pretty straightforward: It goes back to freedom of the press, as a matter of fact. Take newspapers as an example. A great many local papers are distributed through the mails. If the postal rates went up, that would simply be the last straw, and some of them—which make very little money now—would be driven out of business. Surprisingly, the importance of low mail rates for newspapers isn't confined to papers with small circulations. A great many of the larger papers don't make much money, and they, too, would be seriously affected if postal rates went up.

Congress has long felt—and I believe, wisely—that it is in the best interests of our country for people to get information easily and inexpensively. If rates on magazines, newspapers, books, and so on, were to rise, the prices would go up, fewer people would read them, and our democracy, which depends so heavily upon an informed public, would suffer.

I might point out, too, in connection with postal rates on books, that many libraries in rural areas circulate books to schools, and to others, by use of mail rates that are quite low. Here again, an increase in mail rates would have a serious effect.

There is a bill pending in Congress to raise the rates on certain classes of mail, and hearings are presently being conducted in the Senate on that bill. The Senate committee has not yet reached a decision as to what mail-rate increases, if any, it will recommend to the Senate—and I think you can understand why any such recommendations would have to be considered quite carefully in terms of the importance of having our people acquire good information at reasonable prices.

All told, the Post Office Department went in the red last year by more than half a billion dollars, and suggestions have been renewed that postal rates be increased to cut down the loss. The big question to be settled in a situation like that is to find where rate increases can be allowed without causing harm—and some savings could undoubtedly be achieved by reorganization of certain sections of the Post Office Department itself.

Most of you undoubtedly saw the stories in the papers 10 days or so ago that the Postmaster General had ordered home deliveries of mail cut to one trip daily. This order has been widely protested—and, I think, for good reasons. I don't believe the Postmaster General is altogether to blame for the order. Apparently, members of the Appropriations Committee in the House of Representatives told the Post Office Department recently that it would not appropriate as much money to make up the Post Office deficit next year—and told the Postmaster General to cut down on mail service, or else.

I think this was an ill-considered move—and most of the people I've talked with about the proposed cut in mail deliveries seem to agree. It's possible we don't need more than one home mail delivery in some parts of the Nation—but I feel we ought to get the facts before we move impulsively to cut service back to that level. As matters stand now, the order to reduce the number of deliveries comes before anyone has been given a chance to be heard. The Appropriations Committee doesn't know how many people actually need more than one delivery daily. Before making any arbitrary decision of that sort, people should have an opportunity to express their feelings on the matter.

I don't expect that the order will go through, and I am doing my level best to get the order rescinded.

Certainly one of the big objections to the proposed curtailment of mail services is found, as I've indicated, in the fact that a reduction in mail deliveries has never received any study. On the other hand, the Hoover Commission, in its broad study of the operating practices used by the executive branch of the Government, devoted almost 2 years to the organization and operation of the Post Office Department—and the commission made a comprehensive body of recommendations that would save money and generally put the Post Office on a sound basis.

The commission estimated that its recommendations would save about $200,000,000 annually if all of them were carried out, and furthermore, the commission felt its recommendations would improve mail service, rather than cut it back as the present order proposes to do. The Hoover Commission recommendations called for increases in some of the second- and third-class mail rates, and secondly, that a number of internal changes be made in the organization of the post office itself. I've already mentioned that a bill to increase mail rates is being considered by the Senate Post Office Committee, and it is also important to point out that certain of the reorganization changes submitted by the commission were carried out last year by the President and Congress.

Additional reorganization measures for the post office are included in the group of 21 reorganization plans recently submitted to Congress by the President, and further streamlining of the post office is contemplated by other legislation now in Congress.

These reorganization plans, based on long study, and on extensive hearings before Congress, are the sensible way to face the problem of postal deficits and the general efficiency of post-office operation. By and large, while there are undoubtedly some desirable changes that should be made in the postal system, it cannot be denied that the people of America have tremendous faith in the United States mail service. The mail does go through, and it is no answer to a $527,000,000 postal deficit to attempt a saving of a tiny fraction of this by curtailing mail service, especially when no study has been given the question.

In closing, I want to say a bit about the progress of the Hoover Commission recommendations. The Commission was established back in 1947 as a completely bipartisan investigation of the executive branch of Government. The members of the commission included equal numbers of Republican and Democratic Members of Congress, representatives of the executive branch of Government, and representatives of the public.

The purpose of the study was to determine ways of improving the efficiency of Government operation. The commission made the first exhaustive study of our executive branch that had ever been made. During the 160 years of our national life, the Government had gradually accumulated a vast and complex pyramid of agencies, bureaus, commissions, and so forth, that had been designed to meet particular problems. The commission's final report consisted of a 2,000,000-word blueprint for efficient government.

The recommendations in the Commission report were general in nature, and 60 percent of them required action by Congress to put them into effect. When you consider that our Government is the biggest business in the world, it is evident that all the changes suggested by the Commission will take a long time to carry out. To date, however, progress has been far above expectations. By the end of 1949, 20 percent of the recommendations were in effect, and it was estimated that those changes alone would save about a billion and a quarter dollars annually.

Naturally, there has been some disagreement over the various recommendations to reorganize various agencies of Government, because differences of opinion have arisen over what is, in fact, the best and most efficient way to carry out a given function. These objections have been raised by Republicans and Democrats alike, but I am proud to say that the efforts to carry forward the reorganization plans have continued on a broad, bipartisan basis, with

members of both major parties strongly behind the reorganization program.

Next Tuesday, by the way, there will be a ceremony at Independence Hall in Philadelphia which will mark the beginning of a Nation-wide program to promote interest in, and knowledge of, the reorganization program. A bipartisan group of private citizens, known as the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report, is sponsoring what they are calling a Cracker Barrel Caravan that will tour the country telling people of the Commission's recommendations, and informing them of the progress that is being made. The caravan will tour eastern Pennsylvania in May—and later in the summer will visit the western part of the State. Dr. Robert Johnson, president of Temple University at Philadelphia is national chairman of the Citizens Committee, and he has invited me to speak at the Independence Hall ceremony. Unfortunately, I am so busy in the Senate just now that I won't be able to attend.

I do urge all of you, however, to watch for the Cracker Barrel Caravan in your own community, and to learn everything you can about this important task of promoting efficiency in Government. I have supported the Reorganization program from the start, and if you'd like some further details about the program, I urge you to write me for a copy of a recent news-letter I issued on the progress of the reorganization work. Just address me, United States Senator FRANCIS J. MYERS, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Business Week Magazine Commended on Editorial, Productivity: Promise and Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 27, 1950

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the purposes of the Murray-Patman Employment Act of 1946 was to promote a fuller understanding of economic problems. A dramatic illustration of the fact that this purpose is at least in part being achieved is found in the editorial entitled "Productivity: Promise and Problem" in the magazine Business Week of March 18, 1950.

I commend this editorial to the businessmen of America, both small and large. I commend it to the attention of business organizations in the fields of both distribution and manufacture.

In this editorial Business Week commits itself to the idea of a steadily expanding economy.

Let me quote:

If we are to balance the Federal budget and end deficit spending, we need to expand the whole economy in the same way. A bigger national income, which would raise Government revenues, would be the painless solution to deficit financing.

This is the same position taken by President Truman and his distinguished Council of Economic Advisers in the Economic Report which was transmitted to the Congress on January 6 of this year.

As business conditions continue to improve—

Stated the President in this report—

we should bring Government receipts and expenditures into balance, and provide some surplus for debt reduction, at the earliest date consistent with the welfare of the country.

In the same report, the President also pointed out that—and I quote:

Within 5 years, we can achieve an annual output in excess of $300,000,000,000.

This goal also has now been taken over by the editors of Business Week. Let me quote once more from their editorial:

A real gain in production per man-hour—not the spectacular 10 percent a year that came after World War I, but a steady yearly climb of, say, 3 percent over the next 5 years—would add roughly $40,000,000,000 to the total of goods and services that the country is producing. That would leave room for moderate wage increases, a gradual but substantial increase in social services, and some tax reduction.

The Business Week editorial did not specifically say that we could reach a $300,000,000,000 national economy within 5 years; it merely said we could increase our total production of goods and services by forty billion. But since the present size of our national economy is just about $260,000,000,000, the simple addition of these two figures shows that Business Week has accepted the President's target.

To encourage the expansion of our economy, the editor of Business Week called for an expansion of domestic markets. Let me quote their exact words:

Our markets must be expanded to keep business expanding, and to provide enough jobs to maintain reasonably full employment. We need more customers and better-heeled customers to take our growing production.

This, of course, is only a more popular and somewhat less erudite way of saying what the Council of Economic Advisers has been saying for many years—namely, that an economy which is expanding at a healthy rate must be a high consumption economy.

As the national income grows—

States the Council in its annual economic review of January 1950—

a trend toward relatively greater increases in income for families in the lowest brackets of the income structure would therefore give an extra stimulus to demand of consumption goods.

The editors of Business Week also pointed out that as productivity increases, the people who may be hurt will need help.

They may need help—

The editorial states—

from their communities in the form of adequate unemployment compensation, and in finding new jobs.

On this point also their observation squares with the long-standing recommendations of the President and his economic advisers for a more adequate unemployment compensation system and a more effective employment service.

It is interesting to note that Business Week makes no mention of what the President and his Council of Economic Advisers have said on the same subject. Someone who had not read the Economic Reports transmitted to Congress under the Employment Act of 1946 might think that all these thoughts originated in the minds of the editors of Business Week.

Yet, I for one, am not interested merely in seeing that credit is given where credit is due. I am much more interested in seeing that sound thinking is done on the great economic problems that confront America.

I am, therefore, deeply gratified to know that such an important business magazine as Business Week can put forward such forward-looking and constructive ideas and that they are not afraid to do so merely because the President and others in Washington have said the same things. I hope that other business magazines and papers and journals will promptly address themselves to the same problem and in the same constructive spirit.

The editorial is as follows:

PRODUCTIVITY: PROMISE AND PROBLEM

Some of the best economic news we've carried since the war appeared in Business Week, March 4: The Nation's industrial productivity is climbing once more.

Most postwar news about productivity has been discouraging. Production per man-hour in a plant is difficult to measure at any time. With all the changes war brought in the economy, it has been impossible to get good figures on what happened to our national productivity. But even as late as 1948, the evidence seemed to show that the country's productivity was probably little if any higher than it had been in 1941.

Now, Business Week's spot-check of plants and of the opinions of a broad range of top-management men points to a sharp jump in industrial efficiency. It looks as if the long-awaited turn may have come.

This is good news because it means that the country is again getting the kind of progress that made it great—stronger and wealthier than any other nation, and with living standards higher than most of the world's people ever dreamed of.

PROMISE OF BETTER LIVING

Better productivity holds the promise of still better living. It is the way to make good on the things that people are talking about, and wanting, today: Better wages, pensions on a more secure level for all workers, better social services. The country can have better educational systems, better housing, more medical care, adequate unemployment insurance, and all the rest—if we will buckle down to improving our industrial efficiency.

If we are to balance the Federal budget and end deficit spending, we need to expand the whole economy in the same way. A bigger national income, which would raise Government revenues, would be the painless solution to deficit financing. It would make it possible to keep our big military establishment, and to continue to give economic aid to the nations that need it—without sinking our currency and national credit. It would open the way for sorely needed reductions in business and personal tax rates.

But, we can only have better living standards and a bigger national income in real terms—more goods and more services—if we increase our efficiency to produce more in each hour of work.

A real gain in production per man-hour—not the spectacular 10 percent a year that came after World War I, but a steady yearly climb of, say, 3 percent over the next 5 years—would add roughly $40,000,000,000 to the total

of goods and services that the country is producing. That would leave room for moderate wage increases, a gradual but substantial increase in social services, and some tax reduction.

This is a reasonable target for economic expansion—but even it cannot be reached without some growing pains. While better efficiency pays off for everyone in the long run, it is bound to hurt some people in the process.

In fact, better productivity can be a hazard to the economy if we go on as we did in 1949—producing only about the same amount of goods, with fewer and fewer workers.

NEEDED: BIGGER MARKETS

As we see it, two things are needed to encourage better efficiency, and to minimize dislocations:

1. Our markets must be expanded to keep business expanding, and to provide enough jobs to maintain reasonably full employment. We need more customers and better-heeled customers to take our growing production.

If we are to expand the markets, the dividends of rising productivity must be widely distributed. Workers must have a share in the form of wage increases. Business, itself, must have a share so that it will be able to buy the new plants and equipment that will increase efficiency. Owners and stockholders must have a share to give them the capacity and incentive to invest in new enterprises. Finally, the country must decide how much of a share it will set aside for Government, and to expand social services, pensions, and the like.

2. The people who will be hurt as productivity improves will need help. Some workers will lose jobs, because new machines will do them better. These people will need help from their companies in transferring them to other jobs, or in helping them get new jobs. They may need help from their communities in the form of adequate unemployment compensation, and in finding new jobs.

We may, too, have some of the trouble that we had in the thirties, during the great depression. Then the technocrats, and others, spread the idea that better industrial productivity was a ruthless destroyer of jobs and men.

To avoid that, the people who are hurt in the process will need to understand what has happened to them, and to have other people understand it. They will be in trouble, not because they fell down on their jobs, but because they are displaced by progress. They will be temporary casualties who deserve decent consideration and help.

Increasing productivity is not a new thing in this country. It has been the key to the whole history of our economic progress. But, in the years of the war and postwar expansion, when we had overfull employment, it lagged badly. We had prosperity but no progress toward better productivity.

That's why word of a gain now is good news.

Voluntary Health Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 1, 1950

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a recent guest editorial from the Rochester (N. Y.) Times-Union, supporting legislation which I introduced earlier this session to encourage participation in voluntary health insurance programs by providing for tax credits of a percentage of the premiums paid. The author, Sol M. Linowitz, now an able practicing attorney of that city, has made a careful study of the subject and was an early proponent of such a plan.

The need for some type of health insurance is undeniable. But to compel a man to subscribe to health insurance by forcing deductions from his weekly pay check is contrary to our American tradition of individual freedom of action. A compulsory system would, in the long run, be detrimental to the maintenance of both individual initiative and the standards of the medical profession.

In addition, the cost to the taxpayer involved in this incentive to subscription to voluntary plans would be incomparably less than the establishment and maintenance of a governmentally operated compulsory health insurance program. There would be no cost of Government administration and the loss of tax revenue to the Government under my bill (H. R. 6819) would be but a fraction of the estimated annual involvement of the Federal Government to the extent of about $6,000,000,000 for the compulsory system.

LET'S MAKE HEALTH INSURANCE TOO GOOD TO MISS

Early last year I set forth in this column a proposal for a national health insurance program based on the use of an income tax credit or allowance. The plan itself was simple: the Federal Government would provide that every person who insured himself and his family in an approved type of health insurance program, commercial or noncommercial would be entitled to a tax credit (directly against the payable tax) for a designated portion of the premium to be paid. The allowable tax credit would vary in the different brackets, offering the highest allowance to those in the lowest income groups and decreasing as the income increased. In short, the schedule of graduated income tax credits would be set up in such manner as to induce rather than compel Nation-wide health insurance.

On its face, the idea seemed to offer some fairly obvious advantages:

1. It would avoid the necessity for an involved and costly governmental regulatory agency contemplated by the administration compulsory program.

2. It would rely on existing commercial and noncommercial health insurance plans and groups established to handle just such programs.

3. Each State and community would be free to make its own voluntary arrangements to meet its own particular needs.

The proposal afforded a possible compromise program acceptable to the various factions, and quickly won support in a number of quarters. Men such as Bernard Baruch, Senator Ives, Dr. Paul Magnuson (Chief Medical Director of the Veterans' Administration), Dr. Paul Hawley, and others close to the health insurance problem, announced their endorsement of the plan.

The plan was not actually presented in the form of legislation until early this year. In January 1950 Representative KENNETH B. KEATING introduced a bill based on the proposal and providing a schedule of income-tax credits for premiums paid in private health insurance programs. Because of Representative KEATING's interest and support, Congress today has a real opportunity to consider the validity of the tax credit plan as an answer to the health insurance problem.

The real significance of the plan and the widespread support it has received lie in the fact that it undertakes to meet the national health problem on a wholly voluntary basis and without resort to compulsion.

During the past months the American people have been subjected to a high-powered hullabaloo about national health insurance. They have been dismayed and confused by the ferocity with which drums have been beat by both sides. One group has vied with the other in broad characterization, claims, charges, countercharges, high-pressure campaigns, and publicity build-ups.

As Mr. L. R. Blanchard recently pointed out in his address before the Orange County Medical Society, the medical profession, caught in the midst of the fray, has not always seen its responsibility clearly and has been trading punches with the best of them. None of this has been helpful to the American people who are entitled to an alternative program on a voluntary basis rather than merely an irate condemnation of the administration proposal.

Those who have been studying the income-tax allowance plan believe that it may offer the alternative which has been sought. First, because, when combined with appropriate provision for the nontaxpaying group (as under the Taft or Hill bills pending before Congress) it promises truly Nation-wide coverage. Secondly, the role of the Government, Federal or State, is cut to a minimum; the initiative is in each case left for the individual; and the goal of full-scale health insurance throughout the country becomes the personal concern of the private party.

Will the tax-allowance plan work? The only way to find out is to try it. If it operates to induce widespread health insurance, the need for a compulsory system will be obviated. If not, resort can always be had to the type of program the administration now seeks. The time is not yet, however, for plunging headlong into a far-reaching compulsory health program which is in so many respects beset with so many dangers. Experience abroad demonstrates that compulsory medical care is no panacea, and that once the step is taken there can be no turning back.

To the factions engaged in spirited battle on the health-insurance front, the tax-allowance plan seems to offer a simple, sensible middle road toward the common goal. To the American people, it holds out the real possibility that the fight against the ravaging cost of ill health can be won on a voluntary Nation-wide basis.

One Hundred and Fifty-ninth Anniversary of Signing of the Polish National Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 2 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement I have prepared on the one hundred and fifty-ninth anniversary of the signing of the Polish National Constitution.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SCOTT W. LUCAS ON THE ANNIVERSARY OF THE POLISH CONSTITUTION

I think it is not at all irrelevant to pause in the midst of our debate on the European economic aid program to note that today is an important anniversary in the history of man's struggle for liberty. Today is the one hundred and fifty-ninth anniversary of the signing of the Polish National Constitution under which the Polish people obtained the bill of rights that now they are denied.

To note that fact is completely to the point for many reasons. We are engaged in the vital matter of exploring all aspects of the program of economic aid to strengthen and bring to full recovery the freedom-loving democracies of western Europe. These free nations, devastated by one form of totalitarianism, face the threat of another, more insidious, totalitarian regime. That recalls some important events of recent history.

On September 1, 1939, the Nazi hordes began to pour across the border into Poland. The brave Polish people, jealous of their freedom and willing to die for the rights they won in their constitution of May 3, 1791, chose to defend their beloved homeland in the face of hopeless odds. Their allies, Britain and France, with whom they were bound by mutual defense treaties, immediately responded with declarations of war against Germany. Britain and France joined Poland in living up to the highest traditions of national honor.

Less than 3 weeks later, in contrast, one of the low points in the history of honor among nations was reached. The Soviet Union, united with Germany under the infamous Molotov-Ribbentrop pact, stabbed Poland in the back with an invasion from the east.

Subsequent history is well remembered. Today through our economic aid we are seeking to strengthen in western Europe the kind of spirit the Polish people showed when their nation was submerged under the attacks of two ruthless, totalitarian war machines.

For the sake of the people of Poland who still remain under the heavy hands of one of those dictatorships let us regard our work here today as a measure to keep the light of freedom burning in Europe. Let us work to make it gleam as a beacon of hope to all those who are held captive against their will. Let us show the oppressed people of Poland that we are determined to keep the democratic spirit alive throughout the world. America's greatest chance for preserving peace in the world lies in keeping hope in the hearts of those held in Communist bondage and in providing material aid to those free people who are actively fighting the battle against communism.

Our ties with the Polish people extend back to the days when America was struggling for its freedom. Those great Polish soldiers, Kosciusko and Pulaski, came across the seas to join our fight. Count Pulaski laid down his life in our soil. Thaddeus Kosciusko carried back to Poland's fight for independent, the American ideal of liberty.

Brave Polish soldiers fought alongside Americans, among them thousands of Polish origin, in the bloody campaigns of the last war. The blood of the two nations has thus been blended together for nearly two centuries.

We are prevented at the moment from directly aiding the captive Polish people, but there is much that we can do indirectly. The United States can, as the Senate has recommended, admit some 18,000 Polish veterans under our displaced persons law. But, more important still, America can render real service to the Polish people by finishing well the task of restoring the strength and vitality of the free nations of Europe. Poland can become free again if the spirit of man's liberty and freedom is kept strong and vital throughout the world.

There is nothing more contageous than freedom. If we insure that western Europe remains free, the spirit of freedom will hurdle all Communist barricades and one day aid the Polish people to regain the rights set forth in their glorious constitution.

Gallup Poll on Dissemination of Information About America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM BENTON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 2 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a recent Gallup poll as reported in the Washington Post of April 28, 1950. Here again, as so often in the past on other issues, the public seems to be ahead of the Government, including the Congress. By majorities which would be regarded as very substantial in election campaigns, the public approved stepped-up efforts and greater expenditures to offset the Russian propaganda and to strengthen the Voice of America.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of April 28, 1950]

THE GALLUP POLL—VOTERS FAVOR WIDER SPREAD OF UNITED STATES INFORMATION ABROAD

(By George Gallup)

PRINCETON, N. J., April 27.—Even before President Truman's strong appeal before the American Society of Newspaper Editors for intensive efforts to spread information about America to the people of other countries, the weight of opinion throughout the United States was in favor of an expanded program along those lines.

This is shown in interviews conducted among a representative cross-section of American voters during the last week in March. These interviews show substantial popular sentiment for spending a great deal more money than we are now spending to offset Russian cold war propaganda throughout the world.

Voters who are aware of the work being done by the Voice of America in its broadcasts overseas are more in favor of an expanded program than the general public is.

Here is the national vote in the survey:

Some people believe the United States should spend a great deal more money than we are now spending to offset Russian propaganda (information) and to tell our side of the story to Europe and the world. Do you agree or disagree?

	Percent
In favor of more expenditures	47
Against	38
No opinion	15
Total	100

The survey also indicates that part of the job facing the State Department is to acquaint people here at home with the work being done by the Voice of America in bringing the American point of view before the people of foreign lands.

A total of 46 percent, or nearly half, of the persons questioned in the survey said they had not read about or been told anything about the Voice of America broadcasts. When each person was asked, "Have you ever read or been told anything about the Voice of America broadcasts to foreign countries?" here was the vote:

	Percent
Yes, have heard about VOA	54
No, have not	46
	100

The 54 percent who were aware of the Voice broadcasts voted as follows on the question of an expanded program overseas:

	Percent
In favor of more expenditures	58
Against	35
No opinion	7
	100

A resolution calling for a greatly expanded overseas program of information about the United States was introduced in the Senate last month by 11 Senators, with Senator WILLIAM BENTON, of Connecticut, acting as spokesman. The proposal included a network of long-wave, medium-wave, and short-wave radio stations capable of reaching every receiver in the world.

President Truman, in his speech to the newspaper editors on April 20, declared:

"Unless we get the real story across to people in other countries, we will lose the battle for men's minds by default. * * * We cannot run the risk that nations may be lost to the cause of freedom because their people do not know the facts."

The survey also brings out the fact that voters who have had the most education are the most in favor of expanding the work of publicizing the American point of view abroad.

Here is the vote by degree of education:

	College	High school	Grade school
	Percent	Percent	Percent
In favor of more expenditures	59	47	44
Against	34	40	37
No opinion	7	13	19
Total	100	100	100

Air Warfare and Morality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 2 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to offer for insertion in the RECORD a very fine article by Maj. Gen. Orvil A. Anderson, the Commandant of the Air War College. I think that General Anderson has ably presented an argument for strategic bombing during time of war. It is well for us to discuss matters such as this so that we may be more fully prepared against any emergency.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AIR WARFARE AND MORALITY

(By Maj. Gen. Orvil A. Anderson)

Throughout recorded history, evolution in the nature of war has been associated with evolution in the technical and mechanical characteristics of weapons. Over a period of some thousands of years we have progressed from the stone and club age, through the spear, bow and arrow, crossbow, and gunpowder periods, finally to arrive at the atomic era. Each major advance in weapons has been marked either by an increase in the range of the weapon or by an increase in its destructive capacity, or by both. We have gone from the war capability of the club, the capacity to bruise or kill a single individual at a range of a few feet, to the war capability of modern air weapons, the capacity to destroy whole cities of key industrial systems at ranges of thousands of miles.

The frightening increase in the potential of weapons has been matched with an evolution in our social and economic structure which adds further hazard to modern existence. The simple agrarian life, with humanity living close to the soil, dispersed and largely independent, has been replaced with a complex social and economic fabric which is supervulnerable in many critical areas. As the power of weapons has increased, concentrations of population, industry, and transportation have developed which provide highly profitable targets for destruction by modern military weapons. Thus the evolution of our social order into a compact industrialized structure has placed us in double jeopardy: First, it has produced long-range weapons capable of great destruction. Second, it has created the targets for these weapons.

This observation has a singular significance to our problems of today, when the fate of America, the fate of world civilization itself, is primarily dependent upon the strategic concepts that guide the provisions we make for our sustained security. It is pertinent here to note that, as in most fields of human endeavor, the evolution of military strategy has not been completely abreast of the evolution in weapons.

Most military strategists—not being responsible for, and in some cases not familiar with scientific developments—have normally resisted new weapons. Strategic thinking generally has tended to retard the rapid development and exploitation of the full potential of new weapons because the new weapon tends to upset the familiar relationships that the strategist has been accustomed to employ in his thinking. The revolutionary potential of modern weapons so far exceeds the power of traditional weapons that it is questionable if there is much in common between past military objectives, and consequently military strategy to achieve these objectives, and the military objectives of a possible third world war.

Wars in the past, including the Second World War, have been fought basically to a surface strategy. By this is meant one in which surface-force operations dominated the grand strategy. Either a final assault and invasion of the enemy homeland by ground troops was visualized, or sea blockade, with its attendant economic and military strangulation, or both, was intended to be decisive.

For example, the strategy of World War II against Germany was a surface strategy. Its objective was invasion and occupation of Germany proper. In implementing this strategy air power was employed to prepare for the invasion and sea power was employed to project the invasion forces and their logistics across the sea. The strategy of the war against Japan, as implemented, was little more complex. The grand strategy still visualized final invasion of the Japanese home islands, but the economic vulnerability of Japan was such that she could have been defeated primarily by sea power exercising a technique of blockade and strangulation. The complexity of Pacific strategy was further compounded by a command structure which led to two major surface thrusts aimed at Japan and by the new weapons system—the long-range air force—which upset the intention of the planned invasion by forcing surrender before the final invasion could take place.

These examples from the Second World War point up the inherent tactical capabilities of land power, sea power, and air power, and show that the requirement for these various capabilities should be judged in relation to the potential of weapons currently available and in relation to the other factors in war.

The ultimate strategic objective of all three military forces is identical. It is the reduction or elimination of the power and power potential of the enemy in order to remove his capacity to threaten our security. The techniques employed by the three categories of military force are dictated by the capabilities and limitations of the weapons employed by these forces.

Land power, in order to accomplish the strategic objective, must invade and capture the territory of the opposing state. By occupying vital areas it deprives the enemy of the use of the resources of the area occupied. These resources may be raw material, communications, industry, or government institutions.

Sea power, by establishing control of the sea lines of communication, may strangle or starve the economic life of a nation, providing that nation is dependent on these lines of communication to a large extent for survival. Great Britain or Japan would be outstanding examples of insular nations which are wholly dependent on sea lines of communication for bare survival.

Similarly the strategic objective of air power is the elimination or reduction of the enemy's power and power potential. The technique employed by air power in accomplishing this objective is to attack directly the power and sources of power of the enemy state. The targets may be selected segments of his industrial establishment, his communications or transportation system, the source of his governmental or social control, or his military forces in being.

Land power, in invading and occupying, may have to fight land armies, but the destruction of those armies is not the ultimate strategic objective of land power. Sea power, in accomplishing sea blockade, may have to fight sea battles; but these battles, again, are not the ultimate strategic objectives of sea power. And air power, in neutralizing an enemy, may have to fight air battles, but victories in the air are not the ultimate strategic objectives of air power.

If these fundamentals were fully understood, thinking on the present security problem would be improved. The destruction of armies, navies, and air forces is not the ultimate strategic objective of the various components of our armed forces. At best, armies, navies, and air forces are but means to ends. If our present position is viewed in the light of the techniques appropriate to the three categories of military force (land, sea, and air) there is immediate indication of a solution. What should be the core of our strategy for a possible future war? Invasion and occupation—sea blockade and strangulation—or air neutralization?

If a possible military enemy in the forseeable future is a land-mass power, operating on interior land and river lines of communication, geographically and economically it is not particularly vulnerable to sea blockade and strangulation. Thus a strategy based primarily upon offensive sea power would not defeat that enemy.

If this potential enemy has a powerful land force-in-being backed up by a relatively secure and adequate logistic base, and if we want something near a numerical land-power equality with this potential foe, we then would be required to maintain constantly an army as large as the one we built for World War II. Further, even this force could be outnumbered very quickly by full mobilization of the enemy's potential land power. The continued maintenance of an army of this size would impose such a staggering load on our economy that our standard of living and our democratic way of life would be seriously affected. We know also that the projection of land power, in mass, across the seas requires control of those seas. At the same time a potential enemy nation—herself relatively invulnerable to sea power attack—through effective use of a modern submarine force could seriously interfere with and possibly defeat any opposing force requiring vast movement of logistics across the ocean. It would appear then that a strategy based upon land power would be costly, hazardous, and uncertain of success.

Logic, therefore, strongly supports the conclusion that a basic strategy which exploits the power potential of new weapons to the fullest is our soundest hope of successfully defending ourselves. The combination of air vehicles and atomic explosives represents, at present, our greatest power potential.

Such a strategy does not mean that land power and sea power are excluded from the operation. They would participate in roles appropriate to the support of that strategy. All our military forces would be integrated toward the one common strategic objective. This strategy would permit maximum utilization of our technological superiorities and maximum exploitation of enemy weaknesses. It would avoid the areas of greatest enemy strength. It would be most economical in American lives and resources. It would be designed to the geography of the situation, to our own strengths, and to the achievement of our postwar objectives.

This basic strategy in the foreseeable future involves what is commonly referred to as a strategic air offensive. Recently the concept of a strategic air offensive has come in for some rather violent criticism. It has been charged that a strategic air offensive cannot be carried out and that, even if it could be carried out, it would have no military effect or value. These criticisms are both transparent and senseless to a thinking person.

There is, however, one criticism against the strategic air offensive which, if properly nourished and expanded, could cost us a war. This argument attacks the concept of strategic bombing from a basis of morality. It has a certain attraction to people of western culture. Traditionally we have attempted to maintain a combatant and noncombatant status in our wars. The distinction between the two has, however, been more difficult to discern as wars have become more nearly total in scope. The difference between the citizen soldier and the factory worker who provides the tools of war is rather nebulous. The soldier and the worker are complementary in modern war.

It is naturally abhorrent to us to consider that war may be fought which will involve our homes and families. We want it to be fought at the greatest distance from them as possible. An aggressor is not concerned about these values.

In essence the argument from morality condemns strategic bombing as an effort aimed at women and children and the civil-

ian population. It alleges that strategic bombing kills the innocent population and is not directed against legitimate military objectives. Under analysis this argument is fallacious.

Before the airplane and the atomic bomb became significant instruments in the military arsenal, the same basic problem in humanity was present. During World War I and World War II, which were fought with traditional weapons on the surface of the earth, it was recognized that noncombatants in a combat zone were very likely to get hurt. Insofar as practicable, the problem was solved by evacuation. Women and children and noncombatants were cleared out of the combat areas. If the principle of evacuation was not or could not be employed—if the noncombatants happened to be in a village under artillery bombardment—the artillery shells did not differentiate between enemies in uniform and civilians that might be present. If the civilian happened to be in a foxhole, he could expect the fire of the battlefield.

During World War II, insofar as air action was concerned, this principle of evacuation was still employed. The French civilians living adjacent to the railroad marshaling yards which handled German army logistics were warned by leaflets that the marshaling yards were critical targets and that they should get out of the area. Likewise the residents of Japanese cities were warned that the cities were military targets because of the dispersed home industry which was so essential to the Japanese economy. Those who abandoned their homes lived. Those who did not, in effect, remained on the battlefield and took the chances of a battlefield.

The important point is that the categories of military targets appropriate to modern weapons have expanded the battlefield to include the industrial and economic sources of strength of a nation and that these critical elements of economy are legitimate military targets because they create and maintain the enemy's fighting forces. The principle of evacuation can still be applied, as it was applied by the British in World War II when thousands of women and children and noncombatants were removed from city areas.

In other words, nothing completely new in the field of ethics or morality has been added to the grim problems of war. No new issue of morality is involved. Only the degree of hazard has changed. There is no new principle.

It is significant to observe that aggressor nations normally do not like the idea of strategic bombing. It is not consistent with the philosophy of conquest and exploitation. Hence it may be expected that through established international agencies and by means of every known type of propaganda, the attempt will be made to discredit and to outlaw strategic bombing. Hitler himself spoke out against strategic bombing during the last war. Certainly he had no moral objections. A monster who would tolerate—in fact, encourage—such pestholes as Buchenwald, Dachau, and other concentration camps and mass-murder sites would not be deterred from killing citizens because of any moral issue involved. The reason for his efforts to outlaw the bombing of cities is quite evident. It stems logically from his war aims. Germany under Hitler was bent upon dominating the whole of Europe, if not the whole world. She was embarked upon a policy of expansion and aggression. It would not have served her purpose to destroy the economic plant which she wanted to control. She was not threatened by Holland, Belgium, France, Poland, or England. They were not attempting to take her over. The reverse was true. Thus Germany's war strategy was based upon an occupation of the other continental powers with ground forces, after a minimum destruction of the economy of those countries.

Germany also realized that the Allies were not prepared to take the war to Germany on the ground. However, from British bases the air war could be launched against Germany herself. Obviously, in a situation such as this, wherein Germany had nothing to gain and everything to lose, she would come out strongly against the weapon which could hurt her most—strategic bombing.

To rely, however, upon the belief that any possible enemy, because it is committed to a policy of aggression, might not use strategic bombing on the United States would be to take an unnecessary and unrealistic gamble. Hitler believed that he could take over Europe without involving the United States in war. If an enemy believes to the contrary, she could be perfectly willing to destroy Britain and the United States to gain the rest of the world—and, under another circumstance, could be willing to destroy Britain and the United States to prevent collapse from the inevitable internal corrosion associated with any dictatorship. In the meantime it would be distinctly to her advantage to outlaw strategic bombing and to convince the Western World that they are too moral and too humane to employ their best weapon in their fight for survival.

If we permit ourselves to become mesmerized with this humanity aspect, we can place ourselves in position to lose a war, because we will have failed to exploit the power of modern science in our own defense. A longer-term view of humanity would undoubtedly recognize that humanity is best served by the survival rather than by the destruction, of western civilization. An informed viewpoint will also recognize that the survival of western civilization will depend in large measure upon the utilization of those weapons in our arsenal in which we are superior—chief among which is our scientific and technological potential.

Those who condemn the strategic air offensive on morality grounds also maintain that the destruction incidental to such an attack ensures losing the peace even though we win the war: Germany, after World War II, is frequently cited as a case in point. Again this is a most superficial type of reasoning. It is a matter of record that the grim determination of the Allies, as they went to war with Germany in World War II, was so to reduce Germany that she would never again constitute a threat to the peace of the world. Our basic strategic thinking was founded on this tenet long before the power of the strategic air offensive was comprehended, and the extension of that national intention was found in the postwar application of parts of the Morgenthau plan. If strategic bombing so decimated Germany that it was not consistent with our national objectives, why then were German industrial plants dismantled and destroyed by the Allied occupying powers after the war ended? It is obvious, from the course of action which we followed, that strategic bombing—in spite of the great destruction wrought—had only partially satisfied Allied policy. The wrecking of Germany continued long after the last bomb fell.

The strategic air offensive had been designed to destroy only certain vital segments of the German war economy—such as oil. In this it succeeded, and the German war machine ground to a halt. However the strategic air offensive had not been designed to destroy the total industrial fabric of Germany, and the dismantling of German industry continued for some time after the war ended. Hence it becomes obvious that the destruction from the bombing was consistent with our national objectives, but being confined to certain segments of the German war economy, it was not sufficiently widespread to prevent the recuperation of German industry. Reduction of the recuperative power of the industry was apparently one of the objectives of the postwar dismantling program.

Actually, we did not come close to losing the peace in Europe because of the physical damage we did to our enemies in defeating them, but rather because of the unmasking of a former ally as another totalitarian aggressive power bent on world domination.

In visualizing the physical and material damage which might be heaped upon an enemy in a strategic air offensive, it is well to compare such damage with the disastrous losses to France and England of their young manhood during World War I. The cream of the manhood of both nations was lost, in traditional surface warfare, and the impact of this blood bath was one of much greater significance than the destruction of factories. Generations are required to rebuild a race. On the other hand our own casualties during World War II, in surface combat, were the lowest we have ever suffered, percentagewise. This was true in spite of the greatly increased killing power of surface weapons. Our World War II casualties were low simply because we partially exploited the power of an air offensive in preparing for our surface operations. We reduced the capability of the enemy for effective and sustained surface warfare prior to the time that we committed our forces to surface combat. United States military leaders would be derelict in their duty to the people of the United States and the western democracies if they did not fully exploit the power of the air offensive in a future war and so minimize the casualties which would be suffered by us and our friends.

The whole issue of morality as applied to warfare engaged in by peace-loving people must be considered against a background of war aims. Traditionally the United States will fight only if her security or the security of other peace-loving peoples is threatened. We have no aggressive intentions toward any other power. If we had such intentions, we would be subject to censure before world opinion as being unnecessarily brutal to use weapons of mass destruction in accomplishing our aims. If, however, our position as a champion of the dignity of man and human rights were threatened by a totalitarian power which has indicated it has no such standards, we would clearly be at fault if we did not use the key means at our disposal to defend ourselves. We are only defending ourselves, albeit we are doing it by taking the war to the enemy.

To summarize, fallible man, adhering to the pattern of past thinking, resists the evolution and change dictated by the power of science. He resents the threat to his established order and traditional patterns. These failings have been able to slow down but not stop progress. Such weaknesses can be sources of great danger when our security is threatened.

It has been pointed out that the strategic objectives of land, sea, and air warfare are similar. An objective analysis of the specific factors in the situation will logically dictate a certain course of action. Sea blockade and strangulation will not defeat an enemy who is not dependent on sea communications to a large extent for survival. Invasion and occupation in the face of heavy odds, if successful at all, would be terribly costly in American lives and resources. Utilization of strategic air power presents the soundest solution to our military problem. This will require the wisest balance and employment of our integrated land, sea, and air forces to attain maximum effectiveness.

The employment of weapons of mass destruction is not immoral. This propaganda line will probably be exploited by an enemy—as it was by Hitler—to suit his own purpose. He realizes that he has little to worry

about in a war with us fought according to traditional patterns. An enemy having nothing to fear will feel free to continue a policy of aggression and expansion until his aim of world domination is achieved. We are not only morally justified but morally obligated to develop our maximum strength to provide our own security.

A Report on Progress of Connecticut's Project for State Government Reorganization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM BENTON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 2 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the current issue of the magazine State Government which describes the methods and procedures followed by the Connecticut Commission on State Government Organization. This article was written by Mr. Ralph P. Sollott, the able staff director of the Connecticut commission, and represents a unique and fundamental approach to the task of government reorganization. I understand that 20 other States and Territories are presently engaged in working out more efficient and manageable patterns. The Connecticut survey of government might well serve as a model for others to follow in the tremendous task of making our State governments more effective, responsible, and economical.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALL THE FUNCTIONS OF STATE GOVERNMENT—A REPORT ON PROGRESS TO DATE IN CONNECTICUT'S PROJECT FOR STATE GOVERNMENT REORGANIZATION

(By Ralph P. Sollott, staff director, Connecticut Commission on State Government Organization)

As this is being read, the Connecticut General Assembly is in special session. Its purpose is action on the report of the Commission on State Government Organization.

Less than a year ago, Gov. Chester Bowles approved special act No. 28, 1949 session, creating this five-citizen commission. In a politically divided general assembly there was bipartisan agreement on the need for a thorough reconsideration of the State government.

Noteworthy in its charter was the legislative mandate that the commission shall study all the functions of State government. This direction obviated the key weakness of most other such studies—there was no limitation to the executive branch. The legislative and judicial branches, as well as the constitution, were made the subjects of study.

The principle of "one world" has found its way into government-organization studies. No single branch can be made more effective in vacuo. The interrelationships of executive, legislative, and judicial branches are here to stay.

FIVE CITIZEN COMMISSIONERS

Bipartisan agreement resulted directly from the caliber of the gubernatorial nominees. Each of the unpaid commissioners had a long record of nonpolitical experience and interest in governmental affairs.

Carter W. Atkins, chairman, is executive director of the Connecticut Public Expenditure Council; he has made a career of governmental research. James Lee Loomis is the retired chairman of the board of the Connecticut Mutual Life Insurance Co. Oliver B. Ellsworth is president of the Riverside Trust Co. G. Keith Funston is president of Trinity College and has a long background in business and government. James G. Rogers, Jr., is a management consultant with extensive prior experience in business and government.

The commissioners, all with other obligations, devoted upward of 15, and as many as 40, hours weekly to their deliberations.

THE WORKING PLAN

The commission selected as staff director the man who had been the Governor's consultant on budget and organization. His background has been in management engineering, law, business, and government—Federal, State, and municipal.

In the formulation of Connecticut's first consolidated executive budget, specific data had been developed to give the commission staff a running start into its work. With the executive budget and the State Register as its base, the commission divided the whole loaf of State government into 22 manageable slices.

Each of the existing agencies of government (then believed to number some 108, since determined to be 202) was allocated to one of the 22 organization survey units. Provision was made for the coordination of inevitable overlapping between horizontal (across all agencies) and vertical (within specified agencies) survey units.

A commission program and policy statement was prepared to define the commission's understanding of its charter. This same statement served as the basis for negotiations for technical staff.

Although less than 7 months were available to do the job, negotiations for staff extended over 3 months. The time was well spent. Each of the project directors was enabled, through the specific working plan, to submit a required outline prior to the contract commitment. The commission thus had early, competent estimates on unit work program, manpower, and budget requirements, as well as time accomplishment objectives.

Thus, from the outset, the entire technical staff, whenever and wherever acquired, originated and developed its thinking against a single frame of reference—the commission's program and policy statement.

THE SURVEY PROGRAM

Each department head was requested to designate an organization liaison officer and deputy. Their duties were to establish entrance communications directly to agency personnel best equipped to supply required information. Simultaneously, these officers provided a continuing agency awareness of our survey unit activities.

While negotiating for technical staff, we initiated the development of essential data for each survey unit. Binders were compiled for each project director containing all pertinent statutes, digest of all prior related studies, directory of agencies and officers, digest of current administrative reports and bibliography. Ten-year fiscal histories and other useful data was added. This process not only expedited the actual surveys, but also saved many more expensive and otherwise irreplaceable technician man-days.

Our operations were begun with an original appropriation of $50,000. The detailed, estimated requirements of our first survey units soon confirmed the inadequacy of this sum to accomplish even a minimum worth-while job. Governor Bowles promptly added another $75,000 from his contingent fund.

The 202 State agencies were allocated to survey units designated as follows: Executive, fiscal, education, health, highways, public works, industrial relations, agriculture, conservation and development, regulative, licensing and examining, State police, military, welfare, hospitals, corrections, purchasing and procurement, management of land, buildings, records and communications, research and statistics, legislative, judicial, constitution.

Some 120 specialists were engaged for nearly 3,000 man-days at approximately $70,000 in salaries. The project directors and their associates represented a diversity of skills, talents, and experience seldom gathered in a single venture. Several were former staff members of Hoover Commission studies. More than half had prior experience in government operations or surveys. Others had both specialized business and technical experience in the survey study areas.

The commission, having confirmed each survey unit work outline, knew the proposed direction and required coordination of all. Therefore, for the duration of each project, its director reported weekly to the staff director. The weekly reports covered days worked by each staff member, budget status, staff services or policy resolution required, accomplishment objectives, or any deviations.

Each commissioner was designated as subcommittee chairman of four or five survey projects for consideration, review, and conference with the project directors. By this means, over-all workload for each commissioner was reduced and, at the same time, a degree of specialization provided to assure the most effective results in review of the various reports.

As soon as the project director felt that the direction of thinking and fact development had taken concrete shape, he submitted a preliminary report. Its principal purpose was to keep the commission fully informed and call attention to any required modifications of original work plan. At this time, also, were confirmed the accomplishment objectives for interim and final reports.

The interim report, some time before termination of field work, provided a comprehensive statement of progress development and survey trend. Major policy questions were raised at this time. Significant areas of overlap were here identified and resolved. From detailed consideration at this time, such additional field work or coordination as required could be provided for.

At this stage, also, the commission held several round-table sessions with groups of project directors to get the advantages of the exchange of ideas on broad policy questions.

In most cases, it developed that the interim report represented 85 percent or more of completion.

In its final report, in addition to report substance along generally uniform lines, each survey unit outlined its recommendations in three groups—those which might be accomplished by executive authority; those which would require statutory enactment; and those which required constitutional change.

SYNTHESIS

From the outset of its work the commission recognized the distinctions between organization analysis and management audit. It resisted the temptation to follow traditional lines in attempting to achieve economies directly. No mere elimination of carbon copies or file cabinets could establish a

solid foundation for future governmental effectiveness. In one survey unit after another, the same factors were disclosed as fundamental causes of confusion, ineffectiveness, and waste.

1. The management of the functions of the State government is so decentralized and so illogically divided among nearly 200 separate departments, boards, commissions, and agencies, as to lead to uncontrolled State expenditures, without any means under this system of producing an efficient and economical government.

2. The citizens are not getting 100 cents worth of Government service for their dollar.

3. The best interests of the public are not being served under this system of government. Too often the agencies under this decentralized system respond to interests which are special and local rather than to the larger interests of the people of the State as a whole.

It became increasingly clear to the commission that a mere functional analysis of major departmental grouping would be insufficient. There were some obvious general principles applicable to all the functions. These principles the commission stated.

"1. We believe our Government is not an end in itself but a means * * * to assist free men and women to live their lives peaceably, securely, and prosperously, in a free society.

"2. We believe that our State government should be competent. It should do well the things it undertakes to do.

"3. We believe that our State government should be economical. The citizens have a right to expect that the State's affairs will be prudently managed, to yield full value for the dollars spent.

"4. We believe that better organization—for responsibility, competence, and economy—is essential to a better government.

"5. We believe, finally, that public office is a public trust, not merely a way of making a living, or of serving the interests of special groups."

By these standards, the Commission made its recommendations.

The frame of reference adopted by the Commission—fundamental issues and general principles—clearly indicated that its work could, at best, provide the foundation upon which progressive application of known management principles might perfect our State government structure.

1. The statutory mandate called for a report looking to the most economical method of furnishing "the present State services." The Commission straightforwardly concluded: "It follows from this that the results of our recommendations, if carried out, will show up principally in the form of better government with its resultant benefits to the people, rather than in wholesale cuts in State expenditures." This in spite of the fact that a probable $2,000,000 savings was apparent in one area alone. No price tag was placed on better organization.

2. Citing the truism that "we cannot make an omelette without breaking some eggs," the Commission bespoke the support even of those whose responsibilities might be altered.

3. Defining its task "to chart a pattern and a course of action" the Commission called for debate, understanding, approval, or modification. It emphasized that the third step of detailed application and installation must be shared by all agencies. Only with completion of installation can our task have successful outcome.

LIAISON

From the outset of its work the Commission met frequently with the leaders of both houses of the general assembly. These meetings not only accomplished an important exchange of views but also were requisite in clarifying Commission objectives and direction for our politically divided general assembly.

At an early date the Commission met with the publishers and editors of the State's major papers. Our working plan, survey program, and objectives were outlined. Subsequently, the Commission met from time to time with the press—the political reporters of those papers. These men understood and guided us objectively, as technicians rather than as representatives of any particular policy.

Both the legislators and the press were largely responsible for the Commission's decision to release its report chapter by chapter in advance of printing the text as a whole. In this manner, chapter mailings were made directly to each member of the general assembly and the Governor, simultaneously with release to the press and radio. Our coverage, therefore, was point-by-point and, as a result, far more extensive and effective than if the entire report had been released at one time.

As the commission came to the point of formulating its own report, a citizen's committee on State government was created. Its members sat frequently with the commission during discussions of its report. A nonpartisan group, they became wholly familiar with the commission's work and survey techniques. When, therefore, they set forth to explain our report to the people, it was of their own knowledge and conviction that they were enabled, through pamphlet, press, radio, and direct speech, to support our work.

THE COMMISSION'S REPORT

As its findings merged into fundamentals and principles previously set forth, the commission believed that the general assembly, the governor, and the people would be best served by brevity, simplicity, and cohesive pattern. The commission realized also that its report must be its own. The specialized technical studies had to be integrated and synthesized. The survey units could not have the over-all view. Their work, in many cases, was completed before other vital studies had resolved overlapping questions. Hence, although the survey units reports will be available for next analysis and installation stages, they were not published as part of the commission report.

Brevity and simplicity were served by confining the report to fundamental points of organization and major principles arising from findings which were generally applicable. The objectives of cohesiveness and "single pen" writing were believed essential. The commission engaged the services of Harvey C. Mansfield, now chairman of the political science department, Ohio State University, and a Connecticut resident for a dozen years before the war, as its editor-writer. The editor-writer sat throughout the final meetings of the commission, and having become saturated with the philosophy of the several commissioners, was able to translate their conclusions into language acceptable to each and all of them.

The 11 chapters, the last setting out the proposed legislative program, were released at intervals of 2 to 3 days. This provided chapter content coverage on the first day and analytic or speculative stories on the intervening day. The wire services of press and radio thus were enabled to give broader coverage to these stories as gradually released. Following this month-long chapter coverage, the entire report and legislative program were bound into the consolidated report for general circulation and use.

The chapter titles of the report, which follow, indicate its pattern. The first 10 chapters varied in length from 1,400 to 2,700 words. Chapter XI, containing the text of 10 acts to accomplish the program and including a proposed constitution, is approximately 14,000 words.

I. Principles.
II. Financial Management.
III. Personnel Management.
IV. Management in the Executive Branch.
V. Boards and Commissions.
VI. Elective Offices in the Executive Branch.
VII. Strengthening Local Government.
VIII. Strengthening the General Assembly.
IX. Strengthening the Courts.
X. Strengthening the Constitution.
XI. Ten Acts To Accomplish the Program.
1. An act to provide for the organization of the State government.
2. An act to provide for the organization and operation of the departments of the State government.
3. An act to provide for the reorganization of executive departments.
4. An act concerning administrative procedure of executive departments.
5. An act concerning the establishment of administrative adjudication boards for the executive departments.
6. An act concerning the revision of the Constitution of the State of Connecticut.
7. An act concerning compensation of the governor and lieutenant governor.
8. An act concerning the appointment, tenure, salary maxima of executive department commissioners, administrative adjudication board members, and executive officers of legislative and judicial departments.
9. An act concerning the appointment and tenure of executive and departmental assistants.
10. An act concerning the receipts and disbursements of State funds.

Following is a summary of consolidations of officers and departments which will be effective if the proposal covering such consolidations is approved.

New agency	Existing agencies from which it would assume functions	
	In full	In part
1. Executive Office of the Governor	5	1
2. Office of Personnel Services	3	1
3. Office of General Services	2	5
4. Office of Public Works Services	4	2
5. Finance Department	13	8
6. Labor Department	9	2
7. Commerce Department	9	0
8. Agriculture and Natural Resources Department	27	2
9. Highways Department	9	0
10. State Police Department	5	1
11. Motor Vehicles and Aeronautics Department	3	1
12. Military Department	7	0
13. Education Department	11	1
14. Health Department	30	6
15. Welfare Department	7	3
16. Mental Health Department	9	1
17. Corrections Department	12	0
18. Housing Authority	2	0
19. Judicial Department	9	0
20. Legislative Department	9	1
Subtotal, whole agencies	184	[1] (35) 18
Total	202	

[1] The 35 agencies from which functions would be assumed in part are equivalent to 18 full agencies.

NEXT STEPS

The commission recognized in Act No. 1 that there cannot be an intelligent detailing f plans and specifications until the basic arrangement of existing governmental functions is agreed upon.

In Act No. 2 the commission proposed the termination of its own existence—14 months before its statutory limit. The mission of stage one accomplished, the commission recommended its replacement by a temporary commission on organization and operation of the departments.

An appropriation of $500,000 was proposed for the job of detailing plans and specifications for operation of the consolidated departments. The commission noted that this

amount represented only one-fifth of 1 percent of appropriations for 1949–51. It further concluded that this amount monthly was viewed as a savings goal to follow complete installation.

Many commission proposals involved basic constitutional changes. These included short ballot (for financial and executive management); initiative, referendum and recall (for executive and party responsibility); and new means of constitutional change.

These constitutional changes being so fundamental, it was clear that mere amendment was not the means. The commission proposed an entirely revised constitution for submission to referendum in November 1950. No attempt was made to write an ideal document. The effort was limited to modernizing the language of the 132-year-old constitution, incorporating the proposals essential to accomplish the State organization plan, and adding other matter now partly covered by statute, which the commission believed should be included in a constitution written for 1950. Act No. 6 carries the text of the proposed constitution.

In Acts No. 4 and No. 5 the commission proposed the adoption of an administrative procedure act and the establishment of administrative adjudication boards for the executive departments.

In Acts Nos. 7, 8, and 9 provision was made for the appointment, without confirmation, of department commissioners, bureau directors, their executive assistants, and confidential assistants. Act No. 10 proposed the consolidation of all funds into the State general fund.

On March 9, 1950, the general assembly, convened in special session. It is now studying and debating the report, which is available upon request.

Attacks on Hon. Joseph R. McCarthy, of Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 2 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Red Defenders Smear Senator McCARTHY," from the Maynard News, Maynard, Minn., of April 7, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RED DEFENDERS SMEAR SENATOR McCARTHY

"To Senator McCARTHY:

"We are not deceived by the propaganda being used against you in your present exposé of communism. The 159 members of this organization feel that you are doing a great patriotic work. May God sustain you in this great effort. Signed Lutheran Men's Club, Silo Lutheran Church, Cottonwood, Minn."

This resolution was forwarded to Senator McCARTHY in Washington, D. C., and to the Minneapolis and St. Paul newspapers.

The propaganda against Senator McCARTHY has been more vicious than usual. Drew Pearson has been especially vociferous in his insinuations against the Senator from Wisconsin.

In its more academic style, the editors of the Minneapolis Star and Tribune have created the impression in the minds of their readers that McCARTHY is irresponsible, that his statements are groundless and false and that he is doing a great deal of damage to our State Department.

They have by innuendo and insinuation indicated that there is something not quite honorable about the fighting Senator from our neighboring State. At the same time, the Star-Tribune have published the malicious statements of Drew Pearson and Mrs. Roosevelt, who are notorious for their smear attacks against anyone who dares point a finger of suspicion at the radical "untouchables" in the Federal administration.

As a result of the one-sided reporting job being done by the Associated Press and the prejudiced editorial handling of the McCarthy incident, most people in Minnesota are of the opinion that McCARTHY made a lot of wild charges and then failed to produce the evidence.

As a matter of fact, McCARTHY has produced evidence of his charges.

This writer has just finished a careful study of a 24,000-word speech made by Senator McCARTHY on the floor of the Senate last week Thursday.

Included in this speech were dozens of affidavits, sworn statements, letters, and other documented material which prove conclusively that Owen Lattimore and John Service are poor security risks at the very least, and possible conspirators against the Government of the United States.

Senator McCARTHY did not accuse Judge Doris Kenyon of being a Communist and a traitor, but did say that she had an affinity for Communist fronts because she belonged to 28 of them. Judge Kenyon called McCARTHY a liar, and the newspapers played up that story. A few days later Mrs. Kenyon admitted to the Senate Investigating Committee that she had belonged to these organizations, declared by the FBI to be Communist fronts, but that she was not a Communist or even a Communist-fronter.

If a person belongs to the Baptist Church, he is a Baptist. If he belongs to the Lutheran Church he is a Lutheran. If he belongs to 28 Communist-fronts, then he must be a Communist-fronter. That makes sense, doesn't it?

The critics of Senator McCARTHY say that he should not have publicly exposed the names of the suspected reds in the State Department until proof could be established. That is exactly what McCARTHY asked of the Senate investigating committee, but because of the insistence of two Senators, LUCAS and WITHERS (both Democrats), Senator McCARTHY was eventually forced to testify at a public hearing instead of an executive session of the committee. McCARTHY showed more restraint and common sense than did the administration forces on the Senate committee. Yet, he is the only one criticized by the propagandists.

The Democratic members of the committee had been encouraged by the statement of President Truman that he would "cooperate with the committee" to disprove the accusations of Senator McCARTHY. Neither he nor the committee were open minded in their consideration of McCARTHY's charges.

Because Owen Lattimore is by far the most implicated in the Communist conspiracy, and because he is the brains behind some of the other figures in the controversy, Senator McCARTHY has decided to make his first fight on the one case. As he unveiled the affidavits and evidence last Thursday afternoon he handed the documents to an agent of the FBI with the request that the FBI follow up the leads and compile the evidence which will prove or disprove his charges. It is not hard to understand why he has bypassed the partisan Senate committee and is taking his case to the American people via the Senate floor.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 30 details at considerable length, the long history of collaboration by Owen Lattimore with the Communists of this country and China. In fact, the evidence turned over by McCARTHY to an agent of the FBI who was in the Senate at the request of the Wisconsin Senator, was so conclusive that McCARTHY named him as a Soviet agent.

Here is a brief summary of the evidence McCARTHY turned over to the FBI:

A former top Communist will testify that Lattimore was known to him to be a member of the Communist Party, over whom they had disciplinary powers.

He presented an affidavit showing that Lattimore received instructions in Moscow from the Soviet Government as to the line which the Institute of Pacific Relations ought to follow.

He turned over an affidavit from a former general of the Russian Army, who agrees to testify also, that he had received information from a top Russian intelligence officer to the effect that the Russian Communists were having excellent success through the Institute of Pacific Relations and he particularly mentioned the name of Owen Lattimore.

Another affidavit tells of the six persons involved in the Amerasia case at the home of Lattimore where they were declassifying secret documents. The FBI arrested the six the next day, and charged them with stealing secret documents. They were indicted later, but in spite of what the FBI called an airtight case against them, only one was indicted and fined. John Service was fired by the State Department and then rehired and promoted when Dean Acheson became the new Secretary of State.

In a letter to Joseph Barnes, former head of the OWI, Owen Lattimore instructed him to fire all Chinese who were loyal to the Nationalist Government of China, and hire Chinese from the staff of the New China Daily News, which was a well-known Communist publication in New York. This was at a time when the United States was committed to all-out cooperation with the Nationalist Government which was helping us in our war against Japan.

McCARTHY turned over another affidavit from a man who lived with Lattimore in China, who declared that Lattimore was the leader of several pro-Russian student uprisings in China.

Throughout Senator McCARTHY's speech he was heckled by proadministration Senators, seeking to embarrass him and to confuse the issue. Our own Senator HUMPHREY was particularly loud in his abuse of McCARTHY, but the fighting Irishman from Wisconsin soon put him to rout, much to the amusement of the galleries and the other Senators.

In addition to the evidence briefly mentioned above, this writer has spent several hours reading excerpts from books written by Mr. Lattimore. They were filled with a great deal of pro-Russian, pro-Communist bias, and, on the other hand, the author was apologetic when he mentioned the United States, its foreign policy, and the capitalistic system.

Senator McCARTHY is doing his country a great service. In spite of what the so-called intellectuals of the country may think about his methods, this writer has observed that it takes a blast of dynamite to jar loose the little click of left-wingers, sly subversives, and radicals who infest our Nation's Capital.

We predict again that Senator JOSEPH McCARTHY will win his fight and that American democracy and our world prestige will gain, rather than lose, by the house cleaning that we hope will follow.

More power to you, Senator McCARTHY.

A Chinese newspaper summed up Senator McCARTHY's charges against alleged Communists in the State Department by a single line: "What do you know, Joe." The editor might have added, "Why be so wary, Harry."

Drew Pearson, hatchetman for the Frankfurter clique in the administration, tried to

make it appear that McCARTHY had committed some kind of a crime when he ran for the Senate without resigning his judgeship in Wisconsin. He also made insinuations about McCARTHY's income-tax squabble with the State of Wisconsin. Now who's making wild accusations? Drew Pearson is a regular contributor to the editorial page of the Minneapolis Star.

Spartanburg County, S. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 2, 1950

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, the county of Spartanburg, S. C., has been recognized as the greatest fresh-fruit producing county in the United States. Her orchardists have invested much labor and money in the cultivation of their trees. Occasionally late frosts destroy the crop, as is the case this year. Peaches valued at approximately $6,000,000 have been destroyed, but in spite of this unprecedented loss the farmers and orchardists of Spartanburg County have not despaired. They are carrying on with courage which has made them self-reliant.

In this connection, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD the following statement recently issued about the outstanding accomplishments and productive capacity of both farmers and industrialists in Spartanburg County:

Spartanburg County has turned the mid-century point, riding the highest crest in her history. She has had her ups and downs during the past 50 years but today faces the future with confidence.

The picture, as it will look in the year 2000 A. D., will depend much on the courage, foresight, initiative, ability, faith, and hard work of her people. That, plus the intelligence with which the county's God-given assets are utilized.

Before we tackle the second half of the century it would be well if every citizen of Spartanburg County paused for a moment to take inventory to see just what it is that makes us tick.

A look at Spartanburg County's economy proves conclusively that her future is bound inescapably to the fortunes of her greatest industry, the textile industry.

The textile mills of the county provide the motor which makes our vehicle move. The direction in which we move—either forward or in reverse—pretty much depends on the driver.

If the motor is kept in good condition and enough fuel is available to keep it running, Spartanburg County can expect to continue to improve her lot.

You and I, the drivers, hold the key to the direction in which we move.

Forty and eight-tenths percent of Spartanburg County's white population, over 16 years of age, is employed today in one of the county's 43 textile mill units, operated by 23 companies.

Twenty thousand, three hundred and thirty Spartanburg County people are employed in the textile mills of the county—this number is 110 percent greater than the total of all farm owners, farm managers, farm foremen, paid farm laborers, and unpaid family farm laborers in the county.

Forty-four million, eight hundred thousand, nine hundred and fourteen dollars in wages were paid to Spartanburg County textile mill employees last year. That sum represents 85 percent of all of the industrial wages paid in the county during the year.

Twenty times more dollars in wages were paid to textile workers in Spartanburg County last year than the total cash value of the county's important peach crop during 1949.

Twelve times more dollars in wages were paid to textile workers in Spartanburg County last year than the total cash value of the county's important cotton crop during 1949.

Seven times more dollars in wages were paid to textile workers in our county last year than the combined value of the peach crop and cotton crop of the county during the year.

Two hundred and fifty-eight days was the average number of days worked by Spartanburg County's textile mills during 1949, thus providing stable year-round employment.

Agriculture and textiles are the basis of Spartanburg County's economy. The growth of each has been both tremendous and healthy during the past 50 years.

Today, when the farmer encounters difficulties other than weather, labor, or insects he can usually look to the Government for help in the form of price supports and Government purchase of surpluses.

When the operators of our textile mills meet with difficulties of any nature they must work out their problems for themselves. They are dependent on the stability of market, labor, and legislation for their survival.

Agriculture is important to all of us. It must be advanced and maintained in a healthy condition. And so, also, must we help to keep the textile industry healthy.

The continued successful operation of the textile mills in Spartanburg County is the greatest single guaranty for security for the individual man and woman of the county.

If our textile mills prosper we will all share in the benefits.

If our textile mills are allowed to become sick, the result will be the biggest calamity in the history of the South.

Such is our dependency upon the condition of the textile industry here in Spartanburg County.

Because it means so much to each of us and because it forms the basic economy of our county, the textile industry deserves the interest, cooperation, support, and sympathetic understanding of every citizen of Spartanburg County.

The Truth in Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS B. HELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 26, 1950

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Washington Evening Star of May 1, 1950, entitled "The Truth in Russia":

THE TRUTH IN RUSSIA

The latest example of how truth is mutilated behind the iron curtain is furnished by Pravda's presentation to the Russian people of Secretary Acheson's recent address to the American Society of Newspaper Editors. Never has the Soviet propaganda machine done a more thorough job of making words mean the exact opposite of their real meaning. The distortions involved, the absolute butchery of fact, the deliberate transformation of white into black, and vice versa, can only be described as an almost perfect application of the totalitarian technique of telling lies so big, bold, and dazzling that the masses are mentally numbed and blinded into believing them.

Thus, in substance, Mr. Acheson's speech amounted merely to the outline of a peace policy calling for six lines of action: (1) That the American people keep alive a militant faith in freedom for themselves and the world; (2) that they join with like-minded peoples in letting mankind know what this faith is and what it has accomplished and can still accomplish for human betterment; (3) that the United States be strong and adequately prepared to preserve liberty wherever it now exists; (4) that present and future aid programs be used to improve the economic lot of free humanity; (5) that the non-Soviet, independent nations organize politically for common action through existing international machinery, and (6) that the idea of aggression be eliminated between these nations and Russia.

But how has Pravda—which, ironically enough, means "truth"—reported and interpreted all this to the people of Russia? Under the name of M. Marinin, one of its high-powered international commentators, it has summarized Mr. Acheson's program as follows: (1) "A further armament race, a greater orgy of militarism and an extension of the cold war"; (2) action to bring about the "economic enslavement of western Europe by the forcible creation of a single western European market under complete domination of American monopolies"; (3) placing all dependent and colonial countries under the mastery of the United States; and (4) enlargement of the Atlantic Pact bloc into "a kind of superstate of Wall Street."

Taken simply by itself, this complete misrepresentation of Mr. Acheson's address might be a source of amusement to people interested in the absurdities of totalitarian editorializing. But there is nothing really funny about it. It is tragic, poisonous, dangerous. It is all of these things because the Russian masses—sealed off as they are from the outside world—have access only to Moscow's version of the facts, the Voice of America being pretty much jammed out. In time, unless this condition can be corrected, the falsehoods they are hearing will become gospel truth to them, and the outlook for peace and understanding between their world and ours will be bleaker than ever.

Investigation of Subversive Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 2 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Charges of 'Asset of the Kremlin' Boomerang" from Capper's Weekly of April 8, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHARGES OF "ASSET OF THE KREMLIN" BOOMERANG

(From a radio address broadcast by Arthur Capper, former Senator from Kansas, over WIBW, the Capper publications station at Topeka, April 2, 1950)

President Truman's scathing denunciation of Republican Senators for criticisms of the State Department, in a press conference in Key West last Thursday, centers attention on some vital developments affecting the foreign policy of the United States.

The President accused Senator MCCARTHY, of Wisconsin, and Senators associated with him of attempting to "sabotage the bipartisan foreign policy of the United States."

I had been of the opinion that the White House and the State Department, through concealing from Senator VANDENBERG and other Republicans on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee—as well as from Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek—the promises to Stalin at the Tehran and Yalta Conferences that resulted in turning over China to the Communists, had pretty well sabotaged the bipartisan foreign policy some time ago.

SECRECY ON FOREIGN COMMITMENTS

A bipartisan foreign policy in which the administration makes secret commitments as far-reaching as those made at Yalta and other conferences, and then calls on the opposition party to support these regardless, is not much of a bipartisan foreign policy, according to my way of thinking.

It is more like calling for bipartisan support for a very partisan foreign policy of very dubious value to the United States. And when the President of the United States follows up that charge with the further direct charge that Senator MCCARTHY—and by implication also Senators WHERRY, of Nebraska and BRIDGES, of New Hampshire—are the Kremlin's greatest assets in this country, I think he is venturing rather far afield.

Now I do not hold any particular brief for Senator MCCARTHY in his specific charges as to how many and which persons in or connected with the State Department are, or have been in the past, promoting the interests of a foreign government. He says the evidence is in the loyalty files of the Department. And so far the contents of those files have been kept secret.

But I do happen to know this much about the matter. Neither Senator WHERRY, nor Senator BRIDGES, nor MCCARTHY, was present at the Yalta Conference where the Chinese National Government, our ally, was sold down the river and Stalin was given the go ahead signal for the conquest of China.

OTHER EXAMPLES OF AIDING RUSSIA

Nor were any of these three consulted when other commitments were made which gave eastern Germany, and most of central Europe, over to the control of Soviet Russia.

We do know that Alger Hiss sat in with President Roosevelt and Stalin at the Yalta Conference. And that Alger Hiss was a power at the San Francisco Conference which drew up the United Nations Charter, which contains provisions that turned out to be much more favorable to the interest of Soviet Russia than to the interests of the United States of America.

And through the work of the House Committee on Un-American Activitics, and the activities of a Federal grand jury, and the action of two Federal trial juries, we have learned considerable as to Alger Hiss' extracurricular—if that is the right term—activities while he was in the State Department.

Also there is little real doubt in the minds of those who have been in touch with the results of our foreign policy, particularly our Far East foreign policy, that what has resulted from that program has been of more benefit to Soviet Russia than to the United States of America. Or to our ally, China.

AND WHO BETRAYED CHINA TO RUSSIA?

The tale of what various persons representing our State Department, and various organizations and persons which and who Secretary of State Dean Acheson says have no State Department ties, is a long tale, and does not redound to the credit of this country.

So I say it comes with a very poor grace for President Truman to charge that Republican Senators trying to clean up the State Department are the greatest asset of the Kremlin in this country, when the record of the past 4 or 5 years seems plain enough that it was the State Department's Far East policy which did so much to turn China over to the Communists.

I again call attention to the fact that no Republican Senator was present, or had anything to do with, or even had any knowledge at the time of the betrayal of our ally, Chiang Kai-shek, to Stalin at the Yalta Conference, but that Alger Hiss of the State Department was there, and was said at the time to be one of President Roosevelt's most trusted advisers.

On the record as disclosed to date, would you say that the Senators, WHERRY, BRIDGES, and MCCARTHY, or representatives of our State Department dealing with the Far East (specifically China) have been assets to the Kremlin?

WILL TRUMAN BLUFF AGAIN IN 1950?

I believe the answer is self-evident. And I hope the Republican leadership will stand by their guns, instead of running for cover as they did when President Truman, in 1948, made equally unjustified charges against the Republican Eightieth Congress. Harry S. Truman bluffed the Republican national leadership to a fare you well in 1948. Will he do it again in 1950?

I note also that on Friday Secretary of State Dean Acheson made two pronouncements concerning far-eastern affairs.

First, he announced that one Owen Lattimore, now just home from Afghanistan (where he had been investigating for the United Nations the prospects for the United States sending funds into that region under President Truman's point 4 program for developing backward countries) is not in the employ of the State Department. Also that so far as Secretary Acheson can learn, he never carried much weight in the State Department.

Senator MCCARTHY maintains differently. Perhaps some day we will get at the facts of this case.

Dr. Lattimore is said by his friends to be a recognized authority on Asia and Asiatics. He at one time was head of the Institute of Pacific Relations and editor of its official organ, Pacific Affairs. Also, he wrote a book, Solution in Asia, of which the publisher's announcement (1945) said, and I quote:

"He (Dr. Lattimore) shows that all the Asiatic people are more interested in actual democratic practices, such as the ones they see in action across the Russian border, than they are in the fine theories of Anglo-Saxon democracies which come coupled with ruthless imperialism."

Perhaps it is just as well, if Dr. Lattimore sees actual democratic practices across the Russian border, and contrasts these with the fine theories of Anglo-Saxon democracies—coupled with ruthless imperialism, that Dr. Lattimore wields little or no influence in our State Department. But in our dealings with Russia over China the past few years, our State Department seems to have held much the same views.

UNPUBLISHED PROVISIONS AT YALTA

But not now. Not anymore. For on Friday last Secretary Acheson's other pronouncement deal with the ruthless imperialism of Russia in grabbing half the oil and minerals produced in the far west province of Sinkiang in Communist China.

"It seems clear," he added, "that the effect of the unpublished agreements arrived at in Moscow last winter was to award to the U. S. S. R. preeminent rights in China's strategic western provinces."

Secretary Acheson said such exploitation has been witnessed in Manchuria and eastern Europe. But he said nothing about the unpublished provisions of the Tehran and Yalta agreements President Roosevelt and Mr. Hiss entered into with Mr. Stalin by which Russia was assured control of Manchuria, and as an end result of which she has taken over all the mainland of China.

Americans have little to brag about in the history of our Far East policies the past decade.

I doubt very much if President Truman can dispose of the charges of disloyalty in the State Department, by saddling on Senators who most emphatically have not been allowed even to know the inside of what has been going on there the responsibility of being the greatest assets of the Kremlin in this country.

You may remember he tried to dispose of the Whittaker Chambers charges that Alger Hiss furnished secret State Department information to Russian agents, by calling them a red herring.

CRYING "RED HERRING" NOT ENOUGH

Since that time Alger Hiss has been convicted of perjury for denying, under oath, the truth of these charges.

A Dr. Charles Fuchs, a refugee German scientist entrusted with top atomic secrets, has admitted in London to being a Soviet agent at the time he was under loan by Britain to the United States during the war.

A woman employee of the Department of Justice has been convicted of betraying official confidential material to a Soviet citizen, an employee of the United Nations.

A number of persons are reported to have been released from the State and Commerce Departments as being poor security risks. It is odd how many of these have shown up later on the pay rolls of the United Nations and its agencies.

I don't believe this situation can be cleared up by counter-charges of "red herrings" and assets of the Kremlin in this country.

Our German Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. D. ROOSEVELT, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1950

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the fundamental reason for my joining in the sponsorship of this resolution for an over-all review of our German policy leaps from every newspaper, magazine, and book that deals with the future of Europe. Reporters of every political persuasion agree that the key to that future is Germany. Each day, skilled journalists, public officials, businessmen, scholars, and trade-union leaders remind us of this.

Here are some of the quotations from articles that I have seen within the last few days. The last issue of Time Magazine quotes John Cowles, president of the Minneapolis Star and Tribune, who is just back from Europe:

The German problem * * * is the vital factor.

The New York Herald Tribune carries a column by Joseph Alsop that begins:

This complex, fear-distorted German situation is the key to the European future.

The New Leader carries a provocative article by Irving Brown, AFL representative in Europe:

This symbolic demonstration of Russia's major concern with China in the east and Germany in the west sums up Soviet aspirations for eventual world domination.

The current issue of Congress' own Legislative Reference Service's Public Affairs Abstracts bears further witness to this. Writer after writer on the Problem of Germany makes the point that "Germany occupies a focal point in the current east-west conflict"; that "settlement of the German problem may well determine the future of Europe."

There is no need to belabor this fact. The success or failure of our occupation policy will be felt by unborn generations on every continent in the world. Our foreign-policy makers and administrators, on the whole, have possibly done the best that could be expected in the face of ominous, world-wide cold war. But German policy cannot be made effectively on a basis of moving from crisis to crisis; often of not moving until a little too late. It is time the very fundamentals of our German policy were reviewed, and our west German goals restated. It is time for a national, bipartisan audit of the net effect of the day-to-day decisions of the military and civilian leaders who deal with Germany.

We need the greatest clarity of purpose in Germany. We need continual assurance that our victory was not a vain one, that our expenditure of American treasure for that victory and for the occupation has not been a waste. We went to war in 1941 because we had no choice, because we were attacked. But we fought for more than survival, we fought for a peaceful world in which democratic freedom could flourish. I do not think that it is too much to say that Germany may well be the cradle or the grave of new freedom and a new peace. There are no higher stakes; there is no greater challenge.

We should not need the spur of Russian competition in this matter; but need it or not, we have it. Soviet leadership well understands the all-pervasive importance of the direction of Germany's development. Abundant evidence of that is in the opening portion of the report of the AFL's Irving Brown:

NEW GERMAN "DRANG NACH OSTEN" EXTENDS FROM RUHR TO SHANGHAI—MOSCOW, BETWEEN BOTH, HOPES THUS TO CONTROL ENTIRE WORLD

The new German "Drang nach Osten" is under way. This time the drive to the East extends to the very shores of the Pacific Ocean. For the Russians are now attempting to win the battle of the Ruhr via China and thus conquer all of Germany.

In addition to the markets of eastern Europe, Ruhr industrialists cannot but cast longing eyes on the great and vast areas of primitive, underdeveloped China now resting in Communist hands.

On December 21 the seventieth anniversary of Joseph Stalin's birth was celebrated in Moscow. At the side of Stalin were Mao Tse-tung, leader of the Chinese Communists, and Walter Ulbricht, president of the Soviet-dominated East German Republic.

This symbolic demonstration of Russia's major concern with China in the east and Germany in the west sums up Soviet aspirations for eventual world domination. This symbolic joining together of China and Germany via the U. S. S. R. became a little more concrete when, on February 9, Herr Ulbricht announced that his Minister of Trade, Herr Handke, had been taking part in trade negotiations with Mao during the latter's stay in Moscow. Ulbricht further revealed that Handke had been instructed in the negotiations to take into account export possibilities of the West German enterprises.

Thus the Soviets have advanced one step further in their drive to conquer the Ruhr and Western Germany through the bait of eastern markets—European and Asian. And as history has shown, such economic relationships with totalitarian nations give rise to eventual political pacts or traps.

What will the West do? What can it do to resist this growing menace of a new eastern orientation on the part of Germany? What markets in the West will be open to German industry which will permit some solution of the growing and disturbing mass unemployment, now reaching 2,000,000 out of a working force of 12,000,000 in Western Germany?

Can western Europe and the United States provide not only markets but an integration of the West German economy into the Occidental world? Many of the West's industries are competitive to Germany's and therefore do not easily permit the kind of complementary arrangements usually possible between industrial and nonindustrial areas.

The urgent need for west European integration in which Germany plays its part has become the order of the day. However, more than the mere offering of markets is necessary to prevent the threatening German-Russian alliance. No matter what the West does in the way of integration, expanding markets, and the opening of new market areas, the fact remains that Germany will still have to seek markets in the East.

Therefore we need political allies in Germany more than economic solutions. Reliable democratic forces in control of the German economic and political system can bar the way to any new German-Soviet political alliance. Integration into western Europe must be backed up by a policy of supporting the internal forces of German democracy, which are the only guaranty against this rising tide of the East. This can be found in the organized labor movement.

If the trade-unions are given a decisive voice in the control of the Ruhr coal, iron, and steel industries, no German nationalist deal with Stalin is possible. These pro-West forces can prevent the rise to power of a renascent and insurgent German nationalism and prevent entry into a pact with the Russians, who are now offering what appear to be juicy business contracts. But if unemployment continues to mount and no economic solution is forthcoming from the Western World, these growing economic relationships with the East will constitute the material foundations for a united Germany under Soviet domination.

Mr. Speaker, whether the colors of their flags are brown or red, totalitarians have a way of winding up together. We cannot risk, nor can the other peoples of the Western democracies, a union of Communist and reborn Nazi imperialism. Such a union would be a disastrous end to the cold war. Such a union would crush all hope for a lasting peace. The only sure way to prevent the emergence of such a union is to build a stable democracy in Western Germany, and then to cement it into a cooperative alliance of free peoples. If we can bring about that "situation of fact," our "total diplomacy" cannot fail.

We can lose nothing by a Presidential Commission such as is proposed here. If it makes the slightest contribution to strengthening our German policy, it will have justified itself. Compared with the billions of dollars we are spending, compared with the millions of men we have committed, this step is a tiny one. But there is, at the very least, a strong possibility that it would help us to make use of these billions and millions with greater wisdom and sharper effect.

Cotton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 2, 1950

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, Cotton Week is being observed throughout the country. The Maid of Cotton, Miss Elizabeth McGee, after an extended tour of Europe, has been fittingly welcomed to her home town of Spartanburg, S. C., in my district.

The importance of cotton is so well expressed in the accompanying statement, under unanimous consent, I include it as a part of my remarks:

COTTON AND YOU

As you read this, no matter where you are, you can reach out and touch cotton.

If it's daytime and you're fully dressed, you will find cotton in your clothing even to your shoes. If you're in bed you are lying on cotton. Even if you read this in the tub, you can reach out and touch a cotton wash cloth or towel.

Maybe you have thought of cotton as something growing in a field, as something they use in textile mills, or as all sorts of things in your favorite store. Cotton is all of that, but all of its leads to you. You and cotton depend on each other in hundreds of ways—so many ways, in fact, that if some devil-inspired magician should wave a wand and suddenly take cotton away from you—

Your first handicap and major embarrassment is the immediate disappearance of cotton from your clothing, even to the reinforcements in your hose, and the laces and linings in your shoes. You are up against it even to get home. If you walk, you have to go barefooted because your shoes have fallen apart for lack of cotton stitching. And you can't ride, because no buss, cab, bicycle, or railroad car runs without cotton in its electric wires, tires, seats, or other parts.

When you get to the living room, you find a drastic change. The malicious magician has removed the strong cotton tapes that held the venetian blinds or has taken out your cotton shades. The beautiful fresh curtains and drapes are gone from the windows. You

start for the easy chair to relax and pull yourself together, only to find that the handsome washable slip covers have been taken away and the soft cotton padding has vanished. The floor may seem more inviting than the naked frame and springs of the big chair, but gone is the cotton or cotton stitching from the rug and from the mat beneath it.

But the kitchen is having troubles, too, with no cottonseed oil shortening or salad dressing, and no meat from animals fed to tender perfection on cottonseed meal. The electric refrigerator has shortcircuited because of no cotton windings for the wires. And there is, in addition, the problem of dish cloths and towels and pot holders.

But dinner can be prepared, if there is a coal or gas stove in the house—no kerosene because of the cotton wicks, and no electric stove. You have to sit on the bare frame of the dining chair because the familiar cotton-covered seat has done a disappearing act. Snowy fresh table cloths and napkins are out unless you happen to have some pure linen ones around. (Don't forget to eat before dark, for the cotton wrappings are gone from the electric wires all over the place, and lamps and candles are no good without cotton wicks.)

A bath before bed—and what would be more soothing now than a hot bath and then a rub-down with a clean, fresh towel? But that's impossible * * * there are no towels, no wash cloths, no bath mats.

And so to bed. But how different your bedroom is tonight. The anticotton magic has left you no spread, sheets, or pillowcases. The mattress is bare of ticking and padding—you will probably want to discard the whole thing, because even the inner springs are no longer boxed in cotton. You can't even rest your weary head on your pillow—with no cotton ticking it is now only a pile of feathers.

You can't hop into the family car and get away from it all—you can't even use the car without the 65 pounds of cotton that should be in its various parts. To make matters still worse, you can't use the telephone or radio—they are both out of order. (It's those cotton-wound wires again.)

Minor medical care, much less an operation, is practically out of the question. A doctor's office or hospital where there is no gauze, absorbent cotton, adhesive tape, X-ray machine, table pads, sheets, mattresses, or ether applicators would be a dangerous place.

But no magician could do that. Cotton is with and around you day and night, from the time you start life in a cotton diaper to the time the undertaker lays you on cotton padding in a casket. From cradle to coffin, and every day of every year in between, cotton is serving you in dozens of ways you see and recognize, and in hundreds of ways you don't. Cotton's service, its certain comfort, its easy washability, its convenience and beauty are so ever present that they often come to be taken for granted.

Yes, cotton is important to you—so important that you use nearly four times as much of it as of all other fibers combined.

And you are important to cotton—tremendously important. Fifteen million workers on cotton farms, in cotton factories, and in processing plants are glad when you buy a spool of cotton thread, a cotton handkerchief, or cotton clothes for work or play or dress. They are glad when you buy flour or feed or sugar in cotton sacks, when you put on cotton socks or hang cotton drapes or curtains. Because you mean jobs and health and happiness to them.

You and cotton—you two have done, and can do, a mighty lot for each other.

Repeal of Excise Taxes on Distilled Spirits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS B. HELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 26, 1950

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, distilled spirits excises were imposed by the Federal Government from 1791 to 1802, again from the Civil War to the World War, and again after the repeal of prohibition. During the whole history of such taxes it has been argued that taxation restricts drinking of the beverages on which levied; and that if drinking is not stopped by taxation, at least those who drink must be patriotic about it. Their beverage must help pay for the war—civil war, world war, or cold war—and they must drink down the national debt—1791 and post-World War II. The first of the purposes, to restrict consumption, is not valid other than in wartime, as it constitutes a discriminatory burden on a necessity and an unwarranted infringement of personal liberty. The excise is not justifiable at any conceivable schedule of rates, other than as a means of picking up revenue for immediate war purposes when no other revenue resource is available. But even if the purposes of the tax were accepted, the rates have been so immoderate as often to result in a confusion of purposes and to thwart their accomplishment.

Repeal of the excise on distilled spirits is urgent now, as is apparent from a review of the character of the tax when in operation. First, excise rates on distilled spirits have been so high as to cut into the yield of the tax. In recognition of this effect, the tax was repealed in 1802, and rates were sharply reduced after the Civil War. Following the reduction in rates after the Civil War, this excise became the principal source of Federal internal revenue, from 1873 to 1915. Current tax rates, established during the Second World War, subject this commodity to higher excises than are applicable to any other commodity affected by wartime excises. As a result, the yield of the tax has fallen during a period of expanding adult population, higher incomes, and availability of materials of manufacture. Second, the tax has been, at whatever rates levied, an infringement of the liberty of consumers and of the liberty of business to pursue and develop a line of manufacture and sale. In recent years the excise, levied on a commodity which always has been more a necessity than a luxury, has tended to lower standards of living, and to bring business difficulties to the retail and manufacturing firms engaged in the industry. Diminishing returns to the Government have been accompanied by loss to consumers and to the producing interests. Third, this excise, urged on the pretext of reforming the public morals to suit certain conceptions which never in any place have been universally accepted or even long accepted by a majority, has always contributed to lawlessness. It led to the whisky rebellion in its earliest days, and in later periods has led to moonshining and bootlegging. It contributes toward intemperate use of the beverages on which it is levied.

These characteristics of the excise are discussed in more detail in the following paragraphs:

First. The rate of tax established by the Revenue Act of 1943 is $9 per proof gallon. This rate is about 42 cents out of every dollar of the price to the consumer—a rate more than twice as high as the highest rate—20 cents—levied on any other commodity subject to the wartime excise taxes. The rate, in addition, is heaviest on the workingman or workingwoman who buys less expensive brands; the rate does not go up or down with the price per bottle. The repressive effects of the tax are clear in the following figures showing reductions in revenues, whisky withdrawn, and purchases as percent of spendable income:

Fiscal year	Receipts from distilled-spirits tax	Whisky withdrawn, tax-paid
		Tax gallons
1950 (6 months)	$788, 958, 000	
1949	1, 431, 741, 000	52, 674, 964
1948	1, 471, 209, 000	53, 603, 200
1947	1, 728, 854, 000	58, 822, 676
1946	1, 788, 460, 000	63, 226, 912
1945	1, 516, 855, 000	63, 891, 224
1944	918, 311, 000	58, 832, 992
1943		87, 913, 792
1942		84, 709, 171

Distilled spirits purchases as percent of disposable income

Fiscal year:	*Percent*
1949	2.0
1948	2.0
1947	2.6
1946	3.2
1945	2.9
1944	2.6
1943	2.4
1942	2.3

Losses of revenue are apparent in the years since the end of the war. Tax rates have gone beyond the point of diminishing returns. In a period when the adult population was increased by more than 8 percent, total consumption of taxed spirits declined, and in a period of rising incomes, the portion spent on spirits fell. The tax has been discriminatory against the manufacture and consumption of distilled spirits. The war portion of the excise rate was intentionally discriminatory, and consequently is peculiarly unjustifiable at the present time. The cost of excises exceeds the cost of manufacture by 7 or 8 times, following the Civil War pattern of immoderate rates. At that earlier period, rates were 10 times the cost of manufacture. At the present, as at the earlier time, the rates exceed the point of diminishing returns.

Second. As result of discriminatory taxation, the purchase and production of whisky and like beverages is not regulated by a balancing of consumers' desires and purchasing power against business costs, but by arbitrary legislation. The tax limits the operation of the forces

of a free market, of the very foundation of economic liberty. As has been remarked of the tax since first levied in 1791, it contravenes individual liberty. It operates in the same direction and under the same animus, as the prohibition amendment. But, unlike prohibition, it is in such form as not to be referrable to popular vote, where it would be rejected. Its infringement of personal liberty, like that of prohibition, has brought resistance by consumers. Consumer resistance, as is obvious from data already quoted, has caused a loss of revenues and has become burdensome to the distilling and to the retailing industries. The excise makes the industry incapable of free and effective competition with other industries for the consumer's dollars.

The depressive effects on an important industry must be taken into account in a period of growing unemployment. The distilled-spirits industry directly employs 800,000 persons. There are 773 producing and processing units in 26 different States, and 184,000 retail outlets, principally small businesses—in 47 States and the District of Columbia. These retail outlets have hundreds of thousands of owners and employees. The purchases made by the distilling industry provide indirect employment for hundreds of thousands of workers in other industries. Overtaxation of distilled spirits jeopardizes the markets and the employment of all these industries and workers. The tax is oppressive to those arts and industries which require distilled spirits as a material in manufacturing. This always is characteristic of such excises. Today, as in Civil War times, the tax exceeds the manufacturing cost of the alcohol which goes into drug items.

Repeal of the excise would free purchasing power, now taken by the Government, for consumer purchases of distilled spirits in additional volume. More than that, it would make available purchasing power which would move into all consumer spending channels, benefiting the entire economic system. Low-income groups in particular would be benefited, because 85 percent of all distilled spirits are purchased by consumers with incomes of less than $5,000 per year. It is obvious that the substantial cut in liquor prices would permit a fuller enjoyment of leisure time, enabling many people to entertain more frequently and at less sacrifice. A substantial contribution to improved business and to higher standards of living would be made possible by the repeal of the distilled-spirits excise.

Third. An excise, which, together with State taxes, amounts to about $2.05 on the average per fifth of liquor, is so high that temperate drinking is almost prohibitively expensive for many working men and women. The excessive cost makes it possible to drink only occasionally and irregularly. An immoderate use of the beverages becomes more likely as use becomes more irregular and longer postponed.

Excessive cost has another obvious and more readily measurable consequence. It increases moonshining and bootlegging. Evidence of this is found in the increase by 46.4 percent from 1946 to 1949 in the producing capacity of illicit stills seized by the Federal Government. The stills seized in 1949 by the Federal Government's agents alone, not including State seizures, had a daily capacity of 240,809 gallons. This represents a potential daily loss of $2,167,281 in revenues to the Federal Government in excise taxes alone. Further losses of income and other taxes would be involved. The high taxes make illicit operations extremely profitable, to the injury of legitimate business and to the detriment of the consumer who gets a lower-grade product.

Mr. Speaker, repeal of the excises would benefit consumers in terms of higher standards of living and greater individual liberty, would be beneficial to industry generally, would reduce lawlessness by making it unprofitable, and would not involve commensurate loss of revenue to the Fedcral Government.

Winning the Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN M. VORYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1950

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, under the leave given me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my opening statement in a panel discussion this morning with Mr. Walter Lippmann, newspaper columnist, Mr. Paul Hoffman, ECA Administrator, and Mr. Eugene Holman, president of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, before the thirty-eighth annual meeting of the United States Chamber of Commerce in the National Chamber Building here in Washington on the subject Winning the Peace:

WINNING THE PEACE

STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE JOHN M. VORYS, MAY 2, 1950

As a mere Member of the House, my viewpoint on our foreign affairs is probably very limited. I have no inside, advance information. We House Members never hear officially about any American foreign policy until it is time to pay; then it is presented as a commitment we must carry out—or else.

On the other hand, our policy makers know very little about the House. For instance, the President said last Thursday that he hoped the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House would see fit to adopt the Connally plan of area subcommittees to bring about greater understanding and confidence between the State Department and the House. Well, we have had such area subcommittees in the House Foreign Affairs Committee for the last 5 years, and the President didn't know it. Apparently these subcommittees did not bring about very much Presidential understanding. As for confidence, we might have more of it in the President and the State Department, if they would, just once in a while, take us into their confidence.

To arrive at policies for winning the peace, we need, first of all, a reform in some policies and politics right here in Washington.

We are hearing a good bit these days about a bipartisan foreign policy, whether we have one or ought to have one. I wish we had a real bipartisan foreign policy, but this will require three things: first, bipartisan consultation before the policy is determined and the country committed; second, cooperation during the committee and floor consideration of legislation, and third, proper credit given both parties for the formulation and implementation of the policies. In order to have a working bipartisan foreign policy, politics must stop at the water's edge not only in the spring when bills are on Capitol Hill, but in the fall during presidential and congressional campaigns.

As to the need for unity in foreign policy; in this perilous period between peace and war, I believe it is more important for our country to be right than to be united. History is strewn with the wrecks of nations whose people were united in the wrong course.

But foreign policies on which we can safely unite should not only be bipartisan, but bicameral. There are two Houses of Congress and as our foreign policies have become more and more expensive, action by the so-called lower House has become more and more important, and its Members are becoming less and less inclined to furnish whatever the administration wants, merely because it has been approved in advance by a few Senators of both parties. At present, diplomatic relations are strained not only between Capitol Hill and "Foggy Bottom," where the State Department is located, but also between the two Chambers on the Hill. One step toward developing policies that will win the peace, would be for not only the Republicans and Democrats, but the State Department, the Senate, and the House, to get together. I am sure the House is willing.

Under the circumstances, I can only present my own ideas on the cold war from a limited viewpoint and based on such information as you all have. For 4 years I have felt that in this deadly struggle between communism and freedom war is inevitable unless there is revolution over here or over there; but peace is inevitable some day, before or after war, and this time we want to win the peace.

How will we know we have won the peace? From my limited viewpoint, it will be when we can safely reduce our military expenditures to police force size; when we will not have to cope with spying, sabotage, and subversive activities in Government and other key spots, directed from abroad and designed to overthrow our Government.

Even if we win the peace, we will still have problems to solve, economic, military, political, and moral. We may have inflation or depressions or bad government; we are sure to have arguments and crime and cussedness. Eternal vigilance will continue to be the price of liberty. But when we can safely reduce our armaments and safely reduce our loyalty checks here at home, we will have won the cold war.

That day looks a long way off right now. I have voted for all of the administration's cold-war measures before the House to date: Voice of America, Greek-Turkish aid, Marshall plan, arms aid, point 4, increased national defense, and they have not won the cold war. Instead, we need more arms and more loyalty checks here at home and we are on the way to bleeding ourselves white through the insidious, temporarily painless, method of inflation through an unbalanced budget.

Things have gone wrong in Asia and in Europe.

Asia is being overrun by the Communists. We could have prevented it. In spite of the

defeatist attitude of Messrs. Acheson and Jessup, who follow the Lattimore line, we might still change the result in China, but only if our policy makers change their minds or if we change policy makers. We have had a bipartisan China policy on Capitol Hill since 1947 and it is written into law in the China Aid Act of 1948 and that act is still the law, but it has not been carried out by the Executive. Instead it has been evaded and misconstrued and action delayed by those charged with making it effective. I have seen recent letters from Formosa from reliable military and governmental people, showing how the furnishing of aid now authorized by law to the Chinese Government we recognize might even yet be effective to stop Soviet Russia in its conquest of Asia, but our policy is still to relax and enjoy it. I feel certain that we cannot win the peace while Asia is going Communist.

In western Europe we have done our part, but the nations of Europe have failed to achieve the unity, economically and politically, that is their only salvation in war or peace. Paul Hoffman has done his part. There is a propaganda of ridicule against him for carrying out the mandate of Congress encouraging unification of Europe. It is becoming the style in certain quarters to sneer at his attempts to break down the age-old rivalries, hatreds, and jealousies that these nations can no longer afford. Right now isolationism in Europe, particularly in Britain, is more damaging in the cold war than any isolationism in the United States. We cannot win the peace with 17 separate, independent, feeble allies in Europe.

We even have columnists who preach isolation, neutrality, as a policy we should encourage for Japan, Germany, and China. I believed in neutrality once. I thought we could remain neutral. I found out, however, after 2 wars, that this country was with neutrality as with prohibition; they could take it or leave it, but they always left it. In this present deadly struggle we will find out that those who are not for us, for the side of freedom, will soon be lined up against us, whether they want to be or not. We cannot win the peace with a neutrality belt around Russia.

Point 4 will not win the peace. Technical assistance and encouragement of investments are fine ideas, but neither of them is bold or new. I know of nothing in recent years that has been more thoroughly oversold, here and abroad, than point 4. I was present in the United Nations when their point 4 program was adopted, last November, by unanimous vote, with no abstentions. This vote caused great joy in UN circles, because the Soviet and its satellites joined in the vote for the first time since the early days of the UN, but it aroused my suspicions. Coming as I do from the House committee that picks up the check on our foreign aid commitments, I naturally looked into their resolution to see what the unanimous arrangements were for paying for this United Nations program. I found there was no provision for payment at all. Who do you think those 59 nations think is going to pay the biggest part of the cost? What are 58 of those 59 nations going to say, especially the Soviets and their satellites, if we flinch when we are handed a statement for the total dollar cost of their program? Point 4 is still very fuzzy in UN and United States thinking. If it is cleared up and carried on sensibly, it can mean a better world some day, but it won't win the peace.

We now have the ITO charter before our committee. It is probably the most exceptional document in world history. While it is supposed to set up a code of fair practice for all international trade, over 90 percent of world trade, except our own, will come under the exceptions for a period of from 2 to possibly 15 years. The pressing present problems of recovery, balance of payments, outworn historic trade preference and undeveloped countries are not solved, but merely excepted and accepted. The ITO proposal is 5 years old, the charter is 2 years old, and the only nation in the world that has unconditionally approved it is Liberia. ITO will not win the peace.

Perhaps all of this sounds depressing. It ought to; it seems so to me. Perhaps, even though no single one of these policies will win the peace alone, a combination of them will help. I hope so. Do we have any chance to win the peace? I think so.

I am still for a policy of containment of Russia. No more territory must be yielded by the free people to Russian aggression or infiltration, and when free people are threatened, we must help. This policy has worked in Greece, and Turkey, and Trieste, and western Europe. Where it was not tried, as in China, we have lost. It has been an expensive policy. We must reduce the cost as postwar recovery progresses. We must insist upon mutual aid; other nations must help themselves and each other and us. There are two great risks in this policy: First, we may overstretch our resources, and second, we may get into war. Both of these dangers threaten if we abandon containment and try neutrality, appeasement, or isolation. We can bleed ourselves white arming to the teeth here at home and if we finally stand alone, we will have war. I have seen war-devastated countries; I believe our policy should be based on having our wars away from home if possible. This policy is not as selfish as it sounds. None of the other free nations want to be overrun again, because they know how little will be left next time for liberation. We give them their chance, too, when we arrange to start to fight alongside their forces, on their borders, and plan together to hold the arsenal of democracy intact.

But we need to take the offensive on the ideological front. We must do more than tell how good we are and how bad the Communists are. What is the greatest need of the world today? Better world government. We have world government now, but it is not very good. A United Nations paralyzed by vetoes and walk-outs, international law as set forth in treaties and in books, plus 34 other international organizations, 7 semi-autonomous under the United Nations, 10 inter-American, and 16 miscellaneous, plus ECA; these constitute world government now. These organizations, including the United Nations, cost the United States three or four million dollars a year. The failure of all of them to give us military security costs us about $14,000,000,000 a year in addition. Our part in all of these international organizations is carried on by the State Department, which costs us over $100,000,000 a year. This is called total diplomacy. I think we need less diplomacy and more government in international affairs. We should try to strengthen the United Nations and seek its development into some sort of world organization open to all nations, with defined and limited powers adequate to preserve peace and prevent aggression through the enactment, interpretation, and enforcement of world law. Note that I say "open to all nations"; the organization might not include all nations at the start; I do not see how it could include Soviet Russia on a basis that would be satisfactory to us without a revolutionary change in that country, but such an organization should leave its doors open for nations to join who can and will comply with its membership requirements.

The principal foes of improved-world government are:

1. Communists.
2. Certain patriotic organizations.
3. The diplomats.

The Communists are for world government, but it must be a dictatorship of the proletariat ruled from Moscow and anything else is capitalist imperialism.

Certain patriotic groups in our country are expressing opposition to anything that surrenders any of our sovereignty. They are too late. What we need is something that will regain for us a little more sovereignty. What we need is some organization where our vote counts for more than Luxemburg or Yemen. The highest attribute of sovereignty is to decide when to go to war. Actions of other powers over which we have no control at all, not even a vote, have thrust us, unwillingly, I think, into two world wars. We want at least a vote next time and we want a vote equal to our population or to our contribution. We do not want to be relegated, by European ideas of national sovereignty that are only about 300 years old and already outworn, to a one-sixtieth vote in the affairs of the world.

The diplomats like our present kind of world government. The United Nations at present is only a council of ambassadors. The United States delegation is chosen and instructed by the President. If there is to be any representation of the minority, the opposition party, the President selects the representative and instructs him. That is the diplomatic way of life. Running the world that way is total diplomacy. I think we want decisions on world questions to be made by representatives of people, not diplomatic representatives. We need more of law and less of the fencing of diplomats, to win the peace.

These are generalities. To work out the details of better world government is going to take a lot of work. A number of voluntary groups are trying it now and they disagree among themselves, are misunderstood by the public, and are ridiculed by the old-fashioned diplomats whose work has always ended up in war. What is needed is some Yankee ingenuity and some American know-how and resourcefulness and inventiveness, applied to international political problems. The Government will not do it. The Council of Europe, launched at Strasburg, was the work primarily of European statesmen out of power. Those in power like the diplomatic way.

Our work for better world government should be the spearhead of our ideological offensive, when we talk over the Voice of America. In our discussions we might even feel that the new United Nations should guarantee to every state, as our Constitution does, a republican form of government. This may have astounding results. Remember, the most revolutionary document in history is not the Communist manifesto of 1848, but the Declaration of Independence of 1776, which declares that when people are threatened with "absolute despotism it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such government."

At the outset, I said war is inevitable unless there is revolution here or behind the iron curtain. We want a revolutionary change in Russia. To obtain it, we must never again, in peace or war, make the mistake of demanding unconditional surrender. We must remember that peace, not war, is inevitable. Holding out the mailed fist, and at the same time, the right hand of Christian fellowship, is difficult, but we must learn to do it.

Force will rule the world, but we must depend more on moral force, spiritual force. Humanity is still incorrigibly religious and we must be on God's side in the struggle for the minds and hearts of men against godless, ruthless communism. To win the peace, we must first of all deserve to win.

Panama Canal Reorganization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN J. ALLEN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1950

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Speaker, the subject of legislation regarding the organizational aspects of the Panama Canal is being considered as indicated by the recommendations of the Special Subcommittee on Panama Canal Tolls, as set forth in House Report 1304, Eighty-first Congress, and the recommendations for legislation set forth in House Document 460, Eighty-first Congress, in which was transmitted a report of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

A short time ago a former colleague, the Honorable Willis W. Bradley, sent to me an editorial published in the March 1950 issue of Marine Progress, setting forth the viewpoint of the merchant marine, as understood by that publication, in order that I might have the benefit of the views expressed. In order that the Members of the House may be familiar with the article, I include it as a part of these remarks.

The article is as follows:

PANAMA CANAL REORGANIZATION

Less than 5 years ago the first moves were made in respect to the modernization of the Panama Canal, and the maritime industry was first apprised of the tense controversy that subsequently became known as the Battle of the Levels, waged by the proponents of the sea-level canal and the lock type with the added feature of a terminal lake at the Pacific end similar in function to that of Gatun Lake at the Atlantic end.

In the subsequent studies it was reestablished that the tolls received by the Canal authorities were expected to pay for whatever reconstruction or modification that was to be attempted. An alerted shipping industry watched developments carefully, and later, when President Truman, on the advice of Canal officials, ordered an 11-percent increase in tolls, the protests were both immediate and forceful. The toll increase was progressively postponed until it now stands at April 1, but with every likelihood that it will be either rescinded or indefinitely postponed until the entire Panama Canal situation is clarified, not only as to the proper rate of tolls but also as to modification so as to get the best canal possible.

CHANGING VALUES

Since the atomic bomb was developed and with a hydrogen bomb in the making, the question of defending the Canal has been relegated to a position considerably behind other factors affecting the operation. If a successfully placed bomb of atomic or hydogen power was detonated in the Canal area there would be a deactivated canal, no matter whether it was a sea-level waterway or a lock canal. That leaves the marine operating factor high on the list of desirable characteristics of whatever waterway is to be developed.

The emphasis on the costs of the canal modernization brought attention to the question of what burden the tolls now carried, in other words what did commercial shipping pay for aside from being taken from one ocean to another? I developed that tolls were paying for practically all expenses of operating the Canal Zone, such as schools, administration expenses of all kinds, maintenance of cemeteries, transit of Government vessels, highways, garbage disposal, police and fire departments, and many others. It is the contention of the shipping industry that these expenses should be borne by the departments responsible and not charged against the transits of the waterways.

As a result of the interest the tolls question has stirred up, plus the ever-present question of adequate modernization, the President transmitted to the Congress the report of the Bureau of the Budget on the organization and operation of the Panama Canal.

In his letter of transmittal the President informed the Speaker of the House that he had issued two Executive orders, one delegating to the Governor of the Panama Canal the authority to determine the internal organization of the Panama Canal and the second which transfers certain business operations from the Panama Canal to the Panama Railroad Company. The object of this last is to facilitate future transfer of all business operations to the Company. These moves were in accordance with the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget but the President said that there were others that required congressional action.

The first of these is the authority to transfer the Panama Canal to the Panama Railroad Company. The second is for the change of the name of the Panama Railroad Company to the Panama Canal Company. Third, to authorize the Company's board of directors to establish toll rates, subject to the President's approval. Fourth, permit the company to retain and utilize toll revenues and, fifth, to authorize appropriations to the company to cover losses which might result from changes in economic conditions.

The President recommended legislation to bring about these changes.

INVESTIGATIONS

Last August the President ordered the Bureau of the Budget to make a study of the Canal's organizational aspects and this study has recently been completed and the report to the President made. In its study the Bureau uncovered a number of factors that have tended to stand in the way of a more flexible operation of the Canal. As a matter of fact it discovered that the executive order issued by President Wilson in 1914 outlining how the Canal should be operated is still the only order in force in the Canal Zone.

The Bureau also informed the President that the Panama Railroad Company, as a corporation owned by the Government, was on a self-supporting basis, was run on a businesslike basis, had control of its revenues insofar as operation, maintenance, and expansion were considered and paid into the Treasury such surplus as was earned in the form of a dividend. The Panama Canal, on the other hand, is a Government agency, its revenues are turned over to the general fund of the Treasury and the money for its operation, etc., comes from an appropriation by the Congress.

TOLLS POLICY

The controversial tolls situation was studied by the Bureau and the report made on this phase of its studies was as follows:

"The treatment of the Panama Railroad Company and the Panama Canal as separate entities for financial and accounting purposes has not provided a clear basis for a sound tolls policy. Although the 1937 Special Committee on Panama Canal Tolls and Vessel Measurement recommended that in considering expenses and revenues the Canal and its adjuncts, including the corporation, should be regarded as a single enterprise, this practice has not been followed.

"Under the existing formula, revenues from tolls, together with profits from the Canal's business operations and miscellaneous revenues from licenses, fines, etc., are expected to produce an amount sufficient to cover operating expenses of the Panama Canal (including civil government, health, and sanitation) and a 3 percent return on the capital investment. Neither the revenues nor the expenses of the corporation are included in the tolls base. Consequently, the Canal would now automatically lose the benefit of the profits of any business activity transferred from it to the corporation. This fact has naturally led to opposition by the shipping industry to any such transfers.

"No uniform pattern has been established for allocating to the corporation its share of the civil government, health, and sanitation. The corporation is required to pay for hospitalization of its employees (but not outpatient care and dispensary service), garbage collection, police and fire protection of its own facilities, but it contributes nothing toward the upkeep of municipal police and fire protection, the Canal Zone school system, cemeteries, streets, highways, and sewers. The cost of the latter services is borne entirely by the Panama Canal. The corporation does bear its full share of the costs of overhead administration, such as the Governor's office, accounting department, and so forth.

"The most controversial aspects of tolls policy are (1) the interest charge on the capital investment; and (2) the question of whether any of the costs of constructing, operating, and maintaining the Canal should be allocated to national defense.

"The principle that Federal business enterprises should pay a rate of return on the Government's investment equal to the cost of the money to the Treasury is now well settled. The President recommended in his 1948 budget message that 'Corporations should be required to reimburse the Treasury for the full cost of the money advanced to the corporation.' There is no reason why the Panama Canal and its adjuncts should be exempted from payment of interest since they are essentially Federal business enterprises. However, at current average long-term rates the Panama Canal would be required to pay interest at the rate of approximately 2.3 rather than 3 percent.

"Whether any part of the capital costs of the Canal should be allocated to national defense presents a problem to which there is no positive answer. The Canal admittedly does serve a dual purpose—defense and commerce. However, any attempt to establish which purpose was primary at the time the Canal was built would be an utterly fruitless undertaking. An equal number of statements on either side can be found, often by the same individual, to support whatever conclusion one wants to reach.

"Studies made by the Bureau of Efficiency in 1931, and by the special committee in 1937 determined that no major part of the capital costs of the Panama Canal should be allocated to national defense. The only additional feature of the Canal which might not have been included if it had been constructed exclusively for commercial use is the increase in the width of the locks from 100 to 110 feet. Actually the additional width has been an important factor in facilitating the approach to, and handling of, commercial vessels in the locks. There would appear to be no significant added costs in the construction of the Canal attributable solely to national defense.

"The subsidy to national defense comes not from a failure to allocate capital costs but from the fact that military and other Government vessels do not pay tolls. While a record is maintained of such free transits, no allowance is made for them in the tolls base. This policy stems from an interpretation of an Attorney General's opinion in 1915. That interpretation need not be controlling for, while the Attorney General did hold that free transits would not constitute a treaty violation, he did not rule that it would be

illegal either to require the payment of tolls by Government vessels, or to credit them in the tolls base.

"The cost of transiting a military vessel through the Canal is just as much a national-defense cost as the cost of operation of the vessel itself. It is in no sense an essential part of the cost of operating and maintaining the Canal. Yet, the cost of free transits is now included with the other costs which the commercial user of the Canal is expected to meet by the payment of tolls. While during the period from 1921 to 1939, free transits have averaged 4.1 percent of total Canal tolls, during what may be considered the war years (1940–45) the volume of free transits averaged 26.2 percent, and in 1945 reached 64.5 percent. The total amount of free tolls from 1921 to 1949 amounted to $64,194,574.

"The military pay for most of the other services which they obtain from the Panama Canal, such as hospitalization, water, electricity, garbage collection, etc. The only major item of this type for which the military do not pay is the school facilities for children of military personnel and civilian personnel employed by the military. Over 45 percent of the school population of the United States rate schools at the present time consists of children whose parents are members of the armed forces or employed by the Army, Navy, or Air Force.

"The Coast Guard reimburses the Panama Canal for the maintenance of two of the most distant offshore lighthouses, but the Canal meets the cost of the other offshore lighthouses.

"To look at the other side of the picture, the Canal receives certain services from the military without reimbursement. These consist principally of Army and Navy personnel assigned to duty with the Canal. Salaries paid by the military to such employees of the Canal amount to approximately $430,000 per annum."

TRANSFER OF THE CANAL

There has been considerable opposition to the Hoover Commission recommendation that, "There be established in the Department of Commerce a grouping of all major nonregulatory transportation activities of the Federal Government." This means, according to some officials the inclusion of the Panama Canal, while to others it means nothing of the kind. The Budget Bureau report agrees with the Hoover Commission and stated that the Canal would clearly come under the definition of a transportation activity. The Bureau also sees that some of the disputes that arise could be easily settled by such a change. It reported to the President, "The Governor under existing arrangements operates at a serious disadvantage when he attempts to persuade the Secretary of the Army to overrule his military advisers. Often the best he can hope for is no action. Some of these questions could undoubtedly be settled more expeditiously by across-the-board discussions between the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of Defense. It would only be on rare occasions that unresolved issues would have to be taken to the President."

The New Isolationism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 2, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, in his usual clear and penetrating way of thinking and expressing his thoughts, the noted columnist Walter Lippmann analyzes the recent address of Herbert Hoover, particularly that part of his address in which the former President advocates a reorganization of the United Nations. The effect this would have on our foreign policy and the inescapable meaning of such a step is clearly indicated by Mr. Lippmann as a withdrawal to isolation. I believe every Member of this House should give thought to this matter, and for that reason I am placing Mr. Lippmann's column from the New York Herald Tribune of May 1, 1950, in the RECORD:

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

COMMUNISM AND THE ISOLATIONISTS

Mr. Hoover's address to the American Newspaper Publishers Association will help many who have been trying to understand the views and the intentions of the old-guard Republicans. The main puzzle has been how to reconcile their warlike and crusading fervor against communism and Soviet Russia with their growing opposition to ERP, military aid, point 4, and all the other measures of that sort. The old-guard Republicans in the Senate talk as if they were about to advocate a declaration of war. But increasingly they are disposed to vote as isolationists.

Mr. Hoover's speech provides the key to this paradox. It is that the old-guard Republicans wish us to retire into isolation during a great roar of anti-Communist noises.

"The world needs," said Mr. Hoover, "mobilization against this creeping Red imperialism. The United States needs to know who are with us in the cold war against these practices and whom we can depend on." With these bold, brave, and resounding words, Mr. Hoover declared: "Therefore I have a proposal to make."

And what was the proposal he had to make? It was that if the United Nations cannot be reorganized without the Communist nations, if, in other words the Soviet Union and its satellites cannot be expelled, then a definite new united front should be organized of those people who disavow communism. In plain English Mr. Hoover is advising us to withdraw from the United Nations and therefore to break it up, and then to form a new united front of those who disavow communism. In his view, apparently any nation which does not vote to expel the Soviet Union and its satellites from the United Nations has not disavowed communism.

Mr. Hoover's new united front, which he would organize after withdrawing from the United Nations, is, he says, "specifically not a proposed extension of a military alliance or any color of it. It is a proposal based solely upon moral, spiritual, and defense (sic) foundations." Mr. Hoover made it quite plain elsewhere in his speech that he means it when he says that the united front is not to have the color of an alliance. For at every opportunity in his address he sneered at the idea of helping countries which, when they oppose Soviet Russia, run risks and need support. Thus, of military aid, Mr. Hoover could say only "in persistence of an old habit we are taking up the check."

So the new united front, if Mr. Hoover has his way, will consist of the United States plus those nations which, without costs to the United States, feel able unaided to take such a vital stand. Thus, Mr. Hoover's new united front against communism is not very new. It is certainly not very united. It is not much of a front. It is a proposal to scuttle the United Nations, and—though Mr. Hoover does not quite say so—the existing western framework of collaboration through the security pact and the Marshall plan.

The new united front against communism, as Mr. Hoover virtually admitted, is the new isolationism. "It may be," he said, "that the non-Communist world is not willing to take such a vital stand"—not willing, that is to say, to wreck the United Nations, not willing to challenge the Soviet imperial power without guarantees, alliances, and support. Mr. Hoover is prepared to see the new united front come to nothing. Indeed, he expects it to come to nothing, saying that "it may be the non-Communist world is not willing" to follow him. What then? "At least it would clarify what we have to do." What do we have to do? Mr. Hoover never quite clarified that. But what he means oozes out of every phrase in his address. He proposes to live alone, associated only with those who are as purely and perfectly anti-Communist as he feels he is. If the American people would follow him, they would then have repudiated the whole foreign policy of the United States, and indeed the history of the world, as it has developed since Mr. Hoover left the White House. Again we would withdraw into isolation—there to brood once again upon our own moral superiority.

Thus we see how the new isolationism works: how with the drums and the trumpets of an anti-Communist crusade the old guard is beating a retreat from what Mr. Hoover calls, truly enough, "an expensive and dangerous cold war." Mr. Hoover has made it all much plainer, and that, in a way, was a public service.

World Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 2, 1950

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include an article on World Government, by Thomas L. Stokes, which appeared in the May 1, 1950, issue of the Worcester (Mass.) Evening Gazette.

Mr. Stokes' comments on and review of this important subject are timely, thought provoking, and very interesting. They illustrate quite vividly that "hope springs eternal in the human heart," especially for peace in this modern, troubled world.

The article follows:

WASHINGTON, May 1.—When things look discouraging, as they do now in the world, it is helpful—without being pollyannish about it—to look at the constructive efforts being made for peace and to recognize the real vigor they possess despite all distractions.

More than ever is there reason for redoubling those efforts through organized activity.

Cold war tension is perhaps at its peak as we observe this week the fifth anniversary of the opening of that meeting in San Francisco that created the United Nations.

The United Nations still is a going institution. It is doing lots of good throughout the world through various of its agencies, slowly spreading understanding and good will in many ways, even though it is handicapped in tackling some of the major dilemmas that confront the world because of the impasse between us and Russia.

Last week, simultaneously, there were also observances up and down our land, for which governors of States and mayors of cities had issued proclamations, to campaign anew for the next step—for a world federal government with world law. This is the only way, in the end, to check the recurring violators of peace, the aggressors who seem to rise periodically through history, a manifestation of distorted human nature and greed for power that we probably always will have with us, human nature being what it is.

FOR WORLD GOVERNMENT

The vigor of this movement in our Nation was being exhibited last week in earnest men and women who, in increasing numbers, gathered together in public meetings, including church meetings and other specially arranged functions, to rededicate themselves to peace under world law.

They turned aside from the disturbing news of the day to look hopefully forward and to intensify their activity before it is too late.

How effective these people have been—and there are millions of them supporting plans for strengthening union among nations of the world—is revealed in checking over achievements, which it is well to do at this time.

Pending in Congress are several proposals looking toward this objective which are publicly supported, in one form or another, by more than a third of the membership of the House and Senate. Twenty-one State legislatures have passed resolutions endorsing the idea of world federation, which shows the grass-roots pressure behind it. Five of these States—Connecticut, Florida, Maine, New Jersey, and North Carolina—have adopted resolutions asking Congress to call a convention to propose a constitutional amendment to "expedite and insure American participation in a world federal government open to all nations."

SAYS OPPOSITION COMMUNIST

Supporters of the various proposals include persons from all walks of life and of all ranks, high and low—a great middle group. The noisy opposition is agitated by Communists on the extreme left and by groups of the extreme right, a familiar combination.

Nor is the world federation movement confined to this country. It is active and growing in strength all around the globe. There are live and alert world federation groups now in Canada, China, Denmark, England, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, India, Italy, Japan, Luxemburg, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, the Philippines, and Poland. Significant is the fact that France, Italy, and West Germany have causes in their new constitutions enabling them to participate in a world federation when other nations agree to create it, so that no further authority is needed in those cases.

All of this has real meaning, which it is hopeful to consider now in the flood of depressing news. It shows that millions of people all over the world are thinking, speaking out for themselves, and working.

Hon. Hyman Rayfiel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 1, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, all of the borough of Brooklyn was grieved several weeks ago at the loss of one of its finest and most-beloved citizens, former Judge Hyman Rayfiel, who died at the ripe age of 89. He was the father of our former colleague in this House, Leo F. Rayfiel, who now graces the United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York.

Hyman Rayfiel was a great scholar of the old school, one who was as well versed in modern law as in the ancient treatises of the Hebrew Talmud. He was a man of deep religious convictions, yet tolerant of men of all faiths; he was a man of high ethical character. He never forgot the humble beginnings from which he stemmed. A penniless immigrant from eastern Europe, he found much for which to be thankful in this country. He loved his adopted land with unbounded devotion. His service to his community was attested to by the throngs who attended his funeral. They came from every walk of life, public and private.

I had known Hyman Rayfiel for many years. All who knew him loved him. As humble worker or merchant, as court interpreter or clerk, as lawyer, magistrate or special sessions justice, he was the genial philosopher always teaching brotherly love. He will be missed by all.

The following tribute appeared in the Brooklyn Eagle of April 30, 1950:

HYMAN RAYFIEL, FRIEND TO EVERY LIVING THING THAT CROSSED HIS PATH

(By Katherine Dangerfield)

Easter Sunday I went to a funeral home in Church Avenue for a last look at Hyman Rayfiel. I shall not call him former Magistrate Rayfiel nor former Special Sessions Justice Rayfiel because I did not know him, never saw him after he had achieved these distinctions. It was in the New Jersey Avenue police court that I knew him, beginning when that court opened in 1907 and he became chief clerk. He was new to his job and I was not old in mine—court clerk and petticoat cub reporter.

In my mind's eye I can see him now seated at his desk in the complaint room on the second floor of what was once the home of the Brighton Athletic Club. He is scattering kernels of corn to a dozen pigeons which flock through the open windows. It is 8 in the afternoon and there is a lull in the sordid grind of the police court. The pigeons are his friends and he is theirs. They perch on his shoulders and feed from his hands. When he calls to them they answer with a cooing that can be heard out in the reporter's room—the only blessed sound to drown out the court's babble of tears, prayers, oaths, and bitter laughter.

His desk is the common roll-top piece of office furniture, but there are several things about it which make it of more than passing interest. You discover there a few things never found on any other business desk. First there is that dish of corn from which the pigeons help themselves when the chief clerk is busy with complaints. Then there is a brass coiled snake, a sly-looking thing with venomous cunning in its eyes, and a forked tongue ready to strike. The chief clerk tells me he would not be without that coiled snake on his desk. It serves a good purpose when he finds in a complainant the same sly look, the same venomous cunning in the eye, and the same forked tongue ready to strike.

SEE NOT, HEAR NOT, SPEAK NOT

Above the snake hangs a small bronze tablet of Hebrew characters; the same to be found on the doorpost of any Jewish home. Beside it, where his eyes rest upon it every time he lifts his head, Kipling's poem, "If you can keep your head when all around you are losing theirs, and blaming it on you." Under the poem a book written in ancient Hebrew, its contents old when Christianity began, and close by two antique Arabic figures, a philosopher and a warrior. There, too, are the three little monkeys of the Chinese—See Not, Hear Not, Speak Not.

All of these things are not just ornaments or knickknacks on a man's desk. To the chief clerk of the New Jersey Avenue police court they are fingers pointing out the way. Between that hoary little volume on his desk and the complaints which he makes out there is a long road running through centuries, but the sinful and the sorrowful who wear a beaten track up the courthouse steps to the complaint room have reason to know that between the two there is a very close communion; for many a wound has been healed, many a shame kept hidden from the world, many a life redeemed, because Hyman Rayfiel regulates his life by those yellowed pages, every line of which breathes kindness, charity, justice, and the brotherhood of man.

In the New Jersey Avenue police court, as a petticoat cub I am often up against it. There I am competing with seasoned newsmen from all Brooklyn and New York papers, some of them veterans from headquarters and city hall. My big worry is my job. I have to make good or lose it. I cannot afford to lose it. I need the job, need it desperately, and the money it pays. Sometimes I do not sleep nights thinking about it. This especially when copy falls down, city editors wax cantankerous, and the whole world seems to go wrong. Then I betake myself to the complaint room and unburden myself to Hyman Rayfiel. He hears me with infinite patience, a quiet smile in his deep gray eyes.

COARSE FARE, EMPTY PURSE

After I have exhausted myself with petty complainings, he tells me of his own early struggles, of the hard road he has traveled; the early misfortunes which dogged his steps; the obstacles he had to overcome; the difficulties he had to surmount; the hod he carried; the horsecar he drove; the coarse fare and the empty purse. He winds up by reading to me a little from Moses, from Buddha and Christ, until I feel that I am a weak, dissatisfied creature unworthy of many blessings and opportunities enjoyed. And then when he leaves his desk to lend a supporting arm to tottering steps, maybe those of fishmonger or a charwoman; when I note him lift his hat to an aged beggar woman who smells of salt herring; and when I see him give of his substance to white and black, Jew and Gentile, to Catholic and Protestant; see him pay small fines to keep small offenders out of jail, I deny that the chief clerk of the New Jersey Avenue police court belongs to any special race or creed. I hold him God's gift to a troubled world.

He was in his forties when he came to the New Jersey Avenue police court. He was born in Austria. When he came to this country he carried his earthly possessions in a small bundle. He was poor, so poor in fact that later he wondered how he ever got by Ellis Island. An Irish contractor, one Patrick Mooney, of New Brunswick, Canada, gave him his first job as a hod carrier. He carried with him to New Jersey Avenue—and maybe to his grave—the envelope in which he received his first pay for that hod-carrier's stint, and the calloused shoulder which the hod left to him. Under that hod his health broke down, and then he took a job in Meyerbeer's silk mills at Hoboken, N. J., and later became a conductor on the Second Avenue trolley line in New York.

Hyman Rayfiel was 30 years old and had eight children when he began to study law. Long before, while working in mills and factories, he had studied at night, keeping himself awake by attaching a pin to the candle which lighted his books, the pin jabbing him in the forehead and bringing him back to life

whenever he fell prostrate across the table, worn out in body and mind. While studying for the bar he took the civil-service examination for court interpreter, passing first on the list with 98.30 in German, 96.70 in Hebrew and English. He was appointed a court interpreter in the fourth municipal court and was holding that office when Magistrate John F. Hylan named him chief clerk of the newly opened New Jersey Avenue police court.

GALL AND WORMWOOD

Meanwhile the political star of Hyman Rayfiel had risen and he became a figure in Brooklyn politics. His activities centered in the Twenty-third Assembly District. Here the Irish and the Jews held common ground and were friends or enemies as the fortunes of the political situation decided. Politics made enemies as well as friends for Hyman Rayfiel. The humble, penniless Jews who had loved him through years of tribulation and had trusted him above all men, began to have doubts when the rich Jews and the Irish began advancing him for public office.

"He has used us for his own purpose and now he delivers us into the hands of the enemy," they said.

To be mistrusted by his own, the poor with whom he had broken bread, with whom he had sat so often in the light of Sabbath candles, with whom he had smiled and wept, was gall and wormwood to the soul of Hyman Rayfiel. Honors are but empty if they find you without the gates, a stranger to your own. And so the heart of the chief clerk of the New Jersey Avenue police court was troubled; and this troubled heart he laid bare to me so many times, just as I had gone to him with my own burdens.

Meantime, the rich Jews of Brownsville would have wined and dined him, clothed him in royal purple, but he would have none of it. And this while the poor ones did not understand. All he wanted out of politics were better housing conditions, cleaner streets, modern schools, libraries, sanitary workshops, and a fighting chance for Brownsville tenements.

AFTER 40 YEARS

I left the New Jersey Avenue police court before he did, going to newspapers up-State and over in Jersey. From odd paragraphs here and there I heard of his appointment as a city magistrate and later as a special sessions justice, but with a silent "good luck to you." I let it go at that. You see, when the friend or neighbor you have known moves up in the procession, should you not wish to have your motives misjudged, perhaps, you will quietly withdraw to the sidelines and from there keep the old regard in kind and enduring remembrance.

But Easter Sunday, after 40 years, I went down to that funeral home in Church Avenue for one last look and a Godspeed to Hyman Rayfiel on his long journey into the sunset. Before starting out I set out on a table two small Arabic figures, one a philosopher, the other a warrior, which he gave me from his desk 40 years ago, telling me then what the world might well heed today—the philosopher is a better guide than the warrior.

Of this, I feel certain: Some day when Brownsville in the Borough of Brooklyn shall raise a monument to its pioneers who laid the foundation of what it is today, that monument will carry the name of Hyman Rayfiel, the humble Canadian hodcarrier who went to the bench of the court of special sessions, and who left behind him, besides the tinsel of life's small honors, the truly golden nuggets of kindly deeds that will live forever in the hearts of the poor, the unhappy, the sinful and the downtrodden. Brownsville owes him a lot. Like me, it may remember him, not as he was on the bench as magistrate of justice but as the chief clerk of the New Jersey Avenue police court, a friend to every living thing that crossed his path

Presidential Commission of Inquiry on Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the resolution for a Presidential Commission of Inquiry on Germany introduced in the Senate on April 17, 1950, by Senator GILLETTE, for himself and Senators PEPPER, HENDRICKSON, IVES, LEHMAN, KILGORE, DOUGLAS, and CHAVEZ, was today introduced in the House of Representatives on a bipartisan basis by the following members: Representatives JOHN A. BLATNIK, Democrat, Minnesota; EMANUEL CELLER, Democrat, New York; HERMAN P. EBERHARTER, Democrat, Pennsylvania; FOSTER FURCOLO, Democrat, Massachusetts; WALT HORAN, Representative, Washington; HENRY M. JACKSON, Democrat, Washington; JACOB K. JAVITS, Republican-Liberal, New York; HUGH B. MITCHELL, Democrat, Washington; BARRATT O'HARA, Democrat, Illinois; FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT, JR., Democrat-Liberal, New York; and CHASE GOING WOODHOUSE, Democrat, Connecticut. It was also endorsed at the same time in a statement by four additional Members.

In introducing the resolution, the sponsors in the House made the following statement:

We are convinced that Germany remains the principal front of the cold war and that as she goes Europe is likely to go. In the European-recovery program, $552,900,000 is provided for western Germany, and through our aid to Great Britain and France (which are also occupying Germany) and the maintenance of our occupation establishment we estimate that the aggregate cost of the German occupation will be not less than $1,000,000,000 for the fiscal year 1950–51. In voting funds for the continuation of our occupation of western Germany, we feel that the House of Representatives has a serious joint responsibility in respect of such occupation policy with the Senate.

It has been charged that the dismantling of industrial plants, particularly in the Ruhr, and that economic restrictions are hampering western Germany and therefore western European recovery. At a time when economy in government is the order of the day, the uncritical acceptance of these arguments could lead to a premature turn-over of full control to the Germans themselves with the gravest consequences to Germany and to Europe. If at this stage full German control should lead to unification of the eastern and western zones of Germany, remilitarization and a new Soviet-German alliance, open or covert, a new and even graver threat of aggression than the world has ever known would be presented. The drive toward German unification which is gaining so much ground today could well make of Germany a new Soviet satellite, for the Soviet under present conditions has everything to trade with—the eastern provinces from which come the 9,000,000 expellees who are Germany's great problem, and eastern markets. A Germany, unified on Soviet terms, would in the minds of most Europeans seal their fate.

A full development of all the facts with regard to any community of interest between ultranationalists and ex-Nazis in the western zone and Communist elements in the eastern zone as well as a complete exposition of how the effort to bring democracy to western Germany has fared is essential information for the American people. A vigorous United States policy along permanent lines is essential. The opinion is fairly general that the political and economic federation of Europe is vital to European security and is an essential framework within which to attain the full economic revival and even ultimate unification of Germany. If we are to continue heavy expenditures and responsibility in the occupation of Germany it must be with our eyes open and with an understanding of the reasons and the objective.

We believe that High Commissioner McCloy, whose impressive talents and record we value, will welcome this inquiry and that the support which it will marshal among the American people will be invaluable to him in the firm and unalterable resistance to Communist pressure in Berlin and elsewhere in Germany which he has already shown.

The four Members endorsing the introduction of this resolution in the House are Representatives CLIFFORD P. CASE, Representative, New Jersey; T. MILLET HAND, Representative, New Jersey; ROBERT W. KEAN, Representative, New Jersey; and JOHN W. HESELTON, Representative, Massachusetts. Their statement follows:

The resolution reflects the acute anxiety which the American people feel as to the future of Germany in relation to world peace. A thorough review of the specific problems with which the resolution deals, as well as of our over-all policy in regard to Germany is most desirable.

The text of the resolution follows:

Whereas, in common with the other free nations, the United States has a vital interest in the maintenance of democratic institutions in Germany; and

Whereas the United States has a vital interest in the development of such economic, social, and cultural conditions in Germany as will further the growth of democratic institutions; and

Whereas the United States has a vital interest in preventing any alliance between Nazi, militarist, or other antidemocratic elements in western Germany, and the totalitarian communism of the east: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the President of the United States is requested to appoint at his earliest convenience a bipartisan commission composed of six (or eight) members and to direct such commission to conduct a study of all matters relating to the conduct and status of American policy in Germany and its coordination with American foreign policy, and to determine—

(a) whether political parties or groups based on antidemocratic ideologies exist and are obstructing American objectives as stated above;

(b) whether German cartels and trusts have reemerged contrary to Allied policy and constitute a threat to German political democracy and world peace;

(c) whether the present German educational system has successfully developed means to further the dissemination of democratic ideas and information about democratic institutions and practices;

(d) whether there is significant evidence of militaristic, ultranationalist, anti-Semitic or other antidemocratic propaganda in the present German press, periodicals, and cinema and over the German radio;

(e) whether the German war potential is being restored to an unwarranted extent and whether German military or paramilitary organizations have appeared;

(f) whether and to what extent persons with prior Nazi affiliation or antidemocratic convictions have penetrated into the political, judicial, economic, educational and cultural life, and the civil service of Germany;

(g) whether prodemocratic elements have been deterred or discouraged from active participation in building postwar Germany;

(h) whether the German people are being encouraged to look beyond purely nationalistic aims toward participation in a broader association of free nations;

(i) whether economic power in Germany has shifted into new hands or is again gravitating to or has been regained by the same individuals, families, or groups who held that power before the outbreak of war;

(j) whether Economic Cooperation Administration funds have been utilized to strengthen prodemocratic elements and tendencies in western Germany; and be it further

Resolved, That the President is requested to direct the commission to make a preliminary report to him, for transmittal to Congress, within 90 days of its appointment, and to report to him, for transmittal to Congress, on or before December 31, 1950, the final results of its study, together with specific recommendations for the future conduct of American policy in Germany.

Housing Act of 1950 Liberalizes GI Loan Privileges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 2, 1950

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the April issue of the magazine the Gold Star, which sets forth in a brief and concise manner the provisions of the so-called Housing Act of 1950 as they apply to our veterans, their widows, and dependents.

The article is as follows:

Widows of men who died in service or as a result of direct service-connected disabilities are now eligible to apply for Government-guaranteed loans for the purchase of homes or small businesses. This new amendment to the Servicemen's Readjustment Act went into effect with the passage this month of the Housing Act of 1950.

HOUSING BILL PROVIDES DIRECT LOANS TO VETERANS

In addition to the inclusion of the widows in the program, the act greatly facilitates the procurement of loans and authorizes the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to make direct loans to those eligible for the purchase or construction of houses or for the construction or improvement of farmhouses.

New regulations would provide that, upon application by a veteran or widow eligible for the benefits who has not previously used his guaranty entitlement, the Administrator may make a direct loan upon two conditions. The first condition is that the Administrator must have found that in the area in which the dwelling or farmhouse is located or is to be constructed private capital is not available to finance the purchase or construction of dwellings, or the construction or improvement of farmhouses.

The second condition is that the veteran must show (1) that he is a satisfactory credit risk; (2) that the monthly payments under the loan bear a proper relation to his present and anticipated income and expense; (3) that he is unable to obtain from private lending sources in such area at an interest rate not in excess of 4 percent a loan for such purpose for which he is qualified; and (4) that he is unable to obtain a loan for such purpose from the Secretary of Agriculture under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act or the Housing Act of 1949.

A loan under this provision would bear interest at 4 percent, could not exceed $10,000, and would be subject to applicable requirements or limitations prescribed under the existing regulations of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act. The total amount of these loans could not exceed $150,000,000 and the authority to make them would expire June 30, 1951.

California's Indian Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I should like to bring to the attention of this body, which is at present debating the Interior Department appropriations bill for 1951, communications that have come to my office protesting against the failure to include in the committee bill any appropriations to California for services on account of Indians.

As a result of what appears now to have been highly questionable information by certain persons before a subcommittee of our body in February last, on the wishes of the Indians and the needs of the State, California alone was singled out to be deprived of Federal Indian funds. Not only would California's education and health programs be seriously affected by this unjustified cutting off of much needed funds from the Indian Bureau in California and in consequence from the State of California itself, but also our entire social security, construction and irrigation programs, of which our Indian work is an integral part.

While it may be true that the country's entire Indian policy and procedure may need reevaluation, this drastic curtailment of funds from California alone does not seem to me to be appropriate, either in time or in method, to a solution of our Indian problems.

A telegram from the California Teacher's Association, representing 56,000 teachers, and a factual letter from the superintendent of public instruction of California's State Department of Education, are given below:

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *April 11, 1950.*
Congresswoman HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

California Teacher's Association comprising 56,000 teachers by official action protests discrimination against California by failure to include California in appropriations of Indian funds. Education and health programs will be seriously affected. We strongly urge your support in restoring the California Indian appropriations.

ARTHUR F. COREY,
Executive Secretary, California Teacher's Association.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
Sacramento, April 10, 1950.
Hon. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS,
Member, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN DOUGLAS: It has come to our attention that Purl Willis, who represents himself as a counselor for certain Indians in California; Norman M. Littell, who represents himself as an attorney employed by certain identifiable groups of Indians in California; Adam Castillo, president of the Organization of Mission Indians; and five Mission Indians from the Mission Reservation in southern California, testified before the Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations on February 28, 1950. According to our information this testimony resulted in the deletion of all of the proposed appropriations to California for services on account of Indians. Included in this appropriation are the funds for the contract between the Indian Bureau and the State Department of Education of California for assistance to school districts which have serious problems resulting from unusual needs for Indians who live within the boundaries of the school districts, and a capital outlay item to provide school facilities in the Hoopa Valley Unified School District which is entirely within the Hoopa Indian Reservation. Other funds included assistance to the health department, policing, Sherman Institute, and other facilities which have been recognized as a responsibility of the Federal Government on account of the Indians living in California.

We are particularly concerned with the deletion of those funds which represent aid and assistance to the Indians of California, particularly in view of the fact that this deletion was made only in the case of the State of California.

The funds for the Indian contract represent $322,000, and the Hoopa Valley school buildings which have been approved by the Congress of the United States in the amount of $800,000. The funds made available to the Department of Education under the Indian contract were allocated to 130 separate school districts in 27 counties in California during the current year and provided assistance to approximately 2,300 Indian children. This assistance in no way whatsoever is a part of the regular funds accruing to school districts on account of the average daily attendance in the districts. All Indian children in California are permitted and are required to attend the regular schools of California. However, Indian lands, if publicly owned, represent no valuation for taxing purposes. Our State apportionment plan provides that a large share of the support for the public schools is derived from local property. School districts which contain any substantial amount of Indian reservation property provide little or no local resources. Consequently, the children in these districts are deprived of their full share of educational opportunity unless assistance is made available. The funds are used in every instance to benefit the Indian children themselves. Much of it is used for school lunches, transportation, physical welfare services, and providing additional teachers who otherwise could not be employed by the districts.

The school estimated to cost $800,000 has been authorized to be constructed in the Hoopa Valley Unified School District. This school district is located entirely within an Indian reservation. Consequently, there is no assessable property, as has been indicated

above. The Hoopa Valley Unified School District has a tax rate of $1.55 per $100 of assessed valuation and this tax produces only $560 per year, resulting from taxes on personal property. It is the only high school available for approximately one hundred persons scattered throughout the valley. The enrollment for elementary and high school has increased from 207 to 335 in the past 3 years. Seventy-five percent of this number are Indian children.

The laws in California provide that a school district must provide its own buildings and many do so by voting bonds on the assessable real property of the district. Since there is no assessable real property in the Hoopa Valley School District, it is impossible for this district to provide buildings of any kind. The present buildings are extremely inadequate and were originally built by Federal funds. The fact that the school is located on Federal property presents a very serious problem in connection with any State assistance which may be available to the school district. It is true California recently voted to expend $250,000,000 of state funds to assist distressed school districts with their building problems. The question arises as to whether these State funds may be used for buildings to be located on Federal property. We have many similar situations in California which involve military installations. So far the State has not found it possible to provide buildings on Federal installations and in the case of the military installations, the Federal Government has assumed much of the responsibility for housing. The fact that the Congress approved the construction of the buildings on the Hoopa Indian Reservation is in complete harmony with the practice and policy which has been carried on in California for a number of years regarding Federal property.

The Hoopa Valley Unified School District is a regular school district established under the laws of California which all children living in the district may and must attend. The school is not limited to Indian children, nor are they excluded. In fact, this is true in every school district in California. The statement has been made that since all children, including Indian children, are eligible to attend the State school system, there can be no justification for the building of a school in the Hoopa Valley Unified School District, notwithstanding it has been expressly authorized by an act of Congress.

In answer to the statement that the schools of California are available to all Indian children, it should be pointed out that while this is true in the particular instance at Hoopa, the district is without resources to construct a school and it was on this basis that the Congress of the United States authorized the building in order to provide education for all of the children living within the boundaries of the Hoopa Valley Unified School District. The fact that a small proportion of the children are non-Indian is without importance because the building was planned primarily to provide education for the Indian children.

It has been reported that California was able and willing to provide all school facilities, including school buildings, for all of the Indian children in the State of California. From the statements in the preceding paragraphs it should be clear that while California is willing to do its full share toward the education of all its citizens, nevertheless, it is unable to meet the requirements of the Indian children who reside on property belonging to the Federal Government or on property which has such low assessed valuation that local funds are not available to the public schools.

It has been reported that testimony was given to the effect that $882,000 for the education of Indians in California is a waste of money. It has been reported further that with this money Indian children are actually prevented from going to the public schools and securing an education. Since 1933 Indian education in California has been under the jurisdiction of the State of California with the same prescribed course of study and standards as are required in any other public school in the State. Some of the schools are located on the reservations merely for the convenience of the Indian and non-Indian children who attend the schools. The testimony apparently attempts to give the impression that any assistance given to the schools on behalf of the Indians of California is preventing them from getting an education and is preventing them from going to the public schools. As a matter of fact, every school in California, with the exception of Sherman Institute which is operated by the Federal Government for Arizona tribes, which Indians attend is a public school open to the attendance of all children within the district, whether they be Indian or non-Indian.

On page 24 of the hearings before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, Purl Willis is quoted as stating that the Hoopa Indians are wealthy people and they tried last year to take the cost of the construction of the proposed school out of the $6,000,000 judgment fund. We have no knowledge whatever that the Hoopa Indians at any time advocated taking the cost of the Hoopa School out of the judgment fund. As a matter of fact, every transaction having to do with the construction of school buildings in the Hoopa Valley Unified School District has been conducted on its own merits without reference whatever to any other funds. We also are unable to understand who Mr. Willis means by "they." Mr. Willis further states, or at least gives the impression, that children from the Mesa Grande Reservation would be a part of the student body which would attend the school in the Hoopa Valley Unified School District and that this school would be treated as an Indian school. This absolutely is untrue because the Mesar Grande Reservation is in southern California and the Hoopa Valley Unified School District is in northern California. They are separated by a distance of between 800 and 900 miles. I have pointed out before that the Hoopa Valley Unified School District is a regular school district and there has been no attempt in the past, at the present time, or contemplated in the future, to consider it in any manner other than as a public-school district.

We hope it has been made clear that either the direct testimony of Mr. Willis and his associates is incorrect, or his statements have been such as to give the subcommittee incorrect impressions. Mr. Willis, on page 30 of the record, reportedly made the statement that the Indian Bureau staff in California is controlling the expenditure of whatever is paid the State under the Johnson-O'Malley Act and that the Indian Bureau has set up its own State-wide school staff with the result that the Indian Bureau actually is interfering with the State's free public schools.

The Bureau of Indian Education is a part of the Division of Public School Administration of the California State Department of Education and the Federal Indian Bureau does not in any way interfere with the operation of the free public schools of this State. The funds are allocated to the schools for the benefit of the Indian children and decisions in regard to these allocations are fully in the hands of the officials of the California State Department of Education.

It is further understood that the proposed appropriations for the entire United States were approved by the subcommittee with the single exception of California, and that all of the proposed appropriations for this State were completely eliminated, chiefly due to the testimony of Purl Willis and his associates. To single out California alone and remove the appropriations for this State, leaving all others intact, purely upon the word of irresponsible persons who neither represent the Indians, the facts, nor any official body of the State of California, would indeed be a miscarriage of justice.

It is our hope that the subcommittee or other official bodies of the Congress of the United States will see fit to restore these appropriations so that the Indian children of California will not be discriminated against.

In conclusion, it should be pointed out that inasmuch as the Indian children are a part of the regular school system of California, any injustice done to these children has its effect not only upon them but upon all other children attending the public schools.

Sincerely yours,

ROY E. SIMPSON,
Superintendent of Public Instruction and Director of Education.

To a Good Friend

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CECIL R. KING
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 2, 1950

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I have on several occasions been asked by Mr. Liynhart to place his poem, To a Good Friend, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I therefore, under unanimous consent, extend my remarks and include therein Mr. Liynhart's poem:

TO A GOOD FRIEND

Humane and kind he was, but if
You found by pure coincidence
He had a heart, he made out gruff
And barked at you on small pretense.

So fierce in love of life he stood
And in concern for who was nigh
His strength, his kin and every friend,
He found no time to slowly die.

—*R. T. Liynhart.*

Thoughts on Beating Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 2, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, some timely thoughts on a problem that is giving nightmares to many, are expressed in the May 1 issue of New Republic by Michael Straight. His article, The Right Way to Beat Communism, is food for thought on this subject. He asks: "Why, at the peak of our power, should we be afraid?" That great president, the late Franklin D. Roosevelt, at a time of national emergency, told the people of this country that the only thing we had to fear was fear itself. Should another emergency arise, the American people will not be afraid to rise to the situation. Our problem is how to avoid that emergency, how to stave off disintegration from within and destruction of our freedom from without. I am certain many

of my colleagues will find this article absorbing reading:

THE RIGHT WAY TO BEAT COMMUNISM

(By Michael Straight)

A major debate on America's world policy is inevitable and necessary. The alternative for our democracy is continued drift and ultimate defeat.

This debate will take place within the framework of an attitude common to all save extremists of left and right which recognizes that Soviet communism is today the greatest organized evil in the world.

Within this area of agreement there are profound differences concerning the size and nature of the effort required of the free nations. These differences have been concealed by the fears engendered by hysteria, the sparring for strategic gains in partisan politics, and the belief among all people of good will that as long as negotiation seemed possible with Russia, our task was to preserve fluidity in world politics.

There are no longer many opportunities for America to cooperate with Soviet communism. But there are major choices to be made in the means of opposing communism and of strengthening the non-Communist world. The survival of democracy depends quite substantially on the clarity and honesty with which these choices are placed before the American people.

As the choices are unraveled, two basic approaches may emerge. They cross the shifting lines of party, class and faith as these lines have formed to meet traditional problems of the past. Yet ultimately they correspond to the classical definitions of conservatism and liberalism as these attitudes have expressed themselves in the past.

The first approach stresses institutions; the second, human values. The first sees in power the means of combating communism, the second stresses progress.

As further illustration, take five aspects of the present struggle and contrast in each the conservative and liberal points of view. We find on the liberal side bold men such as Paul Hoffman and George Marshall, and on the conservative side "leftists" whose intent seems to be the division of society into the damned and the condemned: those consigned to the outer darkness as "fellow travelers" and those who accept the inevitability of war.

THE BASIS OF WORLD COMMUNISM

In analyzing the basis and appeal of world communism, the conservative begins by a defense of the status quo. He may concede that two-thirds of the world's people's live in hunger and poverty caused by low productivity and exploitation. He does not concede that these millions are demanding rapid improvement in their lives with a force that cannot be denied. For the same reason he does not concede that communism, which agitates for rapid change, has any mass appeal. Consequently the conservative is compelled by his original premise consistently to underestimate the appeal and the threat of world communism.

Yet, the threat is only too clear. The conservative undertakes to explain it in terms of the power of Russia as a police state, backed by its agents and by its armies.

James Burnham, the arch conservative in the sense in which the term is defined here, is totally indifferent to the conditions that give rise to communism, and largely unconcerned with economic programs to alleviate those conditions. In his new book, the Coming Defeat of Communism, he is concerned solely with power, and not at all with the purposes for which power is used. Russia to him is a national power, opposed by the national power of the United States. The task is to destroy Soviet power by the extensive use of Soviet techniques. Since his program is devoid of all social principles and concerned only with the destruction and the creation of power, it appeals equally to the amorality of the ex-Communist and the reactionary.

In contrast, the liberal approach to communism has been a humanist approach. Its first premise has been the insistence that for two-thirds of the world's people the status quo is intolerable and demands rapid change. Therefore it has acknowledged the potential of the Communist appeal.

A classical statement of this approach was made 30 years ago by Lord Keynes:

"Whatever the content of Russian communism may be, it represents a gigantic human enterprise. In it men have resolutely embraced a purpose of reform and live tensely under the discipline that faith instills in them. It is simply a misunderstanding of the European to expect that he can hear unmoved that call to new action when he has no standard of a cause as great to unfurl in opposition."

That high point of respect for the Communist appeal was maintained in the thirties by the contrasts of capitalist depression and the need for a common front to Fascist aggression. It was maintained in the war years by the Soviet military effort.

Since the war Soviet communism has emerged as an aggressive dictatorship. Consequently the liberal attitude to Russia has moved swiftly toward the conservative interpretation. Yet the liberal still insists that for poverty-stricken peoples to whom democracy means foreign exploitation and Moscow is a vague name, the potential of communism still remains. An indifference to that potential, a decision to oppose communism on the military front alone, while communism is fighting on economic, social, political, cultural, and psychological fronts, is to guarantee the destruction of the free world.

THE OPPOSITION TO COMMUNISM

The opposition of American democracy to Soviet communism requires a program, and it requires allies.

A program in turn requires Government action and Government funds.

Since they are committed to cutting taxes and reducing the role of the Federal Government in our economy, the conservatives are compelled to minimize all programs. They hesitate on rearmament; they resist endeavors to aid world economic reconstruction by the public investment of American resources.

Both major parties, for example, are committed to full support of the United Nations. both are committed to the point 4 program as a means of strengthening the United Nations and of preventing further Communist encroachment in backward areas. This year the conservatives in Congress have sent the point 4 program off to a flying start with appropriations cut down to one-hundredth of 1 cent in every dollar of our national income.

Burnham once again rationalizes the opposition of the conservatives to the expense and effort of world economic reconstruction by explaining that in the absence of a political "offensive" these efforts are doomed to fail. "The Marshall plan," he explains, "can have no more than a negative success; it cannot produce positive gains." The real problem is "the shattering of the iron curtain," "the smashing of communism" and "the alteration of the power balance." Brave words!

Second, a policy of opposing communism requires allies.

The American conservative lacks allies in today's world. His loneliness tends to reinforce his natural reliance on his inheritance of America's nationalist and isolationist past. Once again Burnham, the philosopher of the conservative approach, rationalizes this deep-seated prejudice. "World politics." he explains, "is * * * the field of struggle between the United States as representative of western civilization * * * and communism with its primary base in the Soviet Union." This argument, absolving other peoples of their responsibilities, like Burnham's further assertion that there is no real distinction between cold war and shooting war, plays right into the Communists' hands.

Where alliances are necessary, the conservative, fearful of positive programs, seeks allies among those who profess anticommunism.

Our best allies, Burnham, explains, are those "who can be relied on to resist communism to the end." General de Gaulle qualifies at once, since he alone in France is firm. Franco, presumably, is such another. A united front with the Vatican is a first priority; the supposed argument that the Catholic Church is * * * a totalitarian movement is, quite apart from its abstract truth or falsity, simply irrelevant.

To the liberal, in contrast, democracy is not a relic, to be paraded on ceremonial occasions, but a principal weapon and means of salvation.

America's first task to the liberal is to raise the living standards of the world to the minimum level at which democratic government becomes feasible. The method is by strengthening the existing and potential forces of democracy, if necessary in opposition to their rulers where these rulers represent a feudal past or a contemporary police state.

The point 4 program is one example of this conflict which remains unresolved. The majority of the backward areas for which technical assistance and capital investment are proposed are governed by unrepresentative and reactionary rulers. These rulers are also our present allies in the cold war. To be effective, technical assistance to these regions will lead directly to social reform and therefore to social upheaval.

Faced with these alternatives, the conservatives will choose to keep the areas backward for reasons of short-term strategic advantage; the liberal will seek long-term security by the promotion of social reform. There is no guiding rule in every case. The decision may often be a matter of pace and degree. Yet the choice is present and pressing on a world scale. Land reform in Italy, tax reform in France, the destruction of cartels in Germany are social issues implicit in our present economic programs, which we have refused to face and yet cannot for long ignore.

THE HANDLING OF COMMUNISTS

Neither liberal nor conservative has a final answer to the perplexing contrast between constitutional principles and Communist practices. Yet a contrast in views is clear.

The Communist works away among lower income groups and within progressive organizations, often calling for the same short-term objectives as those of non-Communist left. The conservative lacks understanding and sympathy for the non-Communist left, its objectives and its organizations. With faith in its ability to defeat the Communists, and no belief in progress as the alternative to communism, he turns toward repression by legislation.

For Burnham, outlawing the Communist Party in all free nations is simply the first step. The objective is liquidation. De Gaulle is favored in the belief that he alone is willing to line up the 100,000 hard-core French Communists against a wall and execute them.

The liberal, in contrast, has assumed that once suppression starts, it has no end. He has worked with Communists in the belief that disagreement on ultimate aims did not preclude cooperation on short-term objectives.

That policy was clearly wrong. Ultimate aims and short-term aims can never be separated, and in the case of Communists and

liberals are in basic conflict. Nor are there good and bad Communists. The Communist Party is a recruiting ground for subversion and espionage. Whoever joins it, either through guilty conscience or idealism, ends by losing all conscience and all ideals.

Yet for the liberal suppression is no answer. Instead, it breeds a totally false sense of security. For America's front lines in this struggle are not on Times Square but in the jungles of Indochina and the streets of Berlin. In addition, Russia is so far superior to America in matters of suppression that once we decide to fight with her weapons we are lost.

"The search for truth cannot go forward in the absence of heresy and opposition. * * * When the unity of a democratic society is maintained through arbitrary imposition even over a very small area, it ceases to be the kind of unity that is appropriate to a truth-seeking society. * * * Error is always the result of a defeat suffered by truth on its own territory. Every attempt to fight error as if it were born beyond the frontiers of truth * * * not only fails as a matter of course but prevents the application of the only effective remedy. * * * We can liquidate error only as we absorb and transcend it."

These are the words, not of a sentimental liberal but of A. Rossi, a one-time executive committee member of the Comintern. In his book, A Communist Party in Action, Rossi concludes:

"The citizens must confront the Communists in the factories, in the streets, in the villages. * * * The state should step in only when Communist action takes a form that private citizens simply cannot cope with.

THE DEFEAT OF COMMUNISM

With great precision Burnham analyzes the weaknesses of world communism. With equal force he argues that our policy makes sense only if it foresees communism's ultimate defeat. He recommends measures of psychological warfare that are valuable. But none begins to add up to defeat.

And no wonder.

For the truth is that concentrating on the cold war will never permit a solution to the underlying conflict.

The Russians know this. Their program is to achieve world conquest by exploiting the inner weaknesses of democracy. To the extent that we concentrate on the cold war and ignore the developing imbalances within our society, we play into Soviet hands.

America's strength in the Berlin airlift startled the Russians. Yet it was entirely within their frame of reference. America's failure to collapse in a postwar depression really shook the Russians. It was a development outside their realm of discourse and in defiance of their theology.

The cold war was largely a fight over the breakup and division of the world. Today the world is more or less divided. A shift in concentration from the cold war to the strengthening of the non-Communist world is our first task in defeating Communism.

The elements of strength for the non-Communist world include its military power, its economic stability, its solidarity and the faith of its peoples.

On each of these issues choices are developing that cannot be ignored.

Gen. Omar Bradley has indicated that the military power of the non-Communist world can be increased only by the abandonment of nationally balanced armed forces in favor of a unified western force, Paul Hoffman has added that Europe's economic stability can be obtained only if the economies of western Europe and America advance toward unification. John McCloy has declared that the solidarity of the non-Communist world can be preserved only if western Europe is federated, in close association with America and with the British Commonwealth. All these endeavors rest, as soldiers and statesmen know, on continued full employment in the United States. And they need to be joined under a concept and a flag that peoples can recognize and understand.

These are the next steps that the defeat of world communism requires us to take. Far from moving ahead to these solutions, we have yet to recognize that these are problems that require solution.

Even if agreement were achieved on the size and nature of the effort required to defeat communism, conflicts concerning time and emphasis would need to be resolved.

But there is not yet any agreement on the effort itself.

The liberals are largely silent on these issues in this campaign year. The conservatives are seeking reelection not by challenging new undertakings in prospect, but by attacking present programs already inadequate and close to conclusion.

Our election, which should be the occasion of a debate on America's future, is more likely to be an irrelevant sideshow featuring slander and stories dug up from a past that is dead and gone.

The decisions that we face cannot be taken without recourse to public opinion. There is no short cut to public enlightenment through frank debate. As time passes, and we drift, imbalances accumulate and solutions become more drastic and harder to achieve.

THE POWER OF IDEAS

Prevalent in high circles is the enervating conviction that the American people are weary of major international endeavors and hostile to new ideas.

If this is true then we are in danger, even if we continue economically to progress. Thirty years ago Keynes noted that the appeal of communism was not primarily economic and could not be countered by economic action alone; it consisted not of the substance but of the fervor of Communist faith.

"If the Communists win power in France [adds Rossi today], it will be because France is a country in which the bonds of community have grown weak; a country in which almost everyone is ready, at a moment's notice, to call into question the moral foundations of national unity. For where unity can be had on no other terms, men finally seek it in some political movement that is able and willing to impose it."

In this context, the central threat of conservatism is its complacency and its resistance to new ideas. Liberalism, on the contrary, welcomes new ideas and thrives on impatience.

America was born in rebellion against colonial oppression. We fought a civil war to resolve a moral issue. We inspired the League of Nations and the United Nations. We lifted ourselves from depression by the New Deal. We said in depression that we had nothing to fear. Why, at the peak of our power, should we be afraid?

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. GARY CLEMENTE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 1, 1950

Mr. CLEMENTE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on Federal aid to education given by Mr. Aloysius J. Maickel, Friday, April 21, 1950, before St. Anne's Council 2429, Knights of Columbus, Queens Village, N. Y.:

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

In the building of our country's future, the education of our youth should come first. The war has reminded us of many virtues and ideals that we had forgotten. One of them is the duty we owe to our children in the provision of their education; not education merely in terms of books, credits, diplomas, and degrees, but education also in terms of living and of preparation for future living.

There are two important facts to remember about all American youth. First, there are about 11,000,000 of them between the sixteenth and twenty-first birthdays, the group who will be the immediate leaders of our Nation in the future. Secondly, no two of the 11,000,000 are identical in intelligence and aptitude, in occupational interests and outlooks, in social and economic status, in mental health, and in physical well-being. The aforesaid are only the principal points of difference existing among all American youth.

The common qualities of youth are fully as important to education as their differences. All American youth are citizens now; all will be qualified voters in the future; all require education for civic responsibility and competence. All American youth are members of family groups now, and will become members of other family groups in the future; all require an understanding of family relationships. All American youth are now living in the American culture; all require an understanding of the main elements in that culture. All American youth need to maintain their mental and physical health now and in the future; all require instruction to develop habits of healthful living, understanding of conditions which foster health, and knowledge of ways of preventing disease, avoiding injuries, and using medical services. All American youth will be expected to engage in useful work and will need to work to sustain themselves and others; all therefore require occupational guidance and training, and orientation to current economic conditions. All American youth have the capacity to think rationally; all need to develop this capacity, and with it, an appreciation of the significance of truth as arrived at by the rational process. All American youth must make decisions and take actions which involve choices of values; all therefore need insight into moral values. Particularly do they need to grow in understanding the basic tenet of democracy, that the individual human being is of surpassing worth and dignity.

When we refer confidently and inclusively to "education for all American youth" we mean just that. We mean that all youth, with their human similarities and their equally human differences, shall have educational services and opportunities suited to their personal needs and sufficient for the successful operation of a free and democratic society. All these youth are children of God and equal citizens of our Nation whether male or female, black or white, halt or hale, Jew, Catholic, or Protestant. Birth and environment have tended to make some of them more alert or more shrewd or more bold than others. Environment and education have made them rich or poor, law-abiding or delinquent, employed or idle. Yet they are Americans all. Their names are Dumbrowski, Cohen, Ryan, MacGregor, Romanelli, Schmidt, Smith, and Smythe. These youth—all of them—are creatures of the same Divine Fatherhood and members in the same brotherhood of man in American society. They are to be the heirs and trustees for all that is good or bad in our civilization. What humanity will achieve a generation hence depends largely on them and on their education

now. Each of them is a human being created by God, more precious than material goods or systems of philosophy. Not one of them is to be carelessly wasted. All of them are to be given equal opportunities to live and learn. Education of all American youth has created a fundamental educational problem in modern American society. Simply stated, the problem is based upon equalization of educational opportunity for all our youth. Suffice it to say, equalization of education is impossible without equalization of fiscal assistance. Educational systems cannot exist without a financial basis. How much money we spend on education shall always determine the quality of education and the caliber of its product—the American youth. Properly financed, the school system can flourish well; improperly financed, it can never meet the needs of the community and all American youth. Money spent for education is an investment.

There are two opposing points of view regarding expenditures for education. One, discredited but unfortunately still persisting, holds that education is a luxury—and an expensive one at that. The money spent is largely wasted. For the great mass of people, it is enough that they learn to read, write, and keep simple accounts. They will be the hewers of wood and the drawers of water. Let them get on the farms, in the factories, or begin to learn a trade as soon as possible. A favored few should go on for advanced training to supply necessary technical service and leadership, but these few only who may not be your children. Accordingly, say those who hold this view, cut out the "frills," keep school expenditures down, and stop trying to make silk purses out of sows' ears. No intelligent person today can take such a position when he has facts laid before him. An accumulating mass of evidence shows more and more clearly that expenditures for education are a good investment. If children are our most precious resource, where can we invest our money to better advantage? Their proper development returns untold values to the society which nourishes them. That a sound educational program has far-reaching, beneficial effects is part of our American faith. Our people believe that through education, their lot and the lot of their children can be improved.

Respectable research is supporting our people's faith. In the first place, studies of delinquency, crime, and other forms of antisocial behavior, show that far more offenders come from the ranks of the uneducated, or poorly educated, than from among the well educated. A number of school systems have won increased fiscal and public support merely by delving into the records of children who, over a period of years, quit school, and comparing them with the records of those who remained until graduation. The "drop-outs" invariably show a much higher percentage of subsequent delinquents, charity cases, criminals, and undesirable citizens. It is apparent that sound education in good schools, properly financed, develops desirable character traits and moral standards in our children.

Secondly, several investigations, including an extensive one promoted by the United States Chamber of Commerce in 1945, have pointed out the close agreement between the level of education of a country and its standard of living. This study has shown that among the various nations of the world, a high standard of living is always accompanied by a fine educational system, generously financed. By way of contrast, the report showed that Colombia and Rumania, each possessing immense resources of minerals, forests, water power, and rich soil, have poorly educated peoples, a poor educational system inadequately financed, and a resultant low standard of living.

The economic argument can be pushed further. It has been shown that within our own Nation, variations in the level of educational financing from region to region are accompanied, in general, by corresponding variations in economic well-being. In other words, a high level of education and a high standard of living go together even within the boundaries of our own Nation. It is evident that only through spending to educate the minds and to stimulate the imaginations of men, can resources be developed, can people want more goods, become better producers, and thereby furnish expanded markets and higher standards of living for all. Clearly, the self-interest of the businessmen is not promoted by dilapidated, one-room, rural schools with poorly clad, undernourished, and poorly taught youngsters.

By now the question must be in your minds, "How much does it cost to provide a good educational program?" Educators estimate that the expenditure necessary to support a good educational program is $200 per pupil per annum. Below this level on the financial scale, the educational program appears to be stunted and lacking in both breadth and depth. Above this level are found our better, more wholesome schools.

How near we are in the United States to realizing a minimum expenditure of $200 per pupil is indicated by the figures for 1947. In that year, the range in expenditure per pupil was from about $18 to well above $300. The average expenditure was $99. In other words, half of the pupils in our schools in the entire Nation in 1947 attended schools financed at the $99 level or below. Less than 10 percent of our pupils benefited from studying in schools costing $200 or more per pupil. Over 90 percent were attending schools costing less than $200 per pupil, where it is unlikely that a full flowering of the educational program can result. Although there was a slight upward revision of these figures since 1947, there is much ground to be gained before the battle for adequate, effectively free education for all is won in our Nation.

Our public schools are supported almost exclusively by money derived from taxation. Local, State and Federal levels of government have each been charged by the people with the responsibility for levying and collecting taxes for schools. The bulk of the burden thus far has been borne by the local property tax, with State taxes second, and Federal taxes a poor third. The typical pattern of school support is for more than half of local school costs to be raised by taxes on local property, almost all the rest comes from State sources, with a very small percentage, if any, from the Federal Government.

As the cost of formal education has increased, a perennial problem has been that of how to spread the burden equitably. So long as a fair measure of each man's wealth was the amount of property he owned, the local property tax served rather well as the base for school support. But the farther we have progressed into the twentieth century, the more evident it has become that real property holdings can no longer be relied upon as an index of wealth. With the increasing industrialization of our country, the rise of giant corporations employing tens of thousands of wage earners, and the tremendous increase in the number of public employees, it became apparent early in the century that an income tax was necessary if governmental services were to be financed. The income tax, as history shows, is an excellent revenue producer. The lion's share of the income tax revenues goes to the Federal Government.

With each level of Government more or less specializing in certain forms of taxation, it would at first glance seem as if the problem of financing their activities had been solved. Actually, it was not; incomes and expenditures did not vary proportionately at the three levels. Local governmental costs, including school costs, have risen greatly almost without interruption. But the income from the local property tax has not risen proportionately. Local school districts, then, have had to seek funds from the other governmental levels which possessed a broader tax base.

The first source of school funds to supplement those raised locally, was the State treasury. In effect, the people of the State, speaking through their legislators, instructed the State officials to raise some money for schools on a State basis and distribute it to the local school districts. The movement for State support of local schools has been under way for about a century in this country. With the result that all States have some plan or other for so doing. That practice is well established and accepted.

During the last 25 years, a growing group of people has been realizing that if formal education is to be adequately financed, the immense taxing power of the Federal Government must assist. Many of our States, with their present resources, are too poor to be able to finance their school system at an acceptable level and to equalize educational opportunity and services for all our American youth on a national basis of agreement, without outside help. We now face the consequences of accepting Federal aid plans so that the burden may be shared three ways.

It is not that we have had no Federal aid for education already. Actually, according to a tabulation made by the National Education Association in 1946, 160 Federal-aid laws have been passed by Congress since 1785. No consideration of a national role in education could be complete without an examination of education in a national historic perspective.

The historic development of American society has set the ideas, aspirations, knowledge, and working rules which prevail today, and set the task of American education. The past, distant and near, has given us our society, including all the material, intellectual, and moral manifestations with which education must work.

American independence was secured through revolution and war, accompanied by intellectual concentration, storm, and stress. America had broken with the past in many respects and had founded government on a new base—social purpose as distinguished from the prescriptive rights of class. The leaders of the infant Republic were set upon realizing a better life for the free members of American society. The Republic's founders were concerned with more than the material aspects of life. They were public personages, imbued with a deep sense of social and moral responsibility. They had staked their lives and their fortunes on independence and the welfare of the Republic. Having used their all in the creation of a nation, the ablest among them gave unremitting attention to the study of public affairs and the methods calculated to preserve and improve the independent society which their labors had brought forth. In the long run, the founding fathers established a government that came to rest on a wide popular base; and with the passing of time, that base was broadened by constitutional enactments and political practices. The fate of American Government and society was increasingly entrusted to the wisdom and knowledge of an ever-widening mass of people. This pattern of popular government was greeted by many as a fulfillment of the principles proclaimed in the Declaration of Independence, and as marking a humane departure from the despotisms of Europe. Lucidly, the declaratory principles, that all men are created equal, and endowed by their Creator with

certain inalienable rights, including life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that goverments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed; and that people have the right to alter or abolish any form of government which becomes destructive of these ends, had been enmeshed in the operational pattern of American Government. The future was to decide whether any government so conceived and so dedicated could long endure.

Having committed themselves to government by popular verdict, to a government with high social and moral responsibilities, many founders of the Republic turned to education as a guaranty that a government of this type would endure. The founders were especially concerned with political education, with the preparation of the people for self-government. Knowledge and a moral sense were required to sustain democratic processes and to make them constructive, rather than destructive. George Washington, in his Farewell Address, wrote: "In proportion as the structure of government gives force to public opinion, it is essential that public opinion should be enlightened. * * * Promote, then, as our object of primary importance, institutions for the geneal diffusion of knowledge." Undoubtedly, such promotion was to come from a national level.

In the Constitutional Convention we find James Madison, Charles Pinckney, Gouverneur Morris, and Thomas Jefferson promoting for the fostering of education by the introduction of specific motions for action. Unfortunately, the motions were lost. Madison had proposed that Congress be empowered "to establish a university," and Charles Pinckney urged a broader provision: "To establish seminaries for the promotion of literature and the arts and sciences." At a later time in the Convention, Madison and Pinckney joined in moving for the creation of a university. Upon their project, Gouverneur Morris remarked: "It is not necessary. The exclusive power at the seat of government will reach the object." The motion was lost. Nevertheless, no express provisions were made in the Constitution for the promotion of education, but leaders among the men who framed that document certainly believed that the power to perform this national service was certainly implied. The framers of the Constitution had set an impressive example to all those of succeeding generations that education is an enterprise forever linked with the destiny of the Nation.

That George Washington advocated Federal aids to education, was made evident in his first annual address to Congress: "Nor am I less persuaded that you will agree with me in opinion that there is nothing which can better deserve your patronage than the promotion of science and literature. Knowledge is in every country the surest basis of public happiness. In one in which the measures of government receive their impressions so immediately from the sense of the community as in ours, it is proportionately essential. To the security of a free constitution it contributes in various ways. * * * Whether this desirable object will be best promoted by affording aids to seminaries of learning already established, by the institution of a national university, or by any other expedients, will be well worthy of a place in the deliberations of the legislature." Washington had a broad view on education from the basis of aid.

The periods following the birth of the American Republic marked an intense reaction to the educational outlook of the founders. This reaction in our historical development was fostered by internal political struggles in our country. A national role in education was completely hamstrung by emphasis on the sovereignty of individual States, by laissez faire in Federal policy, by the march of egalitarian democracy, and by a passionate sense of rugged individualism. These forces stimulated action opposed to a national concept of education. Formal popular education found its origins in State and local enterprise for over 150 years. The concept of George Washington that the promotion of education be urged by national action disappeared from educational practice and theory.

By a strange fate, while American education became a matter of individual and local enterprise, other contrary forces were at work in our national history. The energies of individual enterprise trained under State and local auspices linked all parts of our country together by systems of transportation, communication, and bound its sections and industries into a homogeneous national economy. So it has come about that public education, as in 1789, is once more linked with national economy and interests. Through the influence of common ideals, methods and associations, popular mass education itself draws into a unity of thought and purpose which is national in its reach. Recent years show an increasing tendency on the part of the Federal Government to engage in the fostering of national education. The Federal Government is now spending three and one-half billions of dollars annually for educational purposes, with the largest proportion relegated to funds for individual education benefits to our veteran population.

The Congress has been increasingly concerned with the fundamental problem of equalization of educational opportunity for our citizenry. Educational and political leaders are strongly aware that the inequalities in American educational opportunity constitute a threat to the whole fabric of American democratic institutions. Thus the question of Federal aid to education has become an issue of primary concern to congressional leaders. The current controversy has centered around the method of distribution and who should benefit from the Federal funds. This controversy is in truth violating and inciting others to violate the very rights and freedoms upon which our democratic government was founded. It is a controversy that holds primary import to every American Catholic.

President Truman's Fair Deal plan for Federal aid to education has been engulfed in the House Committee on Labor and Education by a flow of bigotry, ignorance, and malice. The anti-Catholic apostles of bigotry, intolerance, and discrimination have triumphed in the spawning of a monstrous fabrication plan for Federal aid known as the Barden bill. Advocates of the Barden bill, pitting American religious groups against American religious groups, seeking votes to sustain and enforce it, are today conducting a craven crusade of religious prejudice against Catholic children and their inalienable rights. The Barden bill justifies and urges unjust, unAmerican discrimination against our parochial-school children. The southern Congressmen, lead by Congressman GRAHAM A. BARDEN, have virtually killed Federal aid to education. Within a few pages, the Barden bill seeks to perpetrate a monstrosity of injustices. Its unjust provisions forbid the States to use any of the $300,000,000 in Federal funds for non-public-school children, even for such public-welfare purposes as school-bus transportation, nonreligious textbooks, and common health aids. The Supreme Court has upheld the right of the States to make such use of public funds. The Senate's $300,000,000 Thomas bill allowed disbursements "for any current expenditure * * * for which educational revenues derived from State or local sources may legally and constitutionally be expended in each State."

Before discussing the provisions of the Thomas general aid-to-education bill (S. 246), let us distinguish it clearly from two other bills involved in the Federal-aid controversy. These other bills deal only with specific areas of aid to education—school lunches and health services. They are hence very limited in purpose, are not general aid-to-education measures and, though involved in the debate, are not nearly so controversial as the general-aid bills.

The School Lunch Act has been in force since 1946. The relevance of this law resides in one all-important provision—the way its benefits are made available to all American school children, not merely those attending public schools. This is the famous withholding provision of the School Lunch Act. According to this provision the Federal Administrator is required to inquire of State authorities whether they may disburse the school-lunch funds for the benefit of public- and non-public-school pupils. If they can, as happens in about one-half of the 48 States, the Federal Administrator allots the State its full share. If the State officials declare that under the State's laws they cannot disburse Federal funds in favor of non-public-school children, the Federal Administrator is required by the School Lunch Act to withhold Federal allotments in an amount proportional to the number of children in nonpublic schools.

The share of Federal funds thus withheld is then used to reimburse nonpublic schools for part of their expense incurred in serving lunches to their pupils. This law has been in effect for 3 years and was so manifestly fair that few voices have ever been raised demanding that American pupils in nonpublic schools be deprived of their daily bottle of milk and hot lunch, simply because they were carrying out their parents' conscientious belief in religious education.

The Senate also passed a school-health-services bill (S. 1411) on April 29, 1949, by a voice vote. This bill, like the Senate's general Federal-aid bill, was also introduced by Senator THOMAS and consequently bears his name. There are therefore two Thomas Senate bills in the field of Federal aid to education. Fortunately, the school-health-services measure includes the same withholding formula which has made the School Lunch Act a model of fairness. So far, the House has taken no action on the bill. The health and lunch bills have embodied the nondiscrimination principle for auxiliary services for all American youth. We now come to the piece of legislation over which the country became exicited last summer. This is general Federal aid to education.

The term requires definition. Aid to education is general if the funds are made available for the over-all support of education, instead of being earmarked for very specific uses such as lunches or health services. Actually, the various general-aid proposals presented to Congress in recent years have restricted the use of such funds to current expenditures. This restriction rules out capital outlays for new buildings but includes expenditures for teachers' salaries, heating, lighting, general maintenance, free textbooks, and bus transportation.

The general-aid measures also differ somewhat from the specific-aid measures in the way they apportion Federal funds among the several States.

Suffice it to say that the Thomas general aid, in effect, divides the States into two categories—the 30 wealthy States, nearly all Northern, and the 18 needy States, mostly Southern, Southwestern, or border States. The professed aim of the bill is to raise the current expenditures for education in each State to at least $50 per child annually. Since the wealthy States spend more than that sum, they will receive only the minimum amount of Federal aid, $5

for every child of school age (5 to 17 years) under their jurisdiction.

The amount of Federal aid per child granted to each of the needy States, on the other hand, will vary according to the amount required in each State to bring the annual current expenditures for education up to the minimum of $50 per child annually. In Mississippi, for example, about $29.18 in Federal aid per child will be required to reach this standard. In North Dakota, one of the four Northern States, to qualify for more than the minimum, only $5.97 would be required.

It should be made clear that no needy State will qualify for any Federal aid at all unless that State is already spending and continues to spend what is considered to be a properly proportionate share of its per capita annual income on publicly supported education.

The most controversial issue in regard to the Thomas bill is this: "It leaves with each State the option of whether it will or will not use a very small fraction of the Federal funds it will receive for bus transportation for children attending nonpublic schools." In other words, it allows the States to discriminate against sectarian-school children when expending Federal funds.

It seems strange that the people of New York State allow public funds for education to be used to transport children attending parochial schools, while the people of Wisconsin in 1946 voted by a majority of 100,000 to deny such service to parochial school children. You would think that an American child is an American child in Wisconsin as in New York. You would think that it would be heartless to deny a warm, dry ride to a little child on a cold or wet day in Wisconsin as in New York. I wonder how the Wisconsin school-bus driver feels when he picks up four children standing in the rain on a corner and leaves two others standing in the downpour, simply because they are Catholic-school children. If this is "equal protection of the laws," then democracy is hypocrisy.

Unfortunately, the discriminatory technique of the State of Wisconsin is repeated in a number of other American States. The Thomas bill would permit the continuance of this crazy-quilt of discrimination against American children. The Thomas bill excuses itself from doing justice to Catholic-school children on the score that it "leaves it up to the States" to decide who should have bus transportation. The result could only be the outbreak of vicious discrimination and bigotry in the 48 States. The Thomas bill properly offers no such excuse regarding Negro school children. It is ready to take issue with anti-Negro feeling in the South, but not with anti-Catholic feeling in the country as a whole. To this extent, the Thomas bill is not only unjust but dishonest.

This "leave it to the States" to decide who should receive Federal funds for education, spells the abdication of Congress' responsibility in the field of justice and turns our constitutional system upside down. No one can believe that equalization of educational opportunity is guaranteed to all American school children unless Federal laws grant fiscal aid to all school children on an equal, impartial level. Help must be guaranteed for all needy children, including Catholic needy children.

All the inequities of the Thomas bill were to be further expanded by the Barden bill. This bill makes a mockery of the alleged purposes of all Federal-aid measures—to more nearly equalize educational opportunities. The Barden bill, unlike the Thomas bill, does not even insure to Negro school children a proportionate share in Federal aid. To make sure that no parochial-school children receive a dime of Federal-aid funds, the Barden bill set up a procedure whereby any taxpayer could get an injunction against any school board accused of permitting what the United States Constitution and many State constitutions now permit—the use of public funds for at least incidental public-welfare expenditures for parochial-school children. What the Senate's Thomas bill allowed and the Thomas school-lunch and school-health measures made mandatory, the Barden bill made illegal and subject to injunctive action. This last provision showed Mr. Barden's attitude. He was determined to make his bill a new weapon in the hands of anti-Catholic bigots. Barden devised a means of putting Catholics in a Federal strait-jacket by using a bill to equalize educational opportunities as a device for bribing the States into completely excluding parochial-school children from even incidental public educational funds.

The Barden bill shows the depth of its malevolent prejudice and bigotry in its disbursing of Federal aid funds method. The bill awards the 29 wealthy States a minimum of $5 for every child of school age in each State, including those attending nonpublic schools, which means our parochial-school children also. But in the disbursing of funds, the bill limits the beneficiaries, for all practical purposes, to public school children only. For example, if New York State has 200,000 school children 5 to 17 years of age, and of the total, 50,000 are attending parochial schools, New York would get $5 times 200,000 in Federal funds or $1,000,000, of which $250,000, would be awarded by counting in the pupils at Catholic schools. When it came to disbursing the total of $1,000,000 however, New York would turn around and count out the 50,000 Catholic children, and every dollar of the money it received to equalize their education would go to the public schools only. Catholics in New York State would be taxed by the Federal Government on the basis of the educational needs of all the children of the State, only to have the needs of 50,000 of their own children ignored in the disbursing of funds. Such a disbursing plan is rank with injustice, pitted with illogical operation, and reflecting un-American plans of equality.

Clearly, from analysis of the various plans of Federal aid to education, our Catholic school children are maliciously reduced to second-class citizenry status. They are being deprived of equalized opportunity and assistance in every particular instance of legislation. Congress in considering a bill to aid education in the States must be considering the educational opportunities of citizens of all the United States. The responsibilities of the Congress are to the citizens of the United States on an equal basis. Congress, in granting Federal funds in aid of education to the States, cannot allow some States to discriminate against a certain class of citizens in the United States.

We, as Catholics, are not asking the Government to build our schools. What we justly demand is this: When the Government, National or State, is appropriating public funds to give extracurricular benefits, such as bus rides, health service, free lunches to school children, and general aid, we want our children and all American children of school age to be included. This is just. This is American and democratic.

What distant relation has the separation of church and State principle to the examination of Johnny's tonsils in a parochial school, or giving a free glass of milk, when the Government decides to grant these auxiliary benefits to all its school children? None of logic, yet bigots, spreaders of dissension, and fanatics, violently charge we are violating the first amendment and planning the creation of an established church in the United States. Such charges can only emanate from ignorance and passionate prejudice.

Our Catholic parents actually are required to pay double school taxes. We voluntarily and independently contribute to the support of our parochial schools while simultaneously paying school taxes for public schools which some of our children do not use. Catholic taxpayers do not demand to be excused from paying school taxes for the support of public schools which some of their children do not use, but some consideration must be given to the sectarian schools their children do use. Catholic taxpayers save others of the Nation's taxpayers half a billion dollars yearly through voluntary support of parochial schools in addition to the capital expense of the buildings. We do not expect others to take up this fiscal burden, but we cannot sanction the spending of $300,000,000 yearly in accordance with legislation that would be unjust and discriminating against millions of our American children. Catholic schools are as much in the public interest as public schools. To deny general aids to parochial schools is to imply that their graduates are second-class citizens undeserving of equal rights. To condone taxation without Catholic participation in its benefits for our parochial school children is tantamount to repudiation of the equality of American citizenship.

Fearlessly, forcefully, we must unite to demand equal rights for all American children, and in Christian justice must we oppose unequivocally any bill which refuses to grant, or denies, at least nonreligious textbooks, bus transportation, and health services for all the children of all Americans. The parochial school is as truly an American school as the public school, and our Catholic school children are as entitled to their equal constitutional rights as public school children. Justice and equality to all is the American formula and practice. Prejudice, discrimination, bigotry, and intolerance, have no role in the American way of life.

Our Catholic schools are under attack right here in the United States. When we resist the effort of bigots to discriminate against our Catholic school children in Federal aid to education, we are resisting what we believe will bring great harm to our Nation. We are fighting for freedom of religion and freedom of education. Our cause in upholding the rights of religious education is the only sure defense of the democratic ideal and the defense of our religious faith.

Public Health and Welfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK B. KEEFE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1950

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, on May 9, 1949, I introduced House Resolution 207, which had for its basic purpose the appointment of a special committee to investigate and study the economic and public-health aspects of the introduction of chemicals into the food supplies of the Nation and to investigate and study the whole fertilizer question. A short hearing was held before the Rules Committee, and the gentleman from Wisconsin was permitted to make a short statement in support of the resolution. The many witnesses who were present and prepared to testify in support of the resolution have never as yet been given an opportunity to be heard. The chairman of the Rules Committee has himself introduced a similar resolution and has

repeatedly promised to give to the proponents of this resolution an opportunity to be heard. Up to date, and for more than 1 year, these resolutions have languished in the files of the Rules Committee without any action thereon.

It is of the utmost importance to the people of this country that this matter be thoroughly investigated with a view to the suggestion of legislative action in this field.

A recent article prepared by Mr. William G. Holman, of the city of Washington, throws considerable light on the necessity for the adoption of this resolution, and I desire to incorporate it as part of these remarks:

LEGISLATION NEEDED TO PROTECT HEALTH AND WELFARE OF THE PEOPLE

A Federal Trade Commission report shows how a few fertilizer manufacturers acquired a monopolistic control of the phosphate rock and acid phosphate market in this country, and Federal court records show how they have used this control to criminally exploit the farmers and endanger the health of the people.

Eight Members of the United States Senate introduced a resolution on July 20, 1949, requesting an investigation of the monopolistic practices of the fertilizer industry.

This resolution told of the leasing of public lands on which are found the principal potash deposits to a few corporations, and of how this had enabled them to acquire a control of 80 to 90 percent of the potash in this country.

Thus we see monopoly in the saddle—all booted and spurred—and the farmers completely at the mercy of these predatory corporations.

There is another phase of this matter that is far more shocking in its implications.

Fertilizer money is being used to subsidize the research work of the Bureau of Plant Industry, and these gifts of money have resulted in keeping the people in the dark as to the harmful effects of present methods of fertilizer manufacture on the health and welfare of the people.

Is the corruption of public officials today less shocking in its implications than it was at the time of the Teapot Dome scandal?

House resolution 207, introduced by Congressman FRANK B. KEEFE on May 9, 1949, requested the appointment of a special committee to study the economic and health phases of this matter, and report its findings and recommendations to Congress, and on August 10, 1949, the dean of the House, Hon. ADOLPH J. SABATH introduced a similar resolution. Both of these resolutions are now resting securely in the House Rules Committee.

Five years ago I wrote, and Congressman WILLIAM LEMKE introduced, a truth about fertilizer bill, and he has introduced this bill at each session of the Congress since that time. It is still in a pigeonhole of the House Committee on Agriculture.

The farmers need a truth about fertilizer law.

This law should require the manufacturer to tell the farmers what materials have been used in making fertilizer, the number of pounds of each material, and the number of pounds of sand or other useless filler. The law should forbid the shipment of fertilizer in interstate commerce that contains more than 50 percent of water-soluble nitrogen.

The enactment of this law would make it possible for farmers to grow better crops with 50 percent less fertilizer per acre, help to prevent plant diseases, and injury to the health of human beings.

It has been known for a long time that an excess of soluble nitrogen in fertilizers makes all plants more susceptible and less resistant to disease, but only in recent years has there been any suggestion that food crops grown with an excess of soluble nitrogen are poisonous to farm stock, and injurious to the health of the people.

Men of such eminence as Lyon and Buckman, of Cornell University, have said that: "Of the three common fertilizer elements, (meaning, of course, nitrogen, phosphoric acid, and potash), soluble nitrogen is the only one which, added in excess, will result in harmful effects on the crops. It may decrease resistance to disease."

Sir A. D. Hall, a man who achieved such eminence in the field of agriculture that he was knighted by the British Government, has told the public in a widely read textbook that, "The association of high nitrogenous manuring with susceptibility to disease may be seen in all plants."

In spite of the warnings of these eminent scientists, State fertilizer laws were amended and these amendments permitted the manufacturers, (1) to increase the nitrogen content of all fertilizers 21 percent; (2) to remove from the fertilizer bags what were known as source tags which told the farmers what materials had been used in making the fertilizer; and (3) to use almost unlimited proportions of the cheap, water-soluble sources of nitrogen without letting the farmers know that this was being done.

The use of so much of the water soluble nitrogen was soon followed by a scourge of destructive plant diseases that had never given the farmers any trouble prior to the time these radical formula changes were made.

The use of so little of the organic sources of nitrogen forced the farmers to use at least 50 percent more fertilizer per acre in order to get enough organic nitrogen to feed the crops to maturity.

Forcing the farmers to use 50 percent more fertilizer per acre costs them $250,000,000 a year more than would have been necessary if the fertilizer had contained the right proportions of soluble and organic nitrogen, and the ravages of tobacco, potato, and tomato plant diseases cause the farmers to suffer additional losses running into millions of dollars.

These facts should be sufficient to incline the Congress to put an end to a racket of which the farmers have long been helpless victims, but there are other reasons which place a greater obligation on the shoulders of Congress.

Not until recently has there been any suggestion that food crops grown with an excess of soluble nitrogen are injurious to the health of human beings and poisonous to farm stock.

Dr. James Asa Shield, an eminent medical scientist of Richmond, Va., says that people whose food crops are grown with nature's plant food—organic nitrogen—do not have sclerosis of their nerves, their blood vessels, blockage of their veins, or high blood pressure, or kidney or gall stones. He also says that: "People whose food comes from soils fertilized with chemicals appear to have more vascular diseases and more degenerative diseases."

Dr. Max Gerson, of the Gotham Hospital, New York, says that: "The human body lost part of its resistance and healing power as man left the way of natural nutrition for generations. The fundamental damage starts with the use of artificial fertilizer for vegetables and fruits."

Dr. William A. Albrecht, Ph. D., College of Agriculture, University of Missouri, emphasizes the relationship between food and health in the following words: "Our health comes to us, after all, via our food."

Then comes the Yearbook of Agriculture, 1948, page 288, with the startling statement: "More than 1 or 2 percent of nitrates in plants as a result of very heavy fertilization or of excessive amounts in soils is known to be poisonous to stock."

A survey conducted by experts of the United States Department of Agriculture indicates that highly fertilized pasture lands may be the cause of the X-disease that has killed so many cattle, and forced some cattlemen to give up the cattle raising business.

The Spectator (London), October 17, 1941, said that rabbits have died after eating cabbage grown with an excess of nitrates.

Common sense tells us that anything that poisons cattle and kills rabbits is undoubtedly harmful to the health of human beings, and may be the cause of the great increase in the number of diseases that are taking the lives of our people.

Two fertilizer labeling bills introduced early in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress are still in a pigeonhole of the House Committee on Agriculture.

These bills are intended to give the farmers information as to the contents of a bag of fertilizer that State laws do not now give them.

One of these bills, H. R. 3045, introduced by Congressman FRANK B. KEEFE, puts a limit on the soluble nitrogen content of fertilizer shipped in interstate commerce, a necessary provision.

The enactment of this bill will make it easier for State enforcement agencies to see that the farmer gets an honestly made fertilizer.

I think the public is entitled to know how a few manufacturers acquired a monopolistic control of the fertilizer industry, and to what extent they have exerted an influence on officials of the State and Federal Governments.

An act of Congress, approved April 10, 1918, entitled "An act to promote export trade and for other purposes," permitted a few fertilizer manufacturers to form a selling agency combine which controlled practically all of the phosphate rock shipped from this country to Europe. (See United States Statutes at Large 40, p. 516.)

This combine first secured control of the prices and terms of sale of all phosphate rock sold in Europe by threatening to dump 200,000 tons of Florida phosphate rock on that market each year at reduced prices. (See Federal Trade Commission Report, May 1, 1946.)

The almost complete control of such basic fertilizer materials as phosphate rock and acid phosphate enabled this small group of manufacturers to compel other manufacturers in this country to obey their wishes not only as to how fertilizer should be made, but as to what the selling price should be.

Having established a ruthless control of the fertilizer industry, these manufacturers then set to work to have the State laws amended to suit their notions, and their activities in this direction resulted in their being indicted and fined in a Federal court in North Carolina for having exerted an illegal influence on State lawmakers.

However, the amendments to the State laws that they succeeded in having enacted are still plaguing the farmers, and endangering the health of the people.

With a view to protecting the farmers and the health of all the people, I undertook to do two things: (1) prove with properly conducted experiments that an excess of soluble nitrogen was the cause of plant diseases, and (2) secure the enactment of a truth-about-fertilizer law that would put a reasonable limit on the water-soluble nitrogen content of fertilizer, and let the farmers know the number of pounds of each material used in making it, as well as the number of pounds of sand or other useless filler.

I knew that if I could prove that an excess of soluble nitrogen was the cause of plant diseases, it would be easy to convince the Congress of the need of the legislation I advocated.

Twenty-six of my experiments conducted in nine counties in North Carolina resulted in the growth of healthy tobacco plants free of disease.

Dr. Earl H. Hall, professor of botany of the greater university system of North Carolina, expressed the opinion that my theory was physiologically as well as logically sound.

Dr. A. L. Grizzard, associate agronomist, Virginia experimental station, had said that an excess of nitrogen "may cause over-stimulation and a weak, watery growth which is susceptible to disease," and the Yearbook of Agriculture, 1939, page 413, had said that plants relatively high in water content are generally low in some of the carbohydrates, and are particularly susceptible to attack by fungus and bacterial disease.

I knew that starch was the form in which carbohydrates are usually stored in plants, and I was trying to prove that more organic nitrogen in fertilizers would increase the carbohydrate content of the plant and make it more resistant to disease.

Sir Albert Howard, a man who had achieved such eminence in the field of agriculture that he was knighted by the British Government, expressed the opinion in a letter to me that I had hit the nail squarely on the head, and he was in entire agreement with me.

Senators Barkley, Byrd, George, Tydings, and Reynolds, and three southern governors requested the Department of Agriculture to give its approval to a Federal grant to me for the completion of my experiments, and a bill was introduced in Congress to accomplish this purpose.

Mr. R. M. Salter, Chief, Bureau of Plant Industry, opposed this bill, and the statements made by him to the chairman of a Senate subcommittee resulted in an adverse report.

Mr. Salter told the subcommittee that fertilizer had nothing to do with the cause or control of blue mold, and then stultified himself by saying that he had tried to get me to let him conduct tests with my fertilizer formula for the control of blue mold.

Mr. Salter then made two surprising statements to the subcommittee, one of them refuting the other. He said that "several effective and inexpensive control measures have been developed," and then added that "at present $18,000 is allotted to blue mold investigations."

The control measures referred to by Mr. Salter would have cost the farmers of one State $765,000, and to show that they were not effective I need only to assert that they are not even recommended today, and the ravages of blue mold are still resulting in enormous losses to the farmers.

Furthermore, if Mr. Salter had found an effective control measure, why did he want to spend any more of the public funds on blue mold investigations?

The statement made by Mr. Salter in a speech that he delivered at the fertilizer convention at Hot Springs, Va., on June 25, 1946, indicates that he was already under financial obligations to the fertilizer people, and was appealing to them for additional funds.

This is what he said: "Probably you can spend a little more money advantageously in subsidizing research on special problems through fellowships and grants to States. A little financial oil applied to the squeaks in the research machinery often produces surprisingly good results."

The record shows that Mr. Salter's statements helped to delay the day when the truth would be known that an excess of soluble nitrogen was the cause of plant diseases, and of injury to the health of the people.

Mr. Salter must have known that my theory was logically and physiologically sound, or he would not have admitted in a letter to Congressman REID F. MURRAY that "Tobacco plants grown with organic nitrogen can be expected to be higher in starch."

If that be true, then Mr. Salter cannot explain away his efforts to keep me from proving it, and the Congress should undoubtedly inquire into his motives.

Could any problem be raised of more importance to the people than one that involves the corruption of public officials, the criminal exploitation of the farmers, and trade practices that endanger the health of both man and animals?

WILLIAM G. HOLMAN.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

Majority Rule

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM PICKETT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1950

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Speaker, there recently appeared on the front page of the Malakoff, Tex., newspaper some observations by the editor concerning majority rule by the people who would be affected if certain programs sponsored by the administration are put into effect. The editor's comments are pertinent and well worthy of serious consideration by all Members of Congress. They are as follows:

BILL'S MILL

(By Bill Scholl)

We noticed in a city paper the other day that a poll of farmers throughout the country showed a heavy majority as definitely opposed to the proposed Brannan farm plan, one which the President has repeatedly tried to "strong arm" Congress into passing.

And, too, we have noticed all along, as have most people, that the country's doctors are definitely opposed to the plan of health insurance, a nice name for socialized medicine, or any other plan that would subordinate the country's doctors to Federal red tape.

And thirdly, we have heard and read of many noted educators throughout the country who are in dead earnest in their opposition to Federal aid to education of any type; men who firmly believe the task of education is up to the individual States.

WHY THE LEGISLATION, THEN?

Why, then should the administration in Washington, under the leadership of Mr. Truman, insist in attempting to put through these proposals that are so opposed by the people who would be affected? Why is the Government insisting on harnassing these groups with more red tape, less efficiency, and Federal control when the people do not want them. Think it over. Do you want them?

Mr. Truman seems to think it is his God-given task to make the people of the United States succumb to his theories of government. There are thousands of people all over the world who think that their ideas of government are the best and no other will suffice. But does that make it true?

We also have definite ideas of government, what the government should take as its obligation and what it should not. But we don't insist that everyone agree with us. We believe that the majority of the people are the ones to decide what we should have in the Government, not the ones who run on the Democratic ticket to get elected and then veer off to a red-fringed socialistic program. The Democratic Party (the real one) does not stand for socialism, so why should its leaders propose to harness us with socialism?

We contend that it is not up to them to tell us what to do, but that it is up to us, you and me, to tell our leaders what we want. We still contend that to be a good leader you have to be a follower and in the democratic way of life the leaders are supposed to follow the people's wishes. True or false?

Off the Cuff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1950

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Shenandoah (Iowa) Evening Sentinel of Thursday, April 27, 1950:

OFF THE CUFF

(By David Archie)

It may be old stuff or I may be seeing ghosts, but I've become acutely conscious lately of what amounts to a growing anti-farmer campaign in the Nation's press. If I were to piece together all of the references to farmers I've seen recently, I believe the picture would run something like this.

"Soybean Maize, the average American farmer, has been having a hard time finding a place to keep all his Buicks lately because his buildings are filled with his fortune in corn. Soybean and Mrs. Maize had a tough time in the early thirties—but didn't we all. Now that he has been able to buy his farm (with Government gifts), make it the most efficient possible, send his children to college with a convertible apiece and get his bank account in figures that he can't even add—now isn't it about time we stopped all this subsidy nonsense. The whole thing is a complete mess and he doesn't need it anyway. Besides old Soy is just putting land into production that isn't needed."

Mr. and Mrs. Maize seem like strange characters to Iowans, but after you've been out of the Midwest for a while, you begin to realize how closely they resemble the conception many people have of farmers these days. I imagine a boy going away to school in an earlier time would have had to convince people his father wasn't a "hick" farmer. Now he has to convince them the old man isn't wallowing in hogs, corn, and green acres of dollar bills.

I'm glad that the estimation of the farmer has risen so greatly, but I'm afraid there is more danger than good in the situation. I honestly believe that the Mr. Soybean Maize type of attitude may eventually help to destroy our farm price support programs. The recent potato scandals have made people think more about the Government farm program than ever before in its history. This thinking is good if properly routed. The trouble lies in the gross misconception of the lot of the average farmer that has been generated in the city mind.

This misconception tends to color whatever thinking there is on this very complicated and difficult subject. Most newspapers and magazines prefer to present the more glamorous and interesting stories of "rich" farmers through Government subsidies rather than explore the whole, and rather hard subject. In giving this one-sided response to the growing interest to the farm problem, they are rendering a distinct disservice to the country as a whole. But it is the farmers

themselves and the people who depend immediately on the farm trade who will suffer most if the present trend develops into a current of antifarmer resentment. I should not be at all surprised to see us facing an antiagrarian problem in the near future if present trends continue.

It is a problem of which every midwesterner should be acutely aware. More intelligent and farsighted leadership in Congress can do much to alleviate the problem. But if the ball is already rolling, as I fear it is, then farmers and farmers' friends should be alerted so that they can promote better public relations for the agrarian population.

Mr. Speaker, here are some excerpts from a letter to an old friend in my home county setting out my reasons for supporting 90 percent of parity for farm products, which I trust will answer those who are advocating the abolition of our support program for farmers:

DEAR FRIEND: Let us not forget that farm prices were 66 percent of parity on an average in 1931–32 and 1933, and that during those times not only the farmer, but the businessman, the laboring man and everybody in America were in a serious predicament. I need not remind you of this, I am sure, for I know you are old enough to remember it. There was on an average of 14,000,000 American people who were unable to find work during that era, for the very simple reason that the farmer's buying power was almost nil. Now certainly that should be a lesson we dare not forget, regardless of our politics, faith, or vocation.

Ever since my first year in Congress I have cooperated very closely with commonsense economic analysts and many Congressmen, most of whom are from farm States, in search of facts and figures to guide us in the right direction to avoid, if humanly possible, another depression, and possibly the complete destruction of our system of government and everything worth while in our blessed land.

Here is what these many years of research have brought to light. For the past 20 years the records of the Department of Commerce, which are compiled from the records of the Departments of Agriculture, Labor, and from other accurate sources in Government records, show that whether it be periods of peace, depression, war, postwar, or prosperity such as we now have, the national income has been and is now approximately seven times the farm income. The postwar prosperity which we have enjoyed since World War II has held up mainly because we have had a high farm income due to the fact that basic farm commodities have been supported by our 90-percent parity law.

If you will remember, it was less than 2 years after the close of World War I that farm prices took such a terrific drop which brought about a national depression in 1920. And during the several years thereafter many farmers lost their farms and a lot of business houses closed their doors for the very simple reason that the farmer's buying power was almost nil. I remember that era only too well, as I was at that time running a lumber yard in Exira, Iowa, dealing with farmers almost exclusively. Certainly that horrible experience should be a lesson to all of us. It must not happen again. I am thoroughly convinced, after much study, that a slide-down support scale on basic farm prices will bring about a repetition of a like condition during the era which I have just described.

Doubtless you have heard the argument it is necessary to reduce the price on farm commodities to avoid great surpluses from piling up, which the Government would have to buy and store in greater quantities than would be possible for the Government finances to stand. That argument falls flat with those who have made a deep study of what causes surpluses to pile up, which is, when the buying power of the people is not sufficient to purchase the goods they need for the high standard of living we Americans want and expect. The facts are that a greatly reduced American standard of living will very surely be brought about by a great reduction in prices of farm commodities, since all wealth springs from Mother Earth, and because as I said before, the national income each year is approximately seven times the farm income; so, unless we maintain a high farm income sufficient to generate a high national income, and thereby securing high consumption of all goods, Americans will be in serious trouble, and you can bank on that.

Here is something else to think about. Who in America would expect the good Lord to continue to bless us with such abundant crops as we have enjoyed the past 8 years? I am sure, you, like I, will agree that that would be too much to expect of Him who runs nature's business. We are bound to have crop failures in some degrees most any year now, and should it become our lot to suffer, say even a 25-percent crop reduction on an average for a period of 2, 3, or 4 years all over America, below the average of the past 8 years; how I ask in all sincerity would we feed and clothe the American people the way the like to be fed and clad.

You will also hear the argument that unless the Secretary of Agriculture is given the authority to reduce support prices, that surpluses will pile up to such a degree that acreage control will again be necessary. That argument also falls flat when we know that it was cheap farm prices that brought about acreage control in the AAA bill of the early thirties. And the result of that program was that the farmers so fertilized and mined their allotted cash crop-producing acres, that they produced more than ever, and were obliged to do so as to meet their bills.

The 90-percent support-price program on basic farm products, corn, wheat, tobacco, cotton, peanuts, and rice, has not cost the American taxpayer one thin dime to date. It has actually made a profit to the United States Treasury, to say nothing about the great benefits to the farmers of America and to our whole economy, and for these reasons I certainly will not be a party to a program which I honestly believe will be destructive to not only the prosperity of our Nation, but also to the peace and progress of our Nation and the world.

You no doubt also have heard the argument about the potato situation. I agree that potatoes which are perishable and cannot be stored for any definite period should not be supported at the full 90 percent of parity. The facts are that the Potato Growers Association of America suggested to Congress that the support price on potatoes be materially reduced.

If our national income is drastically reduced the American market, which is the only stable and good market of the world today, will lose its buying power, and when that time comes we will neither be able to pay our own way, nor help foreign nations with loans or free dollars with which to buy our goods or other nations' goods, or to ward off communistic aggression any place in the world, America included.

Records of the past 20 years also prove that for each dollar of gross farm income, labor (which includes all kinds, blue denim, white collar, and professional) receives an income of over $4, so the laboring people have a mighty big stake in keeping the farmer's income on a high level, the source of all wealth. Regarding the businessman's interest in this proposition, I am sure I need not explain to them the need of keeping a high farm income, for they know that is the only thing which will insure good profitable trade for them.

A $42,000,000,000 annual Federal tax take from the American people means that each American family pays on an average of over $1,000 per year in direct and indirect Federal taxes. Add to this around $300 which each family is paying per year in local, county, and State taxes, it makes a total outlay in taxes per year for each family of over $1,300. That being a fact, we must surely do two things, keep our national income at the highest possible figure and stop wasting the taxpayers' dollars.

I hope this will explain my reason for opposing any law which will reduce farm income.

Sincerely yours,

BEN F. JENSEN.

The American People Have a Vital Part To Play in the Attainment of the Goals of the Foreign Policy of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 2, 1950

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the recent war, I feel sure we will all agree, could not have reached ultimate victory without the united and concerted efforts of every citizen of this country—whether in the armed services or on the home front. It was, in every way a total war which required complete unity of purpose and determination to gain the victory. I do not believe that our ultimate victory in what we call today the cold war or total diplomacy can be realized without the same unity of spirit and purpose—and the same determination which made military victory possible. Every citizen of every free nation remaining in the world today has a duty to perform in the interest of peace and lasting stability that is as vital as it was during the war. In this connection, I should like to have included with my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by Mr. Edward W. Barrett, Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs, entitled "The American People's Part in United States Foreign Policy," and which was recently delivered.

The address is as follows:

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE'S PART IN UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY

(By Edward W. Barrett, Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs)

I would like to recall some facts about American foreign policy with which you are already familiar. I think that this is worth doing, because I believe that it is only a continuing examination of the obvious and the familiar that we arrive at what is useful and new. Consider the atom: It was familiar to us—or so we thought—for a long, long time. But by dint of persistent study of a familiar impasse—which was that the atom could not be split—we finally came up with the discovery that it could be split. And we split it.

I think that there is a real possibility that if we keep on examining the familiar obstacles to peace and security, someone may yet discover something that no one else has

noticed—a way to split them, a way to overcome them.

A main source of our difficulties in seeking world peace and security is the refusal of the Soviet Union and its satellites to cooperate with the free nations, and the insistence of the Soviet Union in pursuing an expansionist, aggressive policy.

The Berlin airlift showed us a possible way of expanding the area of workable agreements with the Soviet Union—that of giving the U. S. S. R. no practicable alternative but to abide by its agreements. It is a way, however, which can be pursued only by the direct action of the United States Government and other free governments working together. It is not an approach to the solution of east-west tensions which offers opportunity for direct action by the United States National Commission or by UNESCO itself.

Communist policies, however, are by no means the only obstacle between us and our goal of putting the United Nations Charter into fuller operation.

LACK OF UNITY

There is not enough unity within the non-Communist world. This world includes a group of strong, democratic nations which are pulling together; others which are weaker and less convinced of the need to bear down in a common cause; and still others with hardly better than a neutral attitude toward the struggle between the advocates of a totalitarian way of life and the advocates of a free, democratic way of life. There are many non-Communist countries so burdened with domestic and regional difficulties that the issue of a totalitarian versus a free world society seems very remote. They do not realize that they are part of the battleground on which the struggle for the allegiance of man is going forward.

Even among the leading nations of the free world, we still do not have nearly the unity of purpose and action which is needed.

We must come to closer agreement on policies and programs for the solution of world problems and mobilize more power in carrying them out. We must work together to increase mutual understanding with the marginal countries—those not yet convinced of their own stake in the world contest between oppression and freedom—and convince them that their own good lies on the side of freedom. In the words of Prime Minister Nehru, we must convince these other nations that democracy is the way of life that will deliver the goods, both materially and spiritually. And we must make them understand the accompanying need for them to collaborate in establishing a democratic world society.

Here lies a great opportunity for the national commission and for UNESCO—that of winning the informed suport of the American and of other peoples and mobilizing their support more effectively behind policies and programs which can bring peace and security nearer. If we are to get where we all want to get in carrying out the purposes of the United Nations, the member nations must have the backing of their peoples. To get that backing, and the necessary determination to make the United Nations succeed, requires a mass education program which will tax the abilities of governments, of international agencies, and of private organizations put together. We must face the fact that the United Nations and its aims still seem remote to most of the world's peoples. The United Nations has hardly begun to reach them in terms of their own daily lives. We must all work together to establish that vital contact between the United Nations and the peoples of the world. I would like to comment on some ways in which the United States is approaching these needs and some new trends which we are developing in our methods of working.

AFFIRMATIVE PROGRAM FOR FREE WORLD

Such actions as in the Berlin blockade and aid to Turkey and Greece are intended to remove immediate threats to peace and to contain and prevent the development of other threats, thus prolonging the "breathing space" in which to solidify security and international cooperation.

We are also joining in activities of an entirely different order. These measures, as in our support of the United Nations, and our cooperation with other countries as in the European recovery program and in point 4, are not a reply to Communist policies and propaganda but an affirmative program offered to the free world. The success of this program of construction will ultimately put a final crimp in Communist schemes of ruling the world, but that will be a byproduct; that is not the single objective of what we are doing. If the Soviet bloc should miraculously alter overnight into free, democratic, cooperative nations, we should not change what we are doing, except to expand our cooperation and our aid to include them also. Indeed, we have already made that offer, in good faith, only to see the iron curtain pinned down more anxiously. This is an important fact for us to keep in mind and to impress on the rest of the world. We are doing what we are doing in order to preserve a climate of freedom and opportunity in the world for others and for ourselves. We are convinced that the only way to keep that climate is by building a new kind of world society, democratic in spirit and practice.

We want the American people and all other peoples of the non-Communist world to catch the vision of themselves as the fellow citizens of a truly free world, cooperating with each other in peace and friendship. In the United Nations, we already have the organization through which to carry out the affairs of that kind of world. If we succeed in establishing that kind of world—and we shall succeed—totalitarianism will be by-passed and left to collapse far behind the line of battle against the true enemies of man—disease, poverty, ignorance, and injustice. With increased understanding of the reasons for our policies and the nature of our goals, the American people will act with unity to support them.

It is equally imperative to give other peoples a better understanding of the United States and for us to have better understanding of them. This is the reason for the world-wide information programs which we conduct through the radio Voice of America, our wireless information services, our exchange of persons, and other cultural exchange programs. We are going among other peoples and bringing many of them here so that they may get to know us as we really are, and we may get to know them. Out of this kind of mutual understanding, grows mutual trust and a greater capacity to work together.

STRENGTHENING UNESCO'S WORK

In this matter of gaining the understanding and support of the American and of other peoples in the needs and purposes of the free world, it is wholly fitting and necessary that the United States should do everything in its power to strengthen UNESCO's work. We are in the happy position of knowing that UNESCO's services in improving international understanding will also serve to advance the national interests of all members of the free community of nations, including the United States. The aims of the UNESCO constitution exactly express our aspirations for the world.

There are additional reasons for our interest in seeing an expansion in the work of the National Commission and of UNESCO in the fields of cultural exchange and circulation of information. First, such exchanges offer one of the most immediate ways in which the American people can take an active part in carrying out our foreign policy. To the extent that the National Commission can step up such activities, they will broaden this opportunity for participation by individual American citizens.

Second, we place a great value on a factual exchange with other peoples, and let me stress that word "factual." We want other peoples to get an undistorted picture of us and we want to get an undistorted picture of them. We are willing to settle for the kind of factual exchange of information that UNESCO can provide as an objective, impartial international body following the principles laid down in its constitution.

I repeat, therefore, that the United States has strong reasons for giving strong support to the broadening of UNESCO's work in cultural exchange, in education, in the exchange of accurate information between the free peoples of the world. Naturally, the United States has important work of this sort to do on its own, and we are doing it.

In fact, we are now preparing major proposals in this field for submission to the responsible authorities. They will embrace important new steps for increasing the effectiveness of the Voice of America, of our international information operation, and of our educational program.

NEED FOR WIDER UNESCO PROGRAM

My deep interest in UNESCO, my faith in its ideals, my conviction that it can play a vital role in the world today—all these are known. But I say to you frankly that I do not think UNESCO has thus far measured up to what Director General Torres Bodet called "its noble mission." I hope the delegations of the free community of nations which will assemble at the UNESCO conference at Florence will determine that UNESCO shall make this noble mission into much more than a phrase.

To carry out this mission, UNESCO must have a program and a plan of action looking, not only to the distant peace, but also to the immediate problems which divide the world and threaten the rights and freedoms which give meaning to the UNESCO constitution.

Unfortunately, UNESCO cannot reach all the people of the world. In some countries the door is closed to its message, and its voice is altogether too weak to reach effectively the masses of the people. Therefore, its voice must be strengthened. I hope an important and constructive feature of the forthcoming general conference will be to strengthen very greatly the means by which UNESCO transmits its message to the world.

Here in the United States we are witnessing the benefits of UNESCO's influence. We recognize the value of the educational activities which the National Commission is sponsoring here. It is of both practical and historical importance that today, in primary and secondary schools, colleges, and universities, millions of American students are studying the United Nations, getting to know something of international relations and seriously undertaking the job of understanding the traditions and ways of life of other people. The similar studies being conducted by organizations, clubs, and community groups are of equal importance. Out of this education we are bound to derive more unity among the American people in support of policies and programs for the strengthening of the free world. We can expect the American people to take a more active interest and a more active part in our foreign policy.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION IN FOREIGN POLICY

The importance of this public participation is clear enough when we realize that, in the total aspect of our diplomacy, the whole United States is acting before the world as its own representative. People abroad look at everything we say and do, in trying to understand us and to anticipate our probable attitudes. We need to demonstrate to the rest of the world, therefore—

That we are united behind a generous policy toward others;

That we are in earnest about building international cooperation;

That we have at home the strong democracy which we advocate for others.

That we will work, in cooperation with every nation willing to join in a common effort, for the removal of barriers to the interchange of ideas, of persons, of materials, of goods, and services. Yes; that we genuinely seek full and free communication and exchange with all peoples of good will, in whatever part of the world they live—as we move forward in our effort to build a peaceful world.

Effects of Imports on Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

STATEMENT OF O. R. STRACKBEIN, CHAIRMAN OF THE NATIONAL LABOR-MANAGEMENT COUNCIL ON FOREIGN TRADE POLICY, BEFORE THE STEED SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR ON THE EFFECTS OF IMPORTS ON EMPLOYMENT, MAY 2, 1950

This hearing represents the first congressional inquiry that has been addressed specifically to the effects of imports on employment and also represents recognition of the import problem in a new light.

Mr. Chairman, your committee is to be congratulated for providing this opportunity for a fresh approach to an old question. The import problem has become so submerged in threadbare arguments, pro and con, that it has until this moment become almost impossible to inject a new thought. We have repeatedly called attention to the fact that while the tariff argument has proceeded in its traditional channels, the very grounds have shifted beneath our feet and thrown old views out of focus. Nevertheless, the old ideas and views stubbornly persist. This hearing should go far to substitute present-day realities for these obsolete hold-overs of years gone by.

The traditional view of protectionism has been that it stifles competition and therefore contributes to the growth of monopoly and trusts. It has been looked upon as the instrument of the robber barons, enabling them to exact high prices from consumers and thus to grow rich and powerful. Lack of competition, moreover, it was said, led to inefficiency and to indifference to public convenience and welfare. Altogether the protectionist was pictured as a sinister character, quite devoid of any sense of social responsibility.

This picture may or may not have been an accurate reflection of the facts in the past. In any event it no longer represents the facts today. Those who are most interested in protection today are those who face the loss of employment, the reduction of wages, and the prospect of curtailing output or even closing down as a result of foreign competition.

It is not the huge mass-production industries, not the monopolies, or near monopolies, that fear the increasing competition induced by additional tariff reductions. Such industries have the advantages of assembly-line production, automatic or semiautomatic machinery and many economies that come from the installation of extensive and costly processes. Their man-hour productivity is generally sufficiently high to offset the relatively high wages that prevail in this country. In other words, they enjoy a relatively low unit cost of production and can generally outproduce their foreign competitors.

It is rather the smaller industries, producers of a wide variety of goods that are consumed throughout the country, that do feel and will feel yet more the impact of foreign competition if tariffs are further reduced. These industries are scattered over the whole country, from coast to coast, and represent the source of livelihood of thousands of communities and hundreds of thousands of workers.

Such industries and producers are not properly represented as plutocratic groups, harboring sinister motives, bent on plundering the public and lining their own pockets. Nor are they inefficient or obsolete industries, as measured by any reasonable standards. They are industries dedicated to the production of goods for which there is a public demand and a public need. Their employees are similar to those found in any other industries, possessed of the necessary skill and animated by the same sound and healthy desires to retain their employment in sound enterprises.

It is a libel against these people to classify them as greedy or inefficient. It is wrong to look upon operations that retain a greater element of artisanship than is present in production lines, as backward or obsolete. Such work is psychologically preferable to the monotonous, fractionalized and impersonalized stint on the moving lines of mass production. There is nothing to apologize for on behalf of the smaller industries of this country. At the core they may be more sound than the giants. They certainly hold a vital place in our national economy; and anything that threatens them is a threat to that economy and to the political system supported by it.

To identify their efforts to prevent unfair foreign competition with the old symbols, typically set forth in the form of corpulent, greedy, wealthy, and sinister figures, always in silk hats, is not only wholly unjustified but a false representation. If such figures are still on the scene, they are no doubt singing the praises of tariff reductions, for that is where their interests lie today. They have not found it necessary in recent years to do so since the liberals who are the avowed foes of monopoly and who profess their friendship for small business, are very efficiently doing the work of the giant industries for them in this field.

They once learned in college that trusts and combinations favored protective tariffs and they have not awakened to the new facts since. While these liberals are baying at the base of the old tree, the fox is doing very well somewhere else. Recently he has been found more and more frequently running with the hounds. Today he is having considerable success in having the hounds chase themselves around.

It is possible that this committee may be able to bring this picture into a new perspective. The opportunity is enhanced beceuse the committee is taking a new approach. This will give it a new view, at a different angle from the old. It will look at the problem from its bearing on employment and relative wage and living standards. The import duty or other form of import control thus becomes a different instrument from the obsolete one condemned by Woodrow Wilson and Cordell Hull. It will be accpted as complementary to other economic supporting devices to which as a nation we have subscribed, such as national minimum wages and parity prices for farm products; not as a device fashioned for the enrichment of a favored segment of the economy.

The purpose of minimum wage legislation is to make it possible for the employers who pay fair wages to continue to do so without exposing themselves to destructive competition from those who would adhere to lower standards. The object of parity prices for farm products is to prevent one very important producing group from falling below other groups with respect to living standards and as buyers of industrial products.

The object of the tariff is to prevent our wage and labor standards from crumbling under the onslaught of foreign competition which finds its advantage in lower wages and poorer working conditions.

What has this objective to do with building of trusts and monopolies? What has it to do with creating inefficiency? What is the difference in principle between this kind of protection and that provided by minimum wages or price parity for farm products? There is no difference. Justification of the one carries justification for the other.

How, on the other hand, reconcile the maintenance of minimum wages and parity farm prices with the open exposure of our workers to unfair competition from across the border or from abroad, where our minimum wage laws do not penetrate and where our labor organizations cannot through their own efforts establish higher standards? The need for protection of the American producer against unfair foreign competition is therefore, if anything, more urgent than protecting one employer in this country from the unfair competition of other domestic employers who pay less than the prevailing wages.

Obviously there is nothing in the present demand for protection of labor standards against erosion from imports that can be placed in the same category as the old protective tariff grants that were described rightly or wrongly as "grabs." There is little possibility today that the employer groups would retain for themselves the major advantages gained from protection. In fact we do not ask that any margin of advantage be conferred upon the American producer. The request is simply for competitive parity with imports, no more, no less. This would provide no margin for consumer gouging or for extra profit returns or for inefficiency.

Needless to say, the problem before us is both complex and perplexing. Because of the special conditions brought about by two world wars we face internationally certain pressing effects of the economic dislocations produced by the two conflicts. Specifically, we are faced with the dollar-gap problem at the very time when it is imperative, if we ourselves would remain solvent, that this country maintain an unusually high level of national income and that it do not countenance deflation.

We need to maintain a very high level of employment, a high level of wages, and a high level of production. This alone will maintain for us the high level of national income which is necessary to carry the heavy tax burden, which in turn is necessary to meet our high national obligations. These are now somewhat above the $40,000,000,000 level per year, and considering the interest payments on the national debt, benefits to veterans and outlays for national defense, not to mention foreign aid, there is no immediate prospect of any very appreciable reduction in the budget.

It appears, therefore, that we are committed, whether we like it or not, to a high level of prices. There is no possibility this side of economic disaster of going back to the 1939 price level or anywhere near it. In other words, we are not in the same position with respect to foreign competition as before the war. We are highly vulnerable to the onslaught of deflation. We are on an economic plateau and must stay there for some time to come. If we come down, the descent must be gradual.

The claim of consumers to the lower prices that imports would bring if they were admitted without any impediment or under lower ones than now exist, loses its force under the circumstances. We cannot have

much lower prices than the present ones and maintain the national income at its necessary high level.

Those who consider methods of meeting the stubborn dollar-gap problem almost uniformly conclude that this country must increase its imports. Otherwise Europe cannot earn the necessary dollars. Therefore, it is concluded, we should open up our market to a greater flow of imports. Also, it is said that unless we do this our exports will dry up and workers will be thrown out of jobs.

This is all true—as far as it goes.

What, on the other hand, will happen if imported goods, flowing inward more freely because of lower barriers, take a greater share of the consumer dollar in a buyer's market? Imports never affect employment adversely in a seller's market. That is because a seller's market by its very nature means a shortage of goods in relation to demand. Imports superimposed upon a buyer's market represent something quite different.

What then if several hundred million or a billion dollars of additional goods are to come in from Europe? Our productive processes as it is are today not absorbing the additional hundreds of thousands who come from the schools and colleges into the labor market every year. Under such conditions what will be the effect of increased imports? What, especially will these impacts be if the goods come in, duty paid, at prices that our producers cannot meet?

Obviously, the impact will create pressure on employment and wages. Both will decline. This decline will be reflected in the national income and this lower income in turn will show up in lower tax collections. Shall we then raise taxes? That would hardly put workers back on the pay roll.

One of the sources looked to for greater employment lies in outlays for plant expansion, new investments in capital goods, etc. When a wide variety of industries face the prospect of keener foreign competition in the home market, enthusiasm for plant expansion and capital investment is dampened on a wide front. Thus another avenue of worker absorption is narrowed by imports.

To date the Economic Cooperation Administration has played the spotlight upon imports from Europe. But this is only half the problem. The other part is Japan. The threat to wage and labor standards from the Far East is even more perilous to our economy than from Europe. There is no evidence that the Economic Cooperation Administration problem has been integrated with the Japanese problem so far as the import question is concerned. Yet it is highly important that this be done.

Altogether the import flow, under present levels of the tariff and quite apart from proposed additional reductions, presents a deflationary threat of high magnitude. The Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson, has conceded public responsibility for the workers who may be displaced as well as for industry that may be driven out of business by increased imports fostered as a means of bridging the dollar gap.

The problem is not as simple as that.

The type of foreign competition that will close factories in our smaller miscellaneous industries will also have sufficient power to put in motion a deflationary spiral. It is assumed that other industries would be in a position to absorb the retrained workers. This is a gratuitous assumption.

Those displaced by imports would be added to those who are already unemployed. Where would the openings for reabsorption occur? Would the pottery or glass or hat workers, or fishermen, or wallpaper craftsmen, or oil workers, or workers in watch or shoe factories, who had been displaced by imports, go to Detroit and knock on the doors of the automobile industry, or to Pittsburgh to be taken into employment in the steel industry? How far would they get?

What would the personnel officers in those centers say to these clamoring applicants for jobs, assuming that the displaced persons had the funds to make the trip or that the Government had provided them with transportation? Would they receive them with open arms? Obviously a number of difficult and embarrassing questions would arise.

The disruption of industry in its accustomed form creates problems that require something more for their solution than an exercise in some mental chess game. Simply to reduce the dollar-gap problem to a syllogism and then to proceed as if the solution to the problem had been found will not dispose of the stubborn facts. Nor does it help to minimize these difficulties as merely local or to dispose of them by reducing them to a flat percentage of the whole economy. What will be the answer when the error of these glib assumptions comes crashing down on our heads? Who will stand up then and say that those who protested were merely spokesmen of selfish interests? Or, worse yet, merely sectional groups?

Thus simply to say that unless we increase our imports, our exports will decline and with it will come unemployment, is not even stating the whole problem, much less offering a solution. It does raise the question whether the export interests are endowed with some particular quality that raises them above producers for the domestic market. In other words, why are the export interests on the side of the angels? What bestows a halo upon them?

It has been said that there is a greater labor content in products made for export than in those that are imported. This is a half-truth cunningly put forward to convince the unwary and the layman. The statement is based on the fact that a heavy portion of our imports consist of raw products and semimanufactures while our exports are principally in the form of manufactured goods.

In 1948, for example, 48.2 percent of our imports consisted of crude materials and crude foodstuffs and 23 percent consisted of semimanufactures, bringing the total for these classes to 71 percent of our total imports. Finished manufactures represented only 18.4 percent of our imports and manufactured foodstuffs only 10.3 percent or a total of 28.7 percent for the two classes.

On the other hand, 56.5 percent of our exports in 1948 consisted of finished manufactures and an additional 10.5 percent was in the form of manufactured foodstuffs. This made a total of 67 percent of our exports in manufactured products. Only 22 percent were in the form of raw materials and crude foodstuffs. Semimanufactures amounted to 10.9 percent.

This is quite impressive. More work is expended on manufactured products, which we predominantly export, than on raw materials, which we predominantly import.

However, from 60 to 65 percent of our imports are free of duty and therefore do not enter into the discussion. Among these duty-free items are an important array of raw materials such as crude rubber, coffee, bananas, cocoa beans, raw furs, wood pulp, tin, tea, etc.

Now, it is notoriously true that these products come principally from Latin America and Asia. Imports from Europe, exclusive of Russia, on the other hand, normally consist principally of manufactured products. From 1936-40 over half of our imports from Europe consisted of such products, or 51.6 percent. If semimanufactures are included the percentage rises to 80.6.

Obviously, the labor content in imports from Europe is as high as it is in our exports; and it is principally the manufactured items such as we import from Europe, that are dutiable, as contrasted with the raw materials that we import principally from South America and Asia, which are principally duty free.

Therefore, the assertion that our exports have a higher labor content than our imports is true; but it would be false to say the same thing about those of our imports that are dutiable; and only if it could truthfully be said of them, would the statement have any meaning.

On this score there is nothing then that sets the export interests apart as deserving of special governmental solicitude.

The fact is that our postwar exports have been maintained at swollen levels because (1) the war-torn nations were dependent upon us for survival and reconstruction and (2) during the war we undertook to supply markets vacated by Japan, England, Germany, and other exporting countries.

Now, as these nations are recovering, two expected results are emerging: (1) They do not need as large a volume of our goods as before and (2) they are resuming shipments to their prewar export markets. All this adds up to reduced exports from this country.

Postwar readjustments would normally be expected to follow a course of this kind, and when they do the trend should not be the cause of surprise. On the other hand, our exporters would like to retain the war-gained markets. In order to do so they want their associate producers in this country to move over and make way for a greater market here for European goods than the latter enjoyed before the war. This increased market is to be offered as a substitute, in part at least, for the prewar markets that Europe enjoyed elsewhere and that we now continue to hold precariously. The purpose is to keep the shrinkage of exports to a minimum.

And our Government is giving full support to this strange act of brotherly love. It is marshaling all the arguments in support thereof that can be found. The giant mass-producing and exporting interests are the presumed beneficiaries of the policy; but of substantive proof of the so-called over-all benefits of this program there is none.

It is a mystery why, as a matter of national policy, we should strain to attain a dependency on exports such as other nations would give a kingdom to be rid of.

What are the alternatives?

Assuming that imports were permitted simply to take their course, without further stimulation, what trend would they be expected to take? Undoubtedly they would increase, so long as our national income remains at its present high level. Imports from Europe would be expected to gravitate toward their prewar share of this market.

From 1921 to 1935, averaged by 5-year periods (1921–25; 1926–30; 1931–35) Europe supplied 30 percent of our imports (30.4, 29.9, 30.1 percent, respectively, for the 5-year periods given above). During the 1936–40 5-year period this dropped to 25.3 percent. Thereafter a decline set in until the low point of 7.1 percent was reached in 1943.

By 1946 this had climbed back to 16.3 percent, after which a slight decline set in. In 1948 it was 15.7 percent and in 1949 it fell to 13.9 percent.

On the other hand, more of our imports have come from Canada and South America. Fourteen and eight-tenths percent of our imports came from Canada in the 1936–40 period. In 1949 this percentage stood at 23.4 percent. In the case of South America the respective percentages were 13.6 percent and 22.6 percent.

How much of this shift is permanent is not known. Before 1910 over 50 percent of our imports came from Europe. During the First World War (1915–20) this share fell to 20.3 percent. Europe was more resilient after that war, and in the 1921–25 period Europe rose to 30.4 percent as a source of our imports. Despite this springback, Europe never recaptured her pre-War I share of our market. In fact, the 1921–25 share was the highest 5-year percentage attained since then.

Perhaps Europe has lost further to Canada and South America on a permanent basis.

However, it should be expected that she would regain a greater share of our market in the next 5 years than in the past 5.

The over-riding question is not how big a share of the market but rather how large a share of how large a market. In other words, the prime consideration is the continued prosperity of the United States.

The question then arises what line of action, in this field, will be most conducive to continued properity and which would have the greatest influence in the opposite direction. Would, for example, the reduction of tariffs in order to increase imports give greater assurance of continued high employment and a high national income than the alternative of continuing financial aid to Europe without stimulating imports by further tariff reductions?

There is little question that the discontinuance of aid would check exports even more than they are due to decline in any event. In other words, discontinuance of aid would shrink the market for American products. This would spell unemployment in the export industries.

Would it be more conducive then to continued prosperity, so far as this is dependent upon action in this field, to stimulate imports by tariff concessions as a means of sustaining exports at a lesser reduced rate, than it would be to let the imports alone and make up the dollar-gap by grants and loans?

Reduced tariffs would cause unemployment in a wide variety of industries in this country. This would perhaps cost the Treasury as much as European aid. If so, nothing would be saved and, in fact, much greater unemployment would be risked through the onset of deflation.

Continued cash outlays for Europe would spread the burden equally over the country. Europe would continue to buy here. Exports would be subsidized to the extent of the dollar-gap, as has been done under the Economic Cooperation Administration. If Europe can regain a share of our market approaching her prewar share, without specific stimulation, she will earn a considerably greater number of dollars than in recent years, provided our economic level has not declined. Our tariffs are already appreciably lower than in 1939. Two multilateral trade agreements have been negotiated since then, as well as several bilateral agreements.

This course would avoid the grave risk of driving the smaller miscellaneous industries in this country to the wall, throwing hundreds of thousands of the workers out of employment and pressing heavily upon the labor market in the mass-production industries.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, let me say that the present investigation is pointed in the right direction. It is pointed at the phase of the import problem that most concerns the workers in this country: namely, the effect of imports on employment and labor standards. As indicated at the beginning, there has been a great need of a new approach to the import question. This new approach has the supreme virtue of addressing itself to the most important phase of import competition, i. e., the effect on our workers and their living standards.

No Appeasement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 2, 1950

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therein an editorial by William Green, of the American Federation of Labor, appearing in the April issue of the American Federationist.

This article should be read by every Member of the House. Our attitude as a Nation toward the Kremlin, having been one of appeasement, has undoubtedly encouraged the Moscow Government in its policy of irritation, obstruction, and opposition to world peace.

NO APPEASEMENT

(By William Green)

The crucial fact that blocks world peace is the existence of an aggressive nation which at every important turn in national events reiterates its dogma that capitalism and communism cannot exist together in the same world. This dogma ignores the fact that they did exist together until the U. S. S. R. set out to execute its plans for aggression after the Second World War. Looking back, we can clearly see that at every strategic phase of the war the conditions insisted on by the Kremlin were in accord with its blueprint for later aggression.

The Communist political commissars accompanied the Russian Army with the secret police as camp followers. Trained Communists moved in as the military lines moved west. The essential conquest took place before the West awakened to the implications of the Soviet possession of the Balkans. Likewise with Asia, where under secret terms of treaties we reversed pledges to our ally, China, while the U. S. S. R. made ready to move into North China and into the heartland of Asia.

In a period of a few brief years, without formal war declaration but by strategy, trickery, and invention of nonmilitary methods of securing the fruits of military aggression, the U. S. S. R. now dominates eastern Europe to the Elbe, more than half of Asia, and has increased the number of people under Moscow's rule from 200,000,000 to 800,000,000. The Kremlin is poised now in Berlin, where weeks ago the Soviet agents announced a youth demonstration to take over the former capital. The Communists have mobilized east German police forces and are said to have numbers of Asian divisions either in Prussia or Poland. The U. S. S. R. is also hovering over southeast Asia in the hope of obtaining control of the almost unlimited resources of that region. Turkey and Iran are also in danger as well as the dissident Tito of Yugoslavia.

We are in a serious situation which the diplomats of the democratic world failed to avert. Our own Government and many of our people failed at first to understand Communist purposes and methods.

There is yet time to prevent the iron curtain from shutting in if we move promptly and effectively. Many in the Soviet Union and in eastern Europe do not have the faintest idea of what democracy is or what it means. But evidence of resistant groups still fighting against arbitrary tyranny, still trying to have a decent life proves that human detestation of tyranny has not been killed. The frequent purges in the U. S. S. R. and controlled areas, wiping out all who have liberal tendencies and who do not servilely follow each new twist of the politburo, indicate that the Kremlin seeks security at home for some new aggression.

The American Federation of Labor is one organizatiozn that has never trusted the Kremlin. We were long a voice in the wilderness, calling for an international trade-union federation free from Stalin's orders. At last such an organization has been established. The International Confederation of Free Trade Unions is now ready to function. It will be ably supported by the International Transport Workers Federation, the heroic organization which rescued workers in Axis territory from Hitler's fury during the war and furnished aid to free trade-unions and to the resistance movements in many countries. This is the organization that will rally freedom-loving seamen and longshoremen to land defense equipment in Europe under the North Atlantic Treaty. These two great organizations of free labor should have the active support of our Government.

But this is not enough. All organized groups of democratic citizens in this and other countries should band together to get aid to the underground forces courageously fighting the cause of democracy for us. Employers, technicians, professional groups, religious organizations should make their contributions early and work steadily for the cause of liberty until totalitarian despotism is defeated.

This is not an easy undertaking. It will require sacrifice and devotion to carry it through, but each age develops those to do its distinctive work. Every segment of society should assume its responsibility for winning the cold war which the Communists initiated and are directing at our whole Nation.

We have many citizens who are familiar with foreign countries and can serve our Nation and the cause of human liberty by helping to organize and maintain resistance in the nations grabbed by Stalin. These resistance groups would provide the best possible intelligence sources to guide all our efforts in the cold war.

This is one contribution all groups and all exiles can make for achieving lasting peace.

Three Extremely Interesting News Items

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 26, 1950

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, there appeared on the front page of the April 28 issue of the Washington Star a brief news item about ECA purchase of Canadian wheat for England, which should be of considerable interest to United States taxpayers. Then in looking through my files I came to another news item printed in the Star of February 23 reporting ECA purchases, grants, and importations which I am sure must be of interest to the American people. For fear that these news items might refer to the same transaction I conferred with the ECA to ascertain just how much wheat we were buying with our money from one part of the British Empire to give to another part of the Empire with the result that I learned that in the month of September 1949 that a British delegation above the ministerial level came to this country and reported to our Government the rapid deterioration of the United Kingdom's dollar and gold reserves and that a conference was had with the upper echelons within our Departments of State, Treasury, Agriculture, and the ECA, with the result that an arrangement was made for the ECA to purchase $175,000,000 worth of Canadian wheat to be given to the United Kingdom. It now develops that commitments for the entire $175,000,000 to purchase Canadian wheat

have been issued as well as $30,000,000 to procure United States wheat for the United Kingdom have also been issued.

In view of this situation and these transactions financed by the United States taxpayers it is of interest to read the third news item concerning recent gold discoveries and mining development in South Africa taken from the May 3 issue of the Pathfinder.

[From the Washington Star of April 28, 1950]

BRITAIN GETS ECA WHEAT

Great Britain was granted $35,000,000 today to buy Canadian wheat under the Marshall plan. The Economic Cooperation Administration said the grain-buying will begin immediately and continue until June 30. Delivery must be made by August 31.

[From the Washington Star of April 23, 1950]

BRITISH GET $45,000,000 IN ECA FUNDS FOR WHEAT FROM UNITED STATES AND CANADA

Great Britain today received authority to buy $45,000,000 worth of American and Canadian wheat under the Marshall plan.

The Economic Cooperation Administration announced the recovery spending approval in new foreign-aid allotments to seven European countries.

ECA said the British funds will be used to buy $30,000,000 of Canadian wheat. The remaining $15,000,000 is earmarked for wheat and flour from the United States.

The Agency set a May 31 deadline for completion of contracts for the wheat shipments. It said deliveries of the Canadian grain must be made by July 31 and the American deliveries by June 30.

NORWAY REQUEST APPROVED

It was the first big grain purchase by Britain approved this year by ECA.

Buying of the Canadian grain was okayed, ECA officials said, to enable Britain to meet its commitments under the international wheat agreement.

ECA also granted Norway $2,150,000 to buy United States wheat and wheat flour. Delivery specifications were the same as for the British purchases in this country.

OTHER COMMITMENTS

The day's transactions brought total Marshall-plan recovery commitments to $8,374,444,000 since start of the European recovery program nearly 2 years ago.

Included in the latest grants were:

France, $1,275,000 to buy crude oil and petroleum from the United States, the Middle East, and Latin America as well as $300,000 worth of nonferrous ores from Canada; Sweden, $730,000 to pay for industrial metals, chemicals, and professional equipment from the United States and Canada; Holland, $300,000 worth of nonferrous ores from Latin America and naval stores from the United States; Portugal, $220,000 to pay ocean-transportation costs; and Ireland, $148,000 worth of United States motor vehicles.

[From Pathfinder of May 3, 1950]

AFRICAN GOLD RUSH

In April 1946, near the little South African village of Odendaalsrust, 150 miles southwest of Johannesburg, a drill crew looking for gold cut a reef about three-fourths of a mile deep. Anxiously, they pulled up a sample piece of the rock.

Assayers found the sample had enough gold, at $35 an ounce, to make a ton of similar ore worth $2,000—275 times richer than the average grade of ore from the Rand.[1]

[1] Witwatersrand (Ridge of White Waters) is the famous gold field near Johannesburg and, until the Odendaalsrust strike, the greatest known concentration of gold.

GOLD

Unlike the rush of '86, the rush of '46 was to the London and Johannesburg stock markets, not to the open fields. The open fields were controlled by five big Johannesburg mining companies. By last week they were spending £200,000,000 developing 13 mines—all within a 14-mile radius of a fast-growing boom town called Welkom.

Four years ago on Welkom's present site there wasn't a single hut. Today there are 500 houses and 500 more are going up—most of them with electricity and hot water.

Like New York City, Welkom's biggest problem is water. The miners strike plenty of it but it's either salty or brackish. To get good water they had to build a pipe line from the Vaal River which is now pumping in about 500,000 gallons a day. By 1958—when all 13 mines will be operating—47,000,000 gallons a day will be needed.

The man with the biggest stake in the Welkom gold mines is Sir Ernest Oppenheimer, a modern Cecil Rhodes. As a multimillionaire head of the Anglo-American Corp. of South Africa, Sir Ernest owns 7 of the 13 mines in the Welkom area. But that isn't all the property Oppie owns.

Born in Friedberg, Germany, in 1880, the son of a Jewish cigar merchant, Sir Ernest went in 1902 to head a London diamond concern's South African office. In 1917 he got the break that helped make him one of the richest men in the world.

Oppie heard of some gold fields in what is now known as the Rand, that seemed promising. Unable to get his firm to bid for them, he went to London and got an introduction to Herbert Hoover, who in turn introduced him to J. P. Morgan. He persuaded Morgan to back him with £100,000,000 in United States credits, formed the Anglo-American Corp., and bought the gold fields.

DIAMONDS

Within a few years, and with the help of the South African Government, he got control of some diamond mines. After forcing himself into the tight London diamond syndicate, he started after the famous De Beers House. Quietly he bought 200,000 shares of De Beers stock and in 1926 told the directors that he wanted to be made a member of the board. Three years later he was chairman.

He brought his mining companies through the crash of 1929 and the depression. Today, besides his gold interests, Oppie controls 9 percent of the world's copper, 45 percent of South Africa's coal, 50 percent of its iron and steel production, and he sits on top of the diamond monopoly by controlling 95 percent of the world's yearly output.

From the 13 Welkom mines, when they reach full production, South Africa and Sir Ernest are expecting an annual flow of ore worth £50,000,000. Says Oppie, and he certainly ought to know, "It's the most extensive mining development the world has ever known."

Biggest Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the eighth article by Mr. Frank Waldrop on the infiltration of communism in our country:

BIGGEST STORY

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

The Washington, D. C., housewife who put her laundry in the home washer yesterday may not know it but she is a figure of scandal before the Communists of the world, from the Kremlin in Moscow to the State Department in this city.

They have to see her in that light or else deny their own story of the world. And that no Communist dares to do.

Just the same, she does in fact explode the politics and philosophy of the man who organized the Communist view of things, Karl Heinrich Marx, of Trier, Germany.

Marx happened to live in a moment when the world was just learning what can be done with machinery.

But he was crazy, so he spent the years of his life, 1818 to 1852, in a personal war against civilization, which he hated because it outwitted him.

Civilization itself, in those years, learned how to make machinery produce and move goods at a rate and volume unimaginable to the world before.

There were disasters as well as triumphs. But just the same civilization was on the rise, wealth and light were growing.

But not for Marx. The machine, to his mind, was being used to depress and destroy. And he laid it down as inevitable that as machinery increased its grip on civilization, violent revolts would follow.

Such is the starting point for the doctrine of scientific Marxism, which holds that as a nation becomes increasingly industrial the contradictions of capitalism make revolt automatic, inevitable, and irresistible.

The chief industrial nations of Marx's time were England, France, and Germany. And so Marx died convinced that the laws of his science would, as sure as the sunrise, establish a dictatorship of the proletariat over the machines through revolution generated in their great manufacturing cities.

He could not imagine a condition such as we have in modern America, in which machinery has been made the household drudge, and luxuries beyond the reach of kings are made for one-room apartments and prefabricated cottages.

If Marx could ride on the Pennsylvania Railroad between New York and Washington, today, and see the television aerials sticking out of even the shabbiest slums, he would have to declare either his eyes or his science a lie.

But the basic idiocy of Marx's story of the world was proved long before the arrival of television and automatic washing machines.

Marx, in his ignorance, laid down the rule that the more industrialized a nation, the sooner its downfall and overturn to the scientific socialism of his design.

That is why the embarrassment of facts strains scientific Marxism so hard today that Communists all over the world live under the most rigid and brutal discipline. They do not dare look at the world as others do, or let anybody under their rule do so.

For the world of fact nowhere has obeyed the dictates of scientific Marxism.

For example, when a handful of Communists actually captured a nation, they did so, not in the most industrial part of the world, as Marx had said must follow in accord with his law of behavior, but in a land that had hardly emerged from the forest primeval.

Of all the states on the continent of Europe, Russia in 1900 was the least industrial and the most devoted to farm life.

Such a nation, according to the science of Marxism would be the last to arrive in the Socialist wonderland.

And so it came about that the last pretensions of truth in scientific Marxism were blown to bits by World War I.

The great industrial powers were in terrible collision, then. Civilization itself was

put to mortal stress. Yet the Communists failed to capture a single one of the industrial centers.

Indeed, not to this very day have the mass of the people behaved in a single country of this world as Marx had predicted they must.

Marx's philosophy of a Socialist society run on Communist lines is just a ragbag of generalities, as full of holes as a Swiss cheese.

It can be made to seem a rule that fits a case only by throwing away the whole of human knowledge and experience.

Even then it passes only with people held down by the most cruel discipline of mind and body.

Marxism is no success as a scientific explanation of the world. And it would not be a bother to anybody, today, if its early believers had been treated with intelligence.

From here on in, this series deals mainly with men who gambled on Marx being right, and how they fared.

A False Picture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 2, 1950

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Frank R. Kent, which appeared in the Sioux City Sunday Journal of April 30, 1950:

WASHINGTON.—Mr. Truman's contention that a splendid prosperity still prevails in our country and that everything is lovely in our domestic situation is not easy to sustain unless you ignore some pretty pregnant facts and do not care what you say anyhow. Yet, undoubtedly it is the Truman intention to make this his basic appeal to the people on the "nonpolitical" tour of the country which with a great fanfare of administration trumpets he begins this week.

The fact is that recent developments in Washington have made it clear that this assumption is completely fraudulent. The chief of these, of course, is the official revelation that the Truman estimates of the Federal deficit for the fiscal year ending July 1, 1950, is $1,200,000,000 short, which means a net deficit for the current year of $6,100,000,000 instead of $4,900,000,000. And for the year ending July 1, 1951, Senator GEORGE, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, estimates a deficit of $7,300,000,000.

In brief, from democratic sources it is officially estimated that in 14 months the net deficit will exceed $14,000,000. This is so far beyond the administration estimates as to make them seem absurd.

Now, what this really means is that the Federal finances are altogether out of control. When the President and his financial advisers misguess revenues and receipts by $3,000,000,000 (which is an understatement of what they have done) it means that they have lost all sense of the fiscal realities and have no real conception of actual conditions.

When to this you add Senator BYRD's incontrovertible figures showing that excluding interest on the national debt, money appropriated for national defense, the Marshall plan and foreign aid and social security, our expenditures for purely domestic purposes has increased nearly 30 percent since 1948. Few clear headed persons will dispute the statement that our Federal finances are in a run-away condition—and that our fiscal situation is a perilous one.

Considering all these things, it is certainly pertinent to inquire what is this prosperity for which Mr. Truman claims full credit? Is it solid or is it fictitious? Is the breast-beating statement of Leon Keyserling, acting chairman of the council of economic advisers, that "no matter how you measure it, the situation is very, very good" justified or is it just the outgiving of a New Deal-Fair Deal job holder who calls himself an economist without any clearly recognized title to do so?

There is a very strong argument to be made that the sort of prosperity for which Mr. Truman claims credit and to which he intends to point on his nonpolitical trip starting next week is in fact a thoroughly false prosperity. To take this sort of prosperity seriously is to expose ourselves to a shock from which it will be hard to recover.

For the truth is, the prosperity about which the President boasts comes from the fact that the Government is annually spending $6,000,000,000 more than it takes in in taxes. This is a tremendous sum. With it, huge subsidies for the farmers, maintenance for the indigent, idle, and thriftless, provision for countless unnecessary jobholders, and for numerous unnecessary purposes are supplied. All of this money is put into circulation. Along with the vast sums spent on foreign aid and in prosecution of the cold war, it bolsters salaries and incomes of individuals and, satisfying our immediate appetite, gives us a false sense of security.

The fact is that every day the national debt gets larger and the national finances more deplorably unmanageable. This isn't real prosperity. It is about as perilous a state of affairs as well can be imagined. Actually, we are living off the fat of America and it is pretty close to criminal, under these circumstances, to tell us that all is well with the country and that no one need worry about our strength and soundness because wages are up and money is plentiful.

In the war period from 1940 to 1945, we had prosperity which came just in time to rescue us from a disastrous slump as the New Deal spending policies had begun to peter out. Everybody had a job. Factories were working overtime. Ships were being built by the hundreds. Wages were shooting up. Individually, we were all prosperous then but it was a war prosperity founded on huge war expenditures and a debt which now exceeds $250,000,000,000.

The Truman administration has not curtailed domestic expenditures since 1945. On the contrary, it has vastly increased expenditures and further piled up the debt instead of reducing it. The prosperity which we now have is partly due to the tremendous demand for goods following a destructive war, and partly to the continued pouring out of Government money from the Treasury spigots. It is a prosperity fraught with grave danger, and it is the worst sort of demagogery to capitalize it for political purposes, deluding the people into believing that everything is lovely and the goose hangs high. Even those of rudimentary intelligence should know better.

Point 4

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM PICKETT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 2, 1950

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday afternoon, April 18, there appeared an editorial in the Palestine, Tex., newspaper which deals very pointedly with reasons why the point 4 program should not be adopted. Having opposed the adoption of the point 4 title of the bill extending the ECA when it was before the House recently, I offer the editor's observations for consideration of all Members of Congress, should the matter again become an issue.

The editorial follows:

POINT 4 HEADACHE

President Truman, exponent of a point 4 program which he believes would set backward nations off on a spree of development, has received some pointed advice from the representative of one of the backward nations.

George Hakim, counselor for the legation of Lebanon, says the plan to pour private capital into countries like Lebanon isn't big enough to do any good, that it would not inspire in underfed peoples an enthusiasm for democracy, and that it is but another move for exploitation on the part of the demons of private enterprise.

We are not in agreement with Hakim. We can't agree that investment by private enterprise necessarily means exploitation. But we do think Hakim's opinions give this country something to think about.

In more detail, Hakim said the masses of the poor nations are not interested in concepts of free enterprise, free competition, democracy, and human rights. He said before such abstract ideas can get any attention it is necessary first to live and not to starve.

He added: "Point 4 is based on the assumption that the old imperialism, exploitation for foreign profit, will not take place. Is it not likely that private capital in search of higher profits will exploit the workers in the underdeveloped countries?"

Let's think these things over, Mr. Truman.

Let's get out of our heads the fallacy that all the world admires the United States. It does not. And the undernourished millions of people of many lands, who make up about two-thirds of the world's population, don't even know anything about the United States.

As Hakim says, they also don't care.

We are not going to sell them on democracy until they have gained enough education to think about things more abstract than where they are going to find a suitable batch of roots to boil for their dinners.

We are not going to convince them of values of free enterprise until they have learned first that there can be more to life than a place to sleep and food enough to fill the voids in their stomachs.

Hungry people will follow a leader who promises to give them more than the last authority they had. We can't expect them to put much stock in a system of government which depends on the ability of people to take care of themselves.

And let's be honest with ourselves to this extent:

We must admit, if we are honest, that the backward peoples of the world suspect those of any country whose citizens are better off. They have a good reason to be suspect. They have been exploited by great nations for hundreds of years. They expect no great nation to move in on them without exploiting them again.

That fear is explicit in Hakim's warning. It makes point 4 look like a quixotic proposition indeed, instead of like the "bold new program" as envisioned by President Truman.

We can't win the world with the dollar, Mr. Truman, any more than we can borrow our way into prosperity at home.

Mr. Hakim has made that clear.

The Late Generoso Pope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. GARY CLEMENTE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 2, 1950

Mr. CLEMENTE. Mr. Speaker, it was with great sorrow that I learned of the death of Generoso Pope, who served for many years as a publisher of Italian-language newspapers. Continuously for over 20 years he served the interests of Americans. To Americans of Italian extraction he became a tradition. Generoso Pope was a friend of the little man. He never became too important to listen to the plea of the humblest citizen, and thousands in the country can testify to his helpful personal assistance.

Born in Italy in 1891, Generoso Pope left his family when he was 12 to come to the United States. He was an outstanding example of an immigrant who made good in America.

At his death he was president and chief stockholder of the Colonial Sand and Stone Co., Inc., the largest supplier of sand, gravel, concrete, stone and cinders to the city's construction industry; owner and publisher of Il Progresso Italo-Americano, oldest and largest Italian-language newspaper in the United States, and president and chief stockholder of the Atlantic Broadcasting Co., operators of Station WHOM.

Many observers credit him with a decisive role in saving Italy from a Communist government in the last Italian election campaign. When reports from abroad indicated that, discouraged and dispirited, the Italian people were looking with favor on the Communist cause, he organized a letters-to-Italy campaign among the readers of his newspapers. This resulted in the dispatch of thousands of letters from Americans of Italian origin in the United States to kinfolk and friends in Italy urging them to reject Russian blandishments.

Men of his caliber are few. He has made every sacrifice through work entailing inexhaustible demands of energy and virtually almost limitless patience. In the passing of Generoso Pope I feel a distinct personal loss.

Aid for School Districts Affected by Federal Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD IRVING
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 2, 1950

Mr. IRVING. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Education and Labor Committee and also a member of the subcommittee of this important committee, which has made a very extensive study of the subject and the proposed legislation pertaining thereto, it is my desire to call to the attention of the Members of the House of Representatives the grave need for such legislation, and also the Nation-wide interest in it, by inserting a speech, which, because the speaker was also presiding over the meeting, will necessarily include remarks relative to other speakers and phases of the program:

ADDRESS BY MRS. EUGENE MEYER AT MEETING OF METROPOLITAN AREA CITIZENS COMMITTEE FOR THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS FOR FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR SCHOOL DISTRICTS AFFECTED BY FEDERAL ACTIVITIES, TUESDAY, APRIL 25, 1950, AT WESTERN HIGH SCHOOL

Honored guests, fellow Americans from near and far, this is an inspiring crowd.

Let me welcome you to this meeting on behalf of the Metropolitan Area Citizens Committee for the Public Schools. The very size of this audience and the great distance some of you have traveled proves the deep interest of the American people in public education. And we can be sure of one thing—American public schools will be just as good as the people want them to be.

I should like to emphasize one point at the outset. We have not come together to discuss Federal aid to education in general. We are here to discuss only two bills, H. R. 7940 and H. R. 8113, both introduced by the Honorable CLEVELAND M. BAILEY. These bills are to provide Federal aid for the operation and construction of schools in almost a thousand localities where the activities of the Federal Government have created a sudden and often an overwhelming increase in the population. Thirty-four such communities from sixteen different States—from the east to the west coast—are represented here tonight with delegations.

The hosts tonight are twelve governmental units around the Nation's Capital, who have formed the Metropolitan Area Citizens Committee for the Public Schools. All of them are struggling to build schools for a rapidly mounting child population, most of them children of Federal workers.

These local areas are: Anne Arundel County, Calvert County, Charles County, Harford County, Montgomery County, Prince George's County and St. Mary's County—all of Maryland—and from Virginia, Alexandria, Arlington, Fairfax County, Falls Church, and Prince William County.

Those of us who live in the District of Columbia regret that the exclusion of the Nation's Capital from the benefits of these bills was unavoidable. But we are accustomed to being the step-children of Congress. And we know this—if you people who have votes can get help in this crisis, the District schools will eventually derive direct and indirect benefit from the alleviation of the school problems in the surrounding area. Though a resident of the District myself, I have tried to show my interest in the children of the nearby counties by describing the terrible conditions with which their school systems are struggling. I only regret that I could not be in two places at once and accept the invitations I received from some of you in various parts of the country to do the same kind of studies.

But we must express our gratitude tonight to nine hard-working Congressmen who devoted two solid months to making just such studies throughout the country. During October and November of last year they made 23 stops in 17 States and held hearings of from 2 to 5 days in each place. They often put in days from 9 a. m. to 11 p. m. As we all have good reason to be grateful to these men, I am going to call their names and ask them to rise: Representative CLEVELAND M. BAILEY, of West Virginia; Representative TOM STEED, of Oklahoma; Representative LEONARD IRVING, of Missouri; Representative THRUSTON BALLARD MORTON, of Kentucky; Representative THOMAS H. BURKE, of Ohio; Representative ROY W. WIER, of Minnesota; Representative CARL D. PERKINS, of Kentucky; Representative SAMUEL K. MCCONNELL, JR., of Pennsylvania; Representative THOMAS H. WERDEL, of California. And last but not least, we wish to thank Representative JOHN LESINSKI, of Michigan, who appointed the committees and made the money available for their Nation-wide study.

We must not forget that a Senate committee under Senator HUMPHREY also held similar hearings at the last congressional session and reported out a bill which passed the Senate.

I am sure this audience will be glad to know that many other Congressmen are with us tonight. We are profoundly grateful for their interest and their presence. Their names are: Senator ELMER THOMAS, of Oklahoma; Representative L. MENDEL RIVERS, of South Carolina; Representative HENDERSON LANHAM, of Georgia; Representative WINFIELD K. DENTON, of Indiana; Representative JOHN MURDOCK, of Arizona; Representative J. M. COMBS, of Texas; Representative WILLIAM M. COLMER, of Mississippi; Representative TOBY MORRIS, of Oklahoma; and Representative JAMES F. LIND, of Pennsylvania.

Among our other distinguished guests are Mr. Willard E. Givens, executive secretary of the National Education Association, with some of his associates.

In your name I wish to thank all of these busy men for coming here tonight. What a truly American assemblage this is when the people and their representatives get together to discuss a question of Nation-wide importance. I say "of Nation-wide importance" though the bills in question are limited to critical areas because the people whose interests are involved are serving their Government whether in a civil or a military capacity.

What we are trying to do here tonight is simply this. We are trying to convince the Congress as a whole that the Federal Government must help to solve certain problems created by the activities of the Federal Government. We well know that the social problems in these areas are not confined to the need for schools. But we learned during the war that the most stable communities—the ones that stood up best under the immigration of a flood of war workers—were those that had the best public-school system. Therefore by improving the schools for the children of our military and civilian personnel throughout the country, we do far more than appears on the surface. We not only do justice to the children of these Federal workers; we bring order to the whole community. We shall make the parents more content to remain in Government service instead of resigning, as they are now doing in large numbers. In a moment of great peril, we shall strengthen immeasurably the Nation's striking power and its defenses, whether military or civilian.

We are aware that the Federal Government needs to economize in the face of its huge financial responsibilities at home and abroad. But this trend toward economy implies, above all things, choice and discrimination. Where will our available financial resources do the most good? I can imagine no measures which with the expenditure of a modest amount of Federal funds will be more far reaching in effect than H. R. 7940 and H. R. 8113.

And now to our program. For the first half hour we shall listen to each other's troubles in order that we may all feel less isolated, helpless, and overwhelmed by our own troubles.

Having looked the evils with which you are all contending in the face, we shall cheer ourselves up by analyzing what these two bills will do to conquer our common tribulations.

The first person I shall introduce to you is Mr. William A. Early, the vigorous superintendent of schools in Arlington, Va. By this time the citizens of Arlington are famous throughout the country for their battle to improve their school system. Mr. Early had earned a reputation as one of his State's foremost educators before he came to Arlington. He is president of the Virginia Education Association. He is also known to you because he has kept in touch with your problems and knows them at first-hand. Therefore, I am going to ask him to give a broad outline of the educational difficulties in localities affected by activities of the Federal Government. Thereupon he will introduce to you all of our out-of-town guests and the representatives from six different communities, who will speak for their communities.

Mr. EARLY. (Remarks of Mr. Early, as well as those of the several others from various parts of the country called upon to explain their problems are not available.)

Now we must inform ourselves on the two bills before the Congress which touch your lives so closely.

The two men I am going to introduce to you are appearing here as private citizens. But nobody is more familiar with these bills, as both are consultants to the two subcommittees that have studied these problems. They are willing to answer questions, but these questions should be written and sent to the speakers.

Let me present Mr. B. Alden Lillywhite and Mr. Henry F. Alves. (Analyses, etc., not available.)

Our final speaker who will sum up for us the significance of this meeting, is the president of a great State university. But he is more than that. He is a friend of the people, whose human interests go beyond his academic walls. He knows, as few university presidents do, the importance of good elementary and secondary education to college and university teaching.

You can judge the quality of his interest in your problems and the kindness of his heart when I tell you that he broke an important speaking engagement to be with us tonight. I give you a real statesman, administrator and scholar—the president of the University of Maryland, the Honorable Harry C. Byrd.

(Address of Dr. Byrd not available at this time.)

Thank you, Dr. Byrd.

Now, my friends, you who have worked so long on these bills know our work is not over. Wonderful as this meeting has been, the real work has only begun. I wish to assure all of you who have traveled from the four corners of our Nation, that our Metropolitan Area Citizens Committee for the Public Schools will cooperate with you in this battle until it is won.

Let me end with the words I used at the opening of the meeting: "Our American public schools will be just as good as we, the people, want them to be."

The following resolution offered by Mr. Ray McCullough, of Lavonia Township, Mich., was adopted at this meeting:

"RESOLUTION TO BE OFFERED TO THE NATION-WIDE CITIZENS MASS MEETING SPONSORED BY THE METROPOLITAN AREA CITIZENS COMMITTEE FOR THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

"Whereas activities of the Federal Government have imposed serious financial burdens on certain local school districts through acquisition of taxable land, and by causing very large and sudden increases in school enrollment; and

"Whereas the severe financial hardship imposed by these Federal activities has deprived many children living in the affected areas of normal educational opportunities; and

"Whereas some of these Federal activities will continue for some time in the future to impair seriously the ability of certain local school agencies to finance normal educational services: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That this Nation-wide citizens mass meeting go on record as urging the Federal Government to establish as a policy the provision of financial assistance to school districts affected by its activities commensurate with the financial burden it has placed on them; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That this meeting go on record as urging the immediate passage of H. R. 7940 and H. R. 8113, proposals now before the House Education and Labor Committee which have as their purpose effectuating the above stated policy; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to every Member of Congress."

Americanism Versus Communism

REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1950

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the two questions being asked by the American people today are, "What about Senator MCCARTHY and his spy charges? Will he be able to make them stick?" My answer to the last question is, "He will if the Government records are made available."

JOE MCCARTHY is a fighting Irishman. He fought with the Marines. He is a red-blooded, two-fisted American, in the best sense of those adjectives. He has a keen legal mind and has had experience as a judge. He is not a man to make charges without having facts to back up his charges.

Senator MCCARTHY has already accomplished the following:

First. He has forced the State Department to fire 91 sex perverts, who because of their habits were subject to blackmail by their Communist friends. The spotlight of publicity has also been turned upon a list compiled by the Washington police of 4,000 homosexuals, a major portion of whom work for the Federal Government in various departments, and who because of their perverted sex habits are poor security risks. We hope these will eventually be dropped from the Federal pay rolls.

Second. He has reopened the Amerasia case, an incident that was hushed up and glossed over by the administration several years ago. It deals with espionage in the State and Treasury Departments and in the Army and Navy.

Third. He has publicized the fact—I have had first-hand knowledge of the same for 10 years—that the administration has been protecting Communists and fellow travelers in Government departments, and has been doing everything possible to cover up their subversive activities—Alger Hiss, Judith Coplon, and Dr. Fuchs are a few samples in evidence.

The Senator has assured me personally that he has just begun his fight to expose the espionage agents and spies in the State Department, and that he is confident of success in his efforts.

SOUNDS GOOD, BUT NOT A TRUE PICTURE

Mr. Speaker, on April 24, 1950, President Truman made an address to the American Bar Association. In that address the President said:

No known instance of Communist subversion—

In the Government—

has gone uninvestigated and no case where the facts warranted has gone unprosecuted.

He also said:

The agency loyalty boards and the Loyalty Review Board have quietly and effectively carried out their job of protecting the integrity and security of our Government.

These statements by the President sound good, but do they present the true picture? They do not. The fact is that despite these assurances, the loyalty boards have in many cases cleared individuals with questionable loyalty records who were afterward proven disloyal. This demonstrates that the screening process used by these loyalty boards is very carelessly or superficially carried out. So we must look behind the President's nice-sounding statements to get the true facts in the picture.

Mr. Speaker, I cite the following cases as evidence that the picture is not as painted by the President. These cases are just a few of the many that are on record:

First. Alger Hiss. Our agency loyalty boards passed Hiss as a good security risk before he was convicted of lying, which conviction, in effect, proved Hiss to have been a traitor. Even so, Secretary Acheson still claimed Hiss as a friend.

Second. Judith Coplon. She was given a clean bill of health by the loyalty board, and afterward convicted of stealing secret Federal documents. She is now under indictment for conspiracy to give away vital secrets to Russia.

Third. Julian Wadleigh. He was named by Elizabeth Bentley as a fellow traveler. He got out of the Government when things got too hot. The loyalty board approved Wadleigh as a good security risk.

Fourth. George Shaw Wheeler. This man held the position of Chief of the Denazification Section of the American Military Government in Germany. He recently issued a statement from Prague denouncing the American Government and renouncing his citizenship. He was repeatedly cleared by Government loyalty boards. He was first employed by the Government in 1934 and remained on the pay roll until 1947, a period of 13 years.

Fifth. Carl Aldo Marzani. He was an employee of the Office of Strategic Services, a highly sensitive Government intelligence agency. At the end of World War II he was transferred to the Intelligence Division of the State Department. After repeated clearances by the loyalty board he was finally convicted of disloyalty and fired on December 20, 1946.

Sixth. Russell Nixon. A former director of the Division of Investigation of Cartels and External Assets in the American Military Government in Germany. He had a long record of Communist affiliations and had been ousted from the

faculty of Harvard University because of his pro-Communist activities. Yet he was accepted as an employee of the Government and placed in a position of trust and responsibility. He was finally forced to resign in January 1946, after issuing a denunciation of the United States Government.

Seventh. Nathan Gregory Silvermaster. This man was cited by Elizabeth Bentley as a member of the underground cell of the Communist Party. He began his service with the Government in 1935 as an employee in the Department of Agriculture. He remained with the Government until November 1947, when he resigned from the War Assets Administration. He had been repeatedly cleared by the loyalty boards and given a clean bill of health.

Mr. Speaker, it would seem from these and many other instances that might be cited that the Government loyalty boards lock the stable door after the horse is stolen. Their real job is to prevent Communists and pro-Communists from entering Government service; not to wait for years while these rats are doing their damage from within, and then fire them after some court of law has convicted them of disloyalty, and public clamor makes it necessary for them to be removed from the Government pay roll. The real job of these loyalty boards is to uncover the Communist patronage network that secured jobs in the Government for these rats. In this respect these loyalty boards have fallen down on their jobs and have failed miserably.

IRRESPONSIBLE STATEMENTS BY RESPONSIBLE MEN

Mr. Speaker, in referring to Senator McCARTHY, you said, "It is unfair for a man in a responsible position to make irresponsible statements." I am in complete agreement with that statement and I believe every real American feels the same way. However, as yet, we do not know whether Senator McCARTHY has made irresponsible statements. That still remains to be determined. Now, "what is sauce for the goose should be sauce for the gander." President Truman occupies "a most terribly responsible position." He said so himself. Those are his words. Yet the President has made the following irresponsible statements:

First. Speaking of the congressional investigation of the Hiss case, President Truman called it a "red herring." He repeated his red-herring statement nine different times in nine different places. The red-herring statements were made 3 years after the President had been supplied with secret information of the spy ring in Canada and notified that the Russians had an agent in the United States who was an assistant to the Secretary of State.

Second. On September 22, 1948, en route to California, President Truman said the House Un-American Activities Committee "is more un-American than the activities it is investigating." This definitely is an irresponsible statement made by a man in a "terribly responsible position." I served 6 years on that committee myself.

Third. President Truman said on September 12, 1946, that he had read and approved in its entirety the famous foreign-policy speech of Henry Wallace, the speech that yanked the rug from under Secretary of State James Byrnes at the Paris conference. That statement was an irresponsible statement that later proved very embarrassing to the President.

Fourth. On July 11, 1948, Mr. Truman told an Oregon audience:

> I like old Joe (Stalin). He is a decent fellow, but he is a prisoner of the Politburo. He would make certain agreements, and he would keep those agreements, but they won't let him keep them.

I ask, what is this but an irresponsible statement by a responsible man?

Fifth. In a letter to Governor Earle, of Pennsylvania, February 28, 1947, President Truman said:

> People are much wrought up about the Communist bugaboo. * * * I am of the opinion that the country is perfectly safe as far as communism is concerned.

The famous pumpkin papers, the Hiss conviction, Dr. Fuchs' conviction in an English court, Judith Coplon's conviction, have all happened since then, proving that statement to Governor Earle an irresponsible statement.

Mr. Speaker, Communists do not walk around carrying signs lettered, "Look! I am a Communist!" Communists can best serve the party by masquerading as orthodox loyal Americans—and that is what most of them do. Judging the strength of the Communists in America by their known number is a very stupid thing to do. When the Communists took over Russia they numbered less than 1 percent of the population. To boast about the fact that there are but few Communists in the Government today is like a banker boasting that only two of his bank tellers are dishonest. It is a stupid thing to do, yet President Truman and Secretary Acheson are doing it almost every day.

Communists in the Government are almost invariably found in strategic positions of influence, where hundreds of loyal Americans who work under them must bend to their will or suffer unduly in many subtle ways. Alger Hiss was not a minor Government official. He was Assistant Secretary of State, the second man in importance in the most powerful Cabinet post in our Government. He was the chief adviser to our sick President at Yalta, when Poland and all of eastern Europe was turned over to Stalin. Alger Hiss engineered the Bretton Woods Financial Conference, at which Uncle Sam agreed to underwrite the credit of most of the countries of the world. Alger Hiss organized the San Francisco Conference, presided over its preliminary conferences, and did most of the work on the United Nations Charter at San Francisco. Alger Hiss was playing on Stalin's team at Bretton Woods, at San Francisco, and again at Yalta. Alger Hiss is only one man, yet he did more damage from an important position on the inside of our Government than 1,000,000 Communists on the outside could have done. The $15,000,000,000 appropriation each year for national defense—to carry on the "cold war"—and the $5,000,000,000 appropriation each year for international relief are needed largely as the result of the damage Hiss did at Yalta.

Mr. Speaker, until President Truman and Secretary of State Acheson come to realize that one enemy in an important Government position on the inside can do more harm to the Nation than 1,000,000 enemies on the outside can do; until President Truman and the Secretary of State stop making excuses for the known subversive elements that are in Government positions, and start cleaning them out of the Government Departments; we need more Senator McCARTHYS to expose the covering up and the glossing over of subversive elements in our Government.

Mr. Speaker, this Nation needs to revive Gen. George Washington's historic order: "Put none but Americans on guard." We need today to take to heart the warning uttered by Abraham Lincoln in an address to the Illinois Legislature in Springfield, Ill., on January 27, 1837, when he said:

> At what point shall we expect the approach of danger? By what means shall we fortify against it? Shall we expect some trans-Atlantic military giant to step across the ocean and crush us at a blow?
>
> Never. All the armies of Europe, Asia, and Africa combined, with all the treasure of the earth in their military chest, with a Bonaparte for a commander, could not, by force, take a drink from the Ohio or make a track on the Blue Ridge, in a trial of a thousand years.
>
> At what point, then, is the approach of danger to be expected? I answer, if it ever reaches us, it must spring up among us. It cannot come from abroad. If destruction be our lot, we must ourselves be its author and finisher. As a Nation of free men, we must live through all time, or die by suicide.

Government Reorganization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 2, 1950

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous material, I offer for the reading of Members, a very fine article on the Hoover Commission by the very able and distinguished president of the University of Washington, Mr. Raymond B. Allen, who himself was a member of the Hoover Commission. The article appeared on the "Pacific Northwest Industry" published by the Bureau of Business Research by the University of Washington.

President Allen's article follows:

GOVERNMENT REORGANIZATION: A CHALLENGE TO BUSINESS

(By Raymond B. Allen, president, University of Washington; chairman, Washington Committee on Federal Reorganization)

Businessmen have not only a legitimate interest but a very real stake in the Federal tax picture—as, indeed, every citizen has

today. Just as the American consumer quite properly expects full value for his dollar in purchasing the products and services of private enterprise, so too he has a right to know that his Government will use wisely and efficiently the money he spends in taxes.

Upon the effective functioning of the Federal Government depend many things affecting business—a stable economy, peaceful international conditions, and sound labor-management relations, to name a few. Beyond these specifics, the American business system as a whole has a major stake in the maintenance of an American Government which operates efficiently.

We in the Pacific Northwest are perhaps more alert to the size and importance of the Federal establishment than are a good many other parts of the country, for we have the opportunity to observe its operations first-hand in numerous spheres. Military defense construction contracts, foreign-trade policies, development of such natural resources as rivers and forests, and, of course, such major governmental projects as the atomic plant at Richland, all affect directly the health of our regional economy.

It is not my intention in this statement to suggest what our Government's policies should be on these and other matters of national concern. Yet, I submit that there is tremendous room for improvement in the structure and management of our Federal Government (entirely apart from policy considerations), which would promote the sound business principle of full return for every dollar spent.

I refer, of course, to the findings of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Federal Government. Commonly referred to as the Hoover Commission, this group of nationally prominent and distinguished citizens has submitted to the Congress a thorough and searching analysis of our Government structure, accompanied by hundreds of specific recommendations for modernizing the machinery of the greatest, wealthiest, and, in some respects, most archaic government on earth.

BIG GOVERNMENT CAN BE EFFICIENT

Americans today realize that they have (and are paying for) big government. Yet this is not bad in itself. The United States is no longer, as it was 160 years ago, a loose affiliation of ex-colonies, clustered on the eastern seaboard, with a population of some three million and an economy largely agricultural. Today, with 150,000,000 people, spread across 3,000,000 square miles and engaged in a highly diversified as well as a highly mechanized economy, we need big government. Our Nation's domestic problems, to say nothing of its responsibility in world affairs, would stagger Paul Bunyan; and it requires a government of equal proportions to cope with these problems.

Big government, however, need not be inefficient government, and here is the nub of the Hoover Commission studies. The Commission was authorized by unanimous vote of Congress in 1947 to study the organization of the Federal Government with a view to improving and modernizing governmental machinery in the interest of serving the people more effectively. Four members were selected by the Senate, four by the House of Representatives, and four by the President. In each case the Republican and Democratic Parties were equally represented.

At the suggestion of President Truman, former President Hoover was named Chairman of the Commission; and Dean Acheson, now United States Secretary of State, became Vice Chairman. The Commission then selected some 300 distinguished citizens from all parts of the country, all of them expert in some phase of Government operations. These men were assembled into 24 research committees, or task forces, which studied their specialized problems and reported in detail to the Commission. The task force reports and recommendations ran to 2,000,000 words of solidly packed analysis.

The Commission then studied the findings and reached its own conclusions. A number of the resulting recommendations are controversial, to be sure. In fact, the Commission itself was divided in some of its thinking. The basic principle is sound however: That the Federal Government is sorely in need of intelligent reorganization pointing toward efficiency and the economies which will result. As the Commission phrased it: "The Nation is paying heavily for a lack of order, a lack of clear lines of authority and responsibility, and a lack of effective organization in the executive branch."

Broadly speaking, this finding is not new. Attempts to reorganize the executive branch had been made by virtually every President from Taft to Franklin Roosevelt. The promising development is that now, for the first time, the citizens of our country have a thoroughgoing analysis of our Government structure, plus the prospect that something will be done about it.

HOOVER REPORT THEMES

Three major themes may be discerned in the Hoover report. If these principles are acted upon, our Government can be made more truly the servant of the people. They are:

1. To make the Federal Government more responsible, through a clear chain of command and a strengthening of the Executive Office of the President. This is necessary, regardless of who occupies the White House in any year.

2. To establish a scheme of "coherent missions," defining the area of responsibility of the various Government agencies and bureaus. Too often, heretofore, there have been overlapping, duplication, and in some cases actual conflict between units of our Federal Government. A noteworthy example is the running fight between the Army Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation, resulting in disservice to the American people.

3. To improve the managerial operations, notably in audit and accounting and in budgetary classification. Here is an area where the application of business principles can be of major value, and an important step was taken with the presentation of a "performance budget" last January for the fiscal year 1951.

I believe the immediate future must bring some clarification of the matter of Federal-State relationships—especially in the field of intergovernmental relations and taxation. Adequate financing of State operations may be jeopardized if funds are drawn off too rapidly or too carelessly for Federal purposes. The Hoover Commission unanimously recommended that a new commission be appointed to study the difficult problem of intergovernmental Federal-State relationships, especially as they affect fiscal health.

GRATIFYING PROGRESS

Visionary as some of the recommendations may seem, considerable progress has already been made toward putting into effect the principles emphasized by the Hoover Commission. In the 1949 session of Congress, within 6 months after the Hoover report was submitted, five major and several minor bills were enacted, with a potential saving of at least a billion dollars a year. The principal enactments included:

Establishment of the National Defense Department, unifying the armed services under one Cabinet officer.

Creation of the General Services Administration, combining purchasing functions, records, building management, and war assets.

Authorization of an overhauling of the State Department, paving the way for amalgamation of the Foreign Service and the Washington, D. C., staffs of the Department.

Approval of pay raises for Government employees and improvement of the Civil Service Classification Act to reduce the wasteful turn-over in Government personnel and to promote more efficient service.

Reorganization Act of 1949, empowering the President to submit plans for realinment of executive agencies, subject to congressional veto. Under this authorization, the President last year offered seven reorganization plans, of which only one was turned down.

Progress has indeed been made. At a national reorganization conference held in Washington, D. C., last December, it was estimated that one-fourth of the Hoover Commission's proposals were already in effect.

Much remains to be done, however, and, from the standpoint of effective action, 1950 is the crucial year. The President and many Members of Congress have indicated their eagerness to reform the Government structure, and in an election year they will be particularly responsive to expressions of public sentiment on the issue. Unless the people make their support known, however, the great opportunity may be lost.

In the Hoover Commission report—and, equally, in the vast public response thus far—there is real hope that our Federal Government may at last be brought up to date. If public interest continues, and if it finds expression in the Nation's Capital, we can meet the challenge.

To facilitate wider public understanding in our own State of the issues raised by the Hoover report, there has been established the Washington Committee on Federal Reorganization, with headquarters in the 905 Second Avenue Building, Seattle 4. The program of this group, directed by an executive committee of distinguished citizens from all parts of the State, is primarily educational. Through speakers, study groups, press releases, radio broadcasts, and the distribution of informative literature, the objective is to promote an expression of public opinion based on genuine understanding. The Washington committtee urges every citizen to "study the issues; make up your own mind; tell your Congressman what you think." This threefold goal can make all the difference between the results of the Hoover report and those earlier studies which now lie dormant in the files.

It is my earnest hope that the businessmen of the Pacific Northwest will familiarize themselves with the subject of Federal reorganization and, further, will help disseminate the information to their employees, stockholders, customers, and business associates. Contributions to finance the educational program of the Washington committee are certainly welcome, but equally important is cooperation in helping bring the story to all the people.

This can be a great patriotic service, which will produce a better—and, incidentally, a more economical—Government for us all.

Interest in World Government Declines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am including as part of my remarks an article that appeared in the Washington Times-Herald on last Fri-

day containing a report from Lake Success which states that the movement for world government has passed its crest. It is encouraging for those of us who maintain that under no circumstances must world government replace our own Constitution. The one-worlders would submerge and substitute our Constitution for one of questionable value.

STATES' SUPPORT OF ONE WORLDERS BEGINS TO DROOP

LAKE SUCCESS, April 27.—The tidal wave of world government agitation which threatened for a time to engulf the Republic apparently has passed its crest, although the legislatures of 20 States still stand committed to some form of international organization with supernational law-making authority.

Rhode Island recently became the third State to rescind a world federation resolution previously adopted by its legislature. The Legislatures of California and Georgia had previously repealed similar resolutions. Attempts to repeal world federation resolutions have been defeated in Virginia, Maine, and Maryland.

STILL COMMITTED

The States still committed to some form of supernational government are Alabama, Arkansas, Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Tennessee, Utah, Virginia, Washington, Louisiana, Oregon, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Missouri, New Hampshire, and New Jersey.

The popularity of world government proposals in the legislatures of Eastern, Southern and Far Western States is widely attributed to organized propaganda campaigns, disappointment with the United Nations and fear that the present armaments race and so-called cold war will result in another world conflict.

The world government movement received a major set-back last February 15 when the State Department strongly opposed a group of resolutions seeking to put Congress on record for some form of international organization with power to make and enforce law.

Whether or not the State Department's opposition to these proposals was inspired by a conviction that public opinion is turning against world government, it could hardly have been expressed more forcibly.

RUSK QUESTIONS MOTIVE

Testifying before a Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee, Dean Rusk, Deputy Under Secretary, questioned whether the one-worlders were acting from sober reflection or from hysteria.

Assistant Secretary John D. Hickerson remarked that two-thirds of the world's people live on an inadequate diet, one-half are illiterate and only a minority live under democratic governments. He asked whether the American people would be willing to pay the cost of a world federation and whether they would be willing to compromise their way of life and institutions.

Flood Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM PICKETT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1950

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Speaker, on last Tuesday, April 25, I introduced the bill H. R. 8188, the purpose of which is to amend section 13 of the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944, and authorize the Department of Agriculture to give consideration of and treatment to the so-called "no man's land" between where its work now stops in the uplands and where the Corps of Engineers program ends on the main-stem of the rivers.

A brief general statement of the background information and what this bill will and will not do, if enacted into law, follows:

1. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The work of the Department of Agriculture under the flood-control legislation is directed toward the treatment of watershed lands so as to slow down waterflow and run-off, to prevent erosion and sedimentation and other works to prevent damage to agricultural crops on the watershed and improvements along the tributary streams. The Department of the Army is charged with flood-control works on rivers and other waterways to provide immediate protection to high-damage areas including bottom lands, cities, towns, etc.

The policy of the Congress, as expressed in sections 1 and 2 of the Flood Control Act of 1936, is that the improvement of rivers and waterways, including watersheds thereof, for flood-control purposes is a proper activity of the Federal Government and it is believed that the intent is complete control of floodwater and thus prevent agriculture and urban damage and the loss of life. The only practicable method of carrying out the established policy is to give consideration to all water-and-sediment control measures required to manage the water from the source on watershed lands down to the control projects under the jurisdiction of the Corps of Engineers.

An important consideration now is the need for installation of such necessary work projects as will effectively close the gap between the conservation treatment of watershed lands and the flood-control works on major streams by the Corps of Engineers.

The watershed[1] surveys which served as the basis for the recommended programs for run-off and water-flow retardation and soil-erosion prevention which were approved by the Congress in section 13 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 were made before World War II.

Conditions in the watersheds affecting the movement of floodwater and sediment have changed materially in the past 10 years. Erosion has become more serious, run-off accelerated, and waterways deteriorated in many parts of each of these watersheds. Also during the past 10 years significant advancements have been made in techniques for treatment of watershed lands to retard run-off and water flow and to prevent erosion.

2. WHAT THIS BILL WOULD DO

This bill would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to substitute vegetative and structural measures which have proved to be more effective and efficient in controlling the movement of floodwater and sediment from watershed lands to meet present-day conditions and needs.

It would make it possible to install such necessary work projects as structural control of gullies, stream-bank control, upstream floodwater retarding structures, channel improvement, and other sediment and water-control measures, which would result in alleviation of the extensive damages now being suffered recurringly on the fertile bottom lands in the tributary creek bottoms.

It would also provide immediate results in preventing damage to highways, railroads, other public utilities, and reservoirs which because of their location are not protected by the major control works along the main streams.

3. WHAT THIS BILL WOULD NOT DO

This bill would not authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to undertake projects which properly belong under the jurisdiction of the Corps of Engineers or other major construction agencies of the Government, as designated in the Flood Control Act of 1936, as amended and supplemented.

This bill would not change the fundamental concept expressed in the 1936 omnibus flood-control act that the benefits to whomsoever they may accrue are in excess of the estimated costs. It is not intended to change over-all ratio between benefits and costs described in the original survey reports.

The bill would not change the policy of Congress that improvements of rivers and other waterways for flood control and allied purposes shall be under the jurisdiction of and shall be prosecuted by the War Department under the direction of the Secretary of War and supervision of the Chief of Engineers, and * * * measures for run-off and water-flow retardation and soil-erosion prevention on watersheds shall be under the jurisdiction of and prosecuted by the Department of Agriculture under the direction of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Nor does the bill change the need for both general types of treatment, viz, watershed treatment and major river-control works to alleviate flood damages to the extent feasible and practicable in the localities, rivers, and other waterways, including watersheds thereof designated by the Congress.

This bill will not authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to undertake works of improvement beyond the cost estimated in each of the approved survey reports based on the unit costs prevailing at the time the reports were prepared. If, during the installation period estimated in the respective reports to vary from 10 to 24 years, it appears that there will be any substantial change in the over-all cost, this matter will be brought to the attention of the Congress as soon as it becomes apparent.

[1] Buffalo Creek watershed, New York; Potomac River watershed, Virginia, West Virginia, Maryland, and Pennsylvania; Little Tallahatchie River watershed, Mississippi; Yazoo River watershed, Mississippi; Coosa River watershed, Georgia and Tennessee; Little Sioux River watershed, Iowa; Middle Colorado River watershed, Texas; Trinity River watershed, Texas; Washita River watershed, Oklahoma and Texas; Santa Ynez River watershed, California, and Los Angeles River watershed, California.

Government by Consent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. FERNÓS-ISERN

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM PUERTO RICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1950

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, including extraneous matters, I offer an editorial from the Washington Post, April 25, 1950, dealing with a subject concerning which I hope each Member of the Congress will soon have an opportunity to participate. The editorial to which I refer endorses H. R. 7674 which I had the honor of introducing on March 13 and which would provide for the organization of a constitutional government by the people of Puerto Rico, under an act of Congress,

to be accepted by the people of Puerto Rico in the nature of a compact. I consider the editorial as an expression of true and real American thinking, and I commend it to my colleagues with my sincerest thanks to the editor of the Washington Post.

The editorial follows:

GOVERNMENT BY CONSENT

The exemplary course followed by the United States in dealing with the Territory of Puerto Rico needs for its fulfillment only a grant of authority to the island to adopt its own constitution. It is governed now under an organic act which permits complete home rule and which was amended 2 years ago to provide for popular election of the Territorial Governor. A locally adopted constitution would not change Puerto Rico's status in any material way. It would not alter its relation to the United States or its voteless representation in Congress. It would simply give the people of the island an opportunity to embrace by right what is now given them as a gratuity—to apply, in other words, the vital American principle of government by the consent of the governed.

The bill to authorize adoption of a constitution by Puerto Rico, introduced by Dr. FERNÓS-ISERN, Resident Commissioner of the Territory, would provide for continued application of all Federal laws and operation of Federal agencies in the island. It would require adherence in the Puerto Rican constitution to the Bill of Rights. Its principal effect would be to raise the status and dignity of the Territory. As Dr. FERNÓS-ISERN put it, "We adopt our local laws, but we haven't adopted our local law of laws—our constitution. This is what we want to do now." To permit the people of Puerto Rico to do this would be to bind them closer to us by the ties of affection and to present to the world a splendid example of responsibility in trusteeship.

Work of Some Kind Keeps Old People Interested in Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1950

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, just because the custom of business says that they do not want men and women over the age of 60 years, and some places it is less than that, is no reason why these old people cannot fill many places of employment to the complete satisfaction of the employer. The fact is many jobs they can do as well as they ever could.

Even where they have a retirement annuity sufficient to keep on living from day to day, there is something lacking and that is by mere living they are not interested in affairs—and seem to be waiting for one thing—the undertaker.

To live, people must be interested in life and the affairs around them. When the world passes right on past them and all they have to live for is merely to keep on breathing, such a condition is the most unhappy state one could imagine. When, however, they see that day by day their efforts are appreciated and of value to the world, life takes on a different hue and living becomes interesting. They forget their age; forget that they are not wanted, and realize that they are making a contribution to society.

An organization for this very purpose has been organized here in Washington and is meeting with marked success. Mr. Speaker, I desire to quote a statement from the Pittsburgh Press:

MATURE AMERICANS, INC.

(By Fred W. Perkins)

WASHINGTON.—The following classified ad appeared recently in Baltimore newspapers:

"Men wanted—retired, educated and honest men, to attend a meeting to consider means of becoming occupied. No charge."

It brought 59 replies to a box number. The meeting is being arranged for next week in Baltimore.

Thus Mature Americans, Inc., a nonprofit organization of overage citizens which was founded in this city about 6 months ago, is starting to expand. Other cities, including Pittsburgh, will be tried if the Baltimore experiment turns out well.

Otis J. Bouma, a former newspaper publisher who at 71 is active in operation of three tourist lodging houses here, is the originator and spark plug of this body of elderly people who refuse to quit. He tells the story in this way:

"Last September several of us who are over 60 got together to see what we could do about bolstering the morale of men and women who had been forced into retirement because of their age.

"Today our group, Mature Americans, Inc., numbers more than 240 persons here in Washington."

JOBS FOR 45

"We have succeeded in getting jobs for some 45 retired men and women. We have found that by joining hands we have increased our strength—that when one of us intercedes for another member of the group it is easier to get useful employment for him.

"But most important, we have been able to combat the frustration that too often comes with retirement. We have been able to prove to our members that age is no barrier to happy living—that simply because a factory or a store makes rules against working after 65 is no reason for curling up and wasting away.

"Today everyone talks about pensions for security. But human beings must have more than security in their old age. They must be made to feel that they have a place in society, that their experience and skills are needed.

"Our organization slowly, but surely I think, is attempting to fill this void in the lives of men and women over retirement age. We must break down the all too common belief that retirement means discard."

Leaders with Mr. Bouma in this undertaking are four men in their late sixties or early seventies. They are still actively at work. One is a tax accountant, another a lawyer, and a third is in Government work.

The first difficulty, Mr. Bouma says, is that "everybody assumes this is some new kind of money-making racket."

"Our only payment," he says, "comes in the joy and satisfaction we get out of changing frustration into contentment among older people. It is easy enough if you can get them something useful to do."

Three cases in which older persons have been made happier:

A writer, a woman, confined by illness to her room, has been placed in profitable contact with a new magazine.

A former college professor, holder of degrees from three universities, has been helped to a new teaching position in a Washington institution.

A former New York City policeman, unable to get along on his pension because of family demands, has been encouraged to get a job as a hotel detective.

MORE OLDSTERS

All the official statistics show the number and proportion of older people is increasing in this country. The problem of what must be done for the aged is regarded as one of the most important of the future.

One phase of the problem is how to get employment for them—so they can support or help support themselves. Beyond that is the aim of helping these older people to make adjustments in their living plans when retirement puts a period to their accustomed work.

That adjustment period, according to medical authorities, is extremely difficult.

"Our hope," says Mr. Bouma, "is that other groups of mature Americans, under that or some other name, will be formed in other cities and towns throughout the Nation."

That Airtight Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURR P. HARRISON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1950

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials from the Richmond News Leader, Richmond, Va., entitled "That Airtight Budget":

It daily becomes more evident that Congress is baffled and almost helpless in dealing with remorselessly increasing Federal expenditures. By far the largest single cut the House Appropriations Committee was able to make in the President's budget was in the so-called independent offices, that congeries of more than 30 commissions and committees, offices, boards, agencies, administrations, and authorities that, beginning with the American Battle Monuments Commission goes straight down the alphabet to TVA. Each year these independent offices ask more money and justify it stolidly down to the last penny. They now account for some $8,500,000,000 in the 1951 budget. After hearings that lasted 7 weeks (and when published filled five volumes of 2,311 pages) the House Committee was able to cut only $433,271,000 from the $8,478,148,000 that was requested by the President for these lavishly prodigal bureaus that have grown up outside the regular departments of the Government.

Even this sounds better than it is, for most of the cuts were in places where expenditures are not entirely limited by appropriations. Almost exactly half of it was in the Veterans' Administration, and the VA itself does not know how much money it will require—it can only guess at how many veterans will demand how much of their almost unlimited benefits in any given year. With 3 months of the current fiscal year still to go, VA has already spent nearly a billion dollars more than was appropriated for it last August. The House Committee was not even fooling itself when it cut $200,000,000 out of the 1951 VA appropriation; it knows better than anyone else that this will mean nothing but a larger supplemental appropriation for VA next year.

The committee was not able to cut most of the other independent offices back even to the 1950 level—an all-time high. But let the committee's report speak for itself.

American Battle Monuments Commission: "The committee recommends $695,000 for salaries and expenses, which is $385,000 less than the budget estimate and an increase of $50,700 over 1950 requirements."

Federal Power Commission: "The committee has allowed a total of $3,939,300 for this purpose, which is $238,300 in excess of the current appropriation and $157,400 less than the budget estimate."

Federal Trade Commission: "For this activity the committee recommends $3,866,695, which is a reduction of $358,305 in the budget estimate and $216,695 more than the 1950 appropriation."

General Accounting Office: "The committee has included a total of $36,250,000 for all expenses of this office. This sum is $696,800 less than the budget estimate." (It is also $1,180,000 more than the 1950 appropriation.)

General Services Administration: "The amount recommended in the bill is $155,969,830 in excess of the 1950 appropriation available for similar purposes."

Housing and Home Finance Agency: "The bill contains $4,200,000 for salaries and expenses of this office, which is $1,800,000 less than the budget estimate and $225,000 in excess of the 1950 appropriation."

Interstate Commerce Commission: "The bill contains $9,889,600 for this purpose, which is $289,600 in excess of the 1950 appropriation and $113,000 less than the budget estimate."

TVA, which spent some $30,000,000 in 1949, received $49,000,000 in 1950 (and has already overspent it by nearly $12,000,000). It was given $102,714,000 by the committee for 1951. Out of the lot, the Civil Service Commission did get a cut under 1950, which surprisingly enough was concurred in by the Commission during the hearings. But in the whole swarm of agencies, only the Commission on Renovating the Executive Mansion was cut to the bone. This particular Commission already has had $100,000 and its work has never been anything but advisory—all the actual work, architects' plans, and engineers' drawings are done by other departments. With little left to advise about except disposition of White House materials, it wanted another $100,000 for the salary and expenses of two paid commissioners (at $50 a day), an executive director (at $15,000 a year), a consulting architect (at $1,000 a month), two consulting engineers (also at $1,000 a month), three assistant engineers, two secretaries, a clerical worker, an Army officer, and a messenger. Committeemen decided this was expensive advice and cut it down to $20,000. And it may well be the only cut in the whole independent-offices appropriation that will stick.

Representative CLARENCE CANNON, chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, has asked for suggestions on where his $29,000,000 omnibus appropriations bill might be trimmed. Today's suggestion: $107,000 for the Indian Claims Commission.

This quasi-judicial agency, created in 1947, has three commissioners with salaries of $14,000 each. In the past 3 years, only 151 claim cases have been filed with the Commission. Eleven of these have been disposed of. The commission expects that a total of 300 claims will be put on record before the deadline next August. To handle this flyweight legal burden, the commission requires 7 employees with salaries of more than $37,000. This agency's life is supposed to be limited to a 10-year period dating from passage of the act. During hearings on the commission's request, this colloquy ensued:

"Mr. PHILLIPS. Do you think that you are going to get through before 1957?

"JUDGE WITT. Well, I just couldn't say about that, I just don't know what will happen between now and then.

"Mr. PHILLIPS. With three commissioners working on it, and the staff that you have, and less than 300 claims, you are not going to take until 1957?

"Judge WITT. Well, as far as I am personally concerned, I hope that we do not."

While the Government is providing $107,000 a year to an agency which fears it cannot dispose of 300 cases in 10 years, the Federal debt currently stands at $255,841,918,602.68.

Representative CLARENCE CANNON, asserting that the $29,000,000,000 appropriations bill was airtight as it emerged from his Appropriations Committee, has suggested that critics of Federal spending be specific in their objections. Today's needless extravagance is taken from page 216 of the bill, lines 8 and 9. There it is proposed that the taxpayers provide for necessary expenses of the office of the Secretary of the Interior, for purchase of one passenged motor vehicle only, not to exceed $4,500.

We raise the suggestion that a nation with a debt of $258,000,000,000, contemplating a deficit in the current fiscal year of more than $5,000,000,000, could put Mr. Chapman in a Ford or Chevvie. It strikes us that $4,500 cars are air bubbles that could be squeezed out of any budget without hurting it at all.

Today's observation in how a government can spend $43,000,000,000 a year is taken from the House Appropriations Committee hearings on the American Battle Monuments Commission, which prior to World War II spent $150,000 a year, spent $233,000 in 1947, $362,000 in 1948, $1,078,000 in 1949, $9,750,000 in 1950, and asked for $10,168,000 in 1951–52.

"General NORTH. Then there is a project for memorializing in some form places like Iwo Jima, Guadalcanal, Tarawa, all of those places which are relatively remote, yet are much more significant than mere little strips of sand. Our commission * * * proposes to take a rough boulder, carve on it a brief inscription which would read something like this: 'Erected by the United States of America to those 6,000 soldiers, sailors, and marines who died in the liberation of the Solomon Islands.' We would drag these big boulders to the same beaches where the troops went ashore and place them on concrete bases where they would require no maintenance.

"Mr. PHILIPS. What do you estimate it will cost?

"General NORTH. We set a top figure at $30,000.

* * * * *

"General NORTH. Finally, in certain places such as Eisenhower's headquarters and MacArthur's headquarters and so forth, we propose to put a bronze tablet to commemorate that it was at this place that General Eisenhower had headquarters directing so many men. We estimate there will be 18 of these, to cost $3,000 apiece."

Sometimes congressional chickens come home to roost in the administration's airtight budget. Last year when Congress decided to assist Alaska in a 5-year construction program of essential public works, the $70,000,000 bill passed almost unnoticed in the spate of billion-dollar authorizations and appropriations that were pouring over the congressional dam. In the bill, Congress obligated itself to undertake the whole construction program, collecting as it could 50 percent from the Territorial government or other public Alaskan bodies. When the House Appropriations Committee was called upon to consider the first year's result of this impulsive generosity it found Alaska had already submitted essential public-works projects costing a total of $54,035,000.

Looking over the list, their startled eyes encountered items such as the proposal of Auke Bay, 300 population, for a $200,000 school, $150,000 worth of sewers, and a $750,000 power supply. Sitka, with a population of 2,000, wanted $800,000 worth of schools, and $800,000 hospital, and streets, a small boat harbor and a power supply that would bring the total to $4,300,000. Klawock, with 485 population, was asking for a school, power supply, sewers, and a health center costing $720,000.

When the committee had recovered its breath, it slashed the President's $25,000,000 request for this year's construction to $9,000,000 and set forth in its report to Congress that it had grave doubts that many of the communities will be able to meet the obligations which they may assume under the construction program as submitted in the departmental justification. A comparison with any American city's bonded debt shows that it may well say so. Richmond's public debt is now $32,000,000 and it views with considerable dismay the addition of $5,000,000 during the coming fiscal year. If Richmond's essential public works had been constructed on the Sitka scale and half of it paid by the Federal Government, her public debt would be $215,000,000; on the Auke Bay scale, her public debt, after the Government had paid half of it, would amount to $368,600,000.

The Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, Department of Agriculture, operates 519 laboratories with some 2,500 full-time employees. It requested $13,891,000 for 1950–51, up nearly a million dollars from the current year. Among other pressing necessities listed by the Bureau were 63 new automobiles and other equipment. At the hearings before a subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, the following statement from the chairman indicated that if there is one thing the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine does not need it is automobiles.

"Mr. WHITTEN. In the Denver office it was disclosed that you had 217 automobiles and for the first 4 months of 1949, 194 of them were not used at all. * * * The Northwest regional office of blister rust control had 20 1½-ton trucks that were not used in 1949. * * * The white fringed beetle control project at Gulfport, Miss., had 18 stake-body trucks equipped with spray rigs that have not been used for some time. Two were last used in 1944, 11 in 1945, 3 in 1946, and 2 in 1947. * * * The North Central regional office of blister rust control acquired three new Ford stake-body trucks in 1947 for use in Minnesota. Before these trucks were actually delivered, the use intended for them did not develop. As a result the average total mileage on these three trucks is only 2,752 and they have been in storage most of the time. * * *

"Out of 18 cars and trucks owned by the blister rust control project in Minnesota, six of them have been idle since September 1948. In August 1948, while the blister rust control project at Spokane, the blister rust control project in Minneapolis and the white fringed beetle control project at Gulfport had so many 1½-ton stake-body trucks idle, the division of pink bollworm control acquired five new 1½-ton stake-body trucks at a total cost of $9,287. * * * The division of pink bollworm control has a tractor and trailer, which combination was used to haul water in the wild-cotton eradication program in Florida. Appropriations for this project were discontinued for the fiscal year 1947–48 so * * * the tractor was driven from Florida to San Antonio, Tex., and stored in the warehouse there. The trailer was left in Florida with the admitted intention of separating the two pieces of equipment so no one in another division would ask for them. * * * There is just page after page in this report of this same kind of thing. * * * We are running $5,000,000,000 behind in paying the costs of this Government. If this sort of thing goes on throughout much of the Government, you can clearly see why."

When the House of Representatives comes back in session, and renews its search for bubbles in Mr. CANNON's airtight budget, it might take a critical look at pages 341–344 of the $29,000,000,000 appropriation bill. These items provide $21,825,000 for running the Panama Canal and the Canal Zone in the next fiscal year. The hearings indicate that these figures cover such doubtfully urgent matters as (1) the maintenance of an 88-man personnel office to look after 21,000 employees (the Commonwealth of Virginia has 21 personnel workers and 25,000 State employees), (2) the construction of a gasoline station at a cost of $60,300, (3) the removal of a certain wooden porch, 120 feet long and 8 feet wide, from a schoolhouse—estimated at $41,200, and (4) the erection of a monument to Maj. Gen. George W. Goethals at a total cost of $296,000. What business this Nation has in spending $300,000 on a Goethals monument, at a time when the Federal debt exceeds $258,000,000,000 and this year's deficit is placed at $5,000,000,000, is wholly beyond us. Perhaps Mr. CANNON can explain.

That airtight budget has a lot of paper in it too. Most persons are familiar with the infinite variety of Government publications and perhaps no one but a first-term Congressman now thinks the only thing the Government publishes is the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. There is almost literally nothing on earth in which the Government is not perfectly competent to instruct its citizens by return mail. Detailed information on mist netting for birds in Japan, the synoptic principle of cyclones in Texas, the schedule for mail routes in Nevada, canning beef stew or baking an upsidedown cake, growing artichokes or petunias, estimating muskrat populations by house counts or cooling engines in supersonic flight can be had for the asking, or call it a nickel or a dime, no stamps accepted. The Government turns out these handy compendiums of all human knowledge by the tens and hundreds of thousands; after it does so, if nobody wants the things they are stored until the space is needed and then sold for wastepaper. A couple of years ago the Government Printing Office condemned over 10,000,000 copies of publications. Congressional investigators found as many as 500,000 copies of some of them on hand.

But this is only the beginning of Government printing. Congressman REES, during the House debate on the current appropriation bill, stated that the Federal Government operates the biggest printing and publishing business in the world. There is no doubt of it, but we question Mr. REES' estimate of the annual cost of all this printing as being some $50,000,000. The Army alone will spend $10,804,601 on printing next year; the Navy and Air Force, a little less bookishly enclined, will spend $11,838,370 between them, and that great economizer, Secretary Johnson, says he needs $649,000 for printing in his office. Curious readers, wanting to know what the Defense Department does with more than $23,000,000 worth of printing a year—not counting the cost of research, writing, typing, editing, reviewing and checking—are referred to the list and index of Department of the Army publications which lists the more recent publications of the Army; this list runs over 500 pages, two columns to a page.

It is not only the Defense Department that thinks the printing presses were invented to be used around the clock. Congressman REES recalls that a House Appropriations Committee disclosed one year that the Bureau of Internal Revenue printed 500,000,000 tax forms and 114,000,000 instructions sheets to supply 47,000,000 taxpayers. Later it developed that the bureau was leasing a whole building some place to store hundreds of millions of obsolete forms. A Senate Appropriations Committee was momentarily embarrassed in 1948 when it asked the various Federal agencies to submit one copy each of their publications during the past year; after 83,723 different publications arrived at the committee room, Senators hastily called off the exhibit. One bureau that was called off, fortunately in time, had ready a stack of publications of one copy each, 52 feet high.

(The national deficit next year is now estimated at $7,300,000,000.)

Misuse of a Gift

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 21, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the people, through their Representatives in Congress, in 1935 enacted legislation known as the Wagner Act, which made it possible for employees to organize, form labor unions and, through those unions, bargain collectively and effectively with employers.

In 1947, because of public demand, the Wagner Act was amended by the adoption of the Taft-Hartley Act. That act gave employers certain rights, enlarged the benefits granted union members and attempted, in a small degree, to protect the public against strikes which injuriously affected the public health, safety, and welfare.

Under the Taft-Hartley Act, the unions, with the assistance of the Labor Department, the purpose of which was—and I quote from the statute which created it—"to foster, promote, and develop the welfare of wage earners of the United States, to improve their working conditions, and to advance their opportunities for profitable employment," are now able to call and continue strikes which throw hundreds of thousands of union as well as nonunion men out of employment, interfere with interstate commerce, deplete unemployment funds, and at times threaten the welfare of the public.

That is a broad statement, but to realize its truth one need but recall current events.

The coal strike of last winter, when one man, John L. Lewis, successfully defied the Federal Government, caused more than 200,000 workers to lose their jobs and impose hardship and suffering upon the people of the northern half of the United States, has not been forgotten. Nor have we any assurance that a similar situation will not recur next winter.

There is the present Chrysler strike which was called on January 25 for one purpose, with the issue now entirely different. Some 89,000 Chrysler employees have been out of work for more than 90 days. These strikers have lost more than an estimated $126,000,000 in wages. Just how many other employees in supplier plants have lost their jobs, how many dealers have suffered financial loss, and to what extent, is not known. The Chrysler Corp. loss can conservatively be put at not less than $600,000,000.

It is reported that the union has collected around $7,000,000 in strike benefits from union members. It is charged that no more than $2,000,000 of that sum has been paid out in strike benefits by the union; that approximately $5,000,000 will be held in a kitty for political campaign purposes.

From my own district have come letters from members of the UAW-CIO, protesting the dollar-a-week assessment for strike benefits. Some write me that they just cannot understand why they should aid in paying for a strike in which they are not interested.

The press of April 25 stated there was a surprise strike by studio engineers in the American and National Broadcasting Co.'s in New York, which took the two systems off the air for some 2 hours, although their contract with the company does not expire until April 30.

Railroad employees threatened to tie up two of the country's largest railways because—and apparently only because—the railroads would not grant the union's demand for a third and unneeded man on Diesel locomotives. That demand was twice declared unwarranted by a President's fact-finding board—once in 1934 by a board appointed by President Roosevelt and again in 1949 by President Truman's board—although such boards are usually sympathetic toward all demands by the unions.

Sixty-three hundred phone workers here in Washington were ready to go on strike, and according to the press, threatened to jam Washington's telephone service.

Nor are some unions respecters of either charity or the grave.

Many remember when, in an eastern city, the grave diggers union called a strike, and not until a priest and his assistants volunteered to dig the graves were the dead buried.

Only recently here in Washington a radio station offered, without charge, to televise, for the benefit of crippled children the show produced by the Shriners, but the Associated Guild of Variety Artists insisted that circus hands, though they took no part in the performance, be paid for the video performance. Result? The crippled children were deprived of the funds which they would have otherwise received through the joint efforts of the Shrine and the station.

Under our system of government, no individual, no organization, unless it be a taxing body created by law, has the right to deprive you of your money or property. Yet, amazing as it may seem, in addition to a lawful tax burden which takes from each individual at least one-fourth of what he earns, millions of dollars are every year, by the unions, exacted from taxpayers who must pay if they desire to hold a job. In many industries employing hundreds of thousands of individuals a job can neither be obtained nor held unless the demands of the union be met—an initiation fee, all regular and special assessments be paid.

That condition, that is, the ability of any organization to compel a man to pay

tribute for a job which he must have if he would feed and clothe his family or himself, is un-American, and if permitted to grow, will ultimately ruin us all.

That condition exists because, and only because, a majority of our people having sympathy for the man who must work—do manual labor—insisted that the Congress make a gift of legislation which created special privileges, gave special benefits to employees.

But that special legislation which, I repeat, was a gift of the American people to workers, has been misused and abused by organized labor until today powerful unions—more accurately, the leaders of those unions—are not only exacting tribute from their own members but are making it extremely difficult for the unorganized worker to obtain and hold a job.

In addition, unions are arbitrarily collecting millions of dollars which they have, in part, used in the past—do not forget that John L. Lewis, of the UMW, contributed $750,000 to the Roosevelt campaign fund—which they will use in the future, for political purposes to advance their own political ambitions—to establish a labor government similar to that of England, which exists only because we contribute our dollars.

Unions and union members are not the only organizations, the only workers, in this land of ours. In fact, they are in the minority. When hundreds of thousands of people are thrown out of their jobs, on relief, by a strike, or when the public welfare is threatened because of a strike, there must be a remedy.

No group, to advance its own interests, can be permitted to threaten the welfare of the rest of the people, tie up completely and indefinitely transportation, communications, or any other business activity which affects all of us.

To remedy the situation, I have proposed a bill which, while preserving the right of employees to organize, bargain collectively, and to strike, will, if enforced, prevent union and nonunion men being deprived of their much needed jobs through strikes which they do not approve, have not authorized. Men who must work if they would eat should not be deprived by any individual or organization of the opportunity to earn a livelihood.

When unions misuse the special privileges granted them by the Taft-Hartley and other laws, they should automatically lose the special benefits conferred upon them by those laws designed to give them special benefits and privileges.

Former Under Secretary of State Clayton Urges Approval of the ITO Charter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERE COOPER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 2, 1950

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the following letter from former Under Secretary of State W. L. Clayton, appearing in the Washington Post today, stressing the importance of prompt approval of the ITO Charter:

CLAYTON URGES ITO CHARTER APPROVAL

(By W. L. Clayton, former Under Secretary of State)

I am sorry to see from your editorial of April 21 on the International Trade Organization that you favor deferring a decision on the Habana Charter.

You say that the charter contains too many escape clauses and qualifications; that it does not remove all trade discriminations; that it will have little effect on international trade so long as ECA continues to provide aid for western Europe. You add that there is divided opinion in business groups, trade and civic organizations about the charter.

May I remind you that the charter was completed 2 years ago; that it took more than 3 years and several international conferences to reach agreement on it.

After all this labor and waiting, if now we postpone decision on adoption of the charter, the other fifty-odd countries who joined us in writing it will probably conclude that we are no longer interested in creating this mechanism of the United Nations for promoting multilateral trade throughout the world. Further delay now probably means there will be no International Trade Organization.

It is true that the Charter grants certain exemptions and escapes but far from giving any nation any rights it does not already have, it has secured agreement on many vital principles of multilateral trade. Some of the stated objectives of the Charter are:

"To increase the production, consumption, and exchange of goods, and thus to contribute to a balanced and expanding world economy; to further the enjoyment by all countries on equal terms of access to markets, products, and productive facilities needed for their economic prosperity and development; to promote on a reciprocal and mutually advantageous basis the reduction of tariffs and other barriers to trade and the elimination of discriminatory treatment in international commerce."

To aid in the accomplishment of these purposes the Charter would establish the International Trade Organization as an agency of the United Nations. This organization would at once become a forum where representatives of member governments could meet and discuss their trade problems just as they meet in the Assembly and Security Council of the United Nations to discuss their political and security problems.

Mr. Paul Hoffman's recent speeches have emphasized the urgent need of economic integration and the lowering of trade barriers. He has repeatedly called attention to the urgent need for the United States to greatly increase its imports from Europe.

The ITO would provide a forum where such matters could be discussed and dealt with day by day instead of by occasional speeches. Let me mention only one or two of the other numerous benefits which would promptly flow from adoption of this Charter:

Take the question of customs red tape, arbitrary rulings, absence of any impartial tribunal to which to appeal, lack of information about what regulations actually are—all these things make it so difficult for people in various countries to do business with each other that some informed people have said they are a greater barrier to imports than tariffs themselves. The Charter provides for a widespread adjustment, simplification, and publication of customs procedures all over the world. Would you say that this would have little effect upon the character of international trade?

We read much about private cartels—how they hold up prices and otherwise interfere with recovery abroad. The prompt establishment of international machinery for dealing with the harmful effects of cartels, which the charter provides, should prove of great benefit to international trade.

I believe that the rules of the charter are basically good rules. I believe that it is most important that they be made effective at once in order to establish the direction of policy which the member governments will pursue. The fact that governments have agreed to follow the principles embodied in the charter will affect trade policy decisions which member governments make every day. In that way the charter should have a very real and immediate effect upon international trade. In fact, anticipation of the establishment of the ITO has already had its influence in a number of cases; for example, one of the reasons advanced to the British Parliament by the Government in support of the monopoly law recently passed was that it would enable the United Kingdom to carry out its commitments under the ITO Charter.

Finally, may I say that I am surprised at the suggestion that one reason for postponing action on the Charter is the fact that there are conflicting views about the ITO. Have there not always been conflicting views in the United States on international trade? Do you think all our people will agree with Mr. Hoffman that the United States should greatly step up its purchases of European goods? Don't you know that we have powerful interests in our country who would rather see us give away $3,000,000,000 worth of goods annually than to accept goods in payment which might in some small measure interfere with their own business?

One of the most important and beneficial steps taken by the United States in the field of international trade policy was the enactment of the Trade Agreements Act in 1934. This act never would have been passed, or renewed, as it has been on several occasions, if its consideration by the Congress had been deferred until opinion about it had ceased to be divided. Indeed, opinion on it has been so divided that on one occasion, the act was seriously weakened, by amendment, in renewal.

HOUSTON, TEX.

Economic Cooperation Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 2, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert the following article from the Boston Sunday Herald, Boston, Mass., April 30, 1950:

EUROPEAN RECOVERY CASH NOW RETURNING TO AID NEW ENGLAND INDUSTRY

(By Lawrence G. Weiss)

A good dollar, like a bad penny, has a way of turning up again.

That's what's been happening to the dollars the United States has invested in European recovery. They've been turning up in the cash registers of American businessmen, and New Englanders are getting their share.

Our friends in Europe are using our dollars to buy our goods. It means more orders for New England factories, more jobs for New England workers, and more traffic for the port of Boston. It means a $10,000,000,000 investment is paying dividends.

Wide-awake Yankee businessmen, never the ones to sit idle when there were dollars to be spent, have been selling everything

from can openers to textile machinery to customers in Europe.

They have salesmen making the rounds in countries like France, Italy, Belgium, and Britain drumming up business in tires and ice-cream freezers, needles, and eyeglass frames. And the sales are coming in.

The dollars we've supplied to Europe are now paying for about 45 percent of the goods that are being shipped from the port of Boston. They've been the major factor behind the port's gains in export business during the last year.

SPREAD IS WIDE

In 1 month, last year, when the dollars were coming in at a trickle instead of a stream, more than 191 New England firms got some of them. The total number of dollars for these firms exceeded ten million.

The month was June 1949. It's an old month, but there are no statistics available for a later one. The smallest sale in that month was $215 for abrasive wheels. The largest was $2,279,000 for coal.

Since then the flow of dollars to New England has increased.

When the United States first made its dollars available to western Europe in the spring of 1948, the Europeans wanted food, fuel, and agricultural implements. They bought these things from the Midwest and from areas outside the United States.

These aren't the kind of commodities that New England produces. And so, in 1948, New England got only a small amount of the dollars. Most of the dollars we did get came from the sale of coal, which was produced outside New England.

By the end of January 1949, New England had received only about 1 percent of the total number of dollars that were spent throughout the world. But even that 1 percent came to $22,000,000.

After European farms began to produce again and our friends in Europe were less hungry and cold, the United States set out to convince them that they'd have to use our dollars for some long-range objectives.

NEW ENGLAND BOON

We wanted them to buy machinery to build up their industries. In that way, we said, they could become self-sufficient and we would not have to go on supporting them. Most of the Europeans agreed.

They began to put their dollars into machinery, machine tools, and electrical equipment. And that's where New England came in. Those things are our meat. The dollars began pouring in. By June of 1949—the month we have figures for—our percentage of the dollars had more than tripled. It's been going up ever since.

Europeans are buying more and more of the things New England makes. They're making the purchases with dollars supplied by the Economic Cooperation Administration, the ECA. The ECA program is a complicated one, but here's a simple version of how it works.

A customer in France wants to buy something useful from an American factory. He tells his government about it, and asks permission to use up some of the dollars France has had allocated to it by ECA.

If the government says yes and ECA approves, the French customer pays his government in his own currency for the thing he wants to buy. Then ECA pays the American manufacturer in dollars.

ECA PAYS BILL

The American seller and the French buyer do business in pretty much their own way. But ECA, which means you, pays the bill.

The money the Frenchman pays to his government is put into a fund called the Counterpart Fund. This fund can be used to pay for productive improvements in France, like railroad improvements. Or it can be used to pay off some of France's debt. In either case, the money can only be spent with ECA approval.

If it weren't for ECA, countries in western Europe simply wouldn't have the dollars to buy what we have to sell. We'd have had to do without the greater part of six billion dollars' worth of export business in the last year and a half.

That's a lot of business, and it means a lot of jobs. But when you come right down to it, the dividends the United States expects to get from the billions it has invested in Europe have to be measured in something larger than business and jobs.

We're sending western Europe our dollars so that it will be strong enough to resist communism. The men who thought up the idea feared Europe would be overrun by Communists if it weren't helped. And if Europe were overrun, they thought, it would mean war between Russia and the United States.

And they figured that, in terms of dollars and cents alone, a war would cost American taxpayers a great deal more than they've had to pay for ECA. So even if we weren't getting our dollars back, ECA, in their view, would still be a good investment.

The McCarthy Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 2, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial which appeared in today's Washington Post, May 2, 1950, entitled "The McCarthy Record":

THE MCCARTHY RECORD

Dr. Owen Lattimore's clearly deserved rebuttal appearance before the Tydings subcommittee today should bring to an end the public, or circus, phase of the inquiry into Senator MCCARTHY's charges. Thereafter, we hope, the subcommittee will retire into the closed sessions with which it should have undertaken its task from the beginning. Perhaps, then, this is a suitable juncture to recall the original McCarthy charges, although the Senator seems anxious to have them forgotten.

The initial charge came in a speech at Wheeling, W. Va., on February 9. "I have here in my hand," Mr. MCCARTHY was quoted as saying, "a list of 205 that were known to the Secretary of State as being members of the Communist Party and who nevertheless are still working and shaping the policy of the State Department." This was followed by a telegram to President Truman asserting, "I have in my possession the names of 57 Communists who are in the State Department at present." Then, in a 4-hour speech to the Senate, February 20, Senator MCCARTHY declared: "I have approximately 81 cases * * * the names are here." On that occasion, he outlined the cases without disclosing the names, insisting that he had all the data necessary to support his charges. "I shall be willing, happy, and eager," he said, "to go before any committee and give the names and all the information available. I shall refuse to give the source of the information, however."

It can scarcely be recalled too frequently, moreover, that in the same Senate speech, Mr. MCCARTHY made the following categorical statement: "I will not say anything on the Senate floor which I will not say off the floor. On the day when I take advantage of the security we have on the Senate floor, on that day I will resign from the Senate. Anything I say on the floor of the Senate at any time will be repeated off the floor." Since then, he has named individuals and accused them of atrocious crimes, taking advantage of the security of the Senate. But he has conspicuously failed to repeat the accusations outside the Senate's immunity. And he has not yet resigned.

In his appearances before the Tydings subcommittee, Senator MCCARTHY did not provide the information to support his indictment of the 205 or the 57 or the 81. He pleaded that he could not prove his charges unless the FBI would prove them for him by surrendering the confidential investigative records which the President had previously forbidden the agency to surrender. And at last he said he would let his whole case stand or fall on the validity of his accusations concerning Dr. Lattimore whom he called at first the "top espionage agent" in this country and ended by describing as a "bad policy risk."

Dr. Lattimore, it should be remembered, is not and never has been an employee of the State Department. He is a private citizen, recognized throughout the academic profession as one of the foremost authorities on the Far East, who has occasionally submitted memoranda, in response to State Department requests, concerning policy in the area of his experience. Senator MCCARTHY's case against him rests primarily on the opinions Dr. Lattimore expressed—opinions with which the Senator happens to disagree, although many of them have been abundantly vindicated by events.

Two facts appear to be plain concerning the Lattimore case. One is that it can prove nothing whatever about the validity of Senator MCCARTHY's charges that there are 205 or 57 or 81 Communists in the State Department. The other is that the Senate of the United States has no business conducting a trial and passing judgment on the "loyalty" of a private citizen. Of course, if this involves the crime of espionage, then such a case should be referred to a grand jury. However, Senator MCCARTHY has apparently abandoned this charge.

In view of the misrepresentation of Dr. Lattimore as a State Department employee and extravagance of the charges made against him under the Senate's immunity, the Tydings subcommittee was under an obvious obligation to allow him the opportunity to reply in public. It is now under obligation, as a matter of elementary justice, we think, to give Dr. Lattimore a speedy and unequivocal vindication, and in view of the wide mischief and alarm that have been caused, to make a ringing declaration in behalf of the freedom of inquiry which has been gravely threatened by the Lattimore case.

State Law Overruled by United Nations Charter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 2, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, certainly something new has been added when a California court rules that the United Nations Charter takes precedence over State law. Here is a challenge to every loyal citizen of the United

States. I am including as part of my remarks a news article that appeared in the Washington Daily News on April 25 which tells the whole story. This case should be appealed to the highest court in our land so the people may know which way we are going.

The article follows:

LOS ANGELES, April 25.—A California court, in what was believed an unprecedented ruling, overruled a State law which banned Japanese from owning land because the statute conflicted with the UN Charter.

The District Court of Appeals said yesterday the Federal Constitution provides that treaties take precedence over State laws. The decision written by Justice Emmet H. Wilson said the UN Charter is a treaty between the United States and other UN members.

"The Charter guarantees universal respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all, without regard to race, color, or religion. Because the alien land law discriminates against Japanese concerning the ownership of land, its restrictions are untenable and indefensible," the decision said.

Lower courts had ruled that under California's alien land law Sei Fujii, native of Japan, could not keep property he bought more than 40 years ago because he was ineligible for citizenship.

Whither the Railroads?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, a great segment of the national economy is dependent upon the well-being of the great railroad systems of our country. Unless they prosper and progress the adverse effects are felt throughout the length and breadth of the land.

Among the most progressive railroads of the country, the Pennsylvania Railroad system is typical of the most progressive systems with regard to its approach to the problems of the day. Its former president, now chairman of the board, M. W. Clement, has been a recognized authority in the field of railroad development and enterprise.

Few railroad officials have had better opportunity to view comprehensively the problems facing the industry, certainly few such officials have brought to the task a more sound knowledge of matters that affect railroading in large or small degree.

In an address delivered recently before the chamber of commerce at San Francisco, Calif., Mr. Clement voiced the conviction, based on his long experience, that sensible regulation permitting greater freedom of operations is an essential not only to the progress of the industry, but, indeed, to its very survival.

The importance of the railroads to the economy of our country is such that Mr. Clement's views and proposals deserve to be brought to the attention of as great a proportion of our people as possible. I ask unanimous consent, therefore, that the address be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHITHER THE RAILROADS?—SENSIBLE REGULATION, GREATER FREEDOM WOULD AID INDUSTRY'S SURVIVAL

The best way I know to indicate my appreciation of your invitation to come here is to talk with you frankly.

If ever there were a day when men should face frankly the facts of life, it is today. No man should fear to be regarded as a Jeremiah if he becomes thoughtful about what he sees going on and expresses himself accordingly. Nor should he be deterred from using what have been derided as scare words if he believes they are the kind of words that accurately describe what he observes.

It is only natural for businessmen to look at things—social, political, and economic—through the eyes of their own particular enterprise. It is also very easy to see ghosts; it is tempting to argue from the particular to the general. It is human nature to think that what is important to ourselves should be important to others.

These observations occurred to me in connection with what I proposed to say here because it starts with the railroad industry. And I mention them so that you may apply whatever discount you think appropriate in view of my interest in railroads.

No thoughtful, responsible citizen—whether businessman or not—who is interested in keeping alive for his children and his grandchildren the freedoms that he himself inherited, can avoid wondering at least whether there is really any more important issue before the American people than the very form of our Government itself. Are we to continue as a Republic or are we going to have a centralized state—by default?

I say "thoughtful" and "responsible" because there is altogether too little responsible thought being given to the subject, in whatever state one finds himself; too little sense of individual responsibility. Too many are inclined to forget or disregard the principles of freedom in favor of temporary self-interest. Too many do not know their own coin or cannot detect the counterfeit coin of others.

Right now and for some years we have been in the midst of inflation, but who doesn't like a little inflation? On every side there are subsidies, but who believes in private enterprise enough to refuse a little subsidy for himself?

ABILITY TO EARN EXPENSES SIGN OF SOUND BUSINESS

We are gliding into state socialism, which is the easy and alluring path from freedom to absolutism. This path is lined with attractive signs and deceptive words that do not mean what they say; that are meant to disguise and conceal, and to fool the unwary and gullible.

What, you may ask, have the railroads to do with all this? I believe it is the railroads—perhaps more particularly the railroads in the East—whose situation suggests some of the processes which those interested in state socialism find it advantageous to use.

Any business, any endeavor, to continue to exist must be economically sound. Any business to be sound must earn not only its operating and maintenance costs but also its interest and depreciation and its taxes—social security, income, and ad valorem. That the railroad transportation business (which is the most overtaxed and overregulated industry in the United States) does this, is an outstanding tribute to the men who operate the American railroads.

EXCESSIVE REGULATION LEADS TO STATISM

We are not opposed to taxes, but they should be equitable and should not be used to subsidize, particularly our competitors. We are not opposed to regulation, but it should be by law and not by emotion. Many of us in the transportation business realize full well that without regulation the railroads would have been government-owned long ago. It is my own belief that the Interstate Commerce Act of 1887 and the Sherman Antitrust Act of 1890 are the two most important statutes of our time. These two acts properly administered are, in my judgment, staunch bulwarks of the freedoms our Republic was founded to preserve.

Without the Sherman Act a few large rail systems, possibly just one system, would have developed and eventually it would have become government-owned. Without regulation under the Interstate Commerce Act we would likewise have had government ownership. And government ownership is socialism.

If it was important in the past to protect the public and the railroads by regulation, it is equally important now to protect them from regulation. Regulation is gradually ceasing to be what it was intended to be. It is becoming a supermanagement (a form of centralized state operation, if you please) enforcing its own business judgment—or political judgment—upon railroad rates and practices, gradually undermining the capacity of the railroads to provide the quality of transportation under just and reasonable rates that managerial initiative, unhampered, can provide.

The whole approach to the problem of the after-war economy of the railroads has been devious. Procedural delay on the part of the regulatory authorities has cost the railroads vast sums of money—some $250,000,000 after taxes on the Pennsylvania Railroad in the last 5 years—yet prompt action, on the basis of the obvious, would have been beneficial all around. It would have meant no higher rates. It would have improved the economy of the railroads. It would have hastened the decrease in rates that always follows reconstruction after a period of economic upheaval and inflation such as we have been going through.

GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP MAY BE ULTIMATE STEP

If regulation under the law is important to the railroads, it is even more important to the shippers at large and to the public as a whole that regulation shall adjust itself to the law. Today's paradox is that while without regulation we would have had Government ownership years ago, now—as a result of regulation itself—Government ownership is being made to seem inevitable.

GROWTH OF SUBSIDIZATION IS BLOW AT SELF-RELIANCE

I mentioned subsidy. This is another big factor in the transportation situation that has its significance to the thoughtful and responsible businessman who sees beyond his day's work.

It is almost impossible to find any large segment of the voting public today that does not enjoy some form of subsidy. Subsidy is gradually extending itself into all the ramifications of business by one means or another. It is one of the insidious influences that is attacking the self-reliance of all the people.

The upper and nether millstones between which the railroads are caught are the services which are performed at less than cost and the services which are performed at a profit but which are subject to inroads by subsidized competition. It is within these limits of the economy of the railroads that whether we shall have private ownership or the alternative of socialization will be determined.

The commuter believes in the free enterprise system for everyone but the railroads.

The airlines should exist without subsidy. Now they enjoy tax-built, tax-free airports, tax-maintained airways, and a big mail subsidy—many millions a year. In connection with this mail subsidy to the

airlines, it is interesting to note that the Pennsylvania Railroad and the New York Central Railroad together, in 1949, lost about $40,000,000 in handling the United States mail—enough to pay the airmail subsidy.

The railroads, in other words, subsidize the Government and the Government subsidizes our competition. Then, under subsidy, our competitors charge less for their service, and the railroads lose business.

The private automobile owner pays more than he should in gas taxes so that the big trucker can pay much less than he should.

The railroads want no subsidy. A rail subsidy could only mean Government control. Government control means Government ownership, and that is socialism.

The railroads have a constructive problem of their own. It is to reduce the cost of their production and thus to reduce the cost of their service. The upper limit of rail rates is fixed, not only by competition but more so by another condition—the decentralization of industry to avoid transportation charges. The railroads produce nothing but service. They grew great through providing mass transportation in volume at low rates. Their future usefulness depends on the same thing.

THREE PERIODS OF INFLATION POSE PROBLEMS IN TRANSPORTATION

Personally, I have been through three periods of inflation. The first was at the turn of the century. It was one of even progress—spread over quite a few years; a period of expansion and inflation that was generally wholesome in its effect. The Pennsylvania Railroad through that period made large capital expenditures for road and equipment. Mountain grades became low grades; sharp curves became easy curves or straight lines; engines and cars grew in size. Costs were generally held down and there were but slight rate increases. Combined with it there came a general improvement in service and in wages and working conditions. Then it was that the short-haul package traffic became unprofitable and the struggle with regulation commenced.

The next period of inflation was during and after World War I—a period probably all of you remember. Under Government administration railroad rates and expenses doubled. The director general of the railroads was unencumbered then by the delays of regulation and rate increases paralleled increased expenses—so that as the peak of inflation was reached, the peak of rates was reached. During the next decade the railroads of the country spent over $15,000,000,000 in improving their plant and equipment, and the period of the twenties and early thirties saw improvement in service, reduction in rates, and considerable diversion to the truck—particularly in the short haul. But, with the growth of the country, rail traffic—as measured by ton miles and passenger miles—grew during the twenties to exceed anything the country had known before.

RATE CONTROLS PUT BRAKE ON FREE FUNCTION OF RAILROADS

Following the depression came World War II and the temporary period of partial price control; then inflation on a wide scale. That period is too close to need any review. While manufacturing and other industry, in the free economy in which they operate, moved their prices with their costs—and labor moved its rates at will, the railroads were prevented by regulation from functioning as they should under the free enterprise system and from changing their charges as their costs changed. Regulatory processes just could not keep up with economic events.

Unfortunately, the processes of rate regulation do not operate on a business basis. Regulation reflects the emotion of businessmen and their representatives—shippers, producers, traffic leagues, chambers of commerce; and, while all these men in business make their own prices on a business basis, they object to the railroads pricing their services on the same basis. Each and every one of these groups or sections of the country wish to maintain some advantage over other groups or sections through their rate structure. So any attempt on the part of the railroads to make their rates on a business basis, here in the midst of the only free enterprise country of the world, makes slow progress.

The only approach available is the one that we have taken—to raise all rates to get up the unprofitable and then eventually bring down the ones that are too high—and, through changes of practices or methods, keep them profitable.

OPPORTUNITY TO MOVE FREELY IS TODAY'S GREAT NEED

The railroads are going to have to spend as many or even more billions after World War II as they did after World War I. We will need greater capacity motive power; long trains of large capacity, light-weight high-earning capacity cars, with relative low rates for the long haul. Therein lies our salvation and industry's salvation, and we need the help of each other if we are to make progress and preserve a free economy.

The country has doubled in size since any additional railroads have been built. The people consume more transportation every day. With the constant growth of transportation we feel confident that to take the place of that unprofitable business which the railroads lose, there will come more profitable business. It will come if the country continues to progress, and we—the railroads—will be restored to prosperity and will perform to the benefit of the people as a whole if we are permitted to move in the free economy in which you all live and have your business being.

If we don't get that opportunity, then we will move right along with the socialistic drift of the day and become a creature of the state, supported by additional taxation which you will have to pay—if, of course, you manage to stay free yourselves.

PROFIT MOTIVE IS SPARK PLUG OF THE AMERICAN SYSTEM

As you watch developments in this country, note how many people talk against communism and against socialism. If it were not so tragic, it really would be amusing to observe these people in all walks of life denouncing socialism, denouncing Government ownership, while at the same time they are fostering policies that are hastening the advent of the very thing they talk against.

Capital is the product of effort in a free society. The greatest aggregation of capitalists the world has ever known are the American workmen, and as they have become capitalists they have promoted prosperity. Only where the mass of the people have the courage to have capital have they the courage to love freedom. The citizen of the totalitarian state has no property, he is property—state owned. He is a slave. Only the profit motive made us what we are. And the right to, and maintenance of, the profit motive in business or industry, or any other form of capitalist enterprise, is the only way we can maintain our freedom.

AMERICANS CANNOT SUPPORT HALF-SLAVE, HALF-FREE ECONOMY

At the time of the signing of the Constitution someone asked Benjamin Franklin, "What have we got?" and he replied, "You have a Republic if you can keep it." That was the Republic we kept for about a hundred years, and it was the Republic which subsequently a Minister of the United States to England said, "* * * will endure so long as the ideas of the men who made it continue to be dominant." Those are ideas that, in our time, are gradually disappearing or being circumscribed with other ways of thinking as we gradually slide from a republic to a democracy and then to the socialistic state.

One of the country's really great men, Illinois' greatest, said that this country could not remain half slave and half free. If that were true in the agricultural economy of his day, it is just as true of the industrial economy today. We just cannot continue to have America survive with part of its industry operating in a free economy and part operating in a slave economy. Neither can we have any line of competitive endeavor, such as in the transportation field, half subsidized and half taxed, without eventually destroying it.

The world suffers more from those whose intentions are good but whose thinking is warped than it does from those of bad purposes. The Government should not guarantee people an income from their occupation, but the right to pursue it unmolested by unwarranted intrusions of Government and regulation. The theory behind the Republic was that Government should mind its own business as long as the people minded theirs. It was the fear of want and the ambition to excel that brought the human race up from ignorance to intelligence, from barbarism to civilization; that was the compelling urge that brought this country from a wilderness to its high state of prosperity in so short a time.

PROGRESS WAS GREATEST IN ERA OF FREEDOM

Your forebears and mine, after the Revolution, when this country was at its lowest ebb, did not have anyone to guarantee them a price for their crop. There was no handout from any other country to keep them from going communistic. Nobody sent them food to bring up their caloric ration or to improve their vitamin intake. None of those things had ever been heard of. They went out into the far reaches of this country and survived or did not survive as they were able to make a living out of the soil they tilled.

The Republic, in the very beginning, recognized that one of the ruling guides of human association was to guarantee to everyone the free exercise of his industry and the possession of its products, and that agriculture, manufacture, commerce, and transportation—the foundation of prosperity—are the most thriving when left most free to individual enterprise.

Grover Cleveland, one of the strong Americans of my youth—"Tell the Truth" Cleveland—in his second inaugural address stated: "Paternalism is the bane of republican institutions; it undermines the self-reliance of our people and substitutes in its place dependence upon governmental favoritism; it stifles the spirit of true Americanism and stupefies every ennobling trait of American citizenship."

AS THE RAILROADS GO—SO GOES THE COUNTRY

Few people realize that the sixteenth amendment—the income-tax amendment—made over to the Government the whole power of an autocrat to take from one individual and not from another as it will, and to take in different proportion from different individuals as it will. People did not realize when it was adopted that it was not a power of constitutional taxation, but was—and still is—the power of confiscation. The power to tax is the power to destroy.

The evils of subsidy are the taxes it requires. They help the drift of the country toward the socialistic state, and the fact that the railroads and not your business may be involved is no lasting consolation to you. The country will go as the railroads go. And it is in your own interest to see that the railroads continue as free enterprise under sensible regulation, for if they do not survive—no other business will.

We want no Government subsidy, no Government aid. No government is strong enough for everybody to lean on, nor rich enough for everybody to live on. Within the limits of the Sherman Antitrust Act and the Interstate Commerce Act we want only economic freedom to develop and prosper to operate in the best interests of the free industry and the free people that we serve.

The Road to Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a very fine address made by the attorney general of Virginia, the Honorable J. Lindsay Almond, at Madison College, Harrisburg, Va., on April 19.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ROAD TO SOCIALISM

I would like to discuss with you some vital issues which confront all who are concerned with the survival of the institution of American representative democracy. That loyalty and devotion to our country which lies dormant and cankers in lethargy, to awaken in the stupor of drowsiness under the impact only of an international emergency, is a virus which saps the energizing vitality of a Nation rendering it impotent to respond to the call of survival when the dark days of armed conflict descend upon us. Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty in peace as well as in war. "The ramparts we watch" are a challenge to our patriotism in the pursuit of a sane and constructive course in domestic as well as in foreign policy. In the world of today domestic and international issues are interwoven in breadth of scope and depth of importance.

The enduring character of every structure, moral, spiritual, physical, ideological, is commensurate with the stability of the foundation upon which it rests. The architect and builder dare not defy the laws of gravity, nature and nature's God. He will subscribe to, adhere to and follow tried, tested, known, proven, and practical fundamental principles and formulae. Whatever deviation there may be in his commendable reach for progress and improvement he will not overreach, abandon, or undermine the foundation upon which the superstructure must rest. When he does so he knows that there lies ahead the inevitable crash of calamity and catastrophe.

I wonder how many of you realize that our country is reaching, or may have reached, and is enmeshed in the turning point of its history and that the decisions relating to domestic policy now being made, and those that will follow as an inevitable consequence, will determine the character of our political and economic life for a long time to come.

We are at the fateful crossroads of our national development and destiny. Until recently the political and economic roads that we traveled gave ample opportunity for the successful exercise of the proven and tested virtues of individual initiative, self reliance, independence, and responsibility. The paths we are now taking lead only to emphasis upon self security, governmental ownership of basic industry, regimentation of the people through collectivist controls, abrogation of the free market principle, sabotage of the law of supply and demand and the death knell of the free enterprise system. They are the deep and devastating inroads of socialism upon the American way of life. They are the paths to the authoritarian and welfare state. We are at grips with socialism under the fraudulent and deceptive guise of national planning. Socialism is the intervening and deviating step between capitalism and that antithetical and hideous ideology known as communism.

Beckoned by the siren call of the false assumption that we are getting something for nothing, we are bartering our most precious heritage of liberty.

Anyone who dares warn his fellow citizens of our mad and reckless rush into the embrace of socialism is called a reactionary. He is told that he is refusing to face the real issues and is resorting to bugaboo and scare procedures. But let us see who is facing the genuine issues. Certainly, not the welfare state boys. Not the indolent, the idle carefree crowd who seek a redistribution of the national wealth, those who would penalize the frugality and industry of those who have, to reward the indolence, indifference and inertia of those who have not, simply because they seek not to improve their own condition by the exercise of ambition, initiative, and enterprise. Can it be those who seek to create a centralized government in Washington strong enough for everybody to lean on and big enough for everybody to live on, not realizing that the vitality of the entire social and economic structure is sapped in proportion to the increase of the political powers of such a government? Can it be those who seek to destroy the individual zest and initiative, the inventive genius and progressiveness of those who invest their energies, substance, and resources in the stability, growth, and expansion of technology, science, industry, commerce, business, and agriculture, under the impetus of free enterprise, thereby creating the fiber of life and sustenance for the entire body politic, augmenting the strength of the Nation and meeting in full the increasing demands of employment and individual security? The answer is so obvious as to render its statement unnecessary.

That which we now witness springs from the inherent nature of man. Humankind is innately selfish and grasping. Areas, sects, and classes organize to seek advantages limited to their own special groups. The impact upon the commonweal is a matter of no concern. Special privilege with its inevitable encroachments upon the relative rights of others has become the order of the day. Political and economic philosophy has changed to political and economic strategy. We are losing the glorious democratic trinity of "government of the people, by the people, and for the people." Through the welded, compact response of minority pressure groups to the dangling bait of political promises we are descending into government of the many by the few. We are rapidly contaminating and distorting the virtue of another basic and fundamental trinity, "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." We are eschewing the essence of the democratic concept of life, bartering liberty and placing profligate emphasis upon a reckless and costly pursuit of happiness. Instead of improving, securing, and transmitting untarnished to posterity the heritage which came to us through blood and sacrifice we are consuming it in riotous living. The flames on the altar of socialism, unless we reverse the trend, will be its funeral pyre.

From days of old men have yearned to be rid of the uncertainties of a world characterized by change, risk, and want. Faced by the uncertainty of his food supply because of vagaries of weather conditions primitive man resorted to magic to propitiate the gods. Modern man is the counterpart of his cave-dwelling brother. Confronted by limitations on the supply of goods and services modern men dream of utopias and the Santa Claus state. If your resources and production do not permit us to satisfy all of our desires, then, instead of relying on our own initiative and the dint of hard unsparing effort, it is more pleasant and momentarily comforting to follow the lines of least resistance. No matter how degrading to self respect and how derogatory to independence, we indulge the fond thought and hope that there is a kind father in Washington to whom we can look for help in the mendicant role of a supplicant and not go away disappointed. It matters not that the father in Washington produces nothing, that the Government will have to pyramid tax upon tax, further devaluate the currency, increase inflation, and add to the crushing weight of an already appalling debt. These practices are so soothing that their adverse effects are not immediately apparent. They lull us into a state of sonambulism.

It is the caressing simplicity of the line of thinking, or total lack of it, that regards Government spending as a cure-all that makes it so dangerous. They tell us that we need not worry about unbalanced budgets, recurring deficits, a stupendous national debt and and increasing taxation, because the rising national income will take care of that. That is becoming the comforting but dangerous and fallacious dogma of the modern age. It is nothing but a convenient doctrine for refusing to face our inescapable responsibilities. It is whistling in the dark as we pass by the proverbial graveyard.

It was not through the application of such a doctrine that we have succeeded in the past in achieving an increase of national production at the average rate of 4 percent per year. The well-known research agency, the National Bureau of Economic Research, in a study of manufacturing productivity, has shown that by the end of the fourth decade of this century manufacturing output in the United States was four times that achieved at the turn of the century. This increase was accomplished with only one-third as many man-hours of factory labor per unit of output as was the case 40 years earlier. New industries that were created gave employment to our increasing manpower and at the same time these industries turned out products which increased the standard of living for the average man.

Why change from such a system or even contaminate it with the virus of socialism which has brought despair to the people and bankruptcy to every nation which has embraced it?

Our economic strength and progress was not the result of seeking salvation through the gospel of social security at the hands of a paternalistic government. Nor can we associate our economic growth with the idea of Government spending. Our growth and our greatness are the direct and undeniable result of risk taking, investment, and the freedom of the businessman to take chances with his resources because he knew he could own and use a fair proportion of the fruits of his genius and labor. Risk and uncertainty, which were feared by the static societies of the past, were met head on and face to face by the dynamic forces of the free enterprise system. The businessman was the initiator of change and progress and the willing bearer of risks under the natural laws of a free economy. The profit-and-loss statement was the barometer of the forces of competition. Paternalistic socialism upsets the barometer by destroying profit. Without profit the risk of venture and investment is gone, initiative is destroyed, production recedes and unemployment rises, with want and penury stalking in the wake.

The handout state with its philosophy of spending aims at providing bread and

circuses after the Roman fashion. Under the socialistic system the Roman Empire, shorn of all of its glory, power, and prestige, found its last resting place on the scrapheap of oblivion.

We follow the same road when each group, hat in hand, turns to the benevolence of a paternalistic state in a competitive grab for favors in the name of the general welfare.

The philosophy extent in the land that the state must guarantee a minimum of security to every individual against all sorts and kinds of hazards not only weakens the moral fiber of the people but is productive of economic stagnation. It not only makes more and more taxes inevitable but it renders necessary, as a consequence, more and more controls over the economy, reaching down to the grass-root level of the entire society in abridgment of the liberties of all of the people. High and confiscatory levies upon individual and corporate income and inheritance dry up savings necessary for the formation of capital and rob state and local government of the sources of revenue necessary to the performance of their essential functions.

The key to our economic progress has been the fact that the savings of the people have been directed to the manufacture of the instruments and the expansion of production. In the Socialist state the government absorbs the savings of the people. Technological changes, many of them of a revolutionary character, have been brought to fruition and use by innovators—men of imagination, daring, incentive and initiative—who carved their own way of invention, discovery, and success. This spirit of adventure, the creature of freedom of enterprise, is fast giving way to the psychology of dependence upon a paternalistic state.

The fundamental question which we must answer now—and the hour is late—is whether we are more likely to promote economic welfare and individual freedom through governmental measures designed to redistribute income and level all classes and conditions of men or our destiny is to continue to be forged through a competitive system unhampered by bureaucratic controls and free to increase national production.

Proponents of the philosophy of spending maintain that they are the champions of a free competitive economic system. Their actions not only cast suspicion on the professions of their faith but flatly contradict every concept of the free-enterprise system.

It may be that many of these persons are sincere, but misguided through ignorance of the workings of the free, competitive market. They seek to foist controls on the economy the inevitable result of which is to cripple or destroy the system.

There are others, of course, who are less innocent and really know better. They are legion, and are the disciples of the Marxian theory, and Socialists at heart. They are the planners who advocate our following a master plan. They are the integrators and the coordinators who strive for unification of our multifarious economic activities according to a neatly formulated plan worked out by a centralized, self-perpetuating Government bureau or department. They soft-pedal statism, the welfare state, and Government ownership. Like so many of their Socialist confederates of pinkish hue they call it the planned economy. Adroitly, they realize that the idea of nationalization does not strike a responsive chord in the minds of the American people. Planning is a much more attractive term since millions of persons from the housewife to the businessman are engaged in daily planning of their activities. The snare is that it seems to be a very rational procedure to base one's conduct upon a careful weighing of all alternatives and to have a clear understanding of your goal. It seems to be the scientific way of doing things. You clearly formulate your objectives, and then you seek for the best means to accomplish. It is all very simple. They ask the question, if the individual is wise in following this procedure why cannot the Nation follow a similar pattern through Government planning and controls?

Unfortunately, collectivist planners substitute pseudo-science for the genuine article. One characteristic of the scientific attitude is to respect the medium with which the scientist is dealing. In matters pertaining to society the medium that must be respected consists of human beings and the cultural environment in which they function.

During a century and one-half we have developed a constitutional form of government, democratic political machinery, giving voice to the wishes of its citizens, and an industrial system which registers the desires of every family through their daily expenditures on a wide variety of goods and services. Political democracy and the free market have gone hand in hand. One has been the concomitant of the other. We cannot ignore the fact that the nineteenth century, which made the greatest strides in establishing universal suffrage, freedom of speech, of assembly, and of the press, was also an age in which free enterprise and the principle of self-help prevailed in economic affairs. It is also significant that in recent decades those countries where a highly centralized government controls production and distribution, initiative is dead, the people verge on robots, thought is muzzled and the labor prison camp is the destination of the political dissenter. The collectivist-minded should ponder these historical developments. Those bent on driving this country into the slough of socialism might consider the desperate plight of our British cousins.

If the pseudo-science of the planners results in ignoring historical facts about our culture, it also does violence to the facts of human nature. The atmosphere created by Government controls and regulations does not encourage the undertaking of risks, of venturing into untried territory. Ask yourself whether centralized planners would have selected a young Virginia farm boy to mechanize agriculture. Yet that is what Cyrus H. McCormick did. Would a centralized planning bureau have picked an ex-newsboy and railroad telegraph operator by the name of Thomas A. Edison to invent the electric light, the phonograph, and the motion-picture industry? Would they have chosen a mechanic by the name of Henry Ford, who brought about the revolutionary changes associated with the automobile? These are only a few names in the glorious history of modern technology. Innovation, which was responsible for our great material progress, could only flourish in an environment devoid of the authoritarian principle.

The interventionist denies that he is a Socialist and that socialism is the last step before communism. When faced with the facts of history he denies that he is aiming at centralized planning. He claims that he wishes to eliminate the weak spots in the competitive market. He does not desire to interfere with the price system, but hopes rather to stabilize our economy through fiscal and monetary policies. Actually, what we find him doing is attempting to perpetuate price controls, propounding fly-by-night schemes for allocation of materials and rationing, and granting more and more subsidies for a rapidly increasing list of welfare services.

The more forthright among the planners, such as William H. Beveridge in his book, Full Employment in a Free Society, have pointed out that deficit spending will not of itself accomplish the objective of attaining economic stability. It will, in addition, necessitate centralized government controls over prices, production, wages, transfer of workers against their will from one job to another, the location of industry and the selection of private investment.

As I see it, such nebulous schemes can only result in the loss of our liberties. Substituted for your freedom of choice will be the caprice of government officials in deciding what is good for us all. To have the fate of the economy depend upon the ability of a central government agency to forecast economic changes is a deplorably dangerous matter. Errors of judgment, when we are dealing with the over-all economy, must lead to the imposition of further controls and restrictions and to the state taking over the ownership of the key industries.

There is no half-way stopping point between a free market, where the price system regulates production and distribution, and a collectivist economy. The two will not blend. They are irreconciliable. Those who assert that they are for a mixed economy, a combination of private enterprise and governmentally regulated or sponsored industries, can only produce a situation that is very much mixed indeed and where the term economy would surely be a misnomer.

The recent elections in New Zealand, Australia, and Great Britain indicate that their people have called a halt to authoritarian controls. They have had the opportunity of sampling the ways of those who have extolled the glories of socialism and have found that the realities were far less attractive than the utopian promises.

History is full of the tragedies of well-intentioned, zealous advocates who brought down upon their people injury and misery not anticipated in the visionary schemes originally propounded. We know that there are shortcomings in our economy. We must control the growth of monopolies; we must learn to avoid reckless speculative behavior that results in business depressions, and we must render assistance to the needy and afflicted. But in correcting abuses and inadequacies we must not rush to embrace a system of controls that can only lead to the collectivist economy and the authoritarian state.

Americans have a strong idealistic bend in their national character, but it has been tempered by an ever stronger sense of the practicalities of life.

We are not given to rushing in "where angels fear to tread." We wish to know the means by which our ends are to be achieved. While we may welcome change, we desire to see whether or not the programs advanced by the enthusiast or brain-truster may not bring about evils that were not expected or may force us to give up things which we have long cherished and which we continue to regard as essential to the American way of life.

No matter what storm may descend upon us, let us gird our loins with truth and justice, and protected by the shield of an unwavering faith in God give our all in the preservation of the fundamental verities upon which this Nation was founded, upon which she has steadily and soundly grown to her present position of eminence and power and upon which she must endure.

Proposed Sale of Westchester Apartments in Washington, D. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, in the April 19, 1950, issue of the Evening Star, Washington, D. C., there appeared an

article outlining a plan which is being developed by the Randall H. Hagner Co., a Washington real estate firm, for the sale of the 553-unit Westchester Apartments, which is the largest elevator apartment development in Washington.

The article pointed out that among the tenants are the Nation's top housing official, Housing and Home Finance Administrator Raymond M. Foley; Secretary of the Interior Mr. Chapman; Secretary of Agriculture Mr. Brannan; and seven Senators; five generals; three admirals; six judges; and many other civilian and military officials.

Here is just one more instance of the current trend of private corporations to transfer their operations from that of a private corporation to a cooperative for the purpose of obtaining tax exemption under a law which was originally intended to benefit farmers only.

This is another glaring example of how it is possible under our existing tax laws to obtain tax exemption in the name of the American farmer, and unless Congress takes action to correct this trend soon, we are going to have no one left in private industry to pay taxes.

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD this article in its entirety.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAGNER PLANS CO-OP SALE OF WESTCHESTER—553-UNIT APARTMENT BUILDING MAY BE OFFERED THIS SUMMER

(By Robert J. Lewis)

A plan is being developed by the Randall H. Hagner Co., Washington real-estate firm, for the cooperative sale of the 553-unit Westchester Apartments, largest elevator apartment development in the Washington area, it was learned today from George N. Ray, president of the Hagner firm. Mr. Ray said details have not been worked out.

Samuel R. Walker of New York, vice president of the City Investing Co., which controls the Realest Corp., owner of the development since 1947, said the company would consider selling the apartments.

"There is no written agreement involved, but we have been informed that a plan is being developed in Washington, and if it is good then we will discuss it," he said.

LAW CURBS EVICTIONS

"We are very happy with ownership of the property and whether there is any sale is a matter for the future to determine."

Under the District Rent Control Act, consent of 65 percent of the tenants to a cooperative sale would be needed before any evictions could be undertaken, though Mr. Ray said there was no intention to evict any families.

The rent law expires, however, on June 30. After that date, unless the 65 percent requirement is reenacted, cooperative sales could be made without other than normal restraints against evictions.

Mr. Ray said he understood about 60 tenants already had expressed willingness to purchase apartments. He added that he hoped to discuss details of the sales program with a tenants committee.

FOLEY IS AMONG TENANTS

The Hagner Co. president added, "we will have a very fair plan and there will be no effort to force people out."

He said he expected completion of the cooperative sale during the summer.

The Westchester's 553 apartments have a total of 2,171 rooms, plus 686 bathrooms. The apartments are in four buildings on a 27½ acre site at 4000 Cathedral Avenue NW. The development was purchased from Dutch interests by the Realest Corp.

Among tenants are the Nation's top housing official, Housing and Home Finance Administrator Raymond M. Foley; Secretary of the Interior Chapman, and Secretary of Agriculture Brannan; seven Senators, five generals, three admirals, six judges and many other civilian and military officials.

The Kerr Natural Gas Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT S. KERR
OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial published in the Tulsa Tribune of April 22, 1950, regarding the natural-gas bill recently passed by the Senate.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY SUCH FUROR OVER KERR BILL WHICH WOULDN'T CHANGE ANYTHING?

(Rowley on oil)

For a time, I wrote politics on a newspaper back in Pittsburgh. I thought I knew most of the tricks of the game—devising propaganda and selling the public a bill of goods. But I take off my hat to the master mind behind the opposition to the Kerr natural gas bill.

I may be entirely wrong, but I have a strong hunch that Leland Olds, former chairman of the Federal Power Commission, has been patting himself on the back since President Truman vetoed the bill last Saturday. Olds was appointed by President Truman to another term on the Commission, but the Senate refused confirmation. Writings of Olds, presented to Senators at the time, made many believe Olds was communistic in his views about the United States and its institutions and traditions.

Seldom in recent history has so much agitation developed about any measure as that over the Kerr bill. This furor was not confined to Congress. Farm groups, labor organizations, the mayors of 18 large cities, and other civic and political bodies throughout the Nation bombarded Congress to defeat the bill and then put pressure on President Truman to veto it.

All, including radio commentators, had one argument. They said passage of the bill would increase the prices of natural gas to consumers by $100,000,000 a year or more.

According to records I have, Olds was the first person to make the claim that exempting independent natural-gas producers (those who do not own or have any interest in natural gas pipe lines) from jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission in the matter of arm's length sales of natural gas (sales to purchasers at the well), would increase the price of gas to consumers. He told a congressional committee in April 1949 the raise would be $80,000,000 or so a year.

I am told Olds supplied memoranda relating to the Kerr bill to radio commentators. If I had been active enough in efforts to defeat the bill to get up memoranda for radio commentators, I would have supplied the data, also, to mayors of large natural-gas consuming cities and other consumers of gas.

What was not brought out by radio commentators or others was the fact the Kerr bill did not seek to change any condition or situation which has existed for years.

The Kerr bill did not seek to take from jurisdiction of the FPC independent gas producers for the FPC had never exercised jurisdiction over them. Hence, so much agitation over a bill which would not change anything naturally makes one suspicious.

The Kerr bill was designed solely to maintain the same condition and situation which has existed for years. It simply clarified the Natural Gas Act of 1938 by specifically exempting independent natural-gas producers from jurisdiction of the FPC in the matter of arm's-length sales of gas. That exemption was intended by Congress when it passed the Natural Gas Act of 1938, and the FPC had abided by the exemption.

Olds himself admitted such was the intent of Congress and joined with other members of the FPC in so stating in an order issued by the Commission on August 7, 1947. That order, or rule, stated:

"It seems appropriate and desirable at this juncture for the Commission to adopt and promulgate the rule contained herein, which is designed to relieve any existing uncertainty regarding the Commission's position that it will not seek to assert jurisdiction over the sale of natural gas to interstate pipe lines by independent producers or gatherers.

"The Federal Power Commission is of the opinion that it was the intent of the Congress that the control of production or gathering of natural gas should remain a function of the States and that the Natural Gas Act should not provide for regulation of those subjects.

"For the purpose of administering the Natural Gas Act, the Commission will construe the exemption contained in section 1 (b) to the effect that the provisions of the act shall not apply to the 'production and gathering' of natural gas, as including arm's-length sales of natural gas by independent producers and gatherers, made during the course or completion of production and gathering.

"The Commission, consistent with this construction, will not assert jurisdiction over such producers and gatherers who might be subject to jurisdiction solely because of such sales."

Despite this rule by the FPC and its admission as to the intent of Congress to exempt independent natural-gas producers, the Commission, following a United States Supreme Court decision in a gas case involving a producer who owned a natural-gas pipe line, decided it had authority to regulate prices of natural gas sold by independents and that it intended to assert that authority or jurisdiction. Hence the reason for the necessity of the Kerr bill to clarify the matter, and to maintain conditions which have existed for years.

The utter fallacy of claims of opponents of the Kerr bill that its passage would increase gas prices to consumers is so easily proven I can't understand why radio commentators and others fell for such misrepresentation of facts.

Up to this time, independent producers of natural gas have not been under jurisdiction of the FPC. The Kerr bill would have simply continued that situation. Instead of natural gas prices being raised because there was no jurisdiction over independent producers by the FPC, prices, both at the well and for consumers, have been reduced.

Prices of natural gas at the well head declined from an average of 11 cents a thousand cubic feet in 1922 to about 4 cents in 1940. They have increased since 1940, due to increases in costs of operations, but right now are lower than they were in 1922.

Also, Government figures show that, due to larger pipe lines and larger volumes of

natural gas sales, the average price of gas to the consumer in the United States has actually declined during the past 10 years. Yet, during that same period, when gas prices were being reduced, prices of all commodities and labor increased approximately 80 percent.

That is the actual record of natural gas prices over the past years when independent natural gas producers were exempt from jurisdiction of the FPC. So, how in the name of all that is holy can opponents of the Kerr bill claim that unless this exemption were removed these same natural gas producers would increase prices to consumers by $100,000,000 a year or more?

Personally, we can only figure they either did not seek or want facts and that they were influenced by the statements made by Olds that the Kerr bill would result in the big increase in price to consumers.

As to Olds, Congressman JOHN E. LYLE, of Texas, in a statement to the subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the Senate, which was considering Olds' reappointment as Commissioner to the FPC, said he had checked Olds' writings in publications now deemed as favoring communism. He said in those published articles Leland Olds:

"Urges comrades to enroll in Communist training courses so as to equip themselves for greater usefulness in the movement;

"Advocates the elimination of private property in productive enterprise;

"Hails the decay of the church as a religious institution and its transformation into a handmaiden of the capitalistic system;

"Sneers at the Fourth of July as the day set apart by the world's greatest exploiters to glorify their rise to power;

"Reveals his fundamental opposition to the American system of private enterprise;

"Foresees the elimination of competitive private capitalism;

"Extols the virtues of the Russian system as contrasted with conditions of the United States; and

"Praises the Russian system as the coming world order and as a model for the United States."

We feel false information was supplied radio commentators and others about the Kerr bill, and that most of us who knew the facts, including this columnist, were extremely derelict in seeing that they obtained accurate information.

One well-known Tulsan said yesterday: "Many operators fear the application of jurisdictional authority of the FPC to fix the price of natural gas at the well is no red herring but is a part of a shrewdly planned communistic effort to develop lack of confidence in the consuming public of the ability of gas, steel, oil, automotive, and other American industries to regulate prices of their products."

Passage of Rivers and Harbors Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting article on the subject of the recent passage by the Senate of the bill authorizing rivers and harbors and flood-control projects, written by Mr. C. F. Byrns, published under date of April 27, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFF THE RECORD
(By C. F. Byrns)

Newspaper and radio commentators have had a Roman holiday over the recent passage by the Senate of the bill authorizing rivers and harbors and flood-control projects all over America. With almost unanimous voice, they have cried "pork." They have bemoaned the fact that men in the Senate who have been insistent upon economy in Government spending supported the waterways authorization bill and beat down every amendment designed to cut its total.

The $1,600,000,000 total estimated cost of the projects this bill would authorize is matched up with the expected $5,500,000,000 deficit for the present fiscal year, and the impression is created that the waterways bill adds to the current deficit.

Most of the criticism of the waterways bill comes from people who have had little if any personal experience with the resource development projects which are involved in this measure. It's easy to apply the "pork" epithet and to ridicule men who try to trim down the high expenses of government and at the same time, support programs for control and development of rivers and the improvement of harbors. It's especially easy if the critic doesn't know much about the matter he is discussing.

It happens that I have had rather intimate contact with river-development programs for the last 30 years. Anyone who has spent a fraction of the effort I have spent in river development will be slow to charge that any project is sheer waste of the public funds unless he knows the facts about it. And if he knows the facts, he will usually find that "pork" is a word that doesn't fit.

There may be some projects in the authorization bill which are not economically justified. I don't know about all of them and neither do the other commentators. But I do know out of long experience how these projects get into the authorization bills. I know how tough are the tests which the Corps of Engineers applies to every proposal for river control and development.

I know how these projects are born, because I have been in at the birth of some of them. I know that there must be an economic need before they are even considered by the Corps of Engineers. I know about the minute investigations of the engineering problems, the cost estimates, and the economic benefits which are made and have to be made before any project wins approval by the district office. Then I know it has to go through all the channels of the Corps of Engineers and win approval first from the division engineer, then by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, then by the Chief of Engineers, before it can even go to Congress. I know about that because I have been through it repeatedly in the Arkansas Basin program.

Flood-control reservoirs, for example, are recommended by the Corps of Engineers only if the benefits over a 40-year period are greater than the cost of construction, amortized over that 40-year period, plus maintenance and operation. If a proposed reservoir won't pay for itself in that time, then it's out, and Congress never sees it. A similar rigorous test is put to power and navigation projects.

Control of rivers to stop their destruction and harnessing of rivers to make them useful for power, for irrigation, for navigation is wise use of natural resources. What is spent for projects that are economically sound is not expense but investment—investment that must pay out in less than the life of the works or else the project never gets to Congress.

The authorization bill is not appropriation. It is the basis for future appropriation when the Corps of Engineers and the Budget Bureau and the committee and Members of the two Houses of Congress and the President of the United States approve such appropriations. This bill doesn't add a dime to the present deficit. It's merely the foundation for future resource development.

"Pork" has a plausible sound. The loose application of the word to every authorization or appropriation for waterways is a popular pastime. It may please a lot of people who like to see somebody denounced for something. But it doesn't ring the bell with people who have been through the long grind of work and worry that is necessary to develop a river-development program.

Tribute to Admiral Thomas C. Kinkaid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a very fine editorial written by Mr. Harry H. Schlacht, which appeared in all of the Hearst newspapers, and which is a just tribute to Admiral Thomas C. Kinkaid on the occasion of his retirement from the Navy.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADMIRAL THOMAS C. KINKAID, NAVAL WARRIOR OF THE PACIFIC
(By Harry H. Schlacht)

Today America honors Admiral Thomas C. Kinkaid upon his retirement from the Navy. Today, America makes grateful acknowledgment of duty well done.

We honor ourselves when we honor this great admiral.

We honor our country when we honor him.

None of the glorious tributes we tender him can add one star to his crown of glory, can add one leaf to his laurel wreath.

The glory of his achievements is an epic.

The story of his gallantry will go down in history.

The historians of the future who will record the events of our day will linger in reverent admiration over the majestic career of this great admiral.

Every American should know the glory and the story of this valorous man.

He was the naval warrior of the Pacific.

He was the hero of Leyte Gulf which assured the reconquest of the Philippines, which destroyed the Japanese maritime power, which guaranteed our Pacific triumph.

It was he who supplied the transport and protection which made possible General MacArthur's return to the Philippines. It was he who planned and directed the naval war phases which made possible the liberation of those islands.

Admiral Kinkaid showed a bravery and an inspiration which raised him to the immortal peerage of naval heroism.

His victories in the Pacific will take their place side by side with the naval victories in world history.

In victory he gave glory to God.

The hero of the Pacific is as proud of his gallant officers and men as they are proud of his dauntless leadership.

Those who seek the noblest attributes in man will receive their inspiration from his life and achievements.

Admiral Kinkaid will ever be a symbol of the highest traditions of the Navy. He is a modest gentleman. He is a Christian gentleman. He is a great American.

His glorious record made in the fight for our treasured ideals will ever be the precious heritage to our posterity. His name will ever live in our history with the names of Farragut and Dewey.

As long as men love liberty, as long as men love daring, as long as the battles of the Coral Sea, Midway, the Solomon Islands, Guadalcanal and others claim memory in our history, so long will the name of Admiral Kinkaid be revered.

Beyond the seas where men enjoy liberty, beyond the ages wherein men will live as free men, there will descend upon Admiral Kinkaid the benedictions of their heartfelt prayers.

May God give him health and happiness in the years of his retirement.

His place in history is secured.

Niagara Redevelopment Act of 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. F. D. ROOSEVELT, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1950

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following bill and analysis:

A bill to preserve the scenic beauty of the Niagara Falls and River and to authorize the construction of certain public works on that river for power and other purposes, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That, in order to fulfill the obligation of the United States to preserve and enhance the scenic beauty of the Niagara Falls and River and to provide for the most beneficial use of the waters of that river for development of power, navigation, and the control of floods, it is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States that the share of those waters available to the United States for power purposes upon ratification of the treaty between the United States of America and Canada, dated February 27, 1950, shall be used to develop power in the public interest by a public agency as hereinafter provided.

SEC. 2. To implement that policy, there are hereby adopted and authorized to be prosecuted, subject to ratification of said treaty, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers, works of improvement for redevelopment of the Niagara River in substantial accordance with the project plans outlined in the report of the Bureau of Power of the Federal Power Commission, dated September 28, 1949, entitled "Possibilities for Redevelopment of Niagara Falls for Power—Niagara River—New York," subject to such modifications not inconsistent with this act as may be found advisable by the Secretary of the Army upon investigation and recommendation by the Chief of Engineers and the Federal Power Commission, and after consultation with the Governors of New York and other interested States and with other interested Federal agencies: *Provided*, That the necessary plans, specifications, and preliminary work shall be prosecuted as soon as funds shall be available from appropriations hereinafter authorized, in order to provide for rapid inauguration of a construction program. Such works of improvement are hereinafter referred to as the "project."

SEC. 3. (a) The President is hereby authorized and directed to transfer the power facilities of the project to such public agency of the State of New York as its government may designate and properly authorize for that purpose: *Provided*, That all three of the following conditions are satisfied in full before power is available from any generating unit of the project:

(i) An agreement between the United States of America and the State of New York shall have been negotiated by the President or his designated agent with such agent of the State of New York as its government may designate and authorize for that purpose, and such agreement shall have been approved by the Legislature of the State of New York and the Congress of the United States of America. The President is hereby authorized and directed to initiate negotiations for such agreement as soon as any funds for the project are made available under appropriations hereinafter authorized.

(ii) Such agreement shall include, but not be limited to, provisions for ultimate repayment of all costs properly allocable to power as determined by the Federal Power Commission after consultation with such agency of the State of New York as its government may designate and authorize for that purpose, and provisions for maintenance and operation of the project in the public interest, including especially the interests of the State of New York and other States within economic-transmission distance, which provision shall assure, among other things, that:

(A) No part of the United States' share of the waters of the Niagara River made available for power purposes to the designated agency of the State of New York shall be diverted by it to any person or private company; nor shall the use of any part of said waters or the rights pertaining thereto be sold, leased, or otherwise alienated by such agency to any person or private company for the generation of hydroelectric power; nor shall the power facilities be sold, leased, pledged, mortgaged, or otherwise alienated to any person or private company: *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall be construed as affecting any valid existing rights under license heretofore issued pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Power Act (49 Stat. 838), as amended or as now or hereafter affecting the applicability of the provisions of that act in the case of waters of the Niagara River presently authorized to be diverted for power purposes under license heretofore issued under that act.

(B) Full recognition shall be given to the interests of national security.

(C) In contracting for the disposition of project power, (1) preference shall be given to States, counties, and municipalities, including agencies or instrumentalities of any of them, and to cooperative or other organizations not organized or administered for profit but primarily for the purpose of supplying electric energy to their members as nearly as possible at cost, and (2) arrangements shall be made sufficiently flexible that the foregoing recipients of preference, now or hereafter authorized by law to engage in the distribution of electric energy, may secure a reasonable share of the project power.

(D) Such transmission lines and related facilities shall be constructed, or acquired by purchase or other agreement, as may be necessary in order to make project power available in wholesale quantities for sale on fair and reasonable terms and conditions to facilities owned by the Federal Government, public bodies, cooperatives, and privately owned companies.

(E) Project power shall be sold and distributed primarily for the benefit of the people as consumers, and particularly for the benefit of domestic and rural consumers, to whom it shall be made available at the lowest possible rates and in such manner as to encourage the widest possible use.

(F) In the event project power is sold to any purchaser for resale, contracts for such sale shall include adequate provisions for establishing resale rates which shall be fixed by the seller and which shall not only provide for passing on to the consumer savings in costs of generation, but shall also be promotional in character and designed so far as practicable to result in periodic rate reductions. Such contracts shall be for a period of time not exceeding 20 years, including renewals.

(G) If and when a northeastern power pool or other agency for the coordinated operation of power facilities in the Northeastern States shall be created or provided for by legislation hereafter enacted by the Congress or pursuant to a compact adopted by the States concerned and approved by the Congress, arrangements shall be made for coordinated operation of the power facilities of the project with those of such pool or other agency.

(H) In contracting for the disposition of project power, commitments shall be so made as to provide and allow for a determination of disputes as to apportionment of project power among States within economic transmission distance whereby the governor of any State, believing that his State is or may be denied its fair share, may make complaint to the Federal Power Commission, which, after due notice to all States which may have an interest in the availability of project power and opportunity to them for hearing under the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, shall determine reasonable and practicable arrangements whereby and the extent to which project power shall be made available in the public interest to purchasers in States within economic transmission distance of the project: *Provided*, That such determination shall be final and binding in the operation of the project except as it may be thereafter revised in further proceedings before the Federal Power Commission as herein provided.

(iii) The public agency designated and authorized by the government of the State of New York to accept transfer of the power facilities of the project shall have made proper application for, and shall have accepted, a license under the provisions of the Federal Power Act (49 Stat. 833), as amended, which license the Federal Power Commission is hereby authorized and directed to issue after consummation of the agreement referred to in conditions (i) and (ii) above: *Provided*, That to the extent of any conflict, the provisions of this act and of said agreement shall supersede the provisions of the Federal Power Act and of the license so far as the project herein authorized is concerned.

(b) Eighteen months after the beginning of construction of the project the President is directed to transmit a report to the Congress on the status of negotiations for an agreement as provided for in subsection (a) hereof.

(c) When power is available from any generating unit of the project, if transfer of the power facilities of the project shall not have been consummated in accordance with the provisions of subsection (a) hereof, the project shall be maintained and operated, and project power disposed of, by such agency of the Government of the United States as may be hereafter created for such purpose: *Provided*, That, if such agency shall not have been created when construction of the project is complete, it shall be maintained and operated under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and supervision of the Chief of Engineers, and project power shall be delivered and disposed of in accordance with the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 890).

SEC. 4. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be required to carry out the purposes of this act.

SEC. 5. This act may be cited as the "Niagara Redevelopment Act of 1950."

ANALYSIS OF NIAGARA DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1950

(Bill introduced by Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN in the Senate and in the House by Representative FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT, JR.)

PURPOSE

To provide for a public development of water power made available to the United States under the terms of the Canadian-United States Niagara Treaty and to insure at the same time the preservation of the scenic beauties of the Niagara Falls.

WHAT THE BILL DOES

1. Authorizes the United States Corps of Engineers to plan and construct the necessary project works.

2. Authorizes and directs the President of the United States to turn over the project works to whatever agency the State of New York may designate by law for this purpose, provided that certain conditions protecting the interests of the people of the State of New York and the interests of the people of the adjacent States and the Federal Government are met.

3. Provides for the repayment by the State of New York to the Federal Government of such construction costs as are properly allocable to the power development. Costs for works designed solely to preserve the scenic beauty of the falls are to be borne by the United States Government.

4. Provides that amount and terms of repayment as well as other pertinent conditions shall be covered in an agreement to be negotiated between the United States Government and the State of New York, subject to approval by the Legislature of New York and the Congress.

5. Provides that if the State of New York does not choose to acquire and operate the project, or if no agreement is reached by the time the project is ready to deliver power, the power is to be distributed by the United States Government either through an agency authorized by Congress for the purpose or by the Federal agencies authorized to develop and distribute power under the terms of the Flood Control Act of 1944.

ANALYSIS OF BILLS BY SECTIONS

Section 1: Statement of national policy and of purpose of the act.

Section 2:

A. Authorizes construction of the works in accordance with project plans outlined in report of the Bureau of Power of the Federal Power Commission (September 28, 1949) subject to modification not inconsistent with the act and found advisable by the Chief of Engineers and the Federal Power Commission after consultation with the Governors of New York and of other interested States and with other interested Federal agencies.

B. Provides for start of construction as soon as funds are appropriated.

Section 3:

A. Authorizes and directs the President to transfer the project facilities to an agency of New York State, when such an agency shall have been authorized to accept and operate these works by the State of New York and when three major conditions will have been met:

1. An agreement shall be negotiated between the United States Government and the government of the State of New York and such agreement shall have been approved both by the Legislature of New York and the United States Congress.

2. (a) The agreement shall include provisions for—

(1) Repayment of costs allocable to power; and

(2) For the maintenance and operation of the project in the public interest—including especially the interests of the State of New York and of other States withing economic transmission distance.

(b) Agreement shall prohibit the alienation of any of the waters to any private person or company other than waters over which private persons or corporations already have existing rights.

(c) Agreement shall give full recognition to the interests of national security.

(d) The agreement shall provide for the granting of preference to local government units or their instrumentalities and to cooperatives and other nonprofit organizations.

(e) The agreement shall provide for the construction or acquisition of necessary transmission lines in order to make power available in wholesale quantities to facilities owned by the Federal Government, public bodies, cooperatives, and privately owned companies.

(f) Agreement shall provide that project power shall be sold primarily for the benefit of the consumers of electric power at the lowest possible rates (and in such a manner as to encourage the widest possible use).

(g) Agreement shall provide that contracts for resale of project power shall include provision for establishing resale rates to be fixed by the seller (State of New York) so as to pass on the savings to the consumers.

(h) Agreement shall provide that if and when a northeastern power pool or some other agency for the coordinated operation of power facilities in the Northeast shall be created, either by future Federal legislation or by compacts between the States, arrangements shall be made by the State of New York for the coordinated operation of the Niagara power facilities with those of the pool.

(i) Agreement shall provide that other States within economic transmission distance may obtain needed power from Niagara by contract with New York State; if any State is denied what it believes to be its fair share, the Federal Power Commission, after full and open hearings, shall have the power to determine the arrangements whereby the power shall be sold to these States within economic transmission distance.

3. (a) New York State will apply to the Federal Power Commission for a license for operation of the project; the Federal Power Commission is thereupon directed to issue the license, provided that all the conditions referred to above have been satisfied.

(b) In case of any conflict between the licensing provision of the Federal Power Act and the provisions of this act, the provisions of this act shall pertain.

B. Eighteen months after the beginning of construction the President is directed to send a report to Congress on the state of negotiations with the State of New York.

C. If transfer of the power facilities to the State of New York has not been completely accomplished in accordance with the above provisions by the time power is available from any generating unit of the project, the project shall be maintained and power disposed of by any agency which Congress may have meanwhile created for the purpose; if no such agency has been created, the project shall be maintained and operated by the Chief of Engineers and the power shall be disposed of in accordance with the Flood Control Act of 1944 (by the Secretary of Interior).

NOTE.—In this analysis, section 2, A and B correspond to section 2 in the bill; section 3, A corresponds to section 3 (a) in the bill; section 3, (A) (1) corresponds to section 3 (a) (i) in the bill, etc.

Morality as a Basis for Political Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Cleveland Plain Dealer on Tuesday, April 4, 1950, posed a very important question. It was: "Can a government behave in an immoral manner toward its own people? Can it deceive them, rob them, cheat them, plunder their resources, and infringe on their liberties?" Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the editorial in question, which is a very interesting one:

QUESTIONS OF MORALITY

Can a government behave in an immoral manner toward its own people? Can it deceive them, rob them, cheat them, plunder their resources, and infringe on their liberties?

We know how a community would condemn a man who ran up charge accounts, went on a binge every Saturday night and didn't pay his bills.

What would the neighbors say about a housewife who carted home large quantities of food from the grocery and butcher shop every day and then, instead of preparing it for her family, let it spoil?

How long could a respected citizen borrow money from his friends and, when the time came to pay it back, require them to settle on the basis of 60 cents to the dollar?

How lenient would the community be with a door-to-door salesman who insisted at the point of a gun that every householder buy his products? Or with a smooth-talking promoter who tried to force his neighbors to turn over a large percentage of their incomes to him on the promise that he would take care of their insurance, their medical and hospital bills and send their children to college?

Surely any community would frown on a person who indulged in these practices and at least call for the police or the men in the white coats with the strait-jacket to come and get him.

But when a government does these things, is its conduct any less immoral?

The United States Government is on a big spending binge. It is living beyond its income, not accidentally or because of misfortune, but deliberately.

The United States Government has arranged to have more food delivered to the markets than the people can consume and the surplus is either spoiling or is in storage, which merely delays the process of spoilage. This didn't happen accidentally, either, but was done deliberately.

The United States Government has borrowed money from its citizens, promising to pay $100 after 10 years for every $75 that was loaned through the purchase of savings bonds. But when the time comes to repay, the lender get back only $60 in actual purchasing value, in terms of the value of the original $75 loan. Then, to add insult to injury, the Government requires him to pay a tax on the fictitious $25 profit he has collected.

The United States Government forces its citizens to buy things they don't need or don't want or can't afford, at the point of the tax collector's gun. Every subsidy paid out by the Government to some special interest or pressure group is a forced purchase by all the citizens of the products or services of that interest or group. Since the citizens do not or will not of their own volition

buy the products or services of the favored interests or groups, the Government takes the money away from the citizens anyhow in taxes and makes the purchases.

The United States Government has already taken away a large percentage of its citizens' incomes in the form of taxes, thus depriving them of the freedom of spending their own money, and is demanding a larger share, for the purpose of looking after more and more of their affairs.

It is not surprising that a large number of people have lost confidence in the Government, for the Government is conducting itself in a manner which, if an individual so conducted himself, would be condemned as profligate and immoral.

Nor is it any excuse to point out that some Government administrators and policymakers who commit these offenses may be well-intentioned and may sincerely believe they are acting in the best interests of the people. Others, we fear, and this goes for the practical politicians, are not always well-intentioned. Their promises, their deceit and their loose handling of other people's money are deliberate, for the purpose of maintaining themselves in power.

But they will not remain in power, we believe, if the people insist that their Government adhere to the same standards of morality which apply to individuals.

Past and Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal of May 1, 1950:

PAST AND FUTURE

This newspaper has occasionally drawn fire from critics by turning back to look at some of the blunders that have been made in the conduct of United States foreign policy. The attitude of these critics is that what's done is past and that nothing is served by raking over that past.

Some of the same sort of criticism, we notice, has been aimed at former President Hoover for reminding the country that a great deal of the world's present troubles stem from the mistakes of 1941–45. In those years, you will recall, the brave new world was to be erected on the foundation of Russian cooperation for peace.

The attitude of these critics—who are usually those who either participated or acquiesced in that foolish course—is, Why bring that up now? What's that to do with the present problem?

We think it has a great deal to do with it. Knowledge of past mistakes, of course, is not going to guarantee rightness in the future. But until past errors are identified and the cause of failure analyzed there can be no wisdom from experience. Diagnosis must precede the treatment.

Thus we share Mr. Hoover's belief that "the American people ought to take a cold and objective look at this experience before we go any further."

Well, a superficial look shows us that our foreign leaders misjudged the Russians badly. This error is not excusable on the grounds that "everybody did it" because it is a fact that not everybody did. Winston Churchill, as Mr. Royster remarks in an adjacent column, did not misjudge them; he was simply drowned by the wave of pro-Russianism.

But there is more to be learned from the past than how to judge Communists. Anyway, that error has been corrected; we no longer operate by that illusion.

What is more important, it seems to us, is the illusion behind the illusion. Those people who misjudged Communists were not ignorant of the power juggling that followed all previous wars nor of the historical ambitions of Russia. They were simply under the impression that they could ignore history, that with good intentions, hard work, and rhetoric they could make the world different from what it is.

That illusion seems not yet dead. Currently it takes the form of a belief that with enough good intentions behind them dollars can do almost anything; a belief that a great and strong United States can take on any burdens and defy the ills of extravagance that have ravaged other great and strong nations in the past.

Experience, says the illusion, can be set aside. We are different; it can't happen here.

The illusion that harsh realities can be ignored led us back to a Second World War to once more save the world for democracy, and now it threatens a third war to save it thrice. If we do not look back at the past we are likely to find it is in the future.

Lattimore and His Far-Eastern Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, so that Members of Congress and the people of the United States may appraise Mr. Lattimore's position in far-eastern matters, I am including a copy of a draft of his report to the State Department which appeared in the New York Times on April 4, 1950:

TEXT OF LATTIMORE'S MEMORANDUM ON UNITED STATES FAR EASTERN POLICY

(WASHINGTON, April 3.—Following is the text of Owen Lattimore's memorandum on United States policy in the Far East, drafted for a State Department advisory committee last August and made public today by Mr. Lattimore:)

In clearing the way for a fresh approach to the problems of United States policy in the Far East, several negative statements can usefully be made.

1. The type of policy represented by support for Chiang Kai-shek does more harm than good to the interests of the United States, and no modification of this policy seems promising. Chiang Kai-shek was a unique figure in Asia. He is now fading into a kind of eclipse that is regrettably damaging to the prestige of the United States, because the United States supported him. His eclipse does not even leave behind the moral prestige of a good but losing fight in defense of a weak cause.

On the contrary, he put up the worst possible fight in defense of a cause that was originally strong and should have won. The kind of policy that failed in support of so great a figure as Chiang Kai-shek cannot possibly succeed if it is applied to a scattering of "little Chiang Kai-sheks" in China or elsewhere in Asia.

2. China cannot be economically coerced by such measures as cutting off trade. Nothing could be more dangerous for the American interest than to underestimate the ability of the Chinese Communists to achieve the minimum level of economic stability that will make their regime politically secure. Sound policy should allow for a cautious overestimate of the ability of the Chinese Communists in this respect, and avoid a rash underestimate.

TWO ALTERNATIVES IN JAPAN

3. It is not possible to make Japan a satisfactory instrument of American policy. There are two alternatives in Japan. The first alternative is to keep Japan alive by means of American "blood transfusions" of raw materials and credits. Under this alternative, Japan can be made to put on the surface appearance of a strong ally; but the reality will be an overcommitment of American resources to a distant and vulnerable region.

Under the second alternative, Japan can keep itself alive by coming to terms, economically and politically, with its neighbors in Asia, principally China. Under this alternative, Japan cannot serve as a trusted American ally. Its own interests will compel it to balance and bargain between what it can get out of Asia and what it can get out of America.

4. South Korea is more of a liability than an asset to the interests and policy of the United States. It is doubtful how long the present regime in South Korea can be kept alive, and mere effort to keep it alive is a bad advertisement, which continually draws attention to a band of little-and-inferior-Chiang Kai-sheks who are the scorn of the Communists and have lost the respect of democratic and would-be democratic groups and movements throughout Asia.

5. The colonial and quasi-colonial countries of Southeast Asia cannot be forced to grant priorities to the economic and military recovery of Europe, at the expense of their own economic and political interests. In this region as a whole there is a rapid development of combined political and military resistance to coercion which can be indefinitely sustained by local resources. On the other hand, attempts at reconquest by European countries are so expensive that they defeat their own ultimate purpose, which is the strengthening of the country attempting the reconquest.

JOINT BENEFITS SEEN NEEDED

The situation can now be handled only by convincing the nationalist leaders in those countries that any sacrifices they are asked to make are matched by sacrifices made by their former or titular rulers, and are not designed to give priority to the interests of these rulers, but to bring joint benefits both to the ruling countries and to the colonial country, on terms that satisfy the colonial aspiration to equality.

6. The United States cannot assume that Russia will move in to take over direct control in China, and will thus be subjected to heavy strategic and economic strains. It is dangerous to assume that there will be a diversion and commitment of Russian resources in Asia which will limit Russian ability to maneuver in Europe. Recent developments in the Far East have been favorable to Russia, but not in a way that lessens the resources that Russia can deploy toward Europe.

Policy toward Russia and policy toward the Far East meet at the point where such a move as the imposition of an economic cordon sanitaire around China is considered. Such a move would increase Chinese dependence on Russia; but it would probably not make it necessary for Russia to undertake a large-scale program in China. The Russians would get credit in Asia, multiplied by propaganda, for any grants they might make to China, but would probably not have to make grants large enough to distort or strain their own resources.

It would be possible, therefore, if the mistake is made of waiting for the Chinese Communists to come hat in hand to ask for American terms, for United States policy to encounter another set-back in Asia, without even the compensating advantage of hampering Russia's ability to apply pressure in Europe.

POSITIVE OBJECTIVES DEFINED

The foregoing statement defines negative aspects of the situation in Asia, limiting the freedom of maneuver of United States policy. Within these limitations, it seems advisable that a number of positive objectives should be defined.

1. Policy in the Far East and policy toward Russia have a bearing on each other. It certainly cannot yet be said, however, that armed warfare against communism in the Far East, on a scale involving a major commitment of American resources, has become either unavoidable or positively desirable. Nor can it be said with any assurance that, in the event of an armed conflict, undertaken for the purpose of forcing Russia back from Europe, the Far East would be an optimum field of operation.

There are still two alternatives before us—a relatively long peace, or a rapid approach toward war. If there is to be war, it can only be won by defeating Russia—not Northern Korea, or Viet Nam, or even China. Sound policy should therefore avoid premature or excessive strategic deployment in the Far East.

If there is to be a long peace, the primary factor in making peace possible will be a stabilization of relations between the United States and Russia. Sound policy should therefore maintain a maximum flexibility. If and when negotiated and mutually acceptable agreements with Russia become possible, American policy in the Far East should be in a position to contribute to Russo-American negotiations. It should not be so mired down in local situations that direct American-Russian negotiations are actually hampered.

2. Any new departures in United States policy in the Far East must be able to fend off any accusation of appeasement of local or Russian communism. In view of the effectiveness of the Russian issue as a weapon in in-fighting in American party politics, it would seem that the advice of experts on domestic politics should be coordinated with the opinions of those who are consulted on foreign policy.

The dilemma is simple, but not easy to solve; but unless it can be solved no successful United States policy in the Far East is possible. Any United States policy that is interpreted in various countries in the Far East as pressure applied for the purpose of creating a league against Russia will merely increase the ability of those countries to bargain with both the United States and Russia.

It will also increase the identification, in those countries, between local nationalism and local communism. On the other hand, any proposed United States policy in the Far East that is attacked in America itself as a bid for better relations with Russia runs the danger of being defeated.

3. The success of United States policy in the Far East will be measured largely by the contribution that it makes to the recovery of economic relations between the Far East and Europe. This recovery will be possible only if the assent and good will of the far eastern countries are won.

Assent and real cooperation, in turn, can only be won if the representatives of the far eastern countries, including those that are still technically the subjects of European countries, are convinced that they have as direct access to the highest American authorities as do the European representatives, and if they are convinced that their economic needs and political standards are not being given a second priority, lower than that of the European countries involved in the same negotiations.

The two test cases in southeast Asia, on which the leaders of various nationalist movements will rate the difference between what can be attained through friendly association with representatives of the United States and what can be attained through outright defiance of a European country which has strong economic support from the United States are Indonesia and the Viet Nam regime under Ho Chi Minh.

If the negotiations between Dutch and Indonesians, brought about largely through benevolent United States pressure, eventuate in a settlement which seems, in Indonesia, to contain too much of hope deferred, while the resistance in Indochina under Ho Chi Minh achieves more and more of hope fulfilled, the results throughout southeast Asia will be adverse to the United States interest.

INDONESIAN OPINION PUT FIRST

Heavy and primary United States commitments in western Europe make it difficult to bear constantly in mind that when the Dutch-Indonesian negotiations are consummated, the satisfaction or dissatisfaction of popular opinion in Indonesia will have wider repercussions than the satisfaction or dissatisfaction of Dutch public opinion.

It is a fact, nevertheless, that Indonesian opinion is more difficult to satisfy than Dutch opinion, and it is also a fact that the repercussions will be more serious if Indosenian opinion is not satisfied than if Dutch opinion is not satisfied. These facts mark an important difference between prewar and postwar colonial Asia. They are facts that American public opinion has by no means fully accepted; but they are also facts that are critical for the formulation of an over-all United States policy in Asia.

4. The foregoing considerations indicate that the major aim of United States policy in the Far East should be to convince the countries of the Far East that they can get along well with the United States and with the countries of western Europe. They must be persuaded that they can get along well because of the mutual benefits to themselves, to the United States, and to western Europe.

They must not be made to suspect that the real aim of the United States is an ulterior aim of using them against Russia. To put it in another way, the aim of the United States policy should be to enable the countries of the Far East to do without Russia to the maximum extent. This is a much more modest aim than an insistence on and organization of hostility to Russia; but it is an attainable aim, and the other is not.

A few suggestions for implementation are appended.

1. Conferences with the independent governments of the Far East, on the basis of helping them to build their own economies, to revive their trade with Europe, and to expand their trade with us. Emphasis on positive steps that can be taken. No negative conditions, such as prohibitions of trade with Russia or Communist China; no conditions that could be interpreted as American regulation of their political parties.

2. Working relations, and a refusal to be bound by a protocol, with legitimate Nationalist leaders in countries whose full political aspirations have not been met by their European rulers.

3. The United States should not allow any European country, in its relations with any country in the Far East, to state openly or to imply by propaganda that its policy is "backed by the United States." European representatives, in negotiating with the representatives of countries in Asia, should be discouraged from stating or implying that they are authoritative interpreters of United States policy, or intermediaries without whom the United States cannot be approached.

4. It should be made clear that if there is delay or difficulty in establishing relations between the United States and Communist-controlled countries, such as China, the trouble comes from the Communist side and not from the United States side.

FORMAL RECOGNITIONS URGED

5. It should be made clear that friendly and beneficial relations with the United States depend essentially on the inherent friendliness or unfriendliness of the nation concerned, and not on the formalities of diplomatic recognition. In order to facilitate the contrast between countries which are on friendly terms with the United States and countries which are not, the number of countries formally recognized by the United States should be increased.

As a first step, the United States should accept the list of countries recommended for admission to the United Nations by Mr. Trygve Lie, Secretary General of the United Nations. In the first place, it would at this time be a good move for the United States to accept with good will an initiative from the Secretariat of the United Nations. In the second place, the list is on balance more favorable to the United States than to the Soviet Union. In the third place, and with particular reference to the Far East, the move would bring within the scope of United States diplomatic activity the Mongolian People's Republic (Outer Mongolia), an increasingly important potential listening-post country in the heart of Asia.

6. The United States should disembarrass itself as quickly as possible of its entanglements in South Korea.

United States Financial Aid to Foreign Metal Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1950

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, on March 29, I called the attention of Congress to the financial aid which is being given to foreign metal producers while we deny similar aid to American miners who are being deprived of jobs because of large imports of metals from subsidized foreign competition.

As further evidence of my contention, I desire to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a release of the Economic Cooperation Administration, dated May 2, 1950, in which is shown that millions of dollars are being sent to countries like Algeria to develop the mineral production of that country while we in the United States are denied the same benefits.

The release follows:

WASHINGTON, May 2.—A new search for copper, manganese, lead and zinc now is being conducted in the desert and mountains of Algeria with the aid of Marshall-plan dollars.

The Economic Cooperation Administration said discovery of the metals would give Algeria a quick opportunity to earn badly-needed foreign currencies.

Thus far, French geological crews, working under the supervision of the Algerian Min-

eral Research Bureau, have been furnished about $1,140,000 worth of American equipment. The bulk of the equipment consists of mobile compressors, miscellaneous geophysical apparatus and drilling machinery. The crews are at work in the Sahara Desert and the Atlas Mountains. French officials estimate that only about 10 percent of Algeria—a country four times the size of France—has been prospected to any great extent.

In addition, about $3,604,000 worth of Marshall-plan equipment is helping to modernize existing Algerian mines. Algeria's major lead mine is being converted from an under-ground system of mining to an open-pit operation, and the Ouenza open-pit iron mine, Algeria's largest ore producer, is being modernized to boost production from a current 2,000,000 tons annually to 2,500,000 tons.

Other mining programs, including electrification and road building, are being financed with the equivalent of $2,625,000 in counterpart funds—francs deposited by the French Government to match ECA direct dollar aid.

Conferring the Cross of the Eloy Alfaro International Foundation on the Honorable Karl Stefan, of Nebraska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1950

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, on April 30, the Cross of the Eloy Alfaro International Foundation was conferred upon our colleague the Honorable KARL STEFAN, of Nebraska, to whom I know the membership of this House joins me in extending our congratulations. The ceremony conferring this degree upon our colleague also included a radio program containing statements by the Honorable Eloy Alfaro, former Ambassador from Ecuador, and the Honorable KARL STEFAN, of Nebraska. By leave granted me, I include the transcript of this ceremony as part of my remarks:

ANNOUNCER. We have met here in the shadow of the Capitol to witness the ceremony attendant on the conferring of the Cross of the Eloy Alfaro International Foundation upon the Honorable KARL STEFAN, Representative of the Third Congressional District of Nebraska and dean of the Nebraska Delegation to the United States Congress.

Congressman STEFAN has received many honors—from American institutions and from foreign governments. The National University of Washington, D. C., has conferred upon the Nebraska legislator the honorary degree of Doctor of Laws because of his tireless efforts in the interest of good government in this country. The late President Osmena of the Republic of the Philippines bestowed the Medal of Military Merit on Representative STEFAN for his broadcasts to the Philippines during World War II. It was said of Congressman STEFAN's broadcasts at that time that "they saved thousands of lives—the lives of Filipinos and of American fighting men."

The next voice you hear will be that of the Honorable Eloy Alfaro, son of the martyred President of Ecuador, former Ambassador from Ecuador to the United States, and director general of the Alfaro International Foundation.

The Honorable Eloy Alfaro.

Senor ALFARO. Congressman STEFAN, and my other friends of the spiritually united Americas:

It is the avowed purpose of the Eloy Alfaro International Foundation, which I represent at this ceremony, "to give honor and to promote knowledge of the life of General Eloy Alfaro as a statesman and liberator."

The great ideal for which my distinguished father lived and died was the establishment of the eternal solidarity of the peoples and the republics of the Americas.

Although I am a citizen of another nation, the traditions and the gallant history of the United States of America are as familitary to me as are the traditions and the gallant history of my own country. My three sons, my brother, and myself have been cadets of your own United States Military Academy at West Point.

The people of the United States are devoted to freedom. They give their sincere admiration—a gift not given lightly—to the great liberators of other countries, other centuries. Gen. Eloy Alfaro has received, is receiving this sincere admiration.

During his lifetime the forces of freedom were expanding. He furthered this expansion. Now, in the years of our lives, the forces of freedom have been ebbing. Only in the Americas has freedom made a fiercely determined stand. For the enduring good of the peoples of our sister continents, that stand must be maintained and strengthened. That is why it is more important than ever before to perpetuate the memory, the ideals, the accomplishments of Gen. Eloy Alfaro.

Among the means by which the organization which I have the honor to represent has chosen to accomplish this truly American aim, has been that of the bestowal of the Cross of the Eloy Alfaro International Foundation—a decoration which was created to honor any outstanding services toward the memory of Gen. Eloy Alfaro and the noble causes and ideals which he propagated as a reformer of the Republic of Ecuador, and as one of the statesmen and liberators of America.

Congressman STEFAN, it is my pleasure and my honor as the spokesman for my organization and on behalf of its President—the Honorable Doctor Emeterio Santovena—to bestow this decoration upon you. During your nearly two decades of service as the Representative of the Third Congressional District of Nebraska in the House of Representatives you have earned this accolade. You have helped to make your constituents in the State of Nebraska form ties of friendship and understanding with the peoples of the American republics. You have been a foe of tyranny wherever tyranny existed. You have been a friend of freedom wherever freedom flourished. You have carried the cause of American solidarity into the deliberations of congressional committees and onto the floor of the House of Representatives.

Congressman STEFAN, the Cross of the Eloy Alfaro International Foundation is yours. By bestowing it upon you we publicly honor an honorable man. We bestow it upon a fighting friend of the Americas. We bestow it upon a courageous advocate of the people. We bestow it upon a patriotic citizen of the United States.

Congressman STEFAN. Senor Alfaro, officers and members of the Eloy Alfaro International Foundation, and my friends of the Americas—whether those friends live in Ecuador, Cuba, Chile, or in my home State of Nebraska, I accept the Cross of the Eloy Alfaro International Foundation which has just been conferred upon me.

Mine are mixed feelings. I am both proud and humble. I am proud because what I have said and what I have done has been recognized by men whom I know to be lovers of liberty. I am humble because there is so much more I could have said, so much more I could have done, had the awareness of the vital importance of hemispheric solidarity come to me before it actually did.

At this very moment of my receiving the Cross of the Eloy Alfaro International Foundation, it is a matter of great satisfaction to me to know that a statue of the brave soldier-statesman has a position of honor in the State capitol of Nebraska at Lincoln. The location of this statue in Lincoln is, indeed, poetic justice since Gen. Eloy Alfaro was the Lincoln of the other American republics.

We citizens of the United States learn best through the study of the example of others. We could learn of Gen. Eloy Alfaro through studying his victories on the land and on the sea. We could learn of him by studying his writings—lasting documents written on the hearts of men in letters of liberty. We could learn of him by studying his technique as a peacemaker between nations. We could learn of him by studying his numerous biographies, the accounts of his tribulations and his triumphs.

What I have learned about this distinguished American comes from studying his example in the development of his own country.

It is obvious, from such a study, that General Alfaro had determined from the outset of his career to make his country strong. He wanted the people of his country to be informed, to be healthy in body and mind, to be productive in industry, arts, commerce, and the sciences. He wanted the means of communication and transportation to be modernized so that they might strengthen his nation. He wanted his country to be strong in its defenses against potential aggressors from within and from without. But—above all—he wanted his country to be strong so that it might take an equal place with other strong American republics around the international conference table.

His concern with national strength parallels the enlightened reasoning which is gaining support in the United States in 1950. Today—in the twentieth contury—we who advocate the internal development of the United States believe sincerely that we are the rightful heirs-in-spirit of the powerful principles in which General Alfaro believed in the nineteenth century. I am thoroughly convinced that the Alfaro way—the internal development of each American republic—is more than just a way to peace; it is the only positive way.

The best way for the people of the United States to demonstrate their faith in the Alfaro example is to put that example into practical operation.

That can be done.

Democracy, like charity, begins at home. What would the Alfaro example mean to my home State of Nebraska?

Literally hundreds of new commercial uses have been discovered for agricultural crops, other than food. Through the establishment, expansion, and growth of nonfood agricultural industries Nebraska could well take a prominent place in the ranks of our industrial States. Through an intelligent national and international program what actual food-crop surpluses we have could be exported to our friends of the other American Republics who have need of such food. With the advent of growing industry in Nebraska, other developments would ensue. We would need more and better farm-to-market roads. We would need added production in other fields to cope with the increase in population.

In other words, Nebraska, by observing the Alfaro example, would be made strong. Our State would be in a better position to meet on an equal basis, on a national scale, with the other strong States of the United States. Since we citizens of the United States learn by example, it is certain that

the Alfaro way would soon meet with almost universal acceptance.

Senor Alfaro, I am grateful to you and to your associates for this signal honor of receiving the Cross of the Eloy Alfaro International Foundation. But greater even than my gratitude to you is my heartfelt gratitude to God that He, in His infinite wisdom, gave us Gen. Eloy Alfaro to bring into being this solidarity between peoples, this solidarity between republics, this solidarity between the peoples and the Republics of the Americas.

Biggest Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the ninth article by Mr. Frank C. Waldrop on the infiltration of communism in our country:

BIGGEST STORY

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Iosif Vissarionovich Dzugashvili, the czar of all the Russias, stood up before the Moscow crowd a couple of days ago and watched his eldest son's plane roar overhead.

He is an old man now, and also being a very experienced one, he knows that the world's principal interest in him revolves around the question, "Who will be next?"

Deep inside the stone and concrete beneath his feet as he watched lay the body of the man whose death had given Dzugashvili his own day of glory.

At his back were the pink-white walls of a fort that has in one form or other ruled Moscow for more than 600 years. It is called Kremlin, and within the fort are three palaces, three cathedrals, a monastery, a convent, and a dozen more churches, halls, and offices.

All of them are very, very old, a rich mixture of all the architectures of the eastern end of the world, and the very heart of their spirit is a door.

It is a door so low and small that to pass through you must go down on your knees, and that is why the door is built that way, for it is the door to a room in which the czars once received their noble subjects and the ambassadors of nations beyond the steppes.

Whoever would see the czar first had to go down on his knees and approach, meek in body as well as mind.

It was an ideal approach to the czar of those days, and it remains the ideal of today.

The "science of Marxism," through which the very old man, Dzugashvili, rules all the Russians and would seek to rule the rest of the world as well, provides an elaborate apology for the low door. More importantly, it provides the iron discipline that makes the door work.

Iosif Vissarionovich Dzugashvili, above mentioned, is better known by his alias, Josef Stalin, adopted half a century ago when he was train robber and gang leader in the Russian back lands.

The dead man at his feet was christened Vladimir Ilyich Ulyanov, and he, too, had an alias.

He called himself Lenin. The word Stalin is Russian for "steel." Some say that Ulyanov took the name Lenin because it was used as an alias by his brother before him, but at any rate, it does not mean anything.

Lenin's corpse has lain in that mausoleum beneath Stalin's feet since 1924.

As a firm and faithful believer in "scientific Marxism," Lenin lived by the faith that he was born of nothing but biological accident, came from nowhere, and would be going nowhere when he died.

Maybe it means something that the old man who still lives had Lenin's body mummified and displayed in that mausoleum as a preserved symbol of that faith in "dialectical materialism," the Marxists' jargon for plain language meaning "we are animals and no more."

At any rate, Lenin lies there, and every day the long lines of Russians are herded past his casket to gaze on the small, round face, bald head and beard of the man who put them where they are today.

They are required to do that as an act of faith.

Stalin, like Lenin dead in the tomb, must also die one day. Who will succeed him in power? Will it be Vyacheslave, born Scriabin, who now calls himself Molotov, meaning "hammer"?

Or will it be that aviator son of Stalin at the head of the Russian air power, suddenly commanding all Russia to come to him through that low door in the Kremlin, by virtue of the atom bombs stolen with the help of traitors here?

It is a matter of importance, and in doubt. And it is just one of many things unaccounted for in the works and thoughts of Lenin, so long gone to find out whether man begins and ends like a dog, as he contended.

Before you make your own guess as to who will be the next czar of all the Russias, let us run through some of the trials and errors of Lenin's career.

He was the first real practitioner of "scientific Marxism," which holds that the world must be conquered by socialism through force and violence so that, in the sweet bye and bye, all will be heaven on earth and even government itself will voluntarily wither away.

Lenin was born April 22, 1870, at Simbirsk, far down the Volga River near the Black Sea. Simbirsk is today one of six towns and one mountain named in Lenin's honor.

But Stalin has nine cities, plus mountains. What is more, Leninsk, formerly Simbirsk, is just an obscure whistle stop nearby the major city at Stalingrad, which is already a sacred place of worship for Communists.

For the master practitioners of "scientific Marxism" though they have been actual rulers of men for now less than 40 years, and have been hideously inept at the job, still have discovered that men insist on having religion of some sort.

So they are now busy in attempting to fix a mythology and system of hero worship on the Russian people and all others they would rule.

They are using Stalin as No. 1. It is not according to plan, as Lenin laid it out.

Potato Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. POTTER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1950

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Agriculture's administration of the potato program has been inexcusably mishandled. Delta County in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan is a great potato growing section. Last year they had an unusually high production of potatoes. At the present time, Escanaba, the county seat of Delta County, is out of potatoes.

I wish to insert at this point a news article and an editorial which appeared recently in the Escanaba Press:

[From the Escanaba (Mich.) Press of April 27, 1950]

SPUD SHORTAGE HITS ESCANABA—GROWERS' EXCHANGE SCRAPING BOTTOM

While the Federal Government has been burning thousands of bushels of potatoes to keep prices up, Upper Peninsula and Wisconsin housewives are facing a serious potato shortage.

The local warehouse of the Michigan Potato Growers' Association probably will be completely cleaned out by Monday unless more potatoes are located, Manager Ivens said today.

A national chain store, with a local outlet, called Ivens today and said if it could not obtain a supply of potatoes immediately some of its stores would be out by nightfall.

"We have been delivering short all week and I don't know of a single bushel of No. 1 grade potatoes in the county," said Ivens. "St. Nicholas growers are at the bottom of their bins."

Ivens reported a critical shortage of potatoes in Chicago, Milwaukee, and other midwest areas.

[From the Escanaba (Mich.) Press of April 29, 1950]

POTATO SHORTAGE IS STARTLING DEVELOPMENT

If a threatened potato shortage in this area becomes acute, which seems possible, it will be the result of the most ridiculous mismanagement of a record potato crop.

Potato dealers report that the supply of potatoes in Delta County is virtually exhausted and that a critical shortage of spuds has already developed in the Chicago, Milwaukee, and midwestern markets.

This would be understandable perhaps if the 1949 potato crop had been a small one, but it was not. It was, in fact, the largest crop of potatoes in the Nation's history. The crop was so large that the Government spent many millions of dollars to buy up the surplus, which was either destroyed or sold back to farmers at a ridiculously low price for livestock feed.

The incredible mismanagement of the potato situation is bound to increase the anger of consumers, who have already paid heavily for a governmental program that failed to make much sense at any time. They have paid through high support prices for potatoes they purchased at the store and in taxes that were used to buy the surplus to maintain the high prices.

And now consumers are told that there is a shortage of potatoes because too many bushels of the 1949 crop were burned or fed to livestock. If that development does not force a revision in the Government's potato price support program, it can only mean that common sense and reason are completely lost at the national level.

Address of Hon. Peter W. Rodino, Jr., of New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1950

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the brilliant

keynote speech delivered by my able colleague, the Honorable PETER W. RODINO, JR., at the New Jersey State Democratic Convention at Trenton on Thursday, April 27, 1950. Those who were privileged to hear this eloquent address were stirred by Mr. RODINO's able exposition of the great issues, both foreign and domestic, that confront America today. I take pleasure in inserting the speech below, and I commend its reading to thoughtful citizens everywhere:

Members of the convention, I am grateful for the privilege of presiding as temporary chairman of this convention. I feel that, in granting me this honor, you are also honoring all the members of the Democratic delegation in Congress, those already in office and those whom you will help to elect in November.

Even as we meet here in this convention, the frontier of freedom is under continuing attack.

That frontier runs from the Baltic through the heart of Berlin, along the borders of Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Albania, the northern border of Afghanistan, Pakistan, India, Burma, and Indochina. It separates the iron curtain from the rest of the free world.

There is another frontier inside the countries on our side—the free side—of the iron curtain. This second frontier of democracy is stronger now than it was 4 years ago. It is stronger now than it was 2 years ago when our Nation, under the leadership of President Truman and with bipartisan support, moved to the counterattack.

The first frontier is holding because the second frontier is stronger.

The second frontier is stronger because of the implementation of the Truman plan in Greece and Turkey and the Marshall plan in the rest of Europe and in southeast Asia.

With the munitions and know-how of defense we have helped to strengthen the first frontier.

With the instruments and know-how of peace we have helped to strengthen the second frontier.

Except in China, where the hope of freedom has been pawned for the promise of food, and the will to fight weakened by corruption, the double frontier of freedom has been held. New frontiers have been established in southeast Asia that with statesmanship and with material aid will be stronger than was the fluid front in China.

And as these two frontiers hold and strengthen around the world, a new third frontier will develop on the other side of the iron curtain, inside the enslaved countries of eastern Europe, inside China, inside Russia itself. Behind the iron curtain are outposts of freedom, pockets of resistance to totalitarian slavery enforced by terror. While men live, the idea of freedom does not die. There are ears to listen and to hear the voice of America, the voice of freedom. We are pledged to battle any form of totalitarianism both here and abroad. We recognize that the Communist aim of Soviet Russia is, first to undermine, and then to destroy, the democratic principles upon which this country has been built.

Steady nerves are needed in this cold war between the idea of freedom and the idea of slavery. They are needed now more than ever before. Last week the Russians shot down an unarmed American plane and murdered 10 American fliers. In that one cynical act of violence, they have taken the cold war out of the ice box and placed it nearer the stove.

But no matter what the provocation, we must step cautiously. It should be remembered that the cost of winning a cold war is infinitely less in men and money than the cost of a shooting war.

The danger is, not that we shall spend too much in winning it, but that we might be too late with too little. That mistake might cost us a contest that we can certainly win if we go at it in terms of rolling out the implements of peace as we went at the job of rolling out the munitions of war 9 years ago.

To date, we have spent less than nine billions in Marshall-plan aid, and that over the protests of the Tabers, Tafts, and the Gabrielsons. We propose to spend a little more than $3,000,000,000 in the coming year, again over their protests.

Since the war, we have spent in all forms of aid to other nations not more than $30,000,000,000. Much of it will pay—and is already paying—dividends in economic health and security for our allies and ourselves.

These figures sound like big sums. But we must think in terms of survival. What is survival worth? What is freedom worth? What are allies worth? What is it worth to keep war and mass invasion from our Jersey beaches?

The out-of-pocket cost of the last war ran as high as $7,000,000,000 a month.

The estimated final cost of that war—not counting priceless lives lost or maimed—will be $1,300,000,000,000—one trillion three hundred billion dollars. For the 44 months of fighting, that means a final cost of $29,500,000,000 a month, $985,000,000 a day, or $41,000,000 an hour.

Since VJ-day, 1945, we have spent to win the peace less than the cost of 33 days of war.

Does anyone think the next war, if it comes, will be cheaper than the last one?

If the last war was worth winning, then how much is it worth to win the peace?

What price survival?

What price tag shall be put on freedom—freedom for ourselves and for our allies?

It's not a long answer. Only three words: Whatever it takes. That is the answer I think this convention must give, the answer it will want to give to the leader of our party and our President, Harry S. Truman.

Whatever it takes to win.

We are moving into a new phase in the cold war. I think we are facing up to the fact that we are in this war for the duration, that it is being fought for keeps, and that, if we step up our efforts, our production, our practice of the democracy at home that we preach abroad, we are bound to win.

As we enter that new phase, this convention and the Democratic Party in the coming campaign have an important function to perform.

We can and we must dedicate ourselves and our party to an all-out program for the continuous full employment of all our human and material resources.

We must show that free men cannot only out-think, out-produce, and out-fight others in war, but that they can also out-think and out-produce others in peace. Against the propaganda and the promises of the Kremlin—promises that are as deceptive as a string of baited fish hooks—we can and we must dramatize the daily facts of life in a free world.

Facts will always beat propaganda—if the facts meet men's needs and their aspirations for freedom.

What are the facts?

1. We have supported—and will continue to support— development of the United Nations into an effective international organization to outlaw aggression and secure international peace.

2. We have endorsed and will continue to endorse the North Atlantic Pact and the ECA program which has reduced so materially the threat of Communist expansion in western Europe.

3. We urge international control of atomic weapons and other forces of mass destruction through adequate safeguards and inspection.

4. Without putting exclusive reliance on armed strength and turning ourselves into a permanent garrison state in which democratic rights would be suspended, we have kept our Nation militarily strong.

5. Simultaneously—there is no "either" "or"—we must continue to step up our aid to other nations less developed economically and industrially than ours, whenever possible through the United Nations.

6. By lowering international trade barriers, we have helped raise standards of living and freedom everywhere, so that the products of free labor will not face the unfair competition of goods produced by coerced, exploited and sweated labor elsewhere.

7. We have advocated continued assistance to, and encouragement of, the new State of Israel.

Such actions constitute, I believe, the implementation of our total diplomacy that has been asked for by our President and his Secretary of State, Dean Acheson.

But these are not purely partisan objectives. To avoid a war that might disintegrate mankind, we must resort first to all the available instruments of peace. We should avail ourselves also of the advice and counsel of the wisest minds in the Congress as well as in the State Department. At the same time we recognize that the Communist cause is helped no little by head-line hunting Republicans in Congress. We believe in uprooting subversive elements at every level of government. But this should be done through proper channels and with a proper respect for reputations—not by a wholesale smearing of innocent public officials.

In the words of our President: "We are not going to turn the United States into a right-wing totalitarian country in order to deal with a left-wing totalitarian threat."

But this technique of irresponsible attacks against our State Department is not the only weapon which the Republican Party has used to undermine our program. Time and again, they have formed an unholy coalition to block the necessary implementation of our foreign policy and commitments.

Again and again, this coalition of special privilege, fear, and prejudice has commanded a majority in the Eightieth and Eighty-first Congresses to keep vital domestic parts of President Truman's Fair Deal program on the shelf.

Measures in line with the Employment Act of 1946, needed to expand production, maintain purchasing power, and insure continued full employment have been rejected. This coalition seems willing to risk chronic mass unemployment here at a time when the world situation calls for every ounce of productive strength we can bring to bear. It persistently ignores the fact that a depression here is Stalin's fondest hope, the secret weapon he believes will go off in our own hands to bring about our own defeat.

This convention and the Democratic Party in New Jersey in the coming months can do something about that. We can strengthen the hands of President Truman and his Fair Deal administration. We can see to it that the issues—particularly domestic issues as they relate to the winning of the cold war—are brought to the voters of our State. If this is done, if the importance of this 1950 election is made plain, we can be sure that the people of New Jersey will reelect those who have supported the Fair Deal program down the line in both its foreign and domestic parts.

On domestic issues, we have fought for repeal of the iniquitous Taft-Hartley law. And we have sought to reinstate the Wagner National Labor Relations Act, with amendments, to insure full protection for employer

and employee, and to prevent Communist domination of labor organizations.

With the help of our votes, the Eighty-first Congress has enacted a program of slum clearance and housing for low-income groups. We favor additional Federal aid for middle-income housing.

We reaffirm our support of a strong civil-rights program as adopted by the National Democratic Convention of 1948.

We favor an expanded system of social security, Federal aid for education and a progressive, scientific national health program which will avoid socialization, and which, we hope, will attract the cooperation of the medical profession.

I ask the convention to urge repeal or substantial reduction of wartime excise taxes. This should go hand in hand with a general revision of our entire income-tax structure, designed to distribute the tax burden more equitably among those able to pay.

But the goal of sensible economy in Government must not jeopardize our national security. Nor must it cripple our efforts to prevent future wars. And it cannot sacrifice these essential functions of government which provide for the welfare of the people.

We pledge to continue our efforts for the preservation of veterans' rights and benefits, including proper medical care and hospitalization for the disabled veteran.

We advocate continuation of a reasonable farm price support program to insure a stable agriculture economy. We recognize that a collapse of our agriculture economy inevitably will result in a breakdown of our national economic structure.

We also recognize the important position of small business in the scale of a sound American economy. We must protect the small businessman from unfair competition and monopolistic practices. He must be given an equal opportunity with competing enterprises to expand his capital structure. We recognize the need for adequate merchant marine as a principal auxiliary to our national defense program. And we pledge further to work for a plan that will insure that our merchant marine will be kept in first-class condition through adequate appropriations.

On the vital question of housing, the Republican State legislature has shown that it cannot agree on an adequate State rent-control program. Therefore, we recommend that controls be continued at the Federal level until such time as the housing shortage is remedied.

We demand that rent control be continued to protect our low and middle income groups. The failure of the Republican legislature to enact this and other necessary measures for the public welfare places it in a class with the "do nothing" Eightieth Congress. And I don't have to tell you what happened to the Eightieth Congress.

When you draw your platform, I ask you not to ignore the mistakes and errors of the Republican legislature. The rent control fiasco represents only a fraction of the sins committed in the name of the Republican caucus.

They have failed to raise your unemployment and cash sickness benefits to meet the rising cost of living.

They have given you a major scandal in the administration of workers' funds. And they have failed to enact legislation to prevent such scandals in the future.

They have surrendered the legislative powers of government and have given you government by authority rather than by law.

They have made a patronage grab for Sandy Hook, which is supposed to be a State park for the benefit of all the people of New Jersey.

In the name of economy, they have eliminated the State board of tenement house supervision. This would subject supervision of tenements to local political pressure and place unnecessary burdens on the cities of our State.

Yet they have failed to achieve the economy they promised through reorganization of State executive departments. Where now are the million dollar savings which were supposed to have been realized through this reorganization?

Yes, they preach economy. But what happened when they were offered a real chance to economize by getting rid of New Jersey's nineteenth century motor vehicle agency system? They didn't do anything about it, because the agencies were a source of Republican patronage. So you stand in line now to buy your license plates, instead of mailing your application as they do in other States.

In the Congress, we Democrats voluntarily undertook to liberalize our procedure for the introduction and consideration of bills. Not so the Republican caucus. The only way to rid yourselves of this evil is to rid yourselves of Republicans and elect a Democratic legislature. That you can—and will do—next year.

In the meantime, we have a duty to perform this year. We must elect—and reelect—a Democratic delegation to represent New Jersey in Congress.

The program we have laid out calls for more competition and less monopoly, for more opportunity for really free enterprise, for more practice of genuine democracy in the economic and political fields, for more income, wages and insurance and lower expenditures for doles and relief.

The election of President Truman and a nominal Democratic majority in Congress was a great victory. But it was not a thorough defeat for the enemies of the New Deal and the Fair Deal. In electing Harry S. Truman we escaped Dewey and disaster.

What did we win? We made important gains. We won time. We won time to carry on the foreign-aid program, to initiate the arms-aid program, to renew the reciprocal trade program, without cheese paring and outright sabotage by powerful leaders of reaction in the Republican Party.

We won time to strengthen and consolidate liberal forces in the country so that, this year, we have good reason to believe the usual apathy of off-year elections can be overcome and Fair Deal strength increased in the November elections.

If we do our job in this convention and in the coming campaign, all the people of New Jersey will know who blocked major parts of the Fair Deal program, and why.

The people of New Jersey will know the importance of the entire Fair Deal program to the winning of the peace.

We have based our platform upon the Democratic platform of 1948, on the Fair Deal program proposed by our President, Harry S. Truman, on the program for which the American people voted in 1948.

Let us have our own voice of America tell the truth to the people of New Jersey as President Truman has proposed to tell the truth to the people of the world.

If we do that, and if our party does the work of promoting registration and getting out the Democratic vote and the independent vote, New Jersey will send a strengthening fair deal Democratic delegation to the Eighty-second Congress. And we will have done our part in putting the Fair Deal, the whole Fair Deal, to work in time to prevent depression and, let us hope, in time to win the peace.

Full production, full employment, more democracy, prosperity and international cooperation.

By these facts, as we make them facts, shall we win a lasting peace among free men. This is our platform. This is our faith. So help us God!

Dollars and Arms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1950

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post of May 3, 1950:

DOLLARS AND ARMS

The major tools of a foreign policy which seeks to dovetail strategy and statesmanship in the right proportions needed for the successful conduct of the cold war are simple to define. They are leadership and brains. This priority we have not yet acknowledged. The priorities have so far been given to dollars and arms, and on balance both have done as much harm as good.

When, for instance, we shoveled dollars into the Philippines, in lieu of the materials we could not wholly deliver as promised for the repair of war damage, we insured the fiscal spree at Manila which has put our former ward on its back, and by the same token given a great boost to the Communist-led Huks. Our dollars are fastening on the Asiatics the worst of all curses, i. e., inflation. Inflation helps to enthrone the money lender and the speculator in keeping the Asiatic enslaved. As for arms, these we put into the hands of the tatterdemalion troops of Chiang Kai-shek, and we thus helped to insure Chiang Kai-shek's collapse, because those arms were regarded merely as counters in a game of panicky and fear-struck surrender. Thus we ended up by, in effect, arming Communist China. No better work has been done by Congress than to deny an arms-crazy administration the authority to send our lethal weapons anywhere it wished.

In Europe, where there is more sense of responsibility than in Asia, dollars so far have done more good than harm. So have the arms—in priming national self-respect and domestic and the general security. But the usefulness of both is beginning to intoxicate the policymakers and arouse the Oliver Twist instincts of the recipients to such an extent that huge levies are looming ahead on our exchequer and our arsenal. The tendency is to say if x dollars and x arms have been useful, then xx dollars and xx arms will be even more useful. That doesn't necessarily follow. Think of the small number of Germans that were required to overrun the Maginot line and the French Army. It is time to think less in terms of dollars and arms and more in terms of policy and the nonmilitary needs of the Atlantic community. The serried might of Russia should not be our preoccupation. Our preoccupation should be the listlessness in Europe. In Europe the questioner is reminded that the United States is in danger of building up the military machines and the self-sufficient state systems that on two occasions have been Europe's undoing.

Humpty Dumpty simply cannot be put back again. The fact is that neither the east nor the west can be returned to the Old World system. In the east the age of imperialism is dead, and American support for any reestablishment of the old colonial system—as in Indochina for the French—is foredoomed to failure. As for Europe, the peoples are community-minded and nonmilitarist, and their contribution to defense will be nil if they are called upon merely to save their antiquated national state systems. If, therefore, policy making must start with

the realities, here they are, and we ought to be taking a new look at the requirements of realizing such concepts as will fulfill the people's aspirations. People only defend wholeheartedly what they believe in.

Ferrero, the great Italian historian, concluded a study of foreign policy in the last century with this observation:

"One of the gravest mistakes committed by human indolence is the belief that order is best preserved by keeping it as it stands. It can only be preserved by continually reconstructing it. The only real guardians are those who reconstruct it. * * * Nothing is so rare as a great constructive mind."

Nothing is so rare as a great constructive mind! The truth of Ferrero's observation is borne out by postwar history. Our recital is the proof. If in war the first principle is to impose your will on the enemy, the first principle of peace is to discover a unifying idea, and pursue it.

A unifying idea in the world of today would be a comprehensive emigration-immigration policy of relieving Europe's population pressure and of resettling surpluses in such open spaces, as, say, Australia, Oceania, and Brazil. Here is something new, something that could capture men's imagination, something that would unify, something in which a host of nations east and west have a common interest, something that would create a diversion from the present descent into war. All there needs to be is a favorable climate for brains and the assertion of the statesmanship requisite for their mobilization. Any fool can throw dollars and arms around.

Prompt Adoption of ITO Charter Essential to Success of American Foreign Economic Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1950

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Christian Science Monitor of April 24, 1950, stressing the importance of adoption of the ITO Charter to the success of American foreign economic policy:

THE ITO IN TOTAL DIPLOMACY

Congress could do much, if it would, to strengthen American leadership in the world, to aid the economic unification of Europe, and to assure western prosperity by heeding Secretary of State Acheson's plea for the ITO.

ITO is the short name for the International Trade Organization, the blueprints for which were completed in a United Nations conference in Habana in 1948.

This was an American-sponsored project. Its central philosophy is 99.44 percent pure American. It aims to serve free enterprise as against state controls over trade. It asserts American faith in an expanding instead of a contracting world economy.

Its thesis was accepted with varying degrees of enthusiasm, some not far above freezing, among the governments represented at Habana. But after months of efforts the basic ideas were preserved in a world trade charter. The approval of this charter for the United States now rests with Congress.

Secretary Acheson urges adoption of the ITO project by Congress soon. We second the motion. There is nothing to be gained by delay.

The ITO charter may be likened to a set of traffic rules for world trade. Today so many countries engage in protective devices, like tariffs (which are not the worst of them), and import quotas, and money controls, that it would be impossible for individual traders to reach agreements for increasing world trade. The individual's interest is often thwarted not only by reasonable regulations but by a conflict among the aims which governments pursue.

If this is understood, it will be seen that the ITO, so far from being "socialism," as is sometimes charged, is really an effort to curb socialistic controls which arise at the national level. The best attack on these now is through international agreement.

Americans in particular—but all other peoples with a stake in the ITO, too—should never miscontrue the charter as a body of rules designed to add new controls over trade. It is designed to reduce those now in existence. Where they cannot be reduced in the foreseeable future, the charter purposes to harmonize them. It would thus prevent the destructive effects of national controls which clash with each other, often unnecessarily.

Yes, to be sure, Congress has other matters pressing upon it these days. But it always has. It should recognize that the ITO can play a big part in the "total diplomacy" now needed to unify the West against communism. For that reason ITO deserves priority.

Adoption of this program by the United States will go far to reassure other nations about the purposes of American economic policy. This should not be a policy of drastic global deflation, in which those peoples hardest hit by war would be expected to add sacrifice to sacrifice interminably by cutting down living standards and reducing imports in order to keep world trade in balance. It should help to balance world trade at a high level which will support maximum employment both at home and abroad.

A reliable sign that this is indeed American policy would do much to offset the appeals of communism in Europe. It would help to heal the distrust which the working masses there sometimes show America.

But even without this important recommendation, the ITO program justifies itself as a realistic adjustment between present trade realities and world hopes for more orderly trade practices and their benefits to workers and employers, producers and consumers alike.

American Legion and the Hoover Commission Relative to Reorganization of the Veterans' Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 20, 1950

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Charles R. Tyson, legislative chairman of Los Feliz Post, No. 527, American Legion, Los Angeles, has prepared a very comprehensive report on the subject of the Hoover Commission Report relative to the reorganization of the Veterans' Administration. Because of the prohibitive cost of extending this complete report in the RECORD, I have made a condensation of his summary in which he states that not all of the veterans are opposed to the reorganization of the Veterans' Administration.

The condensation follows:

As you all know, I have served the Legion and the Disabled American Veterans constantly during the past 30 years. I have witnessed the growth of the Veterans' Administration from its inception and have battled it successfully in behalf of the veteran and his dependents. I was in the forefront of the most bitter battle during the Economy Act of 1933. At that time I was service officer at the Veterans' Administration Hospital in Tucson, Ariz., acting in behalf of the DAV and the Legion. I saw the havoc created by that infamous act. We had many deaths in Arizona brought on by despair, worry, and loss of income, which was too much for seriously ill veterans to cope with. At that time, during the spring of 1933, at my own expense, I went to Washington, carrying with me a suitcase full of claims and cases. I appeared, personally, before the appeal group in behalf of these claims and within 30 days had nearly all adjudicated favorably.

Serving and believing in the cause of the war veteran I have come to the conclusion that something must be done to straighten out the affairs of the Veterans' Administration. If experience is any indication of what we are to expect, then my 30 years experience tells me that we haven't seen anything yet, of the trials and tribulations of the VA and and veterans as a whole. It was 10 years and more, after the first World War until the peak load of disabled was arrived at. In my mind's eye, I can picture what we can expect as to the possible peak load when 10 years have passed from the date of the Second World War.

All veteran organization units are crying for more money, more men, and more space to carry the load of service. Year by year we are asked to contribute more and more and still it is never enough. The time has come when we must weigh the ultimate cost to ourselves and the country. We know now that the VA is not doing the right job. We also know that the Legion and other organizations are understaffed to maintain proper service. Because of these things the veteran is not getting a square deal, and many worthy cases are denied compensation and/or service connection because of these deficiencies.

If the Hoover Commission's recommendations are even partly right, then we should see to it that those parts are carried out. It is up to all of us, individually and collectively, to write our Representatives in Congress how we feel on the matter and not let hysteria sway our judgment. Finally, let me say that this is not a political issue. Our only ex-President, Herbert Hoover, was called to do this job by the President and Congress and he should not be maligned and held up to ridicule. He was only one of 12 outstanding men, evenly divided politically, and had the advice and help of 300 experts.

St. Lawrence Seaway and Power Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1950

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I

include a statement in support of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project made by Mr. J. Howard Marshall, president of the Ashland, Ky., Oil & Refining Co., and chairman of the board of the Ohio Valley Improvement Association. The OVIA is an organization of businessmen in the Ohio Valley, including citizens of Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Ohio, and Kentucky. At their fifty-fourth annual convention in Pittsburgh on March 31 this organization for the first time went on record in favor of the St. Lawrence seaway. Mr. Marshall's statement, printed in the association's monthly news bulletin, gives the reasons for their position:

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY NECESSITY, MARSHALL HOLDS

The system of water facilities as provided by the Great Lakes and inland waterways which gave the great steel industry of the Midwest and other areas, as well, low-cost transportation for bulk commodities such as ore, sets the pattern by which the treasured "red dirt" of Labrador and Venezuela will be made available for the blast furnaces of mid-America in the future.

This is the studied opinion of J. Howard Marshall, president of the Ashland Oil & Refining Co., at Ashland, Ky., and a chairman of the board of the Ohio Valley Improvement Association, Inc.

Marshall announced recently that the OVIA is definitely supporting the proposed creation of a St. Lawrence seaway as the primary means of bringing the Labrador-Quebec ore to the blast furnaces of the Midwest.

With Mesabi ore resources diminishing and beneficiation of 30 percent taconite the only apparent alternative in Minnesota, the building of the seaway appears to be essential toward the protection of the vast steelmaking investments in this part of the continent, Marshall asserts.

As a shipper of petroleum products, Marshall has seen the consistent growth in use of the Ohio-Mississippi River system, as well as other inland waterways for the transportation of not only bulky raw materials but distribution of finished goods as well.

As a result he sees in the proposed St. Lawrence project the most reasonable method of bringing to the already existing docks and other facilities of the Great Lakes the Labrador-Quebec ore for distribution to the mills of Cleveland, Pittsburgh, Youngstown, Wheeling, Warren, Sharon, Canton, Hamilton, Middletown and various other production areas.

Various military men have pointed to the importance of the inland locations of the Nation's large makers of steel, so vital in time of war, and have emphasized the importance of inland waterways to maintenance of these locations.

In some other respects these present locations are advantageous, also, because most of the iron and steel producers are close to sources of most of the raw materials they need, including coal and fluxing stone.

For nearly 100 years the Lake Superior region has produced most of the iron ore used in the United States. In this area are several large iron ore ranges, the biggest being the Mesabi, which has produced more than a billion and a half tons of ore.

Most of this ore has been taken from huge open pits by mechanical shovels and shipped largely on Great Lakes ore boats. The average analysis of this ore is now 51 percent, the figure having dropped down through the years.

Much of the high-grade ore has been used during the last century during which the Nation fought two major wars. If the country should continue to consume or at the war rate, some writers estimate, the Lake Superior region may have sufficient high-grade ore for only 20 to 25 years.

For this reason, Marshall holds, the St. Lawrence seaway seems to be a necessity.

Hoover UN Proposal Prompts Protests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1950

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article by Mary Hornaday, which appeared in a recent issue of the Christian Science Monitor:

HOOVER UN PROPOSAL PROMPTS PROTEST

(By Mary Hornaday)

NEW YORK.—Herbert Hoover's plea for reorganization of the United Nations without the Communist nations has brought a vigorous joint protest from the American Association for the United Nations and United World Federalists, Inc.

While John Foster Dulles, Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, and others were blasting Mr. Hoover for his April 28 proposal to newspaper publishers that the western world withdraw into its own strong shell, Clark M. Eichelberger, AAUN director, and Alan Cranston, UWF president, announced that they would mobilize their approximately 100,000 members throughout the United States to fight Mr. Hoover's suggestion.

While praising Mr. Hoover's integrity, Mr. Eichelberger said his proposal to "polarize" the UN, forcing countries like India and Indonesia to choose between eastern and western ideologies was "brutal" and indicative of "smug self-righteousness."

HANDS JOINED FOR FIRST TIME

In denouncing Mr. Hoover's proposal, which they said might be a "trial balloon" for isolationism, the AAUN and United World Federalists joined hands for the first time.

Mr. Cranston said his organization, which heretofore has put major emphasis on a program for expanding the UN into a world government, is now turning its attention more to keeping the UN from going under entirely.

The AAUN and the UWF in the past have been considered rivals for the support of American internationalists, but Mr. Hoover's attack, described by the two men as the most serious yet made on the UN, brought the two leaders together at a press conference.

Mr. Eichelberger said it was a "cruel thing for Mr. Hoover to believe that we can force the world to choose sides." He added: "If we can give the world the leadership it needs, we stand a much better chance of holding the moral leadership of the world."

He said further that he "did not like Russia's tactics any more than anyone else."

INCREASED WAR PERIL SEEN

Mr. Cranston ventured the forecast that if Russia "is driven out of the UN by the method Mr. Hoover suggests, it will increase the danger of war in the world."

Mr. Hoover said in his speech to the American Newspaper Publishers Association that his plan for a Russialess UN was "not a proposed extension of a military alliance" but a "proposal to redeem the concept of the United Nations to the high purpose for which it was created. It is a proposal for moral and spiritual cooperation of God-fearing free nations."

At the present time the UN is functioning to a large extent without Russia because of its dissatisfaction with the continued refusal of the majority to seat the delegation from Communist China.

Mr. Cranston pointed out that Russia's recent note in the UN changing its position on the internationalization of Jerusalem showed it was still participating and Mr. Eichelberger made the wild prediction that the Chinese delegation situation would be straightened out this summer and Russia would participate in next fall's General Assembly.

MORATORIUM SOUGHT

Both men said it was their personal view, not yet backed by their boards, that the UN should seat the Chinese Communists if and when their government became stable.

A plea for a moratorium on all the rough talk between the east and the west during UN Secretary Trygve Lie's trip to Europe and contemplated visit to Moscow was made by Mr. Eichelberger.

Instead of following Mr. Hoover's advice, he said, he would like to see the world turn to "total diplomacy based not on a cold war but on building up the United Nations.

"If it had not been for the United Nations, the world today would have disintegrated beyond repair. We must somehow hold our forces together in conversation with the faith that agreement can be reached."

Canada Wants St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1950

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, the House Public Works Committee is now holding hearings on the St. Lawrence seaway and power project—House Joint Resolution 271—and I can say without qualification that the overwhelming majority of the American people are in support of this important project. The facts also indicate that the people of Canada are just as strongly in favor of its construction. In this connection, the March 1950 edition of the London Times Survey of Canada and World Trade carries an article by Canadian Minister of Transport, the Honorable Lionel Chevrier, K. C., which points out the importance of the seaway to Canada's future. Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include this article from the London Times entitled "St. Lawrence Seaway Plans":

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY PLANS

(By the Honorable Lionel Chevrier, K. C.)

The Gulf of St. Lawrence, the St. Lawrence River, and the Great Lakes provided the route for the early explorers of North America in their search for a passage to the western sea and the riches of the Far East. When, instead of this, they found the vast western plains extending for 1,200 miles to the foothills of the Rockies, little did they realize that the waters they had traversed would someday become the busiest inland waterway in the world, serving an area that would surpass in wealth the lands which they were seeking, and that the vast prairies beyond would within a few centuries be called the granary of the world.

MOVEMENT WESTWARD

The improvement of this inland route, which included the surmounting of the

natural barriers to free navigation, was accompanied by the steady movement of population westward, and the idea of a seaway to bring the benefits of water transportation into the very center of the continent stirred the imagination of men of vision many years before confederation of the Canadian provinces. The history of the enlargement of the canals and the deepening of the navigation channels is a history of the industrial growth in Ontario and Quebec, and without a doubt this growth, both in Canada and in the Northern States south of the boundary, and the agricultural development of the West have been made possible only by the existence of this waterway.

The improvement of the waterway has been carried on continuously until at the present time a 35-foot channel is available throughout the 1,100 miles of the Gulf and lower St. Lawrence up to Montreal, a 14-foot canal system overcomes the obstructions to navigation in the 115 miles of river from Montreal to Prescott, and a 27-foot depth of channel is available in the remaining 67 miles of river from Prescott to Lake Ontario. The barrier to navigation between Lakes Ontario and Erie presented by the Falls and rapids of the Niagara River is overcome by the Welland ship canal of 25-foot depth completed by Canada in 1932 to replace a 14-foot canal. Above Lake Erie the United States has deepened the rivers connecting the upper lakes so that at the present time a depth of 21 feet is available in up-bound channels and 25 feet in down-bound channels.

LIFE LINE OF THE ALLIES

The importance of these channels to the economic life of both Canada and the United States is obvious when it is realized that the annual tonnage carried between the upper lakes has been over 110,000 during each of the last 2 years and exceeded 120,000 in 1942. The larger part of this traffic is iron ore eastbound from the head of Lake Superior and coal westbound. These channels were very aptly called the life line of the allies during the last war, as the production of the weapons of war in Canada and the United States depended to a large degree on the maintenance of navigation throughout their length.

EARLY VISIONS

The early visions of a seaway did not include the development of hydroelectric power, but the growth of the industrial centers adjacent to the Great Lakes on both sides of the International Boundary and the advent of the age of electricity drew attention to the enormous power potentialities of the Niagara and St. Lawrence Rivers. Just as the improvement of navigation facilities has been a gradual process, so it was with the power resources in the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin. At the present time the total installed capacity on the Canadian side at Niagara totals 1,230,500 horsepower. On the St. Lawrence River an installation of approximately 1,100,000 horsepower is now available, of which about 1,010,000 is in Canada.

The present plan for a seaway may be said to date from 1920, when the Governments of Canada and the United States asked the International Joint Commission, a body set up under the terms of the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909, to recommend to the two Governments a plan that will secure from the waters of the upper St. Lawrence their maximum efficiency in navigation and power. The international commission reported in 1921 and recommended the construction of what has since become known as the St. Lawrence seaway.

Since 1921 extensive engineering studies have been carried out and the plans proposed for navigation improvement and power development has been changed many times. This has been necessary in order to keep pace with the continual change in the physical conditions along the waterway and the growth in the demand for power.

AGREEMENT WITH UNITED STATES

In 1932 representatives of Canada and the United States signed a treaty providing for the construction of the seaway. Although this treaty received a majority vote for ratification in the United States Senate, it failed to obtain the necessary two-thirds majority. In 1941 an agreement between the two nations was signed providing for the completion of the seaway from Montreal to the head of the Great Lakes and the development of the total power resources in the International Rapids Section of the St. Lawrence River—that section of the river which forms part of the boundary between the two countries. A bill is now before the United States Congress which, if passed, will provide for the ratification of this agreement and the commencement of construction of a project which will, without a doubt, have far-reaching effect on the economy of our country.

The project proposed contains provision for "navigation requiring a controlling channel depth of 27 feet with a depth of 30 feet over all lock sills, from the head of the Great Lakes to Montreal Harbor." The locks will conform with those of the existing Welland Ship Canal with chambers 859 feet in length and 80 feet in width. The depth on all lock sills and over all permanent structures will be 30 feet, which means that deepening in the future to that depth will entail dredging only.

On completion of the proposed improvements the total length of canal navigation along the 1,200 miles from Montreal to the head of Lake Superior will be limited to about 48 miles and the number of locks will be reduced from 30, as at present, to only 15.

The project for the improvement of the International Rapids Section of the St. Lawrence River is a combined navigation and power project which will result in a total power installation of 2,200,000 horsepower at one site. This will be equally divided between Caanda and the United States and will furnish approximately 10,000,000 kilowatt-hours of energy a year—more than that available from any single power development in the world.

ADDITIONAL POWER

In addition to the power to be developed in the international section a further 3,200,000 horsepower is available in the Canadian section of the St. Lawrence. Approximately 1,000 horsepower of this is already developed.

On the completion of the seaway the Great Lakes will become directly connected to the open seas which constitute the world's commercial highways. Deep-draft lake freighters will carry unbroken cargoes from the upper lakes for transshipment at Montreal and other tidewater ports, while ocean vessels will be brought directly to the centers of production and distribution for a very large part of Canada's foreign trade. The Great Lakes will become the Mediterranean of North America.

The importance to British-Canadian trade of the present Great Lakes water route as a feeder to the St. Lawrence route to the British Isles has long been established. The extension of this route for another 1,200 miles inland—one-third of the distance across Canada—must result in reducing transportation costs on commodities such as grain, flour, and coal, which now move between the two countries.

COMMONWEALTH VIEW

The world-wide units of the British Commonwealth are joined together by the oceans which have made possible the development of the various member nations by providing facilities for easy and cheap transportation. The external trade of these member nations can move only by the seaways of the world. It must therefore be readily appreciated how important it is to the promotion of international trade that deep-water access be provided to the great producing and consuming areas of central Canada.

The British Commonwealth of Nations being so dependent on deep-water transportation, it is obvious that the further development of the St. Lawrence seaway in the territory of a leading member nation, with a consequent reduction in transportation costs, is of great importance to a group of nations founded on and bounded by the seven seas.

The supply of a large block of relatively low-cost hydroelectric power in the center of the industrial area of Canada will insure low production costs in the industries competing with similar industries throughout the world and will at least retain for Canada her envied position in the international trade world.

Today's World Must Be Christian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1950

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, with her customary logic based on a sound fundamental knowledge, our distinguished colleague, the Honorable CHASE GOING WOODHOUSE, of Connecticut, has made an outstanding contribution to contemporary social thought in an article, Today's World Must Be Christian, published in the April 1950, issue of the Church Woman.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the article by Mrs. WOODHOUSE in the RECORD.

TODAY'S WORLD MUST BE CHRISTIAN

(By Congresswoman CHASE GOING WOODHOUSE, Connecticut)

The hydrogen bomb is only the latest step in the series of almost miraculous scientific developments which, in the last half century, have so radically changed the physical face of the Western World and raised our standard of living. These material results of the industrial revolution engendered by the work of the natural scientists are very evident. We recognize them, accept their advantages, but to too large a degree we utterly fail to recognize or accept their social implications.

These implications may be summed up very briefly in one sentence. Science has forced us to face a decision; either we really accept the Christian ethic and base our behavior as individuals and as nations upon it, or we face the destruction of civilization. That is a hard fact and one we cannot dodge. There is no argument in saying we are already Christians. We are, but too much in form only. Today the outward form and ceremonial is not enough. Sect, doctrine, dogma, theology, hierarchy—all these I am not discussing. I am discussing the full acceptance of the Sermon on the Mount, the brotherhood of man, the philosophy of brotherly love and of tolerance—in brief, the Christian ethic.

Why is the full acceptance of basic ethic more important today than in previous decades or previous centuries? It is because the scientists while unlocking great potentialities for richer living have also made us highly interdependent. No one individual, no one nation is a free agent. No one individual, no one nation can live in isolation. We are all joined together in what must be a great cooperative enterprise if any of us are to have the security of peace and plenty.

If we do not so join together, the results may be economic disaster and eventually war.

Let us look first at the domestic scene. Not so many years ago the great majority of the families of this country lived on farms. Each family was more or less independent. Each grew and preserved its own food, spun its own wool, wove its own cloth, made its own clothes. There were very few commodities which the farm family had to buy from outside. Each family more or less controlled its own welfare. The hard-working, thrifty family got on; the shiftless did not. In each case the results sprang from the family's own attitude and effort or lack of effort.

Today the situation is very different. The majority of families are supported by one or more wage earners. The wage earner is dependent on his job. The job is available only when economic conditions are good which means when other factories than the one in which he works are running, when other people have jobs and have money to purchase the many different commodities and services offered on the market.

Even the farmer is no longer independent. He must sell his wheat, his milk, his eggs, his chickens, his beef, his cotton, or whatever he grows, on the market. Only when the urban wage earner has a job at good wages can the farmer sell at a good price.

It takes only a most cursory view of our economic life to see to what a great extent we are all interrelated, to see how the well being of all determines the well being of each.

There is no long-term cleavage of interest between labor and capital. Unless labor is fully employed at good wages the products of capital cannot be sold at a profit. On the other hand, unless capital makes a profit there will not be plant expansion and there will not be jobs for the on-coming youth.

There is no sense to labor-management conflict. Each side gains from working with the other. Only together can they move forward to real prosperity.

Good wages, social security, provision for old age, decent housing, adequate health care, school lunches—all the programs which make for healthy, vigorous happy workers aid not only the workers, but through larger and more efficient production, they aid management and the entire community.

In our highly mechanized urban industrial society, where each worker is a specialist, we must work together in brotherly cooperation or else we fail. Economic depression, booms and busts are not necessary. They bring misery to some, insecurity to all. Cooperation can bring stable prosperity and adequate security to farmers, industrial workers, manager and owners.

The same situation occurs in the international field. Two World Wars in the past four decades should have taught us that nations too are interdependent. The United States had no desire to be embroiled in war, and yet twice against our will in the lifetime of our adult population we have been drawn into conflicts.

President Truman's point 4 program recognizes this brotherhood of nations. No country can be backward, its people hungry, sick, ill-clothed, ignorant without effect on us. Our only insurance against a fatal war with communistic totalitarianism is a program which will result in having the great majority of the nations of the world with sufficient economic development so that these people will have a decent standard of living and will be in a position to appreciate the advantages of democratic government.

It will not be enough to send food for European recovery, to send technical experts under point 4 program to the Near East and other areas. We must understand that a free flow of goods from country to country is essential to sound economic development and economic stability. We will have to continue our reciprocal trade agreements policy. Foreign trade cannot be conditioned on a one-way street. We must permit goods to come in as well as to encourage our own exports.

The nations of the world are working together in a way never before known. We can be proud that it is our country which has taken the lead in this movement for world cooperation. We have backed the United Nations. We have shared our economic wealth with other freedom- and peace-loving nations, and many of us feel we must go even further. In the Congress of the United States there are many Members and Senators who are working for an Atlantic union and, eventually, for a world federation. Those of us in this group know that only by such close cooperation can the world have peace.

Peace is the major concern of the world today. The alternatives are peace or destruction, and peace can be achieved only through good will, only through a real understanding of the basic principle of the Christian ethic, only through making a day-by-day reality of the brotherhood of man, in our dealings at home between farmer and urban dweller, between labor and management, and in our dealings abroad with other nations. Today we must be practicing Christians or we must face the peril of destruction.

A Taxi Driver Believes in Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1950

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article by Joseph C. Harsch, which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor of April 25. Mr. Harsch is chief of the Washington news bureau of the Christian Science Monitor.

The article follows:

STATE OF THE NATION—A TAXI DRIVER BELIEVES IN PEACE

(By Joseph C. Harsch)

WASHINGTON.—Joseph Polowsky is a taxi driver in Chicago. He earns a living, but not exactly a princely one. Few taxi drivers do. He is like thousands of other young taxi drivers around the country in most respects, but he differs from most others in one respect. He takes what little money he can spare and does a curious thing with it.' He pays for having an idea of his printed on paper, and he pays for mailing these sheets, on which his idea is printed, around the country to newspaper offices, and finally he comes down to Washington and spends his last penny trying to get newspapermen and Congressmen to do something about his idea on this day, April 25.

He wants Congress and the United Nations to pass resolutions that on April 25 appropriate ceremonies be held to commemorate the fact that on this day 5 years ago two things happened. One was the opening of the San Francisco Conference of the United Nations. The other was the first meeting on the Elbe of Russian and American troops.

When Mr. Polowsky comes into your office trying to persuade you to do something to help him get this day commemorated, you feel a bit embarrassed. He is so earnest. Yet, of course, he is unrealistic. Why bother to commemorate a day which so soon has become tarnished and almost forgotten? Who wants to try to remember that 5 years ago Russian and American soldiers met each others as friends; met each other joyfully, and thought that in their meeting might be born a new and happier world.

These soldiers even took an oath on the Elbe. Let Joe Polowsky tell the circumstances in his words:

"The greetings took place in the midst of some 200 corpses of old men, women, and children. After the preliminary greetings, the Americans and Russians looked down at the bodies and fragments of bodies—especially the body of a child with blue eyes and long brown hair clutching crayons in one hand and a doll in the other. At this historic moment * * * the soldiers present—Americans and Russians—swore that they would do everything in their power to prevent such things from ever happening again, swore that the nations would and must live at peace."

Joe Polowsky was just a private in that army. He was interpreter to Lt. Elbart L. Kotzebue. The lieutenant was the first man across. Private Polowsky was only the second. And perhaps his memory has overdramatized the event. History does not record that the soldiers did anything as serious as taking an oath to try to prevent future wars. Private soldiers aren't supposed to bother with serious matters like that. And what good would it do, anyway?

Since that day, everything has gone wrong with the hopes that did flicker at the time. Of course soldiers do sometimes think of an end to wars.

There have been young idealists with illusions in every war. There was a League of Nations after 1918. Great hopes were placed in the League of Nations. They came to nothing, and then there was another war. After it illusions did not run quite so high. The memory of the old disillusionment was still strong. And this time the hopes have dwindled even faster than they did after 1918.

Joe Polowsky is one person trying to walk up a hill while everyone else is going down it. He talks about commemorating the oath at the Elbe.

The Russians aren't thinking of anything as forgotten and out of step with the times as that. They are trying to digest China, and planning ways of breaking Tito, and pinning medals on their fighter pilots who shot down an unarmed American plane over the Baltic Sea.

The French are spending as much as we give them in Marshall aid trying to hold their colony in Indochina.

The British are striving with us to keep the military power of the west abreast of the military power of Russia. Nothing could be more incongruous than to ask people to commemorate a few soldiers meeting at a river 5 years ago. I myself should be writing about matters of timely and serious import. I never should have let Joe Polowsky take up my time with his probably highly romanticized memories of the day he met the Russians on the Elbe.

Or should I?

Old Stone House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHASE GOING WOODHOUSE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1950

Mrs. WOODHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert herewith two editorials regarding the Old Stone House in Georgetown. I have introduced H. R. 7722 to provide for the acquisition and maintenance of this historic structure by the Federal Government.

The editorials follow:

[From the Washington Post of April 1, 1950]

OLD STONE HOUSE

This is such a young country that any house as much as a century old has historic prestige. Even Washington, which many brash sightseers regard as an ancient city, has few remaining pre-Revolutionary buildings. That is one reason why the Old Stone House at 3051 M Street NW. has such a strong hold on the affections of those familiar with it. Bills have now been introduced in House and Senate to have the Secretary of the Interior acquire this landmark as part of the National Capital parks system. It would then be preserved as an example of the eighteenth century architecture and as a museum for relics and records pertaining to the early history of Georgetown and the city of Washington.

Built in 1764 by Christopher Lehman (or Layman), this quaint story and a half dwelling dates back to the days when Georgetown was a busy seaport and when Bridge (now M) Street was a bustling commercial thoroughfare. Many legends have grown up about it—that it was the headquarters for Pierre L'Enfant, as well as for Washington, while the Federal city was being planned, also the headquarters for the Commissioners who developed L'Enfant's plans, that it was the model for Washington's town house in Alexandria, that it was General Braddock's headquarters. Historians discredit this last legend, argue about some of the others. But there is widespread belief that the Old Stone House was the structural birthplace of our great Federal city, that within its low-ceilinged rooms with their narrow sash windows the blueprint midwifery took place that produced what Tom Moore in 1804 called—

"This embryo Capital where fancy sees
Squares in morasses, obelisks in trees."

If this belief be true, then not only the Capital but the entire Nation has a vested sentiment in the Old Stone House that transcends even its architectural significance.

[From the Washington Evening Star of April 19, 1950]

A RELIC WORTH SAVING

The little old house at 3051 M Street NW. may not have been George Washington's headquarters while he was planning the Federal city which was to bear his name. Somehow, it seems too small, too diminutive in its proportions, to have contained so great a man even for a few days. The same observation applies to the legend that the place once sheltered Maj. Pierre L'Enfant while he was working on his drawings for the future Capital. Conceivably it might have been an office for the first commissioners of the new city, but even this story fails of attraction.

Much more probably the structure was raised for and used by quite humble people. Such houses were common in the second half of the eighteenth century. Its design was standard among carpenter architects. Grace Dunlop Ecker, in her "Portrait of Old Georgetown" says the edifice in question was built in 1767 and was owned by Cassandra Chew. She cites a newspaper advertisement describing it as "the house where Mrs. Annie Smith lately dwelt, containing three rooms and a passage on the lower and three rooms on the upper floor, a large cellar and garret, a kitchen detached from the house, and a good garden."

No verification of the suggestion that General Braddock stopped at 3051 has been found. He died as the result of wounds received in battle in western Pennsylvania in 1755 and thus antedated the little stone cottage by at least a dozen years. Other romantic legends appear to be as inconsequential. But the house still is worth saving. It has been judged by the National Capital Parks authorities to be a relic worthy of renovation, stabilization, maintenance, and preservation. Under the proper auspices it might be a museum of a sort, reflecting the common life of the period to which it belongs.

How Many Friends Do We Have?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1950

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial which appeared in the Detroit News of Saturday, April 29, 1950:

HOW MANY FRIENDS DO WE HAVE?

Relations with Russia may well reach such a pass, perhaps soon, that the total break between "two worlds" urged by former President Hoover in his New York speech will have become inevitable.

The fact that President Truman impulsively phoned Mr. Hoover, presumably to congratulate him on his address, must be taken as significant.

Russia's boycott of the United Nations over the question of admitting Communist China already has created a situation in which the further utility of that once hopefully regarded organization is open to doubt. It was this perhaps that suggested to Mr. Hoover his proposal of a reorganized UN from which the Soviets would be excluded.

That situation itself, however, includes elements showing why the course Mr. Hoover proposes needs to be examined with considerable caution.

The democratic world is not a unit with us in our policy toward Communist China. India and Great Britain have recognized the Mao Tse-tung regime. India and Britain are important, both militarily and politically, to our hopes of holding the Red tide in check.

If we are to initiate a total break with Russia before that step is made inevitable by events, it would be wise to discover first who would be with us.

Mr. Hoover would leave the discovery to be made after the step has been taken. In Western Europe, however, there is already a feeling that our policy toward Russia has progressed too far beyond firmness toward belligerence. Wrong as that feeling may be, it would seem wise to take account of it.

We have urgent need of the loyalty of our European allies. That loyalty cannot be purchased with dollars or guaranteed by our treaty of alliance. It will depend finally on the confidence of Europeans that our leadership, steel-hard though it must be in opposing Communist aggression, is nevertheless a leadership grounded on the desire for peace.

The News thinks, with all due respect to Mr. Hoover, that it had better be left to Russia to be first to blast the world's hopes that peace yet can be achieved on some acceptable basis.

Demonstrate Neighborliness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1950

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, Brooklyn, with its population of over 3,000,000 people of every race and creed, is just as neighborly as any small town in the United States.

Under the permission heretofore granted me by unanimous consent of the House, I am proud to include the following editorial concerning some neighbors of mine which was published in the Brooklyn Eagle of Monday, May 1, 1950:

DEMONSTRATE NEIGHBORLINESS

Brooklyn can be proud of the Bay Ridge Rockets, a neighborhood football team which has demonstrated that it knows the meaning of both neighborliness and teamwork.

Moved by the plight of an elderly Bay Ridge resident who has already had a score of transfusions and needs a great many more to withstand a major operation, the Bay Ridge Rockets arranged to donate their blood through the Brooklyn Red Cross Chapter.

They went further and enlisted the Cronin-Leesha Post of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the local Knights of Columbus Council, and the Eighth Avenue Civic Association to join them in the mass donations.

It is not the first time the Rockets have come to the aid of a neighbor. In fact, friends of Joseph Winn, the Norwegian hospital patient needing help so badly, turned to the Rockets for aid because last year the team made a mass donation for a 2½-year-old leukemia victim about whom they had read in a newspaper story.

Hugh Hayden, captain of the Rockets, the whole team, and all the neighbors who have joined them in their voluntary mercy project deserve a lot of loud, long cheers from their fellow Brooklynites.

Effect of Imported Fuel Oil on the Coal Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. M. G. BURNSIDE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1950

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include letters from Mr. R. H. Smith, president of the Norfolk & Western Railway Co., Messrs. F. F. McIntosh, Jr., Bernard R. Hays, and R. U. Adams, the latter being persons prominent in the oil industry of my State.

NORFOLK & WESTERN RAILWAY CO.,
Roanoke, Va., April 26, 1950.

Hon. M. G. BURNSIDE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to acknowledge receipt of your telegram of April 21 relative to imported fuel oil and its adverse effect on the coal industry.

American-produced coal is being displaced in large quantities by fuel oil, particularly along the eastern seaboard, and this situation arises principally as a result of imports of foreign oil now coming to this country at a tremendous and increasing rate. As a result coal mines are closing down, railroad traffic is falling off, and mining and transportation employees are out of work. The dislocations created by fuel-oil imports are weakening the fuel economy of the Nation which should remain powerful for security purposes.

It is gratifying to know of your efforts to bring about remedial legislation. We, too, are doing what we can.

Yours very truly,
R. H. SMITH, *President.*

McINTOSH & GRIMM,
Spencer, W. Va., April 29, 1950.
Hon. M. G. BURNSIDE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BURNSIDE: It has come to our attention that there is a movement in Congress to curtail or tax the importation of foreign oil. We, here in this section of West Virginia, approve such a measure.

Most people think of this State as coal producing throughout, but this is not the case. We aren't in the coal mining section and can't speak for those who are.

In this rugged part, we must rely on the production of oil and natural gas to supplement our livelihood and nearly every citizen is affected wholly or in part by its market and price.

Nearly all of our present operations are now conducted by small independent producers with little capital and meager reserves. Our wells are either strippers or small pumpers and the present price is about the dividing line between profit and loss. We can't hope to compete with cheap foreign oils and don't think we should be compelled to do so.

Our West Virginia production is both oil and gas and when drilling a test well we don't know whether to expect oil, gas, a little of both or, as it quite often happens, a dry hole. When the price of oil is such that a profit cannot be shown from our operations, and any figure below the present price would be in that catagory, we have lost most of our incentive to explore for natural gas. Therefore the price of crude oil has a great bearing on the production of natural gas as well as crude oil.

Oil and gas have not advanced with the other commodities during the past decade although drilling and producing expenses have doubled and tripled. Congress has seen fit to help other producers of natural resources and we appreciate that fact, but think the time is here now when we should get a lift too.

Sincerely yours,

F. F. McINTOSH, Jr.
BERNARD R. HAYS.

SISTERSVILLE, W. VA., *April 25, 1950.*
Hon. M. G. BURNSIDE,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR BURNIE: As you well know the entire county of Tyler is oil country. We produce the finest quality of Pennsylvania crude oil. With the cost of material as it is, any cut in the price of oil makes it extremely hard for us to operate.

The unlimited importation of foreign oil would work a great hardship if not ruin us. I call your attention to the fact that oil imports increased 23.6 percent in the last half of 1949 over the same period in 1948.

I urge you to support any measure that will materially increase the tariff on oil imports.

Sincerely yours,

R. U. ADAMS.

Arizona Admits Budget Opposes Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1950

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Speaker, the Arizona papers are extremely candid. In an editorial in the Phoenix Gazette of April 28, 1950, regarding the Central Arizona project, it was plainly stated that the Bureau of the Budget is definitely unfavorable to the central Arizona project and, more significantly, that it was only by the intervention of Arizona's Senators at the White House that an adverse report was averted. The Arizona editorial further stated that the Bureau of the Budget had prepared an adverse message on the project but modified it at the President's request to generalities. The editorial in full is included for the RECORD and the attention of our colleagues is particularly directed to the third and fourth paragraphs. The editorial is as follows:

SET-BACK FOR THE PROJECT

The set-back which the Central Arizona project bill has received in the House could be serious. Delaying the vote of the Public Lands Committee until June 15 and possibly later means that the project will be up for consideration at a time when Congressmen are looking longingly toward home in an election year. The House calendar will be jammed and the pressure for adjournment will have started.

Moreover, the Public Lands vote is not the only step before the bill reaches the floor of the House. The measure must be approved and scheduled by the Rules Committee, which is dominated by economy-mindedness to an unusual degree at the present time and would thus be vulnerable to California propaganda about the cost of the project.

On top of these complications is the likelihood that the Bureau of the Budget will return a definitely unfavorable report on the project in answer to the resolution which California's Representative ENGLE maneuvered through the Public Lands Committee yesterday.

Only by the intervention of Arizona's Senators at the White House was such a report averted earlier this month. Washington sources say that the Budget Bureau had prepared an adverse message on the project but modified it at Mr. Truman's request into generalities which could be interpreted as favoring either side in the controversy. Representative ENGLE's resolution, confronting the Bureau with a number of specific questions, is obviously an attempt to force a report which will present the Bureau's original reaction to the project.

The Engle resolution was passed blindly by the Public Lands Committee. Not until after the vote had been taken was a request made that the full draft be read. It is impossible to say whether revelation of the extent of delay, contained in the last paragraph, might have altered the vote enough to kill the resolution.

There is no doubt, however, that California has struck a tricky and upsetting blow.

A Needed Move

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1950

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial appearing in the New York Herald Tribune of March 24, 1950:

A NEEDED MOVE

Nothing can grow up more irrationally and with less conscious purpose than a tax system. As needs arise new fiscal devices are resorted to: one expedient is piled on top of another, until the whole structure can oppress and overwhelm a free people. By the same token, no complex of measures is so difficult to unravel and to reduce to lucid and manageable proportions. Representative FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR., has announced that he will move in the House for a nonpartisan commission to study and recommend a plan of revision for the Federal tax structure. It is a project which deserves encouragement.

Mr. COUDERT is particularly concerned with the tendency of the Federal Government to monopolize the taxing power, turning back to the States sums which have been to a measurable degree eaten away in the process of handling. With the return to the States of their traditional taxing authority goes a return of the powers of Government which have been surrendered or usurped; and services, as he says, are then performed locally under the eyes of the citizen and the voter, and * * * are bound to be more efficiently administered." Unfortunately there are some who disagree with this eminently sound analysis and objective; yet within both parties there are surely men who will be ready to get back to tax fundamentals. Such a nonpartisan commission as Mr. COUDERT is proposing could form the basis of a fresh appreciation of what constitutes efficient and responsible Government in this country. We hope that he finds stanch allies in his work.

Business, Not Government, Kills Free Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAYMOND W. KARST
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1950

Mr. KARST. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to an editorial in the Machinist of April 13, 1950, which I am extending below. It is too bad that every large- and small-business man in our country does not have the opportunity to read this article, which portrays the attempted movement of big business against small business to hinder free enterprise by attempting to place the blame on the functions of our Government.

The editorial follows:

BUSINESS, NOT GOVERNMENT, KILLS FREE ENTERPRISE

There are two ways to keep prices within reason. One is Government control; the other, free competition. We in America believe in free competition or free enterprise, as a lot of people call it. Back before the beginning of our century, Congress passed an anti-trust law to protect our free-enterprise system by preventing industry from falling into the hands of a few giant corporations. The anti-trust laws were supposed to protect small business and to give the maximum opportunity to new firms entering any industry.

Today, these anti-trust laws are dying. Big business—including most of the men who talk loudest about protecting our American way of life—are killing free enterprise. In the past 3 years, big business in the United States has made every possible effort to stifle price competition and to free itself from the antitrust laws.

This postwar drive by the big corporations began in the Eightieth Congress. When the

smoke cleared, two giant industries had won complete exemption—insurance and transportation. It is now legal for insurance companies and the railroads to agree among themselves to eliminate competitive practices.

In industries which are supposedly still covered by the anti-trust laws, violations are common. The Department of Justice does a good job with the tools it commands. However, the penalty is small for a business firm convicted for destroying competition (and our free-enterprise system). Price fixing agreement and illegal suppression of competition add millions to corporation profits. The fine, when the company is caught, amounts to only a few thousand dollars. Even here, in many cases, the fines are imposed, not on the officers of the company, but upon the corporation itself and are charged off as a business expense.

Notwithstanding, the big corporations are not content. This week they hope to jam through the Senate the O'Mahoney bill which if passed will virtually finish the job of freeing big business from the antimonopoly laws. This bill in substance wipes off the statute books a law intended to protect small business from price discrimination. Several hundred thousand small businessmen have fought this bill. Organized labor, including the IAM has backed their fight.

If the free-enterprise system is disappearing in this country, big business and its supporters in Congress, who are amending away the anti-trust laws, are responsible. It is the same old story of greedy men killing the goose that lays the golden eggs.

Cincinnati First in Fire Prevention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES H. ELSTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1950

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, the thirty-eighth annual meeting of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, currently under way here in the Nation's Capital, included in its program today the conferring of a significant honor upon the people of Cincinnati. I know that the Members of this body will join with me in recognizing that honor as a singular achievement in civic Cincinnati's great history.

Of all of the cities in the United States participating in the fire prevention contest of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, the record achieved by Cincinnati in 1949 was judged outstanding. At a general session of the annual meeting this morning the grand award in fire prevention was presented to representatives of the people who merited this honor. Last year, therefore, Cincinnati was No. 1 in fire prevention in the Nation.

Let me say that I consider it a great privilege to live in a community that has so ably demonstrated its awareness of a problem that grows with each passing year. Fire losses over the Nation are mounting and the annual toll in lives and property damage is staggering. An effective fire-prevention program is the one defense that can stop the havoc wrought by fire. Quite obviously the people of Cincinnati are aware of the problem and with expert leadership they have carried on the most skillful kind of fire prevention program.

Fire prevention in Cincinnati is a cooperative civic effort. Through the efforts of the city's fire prevention bureau and the Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce Fire Prevention Committee, clubs and organizations, schools and churches, and newspapers and radio stations, each and every resident is invited to participate in a program to reduce fire losses. The honor being given them today recognizes this achievement, and I am privileged to bring it to the attention of the Congress and the country.

Joint Committee on Fuel Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1950

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, continuing my efforts to assist the coal industry in regaining its lost markets, I have introduced this date the following House concurrent resolutions which are self-explanatory.

The Joint Congressional Committee on Fuel Policy to be created by this legislation is in no way related to President Truman's proposal for a congressional investigation of the coal industry, particularly its labor-management affairs.

My resolution is designed to provide a national policy on the use of all fuels including coal, oil, and natural gas, and at the same time to determine our national reserves of such fuels.

A study will also be made by the Joint Congressional Committee on Fuel Policy of the Government's policy of subsidizing fuel substitutes such as hydropower projects as well as the importation of foreign oil.

The resolutions are as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution —

Concurrent resolution to establish the Joint Committee on Fuel Policy

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby created a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on Fuel Policy (herein referred to as the "committee") which shall be composed of the members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate and the members of the Committee on Public Lands of the House of Representatives. The committee shall select a chairman from among its members.

SEC. 2. The committee is authorized and directed (1) to make a full and complete investigation and study of the available fuel reserves of the United States and the present and probable future rates of consumption thereof; (2) to formulate a national fuel policy to meet the needs of the United States in times of peace and war, such policy to include the use of all fuels and energy resources except atomic energy; (3) to study and recommend methods of encouraging developments to assure the availability of fuels adequate for an expanding economy and the security of the United States; and (4) to report to the Senate and to the House at the earliest practicable date, not later than September 15, 1950, the results of its investigation and study together with its recommendations.

SEC. 3. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this resolution, the committee or any subcommittee thereof—

(1) is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within or outside the United States, whether or not the Congress or either House thereof is in session, has adjourned, or has recessed, to hold such hearings, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, correspondence, memoranda, papers and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary; and subpenas shall be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or by any member designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member; and

(2) may utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the various departments and agencies of the Government to the extent that such services, information, facilities, and personnel, in the opinion of such departments and agencies, can be furnished without undue interference with the performance of the work and duties of such departments and agencies.

House Concurrent Resolution —

Concurrent Resolution to provide for the expenses of carrying out House Concurrent Resolution —

Resolved, etc., That the expenses of carrying out the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution —, incurred by the Joint Committee on Fuel Policy, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $100,000, including expenditures for the employment of experts, assistants and other employees, and all expenses necessary for travel and subsistence incurred by members and employees while engaged in the activities of the committee or any subcommittee thereof, shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives on vouchers signed by the chairman of the committee. Disbursements shall be made by the Clerk of the House of Representatives out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, such contingent fund to be reimbursed from the contingent fund of the Senate in the amount of one-half of the disbursement so made.

Small Business Conventions—Big Business Often Masquerades as Small Business—Small Business Is Not Necessarily Independent Business—Small Business Concerns Often Dependent on One or Two Customers, or One or Two Suppliers—Decline in Number of Small Manufacturers—Article by Ernest H. Gaunt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 27, 1950

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, Washington has been witnessing recently a number of small business conventions. It might be indelicate for me to mention the names of the "small business" organizations which have sponsored these

conventions. The Select Committee on Small Business recently issued a study on small-business organizations indicating that often they are in the pay of big business—including at least one of the organizations which recently met in convention.

However, I would like to refer to an article published in 1938 entitled "How Independent Is Small Business?", written by Ernest H. Gaunt, a sincere friend of small business. With the change of a few words the article might have been written in April 1950. The article follows:

HOW INDEPENDENT IS SMALL BUSINESS?

(By Ernest H. Gaunt)

Very few of Secretary Roper's "700 Dwarfs" who met in Washington on February 2–3, seemed to lay much stress on the need for independence in their business. Many expressed the sentiment that all they needed was to "make a profit." Some asked to be "let alone" but almost in the same breath asked for Government loans or tariffs.

The result of the Washington conference was not "the voice of smaller business." Because there were many minds there were many voices—some the voice of big business speaking through minnows who wished to become pike, as in Jerome Davis' story. And those who went to Washington were not typical or representative of the 1,800,000 small businesses of the country. Retailers, who have the largest number of small establishments in the country, were not adequately represented. There are more retail establishments than all others combined—manufacturers, wholesalers, service establishments, places of amusement, hotels, and construction industry. Some people look upon retailers as the "real" small-business man. This view, while not strictly true, is worthy of consideration by those accustomed to think in terms of manufacturing or wholesaling or construction where business runs in big dollar volume, even in "small" business.

There are 10 times as many retailers as manufacturers, 10 times as many retailers as wholesalers. Although one-half of all retailers employ no other person or only part-time workers, their total employees are more than one-half the employees of manufacturing establishments and more than three times the employees of wholesalers.

Eighty-seven percent of retailers still remain independent, and these independents employ almost twice as many workers as the stores which are not independent—the chains, utility operated stores, direct selling, commissaries, and other types. The multi-unit independents have half the number of stores that chains have, and employ one third the number of persons.

The Washington gathering was not representative of geographical sections. Despite all of the above-mentioned lack of proportional, typical or geographical representation, the conference was of great significance in American economic history. It was the first political recognition in our history of small-business enterprisers as a separate class. It is now being followed by economic recognition, because small-business men are the majority in number of all businessmen in the United States. Ninety-seven percent of the business organizations in our country employ less than 250 people each. Sixty-eight percent of manufacturers employ less than 20 each. Forty-five percent of independent retailers employ 15 persons or less.

The big-business man and the "minnow" now say: "Then why all this disturbance and rabble-rousing?" The answer is that the 3 percent (in number) of businesses employing more than 250, have been dominating the American business system for 50 years with increasing control—making its customs, and making the Nation's laws affecting business, including taxation and banking and credit, and finally making the mess into which all of us were brought in 1929.

Will this 3-percent tail continue to wag the 97-percent dog? When the French small-business men of 1789 (the bourgeoisie) who were almost entirely retailers, bec me class-conscious and organized, the economic and political royalty and big business of that day took them into camp. But something yet remained seriously wrong in the French economic system. The French small-business men stopped their broader thinking when their own wants were temporarily satisfied, and they left the workers and consumers as the forgotten men. The French workers and consumers took the play away from the small-business men. Then followed the dictatorship.

This bit of history may not be repeated in the United States because the smaller-business men of the United States in 1938 are better educated than were the French smaller-business men of 1789. But on the other hand, even if farmers are counted as businessmen, and most certainly they should be, today probably as big or even a bigger percentage of all citizens in the United States are dependent upon a centrally controlled economic system, as were the French citizens of 1789 dependent upon a centrally controlled political system which messed up the economic system of that day.

Much depends upon the degree of independence of small business in the United States. Many small manufacturing concerns are so dependent upon some one or two large customers as practically to belong to those large customers. Seven thousand small manufacturing concerns are said to depend almost entirely on the Ford Motor Co. for orders. Many small manufacturing companies sell a large part of their product through agencies owned or controlled by their big competitors; other small manufacturing enterprises depend upon patents owned by their big competitors; some small manufacturing establishments must buy nearly all their raw materials or goods from one or two large suppliers; and many depend for credit or loans upon one source.

No accurate study has been made of the growth of dependency of small manufacturing companies. The United States census classifies as "independents" and "other independents," the retailers, wholesalers, service establishments, places of amusement, hotels, and construction industry. It does not so classify manufacturers. Possibly one result of the coming investigation of monopoly by the Senate Judiciary Committee will be to disclose this dependency. But this growth has been apparent, without statistics, within the past 50 years. One who has been in close touch with many manufacturers for 40 years, and who has studied this question for 25 years, believes that perhaps one-half of our manufacturing establishments are so greatly dependent upon big business for existence as virtually to be branches of big business.

No less than 45 years ago, when this country had a population of only 64,000,000, there were more than 355,000 separate manufacturing concerns in existence in the United States, and nearly all of them were independent. Today, with a population that has nearly doubled, there are less than 210,000 manufacturing establishments in this country, and perhaps one-half or more of these are not independent.

Moreover, although the bulk of small manufacturing establishments still employ less than 20 persons, there has been a great loss in recent years in the number of these smaller establishments employing less than 20, and a gain in proportion to the total of those employing more than 20. The United States Census formerly listed small hand and neighborhood industries. These are being revived in many parts of the country, with the use of modern, small, electric machinery, and are a household capital-goods industry which should have more attention—not only more attention, but possibly most attention, as a possible solution of our centralization mess. Many who have knowledge of what Mr. and Mrs. Ralph Borsodi have done in Suffern, N. Y., to develop and demonstrate the possibilities of the home and homestead as a productive and creative institution, believe they have the answer as to the contribution which decentralized self-sufficient living in the country may make to redress the economic and psychological insecurities of our industrialized civilization.

The startling and rapidly accelerating trend away from independence has been partly sensed, but not fully realized, by small-business men who do not want to become dependent. The Washington conference gave them an opportunity to express their emotion. In the next 18 months it is possible that this emotion will be translated into an intelligent, purposeful study and even a rebellion against economic dependence upon big, centralized, business and financial and credit control.

Big business, labor, agriculture, and even consumers, are already organized and have started research on their particular problems as well as action in the political field to advance their economic class interest.

Big business, though actually possessing very few votes, is closely organized for group action through its large corporations: Its 7,000 trade associations of which about 3,000 are State, interstate or national; its 4,000 chambers of commerce; its several thousand technical associations (credit, etc.); bureaus, commodity and stock exchanges; its colleges of business administration. Big business had a brain trust of lawyers, accountants, statisticians, economists, professors, researchers, and others dependent upon it for fees and salaries—long before the name was invented to describe a similar group, far less well paid, of the Government.

So it has been that big business has "earned" certain advantages over small business not only in the economic field but in the political field. And thus it has come about that there has been big business in government, making laws, taxes which helped big business over small business. Laws against monopoly have been emasculated in administration, so that during the past 50 years monopoly and chain stores have grown in economic power while independent small businesses were decreasing in number and economic power.

The small-business men, being rugged individualists, have been slow to join together and organize their economic power—and because many of them wanted to become big, they have not rebelled against many business customs which promoted bigness and penalized smallness, such as quantity and cumulative discounts, patent control, higher rates of interest for small loans, higher cost of floating small capital issues, higher cost for small buyers of various kinds of insurance, lower freight rates per mile for long hauls (thus killing local, neighborhood, independent, small businesses).

The whole business system, with the aid of small-business men themselves, has been rigged to strangle or starve independent small business. The business papers and newspapers and the magazines, being dependent upon advertising and especially national advertising—and themselves wishing to become big, have catered to big business and have not published articles or made studies to enlighten small business on how to stay small and independent and yet remain profitable. Certain big business groups are now set, in 1938, to fight even the investigation of monopoly by the Senate. It fears the facts and doesn't want the

"rabble" or small-business men to have those facts.

Small business has been trying to play a game under rules which favored large players. It has been infected with the bigger-equals-better complex, and ashamed to play its own game. Efficiency has not been the main factor, nor quality of product, nor benefit to worker or consumer.

But the Washington conference of small-business men and women started a new trend. Small business has in recent months organized 12 national groups, out of which will probably come one or two strong national groups. Many regional, State, and local groups of small business have sprung up since the Washington conference. These groups are beginning to see clearly those interests of small business which are not identical with those of big business. Soon small business may have a brain trust of its own, publications of its own, and schools and research devoted to its interest—if, and only if, small-business men discover the prime importance of remaining independent or regaining their independence. Small businesses dependent for their existence upon large companies and not wishing to remain dependent, will have no interest in nor need for any knowledge except that provided for them by their big providers. All that such small companies will need will be to do as they are told.

But mere organization will not accomplish this regaining of control by independent small business. It will need to know its own mind, in too many cases the minnow-to-pike mind, or one with a philosophy of centralization. Everything bigger was thought to be better. The story by Jerome Davis is that the slow-thinking minnows who lived in a pond with cannibalistic pike finally discovered that their number was rapidly being depleted by the quicker-thinking and quicker-acting pike. So the minnows organized, called a convention, and appointed a committee to call on the pike. The pike heard the committee and said: "All right. We'll make an agreement with you that we will allow one out of every thousand minnows to become a pike." The committee was overjoyed and so were all the other minnows. But the slow-thinking minnows again woke up to the fact that they were not pike. The story does not tell what the minnows finally did about it. In our human world, maybe organized small business will have an answer.

Those who want to be independent will be given moral and political support by workers and consumers who believe that big business, and too much dependence on it, has brought about our bitterly needless ugly civilization, our centralization of population and wealth with its resulting slums and recurrent boom and bust, our scarcity in the midst of easily potential plenty. The majority of workers and consumers, when face-to-face with the evils of concentration and loss of economic freedom, as now, will realize that economic independence goes hand in hand with economic freedom. The rapidly growing number of consumers' cooperatives in the United States are fully awake to this truth. The organized workers are studying economics as never before, and are partly awake to this truth.

The habit of political action and the pleasure of it as a game is strong among small-business men, and the groups now organizing have thought first of political action as an answer to their problems. But except for repeal of such laws as have placed artificial economic hobbles on independent small business—in taxes, credit, and encouragement of monopoly—the small-business man who wants to be really independent will not lean on Government nor upon big business.

The new associations of small business have a tendency at present to political, top-down, national action. But there are a number of thinking small-business men who believe that stable prosperity will be best promoted from the bottom, by demonstrating in the economic field in their own localities how small business may be kept or made independent, stable and prosperous. For example, if local banks are sending their funds to big cities where they are loaned to big business at low rates, while loans to local independent small businesses are not made on sound collateral, including character, or if made, are at much higher rates than to big business, often twice or three times as high—cannot local independent small-business men and their friends start a new local bank to serve local small business? Consumers and workers have shown the way to do this by starting their own credit unions. Big business could not continue its banks if it had only its own money in them. Big business uses other people's money, the deposits of small-business men, of consumers and workers.

Local groups of independent small business can also study why certain industries once existing in their locality, including wheat and corn growing and milling, butter and cheese making, have passed out. If the reason for the disappearance of these small neighborhood industries was an artificial one, a return to sound, natural conditions would bring the return of these local industries, more employment, and more local trade.

This return of employment to localities and small industries could solve the unemployment problem, and permanently. Big business, even if operated at 1928–29 capacity, could only scratch the surface of unemployment.

Such a study can best be made in a small locality, and the remedy is often to be found by local cooperative action of the independent individuals and businesses concerned. Too much looking to large groups or whole industries for facts and the cure is like "letting George do it," when it can best be done in small units, and by economic action rather than political action. If the action required is State-wide or national, or if political, then the best action for each locality is a common understanding in that locality as to what is best for small independent business in that locality, and an organization for economic purposes of these independents. A firm and unmistakable and organized pressure on the political representatives of that locality in State or national legislatures, to work for remedial legislation, requires a local organization of independent small business.

Congressional Subpena Upon the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD BOLLING
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1950

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, in the March 1950 issue of the Journal of the Missouri Bar, there appears a very excellent article entitled "Congressional Subpena Upon the President." The author of this very important study of a fundamental principle in American government is the Honorable Rufus Burrus, a distinguished citizen of Independence, Mo., and the president of the Missouri bar.

Under the unanimous consent granted me I include the article herewith:

CONGRESSIONAL SUBPENA UPON THE PRESIDENT

(By Rufus Burrus, of Independence, president of the Missouri bar)

A school boy in America is first taught in study of his country's government, that the powers of government are separated and jealously guarded in the Constitution of the United States. They are termed legislative, judicial, and executive.

It would seem that the Senate of the United States would be the last to fail to recognize this fundamental principle. It should also be the first to guard against encroachment of one on the other, even if it be the legislative upon either one or the other.

Senator HOMER FERGUSON, of Michigan, however, proposed an amendment to a resolution pending before the Senate pertaining to investigations by one of the Senate committees, which is in clear violation of the independence of each of the three separate branches of the Government. The language is as follows:

"In the conduct of this study and investigation, the committee is directed to procure, by subpena, and examine the complete loyalty and employment files and records of all the Government employees in the Department of State and such other agencies against whom charges have been heard." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Feb. 22, 1950, p. 2144, column 1; CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Feb. 22, 1950, p. 2148, columns 2 and 3, and p. 2149, columns 1 and 2.)

"Is not that the committee should make a request, but that it is authorized to issue a subpena." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 2145, column 2.)

Senator KNOWLAND had said just before that discussion that the Ferguson amendment was being pressed "so that we can find out whether the executive branch of the Government is going to comply with the subpena of the United States" (p. 2143, column 3).

If, said KNOWLAND, the executive branch does not comply with the subpena, "then the Congress of the United States, in the exercise of its responsibilities under the Constitution, may be forced to take such other steps as are necessary with the power it has under the Constitution."

There is abounding precedents in the actions of the highest authorities, beginning with President Washington, that the incumbent of the Presidency cannot be forced by the legislative through the means of a subpena, or otherwise. No President can obey his oath of office if he casts aside all precedents, obeys such a subpena as proposed by the Senate, in the face of an abundance of legal opinions to the contrary. Such opinions have been penned by the greatest of American lawyers and have been adhered to by the greatest of our Presidents. That such a subpena is unconstitutional is demonstrated by the following excerpts:

PRESIDENTS WHO ESTABLISHED THIS DOCTRINE IN THE FIRST CENTURY OF OUR NATIONAL EXISTENCE

1796: George Washington refused papers to the House (Richardson, Messages and Papers of the Presidents, vol. 1, pp. 194, 196—hereafter cited simply as Richardson).

1825: James Monroe refused papers to the House (Richardson, vol. 2, p. 278).

1833: Andrew Jackson refused papers to the Senate (Richardson, vol. 3, p. 36).

1835: Andrew Jackson refused papers to the Senate (Richardson, vol. 3, pp. 132 and 133).

1843: John Tyler refused papers to the House (Richardson, vol. 4, pp. 105–106, 221–223).

1886: Grover Cleveland supported his Attorney General's refusal to comply with Senate resolution calling for papers.

QUOTATIONS OF VIEWS EXPRESSED BY VARIOUS PRESIDENTS WHO SERVED PRIOR TO THE CURRENT PERIOD

George Washington: "The nature of foreign negotiations requires caution, and their success must often depend on secrecy; and even when brought to a conclusion a full disclosure of all the measures, demands, or eventual concessions which may have been proposed or contemplated, would be extremely impolitic; for this might have a pernicious influence on future negotiations, or produce immediate inconveniences, perhaps danger and mischief, in relation to other powers. * * * To admit, then, a right in the House of Representatives to demand and to have as a matter of course all the papers respecting a negotiation with a foreign power would establish a dangerous precedent. * * * As it is essential to the due administration of the Government that the boundaries fixed by the Constitution between the different departments should be preserved, a just regard to the Constitution and to the duty of my office * * * forbids a compliance with your request." (Richardson, vol. 1, pp. 193, 194, 195, 196, Mar. 30, 1796.)

George Washington, Farewell Address: "The habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution in those intrusted with its administration to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and thus to create, whatever the form of government, a repeal despotism." (Richardson, vol. 1, p. 211.)

John Tyler: "A mass of vague, incoherent, and personal matter would be made public at a vast consumption of time, money, and trouble without accomplishing or tending in any manner to accomplish, as it appears to me, any useful object connected with a sound and constitutional administration of the Government in any of its branches.

"In my judgment a compliance with the resolution which has been transmitted to me would be a surrender of duties and powers which the Constitution has conferred exclusively on the Executive, and therefore such compliance cannot be made by me nor by the heads of departments by my direction." (Richardson, vol. 4, pp. 105–106.)

William Howard Taft (after his Presidency, and before his Chief Justiceship): "The President is required by the Constitution from time to time to give to Congress information on the State of the Union * * *. But this does not enable Congress or either House of Congress to elicit from him confidential information which he has acquired for the purpose of enabling him to discharge his constitutional duties, if he does not deem the disclosure of such information prudent or in the public interest." (The Chief Magistrate, published in 1916, p. 129.)

VIEWS OF A CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE

In 1879, the House Judiciary Committee reported to the House supporting the constitutional doctrine here under discussion, saying:

"The Executive is as independent, as either House of Congress is independent of him, and they cannot call for the records of his action or the action of his officers against his consent, any more than he can call for any of the journals and records of the House or Senate * * *.

"This mischief of the House calling for documents might easily be a very great one * * *. Somebody must judge upon this point. It clearly cannot be the House or its committee * * *. The head of the executive department * * * must be the judge * * *."

ATTORNEYS GENERAL HAVE CONSISTENTLY TAKEN THIS VIEW AND SO ADVISED HOUSES OF CONGRESS AND THE PRESIDENT

The following include distinguished holders of the chief legal position in the Government, including Republicans of stature, and two Democrats of conservative reputation, one of them (McReynolds, of Tennessee) subsequently a Justice of the Supreme Court, and the other (Gregory, of Texas) one of the greatest holders of that office throughout the Nation's history, particularly for his support of the Constitution and the American political system.

1904: Knox to the House (April 27).

1908: Bonaparte to the House (April 13).

1912: Wickersham to the House (March 18).

1914: McReynolds to the President (August 28).

1915: Gregory to the Senate (February 23).

1926: Sargent to the House Judiciary Committee (June 8).

(The above citations besides appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and committee hearings appear in Opinions of the Attorney General, vol. 40, pp. 47–48.)

COURT DISCUSSION OF THE SEPARATION OF POWERS

1. United States Supreme Court in *Kilbourn* v. *Thompson* (103 U. S. 168, 190): "It is believed to be one of the chief merits of the American system of written constitutional law, that all the powers entrusted to government, whether State or national, are divided into the three grand departments, the executive, the legislative, and the judicial. That the functions appropriate 'to each of these branches of government shall be vested in a separate body of public servants, and that the perfection of the system required that the lines which separate and divide these departments shall be broadly and clearly defined. It is also essential to the successful working of this system that the persons entrusted with power in any of these branches shall not be permitted to encroach upon the powers confided to the others, but that each shall by the law of its creation be limited to the exercise of the powers appropriate to its own department and no other'."

2. State courts agree; e. g., Pennsylvania court in *Appeal of Hartranft* (85 Pa. 433, 445, reading: "* * * We had better at the outstart recognize the fact, that the executive department is a coordinate branch of the Government, with power to judge what should or should not be done, within its own department, and what of its own doings and communications should or should not be kept secret, and that with it, in the exercise of these constitutional powers, the courts have no more right to interfere, than has the executive, under like conditions, to interfere with the courts."

AMERICAN WRITERS ON CONSTITUTIONAL LAW WHO EXPLAIN AND APPROVE THE DOCTRINE

3. Willoughby, The Constitutional Law of the United States ((1929), p. 1488 et seq.) Mason, Congressional Demands upon the Executive for Information, 5 Papers of the American Historical Association ((1891), p. 33).

Eberling, Congressional Investigations ((1928), p. 282).

Finley and Sanderson, The American Executive and Executive Methods ((1908), pp. 199–200, 246–265).

Corwin, The President: Office and Powers ((1941), pp. 213–214, 281).

Rawle, A View of the Constitution of the United States of America ((1829), pp. 171–172).

Luce, Legislative Problems ((1935), pp. 466–467).

The following is quoted from American Executives and Executive Methods:

"The President has always exercised a discretion as to giving or withholding information upon the request of either House for it. Thus, President Washington declined to communicate to the House of Representatives the correspondence relating to the British treaty. President Jackson, in 1833, withheld certain pending matters relating to the Maine boundary dispute; President Tyler, in 1842, declined to lay before the House of Representatives the condition of the same affair. President Polk, in 1845, in like manner withheld information from the Senate as to the pending proceedings for the annexation of Texas, and in 1848, declined to lay before the House the instructions given as to the negotiations of the treaty with Mexico. President Fillmore declined to comply with a request of the Senate made in legislative session for information as to negotiations with the Sandwich Islands. President Buchanan declined to lay before the Senate the correspondence relating to the slave ship *Wanderer*, and President Lincoln, likewise, declined on March 26, 1861, to communicate Major Anderson's dispatches from Fort Sumter. These instances are referred to as examples of a general practice." The American Executive and Executive Methods. Finley ((1908), pp. 199, 200).

Also, chapter XVII, "The Civil Service" (pp. 246 to 265).

"Official communications made by a head of departments when made in the discharge of duties imposed upon him by law, are privileged on grounds of public policy * * *" (*Spalding* v. *Vilos* (162 U. S. 483 (1890))).

"Heads of departments, in the exercise of a sound discretion, may decline to furnish communications or papers in their custody in response to legal process; they would be justified in representing to the Court that upon public consideration they decline to furnish them. The administration of justice is only part of the conduct of the affairs of any State or nation, and is, with respect to the production or nonproduction of papers from the files of an executive department, subject to the general welfare of the community" (Devens, 15 Atty. Gen. Op. 415).

And Executive regulations prescribing rules as to the production or nonproduction of such documents have been sustained (*Booke* v. *Commingore* (177 U. S. 459 (1899))).

Page 264, American Executive and Executive Methods, Finley.

This action of the Ferguson-Knowland-McCarthy group in demanding all the files of the President and the State Department, pertaining to so-called loyalty investigations is especially a violation of the precedents above set out. Further it would seem that even without this authority the legislature should, for the sake of secrecy and international security reasons, refrain from opening up those files to anyone.

Would the Senators think of subpenaing the files of a field commander in command of an army, and ask to see his plans of battle or defense, or the records of training of his command, or the data concerning those in lesser commands?

While our country is not at war, in the sense we are in hot combat, the Senators as well as all others recognize we are in a cold war which is of necessity largely carried on by the State Department under the direction of the President.

The President should be at liberty to say what information will or will not be produced for an investigating committee, so as not to disclose those secrets that would have a pernicious influence on future negotiations, or create a situation of danger and mischief, in relation to other activities which are contemplated or being carried on.

Prospecting in 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1950

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article by Harlan Trott, which appeared in a recent issue of the Christian Science Monitor.

PROSPECTING IN 1950
(By Harlan Trott)

WASHINGTON.—Lately there's been a lot of talk about the Nation's dwindling natural resources. We seem to be overtaxing our mineral wealth. Two costly World Wars have brought an ominous scraping sound on the bottoms of a number of different barrels.

Known oil and gas reserves are said to have shrunk to 20 or 30 years' remaining supply. The shining metropolis of Manhattan has taken to water rationing within the last year.

Again Uncle Sam's insatiable scoop is grating on the bottom boards. Right now it's iron.

The Celler committee's monopoly study is currently focused on testimony by major steel interests showing that there's only enough high-grade ore left in Minnesota's famous Mesabi Range for another 10 years at the present rate of depletion.

According to these steel experts, industry must develop other sources of iron ore before 1960 to keep steel output going.

Minnesota's failing supply of rich iron ore imposes some tremendous decisions on the steel industry, and on Congress, too. The big steel companies have acquired large tracts of excellent iron ore in Venezuela and Labrador. Proven deposits in Labrador amount to 400,000,000 tons. The Venezuelan deposits mount up to at least a billion tons.

In both countries the ore is said to assay higher than 50 percent iron. But the transportation problem is terrific.

American steel interests want Congress to authorize the $400,000,000 St. Lawrence seaway project to provide the cheapest transportation link between these two iron ore regions and the iron and steel mills in the Great Lakes area.

The Venezuela deposits are 2,400 miles away; Labrador's are 800 miles nearer. Steel spokesmen say they must build a railroad in Labrador before the ore can be developed. It will take $200,000,000 and 5 years to build.

The problem does not stop there. Minnesotans are asking what about their taconite—the low-grade ore assaying about 35 percent iron—which is more abundant than the dwindling wealth of the Mesabi Range?

Concurrently in another House hearing room, a subcommittee on mines and mining was urged this week to enact a bill introduced by Representative FRED MARSHALL, Democrat, of Minnesota, providing a modest sum for research and development of peat. Fuel and power technologists testified that the peat bogs of Minnesota offer a practical source of fuel for local power plants.

Development of Minnesota's taconite depends on cheap electricity. Leopold Pisner, St. Paul power-plant builder, testified that taconite requires extensive grinding for proper separation, which means using enormous quantities of power.

He said it is not economically feasible to grind a low-grade ore with coal shipped to Minnesota from the eastern bituminous fields. The original mine cost of coal multiplies several times over, due to the long rail and water shipment and rehandling.

The feasibility of drying and processing peat for use under power-station boilers is tied in with the development of peat by-products. Dr. Derso Shybekay, a peat technologist, listed synthetic rubber, acetates for nylon, and hydrogen and newsprint among the latent chemical values of peat.

The ramifications brought out in these current congressional hearings are fascinating. They dramatize the technological challenge confronting us if we are to surmount the complex problems posed by our waning natural resources.

The big decisions facing industry and Congress demand big imaginations and the same kind of daring as that which lured the pioneers and prospectors into having a first look at the Nation's untapped natural resources a century ago.

The New England Economy—1950 Model

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Joseph A. Erickson, president, Federal Reserve Bank of Boston, at the New England congressional dinner of 1950, Washington, D. C., May 2, 1950:

THE NEW ENGLAND ECONOMY—1950 MODEL

I am going to give you tonight another chapter in the continued story of New England's economic progress. New England, like the Nation, reached its first postwar peak in 1948. We lost ground from the latter half of 1948 until the middle of last year, when recovery got under way in the nondurable goods industries which had been the first to slip down. Recovery began later in the durable goods industries.

At the bottom, we had gone a long way down in our manufacturing industries, but we have now recovered much of the ground that we lost last year. During the last 3 months, new orders received by manufacturers have increased, and especially in the durable goods industries. The pickup in new orders has been espcially pronounced in television and other electronic apparatus.

Construction is booming—the value of contracts let in the 3 months ending in February was more than 75 percent higher than it was for the same 3 months last year, and contracts let last year amounted to 6 percent more than they did in 1948.

Department-store sales so far this year are at about the same level as they were last year, but because prices are lower this year, the volume of goods being moved must be above last year's level. New England department-store sales last year were better maintained in comparison with sales in 1948 than they were in the Nation, and this better performance has continued so far this year.

New England's shoe production has shown its heels to its national competition. Last year our production ran 2 percent ahead of that in 1948 compared with a loss of 1.5 percent in the Nation. So far this year, New England production is ahead of that for the same period last year and continues to gain at faster than the national rate.

Nonmanufacturing industries continue to hold up well, employing about as many as they did in 1948.

The growth of new manufacturing firms in New England during the past 5 years has been large. There were 5,000 more manufacturing firms in business in the spring of 1949 than in the spring of 1944, a gain of 23 percent.

Lest you be misled by the optimistic figures, however, let me hasten to point out that recovery is not complete. As of February of this year, New England manufacturing, while it had gained since the low point of July 1949, was short of the February 1948 peak by 14 percent, or about 220,000 jobs.

New England's position in manufacturing has worsened relative to the Nation; our position, 14 percent below the February 1948 level in employment, contrasts with a national figure which was lower by 8.7 percent.

The difficulties experienced by New England industry during last year's recession give new interest to a longer-range look at the prospects for New England's economy. If past trends indicate growth—and I think that they do—then we can proceed with greater confidence to the tasks we must undertake to bring about a continuing expanding regional economy.

A glance at past trends is indeed reassuring. New England's population has grown between 1920 and 1949 at an average rate of about 62,000 per year.

Another good measure of the trend of the whole economy is the amount of income received by all its people from all sources. When we express the total income of the region in dollars having the purchasing power that they had in the period 1935 through 1939 we find that the long-term trend of New England's income from 1920 through 1948 represents an average gain of $153,000,000 per year. Examinations of the trend in retail sales, of bank deposits, of workers gainfully employed, and other measures all point to this same conclusion: New England remains a growing economy with prospects for further growth. The events of last year, by showing up some obvious weaknesses in the New England economy, have had a most stimulating effect upon community and State groups throughout New England. There is a greater stirring to remedy our weaknesses and to seize our opportunites than we have had in many years.

In the State of Maine representatives of banks and other financial institutions have organized and set up for business a unique corporation designed to finance new businesses unable to obtain funds from conventional sources. This new corporation, the Maine Development Credit Corp., is financed by loans to it by member financial institutions to an amount expected to be approximately a million dollars, half of which is already committed. This institution with its limited lending power cannot be expected to revolutionize the economy of the State of Maine, but it nevertheless represents a genuine achievement by its financial institutions in attempting to provide within the State a lender of last resort to give careful review to new business projects. Its worth has already been shown by its placement of several loans with member institutions as well as by a half dozen direct advances just made.

In New Hampshire a special committee on industrial development appointed by the Governor has been hard at work appraising the State's past, its prospects, and what might be done to promote its industrial growth. A similar committee is at work in Connecticut.

In Rhode Island a State agency has been making similar studies, and in addition a special committee of representatives of financial institutions has recommended the establishment of an industrial building corporation to finance new plants in the area.

In Massachusetts a representative group of manufacturers has agreed to cooperate with a study being made by the special committee on taxation of the question whether the burden of taxation in Massachusetts in comparison with that in other competing States

puts Massachusetts manufacturers at a competitive disadvantage. According to a survey made by us, the proportion of manufacturers in Massachusetts who report that the State and local taxes put them at a disadvantage is larger than the proportion in any other New England State.

Vermont continues to push its program of management and engineering services to new or small manufacturers.

In numerous communities throughout New England groups of local businessmen and bankers have been meeting to seek means of obtaining new factory buildings and new industrial employment. Such groups are at work in so many cities and towns that I shall name only a few examples: Portland, Belfast, and Waldoboro in Maine; Berlin, Nashua, and Laconia in New Hampshire; Lawrence, Worcester, and Ware in Massachusetts; and Danbury and New London in Connecticut. These groups, by raising from the community a part of the capital required for a new factory building, may succeed in tapping other sources of funds which would not otherwise be available. These are encouraging signs indeed that New Englanders are facing up to their problems and are turning to methods of meeting them which are consistent with our traditional principle of self-reliance and local control.

New England's economic problems, however, like its economic opportunities, are not entirely of its own making. I have become convinced on the basis of the evidence that New England has a peculiar problem in its relation to the Federal Government. Whether we like it or not, the fact remains that the Federal Government is a far more important agency for determining our destiny now than it has ever been before in peacetime. I am impressed with the extent to which the Congress has the control of our future opportunity within its power. This being a problem relatively new to an area which has ordinarily taken pride in its self-reliance and secured appeals in its own interest to the Congress, what Senator SALTONSTALL said recently about the need for some form of unity in the New England congressional delegation deserves the most careful attention.

Senator SALTONSTALL said: "We have got something in New England. But we can't sit back and expect our industry to stay with us. We have got to fight to keep it and to get more. We have got to have unanimity to fight other sections of the country which are getting greater help from the Government than we are and who are getting our business away from us." However much some of us may deplore the state of affairs under which we must fight in the National Congress to retain our industry and to grow, I believe that those views are correct.

In view of this situation, may I as a novice suggest a nonpartisan economic platform for New England? It is a platform based upon what appear to be economic policies within the control of Congress which would be beneficial both to New England and to the Nation. There are five planks in this platform, each of which requires some explanation. First, let me give them to you in summary form.

1. New England's interest would be served by reducing Federal expenditures.

2. New England would be benefited perhaps more than other regions by revision of certain Federal tax laws on business, particularly those relating to depreciation and small business.

3. New England has suffered from the increased tendency of Congress to pass special interest legislation.

4. New England's ports suffer from discrimination in land and ocean freight rates subject to the control of national regulatory bodies.

5. New England's future economic progress depends greatly upon preserving our advantage in the importation of raw materials.

There are other planks that might be added to this platform but for the time being let us consider these 5 in more detail.

New England's interest would be served by reducing Federal expenditures not only because reduced expenditures would make possible reduced taxes, which in turn would stimulate economic expansion. New England's peculiar position with respect to Federal expenditures is that the areas of greatest increase in Federal expenditure are areas in which New England tends to be hurt more than she is helped. The enormous Federal expenditure for the benefit of agriculture costs us far more than we gain from it. Similarly, vast expenditures for power, navigation, flood control, and reclamation projects almost invariably are made in other parts of the country which then use the argument of cheap power as an inducement to attract our industry. Even national defense expenditures now seem to have turned strongly against our region. So long as we had a heavy naval expenditure we were in a position to get a considerable share of that expenditure in our region, but the shift to greater emphasis upon the Army and the Air Force has inevitably resulted in directing that type of spending away from New England.

These are but samples of the way in which growing Federal expenditures operate against New England's interest. The proof of the pudding is to be found in the relationship of Federal tax collections in New England to direct expenditures of the Federal Government in this area. Direct expenditures of the Federal Government which we can measure include all payments directly to individuals (salaries, interest on the public debt, pensions, unemployment insurance, crop support payments to farmers, etc.), all direct grants to State and local governments, and all payments on Government contracts of the type subject to the Walsh-Healey Act. On this basis New England received about as much as it paid in taxes in 1929, got back about $4 for every $3 it paid in 1940 (probably because of the defense program), and got back only $3 for every $5 it paid in 1948. We paid to the Federal Government a billion dollars more than we received in direct expenditures in 1948.

These figures understate the burden of Federal taxes because taxes collected elsewhere are passed on to us as part of our costs to a greater extent than taxes paid here are passed on to other areas. For example, the excise taxes on automobiles are paid largely from Michigan, but are passed on to us whenever we buy new automobiles. When we take account to the burden of taxes in this way, we find that in 1948 we had a burden of $2 in taxes for each $1 returned here. Obviously, these figures alone do not tell the whole story, but they do indicate that our financial relationship with the Federal Government has deteriorated badly in the postwar period.

To move on to the second plank in our economic program, it would be of interest to the whole economy and of special interest to New England to have liberalization of the rules relating to depreciation of new machinery and equipment. The machinery industry is a very heavy employer in our region. Its market depends upon the ability of its customers to pay for the products that it sells. Restriction of allowable depreciation to unrealistic levels which permit neither the recovery of replacement cost nor in many cases recovery of original cost within a reasonable period of time obviously must depress the market for our machinery producers. Liberalization of depreciation would increase the employment in our machinery manufacturing plants. Moreover, New England probably has a higher proportion of overage plant equipment than most areas; liberalized depreciation would give our manufacturers a special incentive to modernize.

New England also has a peculiar stake in tax relief for small corporations. A study of the sources of growth in our manufacturing industries in New England, for example, shows that we must rely very heavily upon the establishment of new, small firms within the region and upon their growth to larger size for expansion of our manufacturing activity. Although our present corporate income tax makes some special concession to small firms by imposing a lower rate on corporate net income below $50,000, there is need for further tax concessions to assist small businesses to grow.

Now to the third plank which deals with special-interest legislation. The price-support program for agriculture raises our food, feed, and industrial raw materials costs far more than it helps our potato and other farmers. New special-interest legislation may raise our fuel costs. It is well known that New England's fuel and power costs are higher than the national average of such costs. The shift in the source of the supply of oil to the Venezuelan and middle eastern oil fields has presented to us an opportunity to reduce our fuel and power costs. By virtue of our transportation advantage in importing this foreign oil, we have had an improvement in our fuel cost position. Domestic oil producers (and some others with a special interest in coal) are pressing for an increase to the tariff or the imposition of a quota on foreign oil, either of which would work materially to New England's disadvantage. And here again what is to the disadvantage of New England is clearly to the disadvantage of the country and to our whole foreign economic program.

I do not wish to give the impression that I believe the only way to reduce our power costs lies in the direction of securing cheaper fuel. We have, even on the minimum estimate, a sizable potential of undeveloped water power, and I believe that it is in New England's interest to encourage the development of as much of this potential as can be economically justified and as it can be utilized. We should not, however, sacrifice the bird in hand, which is reasonably priced foreign oil, for the bird in the bush, which is undeveloped hydroelectric power, which will take up some years to harness and which would probably not reduce our average costs nearly so much as a continued supply of reasonably priced foreign oil.

New England can also benefit from unrestricted imports of foreign copper to supply its brass industry. A tariff will be restored on copper after June 30 unless the legislation keeping it on the free list is renewed.

New England has long depended upon commerce for the livelihood of an important proportion of its people. Our fourth plank deals with the disadvantage which we suffer in our foreign commerce through conditions not of our own making. You are all familiar with the fact that foreign commerce at the New England ports is primarily a one-way traffic. For example, at the port of Boston, import tonnage is eight times the export tonnage. Lack of export tonnage discourages sailings from New England ports and the lack of sailings causes most of our export cargo to be shipped from other New England ports.

Examination of the history of ocean and rail freight rates discloses a major reason for the continued decline of our ports. Because New England's ports are nearer to all European and Mediterranean ports and to India than other competing ports, for a great many years ocean freight rates to those ports were lower from Boston than competing ports. To compensate for the geographic advantages enjoyed by Boston, the

railroads over the years reduced their export rail rates in favor of inland rail shipments to the ports of Baltimore and Philadelphia and later New Orleans and Montreal. However, after rail freight rates had been adjusted to equalize the advantages of other ports with those of New York and Boston, ocean freight rates came to be equalized. Presently, therefore, the New England ports are denied their geographic advantage by equalized ocean freight rates, whereas at the same time they remain penalized for that geographic advantage in the rail freight rates from interior points. We are now seeking to restore our geographic advantage in the case of grain. The history of this subject convinces me that New England's ports are discriminated against either by the commission of acts or the omission of acts by regulatory agencies of the Federal Government. On this matter as on others New England is not demanding preferential treatment but only recognition of its natural economic advantage.

It has become commonplace to say that New England is at the end of the transportation line. For many of our raw materials and for many of the finished products which we buy this is true. However, changes are in the making which may put more of New England's industries at the beginning of the transportation line to the advantage of the region. We see that now in the case of wool, jute, and oil, and we will see it in the case of iron ore.

"We have fought our last war from the Mesabi ranges of Minnesota," said the president of a large steel company recently. The Nation's iron ore supply is shifting radically to points around the Atlantic Basin. Enormous new discoveries of iron ore have been made in Labrador, in Venezuela, and in Liberia. Cheap, waterborne iron ore plus cheap scrap and a flourishing market for finished steel products open up to us the possibility of establishing an integrated steel mill in New England. The establishment of such a mill would give a strong stimulus to our metal fabricating industries, which have been the fastest growing industries in the region. This stimulus would be felt throughout New England, and is the best argument for regional unity in support of this project. Careful studies have shown that this possibility for New England is indeed a real one. Since New England began to study the possibilities of establishing an integrated steel mill, the iron ore discoveries in Labrador and Venezuela have become known and two of the major steel companies have announced plans for expansion on the east coast. Events have surely confirmed our supposition that in this direction there was opportunity for New England.

Unlike other regions, I do not think that we need to argue for special legislation which would help us to realize this great new opportunity. In this matter, as in so many others, the real threat to New England lies in legislation which would favor other regions at our expense. From time to time, I am sure the Congress will be presented with requests for appropriations to dredge rivers and harbors, to construct waterways, to authorize the lending of money—all in the interest of steel mills some place other than New England. In these matters, as in others, it is obviously not in the interest of New England to help provide the money to deny itself a new opportunity. I trust the New England delegation will keep a wary eye on proposals to use our taxpayers' money to help the steel industry to locate in some other part of the country.

Now to sum up in a few words:

1. New England has had more than its share of economic trouble in the last 18 months.

2. New Englanders are exerting themselves to remedy the causes of their economic ills so far as these causes lie within their control.

3. Many of New England's troubles are the direct or indirect result of Federal policies. We need, and we are going to make, a careful study of how those policies affect us.

4. We, the business people of New England, are willing to do our part to keep New England expanding and prosperous. We are confident that our delegation in the Congress can and will work together for that same objective.

Mother, Can You Spare a Dime?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAY LeFEVRE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1950

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial taken from the Chatham Courier of Chatham, N. Y.

Mr. Speaker, I think this editorial gives the American people plenty of food for thought. As a matter of fact, the result of yesterday's primary election in Florida proves to me that the American people already are caught up on the spending spree promoted by the present administration and those who have stood by the New Deal and Fair Deal policies. To me, the election of GEORGE SMATHERS in Florida is a forecast of what will happen in the general elections this fall. GEORGE SMATHERS is a fine, clean young American and won this primary election on what is practically a Republican platform.

A good many of us on the Republican side have supported the European aid program from the beginning. As time goes on and we learn more about the tactics the British are using in their international trade policies, one begins to wonder if it is not about time to call a halt or else have an understanding which will protect some of our own leading industries.

MOTHER, CAN YOU SPARE A DIME?

Two very interesting sets of financial figures have recently been released.

As of July 1, the United States of America will show a Treasury deficit of approximately $6,000,000,000 with likelihood that in 1951 this will rise to seven billions. In other words, the expenditures of the National Government will be that much greater than it is able to receive from all sources.

The other was the announcement that Great Britain would, at the end of its fiscal year, be able to meet its expenses and balance its budget.

Yet the Congress has before it a request from England that this country provide her (or in other words, give her) $687,000,000 for the ensuing year, under the Marshall plan.

Of course, we imagine Great Britain can use this money and Clement Attlee and Stafford Cripps can probably find means to spend it for further socialistic schemes, but what about the American taxpayers who have to put up the cash?

As Senator ROBERT A. TAFT said this week: "The time has now come to cut these Marshall-plan funds and if we do not do this, we can hardly hope to reduce our domestic expenditures."

To those who can only see unlimited amounts flowing from this country to all parts of the world, this may sound like rank heresy and a desire to let down what they like to term the "Mother Country." But we are commencing to wonder if, when the child is apparently broke, if it wouldn't be nice for Britannia to begin handing over a few millions of those billions we let her have when she was much worse off than she apparently is now.

Low-Rent Housing for Portland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1950

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, on May 19, Portland, Oreg., voters will decide whether or not the city is to enjoy the benefits of the Public Housing and Slum Clearance Act passed by the Eighty-first Congress. The Honorable Phil Dreyer, a member of the Oregon State Legislature and a candidate for the United States Congress from Multnomah County urges Portland citizens to approve the proposed agreement between the city of Portland and the Portland Housing Authority. The agreement provides for the city to furnish civic services in return for payments in lieu of taxes.

Phil Dreyer is president of the Portland Housing and Planning Association. He knows Portland problems. He ably represented his legislative district during his term of office in the Oregon State Legislature and I am certain his training and experience would assure equally effective representation in the National Congress, should he be elected.

Following is a speech titled "Public Housing for Portland" delivered by the Honorable Phil Dreyer before the Guild's Lake Community Club of Portland on April 12, 1950:

PUBLIC HOUSING FOR PORTLAND

LET'S VOTE "YES" FOR PUBLIC HOUSING

On May 19, Portland voters will decide whether this city will have 2,000 new low-rent homes.

The United States Government is putting up the money, but the people must vote "yes" to approve the agreement between the city and the Portland Housing Authority.

WE NEED THE HOMES

Oregon is the fastest growing State in America. But we do not have the place to house the half-million people who have come here. They are living in trailers, in shacks, and in temporary houses.

To house the war workers who flocked to Portland, the Government built 18,500 units of temporary housing. But most of these units have been torn down. Thousands were destroyed by the Vanport flood. Only 6,500 remain, and these must be torn down by 1951.

Shall we ignore the plight of the flood victims, or shall we welcome low-rent housing for 2,000 families which the United States Government has offered to provide?

YES, PORTLAND DOES HAVE SLUMS

You do not have to go to Chicago or New York to find slums. Go out Williams Avenue, or look up the river from the Ross Island

Bridge. You will see shacks and eyesores that are the shame of our city—decrepit structures not even fit for cattle. There is nothing more un-American than a slum.

And the number is greater than you think—23,000 Portland families live in dwellings which menace their health and safety. That is the official report of the 1949 Portland housing survey. Nearly 100,000 people of our city are crowded into dangerous, substandard clapboard tenements.

SLUMS ARE COSTLY TO YOU

Portland slums are social cesspools. They breed crime, disease, and delinquency. Tuberculosis in slums is almost twice as prevalent as in public housing, and it costs Oregon taxpayers $3,000 a year to care for each TB patient in our State hospital.

Remember the headlines: "Seven perish in slum fire"? Slum homes are firetraps. And fire protection costs four times as much for slum areas as for public housing. And the risk to Portland firemen is correspondingly greater.

SLUMS ARE TAX EATERS

Shacks and shanties pay very little in taxes. They are depreciated eyesores that bring in very few dollars. A study of 24 American cities shows that city services to slum areas cost three to eight times as much as the tax revenues those areas pay.

Portland is asked to vote "yes" to provide city services to the 2,000-unit public-housing project. In return, the city will receive specific "payments in lieu of taxes."

NO HIGHER TAXES

Public housing will not raise taxes. It will merely replace slums which pay little taxes and absorb much of our city treasury. Postwar studies of the entire country show that slum districts take 45 percent of the cost of city service, but provide only 6 percent of tax revenues.

Payments in lieu of taxes will range up to 10 percent of rental charges. These payments will be four to eight times as much as the taxes now paid on undeveloped property.

PUBLIC HOUSING CREATES JOBS

Two thousand new homes will mean business and jobs for a large number of Portland people. It will take up the slack in employment and help many of the 96,000 men whom the Governor's committee reported jobless in February.

George Brown, of the CIO, estimates it will take 320,000 man-hours to produce lumber alone, to build 2,000 homes.

AFL leaders point out 2,000 new homes will provide employment for carpenters, painters, electricians, plasterers, and other skilled mechanics.

PROPERTY VALUES INCREASE

Two thousand units of public housing will build up property values. For every unit of public housing built, one slum dwelling will be destroyed or repaired within 5 years.

Public housing will provide homes for steady workers and attract even more industry to Portland. Industrial planners always ask: "Is there housing for labor?" And this influx of employed people will provide a market for new home building. Renters become home owners; that is the history of Oregon development.

BEWARE THE PROPAGANDA BLITZ

Why should the voters turn down the United States Government's appropriation to build decent housing that will replace the fire traps and health traps that blight our city? Only short-sighted and selfish groups which profit from slum misery oppose this humanitarian program.

But the selfish interests have money to launch a scare campaign to tell you public housing will raise taxes, that it is socialistic, etc. Their full-page ads deceived the people of Seattle. Let's not fall for their propaganda.

PUBLIC HOUSING HAS PROVED ITSELF

Public housing is not new to Portland. Columbia Villa and Dekum Court provide examples of the 2,000 permanent low-rent housing, this program will bring.

New low-rent housing must be found for the fastest-growing city in this part of the country. Otherwise Portland will slip back into its old lethargy. We can build a great community of clean, decent homes, where every child will have a chance to grow to maturity in a fine American environment.

Let us stamp out slums in Portland—and the crime and poverty and disease they breed. Let us vote "yes" on May 19 for the 2,000 low-rent public-housing units.

Address of Hon. Robert L. Doughton, of North Carolina, on Boone-Barkley Day, at Salisbury, N. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1950

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, on Monday afternoon, May 1, under clear Carolina skies and before a magnificent audience, our distinguished and beloved colleague, Hon. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, in appropriate fashion and with becoming dignity presented a great American to the people of Rowan and adjoining counties in the district which our colleague has so well and ably represented for more than three decades. The occasion was known and dedicated as Boone-Barkley Day in honor of Daniel Boone, of historic fame, and ALBEN W. BARKLEY, the greatest of all of our Vice Presidents.

The city of Salisbury in Rowan County was selected as an appropriate place for this great meeting because it was in this part of my native State that the Boones and the Barkleys and forebears of our present Vice President settled in the early days of this Republic and made their great contributions to the cause of freedom. The Vice President, therefore, was received with a warm and cordial welcome, not as a stranger or an alien, but rather as one who had returned to the home of his ancestors and to the household from which he sprang.

Neither in all of the Vice President's long line of noble ancestry nor in the ancestry of any of those who today direct the affairs of this great Nation has there been a greater champion of the cause of the common man and of the freedoms which he has a God-given right to enjoy.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I present for the record the introductory speech of that great American, the greatest living North Carolinian, our beloved friend and colleague, BOB DOUGHTON.

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Vice President, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, since entering public life I have had many pleasant duties to perform but none that I could possibly appreciate more than the high distinction of participating in this Barkley-Boone celebration—a most momentous and historic occasion.

Today we honor and pay tribute to two great Americans—one a famous frontiersman, pioneer, and adventurer of almost two centuries ago, Daniel Boone, and the other an outstanding American statesman of our own day, ALBEN W. BARKLEY.

In a way my assignment is a dual one. I am to present our speaker to this large gathering and to this community, and also to present Rowan County and this community to him.

Mr. Vice President, Salisbury, Rowan, and Yadkin are names rich in history and tradition—and much of the history and tradition is associated with your people, your State, and yourself. I bring to your attention a fact with which, of course, you are familiar—that three of your ancestors, Henry Barkley, Alexander Cathey, and William Stevenson, all settled here in Rowan County. Many of their descendants, your forebears, are buried at Thyatira Church and in the cemeteries of Rowan County. So, in a manner, we welcome you, Mr. Vice President, home.

Our distinguished speaker does not come to us as a stranger. The ancestors of many of the early settlers of Kentucky were North Carolinians. Some of them, like some of you, were veterans—young veterans of the Revolutionary War, who, at its close, turned their faces from Kings Mountain and Guilford Courthouse and, following Boone, sought new homes farther West.

Ever since that era the people of North Carolina and Kentucky have been linked by blood and by a common heritage of beliefs and faith. We have generally the same aspirations and objectives, the same passion for liberty and for justice.

Kentucky has, through the years, enriched the Nation with the services of many great men and has played an important part in national and world affairs from the beginning. It is significant that President Abraham Lincoln, and the President of the Confederate States, Jefferson Davis, two adversaries in the great crisis of our country, were both born in Kentucky.

Kentucky has been famous in the Congress of the United States in the person of such renowned men as Henry Clay, who served intermittently in Congress and who, in different Congresses, served as Speaker of the House of Representatives and was also Secretary of State to John Quincy Adams.

Another celebrated Kentuckian was John G. Carlisle, Speaker of the House of Representatives in three Congresses—the Forty-eighth, Forty-ninth, and Fiftieth—and later Secretary of the Treasury in the Cleveland administration.

Ollie M. James, also of Kentucky, and predecessor of our distinguished Vice President in the House of Representatives, was a confidant and adviser of President Wilson.

I am pleased also to mention the splendid services being rendered by the Honorable NOBLE GREGORY, a present member of the Committee on Ways and Means, who represents the great First District of Kentucky.

In more recent years Kentucky has made a greater contribution to the highest Court of the land, the Supreme Court, than any other State in the Union; having today as its Chief Justice the Honorable Fred M. Vinson, an eminent jurist, an outstanding legislator, my friend and colleague on the Committee on Ways and Means for many years—also Mr. Justice Stanley Reed, and Mr. Justice Louis Brandeis, and the late Mr. Justice Wiley Rutledge, and Mr. Justice James Clark McReynolds—all distinguished Kentuckians who have served on this high Court.

One might recite the deeds of Kentuckians for a long and indefinite period, but none of the renown which has accrued to Kentucky as a result of the services and contribution of those who have been mentioned or those who could be mentioned can excel the illustrious record of ALBEN W. BARKLEY.

From humble beginning in Graves County, Ky., through his ambition, courage, and indomitable determination he fought his way in early life in obtaining an education and in early life became interested in public affairs. He was first elected county attorney, conducting his campaign, it is said, on muleback or horseback in the raw and bitter weather of February and March. He was later elevated to the county judgeship, which position he filled so satisfactorily as to attract the attention of the First Congressional District of Kentucky and was elected a Member of the House of Representatives in 1912, succeeding the Honorable Ollie M. James, who was advancing to the United States Senate.

The services of our distinguished guest in the House of Representatives were outstanding, holding membership in that body for 14 years. He served on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and other important committees and was regarded as one of the ablest men in the House. He was elected to the United States Senate in 1926, serving in that body 22 years, and has grown more conspicuous, more popular, and more powerful with the passing years. He served with distinction as a member of the Committee on Finance and as both majority and minority leader in the Senate. He has become the perennial keynoter for Democratic conventions, serving in this capacity in 1936, 1940, and 1948.

His selection by his party and election by the people to the Vice Presidency was a just reward for his service to his party and his country. His life of public service has been one of not only duration but of donation. His time and extraordinary talents have been given freely to the service of his fellow man. Through the years, from the Atlantic to the Pacific—from Canada to the Gulf of Mexico—no man has fought so effectively and valiantly the battles of the Democratic Party as our distinguished speaker of today. Neither a radical nor a reactionary, but an orthodox, Jeffersonian statesman—a wise, robust, powerful champion of the people. In the rough and tumble of debate he has no equal. In all my 39 years as Representative in Congress I have known only one man whom I consider his peer as a debater. That was our own great and beloved Claude Kitchin, of North Carolina.

Taken as a whole, covering so long a period of time, no one has fashioned a record of public service more useful, more brilliant, more outstanding, and I might truthfully say, judging by his recent triumph in the matrimonial field, more romantic, than our distinguished guest and speaker.

A great Kentuckian, a great statesman, a great Democrat, a great Vice President, who has breathed the breath of new life into that high office, a great American, one concerning whom it can truthfully be said, the simple truth is the highest encomium.

Ladies and gentlemen, it is a pleasure, an honor, and a high privilege to present to this large gathering my friend for 37 years and a true friend and faithful servant of all the people, the Vice President of the United States, the Honorable ALBEN W. BARKLEY.

Adequate Funds for Veterans' Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following resolution of the Disabled American Veterans, Department of Massachusetts:

Whereas Past National Executive Committeeman and Past Department Commander Anthony D. Tieso has requested the executive committee of the Disabled American Veterans, Department of Massachusetts, in meeting assembled, to give serious consideration to the loss of service and benefits to veterans and their beneficiaries because of the recent reductions in personnel in the Veterans' Administration; and

Whereas this committee, in executive session assembled, wishes to go on record as commending the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Carl R. Gray, for the wisdom and sound administrative judgment which he has displayed in his recent decision as announced by the Associated Press, April 6, 1950, to defer, temporarily, at least, all reductions in force, insofar as the medical personnel of the Veterans' Administration are concerned; and

Whereas it is the best judgment of the executive committee of this department, after a careful study of the situation presented by the recent over-all reductions in force in the Massachusetts regional office and the subdistrict and suboffices coming under its jurisdiction as well as in the hospitals located in Massachusetts that service to the veterans and their beneficiaries, who are required to come to these installations in the Veterans' Administration for the various services and benefits to which they are entitled by Congress, will be irreparably impaired and such veterans and their beneficiaries subjected to great hardship and serious loss of rights and benefits; and

Whereas the Veterans' Administration, under its present organization, is a cohesive whole, the loss of personnel in any important division such as the Contact Division, the Adjudication Division, the Rehabilitation Division, the Finance Division, and the various auxiliary and subordinate divisions, will subject the veteran to delays, possible injustices, misinformation, and lack of the efficient service which is now being rendered; and

Whereas the contact division in the Massachusetts regional office, located at Boston, has recently been subjected to a loss of contact representatives which, in our opinion, will result in a loss of service to the veteran throughout Massachusetts to the extent that the most liberal provisions of existing legislation relating to veterans and their dependents, which has been enacted by a grateful and benevolent Congress, may not be properly enforced or administered; and

Whereas the various divisions, both major and minor, which comprise the organizational set-up of the Veterans' Administration, may be compared to a chain which is no stronger than its weakest link; and

Whereas it is inconsistent to discriminate in favor of one division, such as the Medical Division, over other equally important divisions, all of which were created to serve the veteran; and

Whereas to reduce personnel in any of the divisions of the Veterans' Administration where such personnel are imperatively required to render the vital services to the veteran in response to the mandates of Congress and the various laws which have been enacted by the various Congresses, is insufficient; and

Whereas it has been said that the United States has enacted more liberal and beneficial laws for veterans than any government in the history of the world; and

Whereas unless the Veterans' Administration is furnished with sufficient personnel to properly administer and enforce the liberal laws enacted by Congress, the provisions of such laws will be violated and ignored, resulting in great hardship and sacrifice on the part of the veteran population which a grateful Republic intended to reward; and

Whereas it is a solemn obligation of this organization to do all in its power to see that our comrades who are disabled and their dependents are adequately cared for and likewise to see that the promises and pledges which were made by the people of this Nation, before, during, and after the last war, which pledges have been enacted into legislation, are kept; and

Whereas, unless the Veterans' Administration is permitted to retain adequate personnel to enforce the liberal legislation which Congress has enacted, the results will be a mockery, savoring of tinkling cymbals and sounding brass: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Executive Committee of the Disabled American Veterans, Department of Massachusetts, in conference assembled, does hereby resolve that the reductions in the divisions other than the Medical in the Veterans' Administration, Boston regional office and its subsidiaries, and in the hospitals throughout Massachusetts coming under the Veterans' Administration should be deplored and that immediate steps should be taken by the Congress of the United States to appropriate supplementarily sufficient funds to provide for the retention of all employees necessary to accomplish the present high type of service to the veteran in Massachusetts; and be it further

Resolved, That sufficient funds be appropriated by Congress to provide for retaining the present number of personnel on duty in the Boston regional office and its affiliates and in the Veterans' Administration hospitals in Massachusetts for the fiscal year of 1950–51; and be it further

Resolved, That the number of such personnel required, shall be submitted by the manager of the various installations in Massachusetts of the Veterans' Administration to the Administrator for final approval; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be filed with all of the Massachusetts senatorial and congressional representatives for prompt and appropriate action by that body and that a copy of this resolution also be sent to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs in Washington, D. C.

Adopted by the Department of Massachusetts, Disabled American Veterans Executive Committee on Saturday, April 15, 1950, while in session at the Chelsea Soldiers Home, Chelsea, Mass.

CHARLES H. LITTLEFIELD,
Department Commander.
THOMAS J. KEATING,
Department Adjutant.

Tariff Rate on Rubber Footwear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1950

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and resolution:

NAUGATUCK CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Naugatuck, Conn., May 1, 1950.
Hon. JAMES T. PATTERSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PATTERSON: The purpose of this letter is to convey to you the attitude of the retail division of the Naugatuck Chamber of Commerce regarding any change in the present tariff rate on rubber footwear. The members of the retail division at their April 18 meeting voted unanimously to oppose any

reduction or change in the method of computing the import duty on rubber or canvas footwear.

Not only are we deeply concerned because of the disastrous consequences such a change would have upon our community, but it is our conviction that the entire national economy would be threatened by any reduction in the present tariff duty.

We urge you, therefore, to exert all possible effort to maintain the present rate of duty on all rubber and canvas footwear.

Yours very truly,

CLARENCE FREEDMAN,
Chairman, Retail Division.

Whereas a bill is pending in Congress entitled "A bill to revise administrative procedures of the Bureau of Customs," which would eliminate what is known as the American selling-price principle, specifically as it applies to canvas and waterproof rubber footwear; and

Whereas the State Department has under consideration negotiations which would result in reciprocal trade agreements lowering present tariffs on canvas and waterproof rubber footwear imported from foreign countries; and

Whereas any further reduction in the tariff rates applying to imports of canvas and waterproof rubber footwear would constitute a serious threat to the major industry of our community and to other local business firms and would result in the loss of jobs, widespread distress, increase of relief rolls and increase of the tax burden of our citizens: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Watertown Knights of Columbus, Council No. 155, at its business meeting held on April 10, 1950, does hereby memorialize and petition the President of the United States, Harry S. Truman; United States Senators and United States Congressmen in New England to take necessary action to prevent any reduction in the tariff on imports of canvas and waterproof rubber footwear whether it be by legislative enactment abrogating the American selling-price principle, by negotiation under the general agreement on tariffs and trade, or otherwise; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent to the President of the United States, Harry S. Truman and all the New England Congressmen, and that these resolutions be spread on the records of the Knights of Columbus Council No. 155 in Watertown, Mass.

FRANCIS A. MORRELL,
Grand Knight.

I, Giles A. Laughrea, Jr., recorder of the Knights of Columbus, Council No. 155, of Watertown, Mass., hereby certify that the foregoing is a true copy of resolution adopted at the business meeting, duly called and held on April 10, 1950.

GILES A. LAUGHREA, Jr.,
Recorder.

Hon. Albert Engel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 2, 1950

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, nobody is better qualified to talk about the Honorable ALBERT ENGEL than those of us who have served with him on the Appropriations Committee and sat at his feet during his membership there. "AL" as he is affectionately called is an indefatigable worker with a memory for facts, figures, and what has gone on and at Committee which gift of God is not only remarkable but a capacity and a quality that few if any possess to the extent that does he. We have called him "the one-man legislative budget bureau," "Mr. National Defense" and a lot of other things, all intended to be complimentary.

That it will be impossible to fill his place is no idle statement—nor flattery. Too well all of us know it is too true.

Without regard to partisanship all of us on the Appropriations Committee and many others hope he will realize his ambition to be governor of the State of Michigan. Its gain will be our loss but Michigan will never have had a more energetic, better qualified, more loyal, and faithful American as its chief executive. Bon voyage and safe landings, ALBERT!

A Glimpse of Life Behind the Iron Curtain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1950

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therein a letter sent from Hungary by secret messenger through France.

The writer is a member of the lesser nobility and consequently the family has been marked for particularly humiliating experiences by the Russians. The writer is highly educated, well grounded in political science, so the comments are not likely to be exaggerated.

This letter gives a glimpse of what life is like behind the iron curtain. This is the kind of life some people in this country want to substitute for our Government of freedom, incredible as that may seem.

The letter follows:

BUDAPEST, *January 4, 1950.*

MY DEAR ———: I am sure you are wondering why I am so silent since such a very long time. I am sending this letter by the French courier post, so I can write without trembling every moment, that they will come for me afterward and take me to the political police, which is very much worse than death. The truth is, that we are simply terrorized. At every office, each first of the month, there come scores of letters, and those who receive them can go away at many instances without a cent more. Men with two or three children, just put on the street, because they are not politically reliable. And those who are sent away cannot get any other position. They live from hand to mouth, selling their last belongings, eating from the charity kitchens of the different churches. This would surely happen if these devils knew of my letters. This is one of the causes why I did not write. The other is that I hate sad letters, and do what I will, it is impossible to write a gay one.

We are suffocating here in this land. Everyone, workers, peasants, not to speak of middle-class people. We have to cry, "Long live Stalin." We have to decorate our homes for each Communist occasion. Some of their spies come every time there is something happening in the world and ask our sincere opinion, and we lie, lie, lie. If we do not, out we go and can hunger away with all our family.

They wanted me to make a speech at one of their innumerable meetings in which I would have had to describe the sins of America. I begged off with being nervous of the crowd, not knowing enough of their ideas yet to be able to talk, etc. They gave me 2 months. Either I shall talk, or I shall be marked for the next blacklist. Each of these little instances is a bitter drop, and our glass is overfilled already. And I can manage being silent, but I am sure it will be impossible for me to talk the way they like it.

I have made quite a propaganda with the views you sent. (Note: The views were a set of View-Master pictures of United States in Kodachrome.) After having sent it to your other correspondent, and his having looked at them I gave it to everyone who is reliable at the office. Now they are again at the other owners, for he wants to show them to the nuns at the hospital. The hospital where he is, is a home for incurable sick, and it is the only place where there are still nuns, no one wanting their hopeless and troublesome work.

We are all putting our hope in you Americans. I wonder whether there will be enough intelligent people there to discover all those who, under different names and different creeds, are helping this communism to win its way. They are the worst enemy anyone can have, for they do not know what fair play means and that is why I am terribly afraid that they will succeed in blinding you long enough to become so strong, that it will be impossible to hold them at bay. And if your government does not do something quickly I am afraid you will learn to know soon all the horrors of this slave life that we are leading now since five years.

It is very much harder than the siege was. There are very few people who would not begin the whole horror of war again if they could get rid of this vermin, that is making life hell upon earth for millions of people.

They are spoiling the children and the young people so that it will be very difficult to repair the wrong they have done. They are taught that there is no God. They are made to betray unwittingly, their own parents. They are taught to adore Stalin like a divinity. A vanquished race from which one exacts admiration and love towards the vanquishers. I could run on for some time in this manner but it is night already. Of course I did not dare write this at the office.

Thinking of you very often with the old gratefulness and friendship, I wish you a very happy New Year.

Yours,

——— ———.

The Strategy of American Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1950

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, for some months, a group made up in the main of members of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Harvard faculties have been holding regular meetings to discuss urgent problems of American security. The group includes

scientists, economists, historians, and political scientists; and many of its members, as a glance at the list of names will show, have had recent experience in the public service.

The attached document sets forth certain conclusions reached by the Harvard-Massachusetts Institute of Technology group relative to the question of the strategy of national defense. The main point is that our present overwhelming commitment to atomic weapons and strategic bombardment may leave us no alternative in case of war except the initiation of an atomic war to which, in the long run, we may ourselves be more vulnerable; and that therefore steps should be taken immediately to correct the present deficiencies in our ground forces, tactical air wing and other forms of conventional armanents. I believe that this statement raises issues of the utmost importance, particularly in view of General Bradley's recent statement that the United States might perhaps have to scrap the theory of balanced military forces; and I earnestly commend it to your attention.

THE STRATEGY OF AMERICAN DEFENSE

This statement is the product of a deep apprehension over the present strategic position of the United States. It is addressed to questions of military strategy and to these alone. We emphasize that we do not regard military defense as the only, or even the first, source of security of the United States. That security we regard, first of all, as depending on the economic strength and political cooperation of the free world. These latter are the first tasks of American policy. We are concerned here with military policy, not as a means of preparing for war, but as a means of gaining time during which economic and political efforts may help create the situations out of which lasting peace may emerge.

We believe that our present strategic position is founded on a misplaced faith in atomic weapons and strategic bombing. This system of defense seems to us, for reasons we shall set forth below, to impair the moral and political strength of the United States in the present period and to evade the true requirements of national security. We believe that the United States must move beyond its present central reliance on atomic warfare and must accept the costs in money and inconvenience involved in such a policy. These costs are to be measured against the loss of the American moral position in the free world, the invitation to limited aggression inherent in the present strategy, and the possibly catastrophic dangers to ourselves and civilization in an atomic war.

We believe that the civilian may properly speak to questions of national defense. While the plans for defense cannot be the property of all citizens, an important distinction is to be drawn between essentials and details. It is the details that must remain secret. The fundamental problems are the proper concern of all; and it is to such fundamentals that this statement is applied.

THE PRESENT STRATEGY

The power which forces the United States to adopt a posture of defense is the Soviet Union. We make no estimate as to the immediacy of the Soviet threat to the security of the United States and western Europe. For present purposes we assume the danger, and the corresponding need for western military strength sufficient to deter Soviet aggression. The difference between a deterrent force and one that accords absolute security in the event of actual aggression must be emphasized. In case of actual war, the Nation can have only the single objective of overwhelming superiority; but the prevention of war is a different undertaking, and there is room for argument as to the size and nature of the effort required.

The present defensive position of the United States depends heavily on its possession of atomic weapons coupled with faith in strategic bombardment. This has been made evident in the recent controversies over the roles of the several services and in the allocation of defense appropriations. It is implicit in the size and distribution of our ground forces—the fact that at present the United States has about 10 divisions, few of which are fully manned and equipped—and in the subordinate role assigned to tactical air power.

This defense plan, with its emphasis on atomic weapons and strategic air power, has been misleadingly attractive to the American people and Congress. It has promised us all great economies in financial outlay, in manpower, and in political inconvenience. We believe that this plan has been shaped less by a dispassionate view of the United States in the world than by political factors, including the ebb and flow of interservice rivalry. However, it is less important to allocate responsibility for present strategy than to assess its consequences. These, we believe, raise questions which go to the roots of the position of the United States in the world.

1. United States strategy today is not well equipped to deal with problems of limited aggression. We accept the view that the essential deterrent to all-out Soviet attack is the conviction that such attack would provoke a general war with the United States. But there are degrees of Soviet pressure short of open military aggression; and to this form of limited aggression—such as satellite guerrilla warfare or "revolution" instigated from outside—the United States may have no effective response except an atomic war. This condition may invite the extension of techniques of guerrilla warfare and internal revolt in marginal areas in the confidence that such local activity would incur only local risks.

2. The predominant reliance by the United States on atomic warfare may weaken the morale and confidence of our European allies. Unless we have substantial ground, naval, and tactical air forces available to supply immediate help in the event of Soviet aggression, our allies may be the less disposed to make the necessary efforts and sacrifices to prepare for such an ordeal. Yet their present strength and their will-to-resist are important elements among the factors which can deter Russian aggression and avert war. Anything that weakens the will to resist of our allies therefore jeopardizes the peace we are striving to maintain.

3. The present reliance by the United States on the threat of the bomb is continuing indication to the world that American military strategy accepts the principle of mass destruction of human life. This can only lead to a damaging misconstruction of American motives and character and to resentment of American power. It has already contributed to the conviction that the United States is a dangerous ally and has strengthened the search for neutrality or some other form of immunity as between the United States and Russia.

4. To the extent that the United States has placed extensive reliance on the bomb, it has become more difficult for the United States to accept agreement restricting the use of atomic weapons. Such an agreement today would, in effect, constitute unilateral disarmament. To the degree that it has liberated its own defense strategy from its present central commitment to atomic weapons, the United States will be the more free to press for international control of atomic energy as part of a general system of disarmament. In the meantime, if control of atomic energy, with genuine inspection and safeguards, is impossible, the United States has no alternative but to continue to build up its atomic strength; for the certainty of retaliation is probably the major deterrent to atomic warfare.

5. The peacetime defects of our present strategy are matched by equally serious defects in time of war. There may be the hope, however faint, that in case of war both sides may hesitate to initiate the use of atomic weapons, through fear of the inevitable retaliation. But there is not the slightest ground for hope that mutual fear may thus spare the world if either side is dependent on atomic weapons as its main instrument of war.

Atomic war has no clear limits. If the battle should be joined in western Europe, the Red Army could be subjected to direct atomic attack only at the expense of blotting out the people and the cultural heritage which the North Atlantic Pact has committed us to defend. The employment of the bomb on Russian soil, whatever its immediate military advantages, would complicate vastly any postwar rehabilitation of the Russian nation. And, now that the bomb is no longer a United States monopoly, Americans must recognize their own exceptional vulnerability to this weapon. Our population and our industry are highly concentrated; our main cities are easily accessible by air and water; we are dependent on intricate and fragile systems of communication and transport; and as a people, we are not accustomed to the shock of military catastrophe. Moreover, where our vulnerability is relatively great, that of Britain is virtually total. An atomic war would almost certainly result in the obliteration of our closest ally. It is one of the tragic contradictions of our time that American strategy has organized the science and technology of the nation around weapons, which, when imitated abroad, are potentially most dangerous to itself and its friends.

From the standpoint of its desire to achieve moral leadership in world affairs, the United States can ill afford a strategy which commits it in advance to warfare of mass slaughter on both sides—which might doom it to the fearful choice between world-wide mass destruction, on the one hand, and outright military defeat, on the other.

THE ALTERNATIVES

The emphasis on the weakness of the present strategy is justified if only to stimulate the search for alternatives. We assume that responsible members of our Military Establishment have this problem constantly in mind; but, inasmuch as military decisions must be circumscribed by political considerations, we believe that the problem will benefit from public discussion. It seems clear that important alternatives have so far been set aside, not on their merits, but because of the strategic commitment to and the popular faith in atomic weapons. The danger of exclusive or even predominant reliance on the atomic alternative must now be clear.

The question of the kind of conventional military force which would supplement the bomb as a deterrent is one the American people must now face. The development of an adequate ground army, the strengthening of our tactical air wing, the supply and logistic components, including the provision for air transport, the development of antisubmarine and other specialized naval forces, the use of the draft—all these problems pose questions not easily answered. But these questions, we believe, must be answered if United States policy is to be liberated from its present overwhelming dependence upon atomic warfare. We call upon our political and mili-

tary leaders to explore these issues with the American people.

Duncan S. Ballentine; Crane Brinton; McGeorge Bundy; Saville R. Davis; Martin Deutsch; John K. Fairbank; Francis L. Friedman; J. K. Galbraith; Myron P. Gilmore; Seymour Harris; William R. Hawthorne; John E. Sawyer; Arthur M. Schlesinger; Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr.; Charles H. Taylor; Robert L. Wolff; Jerome B. Wiesner; Jerrold R. Zacharias.

Address of Senator Russell B. Long, Democrat, of Louisiana, Before National Rivers and Harbors Congress, Washington, D. C., on March 24, 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include an address by Senator RUSSELL B. LONG, Democrat, of Louisiana, before the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, in Washington, D. C., on March 24, 1950, as follows:

ADDRESS OF SENATOR RUSSELL B. LONG, DEMOCRAT, LOUISIANA, BEFORE NATIONAL RIVERS AND HARBORS CONGRESS, WASHINGTON, D. C., MARCH 24, 1950

Mr. Chairman, members of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, and distinguished guests:

When your president invited me to speak on this occasion he assigned me the subject of Conservation and Development of Our Natural Resources. It later occurred to me that I had taken upon myself a rather large order, particularly in talking to you who have spent so many years in studying resource development in all its complexities.

Obviously, these few minutes here are all too brief for a discussion of all the broad phases of our natural resource development. Almost any one phase of it would in itself require much more time for a proper discussion. Already you have heard about our great reclamation program, and, just preceding me, you have heard Secretary Hutchinson elaborate on those of our resources which are under the guardianship of the Department of Agriculture. The list, no doubt, will be added to before you end your deliberations—power, minerals, forests, soils—all are a part of the richness and the greatness which are the blessing of America.

I am going to take a bit of liberty with my assigned subject and talk to you about some things we have accomplished in resource development and then talk awhile about what could happen if we fail to keep alert. Put another way, I want to talk about flood control and navigation on the one hand and the Hoover Commission on the other.

Federal activity in flood control has just come of age. In 1928, Congress first recognized a Federal responsibility in protecting the lives and property of our people from flood when in that year it authorized projects on the lower Mississippi and Sacramento Rivers. Some 8 years later—in 1936—Congress took the next step and initiated a Nation-wide flood-protection program.

On the other hand, the Army engineers have been at work on navigation improvements for more than a century. Robert E. Lee spent his early army years improving harbors on the Atlantic coast and attempting to tame the Mississippi River at St. Louis. The fine city of Shreveport in my own State of Louisiana took the name of Captain Shreve who came to Red River more than a century ago to open it to navigation.

Here we have two principal programs—one a lusty infant and the other a virile old graybeard. It is time to take stock of both of them to determine what they have cost on the debit side and what they have reaped on the credit side.

The flood-control program on a national scale has only just begun. Construction, because of the war, was interrupted and as a consequence, is just now in its sixth year. None of the great dams in the Missouri Basin has been completed. The works proposed in the basins of the Arkansas and the Red are hardly beyond the planning stage. California, the Pacific Northwest, the Ohio Basin, New England—all of them have yet to see completed much more than local segments of comprehensive protection plans. We in the lower Mississippi Valley—because we started first—are somewhat ahead of the rest, for which we are very thankful—at least once every year. Our project is 60 percent complete and even though many vital portions of it remain unfinished and hundreds of square miles of fertile lands are subject to inundation almost annually.

Thus far, in our general flood-control program, we have completed or have in operation 250 projects in which we have a Federal investment of $600,000,000. In the brief time they have been in operation—for the most part less than a decade—they have prevented flood damages of more than $700,000,000. There obviously can be no monetary assessment on the protection of human life, the alleviation of misery and suffering, and the uninterrupted economic progress which has resulted. Last month, after visiting the flood-stricken Red River backwater area in my own State, I was convinced that these "byproducts" are more meaningful, in many cases, than the mere dollars we use as an economic criteria.

Now to recapitulate, out of a total expenditure thus far of approximately $600,000,000 in flood control, general, we find that the benefits in the short period of time through June 30, 1948, approximately $700,000,000, or, in other words, we already have our investment back and have many, many years of useful life left in the various projects.

The control of floods on the lower Mississippi is a much older activity, as I pointed out a moment ago. The tremendous volume of water—the drainage of 41 percent of continental United States—which it must carry and the hazard to life and property which is a corollary, have made it the Nation's No. 1 flood problem. The length of time which the partially completed works have restrained large potential damage reveal that its worth to the Nation is tremendous. The Army engineers a few days ago gave me figures which indicate that the benefits thus far accruing from the works on the lower Mississippi total approximately $5,000,000,000, or roughly seven times more than the $700,000,000 which has been invested in construction.

Altogether on a grand total investment of approximately $1,300,000,000, direct flood damages of $5,600,000,000 has been prevented, or more than a 4 to 1 ratio. Certainly, these are convincing arguments that the program of flood control has demonstrated its economic worth without taking into consideration the very valuable other benefits which have resulted.

I would like to turn briefly to the picture as it affects our river and harbor projects. At the present time, there are over 700 navigation projects completed and in operation and they have cost us approximately $1,400,000,000. From this investment, we are reaping, day in and day out, tremendous returns. Maritime commerce using our coastal harbors has increased from 232,000,000 tons in 1929 to a record 333,000,000 tons in 1948. Traffic on the Great Lakes was 97,000,000,000 ton miles in 1929 and by 1948, had increased to 118,000,000,000 ton miles and had averaged over a 20-year period 84,800,000,000 ton-miles per year.

The increase in our inland waterway traffic has been even more phenomenal. In 1929, our inland waterways—including the Intracoastal Waterway—carried 8,600,000,000 ton-miles of commerce, while in 1948, that amount had more than quadrupled to 40,600,000,000 ton-miles. Over the same 20-year period, inland waterway traffic averaged 20,100,000,000 ton miles per year.

Here again, it is somewhat difficult to set the real worth of what has been done. Obviously, we can multiply the tonnage by the savings as between water transportation and other forms of transportation and come up with a very good figure, but that figure will not reflect the growth of industries which might otherwise have languished without cheap transportation. Nor will that figure show that these same waterways kept factories going and homes heated and airplanes flying during the late war when the Nazi submarines had driven our tankers from the seas, our railroads were already overloaded, and the only means of transporting vital petroleum products to the north and east in many cases was by barge.

For those who would term this entire program a pork-barrel proposition that needs the fat fried from it, I am going to make some concessions in arriving at the benefits which have accrued from our navigation projects. I am going to lump together all of the funds which have been expended by the Army engineers, not only for construction, but for maintenance and for operation of all river and harbor improvements, which the latest annual report of the Chief of Engineers shows as being $2,445,000,000. When we remember that that figure goes back to our early beginning as a nation, it is not a staggering one. As a further concession, I propose to accept as savings to the public only those which have accrued during the 20-year period 1929–48, and by multiplying the ton-mileage, which I have outlined above, by the difference between 9.3 mills per mile—which the Interstate Commerce Commission says was the expense of all class I railroads in the United States for the year 1948 for freight service—and the 4 mills per ton-mile which represent the Federal construction and maintenance cost plus the carriers cost for maintenance and operation of service, we arrive at a dollar saving of $5,478,000,000.

Stated another way on this very liberal basis upon which I have placed these figures, the Federal navigation improvements have returned to the Nation about $2.20 for every dollar expended by the Federal Government.

It is my view that in these two items, the worth of the projects has certainly been proved. Obviously, we might take some few of the projects and, by using them as horrible examples, attempt to tear down the whole program. It is my insistence, on the other hand, that when we take all of the improvements together—both flood control and navigation—and balance them on the scales of social and economic progress, we get a return which should make all of us proud of what has been accomplished.

We now come to the next and final proposition about which I desire to speak. It has to do with a subject which is familiar to all of you.

A little more than a year ago, the Congress had presented to it a series of recommendations. They were portrayed as devices which could be put into being either by the executive or the legislative branches of our Government and result in tremendous economic savings and at the same time give us a streamlined and efficient Government organization.

In general, taken as a whole, I would be the last to quarrel with the report of the Hoover Commission. Many of the recommendations are eminently sound and no doubt will result in greater efficiency and perhaps bring some economy. On the other hand, there are some recommendations of the Commission that seem to be based on prejudice or propaganda, or, to say the least, on something besides fact, and which simply will not stand the penetrating searchlight of careful analysis.

This one further statement should be made with reference to the Hoover Commission report. It has been the subject of the greatest pressure drive that I have seen since becoming a Member of the United States Senate. There have perhaps been more misrepresentations made about it than any other public question before us at the moment. Every time I pick up a newspaper or hear someone discuss it, the millions of dollars we are going to save each year always is increased. I believe the last figure I saw approached $6,000,000,000; whereas, I recall the original propaganda figure was $3,000,000,000. Just what the monthly rate of increase is, I have not discovered, but nevertheless, it is substantial.

Fairness dictates that I point out that the Hoover Commission itself very specifically avoided putting any dollar estimate on the amount of savings that would be forthcoming if their recommendations are placed into effect. When former President Hoover appeared before the Expenditures Committee in the Senate when I had the honor to serve on that committee, I pointedly asked him the question as to how much would be saved and, in substance, he replied that he felt there would be considerable savings, but that the most important thing was the increased efficiency that could be obtained by putting the Commission's recommendations into our governmental structure.

I propose now, as briefly as I can, to discuss just one of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission. Certainly, the Hoover Commission made no greater error than when it recommended that we divest the Army engineers of its civil-works activities.

In the first place, Commissioners Atcheson, Pollock, and Rowe didn't like anything about the manner in which the rest of the Hoover Commission considered the public works and natural-resource programs, and submitted a separate report recommending a department of natural resources.

Then, the late Secretary Forrestal, because of his relationship to the Corps of Engineers as the Secretary of Defense, abstained from participating in the discussion and formulation on this particular recommendation. Then I am sure most of you are familiar with the fact that Senator MCCLELLAN, your president, and Representative Carter Manasco, filed a very vigorous minority report in which they opposed the recommendation which would transfer flood control and river and harbor improvements from the Department of the Army to the Department of the Interior. So, in effect, we have before us a recommendation which represents the thinking insofar as we can tell, of only 6 of the 12 able men who made up the Hoover Commission. I don't believe that you as a citizen or that I as the representative in the Senate of a sovereign State should be asked to buy blindly and without question any recommendation which comes from a group so badly split as the Hoover Commission was on this issue. This state of facts alone should give a thoughtful person pause and should call for the exercise of individual judgment if wise action is followed.

But let us go just a step or two further. Who headed the so-called task forces whose reports served as the basis of the Commission's recommendations and—more important—what fitted them to become the great emancipators?

Well, the principal figure seems to be an individual named Moses whose chief claim to fame is as a playground and parkway planner in New York City. In his contribution to the Commission effort, he had a lot to say about the military significance of the proposed change, but I can find no record of any military experience he has had, unless we count the verbal warfare he carried on with former Interior Secretary Ickes in years gone by. He proposes to set up an engineering and construction agency for the Federal Government, but he isn't an engineer and the only construction he seems to have engaged in is the building of playgrounds and hot-air castles. In short, there is nothing anywhere in Mr. Moses' background or experience which in any way qualified him for the task he undertook.

Then, the second individual who proposes to tell us how we should run things, is the former Governor of Wyoming, Mr. Miller. I don't know Mr. Miller, but I am sure he is an estimable gentleman to have been so signally honored by the electorate of one of our great sovereign States. Again, however, I am unable to find anything in his background or experience which fits him for his self-appointed task of organizing the conservation development program of our Federal Government. From what I have seen in the magazines, he is a prolific writer, bu' we already have too many press agents in the Federal establishment and certainly can deny ourselves his services in that respect. The only things I can discover that he ever built are political fences. Speaking personally, I would welcome any advice and counsel he can furnish me in that regard between now and July, but in the meantime, I, for one, wish he would confine himself to that which he knows and quit riding around the country astride his great white charger, Hells Canyon, telling the country a lot of half-truths. He's about broken the old nag down and if he isn't careful, the poor, tired, old horse will be left at the starter's gate when the big race is run.

Time will not permit me to go into a detailed analysis of the Commission's recommendation. I have satisfied myself that the reasons advanced for the proposed change are not reasons at all, but the prejudices of those who, unable to control, would tear down and destroy. It may well be that some change is needed. Improvements always are to be desired. Change should not be resisted just because it is change, but a program which has proved its value and which has been so well and faithfully administered through the years, should not be tinkered with just to satisfy the whims of professional planners and political has-beens.

I, perhaps, could forgive a lot of the mistakes which the Commission made, but I do not believe I could ever reconcile their proposal that all these functions—and there are others—be placed in the Department of the Interior. There is no more politicalized department of our Government than is Interior. Its officials have done excellent work in some fields, but their success too often have been overshadowed by their lust for power, their scheming and intrigue and by their disdain for Congress as representatives of the people. I don't want the lives and property and the social and economic progress of my people in Louisiana played with as political pawns in the hands of power-mad Washington bureaucrats.

In the final analysis, this business of reorganization is up to you as citizens. I have tremendous faith in the people of America. I believe they recognize truth and will accept it if it is pointed out to them. It is your job to see that the truth is ferreted out from the propaganda and that the facts are made known to the people. If that is done, we have nothing to fear. If you fail—well, it will serve you right.

Correspondence Between Economic Cooperation Administration and Bates Manufacturing Co., of Lewiston, Maine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 4 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the exchange of correspondence between the Economic Cooperation Administration and the Bates Manufacturing Co., of Lewiston, Maine. This exchange of correspondence reflects some of the effects that the ECA is having on Maine industries.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ECONOMIC COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., April 17, 1950.

Mr. H. D. RUHM, JR.,
President, Bates Manufacturing Co.,
Lewiston, Maine.

DEAR MR. RUHM: We are writing to ask your cooperation in helping this administration work out a program under the Marshall plan to assist one of the European Marshall-plan countries in developing plant productivity in the cotton-textile industry. This program is being carried out by the Economic Cooperation Administration as part of the over-all effort to establish sound European economy as an essential aid to world recovery.

It is the desire to bring to this country a few small groups over a period of time. It is also our desire not to ask any one company to accept more than one small group for a visit to observe plant operations in addition to seminars where information can be exchanged. We are certain they will obtain many ideas on materials handling, utilization of manpower, and methods and procedures which can be applied to their plants and bring greater productivity. We would also appreciate any advice, guidance, and assistance you would give us in working out the program for one of these groups.

In making this request, may we point out that there has been only one textile team visit America, where other industries have had many teams from the different countries. Reports coming back to America on our over-all effort show that from their observation of operations and their discussions with management and workers many techniques and procedures were obtained which they will use to a great advantage. It can also be said that we received some good advice from them.

No date has been set for these visits and the schedule will not be developed until we are assured of sufficient industry acceptance.

We shall appreciate hearing from you and again assure you that your cooperation and assistance will be most deeply appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

STEPHEN R. MACRAE,
Project Manager, Arrangements Branch,
Technical Assistance Division.

BATES MANUFACTURING CO.,
Lewiston, Maine, April 20, 1950.

MR. STEPHEN R. MACRAE,
Project Manager, Arrangements Branch,
Technical Assistance Division, Economic Cooperation Administration,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MACRAE: To reply in polite language to your letter of April 17, requesting

our cooperation in imparting manufacturing know-how to foreign competition is extremely difficult.

Textile exports are constantly being curtailed by quotas, embargoes, tariffs, and exchange. Japanese goods are already beginning to come into the United States at prices about one-third of ours. A festival for reducing American textile tariffs still further is planned for England this summer.

On top of all this, to help some fellow employing labor at wages anywhere from 50 to 90 percent less than we pay to become more efficient appears to us to be indiscreet, to say the least.

Everyone in ECA and other parts of Washington appears to believe that we must import more if we are going to export more, and that a major portion of the imports must be textile. Your letter requesting cooperation in bringing about our own funeral is the first opportunity our company has had to say anything or do anything about our own textile fate. Our answer is a most emphatic "No."

We have built the American textile industry into one of the most efficient in the country. Our per man production is far ahead of any foreign country in my knowledge. You can rest assured that the textile industry will fight for its life; will fight to keep its employees' wages from being forced to foreign levels; will fight to turn out ever better products; will fight to expand its own markets, and to expand and improve its own plant. To furnish our foreign competitors ammunition with which to hurt us more and faster is hardly the common sense used by our hardier forefathers who put this country together.

Sincerely yours,

H. D. RUHM, Jr.,
President, Bates Manufacturing Co.

Threat to American Industry and Labor by Importations of Cheaply Made Commodities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 4 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an article by George Sokolsky which appeared in the Washington Times Herald of May 4, 1950, together with my remarks in reference thereto. I feel that this article vividly focuses attention upon a serious situation which the executive branch of the Government has failed or neglected to comprehend. The importation of commodities and merchandise from foreign countries, where cheap labor exists, is and has been a real threat to American labor and American industry. Now here is evidence of the importation of merchandise manufactured in the Soviet Union by slave labor.

Mr. Sokolsky very properly suggests that American industry organize a management labor committee representing the best minds of management and the labor unions to study this problem as it affects each individual industry. I heartily endorse this suggestion and feel it would be wise for that group to take this problem directly to the American people rather than waste time with some of the departments whose responsibilities it should be to follow this but have failed to do so. I know that labor already has groups working on this subject. I might also suggest that it would be well for the State Department to be giving serious consideration to this important question rather than entertaining at cocktail parties for Members of Congress and their staffs by which they subtly attempt to influence the legislative branch of the Government.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of May 4, 1950]

THESE DAYS

(By George Sokolsky)

I hold in my hand some linen napkins. On a yellow paper label, so made that it can readily be removed from the napkin, appears small, badly printed lettering, the words "Soviet Union." The words, under our laws, should be "Made in the Soviet Union."

These napkins were picked up in a chain store in Miami, Fla. They can be purchased anywhere in the United States. They sell at three for $1. Identical napkins made in the United States sell at $1 or $1.25 apiece.

The Soviet napkins are made by slave labor. The Russian Government can dump them into this country at any price. Our labor cannot compete with slave labor. If Americans buy this Russian-made goods, they are putting American workers out of work and closing down American factories.

The best way is not to buy anything made in Soviet Russia or in any of the satellites. The retailer, jobber or wholesaler who sells goods made outside the United States which is not properly labeled, breaks the law. He should be reported to your chamber of commerce and to the labor union of the particular industry. Also, write to me.

In the case of these napkins, they were labeled and therefore I am not citing the name of the seller. However, if you do not buy this stuff, he will not offer it.

The 1948 revision of the tariff has hit American manufacturers of linen goods hard. Producers of flax towels, tablecloths, napkins, and such products are worried about the conference that is to be held at Torquay, England, beginning September 28. They fear that they will be put out of business.

They fear that the new generosity will be used to close down American factories just to show how good natured and self-sacrificing we can be. A linen manufacturer writes me about the Torquay conference: "Under the Tariff Act of 1930, any lowered tariffs that these sterling negotiators work out to favor certain good neighbor countries will give the same rate to that group of countries that is giving our particular industry one of its biggest fights for existence, namely the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and its satellites, Czechoslovakia, Poland, and now China."

This is something that needs immediate attention. May I recommend that each American industry organize a management-labor committee, representing the best minds of management and the labor unions, to study this problem as it affects each individual industry? Certainly Americans need protection when the State Department is off on an internationalist binge.

The same writer says:

"We here in the United States have no conception of the wide wage differences paid to workers in foreign countries. The countries affecting our industry most are the United Kingdom, with whom public opinion is certainly favorable; Belgium, of mixed feelings; Japan, now a practical ward of the United States; and the group of countries controlled both economically and politically by the U. S. S. R. In every instance, the wage levels of those countries are drastically below what has become known as the American standard of living."

The greatest danger is that we shall all discover too late that our industries have been ruined by unfair competition; that our workers are living on relief because they could not compete with slave labor. Then we shall all have to be taxed heavily to solve the problem.

The other day a woolens man came to see me about this problem. Wool has to a large extent to be imported. So the American manufacturer and worker are squeezed two ways: First, by governmental price fixing aimed to make America pay heavily in dollars for whatever raw materials it imports, and then by sending into this country competing finished goods at a price cheaper than the American manufacturer can charge because of his labor and tax costs.

It is a squeeze play that can only produce wholesale bankruptcies and eventually a lower wage scale in this country. Wages can be lowered in two ways: (1) The wage is actually cut; (2) the value of the dollar is reduced. Either way it means bringing down the standard of living of the American people.

There is still time to fight this, but it can only be done by joint management-labor action with wide public support.

The Kerr Natural-Gas Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT S. KERR
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 4 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two editorials relating to the so-called Kerr natural-gas bill. The first editorial is from the McAlester (Okla.) News-Capital of April 12, 1950, and is entitled "Kerr Bill in the White House," and the other is from the Frederick (Okla.) Leader of April 17, 1950, entitled "Adverse to Oklahoma's Welfare."

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the McAlester (Okla.) News-Capital of April 12, 1950]

KERR BILL IN THE WHITE HOUSE

The natives of the Great Southwest have never been accused of being panty waists when it comes to sticking up for their rights.

We have a pretty good reputation up and down the country for being able to take care of ourselves.

That state of affairs is jeopardized at the moment by shenanigans afoot in connection with President Truman's action on Senator BOB KERR'S amendments to the Natural Gas Act bill.

The legislation—which guarantees a free market price for the natural gas produced in Texas, Oklahoma, Louisiana, and elsewhere—still must have the President's signature before it becomes law.

Seldom has the Nation seen such a cleverly organized propaganda campaign against a bill in Congress. What does the Kerr bill do? It guarantees the producer of natural gas the right to sell his product in free and open competition, at whatever price it will bring.

This is the same freedom the citrus growers in Florida enjoy; the distillers in Senator DOUGLAS' home State of Illinois; the shoe manufacturers in Senator DONNELL'S St. Louis; the dairy people in Wisconsin.

But through some unexplainable reasoning, the have-not States of the populous industrial North and East would like to have a bureau in Washington tell us just how much we can get for natural gas.

Mind you, they wouldn't for the world favor an across-the-board arrangement like that. Suggest for a minute that an FPC (Federal Pizen Commission) tell the distillers in Senator DOUGLAS' home State of Illinois just how much they could charge for all the "hooch" trucked down to dry Oklahoma.

Put the natural resources of all the 48 States in a Federal strait-jacket and listen to the foes of the Kerr bill come out squealing like a pig under a gate.

It's high time Oklahomans took pen in hand or trotted down to the telegraph office to let Harry S. Truman hear both sides in this affair.

It's not Kerr-McGee, Phillips Petroleum Co., or the others, who have pioneered in petroleum development in the Southwest who stand to suffer single-handed by unfair Federal Power Commission regulation.

The folks back North and East have been spoon-fed so much Drew Pearson propaganda they probably believe two or three oil companies own this part of the country, lock, stock, and barrel.

They wouldn't believe it if they saw a grizzled Oklahoma farmer tracking red clay into the lobby of the first national bank to deposit a royalty check.

That would be his one-eighth of the proceeds from sale of natural gas which didn't make a blue flame until it warmed the bottom side of a pot of borsch in an East Side Manhattan flat whose inhabitants still believe everything west of the Alleghenies is wigwams and wildcats.

The little guy is affected by the Kerr bill at this end of the line, too, Mr. President. It deserves your signature.

[From the Frederick (Okla.) Leader of April 17, 1950]

ADVERSE TO OKLAHOMA'S WELFARE

President Truman's veto of the bill sponsored by Senator ROBERT S. KERR to exempt independent natural gas producers from Federal regulation came as a sharp setback to Oklahoma and Texas—major areas supplying the fuel affected. The action leaves with the Federal Power Commission the right to fix rates and make other arbitrary rulings governing natural gas as it flows thrcugh pipe lines in interstate commerce.

Even here in Oklahoma the superb effort of Senator KERR to secure passage of the measure that bears his name, has been grossly misunderstood in some quarters and roundly misquoted in others. It is complimentary to the State's junior Member of the upper House that Senator ELMER THOMAS joined the author in his fight for the bill.

The application of the rule involved is simple. Natural gas, as a heating and industrial fuel, has long been sought after in the North and East. It is produced principally in the Southwest, and has been carried to the more populous industrial centers through vast networks of pipe lines. In this way, producers and owners in this area have been sharing one of the finest fuels ever known to mankind.

Natural gas, as a mineral resource, is one of the chief industrial products of the State of Oklahoma. Aside from the yield of its soil, fuel ranks high in the dollar volume of income, insofar as enriching the economy of the Sooner State is concerned.

Now that it is being shared as a product, and now that the convenience, flexibility and utility of gas have been taken across State lines and into other areas, the Federal Power Commission claims—and has—the right to set its price and to issue other arbitrary orders regulating its flow into commercial channels. It was this adverse status that Senator KERR'S bill sought to correct for Oklahoma, and other major gas-producing States.

Competitively with other fuels, the price of natural gas always has been extremely economical—particularly when the utility of its service is considered. This same competition will continue to govern its price without Federal interference. In the same vein, with regulatory barriers, the development of gas resources may become too risky a venture in capital investment and adverse rulings could choke off the enlargement of sources of supply.

No Federal agency has the power to regulate the prices of cars, implements, refrigerators, radios and other manufactured goods coming out of the industrial North and East. Conversely, it is contrary to the interest and well-being of Oklahoma and her sister gas-producing States to leave with a Federal agency the power to regulate about the only major segment of interstate industry that we have.

Knowing BOB KERR as we do, and with a consciousness of his varied abilities, it is safe to say that the battle in behalf of the independent producers of natural gas is not yet over. And up to now, it is an issue on which the powerful northern and eastern interests have outmaneuvered the people who own and produce natural gas for a great part of the Nation.

The matter deserves more thoughtful attention than the people of Oklahoma have given it. And when it again becomes an issue before Congress it will be a matter that should be given forceful backing in behalf of a measure that is important to this State and its citizens.

Effect of Rent Decontrol in Dallas, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY P. CAIN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 4 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, Dorothea Lyle, housing editor of the Dallas Morning News, has recently written about what has happened in Dallas, Tex., since rents were decontrolled, some 11 months ago. Her report appeared in the Kansas City Star of April 30, 1950 and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, together with a brief article in the same newspaper which points out that rents are lower in Wichita, Kans., since that city was decontrolled. Both Dallas and Wichita are larger cities and the benefits which have come to them from the decontrol of rents can, I believe, be expected in similar American communities if the prevailing Federal rent-control law is permitted to expire on June 30, 1950, as the law provides.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Kansas City Star of April 30, 1950]

DALLAS, TEX., UNDERGOES THE TEST OF DECONTROL OF RENTS—SINCE CITY FIRST TOOK ACTION LAST JUNE, ABOUT 300 COMPLAINTS OF UNFAIR INCREASES WERE RECEIVED FROM ESTIMATED 60,000 TENANT-OCCUPIED UNITS

Interest in rental unit decontrol over the Nation has grown in the last several months. Congress now is faced with a drop of controls June 30. The National Association of Home Builders foresees a compromise on rent-control legislation. Tighe Woods, Housing Expediter, says 8,375,000 rental units occupied by 29,000,000 persons would be subject to intolerable rent rises if controls are dropped. Realtors, home builders, and apartment owners reply "Nonsense." At the present, there is little pressure in Kansas City for decontrol. The city council deferred any action on the subject following a report last October 17 by the city research and budget department, inferring a still critical situation here. One major city—Dallas, Tex.,— has tried decontrol, however. The following is a report of what has happened in Dallas since decontrol, written by Dorothea Lyle, housing editor of the Dallas Morning News:

"DALLAS, TEX., April 29.—Eleven months ago, this city of 500,000 persons was loosed abruptly from 6½ years of Federal rent control. Some 60,000 rental dwelling units went free on the market to command their own prices.

" 'The spotlight of publicity will be on us,' Mayor Wallace H. Savage told a tense crowd one June day last year in the city council chamber. 'If you don't make rent decontrol work here, then people won't get it elsewhere.'

"Seconds before, the eight city councilmen had scrapped rent ceilings in Dallas by unanimous vote. Dallas was the first major city in the Nation to take this action after Congress left decontrol powers in the hands of city governments, subject to State approval.

"What happened to rents of the 60,000 dwellings.

"Mayor Savage maintains firmly that the majority of landlords kept faith with the city council by not raising rents unreasonably, and by not bringing about an unusual number of evictions.

"HEARD ABOUT 300 COMPLAINTS

"Russell Stephens, former Dallas regional housing expediter, whose office administered the rent-control program, says:

" 'After decontrol, our complaints from tenants about high rents totaled about 300. The complaints came by telephone, letters, and personal visits from tenants.

" 'Admittedly, that isn't many. They indicate that general increases for older units run all the way from 5 to 50 percent.'

"The CIO, which bitterly opposed decontrol, claimed that rents for inferior accommodations soared in some cases up to 400 percent.

"That is how organized labor's spokesman, Don Ellinger, president of the Texas CIO council, feels about it:

" 'Only the lack of organization among tenants, especially Negroes, who have been hit hardest, has prevented more effective protest.

" 'The landlords have used freely their unlimited power to evict under Texas law to stifle objections and silence opposition.'

"D. A. Frank, veteran attorney who led the decontrol fight, declared he had contacted literally scores of landlords and found that they had not raised rents unreasonably.

"A LANDLORD PLEDGE

"Frank is chairman-emeritus of the Dallas Apartment House Owners Association, which pledged its 500 members not to raise rents without consulting tenants. The idea was to inform tenants of raises necessary for repairs and proper maintenance of rental property.

" 'If I had been chairman of the renters instead of the other side,' said Frank, 'I would have to say in all fairness that I am more than delighted with the way decontrol is working out.'

"The Bureau of Labor Statistics sampled rents in 800 units 6 months after decontrol and came up with the statement that rents had gone up an average of 35.4 percent. The BLS index was much higher than a newspaper spot check on selected blocks. It showed an average 11 percent over-all increase.

"The majority of increases, said BLS, came in $30-and-under apartments. Seventy-five percent of these units went up an average of $10.95 a month, or 55 percent.

"In the $30 to $49.99 range, BLS said, 59 percent of the units were raised an average of $14.09 a month, or 36 percent. Increases of $17.14, or 26 percent, affected 66 percent of the units in the $50-and-over group.

"In the 6 weeks after rent curbs went off, Dallas justice of the peace courts booked 301 eviction suits. Three of the courts said their filings were normal. The fourth reported filings had doubled.

"Mayor Savage, pointing to the figures, declared 'that the 300 evictions, when compared to the 60,000 units freed from controls, doesn't sound like any mass wave of evictions.'

"PENALTY IN 'WILLFUL' CASES

"When the city council took off controls, Savage recalled an old World War I anti-profiteering ordinance which he said would be used to prosecute willful violators who raised rents excessively. Maximum penalty was a $200 fine. He named a three-man rent committee to keep an eye on the situation.

"Organized labor complained bitterly because the committee had only landlord representatives on it. CIO and A. F. of L. leaders formed a tenants rent committee and advertised through newspapers for tenants to bring their complaints to the tenants committee.

"Two weeks later, the first list of 54 complaints went to Mayor Savage with the request he investigate the situation. These were some of the examples quoted by tenants:

"Rent on a two-bedroom apartment jumped from $46.50 to $95 a month; a three-room duplex went from $35 to $45; a four-room partly furnished apartment from $55 to $80; a one-bedroom apartment from $46.50 to $59.50; a three-room unfurnished apartment in an old part of town from $25.20 to $65.

"Highest raise on the list was for a three-room apartment which jumped from $52 to $123 a month. The smallest was a 45-cent-a-month raise on an unfurnished, one-bedroom apartment that had rented for $69.55.

"The tenants committee list said an eviction suit was filed against one tenant who had four children, the youngest 8 weeks old. Another was filed against a blind Negro.

"CHECK OF COMPLAINTS

"Savage turned the list over to Frank's landlord committee that had agreed to bring about decontrol in an orderly manner. This was the result of their investigation in the 54 complaints:

"In 24 cases, the raises were obviously reasonable. Nineteen failed to list either the tenant's or the landlord's name, and it was impossible to get both sides of the story.

"Four apartments, raised from $25.20 to $65, were owned by a woman who had moved from Florida to Dallas, and who 'probably was used to very high rentals.' The committee said three of her apartments stood vacant.

"The biggest raise (from $52 to $123) was 'a mere gesture by a man who sold his apartment house 1 month after decontrol,' the investigators said. They reported no complaints about the new landlord. In many cases, the tenants had moved to other buildings and some had bought new houses.

"The committee recommended action in one case, that of an aged widow whose rent went from $41.20 to $60 for a run-down, three-room-and-bath apartment. The report suggested that the mayor's committee contact the landlord and persuade him to ease up on the rent. But the tenant reports today she still is paying $60.

"On the brighter side, hundreds of landlords dug into their pockets and started repainting and redecorating apartments that had had little maintenance since rent controls were first begun. C. A. Farrell, building inspector, said in July and August, his office set new records for building-repair permits issued.

"Also, newer apartments that were not under rent control have begun to seek a lower level. Owners of five large projects have dropped rents substantially, some as much as $10 a month. One builder lowered rents twice, so that new one-bedroom apartments which were renting unfurnished for $85 now are on the market for $67.50."

RENTS DOWN IN WICHITA—CHAMBER THERE REPORTS DECLINE SINCE DECONTROL

WICHITA, April 29.—Rents are lower since decontrol in this Midwest city of 215,000 (metropolitan area), the Wichita Chamber of Commerce says.

In its weekly Wichita Magazine, the chamber of commerce said its own recent survey shows that one-bedroom apartments ceilinged at $54 a month under rent control now rent for $47 to $49 a month.

Two-bedroom units at a $70-a-month ceiling now rent for $62.50 and $65 a month, it added.

Congratulations to the St. Louis Star-Times

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK M. KARSTEN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1950

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Speaker, I have just received the announcement of the decision of the University of Missouri to present to the St. Louis Star-Times its honor award for distinguished service in journalism.

In selecting the Star-Times for its highest journalistic award to an American newspaper, I believe the University of Missouri, long noted for the excellence of its school of journalism, is paying a deserved tribute to an institution that exemplifies the best traditions of the independent and free American press.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the text of the citation to be presented to Elzey Roberts, publisher of the Star-Times, for his newspaper at special ceremonies climaxing Journalism Week at Columbia, Mo., Friday afternoon, May 5:

The citation reads:

To the St. Louis Star-Times in recognition of its editorial incisiveness, independence, and thoughtfulness; its alert news service, intelligently designed to serve the people of its city and region; and its outstanding record of enterprise in the production of a modern newspaper.

In announcing the award, Dean Frank Luther Mott pointed out that it is based upon records of performance over many years.

I wish also to congratulate the four individuals chosen for special honors and the Nieuwe Rotterdamse Courant, chosen as the foreign newspaper to receive a similar honor.

The individual awards will be received by Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby, executive vice president of the Houston Post; Joe Alex Morris, former editor of Collier's and now a contributor to the Saturday Evening Post; Arthur Hays Sulzberger, publisher of the New York Times; and James Todd, publisher of the Moberly (Mo.) Monitor-Index.

Abrogation of American Treaty Rights in Morocco, and Morocco's Embargo on United States Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRVING M. IVES
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 4 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of a statement of recent date by the committee on foreign commerce of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York concerning the abrogation of American treaty rights in Morocco, and also the text of a press release of the Textile Export Association of the United States, dated March 30, 1950, concerning the approval by the United States Department of State of Morocco's embargo on many United States products.

There being no objection, the statement and press release were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ABROGATION OF AMERICAN TREATY RIGHTS IN MOROCCO

NEW YORK, *January 25, 1950.*

To the Chamber of Commerce:

The Committee on Foreign Commerce offers the following:

Assent by the United States Department of State to a French decree establishing embargoes and restrictions on the importation of American goods to Morocco, in contravention of long-standing treaty rights and privileges, presents a grave threat to the future of American foreign commerce and business enterprise on which so large a part of the well-being of our Nation, and the world, depends.

THE BACKGROUND OF THE CASE

Since 1836 the United States has had a treaty with Morocco according Americans trading privileges equal to those of any other Christian nation.

The principles of this treaty were reaffirmed in 1880 and 1906, when France and Spain also became signatories to the pacts of Madrid and Algeciras. All the terms of the 1836 treaty were recognized by the signatories in 1906.

In 1912, France, under the terms of an agreement with the Sultan, assumed a protectorate over Morocco, and undertook to provide certain administrative services and to exercise certain of the Sultan's powers. Almost immediately thereafter, France began to press the United States to recognize the protectorate and also to give up American treaty privileges in Morocco, which had been granted in 1836, and reaffirmed in 1880 and 1906.

The United States recognized the French protectorate of Morocco in 1917. However, it is plain from the various communications of American Secretaries of State that recognition of the French protectorate did not abrogate, in any sense, the various interests and rights accorded to Americans by the treaties of 1836, 1880, and 1906. In the subsequent years, and particularly in the post World War II period, a small group of American businessmen settled in Morocco to engage in a thriving, useful, and profitable trade between the United States and that country.

At the outbreak of the war, in 1939, certain exchange restrictions were imposed in Morocco. The United States protested these until 1944, when under the pressure of the war emergency, and primarily to discourage the possibility of any flow of funds between Allied and Axis territories, we consented to their imposition. They are still in effect.

On March 20, 1948, however, a decree of the French protectorate of Morocco provided that all goods, including American goods, could enter Morocco freely, under the terms of the historic treaties, where there was no requirement for the allocation of official exchange by the government.

The United States maintained, and Morocco agreed, that these restrictions could not prevent imports by United States citizens when no government foreign exchange was required.

This partial lifting of trade restrictions was short lived, however. On December 30, 1948, a decree was issued by the French protectorate which embargoed most United States products and restricted those not under embargo. There is no doubt that the purpose of the decree was to free from American competition those French cartels and other interests which seeks to extend an economic monopoly over several lines of trade in Morocco.

At that time the American State Department protested the decree, and our protest was fruitful in that, in May 1949, the onerous restrictions were lifted.

Almost immediately, however, the restrictions were reimposed, and this time the United States Department of State accepted the restrictions for a 3-month period. Subsequently, the temporary acceptance was extended four times. Finally, on December 31, 1949, our Department of State accepted, for an indefinite period, the restrictions imposed by the French protectorate.

A public hearing, of sorts, was held by the State Department on September 27, 1949, for the announced purpose of determining whether to accept or reject the decree. Although grievances of American businessmen in Morocco were presented at the hearing, they were ruled to be outside the scope of the subject under discussion, and these complaints have received no official action on the part of the State Department.

It is interesting to observe that Morocco's dollar position actually improved during the period of relaxed restrictions and free competition, while there was a deterioration in 1949 when the new embargoes were enforced. The Department of State had claimed that the restrictions to which it finally assented would improve Morocco's dollar balance.

An examination of the list of products under embargo and of those that may enter Morocco freely indicates that reasons other than those of economic necessity prompted the choices.

As a result, some 40 Americans, many of them veterans of World War II, who have settled in Morocco to engage in trade with the United States, find that they are being denied the protection of the treaty between the two Nations, which is still in effect, and they are being forced to quit business and come home while their French competitors remain to take over the field.

It is particularly irksome to these American businessmen, inasmuch as France, which is thus acquiring an economic monopoly in Morocco, is receiving considerable aid from the United States under the Marshall plan.

THE BROADER ISSUE

But the issue goes far beyond what may happen to twoscore American businessmen in Morocco.

It goes right to the matter of the sanctity of treaties, and to the constitutional requirement that any change in existing treaties between the United States and a foreign nation is a matter requiring action by the United States Senate.

In that sense, what is happening to the American treaty with Morocco has a meaning that could profoundly alter our foreign commerce, programs for investment abroad, and the whole scope of our international relations and commitments. For if American businessmen have reason to believe that our treaties can be abrogated by a foreign nation without any effective protest, and even with the acquiescence of our State Department, then an insuperable obstacle will be placed in the way of our foreign commerce and of our developing programs for increased investment abroad.

And profoundly disturbing is the suggestion that the State Department, without the consent of the Senate, can alter fundamentally our treaty relations with foreign powers.

FIRM ACTION NEEDED

In this situation we urge the State Department to recall its acceptance of December 31, 1949, of the restrictions imposed by the French protectorate of Morocco; and to proceed without delay to enforce the rights of American businessmen in Morocco, as guaranteed by the terms of the treaties that exist between the two countries.

We urge, further, that the Committee on Foreign Commerce of the United States Senate undertake an investigation of this infringement both of the rights of American businessmen in Morocco, and of the constitutional prerogatives of the Senate. Safeguards must be provided to prevent a repetition of this kind of situation which seriously damages the influence and prestige of the United States, and impedes greatly progress toward the goal of a better world through economic development and freer trade between nations.

Respectfully submitted.

SAUL F. DRIBBEN, *Chairman,*
WILLIAM H. BALDWIN,
VICTOR BOWMAN,
DAVID M. KEISER,
FERGUS F. WALLACE,
Of the Committee on Foreign Commerce.

TEXTILE EXPORT ASSOCIATION
OF THE UNITED STATES,
New York, N. Y., March 27, 1950.

The Textile Export Association of the United States has complained to the Secretary of State against the Department's approval of Morocco's embargo on many United States products, including textiles, according to Mr. John H. Judge, president of the association. Mr. Judge said that the association has questioned the exclusion of United States goods from Morocco and the State Department's abrogation of an existing treaty which assured an open door to our trade there. He added that they have not actively protested heretofore because the Secretary of State has insisted that the measures were necessary to conserve Moroccan dollars.

Mr. Judge points out, however, that since the embargo began United States total exports to Morocco have increased 33 percent and that on January 1, 1950, Morocco freed imports, including cigars of all categories, cigarettes, soft-drink ingredients, and radio sets while still banning more essential United States products, among them textiles. These facts, he asserts, indicate that the embargo is for some other reason than economic necessity.

(American traders in Morocco have repeatedly maintained that the embargo affects goods formerly sold in free competition by independent Americans, while most of the free list consists of products which French concerns control by exclusive agencies or otherwise.)

Mr. Judge said that in 1948 when free competition prevailed in Morocco, the United States sold over $3,000,000 worth of cotton goods to that country and that sales were $600,000 in the month of January 1949 but became negligible thereafter when the embargo was applied. The potential market is estimated at more than 6,000,000 yards. Much of this business, which formerly went to the United States, has been given to Poland and Czechoslovakia whose bilateral trade agreements with France are observed while our treaties, of longer standing, are set aside.

Smear Attack on Alfred Kohlberg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 4, 1950

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, the smear attack against one of my constituents, Alfred Kohlberg, by fanatical friends of the State Department needs exposing. Kohlberg is a private citizen concerned over the security of our Nation.

There is only one issue in the current charges against our foreign-policy advisers. That issue is: Is there a danger to American security from enemies within our Government?

The State Department has taken the curious position that its duty is to defend itself instead of ridding itself of Communists. Never mind the grave danger to the Nation if only our officeholders can rid themselves of bothersome criticism.

So they smear attack Senator McCARTHY. Just so they have systematically attacked those private citizens who have tried for years to bring light into the dark places in our State Department. I refer especially to the rash of carefully timed attacks in the press on one of my constituents, Alfred Kohlberg, and on the American China Policy Association.

THE AMERICAN CHINA POLICY ASSOCIATION

The American China Policy Association is a private organization which has for years been warning the American people of Communist sabotage of our

foreign policy. Its directors are responsible citizens whose names and connections I shall list at the end of this statement. Its president, William Loeb, is the son of the secretary of President Theodore Roosevelt.

The program of the association is support of the open-door policy in China. The open-door policy was announced by Secretary of State John Hay in 1899. It said that the United States was opposed to the conquest of China by any foreign power, even if China was as weak internally as it then was, just before the Boxer Rebellion. Our open-door policy made possible the establishment of the Republic of China under Sun Yat Sen.

The open-door policy is merely the extension to Asia of the Monroe Doctrine, enunciated by President Monroe in 1823. Then Russia was trying to seize our Pacific coast along what is now Washington and Oregon. The Monroe Doctrine says that the United States is opposed to the conquest of any nation, especially a weak one, by rapacious stronger powers. The Communists and their dupes in our foreign-policy making have sold us a new foreign policy. Our old and great policy has not failed. It had succeeded too well. It stood as our promise to the people of Asia that we would not tolerate any new imperialism in the twentieth century.

John B. Powell and Alfred Kohlberg were the founders of the American China Policy Association. Their offense consisted of their firm belief in the American policy of justice to undeveloped nations threatened by the Great Powers. For that they were secretly denounced by those who wanted to sell out our country, and buried China on the wormeaten timbers of the united front in place of the sturdy beams of the open door.

MR. KOHLBERG AND THE INSTITUTE OF PACIFIC RELATIONS

Mr. Kohlberg is accused of having waged an unsuccessful fight against the Institute of Pacific Relations. It is true that the open meeting of the Institute voted down his demand or investigation—after the Institute staff had refused to let Mr. Kohlberg send his information to the members. But why did the Institute board suddenly clean house, right after Mr. Kohlberg's charges were voted down? Why did E. C. Carter leave the Institute? Why did they fire Frederick Vanderbilt Field? Why did the Institute show a marked, though not complete, change of policy away from paralleling the Communist line just after Mr. Kohlberg's charges were "disproved"?

Mr. Kohlberg's critics complain that the Institute is highly respectable. It has a distinguished board of directors, and a well-established reputation for scholarly work. But where would the Communists want to put their hidden propaganda? In the columns of the Daily Worker? Where would they find anything better than a scholarly, sedate, technical journal which had previously been devoted to fact-finding, and which could be quoted by Communist writers for years before the public would know it had been pentrated?

Mr. Kohlberg is charged with criticizing the Institute's acceptance of funds from Frederick Vanderbilt Field and from Communist fronts, whereas they really got most of their money from the Rockefeller and Carnegie Foundations. But what, may we ask, was the bias of the Carnegie Foundation when they were under the direction of Alger Hiss or the board members who picked Alger Hiss for their director? And why have both Carnegie and Rockefeller Foundations now canceled their subscriptions?

Senator MCCARTHY is accused of having parroted the charges of Mr. Kohlberg. Apart from the smear word, is there any good reason why Senator MCCARTHY should not want to see such charges aired?

Mr. Kohlberg is also accused of having started the journal Plain Talk. For years it has been one of the very few publications in this country in which it was possible to tell such truths about the danger to American internal security. Their first issue described how the Justice Department muffed the prosecution of Communist stooges in the Amerasia case. The recent article on the strikes in Hawaii shows Communist dress rehearsals in the capture of an island—like Manhattan for instance.

SIX LONG YEARS

Mr. Kohlberg is accused of having made his charges as early as 1944. That, Mr. Speaker, is the most shocking thing of all. Six years ago, Mr. Kohlberg was spending his own time and money trying to warn American officials. He warned of the existence of cells of the NKVD or the Russian General Staff within our policy-making Government agencies. Was there something wrong with Mr. Kohlberg because he kept on fighting treason? But what shall we say, Mr. Speaker, of the State Department and the Presidential advisers who for 6 years could not hear the charges? They did not think they were important. They saw it as their duty to protect officeholders like Hiss rather than to protect our country.

His critics say Mr. Kohlberg's charges were not believed by a succession of Secretaries of State. But have we ever in our history had so fantastic a collection of Secretaries of State? Mr. Hull, who had the confidence of the country, was bypassed for Sumner Welles, about whom we shall say no more. Harry Hopkins was virtually Secretary of State in wartime. Secretary Byrnes was summarily removed when he began to see through the veil and questioned some of the information his assistants gave him. General Marshall was a prisoner of the Communist cell in the Department who knew exactly how to feed him the right information and keep any doubters far from him. Acheson has been Under Secretary or Secretary almost continuously since 1941. His regime coincides almost exactly with the most shameful humiliation and the most disastrous retreat in all American history. It would seem that a man might be honored to disagree with such a succession of Secretaries of State.

WHO IS PLANNING THIS CAMPAIGN?

The attacks on Senator MCCARTHY and Mr. Kohlberg are obviously well-organized and well-planned. All the charges and twisted lines of reasoning have been neatly assembled by someone for distribution to those who will help to fool the public.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, whether by chance any of the paid employees of Government, the so-called public information specialists, have been helpful in disseminating any of this smear material. We know that Government employees in high place, who are accused of collusion with a foreign power have the services of Government lawyers and publicists, while private citizens, patriotically working for their country's safety, have to pay the cost of their investigations out of their own pockets.

Minor Government underlings, charged with petty theft, are immediately suspended. They do not have high-paid Government lawyers working for them, and publicity men trying to win a favorable popular verdict.

THE INDIVIDUAL AGAINST THE GOVERNMENT

There was a time in this country when an individual could disagree with a Government official as man to man. Today our administration officials have their retinues of lawyers, economists, public-relations experts, and the rest, clustered about them like the court followers of a petty noble. A plain citizen cannot disagree with the Government without hiring a lawyer and three publicity men to protect him.

It is time we restored the balance in this country between plain citizens and officials who are supposed to serve them. It is time we gave the advantage to the plain citizens—including Senators—who must pay for their own investigating and hire their own lawyers, and took away the advantages of accused public officials and advisers, who have a corps of lawyers and public-relations experts paid for at public expense.

It is Mr. Kohlberg who is the true public servant, not his detractors. We cannot in a free country permit such men to be smeared by the clever propagandists of the executive power. Congress is the defender of the plain citizens of the Nation, against executive arrogance. We must make it clear beyond any misunderstanding that any executive department which comes to the aid of men accused of near treason can expect no part of the public funds.

DIRECTORS, AMERICAN CHINA POLICY ASSOCIATION, INC.

Alfred Kohlberg, New York City, 34 years business in China, New York City, chairman.

Marguerite Atterbury, of San Diego, Calif., former missionary in China.

Dr. Alexander Baird, professor at Bradley University, Peoria, Ill.

John Earl Baker, former director of Burma Road, Mill Valley, Calif.

Maj. Gen. David P. Barrows, president emeritus, University of California, Berkeley, Calif.

William E. Bohn, editor, New Leader, New York City.

Rt. Rev. John P. Boland, Buffalo, N. Y.
Edna Lee Booker, author, long-time resident of China, New York City.
Dr. Karl Brandt, professor of agriculture, Stanford University, California.
William Henry Chamberlin, author, historian, Russian and Far East correspondent, Christian Science Monitor, Boston.
Bishop Frederick Pierce Corson, Methodist Church, Philadelphia, Pa.
George Creel, director, United States Government Information Bureau under President Wilson, San Francisco, Calif.
Frank R. Crosswaith, labor leader, New York City.
Dr. Benedict J. Duffy, Jr., former marine medical officer, Pacific and China theaters, New York City.
Hon. George H. Earle, former Governor of Pennsylvania.
Christopher T. Emmet, Jr., author, New York City.
Rev. James W. Fifield, Jr., pastor, First Congregational Church, Los Angeles, Calif.
Geraldine Fitch, YWCA leader in China, New York City.
Varian Fry, labor author, New York City.
Sidney Hook, professor of philosophy, New York University.
Rev. J. C. Jensen, Lois Butler Jensen, former missionaries in China, South New Berlin, N. Y.
Rear Admiral I. C. Johnson, retired, Laguna Beach, Calif.
Representative J. LEROY JOHNSON, of California.
William R. Johnson, former missionary in China, Polo, Ill.
Representative WALTER H. JUDD, of Minnesota.
Alexander Kahn, editor, Jewish Forward, New York City.
Rev. William C. Kernan, Episcopal Church of Scarsdale, N. Y.
Lucian S. Kirtland, former correspondent in China, Bronxville, N. Y.
Irene Kuhn, former correspondent in China, New York City.
Isaac Don Levine, editor of Plain Talk, New York City.
William Loeb, publisher, Manchester, N. H.
Edna Lonigan, author, Washington, D. C.
Rev. Daniel A. Lord, S. J., St. Louis, Mo.
Clare Boothe Luce, former congresswoman, Connecticut.
Dr. Frank L. Meleney, Columbia University, School of Medicine, New York City.
Emma DeLong Mills, executive director, American Bureau Medical Aid to China, New York City.
Mrs. Victor Morawetz, philanthropist, New York City.
Hon. James R. Nolen, judge, Ware, Mass.
Rev. Ronald Norris, C. P., director, Institute of Chinese Culture, Washington, D. C.
Liston M. Oak, editor, New York City.
John O'Connor, author, Jersey City, N. J.
F. Gordon O'Neill, editor, San Francisco, Calif.
John S. Potter, author, resident of China.
Dr. Roscoe Pound, dean emeritus, Harvard Law School, Los Angeles, Calif., now visiting dean, Law School, UCLA.
A. Philip Randolph, labor leader, New York City.
Dr. Leland Rex Robinson, economist, New York City.
Dean William F. Russell, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City.
Mrs. Joseph Schumpter, economist, New Haven, Conn.
Dr. Aura Severinghaus, vice dean, Columbia University School of Medicine, New York City.
Margaret Proctor Smith, author, Louisville, Ky.
William H. Smyth, businessman, New York City.
Benjamin Stolber, author, New York City.
Dr. Fred J. Tooker, former missionary doctor in China.
Ashley L. Totten, labor leader, New York City.
Freda Utley, author, Washington, D. C.
Dr. Donald D. Van Slyke, former president, American Bureau Medical Aid to China, New York City.
Louis Waldman, attorney, New York City.
Dr. Jerome P. Webster, professor of surgery, Columbia University School of Medicine, New York City.
Dr. Maurice William, author, authority on Sun Yet-sen, New York City.
Michael Williams, former editor of America.
Rev. Charles Ernest Scott, of Philadelphia, retired missionary.

Arming of Arab Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 4, 1950

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, in the light of the continuing reports that Great Britain is supplying arms to the Arab nations, the following news story, published in the New York Herald Tribune of Wednesday, May 3, 1950, is of particular interest:

UNITED STATES WILL REFUSE ISRAEL'S PLEA TO PURCHASE ARMS—STATE AND DEFENSE DEPARTMENTS HELD AGREED THAT ARABS ARE NOT PLANNING A WAR

(By Homer Bigart)

WASHINGTON, May 2.—The State and Defense Departments have come to the conclusion that Israel is in no immediate danger of aggression from the Arab states and that the Israeli request for assistance in purchase of modern arms should not be granted at this time.

This decision will not be revealed publicly. Instead, the State Department will continue to say that the request by Israel for the granting of export licenses for up-to-date weapons is still "under consideration."

At the same time, the Defense Establishment is defending the action of Great Britain in sending modern tanks, jet-propelled military planes, and other equipment to Egypt. The Pentagon view is that the flow of arms from Britain to the Arab states is "in the strategic interest of the United States." This view, it was learned today, has considerable support in the State Department.

The Pentagon argument is that renewal of Arab-Jewish warfare is unlikely now. It is stressed that this prediction is based on the Defense Establishment's own intelligence sources and not on British intelligence. The Pentagon also insists that United Nations observers in Palestine are reporting that neither the Arabs nor the Israelis are in position to renew fighting and that there has recently been a lessening of tension.

The military feels that Israel is stronger than any combination of Arab states and is perfectly able to defend itself with the arms in its possession. Moreover, the Pentagon says it is not fully informed on the total military strength of Israel because of reluctance on the part of Israel to divulge figures.

Claims that Israel enjoys military superiority over the Arab states were labeled "absolutely fantastic" this afternoon by a spokesman of the Israeli Embassy.

"The records show," he said, "that the Arabs have been getting modern equipment during the last few months and that they are in a far better position militarily than they were when hostilities began in May 1948."

He said no request for details on present Israeli military strength had ever been made officially of the embassy here.

Roberto Rossellini—Correspondence Between Senator Johnson of Colorado and Gustavo Garzia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 4 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an exchange of letters between Gustavo Garzia, of Italy, and myself, which may have some possible interest.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROME, *March 29, 1950.*

Senator EDWIN JOHNSON,
United States Senate,
Washington.

MR. SENATOR: He who writes to you is a Partisan officer, tortured by the German SS of Via Tasso, whence he escaped. A reward of 1,500,000 lire was offered for his capture and he was condemned to death in absentia, by a Nazi tribunal. Therefore, he has the right to write to you * * *.

Not an hour ago I read in the journal, Paese Sera No. 75 of March 29, 1950, your false words to the detriment of an honest and honorable man of the Italian cinematography * * *. Everybody in Italy knows Rossellini, his hard life of work and his moral uprightness, which distinguishes him from you, and he is appreciated and esteemed by all gentlemen, by honest people.

* * * I have known Roberto Rossellini for many years, his honest life as a worker, his moral rectitude (which you lack); his

pure and calm life is an example, a spur to many.

I am a journalist and live by my work. I have no interest in defending Roberto Rossellini. I defend him as a Partisan officer, because I know I am right and you are wrong * * *.

I await your reply:

GUSTAVO GARZIA,
Partisan Officer, Viale della Pineta 96, Lido di Roma, Italy.

MAY 3, 1950.

Senor GUSTAVO GARZIA,
Partisan Officer,
Viale della Pineta 96,
Lido di Roma, Italy.

DEAR SENOR GARZIA: You have indeed had a tragic war experience. I rejoice that you escaped from your Nazi persecutors, and I rejoice, too, that you had the courage and patriotism to undergo these terrible hardships for your beloved Italy. For inviting these dangers and making these sacrifices you have won my great respect and admiration.

While you, in constant danger of losing your life, were waging this almost hopeless underground battle against great odds, another of your countrymen was enoying the comforts and political security available to those who collaborated with the enemy. Roberto Rossellini joined the Fascists in 1942 and became a close friend of the Nazi gangster who directed the Nazi operations in Italy. Rossellini's mistress was a German actress named Roswitha Schmidt, with whom he lived as late as January 1948.

Roberto Rossellini has been incarcerated in a mental institution in Naples at least twice. Furthermore, he was investigated respecting narcotics in New York City on January 17, 1949. Early in that same year he transported another of his women across State lines in the United States. In this country it is a violation of the Mann Act, commonly known as the "White Slave" Act, to transport a woman or cause her to be transported across State lines for immoral purposes. The punishment for this crime is a long penitentiary sentence.

I shall be glad to furnish you further information about Roberto Rossellini should you desire it. However, if this promiscuous male is your ideal, then any further exchange of notes would be a waste of time.

Sincerely,

EDWIN C. JOHNSON,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Production of Secret State Department Papers for Examination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 4 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I attempted earlier in the day to have placed in the RECORD an article by Bert Andrews in the New York Herald Tribune of today entitled "State Department To Let Service See Secret Papers Senate Couldn't." This is a most interesting article. I would have liked to read it into the RECORD at this point, but in view of the fact that it is somewhat late, I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE DEPARTMENT TO LET SERVICE SEE SECRET PAPERS SENATE COULDN'T—WILL DECLASSIFY SOME DOCUMENTS TO HELP HIM PREPARE DEFENSE FOR DELAYED LOYALTY HEARING

(By Bert Andrews)

WASHINGTON, May 3.—The State Department is declassifying certain restricted and confidential documents to make them available to counsel preparing the defense of John Stewart Service, who will soon appear before a Department loyalty board.

This is being done despite the fact that the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee, although authorized by unanimous Senate action to subpena the files in the Service and other cases, has been denied access to any and all information about the cases.

These facts were learned today from senatorial sources and were confirmed by Charles E. Rhetts, of counsel for Mr. Service.

Mr. Rhetts commented on a story in today's New York Herald Tribune which pointed out that the State Department hearing in the Service case had been postponed indefinitely at the request of Mr. Service's counsel, although Mr. Service returned to the United States from the Far East 5 weeks ago yesterday. Mr. Rhetts assured this reporter there was nothing mysterious in asking the delay.

Mr. Rhetts said he had advised Mr. Service to prepare as complete documentation and as comprehensive a statement as possible "so that these charges can be cleared up once and for all." He said this necessitated the gathering of documents from many places and about many things.

One of the things included the Amerasia case of 1945. Mr. Service was one of six arrested on charges of conspiring to violate the Federal espionage statutes through the theft of highly confidential documents. He was not indicted and was reinstated "for important work in connection with far-eastern affairs."

Mr. Rhetts said that some of the delay in gathering documentation resulted from slowness within the State Department. He explained that some State Department documents needed by Mr. Service's counsel had to be declassified by the Department. This is a term used to describe the process by which high State Department officials, presumably after close scrutiny, cross out designations ranging from top secret down to confidential so they can be circulated freely without violating security rules.

Mr. Rhetts was not sure just when the State Department hearing of Mr. Service would be held. The case will be considered first by a panel of three State Department employees. It will then be subject to review by the Loyalty Review Board of the Civil Service Commission, which is the top board.

FBI FILES NOT INCLUDED

Mr. Rhetts did not describe just what documents were being received from the State Department. It was clear, however, that they were not the loyalty or personnel files, which are gathered by the FBI and other investigating agencies. Presumably they were copies of reports sent in by Mr. Service and about him by diplomats under whom he has served. However, the blanket rejection of the Senate subpena prevented the Senate subcommittee from gaining access to even that kind of information about any of the cases.

Senator JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY, Republican, of Wisconsin, said he had heard that Mr. Service's attorney was being supplied with documents from the State Department.

"I think it is a pretty shocking thing," he said, "considering the fact that the State Department, by President Truman's order, refuses to let the Senate Investigating Committee see anything in the files. It is additional evidence of what President Truman meant when he said on February 23 that he would cooperate in every way possible to disprove 'false charges.' It is clear the Truman administration is not interested in trying to get at the truth."

Senator BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, Republican, of Iowa, echoed Senator MCCARTHY's statement. "It is absolutely appalling," he said, "to think that documents are being declassified to aid Mr. Service when the Senate subcommittee can't even find out whether there are any documents in the files which might prove the truth of Senator MCCARTHY's charges. I am going to ask the committee to investigate."

Tension in the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 4, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, public opinion in this country is growing more restless by the day over the situation in the Middle East which continues to remain tense because of the shipment of arms to the Arab states by Great Britain, while arms are being refused to the State of Israel. The United States Government has had under consideration for the past several months a request from Israel to purchase certain arms in this country for purposes of security in the event of an Arab attack, but to this day no decision has been reached. By such action, which is actually procrastination, our State Department is condoning the action of Britain in supplying arms to the Arab states and keeping the Middle East in a constant state of turmoil.

I believe that all of my colleagues will be interested in reading a brief editorial, The Arabs and Israel, which appeared in one of the leading newspapers in this country the New York World-Telegram and Sun, on Wednesday, May 3, 1950. It is as follows:

THE ARABS AND ISRAEL

Britain's full recognition of the State of Israel and of the union between the kingdom of Jordan and those parts of Arab Palestine under Jordan control should relieve some of the tensions in the troubled Middle East.

But the British policy of furnishing arms to the Arab states, while they remain in a technical state of war with Israel, is subject to serious question.

Specifically, Winston Churchill has asked the Labor government whether it feels that 110 jet planes allegedly sold to Egypt are being acquired by that country solely for defense purposes.

The United States Government is concerned in this situation, both because we are furnishing arms to Britain and because Israel has asked for licenses to purchase arms in this country. Until now these licenses have not been granted.

Spokesmen for the Israeli Government say they would prefer to spend their money for tractors and other peacetime equipment. But, they add, if Egypt, Jordan, Iraq, and Syria are permitted to buy arms from Britain, Israel should be allowed to obtain similar equipment here. Under the stated circum-

stances, we do not see how our Government can deny Israel licenses to do so.

It would be even better, of course, if the United States and Britain would try to convince the Arab States that they should use their money for the economic improvement of their respective territories.

Since all of these Governments are looking to us for assistance under the projected point 4 program, we should be in a position to give them some advice.

What Price an Expanding Economy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 4 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, agreeable to the permission granted me by the Senate, I am inserting in the RECORD herewith a stenotypist's report of an extemporaneous address which I delivered before the national meeting of the American Retail Federation, which was held in the Shoreham Hotel on April 4 of this year. This address was my contribution to a panel discussing "What Price an Expanding Economy?" in which the preceding speaker was the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. JONES. The next speaker on our program this morning is a man who has been known to me for many years, a man who has already, I think, made a very definite place for himself and his State in the Senate of the United States.

Senator KARL E. MUNDT was born 49 years ago in Humboldt, S. Dak. He was graduated from Carleton College, Northfield, Minn., and from Columbia University in New York.

He has been a school teacher, a superintendent of schools. He has taught in the speech department of teachers' colleges in the State of South Dakota where he made a great reputation.

He was elected to Congress, first to the House of Representatives in 1938, and served in that capacity for 10 years, being elected to the Senate for the full 6-year term in 1948.

Senator MUNDT is one of the best known conservationists in this country. He has been national vice president of Izaak Walton League and a member of the executive board of that group.

He has been widely read as editorial writer for Outdoor America.

He has pioneered in Congress for some years for pollution-control legislation.

He was district governor of Kiwanis International in the Minnesota district of Kiwanis and he served as chairman of international committees of Kiwanis for some time.

His hobbies are many: Hunting, fishing, as you might know, writing and travel, and he is a polished and finished public speaker.

He has served on the following committees of the House of Representatives: Education, Irrigation and Reclamation, Indian Affairs, Foreign Affairs, the House Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities, of which he was acting chairman during the Alger Hiss espionage hearings resulting in the discovery of the so-called pumpkin papers. He is now a member of the Senate Committee on Executive Expenditures and the Rules Committee of the Senate.

The articles by Mr. MUNDT have had wide distribution in many types of publications.

In 1945 he made an extensive trip to 20 countries of Europe and spent some time in Russia studying the situation there.

Mr. MUNDT has made many trips to Europe which have broadened his outlook until today I am sure that you will find him a polished and a well-rounded public servant in the Senate of the United States.

I value him as an old friend of mine and my family, and it is with particular pride that I introduce to you today Senator KARL E. MUNDT, of South Dakota. [Applause.]

Senator MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, Rolly, thank you for that friendly introduction.

Rolly and I stop to talk and pat each other on the back every opportunity we get, and I am certainly not going to be derelict by failing to state that I recognize Rolly as one of the great advocates of free enterprise and one of the splendid constructive representatives of business here in the city of Washington.

He has been here a long time, and he came to the position of business representative, which is the $4 word that we call lobbyist down in Washington—he came to that position honestly by running a private enterprise of his own up in the city of Gettysburg, S. Dak., a drug store which still exists, which still operates in the black, and which demonstrates that he knows how to keep a balanced budget insofar as his personal business affairs are concerned.

I always enjoy the opportunity of addressing a group of businessmen because I am one of those who believe that the future of this country depends primarily upon what businessmen such as you do, or fail to do, within the next 5 years.

I don't think we have forever in which to solve our problems, and I don't believe that we are going to get the problems solved through the machinations of politicians like me operating down here on the wrong side of the Potomac River.

I think you can pick up any daily balance of the United States Treasury and recognize that until and unless folks like you do something somehow different from what folks like you have been doing in the past 5 years, until you do something different in the next 5 years I am afraid that we too are going to suffer this socialization of enterprise and this nationalization of industry which has come to plague and perplex most of the rest of the civilized world. You are visiting in a community which, as you know, is comprised of very, very important people. Everybody in Washington is either a mighty important person or else thinks he is, and it amounts to about the same thing. [Laughter.]

You can hop in a taxicab, to come up and visit us on the Hill, and ask the taxicab driver any kind of profound question, and he will give you a ready answer before he gets you up to the Capitol.

Our Washington cab drivers are authorities on every conceivable subject, and they speak with great authenticity and no skepticism at all.

Every Member of the House of Representatives is an important fellow and is a candidate for the Senate.

Every Member of the United States Senate and every member of the President's Cabinet is an important fellow who is a candidate for President.

And these days every President somehow seems to think he is entitled to a lifetime lease on the White House. [Laughter.]

So, you understand, we are a city of important people.

But, important as we are or as we think we are, I am one of those, I say, who believes that you are the important segment of the body politic; and if we are going to do anything about this expanding economy, which we recognize is essential and which I salute you as having adopted as the theme for our discussion this morning, I think it is going to have to be brought about primarily by what you do rather than by what we do, because we are going to do in large part those things that you would make it possible for us to do, or that you prod us into doing, because left alone and judging the future by the past—and I know of no other criterion to follow—leaving us alone, we are going to continue to take from you your money and your power and your rights of decision and your freedoms of operations because, strangely enough, we in the political profession have concluded we are able to spend your money more wisely than you are and that we can exercise your free decisions more judiciously than you can and that we are men of purer motives than the business colony of America.

I don't believe in that philosophy myself, but it is generally and widely and affirmatively expressed here in Washington, and I am woefully in the minority in feeling somehow that the men of my profession lack this Olympian judgment which so many of my colleagues somehow feel they have.

So I am going to suggest to you some things this morning that I think perhaps as business people you should do—and, after all, while I did teach school out in South Dakota in the colleges of that State for some 12 years, I was in business all the time I taught schools—in the investment business and in the insurance business; and during the interim between the time I taught school and the time the people of South Dakota exercised the rare good judgment to send me down to Washington, I was exclusively a businessman.

I know something of the problems you confront, something of how you feel when you run into competition with Government, because I was in competition with Uncle Sam for several years in the business of loaning money to farmers with which to improve their farms, in the business of loaning money to householders, to those who wanted to construct homes for themselves and their families, and I even was bold enough to be in competition with Uncle Sam for a while in the insurance business. So I discovered even before I got to Washington that as a competitor with Uncle Sam I was a complete failure.

I didn't have resources enough. I couldn't compensate for my bad judgment, and my losses, by taxing the people of the community to replenish the reservoirs of finances with which I dealt; and so I was having difficulties backing my own judgment and having to pay for my mistakes when I was also having to pay for my share of Uncle Sam's mistakes as he went into competition with me.

I certainly agree with Senator O'MAHONEY when he said a few minutes ago on this panel that facts produce movements. But I think there is also a corollary to that statement. I think it can be demonstrated with equal validity that movements produce facts; and I want to take that side of the discussion for a while this morning, because down here, you see, we have discovered that nobody can make a pancake so thin but that it has two sides, and that pancake has two sides, too, because movements have produced a strange series of startling facts all over this world today, facts which in my opinion primarily are involved in curtailing our economy rather than helping it to expand.

I think if we are going to discuss how to expand our economy we must first of all analyze those things which are tending to curtail it or to constrict it or to hold it down because certainly we don't want to have the experience that Great Britain is now having.

I heard Senator O'MAHONEY say, and I agree with him, that a big reason why nationalization has come to bring almost economic ruin to Great Britain was the financial condition of its treasury. The greatest

nation of private tradesmen that the world has yet produced; who because of their uncanny business ability were able to parlay a little group of islands into a mighty world empire, a nation which in the hour of its perils triumphed over the forces of tyranny and fought back the Huns, after having stood up against the blitzkrieg, after having demonstrated that their tight, strained little island could defend itself against the forces of nazism, after having been joined with us as partners in a mighty successful war, at that hour of purple triumph, the British discarded the formula of private enterprise, discarded the formula of individual initiative which made it an empire and adopted instead the formula of failure that brought Hitler to his knees, because national socialism, stripped of all its phony language, is exactly the same formula that Hitler employed in bringing himself into authority in Germany.

We Americans forget so easily. Sometimes we don't recognize the fact that the word Nazi is simply a German contraction meaning national socialism and that what the British have produced is an imitation of the German national socialism devoid at the moment of the strong tyrannical leadership of somebody ruthlessly willing to crack down on every dissident factor in the economy.

Now history has been going on for a long time, and a lot of different people in a lot of different eras of history and a lot of different areas of the world have tried national socialism, always and inevitably with one of two outstanding results: Either they have found as we Americans discovered, for example, early in our history after the signing of the Mayflower Compact, up in that cold New England climate, that it would not work in a climate of freedom, when the voyagers on the Mayflower decided in order to meet the vicissitudes in a foreign life with Indians and blizzards and lack of conveniences, they should collectivize.

They adopted on American soil as the first government in this country after the Indians the theory that they should take from people according to their ability and give to people according to their needs, which is the essence of socialism, which is the essence of a planned economy, which is the essence of government running your businesses, and which is the essence of theoretical communism, fascism, and nazism.

So they said, "We will send everybody out into the woods to shoot the wild turkey, shoot the bear, and cut down the timber. They will bring it back into the common stockade and we who run the colony will parcel out the produce according to the needs of the people here who came over on the *Mayflower*."

And history records what happened. People starved to death that first winter.

Before we could commemorate the first bountiful Thanksgiving Day on American soil, we discarded the system that the British now adopt—national socialism—and started out with a theory of private enterprise which we have clung to tenaciously from that day until now and which has made us the envy of the world.

Now it has been said this morning, with considerable veracity, that one of the reasons why the British have discarded that success formula and adopted national socialism is because Federal spending through one cause or another has placed their fiscal situation in such a desperate condition that they had to collectivize the industries of Britain in order to try to meet that challenge.

I have said that and accept that as one of the reasons. I accept that as one of the reasons also why we are approaching national socialism in America today, because our Federal budget is out of balance much more seriously than was the British budget and is considerably more out of balance today than are the budgets either of Great Britain, France, Belgium, or Holland at this very moment; and the politicians there as the politicians here reasoned, with considerable merit, I think, that when you have such a terrific overload of Federal taxes and Federal spending and deficit financing, that if you can't exact from the taxpayer in prosperous times like these enough money to keep the budget in balance, that certainly you are never going to find the time in your national history when you can balance the budget, that a continuation forever of fiscal deficits means economic disaster, and so they adopted national socialism.

Unable to tax the coal industry sufficiently to balance the budget, unable to tax the transportation industry sufficiently to balance the budget, unable to tax the electrical industry sufficiently to balance the budget in Great Britain, they said, "We will nationalize the industry and use all of the profits therefrom to help support the financial structure of the country."

It has failed because putting politicians from various precincts of any country in positions of economic control does not provide the efficiency and the good managerial ability required to make an enterprise successful.

Immediately, employees of enterprises who have become employees of public property begin through lobbying techniques and power of collectivized voting a propaganda campaign to increase their take in the national production to the point that industry itself soon starts running into the red; and so socialism has to start reaching out for something else: It grabs the medical profession; it grabs, as it has in Britain today, eight different types of industrial enterprises; and, still running into the red, says "In order for us to succeed, in order for us to produce economically as business managers sufficient profits so that we can put the Government into the black, we must take over the steel industry," and that is the next thing which they propose to take over in Great Britain.

I think, however, it is only half the story to say that in Great Britain the condition of the Federal budget made it attractive to experiment with national socialism.

I think that ignores the side of the pancake which I described as the record that movements also produce facts as well as facts producing movements.

I think it ignores entirely the fact that a movement began in 1848 in Germany, launched by Karl Marx and Dr. Engels, called communism, which, in just a century, just 100 years, has come to influence the lives of as many people in the world today as Christianity has come to influence in 20 centuries. I think that movement there has produced these facts.

I think in analyzing the situation in Great Britain simply on the basis of believing that the financial condition of the country precipitated Britain into national socialism and began to spell its doom, another fact is ignored, and that was that in 1883 on the shores of Britain itself there developed a movement called the Fabian Movement, which began preaching a philosophy of nationalization, which began a very skillful and bland and predetermined basis of working its way into the schools, into the labor unions, into the farm organizations, and into the Government itself of people who believed that only politicians are smart enough to run an enterprise, of people who believed that private enterprisers left alone are bare-teeth wolves, and that only politicians have the rectitude to do things always honestly.

Those Fabians developed such a powerful propaganda campaign, such a skillful technique of indoctrination and such a well-heeled political machine that their successors in line, the Labor Party—so-called, but the Socialist Party, in fact—the Fabian Socialists of Great Britain came into control in Great Britain today as a movement producing the fact of national socialism in that country.

Now I think that in considering an expanding economy in this country, consequently we have to recognize that we are threatened not only by facts but by movements—a movement in the form of communism which has become an international conspiracy, a movement in the form of communism which one of our great Americans, Gen. George Marshall, said yesterday, provides the greatest peril to freedom that this country has ever known.

And that movement is rather easily defined: Communism is not an economic theory. Communism is not a political party. Communism in no one of the 13 countries which it has conquered and in no area of the world which it today controls, operates in conformity with an economic theory such as is expressed in the theoretical writings of the early Communists.

Communists have discarded entirely the concept of taking from people according to their ability and giving to people according to their needs. They found it wouldn't work. So they have substituted a form of tyranny, one-man control or one-group control over every enterprise, over every movement, over every segment of the population.

I think the best proof that communism is not a political party is the fact that in none of the countries it now controls did it attain its authority by operating after the formula of a political party.

We know what a political party is. We know how it operates; it has a modus operandi. A political party has candidates and campaign funds and chairmen and committee work and platforms and conventions and campaigns. But primarily a political party achieves its objective at a voting booth, and unless a movement does achieve its objective in the voting places of the land, whatever else in the world it is, it is not a political party.

Neither in Russia, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Albania, Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Poland, eastern Germany, or China, the countries that the Communists now run, has any Communist leader ever achieved his authority by a vote of the people; and in none of the countries has he ever continued to stay in authority, once he achieved it by a coup d'etat, by a vote of the people in which they were given a choice between two different sets of principles or two different sets of candidates. So they did not have an election because the word "elect" means that you can elect to take one choice or another. Under communism that is not the procedure.

I remember the last visit I had coming out of Moscow, leaving Russia in 1945.

After having spent about a month in 1945 studying conditions in Russia and behind the iron curtain, after having celebrated VJ-day on the Red Square of the Kremlin, we were flying out of Baku, down on the Caspian Sea, and our committee had been royally entertained by the mayor of Baku, a friendly little Asiatic who spoke a little English.

That particular morning for a send-off party he was giving us a typical Russian breakfast comprised primarily of vodka and caviar.

In South Dakota, where Jones and I came from, you don't get that kind of breakfast very often and our stomachs weren't just acclimated for it, and so I was trying to make a lot of big talk so I wouldn't have to partake very heartily. I proceeded:

"Mr. Mayor, you have been a very gracious host, taken us down to the oil field here in Baku, shown us how they extract caviar from sturgeon. You have shown us the old part of the city and the new part of the city and great statues erected to Stalin and Lenin, but, tell me—I want to ask you a personal

question: How did you get to be mayor of Baku?

"How? How? The people. The people elected me to be mayor of Baku."

I said, "That is wonderful. That is how I got to be a Congressman from South Dakota."

I said, "Tell me, did you have much opposition in the election, have much difficulty?"

He said, "I have no opposition at all."

Well, that was the answer to a Congressman's prayer. We gathered around like football players around the quarterback. We said, "Tell us—how did you do it? How did you work that out?"

And he said, "It is very simple. Very simple. In Russia, when the Politburo in Moscow nominated me I was the only candidate that they nominated, and then the people—the people they voted for me."

He thought it was democratic. He thought it was an election. He thought it was acting like a member of a political party. But it was acting like the finger of a great tyrannical machine.

What is this great movement that has produced a $20,000,000,000 fact — communism?

Communism is a way of life, a godless way of life, that holds that all of the economy of a country, the means of production, the farms, tractors, mills; the means of distribution, the railroads, the ship lines, the telegraph companies, the retail stores; and all of the flow of capital, building and loan associations, insurance companies, loaning agencies, the whole economic fabric, shall be controlled—it doesn't say owned, shall be controlled—in the capital city of the land by one group resisting all opposition and joining with others around the world in promoting and supporting a creed having as its goal the development of a world-wide dictatorship under the control of the Kremlin.

I don't think in America we are ever going to quite recapture freedom as we used to have it until we understand what communism is, what Fabian socialism is, and how the related ideologies and creeds and programs of that central ism affect our daily lives and our daily jobs.

Let me repeat this definition of communism which has been demonstrated to be 100 percent accurate in every single section of the world that the Communists control and by every single activity of those supporting communism here:

It is a godless way of life, denying God simply because the people in the country cannot serve two masters—a godless way of life which holds that the entire economic pattern of the country shall be controlled in the capital city of the land by a selected group permitting no opposition, and believing in the internationalization of the world under the dictatorial leadership of the Kremlin.

And every American Communist supports that kind of program, every French Communist supports it, it is supported by all Communists in every part of the world today.

Eighteen months ago when the Kremlin insisted that the people loyal to it speak out and declare themselves, Togliatti in Italy, Jacques Duclos and Maurice Thorez and the Communist leaders of France, Earl Browder and Gene Dennis, the leaders in America, and W. Z. Foster, speaking within a short span of 72 hours said, "In the event of a war, in the event of a war between communism and our respective countries, of course we are going to be fighting on the side of the Communists."

So only those who refuse to face the facts need have any skepticism about what the Communists propose in America, and they propose it with equal vigor whether it is a Communist like Gene Dennis operating in the open or a man like Alger Hiss working as assistant to the Assistant Secretary of State in the State Department and having more to say about the final determinations at Yalta, probably, than any other English-speaking citizen.

The Communists subscribe to this theory and operate on it whether they operate in the capacity of the 11 Communists convicted under the mighty fine judicial environment established by Judge Medina in New York or whether they operate like Carl Aldo Marzani now in the Federal penitentiary whose last position was in the State Department in the code room interpreting secret codes from our foreign embassies, or whether it is a Henry Julian Wadleigh who confessed that he had delivered hundreds of secret American documents to Russian agents in this country.

We are faced with a situation which is serious because most of us recognize it but fail to strike out against it.

That kind of movement left unchallenged and unexposed and not corrected in America can ruin any dream that any man here has about producing an expanding economy on our shores because it simply can't operate under communism.

Now I said something about communism and its related ideologies, its associated creeds, its fellow-workers and its fellow-wanderers, and its fellow-travelers who move in the direction in America of placing in the hands of men like me, in jobs like mine, increasingly the money which you silly people think belongs to you and would give to us with our supreme holy wisdom increasingly the power to exercise daily judgments that you can't be trusted to exercise in your own interests and in the public welfare.

That is the basis of the theory followed by many politicians who say they are going to solve the problems of America. On any other basis, certainly a man would be stupid indeed to say, "Create this regulatory body, enact this piece of legislation, impose this extra tax, nationalize this new industry."

You do or permit those things only because you must believe in the superior capacity of politicians and in the ignoble purposes of private citizens. At least, Communists believe in that. They demonstrate that in every area. Many non-Communists, too, have accepted this Communist doctrine that big government is the only solution to big problems.

And so every time we move increasingly in the direction of spending, we move in the direction of a totalitarian state.

You can read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD if you will—most of you unhappily won't, and because most of you don't the things that I am about to report do occur in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. If most of you read it more regularly, you could take care of this problem at home, making sure that this kind of thing wouldn't happen among those representing you in Washington.

But if you will take the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for any year of the last 10 and examine the roll-call votes on any issue in which there was a question of whether or not we should increase the power of politicians here in Washington, every Congressman that you suspect of having an affinity for communism will be recorded in that roll-call vote as voting "aye," put the power in Washington; give it to the politicians.

Does that mean that everybody who votes for a concentration of power in Washington is a Communist? Let me make it clear, it does not. But it does mean that everybody who has an affection for communism in every vote has always voted for concentration of power in Washington. There are no exceptions to that. You can check those whom you suspect the most. You will find it 100 percent an accurate prediction.

If you will check the roll-call votes, whenever there has been an issue down here in the last 10 years of whether we should break down the right of a State or the rights of an institution or the authorities of an individual, on every single roll-call vote, those associated with communism, those belonging to the greatest number of so-called front organizations, those who for want of a better term we call the "extreme leftists" in America, without exception have voted to break down the rights of States, have voted to cripple the function of an institution, have voted to decrease the authority of an individual. Why?

"No Communists are voting in the Congress of the United States of America today," you say, and I will agree.

But because since 1848 Communists have been studying the catechism of how to get control of a country, they know the first and essential step in a great commonwealth of States like ours is to put the power into one central place so that when at long last you can have a coup d'etat and a bloody or a bloodless revolution, once you have taken over the control spot, you have the entire country in an iron grip.

Communists understand that so much better than we do. We go along distressed and disturbed by world-wide problems and local conditions, a little bit here, a little bit there, depriving ourselves of the dignity of human beings and of our importance as individuals, of the sanctity of States' rights, and the validity of an institution, decreasing our functions and our importance and sending all this power and authority down to Washington for politicians, either elected or appointed, to exercise and operate for us. Thus we are the careless architects of our own destruction and distress.

Every time we do it, we move in the direction of the Communists. They comprise the one group that in a propitious moment of a depression or a war, steps in and takes control, and like the people of Czechoslovakia, we discover it too late.

Ever since we were school boys, you and I have studied in our economics and political science books about the great check-and-balance system of America, about the balance of powers in our Government.

Unfortunately, most books on economics were written by people who never have made very much of an economic success in life themselves, and most books on jurisprudence are written by theorists who don't know much about practical problems, and so they have talked almost exclusively about the checks and balances which exist between the judiciary, the legislative, and the executive branches of government.

I agree it is tremendously important to maintain that equilibrium. I think it has become lopsided today, but something has become much more lopsided than that in our check and balance system.

The check and balance system, which has contributed fully as much to our success as a country, in my opinion, as a balance of powers within our Government, is the check and balance system existing between the politician and the individual, between the Government and our economic system.

When individuals practicing this private economy have worked the people too hard or too long or have beaten them down too much, a law has been passed to keep the economy in balance and politicians have helped pull up the behavior of the individual entrepreneur and the individual industry.

Likewise when the politicians, smacking their lips because of the good taste of the new power, have gone too far, individuals have gotten together and thrown that outfit of politicians into the discard and put in a system, a new principle, a new party, or a new President.

And that kind of check and balance for over a century and a half has kept us dedicated to private enterprise.

It is a new philosophy, and it is a new concept—and it doesn't come out of the machine shop—it comes out of a conspiratorial source,

which now holds we should discard our American kind of check and balance system entirely and trust everything and everybody to the decisions of a little group of politicians here in the Capital City of the land. If and when we do that, we discard our concept of freedom for the concept of communism.

The Spence bill, which I hope you have all read, which you should read because there isn't any use even talking about an expanding economy if the Spence bill passes—the Spence bill was introduced on the 15th of February 1949 by BRENT SPENCE, of Kentucky, a man with whom I served in the House of Representatives for 10 years, a good American. He has no part in anyone's conspiracy, but as chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, one of the six most important committees of the House, he was asked by someone on top to introduce the Spence bill as an administrative measure.

If you haven't read it, before you leave Washington get a copy of it. In part it says: In event of an emergency—it doesn't say war, it doesn't say an atomic attack, it doesn't say a revolution—in the event of an emergency—and I dare say, Rolly Jones, you haven't got a member of your organization so old he can remember back so far that we haven't had a national emergency in government, but the bill says, "in the event of an emergency to be defined by the Chief Executive," whoever he may be at the time, that Chief Executive after making that finding shall then have the power, no other bill, no new appropriations, no new appeal to the people required—he shall then have the power to take over, to operate, to own, or to build any enterprise in America essential to our national defense.

And in an atomic age, I think that includes everything except the manufacturers of pinball machines, and it might include them, because up to now the Pentagon hasn't produced any better plan than hiding under pinball machines. We don't know what we are going to do if they drop those bombs on us.

That isn't in Britain; that isn't in Czechoslovakia; that is a bill produced by the chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee 20 days after our President, talking to a joint session of the Senate and House, wrote a footnote to American history by becoming the first Chief Executive in the land to tell Congress, as he told us, that the time may come in the United States when it is necessary for the Government to take over the steel mills in the interests of security.

Let me tell you as a private enterpriser who knows something about competition with the Government, out of an experience of 12 years in that capacity, let me tell you as an ex-student of economics who has studied this problem in 27 different countries of the world, if our Government or the British Government or any other Government takes over the steel industry, you might just as well kill the canary and throw the cage away, there is no private economy left, because steel is the basis to our whole modern industrial enterprise.

We have had another balance in this country I would like to mention briefly. We have had the greatest balance in America, maintaining equilibrium between a security state and an opportunity state, that the world has ever seen.

There are people and areas and regions where folks have more security than they have under our American system of government now, and I am talking about American conditions today in April 1950, not the way somebody would make them over; as of now, we have all the security in our system that any good man should want, not as much as we can get, but an adequate status of security which can and should continue to evolve and improve as the years go on.

But there is more security, certainly, for a political prisoner in a salt mine in Siberia than there is for a retail merchant in America today. No question about that. Uncle Joe takes care of his security. He won't let you freeze the man in the salt mine because a frozen corpse can mine no salt; and he won't let you starve to death because if you starve, you are no longer a productive agent. You have security there certainly against being struck down as a pedestrian by a drunken motorist because you are never going to get out on the highway. You have security against any vicissitude of life overtaking you as you move around freely in the country because you are going to stay in the salt mines and die.

The prisoners in Alcatraz have more security from disaster and difficulty than you, better security in old age, better medical security; some doctor takes care of them every time they get ill; a better and more permanent guaranty of food and clothing and housing than any of you can expect to have.

Two or three bad buys in a depression and you move from your aristocratic home into a soup line, if you go broke, as many businessmen have. No guaranty in your adventuresome lives. But you do have it in Siberia and in Alcatraz. We don't propose to provide that degree of security in America, or at least we never have, nor are we going to give people unlimited opportunity. If it is completely unlimited opportunity you want, go down to the Caribbean; you can get it on the islands of the Caribbean. Go down to the West Indies—you can get it there. Go to any semicivilized area of the world where there are no codes of ethics, no laws, and no business standard or ethics and there you can practice the law of the fang, the tooth, and the claw. There you can have opportunity—unlimited, uncontrolled, and probably unrewarded. We have declared for a long time in America that government exists to prod and to penalize the people who need prodding and the people against whom a penalty should be attached. Such a rule of reason provides the maximum in opportunity dividends with just government supervision to provide a fair chance for a free people.

Aside from that, there is opportunity enough, there is security enough, and no other country has been able to establish that balance and that equilibrium of human objectives that we have in our American opportunity, and those who would now centralize all authority in Washington would destroy that.

To get an expanding economy, I think we are going to have to increasingly move in the direction of flexibility of decision on the part of the citizen.

There are at least 10 things now which are operating in your lives which tend to put in a strait-jacket your capacity to provide your share of an expanding economy.

You have a minimum-wage law. You have a maximum-hour law. We have price floors in certain phases of the economy. We have standardized, legitimized margins of profit in certain economic enterprises. We have established rules of competition in many areas, like transportation. We have been confronted with a salary limitation that anybody making over $25,000 a year must be considered a second cousin to Hitler. That bill didn't pass Congress, but it may come up again, and it could pass at that time. And you have it in fact, if not in substance now, in the income tax which makes it almost impossible, beyond a certain level, to acquire any wealth.

We have a Fair Dealers' theory of equalization of wealth and income as a new concept of taxation, the old theory being that taxes were levied primarily to support the Government. Now taxes are used to punish the wicked and reward the just—an equalization trend operating increasingly in America today.

We have allocation of materials in certain areas. We have the concept that the Government should establish a yardstick so holier-than-thou politicians can take crooks like you, in the minds of lots of people, and establish a yardstick to determine how you should operate and what you can do. Finally we have outright Government ownership in certain areas and moving rapidly in the direction of Government ownership in insurance, in medicine, in steel, and in many other areas, including the functions of banking and construction.

Now I submit to you that in my opinion those facts are the results of movements, movements which have been running around in the world for at least a hundred years and from which we have not been immune. Movements, if you please, which we are still importing from Europe.

In America we describe them mostly as part of a planned economy. In essence what does a planned economy mean? Those favoring a planned economy believe politicians can plan more wisely and equitably than individuals in private business, that is all.

A planned economy is, in my opinion, the most gratuitous insult ever thrown to the businessman, because it assumes the people you elect are so much abler or ethical than you that they alone can arrange it; and a planned economy is committed to failure unless it has authority in the hands of the planner to compel the people to go along.

What good is a planned economy if each of us is still going to follow the inclination of our own nose? Why give fellows like me in the United States Senate the authority to plan your lives if some of you can still lead your own lives? Why permit us to pass laws and establish bodies determining how you can mark up and where you can advertise and how big you can grow, and so forth, if we are still going to permit exceptions? So you have to put in our hands the police power they placed in the hands of Adolf Hitler and they placed in the hands of Joe Stalin. And when you fail to put that police power in the hands of the planners, you get the catastrophe that happened in New Zealand and the chaos that fell upon Australia, and the sorry situation prevailing in Great Britain.

Too many cooks spoil the broth—a lot of plans and nobody operating them so as to get efficiency, economy, or sustained direction. Consequently a planned economy always leads to tyranny where there is but one plan, and one man or group with power enough to make everybody conform with that plan. Thus you get communism, nazism, fascism, or national socialism. Same difference either way.

Let me suggest in my concluding statements some things that I think you must do if we are going to expand the economy and restore the areas of freedom to the American business colony, because I think it can be demonstrated by the book that the areas of human freedom all around the world have been shrinking startingly for the last 20 years. With the sole exception of Turkey, the areas of human freedom have been growing smaller, and that includes the United States of America.

The first thing I think you have to do is this: I think businessmen have got to get into politics. I know from experience that politicians have gotten into business, and by the way, we have some great plans we haven't talked about yet. I think unless business gets into politics, the labor organizations which are in politics, the farm organizations which are in politics, the pressure groups which are in politics—those big and brave and bold enough to make their influ-

ence felt on election day—are of course going to continue to determine the trend of our economy, and it isn't going to be an expanding one.

If you get into politics, you are the most influential people in your craft and in your community who can help determine the trend of destiny in America, and that pretty well, in my opinion, predetermines the trends of world affairs.

There is always a choice in your home district between two candidates. It doesn't mean you are always going to vote for a Republican against a Democrat or a Democrat against a Republican, but there is always a choice. You seldom find two fellows equally dedicated to the principles of private enterprise, equally articulate, equally influential, and equally supported by a voting record demonstrating where they stand when the chips are down.

Get on the side of the fellow fighting your battles whether he is a Democrat or a Republican, whether it is in the primaries or the fall election. If you don't support him, he may not win and cannot support you.

So I say, first of all, that this thing is going to be determined in large part in America at the polling places by what people like you do or do not do.

Secondly, I submit there might be a place for your organization in a great new movement which in America we hope is going to produce another fact. I refer you to the All-American Conference to Promote Freedom and Defeat Communism, called under the auspices of George M. Craig, holding its first meeting in the Astor Hotel in January, its second meeting last Sunday, and there is to be a big meeting in Chicago in the La Salle Hotel come next May 13 and 14, in which we propose to organize into one great phalanx for freedom, all of the organizations in America of good repute wanting to do something except grumble about what is happening to their freedoms and about the threat of communism here at home.

I am sure your organization is an organization of good repute. We have been able to bring the American Federation of Labor into this new conference along with the Federation of Women's Clubs, the Kiwanis Clubs, the Lions Clubs, the National Grange, the Jewish War Veterans, the VFW, the American Legion, and many others.

We now have organizations representing some 50,000,000 Americans we hope to unite in a program in Chicago to do something at the grass roots level to protect the freedoms which we have, to fight for them again the way Americans have done repeatedly in times past to make them work.

A third thing I think you can do, I think you can get behind legislation—and I am not going to press this point, because I didn't come down here to lobby.

But there happens to be a bill on which my name is associated with Senator FERGUSON, of Michigan, and Senator JOHNSTON of South Carolina, but it is a significant bill, one time called the Mundt-Nixon bill, now called the Mundt-Ferguson-Johnston bill. It should more significantly be called by its title which is the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950. The Senate Judiciary Committee brought it out of committee with a favorable vote of 12 to 1.

What does it do in essence? In essence, it denies Communists the privilege of holding a job in the Federal Government, and if they sneak their way in it puts them in jail. And it also puts in jail the Government official who knowingly appoints them to the job. It doesn't outlaw the Communist Party. I wouldn't outlaw it. I want to permit them to circularize and hold their campaigns and stand for election because not many people are going to vote for them. But our bill would prevent them from getting jobs like Hiss got his, by appointment, like Wadleigh and Noel Field and Judy Coplon.

Also, it makes the Communists register themselves and operate in the open; and if they continue to sneak-thieve their operation in positions of importance it puts them in jail for violating a law which says, "You have got to operate in the open. You are not going to get into politics secretly."

You register if you vote in the primaries. You have to register your party literature in all States under the Hatch bill. Those things we are going to require the Communist Party to do.

And, fourthly, may I suggest the great educational opportunity that you confront if you really want to do your part in helping to keep America American?

May I show you just one exhibit here? If you think that the so-called Mundt-Ferguson-Johnston Act isn't going to stop this kind of Communist conspiracy in this country take a look at the Daily Worker published March 2, every page devoted to opposition to the so-called Mundt-Ferguson Act. They are working. They claim they are raising a million dollars to keep it from Congress and off the floor of the Senate. At least, the Communists know this bill will expose and curtail their racket.

If you feel as we do, and as the 12 Members of the Senate Judiciary Committee feel, that the time has come to deny Communists the right to represent us in appointive jobs, I believe men like you can offset this kind of attack which comes every day from the Communists.

Now, about your education opportunities in a broader challenge. I don't know any group of Americans in any line of activity that have contact with more individuals than you have. I think you can do a great job of educating your employees, your customers, and the general public against the growing tendencies toward collectivism here.

That is part of the program we hope to undertake in the All-American Conference. But think of the things you can do individually. Think of the great job General Motors has done by publishing this book Something To Think About, which records facts for everybody in the employ of General Motors to read and understand, simple facts about what private enterprise means in America, simple facts pointing out the difference between life under socialism and life in the United States, facts no American should ever forget.

It says that in Russia for example, the average worker with a week's salary can buy 17 pounds of sugar; 500 pounds of sugar in America, in Russia 17 pounds; under socialism in Great Britain 282 pounds—all with the same amount of work at exactly the same type of job.

Those are the facts that mean things. Take-home pay. That's what employees are interested in. They want to know what our badly inflated 59-cent dollar will buy and how many we must stack up on a counter some place to buy what we need compared to the purchase power of similar work under communism and socialism.

General Motors is telling its employees the lesson you could tell all the people in your community in a full-page ad, in a little message inserted some place on the back of a sales slip, in the material that goes out to the customer, and as you talk to people in the associations you belong to in our American towns and cities.

In April 1950, in the United States, one worker in a week can buy 276 quarts of milk, under socialism in Great Britain, 133 quarts of milk; for the same amount of labor in the same kind of job in Russia, 25 quarts of milk.

Page after page of facts and charts and diagrams like that, General Motors has sent to every employee of its groups, facts that you can get, facts that you should use.

If you haven't the book, you can write for it. General Motors will be happy to send it to you because they are working to protect an environment for all of us—Something To Think About, that is the name of this monograph.

Jobs such as Spiritual Mobilization is doing in California should be encouraged by you all. A great American, Donald J. Cowling, who has associated himself with great educators and preachers, is working with Reverend Fifield on this great project. You should help. For what would they defend freedom? For you to have the freedom. For whom? For you to fight politicians looking for more power and for you to continue as independent, respectable, and respected businessmen.

I am for you because I have been down here 12 years, and in that length of time I have yet failed to see any politician, executive or legislative, Democrat or Republican or independent, civil or not civil service, so good and so wise and so important that I for one am willing to turn over to him my America. And I have known them all, most by their first names. They are some good and some bad. We are doing pretty well in Congress, you know. We have two of our boys in jail, one in the White House. We have got them moving in both directions.

"We are interested in helping the movement," you can write to Spiritual Mobilization, if you want to do something effective to strike back against communism and its collateral creeds. The address is: Title Guarantee Building, Los Angeles, Calif.

I wonder how many of you have circularized the book you helped to pay for? The chamber of commerce helped to get out a book Socialism in America. It is a fine thing to distribute. Don't ever think politicians are going to distribute it for you. It is something you can distribute in the community, to the kids in schools, to the youngsters home from college, to offset the movement so highly financed by the sources from the left.

Let me point out to you what some Americans are doing individually; it is what I think has to be done generally as an education process if we are going to organize America within 5 years to defend the system which I think can collapse within 5 years if we continue to reward the apostle of collectivism and to defeat the fighters of freedom, which we are apt to do unless folks like you somehow can change the trends.

"Socialism, brother, you don't know the half of it." This is a Standard Steel Spring full-page advertisement. It tells in layman's language exactly what is wrong with state socialism and a planned economy.

If you write to this company at Coraopolis, Pa., they will send it to you so you can make it available, too, to the folks of your community because it is important. The same company has run many similar advertisements. It is encouraging to know that we are getting some individual support, at least, for this great system which protects the individual.

Here is one from the McGraw-Hill Co., manufacturers of, producers of, a great many periodicals a great many of us have read: "Give us the tools, your only chance of getting ahead."

It points out the only safe national policy is to make it possible for American industry to do its job, not to terrorize private business by political proposals and threats of ruinous taxation and take-over programs, but to defend it and give it a chance. How are you going to expand our economy if the reward for expansion is a Government penalty? How are you going to change the atmosphere without making the people of your community for whom expansion means the most—the employees, the customers, the housewives, the farmers, the workers—realize that their eggs are in the same basket and their chips are in the same game along with yours? What are you doing to bring this realization home to them?

That is an educational program. It has to be undertaken somehow by folks like you. Are you doing your part? Or are you trying to hitchhike a free ride on the freedom train?

Hats off to the Texas and Pacific Railroad Co. for its series of ads: "Because I don't want to move," the lady says in this advertisement. "Too bad," the article says, "but you are going to have to move." A Government bureaucrat runs your home and tells you you have got to move out. All the dividends from public housing are not tile bath tubs! A lot of them are unhappy people pushed around by arrogant politicians who become the landlords.

I have spoken my allotted time. I don't want to talk any further, but I do want to urge you, in concluding, that there is a job in America to be done, to save this country. I see nothing wrong in the formula which built us as great as we are. What we need is the will and the courage to defend it.

I see nothing in the technological foray of new inventions in machine shops that makes it essential for us to discard the formula of freedom. Ours is a political challenge not a mechanical one.

I see nothing in the atomic bomb or television which has glorified the politician to make us so wise that a few of us know so much more than all the rest of you in America.

I think it is just time that the individuals to whom this country belongs do something to protect it and to build it and to support it. I have suggested at least a few ways in which you yourselves can join in a fight for freedom to preserve it here in its last great bastion of the world. The movements of collectivism everywhere else have concentrated power in the capital cities of the land to the distress and despair of the people generally. In America, let us continue the formula that has made us great. [Applause.]

Mr. JONES. That was South Dakota that was talking.

Thank you, Karl, very much for that message. I knew this crowd would like it, and I think you have done us a great service.

Since the hour is growing late, are there any questions that we can have very quickly?

Dr. Nystrom.

Dr. NYSTROM. Mr. Chairman, this is not a question to Mr. MUNDT.

I am asking for the privilege of addressing our President, Mr. MUNDT, so if you care to sit down while I complete this.

I would like to offer three resolutions, either together or to be handled separately, as you may think best.

The first resolution is a thanks and deep appreciation to Senator KARL MUNDT for taking time out of his busy days in the Senate and coming here and making a highly inspiring, stirring address that will move us to action. Of that I am sure.

That is my first suggestion. I would move that resolution.

FROM THE FLOOR. Second.

Mr. JONES. All those in favor say "aye."

(Chorus of ayes.)

Opposed?

(No response.)

The motion is carried.

Dr. NYSTROM. Mr. President, the second resolution that I would like to offer is something that I think that we need to take in the way of implementation of the suggestions that Senator MUNDT has made here today.

They are ideas about which we have been thinking, but he has given them an enormous spur by what he has said here this morning.

One of the things we can do is to get the American public to get out and vote and to start with ourselves first of all.

I have been amazed and shocked at, ashamed, over the fact that in the last presidential elections only between 45 and 50 percent of the voters of this country actually voted. I would like, therefore, without any argument, any further than that, to offer this resolution:

Resolved, That the members of the Federation be urged to use their influence to carry out the following program so far as possible:

1. Speaking to ourselves, to register and vote in all elections.

2. To see that all members of our families who are qualified to vote also exercise their franchise.

3. To urge our employees and their families to register and go to the polls and exercise their right to vote; and

4. To urge others among our friends and their friend's families to vote.

I would like to move the adoption of that resolution.

Mr. JONES. Is there a second?

FROM THE FLOOR. Second.

Mr. JONES. Any discussions?

All those in favor say "aye."

(Chorus of ayes.)

Opposed?

(No response.)

The motion is carried.

Dr. NYSTROM. Mr. President, I offer a third resolution. I think we have done something of which we have a right to be proud, providing we do something about it, and the third resolution that I would like to offer is that you as President of the American Retail Federation designate a suitable committee for the implementation of this resolution—the appointment of a committee to consider all of the things that may be done in the way of a program for getting out the vote in this coming election, both for the registration for the primary election and the general election that will come next fall.

If there is any one thing that we ought to do, ladies and gentlemen, as business people confronted by the facts as presented here this morning, it is getting out the vote; and I would move the adoption of a resolution asking our President to name a representative committee from the respective retail trades to work out the ways and means by which suggestions can be made on what can properly be done by retail trade. That is my motion.

From the floor: Second.

Mr. JONES. Any discussion?

All those in favor, say "aye."

(Chorus of ayes.)

Opposed?

(No response.)

The motion is carried.

Thank you, Dr. Nystrom.

Is there anyone in the audience who would like to direct a question to Senator MUNDT?

Mr. HARMAN. Harman is my name, from Delaware.

I would like to ask the Senator a question. The former speaker in effect said spending is necessary to keep the standard of living expanding. How would you supplement the economy if it were not for Government spending? I would like to ask him if he thinks—and, in effect, he said if we keep on spending it will wreck the economy now—is Government deficit spending necessary to advance the standard of living or can we progress under a balanced economy?

Senator MUNDT. Of course, I very much dislike getting into an argument with a colleague who is absent, but since you have asked the question——

Mr. HARMAN. Would you pardon me if I just make one statement? He did not say that Government deficit spending was necessary.

Senator MUNDT. Let's assume the statement then read Government spending is essential to prosperity.

I would like to call attention to the fact, which I think is so equally overlooked both in public and private life, that I find nothing in my study of economics either from the books or from experience at home or abroad which points out any place anywhere that Government produces any new wealth.

I think we have got to recognize it is just a question of who is going to handle the dollars which are available. Are they going to be handled by people engaging in businesses, permitted to use the larger portion to put a new wing on the factory or a new floor in the store, or are we going to take the money from the people increasingly in the form of taxes to give the politicians in Government to turn back to the public in the form of subsidies or benefits or programs that Government operates?

The wealth of this country comes from one place, and that is pumping it out of the soil somewhere. New wealth has to be produced from the soil or from the water in the form of raw foods or fibers or from the timber industries or metal industries or oil or coal.

That new wealth is processed and turned over in the march of trade and pyramided up so that almost inevitably the national income is seven times, every year—good years or bad—the total amount of the price paid for the raw materials produced by new wealth in this country. The Government is simply a handler. It is the turnover and processing of each year's production of new wealth that brings our annual national income to seven times the value of the raw materials. The Government itself produces nothing.

So to my way of thinking, the less Government expense the more money for the people to spend in productive enterprises and in the expansion of new wealth, and consequently the greater is your expanded economy. The private dollar always buys more for America than the public dollar buys.

Mr. PETERSON. I want to say, first, Mr. President, that as one who was born and raised in the State of Alabama, it encourages me to hear a Republican from South Dakota defend States' rights and decentralization of power.

The comment I wanted to make, Mr. Senator, was this: You spoke of the conditions in England. England, of course, went socialist because the majority of the people who voted voted for socialism. Isn't it because the people were led to vote for socialism by the promise of the government for increased allotments and increased security, and aren't we moving down that same road very fast when we constantly increase our social-security benefits, when we lengthen the time of the unemployment compensation, when we give the farmer more and more billions for his potatoes and other products?

Aren't we moving down the same road that the English travel, buying the votes of these people for the purpose of perpetuating an administration that is moving more and more toward socialism?

Senator MUNDT. I want to say to my good friend from Alabama that I think the questions on that answer themselves: I think we are, and that was the basis of my observation that creeds and movements tend to produce facts. What we see is the result of an organized movement.

I know you people in business have been so busy you haven't had time, I imagine, to read the entire Communist creed. But I have studied that now for 20 years. I know what they planned and what they proposed, and this business of holding a carrot out in front of a horse, the long promise, is part of the program, of course, of every collectivist movement.

But since you are from Alabama, may I say something else?

I have been trying to discuss these problems which confront us now for a period of years, and in the last 2 years have had the termerity as a Yankee to go down into the deep South once or twice. I spoke down in Charlotte, N. C., 2 weeks ago today and Friday night to approximately 2,500 businessmen in Memphis, Tenn., in the city audi-

torium. My theme there was this: That time is moving mighty fast; that if we are going to stop this drive toward centralization, I think there are three things—three possible things—that might be done and which should be done in the very, very early future.

No. 1, I think, sir, that if your great Democratic Party of the South could recapture its party and rededicate itself to the principles of individual and State rights, nominating a candidate of the capacity, let's say, of HARRY BYRD, of Virginia, that all kinds of Republicans in my area would be delighted to vote for that kind of candidate. That would stop the current crusade toward collectivism.

Or, if that can't be done, I think if the Republicans were to nominate a presidential candidate who would make a fight for the American way and make it clear that he went straight across the board with that concept and avoided putting into his platform and program a few minor proposals which understandably are insulting to the South, I think there are hopes, perhaps, that the South for the second time in history might break its solid phalanx and vote for a principle instead of a prejudice.

If neither one of those two things happens, I think the tremendously significant analysis that Raymond Moley made of the British election in Newsweek is then in point. I think all of us should read and read again that significant report by Mr. Moley in the last issue of Newsweek. Moley pointed out that the forces against socialism in the last election cast 3,000,000 more votes than the forces of collectivism, but the forces opposing socialism were divided between Conservative and Liberal. And, as Moley said, "that is the trouble in America." More people believe in the system that has made this country strong than the theory that politicians can make the country greater, but they are divided, unhappily, by a historic, imaginary boundary drawn some place called the Mason and Dixon's line.

If there could come about a political realinement so that the forces believing in this system could make their influences felt on election days for President, I think you would see that well over 50 percent of all Americans, if they could vote in unison for the same candidate, would vote for a preservation of State and individual rights and for defeat of those who would glorify politicians at the expense of the private citizen.

I think those are three possibilities; none of them are very easy to bring about, but all of them are possible. Any one of the three, in my opinion, will rededicate America to the faiths of its fathers. I sincerely hope we shall not permit devotion to the Mason and Dixon's line in America to cause us to fall completely victim to those devoted to the Communist line in Russia.

Mr. JONES. Since we are running right close to our lunch hour and we have another very fine speaker, I think we will bring this session to a close.

I would like to say to Karl again, thanks very much for being here.

An announcement or two: This afternoon we have two very fine speakers on the program that will have something to say that I know will be interesting and informative.

First, Mr. Denham, the general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board who is now more of a controversial figure than he has been in the past, because of Reorganization Plan No. 12.

We also have Senator BRIEN MCMAHON, the chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, who has consented to talk to us in a closed meeting and off the record on the subject of atomic energy and defense.

I think that is a full program for the afternoon, and tonight, of course, is our annual dinner at which Senator TAFT will speak on the subject, Are we heading toward financial disaster?

That speech will be broadcast coast-to-coast with the Columbia Broadcasting System.

The last count is that we still have nearly 300 Senators and Congressmen on hand, and I am sure that it will be an evening which you will all enjoy. So please don't anybody try to catch the Congressional today, and stick it out with us.

We will adjourn for luncheon in the same room we met yesterday.

(Whereupon at 12:20 p. m., the morning session adjourned.)

Equality of Treatment an Opportunity in the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 21, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, there is appended the extensive text of a text and picture story in a leading national magazine, Our World, of June 1950, entitled "United States Armed Forces, 1950." It is regrettable that the pictures cannot be shown here and it is to be hoped that Members will take occasion to review them as they are just as important as the text. The story is the culmination of a monumental project for this magazine, having required the work of 6 members of its staff working around the clock for 294 man-days, and who traveled 34,500 miles by plane, car, jeep and foot and shot 3,600 pictures in 10 military installations.

Such a story and the pictures accompanying it are most valuable to show the progress which has been made in eliminating segregation in the armed forces and encouraging equality of treatment and opportunity regardless of race, creed, color or national origin in response to the Presidential Executive order of July 6, 1948, and the directive of Secretary of Defense Johnson of April 6, 1949.

I introduced House Resolution 328 seeking an investigation of this whole situation by the Armed Services Committee at the opening of this session. At that time I said "Certainly our constitutional democracy cannot tolerate discrimination or segregation among men who wear the uniform of the United States and have sworn to uphold its national security at the cost of their very lives." I pointed out, too, the damage that had been done to us in the use by Communist propagandists of race relations policies, particularly in our armed forces.

The appended article shows that much progress has been made, but that much still remains to be made, particularly in the Army where due to the numbers concerned and other conditions progress has not been as rapid as in the Navy and the Air Force. This summation of the whole situation is put into the RECORD in a spirit of helpfulness as a progress report and also to show the area in which further progress is required. It is written with considerable objectivity and contains numerous facts which should be of interest to every Member concerned with the effectiveness of the National Military Establishment.

UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES, 1950—EQUALITY OF TREATMENT AND OPPORTUNITY IN ARMED FORCES IS NO HOAX BUT A WORKING POLICY OF UNITED STATES

The Executive order of President Truman calling for "equality of treatment and opportunity for all those who serve in our country's defense" works. It works because Secretary of Defense Louis A. Johnson has made it clear to all branches of the armed forces that within the immediate future he intends to accomplish complete integration of Negroes into all of our services. It works because tens of thousands of white and Negro boys and girls in all branches of the service—and from all sections of the country—have shown the democratic will to work, eat, sleep, play, and if need be, fight together in the service of their country.

Not every intention of the Truman order has been accomplished. The Department of the Army has only had an "acceptable" plan since January 16 of this year. Other branches of the armed forces have been at work implementing Defense Secretary Johnson's policy less than a year. There can be no doubt until every all-Negro unit is completely abolished full equality will not be achieved. But the degree of opportunity open to Negroes in our armed forces today is a far cry from those dim days 20 years ago when Negro cavalrymen were used as "officers' grooms" and Negro seamen were restricted to duty as mess stewards.

Pictorially this story is limited to 10 major defense installations in the zone of the interior (continental United States). But it gives a fair picture of the degree of Negro integration in all our armed forces. It is limited also to men and women in uniform. But it reflects the growing favorable treatment accorded a vast army (about 70,000) of Negro civilians who serve under the flag in United States and overseas.

Today in our armed forces roughly 100,000 Negroes are in uniform: 60,000 in the Army, 25,000 in the Air Force, 15,000 in the Navy and Marine Corps. Many of these troops remain engaged in service units. However, increasing numbers of them are in training in tactical units for combat duty. In all armed-forces schools of whatever branch of the service—the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, or the Marine Corps—the training program is carried on with no separation based on race. For all Negro personnel the integration program spells greater freedom.

ARMY'S OLD QUOTA SYSTEM WHICH ONCE STYMIED INITIATIVE IS OFF—HOW FAR NEGROES GET NOW IS UP TO THEM

The Negro soldier stands today strictly upon his own merits so far as promotion and advancement in the Army are concerned. How far he can go no longer depends on Army quotas. That is borne out by the integration policy. And to understand how sweeping it is, it becomes necessary to summarize the Army policy on the use of Negro manpower, announced January 16.

The Secretary of the Army, North Carolina's Gordon Gray, reiterated the Truman order of equality of treatment and opportunity. He made Army commanders responsible for the unreserved acceptance of the policies by all personnel under their command. He made them responsible for the execution of the policies. A board of senior Army officers was named to make a periodic review of the utilization of Negro manpower. Processing of raw recruits, training in Army schools, eligibility for promotion and assignment to military occupational specialties were all placed on an Army-wide nonsegregated basis. Selection and assignment of officers was also freed from any restrictions based on race.

These policies can and have had far-reaching consequences for the 58,864 Negro enlisted men and the 1,233 officers. There are still many white commanders unwilling or unable to carry out these policies. These can only delay but never halt the trend toward integration.

SHOULD WAR START TOMORROW, THE NEGRO SOLDIER IS BEING TRAINED TO BE READY TO DEFEND HIS COUNTRY—TODAY, NEGROES ARE GETTING THEIR BEST CHANCES

World War II taught us a lesson. Racial intolerance was preventing us from making full use of this country's manpower. Few Negroes were used or trained in combat tactics. The policy has changed. The Department of Defense plans to make full use of all manpower if war should come. Today, more Negroes than ever are being trained in all phases of modern warfare. They are in communications, field, and mobile artillery, learning to use the recoilless 75's, driving M-41's and M-26's. They're learning not only how to follow but also how to lead in combat tactics.

With white boys, many Negro youngsters at Fort Benning are grappling with the Army's paratroop training program. As part of the proud troopers, they're learning the rigid discipline, fighting know-how, and the rugged team spirit of the outfit. A paratrooper's life is no bed of roses, but these boys take to it like a 'chute to the breeze. They learn how to fall, how to put on their harness. For 4 weeks they learn how to jump from 2, to 34, to 250 feet, before they make the big 1,000-foot jump from a flying boxcar. They are in fine physical shape, don't drink, and do little smoking.

WHAT ARE THE ISSUES IN THE ARMY?—HOW FAR CAN A COMMANDING GENERAL TAKE INTEGRATION ON A POST?

There is still a wide gap between Army policy and Army performance. Separate infantry and artillery battalions of Negro troops, with separate quarters and only token integration of Negro and white officers, remain the rule at many Army posts. In auxiliary units integration on an individual level has begun. And it is the trend begun in these auxiliaries which seems certain to establish a pattern for all.

Some Army commanders have time and again raised the old fears that mixing the Negro and white soldiers indiscriminately in the same units will impair fighting morale. They have claimed that integration of so large a mass of Negroes as are in the Army is more difficult than in the Navy and Air Force with their fewer numbers. These are old dodges without foundation in fact. The facts are that the Air Force has integrated fully 25,000 Negro airmen on an individual level without a single serious incident. The reason for Air Force success can be found in such blunt and forthright comment as that made by Air Force Maj. Gen. Laurence S. Kuter, who wrote every officer in his command as follows: "Selected and qualified Negro officers and men will be assigned to duty throughout the Air Force without regard to race. * * * Commanders who cannot cope with the integration of Negroes into formerly white units or activities will have no place in the Air Force structure."

Within the month after this story is published the Fahy committee, established by President Truman, is expected to report on the execution of the integration policy. The firm attitude of the President, his Secretary of Defense, and the work of this committee are factors which face recalcitrant Army commanders unable to cope with the problem of complete integration. Dynamic public opinion inside (two out of three white soldiers do not oppose integration) and outside also faces them across their Maginot line of prejudice. And these are factors which make it possible to predict that within a matter of months (possibly at Fort Lewis) we will have the first completely racially mixed battalion.

NAVY'S POLICY OF INTEGRATION TODAY CALLS FOR STEPPING UP NEGRO RECRUITING

In comparison with the Army and Air Force there are fewer Negroes in the Navy (15,000). This number is less than 2 percent of the total strength. Traditionally Negroes were restricted to the Navy messmen's division. Today, 8 years after this ban was dropped, most Negroes (about 60 percent) still are stewards. But in contrast with former years, Negroes now hold every general-service rating and serve on every type of ship.

The Navy's drastically reduced appropriation is one of the main reasons for the Negro's numerically unimportant role in this service. With economy demanded, the Navy pruned out its least capable men, relegated much of its fleet to the "mothball" class, and operated installations with minimum crews. The Navy has witnessed a trend from complete segregation to one of integration. It began 6 years before the Executive order banned discrimination.

In April 1942 the Navy announced its experiment to train Negro volunteers as seamen. And in June 1942 it followed through by opening Great Lakes Naval Training Station to Negro apprentice seamen. In September of the same year, 150 of these trainees arrived at Hampton Institute for advanced training in such general-service ratings as machinist mates, electricians, metalsmiths, cooks, bakers, and carpenters. Subsequently, the Seabees division (similar to the Army's engineers) was opened to Negroes. And in November 1943 the Navy began using Negro seamen and rated men aboard ships.

Today its policies for equality of treatment and opportunity are fully approved by the Secretary of Defense. Implementing this policy, it has stepped up recruiting among Negroes and encouraged college students to enroll in the Naval ROTC. Also, the stewards branch has lost its "for minorities only" label.

Faced with unprecedented orders some ship and station commanders required several reminders before they adopted the equality program. But enlisted men accepted it and there were no incidents. Tan faces, once the symbol of the Navy's servant caste, now are recognized as skilled craftsmen on battlewagons, carriers, and subs.

WILL NAVY COMMISSION MORE NEGROES?—ANSWER IS "YES"

Today Negroes operate cranes, control radar apparatus, handle electrical and clerical jobs aboard such aircraft carriers as the *Roosevelt* and *Midway* (the Navy's pride). In the event of another war undersea strategy will figure prominently. And in increasingly important sub and antisub squadrons Negroes serve in a variety of general service ratings. Their job well done also extends to battle wagons, destroyers, and auxiliary craft.

Negro base personnel and trainees are just sailors at New London, Conn., Norfolk, and Great Lakes naval establishments. Northerners and southerners from every family background are buddies. But there is a problem. There are only 17 Negro officers in the Navy and Naval ROTC's and Annapolis will hardly produce more than 10 annually. This problem is being tackled by the President's Committee on Equality of Treatment and Opportunity in the Armed Forces, but as yet no solution has been found.

THE MARINES HAD NO NEGROES BEFORE 1942, BUT TODAY FOLLOW NAVY DIRECTIVES IN ATTITUDE TOWARD NEGROES

Although the Marine Corps takes its orders from the Navy, its policy toward Negroes does not always follow the Navy pattern. In fact, the Marines did not accept Negroes in their ranks until 1942 when the Corps was being mobilized to a strength of 70,000. Yet when the Marines hit the shore at Bougainville in 1943, Negroes were among them. Later they fought in all the Marine campaigns through Okinawa.

Today, of the 74,000 men in the Marines, about 1,500 are Negroes, most of them in pay grade 6, the next to lowest. The number of them in pay grade 1 is increasing, mainly because the quota system in the Marines has been abolished. Montford Point, once designated as "a recruit training center for Negro Marines" is deserted but for a few guards watching United States Government property. Now Negro Marines do their boot under the same conditions as the white boys at Parris Island, S. C., and San Diego, Calif. From there they move on either to the 173 square miles of Camp Lejeune or, depending on their ability, to basic schools at Quantico, Va.

As the east coast center of varied Marine Corps training activity, Camp Lejeune is the home of the famous Second Marine Division and the Marine Barracks, Headquarters and Service Battalion, in which are some 300 Negroes. They mess, use the same service clubs, and are billeted with white boys. Camp facilities include a free theater (in the Army it costs 24 cents), a 19-hole golf course and the use, on separate days, of Marston Hall, a palatial ballroom.

The Marines have four Reserve Negro second lieutenants, but none on active duty. But the way is open, if they can qualify.

WACS, WAFS, WAVES, MARINES—LESS PUBLICIZED, BUT VERY IMPORTANT IN THEIR OWN RIGHTS ARE SERVICES WOMEN

Negro women specialists served with the Army and Navy during World War II. Enlisting when the Women's Army Corps was founded in July 1942, Maj. Charity Adams commanded a Negro WAC unit overseas. Maj. Harriet West, another of the Army's Negro pioneers, was chief of the Planning Bureau Control Division in the Army's Washington headquarters. Pacesetters in the Navy were Lt. Harriet Pickens and Ensign Frances Wills. There were no Negro WAFS or women Marines during the war.

Today Negro women hold responsible jobs in all branches of the service within the zone of the interior, and in Europe and Japan. Capt. Blanche Scott commands the all-Negro WAC detachment at Fort Dix. Others who command Negro WAC units with strategic jobs are Lt. Margaret Barnes at Madigan General Hospital, Tacoma, Wash., and Lt. Doris Williamson at Fort Lewis, Wash.

At present Negro WACS number 594. There are 200 WAFS. Typical of these is Staff Sgt. Annie Moore at Lackland Air Field Base, Tex. Flight leader of 127 white and Negro WAFS, she is a member of the permanent party on the base. Figures on the number of Negro WAVES are not available. An estimate places them at 15. There are only two Negro women on active duty in the Marine Corps. After training at Parris Island, S. C., on a completely unsegregated basis, they are on assignment at National Marine Headquarters in Washington.

THE AIR FORCE MAKES NO BONES ABOUT WHAT IT MEANS BY INTEGRATION—NEGRO BOYS ARE BEING TRAINED IN ALL ITS HIGHLY TECHNICAL DEPARTMENTS

When the Negro unit at Lockbourne Air Base was decentralized last October, many Negroes had their misgivings. The "Race Base" (as Lockbourne was slanged) had operated so well under a Negro commander that they felt it was a crime to break it up. Some were convinced that Negro pilots would be lost in the diffusion, be grounded because of race, and would lose their flying pay. Others saw the glory of the Three Hundred and Thirty-second scattered to the winds.

Those were short-term views; in many cases, selfish. The Air Force proposals provided for the assignment and utilization of Negro personnel on the basis of individual ability. All references to race were to be stopped. Breaking up Lockbourne was only the initial step in the implementation of the policy. Soon enough the Air Force showed that it meant business. By December 31, last year—the time set for the policy to be in complete operation—the scheme had worked far beyond expectations without the least friction. The majority of Negro air officers with whom Our World talked are now sure that this is the best thing that ever happened to the Air Force in terms of a long-range plan. A few still "beef" about the high percentage of grounding among Negro pilots.

But investigations in Washington indicate to Our World that white boys have suffered just as much; and grounding, in most instances, has been ordered because of appropriation cut-backs or to conform with age limitations.

If anyone needs confirmation of the Air Force's good faith in the accomplishment of this program, a visit to Lackland Air Field Base, deep in the heart of Texas, will do it.

Being the "gateway to the Air Force," Lackland, more than any other base, needs the strictest supervision to mold its raw recruits. Maj. Gen. Charles W. Lawrence, the commander, has set down the strictest discipline for the acceleration of the integration plan. If any "jeep" has racial prejudices when he enters the indoctrination center, he had better get rid of them. From the time he hits the "Red Arrow" until he leaves the base at "Grand Central Station," his race is incidental. The flight chiefs, who practically teach them everything they learn, are carefully screened. And, on graduation, these boys receive assignment strictly on ability.

Officer personnel, too, like Maj. Lee Rayford and Lt. Bill Kelly, have been appointed here strictly because of their ability.

TOGETHER, "CHASING ELECTRONS" OR FLYING JET PLANES, NEGRO AND WHITE BOYS ARE BUILDING A GREATER AIR FORCE

And Lackland is not alone. In varying degrees of efficiency, dependent on local commanders and geographical position, the Air Force's nonsegregation program is going into high gear. We saw Negro youths at Keesler, in Biloxi, Miss., side by side with whites, studying the most technical elements of air traffic control, radar net defense, and communications. We saw Negro officers (many of them ex-Ninety-ninth men), side by side with white boys "chasing electrons," sweating through calculus, or studying the supersonic trainer. We saw them at officers' clubs, with their wives, eating at the same tables, slumped on the same bars as white officers and their wives. We saw them in the same BOQ's, in the same toilets.

At Williams Air Field Base in Arizona the same thing happens. There, the center of the jet-plane command, the boys—black and white—sleep, eat, and live "jets." To them and their wives the all-important project is jet planes, jet engines, and their performance. Four Negro officers are flying instructors here, among them the fabulous "Mr. Death," Lt. John Whitehead.

What does all this mean? It means that the Air Force is following the order to the letter and in its true spirit. In fact, giving the lie to the old bromide of racial incompatibility.

THE LOGIC OF THE COLD WAR DEMANDS COMPLETE INTEGRATION OF NEGROES IN ALL DEFENSE FORCES

As praiseworthy as are the moral and the ethical grounds for giving to all Negroes full rights in our armed forces, there are even graver considerations which make integration mandatory: The very security of the Nation is at stake.

The cold war now being waged against western democracy by world communism is making wide use of examples of antidemocratic treatment of Negroes in America to win the allegiance of darker peoples all over the world. The allegiance of more than seven hundred million is weighing in the balance. Segregation, denial of opportunity to Negro Americans, spells tragedy for America in the cold war of ideas. America cannot afford anything less than complete integration in her armed forces.

If the "cold war" becomes "hot" then there is even greater reason for the fullest utilization of all available Negro manpower to save the Nation.

It is against this background of clear necessity that one sees the Truman administration through its Department of Defense move into high gear to carry out its program of equality of treatment and opportunity for Negroes in the armed forces. Much remains to be done. There are still military commanders "overprejudiced in grade." But the race is against time. And time is short. United States armed forces in 1950 must march forward to complete integration for all of America's races.

Warmed-Over Biscuits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, with permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I attach the following column by Doris Fleeson, which appeared in the Washington Star, May 3. The column speaks for itself in its careful review of the absolute clearance of State Department personnel by the Republican Eightieth Congress, a clearance now being disputed by other less responsible Republicans.

WARMED-OVER BISCUITS—MCCARTHY'S FAMOUS LIST OF SUBVERSIVES COMPILED BY GOP EIGHTIETH CONGRESS

(By Doris Fleeson)

His fellow Republicans of the Eightieth Congress compiled Senator MCCARTHY'S famous list of subversives in the State Department during 1947–48.

Various committees analyzed it, took testimony on it, and concluded by praising the State Department and its security officer, Deputy Under Secretary John E. Peurifoy, for their zeal. Then they pigeonholed it without even bothering to make a report.

The Senator from Wisconsin thus stands in the grotesque position of accusing the only Republican-controlled Congress in 20 years of having failed to do its duty in rooting out communism.

WHOLE STORY IN DETAIL

The Tydings subcommittee of the Senate will momentarily disclose the whole story in detail. It will show that—

Every name on the list of 81 supposed Communist sympathizers handed to Senator TYDINGS by Senator MCCARTHY appears on the old House list.

The descriptions given by Senator MCCARTHY of the 81 tally in substance in every instance with the descriptions given in the House record as to ages, dates, type of work, background, etc. In some instances Senator MCCARTHY scarcely bothered to change the wording.

As the subcommittee reconstructs the story, the original list was put together by the staff of House Appropriations, then functioning under the iron hand of Representative JOHN TABER, of New York. At the time President Truman had not issued his loyalty orders so that Mr. TABER'S people helped themselves freely from State Department files.

Of files the Department had plenty. It had just been vastly swollen by the transfer of many war agencies. The investigators took a sampling of 108 names to the Hill and Mr. Peurifoy followed.

Before the Eightieth Congress bit the dust House Appropriations, Expenditures, and Foreign Affairs, and Senate Foreign Relations all had a whack at the 108 and Security Officer Peurifoy. The personal interest taken by Representative TABER, a tough customer, showed in the fact that it was the only State Department item to which he gave his own attention. The rest he entrusted to Representative STEFAN, of Nebraska, but when the list was at issue Mr. TABER sat in.

BALL HANDLED SENATE JOB

Senator Ball of Minnesota, then Senator TAFT'S principal backstop on labor policy, handled it for Senate Appropriations. The Senators not only cleared the State Department but never leaked the fact of the list.

Representative Chenoweth of Colorado headed the Expenditures Subcommittee which closed its hearings after 3 days and voted four to one not to continue with the matter.

The final sweeping exculpation came from Representative Jonkman, chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee, who said on the House floor: "I want the Members to know there is one department in which the known or reasonably suspected subversives, Communists, fellow-travelers, sympathizers, and persons whose services are not for the best interests of the United States, have been swept out. That is the Department of State."

Representative Jonkman modestly took credit for the Republican-controlled Congress for his happy situation with a few kind words thrown in for himself and Mr. Peurifoy.

Then came Senator MCCARTHY. The Senator has bounded lightly from 205 fellow-travelers to 57 card-carrying Communists and he gave the Tydings subcommittee 81 names. His 81 all appear on the old House list of 108 by name and description.

Actually 51 of the 108 were never hired by State. It is presumed that Senator MCCARTHY got his 57 card-carriers by subtracting the 51 unhired from 108—and, of course, making a rather large assumption as well.

Of the 57 who were hired, only 40 remain with the Department. They have been found absolutely loyal after investigation and reinvestigation by the FBI and the President's loyalty boards.

Representative KARSTEN, Missouri Democrat, hinted at the above in his blast at Senator MCCARTHY for his attempt through deceit and fraud to hoodwink and inflame the American people.

Some politicos are slightly more tolerant. They suggest that Senator MCCARTHY needed a fiery speech for a Lincoln Day Dinner and some Republican handed him these warmed-over biscuits. Ambitious but little-noticed here, he then found the attention he attracted was irresistible. Perhaps he was a little stampeded by the headlines. Thus say the Democrats.

The Republicans apparently are left to moan: "Say it ain't so, JOE."

"Little Abner" Brannan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY O. TALLE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 4, 1950

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to commend the Democratic National Committee for its realistic appraisal of the Brannan plan, as evidenced by its recent announcement that the comic book technique will be used to explain it to the people. This is a most intriguing development indeed. I am sure most of my colleagues will agree that there could be no more appropriate medium than the comic cartoon for depicting the Truman administration's so-called farm program. Unfortunately, the humorous aspects will be replaced by the tragic if this monstrous proposal to regiment the farmers is foisted upon the already overburdened American taxpayers.

Taxation of Annuities of Retired Federal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 1, 1950

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, under permission of the House, I would like to call attention to the following communication written by Mr. H. G. Richey:

STATEMENT RELATIVE TO UNJUST TAXATION OF ANNUITIES OF RETIRED FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

NEW ORLEANS, LA., *March 1, 1950.*

HON. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON,
Chairman, House Committee on Ways and Means,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: The following statement and plea is submitted in behalf of those Federal employees who, when retired, had to sever their connection and withdraw membership from any employee organization in which they were associated, in order to reduce their living expenses to the level of the annuity they were granted by the Government. This group of retired employees, having no connection with any employee organization which may be represented before your committee in support of proposed legislation, will have no representation except this statement, submitted by their representative whose signature is hereinafter affixed.

This statement is submitted with the request that it be laid before the Committee on Ways and Means, and be made a part of the record of hearings on proposed legislation, such as bill H. R. 124, which is to clarify section 18 of the Civil Service Retirement Act, relative to the collection of any tax on the annuity paid to retired Federal employees. This group of retired employees requests favorable action by your committee on such legislation, and early enactment into law by the Congress. That our request is just is shown by the following arguments:

(a) The Civil Service Retirement Act (sec. 18) provides that the annuity of retired employees shall not, "be assignable either in law or equity, or be subject to execution, levy or attachment, garnishment, or other legal process."

The wording of this section clearly indicates that the Congress which enacted the Retirement Act, intended that the retired employee should receive the full value and benefit of the annuity, without any reduction by "levy" or "other legal process." The word "levy" as defined by Webster's New International Dictionary, is "to raise or collect, as by assessment, execution or other legal process; to execute or impose by authority, as to levy taxes, toll, tribute, or contribution." Note how closely the wording of section 18 of the Retirement Act follows the definition of the word "levy" as given by the dictionary, and that this recognized authority on the meaning of words states that "levy" means to collect taxes by "levy," and the Retirement Act exempts the annuity from "levy."

The word "levy" to the layman means to tax, or to levy a tax; and to date there has been no legal interpretation as to the meaning of the word "levy" as used in section 18 of the Civil Service Retirement Act. Taxing the annuities is the result of a decision by the Treasury Department, the agency which collects the tax. That it is an unjust tax is shown by the fact that no legal action can be taken, under the law, against the annuity, to collect any unpaid taxes. Therefore, it would seem that the collection of a tax, which cannot be collected by a legal process, is an illegal tax, and an illegal collection. Bill 124 should be enacted into law to clarify and make explicit the intent of section 18 of the retirement law, and the intent of the Congress which enacted the Retirement Act.

(b) The Railroad Employee Retirement Act provides that "No annuity payment shall be assignable or be subject to any tax or garnishment, attachment, or other legal process under any circumstances."

The Civil Service Retirement Act provides that "None of the moneys mentioned in this act shall be assignable, either in law or equity, or be subject to execution, levy or attachment, or other legal process."

The only material difference in the wording or meaning of the two separate acts, is any difference there may be in the meaning of the word "levy" and the word "tax." Webster's New International Dictionary defines the word "tax" as, "A sum imposed or levied upon the members of a society to defray its expenses; a charge or burden, usually pecuniary, laid upon persons or property." Note that the word "levied" has the same meaning as the word "taxed" or "tax." Comparison of the two sentences quoted from the two different acts, clearly indicates that the two words, "levy" and "tax," were intended by Congress to mean the same thing. However, under the Railroad Retirement Act, the annuity of a retired railroad employee is not taxed, while the civil-service employee, under a ruling of the Treasury Department, has to refund, or "kick back," a part of his annuity in an unjust tax.

When an attempt was made to obtain an interpretation of section 18 of the Retirement Act, by the United States Attorney General, that Office advised that such action could only be taken on the request of the President or the head of a department. When the President was requested to obtain such decision or interpretation, the request was referred to the Internal Revenue Bureau, the agency which collects the tax.

When a retired employee protested against the collection of a tax on his annuity, and made payment under protest, he was advised by the Internal Revenue Bureau that:

"Consideration was given to the question of the taxability of annuities received by retired civil-service employees in connection with the preparation of the income-tax regulations and the fact was established that section 18 of the Civil Service Retirement Act was not intended to exempt annuities from Federal income tax, and that such annuities were taxable under the provisions of section 22 (b) (2) (A) of the Internal Revenue Code."

The Internal Revenue Bureau also cited the following court decisions relative to the collection of income taxes: *Disouke* v. *U. S.* (297 U. S. 167); *Raymond* v. *Commissioner* (114 F. (2d) 140; 311 U. S. 710); *Gillespie* v. *Commissioner* (128 F. (2d) 140); *Nanne* v. *Commissioner* (165 F. (2d) 304).

A study of the decisions cited shows that section 18 of the Civil Service Retirement Act, or the meaning and intent of the word levy as used therein, was in no way a part of the cases decided; hence the decisions cited have no bearing on the present question.

The various tax laws passed by Congress, under which the Internal Revenue Bureau operates, instructs the Commissioner of Internal Revenue that, "There shall be levied, collected, and paid," etc., etc. Note the word levied as used in the tax acts, instructs the Commissioner to levy and collect the tax; then note that section 18 of the retirement act states that the annuity of retired Federal employees is not subject to levy. Thus to levy and collect a tax on the annuities granted to Federal employees, retired under the retirement act, is in violation of section 18 of that act.

It has been suggested by the collecting agency that a test could be made and an interpretation obtained, by a retired employee refusing to pay the tax, and take the case through the Tax Court, and to the higher courts. The retired employee, however, has neither the finances, or the expectancy of life to institute such proceedings, and can only seek relief through the Congress.

To give some relief from their present situation the retired employees request that proposed legislation, such as H. R. 124, be reported favorably by your committee, and enacted into law by Congress.

Congress has recognized the decreased purchasing power of the dollar by granting various increases in the salary of employees still in active service, but no such consideration has been given the retired employee. These aged retired employees, physically incapacitated by age or ailment from obtaining further employment, to augment their annuity, seek relief through your committee and the Congress, by enactment into law bill H. R. 124, or similar legislation.

As representing the herein described group of retired Federal employees, I thank you and the committee for your kind consideration.

Very respectfully,

H. G. RICHEY.

Runyon's Last Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 4 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, we are now in the midst of a Nation-wide cancer drive sponsored by the American Cancer Society. I participated in the opening ceremonies of this national campaign, at which time I presented a medal, the Clement Cleveland Award, to the

distinguished columnist, Walter Winchell, who at that time donated on behalf of the Damon Runyon Cancer Fund $250,000, with which to get the drive under way.

There appeared in the April 22, 1950, issue of Collier's magazine an article relative to the fight against cancer, which is a matter of vast importance to the American public. The article, entitled "Runyon's Last Story—By His Friends," was written by Albert Q. Maisel. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RUNYON'S LAST STORY—BY HIS FRIENDS

(By Albert Q. Maisel)

A few weeks before Damon Runyon died of cancer, he took the short end of a thousand-to-ten-dollar bet. It was the kind of bet you could get only on Broadway, where the bookies can figure the odds, even on life and death, more accurately than any actuary.

Runyon bet that he would return after his death. He had no expectation of ever winning that wager. "It's just," he shrugged, "that I couldn't resist the odds."

Yet Runyon, the gifted writer who knew Broadway and the race tracks and the prize rings far better than they knew themselves, has come back. Today, more than 3 years after the ashes of his wasted body were sprinkled into the winter wind over Manhattan, he is influencing the lives of all those who know him and of hundreds of thousands to whom his name was only a byline beneath which they knew they would find a terrific story.

Runyon's last story is being written by all the weird and wonderful characters who peopled the tales he wrote while cancer slowly choked him. It's a magnificent story of a strange and democratic memorial erected by a million Joes and Janes, touts and chorus girls, crooks and con men, generals and Congressmen, who have jumped at the chance to buy their way into the business of being philanthropists.

Like much of Runyon's fiction, it is full of bad guys doing good things. But it isn't fiction. There is nothing fictional about 3,000,000 bucks in cold, hard cash.

It is also the story of Runyon's friends, the worldly wise denizens of table 50 at New York's Stork Club, who started out to raise enough money to endow a bed in Memorial Hospital in New York and ended up in the philanthropic big time, teaching new tricks to the experts.

The plot, like every Runyon story, has a surprise twist. The hep characters who touched off the Runyon Memorial Fund as a sentimental gesture have had their baby taken away from them. A million contributors have made it public property and thus proved what Runyan could have told them from the start: You never know what the people will do except that it's always better than you think.

The fund got its start 4 days after Runyon died, just before Christmas in 1946, when Walter Winchell grabbed his microphone to begin his staccato Sunday-night barrage of the air waves. "It seemed like nothing much at the time," Winchell recalls. "For more than a year I had watched one of my oldest and dearest friends dying. In all that time we had talked of everything but death, because you don't talk of death with a man whose voice has been choked out of him, a man who has to write down on slips of paper every word he wants to say. When Damon was released at last from the pain he never talked about, I had to say something, if only to get it off my chest.

"There I was, with the mike in front of me, and for the first time in my life the words came hard. But what I did say, they told me afterward, was that maybe other people felt the way I did about the thing that had killed Damon, that maybe they'd want to send a buck or so and take a share in building a Damon Runyon Memorial to fight cancer.

"I didn't have the slightest idea how much we could raise, twenty or thirty thousand, maybe even seventy-five thousand tops. But that wasn't the point. It was just one of those things you do first, then reason about afterward."

When Winchell walked out of the studio that night in Miami and began his usual tour of the night clubs, people sidled up to him and stuffed money into his pockets. The next day, at Tropical Park, you could have mistaken him for a bookie, getting the kind of heavy play most bookies only dream about. In restaurants head waiters, famous for itching palms, slipped him $5 bills. Guys on the rim of the underworld—the shadowy characters straight out of Runyon's books—stopped him in the street to say, "Lay this C note on the cancer deal."

Winchell, pad in hand, tried to be businesslike: "What name shall I put this contribution under?"

More often than not the answer followed the line of one gangland figure who said, "Never mind me name—just put it down as from 'synonymous'."

The mail came in baskets. Three days after the first broadcast, Winchell got a panic-stricken call from his secretary in New York. "Help," she screamed. "I'm drowning in dollar bills."

Winchell, by then was deep in trouble himself. It had never occurred to him that you can't just set yourself up in the foundation business by making an announcement over the air. There were technicalities he had never heard of about the little matter of collecting money even for a good cause. The postal authorities and the Department of Justice, while not quite ready to throw the columnist into the calaboose, made clear that the formalities had better be complied with in a hurry.

Winchell put through a rush call to lawyer Morris Ernst. "Get us a charter, Morris," he begged, "before they throw me into the jug. But don't forget, we have no money to spend. Every cent we collect goes to cancer research. So shop around and see if you can get a charter for nothing."

Soon Winchell made another discovery. It was necessary to have officers if you were going to have a foundation. Again the phones buzzed. Winchell called Broadway columnist Leonard Lyons to ask him to be vice president. Lyons accepted. Sports columnist Dan Parker, Winchell tagged as "El Presidente." Parker demurred. "You started this thing," Dan said, "You be the president."

"Oh, no," Winchell replied, "I've got the money—I'll be the treasurer."

There still remained the problem of a secretary. Here Winchell tagged Leo Linderman, the Lindy of Lindy's Restaurant on Broadway. "That," Walter explains, "gave us a free board room in which to hold meetings, with free board guaranteed."

The Damon Runyon Fund was in business, and everybody wanted to get into the act. For a time Winchell appointed honorary directors like a Kentucky governor appointing colonels: Arthur Godfrey, Milton Berle, Gabriel Heater. Finally he just passed out word that every newspaperman in the United States was, willy-nilly, an official honorary director of the fund, their rights and duties to give the fund plenty of publicity and to forward all contributions without taking anything off the top for expenses. This was about as radical a departure from standard fund-raising practices as can be imagined. In over 3 years of operation, with the first $3,000,000 funneled through the banks and out into the research laboratories, the fund has spent not one penny for overhead or administration.

Whenever receipts have to be printed, Winchell calls Lyons and asks him to get some receipts. When letterheads are needed, he calls Parker and asks for letterheads. When the volunteer secretaries need a place to sit down, the Park Sheraton Hotel in New York is spontaneously moved to discover that it has an unrentable suite. Out of the blue comes a volunteer sign painter and on the door go the words: "Damon Runyon Memorial Fund."

The fund officers have applied their no-overhead rule as rigorously to themselves as to all others. Winchell, Lyons, and Parker, frequently traipsing around the country to officiate at Runyon Fund benefits or take part in ceremonies turning over money to a research institution, always pay their own way. Their expenses have averaged over $15,000 a year.

The very amateurishness of this approach to fund raising has had a curious effect. Since the three officers admitted they knew nothing about fund raising, everybody else could qualify as an expert. Suggestions, offers, and propositions poured in.

MEMORIAL HANDICAPS BOOST FUND

Jerry Brady, of Tropical Park, touched off an avalanche of contributions from the racing world when he ran the first Damon Runyon Memorial Handicap early in 1947. It netted the fund $5,000. Other tracks followed. Suffolk Downs topped Tropical Park with a 10-grand Runyon Handicap, which it now runs annually. Hollywood Park turned over a full day's receipts—about $35,000. Churchill Downs runs a Memorial Handicap and tops it with an additional $5,000 from the gate receipts on Derby Day. Chicago tracks turned over $33,000. All in all, some 38 tracks, virtually every major United States racing park, have worked out one twist or another to swell the coffers of the Runyon Fund.

Other contributions have come from sources that would shock the staid directors of more orthodox philanthropies. The coin-machine industry dropped a $350,000 jackpot into the fund. Bugsy Siegel, who left much unfinished business when he was shot to death 3 years ago in Beverly Hills, somehow had the foresight to slip the fund an $8,000 check only a few days before his demise. Joseph "Socks" Lanza, the ex-king of Fulton Fish Market, sent $250 from Sing Sing Prison, where he was serving a term. With the check was a note from Lanza's lawyer, apologizing for the meagerness of the offering. "'Socks' would be glad to raise much more," the letter said, "if it could be arranged for him to circulate more freely."

A few months later the Sing Sing grapevine brought news that Lanza himself was suffering from cancer. His friends, who still ran things in Lanza's old hunting grounds, the fish market, decided to tack a premature Lanza memorial onto the now burgeoning Runyan Memorial. By methods best not talked about they rounded up a bank roll.

It would have been simple enough to put the money in an envelope and trust it to the mails. But the underworld never makes a pay-off that way. Late one night Leonard Lyons received a phone call and a voice said, "Stay put, fella. Ya gettin' some visitors."

Lyons stayed put. Presently in walked three gentlemen, their coat collars raised high, their hatbrims pulled way down. Each one pulled out a cigar box and placed it on the table. Then all three of them gumshoed away, leaving the bug-eyed columnist to discover, inside the boxes, 6,000 greasy dollars, smelling strongly of fish.

A PUBLICITY-SHY STATESMAN

Actually, the underworld's part in the total fund is a very small one, far overbalanced by

contributions from the other end of the social scale. One of the earliest large contributions was a $5,000 check from a distinguished elder statesman. A scrawled note read simply: "Don't advertise this." A few months later Winchell buttonholed the donor and argued him into a release of his name on the theory that, if people knew that Bugsy Siegel could support the Runyon Fund, they also had a right to know it was approved and supported by Bernard Baruch.

Another small check came in, pinned to a letter which read: "I like what you fellows are doing about cancer. Please don't put this in the papers and don't look at the amount of this check. It's all I can afford from a humble soldier's pay."

This request for anonymity was honored until Winchell recently presented a check for cancer research at Columbia University. With Columbia's president standing alongside him at the microphone, he then read the note, ending with the signature, "Dwight D. Eisenhower."

Between the noteworthy contributors of high and low degree stands a vast army that now totals nearly 1,000,000 individuals—workmen, housewives, actors, ranchers, pensioners, and children.

A private stationed in the Canal Zone presented probably the most heartbreaking donation in fund history. His pay had been snafued for a long time. When the Army finally came through, he received nearly $1,500 in a lump sum. He bought ten $100 money orders, every last one made out to the Runyon fund. His letter ended with a simple postscript: "Hope this helps you catch that cancer. It killed my wife."

In New Yorks' teeming Bronx some 7-year-olds decided to help by putting on a cellar show and charging 2 cents admission. Neighborhood adults contributed pennies. After a few weeks, a swarm of grimy youngsters emerged from the subway and entered the fund's office. Each toted a clinking milk bottle which he promptly poured out on the desk. The pile totaled 9,000 pennies. In Warrenton, Va., a group of kids from the horsey set got the same idea. They trotted out their own ponies and let other children ride them for a 5-cent contribution.

At least a dozen individuals have converted the fund into their own memorials by remembering it in their wills with sums ranging from a few dollars to many thousands. The fund also is acquiring property. One woman gave it a share in an Arizona gold mine. The father of a 16-year-old cancer victim learned only through Winchell's announcement over the air that a close friend had donated the major share in a high-production oil well to the fund in memory of the boy. Oilman John Wrather turned over to the fund the renamed Runyon-McGee Well No. 1, with a guaranteed income of at least $100,000.

Actors and night-club entertainers have worked out ingenious methods of shaking down their audiences for the Runyon Fund. Comedian Joey Adams, for example, wrote a book and proceeded to peddle it at every performance, calmly charging $5 per volume and turning the entire proceeds over to the Runyon Fund. His collections total well over $10^,000.

Richard Rodgers and Oscar Hammerstein II devised another fund-raising gimmick. With ticket scalpers getting $60 a seat for tickets for South Pacific they arranged to allot 14 house seats for every performance to the Runyon Fund. These tickets are sold to the highest bidders. St. Subber and Lemuel Ayers followed suit with their show, Kiss Me Kate. To date, this has netted the fund well over $60,000.

The latest innovation in Runyon fund raising, one that promises a tremendous sum for cancer research, was suggested in a letter by the wife of an Army colonel.

TRYING IT OUT ON GODFREY

Winchell tested it out first on Arthur Godfrey before a recent Sunday-night broadcast. "Whatever became of all the short snorters we used to collect during the war?" Walter asked him.

Godfrey dug out his wallet. Buried deep behind old auto licenses and honorary deputy sheriff cards, he found a yard or so of pinned-together short-snorter money. He displayed it, then began to return it to its hiding place.

But Winchell was too quick for him. He appropriated the short snorter and 10 minutes later was screaming the story on the air, ending: "Send me a million please."

For days vast bundles of soiled and folded samples of every kind of legal tender in the world came through the mails.

Another inspiration occurred the night fire swept Bar Harbor, Maine, and a cancer laboratory burned to the ground. A mile away, a doctor sat in his car watching 35 years of his lifework go up in flames. Then, over the car's radio, came Winchell's voice: "This is to tell Dr. Little up in Bar Harbor, Maine, that the Damon Runyon Fund is mailing him 50 grand tonight. He will get it in the morning."

A few months ago Milton Berle reached right through the television cameras to shake down all America for the fund in a 17-hour performance. By the time he dropped from exhaustion, he had gone through 76 cups of coffee and collected $400,000.

Occasionally, heels have tried to latch onto the growing fame of the fund. One of the boldest was a Midwest fight promoter who called Winchell to announce that he was going to put on a series of bouts for the fund. Winchell plugged the bouts on the air, and then waited for the check—which didn't arrive.

After 2 weeks Walter blew his top. He learned that the promoter had once been a partner of another shady figure whose fame rests upon his ability to get arm-twisting jobs done anywhere in the United States. The arm twister was sent for. Winchell banged the table: "Get me that money in 48 hours.

"And if I don't get it," he added, "you can tell that no-good welsher that I'll get on the radio every Sunday night until every boxing commission in the country has barred him from the fight business."

The astounded thug backed slowly out of their restaurant meeting place.

Two hours later, $5,800, the exact amount due the fund, was quietly slipped into the columnist's pocket.

PHONIES GET THE BRUSH-OFF

Occasionally a cancer faker touting a quack cure tries to horn in on the good will that envelops the fund. Winchell, Lyons, and Parker, however, have learned how to get rid of these phonies. All three, recognizing that their forte is fund raising, not cancer research, have wisely used the same experts who guide the allocation of grants for research for the American Cancer Society and the United States Public Health Service.

Even here the trio has followed the rule of "not one cent for overhead." Forty days after the fund was started they voted their first grant of $250,000 to the New York chapter of the American Cancer Society. They tied only one string onto the grant, that the society would provide them, free, with an expert adviser. That is how they acquired John H. Teeter, who makes order out of their chaos, yet lets them run as wild as they want to whenever they get an idea for raising money.

Teeter and other fund advisers have saved Winchell and his pals from a number of boners. Winchell, for example, felt that money coming from the 48 States should go back to all of them.

But, under Teeter's tutelage, the amateurs who run the fund discovered that you can't parcel out the money on a simple geographical basis. Some States just don't have the scientists and the laboratories capable of using research funds to full effect. So Runyon Memorial money goes to the institutions best fitted for cancer research.

More than $2,500,000 has already gone to colleges and hospitals in 34 States.

MORE WORKERS BEING TRAINED

Frustrated in its original scheme for geographical distribution, the board of directors is still trying to lick this problem, really the problem of a lack of cancer experts, by pouring more than $410,000 into fellowships for individual researchers who today work in the big cancer centers but who will eventually move out to fill gaps in the national cancer research pattern.

Although experts advise the amateurs who direct the Runyon Fund, the final decision on spending money as well as on raising it rests with the directors. Only two directors' signatures are required on a fund check, but never has any decision been reached without the O. K. of the entire board.

When the Runyon Memorial first began, many an old-line fund raiser and scientist looked askance at the brash, promotional-minded, high-pressure team. Today, many of their unorthodox methods, such as raising money by giving away a house and lot, have been adopted by other public-health and research foundations.

Winchell and Lyons and Parker have not only learned from the experts, they have taught them as well. And the greatest lesson they have taught is that the people—all people—will give and give and give and give if given half a chance.

Statehood for Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 4, 1950

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an excellent editorial from the April 24 issue of Trainman News, publication of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. The editorial, which presents so convincingly the case for Alaska statehood, follows:

ADMIT ALASKA NOW

The important Alaska statehood bill is soon to come up for consideration by the Senate, and we're hoping the lawmakers will lose no time in admitting this rich and strategically vital Territory into the Union.

Since a statehood plank is embodied in the platforms of both major political parties, there can be no legitimate reason for protracted delay. The measure passed the House of Representatives some time ago.

Although many BRT'ers live and work in Alaska and have repeatedly expressed their desire to have it made a State, our interest extends beyond the membership.

Alaska has earned the right to a place in the Union. Its population and resources are adequate to support State government. Its resources, in fact, and population of approximately 135,000, are greater than those of nearly half of the States at the time they were granted statehood. Some which were admitted with fewer people than Alaska include Delaware, Georgia, Rhode Island, Ten-

nessee, Ohio, Mississippi, Illinois, California, and Missouri.

The United States has received wealth from Alaska amounting to 400 times the purchase price of $7,200,000, a fabulously profitable investment. At present it has no public debt. Alaskans are subject to all the taxes, including the income tax, but have no voice in how the money is spent. And wasn't our battle for freedom based on the rallying cry that "taxation without representation is tyranny"?

Because of its lack of participation in our national programs, Alaska has suffered economically. Its underdevelopment is glaring by contrast when we consider that only 54 miles away, across the Bering Straits, the Soviets are pushing the limits of agriculture, erecting experiment stations every 100 miles, and establishing a permanent farm population to support a new industrial, mining, and military development.

This latter point must be weighed with considerations of self-preservation. Today, when every national act of our Government has its effect on the cold war, it would seem strategically and psychologically imperative that Alaska be admitted to statehood and be afforded the defenses necessary from such disquieting potentialities.

Gov. Ernest Gruening recently stated that Alaska today is literally defenseless; it could be taken in a few hours by two air-borne divisions, which could overwhelm the meager garrison of 8,000 men stationed there. Fact is, Alaska was the only portion of America invaded and for a time held by the enemy in the last war.

Granting of statehood would demonstrate to the other nations of the world that we practice what we profess about self-determination, self-government, and the superiority of the democratic process. This is of vital importance during these trying days when democracy is being challenged throughout the world by totalitarian propaganda.

The importance of these issues transcend narrow party lines. The Senators should pass the measure promptly.

Statement Submitted in Opposition to H. R. 7595, "To Protect the United States Against Certain Un-American and Subversive Activities," by Mr. Nixon, of California, or Any Similar Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 31, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave, I am inserting in the RECORD my own statement submitted to the Committee on Un-American Activities in opposition to the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950:

FORMAL STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE ARTHUR G. KLEIN, OF NEW YORK, TO THE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES IN OPPOSITION TO H. R. 7595 OR ANY SIMILAR LEGISLATION

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am opposed to the bill, H. R. 7595, "to protect the United States against certain un-American and subversive activities, and for other purposes," on the grounds that the bill is too vague, its criminal sanctions too harsh, that it is unnecessary and redundant, that every good purpose which might be served by the bill's enactment is better served by existing legislation and administrative action, and that its other purposes are themselves dangerous and subversive of American democracy.

It is my considered opinion that the mere introduction of this legislation, or any similar legislation, and the dignity given it by formal hearings, is an abject confession of lack of faith in the ideals of democratic living, and appears to me to be a serious effort to introduce totalitarian uniformity of political thinking under the guise of making totalitarianism unlawful.

I am sure that the sponsor of this bill is motivated by a sincere desire to protect the United States against foreign and domestic enemies, which is a meritorious and desirable purpose; but I disagree profoundly with the means.

I should like to remind the committee that one of the most brutal tenets in the whole depressing manual of revolutionary communism is that the end justifies the means. This does violence to the modern concept of ethics, and to the basic premises of the democratic way of life.

I feel that the enactment and active enforcement of such legislation would weaken our democracy and destroy that which all of us seek to protect.

With some change in language but with no change in its nature and ultimate ends, this is the measure which I fought in the Eightieth Congress, which I fight today, and which I shall continue to fight.

At the outset, I want it clearly understood that my opposition to all legislation of this kind springs from my own deep faith in the strength of American democracy, and not from any external influence.

1. The bill is redundant and unnecessary: Every useful and desirable purpose that could or would be served by the enactment of such legislation already exists in the statutes of the United States or in the explicit powers bestowed on the Chief Executive by the Constitution.

Mr. Chairman, I instituted a search of the United States Code for existing law to prove this measure to be duplicative and redundant. I was startled anew to discover with what minute supervision the 80 Congresses which have preceded this one into history have acted to safeguard the security, the dignity, and the sovereignty of this Nation, without violation of the letter or the spirit of the Constitution and the noble principles of representative self-government by majority rule, without threat to the rights of dissident minorities, on which this great Nation has flourished and endured since the Declaration of Independence in 1776.

We found that scarcely a chapter in any title of the code was without some measure of national protection. We found that every useful purpose which might be accomplished by H. R. 7595 or a variation of it is being accomplished under present law, or by executive action under explicit powers.

Because of the sheer bulk of the notes which resulted from this search, we have reduced the catalog of sections to those of major importance, and have prepared the notes in the form of an appendix annexed to this statement; I request that it be included as a part of my statement.

The 1946 edition of the code was used. Even in synopsis form, the resulting citations from titles 8, 18, and 50 are so voluminous that we mentioned some titles only by name and number; and we have skimped on the appendix to title 50 and the supplements issued since 1946, containing enactments subsequent to the general edition.

I was impressed by the fact that with the exception of the quickly repealed Sedition Act of 1798 statutory enactments up to 1939 had studiously refrained from entering the field of thought and association; beginning with the Hatch Act in that year there has been a regrettable tendency to attempt to emulate the Fascist and Communist dictatorships by prescribing "naughty thoughts."

The instant bill represents, perhaps, the most startling innovation in that field ever seriously considered by a congressional committee; and I trust sincerely that, as I shall show, the views of the author of the bill on other comparable legislation will prevail here.

(See appendix for recapitulation of citations to the 1946 United States Code, and for statement by Hon. William O'Dwyer, mayor of New York City, in 1948, in opposition to Mundt-Nixon bill in 80th Cong.)

2. The bill is vague and woefully lopsided: The title of H. R. 7595 instantly raises questions of constitutionality in its vagueness.

A careful search of the laws fails to disclose a statutory crime of subversion; as codified, the subtitles of the Smith Act refer to subversive activities but the text does not refer to them directly in the category of prohibited acts under the subtitles. (See U. S. C. 18, secs. 9 to 15, inclusive.)

Undoubtedly it would be possible, though difficult, to frame an objective judicial or legislative definition of subversion and to make specific acts definable as subversive illegal; but it is utterly impossible to arrive at any objective definition of un-Americanism.

Acts highly patriotic to one good citizen are despicably un-American to another. The phrase is, and must be, completely subjective, as a matter of semantics. It can have only that meaning by which it is clothed in the mind of the speaker.

To me, for example, the invasion of private beliefs and associations and the imposition of a standard of political and economic orthodoxy, together with the extremely dangerous current tendency to freeze the current economic system or systems into statute, are highly un-American.

To some of my colleagues, and in equally good faith, the very opposite is true.

I hope the time will never come in America when I can impose my beliefs on another person, or another person can impose his beliefs on me, by force of law or arms.

The policy statement incorporated in H. R. 7595 under the heading, "Necessity for Legislation," raises the same issue of subjectiveness.

There is no factual statement in this preamble with which I strongly disagree, and only one or two conclusions of opinion in which I believe the validity of the logic is dubious.

What I disagree with violently is the thesis that the remedy for the threat lies in undemocratic suppression of free opinion and the imposition of drastic criminal sanctions to enforce that suppression. In this I stand with Oliver Wendell Holmes and other great American lawyers and jurists who insisted on the capacity of truth to find acceptance in the free marketplace of ideas. If this is a pragmatic concept of political teleology, it is self-evident that the genius of America has been pragmatic, and any effort to bend that genius to dogma must fall, or destroy the genius which has made this country great.

The attempt in sections 2 and 3 to define totalitarianism only in terms of communism is absurd on its face.

The dogma on which a totalitarian government rests is unimportant to the effect on the governed; a totalitarian government may be a personal dictatorship, a dictatorship by a class, or by a caste, or by a clique, or junta. Totalitarian dictatorships may and often do repudiate in practice the principles to which they subscribe in their published ideology. Perhaps the most damning indictment of Communist dictatorships in those countries where they exist is their brutal perversion in

the practice of statecraft of the principles they publish to the world.

Aside from the philosophical inaccuracy of these sections, they quite obviously open the way to subjective interpretation and consequent abuses and injustices. It would be an emotional and intellectual impossibility for any group of fallible men to make an objective finding of the facts and the law under these definitions.

Similarly, the attempt in section 4 to define as acts what may be only thoughts or utterances introduces a novel principle into American concepts of justice and law.

There is a strong clash between succeeding sentences of this section. In the first sentence of section 4 (a) the act declared unlawful is anything substantially contributing to a totalitarian dictatorship "the direction and control of which is to be vested in, or exercised by or under the domination or control of, any foreign government, foreign organization, or foreign individual."

The succeeding sentence, much more rationally, gives a definition of a totalitarian dictatorship in terms of any dictatorship in which there is no practical distinction between the single dominent political party and there is forcible suppression of all opposition to the party.

But for the life of me, I cannot tell whether the crime the section attempts to define is limited only to an effort to establish a foreign-dominated dictatorship, or extends to any kind of totalitarian dictatorship.

Paragraphs (b) and (c) set up a category of crimes in which the principal factor is knowledge or reason to believe.

Apparently enforcement of these fantastic provisions is to lodge with the Attorney General; but what prosecutor, what court, what jury, can look into the minds and hearts of accused and of accuser and say what knowledge or reason to believe lay there? The paralyzing fear of prosecution through some error of judgment would reduce public administration to an ineffective palsy of indecision.

The bland disregard of existing dictatorships of the extreme right is not flattering to the intelligence and knowledge of the American people.

It is true that the three principal and explosively expanding totalitarian governments of the extreme right—Hitler's Germany, Mussolini's Italy, and Hirohito's Japan—have fallen; there still exists one totalitarian and authoritarian regime deliberately patterned on and fostered by the Italian and German Fascist dictatorships, and actively and expensively propagandizing in the United States today.

I refer now to Falangist Spain, in which Dictator Franco maintains a government no less absolute than Hitler's, and differing in political dogma from Hitler's only in about the same degree quantitatively and qualitatively as Mussolini's corporative state differed from Hitler's Nazi state.

There are a number of personal dictatorships of the nature of total government, but resting on little in the way of party dogma or ideology. At least one of these—that of Peron in Argentina—seems to be headed in the direction of complete totalitarianism, including absolute one-party rule, active foreign propaganda with an ultimate aim of imperialist expansion by force, suppression of dissident opinion by police-state methods, and abrogation of all civil rights. In Argentina's threat to the contiguous free republics of South America, and to the peace and harmony of the Western Hemisphere, there appears at this stage to be no real difference between the Russia of Stalin, the Germany of Hitler, the Italy of Mussolini, the Japan of Hirohito, and the Argentina of Peron.

Except as the phrase, "totalitarian dictatorship," is all-embracing, there is nothing in this bill to indicate any recognition of totalitarianism except that of militant revolutionary communism.

3. This bill is class legislation of a peculiarly vicious kind: It singles out for opprobrious sanctions a small and limited class of American citizens, and condemns them, not by judicial process, but by legislative and administrative fiat, and (with minor exceptions) not for overt acts of criminal nature but for passive association and for alleged thoughts and beliefs.

4. This bill would open the door to cruel distortion and abuse. No single person or administrative body should ever, in a nation calling itself democratic, be given such broad and sweeping powers of condemnation over other persons as would be bestowed by this bill to the Subversive Activities Control Board.

This bill would deliver to a small body of men of fallible knowledge and decision absolute power over the thoughts and associations of our whole population.

There is no use in saying that such power would not be abused, or that safeguards against abuse will be written in.

It is legalistically impossible to write safeguards which will prevent abuse of such vast and dictatorial power of destruction. The definitions in the bill are vague and sweeping, and the language constitutes an invitation to the Control Board to exercise its great powers on a subjective basis; the Board's answerability to the courts is less than perfect, since no aggrieved party could conceivably recover in a favorable judgment the good name lost by the original administrative decision.

Merely to carry out its defined duties the Board would require an army of investigators, with a constantly widening latitude of faulty and subjective judgments in each descending echelon of authority.

5. The bill is dangerous and subversive of American freedoms: Such legislation, by whatever name it may be called, opens the door to the very evils it seeks to guard against.

By proscribing an unpopular political and economic dogma, this measure would introduce totalitarian controls of thought and association, a principle deeply repugnant to the Constitution, to American traditions, and to the best that has been written by our founding fathers and political leaders.

Thomas Jefferson said:

"Subject opinion to coercion: Whom will you make your inquisitors? Fallible men; men governed by bad passions, by private as well as public reasons." (From Notes on Virginia, query 17.)

6. There is, and by definition can be, no adequate safeguard in the bill against false accusation of groups having no primary political significance: While I cannot conceive of a time when this measure would be sustained by the courts, judicial adjudication necessarily takes a long time; and in the meanwhile, with no recourse, many groups primarily ethnic or religious would be open to false accusation, shame, and disgrace. Labor unions would be vulnerable.

7. The penalties provided are unduly harsh: The bill abandons principles of court procedure and legislative standards which have grown up through centuries of slow evolvement to their present state, which is yet less than perfect.

8. This is the wrong way to preserve our democratic way of life: If the same energy put behind this bill were devoted to enactment of the President's civil-rights program, the country and the world would be better served.

The way to preserve our democracy is to make it more democratic, not less so.

When every man has an equal opportunity to earn a living, regardless of race, religion, national derivation, creed, or status; when every man is equally safe from assault, discrimination, and illegal action by law officers; when every man is equally free, and freely equal, within the obvious limitations of his own natural gifts; when every man is judged on his own worth, and not by any external qualification, then, I assure you, the Communist Party will wither away and disappear.

All revolutionary parties, regardless of their ideological content, thrive on discontent, insecurity, discrimination, and fear.

I condemn as boldly as any member of your committee the chicanery, the deceit, the double talk, and the absolutism of revolutionary communism. However, the whole approach of this bill to the very real economic, political, and social problems of our country is negative.

I differ from the author of this measure in believing that not repression and indiscriminate proscription but redress of grievances is the answer to the discontent on which, in the black depression years, the Communist Party gained its greatest membership in the United States and elsewhere, while revolutionary fascism took over absolute power in Italy, Japan, Germany, and Spain.

By your own figures, the Communist Party of America is today in a parlous state. Its membership has shrunk to a small figure, about one-thirtieth of 1 percent of the population.

As for fellow travelers, I am sure that those who were not shaken loose by the Hitler-Stalin alliance in 1939 have been jarred from their emotional moorings since the end of World War II.

The only members left in the Communist Party in the United States are the hard core of fanatics—those to whom communism is less a political and economic panacea for obvious wrongs than a religion to which they cling with psychotic fervor.

This legislation would create martyrs of the true Communists, and might even arouse sympathy among many people hitherto disgusted by the terrorism, the imperialist aggression, and the blind bigotry of communism, both as a world movement and as a personal religion.

Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, I urge you to drop this bill and to devote the resources of your committee to ferreting out the real un-American activities which are on every side—the hooded terror of the Ku Klux Klan and its imitators; the insecurity, political and economic, of our Negro citizens in every State; the open advocacy of falangism and the existence of Falangist cells under one name or another in some of our States, especially where there is a Spanish-speaking population; economic and political discrimination against many minority groups, whether ethnic, religious, economic, or political; the resurgence of pan-Germanism in the United States; the creeping paralysis of monopoly enterprise which is clutching at the throats of free and open business competition of small units.

You have a vast field in which to operate.

It is a disservice to the House and to the country to become so obsessed with one danger that you fail to see other and equally real un-American activities.

I cannot add anything to my opposition. I am against the bill, section by section, line by line.

I can, however, if the committee will permit, point out a curious inconsistency on the part of the author of the bill, the gentleman from California [Mr. NIXON].

On page A2129 of the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the gentleman inserted an editorial in opposition to a proposal made in the other body for the licensing of the motion-picture industry.

The gentleman's position on the censorship proposal almost precisely expresses my own views on the bill which you have under consideration.

I ask permission of the committee, Mr. Chairman, to include the remarks of the gentleman from California [Mr. NIXON] as

a part of the record on the instant bill, and I ask that the committee take into consideration the utter lack of consistency between his authorship and support of the Subversive Control Act of 1950 and his strong opposition to an almost identical proposal affecting the motion-picture industry.

"MORE FEDERAL CONTROL

"Extension of remarks of Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON, of California, in the House of Representatives, Wednesday, March 22, 1950

"Mr. NIXON. Mr. Speaker, one of the most startling and dangerous proposals which has been made in recent years is the suggestion that a Federal bureau should be set up for the purpose of licensing the motion-picture industry. Even actors and actresses would be required to take out licenses with the Government before they could appear in pictures. The ostensible purpose of this proposal is to improve the standard and quality of motion pictures. The ultimate effect of it, however, can be not only censorship of motion pictures themselves but also complete control of the individual lives of those who appear in and produce the pictures.

"But the greatest threat inherent in this proposal is the precedent that would be established. It would open the way toward licensing everybody who engages in interstate commerce. This, in the final analysis, gives the Federal Government the power to deny a license to anybody whose business standards and personal behavior it does not approve. Right now we should be giving more thought to reducing the power of the Federal Government to control our individual lives and fortunes rather than considering proposals to increase that power.

"The motion-picture industry has established its own governing body to enforce a code of morals and ethics. Under this procedure, the industry has been eminently successful in raising the moral standards of the films it produces. True, under this self-regulation, the code governs only the productions themselves and does not apply to the private lives of those who appear in the pictures. But I see no more reason for the Federal Government to set itself up as the arbitrator of the moral conduct of individuals in the motion-picture field than I do in any other field of private employment."

Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, I agree with the gentleman's position here absolutely.

I am opposed to such authoritarian controls.

I am opposed to them in the moving-picture industry, in publishing, in politics, in religion, and in this legislation.

APPENDIX TO FORMAL STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE ARTHUR G. KLEIN, OF NEW YORK, IN OPPOSITION TO THE SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL ACT OF 1950

CITATION TO THE UNITED STATES CODE, 1946 EDITION, WITH SUPPLEMENT

I. Title 18, Criminal Code and Criminal Procedure

Part I. Crimes

Chapter 1. Offenses against the existence of government: Every one of the 17 sections of this chapter support my thesis that H. R. 7595 is redundant and unnecessary, and that every proper and desirable end which might be accomplished by its enactment is better accomplished by existing law or administrative action under explicit powers.

Sections 1, 2, and 3, codifying statutes going back to the first Congresses under the Constitution following the successful outcome of the Revolutionary War, define and prescribe punishments for treason and misprision of treason. (It is to be noted that the Constitution includes a restrictive definition of treason to guard against the very kind of indiscriminate accusation and proscription provided for in this bill; this bill and others of similar intent are, by definition, evasions of the constitutional limitations by creating a lesser order of offenses tainted with treasonable intent.)

Section 4 defines and prescribes penalties for inciting rebellion and insurrection. (See also title 50.)

Section 5 interdicts correspondence with foreign governments and their agents for all purposes except that of redress for private wrongs, in language more exact than that of the proposed legislation.

Section 5 defines and penalizes seditious conspiracy; sections 6 and 7 prohibit recruiting or serving in armed forces opposing the United States.

Sections 9 to 17, inclusive, codify the sweeping provisions, prohibitions, and penalties with very great delegations of power to the Attorney General, embraced in the act of June 28, 1940 (Alien Registration Act).

It is noteworthy that there is a similarity not only of intent but of language between these sections and the text of H. R. 7595.

Section 9 is one of several having subheads citing subversive activities, but with no specific reference in the text. The subhead reads: "Subversive activities; undermining loyalty, discipline, or morale of armed forces." The text is broad and sweeping, and is not confined to states of war or emergency.

Section 10 (same; advocating overthrow of government by force) is equally sweeping in its interdictions of seditious activities, while section 11 makes unlawful conspiracy to violate the sections.

Section 12, containing the broadest grants of power as to search and seizure ever granted by Congress to an executive agency in peacetime, is now covered by rule 41 of the Federal Rules of Prosecution (q. v.). See also note under this section.

Sections 14, 15, 16, and 17 provide for registration of a large category of organizations, with a wide grant of power to the Attorney General, in language paralleling the bill before you.

Since these sections are now undergoing their greatest court test I refrain from any comment beyond their citation as complete and adequate protection against any dangers of sedition or of seditious conspiracy, from within or from foreign sources, against our country, in peace or in war, when taken in conjunction with other provisions which I shall cite specifically or by reference.

Chapter 2. Offenses against neutrality: The 19 sections of this chapter act to guard this Nation against unintended involvement with foreign quarrels, and provide punishment for individuals commiting acts dangerous to amicable relations with other powers.

Chapter 3. Offenses against elective franchise and civil rights of citizens: Not only do sections 51, 52, 53a, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, and 59 offer specific protection against the internal imposition of totalitarianism; the principle on which these sections are founded clashes headlong with the indiscriminate grant of power in H. R. 7595. Additionally, this chapter contains the provisions of the act of August 2, 1939 (Hatch Pernicious Political Activities Act), of which section 611 reads:

"It shall be unlawful for any person employed in any capacity by any agency of the Federal Government, whose compensation, or any part thereof, is paid from funds authorized or appropriated by any act of Congress, to have membership in any political party or organization which advocates the overthrow of our constitutional government in the United States.

"2. Any person violating the provisions of this section shall be immediately removed from the position or office held by him, and thereafter no part of the funds appropriated by any act of Congress for such position or office shall be used to pay the compensation of such person."

Chapter 4. Offenses against operation of Government: Every section in this long chapter relates directly, or can be made to relate without any wrenching of the plain intent of the law, to the national security and to that stability and freedom needed by a democratic and representative government against the overreaching power of unscrupulous individuals or conspiratorial groups.

All sections are cited by reference; but some sections are necessarily more specific and relevant than others.

Sections 71 to 87, inclusive, are concerned with defining and prohibiting false personation of United States agents and officials or private persons in negotiations with Government and fraudulent conversion of Government funds or property.

Section 88 is a general provision against conspiracy so all-embracing as to demand full quotation: "If two or more persons conspire either to commit any offense against the United States, or to defraud the United States in any manner or for any purpose, and one or more of such parties do any act to effect the purpose of the conspiracy, each of the parties to such conspiracy shall be fined not more than $10,000, or imprisoned not more than 2 years, or both."

Section 89 prohibits and penalizes threats against the President; section 91 prohibits and penalizes bribery of a United States officer.

Sections 94 to 98 contain detailed definitions and penalties for offenses directly concerned with the Army, Navy, national defense establishments and its reservations and plants, and international relationships.

Sections following close on this cover the counterfeiting of Government documents, passes, etc., interference with communications, etc.

Chapter 5. Offenses relating to official duties: It is natural that the provisions of this chapter should be chiefly designed to protect the financial probity of officers and employees of the United States Government.

Section 171 is so phrased, however, as to be of direct interest in connection with current discussions of employees who are security risks because of personal habits.

The section makes unlawful the performance of any act or attempted act of extortion.

It is respectfully submitted that consideration of an amendment to extend this section to acts or attempts at acts of extortion by other than officers or employees and directed toward officers or employees, by a committee having proper jurisdiction, would be of greater service than any effort at invasion of private rights of views and affiliation.

Chapter 6. Offenses against public justice: The recitation of the section titles of this chapter is a recitation of specific and detailed definitions of prohibited acts, with penalties, tending to interfere with public justice, and includes forgeries, destruction or concealment of records, perjury and subordination of perjury, bribery and other offenses, all of which further safeguard the peace and security of the United States against acts against public security and interest.

Chapter 9. Offenses against interstate and foreign commerce: While less directly relevant to internal and external security than other chapters cited, these sections have a real usefulness in protection of peaceful commercial intercourse.

It is especially to be noted that, in the criminal code, this is the entire statutory recognition of the private economy, and that the laws are designed to preserve a free competitive economy without attempting to freeze into immobility against future development any specific stage of the economy.

II. Title 50, War

Chapter 3. Alien enemies:

Section 21. Restraint, regulation, and removal: This goes back to an act of July 6, 1798, and has guarded this country against hostile activities of aliens owing allegiance to any enemy power very effectively. Sections 22, 23, and 24 give detailed instructions and definitions of powers.

Chapter 4. Espionage: The 11 sections of this chapter are all devoted to protection of the national security against espionage and sedition, by specific definitions of prohibited acts or of entities and places. It has long been my belief that a proper duty of the Congress is to reexamine this chapter, particularly sections 31, 32, 33, 34, to determine if the sections should be strengthened and broadened; proper jurisdiction lies obviously in the respective committees of lawyers—the Committees on the Judiciary of House and Senate. For my part I have no prejudgment except that the sections cited obviously offer no specific prohibition against activities in peacetime which in war are prohibited and heavily penalized. Even in this regard it must be kept in mind that most such activities can be kept under reasonable control through the invocation of appropriate sections of other titles or by administrative and educational methods. See also chapter 4A.

Chapter 4A. Photographing, sketching, mapping, etc., defensive installations: The powers bestowed on the Executive by this chapter, and the all-embracing language of Executive Order 8381, offer substantial safeguards against peacetime espionage.

Chapter 5. Arsenals, armories, etc.: Sections 56 and 57 provide specific safeguards against internal sabotage by Government employees.

Chapter 6. Willful destruction, etc., of war or national-defense material: The six sections of this chapter offer adequate legal defense against any sabotage operation, in war or in peace, by any person, alien or citizen, Federal employee or not, without invading beliefs.

Chapter 8. Explosives, etc.: By its licensing provisions and prohibitory language, this chapter guards against unauthorized manufacture of explosives of any kind, in war or in peace.

Chapter 12. Vessels in territorial water, etc.: Again, with minute detail, and in language so broad it can be extended to any type of machine for transportation, in war or in peace, the Executive is authorized to take security measures.

Chapter 13. Insurrections: Although most of the 26 sections of this chapter were enacted during the Civil War, the language is broad enough to meet any conceivable situation of internal disorder.

Title 50. War

The appendix, although merely a compilation of laws and executive orders of specified terminal date, applicable only to periods of open war or enacted for a specific purpose during that period, offers ample illustration of the ease and swiftness with which a democratic nation, without abandoning its freedoms beyond the time necessary for the completion of its war task, can act to meet an emergency. The Trading With the Enemy Acts, although included in the appendix, stand as permanent statutes available at all times for economic reprisal against enemy nations or allies.

III. Title 8, Aliens and Nationality

Chapter 6. Immigration (et seq.): Aside from the broad and general powers over the admission to the United States of aliens granted to the Attorney General and the Secretary of State, section 137 spells out specified categories of excludable aliens on political grounds; section 157 provides for deportation of aliens convicted of specified wartime offenses; sections 165, 166, 167, 171 guard against landing of excludable seamen. See also title 8, Code of Federal Regulations, 1949, part 175, sections 52–53, 57.

Chapter 10. Alien registration: This chapter embraces the provisions of the Alien Registration Act of 1940. Drawn with the active participation of one of the most distinguished members of your own committee, this chapter and the succeeding chapter have stopped every conceivable loophole through which alien disaffection might be spread. It is pertinent to note that these statutes have been termed too rigorous for a democratic way of life, and that they are confined to overt actions.

Chapter 11. Nationality: The many sections of this important enactment, embracing all provisions of the Nationality Act of 1940 together with unrepealed prior statutes, act as a whole to guard the safety of the United States against subversion of aliens and of citizens and to penalize disloyalty by loss of citizenship. Again, the punitive and prohibitory language is directed against acts, or the failure to perform specified acts. Certain sections do, however, stand out when evaluated against the instant bill.

Section 705 specifically denies the right of citizenship (naturalization) to individuals advocating overthrow of government by force and violence or the unlawful damage and destruction of property in sweeping language.

Section 706 denies naturalization to deserters or draft evaders.

Section 801 prescribes loss of citizenship as a penalty for taking any oath of loyalty conflicting with loyalty to the United States.

Section 746 contains a long list of penal provisions for offenses against the chapter, all of which are safeguards against fraud and misrepresentation of citizenship.

The powers already possessed by the President and by the Secretary of State to control the extension of passport privileges for citizens of the United States engaged in foreign travel approach the absolute, in language much more parliamentary than the direct and limiting provisions of this bill. If called to testify, I am sure the Secretary or the chief control officer would confirm my belief that existing law is broader and more useful than the narrow clause of H. R. 7595.

There are other provisions, notably in titles 10, 14, and 34, and in enactments subsequent to the 1946 edition of the code, which act to safeguard the national security in peace and in war; but no good purpose would be served by continuing what can be, in such brief compass, only a catalog of laws and Executive orders.

It is my belief, however, that the sections specifically cited and those cited by reference only make my point, almost to intellectual suffocation, that every useful end which might be accomplished by enactment of the Subversive Control Act is better accomplished by existing law, or by the consideration of amendments to existing law where there appears to be a specific lack.

Nothing in history or in the present strained international situation; nothing in the precarious domestic political economy with its unending threat of depression or of inflation, or of unemployment or of surfeit; nothing in all the ideological assaults which are being or may be made on our accustomed modes of living and doing business, nothing, I repeat, can conceivably excuse the enactment of any law which seeks to peer into a citizen's mind and say that what is found there is unorthodox and heretical and must be proscribed by severe criminal and economic sanctions.

Such a law, in the words of my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. NIXON] author of the bill under consideration, "would open the way toward licensing everybody."

Section 4 (e) of Nixon bill included in H. R. 4703: As a final citation I wish to draw attention to the fact that section 4 (e), which extends the statutory limitation on prosecutions for violations of section 4, is substantially included in H. R. 4703 (by Mr. BRYSON of South Carolina), introduced on May 16, 1949, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and passed by the House on March 15, 1950, by a vote of 368 to 2; placed on Senate Calendar March 16.

I quote verbatim from the digest of the bill furnished by the Library of Congress:

"H. R. 4703. Mr. BRYSON; May 16, 1949 (Judiciary). Amends the Criminal Code to impose a $10,000 fine and/or 10 years imprisonment on any unauthorized person who controls, obtains, and so forth, any document, and so forth, relating to national defense and who transmits or communicates it to unauthorized persons or fails to deliver it to Federal employees entitled to receive it. Similarly punishes persons having lawful possession of such documents, and so forth, for failing to report promptly loss, theft, destruction, and so forth. The Statute of Limitations in such cases shall be 10 years.

"Requires registration under the Act of June 8, 1938 (U. S. C. 22; 611–621) of persons with knowledge of or having received instruction in espionage, sabotage, and so forth, tactics of a foreign government with certain exceptions.

"Subject to a $5,000 fine and/or 1 year's imprisonment persons violating orders of the Secretary of the Navy for protection of security of vessels, harbors, and so forth, or orders of the Secretary of Defense regarding protection of security of aircraft, airports, etc."

Biggest Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the tenth article by Mr. Frank Waldrop on the infiltration of communism in our country:

BIGGEST STORY

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Russia is a vast region, but is not now, nor has it ever been, what we understand in this part of the world when we speak of a "nation."

It is not a tight-knit body of men and women all educated in the same general language, law, and idea of life.

Instead, it is a disjointed confederation of races and languages held down by threats of personal death to the man in the street on orders from afar.

It is easier for that power from afar to rule now than it used to be, on account of bombers, artillery, and automatic rifles. But even yet, ruling Russia is a hard and complex job.

In the old days, the kings in Moscow who called themselves "czar" in a Russian corruption of the Latin "Caesar," extended their shaky rule by guile, intrigue, and sudden pounces with the sword.

But they were never sure.

The old duchy of Moscow was made up of Russians. But to the south were the people who called themselves the "Ukraine," and beyond them, "Turks."

To the west were the Mongols, who once spread their deathly touch from the shores of the Adriatic where Tito is trying now to

be a jitney junior Stalin, all the way down to India and across to China. In between were more than 20 varieties of tribes, languages, and races.

All in all, the Russian empire of old was as disorderly as it was disjointed, and revolt was instinctive with all, from the regional nobility and gentry down to the slaves.

The Moscow czars were perpetually overextended, always required to cut off heads to make themselves obeyed.

One of them, named Peter, went to western Europe and saw how countries could be orderly and progressive. So in 1700 he directed that a new "window on the west" be built for him on the marsh edge of the Baltic Sea, and called it St. Petersburg.

Peter (the Great) was an imaginative man. He defeated the Swedes when they attacked him under command of the dreaded Charles XII. He also reformed the state religion to suit his ideas and one day had 5,000 soldiers beheaded to keep discipline. In general he made the loose confederation of tribes tremble.

But he could not have foreseen that the town he called St. Petersburg, his "window on the west," one day would be ruled by a German woman empress called Catherine, also the Great.

Nor would Peter in his wildest hangover, for he loved to get drunk, have imagined that in 1894 there would come to St. Petersburg a country schoolmaster's son, Vladimir Ilyich Ulyanov, who would take the alias of "Lenin" as a preliminary to a career devoted to overturning the reign of Peter's successors on the Russian throne.

Least of all could he have dreamed that on the night of April 4, 1917, that same schoolmaster's son would step down from a train arriving in the Finland railroad station in St. Petersburg, then renamed Petrograd, and announce:

"We will now proceed to build the Socialist state."

What's more, that the Socialist state would soak in blood and terror worse than anything ever known in Peter's day.

Lenin was born April 9, 1870. Russia was ruled then by the Czar, Alexander II, who had spent the past 9 years giving freedom and land to some 23,000,000 slaves and then having to put down their revolts against his government.

Czars through the centuries had followed more or less the same pattern of extending their rule, acquiring new subjects and broader territories, and then having to kill large numbers to maintain control.

Lenin was born in the period of upheaval precipitated by Czar Alexander's attempt to bind the slaves to him by giving them citizenship and land, in an empire already over-extended and inclined to fly apart.

Lenin's older brother, himself named Alexander, was already a revolutionary when someone threw a bomb at the Czar that hit the bull's eye.

Then in a few years that older brother was one of a group that threw another bomb at the new Czar, Alexander III, and missed. So that time it was the bomb throwers who died, including the said brother.

Lenin became a law student, fell in with the college radicals even as students do today, and gave himself over to a life of revolutionary conspiracy.

As such he was a genius. But his fatal day came when he stepped down from that train in the Finland station to attempt the Socialist state.

He got as far as kidnaping the power of the government, a story next in this series, but he was an utter failure as a Socialist or even as a czar.

The science of Marxism failed as soon as tried. A girl put a bullet through his neck one day, he never really recovered, and then he died.

Relation of the Methodist Church to the Federation for Social Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 4, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by the Council of Bishops of the Methodist Church on the relation of the church to the Federation for Social Action, unanimously adopted at Cleveland, Ohio, April 20, 1950:

The Methodist Church takes pride in its achievements in the field of social action. It has always held that it had a divine obligation not only to call men and women one by one to repentance and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, but also to serve as an instrument of God's will to define and defend those moral and spiritual standards which undergird Christian society. Such convictions have through the years made us the enthusiastic champions of movements which ever seek the reconciliation of our divided society, the removal of prejudice and hate, the cementing of the bonds of brotherhood, the exalting of God as the Father and Ruler of mankind and Christ as the Saviour of all men. We believe that God wills that all men be free to work out their destinies in a just society amid conditions favorable to the abundant life. We seek to be universal in our outlook and ministry without becoming partisan or political.

The pioneering of the Methodist Church in the field of social justice is evidenced by the social creed which came out of the mind and heart of the church as early as 1908, and which has become a kind of Christian Magna Carta for the churches of Protestantism. In line with the spirit pervading this creed, the bishops of the church declared in their most recent episcopal address, "We are determined that free preachers, occupying a free pulpit, preaching to free laymen in a free land, shall proclaim the freeing truth of the religion of Jesus."

The address of the council of bishops to the general conference in 1948 made unmistakably clear the position of the Methodist Church concerning communism: "We reject communism, its materialism, its method of class war, its use of dictatorship, its fallacious economics, and its false theory of social development; but we know that the only way to defeat it permanently is to use the freedom of our own democracy to establish economic justice and racial brotherhood."

We have recently received communications of various sorts from devoted and loyal Methodists in many sections of the church making inquiry as to the Methodist Federation for Social Action and its relation to the Methodist Church.

The federation was organized in 1907. Across the years, it has counted in its membership some of our most distinguished Methodists and loyal Americans, and has made notable contributions in the field of social justice. The federation, however, is not and does not claim to be an authorized agency of the Methodist Church. It is a voluntary and independent organization. It is not responsible to the church. It does not speak for the church, and over it neither the general conference nor the council of bishops has jurisdiction.

We are reliably informed that the executive committee of the federation has recommended to the federation's membership that the word "Methodist" be dropped from its title. We commend this action. Should this recommendation be approved, it would, in our opinion, clarify in the public mind the independent nature of the federation.

We deplore and sharply disagree with certain positions taken and statements published of late in the federation's official bulletin. Many months ago, members of the federation initiated actions which have made clear their similar judgment.

Our position as bishops in the church affords us unusual opportunity to know the mind and character of our Methodist people. We are convinced that no group of American citizens can be found possessed of a more stalwart loyalty to our Christian ideals and the evangelical emphases of Protestantism.

These are days of fierce perplexities. Enormous forces have been released in the world which challenge our faith and courage. We Methodists must not allow hysteria and fear to rob us of confidence in our leadership nor divert us from our task. We therefore summon both ourselves and our people to a new consciousness of God's power; to quickened insight by which we are made increasingly aware of human need; to a more constructive Christian statesmanship through which the gospel may be preached in language all can understand, with a thoroughgoing application of its ethic to all the affairs of the world's life.

The Postmaster General's Order to Curtail Services Not Warranted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1950

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, on April 18 Postmaster General Donaldson decreed that the letter carriers of the postal service, in residential areas, should work twice as hard. He in effect ordered these public servants to carry double their usual loads.

The Postmaster General is an expert on this subject. He, too, has carried mail from door to door. At the beginning of his own career he faced personally the problem of getting as much mail as possible delivered in the shortest time.

What record the Postmaster General set in hauling mail on his back, I do not know. I do know that he soon moved on to a higher position. Now, instead of carrying mail on his back, he has instead the difficult, distasteful, unfriendly job of policing these "couriers in the swift completion of their appointed rounds."

He has made the postal service his career. His son is also making this service his career and holds the position of Assistant Chief Inspector of the Post Office Department. His rise to that post was meteoric.

We all know the letter carrier. He is a friend of all of us. Has any one of us ever experienced anything but courtesy, friendliness, and sincere devotion to duty on the part of the quiet, efficient, and faithful mailman who serves us daily? Dignity, decency, and uncomplaining performance of duty are expected of the letter carrier for the simple

reason that we all have never known anything else.

If it were necessary for the Postmaster General to take the step he did in ordering curtailment of service, my voice would be silent. But it seems to me that this step was completely unnecessary and impractical. The Postmaster General is the last person to deny this. His own testimony before various committees of Congress, on numerous occasions, he is in no position to repudiate. The mail must move. Post offices are not places of storage. What comes in must go out to make room for more incoming mail. The letter carrier moves the mail out to the people on his route. He makes whatever number of trips are necessary to keep the mail moving. The length of his route is fixed in such a way as to keep him busy and his sack loaded.

Can a letter carrier's load be doubled by a stroke of the pen of the Postmaster General? If so, why was this not done before?

We all know that the volume of mail has increased tremendously in recent years, even in recent months. This increase is continuing. All the more reason for keeping the mail moving. Postal facilities are already overtaxed. What will happen when the letter carrier becomes a bottleneck, stopping the flow of mail and causing it to pile up in already overburdened post offices? The Postmaster General must know about this condition? But he cannot solve this problem by another order. He cannot decree that each post office be doubled in size.

All this in the name of economy—but a ridiculous, impossible, deceptive economy, perpetrated at the expense of the letter carrier—the friend and faithful servant of every man, woman, and child in the United States. This is no real economy; there is the appearance of an effort but no genuine effort to economize; and this action treats the friendly mailman with the lack of the consideration to which he is entitled.

This so-called economy would be more understandable if there were no real opportunity available to the Postmaster General to economize in the true sense of the word. But such opportunity does exist; it has been ignored, even though it would result in increased service to the American public while a saving is being made. When the Postmaster General passes this opportunity by, and instead reduces service to the public with no real saving, what language can be used to characterize his action?

The Postmaster General has undoubtedly traveled much, particularly in recent years. It is fair to assume that he has frequently been a railroad passenger. We can also take it for granted that when the Postmaster General pays for a first-class ticket, he rides in the parlor car, not the coach; and if he pays for a lower berth, he does not climb into an upper. Jesse M. Donaldson, as a railroad passenger, gets what he pays for. To this he is entitled. He does not pay two fares for one ride.

But what happens when he as Postmaster General, is paying the fare for mail. To begin with, he pays double for the service he is supposed to receive. According to his own testimony before the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, in connection with his bill to increase postal rates (H. R. 2945), the Post Office Department, in shipping mail by railroad, "used about half of the space that we paid for."

In other words, in shipping mail, the Postmaster General pays for two seats, and uses only one. And sometimes he does not even get a seat. Instead he rides a boxcar in a freight train, despite the fact that he is paying a parlor-car rate. Any product can ride in a freight train without paying a passenger fare.

A very interesting and enlightening report on this situation has very recently been made by the General Accounting Office. This report states, page 35:

> Many cars of mail are moved in refrigerator and other kinds of freight cars on which passenger-train rates are paid.

This report of the General Accounting Office, made to the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, is entitled "A Study Made of the Round Trip Provisions of the Railway Mail Pay Act of 1916."

This is a serious statement, made by an agency of Congress. It is short and to the point. So much is said in so few words that it will bear repeating and I accordingly repeat it:

> Many cars of mail are moved in refrigerator and other kinds of freight cars on which passenger-train rates are paid (p. 35).

This report makes the similar additional finding:

> Much mail traffic moves in freight trains at passenger rates. There are no mail freight rates approved at this time (p. 4).

The Post Office Department is now paying a railroad bill each year of approximately $250,000,000 (a quarter of a billion dollars, two hundred and fifty millions of dollars). We are paying this sum for first-class, de luxe service in passenger trains. Yet we are getting not even coach service. We are putting our mail in box cars, and shipping it in freight trains.

The Postmaster General is interested in both service to the public and reducing expenses. Here is his opportunity. Let him take the mail out of slow freight trains and increase service to the public by putting it in fast passenger trains. Since he is paying for passenger-train transportation, this will not cost the Post Office Department one cent.

When mails can be transported in freight trains without damage to the service, I suggest that the Postmaster General reduce his expenses by paying a freight rate instead of a first-class passenger rate. Perhaps he might also wipe out a large part of his deficit by recovering for what may be called overcharges already paid the railroads.

The report of the General Accounting Office which I have mentioned is a very interesting document. Most interesting is the fact that it does not tell the whole story of the transportation of mail by the railroads of this country. It is many pages long, accompanied by many exhibits. It shows that the Post Office Department has been overcharged by the railroads many millions of dollars a year, in many ways. Paying passenger-train rates for freight-train service is only one of the ways in which the overcharges come about.

This entire matter should be thoroughly investigated. The General Accounting Office should go into this matter completely. It is that agency of Congress which is charged with the duty of supervising payments by the Post Office Department.

In the meanwhile, I suggest the Postmaster General revoke his order making the mailman the scapegoat of his effort to effect alleged economy. If he is sincere, let him do what he can to economize by paying the railroads no more than the law entitles them to.

The American Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ERNEST W. McFARLAND
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Our Merchant Fleet," from the New York Times of this morning.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR MERCHANT FLEET

As a last resort the subsidized American-flag shipping operators submerged their minor differences last week and appeared in force before Senator MAGNUSON'S Maritime Subcommittee to lay before Congress disclaimers of excessive earnings under the subsidy system. It was a demonstration of unity that will do the industry good. The operators gave an answer, documented and accompanied by an unusual composite financial statement drawn by independent accounting firms, that should have been given last year when the whole question of Maritime Commission subsidies, both construction and operating, was brought under fire by the General Accounting Office and members of the House Expenditures Committee.

The steamship industry is a relatively small facet in the national economy, but it is a critical one. It has aptly been described as less an industry than an instrument of foreign policy. The subsidy to shipping is small. It is not a gift to the operators.

Subsidized operation carries well-defined obligations and restrictions, and from all of these the nonsubsidized line is free. Moreover, the subsidy system has strong recapture provisions. The company board chairmen and presidents showed that more than 70 percent of the operating subsidies went back to the Treasury in outright recapture. In some individual cases all of it was retrieved by the Government.

To permit the shipping industry to wither, as it has too often in the past, would be folly, for the country must have a strong merchant marine. We do not want a top-heavy merchant marine, and we do not want one that will put friendly maritime nations out of business; we must remember that foreign shipping services are a means of support and dollar aid to Marshall plan countries. But we want a good fleet, and one

with enough modern passenger ships to carry our share of travel and provide a reservoir of potential troop transport in time of emergency.

Senator MAGNUSON, who has devoted a great deal of time and interest to the hearings, is to be congratulated on his job. We hope he can arrive at a dependable estimate as to the size of the fleet needed, and then press for legislation on the phases his committee covered.

Saving at the Spigot and Wasting at the Bung

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 27, 1950

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, today we are appropriating more than $56,000,000 for the conservation of our soil. I approve every cent of such expenditures when wisely and effectively made to accomplish the intended purpose. Naturally, I vote for such appropriations as the one contained in this agricultural appropriation bill. Just as naturally, I am grieved to see a glaring waste of soil and water great enough to counteract or to cancel, five times over, the effect of the present appropriation we are considering. What is this avoidable and glaring waste?

The avoidable and tragic waste large enough to counteract the amount of the conservation appropriations in this bill, several times over, is the senseless spilling of Colorado River water annually into the ocean to the extent of $300,000,000 worth of potential wealth in the 8,000,000 acre-feet of water flowing, unused, to the Gulf of California. That water could be used on soil in the United States and still supply the Republic of Mexico with the amount guaranteed her under the recent water treaty. This 8,000,000 acre-feet wasted annually could produce perpetually $300,000,000 of agricultural wealth in seven States of the Colorado River Basin, and, as I see it, existing law provides for a proper division of this water in the fairest way that human beings can devise among the seven States of the basin.

Proposed Curtailment in Mail Deliveries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, 50,000,000 American families have been hit in the mail box.

Mail deliveries to residences are being cut from two a day to one a day, and other vital services are getting the ax. So, on April 19, a few hours after reading the announcement of Postmaster General Donaldson's drastic ruling curtailing these postal services, I issued a strong protest against that ruling. I stated that it seemed very inappropriate for the Post Office Department to slash postal services:

(a) Before the Hoover reports on the Post Office Department were applied.

(b) Before an efficient budgeting and accounting system was set up, so that we would know exactly how much various postal services really cost.

(c) Making a few humble postal workers the victims of a slash which will not really save money, but which will merely put out of employment some $40-a-week veterans—clerks and carriers.

I am glad to say that the favorable response to my statement from all over Wisconsin has been very gratifying. In addition, I have heard from many other States of the Union. I ask unanimous consent, therefore, at this time that a supplementary statement which I have prepared be included in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE MUST CONTINUE ADEQUATE MAIL SERVICE

"Why slash the Post Office Department's services at the very time when the need for more and better mail service is being constantly felt?" This is a question asked all over our Nation.

We all know that this is an age of high-speed mail communication. Modern business depends to a tremendous extent on fast mail service. American newspapers and magazines operate on hair-breadth deadlines which require getting out the copies at high speed. Countless wage earners depend on the mail for prompt job information. Old folks, veterans receiving certain types of aid must get their mail promptly.

WE CAN FAVOR ECONOMY AS WELL AS ADEQUATE SERVICE

But someone may ask:

"Can one be both for Federal economy and against this drastic service cut?" The answer, I feel, is very definitely yes. It is entirely consistent to favor Federal economy as well as to favor adequate mail service to the American public. Let us see how that works out. By adequate service, we help businesses using the mails and by helping these businesses we help to assure a large amount of revenue ultimately for Uncle Sam. Obviously, a prosperous America can help make for a healthy American Government. Crippling our mail service certainly does not make for a healthy America.

Any Government expert knows that the greater the volume handled, the greater economy can be achieved through assembly-line techniques providing scientific management principles are of course really utilized.

POST OFFICE DEFICIT IS ARTIFICIAL IN PART

Yes, we are all indeed interested in cutting down on the huge deficit facing our Government. That includes the deficit facing the Post Office Department. However, I have contended for many years that the deficit in the Post Office Department is in many respects an artificial concoction. Why? Because there are many items in the Post Office Department budget which have no business being there. These items serve to increase the size of the budget.

I refer, for example, to the air-mail subsidies, to the cost of carrying so-called penalty mail free for Government agencies, and yes, the cost of carrying congressional franked mail. I believe that each of these respective costs should be set up within the budget of the department units. In other words, the budget for the legislative branch should include the charges on franked mail. I do not believe that Congress should make the Post Office Department carry Congress' mail costs. We should pay our own way in our own budget. We all realize the fact that franked mail (that is, postage-free official mail) is about the only way by which the Members of Congress can contact the public, and so it is a necessary service. But that does not mean it should be carried in the Post Office Department budget.

POSTAL UNIONS ARE FIGHTING CUT

It is an important fact to note that America's able postal unions—the organizations which are most familiar with the actual operations of the first-, second-, and fourth-class post offices throughout our country have taken a very determined stand in opposition to the Postmaster General's ruling. I have received many fine communications not only from the national officers of these various postal unions and their auxiliaries, but from the State officers in Wisconsin. These conscientious unions are rightly fighting for elementary justice for their members and particularly, as I have pointed out, for the new folks who have only recently come to the Post Office Department and who have just been fired as a result of this drastic order.

We do not lose sight of the fact that post-office workers are, after all, taxpayers as are other Government employees and the rest of us. They realize that the tax burden on the American people is very high. They realize that it is necessary for the Government to become more and more efficient. But they do not believe, and I join with them in this conviction, that it is necessary to slach service to the American public recklessly, arbitrarily, and without heed as to consequences.

EXCERPTS FROM WISCONSIN LETTERS

The people can speak for themselves.

Let excerpts from various expressions which have come to me from Wisconsin be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In the instance of individuals who have written to me, I have necessarily, of course, respected their confidence, and I have not included their names. However, in the case of organizations which have sent me public letters, I have included the name and the title of the various folks who wrote to me. I could add to this list literally hundreds of other messages, e. g., from the Wisconsin State Federation of Labor as well as many other distinguished groups too numerous to mention.

To be sure I have received some few messages which support rather than oppose the curtailing of postal deliveries. But I do want to point out that these messages are based upon the premise of saving the Government's money. However, I, for one, firmly believe that we are not going to save the Government money by ruthlessly cutting down on mailings, because inevitably there will be decreased volume and decreased volume will mean increased costs to the Post Office Department.

Now, we all appreciate the fact that the farmers of our Nation receive only one mail delivery a day. At the same time, we all recognize that the farmer, like everyone else, is increasingly using mail service.

So, now from the city as well as the country areas of Wisconsin, this is the voice of our people:

SHEYBOYGAN, WIS.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: It gave me a great deal of pleasure and satisfaction to read your blast against Postmaster General Donaldson's cut-back order hitting the "50,000,000 tired taxpayers in the mail box" (and the postal employee below the belt). This on top of the

infamous "mail-handler order" of October 27, 1949, will do much to demoralize the postal service and the employees. It will certainly not improve the service nor save any appreciable money for the Department; not to the extent of taking it out of the red.

Your statement regarding the removal of air-mail subsidies, free-mail costs of Congress and other Government agencies from the budget of the Department is consistent with the bill H. R. 6103, introduced August 23, 1949. This bill, if passed, will accomplish that objective and will give us the proper credit for all the extra services that are at the present time considered a deficit.

ED W. KNABE,
President, Wisconsin Federation of Post Office Clerks.

MILWAUKEE, WIS.

It is the sincere hope of the Milwaukee County Industrial Union Council, CIO, that you work actively to have the cut in postal service, as recently ordered by the Postmaster General, rescinded.

FRED A. ERCHUL,
Secretary-Treasurer, Milwaukee County Industrial Union Council, CIO.

OSHKOSH, WIS.

Millions to destroy food; billions for foreign relief; no money to deliver the mail. In Oshkosh Post Office, 10 men, all veterans, are being laid off. Is this what we fought for? We are counting on you to help end this fiasco.

LYLE E. ROE,
Secretary, Branch 173, National Association of Letter Carriers.

MILWAUKEE, WIS.

We hereby petition you to support Senate Resolution 261 by Senator LANGER and to use your best influence with the Postmaster General to have him rescind his recent mail curtailment order.

LOUIS BEDALOR,
Treasurer, Croatian Central Committee, Inc.

SHEBOYGAN, WIS.

We heard on the radio the same night that the Postmaster General's orders were given, that our Senator WILEY, from Wisconsin, was opposed to cutting down mail deliveries in curtailing the post-office expenses in the Post Office Department.

We appreciate what you have done in the past and we know that you will support and urge any legislation in the Senate that will redound to our well-being, namely, security of our husbands' jobs, continued ownership of our homes and our present standard of American living.

Mrs. WALTER A. BRAND,
President, Auxiliary to the National Federation of Post Office Clerks.

INDIVIDUAL MESSAGES FROM BADGER CITIZENS

A message from an unemployed veteran in De Pere, Wis.:

"Congratulations to you on your strong opposition to the recent cut-back in our mail-delivery service. It gives me great pride and pleasure to know that my home State Senator is in there pitching for fellows like myself.

"Because I, as substitute carrier, am one of the many thousands affected by this so-called economy move by our Government experts. Yes, Senator, I was good enough during the recent war to serve 35 months for a government such as this; but now we aren't needed so out we go. Today our postmaster handed me my walking papers after serving 25 months in the postal department."

A message from Fennimore, Wis.:

"I wish to thank you for your courage and action in opposing the drastic reduction of postal service which the Postmaster General has instructed to be put into effect."

A message from Green Bay, Wis.:

"We are in full agreement with you on the post office cut-back to one delivery. The people pay for better service and expect it."

A message from Milwaukee, Wis.:

"My hat is off to you, Senator WILEY, for standing up against this disgusting situation, and so are the hats of every other mailman in the United States. Keep up the good work, we all appreciate it."

EDITORIALS IN BADGER PAPERS

Excerpts from editorial in Fond du Lac (Wis.) Commonwealth Reporter:

"We are inclined to agree with Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin, that the Post Office Department action is outrageous and that there is a need for more mail service rather than less mail service.

"We believe the American public is willing to pay for what it receives; we doubt, however, whether it is willing to pay for service that it does not receive and we fear that is what the retrenchment order of the Post Office Department is going to mean."

Excerpts from editorial in Waukesha (Wis.) Daily Freeman:

"If you don't think it is costly business to use the Post Office Department as a tool of the Democratic Party, reflect a moment upon what is about to happen to postal service all over the country. The number of deliveries are about to be reduced, post offices will be closed sooner in the day, there will be fewer street box collections, windows will be closed Saturdays and the bulk of the mail will reach its destination on delayed schedules.

"Today, in the face of the greatest peacetime budget and the greatest Federal deficit in the history of this Nation, the post office must go on shorter hours, the people must wait longer for their mail to be delivered and the fewer are the hours when post offices the country over will be open to give the public service. Does it make sense? It makes about as much sense as turning the Waukesha post office, lock, stock, and barrel, over to the county Democratic Party as was done a few short weeks ago. This is the gift of the DOC in Wisconsin to the people of Waukesha and the State."

Termination of Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY P. CAIN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the question of Federal rent controls is of continuing interest and concern to a large number of communities and States throughout the Nation. I have recently received two provocative letters on the subject from citizens living in Minneapolis and St. Paul, Minn. I ask unanimous consent that these letters be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, where they may be read by anyone who is concerned with the thinking of others. The question of whether Federal rent controls shall be permitted to terminate on June 30, 1950, as the 1949 Rent Act provides, or be continued in the future will soon be before the Congress. The letters and observations I have offered, and others to be offered, come from those whom we serve, American individuals. They often are more familiar with what is taking place in their own areas than we can ever be here in the Congress. I think we ought to give consideration to their reflections before extending legislation which first was initiated because of a wartime emergency.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *April 24, 1950.*
Senator HARRY P. CAIN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: The attached article on rent control appeared recently in the Minneapolis Star.

I am renting what are called luxury apartments. Some have in excess of 2,000 square feet of living space, including four bedrooms and three baths, and are located in one of our exclusive residential districts, overlooking one of our beautiful lakes. I have very fine tenants, some are the heads of the largest concerns of their kind in the United States and are perfectly willing to pay fair rental.

Through rent control, I am compelled to rent these luxurious apartments for 40 percent less than similar accommodations rented for 20 years ago. On a square-foot basis, I get 40 percent less than the city of Minneapolis is getting for their cheap Quonset huts that they rent to veterans.

Last year my rental income gave me a net of 2 percent on my investment, with no allowances for management fees, vacancies, or collection losses. FHA on new construction, loans about the entire cost of the project, and rentals must provide for an annual return of 6½ percent after expenses and taxes, and after an allowance of 7 percent to cover vacancy and collection losses.

I am a World War I veteran and due to a recent illness I am unable to work, and about my only income is from my property that I have worked for years to accumulate. Is it fair that I should have to rent my property at an unfair rental, to tenants who pay many times more in income taxes than they pay me in rent?

Luxury apartments are rented to tenants in the higher-income bracket. To put these units in balance, may I suggest that all unfurnished housing units now renting for $90 or more per month be decontrolled, if rent controls are continued.

Yours very truly,

D. G. CHANDLER.

P. S.—Yesterday's Sunday Tribune listed 428 advertisements for housing accommodations, many for more than one unit. Unfurnished apartments were offered as low as $24.50 per month.

NOW, ABOUT RENT CONTROL

To the EDITOR:

It amuses me when I read that by removing rent controls there would be more homes at lower rates available. If these people would glance through the Sunday want ads and find one below $90, I'd gladly like to see it. It's the poor people who have to rent, and who can afford that on average wages?

E. J. WATSON.

MINNEAPOLIS.

To the EDITOR:

I read the letter of Mrs. Benston, April 13. If some of these owners didn't think so much of their own pocketbooks and more of the

average working people who make a salary of $35 or $40 a week, the tenants would be more agreeable.

M. NELSON.

MINNEAPOLIS.

To the EDITOR:

I sacrificed many necessities to put up an apartment building completely furnished, heated, electric refrigeration, etc. Now the rent dollar I receive will buy half the necessities of life it did in 1942. I am not asking for a subsidy such as the farmers get, but if somebody comes along and offers an American citizen a better job with more pay, he should be allowed to accept it. If not, is this not forced servitude or slavery?

I would like to offer my solution to this situation. Wages for many occupations are figured on the United States Department of Labor cost-of-living index. Why not rents?

If there is a housing shortage, why did the politicians pass a law allowing 359,000 displaced persons to enter our country and then tax us $2,500,000,000 to build houses? Figure the cost of homes, possible schools, and all other institutions they will require, and where do you get off?

EDWARD T. WARDELL.

ST. PAUL.

To the EDITOR:

Your April 12 article on AFL Local 359 urging continuing rent controls after June 30 shows a selfish and unjust move on their part. At one time monthly rentals in budgets were figured at a week's salary. I wonder if the AFL officials pay a week's salary for a month's rent.

OLE JOHNSON.

MINNEAPOLIS.

To the EDITOR:

I am deeply impressed by the pitiful letters written by tenants in your Everybody's Ideas column. For 8 years they have been living off the blood and sweat of honest people who have sacrificed in order to own income property. I admit it is becoming increasingly unpopular to work for anything since our Democratic give-away government or soak the rich politicians decided they could remain in office indefinitely simply by confiscating the property of minority groups and feeding it into the maw of the public.

W. H. ASHFORD.

MINNEAPOLIS.

To the EDITOR:

Why don't you publish more letters against rent control? Taking rent control off is the only thing that will solve our housing shortage. If rent controls come off, rents on older places would probably go up for a short time, but would gradually be adjusted and everybody would have an equal chance.

MRS. EDNA SMITH.

MINNEAPOLIS.

To the EDITOR:

I am a landlord, but first of all I am a humanitarian, so I believe in fairness in all things. We all, including tenants, know that landlords have not had a fair deal. Rent controls should have been discontinued immediately after the war and rents would have been adjusted to a fair price long ago. Now, here is where I hope the landlords will be fair if controls come off: Please, landlords, do not increase your rentals for 3 months. In that length of time, an adjustment will take place and still will permit a raise fair to tenants and landlords.

MRS. V. C. KRANER.

MINNEAPOLIS.

To the EDITOR:

Your recent article (April 10) regarding rent controls being outmoded was very fitting at this time. Tenants who are now well set in rent-controlled property are opposed to decontrol. No doubt the landlord is wondering how he will meet increased real-estate taxes and other expenses, and needy young couples can't find places to live. Isn't it time rent controls are discontinued so all may have an even chance?

MRS. M. ALLEN.

MINNEAPOLIS.

To the EDITOR:

The AFL must have enough to do without interfering with all the politics. They say if we ended Federal rent control in June, rental fees would skyrocket and they would have to get higher wages. Everything that was rationed has been lifted except for the landlord. If we are the only fools left, then we need a guardian, not a bunch of political racketeers, to run our business.

MAUDE ANDERSON.

MINNEAPOLIS.

ST. PAUL, MINN.

Subject: Facts about Federal rent control.

MY DEAR SENATOR: We are just struggling landlords between the ages of 63 and 68; one, a teacher for some 34 years, now retired, one a retired farmer, and one a retired building contractor. All of us worked for wages or salary for many years—all took their parents' advice to work hard, save if possible, and invest in real estate, and to look to ourselves rather than to our Government for old-age security, and we all support ourselves from rental income.

If our story was not representative of millions of other small landlords we would not presume to burden you with these facts.

During the war, wages, salaries, prices and rents were frozen, and we all felt it would help the war effort and that it was justified, but when wages, salaries and prices were decontrolled, leaving only rents still under drastic Government control, the problem of the landlord became increasingly more difficult as all other prices and wages increased approximately 100 percent. Thus the landlord was forced to pay ever-increasing prices for items of maintenance as his net income diminished. He also must now pay 100 percent more to cover his living expenses or reduce his standard of living.

A book could be written to explain why the rent-control laws as revised from year to year and administered by OHE did little else than give lip service to meet this ever-increasing difficult position of the landlord, but suffice it here to say that its accomplishments are summed up by the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics who report that rents increased an average of less than 12 percent from 1942 to 1950.

During the same period the farmers cash income increased over 200 percent, corporations earnings increased over 200 percent, personal income over 180 percent, coal over 100 percent, homes over 100 percent, wholesale prices over 100 percent, wages and salaries increased 170 percent, cost of living increased 67 percent, Federal taxes over 600 percent, and rents increased less than 12 percent.

In my humble opinion the seeds of disaster have been planted and will come to fruition if Federal rent control is not uprooted and allowed to die—and we give you the following facts to prove our position:

1. Rent control, as administered, has sickened the entire business of private building for housing rental, and the repair and redecorating of existing rental properties, because the landlord has insufficient income under rent control to hire this work done, which adds to unemployment. This weakness in our otherwise prosperous economy may well be the cause or contribute largely to our next possible depression.

2. While all other segments of our economy are prosperous and able to set aside a nest egg for possible hard times, the landlords have no reserve whatsoever and in addition must compete with Government subsidized housing.

3. The landlords, for lack of sufficient rent income, have of necessity let their property run down for lack of repair, redecorating, and replacements. What is to happen to the landlord when the heating boiler or refrigerating system needs replacing or gas stoves, carpets, and furnishings wear out? I ask what is to be his fate and what effect will it have on our economy in general?

4. The landlord, instead of the Government, has been compelled by rent control to subsidize the tenants, so they will have more money to bid up the things they buy, and this greater purchasing power has created added pressure on prices. It is most doubtful if their standard of living has been thereby increased. It is a fact however, that if the landlord was allowed a just rent he could keep up his properties better, which would mean better living for his tenants. We do not believe that good can blossom from injustice. When the farmer is subsidized the cost comes out of the United States Treasury or the consumer, or both, but when the tenant is subsidized it comes out of the landlord.

5. Russia confiscates the lands of the landlord and gives its use to the tenants. Rent control, as now administered, takes part of the rent income which belongs to the landlords and gives it to the tenant. The principle involved is the same in each case—for one's property is taken away without just compensation.

As disastrous as rent control may prove economically if continued, it has sown far more deadly seeds which can do much more harm politically, as explained below:

A. When a democratic government deliberately takes away unjustly from one minority class of its citizenry without just compensation and gives to another class, no matter how worthy the cause is thought to be, no class is safe from exploitation, and representative government is tottering for a fall.

B. If the farmers' representatives in Congress or any other important voting groups would, at the request, let us say, of the organized labor groups, vote for the extension of rent control, solely to get labor's support of some pet legislation of their own, even though the farmers' representatives felt rent control unjust—then I say integrity is dead and it is only a matter of time when chaos will become rampant and representative government is doomed.

C. The farmer, through direct aid and price support, has been subsidized to the extent of over $2,000,000,000 in 1949 alone—can it be that he favors continued rent control for others who receive less than 12 percent more rent income than in 1942? The landlord asks for no subsidy or price guarantee or profit guarantee—all he asks for is common justice and fair dealing. He asks for a chance to run his own business. He asks that the farce that World War II is still in progress, be forever buried.

D. We challenge you to strike a blow for equity and justice and for our representative form of government by voting against the extension of Federal rent control, before it destroys our way of life, and also discourage the States from attempting State rent control with its disastrous results as shown so clearly in France.

Respectfully submitted.

ISABELLA F. BOYD.
LEON H. BOYD.
JAS. H. BOYD.

Curtailment of the Veterans' Hospital-Construction Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 5, 1950

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, last week the House of Representatives reaffirmed its position on the veterans' hospital-construction program by passing H. R. 5965 to direct the Veterans' Administration to proceed with the construction of new hospitals totaling 16,000 beds.

For a little history of this program we should remember that the Veterans' Administration reported in January 1945 during hearing on the independent offices appropriation bill for 1946 as follows:

In compliance with section 101 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, the Veterans' Administration, in collaboration with the Federal Board of Hospitalization, submitted an estimated program covering the hospital needs of the Veterans' Administration up to and including June 30, 1947. This program covered the estimated requirements for additional neuropsychiatric, tuberculosis, and general medical and surgical beds and provided for the acquisition by new construction, or by transfer at such time as they might become available from the Army and Navy of approximately 22,000 beds. This program was approved by the President on September 12, 1944, and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs was authorized to submit a specific construction program totaling approximately 14,100 beds for inclusion in the appropriation estimates for the fiscal year 1946.

Subsequent to the program for 14,100 beds that was approved by the President on December 2, 1944, the Veterans' Administration submitted additional programs—one covering 19 new hospitals that was approved on October 16, 1945, and one covering 30 new hospitals that was approved on December 3, 1945. The final program submitted by the Veterans' Administration provided for 15 new hospitals and was approved by the President on October 19, 1945. This program was designed to meet our requirements through the fiscal year 1951.

You can see from the testimony of the officials from VA that the proper armed services officials and the VA medical people were working out a hospital program for veterans as authorized by Congress and the Federal Board of Hospitalization had approved of the planned projects.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that it is important that the established policy of Congress should be carried out as directed by the elected representatives of the people and if the policy by later events appears to be in error, then the facts should be presented to Congress for its action. By no means should the established hospital construction program authorized by Congress be changed by the drastic expedient of curtailing beds as was done by the executive branch last year.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert at this point an explanation of the Federal Board of Hospitalization and its duties to show that this was a responsible group which approved the planned VA hospital program:

FEDERAL BOARD OF HOSPITALIZATION

On August 1, 1943, the Executive Office of the President directed a new Federal Board of Hospitalization to serve as an advisory agency to the Bureau of the Budget. This Board was charged with the duties of analyzing and reviewing hospital, convalescent, and domiciliary activities and programs developed and operated by all departments and establishments of the Government for the purpose of—

(a) Preventing the overlapping and duplication of services and overbuilding of facilities;

(b) Insuring the most efficient and complete utilization of the total services and facilities of the Federal Government by each department and establishment;

(c) Determining the need for existing or additional facilities of each department and establishment;

(d) Determining the area or locality in which additional facilities should be provided;

(e) Determining the extent to which non-Federal facilities may be utilized in the administration of the hospital activities or programs of any department or establishment;

(f) Developing a complete over-all program for providing hospitalization for the veterans of World War II; and

(g) Furnishing recommendations with respect to such matters as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget may refer to the Board.

The above will be recognized as very significant, in view of recent announcements in the press and developments otherwise. No less important is another instruction given to the Board at the time it was reestablished, so to speak, which reads as follows:

"No project for acquisition of additional beds by new construction, major alterations, or leasing of or contracting for existing facilities shall be undertaken by any department or establishment until it has been submitted to and reviewed by the Board as to need, location, type of construction, and any other factor which the Board may consider pertinent to the performance of its responsibilities, nor until the resulting recommendation of the Board has been transmitted and considered * * * as approved by the President."

An article appearing in the Washington Evening Star of Friday, April 28, 1950, quoted Dr. Paul B. Magnuson, Medical Chief of the Veterans' Administration, as saying that he wished more Members of Congress, chamber of commerce heads, and Legion commanders knew what a hospital was. Further, he stated that he could not use 16,000 more hospital beds if they gave them to him, stating that it took 1½ people to take care of each bed year in and year out and that he had nearly 4,000 of their present beds empty for lack of staff.

However, in 1949, the Senate and Public Welfare Committee prepared a committee print including the hearings which were conducted by it on the curtailment of veterans' hospital construction which included an exhibit prepared by the Veterans' Administration and can be found on page 16 under the heading "Exhibit F," as follows:

Staffing requirements as presented by the Veterans' Administration for the facilities proposed to be cut back, with pertinent information indicating whether or not the problem can be met by the Veterans' Administration in the case of the institutions proposed to be cut back.

EXHIBIT F

COMMENTS REGARDING STAFFING OF HOSPITALS INVOLVED IN CUT-BACK IN THE VA HOSPITAL PROGRAM

1. In the 16,000-bed cut in the VA hospital program the following 14 hospitals were reduced in size:

Syracuse, N. Y	GM.
Philadelphia, Pa	GM.
Pittsburgh, Pa	GM.
Washington, D. C	GM.
Pittsburgh, Pa	NP.
Atlanta, Ga	GM.
Cincinnati, Ohio	GM.
Cleveland, Ohio	GM.
Cleveland Ohio	NP.
Louisville, Ky	GM.
Chicago, Ill	GM.
Kansas City, Mo	GM. and TB.
Oklahoma City, Okla	GM.
St. Louis, Mo	GM.

All of these hospitals are to be located in communities where there are medical schools, and no difficulty in staffing these beds would be encountered.

2. Among the hospitals eliminated from the program, we could very readily staff the following hospitals:

Detroit, Mich	TB.
New York City	Rehabilitation.
Charlotte, N. C	GM.
Grand Rapids, Mich	GM.
Greenville, S. C	GM.

3. Hospitals that would be moderately difficult to staff:

Norman, Okla	NP.
El Paso, Tex	NP.
Chattanooga, Tenn	GM.
Tallahassee, Fla	GM.
Harrisburg, Pa	GM.

4. Hospitals that would be difficult to staff properly:

Salisbury, N. C	NP.
Americus, Ga	TB.
Gainesville, Fla	NP.
Memphis, Tenn	NP.
Thomasville, Ga	GM.
Decatur, Ill	GM.
Duluth, Minn	GM.
Mound Bayou, Miss	GM.
Tupelo, Miss	GM.
Klamath Falls, Oreg	GM.
San Diego, Calif	GM.

In determining the difficulty of staffing certain hospitals, consideration has been given to recruiting of all types of needed personnel, including the necessary medical specialists. Without complete coverage of all the various types of technicians and doctors, a hospital cannot be operated satisfactorily.

If only an X-ray specialist is not available, it may mean a difference of several days' hospitalization resulting in greater cost to the Government. The same thing applies to other specialists and technicians in the hospital.

Mr. Speaker, several of our cities, such as El Paso, Tex., spent considerable amounts of money preparing for the expansion of their water and sewer systems on the promise of Congress that authorized VA hospitals in their cities would be constructed. I have given considerable thought to all of the various aspects of our hospital construction program and I believe that the 16,000 beds that we previously deleted from the program should be restored.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a resolution adopted by the Veterans' Affairs

Commission of Texas in regards to the VA hospital program:

RESOLUTION

Whereas there are many vacant beds in the old section of the Veterans' Administration Hospital at Legion, Tex., that are not being used; and

Whereas there are many tubercular veterans in Texas and surrounding States who are being denied hospital treatment as a result of these vacant beds; and

Whereas this situation could be relieved by the Veterans' Administration if they would complete the renovation of these ward rooms and reactivate the complete facilities at this hospital: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Veterans' Affairs Commission of Texas in executive session at Austin, Tex., this 25th day of March 1950, hereby calls this deplorable condition to the attention of the Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C., and hereby requests that immediate action be taken to complete the renovation of existing facilities and reactivation of the complete facilities whereby the acute need of tubercular veterans may be alleviated; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent tor the President of the United States, to the Governor of Texas, to the major veterans' organizations, to Administrator Carl R. Gray, Jr., to Chief Medical Director Dr. Paul B. Magnuson, and to the manager, Veterans' Administration Hospital, Legion, Tex.

RENE A. GARZA,
Chairman, Zapata, Tex.,
ROBERT W. AKERS,
Vice Chairman, Beaumont, Tex.,
JOE M. DANIEL,
Secretary, Corsicana, Tex.,
LEWIS P. FIELDS,
Member, Amarillo, Tex.,
MARCUS WEEMS,
Member, West Columbia, Tex.,
Veterans' Affairs Commission of Texas.

Colorado's Senator Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Colorado's Senator JOHNSON," by Thor Severson, from the April 15 issue of the magazine Frontier. The article is an extremely interesting profile of our esteemed colleague, the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON].

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MAN WHO GAVE HOLLYWOOD A HOTFOOT—COLORADO'S SENATOR JOHNSON

(By Thor Severson)

Big Ed's voice quaked with indignant wrath. His mammoth head lifted in righteous purpose. Shoulders back, he stood proud and erect. His bold finger, this day, was searching out a woman who had sinned. Magnificent was the word for Big Ed in his role as an apostle of virtue.

The place: The most public stage in all the world, the United States Senate. The subject: Ingrid Bergman, her Italian lover, Roberto Rossellini, and an island called Stromboli.

The day: March 14, 1950.

This was the day big ED JOHNSON, the razor-tongued master of the unpredictable, the bull-shouldered Senator from Colorado, made his now celebrated attack on Hollywood's motion-picture industry and the stars the industry has made wealthy and famous.

This was the day big Ed cast the biblical stone, labeling Miss Bergman a common mistress and costarring her with Princess Rita Hayworth Kahn as Hollywood's two apostles of degradation.

This was the day he dismissed Rossellini as vile and unspeakable and a common love thief, and the day he bull whipped RKO studios for its nauseating commercialism in releasing the picture Stromboli, even while Miss Bergman was giving birth to Rossellini's child.

This day, too, the Coloradan called upon the United States Senate to take a bold action—to license the motion-picture industry and its stars' morals.

Said JOHNSON: "Miss Bergman, Rossellini, and RKO have invited restraints by law, and I shall do my best to see that they get what they have asked for."

And JOHNSON has.

His attack has touched off a full hearing for mid-April on his proposed film licensing bill. Hollywood, at that hearing, will be called to account.

Now this article, most certainly, does not attempt to plead the justice or injustice of Senator JOHNSON'S castigation of Hollywood.

It is interested, primarily, in the why, and in the man JOHNSON, himself.

But Hollywood did not lack for defenders. The film capital, smarting under the senatorial lash, squirmed with almost equal pain and embarrassment, when many of its professional in-print and on-the-air babblers—the source themselves of more Hollywood smears than the Senator is accused of inventing—rushed to its defense with cries of outraged virtue.

Fortunately, Hollywood had its defenders, also, in more respectable quarters. The Motion Picture Producers' Association, for instance, took sharp exception to JOHNSON'S barrage of charges when he daubed the entire film colony into the picture of degradation he painted.

Said the Senator: "Stars go to jail for brawling or peddling 'reefers' or they get into the papers for negotiating a Mexican mail-order divorce, whereupon they are cast in a leading role so that the industry may cash in on their notoriety while it is still hot."

REBUTTAL

The producers association replied:

"Hollywood, like every other community, has its share—but no more than its share—of people who violate the moral code. The majority of people in Hollywood are the finest type of Americans, devoted and loyal to their families and their country."

Aly Khan laughed off the Senator's reference to his screen-star wife, Rita Hayworth. He asked: "What should I do every time some idiot utters imbecilities?" But even the Senator's most devoted enemies—and he has some—would have a reservation about Mr. Khan's wrathful reaction. In many controversial situations in the past, it has not been JOHNSON who looked foolish, in the opinion of the voting public, when the box score was totaled.

Rossellini took the charge with more humility. He said: "The Senator threw the book at us." As for the famous Ingrid, she did not comment at all.

The all-out attack on Hollywood and its stars by an acknowledged movie patron of 40 years standing and a long-time admirer of Ingrid, opened wide avenues of thought on what manner of man JOHNSON himself is, and his motive in setting a torch under the Hollywood camp.

Variety, the trade paper among show folk, saw the fine hand of politics involved. It viewed the assault as more politically contrived than morally inspired—as a move to drag the carpet out from under the growing boom in Denver to elect Frank H. (Rick) Ricketson Governor of Colorado.

Ricketson, president of Fox Intermountain Theaters, Inc., and the man who reaped a fortune with the bank-night theater gimmick, has not announced for the governorship but his name is figured prominently as a potential Republican Party candidate.

And, says Variety, JOHNSON'S attack was timed to link Ricketson with the "big, bad people of Hollywood"—just in case Rick does declare for the post.

This view, perhaps, is taking the long way around—a little like walking around to the back door to get into the front living room. But it is an opinion, another slant.

Walter Winchell, who quoted the Variety charge, drew a prompt reply from JOHNSON, who said, "Screwball Walter Winchell devoted a lot of his valuable radio time last Sunday to spreading a yarn about Rick Ricketson, which does not even make good sense. The Peephole Kid does not know how sincerely I admire Rick and how affectionately I regard him."

And Ricketson stated:

"This whole Johnson story that appeared in Variety sounds ridiculous to me. I don't believe politics are played that way in Colorado. Although ED JOHNSON and I do not agree on politics, I don't believe this attack would be any part of his program."

Others are divided on JOHNSON'S motive. Some say a motion the like of JOHNSON'S was inevitable. Others say it was just a play for page 1. JOHNSON, himself, explained his stand thus:

"I'm not a prude nor a Puritan. But it seems to me the motion-picture industry is getting to the point where all an actor has to do is get arrested for something or get messed up in some immoral affair and stardom is guaranteed."

This, says JOHNSON, is his principal concern. This along with the far-reaching effect that movies and the lives of the stars have on American life.

But what of the man, himself—this powerful voice in the United States Senate? This man whom politics reckons with as a figure of tremendous influence, as a good friend when he's a friend but a capable and dangerous enemy when he's an enemy? This man who pointed a righteous finger at the Nation's lucrative film industry? And why?

THE COMMON TOUCH

You'd probably give JOHNSON more than a passing glance if you met him on the street at high noon. He's a man of the rough cut, a man with the common touch. His frame is huge—big-boned, powerful. His hands are muscled, like the hands of a boilermaker. His brow, beneath a heavy shock of graying hair, is knuckled, bold.

He can be gracious. And he can be vitriolic. He fears no man. Yet he is among the most sensitive of men. This man can speak and write in the character of the indomitable Churchill. Yet his schooling was meager.

You see him at a formal gathering—and he is a man who never seeks you out; you seek him out. He has the face of a lonely man. He never impresses you as entirely comfortable. No one has ever said of JOHNSON, "There is a man at a loss for words"; yet he speaks only when there is occasion to speak. Idle chit-chat is lost with this Senator.

His dress is conservative, unless you take into account the red suspenders he sometimes wears and is not loath to show when he shucks his coat, as he will when the spirit moves him, at public gatherings. He dons a tuxedo occasionally, when he must.

The rough-hewn Senator from the mountain State turns a cold eye on the social blandishments of Washington. He lives in a modest apartment not far from the Capitol

and is reputed to have saved money from his salary when other Senators are complaining about the high cost of living in Washington.

But what of the man?

JOHNSON'S character, his personality—the JOHNSON, himself—has been tempered by an early life of a son of a Swedish immigrant homesteader; dedication to the God his parents taught him to worship; a turn at homesteading himself; illness with tuberculosis in his young manhood; and, finally, politics as a Colorado State representative, lieutenant governor, governor, and United States Senator.

This man has never been defeated in a political campaign. He talks to a farmer as a farmer, to a businessman as a businessman. The languages of the land and the market place—he knows them both.

All told, JOHNSON has served in public office since 1922; four terms as State representative, one as lieutenant governor, two as governor, and, at present, he's in his third term as United States Senator.

His politics: Ostensibly Democratic. But sometimes the question is raised: Is not JOHNSON a party unto his own? Many times, he has confounded even his own party by his trading with the Republican camp. He is no lone wolf; yet, he has switched packs so often he cannot be tied, without allowance for error, with any certain group.

This trait in the political character of JOHNSON has led him more than once into the stumbling path of inconsistency. His record, in spots, is pocked with the cross-currents of contradiction. Political-wise, he's about as predictable as next year's weather. At that, however, his vote is cast along party lines about 75 percent of the time.

TALENT FOR TIMING

JOHNSON has the same ear for politics that a piano tuner has for musical pitch. This man, JOHNSON, seems to have an inborn talent for timing: Despite this, he's hit a few discords in his political career.

The man recovers beautifully, however—this, when another would perish. It's been said that every time JOHNSON appears to have cut his own throat politically, another man bleeds to death. And there are many reasons to believe the truth of the observation.

For example—

During his last senatorial campaign in 1948, JOHNSON gave but very feeble, left-handed assistance to the reelection of President Truman.

His speeches—especially, in the one example when he debated with his opponent, Will F. Nicholson, at the University of Colorado—were geared to put across one thought:

Whichever candidate won in the Presidential election, Truman or Dewey, JOHNSON would give his full support whenever his own principles were not violated. He could work with Dewey, he hinted. There was no sound reason to object to him as a candidate in the event of a Dewey victory—which, then, appeared inevitable—simply because he, JOHNSON, was a Democrat.

This, by another man, could have smacked of party traitorship. The party-line voter could have been enraged. What JOHNSON did was to open the door to the maverick Republican vote. And he got a goodly share of them, too, trouncing Nicholson unmercifully. Nicholson, a sound, liberal Republican with youth and the veteran vote on his side, knew he had been up against a pastmaster vote-getter when the ballots were tallied election night. His throat was unmarked, but it was his blood, not JOHNSON'S, which flowed.

Backtracking a few years further, JOHNSON was elected as a New Dealer when Colorado first put him in the governor's chair in 1932. Partially, JOHNSON'S victory was traced to the Democratic landslide of '32; but, for JOHNSON, let it be said he polled more votes in Colorado than even F. D. R. that election year.

Yet, he was elected as a New Dealer, too, when Colorado sent him to the United States Senate for the first time in 1936. Yet he was never an administration man during the tenure of F. D. R., just as he is not an administration stalwart under Truman. He seemed, in the time of F. D. R., to be eternally in and out of the good graces of the White House. Under Truman, he's just out—except that Truman, after keeping JOHNSON dangling on the string for several months, finally accepted his choice of Colorado's Governor Lee Knous this month to a Federal judgeship.

Today JOHNSON supports this Nation in its role as a world leader, the same Senator who was a driving force against intervention in any phase of Europe's troubles before the last great war. A fellow traveler with the isolationists was ED JOHNSON. He lampooned Roosevelt for lend-lease; he preached the Monroe Doctrine. The United States, he suggested, was sufficient unto itself.

But it would be unfair to shake this skeleton without pointing out that JOHNSON, in the prewar years, believed sincerely this Nation could avoid war—that, at least, it should leave no stone unturned to avoid that war. His fight to keep the United States free from foreign entanglements was based on that belief. It was, on the part of Johnson, a sincere effort to prevent this Nation from spilling its youthblood. And who is to say he, JOHNSON, was wrong in so trying?

JOHNSON, of course, has been the target of many editorials in the national press during his 14 years on Capitol Hill. He has been both damned and blessed. His dramatic career—dramatic without the trappings of affected drama—has been fertile soil for Washington observers.

Even before he went to the Hill JOHNSON had a knack for hitting the headlines. There was the time, for example, when he called out the national guard to prevent Mexican beet workers from entering Colorado to take jobs away from Colorado's own.

FLIES BY THE SEAT OF HIS PANTS

In politics, the observation has been made that JOHNSON flies by the seat of his pants—that he wouldn't know how to read a political instrument board if it were thrust under his nose.

This may be true. But, despite this, he always seems to land safely.

Take the recent television broadcast the Senator made on the A-bomb, the telecast which rocked Capitol Hill.

David E. Lilienthal, then Chairman of the United States Atomic Energy Commission, said JOHNSON discussed questions which could not be discussed publicly without serious involvement of national security.

His telecast, in effect, alerted the world on the H-bomb. It provoked editorial comment pro and con on the so-called disclosures he made.

As far as JOHNSON was concerned, he denied saying anything that had not been stated time and time again by officials and published over and over—that he made no new disclosures.

They're still talking that one over.

This, then, is ED JOHNSON. His attack on Hollywood, right or wrong, was apparently voiced with conviction that the State should curb the film capital, since, in his belief, Hollywood has no proper sense of restraint itself.

He's 66 now. He's been married to the same woman since 1907, and happily. His pleasures are simple; his capacity for work immeasurable.

He walks his way a sensitive man, but insensitive to controversy. Admired. Disliked. He is never ignored. He is EDWIN CARL JOHNSON, of whom no man can predict a course of action.

Cargoes and Pacific Northwest Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1950

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

CARGOES AND PACIFIC NORTHWEST POWER

(By Ivan Bloch, of Ivan Bloch and Associates, consultant to the Port of Portland Commission)

Tonight I would like to speak of ships and kilowatts; of distant lands and Pacific Northwest industry; of bauxite mines in Dutch Guiana and Sumatra, and the aluminum plants of our region; of Alaskan limestone and Portland's calcium carbide industry; of Australian zinc concentrates and electrolytic cells; of Turkish, New Caledonian and Philippine chromite for Pacific Northwest electric furnaces. And I will speak of the water-borne cargoes needed by the new and potential electrochemical and electrometallurgical plants of Oregon and Washington, and of the water-borne shipment of their products to distant markets.

All of us in the Pacific Northwest have developed a conscious understanding of the magnitude of our hydroelectric power development—with at least 25,000,000 of kilowatts yet to come. We admit to the abundance and excellence of our pure water supplies, even though perhaps we may not fully appreciate their industrial importance. We all know of the fabulous population increases of the past decade; 53 percent for the Pacific Coast, and 59 percent for Oregon—as compared to 12 percent for the Nation. These are the things whereof the future of the Pacific Northwest is made. These are the things which make possible a new era for the Pacific Northwest. The scope of the opportunities at hand is immense. It is going to take thinking and action of similar magnitude.

We of the West have passed over a very significant hump, the importance of which is not yet appreciated: our own backyard market—the 15,000,000 people of the Pacific Coast States—is now big enough to support the output of most modern plant production units. It is becoming less necessary for us to market a sizable portion of the goods we manufacture over long and expensive distances to eastern, midwestern, and southern consuming centers in order to sustain economic plant operations. This important fact is beginning to soak in to the planning of our own business and of industry. The result cannot fail to mean the expansion of all types of manufacture in the West.

Each subarea of the Pacific Coast will have its own peculiar pattern of development, largely dependent on traditions, attitudes, and basic resources. Thus, for some years to come, it is clear that althought enormous strides will be made in the Pacific Northwest in all categories of industry, major growth will take place especially in those relying on our supplies of low-cost power and pure water. The very nature of those industries will place a premium on increased water-borne commerce and appurtenant facilities. It is this phase of future development which I will discuss this evening.

The growth of electroprocess industries in the United States has been enormous. That segment of basic industry is now indispensable to the maintenance of our modern way of life and shows every indication of

becoming even more necessary. This is due to the fact that a large portion of today's metals and chemicals can only be manufactured in the electric furnace and the electrolytic cell. Among these materials are aluminum, magnesium, titanium (now called the metal of the future), stainless steel, electrolytic zinc, chlorine and caustic soda, calcium carbide and many others. Another important reason for the growth of these industries is that the purity of their products cannot be attained by any other method. Furthermore, our supplies of mineral raw materials are becoming increasingly more complex and low-grade in their make-up, and frequently can be treated only by electroprocess methods. These factors all increase dependence on electrical power as a basic raw material.

Electroprocess industries require such extremely large quantities of power that the amounts of electric power per pound of end product are a primary element of cost. For example, a 2-mill per kilowatt-hour cost is equivalent to 2 cents per pound of aluminum, or about 20 to 25 percent of its production cost. In addition, the over-all quantities of electricity required per plant for the production of electroprocess materials are very large and their supply must be continuous, 24 hours a day for 365 days of the year. For example, the Vancouver aluminum plants consumed over 1,400,000,000 kilowatt-hours in 1949. This was about 25 percent more than the consumption for the Portland, Oreg., area. The entire aluminum industry in the Pacific Northwest—producing about one-third of total national consumption—required almost half of the output of both Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams in 1949. Titanium—a light metal now in its infancy and for which an auspicious future is in sight—requires even larger quantities of electric power for its reduction from the titanium-bearing ore. Estimates are now on the order of 20 kilowatt-hours per pound, or twice the requirements for aluminum. The production of 100,000 tons of this metal would require close to half a million kilowatts, or roughly the equivalent of the generating capacity of Bonneville Dam.

This dependence on large blocks of lowest-cost electricity, available continuously, necessitates the locating of industry in close proximity to large hydroelectric installations. As a consequence, electroprocess industries generally have clustered in those areas having ample supplies of hydroelectric energy, such as at Niagara Falls, in the Tennessee Valley, and in the Pacific Northwest. It is now an indisputable fact that the major portion of further expansion of electroprocess industries in the United States must take place in our region. As a matter of fact, were it not for the temporary deficiency in power capacity which has plagued the Pacific Northwest since the end of the war, a very sizable expansion of existing electroprocess industry would already have taken place and several new plant units would have become established here.

If power supplies are a control in the location of electroprocess industries, what about requisite raw materials and markets? The picture is relatively clear: raw materials will be moved to the region of abundant power supplies, and the finished products likewise will be transported to distant markets. A prime example of this is our Pacific Northwest aluminum industry. Its raw material—bauxite—now originates in areas of the Caribbean Sea. These supplies are initially processed into alumina by chemical plants in the southern part of the United States. The alumina is transported overland to the Pacific Northwest for reduction to metal. The resulting ingots of the metal are shipped away to distant consuming markets, except for that portion which is rolled in sheet and plate at Spokane and which will be processed into wire and cable at the new plant now under construction by the Aluminum Co. of America at Vancouver, Wash. Another example can be found in chlorine and caustic soda: the salt required as a basic raw material is produced in California and is shipped to Pacific Northwest plants to be processed with Pacific Northwest power. The finshed products find a world-wide market, although a large portion is consumed in our own pulp and paper plants.

These two examples illustrate the fact that, by and large, the availability of power is more controlling in the location of most electroprocess industries than the factors of local raw materials or immediately adjacent markets.

In addition, there is another situation to be considered. A substantial number of electroprocess industries are utilized for the production of important industrial materials obtained from minerals of which the known domestic supply is far below national needs and which therefore must be imported from distant world points. These minerals include bauxite for aluminum metal and abrasives; chromite for ferrochrome and stainless steel; manganese for the production of ferromanganese for the steel industry. Also involved in varying degrees are the ores of copper, lead and zinc, iron, nickel, tungsten, and titanium. The sources of these materials are all over the world—some have been drawn upon consistently during the past decades to maintain the national industrial structure in operation. Others are gradually coming into being, due to the rising tempo of our industrial requirements and our domestic "have not" status. This dynamic situation, although it must reflect exchange and political world conditions, is directly tied into the nature and trends of the United States' industrial economy. In general, the diversity of materials we must import is steadily increasing, and the tonnages are mounting.

The nature of this over-all situation therefore draws attention to the potential tonnages of inbound raw materials which will flow in increasing quantities to the Pacific Northwest, and to the outbound shipments of finished and semiprocessed materials which will leave our shores for coastal, intercoastal, and world markets as a result of what I would term the inevitable growth of electroprocess industry in the Pacific Northwest.

In presenting the following estimates of some of the potentials, I am fully aware of the hazards of so doing. It is not possible to describe the "absolutely feasible," but it is desirable to try, at least, to provide a framework of reference to guide our thinking, and to justify our giving consideration to the establishment of facilities and practices which will hasten the development of tonnages of the industries to which I will refer.

The estimates I will present are based on the results of an intensive study of potential Pacific Northwest electroprocess industries. For 2 years, starting with 1945, a staff of highly qualified technicians and industrial consultants at the United States Bonneville Power Administration, under my direction, carried on an analysis to be incorporated in the United States Corps of Engineers' monumental report on Columbia River and tributaries. The directive to this group—assigned as consultants to the Corps of Engineers for the purpose—was to develop estimates for a rational level of power capacity which would be required in 1960 or thereabouts for electroprocess industries believed to be feasible of establishment in this region. The staff therefore studied critically all of the factors underlying such establishment—industry by industry—processes, raw materials, costs of production, national, west coast, and local markets, and the structure of industry. The final rough drafts of the reports for each industry were circulated among leaders of the industry for review and criticism, so as to make sure that estimates of potential growth in the Pacific Northwest reflected general agreement with the industry's own beliefs.

The results of this analysis show enormous growth, given a continuation of good economic conditions, no war emergencies, and ample continuing power supplies. I feel certain that the expansion forecast is entirely possible of realization. Because of our power shortages I think it highly probable, however, that some of the expansion may take place some time during the decade beginning with 1960, rather than as of 1960 itself.

In order to arrive at an estimated level of potentially feasible inbound shipments of raw materials and the resulting outbound shipments of semi-finished products, I have estimated what portion of over-all future Pacific Northwest electroprocess industry development may logically take place in the lower Columbia River area. From this examination, raw material requirements were developed for each industry. These are shown in tabular form, "Estimated Potential Inbound Shipments for Some Major Electroprocess Industries—Lower Columbia River Area, 1960–1970."

A few details on the background of these estimates I believe will be of interest to you.

Estimated potential in-bound shipments for some major electroprocess industries, lower Columbia River area, 1960–70

Raw material	Electroprocess use	Annual potential tonnage	Annual tonnage requirements, established aluminum industry	Some places of origin
Bauxite	Alumina, artificial abrasives.	2,700,000	1,200,000	Dutch Guiana, Jamaica, Haiti, Sumatra, India, Caroline Islands.
Petroleum coke	Aluminum, ferro alloys, calcium carbide.	500,000	160,000	California, etc.
Limestone	Alumina, calcium carbide, glass.	400,000	150,000	Alaska.
Soda ash	Alumina, glass	120,000	50,000	California, etc.
Zinc ore and concentrates	Electrolytic zinc	65,000		Australia, Bolivia, Peru, Chile, British Columbia.
Chrome ore and concentrates	Stainless steel, ferro alloys, chemicals.	50,000		Philippines, New Caledonia, Cuba, Gold Coast, Turkey.
Lead ore and concentrates	Refined lead	50,000		Australia, Peru, British Columbia, etc.
Salt	Chlorine and caustic soda	50,000		California, etc.
Cryolite	Aluminum	50,000	20,000	Greenland, United States east coast.
Manganese ore and concentrates.	Ferro-alloys, electrolytic manganese.	40,000		Philippines, Indochina, Netherlands East Indies, India Gold Coast, Turkey, etc.
Silica sand	Glass, artificial abrasives	20,000		Belgium.
Grand total		4,045,000	1,580,000	

To begin with, the largest electro-industry group now in existence in the Pacific Northwest is for the production of metallic aluminum from alumina. As pointed out, the principal present raw material requirements for this 300,000-ton capacity industry—600,000 tons annually of alumina—are now shipped by rail from eastern alumina plants at Baton Rouge, La., Hurricane Creek, Ark., Mobile, Ala., and East St. Louis, Mo. These alumina plants obtain bauxite, the now preferred primary ore for the industry, from various Caribbean areas, principally Dutch Guiana, and a relatively much smaller portion from domestic bauxite deposits primarily in Arkansas. For some time it has been evident that the economics of this widely separated industrial structure are not satisfactory. There is little doubt that the industry is actively thinking of—and planning for—the ultimate establishment of alumina plants here in the Pacific Northwest to process bauxite ores to be shipped from such areas as the Caribbean—Dutch Guiana, Haiti, and Jamaica—possibly from the Caroline Islands and India, and undoubtedly from Bintan in the Dutch East Indies. An unknown amount of local ferruginous bauxite located near Portland, Oreg., will also be utilized some day. The equivalent amount of bauxite which the present Pacific Northwest aluminum industry requires totals 1,200,000 tons. As the industry expands to the production level estimated for the decade 1960–70 the bauxite requirements of possible alumina plants on the lower Columbia River would be 2,700,000 tons. Assuming a bauxite cargo capacity of 8,000 tons per ship, the present requirements of the existing industry would be equivalent to the arrival and unloading of 150 ships per year, or about 1 ship every 2 days. The potential requirements would be equivalent to 325 ships per year, or almost 1 per day. To cut down time at unloading dock, modern bulk unloading facilities will be necessary.

It is important to remember that there are other bulk materials which the establishment of alumina capacity will require, such as limestone and soda ash. Also needed for the aluminum reduction plants are petroleum coke and cryolite. For example, petroleum coke is now shipped into the area by rail, with tonnages well over 150,000 tons per year. It is my belief that a very large portion of this tonnage, if not all of it, could be shipped in by boat from southern California, for example, if modern bulk unloading facilities were available here in Portland. Natural cryolite from Greenland and synthetic cryolite from the east coast could also be shipped and unloaded at lower Columbia River points. Present tonnage is on the order of 20,000 tons per year.

As to chrome and manganese ores, the Pacific Northwest already processes these materials into ferro alloys. The outlook is one of slow but certain expansion, together with possibilities for the production of stainless steel. In general, as western steel demands and production increase, so will the requirements for ferro chrome and ferro manganese. These two materials are very high on the list of so-called strategic and critical materials, the consumption of which has been steadily rising. As a consequence, the United States must draw upon foreign sources, such as in the Pacific basin, which provides an unusual opportunity for processing in the Pacific Northwest. The availability of modern bulk unloading facilities—should these be installed—would cut costs and enhance the competitive position of Pacific Northwest production.

As for electrolytic zinc and refined lead, the aspects of the situation involve both Pacific Northwest production and the importation of foreign concentrates. For many years considerable thought has been given to the establishment of an electrolytic zinc refinery in the lower Columbia River area. It would appear that in the not too distant future such a plant will probably be established somewhere along the lower Columbia River; this could be expected to stimulate the development of some local Pacific Northwest ore reserves at present without an economic outlet, and would also have the advantage of drawing upon such producing areas as Australia, coastal British Columbia and, in time, Alaska. The refined slab zinc could then move by water shipment to consuming centers in the East, providing over-all economies much to be desired. Whether copper refining capacity could be established in the lower Columbia River area is highly speculative and problematic, and is best left for contemplation at some later date.

As to the production of calcium carbide, the demand for this material, which is the base for the production of acetylene and such chemicals as calcium cyanamid, is increasing so that the outlook for expanding carbide production in the Pacific Northwest is highly favorable. One of the factors providing grounds for such optimism is the increasing interest in the production of chemical substances known as acrylonitriles. These chemicals are manufactured by the interaction of acetylene with hydrogen cyanide, both of which are made from calcium carbide. It is reported that the most important new use of acrylonitriles is for the manufacture of synthetic fibers such as Orlon, and others which it is believed will eventually outstrip nylon in use and importance. In addition, there is an expanding market for chemicals based on acetylene and chlorine. The key to the expansion of the Pacific Northwest calcium carbide industry will probably rest in the development of high-grade tidewater limestone deposits to provide much lower costs than those now prevailing. In this connection, shipments of extremely pure limestone from southeastern Alaska are definitely in the cards. Modern bulk unloading facilities would provide a reduction in laid-down prices for limestone, resulting in a sizable expansion of its use—not only for calcum carbide but for other chemical purposes, for cement, and agricultural soil-conditioning purposes.

The production of chlorine and caustic soda in the Pacific Northwest plants in Tacoma and Portland is on the upward move. The markets for both products have been increasing and the future appears quite bright. The tonnages of salt—the basic raw material for chlorine and caustic production—can become significant.

Another industry which eventually will locate in the lower Columbia River area is the manufacture of flat and bottle-wareglass. No flat glass is made in our region; the only producer of bottle-ware in the Pacific Northwest, at Seattle, employs both electric and fuel-fired furnaces. The observed benefits of electric operation would seem to indicate possible expansion of this type of production. The raw material requirements of soda ash and silica sand will provide substantial tonnage possibilities for water movement. Although the Pacific Northwest does have sources of silica and undoubtedly more will be found and exploited as time goes on, one should not overlook the possibilities of shipments from such sources as Belgium, a practice well established prior to the last war.

Considering these industries alone—and I would like to point out that they are only a portion of those which may ultimately locate in the Northwest—the total inbound tonnage level which may be expected to develop between now and sometime during the next decade can be set without too great question at around 4,000,000 tons per year. As I have pointed out before, the present requirements of the aluminum industry alone in the Pacific Northwest represent an inbound tonnage potential of around 1,500,000 tons per year. Of this I believe at least 75 percent, if not all, of these tonnages will move by deep-draft seagoing vessels. The resulting outbound shipment potentials involved for the industries described are more difficult to estimate, but I believe that 1,000,000 tons is not beyond possibility for shipment by water.

In this discussion I have dwelt only on electroprocess industries and only on those which, as of today, seem feasible of expansion along the lower Columbia River area. To this list should be added an unknown number of electroprocess industries now in the laboratory stage. The enormous advances of electroprocess technology and the increasing reliance of manufacturing industry on the products of the electric furnace and the electrolytic cell lead me to believe that the potentials for the years 1960–70 may be even greater than those just outlined.

In addition, our vast inland empire can directly benefit from—and contribute to—the expansion of maritime commerce on the lower Columbia River, in ways which are not always apparent. For example, I would like to suggest consideration of some of the opportunities which may arise as a result of the economic development taking place in southeastern Idaho, western Wyoming, and northern Utah. In my judgment, this area may become one of the great chemical production centers of the United States. Located within a radium of 100 miles of its center are large natural gas reserves, oil, coal—including major sources of coking coal for the West—high concentrations of potash salts and other natural chemical substances, sulfur (from natural gas and sulfur-bearing ores), and the Nation's largest reserves of phosphate rock. This is only a portion of the roster of raw materials available in that area, as it abounds in metallics such as copper, lead, and vanadium. Already great developments have been taking place there, such as the operations of copper and lead refineries, of the Geneva steel works, and of the recent large fertilizer and phosphorous producers. This is but a beginning, and it behooves us to anticipate a substantial movement of the output of these industries westward for export to the world. The question is whether the existing and potential export movement will be via California ports or via the lower Columbia River area. The primary problem obviously is one of transportation economics and I wonder what validity there may be to the thesis that the lower Columbia River area could capture this potential tonnage. It would necessitate a combination of competitive modern bulkhandling facilities at original and terminal points, and the use of both rail and inland waterway facilities. The challenge of this possibility is certainly intriguing, and typical of the maritime commerce opportunities afforded in the expansion of industrial activity of our inland areas.

Throughout this discussion you will note that I have referred to the need for competitive transportation and cargo handling facilities. Although I believe in the inevitability of industrial establishment in the Pacific Northwest and the resulting movement by water of very large tonnages, I am just as aware of the competitive position of other port areas on the Pacific Coast and particularly on the Gulf of Mexico. In this connection, time is working against us—at least as far as the Gulf ports are concerned—as they are steadily increasing the establishment of industry and the consequent movement of traffic by means of the most modern port facilities.

What we must do, therefore, is to supplement now our undoubted natural advantages to improve our competitive position. No single factor can probably resolve the situation, but in terms of the movement of bulk commodities one of the major answers seems quite clear; those ports on the west coast which provide the most efficient and economical facilities for loading, unloading, and otherwise handling cargo will have a tremendous advantage over those which do

not have these facilities. Surely we must have faith enough in the future of our lower Columbia River area and its tributary inland empire to provide those facilities without further delay and thus accelerate the development of inbound tonnages. There already is a substantial bulk tonnage moving to this area, which undoubtedly could be transported by water at a saving if we had modern bulk unloading facilities. The establishment of such facilities would be a very strong competitive talking point with industries now casting about for possible locations on the west coast.

In all of this, and particularly with respect to the Portland-Vancouver area, our intermediate future cannot be viewed within any concept less than that of a major world seaport and industrial center. This calls for a consolidation as well as an extension of our port and industrial facilities into a homogeneous and integrated structure to handle, warehouse, process, and manufacture inbound outbound cargoes. That is to say, no single isolated facility—whether it be an industrial site, a rail siding, or a bulk handling dock—can do the job alone. It requires an effective combination of all of these—and more—to bring maximum results.

For such a unit the physical location and character of present and future facilities will require careful consideration. Any emerging well-knit system of docks, cargo handling, access to land transport, warehousing, and industrial plant sites must recognize the peculiar requirements of heavy and light industry. For example, it would appear that the downstream portion of the St. Johns Peninsula is ideally situated for heavy industrial development and hence heavy maritime commerce. The portion of the Peninsula and its adjacent areas on both shores of the Willamette lying closer to the center of Portland are decidedly more favorable for lighter manufacturing, warehousing, and the like. In a very real sense, such a segregation is taking place. The question is whether it is occurring in the manner most conducive to the long term well-being of our community, or whether it is merely happening. Is there not need for a carefully conceived set of blueprints and program of consequent action to facilitate our building a greater port, a greater industrial center, the Portland of the future?

There is another ingredient which is necessary if our area is to reap the full benefits of its potentials. It is that intangible known as aggressiveness. Purely as an observation and not as a criticism, I have a feeling that we lack the kind of aggressiveness which is building up Gulf and California ports. This is not a matter which reflects upon the shipping men of the area, but I think it does reflect somewhat on the attitude of the general community which ultimately can gain so much from maritime activity. What aggressiveness we have—and we have demonstrated it in numerous instances—is spasmodic rather than continuous. After reaching a partial objective we are too often prone to sit back and relax with a feeling of satisfaction. Perhaps in a sense we have not always raised and maintained our sights high enough as to the magnitude of our potentials and of the things we must do. Today we cannot afford not to be expansionist-minded in this expanding west coast of ours—a west coast with a forecast population of 25,000,000 by 1975—an increase of 66 percent as against an estimated 32 percent for the United States as a whole. We cannot afford to be timid about the planning and building of facilities the use of which will eventually bring us returns in jobs and in taxable wealth amounting to several times the original investment. One thing is certain: looking at the past is not going to tell us where we are going. Even the conditions of our amazing growth of the past 10 years are no guide as to the conditions of the next decade.

Thus our task ahead is a clear-cut one. Kilowatts mean cargoes, and cargoes mean the use of kilowatts. Both mean pay rolls and increasing wealth. We cannot falter in supporting an aggressive program of power development, of waterways development, of port development. We owe this to ourselves and to those who are coming from all parts of the United States to live and work with us. The stakes are high. The opportunities are great. Our effort must match the vision of the near future.

Compensatory Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I regard it a very great privilege and a distinct public service to insert a masterly speech delivered by Mr. George E. Stringfellow in his capacity as vice president of the Thomas Edison, Inc., before the Purchasing Agents dinner at the Builders Exchange Club, New York City, on April 18, 1950.

The vital issues before the country are clearly and forcefully expressed by this distinguished gentleman, and should be read with interest and profit by all those who are interested in the preservation of our Government. The socialistic trend is now obvious to everybody and they should be supplied with all pertinent facts relating to this national danger.

Under leave to extend, heretofore granted, I am inserting Mr. Stringfellow's address:

COMPENSATORY SPENDING

Some years ago Lenin, the chief architect of communism, said, "Some day we will force the United States to spend herself to destruction."

Eighteen years ago the annual cost of Federal Government was under 5 billion dollars and the national debt was slightly under 20 billion.

The cost of Federal Government for the fiscal year ending June 30 next will exceed 46 billion dollars. The Federal debt is now approximately 260 billion, not including some bad loans which will have to be charged off.

In order to understand the enormous increase in the cost of our Government, let me make a few comparisons:

During President Roosevelt's three terms, the average yearly spending of the Federal Government was $31,000,000,000, including most of the military cost of World War II and F. D. R., as you recall, was no miser in spending public funds. In the four post-war years of Truman's administration, the average yearly spending jumped from $31,000,000,000 to $45,000,000,000—an increase of almost 50 percent.

The Truman administration collected an average of $42,000,000,000 per year in taxes, or three times the average collected by Roosevelt.

It would, therefore, appear that we are well on the way to making Lenin's prediction a grim reality.

In 1932 the Democratic Party pledged all candidates who ran on its platform to reduce the cost of government at least 25 percent by abolishing useless commissions and offices, consolidating departments and bureaus and eliminating extravagance. "That platform," said candidate Roosevelt, "is a covenant with the people and when I'm elected," he continued, "I shall put it into effect in every detail."

In the words of a former governor of this State, "Let us look at the record".

Immediately following his inauguration to the presidency, Franklin Roosevelt set out to implement the promises set forth in the Democratic platform which, in my opinion, was one of the greatest documents ever submitted by any political party in the history of our country. The Republican Party would do well to adopt it in 1952 unless it wants to continue to be a "me too" party.

During the first 4 months of Roosevelt's first administration he did a remarkable job of cutting the cost of Government. It has been estimated that as a result of this almost unprecedented service to the people, at least 90 percent of the people of this Republic were enthusiastically supporting the President at the time of his first fireside chat.

Almost immediately afterwards he showed a complete reversal in his policy on cost of Government and Federal debt. How can candidate and President Roosevelt's right-about-face on cost of Government and debt be reconciled with his advocacy of economy during his campaign and the first 4 months of his first term? Here, I think, is the answer to that question. He embraced the philosophy—compensatory spending—of Lord John Maynard Keynes, British Socialist economist, who visited President Roosevelt in 1933. According to the British press, Keynes' ideas "captivated President Roosevelt." Those who are in a position to know say that Roosevelt's about-face stemmed from this "captivation." The Keynes philosophy—the more you spend the more you have—has been practiced in this country in an increasing degree since Roosevelt embraced it in 1933.

It has infiltrated the States and municipalities of our Nation; it is largely responsible for our inflated debt, unbalanced budget, and general extravagance. Let us follow its destructive effects:

In 1932 there were 30 major Federal agencies. There are today 62 major Federal agencies, an increase of 110 percent.

On December 31, 1932, there were 564,103 Federal employees. On December 31, 1949, there were 1,981,156—an increase of 252 percent.

When he first took office, President Roosevelt was terribly disturbed about the size of our debt, which was less than $20,000,000,000. Five years later, when that debt had reached $38,000,000,000, he said, "Our national debt, after all, is an internal debt owed not only by the Nation but to the Nation. If our children have to pay interest on it, they will be paying interest to themselves." In a short span of 5 years after taking office, President Roosevelt was looking upon an increased debt as a national asset.

Keynes' philosophy of "compensatory" spending has about bankrupted Britain. That philosophy destroyed Rome. Keynes' philosophy is advocated by the Communists for our destruction and is certainly taking root here to the gratification of Joe Stalin, whom President Truman referred to in the last presidential campaign as "good old Joe."

Rome fell because her rulers gained and retained power through false promises and the use of taxpayers' money with which to corrupt the electorate, a procedure not different from that which our British brethren and our American politicians have been employing.

Our politicians appear to be more interested in balancing the budgets of foreign countries than they are in balancing our own. Let me give you a couple of examples. Within a week, Dean Acheson, Secretary of State, rebuked the Government of Korea for not balancing her budget. Acheson said the

Korean unbalanced budget is bringing about an inflationary crisis in that country. He told them in effect that if they didn't cut expenses and balance their budget, our Government might stop giving the Koreans American taxpayers' money. Acheson also instructed our Ambassador in Greece to inform the government there that it must balance its budget to avoid inflation, otherwise we might withdraw our subsidies.

Yet, President Truman budgeted a deficit this year of $900,000,000. That deficit will exceed $7,000,000,000. He is budgeting a deficit for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, of $5,000,000,000 which could easily exceed 10 billions since he is notorious for overestimating Government income and underestimating Government expenditures.

If we continue to spend more than we take in, inflation in this country is as certain as night follows day. And, it was inflation that made Mussolini; it was inflation that made Hitler; it was inflation that made Stalin, and inflation will produce a dictator in America. Let us not delude ourselves into believing that an American dictator would be more benevolent, more generous, or more decent than Mussolini, Hitler, or Stalin.

Much has been said in recent years about Britain's dollar shortage, but very little has been said about the cause of that shortage. Britain's dollar shortage is caused by inefficient management, confiscatory taxes, and the chloroforming of incentives by the Socialist government.

We are doing the same thing in this country in a measure. We, too, have a dollar shortage. Our dollar shortage doesn't seem to disturb our Government officials. Our budget has been balanced but twice in 20 years, and then by accident. Our dollar shortage is the result of our spending more than we can afford. It stems from the same trouble that Korea is having; it stems from the same trouble the Greeks are having—both have been told by our Secretary of State that they must reduce their outgo to meet their income. It never dawns on our politicians that if we do not reduce our outgo to meet our income that we, too, will have inflation from which chaos and communism grow.

In pleading for a balanced budget and a reduction in Federal cost of government, as well as a reduction in Federal debt, Candidate Roosevelt in 1932 said that a government, like a family, can spend more than it takes in for a year or two, but any government or any family that becomes a spendthrift and spends more than it takes in for more than a year or so is headed for the poorhouse. I think he was right. Our Government has been spending more than it has been taking in, not for a year or so, but for 18 years, and there is no prospect for a balanced budget until we discard the Keynes' theory of compensatory spending, which is another way of saying "until we get rid of Truman."

When a corporation gets into financial difficulties the courts appoint a receiver who either liquidates the corporation's assets or reorganizes and staffs it with new management. In either case, the stockholders lose most of their investment.

When a government gets into financial difficulties there is no court to appoint a receiver. A self-appointed dictator arises who takes over, not as a receiver responsible to a court of law, not as an elected public official responsible to the people, but as a dictator responsible only to his whim. He prescribes their way of life. The people become his subjects.

There is still clamor in this country for aid to Socialist Britain and other nations at the expense of the sorely pressed American taxpayer. It seems to me that we might give thought to the fact that since World War I our Government aided Britain to the tune of approximately $44,000,000,000. This is equal to the cash-in value of all life-insurance policies in the United States. Since World War II we have aided Britain and other nations, by grants, exceeding $33,000,000,000—grants which have kept socialism alive in Britain. Had the British Socialist government not been subsidized with American taxpayers' money, Britain's socialism would have died on the vine long, long ago.

The Socialists in Britain tell us that American capitalism and free enterprise are on their last legs. Indeed, they will be if we continue to subsidize the various segments of the peoples of the world in idleness.

Much of the American taxpayers' money is used both to fight and to support communism. Let me give you an example. Since World War II we have given the Greek Government around $600,000,000 with which to fight communism. Since World War II we have given Communist Russia, through lend-lease and other grants, $440,000,000 of our taxpayers' money and we have given her satellite, Poland, more than $480,000,000, and until recently we were buying rye from Poland which aided her economy. Even morons know that we have a great surplus of rye in this country. I know that this aid to the Communists, amounting to more than $920,000,000 since World War II, is hard to believe but I would have you understand that the United States Department of Commerce and Senator HARRY FLOOD BYRD, of Virginia, are my authority for this statement. It is obvious, therefore, that we are fighting communism on the fringe and wooing and feeding it at the core.

It is clear from Truman's record that he, like his immediate predecessor and his Socialist-minded British brethren, has embraced the Keynes' philosophy of compensatory spending and not unlike former President Roosevelt, he seems to look upon a mounting debt as an asset. "We owe it to ourselves" is perhaps his philosophy too.

On his return from a month's vacation in Florida, at the taxpayers' expense, President Truman was quoted in the press as having said, "The country is in fine shape." There would be some justification for such enthusiasm if the income of the Government was in excess of our outgo and our national debt and annual cost were being systematically reduced.

If we cannot balance our budget when the country is in fine shape what will happen to us when we run into the next tailspin? That is something that never dawns on Fair Dealers, liberals, or pinks.

If anyone ever supposed that the Truman administration was interested in economy, a look at a recent report of the armed services committee of the House would correct the impression. It mentions the following five items:

A budget request is pending for a new $18,000,000 veterans' hospital in the Los Angeles area, while the Navy is closing the 1,500-bed Long Branch Naval Hospital in the same area.

A 500-bed veterans' hospital is being built in Philadelphia, while the Army is closing the 2,000-bed Valley Forge Hospital 20 miles away.

The veterans' agency plans to build 1,000-bed hospitals in Boston and Brockton, Mass., while the Army is closing the Murphy General Hospital at Waltham, Mass.

The Veterans' Administration wants to build a 500-bed hospital in Atlanta, while the Army is closing the Oliver General Hospital at Augusta, Ga.

A 500-bed veterans' hospital is planned at Ann Arbor, Mich., while the Army is closing the 1,600-bed Jones Hospital at Battle Creek.

There won't be any Government economy until there is another and a different kind of man in the White House.

During the last 18 years a Roman holiday has been declared by and for our spendthrift and muddling politicians. Governmental extravagance has been the order of the day. The national debt has increased from $20,000,000,000 to $260,000,000,000—an increase of 1,200 percent. The annual cost of Government has increased from $5,000,000,000 to close to $46,000,000,000, an increase of over 800 percent.

How long will it take the American people to learn the lesson of the collapse of the Roman Empire and understand why Britain is tottering? How long will it take them to realize that the Keynes philosophy of compensatory spending will lead to ruin if we don't put a stop to it soon?

I conceive it to be the duty of the men in our segment of the human family to become Paul Reveres. We owe it to our founding fathers; we owe it to the present generation; and we owe it to posterity to do our part in saving our way of life—a way of life which has given us a higher living standard and greater liberty in 160 years than any peoples have experienced in 6,000 years.

Those businessmen who are unwilling to risk their necks in the defense of a great cause will likely lose their souls. Those who by their inaction are saying to the selfish politicians, whose greed for gold and lust for power is rapidly consuming us, "Go ahead, we will do nothing to block your way to our destruction" are aiding and abetting our destruction.

If America fails, it will be from extravagance, internal decay, and cowardice. We see these three adversaries around us constantly. America will not follow the Roman road to ruin if we and millions of others like us discharge our duty as citizens and thus prove that we are worthy of our great heritage.

The times call for the election of men to public office of:

"Strong minds, great hearts, true faith, and willing hands;
Men whom the lust of office does not kill;
Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy;
Men who possess opinions and a will;
Men who have honor, men who will not lie;
Men who stand before a demagogue and damn his treacherous flatteries without winking;
Tall men, suncrowned, who live above the fog,
In public duty and in private thinking."

Two such men, who reflect the philosophy of our founding fathers and place principles above patronage and principles above party loyalty are the senior United States Senator from Ohio [ROBERT A. TAFT], and the senior United States Senator from Virginia [HARRY F. BYRD]. They, in my opinion, constitute a symbol of our way of life. These men are constantly being smeared by New Dealers, Fair Dealers, pinks, professional liberals, and Communists.

When you find where BOB TAFT and HARRY BYRD stand, there is where those of us who would preserve our liberties and be worthy of our heritage should also stand. These two men will not take us down the Roman road to ruin. These two men know the fallacy of compensatory spending.

Will you get behind them with your voices, with your influence, and with your substance?

Report of Petroleum Imports Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. H. HEDRICK
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 5, 1950

Mr. HEDRICK. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include in the Appendix of the RECORD the report of petro-

leum imports committee to the National Bituminous Coal Advisory Council, dated March 1, 1950, adopted by the council, March 8, 1950:

REPORT OF PETROLEUM IMPORTS COMMITTEE TO NATIONAL BITUMINOUS COAL ADVISORY COUNCIL, MARCH 1, 1950

1. FUEL SUPPLY

The development of oil imports since World War II has caused significant shifts in the American fuel structure. Continuation of current imports, much less further increases as are prospective, will have far-reaching effects. Eventually the country's pattern of fuel supply will be revamped such as few today may realize.

Energy availability is the foundation upon which the American economy has been built. Its source has been almost entirely in fuels—coal, petroleum, and natural gas—which have been abundant in the country's natural resources. Had there been less energy available, the American economy would not have grown as it has. Hence, the fuel structure as changed because of oil imports is of great consequence, and its final appearance, no matter the form, is of national concern.

Progress of the economy with its expanding mechanization has required a multitude of fuel products. The tendency has been for an increasing need of petroleum products such as gasoline and other refined oils to power a variety of machines. Advancing technology likewise has promoted the use of natural gas for special purposes. It, too, has given coal added opportunities by improved methods for converting into electric power, coke, and additional products. Coal, as yet, does not have the advantages that petroleum and gas enjoy in the production of products that much of new technology needs. Nevertheless, it has the essentials for steam-raising and other power needs which still represent a sizable place in the energy pattern, and eventually, since it can be converted into oil products and technological advancement will make this feasible, coal with its huge reserves will be a substitute indefinitely for petroleum as so required. Presently, however, to satisfy all of the economy's fuel requirements efficiently, it takes a combined use of petroleum, natural gas, and coal. Of the three, no one or two can do the job.

Growth of the economy will demand larger amounts of petroleum for gasoline and many refined oils. It will give natural gas a vast special-purpose market. Coal in the course of this trend will lose in relative importance as a solid fuel, although the area it now serves will need a greater volume of energy. In the aggregate, total fuel requirements will increase.

But what about oil imports? Companies financially interested in foreign oil claim that imports are essential if future fuel requirements are to be met. In other words, American petroleum reserves are not going to be adequate forever.

Few will disagree on this long-term outlook for petroleum reserves. It is getting harder to find and produce American petroleum. The country will have petroleum output indefinitely, but its natural reserves are fixed and sometime a point is going to be reached where the production rate cannot be bettered and probably not maintained. American production deficits in terms of an expanding market will have to be made up by synthetics or oil imports. The latter provide advantages according to proponents of foreign petroleum development.

The country's proved reserves of petroleum are equivalent to a dozen years' supply at their present depletion rate. New oil will have to be found continually and in substantial volume to maintain this relative position of reserves. Companies promoting foreign petroleum question that this can be done for very long. In comparison, proved reserves of natural gas have a life exceeding 25 years. Their life is figured, however, on a lower production rate than petroleum. Gas reserves are not much larger than those of petroleum on a B. t. u. basis. On the other hand, coal reserves are far greater than those of petroleum and natural gas, measured in terms of centuries, although estimates vary as to how great they actually are. One fact is clear: As fuels are now used, American petroleum supply is in the weakest position and coal supply is in the strongest over the distant period.

Yet, while general agreement can be found for the principle that American interests should be active on foreign oil, there is wide disagreement about the way foreign oil development has been handled. It has been demonstrated that oil imports increase as American interests advance their development in foreign fields. Stated in another way, production of American fuels must be decreased to allow foreign petroleum output to grow; nor is there general agreement that the development of foreign oil should overshadow that of American synthetic output.

The pushing of foreign oil into the American fuel market in a volume not required for supply reasons obviously is disturbing. This has been the case during the last year. Effects have been adverse to coal and even to the oil industry itself. Immediately ahead, oil imports are scheduled to increase and a further shake-up of the fuel structure is expected. The question is prompted: What will be the outcome of the import program as conducted in terms of national welfare?

2. DEVELOPMENT OF IMPORTS

American development of foreign petroleum production and the importation of oil are not something of recent origin. After World War I, when it appeared that the country's petroleum output might soon be inadequate, both the Government and the oil industry emphasized the necessity of finding outside sources of supply. Proposals in Congress to enter the Government as a partner with industry in foreign ventures were rejected, but American companies supported oil exploration in many parts of the world. During the twenties, great progress was made in the development of foreign oil, particularly in Latin America.[1]

Large reserves were discovered in the United States in the meanwhile. This plus the depression in the early thirties discouraged foreign development. From then until World War II, there was a problem of excess supply in the American fields. In 1932, an excise tax of 21 cents per barrel on crude, and $1.05 on gasoline was authorized. These duties were reduced in 1939, but a quota on imports was reached by agreement. However, it was in 1933 and 1934 that American companies secured large concessions in Arabia.

Changes in oil supply that have taken place during the last 3 decades are indicated by the trend in imports. Between 1920 and 1922, when the adequacy of American reserves was in serious question, imports ranged from 297,000 to 373,000 barrels daily, 19 to 21 percent of the country's new supply. Thereafter and until World War II, imports declined, averaging from 144,000 to 162,000 barrels daily by the 1935–39 period, or from 4 to 5 percent of new supply. They averaged 266,000 barrels in 1941 when American oil supply started to tighten but 252,000 barrels in 1944 was the peak during a full war year when oil was short and after import quota restrictions had been removed.

Following World War II, fuels of all kinds were in tight supply. American business had shifted rapidly to a record level of peacetime activity and was consuming fuels in vast volume. Foreign countries battered during the war needed fuel help from the outside as they started on the reconstruction of their economies and they looked mainly to the United States.

In the comparatively cold 1947–48 winter, fuel oils were short in various markets. This situation led to a series of developments. Inadequacy of American petroleum reserves were again featured particularly since international conditions were unsettled. Elaborate plans were proposed for synthetic oil production. In the meanwhile, the oil industry made preparations to avoid any oil shortage the next year, by pushing American production, and the companies with foreign interests also began to see additional oil in imports.

During World War II, petroleum production was hit hard in certain countries like Rumania and the Netherlands East Indies, but expanded in others like Latin America and the Middle East through military necessity. Development in the Middle East was to open fields with tremendous reserves. The wartime expansion in Latin America and the Middle East gave the impetus for rapid postwar growth of foreign production. In turn, what appeared to be an oil scarcity in early 1948 gave evidence of a ready market for the foreign output. Thus, while plans on synthetic oil were being given general consideration in America and there was still worry about petroleum supply immediately ahead, foreign refineries representing a sizable capacity were nearing completion. Also, in each succeeding month, some of the strain was disappearing from international relations.

Following is a table that shows trends in American oil market and supply, and the part played by imports. Between 1945 and 1949, the volume of imports has more than doubled. It is interesting to note in the table the extent to which the American oil market has grown since 1940 and the substantial increase in American petroleum production. Moreover, in 1949 as against 1948, while total demand increased slightly, American production was reduced in order to make room for additional imports. The country went on a net import basis in 1947 for the first time since the early twenties.

United States petroleum market and supply

[Thousand barrels daily]

	Total domestic demand	Total domestic and export demand	United States production	Imports	Total new supply
1940	3,625	3,981	3,858	229	4,087
1941	4,071	4,369	4,073	266	4,339
1942	3,972	4,293	4,034	99	4,133
1943	4,168	4,579	4,372	174	4,546
1944	4,566	5,134	4,864	252	5,116
1945	4,857	5,358	5,010	311	5,321
1946	4,912	5,331	5,074	377	5,451
1947	5,452	5,903	5,452	437	5,889
1948	5,775	6,143	5,922	514	6,436
1949	5,792	6,119	5,470	642	6,112

Source: U. S. Bureau of Mines.

The world supply of petroleum rests on a complex framework. A number of countries have small or no reserves and a few countries have the greater part of the reserves.

Currently, the United States could meet its own requirements by stretching facilities. Canada is developing what may be sizable reserves, and Latin America has an excess in production. Hence, the Western Hemisphere can more than take care of its wants.

[1] See *Arabian Oil* (1949), by R. F. Mikesell and H. B. Chenery, ch. 1; also United States Crude Petroleum Reserve Productive Capacity (1950), report of National Petroleum Council.

Europe, the Far East, Africa, and Oceania, have production deficits. The Middle East is the only area in the Eastern Hemisphere that has potential excess oil in quantity, but its development still is in the primary stages. In a matter of a few years, the Middle East can be in a position to add enough oil so that the Eastern Hemisphere will be self sufficient. As a consequence the Western Hemisphere would lose one of its large outlets and, in turn, have excess capacity.

Over a longer time, with an increasing market, there would be a period of years when both hemispheres would be self-sufficient in petroleum from a physical standpoint. But if the Middle East continues its remarkable development and features cost advantages as now claimed for it, it could gain a strong foothold in the Western Hemisphere market. If this proves to be the case, petroleum development as well as that of other fuels in the Western Hemisphere will be retarded. Events of the last year point in this direction.

3. IMPORTS VERSUS FOREIGN PRODUCTION

Oil imports since World War II take on an appearance different to the one they had previously. They evidently are part of a long range program that schedules almost continual increases in their volume. Sizable expansion that has taken place in the last few years is to be followed by additional growth which, in a few years, will make imports a relatively large segment in the American fuel structure.

In 1949, imports of 642,000 barrels daily, were more than twice the volume necessary to supplement prevailing domestic capacity in order to assure a full supply for consumption and export requirements. In other words, what had been American petroleum production in 1948 was cut over 400,000 barrels daily because of the foreign oil. Indications are that imports will continue to increase at a much faster rate than needed to supplement American production.

A number of reasons may be listed as to why imports have and may continue to be developed on a scale much larger than required to take care of deficits in American production. American companies that have invested heavily in foreign oil expect to realize a return to cover their capital outlay by enlarging their market, which includes movements to the United States. Foreign exploration and production costs are much lower than those in the United States, and can offer competitive advantages. Royalties from oil provide a major source of income to governments of countries where foreign oil is produced. To keep royalty income at a satisfactory level to protect concessions sometimes means that foreign production must be kept at a full rate, if not increased. Foreign oil controlled by American interests has been limited in the world markets more recently as other countries, partly financed by United States funds, have increased their oil output. Its disposal will depend more upon an American market. Finally, American investment in foreign countries and the expansion of foreign trade, as to which the development of oil imports is attached, express a policy strongly supported in important parts of the United States Government. Moreover, the Government has long encouraged American activity in foreign oil fields.[2]

Development of oil production in the Middle East area since World War II has been at a faster rate than many had expected. Changes taking place in supply as a result are shown in the following:

Crude-oil production in select countries

[Thousands of barrels]

	First 6 months of 1948	First 6 months of 1949	Percent change
United States	988,011	931,144	−5.76
Venezuela	238,355	223,761	−6.12
Total, United States and Venezuela	1,226,366	1,154,905	−5.83
Iran	88,217	101,254	+14.78
Saudi Arabia	60,283	92,036	+52.67
Iraq	14,589	9,701	−33.50
Kuwait	15,103	44,823	+296.78
Bahrein Island	5,505	5,463	−.76
Total Middle East	183,697	253,277	+37.88
Grand total	1,410,063	1,408,182	−.13

Source: U. S. Bureau of Mines.

In the above table it will be seen that the combined crude-oil production changed little between the two periods. But the output decreased in both the United States and Venezuela in 1949 as compared to 1948, the difference being made up by the increased production in the Middle East. The latter passed Venezuela from a production standpoint, although its growth has barely started.

American holdings in the Middle East are of great magnitude, said to be over 40 percent of the area's known petroleum reserves. They include concessions having proved reserves that appear as large as those in the United States, and with far greater potentialities. Refining capacity and transportation facilities have hardly been started in terms of crude oil available. The larger American companies dominate Middle East, like other foreign development, as might be expected because of the tremendous investment and great risks involved.

United States imports of crude petroleum and refined products by 11 principal importing companies, 1948, 1949, and company estimates for first 6 months of 1950

Importing company (in order of estimated imports for first 6 months of 1950)	Barrels daily				Percent change first 6 months 1950 over year 1948
	Average year 1948	Average first 6 months 1949	Average second 6 months 1949	Average first 6 months 1950 (estimated)	
Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey)	184,300	192,700	211,600	231,200	+25
Gulf Oil Corp.	83,000	85,800	104,700	115,000	+39
The Texas Co	16,900	40,900	59,100	80,000	+371
Socony-Vacuum Oil Co	57,200	60,200	69,700	75,300	+31
Asiatic Petroleum Corp	9,700	19,900	45,400	61,600	+529
Atlantic Refining Co	24,500	38,000	37,300	42,500	+73
Standard Oil Co. (Indiana)	25,500	25,100	36,000	35,600	+40
Standard Oil Co. (California)	13,800	15,300	20,400	29,700	+115
Sinclair Oil Corp	24,600	24,300	27,600	23,600	−4
Shell Oil Co	5,900	16,800	21,300	17,400	+195
Cities Service Co	18,400	7,700	9,800	10,200	−45
Total 11 companies	463,800	526,700	643,800	722,100	+56
All other imports	48,200	76,300	57,100	68,600	+43
Total imports	512,000	603,000	700,900	790,700	+54

Source: Figures for individual companies submitted by companies to Subcommittee of the House Small Business Committee.

Total import figures from U. S. Department of Commerce.

Figures for "All other imports" for first 6 months of 1950 included at same rate as average of actual of these imports during first 10 months of 1949.

Figures for second 6 months of 1949 are based primarily on actual imports but partially estimated for last 2 months where actual imports are not available.

NOTE.—Since the compilation of these tables, the Texas Co. and the Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey) have reduced their estimates for the first 6 months of 1950 by approximately 17 and 7 percent, respectively.

Source: House Select Committee on Small Business.

4. ORIGIN OF IMPORTS

In 1949, imports consisted of 66 percent crude oil and 32 percent residual oil, the remaining 2 percent being largely distillate fuel oil. Imports other than crude and residual have been on the decrease in recent years.

Of the crude oil imported, one-fourth came from the Middle East, the rest from Latin America, principally Venezuela. As against 1948, the proportion originating in the Middle East was more than twice as great. Crude-oil imports were entirely from the Western Hemisphere until 1947.

Nearly all of the imported residual fuel oil has been from refineries in the Netherland West Indies located off the Venezuelan coast.

Part of the crude imported from Latin America is of a heavy grade and used mainly for the making of residual. It is tantamount to the importation of residual. According to the National Petroleum Council's import study, this particular crude averaged approximately 16,000 barrels daily during the first half of 1949. Moreover, the total crude imported from Latin America and the Middle East, averaging nearly one-half million barrels daily, is said to give a larger yield of residual than comes from American crude under ordinary refining conditions but figures evidently are not published in this regard. It is clear, however, that residual fuel oil is the major product derived from imports.

Imports of petroleum products

[Thousands of barrels]

	Crude oil	Residual oil	Other	Total
1940, year	43,085	29,366	11,162	83,613
1948, year	129,093	53,269	5,782	188,084
1949, year	154,922	74,555	4,654	234,131
1949, daily average	425	204	13	642

Source: U. S. Bureau of Mines.

5. IMPORTS AND THE FUEL MARKET

Effects of oil imports since 1948 have been felt throughout the American structure. They have had a depressing effect on American petroleum production. They have shrunken the coal market. Aspects of the latter are of special concern in this report.

The major product furnished by the imports, as indicated above, has been residual fuel oil, which can compete directly with coal. It is sometimes called the waste product of refining. The annual proportion or

[2] Note: The Effect of Oil Imports on Independent Domestic Producers (Jan. 26, 1950) a report sent to President Truman by Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, chairman of the Select Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives.

yield of residual resulting from the manufacture of oils has been on the decline in the United States because of advancements in refining methods. It is now around 20 percent where it was nearer 30 percent in the early thirties. However, because of the great increase in refining volume, the amount of residual has grown substantially although its relative place among petroleum products has dropped. This is pertinent since the market it serves is on the decrease unlike the markets for gasoline and other refined products which are on the rise.

The market residual served during 1947 and most of 1948 was mainly noncompetitive from a practical viewpoint. It included consumption for ship bunkers for which another fuel could not be easily used, plants located near oil fields or in congested areas where coal or gas could not be distributed except at a disadvantage and for special purposes. In 1948, in New York City, for example, the average price for residual was approximately $3 per barrel; 50 percent higher than coal on a heat basis. This was at a time when extra coal was available to take over residual accounts, had consumers wanted to switch for price reasons.

As late as 1946, railroads were the major buyers of residual. Carriers in the Southwest and on the Pacific coast used this oil as their main fuel for steam locomotives. In recent years, rapid dieselization of the carriers has decreased the use of residual as it has coal. The railroads could be entirely dieselized and would burn only about the same volume of oil represented in the 90,000,000 barrels of residual that fueled but one-sixth of the railway system in 1948. While switching largely to Diesel oil, the carriers are adding nothing to total petroleum consumption because of technological advancements.

Sales of residual fuel oil, 1947–48

Uses	Thousand barrels		Percent total, United States	
	1947	1948	1947	1948
Railroads	97,500	89,588	18.8	17.8
Vessels, inc. tankers	101,900	95,763	19.6	19.1
Gas and electric power plants	60,964	56,812	11.7	11.3
Smelters, mines, manufactures	115,108	117,780	22.1	23.5
Heating oils	56,402	58,639	10.8	11.7
Military	19,147	20,209	3.7	4.0
Oil company fuel	62,649	56,637	12.0	11.3
Miscellaneous uses	6,859	6,623	1.3	1.3
Total United States	520,529	502,051	100.0	100.0
Exports	10,623	12,539	------	------
Grand total	531,274	512,590	------	------

Source: U. S. Bureau of Mines.

Current large uses of residual are as vessel fuel and in the general category of smelters, mines and manufacturing. Vessel fuel is dropping because of a slackening in shipping and also with the growth of the Diesel engine for marine purposes. During 1949, the sale of residual was pushed in the manufacturing field, among utilities, and larger amounts were burned as company fuel. Data are not available yet to give the complete picture of the 1949 residual market.

In 1948, the total demand for residual amounted to 513,000,000 barrels, of which 13,000,000 barrels or less than 3 percent was export. Residual production has been increased and imports about maintained compared to 1947. This resulted in a new supply of 543,000,000 barrels, 30,000,000 above market requirements. Stocks which had been relatively low were built to 64,000,000 barrels by the end of 1948. Allowing for improvement in stocks, residual was in excess probably 20,000,000 barrels—4 percent of total requirements at that time.

This comparatively small excess was to start the dumping of residual, a practice that gained momentum in 1949 and reached significant proportions. Residual prices were cut in half in a matter of months to invade markets of other fuels.

The year 1949 was a hard one for fuel like residual and coal suitable for heating and steam generation. The winter and fall were extremely mild. Business activity dropped. Shifts were taking place among fuels such as brought by dieselization. These were the conditions under which an attempt was made to increase the sales of residual.

It is not startling that residual prices had to be cut drastically and generally—at least a dollar a barrel on the average over the year, a subtsantial sum figured on a half-billion barrels, and a loss not to be offset by price advances on gasoline and other products although that was tried. Nor is it surprising that coal, along with railroad transportation that depends heavily on coal for revenue, was squeezed in the process.

Supply and market of residual fuel oil

[Thousands of barrels]

	1947	1948	1949 (estimated)
Production, including transfers from crude	474,886	490,164	429,579
Imports	54,244	53,269	74,555
Total new supply	529,130	543,433	504,134
Exports	10,623	13,011	12,641
Stocks, end year	(1)	64,021	60,193
Domestic demand	518,510	500,543	495,321
Daily average	1,421	1,368	1,356

[1] Not available on basis comparable with figures for 1948 and 1949.

Source: U. S. Bureau of Mines.

Why should this happen? Why should the oil industry lose so much money? Why should coal and transportation be depressed? On the face, these questions lack a satisfactory answer. Residual excess did not average more than 50,000,000 barrels during 1949, less than imports and approximately 10 percent of a normal market. United States production of residual was lowered more in that year. But here is where imports enter. The imports of residual were increased along with the imports of crude, some of which gives a high yield of residual. In the circumstances, the new supply of residual could not be kept within appropriate limits. If the volume of residual imports could have been adjusted to remain as a supplemental source to domestic supply, the fuel disturbance of the last year could have been avoided. But apparently the volume of imports is not subject to fluctuations in the American market. Instead, it must be increased.

Dumping has caused residual to be widely disturbing to coal, and to invade coal's eastern coastal market with success. A large number of coal consumers located in the New England, Middle Atlantic, and South Atlantic States, have switched to residual oil after receiving attractive price offers.

As an illustration, most of the electric utilities located on or near the eastern seacoast have shifted from coal to oil in part or whole within the last year. A check of 15 utility plants in New England which converted showed that 6 were entirely fueled by oil, and 7 were from 50 to 100 percent on oil. Similar changes have taken place in New York and south.

The table following, taken from Federal power records, measures the displacement of coal at 26 plants between September 1948–49, which amounts to over 6,000,000 tons, as oil consumption increased five times. Additional oil imports will mean that residual will widen its attack, and further depress American fuel production.

Coal and oil consumption by select electric utilities

	Coal consumption (thousand tons)		Oil consumption (thousand tons)	
	September 1948	September 1949	September 1948	September 1949
New England (19 plants)	293	79	373	1,176
Middle Atlantic (7 plants)	680	363	58	903
Total	973	442	431	2,079

Source: Federal Power Commission.

6. EFFECTS OF THE IMPORT PROGRAM

The case for oil imports rests upon the contention that the country will need outside petroleum sources in the years ahead to supplement its own production. Otherwise, the imports proponents say, the United States will have inadequate fuel in terms of what is available in volume and costs to the world and thus to other countries, and will be at a disadvantage to that extent.

Oil imports also receive support in the promotion of foreign trade. This is important but not the controlling economic factor. Fuel supply is too vital to the economy's operation to be secondary to foreign trade per se. Imports, where essential, fit nicely into foreign market development. But the country cannot let trade promotion alone interfere with a sound fuel policy.

One weak point in the argument for oil import is the time aspect. When will American petroleum production be inadequate? Oil companies without foreign interests claim there can be plenty of American production for years to come. The National Petroleum Council has a similar view. Certainly, the growth of foreign production controlled by American interests has been at a faster rate than indicated by needs.

Another point not clear is the loss of interest in synthetic output with the development of foreign oil. Preliminary reports by the Government and industry contain favorable statements on the making of synthetic oil. From a long-range view: Might not synthetics be advanced to a position comparable to oil dependent upon foreign supply?

Technologists say there is no physical problem in converting coal to oil. They admit that their exploratory research has shown that costs for synthetics are higher than those for oils gained from petroleum refining. But synthetic production costs would be bettered with further research and experience. Even if higher they might tax the economy less than it would to provide protection for foreign oil supply.

When reference is made to an adequate oil supply in the future: What is the meaning? In brief, the answer covers a satisfactory volume of gasoline to run planes, automobiles, trucks, and similarly fueled vehicles. It includes diesel oil for locomotives, marine engines, and other equipment. It also includes additional light oils, lubricants, and various refined products, that serve numerous uses. More and more of these products will be consumed as the economy progresses with the benefits of additional technology. Without gasoline, diesel oil and other refined output, the economy would be paralyzed. If needed, obviously imports should be developed to assure that such refined products will be in ready volume.

However, this is not the way imports have been handled. The main product from foreign countries has been residual fuel oil. This product has certain special uses for which there is no convenient substitute but which aggregate into an amount that could be supplied by the country's ordinary refining operations. A given amount of residual will be required in the future but the volume will tend to decline unless it proves more profitable than gasoline and other refined products which is unlikely in view of technological trends. But the imports program has been mainly to bring residual into the country, pushing supply above normal requirements and dump the excess, largely into coal markets. The effect has been to develop oil imports principally to displace coal as to which we have vast reserves.

American financing of coal development in some foreign country that features immediate cost advantages could have given the same results as has the oil-import program. Coal then could be imported to displace tonnage mined in the United States. Benefiting would be particular coal consumers while nothing would be gained by millions of other fuel users. Nothing would be added to strengthen fuel supply ahead.

American interests in foreign oil may hold that the present import program is a necessary step in securing later benefits. Depressing domestic oil and coal production—displacing the country's labor with foreign—are only temporary expedients for developing imports as to be essential in the future. But how far is the future? Oil imports now make for an excess oil supply and still are on the increase. Their impact has been seriously felt within only a matter of a single year. Their prospective development can remodel the fuel structure within a few years.

The manner in which the oil-imports program discourages the continuation of a sound coal industry may be briefly summarized.

Coal is an essential energy source for the economy. Suddenly stop coal supply and American industry will come to a standstill and civilians will face severe hardship. During the peak war and postwar years, bituminous and anthracite coal was produced at an annual rate of between six hundred and eighty to six hundred and ninety million tons. In 1949, the consumption and export of coal amounted to 520,000,000 tons, nearly 25 percent below peak levels but yet the most important source of energy among the fuels. Coal as a solid fuel will continue to be essential and will take on extra importance should there be a war.

The basic structure of the coal industry consists of equipped mines which, today, have mining capacity to meet requirements. It has a heavy investment in plant and equipment, is geared to produce and prepare the numerous coal products needed. Mines are depleted from day to day and new operations must be brought into service to maintain capacity. It sometimes takes several years to reach full production in a new mine. Both existing and prospective mines reflect the trend in improved mechanization.

Besides the equipped mines, marginal operations are developed during peak periods. They mine out crops and other deposits easily reachable which, though generally of poor quality, help supplement supply in periods of heavy demand. The marginals ordinarily have little capital outlay. A good deal of the coal suitable for marginal mining has been depleted since the start of World War II.

A requisite for coal mining is an experienced labor force. Miners have to acquire considerable training before they can undertake responsible assignments. Approximately 500,000 men are engaged in mining at the present time.

Capacity at a coal mine is of no value unless there is transportation. Tonnage must be moved in great volume and over long distances to service consumers. Coal is the largest source of revenue for the railroads, and it is important tonnage in trucking and water movement. A rough measure of the place of coal in transportation is one railroad employee for each miner.

Now as to the importation of residual fuel oil. It takes about four barrels of this oil to supplant a ton of coal. On the average, each million barrels of residual displaces 250,000 coal tons, 250 miners and the same number of railroad employees, and 5,000 cars of coal that would provide a freight revenue of $750,000. The dumping of residual takes part of coal's market and puts a downward pressure on prices as to the remainder. With 75,000,000 barrels of residual imported in 1949 and apparently larger amounts to be brought in during the succeeding years, it is easy to understand how the coal industry has been and will be squeezed. Coal confronted with the import situation will be unattractive to the miner, to the investor, and to the railroad. Its employment will decrease, its plant will deplete without replacement, its transportation facilities will shrink.

In conclusion, there is the question: Why does the country need a sound coal industry? Imports that permit oil to displace coal because of advantages and an assured supply would benefit the economy. This seems logical but nothing has been put forward to make it practical. The country is never sure of imports. It failed to maintain its movement from Latin America during World War II when it desperately needed oil. Imports from the Middle East would be even harder to protect. In addition, the oil industry admits that less residual will be made in the more distant future as refineries must concentrate on gasoline, Diesel oil, and other products, in order to meet requirements. Thus, by shifting from coal to residual the country would depend upon a foreign fuel with a possible interrupted supply as well as a declining supply in the long run.

But some contend, if the import movement is cut and residual is short, consumers again can turn to coal. The trouble with this thinking is that coal may not be available. Take the extreme case, a war declared several years hence after residual has taken a good part of the coal market. Imports stop and consumers like the eastern utilities place orders for millions of tons of coal, deliveries to start in a few days. Coal's plant capacity, employment, and transportation, having been depressed, already is overloaded because of war activity. Where is additional coal to be obtained immediately? This would be difficult to answer, especially if at that time it is decided to rush the establishment of a coal-to-oil industry that will use millions of tons of coal per year.

Without war, the problem of fuel supply would appear gradually rather than suddenly. Late in the fifties, as an example, it may be found that residual is short. World activity places heavy demands on refining capacity for gasoline and light oils, and the volume of residual falls. Again, coal is called upon to supply energy. But like in Great Britain after World War II, coal would be unable to meet demands adequately and operations of the economy would be restricted. You cannot build mines, increase employment, and supplement transportation on a short-term basis.

True, coal as a solid does not have the increasing market that oil enjoys. But the country must have a coal supply in the future as it does presently. And the country is entitled to receive this supply upon an efficient basis such as can be expected from a well-run coal industry with reasonable competitive opportunities.

In conclusion, it appears that the current oil imports program is going to result in a development opposite to the one declared to be its objective. The program will tend to weaken instead of strengthen the country's fuel structure of the future. Its effects will be to depress American petroleum and coal production, and to discourage advancement in synthetic oil output. What it will do is make America unnecessarily dependent on foreign fuel supply and, at the same time, without proper safeguards in case import flow is blocked or reduced. If this is a proper conclusion, then the country is moving in the direction of fuel shortages, not a pleasant prospect for an economy that should expand, and remain powerful for security purposes.

The Hydrogen Bomb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL HINSHAW
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 21, 1950

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following talk given by Dr. Robert F. Bacher, former member of the Atomic Energy Commission, now of the California Institute of Technology, at Town Hall, Los Angeles, March 27, 1950, entitled "The Hydrogen Bomb":

On January 31 President Truman issued a short and momentous statement about the hydrogen bomb. Quoting the central part of his statement, he said: "I have directed the Atomic Energy Commission to continue its work on all forms of atomic weapons, including the so-called hydrogen or superbomb. Like all other work in the field of atomic weapons, it is being and will be carried forward on a basis consistent with the over-all objectives of our program for peace and security."

There has been no amplification of this statement.

During the weeks before the President issued his statement and in the following weeks there have been many conflicting statements about hydrogen bombs and what we should do about them. Some of these statements have become distorted in repetition. Others, while clearly stating physical possibilities, concern events which are so improbable as not to warrant serious consideration at the moment. Some of the statements made by scientists, whether intentionally or otherwise, have been very frightening to our citizens. Back of such statements seems to be the idea expressed by some that if the United States citizen will just become sufficiently frightened somehow, we will not have any war in the future.

There is no question that the hydrogen bomb has terrifying possibilities, and a little later I shall try to give some estimate of what such a bomb might be like. It is our very deep obligation, however, as citizens in a democratic country, to consider this whole question objectively, dispassionately, and as carefully as we can under the circumstances to decide just what our country should be doing. It will not improve the judgment of the citizen to scare him to death first. This is a very serious time for the United States. We cannot afford any irrational or purely emotional action. Our future safety and security depend today on keeping our heads and using wise judgment.

Many people in considering the national policy on the hydrogen bomb have been able to formulate their opinions of this weapon very quickly on moral grounds alone. They say, and with justice, that the hydrogen bomb is a weapon of tremendous mass de-

struction and that accordingly no civilized country should consider its possible development and use. This is a comfortable position and one very easy to take, but where do we stop? Atomic bombs are also weapons of mass destruction. Are they moral or immoral? Nothing could be more gruesome or immoral than the reports which many of us have heard of some of the hand-to-hand conflicts during the past war. Nothing could be more uncivilized than some of the torture to which war, conflict, and slave states have led.

There is no question about it. War inevitably leads to many acts which are immoral. The relative immorality of various weapons and acts of war becomes difficult to distinguish. The hydrogen bomb, being a weapon of tremendous destruction, is more to be condemned than lesser weapons on these grounds if used for needless mass destruction. Indeed, no one can argue that the moral position of the United States will be improved by the possession or use of this bomb. Immoral as war is, war consumes a large part of the efforts of the people of the world. Situations arise in which war seems to be the lesser of two evils. The moral problem is therefore a much deeper one. The real question is: "What should the United States do in order to diminish the probability of world conflict and to increase world peace and international accord?"

To this question many answers are given. One man will say that the only approach is pacifism. Another man will say that the only approach is to be fully and completely prepared to act against any aggressor immediately and effectively. The problem seems to be much more subtle. No such simple solution has been found in the past to be effective.

I have no complete answer to this question for you today. But what we do about the hydrogen bomb in the future may affect world peace, and is directly related to this basic question. One man says that to make the hydrogen bomb starts us on a weapons race which will inevitably lead us to war. Another man says that we can only maintain our security if we make hydrogen bombs and thus are able to hold an aggressor at bay. Which one is right?

Many of our citizens have lost all faith in the United Nations and believe that there are no possibilities at all for international agreements which will have any meaning. Others feel that we have not made the right approach to the Russians as yet. Certainly there is little reason from our experiences in the United Nations and particularly from our experiences and efforts toward the international control of atomic energy, to be very hopeful. While yielding no tangible results these discussions of the control of atomic energy have been very useful in pointing out where the difficulties lie.

Our Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, stoutly maintains that if Russia will face the real needs for international agreement on vital issues and will show a desire to reach agreement, then it would be possible to lessen the tension which grips the world today. While he is not optimistic on Russian willingness to decrease that tension, he believes that accord on the international control of atomic energy is one of the vital issues. If international accord seems so unlikely, we should be interested in whether a vigorous development and production of the hydrogen bomb will increase or diminish the probability of war.

Of course, there will be some who will argue that any weapon development at all leads to war and therefore we should make no development of any kind. Though this is in agreement with some of our most deeply rooted Christian ideas it cannot be followed. There is no question at all in my mind, that for our Nation to pursue such a policy in the present world would be for us greatly to increase the probability of a world holocaust and a national calamity.

Throwing aside then such a pacifist view, let us ask the questions: "What weapon development is important to the national security? How important is the hydrogen bomb to national security? Will hydrogen bombs increase our chance of winning a war with minimum loss?"

Before trying to answer these questions, let us look briefly at some of the technical background of the hydrogen bomb. It has been known for a great many years that if one could somehow find a way of putting light atomic nuclei together to make heavier nuclei, it would be possible to extract energy. It has also been known for a long time that if one could take the heaviest nuclei and split them apart, one would be able to obtain energy.

The first indication that either of these processes might be important to us as a source of energy came from the suggestion by Hans Bethe that the fusion of the light elements was our fundamental source of energy in the sun and stars. Dr. Bethe worked his ideas out in some detail and scientists now believe that this is the origin of solar energy. These ideas were well developed before the fission of uranium was discovered. The discovery of the fission of uranium in 1938 was immediately recognized as a possible source of energy for man. Released gradually he could use this energy for power. Released suddenly this energy could provide an explosion.

Two fundamental scientific discoveries which followed soon after the discovery of fission were of far-reaching importance. The first of these was that in the fission of uranium caused by the absorption of low-energy neutrons, additional neutrons were released in the process. The importance of this fact is that the fission of uranium could produce neutrons which could then produce another fission, hence the term chain reaction. These neutrons released in fission could make the reaction self-perpetuating.

The second discovery was that some of these neutrons were emitted some time after the fission took place. It was this fact that made the controlled chain reaction or nuclear reactor a possibility. Without these delayed neutrons we would have no way of controlling a nuclear reactor.

With the fusion of the light elements the situation is entirely different. Here the basic nuclear reactions which lead to the release of relatively large quantities of energy are those which occur when the nuclear particles collide at high velocity or high relative kinetic energy. At the center of the stars the temperature is many millions of degrees centigrade and the particles of matter are moving at such high speeds that these nuclear reactions may take place. Even then, only a few nuclear reactions are possible. There is no possibility that the energy release from this type of reaction can be controlled on the earth. In the stars the reaction is controlled because of their great size. On the earth these self-sustaining thermonuclear reactions will either give an explosion or nothing at all.

Whether or not a hydrogen bomb can be made depends upon whether it is possible to create on earth, an assembly of materials which will produce a nuclear reaction if heated to a sufficiently high temperature and then to devise a way to raise these materials to that temperature.

The temperature required is comparable to that reached in the interior of the sun which is more than 10,000,000 degrees centigrade. The only way that we know to reach such a temperature today is an atomic bomb where the sudden release of energy causes the materials of the bomb to be heated to an extremely high temperature.

The main light element, of course, to which I have been referring is hydrogen. Now ordinary hydrogen just won't work. The scientific evidence for this seems to be quite clear. But hydrogen as it is found in nature has two forms or isotopes. The heavy hydrogen discovered by Urey nearly 20 years ago, is a possibility. In recent years heavy hydrogen, as contained in water, has been separated in relatively large quantities.

There is another possibility. For more than 15 years it has been known that another isotope of hydrogen called tritium because it has mass three, is produced in nuclear reactions. This material is radioactive and ordinarily does not exist in nature. It has a half life of 12 years but its nuclear properties are such that it is of basic interest in the release of energy by fusion.

It has been known for many years that tritium could be produced in a nuclear reaction in which neutrons are absorbed. As you all know the big nuclear reactors which are now in operation, do produce neutrons in large quantity. These neutrons are ordinarily used in the production of plutonium. But they could be used just as well to produce quantities of tritium. Any nuclear physicist can sit down and figure out the theoretical limit of the amount of tritium that can be produced with a given number of neutrons. He would quickly recognize that since you need neutrons to produce plutonium and neutrons to produce tritium, a nuclear reactor could be used to produce one or the other at will. It would be necessary, of course, to know a great deal about the actual workings of a nuclear reactor in order to say just how much tritium could be produced in that reactor if one were willing to forego the production of a certain amount of plutonium. It sounds as if the production of tritium in quantity is at least a fairly expensive if not formidable process.

That these two isotopes of hydrogen can possibly play a fundamental role in the release of nuclear energy by fusion is well known. Just exactly what relative role they play and how they might play it, is not a subject for open discussion today. These questions are secret and we can have no discussion of them. But any nuclear physicist will quickly grasp the basic science requirements even though the bomb technology is much more complicated.

The real problem in developing and constructing a hydrogen bomb is: "How do you get it going?" The heavy hydrogens, deuterium and tritium, are suitable substances if somehow they could be heated hot enough and kept hot. This problem is a little bit like the job of making a fire at 20 degrees below zero in the mountains with green wood which is covered with ice and with very little kindling. Today, scientists tell us that such a fire can probably be kindled.

Once you get the fire going, of course, you can pile on the wood and make a very sizable conflagration. In the same way with the hydrogen bomb, more heavy hydrogen can be used and a bigger explosion obtained. It has been called an open ended weapon, meaning that more materials can be added and a bigger explosion obtained.

Let us look for a moment at what sort of an explosion is imagined. Here I shall take the figures which have been commonly reported in the press and stick to round numbers. I believe that these are quite adequate for you to obtain some general idea of what such an explosion is like.

In 1945 President Truman stated that the atomic bomb was equivalent to 20,000 tons of TNT. In talking about the hydrogen bomb it has commonly been speculated that such a bomb would be one thousand times as powerful as the bomb dropped on Hiroshima. If it is 1,000 times as powerful this would mean that it would have an explosive effect equivalent to about 20,000,000 tons of TNT.

Now it happens that the radius of damage from a big explosion increases as the cube root of the energy is released. With a bomb a thousand times more powerful than the Hiroshima bomb the radius of damage will be 10 times greater. Since the radius for almost complete destruction from blast was approximately 1 mile at Hiroshima, the corresponding radius for a hydrogen bomb 1,000 times as large would be approximately 10 miles.

Such a hydrogen bomb would be sufficiently great to cause almost complete destruction of any metropolitan area known today. In Los Angeles, for example, a circle of 10 miles radius would cover most but not all of the metropolitan area. Outlying communities would not be included but would still suffer damage.

There are other damage effects from atomic weapons. At Hiroshima people who were in the open and exposed directly to the light of the bomb were seriously burned. With a hydrogen bomb these effects will be much greater and may extend to an even greater radius than the blast affects. On the other hand, the radiation which produces these burns is very easily absorbed. It is very much like the radiation from the sun and a shadow or a blanket of smog is a great protection. The same evil smelling smog blanket which cuts off our sun may after all be some protection.

Generally speaking one would expect the flash burn effects to increase as the square root of the power of the bomb. In other words, for a bomb a thousand times greater than Hiroshima the effects would be expected to extend roughly 30 times as far. At Hiroshima flash burns were severe out to two-thirds of a mile and without smog absorption or shadows similar burns might be expected out to 20 miles for a hydrogen bomb. Except for a hydrogen bomb exploded at extraordinarily high altitude, such a damage radius would mean that shadows of buildings, trees, bushes, and other objects would be very important in cutting down the direct effect of flash burn. If you couldn't see the bomb directly you would expect no effect of flash burn. For a bomb exploded at an elevation of 2 miles it would be rather like trying to see Mount Baldy from 20 miles away. Even without atmospheric absorption there would be relatively few spots where some building or other structure would not be in the way.

Atomic bombs and hydrogen bombs as well, may be expected to release neutrons and penetrating gamma radiation. These particles and rays, however, are absorbed fairly easily in air and will not have an appreciably greater radius of action for a hydrogen bomb than for an ordinary atomic bomb. People who are sufficiently close to be killed by penetrating radiation would very likely be killed by blast effects either direct or indirect in any event. Among those injured, some will definitely show effects of radiation damage.

There has been a great deal of speculation about the radioactive products produced by a hydrogen bomb. The disintegration products produced in the explosion are themselves not radioactive as are the fission products from an atomic bomb. But since an atomic bomb would be needed in order to get the conflagration going, some fission products from that bomb would doubtless be present. But large quantities of radioactivity may be produced from the neutrons which are released in the nuclear conflagration.

If the neutrons released in the hydrogen bomb explosion are absorbed in some material which becomes artificially radioactive, then a very large quantity of this radioactive material will be produced in a big explosion. On the other hand, many of these neutrons might be absorbed in material which would be inactive and the effects of the radioactivity at least in part avoided. If the neutrons escaped into the air, many of them would be absorbed by nitrogen and, by a nuclear reaction, produce radioactive carbon. This material is most disagreeable as a radioactive contaminant since it has a half life of many thousands of years.

If such a bomb were exploded under water, however, very few of the neutrons would escape and most of them would be used to produce radioactive sodium or to activate other elements in sea water, or to produce heavy hydrogen by neutron capture in ordinary hydrogen.

The radioactivity effects of a hydrogen bomb are thus difficult to estimate, since they depend very much on where the bomb is exploded and what material surrounds it. Under conditions in which the largest amount of radioactivity is formed it would be a dangerous hazard. One of the real scare stories about the effects of radioactivity, has postulated the complete explosion of 500 tons of deuterium, which, while not impossible as far as anyone can say, is stretching probabilities a long way.

From our brief analysis of well-known scientific information it appears that a hydrogen bomb would require a considerable quantity of heavy hydrogen, both deuterium and tritium perhaps, as well as an atomic bomb to set it off and raise the temperature sufficiently so that a nuclear conflagration can exist. Technically the problem is to figure out how a sizable fraction of the energy of the heavy hydrogen can be released before the material is cooled too much by emitted radiation or dispersed by the explosion. In the stars the radiation is retained because the stellar atmosphere is relatively opaque and there is an enormous temperature difference between the center and the outside of the star. In a hydrogen bomb there is no such protective layer and the central problem is to get a large fraction of the energy released while the temperature is still high enough.

Whether this can be done will of course not be certain until it has been done. There are many opinions as to how difficult it may be. Since the President has directed the Atomic Energy Commission to continue with the development, we can assume that this development is regarded as both possible and feasible.

So much for the technical problems which must be solved in order to develop a hydrogen bomb. While it seems possible that these problems may be solved, whether or not a hydrogen bomb can be developed will be fully determined only when a bomb has been made and exploded. But let us for the moment, assume that the development can be completed. In order that we may try to determine whether or not hydrogen bombs will add materially to our national security, let us try to summarize briefly their effectiveness as military weapons and compare them with atomic bombs already in existence.

If we assume that the hydrogen bomb is a thousand times as powerful as the Hiroshima bomb, it will have a radius for blast damage which is 10 times as great. For severe blast damage that means a radius of about 10 miles. For flash-burn damage, the radius will be theoretically 30 times as great as for the Hiroshima bomb. Absorption and shadow effects will cut this down greatly at the larger distances, so that an effective radius for flash burns for those in the open might be roughly the same as for severe blast damage. Effects of neutrons and hard gamma radiation from the hydrogen bomb, would not be expected to extend very much further than they would for an atomic bomb.

The effects of radioactivity would depend very greatly on where and how the bomb was exploded. Exploded in the air, the effects of radioactivity from a hydrogen bomb would be quickly dispersed and for long-lived activity, the effects would be almost the same for all parts of the world unless brought down by rain. It might be possible to enhance these radioactive effects by surrounding the bomb with the proper materials and to arrange it so that the active material is deposited near the point of explosion. How successful such an unpleasant operation might be, would again depend upon where the bomb was exploded and upon the general climatic conditions which existed at the time. Whether or not our Nation would ever want to use radioactive poisons or a bomb so designed that it would produce them in quantity, is very doubtful. Without trying to answer this question, we see that the effectiveness of radioactive contamination from a hydrogen bomb designed and exploded to enhance that effect seems to be somewhat uncertain and at least in part unpredictable.

We can easily see that a hydrogen bomb is capable of destroying any major city, with the exception perhaps of some of the outlying districts. How does this compare with what could be done with atomic bombs? We have been comparing the hydrogen bomb with the atomic bomb used at Hiroshima but it has been stated that since the war there have been significant improvements in atomic bombs. These improvements have resulted in more powerful bombs and in a more efficient use of the valuable fissionable material.

Most large metropolitan areas include many areas covered by water or otherwise unsettled so that a hydrogen bomb would include many square miles whose destruction would contribute in no way to the effectiveness of the bomb. Atomic bombs could presumably be dropped so as to avoid these areas. Furthermore, it was found in the last war that a saturation raid which greatly hampered fire fighting caused damage far beyond the areas of immediate blast effects. Considering all these factors, it seems likely that there is no metropolitan area which could not be thoroughly destroyed with 25 atomic bombs. It is more likely that less than 10 atomic bombs would be needed to destroy major metropolitan areas and that two bombs would completely paralyze even large cities.

Except for the psychological effects and for the most unpleasant and somewhat unpredictable effects of the radioactivity produced, it appears that a hydrogen bomb which is a thousand times more powerful than an atomic bomb might cause more destruction but would probably not be much more effective than 10 atomic bombs. For smaller industrial targets it would not be much more effective than a single atomic bomb.

One begins to wonder just how powerful a military weapon the hydrogen bomb would be. There does not seem to be very much to the statement which has been made by some, that the hydrogen bomb is such a tremendous new weapon that it can completely revolutionize warfare. The hydrogen bomb seems to be a terrible weapon and certainly large numbers of these bombs could cause untold destruction. Even a relatively small number could be a major blow to any highly industrialized and centralized country.

But what about the atomic bomb and the damage which might be inflicted with a sizable stock pile of these weapons? Suppose, just to take a round number, that the United States possessed 1,000 atomic bombs of the improved variety. If they could be delivered to military objectives at all, they would go a long way at the rate of 10 for a major metropolitan area and perhaps an even smaller number for major cities. With a thousand bombs, there would be a great many for relatively minor military objectives and I imagine that the military commanders charged with the responsibility of the prosecution of a war would have a hard time figuring out what to do with the last hundred.

It appears that if any nation has as many as a thousand atomic bombs, that the world

is already in the position where any nation could be blasted thoroughly and completely insofar as bombing alone can be effective. If this is the case, just what additional military use is a hydrogen bomb? For the most part it just seems that everyone is fascinated by the idea of "the bigger the better." There are a few examples in the history of the world that should lead us to question this view and not accept it, at least not without argument. We should not forget the dinosaur nor the dodo. We should not forget the battleship, now almost extinct.

Of course it might turn out in a war that it would not be possible to deliver atomic bombs or any big bombs, to the targets which the military commanders might want to destroy. If this is the case and if atomic bombs or any big bombs are any major part of our military preparation, then from the military standpoint, the solution of this problem is vastly more important than exactly what kind of bombs would be carried if they could be delivered.

If hydrogen bombs would not add very much to the military effectiveness of the United States we might ask whether they would add much to Russia's military potential. Here, of course, one gets involved in even more speculation. One is not able to judge very well whether the Russians have an appreciable chance of delivering the hydrogen bomb by air against the radar defense of the country which is now being constructed. But even if such a defense is constructed and is reasonably effective and even if the Russians do not have the same strength of long-range bombers which the United States has, still there is another method of delivery which for them would be perhaps quite effective.

Many of the big metropolitan areas of the United States are located on the seacoast. Into these harbors, or at least reasonably close to them, a hydrogen bomb might easily be brought in the hold of a tramp steamer. While this might not be the most effective place to detonate a hydrogen bomb, it would be a simple method of delivery for a surprise attack. On the other hand, there are practically no Russian cities which could be reached using a similar method of delivery by the United States. Another variation might involve the use of relatively small unmanned craft which would run ashore with a hydrogen bomb aboard.

It would thus appear that while the potential effectiveness of a hydrogen bomb in the interior of either the United States or Russia would be about the same for both countries, the hydrogen bomb would be a more effective weapon used against seacoast cities. This means that the hydrogen bomb would be a more effective weapon for the Russians than for the United States.

Some people have argued that if we develop the hydrogen bomb and can really keep its details secret, the Russians will never be able to develop it. There is absolutely no reason at all to believe that this would be the case. Recent experience has shown that the Russians have an atomic energy enterprise adequately developed to make a sizable atomic explosion. In addition they probably have fairly detailed information on our atomic weapons work and at least some of the early thoughts on the possibility of a hydrogen bomb as a result of well-known scientific information combined with the blundering indiscretions of some months ago and also from their espionage activity. Given adequate time, they can most surely make a hydrogen bomb if it is possible at all.

From these arguments it appears that hydrogen bombs will not add greatly to the military effectiveness of the United States. How much they would add to Russia's effectiveness against the United States is not exactly clear, but probably somewhat more than they would add to ours. The President's decision to go ahead with the development of the hydrogen bomb 6 weeks ago created a tremendous stir in the Nation. Viewed only from the standpoint of its military effectiveness there seems to be little reason to attach such great significance to the hydrogen bomb. While it is a terrible weapon, its military effectiveness seems to have been grossly overrated in the mind of the layman.

What is probably much more serious about the hush hush subject of the hydrogen bomb is that here is a weapon about which the average citizen is so ill-informed that he thinks it can save the country from attack. Pumped full of hysteria from Red scares and aggravated by political mud slinging, the average citizen is easily convinced that he can find some security and relief from all of this in the hydrogen bomb which will protect him. The most tragic part is that the hydrogen bomb won't save us and it isn't even a very good addition to our military potential.

Here we have the outcome of what can happen in a democracy when decisions of far-reaching national significance are made without public scrutiny of pertinent information. While most of the pertinent information is not secret at all, some of the information which the citizen should have in order to judge whether a national policy is sound, is secret. One of the most important facts which the citizen should have to make a reasonable judgment is the approximate number of bombs in the United States stock pile. It would be quite surprising if the Russians from the information which they obtained could not figure this out. Senator McMAHON raised the question of making the number of atomic weapons available generally. He was vigorously criticized. As of last spring, not even the members of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy knew how many atomic bombs the United States had.

Additional information which would help the citizen to appreciate the relative cost of hydrogen bombs and atomic bombs would be the fissionable material needed to get the hydrogen reaction started and the plutonium equivalent of the tritium to be used. Since neutrons are required to produce either plutonium or tritium, the neutron cost of a hydrogen bomb may be larger than it first appears. These neutrons could, of course, be used to produce additional plutonium so that there is a very real sacrifice of potential atomic bombs in order to obtain the ingredients for hydrogen bombs. There have been such wide discrepancies in the estimated dollar costs of the hydrogen bomb that the citizen cannot make any sensible conclusion about the money costs at all.

It is most important in our democracy that our Government be frank and open with the citizens. In a democracy it is only possible to have good government when the citizens are well informed. It is difficult enough for them to become well informed when the information is easily available. When that information is not available, it is impossible. While there may be some cases in which the information which the citizen needs in order to make an intelligent judgment of national policy, must be kept secret so that military potential will not be jeopardized, the present use of secrecy far exceeds this minimum limit. These are the methods of an authoritarian government and should be vigorously opposed in our democracy.

The hydrogen bomb and its potential usefulness to the United States as a military weapon is a subject on which the citizens should be much more fully informed. It is a subject of national inmportance, not only because it is a weapon whose effectiveness has been grossly exaggerated but it is also one in which we can place relatively little reliance for the future. Quantities of hydrogen bombs will not contribute very much to the security of the United States. Unfortunately the citizen today believes that they will.

If the development of the hydrogen bomb will probably not do much to increase national security, what then might be done which would have importance in this direction? There are probably many answers to this question but let me just make one suggestion that I am sure is clear to anyone who has thought seriously about the problem.

If the Russians should decide to move into western Europe, we would immediately be faced with the prospect of fighting a war. Presumably, we could use atomic bombs. It would not be long, however, before we would need a big United States Army and supplies not only for that Army but also for our allies in Europe. We would have to send these supplies from the United States.

But just how would we get those supplies to Europe? During the past war on at least two occasions, the Germans came dangerously close to shutting off our supplies to England. This was before the development of the schnorkel-type of submarine which we are told the Russians now have in quantity. It is well known that the schnorkel submarine, while not absolutely impervious to detection by radar, is most difficult to run down. No method of detection of submarines has been developed which can locate them at any great distance under water. At the moment there is no good solution to the problem of hunting down the schnorkel submarine and it appears that a determined enemy with adequate bases and submarines could go a long way toward preventing us from delivering men and supplies to Europe. We could presumably deliver a certain amount of material by air, but when it comes to delivering millions of tons, our experience with the Berlin air lift should show us that this is not a feasible solution.

Here is a problem whose solution would contribute greatly to our military strength and, therefore, to our security. Its solution might even deter the Russians from overrunning western Europe if they had planned to do so. On this ground it seems to be much more important than the more spectacular hydrogen bomb development.

There are probably a great many more developments which are almost as important as the solution of the problem of antisubmarine warfare. For example, there are the problems of the development of long-range guided missiles. This development is clearly important to military strength. During the last war both the Germans and the Russians were very successful in the tactical use of airplanes with ground troops. New technical developments might be made which might greatly increase the effectiveness of airplanes in tactical use.

It seems very likely that there are many developments related to military strength which may be important for us to pursue. For some of these, as in the case of the development of atomic energy, we may need to choose between weapons and other developments of nuclear power which may have long-range, peacetime significance. This long-range, peacetime significance may add to our increased industrial strength and thereby make a greater contribution to our long-range strength than the more immediate development of weapons themselves.

At the present time it is most difficult to ascertain how our Government decides what policies to follow regarding national security. High Government officials find themselves with advice to pursue this or that development and construct this or that weapon without being very sure how one weapon compares with another. Where the development of a weapon may compete with a long-range industrial development the problem is still more difficult. The real way to make sure that a reasonable policy is followed, is to have those policies and the information

on which they are based open for public scrutiny.

Furthermore, although the United States is a rich country, we are not in the position of being able to follow every recommendation that anyone believes will increase our national security.

The citizen must choose insofar as that is possible. Today if he tries to come to some conclusion about what should be done to increase the national security, the citizen runs up against a high wall of secrecy. He can, of course, take the easy solution and say that these are questions which should be left to the upper echelons of the Military Establishments to decide. But these questions are so important today, that to leave them to the military men to decide is for the citizen essentially to abrogate his basic responsibility. If in time of peace, questions on which the future of our country depend, are left to any small group not representative of the people to decide, we have gone a long way toward authoritarian government.

The United States has grown to be a strong Nation under a Constitution which wisely has laid great emphasis upon the importance of free and open discussion. Urged by a large number of people who have fallen for the fallacy that in secrecy there is security and, I regret, encouraged by many including eminent scientists who prophesy doom just around the corner, we are dangerously close to abandoning those principles of free speech and open discussion which have made our country great. The democratic system depends on making intelligent decisions by the electorate. Our democratic heritage can only be carried on if the citizen has the information with which to make an intelligent decision.

Another President Comes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 5, 1950

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Oregon Journal of April 30, 1950:

ANOTHER PRESIDENT COMES

President Truman's schedule has been partly announced. He is to "dedicate" Grand Coulee Dam on May 11. A week later, such political implications as his visit contains will be transferred to Spokane and a speech by Vice President ALBEN BARKLEY who never thinks he needs to pull his punches on whether his subject is politics. It always is.

The President's coming starts all kinds of agitation. Will he stand in the presence of the Nation's greatest hydroelectric plant and propose, "Turn it over"?

Turn it over, that is, to CVA?

Or will he put the Presidential weight back of the present development program stimulated by a new form of coordination?

FDR PLAYS PROPHET

Will HST, when he departs, leave as memorable a phrase as did his predecessor, FDR, who came at the outset of Columbia River power development and said:

"More power to you."

Franklin D. Roosevelt had come into the Pacific Northwest in 1920. In Spokane he made a speech. Pointing toward the Columbia River basin, he said:

"Great stretches of physical territory now practically untouched are destined some day to contain the homes of thousands and hundreds of thousands of citizens like ours, to be developed by the Nation and for the Nation. * * * We have made beginnings with reclamation projects, but I like to think they are only beginnings and that in our lifetime, yes, in the immediate years to come, we are going to see with our own eyes these problems taken up on vastly larger scale. We have got to have a national policy that will put in not $100,000,000 in 10 years, but $100,000,000 every year for 10 years."

This was Roosevelt playing prophet to himself.

Thirty years ago, the idea of Grand Coulee was not born. The idea, so far as it had been formed, was of a diversion dam near Albeni Falls on Coeur d'Alene River in Idaho. Its purpose was to divert enough water to make five Spokane Rivers, carry it 130 miles to the head of the Columbia Basin, thence to distribute it over 2,000,000 acres of arid lands and make them smile with abundance.

Years were to pass before the campaign for Bonneville Dam was more than an isolated effort. The organized drive was for Umatilla Rapids (now McNary) Dam, and the goals were navigation and reclamation with power the incident.

Economic depression was to be the rough key that unlocked the power of the Columbia. Roosevelt admitted reclamation to the recovery program in response to western appeal. A pressure that mounted and found its focus in the late Senator Charles L. McNary and Representative Charles H. Martin in Washington led the President to authorize initial construction of Bonneville. Even then it was a struggle to secure authority for a power development or for a dam of more than navigation height, due not to the reluctance of FDR, but to the notion of Harold L. Ickes, then head of PWA, that the low dam was enough.

President Roosevelt, in 1934, stood at the site of Bonneville Dam to say, "More power to you." Ten months before he had authorized the first money allocation. "I think we have gone a long way in less than a year," he commented with pride, gazing at the busy scene of construction.

He went on to Grand Coulee, following by motor the route of the ancient and enormous channel of the Columbia. On August 5, 1934, he pledged himself to a high dam. He was confident against a lot of pessimists that the power could be marketed. He explained why Western States were getting what seemed a disproportionate amount of public-work funds. The money was not only for those now in the West, but for the many who would come from regions of blight and limited opportunity.

Here again Roosevelt was playing prophet to himself. The people had begun to come before he passed away. They are coming in ever-increasing numbers.

But did FDR prevision all that was to come and how swiftly?

WAR USE AT FIRST

With Bonneville and Grand Coulee there was power in new dimensions for new calculations. Big reclamation, such as that in Malheur County, Oreg., came into fruitfulness.

War caught us napping in armament, but there was power for shipyards, for aluminum, for many other war-connected industries. It had been like whistling in a graveyard at first to say all the power would be marketed. The problem became how to develop power fast enough to meet demand.

That continues to be the problem, although the shooting war ended in 1945.

And one of the greatest consumers of hydroelectric power was the mysterious industry at Hanford which had contributed to the atom bomb.

But the changes were not to be limited to the evolution from power to war industry to the most frightful of all weapons and to the recovery program.

There was also coming, unseen, the play of new things upon our own way of life in the Oregon country. We had seen the power policies of the New Deal linked to a plan for wider distribution of population as a means of checking the overgrowth of the great eastern industrial districts.

A longer time was necessary to see how the collectivism we abhorred in older, dictator-governed parts of the world was creeping in upon us in the form of new schemes of government and new controls by government upon the individual. The veteran who had dreamed of his own home for his own family on his own land in a Columbia Basin reclamation project began to feel the push of a proposed collectivist valley authority standing between him and his smiling Uncle Sam.

INDIVIDUAL SUBMERGED?

Obscurely, it is true, but with increasing light it could be seen that the individual himself might become only a unit of a planned economy that dealt with men in the same terms as machinery and land and sought to control all in the same way.

That's a pretty bad fate for the American individual. James B. Conant, president of Harvard, writes in Foreign Affairs:

"The American public is quite uncertain as to the relation of the physical and natural sciences to the set of moral and spiritual values by which the average individual guides his daily life."

REALITY OF FREEDOM

Maybe it reads here like mere "highfalutin' talk" to insist that the set of factors to be applied to the people concerned in the development of the Columbia Basin will have a lot to do with their moral and spiritual values in the years to come.

And a lot to do with the reality of their freedom.

To repeat, President Truman is coming to dedicate Grand Coulee on May 11, about 10 years after the big dam began producing power. When President Roosevelt came, he set in motion a train of events that bear upon the interests of every one of us living in the Pacific Northwest.

We have no doubt that President Truman's coming to Grand Coulee was originally planned to lend strength to the CVA campaign. Some insist that his big immediate purpose is to lend strength to the candidacy of his friend, Senator WARREN MAGNUSON, whatever may happen to CVA. However, the President, while committing himself to the valley authority program, has also supported the plan for coordinated development evolved by the big construction agencies of the Government.

Since these big agencies, such as the Army engineers and the Reclamation Bureau, have done the building and created the properties that now make the Federal interest in the Columbia Basin such a rich political and ideological plum, the President has been no more than just in allowing them to go ahead.

"KEEP AMERICA FREE"

Likewise, it saves the Columbia Basin program from debacle.

The train of events will move more swiftly. If what has happened since was incomprehensible to the beginnings of Bonneville and Grand Coulee, but is the accepted order today, what is to happen in the next few years will be as much greater as momentum and change are greater.

Compare jet propulsion with the Columbia voyageur in his bateau.

In the past we've kept the American way and compelled the American kind of progress because we had an instinct for the right choice.

We'll have to stick tenaciously to the simple old maxim that America is the sum of its free individuals.

Another President comes.

Japanese Competition Threatening Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 5, 1950

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Southern Textile News.

JAPANESE COMPETITION THREATENING INDUSTRY—PLAN DRIVE IN CONGRESS TO PROTECT MILLS

(By Charles Sampas)

LOWELL, MASS.—Representative EDITH NOURSE ROGERS is spearheading an all-out drive in Congress to preserve northern and southern textile industries from foreign competition which is today threatening the entire industry.

A number of foreign factors are threatening the textile manufacturers of America and their competition and actions are responsible for the fact that thousands upon thousands of New England woolen mill employees are currently out of work.

The factors:

All-out Japanese competition, the Russians' bidding in the Australian wool market, British devaluation, the rise of the Italian textile industry, among others.

Is is pointed out that Japanese mills were once the biggest exporters of textiles in the world. The war reduced Japan's exports of cotton goods by 2,000,000,000 yards. The number of spindles in operation were cut from 12,000,000 to something under 3,000,000. This resulted in a gain for American cotton mills, whose exports increased from 3.6 percent of the world's total in 1934–38 to 26.8 percent 2 years ago—in 1948.

MORE SPINDLES

Now, however, Japanese mills expect to have at least 4,000,000 spindles in operation by the end of this year and to add 500,000 spindles every year thereafter.

This year, the Japanese expect to export about 1,000,000,000 yards of cotton cloth. This would be 25 percent over the Nipponese figure of last year—and marks 60 percent of her total production.

New England experts point out that Japan is already shipping gray goods to England and Italy for finishing and reexport—more competition for New England and Dixie. It is also emphasized that the Japanese are selling even finished cotton to Great Britain and Holland. Last year, 35,000,000 yards of fabric silk were exported to the United States of America from Japan.

The Boston Globe's business editor, "T. G. M.," reports that last week in New York he got as much as possible of this postwar story of Japanese textiles from two Japanese importers. He writes:

"It is of necessity a fragmentary story in which the segments do not entirely fit. But it holds interest both because of its possible effect on the domestic textile industry and the broad question of Japanese recovery."

He points out that Japanese looms and spindles before the war carried the economic threads upon which the country's whole exporting insular economy depended, providing the foreign exchange with which Japan purchased the food and raw materials by which she lived.

This, he stresses, brings the United States face to face with a rather uncomfortable dilemma. We must have an economically strong Japan as a bulwark against communism in Asia, yet the sole means to such economic strength lies in allowing Japan to rehabilitate a textile export trade with which we cannot help but find it difficult to compete.

Wages in Japan are low, 7,000 yen ($16.19 a month) for a 48-hour week, and while productivity is as yet below this country, efforts are being made to increase it. (A new wrinkle, for instance, is the equipping of female workers with roller skates for greater speed in moving between machines.)

TARIFF BARRIERS

The Ministry of International Trade, however, which regulates the industry, has set export prices at a figure which will not allow Japanese cotton entry into this country over freight and tariff barriers.

Eighty square percale, for instance, is quoted at 17 cents f. o. b. Japan. With a 35 percent tariff and three-quarters of a cent freight, however, the cloth comes to an American cutter at 24 cents a yard as against a 22 cent price for cloth of like quality and domestic manufacture.

Thus the competition in cottons is not in our domestic markets, but in foreign trade.

In silks and certain specialties, according to the Globe writer, however, the story is different. Take pinwale corduroys, Japanese corduroys, for instance, may be imported for 78 cents a yard as against a price for the domestic product at 87½ cents.

If we have so far felt no very serious competition in the domestic market in these lines, it is because a shortage of vat dyes has kept down Japanese production, a situation that may soon be expected to change. Indeed, the pressure of Japanese textiles on our own and the world markets may soon force our whole Asiatic economic policy to a head.

CHINA IS CRUX

The crux of the matter, the Japanese say, is China. This nation was once Japan's great source of raw material and her principal outlet for manufactured goods, accounting for roughly 25 percent of all Japan's foreign trade.

We have now cut that trade to only a trickle, with the result that we have created a distortion of the normal trade pattern. Japanese goods now press for markets to the west, which inevitably works to our own disadvantage by forcing upon ourselves a competition we are bound to find increasingly hard to meet.

The cold war, on the other side of the world, is cutting the heart out of New England's woolen industries. The price of wool is being boosted by Russia's bidding in the Australian market and it is estimated that 38,000 woolen workers are out because of this.

Freedom and Petroleum Geology

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT A. MEYER
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 5, 1950

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, on April 25, at the annual convention in Chicago of the American Association of Petroleum Geologists, Mr. C. W. Tomlinson, of Ardmore, Okla., retiring president of that large and highly important organization, expressed most eloquently certain truths which are basic to our entire social and economic system.

These are days of planning for controls of industry, of business and of the intellectual resources of our country. It is most timely that one who has been a leader for many years in the application of a science that has brought great good to all the people should have spoken frankly and fearlessly on the reasons why the efforts of his profession have met with a high degree of success. What he has said concerning petroleum geology applies with full and equal force to all sciences, professions, and occupations.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I quote Mr. Tomlinson's address herewith:

FREEDOM AND PETROLEUM GEOLOGY

What part has freedom played in the development of petroleum geology in the United States? To a degree never before equaled on so great a scale, we have honored here in America the principles of national and personal freedom balanced by a personal responsibility; of local self-government and individual ownership of property; of competitive private enterprise under rules of fair play to all. Have these been influential in the progress of our science? If so, have they been an obstacle or a stimulant?

Unquestionably, a tremendous stimulant. Though the achievements of petroleum geology, geophysics, and paleontology in the twentieth century have not so greatly altered basic scientific concepts as have those of physics, chemistry, and astronomy, no science or profession except medicine can claim a greater share of credit for increasing the comforts and the happiness of men. By the use of petroleum, millions of people have moved from the slums to the suburbs. The entire American people has been put on wheels or wings, and given the pleasure of distant vacations and the even more cherished privilege of week-end outings many miles from home, conferring freedom in return for freedom. The range of effective action in many lines, including our own, has been multiplied, and individual accomplishment correspondingly increased. Oil and gas have supplied the fuel for most of the vast upsurge in the use of power, with its prized and manifold applications not only in domestic comfort and convenience, in better food and sanitation, but in the industries which make the useful gadgets that achieve those ends: gadgets whose use is fortunately spreading now throughout all countries where the individual may buy what he wishes and has opportunity to earn it. As they are acquired, these tools and comforts of modern life increase the productivity of men, make possible more leisure for them, and open opportunities to other men. The beneficent circle widens to assist all people.

In this half century annual production and use of oil in the United States has been multiplied by 30, and that of natural gas has had a parallel growth. Though proud of their profession and intensely interested in their work, petroleum geologists are so modest that few have dared, at any time in those 50 years, to predict such growth for more than a few years ahead. Which of us now would be more daring? For in any branch of science, who can be sure of the undiscovered? Less than 3 years ago predictions were heard that little, if any, increase in productive capacity could be expected in this country, even with higher prices for crude oil. But, as has happened often before, the law of supply and demand did not fail us—nor did you. The increased pace of exploration made possible by good prices, and by the postwar flood of well-trained young geologists and geophysicists, engineers, and paleontologists, has more than kept pace with demand;

resulting in an excess capacity to produce oil here in North America, which is one of the hemisphere's most essential assets in event of war. The excess is perhaps not yet large enough for safety. But with vigorous competition, both international and domestic, it helped to bring a shrinkage in allowable yields per well and in profits, and a lull in the expansion of exploration; though demand still grows. At the first new hint of even prospective shortage there will be another forward surge in exploration.

In this record of achievement for humanity we must acknowledge that our exploratory sciences have been but one of many factors. The chemists in the refining industry have played an outstanding role. Nearly all branches of science have assisted. They can take pride that their studies have been put to useful service for mankind. And perhaps even greater credit should go to the investors who have taken the risks we recommended; to the engineers, inventors, and industrialists who have developed and marketed our equipment and that which employs our products; to the consumers who use them in ever-increasing volume; to those who have taught in our schools and colleges; and to the efficient workmen in our industry and in those which use our products or facilitate their use. Those who guard our health have had a part of it; and the churches which have kept us conscious of the Golden Rule—of the responsibilities that go with liberty. In fact, every constructive element in American life has helped make our achievement possible. And they have prospered with us.

But what part has freedom played in this great progress? It has been the lifeblood of the industry. Freedom of any man to search for oil in the United States and Canada. Freedom for any savings, foreign or domestic, to be invested here. Freedom of every farmer or even town-lot owner to obtain the best trade he can from anyone willing to pay for the privilege of exploring for oil on his land. Freedom of each of our many thousands of oil and gas producers to risk their savings in projects of exploration or development chosen on their own judgment or on that of their scientific employees. Freedom to advance, to grow, so long as one plays fair and does not trespass on another's rights. Freedom of the scientist to use to the limit his own imagination and ingenuity, to differ with others of his ilk.

And how we do differ! And what great resources are found as a result! There is hardly an oil or gas producer in the United States who has not had the pleasing experience of succeeding in a venture which had been rejected by others in the light of differing judgment. Some of them make quite a habit of it. And yet practically every producer has also rejected or overlooked ventures he had equal opportunity to make, in which another took the risk and won. Ours is still an inexact science, in which failure comes more often than success.

What old oil district has not seen newcomers arrive : nd find oil not found by those who knew the region best? In that free play of thought and of competition, and in widely disseminated ownership of subsoil rights, lies the chief key to the success of the United States in producing for nearly a century far more than its share of the world's oil. We have not had greater resources than some other equal segments of the world. But we have found a larger part of what we had. We have developed them and put them to use, because we have kept open the doors of opportunity to every man who had the vision and the energy to walk through. The rapid growth of our domestic market has been possible because the same freedom to seize opportunity existed for those who devised new ways to use our product; and because American devotion to freedom and to equality of opportunity, reflected for example in ever-rising levels of public education, gave our whole economy a dynamic power of expansion unknown under monopolistic or totalitarian regimes. And Americans were free to buy what they wished with their increasing purchasing power.

Our growth in service has not been the result of central planning, but a tribute to the lack of it. It is the fruit of freedom. No central planning body, no State monopoly or private cartel, could have accomplished half as much. Not even with the same personnel. For their freedom in choosing exploratory and development projects and methods would have been restricted to conform to a single policy centrally determined. A single office would have controlled it all, in contrast to the many thousands which do not choose such projects independently of all the rest.

When you mix an acid and an alkali in a test tube, no central planner (save God himself) lays out or coordinates the action which takes place. Each molecule seeks out its own opportunity for combination with another; and when it finds it, acts. There may be left a surplus of one type, but not of both. Every single possibility of action is utilized. Individual, chaotic action achieves the maximum result.

We have considered the fruits of freedom in discovery and development of resources, in industrial production, in human productivity and comfort. Has it borne good fruit in science itself also?

The answer lies partly in technical programs such as that of this convention. More fully, it is told on the shelves of our libraries and in those of universities throughout the world. Perhaps in no other branch of science do the publications of a single society comprise so large a fraction of the total literature of that science, as those of the American Association of Petroleum Geologists constitute in the literature of petroleum geology. Consider also the publications of our friends the geophysicists, who have cooperated so helpfully with us through the years in the work of exploration and in these annual programs; the Journals of Paleontology and of Sedimentary Petrology; and the guidebooks, structural and stratigraphic sections and periodicals made available to the science by our 30 affiliated local geological societies, largely composed of our own members. Taken together, they contain the most inclusive and complete assemblage of subsurface geological and geophysical data, of geology in three observed dimensions, that ever has been published; together with both comprehensive and detailed interpretations of those data in terms of structure, statigraphy, geologic history, geologic processes, the evolution of living things, and the genesis of oil and of oilfields. They record also a great part of the incisive and imaginative thinking on basic and theoretical problems which has been vital to the progress of our science.

The value of these publications lies in their usefulness to you and to all geologists. Perhaps no comparable set of volumes has been more fully used, or is more actively in use today. Testimony to that lies in every volume we have had to reprint to meet demand in later years; and in the constantly increasing number of copies required of everything we print. The Bulletin and our many special volumes are an enduring monument to our profession: to the authors who have contributed, to the thousands who have helped them, to the editors who have checked their work; to our skilled, hard-working, loyal personnel at headquarters, and to our printers.

We owe a deep debt too to the far-sighted and public-spirited employers and executives who have encouraged the members of their scientific staffs to publish studies that would be useful to all the industry. For that we truly thank them. Companies active in all parts of the world where Americans may operate, contribute to our annual reviews of development. Many companies and individuals have participated in preparing the symposiums of fact and thought that you will hear at this convention. They are free to withhold if they wish their own modicum of information; but they have far more to gain than to lose from free exchange of factual data. Some of the greatest as well as some of the smallest units in the industry have been most generous with it. Those who have most encouraged independent study and research, and publication, have fared at least as well as the few who have been more cautious in this matter. The former deserve special credit for having been most helpful to our science, to the oil industry as a whole, and to the public.

It is recognized that in competitive private enterprise there is a commercial value in some types of newly acquired data or ideas, which one is fully justified in first applying to his own advantage if he can. The ability to do just that is the prime incentive and motive power in a free economy—one which many magnanimous employers of geologists have found it profitable to preserve to some extent to their employees as well as themselves. Incentives are effective only through individuals. But in the great masses of information accumulated at private expense in our industry, there is little of real scientific value and of general interest which is not ultimately made available to all. Voluntary cooperation for the common good is typical rather than exceptional among us. And if we keep that spirit, and continue to cherish freedom and fair play at the threshold of its greatest service to mankind. We have just begun.

1949 Report of the Newton County, Ark., PMA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1950

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, Mr. William J. Nanney, county administrative officer of the Production and Marketing Administration of Newton County, Ark., has just sent me the report for Newton County for 1949.

In each of the counties which I represent, the Production and Marketing Administration is doing an outstanding job in soil conservation. This is being done by terracing, check dams, crop rotation, pasture development, and applying potash and lime. A fine feature of the program is that it is controlled by the local people as all farm programs should be.

I insert this report as a part of my remarks:

ANNUAL REPORT, NEWTON COUNTY (ARK.) PMA, 1949

INTRODUCTION

This report has been prepared by the Newton County PMA Committee to give the general public of Newton County, as well as the farmer himself, a better understanding of just what was accomplished by the PMA here in this county in 1949.

Until only a few years ago very little had been done by the general public, or the farmer, to encourage conservation of the Nation's most natural resource, the soil. If

we will only stop to think and review the agricultural situation as it was only a few years back we can readily see that at the alarming rate we are going it would not have been many years until our productive land would have been so depleted it would not have been humanly possible to maintain our present high standard of living. It is the aim of the Production and Marketing Administration to conserve the topsoil we have left and to restore that which already is depleted of the necessary minerals for a prosperous agriculture, to a productive basis. Since people from all walks of life depend upon the soil for their food and fiber and the prosperity of the Nation depends upon a strong and prosperous agriculture we feel it is the public's responsibility to help the farmer in paying the cost in this tremendous job of conserving our Nation's soil. Through the Production and Marketing Administration, farmers receive assistance for about one-third the cost of approved soil-conservation practices and without this assistance many of our farmers would not be financially able to carry out these needed practices.

OSCAR VILLINES,
Chairman.
J. T. SEXTON,
Vice Chairman.
GARLAND BALAN,
Regular Member.

MINERALS

In 1949 those farmers who participated in the program applied 1,478,255 pounds of superphosphate, 4,019 pounds of potash and 822 tons of limestone to meadows and pasture land. We, as your county committee, realize this is a very small amount of minerals applied, compared with the actual needs, but in checking through the records we find that approximately 42 percent more phosphate was applied to meadows and pastures in 1949 than any previous year. The county office personnel and the county committee received many requests from farmers for potash and limestone that they were unable to fill. The vendors could not get enough potash to take care of the demand. Due to road conditions and the distance limestone would have to be hauled, most farmers were not able to pay the cost of getting the material delivered and spread. But according to the records on phosphate and the increased demands for potash and limestone we feel that the farmers in Newton County are realizing more than ever before the necessity of applying these minerals that they may have a better protective cover from wind and water erosion, as well as a more productive cover, which is the making of a strong and prosperous agriculture.

PASTURE DEVELOPMENT

In 1949 the farmers in this county improved or established an estimated 7,313 acres of pasture land by seeding 87,757 pounds of approved pasture grasses and legumes. In addition to the estimated 7,313 acres seeded, these farmers sodded 208 acres of bermuda grass for permanent pasture. Bermuda grass makes an excellent pasture, and at the same time provides one of our best protective covers against soil erosion.

Farmers are beginning to realize that controlling weeds on permanent pasture by mowing is about the best method we have in maintaining a good pasture after it has been established. They have found, through this method, that in a short period of time they can just about eliminate all competitive plants and receive approximately one-third more pasture from the same acreage.

ENGINEERING PRACTICES

Thirty dams were constructed and five springs or seeps developed in 1949 in order that a year-round supply of water for livestock purposes would be available on these farms. Dams constructed in the proper location always serve a twofold purpose. However, a dam qualifies for payment for only one purpose, and that is to collect a year-round supply of stock water, but if constructed in the right location, these dams aid greatly in conserving the topsoil.

In 1949 there were 20,049 feet of terraces constructed in Newton County. Where we find fields that have been terraced, we not only find the soil protected from water erosion but we also find a more fertile soil with better yields per acre.

PRODUCTION GOALS

Each year the PMA committees are informed of the supply and market conditions of all the farm commodities with suggested State and National goals for each commodity. After reviewing these State and National goals, the committees then set up county goals to meet the estimated needs for the county. In previous years these production goals have proven to be very beneficial in helping to adjust the production of certain crops to meet the demand.

PRICE SUPPORT

The price-support program is another part of the Production and Marketing Administration and is administered by farmer-elected PMA committeemen. In reality, price supports is a form of insurance and without it the farmers would have to sell the entire year's production on a market that's glutted with a surplus of such commodity. None of the agricultural commodities produced in Newton County in 1949 were directly affected by the price-support program. However, some of our commodities, such as dairy, poultry, and meat products were affected indirectly.

MARKETING QUOTAS AND ALLOTMENTS

Acreage allotments were not established in 1949 for any of the commodities produced in Newton County. However, cotton allotments have been established for the 1950 crop. These allotments were worked out on the cropland basis and past history of the crop on the farm. Marketing quotas are put into effect only when approved by two-thirds of the number of eligible voters taking part in a referendum. When acreage allotments and marketing quotas are in effect a producer is guaranteed full parity price for all of the commodities produced on his farm, if he planted within the allotment established for the farm.

COMMITTEEMEN

In November of 1948 an election was held in each of the 15 communities in Newton County at which time a community committeeman and delegate to the county convention was elected by the farmers in each community to serve during the 1949 program year. In December of 1948 the delegates that had been elected in November, gathered together on county convention day and elected three farmer county committeemen to serve during the year 1949.

A committeeman's term of office runs for one calendar year and expires December 31 of the year for which elected. But he may be reelected in the next election or at the next county convention. Contrary to some thinking, committeemen do not receive a salary and are reimbursed only for time actually spent in connection with the program. In many instances these committeemen are not reimbursed enough to pay for a hired hand to take their place on the farm, that the necessary activities may be carried on during their absence.

Following are the names and addresses, by communities, of the community committeemen that were elected by their farmer friends in November of 1949, to serve as their PMA representatives during the 1950 program year.

A. Lurton: Ernest Daniels, Stanley Smith, J. L. Awbrey, Lurton, Ark.

B. Bass: Ben Dickey, Cave Creek, Ark.; Ira Dodson, Verble Manns, Bass, Ark.

C. Mount Judea: Frank Cheatham, Ralph Kent, Elmer Campbell, Mount Judea, Ark.

D. Vendor: W. H. Flood, Garland Smith, Claude Smith, Vendor, Ark.

E. Hasty: Alvie Hoppis, Richard Hancock, Marion Gipbson, Hasty, Ark.

F. Yardelle: Veatle Waters, Mose Hill, Yardelle, Ark.; A. B. Jones, Western Grove, Ark.

G. Marble Falls: Mirl Neighbors, Marble Falls, Ark.; Arlin Tinsley, Erbie, Ark.; James Shore, Marble Falls, Ark.

H. Limestone: J. A. Curtis, Ira Spradley, J. S. Norton, Limestone, Ark.

I. Deer: Joe Wylie, Deer, Ark.; George Essex, Jasper, Ark.; Grover Breedlove, Deer, Ark.

J. Parthenon: W. J. Brasel, Jasper, Ark.; I. G. Snow, Wayton, Ark.; Lawrence Vaughn, Parthenon, Ark.

K. Jasper: J. A. Harrison, W. C. Struck, Wayne Harrison, Jasper, Ark.

L. Compton: J. H. McFerrin, Lex Burge, Alpha Sims, Compton, Ark.

M. Fallsville: Walter Cowan, Paul M. Smith, Fallsville, Ark.; Virgil Wyatt, Red Star, Ark.

N. Boxley: Troy Fowler, Boxley Ark.; George Petree, Waymon Villines, Ponca, Ark.

O. Swain: Harley Berry, Alpha Weston, Walnut, Ark.; Alvin Ashlock, Fallsville, Ark.

At the county convention in December of 1949 the following county committeemen were elected to serve during the 1950 program year:

Chairman: Albert H. Raney, Marble Falls, Ark.

Vice chairman: Oscar Villines, Parthenon, Ark.

Member: J. T. Sexton, Mount Judea, Ark.

First alternate: Garland Bolin, Bass, Ark.

Second alternate: Mose Hill, Yardelle, Ark.

On January 20, 1950, Mr. Albert H. Raney resigned as chairman of the county committee. Mr. Raney had served as chairman on this committee for the past 5 years, and we regret losing his services, but he stated that due to more and more pressing business in farming activities and other matters around his home and community he felt that he should spend more of his time there.

COUNTY OFFICE PERSONNEL

William J. Nanney, county administrative officer; Mary Jo Spencer, clerk; Eva Isenberger, clerk.

Two part-time clerks were employed during the spring of 1949 to help with tabulating crop-acreage data for all commodities produced in the county since 1941.

COOPERATION

There were 887 farmers on 869 farms that reported one or more soil-conservation practices for assistance in 1949. The 869 farms participating in the program shows an increase of 10.4 percent over the 1948 participating farms. Using the payment rates offered under the 1949 program for carrying out these various conservation practices these 887 farmers earned $29,635.79. This is approximately one-third the total cost of these practices, so the farmers themselves invested an estimated $59,371.58.

CONCLUSION

The Newton County PMA program worked with 1,769 farms during the 1949 program year. The funds allocated to this county each year, to help the farmers pay a part of the total cost in carrying out approved soil-conservation practices, is available to every farmer in the county, and all are urged to participate in the program. It is the aim of the PMA program to get all active farmers within the county to take part in this tremendous battle we now have under way against wind and water erosion and the restoration of depleted minerals to the soil. We, as your present PMA county committeemen,

are very proud of the accomplishments made in the 1949 program year and want to take this opportunity to express our grateful appreciation to the editors of our two county newspapers for the space given to this program throughout the year and all others who assisted us in making our PMA program a success in the year 1949.

OSCAR VILLINES,
Chairman.
J. T. SEXTON,
Vice Chairman.
GARLAND BOLIN,
Member.
WILLIAM J. NANNER,
Secretary and Treasurer.

Czechoslovak Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. BATES
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 5, 1950

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the newspaper editorial below, from the Newburyport News, of Newburyport, Mass., indicates, in my opinion, the American approach to the problems that now face us in regard to international trade.

The paradox of spending billions of dollars in Europe to stem communism and at the same time purchasing goods from behind the iron curtain to the detriment of our own industries is extremely difficult to understand and should not be tolerated, and unless action is taken immediately, thousands of our American workmen will be thrown out of their jobs.

The editorial follows:

THE OLD HIGH TARIFF-FREE TRADE DEBATE

Our younger readers don't remember when the home market question was the dividing issue between American political parties. The Republican in general wanted a high tariff on goods imported into the United States so that our own factories could keep our markets, and high wages could be paid their workers. The Democrats pleaded for tariffs for revenue only; just tax on them to support our then not-very-expensive Government.

As the world has grown smaller and more closely knit together these party planks have been more or less shuffled about, though possibly Democrats and Republicans still stand more vaguely in their old positions.

One new issue that has confused the old one arises from the war weakness and debts into which many countries which have been our allies and are our natural friends have fallen. We want to help them get on their feet, and are in general disposed to let them sell us goods, and thereby get money, without a too high tariff barrier.

We have always recognized, however, that such cooperation must not be extended to such a point as to wipe out one of our own industries. And two instances, of particular importance to us about here, have lately arisen where there is no question of what stand the United States ought to take.

Imports of two lines of manufactured articles, hats, and shoes, both from the same European country are threatening our own neighbors who make such goods here. And these imports come from one and the same country, and a country that is now the vassal of the Communists: namely, Czechoslovakia. Congressman BATES has brought onto the floor of the House at Washington the question of stopping this attack on our means of support. We here cannot make shoes in competition with the cheap Czechoslovakian labor. Mr. BATES recalled how such competition—from the Czech manufacturer Bata—drove much of Haverhill to the wall 10 or 15 years ago. The same thing is happening now. Connecticut hat makers have told the same story about their products, which is made hereabouts, too.

There seems no question that the Government should clamp down on these imports by a sufficient tariff. The problem is simple. We might make a sacrifice for a friendly country. But the present Czechoslovakia is, if only by a sad necessity, the tool of Russia. No argument exists for our letting it build up Stalin by killing our prosperity here.

Pulitzer Prize to St. Louis Post-Dispatch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK M. KARSTEN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 5, 1950

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to congratulate the St. Louis Post-Dispatch on its receipt of a Pulitzer prize for 1949 for the most disinterested and meritorious public service by an American newspaper.

This prize was shared with the Chicago Daily News for last year's exposure of the fact that more than 50 Illinois newspaper editors and publishers were on the State pay rolls. In accepting this money, these men compromised themselves to such an extent that they could no longer be regarded as capable of fulfilling their obligation to present their readers with news of graft and corruption.

A distinct service to the newspaper profession was rendered by Roy J. Harris, of the Post-Dispatch, and George Thiem, of the Daily News, the reporters who worked for weeks to dig out the names of the editors and publishers in the pay of the State.

This latest prize to be won by the Post-Dispatch is proof that the principles of crusading journalism established by Joseph Pulitzer, founder of the Post-Dispatch, are still a vital force in America. I should like to include the Post-Dispatch platform as a part of my remarks:

THE POST-DISPATCH PLATFORM

I know that my retirement will make no difference in its cardinal principles; that it will always fight for progress and reform, never tolerate injustice or corruption, always fight demagogues of all parties, never belong to any party, always oppose privileged classes and public plunderers, never lack sympathy with the poor, always remain devoted to the public welfare; never be satisfied with merely printing news; always be drastically independent; never be afraid to attack wrong, whether by predatory plutocracy or predatory poverty.

JOSEPH PULITZER.

APRIL 10, 1907.

American Zionist Council Denounces Arms Sales to Arabs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 28, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave, I am inserting a news story from the New York Times of May 4, 1950, reporting the public denunciation of British sale and delivery of arms to the Arab States. Text of the story follows:

LIPSKY DENOUNCES ARMS AID TO ARABS—ACCUSES BRITAIN OF TRYING TO EXCLUDE UNITED STATES INTERESTS FROM THE MIDDLE EAST

Louis Lipsky, chairman of the American Zionist Council, spokesman for all major Zionist groups in this country, strongly denounced yesterday the British sale of arms to the Arab states and maintained that Great Britain was attempting to control the Middle East and exclude American interests from that territory.

At the same time, Mr. Lipsky, at the council's offices, 344 Madison Avenue, announced that the council would convene a national conference of its affiliated members in Washington on June 4 and 5 in protest of the arms shipment and also of the State Department's refusal to permit Israel to purchase arms for cash in this country. About 500 delegates are expected to attend.

The sending of arms to the Arab states, particularly Jordan and Egypt, Mr. Lipsky asserted, "was a double-barreled threat to Israel which can be used in the first place to pressure a peace disadvantageous to Israel and in the second place which can be used to attack Israel."

Mr. Lipsky declared that "the leaders of our foreign policy have been maneuvered into a position of giving Britain the lead in middle eastern affairs and of backing to the hilt, without reservation, the anti-Israel policy of the foreign secretary of the British Government."

The Zionist official held that "the forces in Britain who are interested in prolonging chaos and confusion in the Middle East—and unfortunately these forces seem to have gained the upper hand in our State Department—are bent on the resumption of warfare between Israel and her neighbors."

Sadist's Holiday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SIDNEY R. YATES
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 5, 1950

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper article by Leo A. Lerner:

THE FIRST COLUMN
(By Leo A. Lerner)
SADIST'S HOLIDAY

A Chicago real estate lobbyist, whose opinion I suppose I must respect because he is a man of property or at least a representative thereof, has made the statement that within

6 months after rent control is abandoned rents will be lower than they are now.

This is a shining promise, so encouraging and apocalyptic, that it ought to be set in neon lights and carried around the streets on the top of an elephant, perhaps with the promiser's signature attached thereto.

A signature is a very good thing to have on a promissory note. If those who are pushing for rent control to be dropped are doing it for the good of the renters, they might prove their good intentions by signing the promise which was so cheerfully made by the gentleman from the real estate board. They should contract to make good on a possible forfeit by putting up something substantial and valuable to guarantee to the public that the result will be as sanguine as promised.

I would be satisfied, for instance, if the fellow who made that promise would come forward and offer to put up $5,000 cash that his prediction will come true. Then, at least, I would believe that he is willing to back his predictions with that neatly engraved green stuff which is so widely cherished elsewhere, but scorned by landlords. As they say in the bleachers out at Cubs park, let the gentleman put up or shut up.

I wonder if the people who are likely to believe that rents will go down remember the promises of the American Meat Institute. The American Meat Institute is a charitable organization run for the benefit of indigent meat packers. Before the lids were lifted on meat prices they promised us that meat prices would go down as a result of ending the OPA.

Well, they didn't.

Guess what happened. The prices went up.

And meat prices are still far away and above what they ought to be, 4 years after that juicy promise was made. The farmers who feed grain to beef cattle are being broken in two by high grain prices and low-market prices. The spread between the average price paid for cattle on the hoof and the retail price of meat is worse today than it has been at any time since 1940. But the Meat Institute spent millions to sell the idea that lifting controls would mean lower prices. The only trouble is, they didn't offer to pay a forfeit, and they could well have afforded it, as you will agree if you have seen the 1949 profit statements of the big meat packers.

Now let's look at areas where rent control was lifted. Dallas, Tex., had an average increase of 36 percent. Lincoln, Nebr., which does not have a housing shortage as bad as Chicago's, had a nearly 30-percent increase. The only rents that went down slightly were in the high brackets, above $100 a month. The rest went up, and that wasn't all. Evictions were heavy and many people were thrown out on the street with no place to go. In Chicago, this situation would be much worse because there are at least 300,000 families which are inadequately housed. Lack of controls would be a sadist's holiday.

To come down to saying the thing plain, it would be suicidal to lift rent controls in Chicago. There are not enough places to live, and the resulting chaos would be a serious blow to the whole city.

Add 30 to 40 percent to Chicago's total rent bill and then ask yourself where that money would come from. In New York, the State legislature has already passed a rent-control act in case Congress fails to renew rent controls after June 30. In Illinois we haven't done a thing except fret.

Businessmen have a big stake in this problem because billions of dollars of national income would be diverted in the mad scramble for housing in the shortage districts. Sales and employment would surely go down. Variety magazine has just finished a survey showing that business has been seriously injured in areas where rents have been decontrolled.

But, of course, if that fellow who says rents will go down is right, there's nothing to worry about. In fact, if rents are sure to go down, why are they pushing so hard to kill rent control? Maybe the real estate lobby is on the wrong side.

Award to Maj. Frederick Sullens for Best Editorial of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES O. EASTLAND

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, at the annual meeting of the Education Writers Institute, sponsored by the National Education Association, held in this city last night, the capital award for the best editorial of the year was awarded to Maj. Frederick Sullens, editor of the Jackson, Miss., Daily News. It was one of a series of editorials from the pen of Maj. Sullens which inspired the Mississippi legislature at its recent session to make the largest appropriation for education in the State's history, and to make more liberal provisions for the education of Negroes and general betterment of Negro schools. I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR DISGRACEFUL NEGRO SCHOOLS

Whether we like it or not, the Supreme Court of the United States has declared that Mississippi, in common with other Southern States, must provide equal educational opportunities for Negroes.

No use fussing, cussing or fuming about it.

That decision is the law of the land and we have no alternative save to obey.

It is far better to obey promptly, cheerfully, and in our own way, than to be forced to do so.

Moreover, that decision embodies justice and common sense.

In the matter of education we have for many years been treating Negroes most outrageously.

The type of education we have been providing for them is nothing short of a disgrace. It might well be called a public scandal.

Let us face a few of the ugly facts—not all the ugly facts, for it would take too long to tell the whole story. Statements that follow are based on official reports in our State department of education.

The estimated value today of all school property in Mississippi being used for white children is $57,000,000.

The estimated value of all school property being used for colored children is only $11,000,000.

According to the latest survey there are today in our State 3,700 Negro schoolhouses, but not all of them are school property. About 2,300 of these buildings are owned by counties and communities, and many of them are the old Julius Rosenwald school buildings constructed at the time when that great philanthropist was spending money freely in Mississippi—and a goodly part of it being stolen and diverted to other uses.

Over 1,400 of the buildings now being used to house Negro schools belong to churches and Negro fraternal bodies. Some of them are tenant cabins, used where no other structures are available.

As a matter of fact, Negro churches and fraternal organizations in our State are furnishing nearly one-half what little Negro children get in the way of educational facilities. It is a shame and a disgrace that such should be the case.

Our white rural schools, as a rule, are fairly well maintained, but Negro schools are poorly equipped, shabby, dilapidated, and unsightly.

Go into any rural school building for Negroes and see for yourself how things are. Almost without exception they are one-room structures, rickety stoves are propped up on brickbats, blackboards are absent or worn to the point of uselessness, sanitation is sadly lacking and the common drinking cup is still in use.

In many hundreds of instances it will be found that one Negro teacher is struggling along trying to teach children in all the grammar school grades.

Here in the county of Hinds, wealthiest in the Commonwealth, our school facilities for Negroes are so poor and shabby that churches and lodges are furnishing 18 of the buildings in which Negro schools are housed.

Moreover, in recent years we have not had official honesty in the matter of providing for Negro schools.

During the administration of Gov. Thomas L. Bailey a legislative survey committee headed by Senator John Kyle, studied our public school system and submitted a report to the lawmaking body—a report that should have made our people blush for shame. It fully revealed the appalling conditions in our Negro schools and gave the legislature such a shock that it was decided to vote an appropriation of $3,000,000 for the purpose of aiding communities in the construction of new school buildings.

It was a sort of gentleman's agreement, fully understood among lawmakers who voted for the appropriation, that this money would be used for the improvement of Negro schools.

But it didn't happen that way.

The fund was administered by the State building commission. Due to political pressure, and other causes, most of that $3,000,000 was spent on white schools. It was explained by the commission that in most rural areas the Negro schools had no way of raising funds to supplement State allowances and they received practically no help whatsoever from boards of supervisors.

In other words, that $3,000,000 appropriation—a sum wholly inadequate for the purpose—was a good gesture, a noble experiment, and all that sort of thing, but the Negro schools for which it was intended didn't get the benefit.

And it has been that way for so long that the mind of man runneth not to the contrary.

It has been that way quite too long, and it must quit being that way.

Our educational theory of all for the white folks and nothing for the Negro must be abandoned.

The Daily News here and now serves notice that when the next legislative session is convened this newspaper, aided and supported by a large majority of the newspapers in Mississippi, is going to wage a fight to see to it that a good portion of that treasury surplus, about which there has been so much boasting and on which so many avaricious eyes have been cast, is used to provide a decent educational system for Negroes.

It is well-nigh unbelievable, but it happens to be a fact that in an area nearly 2 miles square in great and growing Jackson, Miss., biggest, best, and most progressive city, there is not a single Negro school building.

It happens to be a fact throughout the State that in some Negro school buildings there is not even standing room for pupils. In many cases hard-working teachers are trying to do the best possible with a deplorable condition by teaching Negro children in two or three shifts each day. Under such conditions the children get little or nothing in the way of education.

The United States Supreme Court has decreed equal educational opportunity for the races.

That's the law of the land. It must be obeyed.

It is up to our lawmaking body to handle this question intelligently, to meet all phases fairly and squarely. Whatever may exist in the way of race prejudice must be thrust aside and a program prepared that will deal justly with the Negro race.

West Coast Statue Proposed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 5, 1950

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, on September 22, 1949, I had placed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page A5847, a proposal for a monument on Mount Tamalpais which was made by a resident in my congressional district, Miss Alma Schulmerich. Under leave to extend my remarks I am placing in the Appendix today a letter from Miss Schulmerich which appeared in the Portland Oregonian on April 10, 1950, entitled "West Coast Statue Proposed" which contains interesting observations on the proposal made by Miss Schulmerich:

WEST COAST STATUE PROPOSED

To the Editor: The world is suffering from "atomitis." It is true there has been an atomic scare, but in reality we should feel more secure in the knowledge that Russia has a bomb. Didn't both sides have germ and chemical warfare during World War II and refrain from using these implements of destruction because of fear of retribution? Why, then, must we talk unconstructively about world war III? Cannot we so conduct ourselves that other nations will be able to work with us for peace and the one world about which Wendell Willkie spoke?

Uncle Sam is pouring millions into Europe which we know will not be returned—we do not intend that they should be. Why, then, cannot a few dollars be advanced toward a memorial to honor our boys who have paid with their lives, and those who continue to pay, though they still live, in our hospitals?

As a member of the secretariat of the United Nations conference at San Francisco in 1945, it was my pleasure to visit Mount Tamalpais, just across the Golden Gate Bridge from that city. From the summit it is possible to view the entire bay area, as well as far out to sea. Nearby stand those solitary sentinels, the Muir Woods.

Many UN delegates visited Mount Tamalpais to get away from man-made things and ponder their problems and the effect of their decisions on future generations in the clear, fresh air atop the mountain, where one seems a bit closer to the infinite. Franklin Roosevelt found it necessary to go to the mountain top to think things out and get a clearer picture and a broader horizon for the problems before him. So must we have time to meditate.

While I watched from the mountain, formations of bombers thundered by on their way to the Pacific theater. Far below, ships, with capacity loads of our finest young men, were threading their way through the Golden Gate and on out to sea and distant combat areas. Those boys didn't know what was in store for them. Many of their buddies had passed on. Many of their numbers would not return. Therefore, as they stood on deck watching the Golden Gate and the familiar landmarks disappear from view, I am sure they felt they were leaving behind everything that stood for America and the things they were fighting for.

I, too, once stood on the deck of the *Queen Mary* and watched the Statue of Liberty disappear from view, and I will always remember the picture she made as she lighted the way through the fog on our return journey. Therefore, as I watched the procession overhead and the ships far below, I earnestly wished that there had been erected on top of Mount Tamalpais, as our Pacific coast Statue of Liberty, an illuminated sign of the cross which would be visible far out to sea—the last thing those boys would see when they left America, and the first thing that would greet those who returned. This cross would serve as a beacon for all who travel, be it by land, sea, or the air.

It would be a constant reminder that those who gave their lives did not die in vain and that if we are to remain the strong world power we now are we must work together for peace with the same energy we expended in war.

In this respect you will recall the words of Jan Masaryk, of Czechoslovakia, on the closing day of the San Francisco Conference:

"Please stop talking of the next war. The language one hears in certain places is lamentably unconstructive; it arouses suspicions at a moment when mutual confidence is all-important. Not one of these selfless children of ours, whose graves are scattered as sacred mementos all over the face of the scarred earth—none of us want these children to die in another war in another generation—we want them back to live and work for their respective countries in peace and security in a socially just and safe world. That's why we assembled here, that's why we drafted the Charter. It contains all the necessary safeguards against future wars. Let us see to it that our lofty aims are carried into deeds worthy of the memory of our heroic beloved youngsters."

Miss ALMA SCHULMERICH.

Mr. Truman on Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 5, 1950

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial appearing in the Watertown Daily Times of May 3, 1950:

MR. TRUMAN ON POWER

President Truman knows, as so many of us do, especially here in the north country, that the United States is short of hydroelectric power. He now urges the Senate to ratify a United States-Canada treaty to develop power in the Niagara River.

The Niagara Treaty certainly seems to have caught on in Washington. Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN's joyous declarations when the treaty was proposed are not easily forgotten. And there is much to be said for the Niagara development, for it is recognized that the St. Lawrence River project alone will not be able to supply all power needs either here or in Canada.

But, and it is an important but, the St. Lawrence project would not only produce more power, it would also be more economical to construct. In view of the testimony now piling up before the House Public Works Committee in Washington, we may well wonder why the hold-up on the St. Lawrence, and why the sudden eagerness over Niagara. The State power authority's annual report this year was clear enough. Both projects are needed. First, the St. Lawrence; second, the Niagara.

Another crucial consideration is public or private handling of the development. President Truman's message reiterates his stand for public construction of the additional power facilities in order that the benefits of the hydroelectric power produced there can be passed on to the people at the lowest possible cost to them. All well and good, but construction of the facilities is one thing, and the people's getting the electricity is another. In between is the little matter of distribution. Who is going to do it?

Private power sources are angered over the treaty, presumably because the Federal Government is going to build facilities. That anger would fade in the twinkling of an eye if distribution rights were handed over to them.

Things look pretty good for the Niagara Treaty. Senator TOM CONNALLY, the Foreign Relations Committee chairman, thinks chances for passage at this congressional session rate high. We appreciate these efforts to satisfy the need for power in the Northeast. The danger lies in two directions, forgetting the St. Lawrence once the Niagara Treaty has been signed and turning over publicly constructed power facilities to private companies for distribution of the current.

Admiral Thomas Cassin Kinkaid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 5, 1950

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, the last of the wartime four-star admirals of World War II went into retirement on April 30. Of course, I have reference to Admiral Thomas Cassin Kinkaid, commander of the Eastern Sea Frontier and of the Atlantic Reserve Fleet. Admiral Kinkaid is a veteran of most of the major naval engagements in the Pacific in World War II and with his retirement, he will conclude a 46-year career, extending back to 1904 when he was appointed to the Naval Academy by President Theodore Roosevelt. During my service as a communications watch officer and top secret officer on the staff of the command of the Seventh Fleeters, I was privileged, through these duties, to have association and contact with Admiral Kinkaid, who was then the com-

mander of the Seventh Fleet. Today I look back upon that association with a most pleasant memory because I always found Admiral Kinkaid to be a gentleman, a great patriot, and a man of outstanding character, devoted to the highest traditions of the Navy. I deem it a great privilege to incorporate with the good wishes I extend to my former commander on the occasion of his retirement, the history of his career:

ADMIRAL THOMAS CASSIN KINKAID, UNITED STATES NAVY

Admiral Kinkaid, born in Hanover, N. H., on April 3, 1888, the son of Thomas Wright Kinkaid, late rear admiral, United States Navy, attended Western High School in Washington, D. C., before his appointment to the United States Naval Academy by President Theodore Roosevelt in 1904. While a midshipman he won his red N and was stroke of the varsity crew as a first classman. Graduated in June 1908, he served the 2 years at sea then required by law before he was commissioned ensign in June 1910. He subsequently progressed in grade until his promotion to admiral, to rank from April 3, 1945.

After graduation from the Naval Academy in 1908, Admiral Kinkaid served consecutively on the U. S. S. *Nebraska* and the U. S. S. *Minnesota* until September 1913, when he reported to the postgraduate school, Annapolis, Md., for instruction in ordnance engineering. He continued this course at the Navy Yard, Washington, D. C., and various other places until May 1916, with time out for a period of duty from April 1914 to January 1915 on the U. S. S. *Machias*, operating in Mexican waters. From May 1916 until April 1918 he was attached to the U. S. S. *Pennsylvania*, with duty during the latter part of that period with the British Admiralty.

Admiral Kinkaid served as gunnery officer of the U. S. S. *Arizona* from May 1918 until July 1919, while she operated in the Chesapeake Bay area during the last months of World War I; when on November 18, 1918, she sailed from Hampton Roads, Va., to Portland, England, for duty in company with other battleships to meet and escort the U. S. S. *George Washington*, with President Woodrow Wilson aboard, en route to the Peace Conference at Versailles, into Brest, France; and when, as part of the Atlantic Fleet, she was reviewed on December 26, 1918, in the North River, N. Y., by Secretary of the Navy Josephus Daniels, other members of the Cabinet, and fleet commanders.

He continued to serve in the *Arizona* during operations in Cuban waters early in 1919, and was aboard when she made a cruise to France, thence to Smyrna, Asia Minor, in connection with the occupation of that city by the Greeks. Returning by way of Constantinople, Turkey, and Gibraltar, on June 30, 1920, he was detached with orders to the Bureau of Ordnance, Navy Department, where he served until June 1922.

From August 1922 until July 1924, Admiral Kinkaid was Assistant Chief of Staff to Rear Adm. Mark L. Bristol, United States Navy, Commander, United States Naval Detachment in Turkish waters (U. S. S. *Scorpion*, flagship), and after his return to the United States commanded the U. S. S. *Isherwood* from November 1924 until the summer of 1925, when he reported for duty at the Naval Gun Factory, Navy Yard, Washington, D. C. Detached from that assignment in October 1927, he served as fleet gunnery officer and aide on the staff of Admiral Henry A. Wiley, United States Navy, Commander in Chief, United States Fleet, of which the U. S. S. *Texas* was flagship, until May 1929. After completing the senior course at the Naval War College, Newport, R. I., a year later, he was secretary of the General Board, Navy Department, Washington, D. C., from June 1930 until November 1931, with additional duty during that period as naval adviser to American members of the Preparatory Commission for the Disarmament Conference, Geneva, Switzerland, in November and December 1930. Returning to Washington, he had further duty in connection with the Disarmament Conference, and in 1932 was technical adviser at the Geneva Conference.

Admiral Kinkaid was executive officer of the U. S. S. *Colorado* from January 1933 until October 1934, and after duty in, and later as head of the Detail Section, Officer Personnel Division, Bureau of Navigation, Navy Department, Washington, D. C., until May 1937, he commanded the heavy cruiser *Indianapolis* from June of that year until August 1938. He was naval attaché and naval attaché for air at the American Embassy, Rome, Italy, from November 1938 until March 1941, with additional duty from March 1939 as Naval Attaché and Naval Attaché for Air at Belgrade, Yugoslavia. He was serving in the assignment at Rome when Italy declared war on France. Returning to the Navy Department, he was on duty in the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations from March to December 1941. Upon the outbreak of war with Japan, he left immediately for the Pacific theater where on December 30, 1941, he assumed command of Cruiser Division 6. He commanded that Division until October 29, 1942, when he became commander, cruisers, Pacific Fleet.

During those commands, which extended to December 6, 1942, Admiral Kinkaid participated in many of the major engagements in the Pacific. He commanded a task force in the Battle of the Coral Sea, May 4–8, 1942, which marked an end to the period our forces were totally on the defensive. He was commander of cruisers, one of the two task forces which in the Battle of Midway, June 4–6, 1942, inflicted on the Japanese Navy the first decisive defeat suffered in 350 years, put an end to the long period of Japanese offensive action, and restored the balance of naval power in the Pacific. He commanded a task force preceding and during the Battle of the Solomon Islands in August 1942, and in October of that year, in the Battle of Santa Cruz Islands when a big Japanese battle fleet was turned back from Guadalcanal, he commanded one of two task forces, with two carriers, one of them the *Enterprise*, 1 battleship, 3 heavy cruisers, 3 antiaircraft light cruisers, and 14 destroyers comprising his force. In the Battle of Guadalcanal (third Savo), November 12–15, 1942, he commanded a task force, built around the *Enterprise* Air Support Group and battleships, in support of Rear Adm. (now admiral) Richmond K. Turner, USN. In spite of heavy losses sustained in battle, it was a decisive victory for United States forces as it assured that our positions in the southern Solomons would not be threatened seriously again by the Japanese.

For his services in command of a task force during the Battle of the Coral Sea, and for the period preceding and during the Battle of Solomon Islands, Admiral Kinkaid was awarded the Distinguished Service Medal, and Gold Star in lieu of the second Distinguished Service Medal. He also received a facsimile of, and is entitled to wear the ribbon for, the Presidental Unit Citation awarded the U. S. S. *Enterprise*, which was his flagship during part of the Pacific operations. The citations follow:

Distinguished Service Medal:

"For exceptionally meritorious and distinguished service to the Government of the United States in a position of great responsibility as commander of a task force in the Battle of the Coral Sea, May 4–8, 1942, and specifically on May 8, 1942. Due to Rear Admiral Kinkaid's aggressive leadership and determined action, and through the skill and courageous devotion to duty of the units under his command, heavy losses were inflicted on attacking enemy Japanese air groups, thereby contributing immeasurably to the ultimate success of our forces in these notable engagements."

Gold Star in lieu of second Distinguished Service Medal:

"For exceptionally meritorious service to the Government of the United States in a duty of great responsibility as commander, Task Force 16, prior to and during the Battle of the Solomon Islands on August 24, 1942; the Battle of Santa Cruz on October 26, 1942; and during the naval action to the southward of Guadalcanal on the night of November 14–15, 1942. With flag in the U. S. S. *Enterprise* throughout these three major engagements, Admiral (then Rear Admiral) Kinkaid conducted the operations of his command with superb tactical skill, striking repeated blows at Japanese supply lines, naval strength, and air power during this early critical period of hostilities. Cool and decisive, he effectively coordinated the units under his direction to repel and destroy a massed air attack by Japanese planes during the Battle of the Solomon Islands, retiring from the action with but minimum damage to his own ships; he hurled the full fighting power of his forces against the enemy's sea and air strength at Santa Cruz to blast more than half the Japanese planes from the sky and knock out two large carriers; he reached out with his search and attack planes to track down and hit Japanese warships, troop transports, and cargo vessels off Guadalcanal, with *Enterprise* aircraft shooting down several Zeros in addition to inflicting heavy damage upon the enemy's surface vessels. Unwavering in his devotion to the fulfillment of the obligations of his command, Admiral Kinkaid contributed essentially to the success of the determined offensive in the South Pacific. His dauntless leadership and sustained aggressiveness throughout reflect the highest credit upon himself and upon the United States naval service."

Presidential Unit Citation, U. S. S. *Enterprise*:

"For consistently outstanding performance and distinguished achievement during repeated action against enemy Japanese forces in the Pacific war area, December 7, 1941, to November 15, 1942. Participating in nearly every major engagement in the first year of the war, the *Enterprise* and her air group exclusive of her far-flung destruction of hostile shore installation throughout the battle area, did sink or damage, on her own a total of 35 Japanese vessels and shoot down a total of 185 Japanese aircraft. Her aggressive fighting spirit and superb combat efficiency are fitting tribute to the officers and men who so gallantly established her as a solid bulwark in defense of the American Nation."

Gilbert and Marshall Islands raid, February 1, 1942.

Wake Island raid, February 24, 1942.

Marcus Island raid, March 4, 1942.

Battle of Midway, June 4–6, 1942.

Occupation of Guadalcanal, August 7–8, 1942.

Battle of Stewart Islands, August 24, 1942.

Battle of Santa Cruz Islands, October 26, 1942.

Battle of Solomon Islands, November 14–15, 1942.

From January to October 1943, Admiral Kinkaid was Commander, North Pacific Fleet, and in that capacity was Aleutians Area Commander, with the over-all responsibility of coordinating and implementing the various forces involved in the Aleutians operations, Army, Navy, Air, and Canadian Air Forces.

His was the responsibility of transporting troops to points of attack; of air attacks before and after landings; of cooperation with Army forces, and with pilots of the Royal Canadian Air Force. During his command, Amchitak was occupied in January 1943, and in February good progress had been made in establishing and equipping the base on Adak. Meanwhile, Kiska was attacked by planes almost daily, and in March when the Japanese attempted to support their garrisons at Kiska and Attu, there ensued the Battle of the Komandorski Islands in which a superior enemy force was driven off with slight damage to our force. On May 11, 1943, landings at Attu, Massacre Bay and Holtz Bay were made, covered by our naval forces, and in the bitter fighting which followed, various naval units assisted Army troops by furnishing fire support and air cover. By May 31 the Island of Attu had been captured from the enemy. During July and August, Kiska had been heavily bombed by our planes and on numerous occasions bombed by our naval forces. When assault troops landed on the island on August 15, 1943, it was found to have been evacuated by the Japanese under cover of fog. Thus with the occupation of Kiska, the Aleutian campaign was ended with our forces once more in possession of the entire chain of islands.

For carrying out these joint military operations in the Aleutians in the face of adverse weather conditions, fog, cold, and high seas, Admiral Kinkaid was awarded a Gold Star in lieu of the third Distinguished Service Medal with the following citation:

Gold Star in lieu of the third Distinguished Service Medal:

"For exceptionally meritorious and distinguished service to the Government of the United States in a position of great responsibility as commander, North Pacific Force, United States Pacific Fleet, from January 6 to October 12, 1943. In cooperation with the Army, Vice Adm. Kinkaid planned offensive operations and established advance bases while our forces moved steadily westward in the Aleutians. Exercising his command of all naval forces and certain Army amphibious and air forces with sound judgment and tact, he conducted a determined and successful offensive drive in this strategic area which resulted in the occupation of enemy-held Attu and Kiska and in the final expulsion of the Japanese from the Aleutians."

Following the conclusion of the Aleutians campaign, Admiral Kinkaid returned to the operations on the opposite side of the Pacific and on November 26, 1943, reported for duty as commander, Southwest Pacific Force, and commander, Seventh Fleet. As commander of the Seventh Fleet, he was under the command of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur, commander in chief of the Southwest Pacific area. In December 1943, as area naval commander, Admiral Kinkaid participated in the Bismarck Archipelago operations, and when in May 1944, Biak Island, off the New Guinea coast, was invaded by United States Army units under the command of General MacArthur, Admiral Kinkaid's Seventh Fleet supported the operations with bombing and naval bombardment.

In October 1944 when forces under General MacArthur carried out the landings in the Philippine Islands, Admiral Kinkaid commanded the central Philippine attack force, composed of Seventh Fleet units greatly augmented by temporarily transferred Pacific Fleet forces. This force comprised more than 650 ships, including battleships, cruisers, destroyers, escorts, escort carriers, transports, cargo ships, landing craft, mine craft, and supply vessels. The landing on Leyte on October 20, which established our troops in the central Philippines, where challenged by Japanese naval forces determined to drive us from the area. Between October 23 and 26 a series of major surface and air engagements took place with far-reaching effect. These engagements, designated the Battle for Leyte Gulf, culminated in three almost simultaneous naval actions, the Battle of Surigao Strait, the battle off Samar, and the battle off Cape Engano, involving ships of the Third as well as the Seventh Fleet. At the successful conclusion of the battle for Leyte Gulf, the three enemy forces which had attacked were either destroyed or in full retreat, the major Japanese threat to our initial Philippine landing was averted, and the enemy's total surface power was severely crippled. Following the carrier strikes on Manila Bay in mid-December 1944, Admiral Kinkaid was placed in command of the Luzon attack force, composed of the augmented Seventh Fleet and comprising more than 850 ships. Early in January 1945 that force transported, put ashore, and supported elements of the Sixth United States Army, Lt. Gen. Walter Kreuger, commanding, and assisted in the successful seizure and development of the Lingayen area of Luzon, largest island in the Philippines.

For his services in that command, Admiral Kinkaid was awarded a gold star, in lieu of the fourth Distinguished Service Medal with the following citation:

Gold star in lieu of fourth Distinguished Service Medal:

"For exceptionally meritorious service to the Government of the United States in a duty of great responsibility as commander, Seventh Fleet, and commander, Allied naval forces in the southwest Pacific area, during the Leyte operation of the Philippine Islands campaign, from October through December 1944. A master of naval warfare, Admiral Kinkaid planned and carried out the naval phases of this operation which made possible the liberation of the Philippines. Welding the diverse and limited forces available to him into a highly effective fighting organization, he directed the offensive with outstanding strategic skill, as evidenced by the annihilation of powerful Japanese fleet units in the battle or Surigao Straits phase of the battle for Leyte Gulf. As a result of his aggressive leadership and brilliant overall strategic control, his determined forces repulsed and decisively defeated two major task groups of the Japanese fleet which had seriously threatened the operations for the capture of Leyte and the entire Philippine campaign. His indomitable courage, inspiring leadership, keen foresight and exceptional professional skill were primarily responsible for the complete success of all naval operations under his cognizance in the southwest Pacific areas during this period and reflect great credit upon Admiral Kinkaid and the United States naval service."

In November 1945, after the capitulation of the Japanese in August of that year, Admiral Kinkaid was relieved of command of the Seventh Fleet by Vice Adm. Daniel E. Barbey, United States Navy, and ordered to duty as commander, eastern sea frontier. In January 1946 he was assigned additional duty as commander, gulf sea frontier. In February 1946 he was relieved of the additional duty, and in June of that year was assigned additional duty as commander, Sixteenth Fleet (the inactive Atlantic fleet).

The operating forces of the Navy were reorganized as announced on January 1, 1947, and all numbered fleets abolished except for one fleet in each ocean. Admiral Kinkaid became commander, eastern sea frontier, with additional duty in command of the Atlantic Reserve Fleet, composed of ships in and out of commission.

In addition to the Distinguished Service Medal with three gold stars, and the Presidential Unit Citation Ribbon, Admiral Kinkaid has the Mexican Service Medal (U. S. S. *Machias*), the Victory Medal, Atlantic Fleet Clasp (*U. S. S. Arizona*), and is entitled to the American Defense Service Medal, the Asiatic-Pacific Area Campaign Medal, and the World War II Victory Medal.

Senator McCarthy's Charges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY P. CAIN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, a great many things, some unkind and others complimentary, have recently been said about the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY]. Without discussing the merits of the case which the Senator from Wisconsin has placed before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, I wish to point out that the Senator from Wisconsin is not without those supporters who believe in fair play and who believe that the Senator from Wisconsin is right in having brought the issue of communism to the attention of the Nation.

I ask unanimous consent that a column by John Fisher from the Times-Herald of May 5, an editorial from the Dubuque Witness of May 4, and an article by Father William H. Rowan from the Dubuque Witness of May 4 be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, where they may provide the Senator from Wisconsin with some encouragement and stimulate the determination of the Senate committee to determine the truth regardless of who may be found to be in the way.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Witness, Dubuque, Iowa, May 4, 1950]

THE TRUTH DOESN'T HAVE A CHANCE

We are well aware that it is up to the courts to decide whether Owen Lattimore is, or has been, a Communist spy. We don't intend to make any accusations about him that would make us liable to libel suits. But we can't help but ask what to us is an obvious question, Why is there so much effort being put forth to clear Lattimore of the charges made against him by Senator JOSEPH MCCARTHY?

Louis Budenz, former editor of the Daily Worker, has testified in Congress that Lattimore had been a member of a Communist cell. The ex-Communist also testified, among other things, that Lattimore had organized Red writers in behalf of the Soviet policy in the Far East. Now why is the testimony of Budenz being questioned?

He was one of the key witnesses who named Alger Hiss a Communist. Budenz' testimony was not questioned then—except perhaps by the Communists.

He exposed Gerhart Eisler as the Soviet's top espionage agent in this country. Budenz' word was accepted as true—except perhaps by the Communists.

He was used by the Government as a star witness in the trial of 11 Communist leaders in New York. He was regarded as a highly reliable witness by the Government then. Why should his reliability be open to question now? Or why shouldn't Budenz be telling the truth? First of all, he has proved himself to be an authority on Communist activities and a trustworthy witness. Secondly, he has nothing to gain by failing to tell the truth.

Senator MCCARTHY has named Lattimore, a one-time State Department employee, a Communist agent. Budenz, in turn, backed

up the Senator's charge by stating Lattimore had been the member of a Communist cell. That should be as worthy of belief as Budenz' testimony in the trials of convicted Communists. But no. Other witnesses are brought in and they contradict Budenz. Consequently the public is confused. The truth doesn't have a chance.

[From the Witness, Dubuque, Iowa, May 4, 1950]

THE NOTE BOOK—QUOTATIONS AND COMMENT

(By Father William H. Rowan)

THE LATTIMORE-M'CARTHY CASE

To hear and read your ordinary columnist and brcadcaster, one would imagine that Senator JOSEPH MCCARTHY was the villain of the piece; the scoundrel and traitor that had betrayed 500,000,000 Chinese (who control Asia where most of the human race reside) into Soviet slavery; that had destroyed the great traditional American policy of a strong and independent China and brought the country thereby into dire peril; that had betrayed American interests and security and liberty and the world's; that had betrayed freedom and civilization and Christianity to their sworn and mortal enemy, the accursed antifreedom, anticivilization, and anti-God Soviet.

To listen and read the unprincipled partisans, concealed Communists, fellow travelers, one would think that Senator MCCARTHY were on trial instead of the guilty wretches and Benedict Arnolds and Judas Iscariots who have betrayed civilization and liberty, God and country to the vile Soviet.

To the foregoing nefarious line there are honorable exceptions like the Hearst chain and the Chicago Tribune among publications and Sokolsky among the columnists.

We are leaving to the Senate investigation the establishment of Lattimore's connection—if any—with the Kremlin.

Truth of the matter is that Senator MCCARTHY has undertaken a job that needed to be done and should have been done long ago.

So doing, as that excellent columnist Sokolsky, who is a real Chinese expert, remarks, MCCARTHY has already rendered signal public service by flushing out many a foul bird, and Sokolsky recites a long list of the services of MCCARTHY in this connection. He forced out, for example, the existence of a foul moral perversion in the State Department.

Only MCCARTHY had the courage to face the inevitable smearing, abuse, blackguarding, consequent on all that.

The impressive Budenz testimony cannot be sneered off nor smeared off nor laughed off.

Fact of the matter is that the Soviet propaganda and line to the effect namely; that the Chinese Soviet agents were agrarian reformers, then nationalists and patriots, now Titoists ready to break with Stalin was sold to the State Department; and that line has lost us China and bids fair to lose us all Asia; that that line coincided with the Snow-Lattimore line; that Lattimore was quoted constantly and gleefully by Pravda and Isvestia, as Dallin shows in his book on the Soviet advance in Asia; that Lattimore was most influential in urging that line (a book of his to effect was observed on the President's table); that nowhere in his multitudinous books and articles—(he had access to publicity of widest circulation) on China is there aught hurtful to the Soviet advance in China until it was lost to the Soviet.

"You would not be far wrong in saying that a 'stable' of left wing, pro-Communist writers exists to which the editors of the book review sections can turn for the particular job at hand," asserted one writer on the wide prevalence of the Soviet line in the American press.

Another writer said on examination of the review sections in recent years shows what amounts to a sort of interlocking directorate among reviewers of books on China.

"Go back through the reviews and you will find that Edgar Snow reviewed a book by Owen Lattimore and that Lattimore got the assignment to review a book by Snow," he continued. They do a good job of back scratching.

"John Fairbank, a Harvard history teacher, who reviewed Chiang Kai-shek's book with notes and comment by Philip Jaffe, made no mention of Jaffe's known bias against Nationalist China. Nor did he mention that Jaffe pleaded guilty to a charge of conspiracy to steal State Department documents and paid a $2,500 fine." That was the Amerasia Communist spying case that was hushed up.

Recall in this connection: China's Mao Tse-tung who is currently being sold to the United States as the Tito of Asia by Authors Edgar Snow, Owen Lattimore, and others who until recently used to peddle the disastrous line that China's Communists were mainly "agrarian reformers." Time: April 18, 1949; page 29. [So this column for years.]

"That review [Fairbank's] apparently qualified Fairbank to review the book 'Thunder Out of China,' by Theodore White and Annalee Jacoby, and Mrs. Jacoby, no lover to Nationalist China, was assigned to review the late John Powell's 'My Twenty-five Years in China.' Mrs. Jacoby took Powell to task for calling Chinese Communists 'bandits' and seeing a Red menace in their activities."

Colossal impudence on her part in connection with Powell, a great Chinese and Far Eastern expert unlike the salesmen and salesladies who sold the catastrophic party, Soviet, Stalin line for which they were handsomely paid in publications (mostly on the Eastern seaboard) of vast circulation, wide influence, potent prestige; while real Far Eastern experts were excluded from their pages and the facts and the books written by genuine Far Eastern authorities were sneered, smeared, ignored. Snow is still an editor of the Saturday Evening Post. Lattimore only recently had an article in the Atlantic in which there was nothing really hurtful to the Soviet line. Atlantic used to be our leading quality publicatcn.

Here is a sane comment on the whole catastrophic affair:

As for Lattimore and his alleged connection with the Kremlin, we must necessarily wait for the proper legal decision. But it can be said now that his activities, shown by his published documents, have consistently followed a line that has cost us tremendous defeat in China. He is the so-called architect of the doctrine that the Chinese Communists were not really Kremlin stooges at all, but "democratic agrarian reformers." That false doctrine apparently had compelling influence on our conduct of foreign affairs in China. He should have been discredited long ago—not as a spy—but as an "authority" on foreign policy in China. Editorial in the Telegraph-Herald, Dubuque, Iowa, April 23, 1950.

[From the Washington Times-Herald of May 5, 1950]

AMERICANS SHOWER MCCARTHY WITH PRAISE FOR COMMIE FIGHT—50,000 MESSAGES OF ENCOURAGEMENT POUR IN FROM ALL SECTIONS OF NATION

(By John Fisher)

From all walks of life, from all sections of the Nation, the people are standing solidly behind Senator MCCARTHY, Republican, of Wisconsin, in his demand for exposure of Communists in the State Department.

A random examination of the estimated 50,000 letters, cards, and telegrams received by MCCARTHY since he made his charges of Communists in the Department reveals a spontaneous upsurge of public sentiment in his behalf.

Most of the writers had no other wish than to give MCCARTHY encouragement in facing tremendous odds. They told of praying for him. They inquired if there is anything ordinary citizens can do to help.

MANY CONTRIBUTE MONEY

Many, hearing that MCCARTHY was hardpressed to finance his part of the investigation, and forced to cut his investigating staff, contributed money. The donations aren't large, usually a dollar or 2, sometimes 10. They said they gave what they could afford to help him carry on the fight.

MCCARTHY has acknowledged spending about $7,500 of his personal funds to date on expenses incurred in connection with his search for evidence to be furnished the Senate investigating committee, which has a staff and $25,000 for probing MCCARTHY'S charges.

Although MCCARTHY has made no appeal for help, he has accepted the donations in the spirit in which they were given.

Following are some of the explanations given by the people who contributed.

DISABLED VET HELPS

A disabled veteran of World War I, described himself as a pauper, sent a money order for $1 from Liberty, Mo., saying "the Democrats are leading us to war," and he would have sent MCCARTHY more money if not so poor.

From Mount Vernon, N. Y.: "I'm a Democrat but I'm for you 100 percent in this effort. The present Democratic leaders don't seem to realize that what's bad for the country is bad for the party. Enclosed please find check for $10 to help in defraying the expense of this very urgent patriotic effort."

From a Chicago couple describing themselves as "Mr. and Mrs. Democrat" came $10 with the wish, "hope you have a million more converts to your cause."

Enclosed in a United Nations envelope, McCarthy received $2 with the explanation: "This is the best I can do at this time; will repeat again in 2 weeks."

"YANKEE GREEN BUCK"

"Here is a Yankee green buck to lick a Communist Red buck," declared a donor from Aberdeen, Md.

A Government employee in Washington sent a dollar with an unsigned letter, saying, "If my name were signed, and through any reason it would become known, my means of making a living would be abruptly terminated." But the letter said: "In my opinion you and the few on your side of the aisle who have the guts to assist you are performing one of the greatest services to the country ever performed. Keep at it! It is way past time for America to wake up, so keep the alarm ringing."

Twenty-three other persons signed a joint letter, enclosing 23 crumpled dollar bills, "which we hasten to send today, realizing that under Truman's profligacy they may be worth less tomorrow." The letter continued:

"The undersigned, realizing the pressure under which you as a loyal, patriotic American, are laboring to bring to light the subversive activities of traitors and spies on our Government pay rolls, consider it a privilege to be able to make this small contribution to help you carry on the fight."

TOKEN OF APPRECIATION

One of the most unusual letters came from Chicago, and read:

"I am sending you herewith $5 for your personal use—some good cigars, a box of candy, or anything your pleasure desires. No acknowledgment is necessary.

"I am a poor man, 65 years old today, and since my social-security benefits start today, I feel I can afford this little token of appreciation of your splendid service to our country. Your unseen friend."

"I heard last night on the radio program that you are having financial trouble after all the good you have done this country," said another letter from "working family of three. I therefore pledge $1 to help fight the elements that threaten this country and hope that more of my fellow countrymen shall do the same."

ACHESON CRITICIZED

A Connecticut man sent a dollar in behalf of his grandson, saying: "Sent in the hope that what you are attempting to do will succeed, and that my grandson may grow up in the same sort of a country that I grew up in. A man that will stick by Alger Hiss and permit a convicted Russian spy to return to Russia should not be Secretary of State; we need someone about whom there is not the slightest doubt of his loyalty and love of this country."

A terse penciled note on white wrapping paper said: "A humble contribution for expense connected with your excellent effort." It was unsigned and enclosed a dollar.

"Kindly accept this small contribution of $3 that you can use to help pay the private investigators on your pay roll," said a man from Staten Island, N. Y. "I wish it could be more," he added. "God bless you and keep you in good health. Please keep on fighting for what you believe is worth while."

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA WOMAN CONTRIBUTES

A Washington woman sent $10 "as a slight token of appreciation of what you are undergoing in your patriotic, courageous efforts in behalf of our beloved country. If the Reds win, it will mean not only we of this generation, but our children's children's grandchildren will be under the Soviet yoke."

Another group of five local citizens sent $35, saying: "We wish to express to you our congratulations and deep appreciation for your courageous efforts in behalf of all real American citizens." A Wisconsin couple said "Hurrah for McCARTHY. The people of Wisconsin sure must be proud of you. Keep up the good work." They enclosed a dollar.

Separation of White and Colored Passengers on Southern Railway Dining Cars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARRY J. DAVENPORT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 5, 1950

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following argument by Hon. J. Howard McGrath, Attorney General of the United States, before the Supreme Court of the United States, in the case of Elmer W. Henderson against United States of America, Interstate Commerce Commission, and Southern Railway Co., No. 25, October term, 1949, on Monday, April 3, 1950:

The issue on this appeal is the validity of regulations of the Southern Railway providing for separation of white and colored passengers in the railroad's dining cars, and of an order of the Interstate Commerce Commission upholding such regulations, to be equitable and reasonable division of dining car space between the races.

The Solicitor General and I are appearing on behalf of the United States because the case raises basic questions as to the validity of racial segregation. This is a matter of great national importance, affecting the interests and well-being of millions of Americans.

The underlying question in this case is the true nature, purpose and effect of legally-enforced separation of the white and colored races. The position of the United States on this question is that such segregation, in and of itself, is a form of inequality and discrimination condemned by the Constitution and the Interstate Commerce Act.

The pertinent facts can be briefly stated. The railroad reserved one table in its dining cars exclusively for colored passengers and all other tables exclusively for white passengers. The Jim Crow table is at the kitchen end of the car and is separated from the next table by a curtain or a 5-foot-high partition extending from the side of the car to the aisle.

The applicable statute (section 3 of the Interstate Commerce Act) makes it unlawful for a railroad to subject any person to any undue or unreasonable prejudice or disadvantage in any respect whatsoever. In *Mitchell* v. *United States* (313 U. S. 80, 94), this court held that the sweeping prohibition of the statute extend to acts of discrimination which, if done by a State, would violate the equal protection clause of the fourteenth amendment. In other words, the case appears to lay down a test of legality under the statute which is identical with that applicable to State action under the fourteenth amendment and, presumably, to Federal action under the fifth amendment.

The decision of this Court as to the proper interpretation and application of the Interstate Commerce Act to the circumstances of this case may, therefore, carry with it serious implications as to the scope of these amendments. In particular, this case may furnish an appropriate occasion for the Court to reexamine the so-called separate but equal doctrine of *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* (163 U. S. 537). In that case, decided in 1896, almost three decades after the fourteenth amendment became part of the Constitution, there was for the first time read into the amendment an implied limitation, namely, that compulsory racial segregation in the use of public facilities is not a denial of equal protection of the laws, so long as the separate facilities are equal. In our brief we have set forth at length the reasons why the Government is convinced that "separate but equal" is a contradiction in terms, a consitutional anachronism which a half-century of history and experience has shown to be an unwarranted departure from the basic constitutional principle that all Americans, regardless of their race or color or religion or national origin, stand equal and alike in the sight of the law.

We need look only at the facts in this record to realize that facilities segregated on the basis of race or color are not, and never can be equal in any full sense of the word.

It is not disputed that the railroad divides its passengers into two classes. It is not disputed that the rights and privileges accorded white passengers differ from those accorded colored passengers. What is disputed is whether singling out of the colored race for separation from the other members of the community is discriminatory.

Legally enforced separation of people, whoever they may be, on a basis of race, necessarily implies that all the members of that race are inferior to all the members of other races. Negroes understand only too well the meaning and effect of segregation. Students of our social institutions are in unanimous agreement. Segregation signifies, and is intended to signify, that each and every member of the colored race is not the equal of any member of the white race.

The barrier in the dining car is important, not only as a physical barrier, but as a symbol. It is a ceremonial separation, symbolizing the legally enforced caste status of those segregated.[1]

Few things can be more invidious, more humiliating, than thus to be tagged as unfit to associate with others. Individual distinction, achievement, character, count for nothing. A trace, a taint, of Negro ancestry is all that is necessary to put one beyond the pale.

Segregation in railroad dining cars forms part of a larger pattern of segregation which at every turn marks the Negro as ostracized from his fellow citizens. Such setting apart is a token of his inferiority. It gravely affects his whole personality and behavior. Many students and writers on this subject attest to the deep-seated effect of the feelings of resentment and frustration which are thus aroused and how seriously such segregation affects the social and economic development of members of the segregated race. Dining-car segregation or any other segregation sanctioned by law and approved by this court is bound to have a special impact on persons segregated.

If the order of the Interstate Commerce Commission authorizing such segregation is upheld in this case, then I believe that a serious blow will have been struck at the free institutions which our democracy so proudly proclaims before the world and last hope will have vanished that under our constitutional system all men can expect to be treated with equality based upon their human dignity and personality.

Persons who are given service in a dining car only upon the accepted condition that they will allow themselves to be held up to public view as members of an ostracized race cannot possibly be said to be receiving equality of treatment. Unless the law deals only with the trappings of equality and not with its substance, unless we are prepared to say that the requirements of equality are to be measured solely in terms of knives, forks, food, and table linen, then this court should strike down the provisions of the Interstate Commerce Commission holding. Only if the law is to have this narrow scope would the phrase "separate but equal" have any validity. When separation is for the very purpose of express inequality and thus in itself creates inequality, there is no other conclusion to be drawn than that such separation in and of itself is discrimination.

Mr. Justice Brandeis in a great dissent once said: "If we would guide by the light of reason, we must let our minds be bold."[2] Here, if we would guide by the light of reason, we must let our minds be free. We must free our minds of notions which have no validity other than the powerful pull of the familiar and the accustomed. If we can do this, we can see that persons who are subjected to the humiliation of being set apart from their fellows, simply because their skin is of a different color, are denied equality of treatment, and deeply wronged.

Whichever way the decision in this case goes, the rule declared will stand as a rule authorized and enforced by the Federal Government. The case does not present a mere question of private rights. The United States regulates the practices of the railroad which are here involved. Under the statute imposing general and inclusive prohibition against discrimination in service by an interstate railroad, the question for decision is whether it was nevertheless the policy of Congress to authorize racial segregation which bespeaks by force of its own viciousness the inferiority of those segregated, nor could it have any other purpose or effect.

[1] Appropriate illustration: If this court would insist on segregation of lawyers before its bar.

[2] *New State Ice Co.* v. *Liebmann* (285 U. S. 262, 311).

Many in this country sincerely believe that segregation is in the public interest. They believe that segregation and practices allied to it serve to diminish racial prejudice and racial friction. Many others believe the contrary. They believe that such practices promote prejudice and friction between the races, and tend to create a disaffected body of citizens.

Obviously no act of Congress, no decision by this Court can eradicate the evil of racial prejudice. But ways of thinking and behavior are at least partly shaped by the rules of conduct prescribed by law as interpreted by this Court. Your decision can and may give rigidity and respectability to barriers which have their roots in prejudice, and thereby solidify these barriers, or your wisdom may to a large degree undermine these barriers and bring them into disrepute.

I submit to the court that racial segregation enforced by law is not permitted under the Constitution nor the Interstate Commerce Act. The judgment by a majority of the three-judge district court which approved the legality of the regulation involved in this case should be reversed.

Teach What Is Right

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURR P. HARRISON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1950

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Nelson County Times, Amherst, Va., entitled "Teach What Is Right in America":

TEACH WHAT IS RIGHT IN AMERICA

In one of his Newsweek columns, Raymond Moley dealt with the people who have been convicted of serving communism as espionage agents. Two of them, he observed, "were educated in institutions provided by the profits of the very economic system that communism is determined to destroy."

Then he said this: "Let us be slow in condemning our educational system for these failures. These people were exceptional. But it may well be considered by those who direct higher education in America whether there is not a need to reexamine their responsibilities and the way they are carried out. The danger is not that there is too much taught about what is right in communism, but that there is too little taught about what is right in America."

We all prize academic freedom. But that freedom, like others, involves grave responsibilities. Education much cleanse itself from within. There can be no question but that a certain amount of teaching has been Communist inspired. Some has come from fellow travelers who religiously attempt to follow the tortuous turnings of the Soviet line. And much of it seems more concerned with searching for what may be bad in our form of government and our economic system than in describing what is good.

The young men and women who are attending our universities of today will decide what this country is to be like a generation from now. Unless they know "about what is right in America," education will have proved itself a ghastly failure—and academic freedom itself will die of a disease of its own creation.

An Old Hoax Revived

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 5, 1950

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, that old hoax, the St. Lawrence seaway and power project is haunting the American taxpayer again.

Here is what the New York Journal-American had to say about the old hoax on June 15, 1949:

AN OLD HOAX REVIVED

With little hope of success, political advocates of the St. Lawrence seaway have again brought up their visionary project in Congress.

The hoary St. Lawrence scheme has become a part of the New Deal's plan of dividing the Nation into regional Federal satrapies by developing separately the great river basins along the lines of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Of severals bills in Congress, one would take over the Columbia River and its tributaries in several States.

Another would put one-fourth of the country under Federal tutelage in the Missouri Valley.

The St. Lawrence project differs from the others in that it has an international aspect, since most of the river is in Canada: And that, while it was originated as a supposed navigational facility, it has since acquired a hydroelectric-power element, and is now definitely a part of the movement to socialize the United States through Federal domination of the electrical industry.

The objections to the St. Lawrence project are numerous.

As a source of hydroelectric power, it would be unreliable.

Canadian experience proves that droughts would reduce its output.

The project would therefore require "auxiliary" steam plants to stabilize its capacity: And there are already several privately-operated steam plants in the State of New York each one of which produces more power than could be obtained from the whole St. Lawrence River.

If New York and New England need more electricity, therefore, the apparent solution is more steam plants—and private enterprise can and will construct them when they are desirable.

Secondly, as a seaway the St. Lawrence is a childish chimera.

The river would be ice-locked, and hence unnavigable, during half of each year.

Its proposed dredged channel would be useless without costly local port construction in the Great Lakes.

Leading American shipping companies have informed Congress that they would not use the artificial route, and if they were to do so, American railroads would be bankrupted by the loss of heavy freight in the warm months of the year.

Congress is thus being "pressured" again to dump a billion dollars or more into a hazardous project which would serve only to benefit small ocean-going vessels, mostly of the "tramp" type, under alien flags and to the incurable injury of American industry and commerce.

Likewise, emotional assertions that the St. Lawrence seaway is desirable for the national defense are spurious, inasmuch as a single bomb exploded in one of its locks or narrow channels would obstruct it completely.

The same sound reasons that have impelled Congress wisely to reject the St. Lawrence seaway scheme in the past should prevail again.

The Day of Final Appeal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OWEN BREWSTER
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an editorial from the Journal of Commerce, of New York, entitled "The Day of Final Appeal," written by Edward P. Tastrom.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SHIPPING OUTLOOK
(By Edward P. Tastrom)
THE DAY OF FINAL APPEAL

The Senate Committee on Expenditures has a thoroughly logical basis for adopting the resolution offered by Senator BREWSTER, of Maine, this week which would postpone the shift of the Maritime Commission to the Department of Commerce, now scheduled to take place in about 10 days.

The argument, as we see it, that industry interests can advance at the committee hearings scheduled for next Monday is both a logical one and, as the Chinese say, "face saving" all around. It is simply that this is not the proper time to uproot the Maritime Commission and tuck it away into a Commerce Department division since we are right in the middle of proposing legislation changes in our basic shipping law—the Maritime Act of 1936.

Hearings have been going on in Washington for months, during which period interested industry leaders have given much of their time for testimony designed to formulate a long-range shipping policy. We are close to legislative recommendations, based on the facts that have been brought out at these sessions.

The way things shape up at the moment, Congress will be confronted with an entirely different administrative and regulatory functioning body to carry out new legislation than that which existed when most of this testimony, that presumably is to form the basis of our new maritime policy, was offered.

This may seem to be a fine point and those given to arguing the thickness of a hair could say that Congress still would be in a position to fit legislation into the new administrative arrangements. However, isn't that something like laying out plans for a new model car and then finding that it must be built in a carriage factory instead of on an assembly line?

Assuming there are defects in the present arrangement under which the Maritime Commission functions, the timing involved in putting reorganization of the agency into effect is akin to prescribing for the patient before determining exactly what his ills consist of.

It is for these reasons that we say the Senate is perfectly justified in approving postponement of Reorganization Plan 21 until

such time as we determine our new shipping legislation. If it is considered advisable at that time to include this executive change in the new legislative enactments, it can properly be integrated with the other revisions that may be made in the law. This is only fair to the shipping industry and for that matter, it is something that the Commerce Department should approve since we are assuming that Commerce is desirous of getting as workable an arrangement as possible.

Also Democratic Senators who feel they should not go against the administration wishes, and Republicans who feel they should not be on record against the Hoover Commission proposals would, in effect, simply be postponing action on this shift until such time as its desirability can be studied in connection with other and broader problems affecting the shipping industry.

The situation with respect to Reorganization Plan 21 thus is quite different than that which exists in connection with other Hoover Commission proposals where Congress has been asked to voice disapproval:

The major considerations advanced for the transfer of the Maritime Commission have been that its efficiency would be improved by segregation of administrative and regulatory functions and secondly, that it would result in actual economies. Neither contention has been adequately documented thus far.

There is, without doubt, room for improvement in both these respects. This also is the case, for that matter with a great many other Government bureaus. However, there is no assurance that we will attain either of these objectives by putting into effect Reorganization Plan 21. In fact, strong arguments, which hardly need repeating here, can be advanced to indicate the new maritime board set-up would be not more, but rather less, efficient than has been the case in the past.

Finally, if we are to strive for efficiency and economy, it should be tied in with our new maritime policy, if it is to be effective, and be written in, chapter and verse, as a part of the changes made in the Maritime Act of 1936.

This is the sort of case that might well be presented to the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments next Monday—the court of final appeal.

Sale of Surplus Navy Frigates to Egypt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, two articles have appeared on successive days in the New York Herald Tribune by Carl Levin concerning the sale of two surplus United States Navy frigates to Egypt.

It is clear from these two articles, and from facts I have personally ascertained, that although it was claimed that the ships were to be used for passenger service, they have no passenger capacity except for crowded quarters for the crews, and that the superstructures of the ships show a number of gun mounts and ammunition bins and depth-charge racks. The ships were reconditioned at an estimated cost of $75,000.

It should be remembered that these ships are destined for the Middle East, where the Arab league is still restive, and where a peace between the Arab States and Israel has not yet been written. I ask unanimous consent to insert these articles in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES HALTS SALE OF TWO ARMED SHIPS TO EGYPT—STATE DEPARTMENT TO INVESTIGATE THAT NATION'S FAILURE TO DISARM NAVY FRIGATES

(By Carl Levin)

WASHINGTON, May 3.—The State Department issued a hold order and started an investigation today of two surplus Navy frigates which were scheduled to sail momentarily for Egypt, ostensibly for passenger service under the Egyptian flag.

The Department previously had authorized the transfer of the 303-foot World War II vessels, despite a ban on sale of warships to countries in the Middle East, upon certification that they were to be demilitarized.

Today's action, it was learned, followed receipt of information that although $75,000 had been spent to recondition the two ships at the Bethlehem shipyards in Baltimore, not a single gun mount or ammunition bin has been removed.

Frigate is a Navy designation for a ship similar in size and purpose to a destroyer escort. The two in question—the *Papua* and *Tobago*—were built in 1944 and saw service during the war under lease to the British. Each carried three 3-inch guns, two 42-millimeter, and several 20-millimeter antiaircraft guns and depth charges.

The embargo, preventing departure of the ships pending investigation, was issued by the Munitions Division of the State Department to the collector of customs in Baltimore, after agents for the Egyptian buyers had refused to permit a reporter to view the frigates. The same official, John Krell, Baltimore representative of the Stockard Steamship Co., agents for the Egyptians, sent word to the shipyard that "no pictures of the ships are to be taken under any circumstances," thus defeating efforts of a news photographer to take pictures of the vessels. This was a short time before the embargo was ordered.

Despite Mr. Krell's orders, however, a reporter viewed the frigates at the Bethlehem Shipyards on Key Highway, Baltimore. He found all the gun mounts and ammunition bins intact. Only the guns had been removed. No reconversion to commercial uses had been effected. And British captains and middle-eastern crews were already on board, ready to take the ships out.

A State Department official charged with enforcement of the munitions-export ban said the hold order was issued because the Department's understanding in approving the sale was that the ships were to be demilitarized here. That, he said, implies more than simply removal of guns, which could be easily replaced.

"NEEDS LOOKING INTO"

"It certainly looks as though this needs further looking into," he said. "We wouldn't think of approving a warship for that area."

The incident developed as the State Department said it still has under consideration an application by the State of Israel for permission to buy heavy arms here to defend itself against any possible resumption of the Palestine war, in which Israel was arrayed against Egypt and the other Arab nations.

Egypt is receiving modern tanks, jet-propelled military planes, and other heavy military equipment from Great Britain pursuant to treaty arrangements. Trans-Jordan similarly is being armed by the British.

While Secretary of State Dean Acheson has said that there is no likelihood of a resumption of Arab-Jewish hostilities, the State Department has retained the ban on export of heavy arms, including warships, to that area.

DECISION ON ISRAEL DENIED

Mr. Acheson denied today a report that the State Department has decided to reject the Israeli request for assistance in buying modern arms here. He said consideration has to be given item by item, and specific requests have to be considered against the available supply, and defense requirements in the Middle East.

A spokesman for the Israeli Embassy expressed "grave concern." He said that during the 3 months since Israel approached the United States on this matter, "Arab rearmament has been moving ahead at a very rapid pace."

The two frigates, built exclusively for war purposes, were declared surplus after they were returned by the British in 1946. Subsequently they were sold to the Boston Metals Co. in Baltimore. This company asked authorization last year to sell the frigates to the Khedivial Mail Line, of Alexandria, Egypt. It certified that they were to be demilitarized and used exclusively for passenger service between the Red Sea and Indian Ocean ports, particularly for holy year pilgrims.

The Navy approved the sale, and the State Department issued the export license, after the Maritime Commission notified Assistant Secretary of the Navy John T. Koehler that the Commission had no objection.

Inquiry today revealed that the Maritime Commission vote was 4 to 1 to interpose no objection. The one dissenter, it was learned, was Commissioner Raymond S. McKeogh. He explained at the time that he saw no sense in sending a potential war vessel to the Middle East and that he also, in event that the ship actually was to be used commercially, was against transferring any vessels to foreigners to compete with the American merchant fleet.

Mr. Koehler was in Europe today and not available for comment. A naval officer assigned to control of surplus warships laughed and commented, "It looks fishy," when told today that after $75,000 worth of repairs, the frigates still have all their gun mounts and ammunition bins.

After further inquiry, however, he reported that all the disarming required by the Navy has been done. This, he said, included removal of the guns and any radio and electronic equipment not cleared for export.

NAVY SAYS SHIPS SOLD TO EGYPT ARE DISARMED—STATE DEPARTMENT RECEIVES ASSURANCE STANDARDS ON DEMILITARIZING ARE MET

WASHINGTON, May 4.—The State Department announced today that it has been assured by the Navy that two surplus 303-foot World War frigates which have been sold to an Egyptian company have been disarmed sufficiently to meet the demilitarization standards of the Navy.

The ships, preparing to sail from the Bethlehem Shipyards in Baltimore, however, were today still under the embargo which the State Department ordered yesterday on information that the frigates' gun mounts and ammunition bins are still in place after a $75,000 reconditioning of the ships.

Michael J. McDermott, State Department spokesman, said that before the frigates are permitted to sail for Egypt, where they ostensibly are to be used for commercial purposes, further steps will be taken "to ascertain whether there is material aboard these vessels which can be classified as arms, ammunition, or implements of war from the standpoint of export controls."

DISARMING RULES SET

The State Department, which has been asked by the State of Israel for aid in pur-

chasing defense arms against a possible resumption of the Arab-Israeli war, has a ban against the transfer of warships of any kind to Middle Eastern countries.

However, Navy-State Department regulations provide that a warship is demilitarized once its guns and secret electronic equipment have been removed. This much, the State Department was assured today, was done before the ships were sold to their Egyptian purchaser, the Khedivial Mail Line, of Alexandria, Egypt.

Fifty-one House Members—30 Democrats and 21 Republicans—asked Secretary of State Dean Acheson today to use his influence to stop the shipment of British arms to the Arab states.

In a letter to Mr. Acheson, the group urged him to confer with British authorities during the forthcoming Foreign Ministers' meeting in London to obtain these objectives: 1. Stop British shipment of arms until peace treaties have been made between Israel and the Arab states. 2. Joint efforts by the United States and Britain to promote such peace treaties.

CRITICISM BY ARAB LEAGUE

CAIRO, EGYPT, May 4.—Secretary General Abdel Rahman Azzam Pasha of the Arab League denounced today the proposal of 51 Members of the United States House to make aid to Arab nations conditional on peace with Israel. Arabs are "not going to be intimidated by United States Congressmen into a humiliating and unjust peace with Israel," said the secretary of the seven-nation league.

Rearming of the Arab States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 5, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, our Secretary of State, the Honorable Dean Acheson, is about to depart for Europe for the purpose of conferring with the Foreign Ministers of the nations of the North Atlantic Pact, including Mr. Bevin.

There is no doubt that the agenda for discussion will include, among other things, the problems of peace and security in the Middle East as well as the rearmament of the Arab states by Great Britain.

I think it is fitting and proper that Mr. Acheson should know what I believe to be the sentiment of a great number of the Members of the House relative to some of the problems.

It is no secret, in fact it is admitted by all concerned, that England is rearming the Arab states and particularly Egypt on an unprecedented scale, supplying them with jet planes, cannons, Sherman tanks, and battleships.

The little State of Israel, surrounded as it is by the hostile Arab countries, is naturally disturbed and is in fear for its security. It is maintained by the Department of State that there is no reason for Israel's apprehension and that all is quiet in the Middle East. However, in the light of the frank declarations of the Arab leaders that they intend to embark on a "second round" in a "war of revenge" against Israel, one finds it difficult to reconcile the complacency of Mr. Acheson with the existing reality in the Near East. The recent proceedings at the meeting of the Council of the Arab League in Cairo are cruelly in conflict with the optimistic view of the Department of State in denying arms to Israel for the defense of its borders against a possible attack. The establishment of an economic and military pact by the Arab League, the granting of an official voice to the ex-Mufti of Jerusalem—the former collaborator of Hitler—and the prevention of peace negotiations with Israel by any member of the league contradict the confidence of Mr. Acheson.

It is said that England is delivering arms to the Arabs by virtue of treaty obligations. It may well be pointed out that Great Britain is shipping military planes to Lebanon, which country is not included in those treaties.

It is not in vain that Egypt has increased its military budget from £5,000,000 last year to £50,000,000 this year.

No one can predict with absolute certainty that the threats of the Egyptian leaders will not be carried out. Certainly no one can absolutely exclude the possibility of an attack on Israel as threatened by the heads of the Arab countries. Should the conflagration of war break out against Israel it may be too late to stop it; it may even spread to other parts of the world.

The United States of America, which was the first country to give, 2 years ago, recognition to the establishment of the State of Israel, owes a moral duty to the million inhabitants of Israel and certainly to the 400,000 displaced persons who came to Israel with the encouragement and financial support of the United States, not to expose them again to slaughter; they suffered enough already.

We in the United States are engaged in military preparedness against a possible war between the West and the East, and properly so. It is the sacred duty of a nation to be completely prepared for the defense of its security and its ideals, even against possible violence from without. By the same process of reasoning why is not Israel entitled to the opportunity of complete military preparedness against a possible assault by the Arab countries in view of their constant threats.

The fair-minded people of the United States will never acquiesce, Mr. Speaker, in a policy of discrimination against the infant State of Israel relative to arms; they will not condone the pursuit of Mr. Bevin's anti-Israel policies by placing the people of Israel at the mercy of fanatical Arab leaders.

The rearming of the Arabs and the denial of arms to Israel is not the way which will lead to peace.

It is alleged that the rearmament of the Arabs is dictated by the concept of security of the Middle East against a possible attack by a third power. If that be so, why should not Israel be included in that program?

On the basis of past experience and by virtue of Israel's military record, it is not unreasonable to regard Israel as a strong ally in case of hostilities, even much more than the Arab states.

Israel is an outpost of democracy in the Middle East. It is guided by the American democratic ideals of freedom, equality, justice, and liberty for all, regardless of race or creed. Israel is a robust democracy which has left the world in no doubt as to its identity of principles with those of ours. Israel aspires to friendship with all peace-loving nations and seeks no quarrel with any country near or far. Israel derives its true democratic ideals from the ancient prophets who implanted them so deeply in the Jewish nation that they have maintained their power and freshness to this day.

Israel desires to be a good neighbor. Israel needs peace for the next 50 years to be able to absorb and rehabilitate the hundreds of thousands of the remnant of the Jewish people who are marching to its shores in search of security. Israel needs peace to develop and to consolidate its industry, agriculture, and its economic resources.

I am persuaded that if granted the opportunity Israel will serve as an example and as an inspiration to its Arab neighbors in the direction of social justice, human dignity, and brotherhood.

It is in this spirit that I address myself to our Secretary of State, the Honorable Dean Acheson, and appeal to him to beware of the anti-Israel Bevin psychosis, and not to encourage the warlike Arab leaders in their intention to push the Jews of Israel into the Mediterranean Sea. Only a militarily prepared Israel is a guaranty of peace.

Oil-Import Policy Neglects United States Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OMAR BURLESON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 5, 1950

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Fort Worth Star-Telegram of April 9, 1950:

OIL IMPORT POLICY NEGLECTS UNITED STATES SAFETY

Assistant Secretary of State Thorp's testimony on oil imports before a Senate Interstate Commerce Subcommittee is cause for alarm not so much for what he said as for the official attitude it indicates. As a representative of the State Department, Mr. Thorp previously has expressed opposition to curbing imports of foreign oil into the United States, though never before in such plain and unequivocal language. And never before has it been made so plain that continuation of this flood of foreign oil will have the backing of the State Department as a matter of official policy, regardless of the harmful effects it may have upon the petroleum industry in this country and upon the vital interests of the Nation itself.

Mr. Thorp's statement in this regard is that the concerns which are pouring oil into the United States from abroad deserve and should receive the strong support of the Government. His further statement indicates that the State Department will continue its incredible attitude, in the face of conclusive evidence to the contrary, of denying that the

domestic industry is suffering any damage from having its markets taken away by these foreign-oil imports. Mr. Thorp professes to be unable, after 8 months of study, to find where the domestic industry has been injured or to see where it is threatened with serious injury in the future.

By leaving out logic and the facts of life in the oil industry and relying solely upon statistical tables of past performances, a superficially plausible case can be made out for the contention that oil imports have not caused appreciable curtailment of domestic drilling and exploratory activities. Through the end of last year the figures show no diminution in such operations. But that is due to the fact that commitments already had been made before the high tide of imports was reached, and these commitments had to be carried out. Producing companies had made their drilling appropriations, assembled acreages, and completed exploratory work, and were bound by contract and economics to proceed during that period with virtually full-scale operations.

But that is not to say that continued shutting in of domestic production as it is supplanted by foreign oil will have no effect in discouraging new drilling and exploratory operations. Obviously and inescapably, it will. There is no incentive to developing new sources of oil when upward of a million barrels of present daily oil production already has been displaced by oil from overseas. And there can be no argument that the loss of half a billion dollars a year by the domestic industry if the import rate is sustained will not impair the financial ability of producing companies to drill new wells and uncover new petroleum reserves.

Those reserves are the invaluable stock pile of a material indispensable to the Nation in case of emergency and essential to the military strength needed to deter attack upon us by an aggressor nation. Without adequate and constantly expanding reserves of oil within its own borders, the Nation would stand in deadly peril. To realize this one has only to think back to the last war, when enemy submarines cut off all supplies of oil from abroad and ranged close enough to our coast line to pinch down shipments by tanker from Gulf points to the Northeastern States.

If the absurd policy supported by Mr. Thorp had been in effect before World War I or World War II, we could have won neither of those wars. And if it remains long in effect, we not only will be inviting world war III but will be putting ourselves in a position where we certainly will lose it. One of Stalin's first moves, in launching an attack on the United States, would be to grab its sources of oil in the Middle East. With all due respect to Mr. Thorp, he is simply talking through his hat when he says that developing oil fields under the shadow of Russia's might is more in the national interest than developing our own.

The taxpayer, particularly in Texas, is likely to feel he is being entirely overlooked when Mr. Thorp asserts that the climbing rate of oil imports has caused no hurt and threatens no hurt to anyone. The Federal Government is losing hundreds of millions of dollars a year in lost profits from oil not produced—a loss which can not help but increase the burden of other taxpayers or add to the mountainous public debt. Texas, which has borne the brunt of production cut-backs necessitated by the inflow of foreign oil, now is losing petroleum tax revenues at the rate of more than $25,000,000 a year. More than Mr. Thorp's bland assurance will be required to convince the taxpayers and the numerous Texans who depend directly or indirectly upon oil for a living that a forced decline in the State's petroleum production threatens them with no damage.

Because the producers and importers of foreign oil are chiefly American companies, Mr. Thorp places the welfare of these few concerns above the welfare of the many dependent upon the domestic petroleum industry and allied businesses. To curtail the activities of these few companies, he avers, could seriously harm the national interest. This is to shut his eyes to the fact that crippling the oil industry at home can and certainly will be harmful and highly dangerous to the national interest and to national security. Mr. Thorp and his State Department colleagues who foster this hurtful and hazardous policy exemplify the saying that "there's none so blind as they who will not see."

United States Travel Industry Faces Losses Through Threats to Employee Leave

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THURMAN C. CROOK
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 5, 1950

Mr. CROOK. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith the following news article, highlighting the threat to annual-leave revenue of every State in the Union, appearing in the current issue of the Government Standard, national weekly newspaper for Federal employees, published by the American Federation of Government Employees, and edited by Hal. J. Miller, Washington (D. C.) newspaperman, who is a member of the National Association of Travel Officials:

UNITED STATES TRAVEL INDUSTRY FACES LOSSES THROUGH THREATS TO EMPLOYEE LEAVE

The American travel industry, which is an important source of revenue to every State in the Union, is seriously concerned about threatened losses of income through the proposals to reduce Federal employee sick and annual leave.

The subject is coming up for discussion at a meeting of officers of the National Association of Travel Officials to be held this month in Chicago.

Travel authorities and writers, aware of the opposition of the many segments of the industry, such as hotels, holiday resorts, transportation facilities, tourist motels, to proposals that will imperil their sources of revenue, indicated to the Government Standard that they will want their views to be presented to Congress when leave reductions are considered.

ECONOMIC THREAT

The threat to American travel of such proposals as the bills by Senator DOUGLAS to reduce annual and sick leave was described by a prominent travel writer, Anthony F. Merrill, of 1707 Twenty-ninth Street SE., Washington 20, D. C., husband of a Federal employee, who said:

"It's going to hit every gas station, every dining spot, and every hotel in every resort area and resort route in America at $5 to $10 a lost transaction for each potential Government tourist removed from the American travel scene."

Mr. Merrill said that "the losses could run into millions in this penny-wise-pound-foolish idea."

He cited the example of a secretary who is flying to Rome for a long-deserved holiday and commented: "TWA won't welcome having her leave cut."

The detrimental effect on travel income, which is an important part of State and community revenue, follows through every phase of the travel picture.

Another example: The Virginia Skyline Corp. could hardly be expected to cheer if the leave time of the 105,000 District of Columbia, Virginia, and Maryland people who visited Shenandoah National Park last year, were to be cut.

Travel people believe that once the menace to the industry is made known that this will be communicated to Members of the Senate and House of Representatives.

SUBJECT OF STUDY

Lee J. Bossemeyer, eminent former head of the United States Travel Bureau, and currently the Washington representative of the National Association of Travel Officials, said the matter would be a subject of serious study by his organization at the Chicago conference, when Clyde Edmonson, NATO legislative chairman, will be present.

Other travel groups will be asked to make known their attitude toward reduction in American travel income by unjustified invasions of United States worker leave rights.

Mr. Merrill conveyed the views of many eminent American travel authorities when he declared that "the Douglas proposal is a backward step because the whole American trend is toward longer holidays and shorter hours."

AFGE has contended that the Federal employee leave rights are an ideal toward which all American employers are striving as technological and scientific advances reduce working hours. Uncle Sam, as the country's largest employer, has an obligation to set adequate standards of leave.

Recreation authorities contend that as the machine takes over more and more of the work of man, his working hours must of necessity be shortened in order to spread the work.

Recreation has thus grown in importance in this foremost world democracy, in order, as one authority states it, "that we should not have millions of workers dangerously killing time in complete idleness."

ADEQUATE VACATIONS

Because of their steady income the regularly employed Government worker has been able, along with similarly situated people in private industry, to enjoy adequate vacations.

This is an objective toward which all American working people justifiably strive.

We are grateful to Tony Merrill for his helpful comments on the menace to the travel industry of any reduction in Federal leave. He is the author of the popular Whittlesey House publication, Our Eastern Playgrounds, a guide to all of the State and National park and forest recreational areas in the East. He has just completed another book for the Crowell Publishing Co., The Golf Course Guide, which will accent the vacationing golfer's needs.

Tariff Rates on Imported Leather

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 4, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very interesting circular distributed to the workers in the leather industry which is self-explanatory. I know that this information will

be of assistance to every Member of Congress who is interested in retaining full employment in our domestic industries.

YOUR STAKE IN A FAIR TARIFF DEAL: JOBS, WAGES, LIVING STANDARDS

You and 50,000 other tannery workers have a vital stake in a fair tariff deal for leather. United States tariff rates are already the lowest in the world, but they might be cut further if we do not protest vigorously. Another slash in our weak tariff and a flood of leather imports from low-wage countries with subsidized industries will threaten your job and your security, your wages, and your living standards. This is to tell you what is happening and how to protect your industry and your job.

HERE IS THE STORY OF HOW TARIFF RATES AND LEATHER IMPORTS AFFECT YOUR JOB

United States tariff rates on imported leather have been cut again and again in recent years. They are now lower than the leather tariffs of any important country.

Cheap labor in foreign countries makes it impossible for American leather to compete with foreign leather. We need tariffs to prevent low labor costs abroad from flooding our markets with low-cost leather, destroying our industry and wage levels. We need a fair tariff to give us a chance at fair competition with cheap labor in foreign countries. But, that isn't all. Tanning industries in many foreign nations have other great advantages besides far cheaper wages.

They get financial subsidies from their governments.

They have benefited from United States economic assistance.

They are protected against competition by import restrictions.

Their governments discriminate against United States tanners by raising obstacles against the export of raw hides and skins.

Does this sound one-sided and unjust? It is exactly that. Our present low tariff on leather should be raised, not lowered, as the minimum protection against unfair competition from abroad.

Present United States duties on foreign leather are the lowest of any leather-producing country in the world. They have already been cut in some cases as much as 60 percent below 1930 levels.

	Tariff act of 1930	Present rate	Tariff already cut by—
	Pct.	*Pct.*	*Pct.*
Sole, belting, and harness leathers	12½	10	20
Side upper leather (including linings)	15	12½	16⅔
Split leather	15	12½	16⅔
Calf leather	15	12½	16⅔
Cattle and calf garment leathers	20	15	25
Bag, strap, and collar leathers	20	10	50
Patent leather	15	7½	50
Pigskin fancy leather	30	15	50
Cattle and calf fancy leather	30	15	50
Chamois leather	25	15	40
Goat and kid glove and garment leather	25	10	60
Sheep and lamb glove and garment leather	25	15	40
Horse and deer glove and garment leather	25	15	40
Horse shoe leathers	10	7½	25
Goat, kid, reptile, and sheep for shoe purposes	10	10	--------

WHAT'S UP NOW?

In September 1950, the United States will start tariff conferences with 17 other nations. One of the purposes of these negotiations is to make it easier for foreign countries to earn dollars by selling more in the United States. Our Government has announced the list of goods on which it may consider further tariff cuts, and every kind of leather is on that list.

If United States tariffs on leather are cut again the results will be swift and deadly because:

Shipments of leather to the United States have already been steadily increasing from countries where cheap labor, subsidies, and other Government assistance make for unfair competition.

Shipments of leather from the United States have been steadily declining. Many foreign nations have outright restrictions against the import of United States leather and they have tariff rates far higher than ours.

During the war years when the United States had restrictions and shortages, certain countries not in the war encouraged new tanneries. Plants mushroomed up in South America, India, South Africa, and elsewhere. Labor costs in these industries are a fraction of ours and the standard of living is far lower. Such new plants are trying to profit by exports and another cut in the United States tariff would be the green light for a rush of leather to this market.

In European countries, Government policies and financial assistance make it highly profitable to export to the United States. Producers have the advantage of labor costs one-third or one-fourth of the rates paid in the United States.

If the weak United States tariff protection now in effect is stripped away, there could be only one result—a tremendous increase in foreign-leather shipments to the United States. How could the United States tanning industry compete against the unfair advantages of foreign tanners and continue to pay United States wages?

AN ESSENTIAL INDUSTRY DESERVES A FAIR TARIFF DEAL

The tanning industry is essential in time of peace and of war.

It is an efficient industry; its employees know their jobs and make the best leather in the world. Without noise and publicity, the tanning industry did an outstanding job in the war. It did not get and does not now receive any Government assistance or subsidies.

This industry is not afraid of fair competition from any quarter but it cannot compete against wages that are as much as 90 percent lower, against foreign subsidies, against government monopolies and cartels abroad.

If the flood of imported leather keeps up, leather made in tanneries supported or run by foreign governments with cheap labor, what is going to happen to your job and your pay? The answer is that many Americans won't have jobs and won't be getting any pay in the tanning industry. They will be squeezed out by unfair competition and cheap foreign leather, unless you do something about it.

WHAT DOES THE TANNING INDUSTRY ASK?

This industry asks for a fair tariff deal.

United States tariff rates on leather should not be cut again when they already are lower than the tariffs of every other leather-producing country.

The time has come for other countries to start cutting tariffs and to begin matching the sacrifices we have made.

Let other countries begin to act in good faith by putting an end to trade discrimination, subsidies, embargoes, and other Government assistance to their tanning industries.

Why in the face of commercial funny-business abroad should the United States cut tariffs again to sacrifice the jobs and living standards of United States tannery employees?

If you want specific facts, take a look at the table which shows how much our tariff rates have been cut and remember how little other countries have done to match us.

Who wants foreign leather made by cheap labor to take your job away from you?

You don't, do you?

Then be sure to act at once.

YOU CAN DO THE FOLLOWING

1. You or your representatives can state the facts at the open hearings which start in Washington May 24. Write or wire, before May 10, to the Committee for Reciprocity Information, Tariff Commission Building, Washington, D. C., asking to be heard.

2. You and your fellow workers can file a statement in protest against further tariff cuts. This must be filed by May 17 with the Committee for Reciprocity Information. Ten copies are needed.

3. You can petition your Senators and Congressmen to state the facts on your behalf, to protect your job and your security.

4. You can ask your relatives and friends to help by writing to Congress so that something will be done to help you hold your job and your pay.

Biggest Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 5, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the appendix of the RECORD, I include the eleventh article by Mr. Frank Waldrop on the infiltration of communism in our country:

BIGGEST STORY

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Russia in 1900 was just teetering on the edge of good times, better than it had ever known before or seen since.

Napoleon had captured Moscow in 1812 only to be defeated by General Winter, that same frost-bitten campaigner who also stopped Hitler within a camera's-eye view of the same city in 1941, early enough for the United States of America to avoid Pearl Harbor, if that had only been the will of the men in office.

But if Napoleon had been destroyed by the same vastness that made Russia so hard for Moscow itself to maintain a solid government, at least he cut open the dark curtains between Russia and the West.

In the years that followed, Russian music, art, literature, science, and industry began to sprint in pursuit of the Western World.

The natural tendency of the Russian Empire to come apart had its influence on the writers of the age, so that almost without exception they reflected notions of anarchy and "down with government." But they were great artists just the same. So were the musicians.

Russian medicine, scientific research and invention, and Russian art were all blooming.

And as the new century dawned, Russia's ancient cities began to see the rise even of a vigorous merchant and manufacturing class. These wanted no part of the dreary, endless struggles between the tribes on the steppes and the handful of aristocracy in St. Petersburg and Moscow who were still trying to weld a government under the czars.

So along with the arrival of 1900 came a series of jolting revolts against the throne and a relentless demand for parliamentary government.

The least significant and unimportant of all those scrambling to grab the powers falling from the hands of the czars were the citified believers in scientific socialism as drawn up by the crazy German, Karl Marx, and ignored by the working classes and everybody else in western Europe.

To understand how Stalin ever got control of the empire of the czars, you must always keep in mind that aside from these excited Marxists above-mentioned there were literally dozens of other revolutions cooking all the time.

There were the drives of the merchants and traders to westernize the government on legal lines. The philosophical radicals, influenced by the literature of Tolstoy, Bakunin, and others, wanted anarchy, no government at all.

The Socialists themselves were split up between those who, as today in England, thought they could get the public to vote the government into owning everything, and the Marxists, who preached that civilization itself must be devastated and a new society built on a foundation of corpses.

To this last belonged Vladimir Ilyich Ulyanov, the Lenin of this story, and to the other class of Socialists belonged his fellow townsman from Simbirsk, Alexander Kerensky.

The czar's government was badly shaken by defeat in the war with Japan (1904–05), into which it had been drawn by overextension into Asia and further agitated by the perpetual headaches of past overextension into Europe.

All very familiar, isn't it? Just like new times.

The intrigues and the commitments grew and the extensions of the never-too-understanding or efficient government finally dragged the last czar, Nicholas II, into the 1914 war that was his end.

An obscure, unheard-of Serbian named Gavril Princip pulled the trigger that started the horror. His name comes into this story again.

But on June 28, 1914, Princip was just a crazy student who shot the Austrian archduke, Francis Ferdinand, who had come down to Belgrade in Serbia, now Yugoslavia.

Three years later, every important nation of the world was deep in the blood-letting and the czar's government was so rattled by defeat and disorganization that it just quit.

Alexander Kerensky, from Simbirsk, was head of the timid wing of the Socialist movement in Russia. It was timid, but it was the biggest of all the Socialist factions.

So in typical fashion the hard-nosed Marxist element declared themselves the Bolsheviks, Russian for "the big party."

The real majority they labeled "Menshevik," for little.

To follow this international murder mystery on, you have to keep all these odd labels straight. And so remember that wherever you read here or elsewhere the words "Bolsheviks," "Marxists," and "Communists," they all mean the same people.

Anarchists are people who want to destroy all government by force and violence so the world can run itself—by what?—and at the opposite end are the Marxists, who want to destroy all other governments by force and violence so they can run the world, with remorseless and brutal discipline. In between are all shades and forms of government.

British Policy in Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 5, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Dr. Frank Kingdon from the New York Post of May 2, 1950:

TO BE FRANK
(By Dr. Frank Kingdon)

The ways of the British Foreign Office are always a wonder to watch in much the same was as it is fascinating to see a wily real-estate operator acquire extra lots by the use of dummies to conceal his own interest. Fascinating, but not endearing.

The dummy in the present case is called Abdullah, an intriguing little chieftain who managed to get control of a country containing about 350,000 wandering Bedouins which the kindly Foreign Office equipped with a well-trained fighting force called the Arab Legion. The pashas commanding this army were British, on the British Army pay roll, up to and including the onomatopoetic Glubb Pasha. In the books of the Foreign Office, the Bedouins were nothing, Glubb was a desert expert, the Arab Legion was a valuable frontier force, and Abdullah was a king and no people know better than the British how useful a king can be, provided he takes guidance with docility.

The real estate for which the Foreign Office had a hankering was called Palestine. The obstacle was an obstinate people who refused to hand over the deed. Instead, they drove out the British bailiffs and then beat back the neighbors the British set on them. The only force in the neighborhood left in shape to make life uncomfortable for the people who would not surrender was the Arab Legion.

It moved across the Jordan and possessed some of the land, including the Old City of Jerusalem. The Foreign Office still had the idea it might drive the embattled defenders of their farms and cities into the Mediterranean. When this dream was exploded, Abdullah, under orders, called for an armistice. His idea was to draw a long breath and recuperate for the final drive to the sea.

His only difficulty turned out to be that the people of the land got their breath first, and when he renewed his attack, they struck with such force that he knew he could not even hold the Old City. Seeing his peril, the Foreign Office jumped to his aid with a pious appeal to the United Nations to intervene, and fighting stopped with the little chieftain still holding both sides of the Jordan and still in Jerusalem.

The Foreign Office now was in a quandary. It clung to the idea of controlling Palestine, but in the glare of the United Nations it could not be quite crass enough to tell Abdullah to announce that he would at once annex what he had occupied by force. So it instructed him to be patient, until the sagacity of Whitehall had figured a more seemingly respectable procedure. They finally evolved the impeccable device of a referendum which, strange to relate, resulted in the people of the land watched by his army asking to be included in his kingdom. With this vote to support him, he annexed the land he occupied.

This done, the Foreign Office approved his action and accorded him full recognition as king, undoubtedly by the grace of God. At the same time, having their puppet well established on the borders of Israel and in possession of the Old City, they extended full recognition to the Government of Israel also.

The net outcome is that the Foreign Office is back in Palestine with an army it controls on Israel's most exposed border and dedicated to assuring that Israel shall not enlarge its territory. Not having been able to prevent Israel from coming to birth, the Foreign Office has compromised by keeping it within range of its guns.

Archie E. McCrea, 1880-1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT J. ENGEL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 5, 1950

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I received a copy of the Muskegon (Mich.) Chronicle yesterday. On the front page was a large picture of an old friend of mine I had known, loved, and respected for many years. At the bottom of the picture were these lines, "Archie E. McCrea, 1880–1950." That is all. Just the name of an old friend and two dates. I was shocked. I had a feeling of loss and sorrow, a feeling that can come only to one who had lost a very dear friend, an old friend who has meant much to him. I looked at that picture again and at the dates, 1880–1950, nearly 70 years, 40 years of which were spent editing a newspaper, the Muskegon Chronicle, a paper which he had built up with the help of those associated with him, from a small daily into one of the finest and best newspapers in the State and Nation. I thought of those many years of service, the good he had done, and the place he had filled in his community, State, and Nation. I thought of the great contribution he had made to his country as a citizen and to his God and his church as a great churchman. I had seen him just 2 weeks ago, a strong, powerful man lying there weak and helpless and I knew that the end was near. I knew that he would meet his Maker whom he had served all his life unafraid and with that confidence that comes after a life of Christian service. He had lived his life and he knew that he would soon hear the words, "Well done thou good and faithful servant, enter thou into the joy of thy Lord." As I talked to him for the last time, his wife stood by his side as she had stood through 43 years of married life. "Until death do us part" meant something to this couple who were reaching the end of a long and happy life. The memory of those years will help her bear her burden and I extend to her and her family my heartfelt sympathy in their loss.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include therein an article from the Muskegon Chronicle of which he was editor for 40 years, written by those who worked with him and loved him:

Archie Elbert McCrea, beloved editor of the Chronicle for 40 years, and known throughout the Nation as a leading layman of the Methodist Church, died at his home, 2471 Lake Shore Drive, at 8:45 a. m. today. He was 69 years old.

One of Michigan's foremost newspaper editors, and a towering personality in this community, Mr. McCrea had been seriously ill since early December. At that time he suffered from virus pneumonia and entered Hackley Hospital. He returned to his home just before Christmas only to suffer a serious heart involvement. His condition has been critical since, and the end came today within

a few minutes after he suffered a second coronary attack. Mrs. McCrea was at his side.

Tears flowed at the Chronicle office as news of his death was received, especially from those who had been associated with Mr. McCrea for years. The flag at the Chronicle was placed at half staff.

Bruce McCrea had visited his father yesterday and returned to Lansing last evening. Ralph S. McCrea, a brother, is in the South. He was notified of the death and is returning immediately.

No other personality had a greater influence on the growth and development of Greater Muskegon than Mr. McCrea during his more than 45 years of service with the Chronicle, 40 of them as managing editor and editor. He had served in the latter capacity for the last 14 years.

His intense interest and keen insight into the fields of government, education, youth, church, and charitable activities have left deep imprints on Greater Muskegon's civic and cultural life.

No man in Greater Muskegon ever gave more freely of his time and effort to his community than Mr. McCrea. Several years ago Mr. McCrea suffered a heart attack. Doctors warned that he must give up his outside activities. He agreed to resign from all but two—the presidency of the Hackley Hospital board of trustees and the teaching of his Sunday school class at the Lakeside Methodist Church.

He did so, but only briefly. During the last 2 years he took on even more duties than before. The load proved too great for him, as his family and friends repeatedly warned. But that is the way Mr. McCrea wanted it.

Almost until the minute of his death today he had looked forward to returning to his duties at the Chronicle. After all, the Muskegon Chronicle had been Mr. McCrea's life. He had seen it grow from a small daily to one of Michigan's leading newspapers.

Mr. McCrea was a native of Newaygo and until his death he retained membership in the Fremont Chamber of Commerce. A graduate of the Fremont High School in 1901, he taught in rural schools for 2 years before coming to Muskegon, where he took graduate work at the Muskegon High School and Hackley Manual Training from 1902 to 1904.

On the completion of his schooling he began his long career with the Chronicle, a career which led to his being considered one of this community's outstanding citizens. The newspapers of 1904—there were three in Muskegon at that time—were far removed from the papers of today. The city itself was only a fraction of its present size. It was in a humble position that Mr. McCrea started to work for the Chronicle. He was a solicitor of rural subscriptions and his tasks required that he travel the county's roads and lanes on his bicycle. But before he could even start in the newspaper business he was forced to borrow 50 cents from E. B. Dana, then publisher of the Chronicle, when he arrived for work the first time, July 6, 1904. He needed the money for repairs to his bicycle.

Mr. McCrea had known for some time that newspaper work was to be his chosen field, but he had never thought his start was to be as a subscription solicitor. He had hoped for something more where he would be able to report the day's happenings and their influences on the lives of residents of this area.

The rural subscription duties did not continue long. By the time the first snows came in December 1904 he was called into the office for the start of a succession of advances in the newspaper profession, attaining after 32 years the position of editor of the Chronicle. As Mr. McCrea continued his rise in the business of presenting the day's news and interpreting it, greater Muskegon was growing. The conversion of Muskegon to an industrial center after the decline of the lumber business and later its development as the arsenal of democracy in World War II left a deep impression on the editor of the Chronicle.

"On the life of no other single individual, I presume, has the life of the Greater Muskegon community impacted itself more persistently than on my own," he once said.

What he did not add was that his influence and foresight made a strong impact on the community.

His first job in the office was as a proofreader, but it was only a short time until there was a vacancy on the staff and, in 1905, Mr. McCrea became a reporter. After being the local reporter—covering the city hall, county building, social and fraternal functions and even football—he was named city editor in 1908.

He had only an inexperienced staff at this time, but he managed to produce a highly satisfactory paper. Reporters came and went, some going to larger cities where they made enviable reputations. Others were highly successful in other fields. Among his former reporters were John C. Beaukema, secretary-manager of the chamber of commerce, the late Harris E. Galpin and William G. Turner, both of whom became outstanding attorneys.

In 1911 Mr. McCrea was named managing editor, a post he held for 25 years. He was named editor in 1936. Twice during his years of directing policies of the Chronicle, Mr. McCrea saw this Nation weather perilous times in the World Wars.

During World War I he won the acclaim of fellow American journalists for his editorials. In 1918 he was given a certificate for special excellence by Editor and Publisher, trade paper of the journalistic world, for his editorial Back Them Up in support of the Fourth Liberty Bond drive.

Shortly after World War I there was a crisis in Muskegon municipal government and the city seemed headed for bankruptcy. Mr. McCrea was chosen as a member of the charter commission which in 1920 presented the proposal for the commission-manager form of government to replace the old ward system, which was one of the main reasons for Muskegon's distressed position. His background of municipal affairs made him a valuable member of the committee which outlined a new form of government adopted by the voters in 1919 and which has led to great improvements in governmental administration.

Mr. McCrea served on the Muskegon Board of Education from 1928 to 1930.

His experience and background in municipal and school affairs made him a valued member of the Muskegon County Tax Study Committee, which reported its recommendations last year after more than a year's study of all branches of Government.

One of the pioneers in YMCA work here, Mr. McCrea served as one of its directors since its organization in 1916. He was president from 1918 to 1928 and was a member of the national council since 1926. He was chairman of the committee on public affairs from 1936 to 1945 and a member of the international board.

His interest in journalism extended beyond his newspaper work, which for the last 14 years consisted chiefly of editorial writing and directing of editorial policy. He was a member of the advisory board of the University of Michigan journalism school, a contributor to the Michigan Christian Advocate, and a member of the board of publications of the Methodist Church. He was also a member of the American Society of Newspaper Editors.

He was active in West Michigan Tourist and Resort Association, having served as a director from 1925 to 1944 and as a vice president from 1926 to 1944. He was a member of the board of trustees of Hackley Hospital and served as its president. He also was a member of the Kiwanis Club, honored by its "Flowers for the Living" tribute in 1948.

Mr. McCrea in 1944 was named to the original recreation board in Muskegon, and McCrea Field is named in his honor. He was appointed in 1947 to the board of directors of the United Health and Welfare Fund of Michigan. In 1940 he was named vice president of the chamber of commerce and was appointed to the committee on national defense. It was that year he was first mentioned in Who's Who and has remained listed since.

His life and interests left a distinctive good effect on Muskegon's civic and cultural life, but he always expressed gratitude for all that the community had given him.

He married Eudora Hope Wells here September 3, 1907. He leaves, in addition to Mrs. McCrea, two sons, Malcolm R., a member of the staff of the Saginaw News; Bruce D., of the Lansing State Journal staff; a daughter, Mrs. E. E. Cowles, of Burr Oak; four brothers, Ray, Ralph S., and Frank, of Muskegon, and Fred, of Grand Haven; a sister, Effie McCrea, of Muskegon; and five grandchildren.

National Recognition Awarded Mr. McCrea for Outstanding Methodist Church Work

No Methodist layman in Michigan has done more for his parish church or his denomination than Archie E. McCrea.

Born into a Seventh-Day Adventist family near Fremont, he became a Methodist more than 40 years ago when he joined the Lakeside Methodist Church and started on a career of active Christian service.

This career has taken him from his home church into district, State, and National service, not only for the church but also for the Young Men's Christian Association and for Albion College, a Methodist institution.

Paralleling an outstanding succession of more than four decades of service in his profession and to his community, has been his record in Christian action.

He served his own church as Sunday school superintendent for 25 years, and through all the years as a teacher and leader of young people's classes and youth groups until illness prevented.

Since 1907 his name and that of Lakeside Methodist Church have been synonymous. Most of these years he was a member of its official board, a leader of its brotherhood and its official lay delegate to annual Michigan conferences.

Five years after he joined the church, Mr. McCrea's influence in church circles began to spread through the County Sunday School Association, now the educational division of the County Council of Churches.

From Lakeside church lay leader, he became Michigan conference lay leader, a member of the general board of lay activities and Michigan conference lay delegate to three quadrennial general conferences of the Methodist Church in 1940, 1944, and 1948. He was a member of the committee on episcopacy which recommended the appointment of new bishops at the 1948 general conference, and on other committees.

He was a trustee of the Michigan Methodist Foundation, chairman of the Michigan Conference Commission on World Service and Finance and, in 1949, on the social-action committee of the Michigan Council of Churches. He also was on the conference policy committee.

The latest, and one of the outstanding tasks Mr. McCrea shouldered for the church was the Michigan conference chairmanship of the Albion College advancement program. His goal was to lead the drive to raise $400,000 from western Michigan churches for the college in the fall of 1949 toward a $5,000,000 endowment fund.

In June 1941, Albion College conferred upon Mr. McCrea the honorary degree of L. L. D., Doctor of Learned Laws. His three children are graduates of Albion, but one of the few regrets of his life had been that he did not have the opportunity to attend Albion.

Soon after his zeal for church work carried him into wider and wider fields, he became identified with the Greater Muskegon Young Men's Christian Association. He was a charter signer of its constitution in November 1916, was elected to its first board of directors and served continuously since.

Reelected to the board for another 3-year term in December 1949, his name appeared on every ballot cast.

He was president of the local YM board for 11 years from 1919 to 1930, during which time he led the board through its $425,000 campaign for a building fund in 1925. In 1920 Mr. McCrea, almost single-handedly, kept the association alive when financial difficulties threatened its existence.

He was a member of the executive committee of the building campaign and of the building committee. He has served as chairman of almost every local Y committee.

As in his church work, his greatest interest outside his home and profession in recent years has been in national and world services.

For 30 years he was a member of the Michigan State Y committee, and recently was chairman of its World Youth Fund and world service committees.

He was a member of the national council of the Y for 25 years, chairman of the national committee on public affairs for 10 years, and 4 years chairman of its committee on membership, and a national vice president in 1946.

When honored by the Lakeside Church in 1941, he said:

"This church owes me nothing; it has been my inspiration and I owe everything to the church."

This expressed his sincere conviction on his relationship to the church and the YMCA as an expression of Christianity in action.

What To Do in a Cold War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 4, 1950

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me at the twentieth annual dinner of the Railway Business Women's Association, Cleveland chapter, held at the Hotel Cleveland, Cleveland, April 29, 1950:

The rift between the Communist world and the free world grows wider day by day. The tensions are increasing alarmingly. As the Soviets move from one provocative act to another, there is no blinking the fact that our relations with Russia are being strained toward the breaking point. My colleague, Congressman MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, went so far, after our plane was shot down over the Baltic Sea, as to demand that we break off diplomatic relations.

Secretary of State Acheson expressed his belief in a press conference on April 21 that the world situation was serious and tense. He did not believe, however, that it is heading into an armed conflict at this time. Whether or not it does depends, of course, almost entirely upon the Russians. As President Truman said in his address to the American Society of Newspaper Editors April 20, "You and I know that the United States is wholly dedicated to the cause of peace. We have no purpose of going to war except in defense of freedom." The Russians, on the other hand, will resort to war whenever they deem it necessary to further their imperialistic ambitions. Direct aggression does not seem necessary at the present moment, since they are succeeding so well with indirect aggression. Witness Czechoslovakia and China.

How then shall we explain their growing recklessness? Not only have they shot down one of our unarmed planes, they are behind the threatened May march on western Berlin; they have demanded withdrawal of our troops from Trieste; they have demanded that Turkey take them into the control of the Dardanelles; they have inspired the attempt to prevent shipments of arms from reaching western European nations. I incline to the belief that these are simply more moves in the cold war—the period, as John Foster Dulles calls it in his new book, War or Peace, of no war, no peace—not preliminaries to a hot war. I believe these harassments are intended to soften us up, preliminary, perhaps, to a diplomatic move for new negotiations in which the Soviets might expect concessions from a frightened Western World.

This very uncertainty about the meaning of Russian moves is one of the chief objectives of the Kremlin's cold-war strategy. All the political prophets agree that we must expect more and more provocative moves, more saber rattling, and that we will need strong nerves and clear heads to avoid hasty and ill-considered action.

Which brings me to the question I should like to discuss with you tonight: "What To Do in a Cold War."

Secretary of State Acheson touched upon that question in his address to the American Society of Newspaper Editors on April 22. It was understood in Washington that his address was considered by the Department of State to be one of his most important efforts. Mr. Acheson did not minimize the seriousness of the crisis confronting us. "Make no mistake about it," he said, "we are faced with a challenge and a threat to the very basis of our civilization and to the very safety of the free world, the only kind of world in which that civilization can exist."

Among the six lines of action he proposed to meet that challenge and that threat he properly placed first "the demonstration that our own faith in freedom is a burning and a fighting faith. If we are clear about this," he continued, "if we are full of passion about this, then we have in our hearts and minds the most dynamic and revolutionary concept in human history, and one which properly strikes terror to every dictator, to every tyrant who would attempt to regiment and depress men anywhere."

What is this freedom, in which we must have a burning and a fighting faith? I must confess that it seems to me that Mr. Acheson too much restricts the concept of freedom. He seems to limit it to "freedom of the mind and spirit"; in another place he speaks of the "exercise of the freedom of the human mind." In another address, delivered on March 16 at the University of California, Mr. Acheson gave indications that he understands freedom in a fuller sense. Discussing the philosophy of a free society he said, "The free society values the individual as an end in himself. We can see no moral compromise with the contrary thesis of international communism. That the dignity of the human individual is of no importance as against the interest of the state." Here the Secretary touches upon something that is more fundamental than freedom to our way of life, the dignity and rights of the individual as a person. It is because he possesses that dignity that a man has a right to freedom. Over against the free society based on the inalienable rights of the human person, among which is freedom, Mr. Acheson rightly places the "police state with all that that implies: a regimentation of the worker that is hardly distinguishable from slave labor; a loss to society of those things which appear to us to make life worth living; a denial of the fundamental truths embodied in all the great religions of the world." Mr. Acheson recognizes that "there is a moral issue of the clearest nature." It is only when we understand clearly that a moral issue lies at the bottom of today's crisis that we can hope to summon up the power to confront and conquer our adversaries.

We need also to interpret and to explore the full meaning of that freedom which according to Mr. Acheson, should inspire us. Although it is only one aspect of democracy, freedom is often used to stand for democracy as we Americans know it. Both Secretary Acheson and President Truman frequently do so. It would be better, I think, to speak of the free state as opposed to the police state. No one has expressed the essence of the free state better than did General Marshall when he was Secretary of State. At the meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers at Moscow he declared: "We believe that human beings have certain inalienable rights—that is, rights which may not be given or taken away. They include the right of every individual to develop his mind and his soul in the ways of his own choice, free of fear and coercion—provided only that he does not interfere with the rights of others. To us a society is not democratic if men who respect the rights of their fellow men are not free to express their own beliefs and convictions without fear that they may be snatched away from their home or family."

Several years ago, the Federal Council of Churches, in a public statement, deplored the fact that there was not at the time any impressive and decisive alinement of the moral and spiritual forces of the world against communism. Neither is there any today. The council urged that our Nation "stand plainly for something so simple that all men can understand, and so clearly right that all men of good will must agree." That goal, the council said, "is a world of free societies wherein all men as children of God are recognized to have certain basic rights including liberty to hold and change beliefs and practices according to reason and conscience, freedom to differ even from their own government, and immunity from persecution or coercion on account of personal, spiritual, and intellectual beliefs."

This, of course, is the traditional political doctrine of American democracy, and it is that in which I presume Mr. Acheson wants us to have a burning and a fighting faith. It is even more important, it seems to me, that we have a living faith—a faith in these precious principles by which we live each day of our lives. In what I consider the most impressive and practical passage of his April 22 address, Mr. Acheson declared: "Today we all represent the United States. Everything that happens in this country can be flashed in a second to the uttermost reaches of the world. Today, in a very real sense, the United States represents itself to the world. The world hears speeches which are made in the Congress. The world hears what is said over our radio. The world reads what is said in our press. If there are acts or words of violence, discrimination, and irresponsibility, the world sees and hears them. Everything we do or say enters into the picture of America which is seen abroad."

There is much talk of enlarging the operations of the Voice of America. But already, as the Secretary says, "America speaks with a thousand voices," and often our deeds

speak louder than our words. And it is our deeds at home which do much to defeat the words which we beam abroad. We profess to be the leaders of the free world, but we give the impression to foreigners that by freedom we mean license. Some years ago, a Canadian observer thus expressed the foreigner's reaction to our conduct:

"Assuming that the United States will use its leadership for the benefit of the world, there still remains the question of American morality. This will overshadow every other question, because the paramount issue of humanity in our time is a moral, not a political or economic one. When the Republic was founded it stood, over and above all purely economic and selfish ambitions, for the freedom of the individual under God. The principles of American democracy, as it began were inseparable from a deep religious conviction, and from an individual life of virtue. The most dangerous thing that has happened to American life in the last several generations, and probably the most profound thing, is the attack on these original ideals. The paramount question is not whether the American people can solve the political and economic problems of the world, but whether they can solve the problems of their own life."

No one would deny that our private and public morality has declined even further since that was written. Juvenile delinquency is on the increase, family life is threatened, organized crime is rampant, public entertainment becomes daily more licentious, and our public entertainers live public lives of immorality; religious feuding grows in bitterness; intolerance mounts rapidly.

President Truman said to the newspaper editors: "We must make ourselves known as we really are—not as Communist propaganda pictures us." I think we would all admit that if we took him literally, we would hardly be 100 percent examples of the democratic ideal. By our conduct we must give no color of truth to the Communist charge that we are decadent. Let us try to make ourselves what we should be. Then the Voice of America will carry conviction to all the peoples of the earth.

In that task, if I may make bold to say so, the women of America have an important, even decisive part to play. You can clean up Hollywood and its sordid productions; you can demand that the unholy alliance between criminals and politicians be dissolved; you can fight the intolerance that belies our professions of democratic equality; you can demand that the religious groups who say they work for world peace first make peace among themselves.

So many people ask: What can I as an individual do in the cold war? Here is the answer: Help make democracy work at home so that it will win all over the world.

Electricity and the Public Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, it is a pleasure to me to offer a splendid address by Hon. Gordon Clapp to be included in the RECORD. Mr. Clapp, as Chairman of the Board of the Tennessee Valley Authority, delivered this speech before the annual meeting of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association in Chicago in March 1950. The fine comments made by Mr. Clapp on public benefits from electric power plants are certainly worthy of being called to the attention of the general public.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ELECTRICITY AND THE PUBLIC INTEREST

(Address by Gordon R. Clapp, Chairman of the Board, Tennessee Valley Authority, annual meeting of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, Chicago, Ill., March 7, 1950)

Private corporations generate and sell four-fifths—80 percent—of all the electric power used in the United States. The other one-fifth is supplied by public plants and systems owned by the Federal and local governments and private consumer-cooperative corporations.

The electricity business, whoever owns and operates it, is a public business. And it has been so regarded by Americans for many, many years. This idea is not new, foreign, or alien; it is as native to this land as corn bread; it is a more ancient American tradition than the ice-cream cone. The same can be said for public ownership of electric plants. It has been a part of the American pattern from the beginning of the industry. By the end of 1882, the more or less accepted date of birth of the industry, there were four publicly owned electric systems. From that time on publicly and privately owned systems have been a characteristic feature of the American economy.

Private corporations engaged in the electric business enjoy privileges granted by the public. They use the public streets and roads as right-of-way for poles, lines, and underground circuits; they are permitted to exercise the sovereign right of eminent domain to secure land and right-of-way for their plants and facilities; because of the nature of their function they occupy the position of veritable monopolies in the areas they serve; laws are passed to assure them a reasonable level of earnings. Now, of course, none of these privileges or prerogatives is granted by the public to electric corporations as a mark of favor. They are granted in order that the companies as a vehicle for prudent investment may do an efficient job of public service.

The operation of an electric system is a managerial job. The managers can be either private or public managers, as the public elects. But whether managers are hired by a public agency or a private corporation, the public has a right to expect them to perform a true public function.

If the private utilities satisfy the public objectives of providing low-cost electricity in abundance, they have a good chance of staying in the business. But if they fail the public—consumers generally, and especially the farmers—then the private managers should not be surprised if they are fired by the consumers and replaced by public managers. When private utilities do a good job, as many of them do, there is little public demand for dismissing the private companies as the public's agent.

The public character of electric service is dictated by the very nature and function of electricity. Electricity is not just another commercial product, to be placed on the commodity market at the highest price it will bring. Electricity is energy, a basic necessity of community and national life, an absolute requirement for minimum national strength and security. Every community is entitled to an adequate supply at reasonable rates. It is one of the important requirements for industrial development. I do not need to tell this audience how important it is for the rural life of the Nation, both as an essential of modern, comfortable living and as a tireless "hired hand" to perform farm tasks more easily and more profitably.

These facts are elementary. But a persistent segment of the privately owned power industry is attempting to make the American public forget the history and purpose of the electric business. There are spokesmen for private power interests who seem to have hypnotized themselves into thinking they are engaged in a business as private as selling automobiles, groceries, or shoes. So every time the public concerns itself with the control or expansion or ownership of electric facilities, we have outcries of "socialism," or "communism," or "totalitarianism." This noisy campaign is led by hired mouthpieces of that part of the private-utility industry that wants to hold its place of special privilege by a battle of words instead of by a record of progressive public service.

Some of these spokesmen try to be very subtle. For example, you have probably heard this one: "The electric industry is now in the front-line trenches fighting the battle of free enterprise." By this stale metaphor they hope to scare the businessman on Main Street into the belief that the private utility and real private enterprise people are partners in a big fight. Ask your business friends on Main Street how many of them are guaranteed a protected market and permitted to exercise the right of eminent domain.

What happens to the ownership of the utility industry has very little to do with the real free enterprise of this country. But the quality of management and the policies and practices utility management pursues have a lot to do with real free enterprise. The availability of more and more electricity at lower and lower rates has everything to do with the growth and greater freedom of American enterprise in thousands of rural communities, towns, and cities.

Then there is the less subtle and more transparent device used by one of the highest paid utility lobbyists in the business. In a fancy hand-out attacking the TVA's proposed to build another steam plant, this man said:

"If the Federal Government can assume the obligation to meet the full needs of population for one commercial product—note well the words 'commercial product'—then it can assume a similar obligation for other products. Thus, the way would be opened for state socialism."

Electricity as a commodity—a "commercial product"—that seems like a quaint idea to me. When you press the button in your dairy barn to operate the milking machine or the separator the operation is quite different from purchasing nylons for your wife or daughter across the counter of the store of your choice. If the nylons cost more than you want to pay you will probably buy something cheaper or go to another store or go without. Electricity is energy and service—and the owner of the electric facilities that supply the energy to your milking machine, as a practical matter, controls the only counter you can go to. And you can't let your cows wait while you bargain about the electricity.

* * * * *

In the development of the river, TVA was directed by the TVA Act to control its flow primarily for the purposes of promoting navigation and controlling floods and to produce, transmit, and sell power so far as may be consistent with such purposes. It was this and other power provisions of the act which were most violently debated in the 1920's and early thirties as the principles finally incorporated in the act were hammered out. There were the usual contentions on the part of private utility spokesmen. First, they contended that the Government should not build projects which would generate power, claiming that this would simply add an unsalable surplus of

electricity in a region already adequately supplied. (The facts I shall come to in a moment make that claim look ridiculous today.) Second, they contended that if the Government did build generating plants, it should not build transmission lines; instead, they said, the private utilities could be persuaded to purchase the power at the bus bar for distribution over their lines—and at their existing high rates.

This offer did not impress the people of the Tennessee Valley; they already had a demonstration of the idea of selling at the bus bar. At Wilson Dam, built by the Government at Muscle Shoals under the National Defense Act of 1916, the power had been sold at the bus bar for several years to a private utility. The power generated at Wilson Dam was seasonal, interruptible power, dependent upon the ups and downs of an uncontrolled stream flow. The Government had no outlet for the power except to the adjacent private company. So the power was sold for what the company was willing to pay—an average of only 2 mills a kilowatt-hour. A few miles from the bus bar the customers of this utility paid several cents a kilowatt-hour.

The people, the Congress, and the President were not persuaded that this pattern of sale at the bus bar should be applied to the whole Tennessee Valley. They went ahead and incorporated provisions in the TVA Act which spelled out in detail the public character of electric service. The act authorized the construction of transmission lines, thereby opening the way to widespread marketing of power rather than reliance upon one or two large monopoly transmitters and distributors. It provided, further, that the power facilities as distinguished from the flood-control and navigation facilities, were to be self-supporting and self-liquidating. And I can add right here that they are that, and more.

But the Congress did not stop there; it went on to recognize the vital role which power could play in the general economic development of the region. It provided that "the projects herein shall be considered primarily as for the benefit of the people of the section as a whole and particularly the domestic and rural consumers to whom power can economically be made available." It authorized and directed TVA to "make studies, experiments, and determinations to promote the wider and better use of electric power for agricultural and domestic use, or for small or local industries." It declared TVA "may cooperate with State governments, or their subdivisions or agencies, with educational or research institutions, and with cooperatives and other organizations, in the application of electric power to the fuller and better-balanced development of the resources of the region."

And finally, it made certain that the power developed by public investment on public streams should get into the hands of the people themselves. It directed that TVA in its sales of power should "give preference to States, counties, municipalities, and cooperative organizations of citizens and farmers, not organized or doing business for profit, but primarily for the purpose of supplying electricity to its own citizens or members." (Today, 61 percent of TVA's electricity goes to these preferred customers, including other Federal agencies, such as the Atomic Energy Commission.)

* * * * *

The people of the valley region today use in their homes more than four and one-half times as much electricity as they did in 1933—an average of 2,873 kilowatt-hours per residential consumer in 1949—and about 70 percent more than the average residential consumer in the United States. At the same time, they paid a little over 1.5 cents per kilowatt-hour, or just a little over half as much as the average cost for electric se. in the homes of the United States.

* * * * *

Since the end of the war rural el trification has been able to hit its full stride. At the end of 1949, there were more than 461,000 rural consumers served in the Tennessee Valley region. The number of farms served was more than 320,000, or more than 70 percent of all farms in the region; compare this with the 15,000 farms which had electric service in 1933.

Last year alone, electric service was made available to 75,000 farms through the construction by cooperative and municipal systems of 17,000 miles of rural line.

The farms in the area used 445,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity last year, as compared with 112,000,000 kilowatt-hours in 1945. In 1933, before TVA, they used only 9,000,000 kilowatt-hours.

More than two-thirds of the farms served have received initial service since June 30, 1945.

Cooperative associations distributed TVA power to about 363,000 consumers.

Naturally, the Tennessee Valley is proud of this record of progress in putting electricity to work. Credit for this result goes beyond the TVA—it goes to the hard-headed businessmen who head the operations of the municipal and cooperative systems and the consumers who elect them. A major share of the credit must go to those Senators and Congressmen, led by George Norris of Nebraska, and inspired by the vision and leadership of President Roosevelt, who wrote into the TVA Act the provisions which governed the production, sale, and distribution of power. And, above all, Congress and the President have consistently added to the growing and profitable public investment in the system which puts these policies into practice for the benefit of the region and for the strength and security of the Nation.

There are several features in the experience of the Tennessee Valley which may deserve to be examined by people in other parts of the country who face generally similar problems.

One of these is the division of responsibility between TVA, which generates and transmits power and sells it wholesale at the city or cooperative gate (and to other Federal projects, several large industrial plants, and to utilities), and the municipal and cooperative electric systems, which buy the power under wholesale power contracts with TVA and distribute it to the ultimate consumer.

TVA carries on the part of the business in which efficiency and economy can be promoted by a large-scale integrated operation. Operation of the TVA system must meet the primary purposes of navigation and flood control as well as power. This part of the job requires engineering skill and knowledge of the complexities of relating hydro generation to a multipurpose water-control system and large auxiliary steam plants. TVA produces power in an integrated system of 28 dams, reservoirs, and powerhouses, and several large steam-electric generating stations (425,000 kilowatts of steam capacity in the total of more than 2,700,000 kilowatts; 375,000 kilowatts of additional steam power is under construction at the New Johnsonville steam plant). Generation of power from this large network is the part of the job with which the ultimate consumer has least direct contact.

But the distribution of electricity, where it directly touches the lives of the people who use it, is a direct concern of the consumers. In the Tennessee Valley this part of the job is in the hands of the locally owned and operated systems. Their officials set the policies and make the decisions within the framework of their agreement with the TVA. Shall surplus revenues be used to pay off indebtedness, for expansion of the system, or a reduction in rates? Down which highway will the next new rural lines go? What steps shall be taken to build, load, or acquaint new rural consumers with the multiple uses of electricity on the farm? These are questions that are decided, not by some remote higher up in a Federal office or a private utility headquarters, but by local power boards and system managers who are in daily contact with the people they serve and for whom they work.

This clear divorcement between wholesale generation and transmission operations and retail distribution performs another valuable function. It shows very clearly where the hopes for low electricity rates must be realized. For the first time on a large scale, the experience in the Tennessee Valley has revealed facts about the relationship between the cost of producing and transmitting power and the price paid by the farmer or the householder at the end of the line. Here the separate costs are clearly set forth. The TVA sells power at wholesale rates that compare favorably with, but are not much lower than, wholesale rates of some utilities; they are within the range of the costs of generating power in modern plants of private utilities. In 1949, the average rate paid by the 145 municipal and cooperative systems, that is, the wholesale rate, was 4.29 mills; the average for the 50 cooperatives was 5.15 mills. These rates paid to the TVA produce ample revenues to cover all the costs of producing and transmitting the power, and more besides. In the last fiscal year, TVA's net operating revenues of $21,500,000 represented a 5-percent return on its average power investment of $430,000,000.

The municipal and cooperative systems distribute TVA power at resale rates among the lowest in the Nation. They too are successful financially. In the last fiscal year, with revenues of $70,000,000, they had earnings of $14,000,000. They could have paid TVA 2 mills more per kilowatt-hour for wholesale power and still have cleared more than a million dollars—after all costs, including depreciation, and after interest on long-term debt.

Now these figures mean one thing above everything else. They mean that the low rates in the TVA region are not due primarily to low generating and transmitting costs for power, important though low wholesale rates may be financially to a municipal or cooperative system. No difference of 1 or 2 mills per kilowatt-hour in the cost of wholesale power, or even of several mills, can account for the fact that in the Tennessee Valley region, in 1933, people paid about 6 cents per kilowatt-hour; today they pay only about one-fourth of that—a drop of more than 4 cents per kilowatt-hour—for electricity used in their homes.

This reduction in rates cannot be explained by the difference between TVA's wholesale rates and the private utility cost of generating and transmitting power in the Tennessee Valley before TVA. A difference of a few mills at the bus bar cannot cause a difference of 4 cents in the home. The basic reason for low rates in the valley today is that they were set low in the first place, in the firm conviction that such a policy of pricing electricity, coupled with proper electrical-development promotion and education, would bring about a great increase in power consumption thus reducing the cost per unit while producing sufficient revenues to cover these costs.

This experience in the valley is worth examining in connection with the offer now sometimes made by private utilities, or advocated by their propaganda satellites, namely, that the private utilities should be allowed to purchase power produced by Federal projects at the bus bar. This, they say,

would avoid construction of duplicate transmission lines, while the savings from the purchase of Government power would be passed along to consumers.

Both these propositions need to be examined with great care when made in specific instances. Transmission lines may need to be duplicated. As many a farm wife in the Tennessee Valley could have told you a few years ago, in the prerural electrification days, if you need two buckets of water it sometimes pays to carry two buckets. And second, the promise to pass along the savings, a difference of a mill or two per kilowatt-hour at wholesale—may or may not mean a thing by the time the electricity reaches your home. It may be that in some instances the public interest—that is, the consumers, as well as the taxpayer-investors—can be served by selling power at the bus bar to private utilities; certainly the American people are a practical lot, willing to look over every proposition on its merits. But in examining any proposal, it should be remembered that whoever controls the power between the generating plant and your home will govern the price of electricity to the consumer. Consumers should keep their eye on the ball and see to it that the sale of power at the bus bar is guarded by adequate controls, and that those who buy it, whether public or private agencies, not only believe in, but practice the policy of low rates and abundant use.

Today the demand for electric power in the TVA area has reached a point where TVA is hard put to keep up with it. Expansion of facilities is being carried on at a fast pace, but TVA will have no surplus for export or to serve an expanded area. Last year, in order to meet the normal demands of the region, TVA commenced the construction of a large steam plant, the New Johnsonville steam plant, on the shores of Kentucky Lake, in west Tennessee; in more recent months, a second steam plant has been proposed, as well as expansion of the plant now under construction, largely to meet the increased requirements of the Government at the Oak Ridge atomic energy plant.

Sales to private utilities outside the TVA area are being reduced or cut off, except for interchange and stand-by agreements to protect service of TVA and utility systems and for economical operation. TVA's inability and reluctance to expand its service area is a disappointment to many neighboring rural cooperatives and cities whose power supply is inadequate and whose rates seem too high. New neighbors are springing up—federations of REA cooperatives outside the TVA service area but adjacent to it, mostly north of the TVA system. In some cases they are finding it difficult to obtain an adequate supply of power from private utilities in their areas, or to secure contracts for wholesale power at reasonable rates without restrictions as to industrial loads or urban areas which may be served. No such restrictions obtain in the TVA area, of course; cooperative associations can, and do, serve the industrial loads in their areas of operations and pay no premium for power delivered to such customers. Many of the 50 cooperatives serve some urban, as well as rural, areas; in fact, more than a fifth of all the cooperative customers live in towns and villages.

With some of these new neighbors, who are considering the construction of their own generating plants, TVA has discussed interchange arrangements similar to those we have with private utility neighbors. Such arrangements, if they can be worked out, we are sure will prove mutually beneficial. But the TVA is not able to supply these new agencies on a firm power basis. TVA has its hands full keeping up with the growth in the area it now serves.

Many cooperatives outside the TVA area now find themselves forced to build or acquire generating plants and transmission lines to assure their members of an adequate supply of power, without load restrictions and at a reasonable cost. This growing trend is a general index of the attitude of some of the private companies on whom consumers depend for power. Companies intent upon serving a broad public interest will help you accomplish your purposes: To supply your members abundant electricity at the lowest possible cost. Private companies, which regard your members solely as a market for their commodity and thus place their interest above yours, their convenience above your necessity, are inviting, yes, forcing you to take the electric service business back into your own hands. The best way for the private companies to remain private is to show more enterprise.

For of this you may be sure: The direction of power policy is not going to be determined by impassioned debates over socialism, statism, and private enterprise. The status of electric service as a public function is too well established in the American pattern to be decided by a battle about abstract doctrine. The final decision as to who provides electric service is going to be decided by the people themselves on a practical basis, case by case. And it will be decided on the basis of how electricity—the lifeblood of a modern economy—may be made available more and more abundantly, through reliable services and at the lowest possible cost to the consumer.

Partition of Ireland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY J. DAVENPORT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 5, 1950

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered by Brig. Gen. Eric Dorman O'Gowan, British Army, retired, at a mass meeting honoring the heroes of the Easter uprising in Ireland calling for the end of the partition of Ireland on Easter Monday, April 10, 1950:

As you have heard, I have come direct from my home in Ulster to speak to you tonight. I'd like you to note that when I say Ulster, I do not mean Northern Ireland; I refer to that part of Ulster which is already free, for my home is County Cavan. I speak as a private person and as an Ulsterman. My stock in purely Celtic, a race which was in Ulster before the British came there and will be in Ulster long after the last Briton has left it. As an Ulsterman I naturally deplore the division of my historic province into two parts by a border laid down in the interest of Great Britain and supported by British bayonet; a border which did not exist when I was a boy and which I trust soon to see abolished.

It has been said that this border is put there with the consent of three governments—the Irish, the British, and the Northern Ireland Government. I wish to make it clear that we in Ireland do not and dare not recognize as final any interim agreement which may have been made in the past 25 years, because history demonstrates beyond refute that the border was imposed on my country against the expressed will of 85 percent of the population of Ireland by threat of force and by a trick of the British Cabinet. Let no one therefore mislead you into believing that the border is something final and irrevocable.

It cannot be emphasized too strongly that this matter of the unification of the territory of Ireland under an Irish Government is not an internal domestic issue. It is an issue on an international level between two sovereign states: Ireland and the United Kingdom of Great Britain. That the issue exists at all is the responsibility of the British Government which Government short-sightedly believes that a divided Ireland better serves its purpose so strategically and economically.

Thus, at the present time, there are six counties out of the province to which I belong which remain an integral part of the United Kingdom, sending representatives to the Westminster Parliament; and, therefore, the abuses to which I am going to refer must ultimately be laid at Britain's door.

It does not suit the book of the British Government that this should be widely known; much trouble is taken to make it appear that the local administration set up in Northern Ireland, the British bridgehead in Ireland, is the responsible autonomous authority for all that occurs in their area. This cannot be true because in fact the London government retains strict control over defense, taxation, and foreign relations, but it leaves to their chosen agents in Northern Ireland the task of maintaining law and order, administering justice, and taxing for local needs.

Who then are their chosen agents? We know well that they are drawn from the ranks of the British colonials planted in Ulster during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries for this very purpose. We also know that the border has been drawn through Ulster so as to exclude the greatest number of the native Irish, and thus insure the colonial element of perpetual majority in the Northern Ireland Parliament.

Thus by a simple process of drawing a border where no division had ever been before, a minority in Ireland has been turned into the controlling majority in Northern Ireland. In Northern Ireland, therefore, politics is a matter of flags—"the majority" supports the Union Jack; the Irish minority supports the flag of Ireland. Politics is, therefore, a matter of repression; the dominant regime is expected by the British Government to insure perpetually British control in their area, and so long as British control exists, colonial predominance in government is automatically perpetuated.

It is impossible, therefore, that there should be in Northern Ireland any but the facade of democracy; the regime is a dictatorship, and within his limitations the Prime Minister of Northern Ireland is the most complete puppet dictator this side of the iron curtain.

This undemocratic institution is supported not only by the full military backing of the United Kingdom, but also by a private army comprising 3,000 regular armed constables, backed by trained reserve of 1,200 armed special constables—all hand-picked for their political adherence to the Northern Ireland colonial Tory regime.

Nowhere else in the British Isles is there an armed police force. The significance of an armed police force in the British bridgehead of Northern Ireland derives from the fact that the Northern Ireland Government is determined to have its own army available even should British forces be withdrawn.

This private army of the Ulster-British is required, of course, not to protect its frontiers from external attack, but to insure the docility of the native Irish population which remains in the six county areas in the proportion of 5 to 8, a resentful and suppressed minority, which refuses absolutely to accept the constitutional position. This minority is heavily taxed for the privilege of main-

taining a government abhorrent to it which it is totally unable to remove by any democratic process. Note that the tour now taking place in America by the Tory Premier of Northern Ireland is paid for by public moneys and approximately 1 pound in every 8 comes from the pockets of this resentful Irish minority. That is taxation without representation in its most modern form.

In order to support their authority by legal means the Northern Ireland Government employs an iniquitous instrument known as the Civil Authorities (Special Powers) Act. That act permits the officials of the Government to confine population in any area to its houses, to search banking accounts for funds which might be directed against it, and to confiscate those funds if found, to impose the death sentence for the mere carrying of a firearm without authority, to search any house or building or motor vehicle, to arrest without warrant, and to imprison without trial, and to ban any meeting which it does not wish to be held, and to prevent under pain of arrest the display of the Irish flag anywhere north of the border.

I cannot believe that any fair-minded American brought up in a democratic atmosphere could read the document on which the powers of the Northern Ireland Government are based without revulsion.

Recently after vigorous representations by the Irish Government in the Council of Europe, a number of sections of this obnoxious act was suspended until publicity given to them at Strasbourg had died down. On the 5th of April of this year these suspended regulations have been reimposed. The Irish in Northern Ireland have had the cat-and-mouse experience of freedom granted and then withdrawn.

It is difficult for you here to imagine any element of a self-respecting population being compelled to live perpetually under such a regime and to maintain its loyalty to the Irish nation in the knowledge that they have only to line up with their Tory masters to receive the benefits and privileges which are considerable and are now reserved for the supporters of the Northern Ireland Government and the connection with Britain.

Let me give you a few concrete examples: Last St. Patrick's Day the King in London presented shamrocks to the Irish guards; a memorial was unveiled in Armagh City to the Irish Fusiliers, but throughout Northern Ireland all national demonstrations were banned and the truncheon was used by armed police against meetings displaying the Irish flag. Again, recently also in Armagh a British ex-soldier was arrested for carrying an Irish flag in a procession. At his trial, he stated that he had been taught in the British Army to fight for the freedom of small nations. He was going on fighting for the freedom of one small nation. It was admitted at that trial by the police that though there was no objection to the banner of Communist Russia being paraded anywhere in Northern Ireland, the Irish flag was taboo.

I absolutely refuse to believe that any American would accept the situation in Northern Ireland as a reasonable way of life for the Irish population there. You will understand, therefore, why we in Free Ireland utterly refuse to cooperate with the regime which treats the people of our race so abnormally.

Now I would like to come to the wider issue: Ireland is vetoed by Russia from participation in the United Nations and her northern counties are incorporated in Great Britain. She is thus debarred from any activity in the defense of western Europe or the Atlantic Pact. You Americans are expending vast sums of money in coordinating defense of the western Atlantic coast line, yet you appear to ignore the strategical gap created by the fact that Ireland has got to be left out of your deliberations. Generals will plan anything, however ridiculous, but citizens have to pay for the ridiculous behavior of generals. How can you pretend that Ireland is just a hole in the map on which you plan Atlantic defense?

Should the early stages of world war III go wrong in western Europe and the early stages of a war always go wrong for the British, then you will have the Russians on the shores of the Channel and southern Britain a war zone. In such circumstances the cooperation of Ireland will be vital to the survival of Britain. If, however, this has not been prearranged, the urgency of the situation may make it impossible to rectify the omission of Ireland from prewar Atlantic strategical planning. We Irish desire above all things to support the defense of western Christendom, but it is useless to ask us to do so in an impractical manner. We cannot coordinate the defense of Ireland except on an all-island basis.

With the utmost seriousness, I suggest to you that the partitioning of Ireland and the persistence of British occupation in our six northern counties has proved to be a costly, dangerous, and short-sighted expedient. For reasons of prestige, Britain is reluctant to undo her mistake and reunite the island under an Irish government. So Ireland remains sullen, sterile, neutral instead of active and cooperative.

For moral and material reasons, this is a most dangerous situation. Freedom is indivisible. World war III will be the supreme war for human freedom, if it happens.

I have tried to tell you that moral considerations and material factors urgently require the ending of this unnatural and abnormal state of affairs. The Irish people fear that the denial of freedom in the British area in Ireland may one day, indeed quite soon, provoke an explosion, with the most dangerous consequences; alternatively world war III may begin before this international problem is resolved. In either case the fact that the civilized peoples of the West have failed to persuade Great Britain to undertake the final act of liberation in her imperial record, may well prove to be the end of Western civilization.

This is where the Irish question has got to today.

Arming of the Arab States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 5, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, the following letter, protesting British arms shipments to the Near East Arab states, and handed to the Honorable Dean Acheson, Secretary of State, on Thursday, May 4, was signed by 30 Democrats and 21 Republicans, Members of the House of Representatives:

Hon. DEAN ACHESON,
Secretary of State, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Following your recent conversation with a group of Members of the House with respect to the Near East armaments situation and the indication that you would in due course discuss the situation with the Secretary of State for the United Kingdom, Mr. Bevin, we thought that it would be advantageous to you if we listed the objectives which we believe you should seek in these conversations and the questions, the answers to which we are convinced would enable you to attain those objectives.

The objectives as we see them are:

1. Cessation of the shipment of arms to the Arab states by Great Britain until peace treaties have been consummated with Israel.

2. Use of their good offices by the United States and the United Kingdom to bring about peace treaties between the Arab states and Israel.

The questions the answers to which we believe will support you in attaining these objectives are:

(a) To what extent is Great Britain actually shipping or permitting the shipment of military aircraft, gunboats, and tanks under treaty arrangements with Iraq, Jordan, and Egypt, or otherwise to any of the Arab states; how such shipments have been paid for; what supervision is being maintained over the disposition and use of such armament; and whether the supplying of such armaments is directly or indirectly facilitated by the settlement of Great Britain's United States lend-lease account, the mutual defense assistance program, or ECA aid?

(b) What assurances, if any, have been given by the Arab states that they are not preparing for a renewal of Arab-Israeli hostilities?

(c) What assurance, if any, has been given by the Arab states of their intention or capability to protect the security of the Near East from a Communist advance?

We believe, too, that it would be most helpful if the United States declared its policy to be opposed to a Near East arms race or a renewal of Arab-Israeli hostilities, and that technical assistance under point 4 projects could only be made available to Arab states which were at peace. We recall your recent statement that a recurrence of the Arab-Israeli war would be "a tragic development which the world community must bend every effort to prevent."

We sincerely trust that before you leave you will be able to assure us that you agree with us as to the objectives set forth above, and will endeavor to attain them in your conversations with Mr. Bevin.

Sincerely,

HUGH J. ADDONIZIO, Democrat, New Jersey; JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS, Republican, New Jersey; WILLIAM A. BARRETT, Democrat, Pennsylvania; J. CALEB BOGGS, Republican, Delaware; EDWARD BREEN, Democrat, Ohio; EMANUEL CELLER, Democrat, New York; CHESTER A. CHESNEY, Democrat, Illinois; EARL CHUDOFF, Democrat, Pennsylvania; L. GARY CLEMENTE, Democrat, New York; ROBERT J. CORBETT, Republican, Pennsylvania; HARRY J. DAVENPORT, Democrat, Pennsylvania; JAMES J. DELANEY, Democrat, New York; ISIDORE DOLLINGER, Democrat, New York; HAROLD D. DONOHUE, Democrat, Massachusetts; HERMAN P. EBERHARTER, Democrat, Pennsylvania; ALBERT J. ENGEL, Republican, Michigan; JAMES G. FULTON, Republican, Pennsylvania; EDWARD A. GARMATZ, Democrat, Maryland; WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN, Democrat, Pennsylvania; EDWIN ARTHUR HALL, Republican, New York; T. MILLET HAND, Republican, New Jersey; LOUIS B. HELLER, Democrat, New York; CHRISTIAN A. HERTER, Republican, Massachusetts; DONALD L. JACKSON, Republican, California; JACOB K. JAVITS, Republican-Liberal, New York; EDGAR A. JONAS, Republican, Illinois; RAYMOND W. KARST, Democrat, Missouri; ROBERT K. KEAN, Republican, New Jersey; KENNETH B. KEATING, Republican, New York; EDNA F. KELLY, Democrat, New York; ARTHUR G. KLEIN, Democrat, New York; HENRY J. LATHAM, Re-

publican, New York; JOHN DAVIS LODGE, Republican, Connecticut; JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Democrat, Massachusetts; CHRISTOPHER C. MCGRATH, Democrat, New York; THRUSTON B. MORTON, Republican, Kentucky; ABRAHAM J. MULTER, Democrat, New York; BARRATT O'HARA, Democrat, Illinois; DONALD O'TOOLE, Democrat, New York; WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER, Republican, New York; A. A. RIBICOFF, Democrat, Connecticut; R. WALTER RIEHLMAN, Republican, New York; PETER W. RODINO, Jr., Democrat, New Jersey; JOHN J. ROONEY, Democrat, New York; ADOLPH J. SABATH, Democrat, Illinois; JOHN P. SAYLOR, Republican, Pennsylvania; HUGH D. SCOTT, Jr., Republican, Pennsylvania; JOHN F. SHELLEY, Democrat, California; ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO, Democrat, New York; THOR C. TOLLEFSON, Republican, Washington; SIDNEY R. YATES, Democrat, Illinois.

Mr. Speaker, on March 28, 32 Members of the House of Representatives had a conference with the Secretary of State on this subject and this letter is a sequel to that conference.

Some Water Problems of the Pacific Southwest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, May 6, 1950

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, water sources and water development have controlled and shaped the progress of our great Pacific Southwest, a semiarid region which covers about half a million square miles, or one-sixth of the area of the United States. Today industrial growth, agriculture expansion, and metropolitan extension in this area all depend upon a consistent adequate supply of water.

Mr. Raymond Matthew, chief engineer of the Colorado River Board of California, at the fortieth convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Conference held in Washington, D. C., on March 25, 1950, delivered the following factual and informative address on some of the water problems of the Pacific Southwest, and I urge the Members of the House to give serious consideration to Mr. Matthew's discussion of our water problems:

SOME WATER PROBLEMS OF THE PACIFIC SOUTHWEST

(By Raymond Matthew, chief engineer, Colorado River Board of California)

(A contribution to panel discussion on Water—Our Most Precious Natural Resource, Fortieth Convention National Rivers and Harbors Conference, Washington, D. C., March 25, 1950)

The subject of this panel discussion applies with particular force to the Pacific Southwest. For water is the very lifeblood of this semiarid region which may be considered to cover about half a million square miles—one-sixth of the area of the United States—including all the States of California, Nevada, and Arizona. Not only is water a vital necessity for domestic, municipal, and industrial purposes as in other sections of the country, but also, in common with other sections of the West, water for irrigation is essential to the successful production of farm crops in most of the region.

Indeed, the history of this region is replete with accounts of violence and bloodshed and of frequent and prolonged litigation in State and Federal courts in conflicts over the ownership and control of water—so all-important and precious is this resource because of its relative scarcity.

The Pacific Southwest is a region of sharp contrasts; in terrain, from the nation's highest mountains to desert valleys below sea level; in climate, marked by wide variation in temperature, rainfalls ranging from about 100 inches to 5 inches or less annually, and growing seasons ranging from a few months in the high plateaus to all year round in the low valleys and along the coast; and in character and extent of development varying from the sparsely settled areas of forest and desert to the fertile valleys of highly developed irrigated agriculture and the densely populated metropolitan and industrial centers of Los Angeles and San Francisco.

Although numerous other factors are involved, the availability of water and the feasibility of building works for its conservation and use have played a predominant role in the developments that have occurred, and will continue to limit and control future development.

Most of the precipitation in the Southwest occurs in three or four winter months with little if any in the late spring, summer, and fall. There are some exceptions to this generality in parts of Arizona and high mountain areas where some summer rains occur, but the bulk of the water supply comes in winter rains and snows.

In California, the average annual rainfall ranges from 100 inches along the extreme northwest coast to almost nothing in the southeast desert region. Relatively heavy precipitation occurs in the Coast Range and Sierra Nevada Mountains, largely in the form of snow in the higher reaches, and it is these mountain areas from which most of the water supply is derived.

In the central and coastal valleys, which are largely devoted to farming, the average annual rainfall varies from 15 to 25 inches in the northerly valleys to 5 to 15 inches in the southerly valleys. In the south Coastal Plain of California it ranges from 10 to 25 inches. Hence, the rainfall is insufficient to grow most crops, even if all or most of it came in the growing season. Thus, irrigation is essential.

In southeastern California, also in much of Nevada and Arizona, average annual precipitation is only 5 to 15 inches. In fact, most of the Colorado River Basin is a semiarid area. Greater precipitation occurs in the relatively limited mountain areas of Utah, Wyoming, Colorado, and Arizona, and these areas are the source of most of the water of the Colorado River.

The rainfall in the Southwest is characterized by wide cyclic variations. The precipitation at Los Angeles is typical. The 75-year record extended back to 180 years by correlation with crop records of the Mission Fathers shows seven wet periods of 9 to 13 years in length, averaging 122 percent of normal, and six alternating dry periods of 11 to 28 years in length, averaging 84 percent of normal. Studies of tree rings and other historical information indicate even greater cyclic variation and more severe droughts in the past. Currently, southern California is experiencing its sixth successive year of subnormal rainfall. Rainfall from year to year ranges from 25 to over 200 percent of the average.

The scarcity of water in the Southwest is further revealed by data on run-off. In California as a whole, which has an area of 156,000 square miles, the average annual depth of run-off in rivers and stream flow is about 8½ inches; but in southern California it is less than 3 inches. For the Colorado River Basin as a whole the average depth of run-off in river flow is only about 1½ inches. As compared to these, the average depth of run-off of Atlantic coast streams ranges from 15 to 20 inches.

The stream flow in the Southwest varies widely from month to month and from year to year. Most of the run-off occurs in the rainy season. The flow of rivers and streams fed by melting snows often continues into the summer and fall, and a few streams fed by springs have a continuous base flow. But for several months of the summer and fall stream flow is greatly reduced and it is not unusual for streams and rivers to dry up completely. On the other hand, the rivers and streams of the Southwest are subject to violent and destructive floods, which result from rainstorms of high intensity or rapidly melting snow or a combination of both.

In addition to seasonal and cyclic variations, the water resources are not distributed geographically in consonance with the demand. For example, in California, about 75 percent of the water supply is in the northern half of the State, whereas two-thirds of the demand for water is in the lower half. The discrepancy is even greater in southern California which has only about 5 percent of the water and 25 percent of the demand. All these figures are exclusive of the Colorado River which is also used in California.

Because of these wide discrepancies between water supply and demands, the conservation, regulation, and distribution of the available water resources to obtain the maximum practicable and efficient utilization of water for all needs and purposes involve the solution of many problems and the construction of major engineering works. It calls for storage and other works to control floods, large cyclic storage reservoirs to conserve and regulate the extremely erratic flows, and, in many cases, long canals and aqueducts to convey water from areas of surplus to areas of scarcity.

Fortunately, underground reservoirs are available in several areas where large quantities of water are or can be stored, and drawn upon by pumping from wells. For example, in California, the ground water reservoirs have a capacity of over 20,000,000 acre-feet in the San Joaquin Valley, about 5,000,000 acre-feet in the Sacramento Valley, and about 7,000,000 acre-feet in the south coastal basin. Important groundwater basins occur in other valleys also. In central Arizona, the ground-water basin has a capacity of about 35,000,000 acre-feet.

The use of ground water was started early in California, and has become widespread and of major importance not only in California but also in Arizona and Nevada. According to estimates of the United States Geological Survey, about 10,000,000 acre-feet annually or half of the water now used in California is pumped from underground; in Arizona, about 3,000,000 acre-feet or 60 percent of the water used is pumped from underground; and, in Nevada, about 250,000 acre-feet or 15 percent.

The storage of water in underground reservoirs and the use of ground waters will continue to be of increasing importance in the Southwest. It is an essential element in any plan and program of development.

Water developments in California have been marked by many outstanding projects. The large cities, San Francisco, Oakland, and Los Angeles, have augmented their local supplies by bringing in water from the Sierra Nevadas through aqueducts 200 to 300 miles long. California's 6,000,000 acres of irrigated lands are served by a multitude of reservoirs and canal systems developing and

using local water supplies and built by private initiative and financing.

The Central Valley project is now being built by the Bureau of Reclamation to augment irrigation supplies in the Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys. One of the main objectives is to transfer surplus water from the Sacramento Valley southerly to meet water shortage in the San Joaquin Valley. Other dams are being built by the Army engineers to provide for much-needed flood control and some conservation.

In southern California, in the metropolitan coastal plain region, local water supplies, both surface and underground, have long since been fully developed and utilized for irrigation, domestic, and industrial purposes. In fact, the supplies are already overdrawn. These were augmented in 1913 by the city of Los Angeles bringing in a supply of 400 second feet by a 250-mile aqueduct from the Sierra Nevada. The supply was further augmented in 1942 by Colorado River water. The 300-mile Colorado River aqueduct involving a pumping lift of 1,600 feet was completed in 1942 with a capacity of 1,500 second feet. It was built by the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, now comprising municipal districts and 28 cities including Los Angeles and San Diego. It is designed to serve domestic and industrial water needs in the entire coastal plain region in general which has a present population of over 4,000,000. All future needs of this area are dependent on Colorado River water, which it is planned to use ultimately in the amount of 1,212,000 acre-feet annually. With all local and imported supplies combined, it is expected that sufficient water will be availabe for a popuation of about 8,000,000.

In the desert area of southern California, the Colorado River is practically the only source of water supply. Use of Colorado River water for irrigation in the Palo Verde, Imperial, and Coachella Valleys was started over 50 years ago and has since grown until there is now about 600,000 acres under irrigation out of about 1,000,000 acres ultimately to be irrigated. Thus, southern California is vitally dependent upon the Colorado River for irrigation and domestic and industrial water supplies. It is planned to use for these purposes about 5,500,000 acre-feet per year and works have been built and are in operation on this expectation.

There has also been substantial use of Colorado River water in Arizona for irrigation including the Parker, Yuma, and Gila projects, which constitute those projects in Arizona which could be feasibly irrigated from the main Colorado River because of the adverse terrain. However, in addition, some 600,000 acres of lands in central Arizona have been brought under irrigation by developments on the Gila and Salt Rivers.

The most outstanding project on the Colorado River that has been built to date is the Boulder Canyon project. This project was authorized as a Federal Reclamation undertaking in 1928. It includes Hoover Dam to conserve and regulate the waters of the Colorado River, provide much needed flood control and silt control and furnish regulated water supplies for irrigation, domestic and industrial uses, and a hydroelectric power plant of about 1,325,000-kilowatt capacity. The project also includes the All-American Canal of 10,000 second-feet capacity designed to irrigate lands in the Imperial and Coachella Valleys.

Hoover Dam, rising 600 feet above streambed, creates Lake Mead with a storage capacity of 32,000,000 acre-feet. This dam, completed in 1936, provides practically complete regulation of the river at this point. It is designed to assure adequate water supplies for all downstream projects. Most of these projects that can or will be served, such as those in California, are already built and in operation or are authorized and under construction.

Other major dams have been built or are underway in the lower Colorado River. Parker Dam was completed in 1940 for the purpose of diverting water into the Colorado River aqueduct and incidental hydroelectric-power production. Davis Dam, designed to re-regulate releases from Hoover Dam, serve the needs of the Mexican Water Treaty, and generate hydroelectric power, is now nearly completed.

Only about half the waters of the Colorado River and its tributaries is utilized at present, mostly because the States in the upper basin are using less than one-third the amount of water reserved for them by the Colorado River compact. Many storage reservoirs and other major works, chiefly in the upper basin, will be needed to fully conserve and utilize the waters. Unfortunately, even under full practicable development, the water supply that can be made available will be far from sufficient to meet present and potential requirements including the guaranteed delivery to Mexico under the Mexican Water Treaty.

In the face of such a scarcity in water supply, it is obvious that every effort must be made to design and operate works which will secure the maximum possible conservation and the most efficient and beneficial use of the available water.

The needs of existing projects having established rights to the use of water should be fully met before additional new projects are undertaken. Further development should be restricted to a selective choosing of projects within the water supply that can be assured and on the basis of comparative need and justification, thus obtaining the greatest benefits at the least cost from the standpoint of the region and the Nation as a whole.

Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, May 6, 1950

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, it is regrettable the extent to which selfish and avaricious influences, not only individuals but even certain groups and associations, will go, and the large sums of money they have expended, to gain their nefarious aims. Especially is this true as to those who are trying to defeat the proposal to extend rent control, notwithstanding the fact that it may deprive thousands upon thousands of families, including many ex-servicemen and their loved ones, of roofs over their heads by being evicted from their homes, unable to pay the increased rents these very men admit and concede will come about if rent control is not extended.

I have in my hand, and now ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD, a list of the organizations behind this inhuman activity. They stop at nothing. They have now, and for several years past, gone beyond any decency in their efforts to kill the Rent Control Act. The people behind this movement—behind these organizations and special interests, such as the National Association of Real Estate Boards, Mortgage Bankers Association of America, Associated General Contractors of America, and the others listed below—are, in most instances, the owners of the large apartments, apartment hotels, and hotels in the metropolitan areas of the United States which they secured control of after the crash of the 1930's at 10 to 25 cents on the dollar, and upon which they desire income based upon the original cost of construction. It has been estimated that this group has expended over $3,000,000 on lobbying and publicity against housing and rent control.

Mr. Speaker, they fail to realize that if rent control is not extended, hardship will descend upon thousands of families, unable to pay the increases the owners will levy upon these unfortunate people. I regret to predict that a great deal of trouble is bound to ensue. Therefore, I hope that the monies being spent from these ill-gotten gains will not result in misleading Members of the House, but that the Members will realize the conditions that now exist and will vote to extend rent control for another year.

[From the League Reporter, Labor's League for Political Education, May 1, 1950]

NINETEEN GROUPS FROM REAL-ESTATE LOBBY

The real-estate lobby consists of 19 organizations. They include realtors, bankers, builders, contractors, and building-supply manufacturers.

Secretary Calvin K. Snyder, of the Realtors' Washington Committee of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, lists these 19 groups as making up the group known as the real-estate lobby:

American Bankers' Association.
American Institute of Architects.
Associated General Contractors of America, Inc.
Institute of Electrical Contractors.
Mortgage Bankers' Association of America.
National Apartment Owners' Association.
National Association of Home Builders.
National Association of Manufacturers.
National Association of Real Estate Boards.
National Electrical Contractors' Association.
National Home and Property Owners' Foundation.
National Lumber Manufacturers' Association.
National Retail Lumber Dealers' Association.
National Savings and Loan League.
Prefabricated Home Manufacturers' Institute.
Property Owners' Association of America.
Structural Clay Products' Institute.
United States Chamber of Commerce.
United States Savings Loan League.

HOW TO PUT THE PRESSURE ON CONGRESS—NAREB OFFICIAL TELLS HOW LOBBY WORKS WITH NAM, READER'S DIGEST, CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, RADIO CHAINS

Let's take a good look at the real-estate lobby. Let's see how it cooperates with big business, the press, radio stations, and its congressional pals.

Officials of the National Association of Real Estate Boards (NAREB) have testified at hearings of the House Select Committe on Lobby Activities. The committee says NAREB is a typical lobby. It's the cornerstone of the real-estate pressure group.

Here are some of the facts about NAREB brought out by testimony at the hearings and investigation by the lobby committee's staff:

1. NAREB often gets information from friendly Congressmen and Senators about secret sessions of House and Senate committees. On at least one occasion a Representative let Calvin K. Snyder, secretary of

the Realtors' Washington Committee, part of NAREB, copy parts of a secret report of a Senate-House committee.

2. NAREB was instrumental in having the Reader's Digest publish an anti-rent-control article in 1948. In reply to a suggestion by a Boston realtor that NAREB "plant" a rent-control article in the Saturday Evening Post, Herbert U. Nelson, executive vice president of NAREB, wrote: "We have helped to secure a write-up of what is happening in France (concerning rent control) * * * in the Reader's Digest." Five hundred thousand copies of reprints of that Digest article were distributed by NAREB in its 1948 campaign against rent control.

3. In 1949 Nelson wrote in a letter to T. K. Maenner of Omaha, a past president of NAREB and a political adviser to Republican Senators KENNETH WHERRY and HUGH BUTLER, of Nebraska, "My personal contacts with the radio chains have become of great value." Nelson did not elaborate much on those contacts.

4. In the same letter to Maenner, Nelson speaks of "some of the favors we have had from NAM." In testimony before the committee Nelson was vague in answering questions concerning favors the NAM had done for NAREB.

5. Nelson's and Snyder's testimony also brought out the close cooperation between the real-estate lobby and the United States Chamber of Commerce.

6. Nelson admitted that NAREB used to get delegations of small property owners to testify at rent-control hearings. Such delegations leave the impression that everyone who owns apartments is having a tough time. In a letter replying to a suggestion by a Detroit banker that the real-estate lobby use this stunt, Nelson said, "We used to try this sort of thing in order to dramatize our situation * * * but it wasn't too successful."

7. Senators and Representatives who speak at national and State meetings of the real-estate lobby are paid travel expenses and lecture fees by the realtors.

8. NAREB often advises Federal agencies on the drafting of legislation for Congress and the administration of laws like rent control and public housing.

9. NAREB used to keep a card file on every Congressman, indicating realtors who are friendly with them, how they voted on housing legislation and other information that was helpful in trying to sway them to the real-estate lobby way of thinking.

10. Speeches and radio talks are often prepared by NAREB for friendly Members of Congress.

BIG BUSINESS

The real-estate lobby is big business. From July 1, 1946, through December 31, 1949—a period of 3½ years—the National Association of Real Estate Boards alone spent $440,360 for lobbying.

The Dawn Is Breaking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 5, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, over the years the Detroit Free Press, like the Irishman's flea, has been "on again, off again, Finnegan" in its support of, opposition to, the New Deal and those who, from its inception, have vigorously and persistently fought the fallacies of the New Deal.

In its issue of May 5 is an editorial which indicates that the Detroit Free Press is beginning to see the light.

That editorial, with certain omissions made in order that its reprinting may comply with the rules of the House, reads as follows:

REAL INVESTIGATION OF CRIME BY SENATE HAS BEEN BLOCKED BY TRUMAN ADMINISTRATION

The radio and newspaper headlines shriek that "The Senate has voted for a crime investigation."

"That's good," say the headline readers and those who listen with their ears instead of their minds.

But is it good?

As far as the Detroit Free Press can see, the Truman administration has blocked any such investigation.

Since the latest political murders in Kansas City there has been an ever-growing demand for investigation of crime conditions, a nonpolitical inquiry into the reign of criminal terrorists which is destroying American liberties by taking over city and State governments and in Washington is crowding close to the heart of our Republic itself.

By the dirtiest kind of alley fighting behind the scenes and by every known trick of forensic sophistry before the people, the Truman administration has sought to prevent any such exposures.

Let us look at the record.

A splendid young man from Tennessee introduced a resolution last January calling for an investigation of the national menace of organized gambling, narcotics traffic, prostitution, and all the other vices by which the Pendergast gang in Kansas City corrupted governments and grafted millions from the taxpayers.

Crime, it is now shown, is a Nation-wide business in the same sense that we have chain groceries and other chain merchandising stores.

Charlie Binaggio, a graduate of the Pendergast school of crime, was the Kansas City agent for this syndicate which merchandizes not only gambling, dope, and prostitution but blackmail, extortion and murder to its favored clientele.

Normally, and naturally, the resolution of Senator KEFAUVER said the investigation should be conducted by the Judiciary Committee, of which he is a member.

But so are a man of Michigan and others trained in the investigation of crime.

That would never do.

When Charlie Binaggio, a professional murderer, was slaughtered the Nation stood shocked because of connotative tangencies with the White House.

The Truman-controlled Democratic policy committee moved fast.

Butcher Charlie, now himself butchered, was on the executive committee which made the arrangements for the big testimonial banquet given to Bill Boyle, another Pendergast henchman, who had just been made chairman of the Democratic National Committee by order of Truman.

President Truman attended and made that sacrilegious speech to the effect that his political philosophy was based on the Sermon on the Mount.

Gunman Charlie was there to shake hands with the President and to pose for pictures with his old friend Bill Boyle—their arms around each other.

No.

There must be no legitimate, thorough, and honest investigation.

It was decided then to create a new committee of just five men to do the investigating.

The Truman group fought so hard to get this nefarious device put over as an escape mechanism that they got a tie vote, 35 to 35.

The Truman forces won the fight by this narrow squeak.

The administration will now conduct an investigation of itself.

By this trick they have barred some who know all about too many things to have them around asking questions.

In the criminal world it does not pay to have people around who know too much.

They might talk.

That is the logical reason for the murder of Gunman Charlie Binaggio.

He had pushed Jim Pendergast out of power.

As Tom was the Napoleon of the underworld of Kansas City, Nephew Jim was the weak and befuddled Napoleon III. He was a pushover for tougher, smarter disciples of Boss Tom—and Butcher Charlie did the pushing.

Jim appealed to his friend Truman. A Federal grand jury was called in Kansas City to investigate, what we do not know. The chief witness before that body was Binaggio.

He went to Key West to see Truman and Boyle and to plead for peace.

The story is that Truman refused to see him, but that National Chairman Boyle did. No dice.

According to the carefully accurate Newsweek, Boyle, a former Kansas City cop, told Binaggio to "run along back to Kansas City and to make his peace with Jim Pendergast."

Now it stands to reason that the boss of a machine that (again quoting Newsweek) "contained some of the most notorious murderers, bank robbers, arsonists, thieves, and hoodlums ever collected in one place—and, moreover, the head of the Kansas City branch of the Chicago Capone Crime Syndicate," could not go back to Kansas City and plead with Jim Pendergast for mercy.

The power and the glory of precinct puissance was to go back to pal Jim.

How then could Binaggio function even if he had elected the governor and had taken over control of the Kansas City police department?

The Federal grand jury moved remorselessly.

The professional murderer knew that a bell was tolling for him.

He announced that he was going to "get out of the racket" and retire to a farm.

That was his death knell.

Nobody is allowed to retire from the crime syndicate.

He might talk.

A death decree was issued for Boss Binaggio by the underworld rulers of the United States.

To the residents of Kansas City this is not startling.

Since the rise of the first Emperor Pendergast, who made the hideously Himmlerian, Johnny Lazia, a fabulous figure as king of the narcotic and prostitution rackets in Kansas City, murder has been considered a minor incident.

Lazia himself was machine gunned to death by rival gangsters.

Binaggio took over the business.

When Pendergast and 230 of his lieutenants were sent to the penitentiary by the fighting, crusading District Attorney Maurice Milligan, Jim Pendergast assumed the throne but he so loved his bourbon that Binaggio stole from him the royal diadem of iniquity.

That reach for power cost the killer his own life.

As far as this newspaper can ascertain the Federal grand jury heat was on Binaggio alone.

In this there is the inexorability of a Greek tragedy.

For it was the daring Binaggio who came to the rescue of President Truman when he ordered Congressman Rodger Slaughter purged from the House for daring to disagree with him.

It was Binaggio and his most notorious murderers, bank robbers, arsonists, and thieves who stole the election from Slaughter by fraudulent ballots.

The Kansas City Star exposed this theft of an election.

The evidence was so overwhelming and the public demand for action so vociferous that something had to be done.

Some of Binaggio's best safe crackers were ordered to blow up the county vaults and to steal the evidence.

Ironically, when this was being done, Mr. Truman was peacefully sleeping in the Presidential suite at the Muehlbach Hotel, just five blocks away.

Of course, with the evidence stolen, most naturally—and assuredly—nothing could be done about it.

Attorney General Tom Clark, who now graces the United States Supreme Court was most plausible about it.

But there is a journalistic conscience in Missouri, not only in Kansas City with the Star, but in St. Louis with the courageous, fighting liberalism of Joseph Pulitizer, worthy son of a great sire, in the never ending fight to protect the people's rights.

So, now, every day on the editorial page of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch is this note in black-face type:

"THIRTY DAYS

"On the night of May 27–28, 1947, a safe in the Kansas City Election Commissioners' office was blasted and vital evidence in the 1946 Democratic primary vote frauds was stolen. From that day to this, no agency of the law, not even the celebrated FBI, has brought about the arrest of the guilty person or persons. Since the statute of limitation takes effect after 3 years, the FBI has 30 days to solve this outrageous crime against the cornerstone of America democracy—free and honest elections."

Each edition the days grow less—the only change made: 30 days, 29 days, 28 days, 22 days.

President Truman as Chief Executive, is the ultimate power, the only absolute authority to order such an investigation of a crime in which he was a beneficiary. Slaughter was purged.

And so the fight against a real investigation rages in Washington.

The statute of limitations!

What a refuge!

Five days, four days, three days——

One sample of practical politics is well evidenced by another job of shadow boxing in a pretended pursuit of crime.

With a great fanfare of publicity a conference of law enforcers was called at Washington by the Attorney General's office. Mr. Truman spoke briefly saying that he was against sin and that something ought to be done about it. Mr. McGrath was even more emphatic.

Committees were appointed by the group to make studies of what could be done. They are still studying.

But what very few noticed was that the conference had very few career men in the war against crime. They were not invited, not the police experts who have to face the bullets.

Most of those who came were Democratic prosecutors from Democratic counties and attorney generals from Democratic States.

And by a happy coincidence they arrived just in time at Washington to pay $100 apiece for tickets to the Jackson Day dinner. The counties and the State paid their expenses while—we hope—they paid the $100 tribute gouged from them out of their own pockets.

And that was the end of that investigation.

Attorney General McGrath suggested to the Senate that perhaps a law barring slot machines from being sent across the State lines and preventing interstate wire services from sending out gambling information might be a good thing.

With perfect solemnity the lads agreed to make an investigation into these matters and call witnesses.

So Frankie Costello and other nationally known gamblers were called in to tell the poor, dear innocent little Senators that there is no way of stopping gambling, that it is something inherent in the human breast—and all that sort of rot.

The underworld bosses had a good time for themselves and their mouthpiece columnists and press agents dwelling on the utter futility of law enforcement. Fun, no end.

But the issue, as every criminologist knows, is not gambling in and of itself.

As a representative of the United States told the committee:

"If sports can be embargoed from interstate commerce on the grounds that it is used for gambling, then other categories of news, such as stock-market quotations and even election returns, conceivably could be embargoed on the same grounds."

No news could be transmitted at all under such a law as those who desire to bet will bet on anything.

This is the reductio ad absurdum that artful politicians and legal loophole seekers love to find and dwell upon to make any efforts at reform appear ridiculous.

The crime is not gambling per se.

The crime is the bribery and the corruption of our police, our law-enforcing bodies, and our courts which make necessary the fraudulent elections.

Without this unholy alliance between government and criminals, professional gambling cannot flourish.

That is something that any rookie cop knows.

That is why political gangs are organized in our metropolitan areas.

To sell out their communities to the gamblers.

Once they have sold out, there is no halfway stop.

The other vices move in and the city or State bosses exact their graft from prostitution, dope, blackmail, kidnaping, extortion, and, when necessary, cold murder. Murder becomes king.

The Pendergast gang went the limit in all these things until Kansas City became a stench in the nostrils of the Nation as the wickedest city on the North American continent.

And Harry Truman never smelled a thing.

As the underworld czars take over complete domination of the police and the courts, they are not content. They move into legitimate businesses, force out the real proprietors and reap the illegal profits because people must buy from them—or else.

Thus it was that Tom Pendergast amassed millions by having an absolute monopoly in cement.

And throughout prohibition no liquors could be sold by the blind pigs of Kansas City—and they thrived as in no other community—without first paying Tom Pendergast a fee of so much a case.

When the heroic and personally innocent General Grant, as President, found himself surrounded by corruption, he touched the hearts of all Americans when he said as calmly as he fought at Shiloh:

"Let no guilty man escape."

Mr. Truman quotes, instead, the Beatitudes and reaffirms his faith in the Ten Commandments.

As Mr. Truman's ghost writers can quote Scripture for a purpose, it might be well for them to avoid the seventh chapter from St. Matthew, wherein it is written:

"Ye shall know them by their fruits. Do men gather grapes of thorns or figs of thistles? * * * Every good tree bringith forth good fruit; but a corrupt tree bringeth forth evil fruit. * * * A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit. * * *

"Wherefore by their fruits ye shall know them."

Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. O'BRIEN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, May 6, 1950

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of May 5, 1950:

FUTURE OF RENT CONTROL

If national rent control is extended once again after June 30, the extension is apt to follow the lines of a compromise suggested by Representative SPENCE, of Kentucky. Under his plan, Federal rent control would automatically end after 1950—except for those communities that in the meantime took the positive step of asking that it be continued.

The compromise seems reasonable and carries a persuasive appeal. That Federal rent control is still very much in the picture is shown by current estimates that some 29,000,000 people, living in nearly 4,000 incorporated cities, towns, and villages, including 63 out of the 92 cities of 100,000 population, are still protected by Federal rent control. Only four States and a relatively small number of towns and cities have chosen to end rent control. Two States have adopted rent control laws of their own, which are superseding Federal law. But if failure throughout the country to end rent control indicates anything, it would seem to be that control is still needed in many localities. That control, under the Spence plan, could be retained by any city or town that asked for it.

The District law, of course, is entirely separate from the national rent-control law. If Congress ended national rent control by failure to extend it, the same thing might be expected to happen with the local law. But the wiser way of reaching a decision on extending or ending local rent control is to rest that decision on what the facts may show. It would be well if hearings were begun soon on pending House legislation to extend local rent control and every effort made to obtain through testimony an accurate picture of things as they are.

Few cities of the country, if one includes metropolitan areas, have exceeded Washington in the amount of new construction in relation to population. Last year alone 16,989 new units were completed here. Rentals in this new construction are far above those in controlled buildings. Those who favor it argue that control for another year will tend to bring down the rents in new construction; those who want to end control, argue precisely to the contrary, claiming that only when rents in new construction are subject to competition from rents released from control will the level of new construction rentals begin to fall. Nothing is proved one way or the other by such opinions and a congressional hearing could at least obtain pertinent facts on the need for continued control.

The United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, May 6, 1950

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the President upon his statement this week wherein he said that there is less danger of war today than any time in the past year.

At the same time, I want to congratulate the Republican adviser to Secretary of State Acheson, Mr. Dulles, on recanting his former views, as expressed by Mr. Herbert Hoover. The former President, as you know, is urging that the United Nations should be reorganized and thereby weakened. Mr. Hoover and his Republican leaders are following the same unfortunate tactics that they advocated in bringing about the defeat of our entry into the League of Nations, which, if our country had entered, and students and men of affairs generally agree, would have precluded our entry into World War II and the curse of Hitlerism would not have been possible.

I wish to take this opportunity of congratulating the Chicago Sun-Times and its editor for the clear position they have taken in an editorial printed on April 30, 1950. I suggest that the entire membership avail themselves of this logical reasoning, which I insert herein.

At the same time, I observed an article in the Chicago Sun-Times under date of April 29, 1950, wherein the League of Women Voters at their national convention, held a few days ago at Atlantic City, N. J., went on record and pledged themselves to devote their energies in bringing about the strengthening of the United Nations in the hope of ultimate world peace. It is very worthy of insertion into the RECORD.

The editorial and article follow:

[From the Chicago Sun-Times of April 30, 1950]

HOOVER AGAINST DULLES

Two Republicans have come out with plans for revising the United Nations. But aside from party affiliation, John Foster Dulles and Herbert Hoover have little in common.

Mr. Dulles, Republican adviser to Secretary of State Dean Acheson, wants the Soviet Government and its satellites to stay in the United Nations.

Mr. Hoover thinks "the United Nations should be reorganized without the Communist nations in it."

Although Mr. Hoover doesn't desire another military alliance, and says he wants "to redeem the concept of the United Nations to the high purpose for which it was created," we think he's misguided. Nevertheless, it is quite likely that a great many Americans will think that Mr. Hoover has a good idea.

This newspaper feels, on the contrary, that the United Nations still is the best place to work at peaceful solutions of international conflicts. If one side is excluded from the organization it inevitably will become a meeting place only of allies. It certainly will develop into an alliance against the excluded Communist states.

In what way could the United Nations then serve the high purpose for which it was created?

Mr. Dulles thinks the United Nations could serve this purpose better if all the governments in the world were members. He advocates the admission of all effective governments, including Communist China.

He admits this would give Moscow more votes, and even "might end a preponderant voting superiority of the United States." But he believes that unless the UN becomes a world organization its decisions cannot reflect reality.

"If we want to have a world organization," states Mr. Dulles, "then it should be representative of the world as it is."

Mr. Dulles wants a general conference under article 109 to review the UN Charter, to agree on universal membership in UN, on limiting the veto power, and on increasing the authority of the General Assembly. He advocates adding weighted voting in the Assembly, while removing Moscow's present three separate delegations.

Mr. Dulles believes:

"The present is, by common consent, a time of crisis. The world is perilously poised on the brink of disaster. Under that circumstance there is no reason against, but every reason for, holding a world conference at which the concern of all peoples, particularly the small peoples, can be made manifest. * * *

"There is much to hope for, and little to fear, from another great world conference called primarily to modernize the United Nations in the light of its 5 years' experience, and to review broadly its basic objectives of peace, justice, human liberty, and regulation of armament."

It is with these things in mind that UN Secretary-General Trygve Lie is planning to visit the Kremlin. He probably won't get very far. There is no need yet to assume that his mission will fail entirely. There is no need to assume that all of Mr. Dulles' (and the administration's) plans to improve the UN are hopeless.

Yet these seem to be the assumptions of Herbert Hoover. Much as Mr. Hoover desires peace, his plan to break up the United Nations would make the cold war less cold than it is—possibly even hot.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times of April 29, 1950]

WOMEN VOTERS ADOPT WORLD PEACE PROGRAM

ATLANTIC CITY.—The League of Women Voters Friday elected Mrs. John G. Lee, of Farmington, Conn., as its first married president in 30 years. It also adopted a three-point program for world peace.

Mrs. Lee succeeds Anna Lord Strauss, of Washington. The elections followed the organization's adoption of a resolution affirming its traditional position as champion of civil rights.

Others elected unopposed at the closing session of the 5-day national convention here are: Mrs. Bradford L. Patton, 5532 South Shore, former president of the Cook County League of Women Voters, treasurer; Mrs. Robert F. Leonard, Washington, first vice president; Mrs. Malcolm E. Cummings, Pittsburgh, second vice president; and Mrs. Walter Neale, New York, secretary.

OUTLINE PROGRAM

The league's program for world peace—on which it will work during the next 2 years—pledged support of these points:

1. Expansion of world trade and international economic development with maximum use of United Nations agencies.

2. A continued analysis of the Federal budget in relation to a stable and expanding domestic economy, and support of such fiscal measures as make for a stable and expanding economy.

3. Reorganization measures to improve administrative efficiency in the development and use of natural resources.

Curtailment of Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, May 6, 1950

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a resolution adopted by the town of Bloomfield, N. J., which is a part of the congressional district which I represent, protesting the recent directive issued by the Postmaster General curtailing the postal service:

Whereas the United States Post Office Department has announced a curtailment of mail service and deliveries to residences, industries, and commercial establishments in the United States which action, in the opinion of the town council of Bloomfield, N. J., seriously affects the convenience and welfare of the Nation; and

Whereas the town council of Bloomfield, N. J., is of the opinion that a survey of costs, charges to the public, and operating expenses of the United States Post Office Department should disclose ways and means to continue the present service and schedule of deliveries o' mail to the residences, industries, and commercial establishments throughout the Nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the town council of the town of Bloomfield record its protest to the curtailment of mail service and delivery by the United States Post Office and direct the town clerk to send a copy of this resolution to the United States Senators of New Jersey and to the United States Representative of the Tenth Congressional District, and request each one to record the protest of the town of Bloomfield to such proposed action; and be it further

Resolved, That our Senators and Representatives be requested to initiate such study or survey as shall seem desirable as expedient to forestall such proposed curtailment of postal service and deliveries.

I hereby certify the foregoing to be a true and correct copy of resolution adopted by the Bloomfield town council at its meeting held May 1, 1950.

J. CORY JOHNSON,
Town Clerk.

Save the Merchant Marine Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, May 6, 1950

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include herewith a letter from my dear friend from Charleston, S. C., the Honorable Edward I. Condon, an alumnus of the Merchant Marine Academy at King's Point, N. Y. Mr. Condon is qualified to speak for the great advantages afforded the youth of our country as well as the security to the Nation the training at Kings Point affords Americans.

In addition, I also include a letter under date of April 25 addressed to my secretary, Mr. Shuman, on the same subject

from Mr. Wheatley N. Hemmick, Jr., executive vice president of the Alumni Association of the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps.

I am thoroughly in accord with what these gentlemen have to say about the Merchant Marine Academy. Once America's merchant marine is swept from the seas, she will never regain it.

Mr. Speaker, it is later than we think.

The letters follow:

JAS F. CONDON & SONS DEPARTMENT STORE,
Charleston, S. C., March 31, 1950.

Hon. L. MENDEL RIVERS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RIVERS: On receiving news from my Alumni Association of the United States Merchant Marine Academy, I am informed that you people in Washington are gradually closing up the Academy at King's Point, N. Y., by cutting appropriations ever so often.

Losing our National Academy means a step down in our present-day merchant marine, and life line of defense.

The city of Charleston should thrive on our merchant marine, and is gradually working toward that point, but if the Academy is closed, it will hurt Charleston.

I am asking you to vote to amend H. R. 7786, to read "that funds be specifically earmarked for the purpose of covering the incidental expenses of the cadet-midshipmen, and that the cadet-midshipmen at the United States Merchant Marine Academy be given an allotment equivalent to that given cadets and midshipmen at the other Federal Academies."

With kind regards, I remain,

Yours truly,

EDWARD I. CONDON.

ALUMNI ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED
MERCHANT MARINE CADET CORPS,
New York, N. Y., April 25, 1950.

Mr. DELACY SHUMAN,
Secretary, Committee on Armed Services,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SHUMAN: I have been informed by Mr. Edward Condon of Charleston, S. C., that in reply to correspondence relative to the appropriations for the United States Merchant Marine Academy, you were advised by the Appropriations Committee and Admiral Knight, chief, Bureau of Maritime Services that, although the $65 monthly allotment is being discontinued the allotment of $200 which is to provide in kind for uniforms and textbooks, will be substituted and that everything else is provided for. This is not true. I would refer to the bulletin enclosed in which we outlined the actual expenses of the cadet-midshipmen and in which it is evident that either of these items listed will have to be eliminated or will have to be met by the families of the cadet-midshipmen.

Also I would like to point out that the percentage of graduates who received appointments in the merchant marine is, I feel, rather good. Of the last graduating class, June 1949, 80 percent were actually aboard American-flag vessels by October of 1949. The steamship companies in a recent survey by Professor Seward of Yale University indicated a need for 235 graduates in the United States Merchant Marine Academy in the present year 1950. This June the academy will graduate 232 cadet-midshipmen.

I believe that Admiral Knight has been forced into a position where he must accept the Bureau of the Budget's recommendation concerning the allowances for the cadet-midshipmen and that he has attempted to support this recommendation as far as possible.

With regard to the advice given you that the difference in pay for the merchant marine cadets and the cadets at West Point and Annapolis is due to the fact that merchant marine cadets are not required to enter Government service upon the completion of their training while the cadets from Annapolis and West Point must enter a period of active service upon completion of their schooling, I would like to bring your attention to the notarized statement which each cadet-midshipman must sign before admittance to the Academy in which he swears to serve in the United States Navy if so desired for a period of at least 2 years after graduation. The latter part of this week I will be in Washington and would like to further discuss this matter with you and Congressman RIVERS.

I believe that if the appropriation act is passed in the House as it now stands it will ultimately mean the defeat of the entire concept of maritime training and the eventual closing of the United States Merchant Marine Academy.

Sincerely yours,

WHEATLEY M. HEMMICK, Jr.,
Executive Vice President.

Our China Policy—What Went Wrong?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, May 6, 1950

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the RECORD an article by Mr. W. K. Kelsey that appeared recently in the Detroit News, entitled "Our China Policy—What Went Wrong?"

The record of what went on in China in the confused postwar years is a long and complex one. I think that this article serves as a very useful, brief review of that record. It follows:

OUR CHINA POLICY—WHAT WENT WRONG?

(By W. K. Kelsey)

Undoubtedly mainland China is in the hands of the Chinese Communists.

Therefore, say many Americans, we have been defeated in China.

The question then arises, where did our Chinese policy begin to go wrong?

What should the Government have done that it failed to do?

What did it do to help bring about the Communist triumph?

A study of the history of China from the defeat of Japan to the present time has yielded this writer little light on these matters. Some Senator may know the answers; if so, it would be good to have his analysis.

At the end of the war, China's economy was pretty well ruined. Industry was at a standstill; the currency had gone to pot; large sections of the people were without food. Relief and reconstruction were urgently indicated, and were undertaken by both the United Nations and the United States.

Our political policy at that time was to try to achieve the unity of China. Gen. Patrick J. Hurley worked to bring it about, but he said his attempts were being sabotaged by the State Department.

In December 1945 President Truman announced that our policy was to bring about a cessation of hostilities between the Nationalist troops and the Communists, who had skillfully fought the Japanese in the north, and to arrange for a national conference of representatives of all major political elements in China to seek unification.

For these purposes the President sent Gen. George C. Marshall to China. Our marines remained in the country to look to the disarmament and evacuation of Japanese.

Anything wrong, so far?

GENERAL MARSHALL IN CHINA

General Marshall went to China after a conference of representatives of Britain, Russia, and the United States in Moscow had agreed on the need for a united and democratic China under the National Government, for broad participation by democratic elements in all branches of the National Government, and for a cessation of civil strife. Such was the program General Marshall tried to implement. He remained in China a year, and got nowhere.

There were innumerable conferences with Gen. Chiang Kai-shek's Kuomintang, with the Communists, and with both parties together. But much of General Marshall's time was spent in trying to bring about a truce between Nationalist and Communist armies, between whom fights broke out in many sectors, on various grounds. The fact seems to be that neither side was willing to give up any territory which it occupied until a political settlement had been reached. But it was impossible to secure a political settlement as long as the armies were disputing.

The Communists persisted in demanding that there be no merger of the two armies under a single government until a political compromise had determined the nature of the government. The Nationalists held that until the armies had come under a single command, it was useless to talk about formation of a national government.

Meanwhile the Communists were protesting against the presence of our marines in China, insisting that they were aiding the Nationalists side in protecting the movement of Nationalist occupying troops into Manchuria and seeing that, as the Russians moved out, Nationalist soldiers replaced them even in territory claimed by the Communists.

In November 1946, we signed a treaty of friendship and commerce with the Nationalist government. In December, President Truman reiterated American policy to aid the Chinese people in achieving peace and economic recovery under the Nationalist regime.

Anything wrong so far?

In November 1946, a national assembly convened at Nanking to work out a constitution for China. The Communists boycotted it. On December 25, the assembly adopted the constitution. The Communists refused to recognize it.

On January 8, 1947, General Marshall packed his bags and started home, after asserting that the salvation of China "would be the assumption of leadership by the liberals in the Government and in the minority parties," and blaming extremists in both camps for thwarting his efforts to restore peace.

By summer the war had been resumed on a wide scale, Nationalist troops winning some important victories.

In July, President Truman sent Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer to China to study the situation. After a month's stay he reported the need of drastic, far-reaching political and economic reforms in the Government.

It was announced that from VJ-day to July 15, 1947, China had received $561,000,000 in delivered aid from the United States. This did not include the $20,000,000 in cultural aid voted by Congress that year, nor the 22 naval vessels handed over as gifts, in 1948. And in that year Congress provided for an additional $463,000,000 for Chinese aid, and it was estimated that $63,000,000 worth of fighting equipment had been given the Nationalist armies.

Nevertheless, throughout 1948 the Nationalists continued to lose battles and cities, and whenever an army or a city surrendered, the Communists availed themselves of captured arms—including American weapons.

Anything wrong with our Chinese policy so far?

WHERE DID OUR POLICY FAIL?

It may be charged that in the civil war which was resumed after General Marshall had washed his hands of China, we might have given Chiang Kai-shek more military aid. But it is doubtful if Congress would have been willing.

At the end of the war with Japan, China had a large army trained by American officers and provided with American arms to fight the Japs. What became of it? What became of the arms and supplies furnished out of surplus war stores? Some of them certainly fell into Communist hands.

By the end of 1948 our choice lay apparently between spending more hundreds of millions for aid to the incompetent leaders of Chiang's armies, or sending armies of our own into China to carry on effective war against the Communists. Such intervention could not be seriously considered.

It would have been a provocation to Russia to intervene on the other side, and it might thus have been the cause of another general war.

There was not in that year, and there has not been since, any showing of public opinion in this country in favor of either vast expenditures to bolster the Nationalists, or armed intervention in their behalf.

Where, then, did our Chinese policy go wrong? At what stage should it have been changed, and how? It seems to this writer that the critics of our policy, to be consistent, must make a showing on these points.

Agriculture Yearbooks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. R. POAGE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, May 6, 1950

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, the following information about the Yearbook of Agriculture is provided by the yearbook editor in response to requests from Members of the Congress.

In accordance with Public Law 146, Eighty-first Congress, no yearbook will be published in 1950. That law—an act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes—provided:

> For reprinting [in 1950] the 1948 Department of Agriculture Yearbook, Grass, for the use of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, in the ratio of 110,000 to 360,000 copies (of which not to exceed $156,674 shall be available for the yearbook reprint for such use).

Thus, 179,667 copies of Grass were reprinted in April 1950 for congressional distribution—425 copies for each Member of the Senate and 312 copies for each Member of the House. No copies were provided for the Department of Agriculture.

During the 1949 hearings, before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives—part I, pages 255–258—the following were some of the points brought out:

Members of the Congress do not have enough copies of the yearbook to get them into the hands of the farmers they should reach. Rising printing costs—in 1949—necessitated last-minute changes in number of pages and material just before publication. A decrease in the 1948 appropriation necessitated a reduction in the yearbook staff, which now comprises the editor and a typist. It is not expected that a new yearbook can now be put out every 12 months. Every effort is made by the editor to make the yearbooks readable and understandable by the layman and the average practical farmer.

Work is in progress on the next yearbook. Most of the manuscript should be ready for the Government Printing Office by July and, based on previous experience, 8 to 10 months would be required for printing and binding.

That volume will be devoted to the utilization, processing, new uses, byproducts, residues, and marketing of farm products, notably those in oversupply. Nearly all farm crops are discussed—among them fruits, vegetables, corn, oats, wheat, peanuts, wood, cotton, tobacco, sugarcane, sugar beets, starch, potatoes, sweetpotatoes, citrus, honey, maple, rice, soybeans, rubber, sorghum, wool, feathers, fats and oils, cottonseed, eggs, meat, milk, and other dairy products, hides, naval stores.

Among the processes considered are antibiotics, enzymes, fermentation acids, alcohol, waste byproducts, freezing and dehydration, locker plants, handling of fibers, and many more. Numerous examples are drawn from the work at State experiment stations, industrial laboratories, the four regional research laboratories, and other Government agencies. The tools of research—biology, chemistry, physics, and other techniques—are explained, to exemplify the possibilities of further food and nonfood uses of the products of American farms. The volume is written for the nonscientific reader.

The goal is to produce a volume of practical use and interest to a large segment of United States citizens—farmers, who have an interest in what happens to their products after leaving the farm and who will use the information for planning future operations; industrialists, who will find many details on the processing techniques and gain information on laboratory discoveries that bear on their fields; housewives, who will get information on such subjects as bread, nutritive values of foods, detergents and soaps, natural and synthetic fibers, preservation of food; high school and college students; and the general citizen, for whom is given a survey of important scientific developments that touch his life in many ways.

Great interest has been shown in the recent yearbooks, as shown in sales figures of the Superintendent of Documents—which are in addition to approximately 234,000 copies distributed by Members of the Congress:

1943–47, Science in Farming	23,000
1948, Grass	23,473
1949, Trees	25,007

In addition, the Superintendent of Documents has contracted recently for the additional printing, for sale, of 10,000 copies of Science in Farming and 20,000 copies of Trees. Four thousand of those copies of Trees have been ordered and paid for and are included in the sales figure above.

For comparison, 8,946 copies, 10,852 copies, and 15,028 copies were sold of the 1936, 1938, and 1941 yearbooks, respectively.

Several factors determine the selection of a yearbook subject—evidences of interest and need on the part of farmers, Congressmen, and the general public; the amount of printed matter available elsewhere on the subject; and the availability of writers and material in the scheduled time.

The yearbook is a congressional document, issued under an organic law of 1894.

Because of the time needed to plan, write, organize, edit, and print the yearbook, three volumes are in the mill at one time—one is in active production, one is in the stage of writing, and one is in the preliminary stage of discussion and outlining.

Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, May 6, 1950

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, indicative of the need for continued Federal rent control and orderly decontrol is a survey released by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. It has been found, according to the figures from the Bureau, that premature decontrol in six large cities resulted in soaring rents and greater hardship on renters. While every city has had the right to end controls since April 1, 1949, of 90 cities having a 1940 population of 100,000, only 8 had exercised that right.

My colleague from New Jersey, Congressman HUGH J. ADDONIZIO, a member of the Banking and Currency Committee and well informed on the subject of rent control, has stated: "That I am convinced of the need for continuing a law which provides for orderly decontrol at the right time," citing the housing shortage in his district as a basis for the need. Congressman ADDONIZIO's district, which takes in a good portion of Newark, adjoins the district which I represent. I concur with my able colleague in urging that immediate consideration be given this very pressing problem. A gradual and orderly process of decontrol which will not work hardship on veterans and others who have already suffered hardship from the housing shortage is undoubtedly the most equitable, the fairest, and the most prudent course to pursue.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein the following pertinent editorial which

appeared in the Newark Evening News of Sunday, April 30, 1950:

ASKED AND OFFERED

Mayors of seven of New Jersey's largest cities, including Newark's Ralph Villani, have appealed to the Senate Banking and Currency Committee to release a bill which would extend Federal rent controls beyond June 30, which is the date the present law dies. Mayor Villani said housing conditions in Newark are acute.

Representative ADDONIZIO agrees and says the shortage in his district, New Jersey's eleventh, is most serious for tenants who cannot afford to pay more than $75 a month. He's for continued rent ceilings until controls can be lifted without widespread hardship.

Real estate spokesmen maintain there is plenty of rental housing. Let's take a look at the classified columns of the Newark News, an accurate mirror of real estate conditions in New Jersey. Take Wednesday night. There were 58 advertisements of vacancies in Newark and vicinity. Of these, 49 offered only one apartment each. In those which advertised more than one, the offerings included two to 4½ rooms at $57 to $105, 2 and 3½ from $75, 2 rooms at $70, 3 rooms at $88 and $92. In those which advertised only 1 apartment, rents included $100 for 4 rooms, $92 for 3½, $125 for 4, $150 for 5, $100 for 5, $90 for 4.

Now we come to apartments wanted. There were 61 advertisements. Of those advertisers who mentioned rent, 11 wanted 4 or 5 rooms and 12 wanted 3 or 4 rooms. Of those who want a minimum of 4 rooms, the average offered rental was $68, or $17 a room. Of those who need a minimum of 3 rooms, the average offered rental was $57.50, or $19 a room.

But the available vacancies averaged $96.40 for 4-room apartments, or $24.10 a room. Three-room apartments averaged $92.75, or $30 a room. Thus there is a gap of $28.40 between offered and asking price for 4-room apartments and a gap of $35.25 between offered and asking price for 3-room apartments.

These figures, of course, are not conclusive, but they are indicative. They prove that the shortage is in shelter for those able to pay not more than $75. And they suggest what would happen if rents generally were decontrolled. There would be a precipitate rise throughout this area. The scarcity of vacancies in the desired rent range means that thousands of tenants would have no alternative but to pay whatever was demanded.

Past Comments on National Health Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, May 6, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to the following safe-and-sane editorial which appeared in the Lincoln Journal, of Lincoln, Nebr., under date of Wednesday, May 11, 1949, as it seems to be so very much to the point that I feel it should have far wider circulation than it has hitherto received:

EDITORIAL COMMENT AND OPINION

SLOGANS AS MEDICAL PRACTICE

If the publicity campaign of the American Medical Association against national health insurance, as outlined in a recent issue of Everyday magazine, is correctly described by the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, then it is an odd sort of thing indeed for which a million dollars has already been raised by a head tax of $25 on doctors. Its philosophy is epitomized in a Post-Dispatch editorial by this adage, long associated with the profession of public relations:

"You don't have to make a thing better if you can sell it to enough people as it is."

The campaign laid out by the counseling firm of Whitaker & Baxter is based on that philosophy almost wholly, writes the editor. "It intends to put slogans in the mouths of doctors, to dose PTA meetings and the like with propaganda pills lusciously sugar-coated. Unless people are prone to believe what they are told in preference to what they can see with their own eyes, and we don't think they are, the AMA campaign is largely going to consist of the medical profession talking to itself.

"The head of a family swamped with a $500 surgical and hospital bill for which he has saved no money whatever—the person who struggles along in discomfort for years because he can't afford to pay the exorbitant prices the dental cartel charges for plates—are not going to form their opinions on the basis of anybody's slick slogans.

"Public approval will wait on improvement in the services themselves, and when it comes no slogans or high pressure campaign will be required to convince anyone it's here."

There also appeared in the October 8, 1949, issue of Capital Comment, published by the Democratic National Committee at Washington, D. C., the following about the present attitude of the American Medical Association:

Syndicated Columnist Peter Edson, whose objective reporting has won him national awards, recently summed up the AMA's position on a health program, as put forth by the AMA publicity staff, as follows:

"Clem Whitaker, director of the AMA-educational campaign, says medical care of the indigent isn't the doctors' problem. That is said to be the problem of the local community in which he lives. The man may be sick only because he also needs food, clothing, or housing.

"None of the AMA spokesmen will take a position on whether there should be Federal aid for housing or feeding the undernourished. They do believe that there should be Federal aid for hospital construction, Federal aid for medical education, Federal aid for research.

"But they are against bills providing medical care for all school children. That would be socialized medicine. They are against laws for national-health insurance. That would be socialized medicine.

"In summary, Federal subsidies for the doctors seem to be all right, but Federal aid for their patients is all wrong."

My position in reference to socialized medicine and compulsory national health insurance has been so grossly misrepresented in the past that I wish once again to make my legislative stand on these matters clear. I have always been of the thought that socialized medicine should never find a place in our Government set-up. But socialized medicine and national health insurance are two different things, as the slightest investigation will disclose.

It seems to me that the medical profession has been grossly deceived by some interests or some sources and have refused to investigate or learn the difference between socialized medicine and national health insurance.

There are at least three national health-insurance bills pending in the Congress now which are compulsory in nature. Having had some disastrous life-insurance experience personally, as far as loading up on insurance was concerned, I can see the danger of compulsory health insurance to many well-meaning persons.

I think that we need some sort of national health insurance, if private insurance companies cannot do the job, but any such insurance should be voluntary and by that I mean that the individual should be accorded the right to say whether he wants the insurance or not and to choose his doctor and the doctor should have the right to accept or reject the patient.

There are many people who would not want national health insurance such as persons who already have adequate insurance of their own choosing with private insurance concerns, persons who work for railroads and other large business institutions, as well as certain public and quasi-public businesses and, of course, all veterans have a hospital, medical, and dental plan already and it would be of no use to compel these veterans who are employed to take out national health insurance. In other words, I do not believe in loading up people who do not need it with health or accident insurance whether it be Government insurance or private insurance.

It is my most earnest hope that when the fog of misrepresentation has cleared away that some voluntary plan of national health insurance will be evolved which will be safe, sane, and workable.

Curtailment of Postal Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, May 6, 1950

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, as sponsor of H. R. 8205, to rescind the order of the Postmaster General curtailing certain postal services, I was pleased to receive the following resolution of the city of Newark, N. J.:

Whereas Postmaster General Donaldson has recently issued a directive curtailing mail deliveries and other services generally, and particularly mail deliveries in residential districts, from two trips a day to one trip a day therein; with resulting inconvenient and unsatisfactory delivery service, all of which is a departure from long-established practice and a retardation of mail service, to the disadvantage of business as well as residents of the city of Newark; and

Whereas the curtailment of the services aforesaid will result in reduction of employment in the postal service, will add to present unemployment, and will be productive of hardship unreasonably imposed upon our people; and

Whereas it is the duty of the Federal Government to sustain present essential Government activities and employment and to avoid creating unemployment when in fact any economy effected will result in imposing a burden upon State and municipality which may arise therefrom: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Board of Commissioners of the City of Newark, That we, for and in be-

half of the citizens of our city, do hereby address ourselves to the President of the United States and to the Postmaster General, and respectfully request that the aforesaid directive curtailing postal-delivery service be and the same shall be withdrawn, on the following grounds:

1. Curtailment of services will work a hardship on our citizens;

2. Will result in increased unemployment and possible strain on relief load;

3. Any economy which might be effected would not warrant this drastic action; and be it further

Resolved, That the city clerk shall forward copies of this resolution to President Truman and to Postmaster General Donaldson; and to the United States Senators from New Jersey, and the Congressmen of the Tenth, Eleventh, and Twelfth Districts.

RALPH A. VILLANI,
LEO P. CARLIN,
STEPHEN J. MORAN,
J. B. KEENAN,
M. ELLENSTEIN,
Board of Commissioners of the City of Newark, N. J.

The Secretary and Treasurer of the American Federation of Labor, Hon. George Meany, Predicts Doctors Will Eventually Hail Health Insurance as a Boon to Their Patients and Themselves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, May 6, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, there appeared on April 18, 1950, in the American Federation of Labor Weekly News Service, a very timely and enlightening article entitled "Meany Predicts Doctors Will Hail Health Insurance," which article is well worth reading and giving serious consideration. It is as follows:

NEW YORK.—A. F. of L. Secretary-Treasurer George Meany predicted that the American Medical Association "will be forced to admit—after it is enacted" that health insurance is "the best break the doctors of this country ever got—to say nothing of their patients."

In a speech which summed up A. F. of L. philosophy and reasons for choosing a liberal Congress in the 1950 elections, Mr. Meany said the American people are not asking handouts from their Government but "are paying our own way."

"I am convinced that the American people are willing to pay still higher taxes for more adequate protection against economic disasters and for new programs such as health insurance," he said.

Mr. Meany spoke in presenting a citation for public service from the League for Industrial Democracy to Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN. Mr. LEHMAN said in acceptance that critics of the welfare state spend their time hunting Communists while opposing measures that would weaken communism.

Mr. Meany said:

"Permit me to preface my remarks on freedom and the welfare state by admitting that I believe in both. More than that, I believe that both freedom and a state of welfare can and should be enjoyed by the American people at the same time.

"So, I am sure, does our special guest—Governor LEHMAN—because his whole public career has been aimed at the achievement of those goals. That is one of the chief reasons why the labor movement has always regarded him so highly.

"Of course, there is no such thing as a welfare state, neither here in America nor anywhere else in the world. To liberals, the welfare state is an ideal worth working for and fighting for. To the reactionary politicians who pounced upon the phrase for propaganda purposes, the welfare state was merely something to frighten people into voting against their own interests.

"Fortunately, the great majority of the American people do not get panicked that easily. They have more common sense.

"A free government, like ours, was established in the first place not to rule the people, but to serve them.

"The Government does not deprive us of any liberties by such services as workmen's compensation, bank deposit insurance, crop insurance and social security. The only compulsion in any of these programs is the payment of taxes for the insurance provided, and taxes always have been and always will be with us.

"I am convinced that the American people are willing to pay still higher taxes for more adequate protection against economic disasters and for new programs, such as health insurance.

"When the welfare state slogan fell flat, the reactionaries hunted around for a new phrase and came up with the hand-out state. All of us who pay taxes for the extremely meager economic and social insurance which our Government, as yet, affords us realize quite clearly that we are not getting any hand-outs but are paying our own way.

"But, speaking of hand-outs, it is somewhat surprising to me that our reactionary friends never do refer to the very considerable hand-outs which our Government has generously awarded to big business in the past and the heavy subsidies which it is still pouring out.

"Was it a 'hand-out state' when the Government spent millions to help the railroads build transcontinental transportation networks?

"Was it a 'hand-out state' when the Government paid heavy subsidies to American shipping, so that an adequate merchant marine could be maintained against foreign competition?

"Is it a 'hand-out state' when the Government subsidizes the airlines through higher air-mail payments than are economically justified?

"Is it a 'hand-out state' when the Government deliberately takes a loss on second-class mail in order to help publications circulate more widely? Do you ever hear the newspapers and their friends in Congress complain about Government largess when big business is the direct beneficiary?

"The American Federation of Labor is, and has consistently been, a firm defender of our free-enterprise system. As a general policy, we do not believe it wise or prudent for the Government to invade the field of private business, wherever private enterprise is serving the public well. If any of the social-justice programs undertaken by the New Deal or Fair Deal were actually damaging to private business, we would be among the first to object. But, has private business really suffered under the New Deal and the Fair Deal?

"I am sure we can all remember back as far as 1933 when Franklin Roosevelt took office. Our financial structure on the brink of complete disaster; agriculture prostrate, and the buying power of our people at the lowest point in 40 years; small business failures at an all-time high.

"We didn't hear any arguments about statism or socialism from the great leaders of industry in those days. No—on the contrary they flocked to Washington by the thousands with all sorts of proposals by which they hoped the new administration would save them from disaster. That they were saved by the prompt actions of that administration is a matter of history.

"And how have the great captains of industry, who were the architects of our ruin back in the twenties, made out under the Fair Deal which they now so viciously condemn through their spokesmen? * * *

"I am not going to bore you with any long-winded analysis of the present position of big business. Let me simply quote from a report, just out, by the United States News, which is edited by David Lawrence. This special report appeared in the March 24 issue of that publication. Here is the quotation:

"'American corporations, as a group, are rolling in money. In four postwar years they have invested $60,000,000,000 in new plant and equipment; they have increased other assets by $11,000,000,000; they have added $21,000,000,000 to reserves for depreciation, and they still have $40,000,000,000 in cash and Government bonds on hand.

"'Never before was the financial position of United States business so strong.'

"I think those figures tell the story. Today, the insurance companies, who so bitterly fought us every step of the way to prevent workmen's compensation and social security are making more money than they know what to do with. Today, the utility interests which tried every fair and foul means of blocking the rural electrification program are silently splitting up huge dividends from increased sales of electric power and electric appliances.

"In the same way, I venture to predict, the American Medical Association, which is so frantically campaigning against health insurance, will be forced to admit, after it is enacted, that it was the best break the doctors of this country ever got, to say nothing of their patients.

"This controversy over the policies of the New Deal and the Fair Deal is nothing new. It goes back to our very beginning as a nation. Simply stated, it is: Shall our political and economic policy be what the people want? Or shall it be what some superior guiding group may think is best for the people?

"The present-day Bourbons of our country talk about statism, socialism, and the welfare state. To me labels, with the exception of the union label, are more or less without meaning. I am for the greater welfare and security of all the people of this Nation. I believe that it is a proper function of a democratic government to strive for a better life for all its people, including those who work for wages. Put any label you desire on this effort for a better day—statism, New Deal, socialism, Fair Deal, or welfare state—I am still for it.

"In your time and in mine, I am confident that the American people, by their own decision in free elections, will be able to achieve a greater degree of human welfare and security and will discover that their freedoms have been broadened, rather than curtailed, in the process."

World Without God

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, May 6, 1950

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call attention to an excellent editorial comment on communism, which appeared in the May 2, 1950,

issue of the News-Tribune, Waltham, Mass. Here is summed up, in a few poignant paragraphs, a precise description of what human existence would be in a Communist world and it is well worth reading. The article follows:

WORLD WITHOUT GOD

When communism takes over, all the things men have held dear throughout history are taken away. Communist rule is an insidious thing, affecting one liberty at a time until all are gone.

What goes on behind the iron curtain in Russia is more or less a matter of conjecture, but it is known there is little personal freedom, and the Russian people are virtual slaves of the government. A clearer picture of Communist rule is found in the Russian zone of Germany.

Latest move there is an attack on religion. The young are being taught there is no God, and that Christ never lived at all. Forcible attempts are being made to replace the Christian faith with dialectical materialism, especially in the schools. Appeals to the government by distressed parents have been ignored.

Police force is back of the movement to drive religion out of the lives of the people. Unless the children say the things they are told to say, and take part in activities arbitrarily imposed, they face punishment. Parents are told they will be deprived of what little freedom remains, their jobs and their bread, if they do not join in the move to make eastern Germany a pagan land.

Here is communism in its ultimate development, a world without a God and without hope.

A Splendid Editorial Comment on President Harry S. Truman's Veto of H. R. 1758, the So-Called Kerr Natural-Gas Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, May 6, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, since our great President, Harry S. Truman, so wisely vetoed H. R. 1758, the so-called Kerr natural-gas bill, wails, editorially and otherwise, have poured forth through the media of money-locked newspapers and other publications throughout the land, which sheets are engaged always in doing disservice to the natural-gas buying and natural-gas using public. A number of insertions from these sources have been made in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and they, too, have bewailed the fact that this allegedly dicta-overruling and legal-clarifying measure got the knockout punch from our splendid people-elected and people-serving President.

I dare say more financial tears have been shed over the inglorious demise of this dollar-catching bill than has ever heretofore poured forth from avaricious, greedy, and selfish eyes.

It is most heartening indeed to find that many newspapers in our land which have not degenerated tc the sordid level of "kept" news-dispensing journalism have spoken out fearlessly and in a most appreciative way about the wisdom and courage displayed by our Chief Executive in turning thumbs down on this legislative wolf in sheep's clothing.

I now shall place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point an outstanding editorial which appeared in the May 17, 1950, issue of the Lincoln Star, a daily Democratic newspaper, published at Lincoln, Nebr., which was authored by its distinguished editor, the Honorable J. E. Lawrence.

This editorial is as follows:

TRUMAN VETO

President Truman's veto of the Kerr natural-gas bill was a vindication of the faith which millions of Americans placed in the Chief Executive.

If Washington observers of the stature of Drew Pearson, Mark Childs, Tom Stokes, and Bob Allen are correct, the bill which the President vetoed was an uncalled for, unbridled grab by powerful interests. In practical effect, it was a move by the so-called independent natural-gas producers to get out from under rate regulation by the Federal Power Commission. It has been said that the bill would take between $100,000,000 or double that amount from the pockets of the consumers of natural gas. Right here in Lincoln, and in other Nebraska communities, there is an illustration of its possible results in the application of the Northern Natural Gas Co. to raise its rates. While that action is based upon a ruling by the Kansas Utility Commission granting the company an increase, it was a striking parallel that the step was planned at the time the Kerr bill was up for passage and notice came almost simultaneously with final congressional action.

It wasn't an easy decision for the little man. The amazing thing is that Mr. Truman, when the chips are down and issues of great consequence to the American people are to be determined, comes to the front with a magnificent display of courage. I mean courage. That veto of his required him to turn thumbs down on Democrat BOB KERR, a man in the gas business himself, who has spent most of his time greasing the path for congressional approval of his bill. It meant that the President had to soak the Speaker of the House, another Democrat, and a powerful Democrat, SAM RAYBURN, also with a veto. It meant that Mr. Truman deliberately invited the retaliation of a majority of the Democratic Members of the Senate. In the field of politics, that is the kind of courage the American people admire.

At no time has this bill made sense to the consuming American public. Its sponsors have claimed that in removing them from the regulation of the Federal Power Commission, there would be no increased costs for natural gas, but on the contrary, competition in the system of free enterprise would take care of all that and the consumer might even benefit. How their hearts bled for the consumer. What kind of sense does that make? In his veto message, Mr. Truman pointed out that the natural factors relating to the production and distribution of natural gas limited the competition of free enterprise, which is a matter of common knowledge. Even more, it is difficult to believe that the people behind this bill were busy turning heaven and earth in order to open up a hot competitive fight in the natural-gas field.

Well, the people won a victory, thanks to Mr. Truman. They could well think soberly upon this great fight now in progress in Washington. There are other bills of equal interest to the American people still pending. They relate very directly to the future of America. In all the chorus of today, part of the time, a thundering denunciation of communism to detract public attention; part of the time a "sweet song of free enterprise" to lull the people to sleep and to arouse a recognized devotion to the system of capitalism. Who is there in this country that wants to tear capitalism apart? Who is there in this country that doesn't recognize that regulation of a sensible character is the strongest safeguard to capitalism that exists? Mr. Truman met this challenge and met it nobly.

Report of Chicago Community Fund Stresses Housing Shortage—A Factual Picture From an Authoritative Source

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, May 6, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on Monday the Banking and Currency Committee starts the public hearings on the Spence bill for the extension of rent control. As far as Chicago is concerned, the termination of rent control on June 30 of this year would result in a situation of extreme distress which none of the Members from that city would wish to contemplate.

I on several occasions have called the attention of the House to the continuing lack of housing in Chicago within the means of a large segment of our population and of the certain tragedy which was certain to befall our people if the controls ceased before the present housing shortage had been eased. I have sought to present the matter factually, and without any exaggeration, which I think will be shown by the following news article from the conservative Chicago Daily News of April 28, 1950, appearing under a four-column headline, "95,000 families doubled up here—144,000 living in houses unfit for human beings":

NINETY-FIVE THOUSAND FAMILIES DOUBLED UP—144,000 FAMILIES IN HOUSES UNFIT FOR HUMAN BEINGS TO LIVE IN

This description of Chicago's need for housing is given by the Welfare Council of Metropolitan Chicago in its annual report on unmet needs, submitted to the community fund.

The lack of adequate housing is the primary problem in the divisions of education and recreation, and family and child welfare.

"In almost every statement housing appears as the foremost community problem affecting the work of family and children's agencies," the report says.

"Lack of housing, hazardous housing, wholesale evictions, and exorbitant rentals for poor dwellings were all listed under the general subject of housing."

American Opportunity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT THOMAS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, May 6, 1950

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech made by Glenn McCarthy to the combined

service clubs of Gainesville, Tex., April 19, 1950:

It is an honor to be invited here today to participate in the opening of the Gainesville community circus. My good friend Virgil Shepherd, of course, gave me no alternative. He called me and told me I was coming. I'm glad he did.

The Gainesville circus is one of the finest demonstrations of the meaning of American opportunity and initiative in our country today. I have heard how your citizens from all walks of life join together for the purpose of building a community tradition; how opportunity is afforded young performers to get their first experience, and how boys and girls get their first training in business. All of this is done in what has become known as the Gainesville spirit, to building a community better than it would be otherwise, and to aid in worth-while charitable undertakings.

No man could be less than proud to be selected for a part in these festivities, particularly an outsider. To be with people like you is honor enough, and I appreciate the invitation you gave me.

I was asked to make a talk on a subject of my own choosing. That leaves a man with quite a responsibility. I want to talk about American opportunity, what some of our outstanding Texans have done, and a policy which is today threatening to stifle opportunity.

Before the Lucas gusher spouted forth a hundred thousand barrels of oil a day, the petroleum industry was merely an illumination and lubrication business. That historic morning of January 10, 1901, not only gave birth to the automotive and air age; it made such an age necessary. That morning Capt. Anthony Lucas, the wildcatter, boosted America out of the horse-and-buggy era. He pointed the way for men of guts and will to build Texas into the empire it is today. He made it possible for America to become the first power among nations.

The first independent oil man of modern vintage opened the avenue that led men of determination and vision into every section of the Southwest in search for oil. The salt domes of the gulf coast, the Rangers, the Burkburnetts, the Desdemonias, the Glenn Pools, the El Dorados, and others followed. Then oil came to west Texas, east Texas, and Panhandle fields. From there came other prospectors and the quest is still on. It will never end unless initiative is completely killed, and that is certainly possible.

Men have made fortunes—great fortunes. In fact almost every major oil company in the world was born in Texas, most of them at Spindle Top. But for every fortune that has been made, a thousand prospectors have gone broke trying. Those men had a right to search for fortunes here. Our forefathers gave them that right to search for fortunes here. Our forefathers gave them that right and until some tyrant takes it away, they will continue to exercise it.

Men have come to find oil where science has said it could not exist. That is still happening. Lucas was called a fool. Dad Joiner was laughed to scorn. Burkburnett came out of "Fowler's folly." Oil is where you find it—not where someone says it is. But it takes an indomitable spirit, a will to gamble, and hard work, to find it. That spirit and that will are typically American. But there must be an incentive. That incentive is the chance for wealth or financial independence, as well as the incentive of doing good for your fellowman. An independent oil man can make a fortune or go broke—it is his own business. That's why independents find most of the oil. They can follow their own dictates—take their own chances.

They are individuals, responsible only to themselves. They usually listen to no board of directors, limited in their decisions by a group of stockholders. That's why they find the oil, and will continue to do so as long as independent oil men have an incentive to operate.

To a far greater extent than most people imagine, the oil industry is responsible for our world leadership. Try to imagine what the world would be like without oil or try to imagine what America would be like if England or Russia or Germany had America's supremacy in petroleum. When you get through thinking about that, I believe you will thank God for Captain Lucas' discovery and the system of government that made the early development of this industry possible.

Today Texas enjoys a position in the Nation as the leading oil-producing State. You can't give that credit to any major oil company. You must give it to an army of independents, thousands of whom neither you nor I ever heard of because they lost everything they had drilling dry holes.

Gainesville is located in the center of the greatest oil producing area in the world. You gentlemen know what the oil business has done for you. You know what your business, your industry, or your profession owes to oil. And the men who work for you should know, too.

But as an industry, oil owes its greatest debt to the independent. Without him there would have been no oil industry, now or in the future. Without the independent the oil industry would become a monopoly upon which the people must depend, especially after the fittest has survived the battle of the majors which would follow the disappearance of the last independent.

I think it is unimportant what an independent does for himself or to himself; whether he becomes wealthy or goes broke. That's unimportant. What is important is his contribution to national, State, and community prosperity. Who can match the oil man's contribution to progress and prosperity, here or anywhere else? He has created wealth where poverty has existed. He has built industry and business where none existed. He has given an abundance to our way of life that no man in other fields can equal.

Yet at this very hour the independent oil man, as such, faces extinction. His life, as an oil man, is in a balance, and with it, so is yours in whatever field you are engaged in.

Let me explain your part. Just a few weeks ago your governor was forced to call a tax session of the legislature and increase your taxes. In spite of that, old age pension payments are down. In spite of that, farm roads are not being built. Unemployment is growing in Texas—and elsewhere. Businesses are closing their doors in some areas. There is a trend in Texas that may lead us a long way down the road away from the progress and prosperity we have known.

You should and probably do know why every one of these things is true. It is because of the importation of almost a million barrels of foreign crude into this country every day. Every time a barrel of foreign oil comes into America, a barrel less is produced in Texas. Texas is taking most of the licking but the rest of the country will eventually, feel it. Your State revenues were off $20,000,000 from oil taxes alone last year. But that's just State revenue. How much is it off in oil payrolls, oil investments, oil explorations, lease buying, drilling? The figure would stagger all of us.

Texas bears the burden of these imports because it is the only State with a conservation and regulatory body controlling the oil industry both honestly and efficiently. You might think the railroad commission should take another course. If it did, the price of oil would drop, and business, taxes, and industry would suffer even more. We are on the horns of a dilemma. We can choose one of two ways of going over the deep end. We can cut production and make room for imports. Or we can keep production up and permit the bottom to drop out of the conservation of a vital natural resource.

We must take steps to stop or at least retard oil imports. We must at least equalize imports with exports. I say this because we cannot compete with foreign imports.

Our economy is healthy because oil wealth is spread to the greatest possible extent. The oil industry pays handsome wages to labor. It pays landowners well for leases and rentals. It pays investors good dividends and royalties. It pays a great share of State, county, and Federal taxes. It builds communities, businesses, industry, and generally brings prosperity and progress.

American industry is forced to compete with foreign oil. This oil is produced with slave labor. It is produced without regulation, and without limit. Where we produce a hundred barrels a day, a well in Arabia or Venezuela is producing ten and twenty thousand barrels a day and there are no taxes, although good chunks of cash must be handed out to foreign politicians and potentates and because of the volume of production per well a barrel of foreign oil can be sold in New York Harbor for approximately $1 per barrel in competition with domestic crude at $2.65 per barrel.

I'm not blaming the importers. They have found the oil and they are coming to the only oil market. The people must be told what this is doing to American industry. This is a message that must be carried to the people. Our Texas Congressmen understand it. Your Congressman, ED GOSSETT, probably understands it better than any man in Congress. But neither ED GOSSETT nor the other Texas Congressmen can sway the rest of Congress. Something must be done to make our Government leaders realize—not wait to find out before it is too late—what this oil-import business is doing to the economy of our Nation. It is destroying the initiative of men in the oil business. I see good men dropping out of the oil business every day. Every time one drops out, the industry suffers. It seems that even the majors who do the most importing could see this.

I believe we should keep this know-how in the oil industry. I respect the college-trained engineers, geologists, geophysicists, and executives. They have a vital place in the oil industry. But they are going to be in a pretty bad way when the last independent moves out of the field. It takes something different to drill for oil with your own dollars.

I'm afraid that when the independents are stopped in America they will go into foreign fields. I don't believe we have found half the oil in America that remains to be found. And I don't believe the other half will be found if the independent is forced out of the field. I give the majors a great deal of credit for developing oil properties after they are found, but I believe that they will admit that they are not so hot at finding new reserves. Yet new reserves in America are necessary.

It seems foolish to develop oil properties in foreign areas, particularly the Middle East, at the expense of domestic production. All that Russia is doing is waiting for American dollars and American know-how to drill the wells, build the pipe lines, and the refineries. Then they will have the advantage we have—all at our expense. Even to the point of breaking down our economy in the process. Certainly without American capital and know-how the Russians won't get far. They have done a pretty poor job with a great oil reserve of their own during the past 50 years.

War with Russia is inevitable. All Russia needs is petroleum for tanks and planes. War will come when Russia has that petroleum. If we know the production Russia now has, plus the length of time it will take

our own major oil companies to develop the Arabian area production to the point where that production would give them sufficient oil, added to their own, to fight a full-scale war, we could predict within 90 days the actual date of the outbreak of war.

So if we do as the uninformed Members of Congress and the poorly informed State Department officials advocate, we will be cutting our heads off with both sides of a double-bladed ax. We will kill our own industry; chase out the independent who makes it go the American way; destroy initiative, and hamstring domestic development with one blade. With the other blade we encourage foreign development and give our potential enemy the weapon with which to crush us militarily.

Gentlemen, I hope I have made myself clear. If I have given even a few of you a clearer impression of a threat to all of us—you as well as me—I have accomplished what I set out to accomplish.

In this homeland of initiative and opportunity, I thought the message appropriate.

Thank you.

Address of Harvey G. Ellerd

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, May 6, 1950

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, mutual respect, mutual confidence, and real team work between Members of Congress and the businessmen of their districts are very necessary if this Nation is to be saved. Because I feel so keenly about this matter I was deeply impressed by the address of welcome given the Illinois congressional delegation at a dinner in the Statler Hotel, Tuesday evening, May 2, 1950. Under leave to extend my remarks, therefore, I include the address of welcome of Harvey G. Ellerd, president, the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry:

Members of the Illinois delegation and the Eighty-first Congress, ladies and gentlemen, this annual gathering with our Illinois lawmakers is a very pleasant event. It gives us, the folks from back home, an opportunity to renew our contact with the men we read about in the newspapers and to greet them on an entirely personal basis. Usually, when we meet our legislators they are out trying to get votes, or we, as businessmen, are trying to influence their judgment on pending matters.

It is likewise a pleasure to meet the congressional wives. More than that, it is an educational privilege to meet these ladies whose influence on our elected representatives is so substantial and, may I say, beneficial. I doubt whether any of the members of the Illinois delegation will belittle the high place that congressional wives hold in the scheme of things. If any of the gentlemen does contend that he is not influenced by his wife, I think it is important that his constituents know that too, because there is a widespread opinion that a man who claims to be boss in his own house will also lie about other things.

All of the members of the three great Illinois business organizations represented here tonight regard themselves as a substantial and important part of your constituency. I am supposed to tell you about the interest of these business organizations in good government. But who is not interested in good government? Certainly every citizen who aspires to any degree of respectability will insist that good government is one of his primary interests.

There may be a wide difference of opinion among these partisans of good government, however, as to what government is good and what is the right way to improve it. And, since we are all a part of government in this Republic, each of us has a right to an opinion.

In our attempts to make and keep good government we believe it to be our responsibility as businessmen to furnish you lawmakers with the facts upon which laws are based and to forecast for you the effects and the results which we believe will develop if certain proposed legislation is passed.

I, personally, have great respect for a Member of Congress because he has corralled enough votes to get elected. If I were to run for Congress they would not even need a tally sheet to count my votes.

Developing a following in politics, and so conducting one's self as to inspire the continued confidence of the people, is an achievement which requires a great deal of professional skill and knowledge.

The people are fickle and they switch their allegiance suddenly and too often on an emotional basis. I have often been impressed with the insecurity of a career in public service. Some businessmen are inclined to believe they could do a better job of running the Government than the men who have made politics a life work. When businessmen, professional men or military men are elected to office, however, they seldom distinguish themselves and some of them wind up as failures. I believe very strongly that the men whose business is Government should be entrusted with the conduct of Government. Just as in business, there is no substitute for experience.

Just as businessmen sometimes develop delusions, however, regarding their ability to administer a public office better than the men who make public office a career, so some public office holders become imbued with the idea at times that they could operate business much more satisfactorily than the men who meet the pay rolls. As a rule they cannot. As a rule they fail just as significantly as the businessmen fail in their efforts to conduct a public office.

All of this is a very roundabout and probably a tiresome way of saying "shoemaker stick to your last." I believe, however, that it is something which needs restating from time to time. If businessmen and our representatives in the Government will each remember their own limitations and each respect the abilities of the other group, I think we will accomplish more for the general good.

As far as the businessmen are concerned, I think you will find most of us fair minded and constructive. There was a time when many businessmen were like a ball team I played on a few years. Our motto was "Win, tie, or fight—never lose."

We should, and largely do, give each other credit for honest motives in seeking good Government. An occasion such as this, which enables us to get acquainted informally, does much toward that end.

I have had the pleasure of being closely connected with the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry for nearly 20 years, and have been its president for the last year and a half. I have also participated in the activities of the Illinois Manufacturers Association and the Illinois State Chamber of Commerce. As a result of these experiences I say to you ladies and gentlemen with all sincerity, that these organizations are not motivated by any selfish interest but rather by a desire that they be a factor in producing the greatest good for the greatest number of people.

Jobs are one of the most important items of our economic necessities and the membership of these three great organizations represents a tremendous number of jobs. We know that you, as lawmakers, are for those things which will make for permanency in jobs and which will create more jobs. Both of these results depend upon the success with which business is able to operate. When we feel that laws will place a handicap on our ability to maintain and create jobs, you will hear from us, and we believe that your response will depend upon our ability to convince you of the correctness of our position.

I really had not intended to say these rather serious things on this occasion but I could not let the opportunity go by.

The English have a song which goes, "The more we are together, the happier we'll be," and that is the theme upon which I should like to close. The better we know each other, the better the results of our efforts as businessmen and of yours as lawmakers, the happier we'll all be.

Antihistamines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK B. KEEFE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, May 6, 1950

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, some time ago I addressed the House on the subject of antihistamines. I did so in an attempt to prevent a huge fraud being perpetrated upon the American people that might have a very deleterious effect on public health. I pointed out at that time that the Food and Drug Administration had never made any findings as to the efficacy of these new pills. It is interesting to note that the blatant advertising on the radio has ceased and that the full-page ads in the newspapers have likewise subsided. Evidently the cream has already been skimmed from the public purse.

It is also interesting to note that the Federal Trade Commission has instituted proceedings designed to obtain cease-and-desist orders against the manufacturers of certain of these pills for the reason that the advertising claims are false and misleading.

It is also interesting to note that a news item appearing in last evening's Washington Star indicates that an armed forces medical board, after a 6 months' investigation made by the armed forces epidemiology board reports that "no benefits from the standpoint of either prevention, reduction of symptoms, or shortening of duration of colds was shown." The Army revealed at the same time that it would not use the drugs for cold treatment and that other armed services are expected to follow suit. The article referred to follows:

ANTIHISTAMINES FAIL ON COLDS, ARMED FORCES TESTS SHOW

An Armed Forces Medical Board today announced that an investigation had produced no valid evidence that antihistamine drugs are beneficial in treating colds.

The Army revealed at the same time that it would not use the drugs for cold treatment. The other armed services are expected to follow suit, a board spokesman said.

The Navy is conducting independent tests of the antihistamine drugs at its Great

Lakes Naval Training Station, and a spokesman said its stand on the drugs probably would not be settled until completion of these tests.

The report, based on 6 months of tests, was made by the Armed Forces Epidemiology Board meeting today at the Army Medical Center here. The Board is a joint advisory agency of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, consisting mainly of civilian doctors.

Tests were conducted on both civilians and military personnel, mostly in Cleveland, by the Board's Commission on Acute Respiratory Diseases, headed by Dr. John Dingle, of Western Reserve University.

They showed no benefits, from the standpoint of either prevention, reduction of symptoms, or shortening of duration of colds, the Board said.

Effect of the durgs on allergies such as hay fever was not studied. Persons suffering from such allergies were specifically excluded, Col. William F. Stone, Board member and commandant of the Army's Medical Research and Graduate School, explained.

Persons participating in the tests were given either antihistamine tablets or tablets of plain sugar, Colonel Stone said.

"No significant difference was noticed," he said.

National Children's Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, May 6, 1950

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, the Judiciary Committee has jurisdiction over, amongst many other matters, legislation establishing holidays and commemoration days for national observance. I have the honor of being chairman of the particular subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee to which has been assigned initial responsibility for considering bills of this nature.

On May 3, 1950, my subcommittee conducted a public hearing on House Joint Resolution 227, introduced by the gentleman from California, my esteemed colleague [Mr. DOYLE], and many companion bills, which have for their purpose the establishment of a National Children's Day on the first Sunday in May of each year. These bills, which are noble and meritorious in their intent, are sponsored by the Kiwanis, and certainly I could take no exception to their constructive purposes.

Mr. DOYLE and several other Members of the Congress appeared before the subcommittee and delivered very effective and inspiring statements on behalf of the worthy cause. I commend the gentlemen on their lofty, unselfish thoughts.

At the same time, however, there also appeared before the subcommittee a Mr. George J. Hecht, chairman of the Children's Day National Council and publisher of Parents magazine. Mr. Hecht in his presentation revealed with shocking poor taste the purely commercial motives with which he viewed the establishment of National Children's Day. So apparent was his avidity for extracting the last ounce of profit from the measure that he proposed the day be set for some time in October instead of June on the grounds that the time of the year would lend itself better to commercial exploitation. His misplaced emphasis on the importance of gifts as a means of cementing a child's love for his parents comes as a revolting thought to those of us who have always felt that the bonds between children and their parents are fostered not by sordid thoughts of gain but by the love and tenderness which God in His great wisdom has planted in the breasts of all men. It needs and should need no artificial stimulants. To Mr. DOYLE's great credit may I say that he offered to withdraw his resolution rather than have it fall into the hands of those whose interests are entirely selfish and commercial.

Let me say here that so long as I may have any influence with reference to holiday and commemoration-day resolutions I shall consider a commercial motive as a bar to my consideration of any such legislation.

Biggest Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, May 6, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the twelfth article by Mr. Frank Waldrop on the infiltration of communism in our country:

BIGGEST STORY
(By Frank C. Waldrop)

There is in New York today a man who once held the power of Russia in the palm of his hand. But he lacked the killer instinct that lives in all who were born to rule.

So as he fluttered and doubted a fellow townsman from his birthplace of Simbirsk kicked him downstairs and started a train of explosions, the end of which is not yet.

The man who had power and lost it was Alexander Kerensky, who still lives. The one who took power was Vladimir Ulyanov, alias Lenin, who died before he had a chance to enjoy it.

These two adventurers from Simbirsk, now renamed for Lenin, collided as the last of the Romanov czars, Nicholas II, gave up his throne.

It was a time of staggering upheaval. Millions of Russian troops were being slaughtered by the machine-like precision of Kaiser Wilhelm's Germans.

The Czar went to the front to take personal command, and while he was away a weird magician from Tobolsk in the Russian back country came to prominence in St. Petersburg. The magician was a ruined monk named Gregory Rasputin.

Rasputin from Tobolsk was a bad man, but a powerful magician. He got into the palace politics through claims that he could cure the heir-apparent to the throne of fits. And before anybody knew what he was about he had become the most influential man in town.

Lest you think that is exclusively the nature of things in a weak and disintegrating monarchy and that no other form of government suffers such ills, just remember Washington these 20 years past.

And to parallel that, some murderous palace politics of the Communist regime in Russia. Chapters on both lie ahead in this series.

The truth is that no matter what the form of a government, none is ever any better than the men in office.

The main thing to be said about forms of government is that for safety's sake the men in office should be put there by the people and taken out on schedule, so that power of government cannot ever harden in any one group's hands.

Rasputin became such a power over the royal household in 1916–17 and his influence was so disruptive of the efforts of a few to swing Russia toward orderly government, that a handful of aristocrats under the leadership of Prince Felix Yussupov poisoned, stabbed and finally took him out and threw him in the river.

He was hard to kill.

But as soon as he was dead, riots, strikes and mutinies broke out all over. Parliament ignored the royal household and set up a temporary government on its own, with Alexander Kerensky as minister of justice, representing the Socialists.

While all this was going on, in the period from September 1916–March 1917, a gigantic war was roaring in northern France and along the edge of Russia.

Far over the sea in Washington a United States President named Wilson itched and edged toward the edge of the volcano. He had run for reelection in 1916 with the slogan "He kept us out of the war." And now that he was safely elected, the slogan became "Freedom of the seas."

That, with other help, got the United States of America into the war against Germany on April 6, 1917.

And while all that was happening the man who called himself Lenin was hiding in Zurich, Switzerland, with a handful of other exiles from Russia, futilely and hopelessly watching the world turn upside down.

But suddenly Lenin found himself on a railroad train in a sealed car with a handful of fellow conspirators on the way home. The German general staff had been struck with the bright idea that if the United States of America was coming in against them on one side they had better do what they could to knock Russia loose from the other.

They classed Lenin as a poisonous flea who, if they could only get him in the Russian ear, might be able to do some damage. So they sent him into St. Petersburg with, so some historians say, $10,000,000 in gold and a nod and wink.

In the meantime, Kerensky had risen to the head of the government and as Prime Minister was trying to wage war abroad and build socialism at home.

Lenin arrived in St. Petersburg, by then renamed Petrograd, April 16, 1917. By November, with German help, he had bounced Kerensky, stopped the foreign war with an armistice that was put into a treaty of peace by March 3, 1918, and had started a monumental civil war at home.

Not for one moment in all that did he or his gang ever hold a popular majority of votes, where there were any.

Indeed, Lenin had nothing but contempt for what he called parliamentary feebleness and he openly said so.

Hoover Answers 10 Questions on the FBI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. WILSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, May 6, 1950

Mr. WILSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD

the very enlightening article published in the New York Times magazine for April 16, 1950, entitled "Hoover Answers 10 Questions on the FBI."

I am certain that all good American citizens are deeply concerned over national security and are vitally interested in the increasing importance and scope of the activities of the FBI. I noted with great interest the timely questions by the New York Times magazine as put to Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI, and his very cogent answers to these 10 questions about this great Federal law-enforcement agency's role. The questions and Mr. Hoover's answers are presented in full. They follow:

HOOVER ANSWERS 10 QUESTIONS ON THE FBI

(By J. Edgar Hoover)

(The increasing importance and scope of the activities of the Federal Bureau of Investigation have been underlined by concern over national security and the safeguarding of atomic secrets. On the one hand, Director J. Edgar Hoover has asked that the FBI staff be expanded to meet duties imposed by America's atomic-hydrogen bomb program; on the other hand the FBI and its methods have been criticized as a threat to individual freedom. For these reasons the New York Times magazine put to Mr. Hoover 10 questions about the Federal law-enforcement agency's role. The questions and Mr. Hoover's answers are presented here.)

1. What is the chief job facing the FBI today?

The chief job facing the FBI today is to afford the maximum protection to the American people. This obligation, of course, varies from day to day. The FBI by congressional enactments and Presidential directives, is responsible for investigating violations of specifically assigned Federal laws; the collection of evidence in cases in which the United States is or may be a party in interest and performing other duties imposed by law.

These duties, naturally, place heavy and continuous responsibilities upon the FBI. The work of the FBI, in general terms, is twofold: protecting the Nation against the violation of Federal laws and the subversive agent. In the early years of the FBI, in fact up until about 1939, the chief focus of the Bureau was directed against the criminal—the vicious hoodlum, the John Dillinger, the Alvin Karpis, who was intent upon advancing his own predatory interests at the expense of the innocent citizen.

However, by 1939–40, a new national menace began to manifest itself—the danger of fifth column intrigue. Since that time, the FBI has directed increasing attention to internal security problems, until today a large proportion of our staff is assigned to security work. The nature of the menace has changed from nazism to communism, but the danger to America's welfare remains the same.

2. Whom does the FBI investigate? On what basis does it determine who shall be investigated? Is a letter of accusation enough to cause an investigation? Is the accuser investigated too?

Since I assumed the directorship of the FBI in 1924, the basic principle has been followed that the FBI will investigate only upon the presentation of a complaint or information which, if true, constitutes a violation of Federal law coming within our primary jurisdiction, or a matter assigned us by higher authority.

Obviously, we must be on the alert for those acts for which we are responsible. At no time, however, will we investigate unless there is a factual basis or unless we are directed to do so by higher authority. For example, we have the responsibility of investigating alleged violations of the antitrust laws when the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice so requests; violations of civil rights when so directed by the Civil Rights Section of the Department's Criminal Division; accidents involving possible Federal liability under the Torts Claims Act when so requested by the United States attorney; and fraudulent claims against the Government when so requested by the Claims Division of the Department, along with scores of other matters the general public seldom considers.

As a public-service organization, our doors are open to any citizen or person in the United States who wishes either to make a complaint or furnish information. A letter, signed or anonymous, if it sets forth information which, if true, comes within our jurisdiction, receives consideration. Action to be taken must be decided on the basis of the facts in each case.

In one instance one of our field offices received an anonymous letter alleging that a certain individual had transported stolen cars interstate. We investigated. The results: Sixty stolen automobiles recovered in three States, the thief identified, evidence collected, and eventually the culprit convicted in Federal court. An anonymous letter started the entire investigation.

In another case a police department advised the FBI that a certain Federal employee had signed a Communist nominating petition. We investigated under the provisions of the Federal employee loyalty program. An FBI laboratory technician compared specimens of the employee's handwriting with the signature on the Communist nominating petition. The Government employee's name was there, but he was not the signer. Subsequent investigation conclusively established his loyalty to our Government.

The facts in each case must determine how much credence should be given the individual who makes the accusation. If, for example, we received word from John Doe that another named person was a spy we would want to know the basis for John Doe's accusation. Was he in a position to possess the facts he related? What was his motive? Did it result from malice or a grudge, or was he fulfilling the responsibilities of citizenship? The facts in each case must determine whether he would or would not be investigated.

3. What facts does the FBI seek in the way of information about a man's political, social, and economic beliefs?

The facts vary in each case. The first step is to establish the truth or falsity of the complaint. If true, then there are certain basic facts which are necessary under rules of evidence to sustain a charge in court. With the tremendous volume of work, our investigations are limited to fundamentals. An automobile theft case is one thing, while an espionage ring is another. In the latter we want to know everything the spy does, who his contacts are, where he gets his information, how he transmits it; in fact, we would be derelict if we did not know everything he did from the time he was identified until the investigation was concluded. The responsibility of the FBI is to secure the facts. We do not make decisions as to prosecutive action or recommendations as to whether an individual is suitable or unsuitable for Federal employment.

The FBI is concerned with acts and deeds, not thoughts or beliefs. A man is entitled to think and to believe what he desires. If, in the course of the investigation, however, a witness states that an individual advocates the overthrow of our Government by force and violence, the FBI will want to know what he has done to carry out his threats of force and violence. Whether he is a Republican, Democrat, or Progressive is none of our concern.

In one case, we received a report that a Federal employee had been a card-carrying member of the Communist Party. The investigation established the accuracy of the original allegation. In fact, we even secured the number of his party card. He was not only known but active as a Communist. The investigation, however, revealed additional data. The Federal employee once had been active in a union. With an associate he had joined the Communist Party for the primary purpose of worming his way inside the party clique—to obtain the information which eventually rid the union of Communist domination. The investigation revealed, clearly and vividly, the true loyalty of the Federal employee.

Either through design or misunderstanding, there are those who say that the FBI is invading the realm of thought. Each time this charge has been raised we have endeavored to secure the facts. Invariably the accuser, when asked for specific details, answers in neubulous and vague terms. He is unable to produce the proof to substantiate his charges. Recently one reviewer wrote—attesting fiction as fact—that FBI agents has asked him if a person under investigation read a certain publication. When asked for the name of the agent, the writer replied the incident had occurred so long ago he could not recall the name.

Another individual berated the FBI because of the manner in which we had investigated him. The fact of the matter was he had never been investigated by the FBI. We would gladly have told him if he had been sufficiently interested in the truth to have inquired.

The FBI is interested in actions, not thoughts; in deeds, not beliefs; what a man does, not what he thinks.

4. What is your attitude about the disclosure of FBI files in court or before congressional committees?

The public record clearly proves that the FBI, because it does maintain confidences, has been able to develop valuable sources of information which have a direct bearing on the internal security of the Nation.

The disclosure of the contents of the files by the FBI would reveal confidential procedures and techniques. If this material were spread upon the record, criminals, foreign agents, subversives, and others would be forewarned and would seek methods to carry out their activities by avoiding detection and thus defeat the very purpose for which the FBI was created. Each exception undermines this principle, establishes a precedent, and would inevitably result in a complete collapse of a traditional policy which has proven its soundness.

A disclosure of FBI reports would reveal the identity of confidential sources of information and, if it did not place the lives of such persons in actual jeopardy, it would certainly ruin their future value for effectiveness.

I would not want to be a party in any action which would smear innocent individuals for the rest of their lives.

5. What do the FBI investigative files consist of? To whom are they available?

An FBI investigative file consists of communications pertaining to the investigation, instructions issued by both the Department of Justice and the headquarters of the FBI to its field offices, the reports of its agents, and any other data pertinent to the investigation.

FBI files are confidential by ruling of the Attorney General of the United States. Data contained in the files are for official use, which has been defined by higher executive authority. Investigative reports are furnished other Government agencies when the investigation pertains to these agencies, without recommendation or evaluation. By virtue of Presidential directives charging the FBI with the responsibility of coordinating information pertaining to the internal secu-

rity of the United States, information of interest to other Government agencies is furnished them. The FBI also has the duty of answering requests for information from other agencies.

The FBI fingerprint files contain the fingerprint records forwarded to us by local law-enforcement agencies, the Civil Service Commission, and other Government agencies. The technical files contain only the best set of fingerprint impressions, all other fingerprint cards and resulting correspondence pertaining to identification matters are kept in folders. Data are placed in the fingerprint files only when they relate to identification by fingerprints, such as dispositions following arrests, wanted notices, missing-person notices, and dispositions from the Civil Service Commission and other Government agencies.

6. Are there files on Members of Congress?

No. Investigative files are not maintained on anyone, in or out of Congress, unless there has been a complaint coming within the purview of our investigative responsibilities. The FBI does not maintain files on individuals or organizations, irrespective of position, unless in connection with the discharge of our responsibilities imposed by law or administrative direction. Of course, we have correspondence files, as does any other organization.

7. If a person accused of disloyalty has been cleared, does the FBI destroy the file?

The FBI does not destroy files unless they are obsolete and then only with the permission of the Archivist of the United States. So-called housekeeping records as defined by the Archivist are destroyed after they have served their usefulness. Once an investigation has been made, even though the complaint was found to be untrue, it would be improper and illegal to destroy the file. The innocent person should have the protection of a record of the facts which established his innocence. Should a future similar complaint arise, we would have the benefit of previous information secured, which would make a further investigation unnecessary. As a matter of fact, we receive information daily which on the surface would require investigation but a check of the files reveals previously received data which provide a logical explanation.

In one case, a question arose concerning the loyalty of a Federal employee. Our files revealed that in 1942 he had been investigated as a result of disclosures by a congressional committee. That file contained not only the employee's complete explanation but a verification of the facts. We saw no need for further investigation.

The fact that a man has been proved innocent of charges is even more important in the interest of decency and fair play. Should old charges be revived in the future, the Government employee should be protected by a retention of the file. The question of maintaining a newspaper morgue might very well have been asked. In fast-breaking stories the over-all facts and conclusions frequently are changed through further verification, yet I have never heard it argued that a newspaper should destroy its morgue.

8. To whom is the FBI responsible? Who reviews its work?

The FBI is primarily responsible to the Attorney General and through him to the President. It is also responsible to Congress and, in fact, annually must justify its activities before appropriations committees when the Congress considers its appropriations needs. In addition, the Bureau of the Budget, representing the President, periodically checks our fiscal operations.

The FBI is not a policy-making organization and it does not make recommendations as to action to be taken. It reports facts. In criminal and civil cases, investigative reports are submitted to the United States attorneys and to the appropriate officials of the Department of Justice. When these cases go into court, the activities of the FBI come under the scrutiny of the courts as well as defense counsel.

In connection with loyalty investigations, its reports go to the various agency loyalty hearing boards and are subject to later review by the Civil Service Loyalty Review Board. The work of few Federal bureaus is subjected to as much review as that of the FBI.

9. Does the FBI employ the use of wire tapping? If so, what is its justification?

The FBI does utilize wire tapping as an investigative technique, pursuant to policies established by the highest executive authorities in the land, but only under strictest control and supervision. In each instance, the express authority of the Attorney General is received in writing.

Wire tapping is employed only in matters involving internal security or when human lives might be in jeopardy. Information secured as a result of wire tapping is not used as evidence and is not divulged publicly by the FBI except under force of judicial compunction, over the objection of the Government.

The late President Franklin D. Roosevelt, in a widely publicized letter dated February 26, 1941, said:

"I do not believe it should be used to prevent domestic crimes, with possibly one exception—kidnaping and extortion in the Federal sense. I have no compunction in saying that wire-tapping should be used against those persons, not citizens of the United States, and those few citizens who are traitors to their country, who today are engaged in espionage or sabotage against the United States."

A long line of Attorneys General, including Supreme Court Justices Robert H. Jackson and Tom C. Clark, along with former Attorney General Francis Biddle, has consistently approved the use of wire-tapping for the purpose for which it is employed by the FBI. Former Attorney General Clark observed in a public statement on March 31, 1949: "The statutes and decisions of the courts, including the Supreme Court, concerning wire-tapping do not prohibit the tapping of wires, but rather the divulging or publishing of information and use of it as evidence when obtained by wire-tapping."

10. What answer do you make to the charge that the FBI has too much power in our democracy; that recent developments, in which innocent persons have been accused on the basis of FBI information, are dangerous to civil liberty?

The FBI is the investigative arm of the Department of Justice. As a fact-finding agency, it investigates violations of Federal laws and presents its findings to the Attorney General, his assistants, and the United States attorneys. The FBI cannot file a complaint against a person without first presenting the facts to a United States attorney. In the event prosecution is authorized, then a judge or a jury passes upon the guilt or innocence of the accused.

Prosecution is not a matter within the jurisdiction of the FBI. As a matter of fact, the rules of the FBI require that FBI agents shall not recommend prosecution or urge that prosecution be dropped.

In the case of arrest and seizure of evidence, the FBI operates within the framework of law. Otherwise, an appeal may be made to the courts.

Our governmental system is one of checks and balances. To this end, the instruments of government, including the FBI, are zealously watched by the executive, the judicial, and legislative branches in order to insure that they will not go beyond the well-defined limits of their existence. As previously pointed out, the FBI must justify its every activity to the Attorney General, his assistants, the President, the Congress, and the American people.

One of the greatest protectors of our democratic way of life is the free press in America. The press certainly is alert, and justifiably so, to disclose an improper abuse of power by the FBI or any other Government agency.

The judiciary remains the protector of our way of life. If FBI activity were totalitarian in nature, the courts would be appealed to with dispatch. Prosecution of FBI cases takes place in the courts. During the 1949 fiscal year the total number of convictions in all FBI cases was 8,415. Of all persons brought to court in FBI cases, 97.2 percent were convicted; 93.9 percent of the convictions were based upon pleas of guilty.

One of the best guaranties that the FBI will continue to function within a framework of law stems from the character of FBI men and the training they receive. They would do everything in their power to prevent the FBI from becoming a totalitarian, power-drenched organization. The typical FBI man is, in turn, a typical American. He is just as anxious to see to it that American principles are preserved, either in FBI investigative activity or in any other phase of daily life, as he is to continue to enjoy the freedom incident to democratic living.

The FBI is a servant of the people. A law-enforcement agency becomes too powerful when it is the master of the people. This condition does not exist in the United States.

The FBI makes no accusations. In posing this question the author undoubtedly had in mind the recent case in Washington where, upon the motion of defense counsel, a Federal judge ordered certain FBI reports introduced into evidence. The record demonstrates clearly that the prosecutive officials bitterly opposed the introduction of these reports. An investigative report of the FBI is like a newspaper reporter's notebook. In the course of covering a story, the well-trained reporter secures much information; some true, other portions rumor, gossip, or hearsay. In writing his story he uses only the material which is verified.

In many files the number of reports runs into the hundreds and any one report will not give the complete truth. In fact, all the data in that report, furnished by some person interviewed, may later be proved untrue.

As one very fair and astute Washington columnist stated: "The press has something to answer for in this connection, it seems to me. The raw material of the FBI reports was translated into sensational headlines with little indication for the guidance of the reader that these were not conclusions reached by the FBI but merely the stuff to be ground through the security mill. More responsibility all around would be helpful."

The record of the FBI is well known. We are a human organization functioning in a field where the possibility of error is high, where temperament is sensitive and the security of the individual is paramount. We have sought to discharge our responsibilities with impartiality, fairness, and regard for nothing but the truth. The men of the FBI are taught that it is even more important to establish innocence than guilt.

The FBI is an organization built upon merit and personal integrity. In the final analysis, the character of the special agents of the FBI and their record is the guaranty that the innocent have no basis for fear. They come from every section of the country and are products of the Nation's colleges and universities. The FBI stands today as a service institution, dedicated to the protection of the welfare and security of the American people. The magnitude and vital importance of our tasks lend us strength, courage, and conviction to do ever a better job.

Additional Beds for Veterans' Hospitals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN R. DAVIS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, May 6, 1950

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in amplification of my statement on the floor of the House on April 25, when H. R. 5965, directing the President to provide space for 16,000 additional hospital beds in veterans' hospitals was before us, I set forth here an enlightening article which appeared in the Washington Evening Star on April 28:

MEDICAL CHIEF SAYS VA CAN'T USE MORE BEDS

(By Martin S. Hayden)

The angry medical boss of the Veterans' Administration wishes that more Congressmen, chamber of commerce heads, and American Legion commanders knew what a hospital is.

Dr. Paul B. Magnuson says that, if they did, he would not be asked to seek doctors to work in Dublin, Ga., and Battle Creek, Mich., and there would not be talk of giving him 16,000 more veteran beds that he could not operate, if he had them.

In a blunt interview, the one-time Northwestern University surgery head, now VA Medical Chief, had his say about "pouring taxpayers' money down drains under the guise of helping veterans." Specifically, he slapped the election-year alacrity with which the House Monday pushed through Representative RANKIN'S $237,000,000 bill to reinstate the 16,000 beds pruned by President Truman from the VA hospital-construction program.

"I couldn't use 16,000 more beds if they gave them to me tomorrow," Dr. Magnuson protested. "Some folks have the idea that all you do is spend $15,000 to provide one hospital bed and everything is fine. They forget that, after the buildings are open, it takes $12 a day per patient to fill the bed; that would be $192,000 a day, or $70,000,000 a year for 16,000 beds.

"And then," says the doctor, "there is the matter of hiring doctors, nurses, and technicians.

"Do they want 16,000 boarding-house beds, or hosptals?" he asks, "If they want hospitals, it might be well to remember that it takes 1½ people in a hospital to take care of each patient, year in and year out. We have nearly 4,000 of our present beds empty for lack of staff."

That gets the doctor around to Dublin, Battle Creek, and other small communities where, he says, "Chambers of commerce and Legion posts raise hell till they get a veterans' hospital."

Dublin, in the home district of Chairman VINSON, of the Armed Servces Commttee, now has its hospital: A modern 1,000-bed unit built by the Navy, 53 miles from Macon, the nearest city, and presented after the war to the VA.

"We authorize use of 500 of the beds," Dr. Magnuson says. "We've never been able to get enough staff to open more than 300. Dublin is a nice place, but we just can't find hospital technicians, nurses, and doctors willing to move there. I took the bull by the horns and ordered 15 of our doctors down there and 8 promptly resigned."

In Battle Creek, Dr. Magnuson is criticized for not grabbing up the 1,200-bed, $30,000,000 Percy Jones Hospital, which the Army is about to close.

"Another nice town," Dr. Magnuson comments. "But look at its census of doctors: No specialists in anesthesia, skin, or plastics; one each in neuropsychiatry, urology, and orthopedic surgery; three each in internal medicine, pathology, and nose-throat-ear; and five each in surgery and X-ray.

"If we asked those doctors for a guaranty of hours to help us, they would be too busy to give us a total of 10 hours a week. That would mean we would have to bring in a whole new staff and you just can't get them."

At the opposite, and good, extreme, Dr. Magnuson points to the situation in San Francisco where the VA has a staff of only eight full-time doctors in a 430-bed hospital. The bulk of the work is handled by the Stanford and University of California medical school staffs. He would like more beds in such cities.

"They are less expensive," he says, "and the patients have readily available the finest specialized talent that science can produce."

Dr. Magnuson snorts at some of the things said by impassioned House Members during the Monday debate.

Representative EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, Republican, of Massachusetts declared: "It is a cruel thing to prevent men who have fought for us and who were injured from receiving hospitalization."

"There is no such veteran," answers Dr. Magnuson. "Any man disabled in the service can have a bed immediately and get the best medical treatment in the world. The only exception is when he insists on going to a specific hospital and refuses to let us send him where there is space available."

There is a 26,000-veteran waiting list for free VA beds, Dr. Magnuson admits, but all are veterans whose illness is in no way traceable to their service.

Under old law, the VA may give notification for non-service-connected disability, provided there is space available. The records show that, ever since Congress passed the law, it has poured out money to make space available and, of the 99,311 veterans actually hospitalized as of last February 28, two-thirds were for nonservice disabilities.

Another objected-to congressional complaint was this, from Representative DAYTON PHILLIPS, Democrat, of Tennessee:

"Seriously ill veterans are being moved out of hospitals, many of them sent home to die."

"Bunk," says Dr. Magnuson. "There has never been a sick man put out of a veterans' hospital. Some have died after they went home. But death was started by Adam and has been going on pretty consistently ever since. We can fight it, but, but we can't stop it."

What You Haven't Been Told About China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, May 6, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article from the American Legion, written by Mr. and Mrs. Arthur Hart Burling, who were for years distinguished members of the American diplomatic corps with long service in China:

WHAT YOU HAVEN'T BEEN TOLD ABOUT CHINA

(By Judith and Arthur Hart Burling)

Should the United States recognize Communist China? Those who are pressing for recognition claim that it is essential for us to have a listening post. How effective can a listening post be in any Communist-dominated country? Even before the war foreign correspondents in China concentrated in the large centers—Shanghai, Peking, Tientsin, and Canton—and rarely ventured into the rural areas. Does anyone really believe that now, under Communist rule, Americans will be permitted to travel and talk freely to the Chinese farmers?

It is chiefly due to the absence of first-hand information about the interior of China that the Reds have had such overwhelming success with their all-out propaganda attack of the last 10 years. Masters of double talk, the Communists (and their fellow travelers and stooges) have made use of words like agrarian reform, liberation, democracy, people's government—words which fall pleasantly on American ears—to mask what has been nothing but the brutal drive for power of a ruthless minority.

One successful propaganda line has been that this is a spontaneous revolution of the people. But the people who joined the Communists were chiefly students, intellectuals, and groups of factory workers in the cities—many of them fired by ambition to become the commissars of the new order. These represent a very small percentage of population, since from 80 to 90 percent of the Chinese are farmers, and not more than 10 percent live in cities and large towns.

Many of those we call farmers would be termed peasants in Europe, or other parts of the world, but that word has no meaning in China, because the Chinese have not lived under a feudal system in the last 2,000 years. The Chinese farmer has not been a serf, but has owned his own piece of land. Small and poor his holding may have been, but it was his own. He has been a freeman. More than half of the Chinese farmers were owners, less than one-third part owners, and only about 17 percent tenants.

Another successful propaganda line has been that the Communists are dividing up the large holdings. The main flaw in this picture is that there have been very few large holdings. The average farm size is about 4 acres (compared with an average of 157 acres in the United States), and this figure includes the 7 percent of what are called very large farms, of which the average size is only 13 acres.

The farmers comprise the vast bulk of the people of China, and their response to communism has been demonstrated by the millions of refugees who abandoned their farms and fled before the advancing Communists into the Nationalist areas. There has never been any instance of Chinese fleeing from the Nationalist areas into the sections controlled by the Reds. At one time it was estimated that there were more than 38,000,000 of these refugees who had taken to the roads. Many were middle-class people, landowners, and home owners, who had reduced themselves to beggary because they had heard what happened to other villages when the Communists took over. The only reason why there are no longer these pitiful floods of homeless refugees on the roads, is simply that now there is nowhere for them to go. They are trapped.

What has life been like for those who live in the rural areas since the Communists seized power?

This is the way in which the Reds are carrying out their much-publicized program of agrarian reform:

In each district (hsien), they appoint five or seven Communist directors. These are chosen from the large groups of plain-clothes Communists who accompany the Red army, and who are known as politicals or political organizers. Their task is to completely terrorize and subdue the villagers. At least half of the directors must come from provinces other than those in which they operate to insure that no partiality is shown.

These directors go into every village, however small, and select one or two young men as their representatives. Those chosen must have no profession, trade, or steady work. Nor must they own a farm or property of any kind. In other words, they must be the men whom the farmers have looked upon as ne'er-do-wells. Their main qualification is that they be maladjusted, violent men who bear a grudge against society. These young men are then told just how many people (50, 100, 200, or more, according to the size of the population) must be liquidated as an example to the rest of the village.

They make up this list of victims, in consultation with their cronies, and this gives all who have a quarrel with, or are jealous of a neighbor, a fine chance to avenge themselves. When completed the list is handed to the Communist directors for approval.

Then a village meeting is called, usually in the night. The word "meeting" strikes terror into the heart of every man, woman, and child. Everyone must be present, and nobody knows when or whether his will be the name that turns up in this gruesome lottery.

The Chinese Communists have no legal code of any kind. The victims are not told beforehand what they are accused of, or even that they are accused. There is no defense and no appeal. Sentence is passed and carried out on the spot.

When the whole village is assembled, the village representative takes the chair, with the Communist director sitting beside him to tell him what to do, and to read the confession. This has been prepared before the accused has even been told what the charge against him is.

The village representative then stands up, calls out the name of the victim, and waits for the director to read the long recital of all the misdeeds of which the man is accused.

The conclusion is always a statement that this wrongdoer must be punished, followed by the decision as to whether he is to be shot or beaten to death. Shootings are few, because the reds are told to save their bullets for fighting, and also because they know the Chinese now say: "A man is lucky if he is shot to death."

The sentence usually runs: "This guilty man is condemned to be beaten to death. Any objection?" Nobody dares to speak. The village representative then announces: "Everybody is in agreement."

The real reasons why the victims are selected include being a little more prosperout and successful than others, knowing how to read and write, having a knowledge of the history of China, or knowing about the outside world, being too popular with the villagers, or having their confidence. Such men, it is feared, might be able to influence the minds of the villagers against the Reds.

The trumped-up charges against the condemned men are fantastic, and are apparently not even intended to be taken seriously. A typical accusation is the following: "Fifty years ago such and such a family was the tenant of your father (or grandfather or great-grandfather). For the new year festival, this family gave your ancestor a gift of a couple of chickens, or a dozen eggs. Now let us reckon up and see how much wealth the family of the tenant have lost by this transaction."

The director fixes a value for the gift, takes the highest known rate of interest, compounds it, and then states: "By now I find you have cheated this family of such and such a sum." Care is taken to arrive at a figure far greater than all that the man and his family possess.

Then comes the judgment: "You must give up all your family lands, all your money, everything you own, to repay part of this debt. As a punishment you will be beaten to death."

Then sentence is carried out immediately, and the whole family is forced to be present, but forbidden to weep or make any sound. Afterward the man's wife and children are turned out to beg.

It is a universal custom for the Chinese to exchange gifts at the new year. If a tenant gave a farmer a gift, he would, as a matter of course, give the tenant, in return, something like a box of tea, or a piece of cotton cloth, or a dish of sweet cakes. This fact is, of course, not mentioned.

Both logic and justice are completely outside the range of these people's courts.

In one village in Honan a young man who was extremely popular with everyone was sentenced for some imaginary crime. But, because the people murmured angrily at the decision, the court decided to hang him up by the thumbs overnight, as a lesson that the judgment of the Communists must not be questioned. Execution was to be deferred until the next day.

Somehow, during the night, the young man managed to loosen the bonds and climb down. At the risk of their lives the villagers hid him and helped him to escape. When the Communists found that the young man had got away, they avenged themselves by having his mother and sister beaten to death.

In one village in northern Kiangsu two old women grumbled to each other as they walked together: "Why must such things happen?" Both were seized by soldiers, and ordered to be beaten to death in front of the whole village as an example. While the execution was being carried out, the Communists cried: "You are beating these women too hard. You must be in sympathy with them, and want them to have a quick death. Work more slowly, or you will be the next ones to be liquidated."

In spite of all this terrorism, there have been many rural uprisings. Whole villages, and the populations of whole areas, have been wiped out. The Red leaders publicly state that it does not matter how many millions are killed as long as all resistance is stamped out.

Much has been made in certain quarters of the fact that the Nationalist soldiers had to take food from the farmers, whereas the Red armies do not take anything. The truth is that they do not need to, because food is requisitioned from the farmers by the aforementioned politicals. So much is taken from them that many young men in the villages joined the Red army as the only alternative to starvation.

On the other hand, the people in the rural areas, feeling that everything will eventually be taken away from them, eat up whatever they have—killing their pigs, chickens, and even their buffalo. This is bound to result in widespread famine in the near future.

The Communists claim that they have divided up the land more equally. Actually they have taken land away from some farmers, and given it to others, frequently less competent people. Far from bringing about any agrarian reform the results are already disastrous.

The farmers now figure out that the best they can hope for this year is 50 percent of the usual crop. There are many reasons for this, including the redistribution of land, the lack of buffalo, and the fact that too many women are left without husbands or grown sons. This last is due to the fact that vast numbers of men have been forced into the Red army, and also because so many villagers, about four to each combat soldier, have been compelled to accompany the Red troops and do their work for them.

Then there is the lack of fertilizer, and of food for such animals as civilians still retain. One of the main necessities of the farmer is a supply of soya beans. These are used as food and as oil. The soya bean cake, after the oil is squeezed out, provides fodder for the cattle and pigs, and it is essential as fertilizer to supplement the droppings of the animals. Now the bulk of the whole soya bean crop is being sent away to Soviet Russia, causing incalculable loss to Chinese agriculture.

In addition every farmer now has to give one-third of his crop in kind (not in money) to the government, plus another one-third as a voluntary contribution to the Red army. On top of all this they have to provide food for the soldiers, who are always well fed, especially for several days before they leave for the front, when they are stuffed up like prize turkeys.

Above all there is the psychological factor. Everything now belongs to the government. Nobody in China has the right to buy or sell land. For the first time in their long history no man now owns his own piece of the "good earth." There were never any robber barons in China. Even those few who had holdings of 10 or more acres did not steal them, or acquire them by conquest, but through hard labor and thrift of their ancestors. Now everyone feels that he has been robbed. Even those who had nothing before take no pride in their newly acquired little holding. They know it is not their own, and can be taken away at any moment. Thus the farmers no longer have the incentive to wrest all they can from the soil. Anyway, they say, they are too tired to work hard during the day when they have to attend meetings almost every night. These meetings are not only for trials but for political harangues as well. Attendance is compulsory.

Bitterly resented by all the farmers is the ruling that, in order to go from one village to another, they must obtain a road passport (lu t'iao), bearing their name, where they come from, and their destination. Since these are issued by the village representative, who can seldom read, villagers have in some cases written false names and destinations on their passes and thus managed to escape from their district. Some of our informants have escaped from Communist China by this device.

Before the Communists began to have military successes, they promised the farmers such improvements that some of them, weary of their sufferings during 18 years of war and its aftermath, were inclined to welcome the Reds' arrival. They now say: "These people promised us a better life, but as soon as they got control they took the masks off their faces and we saw that they were devils."

Now the people in the rural areas know what communism means, and they say: "All we want is to be left alone without meetings, and without beatings, without passports, and without requisitions. We want to live peaceably and look after our own little farms."

Never before has a whole population so quickly turned against a new regime. In the rural areas practically all of the people are filled with hatred for the Reds. In one village after another, men whisper to their friends: "I live only for the day when some internal or external trouble will give me a chance to kill a couple of them myself, with my hoe or sickle, or even with a big stone."

The people feel that their whole life is now poisoned. Even stronger than the need for livelihood and security, ingrained in the Chinese mind for centuries, is the importance of an ethical code, or correct personal relationships, of respect for their ancient civilization. All these the Reds are trying to destroy. They have changed all the textbooks, and teach the children an entirely false version of Chinese history and philosophy. As to foreign relations, they teach that America has always been the enemy of

China, that it was the United States that presented the infamous Twenty-one Demands to the Chinese in 1915, and that America refused to fight the Japanese, so that Soviet Russia had to deliver them from the Japanese invaders.

The firmest foundation of Chinese life has been the family, the respect of children for their parents. Now the Reds constantly preach that older people do not count, and that it is best for them to die or be killed off. Children are being trained from infancy to hate their parents, and to spy on them, as in all totalitarian countries.

Of course a whole civilization cannot be wiped out in a day. The Chinese farmers are skeptical of propaganda, and many still have influence over their children. They tell them: "Now we are told that the Americans are our enemies. A few years ago we were told that America was our best friend, that we had to risk our lives to protect any of their airmen who fell down amongst us. How can they expect us to believe that things change so quickly?" But as a new generation grows up, as the older people become more and more afraid to express their thoughts, the situation will inevitably deteriorate. The idea of freedom will fade away.

Even in the cities, and that is where the Communists have tried to make the best showing, there is no attempt to build up industry or improved standards of living. Factories are being dismantled in Shanghai, as they were in Manchuria. There is widespread unemployment, and the people are told to go back to the land. Those who follow this advice find themselves faced with starvation.

The students welcomed the Communists with much rejoicing, but now most of them are completely disillusioned. It is estimated that at least 70 percent have become anti-Red. A common saying among the students is that, as far as fulfilling their grandiose promises is concerned, the Communists have turned out to be only a paper tiger. "You put in your finger and make a hole, and inside there is nothing but air."

As regards the factory workers, they are completely baffled. Forbidden to strike, and forced to work 2 or 3 hours a day longer than before without any additional pay, they ask what benefits the Communists have brought them. "Of course you cannot strike, and you must be glad to produce as much and as cheaply as possible, because the factories now belong to you" is the stock answer. "The factories may belong to us," the men grumble, "but we would prefer to have enough food to eat."

The Communist Party in China numbers no more than 3,000,000—considerably less than 1 percent of the total population of 450,000,000. Few of the soldiers of the army are party members, although a Red political adviser is allotted to each 10 to 15 soldiers. Perhaps as much as four-fifths of the Red Army now consists of Nationalist soldiers who changed sides because they had no weapons or food, or because they were handed over wholesale when generals and governors of provinces sold them out. They have no reason to love the Communists.

It is true that they are better fed than before, but they realize that the reds have no intention of demobilizing the arm even when the whole country is in their hands. They know that they are expected to fight for Russia, and they do not want to spend all the best part of their lives as soldiers under the rigid Commie discipline. They want to be freemen again, to go home, to marry, to have a little piece of land that they can cultivate without interference. They would change sides again even more quickly than before if there were another party with efficient leadership.

Throughout the whole country there is a strong third force of men arising who want to institute reforms and modernize the country, but who also want China to be a land where men can live in peace and dignity. This third party includes all the better elements among the Nationalists, but is chiefly made up of men who have not been associated with any political group. Many of them were highly critical of the former government but are now even more bitterly opposed to the Communists. They say they looked for something better, not for something far worse.

These people are all looking for efficient leadership, for moral as well as for material support. But without arms or some free centers of resistance they are helpless. It is not even possible to carry on guerrilla warfare as it was during the Japanese occupation. The Communists with their highly disciplined organization have infiltrated every part of the country. Unlike the Japanese, who concentrated on the large centers and the areas bordering the railroads, the Reds have a vise-like grip on even the smallest and remotest village.

The Chinese all realize that they have been betrayed by the Communists with their high-sounding slogans. They see that the Reds are able to destroy and tear down and exterminate, but unable to build up the economy. The people now know that their leaders take their orders from Moscow, and that they would be thrown out and replaced by other puppets, if they did not do exactly what they are told.

China, to the Communist leaders, is not a land of human beings with souls and hearts and aspirations toward a better life, but simply a prize pawn. The destiny of China, as they see it, is merely to provide a vast reservoir of soldiers, and of slave laborers to be used, together with all China's vast wealth of raw materials—coal, iron, tungsten, etc.—to enlarge and strengthen the war potential of the Soviet Union in its attack upon the rest of the world.

If we recognize Red China, and to the Chinese recognition signifies approval, we shall deal a body blow at the tens of millions who comprise this third force, and who are yearning to throw off the Red yoke and stand up again as freemen. The Chinese will then feel that they have no longer a friend or a hope in the world. And a whole continent will be delivered over to darkness.

Excise Taxes Hurt You and Hurt Business, Too!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. T. MILLET HAND

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, May 6, 1950

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, once again I demand repeal of the wartime excise taxes. They are completely unfair. They are an intolerable burden on the backs of the people who are forced to pay them and on the people employed in businesses hurt by them. At a time when business should be encouraged, the excise taxes are depressing trade and costing thousands of jobs. They help no one. They hurt everyone.

These unbearable taxes were enacted during the war under the guise of being luxury taxes. Actually, they are nothing of the sort. They are a sales tax that hits the average American almost every time he turns around.

Think of it—a 20-percent sales tax on baby oil, light bulbs, handbags, luggage, and even wedding rings. Since when have such items been luxuries? The list of taxed items goes on and on—telephone service, train and bus tickets, movie tickets, bowling alleys, billiard tables, club dues, beverages, night clubs, and many others.

The wartime excise taxes were due to end in 1948, but the President demanded that they be kept on. I was one of only 35 Members of the House who voted against continuing them. Here is what I said at that time:

> These taxes strike at the masses of Americans when they buy the daily necessities of our way of life. They are a nuisance tax on the purchases of the people. Despite the high taxes of the rich, it is our average families, that, in total, supply most of the billions.

Every word I said at that time has proved all too true, so I have continued my efforts to get rid of these taxes. On March 3, 1949, I introduced a bill to repeal the tax on transportation, in an effort to stimulate travel to resort areas and other places. Twelve days later I introduced a second bill, which would have repealed the other wartime excise taxes.

On July 27, and again on October 14, 1949, I took the floor of the House to denounce the excise taxes again and to demand their repeal.

I am gratified that more and more Members of Congress are in agreement that the wartime excise taxes must go. I hope we can bring about their repeal without further delay, for the disastrous effects of the taxes are all around us.

Only a few days ago the Commerce Department reported that 4,684,000 Americans are out of work—the highest since 1941. The head of the President's Council of Economic Advisers said there is a 50–50 chance that unemployment will rise between now and December. One million boys between 16 and 24 are looking for work, and there is talk of reviving the Civilian Conservation Corps of the last depression.

I am not contending that all of the unemployment is caused by excise taxes, but it is obvious that a good part of the business distress springs from them. I am told, for example, that the fur industry in many parts of the country has faced a tax-caused buyers' strike for many months and is now in desperate condition. Some firms have already laid off half of their workers and may have to lay off many more if the killing excise taxes are not lifted.

One of the worst aspects of the excise taxes is that we pay them in addition to the thousands of other taxes that are levied on our everyday living. There are 150 taxes on a woman's hat, 116 taxes on a man's suit of clothes, 100 taxes on a dozen eggs, and 151 taxes on a loaf of bread.

When you buy a new car in the medium-price bracket, you pay about $400 in taxes. Think of how many more people would be taking vacations if they had some part of that $400 to spend on them. On gasoline there is an average tax of 6½ cents a gallon. For most motorists, this comes to about $50 a year.

Think of what this money would mean to the average American.

The way to cut over-all taxes is to cut Government spending. The Hoover Commission estimates that three billion to five billion dollars a year can be saved merely through more efficient organization of the Government. In addition, huge sums can be saved by dropping unnecessary operations by the Government. These savings would show up where they are needed most—in the pocketbooks of our people, who are already handing over more than one-quarter of their earnings to the tax collectors.

The people are crying for tax relief. Congress must heed their pleas. I urge every taxpayer, every voter, every citizen to get behind the move to repeal the wartime excise taxes immediately. We should act promptly to help our people.

River and Harbor Act of 1950—Flood Control Act of 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. WHITTINGTON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, May 6, 1950

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I delivered at the fortieth annual convention, National Rivers and Harbors Congress, Washington, D. C., Friday, March 24, 1950, to wit:

RIVER AND HARBOR ACT OF 1950—FLOOD CONTROL ACT OF 1950

The rise and fall of civilizations through the centuries have been largely determined by the conservation and utilization of natural resources. The misuse of land is a warning that the bounties of nature are not inexhaustible, and that once exhausted, it is difficult to replace. The pioneers of America may have had both land and water to misuse and to waste, but their descendants are not so fortunate. The natural resources of the United States enhanced by science and invention are the foundation of the unprecedented production in World War II that made our country the most powerful in history.

Water gives life and must be conserved. Where it is scarce, it must not be wasted. Where it overflows, the overflows must be curbed. Planning is most important. The Spaniards came to the New World in search of gold, but they lost their empire. The Pilgrim fathers came to Plymouth Rock in search of freedom. They won their freedom and their descendants won their independence.

STREAMS AND LAKES

Nothing in nature is more interesting to me than streams and lakes. They appeal to poets. They are the inspiration of artists. They are useful to the historian. They are the delight of sportsmen. They invite lovers to stroll along their banks. They are attractive to the writers of fiction as well as of verse. They appeal to the engineer as he dreams of building and ministering unto man.

Above the streams and lakes are the sources of both; there are the brooks and there are the forests that have been aptly termed the cradles of rivers. Walking beside the still waters of lakes appeals to me, and nothing is more delightful than to roam through the green pastures of valleys. As I linger along rivers my thoughts, as I have dreamed for years, always turn to the improvement of rivers and to the protection of valleys. Nothing intrigues me more than: "The journey of the raindrop to the sea."

SOLID FOUNDATION

The Corps of Engineers have been constructing river and harbor works since 1824. Flood-control improvements had a small beginning with the organization of the Mississippi River Commission some 70 years ago. The Flood Control Act of 1928 declared that flood control is a national problem. The authorizations under that act were limited to the lower Mississippi River and to the Sacramento River. The act of 1936 implemented the declaration, and for the first time a national policy of flood control was proclaimed by the Congress applicable to all of the rivers of the country. The foundation of the policy is that in all improvements the benefits must exceed the costs.

The flood-control works and the river and harbor improvements of the United States surpass those of this or any other country. No nation has made more or comparable progress in flood control and river improvements than the United States.

RECLAMATION

Another national policy was adopted in 1902. Reclamation was authorized. Progress has been notable. The deserts have been reclaimed. Waters are being conserved. The program is sound.

COOPERATION AND COORDINATION

Under the guise of reorganization it is now asserted that there is not cooperation and coordination between the work of the Army Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation. Let the record speak. A great flood is being safely carried down the Mississippi River today. To protect Cairo and southeast Missouri there was coordination between the TVA and the Corps of Engineers.

Cooperation obtains between the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation along the Missouri River. There is no occasion to supplant the work of the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation by the establishment of an administration along any river valley.

DISCRIMINATION IN LAWS

I am not saying that our flood-control and reclamation laws are perfect. I emphasize that they are both on a solid foundation. Much of the criticism that now obtains, however, can be eliminated by the Congress of the United States. The remedy is not to create administrations, but the forward step in legislation is for Congress to eliminate the differences in the laws with respect of flood control and reclamation. I believe that such legislation will do much to defeat the authorizations of expensive administrations.

Congress should amend existing laws to provide that in evaluating benefits the same rate of interest should obtain, the same charge for the disposal of power should be provided, and the same system of costs and benefits, with allowance for essential differences that may be involved, should obtain in both reclamation and flood control, and the discrimination in existing laws between flood control and reclamation, particularly with respect to amortizations and with respect to the disposal of power, should be abolished. The two agencies have grown older, and with age they have grown more sensible.

Dissension will be eliminated, expansion will be promoted, and new agencies will be defeated by the passage of Congress of laws that will prevent and eliminate the fundamental differences that now obtain between reclamation and flood-control authorizations and construction.

APPROPRIATIONS

Formerly appropriations for flood control and rivers and harbors were contained in the annual appropriations for military affairs. Some years ago separate bills were provided. The bill for river and harbor and flood-control appropriations is now called the Civil Functions Appropriations Act. During the current session, for the first time, the Committee on Appropriations in the House of Representatives has determined to submit one over-all appropriation bill for all of the agencies and the departments of the Government. That bill has been reported by the committee. It will be considered by the House within a few days. It is an experiment. A one-package bill should be of benefit with respect to balancing the budget. Departments can be more familiar with appropriations for other departments. I trust that the one-package bill will be successful. Such a policy obtains in the British Parliament. I emphasize, however, it is an experiment in the United States. I am apprehensive of delay. The members of this organization should be on guard. The bill as reported reduces materially the recommendations of the President of the United States for the next fiscal year. It is important that the members of this organization contact their Senators and Representatives and urge that while river and harbor and flood-control projects should share in any reductions essential to balancing the national budget, the budget should not be balanced at the expense of river and harbor and flood-control projects. All should share alike.

I must speak frankly. The report on the pending appropriation bill is critical of the Corps of Engineers. That criticism is not deserved. No funds for planning are provided. The Corps of Engineers are criticized for increasing the costs of projects. Such increases are not their fault. They result from the increasing costs of labor and of materials. Costs of construction have increased.

The preliminary examination is to determine whether or not a project is feasible. In the final plans for construction, in order to protect lives and property, to promote navigation, and to develop power in the public interest, changes are made, but they are made upon the request of Senators and of Representatives of all interested communities. The dams should be strong enough to withstand the waters stored behind them. The floodwalls and the levees should protect lives and property. The work should be permanent. Plans for adequate construction are imperative. The report, on the one hand, criticizes constructive planning and adequate building. On the other hand, it is proposed to deny additional funds for planning. The work of the Corps of Engineers will be hampered. Adequate appropriations for planning are essential. The members of this organization should not overlook contacting their Senators and Representatives to urge that funds for adequate planning be appropriated, and that solid and substantial works be constructed.

AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1950

There is another matter that is of vital importance to the country. The House Committee on Public Works, after full hearings, reported probably the most constructive flood-control and river-and-harbor bill ever submitted to the Congress. It provides for increased authorizations in river basins. It promotes new projects for both flood control and rivers and harbors. All projects were carefully screened. The bill was passed by the House after full debate and after much opposition, on August 22, 1949, by the overwhelming vote of 202 to 1. It was a great victory, but the members of this organization and other sponsors for river and harbor and flood-control improvements must not rest upon their laurels. The bill has been pending in the Senate for months.

It was there before the last session adjourned. The advocates of river-and-harbor and flood-control authorizations have done their best to obtain consideration. I am glad to say that I understand the bill will be considered by the Senate in the next few days. I trust that it will be promptly passed, and approved by the President.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS

No agency of the Government has ever wrought better than the Corps of Engineers. George Washington, himself an engineer and a great administrator, provided for the construction of nonmilitary works by the Corps of Engineers 175 years ago. They are the servants of the Congress, the elected representatives of the people. They are selected and appointed to West Point by Senators and Representatives. The Corps is selected from the high men of the class. They take postgraduate courses after graduating from West Point. No engineers are better trained. They are prepared to meet the challenges of peace as well as of war. They are equipped for emergency and for disaster. They respond when there is an explosion such as occurred at Texas City. They are on the job when cities, States, and regions are snow-bound. They respond to rehabilitation from destruction by hurricanes and storms along the oceans and along the Gulf. They are ready wherever disaster strikes and wherever emergency calls. They serve the people of the United States in rain and in sunshine, in prosperity and in adversity. They should be encouraged. The civil functions of the Corps of Engineers must be preserved and strengthened. They should not be stripped of these functions. They should remain in the Department of the Army. It is an established agency. It is doing an outstanding job. It would be a national disaster if the Corps of Engineers were transferred from the Department of the Army, or if they were deprived of their civil functions.

The members of this organization should be on guard. They should take advantage of this annual meeting to contact their Senators and Representatives and urge that the planning and construction of river-and-harbor and flood-control works should continue to be under the supervision of the Corps of Engineers in the Department of the Army. They have a record that is untarnished and unexcelled. Their work should be continued. Their arm should be strengthened. There is no more important function of the Government than promoting the improvement of our rivers to protect the lives and property of the people of America.

Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SIDNEY R. YATES
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, May 6, 1950

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, during the debate on the 1951 appropriation bill, I pointed out the fact that rent control still was vitally necessary in the metropolitan communities of our Nation and that the great Appropriations Committee should conduct hearings immediately upon the President's request for a deficiency appropriation for the Office of the Housing Expediter. It would be an appalling catastrophe if rent control was to be killed prior to June 30, when the present act expires, because of lack of funds.

The Congress has voted that rent controls continue until June 30, not until May 24, when the Housing Expediter's funds run out. The Appropriations Committee cannot do less than to carry out the will of the Congress and it must consider the necessity of allocating sufficient money for this purpose.

There seems to be a belief that need for rent control no longer exists; therefore, why grant additional funds?

That belief is not based on fact. The facts disclose that the housing market is still so tight that people in the large cities have not yet achieved a reasonable freedom of choice of a place to live. New construction has not yet broken the housing shortage.

Mr. Speaker, in order to present some facts relating to important aspects of this problem, I am appending to my remarks a recent study by Shirley Hillmer, entitled "The Cost of Purchase Housing and a Cue for Private Enterprise," which was published in the December issue of the Journal of Property Management. The article follows:

THE COST OF PURCHASE HOUSING AND A CUE FOR PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

(By Shirley Hillmer [1])

EDITOR'S NOTE.—The views in this article are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect those of the Chicago Housing Authority. The author is indebted to David Eddy of the Chicago regional office of the Federal Housing Administration for assistance in preparing data used in the article.

(In terms of the present economy—leveling off of wages, downward employment trend, etc.—bankers and purchasing families are growing more reluctant to open their wallets, Shirley Hillmer believes. But, hold, this assumed shyness of capital is a blessing in a sense. Under our present economy the Government will have to decrease interest and amortization costs, thus opening the housing field to private enterprise in construction of large-scale rental projects for middle-income families.)

The cost of buying a house is of interest to everyone today. In a market where there still is virtually no rental housing, the availability of housing is determined by the housing for sale. The factors that go into the buying of homes, such as the purchase price, the down payment, and the monthly payments, establish the market for available housing. Such information as to this market concerns not only the man who is buying the house, but also those who build it as well as the banker who is risking his capital. Such information is of particular interest to the managers of rental property who compete with this market.

It is generally assumed that houses are selling at relatively high prices and that because of the housing shortage some people are buying at prices they cannot afford. Little documented information has been offered, however, as to the incomes of purchasers, the relationship of income to purchase price, and the relationship of down payments and monthly payments to income. The figures presented in this paper bear upon Chicago's housing, but it is likely that the relationships indicated here are duplicated elsewhere in the country.

SEVERAL FINANCING STUDIES

The facts presented are based chiefly upon a survey of 80 percent of all single-family houses purchased in 1948 with mortgages insured by the Federal Housing Administration. While these homes may not be completely representative of all houses bought in Chicago, they are a good sample of the lower and medium priced homes meeting minimum requirements.

Two other studies supplemented the FHA survey. The first relates to all single-family houses on which title insurance was purchased from the Chicago Title & Trust Co. in March 1949. A study of the Chicago Title & Trust Co. files represents an excellent sample, since this company provides title insurance for virtually all home properties purchased.

The second study, made by the Real Estate Research Corp. at the request of the Chicago Housing Authority, is of typical houses built from April 1948 to April 1949. "De luxe custom-built types and shoddy fringe-type" housing are not included. This Research Corp. estimated costs of various typical houses.

A SUMMARY OF THE FACTS

The lowest-income families purchasing housing earned $3,000 per year. Fifty-five percent of home buyers earned between $3,000 and $5,000 per year.

The median purchase price of all new homes ranged from $12,400 to $12,800, and of existing houses from $11,000 to $11,800.

Nine percent of all families paid three and one-half or more times their annual income for the purchase of a house. Another 19 percent paid between three and three and one-half times their annual income.

The median down payment for the least expensive home, costing $8,000 to $10,000, was $1,920. For all homes the median down payment was $3,665.

The median monthly payment on debt service, insurance, and taxes for all families was $87. This excludes all maintenance and upkeep costs on the house and any payments on Veterans' Administration loans. The median monthly payment of families with incomes from $4,000 to $5,000 is $65 and for families with incomes of $5,000 to $6,000, $70.

PURCHASE PRICE OF HOUSING IN CHICAGO

The bulk of new housing, as shown in table I, sold between $10,000 and $14,000, with 6 to 9 percent selling for less than $10,000.

The study made by the Real Estate Research Corp., which covered new houses built from April 1948 to April 1949, corroborates these figures. The house most frequently constructed today, it was found, is the four-room dwelling. Typically, it is a one-story, one-family residence with 830 square feet of floor space. It is built of common brick, with plastered walls and partitions, and has a full basement. The unit is heated by a coal-fired gravity hot-air furnace, with the roof area insulated. This typical one-story home sells as a "package" to the consumer, including land and building. Completely decorated and with front and rear walks, it sells at $11,850. A large number of one and one-half story and two-story homes for one family are being built also. The typical 1½ story house built during the 12-month period consisted of five rooms containing 1,220 square feet, and it sold for $13,950. The typical two-story house had 5½ rooms, and was 1,244 square feet in area; it sold for $14,580.

The bulk of the existing housing sold between $8,000 and $14,000, with the median between $11,000 and $11,800. For existing housing, the distributions from the FHA study and study of Chicago Title & Trust Co. houses differ appreciably, since substandard houses are included in the title company's figures. FHA carefully eliminates housing it considers substandard, while the title company does not look into the physical condition of the homes in which the title is insured.

[1] Miss Hillmer is associated with the research section, development department, of the Chicago Housing Authority.

TABLE 1.—*Purchase price of single-family homes sold in Chicago, 1948, and March 1949*

[Percent distribution]

Purchase price	Newly built homes		Existing homes	
	Loans insured by FHA, 1948	With title insurance from Chicago Title & Trust, March 1949	Loans insured by FHA, 1948	With title insurance from Chicago Title & Trust, March 1949
Total	100	100	100	100
Under $8,000	0	3	3	24
$8,000 to $9,999	6	6	22	18
$10,000 to $11,999	39	28	29	17
$12,000 to $13,999	30	33	22	18
$14,000 to $15,999	12	13	11	11
$16,000 and over	13	17	13	12
Median	$12,800	$12,400	$11,800	$10,700

Source: Federal Housing Administration and Chicago Title & Trust Co.

NUMBER OF ROOMS

The large number of new houses selling for less than $12,000 is primarily the result of building economies at the expense of number and size of rooms. The number of rooms, which varies considerably with the purchase price, is one criterion for judging the suitability of a living unit. A home must not only be suitable in size and arrangement at the time it is bought, but flexible enough to adapt to changes in family composition or unforeseen family emergencies. Tenant families normally can adjust to changes by moving, but the owner-occupant has this option only at the risk of a substantial financial loss. A four-room, two-bedroom house could accommodate most three-person families, and some four-person families. Other four-person families and most five-person families would need three bedrooms to accommodate them comfortably and provide flexibility for a long period. A report on the New York City Housing Authority's new program made by the American Institute of Architects states that in planning housing for a four-person family with two children of opposite sex, a three-bedroom dwelling should be provided.

TABLE 2.—*Purchase price of new homes by number of rooms, Chicago, 1948*

Purchase price	Number of new houses	Percent distribution			
		Total	4-room	5-room	6-room
Total	581	100	38	35	27
Under $8,000	------	------	------	------	------
$8,000 to $9,999	35	100	66	34	------
$10,000 to $11,999	227	100	63	32	5
$12,000 to $13,999	173	100	27	41	32
$14,000 to $15,999	69	100	[1]	46	45
$16,000 and over	77	100	1	18	81

Source: Federal Housing Administration.

Almost two-thirds of the homes selling for less than $12,000 were four-room units, and there were no six-room units in this group. These four-room houses are a result of economy rather than desirability for living. This seems indicated by the fact that 81 percent of the families who bought $16,000 homes chose six-room dwellings, and none bought four-room dwellings.

FAMILY INCOME OF PURCHASER

A study of family incomes of home purchasers in relation to purchase prices should be of great interest to property managers and real-estate brokers by indicating what middle-income families are willing to spend for housing.

The fact that, as the table shows, practically no families with incomes under $3,000 ventured to buy a home immediately delimits the lower levels of the purchase housing field.

TABLE 3.—*Percent distribution of annual family income of families buying single-family homes with FHA-insured mortgages, Chicago 1948*

Annual family income:	Percent of families
Total	100
Under $3,000	3
$3,000 to $3,999	24
$4,000 to $4,999	28
$5,000 to $5,999	14
$6,000 to $6,999	14
$7,000 to $7,999	6
$8,000 to $8,999	4
$9,000 to $9,999	3
$10,000 and over	4

Source: Federal Housing Administration.

Three thousand dollars a year, or $60 a week, is equal to the average weekly wage of Chicago's manufacturing employees in 1948. This means a large proportion of families could not buy a home with the wages of the principal worker alone.

One "rule of thumb method" of measuring ability to buy housing is the ratio of selling price to income. Frederick H. Allen, a private housing consultant, in his article in The American City, assumes that for a sound investment, purchase price should not be more than double the annual income for persons in all income groups.[2] A two-to-one ratio is conservative, and many authorities suggest a ratio of two and one-half-to-one. In the past, the valuations of FHA-insured homes on a national average have been less than twice the purchasers' income. In any case, such a ratio can be only a rough guide, as questions of down payment and mortgage terms are so important.

As table 4 shows, current ratios of purchase price to income are considerably higher than in the past. In a number of cases, moreover, they are based on higher family incomes at the time of purchase than can reasonably be expected to continue over a period of years. FHA estimated, without reference to a possible depression, that 17 percent of the families would probably suffer decreased income in the future through loss of secondary wage earners, overtime, and other temporary sources of income.

An analysis of the ratio of purchase price to income shows that 89 percent of the families earning less than $4,000 annually paid two and one-half or more times their incomes for homes, while 63 percent of the families with incomes between $4,000 and $5,000 paid two and one-half or more times their income. The fact that families themselves do not want to pay these high ratios is partially indicated by the fact that at the $5,000-and-over level 70 to 85 percent of all families paid less than two and one-half times their incomes.

TABLE 4.—*Purchase price of single-family homes with FHA-insured mortgages in proportion to annual family income, Chicago, 1948*

[Percent]

Annual family income	Total	3.5 and over	3.0 to 3.4	2.5 to 2.9	2.0 to 2.4	Less than 2.0
All families	100	9	19	29	27	16
Under $4,000	100	23	39	27	9	2
$4,000 to $4,999	100	4	15	44	31	6
$5,000 to $5,999	100	2	6	22	45	25
$6,000 and over	100	0	4	11	31	54

Source: Federal Housing Administration.

[2] The American City, September 1948, p. 117.

FINANCING OF PURCHASE HOUSING

Financing terms play an increasingly important part in a family's ability to buy a house. The original down payment cannot exceed family savings, and the monthly payments must fit within the monthly family budget. If these two conditions can be met satisfactorily, the total price may be of lesser importance.

One of the explanations of the high purchase price-income ratio found in the FHA study was the sizable down payments that were made by these families. For example, a large proportion of families with as little as $4,000 annual income were able to raise $2,000 to $3,000 for the down payments, thus reducing the amount they would have to pay monthly, and enabling them to buy a house that under the accepted purchase price-income ratio would be completely beyond their means. One of the indications of the importance down payments play in home purchase is found in the current market, where in a number of cases sellers are making contracts for accepting them over a period of months.

For even the least expensive new house, about $2,000 was the usual down payment, and for the $16,000 houses around $5,000 was paid down. Down payments would have been higher than those indicated in the table above had not VA loans (which were made in 30 percent of the cases) ranging from $500 to $4,000 been obtained in addition to the FHA insured mortgage. Moreover, closing costs which may range up to several hundred dollars are not included in these down payment figures.

Because of the weight of the down payments, a family's savings determines whether the housing should be bought or rented. To estimate possible future sales, therefore, it is necessary to estimate savings. A Nation-wide survey conducted early in 1948 to ascertain the savings of all "spending units," showed that only 25 percent of the families with annual incomes from $3,000 to $5,000 had total savings exceeding $2,000. These families constitute an important segment of the home-buying market. In Chicago, where prices are higher than elsewhere in the Nation, probably a smaller percent of the spending units had savings.

TABLE 5.—*Median down payment[1] of single-family FHA-insured homes by purchase price, both new-built and existing, Chicago, 1948*

Purchase pric	Median down payment			Median down payment as a percent of selling price
	Both	New	Existing	
Total	$3,630	$3,600	$3,650	------
$8,000 to $9,999	1,920	[2]	2,150	20.0
$10,000 to $11,999	3,010	2,740	3,400	27.1
$12,000 to $13,999	4,150	4,000	4,370	31.4
$14,000 to $15,999	6,220	5,830	6,460	35.0

[1] Down payment was computed by subtracting FHA-insured loan and VA-insured loan from purchase price.
[2] Number of cases too small to compute median.

Source: Federal Housing Administration.

TABLE 6.—*Size of liquid assets by income of spending unit, United States, early 1948*

[Percent]

Spending unit income	Amount of liquid assets held					
	Total	None	$1 to $499	$500 to $1,999	$2,000 to $4,999	$5,000 and over
Total	100	27	27	24	13	9
Under $1,000	100	56	21	14	6	3
$1,000 to $2,999	100	34	32	23	7	4
$3,000 to $4,999	100	14	31	30	18	7
$5,000 and over	100	2	13	24	27	34

Source: 1948 Survey of Consumers Finances, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

TABLE 7.—*Monthly family income by monthly mortgage payments on homes with FHA-insured mortgages, Chicago, 1948*

[Percent distribution]

Monthly family income	Monthly mortgage payments [1]							
	Total	Under $50	$50 to $59	$60 to $69	$70 to $79	$80 to $89	$90 and over	Median payment
Total	100	8	22	29	21	9	11	$66.80
$250 to $332	100	15	39	34	9	2	1	58.90
$333 to $416	100	8	21	36	29	5	1	65.80
$417 to $499	100	5	18	26	29	13	9	70.00
$500 to $584	100	6	14	27	23	16	14	71.30
$585 to $665	100	2	8	[2] 6	27	20	27	78.80
$666 and over	100	1	5	[2] 4	19	16	45	86.50

[1] Monthly mortgage payments included payment on principal and interest, mortgage insurance premium, hazard insurance, taxes, and special assessment. It does not include payment on a loan insured by the Veterans' Administration or maintenance, repair, heating, and utilities.

[2] A spending unit consists of all persons belonging to the same family and living in the same dwelling unit who pool their major items of income and expense. The spending unit is sometimes slightly smaller than the family.

Source: Federal Housing Administration.

MONTHLY PAYMENTS

The continuous obligations assumed by a home-purchasing family are the monthly payments. These payments are inflexible for a long period of a family's existence and cannot be geared to short-run fluctuations of income, family size, or any other temporary family or national emergency. These are the payments which may be considered as rental.

Seventy percent of all families paid more than $60 a month. Forty-six percent of the families earning less than $4,000 a year paid more than $60 a month. The advisability of any large number of additional families in this income bracket undertaking similar burdens is open to some question. First, some incomes are likely to be reduced when secondary workers, overtime, and/or other temporary sources of income are eliminated. Second, the monthly mortgage payments of $60 do not include payments up to $20 a month on VA-insured loans, held by one-third of these families. Most important, the payments exclude costs of upkeep maintenance, such as heat, utilities, and repair. Repair and maintenance are flexible costs in the sense that they can be postponed. The postponement or elimination of this type of expense, however, takes serious toll in property values and leads to the creation of new slum areas.

Families with incomes of $5,000 and more per year were paying $70 to $90 in monthly payments. This is only 12 to 15 percent of their income, suggesting to those engaged in home building for either rent or purchase the limits to which these families are willing to go.

CONCLUSIONS

The implications of these facts for real-estate brokers, real-estate managers, and other members of the building fraternity are fairly clear. It is quite apparent that the purchase of housing under conditions similar to those detailed here will not continue. Family incomes are not showing signs of increasing, and bankers are showing an ever-growing reluctance to take much additional mortgage paper under these circumstances. Hence, as long as construction costs remain up, there is a good possibility that additional rental units if economically built can lure many of these would-be buyers away from the purchase market.

However, it should be clear to the group interested in building rental housing that even families with higher incomes can find purchase housing with monthly payments of $90 a month. Therefore, although renters may be willing to pay somewhat more than this amount because of the relative freedom that renting provides as opposed to home owning, the amount of the rental can probably not be far in excess of this figure.

There is little question, however, that the essence of the problem both for those interested in selling or in renting housing is the high construction costs. These costs can of course be lowered by a direct attack on material costs, building methods, or by introducing the economies of mass production and prefabrication. In the absence of such basic readjustments, governmental help, such as subsidies in the form of longer amortization or lower interest costs may prove to be another answer for meeting the housing need of these middle-income families.

Do We Want To Drive the Germans Back to Totalitarianism?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, May 6, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article from the European supplement to Human Events, written by Marian Doenlioff, an anti-Nazi German who realizes that no people can live forever in a vacuum, and that unless the western victors treat with ordinary decency, justice, and encouragement, those who were anti-Nazi and humane, then we need not be surprised to find more and more Germans turning in desperation to their eastern victors.

The treatment of General von Falkenhausen is a blot upon the record of the western powers. Our own Government ought to take the lead in correcting the situation.

VON FALKENHAUSEN

Recently I met a young man with whom I often had very lively discussions during the war. He was, then, aide-de-camp to a rather objectionable Nazi general whom, partly because of stupidity, partly because of loyalty, he used to defend whenever I attacked the attitude of his chief and of the German military leadership as a whole. I remember quite well that during our last discussion, in the autumn of 1943, he indignantly exclaimed: "I do not know what you mean; is there then no general whose attitude meets with your approval?" "Yes," I replied, "there is one who should be an example to all German officers: General Von Falkenhausen."

Obviously he, too, remembered that talk because his first question the other day was: "What has happened to your Falkenhausen?" Rather shamefacedly I had to tell him that Falkenhausen during the last few years has been in no fewer than 51 camps and prisons in 6 countries, and that for the last 2 years he has been imprisoned at Liége in Belgium—without any trial, even without any indictment. Whereupon my young friend replied, with a show of satisfaction: "My general, on the other hand, is doing extremely well." Due to his relatively good upbringing he did not go on to say: "Now you see what your obsolete ideals are worth."

Because it is typical that many Nazi officers are free, and because it is equally significant that many of the best and most decent Germans, who for years fought against the Nazis—such as, for instance, Weizsacker—are in prison, I want to sketch the story of Von Falkenhausen, whose case has come dramatically into the limelight during the last few weeks.

During the German occupation of Belgium, Falkenhausen was military governor and as a result of his high office was taken into custody in 1945 as a potential war criminal. The 5 years which have elapsed since the end of the war have obviously been insufficient to find out whether he will be tried individually as a war criminal. Many Belgians have unsuccessfully pleaded for Falkenhausen. They have stressed again and again that it was primarily due to him that Belgium came out of the war relatively unscathed and was the first European country to stage a spectacular recovery. A highly placed Belgian last week refused to accept a decoration, giving as his reason that he could not accept this honor so long as Falkenhausen, who had done very much more for Belgium than he himself, was in prison.

As early as 1930, when many Germans who later joined the resistance movement, and many foreign politicians also, had no clue to what the Nazis really wanted, Falkenhausen in public speeches warned against the new movement. In 1932 he endeavored to get Chancellor von Schleicher to ban the SA. In 1934, shortly before the 30th of June, when his brother was murdered by the Nazis, Falkenhausen went to China as private military adviser to Chiang Kai-shek, seeking a refuge there. After the conclusion of the German-Japanese treaty Ribbentrop forced him to return to Germany by threatening to take revenge on his family. Immediately after his return, in 1938, Falkenhausen joined the German resistance movement around General Beck and Burgomaster Goerdeler. I remember quite well that at the time, and also at the beginning of the war, a strong group pleaded for the appointment of Falkenhausen and not General Beck as head of the resistance movement.

In 1940 responsible persons took steps to get him appointed to the post of Military Governor of Belgium in order to counteract the influence of the Nazi Party in that occupied country. This task he fulfilled splendidly in constant struggles with the Gestapo, police, and Führer's orders, as far as it was at all possible. Twice he tendered his resignation but it was twice brusquely refused. When, finally, in 1944, he refused to conscript Belgian youths of 19 for work in Germany, he was dismissed by Hitler and sent to a concentration camp "for constantly favoring the enemy." He was liberated by the Americans only to be incarcerated by them later as a potential war criminal. His successor in Brussels, the Nazi Gauleiter Grohé, was freed by the Belgians a long time ago.

Since 1944 Falkenhausen has been dragged from one European concentration camp or prison to another. Now he has reached the age of 71, yet is still the prototype of the knight without fear or reproach. But he has become a lone old man still more lonely since his wife died on March 4 of this year. She lay dying of cancer in a hospital in Hesse, and because he had not seen her for 10 years, people after a great struggle succeeded in getting him so-called leave of absence. A certificate of the German doctor, an application by his counsel, and the recommendation of the Bonn government were not enough to obtain the leave. Only after two doctors came from Belgium to X-ray the very weak, old lady, who fainted repeatedly during the procedure, was leave finally granted. Escorted by two Belgians he was allowed to visit the hospital which for his reception had been specially occupied by 25 American military police, and he could

only see his wife in the presence of another military policeman.

Shortly before the vital operation he had to return to Belgium, and when his wife soon afterward died he was transported back again to Germany by the same procedure. On special orders from Brussels he was not allowed to attend the burial, but had to stay in the hospital under a strong guard. He was forced to spend the night with three rowdy GI's in a barracks room, because allegedly there was no privacy available.

General von Falkenhausen is nearing the end of his life. All these afflictions can no longer injure him. He is beyond resentment and complaint, and looks into a better world. But we who want to rebuild this world are questioning whether this can be done unless justice and kindness find some place in the foundations.

Threat From Within

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. MILLET HAND
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, May 6, 1950

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, perhaps the chief threat to our American democracy is the failure of many millions of Americans to take a strong interest in our Government. The Atlantic City Tribune on April 18, 1950, published an editorial entitled "A Threat From Within," which is worthy of the attention of all of us.

The editorial follows:

THE THREAT FROM WITHIN

As is usually the case, voters in the primary election today probably will be conspicuous by their absence.

It is a strange trait of Americana, more evident on primary election day, that the ordinary voter doesn't "bother to take the time," especially since there is little in the way of interesting political contests on the primary ballot.

This trait, which has become more pronounced with the passing years and which hit a new low in the last Presidential election when barely more than half the country's registered voters trooped to the polls, is feared by many officials as a weakness which could lead eventually to disintegration of the democratic system of government simply through lack of popular interest.

"How much more difference can my vote make?" has been a familiar refrain by many voters, a refrain which is dangerous.

"Besides," some voters say, "I don't have any say in picking the candidates, so why should I bother with a primary?"

That is true to a great extent, but it is also true that the system itself can be kept in line only through popular evidence of voting strength. The laggards in the registration books can be spotlighted only through a general resurgence of faith in the voting system, a resurgence that can be brought about only by a willingness to "take the trouble to vote."

There have been many moves in the past to introduce legislation which would make it mandatory for every registered voter to exercise his franchise, but they were defeated chiefly because many politicians are aware their success lies in a limited vote.

This threat from within our borders is just as dangerous to our security as any from without. Let's tackle this apathy today as a starter.

The Veterans' Preference Act Goes Too Far in Discrimination in Certain Circumstances Against Nonveteran Employees With Long and Efficient Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, May 6, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter recently received from a constituent. It portrays vividly, but without venom, the inequities and injustices created by certain provisions of the Veterans' Preference Act, which should be modified to correct them:

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *March 21, 1950.*
Hon. WALTER H. JUDD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. JUDD: I am a nonveteran Government employee writing in the hope that you will listen to the inequities and inequalities of the Veterans' Preference Act and pray that you will take the necessary action to repeal it.

At the present time I am employed at the Veterans' Administration Center, St. Paul 11, Minn., and have in my possession a letter from that center possibly terminating my services in 1950, due to personnel ceilings and reduction in force.

I have worked for the Federal Government going on 10 years and also have an excellent efficiency rating, but even with this service and efficiency rating I am either to be demoted or will be out of a job.

It is all so unfair, for as I look about me and see the various persons who have much less qualifications and service than I, who are permitted to stay, merely because they are veterans. Some have only a few months of military service behind them and only a couple or 3 years of Federal Government service.

All of the nonveteran employees that have served the Veterans' Administration since its origin have received these letters of reduction in force. Many of them came directly from high school and colleges into the Federal service to the Veterans' Administration expecting to find security and advancement. After serving as many as 30 years and even more in some cases, they now face disillusionment and despair for the very Government that they have given the best years of their lives to, is now telling them to move on.

Who wants them now? They are in their late forties and early fifties, which is an age too early for retirement, and yet no one will want to take them on. Where will they go? What will they do?

These nonveteran employees have knowledge and years of experience that is valuable to the United States Government, and they are to be replaced by new employees that will have to be trained, taking unnecessary time and money, at a time when economy is being stressed. I know this for a fact, for we are still training those employees that were put in our particular division from the last reduction in force which was a year ago. They still cannot handle the job, thus with still more new employees in these jobs, the efficiency of the Veterans' Administration will really suffer.

Give preference to the truly disabled veteran who cannot go out into private industry and make a living. By all means, give him preference and all the way, but for the good of the Government and actually for the good of the veteran himself, help to eliminate this out-and-out preference, for today and tomorrow the Government is losing some of its best people.

Very truly yours.

ANSWER TO THE LETTER ON VETERANS' PREFERENCE ACT

Thank you for your thoughtful and detailed letter regarding the inequities and inequalities of the Veterans' Preference Act with respect to Government employees who have long and efficient service and are displaced when a reduction in force goes into effect.

You may be sure I agree with the views you have expressed and believe there will have to be some changes in the act. There are bills now before Congress to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 and to preserve the equities of permanent classified civil-service employees. The House Post Office and Civil Service Committee expects to consider this matter soon and I shall press for some early action which will help in cases such as yours.

With best wishes.

Very sincerely yours,

WALTER H. JUDD.

Twelve O'Clock Noon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, May 6, 1950

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Leland I. Doan, president of the Dow Chemical Co., at the annual meeting of the Midland Chamber of Commerce, Midland, Mich., January 18, 1950:

TWELVE O'CLOCK NOON

Nineteen fifty is a year to reckon with. Gentlemen, I pray we will reckon well.

A few days ago some of you people came down to see us about a sort of midcentury celebration for Midland and Midland County. It's probably a good idea. Anyway it set me thinking that there is—or at least can be—vastly more importance to such celebrations than we may realize.

All over the country communities and organizations of one sort or another are, or will be, planning some special observance of 1950. The number itself is psychological. It is a nice round number. It is the 12 o'clock noon of the twentieth century.

So all these communities and organizations are just naturally going to take time out to review the past. They're going to celebrate. They're going to pat each other on the back. And they're going to brag a bit.

Well, that's all well and good. The backpatting, the bragging, the celebrating are certainly well deserved. Even though we were to borrow all the adjectives in Hollywood, we would be at a loss to aptly describe the past 50 years. Never in history has there been a like period when the lives of so many people have been affected so often and so much by so many things. And we here in America have had ringside seats.

We have fought and won two wars, of course, although as yet we have failed to win the peace from either. We have seen the maps of the world redrawn, and we have seen them shrink to postage-stamp size because in these 50 years we have, among other things, conquered time and space. In 1900 you would not have expected to go from here to Mount Pleasant and return the same day. People commonly were born, grew up, raised families, and died without ever having traveled that far from their birthplace.

Today any one of you can step outside your house and into a device you call an automobile. In 15 minutes you can be at Tricity Airport, 10 miles away. And you can have dinner beside the Pacific Ocean or in Mexico City. The point, of course, is that not only are such things possible, they have become almost commonplace.

It has become commonplace also to transact business in Chicago or St. Louis in a few moments through an instrument on the corner of our desk, to hear music or a ball game being played in New York or California. If we want light, we flip a little lever on the wall, and if we want it warmer, we adjust another. Still another gives us instant heat to cook our dinner.

If you really want to know what has happened in the last 50 years, start in tomorrow morning when you get out of bed and analyze every move you make until you go to bed again. And with each move ask yourself, "How would I have done this 50 years ago? Or would this even have been possible?"

We walk the same, we talk the same, we see, hear, smell, taste, and feel. We know love and hate, joy and sorrow. But those bodily actions, senses, and emotions are about the only things in our lives that are like they were in 1900. And even those have all felt the influence of the things that have happened since that time.

Yes, countless intimate, physical things surrounding our lives have been created and improved. But there have been less obvious things, too.

Fifty years ago Midland was a little town of dirt streets, wooden sidewalks, a scattering of business places and some 2,000 souls. The boom of the lumbering days had passed. There was agriculture, but of limited area and extent. Salt, manufactured locally, had become a glut on the market. The old bromine industry had gone out with the salt. And down at the end of Main Street was an upstart chemical company that seemed to be gaining ground but could certainly not be reckoned to replace King Lumber.

Education, typical of the times, was elementary. Medical care was limited to what could be accomplished in the home or office of the local physician. Men who had jobs—and boys too—toiled 10, or more likely 12, hours a day to earn three squares, clothing, and shelter. And often they were paid, not in money, but in scrip.

I don't have to tell you men about Midland today. You are Midland. This organization represents a guiding force. It can steer Midland to the right or to the left, forward of backward. Today our educational facilities are among the best in the country. And we are even now building to make them better and larger. We have a modern, well-equipped hospital. Our men work 8—not 10 or 12—hours a day. And while we think prices are high, the money they earn in 8 hours buys more goods than ever before in history. Our homes stir admiration in the visitor, and as a friend of mine put it recently, we are so everlastingly widening, paving, sewer digging, and building that you never know what street to take to get through to where you want to go.

Yes, if ever people had cause for celebration, we have it—for our accomplishments as a nation of people, for our accomplishments as a community.

But for all this my mind keeps turning in another direction. In this noontime of the century we are still only half through the day, and there is always tomorrow. At lunch we are prone to remark to our companions, "This morning I wound up such-and-such a deal." And later we will probably say, "This afternoon I must look into this," or "Right after lunch I must take care of that."

There are some things we had better take care of, and right after lunch may hardly be soon enough.

I wonder how the future historian will sum up the first half of our century. I wonder what he will say of 1950.

I wonder, for example, if our grandchildren, taking a federally prescribed course of education, will one day read in their history books something like this:

"The year 1950, to all intents and purposes, saw the end of free capitalism in the United States. While another 10 years was consumed in bringing about complete national control of all business, the victory of the welfare state was essentially fact by the middle of the century. Clinging to their sentimental notions of private ownership and freedom of endeavor, the owners and managers of business and industry nonetheless failed to convince the people of the merit of what they called free enterprise and the elections of 1952 left no doubt that the American people favored the security of state planning and paternalism.

"The victory of the welfare state did not, of course, come about overnight. It was won by successive stages over several decades. The great depression of the thirties and the great war of the forties which followed hastened it by disturbing the normal operation of the old system. This gave early progressive planners an opportunity to educate the populace to accept controls over prices, wages, and the purchase of certain commodities, as well as intermittent direct control over certain industries. And with the high wages prevailing in the forties the people appeared quite willing to turn over much larger portions of their income to the Government to be used in providing welfare services, in stimulating food prices through farm subsidies."

Does such a prospect scare you? Or do you think it can't happen here?

I can remember when Hitler was a comic little man with a trick mustache. I can remember when we joked about Russia's "5-year plan." We didn't think it would last 5 years.

Only a few years ago Britain was the very symbol of stalwart stability among nations. The world virtually revolved on the pound sterling. Could it possibly be significant that the recent devaluation of the pound caused little more than a momentary flutter of speculation and anxiety on this side of the Atlantic? Today she is clinging by her fingernails from the top window ledge of her tower of socialism. And we here in America are helping her Socialist leaders in their frantic efforts to keep the tower itself from falling apart.

Well, these things scare me. I don't like to say "scare," but I'm afraid "disturb" would be quite an understatement. In any event, I'm not alone in my thinking. There's a recurrent question afloat these days. It's been the subject of some public debate, and a number of public speeches. It goes like this: "Are we slipping (or sneaking) into socialism?"

Some of our country's leaders have laughed at this question. But not the way you may think. They have said: "No, we aren't slipping into socialism. We are dashing headlong into it."

A few weeks ago Father Edward A. Kellar, director of the bureau of economic research of Notre Dame University, mentioned this in addressing a group of public relations people—people who in one way or another do much of the talking for American industry. And he made what is to me a horrifying statement. He said: "I am not going to tell you, 'It is later than you think.' I am telling you, you have 2 years at the most."

Unfortunately, there is evidence to support Father Kellar's statement. Consider just two current movements—the agitation for socialized medicine and the outbreak of antitrust actions which appear definitely to be aimed more at bigness in private business than at the conduct of the business.

These, certainly, are straws in the wind. But I wonder if they aren't much more than that. The first, it appears to me, is the most obviously socialistic scheme that has ever been openly proposed on a national scale. If the American people buy that scheme they will buy others. The second, while perhaps not ostensibly socialistic, appears to me as an unprecedented effort to exert peacetime governmental control over industry beyond the intent of our existing laws.

Our problem is not one of dealing with the admitted Communists and the admitted Socialists, but—far more difficult—of stemming the socialistic trends and ideas which have been infiltrating our traditional and presumably respectable institutions. * * * our old line political parties, our educational institutions; yes, even some of our churches. Of course, they do not carry the labels of socialism, but rather travel under such appealing names of medical insurance, welfare economy, planned economy, and so on. We are not up against visible antagonists, but insidious ideas attractively packaged.

Nor are we up against some set "day of confiscation" of all private business, but against the gradual encroachment of Government control which will perhaps ultimately leave today's businessman with all his present responsibilities but without his present remunerations, incentives, and opportunities.

Britain's Socialist Government has by no means taken over all business—just credit, communications, civil aviation, transport, coal mines, electricity, gas, medical service. That's all. With those, of course, she can control any business * * * to any degree she sees fit. And her remaining private industry now has the responsibility of trying to make enough money to cover the operating losses sustained on those she has taken over.

Regrettably, her failures and dilemmas do not seem to be cooling even slightly the ardor of the planners who are working toward the same sort of system here. We are today in this country going through much the same sort of social and economic reforms Britain went through before her government became openly Socialist.

If you want to see the parallel between Britain and the United States you might read John T. Flynn's The Road Ahead. It is not conducive to pleasant dreams, however.

You know, sometimes I get the uncomfortable feeling that we have created so many toys for ourselves in the last 50 years that they're taking our attention away from the fundamentals of our existence. I'll wager a lot of people spend more time trying to figure out the week's mystery tune than they do the qualifications of the man who gets their vote for Congress.

Well, I wonder. Are we right, or are the planners right? Is this system of ours any good? This system that says a man may work according to his own choosing; that says a man is entitled to the rewards of his own toil; that says his savings are also entitled to profit if he wishes to risk them in the creation of new productive power; that says his opportunities for self-betterment are limited only by his own willingness and ability to serve others with his hands or his brains; that says that so long as men compete honestly and openly the public interest will be served, and the dishonest will, in the long run, engineer their own downfall?

It is not, never has been, perfect. Nor, for that matter, has anything which man has ever created been perfect. But I know one thing. The things we have accomplished in this country since 1900 have not resulted from any master plan set up in that or any other year. Nor have they resulted from any paternalistic promise of security.

No; they have resulted rather from men working to make their own security; from men, in competition with each other, trying to do a better job, to invent a better mousetrap, to open a new frontier in the knowledge that America rewards achievement—not subservience.

As a people we are, I think, generous, humane, and thoughtful of our fellow man. And we find joy in accomplishment for its own sake. But no one would claim that our successes have resulted entirely, or even largely, from altruistic motives. They have come from our individual attempts at self-betterment—which is just a part of the natural law of self-preservation.

The trouble, perhaps, is that because our motivating forces have been inherently selfish these motives are now being questioned without regard to the human benefits that spring from them. Our measuring stick is the dollar, rather than the product or the service.

Well, this year we are going to be looking at some of those human benefits. We are going to be comparing 1950 with 1900. And perhaps we will be saying, "Just look at all the wonderful things that have happened in 50 years."

But that isn't quite true, because they didn't just happen. They were created—by American hands and American brains—because our American system gave those hands and those brains the incentive to create. I wonder if as we celebrate our achievements we can somehow adequately tell the tremendous story that lies behind them.

You can see this story in hundreds of communities throughout the country. But you need not even travel outside of Midland. Herbert Dow, a young lad of 25, came here with an idea.

Why? He wanted to make some money—a perfectly simple human desire that's just as prevalent today as it was in 1890.

But he needed money to even get started, and he didn't have any. So he used someone else's. How could he do that? Why, because those people wanted to make some money too; and they thought maybe they could do it with his idea. Those men were capitalists.

Well, they did make some. And a lot of others have since. And today more than 19,000 capitalists are hoping, and are making some money by letting the company that Herbert Dow started use their savings.

Now you could complete the story, perhaps, by saying that today that company has an annual income of more than $200,000,000. And that it returns to these capitalists eight or ten million dollars a year in dividends.

But I wonder if that is the story? Is it of any possible human significance that 15,000 men and women today earn decent, respectable livings from jobs that are in existence because some "capitalists" wanted to make some money with their savings and lived under an economic system that permitted them to do so?

Is it of any possible human significance that in your daily lives you can scarcely touch a thing that has not been made possible or made better because of one or more of the six-hundred-odd products that have come from the business Herbert Dow and those capitalists started?

Is it of any significance to the people of Midland that the city they live in has, directly and indirectly, shared in the rewards that have come to that company because its goods and services have found favor in competition with those of other companies?

We have, in this economic system of ours, the best product the world has ever known. We're supposed to be the best salesmen in the world. We have the most intelligent all-around group of customers, and they've had a long and on the whole very satisfactory demonstration. It is possible that we can't keep that product sold to those people, that we're going to lose out to a piece of merchandise that has never offered anything but promises—and as yet has not made good on them in the countries that have bought it?

I don't think so. But it's going to take some selling—in every way we know how, in every place we can tell the story, in our schools, our clubs, our social gatherings; yes, right down to the level of street-corner conversation. For it is at that level that much of the antiprofit, anticapital, anti-big-business talk circulates.

Yes; it's going to take some selling—some telling. And you can talk on a national scale if you want. But you can find it all right here. You can take your customer around Midland and show him our homes, our good streets, our fine schools, our recreational facilities. You can take him up Main Street and around Ashman Circle, and show him our busy shops and stores. You can bring him down to the plant and tell him the story, the one we, ourselves, too often forget.

And then, late in the afternoon, you can take him up by the courthouse and let him look back down Main Street, through the stores, the traffic, the silver boulevard lights and the green elms. And way in the background the sun should be lighting up a river bank studded with red bricks, and green and red and yellow tanks and pipes.

And you can say to him in all sincerity: "That, Mister, is Main Street, U. S. A."

A Real Danger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 5, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, let us hope that President Truman, when he stated recently that there were no Communists on the Federal payroll, knew what he was talking about.

If there are none there now, that is a most encouraging circumstance, for recent convictions of Communists who were on the Federal payroll, admissions by former Communists, proved beyond argument that communism is a real threat to our national security.

Unless there is imminent danger of a war with Russia, there is no excuse for the appropriation of the billions of dollars of the taxpayers' money for which Mr. Truman and the heads of his departments, especially the armed services, are asking.

In the May 1 issue of the Allegan Gazette, published in my home town of Allegan, Mich., there is a very brief editorial by Leo W. Hoffman, which points to Mr. Truman's error and which reads as follows:

TRUMAN REVEALS WEAKNESS OF HIS POSITION ON COMMUNISM

In a speech before the Federal Bar Association at Washington, Tuesday evening, President Truman stated there were no Communists on the United States payroll, and attempted to take the credit for the convictions of Communists that have been secured up to date.

He ignored the Alger Hiss case, his attempt to quash that investigation and the effect that Hiss may have had on United States security.

He ignored the Amerasia case and the fact that over 500 State documents had been stolen with no solution by the Justice Department.

He stated that there was no danger from communism within this country but the danger lay in Russia and communism taking over free countries abroad and thus increasing the threat to this country.

This last statement reveals the weakness of his position. We agree with him that the real danger lies in permitting Russia to expand but we add that there is a very grave danger within this country when our State Department not only does nothing to halt Russian expansion but aids and encourages the spread of communism in some parts of the world.

It is no secret that a certain group in the State Department was responsible for propaganda encouraging Chinese Communists and for preventing this country from giving aid to Nationalist China in its fight against the Communists. And just as Truman said, whenever and wherever communism takes over another country, that constitutes an additional menace to the security of the United States.

It is this group in the State Department that MCCARTHY has attacked and the people are entitled to know just what happened. So far neither Truman, Acheson, Mrs. Roosevelt, or any other New Dealer has given the public any account of our failure in China.

By their silence on this subject they lend support to MCCARTHY's charges.

President Truman assumes that only he and his Justice Department have any right to investigate anyone. From the beginning he has used the office of Attorney General, not to impartially try known criminals but as a weapon against political enemies.

For instance, within this last month former Congressman Slaughter from Missouri, the man Truman purged (an investigation into that ended when certain ballot boxes were stolen) was tried before a Federal court on a charge of illegal lobbying. It didn't take a Federal court on a charge of illegal lobbying. It didn't take a Federal judge 5 minutes after the Government's case was in to dismiss the charge on grounds that Government had failed to make out a prima facie case. Why was this man, Truman's enemy, prosecuted in the first place?

Then too, why for so many years did Truman attempt to quash the investigations of the Un-American Committee?

Why did he halt a full and complete disclosure of the Amerasia case?

Why did he for so many years prevent a complete investigation of Alger Hiss?

Why did he ignore Patrick Hurley's accusations against certain men in our State Department, when Hurley resigned as special envoy to the Nationalist Government in China?

And why doesn't Mr. Truman answer these questions when he attempts to defend his actions and the policy of his State Department?

Our conclusion is that he hasn't any answer. He knows he is on the wrong side of the fence and he doesn't see any way out except to ignore any explanation and hope he can be reelected with the aid of his corrupt big city machines and by promising some of the people who are inclined toward socialism, more unearned benefits.

L. W. H.

Mr. Speaker, in the same issue of the same paper is another editorial entitled

"The Value of the McCarthy Probe." That editorial is as follows:

THE VALUE OF THE MCCARTHY PROBE

We listened to a short broadcast by Dr. Dunbar several nights ago and it was our impression that he was in favor of dropping the McCarthy investigation, which he assumes is only serving political purposes.

We believe that the American people will never be satisfied until there has been a complete and full investigation of Senator McCARTHY's charges.

The people of this country now realize that our State Department failed in China. They realize that Communist success in China constitutes a potential danger to the security of this country. Senator McCARTHY and other responsible persons, including Patrick Hurley, claim the reason for Communists taking over China is because the personnel of our State Department, to say the least, favored the Communists in China over the Nationalists.

If our failure in China was due to influence exerted in and on our State Department we are entitled to know it.

Truman has claimed the credit for what he calls our postwar prosperity; let him explain and take the responsibility of our postwar failure in China.

Dr. Dunbar cannot excuse this failure by saying that during the war Stalin was our friend and Russia our ally. Surely he is not so naive as to believe that even during the war responsible people in Government did not realize the threat of communism and the danger of becoming engaged in a war with Russia. No, we can't find it reasonable to say that our Government should be excused for its failure simply because during the last war we all were boosting for Russia to give Germany a licking.

Our State Department was supposed to cope with the postwar conditions in China. In order to prevent a third world war it was the policy of this country to check the spread of communism. Our Government failed miserably in China and now we want to know whether it was because of Red influence in high places or just plain dumbness.

It is true that Owen Lattimore was not an employee of our State Department. It is not true that our State Department did not follow Lattimore's advice in all particulars. At least our State Department favored the China Communists over the China Nationalists and now we want to know why. Was it because of Lattimore and others like him? Did our State Department permit Communists and Communist sympathizers to influence it? That is what we want to know.

Mr. Speaker, these two editorials show something of the thinking of the people of the smaller communities throughout the Midwest, for they are typical of the thought expressed in many letters which come to me from that area.

Whether there are at the moment Communists in the State Department and whether Senator McCARTHY has been reckless in his charges; whether the truth will ever be known, one thing is crystal clear, and that is this: Regardless of the intentions or of the loyalty of those who have been in charge of our postwar foreign policy, they have failed to prevent the spread of communism.

In spite of the expenditure of billions of dollars to aid other nations, it is extremely doubtful that, if war with Russia comes, any nation in the world will be able and willing to render us worthwhile help in that war.

Having made a mess of our foreign policy, created a situation where we are threatened with a third world war—and every student of history knows that suffering and disease follow in the wake of war—those responsible for that failure should not be permitted to either represent us abroad or direct our activities if war comes.

Men who have failed so miserably, no matter what their qualifications, should not have under their charge or direction the lives and destinies of the millions of young Americans who will be called to fight in any war which may come to us because of a lack of ability and foresight on the part of those who have been directing our foreign policy.

Reclamation in the Arid and Semiarid West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 8 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a splendid address entitled "Reclamation in the Arid and Semiarid West," delivered by William E. Welsh, secretary-manager of the National Reclamation Association, before the recent convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RECLAMATION IN THE ARID AND SEMIARID WEST

It is a pleasure to appear before this organization, an organization national in scope and now in its fortieth year, an organization that has had a great and beneficial influence upon the policies of this Nation with respect to the development of its water resources.

It is likewise a pleasure to appear on behalf of an association such as our National Reclamation Association, an association in its eighteenth year and representing the western half of the United States.

Both organizations are interested primarily in fostering and promoting a sound and orderly program of water-resource development. Water is a basic resource. Its use affects the economy, happiness, and prosperity and the future welfare and security of all the people.

We have long recognized the importance of water to the western half of the United States. More recently such great cities as New York City, as well as other areas in the East have been brought face to face with the fact that they cannot continue to grow and expand, in fact they cannot survive without water.

Our National Reclamation Association, representing the arid and semiarid West, was organized primarily for the purpose of fostering and promoting reclamation development in that area. You who are here because of your interest in water realize, I am sure, that out in that desert country man cannot survive upon the use of water as it is delivered by nature—from melting snows and the winter precipitation. Water must be stored in reservoirs and held over for the dry summer season.

TOTAL IRRIGATED AREA

The total irrigated area of the entire West today amounts to 21,000,000 acres. Only 17,000,000 acres remain to be irrigated. To put it in a different way—all of the land remaining to be irrigated in the West and susceptible to irrigation amounts to only one-third of 1 percent of the total land under cultivation in the United States. Furthermore, with respect to agricultural surplus the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on March 20—last Monday—in report No. 1351, pertaining to the Columbia Basin, said:

"The committee examined the effect, if any, of the agricultural production from all reclamation projects collectively upon so-called food surpluses and determined that with regard to items which are said to be in surplus supply, the effect is relatively insignificant."

RECLAMATION REQUIRES TIME

Reclamation, as you well realize, is a slow process. The problem of reclaiming the desert lands of the West and bringing them under irrigation is entirely different today than it was 50 or 75 years ago. The irrigation in the West was on a very small scale. The early day western pioneer who settled in the valleys and by the side of a stream, constructed his own irrigation canal and diversion works.

Today the situation is entirely different. Land to be irrigated and brought under cultivation is often many miles away from the point of diversion from the stream. Huge dams and reservoirs are required to catch the flash spring run-off and hold the water for use when needed later.

Today reclamation is a multi-purpose, basin-wide undertaking. It requires a long period of time to make all necessary surveys and investigations and it requires even more time to complete the plans and make the final determination as to how and where the waters of a river basin can best be utilized within that basin.

It requires years to build these great multi-purpose projects. Thus to complete the reclamation of the remaining 17,000,000 acres yet undeveloped and susceptible to irrigation will require many years—perhaps half a century, perhaps longer.

In the meantime, through erosion and soil depletion, we are losing approximately 500,000 acres of agricultural lands every year, while our population is increasing at the astounding rate of considerably more than 1,000,000 per year.

LONG-RANGE PROGRAM

The need for future reclamation development should not be determined upon the exigencies of today alone, but rather upon the ultimate, long-range requirements of our rapidly growing population and the necessity of maintaining our high standard of living, which is the envy of the entire world.

It would be folly to plan our reclamation program on a stop-and-go basis, determined by changing conditions from year to year. The program must be determined on the basis of the long-time needs and requirements of the country.

A reclamation project, once it is constructed, is wealth producing for generations to come. Reclamation, in addition to repayments by the water users and repayment through power revenues, also pays the Federal Government and the Nation in many ways. Farmers on reclamation projects and citizens and industries of the communities which are sustained by those projects pay in Federal income taxes in a few short years more than the cost of the entire project.

Reclamation conserves the natural resources of the West. It creates self-sustaining communities. It provides stabilized agriculture. It is a field in which private capital cannot, and will not, invest.

The reclamation projects of the West provide a ready market for the manufactured products of the East. The Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee in the report of March 20, just referred to, stated that the

total incoming freight shipments to the irrigated areas of the West from Central and Eastern States in the year 1948 was estimated at $1,566,000,000. In 1949 one valley of two counties in southwestern Idaho purchased $55,000,000 worth of merchandise, which was imported from six North Central States.

POPULATION MOVING WESTWARD

There has been during the past decade, and still is, a tremendous westward movement of our population. Five far-western States have increased in population since 1940 nearly 50 percent, while the Nation as a whole has increased only 7 percent. This is caused to a very large extent by the tremendous, and yet undeveloped, great natural resources of that area.

In that connection I would like to quote from a statement signed by seven northwestern Governors, or their representatives, at Pocatello, Idaho, March 24, 1949, as follows:

"These new citizens add materially to the urgency of providing new jobs, new industries and opportunities through the development and use of these resources. We are now far behind in our development and are faced with the urgency of expanding every effort in united endeavor to provide for these new citizens, and we are not unmindful of the material national benefits that will be secured. * * * Most important to the whole basin, we believe, will be the development and reclamation of lands through irrigation, accomplishing greater agricultural production, providing a balanced regional economy, vital in times of peace as in times of war."

FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES

There are several principles which we of the West consider to be fundamental and which we believe should be strictly adhered to in any development program for the West:

1. Section 1 of the 1944 Flood Control Act should be maintained and the waters of the West which may ultimately be used for irrigation and reclamation and other consumptive purposes should be reserved and protected for those purposes.

In making that declaration I again call your attention to the fact that in the deserts of the West man cannot survive except by the artificial application of water to the land.

2. Throughout the arid West power should always remain incidental to irrigation and reclamation.

True, we should develop the full power potential that is feasible in connection with our multipurpose water-resources projects. However, power should not only remain incidental to reclamation, but power should be required to repay those costs of such basin-wide development as are beyond the ability of the water users to repay. Otherwise, there can be little, if any, further development of the West. The small projects, easy to construct, were completed many years ago.

3. In any basin-wide water-resources development all phases of such development, including reclamation, navigation, flood control, power, and all other phases should proceed concurrently.

In no other way can a balanced economy within the region be maintained.

4. The integrity of Western States' water laws should be forever protected and preserved.

The West has been developed and the water rights of the West have been established under these State laws. The economy of the West is dependent upon these State water laws. These rights should be protected against all hazards, including the threat of encroaching Federal controls.

All water-resource projects by the Federal Government in the West, whether to be constructed and operated by existing agencies, or by agencies hereafter created, should be developed, operated, and carried forward in full recognition of, conformity with, and adherence to the laws of the several States of the West.

The Federal Government in acquiring water rights for a contemplated project, should be required to file upon the water as provided for by State laws the same as any individual. The right to the use of the waters of the West under reclamation projects stems from State laws and not a contract with the Federal Government.

5. Valley authorities, such as MVA, CVA, and other proposals patterned after and similar to TVA should be opposed.

We of the West oppose valley authorities, not only because of the general objections which are valid throughout the entire Nation, but particularly because of their proposed interference with, and control over the waters of the region encompassed. If there is one possession concerning which a western farmer or rancher is zealous and will tolerate no interference, it is his water rights.

CVA would supersede and do away with existing agencies, tried and proven, such as the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers and establish in their places a board of three men—who they will be or where they will come from no one knows.

ASSOCIATION SPONSORS PROGRAM

Our association is now sponsoring the following program before the present Congress:

1. To encourage basin-wide development throughout the West by existing agencies, coordinated through interagency committees, and opposing valley authorities.

2. To liberalize and clarify the Federal reclamation laws, without abandoning the sound economic principles upon which reclamation was founded.

The first reclamation law was enacted in 1902 under Theodore Roosevelt. The last significant amendment was made in 1939. The law needs to be brought up to date.

3. To sponsor a small projects program, including a separate small projects division within the Bureau of Reclamation.

4. To expedite the construction program of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers in the West.

5. To accelerate and encourage the Forest Service program of revegetation and range improvements, and soil and water conservation, as well as the conservation programs of other State and Federal agencies having jurisdiction within the watersheds of the West.

6. To continue the snow surveys program of the Soil Conservation Service.

7. To implement stream-flow measurements and ground-water studies of the United States Geological Survey.

8. To encourage an increase in credit and loans by Farmers Home Administration to settlers on reclamation projects, the majority of whom are veterans.

We believe there should be adequate funds available for our surveys and investigations in order to have available a shelf of projects. The employment situation is not too critical today, and, of course, we all hope that we never again in our lifetime see conditions as they were in the early thirties. But if such a situation should develop and it again becomes necessary for the Government to embark upon a public-works program in order to stimulate employment, then we believe that we should be prepared with a shelf of projects providing for water resource development which would add to the permanent wealth and prosperity of the country.

We have had our floods in the West, some of which have been most disastrous. We appreciate the part which your organization played in bringing about a general recognition of the fact that the control of the rivers and the prevention of floods is a national problem, which should be undertaken by our Federal Government.

The world today is confronted with a cold war. What the outcome will be no one can say. However, there is one situation which we all realize. America has emerged with the responsibility of leadership among the democracies of the world. In that leadership we cannot fail. To succeed we, as a nation, must remain strong. Our expanding economy must meet the needs of our increasing population. Our standard of living must be maintained. The development of our natural resources will create greater opportunities for our people, better living conditions, a more stabilized economy. It will strengthen us as a nation and give encouragement to our people.

With this in mind we congratulate your great organization, the National Rivers and Harbors Congress. We believe you are performing a patriotic service for our country in outlining and fostering a sound program for the orderly development of the water resources of the Nation. We believe, too, that reclamation has a proper place in that program. We consider it a privilege to work and cooperate with you in carrying forward such a worth-while program.

National Defense Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 8 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the week from May 13 to May 20 is being observed as National Defense Week. During this week our Nation will be reminded that it must be enternally vigilant to defend itself from the menace from without and the menace from within.

It has been a pleasure in previous years for me to help point up the need for vigilance. Thus, in February 1948 and in February 1949 I was glad to contribute articles for National Security Week observances to the distinguished magazine prepared by the Reserve Officers Association of the United States. In those articles, I pointed out the need particularly for Federal decentralization.

In the May 1950 issue of the Reserve Officer, I have been glad to contribute another article, this time on the subject of the strategy of the masters of the Kremlin in the cold war in which they are now engaged with us. It is my hope that this article will be of some value, however small, in pointing up the public-spirited goals of the Reserve Officers Association and other alert defense-minded groups in our country. The ROA is well represented in my own State of Wisconsin and throughout the Nation, and I know it will continue in the vanguard of United States defense.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of my article, which is entitled "If You Were Joe Stalin," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IF YOU WERE JOE STALIN

(By Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY, United States Senator from Wisconsin)

What would you do if you were "Uncle Joe" Stalin, the master of the Kremlin, controller of the destiny of 200,000,000 Russians?

No, that is not an idle question, friends. Think it over carefully. What actions would you take, assuming that you were the leader of the underground Communist conspiracy throughout the globe, assuming that you were the spearhead of the world-wide revolutionary movement aimed at overturning the capitalistic system?

What would you do, assuming that you were the man who had master-minded the conquest of 400,000,000 Chinese and of practically the entire Asiatic hemisphere?

Those indeed aren't just academic questions. It is up to you as readers of this magazine and to me to try to put ourselves in Joe Stalin's shoes, so to speak, to try to imagine what we would do in the event that we were moving the Russian chessmen in this master chess game in which we find ourselves. The security of our entire country depends on solid, constructive answers to the question as to what we would do if we were Joe Stalin.

No man can, of course, think accurately for another man. No man can predict accurately what is going on in another man's mind, particularly when we of the West attempt to do so with someone who has an almost Asiatic or Oriental approach in his nature. But we can assume that if you or I were Joe Stalin, we would be aiming at certain objectives, among which we might presume are the following:

A WEAK RESERVE

1. If you were Joe Stalin and if you wanted to conquer the globe, you would be trying with all your might to weaken the reserve forces of America. You would recognize that organizations like the ROA, designed to maintain a strong, vigilant reserve cadre in America, designed to maintain a strong force of minute men—that such organizations would have to be discredited. You would strive to discredit the idea of National Defense Week as unnecessary or a waste of time.

You would recognize that your propagandists would have to keep up a continuous drum-fire of hate messages against those civic-minded Americans who devote quite a bit of time from their normal businesses or other affairs in order to train in the Organized Reserve and in various affiliated units.

You would recognize that any step, whether it be a congressional appropriation slash or any other action which would weaken the Reserve forces of America—discourage them, ruin their morale—would be that much to your advantage.

CUT DEFENSE TO BONE

2. If you were Joe Stalin, you would not be content with simply weakening the Reserve forces, you would try to cut down on America's Army, Navy, and Air Forces themselves. You would constantly have your propagandists roar that America was becoming a militaristic nation, because it was appropriating too much money for the Armed Forces.

You would play upon the admitted need for economy here at home to bring about completely arbitrary slashes in Armed Forces appropriations, going far beyond the needs of economy and eating into the very bone and marrow of United States defense. (Not to miss a good bet, too, you would, on the other hand, seek to encourage wasteful use of funds by defense heads—wasteful use in obsolete weapons and programs for example.)

You would attempt to have your propagandists gloss over the fact that right now in our country we have less than three full combat divisions ready for armed warfare. (Why is America so weak? Because all of our combat strength is dispersed throughout the rest of the globe, and because the remainder of our personnel are in supply or other roles.)

NERVE WARFARE

3. If you were Joe Stalin, you would try to unsettle the nerves of the American people. You would use off-again on-again tactics designed to make the people jittery and to throw up their hands in disgust. You would open the land corridor to Berlin and then close it. You would put out peace feelers, then dash them to smithereens. You would agree to a discussion of atomic energy and then when the discussion actually started, you would completely destroy all possible basis for discussion. By this constant jabbing off balance, this constant reversal of action, you would hope to make the American people completely numb, completely disappointed and disenheartened in any possible constructive result.

These are some of the things you, substituting for Joe Stalin, might do. How about some others?

TORPEDOING ARMS AID

4. If you were Joe Stalin, you would do your best to torpedo the Marshall plan and the program of arms aid to western Europe. You would use every possible weapon in your arsenal (like (a) Red-controlled longshoremen strikes designed to prevent the landing of arms aid or (b) anti-European appropriations propaganda in America) in order to sabotage the arms-aid plan.

You would have Communists in western European countries scream that America is attempting to take over the armed forces of those countries and, too, that "America would fight to the last Frenchman," or "to the last Belgian," or "to the last Englishman." Meanwhile, on the other side of the ocean, you would be telling the American people that England would fight "to the last American," or then be telling us that "France would fight to the last American," etc. In other words, you would carry on what amounts to self-contradictory propaganda, assuming that the Americans and Englishmen would never compare notes about your self-refuting claims and would never appraise the fact that you were obviously trying to set them against the other.

ANTIFEDERATION EFFORT

5. If you were Joe Stalin, you would do all that was possible in order to prevent the program of European federation. You would play on age-old jealousies, fears, and hatreds in order to prevent the western democratic nations from integrating their economies. You would at the very minimum try to torpedo the efforts to make currencies interchangeable, the efforts to cut down tariff barriers. You would realize that a united Europe would inevitably present a strong anti-Communist front to resist Soviet aggression.

STRANGLE HOLD ON CONQUERED PEOPLES

6. If you were Joe Stalin, you would send out propaganda indicating that all the people behind the iron curtain are allegedly irretrievably lost to the western world, that their amalgamation within the Soviet Union is an accomplished fact. You would attempt to make the people of the world believe that devout Poland, that Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Rumania are all "lost forever" to the western cause, that no thought should be given whatsoever to their one day regaining their independence and their territorial integrity. You would attempt to make the people of the world believe that the self-determination of these various peoples is a closed book, that nothing can be done about it, that there is no use trying to propagandize these peoples, that their hope for liberty is lost forever.

CLASS WARFARE AGITATION

7. If you were Joe Stalin you would be active on the home front in America in attempting to set class against class, race against race, religion against religion, color against color. You would use your principal agents to infiltrate the labor unions of key industries, electric utilities, coal, railroads; heavy industries like steel and automobile, so that whenever the crucial occasion arises that you need to call these men out on a crippling strike, they would be able to respond like automatons. You would fight against legislation designed to prevent crippling national strikes. You would want to lay America open for ruinous industrial paralysis.

SMEARING OF FBI

8. If you were Joe Stalin you would make every effort to smear organizations working hardest on the problem of protecting America's internal security. You would give a king's ransom to any individual who could get courageous J. Edgard Hoover out as head of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. You would do everything you could in order to attempt to portray the FBI as a gestapo, in order to smear the FBI as allegedly violating the civil liberties of American citizens. You would similarly try to smear the Central Intelligence Agency, the House Un-American Activities Committee as well as individual Senators and Congressmen trying to clear disloyal individuals and groups from the Federal Government.

Above all, you would concentrate on combating permanent anti-Communist legislation now pending before the Senate which would really put a crimp on your subversive forces in this country.

These are some of the things you, as Joe Stalin, might do.

REALISTIC CHESS PLAY

I repeat: What my friends, do you as individual members of the ROA, think that Joe Stalin would do? And once you have thought of the actions that he would take in order to further his interests, the answer will come readily to your mind and mine on what we should do to foil his efforts. As you know, a good chess player always imagines not only his own moves many moves ahead, but the moves which his opponent will take. So, too, a good infantry commander, or naval commander, or air force commander always visualizes the actions which his opponent will take in order to prevent and checkmate those actions.

Let us accordingly mobilize our best thinking, not on a wild spree of loose, irresponsible imagination, but on a coldly realistic basis. Let us think and we will save America.

CONCLUSION

Let us have a stronger Reserve Officers Association than ever before. Let us have more universal dedication to national defense week than ever before. Let us have America's armed forces trained to a peak of efficiency with every dollar in the national defense budget and atom energy budgets being used for the soundest possible purpose.

Let us not be weary and disheartened by the nerve warfare continued by the Russians. Let us not allow any inconsequential factors to interfere with the Marshall plan, and with arms aid to Europe. At the same time, let us point out that the European nations must stand on their own feet and meet their domestic problems head-on, including, of course, the problem of ruinous strikes which peter out our aid. Let us urge the European nations to come closer together toward the goal of federation. Let us never give up hope that the brave people trapped behind the iron curtain will maintain their desire for freedom and independence.

Let us here in our country heal whatever wounds exist between classes, between groups, between religions, and between regions. Let us carry on the anti-subsersive fight and give our heartfelt support to the great organization which has already spearheaded that fight, the Federal Bureau of Investigation. These are some of the things

which you and I must do in our capacity as individual citizens and as legislators.

You can be sure that the individuals in the politiburo are thinking:

If we were Americans and we were trying to protect our peace and security, what would we do? In other words, the politburo will be trying to imagine actions which we would take in our self-interest. Let us show that we can think through our own needs clearly and that we can foresee to the greatest possible extent the thinking and actions of the Kremlin. This is a hard task, but it is an urgent one. Let us think, I repeat and we will save America.

Address by Governor Dewey at Annual New York State Republican Committee Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 8 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an address by Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, of New York, delivered last Thursday evening, May 4, at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York City.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

You know the Democrats have sometimes accused the Republicans of saying "Me too, but we will do it better." Well, for once they are right. They did invent this idea of a fund-raising dinner. Now we have borrowed it and we have done it a whale of a lot better.

This is the biggest family dinner ever held by any political party in our State. I congratulate BILL PFEIFFER and every one of you on a wonderful job.

All three thousand of you here tonight have contributed to the cost of running the party. It shows that in New York State the Republicans do not depend upon any individual or group but have a base as broad as the American people themselves.

Today it is the Democrats who are the party of big money. Last year in the New York City and State campaigns they proved it by drenching the air with paid radio time and by full-page advertisements in the papers. They spent at least $3 for every $1 of Republican money that was spent.

The Democrats have, indeed, become the party of big money. But there are other differences even more important than their ability to tax union treasuries without the consent of the members and to shake down wealthy playboys for Government jobs.

One big difference is that we Republicans believe in keeping our political promises—and we keep them faithfully.

Another difference is that we really believe that spies and traitors belong in jail.

We also believe that sex offenders and the like should be in prisons or mental hospitals and not in any part of the Federal Government.

FOR HONEST ELECTIONS

We believe that State elections should be decided by vote of the people and not by stolen paper ballots or by the pistols of gunmen in Kansas City clubhouses.

We believe in honest government and I am happy to say that no associates in my office have been convicted of perjury.

We believe that in a free Republic the purpose of a political party is to serve the people and not just to hang on to public office by hook—or by crook.

We also believe that a political party ought to stand for something. In this State the Democrats don't stand for anything at all. In the legislature they vote as they are told by the CIO: they take their candidates from the misnamed Liberal Party and they take their orders from Washington.

And what do they do when a State campaign comes around? Do they have the guts to run as Democrats? Heaven forbid. No Democrat would dare run for governor or Senator on his own feet and hasn't done so in 14 years. They have to have at least two crutches, one labeled the Communist American Labor Party and the other labeled the Socialist Liberal Party.

And this year I forecast right now that, again, no Democrat will dare to run on his own hind legs. They will bend the knee again. They will pay the price and they will get the support of one or both of the splinter parties which would ruin the State and Nation if they ever got in control.

By contrast, the Republican Party in this State, standing by its principles and keeping its promises, attracts to its candidates the votes of thousands upon thousands of Democrats, Liberals, and Independents, men and women who vote their own convictions. We welcome them to our ranks in the never-ending effort to give good government.

We welcome them on the record of what has happened here during the eight legislative sessions in the almost 8 years of Republican administration. That brings up the final great difference between the Republicans and the Democrats in New York State. They talk—we act. They promise—and promise and promise. We perform. They talk about the welfare state. We provide social welfare.

Whoever runs for Governor on the Republican ticket has a record the Democrats can never equal.

Take housing, for example. In the 20 years the Democrats ran this State, from 1922 to 1942, just 7,200 subsidized or limited-dividend housing units were built.

We have had less than 5 years since the end of the war. How have we done with our limited dividend projects, cooperatives, slum clearance and low-rent housing, our new redevelopment companies law, and veterans' emergency housing? Compared with the Democrat 20-year record of 7,200 units, we can show you 36,900. In 5 years, under a Republican administration, five times as many housing units have been built as under the Democrats in 20 years.

The Democrats talked about houses, the Republicans have built them.

We will keep on building them until the housing shortage is met. Until then we need rent control. Back in 1946, when the Federal rent control lapsed, you will remember what happened; ours was the only State in the Union with a stand-by law to protect its tenants from gouging.

This year two inconsistent sets of rent control—city and Federal—operated in the biggest city in the United States. The Democrats in New York City and in Washington were busy fighting—each saying what a rotten job the other was doing on rent control.

For once they were both right. To bring an end to that farce and to protect the tenants, again we had to take rent control over. And who was against it? The Democrats, as always. And every last one of them in both Houses—with a single brave exception—voted against the only rent-control bill they knew would work. We have rent control in New York because the Republican administration brought it about.

Let me mention a few more high lights of the record.

The Democrats had 20 years to do something about discrimination in our State. It waited for the Republican Party to make New York the first State in the Union to pass a law carrying out the fundamental that people have a right to earn a living regardless of who their parents were. Since then we have also outlawed discrimination in education and publicly aided housing. The Democrats talk about fair play. We believe in it—in action.

PUBLIC POWER

Now, let's take a minute to look at that good old subject of public power. For 20 years the Democrats talked about water power, but it took a Republican administration to pass the laws declaring that the water power of this State belongs to the people.

This business of water power is now getting serious. We need that water power; we need to develop it; we need it right now. With every factor that goes into costs skyrocketing, what's going to happen to your electric-light bills? Even the efficiency of the power industry can't keep them down forever, unless we can get cheap hydroelectric power flowing in the veins of our power system.

We want to build those hydroelectric plants on the St. Lawrence River and on the Niagara River. Enormous amounts of cheap power are there waiting for the asking. New York State and the Province of Ontario are ready, able, eager, and willing to develop that power. It has been only Mr. Truman who says no, the people of New York may not develop their own power. We will tax them to death to build power in the Missouri Valley, in the TVA, in California, in Washington, Oregon, and Idaho, says Mr. Truman as he travels to Oregon to dedicate a Federal dam. But, he has refused to allow us to work with Canada to develop our own power at our own expense. And we can do it ourselves without a penny of new taxes, on a self-liquidating, self-sustaining basis and get cheap power to keep down the cost of living in the State of New York.

I see by the papers that Senator LEHMAN and "Junior" have just introduced a bill to permit diversion of water from the Niagara River for power purposes. I sincerely trust that their bill will not attempt to rob the State of all that enormous power; that it is not designed merely as a Federal power grab. I hope that it's not just another political maneuver in the old-fashioned Democrat faro game.

The Fair Deal is a faro deal for New York State. The people get trimmed every day. We have a right to that water power by solemn agreement and I propose that we fight for it.

HIGHWAY TRANSPORTATION

Take highway transportation: we inherited from the Democrats a crumbling and decrepit system. Since the war we have made great strides in improving it but a billion dollars wouldn't make our present winding, narrow highways serve modern needs. If we should continue to rely on them, New York State would wither away for lack of adequate modern transportation and from traffic congestion in the cities.

More than a century ago the Erie Canal opened New York to the West and made it the Empire State.

What the Erie Canal did for the nineteenth century must now be done for the twentieth century with the great new thruway—486 miles long, four to six lanes of concrete, running from New York City to Albany and west to Buffalo with a thousand feet of clear vision at every point, not a grade more than 3 percent, and not a stop light all the way.

The thruway will cut an average of $28 off the cost of every truckload of milk that reaches the city of New York. It will save

$100 on every shipment of heavy machinery between Buffalo and New York City. It will reduce the cost of living for every New Yorker and make his job more secure. It will double our $2,000,000,000 vacation industry from the Great Lakes to Broadway and from the Adirondacks to the Thousand Islands.

It will release funds for highways all over the State and for the $232,000,000 of new arterial routes in the Bronx, Brooklyn, Queens, and Manhattan. It will end the dreadful bumper-to-bumper congestion around the city of New York and in every other city all the way to Buffalo.

The Federal Government wants it urgently for national defense. Every expert who has studied it recommends it. The people of our State desperately need it. Mayor O'Dwyer, of the city of New York, is all out for it. And who is against it? Nobody but the poor old Democratic Party. They are so desperate for an issue they forgot something. They forgot that it was Governor LEHMAN who signed the first Republican bill for the thruway eight long years ago.

NOT ONE DIME OF TAX MONEY

They also forget or can't seem to understand that the thruway will not cost one single dime of tax money. It will be built by an independent authority and will be self-supporting and self-liquidating. It will pay for itself a hundred times over. It is the most important physical development of the century.

There is no need to go into the salt tears the Democrats are shedding as they call for hospital beds not roadbeds. We're building both. We have to because in the last year they occupied Albany, the Democrats had the mental hygiene department squeezed down to $41,000,000 against $107,000,000 we are now spending for the care of the mentally ill.

But money is not the only test. The quality of care has been revolutionized. Our mental hospitals are no longer custodial institutions. They are symbols of hope and cure. A great new staff of dietitians and additional funds have made the food good. In our new internship program, work therapy and brain surgery, we are leading the Nation. Meanwhile, today we have 60 mental hygiene projects under way involving $45,000,000 and during this year we will double our program of construction.

Under my Democratic predecessors the State of New York did more to cure tuberculosis in cattle than it did in human beings. Today we have the leading tuberculosis program of the world with free X-rays in process for all 14,000,000 people of the State and free hospital care until cured.

Where were the Democrats during all their 20 years? They were talking about welfare. We have been delivering welfare and preserving human freedom in the process.

We have made mighty contributions to a whole panorama of services in aid to the blind, in the reduction of the death rate of infants, in pioneering a cerebral palsy program, in blood bank services, in water pollution, by a 2,000 percent increase in cancer detection work, and in research in the Rh factor in the blood of infants and in the medical problems of the aged.

Under our social welfare programs, no citizens of the State of New York need go without adequate medical care whether he has the money to pay for it or not. And all of it is done, let me assure you, without the slightest tinge of Mr. Truman's socialized medicine which would wreck the standards of health of our people.

SICKNESS DISABILITY LAW

Our latest program is the new sickness disability law which will start paying benefits on July 1. At a cost of no more than 30 cents a week to employer and employee, 6,000,000 workers in our State will be protected during illness up to 13 weeks.

And let me remind you that when this program came to the floor of the legislature, every single Democrat in both Houses voted against it on direct orders from their CIO bosses—and I hope you will see to it that they are reminded of it every day from now on.

So it goes. The Democrats talked. We acted. We increased unemployment insurance from $18 to $26 a week and the coverage from 20 to 26 weeks. We extended minimum wage protection to 500,000 new workers. We guaranteed women equal pay for equal work. Through our youth commission we have established 700 youth centers in this State and we have reduced juvenile delinquency by 27 percent.

We have provided on-the-job and apprentice training for 110,000 veterans and homes for 28,180 others, with their families, in State-aided housing projects. Our veterans have made use of the counseling services of our division of veterans affairs no less than 4,760,000 times.

In addition, we have more than doubled the State aid to education, more than doubled minimum teachers' salaries, created a State university, five new institutes of applied arts and sciences and added two great medical centers for the training of much-needed doctors. The story could go on and on, but again in 8 years we have done much more than the Democrats did in 20 years in every branch of education.

The New York farmer also knows that at last he has a State administration that knows something about farming. Great new research programs in cattle and poultry diseases have brought real progress. Research in marketing and the mighty new program of farm-to-market roads approved by this year's legislature are the most important progress for our farmers in many a decade.

BUDGET BALANCED

Business has flourished because we have created and maintained here the atmosphere in which private enterprise expands. Today we have 580,000 individual firms doing business in this State. In the period since VJ-day, we have added 179,000 business establishments. For eight successive years we have led the country in harmonious labor-management relations, with the lowest proportion of man-days lost through strikes. This has meant uninterrupted production and steady, profitable jobs and operations.

And finally, what has happened to the taxpayer in New York? Well, our budget is balanced and the Federal Government is running a deficit of $6,000,000,000 a year.

Here in New York we have doubled our contributions for local assistance, our aid to education, our aid to welfare and still we have reserve funds for a rainy day.

As we made great social progress, we have actually reduced the tax rates. Right now, despite these vital increases in services and the payment of a $400,000,000 veterans' bonus in 10 years, our tax structure is 10 percent below what it was in 1941, the last prewar, peacetime year. We have saved the taxpayers of this State a billion dollars by good management. We have substituted good government for hot air.

In all this you who are here tonight have had a liberal share and I know the people of the State are grateful for what you have done. It has been a teamwork job by a great team of good citizens.

As we have given good government to our State, we have given our best to the welfare of the Nation in a troubled world. We have stoutly fought for a strong America in a peaceful world through a bipartisan foreign policy which we have supported all the time and not just when it was politically expedient.

As Americans we have put our country first and made our party an instrument of great service to all the people. May it ever be thus.

St. Lawrence Seaway and Power Project Fallacies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 8, 1950

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the longer the proponents of the St. Lawrence seaway project testify the more fallacies are uncovered.

The following article from the April 27, 1950, issue of the New York Journal-American reveals glaring inconsistencies in the testimony presented to date.

To those who are searching for the truth the following article tells the story:

SEAWAY FALLACIES

"Acheson favors seaway project," so runs a recent newspaper headline. Another is: "Sawyer indorses seaway project." We may expect that pretty soon Secretary of Agriculture Brannan will favor seaway project for the Brannan plan, and Mrs. Roosevelt will endorse seaway project on behalf of the world.

This St. Lawrence seaway scheme has been under more or less active consideration since 1933. By this time, all the facts and arguments should be known. I think I know them. I can say without qualification, that the scheme is without any economic or military merit. The endorsements and favors of these politicians are but proof of their incompetence or their servility to the little boss, Truman. (He never misses a chance to drag the seaway scheme into his messages.)

Briefly the facts are: (1) the seaway is an economically unsound and impractical scheme; (2) we can't afford the huge cost of it. It would never be self-supporting, and no competent or informed person has ever thought or said that it would be.

As to its economic merits: Probably the outstanding point is that the seaway would not be a seaway, because of the many insuperable difficulties it would present.

1. It would be closed by ice at least one-third of the time. Ice and fog would seriously hamper its use approximately one-half of the time.

It is as much an iceway as a seaway.

Look at lake navigation this year. It has hardly opened yet, and the total railway freight traffic has been much less than in some years because we can't get ore down from Lake Superior to Cleveland and Ashtabula by lake.

This is fresh water, you know. It freezes solid.

Maybe Acheson and Sawyer, as experts on such matters, plan to develop the electric power part of the project in order to use the current for keeping their precious seaway warm in winter.

2. It would not be used by seagoing vessels to any important extent. Not only is the fact of ice and fog enough to keep any regular liner service off, but also the length and the slowness of the trip are prohibitive. It is 2,200 miles from the Gulf of St. Lawrence to the head of the lakes. The locks and currents that would beset the course would greatly hamper traffic. A different type of vessel would be required. The number of turn arounds or trips per year would be so reduced, that nearly all steamship companies have stated that they would not use the seaway.

As the thing would cost about $2,000,000,000, the tolls required to make it pay would be prohibitive: either no traffic, or more taxes for you and me.

As to the military argument: I have yet to see a single unqualified approval by any Army or Navy authority. Here is what the thing would do:

1. It would be indefensible, inviting easy bomb attack on far-flung locks, canals, and shipping.

2. It would divert great war equipment and forces to attempt its defense.

3. If by any chance we came to rely upon it, it would be a serious hazard, as its easy stoppage might be a fatal blow.

Two added thoughts: If there is any power shortage, the electric power part of the scheme can be executed separately at half the cost. Is there a power shortage?

The scheme is no sounder than the Passamaquoddy Bay scheme. Where are the labor and money we sank in that silly project? Yet that, too, was endorsed by eminent political stooges. Remember, the Pharaohs made the Egyptians build the pyramids.

Importations of Fresh and Dried Eggs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES I. DOLLIVER
OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1950

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., May 1, 1950.

Hon. JAMES I. DOLLIVER,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. DOLLIVER: This is in reply to your request of April 20 for information regarding the quantity of dried and fresh eggs imported into the United States in 1949.

According to census data the following quantity of eggs was imported in 1949:

Whole in shell (chicken) (dozens)	3,359,428
Whole in shell (other) (dozens)	234,753
Dried whole (pounds)	93,205
Frozen whole (pounds)	48,093
Yolks, dried (pounds)	1,811,400
Yolks, frozen (pounds)	283,088
Albumen, dried (pounds)	47,721

We hope that this information will be of service to you.

Sincerely yours,

RALPH S. TRIGG,
Administrator.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
OFFICE OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE,
Washington, D. C., May 5, 1950.

The Honorable JAMES I. DOLLIVER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DOLLIVER: This will acknowledge your letter of April 20, 1950, in which you request the amount of fresh and dried eggs imported into the United States during 1949.

United States imports of eggs, by country of origin, during the calendar year 1949 are as follows:

Imports of shell eggs, by country, 1949

[Dozens]

Country	Chicken eggs	Other
Canada	3,249,996	300
Mexico	1,050	-------
Dominican Republic	102,480	-------
United Kingdom	30	-------
China	5,747	221,919
Hong Kong	125	12,534
Total	3,359,428	234,753

Imports of dried and frozen eggs and egg products, by country, 1949

[Pounds]

Product	Canada	China	Argentina	Japan	Total
Dried whole eggs	5	93,200	-------	-------	93,205
Whole eggs, frozen or prepared	45,228	2,865	-------	-------	48,093
Egg yolks, dried	-------	1,766,526	40,874	4,000	1,811,400
Egg yolks, frozen or prepared	283,088	-------	-------	-------	283,088
Egg albumen, dried	-------	43,312	4,409	-------	47,721

Source: Report No. FT 110, United States Imports of Merchandise for Consumption, 1949, Bureau of the Census.

The major markets for United States exports of eggs and egg products in 1949 are indicated in the following tabulations:

Exports of shell eggs, by country of destination, 1949

	Dozens
Mexico	1,514,501
Canal Zone	1,043,804
Cuba	2,985,901
Venezuela	9,160,196
Philippines, Republic of	1,234,730
Switzerland	596,228
Netherlands Antilles	550,974
Others (24 countries)	1,358,645
Total	18,444,979

Exports of dried eggs, by country of destination, 1949

	Pounds
United Kingdom	6,109,750
Germany	3,727,252
Austria	1,492,658
Switzerland	253,550
Indonesia	346,126
Others (41 countries)	417,548
Total	12,346,884

Exports of frozen eggs, by country of destination, 1949

	Pounds
Mexico	174,780
Canal Zone	104,088
Venezuela	265,426
United Kingdom	13,945,812
Belgium	637,866
Switzerland	263,070
Others (20 countries)	176,709
Total	15,567,251

Exports of other prepared or preserved eggs, by country of destination, 1949

	Pounds
Egypt	2,200
Colombia	1,000
Union of South Africa	1,000
Others (9 countries)	2,670
Total	6,870

Detailed information regarding exports by country of destination is published in Bureau of the Census Report FT 410, United States Exports of Domestic and Foreign Merchandise, 1949.

If we can be of further service, please call on us again.

Sincerely yours,

LORING K. MACY,
Deputy Director.

St. Lawrence Seaway Must Be Completed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 8 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a statement on the St. Lawrence seaway, which I ask to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS MUST QUIT DAWDLING AND MUST PASS A SEAWAY BILL

On Wednesday, the House Public Works Committee will conclude hearings on the St. Lawrence seaway bill. According to reports, that committee will then put the seaway bill to sleep until and unless the Senate takes action.

Mr. President, our country is considerably surprised that hearings were held over on the House side without substantive committee action developing.

I personally deplore this "After you, my dear Alphonse"; "No, after you, my dear Gaston," act which has been played by what might be regarded as the suspiciously overpolite Senate and the House for many years on this issue.

SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE IS STACKED AGAINST SEAWAY

Since when must statesmen sit on their dignity and await actions of the other Chamber if they really feel that action is necessary and desirable? The House committee knows full well that the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on the Seaway Bill (S. J. Res. 99) is stacked against the seaway 4 to 1, with my own vote being the only committed proseaway vote. Since July 29 last year, this subcommittee under the chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] has been sitting on the bill, in spite of my numerous appeals for action. Why, then, doesn't the House committee take this issue in its teeth and proceed to report it? Why cannot the House set a pattern for the Senate instead of allowing Senate inaction to serve as an excuse for a House serenade of lullaby and good night on this issue?

I am not excusing the obstruction of my colleagues in the Senate who feel contrary to the way I feel on this issue, nor am I condemning them as individuals. I deplore their stand, but I do respect them for the honesty of their mistaken convictions.

AMERICA IS SKEPTICAL ABOUT HOUSE HEARINGS

Let me say quite candidly that the people of this Nation were somewhat skeptical about the House hearings from the very beginning. The people felt that these hearings were (a) too long, (b) too late in the session, (c) played into the hands of the obstructionists who have sabotaged the seaway all along.

With all due respect to that able committee, let me point out that the sands are running out on this second session of the Eighty-first Congress. Based on the regular legislative schedule, presumably only the full months of June and July remain. The Members on the House side realize full well, I am sure, that the House has a tremendous number of issues which it must take care of during the next 90 or so days, and that the only hope for the seaway is for a prompt report to be made to the full House of Representatives, with floor time quickly cleared by the Rules Committee.

Mr. President, I am presenting these comments frankly, because America's 150,000,000

people are not interested in anything but frankness from their Congress on this or any other issue.

COMMITTEE PRINT PREPARED BY WILEY SUBCOMMITTEE

Mr. President, on March 2, 1949, as former subcommittee chairman during the Republican Eightieth Congress, I presented to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee a complete report of the latest opinions of Government agencies and outstanding private individuals and groups on the St. Lawrence seaway. This 76-page committee print indicated that this great self-liquidating project would involve expenditures of only $802,000,000 on the part of Canada and the United States, for completion of the 27-foot project. Of this sum, the United States share was $573,000,000 and Canada's share was $229,000,000. My aim in presenting the committee print was to show to the obstructionists that there was more than enough technical evidence already on hand to complete this seaway legislation once and for all without dawdling in further surveys. Unfortunately, however, this committee print, like so many previous studies has not been heeded by the majority.

ECA APPROVED BUT NOT SEAWAY

On Friday night, the Senate passed a $3,000,000,000 foreign-aid bill. I should like to point out, Mr. President, that it is an incredible contradiction that the Senate and House should approve with great speed a $3,000,000,000 measure for revitalizing European countries, while the Congress drags its feet on a project which has been pending before us for 30 years to vitalize the great Middle West and to help assure continuing economic health for the best neighbor that any other country ever had, namely, our good friend to the north, Canada.

Now, Mr. President, I do not mean to underestimate completely the value of the hearings held before the Public Works Committee. I know that no subject is ever so completely studied as not to benefit from some additional facts. But I, for one, feel that the necessity for action far outweighed the necessity for accumulating some minor additional facts on this issue.

WISCONSINITES HAVE TESTIFIED ON SEAWAY

I was glad to personally testify before the Public Works Committee and I am glad to say that numerous other Wisconsinites also testified including the following:

The energetic president of the Wisconsin State Federation of Labor, Mr. George Habermann.

One of the outstanding port experts in our Nation, the municipal port director of Milwaukee, Mr. Harry Brockel.

One of the stanchest battlers for the seaway down through these decades, Mr. Herman Ekern, chairman of the deep waterways commission of my State.

One of the ablest businessmen and industrialists of Wisconsin whose interest in the seaway has never flagged, Mr. Walter Olen, of Clintonville, as well as other able individuals.

SHEBOYGAN PRESS EDITORIAL

Now, Mr. President, in this connection I have in my hands an editorial entitled "Thank You, Governor," written by one of the greatest newspapermen of the Badger State, a renowned fraternal leader and civic-minded citizen, Mr. Charles E. Broughton, of Sheboygan. While Charley and I have not always seen eye to eye on some of the political issues of our times, I am glad to say that on the seaway as well as on many other themes there is virtually complete agreement between myself and this outstanding American.

STATEMENT BY GOVERNOR RENNEBOHM

I was particularly happy to see that Mr. Broughton drew attention to a splendid statement prepared by the esteemed Governor of our State, the Honorable Oscar Rennebohm. Our State's chief executive had intended to appear personally before the Public Works Committee, but due to an illness was unable to come to Washington. He was, however, well represented by his executive secretary, Mr. Phillip Drotning, who presented the governor's comment.

TUESDAY A. F. OF L. CONFERENCE IN CHICAGO

Now, Mr. President, tomorrow, Tuesday, May 9, there is going to be an important preliminary conference on the St. Lawrence seaway at the Stevens Hotel in Chicago, attended by A. F. of L. representatives throughout the Middle West. There is an interesting article on this conference in the May 1950 issue of the official bulletin of the Wisconsin State Federation of Labor, the Wisconsin Federationist. And so I ask unanimous consent that this article commenting upon this important meeting be printed at this point in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I should like to convey my warmest greetings to the convention and my sincerest hopes that out of its deliberations will come renewed and strengthened A. F. of L. leadership in this struggle to which we of labor, government, business, agriculture are mutually dedicated on a nonpartisan basis. Regardless of our differences on other issues, regardless of political party, let us join hands in continued battle for this great project.

Finally I present for reprinting also in the RECORD a terse, hard-hitting editorial from the April 28 Toronto (Canada) Daily Star entitled "United States Actions Speak the Louder."

[From the Sheboygan (Wis.) Press of May 5, 1950]

THANK YOU, GOVERNOR!

Twenty-three years ago, April 11, 1927, the Sheboygan Press editorially had this to say of the proposed St. Lawrence waterway:

"At last the United States has taken up the question of negotiating with Canada for the building of the St. Lawrence waterway, and we will now see these problems ironed out with more than a possibility that a treaty will be presented and ratified on the part of the United States and Canada. Present at the conference at Muskegon, Mich., this winter, we predicted that the deep waterway would be built and that ocean liners would 'make' western ports on Lake Michigan in 8 or 9 years. That is no idle dream.

"Canada will benefit as much as the United States by such a waterway, and where interests are identical, and when the cost of the building will eventually be met out of the receipts from created electric power, neither country can afford to pass up this opportunity."

Ever since that time selfish interests have been blocking a treaty with Canada which would make possible water transportation between the Great Lakes and the nations of the world. In other words, we would have ocean steamers plying the Great Lakes and making landlocked regions in this and Middle West areas open to the trade of the world. There are some who may argue that we would be brought into competition with the world, but that argument will come from isolationists rather than from broadminded citizens who realize that even in America you cannot live alone or have your doors barricaded.

Gov. Oscar Rennebohm Wednesday afternoon expressed his views through Phillip D. Drotning, executive secretary, who appeared at the hearing of the House Committee on Public Works with reference to House Joint Resolution 271 dealing with the St. Lawrence Seaway problem. We like the sentiments expressed in the statement of the governor when he said:

"The State of Wisconsin has been a leader in pushing this project. In the year 1919 the Legislature of Wisconsin created the Wisconsin Deep Waterways Commission, which was entrusted with the task of working for a deep-water route connecting the Middle West with the Atlantic Ocean via the St. Lawrence River. Since its creation the Wisconsin Deep Waterways Commission has worked unceasingly to attain this goal."

We might add, too, that our Wisconsin Senators and Congressmen over the years have worked untiringly in the interest of the St. Lawrence waterway and one of the outstanding figures has been Senator ALEXANDER WILEY. This is neither Republican nor Democratic legislation; it is legislation for the whole Nation.

Here is something, too, that is very important, and that is the development of water power, a necessity if we are to maintain lower costs. The railroads of the Nation cannot give us the service that we need, and they will profit even more in the tomorrow that is to follow by the increased shorter hauls to ports of embarkation.

The Governor has six points that he raises, and the second is one of the best, telling the story of the need for an ocean waterway into the Great Lakes. He says:

"The seaway will give the Middle West access to the newly discovered high-grade ore deposits in Canada which will offset the rapid depletion of the iron-ore deposits in the Lake Superior district. Inasmuch as three-fourths of the Nation's total production of steel is centered in the Great Lakes States, the importance of cheap water transportation to carry the Canadian ore to the Middle West cannot be overemphasized."

The Governor then calls attention to the St. Lawrence seaway as a necessity for our national defense and the military security of this Nation.

In the last war many of our large munitions plants were built on the seaboards. If another war is to come these will have to seek safer interior locations and likewise safer places for the storage of strategic materials and for the construction of naval and merchant vessels. The Great Lakes offer a rendezvous for just this kind of manufacture. Long before we were conscious or mindful of the advantages of the St. Lawrence waterway, Canada was interested in the subject. They were the first to urge a joint seaway project and we would have one today but for the fact that selfish interests have been able to keep Congress from voting on the subject. Canada has completed the Welland Canal which bypasses Niagara Falls and which will be a vital link in the ship channels from the Great Lakes to the Atlantic Ocean. We of Wisconsin have always been ocean-minded. There has never been a day when we thought that this Nation could live entirely on its own resources. We must give and take in this matter and when all is said and done we can back the words of Governor Rennebohm when he said:

"In the interests of the United States, and on behalf of the people of Wisconsin, I urge this committee to report out favorably House Joint Resolution No. 271, Eighty-first Congress, second session."

We do not ask this for Wisconsin; we ask it for the Middle West; Michigan, Minnesota, Indiana, and the great North and Middle West. We attended our first deep waterway conference at Muskegon, Mich., in 1927 and it was so heartening and the expressions of those in attendance so optimistic that we had every belief that it would be only a few years before jointly we would open the channels of water navigation from the ports on the Great Lakes to the markets of the world. By this time the railroads have found out that they need the deep waterway, the power interests have awakened to the grave situation if electricity is to be provided for the whole United States.

[From the Toronto Daily Star of April 26, 1950]

UNITED STATES ACTIONS SPEAK THE LOUDER

Canada is becoming tired of the favorable words uttered by United States public men about the St. Lawrence River improvement, tired because of the unfavorable actions of United States public bodies. Prime Minister St. Laurent reflected the attitude of this country when he said it had waited patiently, and recently not so patiently, for the neighboring Republic to let the work proceed.

The defense authorities of the United States say that the St. Lawrence improvement is desirable in the interest of the safety of Canada and the United States. The United States Secretary of Commerce told Congress on Monday that everyone who seeks the continued economic strength and expansion of the United States supports the project. Secretary of State Acheson said yesterday that the work was long overdue; that it would make the already happy relations with Canada still happier.

Perhaps Canadians should be pleased with such observations on the part of United States governmental authorities. But of what value are they when the party in power appoints hostile chairmen to committees dealing with the project who use their authority to prevent the matter going to a vote? That has happened not once but many times. Always some maneuver or specious argument is used to block progress.

This country has a feeling of frustration. It has to look on impotently while $60,000,000 of electric energy go to waste annually down the St. Lawrence Rapids—half of it Canada's—as it has been doing during the past 30 years that selfish interests across the line have been blocking the undertaking. And it has to pay transportation costs millions of dollars higher yearly than those that the deep St. Lawrence ship channel would provide.

The United States is much richer than Canada. But Congress acts as though it were appalled by the estimated cost of the combined power and navigation project. The Parliament of Canada knows, on the contrary, that the project would more than pay for itself, being, in effect, a rich and inexhaustible gold mine. This country is ready to go 50–50 in sharing the cost.

Surely it is time that the great United States of America stopped trifling with so important an international question and showed herself to be a partner worth having in the economic field as well as in the common defense of this continent.

[From the Wisconsin Federationist for May 1950]

ST. LAWRENCE PROJECT FINAL PLANS MADE; PROGRAM ANNOUNCED

Final plans have been made for the preliminary conference on the St. Lawrence seaway project, to be held at the Stevens Hotel, Chicago, on May 9. Invitations to participate in the planning phases have been sent to AFL representatives and State officers in Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Nebraska, Ohio, North and South Dakota, and Wisconsin.

In urging the State groups to attend WSFL President George Haberman writes: "With the growth of our industrial center and great amount of foreign exports from both agriculture and industry in the Midwest, and with conversion from coal to both gas and oil for heat and power, as well as new deposits of ore to replace the depleting supply of the Mesabi Range, the welfare of our industries stands in peril, not only in the way of expansion, but a continuity of production."

GOVERNMENT ASSIGNS DELEGATE

Haberman also announced the program of speakers in the invitation. The Government was assigning Col. William Fondren, of the Plans and Operations Division, United States Army, to address the delegates. It is unique for the Government to do this since this is a preliminary planning session and Army representatives rarely attend such conferences. Haberman also pointed out this was significant in that it stresses the national security aspect of the seaway project. Other speakers include:

Dr. N. R. Danielian, executive vice president, Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Association.

Daniel W. Hoan (former Milwaukee mayor), president, Great Lakes Harbor Association.

William Snow, Chief, Canadian Division, United States Department of State, and member of United States-Canada Joint Board of Defense.

Harry C. Brockel, municipal port director, city of Milwaukee.

Haberman is also attempting to get United States Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS (Democrat, Illinois) to attend and discuss with the delegates the possibility of appropriations for the seaway project in the near future.

In planning the conference with Milwaukee Federated Trades Council representatives it was pointed out that the principal goal of the preliminary session was to convince the national AFL body of the economic and national defense justifications of the project. Its economic benefits claimed are low-cost water transportation and low-cost hydroelectric power. Defensewise it should be noted that shortly after World War II the Joint Chiefs of Staff advised the Congress that from their experience in World War II, the project is absolutely essential to the national security as a shipbuilding resource, as an additional transportation facility, and as a new source of power.

The sessions will begin at 10 a. m. on Tuesday, May 9.

Termination of Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY P. CAIN
OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 8 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Washington asks unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD six of the hundreds of letters, including an editorial from the Cleveland Plain Dealer, which come constantly to my office on the subject of Federal rent control.

Readers will note that the present communications, and others I have and will offer for the RECORD, are signed by citizens in every walk of life and who live in every region throughout the Nation. These citizens write to make their views known to the Congress, and I would urge the Congress to fully disprove the views expressed before permitting Federal rent control to be extended beyond June 30, 1950, its legislative termination date.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator HARRY P. CAIN,
The Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAIN: I am writing a letter of protest against the continuation of rent controls. Much has been said against this law which by common consent is agreed to be unfair, discriminatory, and unsound economically.

A great deal has been said both pro and con about the scarcity of rentals. It is true that we do not have 8 percent or 10 percent vacancies, but on the other hand, everyone is housed and housed better than ever was true in the history of this country. It is ridiculous to expect large percentage vacancies when the rest of the economy of the country is going full blast.

I might shed a little light on this question from my own experience. I happen to operate two medium-sized apartments totaling 75 suites. In the last 12 months I have had a turn-over of 25 suites out of the 75. This should more than indicate that suites are available and people are moving around, although rental quarters do not go begging.

I would also like to say that if there were any fair parts of the rent control law, the part permitting local option to determine the continuation or decontrol was such. However, the Ethiopian in the wood pile is the mandatory provision that the Governnor must approve such decontrol after it is voted at the local level. This again immediately makes it a political football, and is true in the case of our own Governor. He has decontrolled a few minor towns and villages as a sop to his own conscience, and has failed to do so with the others regardless of their wishes.

I agree with all of the editorials that we have had by all the papers in this city against the further extension of rent controls. I believe that anyone who is interested in the good of the country and sound economy, should vote against it.

Sincerely,

HENRY DULAURENCE, Jr.

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer of March 23, 1950]

RENTERS ARE GIVEN NOTICE

The occupants of rental housing have been given notice by Congress that it probably will decline to vote another extension of rent controls beyond the expiration date of June 30. Similar notice has been served on Housing Expediter Tighe Woods and his 4,000 or more employees.

No doubt a last ditch fight will be waged by the Socialist-labor coalition, which now controls both the Truman administration and the Democratic National Committee, to extend rent controls for another year, or at least until after the November election. Congressional committees are still to conduct hearings on this subject, but as of this date Congress has voted $2,600,000 to the Housing Administration which is to be used only to pay terminal leaves of employees when the agency is abolished. Moreover, Congress appropriated only $1,400,000 for operating expenses of the agency from now until June 30, although Woods had asked for $3,600,000. This was clearly a directive to Woods to begin now to curtail operations and to be ready to close up shop when the existing rent-control act expires.

This newspaper believes the termination of Government rent control is long overdue. The legal basis for this form of property confiscation is the fiction that the country is still at war and cannot spare the materials with which to build housing. But the political basis for it is even more indefensible. It rests on the assumption that one class of people, the owners of rental property, should subsidize part of the living expenses of their tenants because it would be politically unpopular if renters had to pay the full value of the premises they occupy.

It has been demonstrated time and again that there is no longer an actual housing shortage. What has happened is that the beneficiaries of cheap rent have been encouraged by rent controls to occupy more

space than they really need or than they would retain if they had to pay the going price for it. Another and even more evil effect of rent controls has been to drive rental property off the market. The owners of rental property have preferred to sell it to owner-occupants rather than to continue to rent it for an inadequate return or to take the risk of acquiring undesirable tenants who cannot be evicted except at great trouble and expense.

It is probably true that in some parts of the country there is a shortage of rental housing, but this is a situation which has been brought about by rent controls which cannot be overcome until they are abolished. Moreover, the situation will grow worse the longer rent controls are continued.

We believe, therefore, that Congress should allow rent controls to expire on June 30. It is probable that in many communities there would be a period of considerable confusion if landlords were free to charge what they could get for their properties. But out of this very confusion more rental property would emerge, as competition was restored and the law of supply and demand began to reassert itself.

In any event, renters have 3 months in which to prepare themselves mentally and financially for the probable expiration of rent controls. They should start thinking now about paying their own way and standing on their own feet, instead of basking in the comfortable illusion that someone else is going to pay part of their housing bills indefinitely.

SEATTLE, WASH., *April 19, 1950.*

Senator HARRY P. CAIN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR CAIN: I take the liberty of writing you with reference to the continuation of rent controls in Seattle, Wash. I am sure that no good can come from continuing these controls, either to the tenants or the owners. At the present time it is practically impossible to rent a house in Seattle because the owners will not rent their property but insist on selling it while rent control continues. There are many, many tenants with children, or with more than two in a family, who cannot buy or at least it is not to their advantage to buy, but who should be in a home, which is not available. Hundreds of houses would be put on the market for rent if the controls were lifted and would relieve the entire situation, and at the same time eliminate the hundreds of places where people are forced to live where they are required to share the use of the bathrooms and the kitchens with other tenants and pay ridiculous rates for such accommodations. Controls were lifted in the city of Spokane this past year and it improved the condition generally for both tenant and landlord. The average increase in rent, I understand, was less than 15 percent. I am satisfied that the rates in Seattle would not be increased at an average of over 15 percent and possibly not over 10 percent to 12 percent.

We have built thousands of houses and apartments since the close of the war. The houses cannot be rented; the apartments are not filled. The condition is wrong and should be remedied. We urge you to vote that these controls be discontinued June 30, 1950.

Very truly yours,

D. B. MACKINTOSH.

ST. LOUIS, MO., *April 21, 1950.*

Hon. HARRY P. CAIN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. HARRY P. CAIN: I write this letter to ask for rent decontrol. I am an owner of rental property, and I believe that ever since the last war ended nearly 5 years ago the property owner, who belongs to a responsible and trustworthy part of our citizens, has been discriminated against.

Our country has been prosperous ever since the war ended, but the money has been spent on nonessentials in many cases, while our Government has decreed that a basic thing like shelter had to be provided by its owner at far below current prices. The rental owner has been browbeaten and intimidated at the rent office. Our State capital at Jefferson City, Mo., has imprinted above its stone pillars, "Property is the fruit of labor." I know that my property represents just that and also self-denial to have savings to invest that way.

The United States of America solved every problem of the last war with prompt efficiency, which won the war and our standing as a preeminent Nation. All such was done in less than 5 years, and so could the housing problem have been solved, but the Government has been willing to persecute one part of the population to attain popularity with the rest of it. The condition of older property has suffered or deteriorated more, too, due to the rise of the prices of labor and materials for upkeep. Surely now is the time to rectify this condition, which has the characteristics of old-world absolutism. I really meant to say like Russia.

Yours truly,

GLADYS C. STAMM.

SECURITY ABSTRACT CO.,
El Dorado, Ark., April 6, 1950.

Re Federal rent control.

Senator H. P. CAIN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I wish to thank you for your vigorous opposition to continuance of Federal rent control as expressed in meeting of Town Hall last evening.

May I add my testimony to support your position? My husband was a victim of cancer, dying two days before Pearl Harbor. He left my daughter and me a small title business and a brick apartment house, into which all our savings had gone. Depression prices still were prevailing in this oil boom town on rental property, because of overbuilding in the 1920's and because the East Texas oil discovery had emptied our houses of the oil industry.

Our four room furnished apartments, water bills, garbage bills, and yard upkeep paid by owner, have been frozen at $38.25 per month (the dirctor let us raise to that sum).

One of the tenants stated to me that he made around $20,000 last year. One tenant, a widow, married a wealthy man and they now live in the apartment she originally rented. All of them have prospered to the point that I have had to reconstruct the driveway to the garage (a stall for each apartment) to accommodate the long low lines of their expensive new cars.

Aside from the monetary angle, I have been unable to have the use of my own property when I wanted to bring an abstracter here to work in the business, and have been unable to secure room for relatives when I should like to help them. The measure is no longer a war measure; it is high-handed bureaucratic usurpation of the rights of private citizens as guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States.

It is working a hardship on the lower income group; one of the typists working for me has to pay $50 for a small three-room apartment (basement, but new construction). The economic level should find an adjustment somewhere between these two levels and the general public should be able to shop for its rental facilities according to their likes and dislikes. There are vacancies listed in the paper now; many people would offer rental units if they could again manage them as they prefer.

The labor unions got behind the rent control man here and prevented the councilmen of the city from passing a measure to decontrol the town. We will never be able to decontrol through local petitions.

My plight can be multiplied many times over in this area, and those persons so affected join me in imploring you to see that the Federal rent-control measure is not renewed in June.

Thanking you for your patience in reading this, and trusting you will continue to represent all of the people of the Nation in the light of the Constitution by which we exist as a free people.

I am very truly yours,

Mrs. E. J. DRAKE.

DENVER, COLO., *April 26, 1950.*

Hon. HARRY P. CAIN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: As property owners, we are watching closely the hearings in Washington this week. We know your stand and are glad for people like you, and we think we are due for a break. We just finished paying $472 taxes on our remodeled houses located on six lots in the low-rent area. Our rents would go up very little in some cases and not at all in others. There are many many landlords in Denver who are sick and tired of waiting and fighting and have given up. They are converting to business, or selling out, so that rent control is not helping the housing situation. It helps some politicians, I guess. What we want is our freedom to run our own business.

Sincerely,

F. HANSON.

BELLINGHAM, WASH., *April 25, 1950.*

Senator HARRY P. CAIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Please be advised that we sent the attached copy of letter to Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON, Representative THOR C. TOLLEFSON, Representative HENRY M. JACKSON, and Representative HUGH MITCHELL. The reason we did not send it to you is because we know you are doing everything you can to eliminate rent control, and we appreciate your efforts, but thought it wise to advise you what we had done in this respect.

Very truly yours,

D. L. ABSHIRE.

APRIL 25, 1950.

DEAR SIR: 1. We have purposely held our correspondence to you to a minimum because we know you are busy and we try to carefully weigh what we convey as there are two sides to most issues, but we feel it is timely that we contact you regarding the termination of rent controls, which, we believe, are long overdue termination here. Please believe us, as we are really close to the issue here. We are probably this city's largest rental agency (not by choice, but because our customers ask that we give them this service) and we have had considerable contact with rent-control personnel here.

2. Locally, we feel, relations here with rent-control personnel has reached such a state of deterioration that an almost unworkable state of cooperation exists. Property owners are being put to needless expense of delay, loss of revenue, attorneys fees, etc., to evict undesirable tenants. Most tenants are very easy to get along with, but the exception that occasionally rears his head is a troublemaker from the beginning, and any thread of support he can solicit to further enjoy his trouble-making of course he does, and he does this through rent control, who for a lack of much else to do and to make their superiors think they are busy, rush to these isolated cases and build them up. This is typical in this area.

3. In this area a fear of excessive rents is foolish, as we have several places now that

are charging less then the authorized ceiling because we are more concerned with obtaining good steady renters, and in turn, we recommend to the owners that allowances be made accordingly in favor of good tenants.

4. May we further state that to our knowledge there is no other phase of industry who is so penalized by the Federal Government that the extrepreneur has to actually subsidize his own client without aid or relief from increasing costs. We are aware of certain courses of possible relief under rent control, but from a practical angle in actual practice here it's a lost cause.

5. We are of the opinion that rent control on a national level should be abolished, and should there be any justification for continued controls, then let each community involved take care of its own situation. We sincerely urge your support of termination of rent controls.

Thank you.

Very truly yours,

D. L. ABSHIRE.

Address by Hon. Harold E. Stassen Before Women's Auxiliary, New York Republican County Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 8 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, in accordance with unanimous consent given me during the course of the debate today, I present for publication in the Appendix the address delivered by Hon. Harold E. Stassen, former Governor of Minnesota, now president of the University of Pennsylvania, before a women's Republican group on Tuesday, May 2, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S TRAVELS

I commend the Republican women of New York for their early and thorough preparations for their part in the crucial congressional elections of 1950. You can—you must—play a very important part in those elections.

The 1950 elections may well turn out to be the most important congressional elections ever held. If our Republican Party makes major gains, it will signalize a rebuilding which this time, I am confident, will not stop short of complete National Republican victory.

But we must neither underestimate the difficulty of this congressional campaign nor its importance. President Truman has already indicated that he will take an all-out personal part in the congressional elections. This should not be taken lightly.

President Truman is the cleverest politician ever to occupy the White House. And he is also the worst President ever to occupy the White House.

He is a postgraduate of the most effective political school in America—the Pendergast school of Kansas City, Mo. From that school he knows the methods of attacks on opposition, of claims for all improvement, of dodging blame for things that go wrong, and marshaling votes through organization.

He will demonstrate his political aptitude next week on the trip that he is taking across the country. With a carload of his political supporters, he will travel across the Nation in a special train, with his trip paid for out of the taxes of the people. He will go out to the Grand Coulee Dam; the plans for which were prepared under President Hoover; the construction of which was carried on by President Roosevelt; the payment for which was voted overwhelmingly by both Republicans and Democrats; and standing at the edge of that dam he will strike a pose and act as if he built it with his own little Missouri hands.

He will act as if he came to the State of Washington for a ceremony to start the generating of power at the dam, whereas in fact, he is going there to try to generate more political power behind his Democratic Senator of that State who is in trouble because of playing on the sands of Hollywood instead of working at his seat in the Capitol.

Going to and coming from the dam, he will just happen to stop in the congressional and senatorial districts where he hopes to salvage a troubled Democrat incumbent or weaken a present Republican Congressman or Senator. With the great advantage of naturally having the front page of every newspaper in America, and ample quantities of radio and television time, he will do a very, very clever and effective job of campaigning.

It is strange but it is true that the methods of the foreign economic Socialists and of the domestic political bosses are very similar. Both make extravagant, extreme, and rosy promises. Both collect heavy taxes from the people. Both give less than they promise. Both keep a lot of the people's money for themselves in the Government. Both thrive when citizens carelessly depend on politicians to take care of their worries. Socialism is as surely the result of giving too much power to the national Government as the Kansas City scandals are the result of political inertia in city wards.

The tragedy for America is that the same school which made Truman such a clever politician also made him such a bad President. This is true because it is a school whose graduates are lacking in a sense of idealism and who minimize the importance of honesty and integrity. This lack of the sense of the importance of idealism is what has made our postwar foreign policy so negative and weak, and has caused us to lose so much ground in the cold war with the Soviet Union. The idealism of this Nation is the most dynamic force in the world. But that idealism has not translated into an affirmative, hard-hitting, inspiring foreign policy under President Truman's administration. Thus it is, that with a policy of holding the line, of waiting for the dust to settle, of containment, the United States is in part responsible for the tremendous advance in the cruel and dictatorial domination by the rulers of Russia. In the brief space of 5 years this Kremlin clique has established dictatorships over 600,000,000 people in Poland, in Rumania, in Czechoslovakia, in Bulgaria, in eastern Germany, in Hungary, and in China.

The administration's lack of appreciation of the importance of honesty and integrity is shown in the flagrant association of the President in the White House with men like Ed Pauley, who made a million dollars in speculating as an insider upon the food of the Nation; and John Maragon, who accepted funds from a perfume company while officially representing and being paid by the United States Government in Greece. These are but small examples of a situation that exists and which tends to undermine the morality of the Nation and contribute toward the record high total of gambling and of illicit funds in America today.

In fact, one of the greatest difficulties which our Republican Party faces is the fact that the people of the country are reluctant to believe that the corruption and the communism are as bad under President Truman's administrative as they really are.

Furthermore, if we analyze the record of the Truman administration, we find that in those situations in which he had his own way our country is in a bad way. He had his own way at Potsdam without any Republican participation and without any congressional participation. The result has been very, very bad for the position of our country in Berlin, in Austria, and in the entire Balkans. It has been a part of the cause of losing the cold war.

He had his own way in Asiatic policy without any participation in the forming of the policy by the Republicans and without any participation by Congress. The result has been very, very bad, and our country has also lost much ground there in the cold war.

He wanted to keep control over all the housing materials in this country after the war. He wanted to keep control over all new building. But Congress overruled him and freed the builders, retaining only the loaning programs which had support by both parties. The result has been that the private builders and the building craftsmen of the country, aided by the suppliers and lumbermen, are now turning out a record total of houses, and we are on the way to real improvement in the housing supply in this country. It was the action of Congress in overruling President Truman that led to this progress. If President Truman had his way, the whole building industry would still be in a snarl. There would still be the necessity of knowing somebody who knew somebody who could call Harry Vaughan to get a permit approved for building material.

He tried to have the Government go into the steel business. Congress overruled him and left the steel industry in private ownership, and it is today producing more steel than ever before and is rapidly catching up with all the requirements for the country, with enough left over to help rearm western Europe.

He wanted to bring agriculture under the grip of his administration, but Congress at least partly overruled him, and the farmers have produced an abundant supply of food so that food prices are now coming down to the consumer, and we are able to supply needs throughout the world.

We Republicans can meet the 1950 situation brought about by the political cleverness of the President and by his use and misuse of the great power of his office, only in this threefold way.

First, by fighting back vigorously and hitting hard in the exposure of the conditions of his administration. Second, by bringing forward definite, sound, constructive measures to meet the problems of our country at home and abroad. Third, by organizing and working and voting with a thoroughness and a drive such as we have never shown before.

Of these three, I count as the most important the bringing forward of constructive solutions. We must think through and study carefully, and then with ingenuity and with forthrightness present definite, sound, and constructive measures for the improved health of the people, for an agricultural program, for more and more jobs at good wages, for streamlining the Government, for saving money and keeping down taxes, for winning the cold war with Russia, and for advancing the cause of freedom of men throughout the world.

Let me discuss in detail tonight just one of these issues. You all know of the Truman-Ewing proposal to have the Government take over the health system of America; to put all doctors and hospitals under the thumb of a five-man board appointed by the President; to bring politics into the relationships between patients and doctors, and patients and hospitals; and in general to copy the British and German systems of socializing medicine.

We know President Truman's proposal is bad. The majority of the people now know it is bad. The British experience is proving that what looks in theory like a grand scheme turns out to be a sad mistake which leads to more medical care of a lower quality for more people at a higher cost with more deaths and increased illness throughout the Nation.

But it is not enough to recognize the evil of President Truman's proposal. There are very real problems in health in America. Serious illness or accident to a member of a family in the working or middle income group is an economic catastrophe. There are not enough doctors today and not enough opportunities for young men to study medicine. Many of our hospitals are in financial difficulty. Many areas of the country are entirely without a doctor or a decent hospital. We have the best health record of all the major nations in the world, but it is not good enough for America.

These problems must be met without making the mistake of President Truman's socialized and political medical program. They should be met with the cooperation of the medical profession. They should be met by working with the doctors and the nurses and the hospital administrators. I believe our Republican Party might work out, with the professions involved, a program to meet the problems in a modern effective way without making the mistakes of the British or Truman programs. Something like this might be done. We could use the example of the very successful Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, which Senator VANDENBERG initiated, and which has secured the bank deposits of America without having the Government take over the banks. We could establish a Federal Health Reinsurance Corporation to underwrite the various Blue Cross and other local voluntary insurance systems developed by farm cooperatives, unions, and local groups, so that these groups could offer comprehensive complete coverage for the people at moderate cost. This Federal Health Reinsurance Corporation would thereby have a relationship only with the local insurance associations and would not bring the Government in between the patient and the doctor or the patient and the hospital.

Contracts such as that recently entered into by Bethlehem Steel should then be encouraged through which the employees and the employer join in paying the health-insurance premium and under which splendid protection is given to the workers and their families. Careful expansion for insurance coverage for those who are self-employed or are not on social security could also be worked out through these voluntary local associations. In this method, within a brief space of time, with the expenditure of a fraction of the amount of money, we could have in operation a system giving better quality of medical care at lower cost with better results than any of the socialized schemes that have been advanced.

Steps should further be taken to assist in establishing doctors in those poor or remote areas of the country that cannot now support a doctor in private practice. These are the same territories that need the public health services of vaccination, immunization, examination of school children, inspectors for health and sanitation. Therefore a moderate, careful program of paying a small part-time salary to a young doctor to go into those territories to practice privately, but to give a part of his time to public health activities, would lead to an advance of health in these areas.

The further extension of the Hill-Burton Act, which is a sound bipartisan measure, to assist in the construction of local hospitals and local health centers should also be carried forward. Likewise some moderate assistance in the expanding of medical education should be given: Medical education is very expensive to administer because on the average, as our experience at the University of Pennsylvania where we are operating the oldest medical school in this country shows, it costs about $2,700 per student per year to give a good medical education. Since the tuition is just $700, there is a large difference to make up from other sources. That is the principal reason that medical education is so difficult to attain. Some steps should be taken to expand these opportunities, particularly in the South where the present chances to study medicine are entirely too limited.

This expansion likewise should be done without any discrimination as to race, or color, or creed. By measures such as these, and by increasing private support through philanthropy, through keeping inviolate the local control and the high independent professional standing, and by pushing on with health research, we can keep America in the very forefront in the health of the people of the world steadily improving in every respect. From steps such as this we should work out a Republican health program that will be sound for the people and will be recognized as such and will be supported by them. In a similar way we should develop programs on the other major problems.

Angry and petulant about Congress' refusal to obey his orders, the President is now taking to the stump to try to get a puppet Congress. He knows how to pull the political strings. But I believe that the American people want men and women who stand on their own feet in Congress, and they will refuse to send President Truman's personal puppets to Congress.

A Republican Party, ready to serve the people of this country and fighting hard against the weakness and deficits of the present administration, will become a victorious Republican Party.

Cut in Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 8, 1950

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, evidence continues to accumulate that while the people want to see economy in the various departments of the Government, even if it means curtailment of services, they are not disposed to take kindly to the proposal of the Postmaster General to save money in his Department by a cut in the postal service through a reduction of mail deliveries unless they can be satisfied that the report of the Hoover Commission is wrong in pointing out other ways in which the desired economy may be effected. Under leave to extend my remarks, I add hereto the following editorial from the Malden (Mass.) Evening News:

CUT IN POSTAL SERVICE

Decision to reduce postal service in behalf of economy will not be accepted by the American people with good grace. While there is a universal cry for a reduction in Government expense it is hardly fitting to start with a branch so vital in the life of the people. A single mail delivery in residential and semibusiness sections will not be accepted without protest. Yet that is the first move inaugurated by the Department. Postmaster General Donaldson says this is necessary following the refusal of Congress to grant increases in postal rates which would net some $600,000,000. Just how reduction of deliveries will save money is hard to understand. If the Department has sufficient manpower now to make two deliveries what will become of the manpower released by cutting the service in half? Certainly it does not mean that any sizable number of employees will be laid off. Surely there are other places where millions could be saved without reducing a service so vital to the public. Then, too, there could be a bit of slick politics mixed up in Donaldson's scheme. If the people want economy, let's take it out of their hides, so to speak. Adequate mail service is extremely vital to the Nation. To go back to horse-and-buggy service will be a distinct harassment to every American. It might be a good thing for the Postmaster General and his advisers to take another peek at the Hoover Commission report that found that the Post Office could make greater use of mechanical devices for handling mail. In general, it was short of equipment of all kinds, and much of its equipment was obsolete. Average age of Post Office motor vehicles was over 15 years. The Commission recommended the modernizing and streamlining of the Post Office Department and that the Department should be taken out of politics by abolishing Senate confirmation of postmasters.

Boston Herald Comment on Address By Joseph A. Erickson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 8 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, last Thursday I asked unanimous consent to place in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled, "The New England Economy—1950 Model," delivered by Joseph A. Erickson, president of the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston, at the New England congressional dinner of 1950 held at the Hotel Mayflower in Washington on May 2, 1950. At the same time I asked unanimous consent to place an editorial entitled "New England Rallied," from the Boston Herald of May 3, 1950, commenting upon his address.

Mr. Erickson is a distinguished New England banker and a business analyst of great repute.

I now find that Representative LANE, of Massachusetts, had previously placed Mr. Erickson's address in the RECORD. As a result, my remarks requesting the insertion of Mr. Erickson's speech, under the rule, were not printed. I renew the request for unanimous consent to place in the RECORD the editorial from the Boston Herald.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW ENGLAND RALLIED

The day is past when New England can shape her destiny within New England. The power wielded in Washington over the coun-

try's economy is too great now. Much as we may dislike sectionalism, the formation of blocs, and the horse trading of Congress, it's there, and we have got to play the game as it is played or drop out by default.

Joseph A. Erickson, president of the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston, spoke to a meeting of the New England delegation in Congress along these lines last night. These gatherings have been sponsored annually by the New England council and the chambers of commerce for some time, and they have produced potent argument for a unified nonpartisan approach by the Senators and Representatives of this section. But never before has the problem been put so bluntly. This was plain speaking by Mr. Erickson.

There is, for instance, the matter of a steel mill in New England. The United States Steel Corp. has chosen to ignore a New England site in favor of a plant on the Delaware River. That's the company's right. But will New England be required to pay its share of the dredging of the river so another section can have the steel mill?

The last year has shown an extensive conversion to oil as a fuel in New England. We are fortunately situated to get oil from foreign fields. Should our delegation in Congress be asked to support the program of domestic producers for higher tariffs and quotas on foreign oil?

The huge expenditures for power, navigation, flood control, and reclamation serve other sections that would invite industry away from us by the lure of cheap power. Exactly what do we get in return?

A united New England delegation would command enough votes for effective bargaining. It could say to the farm bloc which imposes an undue burden on New England by the huge cost of subsidies, "what can you give in return that will afford our section an advantage equivalent to yours?"

Mr. Erickson did not carry his exhortation to the precise point of intersectional bargaining, but it was clearly implicit in what he said. His was a rallying cry for a realistic defense of New England interests. Will the New England Senators and Representatives respond?

This Nation Under God

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 8 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, a distinguished Member of the Senate, the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], recently wrote and published a book entitled "This Nation Under God." There appeared in the Washington Star of Sunday, in a column entitled "Spires of the Spirit," by Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, the Chaplain of the Senate, an editorial in which, among other things, Dr. Harris said:

. Here is a book with truths timely and timeless, which will help to put our contemporary lenses in focus.

Mr. President, it was my privilege a few days ago to hear a discussion of the book written by the Senator from Utah, and I am happy to recommend it. I ask unanimous consent that the entire editorial by Dr. Harris be printed following my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIS NATION

(By Frederick Brown Harris, pastor, Foundry Methodist Church; Chaplain, U. S. Senate)

This Nation is today the most significant factor in all the tangled and tragic skein of human affairs. This Nation holds in its hands the power to determine the destiny of this planet for generations to come—perhaps, forever—whether it shall be the blessing or the curse, life or death.

This Nation is today the greatest reservoir of material resources and spiritual idealism on the face of the earth. This Nation is the only serious challenge to the bid for world domination by a sinister slave system which already holds untold millions in the despotism of its iron grasp. This Nation in the providence of God has come to the kingdom for such a time as this.

All this means that, in an age—on ages telling—to be true to America at its best is to share an awe-inspiring role in the unfolding of the divine purpose. Rather than any American should sap his Nation's strength by his own moral treason; betray her by his treachery, or exploit her by his greed, it were better for him that a millstone be hanged about his neck and that he be drowned in the depths of the sea. No one can be a worthy partner in a democracy unless he helps sustain the moral and spiritual roots. If democracy withers it will never be destroyed by suspected Reds, but by neglected roots. The surest way to cause the fair flowers of freedom to fade is to cut the roots reaching into rich, ancestral soil in which they have been nourished, and from which, fed by springs of living water, has come their help and health. A cut flower is a doomed flower. Its beauty cannot endure because its roots have been severed. For a democracy which has fruits without roots the undertaker called Time is already at the door.

In this frightening day it is dawning upon America as with a fresh and startling revelation that only religious faith can undergird democracy, and that when this is withdrawn some form of coercive totalitarianism lifting an almighty state into God's throne comes in like a flood. An honored member of the United States Senate, a national leader with a rich working background in religious, labor, educational and international affairs, Senator ELBERT D. THOMAS of Utah, has recently published a volume tingling with intense conviction and shot through with prophetic insight. In scintillating chapters he writes the title, "This Nation Under God," in letters of fire across our national sky.

To this perplexed day, the distinguished Senator declares: "Everything for which democracy stands is based on religious faith. Neither enlightened self-interest nor practical ethics can make an effective substitute." In "This Nation Under God" is inspiringly portrayed the real manifest destiny of America. The author is no strutting Pharisee under the white dome of the National Temple, thanking God that we are not as other people. We are only a chosen people when we choose to be instruments of His will for all mankind.

Here is a book with truths timely and timeless, which will help to put our contemporary lenses in focus.

The Senator's credo is set down simply but profoundly, as he bears witness: "To me, the basic fact about our faith in God's power and our destiny is that He has blessed us with the opportunity to provide abundance for ourselves, all of us, and to share the abundance with the world—that our destiny is to hold high the flaming torch of liberty for all, and to rule over none. I believe in something wordless and wonderful about man and the universe. I believe in faith without proof, hope without reason, love above advantage, without which mankind will indeed perish."

In this volume there is impressively pictured the unanimous procession of the American Presidents as each in his own words witnesses to the spiritual roots of America. The ultimate truth about "This Nation Under God" has never been put more succinctly than by Woodrow Wilson, to whose "world" Senator THOMAS devotes a chapter. Significantly, Wilson's warning sentence is from his "The Road Away From Revolution." Hear it, O America!

"The sum of the whole matter is this, that our civilization cannot survive materially unless it is redeemed spiritually. Only thus can discontent be driven out and all the shadows lifted from the road ahead."

A fable tells of a spider that once slid down a single silky thread from the lofty rafter of a barn and set up an elaborate domain on a lower level. There he spread his acquisitive net, caught flies, grew slick and prospered. One day, wandering proudly about his opulent premises he saw the thread that stretched up into the unseen above him. What is the use of that? he cynically blurted, and snapped it. And his filmy palace collapsed.

God forbid that a collapsed silken web should be a portent of the fate of this Nation.

To Help Mr. Acheson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD L. LEAHY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 8 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an editorial entitled "To Help Mr. Acheson," which appeared in the Providence Journal of May 3, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO HELP MR. ACHESON

The sort of attack that has been leveled at Owen Lattimore invites retaliation in kind. It was probably inevitable, therefore, that the Far Eastern expert who has been called the top Soviet espionage agent in the United States should have included in his defense a violent personal attack on his accusers. From the viewpoint of the public, however, it must be said that Mr. Lattimore's latest diatribe on the morals and motives of Senator MCCARTHY and his principal witness, Louis Budenz, contributes nothing toward resolution of the controversy.

An end to this procedure of smearing and counter-smearing is certainly what the national interest demands. Secretary of State Acheson, who is the real target of the MCCARTHY campaign, is about to sail for London on a highly important diplomatic mission designed to extend cooperation among the Atlantic pact nations from the military sphere into the economic and political field. How much damage has already been done to his stature as a negotiator by these attacks on his competence and good faith remains to be seen.

It is obvious, however, that a continuation of this controversy during the forthcoming conferences will in some degree lessen Secretary Acheson's ability to speak with authority

for the United States. To that degree, any prolonging of the public debate touched off by the McCarthy charges will directly damage the security of this country, which depends so heavily on maintaining and expanding western unity.

The debate cannot simply be turned off, of course. If Senator McCARTHY chooses to go on making public charges of Communist influence in the State Department, he cannot be stopped. If the individuals named by him want to continue dragging out the Senator's dirty linen in an effort to discredit his charges, they are free to do so. But it does seem to us, in view of the fact that these tactics cannot bring out the truth but can only do serious harm to our national interests at London, that the Senate investigating committee should do what it can to call a halt to such public exchanges.

Ideally, we would like to see the whole matter taken out of the hands of the Tydings group and turned over to some more responsible investigating body, such as Senator LODGE has suggested. If that is not practical—as it appears not to be—the Tydings committee might well wind up its own inquiry forthwith. Or if it is not ready to do that—and continuing reports of new developments again indicate that it probably is not—at least the Senators should be able to issue an interim report on their findings to date.

An official reminder to the world that Senator McCARTHY's charges are still unproven, to say the least, would be some help to Secretary Acheson at London. Even if the report established conclusively nothing more than the indisputable fact that Mr. Lattimore was never a permanent or prominent employee of the State Department, it would do something to dissipate the cloud of confusion in which this country's spokesman is going forth to represent us before the bewildered peoples of the free world.

Federal Bureaucracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 8, 1950

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, the steadily growing Federal Government and what it would mean to the American people's welfare if a citizen's daily life is regimented is exemplified in a series of letters by Associate Editor A. A. Fredrickson in a recent edition of Blytheville (Ark.) Carrier News. These letters are purported to have been written in 1960. I am including as a part of my remarks the full text of Mr. Fredrickson's most unique article:

ONCE OVER LIGHTLY
(By A. A. Fredrickson)
WELFARE, IT'S WONDERFUL

MARCH 28, 1960.

OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR,
Payroll Division, Redistribution Bureau, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: After submitting it for my endorsement, my employer as usual sent my pay check to Washington last week to cover my participation in the Federal-benefits program. But something must have happened to it.

Anyway, I haven't received my certificates of entitlement for this week. My wife needs an infected tooth pulled but cannot get an appointment with the United States dentistry office here without her certificate for this week. The Dry Gulch Valley Authority has threatened to shut off my electricity if I don't turn in my certificate showing I am a paid-up consumer.

Also, until I can show my entitlements for this week, my credit has been cut off at Brannan Memorial Delicatessen No. 82A, I can't get a pair of shoes my boy needs from the Federal Clothing Allotment Administration branch here, I can't make the next payment on my house to the Bureau of Low-Middle-Class Housing and I can't get credit for the second-quarter premium on my Government life insurance.

While I am writing you, I would like to take care of a couple of other matters. Since I have been authorized by the Bureau of Extra-Curricular Employment Assignment to raise a half-acre of black-eyed peas in my back yard, I would like to apply for the required 200 pounds of Government fertilizer.

THORNTON P. BLIVETT.
WET ROCK, ARK.

THORNTON P. BLIVETT,
Wet Rock, Ark.

DEAR MR. BLIVETT: Yours of the 28th instant received and noted.

However, you failed to submit your correspondence in octuplicate so as to provide copies for each of the organizations mentioned in your letter.

Kindly resubmit your letter thus in order that all items may be properly channeled.

QUAGMIRE K. GRAPHT,
Director, Payroll Division, Redistribution Bureau.

P. S.—You are cautioned to note closely the carbon-paper ration for your district for the current month and penalties for exceeding same.—Q. K. G.

DIRECTOR, PAYROLL DIVISION.

DEAR SIR: It's been 2 weeks since I resubmitted. I'm now missing certificates for 3 weeks. My family is starying. My electricity has been shut off. My wife's jaw is infected, my insurance has been canceled and the Government is threatening to foreclose on my house. Can't you do something? And my name is not Thornwall T. Blivets.

THORNTON P. BLIVETT.

THORNWALL Z. BLIVENS,
Wet Rock, Ark.

DEAR MR. BLIVENS: In answer to your request of April 9, 1958, please find enclosed the Government manual on Sex Life of the Female Night Crawler in Lower Slobovia.

OLIVER H. RINGWORM,
Department of Animal Husbandry.

DIRECTOR, PAYROLL DIVISION.

DEAR SIR: I'm now down to 103 pounds and barefoot. For goodness sake, do something! Even if it's only getting my name right.

THORNTON P. BLIVETT.
WET ROCK, ARK.

THORNLEY E. GLIVENS,
Wet Rock, Ark.

DEAR MR. GLIVENS: As per your request, 103 pounds of fertilizer is being shipped to you express collect.

CROMWELL C. COMPOST,
Department of Utter Fertility.

DIRECTOR, PAYROLL DIVISION.

DEAR SIR: What's the matter with you people? A month has past since I wrote you. I'm now out of a job and living in a tent on the courthouse lawn. Can't even get unemployment compensation because you've got my records all tied up. I beg you, get this mess straightened out. * * *

THORNTON P. BLIVETT.
WET ROCK, ARK.

THORNY C. SPIVENS,
Wet Rock, Ark.

DEAR MR. SPIVENS: After a thorough check of your records, we fail to understand your trouble.

According to our files, you died February 16 last year.

Such being the case, you will report immediately to the public embalming administration branch office nearest your home.

In your case, this office is located in Formaldehyde, Ariz.

We hope this takes care of your case. We have been happy to assist you, and assure you that any future business you may have with our department will be just as speedily consummated.

CLIFTON Q. BUNGSTARTER,
Federal Benefits Administration.

River Valley Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 8 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able article on river valley development, by Willard R. Espey, appearing in the magazine section of the New York Times of Sunday, May 7, 1950.

This article constitutes an extensive study of the serious conditions of erosion, waste, and neglect in the various river valley areas of our country, and calls for the application of the successful TVA program to our whole river valley system. The program is opposed by a small clique of vested interests, backed by great wealth and desire to exploit the undeveloped resources of our country at the expense of the Nation. It is a challenge to the common sense of the American people. The future of our American economy will be determined by our action on this vitally important program.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MORE TVA's?—THE ISSUES WEIGHED
(By Willard R. Espey)

The Senate recently passed a measure adding half a billion dollars' worth of navigation and flood-control projects to the billion-dollar rivers and harbors bill approved by the House. Both branches of Congress ignored alternative bills for TVA-like authorities which, their backers contend, would save the taxpayer hundreds of millions of dollars that are now going to waste through political logrolling and would provide controlled development of our great river valleys.

Not that these ignored projects would be cheap. Over the next half century they would cost in the neighborhood of $42,000,000,000. But valley authority proponents assert that the record of the present Congress, like that of most earlier Congresses, proves that $42,000,000,000 will only be the start if valley development remains a pork-barrel item. The true question is what do we get for our money.

The proposed authorities—many of them do not go by that name—would directly affect almost every corner of the country: A fourth

of the Nation's farmland in the Missouri Valley; 10 percent of our land area in the Pacific Northwest; a seventh of our population in the Ohio Valley; the entire heart land of the United States that would be served by the proposed St. Lawrence waterway.

These projects are as important as they are expensive because of what they can do for the country. If we spend the $42,000,000,000, says a recent Twentieth Century Fund survey, the United States would be enriched by hydroelectric plants with a combined generating capacity of 54,000,000 kilowatts—nearly the equivalent of our capacity from all sources at the end of the war. We would be freed forever from the danger of floods of the kind that turned a Columbia River city of 40,000 people into kindling wood in a half hour's time in 1948, or killed 137 persons and destroyed $400,000,000 worth of property along the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers in 1937.

The amount of western land under irrigation—21,000,000 acres now—would be doubled. Erosion would be halted on 300,000,000 acres of crop and range land, while 100,000,000 acres more would be made cultivable by draining and clearing. Cutting and replacement would be brought into balance on nearly half a billion acres of forest land.

If we do not adopt a program of control and development projects, the retarded areas of the United States must slide even farther backward. In great sections of the most advanced country in the world today, poverty, filth, ignorance and sickness are the order of the day. Topsoil is peeling off our earth like a rind off an orange, decreasing our wealth at a rate which has been estimated at $4,000,000,000 annually. Every year our flood losses alone run to more than $100,000,000. Stream pollution has turned the loveliest rivers known to man into currents of diluted sewage.

It is because of the growing realization of these conditions and the necessity of correcting them that demands, both in and out of Congress, for additional river-valley developments are increasing.

Allowing for regional differences and special problems, the proposals seek to apply in other areas the experience and techniques of the Tennessee Valley Authority, the American project which set the minds of men in every retarded region of the world afire with the dream of bettering their lot through grand-scale river-valley developments.

In the light of the expanding demand for development projects, why has Congress not passed legislation authorizing them? The answer is that it has been unable to agree on the answers to two fundamental questions: Can we afford, at a time of unparalleled commitments, with a deficit running at $5,000,000,000 and more a year, to spend still more money for large-scale TVA's? Does Government creation of additional power represent unfair competition with private enterprise?

Fortunately, both questions can be answered objectively out of our own experience and without regard to any special interests. But before presenting the answers it might be well to review briefly the need for and present status of our development projects. There are three reasons for this:

First, all intelligent discussion of river-valley developments must start with need, and the need for additional projects has been studied and well tabulated.

Second, the plans have been drawn up. Although Congress has yet to pass the necessary over-all enabling legislation, all projects have been worked out in detail, at least on paper.

Third, much more has already been done than many of us realize. While the Congress has debated, engineers have gone ahead and changed the face of America. On the Tennessee, the Missouri, the Columbia, the Snake, the Colorado—on all those rivers, and others, there have risen monuments so huge as to be visible from the moon. Sums so tremendous as to dwarf our national income of a generation ago are being expended each year on dams, levees, power plants, irrigation ditches. The argument as to whether or not we should encourage more TVA's is to some extent academic because most of the proposed developments are, in one way or another, already in work.

Here is a résumé of the major projects.

The Ohio Valley is increasingly menaced by floods and pollution. The valley drains waste from a population of 4,000,000 directly into the Ohio River; in some places a quarter of all the river flow has passed through a sewage system. Proposed projects would not only stabilize and cleanse the Ohio, but also provide a badly needed fresh-water connection between Lake Erie and tributaries of the upper Ohio, facilitating traffic in iron and coal. They would cost about $2,000,000,000.

The Arkansas Valley suffers from underemployment of 60 percent of its farmers. It has been proposed to retire 8,000,000 marginal acres from cultivation, putting the displaced farmers into new industries powered by abundant hydroelectricity. Cost of soil conservation, flood and pollution control, power, irrigation, and water-supply projects is estimated at $2,000,000,000.

The lower Mississippi has been the scene since 1927 of $500,000,000 worth of work on levees, reservoirs, spillways, and floodways. Another $500,000,000 remains to be expended on projects to provide for flood abatement and malaria control and to support a larger and healthier population.

In the Savannah Valley, an authority proposed jointly by the two Senators from Georgia would cost between $250,000,000 and $300,000,000. Besides navigation and flood control, it would include dams with an installed generating capacity of 761,200 kilowatts.

In the Connecticut and Merrimack River Basins of New England, the enactment of proposals for flood control, pollution abatement, and hydroelectric projects would cost $100,000,000, produce a billion kilowatt-hours of electricity a year. An effort is now being made to integrate the entire river-valley development of New England.

The Colorado Valley, third largest drainage basin in the United States, is being developed, not through a single regional authority but through an interstate compact. An international flavor is added to the undertaking by the involvement of Mexico in the lower river. In addition to Boulder Dam and the All-American Canal, projects are planned to control silting, establish an electrical generating capacity of 4,000,000 kilowatts, and irrigate 2,000,000 more acres. They will cost $2,500,000,000.

The Central Valley of California has 200,000 acres of land returning to desert. The State water plan will restore this land and bring an additional 7,000,000 acres under cultivation through water from 38 major dams. The cost has been estimated at between $1,000,000,000 and $2,000,000,000.

The Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway is the only project that still remains entirely on paper. Canadians and Americans for more than 50 years have agitated for a canal which would enable deep-draft ocean vessels to steam from the Atlantic to the Great Lakes. At a cost of $500,000,000 the 27-foot-deep ditch would create an electric-generating capacity of 1,640,000 kilowatts.

All the above proposals have aroused bitter controversy. The banks of the Colorado have provided a setting for disputes among Western States which for a while took on characteristics of civil war. But the developments which are bringing about the greatest exchange of name calling today are those which are already under way for the Missouri Valley and the Pacific Northwest. They are also the two best known and the two largest.

The Missouri: The Missouri River, twisting 2,640 miles and serving 29 percent of the total area of the United States, represents an economic and social problem of tremendous complexity. In its lower reaches—eastern Nebraska, Kansas, Iowa, and Mississippi—the crying need is for flood control. Farther toward the source, in the Great Plains, a parched countryside waits for irrigation.

The Army engineers, one of the two great Government bureaus at work on the Missouri, started from the assumption that the valley needed flood control and increased navigation. They began building dams for a few tremendous reservoirs.

The Bureau of Reclamation, on the other hand, decided that irrigation was the primary need and, accordingly, began building a large number of small reservoirs.

Both parties worked with a will—throwing up dams and levees, hydroelectric power plants, flood walls; boring tunnels, digging ditches, deepening canals.

Into this turmoil there was flung in 1944 a proposal for a unified Missouri Valley Authority. As fighting cats will forget their quarrel long enough to drive off an invading dog, the Army and the Bureau of Reclamation at once joined hands in a compromise, known as the Pick-Sloan plan.

The Hoover Commission, which looked over Pick-Sloan, reported in consternation: "The 'compromise' consisted for the most part in a division of projects, each agency agreeing to forego the privilege of criticizing projects assigned by the agreement to the other. The result is in no sense an integrated development plan for the basin, and there is serious reason to question whether agreement between the two agencies is not more costly than disagreement."

The proposed Missouri Valley Authority differs from Pick-Sloan in being a unified project, which would be preceded by a careful study of the entire valley area. According to its backers it would raise the Pick-Sloan sights on power production from 1,000,000 to 3,000,000 kilowatts—more than the entire capacity of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics as recently as 1930.

The Columbia. In some ways similar, in others vastly different from the story of the Missouri, is that of the Columbia and Snake Valleys. Where the Missouri population is dwindling, that of the Northwest between 1940 and 1949 rose 36 percent. Where the Missouri lacks major industrial development, the Columbia is going through one of the great industrial bursts of American history. The economy of the Missouri is on dead center; that of the Columbia is hurtling forward.

The Columbia River is 1,214 miles long. Its hydroelectric potential is 30,000,000 kilowatts—more than a third the potential of all the United States, and more than our entire electric consumption in 1929.

Federal agencies working to develop the Columbia Valley are handicapped, as on the Missouri, by lack of over-all direction. In early 1949 President Truman had to give a public spanking to those same old Kilkenny cats, the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation, for squabbling over who was to build what. A few weeks later, his administration's proposal for a Columbia Valley Administration reached Congress. It called also for an additional immediate outlay of $100,000,000 for hydroelectric and reclamation projects.

These, then, are our Nation's most urgent development needs, and what has been planned and is being done to meet them. There remain the two great policy questions: Can we afford to go all-out for valley developments at the present time? And are the projects compatible with the American tradition of free, private enterprise?

Answers to these questions can be found in the record of the one great valley development project that has had a chance to show its effectiveness—the TVA.

Today TVA produces 15,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of energy a year. It watches 3,400,000 acres of test-demonstration farms. It is checking erosion and building soil on 7,000,000 acres. It is cooperating in developments of new mineral deposits and control of pollution.

In 1933, only 15,000 farms in the Tennessee Valley power-distribution area had electricity, today there are 300,000. During the first half of 1949 residents of the valley purchased $100,000,000 worth of electric appliances. Tennessee Valley farms in the same period used twenty times as much electricity as they had used in 1933, while the United States as a whole was using just three times as much. Within a decade the valley has developed 400 new industries, employing 100,000 workers.

In 1930 an acre in the Missouri Valley was worth $39.17—15 cents more than in the Tennessee. Fourteen years later an acre in the Tennessee Valley was worth $46.30, while in the Missouri Valley it was down to $25.82. Despite its scantiness of resources, the Tennessee Valley today supports 65 persons per square mile. If the Missouri Valley reached the same figure, its population would be up by more than 20 million.

It would be unrealistic to maintain that the faster gain in the Tennessee Valley was entirely due to TVA. Other parts of the South have also shown a more rapid improvement than the national average. Nonetheless, if the income of the Tennessee Valley had risen only in the same proportion as that of the rest of the country, its annual income—and the nation's—would total $1,240,000,000 less than it is today. This yearly difference is far more than the entire $762,000,000 cost of the Authority. Similarly rapid growth is likely in other valley authority areas. As the Twentieth Century Fund has remarked in analyzing the Arkansas Valley proposal, "The limit to such expansion cannot be estimated. But it would certainly be many times the initial outlay. * * *" The conclusion seems inescapable that we not only can afford such projects but also that we cannot afford to forego them.

Flood control, hydroelectric production, irrigation and reclamation have long constituted a pork barrel in which almost any Congressman could find a little money for his own constituency. The pork barrel in President Truman's latest budget amounts to $1,200,000,000, much of it for projects already under way. It is hardly to be expected that a vote-hungry Congress, however loud it cries for economy, will appreciably cut that figure.

But there is no pork for a hungry Congressman in a TVA. Valley authorities in such areas as the Missouri and Columbia Basins—set up either by Congress or by interstate agreement—are the only means on the horizon by which the waste, overlapping and log-rolling now taking place there are likely to be eliminated. On future undertakings of comparable magnitude valley authorities will be equally necessary—and for the same reason.

The principle of responsibility to Congress has been invoked against TVA's by some sincere and disinterested men. It has been invoked by some also, however, to cover an equally ardent interest in the principle of the pork barrel.

Valley authorities need not be a way to spend money. They can be, on the contrary, a way to get far more value for the money we are spending now.

Our experience in the Tennessee Valley also appears to answer the second major question negatively. Many critics contend that the regional development projects contradict the spirit of private business. On the basis of experience so far, however, it seems to me fair to say not only that valley authorities can act as a stimulus to free enterprise but that it is free enterprise alone which makes their full achievement possible.

In the Tennessee Valley the Government did not shut off a segment of the country from private investment; it opened a segment to private investment. It performed in twentieth-century terms the same function that it had performed a hundred and more years ago, when, by turning over tens of millions of acres of public land to homesteaders and railroads, it made possible the settlement of a continent nearly in the twinkling of an eye.

Today the Tennessee Valley is dotted with profit-making businesses—private businesses—which could not have existed there 20 years ago.

Conversely, the gigantic achievements of the Tennessee Valley Authority were possible only because private capital was available to turn the newly available power into machines, to hire for industry the men and women who were no longer tied to their farms, to create the goods and services which could make for a richer and fuller life. Without that capital and that grassroots incentive the network of dams could have produced but a fraction of its actual benefits.

There should be no stampede into new development projects. In each case the need should be clearly established, the remedy clearly effective. The timing and details will differ. Some projects are urgent; others can await the Nation's convenience. As each is launched, it will be the duty of every citizen to seek firm safeguards against Federal encroachment, to insist on a maximum of local control and a rate of expenditure which is not in excess of a reasonable public investment capacity. But that is far different from blind opposition. Now, as in the past, those who seek to oppose something with nothing are likely to find themselves wringing their hands in the ruck of history. For integrated river-development projects, properly administered, can enrich America and strengthen American democracy. The projects are feasible, they are desirable, and therefore they are inevitable.

Freedom and Government Hand-Outs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1950

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, in recent meetings with various groups in my congressional district, at all of which I have given myself the benefit of a question period, I have become more and more convinced that the rank and file of our people are demanding that Government hand-outs to pressure minority groups be stopped. The First National Bank of Boston has just published something along this line in its regular New England Letter and I append it hereto under leave to extend my remarks as reprinted in the Wakefield (Mass.) Item:

FREEDOM AND GOVERNMENT HAND-OUTS

Throughout our history, freedom has ever been the rallying cry in our struggle upward as a nation, says the First National Bank of Boston in its current New England letter. Continuing, the bank says, it is our most precious heritage. So much has this ideal dominated our national life that America has become the symbol of freedom to liberty-loving people everywhere.

This freedom was dearly won. Every step in our forward march has been marked by risk-taking. As Vannevar Bush, president of Carnegie Institution of Washington, and former Director of the Office of Scientific Research and Development, has pointed out: "There is no such thing as absolute security. In this uncertain and complex world there is no workable security without the willingness and courage to take risks. We cannot protect ourselves by passing a law. We can hope to protect ourselves only if our people—our greatest resource—maintain and develop their imagination and initiative and are willing and able to take chances."

Our forefathers by overcoming starvation and the perils of the wilderness developed the capacity that enabled them to deal with stern reality, and through their energy, daring, and vision laid the foundation for the American system which rests primarily upon personal initiative and individual freedom. But this system is being jeopardized by the extension of the paternalistic spirit of government.

Every special favor asked of government, however, for protection against the risks of life imperils the liberties of the people. With government aid goes control, and unless checked, there grows up a Frankenstein bureaucracy that saps the vitality of the Nation.

But the American people in general are in a state of lethargy and do not realize that their liberties are in peril as they are being duped by sugar-coated slogans, honeyed words, and false promises.

While there are many manifestations of the shrinkage of freedom, it is most clearly revealed on the financial front. It finds reflection in the increasing proportion of the income syphoned by the Government from the American people. Taxes of all kinds—Federal, State, and local—now constitute about 25 percent of national income as against 13 percent in 1929 and 7 percent in 1900. All told, more than $60,000,000,000 is being spent through various governmental channels. This is equivalent to 85 percent of total national income in the prewar year 1939.

Socialistic experiments can be extended only by means of financial aid provided by the taxpayers. In consequence, it is highly essential in the interest of freedom that the purse strings should be tightened on expenditures that are carrying us at a rapid pace down the road of collectivism. It has been pointed out by the nonpartisan Hoover Commission, as well as by other authorities, that at least $4,000,000,000 can be cut from the Federal budget without in any way impairing essential governmental services. A campaign for substantial savings of taxpayers' money could become a rallying point for freedom which is being attacked on many fronts. All liberty-loving Americans should take a definite stand by joining forces with the nonpartisan committees for the Hoover report which have been organized in 38 States. The purpose of these committees is to keep the citizens intelligently informed on the savings that can be made by eliminating waste and inefficiency in government and zealously working for the adoption of better government at lower costs. In other words, the objective is to apply to government the same principles of management and experience that are necessary for survival in the field of business. The success of this commendable undertaking will depend upon whether the American people can be aroused to realize the inseparable link between freedom and solvency of the Nation as was clearly understood by its founders. At this crucial stage it is well to heed the counsel offered by Thomas Jefferson more than a century ago: "We must make our selection between economy and liberty, or profusion and servitude." A recent warning regarding the threat to freedom was made by Senator BYRD when he said: "Let us al-

ways remember that human freedom is not a gift to man. It is an achievement by man, and, as it was gained by vigilance and struggle, so it may be lost by indifference and supineness."

Chips Are Down

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 8, 1950

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial from the Somerville (Mass.) Journal states succinctly and pungently the feelings of many citizens with reference to desired economies in the Post Office Department. Under leave to extend my remarks, I append this excellent editorial hereto:

CHIPS ARE DOWN

The chips are down—the fight is on—the People versus the Politicians.

Never was an issue more clear-cut than the disgraceful exhibition now being staged where we see the Hoover plan for modernizing the post office being scuttled by the cowardly action of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The bipartisan Hoover committee clearly showed the way to substantial savings in postal operations. If adopted, the Hoover blueprint would reduce the post office deficit from five hundred million to at least three hundred million—but more important, by streamlining and modernizing the post office structure and equipment, the efficiency of its service would be improved.

Since last July a series of bills endorsed by President Truman and Postmaster Donaldson has been before Congress. Yet no affirmative action has been taken.

Now the showdown reveals a few willful Senators smothering Senate bill 2213 by postponing indefinitely any action.

Senate 2213 is the bill to reorganize the post office. Among its many provisions for more economical and efficient administration of the post office is a proposal to remove 22,000 postmasters from politics by making Senate confirmation unnecessary.

Who is in favor? The President; the Postmaster General; the Hoover Commission; the National Association of Postmasters and Assistant Postmasters; letter carriers; railway mail clerks; the American people. Who is against it? A few politicians who place politics above the national welfare.

This bill was approved by a subcommittee but laid on the table by the full committee. Thus we witness the spectacle of a few selfish Senators prevailing over the will of the American people.

The Truth About Federal Health Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 8, 1950

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Dr. Ira Dean McCoy, from the Huron News of February 17, 1950:

THE TRUTH ABOUT FEDERAL HEALTH INSURANCE
(By Ira Dean McCoy, M. D.)

"Honesty of thought and speech and written word is a jewel, and they who curb prejudice and seek honorably to know and speak the truth are the only builders of a better life."—John Galsworthy.

The American Medical Association, at enormous cost, has bombarded the American public with a flag-waving, red, white, and blue propaganda leaflet "explaining" the proposed Federal health-insurance legislation. Every member of the AMA was assessed $25 in order that one of the Nation's top publicity agencies might be employed to frighten the American public by untruthfully calling the proposed legislation socialism, statism, and paternalism.

Often in the heat of argument or in criticizing another's belief, the words "paternalism" and "statism" are too indiscriminately used and the users forget or lose sight of exactly the form of government we have in these United States.

The Government is composed of men like ourselves whom the majority of us elect to govern us and it is always within our power to change the political complexion of our National Government every 2 years if we so choose. Far, far more dangerous to the welfare of our country than statism or paternalism is our apathy toward our duties as citizens. It is everyone's duty to be actively inquisitive and interested in Government; and it is the sacred privilege as well as our duty and obligation to cast our ballot at every opportunity. The more active and interested we as a people become in Government, the better will be our Government and the safer will be our liberties.

I firmly believe in the system of free enterprise and our capitalistic way of life; but in a complex nation the size of ours, government simply must take over the education and health of our people to a greater extent in the future. If the handling of atomic energy is too complex and too big for private industry, certainly the health and education of our people is too great and pressing a problem to be allowed to drift much longer. There can be no solution but more and more Government aid and control. After all, isn't good Government, "One for all and for one"? But let's get back to Federal health insurance.

In last week's article I said over 300,000 of our people, men, women, and children, will die this year because they cannot afford medical care. That isn't all the sad truth: this year, too, America will lose 4,300,000 man-years of work because of bad health. And this year, too, $27,000,000,000 in national wealth will be lost—lost because of sickness and disability. On the basis of selective-service experience at least 40 percent of our men of military age—between eight and nine million men—are unfit for military duty. On any one day, at least 7,000,000 people in the United States suffer some illness. As many as 23,000,000 persons have a chronic or disabling disease. Sickness and accidents cost the Nation at least $8,000,000,000 a year.

Our health services and facilities are wholly inadequate. Forty percent of our counties do not have even a full-time local public-health officer Hospitals are needed—areas of our country with an aggregate population of 15,000,000 people do not have a single recognized general hospital. Pure shortages of doctors, nurses, dentists, psychiatrists, and other trained health personnel are so great that many persons are forced to forego medical care. In 1944, 553 counties had less than one active physician per 3,000 population, the danger line. And numerous counties had no active doctor at all.

If we had adequate services available for mothers and children, we could prevent at least half of the deaths of mothers who die in childbirth, and one-third of the deaths of the young babies. Our State health agencies have, on their waiting lists, thousands of crippled children who require and cannot get proper attention because of the lack of facilities and personnel, and over half a million children with rheumatic fever fail to receive good medical care.

Staggering statistics, aren't they? But more shocking is the simple fact that we have the knowledge to prevent these needless deaths and this tragic waste. We have the highly trained personnel capable of applying that knowledge. The one essential ingredient lacking is the assurance that people needing that knowledge can have it when they need it.

But before we project the solution, let's look more searchingly at the problem. Can the average American family pay for modern medical care? Can you?

At least two out of every three Americans—that means 97,000,000 people—cannot, and this figure comes straight from the American Medical Association's Bureau of Medical Economics. If your family has an annual income of $5,000 or less per year, you are in this group. You cannot afford adequate medical care.

Most Americans avoid seeking prompt medical attention at the first sign of complaint. They tend to put off going to the doctor in the hope that the pain or illness will right itself. They delay mainly because of fear of medical costs.

Such delay is often serious, and sometimes fatal, as in tuberculosis and cancer. We doctors know that 30 percent of cancer is curable if caught in its very early stages. We know that the disabling effects of many other chronic diseases can be halted or even prevented entirely, if caught in time.

There is an endless amount of data to prove that the relation between money and life—between wealth and health—is direct and deadly.

The problem, from which we can no longer run, is simply this: how can we remove this major economic barrier which blocks better health for the Nation and assure everyone who needs it adequate medical care regardless of economic status?

The democratic solution is: National health insurance. By broadening the scope of our compulsory social-security program to include a system of national health insurance, by utilizing the proven, successful method of pay-roll deductions to which employers and employees would contribute equal shares—the costs of physicians and hospital care could be prepaid, guaranteeing both availability of care to all who need it and adequate payment to doctors, hospitals, and others who supply the services.

For a long time, the AMA fought even voluntary health insurance plans. It still fights them today, unless it can control them. It supports voluntary health insurance today, in a frenzied rearguard action to head off national health insurance. The AMA has long been several steps behind the march of events and the needs of the American people.

Voluntary health-insurance plans, while often excellent in the limited spheres in which most of them operate, cannot and will not be able to do the necessary job because:

1. Benefits are inadequate. The plans which provide anything approximating comprehensive insurance protection reach relatively few persons—actually less than 3 percent of the population—because they have been held back by the opposition of medical societies. The plans sponsored by medical societies provide only very limited services.
2. Voluntary plans have no sliding scales of payments to match incomes. They charge a flat rate, usually high, for limited benefits that cover only a fraction of the population. It is hardly likely that they could broaden their benefits without pricing themselves out

of reach of many present subscribers. 3. Many of them offer only cash payments instead of actual medical services, and these payments cover only part of the costs of care. 4. They have the smallest coverage where the need is greatest—in rural areas and among lower income groups.

A continuous smokescreen has been laid down by special interests to befog the public's mind on what national health insurance is and what it would mean to the doctor and to the patient.

Proponents of national health insurance cherish the freedom and intimacy of the doctor-patient relationship as much as our die-hard opponents. Patients, as now, would select their own doctors; doctors, as now, would accept or reject patients. National health insurance is just a method of paying for medical care.

The only change proposed by advocates of national health insurance is that, instead of the patient paying when and if he has money available, the doctor or the hospital of his choice would be paid by the insurance system at a rate and by a method to which the doctor had agreed.

Those who support national health insurance are keenly aware that our Nation has fewer physicians and hospital beds than we need, and these so poorly distributed that in some rural counties there are no resident physicians at all, and little or no hospitalization accessible.

Nevertheless, it is unrealistic to argue that national health insurance should be delayed for the years required to train many more doctors and build many more hospitals. The supply of medical personnel and facilities will expand only when, through insurance, the money to pay for them is guaranteed. This demand depends on families' purchasing power for medical care. This is the simple principle of supply and demand which operates throughout our economy.

Opponents claim that national health insurance will cost too much, that national expenditure for medical and health services would be greater under this plan, and that administrative costs would be excessive.

The first answer to this objection is that the Nation needs to spend more for health. Too many of us have been doing without for too long. Moreover, a large part of the expenditures under national health insurance would not be new or added expenditures. Money now expended in direct payments for medical care by sick persons would be distributed under the plan in small regular payments from all people. Consequently, the costs of sickness—ordinarily concentrated upon a small part of the population in any given year—would be spread over the whole year and over all the people.

As for administrative costs, it is worth noting that expenses of voluntary, nonprofit plans run to 12 percent or more in comparison with the premiums collected. An important part of these administrative expenses is the cost of soliciting and retaining members, a task that would be eliminated by national health insurance.

Many other costs would also be eliminated by national health insurance. It might at this time be interesting to note that the Blue Cross of Michigan has approximately 1,500,000 policyholders, or subscribers, as they choose to call the people who are buying Blue Cross insurance. From January 1 until June 30, 1949, the Blue Cross of Michigan had a total earned income of $12,399,566.37. But during that same period of time their operating expense was $1,135,477.46. Of that $1,135,477.46 are some interesting items of expense: $711,990.07 was paid out in salaries; $47,547.09 was paid out in travel and other expenses; and $79,783.54 was paid out in sundry expenses (of which no explanation is made). By these few figures I have given, it is very plain to be seen that the administrative costs of the Michigan Blue Cross are tremendous in comparison to the amount of money collected from their policyholders. It is, however, a nonprofit corporation. A great many patrons who are using the Blue Cross learn to their sorrow its services are limited. This could be due to the huge expenses I have already cited.

As a result of the very cunning insidious, and extremely expensive propaganda campaign carried on by the medical lobby, the AMA and its national physicians committee, most people think that all doctors, or nearly all, unqualifiedly follow the AMA "party line" in opposition to national health insurance.

The dictatorial, undemocratic rule of the AMA's house of delegates imposes its policies practically by fiat on a hapless and helpless membership. Serious disagreement by an individual doctor with the policies laid down by the house of delegates or by his local medical society may result in unpleasant economic and professional consequences for that doctor. Few doctors dare risk these consequences.

But opposition to AMA reaction has been growing and has expressed itself in several organizations of doctors who are in favor of national health insurance and who say so openly. These organizations—the Committee of Physicians for the Improvement of Medical Care, the Physicians Forum, and the Committee for the Nation's Health, composed of both laymen and doctors—are becoming growing spearheads of opposition to the entrenched leaders of the AMA.

The American Medical Association has been spoon-feeding the American people a terrific amount of propaganda against national health insurance, but I can cite the bill itself and tell you as well as anyone just what it is and what it will do for you.

1. It would make available to you and all other employed and self-employed persons (with few exceptions) all the care you need from physicians, both family doctors and specialists, hospital, laboratory and X-ray services, unusually expensive medicines, eyeglasses, and appliances; and dental care and home nursing to a limited degree.

2. It would also cover the dependent members of your family.

3. You would be free to choose your own doctor, hospital, etc., and to change your selection. Actually, countless individuals would have greater freedom of choice than they have now, because the prepaid plan of health insurance would help assure a better supply of physicians in many areas where there are not now enough doctors, and because the prepayment plan would enable millions who cannot now pay to have the services of a doctor of their choice for the first time.

4. Your doctor's professional freedom would be fully protected. He would not become a Government employee. He would remain a practitioner, free to accept or reject patients, to locate wherever he wishes, to participate in, or stay outside, the insurance plan. He would be paid by the insurance funds in amounts and methods which he or his own representatives would negotiate.

5. It would cost you 1½ percent of your earnings (up to $3,600 of income). Your employer would pay an equal amount. You would pay 3 percent (up to $3,600) if you are self-employed.

6. If you are a member of a voluntary health-insurance plan that meets minimum standards, this plan could continue to provide you with services, and your premiums would be paid from the national insurance fund.

8. Health insurance would not be run from Washington. It would be managed by local areas under a plan adopted by each State.

In closing these series on health and education, I wish to say there are four great issues confronting the American people. 1. The issue of war or peace; 2. peace between labor and industry; 3. the health of our country; 4. the education of our children. We must all work and strive to see that these issues are brought to a satisfactory conclusion.

Many of us fear the threat of communism but do we all realize the best way to combat the scourge of communism is to increase the opportunities of the ordinary individual? America is great enough and rich enough that we should have no slums; we should have equal opportunity insofar as public-school education is concerned in this country for all our children whatever their color or creed. All children have a right in this great country of ours to healthy and sound bodies insofar as our medical science can give it to them.

These are not visionary ideals. We can and must find a way for their fulfillment. "He stands straight who stoops to help a child."

Truman Prosperity on Borrowed Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1950

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article by Edson B. Smith in the Boston Herald and I commend to my colleagues a careful reading of this timely article:

TRUMAN PROSPERITY ON BORROWED TIME

Mr. Truman soon will start out on a transcontinental speech-making tour. In the course of his public addresses he probably will call attention to the great prosperity of the country and ask that he and the Democratic Party be given credit for it.

He probably will not explain to the voters that in considerable measure the undoubted great business boom is due to credit policies which, if persisted in, can end only in disaster. Superimposed upon the Government deficit has been a great expansion during the last 9 months in consumer credit and in real-estate mortgages.

If enough money is borrowed and promptly spent business is bound to boom. When the Government borrows it does not have to worry too much about repayment day so long as individuals and banks are willing to take new Government issues as offered. Unfortunately, in the case of individuals, debts have to be paid off when due. What a man borrows and spends today is just that much less he will have to spend in the future.

Maybe sometime we will have a Government blessed with more financial responsibility than the present administration. At some stage in this borrowing from the future for the sale of the present, creditors may get the jitters.

We all like periods of prosperity but some of us cannot help feeling very uncomfortable in the knowledge that the longer the present boom goes on the more trouble is being stored up for the future.

Lynwood, Calif., High-School Students Use Self-Created Booklet, We Hold These Truths—They Have a Zeal for Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 5, 1950

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, at Easter recess of Congress I again had the privilege of visiting at Lynwood High School, California. It is one of the largest high schools in the great Eighteenth Congressional District, which I am now representing for the second term.

My first visit was an occasion upon which my privilege was to address the entire student body and faculty. I then noted the prompt, courteous, and patriotic manner in which they one and all saluted the flag of the United States of America and gave the usual pledge. They all knew which side their heart was on and where it was in their physical makeup.

Upon my most recent visit I found opportunity to ask the beloved school principal, William W. Jones, to explain to me the reasons for what I have just related to you.

Well, among other factors, he handed me a printed booklet entitled "We Hold These Truths." I will not here have opportunity to submit the complete text of this very valuable paperback, neatly printed booklet. It is printed in the Lynwood High School print shop, too, and was created and compiled by the social-studies department of said high school in January 1950.

It is such a significant, timely, and sincere publication that I am certain its contents will be of real value to you who are here in the United States Congress and all others who learn of it.

Every high school, academy, college—both public and private—could well emulate the example of Lynwood High School, California. No doubt the vision, vigor, vigilance, and good common sense of Principal Jones and his faculty associates helped to inspire and lead these high-school students to a constructive and valuable high in this manner. As knowledge is power, so the best and surest way to keep communism from spreading its poisonous points is to have American youth kept aware of their glorious heritage and their privileges and to point them into living a proud and vigorous and enduring democracy.

I am not here listing the several patriotic poems, songs, and sayings the student print shop also included, but such as America, America the Beautiful, God Bless America, There Are Many Flags, America for Me, This Day, My Creed, The Ship of State, America I Love You, O Captain! My Captain, Concord Hymn, Barbara Frietchie, by Whittier.

These are a typical list used.

The following text was printed in clear, sizable type, made attractive to read:

DEAR PARENT: Please accept this pamphlet, We Hold These Truths, a booklet which has been compiled by the social studies department of Lynwood High School under the chairmanship of Mrs. Ethel Gillette. It was printed in the school's print shop; the boys of the printing classes doing all of the work under the supervision of Mr. Wesley T. Dunn, our printing teacher.

We use this book for the promotion of the zeal for democracy program in our school. It is only a small part of the total program; nevertheless, we feel it is extremely important because in the documents reproduced in this book are embodied the fundamental principles upon which American democracy has been founded. Will you please keep it in your home where it will be readily available for use by your son or daughter.

Each student is given a copy of the booklet, and before he is permitted to graduate from this school he must commit to memory, as a minimum requirement, the following: The first and last stanzas of The Star-Spangled Banner, all of the American's Creed; the Preamble to the Constitution of the United States; the Gettysburg Address; that part of the Declaration of Independence which appears in italics; and the 32 high lights of American history which are included in the pamphlet.

We know that this does not constitute all that is necessary in the way of teaching the principles and ideals of American democracy; but we do feel that every American should be thoroughly acquainted with these principles as they are set forth in these documents.

Very truly yours,

WM. W. JONES,
Principal.

LYNWOOD HIGH SCHOOL,
January 1950.

DEAR FELLOW AMERICAN: By the grace of God and the fact that you were born in the United States of America, you have been endowed with the greatest heritage it has ever been the lot of man to enjoy.

No effort has been required of you to make this good fortune of yours a reality. As a result, there is danger that you may not value it highly enough, for the very reason that it has cost you nothing. Or there is the danger that you may feel it is yours just as a matter of course, because you were born an American and naturally everyone recognizes what fine persons Americans are and wants them to continue enjoying the privileges of living in the greatest country in the world. Either of these attitudes can result in disaster and a loss to the world of the highest political, social, and economic achievements that man has ever been able to attain.

You enjoy the benefits and responsibilities of American citizenship only because, down through the ages, there has resided in the heart of man a burning and driving desire to uplift himself, to do and be his best in the eyes of God and man. The history of his constant struggle against human and natural forces, to elevate his dignity and better his lot, is a thrilling story of which you as an appreciative and deserving heir can justly be proud.

The birth and development of the United States of America mark the highest achievement of this age-long struggle. Men and women who held an unfaltering faith in the constancy of a Divine Creator, the sacredness of human personality, and the dignity and worth of the common man, were willing to sacrifice their lives and fortunes that these ideals might become a reality in this Nation which they have given to you. It is yours to enjoy, but you cannot assume a complacent attitude and satisfaction in its possession.

From the time in 1607 when the first permanent settlers landed at Jamestown, to the end of the Second World War, our people have had to fight against foes that opposed them with physical force. The Indians, the wilderness of the frontier, and the French were the enemies to be overcome in the first epoch. Then the Revolution, the War of 1812, and the expansion westward engaged the physical strength of our forefathers in the establishment of our Nation. The winning of the Mexican War, the Civil War, and the extension of our boundaries to the Pacific coast demanded the extreme of physical exertion and sacrifice. Again, the Spanish American War, the First World War, and the Second World War called for the utmost in the mobilization of our industrial and physical strength to achieve victory. Each time, the victory has been ours because the moral, physical, and industrial strength of our people has been greater than that of our foes. The building and development of this strength is a glorious and proud story of a people who have ever been willing and equal to the demands of the establishment of an ideal and the founding of a great nation. In this short 343 years since Jamestown we have done more to improve the condition of man than was ever before achieved in all recorded history.

But now, the scene and times have changed. We have entered a new era in which the physical and industrial strength of our Nation are no longer a guarantee of the victory. We fervently pray for peace but the struggle and danger have not ended. The human and mind-poisoning forces of fascism and communism are threatening now as never before in our history to wrest from you this hard-won heritage. Although the development of the implements of total destruction, such as the atomic bomb, and the strengthening of our power to attack may ward off a physical conflict with the enemy, they are not sufficient in themselves. These enemies of ours have developed a weapon that seeps in and can undermine the greatest of military establishments because these defenses are founded on physical and material strength alone. They have developed as insidious weapons, the sinister forces of fear, hate, and doubt. These they plant in the hearts and minds of people to create confusion and the lack of will for opposition to their degrading doctrines. With these implements they have made great progress in extending their power in Europe and over a great part of Asia. They will not be satisfied until they have spread their rule over all the world. The extent of their power is so great that now we must fight for our very existence as a nation.

At present we have assurance that we could meet them and come out victors in the opposing of physical strength to physical strength, but this is not sufficient; for already they are at work with the weapons of fear, hate, and doubt, undermining all that we hold dear. We know what they plan and we know what they are doing. We also know that the only way to oppose and defeat them is to build in the hearts and minds of our people an understanding, patriotic, moral, and spiritual strength that will stand not only as an impregnable wall against their sinister assaults, but as well, a monument of strength declaring to all the world that liberty, equality, and justice can and will prevail.

This conflict is not one of just a day or even years, but is a continuation of that age-long struggle to uplift mankind. You, in your lifetime, if you are to preserve the dignity and worth of your heritage, will have to devote your total efforts to warding off the catastrophe that would ensue should

fascism or communism succeed in achieving their goals. Such a catastrophe would erase the little progress that man has made toward uplifting himself, and civilization would be set back at least a thousand years. All that we hold dear in these United States would be lost, not even to be recorded as a part of history. But such a calamity cannot occur because you are worthy of the faith placed in you. You are an American, understanding, cherishing, and willing to defend the ideal upon which this Nation was founded. The ideal that the soul of man is more precious than the most fabulous accumulation of material wealth. That ideal is built into the structure of our Nation like girders of steel, and is set forth in those instruments of government which have served as blueprints for the plan we have followed to build this, the greatest Nation in the world.

Some of those instruments that are basic to the security of your rights, privileges, and responsibilities as freemen in a free Nation under God, are in part, reproduced in this booklet. Material wealth will pass away because it can be stored only in perishable and inanimate vaults, but the truths, ideals, and dynamic import of these instruments will last forever if they are stored in the immortal hearts and minds of men. Read these documents, learn them, and make them a part of your very being, that through you, "This Nation may continue as one deriving its just powers from the consent of the governed," and, "that government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth."

WM. W. JONES, *Principal.*

Presidents of the United States

	Took office	Political party
1. George Washington	1789	Federalist.
2. John Adams	1797	Do.
3. Thomas Jefferson	1801	Democratic-Republican.
4. James Madison	1809	Do.
5. James Monroe	1817	Do.
6. John Quincy Adams	1825	National Republican.
7. Andrew Jackson	1829	Democrat.
8. Martin Van Buren	1837	Do.
9. William H. Harrison	1841	Whig.
10. John Tyler	1841	Do.
11. James K. Polk	1845	Democrat.
12. Zachary Taylor	1849	Whig.
13. Millard Fillmore	1850	Do.
14. Franklin Pierce	1853	Democrat.
15. James Buchanan	1857	Do.
16. Abraham Lincoln	1861	Republican.
17. Andrew Johnson	1865	Do.
18. Ulysses S. Grant	1869	Do.
19. Rutherford B. Hayes	1877	Do.
20. James A. Garfield	1881	Do.
21. Chester A. Arthur	1881	Do.
22. Grover Cleveland	1885	Democrat.
23. Benjamin Harrison	1889	Republican.
24. Grover Cleveland	1893	Democrat.
25. William McKinley	1897	Republican.
26. Theodore Roosevelt	1901	Do.
27. William H. Taft	1909	Do.
28. Woodrow Wilson	1913	Democrat.
29. Warren G. Harding	1921	Republican.
30. Calvin Coolidge	1923	Do.
31. Herbert C. Hoover	1929	Do.
32. Franklin D. Roosevelt	1933	Democrat.
33. Harry S. Truman	1945	Do.

THE STAR-SPANGLED BANNER

(By Francis Scott Key)

(Our national anthem has a dignity of tone and measure that inspires respect and patriotic fervor in the hearts of all true Americans. Here we have printed only the first and last stanzas. This last stanza sets forth our motto and breathes a prayerful and thankful spirit that should more truly express the feelings of our people. We should sing it more often.—W. W. J.)

O say! can you see, by the dawn's early light,
What so proudly we hail'd at the twilight's last gleaming?
Whose broad stripes and bright stars, thro' the perilous fight,
O'er the ramparts we watch'd were so gallantly streaming?
And the rocket's red glare, the bombs bursting in air,
Gave proof thro' the night that our Flag was still there.
O say, does that Star-Spangled Banner yet wave
O'er the land of the free and the home of the brave?

O thus be it ever when free-men shall stand
Between their Lov'd homes and the war's desolation
Blest with vict'ry and peace, may the Heav'n rescued land
Praise the Pow'r that hath made and preserved us a nation!
Then conquer we must, when our cause it is just,
And this be our motto: "In God is our trust!"
And the Star-Spangled Banner in triumph shall wave
O'er the land of the free and the home of the brave.

THE AMERICAN'S CREED

(By William Tyler Page)

(The American's Creed is the composite of a number of outstanding statements by patriotic American statesmen. It embodies in its brief statement many of the beliefs and ideals which are basic to our form of government. You should learn it gladly.—W. W. J.)

I believe in the United States of America as a Government of the people, by the people, for the people; whose just powers are derived from the consent of the governed; a democracy in a republic; a sovereign Nation of many sovereign States; a perfect union, one and inseparable; established upon those principles of freedom, equality, justice, and humanity for which American patriots sacrificed their lives and fortunes.

I therefore believe it is my duty to my country to love it; to support its Constitution; to obey its laws; to respect its flag; and to defend it against all enemies.

PREAMBLE TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

(The preamble is probably the most important part of our Constitution in that it definitely sets forth the fact that ours is a Government of the people, since they are the ones who established it. You should know the preamble so well that you could recite it under any circumstances.—W. W. J.)

We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

GETTYSBURG ADDRESS

(Lincoln's Gettysburg Address is the most eloquent statement of American ideals and principles in American literature. Learning his words should give you a deep patriotic satisfaction because those words are still the hope of America.—E. J. M.)

Four score and seven years ago our fathers brought forth upon this continent a new Nation, conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal. Now we are engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that Nation, or any nation, so conceived and so dedicated, can long endure. We are met on a great battlefield of that war. We have come to dedicate a portion of that field as a final resting-place for those who here gave their lives that that Nation might live. It is altogether fitting and proper that we should do this.

But in a larger sense we cannot dedicate, we cannot consecrate, we cannot hallow, this ground. The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here, have consecrated it far above our poor power to add or to detract. The world will little note nor long remember what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here. It is for us, the living rather, to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion—that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain, that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom, and that government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth.—ABRAHAM LINCOLN.

PREAMBLE TO THE CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS

We the peoples of the United Nations determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind, and to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of human persons, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small, and to establish conditions under which justice and respect for the obligations arising from treaties and other sources of international law can be maintained, and to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom, and for these ends to practice tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbors, and to unite our strength to maintain international peace and security, and to ensure, by the acceptance of principles and the institution of methods, that armed force shall not be used, save in the common interest, and to employ international machinery for the promotion of the economic and social advancement of all peoples, have resolved to combine our efforts to accomplish these aims.

Accordingly, our respective Governments, through representatives assembled in the city of San Francisco, who have exhibited their full powers found to be in good and due form, have agreed to the present Charter of the United Nations and do hereby establish an international organization to be known as the United Nations.

DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

(A declaration by the Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled July 4, 1776)

When, in the course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume, among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the laws of nature and of nature's God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to separation.

We hold these truths to be self-evident: That all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That, to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed; that, whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute a new government, laying its foundation on such principles, and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness. Prudence, indeed, will dictate that governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes; and accordingly all experience hath shown that

mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed. But when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same object, evinces a design to reduce them under absolute despotism, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such government, and to provide new guards for their future security. Such has been the patient sufferance of these Colonies; and such is now the necessity which constrains them to alter their former systems of government. The history of the present King of Great Britain is a history of repeated injuries and usurpations, all having in direct object the establishment of an absolute tyranny over these states. To prove this, let facts be submitted to a candid world.

He has refused his assent to laws the most wholesome and necessary for the public good.

He has forbidden his governors to pass laws of immediate and pressing importance, unless suspended in their operation till his assent should be obtained; and, when so suspended, he has utterly neglected to attend to them.

He has refused to pass other laws for the accommodation of large districts of people, unless those people would relinquish the right of representation in the legislature—a right inestimable to them, and formidable to tyrants only.

He has called together legislative bodies at places unsual, uncomfortable, and distant from the depository of their public records, for the sole purpose of fatiguing them into compliance with his measure.

He has dissolved representative houses repeatedly, for opposing, with manly firmness, his invasions on the rights of the people.

He has refused for a long time after such dissolutions, to cause others to be elected, whereby the legislative powers, incapable of annihilation, have returned to the people at large for their exercise; the state remaining, in the meantime, exposed to all the dangers of invasions from without and convulsions within.

He has endeavored to prevent the population of these states; for that purpose obstructing the laws for the naturalization of foreigners, refusing to pass others to encourage their migration hither, and raising the conditions of new appropriations of lands.

He has obstructed the administration of justice, by refusing his assent to laws for establishing judiciary powers.

He has made judges dependent on his will alone for the tenure of their offices, and the amount and payment of their salaries.

He has erected a multitude of new offices and sent hither swarms of officers to harass our people and eat out their substance.

He has kept among us in times of peace, standing armies, without the consent of our legislatures.

He has affected to render the military independent of, and superior to, the civil power.

He has combined with others to subject us to a jurisdiction foreign to our Constitution and unacknowledged by our laws, giving his assent to their acts of pretended legislation:

For quartering large bodies of armed troops among us.

For protecting them, by a mock trial, from punishment for any murders which they should commit on the inhabitants of these states.

For cutting off our trade with all parts of the world.

For imposing taxes on us without our consent.

For depriving us, in many cases, of the benefits of trial by jury.

For transporting us beyond seas, to be tried for pretended offenses.

For abolishing the free system of English laws in a neighboring province, establishing therein an arbitrary government, and enlarging its boundaries, so as to render it at once an example and fit instrument for introducing the same absolute rule into these colonies.

For taking away our charters, abolishing our most valuable laws, and altering, fundamentally, the forms of our governments.

For suspending our own legislatures, and declaring themselves invested with power to legislate for us in all cases whatsoever.

He has abdicated government here, by declaring us out of his protection and waging war against us.

He has plundered our seas, ravaged our coasts, burned our towns, and destroyed the lives of our people.

He is at this time transporting large armies of foreign mercenaries to complete the works of death, desolation, and tyranny already begun with circumstances of cruelty and perfidy scarcely paralleled in the most barbarous ages, and totally unworthy the head of a civilized nation.

He has constrained our fellow citizens, taken captive on the high seas, to bear arms against their country, to become the executioners of their friends and brethren, or to fall themselves by their hands.

He has excited domestic insurrections among us, and has endeavored to bring on the inhabitants of our frontiers the merciless Indian savages, whose known rule of warfare is an undistinguished destruction of all ages, sexes, and conditions.

In every stage of these oppressions we have petitioned for redress in the most humble terms; our repeated petitions have been answered only by repeated injury. A prince whose character is thus marked by every act which may define a tryant is unfit to be the ruler of a free people.

Nor have we been wanting in our attentions to our British brethren. We have warned them, from time to time, of attempts by their legislature to extend an unwarrantable jurisdiction over us. We have reminded them of the circumstances of our emigration and settlement here. We have appealed to their native justice and magnanimity; and we have conjured them by the ties of common kindred, to disavow these usurpations, which would inevitably interrupt our connections and correspondence. They, too, have been deaf to the voice of justice and consanguinity. We must, therefore, acquiesce in the necessity which denounces our separation, and hold them, as we hold the rest of mankind, enemies in war, in peace, friends.

We therefore, the representatives of the United States of America, in general Congress assembled, appealing to the supreme judge of the world for the rectitude of our intentions, do, in the name and by the authority of the good people of these Colonies, solemnly publish and declare, that these united colonies are, and of right ought to be, free and independent states; that they are absolved from all allegience to the British Crown, and that all political connection between them and the state of Great Britain is, and ought to be, totally dissolved; and that, as free and independent states, they have full power to levy war, conclude peace, contract alliances, establish commerce, and do all other acts and things which independent states may of right do. And, for the support of this declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of divine providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor.

HICH LIGHTS OF AMERICAN HISTORY

1. 1492: Columbus discovered America.
2. 1542: Cabrillo discovered California.
3. 1607: Jamestown, first permanent English settlement.
4. 1619: Negro slavery begun in America.
5. 1620: Plymouth colony established.
6. 1763: End of French and Indian War; French possessions taken by England.
7. 1775–83: Revolutionary War for independence.
8. 1776: July 4, Declaration of Independence signed.
9. 1781: Capture of Cornwallis at Yorktown.
10. 1787: Constitution framed at Philadelphia.
11. 1789: George Washington inaugurated first President.
12. 1803: "Louisiana Purchase" from France.
13. 1812–15: War of 1812 with England.
14. 1823: Monroe Doctrine.
15. 1830: Beginning of railroads.
16. 1844: Morse's telegraph.
17. 1845: Annexation of Texas to the Union.
18. 1846: Oregon boundary dispute with England settled.
19. 1846–48: Mexican War; California and New Mexico ceded to United States.
20. 1848: Gold discovered in California.
21. 1850: September 9, California entered Union (admission day).
22. 1861–65: Civil War over slavery and secession.
23. 1863: Emancipation Proclamation.
24. 1867: Purchase of Alaska from Russia.
25. 1869: First transcontinental railroad.
26. 1876: Bell's telephone.
27. 1898: Spanish-American War; United States took Philippines.
28. 1901: Marconi's first wireless signal across Atlantic.
29. 1903: Wright brothers' airplane flight.
30. 1914–18: World War I.
31. 1941: December 7, Pearl Harbor.
32. 1945: End of hostilities—World War II.

A SUMMARY OF THE BILL OF RIGHTS AND SUBSEQUENT AMENDMENTS

Article 1: Freedom of speech, religion, the press, and assembly.

Article 2: The right to keep and bear arms.

Article 3: No soldier to be quartered without consent.

Article 4: Regulation of search and seizure.

Article 5: Prosecution, trial, and punishment for crime. Compensation for private property taken for public use.

Article 6: Right to speedy trial, witnesses, etc., in criminal prosecutions.

Article 7: Right of trial by jury in suits at common law.

Article 8: Prohibiting excessive bail, fines or cruel punishments.

Article 9: Retention of rights not enumerated in the Constitution.

Article 10: Rights reserved to the States or the people.

Subsequent amendments

Article 11, 1795: Judicial powers explained.

Article 12, 1804: Method of choosing the President and Vice President revised.

Article 13, 1865: Slavery prohibited.

Article 14, 1868: Rights of citizenship are not to be deprived any person.

Article 15, 1870: Colored and white citizens have equal rights.

Article 16, 1913: Congress shall have the power to levy income taxes.

Article 17, 1913: Senators of the United States are to be elected by direct popular vote.

Article 18, 1920: Prohibition of the sale, manufacture, and transportation of liquors.

Article 19, 1920: The right to vote shall not be denied because of sex.

Article 20, 1933: The terms of President and Vice President are to begin on January 20, Senators and Representatives on January 3.

Article 21, 1933: The Eighteenth Amendment to the Constitution is repealed.

I AM THE UNITED STATES

(Benjamin DeCasseres makes the United States talk—giving a record of historical events that have made our country great.—J. M.)

For 150 years all the peoples of the earth have held me as a hope in their eyes.

Every revolution in the last 150 years that had for its aim more freedom has modeled its laws on my Constitution.

From the four corners of the earth people of all colors, religions, and races have set sail to make their home under the folds of Old Glory.

In 150 years I have raised the level of wages and living to the highest point ever attained in all historic time.

I have given more persons opportunities to raise themselves, under my individualistic-capitalistic-free-enterprise system, from menial to commanding positions than any other nation in the world, past or present.

I have guaranteed to each and all, native and foreign, free speech, a free pen, freedom of religion, and trial by jury.

I have abolished slavery and succored the victims of flood, famine, and earthquake everywhere on earth.

I have given the world the greatest symbol for all time of revolt against oppression—George Washington.

I have given the world the greatest expounder of individualistic democracy and personal freedom in the history of mankind—Thomas Jefferson.

I have given the world the greatest symbol of a liberator of an enslaved people and the most humane ruler in time of civil war that history records—Abraham Lincoln.

I have made the words "liberty" and "America" synonymous.

I have given the world in a Congress, a Supreme Court, and an Executive the best-balanced governmental set-up in history.

No call from an oppressed people has ever gone unanswered by me.

When I have made mistakes—and I have made some great ones—I have admitted them finally and tried to rectify whatever injustice may have flowed from them.

My mighty rivers, towering mountains, my prairies, my forests, and my oceans have been open to travel for all my people without police permits or a spy system.

I was born in Philadelphia on July 4, 1776.

I gave the world its model Constitution on September 17, 1787.

I froze, shoeless, in the snow at Valley Forge.

I hung on by a hair for my life at Gettysburg.

I freed Europe and myself from the deadly menace of Prussian militarism in 1917–18.

Today I lift myself to my full proud height and proclaim that I who froze at Valley Forge and battled for my life at Gettysburg shall lay in the dust those enemies who again seek to enslave me. For I am democracy in action. I am the United States.

I AM AN AMERICAN

Are you? Then you should be proud to make this statement yours. It expresses the American's humble gratitude for his priceless heritage, and acknowledges his duties and responsibilities.—J.M.

I am an American.
The Golden Rule is my rule.
In humility and with gratitude to Almighty God,
I acknowledge my undying debt
To the founding fathers
Who left me a priceless heritage
Which now is my responsibility.
With steadfast loyalty
I will uphold the Constitution
And the Bill of Rights.
I will treasure my birthright
Of American ideals.
I will place moral integrity
Above worldly possessions.
Problems of interest to my country
Shall be of interest to me.
I will count my right of suffrage
To be a sacred trust,
And I will diligently strive
To prove worthy of that trust.
I will give my full support
To upright public servants.
But those with unclean hands,
I will firmly oppose.
Each obligation that comes to me
As a true American,
I will discharge with honor.
My heart is in America
And America is in my heart.
I am an American.

—*Benjamin E. Neal.*

THE FREEDOM PLEDGE

(The Freedom Train, speeding through the land with the most treasured documents of our American heritage, inspired this pledge. In a few words it states the beliefs and desires of all true American patriots. It should be your pledge too.—J. M.)

I am an American. A free American.
Free to speak—without fear;
Free to worship God in my own way;
Free to stand for what I think right;
Free to oppose what I believe wrong;
Free to choose those who govern my country.
This heritage of freedom I pledge to uphold
For myself and all mankind.

FULL TEXT OF BILL OF RIGHTS

Amendment 1: Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercises thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

Amendment 2: A well-regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed.

Amendment 3: No soldier shall, in time of peace be quartered in any house, without the consent of the owner, nor in time of war, but in a manner to be prescribed by law.

Amendment 4: The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by oath of affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.

Amendment 5: No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a grand jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the militia, when in actual service in time of war or public danger; nor shall any person be subject in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.

Amendment 6: In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law, and to be informed of the nature of the accusation; to be confronted with the witness against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to have the assistance of counsel for his defense.

Amendment 7: In suits at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed $20, the right of trial by jury shall be preserved, and no fact tried by jury, shall be otherwise reexamined in any court of the United States, than according to the rules of the common law.

Amendment 8: Excessive bail shall not be required nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted.

Amendment 9: The enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

Amendment 10: The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

WHAT THE FLAG MEANS

(By Robert Quillen)

The newspapers report that a New England boy of good American stock has refused to pledge allegience to the flag.

Well, son, the notoriety and conflict and martyrdom may be exciting fun, but you don't realize what you are doing. Evidently nobody has taken the trouble to make you understand just what the flag means.

It isn't a mere strip of cloth with a cluster of stars in one corner.

It stands for America—not a certain area of the earth's surface, not even the millions who inhabit it, but the spirit of America—the ideals and standards and institutions that are typical of America.

It stands for freedom, for the right of every decent individual to do as he pleases without fear of lurking spies or brutal police.

It stands for the right to say what you please, within the bounds of decent taste, without dread of a heartless and tyrannical government.

It stands for the pledge that you will not be killed or tortured in prison or beaten or shamed on the street or deprived of all human rights if you happen to belong to a minority.

It stands for the assurance that no man can have you whipped or scorn you or deny you a chance to get ahead merely because his parents were rich and yours poor.

It stands for the promise that police shall not break into your house or keep you in prison without fair and public process of law.

It stands for the pledge that your mother and sister and sweetheart will be treated as human beings worthy of respect and not as chattels or work animals.

It stands for the assurance that every boy will have a fair chance to earn all he is worth; for the right to get a free enducation; for a land where the poor hold their heads high; for a land free of swarming, sullen, sore-covered, vermin-ridden professional beggers; for comfort and abundance and safety; for fair play and sympathy for the underdog and hatred for all corruption.

All these pledges and rights have been threatened many times and denied at intervals, because of the folly and greed and dishonor of individuals, but it isn't the fault of the flag. The flag still stands for these good and decent things coveted by all mankind.

And if you can't pledge allegiance to such a symbol and fight for it to the last breath, you have very little understanding or a very bad heart.

AMERICANISM

(Extension of remarks of Hon. Sol Bloom of New York in the House of Representatives, Thursday, January 11, 1940)

Article by the Right Reverend James E. Freeman, D. D., LL. D.

Americanism is complete and unqualified loyalty to the ideals of Government set forth in the Bill of Rights, the Declaration of Independence, and the Constitution of the United States. It is respect for and ready obedience to duly constituted authority and the laws of the land. It is freedom without license, religion without bigotry, respect for all nations without entangling alliances, Christian charity without bias or race hatred, love of flag and readiness to defend that for which it stands against every alien and subversive influence from without or within. This I believe, is Americanism.

(Extension of remarks of Hon. John G. Alexander, of Minnesota, in the House of Representatives, Wednesday, Jan. 3, 1940)

Article by K. L. Brown

Americanism is an abiding faith in the correctness and justice of the principles contained in the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States, and the Bill of Rights.

Americanism is a way of life, based on this abiding faith. It is a willingness to live in peace and harmony with our fellow men, regardless of political or religious faith.

Americanism is a willingness to apply the principles of free speech, free press, and freedom to worship God to our fellow men, even when their ideas and speech and methods of worship are opposed to our own.

Americanism is a willingness to live for the principles of America in peacetimes, as well as a willingness to die for American principles in war times.

Americanism brings to each American liberty under law, and a regard for law which means liberty and happiness for each of us.

THE CODE OF THE GOOD AMERICAN

(The Code of the Good American, prepared by William J. Hutchins, was awarded first place and a prize of $5,000 in a national competition conducted in 1916 by the Character Education Institution of Washington, D. C.)

Citizens who are good Americans try to become strong and useful, worthy of their nation, that our country may become ever greater and better. Therefore they obey the laws of right living which the best Americans have always obeyed.

1. The law of self-control

The good American controls himself. Those who best control themselves can best serve their country.

I will control my tongue, and will not allow it to speak mean, vulgar, or profane words. I will think before I speak. I will tell the truth and nothing but the truth.

I will control my temper, and will not get angry when people or things displease me. Even when indignant against wrong and contradicting falsehood, I will keep my self-control.

I will control my thoughts and will not allow a foolish wish to spoil a wise purpose.

I will control my actions. I will be careful and thrifty, and insist on doing right.

I will not ridicule nor defile the character of another. I will keep my self-respect and help others to keep theirs.

2. The law of good health

The good American tries to gain and keep good health. The welfare of our country depends upon those who are physically fit for their daily work. Therefore—

I will try to take such food, sleep, and exercise as will keep me always in good health.

I will keep my clothes, my body, and my mind clean.

I will avoid those habits which would harm me, and will make and never break those habits which will help me.

I will protect the health of others, and guard their safety as well as my own.

I will grow strong and skillful.

3. The law of kindness

The good American is kind. In America those who are different must live in the same communities. We are of many different sorts, but we are one great people. Every unkindness hurts the common life; every kindness helps. Therefore:

I will be kind in all my thoughts. I will bear no spites or grudges. I will never despise anybody.

I will be kind in all my speech. I will never gossip nor will I speak unkindly of anyone. Words may wound or heal.

I will be kind in my acts. I will not selfishly insist on having my own way. I will be polite: rude people are not good Americans. I will not make unnecessary trouble for those who work for me, nor forget to be grateful. I will be careful of other people's things. I will do my best to prevent cruelty, and will give help to those in need.

4. The law of sportsmanship

The good American plays fair. Clean play increases and trains one's strength and courage, and helps one to be more useful to one's country. Sportsmanship helps one to be a gentleman, a lady. Therefore:

I will not cheat, nor will I play for keeps or for money. If I should not play fair, the loser would lose the fun of the game, the winner would lose his self-respect, and the game itself would become a mean and often cruel business.

I will treat my opponents with courtesy, and trust them if they deserve it. I will be friendly.

If I play in a group game, I will not play for my own glory, but for the success of my team and the fun of the game.

I will be a good loser or a generous winner.

And in my work as well as in my play, I will be sportsmanlike—generous, fair, honorable.

5. The law of self-reliance

The good American is self-reliant: Self-conceit is silly, but self-reliance is necessary to citizens who would be strong and useful.

I will gladly listen to the advice of older and wiser people; I will reverence the wishes of those who love and care for me and who know life and me better than I. I will develop independence and wisdom to think for myself, according to what seems right and fair and wise.

I will not be afraid of being laughed at when I am right.

When in danger, trouble, or pain I will be brave. A coward does not make a good American.

6. The law of duty

The good American does his duty: The shirker and the willing idler live upon others and burden fellow citizens with work unfairly. They do not do their share, for their country's good.

I will try to find out what my duty is as a good American, and my duty I will do, whether it is easy or hard. What it is my duty to do I can do.

7. The law of reliability

The good American is reliable: Our country grows great and good as her citizens are able more fully to trust each other. Therefore:

I will be honest, in word and in act. I will not lie, sneak, or pretend.

I will not do wrong in the hope of not being found out. I cannot hide the truth from myself and cannot often hide it from others. Nor will I injure the property of others.

I will not take without permission what does not belong to me. A thief is a menace to me and others.

I will do promptly what I have promised to do. If I have made a foolish promise I will at once confess my mistake, and I will try to make good any harm which my mistake may have caused. I will so speak and act that people will find it easier to trust each other.

8. The law of truth

The good American is true. I will be slow to believe suspicions lest I do injustice; I will avoid hasty opinions lest I be mistaken as to facts.

I will stand by the truth regardless of my likes and dislikes, and scorn the temptation to lie for myself or friends; nor will I keep the truth from those who have a right to it.

I will hunt for proof, and be accurate as to what I see and hear; I will learn to think, that I may discover new truth.

9. The law of good workmanship

The good American tries to do the right thing in the right way. The welfare of our country depends upon those who have learned to do in the right way the work that makes civilization possible. Therefore:

I will get the best possible education, and learn all that I can as a preparation for the time when I am grown up and at my life work. I will invent and make things better if I can.

I will take real interest in work, and will not be satisfied to do slipshod, lazy, and merely passable work. I will form the habit of good work and keep alert; mistakes and blunders cause hardships, sometimes disaster, and spoil success.

I will make the right thing in the right way to give it value and beauty, even when no one else sees or praises me. But when I have done my best, I will not envy those who have done better, or have received larger reward. Envy spoils the work and the worker.

10. The law of teamwork

The good American works in friendly cooperation with fellow workers. One alone could not build a city or a great railroad. One alone would find it hard to build a bridge. That I may have bread, people have made plows and threshers, have built mills and mined coal, made stoves and kept stores. As we learn better how to work together, the welfare of our country is advanced.

In whatever work I do with others, I will do my part and encourage others to do their part, promptly, quickly.

I will help to keep in order the things which we use in our work. When things are out of place, they are often in the way, and sometimes they are hard to find.

In all my work with others, I will be cheerful. Cheerlessness depresses all other workers and injures all the work.

When I have received money for my work, I will be neither a miser nor a spendthrift. I will save or spend as one of the friendly workers of America.

11. The law of loyalty

The good American is loyal. If our America is to become even greater and better, her citizens must be loyal, devotedly faithful, in every relation of life; full of courage and regardful of their honor.

I will be loyal to my family. In loyalty I will gladly obey my parents or those who are in their place, and show them gratitude. I will do my best to help each member of my family to strength and usefulness.

I will be loyal to my school. In loyalty I will obey and help other pupils to obey those rules which further the good of all.

I will be loyal to my town, my State, my country. In loyalty I will respect and help others to respect their laws and their courts of justice.

I will be loyal to humanity and civilization. In loyalty I will do my best to help the friendly relations of our country with every other country, and to give to everyone in every land the best possible chance. I will seek truth and wisdom; I will work and achieve if I can, some good for the civilization into which I have been born.

If I try simply to be loyal to my family, I may be disloyal to my school. If I try simply to be loyal to my school, I may be disloyal to my town, my State, and my country. If I try simply to be loyal to my town, State, and country, I may be disloyal to humanity. I will try above all things else to be loyal to humanity; then I shall surely be loyal to my country, my State, and my town, to my school and to my family. And this loyalty to humanity will keep me faithful to civilization.

He who obeys the law of loyalty obeys all of the other 10 laws of the good American.

THE AMERICAN BILL OF RESPONSIBILITIES

(A good citizen should know what his rights and privileges are, but even more important, a good citizen should know what his duties and responsibilities are. You will find listed below some of the rights and privileges that are guaranteed to you by the Federal Constitution, and also, a listing of your duties and responsibilities. In a democracy each citizen must accept responsibility and do his duty in order to keep and preserve the rights and privileges he enjoys.—E. J. M.)

Free speech: You must be willing to allow others to speak, even though you disagree. You must not use this right to injure others. It is wrong to use this right to advocate the change of your Government by the use of force.

Freedom of the press: You should read widely and wisely. You should not write or have printed things that are untrue or that would injure others. You should insist that others print the truth.

Freedom of worship: You should respect the religious beliefs of others. You should support and become a worker in some church.

The right to petition the Government: You should write to your elected officers. You should help to correct wrongs done to others. You should join organizations that work democratically to preserve and improve our democracy.

The right to assemble peaceably: You should plan, organize, and take part in meetings which advance the cause of democracy and our way of life.

The right to be protected from loss of life, liberty, or property: Help to protect the property of others and public property. Guard your actions so that they might not endanger the life or property of others. Help others to avoid having their legal rights infringed upon.

Right to a fair trial: Serve on juries when called, appear as witness when you have information that is helpful to enforcement of the laws. Respect law-enforcement officers. Obey the law. Help officers catch lawbreakers.

Right to be safe from unreasonable search and seizure: Respect the privacy of others in their homes, mail, telephone calls, and conversations. Do all you can to see that others do not violate this right of your fellow citizens.

Right to go where you wish and do work of your choice: Do not try to limit the movement of others. Do the kind of work you can do best. Do your best in your work.

Right to make contracts and agreements and have them enforced: Read all agreements carefully. Carry out all contracts you make. Be sure both parties have the same understanding of the contract. Do not enter any contract except in good faith.

Federal constitutional rights: Make every effort to prevent local officials or groups from denying lawful rights to citizens or groups of citizens within your community.

Right to vote for local, State, and Federal officials: Vote whenever an election is held. Keep yourself informed about candidates and issues. Encourage others to vote.

The rights to be a candidate for public office: Be willing to accept nomination for public office if your ability can help your community, State, or Nation.

Right to bear arms: Use weapons safely and only for legal purposes. Obey laws regarding firearms; use firearms only to protect your home, pursuing criminals, or hunting.

Right to make profit on your own invention or ideas: Make every effort to see that the profits from inventions, writings, and works of art go to the person who creates them.

Right to bankruptcy procedures: Make every effort to encourage those who fail to make a new start.

Rights of impeachment and recall of officials: Demand proof of dishonesty of public officials. Respect those you elect to public office. Report any dishonesty you know about.

Rights to be protected when in foreign nations: Remember that when you are in a foreign nation you represent the United States, and conduct yourself accordingly. Be willing to serve your Nation in time of war.

Statehood Now for Alaska and Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 8, 1950

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Martins Ferry (Ohio) Times Leader for Tuesday, May 2, 1950. My stand on statehood for Alaska and Hawaii is well known, and I am happy to place in the RECORD this editorial from one of the outstanding newspapers in my district:

STATEHOOD NOW FOR ALASKA AND HAWAII

This session of Congress should grant statehood to Alaska and Hawaii.

The people of these two Territories are eager and able to assume the rights and responsibilities of self-government.

The arguments for admitting them to full partnership in the Union seem to us overwhelmingly strong.

President Truman is for giving them statehood.

The Democratic and Republican national platforms promise them statehood.

The National Conference of Governors and the Governors' Conference of the 11 Western States have adopted unanimous resolutions endorsing their pleas for statehood.

And large majorities in one branch of Congress—the House of Representatives—have passed bills to give them statehood.

All this would seem to indicate that they have an excellent prospect of getting statehood this year.

But that is not the case. Serious obstacles lie ahead.

The bills are before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the climate there is, to say the most, only mildly favorable.

The Alaska statehood bill, on which the committee is now holding hearings, is in trouble.

Only a handful of Senators have shown up at the hearings so far, all favoring statehood for Alaska, in principle, but some of them appearing to favor it for the future, not just now.

Objections have been raised that the terms of the bill aren't generous enough in grants of land to the proposed new government of Alaska.

But Territorial Governor Gruening and the Territory's voteless Delegate to Congress, E. R. BARTLETT, are happy with the bill as it stands.

They say it gives Alaska the same treatment given New Mexico and Arizona, the last two States admitted. They believe opponents are trying to kill the bill with kindness—to make it so liberal that it would never pass.

BARTLETT charges the salmon-packing industry with spearheading opposition because it fears operation of a State government might mean higher taxes.

But Alaska needs statehood so that its people can supervise development of their own rich resources, increase population and wealth, gain ability to support the kind of government they want.

The Senate committee starts hearings on the Hawaii bill next week, and it, too, will encounter difficulties.

The Truman administration is pressing for early, favorable action on both bills. It should press harder, and the American people should support its efforts.

Get statehood for Alaska and Hawaii out of committee and up for a vote in the Senate before these bills are lost in an adjournment log jam.

Outstanding Civic Leaders of Chicago Urge Extension of Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, May 6, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the board of governors of the Metropolitan Housing and Planning Council of Chicago is composed of outstanding civic leaders representing all groups in our city. Perhaps no one is closer to the housing situation in Chicago, and can speak on the matter of the necessity for extending rent control with more authority, than the members of this board.

That my colleagues may have the benefit of the conclusion reached by the civic leaders of Chicago who are so close to the situation and have made such an intensive first-hand study of all the problems relating to housing, I am extending my remarks to include the following resolution passed on May 3, 1950, by the board of governors of the Metropolitan Housing and Planning Council of Chicago:

"Whereas the removal of rent controls would create devastating hardships, primarily to families of low and lower-middle income; and

"Whereas experience has revealed that the removal of controls results in a drastic rise in rents (as was apparent in the removal of controls on hotels), which inevitably generates an accelerated inflationary spiral; and

"Whereas there is machinery for local decontrol and local petitions where arranged: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Metropolitan Housing and Planning Council of Chicago urges that the Congress of the United States extend the present Federal Rent Control Act for 1 year from June 1, 1950."

Passed by the board of governors May 3, 1950.

The members of the board of governors, which passed the above resolution, are Saul Alinsky; Arthur Bohnen; Aldis J. Browne, Jr.; Earl B. Dickerson; George H. Dovenmuehle; Harvey G. Ellerd; Marshall Field, Jr.; John R. Fugard; Ernest A. Grunsfeld, Jr.; Henry T. Heald; Frank A. Hecht; Porter M. Jarvis; Elmer C. Jensen; Joseph D. Keenan; Philip M. Kultznick; Glen Lloyd; Mrs. Arthur Lowestein; Michael Mann; Mrs. Walker G. McLaury; George A. Morgan; Mrs. Bradford L. Patton; Mrs. Maurice A. Pollak; Wilfred S. Reynolds; Leonard M. Rieser; Walter V. Schaefer; Alfred Shaw; Hermon D. Smith; Sydney Stein, Jr.; Lea D. Taylor; John L. Van Zandt; Albert J. Weisberg; Louis Wirth; George Young, and the officers.

The officers of the council, included in the membership of the board, are Ford Kramer, president; Howard E. Green, vice president; Byron C. Sharpe, vice president; Edward McC. Blair, vice president; Mrs. Sewall Wright, secretary; Walter L. Cohrs, treasurer.

Mrs. Frederick H. Rubel is the director of the council.

Do Not Be Fooled by Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 8, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, with permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I attach the following article, Do Not Be Fooled by Propaganda, by Joseph D. Keenan, director of Labor's League for Political Education, which appears in the May issue of the American Federationist. It is a clear, concise analysis of the kind of nonsense being directed at American workers by those who pretend to protect them.

The article is as follows:

"The rights and interests of the laboring man will be protected and cared for * * * not by the labor agitators but by the Christian men to whom, in His infinite wisdom, God has given control of the property interests of the country and upon management of which so much depends."

With those words George F. Baer, president of the Philadelphia and Reading Coal and Iron Co., answered the plea of a miner's son during the terrible coal strike of 1902. The miner's son, William F. Clark, died in Wilkes-Barre, Pa., just a few weeks ago. But the answer he got from the arrogant coal company president shocked the Nation in 1902 and will long live on in the memories of trade-union men.

Do you think things have changed since 1902? If you do, you are partly right. Today unions are stronger and collective bargaining is accepted by the public. Today it is not good public relations for a boss to say he has the divine right and wisdom to rule the lives of his employees as he sees fit and the public be damned. But because industry heads today can't come right out and say they want to abolish unions, it doesn't mean they would not like to do so.

Today they use subtler means. They say the day of despotic capitalism is over. They say the situation is reversed. They aver that it is the labor bosses who are dictating to big business and to the unfortunate workingmen who have been forced into labor monopolies.

CROCODILE TEARS

The antiunion industrialists of 1950 weep crocodile tears for these poor working people who have fallen under the heartless rule of the agitators and labor bosses.

What were the arguments passed out by the proponents of the Taft-Hartley Act? Did they assert that it was an act to destroy unions and outlaw collective bargaining? Of course not. According to them, it was an act to "liberate" the workers. It was an act to give poor, oppressed industry heads equal bargaining power and protection against "big labor."

Former Congressman Fred Hartley has written a book, Our New National Labor Policy. In that book he has sought to justify passage of the Taft-Hartley Act. Says he:

"The positions of labor and management were reversed. * * * Labor was in the saddle and riding hard. * * * Top labor leaders were equal in power to the elected heads of our Government. Their power had long ago surpassed that of the largest corporation in the Nation."

Hartley further states:

"The plight of the laboring man was a real one. The rank-and-file worker meant no more to the leaders of organized labor than the rabble to Louis XVI."

Hartley praises Dixiecrat GRAHAM BARDEN, of North Carolina, as a man who "had nothing but contempt for the labor racketeer and the professional union agitator." Throughout the book Hartley consistently uses the term "labor boss" to describe elected union officers.

When they enacted the Taft-Hartley law over a Presidential veto, the labor haters evidently believed their own words. They made union shop elections compulsory. The labor-haters were sure that American working people would flock to the polls and vote against their unions. What happened is history now. By overwhelming majorities, 98 percent of the elections favored the union shop. Is there any other institution in America that could have won a greater vote of confidence?

SALARY COMPARISONS

Compare the salaries of so-called union bosses with those of industry bosses. Even top union salaries are low by comparison. The two top officials of the A. F. of L. and CIO, William Green and Philip Murray, draw salaries of only $25,000 each. By contrast, A. B. Homer, president of the Bethlehem Steel Corp., got a total salary and bonus income of $263,280 in 1948. When Homer retires at 65, he will receive a pension of $110,460 a year, toward which he contributes not one cent. Benjamin Fairless, president of United States Steel, drew $207,900 in 1948. Tom Girdler, chairman of Republic Steel, drew $275,000 in 1948 and the president and five vice presidents of Republic each drew more than $70,000.

All the income of all the unions in the country didn't equal the net profits realized last year by just one automobile corporation, General Motors.

Even more ridiculous is the charge of the propagandists for big business that union members don't democratically select their officers and have no control over them. Here the contrast with industry is also startling.

Ask yourself, Can you name one institution that is more democratic than your union? Or how about the firm for which you work? Who selects the board of directors? Who selects the top executives? Do the stockholders control the firm they own? Or is it controlled by a few insiders who own little of the stock?

Take, for example, the country's biggest corporation, American Telephone and Telegraph Co., commonly known as the Bell system. Walter S. Gifford just recently retired as head of A. T. and T. He received an annual salary of $209,000 and now gets a pension of $95,000 a year.

INSIDE CONTROLS

This company is running advertisements that 900,000 stockholders own A. T. & T. But as any A. T. & T. stockholder knows, the divorce of ownership and control of the company was accomplished years ago. Mr. Gifford and other inside top officials and directors own only 1 of each 2,300 shares that provided the company's capital. This is just four-hundredths of 1 percent of all the stock. Yet these insiders control this huge company just as surely as if they owned all the stock.

A similar situation exists in most corporations today.

Read the average corporation financial statement sent to stockholders. It is a masterpiece of vague confusion. Compare it to the detailed financial reports available to all union members and checked by their elected trustees. Remember there are far more banking and business officials than union officials in prison for embezzling money.

Are all trade-union officers plaster saints? No. Sometime unqualified people are elected to office. But at least union members can elect new officers. They have not lost control of their unions in the way that stockholders have lost control of the corporations they own. The best proof of that is in the A. F. of L. mailing room in Washington. There are more than 40,000 local A. F. of L. unions. Officers turn over so fast that 40 percent of the address plates of local union officers have to be changed each year. Is that "dictatorship of self-perpetuating labor bosses"?

Remember these facts when you are handed some of the Senator TAFT's leaflets in which he says that only the Communists and union racketeers want repeal of Taft-Hartley.

SHOOTING AT SECURITY

When they say a particular law is aimed at your officers, not you, don't be fooled. When they weaken the right and power of your elected leaders to represent you effectively, they are taking a direct shot at your security and your paycheck.

The kind of Congress we get depends upon the kind of job we do on Election Day. If we fail to reelect our friends, we may well be put back to the good old days when neither the stockholder, the public nor the employees had any control over the arbitrary dictates of industry heads. If you want your wages and security protected by strong unions and freely elected officers, your vote is needed this election year.

Remember that in 1946 we failed to reelect 45 out of 128 Representatives who voted for labor against the Case antilabor bill. But in 1948 every friend of labor was reelected. Which will it be this year?

It is up to the 8,000,000 members of the A. F. of L. How? Contribute to LLPE, participate in LLPE, register and vote.

The other side may have the money, but we have the votes.

If all of us use our votes as good citizens, then we will have a strong and prosperous America with true freedom for all and true competitive enterprise operating for the prosperity and the happiness of everybody.

Problems Confronting Marine Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 8, 1950

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I include a splendid address delivered by our colleague, Representative DONALD JACKSON, of California, before the national convention of the Marine Corps Reserve Officers Association at the Washington Hotel, Saturday, May 6:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, it is indeed a great privilege and an honor to be here with you this afternoon and to have an opportunity to talk

quite frankly about some of the problems confronting the Marine Corps today, and to possibly indicate to many of you what you can do as individuals and in the organizations to which you all belong.

In common with every other American who has ever served in the United States Marine Corps, I have a deep sense of gratification and pride. It is not possible to see service in that great fighting organization without taking unto oneself a measure of the spirit of the corps which has characterized it during the course of a long and illustrious history.

As a matter of fact, and in some quarters, I am known as something of a nuisance when the subject of the Marine Corps is mentioned. It is true that I have taken the floor of the House of Representatives on many occasions to call to the attention of the membership of that great body some impending threat to the integrity or the function of that outfit. But, as eternal vigilance is truly the price of liberty, so is it the price, these days, for the continued existence of a strong, well-equipped, and adequately manned United States Marine Corps. I should be less than frank if I did not state without equivocation that there are those in high policy positions here in Washington who would prefer to see the Marine Corps abolished. Some of these individuals come to their position out of an honest, if very much misguided, conviction that the functions of the Marine Corps are in no sense so vital that they could not be assimilated into other components of the Armed Forces. Others of our detractors simply state frankly, and with no apology, that the Marine Corps has outlived its usefulness, consists of nothing but a glorified pageantry of press agentry, and is in general a force disruptive to the policies of unification.

To these individuals I would say, quite as frankly, that the alleged unification of the armed services has been one of the greatest legislative fiascos in the history of this country. I say that, despite the fact that I voted for the measure in good faith and in the belief that certain phases of our military and naval operations were in truth and in fact overlapping and duplicating. However, unification, as such, has not served to alleviate the basic and fundamental problems of the national defense. There are those who will take violent disagreement with the statement I have just made. Perhaps there are some in this room who feel that we have made substantial progress toward a true spirit of unification throughout the several branches of the Armed Forces. If complete disruption of morale in the Naval Establishment can be termed an outward and beneficial example of unification, then indeed we are making progress. If retaliatory and punitive steps taken to silence any statement of honest conviction on the part of those who disagree with official dictates from the Office of the Secretary of Defense is indeed making progress toward the unification of the armed services, then perhaps we are moving forward along the desired course of action. If, to create an intellectual Siberia for American officers and men in the armed services who happen to sin in that they disagree, then perhaps unification has indeed been the panacea for the ills of interservice rivalry. I realize, Mr. Chairman, and distinguished guests, that these are blunt statements, but I am also convinced that the hour is at hand for blunt speaking. The Congress of the United States, in passing the unification measure, did not intend that a vast bureau of unlimited powers was to take the place of the separate service groupings which had preceded the legislative act. Neither did it intend to create a situation in which the dice were to be loaded against any one branch of the armed services. It did not intend to create a Frankenstein monster, with the power or the inclination to veto the acts of the legislaive branch, such as we have seen happen on several occasions. When the Congress of the United States authorizes construction of a flush-deck carrier, or a circular carrier, or a square carrier, or a flat submarine, or any other type of construction which has been duly approved by those responsible for design in the Department of the Navy, it is my contention that no bureau chief and no department head in the Government of the United States holds the right to veto that authorization or any subsequent appropriation. The House of Representatives and the Senate are still presumed to be the spokesmen for the people of this country, and I shall resist any suggestion that their legislative acts can be overridden or disregarded by the executive branch of Government, except through open and due process of Executive veto. The system of checks and balances established when this Republic was born placed very definite limitations on the powers to be exercised by the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the Government. This power has been abused and continues to be abused in the instance of the Military Establishment, and the issue has now become one which is much greater than the personal fortunes or the careers of any officer in any of the armed services. The fundamental question now to be decided is whether or not the Congress of the United States is to legislate for the 160,000,000 people in this country, or whether that legislation is to be initiated and implemented by the Secretary of Defense or by any other appointed official.

The United States Marine Corps stands in danger today, gentlemen, not from public opinion, but from the executive decrees of appointed officials, who in many cases can act with entire legality, although in violation of clear intent, within the framework of the legislation passed by the Congress. It has been stated, and I see no reason to take issue with the statement, that the Marine Corps could today be reduced to the strength of a platoon and kept in that status indefinitely. True, according to the legislation which was written during the Eightieth Congress, one of the functions of the platoon would be the development of techniques in amphibious operation, but there is nothing to insure that they would have anything more to work with than a pair of water wings and an Old Town canoe. Public opinion is with the United States Marine Corps. From one end of this country to the other, former marines, parents of marines, and interested citizens who share in the pride of the corps, have written to me, imploring me to take whatever action I could to insure that the structure of the Marine Corps would not be destroyed. That, gentlemen, is a large order. We who have served in the Marine Corps hold a narrow beachhead in the Congress of the United States. There are those who have done magnificent work in protecting the corps and in trying to insure its continued progress and adequate appropriations for the job it has to do.

MANSFIELD of Montana; DAGUE of Pennsylvania; CASE of South Dakota; SMATHERS of Florida, the latter, in case you have not received the intelligence, the new Senator from the State of Florida; and on the Senate side, Senators DOUGLAS of Illinois, and MCCARTHY of Wisconsin. All these, and others, have done Trojan work in holding the line in the legislative halls. Last year Congressman MANSFIELD and myself circulated a petition on the floor of the House, asking other members to join with us in sponsoring legislation which would have created the Office of Secretary of the Navy for the Marine Corps, and would have placed a floor under Marine Corps strength at a figure of 6 percent of the combined strength of the other armed forces. In less than an hour's time we had more than 50 names on our petition, and given more time we could certainly have gotten 250. I bring up this fact only to demonstrate the warm feeling of friendship held for the Marine Corps by many who serve on Capitol Hill. Again I say that it is neither from the public or from Congress that the Marine Corps need fear attrition. The danger to the corps lies in the great power wielded today by the Secretary of Defense. In this connection I should like to quote several paragraphs from a speech made upon the floor of the House of Representatives on Tuesday, April 4, 1950, by my colleague, Congressman JACK ANDERSON of California, a member of the Committee on the Armed Services. Mr. ANDERSON said:

"About a month after Congress was overruled on the aircraft carrier, Washington was flooded with rumors to the effect that Marine Corps aviation was to be absorbed by the Air Force, by Secretary Johnson. These rumors became so intense that our distinguished elder statesman of national defense—the gentleman from Georgia—to whom, let me say, the Nation owes far more than it can ever repay for his vision and leadership in national defense in the Congress for over a third of a century—yes; it was the gentleman from Georgia, Chairman VINSON, who finally found it necessary to visit the Secretary to ask his intentions as regards the Marine Corps.

"From this visit came a letter from the Secretary. That letter flatly disavowed that it was or had at any time been planned to alter the status of Marine Corps aviation. The Secretary asserted in his letter that no studies had been initiated at any time in the Pentagon on the subject.

"Mr. Chairman, the Armed Services Committee and the Congress accepted that letter at face value and dropped the subject.

"But it is widely known—and I must mention it to point up further our need for concern today—that the Secretary personally told members of the press in New York, off the record of course, directly the opposite, and I happen to know that the Secretary had personally directed initiation of comparative cost studies in the Pentagon which had as their purpose justifying the transfer of the Marine air arm to the Air Force, his disclaimers to the contrary notwithstanding."

And so it goes. As I impugn the motives of no man, so I do not question the patriotism or the basic honesty of any department head here in the Nation's Capital. I do say, however, that there is at present an ever-accumulating mass of evidence which tends to indicate beyond any question of a doubt that the prerogatives of the Congress are being infringed upon by those charged with directing policy in the Department of Defense.

We who have seen service in the Marine Corps feel it incumbent upon us to render whatever continuing service we can to that great fighting organization. How well we shall continue to serve the corps and its best interests will depend in large measure upon how adequate is the liaison between headquarters and Capitol Hill. Again I tread upon very thin ice in this connection, because of the fact that such "liaison" is most certainly frowned upon by the powers-that-be in the Defense Establishment. Unless we who must bear the brunt of the legislative fight are kept wheil informed of the order of battle, we shall certainly not be able to conduct any sort of a successful operation without being constantly outflanked by those in opposition. Given the true facts, I have no question as to what course of action the American people themselves will take with respect to the Marine Corps. The distinguished gentleman from Missouri, Mr. DEWEY SHORT, a member of the House Committee on Armed Services, under questioning on the floor of the House during debate on the unification measure stated: "No Representative in his right mind would

vote against the Marine Corps. That would be one of the shortest routes to take back to civilian life." The public and the Congress alike have evidenced their regard on too many occasions to render further evidence necessary. We know where the Marine Corps stands in that regard. We do not know where it stands at the policy-administration level, and that must continue to be a focal point which we must watch with vigilant concern. I am sure that it will suffice to say that marines on the Hill do not intend to retreat from the position we have taken. It is our feeling that there is a definite role for the Marine Corps to play, a role which does not infringe upon the legitimate activities of the other branches of the armed services. Let me say how much I personally appreciate being with you here today, and I am sure that I speak for every other ex-marine on the Hill in saying that we are extremely grateful for the help and cooperation being accorded to us by the Marine Corps Reserve Officers Association. As we continue the fight here in the Nation's Capital, it is heart-warming to realize that throughout the country, organizations such as MCROA are standing behind us. It may well be that we shall need the concerted efforts of every marine organization, every former marine, and hundreds and thousands of other citizens before this fight is over. We know that you will not fail if the necessity arises for a concerted drive in the legislative halls. Thanks again for making it possible for me to be with you today, and good luck to you all!

Joint Statement of 18 Constituent Organizations of National Civil Liberties Clearing House in Opposition to So-Called Subversive Activities Control Bills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave I am inserting in the RECORD a statement issued jointly by the 18 constituent members of the National Civil Rights Clearing House expressing opposition to the subversive activities control bills pending in both Houses of Congress.

The statement speaks for itself.

Nevertheless, I wish to emphasize and underscore the fact that the individuals who signed this statement and the organizations they represent cannot be justly accused of any sympathy or leanings toward any kind of Marxism.

They are as American as the works of Thomas Jefferson and Benjamin Franklin; they are as American as comic strips and ice cream; they are as American as the institution of Congress and the Constitution under which Congress works to protect this Nation.

Because apparently no one is immune from irresponsible and libelous attacks impugning character and loyalty, and because in the present state of hysteria almost anyone who stands up for old-fashioned American freedom of speech and conscience lies in treble jeopardy. I cannot say too strongly that the sponsors and signers of this statement, many of whom are personally known to me, are not even reformers or radicals.

They are just people who, like me, take pride in the noble traditions of this country and love it as it is; people to whom human freedom and dignity are terms of reality and not of lip-service alone; men and women whose faith in democracy is deep and unyielding.

I am including in this insertion the text of the joint statement; the names of the signers and of their organizations; and also the list of officers and members of the steering committee of the National Civil Liberties Clearing House as shown by the letterhead:

JOINT STATEMENT IN OPPOSITION TO THE MUNDT-FERGUSON-JOHNSTON AND NIXON BILLS (S. 2311 AND H. R. 7595)

The Senate Judiciary Committee on March 21 reported out the Mundt-Ferguson-Johnston bill (S. 2311). This bill differs only slightly from S. 1194 (MUNDT) and S. 1196 (FERGUSON), on which hearings were held last spring. Its major objectives are to compel registration by Communist political organizations and Communist-front organizations, and to impose criminal sanctions on individuals for various subversive activities, whether or not in connection with such organizations. Meanwhile, Mr. NIXON has introduced H. R. 7595, identical with the new Senate bill, into the House of Representatives, and hearings on it have been begun by the Committee on Un-American Activities.

We who sign this statement are completely and unalterably opposed to communism and all threats to our national security, whether from the extreme right or the extreme left. We are equally opposed to any violation or weakening of the civil liberties guaranteed in the Constitution—freedom of speech, press, and assembly; due process; and all the other great foundations of our democracy. We believe the proposed legislation would be such an unconstitutional violation of those civil liberties, and would be more dangerous to our American democracy than the evil it seeks to control. We believe, moreover, that its passage would materially aid the cause of communism. It would thus undermine the structure of the American Government and the American society which it ostensibly is meant to buttress.

In our opinion, there are three basic characteristics of the proposed legislation which render it both undesirable and unconstitutional:

1. The language of the bill, which makes criminal any act which would substantially contribute to the establishment of a foreign-controlled totalitarian dictatorship, violates the due process requirements of the Constitution because of its vagueness. The vagueness of the phrase "substantially contribute" threatens the organizational activity of the entire liberal movement in the United States since people would be afraid to joint with their fellow citizens to seek any form of change, progress, or reform which is or might be supported by the Communists. It is standard technique for the Communists to give lip service to a great many liberal causes for their own nefarious purposes. In addition, if enacted, the bill might well be construed as making criminal the performance by an attorney of his duty in defending a Communist client. It might even make criminal the mere advocacy of the repeal of the law itself.

2. It would inflict serious penalties on individuals—criminal sanctions, social and economic ostracism, and character assassination—merely on the ground of association with certain organizations whose natures are not themselves defined with sufficient precision, and would thus inevitably restrict inquiry and thought, belief and expression.

3. The bill would inflict penalties by legislative proscription of organizations instead of by judicial proceedings in which such organizations would be individually tried in accordance with our constitutional guaranties. Hence, the bill is a bill of attainder; this is shown, for example, by the fact that members of Communist political organizations face loss of passport privileges and access to Federal employment, merely by virtue of their membership and not after determination by the courts.

Moreover, it is our conviction that the enactment of the proposed legislation is completely unnecessary for American security and indeed perversely likely to strengthen the very enemies it is intended to disarm. The registration provisions of the bills would not give the Government any information which the FBI does not already possess, nor is it needed to authorize the prosecution of anyone for actual acts which are genuinely subversive—they are already covered adequately by a number of laws. On the other hand, Communists, who would have to label their propaganda as such, would be clever enough to support publicly only the worthiest ideas, in an attempt to enhance the appeal of communism; and every good cause to which they added their unwelcome help would be tarred with their brush, and non-Communists who believed in the same cause would be subject to the unjust accusation of furthering the designs of communism and the Soviet Union. Communism and all its works were never at a lower ebb in American public opinion than they are today. Driving the Communists underground can only make it more difficult to combat them. Helping the Communists make martyrs of themselves can only enhance the appeal they make to the unthinking.

Our supreme interests in defeating the proposed legislation is self-interest—the self-interest of all of us Americans who are not Communists but uncompromising opponents of all totalitarian dictatorships. If this proposed action is taken against Communists today, a dangerous precedent is created for extending it tomorrow to progressives, Socialists, or trade-unionists. Lest such fear be called fanciful, we call attention to a recent statement by Guy Gabrielson, Republican national chairman, that the Socialists will be next * * * "We haven't gotten around to spotlight them yet, but I promise you we will. Avowed Socialists have no more place in the official family of the President of the United States than have Communists * * * socialism is just the first step toward communism."

The only important fear which we need have of Communists in this country today is that they will provoke us into suicide, by piecemeal destruction of our own free institutions. Police-state tactics will not destroy communism. We must not forget that in czarist Russia, the first nation in which communism triumphed, these tactics turned out to be a boomerang. By refusing to adopt police-state tactics, America will strike the heaviest possible blow against communism, and preserve its own democracy.

Patrick Murphy Malin, national director, American Civil Liberties Union; Charles M. LaFollette, national director, Americans for Democratic Action; Dr. Ralph E. Himstead, general secretary, American Association of University Professors; Elmer W. Henderson, director, American Council on Human Rights; Helen Blanchard, legislative representative, Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, CIO; John Slawson, executive director, American Jewish Committee; David W. Petegorsky,

executive director, American Jewish Congress; Michael Straight, chairman, American Veterans Committee; Benjamin R. Epstein, executive director, Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith; Rev. Thomas B. Keehn, legislative Secretary, Council for Social Action, Congregational Christian Churches of the United States of America; E. Raymond Wilson, executive secretary, Friends Committee on National Legislation; Jacob Pat, executive director, Jewish Labor Committee; Ben Kaufman, executive director, Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America; Isaih M. Minkoff, executive director, National Community Relations Advisory Council; Mrs. Irving M. Engel, president, National Council of Jewish Women; Elisabeth Christman, secretary-treasurer, National Women's Trade Union League; Philip Schiff and Herman Shukofsky, co-chairmen, Social Action Committee, National Association of Jewish Center Workers; John W. Edelman, legislative representative, Textile Workers Union of America, CIO.

The letterhead of the National Civil Liberties Clearing House shows that the principal office is at 1000 Eleventh Street NW., Washington 1, D. C., telephone Sterling 3711. The following officers are listed on the letterhead:

Advisory board: Francis Biddle, chairman; Thurman Arnold; Mary McLeod Bethune; Zechariah Chafee, Jr.; Grenville Clark; Morris Llewellyn Cooke, Sr.; Robert E. Cushman; Edward J. Ennis; Earl G. Harrison; Dr. Charles S. Johnson; Dr. Herbert Wechsler.

Chairman, E. Raymond Wilson (Friends Committee on National Legislation); vice chairmen, government and civil liberties, Violet M. Gunther (Americans for Democratic Action); academic freedom, Dr. Richard B. Kennan (National Education Association); civil rights, Herman Edelsberg (Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith); human rights, Dr. Francis J. Brown (American Council on Education).

Secretary, Dr. Flemmie P. Kittrell (Southern Regional Council); treasurer, Philip Schiff (National Jewish Welfare Board); executive secretary, Mary Alice Baldinger (American Civil Liberties Union).

Steering committee: Marcus Cohn (American Jewish Committee), Mike Masoaka (Japanese-American Citizens League), Rev. Thomas B. Keehn (Legislative Committee, Council for Social Action, Congregational Christian Churches of the U. S. A.), John W. Edelman (Textile Workers Union of America, CIO), Olya Margolin (National Council of Jewish Women), Louis C. Pakiser, Jr. (American Veterans Committee).

Was It Cancer?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 8, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, with permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I want to tell the story of a family I ran across in the May issue of the Ladies' Home Journal, in its How America Lives series by Dorothy Cameron Disney. The quotations are from the Journal article.

WAS IT CANCER?

Merrill and Virginia Phillips, of Walton, Ind., and their 5-year-old son, Mickey, are an average American family. Merrill is a plumber-electrician who earned $60 a week. For the past year they had been devoting every spare moment to building their own home.

It started when Virginia noticed a lump on her breast. Did Virginia go straight to a doctor? No, she didn't. For one thing, the Phillipses had no family physician. A much more important consideration was financial. The Phillipses had hospitalization insurance—it cost them $7.20 a month, but the policy provided only partial coverage. Any extra medical expense might jeopardize their hard-won home. So Virginia continued to delay, and to lie awake nights, sick with worry.

"Virginia and Merrill were engaged in a daily gamble with their health. An accident—nothing else—brought their affairs to a crisis." While on a job one evening, an oil tank fell, breaking both of Merrill's collarbones. He was put in a cast from neck to waist.

"With the accident, their financial circumstances took a turn for the worse. Although there was no difficulty about meeting medical expenses—Merrill's employer carried insurance—their income dropped from $60 to $50 a week. Of this sum, the insurance company paid $23, the balance paid from the boss's own pocket. The patience of any employer, as Merrill was keenly aware, has limits."

The accident brought Virginia's breast tumor to the attention of the general practitioner attending Merrill. He insisted on an operation for Virginia although he thought the tumor was benign. At the same time he urged removal of a mole on Merrill's head.

As though this weren't enough, their son, Mickey developed a crippling cyst on the back of his knee. A bone specialist was needed.

"The Phillipses' insurance policy didn't cover the services of a specialist." "'It wasn't easy,' the Phillipses say today, 'But we figured Mickey would have to wait his turn.'" No other decision, under the circumstances, was possible.

Just then, "the blow fell. Merrill's employer explained that he must reduce expenses, and Merrill was out of a job. When he left the shop he could count on only the $23 a week unemployment payments. The family had $93 on hand. This meant they could stay afloat for approximately two months. After that, they would go into debt at the rate of $40 a month."

On the doctor's further insistence, Merrill had his mole removed—as a charity patient. Analysis proved it cancerous. Merrill needed follow-up X-ray treatments, said the doctor. "The Phillipses' insurance policy didn't cover X-ray treatments. Frightened but firm, Merrill refused the treatments."

This story has a happy ending—only because the Phillipses got charity care. This family, self-reliant enough to build their own house with just their hands and homemade plans, was forced to take charity from their neighbors and the State. Mickey's cyst and Virginia's tumor were removed and Merrill's X-ray treatments paid for by charity—charity doled out to indigent persons.

But meanwhile—they spent weeks and months of agonized worry, not only about the illnesses, but because they couldn't carry the financial load. And now their future is more insecure than ever.

For hard-working American families like the Phillipses, every day that the medical lobby blocks national health insurance and disability insurance means needless worry, financial ruin, and human suffering.

They are victims of the dollar barrier which now prevents four out of five families from getting adequate medical care. We must remove that dollar barrier.

Under national health insurance, for $3.90 a month—1½ percent of Merrill's salary—the Phillipses would have had comprehensive care. This would include full diagnostic treatment. For Virginia, Merrill, and Mickey there would have been no worry about the costs of diagnosis, surgery, and follow-up treatment, including home visits by the doctor of their choice.

Without national health insurance, they paid $7.20 for incomplete protection. The benefits just were not there when they needed them most.

National health insurance—a middle-of-the-road plan for self-respecting Americans—would have covered them—not charity.

Let Us Give the District of Columbia Permanent Authority Now for Daylight Saving Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I am, quite naturally, gratified by swift action in the last gap to insure daylight saving time for the District of Columbia this summer.

However, I believe that right now is the time to complete action on the pending bills to give the Commissioners permanent authority to establish daylight saving time in their own discretion.

The Senate bill, S. 3176, was passed by the Senate on April 21, 1950, and is now pending before the House Committee on the District of Columbia, unaffected by the passage of H. R. 6354. My own bill for permanent authority, H. R. 1387, is also pending before the committee. Either bill can be reported; I am seeking no personal distinction, and I should counsel the simplest method, which is to report and pass the Senate bill at the next call of the District Calendar.

ANNUAL DEBATE IS EXTRAVAGANT

The extravagance of the annual debate over the purely local issue of daylight saving time in Washington is becoming comic.

Based on an unofficial estimate of $19,700 an hour as the cost of a session of Congress, the cost of debate on the floor alone, in both Houses, reaches the fantastic figure of about $50,000 each session.

Off-the-floor costs are not so easy to compute; but I think it is not unfair to assume that the time of the committees, the Commissioners, the committee staffs, and of the many witnesses, printing costs, and other incidentals, brings the total off-the-floor expense to another $50,000.

This means that, out of deference to intransigent milch cows in far-off States, the taxpayers have been assessed some $500,000 since the war ended—just

to make a legislative decision which obviously was going to be made anyway.

TOO HIGH A PRICE

This is too high a price.

It is self-evident that an overwhelming majority of the residents of Washington, including virtually all the salaried officers of the District of Columbia government, favor daylight-saving time.

There are a few people who will be inconvenienced by "fast time," and some others who will not be inconvenienced but who will resent and oppose it.

Most people are very much the beneficiaries.

While it is unlikely that in the future temporary authority for daylight-saving time will be denied, it takes little imagination to see what would happen to radio and television programs, travelers' schedules, plane flights, and every other activity involving interstate commerce in such an eventuality.

Now, Mr. Speaker, is the time to settle the whole business while it is fresh in our minds. I am communicating separately with my chairman in an effort to enlist his support.

The Amerasia Investigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1950

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by George Sokolsky:

THESE DAYS

(By George Sokolsky)

All the material in this article is taken from the Report of Subcommittee IV of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, published in 1946:

"On June 6, 1945, the Federal Bureau of Investigation * * * caused the arrest of Philip Jacob Jaffe and Kate Louise Mitchell, editor and coeditor * * * of Amerasia. * * * Andrew Roth, a lieutenant in the United States Naval Reserve, stationed in Washington; Mark Julius Gayn, a magazine writer * * * and Emmanuel Sigurd Larsen and John Stewart Service * * * employees of the State Department in Washington, D. C. * * *

"Among the documents seized in the possession of Jaffe at the Amerasia office in New York City at the time of his arrest were 267 prepared by the State Department, including 2 copies of a top-secret classification, 20 originals or duplicate originals, and 14 copies of a secret classification, and 51 originals or duplicate originals, and 14 copies of a confidential classification; 50 prepared by OSS, including 2 originals or duplicate originals, and 1 copy of a secret classification, and 11 originals or duplicate originals of a confidential classification; 19 prepared by ONI (Office of Naval Intelligence), including 1 original or duplicate original of a secret classification and 3 originals or duplicate originals of a confidential classification; 34 prepared by MID (military intelligence), including 9 copies of a secret classification, 1 original or duplicate original, and 11 copies of a confidential classification; 58 prepared by OWI, including 3 copies of a secret classification, 1 original or duplicate original (and 4 copies of a confidential classification. * * *"

(A number of documents similarly detailed were found when Larsen was arrested at his home in Washington, D. C.)

"The records made available to this committee indicate * * * that Roth, who had been under surveillance, was the contact man or go-between for Jaffe in Washington * * * four items which were seized by the FBI in the possession of Jaffe, and which bore no official classification, were subjected to laboratory analysis, with the resulting disclosure that they were copies of official reports on Indian politics written in longhand by Roth, or typewritten on Roth's machine. * * *

"* * * Virtually all of the late 1944 and 1945 items seized from Jaffe, which on their face indicated them to be Government property, were removed from the State Department.

"Many originated elsewhere, but had been routed to State. Larsen had authority enabling him to take such items from the State Department, although under the regulations he could not retain them or disclose their contents.

"Although the various parties were frequently observed in the company of one another by trained investigators, no one of them was ever seen to deliver any Government items to another."

From the minority view of FRANK FELLOWS, member of the committee:

"Larsen, when arrested, was a research specialist in the Far East Division of the Department of State. The Department of State had no system worthy of the name for protecting the files of that Department.

"He (Jaffe) was photographing and publishing some of them, thereby, through the medium of his magazine, at least, selling the contents of some of the classified documents of this Government at the time when the United States was fighting for its very existence.

"These papers were seized from Jaffe at the time of his arrest in his business establishment, where he was publishing a magazine. They were not his own documents. They were not seized as the result of searching his files.

"They were found in suitcases and pasteboard containers on the tables and desks of his business offices. I do not see how anybody could claim these papers were illegally seized. The circumstances clearly indicate that Roth, who had previously worked for him in this very office, was delivering papers to him."

The activities reported above by a congressional committee, the chairman of which was SAM HOBBS, of Alabama, a Democrat, occurred while this country was engaged in a war which involved an armed force of 11,000,000 men and women and cost this country more than $300,000,000,000.

What has been done about this report?

McCarthy's Victims

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, with permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I attach the following article, McCARTHY'S Victims, by Joseph Alsop, which appeared in the Washington Post, May 8. Mr. Alsop's remarkable qualifications to discuss the far-eastern situation and the personalities concerned are greatly in evidence in this open letter. If the others who have joined in this unwarranted assault on the integrity of the State Department had the same qualifications, it seems likely that the assault would never have taken place.

McCARTHY'S VICTIMS—AN OPEN LETTER TO SENATOR TYDINGS

(By Joseph Alsop)

After long hesitation, I am impelled by the appalling effects in Europe of the McCARTHY witch hunt to offer my testimony to your committee, for what it may be worth.

I do so for two reasons. First, I have already sharply criticized the conduct of our affairs in China on several occasions. Second, I was intimately involved in the events which led to the loss of China, whereas Senators McCARTHY, WHERRY, and TAFT and their informants are offering second-hand evidence. This evidence is so obviously corrupted by political and other pressure that it is a duty to correct the impression conveyed.

Stating the case as briefly as possible, I think it fair to say that the really crucial years in China were those when Gen. Joseph W. Stilwell commanded the China-Burma-India theater, from 1942 to 1944. In this period, Professor Lattimore, who was always at best a fringe figure, played his most important role in our China policy, as a personal adviser to Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek. In this rather brief assignment, he accomplished nothing, but he was quite obviously loyal both to the American Government and to Generalissimo Chiang.

Professor Lattimore had no part whatever in the real debate about China policy, in which the different points of view have been fantastically misrepresented by Senator McCARTHY and his friends. No informed person ever supposed that offering blank checks to the National Government of China would accomplish anything. Those who advocated a strong policy of aiding the National Government only did so with the proviso that the aid given would be closely controlled by American representatives on the spot, as it was during the short and successful period of General Wedemeyer's command. It should be noted that the congressional advocates of postwar aid to China specifically rejected the responsibility involved in this sort of local, on the spot control, in the first major bill appropriating funds for the purpose during General Marshall's Secretaryship of State.

Returning to the vastly more important war period, the other school of thought was composed primarily of General Stillwell and his political advisers. General Stillwell, so far as one could judge, was chiefly animated by his personal destestation of Generalissimo Chiang, arising from their disagreements. His political advisers, among whom was Mr. John Stewart Service, were operating on a more reasoned theory, however.

They asserted, first, that the National Government was too feeble and corrupt ever to be reformed, even with direct American help and under direct American pressure. They said, second, that the Chinese Communists were therefore bound to win in the end, no matter what measures might be taken by the United States. In the third place, they argued that the Soviet Union, insofar as it had intervened in China at all, had given all its assistance to the regime of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek rather than to the Communists, who received no tangible Russian aid whatever until the war was over. Fourthly, they suggested that the Chinese

Communists might be induced to declare their independence of the Kremlin if they were treated as friends and allies by the United States.

Opening friendly relations and offering aid to the Chinese Communists was frankly admitted, at the time, to be a bold gamble. The gamble now looks better than it did then. On the one hand, the Yugoslav Communists, whose experience was precisely what the experience of the Chinese Communists would have been if they had received American aid, have now rebelled against the Kremlin. On the other hand, the recent behavior of the Japanese Communist leader, Nosaka, a wartime refugee at Yenan and intimate friend of Mao Tse-tung, clearly suggests that the idea of independence of the Kremlin must have been in the air in Communist China in wartime.

My right to speak, if I may be said to have a right to speak, derives from the fact that in wartime I was one of the chief American opponents of the school of thought I have summarized above. As a member of the staff of the American Volunteer Group, as chief of the Lend-Lease Mission to China, and finally as an assistant to Dr. T. V. Soong, I did everything in my power to present the pro-Nationalist point of view in influential quarters in Washington.

Those who wished to develop an American policy of friendship toward, and aid to, the Chinese Communists were finally and decisively defeated with the dismissal of General Stilwell, in October 1944. This occurred many months after I had finally succeeded in getting into uniform, as a member of Gen. C. L. Chennault's staff in the Fourteenth Air Force. But although I had long before become a mere junior officer in the Air Force, the effect of my letters to Harry L. Hopkins and the other representations I had made was acknowledged by implication in General Marshall's first instructions to General Wedemeyer.

These are, so to speak, my credentials. Having known the situation in wartime China far more intimately than any of the pro-McCarthy witnesses you have yet heard, I think it my duty to say that while I disputed the judgment, I never had the faintest doubt of the loyalty of any of the American officials or others whom McCarthy has attacked. They were serving the United States to the best of their ability, with courage and fidelity. This should be sufficient to protect them from the kind of vulgar attack McCarthy has made, even if their judgment was incorrect.

Although our views clashed sharply, I was particularly well acquainted with Mr. Service. To the best of my knowledge, although I thought then, and think now, that he was gravely in error, he was a most conscientious and decent American public servant. It is difficult, of course, to offer hard evidence to support such contemporary impressions. But I may cite one fact, at least, to show how erroneous it can be to judge situations from the viewpoint of a later time.

Former Vice President Henry A. Wallace has been, in effect, a pliable stooge for the American Communist Party for more than 2 years. From this, many people have inferred that Wallace was a Communist stooge in wartime. In fact, however, nothing could have been more contrary to the party line in wartime than to urge the dismissal of General Stilwell; yet Wallace recommended the dismissal of Stilwell and his replacement by Wedemeyer in a telegram from China to President Roosevelt in the late spring of 1944. Incidentally, the telegram was sent with the full knowledge of Mr. John Carter Vincent, who entered no protest whatever, although he too has been under attack as a Communist stooge.

In conclusion, there are two points which I feel I must make. First, I do not think I was wrong in opposing the policy of gambling on winning the friendship of the Chinese Communists and inducing them to declare their independence of the Kremlin. I do not think I was wrong, simply because I, and the others who took the same view, could not possibly foresee that when this policy of winning the friendship of the Chinese Communists had been defeated with the dismissal of General Stilwell, there would be a long period after the war during which we had no China policy at all.

None of the men now under attack by Senator McCarthy had any important responsibility, to my knowledge, for this singular hiatus. Speaking for myself, if I could have foreseen that the only alternative to a policy of gambling on the friendship of the Chinese Communists was a kind of vacuum of policy, I should have been on the other side in the struggle in China. The gamble on the Chinese Communists, although unnecessary, in my opinion, was at least a reasonable gamble, such as could be reasonably advocated by entirely loyal Americans.

Second, I should like to suggest to your committee that, if the test of loyalty is following the line of the Communist Party, you had much better launch an investigation of Senators McCarthy, Wherry, and Taft, than an investigation of Messrs. Lattimore, Service, and Vincent. Let the test be a tabulation of the key votes of the three Senators above mentioned on the great post-war measures of foreign policy, and especially of their votes on key amendments by which bills can be nullified.

Unless I am gravely mistaken, such a tabulation will show that these three Senators, and most of the others who have joined them in the present clamor, have voted the straight Communist Party line on every major issue of foreign policy, as laid down in the Daily Worker, ever since the end of the war. If temporary agreement with the party line is to be made the test of loyalty, let these men be called to the bar to explain their records.

In summary, I do not attempt to excuse or palliate the grave American mistakes in China, which I have often before denounced. But I submit that we may as well abandon all hope of having honest and courageous public servants, if mere mistakes of judgment are later to be transformed into evidences of disloyalty to the state. And I submit further that the Members of the Senate who are now persecuting these men who made, as I think, mistakes in China, have far more to explain, excuse, and rationalize in their own records. I still believe that the loss of China was unnecessary. But I think it far more important that we should not destroy the decent traditions of American political life. These now seem to be endangered.

Flood-Control Project at Havre, Mont.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WESLEY A. D'EWART
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 8, 1950

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I was about to make a speech today concerning the need for a small flood-control project at Havre, Mont., a project which would cost only slightly more than $1,000,000. Some of the Members will recall that I have spoken about this project frequently. It was authorized many years ago. Each time the Corps of Engineers has asked for funds to build it the Budget Bureau has turned it down. Each time we have asked the Appropriations Committee to appropriate for it as an additional item, we have been refused. For 2 years the Senate has appropriated money only to have the House conferees turn it down. The only reason we can get for these repeated rebuffs, this refusal to construct a tiny project that is of great importance to the people of Havre, Mont., is that it is against the President's policy to start new construction.

Now the President has announced that one of his stops on the political tour, at taxpayers' expense, which begins this week will be in Havre, Mont. The cost of this tour alone would pay for the Havre project. Instead of making a speech today, I want to suggest that the citizens of Havre ask the President, when he honors their city with his presence, whether he is ever going to withdraw the objections that have stopped their project. I suggest they ask the President, who proposes to put us in debt another $7,000,000,000 this year, when he thinks he can afford $1,000,000 to protect the citizens of Havre from floods. After he has viewed their growing town, ask him if its protection is not worth at least one three-hundredth of the amount he proposes to spend on the St. Lawrence waterway. If he can spare time from politics to consider this problem, perhaps we will get the project underway.

Changing a Republic Into a Socialist State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 8, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, a republic gone to seed is the very worst form of autocracy; and our Government-wreckers have taken long strides toward making of this Government the worst autocracy the world has ever seen.

History teaches that, in the case of every destroyed republic, the destroyers first broke down all lines of demarcation between governmental functions, and rendered the people's representatives, the legislators, impotent. They do not usually abolish legislatures, but they so weaken them, that they enact only such legislation as the wreckers demand of them, leaving the bureaucrats to control or dictate every act of government.

Our Congress has so far surrendered its powers to the Executive and the bureaucrats that it generally enacts into law every measure demanded of it and ours has become a government of men, not of law.

The process of destruction began with the reign of Franklin D. Roosevelt and his horde of bright young men fresh from the colleges, and without experience in government, business, or otherwise.

The late President Roosevelt claimed several mandates, but, viewing them in retrospect, it is now apparent that they were assumed mandates sneaked over on

an unsuspecting Congress and the people, each of which was part of a pattern to destroy this Republic. In a Jackson Day dinner radio address on January 7, 1939, the late President said:

In answer to the demands of the American people we have expanded the functions of the Government of the United States. We are handling complicated problems of administration with which no party has ever had to wrestle. To do that we are constantly recruiting lieutenants who will give intense and genuine devotion to the cause of liberal governing. We have brought to the Government men and women whose first thought is to be of service to their country through their Government—men and women with fewer attributes of selfishness and more objectives of clean service than any group I have ever come in contact with in a somewhat long career.

Almost without exception they are more intent on doing a good job than in keeping themselves on the payrolls. Almost without exception, they possess that quality of cooperative effort which distinguishes them from the old-time political officeholder.

The exceptions which the late President Roosevelt did not mention stand out in bold relief when we view what those unselfish souls did in the pursuit of efforts to render "service to their country through their Government."

They established a long list of alphabetical agencies for curing a depression which was never cured—agencies headed and manned by such immortals as Rexford Guy Tugwell, Henry Agard Wallace, Harry L. Hopkins, Corrington Gill, Aubrey Williams, and others comprising a list too long to enumerate. When it became known that those unselfish guides of our destinies were other than what they pretended to be, and the populace clamored for their jobs and their political heads, they were kicked upstairs into better jobs, where they could go on with their government-wrecking and destruction.

Under the guidance of the late Roosevelt, with his falsely claimed mandate to cure our depression, the general-welfare clause of our Constitution was all but read out of that memorable and honorable document. That clause was stretched to put the Government into activities never contemplated by our founding fathers—it was distorted in a catch-all phrase to justify the appropriation and use of the peoples' money for every hairbrained and cockeyed scheme conceived by the unselfish horde of bureaucrats that had been recruited, as now seems apparent, to wreck this Government.

When it at long last became apparent that the New Deal had utterly failed to cure, or even to show improvement in the prolonged depression, Mr. Roosevelt jockeyed us into World War II as a means of saving face for the New Deal and its horde of unselfish martyrs who were recruited to save the Nation.

The fighting and winning of World War II, plus the loss of the fight against the depression, left this Nation with a known public debt and contingent liabilities of more than $430,000,000,000—far more debt than had been incurred throughout the entire history of the country.

Since the shooting of World War II stopped, the same hordes of Roosevelt brilliantes—unselfish and God-given blessings to mankind—and their descendants, so to speak, have evolved other and further schemes for the continued saving of this Nation, but they have evolved out of their inner consciousnesses a horde of world-wide alphabetical agencies designed to succor and rescue the entire world from communism, commercial disaster, and the like—all at the expense of American taxpayers, American industry, and American labor.

These world-wide alphabetical Fair Deal schemes have already cost our taxpayers some $30,000,000,000, for gifts, loans, hand-outs, and assistance to the rest of the world; and the end is not yet.

Secretary of State Dean Gooderham Acheson has now declared an additional remedy for saving the world—"total diplomacy," which is daily coming more and more to mean: We give away our wealth all over the world to buy friendship and opposition to the spread of communism, as we give it away at home in the form of gifts, hand-outs, and subsidies to buy the necessary influence to keep the Fair Deal's destructive juggernaut rolling.

Furthermore, in addition to our gifts, grants, and hand-outs all over the world in a futile effort to buy friendship, the all-powerful internationalist bloc in the State Department and elsewhere in the Fair Deal hierarchy, are hell-bent on taking the United States into a one-world government where she will be shorn of her inherent and inalienable right to legislate for and govern her own people—a one-world government in which, through alien minds and foreign governments, our own States and people will be forced to surrender their sovereign rights and even their persons to trial by foreign courts and tribunals.

In short, the Fair Deal—a continuation of the Roosevelt New Deal, to which many dangerous innovations have been added—goes merrily on with its steps toward a planned economy at home and all over the world.

Already many American business concerns are being put out of business because of the loose way in which the State Department has handled, and is handling, the reciprocal trade agreements, but the wrecking does not stop there. It is now seriously proposed by the administration that the International Trade Organization be approved—not by treaty but by executive agreement—and that the matter of handling tariff matters, international financing, and even of labor, be delegated to a foreign organization ruled and governed by aliens and alien minds—an organization in which the United States will have but one vote out of 50-odd by the foreigners.

It emerges crystal clear that the Government-wreckers and world-planners mean and intend to make American industry and American labor subservient to this alien-minded and alien-government trade organization, under the claim that the living standards of the rest of the world can be raised to those in the United States.

To anyone who is not willfully and mentally blind, it is altogether clear that such aim cannot be attained through such organization, or otherwise; and that, in the process, American industry and labor will inevitably be reduced to the standards of the rest of the world, rather than the world's standards being elevated to our own.

Extension of Selective Service Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 8, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include the following article written by Gould Lincoln, appearing in the Washington Star in favor of an extension without limiting provisions of the Selective Service Act that in the light of existing world conditions is based on sound and logical reasoning:

DRAFT COULD BE NEEDED DESPERATELY AND IN HURRY

(By Gould Lincoln)

Overriding the views of the administration and of high ranking armed services officials, the House Armed Services Committee has written into the bill to extend for 2 years the Selective Service Act a provision making necessary a declaration by Congress that a national emergency exists before any further inductions may be made.

Cold war or no cold war, this seems to be as far as Congress is prepared to go, with an election just around the corner. Indeed, 6 months ago there were plenty of predictions that Congress would not extend the so-called peacetime draft act at all. It is due to expire June 24 unless given new life by legislation. Only the serious situation in the world, which certainly has not improved in recent months, has brought some willingness on the part of many Members to pass any legislation relating to the draft.

STEP IS NOT ENOUGH

The action of the House Armed Services Committee, which has now unanimously reported the bill with the amendment already described, is a step in the right direction. But it is not enough. Once before in our recent history an attempt was made in Congress to kill off a draft law by permitting it to die. That was in the summer of 1941, 5 months before the Japanese made their attack on Pearl Harbor. General Marshall, then Chief of Staff, argued for hours before the congressional committees in favor of extending the Selective Service Act, pointing out that if it were allowed to die—as die it would—the Army would be hamstrung. Yet when the measure extending the life of the draft law came to a vote in the House it prevailed by only a single vote.

It seems incredible today that so many Members of Congress could have been so short-sighted as to vote against the continuance of the draft. Had the bill failed, this country would have been in far more desperate shape than it was when the attack did come.

In 1945 and 1946 this country tore down great and victorious armed forces. The race to demobilize was swift. The war had been won; there was going to be no more war.

But the peace had not been won—and it has not yet been won. With many pains, and large appropriations, we are building back to a military position. It takes time. It became evident a couple of years ago that the country was not going to get enough enlistments to keep the armed forces up to the strength authorized by Congress, notwithstanding increases in pay and in many advantages of training offered young men entering the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps. So the Draft Act was passed. And also provision was made for voluntary enlistments for 1 year for 18-year-olds, and for 21 months for older men.

NO ASSURANCE ON MEN

The enactment of the Draft Act stimulated enlistments. By January 1949 it was not necessary to draft more men, and the draft has not been used since. But this year, 160,000 enlistments end. With the draft removed—and it will be removed to all intents and purposes by the amendment requiring Congress to act before any more men can be drafted—the sole reliance of the Armed Forces will be voluntary reenlistments and voluntary new enlistments.

What assurance is there the same condition will not be found that brought about the passage of the present Draft Act? There is none.

The administration is asking that, at least, the authority to start up the draft again be left to the executive branch, which could act promptly. The wisest action, however, would be to retain the draft as it now stands, with its machinery continued in effect and ready to go into active operation at the drop of a hat. The draft is one of those things which, if needed at all, will be needed desperately and in a hurry.

What the American Flag Means to Me

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 8, 1950

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following essay by Carlyle Ausley, Jr., of Ocala, Fla., 16 years old and a member of the National Honor Society. Carlyle's essay won first prize for boys in the tenth to twelfth grades of the Ocala High School in a competition sponsored by Marion County Post, No. 27, the American Legion. He tells—

WHAT THE AMERICAN FLAG MEANS TO ME

The American flag, though only a piece of cloth or bunting, has been brought to a proud position by love and sacrifice, and was authorized by Congress June 14, 1777.

Carrying our flag high in a place of honor above my horse last winter in a parade, suddenly I was thinking deeply what the flag meant to me. My mind became more peaceful; gratitude for all good things seemed first place, love for all that's real and worth while, the great need of being helpful to others with patience.

The red color I figured was proud, and must mean valor and zeal. The white must be hope, good conduct, and purity. The blue, being the color of heaven, was surely reverence to God, justice, truth, and sincerity. The star, being high, like in the sky, meant high ideals.

The flag's history is just the history of the American people, where I will find my place, like 140,000,000 or more other humans under this flag.

Feeling by now the physical as well as mental weight of the flag, I promised myself to study the lives of the men who wished to lead us under our beautiful flag so when I become of age to vote I would do it honor.

In time of war its stars and stripes were never pale, and in peace it proudly floats, like now, in the breeze, and is so fair to see, being the third oldest of national flags.

Looking at the flag in a position of honor in front to the right of the speaker of that day these quick thoughts came, for the flag seemed alive, representing a living country—freedom to hunt, fish, grow, mine, cut, make and manufacture; freedom to ship and sell, freedom to work or quit, freedom to hire or fire, freedom to make the most of my natural gifts, and a chance to reason rather than be forced, with my rights safeguarded.

On a casket of a great soldier once I noticed a flag, and I knew if he could talk I would hear, "Our flag will always wave on for the good of mankind, and when I lived I expressed opinions on all matters, also I kept my self-respect. I deserved no better government than what I exerted myself to get. If I had it to do over again I would shudder to see my flag ever dirty or abused—like lettering on it—because we must first respect before we love. Besides, my country was the best fed and clothed, with the same opportunity for all."

The parade finally came to where it disbanded; but my thoughts were still in tune—if I am pleased with my country, thrilled with the red, white, and blue; can just be what my flag stands for, my country will be proud of me, too.

European Recovery Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OTTO E. PASSMAN
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 8, 1950

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Philip Warden, from the Washington Times-Herald of April 26, 1950:

TRUMAN'S AIDES CLAIM IT'S ERP OR A DEPRESSION

(By Philip Warden)

Administration leaders have told the House and Senate Foreign Affairs Committees in a secret session that foreign aid spending must be continued unabated or the country faces the threat of a depression.

President Truman and his aides told the Congressmen that the European recovery program billions are all that is preventing an unmanageable surplus of farm products. Stop foreign aid spending, and our markets will be glutted, they maintained.

EMPLOYMENT PERILED

Administration leaders also declared that the Marshall plan dollars are being spent in industries where widespread unemployment would develop at once if the aid program were curtailed. They asserted unemployment would spread quickly to other industries.

The administration has decided to put all its emphasis on the depression threat at home in its campaign to sell the Marshall plan to Congress for another year, rather than on Europe's economic requirements.

The Senate is considering the administration bill to authorize 3.4 billions for aid to Europe for another year. The bill has been passed by the House.

PRODUCTION RECOVERED

Administrator Hoffman, of the Marshall plan, said yesterday that Europe's industrial production is 20 percent higher than before the war, her food production is back to prewar levels, and her export trade is above prewar.

Asked if he felt that we should continue giving money under these conditions, Hoffman replied:

"The real problem in Europe today, which must be solved or both Europe and America will suffer, is to build up Europe's dollar earnings.

"Europe needs our goods, not our dollars. That is what we are giving them—the goods they can get nowhere but here. Europe could triple her production and still not have enough dollars to buy what she needs from us.

COTTON GIFTS CITED

"For example, Europe does not have enough dollars to buy the cotton she needs. We have been giving her the cotton. If we stop giving her cotton, her mills will close, unemployment will spread, and she will be right back where she was when the war ended."

The administration will rely upon the aid program to prevent the stock piles of surplus food from getting much larger, rather than revise farm supports along realistic lines.

Democrats from industrial areas are being told that they must vote for the aid program or the industries in their areas are likely to suffer and unemployment follow.

Alaska, Key Point of Nation's Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 8, 1950

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, many of our leading editors are taking cognizance, in their editorial columns, of the great importance of Alaska to the United States. The editor of the Tulsa (Okla.) World, in an editorial April 4, calls it "a key point of Nation's defense."

By unanimous consent, I submit that editorial for consideration of the Members of Congress. It follows:

ALASKA, KEY POINT OF NATION'S DEFENSE

Practical attention to Alaska as the most vital point in the American defense system is made certain by the statement of Gen. Dwight Eisenhower. The importance of Alaska in this respect has been growing for many years; the public mind is fairly familiar with the general idea. But it was essential that an authoritative statement be made. The situation poses for the United States a gigantic problem in finance and preparedness. It is one of those things which cannot be avoided.

Immediate plans are for expenditure of from $300,000,000 to $500,000,000 in the next year or so. Most of that is to be earmarked for air expansion, which implies a great deal of preparation along various lines. Probably the work of outfitting Alaska as a defensive base is further along than most of us know. The whole affair starts with the nearness of Russia. Alaska is no longer a remote outpost of the United States or a piece of land which Russia sold. It is now

of first-class importance to the two greatest nations of the earth, and consequently to all nations and all mankind.

On the historical, sentimental, or reflective side, Alaska is a mighty subject. The far-sighted Secretary of State, William H. Seward, bought the country for $7,200,000; that was in 1867, when it was difficult to fix general attention upon anything so remote, even nebulous. It was not until long afterward—or not more than 30 years ago—that the idea of Alaska as defensive territory and a key to the north side of the world gained any real credence. Billy Mitchell was discharged from the Army for making suggestions and he was reprobated for intimating that air was the future power. No greater change in outlook or viewpoint than is involved in the matter of Alaska can be imagined.

When Alaska was bought for what is now called chicken feed, there was no conception of the airplane, no particular idea that nations far apart would ever be gouging and shoving each other in the purlieus of the Arctic Circle. The price paid for the land is a very small fraction of what we now seriously propose to spend on it next year.

While we are considering the practical side, as we must, we Americans are called upon to recognize, in all its phases, a new era. That is an era in which we take a leading part. There is dramatic interest in the story of Alaska. It is close to the heart of American defense, yet it is called geographically remote from the States. It may soon be a State. But, State or detached Territory, it is a matter of vital concern to all of us. It is something rather bigger and more far-reaching than we are usually called upon to consider. Alaska is one of the three cardinal points in vast strategic areas. Manifestly, it is time we quit thinking of it as a cold distant country of ordinary potentialities. It actually is an immediate, engrossing matter of defense, strategy, finance, industry, transportation, and all-around responsibility.

In Support of the Metal-Clad, Lighter-Than-Air Ship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1950

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and statement:

TOMS RIVER, N. J., *April 4, 1950.*

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DINGELL: As you know from my wire of yesterday, I genuinely appreciate your thoughtfulness in sending me a copy of your letter of March 21, to the Secretary of the Navy with respect to airships. It is most gratifying to see that you have continued your interest in this badly neglected type of aircraft.

What sort of a reply will be forthcoming to your letter is problematical but it is my feeling it will be a polite but completely noncommittal one, leaving your idea still unacted on.

On March 18, at the request of the Associated Press, I made a statement on the then recently announced request of the Navy for funds for building four new blimps. A copy of that statement is enclosed herewith for your own information and for whatever other use you might care to make of it, since of course it is public property. Some of the eastern papers carried portions of it, but what happened elsewhere I do not know.

Needless to say, I sent a copy special delivery, to the Secretary of the Navy the moment the statement was released, but of course I have had no Navy Department comment, nor do I expect such.

From reading this statement, it will be clear to you where I consider the responsibility to rest for the shamefully muddled airship situation. Furthermore, you will note that I almost despair of any remedial action originating with the Navy itself.

During the war, after we had the blimp project fairly well under control, I tried to resurrect the metalclad idea but obviously with no results. I even asked Ralph Upson to meet me and discuss the matter, which he graciously did despite all his other pressing work. More recently, I got together with Carl B. Fritsche whom you of course remember as a far-seeing citizen, and we discussed the possibility of getting the metalclad idea reestablished somehow. There is no doubt but that the necessary talent is available, and it is not too much to hope that financial interest can be obtained if there is some indicated prospect for help from Washington.

You will note, therefore, that in my AP statement of March 18, I mentioned the metalclad and also the idea of getting more widespread interest in airships in general. I am more convinced than ever that we must have competition in the airship field to insure progress. It cannot be denied that the great progress made in airplanes has been mainly due to the fact that many minds and many interests have worked simultaneously and competitively on the airplane project.

I cannot stress too strongly the completely fallacious policy of placing airship development and welfare in the hands of airplane personnel. That is precisely the root of all the evil that has beset the airship. It is susceptible of correction administratively but will never so come about for several reasons. Not the least of these is the gradually dawning reason that the piloted military airplane is on the decline, pushed out of the picture by guided missiles, and other developments. Hence there is an instinctive desire to draw into or rather retain in the airplane empire, anything that will keep it alive, even unto the lowly airship. Actually, neither the airship nor the guided missile has any business being in the hands of airplane people.

I do not wish to burden you with a lot of reading but I am sending you copies of various things I have written from time to time on the airship subject. You, yourself, will have to be the judge of how much you can find time to read, but I assure you it contains the gist of the whole airship situation. Let me suggest, however, that the following would be of first value to you:

(a) My AP statement of March 18, 1950.
(b) My 1947 report to the American Legion.
(c) My Airships in the United States Navy. (In this I predict that the fabric airship will go the way of the fabric airplane and be replaced by metal-hulled airships of considerably increased performance and effectiveness.)

The whole world is now aware of the presence of foreign submarines on our Pacific coast, and the Chief of Naval Operations has announced that our anti-submarine strength in the Pacific is to be augmented. However, there has been no statement that such augmentation will include the airships that were so fallaciously removed from the Pacific coast about 3 years ago on the easily exploded pretext of "economy." Does this situation, then, make hypocrisy of the Navy's retention of airships at all?

I do hope that on some coming early visit to Washington I may have the privilege of stopping in for a chat with you, for I am more convinced than ever that the United States is missing a great bet in neglecting airships.

With kind personal regards and best wishes, I am,

Very sincerely,

C. E. ROSENDAHL.

STATEMENT BY VICE ADM. C. E. ROSENDAHL, UNITED STATES NAVY, RETIRED, MADE AT THE REQUEST OF THE ASSOCIATED PRESS, MARCH 18, 1950

The recently published statement that the Navy has belatedly asked for funds for a few modern blimps comes as gratifying news to those who have long hoped that airships would be given a fair opportunity to develop and demonstrate more of their real value to the national defense. Contrary to some opinion, airships have never had such an opportunity, not even in World War II. This latest airship announcement also should be interpreted by the public as apparent assurance that official circles are now at last really concerned over the menace presented by modern submarines in the hands of a ruthless enemy.

Such alarm over modern submarines is well founded. In their various forms and applications, present and coming submarines are the most formidable weapons that could be used against us. By the same tokens, underseas craft can and should be made a keystone in our own military strength. Thus, it is my opinion that submarine vessels and antisubmarine warfare should get top billing at once, a billing in which the airship can, if properly permitted, share to at least a modest degree. The latent potentialities of airships, both large and small, are nuggets of our defense treasure yet to be assayed.

But all that glitters in the headlines isn't gold of reality. Mere acquisition of a few better blimps isn't the whole story by a long shot. Unless the corollary problems such as those of airship personnel and administration are also solved realistically, airships will never reach maturity. But I am reluctantly convinced that solutions to interdependent airship problems will never come until and unless some topside conceptions are changed, and in so saying, I am merely repeating what I have said publicly and officially for many years—but fruitlessly, thus far.

As has been the history of other military weapons, the day of the piloted military airplane as a stellar performer in our national defense is ending. Obviously there will continue to be important uses for manned airplanes of and for the Army ground forces, of and for the Air Force, of and for the Navy. But such airplanes should be integrated into the national defense as work horses in the team rather than as individual stars. Airplanes reached their zenith and covered themselves with undeniable glory in World War II. Let them now settle down to their logical places of today and of the future.

Yes; the ominous shadows of the submarine and the guided missile are eclipsing the former brilliance of the military airplane. But neither submarine nor guided missiles can attain their rightful places until and unless some basic ideas change.

I do not presume to speak for submarine people nor for the artillerymen in whose province the guided missile belongs for the basic reason that it is a modern item of artillery. This is true for both landgoing and seagoing artillery. Let us hope they raise their voices and be heard and heeded in their respective causes of such transcendent importance. But as for airships, I am not unfamiliar with their unfortunate plight, a plight that stems from their continued unrealistic handling by the Navy, and particularly by their fallacious submergence in naval aviation.

While the airplane was top dog there was something to be said for having naval aviators in many important top places because they were aviators. Today, however, these billets should be filled by those naval officers most qualified regardless of whether they be winged or unwinged. What a farce it is to say that if one of the two top men in an important command is an aviator, the other must be a nonaviator, and vice versa. This is but one of the anachronisms still extant. Naval aviation should be integrated into the Navy, and not vice versa. Modern control of the sea will be exercised from the surface primarily by men of broad rather than special qualifications. By no stretch of the imagination do such broad attributes demand inclusion of a once-demonstrated ability to fly an airplane or an airship, for that matter.

With specific respect to the airship, complete recognition must be given to the basic fact that airships are "displacement" vessels of the air and not even remote cousins of heavier-than-air machines. Hence, to afford airships their rightful chance to develop, they should be placed under their own specialists and pioneers and not under airplane men who have a big and important enough field of their own and to whom the airship is just another chore. We must forget the fallacious idea of having dual qualifications in both airplanes and airships, merely as apparent career insurance for airshippers, with the consequent flitting of such men from one to the other, trying to carry water on both shoulders. Nor should the airship branch be used as a catch-all for excess airplane pilots. Indeed, the recently ordained infiltration of airplane men into the airship field may indicate a dawning suspicion of a coming unemployment problem.

From the standpoint of airship progress, let us hope this latest official recognition of the airship will attract new minds and attention from American industry that has done so much for the airplane. For example, it is extremely unfortunate that we ever let development of the metal-class or metal-hulled airship lapse. The Navy has held self-imposed responsibility for airship development for some 30 years, and the whole country looks to the Navy for leadership and inspiration in this field.

Such inspiration, I am reluctantly forced to conclude, will never come as long as we persist in anachronistic domination of the Navy by aviators simply because they are aviators. While commendable and increasing tolerance of the airship is now evident, by itself that is not a sufficient solution. I do not see how we can expect perfection in armed-service unification until we are able to set our own naval house in order, and one of the most urgent needs therein is for straightening out the muddled, unrealistic handling of airships.

The Kerr Natural-Gas Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT S. KERR
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 8 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Real Reason for Kerr Bill Veto," from the April 20, 1950, issue of the Southeast Oklahoman, of Hugo, Okla., and an editorial from the Texhoma (Okla.) Times of April 20, 1950, relating to the so-called natural-gas bill.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Southeast Oklahoman of Hugo, Okla., April 20, 1950]

REAL REASON FOR KERR BILL VETO

We agree with the tenor of opinion in a Paris News editorial which condemns President Truman's veto of the Kerr bill which would have left independent producers of natural gas free of regulation, including price setting, by the Federal Power Commission. However, our estimate of Mr. Truman's reasons for the veto goes somewhat beyond that of the Paris News editorial writer.

"President Truman's veto * * * was in keeping with his determination to have everything regulated by the Federal Government," it was asserted. That point we would not argue, but we think that politics, pure, simple, and selfish, furnished basis for the Presidential disapproval. It adds up this way:

Oklahoma's Senator KERR, Texas' Speaker of the House SAM RAYBURN, and other Representatives and Senators to whom Mr. Truman, to put it mildly, is under deep obligation, had the President's nod before the bill ever was introduced. He did not, so far as we know, attempt to exert any influence against its passage by both Houses of the Congress. It was about the same bill as one advocated, we are told, during the preceding session, with administration assent.

If the President had been opposed to enactment of the Kerr gas bill by a Democratic Congress he could, very easily, have made his displeasure known earlier. And if the essence of the measure did not meet disapproval in a former session, it should not have been objectionable this year.

The tip-off is the statement that the President had been advised that enactment of the measure during this session would be bad political strategy. The truth, we suspect, is that both industry and labor lobbies, representing the North and East, turned the heat on and threatened political recrimination if Mr. Truman signed the Kerr bill. That is the President's most sensitive spot. He judges a lot of things by the yardstick of political expediency, far more, we believe, than is consistent with reasonable standards of statesmanship.

The Paris News made a significant point in the statement that, little by little, gas and oil are taking the place of coal, not only in railroading, but in many industries. Now, as is well known, the price of coal is high and must be kept high to meet the demands of John L. Lewis. If the coal-mine owners cannot meet competition they must curtail operations. Result, fewer coal-mining jobs and less money from union dues for Mr. Lewis and his fellow top brass union officials to spend. It is a safe guess that both the coal operators and the miners were side by each in urging the veto of the Kerr bill. The President needed only mild reminder of how much they did for him at the last election and how much they could do to him in the congressional elections this year and in the next presidential election.

Of the precise merits of the vetoed bill we are ill prepared to express opinion. Both Senator KERR and Speaker RAYBURN denied that it necessarily would raise the price of gas to northern consumers a red cent. They should know whereof they speak. Certainly neither would like to be proven wrong in the matter by subsequent events.

But we do sympathize with the bill's purpose to keep just one industry out of the clutches of a Federal bureau. Now it is reasonable to assume that northern and eastern industrialists and labor leaders, having persuaded the President to go with them, will, as the Paris News predicts, demand that the Power Commission keep down the price of gas, regardless of what it costs to produce it and put it in the pipelines.

If BOB KERR, SAM RAYBURN, and other congressional stalwarts from the Southwest accomplish no more, they have learned the exact depth of Harry Truman's gratitude and how far he can be depended upon to stand hitched when the heat is on. Situated as they are, they are constrained to suffer in silence—but they know the worst.

[From the Texhoma (Okla.) Times, April 20, 1950]

The Kerr bill, to exempt independent natural-gas producers from Federal control, excited more interest in the course of its passage through Congress, in the interim while President Truman considered whether or not to sign it, and since his veto than has any other piece of legislation in recent years.

It is significant that not a single nationally syndicated columnist took a stand in favor of the bill—all of them said the legislation was "against the public interest" and would favor "the big interests."

Most of the columnists, of course, write from New York or Washington and they identify "the public interest" with the pocketbooks of the residents of the cities of the East and North.

So far as the people of the Southwest were concerned, the bill was "in the public interest." But we're outnumbered—there are more votes in the overcrowded cities.

And we're condemned to stand by and see our irreplacable gas drained out from under us at a price set by a Government in control of those hostile to our best interests, drained to warm the inhabitants of eastern cities adjacent to the coal fields.

It sometimes seems that the people of the North and East regard the South and Southwest as subject provinces.

If the price can be set by the Government on gas as it comes from the ground, why can't the same be done with coal or iron ore or timber.

This natural gas isn't going to last long. The Panhandle Eastern Pipeline Co. is even trying to get permission to pipe gas from our field to Canada. Let us hope the attempt fails.

Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the House Banking and Currency Committee commenced its hearings this morning on the extension of rent controls. During the course of those hearings today the Honorable Tighe E. Woods, the Housing Expediter, made a very fine statement showing the absolute necessity for extension of rent controls on the Federal level. Even though my city and State have been removed from the jurisdiction of Federal controls, I heartily concur in all that Mr. Woods has said. I am sure that if my colleagues will examine this very compelling factual statement they will agree that we must extend rent controls for another year.

His statement is as follows:

I want to express my appreciation to this committee for the opportunity to testify on the need for extending Federal rent control.

I subscribe wholeheartedly to the purpose of the Congress as stated in the rent-control

law, namely "to terminate at the earliest practicable date all Federal restrictions on rents on housing accommodations." I have followed the directive of the Congress and have taken more than 500 decontrol actions during the last year on my own initiative. However, hundreds of communities still have an acute housing shortage and great hardship and suffering would result if rent controls were prematurely terminated. In my opinion, the need for Federal rent control will still be a national problem after June 30, 1950, the expiration date of the present act.

By 1941 we had made a start on working off our backlog of accumulated housing needs when Pearl Harbor diverted both materials and manpower to the war effort. At the same time the shortage was intensified in hundreds of areas by the tremendous influx of war workers and servicemen and their families. It was necessary to establish rent control in these areas to prevent the skyrocketing of rents. I should like to point out that rent control has always been confined to areas of extreme housing shortage and has never been in effect in a considerable portion of the geographic area of the country where it was not needed. At its peak 1946, it applied to about 16,000,000 rental dwelling units in 650 defense-rental areas.

During the 4 years of active warfare an average of less than 230,000 new dwelling units were started per year. Along with this restriction of new construction came the war boom in marriages and new families which added a greater and greater strain to the already inadequate supply of housing in the areas of shortage. Since the war, the initiative and energy of the building industry, stimulated by Government aids, have borne fruit so that by 1949 all previous building records were broken. Two contradictory conclusions have been drawn with respect to the volume of new construction. On the one hand, it has been argued that as a result of the high level of new construction there is an adequate supply of vacant housing to meet the demand.

On the other hand, it has been claimed that rent control retards new construction and should therefore be ended. Both conclusions are unwarranted.

The charge that rent control retards new construction is without foundation. There is no rent control on new construction. The Congress removed rent control in July 1947 from dwelling units newly constructed on or after February 1, 1947. This action was taken after repeated assertions that rent control was discouraging the construction of additional housing units. I have stated over and over again that I do not and will not advocate the reimposition of rent control on newly constructed units.

Has the existence of rent control on other than newly constructed dwelling units held back new construction? An all-time high of more than 1,000,000 nonfarm housing starts was set in 1949, and record-breaking new construction is continuing in 1950. And this tremendous building boom is taking place while Federal rent control continues in effect. The critical housing shortage created the need for such a large volume of new construction. The enterprise of the building industry, the economic resources of our country, and Government aids have made this record possible.

The existence or nonexistence of rent control has nothing whatsoever to do with the volume of housing produced. Let us examine what happened to new construction in some decontrolled cities and in comparable cities which have remained under rent control. In Spokane, Wash., in the 5 months following the decontrol of that city—August through December 1949—there was an increase of 72 percent in the number of new dwellings authorized over the corresponding months in 1948. However, in Seattle, Wash., which is still under rent control, there was an increase of 75 percent between the same periods. In Knoxville, Tenn., in the 7 months following decontrol, there was an increase of 9 percent in the number of new dwellings authorized over the corresponding months in the previous year, but in Nashville, Tenn., which is still under rent control, the increase was 193 percent between the same periods. In Tampa, Fla., in the 6 months following decontrol the number of new dwelling units authorized declined 15 percent below the number in the corresponding months of the previous year. Between these same periods the number of new dwellings authorized increased 121 percent in Shreveport, La., which is still under rent control. It is obvious that factors other than rent control determine the volume of new construction.

The claim that the large volume of new construction has provided an adequate supply of vacant housing is not borne out by the facts. The record-breaking volume of new construction is making a noteworthy contribution during this period of housing shortage. Nevertheless, the fact remains that the increase in the number of nonfarm households during the 1940's has exceeded the number of new dwelling units started by nearly one and one-half millions. Today housing vacancies are still at abnormally low levels.

Over-all vacancy rates are generally between 1 and 2 percent as compared with normal rates of 5 to 6 percent. Vacancy rates for habitable dwellings for rent are generally less than 1 percent and many of them are less than one-half of 1 percent. These conclusions are based on recent official surveys of vacancies made by the Bureau of Labor Statistics and the Bureau of the Census in 25 areas located in all regions of the country from coast to coast. Some of the over-all vacancy rates were as follows:

One and six-tenths percent in Detroit and Cincinnati;

One and three-tenths percent in Jacksonville and St. Louis;

One and one-tenth percent in Atlanta, Boston, and Indianapolis; and

Eight-tenths percent in Chicago, Kansas City, and New York City.

The habitable rental vacancy rates were between 0.5 and 0.9 percent in Buffalo, Detroit, Portland (Maine), Memphis, Jacksonville, Cincinnati, Portland-Vancouver, Nashville, New Orleans, Baltimore, and Los Angeles. The rate was 0.4 percent in Atlanta, Boston, Chicago, Indianapolis, Pittsburgh, New York City, and St. Louis. And it was 0.1 percent in Kansas City and Minneapolis-St. Paul. The vacancy rates for all 25 areas are shown in exhibit A which is attached to this statement and which I should like to have made a part of the RECORD.

With these low vacancy rates throughout the country it is clear that new construction has not yet caught up with the backlog of housing demand.

Newspaper ads and various unofficial surveys have been quoted as evidence that the housing shortage has ceased to exist. Some testimony to this effect may be given in the present hearings. I respectfully suggest that the committee examine, as I have done in a number of cases, the nature of the vacancies claimed. My experience indicates that most of the few vacancies which do exist fall into one or another of the following categories:

1. Units which have been rented or sold but are not yet occupied and are not available to anyone seeking housing.

2. Dilapidated housing which is not habitable.

3. Units under construction and not ready for occupancy.

4. Newly constructed units priced beyond the reach of the average family income.

5. Units undergoing remodeling, conversion to multiple units, or to other usage.

6. Rooms in rooming houses or otherwise unsuitable for family occupancy.

7. Temporary or condemned units scheduled for demolition.

8. Units where children are prohibited.

What do low-vacancy rates mean in terms of human suffering? They mean that many families are still forced to live in attics, cellars, shacks, Quonset huts, barracks, and other makeshift housing accommodations. Let me cite a few illustrations from the many hundreds that have been called to my attention.

The News-Journal of Mansfield, Ohio, on March 27, 1950, described the plight of a veteran who had written to the newspaper about his inability to find housing for himself, his wife, and their 2-year-old son:

"He explains that he is a war veteran, discharged from service in 1946, and that for the past 3 months he has been trying unsuccessfully to find a three- or four-room unfurnished apartment.

"He tells of one offer to rent him four unfurnished rooms for $135 a month and another at $22 a week or $85 a month, after which he says: 'People working in factories don't make $100 a week and therefore can't pay such high rent.'"

The following letter, dated March 14, 1950, was sent to the St. Louis Rent Advisory Board:

"After getting out of the Navy in January 1946, we had to live with my sister-in-law for 1 year while trying to locate a place to live. Finally we were forced to rent without utilities, and unfurnished, a two-bedroom, four-room apartment, signing a severe 3-year lease at $96.80 per month.

"Since that time we have tried to locate by advertising, driving around, talking to people, a place at a rental of less than $90 per month with no success.

"Our lease on the present apartment expires in June and renewal is on even more severe terms for another 3-year period. This we cannot possibly afford. For the past year we have been trying to locate a place without success. We find it incredible that anyone can publish the lie that there is ample rental housing in the St. Louis area."

The following is an excerpt from a letter dated February 28, 1950, from Revere, Mass., addressed to President Truman:

"I pay $16 a week out of my $34 a week pay. About half my pay is gone—and I have to feed, clothe, and pay dental, medical, carfare, and provide for us out of the remaining $18. I have to live in two rooms. I'm married and have a baby. I'd like to move to larger quarters—can't afford to. The prices jump up $10 a room, about. Thank God I had terminal-leave pay, a bonus, and now GI dividends to see us through or else we'd almost starve and go naked."

A letter from Philadelphia dated February 19, 1950, said:

"I am not a person of note, but I am a mother of two young children. Due to a heart condition, my husband is not a veteran. * * *

"For years I have tried, unsuccessfully, to rent a unit in one of the low-rent housing projects. No veteran—no unit. The apartment I am in is indescribable. To get another, I will have to dispose of my children. To buy a house is out of the question with my income. * * *

"I have no knowledge of any surveys or statistical records. Yet I know how those I meet in the store, trying to buy a meal for their families, have to struggle to pay rent as it now stands."

These are but a handful out of the hundreds of reports and letters in our files from cities, towns, and villages throughout the country which tell in terms of human misery and suffering the meaning of the statistics I have cited on the abnormally low vacancy rates.

I recognize that not all of the families who have been unable to find adequate rental housing have been compelled to live in makeshift accommodations. Some of them have

been able to obtain shelter by buying a house. In fact, there has been a decrease in the number of rental units in recent years as a result of a shift from tenant to owner occupancy. It has been argued that this change was caused by rent control, which is therefore responsible for the continued shortage of rental housing. This shift from tenant to owner occupancy would have occurred even in the absence of rent control. According to census reports, the number of tenant-occupied dwelling units in the United States decreased by approximately 2,000,000 between April 1940 and April 1947. However, about half of this decrease occurred in rural farm areas which have never been under rent control. The decline in urban and rural nonfarm areas was 6.2 percent. The decline in rural farm areas was 29.6 percent. In other words, the percentage decrease in rental units in areas which have never been under rent control was more than four times as great as the decline in controlled areas.

Factors other than rent control caused this shift from tenant to owner occupancy. It must be remembered that properties have been selling for two and three times as much as they would bring before the war. The opportunity to realize a big profit on investment has motivated many owners of rental property to sell. Rents never fluctuate as rapidly as sales prices and the incentive to sell would have existed whether or not there was rent control. Proof of this is found in the fact that most of the newly constructed units have been built for sale rather than for rent, even though there has been no rent control on new construction for almost 3 years.

From the standpoint of the tenants purchasing homes, there were three considerations: (1) The natural desire and the American ideal of home ownership; (2) in many cases shelter could be obtained only by purchasing during the shortage; and (3) increased incomes and liberal credit, especially to veterans, made it possible for many families to own homes for which they had long planned.

I recognize also that in the midst of this housing shortage some small families and single persons are occupying dwelling units which are large enough to accommodate bigger families or are suitable for conversion to provide additional units. It has been argued that the removal of rent control would free these units for occupancy by larger families and do away with the housing shortage. This argument assumes that landlords would prefer to rent to large families with children rather than to small families or single persons. It also assumes that the large families with many children would be better able to afford the higher rents which would follow decontrol than the small families and single persons.

It is common knowledge that most vacant units are offered for rent to adults only. In fact, when a landlord offers a unit for rent to a family with children it becomes a feature story in the newspapers. For example, the Boston Traveler of January 30, 1950, reports what happened when a landlord who is the father of three children advertised an apartment for rent headed "Children welcome":

"He contracted writer's cramp trying to answer the flood of mail the postman handed him and he hasn't finished the job yet.

" 'It was 323 all told, including telegrams and special deliveries,' he recalls ruefully.

"Eighty percent of the families who did have children he classed as in desperate circumstances—separated because of housing conditions, in crowded quarters or in quarters unfit for children.

"This conscientious man made a brave attempt to write to all 300-plus of the disappointed because he knows what it's like to be desperate. He had spent a whole year separated from his wife, and at that time, two children because of lack of living quarters."

It is well known that small families and single persons generally have lower expenses for the necessities of life than larger families with growing children. It is extremely unlikely that rents high enough to force a small family or single person out of a dwelling unit could possibly be afforded by a large family already living on a tight budget.

With respect to large units suitable for conversion, the present act and rent regulations provide for the decontrol of any conversions which result in additional self-contained family units. This offers every incentive to the remodeling of large units to accommodate a greater number of families.

We have started, under housing legislation passed by this Congress, to relieve the housing needs of low- and moderate-income families, but no substantial volume of housing may be expected from this program for some time. The bulk of new construction since the war has been priced to meet the needs of only the higher-income families. In large cities new units suitable for families with children generally rent for $85 a month or more. There is, therefore, no relief in sight for the millions of families who so desperately need housing.

In the face of our present acute housing shortage, there would be an intolerable rise in rents if controls were removed on June 30. Chicago landlords have already gone on record as to the size of rent increases they would put into effect in the absence of rent control. In a case which they recently carried to the United States Emergency Court of Appeals they contended that their evidence justified an increase in rent of 71.5 percent but insisted that the court order an immediate increase of 45 percent with the statement that the balance should come through the operation of economic laws at the end of rent control. These demands by the landlords of Chicago, where the over-all vacancy rate is less than 1 percent, show what would happen in our larger cities.

The danger of underestimating the amount of pressure which the housing shortage can exert upon uncontrolled rents is apparent in some of the cities which have been decontrolled. In 12 cities where it was thought that the housing shortage had eased enough to permit the removal of rent control and in 2 cities where State control was substituted for Federal control, recent surveys of rents were made by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

The most significant figures in these surveys are those which show (1) how widespread the rent increases were after decontrol for the units whose rents were free to rise, that is, excluding units having continuous leases since decontrol and units individually decontrolled before area-wide decontrol; and (2) the average percentage increase for the units whose rents were raised. The surveys show that many cities had experienced widespread and large increases in rents within a few months after decontrol. In 7 of the 14 cities surveyed rents were raised for more than 50 percent of the dwelling units whose rents were free to rise. For example, in Dallas rents were raised for 67 percent of these units; in Knoxville for 61 percent; in Beverly Hills, Calif., for 74 percent; and in Omaha for 62 percent. The figures I have quoted represent the percentage of tenants who had to pay increases.

Of equal importance is the amount of increase these tenants had to pay. In eight of the cities the tenants whose rents were raised had to pay average increases of 26 to 41 percent. These increases averaged 41 percent in Houston and Beverly Hills; 35 percent in Dallas; 30 percent in Topeka and Eugene, Oreg.; and 26 percent in Knoxville, Jacksonville, and Oklahoma City. Average percentage increases in the general rent level for all units whose rents were free to rise are obtained by combining the rents which had not increased with those which had. These average increases were 20.5 percent in Dallas, 26.7 percent in Beverly Hills, 15.8 percent in Knoxville, and 14.2 percent in Omaha. The inclusion of units whose rents had not been increased in obtaining such general averages conceals the real hardship imposed by decontrol on tenants whose rents have been raised.

Moreover, the heaviest burden was imposed on the tenants occupying units renting for less than $30 a month. In Dallas 75 percent of these tenants had increases averaging 55.8 percent. In Knoxville 63 percent of these tenants had average increases of 36.1 percent, and in Eugene 57 percent of these tenants had increases average 34.6 percent. The Federal Reserve Board in its 1949 Survey of Consumer Finances shows the startling fact that families with incomes of less than $2,000 are paying 23 percent of their income for rent. A 35- to 50-percent increase in rent would cut drastically into their purchases of the other necessities of life.

A summary of the Bureau of Labor Statistics rent survey results for units whose rents were free to rise in all 14 cities is shown in exhibit B, which is attached to this statement and which I should like to have made a part of the record.

The present act does not permit the recontrol of any community which is decontrolled by State or local option. I suggest that the committee consider the possibility of authorizing local governments to secure the reestablishment of Federal control where rents get out of hand.

As the President stated in his special message on rent control "a sudden and simultaneous removal of rent controls on a national scale would precipitate a wave of exorbitant rent increases. Such increases would seriously reduce the purchasing power of millions of families. Since there are very few livable housing quarters available for rent within the means of low- and middle-income families, they would have no choice but to pay the rent increases demanded. These families are already living on tight budgets. The money to pay high rents would have to come out of their purchases of food, clothing, and other necessities. The burden would be most serious for the one-fourth of our families with income of less than $40 a week.

"A sudden and rapid increase in rents would affect adversely sales and employment in many industries and trades. In addition, public assistance costs would rise, increasing Federal, State, and local budgets. Public and private pensions for the aged would become more inadequate."

Letters we have received from decontrolled areas spell out in detail the hardships that result from exorbitant rent increases. The following letter, dated August 10, 1949, came from Dallas, Tex.:

"I am just the mother of a family which has been subjected to rent decontrol here in Dallas, and since our rent has been just about doubled, I find it rather hard to make ends meet, as the children start back to school next month and will require school supplies, clothes, lunch money, etc., and the funds will not be available. Since the decontrol, we have had to forego much, such as cleaning of dress clothes, even for church-going, shoes for the children, floral offerings for relatives' funerals, and many other things that gall one to the quick. Now, since a very close relative is ill in another city in Texas and needs my aid, I cannot even afford the train fare and will have to refuse to go to her side. All these things and many others are happening to the little people in rent-decontrolled cities.

"Dallas is strictly the big man's town, and the penthouse city council is utterly unaware

of the way others live, nor do they care, as they can never be touched by the trials and tribulations that we renters are subjected to.

"Thank you so much for listening to me, as it seems I just had to let off some steam somewhere, and I knew you would be sympathetic.

"P. S.—This decontrol situation will not help the juvenile-delinquency problem, either, as more mothers will have to leave their homes to go to work in order to supplement the family earnings."

This letter, dated March 8, 1950, came from four tenants in Danville, Va.:

"Since the abolishment of rent control in the last session of the Virginia Assembly, to become effective June 25, we, the undersigned, should like for you to have an idea of the effect it is going to have on the citizens of the city of Danville and also the State.

"This is going to create untold hardship and suffering among the mass of people because of the greed and unscrupulous tactics of the majority of the landlords. The landlords have lain in wait to gouge whomever they could as soon as the lids were off and have lost all sight of a reasonable profit on their investments.

"The landlords in this area seem to have the same idea, so there is no alternative of moving out and moving somewhere else where the rent will be more reasonable. The situation is general and people are frantic.

"We, the undersigned are occupants of a 12-unit apartment house composed of six 3-room apartments and six 5-room apartments. The three-room apartments, occupied by the undersigned, consist of three unfurnished rooms, very crude bath. The stove and refrigerators are not furnished. No painting nor other improvement have been made during the past 10 years except by the tenants. In 1943 at the beginning of rent control, these apartments rented for $40 per month. From 1943 to 1949, two hardship increases were granted under rent control, which made a total 20-percent increase. With the abolishment of State rent control, notices have been received by the undersigned that rent on the three-room apartments will be increased from $48 to $70 beginning in June. This one increase amounts to 45.8 percent, or an increase of 75 percent over 1943.

"We consider this completely out of all reason and know that the citizens of this city and this Nation cannot stand increases in such proportions when they are already so heavily burdened with taxes and the general high cost of living.

"We trust that you will submit this information to the proper authority as an appeal for relief for citizens who are being subjected to these scandalous and unwarranted increases."

The pressure of the housing shortage is further indicated by the attempts at unwarranted evictions and collections of illegal rents. The 1949 act restored the authority to control evictions. This authority made it possible to prevent about 75,000 illegal evictions during the past year. At the same time 134,000 eviction certificates were issued where the landlord had legitimate grounds for eviction. In 438,000 other cases where eviction certificates were not required (such as nonpayment of rent or nuisance) a simple notice of intention to evict was filed by the landlord and accepted without question.

In addition to preventing illegal evictions, other violations were cured in 242,000 cases. In 73,500 of these cases where essential services had been reduced, landlords were required either to restore the services or have their rents reduced. In cases where more than the maximum rent had been collected refunds to tenants and penalty payments to the United States Treasury were secured amounting to more than $7,500,000. Of this amount, about $5,500,000 was obtained by compliance negotiation and the remainder by court litigation.

While rent control prevents much suffering and hardship for tenants, it nevertheless permits landlords to secure all rent increases which would be justified in a normal rental market.

What happens if a landlord wants to modernize a kitchen or make some other improvement on his property?

He can get an increase amounting to the rental value of any major improvement, plus an extra allowance for increased costs. Furthermore, before he starts, he can find out exactly how much of an increase he will get.

Suppose a tenant rents out part of a dwelling?

The landlord can get an increase for additional expenses and extra wear and tear on his property.

What if a landlord was caught with a low rent on the date the maximum rent was set?

If a landlord is renting for less than other landlords were gettting for similar accommodations on the maximum rent date, he can get his rent increased to make up the difference.

What if a landlord has already received an increase, but still doesn't have much income left over after he pays his operating expenses?

He can get an increase in his rent to make sure that he has a liberal amount of income left over after paying all of his operating costs, including taxes and an allowance for depreciation.

How about the increase in the price of fuel or any other operating costs the landlord has to pay?

He can get an increase in rent to make up for higher operating costs like fuel, repairs, taxes, utilities, and other services. He thus has every incentive to keep his property in good repair.

Rents are not frozen under rent control. Since controls went into effect there have been 5,000,000 rent increases—half of them as a result of landlords' applications and half by 15 percent leases under the law.

During the period, April 1949 through March 1950, area rent offices processed 589,103 landlords' petitions for rent increases of which 448,120 were granted. In other words, three out of every four landlords who applied for a rent increase obtained it. The 448,120 petitions granted raised the rents for 915,074 dwelling units because in some cases a single petition secured rent increases for all the dwelling units in the building. The increases averaged 17.8 percent. Pending petitions constitute less than 3 weeks' work.

You will recall that the 1949 act directed that so far as practicable rents be adjusted so as to yield landlords a fair net operating income. This directive was carried out by the providing in the Rent Regulations for rent adjustments to give landlords a net operating income equal to 30 percent of gross income for small buildings (that is, structures containing less than 5 units) and equal to 25 percent of gross income for large buildings. Landlords need only report income and operating expenses for the current year. Net operating income is the amount of income the landlord has left over after paying all his operating expenses, including property taxes and in addition an allowance for depreciation. So far only about 80,000 petitions have been filed for rent adjustments under this provision. All but about 4,000 of these have been processed but only about 29,000 were found to be earning less than a fair net operating income. This would appear to be the clearest kind of evidence that there was no foundation to the claim repeatedly made bfore this committee in previous hearings that most landlords had little or no income left after paying their operating expenses and that many were operating at a loss. Similarly, the repeated claims that many landlords have been losing their properties as a result of rent control are not borne cut by the facts. During the period of rent control, nonfarm real-estate foreclosures have been practically negligible and at the lowest levels of the past 25 years.

It was recognized that some landlords may have been adversely affected by increased operating costs even though they were still not eligible for adjustments under the fair net operating income provision. In order to correct such inequities, another provision for rent adjustments was added to the regulations. This provided for rent adjustments to compensate for increases in operating costs since the maximum rent date regardless of the amount of net operating income being earned. In accordance with the directive contained in the Housing and Rent Act of 1949, a landlord-tenant consultant was designated for every defense-rental area. These consultants have provided both landlords and tenants with information on the grounds for rent adjustments and have assisted thousands of them in the preparation of formal applications. Since April 1, 1949, more than 5½ million consultations and personal interviews have been held by the consultants and other specially trained area office personnel.

But what about the landlords who haven't had an increase in rent?

They have benefited in other ways as a result of the critical housing shortage.

Before rent control landlords customarily expected to lose a substantial amount of rental income each year because of vacancies. Now practically every landlord can count on a full 12 months' income from every rental unit. Thus, his total income has gone up, even though his individual rents have not been increased. Before rent control landlords had to compete with each other for tenants. As a result they had to offer special inducements, such as particular color schemes and other unnecessary redecoration. Now such expenses are no longer necessary. Finally, most landlords have benefited from the fact that the value of their property has doubled or trebled during the period of rent control.

The present Rent Control Act contains adequate safeguards to prevent the continuation of rent control in any locality where it is no longer needed. Any incorporated city, town, or village has the right of self-determination and can remove rent control if it finds that the housing shortage has eased to the extent that control is no longer necessary. Any State has the right of self-determination and can end rent control throughout the State or any part of the State if it finds control no longer necessary. Any local rent advisory board which finds that the demand for rental housing has been reasonably met can secure the removal of rent control upon the submission of its recommendation and substantiating evidence. Finally, the Office of the Housing Expediter is directed to remove rent control from any area where the demand for rental housing has been reasonably met. In keeping with this directive, I have taken 534 decontrol actions on my own initiative since April 1, 1949, thus decontrolling about 1,305,900 rental units. Incorporated cities, towns, and villages have exercised their right to decontrol themselves in 262 cases, involving about 1,039,400 rental units. Actions by 7 States removed controls from about 3,087,000 rental units. However, more than 2,500,000 of these units remain under rent control by State law in New York and Wisconsin. Six local rent advisory boards, by their recommendations, secured the termination of control for about 84,400 units. Local boards have also been called upon by city councils and State Governors

considering the possibility of decontrol for information on the local rental housing situation and for their recommendations. I have relied on them in the same manner in all cases where there appeared to be a possibility for decontrol. In areas which have been decontrolled local boards were retained to advise on any changes in the housing situation which might make recontrol necessary. In seven cases controls were reestablished on the recommendation of local rent advisory boards. To sum up, a total of 809 decontrol actions removed controls from an estimated 5,516,700 rental units since April 1, 1949.

Federal rent control still remains in effect, however, for about 8,650,000 rental dwelling units occupied by about 30,000,000 people. This estimate takes into account the number of units decontrolled, shifts from tenant to owner occupancy and the reverse, shifts from residential to other uses, additional units created by conversion, and demolitions and disaster losses. The 1940 census lists 3,521 incorporated cities, towns, and villages in 42 States in the areas still under rent control. All of these incorporated places have had the right to decontrol themselves since April 1, 1949. There are 92 cities in the United States which, in 1940, had a population of more than 100,000. One of these, Flint, Mich., has had local rent control and another, the District of Columbia, has a separate rent-control law. Of the remaining 90 major cities which were under rent control on April 1, 1949, 64 are still under Federal rent control and 8 more in New York and Wisconsin are under State control.

Federal rent control will cease in two additional States, Alabama and Virginia, before June 30, 1950. However, on June 30, 1950, there will still be more than 8,000,000 rental units under Federal rent control. There will still be about 3,400 incorporated cities, towns, and villages under Federal rent control in 40 States. There will still be 62 cities with a 1940 population of more than 100,000 under Federal rent control. Rent control will, therefore, still be a national problem after June 30, 1950.

The continuation of rent control for another year will provide an orderly transition to a free rental market and an orderly process of decontrol as each community meets its housing needs. As the President stated in his special message: "In contrast to the hardships and economic dislocations which would follow a sudden and premature termination of rent control, we have the sound alternative of continuing a policy which protects the tenant and at the same time is fair to the landlord. The welfare of our citizens, as well as the stability of our national economy, require that this policy be continued.

EXHIBIT A

Vacancy rates in 25 areas

Area	Over-all vacancy rate	Habitable rental vacancy rate	Date of survey
Atlanta, Ga	1.1	0.4	February 1950.
Baltimore, Md	2.0	.9	December 1949.
Birmingham, Ala.[1]	1.5	1.0	Do.
Boston, Mass	1.1	.4	Do.
Buffalo, N. Y.[2]	1.2	.5	January 1950.
Cincinnati, Ohio-Ky	1.6	.7	December 1949.
Chicago, Ill	.8	.4	January 1950.
Denver, Colo	1.5	.2	Do.
Detroit, Mich	1.6	.5	December 1949.
Indianapolis, Ind	1.1	.4	January 1950.
Jacksonville, Fla	1.3	.7	December 1949.
Kansas City, Mo.-Kans	.8	.1	January 1950.
Los Angeles, Calif	1.8	.9	February 1950.
Memphis, Tenn	2.3	.6	December 1949.
Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn.	1.0	.1	Do.
Mobile, Ala.[1]	3.8	2.0	Do.
Nashville, Tenn	1.5	.8	February 1950.
New Orleans, La	2.5	.8	January 1950.
New York, N. Y.[2]	.8	.4	Do.

[1] Decontrol by State action becomes effective on May 25, 1950.
[2] State rent control was substituted for Federal rent control on May 1, 1950.

EXHIBIT A—Continued

Vacancy rates in 25 areas—Continued

Area	Over-all vacancy rate	Habitable rental vacancy rate	Date of survey
Pittsburgh, Pa	0.9	0.4	January 1950.
Portland, Maine	2.1	.6	December 1949.
Portland, Oreg.-Vancouver, Wash.	2.1	.7	January 1950.
Richmond, Va.[3]	1.1	.3	Do.
Savannah, Ga.[4]	3.9	2.7	Do.
St. Louis, Mo.-Ill	1.3	.4	December 1949.

[3] Decontrol by State action becomes effective on June 10, 1950.
[4] Decontrolled by local option on Mar. 6, 1950.

Sources: Surveys by the U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics except for Nashville, Tenn., which was surveyed by the U. S. Bureau of the Census.

DEFINITIONS

1. Over-all vacancy rate: The "over-all vacancy rate" is the percentage which the number of vacant units found in the survey is of the total number of units in the sample. Included among the vacant units are any vacancies found among units under construction which have exterior windows, doors, and final usable floors in place, units already rented or sold but not yet occupied, units being held in estate or other litigation, units held for seasonal occupancy, and all available units being offered for rent or sale.

2. Habitable rental vacancy rate: The "habitable rental vacancy rate" is the percentage which the number of vacant habitable rental units found in the survey is of the total number of units in the sample. A unit is not habitable if its state of repair includes deficiencies in physical construction rendering it inadequate or unsafe as shelter, i. e., sagging of roof, walls or floors; holes, open cracks, rotted, loose or missing materials over a considerable area of foundation, walls, roof, floors, or ceilings; extensive damage by storm, flood, or fire; or several similar deficiencies each to a lesser extent which in combination render the unit inadequate or unsafe as shelter; makeshift or inadequate original construction. A vacant rental unit is one which is actually being offered for rent. A unit which is being offered for rent or for sale is considered a rental unit. A unit already rented but not yet occupied is not counted as a vacant rental unit.

EXHIBIT B

Increases in rents free to rise after termination of Federal rent control in 14 cities

[Excludes units having continuous leases and units individually decontrolled before area-wide decontrol]

City	All rent ranges			Under $30 per month			Survey period	Date of decontrol	Method by which Federal control terminated
	Percent of all units having increases	Average percentage increase: For units which had rent increases	Average percentage increase: For all units, including those which did not have rent increases	Percent of all units having increases	Average percentage increase: For units which had rent increases	Average percentage increase: For all units, including those which did not have rent increases			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Houston, Tex	31	41.3	10.7	44	46.4	20.2	Aug. 15 to Nov. 15, 1949	Oct. 19, 1949	State action.
Beverly Hills, Calif	74	41.0	26.7	91	[1] 42.7	[1] 38.9	Oct. 15, 1949, to Mar. 1, 1950	Dec. 7, 1949	Local option.
Dallas, Tex	67	35.4	20.5	75	55.8	41.6	Apr. 15 to Nov. 15, 1949	June 23, 1949	Do.
Topeka, Kans	40	30.3	10.5	50	37.7	19.7	July 15 to Nov. 15, 1949	Sept. 14, 1949	Do.
Eugene, Oreg	38	30.3	9.4	57	34.6	19.7	June 15, 1949, to Feb. 15, 1950	Aug. 18, 1949	Do.
Knoxville, Tenn	61	26.8	15.8	63	36.1	21.9	May 15 to Nov. 15, 1949	June 14, 1949	Do.
Jacksonville, Fla	56	26.2	12.3	[2]	[2]	[2]	June 15 to Nov. 15, 1949	Aug. 5, 1949	Do.
Oklahoma City, Okla.[3]	17	26.2	2.9	31	39.8	11.5	Sept. 15, 1949, to Jan. 15, 1950	Nov. 23, 1949	Do.
Omaha, Nebr	62	21.9	14.2	46	29.3	13.5	do	Nov. 2, 1949	State action.
Milwaukee, Wis.[4]	60	20.2	12.2	59	27.0	15.9	May 15, 1949, to Feb. 15, 1950	Aug. 5, 1949	State control substituted.
Spokane, Wash	46	18.6	8.2	43	28.3	11.8	May 15 to Nov. 15, 1949	July 25, 1949	Housing Expediter initiative.[5]
Wichita, Kans	35	18.2	6.4	34	52.1	16.6	Oct. 15, 1949, to Mar. 1, 1950	Dec. 29, 1949	Local option.
Salt Lake City, Utah	46	16.2	7.1	48	26.3	12.6	June 15 to Nov. 15, 1949	Aug. 5, 1949	Do.
Madison, Wis	51	12.3	5.9	[1] 55	[1] 14.1	[1] 7.9	June 15, 1949, to Feb. 15, 1950	do	State control substituted.

[1] Under $50 per month.
[2] Not available.
[3] General rent increase of 20 percent granted prior to decontrol.
[4] Includes all units—data on rents free to rise not available.
[5] Based on informal recommendation of local rent advisory board.

Source: Surveys by the U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Biggest Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the thirteenth article by Mr. Frank Waldrop on the infiltration of communism in our country:

BIGGEST STORY

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

The first Soviet government in the world was formed in the ballroom of a girls' school in Petrograd, Russia, on November 17, 1917. It wasn't much.

The leader of the new system was Vladimir Ulyanov, alias Lenin, a professional conspirator and revolutionary.

Soviet means merely group or council.

Soviets were to pull together the farmers, the factory workers and the rank and file of soldiers and sailors, unit by small unit, in the villages, towns, and cities.

Delegates from village soviets would go to higher soviets carrying their wisdom upward in happy spirals until at the top the rule of the saints would take care of every one back down the line.

Of course, in every soviet, there would be a Communist or so to plant the seed of Karl Marx's scientific socialism, the key to positive progress.

That was the theory. But not the reality.

While Lenin talked in the ballroom of the girls' school, the firing squads out in the streets were killing on sight a list of "enemies of the people."

This was supposed at first to be just an unpleasant preliminary to happy days for everybody surviving.

Little did the Russians dream that bad as things were, they would soon be worse.

For the list of "enemies of the people" kept getting longer, not shorter. The more who were killed the more had to be killed.

One bargain Lenin did keep. The German General Staff had sent him from Switzerland to the Russian border in April 1917, to do anything he could toward knocking Russia out of the war against the Kaiser.

The Germans were logical enough in their way. President Woodrow Wilson had jockeyed the United States of America in against Germany, so they undertook to lift the pressure from the east by any means they could.

Think what the world could have been saved if that chapter in the history of our times had never been written.

At any rate, Lenin formed his brand of government in Petrograd on November 7, 1917, and on December 5, 1917, he produced, like a rabbit from his hat, an armistice with Germany. To the war-sick Russians, anybody who could stop the murderous German gunfire looked like a savior.

But then came the problem of building the Soviet state on lines of scientific Marxist socialism, with the Communist vanguard leading the way.

That was something else. For the list of "enemies of the people" was now reaching down past the nobility and the aristocracy, past the big landowners and the merchants. It was beginning to blot out the doctors, the lawyers, the school teachers, the writers, and the independent-minded of any rank.

Instead of bread, land, and peace, there was disaster everywhere. People who owned cats kept them on a leash, so they could decide when it was time to eat.

And instead of peace anywhere, a whole series of swirling regional wars broke out. The war between Germany and the western powers ended on November 11, 1918, and soon thereafter the victors sent expeditionary forces to see what could be done about restoring orderly Russian Government.

But people were too sick of war, West as well as East, and so the expeditions soon came home again.

Memorable dates were:

July 16, 1918: The Communists shot the deposed Czar, Nicholas II, in a cellar at Ekaterinburg along with his family.

March 2, 1919: The Communists formed the Third International Congress of Communist Parties of the world. Their simple aim in life was to spy and campaign and propagandize in every nation to cause a world revolution at once.

They were blindly sure that what they were doing to Russia would be simple everywhere. They were not alone in the idea.

April 25, 1920: The Russian Communists opened war on Poland, in line with the above march toward world revolution. But it was a short-lived conquest that ended in a rout, for the Soviet system back home was breaking down as fast as it had been built up.

March 17, 1921: The "New Economic Policy," Lenin's admission that the Soviet state could not deliver the goods.

The NEP was nothing more that a retreat to private enterprise. And as long as it lasted the Russians ate better than they ever had since 1917. Industry even climbed back to prewar levels.

January 21, 1924: Lenin died, exhausted and a proven failure at government, but forever marked as a matter of intrigue and class warfare. Had the western nations kept their occupation forces in Russia until then, the Soviet experiment in the world would have stopped right there.

Biggest Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the fourteenth article by Mr. Frank Waldrop on the infiltration of communism in our country:

BIGGEST STORY

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Two things saved the Communists in the chaos that swept Russia after 1913.

First, they knew exactly what they wanted and they stuck to it while all the other contenders for power switched and changed and fought one another.

The Communists from the start aimed straight for the gold and the guns. Their first gold they got from the Germans and that helped them buy guns.

And nothing adds to gold and guns, like guns and gold.

Second, they were as they remain today, the shrewdest judges of our age at making promises that excite giddy minds and hearts.

Politicians out of power are never limited in the promises they make except by their caution or their consciences.

The Communists, having neither and rolling the dice in the spirit of winner take all, hit the war-shaken people of Europe, Asia, and the Americas in 1918 with a propaganda of dazzling reach and style.

In every country of the world since time began, writers have all loved the melodramatic side of life. The more uproar, the more interest they take.

Why is that? Well, writers write to be read and readers like to read about the blood and fury, the captains and the kings, the disasters and the thunders, not the quiet side of peaceful progress.

Thus, as the Communists undertook in Russia the melodramatic enterprise of revolution plus an experiment in government frankly aimed at the overturn and capture of the whole world, romantic minds everywhere were agitated.

Over in the State Department, today, you can turn the dry, yellowing leaves of dispatches sent long ago and see the thing begin to unfold.

There was, for instance, the case of John Reed—Harvard, class of 1910. A brief departmental press release mentions him as a stowaway who left the United States without a passport and was found in the coal bunker of a ship as it put in at Abo, in Finland.

He had on him, so the message said "large sums of money, films and letters to important Bolsheviks," which surprised nobody, as Reed had been seen in Russia in 1917, had been one of the main organizers of the just-formed "Communist Labor Party" over here and had been indicted for sedition.

The messages did not add that John Reed, as a real Harvard man, would go on with the Communists in their move back from Petrograd to the ancient capital of Moscow.

Or that he would fire the excitement of easily agitated minds in the United States of America with a propaganda account of the revolution, entitled "Ten Days That Shook the World."

Or that he would die of typhus, like uncounted hordes of others and be buried in the wall of the Kremlin where Joseph Stalin rules today.

Or that his beautiful widow, Louise, would soon marry another young man who had been sent to Russia by Woodrow Wilson to observe and report.

Or that the second young man would quit his diplomatic job with the United States of America in disgust because nobody in the State Department cared for the message sent back by another of his exploratory delegation, "I have seen the future and it works."

Or that the second young man who had married the widow and had kicked up his heels, would one day return to Moscow as the first United States Ambassador to the Soviet Government of Russia.

Or that, within a year after becoming that ambassador, the second young man, no longer so young, no longer so pleased with what had once been called the future at work, would quit Russia disgusted and alarmed.

Or that by 1950, he would be one of the most determined voices in the United States of America, crying beware the future that worked—but the wrong way.

The name of the second young man was William Christian Bullitt, who has said of those far-off times:

"You cannot imagine the difference between the men who were in Moscow then and the ones who followed them.

"Jack Reed, Lincoln Steffens (who told Woodrow Wilson he had seen the future and it works)—all of them were the warmest-hearted, most out-giving souls that ever lived. They were men who aimed for good and only for good."

And so it may have been. But they were all talkers and writers and theorizers and they were the kind who can imagine a thing right before their eyes.

They were the kind who looked, for instance, at a plan for what was to be the biggest office building in the world, the Moscow Palace of the Soviets.

The palace got as far as a medium-sized hole in the ground, about 1928. It has never gone any further.

Yet, the Communist propaganda made it as real to the faithful as if they could ride up in the elevators to the very top of the tower that was to be the tallest in the world.

To the faithful that tower of dreams was real. The typhus that killed Jack Reed was hardly there at all.

The Help That Hurts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, May 6, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal of May 8, 1950:

REVIEW AND OUTLOOK
THE HELP THAT HURTS

We've been talking with a small-business man, the kind that Washington professes to do so much worrying about.

He would seem to have reason to be cheerful. After dipping last year, his sales are climbing again. There's more demand for the sensitive equipment his firm makes to measure moisture in lumber, textiles, and paper. His customers also are doing better this year than last and they're more quality-conscious. So they're more alert to the need for moisture-measurers.

But our small-business man friend is perplexed. In the past few weeks he has traveled over about a third of the United States calling on customers. He finds among many of them what he calls an air of uncertainty. There's just a slight unwillingness to risk the money for new equipment though the customers want it and, generally, are making the money to pay for it.

Being something of an amateur reporter, our friend has tried to dig underneath that uncertainty and see what causes it. So far, however, he hasn't been able to put his finger on the cause.

That set this businessman to thinking about his own business and its prospects and problems. He sees a chance for quite a lot of sales, if this air of uncertainty could be blown away. To take care of much larger demand, however, he'd have to get more factory space, buy more equipment and perhaps double his 25-person payroll (evidence he's a small-business man).

That, in turn, directed his mind to one high hurdle—how much various governments take away from him before he can take any money out of his business.

Our small-business man has his factory in a California city, and here are the major taxes he has to pay: City license tax, city sales tax, city income tax, State sales tax, State corporate income tax, State corporate franchise tax, State use tax on materials for his products, State unemployment insurance tax, Federal social security (old age benefits) tax, Federal corporate income tax.

Then, assuming his business is good enough to provide some income for himself after these bites, he has the prospect of paying both State and Federal personal income taxes.

This has created just a touch of uncertainty on the part of our friend about any expansion. He wonders whether that isn't one of the things that bothers his small-business men customers. We wonder, too.

That brings us to the latest proposal out of Washington to aid small and independent businesses. President Truman has wrapped up into a five-point program several ideas that have been kicking around the Capital for a long while. The main points would:

Provide Government insurance of bank loans up to $25,000 each.

Permit the Government to charter "national investment companies" that would offer equity capital and long-term loans. They would be privately owned but Government-supervised.

Let the Government's Reconstruction Finance Corporation relax its collateral requirements on loans to small business.

Turn the management of this program over to the Government's Department of Commerce. That means putting the RFC in the Department.

The administration proposes, by this program, to help the small-business men by putting Government agencies and departments a little closer to their operations.

The two major points of President Truman's program are easing of loan requirements by the RFC and the setting up of capital and credit banks. The dangers of these two steps are obvious. Some small companies that borrowed from the RFC and later found they couldn't pay off are now in the hands of the Government. That could happen many more times under more liberal lending. It's true that the suggested "national investment companies" would be privately owned. But this proposal sounds very much like that incorporated in a bill submitted by Senator O'MAHONEY. In releasing the details of his bill some months ago, the Senator said:

"It is recognized that such capital banking corporations must be in a position to provide not only money but business guidance to small and independent business. It is contemplated, therefore, that the Federal Reserve Board and the Department of Commerce will collaborate to establish machinery within which the capital banking corporations will be able to provide such service."

It's easy to see, therefore, where that financing road leads—to a steady encroachment of Government into the affairs of small businessmen.

There will be lots of talk about how this help-the-small-business man scheme will be self-financing. But we can see the costs of administration piling up and the need for Federal funds to make up losses from loans that go sour. That means a further call on the taxpayer.

We've no doubt about the reaction of our small-business man friend from California. He can see that tax hurdle rising higher and higher. So what's the use of trying to make the leap and expand his business and provide more jobs. He might break a leg doing so.

For Equity in Local Elections

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURR P. HARRISON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 8, 1950

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Evening Star, Washington, D. C., entitled "For Equity in Local Elections":

FOR EQUITY IN LOCAL ELECTIONS

In approving a Hatch Act amendment to permit partisanship by Federal employees in nearby local elections, Congress has paved the way for more representative government in the enfranchised parts of the Washington metropolitan area. Under the Civil Service Commission's interpretation of the no-politics law, Democratic or Republican employees of the Federal Government could not run for local offices except in disguise—as independents. And independents in the past often have lost to nongovernmental candidates supported by one or the other party. This situation sometimes has placed Federal employees at a distinct disadvantage. And local boards and commissions may have been deprived of the services of exceptionally qualified citizens who were under Hatch Act restrictions.

Congress considered another development in reaching its decision to remove the restrictions for purely local politicking. This is the fact that the bar on Federal employees' political activities had tended to create nonpartisan organizations which had every appearance of being full-fledged political parties, except in name. Thus, Federal workers could be as active as they pleased in such a third-party movement, but were denied the right of campaigning under old-line party colors. Representative HARRISON, of Virginia, pointed out that the amendment will permit Federal workers to take part in local politics in the parties of their choice. They would still be prohibited, of course, from engaging in national political campaigns.

This will not prevent local communities from holding nonpartisan elections for certain offices, if that is the will of the voters. But, unless the entire election is to be on a nonpartisan basis, it is unfair to Federal employees to place them under handicaps not applicable to nonfederally employed residents. The amendment, therefore, is in the interest of a more equitable administration of the Hatch Act. And so, also, is the additional amendment giving the Civil Service Commission a wider choice of penalties to inflict on violators of the law.

United States To Pay Off Eight Billions of British Debts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OTTO E. PASSMAN
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 8, 1950

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Arthur Veysey from the Washington Times-Herald of April 26, 1950, and an Associated Press dispatch on the same subject:

UNITED STATES TO PAY OFF EIGHT BILLIONS OF BRITISH DEBTS—PUBLIC O. K. SOUGHT FOR AGREEMENT

(By Arthur Veysey)

LONDON, April 25.—The United States will begin paying off Britain's sterling balance war debts within 6 months under tentative agreements, already reached, it was learned today.

The debts total more than $8,000,000,000. The chief creditors are India, Pakistan, and Egypt.

Negotiations for transferring the debt from Britain to the American taxpayers began last September and have continued in Washington and London.

CONGRESS IS HURDLE

The talks have been completed except for determining the method by which the shift of the debt will be presented to Congress and the American public. The negotiators refer to their present deliberations as a search for a formula.

For a while the negotiators planned to present the debt shift as "a final effort to put England on her feet."

However, they recently decided Congress or the American public might not be interested in "putting England on her feet" after paying more than $50,000,000,000 to that end in the last 10 years. So the current plan is to present the plan as a necessary battle against communism in Asia.

The negotiators agreed that unless something is done, communism will take over the rest of Asia.

HAND-OUT TO ASIA

They agreed also that the best thing to do was to hand out a considerable amount of money to certain people in Asia. Britain would like to hand it out, but doesn't have it. Therefore the bite will have to be put on the American public.

So far no decision has been made as to how much of the $8,000,000,000 the United States will assume initially. The actual sum will depend upon the success of the negotiators before Congress.

The British, recognizing the increasing unwillingness of Americans to continue handouts to Britain, are opposed to presenting the plan as a straightforward assumption of the British debt. They urge instead that Congress be asked for funds to fight communism in Asia.

SEPARATE TRANSACTION

In an entirely separate transaction the countries receiving the hand-outs would wipe out part or all of the British debt. The reduction in the debts would depend upon the amount of the American gifts.

The British continue to fight bitterly any suggestion that the American money must be spent only in America.

American financiers and exporters who have urged the Truman administration to take over the British debts have proposed such a restriction, saying it would not only benefit them but might be a plum to dangle in front of Congress and the public.

PLAN ON DEBTS SLAPPED IN SENATE

Cold opposition was raised in the Senate yesterday to Britain's proposal that the United States shoulder part of Britain's $9,000,000,000 debt to the sterling-bloc nations.

Three leaders spoke out vigorously against it and their position was believed to reflect a general feeling among lawmakers.

Here is what they had to say:

Chairman CONNALLY, Democrat, of Texas, of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee: "The British proposal is astounding. It is my view that the United States cannot and should not entertain the British plan."

Senator TAFT, of Ohio, chairman of the Republican Senate Policy Committee: "It is an extraordinary presumption on their part to ask us now to assume their debts."

Senator WHERRY, of Nebraska, Republican Senate floor leader: "I am not in favor of giving any further aid to Britain."

Long Beach, a California City Sings—A Municipality Music Minded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1950

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, Long Beach, Calif., fully observes National Music Week, May 7 to May 14.

Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, my home city, Long Beach, Calif., is nationally known as a city which sings. The people there recognize that a city which sings has less sin, sickness, and sorrow. So, amongst emphasis which its places upon the power and place of music in municipal experience, it always observes with emphasis and vigor National Music Week, May 7 to 14, inclusive. This present National Music Week is directed by Gladys Comstock Smith, whose great-great grandfather was Judge Nicoll Halsey. Judge Halsey was born in South Hampton, Long Island, N. Y., in 1782, and was a member of the New York State Assembly, and later served two sessions in the Twenty-third Congress of the United States, to wit, from 1833 to 1834. He was one of the Erie Canal commissioners.

I believe it is self-evident that the songs which a nation sings are not less important than the laws which their legislators enact. Music emanates from the souls and hearts of the "folks." Thus it is that I have come to believe that the songs of a people, and the poems which people love, have at least as much to do with their character, happiness, and their prosperity as do the laws which their legislators put on the statute books. For people sing out of their souls and out of their hearts. Permanent history is made out of the hearts and souls of people. What people sing, how they sing, and where they sing determine much history.

The people of Long Beach, Calif., believe it essential that people participate in recreational programs. They voted a special tax levy of 3 cents per $100, to set up a separate budget for recreation for its people. They created a recreation commission. They studied and ascertained that what people do in their leisure time, determines their real character and worth. So my city has become nationally recognized for its promotion of participation by the maximum number of people in items of music, drama, baseball, art, handicraft, roque, tennis, swimming, libraries, song festivals, community singing, and so forth, and so forth. I am pleased to call to your attention an article forwarded me which appeared under date of May 5, 1950 in a Long Beach newspaper. You will note that the theme of the week is "Our American Heritage in Music." I am informed that the distinguished great, great granddaughter of Congressman Nicoll Halsey selected the theme of the week.

When I had the pleasure of speaking with her at Easter congressional recess, about the place of music in the national experience she replied, "Congressman CLYDE DOYLE, we are grateful that in these United States of America every man, woman, and child have full freedom to express the joy or sadness of his heart in music; without fear of oppression."

So, Mr. Speaker, here is the news item about National Music Week in Long Beach:

Long Beach will observe National Music Week May 7 through 14. General chairman of the week's events is Gladys Comstock Smith, founder-president of the Guild of Women Composers and president of the Long Beach Presidents' Club. Cochairman is Harry R. Christensen, baritone, director of several Long Beach choirs and a member of the Kiwanis quartet. Mrs. Smith is a piano composer and poet. Clubs cosponsoring the week are the Guild of Women Composers and the Presidents' Club.

Our American Heritage in Music is the theme for the week and stress will be placed upon American music.

First offering of the week will be May 7 at 4 p. m., when Long Beach Chapter of the American Guild of Organists will sponsor a program in First Presbyterian Church. The speaker will be Rev. R. Merrill Jensen, pastor of Immanuel Baptist Church, who was a concert organist before going into the ministry. Dr. Emerson C. Cox is dean of Long Beach Chapter of the American Guild of Organists. The program will be provided by the music department of the host church.

Throughout Music Week a half hour pipe organ recital at noon will be given daily in First Congregational Church by members of the American Guild of Organists, as follows: Monday, Robert Douglas, graduate student in music at UCLA; Tuesday, Harry and Christine Thomlinson, ministers of music of Palm Springs Community Church; Wednesday, F. Raymond Parmelee, Pacific Coast Club organist; Thursday, Vivian Sutton, organist at Bethany Baptist Church; Friday, Dorothy Rankin Smith, from the music department of Jordan High School; Saturday, Wallace W. Roblee, instructor of organ at Redondo Beach High School.

On May 9, Allied Arts International will give a program of music and classical dancing at 7:45 p. m. in the YWCA auditorium. Franklin Pierce Chaney is president and Edith Emily Dane, vice president of the organization.

On May 10, the Woman's Music Club of which Mrs. B. Tuckley Thompson is president, is to have open house in Ebell Auditorium beginning at 1:30 p. m. where a spring concert will be given. In the evening, a concert will be given by four choral groups of the adult department of Long Beach City College under direction of Arne Zahl, including Mothersingers of Long Beach Council of Parents and Teachers; American Legion Auxiliary Chorus; Call of Church Choir, and Barbershoppers.

May 12 the Woman's City Club of which Mrs. Lucille Swenson is president, will have open house in the Masonic Temple, 835 Locust Avenue.

Mother's Day will be observed in conjunction with Music Week on May 14 when an evening concert is to be given in Convention Hall of the Municipal Auditorium under direction of Gladys Comstock Smith. Included will be manuscript numbers by members of the Guild of Women Composers. John Berry, violinist, will play and piano numbers will be given by George William Mack. Harry A. Christensen and a chorus of 200 singers from the Southern California Welsh Choral group will sing. The groups is sponsored by the Cambrian Society of Long Beach of which W. O. Williams is president and Ann Thomas, secretary.

Development of Irrigation in Nebraska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1950

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD,

I include a résumé of the remarks which I made before the Loup River Basin Irrigation and Conservation Association, at Scotia, Nebr.:

THE DEVELOPMENT OF IRRIGATION IN NEBRASKA

It was 7 years ago, as a member of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, that I asked the then Commissioner of Reclamation, Harry Bashore, who now lives at Mitchell, where the money and plans were for the development of irrigation, power, and soil conservation in Nebraska. I remember the Commissioner's reply. He said, "Dr. MILLER, there are no funds for Nebraska. We have to put the grease where the wheel squeaks the loudest." I replied, "Mr. Commissioner, I expect to do a lot of squeaking. Nebraska needs the type of surveys given other States." In other words, up to 1943, there had been no demands for a detailed study of the great water system of Nebraska, in order to determine how much water was available, what power could be developed and what lands could be irrigated. It was the resolution introduced at that time, and added to the Flood Control Act of 1944, which permitted the Bureau of Reclamation and the Army engineers to proceed with the present studies being made of the Niobrara, Platte, and the Loup Rivers.

To come under the Federal irrigation laws you must form a legal irrigation district under State law. Your survey plans and feasibility must clear the regional office of the Bureau of Reclamation in Denver, and your own State department of public roads and irrigation. It must get clearance through the Bureau of Reclamation, the Department of the Interior and the Budget Bureau before being presented successfully to the Committee on Reclamation in Congress. Then the project must clear the committee, both Houses of Congress, and be approved by the President. This seems like a long road but do not get discouraged.

The Reclamation Committee, of which I am still a member, has recently made some changes in the Reclamation Act. It makes more feasible some of the projects which heretofore could not comply under existing regulations. As you know, under irrigation laws, you originally had 10 years as the development period and then 40 years to pay back the principal without interest. The new proposed law extends the period of repayment. There are certain nonreimbursable items such as flood and silt control, recreation, navigation, and fish and wildlife that are not charged up against the project.

It has been the history of good irrigation projects that water applied at the proper time is a great stabilizer, and gives comforting assurance that this Nation can be well fed. It also assures the farmer a backlog of safety, security, and stability, not only to his family but to the community around an irrigation project.

Irrigation brings new wealth to a community. It brings new purchasing power and improved standards of living, not only to the farmer, but to the professional and business men living in these irrigated areas.

An outstanding example of the benefits which irrigation brings can be found in Scotts Bluff County where about 43 percent of the land is irrigated. The production in Scotts Bluff County, in 1944, was nearly six times that of 1910, when irrigation was just getting started. In 1940 the value of farm crops in Scotts Bluff County was double that of the next ranking county of the State. The population in Scotts Bluff County actually increased 405 percent between 1910 and 1940. There will be a further increase for 1950. The story of Scotts Bluff County can be repeated in a score of places in the Nation where water has been harnessed, and placed to work upon our soil. Putting these new lands into production through irrigation, means new wealth, new sources of taxes and better standards of living. We can create several Gardens of Eden in Nebraska.

Some of my colleagues from the East raise the question of why bring more land under cultivation when we now have a surplus of some crops. These surpluses have not always existed. We should remember that the population of the United States is increasing about two and five-tenths million each year. We can well have 50,000,000 more people in 20 years. They must have food.

The amount of cultivated land in the United States is limited. The development of irrigation projects is a long range endeavor. We ought to always look ahead in order that the people of the United States will have sufficient food for their needs.

As we find new industrial uses for agricultural products, I feel certain that the farm surpluses will not be plaguing the Nation. I doubt if we have ever had an oversupply of food. More often it has been the inability of the people to buy.

Since 1922 with the exception of 1 year, we had to import more farm products than we exported. The records will show that from 1934 to 1942 we imported, annually, on the average products from 50,000,000 acres in excess of our exports. These imports helped to cause the farm and general depression of 1929.

We are again approaching the position where we are promising the farmer high prices for his products, and on the other hand we are importing the same products at less than our American parity level to keep the farmer from obtaining a good price.

We have about 20,000,000 acres of land in the United States under irrigation. There are perhaps another 20,000,000 acres which, with the wise use of water, could be irrigated.

I am hopeful that the feasible projects in Nebraska can get through the blueprint stage and be ready for action in Congress by 1951. I am sure that I can defend the Nebraska projects as one which will bring not only new wealth, but will provide an expanding economy for generations yet unborn. We must plan, not for today or tomorrow, but for those who will occupy this land after we in this meeting have passed over the Great Divide. It seems to me that the cornerstone and very foundation of our country is that of developing our resources for the benefit of mankind. We have brave and hospitable people. Give them fertile soil, a sound government, and they will reach new horizons which have been denied to the present generation.

Peace or War in the Middle East?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 8, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, for months many of us in this House have been warning that the arms situation in the Middle East is getting out of hand. We have been urging our Government, especially our State Department, to take steps to stop the armament race between the Arab states and Israel and to persuade Great Britain to cease her arms shipments to the Arab countries. Unless that is done real soon, we may be faced with another conflict in the Middle East which would be more devastating and detrimental to the nations of that area and to the peace of the world.

Secretary of State Dean Acheson is now in Europe and, according to reports, he is scheduled to discuss the Middle East arms situation with British Foreign Minister Bevin during the coming days. The outcome of that discussion may mean peace or war for the Arab states and Israel, it may mean life or death to the peoples of the Middle East.

In connection with this matter, I desire to bring to the attention of my colleagues a very timely and excellent article by Roger Stuart, the noted Washington staff writer of the New York World-Telegram and Sun, in its issue of May 6, 1950. Mr. Stuart, one of the best-informed journalists in Washington on foreign affairs, visited the Middle East about a year ago and is well acquainted with the problems of that area. His article follows:

UNITED STATES MAY ACT TO STEM FLOW OF BRITISH ARMS TO ARABS—ACHESON PLEDGES TO TAKE UP ISSUE WITH BEVIN AS FEARS OF NEW WAR AGAINST ISRAEL INCREASE

(By Roger Stuart)

WASHINGTON, May 6.—Washington is seriously concerned that an arms race, already in progress in the troubled Middle East, may lead to another conflict between Israel and the Arab states, this time more devastating and costly than the last.

Indeed, it is due to oft-expressed fears by congressional leaders of such a development that Secretary of State Dean Acheson has agreed to take up with Ernest Bevin, British Foreign Minister, the whole question of arms shipments to the Arabs at the Big Three Conference scheduled to open in London Monday.

The Secretary's promise to do so was given to 32 Democratic and Republican Congressmen, who called on him to protest Great Britain's part in rearming the Arab countries. It was the first concrete evidence the State Department is more alarmed than it previously had chosen to admit.

As recently as 2 months ago, Assistant Secretary Jack K. McFall, replying for Mr. Acheson to a query from Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR. (Republican, Massachusetts), asserted he was "happy to inform you that an analysis of information available to the Department indicates that no party to the Palestine dispute is making serious preparations to renew hostilities."

BRITISH FURNISH ARMS

Meanwhile, there was no hiding the fact—both the State Department and the British Government itself admitted it—that Britain was furnishing heavy arms, as well as lighter military equipment, to Transjordan, Egypt, and Iraq. No arms whatever were made available by the British to the Israelis, while the United States had consented to sell both Israel and the Arab states only such light equipment as could be used for internal-security purposes.

That the arms being sent by the British to the Arabs consist of such potent items as jet planes, tanks, and cannon, subsequently was conceded by Foreign Under Secretary Ernest Davies in the House of Commons. He declined, however, to reveal figures on shipments. He contented himself with saying merely that Britain was under treaty obligations to sell arms to the Arabs, but was not required to supply the Israelis.

Concern over the situation in the Middle East began to mount in Congress after the United Nations Security Council lifted its arms embargo last August. At that time both the United States and Britain declared they did not wish to see an arms race develop

in the Middle East. But while this country declined to permit shipments of any heavy armaments, Britain immediately began to increase her help to her Arab friends in building up their stock piles, even as the press in Arab countries renewed bellicose talk of a second round.

"The Palestine war is not yet over," screamed a Cairo paper, Akbar El Yom. "Egyptian blood which drenched the soil of Palestine has laid a path along which we are in duty bound to tread to clinch the victory for which our martyrs fought."

"We must all unite in strong opposition to Zionism," cried the Iraq Foreign Minister, "in order utterly to destroy it."

Coincidentally, the Egyptian Government, its Embassy in Washington revealed, approved the largest budget for "purposes of national defense" in the Nation's history. Part of the money, it was announced would be used to establish a heavy-ammunition factory, a light-ammuniton factory, "and will enable the Egyptian Government to open plants for the manufacture of airplanes."

One United States Congressman, Representative JACOB K. JAVITS, Republican-Labor, New York, returned from a trip to the Middle East last winter with information of Arab rearmament sufficiently alarming to cause him to appeal to Secretary Acheson. He recounted inflammatory stories he had seen in the Arab press and added it was his conviction that "an arms race between the Arabs and Jews in the Near East is being forced" by the British shipment of arms to the Arab states.

DON'T EXPECT WAR

His protest, however, elicited from Secretary Acheson only the assurance that the State Department did not expect a renewal of hostilities in the Arab-Israeli conflict, nor did it object to British arms sales to Iraq, Transjordan, and Egypt.

"There has most certainly been inflammatory and bellicose statements made in both the Arab and Israeli press concerning a renewal of fighting," the Secretary's reply to the New York Congressman said. "While such an attitude on the part of journalists is deplorable and harmful to the eventual establishment of good relations between Israel and the Arab states, under the circumstances, with bitter fighting only so recently terminated, it would probably be too much to expect that highly aroused passions should quickly cool.

"Some of the warlike pronouncements of officials of near-eastern governments," he added, "may well have been made for the purpose of domestic consumption."

ISRAEL WORRIED

That was in mid-January. Meanwhile, word reached Washington from Israel that the Government of that infant republic was genuinely worried. In economic straits itself, due to the cost of its recent war for independence plus the burden of repatriating more than 400,000 refugees from Europe, Israel was faced with two serious problems: (1) The stockpiling of arms by the Arab countries surrounding it, and (2) its own inability to procure arms in comparable quantities.

There was increasing evidence, too, that the Arab League, loosely wrought organization of the half-dozen countries which had fought Israel, was determined its members never should reach a permanent peace settlement with the Jewish nation, at least not on the basis of present territorial status. Indeed, at a recent meeting of the league in Cairo the decision was adopted to expel any member who entered into peace negotiations with Israel.

This was aimed primarily at Transjordan, whose King Abdullah had indicated a willingness to let bygones be bygones and to resume peaceful relations with its next-door neighbor.

SENATOR IVES PROTESTS

Repercussions immediately were felt in the United States, from whence much of the support had come for the establishment of Israel in the first place. By now dozens of Senators and scores of Congressmen were going on record in protest against continued British arms shipments to the Arabs. Typical of the many speeches made in Congress was one by Senator IRVING M. IVES, Republican, of New York, who declared:

"Today the very survival of this stronghold of democracy in the critical Middle East (Israel) is jeopardized by the inexcusable rearmament of its Arab neighbors, openly engaged in all-out preparation for a second round. Already staggering under financial burdens nearly too onerous to bear, Israel is compelled to enter into an armaments race which even further drains her sorely needed resources."

Finally, on March 28, a delegation of 32 Congressmen called on Secretary Acheson to discuss the whole middle-eastern problem, including the Arab League's reluctance to talk peace with the Israelis and the matter of the arms shipments by the British.

No punches were pulled. One of the delegation, Representative EDNA P. KELLY, Democrat, of New York, told Mr. Acheson:

"I am in disagreement with the policy of accepting England's arming of Egypt. I believe the unrest in this area can be overcome in three ways."

OUTLINES PLAN

The first of these, she said, was for the United States and Britain to develop a coordinated course of action limiting quantities of arms to be made available to both Israel and the Arab states. The second was for an agreement between these two great powers to cease further shipments after a balance of armaments had been attained. And the third, she insisted, was for the United States and Britain to undertake immediate and earnest efforts to reach an understanding and obtain permanent peace treaties between Israel and the Arab states.

Representative ABRAHAM J. MULTER, Democrat, New York, another member of the delegation, later told the House that in his opinion, as long as arms continue to be supplied to the Arabs by the British, peace in the Middle East will be a mirage.

It was at this meeting that Secretary Acheson agreed to take up all aspects of this situation with Foreign Minister Bevin at the meeting in London starting next week. Subsequently the fact that he had agreed to do so was confirmed to Senator SCOTT LUCAS, Democrat, Illinois, the Senate majority leader, by the State Department. As a result, Senator LUCAS declared on the eve of Mr. Acheson's departure for London:

"I have written the Secretary a letter commending him for that decision. I feel confident that I can assure the friends of Israel that the United States will continue * * * working to minimize all possibilities of the recurrence of conflict in the Middle East."

Ghosts From Tehran and Yalta

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR A. JONAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1950

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune.

In very concise manner the editorial has epitomized the manner in which Earl Browder former head of the Communist Party of the United States influenced the shaping of policy of this Government in international affairs in 1942 and 1943, the full impact of which has not yet been felt.

BROWDER AND ROOSEVELT

Earl Browder's boast before the Tydings investigating committee that, as boss Communist in the United States, he reported during the war to Mr. Roosevelt confirms the existence of a Communist-New Deal working relationship which has long been obvious to anyone willing to recognize it. Senator TYDINGS, a Democrat, was not anxious to explore the details, nor did Browder tell all that he might, but he told enough.

Browder asserted that in 1942 and 1943 he gave information to Roosevelt which had an important role in reshaping American policy in China. He said that he was receiving military reports from Communist observers in China and relaying them to Roosevelt.

In turn, he said, Sumner Welles, then Under Secretary of State, gave him information to transmit to Mme. Sun Yat-sen, now a vice president of the Communist regime in China, and Welles and Lauchlin Currie consulted him at the State Department on American policy in China. Currie, administrative assistant to Roosevelt, had been dispatched to China by the wartime President on January 24, 1941, to make an economic survey of Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalist Government. Owen Lattimore, a professor specializing on the Far East, followed on June 29, 1941, as political adviser to Chiang by appointment of Roosevelt.

Lattimore has been charged by Senator MCCARTHY with having served the Communist cause in helping shape the State Department's China policy. Currie was named in 1939 by Whittaker Chambers, principal witness against the convicted Alger Hiss, as a fellow traveler who never went quite so far as to join the Communist Party, according to the notes of former Assistant Secretary of State A. A. Berle, read at the second trial of Hiss.

We find, therefore, that these two men, charged with playing with the Communists, were loaded on Chiang by Roosevelt, and we find that Browder was advising the State Department and the White House on what to do in China. At the end of an extended process, Chiang's Nationalist Government lies in defeat, and the Communists are triumphant over all of China. Anybody who believes that every effect has a cause can draw the suitable inference.

Now let us pursue Browder a bit further. In 1944 he published a book called Tehran, heralding the results of Roosevelt's first conference with Stalin, which had been held November 28 to December 1, 1943. Browder held that the Tehran decisions, which were wholly in Stalin's favor, should guide American policy in war and peace. The book contains fulsome praise of Roosevelt, who had gambled at Tehran on the theory that, by conceding Stalin everything and denying him nothing, Soviet cooperation would be assured in the postwar world.

On page 59 Browder said that Roosevelt's defeat for a fourth term in 1944 was the main hope for salvaging a negotiated peace to preserve a base for fascism. On page 106, in order to avert this fancied calamity, Browder recommended that partisanship in the election be suspended. On page 108 he urged that Roosevelt be drafted by popular demand, and on page 109 that the people must make Roosevelt's campaign for him.

"It must be a nonpartisan campaign," Browder said. Here we have some grounds to suspect that what has variously been called the bipartisan, nonpartisan, and unpartisan policy really owes its authorship to the man who then was boss of the Communist Party.

Browder certainly yielded to no one as a rooter for a fourth Roosevelt term, and after the election he claimed credit for Roosevelt's election, stating that Communist policies and work contributed essentially to the victory of November 7. The Yalta Conference, at which Roosevelt made further vast concessions to Stalin, among the most important of which was to give Russia strategic rights in China at the expense of Chiang's Nationalists, had been held by the time Browder made this boast, and it was acclaimed by him as unreservedly as were the results at Tehran: "Our interpretation of Tehran has been confirmed by Yalta."

Browder had great cause for satisfaction. Roosevelt had pardoned him in 1942 after 14 months in prison on a 4-year sentence for obtaining a passport to Russia by fraud and perjury. He had been acepted by Roosevelt and his circle as an unofficial adviser. The China policy he favored was in process of paying out with a Communist triumph. Roosevelt had greatly helped toward that result, and so had his pro-Communist agents.

Browder had returned these favors by making a scarcely disguised appeal for Roosevelt's selection by acclamation as fourth-term President. He contended that Communists had contributed heavily to Roosevelt's success, as was demonstrably true in New York State, where Roosevelt trailed 500,000 votes in the straight Republican-Democratic Party contest, but picked up 800,000 votes from the pro-Communist American Labor Party and the Socialist splinter Liberal Party, which had broken away from the Labor Party.

Looking back, it is clear that the association between Browder and the Communists and Roosevelt was one for mutual profit. Roosevelt's dividends were in domestic political support and success; what Browder collected was for the benefit of Soviet Russia and world communism, which were enormously aggrandized by the Tehran and Yalta agreements which shaped the future of eastern Europe and China.

Roosevelt died a month after Yalta. A little more than a month after that the Kremlin, through Jacques Duclos, French Communist leader, directed American Communists, who had masqueraded for the preceding year under Browder's leadership as a "political association," to reconstitute themselves as a revolutionary party. Browder was ditched as its leader. He had served Stalin well, but now that Roosevelt was dead and Russia had got from him everything it had sought, the new Soviet policy setting the stage for the cold war demanded hostility to everything American. Roosevelt's good friend, Browder, did not fit the requirement after his years of professing that Communists were merely advanced New Dealers.

The Case for and Against the State Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1950

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial which appeared in the Johnstown Democrat on April 26, 1950, entitled "The Case for and Against the State Department." This forthright and frank discussion of the matters which vitally affect the security of our country and the integrity of our Government should give each and every person who reads this article cause for serious thought about the matters discussed.

The editorial follows:

THE CASE FOR AND AGAINST THE STATE DEPARTMENT

President Truman has added his voice to that of Secretary Acheson in meeting the attack on loyalty within the State Department spearheaded by Senator MCCARTHY.

The difficulty about this whole business is that both sides are oversimplifying the issues, overstating their cases.

The picture is neither all black, as Senator MCCARTHY would have us believe, nor all white, as Secretary Acheson and President Truman would have us believe. There are a lot of gray hues.

A circumstance that lends itself to this extremism, on both hands, is the background of this Nation's attitude toward communism and Communists in years gone by.

From the vantage point of the Monday-morning quarterback, we in America have many mistakes in foreign policy to answer for.

Some of these errors were sincere, honest blunders of the type that will continue to be made as long as the human element is a factor in government. Perhaps, in some far-off, future day, when we turn over to mechanical-brain machines the formulation of foreign policy, we shall be able to arrive at the correct, the wise, the all-knowing answer every time.

On the other hand, some of these blunders were the result of dirty work at the cross roads. In the past, we have been led into erroneous conclusions because of the disloyalty and the subversive activities of a few experts and advisers. When intellectual crooks lead well-meaning men to false conclusions, however innocently on the part of the misled Government officials, grave errors can result, and do result. And those errors can be just as fatal as though they were made by subverted officials—under their own power.

The Truman administration now must realize this—although by some strange rule of politics, the present administration seems to think it cannot admit the truth publicly.

For example, mistakes were made at Yalta—by President Roosevelt himself—which will have tragic significance in our foreign relations for 100 years.

No one is trying to say that President Roosevelt was disloyal. But President Roosevelt, himself in ill health at the time, together with many of his principal advisers, were given a couple of bum steers on policy. And those bum steers, on top of which was piled boner after boner, finally resulted in the loss of China to the forces of communism.

These are skeletons in the Democratic administration's closet. And Mr. Truman is eager that the dust of that closet be not disturbed.

Other skeletons there are, too. Probably more than any of us on the outside know about. But there are a few which briefly have been exposed to public view, however fleeting.

Most dramatic of these, of course, was the Hiss case. And here the administration managed to stick its feet in its mouth. It was in the early phases of this exposé that the affair was described by President Truman himself as a red herring.

Secretary Acheson also managed to get himself out on a limb for Hiss. It certainly was not in the best of good judgment that Mr. Acheson stupidly announced that he did not intend to turn his back on Alger Hiss, even though the latter had been convicted of what amounted to treason.

Perhaps the less said about the Coplon case, the better—for the Government.

Then there was the case of Henry J. Wadleigh, a former State Department employee, who has confessed disloyalty, but has not been prosecuted because the statute of limitations ran out in the meantime. But, nonetheless, here was proved subversion within the State Department.

The Amerasia case, too, does not reflect credit upon past security practices of the State Department. In this affair, hundreds of top secret State Department documents were spirited out of the files and photographed. The Amerasia case, incidentally, likely will make the headlines again soon. New evidence has come to light which may make the FBI look like a bunch of chumps.

A loyalty program has been set up by the Truman administration. And we don't hesitate to say—on the basis of what we learned in Washington last week during an editors' meeting there—that in our opinion that loyalty program is working.

Now, of course, it's possible to say that the administration locked the door after the horse was stolen. And, to a degree, there is justice in this charge. But at least there is this advantage to present loyalty screenings. It's going to be pretty tough for anyone to steal any more horses.

That security for the future isn't enough to suit Senator MCCARTHY, and those who side with him in this controversy. As we see it, however, Senator MCCARTHY, by the tactics he has used, is running the grave risk of doing more harm than good.

Sure, root out the subversives. Sure, eliminate the poor security risks, due to moral turpitude. Sure, punish the guilty, when that can be done legally and within the framework of the Bill of Rights.

But don't burn down the school house, just because a teacher or two is suspected of being a bad security risk.

From a very practical and a very real standpoint, the United States State Department must be maintained as a going, functioning, effective concern—even while it is being cleansed.

The American State Department is an organization of 19,000 persons. The infected personnel within the State Department—even giving MCCARTHY the benefit of every doubt—was an infinitesimal fraction of 1 percent of the total personnel.

The vast majority of the employees of the State Department are loyal, sincere Americans who are earnestly trying to do the best job they know how to do at a time in world history when every bit of wisdom and cool-headedness is necessary if we are to win this ideological warfare—this "war that calls itself peace," to quote an ECA spokesman.

We do our State Department and our national welfare a serious disservice if we make that job any harder than it needs to be made. And we seriously doubt that the best way to catch spies and perverts is to give the impression that the State Department is overrun with them.

Senator MCCARTHY is a smart cookie. He's a smooth operator. As we listened to him, we were impressed by his abilities as an infighter. And he has kept it up long after most men would have collapsed from overexertion.

But this is inescapable: Clear away the wreckage of the entire McCarthy crusade, and you discover that he has not made one single charge stand up in its entirety. That's not a good record.

Even in the Lattimore case, the Wisconsin Senator's charges have not been borne out 100 percent.

Professor Budenz says he has been told that Lattimore was a member of a Communist cell. But Budenz says he does not know personally that Lattimore was a Communist. Nor was he willing to describe Lattimore as the top Communist spy in America; in fact,

Budenz went so far as to say that this charge by McCARTHY was not correct.

So, Lattimore is not yet proved to have been a commie infiltrationist. And no matter what conclusions about Lattimore any of us may have arrived at individually, in this country a man is innocent until he is proved to be guilty.

Lattimore has not been officially connected with the State Department for 5 years or so. He prepared a memorandum or two for the Department, but so did dozens of other people—who were not suspected or accused of Communist leanings.

The more we think about this business, the firmer we are in these conclusions:

The Government has much to answer for in the past. The Government was not honest with the people of the United States in failing frankly to admit its past errors, made either through innocent but stupid fumblefistedness as the result of throat-cutting by trusted advisers.

The Government would be in a much more defensible position today—and able to withstand the McCarthy blunderpass attack—if it could come into court with completely clean hands.

However, much of what McCARTHY is shooting at already has been taken care of—beginning back in 1947.

The danger of the McCarthy attack is that it breaks down morale within the Department, among the thousands of loyal Americans; interferes with the effectiveness of the Department in dealing with today's foreign problems, by diverting the time and attention of foreign policy leaders from their real job to the task of defending the Department; and, as a result of these circumstances, strengthens the Communist cause by weakening the effectiveness of our machinery to counter it.

On top of all this, McCARTHY's tactics have made a mockery of democratic principles in his resort to the weapons of guilt by association and guilt by coincidence.

Altogether, it hasn't been a pretty performance.

It is one that we will look back on, some day, with misgivings, if not with shame.

A Day of Memory, Contemplation, and Study

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 8, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues the following editorial which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of Sunday, May 7:

"THEIR WORDS THEIR MONUMENT"

"One does not," as Jewish tradition holds, "set up monuments for the righteous; their words are their monuments." Indeed, it is really so in all faiths; the monument is built out of what men thought, or suffered, or created in their time, and no memorial marker set up afterward can carry a greater content than that which is infused into it by the spirit of those to whose memory it is erected. It is for this reason, and in this tradition, that the Jewish Theological Seminary suggested May 7 as a day of memory, contemplation, and study which would provide a supremely fitting, if intangible, monument to the 6,000,000 Jews who perished in the frightful persecutions of the last dozen years.

The victims are too many to remember—except in certain hearts, still burdened with some tiny fragment of the tragedy—as the individuals which they were. But it was a culture which was crushed together with the lives of those who served it. It was a culture woven of many brilliant strands—the scientific criticism of the German Jews, the saintless of the Polish-Jewish tradition, the Talmudic scholarship of the Lithuanian tradition, and many more. The men and women are dead; but this, the product of their minds and consciences, lives and should be kept alive in their memory. This is the spirit of the May 7 observance throughout the country; this is the meaning of the memorial month of study set aside this year to the works of the Rabbi Akiba, one of the great Jewish spiritual teachers and an earlier martyr, at the hands of Roman savagery, of Judaism. Here is a truly living monument, intangible but enduring, and fully worthy of those whom it commemorates.

The Medical Services Team in Today's Defense Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. DURHAM
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 8, 1950

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Richard L. Meiling, M. D., Director of Medical Services, Office of the Secretary of Defense, before the annual convention of the American Pharmaceutical Association, the Traymore Hotel, Atlantic City, N. J., Thursday, May 4, 1950:

THE MEDICAL SERVICES TEAM IN TODAY'S DEFENSE FORCES

It is a pleasure to spend this period with you and to discuss the current work of the medical services in the armed forces.

With the changes which have taken place in our defense forces during the past 3 years, it is not surprising that there have been some corresponding changes in the medical services which support them. These organic changes in our military forces were not just the result of legislation; they were a concrete reflection of the fact that concepts of warfare, and our means of defending ourselves in such a war, have changed radically. On all sides, we see evidence that man's scientific and mechanical achievements have thrust us into a new and challenging era. The plans of our military medical services must be revised in some respects if we are to keep step with the total defense plan.

The advances in the field of medicine and the allied sciences during the past few years have influenced the basis upon which modern medical defense plans are developed. Our ability to keep the fighting man in fighting trim has been vastly improved. Obviously the expanding importance of such things as the vaccines, serums, antibiotics—biologicals of all types—and a host of others means an even greater emphasis on the role of the pharmacist, whether in uniform or in civilian practice. It is a part of our broad mission of keeping the greatest number of soldiers, sailors, and airmen at combat-duty posts for the greatest number of hours.

Yet these same new advances have served to demonstrate again a trend in medicine which is fast becoming an obvious fact. That is the emergence of medical care as a team concept. The more we have come to understand the complex human mechanism, the more we have tended to branch off into special fields of investigation and therapy. We now are at the place where one of the biggest needs is to reform these many contributors into a cohesive working unit which will pool and concentrate their combined knowledge and skills upon the requirements of the medical problem and, where applicable, on the needs of the patient himself.

Let's take a look at the present-day military medical services and the organization with the Department of Defense.

The Office of Medical Services, of which I am Director, was established a year ago as an integral part of the Office of Secretary of Defense. The Director of Medical Services is responsible for establishing and controlling policies, programs, and standards of military medical services, and for exercising general direction, authority, and control over the administration and utilization of personnel and facilities throughout the health services of the Armed Forces.

The appointment of a civilian physician as Director of Medical Services is the application of the time-honored American concept of civilian control of the military policies in our Nation's defense organization. Through this we are achieving a close working relation between the professional men in uniform and their colleagues in civil life—a relationship which must be constantly maintained if the health programs of armed forces are to match the high professional level of care in this Nation generally.

The organization of the Office of Medical Services is built around three divisions, each headed by a general or flag officer of the three military departments.

The plans and policy division is a long-range planning group, working with such agencies as the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Munitions Board for the development of major programs and strategic and tactical value.

The program coordination division is concerned with current medical activities of the three military departments at the broad program level. Major policy matters such as the joint utilization of hospitals and other medical facilities as well as joint utilization of highly specialized personnel, are developed and promulgated.

The third division is the Civil and Military Health Interrelations Division, which deals with a large number of agencies and organizations whose work is directly related to the health programs of the armed forces. These include such groups as the National Security Resources Board, American National Red Cross, National Research Council, United States Public Health Service, Veterans' Administration, foreign military medical services and civilian professional organizations.

The Surgeons General of the Army, Navy, and Air Force are responsible for the operation of the medical and health activities in their respective departments. They meet with the Director of Medical Services weekly or oftener as members of a military medical advisory council, to discuss the many medical and allied problems of the Armed Forces.

In addition, the chiefs of the several auxiliary corps in all three departments are regularly available to the Director of Medical Services and are consulted on their special interests and problems.

An important part of the policy-making pattern is the Armed Forces Medical Advisory Committee, under the chairmanship of Mr. Charles P. Cooper and composed of eminent physicians and dentists. This committee which considers major problems of health in the armed forces and which reports directly to Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson, represents some of the finest professional talent and experience in the Nation and has performed an outstanding service for the Defense Establishment and for the country.

In the time we have here this morning, it is not possible to discuss all the current programs of the military medical services, yet it seems important for us to briefly cover some of the most outstanding ones. They have a basic importance in the over-all health plans for our military forces and therefore are of direct interest to you in the pharmacy profession.

For some time we have followed the policy of joint utilization of military hospitals, which I mentioned a moment ago. This means that the man or woman who wears the uniform of any branch of service may be hospitalized in the nearest hospital which is equipped to care for him, whether that be an Army, Navy, or Air Force facility. This policy was dictated by the simplest principles of good management. For the sake of the patient, it is important that he be treated promptly—which means in the nearest hospital. For efficient utilization of professional manpower, the available personnel must be distributed in such a way that they may serve the greatest number of patients. For the conservation of time, money, and equipment, the wastage of unnecessary transportation must be eliminated. For all these reasons, joint utilization is the policy of the Department of Defense. It means conservation of critical national health resources in time of emergency.

Many of you are familiar with the outstanding job which has been and is being done by the Armed Services Medical Procurement Agency. This agency was developed by the military medical services some 20 months before the Unification Act became the law of the land. The organization, which serves as a joint agency for the procurement of all medical supplies, drugs, equipment, and related matériel for all three of the military services, is an excellent example of interservice coordination in action. The combined purchasing functions of the agency have been welcomed by the industries which supply are Armed Forces, by the military departments themselves, and by the hospitals, clinics, and other facilities which depend upon them for supplies.

Operating from one central headquarters in Brooklyn, N. Y., the Armed Services Medical Procurement Agency has simplified the maintenance of stock levels in all three departments; it has minimized the losses from out-dated drugs, biologicals, and so forth, and has done an exceptionally fine job in the testing and analysis of supplies and materials purchased for the Armed Forces. New programs are constantly being developed by this agency and the staffs of the military medical services to further improve the medical supply program.

As we pursue these and many other programs which make up the modern health organization of the Department of Defense, I am constantly impressed with the need for concerted team effort to reach our goals. The growing complexity of the demands which are made upon us in providing broad health services for the military forces demands the combined knowledge and effort of many individuals and groups. We cannot meet our responsibility in any other way.

For this reason I take this occasion to welcome the pharmacist to this team. I should like also to comment briefly upon the pharmacist in uniform, both as to the opportunities for him and the contribution which he can make to the defense team.

First, let us acknowledge that the actual number of assignments for full-time practicing pharmacists in the military forces is somewhat limited. The large hospitals require full-time pharmacists, as well as a few other installations. These are important assignments, yet they do not add up to a large total. There is a much larger number of positions throughout the services in which the officer's principal duty is the management of a pharmacy, with other Medical Department duties performed as part of the staff organization. Additional billets are provided in various technical control work and in testing and research laboratories, as well as for the development of specifications, requirements, and procurement.

But I should like to discuss with you today a concept which I believe warrants consideration by you and by your association. Under present organization and staffing arrangements, pharmacy officers are commissioned in the Medical Service Corps. From this corps must come the officers who will hold responsible posts throughout many phases of medical and allied work. It is in the Medical Service Corps that the military medical services must find able, responsible men to serve in hospital administration, research, and testing projects, medical supply, staff assignments, command duties within the medical services and a host of other vitally important duties.

For most of these assignments, there is no standard background of education and training. If you were responsible for choosing individuals for these important tasks, to whom would you turn? I believe you would seek men with a sound professional background, whose training and experience made them specially informed of medical needs and problems, and who by education, association, and knowledge were prepared to become key members of this medical team.

In short, I believe you would turn to the pharmacist.

To the pharmacist who finds a definite attraction in the military service, who derives a sense of personal and professional satisfaction from the stimulation of military medical problems, and who brings to his work a sense of devotion to the defense needs of our country, it is an attractive and gratifying career. The different interests of the individual officers can lead to a variety of assignments. This past week, I spent considerable time with the amphibious and airborne troops, in both water and airborne landing operations. The famed Eighty-second Airborne Division had five pharmacists "hitting the silk" with their respective commands. These officers, fully trained in the military problem of an airborne operation, were actually in the air and on the ground to supply the first phase of the professional medical care—an essential part of the medical teamwork. Today these officers are company commanders; tomorrow they will be staff officers, logisticians, mobilization experts, etc., in the field of medical military planning.

When the pharmacist extends his interests to broader fields of leadership, he is pursuing exactly the same path which other professional men take as they rise in their chosen field. What happens to the professional man who demonstrates his competence and earns a place of respect among his associates? He soon finds himself responsible for problems of management, of establishing relations with a variety of groups related to medical care, for taking leadership in his community—in short, for tackling and solving many problems which lead him far above the confines of his specialty.

This is the history of every professional man who has demonstrated a capacity for leadership. It is the course of real opportunity for the pharmacist in military service. The pharmacist is a valuable member of the health services in the practice of pharmacy—yet his true future lies in his opportunity to go on to more and more responsible posts.

Members of the pharmacy profession have demonstrated many times in our history that they are completely capable of handling large-scale responsibilities, both in civil and military posts. You are aware, no doubt, that David Henshaw, a practicing pharmacist of Boston, rose to a place of respect and distinction in our Nation when he was appointed Secretary of the Navy in 1843. Since that time, many of your profession have served with distinction in civic positions of great responsibility.

The need for men of outstanding ability is greater today than ever before. The Medical Service Corps will bear a heavy responsibility if this country should again be forced into an armed conflict. It looks to the pharmacy profession to provide both practicing pharmacists and a source of trained professional men who can respond to the demands for a variety of essential and responsible posts in the military medical services. Whether the pharmacist elects to serve in testing and research, in administration, in supply, in staff or command work depends upon individual preferences and aptitudes. Not every pharmacist is capable of assuming these command responsibilities, just as some civilian pharmacists are not able to extend their interests beyond the practice of prescription pharmacy. Yet for the pharmacist who has vision and the capacity for leadership, the military medical services offer a real challenge, broad opportunities, and an important place on the medical team which serves our Nation's fighting forces.

Recovery in Midcareer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1950

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article entitled "Recovery in Midcareer," which was written by Mr. Boris Shishkin, Director of the European Labor Division, Economic Cooperation Administration:

RECOVERY IN MIDCAREER

(By Boris Shishkin, Director, European Labor Division, Economic Cooperation Administration)

April 16 was the halfway mark on the road toward European recovery. That date rounded out 2 years since the Organization for European Economic Cooperation was formed to unite 19 governments of Europe in a common task. Their task was to rally the countries of western Europe from their divergent, and often conflicting, economic paths, and guide them along an agreed course toward agreed goals of recovery and reconstruction, made attainable by a 4-year program of American aid.

It is not unusual to hear the European recovery program described as if it consisted entirely of dollars provided by American taxpayers and spent for the benefit of Europeans. Such a description is doubly wrong.

This program, envisaged by General Marshall and known as the Marshall plan, is made up of three elements. The first is self-help. As President Truman made it plain from the outset, the United States would help only those countries that help themselves. And no one can deny today that much of the progress from the economic disease and disaster of 2 years ago toward economic health has been due to the earnest, often desperate, effort of Europeans themselves, within the limited resources and disrupted lives of their own countries.

The second main ingredient of the ERP is mutual assistance. To be eligible for the American aid, European countries must help each other. And help each other they do. Age-long barriers have been swept aside in a mutual effort to stabilize currencies, to

facilitate the transfer of money and credit, to make way for expanding trade and to open barriers to migration of workers. Mutual efforts of several countries have been bent to improve production of food, to provide a common source of hydroelectric power and to establish European-wide exchange of technical assistance.

The third and the most important element of the European program is the availability of American dollar aid provided under the Marshall plan. For these are the dollars which Europe needs, and does not have, to buy raw materials, machinery, and equipment essential for the rebuilding of her economy.

Most of these things European countries buy from the United States. So that by far the largest proportion of the dollar aid to Europe is actually spent directly in the American market and provides the source of income for the American worker, farmer, investor, and trader.

But even the much smaller proportion of Marshall-aid dollars with which European countries make recovery purchases in Canada, Latin America, and other markets are eventually spent in the United States for the purchase of American goods. This is true because the receipt of these recovery dollars enables the other countries to buy from the United States products which they want but would not have otherwise bought.

America's aid to Europe is, therefore, not a charity. The fact is that during the last 2 years many American workers and farmers derived their employment and income from the production of export goods essential for European recovery, which Europe would not have been able to buy without the Marshall aid. At the level of some $3,000,000,000 projected for the third year of the ERP, nearly 1,000,000 American industrial and farm workers will receive employment due to the Marshall plan.

Yet the reason American labor has given solid support to the European recovery program has not been a selfish one. The heaviest contributor among others in the American community, the worker, has under written his share in the earnest desire to lend a helping hand to our neighbors in Europe in their time of dire need.

Along with his fellow Americans who also worked and fought for freedom in the war, he has known that a Europe impoverished and submerged in distress cannot resist Communist penetration from within or the threat of Communist attack from without.

The American worker has been willing to help Europe get up on her feet and start on the road to self-government, self-sufficiency, and self-respect because that is his road and because that is the road to peace.

What has the Marshall plan meant to the workers of Europe? At the halfway milestone of its progress, the European recovery program has already established a record of solid accomplishment in two respects most vital to Europe's workers.

Inflation was sweeping over Europe when the ERP began. The buying power of wages was dwindling from week to week as prices kept spiraling up, and black markets were gaining ground in many European countries. The Marshall plan has made it possible to check the most violent forces of inflation.

Uncurbed, inflation would have quickly reduced the masses of European consumers to starvation. It would have brought back barter and paralyzed productive activity. Today prices and currencies in western Europe have been generally stabilized.

When the ERP started, production in Europe was at a low ebb. Raw materials were lacking and could not be bought with inflation-ridden currencies. Many plants were down for the lack of fuel and power. Others needed machinery replacement parts and even simple tools. The program has pumped into the arteries of the European economy a flow of materials, machinery, and equipment. Provision of these critical industrial needs has made it possible to raise the production index 20 percent above the 1938 norm and maintain high levels of employment in the majority of the participating countries.

To bring to a war-exhausted continent a large measure of economic stability has been no mean achievement. To lift production volume from a low mark to one-fifth above the prewar level in the short space of 2 years has been a feat without precedent in the annals of Europe.

But the very progress of the program has brought European industry face to face with the demands for far-reaching change. Muscle-bound in custom, often obsolete in method and organization, industrial enterprise can no longer seek shelter in protected markets from the challenge of modern technology in production and distribution.

It has become clear that Europe cannot remain divided into a number of independent economic compartments and at the same time achieve an expanding market sustained by a rising standard of living. And the ERP countries have embarked upon the task of chopping down trade barriers in order to free the flow of commerce within Europe.

It has become equally clear that the old-fashioned methods of production, geared to high profit from limited output, cannot withstand the fresh winds of competition fanned by freer trade. Traditional methods are simply not efficient enough to enable European manufacturers to compete in the dollar market or to yield the low-cost products within reach of the mass of European consumers.

The ERP countries are now coming to grips with this problem. The vast reservoir of technical know-how accumulated in the United States—especially in the last decade—has been, for the most part, a closed book to many European industries. What is more, neither European employers nor European unionists have pursued the twin objective of high wages and mass production for a wide and competitive market which so largely has been the practice in the United States.

Today the ERP is opening this closed door to modern technology and providing European industrialists and unionists the opportunity to study the huge American workshop. It is likewise stimulating a brisk exchange of industrial experience and technology among the European countries themselves.

As a part of the new productivity drive in Europe, a number of countries are establishing national productivity centers where a competent native technical staff will coordinate the program, usually under the direction of a board on which management and labor are both represented. These centers, whose work is expected to carry on after the Marshall plan, will not only help bring modern industrial techniques within reach of the country's industry but will also make studies to help assure that the benefits of higher productivity are equitably shared and that high employment is sustained with a minimum of dislocation.

To meet the productivity program thus formulated by each country, the Economic Cooperation Administration is providing a number of forms of technical assistance. This aid makes it possible for teams of manufacturers, technicians, and trade-unionists to visit the United States and to have a first-hand look at the broad range of American industrial activity and labor-management relations. Groups from particular industries have been making more specific and detailed studies of organization and engineering of production in the related industries in America.

When these teams return to Europe they make their knowledge of new techniques available to wider audiences. In the meantime American teams of consultants are coming to Europe to study the technical problems of industries there and give advice based on the American experience.

As a part of this program digests are being prepared from the major technical publications in the United States, and samples of appropriate American products are being provided for analysis by Europeans. Aides in the training and retraining of workers to help them meet the requirements of new technology are also provided.

Such a comprehensive drive to increase the productivity of European industry is no easy task. In too many parts of the European industrial scene it will mean uprooting the deeply ingrown tradition of production limited to the requirements of a limited market. This has been made possible by fencing industrial enterprises and groups of enterprises within a solid wall of agreements, sheltering the producer against the risks of competition and protecting the less efficient producers in the cartel.

Where this economic pattern has shaped the growth of economic life, all segments of the community, including the labor movement, bent their practices to fit this design. In many European countries this restricted pattern still prevails. But industrial resources of Europe must be freed from its stifling grip if the living standards of the great mass of European workers are to be raised and if European products are to compete in the world market.

To become strong and dynamic the European economy must also have a mobile labor force. Yet European labor is traditionally static. In modern times the workers of Europe moved only when they fled—as they have fled hunger, privation, and religious and political persecution. With the exception of limited seasonal migration, there has been little movement from region to region, from country to country, from industry to industry. The European worker is wedded to his community and trade.

The obstacles to the free movement of workers in Europe are many. But the most important of all is the extremely acute housing shortage, which continues to plague virtually all European countries. Unable to move to new and better jobs or to jobs suitable for the particular workers' skills, a sizable proportion of European workers are not working on jobs for which they are best fitted and not getting the pay their skills could earn.

The ECA, in close cooperation with the OEEC, has already done much to increase the mobility of workers within Europe. Agreements have been reached to resettle the unemployed workers of one country in other countries offering employment opportunities. Cooperative programs have been developed for industrial training and retraining. Employment services of individual countries have established cooperative arrangements going beyond national boundaries. And a substantial beginning has been made to assist the construction of low-cost housing for workers near the jobs on which workers could be employed.

Utilizing the resources and the experiences of the ILO which has long been working on these problems, an enlarged program of technical assistance is being developed with added intensity. A beginning has also been made in the larger task of facilitating migration overseas—mainly to Latin America, Australia, and the dependent overseas territories of ERP countries—from the parts of Europe having a large surplus population.

Italy and Western Germany are two countries in which the problem of excess population is critical. Assistance to further migration from these surplus areas has already been provided under the ERP in Italy, and the ILO is looked to as a base for a

broader program of technical assistance to help European migration overseas.

If markets within western Europe expand, productivity increases and the real income of the mass of the workers is improved with the aid of the ERP, the prospect of sustained high employment in Europe will remain well assured. A large share of the responsibility for the attainment of these objectives rests upon the free trade-unions of Europe. It is up to the European trade-union movement to make sure that the benefits of recovery, increased productivity, and freer trade are shared equitably among the various groups in the economy.

Free trade-unions in Europe showed statesmanship and remarkable restraint in their wage demands during the period of inflation following the war. To these unions goes a large measure of credit for the winning of Europe's postwar battle against inflation.

The free labor movement of Europe today is ready to cooperate in a program to raise industrial productivity providing it is carried out within the context of full employment and in the framework of policy designed to translate the benefits of higher productivity into lower prices and higher wages.

Despite the bitter and insidious attacks from the Cominform, the European recovery program is succeeding by bringing vitality and stimulating a healthy flow of production and trade to western Europe. It is giving new assurance of growth and strength in a Europe only recently dominated by devastation and despair. A healthy and strong Europe arising upon the solid foundation of a vigorous productive effort need not fear the future.

Aided by the ERP and set firmly toward the objective of rising income and full employment, Europe will easily throw back the challenge of communism and give the lie to the prophecies of doom spread by the Communist agents.

We in America have a special obligation to keep the faith with the workers of Europe. They look to us in America for making good on a task well begun but which today stands only half done. It must be completed.

The structure of economic coperation we are helping the Europeans to build must be brought to its full completion in the next 2 years. Unfinished, it would make a failure of our purpose. Completed, it will stand forever as the pivotal structure in the larger building of a prosperous and peaceful world.

Home Demonstration Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHASE GOING WOODHOUSE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1950

Mrs. WOODHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, this first week in May is known as Home Demonstration Week and is a noteworthy occasion to at least 3,000,000 women who during the past year have taken part in a great homemakers' educational movement. These women, found in every county of the United States as well as in the Territories of Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico, are marking another milestone in their progress toward wiser and more skillful management of their homes.

You may hear about and perhaps see for yourself what a neighbor or friend has accomplished through this practical, down-to-earth method of getting and applying knowledge to family and home problems. Rural women are placing their achievements on exhibit during Home Demonstration Week.

The information and help needed to produce these results was obtained from some 3,500 home-demonstration agents. The agents are specially trained in the arts and sciences of homemaking and have direct channels to the resources of the land-grant institutions and the United States Department of Agriculture. They live in the county seat and belong to the community which they serve. Each is a member of the agricultural extension team which serves our farm areas and is supported cooperatively by the Federal, State, and local governments.

When added up, the results of the work of home-demonstration agents, in some 56,000 communities, is impressive. For example, some million and a half families improved their methods of canning, freezing, drying, or storing their food products. More than 200,000 increased the efficiency of their kitchens. Twice that number did some planting and improving of their home grounds with the advice and help of the home-demonstration agent. Statistics for family health, child training, clothing, nutrition and other fields of home economics are equally impressive. These achievements were made possible because nearly half a million volunteer local leaders willingly cooperated in attending special training schools and then took the information back to their own club or group.

Rural people have indeed been fortunate in developing such an educational movement which brings to women in their own homes all the newer knowledge in the arts and sciences of homemaking as well as the basic information needed for good family living.

At present more than two-thirds of the counties in the United States have home-demonstration agents. In the other counties, approximately 600 of them, the county agricultural agent gives women and girls some services in the field of home economics. I hope the system will steadily progress to the point where every county will have a home-demonstration agent—trained women to do the necessary teaching, not only in rural areas but in the urban communities as well.

I have seen home-demonstration work pay dividends in my own State. I have seen girls taught to design and make clothes for themselves and the members of their families. I have seen the help given women in combining unlikely material with skill and hard work to make their homes livable and comfortable.

Better homes have inspired women to extend their efforts toward improving their communities and their States. We are proud of their achievements in rural areas for they mean healthier, happier, more effective citizens.

But all homes are not in the country. We have homes in the city, too. City women are also faced with the problem of feeding and caring for their families, of making their homes more convenient and comfortable. The city woman, too, is eager to make the best home possible for her family. She wants to learn about labor-saving techniques for her homemaking tasks and to know about newer discoveries in science which might help her in caring for her family.

Some cities, notably Buffalo and Syracuse, N. Y., have retained the services of a home-demonstration agent since the First World War. A few other cities such as Baltimore, Md., and Portland, Oreg., have quite recently established a successful home-demonstration service for their residents. There are other scattered examples but they are few and far between. By and large, the woman in the city still does not have ready access to this practical, out-of-school education which she needs for her homemaking job—an opportunity which the rural woman in general does have.

I believe that this inequality should be corrected—that the time has come when city women too should have available the help of home-demonstration agents. State and local governments should be encouraged to provide such services in the same way as it is provided for rural people through the Cooperative Agricultural Extension Service.

Secretary of Agriculture Brannan paid a well-deserved tribute to the work of rural women during Home Demonstration Week. He told them: "It is in the home that great achievements in community life, in national life, and in the development of modern civilization itself have their inspiration and their stimulus. So, yours is indeed a challenging responsibility."

I am not unmindful of the excellent educational work done in the public schools by vocational teachers of home economics. They have approached the problem in a fundamental way with good results. But, in addition, a movement is needed in which the city homemakers themselves take the leadership.

On April 3, approximately 175 men and women, leaders in the rural communities of my own State of Connecticut, met at the University of Connecticut at Storrs to consider agricultural policy. One of the recommendations coming out of this conference asked that "more consumer education in foods and nutrition be inaugurated as soon as possible in urban areas" and suggested that "urban areas should have available educational work in foods and nutrition similar to that available to farm people."

This attitude on the part of rural people in one State is perhaps significant for the country as a whole.

The theme of Home Demonstration Week is "Today's home builds tomorrow's world." It is just as true that "tomorrow's world depends on today's home" meaning all homes, in the city, in the small town, on the farm.

President Truman in his message to rural women on the occasion of Home Demonstration Week said:

Our homes are as important to the country as they are dear to each of us. Our homes are the basis of our democratic freedom. Most of our work is done with the home in mind. Home is where we turn the modern

wonders of science into better, healthier, happier living. Home is where we develop future citizens, and where we lay the foundation for community and world-wide understanding.

All of us can agree with the President on the importance of the home to the welfare of the Nation. The welfare and the improvement of the home is our concern. A practical education system has been provided for assisting homemakers in rural areas. It is past the experimental stage and now should be extended to homemakers in our cities.

Section IV of Current Appropriation Bill Is Impractical and Should Be Deleted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 8, 1950

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the problem of establishing some control over deficit and supplemental appropriations is a very important one, and a very old one as well, having plagued the Members of Congress from the earliest days of the Republic up to the present. We would all like nothing better than to do away with deficit appropriations altogether, but under the democratic system of government as it has developed in this country, this is hardly possible. In order to accomplish such a purpose, it would be necessary to have firm estimates of both revenues and expenditures, neither of which is possible. Much as we would like to know exactly what revenues will be available for appropriation under existing laws, it is impossible to see far enough into the future to determine with any great degree of precision what effect changes in the general economic situation may have upon tax receipts 6 or 9 months or a year from now.

Similarly, we would like to be able to make appropriations for the various departments and agencies of the Government on the basis of firm estimates of what it would cost to operate them through a 12-month period, but here again there are many variable and unpredictable factors. The Federal Government has, for instance, committed itself to paying the costs of administration for certain aspects of the social-security program. If a change in economic conditions causes an unforeseen increase in the number of persons applying for unemployment compensation, the administrative costs for this activity will increase and the Congress will be faced with the responsibility for paying the bill.

The number, size, and complexity of the problems of this character now confronting us, or that may confront us at any time in the future, almost staggers the imagination. There is the problem of veterans' benefits which have had a way, throughout the years, "of growing and growing the more as they grow older." The costs of national defense in a world in which peace is so uncertain cannot be estimated very far into the future or very accurately. Our vast foreign commitments, which are all a part of the defense picture, are subject to similar uncertainties. There are further uncertainties connected with public works, the volume and cost of which is bound to depend, to some extent, on the general economic situation. Even in an established undertaking like the post office, there are large areas of uncertainty. These situations all point to the urgent need of action on the part of the Congress itself to establish some sound and workable procedure for financial planning.

In the complicated social and economic structure of the present day, such situations as I have so briefly referred to, are bound to arise. As a result, we are confronted by a dilemma. On the one hand, as a matter of good financial management, we desire by every suitable means at our disposal to eliminate the necessity for deficiency and supplemental appropriations, while on the others, we are confronted by numerous emergency situations involving expenditures which are often necessary if the Government is to discharge its responsibility to its citizens. Many of these situations involve questions of human need. So far as I am concerned, I can see only one possible choice, when confronted by these alternatives. I firmly believe in the importance of good financial management, but when attempts at such management result in the paralysis of essential Government activities and in needless injury to individual citizens, I prefer to cast my vote for the continuous functioning of such services for our citizens. At an appropriate time, I shall propose an amendment covering these provisions of H. R. 7786.

The Bite Is On

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR A. JONAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 8, 1950

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the timely editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune of May 5, 1950. This pithy editorial points out the fraud to the taxpayers of this country in the financing of the Democratic political circus to be held in Chicago on Monday, May 15, by the Bureau of Internal Revenue having issued a ruling that contributions for financing the show are deductible items for computing income tax of the contributors.

The editorial is as follows:

SPONTANEOUS RECEPTION

The Chicago branch of the Pendergast party of humanity is out putting the clip on businessmen for $250,000 to lay red carpeting on the streets for Harry Truman on his coming 3-day visit. Truman is coming here to play politics with a brass band in behalf of himself, his party, and SCOTT LUCAS, his wobbling candidate for Senator. He says, and his managers say, that the stampede is wholly nonpolitical.

This is fraudulent enough, but the fraud is compounded when the boys in charge of his entertainment tell the businessmen they are soliciting, that any contributions to the New Deal kitty are deductible from income tax either as business expense or a gifts to a nonpartisan civic cause.

This view has been propounded by the Democratic chairman of the State racing commission and by another worthy who kicked through with $4,000 for Democratic campaigning, while his wife gave $2,000. Their precedent may be that the Democratic Party was exempted by its own Bureau of Internal Revenue from tax liability on the $420,000 proceeds of the cabaret performance highlighted by Truman's oratory at the $100-a-plate Jefferson-Jackson Day party round-up in Washington. This considerate ruling saved the Democratic National Committee from parting with 20 percent of the loot to the Public Treasury, although the Republicans had been nicked at that rate on a $1 box supper a few days earlier.

The Chicago pow-wow shapes up as an even more flagrant steal than the Washington job, and an added touch of shamelessness is that Republicans as well as Democrats are being subjected to the bite. A few State and city inspectors might be around looking for violations on their business premises should they prove reluctant to hold still. Still another scandal is that the National Guard is being routed out to march for Truman. Attendance is optional, but guardsmen sensitive to prospects for promotion may be expected to form ranks.

Barney Hodes has told the union bosses that their cooperation in routing out the rank and file for what he deftly terms a spontaneous reception will be appreciated, and cash contributions also are welcome.

In the degraded moral atmosphere of the times, incident to the ascension of the Pendergast-Binaggio-Truman mob, these sordid proceedings may not awaken too much revulsion, in the estimation of the mob. The Democrats have got away with so much that by now they may think they can get away with anything.

Let Her Go, Joe! Let Her Go!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 8, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, we hear so much mouthing these days from every conceivable source to the effect that free enterprise is fast going on the rocks because of the actions and the attitude of the great sponsor of the Fair Deal, President Harry S. Truman and his faithful cohorts.

If one gave the slightest credence to the moans and groans of reactionary Repulicans and Democrats, both in and out of Congress, one would fancy that the long unemployed referees and receivers in bankruptcy were about to do yoemen service again as they did during the regime of the last Republican President, Herbert Hoover. It takes very little imagination if one believes the political bellyachers to hear the hoarse voices of the auctioneers as they cry the forced

sales under this Nation's last Republican national rule.

It therefore seems a bit strange and embarrassing to be sure to reactionary republicanism to find the press of the Nation reporting the tremendous prosperity of big business under the auspices of the Fair Deal.

If I were a reactionary Republican I would never open my big, lying mouth again until there was a slump in business, and if reactionary republicanism did that they would keep their mouths closed forever, or at least from here on out.

In support of my claim as heretofore made that big business is enjoying prosperity, the likes of which it has never before experienced, I quote the following from page 1 of the April 29, 1950, issue of the newspaper Labor, published in Washington, D. C.:

FAIR DEAL TOUGH ON GM OFFICIALS? NOT BY $8,000,000—HUGE BONUS EXPLAINS WHY THEY'RE SO ANXIOUS TO CUT TAXES ON RICH—SIXTY-ONE SHARE GIANT "MELON"—DISCLOSURE MAKES COMPLAINTS HARD TO UNDERSTAND; WHAT DO THEY WANT?

A move to limit income taxes is becoming the rallying cry for all kinds of lobby and propaganda groups in an effort to weld them into a single body bent on upsetting everything that the Fair Deal stands for. Their often-repeated complaint is that Fair Deal spending and socialism are ruining the country.

Some of the loudest complainers, and the heaviest contributors to the propaganda groups, are officials of the giant General Motors Corp. After General Motors reported record profits of $656,000,000 in 1949—the largest ever made by any corporation in a single year—many people began to wonder what they were complaining about, and how much it would take to satisfy them.

WHY THEY WANT TAX CUT

This week it became clear why they are so interested in efforts to put a limit on income taxes. For 61 top officials of the company were disclosed to be sharing a huge bonus melon for 1949 of better than $6,000,000 in cash, plus 24,338 shares of the company's stock, worth nearly $2,000,000 at present prices.

Uncle Sam, of course, will get quite a chunk of that in income taxes, but the company arranged to pay it in five annual installments to help the officials keep out of the upper brackets, so they can keep as much as possible.

The announcement certainly is not going to help their propaganda about the Truman administration making it tough for business to get along.

The bonus action had to be made public under regulations of the Securities and Exchange Commission, which requires that such information be given to stockholders. It was contained in proxy statements mailed to the company's 400,000 stockholders with notice of the annual meeting to be held in Wilmington, Del., May 19.

Charles E. Wilson, president, topped the list, with a total of salary, bonus, and director fees for 1949 of $586,100, which suggests that he has not suffered greatly from the Fair Deal. His salary and fees totaled $201,100, and the bonus was $308,021 in cash and 1,243 shares of stock. The shares were given an award value of $76,979, although at present market prices they would bring more than $100,000.

Next behind him were three executive vice presidents: Albert Bradley, who gets $511,225 all told; Harlow H. Curtice, $496,100, and Marvin E. Coyle, $496,000.

As further corroboration of the foregoing statement, I quote the following from page 1 of the May issue of the newspaper, The Voice of 770, published in Los Angeles, Calif.:

GM's WILSON DOING WELL

(By Lewis Arlington)

Top pay for any corporation official in the United States last year went to Charles E. Wilson, president of General Motors Corp., who hauled in $586,100 in salary, director's fees, and bonus.

This was disclosed today in GM's proxy statement to stockholders announcing the corporation's annual meeting in Wilmington, Del., May 19.

The giant auto corporation not only broke all records in the pay it gave to one man, but also reached an all-time high in net profits in 1949. Its take was $656,434,232, the biggest profit ever made by any United States corporation and a 49 percent increase over its 1948 profit.

In announcing the company's profits earlier this year, Wilson modestly described 1949 as a year of "substantial achievement" and said that because of GM's gains "material benefits accrued to a large number of individuals as well as the economy as a whole."

The "material benefits" Wilson referred to were spelled out in the proxy statement issued April 22. The statement showed that GM's 61 officers and directors, including Wilson, shared among themselves a total of $6,035,248 in cash.

Exclusive of bonuses, their take represented an 18 percent increase over their pay for the previous year.

In addition to the over $6,000,000 in cash paid its executives, GM also gave them 24,338 shares of common stock, payable in five annual installments under its bonus plan. The company valued the stock at $61.93 a share. The shares on the New York Stock Exchange closed April 22 at $82, making their total value nearly $2,000,000.

GM tried to soften the impact of the disclosure of Wilson's 1949 haul by complaining that he would have only a little over $150,000 left after taxes. This is still almost 50 times as much as the average GM worker made last year before taxes. According to GM's own misleading payroll figures, which lump together earnings of upper-crust executives and hourly paid production workers, average pay for GM employees in 1949 was about $3,500. Government statistics show workers in the auto industry last year average $64.85 a week.

GM workers, who took a 2-cent hourly wage cut in March of this year, are demanding a 31-cents-an-hour package increase in current negotiations conducted by the United Auto Workers.

Wilson's total remuneration for 1949, when the 1,243 shares of common stock he received are valued at their April 22 price, was actually $610,947. Three GM executive vice presidents followed Wilson on the gravy train. They are: Albert Bradley, who received $511,225 last year; Harlow H. Curtice, $496,100; and Marvin E. Coyle, $496,000.

Other vice presidents who received big amounts are Frederic G. Donner, $411,300; Louis C. Goad, $411,100; Ronald K. Evans, $411,000; and Francis L. Burke, $311,000.

GM board chairman, Alfred P. Sloan, Jr., struggled through last year with pay of $48,600. The proxy statement noted, however, that as of February 28, 1950, Sloan owned 571,825 shares of GM common stock.

In a defense of the huge salaries paid to GM executives, Sloan said in 1946 that "the cost to the business of maintaining the highest available standard of managerial talent is relatively inconsequential."

"What such talent may create in terms of more job opportunities, better product values, and additional profits is most important," he said. "The penalty of any different approach might well involve, and, in fact, must eventually bring into question the effectiveness of the whole administrative structure of the business."

Mr. Speaker, the foregoing indeed is something for the apostles of doom and the prophets of gloom to cry over, so let her go Joe. Let her go.

As an old Polish housewife neighbor of mine was wont to say, "Cry your bucket full today and be dehydrated tomorrow, and then we will all get a rest from your insane, ill-warranted, stupid grief."

The Statehood Bills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1950

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, the case for statehood for Alaska and Hawaii was restated this morning with force, clarity, and logic in editorials appearing in the New York Herald Tribune and the New York Times, and I take pleasure in submitting those editorials for the RECORD:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of May 8, 1950]

A CONVINCING APPEAL

The President's appeal to the chairman of the Senate Interior Committee, JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, urging swift passage for the bills admitting Alaska and Hawaii to statehood, is an able and convincing document on its own and is directed to a significant cause. Approved by the House, the two bills that would add a forty-ninth and a fiftieth State to the Union have been the subject of careful hearings in the Senate; and the time for action is definitely at hand. If anything could add to the general sentiment in favor of these bills, Mr. Truman's reasoned argument that admission of Alaska and Hawaii will "not only promote the welfare and development of the two Territories, but also greatly strengthen the security of our Nation as a whole," sets a final pinnacle upon the case for statehood.

This newspaper has maintained that both principle and expediency impel us to take the step. The history of the American Union is one of growing Territories being brought within the sustaining and stimulating framework of confederation; the tendency has always been to extend the hand in faith, rather than wait until population and economic development had reached a stage of fulfillment. Alaska with its hardy climate bids fair to breed a race of hardy and determined citizens. Hawaii may seem at first glance to present itself under a new aspect, but its distance across the open water creates no greater obstacles to union than the long overland routes which separated our early Western States from the settled East; and its admixture of racial strains is not basically dissimilar from that which we confronted in the old Southwest. As for the frequently repeated argument that, in the case of Alaska at least, the new State Senators would represent a disproportionately small constituency, Mr. Truman remarked with entire accuracy that this problem had been dealt with and disposed of in the Constitutional Convention of 1787.

The case for statehood does not rest, however, merely on ground of tradition and

precedent. The urgencies of the present strongly reinforce it. The need is for vigorous democratic communities at our western outposts, not only adding strength in their own right but as symbols of the continuing creativeness of the American experiment. The admission of Alaska and Hawaii at this juncture will permit the United States, in keeping faith with its past, to meet the challenge of today.

[From the New York Times of May 8, 1950]

THE STATEHOOD BILLS

President Truman is right in urging favorable action on the bills to admit Hawaii and Alaska to statehood. The measures have passed the House. Hearings on them have been conducted by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. What remains now is to bring them out to the Senate floor and adopt them. President Truman is obviously apprehensive lest they die in committee as did the Hawaii statehood bill in the Eightieth Congress.

The balance of argument on these measures weighs heavily in their favor. They are, we believe, enthusiastically endorsed by a substantial majority of the public. There is reason to suppose that if they can be brought to a Senate vote they will have the requisite support for passage. They can be defeated by inertia and the seasonal legislative log jam. If that is done the will of the public will also have been defeated.

The opposition to these measures comes down, eventually, to rather narrow partisan political grounds. This is not the proper basis upon which a question of such solemn magnitude should be decided. The status of these two great Territories is at stake. The judgment on that status should be one in statecraft, not petty politics. The Senate should get its chance to act, and if it does we believe that it will act wisely.

Repeal of Wartime Excise Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1950

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement, letter, and resolution of the International Union of Brewery, Flour, Cereal, Soft Drink, and Distillery Workers of America:

DEFINING ATTITUDE OF THE INTERNATIONAL UNION OF UNITED BREWERY, FLOUR, CEREAL, SOFT DRINK, AND DISTILLERY WORKERS OF AMERICA

The national coordinating committee of the beverage industry, composed of representatives of organized labor and of the alcoholic-beverage industry, held their first official meeting on March 23, 1950, in Chicago, Ill.

Joseph E. Brady, coordinator of the International Union of United Brewery, Flour, Cereal, Soft Drink, and Distillery Workers of America, CIO, was elected permanent chairman of this group and will direct its actions in conjunction with a board of directors. Paul E. Jorgensen, executive director of the National Licensed Beverage Association, was named secretary-treasurer.

Representatives of industry and labor who were in attendance pledged their full support to make the committee a strong and effective organization.

Much discussion centered around the Langer bill, S. 1847 (to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce). This legislation will presently be voted on by the members of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee in executive session.

A resolution was adopted by the committee which asks the Congress for an across-the-board repeal of all wartime excise taxes imposed by the Revenue Act of 1943.

The adoption of the resolution climaxed a day-long meeting in the Stevens Hotel held for the purpose of developing a coordinated campaign to combat any and all Federal legislation of a prohibition nature.

Brady stated that due to the high taxes placed upon the products of the alcoholic-beverage industry, bootlegging, moonshining, and other practices of the prohibition era are encouraged and are on the upward trend. Such illicit practices are causing the Government large losses of revenue. "As things stand now," he added, "the alcoholic-beverage industry is the Government's largest industry taxpayer and provides employment for approximately 1,100,000 workers. If these tax inequities placed against this industry are ever to be corrected, it will be necessary for us—labor and the industry—to work together in wholehearted cooperation and coordination. It is the only way we can impress upon the American people and our friends in Congress the seriousness of the possibility that this industry could be taxed out of existence."

To this end the committee's officers were authorized to contact the top level executives of the alcoholic-beverage industry, who, it is hoped, will lend their support to the undertaking.

Among those attending the Chicago meeting representing industry were: Edward T. Donahue and William W. Wadel of the Blatz Brewing Co., Milwaukee; Harold R. Thielecke, Wine and Spirits Wholesalers of America; Paul E. Jorgensen and Wendelin Kraft, National Licensed Beverage Association; Joseph A. Gollin and Jack Garvey, Schenley Distillers, Inc.; Roland S. St. Pierre, Licensed Beverage Industries, Inc.; Russell H. Hopkins, National Beer Wholesalers Association; and John Daly, Bronx Tavern Owners Association.

Representing labor were: Eric B. Bjurman, International Association of Machinists (independent); Roland J. Hidde, Wisconsin State Council of Brewery Workers (CIO); Fred B. Sweet, Hotel and Restaurant Employees and Bartenders International Union (A. F. of L.); Paul E. Maxwell, Glass Workers (A. F. of L.); Frank Poidl, Coopers International Union (A. F. of L.); and Joseph E. Brady, International Union of United Brewery, Flour, Cereal, Soft Drink, and Distillery Workers of America (CIO).

Congratulatory telegrams from organizations unable to send representatives to the meeting were read. Among these were messages from Repeal Associates, Washington, D. C.; Amalgamated Lithographers of America (CIO), New York; Pennsylvania Committee for Moderation and Law Enforcement; Distilled Spirits Institute, Washington, D. C.; Pennsylvania Federation of Fraternal and Social Organizations; and from Members of the Congress.

THE NATIONAL COORDINATING COMMITTEE OF THE BEVERAGE INDUSTRY,
March 31, 1950.

Hon. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON,
Chairman, House Ways and Means Committee,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: As chairman of the national coordinating committee of the beverage industry, I have been instructed to forward you the enclosed resolution.

This resolution was passed at a 1-day conference by members of the above-mentioned committee, meeting at the Stevens Hotel in the city of Chicago on March 23.

The national coordinating committee of the beverage industry requests that this resolution be given consideration by the House Ways and Means Committee.

This committee is composed of representatives of both labor and industry, and the members who were in attendance and who cast their vote favoring this resolution are as follows:

Representing industry: Edward T. Donahue and William W. Wadel, of the Blatz Brewing Co., Milwaukee; Harold R. Thielecke, Wine and Spirits Wholesalers of America; Paul E. Jorgensen and Wendelin Kraft, National Licensed Beverage Association; Josh A. Gollin and Jack Garvey, Schenley Distillers, Inc.; Roland S. St. Pierre, Licensed Beverage Industries, Inc.; Russell H. Hopkins, National Beer Wholesalers' Association; and John Daly, Bronx Tavern Owners' Association.

Representing labor: Eric B. Bjurman, International Association of Machinists (independent); Roland J. Hidde, Wisconsin State Council of Brewery Workers (CIO); Fred B. Sweet, Hotel and Restaurant Employees and Bartenders' International Union (A. F. of L.); Paul E. Maxwell, Glass Workers (A. F. of L.); Frank Poidl, Coopers International Union (A. F. of L.); and Joseph E. Brady, International Union of United Brewery, Flour, Cereal, Soft Drink, and Distillery Workers of America (CIO).

I would like to call to your attention the fact that the participating labor organizations on this committee at the present time represent over 1,000,000 union workmen and that some of the organizations representing industry are of national scope.

Very sincerely,

JOSEPH E. BRADY,
Chairman.

CINCINNATI, OHIO.

RESOLUTION ON THE REPEAL OF WARTIME EXCISE TAXES, BY THE NATIONAL COORDINATING COMMITTEE OF THE BEVERAGE INDUSTRY

Whereas the Seventy-eighth Congress did pass legislation known as the Revenue Act of 1943 which placed additional taxes upon many articles of commerce; and

Whereas the Seventy-eighth Congress did pledge to the American people that these wartime excise taxes would be repealed 6 months after the cessation of hostilities, and that the war has been over for nearly 5 years; and

Whereas these added wartime excise taxes were to be of a temporary nature and were imposed to curtail consumer purchases during wartime; and

Whereas said wartime excise taxes place an unequal burden upon working people and others of limited income and has a depressing effect upon all industry, thereby aggravating unemployment and business recession, particularly in the industries affected by such taxes and their allied industries; and

Whereas legislation has been introduced to repeal all wartime excise taxes of the Revenue Act of 1943 with the exception of the alcoholic-beverage excise tax of said Revenue Act; and

Whereas the alcoholic-beverage industry is the Government's largest industry taxpayer, having paid to the Federal, State, and local governments the enormous sum of $26,823,255,944 from 1933 to 1948; and

Whereas the alcoholic-beverage industry and its allied industries give employment to approximately two and one-half million workers; and

Whereas due to the high excise taxes placed upon the products of this industry, bootlegging, moonshining and other practices of the prohibition era are encouraged and are on the upward trend, thereby causing the Government large losses of revenue; and

Whereas the repeal of all wartime excise taxes of the Revenue Act of 1943 would greatly stimulate business in all industries upon which they are now levied: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the National Coordinating Committee of the Beverage Industry hereby respectfully requests that the Congress keep its pledge to the American people by repealing each and every one of the unfair and discriminatory wartime excise taxes of the Revenue Act of 1943; and be it further

Resolved, That the House Ways and Means Committee, and all Senators and Representatives be advised by written communication or other means of this action.

This resolution passed this day, March 23, 1950, by the national coordinating committee of the beverage industry, at Chicago, Ill.

Improved Health Standards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CARL T. DURHAM

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1950

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks of Admiral William H. P. Blandy, United States Navy, retired, president, Health Information Foundation, at annual convention, American Pharmaceutical Association, Atlantic City, N. J., May 4, 1950:

In the few months since my retirement from the Navy and my appointment as president of the Health Information Foundation, it has become increasingly clear to me that—barring brief periods when we have been the victims of severe epidemics, like influenza and polio—there has been no time in our history when more popular and professional attention has been centered on health questions.

Our newspapers and our magazines are filled with news and commentaries on health. More and more people are joining organizations like Blue Cross and Blue Shield. New associations are being formed to fight specific ailments—like heart disease and cerebral palsy—to take their places with the organizations fighting cancer, tuberculosis, polio, and other diseases. There are some 20,000 voluntary agencies in the United States, in addition to Federal, State, and county agencies, which are concerned to one degree or another with health. We are striving to encourage the enlistment of more doctors, more nurses, and more technicians in the fight against disease. We are building more hospitals. We are discovering new drugs. States and other areas which have fallen behind in the health parade are striving to catch up.

All of these things—the news stories, the new agencies, the recruitment drives for nurses, the rapid expansion of Blue Cross-Blue Shield—and many more which I have not time to mention—mean one thing above all others. The people of the United States have undertaken a crusade to win for themselves better health standards. They want better health. They are determined to get it. And, in spite of all the hurly-burly confusion which goes with such a high rate of activity, they actually are getting better health.

Any review of health progress during 1949 which you might pick up would convince you that the people of the United States are going ahead full steam to improve their health standards. There is no sign during 1950 that this rate of progress is slowing down. It seems to be picking up.

It is estimated, for instance, that during 1950 a total of 14,000,000 persons will be X-rayed to see if they have tuberculosis. There were 10,500,000 such X-rays in 1949. And, incidentally, the tuberculosis rate per 1,000 of population was 45.8 in 1940, dropped to 30 in 1948, and was 26 in 1949.

The success of tuberculosis detection on a mass scale has been such that there is now a movement on foot to put into action a multiphasic screening program for case detection of such other chronic diseases as syphilis, diabetes, anemia, heart disease, high blood pressure, and eye and ear defects. It is contended that mass testing for chronic diseases can be accomplished expeditiously through the use of rapid diagnostic procedures. And when we consider that 5 out of every 6 hospital beds are occupied by the chronically ill, we can see the importance of early detection.

It may be that in our zest for better health standards we are biting off a rather large piece with such mass testing. It won't be cheap and sometimes, you know, you have to decide whether you want a new car or a new television set. But, in the field of health, I would rather see us try to get too much than too little.

We have accomplished so much, here and there in our huge country, by applying the fundamental virtues of common sense and Yankee ingenuity that I should like to cite a few instances of acomplishment in the health field on a local scale and point out to you that—with the application of a little more common sense and a little more Yankee ingenuity—each of these accomplishments could be duplicated elsewhere. I grant that in many cases we would have to make adjustments for local conditions, but I doubt very much that a problem which has been solved in Wyoming cannot be solved, by similar methods, in any other State, allowing for the natural differences of geographic and economic conditions and for variations between those States which are predominantly urban and those which are chiefly rural.

All over the country we hear the cry that more doctors are needed in rural areas and too many are crowded in the big cities. A great portion of the State of Kansas is about as rural as a State can be and Kansas needed doctors very badly in its farm centers. It was a serious situation, as it still is in other rural areas, but Kansas responded with an answer. All over Kansas, in sections where doctors were badly needed, the people have been baiting doctor traps. When you want to catch a mouse you set up a situation which will attract mice to where you want them. In Kansas they have done just that—except that they wanted to attract doctors to rural sections of the State. People who knew the situation in Kansas analyzed it this way. Any young man of ordinary income who decides to become a doctor has a mighty expensive road ahead of him before he can support himself. Medical education is just about the most expensive kind there is. When the young doctor is finally ready to go into practice he needs access to a lot of expensive equipment—especially diagnostic equipment. He has been trained to use modern machines to diagnose illness. The old family doctor who knew measles by his sense of smell has given way to the highly-trained product of our highly efficient, up-to-date medical schools who feels secure in his diagnosis only when he has checked his judgment against the X-ray, the electrocardiograph and other diagnostic devices which were not available to many doctors a few years ago. Very naturally, they gravitate to the larger cities where the diagnostic facilities they have been trained to use are available to them.

Informed men in Kansas knew about this situation and they devised a way to meet it. In small town after small town—and I am speaking of places like Mankato, Kans., which has a population of 1,500—the townspeople got together and raised or pledged funds to buy the kind of equipment which would attract doctors to their communities. The last figure I heard was that 150 doctors have settled recently in Kansas towns which were sorely in need of medical aid and which supplied the equipment needed to bring medical aid to them. Furthermore, I understand that many more are waiting to settle in other Kansas communities. The doctors, incidentally, have not been too fussy about the appointments and decor of the places they are willing to work in. In these Kansas communities some of them have set up their offices in converted storefronts—but those storefronts have been equipped by the townspeople with the kind of tools that the modern doctor has been trained to use—and at relatively low cost.

That is what I mean by baiting doctor traps. Every professional man, and every business man, whether he be a doctor, a dentist, a pharmacist, a tailor, or a hardware merchant, wants to work where his abilities will be realized to the utmost. No one feels happy doing a half job. No doctor who is worthy of his M. D. feels that he is doing his best when he does not have access to the tools which will help him cure his patients. The moral seems to be this: if your town needs a doctor, find out why it doesn't have one. Then bait your town with what is needed to attract a doctor.

Several States—Michigan, Virginia, Connecticut, for instance—have begun to improve the preparation of medical college graduates for rural health work by assigning them to small town hospitals, where they complete their training and do resident work. I am sure that other States will follow suit, or devise other answers to the problem, just as so many States have been quick to seize upon the plan developed in Alameda County, Calif., where the medical society discovered that too many patients felt their doctors were overcharging, too many were unable to get a doctor in an emergency, and too many believed that in cases of malpractice doctors sided together against the layman. So Alameda County doctors established a bureau which provides 24-hour emergency service and, as has been proved in actual court cases, sides with the patient against the doctor in instances where fees have been too high or careless errors have resulted in injury to a patient. Incidentally, there has been remarkably few such cases since this system was established. The interesting result, however, has been that 20 other medical socities around the country have either followed suit or making local studies aimed at setting up similar systems.

Almost everywhere you look there is an answer to a medical problem which can be either copied or adapted to solve similar problems elsewhere. Michigan's Hillsdale Plan, started only 2 years ago in rural southern Michigan, is an example. Doctors working with this plan—and there are only 16 doctors in the county—concentrated on early cancer detection. Each of them made his office a cancer detection clinic. They informed the people that they were ready, at low cost, to give cancer examinations to every resident of the county. The result has been that the rate of early cancer detection among Hillsdale County residents has been four times as great as in the rest of the United States—and, of course, chances of cure has been greatly enhanced by this early detection.

Furthermore, Michigan has established 18 health information centers, where any resident can go to find out what to do about his own peculiar health troubles.

These things which have been done in Michigan, in Alameda County, in Kansas, and

in so many other areas of the United States are an object lesson to the whole country. There is not a single town, country, or State which cannot do at least something to improve its health facilities. It does take initiative, and, of course, it requires access to proper guidance.

A great many of our problems of health, it seems to me, are really problems in communications. A good many of the answers to our health problems already exist in a laboratory, in the files of a health agency, in some system which a town, or county, or other unit has set up to solve a problem which it thought was peculiarly its own but which, when we examine it, is common to similar towns or counties all around the country. But if these solutions remain in the files, their usefulness is limited. If Michigan's methods can be applied in Ohio, why not tell Ohio about it. If Kansas has found at least a partial answer to maldistribution of the supply of doctors, why cannot this answer be used in Minnesota?

Maybe Minnesota has not heard about what Kansas is doing, although actually the success of the Kansas technique has been such that I am sure it is well known in medical circles. I am citing it simply as an example of what I mean by the necessity for communications. Let us assume that Kansas solved its rural doctor problem but kept quiet about it. All the good that could be done by applying this technique would be locked up in one State.

It requires communications, the distribution of useful information, to get the most good out of these answers to our health problems. The media of communications are many, but because I am addressing an audience with a special interest in pharmacy I should like to point out to you that the retail pharmacy is a fine communications agency. Some 24,000,000 Americans visit drug stores every day. They have confidence in their pharmacists as men of professional training and responsibility and they listen when the pharmacist speaks.

I am pleased to note that the pharmacist is being used by several alert agencies in the distribution of health information to the public. The American Cancer Society has been aided by the cooperation of your association. There was very useful cooperation between American pharmacists and the American Diabetic Association in bringing to the people's attention the importance of early detection of diabetes. The American Pharmaceutical Association and the American Social Hygiene Association are cooperating in a joint attack on the venereal diseases. The American Heart Association has benefited from the assistance of pharmacists in fund raising, in communicating to the people the importance of research in heart disease.

This is a form of communications we do not often consider. In the field of health it is a very special avenue of comunications and I hope that it will be more widely used. I am sure that when the Health Information Foundation is in a position to call upon the pharmacist for help in conveying health facts to the people it will do so with a full realization that the pharmacist is in the front line of American health defense.

Communications will be a very vital part of the work of the Health Information Foundation. I have indicated to you my strong conviction that it is not enough to have the answers to our health problems—we must see that they are used and used widely. The only way to do this is to distribute the answers to points where they are needed.

The Foundation is, in the first place, a fact-finding organization. It will do research at several levels, national and local, to find out the facts about American health and health facilities. It will analyze those facts.

Then it will disseminate the facts—and in doing so it intends to use every possible medium of communications, from newspapers to radio, from magazines to pharmacists.

There is a third step in the foundation program—and I think it is the one which will determine the success or failure of that program. I am a great believer in action. Information is of only potential value until it is put into action. It is not enough to know what should be done. We must do it. And I believe that the foundation, in order to achieve its purpose—in order to make a really valuable contribution to the better health of America—must be a stimulus to action by the people, in their individual communities.

The first purpose of the foundation, as stated in its charter, recognizes the vital importance of this stimulation. The first in the list of purposes of the foundation is as follows:

"1. To stimulate greater public interest in the progress that has been made by medical science and to encourage still greater gains, and to assure increased availability of medical services throughout the broadly expanding field of medical care, with no sacrifice of quality."

We must stimulate the people to act upon their health problems, as they have acted in so many different, but unfortunately in many cases sporadic, instances such as those that I have cited. The foundation, once it has gathered the facts, hopes to be able not only to tell the people what they can do about their health problems but to stimulate them to put the answers into action.

We need to put the answers into action if this country is only to maintain the rate of health progress it has seen during the past 50 years—let alone advance that rate of progress. It is a paradox that our health needs will increase as we become healthier but it must be perfectly obvious that the higher percentage of older people in our population, which is increasing every day, means that we will require more and more health facilities. Older people need more medical attention than do the younger generations.

The time to begin this action is now. We cannot let America lag behind in health progress, any more than we can let it lag behind in other areas vital to national strength. If we are to live in a competitive world we must be strong enough to compete.

The Grange Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 8, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Agriculture will soon conduct extensive hearings to endeavor to draft a new, long-range agricultural program to take the place, in whole or part, of the present laws.

A number of farm programs will be presented, undoubtedly, and among them will be the grange farm program.

There appears in the May issue of the magazine Grange the following article presented by National Master Goss at the Minneapolis Farm Forum last March, which I am sure will be interesting to the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

GRANGE FARM PROGRAM

(So many inquiries have been received about the Grange farm program, as presented by National Master Goss at the Minneapolis Farm Forum in March, his address is printed this month in full. The talk has been described variously by editors and others as "the only practical and positive program yet offered"; as "leading back to a self-help system"; as "you can't beat subsidy proposals with nothing," and that "The Grange program provides what is needed." It will bear careful reading.—The Editors.)

First, let me make it clear that we do not approve our present farm program or any program which contemplates the destruction of food as a means of maintaining satisfactory farm prices. Neither do we approve any program which would make it necessary for the farmer to look to the Government for his livelihood. Most people seem to think we should be either in one camp or the other. We have never been in either camp and have continually pointed out that there is a much better way.

Second, let me make it clear that we realize that the farm problem is only a part of a very serious economic problem with which the Nation is confronted; that during 7 years of unprecedented emergency effort, we increased our national farm and industrial output tremendously, particularly our industrial production which we increased as much as we would normally increase it in almost two generations, that we must find some way of using this tremendous increase if we are to avoid closing down factories and creating an unemployment situation heading directly to depression that no farm program can succeed unless we find ways of maintaining reasonably full employment; and that there is no turning back—we must either maintain a full production economy or follow the dismal road of depression which might destroy our whole system of free economy. The problem of industrial unemployment looms far more ominously than the farm problem. If it is not solved, nothing can prevent a collapse in agriculture. If it can be solved, the farm problem becomes much more simple, for in general, coupled with a program for upgrading our diets, farm production can be adjusted to our needs, and the problem of assuring plenty without destructive surpluses can be met.

On the other hand, the maintenance of a prosperous agriculture is the most important element in meeting the problem of industrial surpluses. Farming is the largest manufacturing industry in the Nation. Farmers eat, wear clothes, and live in houses just like other folks, but, in addition, they buy machinery, fertilizer, and supplies of every description, create the bulk of our transportation industry, and, although now only 20 percent of our population numerically, they and the 20 percent who are directly dependent on farm trade for a livelihood consume a very substantial part of our total industrial production. Anything which seriously curtails this purchasing power immediately affects employment and upsets our whole economic balance. At the bottom of the whole problem, therefore, is the necessity of maintaining a reasonable balance of output and income among the great economic groups which make up our society.

Third, we should recognize that there is no single farm problem. During World War I, we produced tremendous surpluses to win the war. Following the war we struggled for 20 years to find an answer to the problem of farm prices and surpluses. We tried the equalization fee, the export debenture, the domestic allotment, and many other devices in our hunt for some formula that would cure the trouble. The most valuable lesson we should have learned from this experience is that there are almost as many problems as there are varieties of crops, and that no single remedy will cure them all. The plan which will meet the problems of the wheat grower may not work at all on eggs; the plan which will suit eggs won't fit oranges; and the program which would bring help to the

orange grower would probably prove entirely unworkable when applied to cotton. The Grange believes that we must have a wide range of corrective measures available to apply to different crops under different conditions, in order to meet the many problems where farm production is as diverse as ours.

The Grange believes that agriculture is entitled to a fair price for its products at the market place, and we accord the same right to industry and labor. The economic balance previously referred to is essential to stable prosperity. Guidepost two helps point the way. As a means of determining what is equitable and fair, we therefore start with the development of a parity formula which will act as a measuring stick to determine what is a fair and equitable price level for farm products. While we have what we believe to be a more equitable and practical parity formula than the new formula which became effective January first, we have accepted this modernized parity formula as reasonably sound. In fact the Grange proposed this formula about 8 years ago. We do not like the law which permits the use of two different formulas with instructions to use whichever results in the higher price. We believe we should stick to the single modernized parity formula until a better one is made available.

ORDER OF PREFERENCE PROGRAM

With an equitable parity price level for a goal, our problem is how to attain market prices which will be as near as possible to that goal, and at the same time maintain a plentiful supply without unmanageable surpluses. The Grange recognizes that with such a wide variety of crops a broad program of measures is needed to meet the wide variety of conditions under which those crops are raised and sold. We favor just such a broad line of measures, and would make them available for use to meet whatever need may arise in a definite order of preference prescribed by law. That order of preference would start with those measures which call on the Government for the least assistance and control and end with those which call on the Government for the most assistance and control. These measures would fall into six major categories:

First, we recommend a Federal Farm Commission with two major responsibilities. If a wide variety of measures is to be available, someone must use discretion as to what measures to employ. Obviously this is a point at which the best of experience and discretion should be used, and equally obviously we should avoid the choice of one method or another for the purpose of political advantage. We believe this discretion can best be entrusted to a Commission of 12 members, 1 drawn from each farm credit district, thus assuring widespread knowledge of regional problems. To avoid politics, not more than half should belong to any one political party. The President should call for nominees from producer, processor, and distributing organizations. At this point we have a unique proposal designed to assure efficiency rather than political influence. The nominees should be transmitted by the President to a joint committee representing the Committees of Agriculture in House and Senate for their review and recommendations, together with any other names he may have under consideration. The Joint Committee could submit other recommendations. The President would not be required to follow the recommendations, but if he ignored them he would have great difficulty in having the members confirmed by the Senate. The use of a joint committee both in making recommendations on appointees and reviewing the recommendations is a new but very potent safeguard, for the only interest of such a committee would be to see that the laws the Congress passed were administered on as sound a basis as possible.

This committee would act in an advisory capacity to the Secretary of Agriculture. It should have access to all the information of government on matters pertaining to their responsibilities, and should report to the Congress all the recommendations it makes to the Secretary with the reasons supporting them. Thus they would be the representatives of Congress designed to assist in the sound administration of law, and while the Secretary would not be legally bound to follow this advice, no secretary, no administration would survive long which would wholly ignore the recommendation of such a committee and the wishes of Congress.

One major duty of the Commission would be to keep a continuing inventory of supply and prospective outlets for farm products; to work with producer, processor, and distributing groups in pushing items in surplus supply, and assist in adjusting supply to prospective demand. In our judgment, a very large part of the problem, particularly relating to fruits and perishables, would disappear at this point. There is plenty of evidence as to how effective well-directed marketing efforts can be. Our present problem is that we have neither the necessary information on which to base a well-planned marketing program nor the legal means of bringing together representatives of producers, processors, and marketing agencies to assist in carrying it out. In the Federal Farm Commission we are proposing such means.

As we have said, we would provide adequate measures to meet the various complex problems arising in the wide variety of commodities we produce. It would be the responsibility of the Commission to study the various problems as they arise and to recommend to the Secretary the use of the measure best designed to do the job, with due regard to the order of preference as set forth in the act, always reporting its recommendations to the Joint Agriculture Committee of the Congress so that it could be fully informed as to the administration of the laws the Congress enacted and the need for additional legislation, if any. This feature would assist materially in preventing either domination of the Commission by the Secretary or ignoring its recommendations and serve, at the same time, to maintain the best of cooperation between the Department and the Congress.

Second, we favor a broad expansion of the marketing agreements act so that every commodity which could make use of it would find it available. If this could be extended to all crops on which it could be used, it would probably prove to be the most useful single piece of legislation enacted by the Congress in meeting the farm problem in the last dozen years. For example it has enabled the dairy industry to maintain an ample supply of milk at all times with the resultant necessary surplus diverted to secondary uses such as butter, cheese, or skimmed milk, distributing the loss from such diversion to all producers. We believe in an economy of plenty. Under such an economy there are bound to be surpluses and we believe some such method of handling surpluses is necessary so that they will not destroy the basic markets, but will be diverted to useful purposes with any losses which may occur distributed among all the producers. Thus if the surpluses thus diverted become too big and involve losses the producers have an incentive to adjust production to meet the demand, yet maintain adequate supplies. When the Farm Loan Act was passed in 1916, the Farm Loan Board was charged with the duty of carrying on an educational campaign as to the advantages of the act. So we would charge the Commission with the duty of promoting sound marketing agreements where they would serve a definite need.

Third, in such cases as the marketing agreement method would not serve, we would provide some other form of a two-price or multiple-price system. The purpose would be the same, to divert the surpluses to secondary uses and distribute any loss which may occur among all the producers. There are a number of ways in which this could be done, including the equalization fee, the certificate plan, some form of debenture, or other means. These could be employed domestically in such ways as making wheat available for feed or making alcohol out of surplus potatoes, or they could be employed in foreign trade with adequate provisions against dumping. The lack of an adequate two-price system seems to be the weakest point in our present program. We support prices and make no provision to care for the surpluses. This leads to such indefensible situations as our present potato mess. We will not attempt to discuss the details of plans by which multiple-price systems can be developed. Again different methods should be available to meet the varying conditions of different commodities.

It will be noted that these three major provisions are self-supporting except for minor administrative expense. The Government would not be called upon for either money or controls. It is our belief that along these three lines the major part of our crops would be marketed in normal times. We feel that our whole program should be directed toward attaining a normal balance between supply and demand and obviate the necessity of Government controls or direct aid.

Fourth, we recognize that in abnormal times conditions will arise when the three self-help proposals we have presented may not suffice. To meet such conditions, we favor price supports related to parity. There are two types of such supports—flexible and fixed. In most instances, we prefer the flexible support. The case of potatoes may be used as an example to explain why.

The law provided for a support price on potatoes at 90 percent of parity. Suddenly DDT came on the market, mechanization expanded, and, with the use of fertilizer, enabled the producers to increase their production tremendously and thereby reduce their production costs. Under the modernized parity formula which has just gone into effect, such a condition would adjust the parity index for potatoes, if given time, but this would take years, and the industry was confronted with a most unusual and abrupt change in cost. It became so profitable to raise potatoes that growers increased production tremendously. This incentive to increase production was because the support price was too high and left too wide a margin of profit which brought out more potatoes than the country could use. If it is true that the supports were too high, the logical remedy would be to reduce the supports so that the margin of profit on potatoes would be in line with the margin on other commodities, and keep the production in line with the consuming demand. A support price, therefore, related to surpluses would seem to be the most practicable and equitable way of managing most supports, but it is entirely impractical to write into law any uniform basis of changing the supports, up or down, which will fit potatoes, eggs, oranges, cotton, wheat, and a hundred other varieties of commodities. Certain goals must be set and the right to modify the supports must be left to the discretion of the Federal Farm Commission, or the Secretary, acting with their advice.

The Grange has never contended that flexible supports would fit all commodities. Such commodities as wheat and cotton, which historically must seek world markets for part of their outlets, cannot safely be left to the manipulations of foreign governments in regard to surpluses and demand. In some instances the Grange would approve fixed supports, although I might repeat that it would be only when a two-price method or some other self-supporting method would not serve adequately. If fixed supports bring

out too much production, it may be necessary to find some way to control production either through marketing quotas or acreage allotments.

Fifth come production controls either through marketing quotas or acreage allotments. While we do not like either, we recognize that they may be necessary, if fixed supports are to be used, and possibly in some cases with flexible supports. We prefer the marketing quota to the acreage allotment because the marketing quota is reasonably manageable while the acreage allotment is too easily evaded resulting in little or no production control whatever. As an example, some years ago the acreage of cotton was cut to half, but farmers laid aside their poorest acres, poured fertilizer on the remainder, and many raised more cotton than they did before the cut. In most crops, we consider both devices as emergency in character, to be used only in extreme cases where it is necessary to make rapid substantial readjustments in production. Marketing quotas and acreage allotments are, therefore, accepted as a fifth general class of measures which we would make available but we would put them near the bottom of the list in order of preference.

Sixth, and at the bottom of the list, we would make production payments available only as an emergency measure. We do not want to see agriculture dependent upon Treasury payments for its existence, not only because of its effect on agriculture, but we believe that it would be economically unsound. We do not want to see farmers reduced to the uncertainty of income based upon the annual action of Congress. We do not want to see farmers reduced to the political necessity of voting for the candidate who would promise the biggest and best raids on the Federal Treasury. We do not want to see the Government paying a portion of the food bill of American consumers, rich and poor alike, with an unknown drain on the taxpayers which would inevitably result in inflation similar to that which has brought so much economic distress to so many European nations, making the rich richer and the poor poorer. We do not want to see the widespread regimentation of farmers which would follow, with the hordes of public employees necessary to administer such a program. Nevertheless, we feel that in periods of emergency or adjustment it may be necessary to use such payments to meet a condition which could not be met in any other way, provided such payments are safeguarded by a definite order of preference to be used in connection with the recommendations of the Federal Farm Commission. We believe that such a provision should be available for use, but should not be used until it was clear that other means would not suffice. We feel that it would be a serious mistake, and would go a long way toward destroying the incentive for farmers to develop self-help, self-supporting programs, if production payments were made the main reliance for meeting the farm problem.

Eventually upgrading our diets will have a most important part to play in adjusting our production to consumption needs. Armed with adequate measures to promote stability such as we have outlined, a Federal Farm Commission, or the Secretary, with the advice of such a Commission, could assist very materially in promoting adjustments designed to bring such an upgrading about. The Commission would help to bring common sense to bear in meeting the many intricate phases of our farm problems as they arise.

In closing, I call your attention to the fact that our program is flexible, and is broad enough to get the job done, yet is so set up as to use Government aid and Government controls only to the extent necessary, and to get rid of them as fast as self-help means can be made to meet the problem. It is designed to divorce the administration of farm programs from politics as far as possible. It would strengthen the relations between the Congress and the Department of Agriculture and assure constant information to those responsible for providing adequate legal measures for meeting farm and marketing problems. It would not discriminate among commodities. If labor and industry would approach the problem of a well-balanced national economy with the same degree of equity and thoroughness, we would be a long way down the road to the solution of our most difficult domestic economic problems.

From time to time as I learn of new farm programs being offered for consideration, I shall insert them, or so much of them as brevity will permit, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I do hope that we can draft a farm program which will be in keeping with the importance which agriculture bears to the Nation's economy, and as free from partisan politics as possible. Our Nation's economy is geared to agriculture and agriculture is more than a business, or an occupation, or a political football—it is a way of life. It is the very backbone, and not the wishbone, of the Nation.

Polish-Americans Again Pay Tribute to Freedom Ideal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER A. CHESNEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 8, 1950

Mr. CHESNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article entitled "Polish-Americans Again Pay Tribute to Freedom Ideal," by Roman Pucinski, a constituent of the Eleventh Illinois District, an outstanding writer for the Chicago Sun-Times. This fine article, which appeared in the Sunday, May 7, 1950, edition of the Sun-Times, certainly reflects the patriotism of Polish-Americans and their everlasting struggle to preserve the ideals of free people. It follows:

POLISH-AMERICANS AGAIN PAY TRIBUTE TO FREEDOM IDEAL

(By Roman Pucinski)

It was once said that wherever you find two or more Poles you're bound to find a Polish organization.

A casual observer might add: In Chicago you'll find more than 4,000 Polish organizations serving an estimated 600,000 Chicagoans of Polish ancestry. They range from benevolent groups to athletic clubs with a large number of cultural, professional, civic, social, and choral clubs in between.

Sunday, most of those 4,000 organizations will participate in a mass tribute to the one hundred and fifty-ninth anniversary of Poland's Constitution, adopted May 3, 1791. The colorful ceremony will be in Humboldt Park near the monument of Gen. Thaddeus Kosciusko, Polish patriot and hero of the American Revolution.

TEN THOUSAND IN PARADE

A parade of 10,000—ranging from youngsters to old-timers in their nineties—will precede the observance. Many will be in native Polish costumes. The parade starts at 1 p. m. from the Polish National Alliance Building, Milwaukee and Division, and will move along Augusta to the park.

The annual tribute to the charter which gave Poland freedom from serfdom and from religious persecution is expected to attract 100,000 persons. It's a far cry from the small group of Polish refugees who observed the first Polish Constitution Day in Chicago in 1834. There were only 235 persons present then.

PATTERNED IN UNITED STATES

The Polish charter was suspended 2 years after its adoption when Russia and Prussia partitioned Poland for the second time. But it always has served as a symbol of freedom to the Poles. It was patterned after this country's basic charter of liberties and was described as the most liberal document of Europe in its time.

Chicago's Polish Americans are organized into four parent fraternal groups with members from coast to coast. Their headquarters are on the near northwest side, frequently called Polonia. Their total assets exceed $101,000,000.

The four groups are the Polish National Alliance, 1520 West Division, sponsor of Sunday's observance; Polish Roman Catholic Union, 984 North Milwaukee; Polish Women's Alliance, 1309 North Ashland, and the Polish Alma Mater, 1645 Milwaukee. All were organized in Chicago.

The organizations—along with 50 Polish Roman Catholic churches in Chicago—have served as focal points from which the Poles made their cultural, economic, industrial, religious, educational, and political contributions to Chicago's growth.

PROGRESS DOCUMENTED

In the lavishly decorated Polish Roman Catholic Union Museum at Augusta and Milwaukee are carefully kept documents of Polonia's growth here. They show that two Polish-Americans voted in Chicago's first mayoralty in 1937. By 1867 there were 30 Polish families in Chicago, and the first Polish parish was organized at Noble and Bradley. Known as St. Stanislaus Kostka parish, it grew rapidly. By 1899 it had 50,000 families and was considered the largest Catholic parish in the world. It still is one of Chicago's largest religious centers.

Holy Trinity, the second Polish parish, was founded at Noble and Chapin in 1872. Special services will be held at 10 a. m. Sunday in its ornate church to commemorate the Polish Constitution.

Some 200 Polish-Chicagoans joined the Union Army during the Civil War. And Capt. Peter Kiolbasa, one of the outstanding Polish leaders in Chicago at the time, joined the Confederate Army. When he was taken prisoner, he promptly transferred his services to the Union Army where he again became a captain.

WHERE THEY SETTLED

Early Polish settlers made their homes in the vicinity of Milwaukee and Division—still called the heart of Polonia. But as their ranks grew, they fanned out northwest along Milwaukee to Jefferson Park, south along Ashland and on the far southside in Pullman. Now hardly a community in Chicago lacks Polish-origin names on its poll lists.

In their desperate effort to escape political persecution in their native land, the Poles migrated here in ever-increasing numbers at the turn of the century. By 1890 there were 57,756 Poles in Chicago. By 1918, there were 383,000. In 1928 their ranks numbered 427,000 and the latest census figures are expected to exceed 600,000.

A recent University of Chicago population study indicated there still are 95,000 native-born Poles in Chicago. With the steady influx of Polish DP's—being brought here by the Illinois division of the Polish-American Congress—the figure is expected to pass the 100,000 mark soon.

It is not uncommon to hear the Polish language spoken by second generation

youngsters in Polish homes. Polish radio programs and two daily newspapers published in Polish have contributed toward retaining the old-country ties.

The spirit of close organization into various groups helped the Polish-Americans establish their own institutions in practically every field of social and economic endeavor. In 1891 the Rev. Vincent Barzynski, C. R., pastor of St. Stanislaus Kostka Church, founded the first Polish school of higher learning. At 1456 West Division, it is now known as Weber High School. Several other Polish high schools followed.

St. Mary of Nazareth Hospital—oldest Polish medical institution in the city—was founded in 1894 at 1120 North Leavitt. And St. Hedwig's Orphanage—now a haven for Polish war orphans as well as Chicago youth—was organized in 1910 in Niles.

POLITICAL START

Polish-Americans got their official start in politics in 1877 when Peter Kiolbasa was elected to the legislature. Their solidarity in voting for Polish-named candidates has been the subject of frequent debate. But they insist all other national groups are motivated by the same national spirit in supporting their own candidates.

The Poles point with pride today to Kiolbasa, who was the first city treasurer to return interest in city funds to the treasury. Until his time it had been the practice of city treasurers to use the funds for themselves while in office. Kiolbasa was elected treasurer in 1891.

The history of Poles here is almost as old as Chicago.

Their most priceless historic object is a perpetual light at the museum surrounded by bits of earth from every battlefield where Poles fought from 1331 to date—dedicated to their stubborn belief in the freedom of man.

Hammonton News Says: "Little People Can Halt Extravagance"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. MILLET HAND
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 8, 1950

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, I am including in the RECORD an editorial with the above title. I do so because of my great desire to advance in every possible way the truth that the enormous burden of Government and Government taxes is being paid in full measure by the average American family, who tends to overlook the excise taxes and indirect and hidden taxes which they pay to the Federal Government every time they move. When the truth once becomes known to all of our people, we will then halt the extravagant head-long rush of the administration toward national bankruptcy.

The editorial is entitled "Little People Can Halt Extravagance" and appears in the Hammonton (N. J.) News. It follows:

LITTLE PEOPLE CAN HALT EXTRAVAGANCE

Too often it is only the sensational news story that comes out of the Congress that meets the attention of the reading public, but Congressman T. MILLET HAND, of this district, rose in the House a few days ago and made statements which should be brought to the attention of every person in this great Nation.

In a few words, the Congressman brought out that, when the day comes that millions of Americans whose earnings are too low to pay much, if any, direct taxes realize that by a clever system of hidden taxes it is they who are really paying the bill for the extravagant waste in Washington, then, and only then will the wild spending be stopped.

Much spending at all levels of Government has been permitted simply because too many people feel that they don't own their own homes or make sufficient income to put them in the income-tax brackets.

This is unsound thinking today, the Congressman believes. There isn't any item that any of us buys that isn't loaded to the hilt with hidden taxes. Every time you pay a nickel for a newspaper or buy a loaf of bread you are paying high taxes, pyramided through every level of Government, HAND told his colleagues.

Surveys have shown that, if all the money of the wealthy were confiscated, it would operate the Goverment for only 31 days. This shows clearly that the average man with the low income pays the bulk of the tax bill.

We agree with Congressman HAND that not until the people generally become tax conscious will there be sufficient pressure to effect substantial Government economies.

Oily Swindle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR A. JONAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 8, 1950

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial published in the Chicago Daily News under date of May 5, 1950.

This editorial refers to Mr. Truman's visit to Chicago as the big political circus. It levels a blistering attack at the good faith of the jaunt and charges that the promoters are skating close to a species of fraud.

The editorial follows:

OILY SWINDLE

Like other Chicago people, we look forward with interest to the big political circus President Truman and his Cabinet will be putting on in Chicago May 13, 14, and 15.

It will be a pleasure to have these people in our city. It would be even more of a pleasure if the expenses were kept reasonable. But still, the quarter-million-dollar orgy actually planned has its educational value as a symbol of the Truman administration.

The main purpose of this extraordinary performance is to try to reelect Senator SCOTT LUCAS, whose chances do not look any brighter in the light of what happened to his colleague from Florida, CLAUDE PEPPER.

The Chicago visit is part of a long western tour which the President is undertaking to rebuild his party's political fences.

The tour is labeled nonpolitical so that the President can charge the traveling expense to the Government instead of the Democratic Party. This is an oily swindle, little different morally from some frauds for which less important people have been prosecuted in court.

We regret to note that the promoters of the affair in Chicago are skating close to another species of fraud.

Barnet Hodes, the former corporation counsel, has got the Treasury Department to issue a statement that contributions to the Chicago Host Committee may be deducted as business expense from income reported for taxes. Conditions are attached to this assurance from the Treasury, but the conditions are likely to be lost sight of by those actually putting the clout on the contributors.

The condition is that there must be a reasonable expectation on the contributor's part of making some money out of the crowds expected to swarm into the city.

In the case of some concerns, principally hotels and restaurants, the expectation would be reasonable. But for many others, any such pretense would be as completely false as the pretense that this whole affair is a nonpartisan tribute to Thomas Jefferson.

We do not believe Thomas Jefferson would feel honored by an income-tax fraud.

The politicians engineering this circus have enough ways—too many ways, in fact—of shaking down and blackmailing the people without involving the United States Treasury.

Should Rent Controls Be Continued for Another Year?—I Say "Yes"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 8, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, it is comforting indeed to have our progressive President, Harry S. Truman, recommend to the country and to the Congress that rent control be continued, where it has not been taken over by State authorities, for another year, and to learn that Housing Expediter Tighe Woods opened his fight before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee to extend such rental controls for a year.

The inglorious real-estate lobby has claimed falsely that rent controls have put a damper upon new housing construction and more new dwelling houses would be built if rent controls were not extended but allowed to expire.

In reference to this matter as pointed out on page 3 of the May 4, 1950, issue of the Machinist, Mr. Tighe Woods had this to say in answer to that claim of the real-estate lobby:

In Spokane, Wash., in the 5 months following the killing of rent control, new housing construction increased 72 percent; but in Seattle, which is still under rent control, the increase was 75 percent for the same period.

In Knoxville, Tenn., in the 7 months that followed the death of rent control, new housing construction increased 9 percent; but in Nashville, which is still under control, the increase was 198 percent for the same period.

In Tampa, Fla., in the 6 months following the ending of rent control, new housing construction declined 15 percent; but in Shreveport, La., still under rent control, building construction increased 121 percent during the same period.

In answer to another phase of rent decontrol, that rentals have increased instead of levelling off, I received recently the following very interesting and in-

formative letter from the Honorable Glenn Cunningham, Progressive Republican mayor of Omaha, Nebr.:

CITY OF OMAHA,
April 27, 1950.

The Honorable EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: As the mayor of a large city in which rent controls were removed last November, I feel it my duty to report for your consideration the experience we have had under decontrol.

Under the provisions of an act of the Nebraska Legislature, rent controls were abolished in the entire State of Nebraska, on November 2, 1949. Since that time, everyone agrees, Omaha's rent prices have risen. Exactly how much they have risen is a widely discussed question, because there are various ways of computing it. I have been told, however, that the Bureau of Labor Statistics reported an average raise of 13.2 percent for this city.

But figures, for various reasons, do not tell the whole story, because human hardships cannot be expressed numerically, and although I cannot argue statistics, I can give cogent testimony concerning hardships brought about by the lifting of controls.

It would be highly illogical to maintain that all of the evidence to be considered in the question of rent control is on the side of the tenant. Everyone must realize that there were cases of landlord hardships when rents were under control. Landlords, however, were granted increases while controls were in effect, and were able to receive additional increases if the facts warranted. Without rent control, tenants have no such recourse, and must pay whatever is demanded in order to have a place to live.

It is readily apparent that neither control nor decontrol is the path to perfection, and that hardships will be experienced under either measure. I feel, however, that control is the better of two difficult alternatives, and that it should be continued wherever necessary until such time as the housing supply more closely approximates the demand.

Sincerely yours,

GLENN CUNNINGHAM,
Mayor.

Mayor Cunningham has been in the forefront of the fight for bigger and better public housing projects, and more reasonable rentals, without doing injustices to property owners and private builders. He is to be commended for his liberal Republican thinkings and doings, which point the better way for the young Republicans of Nebraska to follow, instead of groping in the political dark with outmoded reactionary Republicanism.

Why Is It Important to Our Form of Government That All Qualified Voters Cast Their Ballot in a Primary Election?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD H. JENISON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1950

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, everyone who studies the problems facing our form of government today comes to realize the danger resulting from widespread failure to meet a primary responsibility—namely, the failure to vote in elections. This has been particularly true in primary elections.

In an effort to take a constructive step toward solving this problem, the Illinois Agricultural Association and its affiliated county farm bureau organizations sponsored an essay contest prior to the recent primary election in Illinois April 11. The results were astounding, not only from the number of entries among the eligible school students, but from the quality of the essays themselves.

In Effingham County, Ill., 1 of the 11 counties in the Twenty-third Congressional District I have the honor to represent, over 150 pupils composed essays on this challenging question. The results indicated a study of the problem and an understanding of what ought to be done about it. In fact, the essays were so uniformly good that one teacher, Teresa N. Hoffman, instructor in the Plain Tree school, wrote the president of the Effingham County Farm Bureau as follows:

Mr. FORREST PHILLIPS.

DEAR SIR: Enclosed you will find the essays written by the pupils of Plain Tree school. The rules say to send the three best papers from my room. That is hard for a teacher to decide, so please forgive me for sending them all. My pupils were so eager and enthusiastic over your splendid project that I simply could not stifle that enthusiasm by not sending in all the papers. I think it is wonderful for the Effingham County Farm Bureau to sponsor such a splendid campaign as this is.

A few years ago I had a job in which I made a survey of a cross section of the voters. I was so thoroughly disgusted when upon inquiry I found how few people really made use of their great privilege of voting. So you see I really appreciate your effort in teaching our future citizens the worth and value of their vote. I think it is a splendid project and thank you most heartily.

TERESA N. HOFFMAN.

EFFINGHAM.

Chosen as the best in Effingham County was the essay of Thelma Bannick of the Palmer school at Dieterich. The other community winners were Gary H. Larrimore, Beecher City school unit winner; Donald F. Berry, Watson, eighth grade, Effingham community winner; Marcella Hartke, Teutopolis school unit winner; and Rose Marie Bauer, Altamont school unit winner. Because it is vital to the welfare of the Nation that such interest in government as is indicated by these essays be encouraged, I am including them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under permission granted by the House. The essays were first published in the Effingham Daily News, this public-spirited newspaper having cooperated with the Effingham County Farm Bureau in carrying on the contest. The essays follow:

The first-place winner:

WHY IS IT IMPORTANT TO OUR FORM OF GOVERNMENT THAT ALL QUALIFIED VOTERS CAST THEIR BALLOT IN A PRIMARY ELECTION?

The purpose of the primary election is to nominate candidates best suited for office. If we vote in the primary elections, we can help to pick these candidates.

If we nominate good candidates in the primary, we may be assured that competent officials will be elected.

American soldiers have shed their blood on the battlefield to give the American citizens the right to vote.

By voting according to the dictates of their own conscience, American citizens can go far in making their contribution to good government throughout the United States.

People in our penitentiaries have their citizenship taken from them; therefore, they cannot vote. Voting is an opportunity to help run our Government. Our voices in Government are heard through our votes.

THELMA BANNICK,
Dieterich, Ill.,
Rural Route No. 1, Palmer School,
Dieterich Community Unit, No. 30.

Beecher City unit winner:

WHY IS IT IMPORTANT TO OUR FORM OF GOVERNMENT THAT ALL QUALIFIED VOTERS CAST THEIR BALLOT IN A PRIMARY ELECTION?

It is important to our form of government, that all qualified voters cast their ballot in the primary election because our voice in government is heard through our votes.

We should vote for the man best qualified for the office regardless of politics so the best man will be elected.

The people who elect poor officials are the ones who stay away from the polls in the primary election. Our primaries govern our elections.

It is every voter's duty to vote in the primary. Vote in the primary election April 11, 1950. Help make a better government for American people.

GARY H. LARIMORE,
Beecher City, Ill., Route 1, School Unit No. 20.

Effingham unit winner:

WHAT IS THE IMPORTANCE OF VOTING IN A PRIMARY ELECTION?

There is a lot of importance involved in a primary election. Primary elections are held for the picking of the candidates who are to run in the general election. If a person who is unworthy of the job is nominated for running in the general election, he may be put in office because a lot of people vote for the party and not the man. The reason for this man being in office may be because you never voted in the primary election. What good will our democracy do us if only a small percentage of people vote in primary elections? What good is the privilege of voting for the great percentage who don't vote in the primary elections? If we of the United States are to take advantage of our freedom of self-government we will have to vote in our elections.

DONALD F. BERRY,
Watson Eighth Grade, Effingham Community, Unit No. 40.

The Teutopolis winner:

WHY IS IT IMPORTANT TO OUR FORM OF GOVERNMENT THAT ALL QUALIFIED VOTERS CAST THEIR BALLOT IN A PRIMARY ELECTION?

Do you really appreciate the right to vote given to you by the writers of our Constitution? It is the difference between a dictatorship and a democratic system of government.

Records show that in some places even in some townships of this county as few as 20 percent of the voters go to the polls on primary election day. This is inexcusable. Take advantage of your privilege and fulfill your duty. Come to the polls on April 11.

Voting in the final election is no more important than on a primary election. In order to be on the ballot for the final election a candidate must win in the primary. So everyone can readily soe that it is the duty of every voter to see to it that the best qualified person wins in the primary election. If

each political party has a good qualified party election in the primary, it doesn't matter much who wins the final election.

MARCELLA HARTKE,
Teutopolis, Ill., Teutopolis Community Unit No. 50.

The Altamont unit winner:

WHY IS IT IMPORTANT TO OUR FORM OF GOVERNMENT THAT ALL QUALIFIED VOTERS CAST THEIR BALLOTS IN A PRIMARY ELECTION?

One of the most important duties and privileges of a democratic people is to take part in electing national officers and nominating and electing local officers. If our Government is to be "of the people, by the people, and for the people," each and every voter must express his wishes through the ballot box. He should do this not only in the general election but also in the primary election. If competent and honest men are nominated in the primary then it should not matter which candidates are elected because good statesmen are in charge.

Too many people blame the Government but do not stop to think that the officials in our Government are men who are there because people voted for them or because they didn't vote at all.

ROSE MARIE BAUER,
Altamont, Ill., Rural Route No. 3, Mound School, Altamont Unit No. 10.

National Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ELMER THOMAS

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Maj. Gen. W. H. Arnold before the Reserve officers' convention, held at Oklahoma City, Okla., on May 6, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I feel that it is a real honor to be asked to speak today before a group which has already served our country so well in time of need and which stands ready to renew that service if the Nation calls.

I am going to talk with you about national security in view of the present situation. In this day of high taxation and overwhelming defense budgets it is essential that we all understand alike how much can be done with the money that is available. In short, we are obligated to obtain the most effective possible national defense with the expenditure of a minimum number of dollars. This can only be done with your self-sacrificing support. Why it must be done is a somewhat longer story.

As you well know, the United States is presently involved in a cold war. This term has been coined to describe a type situation successfully exploited by the Soviets during their early struggle for power in Russia—a situation once described by Trotsky as "No war; no peace." The unannounced opening of this conflict by our erstwhile ally occurred even before the cessation of hostilities with Germany and Japan. For our part, a somewhat longer time was required to digest the inevitability of the quarrel.

What is this so-called cold war? What is its motivating force? What are the stakes?

Basically, the cold war is a clash of ideologies, of two mutually opposing concepts of the way in which the peoples of the world shall live and be governed. It is motivated by a minority cult who are imbued with the teachings of Karl Marx, as interpreted and perverted by Lenin and his ostensible disciples. This minority, now at the head of a great state, asserts its inalienable right to determine for all the peoples of the world what is good and what is bad for them. Clearly, it is the intent of this modern tyranny to dominate the peoples of the world, either through ideological conquest, if possible, or by force of arms, if necessary. The stakes are simply stated. Shall we or shall we not retain a Christian democratic way of life?

As recently as February 10, 1946, Joseph Stalin specifically said: "Wars are inevitable so long as capitalistic states exist."

Again, Stalin has written: "Words must have no relation to actions; otherwise, what kind of diplomacy is it? Words are one thing; actions another. Good words are a mask for concealment of bad deeds. Sincere diplomacy is no more possible than dry water or wooden iron."

Those are some of the words, and these are some of the confirmatory actions that have already taken place: Behind the so-called iron curtain in Europe certain significant developments have occurred. Satellite governments have taken overt action against United States diplomatic and military personnel, in addition to conducting a savage and relentless attack on Christian religions and democratic political parties and institutions. In Bulgaria, there has been a severance of diplomatic relations; the information services of the American Legations in Rumania and Czechoslovakia have been closed; Hungary and Poland have demanded the recall of some of our military attaché personnel. In Poland and Czechoslovakia, Communist imperialism has resulted in increased domination, even to the point of placing Russian officers in key military posts.

In the Far East China is now subject to communistic direction. Russian airplanes and military personnel have been reported by the press in the Shanghai area. Southern Korea is kept in ferment by continuous guerrilla invasions launched from the Communist puppet state of northern Korea. Currently, southeast Asia is being subjected increasingly to partisan warfare, sabotage, and espionage. Recently the frontier with Iran has threatened to become active again, while diplomatic moves have been made against the Dardanelles and Trieste, as well as in the United Nations. And only lately, Russian fighter pilots have been publicly decorated presumably for shooting down an American plane in the Baltic, with the loss of 10 American lives. The pilot of the missing plane was a Reserve officer of the Navy on active duty.

As a result of the victory of the Communists in China, some 600,000,000 people, more or less, have come under the domination of the Kremlin. Vast quantities of the world's natural resources also are now under their control. Should this march of Soviet imperialism in the guise of international communism continue—and I think any reasonable analysis of the present situation indicates that this is likely—then our situation will become progressively more acute as time goes on unless we are willing and able to counter the Communist expansion through constructive democratic efforts rather than mere containment.

Our new international policy, as expressed by President Truman and Secretary of State Acheson, is to take constructive action to halt the spread of communism so that the free peoples of the world may work out their own destinies in their own way.

As the acknowledged leader of the democracies, the United States must shoulder the responsibility for planning to meet the challenge and for furnishing most of the resources then required. Boiled down to tangibles, the basic resources at our disposal are military strength and economic wealth. Obviously there are many other vital factors contributing to our inherent stability and strength. Some of these are: The moral and spiritual fiber of our people and our allies among the other peoples of the democratic world; our deep-rooted belief in the rights of the individual and in the democratic process of law and government; and our indubitable abhorrence of regimentation and slave-state processes.

But from a practical viewpoint, and for speedy application, military power and economic might are overriding factors.

From the standpoint of military power, we alone cannot hope to achieve quantitative superiority vis a vis our potential enemies. This limitation is applicable not only to military manpower, but to most of the conventional materials of warfare. We can, however, hope to approach equality in these areas if we take into consideration the means possessed by the other nations of the democratic world. By applying our economic resources to the augmentation of their means, while simultaneously achieving qualitative improvement in our own military power, a sound basis for effective military security will be established.

Our Government has recognized the necessity for this course of action by the establishment of the mutual defense assistance program, and previously by acts granting military assistance to Greece and Turkey. Some $2,000,000,000 is involved in these transactions. There is no question in my mind but that this expenditure is well justified, for time, which is of the essence, has been gained. Nothing is more valuable to our cause today than the purchase of time—time for our friends to recover from the last war's devastation; time to regain hope for the future; time to learn their danger and strengthen their will to resist.

I do not believe that we can expect the democratic peoples of Europe and Asia to retain the moral and spiritual fortitude necessary to successfully combat communism unless they acquire individual and collective military power sufficient to deter aggression. This cannot be done in a day, in a year, but it must be done as quickly as possible. The American people today must be brought to the realization that the military assistance thus far granted our allies is not sufficient to accomplish its basic purpose. The stakes are too high to permit halfway measures. As in poker, he who checks is often lost.

Should we alone attempt to achieve superiority in being in military manpower and conventional armament, our very effort would most likely insure our ultimate defeat. Our greatest strength lies in our inventiveness and productive capacity. These capabilities would be seriously weakened by any sizable diversion of manpower and raw materials for purely military purposes. I do not think at all that we should attempt to match our probable enemies man for man, plane for plane, ship for ship, or tank for tank. I do think, however, that as an alternative, we must remain qualitatively in the lead.

In addition to preserving our own economic strength, we must foster economic well-being throughout the democratic world. Here again, our Government commenced operations some 2 years ago. The inception of the Economic Cooperation Act, carrying out the Marshall plan, has been of incalculable value in arresting Communist expansion. In 1949 nearly $6,000,000,000 was granted to friendly foreign nations by the United States. Here again, the task is not finished; and, until it is finished, hunger, unemployment, and

poverty will fertilize the growth of insidious Communist aspirations.

A determination of the proper balance between military power and economic stability is of paramount importance. I, for one, feel that a reasonable balance can be achieved and that the determination of this balance is the urgent business of an informed American people. Here, I would like to quote the Secretary of Defense, who said in December 1949: "But, while it would be disastrous to wreck our economy by inordinate military expenses, it would be equally disastrous to be penny pinching. The watchword must be military security first; economy second. And if we are realistic, we must face the fact that our military requirements are not static, but flexible. They are bound to be affected by major shifts in the international situation and new developments in science and warfare.

"* * * military security must by its very nature be relative. Obviously it is impossible to be absolutely secure. The cost of such security and the risks of obsolescence in a fast moving scientific age tend to negate efforts to achieve absolute security. This means that our military organizations must be adequate, efficient, and readily adaptable to change; our planning must always look to the future as well as the present."

The foregoing forms the basis for the present division of the Federal budget as between national defense and other expenses of Government. It is doubtful if there ever was or ever will be complete agreement, even among military experts, as to what the composition of our forces should be under present world conditions. Yet, there is almost unanimity of opinion on two points relative to the maintenance of military forces in being. One is that these factors should be as large as the Nation can afford without throwing too great a strain on the national economy. The other is that our present military budget represents about the maximum amount which can be spent without seriously straining the Nation's economy.

It thus becomes the responsibility of our key military leaders to so program the utilization of our funds and resources that we gain the utmost of a force in being and at the same time strengthen our military potential in reserve. To be effective, programs must be based upon realistic long-range plans, which in turn require some guaranty of the resources to be made available as the plans unfold. Nothing is more costly or pays less in dividends than annual ups and downs in the funds appropriated for our use, frequently resulting in an inability to carry soundly conceived programs to a satisfactory conclusion.

In the Army we are developing a balanced minimum Regular force, large enough to meet our extensive commitments for occupation and to provide for the security of the United States, as well as for retaliation in the event that we are attacked. In this connection, it should be noted that under the North Atlantic Treaty we have assumed an obligation to assist the other signatories of the pact in the military defense of western Europe. Our foreign commitments are at present so extensive that we must take calculated risks in spreading our minimum force to the four corners of the world. The outbreak of war would find us immediately engaged in a fight for survival with such forces as are in being. We cannot quibble for there are no second prizes in war. Yet, despite the need for maintaining a sizable regular force, we must somehow devote a reasonable proportion of our efforts and resources to the building of a truly effective Organized Reserve and National Guard. To keep Reserve units properly equipped with the latest types of modern armaments is alone a tremendous burden. While the Army is doing its best in this field, the program can only be effective if given the solid support of a patriotic-minded Reserve Corps.

Currently, the Army is endeavoring to keep the qualitative potential of the Regular force at a maximum by improving and modernizing equipment as rapidly as possible. We are conducting an extensive research and development program, and we plan to keep our in-being force equipped with the new armaments and trained in their use. Here is one of the most difficult problems facing the military leader operating on a limited budget: At what point does one leave the development phase and go into the "hardware" phase, that is, the actual procurement in large quantities. Modern weapons are extremely complicated and expensive, and frequently they require considerable time for manufacture. On the other hand, modern research moves rapidly so that often the weapon of today is obsolete tomorrow. Our force in being must be trained up to the minute and our industry must be geared to produce the latest weapons in the shortest time possible. Yet, we cannot waste our limited dollars on obsolete matériel which would soon have to be consigned to the scrap heap. To overcome this problem takes skillful long-range planning; but most of all, as I mentioned earlier, it requires a guaranty of income over a reasonable period of time.

With respect to the Organized Reserve Corps specifically, the Army has devoted considerable thought to the problem of how to achieve the necessary potential without expending a disproportionate share of the defense dollar. In view of the cold war and the heavy requirements imposed upon our minimum regular force, how much of our dollar, for example, can be set aside for Reserve pay? How much of the dollar is needed for rifles? We must decide together; and we must justify our decisions to ourselves.

The postwar ORC program laid down in 1945 became increasingly unrealistic by virtue of rapidly changing circumstances and revised strategic objectives. The new program is based upon a realistic appraisal of our means and our current strategic requirements. Within our budgetary authorization, the Army intends to make the ORC as effective and efficient as possible.

The new ORC program establishes a firm troop basis, with 9,000 units maintained at 100 percent officer strength. Provision is also made for progressive, efficient individual training; simplified organization and administration; and the issuance of adequate equipment for training, as fast as additional facilities can be made available. A sound system of promotion and attrition is established, with improved opportunities for professional advancement while providing maximum protection to the individual.

I am sure that the majority of you have seen the statement of the Secretary of the Army in the February 1 issue of Report to the Army relative to drill pay. Let me emphasize that the recent revision of drill pay policies was dictated entirely by budgetary considerations and in no way reflected a lessened interest in the ORC program.

We in the Army are keenly aware of the necessity for economy in our operations; and we are doing our utmost to extract a real dollar's worth for every one we spend. We are trying to be realistic, and above all, objective in our planning and thinking. But we must have the support of all components of the Army to insure success. If we cannot attain a desirable working balance between the Regular Army, the Organized Reserve Corps, and the National Guard, we shall either fail to meet our vital responsibilities with respect to national security or we shall fail to retain our perspective with respect to the even more important balance between military strength and our national economy.

I believe that it is possible to win the cold war without bringing on a shooting war. As one who participated in the war in the Pacific in a major capacity for 3 years, I am convinced of the utter stupidity of recourse to combat as a means of curing the world's ills. I believe we are all convinced that the best way to achieve victory in any war is to prevent the war itself. I believe that we can prevent another war only if we maintain the maximum military strength that our economy can support.

Curtailment of Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD of today's proceedings the complete statement made by William C. Doherty, president of the National Association of Letter Carriers, before the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee this morning. Probably there is no other person in the United States who has made a more thorough, more comprehensive, or far-reaching investigation of this question. Mr. Doherty's reputation for honest, plain, and unbiased testimony is known to every Senator. His timely statement on the postal crisis should be read by the American people everywhere. It speaks not only for the letter carriers, but also for the clerks, messengers, motor-vehicle employees, postal-transport employees, mail handlers, custodial employees, and practically all other employees in the postal service.

Mr. President, I have an estimate from the Public Printer that Mr. Doherty's statement will exceed by two and one-half pages the two pages allowed by the rule, without a statement of cost, and that the cost will be $369. Nevertheless, in view of the importance of Mr. Doherty's statement, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY WILLIAM C. DOHERTY, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF LETTER CARRIERS, AND EIGHTH VICE PRESIDENT, AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR

Mr. Chairman, my name is William C. Doherty. I am president of the National Association of Letter Carriers and eighth vice president of the American Federation of Labor. The present membership of the National Association of Letter Carriers is 102,330, represented in all of the 48 States, the Hawaiian Islands, and Puerto Rico.

At the very outset, I desire to express my profound thanks to the members of this distinguished committee for granting me an opportunity to voice my views on the man-made postal crisis created by the orders contained in the Postal Bulletin of April 18, 1950. In so doing, I desire to place the National Association of Letter Carriers on record as wholeheartedly favoring immediate action on Senate Resolution 261 and Senate bill 3450. Both of these measures were introduced by Senator WILLIAM LANGER, of North

Dakota; also S. 3560, Senators JOHNSTON of South Carolina, NEELY, and HUMPHREY. A large number of similar proposals have been introduced in the House of Representatives. All of them are designed to compel the Postmaster General to immediately rescind his ill-timed, ill-advised, unnecessary, unwarranted, and obnoxious orders of April 18.

The Postmaster General's instructions to reduce delivery trips and to eliminate other service features heretofore available to the American public will result in an inferior postal institution. Mail users will now have to use the remaining facilities of the Post Office Department at the convenience of the officials in charge. The historical role of the postal system as one of swift, certain, and dependable means of communication is discarded.

Congress and the general public should meet this challenge head-on by stating in the most unequivocal terms that the United States Post Office belongs to the American people everywhere. It is one of the most useful and cherished American institutions. It is not an instrument subject to the whims of penny-wise and pound-foolish administrators.

The orders contained in the Postal Bulletin of April 18 will result in irreparable damage and destruction of our fine postal system. It will make the postal service—the Government function closest to the lives of the American people—a second-rate inferior Government agency. Letter carriers have always been mighty proud of the fact that the postal service rendered excellent necessary service. The service ideal is assassinated by the orders issued by the Post Office Department. Delivery of mail Nation-wide is restricted to one delivery a day in residential districts and service is greatly reduced in business areas. Parcel-post deliveries are to be cut in half in business areas. Weekly magazines, such as Time, United States News, Newsweek, and all others that have become an important part of American life, will no longer receive expeditious handling. The prompt mail delivery that the American people have been receiving since the days of Benjamin Franklin will not be available.

Postmasters have been ordered to discontinue directory service on all ordinary mail other than perishable matter and parcels of obvious value. While the reduction in the number of deliveries in the residential areas has attracted the most attention, there are other extremely far-reaching reductions provided for in the Postmaster General's orders of April 18. These orders affect practically every operation of the Post Office Department.

The collection of mail is curtailed. In one of the largest cities in the country located on the west coast, stickers were placed in the mail boxes informing the patrons that hereafter there would be two collections of mail daily from the box. No time was stated for these collections. Inasmuch as boxes in business areas fill up rapidly and require several collections during the business hours, it is impossible to determine how the mail can possibly be handled under the proposed schedule. The drastic cut in collection service will result in many hours of delay at the post office of origin.

The orders further provide that no mail shall be received at the windows or over the platforms except between the hours of 8 a. m. and 6 p. m. Every post office in America is practically bursting at the seams. It is impossible on a 24-hour basis to adequately handle all of the mail received. Yet, by this order the receipt of mail is drastically limited with the exception of a few classes of mail to a schedule of 10 hours a day. Many manufacturing plants confronted with a shortage of plant capacity meet the challenge by putting on additional shifts. The Post Office Department, carrying a volume of mail that cannot be handled in 24 hours, meets the challenge by reducing the hours of receipt of mail to 10 a day.

The order further provides that the distribution of many classes of mail will be limited to a 10-hour daily schedule. We are living in the atomic age; the Post Office Department however is reverting to the stone age. Mail received in the post office will remain there for many hours before being dispatched. Air mail will be placed upon an airplane and sped across the country in 12 hours. These great planes traveling over 300 miles per hour will speed the mail to the offices of delivery. When the mail arrives at its point of destination, in many cases it will take 20 or 30 hours before it is delivered. The mail travels through the air at a rate greater than 300 miles per hour, but it can well take 20 or 24 hours to deliver it 300 feet.

The orders are unquestionably the most drastic and destructive ever issued in the entire history of the Post Office Department. The ideal of service is completely eliminated from all future postal operations. Apparently the Postmaster General bases his policies upon the action of the House Committee on Appropriations in recommending for the fiscal year 1951 the total sum of $2,207,500,000. According to the Postmaster General's Bulletin of April 18, the actual expenditures for the fiscal year 1950 will be $2,240,000,000. At the hearing before the Treasury and Post Office Department Appropriations Subcommittee on February 27, 1950, Postmaster General Donaldson made the following statement:

"The obligations for 1950 are estimated at $2,183,517,086."

He further stated:

"There is available through amounts appropriated to date for 1950, and 1949 balances of appropriations available in 1950 the sum of $2,102,251,486. At this time it appears that the Department would require additional appropriations in the sum of $81,265,600 to cover the new salary increases and the requirements for increase in prices, rates, and additional postal business."

At this point, I desire to include a brief summary of the despicable orders which amount to a rape of the postal service:

1. For the immediate readjustment of residential city delivery routes so as to provide one delivery each weekday, Monday through Saturday.

2. Collection of mail from street letter boxes shall be limited to a minimum number of collections.

3. Deliveries to neighborhood stores and professional offices shall be limited to one delivery a day.

4. Deliveries of parcel post shall be restricted to one delivery each day in business areas.

5. Service for parcel post shall be discontinued where business houses are closed on Saturday.

6. Window service at the main post office shall be provided between the hours of 8 a. m. and 6 p. m. and at stations, between the hours of 8 a. m. and 5:30 p. m.

7. At the main office and stations where mail matter is received in large quantities over loading docks, the acceptance of such mail shall be limited between the hours of 8 a. m. to 6 p. m., except for first-class mail, air mail, daily newspapers, and weekly newspapers of local origin.

8. All bulk mailings of second-, third-, and fourth-class must be deposited between the hours of 8 a. m. and 6 p. m.

9. Discontinue preferential treatment of so-called time-limit third-class matter.

10. Discontinue, during the hours 6 p. m. and 6 a. m., the distribution of all mail, both incoming and outgoing, other than air mail, first-class, daily newspapers, and parcel post.

11. Saturday window service shall be restricted to between 8 a. m. and 12 noon at stations and branches. In some cities it may be possible to discontinue Saturday service altogether, according to the order.

12. In readjusting carrier deliveries to one trip basis, surplus regular carriers will result. Postmasters are instructed to assign these carriers as follows: (a) one regular carrier for each five regular carriers, for the purpose of granting compensatory time; (b) assign surplus carriers for the granting of annual and sick leave and other absence without pay.

13. All vacancies will be held open until further notice from the Department.

There are many other equally vicious provisions contained in the curtailment orders which clearly constitute a complete about-face on the part of Postmaster General Jesse M. Donaldson. Please, gentlemen of the committee, let me prove that statement by quoting the exact words of the then Acting Postmaster General, uttered on July 7, 1947, and which appear in the printed hearings on the second supplemental appropriation bill for 1948, before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, Eightieth Congress, first session, part I, Post Office Department, page 14:

"The big increase in the volume of mail began to hit us with all kinds of complaints from postmasters, and from postal organizations, in March and April, particularly in April. And I think it was more pronounced to us because in those months we were cutting expenditures and reducing the delivery service and the clerical service in not allowing postmasters as much money as they wanted for auxiliary expenditures. Reducing the cost with an increase in the volume of mail just flooded us with complaints not only from postmasters but from the public. We get anywhere from 3,000 to 5,000 letters in the run of a week from the public on curtailed postal service. But we did curtail drastically during May and June of this year in order to come within the amount appropriated.

"We went back practically in every city in the country to a one-trip service in residential sections. I never thought in all of my years of experience that the public would complain so much about that, because I felt that the two-trip service in residential sections was more of a service function than just the public seeing the carrier come to the door twice a day. I knew that our two-trip service was not based upon what the public needs in the way of having a carrier come to their door, but is based upon a prevention of delay in mail. So much mail arrives in these big cities at an hour in the morning when it cannot be distributed and get out to the stations from which the carriers emanate, in time for delivery on the morning trip and therefore, if we do not deliver it on the afternoon trip, it is delayed until the next morning.

"Likewise, if you put carriers on a one-trip basis, we have got to determine whether he can handle his route on a basis of 8 hours within 10. It means that he must leave the office at 8 or 8:30 in the morning and he is continually on duty unless we swing him on his route somewhere, until his 8 hours are up. That means that some people do not get their mail during the morning, and some people do not get it until as late as 4 o'clock in the afternoon.

"I thought that there would not be so much kick about that until we began to do that during May and June and the people began to write us letters, because unless we can get that mail out in the afternoon delivery, it is delayed until the next morning. We have not been able even to begin to answer the complaints because we do not have enough force to handle that correspondence that has come in to us on account of this one-trip basis."

If further proof is needed in pointing up General Donaldson's complete about-face, let me cite statements made by him less

than 4 months ago before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, Eighty-first Congress, second session, part 2, Post Office Department, Monday, January 16, 1950, page 389:

"Mr. DONALDSON. I am trying my very best to give the public the best possible postal service at the least possible cost. In this program, I am having the full support of all officials in the Department and the field and the rank and file of the postal people. We want no unnecessary expenditure anywhere in the service. We are taking advantage of every known device or program that is suitable in the operation of the postal service to improve the service, better the working conditions of the postal people, and reduce the operating costs."

Page 397:

"CONCLUSION

"The heads of all bureaus and offices within the Department and the field have been advised that they must exert every effort to operate their units with efficiency and with the greatest economy consistent with satisfactory service to the public. It will be my purpose to continue this policy and at the same time we will supplant any known obsolete methods and equipment as fast as possible. I consider it of paramount importance to continue to give the public good service. Any economy campaign which would go so far as to destroy the present standards would bring on reactions that not only would nullify economy but, in the end, would result in greater costs. Past history of too drastic actions after national surveys bears this out."

Postmaster General Donaldson knows from personal experience that every time the number of deliveries is reduced, the individual letter carrier has an increased volume of mail to deliver on an extended delivery district. General Donaldson also knows that the efficiency of the individual is seriously impaired because he has entirely too much mail for the separation case. After the case gets too full, the unit cost of handling each piece increases greatly. One-trip routes are not efficient units, nor are they economical; but they are inhumane. To keep a letter carrier on his route six hours or more without an opportunity to eat or relax even slightly, definitely belongs to the dark ages. It is beneath all human dignity to expect a letter carrier to eat his cold lunch at the corner relay or storage box, sitting on a curbstone without regard to the weather or other elements. It is equally beneath human dignity to fail to provide for other human necessities such as toilet facilities.

At this point in my testimony I desire to read into the record a statement by Congressman MIKE MANSFIELD of Montana, which appears on page 5952 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 27:

"POSTAL SERVICE

"Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in protest against the order of the Postmaster General which will curtail delivery and other essential postal services to take effect on July 1, 1950.

"If this order becomes effective on a Nation-wide scale it will completely demoralize the whole postal service and cause the American people in general much concern. I am, however, especially interested in the postal service as it affects the State of Montana because there we have one of the most efficient postal organizations in the country, and because of the distances to be covered and the hazards to be met, one of the most difficult. There is a very high esprit de corps on the part of the postal employees in my State which, at the present time, has suffered a severe shock because of the order issued by the Postmaster General.

"As a matter of fact in the city of Butte, Mont., one delivery postal service was inaugurated on April 25, which is indeed jumping the deadline, many weeks ahead of the time when the proposed cut was supposed to go into effect. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting at this point in my remarks a telegram I have just received from my friend, Dan McGonigle, president, Branch 621, NALC, of Butte, Mont.:

"BUTTE, MONT., *April 26, 1950.*

"Representative MIKE MANSFIELD,
"House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

"One delivery postal service inaugurated today despite vigorous protest. Letter carriers instructed to eat lunch on curb or impose on hospitality of some patron. Climate precludes former as you well know. The latter alternative is objectionable. Pretty picture—lunch pail on one shoulder, mail satchel on the other. Understand Postmaster General Donaldson scheduled again before Senate Post Office Committee Thursday, April 27. Respectfully request your attendance at that meeting and interrogation of Donaldson regarding uncivilized treatment of Butte letter carriers.

"Respectfully request also you demand in writing from Donaldson instructions Nation-wide that letter carriers will be afforded humane consideration and their dignity as a human being will be respected.

"DAN MCGONIGLE,
"President, Branch 621, NALC."

Undoubtedly, there will be pious rebuttal from the Postmaster General to the picture I have attempted to draw with words. It will be said that such things cannot happen, and will not happen.

Gentlemen, it has happened; it is going on this very morning in many places in these United States; unfortunately, it will continue to happen as long as these uncivilized orders are permitted to remain in effect.

I have here for the consideration of the members of this committee an enlarged photograph of a letter carrier forced to eat his lunch on a curbstone. It is not a fake photograph, designed to induce crocodile tears. I will give the facts in the case.

The photograph shows a letter carrier in the Fair Lawn, N. J., post office. His name is Joseph Ulinsky. Fair Lawn is a borough of Paterson, N. J., with a population of approximately 20,000. Unlike Paterson, Fair Lawn is 90 percent residential territory, from a post office standpoint. Carrier Ulinsky is assigned to a route in a section of Fair Lawn called Radburn. This section consists almost entirely of homes described as being "well back from the street, and a spacious lawn in front of almost every home." Stores, lunch rooms, taverns, and the like are confined to a small section of the main arteries running through the town. There are none of these on the route served by Mr. Ulinsky.

The first day that Carrier Ulinsky worked under the curtailment schedule, that is, one trip, he ate his lunch on the porch of a patron on his route. He took the half hour allowed him and then proceeded on his route. His first delivery after his lunch period was across the street from his open-air lunchroom. The lady of the house asked Carrier Ulinsky why he ate his lunch across the street. He gave what he considered a reasonable explanation. The lady informed Carrier Ulinsky that her husband was in the house and that he was "fit to be tied" because of the delay in his mail. It developed that his mail pertained to his business. The suggestion was made to Carrier Ulinsky that he deliver that particular address and then eat his lunch. Carrier Ulinsky rightfully took the viewpoint that, if he complied with that suggestion, the patron in the next house would react the same way and make a similar demand. To end all controversy, Carrier Ulinsky eats his lunch on the curbstone.

I, personally, checked this story and picture. I told the committee it was not a faked photograph. The information comes from the city editor of the Paterson Evening News that he sent a reporter to the scene on telephoned information from a neighbor in the vicinity of the spot where Carrier Ulinsky took his curbstone lunch period. The original photograph appeared in the April 26 edition of the Paterson Evening News.

A few additional relevant facts concerning this photograph will help point up what I am attempting to bring out about the stupidity of these April 18 orders. Carrier Ulinsky is on a route three-fourths of a mile from his office; he is not allowed bus transportation. He is scheduled to report at the post office at 7 o'clock each morning; he prepares his mail and departs for his deliveries at 9 a. m. He is scheduled to return to the office at 3:30 o'clock in the afternoon. In other words, he is scheduled to remain out on the street 6 hours and 30 minutes, sans eating facilities, sans toilet facilities.

Our second picture shows Letter Carrier Floyd Hunt sitting on a curbstone and eating his lunch. It appeared in the Council Bluffs Nonpareil of May 1. Carrier Hunt reports for work at 7:30 a. m. He leaves the post office at 8:50 a. m. and is due to return at 4 p. m.—or a total of 7 hours and 10 minutes out on his route.

There are no eating places, no restaurants, no taverns or grocery stores on his route. Obviously, he must carry his mail sack on one shoulder and his lunch pail on the other.

Carrier Hunt is a veteran of World War II. He spent 4 years and 5 months in the military; 2 years and 8 months in action. He had combat service in Salerno, Africa, Tunisia, England, Scotland, Wales, and Algeria. He was awarded the European ribbon with four battle stars, plus the combat infantry ribbon and good-conduct ribbon. He is a disabled war veteran with 10 percent compensation. He is married, has one child 3 years old, and presently is attempting to purchase his home.

There are thousands of military veterans in the letter-carrier service Nation-wide who, right at this moment, are also sitting on curbstones eating their lunches, thanks to the orders of Postmaster General Donaldson contained in the Postal Bulletin of April 18, 1950.

Letter carriers are neither supermen nor crybabies. I consider them average human beings with the same feelings and emotions as General Donaldson or any of his staff. If General Donaldson and the members of his staff will agree to forego the luxury of eating a hot lunch in pleasant surroundings and move out on the curbstone of Pennsylvania Avenue for their lunch, I believe it will be possible to convince the many, many Joe Ulinskys and Floyd Hunts in the postal service that curbstone eating is considered de rigueur in postal circles.

Postmaster General Donaldson is a master of the art of contradiction. Please, gentlemen of the committee, consider these words uttered by Mr. Donaldson at the Thirty-sixth Biennial Convention of the National Association of Letter Carriers held in Miami, Fla., in October 1948. These are his exact words relative to an investigation conducted by a Cleveland engineering firm:

"I have no criticism to offer of those people who made the investigation, but I believe they would have been in a better position if they had consulted officials in the Post Office Department about the kind of suggestions and recommendations they were going to make before they submitted their report. This they did not do and for that reason many of the suggestions and many of their articles of criticism were ridiculous.

"Well, I don't want to be ridiculous and I am not going to recommend that you provide every carrier in the United States with a scooter to carry his mail. [Applause.] Neither am I going to recommend that you keep a carrier out on the street for 8 hours while some clerk routes his mail and you shuttle the mail to him on the streets. [Cheers and applause.]"

According to General Donaldson's figures, the postal complement of employees will be reduced from 517,000 to 504,000 during the coming fiscal year. Even those ultra-conservative figures clearly indicate that 13,000 loyal postal employees will be added to the already expanding unemployment rolls. Most of these 13,000 displaced postal persons are veterans of World War II. Surely Uncle Sam must have a better fate in store for these battle heroes who gave so much in answering the call to the colors.

The able and distinguished chairman of this august committee, Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON, put his finger on the crux of the situation in a recent radio broadcast when he said:

"There is seemingly a glaring inconsistency in the argument to support the action of the Postmaster General—I have a copy of the orders here before me—as part of his justification for the curtailment program he proposes, Mr. Donaldson says:

" 'Splendid progress has been made and the productive effort of the employees has been increased as indicated by the accomplishments in the fiscal year 1939, compared with the fiscal year 1949 * * *'

"Now here is the part of Mr. Donaldson's statement that I cannot reconcile with his proposal:

" 'During that period (1939 to 1949), the revenues increased more than 110.72 percent * * *

" 'The number of pieces (of mail) handled increased 64.70 percent;

" 'The weight of the mails increased more than 104.73 percent * * * while

" 'The increase in the number of employees was less than 48.43 percent.'

"According to these figures, it would appear that the Postmaster General is trying to test the theory of diminishing returns, in that the more mail handled by his Department, the less personnel he will keep to collect it, transport it, and make final delivery of it."

The Post Office Department boasts a fine tradition of service. Postal employees are imbued with the ideal of giving service to the American people. There is no agency of Government that has finer traditions than the United States postal service. Up until recently the Post Office Department has enjoyed the fullest confidence and has been held in highest esteem by the press and by the American people.

Traditionally, service has been held to be the fundamental purpose of the Post Office Department. It has generally been recognized that good postal service is essential to good business. Some in authority have recently taken the attitude of insisting that the Post Office Department must operate as a successful business. The Postmaster General has insistently called the attention of the American people to the fact that the Post Office Department is operating under a so-called huge deficit. Since the alleged deficit is an excess of expenditures over receipts, let us compare the postal fiscal structure with several other departments and agencies of the Federal Government:

STATISTICAL DATA

1. First-class mail is the only mail classification that pays its own way. In fiscal 1949 first-class mail had an excess of revenues over apportioned expenditures, i. e., profits, of $82,064,709.

Item: The one category showing a profit, viz, first-class mail, is the one classification used by all the mailing public, and it is the one service being curtailed mostly by the curtailment orders. (Source: Cost Ascertainment Report for Fiscal 1949.)

2. Other classifications of mail and special services showed the following excesses of apportioned expenditures over revenues, i. e., losses:

(a) Revenue-producing items:

Domestic air mail	$37,261,064
Second class (paid)	174,674,835
Third class	129,052,786
Fourth class	104,880,608
Foreign surface mail	26,497,033
Foreign air mail	47,723,295
Registry (paid)	13,129,158
Insurance	44,344
Collect on delivery	7,369,476
Special delivery	10,781,201
Money orders	28,409,699
Postal notes	4,006,001

(b) Non-revenue-producing items:

Free in county (second class)	$11,173,870
Penalty	37,710,833
Franked	1,071,753
Free for blind	335,833
Registry (free)	8,989,789
Nonpostal services	28,434,441

The only special service—postal savings—that pays its own way showed a profit of $2,412,982.

Certain unassignable transactions resulted in revenues of $28,938,800. These "unassignable" items consist of such things as receipts from box rents, fines and penalties, unpaid money orders more than a year old, and post route map sales. (Source: Cost-ascertainment report for fiscal 1949.)

3. Total postal income for fiscal 1949 equaled $1,571,896,442. Total expenditures amounted to $2,122,980,800 (both figures unaudited). Operating loss therefore amounted to $551,084,358. (Source: Cost-ascertainment report for fiscal 1949.)

Item: Comparison of postal operating loss with appropriations and revenues of other Government agencies:

	Annual appropriation, 1950	Miscellaneous receipts, 1949	Deficit
Labor	$191,733,753	$337,413	$191,396,340
Interior	590,203,947	130,683,928	459,520,019
Commerce	675,621,402	8,039,026	667,582,376
Agriculture	731,328,607	256,360,297	474,968,310

Source: Library of Congress, Economics Section, Apr. 13, 1950.

Item: An analysis of the above figure discloses that the Post Office Department pays more than two-thirds of its own way. None of the other agencies shown come close to that margin.

4. Totals on mail handled in fiscal 1949:

Pieces	43,555,107,766
Weight (pounds)	11,625,209,458
Special services	906,813,143

(b) Increases in 1949 over 1948:

	Percent
Pieces	8.13
Weight	12.14
Revenue	11.48
Special services	7.48
Employment	6.66

Source: Cost-ascertainment report for fiscal 1949.

5. Estimates of increases in 1950 over 1949:

	Percent
Pieces	1.30
Weight	----
Revenues	4.33
Special services	0.34

Item: Despite these estimated increases for 1950, plus Postmaster General Donaldson's testimony that mail volume and postal receipts have steadily increased each succeeding year for the past 10 years, it is estimated that employment in 1950 will show a decrease of 1.33 percent. (Source: All figures, cost-ascertainment report for fiscal 1949, and Hearing Subcommittee, House Appropriations Committee, Jan. 16, 1950.)

6. Chart showing increase in productivity of employees:

Fiscal year	Pieces of mail	Paid employment (man-years)	Pieces of mail per year of paid employment
1946	36,318,158,366	430,810	84,302
1947	37,427,706,174	439,210	85,216
1948	40,280,374,207	453,589	88,804
1949 [1]	43,384,681,213	482,748	89,870
1950 [1]	43,946,716,000	478,034	91,932
1951 [1]	45,059,798,000	480,640	93,750

[1] Estimated.

Source: Postmaster General Donaldson's testimony before House Appropriations Committee, January 1950.

On April 21, 1950, Congressman JOHN R. WALSH, of Indiana, introduced House Resolution 547, which calls for a sweeping investigation of the Post Office Department. At the time of the introduction, Congressman WALSH issued a statement containing far-reaching implications. Since the statement refers specifically to H. R. 2945, the postage-rate bill presently under consideration by this committee, and the drastic curtailment of postal services, I desire to place it in the record at this point:

"Yesterday I served notice that today I would introduce a House resolution to authorize and direct a sweeping investigation of the scandalous situation existing in the Post Office Department, particularly with reference to the subsidies and overpayments made by the Department to railroads for transportation of the mails.

"I have caused the introduction of the House resolution referred to; it is House Resolution 547.

"In my statement of yesterday, I called attention to the deplorable condition wherein the Post Office Department pays double transportation charges for space purchased from the railroads, out of postal appropriations, for the transmission of the mails. Postmaster General Donaldson testified as much before a Committee of the House of Representatives on March 7 of last year.

"In hearings before the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, on H. R. 2945—which had for its purpose a readjustment of postal rates, the following colloquy took place:

" 'Mr. HAGEN. At that point let me ask this question: Has any survey been made recently as to what percentage of the actual paid-up space that is used in railway cars—and I understand it is on a cubic-foot basis—is used on the average run? In other words, we now pay the railroads, as I understand it, for the baggage cars for mail and the mail cars, so much per cubic foot on each railroad run, and we pay for that space regardless of whether there is 1 sack or 100 sacks, and some days it is more and some days less. Has any survey been made to show the average amount of usable space that has been used on these various runs over a period of time?'

"Postmaster General Donaldson made the following reply to Congressman HAGEN's inquiry:

" 'Yes, Mr. HAGEN, there is a difference of pay to railroads. In other words, I think what you are talking about is space purchased by full cars or storage cars, or what not. That is different from the regular RPO line, the lines in which railway postal clerks operate.

" 'Now, with reference to the space for transporting mails by full-car lots or by 15 feet or 30 feet or 45 feet, or what not, I think

that our investigation indicated that we used about half of the space that we paid for. Under the law, if we transport a carload of mail from New York City to San Francisco, we pay for that so much per foot per mile, so to speak, and then we pay for the return movement of the car, whether we use it or not. There is far more mail moving west than there is mail moving back.'

"I might add in this connection that an investigation on the basis of cost ascertainment figures in 1946 indicated that the Post Office Department paid for 580,462,152,219 cubic foot miles for the transportation of mails, and actually carried only 323,677,344,195 cubic foot miles of non-local surface mails. This indicates that 44.24 percent of space was paid for but not used.

"Now here we find an administrator who testifies before a congressional committee that his Department contracts with the railroads for so much storage space, uses only half of it and, mind you, pays for the total amount contracted for with the taxpayers' money. This same administrator, on April 18, issued drastic curtailment orders reducing delivery service in the Post Office Department to such an extent that it will mean a reduction in force of a minimum of 10,000 employees. One can only surmise that empty box cars are more important than human beings.

"I should like to invite attention to the apparent policy pursued by the Post Office Department with respect to payments for service furnished by railroads transporting the mails. The policy adopted gives no consideration or, at best, very little to the taxpayer.

"On February 14, 1946, William V. Griffin and Hugh William Purvis, receivers for the Georgia & Florida Railroad, were suing the United States Government. The case was heard in the United States Court of Claims. John Hardy, General Superintendent, Railway Mail Service, Post Office Department, was on the stand. Under oath, he declared:

" 'I might add that the most—probably the determining factor in my decision was the fact that the railroad company pleaded that we continue the service because of the financial benefits that were accruing to the railroad, and that has been one of the policies of the Department, that in considering any curtailment or discontinuance of rail service, is to first make inquiry of the railroad company as to what effect upon the finances of the operation of their railroad any such curtailment would have, and we are invariably governed in our decision by the plea of the railroad in response to our inquiry.'

"During this same litigation, Mr. Hardy was asked the following question by Mr. Stern:

" 'Question 19. Have you had occasion to deal with and compare the rates for your service and railway express service?'

"Mr. Hardy replied:

" 'Well, all large railroads have what is known as managers of the mail and express traffic. The majority of those employees are former employees of the Post Office Department, railway mail service, and in my position we have almost daily contact with these managers of mail and express traffic, and from frequent conversations with those railroad representatives I can positively state that the railroads value the mail traffic greater than the express traffic; that is that they consider that their revenue from mail traffic in consideration of what is furnished for the Post Office Department as compared with that which is furnished the express company brings them a greater return.'

"Mr. Donaldson has stated that the Post Office Department used 'about half the space that was paid for.' From the evidence at hand, that might well be described as an understatement. Mr. Peter J. Schardt, chairman of the Committee on Railway Mail Transportation, is quoted in the November 20, 1948, issue of the Railway Age, in an article entitled 'What Future For Mail Revenue?' as follows:

" 'Mail traffic is not evenly balanced; it is heavier going south and west than north and east. The unbalance, moreover, varies sharply on different roads. The ratio of loaded mail space to total mail space authorized varies from 98.9 percent on one big class I road, down to 57.9 percent on another.'

"It is my firm conviction that the entire question of postal subsidies should be thoroughly investigated. Railroads are not the only ones to benefit by subsidies at the expense of the taxpayers. Let me show what a waste of taxpayers' funds is going on in the air industry under the pious name of postal subsidies. House Document No. 1242, Survey and Study of the Postal Service, Preliminary Report, January 15, 1948, page 6, reported:

" 'In paying the airmail subsidy, the Post Office Department is called upon to finance inefficient management, parties, hotel suites, entertainment, excessive public-relations costs, and to finance competition between existing scheduled carriers.'

"Getting back to the railroads, the statement has been made that the Postmaster General has no control over rail rates. That is true only in part. It is true that the Interstate Commerce Commission has the right to determine the rate to charge per unit, but the Postmaster General determines how many units are to be purchased. In a hearing on S. 1596 before the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee on May 27, 1949, Frank J. Delany, Solicitor of the Post Office Department, pointed out:

" 'In other words, we prescribe the service; the Commission—the Commission figures how much it costs the carriers and fixes the rates, also figures the mechanics, whether the rate is to be calculated in terms of space as provided by the Railway Mail Pay Act, or weight, the old weight system, but nothing about directing the Postmaster General in his determination as to what service he requires or how often he requires it, or whether he wants it on a one-way basis or a round-trip basis.'

"On more than one occasion the Postmaster General has stated in effect that his is an untenable position with respect to fees paid railroads for the transportation of mails. As I pointed out above, that is only half true.

"Here is another interesting aspect of this question. Page 23 of the report on the Post Office appropriation bill for 1949 carried the following:

" 'Special contracts with railroads are authorized by statute for transportation of mails where the Postmaster General believes special conditions warrant higher rates. Testimony reveals that there were six such special contracts in effect as of July 1, 1947, providing for an annual increase over regular rates in amount of $111,763. The committee questions the necessity for such special contracts, and desires that the Department undertake a survey to determine the possibility of their discontinuance.'

"I understand that these preferential contracts are still in effect, despite the recommendation of the committee. It is interesting to point out the swiftness with which the Postmaster General complied with the recommendation of the House Appropriations Committee this year with respect to looking for economies by a reduction in services that would not be a hardship or inconvenience to the general public. The Postmaster General, in my opinion, went much further than the recommendations of the committee implied.

"I might also say that the Postmaster General under the law has authority to negotiate with railroads for more favorable rates; this authority has not been used to secure favorable rates where a competitive situation exists. This is exactly opposite to the policy followed by the Department where small contractors are involved. As a matter of fact, the Department encourages cutthroat competition among letter carriers on so-called mounted routes where the difference in their contract bid is seldom more than a few paltry dollars.

"The resolution I have introduced will investigate these unhealthy conditions and bring about corrective action to the end that legitimate rates will be determined for legitimate services performed by the railroads, the airlines, and the steamships. If the Congress in its wisdom decides that these agencies require help from the Federal Government through subsidies, then I am sure they will give consideration to that question. I do hope that any subsidies authorized will be distinctly separated from payments for actual services performed so that these subsidies will not be charged against the operating cost of the Post Office Department.

"I invite support of my resolution. Something must be done to save the postal service and the American taxpayer from the horrible situation which exists today."

On April 24 President William Green, of the American Federation of Labor, issued a timely statement relative to the drastic action taken by the Postmaster General. I respectfully request that his statement be included at this point in my testimony. It reads:

"AFL President William Green today called for a congressional investigation of the Postmaster General's recent order drastically curtailing the Nation's mail delivery service.

" 'This order,' Mr. Green said, 'will cripple the postal system and severely handicap business which must depend upon prompt and efficient mail service. In the name of economy it will cost the American people many millions of dollars. At a time when unemployment is becoming serious it will throw many thousands of additional employees out of work.

" 'The American Federation of Labor will demand an investigation by Congress of this unwise and unnecessary blow at our vital postal service.

" 'Isn't it ridiculous to spend huge sums of Government money to develop high-speed mail transportation by air only to have the mail held up by horse-and-buggy delivery on the ground?

" 'If the Post Office Department is so anxious to make a better bookkeeping showing and wipe out an alleged operating deficit, why doesn't it eliminate wasteful expenditures to railroads for hauling empty mail cars across the continent and for hauling mail back and forth because of lack of storage at terminal points?

" 'The Postmaster General's order is equivalent to saving a few drops at the bung while wasting gallons at the spigot. The traditional policy of the postal system has always been service above all. That policy must be maintained to protect our national economy. Congress should move at once to investigate the Postmaster General's penny-pinching order which would nullify that policy.' "

The annual report of the Postmaster General for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1944, page 53, carried this most illuminating statement by Postmaster General Frank C. Walker:

"The postal service should not be used as a revenue-producing agency. It should be conducted as an organization for service only. The rates and fees for each class of mail and each special service should be generally sufficient to pay its cost of handling. When the operations of the postal service show a surplus it means that the public is not only

paying for the service which it buys, but in addition is paying a tax. When the postal service operations show a deficit it means that there are hidden subsidies which must be met out of the general taxes. Where there are deficits in any branch of the service, postal rates and fees should be increased on the class of mail or special service that is being handled at a loss, unless preferential rates are authorized by Congress for some special class of mail or service. In such cases the rates and fees for other services should be sufficient to absorb any loss."

On Monday, December 3, 1945, Jesse M. Donaldson, then First Assistant Postmaster General, participated in this most interesting colloquy, which appears commencing on page 78 of the printed hearings before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session, on the Post Office Department appropriation bill for 1947:

"Mr. LUDLOW. Since when?

"Mr. DONALDSON. Over the last year. At the present time correspondence with reference to Public Law 134, which was effective July 1, has thrown us in arrears approximately 60 days in most of the bureaus, in replying to the correspondence.

"READJUSTMENT OF FIELD SERVICE

"The readjustment of our field service has also increased our correspondence. Of course you all know that during the war the postal service was greatly dislocated; there was migration of people to certain points where it was necessary to handle a large volume of mail. And the readjustment of the service due to curtailment in the city delivery service as well as other functions of the postal service during the war are now problems that we have to adjust. People have been patient during the war with the poor service we have been rendering. Since the removal of restrictions on a great many things, especially rationing, we have been receiving a great clamor for restoration of two trips by carriers and for more service in the post office than we have been giving. It is going to be absolutely necessary to readjust this service, and that is increasing the correspondence in the department.

"And then we have the problem of the returning veterans and reduction of personnel in post offices incident to the returning veterans, which increases our correspondence. It is very alarming to us in the head office because of the fact we do not have enough employees, especially experienced employees, to handle this volume of work incident to making replies to letters from postmasters and from Members of Congress, which are being delayed as much as 30 days—in some instances 60 days. It creates a problem that we cannot cope with unless we get more personnel."

"RESTORATION OF CERTAIN SERVICES

"Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Donaldson, you have made an observation and I would like to make one. You spoke of the clamor for the restoration of service; that is to say, I assume, largely mail delivery service which was suspended in certain instances during the war. There are many places, I take it, that have only in recent years had one delivery a day in residential districts, particularly outlying districts that formerly before the war had two deliveries a day; and they have gotten more or less used to one delivery. What is the necessity of going back to the two-delivery service?

"Mr. DONALDSON. Mr. Chairman, it is not a question of giving the patrons in the city two deliveries a day so much as it is the question of getting the large volume of mail out of the post office and maintaining the schedule of carriers and of giving the patron a delivery at about the same time each day. You cannot make a storehouse of the post office, and where you have one-trip carrier routes in post offices, the patrons are going to get their mail later in the day with no reasonable regularity of schedule of the carriers which results in curtailment of service even on the one trip.

"Mr. KOPPLEMANN. This is probably what it would do: Newspapers are not taken on the first delivery as a rule, and people would like to get their newspapers in time more than their ordinary mail.

"Mr. DONALDSON. We would have another thing, Mr. Kopplemann: Many of the trains arriving at the large city stations arrive in the morning, and it is impossible for the post office to distribute that mail and get it to the carrier to take out on his first trip. The trains coming to Washington at 7 o'clock in the morning may bring 700 to 1,000 pouches of mail, and you cannot expect to distribute all of that mail to carriers for their first trip if they leave at 8 o'clock and that would mean only one trip and this mail would be left in the post office until the next morning.

"Mr. LUDLOW. Suppose the trips were made later in the day could not that requirement then be met?

"Mr. DONALDSON. No; you must keep the mail moving through the post office to keep it from accumulating as trains arrive, and outgoing mail must be kept moving in order to maintain the schedule of distribution.

"There are some places, yes, where we never did give more than one delivery, and perhaps they will not get more than one delivery now. You might call these the suburban routes, so to speak, and the volume of mail and the patronage are not so heavy, but in residential districts, in large cities. These two deliveries must be made in the residential sections if we are to maintain the service.

"Mr. LUDLOW. Is it your thought that it is in the public interest, therefore, to restore the two deliveries to all the services that have been limited to one delivery during the war?

"Mr. DONALDSON. As far as we can efficiently do so, we should.

"Mr. LUDLOW. Just as an off-hand cornfield opinion it seems to me that where people have become accustomed to one delivery they would be reconciled to one delivery, and it would result in a large saving of money.

"Mr. DONALDSON. It is not so much the saving of money——

"Mr. LUDLOW. I defer to your superior knowledge of the postal service.

"Mr. DONALDSON. It is not so much, Mr. Chairman, the necessity of having the carrier reaching the patron's house twice a day as it is to keep the mail moving out of the post office. In many residential sections throughout the country the delivery of mail is going to be 24 hours late; it is not going to be delivered until the next morning, much of the mail which should have been delivered today.

"Mr. KOPPLEMANN. That would require additional clerical help in the post office to handle the mail due to the fact of its laying over in the post office.

"Mr. DONALDSON. It would impede the distribution in the post office."

This is the language used by the late Robert E. Hannegan in the annual report of the Postmaster General for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1946, page 4:

"During the past 100 years the financial ideal sought by the management of the postal establishment, which has been to make the institution substantially self-sustaining, has rarely been achieved, and then usually during war years. The service ideal as differentiated from the financial has been, as it always should be, held paramount. In the development of our country, in the furtherance of social improvement, and in the fostering of business enterprise, the long-time policy of Congress and the Post Office Department has been to recognize that service must be provided and extensions made even though the costs far exceed the revenues obtained."

Twenty years ago Congress enacted the Kelly postal-policy law (39 U. S. C. 793), which established a definite method of procedure on postal fiscal transactions. That measure remains on the statute books today and is intended to serve as a yardstick for all Postmasters General. For reasons unexplained, recent annual reports of the Postmaster General have not reflected the credits authorized by the Kelly Postal Policy Act. The law reads:

"PROVISIONS OF THE KELLY LAW (39 U. S. C. 793)

"SEC. 793. Classification of extraordinary expenditures contributing to deficiency of postal revenues: certification to Secretary of Treasury and to Comptroller General: The Postmaster General shall certify to the Secretary of the Treasury and to the Comptroller General of the United States, respectively, as soon as practicable after the end of each fiscal year, the following:

"(a) The estimated amount which would have been collected at regular rates of postage on matter mailed during the year by officers of the Government (other than those of the Post Office Department) under the penalty privilege, including registry fees;

"(b) The estimated amount which would have been collected at regular rates of postage on matter mailed during the year by (1) Members of Congress and (2) other under the franking privilege;

"(c) The estimated amount which would have been collected during the year at regular rates of postage on publications going free in the county;

"(d) The estimated amount which would have been collected at regular rates of postage on matter mailed free to the blind during the year;

"(e) The estimated difference between the postage revenue collected during the year on mailings of newspapers and periodicals published by and in the interests of religious, educational, scientific, philanthropic, agricultural, labor, and fraternal organizations, and that which would have been collected at zone rates of postage;

"(f) The estimated excess during the year of the cost of aircraft service over the postage revenues derived from air mail; and

"(g) The estimated amount paid during the year to vessels of American registry for carrying the ocean mail in excess of what would have been paid at pound rates if carried in vessels of foreign registry.

"And the amounts so certified shall be separately classified on the books of the Treasury Department and the General Accounting Office, respectively, in stating the expenditures made from the appropriation to supply the deficiency of postal revenues (June 9, 1930, ch. 413, 46 Stat. 523)."

There follow herewith two accurate charts which prove conclusively that during the 20-year period 1930–49 the excess of expenditures over receipts in postal operation amounted to a total of $510,781,269, or an average annual deficit of $25,539,064. The compilation is taken from each succeeding annual report of the Postmaster General commencing with the year ended June 30, 1930:

Cost ascertainment report

Year	Revenues	Expenditures	Surplus	Deficit	Year	Revenues	Expenditures	Surplus	Deficit
1930	$706,492,179	$804,940,961		$98,448,782	1941	$813,836,289	$840,799,971		$26,963,682
1931	657,348,089	803,893,288		146,545,199	1942	866,666,845	878,492,031		11,825,186
1932	588,957,663	795,843,494		206,885,831	1943	966,227,289	964,892,737	$1,334,552	
1933	588,342,737	698,350,029		110,007,292	1944	1,131,793,140	1,094,025,112	37,768,028	
1934	587,537,068	641,998,783		54,461,715	1945	1,314,240,132	1,151,598,043	162,642,089	
1935	631,819,342	701,621,095		69,801,753	1946	1,224,572,173	1,372,655,008		148,082,835
1936	666,789,415	757,764,912		90,975,497	1947	1,299,141,041	1,562,508,673		263,367,632
1937	727,339,741	772,043,802		44,704,061	1948	1,410,971,284	1,719,943,289		308,972,005
1938	730,031,134	774,728,539		44,697,405	1949	1,571,851,202	2,122,980,730		551,129,528
1939	747,066,378	787,893,473		40,827,095					
1940	768,015,327	810,240,686		42,225,359	Total	17,999,038,468	20,057,214,656	201,744,669	2,259,920,857

Net loss, $2,215,846,188.

Year	Revenues	Expenditures	Kelly law credits	Surplus	Deficit	Year	Revenues	Expenditures	Kelly law credits	Surplus	Deficit
1930	$706,492,179	$804,940,961	$39,669,718		$58,779,064	1941	$813,836,289	$840,799,971	$58,837,470	$31,873,788	
1931	657,348,089	803,893,288	48,047,308		98,497,891	1942	866,666,845	878,492,031	73,916,128	62,090,942	
1932	588,957,663	795,843,494	53,304,423		153,581,408	1943	966,227,289	964,892,738	122,343,916	123,678,467	
1933	588,342,737	698,350,029	61,691,287		48,316,005	1944	1,131,793,140	1,094,025,112	126,639,650	164,407,678	
1934	587,537,068	641,998,783	66,623,130	$12,161,415		1945	1,314,240,132	1,151,598,043	116,198,782	278,840,871	
1935	631,819,342	701,621,095	74,765,902	4,964,149		1946	1,224,572,173	1,372,655,008	100,246,983		$47,835,852
1936	666,789,415	757,764,912	74,002,329		16,973,168	1947	1,299,141,041	1,562,508,673	92,198,225		171,169,407
1937	727,339,741	772,043,802	57,347,800	12,643,739		1948	1,410,971,284	1,719,943,289	96,222,339		212,749,666
1938	730,031,134	774,728,539	49,110,226	4,412,821		1949	1,571,851,202	2,122,980,730	120,118,663		431,010,865
1939	747,066,378	787,893,473	55,374,890	14,547,795							
1940	768,015,327	810,240,686	60,834,394	18,609,035		Total	17,999,038,468	20,057,214,656	1,547,493,900	728,230,700	1,239,004,326

NOTE.—No cost ascertainment report. Figures taken from annual report of Postmaster General.
Net loss, 1930-49 (20 years), $510,773,626.
Average per year, $25,538,681.

Heretofore the National Association of Letter Carriers has never taken a position relative to any pending legislation having for its purpose either increasing or decreasing postage rates. Historically, this association has supported the service ideal, believing that the American people are entitled to the best postal service on the face of the earth. It is utterly ridiculous to expect the American people to pay higher postage rates for an inferior brand of postal service. In view of the foregoing, the National Association of Letter Carriers withholds its approval of H. R. 2945, the pending postage rate increase bill.

Postal employee morale has reached an all-time low. Not even the vaunted hydrogen bomb could have done more damage in shattering the faith and confidence of these loyal hard-working employees in the field service of the Post Office Department.

In the name of Almighty God and human decency, I ask the Congress of the United States to compel the Postmaster General to rescind his devastating orders of April 18. Immediate favorable action by this distinguished committee on Senate Resolution 261 and Senate bill 3450 will accomplish that laudable objective.

Washington County (Ark.) PMA Annual Report for 1949

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 9, 1950

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under the direction of Ensel M. Coleman, L. E. Maupin, W. Shannon Pharr, Calvin F. Holcomb, Dave Barnett, and Lee L. Williams, the Washington County Production and Marketing Administration Committee is doing a fine job for soil conservation, water conservation, and protection of their forests. As an example of the good work which they are doing, I wish to insert their annual report for 1949:

ANNUAL REPORT, 1949, OF PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION AGRICULTURE CONSERVATION PROGRAM IN WASHINGTON COUNTY

INTRODUCTION

This report is an effort to give a better understanding of the purpose and accomplishments of the farm programs administered by the Washington County Committee of the Production and Marketing Administration.

The purpose of the agricultural conservation program is to achieve the greatest possible protection and improvement of the soil, water, and woodland resources of Washington County. It is a part of the Nation's effort to assure an abundant supply of food, fiber, and forest products for all our people.

The PMA program is a joint effort of all the people to conserve the natural resources of our farm land. The farmers contribute cash, labor, and equipment, which are supplemented by cash assistance to encourage additional conservation. This program enables everyone to bear a part of the expense of conservation which until a few years ago was borne by the farmer alone.

In behalf of Washington County farmers, we wish to express our appreciation to those who have helped to make the PMA program a success. We invite your cooperation in future years.

WASHINGTON COUNTY
PMA COMMITTEE,
W. SHANNON, PHARR,
Chairman.
CALVIN F. HOLCOMB,
Vice Chairman.
LEE L. WILLIAMS, *Member.*

FOREWORD

No man ever really owns a piece of land. This simple fact, which should become more and more obvious as generations come and go, is still the very root of our conservation problems.

The owner of land often feels that land is his, that he can use it, plant it or remake it in any way he sees fit. But, in more serious moments, he can see how little truth there is in such a belief. How presumptuous his self-styled "ownership" really is.

The land was here long before our forefathers lived. It will be here long after our bones have gone to dust.

At best, we are only custodians. Yes, we have a deed, and the title is in our name. But, really all it conveys to us are a few rights before the law.

We can erect a fence, keeping others off. The land becomes ours to use—either for making a living, building a home, or for purely recreational purposes, or numerous other uses.

We can, of course go a bit farther than that. We might cut down all of the trees and sell them. We might even sell off the topsoil.

Regardless of how we use or abuse this piece of land, it will be here for ages to come. Dozens of other "owners" will follow us, each thinking of the land as his, and his only. But the tenure of each is but a fleeting moment across the face of time.

As "owners," the worst that any of us can do is to destroy the productive capacity of the land. A farmer does that when he lets the soil on his hillside erode, or when he allows the gullies to carve his best field into useless pieces.

Here we not only damage the land and make it ugly to look upon, but even worse, we injure the chances of our children to make a living, and their children after them.

If fewer of us were to look at land as merely a commodity to buy and sell, and if more of us saw it for the precious heritage that it is—one entrusted to our keeping for only a brief moment, we would be ready to make gigantic strides toward real conservation.

ORGANIZATION

The PMA programs in Washington County are open to all farmers in the county and each one is invited to participate regardless of the size, type or location of farm.

This program is Government-farmer cooperation in the field. Congress makes appropriations to assist farmers in carrying out

needed soil and water conservation practices. Money appropriated is allocated to States on the basis of needs. The assistance represents a public investment in the maintenance and restoration of our soil, and so forth.

The PMA programs provide for a national program under the direction of farmer-elected farmer committees. With farmer-elected farmer committees directing the program the public is assured of getting the most for the money spent. Farmers acquainted with local needs and conditions see that money appropriated is used on practices adapted to the county.

The Production and Marketing Administration program is not only concerned with the needs of individual farmers but with the needs of the Nation. When the fertility of our farms is restored and maintained, the public can be assured of better quality products. We all depend on agriculture for the necessities of life and have a vital interest in maintaining its productivity.

Farmers in 1949 continued to build on what has been done in 17 years of PMA programs. These programs, as before will be open to every farmer and on every farm and all are eligible to share in the assistance offered. The program is voluntary and is available to farmers to help carry on a prosperous agriculture on a share-the-cost basis. The PMA program is planned, developed and administered by farmer committeemen who are elected annually by their farmer-neighbors. Each year county and community committeemen are elected to serve during the following calendar year. The county committee, composed of three regular and two cultural programs dealing directly with alternate members, is responsible for administering the PMA and other related agricultural programs dealing directly with farmers in the county. Community committeemen are elected to represent about 50 farms each and assist county committees in administering the program in their communities. This nonpartisan farmer-elected committeemen set-up is the heart of the farm program and has proven effective in developing and administering the program. In addition, this organization administers the price-support program of the Commodity Credit Corporation, marketing quotas, and production adjustments. The PMA program is farmer-developed and planned with the assistance of technically trained personnel from the PMA and all other agricultural agencies and organizations. Recommendations for programs are developed by farmers in county and community meetings each year. In addition to farmers, representatives of the agricultural agencies are invited to attend these planning meetings. These recommendations are made in such a way that they help, not only the individual farm and farmer, but the community and State and add to the over-all programs. Leadership in developing county suggestions is furnished by a farmer-elected committee and through them are channeled the knowledge and experience of producers as to the needs in the individual county and community. County recommendations for practices are submitted to the state PMA committee which in turn studies the recommendations in relation to national needs and advice from a state technical advisory committee composed of representatives of the college of agriculture experiment stations and technicians of other agricultural agencies. The practices adopted by the State committee are forwarded to Washington USDA officials and when approved become the practices for which assistance will be furnished. After practices for the State as a whole are approved, each county committee selects the practices which are best adapted to the county. Individual plans are developed for each farm whereby the most effective use can be made of the programs. These plans, made at the beginning of each program year, enable each farmer to take into consideration the availability of labor, equipment, materials and the farmer's ability to carry on his farming operations for the best interest for all individuals. Assistance in executing individual farm plans is furnished by farmer committeemen. This planned assistance to farmers makes PMA funds more effective and makes assistance of other agencies more effective.

COMMUNITY COMMITTEEMEN BY TOWNSHIPS

Brush Creek and Goshem: Charles H. Bragg, Lee Culwell, route 1, Elkins; Jack Coger, Douglas Stone, Lloyd Cate, route 2, Springdale.

Prairie: John A. Dean, route 1, Fayetteville; James E. Walker, route 6, Fayetteville; Olen Lacey, route 7, Fayetteville; Noah Smith, route 1, Fayetteville.

Durham and White River: Ben Hicks, Hicks; Orville Brink, Durham; Henry C. Thompson, Hicks; Sam J. Trammell, route 5, Fayetteville; Robert C. Vaught, Hicks.

Lee's Creek and Crawford: William J. Caudle, route 1, Winslow; Dess M. Chandler, route 1, Fayetteville; Fred Doyle, Edward W. Koch, Floyd Hayes, route 1, Winslow.

Elm Springs and Tontitown: Jack Taldo, John I. Smith, route 1, Springdale; Louis Fontinell, Box 52, Springdale; James Finn, route 3, Springdale.

Springdale: Earl E. White, route 3, Springdale; Horace W. Cloer, route 2, Springdale; Leslie Poe, route 3, Springdale; Arlie W. Luttrell, Roy E. Lowe, route 2, Springdale.

Wyman and Richland: Verd Shofner, route 1, Elkins; Bruce E. Parker, route 5, Fayetteville; Homer King, Elkins; Sam Oliphant, route 5, Fayetteville; Ernest E. Maguire, route 7, Fayetteville.

Winslow and Reed: Frank J. Skelton, Arnett; R. F. Morrison, route 1, Winslow; Lambert A. Porter, route 2, Winslow; Adam E. Reed, route 1, Winslow; Hubert Robbins, Hazel Valley.

Greenland and West Fork: Opie K. Volentine, route 2, West Fork; David L. Burnett, L. Dave Cowan, Greenland; George Stanberry, Ernest Pitts, route 2, West Fork.

Litteral, Johnson and Harmon: Aquilla A. Swagerty, route 2, Fayetteville; Arthur A. Cassat, Johnson; James H. Lawson, route 4, Fayetteville; Joe S. Reed, route 4, Springdale; Ross Mitchell, route 1, Springdale.

Center and Wheeler: Claude D. Blew, route 4, Fayetteville; Roland R. Luther, route 6, Fayetteville; Floyd Blew, Farmington; Charles E. Bertsch, route 1, Farmington; Otis McCall, Sr., route 3, Fayetteville.

Marrs Hill and Rheas Mill: John G. Buchanan, Gilbert Whitmire, Lloyd Hullet, route 3, Prairie Grove; Cecil L. Thompson, route 1, Lincoln; Benton Wray, Jr., route 4, Fayetteville.

Price and Starr Hill: Powell C. Williams, George Therneau, route 2, Lincoln; Elmer E. Steider, Lincoln; Claud D. Griscom, route 1, Lincoln; Charles A. Elms, Summers.

Boston and Morrow: Junius C. Duckett, Paul R. Cox, Cecil F. Remington, Rufus H. Seay, Ray Kidd, route 1, Cane Hill.

Prairie Grove and Valley: Tom B. Bell, route 1, Prairie Grove; Dean Ramsey, Prairie Grove; Martin Shofner, route 3, Prairie Grove; Ernest N. Yell, route 1, West Fork; Frank Garrett, Prairie Grove.

Wedington and Illinois: H. L. Gilbreath, route 1, Summers; Robert H. Pasley, Roy E. Spears, Summers; Ralph C. Davis, route 4, Fayetteville; Elmer Ezell, Summers.

Cane Hill and Cove Creek: William K. Jones, box 6, Cane Hill; Otis Quinton, route 1, West Fork; Tom H. Mourning, route 1, Prairie Grove; Robert L. Kidd, route 2, Lincoln; Lacy F. Cox, Clyde.

Dutch Mills and Vineyard: Luther D. Leach, W. Adolph Whelchel, Charles T. Goldman, Evansville; F. L. Eversole, Dale Richardson, Dutch Mills.

COUNTY COMMITTEEMEN

W. Shannon Pharr, Lincoln.
Calvin F. Holcomb, route 3, Springdale.
Lee L. Williams, route 7, Fayetteville.
Dave L. Burnett, Greenland.
Lincoln E. Maupin, Prairie Grove.

COUNTY OFFICE PERSONNEL

County administrative officer: Eusel M. Coleman, Fayetteville.
Chief clerk: Pearl C. Young, Fayetteville.
Principal clerk: Sarah J. Hankins, Fayetteville.
Clerk: Anita Cox, Fayetteville.
Clerk: Hilda N. Goldman, Fayetteville.

PMA PROGRAMS IN WASHINGTON COUNTY

Soil- and water-conservation program

The total land in the 5,293 farms in Washington County is 491,885 acres, cropland 224,493 acres, noncrop open-pasture land is 71,846, and 13,830 acres of commercial orchard.

County data for 1945, 1946, 1947, 1948, and 1949

Year	Farms in county	PMA assistance	Farmers contributed	Worth to county
1945	4,954	$118,528	$373,196	$2,698,207
1946	5,046	117,115	368,912	2,667,234
1947	5,168	119,728	377,143	2,726,744
1948	5,230	58,055	182,873	1,322,172
1949	5,293	111,544	351,363	2,540,354
5-year total	-------	524,970	1,653,487	11,954,711

Assistance for all farms: Each farm in Washington County is offered the same assistance per cropland acre. In addition to the assistance, the PMA committee have been able to pool the individual farm plans and through local merchants' willingness to cooperate, made it possible to enter into fair price agreements and get lime delivered to the farm and spread at $3.50 per ton and 20 percent phosphate at $29.00 per ton, and pond vendors to build farm ponds.

Restoration of depleted minerals in the soil is not only a conservation measure, but a health measure which results in better nutrition. The application of superphosphate, potash and limestone, which aid in plant growth rich in body-building minerals, is important.

In 1949 farmers in Washington County applied 7,452,146 pounds of 20 percent superphosphate, 141,635 pounds of 50 percent potash and 4,049 tons of limestone to eligible crops. Eligible crops include pastures, hay crops, green manure and cover crops, except small grains. Most of this went on hay and pasture crops for livestock. The public gains by having animal products produced on land not depleted in body-building minerals. These farmers provided not only a protective but a productive cover for 47,509 acres of farm land by increasing a more vigorous growth of grasses and legumes for hay and pasture for livestock.

In addition to the minerals used on pastures, farmers either established additional pasture or improved the acreage already in pasture by sodding 305 acres of Bermuda and seeding 294,017 pounds of adapted pasture grasses or legumes on 14,305 acres. Noxious weeds were controlled on 36,433 acres of established pasture by mowing. (Bulletin 485, May 1949, on pasture improvement for Arkansas Uplands.) This bulletin on a number test on pastures improved gives a gain of 300 pounds per acre. Taking this gain as an average for improved pasture, in 1949 the 14,305 acres of improved pasture in Washington County would be a gain in beef of 4,291,000 or at 20 cents per pound would add $85,820.00 on pasture improvement alone in the county.

Controlling weeds on 36,433 acres of pasture by mowing contributed to an increased production of pasture plants. Farmers interested in dairy and beef production realize

that good pastures are their cheapest source of feed, and also that good pasture forage of grasses and legumes assist in preventing erosion of the soil. An initial phase of any pasture-improvement program is to eliminate undesirable plants, brush, and sprouts from the pasture (bulletin 485, May 1949, on pasture improvement for Arkansas uplands). This sets out that results of 2 years' grazing on two pastures is of value in determining the real value to be derived from mowing in a pasture-improvement program. The pasture mowed to control undesirable plants, produced 26 percent more grazing than did the pasture neglected or not mowed. Another comparison may be drawn, that is the actual gain per acre made by the animals for the two pasture seasons. Animals on the mowed or weed-controlled pasture gained, on the average, 203 pounds per acre, while similar animals grazing on neglected or not mowed to control undesirable plants gained 133 pounds per acre, an increase of 70 pounds, or 53 percent gain per acre in favor of the mowed pasture. Taking an average gain of 70 pounds per acre, this would equal 36,433 acres mowed times 70 pounds gain per acre would equal 2,550,000 pounds added beef at 20 cents per pound would equal $51,000 added increase in Washington County for pasture mowing.

The first step in planning a conservation program is the planning of a county-wide production program. The PMA county and community committeemen with the cooperation of educational and technical agricultural agencies agree on the primary items to be included in the county production program are increased production of livestock, dairy, and poultry products together with increased per acre yields of peaches, apples, grapes, berries, vegetables, corn, hay, and small-grain crops.

In order to meet production goals certain conservation needs must be met.

The PMA committees have set a county goal of 15,000 acres of pasture to be developed and improved in 1950. (Fourteen thousands acres of pasture were developed or improved in 1949.) The 1950 goal will require 300,000 pounds of seed which will cost approximately $75,000; 3,000,000 pounds of phosphate which will cost $43,500; 30,000 tons of lime annually which will cost $105,000; approximately 500,000 pounds of potash annually which will cost approximately $12,500; and the mowing to control weeds approximately $15,000, or a total approximate out-of-pocket cost to the farmer of $239,500. The total county allocation of ACP funds for all practices is $136,191. When the farmer out-of-pocket cost incident to terracing stock ponds, cover crops, and other needed conservation practices is added to the $239,500, it can readily be seen that the taxpayer is contributing a very small part of the cost of conservation work accomplished, the results of which are reflected in the stability of income of every citizen of the county.

Fifteen thousand acres of permanent pasture added can produce, for instance, 300 pounds of beef per acre or a total of 4,500,000 pounds of beef. At 20 cents per pound this will increase the gross farm income of Washington County by $900,000 per year. We PMA committees believe this to be a goal deserving the support of everyone.

Ninety thousand acres need to be planted to legumes and cover crops annually in Washington County.

We PMA committees have set a goal for 1950 to 10,000 acres of hairy vetch, 15,000 acres of small grain and ryegrass, and 15,000 acres of summer legumes.

This acreage planned will require 150,000 pounds of vetch seed worth approximately $30,000; 300,000 pounds of lespedeza and cowpea seed worth approximately $30,000; 30,000 bushels small grain worth approximately $38,000. Total out-of-pocket cost $98,000 to seed 40,000 acres of orchard, vineyards, and cropland. The increased production should be worth a minimum of $400,000 to say nothing of the potential production conserved, and added to the 40,000 acres. In 1949 21,000 acres were seeded. We think more seed will be available in 1950 and should get an increased acreage and reach the 40,000 acreage goal.

Value of 1949 ACP practices in Washington County: A total of 125 farm ponds have been built in the county which averaged 954 cubic yards per pond. Farm ponds contribute a great deal in increased production of beef and dairy products and add several hundred dollars in value to the farm. Cost of an average farm pond in Washington County is approximately $155 for a 954-cubic-yard pond. The assistance is 8 cents per cubic yard or approximately $76 and the farmer pays the balance and stabilizes the dam and spillway with sod or other protection. Farmers generally agree that ponds are worth millions to the farm in labor-saving and extra production. Farm ponds encourage development of pastures in fields that are not accessible to water otherwise. This practice particularly appeals to the businessman who has an isolated tract of land that would be useless if sufficient water was not available. Almost every section of the country frequently has dry spells that make it necessary to haul water for livestock. A good farm pond will prevent such inconvenience. Furthermore, farm ponds are valuable in many other ways. They supply water for fire protection, orchards, vineyards, and garden spray, fish production, recreation, waterfowl, and other wildlife. Farmers have built 791 farm ponds in Washington County with an average of 1,000 cubic yards per pond.

In 1949, 250 acres of land was terraced. Had 1949 been a normal crop year an increase of 10 bushels of corn or 10 bushels of small grains per acre could have been expected. This extra production would have a value of $15 per acre or $3,750 for the 1949 crop to say nothing of the added real estate value of $3,000. Since 1936, 6,620 acres of land have been terraced in Washington County. Farmers agree that terraced land normally on annual basis produces 20 percent more crops than unterraced land and adds $15 per acre in real estate value. The assistance for building the 2,649,000 linear feet of terraces is $26,600, and it is agreed by farmers that it cost about $3 per 100 linear feet to build terraces or a total cost of $79,370, of which the farmer's out-of-pocket cost is $52,770.

Price supports: Price supports for agricultural commodities enable farmers to receive a more equitable price for their production in line with costs of operating their "manufacturing plants." Without price supports farmers are in the position of selling an entire year's production in a few weeks on an open, glutted market.

Through price-support operations such as loans, purchase agreements, or direct purchases at equitable levels, farmers are enabled to market their products in a more orderly manner so as not to glut the market at harvest time and starve it at off-season time. This also tends to stabilize prices to consumers without wide fluctuations in consumer costs.

Price-supports are in effect on numerous commodities. Some have direct effect on prices of some commodities produced in Washington County such as apples and peaches, and others have indirect effect such as prices on milk, poultry, eggs, and hogs.

Announced support prices for various commodities place floors under prices farmers receive for their production although actual operation of the programs is not necessary in the county.

Although no direct purchases have been made of commodities in Washington County, the program was available.

Peaches, apples, grapes, and berries: Purchase of fruits for use in the school-lunch program has been made on occasion in some sections of the State when the supply was such that the price was depressed below a fair level. No purchases were made in Washington County but the availability of the program had a beneficial effect on prices for local production. There are approximately 300 peach growers, 1,000 apple growers, 800 grape growers, 500 strawberry and blackberry growers, and 600 growers of plums, cherries, and pears that benefit from such programs.

Poultry and eggs: Poultry prices have been supported indirectly without any purchases of local production. Prices received by farmers for eggs from local produce houses fluctuate with announced support prices. It has been estimated that there are 1,500 farm families in the county who sell eggs at some time during the year and 1,750 broiler growers producing approximately 12,000,000 broilers per year.

Pork: Support of hog prices on Chicago and other markets have maintained prices of local hog markets without direct-support programs in the county. Although Washington is not a hog-producing county there are approximately 500 farmers in the county who have marketed hogs during the year and have received indirect benefits from support programs on pork.

Storage facilities: Many loan programs are dependent upon storage of the commodity. Storage of commodities will also assist in orderly marketing operations. Commercial storage is available for cotton and grain and a few other crops on a limited scale but the big need is for farm storage.

Loans are available to farmers at low-interest rates through approved local lending agencies or direct from the Government to finance storage structures. The difference in market price of some commodities at harvest time and a few months later will pay for the cost of the storage structure in a few years. There is a need for more farm storage in Washington County and farmers are being encouraged to build more facilities. This program expires June 30, 1950.

In addition to loans to farmers for construction of farm-storage facilities, there is a program which guarantees payment for 75 percent of capacity of privately financed commercial-storage facilities for a period of 3 years.

Information on farm-storage loans and commercial-storage guaranties may be obtained from the county PMA office.

Marketing quotas: Marketing quotas are used, in effect, to help distribute the available market for a commodity among all producers, intended to provide mechanism for maintaining a sustained and ample production of the commodity at prices fair to farmers and consumers. Marketing quotas are not in effect on any crop in Washington County and have not been for a number of years; however, the present supply and anticipated production indicates that allotments and marketing quotas may be necessary in the future.

School-lunch program: The supervisor of Washington County schools reports that there are 30 schools operating school-lunch programs in Washington County with an average daily participation in the school-lunch program for the year of 4,400 pupils out of an average daily attendance of 7,200 pupils.

The cost of operation of the school-lunch program in Washington County is $215,000 of of which $50,000 is furnished by the Federal Government, a branch of the Production and Marketing Administration program, leaving $165,000 furnished by the schools and participants served in the county. During the year there are also about 55,000 free meals served by the program to underprivileged children.

The following surplus commodities in addition to the $50,000 furnished by the Government school-lunch program have been furnished schools in Washington County free except unloading and transportation charges: Apples, tomato paste, dried milk, butter, tomatoes, sweetpotatoes, canned peaches, canned corn, Irish potatoes, dried eggs, peanut butter.

The supervisor of Washington County schools states that the school-lunch program is a wonderful program and that schools could not operate a modern lunch-room service without this assistance.

United States Department of Agriculture county council: The Washington County PMA committee participated in the United States Department of Agriculture county council to assist in coordinating programs between agencies.

Crop insurance: Crop insurance is offered to counties on an experimental basis in eight counties in Arkansas. One county has multiple crop insurance on a trial basis. Congress has set up provisions for including other counties for crop-insurance purposes and Washington County may be included in the future.

Meetings held:

A. Number meetings held during 1949:

County committee	34
Community committee	16
Farmer meetings	25

B. Contacts by county office and county and community committeemen, 20,500.

Publicity: The farmers who performed this job of conservation on the farm, wish to thank those who have kept the problems of soil conservation before the public—editors of the county newspapers and managers of radio stations.

To all newspaper editors go our thanks for the space given to this farm program, and to the management of radio stations our appreciation of radio programs during the year.

Soil and water conservation practices carried out since beginning of program	Extent	Farmer contribution and assistance	Increase worth to county and citizen
20-percent phosphate	49,119,760 pounds	$778,656	$11,822,080
Ground limestone	66,541 tons	283,668	1,418,340
50-percent potash	309,065 pounds	16,302	130,416
Mulching material	1,045 acres	3,136	12,544
Winter legumes, green manure and cover crop	93,195 acres	973,251	4,866,255
Summer legumes	297,924 acres	1,537,812	6,151,248
Terraces	363,159 linear feet	73,464	734,464
Stock ponds	791 ponds	298,628	2,986,280
Contour ridging	15,601 linear feet	4,164	12,492
Waterways	124 acres	8,810	35,240
Establishing pasture by seeding grasses and legume mixtures	92,866 acres	797,256	7,972,560
Mowing pasture	132,382 acres	148,758	892,548
Ryegrass	70,190 acres	179,844	719,376
Harvesting legume and grass seed	19,048 acres	193,040	965,200
Contour farming	6,107 acres	7,602	38,010
Small grain for cover or green manure	137,289 pounds	14,016	56,064
Alfalfa	5,046 acres	74,578	289,312
Miscellaneous practices	16,142 acres	26,259	78,777
Total		5,419,244	39,181,206

The average worth to county and citizen is $7.23 per $1 spent by Government and farmer.
Farmer contributes $3.11 (his expense plus labor included) for each $1 of Government assistance.

TESTIMONIALS

The use of agricultural limestone, phosphate and potash on pastures, meadows, legumes, cover crops and many other good conservation practices were introduced by the PMA agricultural conservation program, Jeff Brown declares.

Mr. Brown is a farmer and stockman of the Springdale community and raises cattle on his 310-acre farm. In the spring of 1949 Mr. Brown applied 320 tons of limestone, 3,000 pounds of 20 percent phosphate, 700 pounds of potash and seeded 670 pounds of lespedeza and 250 pounds of redtop on his pasture.

"On this same pasture I had 65 head of cattle grazing, 1,400 bales of hay were cut and approximately twice that amount was left for winter grazing and I had the fattest cattle that I ever had—that is one reason I plan to continue to cooperate and recommend the PMA conservation program.

"I do not hesitate to show my neighbors the results of good practices, who are one by one increasing their participation in good conservation practices.

"As president of the Springdale Chamber of Commerce, a civic organization that believes in and recommends better farming, I do not hesitate to recommend and approve the PMA program's recommended conservation practices and also that the PMA farm elected farmer committee system be continued and enlarged."

Mr. Robert L. Combs, dairy and livestock farmer, owner and operator of a 375-acre farm in Washington county, attributes the improvement of soil and increased production of crops directly to the PMA conservation practices. "The PMA program is the finest agricultural program that has ever come along. Soil is the only real asset our Nation has. Destroy our soil and we have nothing, so to speak. Farmers who bare their backs to the sun to raise food and fiber to clothe and feed the world should have some assistance with the conservation problems. Until the PMA program was set up our soil received the least attention of any industry in the country. Even though our soil is the most valuable asset, too many people take for granted that our country will remain the best fed, clothed, most prosperous nation of the world. People do not seem to realize the importance of the soil or farm land and what is produced on it. How long this Nation remains so depends on how well this Nation cares for the soil. The PMA conservation program has been designed to assist farmers do this."

"I like all the features of the PMA programs and I recommend that farm programs become and use the farmer elected, farmer committee system, elected by the farmers and farmer administrated as the present PMA program system."

Mr. Combs is a veteran farmer in Washington County and put into effect the following practices in 1949: applied 20,100 pounds of 20 percent phosphate, 1,000 pounds of 50 percent potash, 322 tons of limestone, 1,000 pounds of ryegrass, 400 pounds of Crimson Clover, 1,600 pounds of lespedeza, 300 pounds of hairy vetch to pasture and mowed 100 acres of pasture to control weeds.

"In carrying out PMA conservation program's recommended practices, I have built up my soil and pastures and my 45 Jersey dairy herd is producing twice as much milk per cow, and I have been able to increase my herd and produce a better quality milk at less cost. My cows are also in better condition, calve a better calf and have practically no trouble at calving time now, but before I starting using lime, phosphate and potash on my pastures, I had more than my share of trouble at calving time and milk fever. On the portion of the pasture where lime, potash and phosphate was not applied, the cattle would not graze until forced to by the use of a fence."

J. Raymond Kennan, owner and James A. Clark, operator, farmers of the Tuttle community, operate a 247-acre livestock farm.

We are interested in farming, and being farmers, we are especially interested in having farm income increased in Washington County.

Land use and increased production has shown the need for improved methods as encouraged by the PMA program. The use of lime and phosphate has increased the hay and pasture yields greatly. A personal experience and test that we have made will give proof to any doubting person. A 14-acre field which was run down and which was producing about one load of lespedeza hay per acre in 1943–44 has shown outstanding improvements. In 1945 we decided to improve this field. We put 60 tons of lime and 6 tons of phosphate, PMA material on this 14-acre tract. The soil was tilled to a good seed bed, having of course, the lespedeza seed and residue worked into it completely. We then seeded 2 bushels of barley and 2 bushels of orchard grass per acre. The following year the field produced 22 bushels of barley per acre and 56 bales of hay were cut per acre in August. In the fall we pastured 50 cattle on this field for at least 50 days. Last year 20 bushels of orchard grass were threshed per acre besides a good yield of hay and pasture. In 1948 this same field was phosphated with 400 pounds per acre and this spring (1950) another 400 pounds per acre will be spread.

As you can readily see, the stimulation of the PMA program has caused and encouraged us to follow the PMA farm program which will continue.

In 1941 when Mr. Kennan bought the farm, it was considered as a corn and livestock farm with a carrying capacity of 14 cattle, 5 workstock, and 2 brood sows. Mr. Kennan and Mr. Clark have improved the pastures and farm in general by carrying out conservation practices recommended by the PMA such as the following practices that were put into practice in 1949—applying 18,300 pounds of 20-percent phosphate, 840 pounds of 50-percent potash, seeding 640 pounds of lespedeza, 160 pounds of red clover, 504 pounds of orchard grass and mowing 20 acres of pasture to control weeds. By applying practices as the above we have increased the livestock on this farm from 19 to an average of 50 head cattle, and 6 brood sows, and small grain replaces the corn.

We also believe in the method in which the program is being formulated and administered, that is under the control of local elected farmers by the farmers of the county.

Mr. Kennan and Mr. Clark attribute the improvement of pastures, soil and increased production directly to the PMA conservation practices.

Roe D. Stokenbury, Elkins, Ark., former member of the PMA county committee, member of the board of directors of the local Farm Bureau Cooperative, member of the REA board and prominent farmer and dairyman, says "PMA has done its part in helping me to make my 450-acre farm what it is today. I use my farm allowance each year to assist in building up my soil; through the use of phosphate, limestone, legumes, and barnyard fertilizer this is being accomplished. Since I am primarily interested in dairying, I'm developing my pasture to better take care of my needs. Through the conservation of water, brought about by PMA farm ponds, my livestock does not have

to walk as far to water. Through establishing and improving permanent pasture by seeding pasture grasses and through weed control, promoted by the PMA mowing practice, my pastures have improved not only in quality but also in the number of livestock taken care of per acre.

"More farmers need to come to the full realization of what their soils need, and having found out, use every advantage possible in building their soil to fullest productivity.

"In 1949 I put into effect on my farm the following practices: used 31,900 pounds of phosphate, 2,240 pounds of potash, 34 tons of limestone and seeded 2,200 pounds of lespedeza, 60 pounds of hop clover and 85 pounds of Kentucky 31 on my pastures and hay meadows.

"I am not a member of either the county or community committee at present; however, I served as a community committeeman since in the early thirties, until 1945, and was elected on the county committee and served until the end of the 1949 program year. Even though I am not a member now, I believe in and recommend the committee system used through the past years and at present by the PMA in formulating and administering the program which is farm-controlled."

Mr. Herbert L. Thomas owns and operates a 217-acre farm in Washington County, on which he raises registered Angus cattle. The farm is stocked with about 100 head at present.

Mr. Thomas states: "After 10 years on my farm near Fayetteville, I think I should express to the PMA conservation program my appreciation. When I moved on this hill farm, a good deal of it had been cultivated in row crops and little or nothing done to stop erosion, rebuild the soil, or add to the beauty and value of the place. Through the help, advice, counsel, and contributions of the PMA we have terraced a portion of the land, sodded Bermuda grass, and put in a combination farm pond." In 1949, through the PMA, Mr. Thomas added 16,700 pounds of phosphate, 20 tons of limestone, and seeded a great deal of it with lespedeza, hop clover, rye, and orchard grass which was furnished or partly paid for through the PMA conservation program. "I have, of course, through PMA recommendation, added lime and phosphate and I have learned the value of pasture mowing, the usage of my own fertilizer, and I think that what has happened on my farm is no exception to many other farms in this area whose owners have slowly but surely learned these lessons from the PMA conservation program. In fact, I consider that PMA has been one of the valuable mediums of making application to the farmer the accomplishments of research. I frankly think we would be a much poorer community without PMA's good work, and this being an agricultural area, business has naturally profited greatly from the improved condition of the land and the farmer."

CONCLUSION

It is our hope that the information contained in this report will give you a better understanding of the purpose and effect of the various programs administered by the Production and Marketing Administration.

It is our aim to reach all farms and when we have done this we still will not have accomplished all, as we strive for more and better conservation and administration on all PMA programs.

We are at all times open for suggestions which will tend to make future programs more effective.

The committee and the county office personnel recognize the assistance of the various agencies in the county, the Extension Service, Soil Conservation Service, Farmers' Home Administration, vocational agriculture instructors and Veterans Training Instructors. They have all had a part in formulating the over-all program.

We thank you for your interest in reading this report. We also recognize the fact that many of you had a definite part in making the programs effective.

WASHINGTON COUNTY PMA COMMITTEE,
W. SHANNON PHARR, *Chairman,*
CALVIN F. HOLCOMB, *Vice Chairman,*
LEE I. WILLIAMS, *Member.*

Labor Record of Hon. Elmer Thomas, of Oklahoma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELMER THOMAS
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement setting forth my labor record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ELMER THOMAS' LABOR RECORD

In 1907 Oklahoma became the forty-sixth State. The new State, made up by combining Oklahoma and Indian territories, had only a few laws and such laws pertained almost exclusively to the rights of property. Laws affecting humanity, and especially the rights of laboring people, were conspicuous by their absence. Labor had much to ask of the first legislature, and it gained much.

ELMER THOMAS served in the State senate from statehood until 1920, and during these years he had the opportunity of assisting in organizing the new State and enacting all the laws affecting labor in the early days of statehood. He voted for an 8-hour law for women; for a bill providing hospitalization for railroad men, and for a full crew bill applying to the railroads of Oklahoma. He voted for the original State Workmen's Compensation Act in 1915, as well as for a Plumbers' Qualification Act.

ENTERED CONGRESS

In 1922 he was elected to Congress and during his service in the House of Representatives he voted for a bill restricting foreign immigration, and voted to submit the Federal child labor amendment to the States.

ELECTED TO UNITED STATES SENATE

In 1926 he was elected to the Senate and in that body he continued his support of measures sponsored by the various groups of organized workers.

As a Senator he voted for the Norris-LaGuardia anti-injunction bill, and for the McCarran amendment providing for the prevailing rate of wages on all relief work. He voted for the railroad retirement bill; for the Guffey-Snyder coal bill, and for the Wagner low-cost housing bill. He voted for the Wagner Labor Act, and he has always supported and voted for bills which tended to place the workers on a parity with agriculture and industry.

AUTHOR OF 40-HOUR-WEEK LAW

On February 21, 1934, he introduced the bill establishing the 40-hour week, and such bill was promptly passed.

That law has become the cornerstone of every contract and wage agreement affecting labor and the workers throughout the United States. It is now the basic principle affecting Government employees, and not only has this law affected organized workers and Government employees, but it has influenced thousands of collective bargaining agreements with companies in private enterprise.

The International Association of Machinists has this to say about this law:

"This legislation, sponsored by Senator ELMER THOMAS, is regarded by wage earners as one of the most far-reaching and cherished benefits ever conferred upon them by congressional action."

Labor, the publication representing the standard railroad labor organization, has always endorsed him for reelection to the Senate. In 1938 this publication said:

"Senator THOMAS has a splendid record and has always been backed by organized labor."

William Green, for the AFL, has said:

"Senator THOMAS is one of the best friends labor has in the Senate and it would be a calamity should he be defeated."

ENDORSED FOR REELECTION IN 1950

In the pending campaign he has already been endorsed by many of the State and national labor groups and organizations.

The Machinists Nonpartisan Political League, in its publication, The Machinist, of date March 30, 1950, had the following to say:

"Senator THOMAS has supported measures to increase purchasing power of both farmers and city workers. As chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee he has supported high-support prices for farmers. At the same time he has favored collective bargaining for city workers and opposed the Taft-Hartley Act. He is backing the move to liberalize the old-age benefits under the social-security law."

Labor, in its issue of January 26, 1950, endorsed Senator THOMAS for reelection in the following words:

"Senator THOMAS has served 24 years in the most influential legislative body in the world. This experience has been invaluable to the people of his State and the Nation."

Railway Labor's Political League, at a meeting held in Washington on February 22 to 24, 1950, endorsed Senator THOMAS for reelection. The April 1950 edition of the paper representing the league stated that his voting record on matters affecting the workers is such as to justify the support of the organization.

On May 4, 1950, Mr. Harry See, national legislative representative of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, wrote Senator THOMAS as follows:

"It is a pleasure for me to inform you that the Brotherhood has endorsed you for reelection as Senator from Oklahoma in the coming primary election."

On April 27, 1950, Senator THOMAS received the following letter from the Executive secretary of the Oklahoma State Federation of Labor:

"I have just recently had an opportunity to review your voting record of the Eighty-first Congress on legislation of particular interest to the working people of Oklahoma.

"I find that your voting record is very satisfactory and clearly indicates your sympathy with the common people of your State. It is a record of which we are very proud.

"We sincerely hope that you will continue to be our United States Senator and that we can be assured of your continued support in behalf of the working people of Oklahoma.

"With best wishes and kindest regards, I am

"Very truly yours,

"DEAN BAUGH,
"Executive Secretary."

Curtailment of Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials regarding the curtailment in postal service, from the Danbury (Conn.) News-Times of April 20 and April 21, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Danbury (Conn.) News-Times of April 20, 1950]

BILLIONS FOR FOREIGNERS; PENNY-PINCH UNITED STATES POST OFFICE

Here is a country so rich, so prosperous, so able, it is presently supporting almost all the non-Communist world. Since the end of World War II, for instance, we have fed, clothed, and kept Great Britain by our dole.

Yet, it is announced we are too poverty-stricken to support our own Post Office Department.

Heretofore the Post Office Department has been the best in the world. We have been proud of it for many years. American business has depended upon it, and not in vain, for prompt, efficient service.

Family correspondence is highly important, too, and the housewife running to the door twice a day when "it's time for the postman," knows that if a letter is mailed to her on time, it will be delivered on time.

Now, in the interests of "economy," postal deliveries are to be cut, and postal staffs reduced.

This means, not only that there will be only one delivery of mail in residential sections, but that some windows in some post offices will be closed. You will be able to buy stamps, in some communities, only at certain times of the day.

Economy is excellent and should be practiced wherever possible. The Hoover Commission showed that there are many places the Government could save millions of dollars, without in any way hampering business or social life.

But to begin an economy drive by cutting down on the mail service, by firing or laying off thousands of employees of the Post Office Department, is not only foolish, it is asinine, and could harm American business greatly.

If we need to economize, why not cut down on the billions we are tossing to the four corners of the earth? Why not pay fewer millions to the farmers for unneeded potatoes, cotton, eggs, and the like?

Politics may be the explanation. Mr. Truman, a shrewd politician, may have planned this as a dramatic coup. If the hue and cry raised by this order to curtail the postal facilities of the country is loud enough, he can rescind it, and then say: "Well, I tried to economize, and the people kicked."

We refuse to believe that American people will stand for this nonsense, this criminal hamstringing of business, this cutting into the social intercourse of the many millions of Americans who depend upon the mails. We are used to being bullied by our Government, and we hand over our wages and salaries to the tax-collectors like so many mice.

But this is too much. Billions for Englishmen, Frenchmen, Belgians, Germans, Japanese, Italians, Dutchmen, and Scandinavians, but only pennies for the United States Post Office Department, which serves faithfully and well 150,000,000 Americans.

Are we going to take this one lying down?

[From the Danbury (Conn.) News-Times of April 21, 1950]

THAT POSTAL CUT

Everybody seems to be talking about the order of Postmaster General Jesse M. Donaldson to his employees—our employees, that is—to cut down on mail service to all the American people.

Ostensibly this is an economy measure. Actually it appears a snide move by the Truman administration to make economy, real economy, that is, unpopular with the people.

That the economy move will mean the discharge of something like 10,000 postal employees is certain. Many of these are substitute carriers and clerks, barely eking out a living now.

So, the American public will be forced to put up with third-rate mail service, business will be harmed, social and family correspondence delayed, and American war veterans will find themselves jobless.

Meanwhile, we continue to send billions to the far corners of the earth, to support Germans, Japanese, and Italians who fought us and killed our sons.

It all just makes no sense whatever. This Government could save billions of dollars by sensible operation of most of its departments, bureaus, and agencies. It could send less abroad. It could do many sane and intelligent things to relieve the taxpayers.

It does none of the things recommended by the Hoover report.

Instead, it suddenly orders the Post Office Department to cut down on services to the American people. The Post Office Department is honeycombed with politics, as the Hoover report pointed out. It has an appropriation of $1,786,000,000. Congress lopped $25,000,000 from the appropriation Postmaster General Donaldson asked for. So he and his associates in the Truman Administration come up with a proposal that will set us back to Civil War standards of mail service.

Will the American people stand for this absurd and despicable Fair Deal ukase? Will they allow our mail service to be lowered to the standards of the Balkan countries? Will they sit back and take it?

The American taxpayers are weary of waste, inefficiency, and giveaway to foreign countries. They want economy, sane, sensible, intelligent, and reasonable economy.

This cut in postal service is pure hocus pocus, unnecessary, unbearable, and wicked. It could have such an adverse effect on all business as to slow our economy painfully, and no one knows this better than President Truman.

That, to be sure, is the explanation. He and his associates want to make economy so unpopular that they can sink the country even deeper into the morass of deficit spending and waste.

Conduct of Congressional Investigations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, the current issue of the Georgetown Law Journal contains an article of much interest. It is Congressional Investigations—Salvation in Self-Regulation, by Henry H. Glassie and Thomas M. Cooley II. It is too long to be included in the RECORD, but I should like to include the Tentative Draft of Suggested Committee Rules which appears as an appendix to the article.

There being no objection, the draft was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TENTATIVE DRAFT OF SUGGESTED COMMITTEE RULES

I. GENERAL

A. Meetings shall be called by the chairman on not less than 1 day's advance written notice to each member when Congress is in session or 5 days' advance written notice, or 3 days' advance notice by telegram, when Congress is not in session; provided minimum time of notice may be waived by the senior minority member of the committee.

B. The chairman may appoint any member to act as chairman pro tempore in his absence.

C. A quorum of the committee shall comprise three members, including one minority member, and voting on any matter requiring a quorum shall be by members physically present and not by proxy; provided approval or disapproval of committee reports may be made by members in writing when Congress is not in session.

D. No member shall take part in any investigation or hearings in which he is personally interested. Upon challenge by any member of the committee or a witness being questioned, the question of a member's personal interest shall be determined by the majority vote of a quorum of the remaining members of the committee.

II. HEARINGS

A. Hearings shall be held at the time and in the place set forth in the notice to members.

B. All hearings shall be open to the public except executive sessions convened for marking up bills, or for voting, or executive sessions ordered by a vote of a majority of a quorum at a duly called meeting.

C. No witness shall be examined in executive session or under oath unless there is a quorum of the committee present and the committee counsel or a staff member designated by the counsel.

III. TRANSCRIPT OF TESTIMONY

A. All testimony in public hearings or in executive sessions shall be taken down stenographically and preserved.

B. The transcript of all public hearings shall be available to the public; and upon payment of the cost of a copy thereof, any interested person shall be entitled to obtain such a copy.

C. The transcript of testimony taken in executive sessions shall be available to the public:

1. When a majority of a quorum at a regularly called meeting shall so determine, or

2. When any part of such testimony has been made public, or

3. When such testimony has been used as the basis of a report issued; in any of which events any interested person shall be entitled to a copy of such transcript upon payment of its cost.

D. The transcript of his testimony given either in public or in executive session shall in all cases be available to the witness from whom such testimony is taken.

E. The transcript of any executive session may, under conditions prescribed by a majority of the committee, be made available to any interested person upon a confidential basis without being made public.

F. No transcript of testimony taken under oath at either a public hearing or an executive session shall be altered or edited.

IV. STATEMENTS BY WITNESSES

A. Any witness, whether appearing at public hearing or executive session may file a sworn statement which shall become part of the record, and shall be permitted to read aloud a brief summary thereof, provided that the statement and summary are given to counsel for the committee 4 days before the hearing or 2 days after the witness is notified of the date of the hearing, whichever is later. But no witness shall be compelled to submit any statement or give evidence other than in answer to direct questions.

B. Any witness may also submit written interrogatories for use by the committee in questioning other witnesses on matters relating to the witness in question, or his testimony. The interrogatories shall be used or not in accordance with the discretion of the majority of a quorum present; provided if the interrogatories are not used, they shall, at the request of the person submitting them, be included as an appendix to the transcript of hearing, with a notation of their rejection.

C. The committee acting by a majority of a quorum retains the right to reject statements, summaries or interrogatories which are plainly irrelevant to the subject of its inquiry, and to require any witness to put his statement, summary or interrogatory in concise form before its inclusion in the record or reading before the committee.

D. Any person reasonably believing that testimony or other matter taken by the committee has a tendency to affect his reputation adversely may, within 10 days after the date of such adverse testimony if taken in public session or within 10 days after its release if originally taken in executive session, file a sworn statement relating to it, which, if concise and relevant, shall be made a part of the record.

E. Self-incrimination: Nothing in these rules shall impair the right of a witness to refuse to answer on the ground of self-incrimination.

V. ATTORNEYS

A. All witnesses, either at public hearings or at executive sessions, shall be permitted to have present counsel of their own choice.

B. Counsel may advise his client with respect to whether he should answer any question, and may state his grounds for objecting to any question; counsel may further challenge the relevancy of any question and the interest of any member, which challenge shall be disposed of by the committee as in these rules provided; counsel shall not be allowed to participate otherwise except with the permission of the committee.

VI. REPORTS

A. No report or portion thereof or excerpt therefrom shall be filed or made public until it has been approved by a majority of a quorum present at a duly called meeting.

B. No summary of a report or prediction of the contents of a report shall be made public by any member prior to the issuance of a duly approved report.

C. No member shall issue a statement of his conclusions with respect to any investigation or part thereof except concurrently with or subsequent to the filing or publication of a duly approved report.

D. Any member who makes public a summary or prediction of the contents of a report or makes a statement of his conclusions with respect to any investigation or part thereof prior to the issuance of the formally approved report shall, on the vote of the majority of a quorum of the Committee at a duly called meeting, be denied the right to take part in the formulation of or vote upon the committee report with respect to such investigation.

E. No report shall be issued upon an investigation or testimony taken in executive session unless all of the testimony on which the report is based shall be released concurrently with the report.

VII. SUBPENAS

A. All subpenas shall be signed by the chairman, or in his absence by a member designated by him, and attested by the Clerk of the House of Representatives (or Secretary of the Senate).

B. All subpenas shall designate the matter of inquiry with reasonable particularity as well as the specific documents or other evidence required to be produced.

C. Subpenas shall be issued only upon written authorization of the chairman and ranking minority member, or upon the vote or written authority of not less than three members of the committee.

VIII. PUBLICITY

A. No public hearing shall be broadcast on the radio, televised, or be made the subject of a motion picture or newsreel.

B. No photographs shall be made in the committee room while hearings are in session and proceeding.

IX. RELEVANCY OF SUBJECT MATTER

A. Only matter which is relevant and pertinent to the subject of inquiry shall be taken in evidence, and questioning by members and staff shall be limited to such matter. This rule shall be most strictly construed in favor of the witness claiming its protection whenever the question is one relating to his religion, race, political belief, or personal affairs.

B. In any case where a challenge is made to relevancy or pertinency it shall be finally resolved by the vote of a majority of the quorum present.

X. COMMITTEE STAFF

A. Staff members shall be selected by the chairman with the advice and consent of the senior minority member or subject to a vote of a majority of a quorum at a regularly called meeting.

B. Upon request by the senior minority member, such staff shall include one professional appointee selected by such senior minority member with the advice and consent of a majority of the minority members.

Curtailment of Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial regarding the curtailment in postal service, from the Rushville (Ind.) Republican.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CUT IN POSTAL SERVICE

Decision to reduce postal service in behalf of economy will not be accepted by the American people with good grace. While there is a universal cry for a reduction in Government expense it is hardly fitting to start with a branch so vital in the life of the people.

A single mail delivery in residential and semibusiness sections will not be accepted without protest. Yet that is the first move inaugurated by the Department. Postmaster General Donaldson says that is necessary following the refusal of Congress to grant increases in postal rates which would net some $600,000,000.

Just how reduction of deliveries will save money is hard to understand. If the Department has sufficient manpower now to make two deliveries what will become of the manpower released by cutting the service in half? Certainly it does not mean that any sizable number of employees will be laid off.

Surely there are other places where millions could be saved without reducing a service so vital to the public. Then, too, there would be a bit of slick politics mixed up in Donaldson's scheme. If the people want economy, let's take it out of their hides, so to speak. Adequate mail service is extremely vital to the Nation. To go back to horse-and-buggy service will be a distinct harassment to every American.

Plan for a National Defense Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, Dean W. H. Washington, school of economics, Clemson College, Clemson, S. C., has submitted, in the form of a letter to the Honorable Wilton E. Hall, former United States Senator from South Carolina, a proposed plan for a national defense program.

In that these 11 proposals were sound in thought and logical in these times of world strife, Mr. Hall printed the plan in the Anderson (S. C.) Daily Mail, of which he is publisher.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD this proposed plan for a national defense program.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO COLONEL ANDERSON:

I propose this plan for a national defense program:

1. It is believed that national defense, as far as possible modern military practical and theoretical training, all possible phases should be offered for all qualified Americans according to their desires, abilities, and as potentially needed for our country (before actually needed). Full recognition should be given for approved service in Regular Armed Forces and National Guard.

2. It is believed that this program should not be a high school or college responsibility, but the program is a Regular and Reserve responsibility, with the good will and support of all school administrators and teachers, civic, and veteran organizations.

3. Training should be regular, at least on two different days each month, under qualified Regular and Reserve officers with pay and appropriate allowances on Regular scales in proportion to approved time, effort, and efficiency (enlisted as well as officer).

4. Regular biweekly (24 per year) training periods to be supplemented with minimum of 2 weeks with troops, full time, at such places first year as: (a) Fort Jackson; (b) Sumter Air Base; (c) Clemson; (d) the Citadel, etc. (Somewhat as ROTC training at Fort Jackson in 1920 and at Clemson a few summers later.) Each additional year continue or specialize more at (e) Fort Benning;

(f) Camp Lee; (g) Fort Bragg; (h) Fort Monmouth; (i) Army headquarters; (j) War Department; (k) National War College, etc. Training to be of full regular scales, time considered, with transportation, longevity, allowances for enlisted personnel.

5. Retention of status and promotions to be based upon regularity and efficiency in training and in service.

6. Longevity and retirement credits to be based in addition to the above on the accumulation of "points" at the rate of one for approved service each training period (not to exceed one per day) and each day approved for duty in service. Twenty-four training periods plus 14 days summer troop service, plus 15 for Reserve annual unit assignment—53 normal annual; 50 points required; 60 allowed.

7. After 20 years of approved service, inactive status may be applied for; but approved service may continue to age 60. Additional points may be earned by extended active duty with troops up to age 60.

8. In case of national emergency voted by the Congress and approved by the President of the United States, manpower should have already been trained in modern, scientific, and practical defense, and ready to answer the call for service in qualities (appropriately trained in MOS's) and in needed numbers when and where needed.

9. This program to apply to all physically qualified male Americans, not members of the Regular Armed Forces, for at least 6 years beginning after 17 and before 23 years of age. Qualified women may serve in appropriate places as enlisted or officer personnel, voluntarily.

10. Transfer to inactive reserve may be applied for without prejudice, after one full year Regular or extended active duty service, with any branch of the Armed Forces (Army, Air Force, Navy, National Guard, etc.)

11. This program should in no way detract from, but it is intended to strengthen, the Regular Forces. It is, in fact, intended to build for world peace.

W. H. WASHINGTON.

CLEMSON, S. C.

Curtailment of Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article regarding the curtailment in postal service, from the Lowell (Mass.) Sun, of April 27, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TODAY'S QUESTION

"What do you think of the plan to curtail mail deliveries to one a day in residential areas?"

Tillie Sousa, 49 Auburn Street, stitcher:

"I am not in favor of such a move as I think it would cause a great deal of inconvenience. Many times a delay of 1 day could cause serious consequences to the individual expecting the mail, when that correspondence would have a time value connected with it."

Gilman Gentle, 106 Epping Street, operator:

"I certainly do not favor any such change in the mail schedule. The public has grown used to the two-a-day delivery system and I think there would be more of a loss all around, if the deliveries were curtailed to the one-a-day system. Besides, I should imagine having it the way it is would keep the post office better able to handle any rushes or emergencies."

Frank Shevack, YMCA, salesman:

"I am not in favor of any change. I think we pay enough for the postal service and therefore should receive all the service we can get. It seems certain that many inconveniences to the public could arise if such a change were made. And it would never work out in the rush seasons with mail piling hourly in the post office."

Charles Mulonis, 10 Gerard Street, dyer:

"It doesn't seem like a good move to me. The public pays for the service and I don't think that it is too much to ask that the mail be delivered twice a day all over the city. It should appear that such a plan would eliminate the jobs of some of the men now working in the post office and that would add to the unemployment ranks."

The American Free Enterprise System and Socialistic Trends

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Aren't You Grown-Ups Ashamed?" which appeared in the York (Pa.) Dispatch of April 15.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AREN'T YOU GROWN-UPS ASHAMED?

I

There is no use pretending you don't see me.

You just sit still and listen.

I'm not very smart yet, but I'm smart enough to see what you are doing to the country in which I must grow up and support my family.

When I do that, will I be allowed to be myself, or will I be a social-security number in a Government file?

When I get sick, whose doctor can I go to, my doctor or the Government doctor?

When I go to school, who is going to decide what I learn, my mother and father or a Government Bureau?

When I am able to afford a house, will I be able to build one just as good as I can make it, or will it be a Government-built house, worth only part of what the Government taxed me for housing?

When I go to work, will I be able to pick my own job, or will I have to get a work permit from the Government and take whatever job they give me?

And if I have criticized the Government, will I get a work permit?

II

What makes you think it would be "bad" for me to have to make my way in competition with others?

If I work a little harder, or better, or get lucky, will I be able to keep any more of what I earn than the other fellow who didn't work as hard, or as well, or get as lucky?

This luck business is important: In your heart you know that in the game of life there has to be a jackpot, or the game won't be played very hard.

Where did you get the cockeyed idea that the man who earns twice as much should be taxed four times as much?

(I know where you got it: right out of Marx.)

When did you get this idea that government can take care of everybody?

You know you can't get something for nothing; yet you pretend that people in Washington can give you things without first taking them away from you.

Don't try to blame the people in politics: They are simply doing what you want them to do.

Naturally they favor the things you favor because getting elected is their business.

They would change overnight if you would.

And don't get the idea that they respect you for being saps: Only a fool can be sold a ride on his own horse.

And that is exactly what is happening when you vote yourself security by giving the Government more and more so the Government can give you some of it back.

I'd rather risk having to stand on a breadline a few times than spending my life standing in line for Government hand-outs.

III

And you men who run labor unions: You know darn well that unearned wage increases are stage money.

And how about you folks who manage America's business; don't you know any better, and can't you do something about it?

Even I know that you can't expect prosperity when everybody is getting more money for producing fewer things.

Have you forgotten that the only reason Americans produce so much more and live so much better and easier is the whopping supply of tools of production that people used to be willing to save for in the days when profit was not a nasty word?

At the rate you are now going the private property system will fall apart, and the tools will fall apart with it. Then good-by America—and me.

What's wrong with the idea of paying people fairly for the use of the tools bought with their savings? The tools do most of the work.

I don't quite know what you mean by the word "conservative," but if it means what I think it means, that's me.

If there were any other place in the world where Government wouldn't plan my life for me even more so, it wouldn't be so bad, but America is the only place left—and look what you are doing to it.

Aren't you ashamed.

Three Golden Balls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a constructive editorial entitled "Three Golden Balls," from the May 3 issue of the Times-News, a daily newspaper of Twin Falls, Idaho.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THREE GOLDEN BALLS

Although in recent years the American people have been stumbling over themselves in a wild scramble to get "their share" of all the Federal aid being doled out in Washington, there are signs that the public is slowly coming out from under the spell.

It's true you still hear the old argument, coming from various sources, that "if we don't take it someone else will." But there is a growing trend, still small, to be sure, against this line of reasoning.

Gov. Alfred E. Driscoll, of New Jersey, is among those who have seen the light. "We are losing self-government in America and destroying our Federal system by the continued expansion of the pernicious system of so-called grants-in-aid," he said recently.

Even more significant is a little incident which occurred one night recently in Hartford, Conn. Speaking before a group of citizens, Gov. Chester Bowles, of OPA fame, made an impassioned plea that they urge their communities to take advantage of the opportunity to get Federal grants and loans for housing projects. When he had finished, a young World War II veteran named Jay V. Smith, who owns a restaurant in Greenwich, obtained permission to say a few words. Whereupon Governor Bowles received the shock of his life.

"There is no such thing as Federal aid or Federal money," Smith told the audience. "All these funds the Governor told us about were collected from the people. The growing popularity of Federal aid in States and large cities is becoming more and more contemptible, due to the political cowardice of some Governors and mayors who are determined to stay in office come hell or high water.

"Our dear old Uncle Sam is handing out the money with one hand while holding the club behind his back with the other if you should fail to behave. Few States have been able to resist the rule of the three golden balls that ornament the Washington front porch. Think it over."

The audience broke into loud applause. It was not because it had been told something it did not already know. Those present couldn't help but admire one with courage enough to challenge all this "political cowardice" and the sham which characterizes much of our Federal aid.

We should wake up to the fact that the Government can give us nothing it has not already taken away from us—that in getting funds from the Federal pawnshop we are actually hocking our freedom. And these pawn tickets on our freedom are loans we can't redeem.

ECONOMY WITH LETTERS

At the turn of the century Staten Islanders were enjoying an unusual period. Residents of a new part of a growing city, they were looking forward to expansion and prosperity.

And they were getting three deliveries of mail a day.

The new one-a-day order, from Washington, is hardly progressive.

Suppose you drop a letter in the mail box in your community—and just miss the evening pickup, say on a Monday night. Although it's addressed to someone only a short distance away, he won't receive it until Wednesday.

For the average householder, that's one of the toughest features of the economy move just taken by the United States Post Office Department.

The plan promises to boom business for the telephone company and increase personal business.

You'll always be able to say that the material is in the mail and should be along any day now.

Grandpa heard the postman's whistle three times a day. Now his grandson is apparently lucky if the letter carrier trudges around once a day.

It has all come about because the Post Office Department is running up a whopping deficit. And, not coincidentally, Congress is debating the famous one-package appropriations bill.

It's a well-timed move, like receiving a letter containing a check the day the mortgage payment is due.

The howl of protests is likely to be heard from here to there, from Tottenville to Monterey, Calif.

Even if it's an advertising blurb or a plea for funds, everyone likes to receive his mail on time. The fear of not getting something in the mail will drive some people to great lengths.

And as Hamlet said, "Ay, there's the rub." For tops in service someone must pay the bill. You have to pay for what you receive—even if the Government is providing it.

In his shrewd, but obvious, move, Postmaster General Donaldson is attempting to recoup a slashed appropriation. He believes householders will complain to their Congressman, and what Congressman isn't very much aware of his mail?

If economy isn't achieved in postal operations, income will have to be increased through higher rates or the fund allocation boosted. Or some similar alternative will have to be followed.

The situation, generally, is a test of American attitude and opinion. Do they want economy in Government? If so, where and when is it to take place?

The answers will have to be provided by the one-a-day mail recipients.

Curtailment of Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial regarding the curtailment in postal service, from the Staten Island Advance of April 20, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fifteenth Anniversary of Rural Electrification Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on Thursday, May 11, we will celebrate the fifteenth anniversary of the establishment of the vital Rural Electrification Administration. I am glad to say that in these 15 years, there has been a tremendous increase in the harnessing of electricity on the farms of the Nation, and I want to pay sincere tribute right now, to all of those individuals of both political parties who have labored so long and so well in the farmers' behalf. I say "both political parties" because I think it is generally agreed now that both the Republicans and the Democrats of the Nation are firmly committed to a strong unhampered REA program.

During the Republican Eightieth Congress, more funds were voted for REA purposes than at any time in American history.

Yes, I emphasize "bipartisan" because similarly, in recent months, there has been a spontaneous demand in REA's in my own State and in other States to make absolutely sure that the REA is not embroiled in partisan politics. I think that it is essential for the future of the rural electrification movement, that we keep the REA on a nonpartisan basis.

We, of Wisconsin, are particularly proud of the REA. Right now, over 72,000 rural consumers are served over 26,000 miles of wire. The REA has advanced over $58,400,000 to finance the construction and operation of the systems.

There are many challenges ahead to the REA system. Now, the system is being expanded through rural telephone cooperatives, which will deservedly bring this great phone blessing to more and more of Wisconsin's farms.

In recent months, there has been a particularly strong surge of bipartisan sentiment on behalf of the REA throughout my State. As more and more of the modern conveniences are brought to the farmer and to his housewife to relieve what has been the drudgery and the hard, incessant toil of the life in the rural areas. Never again must the American farmer be treated as a second-class citizen, denied the elementary comforts and conveniences of his city brother.

In this connection, Mr. President, I have in my hands a summary article, published in the May 8 issue of the Wisconsin Farmers Union News, which reviews the situation, I believe, in an interesting manner.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of this Farmers Union News article be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REA'S 15 YEARS OF HISTORY TELLS STORY OF PROGRESS

In May 1935, the chain letter fad was at its height, Rear Admiral Byrd returned from another trip to Antarctica, the Cleveland Indians and New York Giants led the major baseball leagues, and 6,000,000 American farm homes were without electricity, including 80 percent of the farms in Wisconsin.

In that month, also, President Roosevelt ordered the establishment of the Rural Electrification Administration, paving the way for a completely new way of life for these millions of American farm families.

When REA was a lusty infant in swaddling clothes, only one farm in every ten had central station electric service. Farming with no electric power to lend a helping hand meant back-breaking toil from morning until dark, and often far into the night, with

only an oil lamp's flickering light. It meant endless chores for the farm housewife, cooking with a wood stove, washing with an old-fashioned washboard, carrying hundreds of pails of water a month.

"SKIMMED CREAM"

American farmers knew the value of electricity, and they wanted it. But power companies were reluctant to build lines to all farms—they "skimmed the cream"—by extending their facilities only to farms within easy reach of their lines, thus insuring profitable operation of these spurs. Other farms, too far from the high line, were ignored. Many commercial power companies told farmers they could get power if they were willing to pay for construction of the lines to their farms. The cost was usually prohibitive.

When REA came on the scene, it was slow going at first. Rural people in Wisconsin got together, talked it over, acted cautiously. They learned that REA provided nothing except expert technical advice, guidance, and loans to be paid back with interest.

They formed cooperatives and applied to REA for loans. If an electrification project was considered feasible—that is, if the Government's financial investment was deemed safe—the co-op got the loan and started building lines.

PERTINENT FACTS

The success of the program can be mirrored through several pertinent statistics. As 1950 started, REA has approved almost $2,000,000,000 in loans to 1,066 borrowers. These included 976 cooperatives, 41 public power districts, 24 other public bodies, and 25 commercial power companies. At the first of this year, REA also had on file or in process in the field, additional loan applications totaling $356,428,800 for new system construction and various line improvements. Most of these applications are for expansion of existing systems financed by REA.

These REA borrowers had almost a million miles of rural electric lines in operation, serving more than 3,000,000 farms and other rural consumers in 46 States. Additional lines are being built more rapidly now than ever before—one new consumer is being connected to an REA-financed system every 15 seconds of every working day.

The speed with which rural electrification has been advanced in Wisconsin is shown by the fact that the first loan to be granted was in May 1936. First REA-financed lines were energized by the Columbus Rural Electric Cooperative, Columbus, in May 1937.

But rural electrification in Wisconsin is past the stage where the accent is on the extension of lines. It is developing to a point which will create a new problem. That problem arises from an increased farm use of power to create income. In December of 1941 the average power use for that month on the State's REA-financed lines was 84 kilowatt hours. In December of 1949, this increased to 210 kilowatt hours. The national average is 141 kilowatt hours. This constantly increased demand for power on the farm eventually is expected to throw an additional strain on the State's power sources. Even now many suppliers are nearing the limit of their capacity to produce dependable service.

SEVENTY-THREE THOUSAND CONSUMERS

Wisconsin's 31 REA borrowers, 30 of them rural electric cooperatives, were serving 72,796 rural consumers over 26,148 miles of wire on February of this year. At that time the Rural Electrification Administration had advanced $58,405,125 to finance the construction and operation of these systems.

During 1949, the State's REA borrowers connected an additional 6,681 rural consumers and added 3,196 miles of energized line.

The State's borrowers own and operate their systems. REA neither owns nor operates power systems. These new private enterprises create new jobs and new opportunities while meeting a need. The principle of one member, one vote assures democratic control. The cost-of-service co-ops bill their members to cover the service and a share of paying off the Government loan. As the loan is paid off the member is credited with an equity in the system. When they retire the debt the members will own the system outright. All of the State's rural electric co-ops operate in areas where existing companies were unable or unwilling to provide service.

CORNFIELD DEMOCRACY

Rural electric cooperatives have been referred to as "democracy in the cornfield." That they are democratic and excellent examples of free enterprise, there is no question. The members elect their directors by popular vote, and the directors hire a manager to handle the day-to-day operation of the business. The co-op's annual meeting is the high spot of the year for members and directors, for here the members themselves elect their directors and decide important policy issues. Contrary to a popular misconception, no member is liable for the cooperative's indebtedness—his only cost is the small initial membership fee, which is refunded if he moves out of the co-op's territory.

Although more than three-fourths of all consumers on REA-financed cooperative lines are farms, membership in rural electric cooperatives is not confined to farmers. Also included are many thousands of rural nonfarm dwellings, schools, churches, stores, community buildings and other commercial enterprises. Many of these industries themselves operate on the cooperative plan.

PROFOUND CHANGES

Fifteen years of REA have made profound changes all across the country. Over and over again, rural electric cooperatives have demonstrated that farm electrification has brought about a higher real farm income and better farm living. It has stimulated private business, both locally and nationally. For example, surveys show that for every dollar invested in rural power facilities, the farmer invests an additional $4.50 in wiring, plumbing, and electrical appliances.

Not only have REA borrowers kept their promise to repay their construction loans with interest, they have actually made payments of more than $20,000,000 in advance of the due date, including $305,398 by Wisconsin borrowers.

Amounts overdue more than 30 days for the entire Nation represent less than one-twentieth of 1 percent of the total loan funds approved.

ECA IS NEXT

The successful REA pattern in rural electrification is now being applied to the rural telephone field. REA was authorized in October 1949 to make loans for the extension and improvement of rural telephone service to the widest practicable number of subscribers. The first telephone loan was approved in February 1950 to a small commercial company operating on the Alabama-Florida border. The first allocation of funds for a loan to a telephone cooperative was made by REA in April 1950 to the Emory County Farmers Union Telephone Cooperative of Orangeville, Utah.

As REA enters its sixteenth year, the job is still a sizable one. More than a million farms are still unelectrified, besides hundreds of thousands of rural dwellings, crossroads businesses, schools, churches, and other rural establishments.

Today electric lines built by REA borrowers are designed to serve entire areas, not only densely settled areas. This principle of area coverage has replaced the policy of building a line for an individual pocket or section. Area coverage assures electrification for isolated farms far removed from any established source of electric power.

Tangible results of the advantages of rural electric power have been seen on thousands of American farms. Higher income for the Alabama truck farmer—better light for the Virginia schoolboy—less drudgery for the Kentucky farm wife—these are but a few signposts of the new way of life that rural electrification has brought to the rural American scene.

Curtailment of Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial regarding the curtailment in postal service from the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POSTAL CUTS

It certainly may be questioned whether the drastic cuts announced in the United States postal service represent a sincere concern for governmental economy or are politically and somewhat ingeniously designed to make such economy so painful and inconvenient for the general public that it will stop its rising clamor of demands for Uncle Sam to stop spending.

No taxpaying American, perhaps, should look an economy gift horse too closely in the face, but this abrupt and sudden decision for economy where the public is certain to feel some immediately bad effects must cause a more than casual look. The timing of these drastic postal service economies has come just when considerable public support had been won to the cause of economy in Government, both by the publicizing of the Hoover report and by the continued attacks of those who fear the result of continued Federal deficit financing. In effect, the Post Office is saying, "So you wanted some economy, well here it is." And the results, unfortunately, may be enough to make many people cry "Uncle" in their economy demands—something the administration would very much like to see happen before the congressional elections.

The public will feel this economy drive in the curtailment of mail deliveries not alone in purely residential districts, but in areas where business and residential districts are mixed. It will feel the results in shortened hours at the post-office windows, and in earlier pickups from street mail boxes at night. People will find important mail delayed, and the post office will blame the public for demanding lower taxes and budget reductions in Washington.

Real economy, gained through efficiency of operation, cannot be scorned by Americans who want just that in all their governmental departments. The type of economy that Postmaster General Donaldson has imposed can be questioned, for he is taking away from the public services which it pays well for in both direct revenues to the Post Office Department and in taxes. His cuts have gone beyond those recommended recently by the

House Appropriations Committee which, in fact, did reduce the over-all Post Office budget to $2,207,500,000 from the $2,235,607,000 requested by Donaldson. Mr. Donaldson's reaction to this is seen in the announced postal cuts.

Mr. Donaldson's concern for economy would have been more impressive and would have seemed more sincere if he had only called for a revamping of his whole department along more economical lines. The Department's bookkeeping and cost accounting system is the same one that was established in 1836, and there has been no basis of establishing costs anyway. The services to other Government departments contribute greatly to its deficit. In a single year, for instance, the Post Office handled 2,000,000,000 piece of mail free for the Government, including some 18,000,000 pieces of registered mail. It has been handling free of charge savings bond sales, documentary stamps, civil-service exam notices and migratory bird stamps.

The public feels that good postal service is a thing to which it is entitled; postal service is not supposed to support itself at all, but to be a public service. It expects efficient operation, and applauds any genuine efforts to achieve that. Mr. Donaldson cannot be applauded on that score yet.

Why Mr. Browder as Witness?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Why Mr. Browder as Witness?" which appeared recently in the Washington (Pa.) Observer.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY MR. BROWDER AS WITNESS?

Earl Browder, former boss Communist in America, has been paraded before a committee of the United States Senate as a witness in the continuing inquiry growing out of the charges made by Senator MCCARTHY, of Wisconsin.

Why was Browder paraded before the Senators and given headlines in the American newspapers as a character witness for the defendant?

The guilt or innocence of Dr. Lattimore has not been established.

But the finger was placed on him by Louis F. Budenz, reformed Communist.

Browder took the stand yesterday and under oath testified that Budenz had given false testimony with regard to Dr. Lattimore. Budenz, who became chief editor of the Daily Worker, Communist-journal, repented and returned to the Roman Catholic Church and is now a professor at Fordham University.

Their testimony is conflicting.

What the public must do is to make its choice.

No one wants Dr. Lattimore to be convicted unless he is guilty.

If he is guilty he should be convicted for he is an enemy of our country.

But Browder did not want to testify. The Government had to make arrangements to get him to Washington.

As Communist, his testimony was just what could have been expected. He is sworn to allegiance to Moscow, even to the extent of deliberately lying. Communists are taught to lie deliberately to further their own cause.

The manner of conducting the case is peculiar.

Certainly there are records which contain facts on the case which could be divulged.

Parading of witnesses of the character of Browder only serves to gain publicity, to spread propaganda, for the cause of communism.

Curtailment of Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article regarding the curtailment in postal service by Robert M. Grannis, published in the Brooklyn Eagle for April 20, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONE MAN SAYS

(By Robert M. Grannis)

SLASH IN MAIL SERVICE IS POLITICAL FRAUD, NOT A STEP TOWARD MUCH-NEEDED ECONOMY

For a number of years now I have expressed myself about the need for economy in Federal Government operations and I suppose I am expected to hail with deep satisfaction the plan to save a few hundred million by cutting mail deliveries in the Nation to one per day. I am about as enthusiastic as I would be if the city fathers decided that 1 day a week there would be no policemen and that because of the condition of the fiscal affairs a payless holiday for cops was indicated.

Of course, such a maneuver as the mail thing is not without its shrewd implications. The net effect is to make the taxpayer a sucker for the spend-and-tax boys by attempting to convince him that economy is an evil word. Sure, we'll save you some money but, boy, oh boy, how it is going to hurt. I am just not impressed and I wish the taxpayers generally would get up on their hind legs and label the thing as a political fraud.

Some day a decision will have to be made about our postal service. It is either a business or a public service. And there are a lot of public services that just can't pay their own way if the best interests of the people are to be considered. Neither the fire department nor the police department can show a profit, nor do they have any means of breaking even on the year's operations.

The postal setup is one of the most vital services we have. If it broke down the public would be paralyzed. The people in it, particularly the little "guys" who "tote" their 35-pound loads, do a magnificent job and it is no idle boast to repeat the weather never stops them. Furthermore, they are terrifically underpaid.

If the Government is so all-fired economy-conscious so far as the Post Office Department is concerned, what's the matter with having realistic rates for air mail? Air mail is a luxury item in a sense and if a man wants extra-fast service, he ought to be willing to pay for it.

Reversion to one mail delivery a day is a backward step that is not reflected in any other branch of Government. It is a "punch in the eye" for the suffering taxpayer and, worst of all, it won't save him a dime in taxes nor a penny.

Millions on millions are poured into every cause and plan under the sun and the taxpayer must be content with the pious statement of the planners that this money is spent for his own good. Sometimes he knows otherwise, but the dollar bills still pour out in an endless stream.

In the case of the Post Office the taxpayer knows he is on the receiving end of a great and general good and that there is little to complain about. Firing a few letter carriers or knocking off substitutes won't balance the budget, and the theory that every little bit helps just doesn't apply. Some services must be kept at their peak. The taxpayers have it coming to them.

There are plenty of ways to save money in Government and if anybody ought to get hurt when we finally become economy-conscious—no matter how belatedly—it ought to be in terms of politicians getting fat salaries when their mental level and ability rate them nothing more than second-rate jobs in the business world.

As I said before, the proposed cut in postal service smells bad and we shouldn't stand for it.

Curtailment of Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two articles regarding the curtailment in postal service, from the Amarillo Globe, of Amarillo, Tex.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAIL CARRIER LOADS REACH 300 POUNDS

Things piled up on Amarillo letter carriers this morning, to result in mail loads that ran up to 300 pounds per carrier.

Of course, the carrier load has been heavier since the reduction of service to one delivery per day, as ordered by the Postmaster General in a recent economy move to reduce the post-office deficit.

Then Thursday is normally one of the heaviest days of the week, as weekly magazines and other weekly publications are added to the normal mail.

On top of all that the terrific volume of monthly magazines piles into the post office during the last few days of the month.

The service reduction order resulted in release of more than a dozen substitute carriers from the Amarillo Post Office. Reorganization of routes, on a permanent, one-trip basis, will not be completed for several weeks.

SIXTEEN POSTAL MEN DROPPED FROM PAYROLL

Sixteen highly regarded Amarillo post-office employees have been cut off in compliance with the postal-service economy order, and their boss Wednesday appealed to employers to help the men find new jobs.

Mel Benesch, city delivery superintendent, said 16 of my very best men had to be

dropped from the payroll and must have new jobs.

Benesch said the men had been acquired as extra carriers over a period of 3 years and are proven.

"Most of them are young married men who have bought homes. They passed up better-paying jobs, expecting to make a career of the postal service. Now they have to be cut off, overnight, and it tears my heart out to do it. I want to help anyway I can to see that they get new jobs."

The carrier superintendent said the carrier group was culled long ago and all of the 16 are dependable, loyal, hard-working, trustworthy, intelligent employees.

"Anybody wanting excellent help can call on me; I can point out his man," Benesch said.

Each of the men forced out of the post office by the order saying post-office budget for Amarillo must be reduced $75,000 this year had passed his examination for classification as a regular employee and would have been so appointed when vacancies appeared.

Benesch said jobs are not as easy to find in Amarillo as they were a short time ago and appealed to employers to help him in placing the workers. A few, he said, now have jobs in sight.

The economy program reduced deliveries to residences to one a day and cut business deliveries to two a day. The action was ordered by the Postmaster General and went into effect in Amarillo Tuesday.

Curtailment of Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Columbus Evening Dispatch, of Columbus, Ohio, of April 20, 1950, regarding the curtailment in the postal service.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE POSTAL SERVICE SLASH

There are two possible motives behind the sudden and drastic slash in the postal service ordered by United States Postmaster General Donaldson.

One may be a sincere desire to carry into effect some of the economy recommendations of the Hoover Commission and thus reduce the annual deficit for the Post Office Department.

The second is still another application of the old squeeze play on the public, in which the sequence goes something like this: (1) An economy drive is announced and dramatized by ostentatious firing of personnel and slowdown in operations. (2) The public, displeased by the slower and less efficient service, vigorously objects. (3) Congress reacts to this prod with larger appropriations. (4) Washington piously announces that when it tries to cut Federal spending, the public won't stand for it, hence the public wants more spending and not economy.

The second hypothesis seems more plausible than the first. Why?

Because the action just announced goes beyond the recommendations of the Hoover Commission in some respects and ignores its findings in others.

The Hoover Commission, it is true, proposes reductions in personnel, in many branches of the Federal Government. But what it suggests is the elimination of wasteful, unnecessary, political, overlapping jobs that are not needed to maintain the essential services of government. Anybody who knows anything about the Federal bureaucracy knows that there are multiplied thousands of such jobs in existence.

The slash which has been ordered does affect an essential service of government and cannot help but make it markedly slower and less efficient—and that service, it should be noted, already has deteriorated noticeably under the Truman administration and its predecessor.

The Post Office Department ignores the part of the Hoover report which suggests that facilities, equipment, and procedure could be modernized and further mechanized, thus bringing its operations more nearly on a par with those of private business in this respect.

However, whatever the motive behind the order from Washington, the end-result is that the public, although it is paying the highest postal rates in history in addition to the heaviest peacetime tax burden any nation ever shouldered, is going to receive still more inferior postal service, at least for the time being.

One mail delivery a day will put residential first-class mail service back into the 1890's. Delivery service of the secondary mail categories, already very laggard, promises to be worse.

For example, Postmaster Rowe, commenting on the local situation, points out that magazines now received at the local post office on Thursday and processed for delivery on Friday will probably not be delivered until the following Monday or Tuesday. Directory service will be discontinued, which means that many letters with slight errors in address will never be delivered.

This is the sort of postal service which is found in the more backward European countries. Certainly it would be a long step backward for the United States.

And, incidentally, since the Post Office Department deficit is one of the reasons cited for the sudden "economy wave" in postal services, how about the vastly larger sums being spent to speed deliveries of Marshall plan commodities overseas? Uncle Sam is showering largesse all over the globe, a process for which the American taxpayer is paying an annual bill which makes the Post Office Department deficit look like small change.

If the United States Government can afford to subsidize foreign governments in Europe and Asia to the tune of billions, it certainly should be able to afford a few millions a year to give its own citizens better mail service than they had when the Spanish-American War was big news.

New York State Assembly Protests Unfairness of Federal Aid Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, May 6, 1950

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a memorializing resolution adopted by the New York State Assembly, relating to Federal aid to the various States, including New York. This resolution points out that in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, New York paid $401,906,789, or 18.35 percent of the total cost of the Federal-aid programs and received back only $131,158,580, or 5.98 percent of the total. Thus, the citizens of the State of New York suffered a net loss of over $270,000,000.

Furthermore, the resolution shows that the farmers of the State of New York have been discriminated against since they received only 2 percent of the total Government payments to farmers, although the taxpayers of the State pay nearly a fifth of all Federal taxes, and thus will have to bear this disproportionate percentage of the losses of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

These Federal-aid programs and their administration have been rankly unjust. Fifteen States pay in more money than they receive, and thus support the programs for the other 33 States. The Representatives of these contributing States in Congress would do well to bear these facts in mind as they vote on the appropriation bill now before us which would increase the national deficit by nearly $6,000,000,000.

It is the taxpayers of these few States who will bear the overwhelming burden of paying the piper for the expenditures which we are approving by this legislation.

I have consistently opposed efforts to increase the total figures in this appropriation bill and have voted for reductions, not only because of the precarious state of our Federal finances, but also because of the prejudicial treatment received by New York, and these other 14 States, in the various Federal-aid programs.

The matter referred to follows:

Concurrent Resolution 120

Concurrent resolution of the senate and assembly memorializing the President and Congress to revise present Federal-aid program to eliminate inequities

Whereas Federal aid to State governments, to local governments, and to individuals (excluding payments to veterans) amounted to $2,190,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949; and

Whereas such aid will exceed $3,000,000,000 for the present fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and will approach $4,000,000,000 for the fiscal year ending 1951; and

Whereas pending legislation, if adopted, for public-health aid and Federal aid to education will increase Federal grants-in-aid by more than $500,000,000 per year; and

Whereas the present session of Congress will be requested to grant an additional $2,000,000,000 in borrowing authority for the United States Department of Agriculture and the Commodity Credit Corporation, according to the President's budget, for the agricultural price-support program; and

Whereas the citizens of the State of New York, in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, paid $401,906,789, or 18.35 percent of the total cost of Federal-aid programs, and received back only $131,158,580, or 5.98 percent of such total, making a net loss of $270,748,209 to the citizens of the State (as shown in attached schedule A), i. e., the citizens of the State received back less than $1 for every $3 paid; and

Whereas the reserve for losses in the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the present fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, is $315,308,500 and the net loss for the first 4 months of the current fiscal year from July 1 to October 31 amounts to $129,369,849; and

Whereas many commodities held by the Commodity Credit Corporation are and will be given away and a large percentage of the inventory of the Commodity Credit Corporation has deteriorated and has become unusable; and

Whereas these commodities are still being carried on the financial statements of the Commodity Credit Corporation at values wholly disproportionate to the present market sale price; and

Whereas prudent business accounting methods would indicate a loss of $800,000,000 rather than the $315,000,000 set up as a reserve for losses in the financial statement of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and that adequate recognition of losses would demonstrate that the Commodity Credit Corporation is now insolvent; and

Whereas the taxpayers of the State of New York will be called upon to bear a relatively large percentage of this loss, namely, 18.35 percent; and

Whereas the farmers of the State of New York have been grossly discriminated against and the citizens have received practically no benefits from the operations of the Department of Agriculture and the Commodity Credit Corporation, having received only 2 percent of Government payments to farmers and only one-third of 1 percent of price-support benefits (as shown by the following table); and

Federal aid to farmers in New York State and total United States

	New York State	Total	United States percentage
Government payments to farmers 1948 [1] (calendar year)	$5,159,000	$256,505,000	2.0
Agricultural price support:			
Loans 1948 crops [2]	6,533,894	2,197,419,289	.3
Loans 1949 crops [2]	3,600,876	819,543,497	.4
Federal tax payments 1949 (fiscal year)	7,427,220,562	40,463,125,018	18.35

[1] U. S. Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Statistics, 1949.
[2] Commodity Credit Corporation, Report of Financial Condition and Operations as of Oct. 31, 1949.

Whereas the Congressional Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments has recommended during the first session of the Eighty-first Congress that a permanent national bipartisan Commission on Intergovernmental Relations be established for the purpose of appraising, clarifying, and systematizing Federal grants-in-aid; and

Whereas the glaring discriminations in benefits received by New York State under the various Federal-aid programs has resulted in a tremendous financial drain upon our citizens: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (if the senate concur), That the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States be and they are hereby respectfully memorialized to revise the present Federal-aid program so as to remove its present inequitable and injurious effect on the people of the State of New York; and be it further

Resolved (if the senate concur), That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, to each Member of Congress duly elected from the State of New York, and to each Member of Congress of those States which are similarly discriminated against, and that these Members of Congress be urged to devote themselves to the task of accomplishing the purpose of this resolution.

By order of the assembly,

ANSLEY B. BORKOWSKI,
Clerk.

In senate, March 22, 1950. Concurred in without amendment.

By order of the senate:

WILLIAM S. KING,
Secretary.

SCHEDULE A

Federal aid—payments and receipts by States, 1949 (for fiscal year ending June 30, 1949)

State and Territories	(1) Population July 1, 1949	(2) Total internal revenue collections 1949	(3) State percentage of total internal revenue collections	(4) Federal aid payments within States	(5) State contribution to Federal-aid program	(6) Net gain or loss on Federal-aid program	(7) State percentage of receipts of Federal aid
Alabama	2,920,000	$259,491,422	0.64	$42,993,959	$14,017,000	+$33,732,648	1.96
Arizona	745,000	82,128,231	.20	17,277,014	4,380,000	+12,897,014	.78
Arkansas	1,964,000	115,873,198	.29	33,305,202	6,352,000	+26,953,202	1.52
California	10,665,000	2,955,909,545	7.30	163,678,730	159,887,000	+3,791,730	7.47
Colorado	1,215,000	276,982,454	.68	40,650,130	14,894,000	+25,756,130	1.85
Connecticut	2,019,000	642,578,113	1.59	17,627,121	34,825,000	−17,197,879	.80
Delaware	311,000	306,168,435	.76	4,755,689	16,646,000	−11,890,311	.21
District of Columbia	870,000			8,894,614			
Florida	2,494,000	342,558,244	.85	45,837,280	18,617,000	+27,220,280	2.09
Georgia	3,196,000	403,532,125	.98	55,028,985	21,464,000	+33,564,985	2.51
Idaho	592,000	76,405,915	.19	17,529,460	4,161,000	+13,368,460	.80
Illinois	8,449,000	3,569,842,223	8.82	104,275,764	193,178,000	−88,902,236	4.76
Indiana	3,994,000	950,548,022	2.35	40,131,202	51,470,000	−11,338,798	1.83
Iowa	2,643,000	407,947,504	1.01	41,333,039	22,121,000	+19,212,039	1.88
Kansas	1,947,000	401,867,955	.99	35,537,500	21,683,000	+13,854,500	1.61
Kentucky	2,983,000	812,289,892	2.01	38,002,152	44,024,000	−6,021,848	1.73
Louisiana	2,630,000	357,363,494	.88	72,444,519	19,274,000	+53,170,519	3.37
Maine	909,000	117,543,220	.29	13,218,300	6,352,000	+6,866,300	.63
Maryland	2,175,000	1,070,387,105	2.64	20,685,626	57,822,000	−37,136,374	.94
Massachusetts	4,713,000	1,232,002,754	3.04	62,070,134	66,583,000	−4,512,866	2.83
Michigan	6,352,000	2,564,512,168	6.34	83,418,398	138,860,000	−55,441,602	3.80
Minnesota	2,977,000	669,015,500	1.65	50,796,309	36,139,000	+14,657,309	2.32
Mississippi	2,130,000	100,752,288	.25	36,430,401	5,476,000	+30,954,401	1.68
Missouri	3,935,000	1,095,204,113	2.71	73,688,933	59,355,000	+14,033,933	3.36
Montana	521,000	78,913,772	.19	20,320,741	4,161,000	+16,159,741	.92
Nebraska	1,285,000	276,248,616	.68	24,298,794	14,894,000	+9,404,794	1.14
Nevada	174,000	38,123,337	.09	8,559,465	1,971,000	+6,588,465	.39
New Hampshire	544,000	71,510,279	.18	8,195,499	3,942,000	+4,253,499	.37
New Jersey	4,873,000	1,151,060,098	2.84	37,844,986	62,202,000	−24,357,014	1.72
New Mexico	589,000	55,378,586	.14	17,183,810	3,066,000	+14,117,810	.78
New York	14,392,000	7,427,220,562	18.35	131,158,580	401,907,000	−270,748,420	5.98
North Carolina	3,864,000	1,166,669,017	2.88	47,115,811	63,079,000	−15,963,189	2.10
North Dakota	605,000	61,694,117	.15	17,266,091	3,285,000	+13,981,091	.78
Ohio	7,989,000	2,626,292,210	6.49	85,959,032	142,146,000	−56,186,968	3.92
Oklahoma	2,302,000	418,750,654	1.03	67,685,190	22,559,000	+45,126,190	3.09
Oregon	1,736,000	298,818,895	.74	33,041,387	16,208,000	+16,833,387	1.50
Pennsylvania	10,633,000	3,213,432,048	7.94	105,334,295	176,094,000	−70,759,705	4.80
Rhode Island	743,000	214,835,204	.53	9,965,631	11,608,000	−1,642,369	.45
South Carolina	2,001,000	205,014,397	.51	30,088,025	11,170,000	+19,713,025	1.41
South Dakota	649,000	64,147,537	.16	18,038,278	3,504,000	+14,534,278	.82
Tennessee	3,234,000	333,226,451	.82	51,903,861	17,960,000	+33,943,861	2.37
Texas	7,532,000	1,381,165,565	3.41	137,890,885	74,687,000	+63,203,885	6.29
Utah	682,000	90,735,818	.22	16,008,196	4,818,000	+11,190,196	.73
Vermont	369,000	40,727,407	.10	7,921,020	2,190,000	+5,731,020	.36
Virginia	3,102,000	770,285,774	1.90	26,444,407	41,614,000	−15,169,593	1.20
Washington	2,582,000	507,030,096	1.25	49,558,069	27,378,000	+22,180,069	2.26
West Virginia	1,941,000	242,680,517	.60	22,074,132	13,141,000	+8,933,132	1.00
Wisconsin	3,355,000	788,235,320	1.95	46,298,155	42,709,000	+3,589,155	2.11
Wyoming	284,000	38,841,551	.10	15,020,781	2,190,000	+12,830,781	.68
Alaska		18,226,201	.04	2,515,891	876,000	+1,639,891	.11
Hawaii		91,203,211	.22	17,833,703	4,818,000	+13,015,703	.81
Puerto Rico		2,259,778	.01	25,458,286	219,000	+25,239,286	1.16
Other				1,280,946			
Total		40,463,125,018		2,190,227,734			

Sources:
Column 1: U. S. Bureau of the Census, "Current Population Reports," Nov. 4, 1949.
Column 2: Compilation of tax-collection data for annual report of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, fiscal year ending June 30, 1949.
Column 4.: From compilation of Federal Aid statistics for annual report of the Secretary of the Treasury for fiscal year ending June 30, 1949—includes Federal-aid payments to States and local units; includes Federal-aid payments to individuals other than grants and loans; excludes payments to individuals by Veterans' Administration.
Column 5: Percentages in column 3 applied to total of column 4.

The United States and the World, 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 9, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include six articles which were recently written and published in the Minneapolis Star by its president, Mr. John Cowles, on his return from a 2-month trip through Europe and the Middle East. The articles are short but comprehensive and well worth reading. They reveal a remarkable grasp of the main issues and problems in the various areas, and a clear statement of the essential principles necessary for their solution. Especially valuable are the fourth and fifth articles dealing with Asia and Israel, respectively, because they usually are given so much less attention than western Europe.

THE COLD WAR HAS MANY FACES—IT'S GOING TO BE LONG, BUT IT NEEDN'T GET HOT

(By John Cowles)

Before we, as a nation, can make sound decisions on any of the problems confronting us, we must get two facts, disagreeable as they are, etched on our minds.

First of all, we are actually in a war. It's a different kind of a war from any we have ever been in before. It's a halfway war—a cold war—but, nevertheless, a war. Many of us can't or won't believe it.

Second, we of the present generation will probably never again be able to relax in what we used to call normalcy—to lead our lives under conditions of genuine peace. The threat of Russian barbarism sweeping over the free world will cast its ominous shadow over us for many, many years. To believe that there is any quick and easy solution to the fundamental conflict between the east and west is wishful, adolescent thinking.

This does not mean that hot war with Russia is inevitable.

While hot war might flare up at any time, I think the odds are overwhelmingly against its happening in at least the next 2 or 3 years. If we act resolutely and intelligently in the halfway cold war, we can, in all probability, permanently avert a hot war and continue to live in freedom and expanding prosperity. If so, the Communist menace eventually will evaporate.

But we must realize that this halfway war is serious business. The Russians are playing for keeps. If we should lose this peculiar thing called a cold war, the ultimate consequences would be the same as losing a hot war. Probably in its final stages, if we were losing it, it would become a hot war.

In any event, if we lost it, we would end up by losing everything—all our liberties, certainly, and our lives, except for those who survived as slaves of the Communist barbarians.

Threatening as the menace of the spread of Russian communism may be, however, we must not let fear of it stampede us into hysterical actions. We must do nothing to weaken our free institutions or our productivity, for our hope for survival depends upon them.

The cold war has many faces. We must learn to recognize them all. One aspect, but only one, is that of the physical containment of Russia. That means providing military and economic support to weak nations like Greece and Turkey, which are adjacent to Russia or her satellites. We can make it difficult—almost impossible without hot war—for Russia to take them over and then drop the iron curtain, the Soviets' mid-twentieth-century guillotine.

If we hope to save much of southeast Asia from Russia, as we have, at least to date, saved Greece and Turkey, we have no time to lose.

Some qualified observers think Indochina is already all but lost. If it goes, the holding of Siam would be extremely difficult. The situation in Burma, Malaya, and Indonesia is precarious.

No one can deny either the strategic or economic importance of southeast Asia. Its prewar trade with Marshall-plan countries alone exceeded a billion and a half dollars a year.

If trade with southeast Asia is cut off, the difficulties of England's economic recovery are further intensified. If southeast Asia should fall under the Kremlin's control, the likelihood of being able to hold India, Pakistan, and the Middle East for the free world would be greatly reduced.

Throughout history nations have maintained outposts at strategic points against barbarian threats. Unless we give support promptly to southeast Asia, we will in all probability lose a highly important battle in the cold war.

The cost, for economic aid and for weapons, for both south and east Asia has been estimated at three or four hundred million dollars a year. When one is fighting a war—even a half-way cold war to avert a hot war—dollar costs of such dimensions should be relatively unimportant, considering the alternative.

Much more than that amount, however, could be saved without serious risk and possibly with affirmative benefit through trimming our proposed ECA-Marshall plan appropriations for western Europe for the coming year.

Time is running out in southeast Asia. Instead of doing nothing, or doing too little too late, the need is for affirmative action there now.

THE MARSHALL PLAN DID A BIG JOB, BUT SOME WONDER IF CUSHION SHOULDN'T NOW BE REDUCED

(By John Cowles)

Our Marshall plan-ECA aid has been enormously successful in western Europe. It has restored transportation and revived production. It has helped rebuild the morale of the people and has given them confidence that Communist control of the entire continent is not inevitable. The Communist tide has been receding for 2 years in Europe while it has been rising in Asia. The Marshall plan may well prove to have been the decisive factor in permanently stopping Russian expansion into western Europe.

Paul Hoffman has done an excellnet job as head of ECA. Despite his great ability and extraordinary powers of persuasion, however, it is doubtful that the economic integration of western Europe is any nearer than it was 2 years ago.

Many qualified observers feel, moreover, that the Marshall plan has already fulfilled—insofar as there is any real chance of its fulfilling them—the functions for which it was originally designed.

They believe that some of the recipient nations won't begin, so long as American dollar subsidies continue plentiful, to take the hard political and economic steps that are imperatively necessary for their long-run solvency.

Every European government naturally likes to receive as many American gift dollars as possible. It postpones the necessity for dealing with thorny issues. The dollar shortage is a highly convenient phrase that masks totally different things in the various countries.

Britain's basic problem is that the Government is spending more for welfare services—socialized medicine, food subsidies, etc.—than the country can currently afford. Not enough British manufactured goods are being sold abroad to give England the foreign exchange it needs to pay for its dollar imports.

Stafford Cripps has done a good job, within the rigid limitations set by his Socialist convictions, in handling Britain's finances. Despite the criticism which many leveled at him over devaluation, that policy was apparently justified. British gold and foreign currency reserves have increased in the last 6 months, and exports to hard-currency areas have expanded.

British taxes are so high, however, that incentives for employees to work overtime or for investors to risk their savings in new business ventures are stifled.

Almost all of the industries which have been nationalized (that is, taken over by the government) are losing large and steadily increasing amounts of money. Living costs, despite controls, are slowly rising. The unions, which had previously accepted a policy of no wage increases, are becoming increasingly restless.

The majority of the British people like their governmentally provided welfare services, whether or not the country can afford them. Both political parties recognize this fact, and each claims credit for having originated them.

The Conservatives claim that they would administer the welfare services more efficiently and economically than the present Labor government, and would nationalize no additional industries. That is largely the extent of the difference between the two parties.

Except for Winston Churchill, most of the leaders of the Conservative Party are happy, I suspect, with the outcome of the recent election. They want the Labor Party, not themselves, to be in power when within the next year or so it becomes clearly imperative for the government to adopt some unpopular policies that are sure to alienate large segments of the population. Thereafter the Conservatives hope to regain power.

For Churchill, however, the sands are running out. If he is to be Prime Minister again, the governmental overturn cannot be long delayed.

No matter how irritated we Americans may become over specific aspects of Britain's foreign or domestic policies, we should never forget that England and its commonwealth are incomparably our strongest ally.

The United Kingdom is currently spending a slightly higher proportion of its national income on direct military preparations than we are. Continued partnership with the United Kingdom is essential if the free world is to restrain Russian aggression.

In France the fundamental problems are political, social, and psychological, rather than economic. France is basically a rich country. But its political setup encourages weak governments, splinter parties, selfish factionalism.

Income tax evasion, for example, is as widespread and socially accepted today in France as was violation of the prohibition law in the United States 20 years ago. Relatively few wealthy Frenchmen have any of that sense of obligation to their fellow men that is taken for granted in America.

Many of the French labor unions are controlled by Communists who are almost open Russian agents. Membership in the Red-run unions has, however, been steadily declining during the past 2 years.

Whether France would fight unitedly against Russia if a hot war should come is doubtful.

American observers say that Norway would fight to the end if Russia tried to invade it. Apparently the Danes, geographically exposed and numerically weak as they are, would also resist within the limits of their power. It is hoped by the United States

and England that a similar spirit will develop in France, now that modern American military equipment is being supplied her.

Perhaps if western Europe's defense forces are unified under an American commander, and the French become convinced that the United States and its allies have the military power to hold western Europe, the French may become more resolute.

Italy's problems are quite different from those of England or France. Italy is desperately poor in natural resources. Its population, constantly growing, is greater than the country can support. Many Italians live in extreme poverty, and the level of popular education is lower than that of any other major nation.

Two million people are unemployed in Italy today, despite the fact that most employers are compelled by the trade unions to keep more people on their payrolls than they need.

Much of Italy's most productive land is owned by a few rich families, while the peasants live in squalor. The government is talking of taking over the huge estates and dividing them up into small plots on which the peasants should be able to earn a better existence. But the government has not acted with vigor.

Observers say that it is almost a miracle that the Communists did not seize control of Italy a couple of years ago. Only lavish and extremely well-publicized Marshall plan aid, plus an intensive campaign by the Vatican, prevented the Communists from winning the last election.

Until Italy faces such basic questions as population, it is difficult to see how, except for continued American financial aid, her standard of living can be kept at a high enough level so that communism will lose its allure.

WHAT'LL WE DO WITH GERMANY? SHE AND BRITAIN ARE VITAL TO ANY EUROPEAN FEDERATION

(By John Cowles)

Little if any real progress has been made toward finding a safe and workable answer to the German problem, which is the vital factor in solving the dilemma of western Europe.

Perhaps the German people, after having been badly beaten in two world wars, are as fed up with the idea of military conquest as the once-belligerent French were after Napoleon's final defeats. But that is a chance the other western powers naturally fear to risk.

No one makes any great claims for the success of our attempts to educate the Germans on the virtues of democracy. The possibility that some new demagogic fuehrer will arise in Germany cannot be dismissed.

The Russians are building a German Communist army in the Soviet zone of Germany. To date the western allies have not permitted the Germans in their areas to possess more than police forces.

If the foreign powers should withdraw their occupation troops, presumably the superior power of the Communists would result in their getting control of all Germany regardless of the wishes of the majority of the German people.

There seems no present alternative but for the United States, England and France to plan to keep substantial military occupation forces in Germany for many years ahead.

Some people bitterly oppose letting the Germans in the western zones develop any appreciable military strength, for fear they might join with the Russians in war against the west. Even though most of the western Germans may detest the Russians, they might conceivably ally themselves with the Kremlin on the theory that after defeating the west they could somehow manage to rule the combined Russian-German empire. Undoubtedly most Germans have a deep desire to see the partition ended and their fatherland reunited.

In addition, desperate people do desperate things.

Perhaps before long a military federation including the United States, Britain and western Europe will be set up. If so, an American general would probably have to be in command, as the friction between Britain's Marshal Montgomery and the French general staff is bitter.

In such an international army, possibly the Germans of the allied occupation areas could safely be permitted to have substantial units.

Despite Paul Hoffman's vigorous pressure and the responding lip-service acquiescence of the nations receiving Marshall plan aid, nothing is actually being done to establish a real economic union of western European nations.

Americans should not be misled by an occasional speech to the contrary by some foreign dignitary. In most cases these stem from expediency. Even the relatively simple Benelux (Belgium-Netherlands-Luxemburg) economic pact has not been seriously implemented.

The creation of a western European economic federation without including Germany would be futile. If Germany felt that she were to be permanently cut off from trade with France, Belgium, Holland, and Scandinavia, the appeal of embracing Russia and acquiring markets for German manufactured goods all the way east to China would be irresistible.

The formation of a western European federation that included Germany but did not include England would be dangerous. In all probability Germany would rapidly assume a dominating position in it, for Germany is still potentially by far the strongest and most productive nation in western Europe.

The present British Labor Government has not the slightest desire to join in any European economic federation. Socialism in England is nationalistic. In an economic sense it is isolationist.

Britain is determined to follow a policy of trying to maintain full employment in the United Kingdom by whatever national controls may be necessary, regardless of economic fluctuations abroad. She has no intention of agreeing to expose herself to exports from the Continent if they should conflict with what she regards as her internal best interests.

Britain has no intention of restoring convertibility of sterling into other currencies to a point where her present control over foreign trade would be weakened. She hopes to tie the Commonwealth closer to her, and is looking overseas, economically, rather than to western Europe.

England will cooperate wholeheartedly both politically and militarily with the United States and the free nations of western Europe against the Russian threat. But she does not intend, if she can help it, to let outside nations force her to modify her economic policies.

Therefore, it is more than doubtful, for the time being at least, that Britain will enter any really meaningful western European economic federation.

Clarence Streit's proposal for Atlantic Union—the creation of a superstate consisting of the United States, Britain and her Commonwealth, and some or all of the democracies of western Europe which are now receiving military equipment from the United States—has to date attracted little attention in England. I raised the question with various informed people; no one mentioned it first to me.

The majority of them indicated that that was the broad direction in which they hoped Anglo-American relations would ultimately develop. The majority likewise expressed the view that the Streit plan for transferring all sovereignty to a superstate was too sweeping, and that advocates of an Atlantic Union grossly underestimate the staggering practical difficulties that would be involved.

Some called it "a noble ideal." Others suggested that it was the logical step toward that eventual world government in which many Americans believe. But no one displayed any belief that it might come to pass in the foreseeable future.

WE MUST HELP ASIA WIN FREEDOM—COMMUNISTS CAPITALIZE ON EFFORTS TO CURB NATIVE INDEPENDENCE

(By John Cowles)

One highly important aspect of our cold war with Russia is that the Communists know how to exploit legitimate, popular aspirations throughout the world and pervert them to the Kremlin's ends.

Until we understand what is happening, and why and how, we will continue to lose cold-war battles.

Everywhere on the globe peoples who have long been subject to others are beginning to demand their freedom, are becoming increasingly determined to rule themselves, even though it may mean misgovernment. Granted that they are politically immature, not yet ripe for self-government, with the great majority illiterate, the people in the backward areas are, nevertheless, resolving to end colonialism.

The United States must show that we not only sympathize with those aspirations but will try to help bring them to successful fruition.

What we did in educating the Filipinos for self-government and then turning them free under our protection is an excellent example to be followed elsewhere. Otherwise many of these peoples, in their frustration, ignorance, and despair, will turn to Communist Russia for aid.

We must make it clear that the United States is not simply the tail to the French kite in Indochina, nor to the British or French or other European nations in either Asia or Africa.

We are providing arms and support to the French in their current efforts to hold Indochina with a quasi-puppet emperor, Bao Dai. The majority of the people of Indochina are hostile to him because his regime is not completely independent of France. They suspect that the French may subsequently try to restore some of those controls that France, in its desperate efforts to avoid utter defeat in the Indochinese war, has recently grudgingly renounced.

Most of the people of Indochina hate the French, who have been unenlightened or worse in their colonial administration. A Moscow trained Communist, Ho Chi Minh, has consequently been able to rally the majority of the Indochinese—including those who are otherwise anti-Communist—to his side because he represents his movement as a war for freedom.

France has a substantial portion of its total military forces, some 130,000 veteran troops, in Indochina fighting Ho in a bloody and so far unsuccessful war. The United States is supplying military equipment to the French, and is thus becoming identified with imperialism in the minds of the Asiatics.

A solution in Indochina will require statesmanship of the highest order. If we are going to save Southeast Asia for the free world and prevent it passing to Moscow's control, the United States must make it crystal clear that we genuinely believe in independence and self-government for the Asiatics.

One great difficulty, however, is that, if we privately told the French that they must give Indochina its complete freedom, there would

be no incentive for the French Army to continue fighting. If the French forces withdrew, Emperor Bao Dai's regime would collapse and Ho's Communist troops would seize control, even though the bulk of the people might dislike communism.

It is even possible that the French Government will privately serve notice on us that they will not continue defending Southeast Asia from Communist Russian control unless we will provide much greater military aid and financial subsidization.

Some qualified observers who know Indochina well fear it is already lost for the Western World. If Indochina goes, it will be much more difficult to hold Siam, Burma, Indonesia, and Malaya.

Perhaps our best if not our only chance would be, after prior conversations with the British and French, for the United States to announce a clear-cut new affirmative policy of "Asia for the Asiatics."

The British do not want to give up their control of Malaya.

We need, however, to develop a joint American-British policy for dealing with Southeast Asia which the American people can whole-heartedly support and which will appeal to the Asiatics.

The British frequently observe that "The United States has not yet learned how to act as a creditor nation." We may have to remind them diplomatically that perhaps England hasn't yet learned how to act as a debtor nation.

If we could announce, with British and French acquiescence, a policy of helping all the southeast Asian countries establish free, independent governments, it would do more to stop the spread of communism than anything else.

Even the Indochinese people might welcome, or at least peacefully accept, the continued temporary presence of French troops in Indochina to maintain order and prevent Communist seizure of control during the transition period while the government was being strengthened.

In dealing with Asia, moreover, we must not forget that the Asiatics feel a kinship with other colored races everywhere. To win the Asiatics' confidence, as well as to do simple human justice here at home, we in the United States need to move much faster toward giving our own Negroes equal opportunities with whites for education, housing, and jobs.

Russian propaganda in Asia constantly identifies the United States with imperialism, with colonialism abroad and human exploitation at home. Our policy toward the Philippines disproves the first part of the allegation. If we progressed more rapidly toward giving our Negroes a completely fair deal here in America, we could more effectively answer the second charge.

Then we would be more persuasive in pointing out the truth, that it is Moscow which wants to dominate and rigidly control the world.

UNITED STATES LOANS CAN BUILD BETTER, NON-COMMUNIST WORLD; BUT WE MUSTN'T THINK WE CAN SHAPE ALL NATIONS IN PRECISELY OUR IMAGE

(By John Cowles)

It is naive for Americans—no matter how deeply we believe in our form of capitalism—to assume that all of the rest of the world should, or can, pattern its economic set-up on lines precisely identical with ours.

The American economic system, clearly the most productive as well as the freest in the world, is based on the foundation stones of scores of millions of educated, responsible, self-reliant individuals. Many have over the years accumulated savings or productive property. The American system has flowered so magnificently primarily because it has been fluid and classless. Penniless mechanics like Henry Ford and Walter Chrysler could aspire to, and achieve, the creation of great manufacturing enterprises.

In most areas of the globe there are a few rich people on top, almost no so-called middle class, and great masses of illiterates living in poverty. Our middle class has been and is the bulwark and source of America's greatness. Its savings have financed America's development and it has produced the men whose genius has built and managed America's industries.

In so-called backward areas, the middle class is trivial in size, virtually nonexistent. This means that in most places natural resources can be developed and industries created only by a government (state socialism) or by foreign corporations, primarily American ones.

Without spending excessive amounts of our American taxpayers' money, we can win one phase of our cold war with Russia through helping develop backward areas. That will mean higher standards of living for those peoples and greater political stability.

In Suez, Egypt, for example, a huge chemical plant is now nearing completion, the first in that part of the world. Seven and a half million dollars to cover the cost of American-made machinery and equipment was provided by our Export-Import Bank. The balance of $15,000,000 was provided by Egypt.

One highly competent American engineer, Clarke Davis, has been in entire charge of the project. He alone, aided by a small staff of educated Egyptians, has trained hundreds of natives to competency in the different building crafts. Soon the plant will be providing Egypt with huge amounts of fertilizer to improve the productivity of her soil.

Other chemical products that have never before been made in that part of the globe will also be manufactured. Eighteen hundred Egyptians working at the plant will have model housing, a model school, and a model hospital.

The project will tend to raise the standard of living in Egypt and will have some beneficial effect on the whole Near East.

There is every likelihood that the chemical plant will be highly profitable, and that the entire dollar debt to the Export-Import Bank will promptly be repaid in full.

We should not forget, moreover, that the dollars provided by the United States were all spent here, making jobs for Americans.

If we help Israel increase its agricultural and industrial output, it will strengthen the political stability as well as raise the standard of living of another important segment of the globe.

No one who has even briefly visited Israel and seen the determination and industry and devotion with which the Jews are facing the staggeringly difficult problem of developing Israel's productivity can doubt that the Israeli would make good use of such dollars as we provided.

"Inspiring" is inadequate to describe the reaction of a visitor to Israel. The single-minded resolution of the people to build a haven for themselves and their coreligionists who have been persecuted in other nations seems an irresistible force. One has a feeling in Israel not only that he is seeing history made but that he is seeing a nation lift itself by its boot straps through sheer will power.

Israel is so poor in national resources that it is difficult to see how the country can ever produce sufficient wealth to provide a decent standard of living for even its present population, let alone the additional hundreds of thousands who are clamoring for admission. But one senses that the impossible will be accomplished. The Jews have such complete faith that it will be done, and such determination and brains and industry, as to make the idea of failure seem inconceivable.

Throughout the rest of the Middle East, in Turkey, and the semifeudal Arab states, there are undoubtedly many projects which would be self-liquidating, which the United States Government and American corporations might advantageously help finance.

If the management were competent and the funds expended on a prudent basis, the debts would be repaid. Workers in America would have the additional jobs created by the manufacture of machinery to be exported; the standard of living in the foreign area would be raised; more battles in the cold war would be won by the Western World.

Substantial amounts could be beneficially invested in India, for hydroelectric plants, for irrigation projects, for industrial facilities. India's hundreds of millions of people would then be less susceptible to Communist blandishments or threats.

Twenty years ago there were no automobile roads connecting the United States with Mexico City. The thousands of American tourists who, as the roads improved, drove their cars southward profoundly affected the lives and aspirations of the Mexicans who came in contact with them. At first the Mexicans sneered at the gringoes who wanted auto cabins and shower baths. But the American tourists had dollars!

Today there are air-conditioned movie theaters in some Mexican towns that were only a collection of mud huts half a generation ago. The Mexicans' standard of living has been appreciably raised by their direct and indirect contact with American tourists, and Mexico is more stable, politically.

The Pan-American Highway, which before long will be substantially completed from the United States to the Panama Canal Zone, should be extended all the way down South America to Buenos Aires. A 200-mile gap in Darien, Panama, between the Canal and the border of Colombia has not yet been surveyed. If United States Army engineers would complete that survey as an indication of our intention to help see that the whole road is eventually finished, South American countries would undoubtedly accelerate their road construction.

Anyone who assumes that the Western Hemisphere is safe from communism, and that the Soviet has no designs on Latin America, is ill informed. That is one of the many other faces of the cold war.

Completion of the Pan-American Highway would result in scores of thousands of American tourists driving to South America. It is not unreasonable to assume that their contact with Central and South Americans might have the same beneficial effect as has already occurred in Mexico. If so, the $200,000,000 which engineers estimate that we would have to provide in American-built road machinery, etc., while the South American countries furnished the labor, might be well spent in helping win the cold war on the Latin American front.

No one should conclude, however, that what we need to do to win the cold war is simply to toss American dollars extravagantly around the world.

Such expenditures—and they need not be colossal—should come only after we have provided adequate funds for our military services, including ample amounts for scientific research and development of new weapons. And they should only come after we have drastically eliminated governmental waste and have balanced our national budget with a level of taxes that will provide, rather than inhibit, incentives for individual investments that will increase our productivity.

STRENGTH ABROAD BEGINS AT HOME—WE MUST GUARD PRINCIPLES WHICH MADE US STRONG

(By John Cowles)

Will the United States win the cold war? Will the danger that Russian Communist barbarism may sweep over the free world gradually recede and evaporate?

Vitally important as our actions abroad are, both along military lines and in strengthening the economies, widening the liberties, and helping raise the standards of living of the rest of the free world, the decisive part of the answer lies in what we do here at home, in three different areas:

First, we must keep our defense forces strong, with liberal appropriations for scientific research and development of new weapons.

This does not mean, however, that we should become a "garrison state" or spend excessive billions in overbuilding planes that would be obsolescent before they were completed and probably obsolete before a hot war, if any, ever arrived. Nor does it mean that we should weaken our present military unification law and return to the wastes and dangers of three separate, largely uncoordinated, military services.

Second, we must follow policies that will keep the United States financially solvent and will stimulate a steady expansion of our over-all productivity.

In the event of hot war, our hope of survival would largely depend on our productivity. In peace, we can only raise our own citizens' and others' standards of living by enlarging the output of goods and services.

Third, we must intensify our efforts to translate all our idealistic phrases about equality of opportunity in America into living reality.

Then, and only then, will all segments of our population have such complete devotion to our country and to the philosophical and spiritual and economic principles that have produced it as to be totally immune to the seductive half-truths in Communist propaganda. Only then will we be psychologically strong, which is as important as being militarily and economically strong.

Probably our worst domestic danger is that of excessive governmental spending. That leads to one of two results, either of which destroys the mainspring—individual incentive—which has been primarily responsible for the greatness and flowering of America.

If tax rates are too high, incentives for workers to put in longer hours, or for individuals to risk their savings in new businesses or in new machinery that increases output, are extinguished.

That danger point has been exceeded in Britain. We are perilously close to it, if not already there, here in the United States. Yet if tax revenues in periods of high-level employment and prosperity are not large enough to equal the government's spending, inflation inevitably results.

The manifestations of such inflation can be temporarily disguised through government controls—OPA, etc.—but only at the expense of suspending the freedom of individuals to make economic decisions, and even then only for relatively short periods if our system of free enterprise is not to be fundamentally altered.

Most self-styled liberals grossly underestimate the dangers in excessive government spending. They urge large appropriations as a cure for all evils. They contend that opponents of vast Government spending and of crushing taxes are reactionaries who would block all progress.

Actually, if our officials wanted to practice genuine thrift, the United States Government could, without raising taxes, eliminate entirely its huge cash deficit and still provide adequate funds not only for defense and foreign aid but for all the essential needs of the Government and for more actual social welfare than is now provided.

The Hoover commission recommendations, which are being largely distorted or ignored by the Administration, point out ways for saving several billions a year through governmental reorganization.

"Feather bedding" is also rampant throughout the Government. Senator DOUGLAS, of Illinois, an intelligent liberal, is conspicuous in being one of the few Fair Deal Senators who appears to comprehend the dangers of our present course.

We can, if we will, make our democratic system stronger and more equitable in many basic ways without spending billions doing it.

Grant, for example, that 8 or 10 Southern States which have large Negro populations are financially unable to provide the quality of public-school education that all American youth deserves.

Instead of the Federal Government's proposing an elaborate system of Federal aid to education for all 48 States, with all the dangers of thought control which that entails, why not simply appropriate one-fifth of that amount of money for those few States which because of their peculiar problem have a special need for it?

We can, if we will, greatly improve job and housing opportunities for our Negroes without huge Federal expenditures.

Why should any individual or corporation be lent or given funds by any Government agency, whether a mortgage loan on a real-estate construction project or RFC financing, if he practices discriminatory policies against any race or religion? We mustn't forget that 10 percent of our American citizens are colored, along with a billion more on other continents.

Our main task here at home is to keep our social system fluid, our economic system productive, our Government solvent.

Ten years ago a great American stumped the country repeating, "Only the productive can be strong. Only the strong can be free."

It is equally true today.

If we will just be wise enough to keep our incentive system unimpaired and, at the same time, speed our progress toward our goal of equality of opportunity for all citizens, we, and not Russia, will be the magnet that attracts the areas of the world which are now in the twilight zone.

Americans have the genius to find new ways of providing more welfare for our citizens, and within the framework of free institutions, than Russian communism can even dream of attaining.

Perhaps some day in the distant future the Russian people will come to realize it.

Refusal of Communists To Acknowledge Membership in Communist Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Why No Answer?" which appeared in the Evening News of Harrisburg, Pa., on May 1.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY NO ANSWER?

Senator TYDINGS, head of the committee boring into the MCCARTHY charges of espionage in the State Department, announces that he will ask his committee to cite for contempt two witnesses who refused to answer questions. One of the questions was, "Are you a member of the Communist Party?"

The witness grabbed the Constitution and refused to answer. Why? If there is nothing infamous, no moral turpitude, no disgrace in membership in the Reds, why hesitate to confess membership or keep mum about it?

Men who believe thoroughly in America and its system of life are not embarrassed by such a question. They answer with a roaring "No." They do not wrap themselves in the Constitution. Such persons know the Constitution was drafted for those who believe in America.

Polish Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 9, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following address which I delivered at the Commemoration of Polish Independence Day, United Polish American Organizations of Lynn, Mass., on Sunday, May 7, 1950, at St. Michael's Hall, 21 Elmwood Avenue, Lynn, Mass., under the sponsorship of Rev. John A. Dronzek, of St. Michael Archangel Church, Lynn, Mass.:

One hundred and fifty-nine years ago, the free people of Poland adopted a democratic constitution.

That was only 2 years after the adoption of the American Constitution.

Almost at the same time and with the same spirit Poland and the United States led the way in establishing representative government which should be the servant and not the master of the people.

Our two Christian nations were the real pioneers in opening up the field of opportunity to all people, and to the protection of their fundamental religious, political, and economic rights.

It is no wonder that this kinship of ideals and practices has ripened through the years and has developed such a strong affection between the Polish and American people.

It explains why so many of your ancestors came to this country where freedom would not be endangered by powerful and envious neighbors. Transplanted to the United States, your people have made good with a will. Through intermarriage, they have brought good health and religious faith and steadfast courage into the making of that fine, new race that we call American.

But you are properly concerned with the fate of your relatives in the homeland and ask yourselves what you can do to help them in this their hour of need.

The Communist tyranny under which they suffer, also reaches out to threaten us. It is a powerful, clever, and merciless foe, that will not be defeated easily. It has conquered smaller nations through fear and treachery. It can and will be overthrown in the long run by a combination of political, economic, and spiritual strength and the greatest of these is faith in God. This quality, your people have in abundance. It is the rock against which the tide of atheism will finally break and fall back in confusion upon itself.

The Communists betray their fear of religion. With their own puppets in control of the Government of Poland and with their own powerful armies on the spot to make armed revolt impossible one would think that they would feel sure of their iron grip.

But they are not.

As long as there is a strong bond between the church and the faithful, they cannot feel

secure. During the war they were obliged to make temporary religious concessions to the Russian people so that they might have something more inspiring to fight for than the poverty-stricken materialism that has been their lot under communism.

And so, even now, they are persecuting the Catholic Church in Poland because they know that the teachings of the church which proclaim the dignity of man under the fatherhood of God is the last obstacle in the way of complete Communist domination of the bodies, the minds, and the souls of men.

The church and the faithful in Poland know that they are not alone. In spite of the iron curtain, there is communication with the Vatican and the free western nations.

They know that evil always gains the first advantage but never the last.

The greatest weapon in our arsenal is truth, and our job is to find a way to get it through to the Russian people themselves. For this is the one thing that communism fears most of all.

That fear was revealed when they shot down four of our Navy planes in the Baltic. We do not yet know all the facts of that tragic incident, but one does emerge clear and revealing. The Russians are jittery when anyone comes near their false frontiers. Why? Is it because the news of this will leak through to the enslaved people and thereby expose the lies of Soviet propaganda? Those in chains will be encouraged when they learn that the United States is still in Europe and has no intention of leaving it until the Communists also withdraw to their own original frontiers.

If the Reds took a little time out to study history, they would discover that our peoples have experienced the benefits of liberty for many years. We know that it is good for individuals and for nations. We will not surrender it to the deceptive promises of the cruel tyranny that overthrew a lesser tyranny in Russia only 33 years ago.

When World War II ended, we made concessions to Communist Russia in the hope that this, in turn, would win corresponding concessions from them and enable the nations of this world to live in peace, if not in complete agreement.

That policy has failed, and in the process Russia has taken over other nations by conspiracy and by betrayal of the people concerned.

It is a poor rule, however, that does not work both ways.

Russia has made quick and fradulent gains but not without paying a heavy price.

The schemers in the Kremlin have outwitted themselves, for they have lost the confidence of the free world. This does not seem much to them at the moment. But as their internal troubles, and those with their restless satellites increase, they will have to come forward with a genuine proposal for peace which will fall on deaf ears.

And then communism will learn the hard way that it will have to give up each and every one of its ill-gotten gains and retire to its own ample territory, before it can earn the right to be considered as a trustworthy member of the family of nations.

We will not wait for the inevitable to happen.

We must hasten its coming.

So far we have been on the defensive, trying to arrange a working arrangement with Russia, but have been rebuffed on every issue.

That phase is past. We are definitely on our guard. We are helping to restore the war-shattered economies of western Europe and in that respect we have saved France and Italy from Communist-inspired revolutions from within. Now we are arming ourselves and providing military assistance for the Atlantic Pact nations.

The time is near when we must seize the initiative.

The truth must be brought home to the Russian people that we have no designs on them. We must prove to them that their worst enemy is communism itself which is breaking their backs to produce arms while withholding from them the good things of life that they might produce and enjoy in a world at peace. We must show them that they are the principal victims of Communist propaganda which keeps them in fear and ignorance of their fellow human beings in the free world.

This is the weak spot of communism and it must be our target.

How can we reach it?

We have the greatest advertising brains in the world. Let's give them the tools to work with on the biggest selling job in all history.

I suggest that the Congress appropriate enough money to set up the most powerful radio transmitters in those nations which are friendly to us and which are located near Russia. From western Germany, Italy, Greece, Turkey, Iran, the Philippines, and Japan, let these experts beam the unvarnished truth to the Russian people and all those who sweat under the Communist yoke. The undeviating truth which can be backed up by facts of freedom—this can crack the Communist structure of lies and open the way for the rout of tyranny as it is caught in the confusion of its own making.

The time for gentle diplomacy is past. We need an all-out campaign to win this struggle for the minds of men with the weapons of truth and justice and faith in ourselves and what we have accomplished.

It is amazing to me that our Government has not pushed such a policy to the fullest extent possible. To my mind, it is the one, bold, imaginative program that has any hope of defeating communism short of the dread possibility of war itself.

On this observance of Polish independence day, we recall the glories of your motherland. We know that yours was the first nation in eastern Europe to fight for freedom. That is proof of its sturdy faith.

The sad fact of the moment is that liberty has been forced underground by the fanatical power of communism.

It is not dead.

It lives on, like a prayer that gathers devotion with repetition, in the hearts of all Polish people and the millions of others who believe as they do, that the spirit is stronger than the sword.

Today we do not merely pay homage to the past.

From it we turn to the future resolved to work for the restoration of Polish independence.

As crusaders for peace and freedom we must reach through the unnatural wall which imprisons the Russian people. We must establish contact with them as fellow human beings and prove that we come to share and not to take.

Once they are enlightened, I am confident that they themselves will overthrow their ruthless masters. And when the top-heavy structure of communism is undermined the Polish people and all other captive peoples will rise again in the full dignity of a civilized world.

Simplification of Our Customs Practices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 9, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on April 27 I introduced a bill in this House calling for the simplification of certain of our customs laws and practices. On May 1, the Washington Post published an editorial Customs Simplification, dealing with certain phases of the customs laws. In response to these comments, I wrote to the editor of that newspaper calling his attention to my bill and emphasizing the need for making the desired changes in our customs laws, as suggested in his editorial and in my bill.

My bill is now before the Committee on Ways and Means. For the benefit of the members of that distinguished committee and of all of my colleagues, I am placing in the RECORD my letter to the editor, published in the Washington Post today, and the editor's original editorial of May 1. I trust this material will help bring about early action to improve our customs practices.

CUSTOMS SIMPLIFICATION

I was interested to read your May 1 editorial, Customs Simplification. Four days prior to the publication of your editorial I had introduced a bill in the House dealing with the very same subject.

I agree wholeheartedly with your description of our customs procedures as "antiquated and unnecessarily complicated." You cite interesting examples of confusing and arbitrary classifications, such as carpets with or without fringes, earthenware ash trays, etc., which make it difficult to ascertain what tariff rates are applicable.

Permit me to point out another phase of our customs procedure which is not only complicated but which is injurious to manufacturers and businessmen in this country and harmful to exporters in foreign countries.

I am referring to the practice of our customs officials to impose, retroactively, increased import duties as a result of delayed reclassification of goods, sometimes many months after the American manufacturer imported these goods at prices established on the basis of the duty imposed.

Here is a case which came to my attention recently: A New York firm purchased from a Canadian company certain wooden carrying cases which it uses for its machinery. Before entering into agreement to import these cases the manufacturer showed them to the appraiser's office at Ogdensburg, N. Y., and furnished all the necessary particulars, including the cost of production. After careful examination, the United States customs officials at Ogdensburg decided that these cases could enter under the customs law at a stipulated import duty. The representative of the New York firm was further advised that if any change was made in the classification of these cases the firm would be notified within 4 or 5 weeks.

Between the months of June and December 1949, the firm imported approximately 2,600 cases from Canada. No notification of a change in classification was received until December 1949. The American importer was notified of a reclassification and retroactive increase in duty of $1.35 per case was imposed. This increase made importation of this article unprofitable, thus putting an end to all further imports. In addition, the increase was made retroactive on the 2,600 cases already imported, all of which was charged to the American importer. None of it could be recouped from the ultimate consumer.

It required a good deal of time and effort to bring this matter to the attention of our customs officials and to convince them of the harmful effect on business in this country such arbitrary decisions have. In this particular instance the reclassification was nullified, but what about the many instances where no relief was granted?

My bill will stop such practices. It provides that any reclassification of import duties previously determined and approved by our customs authorities shall apply only to future imports and is not to be made retroactive to such goods and have already been imported or are in the process of being imported.

In line with the suggestions, contained in your editorial, for a simplification of our customs operations, I submit that early adoption of my bill and its incorporation into the tariff laws would go far in allaying the fears of many business firms abroad concerning the obstructions in our customs procedure and it would convince them that we are seriously interested in fostering freer trade practices.

ABRAHAM J. MULTER,
Representative from New York.
WASHINGTON.

[From the Washington Post of May 1, 1950]

CUSTOMS SIMPLIFICATION

Our antiquated and unnecessarily complicated customs procedures have acted as a sort of invisible protective tariff by discouraging foreign exporters from entering the American market. Customs classifications are confusing, highly detailed, and often arbitrary, making it difficult for exporters to ascertain what tariff rates are applicable to their goods. For example, carpets without a fringe are subject to import duties of 25 to 30 percent. Carpets with fringes pay a duty of 45 percent. And a manufacturer exporting earthenware ash trays to the United States is not sure whether these goods will be classified as household articles (duty 15 percent) smoking requisites (duty 30 percent) or luxury earthenware (duty 50 percent). Labeling and packaging requirements are also needlessly complex and sometimes involve cost that make them equivalent to a ban on shipments. The practice of valuing goods for assessment of customs duties at the wholesale price at which they are offered to domestic buyers in the exporting country is another cause of complaint, as well as the stiff penalties imposed for unwitting undervaluation of imports and undue delays in appraisal.

Although the Treasury has made some reforms in procedure, many of the practices that give rise to complaints are required by law. A bill amending the administrative provisions of the tariff act has, therefore, been sent to Congress by Secretary Snyder. It is designed to reform and simplify customs procedures along the lines of the Geneva Tariff Convention of 1947 and the ITO. While present methods of classification are undoubtedly in need of reform, changes in the classification system would create controversy and impair the chances for enactment of a less ambitious program. Wisely therefore, the provisions of the bill are restricted to administrative and procedural matters. It aims to make valuation formulas more equitable, to eliminate special marketing requirements, abolish undervaluation penalties in cases where the importer is not at fault, and speed up appraisal of merchandise.

The bill, based on recommendations from customs officials, representatives of other Government departments, private trade groups, and a firm of management consultants, is the product of prolonged expert study. This strong backing, together with the facts that the proposed legislation would not reduce the protection now accorded domestic industry under the tariff laws and would lower the cost of customs operations, ought to commend it to Congress. If this reasonable simplification program should be rejected, it would confirm the suspicion of many foreigners that our obstructive customs procedures are deliberately designed to exclude imports and that Congress is opposed to the freer trade practices that this Government is pledged to foster and has urged other nations to adopt.

An Excellent Eulogy by an Ex-Classmate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 9, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the Lynn Telegram News, Lynn, Mass., Sunday, May 7, 1950:

MONSIGNOR SALLAWAY'S WORK IS LAUDED BY EX-CLASSMATE

Following is the eulogy of Rt. Rev. Francis X. Sallaway, S. T. D., delivered Saturday in Sacred Heart Church by Rt. Rev. Thomas F. Markham, P. P., P. A., pastor St. Peter's Church, Lowell, as solemn obsequies were held for the beloved local pastor. Monsignor Markham was a classmate of Monsignor Sallaway at the North American College in Rome as they prepared for the priesthood.

"To one of his servants the lord gave five talents, and to another two, and to another one; to everyone according to his proper ability: and immediately took his journey. After a long time the lord of those servants came, and reckoned with them. And he that had received the five talents coming, brought other five talents, saying: 'Lord, thou didst deliver to me five talents; behold, I have gained other five over and above.'

"His lord said to him: 'Well done, good and faithful servant: because thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will place thee over many things; enter thou into the joy of thy lord.' (St. Matthew, ch. 25, verses 15, 20, 21.)

"Your Excellency, Rt. Rev. Vicar General, Rt. Rev. Monsignori, Very Rev. and Rev. Fathers, devoted religious friends in Christ Our Lord, 'Let us praise men of renown,' says the Holy Book, 'for their glory shall not be forsaken.' Ecclesiasticus 44. Msgr. Sallaway was a man of great renown, and before we consign his lifeless body to the earth whence it came, let us dwell briefly on his talents and the use he made of them. He was born on St. Cecilia's Day, the heavenly patroness of music, in the year 1890, of a deeply religious father and mother. He enjoyed the comforts and refinements of a Catholic home and training. He studied under the Sisters of Charity in St. Peter's Parochial School in Dorchester, at Boston College High School, and graduated with honors from Boston College in the class of 1913. While at college he excelled in his studies, was famous as an orator, was an outstanding debater on his college team, and was the first editor-in-chief of the Sub Turri, the yearly class book of Boston College.

"In the fall of that same year he began his immediate preparation for the priesthood at the North American College in Rome. Here he soon became a universal favorite, for his was a genial soul, and his friendliness was ever manifested in his happy smile and a cheery good word. His talents were developed in this center of catholicity, and the grandeur and the beauty of the church's liturgy made an indelible imprint on his truly artistic soul. The plain chant of the Gregorian music sung in monasteries as well as the music sung by the Sistine Choir gave him a deeper insight to the richness of church music, and enlarged his knowledge of this gift of singing, an art that men share with the angels. He already played the piano and the organ. Truly he developed his talents according to his proper ability.

"His studies he pursued during the troublesome days that existed before World War I, when the entire world was filled with rumors of war, and finally with war itself. On December 2, 1917, he was ordained priest and on the next day, the feastday of St. Francis Xavier, Rev. Francis Xavier Sallaway, from Dorchester, Mass., said his first mass at the shrine of St. Francis Xavier, in the city of Rome, in the great church of that eternal city. Six months later his professors declared him worthy of high scholastic honors, and they awarded him the degree of doctor of sacred theology. Then came his departure from Rome, across the seas filled with mines and submarines, for World War I was still raging in its fierceness, his return to his family, to his mother and sisters and brothers, but not to his father—who died shortly before he left Rome.

"You know well the rest my friends—of his days as an assistant in St. Mary's Parish, West Quincy—in St. Mary's Parish in Dedham—in the Parish of the Immaculate Conception in Revere, and of his first pastorate in the parish of Our Lady of the Assumption in Lynnfield, and finally of his years here as your pastor, in this parish dedicated to the sacred heart.

"With all his talents it is not surprising that he used the newest means that man has devised to spread the truth—the radio. The deep, mature tones of his well-trained voice have been heard on the Essex County Catholic radio program broadcasting for God and country. The sound of his voice has been heard all over the land for he spoke frequently on a national hook-up. He was chosen president of the National Association of Catholic Broadcasters, and his name and fame were well known in the field of radio. Plans he made also for the new medium of television, but another must carry out those plans. Our beloved archibishop, realizing the good that could come from the exercise of Dr. Sallaway's talents, appointed him diocesan director of radio activities and presented his name to the sovereign pontiff, with the recommendation that the head of the church would show to the world his approval of the various activities of this talented priest.

"The holy father graciously accepted his excellency's recommendation and proclaimed your pastor a domestic prelate with the title of right reverend monsignor.

"Priest, professor, pastor, prelate—so runs his life story. For him, as for all men, the paths of glory lead to the grave. But the poet tell us that—

> "'Life is real. Life is earnest.
> And the grave is not its goal;
> Dust thou art to dust returnest,
> Was not spoken of the soul.'

"For him and all others, life is everlasting. However, the light that shines around the throne of God reveals the slightest imperfection. In the presence of God no man is justified. Pray then, my friends, that any fault that he may have committed may soon be washed away.

"As one who was at his side on his ordaination morning, and as one who shared his joys and sorrows for nearly 37 years, I feel that I bespeak the minds of all those who knew Monsignor Sallaway when I express to his sisters and brothers our heartfelt sympathy on the loss of their brother. Separation is always difficult to bear, but with tears in our eyes and sorrow in our hearts, we say what the church has always taught us to say: 'God

knows best. His holy will be done." That, I am sure, will be their prayer also.

"Because thou has been faithful, good and faithful servant, enter into the joy of thy Lord. Singer of His praises here below, sing and sound, thou annointed one, His praises forever and ever. Amen."

Address by Hon. Joseph R. McCarthy, of Wisconsin, Before Midwest Council of Young Republicans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which I delivered before the fifth annual convention of the Midwest Council of Young Republicans at the Hotel La Salle, Chicago, Ill., on May 6.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PHONY FILES TO BE USED IN OPERATIONS WHITEWASH

What a relief it is to come out here tonight to speak to you young people and to breathe the fresh, clean air of the great Midwest and for at least a few hours to get away from the battle I have been having in Washington.

I would like to give you a brief picture of some of the infighting.

The President 2 days ago on the eve of his "nonpolitical" junket across the Nation suddenly and very generously decided to give the committee files in a number of cases. Mr. TYDINGS said 81 cases. However, White House spokesmen immediately corrected him with the statement that they would only give those files and only those parts thereof which had been seen in 1948 by a House committee. Perhaps the Senator was relying on hearsay that all 81 cases had been previously investigated.

Three weeks ago it was a matter of high principle with the President to keep the files inviolate. He cited numerous precedents which, in his opinion, made it absolutely mandatory to keep secret the record of Communists and fellow travelers.

Now, 3 weeks later, this is no longer so. Part of the files—the part that will make his cross-country junket less embarrassing—suddenly become unsecret and Mr. Truman cancels out his high principles.

The files which Mr. Truman is so generously giving at this time can perhaps best be described by quoting from the report of the chief investigator of the House Appropriations Committee—the report which, according to Mr. TYDINGS, cleared all of those investigated.

This report refers to an FBI survey and report criticizing the State Department for the incompleteness of its files because of the slipshod manner in which they are handled.

On page 37 of the investigator's report we find the following:

"It was also determined that there were file jackets for which there were no cases in the files, and jackets were out of file without charge-outs. These failures or errors can largely be attributed to the fact that apparently most everyone and anyone in the State Department has access to the files—removes files and replaces them with very little regulation or control."

On page 38 the following is found:

"In reviewing the security files on numerous occasions, papers were missing from the files which obviously belonged there because other papers in the files would refer directly to them. * * * Further, in this connection it may be stated at this point that there is an over-all laxness in the entire Department of State in the handling of documents."

This is what I had in mind when I warned the committee time after time that this job could not be done with only the skinny rib bones of the files.

Now if a job is to be done, all of the files must be broken open. We must have the files of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Civil Service Commission, the Central Intelligence Agency, Army Intelligence, Navy Intelligence, and the Secret Service.

To make these skeleton files of even less value, Mr. TYDINGS has decided to keep them secret from his own staff of investigators who are supposed to be experts and could detect how badly the files were rifled.

Certainly the Senators themselves have not been trained in this kind of work. This is another long step forward in the famous Lucas-Tydings-McMahon Operation Whitewash.

We have already had a good example in one case of what the Tydings white paper will undoubtedly contain. You will recall that I suggested to the committee that if they could not get the files in the more than 100 cases given to them, that, as a test case, they get the files of Owen Lattimore and thereby determine whether I was correct or not in my statement of what that file contained. The committee did not get the Lattimore file, but got a 14-page résumé of what it contained. You will recall that shortly thereafter Senator TYDINGS, in the proper setting before the news reels and movie cameras, made the solemn statement that he owed it to the Nation and to Mr. Lattimore to inform him that in the opinion of the four Senators, J. Edgar Hoover, and the Attorney General, the files cleared Mr. Lattimore absolutely.

However, Mr. TYDINGS grossly misjudged J. Edgar Hoover and Attorney General McGrath, two honest men, for Mr. Hoover and Mr. McGrath would have no part of him on that deal. Attorney General McGrath promptly made the statement (1) that TYDINGS had no right to speak for him or J. Edgar Hoover; (2) that both he and Mr. Hoover had been very careful not to indicate how they felt about the Lattimore case, so that Mr. TYDINGS could not possibly have known whether they thought the files proved or disproved the charges against Lattimore. Mr. HICKENLOOPER, one of the members of the committee, promptly stated that TYDINGS' statement was completely unwarranted. Mr. LODGE, another member of the committee, stated that TYDINGS had no authority to speak for him; that he could not and would not make any decision on the Lattimore case until he had seen all of the evidence. Even the other two members of the committee, even McMAHON and GREEN, who had been going along with TYDINGS 100 percent up to that point, could not stomach this and when called upon by the press to confirm Mr. TYDINGS, stated "No comment."

I cite this case to give you an idea of what you can expect from the Tydings examination of the purged files.

How much of this nonsense does the administration think the American people will buy?

How much deceit and dishonesty must we be subjected to before we can get some honest action? This is serious business. It is not the time or the situation for politicians to play a fraudulent political game. There are Communist traitors on our Federal payroll. The American people have a right to demand that they be routed out.

Now I have a suggestion for Mr. Truman—the only alternative to his making all those files available. It will help clear away the litter of deceit that has collected about the administration on this Communist issue.

Mr. Truman, call in FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, call in the head of the Secret Service, call in the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, and call in the men who head our military intelligence agencies. These men will reverse Loyalty Board fumbling, and will give America the benefit of the doubt.

Tell them, Mr. President, that you are ask- them to perform an unusual duty for their country.

Tell them to compile a list of names of men and women in the Government who in their opinions are dangerous to the security of the country.

Tell them to study the list, use tough standards, cut them to fit the cloth of Communist treachery, and tell you who to fire. Take their word for it, Mr. President, not McMAHON'S, not TYDINGS', not Earl Browder's.

Let these experts in their line rid the Nation of its spies and traitors. Let's clean house, with decency and honesty. Let's forget petty politics and do for America a job that is long overdue.

Americans are honest people, with pride and decency woven throughout their mode of living. Let's match this honesty, Mr. President, without political conniving. There is strength in truth, even among politicians.

Now getting back to this phoney offer of phoney files. This is 1950, Mr. Truman. Why are we offered 1947 and 1948 files instead of 1949 and 1950?

In the case of John S. Service, for instance, seven supplementary reports have been submitted in 1949. Why won't you even trust your political puppets, TYDINGS and McMAHON, to see those files?

Now let's take a quick look at what we are getting for the $25,000,000 Federal loyalty program.

First of all, it permits each department to investigate its own people. Those doing the investigating know little or nothing of Communist techniques—even less about how to conduct an investigation. In countless thousands of cases the departmental loyalty investigators accept statements from others in the department as all the clearance necessary. In dozens of cases, for instance, recommendations from Alger Hiss on State Department employees was all that was needed to completely clear them. It is like accepting a recommendation from John Dillinger in hiring a bank clerk.

Those cleared by the Loyalty Board included William Remington, John S. Service, George Wheeler, and others I have mentioned previously.

Did the Loyalty Board take note of the two Communist Party organizers who said Remington was a member of the party? It did not.

You will recall that a former State Department employee by the name of George Wheeler recently retired behind the iron curtain after making typical Communist name-calling statements, damning and cursing the United States. This man, George Wheeler, who had been assigned tremendously important work by the State Department, had first been given a clean bill of health by the Loyalty Board, even though his file would have convinced anyone who could add two and two that he was a full-fledged Communist.

Another example of how the Loyalty Board operates and a good reason why we must have all the files—not up to 1948, but up to May 7, 1950—is being demonstrated today in the case of John Service.

Mr. Service, you will recall, was picked up by the FBI in connection with the Amerasia case. This, you will recall, involved the theft of a vast number of top-secret, confidential, and other classified documents from the State Department, Navy, Army, and other Government agencies. The papers carried the story at that time that J. Edgar Hoover stated that this was a 100-percent air-tight case of espionage. However, Mr. Service was not indicted or tried, but was reinstated and under Mr. Acheson was promoted and put in charge of placements and promotions of personnel in the far eastern area. The FBI, however, continued its investigation of Mr. Service. During last year the FBI gave the State Department reports on Service on the following dates: February 18, 1949, March 10, 1949, April 4, 1949, May 11, 1949, August 9, 1949, September 7, 1949, and September 21, 1949. Nevertheless the State Department's Loyalty Board gave him a clean bill of health again last year, although the Review Board disapproved his clearance.

And incidentally, the State Department, which is about to hear Mr. Service, is now busily giving Mr. Service's lawyer the secret documents which the President has denied the Senate. This so that he can properly defend Service.

Does the Loyalty Board use Elizabeth Bentley, Whittaker Chambers, Louis Budenz? It does not. But the FBI, the Secret Service, the CIA and committees of Congress do. And they expose Communists.

The Tydings-McMahon subcommittee, on the other hand, pays the fare of Communists to come to Washington and dispute the testimony of those witnesses who are responsible for putting the Hisses and the Communist Party officials and their lawyers in jail.

There are those who very honestly say, "Oh, we think you are on the right track, McCarthy, and we like the results you are getting, but we just don't like your methods. You should have done this secretly. You should not have done it in public and embarrassed the United States before the world."

Ladies and gentlemen, take my word for it. There is no way on earth this could have been done secretly.

People have been trying to do this with kid gloves for the past five years and have gotten nowhere. Either I had to do a bare-knuckle job or suffer the same defeat that a vast number of well-meaning men have suffered over past years.

The depth that the festering rot had eaten made it necessary to cut painfully deep.

Ladies and gentlemen, I have faith that the American people can stand the pain so that when we are through, this Nation will be cleansed of this cancerous, Communist growth.

When President Truman refused to make available the great wealth of information in the files, I decided to hire the best investigators I could find to produce enough evidence, even before a hostile committee, to convince the Senate and the American people of the dangerous situation, with the hope that public opinion would force the President to crack those files. These men are the best former FBI counter espionage agents I could find.

Perhaps you would like to have a brief review of some of the evidence produced.

Let us take the case of Philip Jessup, the State Department's Ambassador-at-Large. Now he was really a great joiner—especially of Communist front organizations. In case you care to see them, here are photostats of documents of five Communist fronts proudly bearing the Jessup name.

Now let me make it clear that when I refer to a Communist front, I do not refer to an organization that McCarthy has listed as a front for the Communist party. I am referring to organizations which the President's own Attorney General and congressional committee have labeled as agencies of the Communist Party. But his proclivities as a joiner of Communist fronts is not what concerns me most. The evidence shows—and listen to this if you will—that this man, Jessup, our Ambassador-at-Large, upon whose judgment we are supposed to rely in carrying our fight to the Communists, was largely in charge of a publication known as the Far Eastern Survey—the publication of the American Council of the Institute of Pacific Relations. He was in charge at the time when the Communists launched their all-out campaign to take over China and, of course, there was no secret about that campaign.

We find that this publication spewed forth the perfumed Communist Party line sewage and was financed to a considerable extent by Communist money. Now it is easy to make such charges, so let's have the proof here tonight. I have, therefore, brought with me and they are here on the desk photostatic copies of checks representing thousands of dollars of Communist money paid to Jessup's organization.

The checks were signed by Frederick Vanderbilt Field, who brags that he is the Nation's leading Communist and who has spent millions of dollars for Communist causes.

I have asked the Tydings-McMahon committee to subpena the bank account of Mr. Field. They did not do that, but they did call Mr. Field as a character witness for Mr. Lattimore and to prove that Mr. Budenz was a liar.

When this was called to the attention of Mr. Truman, he took immediate action. He promptly gave Mr. Jessup top secret clearance to A- and H-bomb secrets.

Then there is another man whom you may have heard about—Owen Lattimore. Mr. Lattimore, as the Nation knows, has long been referred to as the architect of the State Department's Far Eastern policy—the architect whose shadow lingers over the corpse of China.

To give you some picture of the importance of Lattimore's backstage operations, let me quote to you from a news story in a Washington paper, August 14, 1945:

"Finally, in order to convince Truman, Acheson asked him to discuss the matter with Owen Lattimore, one of the foremost American authorities on China and former adviser to Chiang Kai-shek. "Lattimore talked to Truman for 30 minutes just 2 days before he departed for Potsdam."

And so that you will have a full picture of the extent to which Lattimore shaped our dismal policy of failure in the Far East, I call to your attention a secret document which he furnished the State Department in August 1949, a document which the State Department itself labeled as a guide for Ambassador-at-large Jessup.

But to understand that document fully, it must be compared with the official Communist program for Asia. I have with me copies of the Lattimore secret document and a brief of the Communist official program for Asia for any of you who care for them.

Let me give you a brief résumé of the official Communist program for Asia: (1) Destroy the armies of Chiang Kai-shek; (2) get the United States out of Korea; (3) force the withdrawal of the United States forces from Japan; (4) prevent the formation of a Pacific Pact against Communist aggression.

Now what does Lattimore tell Jessup our policy for Asia should be? And listen to this if you will: (1) Abandon Chiang Kai-shek; (2) get out of Korea; (3) get out of Japan; (4) deny the need of a Pacific Pact.

Just to give you a more complete picture of this State Department adviser and architect of our far eastern policy, let me quote to you briefly from a script prepared under his supervision while he was head of the Pacific Division of OWI—a radio program beamed to the Chinese people on July 23, 1944.

"The Chinese Communists have established 4 colleges. Education is compulsory behind Communist lines. The schools are free. Once this was a poverty-stricken region. Today everyone works or fights. There is no opium traffic. There is little vice. There are no laggards, for only those who believe in the cause of Chinese liberation are here. This is the Chinese Communist government. The Communists have worked out the problems of all the people, living, working, and fighting together. * * * If we are to succeed we must organize the workers politically. The Chinese Communists want political rights for themselves and all the people. They want a thorough going democracy."

Now let's discuss the State Department.

Let me first give you one example of why at this moment we are a Nation without honor among other nations of the earth. Some 18 months ago, Sgt. Elmer Bender of Cincinnati, Ohio, of the United States Marine Corps, and Chief Machinist Mate William C. Smith of Long Beach, Calif., of the United States Navy, were captured by the Chinese Communists. That was 18 months ago, ladies and gentlemen, and they are still prisoners of the Communists. Not 18 days, but 18 months. What is being done about it? I can tell you in one word—nothing. But perhaps that is being unfair to Mr. Acheson. He has sent some notes. In fact, I believe he is employing some total diplomacy. We find Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, who would not turn his back on Alger Hiss, turning his back upon two of our young men in uniform—two young men who are being held by the Communists—the same Communists whom the traitor, Hiss, was serving.

Now are these two young men worth more than Harvard-accented notes and powder puff diplomacy—those men who were captured while proudly wearing the uniform of this Nation? The answer is "Yes."

Mr. Truman says there is nothing wrong in the State Department; that everything is just fine; that if anyone hears of anything wrong, just call him collect and he will personally take care of things.

Mr. Truman, your telephone is ringing. A sailor and a marine are calling—calling from a prison somewhere deep inside of Communist China. They're homesick, lonely, and maybe a little afraid. Answer your telephone, Mr. Truman, it will be interesting to hear what you have to say. They haven't heard an American speak for 18 months. Mr. Truman, they are getting a busy signal on your line. They will call again—when you are through with Acheson, Jessup, Lattimore, and Service.

During Teddy Roosevelt's first term of office a Tangiers bandit named Raisuli captured an American citizen named Perdicaris with the apparent approval of the Tangiers Government. Teddy Roosevelt ordered his Secretary of State to send the following message: "Perdicaris alive or Raisuli dead."

Ladies and gentlemen, that kind of a policy would regain our lost prestige among the nations of the earth and would actually insure peace.

Why is it that wherever it is in the world that our State Department touches the red-hot aggression of Soviet communism there is heard a sharp cry of pain—a whimper of confusion and fear?

Others in the world have ears to hear with as well as those of us in America. And it must be to them, as it is to us, the sound of a whining indecision that echoes around the world and robs us today of the great heritage of courage and might that your ancestors and mine—and you in a recent war—established with grit and guts.

Why must we be forced to cringe in the face of communism? What has happened to

our courage, our determination, and our intelligence?

That is not what America wants. We are not soft, nor are we afraid. What we need in Washington is someone to express the resolute determination of the people of the United States to back down no further, to fight back with the weight of skill, intelligence, courage, and the truth that is ours. We can as a country no longer stand idle as the prancing mimics of the Moscow party line sell us short. The days of dilettante diplomacy are running out on Mr. Acheson and his fancy comrades of the Kremlin. Sugared phrases in a British accent are fine for Washington teas. But this is not a tea party. Put some men with grass-roots common sense in charge of the State Department and then watch America go. It is peace we want and peace we can have. Peace with courage and with honor.

But we cannot have that peace if the policy of this Nation continues to be shaped by those who are either disloyal to this Nation or half-hearted in their loyalty—and remember that a Communist-minded individual strategically placed in a State Department position is much more dangerous than an A-bomb. An A-bomb will kill thousands of people, but a Communist-minded State Department officer in a key position whose disloyalty is hidden by Presidential fiat can enslave this Nation.

Curtailment of Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "It's Time To Cool Him Off," published in the Lancaster (Pa.) Intelligencer Journal of April 19, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT'S TIME TO COOL HIM OFF

We predict hard sledding for Postmaster General Donaldson, and rightfully so.

His order, of yesterday, cutting mail service is ridiculous, to say the least.

The simple fact of the matter is that Mr. Donaldson has a mad on at Congress, and so he's going to take it out on all the people.

He may get away with it, but we doubt it.

We look for mail service to be restored to normal, posthaste, as soon as Congress has a chance to get into action, as well as the citizens.

It seems to be a well-established fact that the Post Office Department has not been, in recent history at least, efficiently run. There is no evidence that Mr. Donaldson has done any better in this respect than his predecessors.

So Mr. Donaldson asked Congress to increase rates, to take care of the Department's deficiency. Congress in effect has said thus far, put your house in order before you ask for increased rates.

Then Mr. Donaldson sought to erase the deficit through a deficiency appropriation, which has been the usual procedure. Congress balked again, as it did in considering the appropriation for the 1951 fiscal year.

Now Mr. Donaldson is mad.

He's going to show Congress. And the people, too.

We are for economy in Government. And we are against those who preach economy, and then holler their heads off when some one in the Government economizes.

We may seem to be doing that very thing right now. But we are not.

We are complaining because Mr. Donaldson has chosen to reduce mail service rather than reorganize his department and, in so doing, put it on a paying basis. For it is a business, a big business, a monopoly, if you please, and as such, in these times, at least, it could and should be made to operate evenly, if not show a profit which, it would seem, would be legitimate in view of the services rendered, up until yesterday.

Another thing we do not like, and do not think is good business, is cutting service when the need is for greater service. The bus companies seem to have the idea, hereabouts, that the way to get business is to reduce service and raise fares.

But it won't work, we feel certain.

In the case of the Post Office Department, the reduced service will undoubtedly turn postal business to the telegraph and telephone companies. And that will happen without a rate increase.

So, as we see it, Mr. Donaldson is cutting off his nose to spite his face.

What Mr. Donaldson should do is reorganize his Department on a businesslike basis, increase service and reduce rates, and he wouldn't have to go running hat in hand to Congress every couple of days for deficiency funds.

And he soon would be breaking even, or showing a profit, if he chose to do so.

Congressman Dollinger's Preliminary Report to His Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1950

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, the half-way mark of the second session of the Eighty-first Congress has been reached. At this time, I wish to make a preliminary report to my constituents, and at the close of the session, I shall make a complete one.

My efforts for a strong Federal rent-control bill have been unceasing. In November 1949, I wrote the President, urging that he make a recommendation in his next message to Congress that rent controls be extended at the expiration of the present law in June 1950. In that letter I stated: "Rent controls are a vital necessity to us, and to end such controls in 1950 would cause dire hardship and extremely disastrous results." The President thereafter recommended extension of the Federal rent-control law.

When the plan for the New York State rent control law was announced, I spoke out against it, saying that it would be only another spineless attempt by New York State to regulate the vital matter of rent control, and would not provide adequate safeguards against increases and evictions. We find that the New York State law indicates that no increases can be applied for before December 1, 1950. This provision sticks out like a sore thumb, and we know it might possibly mean that increases will be granted and tenants exploited. It also shows that there is still great need for Federal rent control. Recognizing the need to give tenants the protection they must have, I shall continue to do everything within my power to assist them.

The question of extension of Federal rent control is now before the House Committee of which I am a member. I will make my views known and urge such extension. I believe that a strong Federal rent control law is essential to the welfare of the people, and shall continue my efforts toward passage of the bill.

FEPC has been one of my strong objectives, and I have fought for it, not only this year, but for many years past. I need not reiterate my stand, for you know that I firmly believe in the principle that all people are entitled to employment, and that discrimination is un-American. On February 22, 1950, when the measure finally came up for debate in the House, I was present to fight for FEPC. I hoped for the long-awaited victory. However, the McConnell Amendment, sponsored by a Republican from Pennsylvania, was introduced. That substitute bill was bad enough, but then, due to the coalition of Dixiecrats and Republicans—amendment after amendment was offered to further cripple the bill.

The measure that was finally before us for a vote was such a spineless, worthless, toothless thing that it made a mockery of FEPC. I could not compromise a principle nor rest short of the goal I had aimed for during the years. The friends of FEPC know who has stood the test. I pledge that I will continue the struggle until the American people have a strong FEPC which will assure equal opportunity in employment to all—without discrimination because of race, color, religion, or national ancestry.

My efforts in behalf of our postal workers continue. The orders of the Postmaster General, curtailing delivery and other essential postal services have caused grave concern both to postal workers and the people of the Nation whom they serve. I sent a vigorous protest to the President and the Postmaster General, demanding that the orders be rescinded at once. I stated:

Our postal employees deserve commendation—not threats to their livelihood, when we consider the fine record they have achieved through the years.

I pointed out that there was no justification for this destruction of our fine postal system, and that a rescission of the orders was imperative.

I am very anxious that our veterans receive from our country all the benefits, care, and consideration to which they are entitled. I was pleased to have the opportunity to vote in favor of the bill providing for 16,000 additional beds for veterans' hospitals. I have strongly protested cuts in Veterans' Administration hospital staffs and other services, and

will always have our veterans' welfare at heart.

The arms race in the Middle East has been a serious problem to all of us who wish to preserve peace—for we have learned that a conflagration in any part of the world today endangers all nations. As soon as the news broke that England was rearming the Arab States, I protested to the Secretary of State, pointing out that our assistance to England made us an unwitting participant in the threat against the new State of Israel. I maintained that the threats of a "second round" were very real, and that Israel was the potential target of the Arab States; that the United States must make it clear that the security of Israel is our concern, and that we will insist upon it.

Thereafter, in a personal interview with Secretary Acheson, I protested the lack of action by the State Department. Reporting on that meeting, Drew Pearson in his column of April 2, quoted me as follows:

"If arms shipments keep up, the Arabs will eventually have a preponderance, and that will mean war," said Representative DOLLINGER of New York. "Unless the British stop, the United States should lift its embargo to Israel."

The new state of Israel, fighting for its life against terrific odds, needs our help as a democracy, and I shall continue to ask necessary protection for her.

The people of Ireland should be allowed to govern themselves, and should be independent. I introduced House Resolution 529 which would assist the people of Ireland to establish their complete independence, and be given the opportunity to settle, by a majority vote of her people, how she wishes to be governed. Thereafter, I spoke in committee urging favorable consideration of the legislation before it in this regard.

My interest in democracy is sincere and deep, and Ireland, who helped us so much in our fight for freedom and in the building of our own great Nation, must be given proof that we are standing by her at this critical time.

Claiming that the Government of the United States has permitted the resurgence of German fascism, antisemitism, militarism and cartels, and has failed miserably in promoting democracy in Germany, I introduced House Resolution 413. This provides for a full and complete investigation and study of the American military government in Germany and the civilian administration which succeeded it, with particular reference to the extent to which they have permitted or encouraged the reestablishment of cartels, the resumption of power by former Nazis, the resurgence of fascism and antisemitism and the rebuilding of German military strength.

There is no excuse for the failure of United States High Commissioner for Germany—John J. McCloy—to delay the execution of death sentences of the top Nazi war criminals imposed at Nuremberg. I have called upon him several times, to obey the mandate given him, insisting that a further delay is a travesty upon American justice. Our failure in this regard is a shining example of how quickly we are forgetting the unspeakable crimes of the Nazis.

I know that excise taxes are strongly objected to by my constituents, and I am doing all I can to bring about their repeal. I am hopeful that we will soon be given the opportunity to vote for the repeal of all of them.

There are many others matters in which you are interested, which are too numerous for me to cover in this report. I wish that it were possible to discuss them all.

The problems and opinions of my constituents are of primary interest to me. So that they may receive proper attention, I maintain a congressional office at 938 Simpson Street, Bronx, which is open daily, where the people of the Twenty-fourth District of New York are welcome to discuss matters of interest to them. It is my wish to serve them to the best of my ability, and they may rest assured that my earnest efforts in their behalf will continue.

Curtailment of Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article regarding the curtailment in postal service from the Idaho Falls Post-Register.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AS THEY LOOK—AND AS IT LOOKS TO THEM

Question of the week: "Do you believe reducing postal expenditures is the right step towards Government economy?"

Dean C. Ekstrom, 169 East Eighteenth street: "I don't think so. The postal service is the most important part of the Government. It not only helps the people in the United States but is a great comfort and necessity to our people overseas."

Bud Jensen, 1353 June Street: "They should never change postal service, specially now that it's doing more good than ever before. It would upset the whole business world, because all business houses are set up as to be dependent of postal service."

Jay Griggs, 1275 Sage Avenue: "If the Government cuts the postal service it will put men out of work. People out of work is one of the first signs of depression. There should be a way of cutting expenditures without taking jobs."

Ada Baker, Irwin, Idaho: "I think there are many other places that would be more suitable to cut expenditures such as having less Government employees. It wouldn't really bother me but so many people depend on mail service."

Mrs. J. D. Lowder, 143 North Third West, Rigby: "The postal department is one part of the Government functions that should be left alone. This service causes no unnecessary expenditure as far as I can see. I am on a new one delivery a day route now and would sure hate to see any less service."

Mrs. Jack Hart, Rigby: "I would rather they cut postal service than have to pay more for stamps and money orders. One delivery is all they get in the country and is all that is necessary."

Danger in the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave, I am inserting in the RECORD an editorial from the May 1950 issue of the Jewish Forum, a magazine of wide circulation published in New York, which discusses the dangerous situation in the Middle East realistically:

A DIABOLICAL SCHEME AND OUR STATE DEPARTMENT

The Economist of London, a weekly review, stated in an article on Jordan, Israel, and the Arab World, that it was most likely that the Hashamite Kingdom of Jordan and Arab Palestine would eventually become one and that, as King Abdullah always relies on the Arab Legion to maintain himself in power, without its support, he could not keep his throne for a week and realizes that he owes his position to the British "who are responsible for building up, training, maintaining, and financing the legion."

Hence, it is obvious that the so-called peace negotiations, almost reaching fruition, between Jordan and Israel, were merely a blind to learn how much Israel was ready to concede in order to attain peace, so that British Bevin might estimate how much to demand of Israel by way of the threat of the British concocted and controlled Mufti's Arab League and of the heavy armament Great Britain has been introducing among the Arab States that might be prepared for the second round, in the hope of recapturing all of Palestine and the Arab world under British suzerainty. All else is camouflage. Abdullah's surrender to the Arab League was a foregone conclusion as soon as Britain thought the time ripe.

Handing over "Arab" Palestine to Abdullah is tantamount to turning it over to the British. Is there any legal or logical reason why Jordan should be permitted, by a mere unilateral declaration, in view of the UN resolution of November 29, 1947, or any subsequent events, to annex "Arab" Palestine and thus become a constantly threatening thorn in Israel's sides?

The chief disappointment, however, is the agreement with this diabolical scheme manifested by our State Department.

When will it recognize that America's acquiescence to the British Foreign Office conspiracies is entirely out of harmony with American interests? These demand a strong, democratic, and industrialized Middle East, not a Middle East eroded and milked dry by the greedy appetite of British colonialism. The willingness of certain influential members of our State Department to follow the British line wherever it happens to lead, surely is as fit a subject for congressional investigation as was the activity of those other men who were fascinated by the Communist idea and who have done so much

incalculable harm through their influence in the making and carrying out of American policy. Whether consciously or unconsciously, a subversion of our policy in favor of the British is quite as dangerous to our welfare as one in favor of the Communists.

This entire issue ought to be brought out into the open for discusison on the floors of Congress where it would be brought to the attention of the country that these British gifts to the Arab feudal lords are actually being paid for by the tax moneys of Americans. Surely our citizens have a right, through their elected representatives in Congress, to know what is transpiring and to demand an accounting. Is it not unfair and even fantastic to expect the innocent citizens of America to pay taxes ultimately to be used for the support, by arms, of Arab chauvinism or British colonialism?

Seaway Run-Around

EXTFNSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 9, 1950

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the Watertown Daily Times of May 6, 1950:

SEAWAY RUN-AROUND

We are in the process of another hearing on the St. Lawrence seaway project in Washington. This time the hearing is before the House Committee on Public Works. This is the former Rivers and Harbors Committee. We can recall back in the early 1920's, when Wallace Dempsey, of Lockport, was chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Committee, it was holding hearings on the St. Lawrence seaway. The late Luther W. Mott then represented this district in Congress.

Death takes its toll but, other than that, the cast that appears each year for the seaway hearing, whether it be before a Senate or a House committee, is very much the same. Of course Cabinet officials change so far as personnel is concerned but their position is always very much the same. They are for the seaway. The arguments advanced each year do not vary greatly. Most of the committee members, Senators and Congressmen, have heard them often before. Although we dislike to say it, the chances are they will hear them often again.

The current hearing is being held in the last few months of the Eighty-first Congress. No one expects that a seaway measure can be passed this year. So the current seaway bill will die with the Eighty-first Congress. That means that they must be introduced once more in the Eighty-second Congress. And that means another hearing, perhaps two more hearings, one before the Senate committee and another before the House committee with most of the same witnesses and most of the same testimony.

We are optimistic enough to believe that the St. Lawrence seaway will sometime become a fact. We appreciate that these hearings, year after year, at least have an educational value. Certainly we detect increasing support for the project. But if Mr. Truman is so strong for the seaway as he indicates he is, we wish he would do something about it. There may be something to the Dewey charge that the Truman administration is strong on talk but weak on action.

Curtailment of Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Adroit Maneuver", published in the Cleveland Plain Dealer of April 21, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADROIT MANEUVER

We have preached economy in the operation of government just as earnestly and insistently as we know how.

So we are in no position to yelp, now that the head of the big service department of the Federal Government, Postmaster General Jesse M. Donaldson, has announced an economy move which will affect the convenience of practically every citizen and the conduct of a great many businesses, but which the Nation can withstand without any peril. In fact we would applaud Donaldson's action in ordering reductions of postal services, including mail deliveries, if we thought for a moment that this was a genuine, sincere economy measure, and would be a lasting one.

But we don't think it was.

We doubt that Donaldson's order will be put fully into effect, or if it is, that it will stay very long in force.

We think Donaldson's action was a bureaucratic squeeze play, pure and simple. From the timing of the Postmaster General's order, and because any resultant economies will not be proportionate to the service reductions ordered, it is apparent that this maneuver was designed to put pressure on Congress to restore Post Office Department budget cuts.

That's an old and transparent bureaucratic trick, cutting governmental services in the very way that will affect the public most directly and most adversely when the heat is on for economy in Government.

We think a couple of circumstances support our viewpoint in this matter. Notice, if you please, that Donaldson's order for reductions in mail deliveries to homes and businesses went beyond the reductions suggested by the House Appropriations Committee when it recommended cuts in Donaldson's budget. The scope of the service reductions ordered by Donaldson amounted almost to an arrogant taunt of the House committee, as if it didn't know what it was talking about in the field of Post Office Department finances.

Note, too, that the Post Office Department admitted yesterday that it could not estimate how much money could be saved by the service reductions Donaldson ordered. If the Postmaster General's order had been a simon pure economy move, it would have been based squarely on an intelligent calculation of how much money needed to be saved and of exactly how much would be saved by the stipulated cuts in service.

If the Post Office Department were as deeply concerned with economy as it would like to have people believe, it would start by overhauling the notoriously wasteful, inefficient and outdated internal management of the Department.

The pattern for making sound and lasting economies was laid down by the Hoover Commission. But little or nothing has been done to bring about the adoption of the Commission's recommendations. And for that Congress must accept its share of the blame, for Congress has shown no zeal for fundamental economies and substantive improvements in the Post Office Department operations.

We will cheerfully accept reductions in mail service if the Post Office Department, as an earnest of good faith, will make the internal economies it so badly needs. Even a privately owned business which Mr. Truman's socio-economic planners have labeled as a monopoly couldn't stay out of the red over one fiscal year if its management policies and operating practices were no more progressive than those of the Post Office.

Too Clever

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 9, 1950

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I insert what I consider a very pertinent editorial which appeared in the New York World-Telegram and Sun on Saturday, May 6, 1950, entitled "Too Clever," dealing with and exposing the President's controversial Reorganization Plan No. 12, which would abolish the office of the National Labor Relations Board's independent General Counsel.

The President's purpose is an attempt to repeal a portion of the Taft-Hartley Act, under the guise of the Hoover Commission recommendation. The Hoover Commission's reorganization of the Government made no such recommendation.

The editorial follows:

TOO CLEVER

A number of the 21 Government reorganization plans President Truman sent to Congress on March 15 are in serious trouble.

That is regrettable. If Congress rejects any of these plans for picayune political reasons it will be a blow to hopes for economy and efficiency through the good work of the Hoover Commission.

But Mr. Truman can't put all the blame on Congress.

He, himself, introduced considerations other than efficiency and economy into some of these plans—notably, the controversial plan No. 12.

That's the one which would abolish the office of the National Labor Relations Board's independent general counsel and divide his functions between the Board and its Chairman, who would become chief administrative officer of the NLRB.

There, in effect, Mr. Truman is making a too-clever attempt to repeal an important section of the Taft-Hartley Act. Congress, in that law, made the general counsel independent, on the sound theory that the NLRB's judicial and prosecuting functions should be separated.

The Hoover Commission did not recommend abolition of the general counsel's office.

The nonpartisan Citizens' Committee for the Hoover Report has refused to take a position on plan No. 12, pointing out that it "raises issues which are not wholly organi-

zational, but are matters of national, political, and economic policy."

In fact, the citizen's committee gave outright approval to only 9 of the President's 21 plans, asserting that some of the others fall short of Hoover Commission objectives and that a few go beyond them.

Plan No. 12 is due to come up in the Senate on May 10. It seems probable that at least 49 Senators—the constitutional majority required—will vote to kill it. If so, Mr. Truman can thank himself and the labor-union leaders who are backing this scheme for partial Taft-Hartley repeal under the guise of reorganization.

Soil Conservation Service Commended for Work in Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN R. DAVIS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 9, 1950

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it often falls to our lot as representatives of the people of our respective districts, to prod or criticize various agencies of the Federal Government. On this occasion it is a real pleasure to do just the opposite—to give credit where I believe credit is fairly and honestly due.

Recently I received a letter from my friend, Marvin F. Schweers, State Conservationist for Wisconsin, who is in charge of the work conducted by the United States Department of Agriculture Soil Conservation Service in my State. That letter presented a picture of real cooperative accomplishment. It related that 61 of Wisconsin's 71 counties have, in accordance with State law, been created as soil conservation districts. These 61 districts have undertaken a wide variety of projects under expert guidance to control and prevent soil erosion, thus preserving the precious topsoil of Wisconsin farms.

I was pleased to note that every one of the five counties in the Second Congressional District of Wisconsin is organized and actively functioning as a soil conservation district. The soil conservation work has "taken" in an effective and healthy manner. Farmers are responding to an all-important effective educational program. There is no coercion. The work is entirely voluntary. The primary responsibility rests with the farmer himself. This sound approach unquestionably accounts for the encouraging progress which has been made.

Last year, under the direction of Mr. Schweers and Charles Skaife, district conservationist for my home county of Waukesha, I had the opportunity to view some of the projects in progress firsthand. It was a worth-while experience, which I hope to be able to repeat elsewhere in the Second Congressional District this year.

Accompanying Mr. Schweer's letter to me was a copy of his statement to his soil conservation district supervisors, commenting on their reports to him and reviewing the progress of the conservation program in Wisconsin during 1949. I submit it herewith in order that it may be available to my colleagues and to other interested persons:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE,
Madison, Wis., May 1, 1950.

To: Soil conservation district supervisors.
From: M. F. Schweers, State conservationist.
Subject: 1949 soil conservation district annual reports.

Rather than acknowledge each of your 1949 annual reports individually we are again sending you a general statement in lieu of separate letters. In this we are reviewing progress made in 1949 as it relates to you supervisors and the Soil Conservation Service and touching upon your plans for 1950. We would also like to comment on some events of this year which have a direct bearing on the affairs of your district.

REPORTS FOR 1949 HIGHLY INFORMATIVE

In general, last year's district reports top those of previous years in terms of interest and completeness. Many were mimeographed. We understand copies were sent to district cooperators, agricultural leaders, and others interested in soil and water conservation.

A number of the reports contained excellent statements from the supervisors. In some instances the chairman or secretary wrote the introduction while others contained brief letters written by each member of the governing bodies. Some of the philosophies expressed presented entirely new ideas on how to develop in more people an appreciation of our land and water resources and persuade them to do something about it.

Another interesting feature of the reports was the indication that supervisors are definitely formulating policies and directing activities in their districts. That's your job and more power to you.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS, 1949

During the past 3 months either Assistant State Conservationist Raymond Brown or Edwin Hill, with field personnel of the Service and others, met with each of the district governing bodies in the State. At these meetings you reviewed accomplishments made in your district during the year. You compared these attainments with goals you had set for the year at a meeting held during mid-winter of 1948–49. Some districts went over the top on their goals while others fell a little short.

In all district reports you indicated you were more than satisfied with production for 1949. The goals set for the year were ambitious ones. We realize that everyone worked hard enough and would have topped them had weather and soil conditions been right.

Following is a table showing State goals for 1949, the year's accomplishments, the percentage of goals attained, and totals to date:

Activity	Unit	Goal	Accomplished	Percent	Total to date
Land capability inventory	Acres	485,100	583,725	120	8,208,301
Contour farming	do	4,970	7,910	159	174,770
Strip cropping	do	68,685	66,928	97	431,346
Pasture improvement	do	16,129	16,175	100	65,320
Woodland management	do	5,390	6,552	122	42,519
Tree planting	do	1,486	1,851	125	14,649
Terraces and diversions	Miles	561.6	518.0	92	1,746.2
Closed drains	Linear feet	748,580	688,913	92	2,089,820
Open drains	Miles	251.4	286.9	114	733.5
Prevention of grazing damage	Acres	10,076	16,187	161	128,876
Permanent structures	Number	17	24	141	229
Temporary structures	do	474	346	73	1,856
Waterways and outlets	Linear feet	896,690	1,005,313	112	3,448,089
Farm plans and replans	Number	2,361	2,268	96	19,087

As you fully understand, we do not maintain detailed records on practices such as changes in land use; influence on farmers to increase purchases of liming and fertilizing materials; improved rotations; etc. However, these are considered at the time conservation plants are developed with the farm family and are written up as part of the specifications. Furthermore, these soil-conservation measures in general do not require on-the-farm assistance in their establishment.

According to your reports service personnel worked with the Extension Service on numerous education and information activities. They appeared on programs for tours, demonstrations, and general and special meetings. They prepared news stories and presented radio broadcasts.

We were pleased to note the extent of the informational program as it affected groups other than farmers. The homemakers' soil-conservation project in the Green County soil-conservation district is something entirely new. Tours of editors, clergymen, and bankers appeared very effective. Talks before civic clubs, PTA, etc., should also make a definite contribution.

Virtually every report contained some information on the youth-training program being carried out in districts of the State. Credit for this fine showing goes to the county superintendents of schools, teachers, 4–H Club leaders, the State soil-conservation committee, and all others who have contributed to the program. We in the Service were pleased to cooperate in this work. We commend I. O. Hembre, of the State committee staff, for his capable and enthusiastic leadership in spearheading this activity on the State level.

GOALS FOR 1950

Before setting 1950 goals, you supervisors appraised the total amount of work farmers of your district are ready to put into effect this year. To provide farmers with necessary technical assistance, it was estimated that it would take up to five times as many technicians per district as we can make available. This relates only to the type of assistance furnished by the Soil Conservation Service.

You supervisors indicated in virtually all annual reports that the first work priority should be laying out planned practices on the land. This work is very seasonal and in view of limited manpower available you developed your work plans so that all Service personnel will devote full time to it during the spring and fall lay-out seasons.

There were some differences of opinion regarding second priority work. In most cases follow-up services to district cooperators was placed in this category. This servicing job involves calling upon your district cooperators to assist them in planning their layout program for the year; encourage them to speed up the application of practices; advise them on how they can get into the program; and help them determine how best to expend budgeted funds for lime, fertilizer and seed. With acreage allotments now coming into the picture, there will probably be more demands for assistance in arranging cropping systems to coincide with these controls. With regard to allotments, quite a number of supervisors have suggested that

land capability inventories be the governing factor in determining these acreages rather than the historical bases.

You gave both second and third priorty to farm planning for new cooperators and replanning farms which have been sold or on which acreage changes have been made. We agree with your viewpoints that cooperators should assume more of the responsibility of getting their plans into effect. How to do this job presents a real problem.

Whatever your decision on priorities might have been, your goals for the year were set accordingly. We all appreciate that conditions, particularly weather, will alter the best of plans. However, we feel that by setting goals the local staff has something to aim toward. In our opinion each district should hit at least 100 percent of its goals.

SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICT WORK PLANS FOR 1950

We are very much interested in your district work plans for 1950. These were by far the best we have ever had an opportunity to review. We were especially pleased to note that these plans will permit our men to spend the maximum amount of their time working directly with farmers on the land. A minimum amount of their time will thus be spent in working with you supervisors, the Extension Service and others on administrative matters, in conducting field demonstrations, in preparing news stories, in presenting radio broadcasts and in completing records and reports. By so doing, your local staff is relieved of virtually all responsibilities other than planning and application.

We are also gratified to note the number of agencies which are now participating in the district movement. In addition to the SCS and Extension Service, references are made in your reports to the Wisconsin Conservation Department, State soil conservation committee, vet trainers, FHA, vocational agriculture, PMA, and schools.

Most of you supervisors have planned ambitious educational programs for 1950. As we see it, this is as it should be. These programs vary in accordance with interest within the district. Where a large number of applications for farm conservation plans is on file, supervisors generally are not giving emphasis to securing additional ones. More attention in these districts is given to method and result demonstrations. Where applications are limited in number, efforts will be made to increase this backlog.

Most work plans revealed a definite trend toward having service personnel work with and through neighboring groups. With your encouragement and active participation we feel that working with neighbor groups provides a medium whereby the soil-conservation program can be stepped up. Our personnel who have used this approach find it very effective. It may not immediately reduce time spent in farm-conservation planning but these men definitely report that farmers have a better understanding of their farm plans as a result of working together as a group. Then, too, a group of neighbors working together in an area where soil and water conservation practices have not as yet been accepted can become much more enthusiastic about adopting progressive methods, than can a single isolated farm family. In thinking of neighbor groups we believe the greatest benefit in using this approach will come in application of practices and in follow-up. We sincerely hope you will personally follow through on this procedure and offer suggestions on improving it.

COOPERATION WITH PMA

As you no doubt know, the 1950 appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture, in the section dealing with the agricultural conservation program, administered by the Production and Marketing Administration, contains the following statement:

"That the county agricultural conservation committee in any county with the approval of the State committee may allot not to exceed 5 percent of its allocation for the agricultural conservation program to the Soil Conservation Service for services of its technicians in formulating and carrying out the agricultural conservation program and the funds so allotted shall be utilized by the Soil Conservation Service for technical and other assistance in such county."

There are three types of assistance PMA and SCS officials have agreed upon as being desirable in this cooperative undertaking. They are:

(a) Furnishing needed data—especially about physical land conditions and the effectiveness of various conservation practices—for formulating and carrying out the agricultural conservation program for the county.

(b) Laying out and supervising the installation of conservation practices approved for assistance under the 1950 agricultural conservation program.

(c) Assisting in training committeemen and association employees.

Nineteen PMA county committees asked for assistance either of the "b" or "c" types. A representative of the State PMA office and a member of our SCS State office staff met with these committees. With the exception of two counties, one or more of you supervisors sat in on each of the 19 meetings held. Seventeen of the PMA committees completed agreements with the Service under the above authority. These are:

Type "b": Pepin, Pierce, Washburn, Eau Claire, Price, Rusk, Fond du Lac, Green Lake, Kenosha.

Type "c": Monroe, Sauk, Taylor, Clark, Calumet, Waukesha, Lincoln, Crawford.

(All of the above are soil conservation districts excepting Kenosha County.)

We feel that this cooperation with the PMA offers some real possibilities. The "b" type of program appealed to most district supervisors since it provides extra assistance to farmers without taking any time of local staffs for training purposes. The "c" type program will require additional time of service personnel in instructing PMA trainees as to the "why's, wherefore's, and how's" of various practices. However, most of this time is on-the-job training and productive accomplishments are thus made during the training period. In our opinion, the help contributed by PMA trainees plus the use of PMA funds for hiring local aids offsets the time utilized in this extra training work. Supervisors in general welcome the extra assistance in districts.

Most of the training plans call for instructing PMA employees on methods of determining soil-erosion losses; familiarizing them with land capability inventories and the potentialities and limitations of various soils in the district; acquainting them with the various soil conservation practices; and planning and laying out less complex practices such as grass waterways, strip-crop systems, etc. In a few instances, PMA employees are being trained to plan, stake out, and supervise installation of simple drainage and terracing systems.

Several supervisors expressed concern over the possibility of this program becoming a single practice affair. We assured these supervisors that we will make every effort in our training program to acquaint PMA employees with the fact that a practical, effective, and lasting conservation program must consider the entire farm as a unit. Various practices such as terraces or strip cropping, which influence the flow of water from one field, can have a direct bearing on what happens to adjoining lands. In the same way, laying out a single field in a strip-cropping system without considering the entire farm could throw the cropping system, the fertility, the soil-erosion control, and the water retention or disposal programs out of balance for the rest of the farm. No one practice can give the farmer protection against undue loss of soil and water. Full conservation can be reached only through a combination of the practices needed according to land use capabilities and for the entire farming unit.

EQUIPMENT

Section 66.34 of the Wisconsin Statutes has been of real benefit toward stepping up application of certain soil-conservation practices where heavy equipment can be used to advantage. As this act is rather short we are quoting it for your convenience:

"66.34. Soil conservation; private roads: Any county, city, village, or town by its governing body or through a committee designated by it for the purpose, may contract to do soil-conservation work on privately owned lands, but no such contract shall involve more than $200 for any one person."

Many district governing bodies have taken advantage of this legislation. Supervisors have contacted town chairmen and governing bodies have met with highway committees and made arrangements whereby equipment will be made available to farmers during layout seasons. Several county boards have appropriated funds for the purchase of motor patrols for use in soil-conservation work. These units, when not in use on soil-conservation work, are used by the highway department in their regular road program.

By virtue of having trained operators and because of the fact that road patrols are particularly well adapted to terrace and diversion construction many more miles of these practices can be installed through the use of this equipment.

Quite a number of contractors have also become interested in soil-conservation work. This should be an inducement to stepping up production.

MEETINGS OF SUPERVISORS

A majority of district governing bodies in the State hold regular meetings; either on a once-every-2-months or a monthly basis. A number of supervisors have told us that at one time they thought the amount of district business would not justify regular meetings. These same individuals have since been attending scheduled meetings and now wonder how they are going to get the job done without convening more often. Looks as though a supervisor's job is never done.

Just a few words about the recent series of area meetings of district supervisors. The programs were set up with the idea of free-for-all participation. We were surely pleased at the response. Joint meetings of district governing bodies, where carried out on a work-group basis, have the enthusiastic support of participating supervisors. These are called for the purpose of exchanging ideas and experiences with the primary objective of improving district administration and stepping up the establishment of planned soil-conservation practices on the land.

OUTLOOK FOR STAFFING DISTRICTS IN 1950–51

At this time we are in no position to make any commitments regarding the staffing of districts for the next fiscal year beginning July 1. Our plans will be regulated by our 1951 appropriation.

Four soil-conservation districts not previously staffed will have completed their memoranda of understanding with the Department and the Soil Conservation Service by July 1. We know that they are expecting some assistance.

Irrespective of what our appropriation may be, we will continue to provide the maximum amount of assistance for funds expended. Our personnel will be assigned in accordance with workloads. We shall total the workloads for all soil-conservation districts in the State and then pro rate our manpower according to needs for each district.

Before taking action to reduce any staffs we will first discuss this matter with governing bodies of districts involved.

No matter what our appropriation may be, districts will still be short handed. We would like to suggest that farmers do more of this work themselves and that other agencies be called in to contribute wherever possible. As we see it, soil and water conservation is the responsibility and obligation of many organizations, departments, and individuals. We in the Service hope that you supervisors will provide the leadership to muster and coordinate the many forces that are available to participate in this important and vital movement.

IN APPRECIATION

In preparing this report we have only high lighted many topics we would have liked to discuss in more detail. Still it has become overly long.

In conclusion, we want to express our sincere appreciation for the many courtesies and splendid cooperation you have extended to us in the Soil Conservation Service.

Sincerely yours,

M. F. SCHWEERS,
State Conservationist.

Curtailment of Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article regarding curtailment in postal service, from the New York Journal-American of April 20, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUSINESS BATTLES SLASH IN MAIL; HEAVY LOSSES FEARED HERE

New York businessmen today were preparing to carry to Washington their fight against the impending slash in mail deliveries.

Estimating that the drastic cuts would cause incalculable losses, representatives in the fields of publishing, printing, mail-order selling and direct-mail advertising were laying plans to appear at a Senate committee hearing on postal rates.

It was charged that the economy order of Postmaster General Donaldson was a political maneuver to win support for a Post Office Department plea for new rates with an estimated yield of $150,000,000 per year.

Concern over the delivery curb was expressed by the Dress Manufacturers Board of Trade, Inc., 220 West Forty-second Street, which pointed out the garment district leans heavily on parcel post.

Under the economy order to postmasters, no parcel post would be received at post offices after 6 p. m. At present, much parcel post is received from garment-area houses at the main post office, Eighth Avenue and Thirty-first Street, after that hour.

Letter carriers have been thrown into a "panic" by the economy order, according to Philip Lepper, president of the New York branch of the AFL Association of Letter Carriers.

Lepper estimated that 10 to 15 percent of the letter carriers in the city would be furloughed or dismissed as a result of the economies to go into effect July 1.

That would mean some 4,300 to 6,450 carriers would be laid off.

The seven postmasters in the city today were hard at work fitting their organizations into the pattern imposed by the economy order, called "the most drastic in the history of postal service."

In the Manhattan-Bronx-Pelham districts, presided over by Postmaster Goldman, it was estimated that a considerable number of temporary workers would be affected by the first cutbacks.

Curtailment of Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial and an article from the Wichita Beacon regarding the curtailment in postal service.

There being no objection the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS SHOULD HAVE AVOIDED THE IMPAIRMENT OF POSTAL SERVICE BY OTHER APPROPRIATION ECONOMIES

The Postmaster General, Jesse Donaldson, has been forced to lay off 10,000 employees of the postal service, due to lack of funds with which to maintain the service at its present high level. Congress failed to give the Post Office Department the appropriation for which it asked.

The result of these layoffs for lack of funds will seriously affect the service. It will be slowed up materially. Congress should have given the Postmaster General the appropriation that was needed. Money could have been saved from other less necessary and less essential appropriations.

The Marshall plan appropriation could have been cut. Less money could have been earmarked for housing. Less could be spent by reorganization of Government agencies and bureaus. We could give less money to Chiang Kai-shek and his Chinese Nationalists.

The United States postal service is the most efficient in the world. Postal employees give their lives to their work. They are underpaid. No Government employees are more faithful or render greater public service. Ten thousand of these conscientious workers should not be laid off to save money for less necessary purposes.

We have the money. We do not appropriate it wisely and rightly. Our postal service should be maintained at its present efficiency and not be selected for economizing when economies could be made elsewhere without harm to the American public.

Appropriation Committees can do as they see fit. They easily could have saved money in other ways, instead of refusing the Post Office Department the money it needs to prevent layoffs of devoted postal employees and deprive the American people of the postal service they need and for which they are taxed.

MAIL SERVICE IS REDUCED IN WICHITA

Postmaster C. M. Fitzwilliam released a statement Thursday afternoon regarding changes in postal service, which are to become effective May 1:

Window service at the main office will be provided between the hours of 8 a. m. and 6 p. m., Monday through Friday. All substations will offer window service from 8 to 5:30, except the airport branch and Planeview which will close at 5 p. m.

Saturday window service at all the stations and main office will be from 8 a. m. to 12 noon.

Cuts in carrier service from 2 daily deliveries to 1 in the residential area, and from 3 to 2 in the business area, will be announced during the next 3 or 4 days.

These changes will be put into effect during the next 30 days.

Effective May 15, all bulk mailings of second, third and fourth class matter will be accepted for mailing only between the hours of 8 a. m. and 6 p. m. Third class matter having a time value no longer will be given preferential treatment unless it carries first class postage.

Outgoing parcel post received by 6 p. m. will be distributed or dispatched promptly. Third class after 6 p. m.

Fitzwilliam explained that first class matter will continue to be handled at night, but that the change eliminates such consideration for second, third and fourth class mail.

Soviet Expansionism in Europe and Asia Since 1939

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 9, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following address given by Mr. William C. Bullitt at Georgetown University on March 31, 1950. No American has had a more brilliant record in diplomacy and especially in diagnosing the true nature of Soviet communism and prescribing the proper way to treat it. Tragically, our State Department ignored his advice and led our country and the world to its present perilous state. Nothing can be more useful, even at this late date, than to study the enemy we face, our own errors, and what to do now—under the guidance of a real master in the field of world affairs:

SOVIET EXPANSIONISM IN EUROPE AND ASIA SINCE 1939

Soviet expansionism springs from the Communist creed: The Marx-Lenin-Stalin creed which denies God and claims to be based on science. It attributes all evil to private ownership of the means of production. It teaches that the establishment of Communist dictatorship throughout the earth and the abolition of private ownership of the means of production will end all war and so improve the nature of all men in all nations that "the state will wither away," and all men will live without a state in perfect freedom and happiness. This is the utterly unscientific faith which, in the name of science, Communist-controlled governments teach as absolute truth to the children they control. They prepare the children to live and, if need be, to die for it. A large percentage of the children, having no other faith taught them, become believers in the Communist creed, and, as Communist believers, offer their lives for their faith as gallantly as did the early Christians. They believe that they are fighting for the emancipation of all humanity from all evil. They think they serve eternal

truth. The Communist Party, to them, is a union of the faithful. Their old testament contains the books of Marx and Engels; their new testament, the works of Lenin and Stalin. Since the highest moral goal, according to their creed, is to achieve the destruction of the state following the establishment of Communist dictatorship throughout the earth, the highest moral duty of man is to promote such dictatorship. This supreme moral end, they believe, justifies all means for its achievement, including the pledged word given and broken, character assassination, torture, murder, and war. In the words of Lenin: "It is necessary * * * to use any ruse, cunning, unlawful method, evasion, concealment of truth. * * * It is inconceivable that the Soviet Republic should continue for a long period side by side with imperialist states. Ultimately one or the other must conquer. Meanwhile a number of terrible clashes between the Soviet Republic and the bourgeois states is inevitable."

The dynamo of Soviet expansionism is the Communist creed. Many older Communists become skeptical and disillusioned. But they do not dare to express disbelief. The penalties are too terrible. So the old, however skeptical, render lip service. But the young believe. And while the old die off, the young come on forever. In consequence, so long as mighty races and resources are controlled by Communists, there will be no peace in this world. The aim of the Soviet Government and the other Communist-controlled governments will continue to be the conquest of the world for communism. The Communists will not stop. They can only be stopped.

Stalin sits in the Kremlin with members of the Politburo, who compose his planning staff for the conquest of the world. He prepares his attacks on a world scale as carefully as the commander in chief of an army prepares plans for his advances. He decides when and where to strike, and what forces will be needed to seize his objective. He is a careful and crafty leader who never takes great chances. He always remembers that the physical strength of the Soviet Union is the most important factor in the spread of communism, and he does not risk destruction of that primary source of strength.

In 1939, Stalin controlled about 170,000,000 persons. Today he directs about 800,000,000. The chief methods which he has employed in making this extraordinary advance toward control of the entire human race have been the following:

First. Easy war. For example, 17 days after Hitler had attacked Poland in 1939, when the Polish armies had been disrupted, Stalin attacked Poland and seized all of eastern Poland. Similarly, in the Far East, after we had pulverized the military resistance of Japan, Stalin, only 4 days before Japan surrendered, declared war on Japan and seized Manchuria.

Second. Occupation by the Red Army and gradual imposition of absolute Soviet rule. This was the method employed from 1945 onward in Poland, Rumania, Hungary, and, with slight variations, in Czechoslovakia. Its effectiveness is demonstrated by the simple fact that Stalin has now been able to install as commander in chief of the Polish Army a marshal of the Soviet Union.

Third. The method of the camel's nose. You all remember the old story of the camel who was cold one night in the desert and put his nose under his master's tent and persuaded his master to let him keep it there. Soon afterward, the camel was inside the tent and his owner was out in the cold. That method, in 1940, was used by Stalin in taking over Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. First, under threats of war and promises of peace, he persuaded the governments of those three little Baltic countries to accept the presence of Soviet garrisons at certain strategic points. The Soviet soldiers behaved themselves well, and many Balts believed their prospects for survival were good. However, when Stalin considered that the moment had come to close his hand on those countries, he closed it. He murdered or deported to death at slave labor his political opponents of all classes. He finally reduced his victims to a terrorized mass of despairing individuals whom he then compelled to go to booths and "vote" for Soviet-chosen candidates under penalty of losing their bread cards which were nothing more or less than permits to live.

Fourth. Use of local Communist movements in areas where Communists have been strong enough to organize armed resistance to existing governments. The foremost example of the success of this method is, of course, China. By turning over to the Chinese Communists all the arms captured from the Japanese Army in Manchuria; by sending a few generals who were masters of strategy and tactics to plan the attacks of the Chinese Communists, Stalin succeeded in bringing the whole of continental China under Communist control. When he attempted to use the same method in Iran and Greece he met such determined opposition from the United States that he allowed his local agents to be defeated—temporarily at least.

Fifth. Communist control or infiltration of nationalist independence movements in colonial countries. At the present moment Stalin is advancing by this method in Indochina and at other points in southeast Asia.

Sixth. Psychological warfare.

Under this heading must be included two different methods of deceiving victims.

A. The pledged word of the Soviet Union given and broken. Stalin lulls his prospective victims to sleep by entering into all sorts of pacts and agreements with them—and breaks the agreements as soon as it becomes convenient for him to do so. Stalin's violations of the most solemn international agreements have exceeded in number similar violations by Hitler.

B. The deception of naive government officials in all countries. We do not have to go further than our own country to observe Stalin's notable achievements in this domain. Quite aside from Soviet agents in our Government departments and atomic-energy organization, we have had in Washington and throughout the world a number of Government officials who were not Soviet agents but served the Soviet Government as effectively as if they had been Soviet agents. You will all recall that from 1942 until 1947 our Department of State was bamboozled into treating the Soviet Union as a "peace-loving democracy." Officials of our Government so described the Soviet Union in a long series of documents.

The Yalta agreements—including the secret one by which we promised Stalin control of the great Manchurian ports of Dairen and Port Arthur and the Chinese Eastern Railroad—were signed during that period. They were one of the greatest triumphs of Soviet psychological warfare. Had we acted in accord with the national interests of the United States and of our faithful ally China, we would have done everything in our power to prevent the Soviet Union from entering the war against Japan. But our leaders had been bamboozled into believing that the Soviet Union would work with us cordially to produce a world of liberty and peace, and in addition had been fooled into believing that we would need Soviet help to defeat Japan. So we secretly sponsored Soviet domination of Manchuria and enabled Stalin to arm the Chinese Communists with the vast armaments of the Japanese armies.

You will recall that officials of our Department of State had also been persuaded by Soviet propaganda to believe that the Chinese Communists were "Mere agrarian reformers who had no connection with Moscow." Our Government, acting on their advice, attempted to compel the Chinese Government to take Communists into the Government, and when Chiang Kai-shek refused to do this, cut off all military supplies to him for a period of nearly 2 years. You will remember that we refused his repeated pleas for a top-rank American general to organize the defense of China in the same manner that top Soviet generals were organizing the attacks on Chinese independence. Thus we allowed China to slide into Stalin's hands.

Similarly, the Yalta agreement with regard to Poland resulted in the present absolute control of Poland by the Soviet Government.

Much ink has been used by apologists for the Yalta agreements in an attempt to prove that what was wrong was not the agreements themselves, but the fact that the Soviet Union did not carry out the agreements. This is as if a banker who had been appointed trustee of the fortune of a child should place the funds entrusted to his care in a Ponzi get-rich-quick scheme; and then when the money was lost, plead that the trouble was not with the trustees—who accepted Mr. Ponzi's promise to pay 200 percent per year—but with Ponzi's failure to carry out the agreement. The people of the United States hire officials to work in the Department of State because they need experts to handle complex world questions. The officials of that Department are trustees of the vital interests of the American people, and the most contemptible excuse that can be offered by or for them is that they meant well but were "played for suckers."

There is a great moral difference between traitors and Soviet dupes. It is the same difference that is recognized in law between a man guilty of murder and a man guilty of manslaughter. In the case of manslaughter, there is no intention to commit the crime. But in both cases the victim ends up dead. Soviet dupes may do as great harm to the United States as Soviet agents.

Seventh. Infiltration of respected organizations: One of Stalin's most effective weapons to reduce resistance to his attack is, of course, infiltration of educational institutions, scientific societies, welfare organizations, and trade-unions by Soviet agents. He managed to use this weapon so effectively in both France and Italy that leadership of the great trade-unions of both of those countries was seized by the Communists and for a time it seemed that both countries might be hopelessly paralyzed by Communist-led strikes. At the present moment, the non-Communist members of the trade-unions in France and Italy have set up their own organizations; but the Communist-led unions are still able to organize strikes of huge dimensions for purely political purposes. Fortunately for our own country, although for a time some of our labor leaders were as deceived as was our Government with regard to the Communists, our great trade-unions have either purged their ranks of Communists or are in the process of purging them. Stalin is having little success in our trade-unions, and I think we should congratulate ourselves on the patriotic qualities of our top labor leaders. I wish I could say as much about our professors, some of whom appear to be too educated for their brains.

Eighth. The final weapon employed by Stalin to disintegrate opposition to Communist advance is fear. Now that Stalin has atomic bombs and plenty of bombers to deliver them to any spot in Europe, Asia, or North America; now that he has China as an ally and is increasing his military power much faster than we are increasing ours; his propaganda has taken a new line—the line of warning his opponents of all classes in Europe and in Asia that power is on his side and that time is on his side and that, unless they desire to meet the fate which he accords to

defeated opponents, they had better leave the camp of the United States and join the Soviet side.

The fear which he is thus able to engender has been vastly increased by revelation of the methods which are now used by the Communists to break down and destroy human personality. You have all read recently in the newspapers Shipkov's statement of the relatively simple methods used to break him down and force him to make a false confession to the Bulgarian Communist authorities. Far more sinister and horrible pressures are used when the individual presents more resistance. The final method is that of narcohypnosis. The victim in that case receives quantities of drugs until he can be hypnotized so deeply that he can be deprived of all memory of the actual facts of his past life and made to believe in a new set of facts invented by his hypnotizer. Human personality can thus be totally changed. No man can any longer say that he is master of his fate or of his own actions and thoughts. If he falls into the hands of the Communists, he can be reduced to a puppet with a new personality invented by his hypnotizer. This is a final horror—an unexampled triumph of satanism. To die in battle is nothing compared to the living death of personality under narco-hypnosis. Recently a French lady said to me: "We are all of us enjoying ourselves as much as possible in Paris since we know that within a few years we shall either be destroyed by Soviet atomic bombs, or raped, or hypnotized into new personalities." That is the state of mind which is growing in western Europe.

We have now glanced at the Communist creed which underlies Soviet expansionism, and at some of the methods employed by Stalin to achieve world conquest. Let us now look briefly at the attacks which armed Communists are making at the present moment.

As we have already noted, they are advancing by open warfare in Indochina, or—to be exact—in the eastern portion of Indochina, which is known as Viet Nam. The war in Viet Nam is one of the saddest that has ever been fought, for three-fourths of the troops of Ho Chi Minh, the Moscow-trained leader of the Annamites, who are fighting the French, and the forces of the Emperor Bao Dai, are not Communists but simple patriots who believe that they can achieve complete independence only by throwing the French and Bao Dai into the sea. Yet, in truth, the only result of such a victory would be that the Annamites would exchange the yoke of France—which has now become relatively light—for the terrible yoke of Stalin.

The French, 3 years late, have given Viet Nam independence with the French Empire, retaining for themselves control over foreign relations and military affairs. To us, this seems a limited, almost nonexistent form of independence. Yet if the French were to withdraw now from Viet Nam, the country could collapse at once into the hands of the Communists. This is so because of the failure of the French to train Annamites for high administrative and military posts. The French reserved those posts for themselves. They never built up in Viet Nam a native civil service comparable to the civil service which the British built up in India. In consequence, Bao Dai, if left to his own resources, could not find the men to staff efficiently the military and administrative services of his country.

For a period, the Annamites, who are highly intelligent as well as patriotic people, will be obliged to rely on the advice and assistance of foreigners of some sort. They would like to have Americans instead of French running their army and their administration; but no American speaks their language. The secondary language of Viet Nam is French, and so few Americans of first-rate quality speak French adequately that it is hopeless to expect that thousands of efficient, French-speaking Americans can be found to go to Viet Nam. The Annamites would also like to have American troops replace the 130,000 French troops now resisting the forces of Ho Chi Minh. Quite aside from other considerations, we have no such number of troops to spare. And we should be thankful that the French Army is fighting Ho Chi Minh in Viet Nam. They will probably have to meet stronger attacks in the near future. For the Chinese Communists have now reached the borders of Viet Nam, and are passing arms and munitions to Ho Chi Minh.

In consequence, unless Indochina is to fall into the hands of Stalin, we shall have to work with and through both Bao Dai and the French. If we fail to do so because some State Department dupe of Soviet psychological warfare takes the position that we must not give help to Viet Nam until all the French shall have left, we shall merely be handing the country by default to the Communists.

If we let Indochina fall, Burma, Siam, and British Malaya—with its vast production of rubber and tin—will also fall. Then it will be India's turn.

At another point, the Communists are making small attacks preparatory to a great attack. The Chinese Communists for some time have been attempting to seize small islands on the way to the great strategic island of Formosa. Formosa is still being held by the Chinese Nationalist Army which, just 2 weeks ago, gave proof of its good morale by seizing a port on the mainland. If the Chinese Communists should capture Formosa, Stalin's forces would be within 250 miles of the northern Philippines. It was from Formosa that Japan attacked and captured the Philippines. Our Joint Chiefs of Staff, headed by General Bradley, pleaded with President Truman to send munitions and equipment, as well as economic aid to Formosa, and a few American officers to advise regarding defense. Secretary of State Acheson opposed our military leaders, and persuaded President Truman to decide that we would continue to give no support to the Nationalists, do nothing toward preventing the fall of Formosa. That is our present policy. For the Philippines, the Department of State is preparing another Bataan.

Recently Secretary Acheson announced that we must wage "total diplomacy." And in San Francisco he intimated that if the Chinese Communists should commit aggressions against the countries of southeast Asia, they would find themselves in trouble with us. But his "total diplomacy" does not include Formosa. He and his closest associates and friends have a vested interest in their own mistakes with regard to China. In any European parliamentary democracy, a minister for foreign affairs who had tossed a great ally like China into the hands of Stalin would have been dismissed from his post. Mr. Acheson retains his office and turns his back on Formosa.

In the Near East, Iran, with its huge oil production which plays such a large part in British economic life, is again threatened by Soviet-directed revolutionaries of the Tudeh party. They have a fertile field in which to work. The poverty among the peasants of Iran is so grinding that they are close to revolt. Unless the Government of the United States moves rapidly to alleviate the suffering in Iran, Stalin may soon add that ancient country to his long list of satellites.

These, for the moment, are the areas in Asia where Stalin is pressing his advance strongly. But we cannot congratulate ourselves that even the situation in western Europe is satisfactory.

In Italy, more than 20 percent of the workmen are unemployed, and the Communists, who gathered one-third of the votes at the last elections, are gaining in strength.

In France, the government is far weaker than any French government before the Second World War, and its entire apparatus is riddled with Communists. Even the head of the French atomic research is a Communist.

Great Britain is staggering toward another financial and economic crisis. In 1945 the British voted themselves a higher standard of living than, under existing world conditions, they could possibly earn. Today they can neither feed themselves nor defend themselves.

Western Germany, under the pressure of unemployment, is beginning to listen to the Soviet propaganda which says: Side with the United States and you will have unemployment, underfeeding, shortage of raw materials, a divided country and, finally, Soviet atomic bombs on your cities; side with the Soviet Union and you will have all the wheat and raw materials you want, no unemployment, and a united Germany including the part that is momentarily Polish. Pastor Niemoeller, much admired by Americans, has now declared himself in favor of a united Germany even at the price of Communist rule.

Moreover, the whole of western Europe is without defense, and everyone in western Europe knows it. Its cities cannot be protected against Soviet atomic bombs except by our Air Force, which today is not strong enough for the task. To oppose the 125 Soviet divisions, the French have 6, the British say they can furnish 1, the Belgians 1. To have a chance to stop the Red Army for a few months, the European democracies would need from 50 to 60 divisions. Modern equipment for such a number of divisions would cost from 10 to 20 billion dollars. And most military authorities agree that no western European defense system can be effective unless both the western Germans and the Spaniards are included in it.

When we began to give Marshall plan aid, and when we signed the Atlantic Pact, our object was to make western Europe a strong ally. We have succeeded only in keeping alive 17 picturesque, competing countries which cannot feed or defend themselves. If they would unite their economies by entering a European federation, they would be on the path to strength. But their governments refuse to take any serious steps toward federation and our Government is making no effective effort to move them toward federation. They feel confident that, even after 1952, we will not stop our doles to them. And, indeed, we do not dare to stop for fear that they will all collapse into the hands of Stalin and be organized as Soviet satellites for his final attack on us.

When will such an attack come? To that question I can, of course, give no definite answer. But I can give you my own opinion and the reasons for it.

Today Stalin has atomic bombs and at least 350 long-range bombers capable of carrying them to any spot in the United States. We have no radar warning net to detect the approach of his planes. We have only a fraction of the number of pursuit planes needed to make effective use of a warning net. The authoritative Finletter Commission in 1948 recommended as a minimum for national security 70 air groups. We have 44. Stalin's total air force outnumbers ours by about 3 to 1. His annual production of war planes is about 3 to our 1. He has 125 army divisions to our 10—among them, 30 armored divisions to our 1. In addition, he has approximately 270 submarines—about 30 of the latest type against which we have not yet produced effective counter weapons. Furthermore, thanks to his agent Fuchs who

transmitted to him all our secrets for production of both A-bombs and hydrogen bombs, he may be ahead of us in production of H-bombs.

Some officials in Washington who have access to most secret information believe that Stalin will attack us this year. They argue that by August 1950 he will probably have 50 A-bombs—enough to destroy our great cities and our atomic production plant, and thus prevent effective American counter-attack. But my opinion is that Stalin will not launch shooting war until he is certain that he can defeat us easily. As I have said before, he is a cautious and crafty leader who strikes only when he feels sure of quick victory. This year his first surprise attack might not be successful. We might be able to strike back effectively. Therefore, it seems likely that he will not start bombing in the near future but will go on increasing his military strength faster than we are adding to ours, and seize more peoples, resources, and strategic areas, until he feels that his power is irresistible. We are allowing time to run on his side. And he knows it.

What, then, is the real state of our defenses against Soviet expansionism? Our own military strength is falling behind the growing military strength of Stalin. Asia is slipping into Stalin's hands; the Near East is threatened; Europe is defenseless. The Soviet atomic bomb threat to our homes, our families, and our country is increasing each day. The Communists are advancing; we are retreating. They are on the offensive; we are on the defensive. And no war, hot or cold, was ever won by forces which remained on the defensive.

Why are we doing so badly? Because our Government has never faced the fact that Stalin will not stop, but can only be stopped. Our President has not understood that an over-all plan for defense, not only of our own country, but also of those countries which still remain outside Stalin's domain, is essential. Not so long ago he said "I like old Joe." In consequence, the systematic advances of the Communists, executed by carefully planned attacks, have been met for the most part either by American retreats or spasmodic and inadequate defensive efforts.

Time is running against us; but at the present moment our Government is behaving exactly as the French Government behaved from 1936 to 1939. In that period, when the Nazis were preparing for war and working 60 hours a week, the French cut their working hours to 40 a week. When the Germans were producing seven to eight hundred planes a month, the French cut their plane production to 50 a month. They did this for much the same reason that we are now reducing our expenditures for our military forces and for support of our friends throughout the world. The people of France, like all other peoples, wanted a higher standard of living and leisure. They did not realize that a higher standard of living would soon give them a higher rate of dying. In 1940, Hitler destroyed the independence of France.

Today we should be living hard, as our forefathers lived hard in the days of Valley Forge. We are living soft. Our President has staked his political future on a program of handouts for crop support, housing, education, and other projects which appeal to groups of voters. To get more tax money for the handout program which produces votes, he has cut down the defense program which might produce survival. Our tax money is being used to buy surplus potatoes instead of jet planes.

In consequence, the balance of power in the world is swinging rapidly in favor of the Soviet Union. And our President, who is an entirely patriotic American, has not yet found within himself the intelligence and the spirit to take the offensive effectively against Soviet expansionism. Unless he will take the offensive, unless we—the American people—will let him know that we do not want to hear from him what we can get from our country, but do want to hear from him what we can give to our country, we shall suffer the fate that France suffered in 1940.

We restored the independence of France. There is no nation standing behind us to restore our independence.

Is it too much to hope that we will find within ourselves the courage and the will to save our country and our Christian civilization? It is not too much. It is late—very late. It is not too late. We can begin today to take the offensive. We can increase vastly our expenditures for national defense and cut our expenditures for handouts. We can take action to prevent Communist conquest of Formosa. We can help the Annamites and the French throw the Communists completely out of Indochina—as we helped the Greeks throw them out of Greece. We can achieve the federation of western Europe and make that federation a strong ally. We can give effective economic aid to Iran. We can help the Albanian exiles to rescue Albania from the Communists and thus give new spirit to all the enslaved peoples behind the iron curtain. We can give far greater aid than we have been giving to the resistance forces in all the Soviet satellite countries. We can stand up with force to the threat of the Communists in eastern Germany who have had the effrontery to announce that on May 23 they intend to arrange an invasion of west Berlin by Communist-led bands from east Berlin.

Those Americans who are still befuddled by Soviet psychological warfare will argue that such a course of action would produce an unbridgable chasm between the free world and the Communist world. That chasm already exists. It was dug by the Communists. There is no bridge, and there will be no bridge. We face today, not a struggle for security, but a struggle for survival. However much we all wish and pray for peace, this is the hard fact which we cannot get rid of by wishful thinking. We can stop Stalin only by keeping him constantly confronted by superior force and by daring to use that force whenever and wherever he commits direct or indirect aggression. Today we are the last strong power on the side of liberty and Christian civilization. We have to find within ourselves the same courage and will that our forefathers found at Lexington and Concord. We have to be ready once more to give all that we have and all that we are to save the greatest adventure in human freedom that this earth has known—our America.

United States-Israel Copyright Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 9, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to call to the attention of my colleagues that a proclamation, dated May 4, 1950, by the President of the United States establishes copyright privileges and relationship with the State of Israel according to title 17 of the United States Code, section 9, entitled "copyrights," as codified and enacted into law by an act of Congress.

In his proclamation of that date President Truman states that satisfactory official assurances have been received by our Government that since the establishment of the State of Israel, on May 15, 1948, United States citizens have been entitled to obtain copyright protection for their works in Israel on the same basis as accorded to citizens of Israel. As the same time, citizens of Israel have been accorded the same privilege and have been entitled to all the benefits of the copyright law in this country.

I am happy to know that this reciprocity in the granting of copyright privileges and benefits between this country and Israel is now being formally realized into an international agreement. This is a further step in the direction of cementing the bonds of genuine friendship between the world's largest democracy and the world's youngest democracy.

Some Comments on the Current Utility Scene

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have read with great interest a very fine address delivered by one of the newer members of the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Honorable Donald C. Cook.

Mr. Cook's address to the New York Society of Security Analysts presents an excellent picture of the success of the Holding Company Act and the great good that has been accomplished by it.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Cook's address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOME COMMENTS ON THE CURRENT UTILITY SCENE

I am glad to have the opportunity of meeting you and exchanging views on the utility industry.

The electric utility industry was first subjected to intensive Federal regulation about 15 years ago, largely because this basic industry had been severely victimized by the high and low finance of the twenties. The numerous bankruptcies and preferred-stock arrearages among both electric-operating companies and holding companies in the thirties were primarily, if not exclusively, attributable to these financial practices, for the operating electric utility industry showed remarkable stability in the great depression. I think it is easy to prove this statement. Kilowatt-hours generated declined only 15 percent from 1929 to 1932, while in the same period, for example, the Federal Reserve Board index of industrial production fell 47.3 percent. We know, too, that the net operating income of private utility companies, before depreciation and taxes, was greater in every year during the thirties than it was in 1928—a year which itself was better than previous years. The industry's

gross income was actually higher in 1932 than it was in 1928. This great industry was too important to the Nation's economy to permit it to remain ensnared in the tangled web of frenzied finance. The Holding Company Act, one of the great and enduring New Deal reforms, was soon forthcoming. The statute, drafted in the finest traditions of New England conservatism, was bitterly fought by interests standing for radical finance. Oddly enough, the act, which demonstrably was a bulwark of our system of free enterprise, was branded, as the handiwork of wild-eyed and impractical Washington visionaries, or—and even worse—college professors. But that was before the professors built the bomb.

Primarily, the Holding Company Act was intended to perform two major surgical operations upon the utility industry: First, to break up the nonintegrated holding company systems and to create an industry pattern of (a) operating companies returned to local control or (b) regional integrated holding company systems most of which, because of their interstate nature, would remain subject to the Holding Company Act; and, second, drastically to simplify corporate structures by eliminating pyramided holding companies, trick securities, and excessive leverage. As you know, the ideal in this latter respect was a simple, understandable, and well-balanced capital structure which would inspire investor confidence and permit public utilities to attract, on economical terms, the vast sums of new capital needed by them to finance their uninterrupted growth.

But in a relatively short time, as these things go, remarkable results have been achieved. Let me quote some late figures as to the extent of the progress made. From December 31, 1935, to December 31, 1949, 696 companies with assets of $9,106,000,000 have been removed from the jurisdiction of the act through divestment. Some of the properties divested were sold to neighboring utilities who integrated them with their own operations. In addition to the figures just cited, 250 companies with assets of $5,470,000,000 have been divested by holding companies but remain subject to the act by reason of their relationship to another registered holding company.

Comparable results have been achieved under the corporate simplification section. Many unnecessary holding companies and other useless but expensive corporate entities have been eliminated, and the pyramided holding company system is becoming as archaic as the Pyramids of Egypt.

Practically all pertinent ratios reflect the tremendously improved financial health of this industry since 1935. More than $1,300,000,000 of sheer wind, or, as it is sometimes referred to, "balloon juice," has been eliminated from utility property accounts. Ratios of depreciation and amortization reserves to gross property went up from 10.8 percent in 1937 to 21.7 percent at the end of 1948. Coverages of all fixed charges and preferred dividends went up from 1.9 times to 2.7 times. While total debt and preferred stock have increased about 10.3 percent since 1937 to December 31, 1948, generating capacity of privately owned utilities has increased by 42 percent and generation is up by 107 percent. Of course, much of this progress must be ascribed to better economic conditions. But I have seen too many of these improvements emerge from conferences at the Commission not to ascribe some of the accomplishments to the operation of the Holding Company Act.

There has been another development in this industry which I want to mention. The capital structures and complicated corporate systems which flourished in the twenties reflected, in part, the type of men who then dominated this industry. Today, the utility tycoon, with his unresponsiveness to investor and consumer needs, is gone—or almost gone. In his place a new generation of utility executives has grown up. The new generation executives recognize the social responsibility of management. In varying degrees, they tend to be aware that they stand in a sort of trustee relationship to their investors, consumers, and the areas they serve. These men also tend to feel obliged to consider the interests of the public in every important decision they make. To the extent that the management of any particular company contains such men—and many managements do—it has intangible assets of substantial importance.

Under the old regime, by and large, financial policy for most of the Nation's operating companies, whether they were located in Maine or California, was determined by a small group of holding company executives and their affiliated investment bankers in New York City or Chicago. Investment banking business of individual utility companies tended to be monopolized by a traditional banker. Competitive bidding was then a theory—not a reality. The breakup of centralized control over utilities has given operating management the opportunity of doing its own planning and of hiring banking, servicing, and other technical assistance of its own choosing, according to its needs and the requirements of its area.

I am not here primarily to talk about competitive bidding. As you know, however, it was designed, in part, to overcome the influence of traditional relationships between banking houses and public utility companies, and its consequent deleterious effects on financing. But whatever else may be said about it, competitive bidding has diversified the management of security offerings. The Commission's fifteenth annual report to Congress for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, contains a table covering 24 companies whose securities have been marketed at competitive bidding on at least 4 occasions during the last 5 years. The table shows the number of managing underwriters who have been successful in purchasing the securities of these companies. In only one instance was a single manager able to win all securities offered by a particular company over this 5-year period. This manager had not been that company's traditional banker, and a number of other bids were submitted for each of the issues offered. Examination of the membership lists of underwriting syndicates also reveals that individual banking firms now participate in offerings under widely diverse leadership.

We at the SEC cannot help but believe that the diversification in underwriting is healthy both for the utility company and for people in the securities business. Logically, one cannot profess to believe in the competitive free-enterprise system and yet insist on restricting the scope of its operations to only the other fellow's business.

But it seems that these hard-won gains must periodically be rewon. Not long ago, a partner of one of the largest investment banking firms in America, in a speech to a utility industry group, invited the industry to institute an arrangement with competent people to advise you with respect to your financing. In less euphemistic-language, the invitation was, of course, for a continuing banking relationship which, obviously, would not be limited to financial advice but would also include underwriting the company's securities. I, for one, do not believe that the history of the past quarter of a century can be erased so easily. I think we have learned that a financial adviser to a company should not also underwrite its securities. The two functions are inconsistent, for, as a buyer of the company's securities, the underwriter-financial adviser has an immediate conflict of interest with the company—the seller. I believe we have also learned that, apart from combining the functions of adviser and underwriter, it is unhealthy for a company to enter into a tacit understanding whereby management of the underwriting of its securities is monopolized by a single firm. There are too many others in the investment banking business who, in any given case, may have fresher ideas or would otherwise be more enterprising, particularly as to price and spread. Once a utility, voluntarily or otherwise, permits the management of its investment banking business to be handled by a single firm, the custom of the investment banking business is such that other bankers will not in any way compete for the business or in other respects infringe upon the traditional banker's relationship. The utility, therefore, must inevitably incur the higher costs and other disadvantages of monopoly price.

Electric utility capital is turned over only once every 4 or 5 years; capital costs are, therefore, an important factor in the fixing of rates. The national public interest and the particular interest of consumers in low-cost power and the interest of utility common-stock investors in maximizing their income require that the industry's securities be issued and sold only on the most economical terms. Management, if it perseveres in its efforts to strengthen and preserve the private utility industry, must insist on following this course.

The electric-utility industry is now in the middle of a great construction program. In the 5 years since the war, 1946–50, new generating capacity totaling over 17,000,000 kilowatts has been, or will be by the end of 1950, installed by the electric utilities. Excluding Federal projects, money expended, and to be expected, in the 5-year period totals over $9,000,000,000. While the rate of increase may now be declining, the industry is of the general opinion that installed capacity of all electric systems, including Federal, contributing to the public supply will reach a total of about 92,000,000 kilowatts by 1955, as compared with about 68,000,000 kilowatts at the end of 1950. Obviously, this growth will require going to the capital markets for substantial sums.

Of course, this construction program can continue to be financed successfully only if utility securities remain attractive to investors. Earnings, naturally, are basic in this respect, and, while, to a considerable extent, the trend of earnings is beyond managerial control, there are many other factors which are within managerial control. These latter factors are sometimes not given sufficient weight, I think, in considering how to attain investor appeal.

The main appeal of utility securities in the coming years will be, I believe, not to the speculative investor interested in large, quick capital gains, but to the investor attracted by the industry's stability and prospects for growth over the years. The decline of interest rates, both governmental and corporate, and the many undesirable characteristics of preferred stocks, have forced "defensive investors," including institutional ones, into common stocks. Fortunately for them, a whole new field of relatively conservative investment—as things go in these troubled times—has now been opened—utility common stocks. Primarily as a result of the Holding Company Act, highly leveraged and speculative holding-company securities have now been converted to the more stable common stocks of operating utilities. This is a major development in American finance. All of you are aware, I am sure, of the trend to change State laws to permit various types of institutional investors to buy common stocks. In some jurisdictions it is being done, in part, by extending the definition of "legals" to include stable utility equities; in other jurisdictions, including New York,

there is pending legislation to substitute the "prudent man rule" for the legal list—a substitution which will permit trustees to invest in common stocks. Capital from savings banks, life-insurance companies, and personal trusts is becoming available for investment in this industry in ever-increasing amounts. The great growth which is now taking place in common-fund trusts, in investment companies, and in industry pension funds will increase the supply of capital for this industry.

These great sources of capital, primarily in the hands of sophisticated investors, will gravitate toward those utility companies which best maintain the essential characteristics of this industry—stability and growth—and which treat the investor fairly. The company which does not attain and maintain a balanced corporate structure without undue leverage will not appeal to these investors and will be at a disadvantage in competing for capital. As to what proper ratios are, the minimum objective today, I think, should be definitely higher than the 25-percent minimum common-stock equity which the SEC spoke about in 1939. Obviously, no one capital-ratio formula is suitable for all the companies in this industry, but a more conservative pattern is clearly discernible.

I want to mention a number of other factors within managerial control which are important to investors. Most of the industry is fully aware that investor confidence can be retained only by a policy of full and current disclosure. The word "current" should be emphasized. By and large, the utility industry does a good job in keeping investors currently informed and is conscious of the need of doing a better job. Many electric utility companies now announce monthly earnings figures, and most companies publish quarterly earnings statements. However, there are still a few electric companies and a number of gas companies who give general release only to semiannual or even annual reports. While some of these companies appear willing to provide quarterly statements upon request, the ordinary investor looks in vain for this information in the major financial services.

It is difficult to see why all utilities in the electric and gas industries should not, at a minimum, publish quarterly earnings data. Indeed, the time will come when utility investors, some of whom are required to make important investment decisions almost daily, will demand monthly earnings data from these industries. Publication of quarterly and monthly data not only keeps investors informed but also serves the additional function of keeping management "on its toes."

One of the most important attributes of a utility company to investors is its dividend policy. In the growing utility industry, many companies find that they must utilize retained earnings to assist in financing construction. Some utility companies, however, have attempted to finance their construction programs through a maximum of retained earnings and a minimum of new common-stock financing. Our experience has been that it is difficult to maintain or attain proper capital ratios in this manner because of the large amounts of new capital needed. It is well known that electric utility common stocks sell more on a yield basis than on an earnings basis. All other elements being equal, dividends paid, rather than income earned, is the most significant price-determining factor. A utility management which relies too heavily on retained earnings is, therefore, consciously or unconsciously, cheapening the price of its stock. If it errs too much in this respect, it is unfair to the utility investor interested primarily in income rather than in capital gains, and it is to the investor for income to whom it must look for new capital. If its price-earnings ratios are too low, it exposes itself to relatively severe dilution of earnings when it goes to sell common stock, and this in turn intensifies its reluctance for common-stock equity financing.

Of course, dividend policy must vary for each company and must take into consideration numerous factors, such as capital ratios, the nature and volatility of the company's load, size and history of the company, trend of earnings, rate problems, margin of safety of the proposed dividend policy, to mention only a few.

I do not want to be understood by what I have said as urging general dividend increases. But there is an optimum dividend policy for each company, and I am expressing doubt that all companies have given full weight to all the factors involved. One may err, of course, on the high side as well as on the low side, considering the necessity of having balanced ratios and financing construction needs.

We are now in the fourth year of the electric utility expansion program. During the first 2 years—1947 and 1948—many companies financed their expansion through heavy reliance upon senior securities, particularly debt money. It is estimated that common stock and retained earnings were only 24 percent of new-money financing, exclusive of intrasystem transactions, in the 2-year period 1947 and 1948, the balance being raised by 64 percent of debt and 12 percent of preferred stock. For the year 1948 alone common stock and retained earnings were only 19.8 percent of the new money raised. The common-stock market had been very good in the first half of 1946, and, apparently, companies could not reconcile themselves to selling common stock at the materially lower levels prevailing in 1947 and 1948. As you know, of course, the market has been steadily rising since June 1949, and we have seen a substantial amount of common-stock financing for this industry in 1949. It is estimated that in 1949 common stock and retained earnings constituted 33.3 percent of new money, exclusive of intrasystem transactions, the balance consisting of 53.6 percent debt and 13.1 percent preferred. The gamble that many companies took that markets would be better in 1949 paid off. But it was a gamble, and, considering the senior securities of the industry, it was gambling on a margin of only 31 percent for the median publicly held company in the industry. Utility managements should not be in the business of speculating on the stock market, and they do not, any more than you or I, have a crystal ball which can assure them that the market will be better next fall or the following spring.

In many cases appropriate common-stock financing is postponed because of the expectation that the next 6 months or the next year will see better earnings. Such a decision involves the assumption that the market will value those higher earnings on at least as favorable a basis as today's earnings. Of course, that is merely another way of betting on the market—which is not the business of an electric-utility company.

It is time to abandon the view that new issues of electric utility common stock should be confined to "boom" markets. By and large, the capital needs of the utility industry should be financed on an as-you-go basis. Under this policy, and in the light of the company's objective as to an optimum capital structure, permanent financing would always include common stock among the securities offered to finance expansion. In this way its capital ratios will be constantly maintained and it will assure itself of attaining its ultimate objective as to capital structure. As W. F. Stanley, of Southwestern Public Service Co., recently pointed out, a financing-as-you-go policy is similar to the policy followed by insurance companies in investing their funds as they go. The averaging of prices involved in financing-as-you-go programs should result over the years in relatively low money costs. A financing-as-you-go program reflects the growing status of electric-utility common stocks as a relatively stable investment security and assigns to them a constant and major role in the financing of utility construction.

As security analysts, your work has been greatly facilitated by the developments in the utility industry in the last 10 years. The elimination of "wind and water" from utility accounts and the simplification and integration of holding company systems have now placed security analysis in the utility industry on a rational basis. In the past, with few operating company equities available and with all the complexities and uncertainties surrounding holding-company securities, you could put only the speculative investor into securities of this industry—others had to be warned: "Danger, stay away." Today it is possible for you to speak with relatively greater confidence—I emphasize relatively—about this industry than perhaps about any other.

You, as security analysts, can play a dynamic role in keeping utility securities a relatively stable investment. Your views tend to be reflected in the investment advice people receive in all parts of the country. Investment decisions made by a small local trust fund in Kalamazoo or a large insurance company in New York reflect your recommendations. Utility companies should realize that, to the extent that their financial policies and other practices affecting investors minimize investor appeal, you, as a group will divert funds to companies which treat investors more considerately and more fairly. I would urge you to speak out, both individually and through the society, against unfair-to-investor practices. To the extent that you will reflect the long-run needs of the investor as distinguished from the in-and-out speculator in utility common stocks, you can become the articulate voice of the owners of this industry—its common stockholders. And don't forget the consumer. His interest in a public service industry should be, and is, parallel, and not antagonistic, to the interest of your clients'—and, therefore, your—interests.

Fuel Resources and the National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRVING M. IVES
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an address entitled "Our Fuel Resources and the National Defense," delivered by Roderick Stephens, president of Roderick Stephens and Associates, Inc., public relations counsel, at the Eighth Annual Anthracite Conference of Lehigh University, on May 4, 1950. I may add, Mr. President, that the address is most pertinent, because it pertains to the recent coal crisis and the coal situation as a whole.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR FUEL RESOURCES AND THE NATIONAL DEFENSE

At the beginning of this century, bituminous coal and anthracite were the dominant

fuels of our Nation. The petroleum industry was in its infancy; the motor vehicle was still looked upon as a curiosity and the airplane was no more than the inventor's dream. Natural gas was not recognized as a major fuel resource.

Bituminous coal powered the locomotives of the Nation's rapidly growing network of railroads and except for the rapidly disappearing sailing ship, propelled our merchant marine, our infant Navy, and refueled the foreign-flag vessels that visited our ports to discharge and pick up passengers and freight.

Anthracite was the dominant fuel for domestic purposes in its distribution area which then extended to the Mississippi River and included a large share of the market of eastern Canada.

Then came the automobile, and with it the development of the petroleum industry. Its growth was predicated upon its fluidity which gave it a monopoly of the business of supplying motor fuel and lubricants to pleasure cars, trucks, busses, and farm equipment. Later, it fell heir to a similar monopoly of the fuel and lubrication requirements of the aviation industry.

Had the petroleum industry confined itself to these areas we would not now have to face a serious defense problem. However, we all know that the technological skills and marketing vigor and resourcefulness of the petroleum industry soon led to an invasion of every phase of the fuel business. As a result, today, substantially one-half of the Nation's energy needs once supplied by solid fuels are now furnished by liquid and gaseous fuels.

The progressive substitution of liquid fuels for solid fuels in maritime and naval service has created a major supply hazard in the event of war.

The extent to which our railroads have recently turned from coal to oil, creates another serious defense problem, for this means that another vital transportation service is now almost wholly dependent upon the petroleum industry.

Remember, too, that these vessels and these locomotives cannot be converted to coal in the event of war. They must be supplied with oil or must be laid up. Obviously, they must be kept in service.

Not only has the use of oil for all forms of transportation grown with the constant increase in the number of vehicles, planes, locomotives, and vessels in daily service, but oil has also become a major source of energy in stationary heating and power plants.

The still more recent and rapid development of transcontinental pipe-line networks for the transportation of natural gas from southern fields to distant markets has injected a new major competitor to both coal and oil. Having a demonstrated appeal as a laborless automatic fuel, natural gas is popular, not only with the domestic consumer but with industry. On that basis, natural gas as such, or in admixture with manufactured gas or as an enriching agent in gas manufacture, has become a major factor in the energy market. New and still more serious defense problems are thus being created, as to which the public is blissfully ignorant and the gas industry generally complacent.

From the standpoint of national defense, there are two basic problems which relate necessarily to all fuels. Do we have sufficient reserves and is our productive capacity sufficient to supply the total fuel needs of our civilian economy and of our Military Establishment, in the event of war? Also, do we know with any degree of exactitude, the extent of the reserves of solid, liquid, and gaseous fuels upon which we must depend, in the event of war, and do we know what will be the total fuel requirements of the Military Establishment, in the event of another war? Perhaps it should also be asked here whether the possibility of war is sufficiently remote so that we need not concern ourselves with the problem of our fuel resources and the national defense.

The last question is one on which the most responsible and best-informed authorities are in substantial agreement. General Marshall gave his estimate of the situation in the phrase, "the chips are down." General Eisenhower's public statements make it clear that he believes the possibility of world war III cannot be disregarded. The recent reestablishment of bipartisanship in the conduct of our foreign relations is significant.

The designation of W. Stuart Symington as head of the National Security Resources Board fills a post of vital importance with a man of ability and experience. It also serves to fill out the personnel of the National Security Council, which together with the Department of Defense, constitute the two key agencies jointly responsible for planning, preparing, and organizing the Nation's war potential, whether for offense or defense. Through these agencies and these leaders, we should be able to assume that our defense needs, in terms of fuel resources will be accurately estimated.

In World War II, the armed forces consumed approximately 1,750,000 barrels of oil a day. Of this amount something over a million barrels came from reserve productive capacity, about 200,000 barrels by forcing production beyond the maximum efficient rate, and about 500,000 barrels came from rationing. World War II taught us, however, that oil which has gone into commerce cannot readily be reclaimed for war needs. It is certain that if war comes within 5 years the purely military needs for oil would have a stunning effect on our entire economy. Industrial users of petroleum products who could not convert to other fuels would, presumably, be given high priority. Whether any liquid fuel would be left over for home heating can only be guessed now. Probably very little. Obviously, military needs will have top priority.

We now come to a question that can be reduced to a factual basis. What do we know about the Nation's reserves of coal, petroleum, and of natural gas? The answer is not reassuring, except as to coal. I assert, as a fact, that there are no data from disinterested sources on reserves of petroleum or natural gas. What these reserves really amount to has yet to be determined with any degree of accuracy or assurance. Further, I assert as a fact that the data that are available, all of which come only from interested industry sources, are so conflicting and contain such glaring discrepancies, that no sane person could afford to place any reliance upon such estimates in planning the Nation's defense. The facts are that the nature of the deposits and reserves of oil and gas do not lend themselves to precise determination, either of the extent of subsurface deposits or of recoverable amounts. Leading authorities on the subject agree that all such reports are estimates at best, which cannot be supported by evidence of the same validity as can be adduced for solid fuels.

The data upon which the Bureau of Mines rely for their published estimates of reserves of bituminous coal and anthracite was obtained by a comprehensive survey of coal deposits made by the United States Geologic Survey. No similar survey of deposits of oil or gas has ever been undertaken by any governmental agency.

Interested industry data contain glaring discrepencies on all types of liquid and gaseous fuels. I shall cite several authenticated examples. Many more examples are available. My first examples disclose discrepancies between figures published by the Oil and Gas Journal, recognized as an official publication of the oil and gas industry, in which are reported estimates of so-called proven reserves of various liquid and gaseous fuels, and corresponding estimates made by committees of the American Petroleum Institute and of the American Gas Association as contained in official publications of these associations.

PROVEN RESERVES OF TOTAL LIQUID HYDROCARBONS AND DRY NATURAL GAS IN UNITED STATES

Example I: From Oil and Gas Journal, issue of Jan. 26, 1950, page 190:

	Jan. 1, 1950	Jan. 1, 1949	Change
Crude oil, condensate and other natural gas liquids (millions of barrels)	28,586	27,325	[1] 1,261
Dry natural gas (billions of cubic feet)	178,136	175,187	[1] 2,949

[1] Gain.

From Official Reports, published jointly by American Gas Association and American Petroleum Institute, volume 4, Dec. 31, 1949:

	Dec. 31, 1949	Dec. 31, 1948	Increase 1949 versus 1948
Crude oil and natural gas liquids—total liquid hydrocarbons (millions of barrels)	28,378	26,821	1,557
Natural gas (billions of cubic feet)	180,381	173,869	6,512

Example II: Same date from Oil and Gas Journal, issue of Jan. 27, 1949, p. 189:

	Jan. 1, 1949	Jan. 1, 1948	Change
Crude oil, etc. (millions of barrels)	27,325	25,984	[1] 1,341
Dry natural gas (billions of cubic feet)	175,187	174,279	[1] 908

[1] Gain.

Same data from Reports of Petroleum Institute and Gas Association, vol. 3, Dec. 31, 1948:

	Dec. 31, 1948	Dec. 31, 1947	Increase 1948 versus 1947
Crude oil, etc. (millions of barrels)	26,821	24,741	2,079
Natural gas (billions of cubic feet)	173,869	165,926	7,942

Industry estimates of gain in reserves of crude oil, etc., exceed the estimates of the Journal by 23.5 percent for the year of 1949 and by 55 percent for the year of 1948. Greater discrepancies exist as to gains in natural gas reserves where industry figures exceed Gas and Oil Journal figures by 120 percent in 1949, and by 774.7 percent in 1948.

Other examples disclose discrepancies in estimates of reserves of gas attributed to specific fields as published in the Oil and Gas Journal and as estimated by a geologist who qualified as an expert for testimony before the Federal Power Commission:

Oyster Bayou field, Chambers County, Tex.

Field total as at Jan. 1, 1950:	*Barrels*
Oil and Gas Journal	60,000,000
Geologist	114,272,400

The geologist in question was Mr. David Hawthorne, a partner in Petroleum Consultants, Inc., Houston, Tex. He testified before Federal Power Commission on January 31, 1950, for Piedmont Natural Gas Co., Docket G–1165, Exhibit 359 C.

Fig Ridge field, Chambers County, Tex.

Field total as at Jan. 1, 1950:	*Barrels*
Oil and Gas Journal	18,000,000
Hawthorne	23,875,000

This figure represented Mr. Hawthorne's estimate of the total capacity of that portion of this field owned by Sun Oil Co., approximately one-half of the area, the remainder being owned by the Texas Co., which was not a party to the proceedings and which portion of the field was not included in Mr. Hawthorne's estimate. Above testimony was given in same proceedings as involved Oyster Bayou Field.

In these two examples, the discrepancies are also startling. Mr. Hawthorne's figures exceeded the Gas and Oil Journal's estimates in the first field by more than 90 percent and in the second field, by more than 150 percent after equalization on an area basis.

Evidence of inaccuracy or uncertainty of estimates of qualified, expert geologists could be multiplied, indefinitely, from the records of the Federal Power Commission. As typical, I cite from the record, estimates by nine qualified geologists, three testifying as to reserves in the San Salvador field and six testifying as to reserves in the Carthage field. As to the San Salvador field, the facts are:

Estimator	Estimate made	Title of proceeding	Estimate (trillions of cubic feet)
SAN SALVADOR			
Ralph Davis.	Jan. 1, 1945	SEC	[1] 1.59
Albert Brokaw.	do	FPC Docket No. G-621.	[1] 1.32
Ralph Graham	Not available; probably 1948.	FPC Docket No. G-962.	[1] .97

[1] A different pressure base was used in each of the 3 estimates. For the purpose of comparison all 3 estimates have been converted to the same base (14.65 psia).

The difference between the Davis and Graham estimates is nearly two-thirds of a trillion cubic feet; between the Brokaw and Graham estimates, more than one-third of a trillion. The discrepancy is said to be accounted for by the discovery of a fault in the field which was not known to exist at the time of the Davis and Brokaw estimates.

As to the Carthage field the record is as follows:

Estimator	Estimates made	Title of proceeding	Estimate (trillions of cubic feet)
CARTHAGE			
E. O. Bennett.	Jan. 1, 1945	FPC Docket No. G-621.	7.27
F. S. Kelly, Jr.[1]	Apr. 28, 1945	----------	8.00
Neil Williams.[2]	May 19, 1945	----------	4.23
John T. Scopes.	Dec. 25, 1946	FPC Docket No. G-880.	5.35
Ralph Graham.	Jan. 1, 1947	FPC Docket No. G-808.	7.25
I. I. Gardescu.	July 1, 1948	FPC Docket No. G-859.	4.17

[1] President, Arkansas-Louisiana Gas Co.
[2] Special writer, Oil and Gas Journal.

The difference between the highest and lowest estimate for this field, which has been referred to as the third largest field in the country, is in excess of 3¾ trillion cubic feet. The Federal Power Commission's staff reported that the Carthage Field embraces about 300,000 surface acres, whereas Mr. Gardescu estimated its area at about 200,000 acres.

Another factor that creates a very special defense hazard is the fact that this Nation is importing a substantial gallonage of crude and residual oil from abroad. Some of these imports come from the Far East, the balance from South America. The effect of these imports is necessarily to diminish domestic production and discourage exploration for new pools. How then can we hope to raise production in the event of war, if our domestic productivity has remained stationary? Remember that we must assume that enemy action against surface ships, such as tankers, will be no less effective in world war III than in World War II. Where then will we get the gallonage to replace the imported fuel? Where will we find the excess productive capacity without which our war effort will be seriously impaired?

Our national defense is in jeopardy for lack of authoritative knowledge of what our oil and gas reserves amount to, and how much of each will be required by the military and how much will be left for civilian usage. Without such basic information no intelligent estimate of the fuel situation can be made by our military authorities.

Also, we had better not assume that "tidelands oil" can be relied upon if war comes, for we have no reason to believe that offshore production and transportation facilities can be protected against long-range bombers, snorkel submarines, rockets, guided missiles, or atomic bombs.

For all these reasons, therefore, we will be wise to encourage the adjustment of our civilian economy to a final pattern that will make it possible to meet the Nation's needs for fuel, not only from within our shoreline, but from sources of supply known to be available and by production facilities known to be adequate. To say that is to stress again the need to know what supplies of oil and gas and hard coal and soft coal are actually available and what output of each can be relied upon in the event of war.

It was with precisely such thoughts in mind that Senator FRANCIS J. MYERS from Pennsylvania introduced on the floor of the United States Senate by unanimous consent, on March 15 past, a resolution of inquiry which was referred to the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. This resolution, known as Senate Resolution No. 239, proposed that the committee (or a subcommittee) shall inquire into "the available fuel reserves of the United States, with the aim of formulating an over-all domestic fuel policy." Other proposals are also pending in the Senate and in the House to create commissions to study and investigate the American coal industry or to regulate the coal industry. Senator MYERS' resolution, however, seems not only to be aimed at the heart of the problem of national defense, but seems also to be the one proposal with an excellent chance for speedy passage.

In introducing his resolution, Senator MYERS made reference to a parallel situation which was faced and solved by American industry and ingenuity, working in harmony with the Federal Government at the outset of World War II. His reference was to the problem created when our principal sources of crude rubber were cut off by enemy action. We had to hastily improvise a synthetic-rubber industry, by which process we solved a situation that threatened our war machine and our civilian economy.

To improvise a synthetic-fuel industry, however, on such short notice would be quite another problem. However there is one interesting fact, which is that we have the know-how to produce; in fact, we are already producing synthetic oil, either in the form of fuel oil or Diesel oil or gasoline from natural gas and at costs competitive with the natural product. That fact has an important bearing on the problem of fuels for defense. It suggests that we should not casually assume that natural gas can safely be substituted in unlimited amounts, either for oil or for coal, whether anthracite or soft coal. Rather should we establish by authoritative evidence, that there is enough natural gas and to spare, to serve the domestic and industrial needs of the States where it is found; enough and more to supply markets to which it is already committed for a 20-year period; and enough and more to supply new and distant markets, now being served by liquid or solid fuels. Also, we would do well to study the desirability of conserving a portion of our natural-gas reserves for production of synthetic gasoline for defense.

This proposed inquiry should be a matter of urgent concern to Senators representing States that must draw their fuel supplies from outside sources. Many such States are already dependent upon long-distance pipelines for a substantial quantity of natural gas. Those States will be well served by the passage of the Myers resolution. The inquiry it proposes should disclose just how much of the remaining gas reserves are already dedicated to pipelines now serving these areas, and for the usual 20-year contract period. Certainly no new lines should be permitted to tap those fields unless surplus reserves are proved to exist.

Another such group of fuel-dependent States that should demand such an inquiry are the New England States, into which it is proposed to feed natural gas from the deep South. This gas will presumably displace coal and oil in homes and industries. Despite high-pressure selling by promoters of natural-gas pipelines, Yankee shrewdness will discourage the buying of "a pig in a poke." It won't take long to find out for sure just how certain it is that the supply of natural gas is adequate to guarantee a definite and substantial quantity for an uninterrupted period of 20 years. Until such assurances are had, New Englind will be well advised to defer final approval of the project. The cost of converting coal- or oil-burning facilities to gas-burning facilities is substantial. Also, it is by no means certain, in the light of recent developments, what actual savings will be realized. But, most important is it to be assured that New England homes and industries will not face the same distress suffered by industries and their employees, in the winter of 1947–48, when automotive plants in Detroit and elsewhere had to close, due to failure of the supply of natural gas.

It must be remembered that conversion of fuel-burning equipment is costly and cannot be improvised. Some installations lend themselves to conversion; some do not. However, conversion equipment is not the only problem. Equally important is it to be able to increase production of the fuel to be substituted for the fuel that will be no longer available.

Certainly coal production facilities cannot be improvised. It is also difficult and costly to maintain idle coal-production facilities on a stand-by basis. Even more difficult and costly is it to maintain an idle coal mine for any length of time in "moth balls." It is literally impossible. That is another important unsolved defense problem.

Nor can we improvise the manpower needed to mine coal. There lies another problem with an important bearing on national defense. It also has an impact on public welfare that should not be ignored in time of peace.

Rail transportation service and facilities are also directly involved in the problem of national defense. Transportation of men and material involves the military problem of logistics. There is no more important problem of logistics than the logistics of fuels for defense. Here, too, it is vital to recognize that we cannot improvise rail facilities and we will do well to determine what rail transportation needs will be involved if a widespread conversion of fuels will be demanded by defense needs.

National security should not be left to chance or guess work. The Nation's need for fuels should be definitely forecast and its requirements assured by intelligent provision. It does not appear feasible to stock-pile coal, or at least, not soft coal, which is subject to spontaneous combustion and which disintegrates with exposure to the atmosphere.

Stockpiling of any coal is a costly process and should not be attempted unless there is no other way to provide against a national fuel scarcity. Crude oil can be stock-piled but it makes little sense to pump it out, then to force it back into underground pools from which it may then be withdrawn a second time. The same remark applies to natural gas.

However, the purpose of this address is not to solve the problem but rather to state the problem and suggest how we should move toward a solution.

Abraham Lincoln once said, "If we could first know where we are, and whether we are tending, we could better judge what to do and how to do it." I know of no better way to accomplish this purpose than to pass Senate Resolution 239 and then proceed with the inquiry as authorized.

The Senior Partner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 9, 1950

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for the record a speech delivered by the Honorable Knox T. Hutchinson, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, before the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, on March 24, 1950:

THE SENIOR PARTNER

I welcome this opportunity to appear before the National Rivers and Harbors Congress.

A richer, safer, and happier life will be assured for all our people when we have learned to use to best advantage all our resources in land and water. This is the goal of true conservation which we in the Department of Agriculture share in common with you.

This is the reason, I presume, for inviting me to talk about the Department's land and water policies. I must add—with all good will—that you were preeminently wise in limiting me to 15 minutes.

Nearly everything we do is connected in the long run with the conservation and use of those resources. My text, therefore, is one upon which we could dwell for many hours in going over the broad sweep of the Department's work to advance the cause of conservation.

In research alone, we are pushing ahead with scores of projects which will give us a firmer hold upon our valuable topsoil. And I mean that in its most literal sense. Nothing short of a bulldog's undying grip will preserve our heritage of soil for the America of tomorrow. The wide range of our research includes tillage, grazing, and forestry practices, the selection and breeding of superior varieties of grasses and legumes, and the application of lime, fertilizers, and other minerals to the soil.

More and more we are coming to understand that our research, like agriculture itself, does not fit into neat little subdivisions. We must conduct our research so that the findings of all its visible parts can be usefully applied in a complete farming operation. This has logical appeal for farmers. Their farm work is often complicated by the difficult task of jigsawing the splendid recommendations of the specialists into a workable farm system.

But there is a far deeper reason for research which employs new discoveries and new methods in combination. Often there is a high degree of interaction among them which gives the separate practices added value in the right combination. The principle of interaction assures maximum benefits far exceeding the results of piecemeal application.

We must employ this same principle in our farm programs. It is the highroad to a satisfactory solution of the interrelated problems of farm income, soil conservation, and family farm living. We cannot treat them in fragments with any genuine hope of permanent improvement.

This is true when we approach agriculture as the primary use of our resources in land and water.

This is equally true when we view farming as the potential soft spot in the Nation's economic welfare.

In fact, there is a vital connection between these approaches.

Let's put it down—here and now—as a No. 1 fact that soil and water conservation problems have economic roots.

Rapidly plunging farm income is a storm warning. It tells us in unmistakable terms that erosion and fertility losses will rise with increasing speed.

The unblinkable fact is grounded in the realities of farming.

Let me illustrate.

First, the ordinary reaction to falling income is to increase production by mining the soil.

This is often the only recourse for farmers pressed with debts and fixed farming costs. By increasing their marketings, farmers can manage for a while at least to keep up their income.

But this practice sets the spurs to erosion and fertility losses.

You may well consider the farmer's choice unwise.

But let me speak for my fellow farmers.

They are usually confronted with the bitter reality of making less and less income do the job of feeding, clothing, and caring for farm children, meeting interest and payments on the mortgage, and paying out what cash they can to keep their farms operating. This skeleton of words fails by far to describe all the hardships and sacrifices that go into the painful task of keeping the family on the farm.

Second, conservation costs money in cash and often in temporary reductions in farm income.

Even some of our stout-hearted conservationists forget this fact and expect farmers to live up to their stewardship of the land without the cash and capital for the essential work. This armchair attitude reminds me of the proverbial prize-fight manager who urged his battered and reeling contender on with these brave words:

"We can lick him!"

Farmers need real backing all the way to carry the main burden of the Nation's efforts to retain its reserves in fertility and its resources in topsoil. Indeed, we have to get in and help them fight—when we can and where we can.

A fair income for farmers rightfully should stand in the first line of defense which the National Congress of Rivers and Harbors has long endeavored to build and strengthen against floods and their choking tides of silt. For this reason, sensible and workable income supports have a proper place in conservation. But our programs should do more than protect farm income. Farmers should be encouraged to undertake the types of farming, especially livestock and grasslands enterprises, which are best designed to maintain our resources as well as to feed and clothe the Nation.

In our conservation, in our flood-control programs, in our resolute efforts to harness great rivers for navigation, irrigation, hydroelectric power, recreation, and improved water supplies, we cannot safely ignore the sum total of individual farming operations which constitute the business of farming.

Farmers have an interest in the utilization of land and water and the policies which influence such use.

This interest must be clearly recognized if we are to achieve good farming everywhere. In its fundamental sense, good farming, which is the basis of soil conservation is nothing more nor less than the use of those resources to the best advantage of the farmer, the community, and the Nation. The widespread failure to understand this fact has created a gulf which separates the programs of the Department of Agriculture and the programs of other public agencies in land and water utilization.

There is a world of difference between the methods employed in an engineering program of public works and the Department's and—I must add—the farmer's usual approach to the same problem on his land.

In an engineering program, the Government acts as its own agent, uses public funds for all the costs, even when they are partially reimbursable, and carries forward the work on sites where the Government has established certain property rights.

But a farm program can only advance when it has won the confidence and cooperation of farmers.

Their conservation work must dovetail with going farm operations which must pay their own way and yield returns over and above net out-of-pocket costs. Even when the Government offers reimbursement in part for conservation, the farmer's share of the cost usually far outweighs the Government's contribution. Conservation farming has to demonstrate that it offers a fair return on this investment. Nor can this return be figured in intangible benefits.

The farmer is our partner in conservation—the senior partner at that.

As a result of these interests and responsibilities, a basic understanding has grown up between the Department and the farm and livestock people. We put a high value on this partnership.

The power of the Government's conservation dollars get a real boost from the dollars that the farmers put up. This is something worth thinking about. Here is a fund-matching system in which the private citizen—in this case, the farmer—puts his own money on the line on his own initiative.

It has been the means of accomplishing many important jobs in which the vital interest and security of the Nation have been protected as well as the basic welfare of farm people.

The dual objectives of production and conservation require a unified approach.

On individual farms the treatment of cropland, forests, and range forms one over-all farm problem.

On large areas of forested lands, forestry improvements must be considered in the light of the need for grazing the same lands. In many areas in the West, the use of grazing areas is closely related to the production of supplemental feed on irrigated land.

Cutting across these separate problems and tying them together is the problem of the conservation, use, and control of water. On the individual farm, the relationship of water to land has primary importance whether the problem is erosion control, conservation of water for crop production, safe removal of excess water, or bringing water to arid lands. What we do on upstream forests and ranges has a bearing on flood control farther downstream. The impact of conservation on the farm goes beyond flood control and irrigation and influences our fish and wildlife resources, recreational opportunities, and water supplies for navigation and for domestic and industrial uses.

This same unified treatment likewise applies to the intimate interrelationships among all the segments of the Nation's conservation and land-use problems.

The Nation is becoming increasingly aware of the pressing necessity for the development and conservation of all its natural

resources. Comprehensive, multiple-purpose plans for resource development are gaining widespread recognition as the best way of doing the job. We likewise are learning that a river basin or some other large region with common interests offers an ideal base for developing and advancing these plans. The evolution of this idea began with flood control, navigation, irrigation, and water power.

But these regional programs with their accent on water have only served to emphasize the inseparability of land and water. As a result, the agricultural agencies are finding it increasingly necessary to adapt their programs to the basic need for treating land and water as a unit.

My lifetime business is farming where we have learned and learned again the lesson that land and water must work together.

We should endeavor to deal with our problems at their very beginning on the land where the water from rain and melting snow starts rushing downhill. This is the beginning of one of nature's most powerful forces. Here on the farm it is still a man-size problem instead of the monster it becomes farther downstream. We should begin to meet the challenge of floods back on the farm. Here we can summon the aid of our strongest allies—the land itself—the furrow contoured across the slope—terraces and waterways and ponds—and trees and grass. Upstream dams have their place in conservation. But they offer at best only temporary benefits unless they are supported by good farming. Silt and sediment from unprotected and poorly managed farm land can turn into folly our reliance upon channel control str' ctures—large or small, upstream or down. We must never forget that the land itself is our foundation.

Agriculture has only begun to show what it can do in meeting the Nation's land and water problems. The present disparity between agricultural conservation and other water programs must be closed if we are to obtain the full benefits of a balanced attack.

The Department has recently taken an important step to adapt its work to the severe problems of the Missouri River Basin. Our proposed program is now before the Congress for consideration. Nine agencies of the Department and the agricultural and forestry agencies of the basin States pooled their knowledge and technical resources in its preparation. We have also taken the necessary first steps to bring the essential benefits of integrated agricultural work to the support of a comprehensive program for the Columbia Basin.

The question may well be asked: "Why is a special agricultural program necessary for the Missouri Basin?" The Federal and State agricultural agencies now do a lot of work in the basin as part of our Nation-wide programs. It is necessary, however, to fit these activities to the pressing needs which are arising from the swift progress of the engineering program Congress has authorized for the main channels of the Missouri and its larger tributaries.

Soil surveys, for instance, illustrate the need for accelerating our work. Under the regular Nation-wide agricultural programs, we expect eventually to make classification studies of all the soils of the basin. In the case of lands proposed for special development, use, and treatment, however, this information is needed in time to guide these developments in their formative stages. This same principle applies to the other aspects of our agricultural programs.

The problem has been met by making an inventory of all agricultural needs in the Missouri Basin, determining a timetable for meeting these needs, and setting up an action program to meet them.

The Department's Missouri River Basin proposal is significant. It points the way to a balanced effort in basin improvement throughout the country. Up to now, the agricultural work has lagged behind the installation of public works for flood control, power, navigation, and other purposes. The principle of interaction should be given opportunity to demonstrate the worth of soil and water conservation in complete land and water programs.

In closing, I want to emphasize again the need for a continuing close working relationship between farmer and government in all efforts to utilize land and water. This should be the dominant theme as we move forward.

Public welfare requires that farmers have the support and assistance of effective and well-adapted public programs. But there is a vital function that only the farmers can perform through the wise management of their own farms and by working together in their own organizations and local institutions. Government can never provide a substitute for the farmer's own efforts. Government's role is essentially one of assistance. We must always remember that each farm family is the custodian of the basic resources upon which the destiny of a great nation ultimately depends.

Articles by Howard Watson Ambruster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 8, 1950

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me, I desire to insert into the RECORD three articles by the well-known expert on German affairs, Howard Watson Ambruster, which appeared in the Daily Compass. One article is entitled "McCloy Ducks Denazification Mess in Reich," and bears the date of February 22, 1950. The second article is entitled "United States Apology for Nazism Spread in West Reich," under date of February 23, 1950; and the third article is entitled "The Cartels That Worked Against Us When It Hurt," bearing the date line of March 8, 1950.

These facts should be brought to the attention of the American people, and the articles follow:

[From the Daily Compass of February 22, 1950]

McCLOY DUCKS DENAZIFICATION MESS IN REICH

(By Howard Watson Ambruster)

United States High Commissioner John J. McCloy has not waited long to recant publicly his tough talk to the Germans on February 6. He has now let it be known that he has no intention of exercising his authority in the denazification bribery scandal uncovered at Stuttgart.

This flagrant denial of his own official responsibilities came only a few days after McCloy had denounced to a press conference the high German official who endeavored to cover up this denazification mess. The latter, Reinhold Maier, minister-president of Wurttemberg-Baden, had made a vicious public attack upon Maj. Gen. Charles P. Gross, the United States State Commissioner. This was because General Gross, very properly, had asked for a thorough investigation and drastic action against those involved in the fixing of denazification trials.

JUDGES BRIBED

It has been revealed that considerable sums were paid out in bribes for the whitewashing of more than 500 Nazis by so-called court action. Prominent Stuttgart industrialists were among those who were cleared of all charges of Nazi activities by the simple process of buying the judge. Thousands of others were pardoned after conviction.

The defiance of United States authority by Maier appears more flagrant in that one of his own denazification ministers, Karle Stroele, is involved. Stroele's own acquittal of being a Nazi, by an earlier German tribunal, has also been questioned. It is charged, too, that Stroele made the deal with Dr. Hjalmar Schacht by which the 8-year labor camp sentence against that notorious Nazi was nullified in North Wurttemberg on June 13, 1949.

After this Stroele skullduggery, Maj. Gen. George P. Hayes, Deputy United States Military Governor, publicly announced that Dr. Schacht was thereby fully qualified for appointment to high place in the new government of West Germany.

Aside from protecting Stroele, Herr Maier appears to have a very odorous record personally on denazification. A parliamentary committee of his state of Wurttemberg-Baden has been instructed to investigate some 10,000 pardons or commutations which he granted to Nazis. These were Hitler followers whose records were so bad that even the packed German tribunals had not dared to whitewash them.

M'CLOY SIDESTEPS

In this connection, Herr Maier is on record as declaring that American denazification policies are all bunk.

Before McCloy returned from his recent Washington trip, some of the United States staff at Frankfurt fully expected that he would invoke the occupation statute and make use of his unquestioned authority to clean up this noisome mess as soon as he got back on the job.

The High Commissioner did use some hard words when he returned. Now he has meekly subsided. He has sidestepped the issue as a "purely local situation." Herr Maier's blast at General Gross is thus vindicated. So, it would seem are his views on denazification.

It has been given out, officially, that the United States High Commissioner has no powers to intervene in this affair unless it is clearly proved that the Minister-President has violated the German state constitution.

HOSTILE ACT

On the record this excuse appears to be an arrant fabrication. The attack made upon General Gross constituted an openly hostile act directed at the authority of the Allied forces. That offense comes squarely within the powers expressly reserved to the Allies by the statute under which the Government of western Germany exists.

As such McCloy can, and should, back up his scolding by drastic action—at least the removal of Maier from his office.

[From the Daily Compass of February 23, 1950]

UNITED STATES APOLOGY FOR NAZISM SPREAD IN WEST REICH

(By Howard Watson Ambruster)

Denial of war guilt by the Germans presents one of the most serious obstacles to establishment of the Bonn government as a peaceful democracy. Despite this, a bold apology for German war lust and Nazi murders is now being distributed in Germany with apparent United States official approval.

Even worse, this rank pan-Germanism propaganda is an article written by a high-ranking subordinate of James W. Riddleberger, director of political affairs on the staff of United States High Commissioner John J. McCloy.

Dr. Kurt Glaser, an American-born citizen now serving in Germany, is the author

of the article. Entitled "The So-called German Mind" it appeared first in the Antioch Review, published at Yellow Springs, Ohio. This quarterly enjoys the prestige of Antioch College, although not an official publication of that institution.

The article, in effect, purports to refute the accepted belief in the intellectual dishonesty of the German mass mind. It also denies the average German's willingness to respond with incredible brutality when even a ruthless leadership believes the right moment for world conquest may come again.

Dr. Glaser's apologies had been translated and is being distributed throughout western Germany by the German Institute of Public Affairs.

According to a German correspondent of this reporter, the Institute is a pseudo-official organization made up of representatives of a dozen or so German groups. Its headquarters are at Frankfurt. With official sanction and approval from the McCloy staff, the Institute appears to be one of the most important sources of so-called Allied or democratic doctrine in Germany.

Through this authoritative voice, the western Germans are now being given, as a reliable American viewpoint, such sophistries as a comparison of the Nazi mass murders with the treatment of Negroes in America and the political morality of the British during the European expansion of the last century.

German weltanschauung is justified with the naive assumption that the fatherland, as put together by Bismarck, is merely going through a growing-up process a little later than England, France, and the United States. The thinking Germans of today, says Dr. Glaser, demand that they be accepted as a nation which is just as moral as the western allies.

They should also insist, he says, that the evilness of the Treaty of Versailles has already been conceded by the Allies, and that no de facto cession of German territory should ever be recognized.

CITES "WRONGS"

A dramatic Germany is thus instructed to "plan for the day when these wrongs can be righted." They are informed that their justifiable dissatisfaction with "conditions of the armistice does not mean that the 'German mind' is planning new deviltries."

In view of the chaotic conditions now existing in Germany due to the scuttling of every vital war objective and occupation policy the sanction of this kind of propaganda is like pouring oil on a blazing fire.

[From the Daily Compass of March 8, 1950]

THE CARTELS THAT WORKED AGAINST US WHEN IT HURT

(By Howard Watson Ambruster)

Robert Bosch, founder and mechanical genius of the great German combine bearing his name, had a younger brother, Dr. Carl Bosch, who was a founder and chemical genius of the German Dye Trust, and of its successor, I. G. Farben.

Each was a master technician of the industry in which he played so important a part. And each made full use of the economic mechanisms of combine and cartel to dominate German Government policies and promote the world conquest dreams of pan-Germanism.

Both were highly educated aristocrats with the arrogance typical of their class toward their fellow men.

INDISPENSABLE IN WAR

Robert, in the electrical and petroleum motor industries, Carl in the production of chemical and synthetic materials, were indispensable for plotting and waging modern war.

Total war (mass destruction) dates back to the turn of the century, when the gasoline engine replaced the horse for ground transport and made aerial warfare possible. The inventive genius of Robert Bosch emerged here. TNT, the original explosive suitable for mass destruction, was first made from dye byproducts 10 years before World War I. Synthetic nitrogen and poison-gas warfare were two of Carl Bosch's notable achievements in that era.

Neither lived to witness the final destruction which resulted from the nefarious use to which their great talents were directed. Carl died in 1940 and Robert in 1942.

Their successors did not change the pattern they designed.

CONTEMPT FOR UNITED STATES

Another close parallel in their careers appears in their hatred and contempt for the United States. It is also found in the fact that the American Bosch Magneto properties and the Dye Trust subsidiaries in this country were both seized by the United States as enemy-owned during World War I, and then sold to American citizens who pledged never to permit them to be returned.

Those pledges were violated contemptuously and illegally. The German Bosch regained control of the American Bosch Co.; Farben regained control of its World War I properties.

During World War II, these properties were again seized as enemy-owned. Now American Bosch and some of the Farben properties have again been sold. And more pledges have been given, as will be told later.

A notable characteristic shared by the two brothers appears in the use which these men caused to be made of their American properties. These German "hide-outs," their ownership disguised with incredible duplicity, were used before and during both world wars as secret headquarters for German espionage, sabotage, and propaganda.

FANTASTIC DOUBLE-DEALING

All this was made possible by fantastic double-dealing bribery and corruption. Some of this has been made known through congressional investigations, criminal prosecutions, and other court proceedings. Much of it, especially of the last war period, while known to exist, has not yet appeared in official public records.

Before the United States entered World War I, Otto Heins, manager of the American Bosch Magneto Co., was accused by German Ambassador of violating the German code by supplying magnetos for British airplanes. Heins' defense was that he accepted the contracts in order to retard production and cripple war material production. The excuse was accepted—by the Germans.

During World War II American Bosch for months delayed the production of airplanes which were being made here for the Allies.

ESSENTIAL PARTS UNDELIVERED

Essential parts were not delivered and the United States Government failed to do anything about it until after we entered the war. United States production of Diesel engines also was retarded before and during World War II by actions of American Bosch dictated from its German owners.

Likewise, espionage of confidential technical data, highly important for the German military, was conducted during both war periods through the American Bosch companies. Bosch engineers who formerly had free run of the United States Army and Navy technical data were finally ordered to keep away from our experimental fields.

Despite this warning, in 1941 the United States Bosch management defiantly attempted to sandbag another American manufacturer into revealing his own technical secrets in return for a sublicense to use a Bosch device.

Surplus Food to Needy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. MILLET HAND
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 9, 1950

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the Atlantic City Union published an editorial entitled "It's Time To Place Surplus Food Within Reach of Poor." This is in line with persistent efforts that many of us have been making here in Congress, and points up the problem very clearly. It seems to me it should be read by the membership of the House.

The editorial follows:

IT'S TIME TO PLACE SURPLUS FOOD WITHIN REACH OF POOR

Surplus butter and cheese, owned and stored by the Federal Government—that is, by you and me—have been made available for free distribution to needy Americans. We have fed the world; now it's time to do something for our own hungry folk.

The Agriculture Department has placed 15,000,000 pounds of butter and 5,000,000 pounds of cheese on the list of "give away" commodities. Those eligible for the food gifts will include public and private relief agencies, the school-lunch programs, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

The provisions will be added to items already on the free distribution list, such as potatoes, dried eggs, and dried milk, and issued from the stock of foodstuffs acquired by the Government, and now valued at approximately $4,000,000,000.

Now, we're doing something beneficial with this mountain of products, raised on American farms, and processed.

There are marked differences of opinion in both political and economic circles as to whether Uncle Sam should continue to buy surplus outputs from his kinfolk on the farms and in the dairies in order to regulate prices. But having become a buyer on a gigantic scale—probably the biggest in the history of any country in time of war or peace—practical use should be made of the stuff—perishable for the most part.

It should not be permitted to spoil. There are many persons of very small income, inadequate means, who should be enabled to share the use of this enormous store of edibles, bought at great expenditure of public funds.

But the question is, how to distribute it so it will reach all who need it. Surely, in a country noted for its efficiency and ingenuity that should not prove an insurmountable obstacle. Bring the goods to designated points for distribution. Make it accessible. Undoubtedly it will prove to be a big task—and cost money—but the details can be worked out by experts.

Incidentally, the handling of these huge stores would give employment to some of the jobless in every area where the stuff would be sent. The important point is that the produce of the soil, and of poultry farms, and dairies—the best food in the world—will be placed within reach of those who do not get enough, who may be undernourished, easy prey to disease—and there are too many of these people in a land of plenty.

It's little short of criminal to permit good nourishing food to perish when people need it—all for lack of initiative in working out distribution methods.

Bountiful providence has blessed us with an abundance. There is grim want in some lands. There is famine in others—due to war ravages, and crop failures. Therefore, it

is virtually flying in the face of providence to delay doing something about handing out this surplus food to those unable to buy it—or rather to buy enough of it.

Yet, this has been going on in the United States ever since the Government began buying the food. At the same time, huge sums are being distributed in every State in the form of grants-in-aid to the indigent, or near-indigent. These grants are inadequate. Augment them with the surplus bought with public funds.

President Truman's May 8, 1950, Speech at Lincoln, Nebr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 9, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I know that every Member of this House of Representatives, and every other citizen of our country, whose political faith and judgment is founded upon true loyalty to his country and respect for duly constituted authority, regardless of his or her own political faith, will be interested in knowing that President Harry S. Truman made an important speech in the State of Nebraska, my home State, yesterday. It was his first major speech on his present westward journey across the United States on several dedicatory missions in Western States.

His speech was as follows:

I have been looking forward very much to this visit to the Middle West. This is my home country, and I always enjoy coming back to it.

I am particularly glad to be in Lincoln on this trip.

Here in the center of the Nation, where the Corn Belt merges with the Great Plains, we can see clearly the greatness and the importance of American agriculture.

The city of Lincoln depends on the farming areas around it for the sources of its livelihood. The city draws products from agriculture, and in turn provides goods and services to the smaller towns and farm families nearby. This is the pattern all over our country.

The whole development of this Nation shows how city and country, industry and agriculture, can grow and prosper together, by cooperation and with mutual benefit.

What's true of our country is true of the world.

This country today, along with other free countries, is engaged in a tremendous effort to bring about peace based on freedom and justice. Make no mistake about it, the struggle we are in now is just as important to our future as was our victory in the last war.

If we are to win through to peace, we must maintain a healthy and strong economy. And our economy can grow and prosper only if the other free countries grow and prosper also. For the genius of freedom is to succeed not by exploitation but by cooperation.

American agriculture is directly concerned with the success of our program for peace. You here in Lincoln are directly affected by what happens these days in Berlin, in Paris, in Singapore.

No one should know that better than the American farmer, because farmers remember what happened to them after the last war.

In the early 1920's the bottom fell out of agriculture in this country. Export markets disappeared. Prices plummeted down. The price of corn dropped in 18 months from $2 to 42 cents a bushel. The price of cotton fell from 40 cents to 10 cents a pound. Land values collapsed. The resulting agricultural depression in the 1920's was the forerunner of the national depression of the early thirties.

Those were the days when international trade barriers were built up and up, in a foolish and futile effort to gain advantage at the expense of somebody else. Those were the days when the farmers were left alone to struggle with their problems while the rest of the country went up and up on the bubble of the boom.

When the bubble burst the hollow nature of that boom was revealed. Our country and the whole world suffered the agony of the great depression.

It is perfectly evident now how the world-wide depression paved the way for the Second World War.

That is why we are doing everything we can to see that the same thing doesn't happen again. That is why we are working so hard to bring about a sensible development of world trade and a healthy world economy. That is why we are determined to prevent another agricultural depression.

Fortunately, we have the experience of the last 17 years to guide us.

In 1933 we started in to attack the national depression at its roots. One of our first efforts was to overcome the farm depression. We developed special credit programs to rescue farm families. We stepped up agricultural research to develop better crops and broader markets. We started national soil-conservation programs to restore the basis for abundant production. We developed a price-support program to assure farmers a fair income.

These and other farm programs helped farmers and they helped the whole country. The national farm income in 1940 was twice as large as in 1932—which meant twice as big a farm market for industrial products. As farm income increased, the income of the rest of our people also increased. This was a practical demonstration of the truth that the people of this country prosper together, or they suffer together.

Of course, these new farm programs were opposed by selfish or short-sighted people. It was the same kind of mud slinging, name-calling opposition that you hear now every time we bring up a new proposal for the benefit of the people.

I remember when I first went to the Senate, an important farm bill was being debated which became the foundation of our present agricultural conservation program. Over in the House of Representatives, one Congressman said this legislation was "an attempt to enslave the farmer," and that it was "communistic." Another Congressman said that under this legislation farmers would be "dominated and regimented for all time"—they would "no longer * * * be free men."

These were the same people whose weird brand of "statesmanship" had brought us to the low point of 1932. They and their kind opposed all the efforts that were made to get the country out of the trouble they had got us into—just as they are opposing our efforts to improve things today.

When you think how miserably wrong they have proved to be in the past, you can see just how little truth there is in the wild charges they are throwing around now.

They said—back there in the thirties—that our farm program was "an attempt to enslave the farmer." Instead, it has made the farmer free—free of the crushing burden of debt that had driven him to the verge of revolution in those dreadful days of the depression.

They said our farm programs were "communistic." Instead, they have strengthened the foundations of democracy by making the farmer more secure in the ownership of his own land.

They said farmers would be regimented. Instead, farmers regained control over their own destinies, and under these programs they have enjoyed more liberty and led a better life than ever before in history.

That is the real story of what happened under our new farm laws.

These laws led to freedom and prosperity. They were and are strong bulwarks for our free an democratic society. Remember that fact when you hear people today croaking the old charges of socialism and regimentation about every new proposal for progress.

Then, when the war came along, our farm programs proved their worth all over again. The soil conservation, research, and education programs made possible an enormous rise in farm output, even though fewer people were available for farm work. The stored-up surpluses of cotton and wheat and other crops, which had been bitterly criticized before the war, turned out to be extremely valuable.

The price-support system was adapted to wartime needs. It was used to encourage farmers to increase total production and to turn out the right amounts of each essential product. As a result, we provided well for our fighting men and our war plants, we shipped great supplies to our allies, and our civilians had more and better food than ever before.

The tremendous expansion of production during the war was equally valuable when the shooting stopped. In the years since the war, literally millions of people have been saved from a starvation diet by the products of our fields. Food from this country helped to stop and roll back the advance of communism. Without that food, many of our friends in Europe would have been lost to the cause of freedom.

Today, our farm programs are undergoing new tests. They have proved their worth in bringing about economic recovery and meeting the demands of war. During the last few years, we have been faced with the problems involved in readjusting to peacetime needs.

Two things have been made abundantly clear. First, that our programs have served us well—have indeed been our salvation—in preventing the kind of disaster that followed the First World War. Second, that there are defects in the present system which require correction.

One of the main reasons we have had no serious economic downturn since the war is the farm price-support system. After the First World War, net farm income dropped nearly 50 percent in a single year. This time, when the market prices of some commodities began to fall sharply, the price-support system checked the decline and protected farmers' incomes. Everybody in this country is better off today as a result of this fact.

However, our present farm price-support program is not fully satisfactory. It is not encouraging the substantial readjustments in production that are needed now. It has allowed farm income to slide downward too much and too fast.

In the last 2 years, farm income has dropped more than 20 percent. That is nothing like what happened after the First World War. Nevertheless, it is serious. This drop is not good for farmers, and it is not good for the rest of the country. We need to take positive action to stop and reverse the trend.

Furthermore, the present law provides no satisfactory basis for dealing with perishable crops. The present program relies on the Government's taking off the market commodities which are in temporary surplus. That works all right for products that are storable, as long as we don't build stockpiles bigger than may be needed in an

emergency. But such a system doesn't work for perishables.

It is foolish to have the Government buy and store food that people want to eat now. It is even worse to have the Government buy food and destroy it, but that sometimes happens under the present program.

Everyone knows about the shameful potato situation. This can lead to public resentment strong enough to discredit the whole farm program. The taxpayers should not be expected to foot the bill for buying food which has to be wasted.

These obvious defects of the present support program have led to a great clamor. Some people would like to abandon the program altogether. Others would like to abandon all of it except the part that helps the crops they are particularly interested in. Others are just interested in muddying the waters for partisan political advantage.

It is not easy to disregard this clamor and see clearly what is right to do in the interest of the whole Nation. We must base our decisions on the facts that are demonstrated by our experience.

We must preserve the good features of the present program. They are built on a solid foundation. They are necessary for our own welfare and that of the free world. But we clearly need to improve and strengthen existing legislation.

This administration has made a very careful study of the changes that are necessary to adjust our farm support program to present conditions. A series of recommendations were worked out within the administration and were presented to the Congress last year by the Secretary of Agriculture. Those recommendations take the existing program which has been built up through years of experience, and seek to improve it further to meet the shortcomings which are evident.

No one claims that these recommendations are perfect in every detail. We are constantly looking for ways to improve them. I am firmly convinced, however, that they form by far the most comprehensive, effective, and progressive proposals that have yet been offered.

The essential purposes of these proposals can be very simply stated.

First, they are designed to obtain the amounts and kinds of farm products that are needed in an expanding economy, and to assure farmers the opportunity to earn a fair income for producing those products. The support program must encourage farmers to reduce costs, and to shift production to the commodities for which we ought to have expanding markets. In particular, it should encourage farmers to shift into livestock, rather than to continue producing surpluses of such crops as grain and cotton.

Under the proposals we have made farmers would be given incentives to make the needed shifts in production. Farmers would be assured of support for all the crops which yield a major share of farm income. At present some of the most important ones are left out. Furthermore, recent production and prices, rather than some out-of-date historical period, would be used in calculating fair income support levels. These are obviously desirable changes.

It would continue to be necessary, in some cases, to limit production to genuine consumer demand, in order to avoid surpluses greater than amounts which are needed for storage. There are some people—the same people who have been against the farmer all along—who seize on this fact and go around crying "regimentation" and talk about how the farmer is going to lose all his liberty.

Now, this is just as strange as it can be. The truth is that such limitations have been provided for in our major farm support programs for many years. We have known since the experience of the Federal Farm Board, some 20 years ago, that there are times when some control of production is needed to make a support program workable. Unless production controls are available on some crops, for use when needed, price support could be an impossible burden on the taxpayers.

And here is something to remember: under our system quotas are not imposed unless two-thirds of the farmers affected vote for them. When two-thirds of the farmers vote to adopt quotas for themselves it is preposterous to go around calling that regimentation. Moreover, quotas are administered by local committees, elected by the farmers themselves. These production controls are in complete accord with the tradition of democratic self-government.

The second purpose of the administration's proposals for changes in our support program is to provide a method for using our entire supply of perishable products, instead of taking part of it off the market and putting it on the shelf. Under our method, all the product would go into the market and be consumed. A system of direct production payments to farmers would make up any difference between the average market price and a fair return.

Such a system would be simple and efficient. The farmer would be sure of getting at least the support price. The people of towns and cities would get the benefit of what is produced.

I have heard this system attacked on the ground that it would cost too much. Most of the fantastic estimates of cost you hear are made by those who don't understand how it would actually work. When you study the facts, you will see that this plan should cost no more, and may well cost less, than the present system. And it would have the tremendous advantage of using, instead of wasting, perishable products.

The plain fact is that the productive-payment plan is the best plan yet proposed for getting an abundant production of perishable crops consumed without knocking the bottom out of the farmer's income. It is in the farmer's interest. It is also in the consumer's interest. I firmly believe that it should be made a part of our national farm program.

Our third purpose is to encourage the conservation and wise use of our land and water resources.

A price-support program can do this in two ways: The first is by encouraging livestock production. If we produce the livestock products that our people want, we shall need more land in grass and hay. And that is one of the major things we need to do in order to conserve our soil.

The second way is to make soil conservation practices a requirement for anyone who wants the benefit of price support. The whole Nation has an interest in soil conservation and benefits by it, just as the whole Nation has an interest in and benefits by a sound price-support program. It does not make sense to provide just as much price support for the individual who is deliberately ruining his soil as we provide for the good farmer who is keeping his land productive for future generations.

The need for soil conservation is one of the most important challenges confronting us. Our price-support program can and should help us meet that challenge.

The fourth purpose of our recommendations is to give the most support where it is most needed—that is, to the family-size farm. The present program channels too much of its benefits to the largest farms. Of course, we must not ignore the welfare of the large farms, which contribute so importantly to agricultural production and income. But it is only sensible, where public funds are involved, to provide a higher degree of protection for the family farm, which is so fundamental to our democratic society.

These are the four major purposes of the recommendations this administration has made for improving the farm-support program. They are designed to contribute to a stable and prosperous agriculture as part of a strong Nation. They will encourage a sustained, realistic abundance of farm production as the basis of rising living standards for our people.

They are an expression of our faith that we can all go forward together toward well-being and abundance—farmers together with city folk—the people of the United States together with free people everywhere.

That is the only way to assure peace and prosperity for ourselves and for the world.

Let Us Follow the Advice of Our Beloved President and Admiral Nimitz

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 8, 1950

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, last week our beloved President Truman issued a statement to the press wherein he stated that he is not alarmed over the cold-war situation. He said conditions are better than in 1946 and he is optimistic over hopes for peace.

Since reading that statement, I have received many letters from all parts of the country approving the President's statement, and urging me to aid the President in every way possible so as to make an early and lasting peace a reality.

Yesterday, I had occasion to read an article in the Chicago Sun-Times under date of May 7, 1950, concerning the great and beloved Admiral Chester W. Nimitz. The article was entitled "Admiral Nimitz, Opponent of Force, Takes Rest."

Unlike many military gentlemen and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who thrive on war and war preparations because it means promotion and personal glory, Admiral Nimitz and other well meaning, honest, and sincere gentlemen, prefer, however, to settle their differences amicably at a peace table before a war is made possible with its killing and crippling of millions of people and the destruction of billions upon billions of dollars worth of property.

It is indeed unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, that some of our radio commentators and so-called radio reporters, at every opportunity, scare the public and instill fear into their minds. They try to involve us in every conceivable way with their war-mongering statements. They could serve their country better if, every Sunday night, they would cease their alarming utterances. To my mind, if these reporters would devote their abilities and influence toward channels of urging and advocating peace, they would surely endear themselves to the American people. I hope for their own future standing and influence, these commentators will so do.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I feel that the statement made by our great Admiral Nimitz will be welcome by 95 to 98 percent of the American people who are opposed to war and who are continually

praying for a lasting peace. The article follows:

ADMIRAL NIMITZ, OPPONENT OF FORCE, TAKES REST

LAKE SUCCESS, N. Y.—The United Nations most famous man of war—Fleet Adm. Chester W. Nimitz—has taken indefinite leave from his work after 13 months' service in which he built a reputation as the United Nations most persistent speaker against use of force—even by the United Nations itself.

The white-haired sailor, who during the war in the Pacific commanded the mightiest battle fleet ever assembled, came to the United Nations as administrator of a planned plebiscite in Kashmir, to settle whether that disputed state joins India or Pakistan.

But, when political events prevented holding the plebiscite during his stay at Lake Success, Nimitz turned himself into a busy public speaker who could be heard week after week denouncing the use of force, by anyone, at any time.

OPPOSE POLICE IDEA

The other day he looked down from the rostrum of a UN committee room at 110 West Point cadets and opened with the quip:

"I hope we can win a football game from you some day."

Then, figuratively, he held up the UN Charter and ripped out of it article 43, which calls for establishment of a world police force. The 65-year-old admiral told the future American Army generals that the UN probably never would be able to agree on creating a police force.

"And in my opinion," he said "its a good thing they don't agree. The UN is not and cannot be an enforcement agency."

For example, he said, "if the UN had tried to use a police force when the General Assembly sought to internationalize Jerusalem over objection of both Israel and Jordan, "we would still be in a bloody bath today."

VIEW ON H-BOMB

A few days earlier Nimitz faced another group of West Pointers and told them he didn't think he'd live to see a hydrogen bomb developed—"and I hope I don't."

He enlarged on this a little:

"I personally hope they don't ever learn to trigger it, but if anybody does, I hope we do, because I believe if we possess weapons like that and have a few of them, that will prevent the others from using them."

The Texas-born admiral is headed for his home in Berkeley, Calif., where he will remain until such time as his services are required at UN.

Curtailment of Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Cuts in Face of Increased Mail Volume Worry Rhode Island Postmasters," published in the Providence (R. I.) Evening Bulletin of April 21, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CUTS IN FACE OF INCREASED MAIL VOLUME WORRY RHODE ISLAND POSTMASTERS

Rhode Island postmasters said last night they didn't know how they could put into effect the sharp cuts in postal service ordered this week by the Postmaster General—"but we've got to do it."

Postmaster Raymond A. Creegan of Providence, one of those who spoke at a meeting of the Rhode Island Chapter of the National Association of Postmasters in Westerly, said the Providence post office had been running on a 24-hour basis with business firms doing a great volume of mailing up to midnight.

"I checked today on the night differential in pay for clerical help," Creegan said, "and I found that by cutting out night work we will save $80,000 a year. But if the work is now being performed in 24 hours, how can we do it in 12 hours?"

Postmaster George A. Dolan of Westerly said he had just completed a survey in his town which showed "we will have to add 18 miles of foot carrier service in our area. As soon as we completed the survey, I received the curtailment order."

Dolan urged the group to "take this up with your Congressman," and Creegan urged the postmasters to build a strong organization. Postmasters are going to seek a reclassification from Congress to obtain salary increases, he said, and "one strong association" would help "educate your Congressman."

Curtailment of Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Is This Economy?" published in the Texarkana Gazette of Texarkana, Tex., of April 22, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IS THIS ECONOMY?

Although it may seem inconsistent to call for economy in Government one day and protect cuts in the postal service on another day, we cannot see the logic behind a so-called economy move that would eliminate a few low-salaried postmen and allow a swarm of nonessential Washington bureaucrats to continue to feed at the trough.

With the possible exception of the men and women doing really essential jobs in the building of our national defense, we do not know of any group of civil-service employees of the Government who work harder for less pay than do the postal workers.

The postal service is a part of the daily lives of the people and is the one Government service upon which business depends more than any other.

Somehow we cannot keep from believing that there is method in the madness of the Government in this approach to economy. To hit the service most essential to the people appears to us to be a calculated move to bring about a grass roots protest against economy in Government.

Greater economy could be achieved by starting in the high-salaried brackets of those agencies of the Government who spend their time developing new theories on a planned economy.

Israel After 2 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 9, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, we recently observed in this House the second anniversary of Israel's independence. A review of the accomplishments of the State of Israel during the 2 years of its existence in the military, political, and economic fields, as well as in immigration and other phases of activity, was prepared by the American Zionist Council, 342 Madison Avenue, New York, and issued on April 23, 1950, on Israel's second anniversary. It is entitled "Israel After Two Years." I commend it to my colleagues' attention:

ISRAEL AFTER 2 YEARS

The State of Israel becomes 2 years old on this 5th of Iyar, 5710—April 23, 1950. A purely objective observer—ignorant of Israel's history and its unique character—would be likely to describe it as a poor, small country, whose boundaries are still not fixed; whose hostile neighbors have not yet concluded peace treaties with it; whose cost of living is high; whose economic future depends upon large-scale outside investment; whose trade balance is unfavorable; whose agricultural productivity is dependent upon the introduction of irrigation projects; whose established population is being flooded by a mass immigration of perplexing variety and great poverty.

There is truth in this objective picture, but it is very far from the whole and the essential truth. It omits the significant human factors of historic attachment and overwhelming need; the factors of intelligence, determination and ingrained habit of collective effort. Those were the factors which made the proclamation of the State of Israel 2 years ago an inspired act of destiny rather than the mad and dangerous whim it seemed to many. The land was full of Arab irregulars who had been attacking since December. Air communications with the outside world had ceased and the ports were under Egyptian aerial and naval bombardment. Five regular armies marched upon a community whose defense force, always having had to train underground, had never functioned as an army. Israel's store of weapons was so limited that camps of many hundred trainees had one rifle to practice with. Hardly more than a dozen tiny, patched-up cast-off British training planes were its entire air force. The British-owned Haifa refineries had been closed in April and British tankers had removed the remaining crude oil. There was almost no oil for the air force and other mechanized equipment. Yet during the period up to the first truce of June 11, 1948, Israel's improvised army and home guards staved off the Syrians with their tanks and armored cars in the north; encircled the Egyptians near Isdud in the Negeb; and, though losing the Old City of Jerusalem to the Arab Legion, saved the beleaguered New City from what seemed inevitable surrender to large and well-equipped forces. In the intertruce period of July 9–July 18 Israel forces seized the Lydda Airfield, Ramle and Nazareth.

Israel was winning its ordeal by battle—but, looking backward, one is shocked by the realization of the precarious state it was in even after the great exertions of the first campaigns. "In the fall of 1948," Prime Minister Ben Gurion wrote a year later,

"Israel actually held only a quarter of the area of the state. Central Galilee was in the hands of Kaukji's gangs and the Lebanese army. The entire south was cut off. The Egyptian forces held, on the one hand, the Rafa-Gaza-Majdal-Isdud line along the coast up to a point less than 40 kilometers from Tel Aviv, and a second line across the country south of Be'er Tuvia. All settlements and defense forces in the Negeb were cut off and the approaches to Jerusalem were blocked. At that time the United Nations meeting in Paris, was presented with a plan to exclude the Negeb from Israel."

The "plan to exclude the Negeb from Israel" was contained in the Bernadotte report which was launched at the United Nations in September 1948, with the enthusiastic support of Secretary Marshall and the British Foreign Office. The security and territorial integrity of the new State were never in such jeopardy as in the months between September 1948, and February 1949. Aside from the military difficulties, there was the very present danger of the adoption of the provisions of the Bernadotte plan, and the reiterated threat—spearheaded by the British—of sanctions against Israel for noncompliance with United Nations orders. No historic record, however, brief, would be complete without mention of the notable part played by American Jewry and President Truman in defeating the threat of sanctions and preventing the passage of the Bernadotte plan. It is difficult now to remember how perilous Israel's situation was then and how close actual war between Israel and Britain seemed in January 1949, after Israeli fighters had shot down five RAF reconnaissance planes over the Egyptian-Israeli frontier, and British troops had been dispatched to Aqaba on the Red Sea "at the request of King Abdullah under the provisions of the Anglo-Transjordan Treaty of Alliance."

The crisis of the fall and early winter of 1948–49 was averted not only by political action at the United Nations but—concomitantly—by hard military facts which turned Israel's theoretical rights into actualities, and at last convinced the Arab governments to enter into the negotiations that culminated in the armistice agreements of the late winter and early spring of 1949. Egyptian violation of a United Nations order for shared use of a highway in the Negeb had led in October 1948 to renewed fighting in the Negeb which ended in Israel's conquest of the keypoint of Beersheba. Almost at the same time fighting broke out in the north after Arab forces out of Lebanon attacked a height inside Israeli territory in Galilee. Within a fortnight Israel controlled all of Galilee. On December 7 a new road connecting Jerusalem with the coast was dedicated to take the place of the main route still blocked by Arab forces. Built over the mountains by youngsters and men past fighting age, Kvish Hagvurah—the Road of Heroism—was the triumphant climax of Israel's desperate effort to save its historic capital from a third destruction. Now, after suffering thousands of casualties during almost a year of bombing, hunger, and thirst, Jerusalem's 100,000 Jews and the shining city they had built were safely linked to the rest of Israel.

A new pattern of governmental control and geographical relationships developed during the war. According to the partition plan of November 1947 western Galilee and Jaffa and part of the Negeb were to have been in an Arab Palestine state, linked by an internationally administered economic union with the Jewish state; Jerusalem was to have been set up at the close of the mandate as an internationally administered area. None of these things happened. The United Nations, charged with responsibility for internationalizing Jerusalem, did nothing. The Arabs of Palestine did not move to set up a state in the territory assigned to them; instead the overwhelming majority of them, incited by their leaders and by British advice, fled to the neighboring countries. According to the partition plan, Israel was to have had a large Arab minority of about 400,000. Ruling now over large areas not included in the area assigned to it by partition, Israel has an Arab minority of only 180,000.

Moving into the vacuum left by Arab flight and Arab and United Nations failure to act, the new Israel took on a shape and form not anticipated by the United Nations nor even by itself. The logic of events in these 2 years has eliminated the distinction between territory assigned by the United Nations and territory occupied in the course of the war. Both are Israeli in population, government, and development. Where 2 years ago there were a half dozen Jewish villages in the largely Arab hinterland of Jerusalem, there are now some 30 Jewish villages and almost no Arabs. Where outside Jerusalem there were stony hills which the White Paper of 1939 forbade Jews to buy and work, 300,000 trees were planted this winter. To take the place of Jerusalem's always inadequate water supply line—still cut by Arab forces—a new aqueduct is being built which will treble the amount of water brought to the city and provide for an expanding population. Most important of all, Jerusalem, almost wrecked by British sabotage and Arab siege, is once more a thriving capital.

It was the scene of the first meeting of Israel's parliament, the Knesseth, on February 14, 1949, and—in swift reaction to the United Nations vote of December 1949 for internationalization of the city—has been made the permanent home of the Knesseth, of the prime minister's and president's offices, and of most departments of the government. If its exalted and central place in the great drama of Jewish history needed the confirmation of a symbolic modern ritual, it received such confirmation in August of 1949 when the bones of Jewry's modern prophet, Theodor Herzl, were brought from Vienna and laid to rest in a tomb on a high hill now known as Mount Herzl.

Western Galilee and the Negeb are, like Jerusalem, integral, constantly changing and developing parts of the new Israel. Of the more than 180 agricultural settlements founded since the establishment of the State (an average of about 8 a month), a particularly large number are in Galilee and the Negeb. The need of peaceful conquest by the plow is as acutely felt throughout Israel as the need for adequate military preparedness. A geobotanical research station, newly established in Beersheba, experiments with trees, plants, and crops, to determine which are most suitable for the Negeb. Pipe lines now under construction will be bringing 15,000,000 cubic meters of water to the Negeb this summer, revolutionizing its agricultural possibilities. A systematic government drilling program has led to the discovery of large quantities of sweet water in the desolate Azaba Valley south of the Dead Sea. The sluggish little Arab town of Beersheba has become a Jewish municipality whose population is expected to reach 10,000 by the end of this year. In the north the small Arab town of Acre has become an expanding Arab-Jewish city. Jewish and Arab workers have begun work on a 5-year plan to convert 10,000 acres of malarial marshland east and southeast of Acre into fertile soil. The Ministry of Agriculture has established a special department for the guidance and advancement of agriculture in the 76 Arab villages of Galilee.

Beersheba, southern limit of Jewish settlement in the Bible's familiar delimitation of Israel's boundaries, is Jewish once more, but it is no longer Israel's southern boundary. Military clashes with the Egyptians in the Negeb grew in intensity in December of 1948 and January of 1949, and in their most effective action of the war the Israeli forces bottled up the Egyptians in a pocket at Faluja. Israel now controlled the southern Negev, and the ground was laid for armistice negotiations with Egypt which began on January 13 and concluded on February 24, 1949, leaving Egyptian forces only in the coastal strip between Gaza and Rafah. In March, despite British political and military maneuvering, Israel secured the right, given it by the partition resolution, to Eilat, the little strip on the Gulf of Aqaba at the southeast tip of Palestine. King Solomon's port of Etzion Gever had been a stone's throw from Eilat which can become Israel's gateway to the Indian Ocean and the East. Eilat is Israel now—inhabited by a small pioneering military force, a goal of pilgrimages, a center of activity. It is linked by air to Lydda. Docks are being built for boats. Private investment is establishing a factory to grind the tiny fish caught in the Gulf into meal for chicken feed. Israel—from Dan to Eilat—is a much larger land now than its most devoted children conceived of only 2 years ago. For the southernmost point of the Negeb, facing Egypt, Transjordan, and Saudi Arabia, is no longer a dot on a map, but an important and cherished part of its new life.

The State of Israel's first obligation had been the defense of its people against attack by land and sea and air. In the midst of this agonized, extemporaneous struggle for life it had to carry out the practical, peacetime task of setting up a government. The mandatory regime had deliberately left Israel a legacy of chaos. It had made no provision for the functioning of any sort of administration to take over after the High Commissioner's departure on May 14, 1948. Here the years of semigovernmental experience which the Jewish Agency and Vaad Leumi had had, proved their extreme usefulness. The task of governing the country was assumed naturally and with as little strain as possible under the circumstances, by the Provisional Council of State established on May 14, 1948, in accordance with an agreement between the principal parties represented in the Jewish Agency and the Vaad Leumi.

In the turmoil of the fall of 1948 a census of the population was carried out, preparatory to the holding of a countrywide election on January 25, 1949. The election was a model of peace and order in a part of the world where elections are notable for violence and fraud. Every adult resident of the State of Israel, Jew or non-Jew, man or woman, was eligible to vote, and over 80 percent of them did so. The Arab women who voted that day in Israel broke a new trail in the history of the Arab world. They were the first ever to have had the privilege of the franchise and they stirred feminist demands in Egypt and Syria, Lebanon and Iraq. They were the inspiration behind a startling development in Syria where Husni Ziam, the revolutionary swept into power during March 1949 in the unrest caused by the Syrian Army's defeat in Palestine, gave the franchise to women with primary education.

Husni Zaim had come to power in a military coup d'état; he was shortly assassinated in a second military coup d'état; the perpetrators of the latter were themselves displaced by a third coup d'état. An attempt at a similar coup d'état, led by the chief of police, took place this winter in Iraq, where cabinets have been changing with unusual rapidity. What bore all the signs of an armed revolt by the Syrian Popular Party of Antoun Saadeh was nipped at the very last moment in Lebanon during the summer of 1949. Political assassinations had become the order of the day in Egypt last year.

In striking contrast to the rest of the Middle East, the Government of Israel—the youngest state and the most exposed to hostility—has been as stable and orderly in its workings as an old and well-established democracy.

The governmental structure of Israel has in fact developed swiftly and comprehensively in these 2 years. The President's functions are similar to those of the President of the French Republic. The 120-member Knesseth functions very much along the lines of the British House of Commons. The Government is responsible to the Knesseth and the latter has shown itself to be very far from a rubber stamp body—debates in it are both lively and on a high level and frequently lead to amendment of government policy. The Knesseth has 9 committees, each of which is composed of representatives of all parties and is responsible for thorough study of all bills falling within its scope. The 17 ministries into which the government is subdivided, are each headed by a director general, who is a permanent civil servant. A nonpartisan state comptroller, directly responsible to the Knesseth, checks the accounts and efficiency of all government offices. The supreme court has the power to check the government where it seems to it to be infringing upon democratic and constitutional rights. It may summon any government official and demand an explanation of his conduct. It has on several occasions reversed decisions and rulings made by ministries, and has won the confidence and gratitude of those concerned with genuine democratic development in Israel.

The Knesseth has proved to be a mature and hard-working body of law-makers. In its first session from February 14 to September 12, 1949, it passed 70 laws, of which the most important pertained to the budget, military conscription and education. The Prime Minister had asked for a budget of 37,000,000 pounds for current expenditure; the Knesseth, after grave and extensive debate, reduced this to 35,440,000 pounds. In March 1950 at the end of the fiscal year, Finance Minister Kaplan was able to report to the Knesseth that the budget had been met without a deficit—a result which could never have been obtained if not for the high income and inheritance levies passed by the Knesseth.

National manpower has been mobilized as well as national income. The universal conscription bill passed in September 1948 imposes military training of various lengths upon all men between 18 and 49 and all unmarried women between 18 and 34. A service bill, passed in February 1950 provides for the drafting of men and women for a year of agricultural and military training and a year of specialized vocational training. Children are required, without exception, to go to school. The education bill passed by the Knesseth provides for free education for all children between 5 and 13 years of age. In succeeding years the age range is to be gradually increased till the goal of free compulsory education for all children from 4 to 16 is reached. In this present school year 100,000 Jewish children and 15,000 Arab children—boys and girls alike—are enrolled in school. During the mandate period 25 percent of the Arab children in urban areas and 50 percent of those in rural areas did not attend school at all.

In faithful reflection of the cooperative tendencies which have dominated the development of the Jewish community in Palestine, Israel's two labor parties—the moderate Mapai, which controls the Government, and the leftist Mapam—are the two strongest groups in the Knesseth. The leaders of the Government have made no secret of their hope for a Socialist Israel, but they are undogmatic and practical enough to understand how vitally necessary private investments are if the country is to be developed adequately and quickly. Hence, on March 29, 1950 the Knesseth by a 47 to 15 vote adopted a law providing special privileges for private investors: 25 rather than the usual 75 percent income-tax ceiling on their earnings; 5 years exemption from property taxes on new buildings; customs exemption till June 30, 1952 for machinery and raw materials; permission to transmit abroad in dollars 10 percent of their investment a year.

It is difficult enough to establish a new independent state in time of war. It is even more difficult to establish a new state in time of war for a population constantly being augmented by immigrants from many different lands and backgrounds. In 1947, after 66 years of Zionist resettlement in Palestine, there were some 700,000 Jews in the land. In the 2 years of Israel's independence, almost 400,000 were added—more than half the number six and a half decades had brought. The process of return from exile, begun on so tiny and tentative a scale by the few young Biluim of 1882, has taken on a swiftness of tempo and a greatness of scale that carry the mind back to the mighty, soaring prophecies of the bible:

"And I will bring you out from the peoples and will gather ye out of the countries wherein you are scattered, with a mighty hand and with a stretched out arm and with a poured out fury, * * *"

"Lift up thine eyes round about and see: all they gather themselves together, they come to thee: thy sons shall come from far. * * * Who are these that fly as a cloud, and as the doves to their windows? * * *"

"Behold these shall come far: and lo, these from the north and from the west; and these from the land of Sinim."

The prophecy is being fulfilled with almost literal exactness. The children of Israel have been returning from the furthest corners of their exile—from every western land, from India and Afghanistan, Morocco and Shanghai, Turkey and Cyrenaica, and, "flying as a cloud" in the airplanes of "Operation Magic Carpet," from out of the medieval prison of Yemen. The arrival on November 20, 1949 of 660 immigrants from Tripoli brought the Jewish population of Israel to 1,000,000. Most months bring more newcomers—20,000 to 30,000—than all but a few of the 28 years of the Mandatory period. There have been days on which three or four thousand landed at Haifa; in a single week of December 1948 one-third of Yugoslavia's 11,000 surviving Jews sailed from Fiume in two ships; and as recently as February 26, 1950, 1,200 came on a single boat from North Africa. The total for 1948 was 118,993; for 1949, 239,331—an average of more than 655 persons every day. There is comforting irony in the fact that 60 percent of the new immigrants are transported, economically and appropriately, on Israeli ships—the very same ships that were the ghost fleet of illegal immigration during the last, bitter years of the Mandate.

The face of the Jewish world has already been radically altered by the 2 years of unrestricted immigration to the State of Israel. The Jewish community of Bulgaria may be said to have disappeared, for 42,000 have come to Israel, leaving only 4,000 or 5,000, most of whom wish to remain in Bulgaria. Yemenite Jewry will be completely transferred to Israel by 1950, 40,000 having come since the establishment of the State. Almost half the Jews of Turkey—about 35,000—have so far arrived in Israel. About 2,000 a month are leaving Tripolitania, and more than half of Libya's 30,000 Jews are now in Israel. Seven thousand—practically all those who wish to leave—have come from Yugoslavia. Twenty thousand have come from Czechoslovakia, leaving 15,000, of whom about 5,000 have applied for immigration to Israel. Some 20,000 of the 45,000 Jews remaining in Germany are to be expected in Israel during 1950, and 30,000 of the remaining 50,000 Polish Jews. The exodus from North Africa has a Messianic haste and fervor. Iraq appears to be ready to allow its Jewish citizens to emigrate. Only Hungary with its 150,000 Jews, and Rumania with its 350,000 have followed the Soviet's example in barring emigration to Israel; unlike the Soviet, they have, however, relented enough to allow a few thousand Jews with relations in Israel, to leave.

The Messianic tempo of immigration is hardly matched by the tempo of absorption in a small, undeveloped land like Israel. That is Israel's burning economic and social problem. It is true that in the period between May 15, 1948, and January 1, 1950, 264,370 immigrants were absorbed into the life of the country, 165,000 of them in towns, 13,000 of them in communal settlements, 14,000 in cooperative settlements, 34,000 in villages, while 15,000 child and adolescent immigrants are being supported and trained for productive living by the Youth Aliyah movement. But satisfaction over these comforting figures is tempered by the inadequate standard of living and inadequate employment of a great many of these 264,000 immigrants and by the shattering fact that there are still at least 80,000 persons in reception camps, for whom not even the barest housing is available.

Normal economic thinking and procedure can hardly apply to Israel's abnormal immigration situation. It is an immigration which, in its vastly greater part, cannot wait, for it flees from present dangers or from the valid fear of the closing of the gates of the lands in which it lives. Swift improvement in the living conditions of the newcomers and acceleration of their absorption into the country are pathetically dependent upon the free-will offerings of Zionists throughout the world, for they cannot wait upon the gradual process of the broadening of the economic base of Israel.

Before Israel's economy can be expanded to the point where it will adequately sustain its present population of over 1,200,000 and its anticipated population of 2,000,000 within 10 years, many obstacles will have to be overcome. The general objective is clear: A mixed cooperative and private economy based on intensive agriculture and highly specialized light industries, supplemented by fishing, maritime trades, and tourist traffic. That this objective can be reached is proved by the agricultural and industrial experience of the mandatory period during which the Jewish community created a self-supporting economy in an utterly undeveloped land. But large investment of both private and public funds is required. Robert Nathan has estimated the amount needed as $2,000,000,000 for the next 10 years. Investment must be supplemented by careful control of imports and currency; sharp reduction in the cost of living and consequently of labor; soil and water conservation of maximum efficiency; moderization of factory and transport equipment; and intensification of agricultural and industrial skills.

How far has Israel gone toward those goals in its first two troubled years? There is reason to feel that the worst is over and that there are encouraging signs on many sectors of the economic front. During 1949, 250 new industrial enterprises were established and 200 others are now being established. Most significantly, an unusually large sum for so small a country—$241,000,000—an amount equal to 40 percent of Israel's total national income, was invested on capital development in Israel in the course of the year. Sixty percent of this investment was public capital; 40 percent was from private sources, more than half of it provided by Israelis. American private capitalists invested $25,000,000 during 1949, and 1950 has brought the news of large new industrial projects in which the technical know-how

and part of the capital are to be provided by American firms; a Kaiser-Frazer automobile assembly plant to be opened in Haifa in August for the production of 6,000 cars a year; an Israeli branch of the General Tire & Rubber Co., of Akron.

Rigid rationing and import and price controls—the so-called austerity program, directed by Dr. Bernard Joseph, minister of supply and rationing—brought the cost of living down by 12.8 percent between January 1949 and January 1950. A satisfactory agreement has been reached with the British Treasury regarding Israel's frozen sterling balance and the settlement of all claims and counterclaims arising out of the termination of the mandate. Though imports (which amounted to 87,700,000 Israeli pounds) exceeded exports (which amounted to 10,600,000 pounds) by about $215,600,000 in 1949, one of the main reasons for this is the inevitable necessity for import of capital goods into the country. Increased production will eventually enable Israel to export more.

As matters now stand, half of Israel's exports—largely citrus fruit—go to the United Kingdom, but Israel has by now signed trade agreements with the Netherlands, Hungary, Poland, Finland, Uruguay, Yugoslavia, Denmark, France, Czechoslovakia. Taking the $3,200,000 pact with Uruguay as a typical example, we note that it provides for Israel's importing frozen meat, wool, and rice and exporting polished diamonds, artificial dentures, wines, oil stoves, and olive oil. The agreement signed with Czechoslovakia in March 1950 provides that $8,400,000 worth of Czech goods—iron and steel wares, food and glassware—be imported by Israel which is to sell Czechoslovakia $2,800,000 worth of citrus products, pharmaceuticals, and other goods. In the period between November 1949 and March 1950 Israel-manufactured textiles valued at $2,800,000 were sold abroad, a million dollars worth in Denmark alone. Large quantities of optical lenses have been exported to Yugoslavia; machinery and paper from Sweden have been bartered for six thousand dozen nylon stockings from Israel and timber from Austria, for artificial teeth.

These are all hopeful beginnings. Moreover, the entire economic set-up should shortly be reflecting the therapeutic effect of the carefully administered Export-Import Bank loan of $100,000,000. Since January 19, 1949, when the loan was announced in Washington, over $96,000,000 worth of credits have been authorized by the Bank, in each case for the purchase in the United States of equipment and materials. Half the credits authorized have so far been spent, and about a quarter of the total equipment to be purchased has arrived in Israel. Israel's key agricultural need is large-scale irrigation, and that is being made possible by the $35,000,000 credit for agriculture, half of which has been allocated for the purchase of irrigation pipe. Dr. Walter Clay Lowdermilk has pointed out after his recent trip to Israel that there is actually a greater abundance of water in the country than experts had thought, making it better-watered than southern California. About 400,000 acres of arable land can be redeemed by irrigation during the next 3 or 4 years, and it is notable that Dr. Lowdermilk with his world-wide experience in conservation is to be adviser to the Government of Israel next year. He will be empowered to set up a coordinated program of full land and water use for the entire country, including the dry southern Negeb whose grazing possibilities must be fully developed.

The Export-Import Bank credit for agriculture has brought Israel many hundreds of heads of cattle and other requisites. The Ministry of Agriculture can now look soberly ahead to cultivation within 4 years of 1,250,000 acres which should provide Israel with all the garden vegetables it needs, half its potatoes and tobacco, one-third of its fish, and one-quarter of its bread grain. The constant expansion that is going on and that will soon be felt in Israel's food basket may be gaged by the fact that this year 23,000 dunams of land—10 times the present potato area—have been put under potato cultivation.

Efficient transport is a prerequisite of efficient agricultural and industrial development. An Export-Import Bank credit of $11,000,000 for communications has already brought Israel 4,000 new trucks and busses and will modernize the overtaxed, archaic telephone and telegraph facilities. A $5,500,000 loan for port installations is enlarging Haifa Harbor and equipping it so as markedly to reduce loading and unloading time and in every way increase the efficiency of the port. A recent $20,000,000 credit for construction materials will alleviate the housing shortage and facilitate building and rebuilding of interurban highways and the expansion of the water-supply and sewage-disposal facilities of Israel's municipalities. Industrial development—key to enlarged employment and a more favorable balance of trade—will be stimulated by a $20,000,000 credit for the purchase of machinery and raw materials.

Economic adjustment is not the only one of Israel's large, present problems. There is the painful struggle about the future of Jerusalem and the uncertain status of the Arab refugees who, having abandoned their homes and left Palestine to become a completely altered land, must now be aided to find a new life—preferably, Israeli and many British and other observers feel, in underpopulated sections of the Arab countries. Over and above all other questions looms the problem of peace and decent neighborly relationships with the Arab countries.

Looking at these vexed problems in the long perspective of Jewish history, one is somehow persuaded to feel that an answer to them should not be too long delayed. The mystery and the tragedy of the exile have found their answer in the third Jewish Commonwealth. The Jewish people has recovered its national entity; its state on May 11, 1949, entered into the fellowship of the United Nations and has been accorded the recognition of most of the governments of the earth, including even the two islamic lands of Turkey and Iran. The incredible has happened; the prayer of generations has been answered.

There is no truer expression of the marvel of Jewish history today than the noble ritual that takes place on the airfield at Aden every time a plane load of Yemenite Jews leaves for Israel. As the passengers go into the modern American planes and the pilot prepares to take off, the Shofar—ancient ceremonial horn of the Jewish people—is solemnly blown. For the airfield at Aden is the threshold of redemption.

Withholding Tax on Dividends at Their Source

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 9, 1950

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegram from the commissioner of corporations and taxation of Massachusetts:

BOSTON, MASS., *May 8, 1950.*

Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Tax revenues for Massachusetts and its 351 cities and towns are likely to be seriously affected if Congress approves withholding tax on dividends at their source. Massachusetts has an income-tax law taxing income from intangibles, major portion of which comes from tax on dividends all of which is distributable to cities and towns of commonwealth under formula established by legislature. Five-sixths of tax on foreign and business corporations measured in part by income is distributed to cities and towns and balance retained by Commonwealth. It is conceivable courts would hold if tax on dividends were withheld that the entire dividend credited to the stockholder actually received or constructively received could not be taxed under Massachusetts law. Under present Massachusetts law dividend of $1,000 would be taxed at 6 percent and that same $1,000 would be subject to Federal tax if amount stockholder received instead of $1,000 was $900. Massachusetts for its cities and towns would be restricted to taxing $900 thus losing $6 tax on that $1,000 dividend. In the aggregate this would deprive the Commonwealth of upward of $2,000,000 annually. If there is anything you can do to prevent this it is my opinion you will be benefiting State and its 351 cities and towns. Your opposition to the proposal is respectfully requested.

HENRY F. LONG,
Commissioner of Corporations and Taxations.

Curtailment of Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Dubious Postal Economy," published in the Buffalo Courier Express, of Buffalo, N. Y., of April 20, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DUBIOUS POSTAL ECONOMY

According to Postmaster General Jesse M. Donaldson, operating funds recommended by the House Appropriations Committee for the fiscal year will not be enough to maintain postal service at present levels. Complying with a congressional mandate, the Post Office Department has ordered a sharp reduction in services, including limitation of residential deliveries to one a day and some curtailment of business deliveries.

This will result in some inconvenience to the public, and possibly some financial loss to private business. It will save several millions of dollars, but by no means wipe out the Department's annual half-billion-dollar operating deficit. Unfortunately, it will cause about 10,000 postal employees to be laid off, a severe and undeserved hardship for a faithful and none-too-well-paid group of public servants.

President William C. Doherty of the National Association of Letter Carriers (AFL) called the reduction "a rape of the postal service" and said the union would ask the Senate Post Office Committee to block "this devastating, ill-advised, and unnecessary order."

The Hoover Commission's comprehensive report on the postal service made various recommendations to put the Department on a pratical business basis. In regard to fiscal management, it said that the Post Office is "in need of greater flexibility than the customary type of appropriation budget ordinarily permits." It also recommended that Congress authorize the Postmaster General to raise certain postal rates, estimated to increase postal revenues by $113,000,000 annually. It made no specific recommendation for a curtailment of service necessitating layoffs of the postal labor force. So it appears that the congressional mandate has only an inferential basis in the Hoover Commission report.

Incidentally, Congressmen never are slow about appropriating money for new post offices in their home districts. In view of this and other Federal spending, to appropriate funds for continued employment of 10,000 postal employees, now threatened by the reduction of essential services, hardly could be challenged.

Near Eastern Armaments Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 9, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, May 5, 1950.

The Honorable ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. TAURIELLO: I am grateful to you and your colleagues for the letter of May 3, 1950, in which were set forth your joint views relative to my forthcoming discussion with Mr. Bevin on the Near Eastern armaments situation. Such expressions of opinion by Members of the Congress are extremely helpful to us in preparing for the meetings shortly to take place at London.

Several of the points which you have raised merit our comments at this time. With reference to your question as to whether the supply of armaments by Great Britain to the Near East is facilitated, directly or indirectly, by the settlement of that country's lend-lease account, the mutual defense assistance program or ECA aid, I assure you that it is not. The mutual defense assistance program for the 1950 fiscal year does not provide to the United Kingdom any items being furnished by that Government to the Arab states, nor does this program furnish Great Britain replacement items for items thus furnished. With regard to ECA, the relationship between this program and the Military Assistance Program was thoroughly explored by the Congress when the latter was pending last year. There has been no indication that the United Kingdom is diverting any undue proportion of its resources into military production.

I assure you also that the United States has consistently sought to persuade both Arabs and Israelis to reach a settlement of their differences through negotiation and voluntary agreement. This has been American policy both in the United Nations and in the direct relations of the United States with the countries themselves.

The same policy has been followed by the American representative on the Palestine Conciliation Commission, which was established by the UN General Assembly on December 11, 1948, and instructed to take steps to assist the governments and authorities concerned in the Palestine dispute to achieve a final settlement of all questions outstanding between them. The Commission is now engaged in discussions with representatives of Israel, Jordon, Egypt, Syria, and Lebanon.

You suggest in your letter that it would be helpful if the United States declared its policy to be opposed to a Near East arms race or a renewal of Arab-Israeli hostilities. That this is United States policy regarding an arms race was set forth by the United States representative in the United Nations on August 4, 1949, when he stated in the Security Council that "So far as the United States is concerned, it does not intend to allow the export of arms which would permit a competitive arms race in the area." This Government has on several occasions declared itesIf to be firmly opposed to a renewal of hostilities in the Near East.

You suggest further that point 4 technical assistance be made available only to those Arab states which were at peace, by which I assume you mean those Arab states which had reached peace settlements with Israel. You may recall that the point 4 program was specifically designed to improve the health and general living standards of the people of a country, as well as to raise their productivity. The Department believes that it would be undesirable to use this program as an instrument of political pressure. The Department also considers that the economic development of the Near East as a whole would lay sound foundations for permanent peace and stability in the area.

I hope that you will convey these observations to your colleagues, together with my thanks for the views expressed in your letter.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN ACHESON.

Curtailment of Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "How Do You Like the New Set-Up?" from the Holyoke Democrat of Holyoke, Mass., of April 22, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BYSTANDER—HOW DO YOU LIKE THE NEW SET-UP?

Postmaster General Jesse M. Donaldson has ordered an economy measure that you, citizen, will have to suffer, grunt, holler and whatnot.

Postmaster Philip F. Ryan will do the best under circumstances but orders are orders and he will have to put them into execution, whether he likes it or not, and it is a cinch that you, citizen, are not going to hold bonfires to celebrate the new schedule.

The regulars will squeeze in their regular hours, but the poor substitutes will have to take it on the chin and enjoy a diet of cheese and crackers. Still, some "monkeys" in Europe will keep on receiving American goods from America with the postal authorities acting the Santa Claus part.

The overtime basis is "in the bag" ready to be closed in the "dead letter" closet. The residential districts will see their favorite mail carrier once a day. If some club or social matron intends to receive an invitation for tonight's meeting or social, she better arrange her affairs in advance to be sure to receive her "invite" in the morning mail—Niema in the afternoon, lady.

It might have its good side if you intend to send a check. You could say: "I mailed it last night." It would be all up to you to find out where they won't collect at night. You would be sure to have "freedom of mind" and feel safe that you will have time to cover said check by the time it will reach its destination—it might take 3 or 4 days. Business districts from Monday through Friday will receive two deliveries instead of three and one on Saturday. Somebody in these districts will "pray" in undertone voice we bet. At night, mail will be picked up only from street boxes which are widely used. From the less popular boxes there will be no stop. It sounds to us as a catch as catch can stuff. From now on, citizen, you will have to speak "sweet little things" to your letter carrier in asking him where in heck you can deposit your correspondence at night. As it will hit the residential sections the most, better use the family car and bring your mail to the post office to be sure of delivery. Wonder if residents from those sections will accept with good grace?

If your correspondence is local or just across the river you may as well deliver in person and economize the 3 cents.

Post-office windows will close at 6 p. m. but the chances are that it will be five. In that case the boys may be able to listen to a couple of innings of broadcast on baseball.

The cut is one supposedly set for economy purposes. But you will notice that Congress is still in session and it is only a short while back that the Postal Department gave us a present in the form of an increase in postal rates.

Congressman JOHN W. HESELTON scored some success by sending telegrams, potatoes, tomatoes, etc., to President Harry S. Truman. We have about 2,000 stamps ready for collection purposes. Wonder if our Congressman would care to present them to the President thereby giving him a hint about the postal curtailment?

Write to your Congressman and Senators, citizen.

The Little Marginal Farmer Is the Homesteader of Today in a Costly Era

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINT SMITH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 9, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, perhaps for the last 25 years, more space has been devoted in the American press on ways to help agriculture than any other subject. Many plans have been introduced in the Congress. Some of these plans have been enacted into law. Yet all seem to have been lacking in some respects. Some of these plans have been rather severe in their application. The most notable one perhaps was to create the doctrine of scarcity—by the use of

the gun and hammer—and some more recent proposals seem to sound more like the program of the "hammer and sickle."

Perhaps the main trouble has been that the planners did not have an overall picture of farming. Many base their ideas on a one-crop farm. So many, in approaching the farm program, lose sight of climate, soil, topography, geography, and moisture. All thinking persons who try to solve this perplexing problem, soon come to the realization that a yardstick and a formula made and enforced by bureaucrats in Washington is not and will not be the answer.

Any farm program, to be successful, must be voluntary and controlled by farmers themselves.

Recently it was pointed out from statistics of the Agriculture Department that there were 25,000 less farms in Kansas in the year 1945 than in 1930, and I am sure that the number of farms have decreased since 1945.

It seems to me that any farm program should be based upon this question: "Will it help the family-sized farm?"

I herewith submit for my colleagues' attention the ideas of Mr. E. I. Chilcott, of Mankato, Kans., who comes from a long line of ancestors engaged in agriculture since the Revolutionary War. He has been an agricultural county agent and knows agricultural problems from a practical standpoint.

His ideas are as follows:

We dare America. Yes, we farmers that grow the food and every laborer that eats it dares America to cut out a lot of red tape, counting of acreages, bushels and pigs, and really get behind America's agriculture.

Did we not finance industry for a war to create a lot of stuff to destroy and kill on a cost-plus basis?

We dare America to get behind agriculture on a cost only, not cost plus, basis to make a prosperous peace. No country heavily endowed with soil and climate like our great Mississippi River Valley can have a sound and enduring prosperity without a sound and prosperous agriculture.

We do not need or desire to have the ownership of property in the hands of the Government. For is not that selling ourselves into communism and socialism? If all our money goes to the Government for taxes and bonds and they in turn buy and own the corn and wheat and the bins on our farms and communities, mortgages on homes, etc., etc., are we not taxing and buying ourselves into socialism, losing our individual liberties and rights?

We all have to keep a record of income and expenses for tax purposes so Federal and State collecting gangs can extract the profit. What are small business and farmers supposed to do with the losses, forget them? Try it. Those things, if over too long a period, get harder to forget and stagnate our whole economy.

Would it not be a sound investment in security of Americanism to stand behind the small marginal and submarginal farmers, not to the limit of $25,000 as Brannan suggests, but even $500, $1,000, or $1,500 to the extent Congress deems economically feasible and desirable, letting them book their feed, seed, fertilizer, repair costs and deduct from income, also deduct one-tenth or 10 percent of the value of auto, tractor, machinery, and home equipment. If the book shows a profit, take the necessary 20 percent (if it is necessary?). If book shows a loss, just mail him a check to that predetermined limit.

The little marginal farmer is the homesteader of today in a costly era. They are the untouched market. Forget socialized medicine, bank guaranties, pig counting, acreage measuring, spud rolling, even a lot of unemployment insurance checks, relief, etc. Let 'em all farm if they want to.

A few small checks to offset these losses, if they do occur, would underwrite our whole national economy. The investment would be economically justifiable and sound. The profit share from all business along the line would many times pay the investment. We would see the national debt shrink, the red tape cut out, a happy prosperous country owned by its individual citizens into which socialism and communism could not creep.

Yes, we dare America to stand behind the little basic farmer upon whom all peacetime prosperity hinges. We dare America to really turn our economy back to the individual citizens.

We dare America to let the regular individual-owned business channels own and distribute the commodities of production, the law of supply and demand set the price. Just assure the farmer his costs and let nature and business take its course. That's Americanism. You'd be surprised what a country they'd make of it.

Where's the Fire?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. HOWELL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 9, 1950

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I want to praise the work which is done by America's volunteer firemen. The first volunteer fire company in America was chartered by the King of England under date of July 11, 1752. I am familiar with the date because the company so chartered is still in existence and has been continuously since that time, and is located in the district which I represent. This is the relief fire company of Mount Holly, N. J., which is now making plans for its bicentennial.

Only those who have had the privilege of growing up and living in a small American town can appreciate the important place which the volunteer fire company holds in the life of the community. Besides the work for which it is chartered, the volunteer fire company contributes immeasurably to the social and civic life of the people. To be a member of the fire company is something to be proud of. I am very proud of the fact that I was a member of the Pennington, N. J., fire company.

Recently the volunteer company of White Horse, N. J., a suburb of the city of Trenton, was selected by the March of Time to play the central role in their documentary film, Where's the Fire. An editorial in tribute to this fine group of men and this outstanding honor which has been paid them was printed recently in the Hamiltonian, the weekly newspaper of Hamilton Township, printed in Yardville, N. J. The editorial, also entitled "Where's the Fire?" follows:

WHERE'S THE FIRE?

One of the most deserving groups of men we can think of will receive recognition on a Nation-wide scale in the near future. The men are our volunteer firemen, and the well-deserved recognition will be provided by a motion picture which should be of special interest in Hamilton Township.

The March of Time recently completed a film entitled "Where's the Fire?" It traces the development of fire-fighting equipment from the early days of hand-pumped engines to the present with its motorized, highly efficient fire trucks. After examining the workings of large and small city departments, the film turns to the volunteers.

The White Horse Fire Co. was selected to illustrate the work of the volunteers. "Typical of the modern volunteer fire company is that at White Horse," a March of Time spokesman says. "Practically all community activities center around the fire house of the White Horse volunteers. The firemen sponsor boys' baseball, basketball, and football teams, a 50-piece brass band, and they stage semimonthly dances for teenagers of the community."

The film is a real tribute to the White Horse firemen and to the volunteers everywhere. Like their White Horse brothers, the members of Hamilton's other fire companies serve their communities ably and willingly. It is difficult to over-praise the volunteers.

To many, the fireman is a professional, paid to risk his neck in battling fires, yet the volunteers outnumber paid firemen by 10-to-1 in the United States today. These volunteers are expertly trained in the latest fire-fighting methods and their equipment, notably in Hamilton Township, is often the envy of large city departments.

We urge you to see this picture. It will give you a good idea of what these altruistic fire fighters are doing in your interest. We salute the White Horse firemen and all the volunteers of the township for a difficult job well done.

Curtailment of Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Sputtering About Postal Matters," published in the Carthage, (Mo.) Evening Press of April 20, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPUTTERING ABOUT POSTAL MATTERS

The same day Carthage celebrated improvement of the mail service by inauguration of a mail bus between here and Kansas City the Postmaster General at Washington lobbed a gloom grenade.

Nation-wide cut in urban mail service to one delivery a day.

Post Office Department going deep into red.

Congress won't make up the difference.

Result a cut in service through cutting work hours and hence workers' total pay. An endeavor to make ends meet.

Businessmen can understand that sort of thing, though this may be the first recorded indication in recent American history of a Government department doing so.

But there might be an alternate to this plan of reducing costs at the financial expense of the postal worker and the inconvenience of the letter-getting public.

In view of the tremendous number of Government offices and bureaus and this-and-thats which use the mails free and freely, it is perhaps not unreasonable to assume that maybe a third or a fourth of the volume of mail is this deadhead stuff.

The Post Office Department could figure it out quite accurately.

Then it could bill Congress for this load which should be charged to the Government direct or to the agencies or bureaus concerned.

If all the postal load were pay load the department very likely would be plenty in the black.

The Hat Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 9, 1950

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the statement made by me this afternoon when I personally appeared before the United States Tariff Commission which is currently investigating a complaint having reference to the hat industry. Most seriously affected are the workers in some 10 concerns located in the Danbury and Norwalk areas, in my district, the State of Connecticut. Other areas in Massachusetts, New York, and New Jersey are likewise affected by the issue involved. The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. ANTONIO N. SADLAK, CONGRESSMAN AT LARGE, CONNECTICUT, BEFORE THE UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION

Mr. Chairman and members of the Tariff Commission, it is the well-known function and capacity of the Tariff Commission in cases of this kind to search for and evaluate details and technical information.

I recognize that a Member of Congress would not normally be able to submit more technical details that would assist the Commission than are made available by research members of your own staff and by the many experts in the industry, some of whom are here to present their statements.

There are some points, however, that are of particular interest to Members of Congress—and one or two have come to my attention as applying to the case which is now before you. I feel, therefore, that it would be of some assistance if we could clear the air a little and get down to the heart of the discussion as to whether, under existing law, the industry now before you can rightfully expect some relief.

I have read with considerable interest the written statement of Vice Chairman Edminster in a previous escape-clause report on spring clothespins. We feel he is to be congratulated for putting in plain language something which has been quite nebulous heretofore, and which, as a matter of fact, seems to have been carefully avoided by those administering the trade-agreements program.

I refer to the statement in which he has spelled out the fact that when tariffs are reduced in trade agreements, it is expected, and therefore foreseen, that increases in imports and decreases in production might take place. This is very logical, for in general, the domestic market is usually blessed with about all of a particular product that it can absorb, and when we manipulate the import end, it should be anticipated that increases in imports would be accompanied by decreases in domestic production.

Now, as I recall, the distinguished Vice Chairman once told a group of businessmen in New York City that it was his interpretation of the escape clause that the President of the United States was the only person who would do the foreseeing. It was pointed out then that the President was the person authorized by Congress to enter into trade agreements and to issue the proclamations lowering rates of duty. Of course, we must assume that he would have expert assistance and some recommendations, but the responsibility ultimately is his.

Summed up, it is clearly evident that the President, when he makes a concession—that is lowers a rate of duty—foresees some increase in imports and quite possibly, some cutback in domestic production.

It appears, then, that the appellants appearing before you now have the Herculean task of proving—if they are to get redress—that the President did not foresee the injury to the fur-felt-hat industry that is so evident.

It would be difficult for me to prove beyond a doubt that injury has occurred. That will be done by the injured, and who is there that could do it better? I am assuming injury, for it appears obvious to me that reductions in output, layoffs of workers, and idle equipment is injurious.

It does not take an economist to figure that, if imports from low-wage-scale countries are increasing; if retail sales in our own market are more and more of foreign origin and less and less of domestic origin, then the imports are responsible for the injurious reduction in United States production. The connection is obvious, the result inescapable. The case before you, one in which unemployment, dwindling sales, curtailment of output, and loss of dollar income coincide closely with increased imports, seems to be one of definite injury as a result of increased imports.

Mr. Chairman, I by no means desire to prejudge this case, but, assuming that some of the firms producing fur felt hats and bodies, have been injured as a result of increased imports, they must still prove that the increase in imports, and therefore the injury, is the result of the concession made on the products they manufacture.

I firmly believe they can and will do that—as nebulous and difficult as such a requirement is. The evidence appears conclusive that foreign producers were induced by lowered tariff rates to enter the domestic market on a much larger scale than formerly. They were quite aware of the great advantage they would have. I recognize that certain foreign currency devaluations may have had some effect, and that the gradual strangulation of free enterprise in one of the principal competing countries by Communist dictators has wiped out other competitive advantages we may formerly have had. Nevertheless, the initial and most important factor was the reduction in duty.

But the end is not yet. Assume the domestic producers prove to your satisfaction that they have been injured, that the injury is the result of increased imports, and that the increased imports are the result of the concession.

They must still show a greater amount of injury than was foreseen by the President when he reduced the duty, and that, gentlemen, is the $64 question, and the one in which I am particularly interested. It is the answer to that question which will decide whether the unemployed go back to work and whether the idle equipment begins operating again.

I do not believe the Tariff Commission has come to grips with this problem in any prior investigations under the escape clause. Either injury has not been proved or the appellants have failed to show the injury has been the direct result of the concession.

In this case, I feel confident you will find both. Your report to the President might then state that you have found those elements to be present and might make recommendations accordingly. I do not presume that you will be able to indicate to the President whether he foresaw the extent of the injury—that will be a decision which only he can make.

However, in the making of your report, may I suggest that you dwell on one of two incident factors. When the negotiations with Czechoslavakia started, it was a free country and, although wages were very low and most of the numerous expenses besetting our own producers for the public good were absent, nevertheless it was unfettered by the imperialism of another country. Since that time, the yoke of rigid communism with all its civil evils has taken over the government reins. I hope the Commission will remind the President of this and point out that he probably did not foresee the injury to the American producers that developed as a result of the despotism that enveloped the principal competing country. I cannot believe that the President would make a concession to a Communist-dominated satellite if he foresaw a resulting injury of any magnitude to any domestic industry because of that action.

Mr. Chairman, the competition between domestic producers of the articles which are the subject of this appeal has always been very keen. Processes have ben improved and efficiency increased to a great extent. The improvements made by research and expensive testing and experimenting have been transmitted abroad almost as fast as they have been put into effect here. In some industries the output per worker is much greater in this country than abroad. It is not true of fur felt hats and bodies.

Labor costs, then, play a very important part in the competitive picture. I need not ask you to make comparisons of the costs of labor in the principal competing country and in our own. Furthermore, you are cognizant, I am sure, that no domestic industry would dare to form a trust or combine, or would presume to fix prices and regulate sales, or force its workers to put in long hours at almost starvation wages. Unfair competition is a phrase that has, by careful Government regulation and inspection, been practically eliminated in our own country.

We cannot inspect, regulate, or make illegal those same practices in any foreign country. We can, however, take steps to protect our own industries from the devastating effects of the unfair methods of foreign competitors. You have the opportunity of taking such a step in the interests of this industry. We cannot dictate to Czechoslovakia that employees there shall receive minimum wages and decent working conditions, health insurance, retirement, or other reasonable blessings accorded our own workers. We can, however, prevent the products of such conditions as exist in Czechoslovakia from driving our own industries to the wall and our employees to the dole.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I realize that a strict administration of the escape clause by the Tariff Commission would require that you decide only whether there was injury, and whether that injury was the result of increased imports because of a concession. You would not be required to take cognizance of the foreign conditions that make the cutthroat competition possible, except as they developed after the concession was made. It is my firm belief that the Congress, when it passed the Trade Agreements Act, and the President, when he ordered the escape clause written into all future agreements, joined in one common principle, that of maintaining our standards of employment

and our system of free competitive enterprise. If that is so, the various fringe elements that I have mentioned here may well be taken into full consideration and when you prepare your recommendations to the President.

This industry is being injured by increased imports. Almost one-fourth of the domestic market has already been taken over. The imports increased rapidly after the duty rate was lowered and this was undoubtedly the main factor in the injury now taking place. While some increase in imports was probably foreseen when the concession was made, it does not seem logical that the President would have allowed the cut had he foreseen the extent of the increase in imports and the extent of the cut-back in our own production.

I shall look forward to seeing the Tariff Commission report on the results of its investigation.

The Last 50 Years in New Hampshire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS COTTON
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 9, 1950

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I insert an article written by Dr. J. Duane Squires of the faculty of Colby Junior College at New London, N. H., a well-known educator, author, lecturer, and civic leader in our State. This article, entitled "The Last Fifty Years in New Hampshire," appeared in the April number of the New Hampshire Troubadour, a monthly publication issued by the State planning and development commission.

The article follows:

THE LAST 50 YEARS IN NEW HAMPSHIRE

(By J. Duane Squires)

On the 31st of August 1899 Mr. and Mrs. F. O. Stanley, of Newton, Mass., drove their Stanley steamer up the carriage road on Mount Washington. It was the original ascent of that mountain by automobile and a fitting augury of the remarkable changes that the next 50 years were to bring. In this brief survey of those changes in New Hampshire life since 1899 three questions will be posed and answers sought: How have New Hampshire people altered their ways of making a living? What new developments in the art of living together have they devised? In what spiritual and intellectual ways have they reacted to the fast-flowing tides of change?

The United States census in 1900 showed New Hampshire to have a population of 411,588. Slightly more than 53 percent of these people are described as rural; i. e., living in the country or in villages of fewer than 2,500 population. By 1940 the rural proportion had dropped to 42 percent, and by 1950 it was expected to be still lower. At the same time, however, the product of farm and field in terms of dollar value rose steadily during the years after 1900; by 1949 it was approaching $70,000,000 in annual value. The establishment of the State Department of Agriculture in 1913, an extensive growth in poultry raising, the appearance of the 4–H Clubs and the county agent, State control of the milk market, and a great increase in tested dairy herds, the modernization of the maple-products industry—all these have been notable agricultural developments in the Granite State since 1900.

Transportation in the last half century has similarly changed. Edwin V. Mitchell in his charming "The Horse and Buggy Age in New England" has reminded us that 1900 was the high point of the equine era. There were then fewer than 8,000 automobiles in all the United States, and at least 20,000,000 horses. Harness makers, blacksmiths, gristmills and feed stores, livery stables, giant snow rollers in the winter, and dusty roads in the summer, in New Hampshire as elsewhere in the Nation were apparently basic aspects of American life. Yet within 50 years what a difference. Old Dobbin has almost disappeared, an ox team is a rarity, more than 100,000 motor vehicles are registered in New Hampshire alone, and even the "iron horse" is not the imposing figure he was in 1900. New Hampshire's modern highway development began in 1905 with the passage of the State-aid road law. A short stretch of bituminous road was laid near Nashua in 1908, and the original stretch of concrete highway cut down in Hooksett in 1918. Interstate bus service started in 1923 between Manchester and Lowell, and interstate air travel began in 1934.

During the same decades consolidation in New Hampshire's principal industries—textiles, shoes, and timber products—waxed and then began to wane. In the latter nineteenth century New Hampshire had 6,000 industrial establishments; today the number is perhaps one-sixth that number, but fortunately increasing. The prototype of the early twentieth century industrial giant was the Amoskeag Mills in Manchester, at one time the world's largest cotton-textile factory. By 1935 such consolidation brought its own downfall, and today the single establishment of yesteryear is functioning as several dozen varied and independent industries. In 1950, as in 1900, manufacturing, including such activities as printing and the processing of materials from Mother Earth, is New Hampshire's chief method of earning a living.

The expansion of the recreational industry in the Granite State over the last 50 years has been impressive. Even in the nineteenth century thousands of persons came annually to New Hampshire, to enjoy its mountains, lakes, and forests. Since 1900 the numbers have hugely increased. The establishment of the 600,000-acre White Mountain National Forest in 1909 was followed a few years later by the beginning of State forest reservations. Today these have expanded into more than 20 attractive State parks. In the last 50 years golf clubs have dotted the State, numerous boys' and girls' camps have been founded, and many summer theaters have flourished. Tourist accommodations have been so well developed that it is now possible to sleep 75,000 visitors to New Hampshire at one time. In recent decades the Cannon Mountain Aerial Tramway, the Cranmore Mountain skimobile, the Belknap and Mount Sunapee chair lifts, snow trains, and winter carnivals, the efforts of the six regional agencies in the State, and the skill of the State highway department in maintaining good roads have raised tourism to unprecedented heights. Thousands of Granite State men and women now derive their livelihood from this important industry.

What new developments in the art of living together have New Hampshire people devised in the last half century? In candor it must be said that, more important than any single act of will by our people themselves, have been the effects of the social revolution throughout the whole Nation wrought by technology in the last 50 years. Among these effects which have influenced New Hampshire mightily have been the wide use of electricity; the marvels of modern medicine, hospitals, and public health; radio and television; the moving picture; the automobile, tractor, and truck; frozen foods and fuel oil; consolidated schools; supermarkets and synthetics of all sorts; and many other technological changes of our age. All these developments have altered our whole manner of living together, and in New Hampshire as elsewhere their impact has been profound.

Nevertheless, in other ways by deliberate acts of their will Granite State citizens have altered the pattern of public and group life. In 1899 "Old Home Week" was begun; 2 years later the present judiciary system was inaugurated; and in 1909 the direct primary law was instituted. In 1911 New Hampshire adopted the Nation's first workmen's compensation law and did pioneer work with the idea of a Public Service Commission, child labor regulation, and factory inspection legislation. During World War I the Granite State furnished more than 20,000 men for the armed services, invested upwards of $80,000,000 in war securities, and produced the author of that famous song, "The Long, Long Trail." A quarter of a century later, during World War II, New Hampshire gave 59,000 men and women to the uniformed services, and in war bond drives and by interim buying invested more than $539,000,000 in the cause of victory.

In other ways New Hampshire people reacted to the problems and needs of the contemporary world. In 1936 after devastating floods and again in 1938 after the terrible hurricane New Hampshire showed the traditional New England spirit of surmounting grave difficulties. In 1905 the State's oldest city, Portsmouth, was host to the Conference which ended the Russo-Japanese War, and in 1944 its largest hotel at Bretton Woods sheltered the conference which led to the creation of the International Bank and the International Monetary Fund. In 1949 New Hampshire was proud to furnish the granite cornerstone for the United Nations headquarters building now being erected in New York.

In what spiritual and intellectual ways have New Hampshire people reacted to the fast-flowing tides of change since 1900? Among Protestants there has been a noticeable increase of the ecumenical spirit, and a lessening of narrow sectarianism. Among those of other faiths similar trends have been at work, and all religious people have cooperated closely in manners of social reform and general welfare. "Brotherhood Week" in 1950 for all the United States was headed by a distinguished Catholic son of New Hampshire. Throughout the half century service clubs, youth organizations, fraternal groups, women's clubs, and welfare agencies, all with a basically religious motivation, have had a steady growth and a far-reaching influence.

Traditionally partial to the "district school," New Hampshire did not establish a real State school system until 1919. As early as 1901 the Normal School at Keene had been established, to do for the southern part of the State what its older sister at Plymouth had long done for northern New Hampshire. In 1923 the modern University of New Hampshire at Durham was organized, and has rapidly grown to a status of leadership among institutions of its kind. In private education Dartmouth College attracted students from all over the Nation, as did Colby Junior College, Exeter, St. Paul's, and Holderness. Other fine schools flourished, both on the secondary and higher level; among these were the Catholic colleges of St. Anselm, Mount St. Mary, and Rivier.

In the field of books and the arts New Hampshire had a proud record over the years since 1900. In 1950 almost every town in the State had a free, tax-supported, public library; an efficient State library furnished bookmobiles; and in per capita circulation of books New Hampshire ranked high among the 48 States. Early in the century Augustus St. Gaudens was a towering figure in the art colony around Cornish, and his beautiful home and studio are now a public preserve. Daniel Chester French, a native of Exeter,

gained world renown from his creation of the Lincoln Memorial in Washington in 1922. The handsome Currier Gallery of Arts in Manchester opened in 1927, and the Orozco murals at Dartmouth became famous a decade later. Since 1908 the MacDowell Colony at Peterborough has been a stimulus to writers and musicians, while at nearby Swanzey in 1914 Joyce Kilmer was inspired to write his immortal poem, Trees.

In summary, it is clear that New Hampshire has changed amazingly in the past 50 years. Yet, as Carleton J. H. Hayes has properly reminded us, the forces of continuity are always stronger than those of alternation. Underneath, the character of the Granite State has been constant. It was no accident that the FBI reported in 1946 that New Hampshire was the most law-abiding State in the Nation. Perhaps with this thought in mind, the late Lawrence Shaw Mayo wrote in 1948:

"Conservative they are indeed, these country people of New Hampshire * * * but it does not follow that they are dull. Far from it. They are as shrewd as they are conservative, and so must occupy pretty nearly the first place among the shrewd peoples of the world. * * * That is merely one phase of the uncanny sense which gives unusual value to their judgments upon everything from uncertain weather to even more uncertain human nature. * * * Is it possible that the countryside in which they live is a tiny cosmos containing all types of human character? * * * Perhaps it is so. At all events their keenness in judging individuals is equaled only by their knowledge of human nature in general."

It is a tribute of which New Hampshire folk in the middle of the changing twentieth century have a right to be proud.

Curtailment of Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "How To Blackjack Congress," published in the St. Petersburg (Fla.) Evening Independent of April 20, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW TO BLACKJACK CONGRESS

The difficulty in enforcing economy in Government is well illustrated by Postmaster General Donaldson's order sharply reducing postal deliveries. There can be little doubt but what Donaldson's order is simply a high-handed attempt to blackjack Congress into appropriating the funds the postal department feels it needs to carry on. He obviously hopes that his order will result in a great hue and cry from the people demanding the restoration of the department's funds.

Undoubtedly that pressure will soon be forthcoming. How Congress will deal with it remains to be seen. Nevertheless Donaldson knows, and so does Congress, that there would be no necessity for a retrenchment in postal service if the department were operated efficiently and sensibly.

The Hoover Commission has pointed measure by measure how the annual postal deficit can be eliminated without curtailment of service. In fact, under the Commission's plan service would actually be increased instead of decreased.

But entrenched bureaucracy in the postal department, as in other agencies is difficult to fight. When faced with a showdown, the bureaucrat invariably finds a means of making the public suffer; for his first allegiance is to the world of bureaucracy, never the people.

Proposed Loan to Spain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES J. MURPHY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 9, 1950

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following article by John O'Donnell:

CAPITAL STUFF
(By John O'Donnell)

WASHINGTON, D. C., April 27.—It was only 9 months ago that Secretary of State Acheson—then riding high, wide, and handsome—coldly told the Senate that he opposed lending $50,000,000 to Spain on the ground that Spain was a poor security risk.

A couple of days later, in his White House press conference, President Truman backed up anti-Spain Acheson. He declared that if the Senate bill then under consideration carried provisions for a $50,000,000 loan to Spain through the Export-Import Bank, he'd be against it and he bluntly proclaimed that this Nation just didn't have friendly relations with Spain.

CONNALLY STATES REVERSAL

Now the powerful chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, TOM CONNALLY, of Texas, solemnly assures the Senate that he has just talked with Truman and Acheson and can assure the upper House that, if Spain applies for an Export-Import Bank loan, the O. K. of White House and State Department will be forthcoming—and pronto.

We can assure the readers that this would never have happened if Acheson and Truman hadn't been nursing the bruises and wounds suffered in their defense against the Communist infiltration charges hurled at the administration by Senator JOSEPH MCCARTHY (Republican, Wisconsin).

It took CONNALLY'S solemn pledge that Acheson and Truman had reversed themselves before the Senate agreed it should pass the foreign-aid bill without a mandatory provision that Spain must receive a $50,000,000 loan out of the over-all $3,250,000,000 appropriation. The mandatory loan to Spain lost, 42 to 35.

Now all this and its background is extremely important as it relates to the individuals who are consciously playing the Commie game in the higher echelons of diplomacy in this Republic.

The facts are that Generalissimo Francisco Franco and the forces behind him have been the foes of the Kremlin since the first shot was fired in the effort to recapture the government of Spain from Moscow-dominated Reds, syndicalists, radicals, anticlericals, etc., who had seized power. That was soft-pedaled along with the record that the anti-Franco groups in this country at the time of the civil war have now, on the whole, been publicly denounced as Commie-front and subversive. In that group are formally listed these organizations: The Abraham Lincoln Brigade, the Action Committee to Free Spain Now, the American Committee for Spanish Freedom, the Comite Coordinator pro Republica Espanola, the North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy, and the North American Spanish Aid Committee.

BARRIER LAID TO MRS. ROOSEVELT

In the UN sessions, even after such Republican leaders as ARTHUR VANDENBERG, of Michigan, and Democrats like CONNALLY had proclaimed months back that the majority of the Senate wanted us to resume normal relations with Spain, and send back our Ambassador, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt in the UN blocked the move and made it impossible for the United States to switch from the Kremlin line.

Then and today, our military leaders will point out, privately, the necessity of having Spain and Portugal on our side when the cold war takes on the heat of battle.

Today's move in the Senate—if Acheson and Truman make good the promise to Spain that CONNALLY proclaimed in the Senate—may well mean the end to the persistent, sinister attack which Moscow's mouthpieces in America have been hurling at Spain during the war years and since.

Roosevelt in his official papers, Churchill in his historical report, Eisenhower in his account and the wartime diary of our Ambassador to Spain, Carleton Hayes, all have emphasized the long-ignored fact that Franco was on our side and not on Hitler's and that without Franco's aid our North African landings would have ended in bloody disaster.

SUPPORT FROM GERMAN SOURCE

Their endorsements of Franco have long been deliberately skipped over or given scant notice. But we notice from another source—this one German—that the American judgment on Franco was correct—even back in the opening days of 1941, when the British were being battered in North Africa and the German armies were riding the crest of victory.

In B. H. Liddell Hart's The German Generals Talk (William Morrow & Co., New York, 1950, 308 pp., $4), Gen. Kurt Student, commander in chief of Germany's airborne forces, was quoted as saying the Germans could have taken Gibraltar only with Spanish help, and Student so reported home, where a parachute attack had been planned.

"After my report, General Student went on, that plan was changed into the bigger one of capturing Gibraltar by an attack on the mainland. Eight divisions from France were to race through Spain. But this depended on the Spanish agreeing to let us through. Hitler did not want to take the risk of having to fight his way through Spain. He tried to persuade Franco, but Franco would not agree. The discussions went on for some time but proved fruitless. So the Gibraltar plan had to be dropped."

Curtailment of Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Post Office—Cat's Paw," published in the Nashville (Tenn.) Banner of April 22, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POST OFFICE—CAT'S PAW

In one of those sweetly chiding "come now" editorials rebuking the unreasonable, a contemporary asks: "Do you absolutely have to have your mail twice a day?" With that as its headline, it goes on to justify the slash of service which Mr. Donaldson has ordered for the Post Office Department. As a stanch defender of the New Deal and then the Fair Deal, it refrains from all suggestion, naturally, that the Post Office has been used to rake squanderbund chestnuts out of the economy fire.

But back to that question: The answer is "No." Most citizens don't absolutely have to have even one mail delivery. They could go to the post office and call at the general delivery window. Or they could communicate by telephone or telegraph or buy time on the radio in lieu of written correspondence. Or they could get in their cars, or even walk, to go see the folks personally, with whom they have social or business contacts.

The point is that they don't have to do that—or haven't had to—because the postal service has built up the finest mail-carrying system of any land. It has steadily improved that service; not as a boondoggle venture, but as a responsible discharge of public service obligations justifying the slogan which declares that neither storm nor other calamities and handicaps shall stop these couriers.

Another point is that this essential service, proudly maintained and improved over the years, has been curtailed by Mr. Donaldson's order when there are dozens of Federal units—each with its encumbering personnel—which could be abridged or lopped off entirely without detriment to the operating efficiency of government, and actually to every taxpayer's benefit.

If the question were asked "Do you absolutely have to have the services of these surplus agencies—these supernumeraries of big Government?" the answer would be an unequivocal "No."

When these, and not the post office, are curtailed, no responsible citizen would register a complaint.

Partition of Ireland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 9, 1950

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert the very impressive resolutions adopted by the Clan-na-Gael at the Hotel Astor, Easter Sunday night, April 9, 1950, sent to me by my valued friend, James Reidy.

These admirably drawn resolutions set forth clearly and forcibly the viewpoint and arguments for the elimination of partition in Ireland. To my mind the arguments presented are unanswerable to any American who believes in the basic principles of freedom and democracy.

I hope that Members of the House will read these resolutions and other similar communications concerning this great contemporary problem which affects so profoundly the destiny of a courageous people who will not be deterred in their age-old fight for liberty and unity.

Americans would do well to ponder the question of Irish unity and Irish autonomy. It is bound up inseparably with our own ideals of free government for which so many persons of Irish descent and blood have so valiantly and indomitably fought and died. It is bound up with eternal principles upon which this Nation was founded, by which it has risen to incomparable greatness. It is bound up with the avowed aims for which this Nation has stood, fought, and sacrificed so much—the dignity of man, the supremacy of moral and civil law, the predominant political significance of self-determination for all nations, great and small, and the right of every people worthy of the name to establish the government of their choice under free institutions and free traditions. It is bound up with strategic values in this time of peril.

Freedom exists for all, not for the favored and the privileged. It exists for mankind, for the Irish as well as every other people. It exists particularly for those peoples, like the Irish, who have cherished it enough unselfishly to die for it throughout recorded time. Let us never compromise the cause of freedom. Let us hold out the hand of encouragement and assistance to the Irish as well as other nations in their gallant struggle to achieve unity and independence.

I hope the Congress will soon express itself on this question. And I hope the great British Government will recognize that the early unity and deliverance of Ireland will do much indeed to cement the bonds which bind that nation to ours in the confraternity of freedom-loving peoples.

The resolutions follow:

Resolved, That we, members and friends of the Clan-na-Gael, assembled in the Hotel Astor, New York City, on Easter Sunday night, April 9, 1950, to honor the men of our race who fought and died for Ireland's freedom in Easter week, 1916, again pledge ourselves to work earnestly, in cooperation with all the other American-Irish organizations, in support of the demand of the people of Ireland for the withdrawal of the English armed forces and the English flag from the six counties of northeast Ulster, which were arbitrarily separated from the Irish Nation by a partition act passed in the English Parliament in 1920; and be it further

Resolved, That as the Government of England dismembered Ireland in 1920 for the evil purpose of fostering division and discord among the people of Northeast Ulster to serve the interest of English imperialism and did so without the approval of even the Irish Unionists who were sitting in the Imperial Parliament at that time, we again charge that Government with being solely responsible for the grievous wrong which was done to the people of Ireland and to the Irish race everywhere by the passage of the Partition Act, and we demand that the English Parliament, which perpetrated this injustice, undo it by restoring to Ireland the six separated counties that have been part of the Irish Nation from time immemorial; and be it further

Resolved, That we charge that the puppet government known officially as the Government of Northern Ireland has from its beginning violated, and still continues to violate, every one of the four freedoms, which were declared to be the things for which the Government of England and our own Government were fighting in the Second World War, and we cite in proof of this accusation the ban against celebrations in honor of St. Patrick issued by the despotic regime in Belfast and the reimposition, on April 6, of the provisions of the infamous Special Powers Act, including authority to the regular police and the auxiliary police force known as the B. Specials, which is recruited from the most fanatical members to raid the homes of the people and search them without a warrant at any hour of the day or night; and be it further

Resolved, That we brand as untenable the argument which has been advanced in some quarters that American citizens of Irish blood should not ask or expect the Government of the United States to interfere in a dispute between the people of Ireland and the Government of England, and we declare, in answer to that contention that the Government of the United States has already injected itself into this situation—and on the side of England—by shoveling, unconditionally, billions of dollars of the American taxpayers' money into the Treasury of the United Kingdom, in which is included the Government of Northern Ireland, and some millions of those billions have been and are used by the English Government to subsidize and support the puppet government in Belfast, keep part of Ireland unfree and prevent the people in the northeast corner of the island from living together in peace and uniting amicably with the inhabitants of the other twenty-six counties of Ireland; and be it further

Resolved, That we, remembering the pledges which were made to the unfree peoples of the world by the spokesmen of our Government in wartime and aware also of the friendship of millions of liberty-loving Americans, not of our race, for the people of Ireland, pledge ourselves to continue insisting that the Government of the United States, which by its prodigality in the use of the money of its citizens, has kept the British Empire from collapsing completely, has not only the right but also the duty to tell the English Government that it is violating American principles by its conduct toward Ireland and that, if it continues to do so, the flow of American dollars into the English Treasury will cease; and be it also

Resolved, That we request our representatives in both Houses of Congress to keep in mind the misuse by the Government of England of part of those billion dollar handouts which it has received from the United States and we demand that no further appropriations be voted to that government while it continues its oppressions in Ireland and maintains a garrison there.

Curtailment of Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from Walter E. Waring to the editor of the Philadelphia Inquirer, published in the Philadelphia (Pa.) Inquirer of April 21, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THAT CUT IN MAIL SERVICE

To the EDITOR OF THE INQUIRER:

It has just been announced that the Post Office Department has decided that there shall be one instead of two deliveries of mail in the residential districts of our cities.

This is certainly a raw deal for the ordinary citizen who for years has been footing more than his share for the maintenance of the Post Office Department.

Every letter sent by humble John Doe must bear a 3-cent stamp. I understand that the average letter weighs slightly less than one-half an ounce. This means that first-class mail pays the Government somewhat more than 6 cents an ounce or about $1 a pound. Simple arithmetic shows that this means $2,000 a ton. The Government can carry letters, at a profit, to any part of this Nation at that rate of payment. But the citizens paying this high rate of postage are to have their daily deliveries cut in half.

Why does the Post Office Department have a deficit? Because any firm acquiring a second-class mailing permit can send John Doe circulars, pamphlets, prospectuses, and what not for practically nothing in comparison with the $2,000 per ton which John Doe must pay for the necessary letters that he sends to friends, relatives, and creditors.

From my own experience I am sure that John Doe consigns immediately to the wastebasket at least 90 percent of this second-class mail. Yet he must not only pay for such mail with his 3-cent stamps but he is penalized by having his mail deliveries cut in half.

Surely the Post Office Department has not considered the rank and file of its citizens—and its patrons—in issuing its decree.

WALTER E. WARING.

LINCOLN UNIVERSITY, *April 18.*

Pension Plans and Public Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 9, 1950

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Beecher E. Hess, for years identified with the movement to provide adequate old-age pensions, visited central Pennsylvania last week and addressed large groups at Altoona and Williamsburg in my congressional district.

Mr. Hess' analysis of the general problem of old-age pensions is of timely interest and for that reason I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of his address:

PENSION PLANS AND PUBLIC POLICY

Following the legislative trends in our National Capitol I am impressed with the great public interest that is focused on the preservation of our Americanism and the general subject of pensions. Americanism versus foreignism of one kind or another is of vital concern to every true American citizen today. Never before in our Nation's history have we been confronted with a problem dealing with so many of those within our own border who would destroy our form of government, enslave us under a dictatorship and subject us to the rule of the iron curtain. It is scarcely believable that such a condition could exist in free America, but it is a fact and not a red herring drawn across the path of our national life. It is a great satisfaction to me to be identified with an organization, as a member, that has for one of its objectives patriotism. I refer to the American pension committee under whose auspices I am speaking now. This nonpartisan organization is national in scope having clubs and memberships in 17 States. I am glad to say that it is particularly active in this area of Pennsylvania where its influence for Americanism and pensions is substantial. In the pension field this organization is devoting its best efforts toward better pensions and improved social security.

Our old folks represent one segment of our population that from year to year are placed in greater jeopardy. This is perhaps due to our national development and to our everchanging economic order. Age limitations for industrial employment are decreasing while it becomes more difficult for older people to get or hold a job. The elderly man or woman has little chance of earning a livelihood today.

The Census Bureau tells us that our population is increasing beyond all past estimates—the population is more than 150,000,000. This represents a gain of 17,000,000 since 1940. That gain is more than the population of all the New England States combined. And the largest percentage of all this increased population comes in the age group of 60 years and over. There are now more than 16,000,000 American citizens over 60 years of age and an estimated 10,000,000 of them are dependent more or less upon someone else for their existence.

Modern science, hygiene, medical care, hospitalization, etc., have greatly prolonged their lives. They sometimes feel that they are too young to die and too old to live. The tragic result of our speeded-up industry is an ever growing army of aged folks forced into unemployment, poverty, and obscurity. While we are most thoughtful for the rest of the world, I feel we are prone to ignore our own needy old folks and let them suffer without attention or concern.

In this Congress there were long debates on the famous minimum-wage proposition. Again and again we were told that 75 cents an hour or $30 per week was an absolute minimum on which an individual could live. If that be true we are guilty of relegating more than 2,500,000 good American citizens to slow starvation, for there are that many who are on the old-age-assistance rolls getting the pitiable sum of about $10 a week, average, throughout the country. By what process of reasoning do we assume that one man must have a minimum of $30 a week to live on and at the same time refuse to hear the plea of the man or woman who is forced to live or die on $10 a week? The answer is obvious. It is unfair, unjust, and un-American.

To guard ourselves against communism we spend millions beaming the Voice of America to the rest of the world. We support ECA to the tune of $15,000,000,000, and we rightly seek to protect ourselves against any and all subversive elements. But let us not forget that one of the greatest perils to our American way of life is the fear of destitution, dependency, and poverty when our productive days are over. Millions of destitute senior Americans find it difficult to enthuse over a security system that provides them only $10 each per week when living costs are at the highest peak in history. While they are proud and perhaps not so vocal as other groups getting Government aid and support of one kind or another, their feeling of neglect is deep-seated and their being ignored is bitterly resented. I have yet to find anyone who is satisfied with old-age assistance as it is operated by the present Administration. All are agreed that it is in need of revision or improvement and many feel that it should be scrapped and replaced with a new system whereby pensions would be paid as a matter of right. Perhaps the most frequent criticism of the present old-age assistance are the lien laws that prevail in many States. Under these laws old persons cannot secure a pension if he or she has property, insurance, or anything else of value. In effect they must proclaim themselves paupers regardless of cause or circumstances which may be beyond their control.

Pensions as security in old age has within a short time become one of the foremost public issues of our day. Industry throughout the country has adopted pension programs for their workers. But can many companies or corporations provide real old age security for their employees? How can anyone know whether or not a large and prosperous enterprise may not be completely out of business 5 or 10 years hence.

You hear it said that pensions are paid for by the company and the workers. Now if we are realistic we must agree that such pension costs are added to the price of the product and paid for by the purchasing public. The United Mine Workers have a $100 a month pension and I am glad to see them get it. But how is it paid? It is paid by adding 30 cents to the price of every ton of coal sold. Everybody pays directly or indirectly into this pension fund. But only the mine worker gets the pension. But even in this instance the mine workers are not absolutely secure. A few months ago when there was disagreement among the managers of the fund, payments were stopped and the retired miners found themselves without pension security. The problem is too big and too complicated to be solved by companies, industries, or unions.

The old age pension issue is national in its scope. About 11 percent of the population of every county in every State is in the old age class and nearly every family has its aged dependents. It is little wonder that pension news gets the newspaper headlines and radio time. What are we doing about it? But first, let us see what has been done.

The present old-age assistance was enacted into law in 1935. The first year's payments averaged about $18 a month to some 435,000 recipients. As time went on the average monthly payments were raised and the pension lists were increased. Last year an average of $44 plus per month, each, was paid to approximately 2,500,000 recipients throughout the country. No one denies that these pensions have not served a humanitarian purpose. Small and inadequate as they are, they have helped—and only helped—to keep body and soul together. Our pension experience over the past 15 years points up the following facts:

That pensions are here to stay; that each year a greater percentage of our population graduates into the old-age class, and that even 45 years of age is too old for industrial employment; that $10 a week will not support an adult human being; that there are millions of needy and suffering aged citizens who are denied pensions because of technicalities, State laws, or the social worker; that organized attempts here and there to find jobs for the oldsters have failed because the young man and the machine get the preference; that we have the financial ability to pay decent livable pensions—we raise billions to send abroad; that pensions clubs, groups, and national organizations have been organized for the purpose of improving the plight of the aged. These organizations deserve great credit for promoting and advancing the cause of pensions. Their insistence and influence have kept the issue alive and before the legislators, both State and National.

In view of the above and other pertinent facts, two schools of thought have developed, particularly in the Congress, in regard to old-age pensions, one believes that the old-age

assistance provision of the Social Security Act should be retained but extended and improved, this position is the one taken by the Democratic administration. The other believes that it is wrong in principle and should be discarded. It believes that a national, uniform old-age pension law should be passed by the Congress, providing a pension to all citizens of a given age with perhaps certain minimum restrictions.

The American Pension Committee is supporting a bill in Congress that would pay a pension of $60.00 a month to any citizen 60 years of age and over who had not paid a Federal income tax the year previous to making pension application. This would provide a man and his wife $120.00 a month. Incidentally, I want to state that the Congressman representing this Twenty-second Congressional District of Pennsylvania, the Honorable JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, has been most active in behalf of better pension legislation during his service in Congress. I want to assure those who are interested in the cause of pensions that you have a sincere, stanch supporter serving your best interests in Washington. He is capable, experienced and respected by his colleagues and associates as one of the hardest working men on Capitol Hill, impartial in his services and thoroughly devoted to his duties as a Member of Congress. He is serving as cochairman of a congressional steering committee for old-age pensions. Congressman VAN ZANDT is doing a good job for you and therefore deserves your full cooperation and support.

There are some 15 social security or pension bills before Congress now—hearings have been held by the House Ways and Means Committee and by the Senate Finance Committee. Some kind of social security pension legislation will certainly be passed in this Congress. I hope it will enact legislation to provide pensions for those who qualify now and not tie it in with an insurance proposition that only anticipates future payments. Pensions are needed now. I know of no action that this Congress can take short of that which deals with our national security that will yield as much in happiness and general good as to provide a genuine American pension for our deserving retired American citizens.

Curtailment of Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Postal Service Not a Business," published in the Canton (Ohio) News of April 22, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POSTAL SERVICE NOT A BUSINESS

Whenever the United States Post Office Department gets into the news, as it is now in connection with the Postmaster General's retrenchment order, effective next July 1, its failure to be businesslike is discussed.

This stems from a widespread belief that the postal service is a business because it collects payment for some of its services. Consequently, its operations are expected to be like the operations of a business, with balance sheets and profits and losses. A deficit is alleged to be a sign of mismanagement, as it would be in a business.

The truth is that the United States Post Office Department was not set up as a business, nor is it operated as a business. It is operated according to the will of Congress, which expects it to do many things no business would be asked to do, such as maintaining some 30,000 post offices that don't handle enough mail to pay their own way.

The Department has no control over its rates, furthermore; it cannot make itself more nearly self-sustaining without congressional authority. It has been used throughout its history as an agency for carrying out certain vital public policies, such as providing public subsidy for development of aviation; distributing publications to as many persons as possible, in order to inform the public; and giving service at no direct cost to every person in the United States.

It cannot bargain with railroads and airplanes over the cost of carrying mail; that is left to Congress. Though the difference between the money it takes in and the money it pays out is referred to as a deficit, this is not the case in any other department of the Government. No one would think of referring to the money spent by the Department of Agriculture as a deficit merely because it isn't offset by revenue from benefited farmers.

In a recent issue of the Postal Record, Jerome J. Keating, secretary of the National Association of Letter Carriers, pointed to the fact that of the 18 percent of Federal spending chargeable to normal operations of Government only one-fifteenth is spent on the Post Office Department.

He declared: "The Post Office Department is operated as a service. It is up to Congress to establish rates that it feels are fair and equitable. It is also the responsibility of Congress and the responsibility of the officials of the Post Office Department to secure sufficient funds to operate the postal service so that the American people are given the service they are entitled to. * * * A doctrine that the postal service should be operated fundamentally to give good service to the American people is absolutely necessary. Poor service gives great distress to conscientious postal employees."

Elsewhere, Mr. Keating pointed out that the Department does not run a business but a service. "Postal operations are always managed by Government," he explained. "There isn't a single country in the world where the postal service is owned and operated by private capital. * * * Even today in this great country of ours the postal service is the only universal public service. There are millions of people who do not have telephones; there are millions who do not have access to telegraphic service; there are millions who do not have running water; there are millions who are not served by public transportation; there are millions who do not have the benefit of electricity."

Biggest Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 9, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the fifteenth article by Mr. Frank C. Waldrop on the infiltration of communism in our country:

BIGGEST STORY
(By Frank C. Waldrop)

History wastes no time on losers. But even so in this limited little story there must be mention of a shadow known as Trotsky.

He is a shadow. But of all the murderers of our age, he was the one who most appealed to American lovers of communism 40 years ago.

And so, to understand today's communism you must know something about him.

Like Marx, Lenin, and the other early builders of the machine, Trotsky was a son of the well-to-do. More than that, he was educated, polished, and elegant in dress and manner.

His born name was Lev Davidovitch Bronstein, and if you are interested in such things you can read a story of his upbringing in his own words, for he was a gifted writer and as a historian of the revolution that cost him his life, he has no equal.

He had wit, charm, and a love of malice. Once in New York City as an exile from the czars, he wrote a widely quoted piece about the gum-chewing crowds on the subway.

But to accept it, you had to forget that no matter how grinding the poverty of one might be at a given moment, the standard of living in the free air of America was moving steadily up, for all.

To let Trotsky persuade you, it was essential to forget that every American was then, as every American remains today, a human being whose lot is the envy of the world.

A good understanding of the difference between the mind of a Trotsky and the mind of an American might be summed up in the case of Siberia.

From the earliest times, the rulers of European Russia have been trying to fill up that vast emptiness. Somehow, it does not work. Right today, the machine guns and the prisons are doing little better for Stalin than did the knouts and the chains of the czars.

Long railroad trains of victims are moving steadily from European Russia to the plains beyond the Ural mountains. And yet it is impossible for the Communists to conceal that the basic drift stays steadily west.

The stubborn nonpolitical will of the people is to huddle into the region that lies between the Baltic and Black seas.

Trotsky was once sent to Siberia in one of the many efforts of the czar to combine dissolution of troublesome politicians with populating undermanned territories.

But Trotsky was a city slicker. He liked drinking tea out of a glass and wiggling his toes and spinning yarns of diversion while his lightning instinct for intrigue worked to cut opponents' throats.

He hated the forests and the snows and the summer winds and the smell of the great outdoors, even though he had been born on a farm, himself. Or maybe it was because of that.

So with his gift for words, he made Siberia an image of horror for the class of people in the Western World who are today commonly known everywhere as intelligentsia. The word is Russian.

And what are the intelligentsia? Well, about the only people who know intelligentsia when they see them are other intelligentsia.

Apparently, though, their main idea is that they know what's good for the rest of us and will give it as they please—New Dealers, so to say.

Forty years ago, Trotsky was laying down a formula for the "intelligentsia" that now is perfected and glazed. He had no taste for the earth to which he had been born.

In contrast, I have in my memory the words of an American who was hired by the Soviet

Government in the 1920's to set up and operate a hunt for gold in the Siberian reaches.

To him, Siberia was a place of wonder and beauty and opportunity. It was nature to be conquered and yet lived with in pleasure. The life, he said, was easier than Alaska, where he had spent many years.

Surely any American who has any knowledge at all can understand that engineer's feelings. Here on this continent our breed has beat the worst that nature can do.

We even dig the borax out of Death Valley. We cut down one forest and plant another. Tear the sod off the western plains and then spend hundreds of millions tacking it back.

If the spirit of America were let loose on Siberia it could be a land of rich fulfillment. But under the czars the Russian people huddled timidly up against the edge of Europe and so they do, today; because they have never been told to go out and make a profit for themselves out of the earth.

And what little development there is behind the Urals can be traced directly to the importation of American and German and a few English and French engineers, first by the czars and later by the Soviets in the 1920's, when the cry of communism was "catch up with and pass America."

Address of Hon. William C. Bullitt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL HINSHAW
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, May 6, 1950

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following text of an address delivered by William C. Bullitt at the Yale Law School at New Haven, Conn., Friday, April 14, 1950. Mr. Bullitt spoke under the auspices of the Pierson College International Relations Club:

Forty years ago when I was a student at Yale we were all obliged to go to compulsory Sunday chapel—which often meant returning to New Haven by the milk train from parties in New York. Our pain was eased, however, by President Hadley. The visiting preachers would invariably ask him how long they should preach. Hadley invariably would reply: "Your time is, of course, unlimited; but the oldest Yale tradition is that no souls are saved after the first 15 minutes."

At the risk of saving no souls at all, I shall take more than 15 minutes because I want to try to give you an over-all picture of the world situation. When you complete your studies you will step onto a field of battle. All of us wish that were not so; but it is so. And you had better know now what you will face.

Why isn't it reasonable to believe that if we display enough good will we can reach an agreement with Stalin that will give peace to the world? After all, the Soviet Union contains a sixth of the land surface of the earth. It is sparsely populated. It could be developed as our own country was developed between the Civil War and the First World War—peacefully, with a constantly rising standard of living for all its inhabitants. Why doesn't that happen? Isn't the trouble with ourselves? Isn't the Soviet Government afraid of us—legitimately afraid of us?

It is not. The Soviet Government knows better than any other government in the world the exact state of mind of the American Government and the American people. It has plenty of agents and sympathizers in our country to give it the facts, and there is no better informed group of men in the world than the Politburo. The leaders of the Soviet Union know as well as we know that we desire to live in peace with all nations.

One day in 1934 when our Government was attempting to establish cordial relations with the Soviet Government—hoping that a combination of the forces of Great Britain, France, and the Soviet Union might prevent Hitler from making war in Europe and the Japanese militarists from pushing further into China—a number of commissars were having a drink with me at our Embassy in Moscow. I showed them the Soviet Second Reader. In it was a chapter entitled "America." At the head of the chapter was a drawing of starving children working at factory machines in a cellar, while on the floor above fat, bejeweled women and fatter men danced jazz. The text read: "America is a country where children of workers and peasants are forbidden to get an education. They are forced to work all day at machines in dark cellars, and get nothing to eat but bread, while the rich dance over their heads." I asked the commissars how they expected to educate leaders for the Soviet Union if they taught their children such lies? They laughed and one of them replied: "Have you ever found any one of us that doesn't know the facts?" I answered that I thought they were better informed than the members of any government I knew. The commissar then went on: "It will always be so. We shall educate in special schools leaders who will know the truth, but as for the rest—we shall teach them exactly what it is in the interest of the Soviet Union for them to know."

Stalin and the members of the Politburo have no fear whatsoever that they will be attacked by the United States. They know the facts. The tremendous trumpetings of anti-American propaganda in Soviet schools, plays, movies, books, press, and radio are merely means to drive fear and hatred into the ignorant in order to make them docile instruments of Stalin.

From 1941 to 1947 we tried to appease Stalin. Hopefully we gave him everything he asked. We failed. His appetite remained as great as ever. We failed to appease him then, and we would fail now if we should try again to appease him. We cannot develop friendly relations with the Soviet Government as we could develop such relations with a normal government because we are facing, not a normal government, but a clique of men who, by their own will, deliberately and consciously, have chosen to declare themselves the enemies of all peoples that live in freedom. They are the high priests of a fighting faith which requires of its adherents conquest of the world. The Russian people, who are capable of performing prodigies of good, are driven by that privileged and persecuting clique to prodigies of evil. In 1939, Stalin ruled 170,000,000 persons. Today he controls 800,000,000—more than a third of humanity. His objective is conquest of the entire human race. He will not stop. He can only be stopped. We cannot get off this planet. We shall have to stop him or submit to his rule.

To believe that it is still possible to appease Stalin, it is necessary to be ignorant both of Soviet history and of the doctrine which inspires the actions of the Communists.

The Communist creed teaches that establishment of Communist dictatorship throughout the earth and abolition of private ownership of the means of production will erase all envy, hatred, and malice from the human heart. It promises that the state will then wither away and that all men will live without a state in perfect happiness. In the name of science, the Communists teach this fantastically unscientific creed to the peoples they control. They educate their children to live by this faith and, if need be, to die for it. A large percentage of the young in the Soviet Union and the Soviet satellite countries have no other creed taught them. So they have faith in the Communist creed and give their lives for it, believing that they are fighting to emancipate all humanity from all evil.

Since the Communists believe this, they are convinced that the highest present moral duty of man is to achieve Communist world dictatorship. This supreme end, they hold, justices all means for its achievement—all means including the pledged word given and broken, character assassination, torture, murder, and war. They revere the words which Lenin wrote: "It is necessary * * * to use any ruse, cunning, unlawful method, evasion, concealment of truth." They hold as gospel truth his portentous statement: "It is inconceivable that the Soviet Republic should continue for a long period side by side with imperialist states. Ultimately one or the other must conquer. Meanwhile a number of terrible clashes between the Soviet Republic and the bourgeois states is inevitable."

There is not the slightest evidence that Stalin disbelieves in this doctrine which now bears his name as well as the names of Marx and Lenin. Even if he should disbelieve in it, he could not abandon it. For the Marx-Lenin-Stalin creed is the fighting faith which holds the Communists together. Without it the Soviet Union and all other Communist states would disintegrate. Stalin must and will continue to try to conquer the world.

No vice in international affairs is so fatal as the vice of wishful thinking. If we continue to believe that we can appease the unappeasable, we shall not survive. We cannot turn a tiger into a cat by stroking it.

In our short history we have never had to face any problem as complex as the problem of this Communist assault. The western world once did face a similar problem. The fighting faith of Mahomet overwhelmed the Christian states of the Near East and north Africa and Spain, and the Moslem forces were not stopped until they reached Tours on the Loire not very far from Paris. I do not wish to compare the Moslem religion, which is a noble one, to the Communist creed, which is satanic; but I do wish to point out than in the hundred years between Mahomet's death in 632 and the defeat of the Moslems by Charles Martel in 732, country after country fell before that fighting faith until it seemed that it was irresistible.

The Communist attack is no more irresistible than was the Moslem attack. But to meet it successfully, we shall need the same faith and courage that the Christians had at Tours. Furthermore, we shall need wisdom. We shall have to be wise in time. And there is not much time. We shall have to grow up quickly, for the burden of defeating the Communist attack has fallen on us at a moment when we are intellectually ill-prepared to carry it. We have always been so occupied with out domestic affairs, so happy in our own continent, that few Americans have taken any long-continued interest in foreign affairs. In consequence, our foreign policies have often been not expressions of our vital interests, but mere spasmodic reactions to the demands of domestic political expediency. The few Americans who have devoted their lives to foreign affairs since 1914 are so exceptional as to be almost oddities. As a nation, we are amateurs in the foreign field. Our leaders play by ear or by hunch. Stalin sits in the Kremlin with the members of his Politburo who compose his general staff for conquest of the world and plans his advances on a world scale as carefully as the commander in chief of an army plans his attacks. Our Government has never prepared an over-all plan of political, economic, and military defense for ourselves and the rest of the free world. Indeed, our

administration has not even understood that such a plan is vital. It is not so long ago that President Truman said, "I like old Joe."

What should we be doing?

Can we stop Stalin without war? It is not impossible but it will not be easy. For Stalin will not stop unless we keep him constantly confronted by superior force and unless he knows that we will use that force against his direct or indirect aggressions. To stop Stalin without war we must, therefore, have both the superior force and the will, if necessary, to use it.

Do we have the superior force? In 1945 we had the atomic bomb and the world's greatest air force to carry it. Our industrial plant was intact. China, the key to all Asia, was our ally. Stalin had no atomic bomb and no long-range bombing planes. His industrial plant was, in large part, worn out or destroyed. Compared to the Soviet Union we were overwhelmingly strong.

Today Stalin has China as an ally. He has atomic bombs and at least 350 long-range bombers capable of carrying them to any spot in the United States. We have no radar warning net to detect the approach of his planes. We have only a fraction of the number of pursuit planes needed to make effective use of a warning net. The authoritative Finletter Commission in 1948 recommended as a minimum for national security 70 air groups. We have 44. Stalin's total air force outnumbers ours by about 3 to 1. His annual production of war planes is about 3 to our 1. He has 125 army divisions to our 10—among them, 30 armored divisions to our 1. In addition, he has approximately 270 submarines—about 30 of which are of the latest type against which we have not yet produced effective counter weapons. Furthermore, thanks to his agent Fuchs, who transmitted to him all our secrets for production of both A-bombs and hydrogen bombs, he may be ahead of us in production of H-bombs.

Moreover, the whole of western Europe is without defense, and everyone in western Europe knows it. Its cities cannot be protected against Soviet atomic bombs except by our Air Force, which today is not strong enough for the task. To oppose the 125 Soviet divisions, the French have 6, the British say they can furnish 1, the Belgians 1. To have a chance to stop the Red Army for a few months, the European democracies would need from 50 to 60 divisions. Modern equipment for such a number of divisions would cost from ten to twenty billion dollars. And military authorities agree that no western European defense system can be effective unless both the western Germans and the Spaniards are included in it.

The balance of military force is swinging so rapidly to the Soviet side that some officials in Washington who have access to secret information believe that Stalin will attack us this autumn. They argue that by August 1950 he will probably have 50 A-bombs—enough to destroy our great cities and our atomic-production plants, and thus prevent effective American counterattack. But my belief is that Stalin will not launch shooting war until he is certain that he can defeat us easily. He is a cautious and crafty leader who strikes only when he feels sure of quick victory. This autumn, his first surprise attack might not be successful. We would probably be able to strike back effectively. Therefore, it seems likely that he will not start bombing this year but will go on increasing his military strength faster than we are adding to ours, and seize more peoples, resources, and strategic areas, until he feels that his power is irresistible. We are allowing time to run on his side. And he knows it.

Unless we strengthen quickly our own military forces and those of our allies and prevent further Soviet aggressions, we shall throw away our last chance to keep Stalin confronted by superior force—and shall throw away, therefore, our last chance to stop Stalin without war.

We shall not even be able to defeat Stalin in war unless we build up our strength and that of our allies faster than Stalin is building up the strength of the Soviet Union and its satellites, and unless we stop further direct or indirect Communist aggressions.

At the present moment the Communists are advancing by open warfare in Indochina. If we let Indochina fall, Burma, Siam, and British Malaya—with its vast production of rubber and tin—will also fall. Then it will be India's turn.

At another point, the Communists are making small attacks preparatory to a great attack. The Chinese Communists for some time have been attempting to seize small islands on the way to the great strategic island of Formosa. Formosa is still being held by the Chinese Nationalist Army which, some weeks ago, gave proof of its good morale by seizing a port on the mainland. If the Chinese Communists should capture Formosa, Stalin's forces would be within 250 miles of the northern Philippines. It was from Formosa that Japan attacked and captured the Philippines. Our Joint Chiefs of Staff, headed by General Bradley, pleaded with President Truman to send munitions and equipment, as well as economic aid to Formosa, and a few American officers to advise regarding defense. Secretary of State Acheson opposed our military leaders, and persuaded President Truman to decide that we would continue to do nothing to prevent the fall of Formosa. That is our present policy. For the Philippines, the Department of State is preparing another Bataan.

In the Near East, Iran, with its huge oil production, which plays such a large part in British economic life, is again threatened by Soviet-directed revolutionaries of the Tudeh party. They have a fertile field in which to work. The poverty among the peasants of Iran is so grinding that they are close to revolt. Unless the Government of the United States moves rapidly to alleviate the suffering in Iran, Stalin may soon add that ancient country to his long list of satellites.

These, for the moment, are the areas in Asia where Stalin is pressing his advance strongly. But even in western Europe he is undermining our friends.

In Italy, more than 20 percent of the workmen are unemployed, and the Communists, who gathered one-third of the votes at the last elections, are gaining in strength.

In France, the Government is far weaker than any French Government before the Second World War, and its entire apparatus is riddled with Communists. Even the head of French atomic research is a Communist.

Great Britain is staggering toward another financial and economic crisis.

Western Germany, under the pressure of unemployment, is beginning to listen to the Soviet propaganda which says: "Side with the United States and you will have unemployment, underfeeding, shortage of raw materials, a divided country and, finally, Soviet atomic bombs on your cities. Side with the Soviet Union and you will have all the wheat and raw materials you want, no unemployment, and a united Germany including the part that is momentarily Polish." Pastor Niemoeller, much admired by Americans, has now declared himself in favor of a united Germany even at the price of Communist rule.

When we began to give Marshall plan aid, and when we signed the Atlantic Pact, our object was to make western Europe a strong ally. We have succeeded only in keeping alive 17 picturesque, competing countries which cannot feed or defend themselves. If they would unite their economies by entering a European federation, they would be on the path to strength. But their governments refuse to take any serious steps toward federation. And our Government is making no effective effort to move them toward federation. They feel confident that, even after 1952, we will not stop our doles to them. And, indeed, we do not dare to stop for fear that they will all collapse into the hands of Stalin and be organized as Soviet satellites for his final attack on us.

What then is the real state of our defenses against Soviet aggression? Our own military strength is falling behind the growing military strength of Stalin. Asia is slipping into Stalin's hands. Western Europe is defenseless. The Soviet atomic bomb threat to our homes, our families, and our country is increasing each day. The Communists are advancing. We are retreating. They are on the offensive. We are on the defensive. No war, hot or cold, was ever won by forces which remained on the defensive.

Why are we on the defensive? Why has our Government failed to defend our vital interests?

Because American foreign policy since 1941 has been a supreme triumph of Soviet psychological warfare. In 1941 our Government was bamboozled into treating the Soviet Union as a "peace-loving democracy," and the Chinese Communists as "mere agrarian reformers who have no connection with Moscow." Our Department of State forgot that the Soviet Government was a predatory totalitarian tyranny and that the Chinese Communists were agents of Stalin. In 1941 the Soviet Government was in desperate straits. Thanks to our aid—$11,000,000,000 worth—it survived. Today, Stalin controls more than a third of the human race, and we are not sure that we shall survive. The measure of our foreign policy is the fact that in 1939 Stalin controlled 170,000,000 people, while today he controls 800,000,000.

Apologists for the Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam agreements have used many words in an attempt to prove that what was wrong was not the agreements themselves but the failure of the Soviet Union to carry out the agreements. This is as if a banker, who had been appointed trustee of the fortune of a child, should place the funds entrusted to his care in a Ponzi get-rich-quick scheme and then, when the money was lost, plead that the trouble was not with the trustee—who accepted Mr. Ponzi's promise to pay 200 percent per year—but with Ponzi's failure to carry out the agreement. The people of the United States hire officials to work in the Department of State because they need experts to handle complex world questions. The officials of that Department are trustees of the vital interests of the American people, and the most contemptible excuse that can be offered by or for them is that they meant well but were "played for suckers."

To explain the sacrifice of the vital interests of the people of the United States by our National Government, it is not necessary to conclude that our Department of State is filled with Soviet agents. We know that there have been some in influential posts. But most of the damage has been done by naive dupes of Soviet psychological warfare. We still have in office, in Washington and throughout the world, duped officials who have not been Soviet agents but have served the Soviet Government as effectively as if they had been Soviet agents.

In our Army, a general who loses a division through incompetence is court-martialed. In our Department of State, men who throw away whole countries are promoted. They have a vested interest in their own mistakes. They cannot detach themselves from their past or their friends—even though those friends turn out to be Soviet agents. In any

parliamentary democracy a minister of foreign affairs who had tossed a great ally like China to Stalin would have been dismissed from his post. Mr. Acheson remains Secretary of State.

There is a great moral difference between traitors and Soviet dupes. It is the same difference that is recognized in law between a man guilty of murder and a man guilty of manslaughter. In the case of manslaughter, there is no intention to commit the crime. But in both cases the victim ends up dead. If our President continues to keep as advisers on foreign policy men who have played a part in the sacrifice of our vital interests from 1941 to the present time, we shall have small chance to survive.

Perhaps it is difficult for you to feel profoundly that all you care about may be destroyed. Have you ever thought how many great civilizations have been totally annihilated? Have you thought of the Athens of Pericles and of the Roman Empire? Of all the great cities of Syria and North Africa where today stretch only lonely sands? Have you understood that a similar extinction may come, and come soon, to the whole Christian civilization of Europe—and may come to us here? This is hard to believe but it is so.

Under these circumstances, what should we do? Let us remember two facts in approaching the problem of our foreign policy:

First, let us remember always to distinguish between the Russian people and the Soviet Government. There can be no peace on earth so long as the Russian people and the peoples of the Soviet satellite states are driven by men who prefer a murderous doctrine to the "plain exigence of charity." In the year 1830, the Poles in revolt against the tyranny of the Czars inscribed on their banners a phrase addressed to the enslaved Russian people: "For your freedom and ours." We should approach the Russian people in the same spirit. However hard it may be, we must make the Russians comprehend that we stand for their freedom no less than for our own, since in our battle against the Communist dictator, the Russian people must be our final allies. We have had freedom for so many years, we have lived so long in Christian civilization under a bill of rights honestly enforced, that we are apt to forget that the idea of freedom is the most explosive force in the world of politics. Freedom is an atomic bomb in the field of ideas. All men hate to live under the eye and hand of an omnipotent secret police. Tyranny, whether it be called by the name of communism, fascism, or by any other name, is loathed by all normal men and women. And however absolute may be today the grip of the Soviet dictator on his subject peoples, that grip can and will be ended eventually by the idea of freedom.

Second, let us remember always that many years will elapse before the peoples of the Soviet Union and the satellite states achieve freedom and that, throughout those years, we and the other free nations will be in danger of extinction unless we keep the Soviet Union constantly confronted by superior force. If any one of you is morally disturbed by that idea, let him remember that the most legitimate use of force on this earth is to hold the field to permit the growth of moral ideas.

Within the framework of these general conclusions, what should be our foreign policy?

1. To build up our military strength faster than Stalin is increasing his military strength.

2. To achieve the federation of western Europe and give adequate arms to that federation.

3. To stand up with force to the threat of the Communists in eastern Germany have announced that on May 28 they will march 500,000 youths from east Berlin into west Berlin.

4. To give far greater aid than we have been giving to resistance forces in all the Soviet satellite countries.

5. To help the Albanian exiles rescue Albania from the Communists, and thus give new spirit to all the enslaved peoples behind the iron curtain.

6. To give adequate and effective economic aid to Iran.

7. To prevent Communist conquest of Formosa.

8. To help the Annamites and the French throw the Communists completely out of Indochina.

9. To insist that the UN—now paralyzed by Soviet veto and boycott—function as if there were no Soviet boycott.

These are but a few of the obvious steps that we must take immediately if we are to wrest the offensive from Stalin.

Won't such a policy be terribly expensive? Of course it will be. Each one of us will have to make sacrifices—genuine sacrifices that will be hard to bear. We have allowed Stalin to acquire such strength and to take over such races, resources, and strategic positions that nothing short of the full efforts of the American people will suffice to stop him. We are not technically at war; but we shall have to live and work as if we were at war.

We know what happens to a people that refuses to face—in time—a mortal danger. Yet today our Government is behaving as the French Government behaved from 1936 to 1939. In that period when the Germans were preparing for war and working 60 hours a week, the French cut their working hours to 40 a week. When the Germans were producing 700 planes a month, the French cut their plane production to 50 a month. They did this for the same reason that we are now reducing expenditures for our military forces and for aid to our friends throughout the world. The people of France, like all other peoples, wanted a higher standard of living and leisure. They did not realize that a higher standard of living and leisure would soon give them a higher rate of dying. In 1940 Hitler destroyed the independence of France. We restored the independence of France. There is no nation standing behind us to restore our independence.

It may be difficult for us to persuade our Government to change its present policies. President Truman has staked his political future on a program of handouts for crop support, housing, education, and other projects which appeal to groups of voters. To get more tax money for the handout program which produces votes, he has cut down the defense program which might produce survival. Our tax money is being used to buy surplus potatoes instead of jet planes. It will not be easy for him to change his course; but our best hope lies in the fact he is a patriot. If we can let him know that henceforth we want to hear from him not what we can get from our country but what we can give to our country, we shall make it easy for him to take the course which will enable our Nation to survive.

The burden of decision is on our President. He, by our Constitution, controls our foreign policy. He commands our armed forces. If he is to act in time to save our country from conquest by Stalin, he will have to change his thinking quickly. He will have to experience something like the transformation which Saul experienced on the road to Damascus when "there shined about him a light from heaven," and he became Paul the Apostle. We should hope and pray that a light from heaven will fall on President Truman; but we should also try to shed upon him a light from the public opinion of Americans who do not want to live soft for a few years and then be conquered, but do want to live hard and keep their country free.

Curtailment of Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Those Postal Cuts," from the Jamestown Sun, of Jamestown, N. Y.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THOSE POSTAL CUTS

To the party out of power the Post Office Department is always run by either an incompetent politician who got his job for faithful work in the party vineyard or a bureaucrat whose sole consideration is building up his bureaus with drones who slyly get around the civil service rules to swing a few votes at election time.

The operation of the Post Office has always been the classic example of the inefficiencies which attend the Government's attempts to run a business.

Jesse Donaldson, having come up from the ranks of the civil service to head the Post Office Department, doesn't fit very neatly into any of the categories reserved by the opposition for the Postmaster General. He not only knows the operation of the Post Office better than anyone to fill the office within memory, but he has also been a voice crying in the wilderness for greater postal efficiency and especially for requiring that those receiving concealed subsidies from the Department be made to pay a greater part of their share of the cost of operation of the Department.

Congress proposes now to cut the cost of postal operation. So, as an economy measure, Jesse Donaldson issues an order curtailing postal service to a single delivery a day in many places where residential delivery was on a two-a-day basis. This is calculated to save about $30,000,000—the equivalent of 10,000 carriers and clerks added to the ranks of the unemployed.

But Congressmen are howling. So are many who believe implicitly in economy until some specific act of economy is undertaken. This isn't the kind of economy they were asking for. Their idea of economy is something which affects the other fellow. Moreover, it's quite embarrassing to return home to campaign for reelection and face the embattled postal clerks and the voters who have had their mail service cut.

Now, as a matter of fact, Mr. Donaldson's order to curtail mail service and throw 10,000 carriers and clerks out of employment is of doubtful validity as an economy measure. It is more than just a drop in the bucket, but the question of its wisdom from an efficiency viewpoint is to be doubted. It is, however, a dramatic and forceful way of bringing home to the voters the demands for postal economy.

But anyone familiar with postal operations, as Mr. Donaldson certainly must be, knows that hundreds of post offices across the land are understaffed, rather than overstaffed; that better mail service, rather than curtailed service, is a crying need; and that a general order of curtailment such as he issued can have only the effect of increasing confusion in the post offices and hampering work already too great for a staff to handle properly.

There would perhaps be good reason for limiting home delivery of mail to a single

delivery a day, but most of the carriers who would be released could be absorbed into other postal operations needing more personnel. That, however, wouldn't provide the reduction in the postal budget which is sought.

The Hoover Commission report on the Post Office calls for economies in many directions. But Congress has avoided those economies in response to the pressures of those who have been receiving postal subsidies. Secretary Donaldson has now countered with a proposal which hits the Congressmen of both parties in their most vulnerable spot—the home folks.

We can be sure that the Congressmen will wriggle and squirm, and they may come to a decision that it is far better to increase rates on subsidized postage and save votes than to take a chance on the displeasure of those who go to the ballot box.

Mr. Donaldson has, however, put the generals on the spot—those generals who are always in favor of general economy but never in favor of a specific act of economy that affects them.

Americans in Asia Doubt United States Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 9, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following extremely informative dispatch to the New York Times from its experienced correspondent in Asia. A wise doctor is always eager to change an erroneous or obsolete diagnosis in order to alter the treatment and save the patient's life. Will our Government be equally eager to change its erroneous diagnosis regarding the Chinese Government in order to alter drastically its policies and save the freedom of Asia? Our security depends whether it puts first its face or our freedom.

AMERICANS IN ASIA DOUBT UNITED STATES POLICY—SAID TO FEEL STATE DEPARTMENT FOLLOWS OUTDATED PLANS—TAIPEI HELD BEST HOPE

(By Burton Crane)

TOKYO, April 21.—Discontent with the State Department has become widespread among Americans working in Asia. In a 3-month trip to Formosa and Hong Kong this correspondent found few compatriots who defended present American policies.

The virtually unanimous opinion is that the Asiatic situation has changed tremendously in the last 6 months, and the State Department still is following policies that may have been valid a year ago but are not now. Even among Foreign Service officials there is a tendency to agree to the view that trying to check communism in the small southeast Asian countries will get nowhere and the best American bet is to help and use the reborn Nationalist Chinese Government as long as possible. It is the only force in Asia with a sizable anti-Communist army.

In justice it must be noted that many of the State Department's loudest critics are the same men who last autumn would have gone even further in the other direction. Then they would have rushed to recognize Communist China in the hope that by working with Mao Tze-tung's government the United States could prevent it from orienting its foreign affairs exclusively to Moscow.

But, argue the critics, the situation has changed since then and the policy also should change. Mr. Mao already has "leaned" toward Moscow, to use his own phrase, and there is no longer any advantage in continuing to advocate a policy designed to keep him from leaning. Besides, it is contended, Nationalist reorganization has made the Formosa regime a potentially valuable anti-Communist instrument.

Although inflation has been halted and financial affairs arranged so the Taipei Government meets its bills without printing banknotes, it is doing so at the expense of gold and supplies that won't last forever. Unless those stocks are replenished soon, collapse appears inevitable. Therefore, any aid must be prompt.

Even among Foreign Service employees this correspondent found no supporters for the view aired by Prof. Owen Lattimore in a Johns Hopkins speech last week. Professor Lattimore proposed that the United States let the Nationalists die, even hastening their fall on the theory after they had gone Mr. Mao would not be pressed so hard against Premier Stalin and the United States might be able to deal with him.

Men on the spot contend that Mr. Stalin already has taken steps to prevent any such eventuality by placing Soviet advisers in all branches of the Chinese Communist Government.

Both those who want immediate American aid for the Nationalist war effort and those who caution against going too fast agree that the Taipei Government has managed a virtually complete rebirth.

Curtailment of Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Postal Cut Called Shock Treatment," published in the New York Times of April 20, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POSTAL CUT CALLED SHOCK TREATMENT—CITIZENS BACKING THE HOOVER REPORT SAY IT IS HARDLY THE ANSWER TO DEPARTMENT'S ILLS

WASHINGTON, April 22.—The Citizens Committee for the Hoover report issued a statement today characterizing curtailment of postal services as "sudden shock treatment" that was "hardly the answer" to the Post-office Department's ills.

Tuesday's order to reduce most mail deliveries to one a day and otherwise cut expenses should have been preceded by congressional action on recommendations of the Hoover Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, it was asserted.

The comments were made by Robert L. Johnson, national chairman of the citizens committee, in a statement distributed by committee headquarters here. Dr. Johnson is president of Temple University.

"The bipartisan Hoover Commission clearly showed the way to substantial savings in postal operations," he said. "All told, the Commission's recommendations, if fully adopted and installed, could mean a reduction of over $200,000,000 a year in the huge postal deficit of $500,000,000. Moreover, by streamlining and modernizing the post office structure and equipment, the efficiency of its services would actually be improved."

Nevertheless, Dr. Johnson continued, "absolutely no affirmative action" has yet been taken on any of a number of pending bills based on the Commission's report and endorsed by President Truman and Postmaster General Jesse M. Donaldson. The measures have been before Congress since July.

Dr. Johnson asserted that he was at a loss to understand the inaction, and went on to say:

"Postmaster General Donaldson and the 400,000 hard-working postal employees will be constantly hampered by an obsolete organizational structure and by antiquated methods and equipment until Congress acts. Meanwhile, Tuesday's action, causing hardship to thousands, highlights even more strongly the need for action.

"In effect, the post office is suffering from the chronic, wasting disease of inefficiency for which the Hoover Commission recommended concrete remedies and a healthful regimen. Sudden shock treatment is hardly the answer. Yet inertia and reluctance to give up special privileges are keeping the patient from treatment."

By the term "special privileges," Dr. Johnson alluded to congressional patronage in the appointment of postmasters, a practice which the Commission proposed to end.

"The Hoover Commission," he said, "distinctly pointed out that the lowered morale wrought by political appointment of postmasters was one of the basic causes of inefficiency in the Department."

Errors in Foreign Trade Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BYRNES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 9, 1950

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the House to two editorials that recently appeared in the Green Bay Press-Gazette which is published in Green Bay, Wis.

Our foreign trade policy is of great importance to the economy and security of this country. Jobs of American workers are at stake. The ability to maintain a supply of strategic goods is involved. The foreign trade policy of the United States must be realistic.

The following editorials point up some of the errors we must avoid in our thinking on this subject:

HERESIES IN FOREIGN TRADE

The President has appointed Gordon Gray as an assistant "to mobilize the resources of the Government and the experience and thinking of our people in charting our course" so as to maintain a high level of exports.

Hitler, in his flamboyant way, told the German people shortly after he came to power: "Export or perish."

It is obvious that nations, like Germany, Britain, Italy, and Japan, to name important ones that are over-populated, must create manufactured products to trade for food and raw materials with such nations as have the latter but do not have the industries.

America is not such a Nation. It, like Russia, is selp-supporting in all important particulars.

We should like to see every nation able to maintain a high standard of living. But in dividing up the American market with other nations, some errors of thinking have developed that should be stopped in their tracks.

The argument is that we would like a lot of foreign trade but that to secure it we must permit imports from foreign countries in order to provide the necessary dollars to others to buy our products.

If this were true in all particulars, why would it not logically follow that the more of our own market we gave away, the better off we would be?

Politicians who play with this subject avoid entirely a discussion of normal trade. They are more interested in the immediate happy results of artificially created trade than they are in genuinely constructive building.

An illustration may suffice. Say we buy from the countries to the south of us nearly or about $2,000,000,000 worth of coffee, fruits, oil and a numerous list of other items peculiar to the tropics and that we can use. They spend most of that $2,000,000,000 purchasing the products of our industries that they cannot create. This is natural trade. It is healthy trade. But if we import from such countries cotton, potatoes, eggs, cheese, butter, or other items that we have in abundance in order to whoop up the figures and provide a few specialized industries with enlarged profits, we create a problem for ourselves while we tend at the same time to bloat the economy of the nations with which we deal.

Obviously countries like Germany, Britain, Italy, and Japan, overpopulated as they are, should arrange their trade agreements with nations that have raw materials and great food supplies but lack manufactured articles.

This idea has no relation to existing circumstances in any of these countries that were torn or ravaged by war and whose industrial plants have been seriously crippled. Marshall-plan gifts when limited to such replacements were not without supporting argument once it be conceded that vast presents between nations could actually tend to pacify the world.

The recent discovery of rich iron ore in forbidden parts of Canada and Venezuela and of manganese in Brazil will greatly increase the normal exports and imports between this country and our neighbors. There is no froth to that kind of trade. It carries no kinks. It wrecks no American business and no American producer. It makes no specialized taxes here in this country, no subsidies, no peasantry, and no political handout.

The President, we think, would have been a much wiser man had he appointed an assistant both to encourage and protect private enterprise in this country as it searches the Hudson Bay area of Canada and the jungles and mountain ranges of Central and South America for other hidden wealth.

Russia, of course, has made it much harder to normalize world trade because it rules from the Pacific Ocean clear to Berlin and Vienna and its obvious purpose is to employ force and violence to secure and maintain a corner on all the trade originating in that tremendous area. Nonetheless, the rest of the world should build its future upon normal demands instead of those highly stimulated trade conditions that are bound eventually to collapse.

Cutting His Throat To Help the Other Fellow

Emil Riebe, president of the CIO Textile Union, with its 400,000 members, told the assembled delegates at the union's convention at Boston that it would be better for American economy to give away surplus goods than to accept imports.

About the same time Mr. Holman, head of Standard Oil of New Jersey, made an address in which he favored increasing our imports by 100 percent in order to provide dollars to the rest of the world and therefore increase our output just that much more.

Columnist Sokolsky recently wrote an article with a linen napkin on his knees that had been made in the Soviet Union by the hollow-eyed slaves who dare not open their lips except to repeat a formula written for them by their master. These napkins naturally were for sale in this country below the price of the identical article made by American labor.

And while spokesmen for the "new concept" were urging us to drop our already low tariff barriers, a canning establishment in our Pacific Northwest was closing and sending all its workers home because it said it could not compete with canned crabmeat imported into this country by Russia. Our Atlantic canneries were also screaming for help because the British were rushing here great quantities of canned crabmeat which they had secured from Russia and could not dispose of among their own people.

American furriers and shoe manufacturers have also complained that they cannot continue to pay the American standard of wages if they must compete with slave labor either from Russia or its satellite countries.

We warn our readers to examine carefully the language employed by those who advocate opening up the American market to aliens. Try to find if you can, any one of them who will put his finger upon the particular article to be admitted and who will face the consequences of describing to us what will happen to American competitors in the same business. It is easy to sing a lullaby if one has the voice. It is not so easy to make bread and butter out of the words.

The Washington administration, knowingly or otherwise, is attempting to create in this land during peacetime a hectic wartime condition in which some plants will be closed down and other plants will be excessively taxed to take care of the unemployed. This is a childish and foolish policy. It is as absurd as if our Government could order us all to buy twice as many articles as we needed in order to give business to foreign firms, and then taxed the more prosperous among us to provide the money to pay for such goods although those who bought them could do nothing more with them than stack them up in the attic.

We are forgetful of the fact that we should aim at a normal life. We cannot wear two pairs of shoes at the same time. We do not need two suits of underclothes even in winter. It is silly to put on two neckties, one hanging down the front and the other hanging down the back. If we eat twice as much as we need, we will get high blood pressure. And if we drink twice as much as we should we will get drunk.

America stands ready and willing at all times to import anything for which it has a call. It does not help to straighten out affairs in the world by importing wastefully or to its own harm. If our country were directed by real leadership, it would show nations like Britain, Germany, Italy, and Japan how to create markets for their products in countries that need them and which have abundant foodstuffs to trade for them.

When the sirens start playing their lullabies, ask them which of our industries they want to close down. We need be that direct.

Disturbing Pattern—Resurgence of Isolationism Described as Threat to United States World Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 9, 1950

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include pertinent paragraphs from Thomas L. Stokes' daily column, published in the Washington Star for Monday, May 8, 1950. The point of Mr. Stokes' remarks seemed to me to boil down to the fact that the same kind of men who caused the United States to become involved in World War II are rapidly planning to have us involved in a third world war. Unless we have the courage to stand up for what we believe to be right now, a third world war will be inevitable at a time and place not of our choosing.

Disturbing Pattern—Resurgence of Isolationism Described as Threat to United States World Leadership

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

A disturbing pattern of confusion of purpose and disunity that threatens our position of leadership in the world at a most critical time has revealed itself recently. It deserves some hard thinking.

It is made up of a resurgence of isolationism of McCarthyism, of economy in the wrong directions, of bitterness and cynicism among our own people. There is politics involved, and it is unfortunate that we have a campaign that lends itself to exploitation just at this time, but it seems to go deeper than mere politics.

It is hard for us, a nation comparatively new in a world role, to recognize what responsibility that entails; to recognize how what we do, often in our careless, boisterous, and frolicking way, now is watched intently all over the world and frequently misunderstood. To perform our mission in the world, and we have a serious one, it is essential that we present a united front and demonstrate a capacity to "stay put," so to speak, so that our friends and allies can depend upon a firm, continuous, and consistent policy without deviation or backing away and can depend upon us and have confidence in us.

We cannot walk alone.

EUROPEANS CAUTIOUS

Ever since our refusal to enter the League of Nations after the First World War and to cooperate with other nations in that era, European nations have had a fingers-crossed attitude about us. They have perhaps been more sensitive to our every whim than was justified. Unable still to understand our free and easy domestic politics, they have sometimes magnified minor political maneuvers of no real consequence beyond their true significance as indications that we wanted to pull out of our assumed obligations.

It must be hard, too, for our European friends to understand how a former President of the United States, Herbert Hoover, would propose to throw Russia out of the United Nations and break up that organization which we, ourselves, initiated. It is still a unifying influence in the world, a source of many humanitarian endeavors of great and lasting value, and the only forum where our allies are continually able to stand

up and reveal to the whole world their own attitude toward Russian designs which are continually exposed there publicly. Isolationists have exploited Mr. Hoover's unfortunate proposal.

Isolationism feeds, too, upon the reckless campaign of Senator McCARTHY, who still is trying to find a Communist somewhere in the State Department. It is not only breeding fear and suspicion among our people, shaking their faith with no reason whatever in their institutions, but shows to the world the spectacle of a great nation torn and divided over a matter that a mature nation would handle quietly, as we have handled it quietly and effectively up to now, and without benefit of the McCarthys. It reveals us as an inept, timorous people and to that extent shakes confidence in us beyond our own borders.

The hates and prejudices it has aroused are alarming. It is to be hoped that this does not persist to confuse the real issues that our country faces in the November election, issues affecting our welfare as a Nation and its role of leadership in the world.

It is time to pause and take a look at ourselves.

Curtailment of Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Post Office Department Seen Using Scare To Get More Cash," published in the Springfield Daily News of Springfield, Mass., of April 20, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT SEEN USING SCARE TO GET MORE CASH—PERSONNEL CUT ORDER HELD MOVE TO PRESSURE CONGRESS INTO LINE

Growing resentment against what is termed "political maneuvering" by high Post Office Department officials was seen today as observers branded coming mail service cuts a move to pressure Congress into going easy with expected slashes in post office appropriations.

A recent directive from Postmaster General Jesse M. Donaldson's Washington office ordered drastic cuts in mail service in anticipation of budget cuts amounting to $24,921,000. The trimmed budget was reported out of committee and Congressional approval of the cut is feared by mail officials.

Informed sources in Springfield, who refused to be quoted, said today that the post office hierarchy is trying to scare the public into applying pressure on Congress to prevent the loss of funds, as recommended in Washington.

"It's a bluff," said one observer who knows the situation. "The Post Office Department isn't sure the budget will be cut, but they are afraid of what Congress might do. There are a lot of veterans who would be affected if the decreased service becomes an actuality and each one of those vets is a pressure on his Congressman in Washington."

According to the Washington directive, the change-over to limited mail service must be accomplished by July 1, the date the Post Office's new fiscal year begins.

Scares of what will happen to vets who took out GI loans and bought or built homes, if they are laid off by the post office are rapidly gaining momentum, according to postal workers, who point out that these vets could not collect any unemployment compensation. A lot of behind the scenes politicing will take place, however, before any such moves take place, according to officials.

It remains to be seen just how effective the postal campaign to prevent budget cuts is, and notices won't go out if the "scare" falls flat, as it well might, observers said.

Curtailment of Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Misplaced Economy," published in the Strafford Star of Dover, N. H., of April 19, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MISPLACED ECONOMY

Most Americans are deeply concerned with the continued national budget and the accompanying heavy tax burden, so that they are eager to see governmental economies—but there will be general agreement that the Post Office Department was not the right place to start.

The decision to discharge 10,000 postmen and to limit home mail deliveries to one a day is not welcome. This move is a throwback, turning back the pages of time for postal service. It means depriving thousands of loyal workers of jobs, causing millions of Americans to be deprived of the early delivery of mail to which they have become accustomed.

There has been plenty of exaggerated growth of other governmental departments. The Hoover report revealed explicitly many places where consolidation, merger and elimination of bureaus could save the taxpayers millions of dollars. We have in mind particularly some of those Federal agencies which sprang up as emergency or war babies but have continued ever since.

One form of minor relief for the Post Office Department could be embodied in a resolution curtailing the amount of free mailing allowed Members of Congress under their franking privileges. While this might be only a small saving, it would hurt no one—except those politicians who might feel that their constituents are thereby deprived of reading their immortal words.

The present maneuver is so ill-advised as to suggest the possibility that it was done deliberately in order to provoke a wave of protest against all economy moves. It could be an attempt to use the Post Office Department as a scapegoat in order to protect other less deserving agencies.

In the meanwhile, we hold that Government economy can be more judiciously directed toward those avenues where a plethora of bureaucratic agencies cling in parasitic fashion to their unnecessary existence. As one department which is performing an excellent job of direct service, the Post Office should be left largely alone.

Twenty Years of Flying Without Fatality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 9, 1950

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following statement made by Mr. Sigmund Janas, president of Colonial Airlines, Inc., on the occasion of its recent celebration of a world record of 20 years of flying without a single fatality to any passenger or any member of its crew:

SAFETY RECORD

Twenty years of flying in all kinds of weather without a single fatality to any passenger or to any member of the crew is indeed an enviable record. It has never before been achieved, and it is made all the more interesting if we pause and reflect that during those 20 years Colonial Airlines flew 310,000,000 passenger miles, and in doing this, made 455,000 landings and takeoffs without a single fatality. This record could only have been achieved through the cooperation of every man and woman in Colonial Airlines, and each and every one of them can be justly proud. The maintenance department and all other employees had to do their part in order that a record of this unequaled excellence could be obtained. To each of them goes my sincere thanks and congratulations.

This record of 20 years of safety without a single fatality is simply an indication of what the future holds for the whole commercial air-transportation industry. All the American airlines have been steadily achieving new highs in their safety records, and the day is not far distant when I believe an airplane accident will be one of the rarest things in the world.

The personnel of all of the American airlines is, in my opinion, the finest to be found anywhere in the world, and many of these men and women are veterans who volunteered their lives in achieving air supremacy in World War II. With the achievements of war behind them, these men and women turned their minds to making American aviation the greatest in the world. The same careful thought which they put into the accomplishment of their missions in the war is now being expended in making air transportation better and safer.

Today we hear a great deal about new types of power for airplanes, and uninitiated are straining on the leash to see inaugurated service in various parts of the world with use of jet liners. Now, there is no question that the jet liner or any other type of new equipment is of great interest to the industry, nevertheless, we must use prudence and judgment and remember that we are the guardians of the lives of our passengers. They rely upon us to see that their confidence is not misplaced. The tremendous increase in speed in aviation and particularly in types of air transport planes makes those of us in the industry realize the increased problems which attend the increased speed and any new equipment.

I have argued for years and will continue to urge that no airplane be permitted to engage in commercial air transportation unless it is flown at least 3,000 hours as a freight carrier or in some type of work where it receives the necessary take-offs and landings and has tested the normal weather that all planes in scheduled air transportation must overcome.

By all means, we should give every encouragement to builders of new equipment, but we should use that equipment only after it has been proved to be of the quality justifying our confidence and only after it has shown that it is free of bugs and is safe. The standards of safety laid down for American air transport companies is higher than that of any other nation in the world and the primary consideration of all of us is the protection of the American people and our friends throughout the world, who show their confidence in American fliers and American planes by patronizing our flag lines. We must keep the faith with these people.

One day the jet plane will no doubt find a place in air transportation but this should come only after the questions of its safety have been solved. We should not confuse military aircraft with air transport liners because their purposes are entirely different. The Military Establishment has their attention focused upon the success of a mission and the accomplishment of this in safety is not always the primary consideration. In commercial air transportation, safety must be first, last, and all the time the principal consideration governing every flight.

Faster equipment of the jet type will require adjustments in our airports, the extension of the runways, and improved control of flying around any airport which they intend to use. These things are not accomplished overnight, and we must not forget our sacred responsibility to the air traveling public during the experimentation with and eventual adaptation of that sort of plane in the years ahead to air transportation. While the jets and their accomplishments are newsworthy, the conservative air transport operator can only prudently see them as rays of hope on the horizons of the future types of transportation.

Colonial and its management will watch with interest every improvement in the art of flying as applicable to commercial air transportation but we are determined to do everything in our power to continue to merit the confidence of the flying public and to carry into the years ahead our unequaled achievement of safety in the air, which we commemorate today in marking the completion of 20 years of totally safe flying. There have been many improvements in the science of flying since we started to achieve this record, but those who are familiar with us recognize that we have maintained our safety record and continued, at the same time, to give the service and safety which the public expect.

Curtailment of Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Reduced Postal Service" from one of the newspapers in St. Joseph, Mo.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REDUCED POSTAL SERVICE

One delivery route in six in St. Joseph will be eliminated as the result of Postmaster General Donaldson's heavy-handed crackdown on postal service, it appeared from reports yesterday at the post office here. Undoubtedly some savings will be made by the sharp cuts ordered in service, which feature but one daily delivery in residential areas.

Back of the loud protests which have been made over curtailment of postal service there seems to be the feeling that the move was designed to force larger appropriations for the Post Office Department from Congress. Two bills to get the Department more money now are before the lawmakers. One is designed to raise postal rates enough to bring in $600,000,000 more a year. The House cut this to $100,000,000, and the revised bill now is pending in the Senate. The other is the post-office appropriation, which the House Appropriations Committee cut by $25,000,000.

It is probable that Mr. Donaldson hopes the service reductions will put his Department's business on a firmer financial footing. But the only estimate so far of what the savings will be comes from an unidentified official who guesses them at $30,000,000. That is hardly a dent in the $500,000,000 cut the House gave the postal-rate bill; nor does it bulk very large against the $550,000,000 deficit that turned up at the end of the last fiscal year.

Probably the place the reduction in service will carry most weight is in the impact on voters, nearly all of whom will be directly affected, and outraged voters have a habit of writing to their Congressmen, who just happen not to have taken final action on the requests of the Post Office Department. Whether Mr. Donaldson's order represents a political maneuver or not, there will be many who will regard his action as autocratic, especially as he did not announce his intended move sufficiently in advance to give communities an opportunity to adjust themselves to the new conditions.

Curtailment of Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Postal Cuts," from the Worcester Telegram.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POSTAL CUTS

It certainly may be questioned whether the drastic cuts announced in the United States Postal Service represent a sincere concern for governmental economy or are politically and somewhat ingeniously designed to make such economy so painful and inconvenient for the general public that it will stop its rising clamor of demands for Uncle Sam to "stop spending."

No taxpaying American, perhaps, should look an economy gift horse too closely in the face, but this abrupt and sudden decision for economy where the public is certain to feel some immediately bad effects must cause a more than casual look. The timing of these drastic postal service economies has come just when considerable public support had been won to the cause of economy in Government, both by the publicizing of the Hoover report and by the continued attacks of those who fear the result of continued Federal deficit financing. In effect, the Post Office is saying, "So you wanted some economy, well here it is." And the results, unfortunately, may be enough to make many people cry "Uncle" in their economy demands—something the Administration would very much like to see happen before the congressional elections.

The public will feel this economy drive in the curtailment of mail deliveries not alone in purely residential districts, but in areas where business and residential districts are mixed. It will feel the results in shortened hours at the post office windows, and in earlier pickups from street mail boxes at night. People will find important mail delayed, and the post office will blame the public for demanding lower taxes and budget reductions in Washington.

Real economy, gained through efficiency of operation, cannot be scorned by Americans who want just that in all their governmental departments. The type of economy that Postmaster General Donaldson has imposed can be questioned, for he is taking away from the public services which it pays well for in both direct revenues to the Post Office Department and in taxes. His cuts have gone beyond those recommended recently by the House Appropriations Committee which, in fact, did reduce the over-all Post Office budget to $2,207,500,000 from the $2,235,607,000 requested by Donaldson. Mr. Donaldson's reaction to this is seen in the announced postal cuts.

Mr. Donaldson's concern for economy would have been more impressive and would have seemed more sincere if he had only called for a revamping of his whole Department along more economical lines. The Department's bookkeeping and cost-acounting system is the same one that was established in 1836, and there has been no basis of establishing costs anyway. The services to other Government departments contribute greatly to its deficit. In a single year, for instance, the Post Office handled 2,000,000,000 pieces of mail free for the Government, including some 18,000,000 pieces of registered mail. It has been handling free of charge savings-bond sales, documentary stamps, civil service exam notices, and migratory bird stamps.

The public feels that good postal service is a thing to which it is entitled; postal service is not supposed to support itself at all, but to be a public service. It expects efficient operation, and applauds any genuine efforts to achieve that. Mr. Donaldson cannot be applauded on that score yet.

One Hundred and Fifty Million of Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 9, 1950

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my colleagues' attention to a very timely and thought-provoking editorial which appeared in the May 7 issue of the Worcester (Mass.) Sunday Telegram.

The concise, vivid description of the fruitful meaning inherent in our exciting, modern population growth presents a healthy, optimistic note to dispel the gloom too frequently, and unwarrantedly, dispensed by our current prophets of doom.

The article follows:

ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY MILLION OF US

One of these days the one hundred and fifty millionth person will arrive in the

United States, either a newborn baby or an immigrant landing in what he hopes will be his land of opportunity. There will be no fanfare to greet this important personage, but his coming will mark a tremendous forward step in the population growth of the country and presage a tremendous economic surge for the future.

On the basis of early returns from the official United States census, the time has come to welcome this one hundred and fifty millionth person. The figure represents a growth of 19,000,000 people in the last decade—quite a few persons when thought of in terms of needed new homes, automobiles, refrigerators and television sets.

The gigantic size of the American population is staggering even the experts who had spent the last decade trying to foresee how many Americans there would be in 1950. For, as it happens, the population growth is a full 6 years ahead of the estimates of the Census Bureau itself. Experts in the Government said 3 years ago that the one hundred and fifty millionth person would arrive sometime after 1955. A life insurance company predicted in 1931 that this figure would not be reached until 1970.

According to sociologists, the various predictions were way off the beam because even the best of statisticians didn't count on the wartime resurgence of the American birth rate. This rate jumped 18.9 per thousand population in 1940 to a high of 27.9 in 1947. At the same time, immigration stepped up, too, in recent years, and the death rate went down.

All of this has added up to headaches for school superintendents trying to figure how to jam all these new children into crowded classrooms, but it is an exciting prospect for most of us to be living in such a dynamically growing country. Those gloomy souls who saw the end of our frontiers in the 1930's just didn't figure on this frontier—population growth. In the figures may be a promise of greater than ever prosperity ahead.

Statement of Harry H. Cook, President, American Flint Glass Workers' Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. M. G. BURNSIDE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 9, 1950

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

STATEMENT PRESENTED BY HARRY H. COOK, PRESIDENT, AMERICAN FLINT GLASS WORKERS' UNION, TO THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, STEED SUBCOMMITTEE ON IMPORTS AND EMPLOYMENT, MAY 4, 1950

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I appear for and represent the officers and members of the American Flint Glass Workers' Union of North America. Our organization was formed in 1878 and I am pleased to make the statement to you that we are one of the oldest labor organizations in the United States and that the industry in which our members are employed and must depend upon for their livelihood is one of our country's oldest industries with its first factory at Jamestown, Va., in 1608. We are affiliated with the American Federation of Labor.

I wish the committee to know that I have been a worker in the glass industry for the past 57 years, starting at the age of 10. I worked in glassware factories as a skilled craftsman for many years. For the past 34 years I have represented the workers in these factories as one of their international officers; the past 10 years as international president.

While business generally is reasonably good, we find the American hand-made glassware industry in a serious condition and rapidly reaching the point of catastrophe because of the damaging influence and effects of the importation of glassware produced by cheap labor in countries embraced by the Marshall plan and also behind the so-called iron curtain.

Imports need not be injurious but can in fact be very harmful. It is not only a matter of quantity but particularly one of prices. If we had competitive parity with imports, so that our domestic products would not be undersold in our own market, we would not face the constant threat to our wage standards that now confront us.

The facts are that the extremely low wages paid in other countries, such as Japan and Czechoslovakia, not offset by lower productivity, gives these countries a great price advantage in this market. This advantage is not based on greater efficiency of the foreign producers, as some people would have you believe; nor is it based on greater skill of the foreign workmen. I am sure that we can match them in both these respects, but we cannot match their prices without sacrificing something that is the pride of America, namely, the high living standard that makes this country stand out alone over the rest of the world.

This high standard of living makes us vulnerable to the onslaught of low-wage producers abroad. This is to say, we cannot hope to compete on a wholly unequal wage basis. The only possible result of being forced to meet this competition is unemployment, joblessness, poor working conditions and a gradual decline to the economic level of these foreign competitors.

We are delighted, Mr. Chairman, to have this opportunity of appearing before a committee that is interested in the employment angle of import competition. We have been coming down here for years and we might as well have saved our breath. We have simply been told in effect that if we cannot meet the competition that faces us we might as well face the music instead. The prevailing theory in the State Department seems to be that if an American industry cannot compete with imports the fault lies with the American industry.

We are held to be inefficient, uneconomic, or to be marginal producers if we cannot meet the abominable wages paid in competing countries. Mr. Chairman, the foregoing is an unfortunate theory and to describe our glassware industry in this way is worse yet. The workers in our glassware industry are well paid. They are skillful artisans and we need offer no apologies to any workers anywhere else in the world. We do not believe that we represent the workers of an industry that might as well be discarded, the State Department to the contrary notwithstanding.

Until a year ago the glassware industry (pressed and blown branch) was getting along very well. However, Czech, Japanese, and German glass tableware has given us more and more trouble. Today there is acute danger of shut-downs and lay-offs. The question is how far this must go before relief can be had, if any.

Few, if any, of our American hand-production glass plants are operating more than 50 percent of normal capacity today. Many are operating far below 50 percent, and some are about to close indefinitely. Many of these plants are in small communities which depend upon them to furnish employment and to support the needs of such communities. In speaking for the more than 35,000 workers, I also presume to speak for the many hand-made glassware factories that constitute the industry as a whole representing a heavy and vital financial investment.

Our workers are trained in glassmaking and not as production-line workers in automobile factories or as steelworkers, or electrical workers. In the handicraft part of our industry individual skill still counts. Our workers retain the close connection between workman and final product, the lack of which psychologists consider as one of the great drawbacks of modern industry.

We are told by high authority in our Government that if the American glassware industry cannot survive the onslaught of importation they should engage in new business and that the displaced glassworkers will be afforded some kind of Federal unemployment relief while training for new kinds of work. Why should the American glassware industry be sacrificed and why should our highly skilled glassworkers be forced, and the thousands of other workers in the industry be forced to depend upon extended Federal unemployment relief?

Our Government, through its social-security regulations, has repeatedly stated that a worker has the right to choose the kind of work he desires to do. Surely our people would, by the proposed arrangement, be deprived of this freedom and be forced to accept employment which they do not choose to accept. Our people are good Americans and splendid citizens.

They should have the right to choose their place of employment and should not be expected to submit to being moved like common cattle to other places of employment through governmental regulations as a matter of expediency. The State Department propagandists condemn the Russians for uprooting humanity by their transfers of large groups of people to new areas of employment yet they propose to force our good American glass workers to sell their homes, take their children out of schools and move into strange communities and accept employment contrary to their wishes.

Are we in America all to become production-line workers, or are we to retain smaller industries in smaller communities scattered throughout the United States? Shall we no longer produce anything that will be worth possessing a generation or a hundred years later? Are we to succumb completely to machinery and be deprived of all the arts of handicraft production?

This is precisely what will happen if we cannot have proper protection in industries that still offer opportunity for handicraft labor. Apparently we are to be forced to go to Europe or anywhere but the United States if we are to find any articles that embody individual skill, artistry and craftsmanship. In the United States only machine-made products, which have no lasting artistic value, are to be produced.

We greatly deplore this attitude in those who have the power to say whether we will or will not survive. It almost looks as if they were more concerned about the welfare of foreign producers than about the well-being of our own. There is a very stubborn insistence upon further duty reductions despite the fact that we should find some remedy for cuts already made, where these have gone too far.

The terms of trade treaties negotiated under the Trade Agreements Act have never afforded adequate protection to the American glassware industry. It is more difficult now because foreign countries are determined to expand their prewar export trade and are coming into a position to do so. We have been told of the relief to be gained under the escape clause in the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. Unfortunately this would afford no help in the present situation. Immediate remedial action on foreign-made

glassware is an absolute necessity if the American glassware industry and the wage and other standards of living of the American glass workers are to be preserved.

The wage rates in Czechoslovakia range from an average of 20 cents for unskilled workers to an average of 40 cents for skilled workers per hour in the glass industry. The rates in Japan are still lower, reaching down as far as 10 cents. The rates in Germany are higher than in Czechoslovakia but are still very low compared with our own rates. Swedish wages are higher than those in Germany where average rates range from 36 to 45 cents per hour. This compares with an average of about $1.35 per hour in this country.

Even if our workers were twice as productive as the European, we would still be at a competitive disadvantage. In those of our factories where handwork still predominates we have little advantage, if any, over the Europeans, in productivity.

In terms of quantity, imports are not extremely heavy. The 1949 imports amounted to slightly over $5,500,000, foreign invoice value. At our wholesale prices this would amount to roughly $10,000,000.

According to the Census of Manufactures of 1947, employment in the pressed and blown glassware industry amounted to 42,170 persons; but no breakdown is given which would show how many of these are in the handmade division of the industry. Hand-made articles amounted to about a half of the machine-made product in tableware and kitchenware classification. However, in employment the two are probably more nearly equal.

The effect of imports, since the lush postwar market has disappeared, is to create pressure on wages, hours, and employment. It also affects the question of old-age pensions. I can tell you that wagewise we are definitely in competition with the low rates prevailing abroad. Unless this wage gap is bridged or unless some other limit is placed on imports the hand-made glass factories face extreme difficulties and eventual extinction.

We hope that you can do something to focus the spotlight on the nature of wage competition that will bring home to the public this fact: We can no more compete with 25- and 30-cent-an-hour wages in Europe and hold up our standards than we could compete with sweatshop wages in this country when they were still in existence. The employer who wants to pay decent wages can continue to do so only if he can hold his market against his substandard competitors. Otherwise he either goes out of business or lowers his standards. The latter is what we want to avoid.

We assure your committee of our appreciation of the opportunity you have made possible for us to appear before you and present this present serious problem of a great American industry and a splendid American labor organization.

Curtailment of Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "False Economy," from the Chicago Daily News.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FALSE ECONOMY

The post office is a utility. If it were privately owned and managed, the Government from President Truman down would be screaming imprecations over the wholesale firings and sharp cuts in service projected by Postmaster General Donaldson.

The nature of the reductions is such as to plant the suspicion that the main idea is to generate a public outcry against the whole idea of Government economy.

For months supporters of the Hoover report have been trying to prod administration leaders in Congress into the reforms which were recommended. The heavy-handed economies now ordered are another instance of how the department clings to outmoded methods.

The streamlined business system advocated by the Hoover Commission experts would have sought the remedy in greater efficiency, increased revenue through more and better service, and by ending the hidden costs which drain the Department's funds but return no benefit to the users of its service.

The Hoover studies developed that the post office does not know what it costs to provide its various classes of service. It is estimated that handling of a penny postcard costs 2½ cents. These are mainly used by business. There is no good reason why this service, along with registered mail, money orders, insured mail, and the like, should not be self-supporting.

For another example, there has been practically no attempt to install the mechanical devices, and utilize the modern principles of materials handling, by which private business has been able to cut costs and give better service. The Department's antiquated vehicles seen on Chicago streets offer another tip to the grievously high maintenance costs.

The investigating experts found a woeful lack of employee-training programs. Furthermore, political appointment of top officials reduces the incentive of workers to improve themselves in the hope of advancement.

And why should users of the mails pay the subsidies which it is deemed expedient to pay the airlines for carrying mail? It is wise to promote aircraft development, but this should be a charge against the taxpayers.

There could be no objection to pruning unneeded employees from the Post Office, and the great expansion in its personnel would indicate that there are some. But to carve all the savings directly out of service is a harsh and backward step. The one good thing that may be said for it is that it will educate a lot of people concerning the Fair Dealer's pretensions that bureaucrats can always do it better.

We, the People, and the World Civil War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 21, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, Prof. Max Ascoli, in a thoughtful editorial appended hereto, marking the first anniversary of the Reporter, a biweekly news commentary which in its initial year has earned much-deserved national attention, gives another name—and a provocative one—to what we now term the "cold war." The "world civil war," as Professor Ascoli has called it, has passed the stage, he points out, where the responsibility is mainly in the hands of governments. The responsibility, he now points out, lies directly in the hands of our people, who are called on to be "practitioners of freedom," to daily live as we would have the world live. Professor Ascoli asks us to keep in mind that dollar aid is only one part of our struggle in the "world civil war." He ably states his conclusion, as follows:

Freedom is the patrimony of the people, and the government is only the instrument for the preservation of this patrimony. The business of defending freedom in this country and in the world is primarily the people's business. Only if we, the people, don't do our part will we lose this civil war. And only if we lose or are about to lose the civil war will the enemy make war on us.

The editorial follows:

THE WORLD CIVIL WAR

(By Max Ascoli)

We are in the midst of a world civil war, launched by a remorseless enemy against all the institutions that give purpose and direction to the conduct of human affairs. Over the years, political and economic crises, wars, and depressions, have been putting an increasing and sometimes unendurable stress on the ties that bind people into a democracy. Our enemies—at the same time the products and carriers of unrest—have become expert at shocking the nervous system of a democracy into a condition first of spasm, then of paralysis. They are confident that by tirelessly drumming up a sense of tension and danger, as they are trying to do in Berlin, they can make a civil population snap, and then even the bravest of men give in. When that moment comes, the Communists are ready to replace the complexities of democracy with the discipline of the herd.

This civil war is not a conflict of ideologies or of national interest. It is an attack by slaves—sometimes self-made slaves—on all men who, with various degrees of deliberation, want to exert a measure of control over their own destiny. In the East, our enemies are now enjoying an extraordinary opportunity: New nations as yet untrained to rule themselves are trying to adopt the pattern of free institutions that is sorely tested everywhere in the world.

International communism, while holding political power in a cluster of nations, is agitating for civil war everywhere else in the world. That is why we in the West have had to reach the conclusion that peaceful coexistence with Soviet Russia is an extraordinarily difficult goal. For whatever peace settlement we might reach the Russian Government would use against us in the world civil war. This is practically what Secretary Acheson has been saying in his recent speeches: That Soviet Russia erases with its left hand any signature it affixes with its right.

INCURABLE LAWBREAKERS

The Russian leaders cannot help breaking pacts. Like all other holders of power, they want to consolidate it and enjoy some peace. In fact, they have been trying to do it repeatedly. Having conquered a mostly agricultural nation, they first attempted to develop its economy according to the Marxist pattern: They tried to establish various types of controlled capitalism that were supposed to evolve into socialism. At the end of the last war, they tried—probably earnestly—to set up mixed economies in the nations of eastern Europe that were to become a meeting ground between east and west. But they cannot control themselves: Whenever they encounter difficulties that may give rise to opposing political programs and

parties, they have to subject their people to purges, mass deportations, and murders. Actually, the Communist dictators are slaves themselves. The irresponsible, unchallengeable power they have extorted from their people does not allow them to be responsible contracting parties to international agreements.

After the devastation of the last war, the Russian Communists now need peace, but it is extremely doubtful whether they can afford to have peaceful relations with the world. They are following a runaway course, and it is difficult to imagine any man—even Stalin—putting on the brakes. The rulers of Soviet Rusisa could enter into constructive negotiations with the Western World only if they accepted full responsibility for all their weapons of international civil war, and agreed to negotiate about their political as well as their military armaments. The acceptance of responsibility for international communism would shake the foundations on which their power rests. This is their business. We cannot settle for less.

THE AMERICAN POSTURE

At this stage of the conflict the Communists know that only by destroying our country can they achieve world domination, but they also know that the Stalinist methods of subversion are of little use here. They must rely mainly on the spontaneous disruption of our economic and political structure which, according to the Marxist theory of history, is bound to come. In fact, ours is the only country that is left free to verify the Marxist laws of history—the exception which should prove the inevitability of a process that nearly everywhere else communism has had to set in motion deliberately through internal subversion and armed intervention.

The enemy has no choice but to trust us, alone among the people of the world, to bring about our own doom. He is waiting for our depression, he rejoices whenever he sees how easily, even without an effective Communist Party, we become prey to hysteria. He approves of our press when it conducts trial by headline, free from any statute of limitations and from any rule against multiple jeopardy. He is heartened whenever he sees how ready we are to pour our economic and military resources into every country in which he decides to start a civil war. And he is certainly grateful to the Americans who make up for the strong Communist Party we haven't got by mobilizing ghosts and robbing graves.

Our Government is defending itself with a sort of shy, harassed, and sometimes belated wisdom. It has been working effectively to contain Russia and build up strength that Russia will have to acknowledge and respect. There is a more thorough understanding of public affairs now in our Government, particularly in the State Department, and in the great economic agencies like the ECA, a greater concentration of skillful, devoted people, than there was at any time during the last war. But the surprising thing is that our Government leaders have been leery of publicizing the global pattern of our foreign policy. In this issue of the Reporter, Harold Graves shows how well-rounded and consistent this policy is becoming. The deeds of our Government leaders seem to be wiser than their words.

It is strange and somewhat ominous that the Communists have taken it upon themselves to express the people's universal craving for peace. It is strange to see how many Americans still consider the conflict as a pure clash of power politics, and look either toward a crude division of the world or the establishment of a string of neutral states between our power and Russia's. Certain other people think that only the threat of war, if not war itself, could stop this paralyzing structural disease that is communism.

WE THE PEOPLE

The responsibility for the confusion and hesitancy inside and outside the Government lies primarily with ourselves, the people. No government can successfully fight a civil war without the aroused and organized support of its citizens—certainly not a civil war of this kind, world-wide in scope. This is the crux of what Mr. Acheson said so compellingly to the American Society of Newspaper Editors.

We expect our Government leaders not only to conduct the political affairs of the Nation wisely, but to formuate the ideas, the beliefs, that should sustain our faith. We expect the men who, in our democratic society, have assumed some shreds of the kingly function of government to be philosopher-kings. We want them to be at the same time political philosophers, policy makers, and policy executives. We constantly ask for governmental or presidential leadership. It is certainly the function of Government to lead. But we had better decide what kind of leaders we want our statesmen to be, orchestra leaders or cheer leaders. Surely we can do something more than cheer or clap at inspiring orations.

We are in an infinitely better position to defend ourselves than any other nation, for, like the two world wars, the civil war on which our existence depends has not touched our soil. The attack can be thrown back once and forever only if we make the texture of our society more compact, the role of intelligence more deliberate, the discussion of issues more open. It can be won inside our western societies, rather than by throwing bombs on the miserable populations that communism has enslaved.

DOLLARS ARE NOT ENOUGH

At long last the time for the people to do their part is coming. If, to close what is called the dollar gap, foreign products are to be thrown into the American market, many sections of our economy are going to be dislocated. It will hurt. Factories may have to be closed, people thrown out of their jobs; and local communities, trade unions, chambers of commerce, will have to pool their energies and inventiveness, to cushion the shocks and solve the problems of reemployment and retraining. Europeans will have to do the same thing, if, as another article in this issue of the Reporter points out, what is called integration is ever to approach reality.

Many lessons have been driven home to us in these last few years; first of all that the money given by the citizens to the Federal Government, and spent by the Government for defense or foreign relief, is not enough to defeat communism. There are at least a billion people in the non-Communist world who need our assistance. Should we double the number of dollars we are now giving away, that still would only mean about 3 cents more a day for each of them—hardly enough to dissuade even the most wretched beggar from becoming a Communist. Even if we give away everything we produce in a year, it would only amount to about 60 cents a day in goods for each person needing help.

The only gifts that will make any real difference are those whose effects are multiplied by the uses to which they are put—gifts that the receiving governments will utilize to make basic reforms in productive techniques or social organization so as to release the latent energies of their peoples. If we stipulate conditions of performance, however, they will have to be reciprocal: conditions that we demand and conditions that we are ready to live up to. We cannot ask the other nations to put their houses in order if in our own house we cringe behind tariff barriers and subsidized exports. We can give an example of how the people's productive energies may be released by letting every one of our citizens, no matter what his race, color, or creed, go as high as his intelligence and character can take him.

In the countries we undertake to help, we must show that we can put brakes on the development of industrialism, handle its wheels so that the least possible disruption of life is imposed on human beings. We must show that we can short-cut or by-pass stages of development, like colonialism or imperialism, that Marxism considers inevitable. To defend ourselves against communism we must keep our economic system creative and resilient. A point can easily be reached where huge government expenses for armament, foreign assistance, and internal welfare can wreck the economic structure of the Nation—something that the Russians would not dislike.

PRACTITIONERS OF FREEDOM

We cannot ask our Government to tell us what jobs we have to assume and what ideas we have to follow if we want to do our part in winning the civil war. Governments are not made to produce ideas, and when Government spokesmen venture into that realm their statements are likely to be opaque and stilted. This is true even of such an exceptionally high-minded and cultured a man as Mr. Acheson when he defines a free society as one that "values the individual as an end in himself." The foreign individual who speaks English and has business contacts with Americans may be glad to be told that he is an end in himself, but the poor peasant in southern Italy is likely to think that Mr. Acheson, too, stopped at Eboli.

It is the function of our political thinkers to help the Government by providing clear, ringing ideas that will give hope to our friends and put fear in the hearts of our enemies. In the same way, it is the function of our business and labor leaders to keep our economy not only viable but expanding and free. Efforts of this kind have been made in the past—by the Committee for Economic Development, for instance, in preparing the business community for the shock of reconversion to peace. Far more strenuous efforts now have to be made by all the productive forces of the Nation, on both a community and a national level.

There are a large number of organizations in this country that provide our citizens with information on foreign, domestic, and economic affairs. They are doing good work. But it is most important not only to clarify the issues but to shape the policies on which the people can take a stand. It is imperative, for instance, in dealing with the nations on our side, to establish a sharp distinction between our allies and our cobelligerents. An aroused, informed public opinion can make it easier for our Government representatives to limit their commitments toward regimes that can produce no other document of their worthiness than an anti-Communist affidavit.

Our Government leaders cannot easily keep up a name-calling contest with the Russians, but private groups can more freely undertake the job of denouncing Communist lies to the people of the whole world. Only private groups and individuals can actually show the spontaneous power of men and women united for freedom. We haven't much to gain by making sermons on freedom to the people of the world unless we back our propaganda and make it powerful by showing that we are skillful practitioners of freedom.

In this work that the people must do by themselves to support their Government, a very great role can be played by the American press. The present situation is almost incredibly different from the one that prevailed between the two world wars, for we are no longer a spectator, but the protagonist nation. The business of the press at the present time is to provide something more

than news and entertainment—promiscuous information or lonely "think pieces" sandwiched between bloated news and cheesecake. The American reader needs focal reporting on the basic issue of our day, which is victory in the world civil war. For the American press is the instrument of vision of the American people. Sometimes one is taken by the fear that the cataracts are coming down, and that the area of vision is being reduced and dimmed. The most popular media of the American press make so few demands on the memory of their readers as to become agents of national amnesia. We need memory, on the contrary, for we need to feel part of that tradition of freedom that has made our country and has given it its unique role in the present world.

Freedom is the patrimony of the people, and the government is only the instrument for the preservation of this patrimony. The business of defending freedom in this country and in the world is primarily the people's business. Only if we the people don't do our part will we lose this civil war. And only if we lose or are about to lose the civil war will the enemy make war on us.

Curtailment of Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Public Service Cut," published in the Altoona (Pa.) Tribune of April 22, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PUBLIC SERVICE CUT

It is ironical indeed that the public's cries for economy in government are being answered by cuts in two departments which certainly are among the most important in government: the Department of Defense and the Postoffice Department.

Postmaster General Jesse M. Donaldson has directed that mail deliveries be cut to one a day. He has further ordered cost reductions in the Department that cannot fail to have a serious effect upon the public service rendered by the Department.

Often those in Government who oppose economy moves for political reasons at once attack critics of such slashes as the Postoffice and Defense cuts by asserting, "You called for economy, and when you get it you holler."

Of course, the answer is that economy can be achieved in Government without affecting either public service of a necessary kind or the national defense. Thousands of bureaus duplicate efforts. The Federal bureaucracy is so vast, so expensive, that no one man knows all its purposes, its costs, or its work.

The Hoover Commission has shown where savings can be effected without loss of vital services. But the professional payrollers scream when the economy ax looms.

Now Postmaster Donaldson proposes a reduction program that will not save the taxpayers any money in practical terms. But it will cost them vital service. The Postal Department probably is the only Department which provides the average American with any real service for his money. It is generally the only Department at least with which he has any contact, that serves him directly. His other contacts with Government cost him money.

The proposed post office economy program would require mail carriers to work straight through from morning to night with only a half-hour break for lunch—to eat wherever they happen to be on their route. If there is no lunchroom handy they either do without or carry their lunch, in addition to the heavy load of mail and magazines they must carry.

Thousands of postal employees will be out of jobs, which is ironic, too, because the Postal Department gives real service, has a hard job to do, needs more employees to do it right, and Government is hiring thousands of new employees for various jobs every month, and probably none nearly so essential.

It would seem that Mr. Donaldson is going to cut the post office progress right back to where it was 25 or 50 years ago. One mail delivery a day may mean no delivery for many people. In fact, carriers say it is possible that some areas might not have a mail delivery for several days.

Mr. Donaldson moves us back to the days of the Pony Express, while the administration and State Department waste the public funds by scattering them far and wide over the earth.

In these days of a vast bureaucracy in Washington, the Federal free mail alone becomes a burden for carriers. Pension checks, notices, Government regulations by the bale for business and private individuals, all are carried free.

The burden upon the Department is increasing. Of course, it is a problem for Congress, and Mr. Donaldson's move obviously is primarily a pressure move against Congress because it failed to give him the appropriation he asked.

But, this is an ill-advised pressure move, for it damages the reputation and prestige of one of the few Government departments which produces a straight job of service for the people.

The Hoover Commission has recommended changes to put the department on a self-sustaining basis, and it has complimented the department upon its service.

It has suggested that the Post Office Department be permitted to set rates for insured and registered mail, money orders, postal notes, postal cards, special delivery and c. o. d. mail which would make each self-supporting. The Commission estimated this would save $113,000,000 a year.

It suggested that the costly air-mail subsidies be paid by open appropriation from tax funds instead of from postal funds, so the cost will be apparent. The Department loses money on every air mail delivery.

The Commission also suggested that the Department keep its own accounts, under the Comptroller General's division.

These are common-sense proposals. To cut the service as drastically as Mr. Donaldson has ordered is not common sense.

Italian Government Honors Civic Leaders in Dunkirk and Fredonia, N. Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, May 6, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the city of Dunkirk, N. Y., my home community, has never failed to meet its civic responsibility either in times of war or in times of peace. The generosity of the citizens of Dunkirk, N. Y., has become a permanent and cherished tradition that, translated into action, has enriched and ennobled those in need of its bounty both here and abroad.

The civic leaders in Dunkirk and Fredonia who have been so beautifully and signally honored by the Italian Government are rich indeed when wealth is measured by an unfailing yardstick, "That no man is worth more than he contributes to the social, civic, and spiritual growth of the community in which he lives."

The article published in the Evening Observer, Monday, May 1, 1950, which I am extending under unanimous consent heretofore granted tells the story of a most worthy civic achievement:

ITALIAN REPUBLIC HONORS DUNKIRK-FREDONIA AREA BY SOLIDARITY AWARDS

In a program recorded for broadcast in 23 languages by the Voice of America, five representatives of the Dunkirk-Fredonia community were yesterday awarded the Gold Star of Italian Solidarity.

Those who were selected for the honor, as representatives of the people and institutions of the two communities, were:

Mayor Walter F. Murray.

Former Mayor Harry F. Salhoff of Fredonia.

The Very Reverend Leslie F. Chard, president of the Dunkirk Society.

Miss Katherine Drago, corresponding secretary of the Dunkirk Society.

Wallace A. Brennan, editor of the Observer.

OFFICIAL THANKS

The occasion was Italy's official thanks for the Dunkirk to Anzio campaign of thanksgiving 1947 in which the Dunkirk-Fredonia community sent gifts valued at $200,000 to Anzio, Italy, and for the later gift of an ambulance to the Anzio-Nettuno Hospital.

About 150 attended the dinner served in Acquavia Post under arrangements made by Chairman Nelson Currier and Industrial Commissioner Roman Wiate. Philip LoGuidice presided. City officials, members of the common council, and members of the Fredonia board of trustees attended.

The medals, which are the only decoration of any kind issued by the present Italian Government, were voted by the Italian Parliament. The presentations were made by James Battistoni, regent of the Italian consular agency of Buffalo. He was accompanied to Dunkirk by Angelo Cordero of Buffalo, a recipient of the star in that city, Miss Alda Fontano of the consul's office, and Alphonse Papplardo of the newspaper, Il Progresso.

MISS DRAGO RESPONDS

Miss Drago, who had visited Anzio recently, made the general response for the local recipients, showing how the gifts had been used in the Anzio-Nettuno community.

Mr. Battistoni read messages from the Italian Ambassador, Signor Alberto Tarchiani, and from the consul general, Dr. Aldo M. Mazio. He said:

"Greetings and salutation to all of you from the Italian Ambassador, Signor Alberto Tarchiani, and from the consul general of Italy, Dr. Aldo M. Mazio.

"Once again I have the great pleasure to be with you and this time to do honor to five distinguished leaders of your esteemed Dunkirk Society, a group of men and women who have done so much and so well to help the European victims of infamous dictatorships and war.

"GRATEFUL REPUBLIC

"I am really happy that Dr. Aldo M. Mazio, the Italian consul general of Italy, has

reserved for me the pleasure of conferring to the leaders of your society the Star of Italian Solidarity and I am honored and pleased to extend to all of you the gratitude of the President of the Italian Republic, and the gratitude of the Government of Italy and of the Italian people, for your wonderful assistance and your valuable contribution to the reconstruction of Anzio and Nettuno.

"When one observes and studies the criminal doings of past and present dictatorships one shudders at the thought of so much of man's inhumanity to man and when war as horrible as the last one is being fought, and brothers kill brothers, one comes near to losing faith in what we call civilization. But, fortunately, one has the opportunity to come in contact with groups of people like you, so ready and so generously willing to extend the helping hand to human beings many thousand miles away; then one discovers and he is reassured that there is still much good in humanity yet.

"I was in Italy 4 months in 1946 and the situation there, at that time, was really heart-breaking, but as everyone that has been in Italy recently can testify, the country of my birth has made great progress in the last 4 years. The wonderful accomplished recovery is due in great part to the moral support and the material help that Italy received from the United States, from every city, large and small, and from men and women like yourselves.

"This symbol, the Star of the Italian Solidarity that I am about to confer to five of your leaders, has a special significance, not only as a token of gratitude toward benefactors like all of you here today, but also as a renewed tie between Italy and the generous American people.

"Ladies and gentlemen, in the name of the Italian Government, in the name of democratic Italy, I have the honor and the immense pleasure to confer the Star of the Italian Solidarity to the Honorable Walter F. Murray, mayor of Dunkirk; to the Honorable Harry F. Sahloff, mayor of Fredonia; to Very Rev. Canon Leslie F. Chard, president, Dunkirk Society; to Wallace A. Brennan; and last but not least, to Miss Katherine E. Drago, secretary of the Dunkirk Society.

"Long live America!

"Long live Italy!"

Curtailment of Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Post Office Economy," from the Detroit News.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POST OFFICE ECONOMY

The layman, who has mail delivered to him by carrier, and who buys stamps at the post office, but has little knowledge of what goes on behind the barred windows, sees the effect of Postmaster General Donaldson's order as this simply: The same volume of mail to be handled by fewer employees.

That apparently will require greater efficiency in the mail service; and this, to the rank and file of postal employees, means speed-up.

But to the higher-ups, the directing personnel, it may mean less of speed-up and more efficiency studies.

Now the Post Office Department is already noted for efficiency studies. It is at them constantly. It demands long and detailed reports from post offices, and presumably these are used in arriving at decisions for improving the service without adding to its cost. But it is not apparent that these studies have succeeded in saving money. The expense of the mails continues to mount in higher ratio than the postal rates. It can be argued that without these efficiency studies the cost would be still greater, but the average citizen has no means of judging whether that is true.

One complaint in the postal service is the constantly shifting personnel. This is especially marked in an industrial community like Detroit, where a fairly large number of persons regard the post office as a sort of sheet anchor. They pass the civil service examination; they get their names on the rolls; in case of vacancies they are called in and offered employment. But if meanwhile they have obtained other jobs at better pay, and there is good prospect of the continuance of these jobs, they turn down the call. Nevertheless, they remain on the eligible roll; and if they are thrown out of work by a strike, or are dismissed, they are eager for postal jobs at which they work until something better comes up.

A situation of this sort is not conductive to either economy or efficiency. Anything smacking of speed-up is likely to make it worse. The real remedy would be to pay wages competitive with those offered by industry, in an attempt to make the personnel more nearly permanent. That would increase costs, it can be argued. But would it? There seems to be a large amount of waste in the present set-up, which might be cut down by giving employees more incentives.

Curtailment of Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have prihted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Frank Ray in regard to the proposed curtailment of postal service.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TIMELY—ACCURATE—INTERESTING

(By Frank Ray)

Only the most brilliant minds of Congress could have planned this great economy slash on the Post Office.

What a great saving will be made by the dismissal of more than 10,000 usefully employed people.

One little item, however, has been overlooked. How much will really be saved in public funds when most of these people must resort to relief rolls and unemployment compensation? The taxpayer will then be paying these same people for remaining idle.

There are enough funds to feed and support the people who were our enemies only a few years ago. Germany and Japan have no difficulty getting appropriations from Congress, and nothing frightens our Congressmen more than the spectre of unemployment—in Japan and Germany.

Also, billions are available to keep the munitions makers busy. After all there will soon be a war to fight. Won't there always be wars?

But funds for the postal system, our most vital and useful Government service: that comes under the heading of necessities-we-can-do-without.

The Post Office shows a deficit because it is a servant of the privileged few who use it as their personal valet.

Congressmen pour tons of mail into the postal system. They don't pay one cent for the service.

And mail-order houses send back-breaking catalogues through the mail for less postage than it costs you to mail a 2-ounce letter.

Advertisers enjoy the privilege of cheap mail. Giant circulars are carried for post card rates.

By firing the men and women who are needed to keep our postal system functioning efficiently we solve nothing. By putting the postal rates on a realistic basis we will take the free-riders out of the mails, and then this wonderful Government service will be seen and appreciated for the great work it really accomplishes.

Watches and War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 9, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Elmira Sunday Telegram of April 30, 1950:

WATCHES AND WAR—WATCHMAKERS WANT TARIFF, NOT SUBSIDY

(By William E. Hill)

During a war all nations are dependent upon watchmakers for their delicate mechanisms, such as aircraft instruments, chronometers, clocks, compasses, fire control watches, jewel bearings, navigation instruments, tachometers, time-delay devices, time fuzes, etc.

You cannot set off an A-bomb or an H-bomb unless you have precision workers to make the fuzes. Watch workers require from 2 to 10 years to train.

Prior to World War II Great Britain had allowed her watchmaking industry to decline, and during the war Switzerland was surrounded by the Axis Powers and so could not supply any precision instruments to the Allies but did make them for Germany. This left the United States as the only source of precision instruments for all of the Allies. Our three manufacturers of jeweled watches, Elgin, Hamilton, and Waltham, stopped making watches for the trade and from December 1941, to August 1945, were employed 100 percent of their capacity in Government work.

Since World War II Great Britain decided that for security reasons they must encourage and protect their clock and watch manufacturers. On October 16, 1945, the government established a credit of about $1,300,000 with a provision made to increase this sum if it should be needed. From 1946 to 1949 subsidies were given amounting to $1,630,000. The government also established a National Horological College at London at a cost of approximately a million dollars.

This college provides for the training of technicians that would be needed in case of war and was opened in 1947.

About 70 firms are now producing clocks and watches and 12 of them can be classed as big. About 21,000 men and 14,000 women are now employed in making clocks and watches. The policy of Great Britain is to encourage export of clocks and watches and to discourage imports. To achieve export goals and meet foreign competition, some manufacturers have reduced export prices below cost. In 1948 the exports amounted to $5,346,840.

Switzerland is said to be working for world control of the watch market, and the elimination of American competition. Switzerland not only subsidizes their watchmaking industry but has established a joint central Government research, and also trains engineers and toolmakers.

The United States Tariff Act of 1930 provided a schedule of duties on watches which fairly well reflected, at that time, the difference in the cost of production of watch movements here and abroad. In 1935 the reciprocal trade agreement with Switzerland reduced the tariff rates by about 34 percent on the average. During World War II, while our watchmakers were all busy making controls for guided missiles and other war material, the Swiss were supplying our trade with watches up to about 9,000,000 in 1 year. By 1946 the Swiss supplied 86 percent of the jeweled watches sold in America.

The main cost of a watch movement is the labor. Our watchmakers received about two and one-half times as much per hour as the Swiss watchmakers. This and the low duty on watch movements is the reason that the cost of Swiss jeweled watch movements in this country is more than $4 less than the manufacturing cost of our cheapest jeweled watch movement.

The United States market has been flooded by an estimated 100,000,000 foreign-made watches during the past 10 years, so that at the close of the last war, when Elgin, Hamilton, and Waltham again were able to make watches for the trade, there was no backlog of orders and they had to compete with foreign-made watches that could sell for what it cost the American manufacturers to make their watches and still make a profit. The logical result has been that since the reciprocal trade agreement went into force in 1936, over 10,000 mechanics formerly employed in the watchmaking industry have gone into other trades.

In 1948 the Waltham Watch Co. had a deficit of $1,610,000 and on February 3, 1950, they closed their plant and laid off the remaining employees, 1,231. The Elgin Watch Co. has reduced its working hours and closed one of its plants. Early this month the Hamilton Watch Co. stockholders authorized increase in corporate indebtedness to four and one-half million dollars, and R. M. Kant, president, told stockholders that "the watch market continues to be in a badly unsettled condition" and that firm's first quarter sales and earnings "will make a poor comparison with the same period a year ago." The percent of profit, compared with sales of Elgin, Hamilton, and Waltham Watch Companies combined, in 1940 was 90.53 percent and in 1947 it was 3.72 percent.

If the Elgin and Hamilton Watch Companies are forced to close due to foreign competition, would we be able to buy foreign-made watches at the price we now pay for them? If world war III catches us with no watch-manufacturing companies that make jeweled watch movements, where will we get the precision instruments to set off our bombs? Switzerland would be surrounded and we might not be able to get any through from Great Britain.

Our watchmakers do not want to be subsidized by their Government but they do want a tariff that will enable them to compete with foreign-made watch movements on an even cost basis.

Curtailment of Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Postal Order," published in the Springfield (Mass.) Union of April 20, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE POSTAL ORDER

It is hard to believe that so drastic a Nation-wide curtailment of postal services as has been ordered into effect by Postmaster General Jesse M. Donaldson would be forced by action of the House Appropriations Committee in pruning the $1,786,000,000 post-office budget by $24,921,000.

In stating that the order would go into effect immediately, even before final action has been taken on the budget, Mr. Donaldson seems to be acting with indecent and suspicious haste. It may not be pure coincidence that a detailed program for a readjustment of the services was in readiness to launch on such short notice.

The Post Office Department is in a particularly favorable position for applying a familiar device of the various departments which are about, or fear they are about, to feel the ax. There is not a community that is not affected by layoffs of personnel and curtailed postal services. By raising a howl from those affected, there would, of course, be great propaganda value for restoration of the full amount of the budget.

It is an old trick that has been tried many times before and that will be tried again. It is most effective where the cut can be made to hurt most. But there is no reason to believe that these proposed readjustments in the postal services are necessary. Economies are. Budgets are not sacrosanct, especially the post-office budget.

There is good reason to doubt that layoffs and greatly curtailed services are necessary because of the slicing of $24,921,000 from the budget. There must be good reason behind the increasing demands for reduction in costs of the postal service, where increased efficiency would cancel out the budget cut.

Why Retain Our American Free Business System?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 9, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter sent by one of my constituents and friends, Mr. W. H. Feldmann, president of the Electric Machinery Manufacturing Co., of Minneapolis, to the employees of the company he is leaving to accept a well-deserved promotion. His letter illustrates the kind of relations a president ought to have with his men, sharing with them his deepest concerns about the things that are necessary to maintain and improve our lives in this country, and in return welcoming their views and concerns. The letter follows:

ELECTRIC MACHINERY
MANUFACTURING CO.,
April 19, 1950.

To: All EM employees.
From: W. H. Feldmann.

DEAR FELLOW EM EMPLOYEES: Business is better for us. Orders received in February and March were 40 percent above the average of November to January. The S and R divisions got the greatest benefit, although all divisions, except two-pole generator, now have a reasonable workload for the next 3 months.

As a result, we have been able to call back 50 men and women which, I assure you, gives us a great deal of satisfaction.

This is my last letter to you. On May 1 I leave the company to accept the position of vice president in charge of sales of our parent company, Worthington. This means moving to New Jersey and cutting direct ties with EM and my friends in its employ with whom I have worked, suffered, worried and thrilled for 28 years. I will, however, have just as much interest in and responsibility for orders for EM as for Worthington.

In this last letter I ask your indulgence in reading my strong feelings about a subject which is of vital importance to all of us, our American free business system. There are many who would replace it with a welfare or socialistic state system. Either would, in my opinion, seriously limit our liberties and eventually lower the living standards of all of us. Let me tell you why.

Under our present system, as you well know, we have an absolutely free choice of what we buy with our money. Your wife and mine go downtown, or to our neighborhood centers and say, "I'll take this one, not that one." She is guided entirely by what she thinks gives her the greatest value for her money. The manufacturers and retailers, who provide—and inform her about—their greater values, get more and more orders, expand their businesses and employ more people. Those who, by high costs and indifferences, offer inferior values are soon called on by the county sheriff. Incidentally, the sheriff is one of America's greatest benefactors. He either opens the minds of or eliminates from our business system the weak, the inefficient and the lazy who would give us less for our hard-earned money and thus lower our standard of living.

On the contrary, the welfare or socialistic state does not weed out the weak and reward the strong. Political considerations govern. Government control, no matter how well intended, cannot possibly provide the needed and immediate corrections our free business system does automatically through the millions of people who say each hour of the day, "I'll take this one, not that one."

And this is aside from the question of our personal freedom. It is the most important thing in the world to us. I hope it will not be necessary for us to lose our freedom before we fully realize this. The inability of many British workmen to change jobs, to move, or to buy what they want is not an unusual situation. It is the inevitable result of a state-controlled system.

It was Woodrow Wilson who said, "Liberty has never come from the Government;

it has always come from the subjects of it. The history of liberty is a history of limitation of governmental power, not the increase of it."

So let's keep our system. And keep on improving it as we have constantly done since 1780, especially in the last 50 years. It has and always will provide, through the constant, terrific pressure to get lower costs and think up new and better products, more things to divide. So much more that even our lowest-paid worker at EM and elsewhere has more things to enjoy than he would get under state management. It will little profit him for the higher paid EM employees to be pulled down nearer to his living standard, if his own is also reduced. Especially when, in the process, he loses his liberty and his country is weakened.

What is true of the products our wives buy is equally true of the products we make at EM. Just as soon as the coil tapers at General Electric or Westinghouse turn out higher quality work at equal or lower cost than do Betty Selinsky and her sister tapers, we start down hill. But when all the members of our sales, engineering, manufacturing and administrative departments do a better job than competitors in quality and costs, and also cooperate effectively, we will have a bigger and stronger company with more security and more things to enjoy for all of us.

Recently Mr. Charles E. Wilson, president of General Motors, told me, "Economic progress and social progress are twins. They are, in fact, Siamese twins, for if one dies, the other dies too." So let's continue our social progress by insuring our economic progress.

I bespeak for Dick Olson, our new president, the loyalty, cooperation and friendship you have always extended to me.

With every good wish for you and yours. Good-bye.

WALTHER FELDMANN.

Curtailment of Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled Truman-Style Post Office, from the Pampa Daily News, of Pampa, Tex.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRUMAN-STYLE POST OFFICE

Postmaster General Donaldson, on the plea that economy is necessary to keep within his budget, has ordered a radical reduction in mail service to the public.

There will be only one daily residential delivery in cities, instead of two. Saturday deliveries to business houses will be curtailed, and smaller post offices will be closed on Saturday where possible. A number of classifications of night work will be stopped.

By these economies, which in the instance of householders, the most numerous of all recipients of postal service, amount to cutting their service in half, Mr. Donaldson hopes to eliminate 13,000 postal employees by July 1. This would reduce employment in the department to 504,000 persons. At the end of the war there were only 403,000 post office employes. The demonstration of economy is not impressive, to put it mildly.

This is not the first time that the Post Office Department has tried to punish the public because Congress refused to give it all the money it asked. Similar tactics were used in 1947 and resulted in demands in the Senate that postmasters who deliberately overspent their appropriations be sent to jail.

The Hoover Commission criticized the Post Office Department as one of the most inefficient in the Government. It has not changed its fundamental plan of operation since 1836. The Commission made 27 recommendations for improving post-office efficiency, and not one of them even hinted at saving money by curtailing public service.

Fundamentally, the Commission reported, the department should be taken out of politics and run as a business instead of a Government bureau. So operated, the Commission said, it could run at a profit instead of piling up annual deficits.

Mr. Truman sent a reorganization plan containing an excessively watered down version of the Hoover recommendations to Congress last year, and it became effective when Congress failed to veto it. It was so weak, however, that in January Robert L. Johnson, head of the National Citizens' Committee backing the Hoover report, pleaded with Congress to enact a real post-office reorganization bill.

Mr. Truman has used the Hoover report to date only to cloak his petty political moves, such as his own salary raise and the attempt to kill the Taft-Hartley act by abolishing the powers of the general counsel of the Labor Relations Board—a step which the Hoover Commission did not sanction. He has no use for the genuinely useful reforms recommended by the Commission, because they would prevent his exploitation of Government service for political purposes. He'd rather beat post office customers over the head than give them economical and efficient service.

After Formosa, Hong Kong?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 9, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Clyde Farnsworth from the Washington Daily News of May 1, 1950:

AFTER FORMOSA, HONG KONG?
(By Clyde Farnsworth)

HONG KONG, May 1.—When and if the Chinese Reds and their Russian big brothers take Formosa, the "liberation" of Hong Kong will be the next order of business.

According to the present line being laid down for the Chinese Communist political workers, Britain will be required to surrender that crown colony—not merely the leased territory but also the ceded territory of the Kowloon Peninsula, Hong Kong Island, and other insular bits. Either that or the Reds will take it "by any means needed."

Disclosure of this policy, circulated thus far only for internal consumption by the Chinese Communist Party, was made by a newcomer from Hankow who credited it to a General Tang, identified as a political commissar for the Communists' most powerful field army, that of Gen. Lin Pao.

General Tang was said to have laid down this line in a recent lecture to political workers in the Hankow headquarters of the Fourth Field Army. The informant from Hankow also claimed to have discussed the matter personally with the Red commissar.

"HIGHER AND HIGHER

"The prestige of the Chinese people's government is growing higher and higher," General Tang was quoted. "We cannot establish relations with Britain until after the liberation of Formosa.

"Then we will liberate Hong Kong, Kowloon, and the leased territories. When Formosa is in our hands the British will recognize that they must withdraw. The people's government will not be satisfied with Kowloon or the new territories (on the mainland) but must have both Kowloon and Hong Kong."

MIGHT RECOGNIZE BRITAIN

"If the British are not wise enough to recognize this inevitability, the people's government will take this territory by any means needed. On the other hand if the British are wise enough to give all of it up, the people's government will recognize Britain."

The last was a reference to the long stymied efforts of London to establish diplomatic relations with the Peiping regime following British recognition last January 6 of that regime as the legal government of China.

Britain has recognized the Chinese Communists, but the Communists haven't recognized Britain.

Curtailment of Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "That Cut in Mail Service," published in the Jackson (Miss.) Daily News.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THAT CUT IN MAIL SERVICE

Postmaster General Jesse M. Donaldson's action in ordering a cut in home and small business mail deliveries to one a day seems hard to justify on grounds of economy. In fact, it looks more like a spectacular play to scare Congress into providing extra funds than a desirable move.

There's no question that the post office deficit is rising. But in most districts the mailmen are already carrying maximum loads, and the only way the second delivery can be eliminated without permitting the mail to pile up at the post office is to shorten the route or put two men on the job at the same time. That would cut service without reducing costs in the least and might even increase them.

Meanwhile, of course, the real causes of the Post Office Department's predicament are to go unsolved. The post office is to go on subsidizing the commercial airlines; giving free mail service to Congress and the Government and providing a dumping ground for politicians who want postmasterships and whatever gravy may be obtained thereby.

As the Hoover report revealed, the Post Office is overladen with wasteful red tape and duplicated activities which should be eliminated. Then, if further economies are

necessary and if money can really be saved by such a step, judicious service cuts might be warranted. But in any case, the haphazard firing of a few $50-a-week carriers, mostly veterans—that's where the saving comes in slashing mail deliveries—will not be the answer.

Firing 10,000 employees is actually an almost infinitesimal stroke against a postal deficit running to $500,000,000 a year. But the act is vivid; everybody will feel the difference. And to the aggrieved mailmen and politicians and even to the householders reduced to dreadful plight of merely one mail delivery, Mr. Donaldson can sit back and ask: Well, what's the alternative?

The question is far from rhetorical. The Postmaster General, if pressed, could give the answer. Reorganize the Post Office as a business institution, make the rates self-sustaining, cut out the political fat. The Hoover Commission spelled out a detailed program of reorganization many months ago which would reduce the annual deficit by more than $200,000,000. Administrative reform, alteration of an inefficient accounting system, elimination of political traffic in postmasters are among the key points. On principle there is no opposition, but Congress stands still. These are savings of the first magnitude, designed to quicken the whole Post Office into new and greater efficiency, and without the painful accompaniment of wholesale discharges.

Mr. Donaldson may have a subtle purpose of directing attention to the Hoover recommendations. At any rate he has violently impressed governmental economy on the public consciousness. But it should be remembered that the slashes in postal service are only a drop in the bucket compared to what Congress could acomplish by putting the Post Office on its own. Only public opinion can win that battle.

Curtailment of Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a carrier's protest of delivery cuts, published in the Sea Cliff News of Sea Cliff, N. Y., of April 21, 1950.

There being no objection, the protest was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CARRIERS PROTEST DELIVERY CUTS

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—William T. Klein, 157 Brown Street, Sea Cliff, is trustee for the Long Island district of the National Association of Letter Carriers, and secretary of the Sea Cliff branch.)

The National Association of Letter Carriers has vigorously protested the instructions issued by the Post Office Department under date of April 18. A copy of our release to the press, and the letter sent to every Member of Congress, are quoted as follows:

"The order is contained in the Postal Bulletin of April 18, directing all postmasters to curtail virtually every type of postal service, amount to a rape of the postal service.

"Congress and the general public should meet this challenge head-on by stating in the most unequivocal terms that the United States Post Office belongs to the American people everywhere."

The National Association of Letter Carriers sent the following letter to all Members of Congress today:

Hon. OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR JOHNSON: We are seriously alarmed over the instructions contained in the Postal Bulletin of Tuesday, April 18. Having spent the greater part of our lives in the postal service, and representing 102,000 letter carriers, we feel that the orders contained in the Postal Bulletin of April 18 will result in irreparable damage and destruction of our fine postal system. It will make the great postal service—the Government function closest to the lives of the American people—a second-rate inferior Government agency.

We have always been mighty proud of the fact that the postal service rendered excellent necessary service. Delivery of mail Nationwide is restricted to one delivery a day in residential districts and services greatly reduced in business districts. Parcel-post deliveries are to be cut in half in business areas. Weekly magazines, such as Time, United States News, Newsweek, and all others that have become an important part of American life will no longer receive expeditious handling. The prompt mail delivery that the American people have been receiving will not be available.

Postmasters have been ordered to discontinue directory service on all ordinary mail, other than perishable matter and parcels of obvious value. This order contains many other provisions, every one of them seriously restricting the fine delivery now being afforded the American people and imperiling the postal service itself.

These orders will result in tremendous money losses to American business and great inconvenience to the general public. Postal employees, particularly low-paid substitutes, will suffer greatly because of the reduction in the number of trips.

We appeal to you as a Member of Congress to take immediate corrective action against this devastating, ill-advised, and unnecessary order issued by the Post Office Department under date of Tuesday, April 18.

W. C. DOHERTY,
President,
D. R. SULLIVAN,
Vice President,
JEROME J. KEATING,
Secretary,
R. B. KREMERS,
Assistant Secretary.

To combat the grave emergency created by the drastic curtailment order, President William C. Doherty has issued a call for a conference to be held in the city of Washington, commencing May 15, 1950, at the Washington Hotel. All branches are invited to send representatives to this conference.

We Shall Carry On

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 9, 1950

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, Generoso Pope has passed on. He had dedicated his life to many exalted and noble tasks—all in the interest of his fellow man. He never forgot the Italy from whence he sprung, and sought in every way possible to help in its era of reconstruction on democratic principles. He was truly a great American who had learned the meaning of democracy and sought to help others participate in the blessings which flow from a true democracy.

His passing was untimely for the noble purposes he sought to attain were not fully and completely realized. However, his sons—imbued and instilled with that same spirit will take up the task where "Gene" left off. I am confident they can carry on. And I wish them Godspeed.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herein the following editorial which appeared in Il Progresso, Sunday, May 7, 1950:

WE SHALL CARRY ON

The untimely passing of our beloved father poses many questions, the foremost of which is: "What are the Pope brothers going to do?" It is with the deepest humility and the fullest realization of the task which confronts us that we answer: "We shall carry on."

The path which we are determined to follow was clearly defined by our father, not merely because it led to the goals he set for us, but because we firmly believe in the principles which motivated his every action. And we have believed in them from our early youth when he taught us many valuable lessons which he himself had learned in the school of hard knocks. It was then we learned of his great love for little people. It was then that he taught us that the greatest blessing we could earn was to help our fellow man.

Our father's life story is a saga of true Americanism. Accomplishments such as his were possible only in a democracy such as ours. Like millions of others before him, he came here as a poor immigrant boy. He took the fullest advantage of the opportunities and blessings of American liberty, and in return he dedicated himself to the service of his country by aiding all the causes which would make our freedom invincible and our national progress second to none. And so, with the passing of the years, he attained success. Yet he never forgot his humble beginnings. We, his sons, were schooled in his philosophy—a deep-rooted feeling of kinship for his fellow man and a constant desire to be of service to humanity.

That is why we will never forget his teachings. We shall always hold dear the memory of his ideals and we shall ever cherish the thought that often he clung to his ideals despite difficulties and great hardships.

His credo is our credo. In advocating and fighting for what we believe is right we shall not yield an inch. We have the utmost faith in America. Having been closely associated with him in all his work, we know exactly what he expected of us and, with the fullest realization of our responsibilities, we shall, with vigor and energy, see to it that Il Progresso continues as a beacon light and effective instrument in the service of our people.

Fully realizing the debt civilized mankind owes to the people of Italy for their countless contributions to human enlightenment and culture, Il Progresso shall never be remiss in its positive and forceful undertakings to help assure the Italian people international justice, equitable treatment and their rightful place of honor and dignity in the comity of great nations.

We shall be ever on the alert against international injustices and spare no efforts to have America lead the nations of the world in restoring to the Italian people the position, prestige, and rights which are justly theirs.

We know that the success of all the campaigns waged by Il Progresso in the name of justice and fair play for Americans of

Italian origin and for the people of Italy; campaigns for tolerance and against all forms of discrimination based on race, color, and religion; our campaigns for education and scholarship, for human liberty and decency everywhere; our constant efforts to strengthen the traditional ties of friendship which bind the people of America to the people of Italy, was made possible because of the confidence of the people in our father and the staunch support they gave him. Because of the inspiration he has been to us and because of our firm belief in his work, we are certain that we can successfully carry on this vital work if we prove ourselves worthy of this same confidence and support.

We are mindful of the many problems which confront our people and it is in their interest, and theirs alone, that we shall dedicate ourselves wholeheartedly. Their struggles shall be our struggles. Their aspirations shall be our principal concern and our mission, with their cooperation, must not and will not fail.

We take this occasion to express our warmest thanks and appreciation to that multitude of friends who have so touchingly shown their esteem and love for our father and shared with us our sorrow upon his passing.

We stand united and shall not permit nor countenance subtle attempts to swerve us from our singleness of purpose. We shall carry on with fullest faith and unshakable determination to be worthy of the great and inspiring heritage which is ours. This we pledge to the readers of Il Progresso. This we assure the people of our city, State, and Nation. This is our message to the people of Italy.

FORTUNE POPE.
ANTHONY POPE.
GENEROSO POPE, Jr.

Curtailment of Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Restricted Mail Service," from the Marion Chronicle, of Marion, Ind., of April 21, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESTRICTED MAIL SERVICE

Postmaster General Donaldson's order restricting postal service may be regarded as an effort to reduce the annually increasing deficits arising from the operation of the mail service. It also is an effort to force certain users of services which Donaldson says are operated at a loss into those that he claims are operated at a profit. The latter may serve to increase the revenues but how much nobody can predict with any accuracy. But savings from the curtailment of services probably will be negligible. In any event, curtailment of service is not a very good way to secure additional net revenue. Such curtailment usually is accompanied by a reduction in the intake, although the post office, being a Government monopoly, may be an exception to the general rule.

The Postmaster General commented on the post-office situation that existed in 1939 compared to that in 1949, as follows: "During that period, the revenue increased 110.72 percent; the number of pieces of mail handled, 64.7 percent; the weight of the mails increased more than 104.73 percent; while the increase in employees was less than 48.43 percent." That usually would be taken to be the picture of a flourishing business, but instead it has produced annually increasing deficits.

These, according to the statement of the Postmaster General, are due largely to increased salaries, fixed by Congress. Additional costs for transportation by rail and air since July 1945 approximate $125,000,000. The total increase of all expenses in the same interval approximates $900,000,000, according to the Postmaster General's statement.

The economies suggested by Donaldson can be no more than trifling when stacked up against the forecast deficit.

The American people are interested in governmental economy. However, inferior service is a poor way of achieving it, as we have stated. The Hoover Commission proposed a much better answer. One of them would take the post office out of politics. This has been bottled up by a Senate committee for more than a year, as has another which in the words of the Hoover Commission, would provide the Department with flexibility in management, simplification in budgeting, accounting, and auditing. It may be that Donaldson's orders are an oblique way of obtaining the required action which is so long overdue. But the Citizens' Committee for Reorganization warns, "only a strong display of public interest addressed to the entire Congress, can get this needed action."

Address of Welcome to Newly Naturalized Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 9, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a living and inspiring address of welcome to newly naturalized citizens made on May 1, 1950, in Boston, Mass., by the Honorable William T. McCarthy, United States district judge of the district of Massachusetts.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, you have been signally honored by the great sovereignty of the United States today because, not only have you received the insignia of solid American citizenship, but you have received it on a day dedicated to the saintly men and women who gave to us our civilization—and I mean the kind of a civilization that we have in the United States of America—who have given to us a form of government predicated upon a Godlike philosophy that goes back over the centuries, and which had its inspiration for our present-day era in a little stable in Bethlehem.

This is, in a way, Mother's Day; but I rather feel the kind of men who run our Government must have had in mind a series of consoling factors. Here we are in this courtroom, a part of a golden treasury of a life that is so strikingly disproportionate to the kind of life that liberty-loving men and women now have in foreign lands. Today we kneel at the footstool of the loveliest lady in the world, who gave to American women the priceless heritage of American womanhood—living in a community life where the dignity of the home is recognized; living in a community life where all steeples point heavenward; living in a community life where men who hold public office hold it with the consent of the governed. And contrast that to the ambitions of irresponsible, autocratic, racketeering leaders, representing all the diabolical agencies in those persecuted lands, ready to overthrow, to wipe out the ideals and the principles which have helped to invest you today with the priceless emblem of American citizenship. May your lives and the lives of the fearless men and women, Godlike men and women, Godlike leaders in those foreign countries, continue in the preservation of the ideals which we love so much here.

There was a distinguished churchman who spoke at the University of Kansas on Saturday. He addressed 700 persons, and he was introduced at that Kansas University dinner by the Kansas Governor, Harry H. Woodring, and he spoke as follows—and I quote:

"If we are to endure as a nation of free, strong-hearted men, we must, in unity, stand sentinel against the potent, growing dangers of faithless, traitorous Communists and Communist sympathizers who are using their freedom to destroy our freedom."

Just think of what that means—who are using the freedoms that were given to us by God himself through an earthly medium, our founding fathers, who, under His inspiration, gave to us a form of government which has stood for over 170 years. And they try to change our way of life, and they are encouraged by a lot of godless men and women who are allowed to teach in universities and in law schools—yes, and in medical schools too. And then this distinguished churchman went on to say—"They are the host of traitorous men and women who, living beneath the protection of our American flag, enjoy the priceless privilege of being citizens of our Republic, while their own allegiance is actually pledged to an emblem representing a theory of government opposed to everything for which Old Glory stands."

Now, I am talking right from my heart. I think of the wise men—soldiers, martyrs, statesmen—who under the guidance and with the inspiration of God gave us our way of life in the form of our Constitution and the Declaration of Independence; who from time to time in the exercise of their wisdom, realizing that there were 13 States, realizing that those States under our Constitution were separate entities, but realizing also that if this Government was to be a great nation it had to be a nation checked by a central government and so they gave us a series of amendments to the Constitution. And as they came along these amendments were a perfect picture of the development and growth of the natural order, and the natural order is nothing more or less than an order upon which nations go ahead under the guidance of Almighty God.

They gave us what is called by lawyers and judges the "due process clause" of the Constitution. It is a clause of the Constitution that was passed for the specific purpose of preventing "jungle law." It was passed for the specific purpose of checking the States so that you would not have a government by might. And yet there are men who should know better that advocate the complete obliteration of due process. And I speak of these things because I think of the boys and girls who will make up the civilization of the tomorrows; and I speak of these things because I want you to become active, potent factors in your community lives. I want you to see to it that there is a demonstration of public appreciation and public worship—that these ideals be translated into acts which indicate a sturdy Americanism; that you participate in the election processes; that you recognize that this country of ours is a panorama where the two principles called "the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood

of Man" are the beacon lights and the milestones and the yardsticks for your conduct—men and women kneeling obediently before the power and the majesty of a Supreme Being—men and women responsive to the kind of discipline that the natural order intended should be the beacon light.

That is the kind of a message that I want to give you on loyalty day. That is the kind of a message that I think every American should give. You exemplars of the democratic way of life, and you should send forth to a world torn apart by strife and turmoil the message of the kind of happiness and hope and good will and peace that the great men and women over the one-hundred-and-seventy odd years of this country's existence intended this Government to be. And you should remember that these attributes are founded not upon the words of men but upon the power and the influence of the great Master of Men and the prophecies that have come down through the centuries.

You are surely having a rendezvous with destiny; and let your beacon lights, and, I mean by that, let your conduct, let your loyalty to your institutions in this country be such as will make this country a better country to live in. Let us have during this whole month a devotion as citizens to a word which is the loveliest of all words—to a word which spells sacrifice, cooperation, and yes, martyrdom to the causes which mean so much to the civilization of tomorrow. If this country is going to be saved, and it will be saved by the grace of God, it will be done through the influence and example of the lovable, saintly mother of God or by the inspiration that men and women get kneeling at the golden footstool of the mother who has long since died but who still lives as an example and as a milestone by which men and women can expect this country to be an abode of peace where men are to live and let live.

That is my message to you, ladies and gentlemen, this morning; and I hope that Heaven will shower upon all of you its choicest blessings, and I hope you will pray every day that you will retain the inspiration to be fine American citizens—to be loyal American citizens—to be able to subscribe to these guiding principles that mean so much for the civilization of the tomorrow. This is the perfect picture of the development and growth of the natural law. That is God's method, that is the American method. and it is not the communistic method.

Curtailment of Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Reducing Mail Service," from the Daily Press, of Atlantic City, N. J.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REDUCING MAIL SERVICE

Ever since the announcement was made that Postmaster General Jesse M. Donaldson had ordered drastic curtailment in mail delivery service we have been waiting for a statement that the order had been rescinded.

It had the appearance of an attention-calling move on the political checkerboard in Washington, to be followed by other moves in Congress that would bring a happy ending to the argument.

Now that the effective date, May 1, is almost here and the order seems to be sticking, we are disappointed and a little sore.

The idea seems nonsensical. In addition to throwing many men out of work, it will be a distinct inconvenience to many business people, not to mention the individual.

It seems like saving money the hard way, in a manner that will bring pain to a great many people.

If Uncle Sam was really up against it, there might be some merit to the plan, but he shows no evidence of being thrifty when it comes to buying potatoes that are later destroyed, or eggs that are gotten rid of eventually at a great loss.

The letter carrier has always epitomized the hard-working, diligent, and faithful employee, the Government worker we most often see. Unless somebody in Washington can come up with a very convincing argument to the contrary, we will string along with the mailman in believing it is a dirty deal.

Detour Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 8, 1950

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, the defense program of the United States, together with the internal life of our people, is so completely dominated by steel and steel products that I feel we can well afford to pay some attention to the observations made by the president of the United States Steel Corp. only a few weeks ago. Therefore, I submit for the RECORD, and without further comment, a portion of his remarks before the Baltimore Association of Commerce, Baltimore, Md., April 21, 1950:

DETOUR AHEAD

(By Benjamin F. Fairless)

Gentlemen, I am about to deliver a critical speech, and at the outset I want to make it clear that I am neither attacking nor defending either political party as such. Neither am I attacking nor defending any individual or individuals of either political party. I am, however, attacking anyone who, in my opinion, is attempting to destroy the free competitive American industrial system which has made our country the greatest on earth. I offer this statement for clarification purposes only and it is not in any way to be construed as an apology for what I am about to say.

This visit to the Free State of Maryland is a pleasure which I have been promising myself for a long time. In fact, I had planned to be with you months ago, but unfortunately I hit a detour and wound up in a notorious suburb of yours, over near Bladensburg—a placed called Washington, I believe.

I guess that's what always happens to people these days when they start heading for a free State. Some traffic cop shunts them off on a rough and bumpy road they did not want to travel, and they end up at an unhappy destination they never wanted to reach at all.

It is about detours that I want to talk to you today—and about Washington. I had expected, of course to talk about the steel business, and some day I hope to get back to Pittsburgh long enough to find out what's happened to it. But during the past few months, I have been specializing in our National Capital, and our National Capital has certainly been specializing in me. Up to now, as you know, I've spent most of my time in O'MAHONEY's dog house; but next week I move to EMANUEL's cellar.

So it is a pleasant relief indeed to escape for a few hours and to enjoy your hospitality here in Baltimore.

I have already spent a most interesting morning. Mr. Charles E. McManus took me over to the Crown Cork & Seal Co. to see the fine new cold-reducing mill they have installed there. To me there is something really beautiful about machines like that. They have majesty, dignity, and grace of motion; and I never cease to be fascinated by the miracles they perform.

The magician who first produced a live rabbit from a silk hat had a great deal of ingenuity and skill, and people of every age still marvel at the trick; but to me it is not nearly as mystifying or as breath-taking as the process by which modern American industry produces even such seemingly simple things as bottle caps.

My visit to this plant today, however, was not merely a pleasure, it was definitely a matter of business as well—not that I am thinking of going into the bottle-closing business; and not that Crown is a customer of ours, either. They are not. They buy their steel from one of our rivals. I hate to say that, because I know what a shock it will be to some of our Washington critics who insist that there is no competition in the steel industry. Apparently they never heard of Bethlehem—or a couple of hundred other competitors of ours who are doing very nicely, thank you. You know, sometimes I wish these critics could join our sales force for a few weeks and try to sell a little steel. I think they would find out for themselves what competition really is.

When I say that my visit was a matter of business, I mean that I think it is part of my job—and the biggest part of my job, perhaps—to know how American industry produces and engineers the millions of intricate things that it turns out—to study the ingenious processes that it has devised and to see how it meets and solves the hundreds of operating problems that it has to face.

I do not believe that any man who has not seen these things for himself can hope to understand our American industrial machine. I do not see how he can hope to discuss our American enterprise system intelligently, factually, or even honestly.

If you happen to detect a note of feeling in my voice as I say that, it is because of my recent experiences in Washington. From the time it was organized 50 years ago, United States Steel has been subjected to almost constant investigation by various agencies of the Government and for the past 10 years and more, I myself, have been on the business end of most of these investigations. Gentlemen, I have been through so many congressional inquisitions that no self-respecting skeleton would hide in my closet on a bet.

So far this year, Senator O'MAHONEY has already had me on the griddle once, and Congressman CELLER starts dissecting me next week. After that, O'MAHONEY wants me back again, it seems; and Representative MACY is proposing that I become the permanent victim of a continuing investigation. I shall never know why.

What with the TNEC report, the voluminous records which we file regularly with various Government agencies, the frequent congressional inquiries we have faced, the proceedings before the Federal Trade Com-

mission, and the evidence we have presented in numerous court actions, I don't suppose there is a single statistic about United States Steel which could possibly be of any real interest or significance to anyone, that is not already a matter of public record. And yet to this day, most of our inquisitors remain blissfully ignorant of the most important fact of all—how steel is made.

Among all the members of all the public bodies we have faced in the past dozen years, I don't suppose that more than two or three, at the outside, have even been inside a steel plant, or have ever seen for themselves what a gigantic operation steel making is. Yet, until he has seen these things for himself, I do not believe that anyone has any right to tell anybody how big a steel company should be; for any views he may hold on the subject can hardly be regarded as the reasoned opinion of a qualified and competent authority.

During the hearings next week, I intend to invite Mr. CELLER and the members of his committee to visit our steel plants. I hope most earnestly that they will accept that invitation; for, by doing so, I believe they could add richly to public knowledge and public understanding of this whole controversial issue of bigness.

I am aware, however, that such action by them would constitute a radical departure from established congressional practice as I have seen it. So far as I can discover from personal experience, congressional investigations of businessmen follow a standardized pattern that has been in vogue in America since the old days of the western frontier, when the established procedure was to shoot first and ask questions afterward.

Nowadays, the chairman sends you a letter inviting you to appear before his committee on a certain date. Then he starts issuing a barrage of statements to the newspapers telling the world what a dangerous and nefarious character you are. When you no longer have a friend left in the world the hearing begins, and the chairman starts out by reading a statement in which he finds you guilty and pronounces sentence upon you. Then he announces that the committee will proceed to a full and impartial investigation of the facts, which seems to be a great waste of everybody's time, because when the evidence has been fully presented the chairman ignores it completely, writes a report setting forth all of his preconceived notions, and quotes at length from his opening statement to prove he was right all the time.

Throughout the proceedings, of course, there is a great deal of talk about the public interest, but I cannot help wondering what public interest a committee is serving when it conceals, distorts, and openly misstates the facts—the basic, all-important facts—which the American people must have if they are to plan their economic future intelligently and wisely.

Now, gentlemen, I am not an alarmist. I don't run around crying "wolf." I never see bogeys under the bed—and seldom see them on a golf course these days. But I am gravely and sincerely disturbed by what I have seen in Washington.

In my opinion, our American economic system is in deadlier peril today than it has ever been in my lifetime. I say that knowing that it has always defended itself successfully against its enemies abroad, but I honestly do not know how it can be protected against its self-styled friends in Washington who would literally hack it to death on the pretext of saving its immortal soul. I am convinced that if these misguided planners and politically ambitious officeholders have their way, three of our most precious liberties—freedom of opportunity, freedom of initiative, and freedom of enterprise—will vanish from this earth.

I have always had great faith in the plain, cracker-barrel common sense of the American people, and so long as they are permitted to know the facts, I have no fear that they will ever allow their economic system to be engulfed by foreign isms and ideologies.

I do not fear communism because every passing day proves its utter failure. The American people know that if communism were really working successfully there would be no need for police-state oppression, phony trials, and slave-labor camps behind the iron curtain.

I do not fear fascism because it has killed the three great nations which adopted it. The American people want no part of any economic system that feeds only upon war and conquest.

I do not fear outright socialism because, in Europe today, socialism itself is living on the dole, and America is the only country on earth that is able to foot the bill for it. No American taxpayer is likely to fall for that kind of an economic system, at least until he has found some other nation that is rich enough and generous enough to indulge him in his folly.

But when somebody in Washington starts telling me how much he loves the free-enterprise system and how he proposes to save it from itself, I shake in my very shoes. I wonder why it is that these self-appointed saviors of our national welfare always seem to miss the point—the one magnificent lesson that should be apparent to anyone who looks about for him at the world today.

The point is, gentlemen, that our American system of free competitive enterprise is the only one left in the world that is not controlled by power-hungry politicians; and whether you call it the Square Deal, the Fair Deal, the New Deal, or just plain Federal regulation, the fact remains that once the dead hand of politics gets its convulsive grip on American business and industry, free competition will be strangled and our economic system will be no different—and no more successful—than those noble experiments which are crumbling into dust in Europe.

Of one thing I am convinced—the American people will never knowingly travel that foreign road to economic disaster. They have built the most magnificent industrial machine this world has ever seen, and they are certainly not going to wreck it that way as long as the road itself is clearly marked by signposts which honestly reveal its destination.

But in Washington today there are theorists and bureaucrats and economists and Congressmen who are switching the signs. They are trying to take down all the honest guideposts and put up others reading "Detour—To Utopia."

To my way of thinking, gentlemen, that is nothing less than economic murder; and it is hard for me to believe that all of these signpost jugglers are so innocent and so credulous that they can sincerely suppose they are pointing the way to salvation.

We are all riding in the same machine, and we are all going to end up in the same place, whether we like it or not. So I think it might be wise indeed to examine the signposts closely. Now it seems to me that the most dangerous deception which has been practiced upon us is the fallacy that our whole economy can be divided into two parts, labeled "big" and "little" business. This deception has been used so long and has become so familiar to us that we have begun to accept it, unthinkingly and without question.

Because some statistician has arbitrarily drawn an entirely imaginary line between companies employing more or less than 500 persons, we argue about big business and little business as though they were two hostile armies warring against each other. And so we fall into the trap that Washington has set for us, by creating class distinction in the industrial world.

How silly that concept is, if we stop to analyze it. There are 4,000,000 individual business units in this country and they are all part and parcel of one great industrial machine. They are very much like the parts of that cold reducing mill I was watching this morning. Some of them were big and some of them were little. There were tiny electrical contacts and huge steel rolls that weighed several tons each. Some parts ran at high speed, while others ran slower; but all of them were intricately fitted together, and each had a particular job to do. So this mechanical giant went grinding along, rolling the hard, tough steel into strips, as smoothly and as easily as grandmother used to roll pie crust.

But of what use would that machine be to anybody if our Washington theorists once went to work on it? Our economists would cut it up into half-a-dozen pieces because it is so big. Our statisticians would sort out all the parts into neat piles according to size. Some Members of Congress would pass a law decreeing that all the parts must be the same size, or that all must run at exactly the same speed. And in the end, there would be no machine at all. All the parts—the big parts and the little parts—would be junk.

Curtailment of Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Making Economy Felt," from the Herald-Journal, of Syracuse, N. Y., of April 20, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAKING ECONOMY FELT

It was certainly with no feeling of pleasure that the public read of the planned curtailment in mail delivery. No part of Government service touches so intimately the lives of the great mass of the population. The people follow with a deeply personal interest the various moves made from time to time to facilitate the handling of mail and have felt that each step toward efficiency has been a contribution toward making life more worth the living.

It was to be expected that the sweeping order issued would be regarded in some quarters as a move to bring pressure on Congress for higher rates. The fact that the rate bill is still pending in Congress lends color to that theory.

However, the defenders of the change can retort that the way to economize is to economize, and that, to use an ancient metaphor, they cannot make bricks without straw—the straw in this case not being hay, but some millions of dollars.

The public has always regarded a deficit in the Post Office Department more tolerantly than one anywhere else, because that Department serves everyone and everybody shares in its benefits.

Curtailment of Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Familiar Pattern" from the St. Joseph News-Press of St. Joseph, Mo., of April 19, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A FAMILIAR PATTERN

Postmaster General Jesse M. Donaldson has ordered one mail-delivery service daily in residential sections. In issuing this ultimatum the gentleman is following a pattern familiar in bureaucratic politics. Every agency seeking to focus attention upon its retrenchment due to limited operational funds invariably strikes at the point most noticeable to the public. Donaldson is taking his move of economy into the home of each taxpayer by whacking off one delivery of mail.

The Veterans' Administration invariably follows this procedure when it slashes for economy's sake. It will close the office of some consultant in the field upon whom its members rely for advice rather than reducing the army of personnel who catalog and file the tons of triplicate forms that pour into its headquarters.

It is not the single delivery of mail that perplexes us on the Postmaster General's directive. After all, country folks have gotten along just fine on one delivery a day for years. We think that the city people will bear up just as nobly. Our bewilderment arises over the predicament of the postal carrier. By making one round daily his time is less. Does this mean that his pay diminishes and thereby saves in operational expenses? If the pay isn't less, then wherein lurks the saving?

The burden of the postal carrier is doubled because the bulk of the mail will remain the same, although it will be carried over the route but once a day. Certainly Jesse Donaldson should be familiar with the weight of the postman's satchel because he started his career 42 years ago as a letter carrier in Shelbyville, Ill. We fail to see how adding to the carrier's burden lessens the postal cost.

For a Job Well Done

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 9, 1950

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, today, without faith to guide and encourage us, one may lose sight of human values. In a world where the dignity of man is challenged by godless forces it is basic that we do not lose faith in man, in our country, and in God. We can bolster our faith by keeping strong the spiritual ties which bind us to God. By our daily actions, our deeds and our thoughts, our simple prayers, each in our own way, each according to our own religious teachings, respecting man's dignity, respecting another's faith, and religion, we give meaning to democracy.

The Newark Evening News, published in my district, has been cited for its outstanding service in the field of religious activities. I congratulate the News and its religious news editor, Miss Vance.

It is a distinct privilege to have been given leave through unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the following editorial which appeared in the Sunday, May 7, 1950, issue of that paper:

RELIGIOUS NEWS

The Newark News takes pride in the fact that it is one of three newspapers to receive an award of merit from the National Religious Publicity Council. The other recipients are the New York Times and the Providence Journal. Miss Margaret A. Vance, religious news editor, whose work in this field is notable, accepted the award on behalf of the News.

In the terms of the award, the News is commended "in recognition of outstanding service rendered to organized religion through the pursuit of impartial journalism, and as a testimonial to its continued efforts in behalf of all faiths to advance the spiritual life of the Nation."

That is a citation which the News will continue to strive to deserve. The News was the first metropolitan paper in the East to have a church page. Through the years it has published religious news, both on the church page and on the general news pages, as an important part of the chronicle of our times. It has been both a privilege and an obligation to do so.

Religious news is now, more than ever, of wide interest and significance, for the spiritual life of man, in a deteriorating world, shines with values that are true and permanent.

Curtailment of Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Bidding for Trouble," from the Shawnee News-Star, of Shawnee, Okla.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIDDING FOR TROUBLE

It's an old trick that Postmaster General Jesse M. Donaldson is using.

Congress has denied increased postal rates. It has refused increased appropriations for the postal department. Therefore, Donaldson figures he'll let the public lobby for him.

By cutting mail service drastically—more drastically than necessary—Donaldson apparently believes the chorus of squawks from an indignant citizenry will bring the lawmakers to terms.

No doubt the complaints will achieve Donaldson's purpose in part, at least. Economy that cripples an essential function of Government will not take well with the people. However, Congress cannot relish being put on the political spot in such fashion, hundreds of thousands of postal workers cannot enjoy the bombshell which threatens their jobs, the public will not think too kindly of an administrator who creates an upheaval to win his way. So, although Donaldson may get some part of the appropriations asked, he'll also acquire a stigma that will make him a political undesirable.

There have been other high-handed Postmasters General in the history of the mail service. But Donaldson is making a real bid for the reputation of most unpopular.

Curtailment of Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Making Economy Unpopular," published in the Bridgeport Evening Post.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAKING ECONOMY UNPOPULAR

One way to make economy unpopular as a national policy is to apply it most drastically in the department where it will do the most harm, hurt the most people, and produce the most resentment. That is the method chosen by the Truman administration in proposing drastic cuts in our postal service.

The cuts in the postal service would result in the laying off of thousands of trained postal workers. Naturally, that is hard on them. The accompanying reduction in service would annoy every citizen of the United States and in some cases might seriously injure businesses which depend on the prompt delivery of mail.

There is no excuse for this sort of thing. The postal service today is good, but any change should be for the better, not for the worse. There is still room for improvement in the speed and frequency of mail delivery. Mr. Truman proposes to move in just the opposite direction.

Notice that the favorite, politically managed alphabetical Fair Deal agencies are not to be cut. We are to continue to pour money down the sewer, but we are to cut an essential Government service—one of the services about which there is no controversy. We are to continue to pamper those services of an experimental nature whose value is accompanied by a big question mark, and to hurt the one service that everybody uses, everybody needs, and everybody wants to see improved.

We predict that the proposed cut will not go through. Or that if it does go through Congress will quickly recall it. But in the meantime, the avid money spenders in Washington will have accomplished part of their purpose—to throw a cloud of disfavor over the whole question of economy.

Mr. Hoover's Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 9, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Minneapolis Morning Tribune of April 29, 1950:

MR. HOOVER'S PROPOSAL

If the United Nations is to be reorganized without the Communist nations, as proposal by former President Herbert Hoover, it will be up to the United States to do the job.

Would the United States have much help in thus reorganizing the UN? Would such a move seriously injure the Soviet power? Would it materially enhance the peace, security, and freedom of the United States and other non-Soviet nations?

Despite our great respect for Mr. Hoover's experience and wisdom in world affairs, we are not persuaded that adoption of his proposal at this time would produce affirmative answers to those vital questions.

It is quite possible that an attempt of this sort would increase rather than decrease the isolation of the American people in the cold war about which Mr. Hoover rightly showed deep concern in his speech Thursday night.

A demand on our part that nations join us in formally excluding Russia and its satellites from the UN might play into Russia's hands more than strengthen our hand in the cold war. It would certainly help Russia increase its domination over Communist China. There is much reason to believe that the last thing Russia wishes is admission of Communist China to the UN despite its pretensions to the contrary.

It is easier for the Kremlin to dominate a Chinese government which has no ties with the non-Soviet world than one which deals on a position of nominal equality with other sovereign states in a world organization or in the customary diplomatic relations.

Soviet behavior in other areas is comprehensible only as part of a policy of widening the cleavage between people under Communist domination and the rest of the world. While Communist spokesmen use the UN for propandaga purposes, the Kremlin currently appears to be more eager to shield its subjects from democratic influences than participate in the UN for antidemocratic propaganda purposes.

A disconcertingly large number of people in non-Soviet countries are not sufficiently persuaded of our worth as an ally or are too afraid of incurring Communist wrath to be willing to join us in such a UN reorganization at the present time. Our insistence on being counted for or against us would not win over such fence-sitters.

Considerations of this sort and first-hand experience in the UN have persuaded a fellow Republican, John Foster Dulles, to take a different view than that of Mr. Hoover. In his newly published book, War or Peace, Dulles says, "I have now come to believe that the UN will best serve the cause of peace if its assembly is representative of what the world actually is, and not merely representative of the parts we like. Therefore, we ought to be willing that all the nations should be members without attempting to appraise closely those which are 'good' and those which are 'bad.'"

Such a UN is much less than is required to preserve peace with freedom and justice. It must be supplemented by coperation between those countries which are determined to preserve their freedom at any cost. To the extent that such cooperation between the United States and other like-minded nations can be maintained within the UN, it should be so done. But if the UN does not permit such necessary cooperation it should be organized outside UN. Survival in freedom and security is the paramount consideration. The UN in its present form is not the be-all of our collective security. But it should not be necessary to risk destroying the UN by purging it of Communists in order to aline with us those who are willing to go as far as we are willing to go in defense of freedom with security. The Atlantic and Rio Pacts show the possibilities in this direction.

Curtailment of Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "Asking for Trouble," from the Durham Sun, of Durham, N. C., for April 21, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ASKING FOR TROUBLE

The Postmaster General's current scare campaign, directed against the House Appropriations Committee, may or may not frighten the Congressmen; but it is apt to get the Postmaster General and the administration in some hot water.

First reaction of many Americans is that Mr. Donaldson's virtual sabotage of mail service is not a sincere move. They doubt he intends to carry it out. It is a tactic designed to force more money out of Congress, hence out of the people. That such is the case seems corroborated by a concerted leaping of all postal employees to the firing line. Someone has inspired them.

Actually, Postmaster General Donaldson had better not carry out his projected program. What the country needs and expects is more mail service, not less; and on a more economical basis.

Curtailment of Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Postal Penny Pinching," published in the Boston Traveler of April 20, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POSTAL PENNY PINCHING

We feel like screaming: How can people be so stupid?

Costs have been rising in the Post Office Department as they have everywhere else. So what? That's no reason to rush off the deep end.

Here we have a fiscal problem which should be solved through fiscal means. Either the rates must be raised as the Postmaster General proposed, or some form of subsidy must be provided. The third absolutely unbelievable alternative—but the one chosen by the Postmaster—is to smash the postal service to smithereens.

Over the years the civilized world has come to take postal service for granted. No one remembers that the daily mail is the backbone of any communications system without which no nation could possibly survive. Not that the United States has ever been famous for really good postal service anyway. Several European capitals, notably London, far outshine us in that field. But suddenly, we who pride ourselves on our modernity have reverted to colonial customs. Cutting back mail service is like wiring a skyscraper with the latest devices and then saying you can't afford the bulbs. Demented.

If the slash sticks, all mail, including first class, will most likely be delayed 24 hours. What this will mean to business, to Government, to ordinary human relations is incalculable.

This type of administrative mismanagement confirms the worst fears of the "agins." We cannot allocate the blame for this mess with any accuracy. Both Congress and the Post Office Department appear culpable—with Congress well in the lead. But if government—meaning the combined legislative and executive—can't even manage the Post Office Department decently, why on earth should anybody believe it could manage anything like a general health insurance program? Let the Democrats who voted against postal rate rises or subsidies think that over.

The Republicans are always harping on efficiency. This curtailment can't help but slow the whole tempo of American economic life. Where were they on voting day?

The hue and cry has started locally already. We hope it mounts to a deafening crescendo. The cutback must be rescinded before it has time to do real harm.

The Post Office is easy, gentlemen. How could you have muffed it so colossally?

Voice of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 9, 1950

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from the Honorable Edward W. Barrett, Assistant Secretary of State:

APRIL 10, 1950.

The Honorable EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MRS. ROGERS: I am very favorably impressed and am interested in pursuing your suggestion for a domestic Voice of America hour as reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for February 23 and March 2, 1950. I

have discussed your idea with various officials of the Department, all of whom feel that it has considerable merit.

The Department's role in such a project would be limited to one of cooperation only, due to legislative restrictions on the use of funds allocated to the International Broadcasting Division. The initiative and responsibility for such a program would have to come from private radio networks.

Any domestic network interested in presenting a documentary program on international broadcasts could obtain, from the Foreign Broadcast Information Service, reports of what official foreign radio broadcasts are saying about the United States and also obtain from the Department what the United States is broadcasting to foreign countries. You will be interested to learn that the American Broadcasting Co. already has communicated with the Department's International Broadcasting Division with a view to producing a program on the Voice of America.

Basic Voice of America scripts are available to Members of Congress and the press at all times. English versions of foreign language scripts, translated on a rotating basis, are available for inspection at the Library of Congress.

I thought you would like to know that your suggestion has received much consideration and that there is a strong likelihood that it will develop into a program on some domestic network. Your interest in the Department's international information services is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD W. BARRETT,
Assistant Secretary.

The False Charge of Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THURMAN C. CROOK
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 9, 1950

Mr. CROOK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following press release entitled "The False Charge of Socialism":

THE FALSE CHARGE OF SOCIALISM

Not the Democrats; not the rank and file of the Republicans, but the leaders of the Republican Party, in their greed for political power and monopolistic control, are instrumental in spreading spurious propaganda, false accusations, and deception over our great Nation today with harbored hopes that they can cause the masses of our people to contract a severe case of jitters.

The Republican leaders and many of their big-business allies are devoting inestimable energy to wolf cries of "socialism" given inception by the Democratic Party. Nothing could be farther from the truth. Under socialism the government owns businesses and there are no large profits and no huge bonuses. In a private enterprise there can be profits and bonuses. In recent years, under Democratic regime, the program of the Federal Government has produced a climate under which our private economy can thrive, profit, and bonuses can be sizable, if you please.

The private enterprise system is doing far better under the present Democratic administration than ever before in our history. If you don't think so, take a look at the following extracts from the records of 1949 and early 1950:

1. Chrysler paid $2,581,000 bonuses to 229 top executives.

2. General Motors bonuses of $7,500,000 went to 61 executives in 1949.

3. DuPont officials receive $2,696,680.

4. New York (Associated Press): "United States Steel hiked dividends on its common stock from 50 cents to 65 cents. Profit for 1949 was set at $5.39 per share."

5. New York (Capital Times): "General Motors Corp. earned more profits last year—over $600,000,000—than any other company ever made in a similar period." Report by Albert P. Sloan, Jr., chairman of the board.

6. Special to the Christian Science Monitor, Washington: "United States dividend payments set record in 1949. United States corporations paid out the biggest total cash dividends in history—$6,495,800,000. This was 7 percent above 1948."

7. New York (Associated Press): "Bethlehem Co. had a net record of $99,200,000—equals $9.68 a share in 1949."

8. Milwaukee Journal: "The Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Co. passed the new high of six billion at end of 1949. Reference had to President Fitzgerald's report."

9. The Wall Street Journal, whose editors fly into a rage every time the words "welfare state" are mentioned, reports: "The Nation's electric utilities will report total earnings for 1949 in the neighborhood of $778,000,000, the largest single year's profits in the industry's history."

10. Detroit, Mich. (Associated Press): "The Nation's automobile industry built 6,238,088 motor vehicles in 1949. The Automobile Manufacturers' Association said the volume topped the industry's two best previous years—1929 by 16 percent, and 1948 by 18 percent."

11. New York (United Press): "Stocks climb to new highs in brisk trade February 4, 1950. Industrial shares advanced for the eighth consecutive day on the stock market Friday."

12. New York (Associated Press): "General Motors nets record $212,287,765 during first quarter of 1950."

If space permitted, I could exhibit an endless chain of evidence further proving the present governmental program is not sapping the lifeblood of free enterprise as many would gladly make you believe. No free enterprise can long exist under any name if we neglect the general welfare of the masses of our people, which is the source of our buying power so necessary to consume the products from our farms and industry. That was adequately proven during the deplorable depression.

If anything the strong and liberal arm of Government has been too nice in helping big enterprise to be prosperous and it is high time that we give like assistance to small business and small industries to prevent the big enterprises from exploiting and liquidating the smaller ones. There is nothing wrong with the bigness of industries and businesses but, unless they be kept under reasonable restraint, they can do irreparable damage to the free-enterprise system. The natural-gas bill, which the President vetoed, predicated an attempt by the big gas and oil companies to escape restraint at the expense of the American consumer.

Curtailment of Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Who's Lobbying Now?" from the Times-Herald of Washington, D. C.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHO'S LOBBYING NOW?

Postmaster General Donaldson's announcement that he is cutting the residential mail deliveries to one a day as an economy move is the most feeble coverup attempted by the administration for many a day.

It is estimated that the only savings will be the salaries of 10,000 postal employees who will lose their jobs. Most of these are substitutes. This is a peanut operation compared with the $140,000,000 annual savings that could be accomplished if the Hoover Commission's recommendation for reorganizing the Department were carried out.

WHAT'S THE IDEA?

Thus, suspicion that the move is a thinly veiled attempt to force Congress to agree to Donaldson's demand for a $600,000,000 a year increase in postal rates is well founded. The House has cut this request to $100,000,000 and the Postmaster General has ordered the delivery reduction in advance of the Senate action.

Can it be that Donaldson figures the home owners and housewives will complain so loudly over the reduced service that he'll get the increases he wants? Or is he attempting to convince the American public that government economy is just a pinchpenny aggravating scheme that's not worth trying?

If he had any such ideas he certainly hasn't fooled some Members of Congress. Hardly had the order been announced when Senator WILEY, Republican, of Wisconsin, said:

"I urge my colleagues in the Senate and House of Representatives to take immediate action and request a withdrawal of the outrageous order just issued by the Postmaster General curtailing mail deliveries to residential sections and making other changes in postal rules.

"I believe that there is a deep suspicion among the American people that this drastic Postmaster General edict has been timed with Congress' review of the 1951 fiscal year budget—as a means of putting pressure on the Congress."

TAXPAYERS ARE TIRED

"Fifty million tired taxpayers have been hit in the mail box by this ruling, and I, for one think it is disgusting because, from reports which I have received from my people, there is need for more mail service, rather than less mail service."

On the House side Representative SADLAK, Republican, of Connecticut, also blasted the Donaldson order.

"The Post Office Department's curtailment of service is a slick maneuver that is intended to deceive the public into thinking that the Truman administration wants to save money," SADLAK said.

"Time after time, congressional committees and outside engineering experts have recommended modernizing the Department's operations and have shown exactly how to do it while protecting the legitimate interests of the postal employees and the public. Instead of putting these reforms into effect, Mr. Donaldson is now busily engaged in covering up his own failures."

Now that Donaldson's petty political plan has been exposed in the House and Senate, the way is open for Congress to achieve some real economy in the Post Office Department by carrying out the recommendations of the Hoover Commission.

WIPE OUT POLITICS

Legislation now pending would take politics out of the Department's administration by wiping out appointment of the 22,000 postmasters on a patronage basis. They

would be selected under civil-service rules. Another bill provides for new budgeting, accounting, and auditing systems. It is estimated that these reforms would result in cutting the annual $500,000,000 post office deficit in half, which is certainly a more sensible way to approach the problem than Donaldson's picayune proposal.

Address of Gov. John S. Battle, of Virginia, at Dedication of Patrick Henry School, Martinsville, Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. STANLEY
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 9, 1950

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. John S. Battle, Governor of Virginia:

I wish to express my appreciation to the citizens of Martinsville for the invitation to participate in these ceremonies tonight dedicating Patrick Henry School.

It can be stated without qualification that this is one of the finest and most complete school buildings in Virginia. Of equal interest to us citizens and taxpayers is the fact that it is one of the most reasonably priced products we have obtained in the school-building field in recent years. For a total cost of $427,000 this community has obtained a building accommodating 660 pupils, containing 22 primary and elementary classrooms, an auditorium seating 600, a library, cafeteria, and all other modern facilities needed for the comfort and proper training of young school pupils.

I congratulate Martinsville on this splendid addition to its educational plant. I know the parents, as well as the pupils enrolled here, are immensely proud of this building and I think I can say on behalf of friends of education throughout the Commonwealth that they also are pleased to know that you are enjoying the benefits of this structure.

You will recall the action of the recent general assembly by which $45,000,000 was appropriated to assist in school building construction in Virginia. This enactment, which I heartily recommended, was in recognition of the urgent need for enlarged and improved school buildings in many sections of the State. Many localities, such as Martinsville, already have undertaken major projects for the relief of crowded schoolrooms. Many others have been unable to meet their needs from their own resources and the funds appropriated by the general assembly will help bring into being equal educational opportunity for school pupils throughout Virginia.

We all recognize that school buildings alone do not make an education, but certainly they constitute an essential factor in providing an adequate educational program for our children. With adequate buildings and able, conscientious teaching staffs, Virginia will move forward with apologies to none for the type of training it affords the boys and girls who are to take their places as responsible citizens in the future.

I am glad to report that necessary regulations governing the distribution of the $30,000,000 available for school buildings prior to July 1, 1951 have now been drafted and approved, and the machinery has been set in motion to permit early grants to the various localities which will be in need of this aid. As I have stated on numerous occasions heretofore, the appropriation of this State fund should encourage the localities to exert their best effort to provide sufficient classroom and related facilities to overcome the shortages accruing from the war and postwar periods. I sincerely trust and believe that the localities will do their part to bring about a lasting solution of this problem.

The executive and legislative departments, in recommending and adopting this program, have not sought to invade the field of local responsibility and local control. They have acted to meet a specific emergency and have clearly defined the nature of the emergency in order that the localities and public generally may fully understand that this in no sense constitutes a permanent policy adopted on the part of the State to take over school-building construction, which always in Virginia has been regarded as primarily a local responsibility.

The general assembly, at the session of 1950, adopted as one of its primary goals a public school system second to none in the fundamentals of sound education. It took many steps to strengthen and improve our program of public education. In addition to the $45,000,000 in grants for school buildings, it provided for transfer of $11,000,000 from the sinking fund to the State literary fund in order to make this additional amount available for loans to the localities for school construction. This, incidentally, in no wise affected the status of Virginia as a debt-free State, which in effect it is. Prior to the new legislation, Virginia had sinking fund investments sufficient to pay off the State bonds when they mature. Under the recent change by the general assembly, the net effect is to allow this money to work for our public schools, pending the arrival of the time when these bonds, which are not now callable, mature and can be paid off.

It is perhaps repetitious to recite the various other enactments by the recent general assembly pertaining to the public schools, but I find in my visits about the State that many people are unaware of the tremendous increases voted for the operation of the school system and what this means to the educational program. The general assembly appropriated approximately $78,000,000 for the next 2 years to the operation of our public school system, primarily teachers' salaries and teacher retirement benefits. This is an increase of about $13,000,000 over the current 2 years and is the largest increase approved by any previous session of the legislature. The $78,000,000 is of course in addition to the $45,000,000 appropriated for school buildings.

The expansion of the State school fund will mean a minimum salary for properly certified teachers of approximately $2,000 a year. We need look back to the salaries of only a few years ago to see what this means to the teaching personnel. Retirement allowances also have been substantially increased, and the program of teacher scholarships has been enlarged for the benefit of those who wish to enter the teaching profession, and those teachers who are endeavoring to complete their degree work.

The general assembly also has given attention to the program of instruction in order that no effort be spared to advance the cause of public education in Virginia.

With the support of the citizens of Virginia, which means the people of each locality and their governing boards, Virginia faces an era of unprecedented progress in public education. It often has been said that the teachers are the key to any sound school program. I am in wholehearted accord with this view. I realize that neither buildings nor salaries accomplish in themselves the fundamental goal of developing young people who are prepared, upon reaching maturity, to accept the responsibility of citizenship and discharge their obligations in a manner which will redound to the benefit of their communities, their State, and their country.

This can be achieved only with the combined cooperation of teachers who are imbued with the desire to make a tangible and worth while contribution to society, parents who are eager and ready to fulfill their obligations in the home; and public officials and citizens generally who are interested in seeing their governmental services operate for the common good. I regard our teachers in Virginia as unexcelled. I am confident that they recognize and appreciate the effort which has been made by the Commonwealth and the localities to make their profession more attractive financially and to relieve, insofar as practicable within our budgetary resources, the concern that they naturally have regarding the time when they arrive at the termination of their active teaching careers. It is significant that the general assembly has appropriated well over half of all the money in its general fund—the money available for the general operations of the State government—to our public schools. This is indicative of the emphasis which your chosen representatives have placed upon education, despite the heavy demands of many other essential State services.

Because of these great demands on all echelons of government for expanded services and new services, it is imperative that we administer with the utmost care the various activities which are the responsibility of the State and the localities. I am proud of the fact that Virginia has operated on the balanced-budget principle and is not confronted with the very grave problem of deficit financing which is current elsewhere. Sound financial operations, in my judgment, are prerequisites of good government, and I can assure the people of Virginia that it will be my purpose during the 4 years I exercise the prerogatives of governor to conscientiously abide by that principle. Our success as a State government in meeting the essential needs and in holding down expenditures will depend in a large measure upon the support of the taxpayers. We have not yet come to the point where government can operate for any length of time contrary to the wishes of those from whom it derives its authority, and maintain itself as an instrument of the people for the proper administration of their affairs. In other words, the policies of government reflect the attitude and wishes of our citizenship. It is incumbent upon each of us, therefore, to register our desire for the continuation of sound government, if we are in sympathy with the idea of efficient public service and only those expenditures which are designed to meet necessary functions.

It is interesting to note, as I have noted during some 20 years in the General Assembly of Virginia, the great demands made upon the public treasury for various projects and enterprises, without a voice being raised on the other side to question the necessity and propriety of our Government entering into such activities. Your representatives oftentimes are subjected to great pressure from reputable citizens for a particular appropriation, and are accorded no commendation or support if they opposed these measures in order to protect what they sincerely believe are the best interests of Virginia.

I cannot forego this opportunity to mention these truths because I am convinced that the people of Virginia, as a whole, are deeply interested in continuing good government and in maintaining the basic American concept of free enterprise.

It is indeed a great pleasure and privilege to participate in these exercises tonight in connection with the dedication of Patrick Henry School. I know this building will serve a useful purpose for many years to come and that many future leaders in the

affairs of this city and this State will here receive their elementary education.

This fine building is but another evidence of the great ground swell of sentiment throughout Virginia in the cause of education. Our people realize that now, as never before, our children must be thoroughly trained along sound educational lines; that in this complex and highly competitive life, sound education is necessary for economic survival; without it our children cannot attain that measure of success in life to which they are entitled. I venture to assert that, before many years have passed, buildings similar to this will be accessible to all the children in the Commonwealth and will develop the type of citizens who have made Virginia the proud State it is today and who have made America the citadel of freedom and the beacon of opportunity for people throughout the world.

This is our challenge—this our objective and our high privilege.

The Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 9, 1950

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following interesting commentary on the present agricultural program which might well be thoughtfully considered by Members of Congress:

APRIL 24, 1950.

The Honorable F. R. COUDERT,
United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I have been studying the Farm Act of 1949, relative to the increasing cost of the farm program and its effect upon prices and the consumer.

The general public imagines congressional committees for agriculture consider both farmer and consumer in a broad statesmanlike manner bearing in mind that the former benefited and the latter suffered from farm legislation during the last 10 years. Last summer they believed the committees were arranging to modify price supports in their favor.

It emerges, however, they and later the farm bloc, rushed through a dual-parity scheme, distorting the original concept of farm aid, and making other changes that have added to the program cost and to the consumer's and taxpayer's plight.

A farm program based upon deficit financing must be unsound. Therefore, I urge that as a start, the following be motivated without delay:

1. Insist upon withdrawal of the provision that United States Department of Agriculture may use whichever period makes parity higher, the original 5-year period of 1910–14, or the 10-year moving average, beginning with 1939–49. This was, I understand, imposed high-handedly against the judgment of some farm organizations and without the public having a chance to appreciate its significance.

The level of price supports provided in the 1949 act, as compared with actual farm prices during 1939–49 are actually above those average prices to this extent: Cotton ranging from 1 cent to 5 cents above the average price of cotton during those 10 wartime years, wheat from 15 cents to 45 cents above and corn up to 22 cents above.

2. Revise the basic method of calculating parity in the index numbers of prices received by farmers to make allowance for the increased production per acre on farms and make sure when made that it is shifted similarly into that for the moving 10-year average.

For example, the average yield of corn during the base period 1910–14 (which equals 100 in the calculation) was 28 bushels per acre; during the last five years 1945–49 it was 36. Wheat was 14.2 and 17 bushels per acre; oats 29.3 and 34, and the increase in cotton productivity was great. It can be seen, therefore, that in modern times the farmer has much more to sell from the same land; consequently the index today should be proportionately lower than when calculated from 1910–14 productivity.

3. Insist upon a fair, reasonable, and realistic revision of the components in things the farmer buys, monthly. The higher the index numbers the higher parity ratio; conversely the more the farmer has to sell in relation to his 1910–14 production, the lower parity ratio should be.

(a) Farmers hardly buy automobiles, trucks, tractors, building and fencing material on a monthly basis as the present calculation implies. More likely the large farm cooperatives (who are farming mainly for the subsidies provided by the Government) replace every 3 to 5 years and the small-scale units (where production according to United States Department of Agriculture is mainly for home use) probably not at all.

(b) Revise the present list of food and feed components to modify its effect reasonably. At present it includes, on a wide scale, byproducts of items included in the opposite index—prices received by farmers—such as food, flour, mill feeds, poultry feed, various animal feeds, and meals made from cottonseed, linseed, and soybeans. When this occurs freely the two indexes of prices received and prices paid, become dependent upon each other preventing flexible parity ratio. In recent years this ratio has barely moved from its high point.

CONCLUSION

The taxpayer feels every card has been stacked against him behind his back. I beg you to try to persuade the House Agriculture Committee to restudy the 1949 act objectively relative to its cost in a deficit budget. If it is impossible to have support prices lowered I suggest contesting energetically the composition of parity itself with the aim of revising as above.

The long-term problem of exporting surplus farm products is aggravated by such legislation as the 1949 Farm Act. During last season, exports of wheat were 500,000,000 bushels and 75 percent of that quantity was paid for with dollars furnished by the taxpayer.

Of total cotton exports of 4,750,000 bales, 60 percent was paid for with dollars furnished by the taxpayer. This season a larger percentage of the exports is being paid for by the taxpayer and the higher the support level the larger the amount involved in "giving away" exports. Where is the net gain?

In conclusion I draw your attention to current prices for both the 1950 and 1951 crops of cotton on the New York and New Orleans Exchanges. There the planter has the opportunity to sell at over 31 cents a pound whatever number of bales he estimates his land can produce this year and next, and without the necessity for support loans at the taxpayers cost. This is a great opportunity considering the average price during the 5 years 1935–39 was 8.37 cents a pound.

The object behind this letter is purely constructive, and I hope you will place its contents before any Congressman on the committee who will fight for the taxpayer, the consumer, and the economic integrity of America.

Respectfully yours.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 9, 1950

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the Ogdensburg Journal in opposition to the stand of the Rochester Times-Union urging deferment of the undertaking of the great St. Lawrence seaway and power project:

ROCHESTER PAPER ASKS SEAWAY DELAY AS ECONOMY MOVE

The Rochester Times-Union has long been a strong advocate of the St. Lawrence seaway and power development. This week it urged deferment of the undertaking for reasons of economy.

The Times-Union has been conducting a vigorous campaign for Government economy. The newspaper has decried the colossal cost of Government and the ever-increasing Federal deficits with their ominous possibilities. The Times-Union has received a vote of confidence from its readers in this campaign to cut down Government expenses, as many thousands have filled out coupons appearing in the newspaper asking for reduced expenses in Washington and mailed these in to their Congressmen and Senators.

The Times-Union apparently doesn't realize that the St. Lawrence project will pay its own way. If power is developed alone, as proposed by Governor Dewey, and the New York State Power Authority, the Province of Ontario and the Ontario Hydroelectric Commission, the cost would be in the neighborhood of $450,000,000. This entire cost would be financed from sale of the electricity, and it would not cost the taxpayers a penny.

If the dual navigation and power projects are developed as President Truman wants, the entire cost of the power part of the project will still be self-liquidating. The part charged to navigation would be paid for by toll charges on ships using the canals. Secretary of Commerce Sawyer told the House Public Works Committee this week "it is my opinion that the seaway will, within a very short time after its completion, handle a huge volume of traffic and the tolls from this traffic will be more than adequate to amortize the cost of the navigation facilities."

Staff members of the Department of Commerce and United States Army engineers have studied the question of Seaway traffic for many years. These studies indicate potential traffic for the seaway ranging from 57,000,000 to 84,000,000 tons. At the toll charges suggested, revenue derived from the traffic would range roughly from $37,000,000 to $49,000,000 a year.

Estimates of traffic developed by governmental and private agencies interested in the seaway indicate that it will be self-liquidating by a very large margin. In fact the seaway will be self-liquidating if a little more than a half of the traffic which the Government anticipates should actually materialize.

On the basis of present costs annual charges required to pay for maintenance expenses, pay interest at 2½ percent, and to amortize the investment in approximately 53 years, are in the neighborhood of $19,000,000. The Department of Commerce and Army engineers minimum estimate of toll revenue of some $36,000,000 a year is nearly twice the anticipated annual maintenance

and amortization expenses, and its maximum estimate is more than 2½ times the annual charges which must be met if the project is to be liquidated.

The tremendous demand for low-cost iron ore from the Great Lakes region and the availability of low-cost transportation of that ore to be shipped from Labrador and Venezuela on construction of the seaway will alone insure a volume of traffic which will nearly pay the costs of the project. With the inclusion of domestic American traffic, and Canadian import and export traffic, economists who have long studied the seaway objectively are convinced that toll revenues will probably reach $50,000,000 a year very quickly. Only $19,000,000 a year income from navigation tolls is necessary to liquidate the project.

The sums of $500,000,000 for power alone or $800,000,000 for the dual project are substantial sums we can all agree. In comparison with sums expended for other public purposes, however, they shrink to relatively modest proportions. As against $800,000,000 to complete the dual purpose project, we have been spending upwards of $4,000,000,000 a year for economic aid to other nations, and about $1,500,000,000 a year to support the prices of agricultural products.

In light of our continuing commitments on such a scale for the purposes of international rehabilitation and domestic economic support, the expenditure of $800,000,000 to render useful a magnificent natural resource, one whose utilization can well serve our national security, is modest indeed. Most important of all to those who very rightly ask for Government economy, the St. Lawrence seaway will pay its own way, be self-liquidating. It will give this country a great natural resource by opening the Great Lakes to the seas and in making available the greatest source of cheap hydroelectric power on the North American Continent. In our opinion it is false economy indeed to ask deferment of the St. Lawrence seaway. The seaway will more than pay for itself.

Curtailment of Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Postman Rings Once," from the Sherman Democrat, Sherman, Tex.; and also, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in that connection a letter to the editor of that newspaper.

There being no objection, the editorial and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POSTMAN RINGS ONCE

No one read of Postmaster General Donaldson's order reducing the number of deliveries without awakening to sudden realization that things in Washington must be worse than the public has been led to believe.

Although postal rates have been raised repeatedly and the Department is now doing several times its prewar volume of business, it is costing $1,700,000,000 to run the shebang this year, which, it is estimated, will be $600,000,000 more than receipts. The Postmaster General has asked further drastic increases in rates which Congress is loath to approve.

The drastic curtailment in the postal service ordered by the head of the Postal Department is its own testimonal to bureaucratic incompetence. The Government can no longer get the mail to the people, except on a gigantic RFD basis, although it is tossing billions to Europe, spending hundreds of millions on dam-building projects, and many more billions to buy up butter, wheat, etc., that it doesn't want in the hope the sellers will vote right at the next election.

How the Post Office Department will save money by delivering the same volume of mail in a single delivery, instead of two or three deliveries, daily and by keeping the former number of employees on the pay roll, is something hard to explain.

A cut in mail deliveries at this time helps put a rein on the free flow of commerce. The action is inimical to the American philosophy of the distribution of goods and services in that it offers less service for more money. Now that the postman will be ringing once instead of twice in residential areas, perhaps more attention will be focused on the main problem plaguing the whole Federal Government.

WHY P. O.?

To the NEWS:

What's wrong with our Congress and President? Cutting down on the post office. Of all the departments in our Government, the post office gives more efficient service than any other department. Why cut the department that does more for the public?

Every taxpayer should protest this cut.

LONNIE F. ROBERTS.

DENISON, TEX.

The President's Address at Cheyenne, Wyo.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL HAYDEN
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, at the request of the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered yesterday by the President of the United States at Cheyenne, in the Senator's State.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a real pleasure to be back here in Cheyenne.

The last time I was here, in June of 1948, you gave me a very fine hat—which I still have. And you most kindly invited me to come back for your famous Frontier Days celebration.

Some day I'd like to come back during Frontier Days. I have been hearing about your celebration for many, many years. But my schedule never seems to come out just right for that purpose.

Nevertheless, the spirit of the frontier is exactly what I want to talk about today.

Some people believe that the American frontier vanished forever when the forty-eighth State came into the Union.

That is nonsense. These are still frontier days.

This Nation has never stopped growing in wealth and strength. It has never stopped finding new horizons of invention, of technology, and of production. It has never stopped blazing trails in finding better ways to use our resources for the well-being of all the people. These are today's frontiers.

And today's frontiers call for the same pioneering vision, the same resourcefulness, the same courage that were displayed by the men and women who challenged our geographical frontiers a century ago.

We proved in war that we have lost none of our strength and courage. We are proving again, since the war, that this country still moves boldly toward the future. Our peacetime production and our standards of living are moving toward new high levels. And we are thinking and planning for steady development and improvement.

Our watchword is not "holding our own."

Our watchwords are "growth," "expansion," and "progress."

This is because there are now, as there have always been, more Americans who look ahead toward the broad horizon than look backward toward times and places left behind.

A steady growth in the standards of living of the American people is a goal well within our ability to attain. There are still some who look upon the goal of an ever-expanding economy as a pipe dream. They still believe in the inevitability of boom and bust.

They are among those living in the past. This country used to have a boom-and-bust economy. You can think back a little over 20 years and recall when the last big bust took place.

But that disaster taught this country a great lesson. We learned from that experience that we cannot leave the forces of a huge and complicated economy to take care of themselves. We learned then that the people had to use their Government as a means of mobilizing the resources of the whole country to restore the economy and start it moving upward again.

That same lesson about the role of Government still applies today. The people, using their Government as an agent, found the means to lick the depression. Now we are employing the same means of well-designed Government programs to help strengthen and steadily expand the national economy.

Earlier today, at Casper, I talked about one kind of governmental activity by which we are creating new frontiers of opportunity every month and every year. This is the conservation and full use of our natural resources.

The opportunities that can be created through the development of our natural resources are immeasurable. Our rivers, our soil, our forests, and our minerals can form the physical base for a steady expansion of real incomes and living standards, if they are developed and used the right way.

This afternoon, I want to talk about another kind of activity through which we can create new frontiers of opportunity.

This is the program to stimulate and strengthen small business which I recommended to the Congress last week.

Small and independent businesses are important to the growth of the economy. They are a constant source of new ideas. They are a constant source of new jobs.

New businesses are also important to the health of the economy. In their effort to grow by serving consumers better, they provide the vigorous competition which is the heart of our private-enterprise system.

Every one of you knows somebody who has had a new idea and has built it into a business. He has not only made money, but his

business has also provided jobs and income for the whole community in which he lives.

Our country has been made great by the boldness, the daring, and the inventive genius of men like that. Our Nation would suffer a slow decay if men with ideas did not have every opportunity to build new businesses and create new wealth.

The task of economic expansion requires using all the resources of this great Nation. Of the nearly 4,000,000 business concerns in our country, more than 90 percent are usually classified as small. These small concerns provide jobs for over 20,000,000 people—roughly half of private, nonfarm employment. If we are to have an expanding economy, small business must provide its share of the additional jobs needed. In doing so, it will not only create new payrolls for workers; it will also enlarge markets generally for other businessmen and farmers.

We need big business in this country as well as small business, of course. We all benefit from the tremendous output at low cost of large, efficient enterprises. But the stimulus of new and vigorous competitors is necessary to keep old enterprises efficient, and to bring the greatest benefit to consumers and the public.

Since the passage of the Sherman Antitrust Act 60 years ago, we have sought to keep monopoly from stifling the growth of new business. The effectiveness of the antitrust laws has varied over the years with changes in our national administration. Right now, the antitrust laws are being enforced as actively as at any time in history. But at their very best, they are only a limited and negative approach.

We will keep on using the antitrust laws and will enforce them vigorously.

But we must supplement that approach—and we must act soon—with measures which will challenge the power of monopoly, not in the courts but in the market place. The force of vigorous, effective competition is the best way to prevent monopoly. If the man with new ideas has a fair chance to put his product on the market, the buyer will do the rest. We must, therefore, take measures to assist the man with new ideas, the small enterpriser, as he starts out to challenge large, powerful, and established competitors.

The recommendations I have made to the Congress rest upon three simple principles. These are that the small business man needs long-term credit; he needs venture capital; and he needs technical assistance.

These things are needed so that the independent businessman can do more for himself. They do not involve Government controls. They will cost the Federal Government very little.

What they will do is to give the man who wants to be his own boss a better chance to use his own initiative and energy.

In the field of credit, I propose that we should insure bank loans to small businesses, such as drug stores, filling stations, and retail stores. The local banks would decide whether or not to make the loan in each case and would share some of the risk. But on the major part of the loan the bank would be insured against loss. This means that banks will be able to make safely, good loans which they now find too risky.

Thus, bankers would be able to give greater consideration to the human element in deciding whether or not to help a home-town businessman pull through a tight period. They wouldn't have to be quite so hard-boiled in demanding gilt-edged collateral.

You know, a lot of people say, when they find out what kind of collateral they have to put up for a loan at the bank, that if they had that kind of collateral they wouldn't have needed a loan in the first place.

Now, I don't think bankers act like that just because they are mean. It's because they have to be careful. This insurance would make it possible for them to do what they would like to have been doing all the time.

This proposal is similar to the insurance that has been provided for years under title I of the National Housing Act for home improvement loans. In that case it has helped the banks, helped the home owners, and the Government has made money from it. I think it will work just as well for small-business loans.

Furthermore, I propose that special investment companies be set up to make venture capital and long-term loans available to help small businesses expand when they have proved their ability. This would provide a way to pool the savings of people who cannot individually make such investments, but who can, through investment companies, put them to work in growing businesses.

This proposal is generally the same as that incorporated in a bill introduced several months ago by your fellow townsman, and my good friend, Senator JOE O'MAHONEY.

In addition, I propose that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation be given broader authority to handle cases which offer a good chance of success but cannot obtain private financing on reasonable terms.

These credit proposals are designed to make banks and other private sources of funds more effective in meeting the needs of small and growing businesses. They have been proposed by bankers and other private citizens who understand the problems of the small-business man. I hope the Congress will soon enact them.

In the field of technical assistance, small-business men are often at a serious disadvantage. They cannot afford specialists on their payrolls to keep up with the latest developments in accounting and management. They find it difficult to learn about the latest research developments that affect their business.

Under these circumstances, I propose that the Department of Commerce should expand the work it now does in providing technical and research assistance to small business. Thus we would provide independent businessmen with the same kind of research assistance and skilled advice which we have provided successfully to farmers for many years.

At the same time, I propose that we should make the Department of Commerce the central Government agency for small business, as well as other business, just as the Department of Agriculture is the central agency for farm activities. This would mean that the independent businessman could go to one place and obtain the advice and services he needs.

These proposals to help small business to obtain credit, risk capital, and technical assistance should do much to increase effective competition. They should result in more independent enterprises, striving more effectively to provide goods and services the people need. As such, I believe these proposals will contribute to the strength and stable growth of the country.

I suppose it is inevitable that this small-business program will meet with determined opposition. Those who fear the rise of new competitors will not be slow in imagining danger to their privileged positions. They will hide their selfish alarm by attacking what they like to call government interference with the economic system.

But the Government is only an instrument in the hands of the people, an instrument we use to help maintain a free, competitive, and expanding economy. That is the kind of economy all of us want.

More abundance for everyone, without the dismal cycle of boom-and-bust, is something that this Nation can have, and something we must have. To bring it about demands dynamic private enterprise, and it demands dynamic government.

All of us, working together, can build a strong and prosperous America. And keeping our own Nation prosperous and strong is the best assurance that our struggle for prosperity, peace, and freedom in the world will end in victory.

Effect of Imports on Employment in the Glass Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 10, 1950

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I herewith present for the consideration of the Members of Congress a very fine statement on the effect of imports on employment in the American hand-made glass industry by Mr. Carl W. Gustkey, president of the Imperial Glass Corp., Bellaire, Ohio, which is one of the important industries in the city of Bellaire in my district.

Mr. Speaker, I voted against the reciprocal-trade agreements because there was no provision in that law for protection of American industry from competition from slave labor from behind the iron curtain. If the policy of the State Department is to be that of putting American industries out of business by allowing cheap importations from Communist countries, then certainly the Congress should take some action to take this power from the State Department.

STATEMENT ON EFFECT OF IMPORTS ON EMPLOYMENT IN THE AMERICAN HAND-MADE GLASS INDUSTRY BEFORE A SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES, WASHINGTON, D. C.

(By C. W. Gustkey, member executive committee, National Labor-Management Council on Foreign Trade; president, Imperial Glass Corp., Bellaire, Ohio, United States of America; chairman, board of governors, American Glassware Association and chairman of its foreign trade committee; treasurer, Glass Crafts of America, May 6, 1950)

PREFACE—SUMMARY—EFFECT OF HAND-MADE GLASS IMPORTATIONS ON AMERICAN WAGE EARNERS

The management of the American hand-made glassware companies directly, normally employing about 15,000 union glass factory workers claim herein and offer factual data to support their contentions, that—

1. Imported glassware in 1949 caused these American workmen to lose $4,000,000 in wages, compared to their actual total earnings of about $20,000,000.

2. Importations are to blame for these American workmen at present finding only about 50 percent of 1949 employment. Their 1950 total earnings, based on first 4 months of 1950 already passed, will not exceed $9,000,000. Wage losses in 1950 due to importations may total as much as $12,000,000.

3. Unless such importations are promptly prohibited, within 12 months this industry, its worth-while employment, and product,

its social and economic contributions will be nonexistent.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I appear before you, grateful for your invitation to be here, as a representative of America's oldest industry which commenced in the year 1608 on the mainland, opposite Jamestown Island, in Virginia Colony. Since that year, the orderly expansion of the manufacturing of American glassware has developed with the course of our continental and industrial progress through New England, into the Pittsburgh area and throughout the upper tri-State and Ohio River industrial area until it is today pretty generally spread over the entirety of our Nation.

The company which I head for a livelihood, the Imperial Glass Corp., is located in Bellaire, Ohio, and began operations in 1904. Our employment for some 35 years has averaged in the constant vicinity of 650 skilled people. As chairman of the board of governors of the American Glassware Association, I speak for approximately 85 percent of the manufacturers engaged in this industry throughout all our United States, excluding, of course, structural, architectural, flat, container, laboratory, and scientific glassware. I am fearful that I lack sufficient ability to properly discharge the great responsibility that rests upon my shoulders in appearing before you as the spokesman for this important segment of our American economy, but I will do my best and shall attempt to be brief, factual, and logical, in the hope that I will not alone present a story that will convince you in the course of logic and reason, but that you will find it entering your hearts, and that your minds will be receptive to a complete understanding of, and sympathy for, the tremendous problem facing our industry these current days.

There are over 13,000 skilled persons normally and directly employed in the American handmade glass industry; but, including all office, sales, management, and the employment of various miscellaneous small plants of which there are no factual records available to me at the moment in the classified glassware industry directory, it would be safe to estimate that as of today we employ a total in excess of 15,000 persons.

We in the American handmade glass industry are of the opinion that approximately 38,000 people find indirect but full and resultant employment in the wholesale and retail distribution and sales of our products. This total, I point out to you, as I recall that we claim there are in excess of 15,000 directly employed in the production of our wares. So please assume that our industry gives total employment, normally, (directly and indirectly) to at least 53,000 persons which safely and conservatively represents total income for about 200,000 American citizens (approximately 4 to a family). I respectfully call your attention to exhibit I, attached to this statement, showing in detail the location of the principal factories producing American handmade glassware and those who are cutting and decorating this product. These plants are principally located in California, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Maryland, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia. In this exhibit, we give you the approximate normal employment in each of these plants and totals in our enterprises in the various States. Suffice it to say, for the moment, as example, that in Indiana we have a normal employment of 475; in Ohio approximately 2,500; in Pennsylvania about 1,500; in West Virginia about 4,500, etc.

A large percentage of these plants are located in small communities of less than 20,000 inhabitants. I have starred the factory locations (on the exhibit to which I have already called your attention) where plants are located in communities of less than 20,000 persons. Many of these small communities would become ghost towns if the glass plants and decorating companies quit business or were forced out of the economic picture. The merchants, service industries, and professional people are in many instances supported almost entirely by wage payments from glass factory workers. In some of the larger places, severe depression has and would again result if the glass factories closed down. Most of these workers own their own homes in these communities and for them to seek employment elsewhere would result in severe financial loss, family disruption, and social displacement from which they probably would never recover. For example, I would like to inform you that 78 percent of the workers in my own company own their own homes, and that our weekly normal payroll of about $36,000 to $40,000 is by far the largest weekly payroll in our community of Bellaire, Ohio, of approximately 15,000 population.

The important raw materials and the conservatively estimated annual consumption in the manufacturing processes of our product can be summarized as follows:

	Estimated quantities	Estimated value, delivered
	Tons	
Sodium carbonate	18,000	$511,000
Glass sand	60,000	362,000
Lead derivatives	10,000	2,850,000
Potash	10,000	1,636,000
Limestone	10,000	84,000
Various high-priced chemicals and coloring oxides	1,000	2,120,000
Special refractories	6,000	1,188,000
Cartons and packing materials		3,000,000
Gas, coal, oil, and electricity		2,000,000
Total		13,751,000

And we must not forget that this American craft industry we are discussing annually expends in excess of $750,000 for national advertising of products to consumers in American national magazines and for printing catalogs, selling aids such as countercards, display pieces, and like assistance for consumer selling by retailers everywhere. This expenditure to an important extent, can be translated into substantial earnings by American labor, for we are all familiar with the high labor costs involving the printed arts.

We will further say that these raw materials and supplies come largely from the central West as that is the location of most of the glass plants and the suppliers have naturally and properly so, from an economic standpoint, attempted to serve this industry from the same geographical location in which the consuming factories are located. It is impossible for me to give you an estimate of the number of people employed in these supply industries; for our hand-made glass producers, as a part of the general glassware industry of America, take only a portion of the output from these supply producers of these chemicals, sand, minerals, refractories, cartons, packing materials, and fuel. What percentage of the total produced, we in our industry consume, is a figure I cannot sugggest to you with any truthfulness or even near accuracy. But, gentlemen, you must agree that the quantities listed and their implied values are substantial and important and represent valuable national employment.

In addition to the just-mentioned values, we estimate that the manufacturing of American hand-made glass, from raw materials to finished product, embodies the usage of about 15,000 railroad cars per year and we submit that when we had this estimated traffic (or transportation load) check a few days ago by an official of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co., it was adequately and sufficiently developed that our estimate was conservative.

Gentlemen, our industry in 1948 produced, successfully merchandised, and sold approximately $35,000,000 worth of hand-made glassware. This was about 99½ percent absorbed by the American retail market, as there is absolutely no opportunity for us to export merchandise, never has been in the last 20 years, and we do not see any opportunity currently or in the foreseeable future, excepting in almost negligible amounts to Canada. In 1949, our industry produced and sold about $30,700,000 worth of merchandise. Note the decline of nearly $5,000,000. These figures I quote were released as of April 28, 1950, by the United States Bureau of Census of the Department of Commerce, in their publication Facts for Industry. In both these years, my own company produced and sold approximately 10 percent of these annual total figures. I'm getting personal again for intended and related reason.

Imported glassware sold in the United States in 1949 had a market value at American factory-price level of approximately $6,000,000. In 1948, the similar total volume was $1,000,000 smaller than in 1949. Note the increase; from nothing at end of war to a gigantic current value. This gives you some little indication of the trend and the dollar value of imported glassware competitive to our own product. I have attached two exhibits dealing with import quantities, sources, and trends. One, entitled "American Glassware Association Analysis, 1949–1948 Imports of Glassware Most Generally Produced by Members of the Association Showing Dollar Totals and the Principal Exporting Countries" dated March 24, 1950. Another, the "American Glassware Association Summary of Annual Imports (past 5 years) of Glassware Most Generally Produced by Members Showing Dollar Totals and Principal Exporting Countries" dated March 30, 1950. This latter exhibit shows the trend of importations by countries, 1945 to 1949, inclusive.

The 1949 analysis and exhibit I have referred to as being dated March 24 shows 1948 and 1949 totals of importations by classifications of merchandise and by countries of origin. Both of these exhibits are based upon United States Department of Commerce figures. General increases are evident in nearly all instances.

Our own occupational forces in Germany and Japan are admittedly and directly competing with us in our own American markets, with our own American tax money as their means, and without hesitation and unashamedly they tell us in detail of their plans for extension of the hand-glass productive capacity in Japan and in occupied Germany to far in excess of prewar levels and ability.

Now, gentlemen, if you will allow me, please, I would again like to become personal and put these import figures on the level of my own company, the Imperial Glass Corp. I have stated to you that we produce approximately 10 percent of the domestic production of American handmade glassware. Had there not been $5,000,000 of competitive importations in 1948, our gross business would have been increased by $500,000 and in 1949 by $600,000 if foreign glass totaling $6,000,000 at the American factory level had not been with us. In other words, last year we would have had $50,000 of business each month that we did not enjoy and our employees at Imperial would have had 390,000 payroll dollars they did not get (about $650 per wage earner on our payroll). Last year our business was off from expectations by approximately this $600,000. This amount of gross business represented the difference between a profit and a loss in our operation and the current result as of the moment is, in our individual factory, that we are operating at about 30 percent of capacity. We have

no immediate hopes of a betterment of this situation.

For the last 2 years the most important retail buyers in America have been visiting Europe and other foreign countries to purchase glassware and spend their buying appropriations at the attractive, foreign give-away prices based upon the dreadfully low foreign labor rates. I'll have more to say about this trend in purchasing by retail buyers a little later on in my presentation.

Let's talk for a moment now about the comparative wage rates we in the American hand-made glass industry pay in comparison to the rates being paid by our foreign competitors. Exhibit III, which is attached, will point out some relative wage schedules in foreign countries. We have recently been told by the United States Army that new wage rates in the Japanese hand-made glass industry, which are considered there to be very high, are approximately 40 cents an hour, average, for skilled workers, including all fringe payments, such as pensions, residential fuel, house rental allowances, and long severance pay; while in the United States, the current average is at least $1.75 per hour for the same skilled workers, not including any extras such as guaranteed turn pay, overtime, vacations, social security, insurance contributions, pensions, house allowances, residential fuel provisions, liberal severance, et cetera.

The wage exhibit I am now referring to, No. III, deals principally with rates paid in the hand-glass industry in socialistic England, Germany, and Communist Czechoslovakia. These earnings figures are based on United States Department of Commerce reports from our American embassies in these three countries. The average hourly male rate in the glass industry in England in June of last year was 44½ cents; Germany, 45½ cents; the average hourly rate of both men and women in Czechoslovakia in the hand-made glass industry was 36 cents. We are comparing these foreign, competitive hourly rates to the hourly rate of $1.75 currently paid in our United States industry in support of our American way-of-life. What a destructive contrast.

The amazingly low wages paid in these three countries—prior to deflation of currencies—as recorded in my exhibit III shows the difficulties which manufacturers of hand-made glassware in the United States have to overcome in order to maintain a fair share of our own American domestic market. When it is realized that approximately 65 percent of the cost of our domestic finished product is labor, it can be readily seen that with European wages averaging fully two-thirds less than our American wages there is little chance of meeting the low-priced European competition based on these ridiculously low wage scales. This is conclusive evidence that foreign nations need not be favored any more by our Government cutting tariffs, for they already have such an immeasurable advantage in their very, very low labor costs. In fact, their costs indicate they can well afford to be faced with duties entirely sufficient to give American producers a fair break, and still have us at great handicap. Why the two great American parent unions, the American Federation of Labor and the CIO, continue to back the present United States trade policy, with no restrictions in it for safeguarding their members who are engaged in the production of glass, pottery, lace, gloves, and many other American craft-produced items, is a mystery to those of us laboring in their behalf. To encourage the sale of imports in this country, as the present Federal administration is now doing, gives support to maintaining low wage scales in Europe and will eventually lead to tearing down the wage scales in this country and bankruptcy of the industries which must compete with ruinous European import prices.

By such action, encouragement is also lent to the actual, currently existent condition where American manufacturers of these competitive products cannot further raise wages, provide pensions, finance adequate holidays, vacations, sick benefits, and insurance, let alone break even and keep their heads above water. The only inevitable result and industrial relief from today's situation is an immediate and extensive reduction in the American rate of pay and wages, and, before too long, the absolute disappearance of employment in the proud, three-and-a-half-century old, skilled trade known as the makers of American hand-crafted glassware.

While we American manufacturers claim, and we believe impartial authority would admit, that we have higher quality than the imported article, we admit that to the ultimate consumer there is an apparent higher quality in imports because of the false but alleged romanticism of foreign source and of the ridiculously low retail prices which come about because of the serious low wage advantage. There are no shortages in our American hand-made-glass industry as to capacity or as to ability. Factories that exist in this country can produce all the hand-made glassware all of North America can absorb, and in so doing we can offer steady employment, increasing employment, and the security that modern wage earners demand. At even cost, up to and at the retail level, the American industry will out-design, out-sell, out-service, and out-perform the imported sources and the imported product.

At the end of this statement I attach another and concluding exhibit which we in the industry believe to be a true condensation and summary of the glassware classifications and tariff discussions which will take place in Torquay, England, beginning September 28, 1950. Many, many of our important articles of manufacture are on the docket for consideration at this conference. It appears that we are once again just as certain as winter becomes spring and summer becomes fall to suffer further in international negotiations. We also attach a cumulative list of tariff-duty changes on glassware articles and we asterisk the items which are publicly and officially declared to be on the Torquay list. We submit to you that if we suffer further tariff cuts and damage our industry is a gone goose. Yea, we further submit, in all sincerity and emphatically, that all relief possible under so-called escape clauses now in existence will not alter the situation.

May I now extemporize from my prepared statement for a brief moment. First, I have here some glass samples I want to submit to you. Second, I have current and most recent information from major American producers of hand-made glassware I would like to submit to you informally. On both subjects—(1) these samples and (2) this current operating information which has just today come into my hands—I would like the privilege of promptly preparing a supplemental statement so as to make these two matters a permanent part of the record. I would like, with your permission, to proceed quickly and informally to cover these matters and then to return to my brief for final concluding thoughts.

Submission of foreign samples priced and domestic comparisons.

Ads on imported glass by prominent American retailers and trends of domestic purchases by those same firms.

Various individual current factory operating facts in our American industry.

We feel the effect of this disastrous, discouraging, and unfair competition from foreign-source merchandise throughout our entire field of production. We feel it pretty generally geographically. There was a time when the competition from imported merchandise was confined to the great metropolitan retail markets such as New York, Philadelphia, Washington, Chicago, San Francisco, Los Angeles. This is not the case since the last war. The importers and foreign manufacturers have studied our American merchandising methods and our distribution methods (at the suggestion of and with the aid of our own governmental agencies) and have publicly announced their plans to compete with us in their own and our American trade journals and in their propaganda to prospective consumers here in America. They have sales organizations today in our Nation which cover all of our 48 States and our entire market. They have regional sales campaign offices in the South, the Southwest, the Midwest, the far West, the Northwest, and they are reaching for every dollar they can secure from the American consumer.

The average worker in the hand-made glassware industry of America is highly skilled. He is considerably over 50 years of age. Well over half of our active workers must of necessity serve long apprenticeships; for instance, 4 years to become a glass blower. And many of our so-called unskilled operations require a vast know-how and cannot be obtained readily by so-called common labor taken at random from our community. Because of the long years they have been employed in this highly skilled craft and because of their advanced ages, our workmen have never and will not in the future find ready employment in other trades or in other jobs.

If they are deprived of working in a glass plant, they usually try to form a little cooperative and work for themselves for whatever they can get out of it in the way of wages; as they say, just to keep their hands in the trade and to wait for better times. Such a condition will literally break asunder our skilled and established working units and cause their utter disappearance. Our union, the American Flint Glass Workers' Union (one of America's oldest craft unions), will no longer find justifiable existence and our individual companies will go out of business.

Gentlemen, I repeat—last year America consumed nearly $6,000,000 worth of foreign hand-made glass at American factory level prices (at least $12,000,000 at American retail price levels). Those factory wage earners directly engaged in the United States domestic industry lost 65 cents for each one of those $6,000,000—or total wages lost to them in 1949 of $3,900,000. Actual earnings of our American hand crafters of glass in 1949 were about $20,000,000.

And what about the capital we here in America have invested to provide these jobs? Again you must forgive me for referring to my own factory, but it certainly is of value for you to know that in our own plant our capital investment stands today at approximately $3,500 for every employee of our group of about 600. And I'll say that figure is a fair, average one, for our national industry. Is this investment in time, skill, in money, in heartache, in management, in struggle, in ability, to be utterly disregarded and thrown aside as at the same time we condemn those who labor in our industry to a future as uncertain as words could describe?

Somebody said the other day that the stockholders in our industry would have to find their liquidating benefits from other use of the physical plants than as glass factories.

Most of you gentlemen (particularly those of you from Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Ohio, Indiana, Texas, and California) are familiar with the physical construction of a glass factory, and know it is not at all suited for ready adaptation to other types of industry. Our production equipment cannot be used for anything else other than the manufacturing of hand-made glass. Mr. Steelman from the White House, recently in a letter to Congressman STAGGERS, of West Virginia, quoted in an editorial in the Morgantown Dominion newspaper of Morgantown, W. Va. (which editorial I attach to my statement as an exhibit) said words which would

indicate that in Washington it is felt there is absolutely no hope for the future of the American hand-made glass industry and suggested that Mr. STAGGERS and his associated, interested citizens in his own congressional district take immediate steps for future employment elsewhere of those now engaged in the glass business. Gentlemen, is this an official governmental pronouncement sealing the destiny of our industry? Are we to accept it as such? If so, the condition arises as a direct result of untoward governmental action and as such our employees, our employers and the owners in our industry are entitled to full, fair, adequate and prompt indemnity for we have not given permission to anyone to confiscate, destroy, or give away our livelihood and property.

A conservative estimate, gentlemen based on facts I have just read to you from various prime producers in our American industry, is that right now the rate of current operations throughout our trade in all its factory units is no greater than 50 percent of 1949 activity. This being so, the year's production will be in the vicinity of only $15,000,000 as compared to $30,000,000 in 1949 and $34,000,000 in 1948. Estimated total wages will be only $9,750,000 for all of 1950, as compared to $20,000,000 in 1949 and $22,000,000 plus, in 1948. Continued operations at such a level for the rest of 1950 will cause individual worker distress of magnitude and bankrupt our entire industry.

The general level of the retail business in America is good, as is the general level of employment. Reliable sources report 1949 retail sales of china and glass to be only slightly below 1948, and currently to be only under 1949 by a very small percentage. Yes, American hand-glass producers are bad off. I submit that the greatest single cause is the importation of cheap-labor-cost foreign-made glassware with which it is impossible to compete, plus the devilish and horrible foreign competitive advantages arising through a manufacturing system which does not have to show a profit, which does not have to give a whoop about costs and their relationship to prices and which exists today only because of the fact that our Government has set it up in business and keeps it in business.

Gentlemen, you have been patient and courteous, I fervently pray you are discerning and courageous. You and the American Congress must wholeheartedly and at once act to save this, America's oldest craft industry, if it is not be traded or given clear away and be gone forever. A prompt, complete and thorough prohibition of hand-glass imports is the only answer. No other treatment will save this industry. Smiles, joviality, promises, preachments will be to no avail. We implore your best consideration, your prompt action, for only to the Congress of the United States can we look for succor. All other governmental streets are closed or stenciled "dead end" to us. Is it necessary to condemn our own American hand-glass industry to complete dissolution to save the rest of the world?

Confusion in Our Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 10, 1950

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, the President has declared that Senators MCCARTHY, BRIDGES, and WHERRY were assets of the Kremlin. In connection with that statement of who is an asset to Russia and how the prestige of our Government was injured abroad, let us look at what happened here in Washington last week.

On May 3, the chairman of the Senate Committee on Armed Services, Senator TYDINGS, delivered an address before the Rotarians of Washington, saying among other things that war may break at any time.

On the same day Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson and George F. Kennan, spokesman for the Department of State, appeared before the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and pleaded for an extension of the draft. Gen. Omar N. Bradley, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, had similarly testified before the committee on the previous day.

These three men based their requests on the greatly deteriorated international situation which they described as the worst since the war. Incidentally, and in connection therewith, they had obtained an increase of $350,000,000 over and above the present budget for national defense.

The next day, and less than 24 hours after these statements were made by highly authorized officials of our Government, the President told his press conference that the international situation was not particularly concerning and that it was not as bad as in 1946. He also said that he expected to reduce the 1952 and 1953 national defense appropriations.

The President, as Commander in Chief, has all lines of information available to him. He receives every day a thorough briefing of world conditions. Surely that information, which comes from State and defense departments, cannot be at variance with information presented to the House Committee by Johnson, Bradley, and Kennan.

The President's statement, transmitted to the people of this country and the world, caused utmost confusion. Our people were confronted with these conflicting views all within 24 hours and do not know whom to believe.

What is worse, our allies in western Europe were dismayed. For the last 2 months there have been repeated suggestions from western Europe military commands that their weak forces be bolstered by additional American ground forces. President Truman's statement about reductions is considered by these Europeans as an indication that such reinforcements will not be forthcoming. That eventuality worries them more than the charges against possible communism in the American Government.

Biggest Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 10, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the sixteenth article by Mr. Frank C. Waldrop on the infiltration of communism in our country.

BIGGEST STORY
(By Frank C. Waldrop)

The primitive American Communists of 40 years ago called themselves by many names. They had no formed system of thought, no organized political machinery and no spectacular leadership.

Least of all did they have a disciplined corps of spies and administrators working with them inside the colleges and Government offices of the United States of America.

They were what the Moscow-trained modern types have since contemptuously called native radicals and were mainly just confused and rattled by the upsurge of American industry and expansion following the United States Civil War.

Few of them were much attracted by the scientific socialism of Karl Marx, beyond occasional agreement with his picture of a world free of want and trouble. Which, after all, is an ideal not invented by Marx.

But as fresh waves of immigrants came over from Europe, an occasional one was caught up in the thread of imported hates and intrigues that some of the new arrivals did not shed.

It is a peculiar thing, this looking backward. After all, America has been settled and developed by fugitives from Europe and all that's in it. Our ancestors came here not to carry on the fruitless conflicts of the past but to forget them and build the New World.

Work on that New World was well in progress 40 years ago when a well-to-do Russian farmer's son became so intolerable to the government of Czar Nicholas II through his propagandizing for revolt that he was utterly banished and exiled.

Those are chilling words. They raise the idea of misery and horror. But, in fact, this banished revolutionary named Lev Davidovitch Bronstein, who called himself Leon Trotsky, suffered comfortably.

First the Czar's police tried to lose him in the frontier country of Siberia. But soon he was back. Local jails only give him time to think up new tacks for the Czar's chair. So, finally, he was kicked over the border.

You can compare the terrors and oppressions of czarist times with the present peace under Stalin from this: Trotsky in Europe immediately became a correspondent for Russian newspapers and magazines, wrote books that were widely read back home, and at regular intervals his friends and family came over to meet him in the wineshops of old Vienna.

Have you made any dates along the edge of the iron curtain lately with anybody from the other side?

When the war of 1914–18 broke out, Trotsky was in Germany, so he took off for New York City, traveling by easy stages all around Europe.

In his autobiography Trotsky claims that President Woodrow Wilson stole the famous Fourteen Points for peace that lie now between the pages of the story of things past from the proofs of a book Trotsky had sent to a New York publisher.

And certainly somebody worked into Wilson's mind the germ seeds of world government which first took shape as the old League of Nations, then came back with Roosevelt as the United Nations.

Now, somewhat more baggy in the knees and with its shirt tail flapping in the breeze, here it is again, joining college girls and moldy old political has-beens under such banners as Union Now and World Federalists.

Trotsky later wrote of his American years: "My only profession in New York was that of a professional revolutionary."

And he added:

"* * * in those days my profession was no more reprehensible than that of a bootlegger."

Days of American innocence.

Little did we dream that one day soon Trotsky would be commanding armies in the field at war; that he would next be stripped of the power and glory; that he would again flee to the New World. And yet that the long arm of Stalin would reach him and knock out his brains even as he sat correcting proofs on his record of Stalin's rise from bank robber to czar.

Or that the dignified United States publishing house of Harper & Bro., with the best grace it could muster, would actually withhold that amazing story from publication because F. D. Roosevelt had the United States of America then deeply entangled in Stalin's influence.

Yet all these things happened, and so many, many more, that even the most severe editing of this running account cannot but mention them.

Let it be noted then, merely that Trotsky in New York saw a fertile field in which to work. He later wrote:

"In the United States there is a large class of successful and semi-successful doctors, lawyers, dentists, engineers and the like who divide their precious hours of rest between concerts by European celebrities and the American Socialist party."

He didn't think them much and even called one of their leaders, Morris Hillquitt, a "Babbitt of the Babbitts." But Trotsky builded more poisonously here than he knew.

Secretly they admired him and in their minds they followed him when the czar's government fell and Alexander Kerensky, the head of the temporary government, let Trotsky come home.

Incredible, fantastic, but still the foolish Kerensky let Trotsky come home. Once there, he joined at once with the poison flea, Lenin, to destroy Kerensky.

Extension of Old Age and Retirement Benefits of Social Security Act to Sugar Workers Favored by Hawaiian Planters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 10, 1950

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to present herewith the text of a statement presented to the Senate Committee on Finance on March 22 by Ernest W. Greene, vice president of the Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association. His statement follows:

BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE, UNITED STATES SENATE, IN THE MATTER OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT REVISION

(Statement of Ernest W. Greene, vice president, Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association, March 22, 1950)

I am Ernest W. Greene, vice president of the Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association, of which all of the producers of sugar in Hawaii are members.

The executive committee of the association, on March 13, 1950, unanimously adopted a resolution as follows:

"Whereas the Committee on Finance of the United States Senate is presently conducting hearings on proposed amendments of the Social Security Act, and consideration is being given by said committee to proposals for the extension of the coverage of said act to include persons not now receiving benefits provided by the act: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That this committee express to the Committee on Finance of the United States Senate the position of the sugar plantation companies of Hawaii in favor of the extension of the coverage provisions of the Social Security Act in order to entitle agricultural labor to the same old-age and retirement benefits now received by other persons covered by the act."

The production of sugarcane and the processing of raw sugar therefrom is necessarily a large-scale operation under the conditions which exist in Hawaii. Persons employed by sugar producers are engaged in year-round employment in every phase of the farming and harvesting of sugarcane, transporting such sugarcane to the sugarmill on the plantation farm, and processing it into raw sugar.

About one-half of the employees of sugar producers are employed in employment which is covered by the present Social Security Act. The other half are employed in employment which is defined by the act as agricultural and, therefore, they are exempt from such coverage. Exemption in this instance means that many thousands of the persons employed in producing sugar do not participate in the benefits of social-security legislation.

The sugar producers of Hawaii urge that the Committee on Finance amend the Social Security Act to extend to employees employed in agriculture the old-age and retirement benefits which are now received by persons who are covered by the act.

We believe that coverage of agricultural workers will accomplish simple justice by affording to such workers the security which is now enjoyed by other workers who are employed in employment which is so classified as to be covered.

Mail Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. WALSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 10, 1950

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I recently called attention to a scandalous situation existing in the Post Office Department having to do with subsidy payments made the railroads for transporting mail. Perhaps I should say payments to the railroads for not transporting mail, since they carry only about half of the mail they are paid to transport.

For this fantastic situation we have the word of Postmaster General Donaldson himself. In my statement of April 21, appearing at pages A2902 and A2903 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that day, I quoted Mr. Donaldson's testimony to that effect in hearings before the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

I am struck by the fact that in his order of April 17 reducing drastically the postal service furnished the American public, the Postmaster General did not complain about this condition. If the Postmaster General is interested in economy, he should economize wherever possible, without diminishing the service for which the American public is paying.

The Postmaster General at least pays lip service to this principle. In his order of April 17, he states as follows:

This Department is exerting every effort to provide for the public the best possible postal service at the least possible cost. We are taking advantage of every known device or program that is suitable in the operation of the postal service, to improve the service, better the working conditions of the postal people, and reduce the operating costs.

This, gentlemen, is what is known in law as a self-serving statement. I question its accuracy. Laying off thousands of letter carriers by ordering the loads on the backs of the remainder doubled can hardly be described as "bettering the working conditions of the postal people." And it is no improvement in the postal service to cut mail deliveries in half.

I fail to see how Mr. Donaldson can accomplish what he claims to seek by his order. If the postal service was operated efficiently before—and here again Mr. Donaldson says it was—this order does not make sense. It simply will not work.

I also fail to see why the Postmaster General did not instead correct the scandalous railroad situation which he himself has admitted to exist. He pays approximately $250,000,000 annually to railroads for transporting mail; but he receives only half the service he pays for. Instead of seeking to double the load of the letter carrier, I assert the Postmaster General should have cut in half the payments made to railroads. He would save much more, and would only be doing his duty.

But Mr. Donaldson did not do this. In fact, he denied that it could be done. In this same order of April 17, he said:

About 96 percent of all expenditures in the operation of the postal service is for salaries and transportation costs. We in the Department have no control over either. Salaries are fixed by the Congress, and transportation rates are fixed by the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Civil Aeronautics Board.

There are those who disagree with this statement, and believe that the Postmaster General is not as helpless as he claims to be. The General Accounting Office for one does not have its sympathies actively aroused at the spectacle of the Postmaster General pathetically pleading that his transportation costs are beyond his control; in effect, that he must order and pay for twice the amount of railroad service he needs.

I have reference to a report of the General Accounting Office, filed only a few days ago with the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, and entitled, "Report on Study Made of the Round Trip Provisions of the Railway Mail Pay Act of 1916."

That report is 37 pages long, and contains 24 exhibits. It is most difficult but interesting reading. Much is said; but it appears that even more was left unsaid, because the General Accounting Office did not attempt to report completely on the transportation of mail by railroad. Had the report been intended to cover that subject completely, I am confident that a situation of extreme gravity would have been presented.

The Railway Mail Pay Act of 1916 which governs the transportation of mail by railroad companies contains what is known as the "round trip" provision. That section of the law (39 U. S. Code 535) requires the Post Office Department to pay at the same rate for the return of a mail-storage car as was paid for its full out-bound movement, provided the car is not used by the railroad for other traffic on the return run. Suppose the Department ships 50 carloads of parcel post from Chicago to Los Angeles, and uses only 30 of these cars to return parcel post originating in Los Angeles to Chicago. The remaining 20 cars, if hauled back empty, without being put to other use by the railroads, must be paid for at the full rate.

There is before the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee a bill, S. 1596, offered to repeal this provision. That committee asked for the General Accounting Office Report to aid it in passing judgment on this bill.

As I said before, many interesting facts are revealed by the GAO report. Among them is the fact that the Post Office Department has permitted the railroads to abuse this provision of law in such a way as to increase greatly the amount of empty space paid for. While some empty returns must under the law be paid for, this has been turned into a racket by the railroads with Post Office Department approval.

It stands to reason that this must be a racket. According to Postmaster General Donaldson, only half the space paid for is used. Not all cars carrying mail from Chicago to Los Angeles must be returned empty. The people in Los Angeles can write as well as read. It is a fair assumption that in a random moment some citizen of that fair city must feel the stir of a literary impulse, and write a letter to a friend in Chicago. Parcel post must be mailed east as well as west. There must be other traffic than mail which the railroads could use to fill the cars.

Some reason for the tremendous empty space paid for is given at page 2 of the GAO report, which states:

> The study has indicated that cars carrying full pay loads out do not return promptly, but are often directed to other use for the carrier's convenience and substitute cars are returned, making it possible for the railroads to realize a greater income. The propriety of this practice is a possible question since the act (39 U. S. C. 535) does not appear to anticipate such substitution.
>
> The substitution of cars further complicates the administration of the round-trip provisions.
>
> Many substitute cars are returned in freight trains and the trip is paid for at passenger rates.
>
> The operation of the round-trip provisions has resulted in numerous complex agreements, which assure the railroads full payment for all returned deadhead cars and empty space. In some instances the return movement is in advance of the out-bound loaded movement.

What this boils down to is the fact that the Post Office Department has done what it can to pay the railroads as much money for the empty return of cars as possible. It has allowed them to substitute other cars for those in which the mail was carried in the out-bound movement. It has even gone so far as to defy the laws of nature as well as those of this Congress by agreeing that the return movement can precede rather than follow the initial movement. You and I must go somewhere before we can return; Postmaster General Donaldson has hit upon a way to reverse this natural time order in the case of postal cars—when to do so means increased payments to the railroads.

In my statement of April 21, I quoted testimony given under oath by the General Superintendent of the Railway Mail Service of the Post Office Department. He testified that the determining factor of his decision regarding railway mail service was the financial benefits that were accruing to the railroad, and that has been one of the policies of the Department. Mr. Hardy appears to be an honest man, on the witness stand. Yet, Mr. Donaldson states that transportation costs are expenses over which he has no control. If that is so, why does he enter into agreements permitting substitute cars to be returned, which, according to the GAO, are for the carrier's convenience * * * making it possible for the railroads to realize a greater income. Why does he permit substitute cars to be returned in freight trains, and pay for the trip at passenger rates? Why does he enter into numerous complex agreements which assure the railroads full payment for all returned deadhead cars and empty space? Is he working for the railroads or the Post Office Department?

An agreement of the kind referred to is found in exhibit No. 6 accompanying the GAO report. The Santa Fe Railroad found itself faced with operating difficulties if it could not claim credit for empty return of mail cars from the west coast in advance of the arrival of the cars from east to west. In other words, this railroad wanted to use its cars as it saw fit, and still claim every cent possible for deadhead cars. To this request the Department agreed. By virtue of its policy of aiding the railroads financially wherever possible, it made sure that the Santa Fe could handle all other traffic and squeeze the last possible dollar from the Post Office Department. The Deputy Second Assistant Postmaster General agreed in writing, as follows:

> It is also our understanding of the space rules that the round-trip provision was written into law for the purpose of allowing railroads to claim deadhead pay for cars used in the initial movement for mail when these deadhead cars could not be used for other traffic. Therefore, we feel that the deadhead claims should be observed carefully in all instances, in order to operate within the intent of our understanding of the law. Regardless, you may advise Mr. McNulty that we will allow deadhead pay for cars operated in train 8, in advance of the initial movement and if all space needed in train 8 is furnished for the handling of mail.

Note carefully this letter. It states the author's view of the purpose of the law; it then piously admonishes compliance with the law, and proceeds to approve a departure from the law. What is behind this? Does the author wish it understood that he is aware that he is giving something away, and, if so, why? Perhaps the answer is found in other testimony of John Hardy, general superintendent of the railway mail service, quoted in my statement of April 21. I quote this again:

> Well, all large railroads have what is known as managers of the mail and express traffic. The majority of those employees are former employees of the Post Office Department, railway mail service.

It would be interesting to compare the salaries of these graduates from the railway mail service with the sums available to them in the postal service.

The Postmaster General entered the Post Office Department in Washington as Deputy Second Assistant Postmaster General, the branch of the Department handling railway mail transportation. A full investigation should be made of these conditions. I ask and call upon the Comptroller General to institute such a general investigation; and simultaneously I urge prompt and affirmative action on House Resolution 547, introduced by me on April 21.

Effect of Imports on Employment in the Glass Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 10, 1950

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I herewith present for the consideration of the Members of Congress the statement by Mr. Harry H. Cook, president of the American Flint Glass Workers' Union, on his appearance before the Subcommittee on Imports and Employment of the House Committee on Education and Labor.

There is no question that imports of glass and pottery from slave-labor countries such as Czechoslovakia and other iron-curtain nations are having a crippling effect in the glass and pottery business in this country. Unless the Congress takes some action to limit this importation, these industries are faced with extinction. To allow these industries to be squeezed out by this kind of competition it not only un-American but absolutely stupid and certainly undesirable.

STATEMENT PRESENTED BY MR. HARRY H. COOK, PRESIDENT, AMERICAN FLINT GLASS WORKERS' UNION, TO THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, STEED SUBCOMMITTEE ON IMPORTS AND EMPLOYMENT, MAY 6, 1950

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee:

I appear for and represent the officers and members of the American Flint Glass Workers' Union of North America. Our organization was formed in 1878 and I am pleased to make the statement to you that we are one of the oldest labor organizations in the United States and that the industry in which our members are employed and must depend upon for their livelihood is one of our country's oldest industries with its first factory at Jamestown, Va., in 1608. We are affiliated with the American Federation of Labor.

I wish the committee to know that I have been a worker in the glass industry for the past 57 years, starting at the age of 10. I worked in glassware factories as a skilled craftsman for many years. For the past 34 years I have represented the workers in these industries as one of their international officers; the past 10 years as international president.

While business generally is reasonably good, we find the American hand-made glassware industry in a serious condition and rapidly reaching the point of catastrophe because of the damaging influence and effects of the importation of glassware produced by cheap labor in countries embraced by the Marshall plan and also behind the so-called iron curtain.

Imports need not be injurious but can in fact be very harmful. It is not only a matter of quantity but particularly one of prices. If we had competitive parity with imports, so that our domestic products would not be undersold in our own market, we would not face the constant threat to our wage standards that now confront us.

The facts are that the extremely low wages paid in other countries, such as Japan and Czechoslovakia, not offset by lower productivity, gives these countries a great price advantage in this market. This advantage is not based on greater efficiency of the foreign producers, as some people would have you believe; nor is it based on greater skill of the foreign workmen. I am sure that we can match them in both these respects, but we cannot match their prices without sacrificing something that is the pride of America, namely, the high living standard that makes this country stand out alone over the rest of the world.

This high standard of living makes us vulnerable to the onslaught of low-wage producers abroad. This is to say, we cannot hope to compete on a wholly unequal wage basis. The only possible result of being forced to meet this competition is unemployment, joblessness, poor working conditions and a gradual decline to the economic level of these foreign competitors.

We are delighted, Mr. Chairman, to have this opportunity of appearing before a committee that is interested in the employment angle of import competition. We have been coming down here for years and we might as well have saved our breath. We have simply been told in effect that if we cannot meet the competition that faces us we might as well face the music instead. The prevailing theory in the State Department seems to be that if an American industry cannot compete with imports the fault lies with the American industry.

We are held to be inefficient, uneconomic, or to be marginal producers if we cannot meet the abominable wages paid in competing countries. Mr. Chairman, the foregoing is an unfortunate theory and to describe our glassware industry in this way is worse yet. The workers in our glassware industry are well paid. They are skillful artisans and we need offer no apologies to any workers anywhere else in the world. We do not believe that we represent the workers of an industry that might as well be discarded, the State Department to the contrary notwithstanding.

Until a year ago the glassware industry (pressed and blown branch) was getting along very well. However, Czech, Japanese, and German glass tableware has given us more and more trouble. Today there is acute danger of shutdowns and layoffs. The question is how far this must go before relief can be had, if any.

Few, if any, of our American hand-production glass plants are operating more than 50 percent of normal capacity today. Many are operating far below 50 percent and some are about to close indefinitely. Many of these plants are in small communities which depend upon them to furnish employment and to support the needs of such communities. In speaking for the more than 35,000 workers, I also presume to speak for the many hand-made glassware factories that constitute the industry as a whole representing a heavy and vital financial investment.

Our workers are trained in glassmaking and not as production-line workers in automobile factories or as steelworkers, or electrical workers. In the handicraft part of our industry individual skill still counts. Our workers retain the close connection between workman and final product, the lack of which psychologists consider as one of the great drawbacks of modern industry.

We are told by high authority in our Government that if the American glassware industry cannot survive the onslaught of importation they should engage in new business and that the displaced glassworkers will be afforded some kind of Federal unemployment relief while training for new kinds of work. Why should the American glassware industry be sacrificed and why should our highly skilled glassworkers be forced, and the thousands of other workers in the industry be forced, to depend upon extended Federal unemployment relief?

Our Government, through its social security regulations, has repeatedly stated that a worker has the right to choose the kind of work he desires to do. Surely our people would, by the proposed arrangement, be deprived of this freedom and be forced to accept employment which they do not choose to accept. Our people are good Americans and splendid citizens. They should have the right to choose their place of employment and should not be expected to submit to being moved like common cattle to other places of employment through governmental regulations as a matter of expediency. The State Department propagandists condemn the Russians for uprooting humanity by their transfers of large groups of people to new areas of employment yet they propose to force our good American glass workers to sell their homes, take their children out of schools and move into strange communities and accept employment contrary to their wishes.

Are we in America all to become production-line workers, or are we to retain smaller industries in smaller communities scattered throughout the United States? Shall we no longer produce anything that will be worth possessing a generation or a hundred years later? Are we to succumb completely to machinery and be deprived of all the arts of handicraft production?

This is precisely what will happen if we cannot have proper protection in industries that still offer opportunity for handicraft labor. Apparently we are to be forced to go to Europe or anywhere but the United States if we are to find any articles that embody individual skill, artistry, and craftsmanship. In the United States only machine-made products, which have no lasting artistic value, are to be produced.

We greatly deplore this attitude in those who have the power to say whether we will or will not survive. It almost looks as if they were more concerned about the welfare of foreign producers than about the well-being of our own. There is a very stubborn insistence upon further duty reductions despite the fact that we should find some remedy for cuts already made, where these have gone too far.

The terms of trade treaties negotiated under the Trade Agreements Act have never afforded adequate protection to the American glassware industry. It is more difficult now because foreign countries are determined to expand their prewar export trade and are coming into a position to do so. We have been told of the relief to be gained under the escape clause in the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. Unfortunately this would afford no help in the present situation. Immediate remedial action on foreign-made glassware is an absolute necessity if the American glassware industry and the wage and other standards of living of the American glassworkers are to be preserved.

The wage rates in Czechoslovakia range from an average of 20 cents for unskilled workers to an average of 40 cents for skilled workers per hour in the glass industry. The rates in Japan are still lower, reaching down as far as 10 cents. The rates in Germany are higher than in Czechoslovakia but are still very low compared with our own rates. Swedish wages are higher than those in Germany, where average rates range from 36 to 45 cents per hour. This compares with an average of about $1.35 per hour in this country.

Even if our workers were twice as productive as the European, we would still be at a competitive advantage. In those of our factories where hand work still predominates we have little advantage, if any, over the Europeans, in productivity.

In terms of quantity imports are not extremely heavy. The 1949 imports amounted to slightly over $5,500,000, foreign invoice value. At our wholesale prices this would amount to roughly $10,000,000.

According to the Census of Manufactures of 1947, employment in the pressed- and blown-glassware industry amounted to 42,170 persons; but no breakdown is given which would show how many of these are in the hand-made division of the industry. Hand-made articles amounted to about a half of the machine-made product in tableware and kitchenware classification. However, in employment the two are probably more nearly equal.

The effect of imports since the lush postwar market has disappeared is to create pressure on wages, hours, and employment. It also affects the question of old-age pensions. I can tell you that wage-wise we are definitely in competition with the low rates prevailing abroad. Unless this wage gap is bridged or unless some other limit is placed on imports the hand-made-glass factories face extreme difficulties and eventual extinction.

We hope that you can do something to focus the spotlight on the nature of wage competition that will bring home to the public this fact: We can no more compete with 25- and 30-cent-an-hour wages in Europe and hold up our standards than we could compete with sweatshop wages in this country when they were still in existence. The employer who wants to pay decent wages can continue to do so only if he can hold his market against his substandard competitors. Otherwise he either goes out of business or lowers his standards. The latter is what we want to avoid.

We assure your committee of our appreciation of the opportunity you have made possible for us to appear before you and present this present serious problem of a great American industry and a splendid American labor organization.

Address by Senator Chavez at Albuquerque, N. Mex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an

address delivered by me at Albuquerque, N. Mex., last Wednesday.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ, UNITED STATES SENATOR, CHAIRMAN, SENATE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS, JEMEZ GROUND-BREAKING CEREMONIES AT STATE FAIR GROUNDS, ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., MAY 3, 1950

Judge Bratton, distinguished guests, fellow New Mexicans, ladies and gentlemen: This day makes history for the State of New Mexico, but especially the Middle Rio Grande Valley. The event that we celebrate is as important as the original trip taken by the lieutenants of Coronado in marching up the Jemez River to Jemez in the sixteenth century.

Everyone should be happy in New Mexico today. I am. I have lived for this day when we could put into effect the efforts of many years of work by a creative citizenship of this valley and we will start the actual construction of the Middle Rio Grande project.

For years I have envisioned the time when the Rio Grande would be harnessed for its entire path through New Mexico. I have looked forward to the day when we could restore farming in the valley to its productiveness of yesteryear. I have longed for the time when all of the communities from Pena Blanca to San Marcial would be free from fear of floods and when our water resources could be used for the benefit of mankind and not for destruction. I look forward into the future when the dams we will build up the stream will be generating power for the benefit of the people. Power—the golden touch which will bring prosperity to northern New Mexico. From this day onward we go forward. It is a historical moment.

With humility I wish to say that I am proud of having fathered the Middle Rio Grande project as you see it today. I recall the trials and tribulations when the local Middle Rio Grande Project was initiated, the hardships bringing about the program that has been made up to now.

For the benefit of those who don't know about the trials and tribulations which the people of the valley underwent, let me briefly review its history. For centuries the tireless waters of the river have brought floods and heartaches to the valley, destroying property, crops, homes, and at times destroying people. But until there was a greater density of population and until there was a greater investment in property, the floods were considered unimportant. Growing numbers of livestock gradually denuded the grasslands. Water ran off more rapidly on bare ground than off the lush when nature reigned. Through overgrazing of the ranges, the cutting of timber, and a multitude of human follies, the threats of floods of today was brought about.

Today we are starting to undo the damage. As early as 1828 there was a recorded flood at Tome in New Mexico and El Paso in Texas. There were floods before that, but we do not have accurate historical data.

You all know that we are gathered in the oldest continuously settled area in the United States. In comparison with the valley's history of over 400 years of European white civilization on this very ground, history of the Middle Rio Grande Valley project is short, indeed. After the coming of the railroad, and also about the turn of the century, people began to worry about the flood threats of the Rio Grande. Lives, property, and crops were constantly in danger. Nevertheless, because of an international situation which developed in the last century, there was an embargo on the construction of reservoirs in the basin. The Elephant Butte Reservoir, which is the lifeblood of the lower Rio Grande Valley in New Mexico and the El Paso section of Texas was built and placed in operation in 1916, but not until a treaty had been agreed to with Mexico which guaranteed that Republic a certain amount of water from the reservoir; the complete embargo for construction was not lifted until 1925. That is as far back as we can reach to find our people really working to eliminate the constant threats of floods by the Rio Grande in this portion of the valley. In 1927 the State legislature enacted a law authorizing formation of conservancy districts, and in August of 1928 came the official plans for the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District. Flood control was one of the purposes of the district. It took courage by the people of the valley to create a local district and to get into debt to the extent of $11,000,000 in order to protect its people and property. Bonds were issued. Bonds had to be sold. The market wasn't so good and the district was having quite a time. I'm going to let you into a secret. Senator Bratton, our honorable chairman of this meeting; the late Senator Cutting, and I, as your Representative in Congress, finally prevailed upon the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to buy the bonds which made it possible for the district to conclude its work.

But while there was this paving of the way which first furnished us with basic thoughts for the future, actually not too much could be done. The work was too vast. The Federal Government had a tremendous interest in the old river. Water was dear to the States of Colorado, Texas, and New Mexico, each trying to take care of its own, and sometimes little more than its own. Long series of conferences as between the States followed. Finally, in 1938, the Rio Grande compact was approved by Congress, after ratification by the States of Colorado, Texas, and New Mexico. It was designed to permit the construction and operation of reservoirs above Elephant Butte. The Soil Conservation Service came into play with a report on soil and water in the valley watershed in Colorado and New Mexico. Even unpublished flood-control projects were made by the Department of Agriculture in 1940. It was about that time that I came to the conclusion that if we were to have actual flood control and an intelligent, thought-out plan for good construction, the Army engineers should be brought into the project—the Army engineers who had started this type of work from as far back as 1854 on the Sacramento River.

Senator Josiah Bailey, of North Carolina, at my request signed an order authorizing the United States Corps of Engineers to make a survey of the problem and report as soon as possible. Remember that up to that time the only actual Government agency that had to do with the Rio Grande was the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of Interior. To further advance the work of the Army engineers, legislation was introduced—legislation that I sponsored.

My good friend, Senator Bailey, at the proper time brought out and reported the bill and it became the law. That was all very good, but what would actually count would be to get construction work going to carry out what was recommended in the reports pertaining to the surveys.

In 1936 Congress passed the Reorganization Act. By said act there was created a Committee on Public Works which took over the functions of rivers and harbors and flood control, public buildings and public roads, formerly a duty of the Committee on Commerce. The Reorganization Act first came into play during the Eightieth Congress. It became my good fortune to be assigned to said committee, which was then headed by Senator Revercomb of the State of West Virginia.

The survey report of the Corps of Engineers, Albuquerque district office was submitted September 7, 1947, to the Chief Engineer in Washington. In the 4 years between the time that that survey was authorized, the middle Rio Grande project had gone through surveys and conferences on the problems; many plans of improvement; the Rio Grande compact was studied. They were also under the close scrutiny of the Governors of Colorado and Texas. They were all studied by the other Federal agencies—the International Boundary Commission, and so forth. The study and conferences by the States continued until April 5, 1948, at which time the Chief of the Army Engineers submitted the plan to the Congress.

On April 28, 1948, Senator Hatch, now Judge Hatch, and I joined in introducing S. 2571, to authorize the Chief of Engineers project and that of the Bureau of Reclamation for the Middle Rio Grande Valley. After that was introduced, the engineers and technicians for Colorado, Texas, and New Mexico got busy and walked up and down the halls of the Senate Office Building and they never had been busier—meetings here and meetings there, conferences with Members of Congress, discussing the project.

New Mexico's patience and the fact that we had a good, solid, sound project formed the combination which triumphed. Oscar Love, Fred Wilson, Hubert Ball, John Patrick Murphy, Phil Maestas, of Espanola, J. C. Crespin, and Holm Bursum, of Cocorro, Joe Tondre, of Los Lunas, Mayor A. F. Apodaca, of Bernalillo, and many others did a lot of fine effective work in diminishing the Colorado and Texas opposition.

Again on May 17, 1948, Senator Hatch and I joined in introducing an amendment in the nature of a substitute to our original bill, the substitute meeting the objections of Colorado and Texas. On June 9, 1948, the substitute bill was reported to the Senate by the Committee on Public Works. The bill passed and became Public Law 858 of the Eightieth Congress when it was signed by President Truman on June 30, 1948.

Let me divert for the moment while I tell you the following: I consider the Public Works Committees of the Congress as nonpartisan committees. They are construction committees and partisan politics do not have anything to say in discussing matters of life and death of American citizens. Public Law 858 was passed by a Republican Congress and signed by a Democratic President because it was good.

The law authorized the appropriation of $3,500,000 to be expended by the Department of the Army for the partial accomplishment of the comprehensive plan for the Rio Grande Basin and what we are starting today is in keeping with that authority. We are starting a partial accomplishment of the comprehensive plan for the Rio Grande Basin.

I have stated heretofore that the valley has been settled for practically 400 years. People living in many communities are the descendants of ancestors of 350 or 400 years ago. They have been here through the centuries. It has always been my thought since working in the interests of the valley that it was the duty of legislators to protect those people in their rights so that they could get some benefits and be the recipients of the great program brought about by the expenditures of Federal money. I want them to save their little land; I want them to save their property; I do not want the advantage of what is being done today to go to speculators whose only interest in the valley is to make a profit out of the hardships and the work of others and for that reason I had inserted in Public Law 858 the following language, which is the law of the land:

"The Secretary of the Interior, in entering into a contract or contracts for the repayment of the reimbursable construction costs of the Middle Rio Grande project, now estimated at approximately $18,000,000, shall

vary that amount to reflect changes in the estimates of those costs occurring prior to the date of the contract or contracts and in so doing may, if need be, extend the repayment period beyond 40 years to permit payment of costs in excess of the present estimate.

"Subject to the limitations of authorizations approved from time to time for prosecution of this plan, approval is granted to the Secretary of the Interior to acquire, on behalf of the United States Senate, by purchase or donation, agricultural lands owned by the State of New Mexico within the Middle Rio Grande project and to develop those lands substantially in the manner outlined in the report of the Bureau of Reclamation referred to above. Lands so acquired shall be resold or leased by the Secretary to actual settlers for agricultural purposes under rules and regulations prescribed by him which rules and reglations shall set out the prices and terms of such sales and leases, the qualifications required of purchasers and lessees, and other matters relating to the disposition and use of these lands, and shall provide a preferred right to purchase or lease any tract of land to otherwise qualified persons of the following classes in the order hereby set out, purchasers in any class being preferred to lessees in that or any other class:

"(1) The former owner or owners of such tracts, if his or their title thereto was divested by reason of sale for taxes to the State of New Mexico.

"(2) Honorably discharged veterans of World War II who are the sons or daughters of the former owner or owners of such tract, if the title of said former owner or owners was divested by reason of sale for taxes to the State of New Mexico.

"(3) The sons or daughters of the former owner or owners of such tract other than those referred to in (2) if the title of said former owner was divested by reason of sale for taxes to the State of New Mexico.

"(4) Honorably discharged veterans of World War II and other than those referred to in (2).

"(5) Persons other than those referred to in the clauses above. Any deed executed by the Secretary in favor of any person described under (4) or (5) shall provide that any persons described under (1), (2), or (3) shall have the right to purchase any land conveyed by such deed, within a period of 10 years after the execution thereof, by (a) paying to the owner the amount or amounts actually paid by him as consideration for such deed and for the actual cost of improvements on such land plus interest at the rate of 6 percent per annum on such amount or amounts, and (b) assuming any obligations of the owner to the Secretary with respect to such land. Any lease executed by the Secretary under the provisions of this section to any person described under (4) or (5) shall, by its terms, expire not later than 5 years after the date of its execution. The preferred rights provided for by this section to purchase or lease any lands shall continue to be applicable until such land is finally disposed of by the Secretary; but the right of any lessee or purchaser to enter into possession shall be subject to any rights under any prior lease executed by the Secretary. Moneys accruing from the sale or lease of such lands shall be covered into the reclamation fund in the Treasury."

Yes, sir, the good citizens who lost their all around San Marcial and Clyde and Valverde during the floods of 1928 are the ones that I want to protect. I want to see the owners of land around Socorro, La Joya, Veguita, Belen, Jarales, Los Lunas, my home town of Los Chavez, and all the communities and citizens from Pena Blanca to San Marcial to receive some of these benefits. That's why I lose my temper and get annoyed with the heartlessness and the selfishness of the State tax commission that would sell out that class of people. I ask all of you people who are listening to me that I know believe in fair play and decency to help me in this behalf. Why shouldn't the father of a boy who is buried in Guam, Okinawa, Anzio, or Luxemburg be protected in his rights? Why shouldn't that type of boy who was fortunate enough to come back, notwithstanding his sufferings in behalf of the Stars and Stripes, be protected in his rights? Why shouldn't his sister be protected in her rights? I know you will help because I know you're decent. Of course, the speculator and the selfish and the greedy are always with us, but thank God they are in the minority, and even now, if there are any around, probably feel ashamed.

The people of the valley owe a debt of gratitude to the tireless efforts of many Federal Government agencies in bringing about the project, but none more so than the United States Corps of Engineers and the Reclamation Bureau. Each has its work to do but said work will be correlated only to the best advantage. I know the work of the Army engineers. I know its personnel and I, for one, want to give thanks for the help and cooperation that the Corps has given me throughout the years in my efforts to be of some help to the State. From the days of General Markham and Capt. Lucius Clay, now General Clay, continuing with Generals Reber, Reybold, Wheeler, and Pick, we have had cooperation. Even in the days of Conchas Dam construction, Capt. Hans Kramer was advising and cooperating. Colonels Stratton, Rosenberg, Killian, and now McNutt, have unselfishly given their time and energy to be of help to the people of the valley.

I can say the same thing for the Reclamation Bureau. From the days of Dr. Mead, of John Page, Harry Bashore, and Mike Strauss we have had the thought and cooperation and the efforts and energy of the Reclamation Bureau to be of help. Assistant Director of Reclamation Wesley Nelson, who was regional director at Amarillo, Tex., devoted many and many a day in trying to help solve the problem, and right here in our city with the Reclamation Bureau we have John Mutes, a New Mexico boy from the Merino Valley in Colfax and Taos Counties, handling the work of that Bureau faithfully, honestly, energetically, and intelligently. I can vision the day when the work of those two Bureaus will be completed, when the Rio Grande Floodway will be concluded, Jemez and Chamita Dams actual facts, and it is not an idle dream that after the proper studies and understandings as between the States, the Chifio Dam in Taos County will be a fact.

Since preparing the statement made up until now, there have been further developments; further progress has been made in order to carry out the comprehensive plan for the basin. When the omnibus flood-control bill was up for consideration in the House of Representatives, that body allowed the authorization of $34,000,000 for flood control work. When the Senate Committee on Public Works considered the House bill we were able to prevail upon the said committee that the House amount should be increased by $5,000,000 to the Army engineers and that an additional $30,179,000 should be authorized for the program to be prosecuted by the Reclamation Bureau of the Department of the Interior. The Senate approved that, but being that there was a difference between the House amount and the Senate amount the matter had to go to conference and only last Wednesday night that conference was concluded and I am happy to announce that the conferees agreed on the full amount of $69,179,000 authorized. So you see, great progress has been made because no appropriation above $3,500,000 could have been made without further authorization, which is now an actual fact.

Ladies and gentlemen, I am thankful for the occasion. I am thankful to the people of the State who gave me the opportunity to be of service, which I shall continue to do until my trust in this respect is ended.

Curtailment of Mail Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 10, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article by Mr. George Sokolsky entitled "These Days."

THESE DAYS

(By George Sokolsky)

I received a letter from the postmaster telling me all about the reduction of the mail service. It is a mimeographed letter and takes two pages and an envelope. It must have gone to lots of folks and it must have cost a good deal of money. It was an unnecessary expenditure because I had read it all in the newspapers. That is where most of the bad news appears.

What the Post Office is trying to say is that its inefficiencies having caught up with it, it hopes to solve the problem by becoming less efficient. A privately owned business would have to go into bankruptcy under such management.

The Hoover Commission had prepared a detailed plan for making the Post Office an efficient operation. This plan had been worked out by competent men after thorough study. However, most of the plans of the Hoover Commission have been sidetracked.

President Truman is for them, but also against them. He is for them in private conversations; he is against them when it comes to legislative action. In fact, nearly everybody in Congress is for them up to the vote.

We shall survive getting our mail once a day instead of twice. We shall also survive getting the mail in the afternoon instead of the first thing each morning. But it will only prove that the American standard of living is receding.

I shall look at our very filthy streets and at no police being around when you need them, and at all sorts of break-downs of public efforts and say to myself: "Standards of living are going down."

For the standard of living of a people is to be measured as much by what one gets for the taxes he pays as by any other yardstick. The Post Office used to be the example par excellence of communal effort. In fact, the Socialists used to say that if a nation can run a post office so well, it can run the railroads and about everything else.

But the fact is that the Post Office constantly costs more money and gives less service. We used to put a 2-cent stamp on an envelope and it traveled swiftly, in the horse-and-buggy days, everywhere in this country.

Now we put a 3-cent stamp on the envelope and accept casual handling. If you want to see, in a big city like New York, some real slow motion, put a special-delivery stamp on the envelope and telephone to find out when it arrived.

All this is just lowering the standard of living. Or maybe it is due to a lowered tone. Now, Harry Truman's homely attitudes have a great appeal to me, because I like the little people of the earth.

Stuffed shirts bore me as they must most of you. But does Harry Truman have to wear that funny outfit when he goes to Florida? Every time I look at his picture down there—cap with the long visor, funny colored shirt, and the cane—I think of sports at an Atlantic City convention walking the boardwalk of an evening to see what's around.

I just can't help thinking of that. It does not mean that he isn't a good guy maybe, but the tone is wrong.

So maybe he sets the tone and by now it has worked its way down to everybody in government. Tone is a standard of living.

There used to be a homely phrase, "high toned." We don't use it anymore. We no longer say "that is a high-toned family," by which we meant that they were well set up, acting according to the traditions of the race, fine looking.

Sometimes you have the feeling about high toned when you see the oldsters, but in our generation we level down.

And that is exactly what our post office is doing. It is leveling down. Maybe the next reform will be mail delivery every other day or come to the post office to get it.

Maybe they will set up some self-service machinery so that you can grab your own, like a cafeteria. Anything can happen when the standard of living goes down. And it can go awfully low.

Happenings in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a newspaper release of mine, dated May 8, 1950, entitled "Happenings in Washington." The statement applies particularly to program No. 24.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAPPENINGS IN WASHINGTON—PROGRAM NO. 24

This is ED MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital, and bringing you another discussion of happenings in Washington.

I want to speak to you about something going on in Washington that's important to the livelihood of everyone in our State.

I want to talk to you about your jobs—how they are being affected by the tariffs we have now and the tariffs to come.

Most of you know where I stand. For the others I'll make my position clear now.

I believe that the best guaranty of security for the United States is a good job at good wages for every American worker.

I believe that every American should be gainfully employed at a wage scale sufficient to maintain the American standard of living.

I believe in the expansion of the purchasing power of the American dollar so as to maintain a growing market for the products of industry and the products of our farms.

That's what I've always fought for. That's what I'm fighting for now. That's what I intend to keep on fighting for.

You can't have good jobs or good wages if the goods we produce must compete with commodities made by people who get only a fraction of your wages. And when enough of those goods, produced by cheap labor, are dumped on our shores, then you don't have any job at all.

For more than 15 years, we have operated under a so-called reciprocal trade system. Under that system our tariffs have been falling lower and lower and lower. Today they are lower than at any other time in 50 years.

The protection formerly given to the American worker is being wiped out, slowly but surely.

Nevertheless, the State Department announced, just the other day, that we are about to make still further and deeper tariff cuts.

Beginning September 28, the State Department announced, conferences will be held in England for the purpose of discussing tariff concessions on 2,500 items.

Seventeen nations in South America, Central America, Europe, Asia and Africa will take part. One of them is the Federal Republic of western Germany.

You may be sure that the outcome of the conferences will be a further flood of cheap labor imports to compete with goods produced by our workers and our farmers.

How does that affect Pennsylvania? I'm going to tell you.

But first let me say something else to the millions of workers in our State, particularly those who have jobs in manufacturing plants.

If there is any question in your minds that these tariff reductions endanger your jobs—well, just ask your unions.

I've been hearing from union leaders. From the United Mine Workers, from the A. F. of L., and from the CIO. Your unions, too, are worried about your jobs. As long ago as 1947 and 1948 I was hearing from the leaders of locals of glass and pottery workers in western Pennsylvania crying out for protection for the jobs of their members.

Let's consider a few specific items, and I'm talking now directly to the skilled watchmakers of Lancaster, Pa.

In the middle of the 1930's, the United States was producing about 53 percent of the fine watches sold in this country—the high quality, jeweled watches.

That was before the reciprocal trade agreements began to go into effect.

Today about 85 percent of our jeweled watches and watch movements are imported.

Today the Hamilton watch factory and the Elgin plants in the Midwest are the last two jeweled watch companies operating in the United States. There was a third until recently when the Waltham Watch Co. went broke under the pressure of foreign competition. Hundreds of highly skilled American craftsmen lost their jobs.

That is what happens to the well paid American worker when the bars are dropped.

But that's not all. The fine watch industry is important to our national defense. It builds up a reservoir of skilled men who can work on precision instruments that are vital to modern warfare.

In the last war, Germany drew heavily on the skilled Swiss watchmakers for such work. Switzerland furnished the bulk of the precision instruments for the German war machine.

We were able to furnish our own.

But what will happen if the cold war should turn into a hot war? What will happen if the Red army sweeps across Europe?

Well, I expect the neutral Swiss will make precision instruments and sell them to the Russians. They'd have no other market.

But what would happen to us? How would we obtain the necessary precision instruments?

If you don't know the answer, I suggest you ask the State Department.

Yes, the jobs of our watchmakers and the skills needed to defend our country are being lost. They are pawns in this foreign policy game played by the State Department.

The folks of western Pennsylvania hardly need to be told what has been happening to the china and pottery and glass industries. Men laid off. Men working part time.

I've heard from the unions out there and I know. Their jobs, too, have been made pawns in this game.

And now they announce that in September, they are going to cut still more the tariffs on textiles, pottery, glass, china, chemicals, rayon, paper, leather goods, clocks, fish products, wines, and dairy products.

I wonder how many more Pennsylvania jobs will be lost in that fancy shuffle. I wonder how many Pennsylvania factories will be forced to post notices that they will be able to work only 2 or 3 days a week.

In our State thousands of families are dependent upon the mining and preparation of coal for their daily bread and the roof over their heads. Things haven't been too good for the miners. We all know that. There are several reasons for this, and I'm not blaming the reciprocal trade agreements for all of the present unemployment in coal mining.

But I am blaming it for a part of the trouble. I am not alone in that stand. Nor does my support come from rich men who own mines. It comes from labor. It comes from the United Mine Workers, the railroad brotherhoods and the CIO oil workers.

This administration has let so much oil come in from foreign countries that the unions are up in arms. The coal people estimate that, Nation-wide, the heavy importation of cheap oil—as allowed under the trade agreements—will throw 50,000 miners out of work.

The railroads that haul the coal will have fewer jobs for railroad men in our State and in the remainder of the country. An estimate has been made that up to 50,000 railroad men may also lose their jobs.

And still they're going to lower rates more and more, reducing another 2,500 duties in September. I say it is time for everyone in Pennsylvania to think it over.

Eastern Pennsylvania is a leading center of hat manufacturing. That industry is in grave danger. Union officials have warned that the American hat industry is being crushed and the workers are faced with the loss of their jobs. Why?

Because of the imports coming largely from Czechoslovakia behind the iron curtain. Thanks to the sharp cut in tariffs, the import of felts jumped 300 percent last year.

The textile workers in Pennsylvania and in New England, as well as those of other States, are feeling the squeeze which is the consequence of this never-ending game of give-away—I mean give-away of your jobs.

The farmer is feeling the weight. Chester County and Delaware County, in our State, are the Nation's most important producers of mushrooms. Tariffs are being cut down to nothing on fresh and canned mushrooms. They are coming in—in great quantity.

We have millions upon millions of pounds of surplus dried eggs stored away in caves. Yet we are importing dried eggs from China. We have more butter in storage than we know what to do with, but we are importing butter. I hardly need mention the great surplus of potatoes which we are destroying. Yet we are importing potatoes.

The Government has bought up vast quantities of wheat, corn, barley, rye, and other agricultural commodities. But, under the reciprocal trade agreements, we are importing them.

There's trouble ahead for our farmers in that kind of situation. It can't spell anything but trouble. But, in September, the jobs and livelihood of our farmers will be made a pawn again—when the State Department further reduces the tariffs on hundreds of farm commodities.

When I ask here in Washington why we do these things, I get the same kind of answers

that many of you receive. Our people are told that we are strengthening our friends and allies. With that answer, the State Department seeks to justify its action.

If that is so, I ask—and you have every right to ask—why are the jobs of our people to be sacrificed to imports produced by slave labor in Communist Russia and the other countries behind the iron curtain?

Why are we letting them dump their surpluses into our markets?

Why do we let this slave-labor merchandise undersell the product of the American worker?

Is Russia our friend and ally? Are Bulgaria and Rumania and Czechoslovakia and Poland and Communist China our friends and allies?

Why should we strengthen them?

We have been told that what we are buying from those countries are strategic materials—things we must stock pile for our defense.

The truth is, my fellow Pennsylvanians, we are getting practically no strategic materials from those countries now.

Here are some of the things we have been importing from iron-curtain countries: Furs, shoes, rubber footwear, walnuts, and canned crab meat.

Now I ask you, Is canned Russian crab meat a strategic material?

Are walnuts from Communist-controlled Manchuria a secret weapon?

Will we be unable to defend ourselves in the next war without rubber overshoes from Czechoslovakia?

There has been convincing proof that most of what we get from Russia is turned out by slave labor and dumped in the United States to cause confusion in our markets and hurt our labor. We have a law in this country that we may bar goods produced by foreign slave labor.

I say we should invoke that law to protect the jobs of our people.

The Russians buy no frills from us. They don't let our manufacturers or our farmers dump surpluses in their country. They don't buy anything which will result in unemployment for their people.

Why, then, do we allow the United States to be made a dumping ground for the iron curtain countries? Why do we allow that kind of competition?

And remember, we are going to get more of it if the State Department further drops our tariffs.

These trade agreements are not the only concern of our workers this year.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee has begun hearings to determine whether the Senate should ratify the International Trade Organization charter. It is interesting that only two of the other 55 countries that took part in drafting the charter, have so far ratified it.

The ITO, among other things, would force further tariff reductions among the countries, and would establish rules to govern and limit some types of tariffs.

Of course, there is one invisible but ever present factor. We have learned from the reciprocal trade agreements, that other nations do not reciprocate. In case after case, other countries have withdrawn their concessions to us. Nevertheless, they continue to enjoy the full benefits of our concessions.

I fear that the same situation would develop under an ITO and still more Pennsylvania jobs would be lost.

I am strongly in favor of helping the free nations that are in need of assistance to restore stability and to raise their standards of living.

Whether all of its objectives are achieved or not the outpouring of American wealth and resources under the Marshall plan will be recorded as the greatest humanitarian effort in world history.

But I do not believe that the American worker, in addition to being burdened with high direct and hidden taxes, should be deprived of his job to bolster a foreign policy which has not distinguished itself with outstanding success in the past.

I repeat, the best guarantee of security is a good job at good wages.

This is ED MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital. I will be with you again in 2 weeks. Thank you for your attention.

Reply to Harold E. Stassen by Senator Humphrey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a reply to Harold E. Stassen by the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], broadcast over the radio last night through the facilities of the American Broadcasting Co.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPLY TO HAROLD E. STASSEN

(Radio address by Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY over American Broadcasting Co., May 9, 1950)

Last week those of you who were listening to this network were subjected to a most extraordinary attack on the President of the United States. Some of you have been sympathetic to the criticism of Mr. Truman's policies. Some of you may have shut off the radio. But I am sure that those who continued listening were shocked at the type of attack which was made.

I, myself, was deeply shocked. And personally embarrassed. I come from the State of Minnesota of which I am justly proud. I am privileged to serve as a United States Senator from that State. So it was especially difficult for me to realize that the slashing irresponsible attack poured out over the air came from a man who at one time had been the Governor of my State—Mr. Harold Stassen.

As a citizen and elected representative from Minnesota I wish to set the record straight.

Mr. Stassen in no way spoke for the millions of Americans who respect and admire their President. Nor did he speak for those Americans, who, at times, feel compelled to constructively criticize the President and his policies. He in no way spoke for the 3,000,000 citizens of Minnesota, the overwhelming majority of whom cast their vote for President Truman in 1948, just as they have supported the New Deal and the Fair Deal in every election since 1932. To be sure, the President has his political critics in Minnesota, but I am proud to say that that criticism comes with good taste and with good manners. Effective and constructive criticism is essential to the preservation of democracy. Irresponsible and reckless criticism is destructive of democracy.

But Mr. Stassen did not criticize—he vilified. Distasteful as his methods were, and in his case under the circumstances strangely reminiscent of the fox and the sour grapes, the false charges of Mr. Stassen could easily be dismissed as the bitter voice of an ambitious but unsuccessful candidate for the office of President. We could have ignored these charges except for one thing. Mr. Stassen represents a pattern of political conduct and political strategy which the disgruntled Republican Party is trying to design out of the rags and tatters of their despair. For 18 long years they have tried every political trick in the book to win the support of the American people. Yes, tricks they have used—not program; trickery—not leadership. Their political sideshow has been repudiated. Having nothing of their own to offer the people of this country, in desperation they have decided to try to tear down what Mr. Truman has offered. Mind you, they offer no real alternative. They do not offer a constructive program.

This attack was timed by the Republican leadership to discredit our President at the very moment that he was going to the people to make a direct report. The partisans of privilege do not want a President who speaks plainly and honestly to the American people. The representatives of privilege fear the democratic example of a President being with and speaking directly to the people.

Yes, the Republican leadership well remembers that when President Truman last went to the people in that memorable campaign of 1948 the people came by the thousands to hear his message. That message was the program of the Democratic Party. The people accepted that message. They believed in their President. They demonstrated their belief and their faith in him by their votes. That message was the program of the Democratic Party. The people accepted that message. They believed in their President. They demonstrated their belief and their faith in him by their votes.

Yes, in 1948 President Truman went to the people and said, "I believe in the people of this country and I believe in the principles on which this country was founded. I believe in their right to work and to be healthy and to live decently. I believe that as a free people we have an additional responsibility to the rest of the world, and that, as a democratic nation, we can and must help the other democratic nations of the world to prevent the aggression of communism."

But the President didn't stop there. He told the people exactly what he proposed to do to make this possible. He spoke of housing legislation, of strengthening the Social Security Act, of increasing the minimum wage, of providing health legislation, and of enacting laws giving all citizens an equal opportunity to work.

Since then the President has stood by his word. It is this which annoys, disturbs, and confounds the opposition. Could it be because of the President's integrity, his courage, his program, and his identity with the people that Mr. Stassen calls him, "the worst President ever to occupy the White House"?

In his first message to the Eighty-first Congress, Mr. Truman presented a complete program which would carry out his pledges.

In the field of foreign policy, he reemphasized the importance of an aggressive, constructive program of economic assistance to the democratic nations of Europe in their struggle against communism. He proposed a bold new program to help the underdeveloped and underprivileged areas of the world, so that they, too, might become strong and able partners with us in the fight for freedom.

The President sent to the Congress a series of measures to guarantee basic civil rights, and equality of opportunity to all people.

He proposed the repeal of the Taft-Hartley law and the establishment of a fair standard of labor-management relations vital to a free economy.

He outlined to Congress a comprehensive slum-clearance and housing program that met the needs of our low-income families, farmers, our middle-income groups and veterans.

The President requested of the Congress enactment of a broad health program. He had promised the people he would try to give them basic economic security, and true to his word, he sent to the Congress a bill raising the amount of monthly allowance for old-age insurance and expanding its coverage to include many people who now receive no insurance at all.

Yes, Mr. Truman is fulfilling his promises. He has fought for his program. He has presented to the Congress realistic proposals. Here we have a President who understands the practical, everyday needs of the American people.

Despite the bitter opposition of the Republican party and their Dixiecrat friends in the Congress, real progress has been made. We have a new housing act which will help clean out some of the worst slums in the Nation and relieve the serious housing shortage.

We have a new minimum wage law providing for 75 cents an hour. We have moved forward in improving the Nation's health. We have provided for the farmer—grain storage and price supports.

Under the constant prodding of the President, we have begun the difficult process of reorganizing and modernizing the governmental machinery.

And, before this Congress adjourns we shall do much more.

But, some parts of the Fair Deal program have not been carried out. And who do you suppose is responsible? Not the President, who outlined the program. Not the supporters of the Fair Deal, who voted for these proposals. Not at all.

It is the members of the party to which Mr. Stassen and Mr. Gabrielson belong who have blocked good legislation—with the help of their Dixiecrat allies. It was this coalition, repudiated in the last election, that blocked repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act and has successfully resisted the enactment of basic civil-rights legislation. It was this coalition which defeated a proposal for middle-income housing. It is this unrepresentative coalition that defeats the will of the American people.

Now, a word about our foreign policy. First, I wish to pay tribute to the leadership of that distinguished Republican Senator from Michigan, ARTHUR VANDENBERG, for his magnificent efforts in attempting to breathe into the Republican Party an understanding of its obligations in the field of international affairs. I also pay honor to those who have joined with him in fulfilling the obligations of a bipartisan foreign policy.

But, the Republican Party policy-makers, from its national chairman to its Senate leaders from Nebraska and Ohio, are leading the Republican Party back into isolationism. Oh, yes, they are unwilling to say they are isolationists—they just say they are economizers. With the world on fire, they think it is important to save on water or to keep half of the fire-fighting equipment safely tucked away in the firehouse.

The efforts to scuttle the Marshall plan come from the Republican leadership. The insults to our neighbors and allies come from that same leadership. The efforts to weaken the reciprocal trade program come from the Republican leadership. The recent unsuccessful attempt in the United States Senate to defeat the important point 4 program of assistance to the underprivileged and underdeveloped nations came from the Republican side.

The same Republican leadership that has initiated and encouraged an irresponsible and unsubstantiated attack on the State Department, would, by their votes and their actions, scuttle our most effective weapon against world communism—the Marshall plan.

This is their official record.

What is the program of the Republican Party? What constructive proposals are they offering the people? A careful analysis will reveal there is no program. There are no proposals. But there surely is a campaign strategy.

It is imperative that every American identify this Republican strategy for what it really is—a strategy to deceive, to confuse, to bewilder, and to frighten the American people. We have seen this strategy unfold itself under the guise of such terms as welfare state, statism, socialism, regimentation, and communism. These scare words have been hurled about with reckless irresponsibility. This is but the beginning of a frenzied effort to stampede the American people into a state of confusion and fear.

They are unwilling to clarify the issues. The Republican leadership is unwilling to tell the American people for what it truly stands. Well, let me tell you.

What the Republican Party really opposes is a program to provide a decent minimum of economic security for the American people. This is what they mean when they cry, "welfare state and socialism." What the Republican leadership really opposes is a constructive program to increase the living standards of the American people through the cooperative efforts of a government of the people working with the people. This is what they mean when they shout regimentation and statism. Yes, what the Republican leadership really opposes is a program to strengthen the democratic nations in Europe and Asia in their struggle against world communism.

Well, our President is on the road again taking the issues to the people, calming their fears, and reaffirming their faith.

The President will have the opportunity again to warn the people in these dangerous moments of the world that American democracy has grave responsibilities. He will speak in the spirit of Franklin Roosevelt, who, in the dark days of 1938, cautioned us with this following message:

"We in America know that our democratic institutions can be preserved and made to work. But in order to preserve them we need * * * to prove that the practical operation of democratic government is equal to the task of protecting the security of the people."

Our President and the Fair Deal program are committed to the welfare of the people, for we know that as a nation we are only as strong as the people.

More on McCarthy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 10, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Burlington Free Press in a recent editorial comments on the McCarthy charges against the State Department. Mr. Pat Dunn, the editor, very clearly calls the turn on this situation. I agree with the thesis of the editorial in question and I am extending it as part of my remarks at this point:

MORE ON MCCARTHY

"Politics makes strange bedfellows," is a saying that is as old and as true as most things in our finite world. And don't they, though?

Segments of our daily press are trumpeting right in chorus with the Commie rag, the Daily Worker, that MCCARTHY is doing the country's foreign relations "irreparable harm" and his "unfounded accusations" are destroying American prestige abroad. Many of the phrases used in the editorial columns of the Red rag and of these great "independent" dailies are interchangeable and seem to be lifted, one from the other.

We are astounded at the slavish devotion to so silly a cause of great dailies such as Milwaukee's biggest paper. Hating MCCARTHY since he opened his political career, they now lead a chorus in condemning his work and his investigative actions.

Perhaps the metropolitan press has grown too big and too lofty and too far out of touch with the little people? They may echo the sentiments of the international set and of the present regime, but we give them odds they are off base 3 feet, in the opinion of most little people.

Damage to American prestige was done, we repeat, by the type of diplomatic representative the Roosevelt-Truman regime has employed. Some 90 individuals of a certain type suddenly kicked out of the State Department, employed there Lord knows how long—perhaps these, apparently the best the country could dig up to represent them before other nations, are what gave Hitler the idea ours was a degenerate nation. And then, the sudden gymnastics of the State Department in switching to the Marshal Tito faction in Yugoslavia and letting this vicious vindictive Communist give the business to our wartime ally in that nation. And now, China, where Chiang is a bum and not the great war year fighter for four freedoms. For our money, the whole four freedoms had a phony ring from the start as long as Communist Stalin was a subscriber thereto.

The great trust of our State Department in Russia through these years, if not indicating a betrayal, at the kindest, indicates an ignorance not in keeping with so-called leaders in our Government.

Great Campaign of Truth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM BENTON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor entitled "Great Campaign of Truth," which was reprinted as a public service by the International Latex Corp. in the New York Herald Tribune on April 27, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Editorial from the Christian Science Monitor]

GREAT CAMPAIGN OF TRUTH

President Truman is displaying a gratifying awareness that the struggle with Soviet imperialism is basically mental. Real gains for the free peoples will begin to appear as the attitude he expressed in his excellent speech to the American Society of Newspaper Editors is carried into action. Mr. Truman said that he had already directed the Secretary of State to plan a more effective national effort to use the great power of truth in working for peace.

The Soviet system does not even have the interest in truth which caused Pilate to

ask, "What is truth?" It denies the whole concept of objective and permanent truth, and sets up instead a party line—defined from day to day by the Politburo. It is carrying on a vast offensive of suggestion, misrepresenting, and vilifying the free nations, particularly the United States. To deal with this aggression Mr. Truman calls for a great campaign of truth to be heard round the world.

He wisely recognizes that government can and should do only a part of this job. But that part can be vastly improved and extended. On its educational and information program the United States is spending less than $40,000,000 a year, compared with $15,000,000,000 for arms and $4,000,000,000 for economic aid abroad. Recently the House Appropriations Committee cut the funds for these purposes. Does this sound as if the American people yet understood the real nature of the struggle for the minds and loyalties of men?

Some competent observers believe that Russia is winning the war of ideas. Almost anyone who has been abroad in recent months has seen instances where American information and propaganda is outmatched by Soviet money, fanaticism, and effrontery. For instance, millions of "neutrals" were fed Moscow's bald "protest" about an American plane invading Russian territory and shooting at Soviet planes. Washington's sharp answer will be accepted by many, but it should have come faster and with more supporting evidence.

It is becoming harder and harder to pierce the iron curtain. The satellites are closing down American information services. Russia is spending huge sums trying to jam the Voice of America broadcasts. Senator BENTON has urged a world-wide network capable of putting America's story into every radio receiver in the world. He also urges documentary movies for at least one-fourth of the earth's population each month. These are ideas well worth exploring.

Much of the job must be done by private agencies—newspapers, magazines, radio, and movies. These are often given more credence than official information. They, too, need improvement. Too many times commercialized sensationalism or partisanship gives a distorted picture of America. Some movies are particularly damaging, even those which are useful at home in showing up abuses and injustices. Possibly one answer would be in a semipublic, nonprofit agency designed to tell democracy's story but avoid an official line.

Fundamentally, our hope lies in the power of truth. Our part is to seek it, adhere to it, and trust it. As we come to understand better that absolute truth is nothing less than God, the disposition to do that should be increased. We should then be less dogmatic, less ready to follow the Russians in taking a party line from one source, more willing to give unorthodox views a hearing. We should then listen more eagerly for truth and insist that it be strictly adhered to in presenting America's story to the world.

Acheson Persuaded To Stay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM BENTON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the column appearing in this morning's Washington Post by that eminent and fair-minded columnist, Mr. Marquis Childs. I regard this article as an eloquent expression of why it is so difficult to keep able men in key Government positions, and it is likewise testimony to the selfless devotion to duty of our distinguished Secretary of State in the face of almost incredible assaults upon his character.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE HATE CHORUS—ACHESON PERSUADED TO STAY

(By Marquis Childs)

It is a strange commentary on the times that on one side of the stage in the present drama of foreign policy—war or peace—is the same cast of characters that played the same role in the years immediately preceding World War II. They might be called the hate chorus.

They are a weird blend of ex-this and ex-that; of chi-chi individuals who cling to the social label and very important Republicans. In 1938 and beyond they were in America First and they hated Roosevelt.

This time they consider the President beneath their contempt. Their hate and their malice are concentrated on Secretary of State Dean Acheson.

At a charming little dinner party given by a soloist in the hate chorus recently, Acheson's resignation was gleefully predicted even down to the number of days preceding the date on which he would be forced out of office. The prophet in this instance was one of the oddest characters in the group who has since been removed from the payroll of the Central Intelligence Agency; the last being an eventuality that may have been hastened by the fact his name was on one of Senator MCCARTHY's lists.

How much this prophecy derived from wishful thinking, compounded with psychopathology of a complicated nature, probably only a good psychiatrist could determine. But, in actual fact, the event this crew have so worked for and longed for came closer to happening than they could have known.

Not long before he left for the series of European conferences now in progress Acheson called on the President. The prolonged and nagging quarrel in Congress with all its savagery had deeply depressed him. He had a heartsick feeling that perhaps his usefulness was at an end.

While it has been for the most part outside the scope of the news, Acheson has in recent months been under a great personal strain in addition to everything else. One of his two daughters, Mrs. William P. Bundy, has been undergoing a series of major operations in connection with a grave illness.

This may have been one of the reasons why, as he told the President, he felt he could not and should not continue as Secretary of State. The President's response was immediate and unequivocal. He replied that whatever Acheson's personal wishes might be, he could not resign.

The President went on to say that he understood Acheson's feelings very well. To serve in high office in times like these was to take personal abuse of an unprecedented nature. But under the circumstances there was no choice but to go on. It was a duty not merely to people here at home but to free people everywhere.

You've got to stay here, Dean, and fight both the Communists and the Republicans, the President is reported to have said in conclusion.

The President was in a fighting mood and he conveyed to his Secretary of State something of this same fiery determination. Acheson left for Paris feeling better about the struggle to maintain some unity of policy at home and the struggle to maintain some unity of purpose among the western allies in Europe.

There was, of course, not a little politics behind the President's pep talk. He well knows that Acheson's resignation, no matter what the real motives, would be taken by the McCarthy-Wherry-Taft wing of the Republican Party as a victory and everything would be done to make it appear as a confession of guilt.

Between the President and his Secretary of State it seemed to be settled that there would be no change—certainly not before the elections of November 7. This means that there is not likely to be any change in or expansion of policy. And it is just here that one comes to the crux of the tragedy.

The policy being pursued today is not big enough or bold enough in relation to the threat of total war; a threat that seems to grow more real and more imminent with each day that passes. Both in theory and in practice the policy of containing communism through strength is inadequate. The policy of strength should be related to a far-reaching peace offensive carried to all peoples everywhere.

Perhaps no course whatsoever can avert destruction. But if there were an all-out effort to avert it, then at least there would be the satisfaction on the day it happened that everything humanly possible had been done on our side to prevent it.

Truman at Lincoln

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, there appeared in the Washington Post this morning an editorial which I think is very good. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of May 10, 1950]

TRUMAN AT LINCOLN

It is significant that President Truman elected to give the first major speech of his "nonpolitical" tour at Lincoln, Nebr. That is in the area where farmers have begun to grumble about price declines, and it is not far from the region where blowing dust and insects have seriously damaged the winter wheat crop. Mr. Truman's remarks thus can be taken as a preview of the administration's campaign to retain the farm vote. Not surprisingly at all, that campaign is based on the something-for-everybody formula of the Brannan plan. Evidently the administration is relying on price declines to bring farmer pressure on legislators who so far have refused to take the plan seriously.

A lot of nonsense has been written about the Brannan plan, and the President had a point in decrying the charges of regimentation. Any governmental program necessitates some controls, and it is the lack of

sufficient controls that has in part been responsible for the disgraceful potato glut. Nevertheless, it is undeniable that the Brannan plan would bring more direct dependence on the Government for farm income. That may not be regimentation, but it is scarcely the way to bring about greater control by farmers of their own destinies—a point Mr. Truman dwells upon. Moreover, the more governmental control there is, the more disastrous can be the effects of misjudgment—and that is where the possibility of ruinous cost comes in.

Most interesting is the President's reference, with apparent alarm, to the fact that farm prices have fallen 20 percent in the last 2 years. It is quite true that if farm prices were to plummet, it would be difficult to stave off a depression in the rest of the economy. Nevertheless, Mr. Truman speaks of price declines as if the highs of 2 years ago were normal. In point of fact, they were all-time highs occasioned by tremendous foreign demand, and what has taken place since is largely healthy readjustment.

It is on this point that the Brannan plan runs into perhaps its greatest difficulty in light of technological advances, new seeds and fertilizers and changes in farm patterns, many farm products are simply not worth even what they cost today. Yet under the Brannan plan many of the support levels would be even higher than under the present system. In other words, instead of bringing flexibility in supports, the Brannan plan would compound the rigidity by giving permanency to overvaluations. Consumption of perishables might be stimulated by lower prices to consumers—made up by Government payments to farmers charged against the taxpayers—and some overproduction might be checked by quotas. But it is hard to see how the shifts in production, better soil conservation and stimulus to more efficient farming the President talks about could be attained under a system which would make it more profitable for inefficient marginal producers to stay in business.

Should President Take a Hand in Congressional Contests?—Minnesota Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, there appeared in the Minneapolis Tribune on May 7, 1950, what we call the Minnesota poll. I think this would be of some interest to all Members of Congress. For that reason I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Minneapolis Tribune of May 7, 1950]

MINNESOTA POLL—56 PERCENT SAY PRESIDENT SHOULDN'T TAKE ANY PART IN CONGRESSIONAL RACES

A majority of Minnesota voters think President Truman, who leaves today on a 9-day, 10-State speaking tour, should take no part in congressional election contests, the Minnesota poll finds in a State-wide survey. Fifty-six percent say the President should adopt a hands-off policy toward such contests.

But 39 percent contend that, as head of his party, "the President has a duty to help elect as many members of his party to Congress as possible." The remaining 5 percent are undecided or offer different answers.

Democrats call the President's scheduled tour nonpolitical in character but Republicans assert it will be a political mission. Observers point out that the President's route will take him through congressional districts in which Republican Congressmen are in the majority.

Views of Minnesotans on the question whether the President should or should not use his influence in congressional races were obtained in a survey in which a representative cross section of the State's men and women 21 years of age and older was questioned.

Interviewers, calling attention to the President's tour, handed each person a card bearing two statements and asked:

"With which of them do you most agree?"

The statements were:

Statement A: "As head of his party, the President has a duty to help elect as many members of his party to Congress as possible; therefore he should help them in their election campaigns."

Statement B: "Because he is President, he should not take any part in congressional election campaigns in the various States."

These are the results:

	Percent
Choose statement A	39
Choose statement B	56
Other answers	2
No opinion	3
	100

People who give other answers say "as President, he can do anything he wants to," or "both parties have always done it and I suppose he has the same right, regardless of how we feel about it," or "he should not be called upon to do this as he has enough to do now."

Democratic-Farmer-Laborites are inclined to favor the position that the President should help to elect as many members of his party to Congress as possible, but Republicans and independent voters differ:

	Democratic Farmer Laborites	Republicans	Independents
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
Statement A	50	26	35
Statement B	47	69	58
Other answers	2	2½	1
No opinion	1	2½	6
Total	100	100	100

A Faribault farm woman thinks that if he got more Congressmen elected who agreed with him, he would get more done. A Duluth man comments that he has to have someone to help him. And a Minneapolis man believes that his speaking would not influence the vote just because he is President.

But another Minneapolis resident thinks the President should not participate in congressional campaigns, saying, "Let the people decide on candidates without the influence of the President." A LaSalle man says, "This is a democracy; the people should make their own decisions." A Worthington man thinks he should stay in the White House where he belongs.

Majorities of the city, town, and farm people interviewed in the study indicate they think the President should not campaign for congressional candidates.

Respectful but Despairing Plea to Mr. Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 10, 1950

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Baltimore Sun, Baltimore, Md., of May 9, 1950:

RESPECTFUL BUT DESPAIRING PLEA TO MR. TRUMAN

Those whose memories go back 2 years will remember that Mr. Truman's last campaign tour was a great political success. When it started, the President faced almost certain defeat. When it ended, the tide had turned and victory was in sight.

The only trouble with the tour was that it was so expensive to the taxpayers. Mr. Truman had to make so many promises to the various pressure groups that making good on them has given the country a succession of enormous deficits. The famous dollar gap of Europe is small compared to the dollar gap which Mr. Truman has presented to the United States.

Now Mr. Truman is off on another tour. He is going to visit those States where the outlook in November is least hopeful for his party. He will be tempted to bring those States into line by promising them more money out of the public till.

Is it too much to ask the President to restrain his generous impulses? Already he has brought the country to the point where people are beginning to ask questions about the value of the dollar. A few more billion-dollar promises and national bankruptcy will be in sight.

Fifty-five Thousand Communists Aided by 500,000 Fellow Travelers Seek To Destroy the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 10, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, last week the Grand Lodge of Masons presented a grand lodge medal for distinguished achievement to that outstanding American, Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. As part of my remarks, I am including an extract from an address given by Mr. Hoover on that occasion. There can be no doubt that J. Edgar Hoover has first-hand knowledge about communism and Communists in this country. The extract in question appears in the current issue of the United States News and World Report.

FIFTY-FIVE THOUSAND COMMUNISTS

(By J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI)

The times demand candid and forthright words. Communists have been and are today at work within the very gates of America. There are few walks in American life

which they do not traverse. Their allegiance is to Moscow; their hopes are spurred by the writings of Marx and Lenin, not Jefferson, Madison, and Lincoln; their enthusiasm is whetted by expediency and deceit, not tolerance and brotherhood. Atheistic materialism is their idol; the destruction of the God of our fathers their goal. Wherever they may be, they have in common one diabolic ambition: to weaken and to eventually destroy American democracy by stealth and cunning. Theirs is an organization built and supported by dishonor, deceit, and tyranny and a deliberate policy of falsehood. They know that as long as the ideals of common endeavor, mutual respect and tolerance remain alive they can never bring to fruition the Communist world revolution. That is why Communists consider America their No. 1 enemy. A strong America, materially and spiritually, is a constant beacon of light, buoying the hopes and aspirations of millions of men, women, and children crushed under the yoke of Communist tyranny which today controls the destinies of one-third of the peoples of the world.

The Communists possess a well-knit, closely disciplined, destructive force of approximately 55,000 members in the United States. In actual numbers, their membership may not be large, nor have the Communists polled at any time a large number of votes in an election. This has been cited by the ignorant and the apologists and appeasers of communism in our country as minimizing the danger of these subversives in our midst. The actual strength of the Communist movement in the United States is not something that can be accurately stated in just so many figures. It has to be measured largely by the general mass influence of the party and its program. We no longer measure the importance of revolutionary organizations by size. In some places where there are only one or two men, more results are obtained than where they have larger organizations.

But, behind this force of traitorous Communists, constantly gnawing away like termites at the very foundations of American society, stand a half million fellow travelers and sympathizers ready to do the Communist bidding. These individuals, though not identified as Communists, are extremely dangerous to the internal security of this Nation, because as hypocrites and moral swindlers they seek the protection of the freedoms which they constantly seek to destroy. They represent, for the Communist movement, a source of wealth; financial resources; the creation of valuable contacts; levers of social, economic, and political pressures; recruiting grounds for espionage information and agents. Moreover, they do their work anonymously, in "front" organizations, and wherever they can exert the greatest influence, each doing his share to the best of his ability. These individuals are difficult to detect. They are disdainful of the very tolerance which enables them to betray their country. They practice their double-dealing, double-minded, double-tongued, and double-faced tactics on all fronts of our American life, whether it be in politics, in labor, in the press, in radio, in motion pictures, in the schools, or even in some of our churches.

The Communists have their membership concentrated in certain key areas of the United States—primarily in strategic industrial and population centers. This membership is coordinated through a national leadership and a dedication to an alien hate which looks abroad for its direction. If additional personnel, perhaps for a political pressure campaign, for infiltration into a labor union, or for a militant educational program, is needed, National Headquarters of the Communist Party will peremptorily transfer members, temporarily or permanently, into the strategic area.

Communist members, body and soul, are the property of the party. They scorn the standards of American democracy. They function like puppets on a string, ready at a moment's bidding to execute the will of the directing master—the Red "Hitler" at Moscow. The party, thereby, through mobility, central direction, and the disciplined fanaticism of its converts can, at any given moment, achieve power and strength in a limited sector. At times, this pressure is so well organized and expertly supervised that the Communists achieve gains out of all proportion to their numerical strength. That is the secret of Communist success; the tragedy of democratic resistance.

If every American faced the reality of what the fulfillment of the Communist objectives would mean to him—he would be inspired to work harder to protect and preserve the individual liberty and freedom which is part and parcel of our American way of life.

President Truman Again Asks for Action on Statehood for Alaska and Hawaii in This Session of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON
DELEGATE FROM HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 10, 1950

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the text of a letter addressed by President Truman to Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, urging the approval of bills to give statehood to Alaska and Hawaii. The letter follows:

MY DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: I am highly gratified by the thorough and objective consideration which your committee is giving to H. R. 331 and H. R. 49, bills which would enable the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii to take their rightful place as members of the Union. As you know, I have long supported the objectives of these important bills which carry out the pledges made to the people of the two Territories.

I sincerely hope that the Congress, during its present session, will enact legislation granting statehood to Alaska and Hawaii. The need is more urgent today than ever before. By such action, we will not only promote the welfare and development of the two Territories, but also greatly strengthen the security of our Nation as a whole.

It should not be forgotten that most of our present States achieved statehood at a relatively early period of their development. The stimulus of being admitted as full partners in the Union, and the challenge of managing their own affairs were among the most significant factors contributing to their growth and progress.

RESOURCES ARE STRESSED

Very few of our existing States, at the time of their admission to the Union, possessed potential resources, both human and natural, superior to those of Alaska and Hawaii. I am confident that Alaska and Hawaii, like our present States, will grow with statehood and because of statehood.

There is no necessity for me to repeat at this time the arguments for statehood. The many qualified witnesses who have appeared before your committee have, I am sure, presented convincing evidence both as to the need for and the tangible benefits to be derived from statehood.

There is, however, one objection made by opponents of H. R. 311 and H. R. 49 which I believe requires further discussion because it goes beyond the question of statehood and raises a fundamental constitutional issue. I am referring to the objection that Alaska and Hawaii, as States, would be entitled to representation in the Senate of the United States disproportionate to their population.

This argument is not only entirely without merit, but also directly attacks a basic tenet of the constitutional system under which this Nation has grown and prospered. Without the provision for equal representation in the Senate of all States, both great and small, regardless of population, there probably would have been no United States.

NO ISSUES DISCERNED

This was one of the great compromises which the Federalist says was a result not of theory, but of a spirit and amity, and that mutual deference and concession which the peculiarity of our political situation rendered indispensable. There is no justification for denying statehood to Alaska and Hawaii on the basis of an issue which was resolved by the Constitutional Convention in 1787.

America justly takes pride in her record of fulfilling to the letter its obligations to foreign nations. We should be no less scrupulous in carrying out the promises made to our own citizens in Alaska and Hawaii. The case for statehood rests on both legal and moral grounds.

These are troubled times. I know of few better ways in which we can demonstrate to the world our deep faith in democracy and the principle of self-government than by admitting Alaska and Hawaii to the Union as the forty-ninth and fiftieth States.

Very sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

Attacks on United States Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 10, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, with permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I attach two newspaper accounts of a significant address made in Milwaukee May 5 by George F. Kennan, counselor of the State Department and generally acknowledged to be the author of the policy of containment of Soviet Russia. It is noteworthy that although Mr. Kennan did not mention Senator MCCARTHY'S name in his address, two of the country's most distinguished independent newspapers simultaneously interpreted his remarks as a rebuke to "McCarthyism." The first of the articles is by James Reston, and appeared in the New York Times May 9; the second is an editorial which appeared in the Milwaukee Journal of May 7.

[From the New York Times of May 9, 1950]

KENNAN SAYS UNFAIR ATTACKS IMPERIL UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY—THEY ALSO TEND TO CAUSE STATE DEPARTMENT TO KEEP PLANS SECRET, COUNSELOR DECLARES

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, May 8.—George Frost Kennan, counselor of the State Department, is that rare Washington creature: a man who

writes his own speeches and does not hesitate to include therein a little history, some objective criticism and one or two ideas.

The net result of this unorthodox approach is that what he writes often has a delayed reaction. He did a piece for Foreign Affairs a couple of years ago under the pseudonym of Mr. X, which was ignored at first and eventually recognized as a detailed and authentic account of the policy of containment toward the Soviet Union.

He later delivered an address before the Academy of Political Science in New York that defined the possibilities and limitations of this country's foreign economic aid policy. This, too, was overlooked at the time, but now stands as the most informative and reliable official document on the subject.

Nevertheless, although he went to Milwaukee last week-end and delivered another reflective essay on United States policy in China and the consequences of McCarthyism, his remarks lost out in competition with other news and were scarcely reported at all in this part of the country.

MAIN POINTS ARE LISTED

Mr. Kennan had a little advice, not only for private citizens but for his colleagues in the Government as well. His main points were as follows:

1. The charges against the State Department should not be ignored. They have disturbed the American people because the people are beset with serious doubts and questions about American foreign policy that have not been answered to their satisfaction.

2. There is generally a great time-lag—as much as 5 or 10 years on the average—between cause and effect in major foreign policy developments. This fact is not generally understood by the people. As a result, they tend to demand results too fast, and they also tend to lay the blame or give credit for current developments to the people who happen to be in office at the moment, even though the real causes go much deeper in time and in complexity.

3. The United States failed to realize in the 1930's that the three totalitarian states that were most dissatisfied with the outcome of the First World War—Germany, Japan, and the Soviet Union—possessed, in combination, a greater military potential than anything that was likely to be mobilized against them.

4. The western allies also failed to face up to the humiliating fact that they won World War II only with the help of the Soviet Union, which was still saturated with hatred for us and determined to encompass our downfall.

5. Instead of recognizing this unhappy state of fact, and drawing from it the bitter lessons which it held for us, we consoled ourselves with the delusion that Moscow would change. We did not fully realize that we were in a situation where the power of the freed world after the war had not really been enhanced and where it would be a hard and dangerous, and wearisome task to restore peace except with Russia's consent and on Russia's terms.

6. Much of the misunderstanding and bitterness in the United States about the victory of the Communists on the Chinese mainland is the result of shallowness and oversimplification of what has been happening in China. Before the war we sentimentalized and patronized the Chinese people, and underestimated their feelings about the historical record of the west in that part of the world. During the war we ignored a great deal of evidence that the Chinese Government would not be able to consolidate its position. And later we gave them much material aid, which they misused and advice which they ignored.

7. It sounds plausible to blame the State Department for what happened in China, but China is not a province of the United States and the State Department did not decide that the Communist Party should be the faction which would have the best morale and discipline and pack the strongest political punch and win the civil war in China.

Mr. Kennan implied that only by direct intervention in China could the United States have changed the course of events, and he added: "I can conceive of no more ghastly and fateful mistake. * * * Nothing would have pleased our enemies more. * * *"

To blame the present state of our relations with the Soviet Union and Communist China on a few contemporary officials was not only an overly simple reading of history, Mr. Kennan concluded, but it created an atmosphere in which it was difficult for the Government to explain policies or to keep good men to administer foreign policy.

"If the atmosphere of public discussion is to be too harsh, too intolerant, too abusive," he said, "this is going to decrease rather than increase the possibilities for a frank and helpful exposition of Government policy to the public at large. * * *

"What I want to urge is only this: that you * * * recognize the profundity of the foreign-policy problems with which we are faced today; and that you do not be misled into the easy conclusion that the dangers and challenges and dilemmas of our world situation are the product of the mistakes or the ill will of any individuals who bear responsibility at this moment for the conduct of foreign affairs."

[From the Milwaukee Journal of May 7, 1950]

KENNAN TELLS OF DAMAGE OF MCCARTHY TACTICS

George F. Kennan returned to his home community Friday to urge the American people to have faith in their State Department, its policies, and its personnel.

If they do not—if they concern themselves with things which are shallow and fleeting and of dubious substance—there is serious danger of losing the cold war, he said.

No one, we are sure, will question Mr. Kennan's qualifications to discuss these matters. He is third in command in the Department of State. He is shortly leaving Government service for a long time. He has devoted his adult life to foreign affairs. He is the author of the policy of containing Russian communism which has engaged us in the cold war. He is an implacable enemy of communism.

The trouble with the American people today is that they are looking for scapegoats, Mr. Kennan indicated—scapegoats to blame for the fact that we are not getting quick results in foreign policy, the cold war is not going entirely our way, the Russians have made some gains, and China has fallen to communism.

It is an easy conclusion, he continued, that our challenges and dilemmas are entirely the product of mistakes, or of the ill will of individuals responsible for the conduct of foreign affairs. It is an easy conclusion that could be disastrous.

Mr. Kennan is not a pessimist about the cold war. He said that the dangers are no greater than they have been. Things have gone well for us in Europe, badly in Asia. The situation in both areas is still fluid, and can turn in our favor or against us.

We have, he indicated, done the best we could—all that was possible and practicable—and have nothing to be discouraged about. He even hinted that there was hope about China, saying: "We are now on the road to a relationship with China which will be expressive of our high regard for the Chinese people but unencumbered by past involvements and illusions."

"I am not a pessimist, but," said Mr. Kennan.

"If the American people take their eyes off the ball, or if they fail to keep in mind the profundity of our problems and the depth in time and space of their origins, if they allow the quiet and sensitive and gifted people to be driven out of the State Department and Government by wild and unfounded charges, then George Kennan can give no promising assurances.

"The responsibilities borne by men who have to conduct foreign affairs are neither light nor easy," he explained. "This country is not rich in men both qualified and available to take these positions. * * * The strains under which they work leave them a very slender margin of physical and spiritual energy to absorb abuse and derision from the people for whom they conceive themselves to be working. * * * The atmosphere of public life does not have to deteriorate much further to produce a situation in which very few of these people will be able to continue with government.

"The margin of safety with which our country moves in the world today is not great enough to permit us to be reckless and wasteful with the talents and the idealism of those people we depend on for the generalship of our peacetime battles," he explained.

Mr. Kennan at no time named Senator MCCARTHY, of Wisconsin, who instituted the campaign against the State Department that is now rocking the country. But it was obviously this campaign that he had in mind when he concluded:

"Perhaps only someone who has lived for many years in totalitarian countries can feel as strongly as I do how vitally important it is to us to preserve the spirit of tolerance and liberality in our relations with each other and the readiness to give the other fellow the benefit of the doubt, where doubt exists. These things lie at the heart of our civilization. They are essential to the preservation of our national identity and to our entire claim of world leadership. If our enemies without can force us to abandon the spirit of tolerance by frightening us with their agents inside our country, then they will have bypassed the Maginot line of our society; they will have seized the citadels from within, and we on the firing line will have been left with nothing to defend."

Mr. Kennan's story was told with a sincerity, a moderation and a simplicity that won him an ovation from his audience of 250 persons. It is regrettable that more Milwaukeeans did not hear him. It would have done much to clarify their thinking about the McCarthy campaign and to bring them to a realization of what a dangerous and irresponsible thing it is.

Stassen's Attack

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 10, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Post of May 4, 1950:

STASSEN'S ATTACK

As president of the University of Pennsylvania, Harold E. Stassen is hardly in the proper position to engage in political warfare. But the attack on President Truman's administration which Mr. Stassen unleashed Tuesday night would indicate that Mr. Stassen is holding two jobs, one as a university president and the other as sharpshooter for the Republican Party. Mr. Stassen, of

course, is entitled to attack Mr. Truman and the Democrats as an individual. Even as the head of one of our large universities he is entitled to criticize the President and the administration. But it would seem that an out-and-out political broadside such as Mr. Stassen fired at the President this week might well have been left to some Republican who is strictly in the business of politics and not part politician and part university president. Mr. Stassen's speech does not compare very favorably either in restraint or content with the speeches that have been made by his fellow educator, General Eisenhower.

Inexperience Blamed for United States Role in Far East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OWEN BREWSTER
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article dealing with the personnel of the State Department and the far-eastern policy, printed in the day before yesterday's Christian Science Monitor.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INEXPERIENCE BLAMED FOR UNITED STATES ROLE IN FAR EAST

(Second of four articles on the men who make American far-eastern policy. As a specialist in this field, Mr. Isaacs analyzes a serious personnel problem faced by the State Department and offers some suggestions.)

(By Harold R. Isaacs, special correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor)

WASHINGTON.—It is an arresting and uncomfortable fact that there is not a single man at the top policy-making level of the State Department who can be described as a matured and experienced hand in Far East affairs. This is by no means the whole explanation for American failures in Asia. But it is a significant part of the explanation.

For both Secretary of State Dean Acheson and Dr. Philip C. Jessup, now one of his top policy advisers, Asia lies beyond a horizon dimly seen. Dr. Jessup's recent swift journey across the world could not overcome the deficiencies which he probably would be one of the first to acknowledge. Yet he has had to take part in serious policy decisions based precisely on this deficient background.

It is presumably at the next lower rung in the hierarchy that one might expect to find the riper kind of experience needed to provide the materials for higher judgment. Yet here, too, there is no change in the characteristic pattern.

POLICY PLANNING

High in State Department councils, in an adjacent sort of way, is the Policy Planning Committee. It was headed until recently by George Kennan, whose chief experience has been in Russia, and who is reputed to be a scholarly and thoughtful individual. His capacity for global thinking, however, was never quite able to embrace Asia. Like many others in Washington, he became an involuntary captive of cold-war thinking, and the trouble about Asia is that so much about it cannot be understood in the simplistic terms of the cold war.

One member of this committee is John P. Davies, Jr., who was born in China and served his entire Foreign Service career there, plus 2 years in Moscow. Mr. Davies is probably the ablest and most knowing Far East man in the Department today. But he had the misfortune to tangle with Maj. Gen. Patrick J. Hurley during General Hurley's mission to China late in the war. Mr. Davies was one of that small group of China officials who foresaw the collapse of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek and tried to foresee what other political combination might provide a new basis for American policy there.

EXPERT FROZEN OUT

For this reason he has been tarred by Chiang Kai-shek lobbyists and propagandists in this country as one of those responsible for the China debacle. Although he commands respect in the State Department, he has not been able, as a result of this, to hold any post in which he could exert any strong influence on the making of Far East policy. Indeed, it is quite possible that Far East matters are now not even within his purview on his present job.

Over on the operational side, the man who became the first Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs under the recent reorganization was a career diplomat, W. Walton Butterworth. Mr. Butterworth served a tour as a stripling vice consul in Singapore 20 years ago. He went from there to Europe and to a host of jobs far from Asia and Asian affairs. He did his most important work in Spain during the war. He did not see Asia again until 1946, when he went to China with Gen. George C. Marshall. He served there for a year and a half and returned to become America's top Far East official late in 1947. He has a reputation for being able, courageous, shrewd, but not for having a detailed knowledge of Asia.

LONG CAREER

He was recently detached from his other duties to concentrate on the problems of the Japanese peace treaty. His successor as Chief of the Bureau of Far Eastern Affairs is Dean Rusk, former Deputy Under Secretary of State. Mr. Rusk has had a long academic and governmental career in this country, none of it directly concerned with Asia until he went to India as an Army staff officer during the war. He is obviously a man of ability. But in his new job he has to start from scratch, and that, at this stage of the game, is very far back.

The career men who sit at the various geographic desks under Mr. Rusk are usually too far down to have much to do with the making of policy. The business of making a career in Government service often has a way of routinizing and bureaucratizing men and keeping them from capitalizing on any latent ability they might have. The Foreign Service in particular has not been a notable producer of notable men for the high policy-making jobs. The few individuals with outstanding spirit and special attainments who crop up in its ranks every once in a while usually run into obstacles, internal or external, that block their advancement. In a bureaucracy only the safe men normally get ahead, and it is not safe men who can make effective policy for the United States in these times, especially in the Far East.

Some of these officials, like John Allison (northeast Asia) and Philip Sprouse (China) served for many years in their areas. Mr. Sprouse is about to be succeeded by Edmund Clubb, who has also spent his whole career in China. The man who presides over the Office of Southeast Asian Affairs, on the other hand, is William B. Lacy, a Government economist, who had never set foot in Asia until last spring, when he made a fleeting trip there.

Under these regional heads, more junior officials sit in various spots. They conform to the usual law of averages and have varying amounts of knowledge and experience. Every once in a while a junior turns out to be superior to his superiors, and, as everyone knows, this is a dangerous business for the junior. Many a man with a light has to find a bushel to hide under or take the consequences. This is normal bureaucratic routine and it does not make for much vitality in the Government organism as a whole.

Still farther down the line is the Office of Intelligence and Research, where a few of the most knowing and knowledgeable people in the whole State Department can be found. But it is not often that these people have a chance to make any impact on policy. They bring together all the strands of information that come from missions abroad and other sources. These are not always adequate. They try to use such judgment as they have, but whether their findings influence the upper brackets of policymakers is a matter of chance or circumstances. In a few notable instances, their findings have been deliberately ignored and policy decisions made that ran directly counter to their factual conclusions. It is no joke to say that this opens them to the suspicion of being maverick, if not downright subversive.

EUROPEAN SLANT

But all the men who, for good or ill, work in the Far East sections of the State Department suffer from another disability that has little to do with their merits or demerits as individuals. This is the deadweight of the European outlook on Asian affairs. If it were possible to put one's finger on any central factor in the weakness of American Far East policy, one might say it is the failure to see Asian problems in Asian terms. Decisions about Asia are conditioned by, and often subordinated to, European considerations.

This was the decisive factor in all American policy in southeast Asia from 1945 onward. It was all but ruinous in relation to Indonesia. It is still operative in relation to Viet Nam. The recent decision, for example, to support the French Army in Viet Nam was a decision made not by men primarily concerned with Asia but by men primarily concerned with Europe. The factors determining American policy in Viet Nam have much more to do with France than they have to do with Viet Nam. Hence, among the makers of American Far East policy one would have to include American diplomats in Paris and the men who sit in the Western European Division of the State Department. It need surprise no one, therefore, if the results are, from an Asian point of view, ruinous.

Veto of the Kerr Natural-Gas Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Thomas L. Stokes, which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of April 21, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AGENCY IS THE TARGET—CONSUMERS COULD STILL LOSE VICTORY WON IN VETO OF KERR NATURAL-GAS BILL

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

The consuming public won a signal victory that it could see, out in the open, when President Truman recently vetoed the Harris-Kerr-Thomas bill designed to exempt independent natural-gas producers from regulation by the Federal Power Commission.

But the story is not ended. The public still might lose some effects of that victory and that takes us to a part of the Government process often overlooked by the public. That is the commission that administers regulatory laws under our commission form of Government. Such commissions have wide discretion, and can make laws really effective or dilute them.

Involved in this instance is the Federal Power Commission and the 1938 Natural Gas Act over which there has been constant friction within the FPC as to its scope. The Supreme Court held that under that act the FPC could regulate independent producers, but the FPC has approached the issue divided and warily. The purpose of the Harris-Kerr-Thomas bill was to make sure it did not exercise such power by a specific prohibitory statute, a familiar technique in recent years, and that measure squeaked through Congress by close margins under pressure from big oil interests that own the bulk of natural gas reserves.

MOVE TO RECOUP IN AGENCY

Thwarted by the Truman veto, sponsors of that bill now have concentrated on the FPC in an effort to recoup in the administrative agency. They include politically powerful figures, notably Speaker SAM RAYBURN, Democrat, of Texas, to whom the President is beholden for his legislative program, and who took the floor personally to jam the bill through the House by two votes. Another is Senator BOB KERR, Democrat, of Oklahoma, who has considerable influence among oil men—of which he is one—who have been generous with campaign contributions to the Democratic Party.

They want the President to reappoint to the FPC its current Chairman, Nelson Lee Smith, a Republican, who is sympathetic with their position. His term expires June 22.

Chairman Smith was not only for the Harris-Kerr-Thomas bill, and wanted the President to sign it, but in the Eightieth Congress he was for amendments to the 1938 Natural Gas Act which went beyond exemption from regulation of independent producers to include also a new rate-making formula. In that view he was supported by Commissioner Harrington Wimberly, a Democratic member from Oklahoma.

Those who fought the broader Rizley-Moore bill of the Eightieth Congress and the Harris-Kerr-Thomas bill which President Truman vetoed, are hostile to Mr. Smith's reappointment because of his attitude.

COMMISSION DIVIDED

In recent years the Commission has been sharply divided over the extent of natural gas regulation, with continual strife.

When the Rizley-Moore bill was before the Eightieth Congress, the FPC on which there was then a vacancy, divided two and two, with Commissioners Claude L. Draper, Republican, and Leland Olds, a Democrat, opposing it vigorously, and Chairman Smith and Commissioner Wimberly supporting the amendments which were regarded as of about the same effect as the Rizley-Moore bill.

To the vacancy President Truman appointed Burton N. Behling, head of the FPC's natural gas investigation staff. When it was revealed that he sided with Chairman Smith and Commissioner Wimberly on the proposed amendments and thus would break the tie in the Commission in favor of the oil and gas industry position, such a protest arose that the President finally withdrew the nomination. Instead he appointed Thomas C. Buchanan, of Pennsylvania, a Democrat, who had served for several years on Pennsylvania's utility regulating commission.

This gave the strict regulationist faction a temporary edge until the term of Leland Olds expired last year. He was reappointed by the President, but the oil and gas interests, ever watchful on the administrative as on the legislative front, succeeded in defeating his confirmation after a bitter fight. To that vacancy President Truman named his old friend, Mon C. Wallgren, ex-Senator and ex-Governor of Washington, who sided with strict regulationists in support of a veto by the President, which seems again to give the majority to that viewpoint.

However, proponents of regulation are taking no chances and want to prevent Chairman Smith's reappointment and, if that happens, his confirmation by the Senate.

To Save $4,000,000,000 in Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES W. WADSWORTH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 10, 1950

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Clarence K. Streit from Freedom and Union for March 1950:

TO SAVE $4,000,000,000 IN TAXES

(By Clarence K. Streit)

ATLANTIC UNION SEEN ALSO AS GIVING LIBERTY 50 PERCENT MORE POWER, YET CUTTING UNITED STATES ARMS BURDEN TWO-THIRDS IN DECADE

How can the burden of taxes be lightened?

That is the question more and more every March.

Something can be done in the domestic field, but hardly enough for the taxpayer to feel it. The reason is that 71 cents of each 1951 United States budget dollar goes to pay for past war or present defense against either cold or shooting war. Only 6 cents goes for social welfare, health, security; only 23 cents for all the other peaceful governmental services put together.

If there is to be tax relief the bulk of it must come in the international field, without weakening our defenses, either in the present cold war or in the possible shooting war. None but Communists would want to weaken these defenses. All others would much prefer to make them stronger, but to do this, if at all possible, without increasing the tax burden but lessening it instead.

How can we work this wonder, of strengthening our defenses while lessening the taxation burden?

The establishment of a federal union of the North Atlantic democracies—which resolutions now before Congress would have us explore in company with the other six sponsors of the Atlantic Pact (Canada, Britain, France, the Netherlands, Belgium, and Luxemburg)—would do this in four ways:

1. By giving greater defensive power with no increase in cost; by giving the taxpayer, in short, more for his money;

2. By increasing the national income at the same time, thus lessening the ratio of the tax load to the income of the people who carry the load;

3. By lessening the cost of defense through removing unnecessary and dangerous duplication by the democracies; and

4. By lessening it still more through eliminating excessive defense expenditure and in other ways.

The total effect of these four factors would be, by conservative estimate, to reduce the defense burden of the United States taxpayer $4,000,000,000 a year, while giving him at least 30 percent more defensive power. Moreover, they would reduce his defense burden in 10 years of Atlantic union to one-third of what it is now while increasing his defensive strength by at least 50 percent.

A detailed consideration of each of the four points will show how conservative this estimate is.

First. There can be no doubt that creation of this union of the free would give the United States taxpayer at least 30 percent greater defensive power at no extra cost. Why? The United States is now spending $13,000,000,000 annually on defense, the other six founders of the proposed union are spending a total of $4,000,000,000. The aggregate annual total of the seven is $17,000,000,000. If United States taxpayers continued under union to pay $13,000,000,000 of this $17,000,000,000 bill, they would be getting a $17,000,000,000 union defense force for a cost of only $13,000,000,000, or 30 percent more for their money.

By this calculation, the other democracies would be getting still more for their money, since they are now spending much less on their national defense. Their population and income are not so great as those of the United States, but the Atlantic union defense force would be as much theirs as ours. Just as the citizen of Rhode Island can count on the United States Army to defend him to the same degree as can the New Yorker or Californian or Ohioan, the citizen of the Union in France or Belgium could depend on it as much as those living in North America.

Atlantic federal union by this calculation would give the British eight times more defense for what they now pay in taxes; the French, 15 times more; the Canadians, 43; the Dutch, 76; the Belgians, 97; and the Luxemburgers, 5,666 times more.

But this calculation errs on the conservative side.

Consider all the United States taxpayer would gain—still at no extra cost—in defensive power by the organic union of our naval, air, and atomic arms with the world-dispersed bases now held by the British, French, Dutch, and Belgians. Consider the gain in strength through the fact that the western European territory of the union would itself be an advanced base. This territory, moreover, is the strategic hub of the principal hemisphere of the air age—the hemisphere that has, as Parker Van Zandt has pointed out in July 1947 freedom and union, 90 percent of the land on this planet, 94 percent of its people, 98 percent of its industry.

Ponder, too, how the British, French, Dutch, and Belgians would gain by the organic union of their defensive position and power with the vast industrial arsenal of the United States and Canada—a great citadel with two oceans for moats. Consider how this great rise in their defensive strength at no extra cost would improve their morale, their will to resist any invasion. And then try to calculate how this improvement in their morale would further strengthen the defense of the American taxpayer's individual freedom.

Look at the kind of attack—atomic attack—that alarms people most. The most hopeful practical defense against it is twofold—dispersion and power to retaliate decisively.

Consider how much more dispersed the vitals of this ocean-scattered union would be than those of any democracy now, how hard it would be for an aggressor to knock out at one surprise blow all its means of dealing a much mightier counterblow.

Consider, too, how much more rapidly the union could develop power in this field through the close combination of European pure science and American technical know-how. It was cooperation between these two that produced the atomic bomb, but since the war, this has fallen away through the recrudescence of nationalism's loyalties and suspicions. Union would develop a far closer cooperation in this field than existed during the war, and at the same time immensely improve—still at no extra cost—security from spies.

Even this much thought shows how much we err on the conservative side when we say the United States taxpayer would gain by Atlantic union 30 percent more defense for his money. It would still be conservative to estimate our gain at 50 percent at least.

Second. If one adds up the national income of each of the seven sponsors of the Atlantic Pact in 1947, the latest year for which these figures are available for them all, the total, as shown in table II, is 283 billion. If the stimulus to production that union gave resulted in a mere increase of 6 percent in this Atlantic union income, it would amount to $17,000,000,000, or the total amount the same countries are now spending on defense.

Suppose the national income of the union rose to no more than by 10 percent, a very modest rise, or by $28,000,000,000. That would make its income $311,000,000,000. Suppose it neither increased nor reduced the $17,000,000,000 figure for defense. Even so, the ratio of the burden of defense to income would have gone down from $1 in $17 to $1 in $19, a reduction of 12 percent.

Among the 13 States, however, the constitution of a Federal Union in 1789 rapidly changed the picture from bust to boom. There are no good figures available on the total income or even on the foreign trade of each of the 13 States before union, but we do know that the value of the foreign trade of the United States quadrupled in the first decade of union.

True, the 13 States had a vast area of undeveloped land, but they were handicapped in developing it by the lack of people, the slowness of transportation, the lack of financial and industrial power. The Atlantic union would have, in its African possessions alone, 10 times more territory to develop than the 13 States had from the Atlantic seaboard to the Mississippi when their Union began. Canada and Alaska could absorb many millions more people, and western Europe could supply more good people now than it could 160 years ago.

The Atlantic union, moreover, would have far swifter means of transportation everywhere than existed then, and the greatest industrial plant the world has ever known. And, instead of beginning with nothing but overdue debts, as did the United States, the Atlantic union would start with practically all the world's gold reserves and financial power.

This would be something quite unprecedented in history—this new republic starting with vast areas rich in undeveloped resources combined with the people most industrially advanced on earth and remarkably equipped with financial, transport, and factory power. It should be noted, too, that this union could be brought about only by mutual agreement of the founding democracies, first, by their delegates in setting up a constitution, and then by their citizens in ratifying it. This would mean that its people had not only tackled great difficulties but overcome them—and would begin their union with all the coverage, vision, and buoyant confidence in themselves and their future that this achievement implies.

Alongside of these factories, the transition difficulties the union would face would seem to be small. It appears reasonable to believe the stage would be set for a period of sound, expansive development, the like of which men have never seen—a period of rapid growth for which "boom" would be too mild and misleading a term.

To be conservative, however, let us estimate that national income of the union would not octuple in the first 10 years, or even quadruple, but would merely double. That would mean a total income of $566,000,000,000. If the cost of its defense remained at $17,000,000,000, the ratio of defense burden to income would then have fallen from $1 in $17 to $1 in $33. It would be only half as heavy as it is now. For the United States taxpayer the ratio fall would be from $1 in $16 to $1 in $31. Coupled with our first point, this would mean that the United States taxpayer would be getting 50 percent more defensive protection at half the present burden.

All this, remember, is estimated on a conservative basis. Moreover, it assumes no reduction whatever in the amount spent on defense. But there is good reason to believe that this figure could be reduced by union. Which brings us to our next point.

Third. Every merger permits economies in removing unnecessary duplication. This would certainly be true of the proposed Atlantic union. At present its proposed founders are maintaining six separate armed establishments (omitting Luxemburg because it is so small). This means six separate defense departments and six independent general staffs, all trying to do the same job, and none able to do it so well, or economically, as would one union defense department and one union general staff. The present duplication is not only expensive but dangerous, particularly when confronting the centralized armed power of Soviet Russia. This is also true of other duplications in the armed forces of these six democracies, as in their atomic plants and competing spy services.

If anyone proposed to save money and yet keep up the defensive power of every part of the United States by dividing its 48 States into 6 sovereign republics and giving each its proportionate share of the existing defense force and budget to handle independently, with no stronger link between them than the Atlantic Pact offers, he would be considered crazy. And he would be crazy.

The illustration shows how incalculable is the gain, both in money and defensive power, that comes from merging six independent defense establishments into one force. But let us be conservative still, and estimate the saving the Atlantic Union would make on this score—with no loss but only gain in defensive power—at merely 10 percent of the present $17,000,000,000 bill. That would be a saving of $1,700,000,000. If the economy were 15 percent, it would total $2,500,000,000 a year. The saving to the United States taxpayer would be respectively $1,300,000,000 and $1,950,000,000.

Fourth. Consider the economies in defense that union would permit, apart from ending duplication. For one example, the union would have about 90 percent of the world's naval tonnage. It would not need to maintain in active service so huge a margin of superiority. As Will Clayton has pointed out, it could retire half of its naval tonnage, and still have 80 percent of the world's active total. If it put on the inactive list two-thirds of its tonnage, it would still retain 75 percent of the world's active total.

Moreover, because of its globe-dispersed bases, the Atlantic union would not need the expensive, long-ranging type of warships and carriers the United States has found necessary, from lack of bases. It could depend more on smaller carriers and warships, cheaper both to build and maintain, less of a risk in battle, and more dangerous to the submarines which form the chief Soviet naval arm.

Similar substantial economies could be gained for the same reasons in the air arm by the union. It could rely much more on medium range bombers than the United States does today. These cost much less to build and operate than 10,000-mile rangers. They can be defended better by fighter planes and can fly lower over enemy territory and bomb more accurately.

There are further savings to be made—again with only gain in power—in standardizing much of the equipment of the Atlantic union defense force. Now, when the forces of western Europe are being rebuilt, it would seem particularly wise to speed this standardizing as only union can speed it.

Not to alarm the admirals and others, let us suppose the union made no drastic economies under our fourth point. Let us estimate this economy at only 10 percent, too. That would mean another $1,700,000,000 saving for the people of the union, $1,300,000,000 of which would go to American taxpayers.

It would still be conservative to estimate the combined saving on the third and fourth points at 25 percent. This would mean a total of $4,250,000,000 a year, of which $3,250,000,000 would be a direct saving for the United States taxpayer.

In fact, the taxpayer would be saved the entire $4,250,000,000. For the $1,000,000,000 economy the European members of the union would enjoy would reduce by $1,000,000,000 the Marshall plan aid they would need for United States taxpayers to furnish.

Nor would this be all the saving the American taxpayer would enjoy. With the greater security and confidence that union would bring to its European members, its great stimulus to business, and its removal of the fear of further devaluations, there would be little need left of further Marshall plan aid to defend the union's European territory in the cold war. Private enterprise, as Will Clayton predicts, would take over most of the job in this area, and much of it in the other Marshall aid countries. The United States taxpayer should save on this score at least another billion dollars, bringing his total saving to $5,250,000,000.

The union might also save about $750,000,000 by funding the present public debt of all its seven members at the same rate of interest as that paid by the United States, which is lower than what the others, except Britain, pay. Result: A total saving up to $6,000,000,000 a year.

By taking over the present debt of each member democracy, along the lines that Alexander Hamilton pioneered so successfully, the union could also insure that an immense amount of private capital would be available in Europe for reconstruction. This would make still less necessary any further taxation of Americans for Marshall aid purposes.

The union could effect still further savings in the cost of diplomacy and in some other governmental services. But these would be small compared to the saving on defense.

In summing it up, let us remain conservative and estimate the total saving to the United States taxpayer on defense not at $6,000,000,000 but at only $4,000,000,000 a year. If we return to our first and second points, and assume that the doubling of the union's national income in 10 years applied equally to the United States part

of it, then we find that this $4,000,000,000 saving would result in the ratio of the defense burden to national income falling from $1 in $16 to $1 in $45.

The short of it is that Atlantic union would not only save the United States taxpayers $4,000,000,000 a year at least, but would give them 50 percent more effective defensive power at only one-third of the real burden they bear today.

ADEQUATE DEFENSE, BALANCED BUDGET

Since Soviet Russia is spending so much more of its national income for war than we are now, some argue that it would be dangerous to make any cut in the arms expenditure of the free. And others argue that the free should spend more, not less, on arms now.

One may answer that Atlantic union would change this picture by the formidable rise in moral as well as general material power that would result, in addition to the great increase in strength union would proverbially bring on the purely military side. But, for the sake of argument, let us assume that it would be wiser for the free to continue spending as much as at present on defense, even to increase that expenditure. In either event union would still lighten the taxpayer's burden. Consider:

No one would argue to continue wasteful expenditure on arms, or expenditure that got less return for the money than could otherwise be had. The $4,000,000,000 thus saved for United States taxpayers by union involves no loss in the armed power of the free. If the free plowed back into arms three-fourths of this economy, they would be increasing their present nonwasteful, effective arms expenditure by $3,000,000,000—and yet they would be spending $1,000,000,000 less than at present.

If they put all their arms economies back into arms, they would still be lightening the taxpayer's burden by (a) giving him more defense for his money, and (b) enjoying the increase in national income that union would bring. And both these factors would remain true if the union decided to spend, say, twenty or twenty-five billion dollars on arms, instead of the total $17,000,000,000 the seven democracies now spend.

If it were wise for the seven when federated to increase their arms bill by half, from seventeen to twenty-five billion dollars, it would be even more necessary for each of the seven, if they did not federate, to increase its arms expenditure even more. But for the American taxpayer, to get without union the benefit of $25,000,000,000 of defense, the United States would have to increase its present expenditure of $13,000,000,000 by levying $12,000,000,000 more in taxes. To get this same $25,000,000,000 of defense through union it would need to add only $6,000,000,000 in taxes to the American's burden, and $2,000,000,000 to the load on the other citizens.

That is, the United States taxpayer, instead of having to pay 100 percent more for defense, would need to pay only 50 percent more. In other words, a 50-percent increase in the arms expenditure of the union would be the equivalent of a 100-percent increase in the same expenditure by the United States as a separate sovereign country.

It follows, therefore, that if it is wise for the free to spend more on arms, then the more they need to spend, the more the United States taxpayer (and the Canadian, British, French taxpayer) will lighten his burden by Atlantic union. Americans get the equivalent of a 100-percent United States increase in arms expenditure at a saving of $6,000,000,000 by Atlantic union—in addition to enjoying all the other savings and advantages in increased power that union brings. The saving to the Canadian and European citizens of the union is still greater.

And with every strong democracy that was added to this nuclear union of seven, the United States taxpayer—and every other taxpayer in this union of the free—would be gaining still greater protection from war while carrying still less of a burden.

Foreword of the May Issue of the Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on Saturday last, through the kindness of Dr. Ernest Minor Patterson, president of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, I was able to examine the galley proofs of the May issue of the annals of the academy. That issue, which will be off the press this coming Wednesday, is devoted entirely to the subject of gambling and law enforcement in the United States. It will contain 17 articles written by eminent authorities on the subject.

As most Senators know, publications of the 61-year-old Academy are noted for the reliability of their contents, and statements found in these publications are cited throughout the United States and abroad as authoritative statements of fact.

I do not want to take the time of the Senate to go into any detail of the contents of the May issue. However, I feel I should tell my colleagues that the high type of factual material it contains should prove extremely valuable to the special committee just established by the Senate for the investigation of organized crime. Separate articles appear on such subjects as bookmaking, slot machines, and the enforcement of gambling laws.

Experts from all over the country prepared the articles, and these experts are among those who most likely will be called to testify before the special committee. I particularly want to call to the attention of the Senate the two excellent articles, one on gambling odds and the other on lotteries, prepared by a local expert who has spent 20 years investigating the subject of gambling. He is Ernest Blanche, Ph. D., chief statistician for the Logistics Division, General Staff, United States Army.

I congratulate the Academy in issuing such a factual and timely publication, and suggest that the May issue of the Annals be placed on the must list of reading for all senatorial offices.

I commend the reading of the publication by Members of the Senate to give them some idea of the problem the special committee named today by the President of the Senate will have.

I ask unanimous consent that the foreword of the May edition of the Annals be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, together with a list of the articles contained in it, and the authors of those articles.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREWORD

Gambling is a well-nigh universal phenomenon. It occurs among people of all ages and cultures. Nor is it an offspring of modern civilization, for it was encountered in primitive communities. Indeed, many of the forms of gambling, as well as some of its rationalizations, go back to the dawn of history. Even the Hittites of Biblical times were interested in improving the breed of horses, which is the current cliché justifying the "sport of kings" and its concomitant, betting on the races.

American attitudes toward gambling have always been ambivalent in character. Widespread condemnation and participation in gambling go hand in hand. The public press sporadically inveighs against gambling and its attendant evils, yet facilitates it by publishing the data essential to gambling in many forms. Churches condemn gambling, yet profit from raffles and lotteries. Legislatures enact antigambling statutes, yet make it possible for States to participate in moneys wagered at race tracks. Flurries of strict enforcement of gambling statutes alternate with long periods of quasi-official tolerance. The citizen who becomes outraged at revelations of police corruption in connection with gambling nevertheless patronizes the neighborhood bookmaker or the "one-armed bandit."

Moreover, each era has seen a fresh emphasis on some new, or the revival of an old, game of chance or outlet for the gambling instincts of the individual. This generation differs from its predecessors perhaps more in terms of an increased participation in the pastime, rather than in the multiplicity of forms it has assumed. Indeed, we have found an amazing similarity between new and old forms of gambling; the stakes are now astronomical, where once they were moderate; the modern devices now employed disguise only thinly the ancient games our forebears played.

It is extraordinary that, despite such universal participation and interest in gambling, little basic material of an analytical and scientific character has been published concerning this absorbing subject. The literature of gambling is studded with colorful polemics concerning its moral and social features; the shelves of libraries are filled with reports concerning official malfeasance in the enforcement of gambling laws, containing some illuminating chapters on the already well-known aspects of gambling. But nowhere, to our knowledge, has the attempt been made to envisage the problem in all its many-sided forms, and from all its facets. Nobody has attempted to analyze and describe the various forms of gambling, as well as to evaluate their moral, political, social, psychological, and economic implications.

This symposium, therefore, represents the first attempt at an over-all analysis of the problem of gambling. It is by no means complete, for this would have required far more space than was available to us, and other techniques of assembling contributions besides that of voluntary collaboration. Nevertheless, despite the gaps and limitations of our material, of which we are painfully aware, we believe that the outstanding features of the problem of gambling have been covered objectively. Our contributors have presented data in the various articles contained herein which make it possible to answer some of the basic questions concerning gambling.

Recent developments have enhanced the timeliness of this volume. During the past few months, gambling has been headline news. At their annual meeting in the fall of 1949, the mayors and city managers of the American Municipal Association discussed the alleged relationship between gambling and organized crime. One result was the launching of a campaign by metropolitan newspapers throughout the country to expose "the nation-wide interlocking operations of well organized crime syndicates heavily financed by the Nation's $15,000,000,000 gambling bill."

On January 5, 1950, United States Senator ESTES KEFAUVER of Tennessee called for a Senate investigation of interstate gambling and racketeering. A few days later, Mayor William O'Dwyer of New York City made his forthright proposal to the legislature (in a message reprinted in this volume) to legalize and regulate certain forms of gambling on sports events. Governor Thomas E. Dewey addressed a public plea (also reprinted herein) opposing this precedent-shattering request. The clergy of the Nation did not remain silent in this controversy, and the Federal Council of Churches stated that it "reaffirms its vigorous opposition to gambling which it considers an invidious menace to personal character and to morality."

These recent developments throw into sharp focus certain basic questions concerning gambling: (1) Does gambling, in any and all of its forms, undermine public morals to such an extent that it must be repressed at all costs? (2) Is gambling primarily an activity conducted by racketeers and underworld characters who are able, through political and other methods, to paralyze local enforcement agencies? (3) Are racketeers in control of gambling using the proceeds from gambling activities to finance other criminal enterprises? (4) Is it possible to control the evils of gambling by legalizing certain of its forms and outlawing others? (5) If gambling is not legalized, how can law-enforcement agencies be strengthened so that gambling statutes can be rigorously enforced, despite widespread public participation in gambling?

We have marshaled the materials contained in this volume for the purpose of furnishing data by means of which questions such as these might be answered. If our readers find our data inconclusive—if they find that our contributors disagree among themselves as to how such questions must be answered—they should not be surprised. The problem of the control of gambling is a complex one, and there are no certainties, no finalities, in this field. All that we hope to accomplish by this volume is to bring about an understanding of the complexities and to stimulate efforts directed toward their solution.

MORRIS PLOSCOWE.
EDWIN J. LUKAS.

LEGAL STATUS OF GAMBLING

The Law of Gambling, Morris Ploscowe; Obstacles To Enforcement of Gambling Laws, Virgil W. Peterson; The Facilitation of Gambling, Paul S. Deland; Gambling in Nevada, Joseph F. McDonald; Legalized Gambling in New York? messages to New York Legislature by Mayor O'Dwyer and Governor Dewey.

VARIOUS FORMS OF GAMBLING

The Forms of Gambling, Oswald Jacoby; Bookmaking, Louis A. Lawrence; Horse Racing and the Pari-mutuel, John I. Day; Slot Machines and Pinball Games, Anonymous; Lotteries Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow, Ernest E. Blanche; Gambling Odds Are Gimmicked, Ernest E. Blanche;

THE GAMBLER

The Professional Gambler, Albert H. Morehead; The Psychodynamics of Gambling, Robert M. Lindner; The Pomo: A Profile of Gambling Among Indians, Burt W. Aginsky and Ethel G. Aginsky; The Argot of the Dice Gambler, David W. Maurer.

GAMBLING IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Gambling in the Latin American Countries, Manuel Lopez-Rey; Betting on Football Matches in Sweden, Bertil Ahrnborg.

Importation of Hats and Hat Bodies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 10, 1950

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement which I filed with the Tariff Commission for inclusion in the hearings before that body relative to an investigation of the importation of hats and hat bodies. This hearing was conducted yesterday, May 9, 1950.

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE JOHN DAVIS LODGE, OF CONNECTICUT, AT THE HEARING BEFORE THE UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION RELATIVE TO AN INVESTIGATION OF THE IMPORTATION OF HATS AND HAT BODIES

As the members of the Tariff Commission must know, the great hat industry of our country is located in Fairfield County, Conn., the district which I have the honor to represent in the Congress of the United States. This industry is centered in Danbury and Norwalk where there is a fine and long tradition for the making of first-class hats.

There is now considerable distress in this industry due principally to the importation of fur felt hats and hat bodies from Czechoslovakia.

It is my understanding that these items are coming into this country pursuant to the agreements reached at the Geneva Convention in 1947 which was prior to the date when Czechoslovakia was dragged behind the iron curtain. In other words, these agreements represented arrangements between two free and independent nations.

Since that time Czechoslovakia has become enslaved. In these circumstances the agreements reached at the Geneva Convention are not only obsolete but they are definitely proving harmful to the people of our own country in the communities which I have mentioned. Furthermore, it is manifestly against our best national interests to assist those forces which are bent upon our destruction. The Kremlin and its satellites are our self-styled enemies. It is high time that our policies and the details of our plans should be brought in line with the realities of the world crisis.

Moreover, these fur felt hats and hat bodies are the product of slave labor and therefore constitute unfair competition. Surely it cannot be part of our national policy to reduce the working men and women of America to a serf status in order to compete successfully with these imports from slave-labor countries.

The labor movement in our country has shown itself understanding and sympathetic with our international obligations and responsibilities. They have been in favor of the Marshall plan from the very beginning. They have been commendably willing to shoulder their share of the burden of foreign aid, conscious of the fact that our national security depends in great part upon the preservation of freedom in other parts of the world. Surely, however, there is no reason why any one segment of our population, any one group of workers should bear the brunt of this effort, even when the imports involved are from free countries. Surely this burden should be spread equally amoug onr people and not handled in a discriminatory fashion. Surely also it is in our best national interest to retain and to stimulate the enthusiasm of our people for the private property, free competitive system.

In these circumstances I think it of the greatest importance that the agreements made under the Geneva Convention with respect to Czechoslovakia should be considered null and void in the light of the present relations existing between the United States and Czechoslovakia.

Indeed, in my opinion, the Tariff Commission and the Committee on Reciprocity Information of the Department of State should seriously consider placing a complete embargo on all items, the manufactured costs of which cannot be ascertained. It is unfair and unwise to expose American industries to competition from items which are subsidized or produced by State monopolies.

Copyright Laws and the State of Israel—Proclamation by the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, last week the President of the United States issued a formal proclamation extending the protection of the copyright laws to citizens of the new State of Israel in consideration of the extension of the protection of comparable copyright laws to American citizens in Israel. This is another sign of the increasing reciprocity between our two nations. I ask unanimous consent of the Senate to have the President's proclamation and these remarks incident thereto inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 4, 1950.

COPYRIGHT—ISRAEL

(By the President of the United States of America)

A PROCLAMATION

Whereas under section 9 of title 17 of the United States Code, entitled, "Copyrights," as codified and enacted into positive law by the act of Congress approved July 30, 1947, 61 Stat. 652, provides in part that the copyright secured by such title shall extend to the work of an author or proprietor who is a citizen or subject of a foreign state or nation only:

"(a) When an alien author or proprietor shall be domiciled within the United States at the time of the first publication of his work; or

"(b) When the foreign state or nation of which such author or proprietor is a citizen or subject grants, either by treaty, convention, agreement, or law, to citizens of the United States the benefit of copyright on substantially the same basis as to its own

citizens, or copyright protection, substantially equal to the protection secured to such foreign author under this title or by treaty; or when such foreign state or nation is a party to an international agreement which provides for reciprocity in the granting of copyright, by the terms of which agreement the United States may, at its pleasure, become a party thereto."; and

Whereas section 1 of the said title 17 provides in part as follows:

"Any person entitled thereto, upon complying with the provisions of this title, shall have the exclusive right:

* * * * *

"(e) To perform the copyrighted work publicly for profit if it be a musical composition; * * * *Provided*, That the provisions of this title, so far as they secure copyright controlling the parts of instruments serving to reproduce mechanically the musical work, shall include only compositions published and copyrighted after July 1, 1909, and shall not include the works of a foreign author or composer unless the foreign state or nation of which such author or composer is a citizen or subject grants, either by treaty, convention, agreement, or law, to citizens of the United States similar rights."; and

Whereas section 9 of the said title 17 further provides that "the existence of the reciprocal conditions aforesaid shall be determined by the President of the United States, by proclamation made from time to time, as the purposes of this title may require."; and

Whereas satisfactory official assurances have been received that since May 15, 1948, citizens of the United States have been entitled to obtain copyright protection for their works in Israel which has been accorded substantially on the same basis as to citizens of Israel, including rights similar to those provided by section 1 (e) of the said title 17:

Now, therefore, I, Harry S. Truman, President of the United States of America, do declare and proclaim:

That since May 15, 1948, the conditions specified in sections 9 (b) and 1 (e) of the said title 17 of the United States Code have existed and have been fulfilled with respect to citizens of Israel, and that citizens of Israel are and since May 15, 1948, have been entitled to all the benefits of the said title 17 except those conferred by the provisions embodied in the second paragraph of section 9 (b) thereof regarding the extension of time for fulfilling copyright conditions and formalities.

Provided, That the enjoyment by any work of the rights and benefits conferred by the said title 17 shall be conditioned upon compliance with the requirements and formalities prescribed with respect to such works by the copyright laws of the United States:

And provided further, That the provisions of section 1 (e) of the said title 17, so far as they secure copyright controlling parts of instruments serving to reproduce mechanically the musical work, shall apply only to compositions published after July 1, 1909, and registered for copyright in the United States which have not been reproduced within the United States prior to May 15, 1948, on any contrivance by means of which the work may be mechanically performed.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington this 4th day of May in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and fifty and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and seventy-fourth.

[SEAL] HARRY S. TRUMAN.

By the President:

DEAN ACHESON,
Secretary of State.

Veterans' Administration Administrator Gives Congressman Pertinent Facts and Figures Showing Numerical Participation in Wars, Number of Dependents of Wars, Number of Veterans Under GI Bill, Guaranteed Loans, Insurance Program, Etc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 8, 1950

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, my recent trip with the subcommittee of Armed Services Committee to several military hospitals in as many States, has given me a continuing interest in the hospitalization problem as to both military and veterans.

So, in a very enlightening interview I was favored recently in having with Gen. Carl R. Gray, Jr., as early as 7:30 a. m. in the morning, he found time, very cordially, to answer my numerous questions. He also found time that early in the morning at his office, to volunteer for my education and on many facts which I felt would be very useful to my congressional colleagues also.

Following, therefore, is copy of his letter of May 3, 1950, to me transmitting some of the facts and figures which I hope may be as helpful to you, as I have already found them to be to me:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, May 3, 1950.

Hon. CLYDE DOYLE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: It is a great pleasure for me to place in this letter the facts and figures which I quoted you this morning when you called at my office. I believe they will show in a very brief way the tremendous ramifications of the Veterans' Administration and give a clear-cut conception of the results evidenced from the laws passed by the Congress which we administer:

Totals, all wars (as of Dec. 31, 1949):	
Participants	24,924,000
Deaths (in service)	934,000
Living veterans	19,022,000
Revolution, 1775–83:	
Participants	395,000
Deaths (in service)	4,000
Living veterans	None.
Last veteran, 1869, age 109.	
Last dependent, 1906, age 92.	
War of 1812 (1812–15):	
Participants	536,000
Deaths (in service)	2,000
Living veterans	None.
Last veteran, 1905, age 105.	
Last dependent, 1946 (age not given).	
Mexican War (1846–48):	
Participants	130,000
Deaths (in service)	13,000
Living veterans	None.
Last veteran, 1929, age 98. On rolls Dec. 31, 1949, 25 widows, 1 child.	
Civil War:	
Participants	2,192,000
Deaths (in service)	364,000
Living veterans	18
Indian wars:	
Participants	106,000
Deaths	1,368
Living veterans	580
Spanish-American War:	
Participants	392,000
Deaths (in service)	11,000
Living veterans	122,000
World War I:	
Participants	4,744,000
Deaths (in service)	131,000
Living veterans	3,553,000
World War II:	
Participants	16,535,000
Deaths (in service)	409,000
Living veterans	15,294,000

Since war ended 6,500,000, or over 40 percent, of all World War II veterans have received some training under GI bill. In addition, 500,000 have been trained under Public Law 16.

Two million two hundred thousand attended colleges, 2,800,000 entered schools below college level, 1,600,000 took on-the-job training, 570,000 took institutional on-farm training, 600,000 took business courses, 400,000 studied engineering, 87,000 took law, 130,000 studied medicine, 170,000 studied teaching. In job training, 34,000 trained for chemists, pharmacists, and social workers, 117,000 entered metalworking, 62,000 took up some phase of printing trade.

Guaranteed loans (as of December 31, 1949):

Number approved:		Number repaid:	
Home	1,700,000	Home	87,000
Farm	55,000	Farm	12,500
Business	115,000	Business	42,000

More than 90 percent of veterans are keeping up payments on loans. Over 141,000 have repaid in full. In past 4½ years VA has had to make good on only seven-tenths of 1 percent loans.

Since VJ-day VA has provided medical treatment to nearly 2,400,000 veteran patients and VA clinics have treated an even greater number. Medical team that cares for veterans has in it 4,200 doctors, 13,000 nurses, 900 dentists, supported by thousands of other trained and specialized workers and volunteers.

In addition, 75,000 doctors and 55,000 dentists cooperated with VA in the home-town treatment plan.

Insurance program: Veterans hold 7,000,000 NSLI policies, $40,000,000,000 worth of protection for families. Some 12,000,000 let $100,000,000,000 worth lapse.

Sincerely yours,

CARL R. GRAY, JR.,
Administrator.

Address of the President at Laramie, Wyo.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 10, 1950

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the address of the President made at Laramie, Wyo., on May 9, 1950:

It is always a pleasure to visit Laramie, a landmark of the old West. It is a particular

pleasure to speak here at the University of Wyoming, a symbol of the new West.

The West exerts a strong influence on the imagination of Americans. The stirring drama of the opening of the West is a part of our national folklore.

It is a tradition that the West is a country of great distances and of isolated communities, of many days of travel between cities. The tradition has left a deep impression on all Americans.

It had much to do, I think, with the notion that many of us once held that the United States was a vast distance away from foreign neighbors—that our Nation was an isolated community separated by days of travel from other communities on the globe.

You know how the West has shrunk. Distances seem to have been wiped out by a network of rails and highways, and now by the huge airliners that cross the entire Nation in less time than it used to take to cross a single county.

The world's distances have likewise shrunk. To put Laramie in its right perspective, you should erect signposts in the center of town that read like this: one pointing east that says, "London, 30 hours"—one pointing west that says "Shanghai, 44 hours"—one pointing south, "Santiago, 35 hours"—and one pointing north, "Moscow, 45 hours."

"NEIGHBORS OF TERRIBLE TYRANNY"

These are the normal flight times of commercial airliners.

There are military planes that fly even faster.

It took two World Wars to bring home to us the fact that world distances have disappeared. We are next door neighbors now to people in other countries who once were scarcely more than names to us. We have become citizens of a larger community—the whole world.

It is the great problem—and the great challenge of our age—that strangers have become fellow citizens at a time when the world is so deeply divided. We have been forced into a common citizenship with people who do not understand our conceptions of democratic life. We must recognize—whether we like it or not—that we are neighbors with a Government which denies all the values of the American tradition, indeed of all ethical and moral traditions, and which seems to spread its doctrine over the entire earth. We have become neighbors of a new and terrible tyranny.

Tyranny is not new in the world. As long as democracy has existed, tyranny has existed. But never before has it been so difficult for tyranny and democracy to find a basis for peaceful coexistence.

There are two reasons for this. The first reason I have already mentioned—the elimination of distances. Where once we could ignore a far-off tyranny, there no longer are any far-off places. Today, everybody on the globe is our neighbor.

NEED FOR ALERTNESS EMPHASIZED

The second reason is that the new tyranny of Soviet communism is giving no evidence that it is willing to let the free world exist peacefully. Communism has clearly shown its purpose to penetrate free countries, to divide free peoples and confuse them, to subvert their institutions, and to weaken their resistance. This is a method of attack far more subtle than the ancient and direct method of military attack. It requires more understanding, more alertness, and more determination on the part of those who want to preserve their freedom.

How do we meet this overriding problem—the most important one of our time?

I will tell you two things we cannot do.

First, we cannot compromise our own moral and ethical beliefs. We know that this newest form of tyranny is a compound of evils. Communism denies all that we have come to know as democracy. It denies freedom and liberty and human dignity. It denies God. We cannot meet the challenge by any form of compromise with such beliefs.

Second, we cannot isolate ourselves. The leadership of the free world, the hopes of millions of people who have not our strength and our resources, depend on us, but, even if we could forget our friends, we know that there is no salvation even for ourselves in any passive policy of withdrawal. If we permitted communism to engulf the rest of the world and to roll up to our four borders, there would be no peace and no security for us.

We cannot compromise our principles.

We cannot withdraw from the world.

What can we do?

CALLS FOR UNITY OF THE FREE

We can do this: We can, together with other nations of the free world, clearly demonstrate the superiority of the ideals of freedom over the iron hand of tyranny.

We can make clear that democracy and freedom bring to each individual, each day, more of what he wants than any other system of government.

The free world must demonstrate moral superiority. It must demonstrate material superiority.

The free world has the resources to make that demonstration. It has the tremendous advantage that always adheres to the cause of justice, liberty, and respect for human dignity. With leadership, with unity, with steadfastness, that demonstration of moral and material superiority can be made.

As the strength and effectiveness of the system of freedom are made clear over the globe—as the peoples who now stand in doubt turn to democracy—the danger of Communist domination will dwindle and finally disappear. The struggle for peace, security, and stability in world affairs can be won.

This is a long-time project. I know that the American people are impatient. But in this instance, we must be more than patient. The conflict that exists in world affairs will be with us for a long, long time. There is no quick way, no easy way, to end it.

In all our relations with other nations, we are following a consistent and forthright policy to strengthen the cause of freedom and bring about stability and peace in world affairs.

VALUE OF UNITED NATIONS VIEWED

We are working, first of all, for unity among the nations. The foremost expression of our will for unity is our work within the United Nations. The United Nations was created on our soil. Its headquarters are in this country. We have worked unceasingly to make the United Nations, and its affiliated organizations, strong and effective agencies of peace and international cooperation.

We have done our best to settle—through the United Nations—some of the difficulties in the world today. You know the record. You know the vetoes. You know that failures in the United Nations cannot be laid to any lack of good faith on our part or any lack of trying.

In spite of all difficulties, the United Nations has done—and is continuing to do—work of tremendous value in helping the nations of the world to get along with one another and solve their common problems. This work must continue—and it will continue.

As long as I am President, we shall support the United Nations with every means at our command.

Within the larger framework of the United Nations, we have joined the countries of western Europe in a great combined effort to assure their economic recovery and political stability.

VOTE FOR FOREIGN AID CITED

The decisive vote of 60 to 8 by which the Senate a few days ago approved the Foreign Assistance Act of 1950 is a powerful expression of the determination of the American people to carry forward our constructive foreign policy. This action by the Senate, following a large favorable vote by the House of Representatives, assures our partners in western Europe that we will successfully complete the great recovery program that was launched 2 years ago.

To promote international peace and security in vital areas, we joined first with the other republics of North and South America in the treaty of Rio de Janeiro, and then with Canada and 10 European nations in the North Atlantic Treaty. Through the mutual defense assistance program, we have joined with a number of other free nations to strengthen our common military defense against aggression.

In the former enemy countries of Germany and Japan, we have been working to restore them to the society of free nations as rapidly as they can build firm and reliable democratic institutions.

Our efforts in Germany have been delayed by the attempts of the Soviet Union to turn Germany into another Communist satellite. Nevertheless, Western Germany has made great progress along the road toward democracy. We believe that the Germans will continue to build upon these elements in their tradition which are good. We want Germany to become more closely integrated with the free nations of Europe.

TELLS OF PROGRESS IN JAPAN

In Japan, we have also seen encouraging progress. The Japanese people, who have not had the same long familiarity with democratic ideals, are none the less learning the ways of democracy. They are rebuilding their economy along more democratic lines. In one field after another, the Japanese are reestablishing their contracts with the rest of the world in preparation for a resumption of full membership in the international community.

Elsewhere in Asia, we are encouraging the aspirations of the millions of people who are striving to establish new democratic governments. In this part of the world, we have witnessed since the end of the war a tremendous event in history—the birth of a great group of new nations—India, Pakistan, Burma, Ceylon, Indonesia, South Korea, and the Philippines. These new nations are now consolidating their independence and working out their problems of internal security and stability.

We welcome these new countries into the family of nations. We can—and shall—continue to give them support, material as well as moral, in their struggle to maintain their freedom.

The credit of $100,000,000 to the United States of Indonesia is one type of material aid. Another type is the technical assistance we shall make available to underdeveloped countries under the program thus become known as point 4. This was approved by the Senate last week after earlier authorization by the House.

Point 4 provides an example of broad-scale collective action on the part of many countries to bring the benefit of better living conditions to millions of individuals now suffering from ill health, illiteracy, and poverty. The point 4 program is one of the greatest contributions we can make to the cause of freedom.

While our support of the new nations of Asia has been of real benefit to them, we have recently been unable to be of any assistance at all to the people of one vast

area—China. Since the Chinese National Government disintegrated and the Chinese Communists seized control of the mainland, the plight of hundreds of millions of Chinese has been tragic. Their new taskmasters have been heartlessly indifferent to the worst famine which has occurred in China in 100 years.

We have been working for some time on steps which our country might take to feed at least some of these stricken people. The attitude of the present authorities in China has forced the withdrawal of American official representatives from that country. However, there are still a number of American religious, educational, and charitable organizations which have representatives in China who might be able to help out. We are now trying to find a way for the government to get food into the hands of these private agencies for distribution in China.

REPORTS OBSTRUCTION IN CHINA

We do not know whether American private organizations will be permitted by the Chinese Communist authorities to provide this assistance. The Communists so far have tried to deny the existence of a famine. They have rebuffed the efforts of others to discover the facts.

They have even sent to the Soviet Union food which is desperately needed by the Chinese people. Nevertheless, we shall keep on trying to find ways to get some food to the Chinese people.

In Asia, and in the rest of the world, we are trying to do far more than to bring relief to people who are in want. We are working, by every means at our command, to build the kind of world economy in which nations can be self-sustaining over the long run by their own efforts. This is of great importance, because there can never be political stability and peace unless there is a reasonable degree of economic stability and prosperity.

Our world economic policies are aimed at breaking down the barriers to world trade.

We believe that a high level of trade can raise standards of living in our own country and every other country. This is the purpose of our reciprocal trade-agreements program, and it is the purpose of the proposed International Trade Organization.

LOOKS TO A LONG TASK

Our economic policies are also aimed at increasing the international flow of investment capital. The industrial growth of underdeveloped areas will mean more production, better markets, and a stronger world economy.

All our international policies, taken together, form a program designed to strengthen and unite the free world in its resistance to the spread of communism. They are aimed at banding the free countries together in a great demonstration that the free way of life is more rewarding to the individual than any form of tyranny, old or new.

I say again that we have a long task ahead. It may be many years before we can be sure that communism is no longer a threat, that our goals of stability and peace have been attained.

But those goals are clearly within our reach. The non-Communist nations together have two-thirds of the world's people and three-fourths of the world's productive power.

And we have much more than mere quantity or mere strength. We have the greatest attraction of all—human freedom. Our system of life satisfies the most fundamental desire of man—the opportunity to be his own master.

We can have faith that with these qualities, and the help of the Almighty, we will attain a just and lasting peace throughout the world.

The Hand-Out Highway to Dictatorship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from an address entitled "The Hand-out Highway to Dictatorship," by H. W. Prentis, Jr. The address as originally delivered was too long to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD under the rule. Therefore, I have deleted certain portions of it.

The address is primarily directed to church men and business leaders and their responsibility in preaching the gospel of free enterprise.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE HAND-OUT HIGHWAY TO DICTATORSHIP

My subject tonight embodies a figure of speech of great antiquity. Twenty-five centuries ago, Isaiah commemorated the return of his countrymen from their long captivity in Babylon with "The voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord."

Highways are always fascinating. They hold the lure of the unknown, the urge to discover what lies beyond the horizon. So tonight we may well ask ourselves where the highway of current national policy is leading us, as it wends its way beside beguiling streams of Government propaganda, between smiling fields of Federal hand-outs, around hairpin turns of preelection promises of Government economy and open-handed postelection spending, uprising mountains of taxes and across the forbidding plateaus of Government deficits. Where is it going? Will it gradually glide down the pleasant slopes of inflation to the green fields of the life abundant? Or will it—God forbid—take us through the dark valley of the shadow of class hatred and economic chaos to the precipice of dictatorship?

* * * * *

Our highway to freedom in America was pioneered by the Greeks and Romans; engineered by Christianity—especially by our Calvinistic forebears; blueprinted by the eminent political philosophers of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries in France and England; and finally constructed as an integrated system by the founding fathers of the Republic in 1789. It has brought us as a nation to the richest land of promise that the world has ever seen.

* * * * *

Sad to relate, however, we Americans seem to have grown tired of paying the price of traveling on freedom's road and instead now seek alluring shortcuts to illusory economic security on the hand-out highway to dictatorship.

GATHERING CLOUDS ON THE ROAD TO FREEDOM

A few years back, whatever clouds there were on our road to freedom seemed quite distant and far removed from the affairs of our everyday existence. Today, that situation has changed. The clouds of collectivism and class consciousness have moved close enough now so that all of us know that they are coming in our direction. * * * The danger of collectivistic infiltration of this Nation is no longer a mere possibility; it is an acknowledged reality. * * * Our problem is no longer that of attempting to keep socialism and communism away from our shores, but rather that of strengthening our defenses against an enemy who has already landed and is now well entrenched in our midst.

* * * * *

THE TASK OF PRESBYTERIAN MEN

The people of America are slowly awakening to that particular danger—when it bears an unmistakable communistic label. But the greatest danger—the most immediate threat—comes not from open communistic infiltration, but from the relatively unrecognized threat of huge, paternalistic, bureaucratic, highly centralized government. The American people do not realize that the so-called welfare state is really the hand-out highway to socialism and dictatorship. The task of us Presbyterian men—and all other Americans who truly love their country—is to make that point clear.

* * * * *

HAND-OUT STATE UNDERMINES PERSONAL CHARACTER

James Madison, one of the chief authors of the Federal Constitution, said that the whole American system rests "on the capacity of mankind for self-government." The capacity for self-government, in turn, depends now, as it always has, on six elements of personal character: Self-reliance, personal responsibility, individual initiative, thrift, courage, and religious faith. These are the coin in which the toll charges on the highway to freedom must be paid.

Self-government means exactly what it says, namely, ruling ourselves instead of being ordered about by a dictator or a ruling class. Obviously, that type of government cannot exist if the citizen is not willing to do his individual part as a free man. Government, after all, is not something mystical and superhuman. It is simply a group of men and women, just like the rest of us. The more rope we give them, the more they will take; the more of our troubles we make them assume, the more powerful they become, for power is a heady drink. So, eventually, under the socialistic hand-out state, the tables are reversed: Government, which started out as the servant of the people, ultimately becomes their master, and popular self-government disappears. So the first reason why a nation that wants to remain free should beware of the hand-out state is that it insidiously undermines those elements of personal character on which freedom depends.

GOVERNMENT CREATES NO WEALTH

The second reason that we should think hard and long before yielding to the enticements of the hand-out state is, to put it bluntly, the question of the cost of financing its operations. Government itself creates no wealth. Everything that government spends comes from only one source, and that is, from the earnings of its citizens. * * * today millions of our people think that government can create wealth and that they, the citizens, can be the beneficiaries of that magical process with little or no effort on their own part.

* * * * *

HAND-OUT STATE LEADS TO COMPULSORY ECONOMIC PLANNING

Another factor that must be taken into serious account is the inevitable tendency of the hand-out state gradually to strangle private, competitive business—one of the essential components of popular self-government—and substitute for it compulsory national economic planning and control. Of course, we want all the voluntary planning we can get on the part of industry, labor, agriculture, and government, and the Government itself must and should plan intelligently in respect to such matters as national defense, public health, fiscal policy,

and foreign relations. But compulsory economic planning of the Nation's economic life is quite a different thing. And wherever it has been attempted, the political freedom and personal freedoms that we now enjoy have ultimately disappeared.

SUCH PLANNING HAS DESTROYED FREEDOM IN RUSSIA AND ENGLAND

Russia has compulsory economic planning and you know how much personal freedom exists there. Germany and Italy put it into effect long before the recent war and you are familiar with the results in those countries. The Labor Government in England is the latest proponent of such planning and already 17 ministries have the power to enter English homes without search warrants where violations of economic regulations are suspected as having taken place. A farmer cannot butcher an animal on his own farm without Government permission. A manufacturer cannot offer a new product without Government sanction. As an eminent British economist recently stated: "The economic life of the citizen is less under his own control than in the days of the Tudors. Even Tudor officialdom is not recorded to have ordered the plowing in of a crop ready for harvest because its sowing had not been sanctioned, nor made it an offense for a man to give a neighbor a pitcher of milk, nor forbidden him to repair his own house with his own hands." Great Britain's troubles today stem in no little part from the stifling of individual initiative and the removing of incentives to work and to venture, which have followed in the train of the compulsory economic planning of the socialistic hand-out state.

* * * * *

COMPULSORY ECONOMIC PLANNING PROPOSALS NOW PENDING IN AMERICA

The advocates of compulsory national economic planning here in the United States are hard at work. Pending in Congress is the so-called economic expansion bill which would exercise authority over manufacturing and mining in much the same way that the Brannan agricultural plan would control the farmer. The heart of the economic expansion bill is the provision to set up production councils. There would be an over-all National Production Council, regional production councils, local production councils, and, finally, individual plant production councils. These production councils would be composed of representatives of government, labor unions, and consumers, along with the manufacturer—the man who owned and operated the plant. Under such circumstances, you can imagine how much influence he would actually have in determining how his plant was run. You may find it hard to take such proposals seriously. But the mere fact that they are now actually pending before committees of Congress is a striking indication of how far the concept of the socialistic hand-out state has already permeated our national thinking. Many things have happened to the American system that no one ever dreamed were possible 15 years ago. And many of them are irrevocable.

* * * * *

BUSINESSMEN HAVE SPECIAL RESPONSIBILITIES

Now if we business and professional men do not arouse the American people to the danger that our freedom faces from the socialistic hand-out state, no one else will. The politician isn't going to do it. The hand-out state is the politician's bonanza. All apparently that you have to do to be elected these days is to find something the people still need, or think they need, and suggest that if you win, you will see that the Government supplies it free. * * * Away back in the first century, the Greek historian Plutarch observed that "the real destroyer of the liberty of any people is he who spreads among them bounties, donations and largesses."

* * * * *

THE CHALLENGE TO THE CHURCH

The church should be in this fight right up to the hilt. For no institution has more at stake. But there seems to be a good deal of muddy thinking on the part of some of our ecclesiastical leaders.

The whole American system of political, economic and civil and religious freedom, is based on a religious principle—the sacredness of the individual soul in the eyes of a sovereign God. With all its imperfections, it has accomplished more for the ordinary man than any other political and economic system that has ever been devised. The overwhelming majority of our ministers are fully aware of the dangers of collectivism, but the statements of some of our church leaders are really astounding. Dr. E. Stanley Jones, for example, says that "Russia has got hold of a higher principle, cooperation, and it is working out in higher results than we can work out of a lower principle, competition." Dr. John C. Bennett, a leader in the Congregational Church, asserts that "Christianity has no stake in the survival of capitalism." The Federal Council of Churches' pronouncement in 1932, entitled "Social Ideals of the Churches," contains this paragraph: "The church's ideal calls for hearty support of the planned economic system in which maximum social values shall be sought. It demands that cooperation shall supplant competition as a fundamental method."

CHRISTIAN EDUCATION SHOULD ENCOURAGE VOLUNTARY SOCIAL STEWARDSHIP

Nothing is more tragic to my way of thinking than to see the American way unwittingly attacked and undermined by good Christian men and women who, in their keen anxiety and praiseworthy zeal to help the unfortunate improve their economic status, fail to realize that the remedies they seek through expanding governmental control, will eventually destroy representative democracy, intellectual freedom and religious liberty itself.

* * * * *

You cannot expect a young married couple who cannot find a medium-priced home to be against Government housing. The young man who is starting out on his own farm is a priori in favor of Government loans, Government subsidies, and a high price support level for the crops he raises. You can hardly expect the laboring man with a family to turn away from what he is told is free hospitalization and free medical care—actually tax-paid, not free.

AMERICANS MUST REALIZE PRICE OF HAND-OUT STATE

* * * The people will turn against the hand-out state only when they can be made to understand the price they will eventually have to pay for whatever immediate benefits they may receive from that type of government. The price is their freedom—and the American people will not sell their freedom at any price if they can be made to realize what they are doing.

* * * * *

WE MUST EXPLAIN HOW BUSINESS BENEFITS US ALL

When we say, "Beware of the socialistic hand-out state," the man on the street is very likely to think that we are only attempting to protect our own selfish interests, because he has been told that taxes on business profits will pay for all the Government subsidies involved. As a matter of fact, the profits of American manufacturers average less than 6 cents on the sales dollar. Hence it's high time to explain American business to the American public.

It is a most compelling and magnetic story. Men working in our American factories are able to buy, with their wages, twice as much as men who work in similar jobs in England, Sweden, Switzerland, and five times as much as in Russia. While we have only one-fourteenth of the total population, we send more young people to high school and college than does all the rest of the world combined. Our national income is equal to that of all the next highest six countries in the world. Our way of life has enabled the American people to create more wealth, to provide more goods and services, than any system the world has ever known. With only 7 percent of the world's people, our Nation produces 40 percent of the world's wealth. We have 85 percent of all the automobiles, 92 percent of the bathtubs, 50 percent of the hospital beds, and 48 percent of all the radios in the world. From the standpoint of distributing this wealth, the American system has brought all of these goods and services within the reach of more people than any system in history.

* * * * *

UNDERSTANDING OF PROFIT-AND-LOSS SYSTEM ESSENTIAL

But we must do more than tell the story. We must give our people an understanding of the principles on which our prosperity and productivity are based, including the profit-and-loss system.

Profit and loss are an essential part of the private, competitive business system that has given us our dynamic economy. The prospect of profit and the fear of loss provide the motivation for private enterprise. In the socialistic hand-out state profits are so reduced by confiscatory taxation that they no longer furnish the incentive that sparks progress. * * * America was built with the profits of private, competitive business, and all profit sooner or later is spent for wages or used up in losing investments and thus returned to consumers in consumption goods.

Only through constant investment of new capital can industry furnish the tools necessary to provide jobs. How can such needed capital be secured? There are only two possible ways: Either from the profits earned by private enterprise plowed back directly into the business, or paid out in dividends and reinvested—or from taxation of that same income by Government. If it comes by the Government route, socialism becomes a fact. Government then becomes responsible for the over-all planning of the nation's economic life and, as I have previously stated, this inevitably leads to the loss of political and personal freedom.

The profit-and-loss system encourages experimentation—the taking of risks on which our mutual progress depends. * * * The profit system, moreover, is a constructive factor in building a man's spirit. It is good to stand on one's own feet and to feel that one has a chance at least to build a business of his own. The profit system promotes such individual responsibility and reinforces one of man's finest instincts—the desire to provide for the financial future of himself and his family.

The profit-and-loss system, furthermore, tends to prevent the freezing of our population into stratified classes. "Shirt sleeves to shirt sleeves in three generations" is true in America as nowhere else in the world. * * * It furnishes the lifeblood for our great private hospitals, colleges, museums, and libraries. It helps support the church and, finally, it is the only system that can build up an economically competent mass of independent citizens without which political freedom and personal freedom cannot long survive. So why should we business and professional men not crusade vigorously for an economic system that has done so much for America?

* * * * *

BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY PROVIDE WIDESPREAD PUBLIC SERVICE

As a part of our whole effort to make the public appreciate the value of the American

economic system we must constantly point out the service that business renders. Stop any man on the street and ask him to pick out a few things that represent his idea of material progress. Let him select anything he wants—the automobile, our air transportation system, radio, television, anything he cares to name. Where did those things come from? Were they spawned by some Government agency? No, indeed. They came from the research laboratories of American business—invented and developed by research workers and engineers whose salaries were paid by private business corporations, employing facilities and materials that again were provided by American business firms.

* * * * *

If there is need to prove that industry can mix altruism with the profit motive, you have only to go into the laboratories of private business and see the record of the great contributions that have been made to our general knowledge as a result of research privately sponsored and financed. Pick up a textbook on any scientific subject—say, some phase of electrical engineering. Where did all of that knowledge come from—all of those scientific facts that are now available for the general good of everyone? Did they come from some Government laboratory? Mark the book, page by page, and paragraph by paragraph, and you'll see the outstanding contributions made by the research laboratories of Westinghouse and General Electric, and so on down a long list of American business firms.

In the field of medicine, where there has been perhaps more Government activity than anywhere else, you'll find an amazing contribution by the privately financed laboratories of Squibb, Merck, Lilly, and Wyeth, and many, many more. Of course, many medical advances have come from research foundations. But where did the research foundations come from? You know as well as I do—from the contributed profits of American business—the same source that has built most of our hospitals, and libraries, and institutions of higher learning.

* * * * *

WE MUST CONVINCE OURSELVES AND OUR FAMILIES

Now let us turn to the other aspect of our task. As in any kind of sales work, whom we sell is as important as what we sell. Whom must we first convince? My answer is, ourselves and our families.

* * * * *

A real danger lies in the subtle but vicious propaganda that the socialistic hand-out state is inevitable; that we are caught up in some great tide of human affairs that makes any other course impossible; that we are living now in a new and different world. Let me say this: Has anything happened that makes freedom less desirable now than it was a generation ago? We fought the First World War to make the world safe for democracy. And all the recent history of this strife-torn world writes a lesson that cries out for more freedom, not less; for greater recognition of the sanctity of individual rights, not less; for more self-determination; for more local control of local affairs; and for less domination by highly centralized national government.

WE MUST REACH OUT INTO OUR COMMUNITIES

When you have won over your associates, then reach out into your community. All of us profess to be shocked by the way collectivistic doctrines have infiltrated so many aspects of our local life. Yet how many of us have been willing to devote enough of our personal time and energy to community matters even to find out what's going on—let alone to raise effective opposition against subversive activities? It's time to correct that situation by taking an active part in community affairs—an outspoken part. You can't sell goods or services without talking—and you can't sell the American way to your assembled neighbors by sitting silently in the back row. Speak out—vigorously and honestly—and without fear that you may offend somebody. If we business and professional men don't win this battle, eventually we won't have any clients or customers. We shall all be servants of the state. So don't be afraid to stand up and be counted. The secret of liberty is courage. Freedom is for the brave.

WE MUST PERSUADE OUR LEADERS

Next, we must convince our leaders—particularly our political leaders—that there are people in America now, millions of people, who don't want to trade their freedom for tax-paid hand-outs, and that there will be still more millions who, with the kind of educational job that I have been talking about, will rally to the cause of the American way.

This is the hardest task of all. But we cannot succeed unless we can get the support of our political leaders. As I pointed out earlier, there is every temptation for the politician to follow the hand-out highway that leads to socialism—and eventual dictatorship—because it seems to be the easy road at the moment to reelection and political power. We must change that situation. We must get into politics and actively support the candidate who really believes in the American way and who has the courage to stand stanchly against the insidious doctrines of the hand-out state now being preached under the guise of humanitarianism. When his courage brings its inevitable reaction from those who want bigger and bigger tax-paid hand-outs, we must see to it that he is not massacred at the polls. We must keep men like that in office. Only in that way can we maintain the right kind of representation in Congress and in our State legislatures. And it is there in the end that the battle will be won or lost.

WE MUST SHOW THE WORLD THAT LIBERTY LIVES ON IN AMERICA

Finally, by precept and example we must convince the world that the concept of a free man, living in a free nation, the master of his own destiny, has not perished from the face of the earth. What, in all our lives, could any of us do more worthy of the best that's in us, than to add our little spark, small though it may be, to keep alive the flame of freedom. If, through our neglect, that flame flickers out upon these shores of ours, where and when will its light be seen again?

"God of the past, our times are in Thy hand;
With us abide.
Lead us by faith to hope's true promised land; Be Thou our guide.
With Thee to bless, the darkness shines as light,
And faith's clear vision changes into sight."

Financing Small-Business Banking's Midcentury Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 10, 1950

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by E. A. Mathson, of San Francisco, Calif.:

FINANCING SMALL-BUSINESS BANKING'S MIDCENTURY CHALLENGE

The challenge to which I refer is that presented by the necessity of finding a way for private banks to supply all the legitimate credit needs of small business, particularly very small business. It is evident that the increasing pressure for solution is going to result in something being done—either the current proposal for an insured loan plan, or perhaps the capital bank program. The real $64 question is, "What can private banking do about it?"

There is no surer way of securing a sympathetic audience than to propose aid to small business. But despite all outside efforts, it is usually the little fellow who helps himself most by supplying the first requisites for success as an entrepeneur: the will-to-win, stick-to-it-iveness, intelligence, and ingenuity.

From my experience, I would say that the best way to help him is to give him what he is entitled to. If he is destined for success on his own, he doesn't want anything more than that. But sometimes he has a hard time getting what he is entitled to when it comes to bank credit, and that is unfortunate in many ways; first for him, of course, but also for the banking fraternity and the public in general.

But what is a small business?

There is where the confusion starts, because the President, the Congress, the Federal Reserve bank, the Department of Labor, the Department of Commerce, the Bureau of Internal Revenue, the SEC, and a number of other authorities have each tried to develop a practical and workable definition. So far, however, no one has come up with a completely satisfactory answer to the question.

The reason is easily understood, as a business that is relatively small within its own field—say a manufacturing plant with 500 employees—is a giant compared to a little machine shop with half a dozen employees, a family-owned grocery store, or a one-man service station.

For this reason, the viewpoint that seems most logical and which has the widest popular acceptance is that taken by the Department of Commerce, which sets up separate definitions for each major business classification. By their standards, a business is small if it is:

A manufacturing plant with less than 100 employees.

A wholesaling operation with annual sales of less than $500,000.

A retail store with annual sales of less than $100,000.

But no matter what definition we use, sooner or later we realize that we must get down to bedrock, to the millions of small enterprises that are collectively the foundation of our whole American way of life. Whether these are one-man shops, partnerships, family enterprises, or small corporations is beside the point—the fact remains that we have several million small-business operations that present us with our midcentury challenge.

I said it was unfortunate for all concerned, directly or indirectly, when a small-business man could not obtain the bank credit to which he was entitled on the merits of his statement, character, experience, and all the other elements essential to a sound credit. Many of you will say with perfectly righteous indignation, "Anyone with those qualifications would get all the credit he was entitled to in our bank."

It is at this point that the conflict of opinion starts, because a great many small-business men obviously do not get the credit to which they think they are entitled from their banks. This is the reason for the continued demand for new and special financing facilities for these small enterprises. It is apparent that their credit needs are a stumbling block to many banks who want to help but

find that the customary limitations of unsecured commercial accommodations will not provide this class of borrower with the kind of credit he needs.

The several types of credit necessary to accommodate manufacturers, wholesalers, and retailers vary considerably. The small retailer and service business present an especially difficult problem. I am referring here to what Dr. Kaplan, the Brookings Institution economist, agrees are really "tiny business," where sales are considerably less than $100,000 a year. These concerns, however, represent numerically the largest section of small business, and, in my opinion, the one most in need of attention. Manufacturers and wholesalers can generally be taken care of by accounts-receivable financing or commodity loans—all too frequently by finance companies rather than by banks. The tiny retail and service businesses usually have to be treated on a character-loan basis. Such loans are generally considered to be too risky and too expensive to handle. However, that is the real challenge: to find a way to accommodate this large segment of the business economy safely and profitably. It can be done because it has been done, but, strangely enough, primarily by large banks. Here we have a perfect example of the interdependence of big business and little business.

Manufacturers rely on small business, and even on very small or tiny business, for many of the parts required for their finished products. In the case of automobile manufacturers, these suppliers number into the thousands. In the wholesale field—food, for example—the wholesaler depends upon many thousands of small outlets, and to insure their existence he provides them with the latest ideas in efficient merchandising. A notable example of big business sharing its know-how with small business is the completely integrated program of the Reid, Murdoch Division of Consolidated Grocers Corp.

Perhaps as these sound, constructive programs on the part of big business to aid small business become better known, some of the current feeling in certain quarters about the badness of bigness will disappear. At least it is a record of which big business can be justifiably proud, because of its farsightedness in contributing time and effort to maintaining a truly free-enterprise system.

There are many Government officials who are aware of this situation. None, to my knowledge, is better informed or more sincerely interested in helping to improve the economic climate for all business than the gentleman who spoke earlier today—our distinguished Secretary of Commerce. While he was in San Francisco on his recent survey trip, I had the privilege of spending a sufficient amount of time with the Secretary to understand his point of view, his aims, and his objectives. I can assure you gentlemen that the bankers and businessmen of this Nation are most fortunate in that this vital office is held by a man of such preeminent qualifications, possessed of such a forthright spirit; a dyed-in-the-wool American who is absolutely convinced that our system is not the best, but that it will continue to be the best.

I know he is anxious that the solution of the problem be found by private banking, and therefore it may be well to give the insured business-loan proposal a trial. At least it leaves Government agencies out of additional direct lending activities; but we may as well face the fact that the insured-loan plan, while unquestionably good in theory, won't work in practice unless all banks get behind it enthusiastically, which for some will mean a major change in policy.

Dr. Kaplan highlights this situation in his analysis of the various capital bank and insured-loan plans which have been proposed. He says in part: "The financing of capital operations involves different psychology and different methods from those involved in the operation of a commercial bank for depositors. It requires personnel not inhibited by orthodox banking traditions."

The reason I say that bankers must pay heed to Dr. Kaplan's very revealing comment is not hard to see when we examine the record of bank participation in other Government-insured loan plans.

A check of FHA operations made during the last half of 1947, showed that less than 20 percent of our 15,000 commercial banks were originating loans under the title I program. Actually, 67 finance companies accounted for almost one-third of the total dollar volume of loans made during that period, while some 3,000 banks were responsible for the remaining two-thirds—and this after the program had been in operation for over 15 years.

We find an even darker picture in the insured GI business loan field. Here, too, there has been a failure to take advantage of an opportunity, because a recent inquiry as to the number of commercial banks which have made GI business loans revealed that less than 600 banks have made VA-insured business loans.

These are good programs. They will both apparently be on hand for some years to come, and they certainly deserve more banking support than they have received.

It is also apparent that no new program calling for insured loans to small business will succeed unless more adequate bank support is forthcoming.

When my good friend, Walter French, asked me to speak to you, he said he felt that other banks might be helped by the experience our bank has had in dealing with the problems of financing all segments of small business. We are always happy to share any know-how we have acquired in this or any other field, and to this end have provided a large number of banks with forms, advertising material, our experience ratios, and counsel and guidance to the extent that they were desired. Judging by the inquiries we have received, the most interesting part of our whole small-business program seems to be our term loans to small business.

These are capital loans for commercial, industrial, or professional purposes, to individuals, partnerships, or corporations, for a maximum amount of $10,000, with maturities presently running from 1 to 3 years. They are secured or unsecured, depending on the type of business, and each is supported by a modified form of business-loan agreement very similar to the agreements we use for larger term loans in the corporate field. Each term loan calls for a definite program of payments—monthly, quarterly, or semiannually—from expected profits of operation.

An analysis of some 6,800 of these loans showed that 15 percent of them involved starting a new business, 35 percent related to buying an established business in whole or in part, and 50 percent were concerned with the purchase of equipment, additional inventory, an increase of working capital, or some other phase of the operations of a going concern.

The analysis further showed that a guarantor was involved in 11 percent of the loans; 15 percent were in the GI category; 31 percent were secured, morally at least, by a chattel mortgage on fixtures or equipment; while the remaining 43 percent were completely unsecured, character loans in the strictest sense.

So far as the type of business was concerned, 46 percent were retail, 39 percent were service or professional, 4 percent were wholesale, and 11 percent were manufacturing.

Our statistics go back to April 1945, the date on which we packaged the program and commenced an extensive advertising and promotional campaign on term loans to small business. Such loans have always been available in our institutions, but from the time they were packaged they have been merchandised. The figures show that, from April 1945 to the end of November 1949, we made 26,478 term loans for a total amount of $89,532,603, or an average loan of $3,388. To date, $75,343,019 of this amount, representing 19,451 loans, has been liquidated in full and the gross charge-off, before recovery, is less than ninety-five one hundredths of 1 percent. Recoveries currently approximate 35 percent.

Our own plan, of course, was self-insured. This was a very simple operation. We set up a memorandum reserve of earnings in excess of 7.2 percent per annum calculated against monthly outstandings. Our reserve, as of the end of November 1949, was $1,152,943. Gross charge-offs against it (before recovery, it should be emphasized) totaled $718,811, leaving a memo balance of $434,131.

It has been, I think you will agree, abundantly demonstrated in the past that the fully qualified borrower performs just about as well in bad times as in good times, insofar as his ultimate repayment is concerned. This factor of reliability applies to large and small borrowers alike. So then it seems logical to conclude that in bad times the fully qualified small borrower will show up as well as the large borrower. In order, therefore, to secure the same results, all you have to do is to pick more qualified borrowers from among the small applicants. In this way, you go to more trouble and have a higher cost of acquisition, but this is counterbalanced by a wider spread of risk.

There is no denying that when you are dealing with small and newly established businesses you are operating in an area where losses will result. But here again there is a solution, for if you follow the established banking principle that loan rates must be adequate for the risk and cost involved you will necessarily establish a higher rate on these loans. The little fellow, or, for that matter, any borrower, has no objection to paying his way, because any properly adequate rate on a term loan will cost far less than a partner's share.

We have followed a policy of setting rates on a basis that would provide us with an adequate return for the risk and cost involved. Our Installment Credit Loan Department, 70 percent of whose $100,000,000 volume represents loans and advances to small business, produces a far greater proportion of our gross interest earnings from loans than its share of our total loan portfolio would indicate. Installment credit loans represented 21 percent of our total loans and produced 34 percent of our total gross interest earnings. The over-all loss ratio is extremely low. Since the inception of our time-plan program in 1935 we have made loans of all types, including retail, wholesale, and rediscount financing, for a total of $6,080,101,000.

The retail segment of this amount, which includes our small-business loans, is made up of 7,809,681 loans, totaling $3,013,154,327, or an average loan of $388, on which gross charge-offs in relation to liquidated balances totaled only twenty-eight one-hundredths of 1 percent. After recoveries, the net loss was less than twenty one-hundredths of 1 percent.

Perhaps this record, and the record of other west-coast banks offering a complete banking service, accounts for Secretary Sawyer's observation as reported in the American Banker for December 29:

"Small-business men cite difficulty getting loans, Secretary Sawyer reports."

The article went on to say:

"With the exception of the west coast, small-business men complained of 'difficulty of securing loans,' Charles Sawyer, Secretary of Commerce, reported to the White House today, after a 15,000-mile across-the-Nation survey."

The fact that the west coast has a highly diversified economy, with State-wide branch banking available throughout the territory, would seem to indicate that, were branch banking available in other similarly diversified areas, the same results might be expected.

The record and the figures I have just given show what can be done. How to do it is the problem. In my opinion, it is only necessary that your management, from the very top to the bottom, be convinced of the necessity safety, profitability and desirability of a small loan program. With the policy firmly established, the rest is a matter of suitable personnel trained to handle the operation. Term loans for small business, like all installment loans, should be handled by people with a definite liking for the activity and the occasional trouble involved. And above all, they should have a sales-minded approach because that is absolutely essential to this type of operation.

The remaining necessity for a successful program is an advisory service, because while adequate capital is essential for the sound development of any business, management is still the priceless ingredient. Our investigations and the investigations of many others who have studied the field show that most business difficulties, and particularly those of small firms, are due to the mistakes of inexperienced management. We therefore established an advisory service in 1946 to gather and distribute information on various phases of small business operation.

In addition to preparing our information digests—brief and factual pamphlets on various types of business, for which we have so far received over 200,000 requests—the service cooperates with chambers of commerce and trade associations in promoting the interests of small groups. Continuous contact is also maintained with the United States Department of Commerce, the California State Department of Education, schools, colleges, and universities in order to aid in developing programs to help small business.

These are only a few of the things our Advisory Service is doing, but I think they illustrate the point that it is just as important to help the little fellow with management information as it is to provide him with the financing that he requires. We recommend that you include such a service in your plans and that you advertise it, merchandise it, and get credit for it.

In conclusion, may I say this on behalf of small business: it is here to stay; it has survived and thrived from the earliest days of our country. Wars, booms, depressions—nothing has stifled the desire of millions of Americans to own their own business.

Dun & Bradstreet's records confirm the durability of small business. Back in 1870, their reference book listed the names of 427,000 business firms, 1 for every 91 people in the United States, or 11 firms per 1,000 population. Eighty years have gone by since then. Now, Dun & Bradstreet lists 2,700,000 firms, 1 for every 56 people, or 18 firms for every 1,000 of population. And at least two-thirds of even these listed firms are the small businesses we have been talking about. This is a demonstration of faith, and of the strength of the desire which so many people have for a business of their own. This is part of our national life—it is the very foundation of the system in which we take such pride.

But as bankers we must do more than just admire free enterprise; we must do our part to make it work. There must be a conscientious endeavor to broaden bank services to provide for the needs of all, no matter how small the need may be; from the school saver or 4–H Club member to the largest corporation. We must take care of them all, for they are all part of the great American heritage—freedom.

One of the best ways to broaden bank services is through the medium of the term loan I described which would make it possible for you to serve one of the most vital elements of the American economy—the little fellow who wants to help himself. To operate in this field successfully you need only four things:

1. Diversification.
2. Volume.
3. Adequate rates.
4. An enthusiastic desire to do the job.

Whatever tools in the form of new plans or devices are necessary must be provided and then used by more banks. Banks must provide for all the legitimate credit needs of small business, no matter how small or how specialized. Failure to do this can result only in more direct Government lending.

This is banking's midcentury challenge—we must not fail.

Address of the President at Casper, Wyo.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 10, 1950

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the address of the President made at Casper, Wyo., on May 9, 1950:

It's good to be back in Wyoming again.

Seeing this western country and talking to the people out here always reaffirms my faith in the vigor of this Nation and the glowing promise of its future.

This is my first visit to the West since 1948.

As you know, we have settled a number of issues since then. And we've settled them in the old-fashioned American democratic way. One of those issues is of particular importance here in the West. It concerns the policy this Nation is going to follow in developing its great wealth of natural resources.

In this country there have always been two philosophies about the use of natural resources. One philosophy is that our resources should be exploited by a privileged few for their own benefit. This first philosophy holds that if we preserve or develop natural resources for the benefit of all the people, that is "socialism" or some other form of "ism."

The second philosophy holds that our national resources are the cornerstone of a strong, free democracy. As such, they must be used to advance the well-being and the prosperity of all the people. This philosophy holds that it is necessary for democratic government to make sure that our land and water, our forests and our minerals, are used wisely and not exploited for the benefit of a few.

STRESSES NATURAL RESOURCES

You know which of these philosophies I believe in. It is the same one that the great majority of the American people believe in.

I am happy to be able to say that since I was out here in 1948, we have been making progress in strengthening the policy of using our resources for the benefit of all the people. This Congress has been moving forward—not backward.

I am particularly happy to say this to you here in Casper.

Wyoming is a State with tremendous natural resources. Here in Wyoming, the Great Plains of the West, with their abundant agricultural possibilities, rise to meet the high plateaus and mountains, rich in minerals and water power.

Not so long ago this part of the country was considered way out West. That phrase meant something more than physical distance. It expressed the attitude of too many people in important places in the East, toward that real needs of this great region.

This country way out West was a source of low-priced raw materials for the East. It was an area where eastern money could be invested for quick, spectacular profits. The real needs of this western country were not understood or appreciated. Because it was way out West. Too many people, both in and out of Government, just didn't care about the future of this part of the country.

NOTES TRAGIC RESULTS OF WASTE

You know where that spendthrift, careless philosophy led us. Much of the best range land was badly damaged—some almost beyond recovery. Precious topsoils were washed down the rivers. The cream was skimmed off the mineral deposits. The primary emphasis was on quick exploitation of resources. The whole idea was to make money quickly and then move on.

I am sure that you businessmen, farmers, and ranchers remember the tragic results of this philosophy. You are still fighting to recover from the loss and waste of that era. But now the American people are with you. They have renounced the narrow, selfish view of natural resources.

For 17 years, with one brief set-back, you have had a Government that recognizes its responsibility for helping to preserve and develop natural resources. This is a Government that works with you, not against you.

The contrast between the enlightened, democratic approach to the use of our natural resources, and the selfish, antidemocratic approach, is plain here in Wyoming. About 50 miles north of Casper lies Teapot Dome. After 50 miles southwest is the new Kortes Dam.

The name Teapot Dome stands as an everlasting symbol of the greed and privilege that underlay one philosophy about the West. It is not only a reminder that there were selfish or misguided individuals seeking special privileges. There are always such individuals. It is almost a reminder of what can happen in your own front yard when you have the wrong kind of government in Washington.

Kortes Dam is a product of a different philosophy about resources and a different kind of government. High up in a mountain canyon on the North Platte River, this dam is a new source of wealth and strength for the people of the West. This is an example of the right way to use natural resources—for the benefit of all the people.

PICTURES BENEFITS FROM PROJECT

When the Kortes power plant goes into operation this year, its three turbines will add 36,000,000 kilowatts of electricity to our national store of energy. It will be tied into a network of transmission lines, and teamed up with the plant at Seminole Dam 2 miles upstream and with other plants downstream. This development will bring light and power to thousands of homes, farms, and industries in Wyoming, Colorado, and Nebraska.

Furthermore, Kortes Dam is a part of the reclamation work of the Federal Government. The dam is built as part of a project which will bring more water to irrigated lands. The income from the power produced at Kortes will help repay the investment in irrigation work.

The completion of Kortes Dam is thus a step toward developing natural resources for the welfare of the people. But this dam has another significance. It is based upon a recognition of the fact that water and land and forests must be treated together. We can make proper use of our resources only if we base our plans on that fact.

Like many of you here today, I was born and raised in the Missouri Valley. Like you,

I have seen first-hand the terrible effects of looking at resources separately. When too much sod on the plains was broken to plant crops, when the range land was overgrazed, the result was not only a loss of grassland and soil cover. The result was floods, and dust storms, and a heritage of waste that has had to be slowly and painfully overcome.

Today, we know that soil and forest conservation, flood control and the development of power, navigation, and irrigation, must all be tackled and solved together. We have learned that a great river valley cannot be developed in piecemeal fashion. It is not possible to separate the land from the water. It is foolish to prepare for floods downstream but to pay no attention to soil cover and small creeks upstream.

It has taken years for us to organize our efforts in line with this concept of the interrelationship of all resources. We have met great opposition from selfish or short-sighted people, although I am glad to say that many have gradually been converted to the right viewpoint as the soundness of what we are trying to do has been demonstrated. We still have far to go. But the progress we have made in the last 17 years is tremendous.

Here in the Missouri Valley, which covers one-sixth of the country, work is going forward to develop the land, water and forests. We have embarked on these enterprises in the best democratic tradition. Our success has been possible because of private initiative, coupled with cooperative work by Federal, State and local governments.

You can see the results all about you. The city of Casper lies in the midst of an area containing about half a million acres of irrigated land. Private enterprise and local, State and Federal governments are all playing a part in making irrigation farming more secure and more productive. Not the least part of the success of irrigation farming is due to the national investment in irrigation and power facilities by the Federal Government.

SEES ROLE IN GROWING ECONOMY

That investment is good for the farmer, and it means a more stable economy for the people in town. For the Nation as a whole, the investment in sound reclamation work is part of our broad effort to create a growing economy.

Here in the western part of the Missouri Valley, we have also been working to conserve and improve range lands. For the long run success of livestock ranchers, a well-grassed area and well-watered range is essential.

Before 1934, almost nothing had been done to create that kind of range. Since then much has been done on both private and public lands. We have found better grasses to provide improved cover and more profitable grazing. We have learned to build small ponds and reservoirs, as a defense against drought.

Right here in Natrona County, within the past 10 years, 2,000 stock water ponds have been built. With more watering places cattle and sheep can spread out over the range instead of overgrazing some parts and letting good grass go to waste on other parts.

This range improvement work means a more productive and secure livestock industry. It is important also in another way. Poor management of range lands contributes to floods and allows silt to go down the rivers to fill up the power and irrigation reservoirs. Good management of range lands prevents erosion, helps to hold back floods, and protects our investments in reservoirs.

We should be proud of the work we have been doing on the rangelands, in irrigation, in power development, and all the other parts of our resource work. Green fields, blue reservoirs, clear streams, and shining, new transmission lines tell of the advances we have made in the development and use of our resources. However, some of the most changing tasks still lie ahead.

We need to put more of our land under good conservation practices. We need to build more ponds and reservoirs on the ranges, and dikes to spread water more evenly over the land. Millions of acres need reseeding. We are far from a balanced range program. Through the agricultural conservation program we are making a national investment on private range lands, which is considerably larger per acre than the amount the Government is spending on public range lands. Incidentally, the amount we are spending on the public range lands is less than 1 cent per acre per year.

Another field in which greater effort is needed is the control of insect pests. Here in Wyoming there is a serious plague of grasshoppers. The Federal Government should bear its full share of the cost of overcoming this plague through the excellent Federal-State cooperative program that has been worked out.

In the forest we need to build more roads, so that we can reach the timber and use it.

Along the rivers we need more sound irrigation projects. In addition, we need other works to control and use the waters of the rivers from the small creeks and tributaries in the mountains, all the way down to the mouths of the main streams.

Minerals must be conserved, too, in the sense that we must take out of the ground all that can economically be extracted, and must increase our exploration for new sources.

Furthermore, we need to go ahead rapidly to conserve our limited water supplies. Out here in the West, water has always been relatively scarce, and, as more and more water is put to beneficial use, it is becoming obvious that more needs to be done to assure an adequate supply of good water.

This water problem is not only serious for farmers and for cities and towns. In many parts of the country it is also a serious problem for industries. For example, down south of here in Colorado there are huge reserves of oil shale. In the years to come, we may well need to obtain oil from that shale. It will take a lot of water to do so, however, and there is a real question whether there is enough water for that purpose.

This whole problem of limited water supply and growing water uses, is the reason I appointed a Water Resources Policy Commission earlier this year. I asked some of the best experts I could find to serve on that Commission, including several from Western States. They are making a thorough study of the facts, and should give us some sound recommendations for our future progress.

As we move forward in our use of resources, we must improve the organization of the Federal Government so that its part of the development can be done better and with more effective participation by State and local governments.

PREDICTS CONTINUED PROGRESS

There are still reactionary forces that oppose every forward-looking proposal to develop the resources and increase the prosperity of the West. The philosophy that produced Teapot Dome is not dead.

But these reactionary forces are fighting a losing battle; we have been overcoming their opposition for 17 years. And we are going to go right on beating them.

Those who are opposing us now are the same ones who said the soil-conservation program would regiment the American farmer. A few years back, they asserted that it was socialism for the Government to lend money to farmers to build rural electric lines. They claimed it was a boondoggle to plant shelter belts of trees on the plains.

Now they're for these things. They admit that these programs have been good for the country. All they want to do now is to prevent any further progress.

But their past record is clear and plain. And their new arguments are no better than their old ones.

The American people will continue to go right ahead taking the practical, sensible steps that are needed to build a better future. We are a strong, free people. We know that to continue free and strong we must wisely develop and use the resources with which nature has endowed us.

The money we spend for effective conservation work is a sound investment in better living for ourselves and our children. We will not be dismayed by those who say the cost of such investments is too great. The cost of not making them would be far greater. We cannot afford to slacken our efforts, for this is work which is vital to our future.

Today, more than ever before, we can see how important it is that we take these steps to develop our resources. We are engaged in a world-wide struggle to bring lasting peace to the world.

ASSAILS "CYNICAL IMPERIALISM"

In that struggle we are being opposed by a cynical imperialism which asserts that freedom and democracy are soft and incapable of strong action.

We can prove how false, how hollow, are the claims of communism. But we can prove that only by deeds. We must demonstrate that our free country, along with other free countries, can achieve strength, prosperity, and growing welfare for our people.

To do so we must continue to move forward in our use of natural resources. We must not permit any backsliding toward the old philosophy of private greed and the public be damned. We must continue to look upon our resources as a public trust, to be preserved and increased as the physical basis for a growing future.

In the tremendous conflict that exists in the world today our fundamental strength is our belief in the worth of the individual under God. Our whole democratic tradition rests on our faith that freemen, working together in cooperation, can achieve justice and well-being for themselves and for one another.

In that faith we shall move forward on the path of freedom and peace.

Socialized Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 10, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, with permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I attach an article from the CIO News of May 8, Socialized Medicine May Be Bad, But—, by Allan L. Swim. It is a direct, concise statement of a fact too many candidates for political office have been neglecting: Socialized medicine and national health insurance are vastly different things. The administration's national health insurance proposal concerns a system of prepaid financing of

good health services for everybody. Socialized medicine would have the Federal Government take over and operate the Nation's medical facilities and personnel; national health insurance has nothing to do with either.

The article follows:

SOCIALIZED MEDICINE MAY BE BAD, BUT—

(By Allan L. Swim)

Political candidates in some parts of the country have already begun making a campaign issue of "socialized medicine."

Those seeking to capitalize on the issue are going through some strange, contorted reasoning. Their argument goes something like this:

A person who is dissatisfied with present health services and believes national health insurance should be provided is an advocate of socialized medicine. Socialized medicine is state medicine—and anybody who believes state medicine is desirable must certainly be a Communist or at least friendly to communism.

Communists are enemies of democracy and consequently, an advocate of health insurance is an enemy of the American system.

The only thing wrong with such reasoning is that it's completely false!

Opposition to socialized or state-controlled medicine for the United States has been expressed in this column on a number of occasions.

This opposition represents general CIO policy on the subject.

But this column has frequently lauded the idea of national health insurance.

This represents no contradiction—although the American Medical Association would have you believe otherwise.

The AMA has hung a phony tag on health insurance and is conducting a costly propaganda campaign in an effort to convince the people that two entirely different things are the same thing.

Doctors who support the AMA in this campaign and condone its underhanded tactics should be thoroughly ashamed of themselves.

They're reflecting no credit upon themselves as individuals or upon their profession.

Let's take a good look at the health situation and see if we can determine what prompted the AMA to shoot off such large quantities of propaganda fireworks.

Back before the war a number of persons became concerned about the state of the Nation's health and the inability of many of our people to obtain adequate medical and hospital services.

Their advocacy of some form of Government health insurance didn't attract a lot of attention.

Then, with the drafting of millions of men for the armed forces, the Nation got a great shock.

The male citizens of the healthiest Nation on earth turned out to be far from the prized physical specimens many had thought them to be.

The number rejected because of disabilities was appalling.

This, plus sharp increases in the cost of health services, revived and increased the demand that something be done about the situation.

The AMA, sensing the revived interest, embarked on a campaign designed to scare the public into opposition to national health insurance.

The AMA drive has made real headway among those who have never taken the trouble to find out what health insurance actually is.

And there's considerable evidence that many doctors fall into this category. They read in their own journal that health insurance is socialized medicine and that is that.

So, at the twist of a bandage or stab of a hypodermic needle they'll tell their patients that a national insurance plan would lead us down the road to state medicine and to disintegration of the medical profession.

Socialized medicine is government controlled and government administered. It does not allow patients free choice of doctors and denies doctors the right to reject undesirable patients.

National health insurance would merely provide the people with a pay-as-you-go plan under which they could finance medical care. The present right to choose doctors and patients wouldn't be disturbed.

And there's a great difference between the two.

If the people of the Nation want better health services they should make a real effort to get an honest presentation of the facts relating to national health insurance.

They shouldn't be content with slogans and phony tags. They shouldn't be content with the word of the zealots on either side of the fence who make outlandish claims.

They should get the facts—the hard, cold facts—and then act according to their own best judgment.

The Great Politician's 1950 Personal Parade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a revealing editorial from the Rapid City Daily Journal, published in Rapid City, S. Dak. The editorial clearly indicates that calling the President's tax-supported political junket through the country a nonpolitical tour is fooling nobody very seriously, including certainly those riding with the President in his special private train.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GREAT POLITICIAN'S 1950 PERSONAL PARADE

Heralded by Harold Stassen as "the smartest politician and the worst President" that even sat in the White House, Harry Truman will leave his feather-nesting buddies and clowning cronies and start on a stumping tour of the Nation next week. The good fellow and the clever politician, presumably, will be at his best.

His 9-day, 16-State tour will begin May 7. He will deliver eight major political addresses, thinly veiled with suggestions of public business; also 50, maybe more, impromptu talks.

The haberdasher who could not make a go of a small business will demonstrate to the people how he can manage the greatest business on earth with the greatest of ease. Smart politics and off-hand good fellowship does it—nothing more is needed.

In 1948 the Republicans tolerantly watched Harry doing it. This year, having learned a costly lesson, they are going to be more alert—they say. They will follow Harry around, mayhap, or unlimber some big guns. Anyhow, they promise to be on the job and to give tit for tat.

In 1948 the master politician jumped the gun and started his cross-country, grassroots electioneering even before he had been nominated by the Democratic National Convention. He left Washington June 3 for a "nonpolitical" speaking tour of 18 States. This year his excuse will be setting his official seal on a few national dams and letting loose a few of his own.

On his trip 2 years ago he touched off a Republican exlosion by labeling the Eightieth Congress (Republican) as the worst in history. Later he hedged and said "second worst." This time he will put in his best licks to defend his own "Eighty-worst" Congress. He denounced the Taft-Hartley Act last time, and promised to repeal it pronto; thus far, even with his own party-controlled Congress, he hasn't yet been able to keep that promise—or few, very few others that he made.

The master politician made other wide swings-around in 1948 while the Republicans looked bored and talked more so. He made a 15-day tour in September of 18 non-Eastern States, with 150 off-the-cuff back platform talks. He wowed 'em, even as the Nation's neglected and botched critical problems worsened. He "gave 'em hell"—the Republicans—and they just stood aloof and let him go to it.

On this tour Harry promised the people just about the whole book, with unnumbered billions carelessly thrown in on the side. It must be admitted that he did his best about the billions as mounting red ink attests. But he couldn't ride herd on his Democrats—some of them, evidently, were thinking about their country.

He was at it again in October in the Northeastern States. Later in the month in the big cities. But the Republicans were still dead on their feet. "Let the patent medicine man sell his bottled water," they said and contended themselves with sonorous noble sentiments. Remember?

Now we're about to have the smart vendor selling his bottled water from the back of the wagon again. Will the curious crowds be as eager to buy this year?

The States Must Resume Their Responsibilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 10, 1950

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, for many years I have observed the constant growth of our Federal bureaucracy, culminating in the vast organization for World War II. Accompanying that growth of these agencies has been a vast increase in powers and activities on the part of the Federal Government and a decrease of powers and activities on the part of the States.

While many aspects of this subject are debatable, one fact of tremendous significance now looms. The Federal activities, especially the armed forces, have created a great pool of experienced administrators available to our States.

An outstanding example of one such selection was the appointment of Rear Adm. Milo F. Draemel, United States Navy, retired, by Gov. James H. Duff, of Pennsylvania, as secretary of forests

and waters, most favorably commented upon in an editorial of the Saturday Evening Post of April 1, 1950.

The calling of such experienced and able men into the service of the States is certainly commendable and most salutary; also is the Pennsylvania example, thus shown, of accomplishing worthwhile intrastate projects with State funds rather than through the long-established and dangerous policy of procuring Federal appropriations with Federal supervision for such undertakings. It is to be hoped that this instance of wise local effort may mark a beginning of the one practice and the ending of the other, with resulting tendency toward the reestablishment of the authority and independence of the States and Commonwealths as contemplated by the Federal Constitution.

In pursuance of leave granted, the editorial is included as a part of my remarks:

WHY NOT RECRUIT RETIRED EXPERTS FOR STATE JOBS?

Nowadays, as everyone knows, government is very much big business, not only the Federal Government but State and local government too. Like any other big business, government desperately needs a supply of able administrators. Unfortunately, such men are scarce. Even the government executives who would honestly prefer to appoint an able man than a political crony don't know where to look.

At least part of the solution, it seems to us, is fairly simple. A continually replenished reserve of experienced administrators exists in the growing body of men who have been retired from business, industry, and the Military Establishment, not because they were played out, but because increasingly prevalent early-retirement plans call for it. These are men who have risen to positions of importance and responsibility largely by virtue of their success as administrators. Inasmuch as executive ability is something that is not confined to any one particular job, but can be applied equally well in almost any field which requires administration, there is no reason why their abilities cannot be made available to public service.

A notable example of this fact is Milo F. Draemel. Retired from naval service at the customary age of 62, Rear Admiral Draemel was snapped up in 1946 by Temple University, in Philadelphia, and appointed vice president in charge of physical planning. About 6 months later, Pennsylvania's new Governor, James H. Duff, asked Draemel to enter public service. As commandant of the Fourth Naval District, which includes the huge Philadelphia Navy Yard, the admiral had lashed out at the disgraceful condition of the Schuylkill River, an industrial sewer which was befouling his ships as well as menacing public health, inviting floods, and offending the eye and nose of everyone who came near it. Duff felt the same way, and he invited Draemel to come to Harrisburg as secretary of forests and waters and do something about it. Temple gave him an indefinite leave of absence.

During the 3 years that he has been secretary, Draemel has nearly completed what he set out to do. The problem has been to clean about 90 miles of river of the accumulated culm deposits left in it by coal-mining operations, deposits that had turned the water black and had, in many places, all but filled in the river's bed. Draemel and his men studied the problem, planned the attack, and put it into operation. During the past 2 years the Schuylkill clean-up has been one of the biggest engineering projects in the country. As a result of careful planning and able administration, the project will be completed at least 3 months before the scheduled date of June 1951.

Meanwhile, Secretary Draemel has been kept busy with other things too. He has built 2 major flood-control dams and 3 major dike systems and completed 97 lesser related projects on Pennsylvania's rivers. He has developed eight new areas to add to the State's park system, which in 1 month last summer attracted nearly a million tired businessmen and tourists, thus bringing a tidy sum into the treasury. In the realm of reforestation, a triple-barreled program has been set up, designed to retard flooding, prevent soil erosion, and husband subsurface water resources. Draemel's department, in addition to advising private owners of timberland, has provided some 20,000,000 seedlings for replanting in the last year, more than four times the number of seedlings which the department could muster 2 years ago.

In short, Draemel has done, and is doing, a bang-up job, despite the fact that he had never been a secretary of forests and waters before and that Uncle Sam officially considered him too old almost 4 years ago. Nor is Draemel's an isolated case; there are an encouraging number of other men on the retired list now occupying administrative positions in the Pennsylvania State government alone, and many more would doubtless serve both willingly and well if they were asked. Men who have worked all their lives usually find enforced leisure irksome and, since many of them have already made their stake in the world, and often have pensions, the low salaries paid to top Government executives as compared with private business executives aren't going to discourage them.

State-government work probably holds a greater appeal for these men than Washington can make, for local pride and local ties are apt to be firmly fixed by the time a man passes 60. In fact, we can't understand why more State governors and executive-department heads haven't taken advantage of this ready-made pool of qualified administrators.

Thoughts for a New Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 10, 1950

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to insert a very dynamic address delivered by the Reverend Crawford W. Brown D. D., canon of the Washington Episcopal Cathedral in Washington, D. C., on May 9, 1950, at the State convention of the P. E. O. Sisterhood:

THOUGHTS FOR A NEW DAY

Madam President and members of the P. E. O. Sisterhood, I am happy to be with you this afternoon to share with you some thoughts for a new day.

I do not lean to pessimism, neither am I a prophet, nor the son of a prophet. However, I would like to remind you that we are not living in "One World" as suggested by the late Mr. Willkie. We are living in a split world and in a world wherein men have learned to split the atom. Put these two inescapable facts together and the potential danger is apparent. A divided world, with so many split personalities, is today threatened with the destructive force of atomic warfare. Remember too, the United States established a precedent in the unleashing of such furious destruction upon an unsuspecting civilian population. Actually, the bomb fell on America. We have now a most unpleasant skeleton in our national closet and it is a skeleton that will haunt and stalk us for many years.

Specifically, I wish to speak concerning several aspects of our national life. I am a firm believer in the tremendous power of the spiritual forces of the Nation. It has always been true that a nation must be defeated spiritually before it can be defeated either by military attack from other nations or by any form of internal disruption, trickery, or conspiracy. The history of nations, from the days of ancient Israel down to this present hour, proves without question that this is true. A study of the facts available to every person in the land, shows there is now taking place within America, as well as within other lands, a spiritual defeat that may well prepare the way for national destruction.

"It is time we wake up and realize that the hand stretched out to crush our spirit is the hand stretched out to kill America. When we see religious groups pitted one against the other, when religious leaders are sucked into the camp of the enemy, when God is banned from our schools, and the existence of the soul branded a fable by men in the public employ as professors; when morality is sneered at and patriotism looked upon as fit only for fools, then we can see how far we have allowed the destroyer to invade the sanctuary of our spirit. It is time to wake up, Americans; time to realize that we are being softened up for the knock-out blow. If America is not worthy of a terrific effort on our part for her preservation, then none of us deserves America."

The delegates to this convention know to what extent God has been ignored or thrust out to the edges of life. This is God's world, at least so we sing: "This is My Father's World." Such a concept frees us on the one hand from the false assumption that there is no hope, and on the other hand that the world has been wound up and will automatically produce a better and better civilization. We are not worshipers of mere progress. Under God we should guide and control it.

But because God has been ignored or thrust out to the outer edges of life, we as a people are confused, uncertain and face the morrow with a definite sense of insecurity. We are a Nation which possesses these characteristics: Knowledge without character, politics without principles, and a Nation participating in the worship of God without sacrifice.

Mr. Malcom Bingay, well-known editorial writer, plainly declared that which every soul within this Nation should hear and heed. "The blame" said Mr. Bingay, "for most of the world's discord can be placed on our failure to recognize three impulses by which man lives: First, instinct—that something which man shares with the animals, the simple impulse to exist. Second, reason—that something by which he is able to differentiate from the animals, and through which he has piled up through the ages his material wealth. Third, spirit—that indefinable something, transcending both instinct and reason and which permits man, in his loftier moods, to glimpse a possible answer to those eternal questions which have haunted him in his materialistic reasoning. By reason alone he has built up the great cities and civilizations of the earth, only to destroy them. The spirit alone can save man from his ruthless reason. Through reason he can find knowledge, but only through his spirit can he learn wisdom."

There is much in the national life and in the temper of our people which must be

commended. The great heart of America beats with compassion for the forgotten and underprivileged peoples of the world. The tired and worn humanity of the world have found sanctuary here and a new opportunity. Such compassionate concern, coming as it has to full flower in the Marshall plan, the Friendship Train, the Milk Ship, and many other humanitarian enterprises all found their genesis in the rich and fertile soil of the spiritual forces of the Nation.

We are a Nation blessed above all other nations in natural resources, favorable geographical situation, productive capacity, free from the scars of war. The democratic principle of government recognizes the dignity of the individual, the initiative, resourcefulness and free enterprise have reached their highest under this Government which is of the people, by the people, and for the people.

But a change is coming over our land and our people. Something is sadly lacking. That which is lacking is not knowledge but skill, not invention or lack of raw or processed materials. The lack is character. Intelligent men produce the A-bomb, but it takes men of character to use it. Knowledge without character is responsible for our immoralities in the economic, social, and political world.

One hundred years ago Horace Mann prophesied that when schools were established so that all may have free tuition our moral problems would be resolved. He also said we would, under such conditions, have no need for police or jails, for armies or navies. Today we have compulsory education and knowledge has increased in the past century far beyond the dream of the greatest dreamer. Our high learning with our low morals is destroying the world. We have gained control over nature only to lose control over human nature.

Science has not been our savior. Our neon lights still leave us in darkness. Our swift elevators bring us no closer to heaven. Our swift advance in the field of chemistry has only produced a greater international understanding. Actually by our process of civilizing men we have succeeded in making man more savage. Knowledge without character is one of our great national sins. As Nehru said: "Good ends can never be achieved by evil means," and America did not speed the day of international brotherhood by her action at Hiroshima or Nagasaki.

The quality of character so sorely needed today is that which grows out of faith in God. Such a faith must master this hour in which we live or the world is lost. This is our day and our opportunity to add new names to the chapter of faith—a glorious chapter written in the blood of heroic men and women. Only as we dare to write such a new chapter can we hope to perpetuate the triumph of God—and bring about a new day of understanding.

Politics without principle. Here I speak with all charity. I would not for one moment minimize or disregard the constant actions of many courageous leaders of our several States and here in the Nation's Capital. One pays willing and just tribute to these men and women for their faithful leadership and sacrificial service to the Nation. But one must also speak of the leaders who have been placed by the people who, having nobly begun their trust with high ideals, were seen stripped of such ideals by corrupting influences.

"God give us men. A time like this demands strong minds, great hearts, true faith, and ready hands; men whom the lust of office does not kill; men whom the spoils of office cannot buy."

How appropriate is the tall, straight, clean shaft erected to the memory of our first President. Thomas Paine wrote: "The character of George Washington puts all men called kings to shame." He accepted no pay as Commander in Chief, he accepted no remuneration as President. He rendered every possible service in his power. Or we stand before the majestic and inspiring Lincoln Memorial; we read again the words of Gettysburg, or the second inaugural and we are moved. Here indeed was a man who lived above the world—in public duty. One does not forget his words to an officer who, in the throes of Civil War said to Mr. Lincoln, "It is good to know that God is on our side," to which Mr. Lincoln replied: "What I want to know is, are we on God's side." Was there ever a great opportunity for another great statesman to immortalize himself?

Another unhappy aspect of our national life is worship without sacrifice. Here I speak to all of us—and directly. We are all guilty. God gave up His all for us, His dearest possession, His Son. What comparable sacrifice has modern Christianity made? If the cross is the insignia of Christianity, it is certainly not manifested in the lives of our people save as it is worn as a tinkling ornament or to decorate a steeple. All of us are guilty of the sin of worship without sacrifice (Christianity's Open Door, P. E. O. Record, May 1950).

We give so little time for the worship of God that the church is rapidly becoming a 1-hour-a-week institution. The members of our churches are not willing to place their energy, time, and talents at the disposal of the church with the result that it is almost impossible to secure teachers in our Sunday schools, leaders for our young people, and workers in the many and varied organizations necessary to operate the programs of the church. When our income is adequate we make our gifts to God our last consideration, and when we must reduce our outgo because of less income religious support is usually the first to feel such a reduction.

Sin is the product of people, not things. Someone has said, "Not many of us know much about biology, but in alibiology we are experts." And we are. We quickly blame others for the plight of our world—the politician, the minister, the capitalist, the leaders of labor. Men of evil design are elected to high office where they gain prestige and power. We cry out against them for their failures, but we conveniently forget that so many of the good people put them in office by their failure to vote. It is the inertia of good people which troubles a modern world.

Good people must assume their rightful responsibility. The forces of evil are ever on the alert, aggressive, well organized, and ready for action at a moment's notice. The devil never takes a vacation. The responsibility for the home, the church, the city, and the Nation is ours. When a better world is built better people will build it.

Now, what can we do to help correct some of these situations to which I have made all too brief reference? What must the individual possess? Above all, he must have a stanch faith in America, in its institutions, and a deep undergirding faith in God and in the inherent decency of man. Mr. Franklin D. Roosevelt reminded all of us: "This generation of Americans has a rendezvous with destiny."

Terrible as were the last two World Wars there is one thing more terrible: a condition of society which made such things possible. The battles of these two World Wars were but outward manifestations of the inner conflicts which still tear at the heart of mankind. Peace is a state of mind, and the war was raging in many forms in the minds of men long before the first gun sang its song of death in 1914.

We need not blame any other nation or foreign situation for having brought us into two World Wars. We can look into our own hearts and blame ourselves. Yet we call ourselves a Christian people.

We hear much about military preparedness. What of the spiritual preparedness which is infinitely more necessary. We talk of military disarmament, but are we ready to arm spiritually? We will never arm spiritually—or engage in any program of spiritual preparedness until we have faith. Faith must make us do our best today because of our interest and concern for those to come. Many of the blessings we enjoy today are ours because someone else had faith and lived as though it counted. Will the next generation say of us that by faith we have left them a heritage of peace, good will, and one world.

Man is capable of changing his environment by new scientific inventions, but what is more important, he is capable of being changed himself. Change the thought and you change the man.

We must put righteousness before self-interest.

We must seek to discover God's purpose for the world rather than pursue our own.

We can have the abundant life which Christ came to make possible for us.

These thoughts translated into action will bring in a new day.

Twentieth Anniversary of Brooklyn College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 1, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Brooklyn College is celebrating today the twentieth anniversary of its establishment as a separate and independent institution of higher learning. Although the origin of the school dates back several years earlier, it was not until May 10, 1930, that Brooklyn College became a separate entity with its own campus and administration.

Today, on its twentieth anniversary, Brooklyn College numbers more than 17,200 students in its day and evening sessions and its graduate school. It is the largest undergraduate liberal arts college in the country and one of the largest collegiate institutions in New York State and in the country. It has been ably led for more than a decade by an outstanding and dynamic educator, Dr. Harry David Gideonse.

On the occasion of its anniversary, I desire to extend my felicitations and good wishes to Dr. Gideonse, to the entire faculty, and to the student body. The Borough of Brooklyn is proud of Brooklyn College and its great accomplishments in the two decades of its existence. In connection with this anniversary, I am placing in the RECORD an article from the New York Herald Tribune of May 7, 1950, by Robert A. Poteete:

BROOKLYN COLLEGE GETS READY TO COME OF AGE—IT'S ALREADY RICH IN TRADITION ON TWENTIETH ANNIVERSARY

(By Robert A. Poteete)

"It's really ridiculous," a Brooklyn College coed complained. "The attitude of the college toward meetings of the two sexes is childish, but no one dares protest."

"If the girls want to meet the boys for a good business reason, we can arrange a time in my office," replied Prof. Adele Bildersee, in charge of women students.

That was Brooklyn College—rather its predecessor—of 1926. A World headline proclaimed: "Sexes Segregated in New Institution."

Brooklyn College Center—forerunner of Brooklyn College—opened September 24, 1926, in a loft building at Willoughby and Bridge Streets. It comprised a City College branch for men and a Hunter College branch for women with a total beginning enrollment of 1,200.

This week, Brooklyn College—a separate entity with campus, administration and no segregation of the sexes—will celebrate the twentieth anniversary of its detachment from the collegiate center and the appointment of its first president, Dr. William A. Boylan, on May 10, 1930.

And Professor Bildersee, now director of admissions and dean of students, can look down from her office window on a grassy, 42-acre campus and see boys and girls meeting all the time on spacious lawns, building steps, campus benches, and in a perennial garden.

Brooklyn College's move from the Borough Hall section—where it had overflowed the loft building and spread into various office buildings—proved no exception to the controversy that raged for 14 years before the Collegiate Center was opened. Out of the proposals that boomed from speakers' stands and filled newspaper columns, a site was selected in the Flatbush section of Brooklyn on what had been a golf course.

In October 1937 Brooklyn College moved to its new campus, which, by city real estate standards, is unusually commodious. Dr. Boylan retired because of ill health in 1938, and was succeeded by a temporary head, Mario E. Cosenza.

On October 18, 1939, Brooklyn College administration was put in the hands of a dynamic Dutchman, Harry David Gideonse, who had developed the National Broadcasting Co.'s national program of educational discussion and the University of Chicago's Round Table broadcasts. After graduation from Columbia University, Dr. Gideonse directed international student work at Geneva University, Switzerland. In the thirties he taught at Rutgers University and at the University of Chicago.

An outspoken student of international affairs, Dr. Gideonse brought a concept of social cohesion to the Brooklyn institution.

Brooklyn College was ingrown, Dr. Gideonse thought—almost all its students were drawn from one city, which made for lack of perspective. So the new president set about hiring faculty members with broad experience in institutions across the country.

A second step the new president took was to encourage extracurricular activity. The 225 active student organizations on the campus attest to his success in this program. Day and night students publish separate weekly newspapers and quarterly literary magazines, the senior class publishes a yearbook and the college has extensive athletic, dramatic, debating, and other specialized activities.

Dr. Gideonse's third step is an experiment in the integration of courses in liberal arts. It is in its first year.

The five large buildings on the Flatbush site are a far cry from the segregated beginning of Brooklyn College in a loft building next to an elevated track. Its faculty—482 teaching personnel, 16 administrative officers, and 81 administration staff members—approaches the size of the original enrollment.

The college has granted more than 23,000 degrees—including 260 master's degrees granted since the graduate division opened in 1935. A class of more than 1,500 will receive degrees in June.

More than 17,200 students are enrolled at present in the graduate, day, and evening sessions.

It's a proud school, from the administrative official who boasts that Brooklyn College is "probably the only college its size that fields completely amateur sports teams" (a fact sometimes deplored by students), to the student journalists who assert in their publications—at every available opportunity—that Brooklyn College is the largest undergraduate liberal arts college in the country.

Home Rule for the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 10, 1950

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include in the RECORD an article by John Day, of the Courier-Journal of Louisville, Ky., in the struggle for home rule in the District of Columbia:

HOME RULE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

(By John F. Day)

WASHINGTON, April 22.—One day this week, a man dressed like Paul Revere rode a horse down Pennsylvania Avenue and along other principal Washington streets. He carried a sign which read, "Taxation without representation is still tyranny."

The one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of Revere's ride was being used to dramatize the fight for home rule in the District of Columbia. That fight doesn't date back quite as far as the midnight ride, but it's hoary enough. The District has been voteless since 1874, when Congress revoked the self-government privileges residents had exercised from 1802. The struggle to regain them has been going on ever since, and Democratic Party platforms have contained home-rule planks since 1892.

PERTINENT QUESTIONS

Most people are aware that Washington is a Federal city run by Congress under power given it by the Constitution. The clause pertaining to that says: "(The Congress) shall exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever over such District (not exceeding 10 miles square) as may, by cession by particular States, and the acceptance of Congress, become the seat of Government of the United States."

But most people are surprised when they are asked, as the Central Suffrage Conference frequently does ask, do you know:

That the capital of the world's greatest democracy is not governed democratically?

That the citizens of the District of Columbia (close to a million) have no representation in their National Government? That they have no control over their municipal government?

That Congressmen, busy with national problems, spend more than 3,000 man-hours yearly on District housekeeping problems that an elected city council could handle?

That citizens of the District pay more taxes than those of 25 States?

That they pay almost 90 percent of the expenses of the National Capital?

That they have nothing to say about the assessing or spending of the taxes they pay?

The city of Washington was specifically described, established, and chartered as a corporate entity by an act of Congress approved May 3, 1802. From then until 1871, it had an elective council and mayor. In that year, Congress repealed the charter and established a new local government consisting of a governor and council appointed by the President with the concurrence of the Senate. From 1871 to 1874, the District also had an elective delegate (nonvoting) to the House of Representatives.

JOHNSON WAS LEADER

In 1874, Congress substituted government by three Commissioners appointed by the President and approved by the Senate, and at the same time eliminated the delegate to the House. Four years later, the Commissioner system was made permanent.

During the days of World War I and later, there was a vigorous debate as to whether the city of Washington legally existed. Principal supporter of a contention that it didn't was Representative Ben Johnson of Kentucky, chairman for many years of the House District Committee. (He is now living in retirement at Bardstown.)

Johnson held that the act of 1878 failed to provide for the continuation within the District of a city of Washington. He carried his point with President Wilson, who departed from the "done at the city of Washington" form used by his predecessors and concluded his proclamations, "done in the District of Columbia."

But during the Harding administration, lawyers and historians opposing Johnson gathered forces and cited various acts of Congress from 1871 on mentioning the city of Washington and thus legally recognizing its existence. Harding returned to the older form, and all the Presidents since then have used it.

NEGROES ARE FACTOR

But whether living in a legally existing city or not, Washingtonians still have no vote for either municipal or national officials.

Why?

No matter how many reasons may be given, the basic one is this:

The large number of Negroes living in Washington.

Last year, the Senate passed by voice vote the Auchincloss-Kefauver bill, which was introduced with bipartisan support. (Platforms of both parties in 1948 called for District home rule.) It provides for an 11-person city council, nine to be elected by the citizens and two to be appointed by the President. It also provides for selection of a city manager. Congress would retain the right to review all legislation passed by the council.

The House District Committee, whose chairman is JOHN MCMILLAN, of South Carolina, has bottled up the bill. Representative KENNEDY, Democrat, of Massachusetts, started a discharge petition which now has 178 signatures. It requires 218 to bring the bill to the House floor. If it should ever get there, the bill probably would pass. But the chance of getting the remaining signatures looks slim.

Only one Kentuckian has signed the petition, CARL PERKINS, Democrat, from Hindman. Seven Indianans have signed. They are all Democrats: DENTON, of Evansville; NOLAND, of Bloomington; JACOBS, of Indianapolis; MADDEN, of Gary; KRUSE, of Fort Wayne; CROOK, of South Bend; and WALSH, of Anderson.

Supporters of the legislation point out that at present Washington has nine bosses: the District Commissioners, the Bureau of

the Budget, House Appropriations Committee, Senate Appropriations Committee, House District Committee, Senate District Committee, conference committee on District appropriation bills, the whole Congress, and the President.

They also make these points:

1. The home-rule charter would become effective only after approval of a majority of District voters in a referendum.

2. The people of Washington are fully capable of local self-government, since they have an occupational acquaintance with public affairs and are better educated, on an average, than citizens of other American cities.

3. Taxation without representation is incompatible with American traditions.

4. Congress would maintain its control over Washington as the Nation's Capital through it veto powers over the city council's actions.

5. Polls show that both the people of Washington and the people of the Nation think the District should have home rule.

BILL SUPPORTED

Organizations representing a cross-section of the District residents are working for the Kefauver bill. They include the Junior League, the American Association of University Women, the American Veterans Committee, the CIO, the Americans for Democratic Action, Washington Federation of Churches, the League of Women Voters, Democratic Central Committee, Young Republicans of District of Columbia, and Young Democrats of District of Columbia.

Most of the opposition is centered in the Washington Board of Trade. It takes many specific exceptions to the Kefauver bill, but the contentions it uses most effectively are:

1. The Negroes would control the city. (Negroes compose about 28 percent of the population of Washington.)

2. The proposed legislation would mean carpetbagger and riffraff rule.

3. Dual voting would be possible. "Registered voters in other places could vote in the District if they lived here 1 year. This means that thousands upon thousands of people voting and giving primary allegiance elsewhere would vote in the District. This group might well be the deciding factor in any election or referendum. The board of trade does not believe this provision is conducive to good government or fair to permanent citizens."

NOT REAL HOME RULE

4. The solid citizen of Washington doesn't want this legislation because outsiders who come here for a few years can put the District into debt, enjoy the fruits, and then go back to their home States and leave the permanent citizens to pay the piper.

5. The majority of people in the Nation want Washington to remain a Federal city rather than become a home-rule city.

The board of trade and some citizens associations which join with it also say the Kefauver bill would not provide real home rule anyhow, because residents still would not be able to vote for President and Vice President or have representation in Congress. That is quite true. It takes a constitutional amendment to provide that form of suffrage. Such an amendment is proposed in a resolution sponsored by Senator NEELY (Democrat, West Virginia) and pending before the Senate Judiciary Committee.

The board of trade says it favors this resolution, and so do supporters of the Kefauver bill.

But the board of trade forces say the case for national representation would be jeopardized by granting local suffrage to District citizens. Supporters of the Kefauver bill say quite the opposite is true—that evidence of a responsible electorate would help in securing the constitutional amendment necessary to grant national representation and voting for the District.

Administration Farm Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. M. G. BURNSIDE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 10, 1950

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include questions and answers on the administration farm plan, published in the April 1950 issue of the Spotlight:

Why is a farm program by the Government necessary? The interests of our farmers and those of other economic groups are inseparable. When the farmer's income falls, he is unable to buy the products of industry; profits fall off; wages are cut; city residents are less able to buy farm products; the spiral continues downward; this is the history of all major depressions. A change of 10 percent in total farm income, upward or downward, equals a change of 1,000,000 jobs in industrial employment. The farm is much more susceptible to cyclical fluctuations than any other unit of the economy.

Is the farm-support principle accepted only by the Democratic Party? No, although the Democratic administration first used farm-price supports in the 1930's to restore the Nation's farm economy, Republicans have supported the parity payment system in recent years.

Why is a change in the farm program made necessary at this time? Farm income has fallen 22 percent in the past 2 years; prices paid by farmers are down only 5 percent. This gap is causing a serious decline in farm purchasing power. A depression spiral may set in if this situation is not altered soon. Furthermore, there are numerous flaws in the present system which should be corrected.

What are the major flaws in the present farm plan? (1) Basic commodities producing only one-fourth of farm income are covered by price supports. (2) The Government is forced to purchase enormous amounts of potatoes and eggs and take them off the market keeping retail prices at artificially high levels. (3) The housewife pays twice for the support of farm prices—once in taxes, again in high prices at the grocery store for products which are not permitted to sell at normal market levels. This causes dissatisfaction and may result in attempts to kill the entire farm price-support program. (4) The farmer's freedom to utilize his land as he may think best is restricted: while some commodities are supported, and others are not, the farmer has an economic incentive to follow farm practices which may not be wisest (since he will concentrate on those commodities which are supported, even though he knows his land is better suited for other products).

What is the basic principle of the administration farm program? Farm income must be maintained at not less than $28,000,000,000 or the entire economy will suffer. Farm products (including perishables) accounting for three-fourths of farm income would be covered by the new program.

How would it work for the farmer? Farmers would sell at the open market. Prices would be determined by the law of supply and demand. If prices fell below the support level, farmers would receive a production payment equal to the difference between the average market price and the support level. If market price exceeds support price, of course, there would be no Government payment.

How are standards for support-price levels determined? We seek such prices as will return to farmers as much buying power as they had in a 10-year modern moving base period.

What are the advantages of the administration plan? Farmers would receive broader, more secure, and more direct income supports. Consumers would have the benefit of entire supplies of meat, milk, poultry products, and other perishables at normal market prices. This would encourage consumption, and lower the food budget.

The program would take the Government out of buying, processing, shipping, storing, and disposing of perishables and return these operations to normal channels of trade.

What about controls for the farmers? No new kinds of control are recommended. The same kind of marketing agreements and acreage allotments that were used to pull farmers out of the Hoover depression will continue to be used wherever desirable. Observance of soil-conservation practices will be required.

Would the costs of the program be staggering as Republicans like to charge? No. The administration farm program for perishables would cost taxpayers no more than the current purchase-type programs and would save consumers many dollars at the grocery store. For example, consumer savings on pork alone next year could be as much as $25 per family. The 1949 potato support program will cost the Government at least $80,000,000 while under the Brannan plan, potatoes would cost the Government only about $33,000,000 and at the same time retail prices for potatoes would drop.

United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 10, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

SEGRETERIA DI STATO DI SUA SANTITA,
Dal Vaticano, November 4, 1949.

MRS. BETTY JACOB,
UNICEF, Paris.

DEAR MRS. JACOB: I was pleased to have an opportunity, in the course of your recent visit to Rome, to discuss with you the work of the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund and to learn of the success which has attended your efforts and those of your colleagues.

As I told you at that time, you may be assured of the abiding sympathy of the Holy See with this humanitarian undertaking and of our interest in your project for the continuation of a supply program which you say would insure for the needy children of the world a further measure of succor and assistance.

With the expression of my sentiments of esteem and consideration, I remain,

Very sincerely yours,

G. B. MONTINI, *Substi.*

Poland's Present Plight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. W. KINGSLAND MACY
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 10, 1950

Mr. MACY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an address made by me at Polish Hall, Southampton, Long Island, N. Y., last Sunday afternoon, May 7, 1950:

Your invitation to address you on this occasion commemorating the adoption of the Polish Constitution does me much honor. Even an indifferent speaker can deliver a rousing speech on the Fourth of July when he is thrilled as a lover of liberty by the meaning of that great day, and thus it is that while I am no great speaker, I humbly hope that something of the inspiration I felt when I reviewed the great event on May 3, 1793, when freedom-loving men adopted the Constitution of Poland and abolished the veto power, will carry through into my words today and serve to stir the unquenchable fire for true freedom that burns forever in Polish breasts.

We of America have only to turn our eyes east to where the iron curtain is draped like a corpse's shroud over a still-living Poland to realize how terrifying a life-in-death existence can be without freedom. We have only to look at proud Poland, subject to a master who is not a free man but a slave devoid of the most rudimentary concept of liberty, to draw back horrified. We have only to remember what Poland was and what her people hoped her destined to be, to realize that without freedom, all is nothing.

Should Russia, and this is fanciful, pave every street in Poland and fill every Polish stomach with the finest of foods, so long as men must walk those streets in regimented boots and the granaries of freedom remain empty, Poland must be an object to excite sympathy. No gain could compare with her loss and her loss must not be ours and to that end we must guard our freedom.

Americans whose ancestral background is identified in time through blood and history with Poland can be counted on to be vigilant, and valiant, too, for who can take lightly the boast of the Poles that 17 percent of the men in our armed forces in World War II were of Polish birth or extraction? Certainly not we where so many of these boys were our own Suffolk boys whose parents and brothers won honors in our schools, enriched our farmlands and aided economy, and made good citizens.

We cannot but be proud of the part Polish youth played in the war and which of us can forget the legions of Polish fliers who defended London from the German blitz, shot out of the air over England 25 percent of the Nazi fliers brought down. These Polish, following flight from their own country, volunteered, as you well know, in England, France, and Belgium for service with the Allies. They paid dearly for their courage, as did the great General Sikorski who recruited them and later died tragically in a plane crash.

And what man or woman with Polish blood in their veins can forget that great exploit of the Polish troops in Italy when they took Mount Cassino from which our own gallant American boys had been repeatedly driven back?

What of the tremendous toll of Polish men and women in the Warsaw uprising against the Nazis in 1944, an uprising urged by Russia, under promise of support—support that never materialized? Many thousand Poles died but Russia did nothing.

Nor can we forget the frightful drama of consistent injustice to Poland found in the nefarious betrayal of her and her people at the Yalta sell-out to Stalin. Poland was sold out at Yalta and Tehran—and at Potsdam—the latter virtually as the first official act of President Truman. You all know that. I'm not telling you things you don't know. But, it's worth repeating, "again, and again, and again" to the end that the American people may know the treason and diabolical cruelty and treachery imposed upon Poland and her people by the late Mr. Roosevelt.

I say it is time for the Polish debacle to be exposed in all its savagery—and I say the full story of Poland's martyrdom has not been completely told. It should be told. It must be told. Senators TAFT, WHERRY, and BRIDGES have done much to expose parts of the rape of Poland and I deplored it publicly years ago. But much more remains to be said of what has happened on both sides of the iron curtain.

What of the 3,000,000 Poles made prisoner by the Russian Communists and hurried off to Siberia—whisked away and never heard from again? What of the cruel blow struck free Poland by President Truman when, at Potsdam, he extended—by agreement, under war-conferred powers given by a reluctant Congress during hostilities—recognition to the Communist government of Poland? Mr. Truman knew, as thousands of less-informed men and women knew—that in granting this recognition, he, Truman, sounded Poland's death knell. You may be charitable and say, "The President was tricked by the Russians." If that's his alibi, his statesmanship is a menace to the world, and certainly to the American people. And it can be added, his quality of statesmanship and knowledge of it is reflected in that of Secretary of State Acheson, and other Democratic Secretaries of State who preceded Acheson.

You here know much of what goes on in Poland today. But the great rank and file of American people do not know and on April 30th, Mayor Joseph Mruk, of Buffalo, whose name as an outstanding Polish leader is undoubtedly well known to you, deplored this lack of knowledge. He issued a number of stirring statements at that time. "I challenge the Secretary of State or any other Government official to deny them" he said, and his indictments were as follows:

"I charge that in Poland today any single utterance or action construed as anti-Communist will result, if overheard, or observed, in the sudden disappearance of the alleged 'traitor'—and inevitably subsequent vanishing of members of his family—and other relatives as well. I charge these people are summarily executed—or die a lingering death.

"I charge that in Poland today English is no longer taught in the schools, as it was under Paderewski and Gen. Jan Pilsudski, former Premier of Poland. Russian is now being taught in place of English. And I charge that the United States is made the incessant target of derogatory propaganda throughout Poland, although this propaganda has not yet been extended to teaching in the schools. The reason—Polish teachers have not yet been fully 'converted' to the new era—nor do they 'see'—except under the figurative lash of Russian-trained administrators, the doubtful benefits of Soviet 'freedom'."

Mayor Mruk's indictments went on:

"I charge that the Catholics of Poland are being denied opportunity to attend mass on Sundays by and through the subterfuge of the government holding Communist demonstrations throughout Poland each Sunday—almost from dawn to early afternoon, and Poles are expected—yes, 'strongly urged'—to attend these 'demonstrations.' Further, I charge that while not actively persecuted—thus far, at least—the Catholic priests of Poland must combat a war of nerves—must withstand implied threats, and battle unendingly in an effort to inculcate some measure of religion into the minds of the children, already subject to growing Communist indoctrination in the schools.

"I charge that complete censorship of mail prevails in Poland—Communist censorship—applying both to mail going in and out of that country.

"I charge that alleged duties imposed on relief packages sent to Poland make it almost impossible for the people in Poland to pay these penalties—and that's what the charges are—penalties. Only duties on used clothing—if ragged enough—are within the reach of Poland's people—and new clothing is, of course, just a dream. A skimpy 3 yards of material, for example, carries a stiff fee, but duties covering 4 yards are prohibitive."

Mayor Mruk's words are freighted with bitter anger, and well they may be. In speaking as president of the National Republican Club in 1946, I was puzzled about the indifference to the Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam debacles and what I then called "the curious tenderness of many of our elected and appointed officials."

I said: "My recollection tells me that Russia was perfectly content to sit down with the Nazis and divide Poland. Russia was not suspicious of the matériel supplied so bounteously by the United States. Now it is patent that the present Polish Government like the states surrounding Russia, is completely under Soviet domination. Vast numbers of the brave Polish people who stood in the way of the full fury of the Nazi machine blitz, and who contributed mightily to affording the Allies opposing Germany the opportunity to gird themselves for battle, seem to want nothing of the present Polish Government. To the average American this does not look fair and just.

"The sheer impudence of the Communistic movement in this country has been so brazen that, had our people not been so bedeviled and bewildered by super-emergency regulation, they would have thrown its supporters out long since as I believe they will shortly when the full facts are known. The left-wing groups represent a species with which up to now we have had little experience in this country. They have taken advantage of our sportsmanship and predilection for free and untrammeled exercise of the franchise to gang up and endeavor to destroy our form of government. Theirs is not a constructive operation within its framework but one that is diabolically destructive. They use all the techniques familiar to the dictator movements abroad over the past two decades. They seek to create dissension by promising the people what they know to be economically impossible, and while pretending to be nondiscriminatory racially, they are actually inciting every possible race prejudice and hatred, or in other words they are the expert conditioners who would prepare the way for overthrow of the Government. The pattern is nothing new. It is simply 'create dissension and take over'."

As Mayor Mruk pointed out, Poland successfully fought the Tartars, Turks, and Swedes. The armies led by Jan Sobieski triumphed over Turks and Tartars in the seventeenth century—but it remained for the New Deal, aided by Hopkins and Hiss, and the Truman administration, to walk Poland into the death trap of patriotic, economic, and administrative extinction, and as he

said, "The tragedy of Poland should haunt forever—decent, brave men and women who gave so much—clung to their tradition—who fought two wars in the belief they were fighting for world freedom. These, too, were betrayed, as was Poland."

Maragon Affair Leaves Bad Odor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I take this opportunity of calling the attention of my colleagues and the country to the editorial I am asking to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. The editorial is entitled "Maragon Affair Leaves Bad Odor." It ably amplifies the theme suggested in its title.

It is especially significant that this editorial is from the Mitchell Republic, published out in Mitchell, S. Dak., under the able direction of W. R. Ronald, who said recently in a signed editorial that he was trying to be the consistent editor of a Fair Deal newspaper. The Mitchell Republic is the largest and most important newspaper supporting the Truman administration in South Dakota.

So far as I can recall, this paper has not had a kind thing to say about me in its editorial columns for many years. Nonetheless I recognize it as one of our important and influential newspapers, and when even the Mitchell Republic bemoans the Maragon-Vaughan activities in the White House, it would, indeed, appear a more satisfactory corrective is required than has thus far been developed.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARAGON AFFAIR LEAVES BAD ODOR

Small-time operator John Maragon, who apparently had delusions of granduer, has been sentenced to serve 8 months to 2 years in jail for lying to a Senate committee investigating the 5-percenter racket.

The conviction and sentencing of Maragon may be a satisfying climax, to some persons, of the 5-percenter inquiry. As a matter of fact, however, Maragon has been cast in the role of a sacrificial goat.

Suggesting that Maragon is taking the rap for someone else, the Milwaukee Journal says:

"The rap for whom? For Harry Vaughan, the military aide to the President?

"It was Harry Vaughan who permitted John Maragon to hang around the White House, using his office and his telephone, and even his name, according to testimony before the Senate committee. Without Harry Vaughan, John Maragon would have been as nothing in Washington, without stature or influence. He would have had no way to pressure governmental favors for friends, or for outfits like the Verley Co., the Allied Molasses Co., and others that paid him money.

"An interesting situation, indeed, Maragon doesn't talk, protecting Vaughan, his crony. Vaughan doesn't talk, protecting Maragon, his crony. Neither side in the trial subpenas Vaughan, thus protecting everybody. And President Truman, as he has said repeatedly, stands back of Vaughan."

The entire picture is an unpleasant one, with an extremely fishy odor. The small fry caught, on a perjury count, was strictly peanuts in Washington's influence industry. But apparently everyone in official capacity is satisfied that what has been done represents a major accomplishment in the interests of cleaning up the 5 percenters.

Actually the entire affair is, as the Milwaukee paper says "one that shouldn't make Americans very proud of their government at the top level."

Tremendous Cost of St. Lawrence Seaway Cannot Be Justified

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 10, 1950

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, during the last several weeks we have heard much about the necessity of the St. Lawrence seaway because of the alleged diminishing supply of iron ore on the Mesabi Range in Minnesota, and a new deposit of ore in Labrador.

A letter written by Mr. W. Sykes, chairman of the executive committee, Inland Steel Co., Chicago, Ill., dated April 25, was read into the record at the hearings being held by the House Public Works Committee on May 3. This letter clearly refutes the statement that the St. Lawrence seaway must be constructed without delay so that ore deposits in Labrador can be made available to the steel industry.

Mr. Sykes in his letter points out that the steel industry of this country can bring ore from Venezuela and deliver it to the Pittsburgh and Youngstown districts at a cost comparable to the ores they are now mining on the Mesabi Range.

The following excerpts from Mr. Sykes' letter is of particular interest:

With reference to your letter of April 21 regarding the development of taconite, the work is being carried on actively at this time. A number of interests, including the steel corporation and the Pickands Mather Co., are building or have built pilot plants and from these full-scale experiments it is expected that plants of commercial size will be developed within the next few years.

However, the development of taconite is not of great urgency because, with the development of the ore properties of the Steel Corp. in Venezuela, the demand for these higher-cost ores will be greatly diminished.

I am informed that the steel corporation studies indicate that they can bring ore from Venezuela and deliver it into the Pittsburgh and Youngstown districts at a cost comparable to the ores which they are now mining on the Mesabi Range. This means, of course, that the demand for Mesabi Range ore will be diminished and a greater time will elapse before there is any great urgency in the development of the low-grade iron-bearing materials.

As I visualize the situation, there will be a gradual exhaustion of the easily mined open-pit ores, a gradual increase in the higher-cost ores from underground mines, and then a gradual building of plants to beneficiate the taconites, so that an economic balance will be established with gradually increasing cost of the ore.

I see no urgency or great need to bring Labrador ore to the Middle West for a very long time to come, and the tremendous cost of developing the St. Lawrence waterway cannot be justified on the necessity of making Labrador ores available to maintain our steel-making capacity in the Middle West.

Defense Expenditures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 27, 1950

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks of Assistant Secretary of Defense Marx Leva before the annual meeting of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Washington, D. C., May 2, 1950:

DEFENSE EXPENDITURES

I feel sure that all of you will recall the case of Mr. Jones, who was introduced by a toastmaster who said: "Mr. Jones will now give us his address." Mr. Jones thereupon stood up, said "My address is 2700 Connecticut Avenue NW.," and then sat down.

Since our toastmaster has just stated that I will speak on "defense expenditures," perhaps I should follow the good example of Mr. Jones, say "Defense expenditures this year will be $12,300,000,000," and then sit down.

If I were to quit talking after such a simple and factually correct statement, it might be a very good thing from the standpoint of the audience—and I am certain that it would be an excellent thing from the standpoint of the speaker. But since neither the audience nor the speaker is to have such an easy way out, I would like to turn now to a discussion of the complex and confusing subject that is bound up within those two simple words, "defense expenditures."

Just in case we should have a question-and-answer period later on, I have taken the precaution of asking Assistant Secretary of Defense McNeil, our comptroller, to accompany me to this luncheon. Over a long period of association, I have found that the field to which you are addressing yourselves today is a field on which Assistant Secretary McNeil is better informed than almost any other person in the Federal Government.

At the very outset of my remarks today, I should like to discuss for a moment the economy program of the Department of Defense—and I should like, in particular, to discuss the interrelation between the economy program and the level of defense expenditures.

Briefly stated, we would be spending approximately a billion and a half more than we are spending this year, if it were not for the economy program. The details behind this figure of $1,500,000,000—or $1,592,000,000, to be exact—are contained in Secretary of Defense Johnson's semiannual report, as submitted to the Congress a few days ago. In chapter IV of his semiannual report, Secretary Johnson discussed the economy program in considerable detail, in order

to make it clear that this program was an essential and continuing part of the policies he intends to carry out, as Secretary of Defense. Both in the semiannual report and in his testimony before the House and Senate Appropriations Committees last week, Secretary Johnson stressed the fact that the economy program, which has been misinterpreted and misconstrued in some quarters, is one of the principal tools used by the Department of Defense in channeling funds into the combatant forces where such funds can be used to give us added strength, and away from such wasteful expenditures as unnecessary overhead, costly duplication, and unwarranted overlaps.

In connection with our economy program, there is a point which I should like to stress. The point to which I refer can be summarized as follows: An economy program in the Department of Defense is important for two reasons:

First, it is important because of the urgent necessity of maintaining a healthy national economy, and in order to maintain such an economy it is essential that military expenditures must be held to the lowest level compatible with our national security.

Second, it is important because of the equally urgent necessity of making savings wherever possible in order to assure that money which otherwise would go into excessive overhead and waste can be used, as I have just mentioned, to increase our combat effectiveness.

In other words, savings are important in and of themselves, because each dollar that we refrain from spending means a healthier national economy; but savings are equally important as a source of money with which we can buy more planes, more antiaircraft and antitank equipment, and more ships.

By way of illustration of the use of savings for increased combat effectiveness, I should like to call your attention to an announcement which was made a few days ago with regard to Marine aviation. This announcement stated that arrangements have just been completed under which Marine aviation, during the fiscal year beginning next July 1, will include 16 Marine air-combat squadrons, instead of the 12 squadrons contemplated when the budget was submitted to Congress last January—the key point in the announcement being the fact that the additional four squadrons that are to be maintained will not require any additional appropriations, but will be financed by means of economies elsewhere in the budget.

This particular illustration, I think, points up the situation to which Secretary Johnson has referred on a number of occasions when he has said that our task in the Department of Defense is the task of transforming fat into muscle. The four additional Marine air-combat squadrons will give us muscle that has real meaning. Similarly, Admiral Sherman recently announced that the Navy will maintain seven large aircraft carriers during the next fiscal year, instead of the six large carriers contemplated at the time that the budget was submitted to Congress last January. In his announcement of this development, Admiral Sherman pointed out that the additional carrier was to be maintained out of economies effected elsewhere in the naval budget.

Additional illustrations applicable to the Army and the Air Force are set out in Secretary Johnson's semiannual report, and in the interest of saving your time, I will not repeat them here. I will be glad to send over copies of chapter IV of the report later in the day, however, for as many of you as may be interested.

All that I have been saying up to this point has been largely by way of preamble. In everything that we have done in the Department of Defense, we have consistently emphasized that security comes first, and economy second, but I wanted to open this discussion with a brief reference to the economy program, because of the widespread misinterpretation to which that program has been subjected.

Turning now to the more specific subject of national security and the military budget, I should like to review with you the developments which prompted the Department of Defense, less than a week ago, to request that the military budget for the coming fiscal year be increased by $350,000,000.

In beginning my discussion of this subject, I would like to go back to last September. Immediately after the President's announcement, on September 23, that there had been an atomic explosion in the U. S. S. R., we began a revaluation of our own military requirements. Almost simultaneously with this development, the President directed the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense, as a working committee of the National Security Council, to conduct a broad reevaluation of our national program, in the light of our international commitments and the constantly changing world situation.

Some of the results of the reevaluations mentioned above are already known to you. Specifically, the President's decision to proceed with the construction of the H-bomb was based in part on the studies described above. In addition, many of the steps we have taken in furtherance of the North Atlantic Pact and the military aid program implementing that pact have been based on the continuing studies I have already mentioned.

I would not like to leave the impression that these studies are completed. Indeed, in the broad sense, studies of this nature are never completed, for both the State and the Defense Departments must continuously review foreign policy and the military strength that goes hand in hand with it. In making continuing reviews of this type, we have the advantage of the very excellent organizational arrangements Congress has provided, through the vehicle known as the National Security Council—and I refer particularly to the language used by Congress in assigning to the National Security Council the duty to assess and appraise the objectives, commitments, and risks of the United States in relation to our actual and potential military power, in the interest of national security.

Secretary Johnson, speaking to this subject last week in his testimony before the House and Senate Appropriations Committees, said:

"The point at which we have arrived at the present time can be described as follows: Based on the work already done by the Council of Foreign Ministers, by the Council of Defense Ministers, and by the Chiefs of Staff, of the North Atlantic Pact nations, we have, for the first time, a fairly clear picture of the collective military requirements of the North Atlantic community of nations. We have also appraised recent events which make it entirely possible that appropriations in excess of those which have been requested for the current year will be required in succeeding years, not only for our own military forces but also for the military-aid program. Just as it is possible that in future years this Nation will have to devote an increased percentage of its total budget to these items, it is also possible that our partners in the North Atlantic Pact will be required by the force of events, and by the force of our collective planning as well, to take similar action. The events to which I allude include the Soviet atomic explosion, the fall of China, the serious situations in southeast Asia, the break in diplomatic relations with Bulgaria, and deteriorating relations with other satellite countries, the Soviet assumption of control over the armed forces of Poland, Soviet naval expansion, the increased Soviet pressures in Germany, the recent attack on a naval aircraft in the Baltic, and the recent Soviet demands relative to Trieste.

"None of these presents a happy prospect; but the cold war is not a happy circumstance. The only satisfaction that I can personally derive from the situation lies in the fact that our own Military Establishment is well on the road to becoming a stronger and more powerful organization, and one which, as circumstances require, can utilize increased appropriations in a manner which will provide substantially increased combat effectiveness, whereas, even as recently as 1 year ago, large sums of money out of any increased appropriations would have been drained off in the form of unnecessary overhead."

The struggle to eliminate unnecessary overhead is a continuing one. I feel sure that all of you face it in your own businesses. To help meet this problem in the Department of Defense, we created, last August, a management committee. This committee consists of Gen. Joseph McNarney as chairman, and one representative of each of the Departments—Army, Navy, and Air Force—as members. This committee, assisted by the management engineering firm of Robert Heller and Associates, has been of tremendous value to us in our efforts to eliminate overhead, and channel the funds thus saved into combat effectiveness.

The work of the management committee is really based upon, and flows out of, the recommendations of the Hoover Commission. Many of you will undoubtedly recall what the Hoover Commission had to say with respect to the Military Establishment, but just to refresh your recollections on this point, I would like to summarize just what it was that the Hoover Commission said about us. These were their comments and recommendations:

1. They said that there was extravagance and waste in military spending.

2. They recommended that, in order to remedy this situation, the Secretary of Defense should be given complete authority—instead of the divided authority which he possessed under the original Unification Act which Congress passed in 1947.

3. They said that the Secretary of Defense should be given full power over the military budget.

4. They said that the Secretary of Defense should proceed to overhaul the military budget and put it on a performance basis.

5. They recommended that Congress provide for an Under Secretary of Defense and three Assistant Secretaries of Defense.

6. They recommended that provision be made for a Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff—the position which Gen Omar Bradley is filling in such an outstanding manner today.

A little more than a year ago, President Truman submitted to Congress his legislative program for carrying out the Hoover Commission recommendations concerning the Department of Defense. After a considerable amount of legislative turmoil, this program was enacted into law by the Congress, and took effect on August 10, 1949.

I mention all of this by way of reminder of the fact that we have been functioning under this strengthened type of unification for less than 9 months—and have been able in this relatively brief period of time, to bring about the major economies to which I have referred earlier.

Rather obviously, the level of defense expenditures in future years is not a matter that will be determined by an abstract intellectual exercise on the part of the people of the United States. Indeed, while the military budget is prepared by the President and enacted by the Congress, in the last analysis the level of defense expenditures is determined by the type and severity of the threat

to our national security which world conditions impose upon us.

Defense expenditures differ from the remainder of the Federal budget in still another respect, for defense expenditures do not really constitute a budget at all, but consist of the translation into dollars of the operating force plans evolved by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. This is a point which has been frequently misunderstood, and I mention it here in the interest of clarity—for I think it is important to understand that the Joint Chiefs of Staff are not a group which sits around deciding how many dollars shall be allotted to the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force. As distinguished from this rather widely held but mistaken view of the functioning of the Joint Chiefs of Staff is the true picture—which is that of a group of men working out comprehensive plans for the armed forces which this country, in concert with its allies, must maintain in order to protect our national security. Once these operating-force plans are worked out by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the job of affixing dollar tags to them can be handled with comparative ease.

In this connection, it is significant to note that the strength levels in uniformed manpower recommended by the Joint Chiefs of Staff for the coming fiscal year are not altered in any way by last week's request for additional procurement funds. In other words, the operating force plan of the Joints Chiefs of Staff—which calls for an Army of 630,000 men, naval and marine forces of 461,000 men, and an Air Force of 416,000 men—continues to be the basic operating force plan to which the military budget is addressed. The augmented strength which the additional $350,000,000 will provide is to consist, in Secretary Johnson's phrase, of "hardware, and nothing else"—that is, more matériel rather than more men. Summing up the picture, I would say that our Department of Defense military expenditures for this year—the total of $12,300,000,000 which I mentioned earlier—can be broken down as follows:

Major procurement, including aircraft, ships, tanks, and the like, will account for $2,400,000,000, or about 20 percent of the total.

Pay and support of uniformed personnel will account for $4,500,000,000, or 36 percent of the total.

Pay of civilian personnel—a field in which our economy program has already resulted in savings in salaries and housekeeping costs that will amount to more than $500,000,000 a year—will account for approximately $2,000,000,000, or 16 percent of the total.

Research and development—a field to which we have given, and will continue to give, the closest of attention—will account for $600,000,000, or 5 percent of the total.

All other costs will account for $2,800,000,000, or 23 percent of the total.

In conclusion, I should like to address myself to a statement which, while frequently made and apparently fashionable, does not seem to me to be wholly accurate. I refer to the rather apologetic statement one frequently hears from Government officials to the effect that most of the difficulty one encounters in Government fiscal matters stems from the fact that Government has no substitute for the profit motive. I realize that many departments and agencies are not as fortunately situated as the Department of Defense in this respect, but I submit that we do have a reasonable substitute for the profit motive, and that substitute is this: The Chief of Staff of the Army, the Chief of Naval Operations, and the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, have the best of all "profit motives" in that each of them knows that the money which he saves can be used to buy additional striking power. Admiral Sherman summed up this point of view in admirable fashion in a message he recently sent to all Naval personnel, in which he said: "Navy Department is exerting every effort to translate available appropriations into maximum fighting strength and mobilization potential. Savings made are generally available for increasing the state of readiness of authorized forces. Economies already effected have permitted increasing previously planned fleet strength by one large carrier and one cruiser, to provide additional equipment for antisubmarine warfare, and to augment general readiness. Planned economies are an important contributing factor in retaining two additional Marine battalions"—to which could be added, in the light of last week's announcement, the four additional Marine air combat squadrons I have already mentioned.

In my opinion, this is indeed a powerful substitute for the profit motive—and it is being so utilized by the patriotic and conscientious men, military and civilian, who head the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force. The caliber of these men, coupled with the able and aggressive leadership of the Secretary of Defense and his Deputy Secretary, seem to me to be the best assurance that the American people can possibly have that the aim of the Department of Defense will continue to be a stronger and more effective military establishment, wherever possible at a reduced cost to the taxpayer.

John F. Moran and Alvin Goodman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY P. O'NEILL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 10, 1950

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article, which appeared recently in the Scranton Times, Scranton, Pa., honoring John F. Moran, Technical High School's first blind valedictorian, and Alvin Goodman, also a 4-year honor student and a member of the sight-conservation class. The article follows:

WEST LOCUST STREET YOUTH CAPS HIS 12-YEAR PUBLIC SCHOOL CAREER

John (Jack) F. Moran, 18, son of Mr. and Mrs. Frank Moran, 904 West Locust St., today capped his 12-year public-school career as a "blind conservation" student by becoming Technical High School's first blind valedictorian. Also, it is said that he is the first blind student to take top honors in any district school.

Young Moran, who became totally blind at the age of 14, will deliver the valedictory address when the school graduates 391 students Tuesday, June 13, at 8 p. m. in West Scranton High School, on the basis of having the highest average in the class during his 4 years in high school.

While he has many accomplishments to his credit, the most important, according to his teacher, Miss Helen Smith, is that he provided proof that handicapped children can be educated in schools in their own home town among familiar surroundings.

According to Miss Smith, she began teaching Jack in first grade at Benjamin Franklin School at the inauguration of the Scranton school district sight conservation program. Partially blind since birth because of a congenital eye disease (one eye was removed when he was an infant), Jack was her first student. During the first 4 years the program was in an experimental stage. Miss Smith later began picking up other sight-handicapped students. Her class at Technical now numbers 14 students.

Miss Smith and Principal W. Albert Murphy praise Jack highly. He is editor of the senior-class yearbook.

An all-around, well-built, and good-looking student, Jack has a high interest in sports. For writing several songs for the football team, this year he was elected honorary captain. He never misses a Technical football or basketball game. Possessing a good tenor voice, Jack has been soloist of the school choir and has entertained at many local affairs.

No story would be complete without mentioning his "eyes," friend and constant companion, Alvin Goodman, son of Morris Goodman, 630 Taylor Avenue, also a 4-year honor student and a member of the sight-conservation class.

Jack and Alvin are familiar sights around the school. Although they use the elevator to go from first to the other floors, the two boys walk down the stairs when changing classes.

Both Jack and Alvin plan to enter college—Jack in law and Alvin in Government work. To gain college credits, the past 2 years they have taken Latin a period a day in Central High School. This gave them 4 years of Latin.

The district's program has been little publicized in the belief that attention to handicapped students is not desirable.

The students go to regular classes with the sighted students but return to the special class for reading and writing. Special text books with large lettering and typewriters, also with large letters are provided. Jack, who learned to typewrite in the fourth grade, knows little Braille.

In this special class "black" boards become "green" boards for the benefit of the students. The walls are painted a dull green. There is no glossy finish in the room and it is lighted with bright flourescent bulbs.

The class is scheduled to graduate four students this year. With Jack and Alvin as honor students, it gives the class a 50-percent average of 4-year honor students—a record probably unmatched in any other class, school, or district.

What's Ahead for the Nebraska Cattlemen?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 10, 1950

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech I made before the Nebraska Stock Growers Association at O'Neill, Nebr., on Tuesday, April 26:

It is good to be back in Nebraska where people live close enough to the soil and the sun to know what makes America tick. It is good to be present at this district meeting of the Nebraska Cattlemen's Association.

It was possible to come because for the next 10 days there is only general debate in the House and no urgent roll calls. I miss very few votes. The Fourth Congressional District in Nebraska has more cattle than any one of the other 435 congressional districts in the United States.

What's ahead for the Nebraska cattlemen? In my opinion if employment and wages

stay high, there will be a continued demand for meat. If unemployment increases and the people's confidence in our money decreases, then I would expect a general pulling in of the belt and less buying all along the line.

I am suggesting that this association join with the National Meat Institute to promote an "Eat More Meat" campaign. Actually the per capita consumption of meat has been declining since the war. Less meat was consumed by the public in 1949 than in 1948. It is estimated less will be consumed in 1950. Part of this is due to agencies of Government who are constantly seeking and advertising substitutes for meat.

The American people have always been meat eaters. Meat has been the principal item of diet for the human race from the beginning of time. Primitive man found satisfaction in making a kill and eating the meat. As a physician, I can tell you that the human body is especially adapted to the consumption and digestion of meat and animal products. There is no food which nature has endowed so lavishly with the necessary proteins, vitamins, minerals, and fat. In fact meat is the master piece of nature's laboratory. It contains 22 amino acids, 10 of which the body needs to keep healthy. People who are big meat eaters are large in stature and have great energy. The Hindus, Chinese, Japanese, and the inhabitants of Okinawa, who eat little meat, are small of stature.

This good meat is produced from Nebraska grass and feed. The people of Nebraska should be thankful that they have a quantity and quality of grass upon which to grow their livestock. There are more than 26,000,000 acres of grass in Nebraska. When it is properly pastured, it will give excellent returns on labor and investment. Your livestock makes a good harvesting machine that seldom needs repairs. Some of this livestock comes off of the range ready for the butcher's block.

Again, speaking as a physician, I feel that an eat-more-meat campaign would dispel the false idea that hospital patients and youngsters should not eat meat. For many years I operated a hospital in Kimball, and at that time there was the feeling among medical men that patients should be given fish and chicken instead of red meat. Recent experiments have shown that red meat is not harmful, but can contribute to the patient's recovery by supplying many of the vitamins, minerals, and acids so necessary to tissue repair and health.

It is estimated that in 1950 there will be 23,200,000,000 pounds of meat produced. This is 6 percent more than in 1949 and 8 percent less than in 1944, when production reached the all-time peak. This would mean a possible per capita consumption of 150 pounds, as compared with 145 pounds in 1949.

The United States imported 241,000,000 pounds of meat in 1949, the bulk coming from Canada and Argentina. We exported 130,000,000 pounds. I would also point out that we imported 10,000 carloads of potatoes from Canada, a million and a half pounds of powdered eggs from China, 48,000 cases of crab meat from Russia, and huge quantities of beans, fish, and other agricultural products from other countries. When we consider what is ahead for the cattlemen we must consider what the international trade organization will do when the nations of the world meet in England on September 17, 1950. If they follow the pattern of their last meeting they will make further reductions in tariffs on agricultural products. In their last meeting 80 percent of the reductions on imports coming to this country were on agricultural products. This could have unusual results to your business.

The production of cattle has increased about 2,000,000 head in the last year. It is estimated that all types of cattle in 1949 amounted to 80,277,000 head. The all-time high was in 1945 when there were 85,573,000 head. It is estimated that beef cattle numbered about 43,000,000 head.

It should be remembered that our human population is increasing about 2,500,000 a year. It would seem that the number of cattle should increase to 90,000,000 head in the next few years if we are to keep pace with the demands of our increasing population. Thirty years ago we had 70,000,000 head of cattle when our population was only 105,000,000.

The increase in the number of livestock would solve another problem. It is estimated that if an additional 2 percent of the cattle were fed grain, it would completely wipe out our surplus of feed grains. It is natural that the high support leveled on grain will discourage feeding it to livestock.

In considering what is ahead for the cattlemen, we must speculate upon how far the administration will go in adopting such measures as the Brannan farm program, socialized medicine, or the so-called Spence bill, which is nothing more than a superduper OPA with more trimmings and regulations than we have ever had before.

If we adopt the Brannan plan, which is similar to the English agricultural program, you would not be able to sell your cattle without a permit; you could not kill them or produce more than the Secretary of Agriculture would indicate. You would be told when to sell and what to feed. The regulations in England, and those under the Brannan plan, would be so numerous that incentive and free enterprise would then be smothered. There are 15 pages of penalties in the Brannan farm program, which would require you to keep such records, letters, memoranda, accounts as the Secretary would indicate. Your books would be inspected. For noncompliance you could be fined $5,000 or be placed in jail. Adopt this plan and the future of the livestock industry would not be very bright.

There is another move that should be watched carefully by your association and that relates to the intense pressure by the consumers of the East to lower the barriers and permit cheap meat to come in from South America. I know there are groups who are considering ways and means to bring this about. If fresh meat is permitted to come from Argentina, Mexico, and other countries infested with foot and mouth disease, and this disease is transplanted to our cattle herds, as it surely will be, then the future of the cattle industry again grows precarious.

I must sound another warning on what is ahead. In my opinion we have two Frankenstein monsters facing our people today. One is increased inflation; the other more taxes. Either can destroy the economy of this country. You people on the farm will be in an ideal position, if an uncontrolled inflation takes hold, because the quart of milk and the dozen of eggs, and your meat still has the same food value regardless of the value the dollar may assume.

You cannot escape so readily the taxes. The huge spending of this administration, with a $7,000,000,000 deficit this year, can mean but one thing—more taxes and more inflation.

Another note of warning must be sounded and that refers to the growth of socialism and regimentation. It is not only in the Brannan farm program, socialized medicine and attempt to nationalize steel and other industries, but it means bigger government with more controls in Washington. I am fearful that socialism, like the termites in a building, is silently destroying our way of life. It is destroying the rights of the individuals. The holding of property should always be a human right, but under socialism, Government assumes the ownership and denies that individuals have the right or the capacity to manage their property and economy. We have seen big government grow, from 1933, when there were only 533,000 on the Federal payroll, a debt of $16,000,000,000 and only $5,000,000,000 to run all phases of government, up to this time when we have more than 2,000,000 on the payroll; a debt of $260,000,000,000; and $43,000,000,000 to run the Government. This does not include a deficit of $7,000,000,000,000 for this year. In 1933 there were 351 departments of government. Today there are more than 1,850.

The need for the adoption of the Hoover Commission recommendations is imperative if we are to rid ourselves of the deadwood duplication, and extravagence in Federal Government. In 4½ peacetime years, we spent more than $190,000,000,000. This is more than 32 Presidents spent in the first 152 years of our existence, and during that time we went through several wars and depressions. We cannot be in a good position with printing-press money. It seems to me that our Government, the banks, trust and insurance companies, who are the unofficial custodians of the peoples' money, ought to be able to tell the citizen that the dollar that he puts in bonds today will always be worth a dollar. Unsound economic policies, with more unemployment, mounting surpluses, declining exports, with threats of Government operation of business are real storm clouds.

I also know that our citizens have great faith, energy, character, and are of sound moral fiber. We have more food, electrical gadgets, and new inventions than any other country in the world. We have great power to produce. The strength of our country rests in our soil and the spiritual make-up of our people. We are a Christian Nation—a praying Nation. We have the ability to meet great emergencies and still keep our economic and social balance. Our know-how of production leads the world. It is a bright shining beacon light. It is my great hope and fervent prayer that the Congress and this administration will be able to guide the frustrated world through the international fog and rough economic waters so that we may be able to pass on to future generations a type of society in which they can be secure and our Nation will remain strong.

Development of Irrigation in Nebraska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 10, 1950

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, on April 25, it was my privilege to ride over and inspect the Loup River Basin irrigation project. With me were Governor Peterson, of Nebraska; Paul Larsen, of St. Paul; Avery Batson, from the Bureau of Reclamation; and many other interested citizens. That evening more than 500 folks had supper in Scotia and listened, with much interest, to the prospects of irrigation in this area. I hope this project can come before Congress next year. It is feasible.

The farmers and the city folks realize the value of water on good land at the

proper time. Irrigation is a great stabilizer, and assures the farmer a backlog of safety and security. Irrigation brings new wealth to a community and the Nation, and provides food for our expanding population and economy. It brings new purchasing power and improved standards of living.

Nebraska has more than a million acres that can be successfully irrigated. This is one of our great natural resources that deserves the support of the Congress.

When these projects come before the committee of which I am a member, they will be easy to defend because they are feasible. Our natural resources are the cornerstone and foundation of our country. They should be developed for the benefit of mankind. The people of the country are brave and hospitable. Give them fertile soil, a sound government, and they will reach new horizons which have been denied the present generation.

A Balanced Economy and the Brannan Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1950

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, so much is being said about the Government price-support program and the Brannan plan that I have taken occasion to express my views concerning price parity and stable national economy in a letter written in response to an editorial sent me from the Cleveland Plain Dealer which is inserted here:

QUESTIONS OF MORALITY

Can a Government behave in an immoral manner toward its own people? Can it deceive them, rob them, cheat them, plunder their resources and infringe on their liberties?

We know how a community would condemn a man who ran up charge accounts, went on a binge every Saturday night and didn't pay his bills.

What would the neighbors say about a housewife who carted home large quantities of food from the grocery and butcher shop every day and then, instead of preparing it for her family, let it spoil?

How long could a respected citizen borrow money from his friends and, when the time came to pay it back required them to settle on the basis of 60 cents to the dollar?

How lenient would the community be with a door-to-door salesman who insisted at the point of a gun that every householder buy his products? Or with a smooth talking promoter who tried to force his neighbors to turn over a large percentage of their incomes to him on the promise that he would take care of their insurance, their medical and hospital bills, and send their children to college?

Surely any community would frown on a person who indulged in these practices and at least call for the police or the men in the white coats with the strait-jacket to come and get him.

But when a government does these things, is its conduct any less immoral?

The United States Government is on a big spending binge. It is living beyond its income, not accidentally or because of misfortune, but deliberately.

The United States Government has arranged to have more food delivered to the markets than the people can consume and the surplus is either spoiling or is in storage, which merely delays the process of spoilage. This didn't happen accidentally, either, but was done deliberately.

The United States Government has borrowed money from its citizens, promising to pay $100 after 10 years for every $75 that was loaned through the purchase of savings bonds. But when the time comes to repay, the lender gets back only $60 in actual purchasing value, in terms of the value of the original $75 loan. Then, to add insult to injury, the Government requires him to pay a tax on the fictitious $25 profit he has collected.

The United States Government forces its citizens to buy things they don't need or don't want or can't afford, at the point of the tax collector's gun. Every subsidy paid out by the Government to some special interest or pressure group is a forced purchase by all the citizens of the products or services of that interest or group. Since the citizens do not or will not of their own volition buy the products or services of the favored interests or groups, the Government takes the money away from the citizens anyhow in taxes and makes the purchases.

The United States Government has already taken away a large percentage of its citizens' incomes in the form of taxes, thus depriving them of the freedom of spending their own money, and is demanding a larger share, for the purpose of looking after more and more of their affairs.

It is not surprising that a large number of people have lost confidence in the Government, for the Government is conducting itself in a manner which, if an individual so conducted himself, would be condemned as profligate and immoral.

Nor is it any excuse to point out that some Government administrators and policy makers who commit these offenses may be well intentioned and may sincerely believe they are acting in the best interests of the people. Others, we fear, and this goes for the practical politicians, are not always well-intentioned. Their promises, their deceit and their loose handling of other people's money are deliberate, for the purpose of maintaining themselves in power.

But they will not remain in power, we believe, if the people insist that their Government adhere to the same standards of morality which apply to individuals.

MAY 8, 1950.

Mr. J. CECIL ROWE,
Cleveland Heights, Ohio.

DEAR MR. ROWE: I received your letter with which you enclosed a reprint from the Cleveland Plain Dealer. This deals with one of the most important issues concerning the people of this country today—sound national economy and stable price structure.

From time immemorial, the necessary adjustments in the price structure have been regulated by competition and the law of supply and demand. If for instance, all the farmers should take occasion at one time to raise watermelons, and a great many more watermelons than are needed and could be used were produced, the price of melons would fall. And melons being a perishable food, much of the crop would waste, and for that reason, people would reduce the production of watermelons.

And so it is with everything else. If the butcher shop in your town were charging too high prices for steaks, chops, hams, and other commodities he sells in his shop, and some enterprising men wanted to go into the butcher business and sell meat at fair prices, and they went down the street and rented a building and equipped it with a refrigerator, butcher block, and other necessary facilities for a butcher shop; then went out and bought livestock from the farmers and slaughtered them, and brought beef, pork, and mutton into their shop and sold meats at a reasonable price, and so as to make a fair profit the fellow who was charging too high prices for his meats would have to meet competition and sell at the right prices or people would purchase from the new butcher shop. It has been this way in every line of human endeavor.

When the Government adopts a "hands off" policy, the big manufacturers, business organizations, and large combines, monopolize the business, drive small competitors out of the field, raise the prices on things people must buy to unreasonable levels, whether it is meat from the butcher or a mowing machine from the manufacturer, and so something has to be done to keep prices within bounds, which we call price parity, and to maintain a stable economy.

The Congress has been struggling with this problem for a great many years, and has finally adopted the support price program for farmers, as well as producers of most everything in the basic industries, whether it is farm products, lumber, brick, lime, lead, zinc, copper, and things for the mining industry.

To maintain price parity, we must have a balance between the prices of the things the consumer must buy, and the price of things he produces to sell, which is being done by price support programs. This scheme has worked pretty well in recent years. The farmers have prospered, and so have the manufacturers and their employees.

But what about the businessman who has saved up a few dollars and retired; the retired engineer, the retired policeman, retired street car man? The manufacturer is making big profits; the farmer is making big profits. So the only way I can see how these retired men can buy the things they need and must have from the farmer and the manufacturer is for the Government to step in and skim the cream off the money taken in by these excess profits and price support payments and pay it over to the people supplying the market so that they can reduce their prices and sell at a fair price to the retired businessman under arrangements which make it possible for him to go into the market places and buy the things he must have at a fair and reasonable price that he can afford to pay. Now, this is called the Brannan plan. If you have a better plan, let's have it. The Congress has been struggling for a great many years with this problem.

Sincerely yours,

COMPTON I. WHITE,
Member of Congress.

Bad Samaritans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 10, 1950

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article:

BAD SAMARITANS

You will remember a stranger on the road to Jericho fell among thieves. They robbed

and beat him, and left him half dead. The Good Samaritan, moved with compassion, bound up his wounds, took him to the inn and told the innkeeper to do what was necessary and he would pay the bill. Are we forgetting about the place of the Good Samaritan in the world today?

Can you picture the Good Samaritan as the agent of a Government bureau? A certain priest, a bureaucrat of the temple, and a patronage holder under the Roman conquerors, looked at the stranger in trouble, and passed by on the other side. His official duties did not cover this situation. The Levite also passed by one the other side. He, too was a part-time officeholder whose official duties did not include attending to an unusually distressing case by the roadside.

Can't you imagine their counterpart, the modern bureaucrat, from Washington or London or Berlin? He must examine his book of regulations to see if he is under any legal compulsion to bind up the wounds of the stranger. He must go to some division chief for instructions and for authorization of funds to cover this particular situation. Most likely he returns to the poor fellow still lying on the roadside, and says, "Sorry, old man, your case is unfortunately not covered in our regulations. Congress failed to appropriate enough money for our department to take care of you. But when you're well again, old chap, you should organize a group of voters in the same kind of trouble and introduce a bill to cover such cases. And if you will vote for our party we will pass the bill, levy a new tax on the people, and fix everything up."

The Good Samaritan was an individual guided by his own conscience. He gave of himself, of his own money, of his own time, of his own mercy. He did not avoid his own personal moral responsibilities. Indeed he could not. He could not shift the responsibility to some government employee. For government has no capacity and no property with which to do charity. It does not produce. It certainly can't steal from one to do charity for the other.

Yet I work with new style "Good Samaritans," who think this can be done. They come to Congress demanding that we take more of your money for them to give away and they insist on keeping a goodly portion for themselves. I know what it is like to refuse their demands, and have them threaten me on election day. I hear their clever arguments showing the easy way to hide taxation in the price of things you buy. They call this "taking money by the democratic process" to distinguish it from outright robbery. They never ask for small appropriations. They ask for more and more.

Does anybody believe that anywhere in the world we have solved any problems by making government officials bad Samaritans? Can they relieve our individual consciences from the duty to be Good Samaritans ourselves?

As Roscoe Pound, dean emeritus of the Harvard Law School, said, "Achieving of high humanitarian purposes by the easy method of using the involuntary Good Samaritan * * * is not edifying. There ought to be a better method of making the legal order effective for our humanitarian ideals than that * * * of the pickpocket who went to the charity sermon and was so moved by the preacher's eloquence that he picked the pockets of everyone in reach and put the contents in the plate."

Robin Hood is dramatized in almost every language as a legendary figure true to every people. We thought we had completely fettered our governing men so they could not steal like Robin Hood and become bad Samaritans.

It is only the free men exercising a free conscience and producing men who have a surplus capable of being given away that can be Good Samaritans.

The Indochina Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 10, 1950

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the New York Times of May 9, 1950, entitled "The Indochina Problem."

THE INDOCHINA PROBLEM

The first question that Secretary Acheson has had to tackle in his current discussions in Europe is the problem of aid to Indochina and what we propose to do about it. That problem is closely tied up to the questions of strength and stability in western Europe, since the French hold that they cannot sustain the cost and effort of a substantial contribution to European defense while they are obliged to spend $500,000,000 a year to fight off the Communist advance in southeast Asia. We have talked about global strategy and global diplomacy, and here is a swift instance of the indivisibility of the fight for the right to remain free.

The Indochinese problem, however, is not simple. It is not an open-and-shut case, right or wrong, black or white. We cannot approach the French in a take-it-or-leave-it attitude, since we, like they, are on the horns of something of a dilemma. We want to support nationalism and the movement toward independence in Asia. We want the French to help us in the defense of threatened peoples against the onslaught of aggressive communism. But we can hardly demand that the French continue to give their lives and half their military budget to preserve a position merely for the sake of abandoning it. We are certainly not prepared to assume all of the French obligations in southeast Asia, so we are scarcely in a position to dictate all the terms of our assistance.

Indochina occupies a critically strategic position. It borders on Thailand, Burma and south China. It is a gateway to Malaya, as the Japanese demonstrated. It flanks the Philippines. It is a big arch in the bridge to Indonesia. If it falls to the Communist advance the whole of southeast Asia will be in mortal peril.

Indochina, moreover, is not a political unit. Two great partially autonomous areas, Laos and Cambodia, are under French protection. They are fearful of the Annamese, who are the dominant element in Viet Nam, and wish to preserve their identity. Viet Nam, taking in the areas of Tongking, Annam and Cochin China, has two rival claimants for nationalist supremacy. In the north, chiefly, is the Communist-led Viet Minh regime of Ho Chi Minh, recognized by the Soviet Union and its satellites as a republican government. Farther south is the French-sponsored Viet Nam government of Bao Dai, former Emperor of Annam, which has been made partially self-governing but which is still under strong French control. Both regimes are nationalist. The Ho Chi Minh group stands for complete independence from the French. How far it can be independent of Moscow is another matter. The Bao Dai group proposes to stay within the French orbit. How far, therefore, it can command profound popular support as truly nationalist is also a question.

The United States Government decided that Bao Dai, with his recognized shortcomings, was at least the lesser of two evils and granted recognition to his regime. It was therefore presumed that United States aid would be forthcoming to strengthen that government in its resistance to the Communist attack. It now appears that the United States wishes some further French commitment in respect to Bao Dai that will enlarge the powers of the regime and enhance the prospects of early independence.

The French are convinced that Indochina does not have the requisite trained leaders to undertake all the obligations of an independent state at this time and they do not believe that those necessary leaders can be found in the near future. The defense of Indochina, for example, cannot possibly be conducted at this time by Indochinese alone.

It is against this background that Secretary Acheson has discussed the Indochinese situation in Paris. It is a situation, obviously, that is not susceptible to any ready-made doctrinaire solution. If Indochina is to have a chance for eventual freedom, and if southeast Asia is to be preserved, the Communist threat must be met. This is not just a choice between colonialism and independence. There will be no free Indochina in a slave world, and we and the French, with British help, must find the means to prevent that eventuality.

If You Were Born in Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 10, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, a new book, If You Were Born in Russia, has just been published, detailing the everyday life of an ordinary citizen in the Soviet Union, and pointing out very vividly what we all know—communism is the sharing of want and despair and the complete denial of freedom, while it indoctrinates its victims so that reality and truth are replaced by propaganda. Appended is a review of this book from the April 16 edition of the Washington Post:

TERRIFYING BOOK CARRIES READER THROUGH LIFE OF SOVIET CITIZEN

(By J. R. Wiggins)

If You Were Born in Russia, by Arthur Goodfriend. Farrar, Straus, 191 pages. $5.

This is one of the most alarming books ever written about Soviet Russia.

Arthur Goodfriend takes the reader through the life of a Soviet citizen, from cradle to grave. The journey reveals the endless flood of indoctrination that engulfs the individual in this Communist society from early youth to old age.

It is a frightening trip for those who still dare hope that somehow the east and west may avoid a conflict that appears sometimes inevitable. It is a discouraging experience for those who still search for a meeting of minds. For this book discloses, with painful clarity, how different are the minds that come to the council table when spokesmen for the Soviet world and the free world foregather at international conferences.

This book is no anti-Communist tract, mind you. The author obviously has done his level best to present objectively a summary of the lifelong process of party indoctrination to which Russian citizens are subjected. Only those who are intimately acquainted with the process can judge how well he has succeeded.

He confesses the handicap of his own point of view. But he has exerted himself to es-

cape it. He has tried so hard to do so that some readers may be misled into regarding this book as a sympathetic study of Soviet Russia. He does not intrude into the narrative to point out the falsehoods in the stream of Soviet propaganda, to warn against the lies about the west, to deplore the distortions of fact. He just describes the floodtide of propaganda as it exists.

Perceptive readers will find this book, in a far different way, as terrifying as George Orwell's "1984." They will put it down in a kind of despair. Can the free world hope that the victim of such a tyranny can retain anywhere in the mind an isolated island of objectivity where truth could find lodgment?

Obviously, Mr. Goodfriend did not intend to inspire such despair. It is his business, and the business of the firm with which he is associated, to help the free nations of the world utilize modern communications to disseminate their story.

The real lesson of this book is that we must proceed with our own indoctrination more vigorously and energetically than ever before, if we are to have any real hope of success. This book is an intelligence estimate of the enemy's weapons in this field. It should frighten us into action.

We Are Under Siege

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 10, 1950

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to recommend to the Members' reading, an excellent editorial which appeared in the May 9, 1950, issue of the Christian Science Monitor.

The writer points out the absolute necessity of the peoples in the democratic nations understanding and supporting the common program against the advancing strategy of the Communist cold war.

The sustained effort to stand together will demand, for a long time, extreme sacrifice, personal and national, for individuals and countries, that hope to remain free. We must continually remind ourselves we are under siege and we cannot, for a moment, forget that the realistic objective is survival itself. The article follows:

WE ARE UNDER SIEGE

This is no time for hysteria.

This is no time for apathy.

The democratic nations of the world are under siege. That is why the United States, Britain, and France are holding conferences of their foreign ministers in London this week.

The moral and practical advantages of righteousness and freedom are on the western nations' side. But advantages don't count unless they are used. Let us use them, let us develop them.

Messrs. Acheson, Bevin, and Schuman can do what is needed for peace and freedom at London if their peoples do what is needed. The United States, Britain, and France can be built into a dynamic core at the center of western defense if their peoples show that they understand how urgent is the necessity.

Of the three men at London, Mr. Acheson needs and deserves the greatest support from the home front. This is true partly because the State Department is suffering from attacks which in a parliamentary system such as Britain's or France's could be answered by a timely vote of confidence, but which have no such adequate answer in Washington. But it is also true because Mr. Acheson's responsibility for world leadership is greater than that of his London colleagues simply because of American power.

Yet, Mr. Acheson had to prepare for London with knowledge that the European recovery program would be subjected to attack from Senator TAFT and other legislators who refuse to recognize any vital difference between foreign aid and domestic spending. Mr. Acheson had to go to Europe, backed up by a Senate vote on ERP which says that Americans may have what it takes to save freedom and prevent war, but they are not prepared to give Europe's survival a priority over unusable beds for veterans' hospitals or untimely expenditures for improvements to American rivers and harbors.

This really isn't America talking. But it's time the real America began. It's time for Americans and their allies to be counting the strengths in the free-world position and organizing these strengths against the threats against that position. The strengths are not too little and we are not yet too late.

At London the Big Three should determine how American economic power can be deployed usefully throughout the western community.

The relationship of America, Britain, and France requires tightening.

A basis for using West German resources safely, for keeping Germany as a member of the western group instead of letting it drift to an uncertain neutrality, should be found.

The risks which France must take in such an association must be balanced by American and British guaranties. British participation in a united Europe must be made economically safe.

The question of relieving Communist pressures on French military resources in the Far East must be faced. At the same time ways must be found to show far-eastern peoples that the west is not an obstacle to their natural development.

The first requisite to success in such a challenging program is the equipment of statesmen to deal with it. This equipment consists mainly of the knowledge that the peoples they represent are prepared for the decisions which must be taken—decisions with no less compelling an objective than survival itself.

The Welfare State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD H. VELDE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 10, 1950

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Peoria (Ill.) Journal of May 8, 1950:

THE WELFARE STATE

The term "welfare state" recently has come into wide use, particularly in a political sense, with Republicans accusing President Truman of attempting to set up a welfare state in this country and defenders of the President either denying that he has any such intention or asserting that the welfare state is a good thing.

Different persons have different ideas as to just what a welfare state is or would be. Generally, however, it is used to describe a country in which the government has taken over almost entirely the responsibility for providing for the general welfare of the people.

A welfare state usually is conceived as one that attempts to provide for "cradle to the grave" security with all manner of assistance being given by the government from provision of medical care at birth to old age assistance in later years. The welfare state runs the gamut from socialized medicine and Federal aid to education, through unemployment insurance, widespread social security benefits, guaranteed wages, and crop insurance to pensions and subsistence in old age.

It is possibly best described as paternalistic government and on the face of things may appear to be a pretty good thing.

It is not until consideration is given to the manner of payment for all these benefits and the way in which they are to be administered that some doubt about its advisability will arise. England today is a fair example of a welfare state. There the people have medical care provided by the government, social security and government housing. They also have lost their choice of selection of a physician, much of the right of selection of where they will live or work, and pay a tax rate far higher than the one that we grumble about in the United States.

Always with a welfare state comes restrictive governmental controls. Farmers are told what they can plant to a far greater degree than exists in the United States. Industries are taken over and operated by the government. Gradually, one by one, the rights of self determination are surrendered by the people in return for what they think is free assistance from the government. In reality, of course, the cost of these free services must be borne by government and the cost is paid by the taxpayers.

The welfare state holds out a rosy promise for the unthinking but it is a trap in which people lose their independence and freedom. It leads the way to totalitarian dictatorship and is to be shunned by everyone who is convinced that free enterprise is a desirable system of economic control.

Missing Files

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD H. VELDE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 10, 1950

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Peoria (Ill.) Journal of May 9, 1950:

MISSING FILES

When President Truman, on the eve of his departure on a 16-State political tour, released a limited number of State Department loyalty files to the Tydings subcommittee, we expressed the suspicion that the files might not be complete. Senator MCCARTHY, in a radio address Saturday, elaborated on the same thought and read from an official FBI report of the laxity of the State Department in allowing access to its files.

Are suspicions justified? A succinct answer may be found in this brief paragraph from the May 8 issue of Newsweek:

"The House Judiciary Committee's entire file on its 1945 closed hearings in the Amerasia case, in which six were accused of stealing Government documents and passing them to Communists, is missing."

No official Washington file, it seems, is inaccessible to spies. Those who have the greatest trouble getting to the files are committees that are looking for the spies.

If there are disloyal employees in the State Department, they have had 6 weeks to alter and remove material from the Department's files. If the Tydings Committee accepts them at face value, the committee itself needs investigating.

Protest Against Curtailment of Postal Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS B. HELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 26, 1950

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, I am this day introducing a bill, the effect of which would nullify the intent of Postmaster Donaldson's order of April 17, 1950, curtailing postal services. I am taking this means of calling this legislation to the attention of my colleagues, many of whom have already indicated their opposition to the Postmaster General's order.

Mr. Donaldson's order would cut residential mail deliveries from two to one a day. Most persons will get their mail in the afternoon instead of in the morning, as at present. Collections from boxes would be curtailed; deliveries in business districts reduced by one delivery on Saturdays; post office windows would be closed at 5:30 p. m.; and parcel-post deliveries limited to one a day.

In New York City alone, between 4,300 and 6,450 faithful postal workers are facing the loss of their jobs because of this order. In addition, the public will be inconvenienced, and business handicapped.

It has been stated that most of the employees who will be affected by curtailed employment are veterans. According to some persons, many of them are 10-point disabled veterans. These postal employees, most of whom are low-paid substitute workers, will be on the receiving end of the brunt of this directive.

The resulting unemployment will be a severe blow to the morale of the postal workers. Mr. Philip Lepper, president of the New York branch of the Association of Letter Carriers, AFL, declared that the order had thrown panic into the hearts of the letter carriers in his organization.

Likewise, David Silverglied, president of the Joint Conference of Affiliated Postal Employees of Greater New York and Vicinity, stated "that the American people are entitled to the continuance and maintenance of the best postal service in the world. This order will not only disrupt the postal service as we have always known it, but will destroy all feelings of security on the part of its faithful employees."

This curtailment of employment and service in the post office will result in irreparable damage to our postal system. With the resulting lowered morale of postal workers, shipments will not receive the attention they have been receiving in the past. Mail will necessarily be delayed. The departmental order will promote inefficiency in our great postal service.

The daily mail is the backbone of our communication system. The demand and need for postal service is now greater than ever. It is a Government function that has become essential to the growth and economic well-being of our country. It is unfair to deny our people the service they want and the service to which they have become accustomed. It is unjust to throw faithful employees out of work when they are providing such a service.

The curtailment of postal services would result in sizable money losses to American business.

The proposed cut in postal appropriations amounts to $24,921,000, or only 1.4 percent of the total requested budget. It does not seem reasonable that this small a cut would warrant such a sweeping reduction in employment and in service. Indeed, it is estimated that 10,000 jobs in the Post Office Department will be lost and that 8,000 first- and second-class post offices will be affected.

There are other ways to save money than to fire $40-a-week postal workers, most of whom are veterans. For example, some of the postal subsidies could be reduced or Congress could provide the sum of money requested. In speaking of subsidies, the Postmaster General has called our attention to the $200,000,000 subsidy to second-class mail. In addition, the Post Office Department's budget supports a fifty to sixty million dollar airmail subsidy. Last year, third-class mail was subsidized to the extent of $129,000,000, and fourth-class mail was subsidized in the amount of $90,000,000. Our foreign mail costs $74,000,000 more than the revenue generated from this service. We do not have to hire $40-a-week clerks to same money—there are better ways to do this.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the preservation of jobs to the faithful postal employees and the uninterrupted excellent services of the Post Office Department to which we have all so properly become accustomed.

Who Won in Chrysler Strike?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1950

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a very interesting article by John R. Stewart, which appeared in the May 8 issue of the Detroiter, published by the Detroit (Mich.) Board of Commerce:

WHO WON?

Last week the 100-day Chrysler strike ended, the second largest and costliest in the automotive industry. Who won? Certainly no one in any way connected with the making or selling of Chrysler-made cars and trucks. Certainly not the merchants, the service-establishment owners, or the employees of such places in Detroit and other cities where Chrysler plants or Chrysler supplier plants are located. Certainly not the city of Detroit which paid out nearly $2,000,000 in welfare funds. In short, nobody won.

This billion-dollar strike resulted in a few wage adjustments in certain plants and classifications, and minor noneconomic changes. Against these small gains, which could have been obtained without suffering a strike, the Chrysler workers lost $87,000,000 in wages and forced losses well over twice that amount among fellow workers in supplier plants—including those in raw-material plants, transportation facilities, mines, and farms.

Chrysler's 89,000 workers lost 72 working days' pay, about $984 per worker, or a total of $87,000,000. (Figures based on earnings of $1.71 per hour, average figure for all hourly paid factory workers in Wayne County, 1949.) Automobile production during period of the strike approximated 1,930,000 cars and trucks. With Chrysler in operation, total would have been somewhat greater, probably averaging out at about the 158,400-car weekly level prevailing just prior to the strike. On this basis, total automobile output over the 100 days would have been 2,263,000. Chrysler's share—as indicated by its proportion in the year 1949—would have been 463,000 cars and trucks. Total cost of these cars at retail was approximately $950,000,000. This loss was divided about as follows:

Chrysler employees lost [1]	$108,000,000
Chrysler stockholders lost [1]	14,000,000
Employees and stockholders lost (retained earnings) [1]	27,000,000
Loss in taxes [1]	66,000,000
Loss in depreciation fund [1]	22,000,000
Suppliers lost (largely wages lost, ultimately) [1]	413,000,000
Factory cost of lost car output	650,000,000
Dealers lost	162,000,000
Optional equipment, handling charges, sales tax, etc	138,000,000
Total	300,000,000
Retail cost of lost car output	950,000,000

[1] Based on Chrysler Corp. financial statement for 1949.

Before strike started, workers were promised $100 a month pensions. After 100 days of strike, workers got $100 a month pensions.

Did Reuther win? Time will tell.

Is Our Denazification Program Working?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 8, 1950

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement I made at Harrisburg, Pa., on April 30, 1950:

IS OUR DENAZIFICATION PROGRAM WORKING?

I bring this question before you because it is basic in any understanding of foreign policy.

Nobody seriously believes that the allied victory resulted in the disappearance of the

Nazi ideology, and nobody seriously believes that Germany welcomed with open arms the occupation authorities, and nobody seriously believes that the Germans have learned or are learning the meaning of democracy. Nobody seriously believes any of these things, and yet we find that the problem of denazification is being treated with more than a measure of indifference and that there are a good many who hold the view that there are many, many more important problems pressing upon the occupation authorities and that denazification is certainly the least of them. Nothing could be more fallacious and nothing, but absolutely nothing, could be more dangerous.

How many wars must be fought before we learn the lesson that ideas are as powerful as weapons? The sword follows the word.

The Fascist and Nazi ideology which brought so much tragedy to the world must not, in the name of humanity, must not be permitted to flourish again. To ignore the danger signals in Germany is to ignore a threat that some day will grow into a conflagration that will burn the very pattern of civilization.

Let us not make light of this. What happened after World War I is happening after World War II. Germany is again being wooed. She is being groomed to be the belle of the ball and is being made to feel that she can sell her charms to the highest bidder in the cold war. What madness is this, what consummate folly to feed in this way the dangerous German ego—to give her a weapon of blackmail?

Let me read to you a resolution I, together with several others in the House and Senate, have introduced:

"Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Affairs, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete study and investigation of all matters relating to the conduct and status of the denazification program in the zone of Germany under occupation by the United States, especially as concerns (a) the result of transferring responsibility for denazification to the German authorities; (b) whether or not there is infiltration of former Nazis, Nazi supporters, and other antidemocratic elements into denazification tribunals; (c) whether or not former Nazis and other antidemocratic elements have been eliminated from high position in public office and the economic life of Germany; (d) whether or not there has been reinstatement of thousands of Nazi teachers to former or higher positions in the Bavarian and other public-school systems; (e) whether or not there is resurgence of intensive antisemitism and militant nationalism in the United States zone; (f) whether or not there is a rise of strong new political parties based on Nazi doctrine and militarism; (g) whether or not there has been reappearance of Nazi-type propaganda in the German press; (h) whether or not there is development in the German youth of appreciation of and devotion to democratic institutions; and to report with expedition its findings, together with such recommendations as it deems proper, to the House of Representatives."

There is no doubt in my own mind of the urgency of such an investigation. If peace is to be deserved, peace deserves to be worked for. It would be a bitter mistake if this resolution were permitted to die in this session of Congress.

Let me point to a few of these danger signals I made reference to earlier. For example, we learn that the Intelligence Service of the western occupying powers in Germany are now employing former Gestapo personnel and former members of the SD, the Nazi security service, whose main task was once espionage, sabotage, and special assignments outside the Reich. We learn, too, that the German Party, which has 17 members in the Bundestag, submitted the following motion to the Bonner Assembly:

"The Bundestag resolves to request the Government of Western Germany to submit to the Assembly a bill ordering the immediate conclusion of all pending denazification cases and a law of amnesty in favor of denazified persons in classes III and IV."

While classes III and IV refer to lesser offenders and followers, it would nonetheless mean the reinstatement of former civil servants in government, state, and municipal services.

We know that the major offenders, the former top Nazis, have not been brought to trial due to the failure of the denazification tribunals to act vigorously. Party officials, like Franz Richter, member of the West German Parliament, asked not only that the amnesty resolution be adopted, but urged the granting of restitutions for damages inflicted by denazification.

Now let's look for a moment at some of the appointments to official posts in the Western German Republic. We read that such men like Dr. Hans Ritter vonLex (once in a high government office in the Chancellery of the Reich) and Dr. Hans Globke (once adviser to the Minister of the Interior when Hitler was in power) are high in counsel in Western Germany.

The occupying Western Allies abandoned the licensing system for the press. What followed revealed immediately the prevailing temper of the German people. Not less than 30 former Nazi publishers rushed back into the newspaper business in the United States zone of occupation alone. Among them was Max Willmy, the notorious publisher of Der Stuermer.

Likewise a few days after the discontinuance of the licensing system for political parties in the American zone, three political units made their appearance: (1) the Socialist Reichs Party in Hesse, (2) the German Action Party, and (3) the German Communal Party, all of which hastened to proclaim the policy of an unbridled nationalist.

Let us look a bit further. As reported by the New York Times, Germans no longer ask whether their country is to be rearmed, but when. There is talk of a limited German army. Just what is meant by a limited Germany army? One that will impress the Soviet, but will not alarm the French? Does it mean strength when marching toward Russia, but weak when facing the west? What ridiculous contradiction is this?

Both the Associated Press and International News Service keep sending reports of secret formation of former German officer cliques.

Naturally, in the short space of time I have with you I cannot dwell in too much detail on all these symptoms of the resurgence of German nationalism, but I would be failing in my duty if I did not sound the alarm.

Now, for example, in contradiction to the occupation statute which states that displaced persons and the admission of refugees are among the powers reserved to the occupation authorities, the Allied High Commission of Germany recently passed a law, No. 13, dealing with judicial powers in the reserved fields. According to the new law, almost all persons may come within the jurisdiction of German criminal and noncriminal courts. The only persons exempted are members of the Allied forces, persons accredited to the Allied High Commissioner, and their families. This may mean that displaced persons who still are concentrated in camps will in the future be subject to the jurisdiction of German courts.

Of course, it is true that article 7 of this law contains the provision that the occupation authorities may, either generally or in specific cases, withdraw from a German court any proceeding directly affecting persons or matters within the jurisdiction of the occupation statute or suspend any decision of a German court affecting such person. The fact still remains that an act of withdrawal or suspension would be necessary after the German courts have had the original jurisdiction.

We know how the German courts have behaved in denazification cases, as witness the Hedler case. We know how the German courts have behaved when any claim has been pressed against a German citizen. We know that the German courts have been affording every opportunity to the extremist and nationalists to make themselves heard. What groundwork is this for future tragedies?

Let us return now to the more general scene. In the United States zone of western Germany, there are now a number of active groups which are busy inflaming the wounds of the defeated German. There is, for example, the League for German Revival, whose leader is Otto Strasser, now in Canada. There are various educational organizations which exist as cover-ups for Fascists, Nationalists, and anti-Semitic groups. The political contact office led by Klaus Mehnert is a typical example. Other groups are the St. Goarer Circle, the Heiligenberger Circle, the Laupheimer Circle, and the Humboldt Association.

The hazardous fact remains that the Liberals in Germany find neither a place for themselves nor encouragement. We know that the Soviets are flirting with German writers to disparge democracy, to build a powerful militant Germany, and to fight for a united Germany. According to Drew Middleton of the New York Times, Communist pressure for the unification of Germany is exerted through the medium of the radical right-wing political groups which include industrialists, former officers, anti-Semites, and opportunists.

It cannot be said often enough that the most potent weapon against communism is the ideological one. Rearming Germany, bribing Germany, wooing Germany, is not the answer. It sounds to some like an expediency we must use in the cold war, but they lose sight that a German-Russian pact was once in existence and could be again if the two contracting parties believed it could be used to a self-serving end.

Mr. McCloy, High Commissioner of Germany has stated unequivocally "There is nationalism in Germany. There is a nationalist fringe on the extreme right which is more active than it has been. There is a Communist fringe that plays the Soviet game, and there is the persistent tendency of both these fringes to work together."

It has been said that it is difficult to undo the 12-year rule of Hitler in 5 years. Of course, it is difficult. Does that mean we work less toward that end instead of more? Does that mean that we are to proclaim that we are permitting the resurgence of nazism and nationalism in Germany because not that we dislike the German less but that we dislike the Russians more?

I am not discounting the Russian threat of aggression. I am as gravely and as seriously concerned about it as is every citizen of the United States, but I maintain and I shall maintain with all the strength possible, that only an active, thriving liberalism—watered and nurtured—in all the countries of the world wherever possible can help us in the diminishing of the Russian threat. Must we forget Buchenwald and Dachau? Must we forget the poison and venom and the murder by Nazi Germany because a country of another name now threatens world peace?

Certainly denazification of Germany is not an easy task. It involves vigorous activity on almost every plane of existence—social, cultural, educational, economic, etc. For example, only a few short days ago testimony was received by the subcommittee on the study of monopoly power, of which I am chairman, that there is every sign of a reviving steel cartel. That is what I mean by activity on the economic plane.

If we pay lip service to democracy and lip service alone, and do not let our right hand know what our left hand is doing, then

henceforth we shall have ourselves to blame if disaster overtakes us. As citizens of the United States, as mothers and fathers, as free men and women who have a stake in the future, who have a responsible part to play—I ask you to take cognizance of this problem and through your Representatives in the Congress express your concern with this growing resurgence of German nationalism and that you ask your Representatives in Congress to act now on a thorough exploration of our denazification program.

Curtailment of Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 10, 1950

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article.

CURTAILMENT OF POSTAL SERVICE

The Post Office, the perfect case the Socialists always cite to prove that socialism is better than free enterprise, has come a cropper. Though it has a Government monopoly, it can't pay expenses. The loss for 1949 was more than half a billion dollars.

Politicians do not like to raise the price of the services they give away, so they wanted to let the taxpayers pay the difference.

Congress thought otherwise. Congress said, "Improve your methods, cut costs. Put in machinery and cut down the losses." The House reduced the budget the Post Office asked for by only 1 percent. But immediately the Post Office politicians retaliated by reducing services, reducing deliveries, delaying mails, delaying business, and throwing thousands of men out of jobs. Home deliveries will be cut to one a day, collections will be cut, post offices closed at earlier hours. Letters in New York City must be mailed before 6:30 p. m. or lose a day. This, in Mr. Truman's most prosperous period of all time.

Here we have the old game of squeezing the people, to make them bring pressure on Congress to pay the losses. The Postmaster General even instructed all the postmasters across the country to give wide publicity to the readjustments provided for in this order. Time is short. Congress must be made to jump through the hoops by violent protests of the public.

A big part of the loss is incurred through carrying mail, for the Government. It gets free postage to the value of $149,000,000, according to Postmaster General Donaldson. The Government propaganda for social security, public housing, socialized medicine, the Brannan plan, and all the rest, is carried by trains and planes and on the backs of mail carriers free—at taxpayers' expense. The Administration sends out trainloads of propaganda free of postage to put over its socialized measures. The cutting down of the service to the public will not disturb the free service to the Government agencies. That will go on unimpaired.

It is interesting to note that all Members of Congress, both Republican and Democratic, in both Houses, spend only $1,200,000 on franked mail against the Executive's $149,000,000. Those whose secret aim is to attack Congress complain about the Congressmen's franking privileges. In fact, congressmen spend only 1 cent for every $3 the administration spends on postage alone.

Why not turn the post office over to private enterprise to deliver our mail more efficiently and at less cost? Then the bureaucrats would have to pay the postage for their propaganda. We did this in the early days. Private carriers carried the mail so much better and more cheaply than the post office that several times they nearly put the post office out of business. They would have done so many times in the past if Congress had not come to its rescue.

Finally, Congress had to prohibit competition. It made a legal monopoly of the mail business for the Government alone to do. All private competitors have been barred, by law, from showing how much cheaper and better the work can be done by them.

Isn't it fortunate that we have not yet put all of our housing and food and medicine and manufacturing in the hands of the Government to manage? We have not gone completely Socialist. If we look closely at the Socialists' pet projects we may yet reverse our steps and recover our liberties.

Czech Shoe Probe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 4, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Traveler of May 8, 1950:

CZECH SHOE PROBE

No more Czech-made shoes will be dumped in the United States. This is the gratifying result of the campaign of the New England Shoe and Leather Association. It takes the form of instructions to the United States appraisers of merchandise at the various ports to withhold appraisement of shoes from Czechoslovakia according to the terms of the Antidumping Act of 1921.

The New England association has evidence at hand that shoes costing the equivalent of $7.50 in Czechoslovakia are being retailed at $2 in this country. Obviously that sort of business is not covered either by the laws of economics or the national objective of promoting foreign trade. Czechoslovakia is now a Russian satellite. It would be hard to find anything better calculated to help the Red cause than to cause unemployment and unrest in the United States by flooding us with the products of iron curtain slave labor. It is one of the cold war strategies against which we must be ever on guard.

Drain on Coking Coals Spurs Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 10, 1950

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I am including an article from a recent issue of the United Mine Workers Journal. Much publicity has been given to the tonnages of coal still remaining unmined in the United States, and it has left the impression that all grades of coal are included in that category. But the rapid depletion of some of the very highest grades of coal is a source of anxiety to the consumers of such coals. One of these high-grade coals is coking coal. During the past years, through the profligacy of mine owners and operators, valuable coking coals have been put to low-grade uses, and the two World Wars have also spurred their depletion.

The article that I have permission to include in my remarks is culled from the Bureau of Mines report, Coal and Coke Production, and it points up the rapid depletion of these coals and the attendant anxiety among coke producers.

DRAIN ON COKING COALS SPURS RESEARCH

Spurred by heavy drains on the best-known and most easily mined beds of coking coals, Government and industry are working together to stretch the available supply.

What is being done in this direction, including research and a new survey of our coal reserves is outlined in a Bureau of Mines report just released, Coal for Coke Production.

Some of the best seams of coking coal have already been exhausted due to the heavy demand for steel in two world wars, plus the mounting peacetime insistence on using increasing amounts of the available smokeless type of bituminous coal.

Virtually all of the best coking coal is in the Appalachian region, the report points out, but these deposits represent only about 4 percent of the Nation's estimated coal reserves, if allowance is made for unrecoverable and low-grade coal.

Thus, the foreseeable exhaustion of good coking coals has added to the pressure for research to develop more effective blending of high-ranking coal with lower grade types, as well as the up-grading of those coals with high ash or sulfur content so that they may be made to yield coke acceptable for blast furnace use, the report states.

Since World War II, Bureau of Mines field and laboratory studies on this problem have in the main been concerned with: (1) a survey of the washing characteristics of coals, by beds and mining fields; and (2) an experimental study of processes for separating the good from the poorly coking constituents of coals of marginal coking qualities. The Bureau has installed experimental slot-type ovens at Pittsburgh, Tuscaloosa, Ala., and Golden, Colo., to study various blends of eastern, central, and western coals.

At present the Bureau and the Geological Survey are engaged in making a reappraisal of the national coal reserves, the results of which will be published on a county basis, giving the tonnages of each coal bed and the ranges of quality. Reserves will be reported in two classes: measured (proved), and indicated (probable).

The President's Speeches at Burlington, Ottumwa, Creston, and Pacific Junction, Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GUY M. GILLETTE
OF IOWA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 11 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the speeches

delivered by the President of the United States at Burlington, Ottumwa, Creston, and Pacific Junction, Iowa, on May 8, 1950.

There being no objection, the speeches were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT BURLINGTON, IOWA

Thank you very much, Mr. Mayor. I don't think I have ever had such a happy birthday.

It is good to be back in Iowa again, I assure you. It always makes me feel at home in this great corn State. You see, I live in a corn State to the south of you, and I never have admitted that Iowa grows taller corn, but sometimes I have to.

I am making a trip across the country so that I can see first-hand how the people are getting along and what problems they are facing. I also want to talk about the problems that all of us are facing together. I want to tell you the truth about public affairs. There is no other way for me to get the truth to the people but to come out and tell it to you. That has been demonstrated—2 years ago—very well, I think. When the people know the truth, when the people can weigh the facts, I have no qualms about the decision they will make. It's the democratic way for people to argue the issues—the only way you can understand what I am trying to do. The only way you can understand whether I have carried out the platform on which I was elected in 1948 is for me to make a report to you, and that is what I am doing, and I have a perfect right to do that. It is not political, it is what any head of an organization does once a year. I didn't get a chance to do it last year, I had too much to do, but I am with you this time to tell you the facts, and when you have the facts, I am perfectly happy on what you will do with them.

Our democracy works because there is always a free and open discussion between the citizens of this country and their elected representatives in town halls, State capitals, and in Washington, D. C. Sometimes, the discussions in Washington, D. C., are not exactly to the point, but they still have discussions.

This is what makes this country different from a dictatorship. Our Government works for the people. It is a Government of and by and for the people, and its only reason for existence is to help build a more secure and a better life for its citizens.

What we are trying to do now is to make sure that our economy continues to grow and prosper, so that everybody in the country can have a better living standard. We have a higher living standard in this country now than we have ever had before, the highest in the history of the world. The way for us to keep these gains and do even better in the future is to see to it that farmers and businessmen and working men and women move forward together. Everybody ought to have a fair and square chance at the economic prosperity of this country. That's all I'm working for.

Here in Burlington, I need hardly tell you people that the people in town are prosperous only when the farmers are well off. Certainly the farmers have learned that they have good markets only when wages are high enough for the people in town to buy what the farmers grow.

I am working for a farm program that will give the farmers a good income. I am going to make a speech later in the day, at Lincoln, Nebr., When I will tell exactly what kind of farm laws we need on the books so that farmers will always have good incomes, and will always be raising the kind of crops we need, rather than raising huge unusable surpluses that the Government has to buy, and sometimes has to destroy.

Of course, I am just as interested in working for the welfare of people in cities and towns as I am for those on the farms, because you can't have one section, or one sector, of a population prosperous and have the others in misery. They must all belong together and share the good things of life.

We have passed a housing law last year that will mean nearly a million new housing units all over the country in the next 5 years, for families who otherwise couldn't afford decent houses.

That is the kind of progressive, forward-looking measure I am working for in the fields of social security, health, and education. Many States need new schools and more teachers. The only way our boys and girls can get the kind of education they need is for the Federal Government to help the States improve their school systems.

A lot of people are expecting me to talk about what the Eighty-first Congress has done on these matters, just as I told the country 2 years ago the truth about the Eightieth Congress.

I will say one thing, and say it emphatically, the Eighty-first Congress has done a lot better than the Eightieth ever did, and it is going to do a lot more than it has done up to date.

The record of the Eighty-first Congress is not complete yet, but when it finally finishes its work and goes home, then I will be ready to come back and give you the full details, and let the chips fall where they may. The country is entitled to know the facts, and that is what I am out here for now, is to tell you the facts in language that you and I speak, and that you can understand. And I believe that when I get through you will understand just exactly what I am trying to do. And when the Eighty-first Congress quits, I think it is going to have a good record. I am going to bet on it, anyway.

Thank you very much. I appreciate all these happy birthday greetings.

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT OTTUMWA, IOWA

Thank you very much; thank you very much. I can't tell you how very much I appreciate this warm and wonderful reception. It is one of the finest gatherings I have ever seen in a long time. Not since Dexter, Iowa, have I seen such a gathering. In 1948 that was, you remember. There were 10 acres of people at that meeting, and I was asked how I measure people, and I said you can put 9,600 people on an acre, and if you multiply that by 10, that's 96,000 people. I don't know how many there are here.

I have been reliably informed that there is a young man, working for the opposition, who has been following me in a plane to look the situation over. Now that young man is perfectly welcome to save himself a little money, and if he will buy a ticket and get on the train, I will take him along; and I sincerely hope that he has been as highly pleased with the reception I have had this morning and with the crowds as I have been, and I hope he will make that report to the opposition so that they can govern themselves accordingly.

This morning I want to talk to you briefly about your future, and the future of the rest of the people all over the country. That is why I am here, to tell you the truth about what your Government is doing. It is a most difficult thing for me to get the facts to the people, but I think I have demonstrated on another trip—and on that trip I was followed also—I demonstrated to the people at that time that when they know the truth and the facts, you can't fool them.

These are troubled times in the world. All of us know that the only way we can get a peaceful world is by keeping the United States strong and prosperous. We can have such strength and prosperity only if the farmers, the businessmen, and the workers are well off. You know, right here in Ottumwa that your meat-packing house and all other businesses in town depend on the incomes of the farmers for miles around. You know, too, that your businessmen and your farmers and your workers have a mutual interest in the prosperity of all our economy.

Well, that is true of the whole country, too, because this country can't remain prosperous unless you in this area prosper. We must make sure that Iowa farmers never again have to burn their corn for fuel like they did 20 years ago. I intend to keep on working to see that farmers and workers and businessmen get a fair deal, and that's all anybody can ask for.

I am going to make a speech in Lincoln today—in Lincoln, Nebr.—and I am going to tell you what kind of farm program we need, and I am going to make it easy and simple for everybody to understand, and it won't be complicated or garbled. It will be just exactly what we need. I am going to discuss those problems specifically, without dodging the issues, as many people have dodged them in the past.

You hear today a lot of wild charges that anything new which we propose for the farmer is socialism and regimentation. That's an old cry that has been going on for a long time; in fact, ever since 1887.

That reminds me of a story about a man from my home State who was in Congress back in the eighties. His name was William Henry Hatch, and his name was attached to many laws which benefit the farmer.

Congressman Hatch was the author of a law in 1887 which granted $15,000 a year for each State to set up agricultural experiment stations in connection with its agricultural college. There were a lot of folks who raised cain when that bill got to the Senate. You would have thought that the end of the world was just around the corner. One Senator from the great State of Kansas said that this proposal was cooked up in response to the "clamor of a certain select class of self-constituted reformers."

This Senator went on to say, and these are his exact words—now this was in 1887—sounds like an argument in the Senate now: "It illustrates a tendency of this class of agitators to demand the continued interposition of the National Government in State and local and domestic affairs, and with the result, as I believe, of absolutely destroying the independence and freedom of individual conduct, and subverting the theory on which the Government is based." Now, that is an exact quotation from the Senator from Kansas, who is also famous as a poet.

Now, that sounds just like the attacks which are being made today against any progressive measure. But it is even more interesting because a few miles north of here, at Ames, the Iowa State Agricultural College has been using the Hatch Act funds since 1887. It is still using them today, and there has been no limitation of anybody's freedom in Iowa as a result that I know of.

I think that our system of agricultural research and education provides real strength for our democracy. Your own Iowa State College at Ames is an outstanding part of this great system. We have the same situation down in Missouri, and even in Kansas, where that Senator made that statement.

The agricultural colleges in the other States are doing likewise. Each one is a part of this great system of research and education that extends all the way from the Federal Government to the individual on the farm.

Whenever you hear people attacking agricultural education, or other progressive measures that will benefit the farmer and the worker and the rest of the people, just remember that agricultural education has been a part of our democratic way of life since the days of Thomas Jefferson, and I hope it always will be in the future.

Now, I want you people to distinctly understand that I am here reporting to you as the President of the United States, giving you an outline of things just as they are in Washington, and just as I would like to have them to be in Washington. I have a perfect right to do that. That is part of my job, to let you know just exactly what the facts are; and when I tell them to you I think you can understand that they are not garbled by somebody who wants to give a wrong impression. You understood them in 1948, and you are going to understand them in 1950, and when we get through, when I report to you the next time, you are going to be happy and satisfied with the results.

I can't tell you how very much I appreciate this magnificent reception this morning. It is grand. I will remember it all my life.

Thank you very much.

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT CRESTON, IOWA

Thank you very much. I appreciate the fact that you are willing to stand around in the rain like this for a chance to get a look at and to hear your President. It certainly is a compliment to me, and I appreciate it more than I can tell you.

You know, this city is almost due north of Independence, Mo. They are in the same kind of bluegrass country down there that you are here. You people are fortunate in having some of the best growing soil in the whole Middle West. I have been glad to see that you know how to take care of that soil and that you know the importance of the farm problems with which we are faced today.

Two of the biggest problems in many parts of the country are electric power and an adequate water supply. I was glad to get a report a few days ago from the Department of Agriculture that shows that you are well on the way to solving your electric and water problems.

This report—I have got it right here; I have to keep it chained down to keep it from blowing away—tells how the Rural Electrification Administration has joined with the city and the State of Iowa in a project to build a new dam and reservoir. They ought to bring tremendous benefits to this good city of Creston. They will mean more power, a better water supply, and a better life for this entire area.

You know, there are all sorts of places in the United States that are having water and power troubles. I appointed a Commission here not long ago to look into the whole situation from Maine to California and from the State of Washington to Florida. I think that is the way in which the REA is working, together with Creston and the State of Iowa, in this project. It is a sample of the way in which we are joining in cooperative effort all over the country. Some people tell you that the Federal Government in Washington is trying to take over everything. That kind of talk is just plain nonsense. It is just not true.

We are all partners together. We believe that we can solve our problems by the kind of city, State, and Federal cooperation which is helping you build this new dam and reservoir in Creston.

If we could get the same kind of cooperation with all the rest of the world that we have here, the problem of guaranteeing world peace would be a simple one.

This cooperative spirit is the very foundation of the Fair Deal program. By broadening the opportunities for a good education, health, social security, and a high standard of living, we are helping each other and, at the same time, keeping the United States strong and prosperous.

You don't know how glad I am for the opportunity to stop here and how much I appreciate your willingness to stand around in the rain to listen to what I have to say. It is a compliment to me, and it is a compliment to you, because you are interested in public affairs. I am here to report to you, to tell you what the problems are with which this great Nation is faced, and to give you some idea of how I am trying to solve them as your public servant. Again I want to thank you very much. I have had a most cordial welcome all the way across the great State of Iowa. I don't think I ever had a happier birthday than this one. Thank you very much.

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT PACIFIC JUNCTION, IOWA

Thank you very much. You know, I have had a grand trip through Iowa today. In some places the weather has not been all that you would expect for a meeting of this sort, but the people turned out just the same, and that is a compliment, a high compliment, when people come out in inclement weather, although I understand you wanted the rain, anyway, so maybe you wanted the rain and not the President—I don't know.

I have been through some great country this morning. It is fine to see Iowa looking so prosperous. I remember very clearly what conditions were like in Iowa just about 20 years ago. We were just as badly off down in Missouri. Corn was selling at 30 cents a bushel, and the farmer was scraping the bottom of the barrel. Farm mortgages were being foreclosed. I can remember it very distinctly. I remember one Iowa judge almost got hanged for foreclosing a farm up here.

Just think of the difference today, not a single bank failure in a year, here in the State of Iowa or anywhere else in the United States. That is because we have had a wonderful prosperity all over the country in the past few years. Business has been booming. Factories have been working at peak peacetime rates. The farm income has been high, too. Of course, it has not been as high as it was during the war, and it fell a good deal last year, because we do not yet have the right kind of farm legislation on the books.

One reason why no banks have been failing these days is because people now have complete confidence in them. They know that their deposits are protected by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. We take the FDIC for granted today.

But, when President Roosevelt first proposed it back in 1933, a lot of reactionaries set up a terrible howl. One prominent Governor said—and he was a neighbor of yours: "The guarantee of bank deposits will completely destroy the entire banking system of the Nation." Think of that—think of that!

Well, the prediction was nonsense. So were all the other predictions against the other great progressive measures of the thirties and forties. And so are all of the predictions about doom and disaster which some people are trotting out today.

The same old scare words about improvements in housing, farm legislation, and social security, are being used over and over again by the people who don't want us to continue growing and becoming stronger. I don't think you are going to be fooled by those scare words any more than when people told you 20 years ago that guaranteeing bank deposits would ruin the country.

It takes a lot of hard work on the part of the Government in Washington, working right along with all the people of the country, to keep us growing and prosperous.

I am making this trip so that I can find out just exactly how things are going, and what it is you want your Government to do. I want to keep us on the road to prosperity, and I want you to understand what I stand for, and why I send down the messages I have been sending down to the Congress in the interests of all the people, the farmers, the businessmen, and the workers. I think it is proper, and I think it is right that the President, who is your hired man, should come out once in a while and let you get a look at him and listen to what he has to say, and find out if he is the same fellow who was out hunting for votes 2 years ago.

I have enjoyed today very much. You know, it is quite a day for me. I am 66 years old today. I know you will say I don't look it, but I am.

It has been great. The people of Iowa have shown me a wonderful, wonderful welcome, and I am going over into Nebraska now, and I am going to Lincoln and make a specific speech on what I believe is proper for the farm program of the United States of America, and I am going to make it perfectly clear and simple so you can understand it. Nobody will have a chance to garble it up, because I am going to talk to you over the radio, and you are going to hear just exactly what I have to say, and nobody will have to interpret it but yourselves. That is the reason I am out on this trip. I want you to understand the facts as they are. You don't very often get a chance to do that, because people don't have the opportunity to read all the records of the Congress, you don't have a chance to read the messages which I send down, you don't have a chance to read the debates. What you read is something that is skimmed off the top, that will maybe make a headline, and sometimes it doesn't mean a thing.

I do thank you most sincerely for your cordiality to me today in the great State of Iowa, and I want you to understand that I am the servant of the people. I am still working for you. I am trying to do just exactly what I told you I would do in 1948, and I hope I haven't changed a bit.

Thank you very much.

The President's Speech at Galesburg, Ill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 1950

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, on May 8, 1950, President Truman made a speech in the city of Galesburg and in my State of Illinois. Although he stopped there at an early morning hour, he was received by a gathering of eager men and women, greater than ever before witnessed by that city. His speech was of course received with great enthusiasm and acclaim.

Of course, this indicates and I am confident that the American people approve of his utterances and policies. Reports indicate that President Truman has been similarly received in every town, hamlet, village, and city that he stopped at.

On May 15, our beloved President will be in my own city, the great city of Chicago, where arrangements have been made for him to make a major speech. I know that he will be received by the greatest crowd ever to assemble in the Chicago Stadium, and same will be overfilled with some 250,000 admirers. He will speak on Monday evening, May 15, 1950, from Chicago.

I am indeed happy to insert the text of President Truman's speech made at Galesburg, Ill., to be read by all. Moreso, I am pleased at the privilege given me personally, to see and hear the President in Chicago next week.

The address follows:

Mr. Chairman, it certainly is good to see all of you. I appreciate your coming out this early in the morning to see me. I am more than happy to be back in Illinois once more. They tell me that Knox College in Galesburg is famous for some very great people. I have been told that Carl Sandburg and Eugene Field were alumni of Knox College. My wife had a great uncle who was a graduate of that college and one of our great Circuit Judges in Jackson County, Mo. I am also told that Adlai Stevenson came from this town, and that reminds me of something—my first "sashay" into politics was in 1892 and I wore a white cap to school, and across the top of it it said Cleveland and Stevenson. That was Adlai's grandfather, that Stevenson. Well, some big Republican boys took my cap away from me and tore it up, and the Republican boys have been trying to do that to me ever since.

I am starting out on this trip which will take me almost to the Pacific coast. I am mak ng the trip so I can give a report to the American people on some of the major problems which this country faces today. I wanted to come out here to find out what you think about them, and to let you know what I am thinking about. There is nothing mysterious about it. I am not running for office. I am merely making a report to the citizens of the United States on what has happened since you honored me by making me President of the United States, and I have a perfect right to do that, and that is my privilege and my duty.

Our democracy is strong because we have always had this kind of free and open exchange of ideas between our citizens and their elected officials. One of the great Lincoln-Douglas debates was held right here in Galesburg.

Democracy was strengthened in those days by the Lincoln-Douglas debates on the great problems which confronted the country at that time. We can make our country stronger today by the same kind of discussion.

I like discussion. I like discussion of the issues, and I like to confine the discussion to the issues, not the side issues and foolishness.

Today, May 8, is the fifth anniversary of VE-day. Instead of having the kind of world we hoped we would get after the war, we find that the kind of freedom and democracy we enjoy here in the United States is being threatened all over the world. It is being threatened by Soviet communism, which is trying to wipe out democratic countries everywhere.

The kind of decisions you and I make in the next few months and years will determine what kind of a world we are going to live in, and whether or not there will be a third world war.

We face a clear-cut choice between two courses of action. We can either isolate ourselves from the rest of the world, or we can take constructive steps to build lasting world peace. And that is just exactly what I am trying to do.

Now, isolationism would be a cheap policy to follow. It would be easy and cheap to stop spending money on our Army and Navy and Air Force, and to stop sending supplies to other countries who survived the great war. We can stop these things today. Isolationism would be mighty cheap for today and tomorrow, and maybe next week. You remember how cheap isolationism was in the 1920's. Taxes were cut, at least for the big fellows, but look at the terrible price we have paid for isolationism in the Second World War.

Today, exactly the same issue faces us. There are still some men who keep telling you that we can economize by following an isolationist policy. These men can't see beyond the ends of their noses. They don't see that isolationism would let the rest of the world be swallowed up by communism. That would certainly bring on a new world war, just as it did in 1939. We reneged in 1921, just as Russia today is doing it with the help of our own isolationists.

I don't think I need tell you that another world war would not be fought and carried on on foreign soil, as the last two have been. The terrible weapons now available could be used to tear up our cities by the roots.

Some people get hysterical in the face of problems like these. I believe that we should meet this challenge calmly. We should do everything in our power to support the United Nations and to help the free nations abroad who are putting up such a good fight against communism. And we ourselves must stay strong.

I have often said, "Our goal must be not peace in our time, but peace for all time."

We can have peace, but it takes hard work, and it will cost a great deal of money. We are now spending 71 percent of our budget to pay the cost of past wars, and to prevent a future war. It would be easy enough—it would be easy enough to cut the expenses of our Armed Forces and to cut off help to European countries that are trying to survive communism. That would be easy enough to do, and we would have a balanced budget. But in the long run we would pay the fiddler. This is the financial load which is causing a deficit, trying to prevent a third world war. But I want to say to you from my heart that this cost is nothing compared to the cost of losing the peace.

In 1945 the budget of the United States was $103,000,000,000. When Japan folded up in September, I cut off $65,000,000,000 of that budget and canceled the contracts so that money would not have to be spent. I have been asking the country to expend over a 4-year period about $20,000,000,000 to prevent another world war. Now, which is cheaper, $20,000,000,000 over 4 years, of $100,000,000,000 a year to fight another war? I don't think I need to argue that question with you.

I am not afraid of losing the peace, because I believe that the people of Illinois and others like you all over the country understand the situation in the world today. I think you know that international cooperation is the key to world peace. We had experience with not cooperating in 1920 and it brought on another war. We must cooperate to end another war.

I think you know that we will never have to worry about the strength of the United States as long as we keep moving forward with measures to provide prosperity and a better life for our fellow citizens.

A fair deal for more people in agriculture and in industry and in housing, health and education, will strengthen this country and make the road to world peace less difficult.

I can't tell you how pleasant it has been to be with you this morning. I had no idea that there were 10 acres of people in Galesburg. This is, you know, the fifth anniversary of VE-day. Also, incidentally, it makes the sixty-sixth anniversary of the President of the United States. I appreciate this delegation. It makes this a very happy birthday for me.

Thank you very much.

The Farmers' Interest in the Kerr Gas Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT S. KERR
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 11 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by me concerning the farmers' interest in the Kerr gas bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KERR ON THE FARMERS' INTEREST IN THE KERR GAS BILL

A pick-up truck comes to a stop in front of a local bank; a farmer swings from the driver's seat and makes his way inside to the cashier's window. Without fanfare but with deep satisfaction, this Oklahoma farmer lays out a fresh, crisp check from oil and gas royalties or lease bonus. He adds to his balance, starts a nest egg, or pays off his note, guaranteeing his family a better future and a greater security.

This is a typical experience. In the past half century, thanks to the production of oil and gas, thousands of Oklahoma farms have literally been saved from the auctioneer's hammer and countless farm families have been given a new lease on life. A steady stream of cash—millions and millions of dollars—has flowed annually into the pockets of Oklahoma farmers.

This welcome income from royalties and leases often has meant the difference between real comfort and bare existence, between solvency and debt. The farmers call it easy money, and they certainly know whereof they speak. It involves none of the hardships of digging a living from the soil. It is not subject to the hazards of flood or drought or storm, green bugs, or boll weevils. No wonder every Oklahoma farmer lives in the hope that some day he may strike it rich below the surface of his land and open a finer way of life for himself and his family.

But there is bad news from Washington for the farmers of Oklahoma. President Truman's veto of the Kerr gas bill may upset this whole picture and puncture many a landowner's dream for quick prosperity.

The purpose of the Kerr bill is really simple, and so desirable as to carry the unanimous indorsement of the Oklahoma legislature. It was sponsored and urged by Senators THOMAS and KERR, in accordance with a special resolution by the State legislature.

Despite the misrepresentations of its enemies, the Kerr gas bill does not involve one iota of change. The Kerr bill seeks only to continue a system which has been both fair and satisfactory to landowners, producers, and consumers, throughout the long history of the industry. The Kerr bill does seek to stop the new and revolutionary threat by the Federal Power Commission to fix oil and gas prices at the production level, and thereby freeze the field developments which have brought big money to the farmers of Oklahoma.

If the FPC is successful in tagging the wellhead with an OPA nonprofit price tag, this would knock the props out from under the oil and gas industry and freeze the flow of gas to northern consumers. It would be the worst blow ever delivered at this multimillion-dollar income so vital to Oklahoma farmers.

How well do I know what a windfall a little oil and gas money can mean to an Oklahoma farm family. When I was a small boy in Oklahoma, I remember the day that Bill Skelly paid my father $500 for an oil and gas lease on our farm home near Ada. That was one of the important economic events in my father's life. It was a matter often discussed not only by my parents but all of the children. In fact, what we and other nearby owners received was the talk of the neighborhood.

We got our precious lease money, but the drill never went down into our land. The field played out before reaching us. Skelly bought the lease because he thought our land might produce gas. However, if the FPC had been regulating the price of gas at that time, as it now threatens to do, Skelly would not have paid my father $5.00 for the chance to drill. There would have been no incentive to hunt for oil or gas.

We have been fighting a battle here in Washington so that Oklahoma farmers can continue to have a chance for the dividends which belong to them. Many thousands of farmers already have benefited from their subsurface property rights in the past, and we expect to win this battle so that they may do the same in the future.

If the northern consumers could just understand that they have the same interest in a healthy, stable gas industry as the Oklahoma farmer and the producer, then selfish politicians and subversive forces would not be able to exploit the issue and build up false pressure. Lacking any sound case based on facts these enemies of the Kerr gas bill deliberately resorted to the personal abuse of its sponsors and the misrepresentation of its purpose. Through carelessness or ignorance, the press and radio of populous consumer areas picked up and peddled what appeared to them to be popular propaganda. But, ironically, in the name of the consumer they only added to his present confusion and his future insecurity. We intend to keep telling the true story to the consumer, and we think time will drive it home.

There are currently nearly 60,000 producing oil and gas wells in Oklahoma. This means the jackpot for between 600,000 and 800,000 acres of Oklahoma land. Oklahoma farmers and other royalty owners share in this tremendous income to the tune of $50,000,000 annually. The Kerr gas bill seeks to preserve that income for the future.

Oklahoma farmers get another big chunk of cash each year in lease money. They enjoy a substantial income before the derricks march across their fields. Twelve million acres of Oklahoma land are now under lease for oil and gas. Oklahoma farmers collect more than $12,000,000 each year in annual rentals from these leased lands which are not yet producing even a drop of oil or so much as a cubic inch of gas. They receive at least another $8,000,000 each year in the form of bonus money for renewals of the leases.

Now, let me tell you what this Federal bureau in Washington seeks to do to this Oklahoma industry and the farmers who share in it. (The McAlester News Capital calls it "the Federal Pizen Commission"). The FPC wants to force the producer to sell his gas at what it costs him to produce it, plus 6 percent. For all the dry holes, the bureau wants the producer just to go in the hole himself. He is supposed to profit only 6 percent from the wells that hit. But, the Commission does not allow the producer anything for the value of the gas, under the established formula for regulation.

This would mean that the FPC could fix the price at 1 cent per 1,000 cubic feet, or 2 cents per 1,000 cubic feet, if it was found that the operator could drill the well and produce it for that price. This, of course, would completely destroy the value of the farmer's royalty and the operator would receive only the amount required to drill the well. Naturally, under such an artificial arrangement, the independent producer wouldn't be interested in drilling any wells. No business man just goes around asking for bankruptcy.

And what happens to the farmer's interests? Exploration for new gas fields would dwindle, and production would drop. His chance to secure bonus money for oil and gas leases would lessen, because the premium on his mineral rights would be destroyed. His opportunity to collect annual rental on existing leases would all but disappear. His chance for new royalty checks would be mighty slim. Yes, the Oklahoma farmer is in for a big shock when the FPC starts to move in on the oil and gas industry, and I think only Congress or the Supreme Court can stop them. They have served notice that they aim to move in to regulate the price of gas. Every schoolboy knows that if they regulate gas today they will get the oil tomorrow.

What the gas producer wants is simply the continued right to sell his product in free, open competition at whatever price it will bring. And, not even the hardest critics of the bill ever have dared to say that gas prices are out of line. They simply raised a bugaboo about what might happen to prices in the dim future.

Gas producers simply want the same freedom, for example, enjoyed by the citrus growers of Florida, the farm machinery manufacturers in Senator DOUGLAS' home State of Illinois, the shoe manufacturers in Senator DONNELL'S St. Louis, and the dairy people in Wisconsin. But, the populous industrial States, for some reason, think that the big "price-fix" should hit nobody anywhere except the gas producers of Oklahoma and the Southwest. Of course, the same champions of price fixing for gas producers would be stricken with horror if the same "price-fix" was clamped on the finished products which Oklahoma must buy. They would "holler" at the very idea of a Federal bureau regulating the price of cars, farm implements, refrigerators, radios, and other manufactured goods sold by the industrial North and East to Oklahomans.

I still agree with Aunt Eller in the show Oklahoma when she said: "We don't claim to be no better than anybody else, but we dern sure are just as good."

The fallacy of this great effort to discriminate against Oklahomans is obvious. The time will come when misguided consumers realize the shortsightedness of their cries of alarm. By imposing this price-fix penalty on the farmers and operators of Oklahoma, the FPC would fail utterly to profit the northern and eastern consumers, whom they say they want to benefit.

This price-fix would mean that Oklahomans could not afford to sell their gas in interstate commerce because they would get nothing for it if they did. They would be forced to keep their gas inside the State and sell what they could in Oklahoma for Oklahoma consumption. This would mean less gas at higher cost to eastern consumers. It would mean that the interstate pipeline companies would handle less volume at less profit. The result would be that everybody from the farmer who leases his land and the operator who drills the well, to the consumer who burns the gas, would lose and nobody would profit.

Of course, the FPC will move very slowly in putting the shackles of price regulation on Oklahoma operators and farm landowners. They will slip up on our blind side if we let them. But we must not be deceived. Unless stopped by the Supreme Court or congressional legislation, exactly like the Kerr bill, this is as sure to come as death and taxes.

Is It Not a Fact That Secretary of State Acheson Contemplates Increasing the Level of German Steel Production From 11,100,000 Tons to 16,000,000 Tons?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 11, 1950

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, on January 26, 1949, soon after he became Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson assured the American public that the United States is not planning to increase Ruhr steel production beyond the 10,700,000 tons a year authorized by this country, France and Great Britain.

It is also a policy of the United States Government to prevent the iron curtain countries from receiving badly needed strategic materials.

The conference of foreign ministers is meeting today in London to discuss Germany's integration into western Europe economically, politically, and strategically. The Germans have stated they would be glad to cooperate with us in the integration of Western Germany on the condition that they be given greater sovereignty in foreign affairs and that they be granted the right to increase the level of industry from 11,100,000 tons (which includes 400,000 tons of steel produced in the French zone) to 16,000,000 tons.

The facts are that the Germans have been selling 18 to 20 percent of their products exported abroad to the areas now behind the iron curtain, and furthermore, they have been and are shipping approximately 1,000 tons of steel daily to Russia. If the German steel production is increased to 16,000,000 tons, the only market available for Germany will be Soviet Russia.

Mr. Speaker, is not Mr. Acheson going far afield in contravention of his former pledges and commitments on behalf of the United States Government? Such unauthorized activity should not be permitted.

Implications of the Hiss Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 11 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Hiss Case Said To Have Aroused Irate Demand for Full Spy Story," written by Mark Sullivan and published in the New York Herald Tribune of May 10, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HISS CASE SAID TO HAVE AROUSED IRATE DEMAND FOR FULL SPY STORY—MARK SULLIVAN SAYS PUBLIC CRY FOR TRUTH STIRS TURMOIL THAT IS HARMING FOREIGN POLICY

(By Mark Sullivan)

An emotion widespread among our people is described by Mr. James Rorty in the New Leader. He is writing a review of a book about the Alger Hiss case called Seeds of Treason and is dealing with American conditions and events during a period of more than 15 years preceding and including the revelations brought out in the trial of Hiss. Concluding, Mr. Rorty says, "Instinctively the masses of the people have grasped the truth. * * * Fear and rage are burning at the American grass roots." While these words are strong, it can be said with complete restraint that America is beset by anger and anxiety.

The people have grasped the truth, but only the central truth, and the grasping of that has led to demand for further and complete light. The Hiss case was of only limited scope; it covered the accusation that Hiss had delivered copies of secret Government documents to a courier for a Russian Communist spy ring, and Hiss was convicted of perjury for having denied that accusation. From what was only alluded to in the Hiss case, it was apparent that there was more; that there must have been what Mr. Rorty calls "the mountainous molehills thrown up by the Communist underground that had infiltrated * * * Government departments."

RAISES TRYING QUESTIONS

The public demand for more light, for complete light, is at the bottom of what now rages at Washington. It raises trying questions. Part of it is the demand by a committee of Congress that the President turn over to it for inspection files assembled as the result of previous investigations of Government employees by Government agencies, including the Federal Bureau of Investigation. This demand was at first strongly resisted by President Truman, but has now been in part yielded to.

This raised a question of fairness and justice to Government employees who had been exonerated by the preceding investigations. It raised a question of public interest, brought up by FBI head, J. Edgar Hoover. He feared, with obvious good reason, that inspection of the files might lead to leaks, which would handicap the work of the Bureau by revealing the names of sources of information which the Bureau had used.

Ordinarily the plea of Mr. Hoover for keeping the files secret would weigh strongly with the public. Ordinarily also the early resistance of President Truman to the demand for the files by a Congressional committee would receive public support. Secrecy of documents in the executive department has been a tradition generally respected since the Presidency of George Washington. But the present case is bedeviled by recollection of a past attitude of Mr. Truman. More than 2 years ago when a committee of Congress was making an early investigation into the Hiss case, Mr. Truman jeered at the investigation as a "red herring."

And there is a longer recollection. Throughout some 13 years, following the creation of a committee of Congress to investigate un-American activities under the chairmanship of Representative Dies, the picture has been one of Congress giving hearty support to such investigation, with jeering at it from the school of thought that created much of the atmosphere of Washington during the Roosevelt and Truman administrations. What is now going on is a climax of that long controversy, precipitated by the Hiss case.

UNITED STATES SOLIDARITY QUESTIONED

The pending investigations, and proposals of more, work tragic harm to the conduct of our foreign relations. They present to foreign governments a question of whether or how completely the Truman administration has the confidence of the people and of Congress. Domestically, they create difficulty for Republicans who recognize the imperative necessity of bipartisan support of the administration's foreign policy.

Beneath all is the public disquiet which causes the investigations and to which the investigations respond. In the present phase the investigations tend to focus on our policy about China during the years in which that country was overcome by Communist Russia. So great a tragedy as the fall of China is not likely to be permitted by the people to pass without investigation. Indeed there will be investigation by historians for generations to come.

Address by Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby at Annual Journalism Banquet, University of Missouri

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 11 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, Texans have long been proud of the outstanding leadership of Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby. During wartime, Mrs. Hobby served her country and the cause of freedom well as director of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps. In peacetime she has served with even greater benefits her chosen profession of journalism as executive vice president of the Houston Post.

Well-deserved recognition of Mrs. Hobby's effective crusade for responsible journalism came last week when the University of Missouri honored her for distinguished service to newspapering. At the time the award was presented to her, Mrs. Hobby presented an address outlining her philosophy of newspaper service and responsibility.

Her remarks are inspiring to laymen; they should also be challenging to journalists of the Nation. I ask unanimous consent to include her remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Considering the world as a whole—if I may use a phrase which has in it more of hope than reality—the profession of journalism and the existence of free, courageous newspapers have seldom been in a worse position. In a large segment of the world, free journalism has been destroyed by dictatorships; a free press still exists in our own country, but even here there are certain elements of weakness.

The first is that we take freedom too much for granted. In the days of Peter Zenger, th words "freedom of the press" were an oriflamme and a battle cry; today, to many people, they are merely a cliche in oratory, the slogan of a fight won long ago, the dusty echo of an old battle.

But, as we are learning painfully, the fight for freedom is never won permanently. Freedom can be destroyed suddenly, by fiat; but it can also be nibbled away while its defenders are engaged on some other battle front. It can be lost in translation or distorted in application.

Freedom of speech, of religion, of association, and of the press are basic to the American way of life.

THREAT IS HERE

Freedom of speech and of association are now being threatened, as anyone who reads the news must realize. Freedom of religion is not yet in crucial danger, but the rising tide of Ku Klux Klanism in some Southern States, and the bitter social ostracism and divisions into social cliques based on religious differences found in many northern and eastern seaboard cities, prove that there are forces within the United States which could threaten freedom of religion were they ever to gain even a local control.

Freedom of the press therefore becomes doubly important, for without it no other freedoms can long exist. This is not just a high-sounding generalization; it is something that anyone in this audience may need to remember in a very personal way. Suppose, for example, that one of you Missouri students is arrested for reckless driving, and your home-town paper prints the fact. Your family may find it hard to understand that the publication of the incident, though embarrassing to you and them, is really proof that you have a God-given protection against something much worse than embarrassment. For so long as no young men can be arrested without a newspaper knowing it and publishing it, that young man cannot vanish without recourse into a dictator's prisons. When the newspapers of Nazi Germany could no longer publicize the arrest and disappearance of private citizens, the people they served were no longer either safe or free.

But freedom of the press is not merely a privilege given to newspaper editors and publishers for their special enjoyment. It is rather a sword of trust with the obligations as well as the privileges of usage. And this brings me to what I feel is the second element of weakness in our press freedom today. We do not use that sword often enough. Too often we remain silent in the face of obvious injustice, when we ought to be crying aloud—or at least questioning.

Take, for example, the case of Doctor Condon. A respected scientist and a public servant, he was labeled one of the weakest links in our atomic security in a report released to the press by J. Parnell Thomas, then chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee. Though Doctor Condon repeatedly demanded the right to a public hearing and official denial, he was not granted this right. The American Press should have demanded the right for him, and continued relentlessly to demand it until it was granted. But worse, some of us gave, by column count, three and four times the amount of space to the charges than we later gave to the statement relating to his innocence.

There was a time when every citizen was adjudged innocent of a crime until legally proved guilty in court. This was a precedent we inherited from English Common Law. Now almost suddenly, in mid-twentieth century, this long-established protection of the ordinary citizen against possible injustice is being nullified. When sensational charges are made by anyone—not by a grand jury, not by a district attorney, but sometimes by vacant-minded hysterical, or politically malicious people—the charges are broadcast from coast to coast. And the public instinct often is to accept charges as proof.

In the case of accusations such as those against Doctor Condon, it is the duty of the press to demand evidence. If the evidence is lacking, it is the further duty of the press to make the accused person's vindication as widely known as was the charge against him.

Sometimes the failure of newspapers to do this is an unwitting, rather than a deliberate, one. A paper may be honorable of intent, but lack alertness in editing. For example, an accusation is made by the House Un-American Activities Committee in time for all morning editions. But the denial may reach the wire services only in time for a late evening edition—thereby covering perhaps one-fifth of the readership offered the accusation story. Unless an unusually fair-minded and alert news editor is on the desk, it is even unlikely that the late-edition denial will be picked up and carried in the first four editions next day.

Papers may also be unjust in more subtle ways—by the words they include or omit in what seems to be a factual story. Some always identify the race of a man in a murder story—"Matthew White, Negro, confessed to the slaying of two white men"—but never mention race if the story is one of honorable portent: "Lawrence Keenon, long time professor at Industrial High School, has been awarded the Carver medal for outstanding service to the cause of science."

This kind of hidden editorializing may sound unimportant. But as in the case of the water torture, the steady, incessant drip of a word many times has a stronger effect than a cataract.

PROFESSION

All of the points about journalistic freedom, responsibility, and weakness which I have discussed so far are already well known to you through your studies. But I have diagramed them again in order to underline the point that journalism is a profession of many facets, many techniques, many greatnesses, and many potential evils.

I used the word "profession" naturally, but I should like to do it again deliberately. For journalism is a profession—regardless of those who try to make it simply a skill, a matter of man-hours and the ability to type.

Newspapers—with all the world—have changed and are changing continuously. The old-time reporter of the five-star-final days would not feel at home with today's best-known journalists, though you may still see him in an occasional moving picture. There he still sits, hat on the back of his head, cigarette dangling from cynical lips, rattling away with two fingers, turning out sensational scoops.

If you would like a nostalgic review of that period read Paris Herald, by Al Laney. Laugh affectionately at those good old days—but don't expect to find any remnant of them left on today's metropolitan newspaper.

The major newspaper stories of that era were accounts of bank robberies, kidnapings, homicides. Such stories are still played daily—but they no longer are considered the top presentation the paper has to offer. The newspaperman who had never gone beyond high school could cover any of these as well—perhaps better—than the intellectual and highly literate product of today's schools of journalism.

But a world war—and the thought-provoking, soul-stretching years of this peace which is no peace—have given newspapers greater depth and a broader perspective. Today's stories of the new medical center, the city-hall probe, the murder trial, are being written with a new clarity and vigor. And with new brevity. And newspapers in Bay City, Tex.; Anniston, Ala.; St. Joseph, Mo., are carrying more international news than did many metropolitan papers back in the 1920's. Journalism is maturing. The emphasis has shifted from scoop to scope.

Such schools as this one have played their important part in the growth of our profession. By turning out graduates trained in political science, philosophy, music, and art—as well as in the art of pyramiding a story—the colleges of journalism have taught newspaper editors to lift their standards in hiring new cubs.

Since the present and future of journalism are yours as well as ours, let us consider our future: First, in terms of style and performance; and, second, in terms of thought and idea.

Murders, court trials, explosions, mine disasters, and the small, heart-touching human-interest stories—all these, of course, must still be covered. They are day-to-day living. But now they are handled more intelligently than formerly, written in better prose, freer of the hackneyed sentimentalities of the sob sister and her time.

Less and less are we using the "it was alleged" and "a spokesman said" type of reporting. More and more the newspaper man or woman is expected to be widely read, widely trained, and widely thoughtful. He is also expected to be a writer—a literate writer—able to give a fresh, vivid coverage of facts with the greatest possible clarity and interest.

RUNYON VERSUS WEST

For a perfect contrast between what yesterday was called great and what is today our target of achievement, read Damon Runyon's book, Trials and Other Tribulations. Then read Rebecca West's Meaning of Treason. Both are newspaper coverage of famous court trials. But what a difference.

Runyon was a superb reporter of his time. His fast-paced copy—spiked by an occasional tear-jerking paragraph—was the envy of newsmen everywhere. But when you reread those famous stories of his you find that his style is already dated. He was writing journalese, not English prose. Today journalism and literature can be synonymous—or should be.

Rebecca West, in her accounts of the treason trials in England at the close of World War II, has lifted journalism into the realm of great prose. The editors of Harper's have called her "the world's best reporter."

Of course, not every story you write can be a great one. As cubs, you will find yourselves coping with what seems a heartless load of routine—unless you learn to see and appreciate the humanity behind it. The church page and the PTA beat seem tame to someone with ambitions to be an Anne O'Hare McCormick or a Walter Lippmann. But the reporter who learns to cover the people behind the simple announcements, to grasp the idea behind the work they are doing, will find this training exceedingly valuable when he becomes, perhaps, a political interpreter or a Washington correspondent. People are still people, and their desires, motives, and reactions are much the same, even though they may have moved from Main Street to Constitution Avenue.

The newspaper writer must not only be well informed, but continually alert to become even better informed. However stimulating or inhibiting an editor may be, the responsibility for professional growth rests primarily with the reporter himself. He must continue to learn every day of his life—or expect to be left behind by those who have gone on learning.

Fortunately, many outside influences are now coming in to help the individual newspaperman grow. The Neiman fellowships to Harvard, and the Reid Foundation fellowships for study abroad are sending many men back to their newspapers with broadened concepts and vastly increased stores of information.

The American Press Institute—another fine undertaking—offers seminars—10 days to 2 weeks each—on every specialized aspect in newspaper production. There is a seminar for managing editors, another for city editors, others for picture editors, sports editors, composing-room heads, municipal affairs reporters, music and drama critics, and so on. It is continuous, drawing into New York from over the Nation a selected group of men, 1 from each of 25 to 27 newspapers over the country. While in New York, the visitors see large metropolitan papers, talk to atomic scientists at Columbia, attend United Nations meetings, and do whatever else interests them and the API can arrange.

Now, with these new skills of ours, how much are we advancing in the realm of thought and ideas?

In common with that of the minister and the scientist, the responsibility of the journalist to the public is far heavier than that of the average man. Tacitus once said that in time of revolution the greatest difficulty for an honorable man was not so much to do his duty as to know it. We have clarified our style, we have trimmed the flowers and flourishes from our prose; but each day it becomes harder to clarify our thinking.

The press in all its expressions is the eyes and ears of the world. The lawyer, the cook, the college student, the mayor of a small town—none can go to Germany to trace the progress of postwar democracy, none can stay at United Nations to watch the developments and achievements. They know only what they read in the papers, in news magazines, or what they hear in brief comments on the radio.

TELL ALL—TELL TRUE

This means that the press has a great responsibility to tell all and tell it true. You will find that is not always easy.

How many of us here have informed ourselves on the facts of today's world events? And how many of us have analyzed our opinions to find the degree to which they have let prejudice color facts? The newspaper writer who is uninformed or prejudiced is, in part at least, responsible for the misinformation and prejudice of thousands of other people—sometimes of millions.

It all boils down to this: Every newspaper writer, however obscure or however famous, is first of all a public servant. The newspaperman who forgets this has betrayed his profession as surely as the doctor who misses his chance to help a patient.

Second to serving the public, the journalist must serve his own profession. Service to a profession means doing all within one's ability to lift the profession to new heights of speed, accuracy, truth, and good taste. Cheap sensationalism may draw readers for the moment, but the highest type of journalism helps to develop an increasingly high type of readers for all time.

Of recent years, there has been a tendency in many fields of expression to try to find out what the public wants and then give it to them at all costs. This is always a precarious move, since none of us singly or collectively know what we want when we have never yet seen the best possible. It is significant that, in moving pictures, the slavery to the so-called box-office appeal has produced neither a large percentage of excellent pictures nor an eager public reaction to pictures as a whole.

Newspapers cannot live without circulation. As a consequence, many formulas are devised to obtain and retain circulation. The formulas may begin with the "A" of art and run to the "Z" of zither. The reason for such an infinite variety and sometimes questionable taste is either the editor's poor taste or a desperate effort to attract readers. Newspapers, in these times of increasing production costs, have as their first obligation the duty to live—to continue to exist as voices in the choir of information. But blended with this obligation is the duty to lift steadily the level of public taste.

In law, a man may not practice until he has passed the State board examinations. In teaching, a professor must have a certain amount of training and must have received certain college degrees. In medicine, the standards, set by law and by the profession itself, are equally exacting.

But in the profession of journalism, each journalist must set his own standards.

I should like to see us work out a journalistic form of the Hippocratic oath, such as is taken by all doctors. Or perhaps we could call ours the Socratic oath. Socrates, the man with an inquiring mind, is surely a model to whom journalists could look for inspiration.

SOCRATIC OATH

Each man or woman who goes to work for a newspaper might be given a copy of the Socratic oath, which could run something like this:

"I will strive to write the truth with complete accuracy, with no expression of my own personal bias or opinion, in order to give the facts I transcribe the chance to be judged for themselves alone.

"I will work to improve my own knowledge in many fields, in order that I may better understand the facts presented to me, and more clearly transcribe them to the reading public.

"I will keep myself aware that my work is a service to my community, my nation, and my world—that I serve all men rather than myself; that man's right to know, rather than the private furtherance of my own career, is, and must always be, the first goal of my endeavor."

Electrical Cartels in Postwar Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM BENTON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 11 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article from the New York Times of May 10, 1950, discussing a report by a committee of the Swedish Government on electrical cartels in postwar Europe. This report illustrates the heavy price paid by Europe due to the business habits which underlie the great cartels. These habits do not flow from the Socialist governments of Europe. Indeed, they lead to the development and strengthening of such governments. This fact is but little understood by the American business community.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SWEDEN UNCOVERS ELECTRICAL CARTEL—WORLD COMBINE ALLOTS MARKETS, FIXES PRICES FOR WIRE, CABLE—"WELFARE" IS A DISGUISE

GENEVA, May 3.—The first authentic information about postwar cartel agreements in Europe has been published by the Swedish Government after an investigation that occupied nearly 2 years' time of a 10-man committee.

Copies of this committee's report, entitled "The Capacity and Competitive Position of the Swedish Electrical Industry," have just reached here. The chairman of the group is Prof. Ingvar Svennilson. The committee consisted of representatives of industry and labor and experts appointed by the Government.

In meters, cables, and copper and copper wire, all vital components of the entire range of end products of the electrical industry, the investigation revealed the revival of international cartel arrangements to restrict competition. This happened as early as 1946, when Europe was laboring through a period of great shortage of nearly all electrical products.

The report throws more light than a dozen speeches on the real price Europe pays for the system of national protected markets in which combinations to curtail competition are tolerated and, indeed, almost inevitable. The progress of the investigation itself brought to light such unpalatable facts about the control of the industry that some of the agreements—not the international ones—have already been canceled.

WELFARE STATE NEW DISGUISE

The postwar cartel builders have learned to dress up their agreements to make them look like part of the welfare state. The agreement on copper products (without which the motor and generator factories could not operate) states that "The parties shall try to attain a high and stable level of employment and a satisfactory standard of living for everybody employed in the nonferrous-metals industry and to give every part of the industry unrestricted access on the same conditions to world trade in these products."

These phrases are precisely those used to state the aims of the International Trade Organization and appear to have been culled from the original Atlantic Charter.

To this high-sounding agreement belong 3 Belgian companies, 1 French national cartel grouping 50 companies, an organization of 10 British companies representing 85 percent of British nonferrous metals output, 2 British export companies controlling 100 percent of British exports, a group of 3 Swiss companies, and the leading Swedish company. No German companies belonged in 1946, but some may have joined since.

The method of giving everybody unrestricted access to world markets is to divide such markets into two sections—the home market of cartel members and markets that have no members in the group.

PRICE CONTROL IS RIGID

In the markets of members no other member may sell below that member's price—the member being itself a cartel that sets national prices or has them set by government machinery, which it usually controls. In other markets no member may sell below an agreed price list kept up-to-date by a permanent secretary.

The committee found that agreements on similar lines had existed since before World War II on cables and electric meters. These both had German membership. The evidence collected in Sweden indicates that they were originally formed when electrical indutries in Sweden were threatened with ruin by persistent German dumping. These agreements have persisted, sometimes purely informally, despite the break-up of the prewar world cartel agreement covering finished products of the electrical industry.

The committee unanimously found that participation in these arrangements by Swedish companies was contrary to the Swedish public interest.

The agreements now in force affect components, not finished products, bought by consumers, and they require a minimum of enforcement or of formal written agreements or records.

Comments by Hon. Kenneth S. Wherry, of Nebraska, on Statements by the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 11 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD my radio address of May 9, 1950, commenting on statements made by President Truman during his present western tour.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Thanks, fellow Americans.

This transcription is being made for radio broadcasting from the radio studio of the United States Senate.

My duties in Congress, in these fateful times, prevent an extended tour of the country. But, as Republican floor leader of the Senate, it is my responsibility to report on public affairs, from time to time, to the people of Nebraska and the Nation. It is for that reason I avail myself of this opportunity to speak to you by radio.

It is vitally important that the people are given the facts if they are to make the right decisions.

President Truman is on the rainbow trail again, promising everything to everybody. When he was on a similar campaign in 1948, some of our highly placed Republican leaders assumed that the people were fully informed and that it was unnecessary to refute misleading statements made by Mr. Truman.

But this time, 1950, it is going to be different, and every time the President, in his role as leader of a political party, divided though it is, makes misstatements we shall answer him.

We shall go further: expose the dangerous road to ruin down which he is leading the Nation, and submit our constructive program for getting the United States onto the road to solid prosperity, and to fulfill our obligations in the troubled world.

As we Americans cross the threshold, into the crucial congressional and State elections of 1950, may I implore you, all patriotic Americans, to weigh carefully the evidence, for freedom is everybody's business.

As a nation, we are today in great danger of losing our liberties; our freedom of choice.

Our republican form of government has accomplished more for our country, in its short span, than all other systems of government combined have produced for their people over 2,000 years.

But, if our country is to survive as a republic, there must be a Nation-wide revival of the spirit of '76.

Fellow-Americans, from the firing line in Washington, I tell you it is just that serious.

Our national economy is resting on artificial props, huge Government spending, goods produced in this country to arm and support half the world, and shots in the arm, from time to time, such as the $3,000,000,000 in refunds to veterans on their insurance policies, overcharges against veterans because of faulty actuarial tables prepared by the administration at Washington.

TRUMAN IS CONFUSED

President Truman recently sought to belittle the rise of communism within the

United States, when every observing citizen in the land knows that Communists, and their fellow-travelers, are boring into every segment of our population, a larger percentage than that which took over the Government of Russia.

Before President Truman started on his present political tour, he told the country that the international situation is better today than it was in 1946.

At the same time, through the national defense establishment, he was asking, and still is asking for a $350,000,000 increase in appropriations for national defense.

General Bradley, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, cited the Communists' conquest of China, the fall of Hainan, the crisis in Formosa, armed conflict in Indo-China, the shooting down of an unarmed American plane by Soviet fighters, Yugoslavia's demands that western powers withdraw from Trieste, our break in diplomatic relations with Bulgaria, and friction in Hungary.

"Frankly," General Bradley said, "it gives us little cause for comfort, and little excuse for delay."

Then, President Truman on his present vote-luring tour of the west, performed one of his all-too-familiar zig-zags, and is reported to have told one of his whistle-stop audiences, that the next few months may determine whether there is to be a war.

Fellow-Americans, we are worried enough about the cold war, without having the President confuse the situation.

But is it any wonder that the President is confused on domestic and foreign matters, when he harbors in the offices of government so many pro-Communists, and other alien-minded radicals, who do not have faith in our republican way of life, and concoct a steady stream of proposals for spendthrift socialism?

Since entering the White House, President Truman apparently has forgotten, or just brushed aside, the ingredients for a strong agriculture and a strong United States—spiritually, economically, and financially.

NEBRASKA REJECTS SOCIALISM

We Nebraskans hope that during his journey across our beloved State, he absorbed some of the sound thinking that has made Nebraska a great State; sound thinking that is incompatible with his specious proposals.

In Nebraska, he found a frugal people pioneering to greater heights, a State that has no bonded debt, no general sales tax, and no State income tax.

Like other States, Nebraska welcomed the President of the United States, although we reject his program for strait-jacket socialism, with an all-powerful government at Washington. His program does not square with the faith of the people in the dignity of the individual and his inalienable right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

The President, in his campaigning across the country, partly at the expense of the taxpayers, professes wholehearted support of liberty and freedom. But his official acts speak louder than his words.

The President has presented officially to the Congress proposals for Government control of industry, agriculture, and labor; control of prices, wages, and materials.

He wants to socialize medicine, have Government "snoopers" invade the confidential relationship between doctor and patient.

And, on the eve of his departure from Washington, despite all of the protests against socialism, the President sent to the Congress a special message to establish a beachhead for Government control of small and independent business firms, all in the name of freedom and liberty.

BRANNAN PLAN IS MONSTROSITY

At Galesburg, Ill., the President fittingly recalled the Lincoln-Douglas debates, and then moved on to Lincoln, Nebr., named after the Great Emancipator, where he advocated the stupid Brannan farm plan, which carries fines and jail sentences for farmers who refuse to goose-step upon command of Washington bureaucrats.

Under the Brannan plan, which the President now unblushingly champions, producers of perishable commodities would become wards of Government. The Government would manage their farms, and tell them what to plant and how much, with an eye to price-wrecking surpluses.

The Government, dependent upon the will of Congress for appropriations from year to year, theoretically would give to each producer a production payment.

Now, the production payment is nothing more or less than wages, wages to make up for the farmer the difference between the market price for his commodities, and what the Secretary of Agriculture may in his wisdom decide is a fair income for doing the work.

And, all taxpayers, including the farmers, would pick up the check.

Of all the fantastic proposals, the Brannan plan takes first prize. Obviously, the President is trying to please CIO bosses and Americans for Democratic Action, with dirt-cheap prices for food and win the farmers' votes with a pap-knows-best proposal that they stand in line with tin cups in their hands.

Problems that confront the farmers are national problems, for unless the farmers are prosperous there can be no national prosperity.

Even leaders of the President's own party in Congress have spurned the Brannan plan, because it is an economic monstrosity.

While the President is out peddling the Brannan plan in political speeches, responsible leaders of both major parties in Congress, including a former Democratic Secretary of Agriculture, are trying to work out a statesmanlike approach to the farm problem. We need a farm program that will give the farmers a fair return for their products at the market places.

A sound farm price-support program, aided by full crop utilization, and by development of new markets at home and abroad, is more in keeping with the American tradition than the give-away proposals of the Brannan plan, which can result only in the total destruction of the normal markets for the farmers' produce.

TARIFF CUTS ARE RUINOUS

By his tariff and other international policies the President is digging the grave of ruin for American agriculture, labor, and industry.

He is pursuing the unsound theory that by abolishing tariff protections for American industry, labor, and agriculture, the United States will maintain prosperity.

The truth is, his tariff-slashing policy is leading the United States down to the world level of low prices, low wages, low standards of living, and jobless millions.

Against American products foreign countries now have their highest barriers in history. Of course, even though their productivity is on the average 20 percent above prewar level, they continue to ask for more and more gifts from the producers and taxpayers of America.

In the United States, tariff barriers are at the lowest level in all history, with an average rate of duty of 5.7 percent and 60 percent of all imports coming in free of duty.

In the first 2 months of 1949, we exported agricultural products valued at $172,000,000 more than we imported. In the first 2 months of 1950, we imported $116,000,000 worth of agricultural products more than we exported, and the Truman administration is now preparing for another tariff-cutting spree next fall.

If the present trend continues, the excess of imports of agricultural products over exports will reach $1,000,000,000 by the end of 1950, and millions of men and women will find their jobs have been exported.

At Casper, Wyo., the President dug up the Teapot Dome scandal of 30 years ago. He failed to say that it was a Republican President who brought that case to justice with convictions for the guilty.

This is strange talk from a President who tried to suppress the Alger Hiss case with claims it was a "red herring"; strange talk from a President, whose lieutenants in the Senate sidetracked a resolution to have a thorough investigation of interstate gamblers and racketeers, such as the old-time Pendergast gang of Kansas City; strange talk from a President who refuses to cooperate wholeheartedly in ridding the Government of pro-Comunists out to destroy our country.

SPENDTHRIFT SOCIALISM IS COSTLY

President Truman is telling the people at the whistle stops that it is too bad the cost of Government is so high, but past wars and the cold war are chiefly to blame.

Listen to the official figures. They come from the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

Senator JOHN MCCLELLAN, a Democrat, is chairman of the committee. Now, the truth is, the report shows that $6,000,000,000 of the nine billion increase in the cost of Government in the last 2 years, is due to domestic civilian spending—not national defense or aid to foreign countries.

Senator MCCLELLAN'S committee says, in Senate Document 150, that 15 new programs and expanded governmental services officially recommended by President Truman to Congress, would cost $7,000,000,000 the first year and twenty-five billion annually within 5 years.

And, the truth is, under President Truman's leadership, we are losing the cold war with Russia, and heading for strait-jacket socialism and national bankruptcy.

This time, next November, we Republicans are going to see to it that the people have a clear-cut choice between candidates who believe in Truman spendthrift socialism, and our candidates, who support the American way by which America became great and strong, for only such an America can stand against communism like the Rock of Ages.

The President's Western Tour

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 11 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Concord Daily Monitor of Friday, May 5, entitled, "The 'Non-Political' Tour" on which the President recently entrained at the taxpayers' expense. I assume, of course, that he will refrain from discussing directly or indirectly any subject relating to politics.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NONPOLITICAL TOUR

The last time the President took to the stump he was trying to save his own political life, for he was the principal candidate.

This time, as he departs on a 9-day, 16-State tour he is not a candidate, at least not in this year's elections. What he is attempting is to preserve Democratic majorities in both branches of Congress.

A politician can speak best for himself. That is, not even a President in an off-year election can deliver support which he might have if he were a candidate to other candidates. He may help create a partisan atmosphere, but the individual candidates for the United States Senate and the House of Representatives are pretty much on their own in each of the States.

The President might have intervened in the Florida contest for the senatorial nomination, but SMATHERS would undoubtedly have defeated PEPPER anyway. In the same way, where the fight is not within the party, the voters of each State will tend to resent presidential influence. They did when President Roosevelt attempted to do some purging within the Democratic Party. They will again.

Even in advance of his speaking trip the President has been on the defensive. He has at the last minute reversed himself in the matter of congressional access to State Department loyalty files. He asked Messrs. Cooper and Dulles to become State Department advisers. He has issued statement after statement trying to discredit the general charge that left wingers have not been kept out of the administration.

These actions are not the same as those with which he campaigned when running for reelection. Then he gave Congress hell. It happened to be a Republican-controlled Congress. But now the Congress is controlled by his own party, yet it has not managed to repeal the Taft-Hartley law nor has it balanced the budget. Otherwise it has done almost nothing, except raise the President's salary.

It wasn't so much the effectualness of the Truman tour of 2 years ago which won for him as it was the ineffectualness of the Republican opponent, Governer Dewey, who was a little too much "me-too" on socialism, and far too gentle in his approach to the issues. Today Truman effectualness is at an all-time low, as measured by popular response. Popular sentiment has changed. The Communist investigation and the various convictions—the Communist leaders, Hiss, Coplon, Bridges, etc.—have made the people more conservative.

The President will have some explaining to do on the stump. If he avoids trying to explain some things his omissions will speak louder than his words. The people want to know more about the Reds in Government, the gamblers in big-city political machines, the surging operating deficit of the Federal establishment. They want tax relief. They want an end to the folly of billions of dollars thrown away on unnecessary surpluses, and the continuing high cost of too many products.

The President can't blame the Republicans for all his troubles and get away with it, though he will try. He and his party are the majority in the Government, and with that power goes responsibility. Even the war scare grows less and less, for the administration has cried wolf so long the people no longer heed the cry as they once did.

The President is the President. People will turn out to see and hear him. They should, even though the pretense that he is making a nonpolitical tour is so thin it fools nobody. The respect Americans have for the office of President has to be tempered with critical analysis of the man who may hold the office. If often hasn't been but in this spring of 1950 it will be more than for a long time.

Not even the political cleverness of the President can much longer overcome his lack of adeptness at being the Nation's Chief Executive. The office glamorizes any man, for a period of time, but in the end the men who occupy the office get found out for what they are. The finding-out process will continue during the current presidential tour.

Double Standard in Administration Harasses Private Parties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 11, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, it has been stated that Reorganization Plan No. 12 is a back-door effort to amend the Taft-Hartley Act. That is utter nonsense. Reorganization Plan No. 12 is no more and no less than an effort to correct an experiment in administration that failed—failed dismally. It is the very type of structural debacle in Government that the Reorganization Act is best adapted and aimed to remedy.

Here we have only one thing: the question of the proper and efficient organization of an administrative agency of the Government. The particular agency involved happens to have the task of enforcing the national policy on matters of a dynamic character. But the question is still the same: the proper structure of an administrative agency. Should this question be considered as a side issue in the heat of debate? Or should it be considered away from the vigorous contests over high policy? It seems to me the latter is the only choice of a rational man desirous of reaching a wise and reasoned solution. And certainly it it most appropriate that this should be done under the provisions of the Reorganization Act. That was the very intent of that act.

The matter we have before us today might be called the experiment of the governmental agency with two steering-wheels. The experiment, you will recall, began 3 years ago when the Eightieth Congress set up the general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board as a completely independent officer—independent of the Board and independent of the entire executive branch of the Government. He was given final authority over the investigation of charges of unfair labor practices, the issuance of complaints based upon such charges, and the prosecution of the complaints. He was authorized, also, to supervise all attorneys employed by the Board except trial examiners and the legal assistants of the Board members themselves. He also was given supervision over the officers and employees in the regional offices of the agency. These powers, which never before had been exercised in the administrative agencies of our Government by anything less than a board of three or more commissioners, were all concentrated in a single man—with no provision for review except when he acted affirmatively. As the present general counsel himself has said, he was vested with powers that are broad and absolute and his authority final to an outstanding degree seldom accorded a single officer in a peacetime agency.

The Board, however, enlarged from three to five members in order to expedite decisions. The Board members could make its decisions, however, only after the general counsel had decided to give them something to decide. And the Board members could get their decisions enforced only through the office of the general counsel.

This experiment in dual control was launched in the atmosphere of heat and horse trading that seems always to appear whenever the emotion-packed issue of the regulation of labor-management relations comes up.

Two years later the Senate specifically rejected the experiment as a failure. One of the two distinguished lawmakers who gave the Taft-Hartley Act its name was at the forefront in urging the rejection of this experiment. Yes, Senator TAFT himself proposed, and the Senate approved, the abolition of the independent office of the general counsel.

In the House, you will recall, the matter became entangled in the contest over the whole labor policy, and, despite a powerful recommendation by the House committee that the experiment of a two-headed agency be rejected, this lame-duck experiment was permitted to continue solely by inaction. It was preserved by being lost in the consideration of larger issues of the national labor policy. This is the very same mistake that certain opponents of plan No. 12 are asking us to repeat by postponing this matter of efficiency in governmental organization for a time when we may again be considering the national labor policy.

Now, the President has reported that the experiment is a failure, and by the completely legal and appropriate use of the Reorganization Act has offered the Members of Congress an opportunity to consider the matter solely on its merits—divorced completely from the heat and fireworks of debate over substantive policy.

Oddly enough, it was the general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board himself who first publicly predicted that the establishment of the Board as a two-headed agency "could lead to fantastic results." As long ago as September 1947 he told the American Bar Association:

> There are bare spots in the picture and there are spots where a protracted division of opinion between the Board and the general counsel could lead to fantastic results. Particularly is this true in matters pertaining to the jurisdictional features of the law. The Board on appeals in representation cases may find jurisdiction and entertain a petition. On the same facts the general counsel may refuse to issue a complaint for what he conceives to be lack of jurisdiction. In neither decision will a direct appeal lie. It is an absurd situation but it can happen in the present state of the law.

The general counsel deserves a high mark as a prophet in this case. The fantastic results and the absurd situation he foresaw came to pass very soon.

They came to pass in spite of the long and earnest efforts of the Board and the general counsel to make the experiment work.

So far, just as the general counsel forecast, most of the conflict and confusion has centered around the question of the extent to which the agency should assert its constitutional jurisdiction over small businesses. The general counsel, as you know, has taken the position that the agency's powers should be exercised over any and all enterprises, however small, that have any affect upon interstate commerce. He has sought to exercise jurisdiction over such local businesses as corner grocery stores, neighborhood drug stores, bars, and restaurants. The Board, on the other hand, has declined to take jurisdiction over these small businesses mainly on the ground that they are essentially local and that the Federal Government should not interfere.

But the general counsel has refused to accept the Board's decision in the matter. In fact, he has taken the position that the Board has no power to reject any case that he may present to it.

In a case involving four neighborhood drug stores out in Oregon he proceeded to issue a complaint based upon charges of unfair labor practices after the Board had declined jurisdiction over the very same employer in a representation case. In spite of the fact that it was certain the case would be dismissed, this was fully within his authority as independent general counsel. The same thing has happened in other cases.

In short, what we have here is a picture of a Federal office so constructed that it can put private parties and Government officials to the expense of preparing cases, conducting hearings, and engaging in lawsuits when everyone—including the general counsel—has full knowledge that the entire matter will be dismissed by the Board on appeal. This indeed is a spectacle. Parties being confronted by a two-headed agency of the Federal Government which has two different policies applicable to the very same case—to the utter confusion and waste of Government and private funds.

Whatever may be the ethics of the case from the standpoint of a zealous Government official, such a fantastic double standard can result in nothing but confusion for private citizens endeavoring to abide by the law. Employer and employee alike are left in a state of complete uncertainty. Instead of minimizing industrial strife, such confusion can only multiply it.

This chaos can be eliminated only by recognizing that the National Labor Relations Board is simply a regulatory commission engaged in carrying out a single national policy, whatever that policy may be. Reorganization Plan No. 12 merely makes the National Labor Relations Board exactly like its sister regulatory commissions—an agency with a single head. The head will be the five-member Board. That is all there is to the plan.

Reorganization Plan No. 12

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 11, 1950

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, under the guise of remedying a complaint that the National Labor Relations Board combined the functions of grand jury, prosecutor, judge, and jury, vitally important administrative and policy-making functions were taken away from the Board members and concentrated in the hands of a single officer, the general counsel. This transfer of functions was one of the many ill-advised features of the Labor Management Relations Act of 1947—the Taft-Hartley law.

Let me now call your attention to one incident which is part of the background of the passage of that law. We all know that in 1947 there was a rash of legislative proposals for revising the Wagner Act or writing a new labor law. Early in 1947, before the enactment of the Taft-Hartley law, there was pending in the Senate of the United States a bill known as S. 360, introduced by then Senator Ball, of Minnesota. At the invitation of another Senator, a distinguished attorney, with years of familiar experience with labor law, expressed his views in writing concerning the merits and demerits of the Ball bill. One of the proposals in that bill was for the separation of the functions of the NLRB, and the assignment of the prosecuting functions to the Department of Justice. I shall read briefly from the comments made at that time by that lawyer concerning this proposal. He said:

> The provisions for dividing the functions of the Board between the Department of Justice and the present Board savors of the wisdom (?) of Solomon in dividing the child. It simply will not work. The administration of labor relations at the source involves much more than the trial and determination of adjudications. More than 90 percent of the matters which might develop into litigations are disposed of administratively in the regional offices. These dispositions must be coordinated to the same general policy that influences the final determination of the litigated cases. This proposed division would only create additional confusion with policy emanating from two independent and uncoordinated sources. (Senate hearings 1949, p. 1130.)

The author of these words is Mr. Robert N. Denham, the present general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board. Mr. Denham was a very accurate prophet. His words have been borne out. They have been proved. The separation of functions, with broad investigative, prosecutory, administrative, and policy making functions in the independent office of the general counsel, "simply will not work." It has not worked. Two and a half years of conscientious effort on the part of the Board members and the general counsel to work together smoothly and cooperatively, as a team, has demonstrated this beyond any possible question.

Mr. Denham also warned, in 1947 that is, that the administration of Labor Relations at the source involves much more than the trial and determination of adjudications. Of course this is true. It is true because the essence of the administrative agency approach to regulation in the public interest is flexibility. Flexibility in marking out and laying down policy within the framework of the regulating statute. That is why it involves much more than merely prosecution and adjudication. The administration of the National labor policy under the Taft-Hartley Act involves innumerable policy determinations. It involves determinations as to when to proceed and when not to proceed to complaint and injunction; it involves determinations as to whether the public policy will be better served by inviting compromise or by insisting on rigorous prosecution; it involves determination of where to draw the line between industries that ought to be brought into conformance with Federal policy and industries whose total impact on the national economy is too small to warrant Federal interference. All this and more is involved. All this is policy determination and under the present setup much of this policy determination is in the hands of the general counsel; some of it is in the hands of the five-member Board; and as to some of it, the two agencies are in irreconcilable conflict and nobody knows where it is.

Mr. Denham also observed, in 1947, that "more than 90 percent of the matters which might develop into litigations are disposed of administratively in the regional offices," and that these dispositions "must be coordinated to the same general policy that influences the final determination of the litigated cases." In other words, the work of the field staffs should be consistent with and governed by the policy of the agency that makes the final decisions in litigated cases—that is, of course, the Board itself. The experience under the present separation of functions justifies Mr. Denham's early fears. The field and legal staffs of the agency are required to serve two masters, who frequently disagree. It is impossible for them to know which master to follow.

Mr. Denham stated—still in 1947—that the proposed division "would only create additional confusion, with policy emanating from two independent and uncoordinated sources."

The confusion foreseen by Mr. Denham with respect to the transfer of Board functions to the Department of Justice it has been his misfortune to experience with respect to the transfer of those functions to himself as general counsel.

Despite Mr. Denham's warning in 1947, the Taft-Hartley law provided for a division of the functions of the NLRB—with the general counsel as its alter ego. That officer now enjoys all the power of a grand jury—sole, unreviewable discretion as to whether a complaint should

issue; all the power of a prosecutor—unsupervised power to prosecute cases and to apply for injunctions; and heavy administrative responsibilities, including supervision of the field and legal staffs of the agency.

The separation of powers has not only placed a disproportionate amount of authority in one individual but it has subjected the entire agency to demoralizing friction and conflict, resulting in dual and confused policy making, inefficiency, and uncertainty in the minds of parties to Board proceedings.

The hearings before congressional committees last year, as well as this year in connection with Reorganization Plan No. 12, have conclusively demonstrated that the public interest and a decent regard for good management require an immediate end to this monstrous organizational freak. Let me briefly repeat some of the outstanding reasons why the costly experiment in dual administration should be terminated:

First. The advantages of group responsibility are lost by assigning tremendous authority to a single individual. I quote from the task force report of the Hoover Commission:

> A distinctive attribute of Commission action is that it requires concurrence by a majority of members of equal standing after full discussion and deliberation. * * * A single official can consult his staff but does not have to convince others to make his views or conclusions prevail. The member of the Commission must expose his opinions and judgments to the critical scrutiny in his fellow members and must persuade them to his point of view. * * * Deliberation has certainly reduced the likelihood of capricious decision, and promoted objectivity (task force report, p. 21).

Inevitably a five-man Board is a better guaranty of fair treatment than any one man can possibly be.

Second. The general counsel, under this act, combines the function of prosecution with that of rule making, which properly belongs to the five-member Board. As was pointed out in the task force report—

> Only in part are his present duties genuinely prosecution. Some parts are administrative, and some parts are a species of rule or policy making. It may be that the administrative and policy-making functions could be subordinated more clearly to the Board's control while still maintaining an adequate separation of the truly prosecuting activities (Senate hearings, p. 6).

Third. Dual policy making by the general counsel may result in the substitution of district court judgment for the Board's judgment in injunction cases. The statute empowers the general counsel to seek court injunctions. If he seeks and obtains an injunction, the result will be that a district court will have passed upon the legal theory of his complaint before the Board has had an opportunity to say whether or not the complaint spells out an unfair labor practice. Where the Board itself seeks an injunction there is no similar danger that the entire proceeding will ultimately prove abortive because the Board rejects the theory underlying the prosecution.

Fourth. The general counsel has supervision over the field staff although that staff performs work which may be wholly under the control of the five-member Board. This tends to separate and isolate the staff from the Board which is responsible for a large part of its performance.

Fifth. As a result of the separation of functions as spelled out in this act, the general counsel's authority impinges even on election cases which are supposed to be exclusively under the Board's control. His failure to issue a complaint may render a Board certification meaningless; his decision whether or not to issue a complaint may determine the outcome of an election held during a strike.

Sixth. The dispute which has arisen between the Board and the general counsel over the power of the Board to refuse to take cases involving small employers has entailed endless confusion. Senator TAFT made this the principal basis of his recommendation last June for the abolition of the separate office of general counsel.

Seventh. The general counsel occupies both the position of a litigant before the Board and the position of the Board's attorney when the Board seeks to enforce its orders in the Courts of Appeals. Several times the general counsel has asked the Board to relieve his staff of the responsibility of enforcing Board decisions with which he disagreed. In one case he has threatened to file a brief in court disagreeing with the Board's position. Yet, under the statute, all the agency's lawyers are under the supervision of the general counsel.

Eighth. The testimony and statistics introduced in evidence before the Senate Committee show that the present dual structure results in more litigation than formerly. A great proportion of all cases of the agency are, always, disposed of informally in the field. But the proportion of such cases that now have to go to formal hearing has risen. This is true not only of cases involving new kinds of unfair labor practices created by the present law, but even of cases involving unfair labor practices which were the same under the old law. This can only mean that the general counsel and the regional staffs are unable to carry Board policy to the parties at the initial stages of disputes, so as to keep down the number of cases that have to go to formal stages.

Ninth. No necessity whatever has been shown for this unusual type of bifurcation. The needs of due process and fairness are adequately taken care of by the Administrative Procedure Act, which applies to all administrative agencies and which provides for an efficient, yet fair internal separation of functions. The NLRB was in full compliance with the Administrative Procedure Act ever since it became law. In fact some of the APA provisions are said to have been modeled on NLRB procedures. No reason has ever been shown why the NLRB should be saddled with a frustrating and inefficient organization, in contrast with all other similar agencies.

Tenth. The separation of functions now in effect at the NLRB is unique and threatens the organizational integrity of all administrative agencies in the executive branch of the Government. As was cogently stated in the task force report:

> The existence of such an office independent both of the Federal department structure and of the Board marks a departure from previous administrative practice. If permitted to set a pattern for future Government organization it may lead to a diffusion of responsibility. (Senate hearings, p. 6.)

It is time to return to a rational organizational structure, with clear lines of authority. The present split-personality of the Labor Board is wasteful and inefficient. The Board can amply safeguard public and private rights through an internal structure which isolates the purely prosecuting function from that of adjudication. All other regulatory commissions in the executive branch of the Government do this successfully. No reason exists for an exception here. Reorganization Plan No. 12 should be adopted. This House should place itself emphatically upon record as favoring restoration of the Labor Board's functions and abolition of the separate office of general counsel through a vote of strong disapproval of House Resolution 516.

United Jewish Appeal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 11 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial entitled, "United Jewish Appeal," which appeared in the New Hampshire Morning Union of May 9, 1950. This editorial presents a real understanding of the problems in Israel which the United Jewish Appeal is organized to help solve.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED JEWISH APPEAL

The state of Israel owes much indeed to the generous understanding here in America of the new decomcracy's problems. Israel itself is prompt to acknowledge that obligation with heartfelt thanks.

Miracles have been performed. But the age of the need of more miracles has not passed. Great tasks have been performed. Greater tasks remain essential.

It is in that realization that the Manchester Jewish community, other Jewish communities throughout this State, and in the Nation, are now emphasizing the tremendous reasons for giving, with the same fervor and generosity marked in the past, to the 1950 United Jewish Appeal. Last evening here in Manchester marked the initial gifts dinner. Now comes the campaign itself.

As in former years, again now! The local quota will be used not only in behalf of performing more miracles in Israel, but also for United States countrywide and local requirements. As an example of home benefits, advantage will occur to the Manchester Jewish Community Center.

In Israel, the contribution of American Jews and their Christian friends will complete immigration tasks, will further rehabilitation requirements, and will make new construction possible.

Eighty thousand new immigrants in Israel are still living in tents. One hundred new settlements must be established. Five hundred thousand Jews in various parts of Europe require help if they are to live. Twenty-five thousand Jews are awaiting a new life in America. Hence—for these good causes and many more—the 1950 United Jewish Appeal.

This is not alone the problem of the Jews—or for the Jews. It also is the problem of all humanity, a truth recognized in the cooperation that the appeal is receiving from leaders of other lands. Governor Adams, for example, is proud to act as a member of the National Christian Committee associated with the appeal. In Manchester, John P. Carleton has been glad to give of his energies and time.

So it is throughout the country, among Jews and all other peoples of God, in the recognition that the moral and material assistance given during the appeal is an investment in the ideals of peace and freedom.

Directors of the appeal are stating the case in all essential detail. The verdict now rests with the people. Again they will make it possible for more miracles to be performed. By their good deeds Americans all will continue to be known, esteemed, and beloved.

Is Not Secretary of State Acheson Exceeding His Authority and Presently Acting Contrary to His Former Assurances and Policies?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 11, 1950

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I hope that the reports in various newspapers, and in particular, the May 10, 1950, editorial in the Chicago Sun-Times, about the actions of our Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson, are not going to form the basis for a change in our basic foreign policy.

For instance, Mr. Speaker, within a few hours after he arrived by air in Paris yesterday, reports indicate that he quickly agreed with French Foreign Minister Schuman on aid to Indochina. Secretary of State Acheson and Minister Schuman specifically agreed to send Indochina military as well as economic aid—most of it being military aid. All of this assistance will go to Viet Nam, an independent state in the French Union, which is presently being torn by real conflict on the part of a revolutionary named Ho Chi Minh. The latter has fought for 40 years against French rule in Indochina, and set up a strong nationalist movement shortly after World War II under an agreement with the French.

In the latter part of 1949, France installed a new government under the leadership of a former Annamite emperor whose family ruled in Indochina for four centuries.

The above editorial suggests that the American people wonder by what authority does Mr. Acheson send military aid to Viet Nam? Is Veit Nam really threatened by Communists from outside or is Ho merely trying to give his countrymen an independent government? Are we helping France hang on to a colonial possession against the will of the majority of the inhabitants?

In that connection permit me to quote excerpts from an editorial appearing in the Chicago Sun-Times on May 10, 1950, entitled "United States Tanks and Planes to Viet Nam," wherein Mr. Acheson said:

Neither national independence nor democratic evolution can exist in an area dominated by Soviet imperialism.

The editorial went on to point out:

Nor as Mr. Acheson knows, can democratic evolution exist in an area dominated by European imperialism. While France controlled Indochina, it did nothing to solve problems of land distribution, illiteracy, poverty, and the like. The Communists make bright promises along these same lines to attract support.

Let us consider what Mr. Ho actually stands for, keeping in mind that he has been a revolutionary leader fighting for 40 years against French rule in Indochina, and I quote further from the above editorial: "The people must be given the means to rebuild, to eat, to live. If we cannot provide this for them they must fall into the misery on which communism thrives." Are these the words of a Communist?

The editorial further states:

In addition to tanks, planes, and guns, Viet Nam needs other aid, including food. It also needs convincing arguments that France is really on the square when it says it wants the inhabitants eventually to run its own affairs.

Mr. Speaker, if France wants Indochina to run its own affairs, why did they agree to placing a former Annamite Emperor into the position of leadership?

The editorial concludes with a gem of a statement, to wit:

Our aim should be to stop not only Russian imperialism but any imperialism that denies peoples the right to govern themselves.

Food Prices and Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. MILLET HAND
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 11, 1950

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, there recently appeared in the Cape May County Gazette a sensible editorial entitled "Politics Versus People," which I feel is worthy of wide circulation. The editorial is appended:

POLITICS VERSUS PEOPLE

"A sensible, honest, radically new agricultural act * * * that will gradually ease the price-control falsework from under the farm economy" is urged in an article in the April Reader's Digest, condensed from Fortune. Declaring that the Government's price structure would collapse if supports were suddenly removed, the article holds that this program is forcing farmers to produce wildly in excess of any reasonable American capacity to consume. It is responsible for most of the $11,800,000,000 deficit in the last fiscal year.

After 17 years the price-support program is coming full circle to its preposterous conclusion as one of our most potent inflationary influences, the article states. The Government's recent wholesale destruction and distress sale of surplus potatoes, a price-supporting move, cost taxpayers $204,000,000. That is a fair illustration of what happens when the Government helps a special group maintain or increase its share of the national income regardless of the group's contribution to that income.

Commodity Credit Credit Corporation has a current investment of nearly $3,000,000,000 in farm commodity loans, purchases, and agreements to purchase. Last year CCC took over 21 percent of the wheat harvest, 26 percent of the cotton crop and enormous stocks of other commodities. Having disposed of minor quantities it is left with a $2,500,000,000 inventory, including:

Nearly 5,000,000 bales of cotton, 600,000,000 bushels of corn, and 400,000,000 bushels of wheat—enough wheat for a loaf of bread a week for everyone in the United States throughout a full year. Millions of pounds of dried eggs, butter, tobacco, wool, soybeans, and other commodities are held by CCC.

This immense inventory, the article states, would feed and clothe millions of poor people, were it not that CCC is forced by statute to price the products so high that poor people cannot possibly buy them.

Present farm policies are certain to increase rather than liquidate this inventory. Following a bumper corn crop in 1949, hundreds of millions of bushels of new corn will probably be put under loan. With prices of hogs at 3-year lows, CCC may soon support hog prices by buying pork on a grand scale. Wheat promises another giant harvest, with further Government loans and purchases indicated.

Surplus farm commodities are being stored in oil tanks, hangars, schoolrooms, and even laid-up ships, the article says. At least $80,000,000 is being spent on additional storage space this fiscal year.

The agricultural planners proposed two solutions: (1) To dump surplus abroad and to cut prices in the open market (against the policy of the State Department); (2) to limit output by curtailing planted acreage.

Despite smaller acreage, output may well be maintained at recent levels by better seed and more fertilizer. And acreage taken out of restricted crops will be shifted to other crops, causing new gluts.

The average taxpayer, mystified by the intricacies of the farm price-support program, has remained inarticulate. But the time has come, the article concludes, for the politicians to pay attention not only to the farm organizations but to the rest of the people as well.

Water Supply of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK
OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 1950

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, the United States is becoming more and more aware of the great importance of its water supply and the proper uses and conservation of water. In that connection, I would like to call to your attention an address recently delivered by Carl G. Paulsen, chief hydraulic engineer, United States Geological Survey. This address was presented at the fortieth convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, held at the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C. The address is as follows:

WATER SUPPLY OF THE UNITED STATES

The front pages of the press throughout the country during the past several weeks have dramatized the critical water shortages in many parts of the Nation. The concern that has grown in recent years over the future of our water supplies has been forcibly brought to the attention of the public by the water shortage that New York City is experiencing. This shortage is not the first that has affected an American community, and it probably is not the most serious. Ample sources of additional water are known to exist in up-State New York, and in all probability construction that will bring this water to the city will be pushed as rapidly as possible. Nevertheless, the fact that our largest city, the center of our business life, has an acute water shortage, even though it may only be temporary, causes everyone to realize something of the importance that water has in our national life and our national economy and security. In nearly every State of the Union one or more communities now has or has had water problems as serious as or more serious than that which now faces New York City. These problems are springing up in increasing numbers, and it is high time that orderly and systematic consideration be given to their solutions and to the avoidance of as many such problems as possible in the future. If the crisis in New York serves to bring this fact into national focus, New York's misfortune may in the long run be a blessing in disguise.

The comments on water problems that have appeared in the press have ranged all the way from the alarmist view that we are short of water on a national scale to the complacent view that all that is needed to cure the troubles is some particular type of conservation or construction which the particular writer or promoter favors. Actually, the truth lies somewhere between these divergent views.

It has been said that we are running out of water. Yet throughout the period of record the total available water resources of our country, except for local and temporary variations due to droughts and floods, have not trended persistently either up or down, but have continued essentially constant. I know of no evidence in either long-term precipitation, stream-flow, or ground-water data that controverts this statement. During the past several decades stream run-off in many places, as shown by carefully selected records of the United States Geological Survey, showed a downward swing which reached its lowest point in the decade from 1930 to 1940, but most records show an upward swing since 1940. In the 1949 water year the annual flow of all major continental rivers gaged by the Geological Survey was near normal or above normal. Likewise, precipitation data of the United States Weather Bureau show no persistent country-wide progression toward long-term declines. Records of water levels in nearly 15,000 observation wells maintained by the Geological Survey and its cooperating agencies show no over-all trend toward decline. Water levels in some wells have declined, but only because of pumping or other activities of man, or temporarily as a result of severe droughts. Even the great drought of the thirties was subsequently offset by above-average precipitation which fully restored stream-flow and ground-water levels to predrought stages.

The amazing situation that has arisen in this country, however, is that our use of water has increased by leaps and bounds. A century ago the per capita use of water was probably not more than a few gallons per day. Today it is estimated that our per capita use of water amounts to more than 1,300 gallons per day, exclusive of water used for hydroelectric power, for dilution of wastes in streams, for navigation, recreation, etc. The total for the country probably approaches 200,000,000,000 gallons (600,000 acre-feet) a day of water now taken from wells and streams for use by industries, municipalities, irrigation projects, and domestic and other users.

During the past century our population has increased about 600 percent. The use of water, however, has increased by several thousand percent. The future is expected to bring an even more disproportionate increase in the use of water. The rapid growth of industry and technological advances, the introduction of new industries such as the chemical industry, the spread of air conditioning and temperature control processes in industry, and the hydrogenation of coal and oil shale for synthetic fuels, will require enormously increased quantities of water. Plans are also going forward for large additional developments of irrigation in the West. In the East, on Long Island and elsewhere, supplemental irrigation to provide optimum moisture for growth of crops has spread very rapidly in the last few years. It is to be expected that such uses will increase rapidly if our national economy is to be maintained at a satisfactory level.

The question is, How does this use of water compare with the amount available? The 200,000,000,000 gallons daily that is estimated to be used now is equivalent to between 1 and 1½ inches of water spread over the surface of the country in a year. The average annual precipitation is about 30 inches, and the average annual runoff is about 8.5 inches for the country.

Supposedly, this country-wide average of 8.5 inches that now runs off to the sea should be utilizable by man, but it is not possible in practice. At least a substantial part cannot be used economically because it is flood flow that occurs in such tremendous volume that there is no feasible means of storing it. And of the low flow of the streams, at least a considerable part must be reserved because it dilutes and carries off municipal, industrial, and other wastes. Also, a part cannot be consumed because it supports hydroelectric power, navigation, and other purposes. Moreover, in some streams, there is the problem of maintaining enough flow to carry off the products of natural erosion. Therefore, our use of the 8.5 inches of runoff is severely limited and restricted.

Of the water now used by industries, irrigators, and others, a substantial part is actually consumed by evaporation and transpiration as it goes into the various processes controlled by man. The rest of it may be altered to a degree depending on the processes through which it goes, but fortunately it eventually is discharged back into the streams or into the ground and is available for reuse as it travels on its path toward the sea.

Thus, the comparison of availability and use of water on a national basis is complex and has many ramifications. However, it appears safe to say, despite the fact that accurate and detailed information is not available, that perhaps several times as much water is available throughout the country as a whole as is now used or consumed. All of which leads to the bold statement that our Nation's water supply as a whole is entirely adequate for all present needs.

However, it does not follow that our water supply is adequate for an indefinite length of time in the future. Nor does it by any means follow that our local supplies in every case are even now adequate.

Instead, as I stated in the beginning, there are many localities throughout the country today, including widespread areas in certain places, where the presently available supplies have been developed to such an extent that serious problems have resulted. In some of these places additional supplies cannot be obtained within the present economic limits, and decentralization of population, industries, and agriculture is a real possibility. In other places, additional water can be obtained, but it will cost more, and the problem is to obtain it in the best and cheapest way.

These problems in the aggregate are very real and are of grave concern to the people who are experiencing them. They cannot be taken lightly. It is one thing to say water problems may be solved by decentralization of man's activities, and another thing to carry it out. We must do everything within our ability to solve the existing problems if possible without such decentralization, and to anticipate and prevent other problems from occurring in the future.

The major way to solve water shortages still appears to be to make better use of water that is already available in our streams or ground-water reservoirs, and which in large part is not now being used or is being ruined by pollution. To do this effectively we need more water data.

Some water-supply problems can be solved by importation of surface water from other drainage areas that have a surplus. Others might be solved by elimination of pollution upstream, making the existing supplies more usable. Impounding of streams salvages flood waters and also lessens pollution problems by using the stored water to supplement stream flow during periods of low flow. Multipurpose dams and drainage basin developments are helping a great deal in many parts of the country.

Another means of solving many local problems is to make better use of our ground-water reservoirs. By and large, the development of these reservoirs will not make more total water available, at least away from coastal areas and away from places where the ground water is now being used by wasteful phreatophytes, for if not developed the water will seep out into streams and be available as stream flow. However, ground-water reservoirs do have several natural advantages that in general have not been fully utilized. The most important advantage is position. Much of our country is underlain by water-bearing formations of one kind or another through which water may move great distances before being withdrawn from wells. Thus, nature does a part of the job of collecting and transporting the water to the points of use. Many of these water-bearing formations are tremendous underground reservoirs. As with surface reservoirs, they collect water in wet periods and store it for use in dry periods. Two special advantages of the underground reservoirs are freedom from large evaporation losses and freedom from sedimentation.

As the press has proclaimed, in some places the ground-water reservoirs are already being utilized to the maximum extent possible under natural recharge conditions, and in a few areas are even overdeveloped. But in many other places there are large undeveloped supplies available which might very well be used. Their use would be the means of salvaging water which otherwise seeps out into the oceans or into streams where it is not needed or where it cannot be impounded for use.

Furthermore, there is the possibility of augmenting the natural recharge of our ground-water reservoirs by artificially recharging with surface water which otherwise would run off to waste during high flow, or which in some cases would be partially lost by evaporation from surface reservoirs. Such practice is termed water spreading. By such practice, the ground-water reservoirs might be made to serve almost identically as surface reservoirs, to store excess water during high flow for later use when flow is small. Such unique use of underground reservoirs is already being practiced on a fairly large scale in California and on Long Island, N. Y., and on a smaller scale in other parts of the country. Effective utilization in this manner of more of these underground reservoirs, including the ones whose natural recharge is already fully developed, it is believed, will go far toward remedying the situation many localities face today, where supplies are plentiful most of the year, but are short in times of dry weather.

The most urgent prerequisite to undertaking these various solutions of our existing and pending water problems is more basic water facts. We can talk in general terms about our water resources, and for many areas we do have adequate basic data, but for much of the country our current store of such facts is pitifully meager. The general tendency in the past has been to take water for granted, and not to worry "until the well goes dry." Now we are being given cause for worry. It will be impossible, of course, to go back into history and gather satisfactory data on stage, flow, recharge, discharge, and quality-of-water changes with time—those facts, once gone, are gone forever. However, for the future, and to help solve the serious water problems of the present, we can make a beginning at the earliest possible time to develop comprehensive programs for collecting and analyzing the water-resources data that will be necessary for sound development. Careful detailed appraisal of our water resources and the establishment of an adequate water accounting system for our major sources of supply will materially assist in solving our present water-supply problems, and will provide a basis for the prevention of future problems of increased magnitude.

Capitalistic Common Sense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 11, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Altoona Tribune of May 9, 1950:

CAPITALISTIC COMMON SENSE

So deeply have prejudice and class hatreds been sown in America in recent years by political opportunists that too many people these days refuse to face common sense, are afraid, indeed, to consider it for fear that they may be victimized by clever propaganda.

Adherents of big government, in their quest for political power in this country, have used a line borrowed from the Communists for many years. That line is to pit the rich against the poor, the successful against the unsuccessful, and capital and management against labor.

We in America have started paying the bill for that kind of rotten politics. The Alger Hiss-Whittaker Chambers case, the Bentley charges, the Budenz accusations, the McCarthy investigation may be traced back to this vicious departure from Americanism * * * this political strategy of creating issues to champion against the established business and very economic system of America.

The Government has been pushing an investigation of monopoly in American business and industry. Mr. Ernest T. Weir, chairman of the board of the National Steel Corp., denied to a House monopoly investigating committee the other day that monopoly actually does exist within the industry.

The mere fact of bigness has centered Government action on the steel industry, as on others of the basic American businesses. Yet, it is illogical to assume that the steel industry could be small. By its very nature it must be big. A railroad never could be a small industry; by its very nature, it, too, must be big. What small-business man, or operator of any kind, could set up a steel mill? Blast furnaces, rolling mills cost millions. What small-business man could set up a railroad?

Both industries are vast. But they have multiple owners * * * thousands of them * * * their stockholders. They make big business possible, and they alone make it big.

There is, in a very real sense, the essence of democracy in our big industry. Of course, it has controlling geniuses, men of skill and initiative and vision to direct it. But its ownership is vested, with few exceptions, in the thousands who hold the stock, who buy the bonds, a majority of whom are just average Americans who want good investment for small savings.

Mr. Benjamin Fairless, president of United States Steel Corp., made one of these common sense talks the other day. Prejudice on the part of many misled Americans may blind them to his wisdom. But, if they should think a moment, they must see it, as true Americans.

Mr. Fairless himself comes under the "capitalist" category. Yet, his father was a coal miner. Fairless worked his way through school, his father didn't pay the way. He went to work on the Wheeling Railroad as a civil engineer, and he worked his way to the top the American way, the hard way, no politician to smooth his path, nobody to "pay his freight."

The Communists call him a "capitalist," and they sneer when they say it.

Does that make Mr. Fairless good, or bad? Does that detract from his words of wisdom?

Here are some of them:

"Our economic system is in deadlier peril today than ever before. Yet, I do not fear communism because every day proves its utter failure. I do not fear fascism because it has killed the three great nations which adopted it. I do not fear outright socialism because in Europe today, socialism itself is living on the dole, and America is the only country on earth that is able to foot the bill for it.

"But when somebody in Washington starts telling me how much he loves free enterprise and how he proposes to save it from itself, I shake in my very shoes. I wonder why it is that these self-appointed saviors of our national welfare always seem to miss the point.

"The point is that our American system of free enterprise, competitive enterprise, is the only one left in the world that is not controlled by power-hungry politicians, and whether you call it the Square Deal, the New Deal, the Fair Deal or just plain Federal regulation, the fact remains that once the dead hand of politics gets its convulsive grip on American business and industry, free competition will be strangled, and our economic system will be no different, and no more successful, than those noble experiments which are crumbling into dust in Europe."

Address by Senator Martin Before Presbyterian Chaplains' Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 11 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] at the Presbyterian chaplains' dinner, held at the Shoreham Hotel on May 9, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM ADDRESS OF UNITED STATES SENATOR EDWARD MARTIN, OF PENNSYLVANIA, BEFORE THE PRESBYTERIAN CHAPLAINS' DINNER OF THE MILITARY CHAPLAINS ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES AT THE SHOREHAM HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D. C., TUESDAY EVENING, MAY 9, 1950

America is a deeply religious Nation.

We rejoice in the spiritual strength of our people, established on abiding faith in God and the teachings of the Holy Bible.

We are proud that in every corner of our land churches of every religious denomination preach the word of God, free from all governmental regulation or restriction.

In the early days of our history the deep religious convictions of the pioneers sustained and strengthened them in the face of grave dangers and terrible hardships.

When trappers and traders crossed the mountains to establish homes in the wilderness and the plains of the West, they were accompanied by courageous men, dedicated to the service of God.

Those heroic Americans carried with them Bibles, axes, and rifles, symbols of faith, truth, and righteousness; hard work and thrift; courage, self-reliance, and love of liberty.

In the growth and development of the United States we have had times of trial and crisis.

We have had financial depressions. We have had bloody conflict within our own borders. We have had wars to preserve American liberty from foreign aggression.

We have experienced periods of reckless and extravagant living. We have had times when the spiritual side was at a low ebb because we placed too much emphasis on material gain.

But, fortunately, from every period of crisis the great majority of our people have emerged strengthened in faith and in firm conviction that God rules in the affairs of men.

The great majority did not forget the teachings of the Ten Commandments, the Golden Rule, and the Sermon on the Mount.

One outstanding reason why North America has made so much greater progress than South America was expressed by a student of history some years ago. He said that the early settlers of South America were seeking gold while those who settled North America came in search of God.

The United States will live and prosper so long as we continue the search for God in our daily lives.

Americans are a peace-loving people. We have never engaged in a war of conquest or aggression. We know that war does not rightfully settle differences among men or nations.

Nevertheless, we recognize that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty. We must be prepared always to defend American freedom and independence against the threat of tyranny and enslavement.

We have always fought to preserve those rights and liberties of the individual which we hold to be derived from the Creator of all mankind.

The essence of American patriotism is willing sacrifice to sustain the rights, freedoms, privileges, and opportunities enumerated in the Declaration of Independence and given force and effect by the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

The strength of American military force is based on high morale.

From early Colonial days our defense services have recognized the importance of religion among our soldiers. The morale of the American Army depends greatly upon the spiritual attainments of the officers and men. It is developed through tolerance, self-denial, respect for the rights of others and devout love of God.

Ministers who wear the uniform of the United States learn to work together in love and harmony.

The relations between a real commander or a leader of a unit and his chaplain should be as close as those of members of the same family. The chaplain should be his constant advisor. When the commander is depressed by problems, hunger, losses, and defeat, he can gain new strength from the spiritual advice and guidance of his chaplain.

Many heroic deeds are recorded in the history of World War II. But none stands out with greater glory than the self-sacrifice of the four Army chaplains whose memory will be honored wherever Americans meet in the name of brotherhood.

None of us can recall the heroism of these men of God without profound reverence and deep humility.

Standing on the sinking deck of a torpedoed transport their thoughts were not for themselves but for others. In their glorious hours of surpreme trial and sacrifice they offered their lives that others might live.

Giving their life preservers to enlisted men they stood, hand in hand, with prayer in their hearts and on their lips for the safety of the survivors.

Two were of the Protestant faith, one a Catholic priest, one a Jewish rabbi—all true servants of God and their fellow men. Each, in the manner of his own belief, prayed to the same God, the Creator of all mankind.

Their honored memory calls upon all Americans for greater faith in all religions and for deeper devotion to the sacred principles for which they gave their lives so heroically.

In my own military experience I have known many tragic moments when differences in form of worship faded into insignificance.

I recall particularly an event of World War I which has made an unforgettable impression upon me. In the fierce fighting around Courmont, in France, the headquarters of the One Hundred and Tenth Infantry were blown up. There were many casualties. Three boys from western Pennsylvania were among the fatally wounded—one a Catholic, one a Protestant, and the third a Jewish boy.

In their dying moments they were ministered to by two chaplains, one of the Catholic faith, the other a Protestant.

No Hebrew chaplain was available but the Jewish boy was not neglected or overlooked. The prayer that ascended to heaven was said by the Protestant clergyman who also administered the last rites to the Catholic boy.

The Catholic priest was at the side of the Protestant boy, bringing the comfort of hope and faith to a soldier who died for his country.

I cannot recall that day without realizing how trifling our worldly differences are when the soul of a hero goes to meet his God.

America is again in a time of crisis. We live in a period of world-wide unrest and danger.

It is a time when we cannot preach too forcefully the need for loyal adherence to the principles of religion, patriotism, and high moral standards without which no nation, however strong, can long survive.

This is no time for men to prevail in politics, business, labor, or the professions who have bitterness in their hearts or selfishness in their souls.

We must break down the barriers that divide us. We must cleanse our land of intolerance, hate, and prejudice. We must strengthen the moral fiber of American citizenship.

The United States must be kept strong and sound financially, physically, and spiritually.

Yes; America is again in a time of crisis.

We pray that we may never again be forced into the horror and the tragedy of war.

But if the time should come when we must defend our liberty and independence, let us foster and inspire deeper understanding and wider acceptance of the sacred ideals that have made the United States the greatest nation of all times.

Toward the achievement of that objective no group will take a more important part than the chaplains of our armed forces.

New Formula Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SID SIMPSON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 11, 1950

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial of May 8 from the Quincy Herald-Whig, Quincy, Ill.:

NEW FORMULA NEEDED

Roosevelt's desperate hope that the Soviet Government would learn to cooperate as a member of the world organization, the United Nations, has not been fulfilled. Five years after San Francisco many agencies of the United Nations are in tight deadlocks. On the eve of the anniversary of the first conference Secretary Trygve Lie has set out in somber mood to explore the possibilities of making the wheels turn again, even mechanically. He hopes to wind up his journey in Moscow.

It was the same motive that actuated his predecessor, Woodrow Wilson, and it became more and more dominant in Roosevelt's thinking as the conflict neared the end. Wilson accepted an unsatisfactory peace settlement in the conviction that the League of Nations provided the machinery for correcting the inequities of the treaties. After Yalta, especially, Roosevelt pinned all his hopes for a fair and amicable adjustment of Russian claims, which already deeply disturbed him, on the confidence he expected to grow out of membership in the United Nations. In his last days he was consumed with impatience to get the covenant signed and sealed before hostilities ceased. He kept telling those about him that there would be no peace unless the fighting coalition was bound irrevocably together in a working system for collective security before the war was won.

It was a case of trying a formula different from the one that failed to work in Wilson's time but different conditions are faced. In Germany the victors are taking a different line from that pursued after the first World War, but there is less assurance every day that it will be more successful. In both cases new elements change the picture. And old forces—expansionism and rooted suspicion in Russia, power and pride in Germany—are seldom given due weight in the assumption that the way to avoid previous errors is to adopt the contrary method. The United Nations succeeded the League because such an organization has to exist, but perhaps the best way to make it work is to forget what was done in San Francisco and what was not done in Geneva and strike out with an entirely new formula.

The Near East Armaments Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 11, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, the State Department's reply of May 5 to the communication of the 51 representatives of May 3 to the Secretary of State, the Honorable Dean Acheson, is painfully disappointing. It is simply a repetition of the allegations of the Department of State during the last 3 months.

Mr. Acheson's assurance that "there has been no indication that the United Kingdom is diverting any undue proportion of its resources into military production" is, to put it mildly, misleading. The amount and kind of arms which England is diverting to the Arabs may not represent an undue proportion of England's resources, but it certainly is out of proportion to the Arabs' ordinary needs for defense unless it intended for aggressive purposes.

Mr. Acheson closes his eyes to the fact that there is an inconsistency between words and deeds; that there is a conflict between the declared policy of the United States relative to peace in the Near East, and particularly between Israel and the Arab states, and the disproportionate shipment of arms by England to the Arab states, which is the very negation of the American policy.

Pious words which are nullified by action are not only meaningless, they are even cruel—cruel to the infant State of Israel, whose very life is being threatened by this overwhelming delivery of arms to the Arab states by England with the blessings of the Department of State. We call upon Mr. Acheson to establish a harmony-in-fact between words and deeds.

Accidents—Bruce Barton's Column

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 11 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a column by Bruce Barton, published in a recent issue of the Seattle Post Intelligencer, in which Mr. Barton suggests that plenty of leeway should be allowed for accidents in making life plans.

There being no objection, the column is orderd to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ACCIDENTS

A young man asks: "Should I have a plan for my life?"

Yes. But allow plenty of leeway for accidents.

When I graduated from college my picture was printed in a Chicago morning newspaper: "Chicago Boy Makes Good."

The publisher of some little magazine in Chicago saw the picture, sent for me, and asked what I was going to be.

I told him a professor of American history.

"How do you know you want to be a professor?" he asked. "You have never been anywhere except school. You should take a year in business; then you would have other experience to compare with academic life. Come into my business for a year."

So I hooked up with the printing press for a year, and never got unhooked. If that man had read the other Chicago newspaper that morning, my whole life would have been different.

It was by just that sort of fluke that the career of Alfred P. Sloan, of General Motors, was changed. When he graduated from Massachusetts Institute of Technology he couldn't connect with any big firm; his first salary was a few dollars a week from a man named Hyatt, who had one ambition—to make a synthetic billiard ball.

Hyatt never realized this dream. Instead of billiard balls, he developed a process for manufacturing roller bearings.

At first the business was small and almost insolvent. Sloan persuaded his father, a wholesale grocer in Brooklyn, to put $100,000, half of his life's savings into it. The father's other $100,000 was invested in good, sound securities. The good, sound securities all went sour.

But the automobile came along and made Hyatt a big company almost overnight. Sloan and his father sold out their $100,000 interest to W. C. Durant, as a part of United Motors, for $15,000,000. Later, Durant merged United Motors into General Motors, and Sloan was merged with it.

"So, you see, it was just a series of accidents," he told me.

By all means, have a plan. But keep your eye peeled for the accidents. They often are more important than the plan.

One other suggestion. Don't fall into the prevalent habit of leaning back and letting the big planners in Washington make the plans for you. They promise to employ you, and clothe and feed you. But when you sit down at their table the seating arrangement is always the same. They sit at the top of the table and are first served. You sit at the foot, near the cashier. You get the check.

Alcohol and Blabbermouths in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 11, 1950

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Clipsheet of the Board of Temperance of the Methodist Church:

ALCOHOL, WASHINGTON, BLABBERMOUTHS, WAR

Currently, a remarkable open letter to the President of the United States, signed by Billy Rose, is appearing in newspapers throughout the country which carry his column, Pitching Horseshoes.

Mr. Rose makes the statement that an editor of a national magazine with more than 15,000,000 readers (is there more than one such magazine?) not so long ago was present at a dinner party in Georgetown, a community of the city of Washington, and over a postprandial brandy was told by a high-ranking official just how many atom bombs the United States has, where they are stored, and the security measures effective in that area. "Fortunately," remarks Mr. Rose, "the editor in question is a man of responsibility and discretion." He continues, however, that the recipient of this information is of the opinion that Washington is currently "a-bursting with blabbermouths" who, at the drop of a daiquiri, are perfectly ready to blurt out classified information to anyone who cares to listen, "including those who cash their pay checks in the First National Bank of Moscow." Mr. Rose concludes his letter with a postscript that calls attention to the fact that the per capita consumption of liquor in Washington is greater than it is in any State of the Union. The damage which has been done to this country, and is now being done to this country, by alcohol consumption on the leadership level constitutes a peril difficult to overestimate.

The Board of Temperance of the Methodist Church has repeatedly, and with the greatest earnestness in recent years, called attention to the fact that it is here the damage and danger of the alcohol custom, promoted under law for profit, imperils the very life of the United States and the future of civilization.

Alcoholism is not the alcohol problem—it is only one phase of it, a relatively small phase of it. More important is the fact that the consumption of alcohol causes blabbermouths, that persons in places of responsibility are by it made irresponsible, that it results in wrong political and military decisions, and this at a time when even one wrong decision may mean disaster, final and complete.

The scientific principle involved is expressed thus:

Alcohol successively weakens and suspends the hierarchy of functions of the brain, and therefore of the mind, in the order from above downward; that is to say, in the inverse order of their development in the individual and in the race. For the emotional dispositions or capacities are a very ancient racial endowment and have their physiological seats in the basal ganglia, the lowest levels of the great brain, the part which alone is represented in the brains of the lower vertebrates. The higher intellectual faculties, on the other hand, are the latest acquired and are connected with the anatomically highest and last developed parts of the brain.

This is the effect of alcohol which is the all-important effect, and which has nothing to do with drunkenness, which, on the contrary, is brought about by the consumption of relatively small amounts of alcohol, such amounts as are commonly consumed at cocktail parties and dinners, where men meet other men for casual social talk.

It is a reasonable deduction from the known effect of alcohol as commonly consumed, that drinking may have been in large part responsible for the fundamental misconception at Yalta which has had such terrible results. With the international communistic conspiracy, brutal and bloody beyond description, shutting off vast areas of the world from the light of freedom, closing the Baltic Sea to the western nations, probing at the defense lines of free men with provocative aggressions, the time has come to call upon all men in places of political or military responsibility to adopt a policy of total abstinence from the use of alcohol as an inherent obligation of their position, in order that the nation may be wisely led in this time of increasing peril.

Tax Exemption of Cooperatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES J. DELANEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 11, 1950

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from America, by Hon. Walter A. Lynch:

COOPERATIVES AND TAX EXEMPTION

Should cooperatives pay income taxes? This controversial question is posed for the thoughtful consideration of the readers of America. It is a vexing problem, and one to which this writer will not, in this article, attempt to give the answer. The affirmative and negative sides of the question were recently argued by more than two score of witnesses before the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives.

There are some who believe the question is too hot a political potato for the committee to handle in an election year. Others are of the opinion that no really comprehensive study and consideration of the problem by the committee was possible in the 2 days of public hearings. It is a fact that while witnesses were presenting their carefully prepared statements, there were at times only two or three members of the committee in attendance. This was due neither to a lack of interest on the part of the members nor to any discourtesy toward the witnesses, but was caused solely by the fact that the days set for the hearings were unfortunately the 2 days when the opponents of a fair employment practices law were using every parliamentary device to block that legislation. Quorum calls, teller votes, and yea-and-nay votes were so numerous that the committee members worked in relays in their endeavor to hear witnesses.

Nevertheless, a group composed of well-organized businessmen seems determined to get action in this session. Its spokesmen point to the existing tax treatment of cooperatives as a loophole in the tax structure and of cooperatives as a revenue source which neither the President nor Secretary of the Treasury Snyder mentioned in the tax program submitted to the Congress.

HISTORY OF OUR CO-OPS

In the consideration of the question it might be well to take a look at the role of the cooperative in the economic history of our country. It is beyond question that the profit system is the bone and sinew of the American way of life. It has made America great by opening up vast opportunity for the enterprise of individuals.

As a result of the profit system, the country has developed a revenue structure based principally upon the taxation of income. Nearly 75 percent of the revenues for the general operation of the Government, national defense, and the commitments the Government has made abroad toward peace and world security come from the taxes imposed on the net incomes of individuals and corporations.

Our economy and tax structure are lashed firmly to the principle of private enterprise for profit. Yet it has been the policy of the Government to encourage the establishment of cooperatives which claim to be nonprofit in character. An apparent conflict that could, perhaps, be safely ignored in 1940, when income taxes amounted to only $2,000,000,000, may require critical reappraisal in 1950, when taxes on corporate and individual profits are estimated at nearly $30,000,000,000.

The cooperative business organization in American history dates back to 1752, when Benjamin Franklin joined with others in setting up a mutual fire-insurance society. Farmer cooperatives, however, originated as a natural outgrowth of the profit system, for as farmers began to grow more cash crops they also began to try out cooperative methods of selling to get better prices.

In 1820, livestock raisers in Ohio made joint shipments to a terminal factory. Nearly a hundred years ago a cooperative cheese factory and a creamery were established in New York State and a cooperative grain elevator was started in Wisconsin.

By the turn of the century mutual fire-insurance companies, irrigation associations, cooperative creameries, grain elevators, and fruit-marketing associations were commonplace. Between 1900 and 1920 the number of farm marketing co-ops almost doubled, as farmers learned to organize regional cooperative associations of local cooperatives, such as the Dairymen's League Cooperative Federation of New York and the Farmers' Union Livestock Commission Associations of Omaha and other midwestern cities.

When farm prices broke in 1920 and 1921, farmers' marketing cooperatives were utilized to control the supply and movement to market of various farm commodities, including wheat, cotton, and tobacco.

The importance of this new function of the cooperative was recognized by the Federal Government in the Capper-Volstead Act, which resolved any doubt about the exemption of co-ops from the provisions of the antitrust laws. Moreover, their exemption from Federal income taxes was broadened. At the same time there was a flood of State statutes on the organization of cooperatives.

With the passage of the Agricultural Adjustment Act in 1933, farm cooperatives returned to the problem of better merchandising methods and left the job of controlling agricultural production to the Government.

Between 1920 and 1930, when most of this legislation was enacted, the estimated total farmer co-op business ranged from $1,300,000,000 to $2,500,000,000, and the number of farmers' marketing and purchasing associations grew from approximately 7,000 to nearly 12,000. Today the number of such farmer associations is closer to 10,000, but the estimated volume of business is $8,600,000,000.

Businessmen engaged in purchase, storage, and processing of farm products, and dealers in feed, farm implements and hardware, fertilizer and other farm necessities complain bitterly about competition from the farmer cooperatives. They point out that in 1930 the Federal corporate tax rate was only 12 percent, in comparison with the 38-percent rate today. (While smaller corporations pay a tax of 21 to 25 percent on an income of less than $25,000, they must pay 53 percent on earnings between $25,000 and $50,000.)

Businessmen contend that Federal tax exemption is the explanation for the increase in the volume of cooperative business and for the rapid rise in co-op net worth. They charge that the tax savings provide capital funds for the expansion of co-op activities—for the purchase of refrigeration plants for the storage of fruits, creameries for the bottling of milk and cream and processing of butter and cheese, gins and warehouses for cotton, oil wells, cracking plants, pipelines and filling stations supplying fuel oil and gasoline to the farmers, and for many other ventures.

The members and supporters of cooperatives answer that cooperatives should pay no Federal income tax because they are founded and operated to do business without making any profit. The doubtful value of the Federal tax exemption to farmer cooperatives is underscored by the fact that only about 60 percent of them take the trouble to qualify for the exemption. They embrace the view, expressed by Secretary of Agriculture Brannan, that "the existing tax status of farmer cooperatives is an aid to agriculture and is fully justified in the public interest."

Both sides admit that the heart of the issue is the practice of the Bureau of Internal Revenue of allowing all cooperatives—city consumer co-ops as well as farmer co-ops—to subtract from their total income the amount they pay out in patronage refunds, and to compute their tax on the remainder. In the case of consumers' and purchasing cooperatives, the patronage refunds are treated as an overcharge return to customers. In the case of marketing cooperatives, the patronage refund is considered as additional cost of goods sold. Co-op supporters argue that a commerical business obligated to return its profit to customers could also deduct such refunds in figuring out its taxable income.

Competing businessmen retort that the patronage-refund ruling is abused by the issuance of "scrip" dividend notes payable at some indefinite time in the future. They say that, since farmers are not actually refunded the cash, the cooperative has a tax-free source of retained earnings for investment and expansion that is driving its competitors to the wall. And, they add, "although these patronage dividends are supposed to be taxable income to the farmer in the year received, we'll bet that very few patronage refunds ever show up on a Form 1040–F."

The patience and wisdom of a Solomon may be required to resolve the conflicting views. Meanwhile, however, individual businessmen are crying, "Don't look to me for higher taxes. I am going out of business. I cannot compete with the tax-free cooperative."

"Nor to us," says the president of a farm-implement company. "We are turning cooperative. We will work for a salary and not for profit."

Of course, a dividend credit to eliminate the double taxation of corporate income would solve the problem; but this is so expensive to the revenues as to make the enactment of such remedial legislation in the immediate future extremely doubtful. Meanwhile, if modification of the existing tax treatment of cooperatives should be enacted, perhaps the next barefoot step along this thorny tax-exempt path would be an analysis of the Federal tax status of mutual savings banks and savings-loan associations.

Interest is mounting in the need of an over-all revision of our tax structure. Perhaps the question of whether cooperatives should pay income taxes should not be decided apart from a more general overhauling of sources of public revenue.

General Counsel of NLRB Is Policy Maker as Well as Prosecutor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 11, 1950

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, there is startling evidence that the NLRB general counsel is in a position not merely to prosecute, but also to interpret and apply the act.

Take, for example, the Taft-Hartley Act provision against excessive union initiation fees.

The act says that—

> In making such a finding the Board shall consider, among other relevant factors, the practices and customs of labor organizations in the particular industry and wages currently paid to the employees affected.

Notice that the act says "the Board shall consider," not "the general counsel shall consider." The act calls for collective deliberation by the members of the Board.

But the General Counsel alone can issue a complaint. The Board cannot issue one. If the general counsel believes that a given initiation fee is not excessive, nothing can be done.

A clear case of policy determination vested in a prosecutor.

The same thing is true with respect to the duty of unions and employers to bargain collectively. If the general counsel believes that a particular union or employer is excused from bargaining, or has fully satisfied its duty to bargain, he simply dismisses the case. The Board may believe that on the same state of facts the union or employer should bargain, or that it has not satisfied its obligations under law. But there is nothing the Board can do.

Even in election cases the Board cannot enforce its views without consent of its general counsel.

Only the Board can issue a certification. But this is not a binding order. An employer may refuse to honor a certification. A rival union may refuse to honor a certification.

Then, the matter is entirely up to the general counsel. He may prosecute or he may not prosecute. If, for any reason he refuses to prosecute, the Board certification is useless. It is a mere scrap of paper.

If an election is held during a strike and the strikers have been replaced, their eligibility to vote will depend on whether they went on strike against unfair labor practices by the employer, or for other reasons.

The Board members believe that they have no power to decide the cause of the strike unless the general counsel issues a complaint. This means the strikers cannot vote if the general counsel, for any reason, fails to issue a complaint. In this way action or inaction of the general counsel may determine the outcome of elections.

What we have at the Labor Board today is no mere separation of the prosecuting function. Great policy-making power, at the initial stages of labor disputes, is in the hands of a single officer. It is time we corrected this situation.

I urge approval of plan 12, by voting "no" on the disapproving resolution.

Present Divided Organization of NLRB Creates Confusion Among Field Personnel and Overemphasizes Litigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 11, 1950

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, one weakness of the present set-up at the Labor Board that has not received sufficient attention is the dual and uncertain control of staff. Under the law the five-man Board has power to appoint personnel. Under the same law, the general counsel, an entirely separate and independent agency, has general supervision of the Board's field and legal staffs.

Over 90 percent of the work of the agency is actually performed and completed in the field offices. Election cases are the final responsibility of the five-man Board, but they are largely handled by the field staffs whom the law places under the supervision of the independent general counsel. A man cannot serve two masters. Shall he try to please the Board which has power to hire him, or the general counsel who has statutory authority to supervise him? This might not present a real problem where the two separate and independent agencies work hand in glove. But the record demonstrates that this is not the case. Frequent and important differences of opinion and policy have arisen between the Board members on the one hand, and the general counsel on the other. Moreover, the statute, as written, contemplates their independence of each other. Under the circumstances it is impossible for an employee in a field office to know whose policies to follow. The result is insecurity, uncertainty, and inefficiency. Mr. Speaker, I know of no other Government agency whose employees are placed under a similar disability.

Another activity which ought to be carried out under the supervision of a single policy maker, is the function of securing compliance with the law through informal procedures and agreements. Under existing law, this function is performed by employees who take their orders, not from the policy-making five-man Board, but from a single, independent general counsel. Under the old Board field employees became proficient in closing out cases through voluntary compliance or agreement, and by securing compliance with Board orders after hearing, so as to make further litigation unnecessary. Now these same employees are under the supervision of a prosecutor. They take a prosecutor's point of view. The public comes to regard them as prosecutors. This has had a most unfortunate effect on field settlement efforts. The testimony of Board Member Styles before the Senate committee is particularly pertinent on this point because he was until recently in charge of a field office. He testified:

> One of the great weaknesses of the general counsel concept has been the difficulty of administration at the regional level, because people wanted to litigate; people said, "This is a statute under which you prosecute. Now, get out there and prosecute."
>
> The whole approach of the Board in the past, of all its regional offices, was "Let us get the public," the employer, back in those days, "to comply with the law. Let us talk him into complying with it. Let us settle these cases if we can."
>
> I noticed in my own regional office that, the minute the new act was passed, there was a tendency on the part of everyone, not confined only to the attorneys who ordinarily like to go to court, who, after all, spend years in law school anyhow to get into the courts, and what to do when they get there, but the field examiners themselves, the people who really do the work of the Board, to say, "Let us litigate."
>
> They dropped their settlement efforts to a large degree. (Senate hearings, p. 228.)

Staff members are not to be too much criticised for this. In view of the frequent disagreements between the Board and the general counsel the staff is no longer in a position to tell the public just exactly what is agency policy. The confusion resulting from disagreement between equal but independent agency heads filters down to the staff, and on to the public. Under such a setup, field examiners will shrink from expressing themselves on agency policy. The inevitable result is confusion, uncertainty, and needless litigation.

If the only thing accomplished by plan 12 were the clarification of this situation and a restoration of an agency staff secure in the knowledge of who their boss is, its adoption would be eminently worth while. For this reason, among many others, I shall vote against the resolution of disapproval.

Destructive Foreign Competition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 11, 1950

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, some weeks ago I called the attention of the House to the increasing threat to our textile industry by the infiltration of textiles from Japan. Since that time, I have been giving further thought and study to this problem, making investigations through every possible channel, but, as yet, I have not compiled the data I have in hand.

Manifestly, our textile industries with their high wages, the average textile worker in the United States receiving more for an hour's work than a Japanese textile worker receives for a day's work, cannot continue to compete under these circumstances.

Of course I intend to continue my studies and seek to prevent this evil un-American practice by every possible means.

I attach hereto a newspaper article pointing out that a committee of outstanding textile men are now in Japan and, of course, we shall be anxiously awaiting their report.

TEXTILE INDUSTRY WORRIED BY COMPETITION FROM ABROAD; PRODUCTION BEING CUT BACK

SLOW BUYING AT HOME EXPECTED TO IMPROVE IN FALL TRADE

NEW YORK, May 6.—Threats of competition from abroad, slow buying at home, and cutbacks in production have returned to harass the textile industry.

Trade sources say the slow buying and production curtailments are only temporary. They say they're looking forward to a good fall.

But foreign competition—that has them downright worried.

The possible influx of foreign textiles into the United States troubles them more than a little. And in addition, dollar-shy world markets are finding it more convenient to buy from sterling-area industries.

When cotton-textile exports from the United States drop, American mills must cut back production. When production is curtailed there are going to be unemployed textile workers.

How much unemployment will shrinking exports mean?

Take an export figure of 1,000,000,000 yards of cotton cloth a year. That was the total in 1948.

BILLION-YARD YEAR FINE

The Cotton Textile Information Service figures that means work for 50,000 persons and an annual payroll of $104,000,000.

A 1,000,000,000-yard year for exports is fine. Many in the industry consider 700,000,000 yards a satisfactory figure.

But cotton-textile exports are slipping. They dropped from a billion yards in 1948 to 980,000,000 yards last year. That isn't too much of a drop.

This year, however, figures for the first 2 months are at an annual rate of 420,000,000 yards. And that's not good.

The cotton men aren't just sitting back twiddling their thumbs. They're starting with a survey of the Japanese textile industry, one of our large competitors in world markets before the war.

A committee headed by Robert C. Jackson, of Charlotte, N. C., executive vice president of the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, has gone to Japan for a joint survey with British textile men.

Their purpose is to collect factual information for use as a possible foundation on which the industry can build a long-range policy for both domestic and world markets.

Japanese osnaburgs are an example of the things they are concerned over. Osnaburgs are a course cotton cloth used extensively for bag linings. They also are sometimes used for upholstery and sportswear.

REPORTS DISTURBING

Osnaburgs have been quiet in the domestic cotton textile market recently and mills specializing in that type of cloth have been disturbed by reports that substantial additional quantities of Japanese osnaburgs are scheduled to arrive here to compete with the American product.

Recently trade sources reported as much as 500,000 yards of Japanese osnaburgs had been sold here at 1 cent a yard under the comparable domestic fabric.

The domestic market for cotton textiles has been slow for some weeks. But most trade sources feel that the fourth quarter will be good. They do not expect a robust third quarter but they point out that normally is a slack period of vacation slowdowns.

At the minute folks just aren't buying. Hand-to-mouth purchasing has returned to the retail and converter markets.

The fabric-making mills have curtailed production by cutting back premium shifts—shifts on which overtime is paid. They prefer this to piling up inventories in slow times.

Many trade sources look on this type of action as healthy. They say mills are a little gun shy after a depressing experience a year ago.

KEEP GOODS MOVING

Rather than be left with a warehouse full of unsold goods they slow production a bit, confine their operation to filling orders they have in hand. And when buying starts again they'll be set to roll again full tilt.

The slackness in recent weeks has been noticeable in woolens and worsteds as well as in cottons.

But the wool men, too, feel it is a temporary situation. One wool-trade spokesman termed it a great waiting period during which everyone is attempting to determine a level at which to stabilize.

Keen competition for the consumer dollar has brought the slow buying at retail levels. This in turn has delayed orders for fall goods by the converter—the garment maker.

But comes fall, he adds, business should be excellent. One source even went so far as to forecast a scramble for delivery of fabrics.

Meanwhile the Government is calling for bids on various types of cloth. Recent Government orders for woolen and worsted goods amount to around 5,000,000 yards. And in the cotton field, the Army Quartermaster has asked for bids on a total of 5,670,000 yards of gray cotton duck.

These orders probably will help several mills bridge a gap.

Prices for civilian goods in the fall? Most textile men think there will be no significant change. They say they just don't see how there can be with raw material and labor costs high and no likelihood of material changes in either category.

FOREIGN TEXTILES SEEN SOUTH CAROLINA PAYROLL THREAT

UNION, May 9 (AP).—South Carolina's economy is inescapably linked with the textile industry, now harassed by a potential influx of goods from cheap-labor foreign countries, a writer-lecturer on textiles said here today.

Mrs. Mildred Barnwell Andrews, long identified with the cotton and cotton-textile industries, said American textile exports have shrunk sharply and that a large quantity of Japanese osnaburgs sold cheaply on the American markets recently.

Mrs. Andrews, who addressed the Union Rotary Club, said the loss of a billion-yard annual market by American mills—exports were that much in 1948, but shrank drastically last year—can be translated into the equivalent of 50,000 jobs and an annual payroll of $104,000,000.

The American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, she added, believes United States tariff policy should provide proper safeguards to the American textile industry and its more than 500,000 employees. A joint Anglo-American textile group now is in Japan on a fact-finding mission.

Only in recent years have textile mills been able to earn profits comparable with those of American industry as a whole, Mrs. Andrews declared. A large part of these earnings had been plowed back into modernization and research, she said.

She cited State labor department statistics showing that South Carolina cotton-manufacturing plants began 1950 with $358,901,038 capital investment, an increase of $110,081,983 over 1948. She said average employment increased from 95,181 in 1937 to approximately 125,000 in 1949.

"You get a payroll in this State from the textile industry of approximately $284,000,000 a year (the 1949 figure, which reflected a recession in the industry) but which nevertheless is an amazing increase from the $72,000,000 in 1937," she said.

"Just visualize the enormous purchasing power represented by the textile-mill employment in South Carolina, and you get some idea of why continuous employment in the textile industry is important."

Senator McCarthy's Charges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 11 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the Saturday Review of Literature, an eminent and respected periodical published in New York, recently ran an editorial entitled "Subversion in the Senate." The editorial is an exercise in irony and is thought provoking. I ask unanimous consent of the Senate to insert it in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUBVERSION IN THE SENATE

The editors of the Saturday Review have carefully studied the records of the congressional hearings into the charges against communism in the State Department. As a result we have reluctantly come to the inescapable conclusion that the chief participant must inevitably be a Communist. We refer to Senator MCCARTHY of Wisconsin. This conclusion is based on a working definition of Communists and secret agents as used by Senator MCCARTHY. We are glad to present the documentary evidence:

First, guilt by association. For 4 years Senator MCCARTHY has belonged to an organization of which a well-known member has been a prominent supporter of the policies of the Soviet Union. Moreover, Senator MCCARTHY has actually worked full-time for that organization. We refer to the Congress of the United States, of which VITO MARCANTONIO, a consistent party liner, has been a Member since 1935.

Second, guilt by smokescreen. Senator MCCARTHY, inferentially and otherwise, has stated that the public anti-Communist activities of such persons as Dorothy Kenyon and Philip Jessup are ostensibly only a cover-up for their real activities and sympathies. The greater the apparent opposition to communism, the greater the real affiliation. This being the case, it is clear that Senator MCCARTHY'S violent outbursts are merely intended to conceal his real sympathies somewhere on the other extreme. What better smokescreen than to attack the State Department of the United States?

Third, guilt by imitation. This is the most incriminating count of all, for it is apparent that Senator MCCARTHY has modeled his tactics after the notorious Russian purge trials. All the elements of justice in a democracy—due process of law, grand jury, presentation of direct evidence, the assumption that an individual is innocent until proved guilty—all these have been spurned by the Soviet as outworn bourgeois niceties. The Senator from Wisconsin has paid high honor to this Soviet conception of justice in his tactics on this matter; indeed, his use of slander and vilification under immunity bears an uncanny resemblance to the privileged position enjoyed by official character assassins of the Soviet Union.

Fourth, service to the cause. The easiest way to black any reasoned, impartial, and effective examination of subversion is through a helter-skelter, wild-jamboree approach that obscures the real problem. In addition, the damage to America's reputation abroad must be heartfelt satisfaction to those who have a large stake in the defamation of the United States. For this service to the cause the Senator is entitled to whatever distinctions the Kremlin can bestow.

Spending by Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 1950

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, in my several visits to my district, I repeatedly said that I would vote for every cut offered in the appropriation bill, and that I would vote against all attempts to increase the amounts.

Mr. Speaker, the country is deeply disturbed about the spending of the Federal Government. They are disturbed about the 16 years of deficit spending under the Democrats. They realize their money is being polluted and the dollar buys less and less. They realize that inflation and increased taxes are two Frankenstein monsters that can destroy our economic system.

Mr. Speaker, the committee has been considering the one package appropriation bill for 5 weeks. It is interesting to note that 45 amendments have been offered to increase items of expenditures and 35 of them came from the Democratic side of the aisle. There were 36 amendments offered to reduce various items, and only 5 of them came from the Democratic side. The other 26 came from the Republican side, and they were rejected. We never did have more than five or six votes for reductions from the Democratic side of the House. That, Mr. Speaker, is the record to date. Your party has voted for continued deficit spending and high taxes. You did not vote for economy.

The amendments offered by Mr. TABER, of New York, and Mr. JENSEN, of Iowa, should be adopted. They will mean a further reduction in the Federal Government of about 300,000 people and will cut appropriations about $1,500,000,000. I voted for these amendments and I hope that they stay in the final bill.

The administration is full of expensive plans and programs for leading the American people down the road to socialism. The programs grow and multiply. They all cost money. It means more taxes, inflation, and deficit spending.

The only way to stop deficit spending and balance the budget is to stop spending. It is just as simple as that. The Government is no different than the people. We must stop spending money for things we might want but do not necessarily need.

Mother's Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 11, 1950

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, Sunday, May 14th, the second Sunday in May, will be observed throughout the land as Mother's Day. Each of us in his own way will bestow love and devotion upon the best mother who ever lived, our own, and in so doing give honor where honor is due. It will be a wonderful day indeed.

This beautiful custom of setting apart one day in each year to pay just tribute to our mothers should never be abandoned or forgotten. We regard mother as the noblest, sweetest and best of all God's creations and in appreciation of her love and devotion pause to pay especial tribute to her this sacred day.

The real origin of Mother's Day dates back to the period immediately following the Civil War, when Mrs. Anna Reeves Jarvis, organized the mothers of her community in West Virginia. The avowed purpose at that time was the reuniting of families and invitations were extended to Union and Confederate soldiers and their families to meet, reestablish friendships and pleasant associations. The results were so encouraging and successful as to instill in the Jarvis family a sincere desire to promote on a national scale the spirit of love and honor. Miss Anna Jarvis, a daughter of Mrs. Anna Reeves Jarvis, a woman of keen intellect, broad vision, high ideals and commanding personality, developed and promoted the idea of honoring the Mothers of America, both living and dead. It was through her persevering efforts over a long period of time that Mother's Day has been officially recognized and proclaimed. Therefore, when paying tribute to our mothers, let us spare a fine thought of appreciation for Miss Jarvis, whose efforts made this special day possible.

The Biggest Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 11, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the seventeenth article by Mr. Frank C. Waldrop on the infiltration of communism in our country:

BIGGEST STORY
(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Communism, today, is an all-Russian power play. In every important country in the world there is now a tightly organized and carefully trained force of Russian agents whose sole aim and object is to carry out the purposes of Russian foreign policy.

There is a very simple way to distinguish between these Communists and the local political groups in any country.

In our own, for instance, we have a number of legally qualified political organizations seeking to elect their candidates to public offices.

The Communists here claim themselves, too, a political party with all the legal rights and powers of any other. But unlike any other group on these shores, the Communists take oaths of allegiance to something they called the Marxist-Leninist line.

That oath ties them to the Communists in France in Britain, in Germany—wherever other Communists may be—to fight and when need be, to die, for Stalin in Moscow.

Such is the Red thread that tied Dr. Klaus Fuchs, the German who became a Briton, to persons as yet undisclosed in the United States of America, and so resulted in the atom bomb being stolen for the Kremlin.

Such is the thread that binds the Harvard prize package, Alger Hiss, to the events of long ago and far away being reviewed here.

When you know how all this began, you know with certainty why things happen now and what to do about them.

And so it means something to us now that as soon as the Communists set up a government in Moscow in March 1918, they rebuilt the musical clock on the Spassky tower in the Kremlin so it would play not God Save the Czar, as of old, but the Internationale, world communism's fighting song.

Lev Davidovitch Bronstein, alias Leon Trotsky, knew why. He was home after years of exile and busy at the right hand of Lenin, the organizer of the Soviets.

In rapid order, Trotsky joined the Bolsheviks, became head of the Soviet foreign office, negotiated the peace of Brest-Litovsk with Germany that was the Kaiser's balance against United States entrance into Europe's war of 1914–18.

And then Trotsky became commissar for war, for he wanted to send Communist armies out against all the rest of the nations as soon as possible.

He was rolling high and wide with a private railroad train, a special commissary out of which to dole judicious gifts to factions that would remember him. For it was already obvious that among Communists as among all others, one boss follows another, sooner or later.

Trotsky, as Lenin's most spectacular lieutenant, was running with all his hands and feet and his lightning brain, to be next when Lenin would go over the river.

Trotsky was a really able soldier and he was a very clever plotter and deceiver. But Trotsky had one great weakness that turned out to be fatal. He was so vain that he could never see himself as others saw him.

He took flattery to be faithful adoration. And he was so interested in forming the Communist International that was to breed revolution abroad he overlooked something at home.

The consequences killed him.

He had failed to take care against somebody who was not a Russian at all, who did not care for drinking tea from a glass or wiggling his toes while he talked airily about "historical necessity" or "dialectical materialism" or explained to friends abroad the regrettable incident of machine-gunning the streets of Petrograd to "keep revolutionary discipline."

No. Lenin died, and Petrograd, which had been St. Petersburg, now became Leningrad. And Trotsky, unfortunately, was out of town when the boys got together to see who would be next up.

That was in 1924.

It took time, but just the same on January 20, 1929, the Gosudarstvennoye Politicheskoye Upravleniye, which means "state political board," and which we know as the GPU, issued the following order:

"Considered, the case of citizen Trotsky, Lev Davidovitch, under article 58/10 of the criminal code, on a charge of counterrevolutionary activity expressing itself in the organization of an illegal anti-Soviet party, whose activity has lately been directed toward provoking anti-Soviet activities and preparing for an armed struggle against the Soviet power.

"Resolved, citizen Trotsky, Lev Davidovitch, to be deported from the U. S. S. R."

The revolution was beginning to eat its own children.

Curtailment of Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 11 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD excerpts from a letter which I have received from a highly respected constituent, a close friend, and a leading surgeon in the city of New York, Dr. Richard Lewisohn, of 1155 Park Avenue, protesting against the curtailment of postal deliveries. The letter is typical of a large number of protests which I have received. I believe that it will interest the Members of the Senate.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I was delighted to see that you spoke against curtailment of postal deliveries in New York. I hope you will get strong support from your colleagues in the Senate. It seems ludicrous that the richest city in the world should cut down on mail service. They have three deliveries in the residential section of London and four in the business section; one delivery a day seems a joke, like RFD.

This is the first time in my life that I write to a Member of Congress. So please don't disappoint me.

Dynamic Republicanism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 1950

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, it gives me great pleasure to include an inspiring and enlightening speech by the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. LODGE]. I had the good fortune to hear this address delivered and felt that it was of sufficient importance to bring to the attention of the entire membership of the Congress.

DYNAMIC REPUBLICANISM

Ladies and gentleman, in Maxwell Anderson's play Valley Forge, George Washington says: "This liberty will look easy by and by when nobody dies for it." Well, it is less than 5 years since Americans were fighting and dying for freedom and yet our freedom is today more seriously threatened than at any time in our history. We cannot take freedom for granted. The great world conflict is still and most urgently a contest between freedom and slavery. In this battle what we do at home is inevitably related to our actions abroad. Indeed our ability to meet this somber challenge, to forge a less precarious peace will depend on what we do at home. It will depend in large part upon the survival of the two-party system.

If we had more than two major parties our political system would probably degenerate into a myriad of splinter parties reminiscent of Europe. We would in all likelihood have a minority government which would be far too weak to preserve political stability.

On the other hand, if we had less than two parties, we would have a one-party system and this would completely nullify our Constitution, neutralize our Bill of Rights, and invalidate all our free institutions. Our checks and balances would be but a nostalgic memory and there would be no separation of powers since all power would be concentrated in one partisan instrumentality.

The two-party system is the greatest bulwark of American freedom.

And yet we have a growing body of independent voters in America. More serious still, there were in the last presidential election some 45,000,000 people who failed to vote.

The independent voter represents the balance of power in our elections. To some extent this can be a healthy condition. It can put the major parties on their mettle. It can engender a fine spirit of political competition out of which the country can benefit. It can result in electing the best candidates to public office. It can produce sound policies and progressive programs.

But if independence of party is carried too far it can undermine our two-party system.

The increased independence of the American voter is in large part the fault of the parties themselves. It is due to an inability to make the parties attractive to a larger number of people. The Republican Party contains people of varying views, and this is natural since our party is a national party and since our country includes many races, creeds, occupations, and climates. Politics is in large part the art of conciliating varying and differing groups of people, of bringing them in and keeping them in under one partisan roof. The Republican Party must convince a majority of the people who vote that it has a constructive plan of action which will respond more effectively to the needs and aspirations of all the people than the tired clichés, the reckless promises and the special interest appeals with which the Democrats have in recent years preyed upon the fears and apprehensions of the voters.

But this electoral independence is also, it seems to me, due to the fact that many people do not associate themselves with the political life of the Nation. It is due to the tendency of many independent voters to think that if the Republican Party should fall by the wayside, if it should succumb for lack of adherents, or because of an excess of independents, then that is "tough luck" for the Republicans. That is hard on the office-holders and on the party workers. It is none of their affair. Yet it is, I fear, desperately true that the disappearance of the Republican Party would affect them as much as it would affect the Republicans. It would affect the Democrats. It would deeply affect the lives of all Americans. The American people have a great stake in the survival of the Republican Party. The independent voter depends for his independence upon the survival of the two-party system.

Narrow partisanship is, of course, deplorable. Partisanship which places party above patriotism, patronage above principle, and personalities above policies is highly reprehensible. Yet the best way to discourage such sordid attitudes and such demagogic practices is not to retire to the sidelines in derisive independence but rather to plunge into the political melee and endeavor to influence the party of one's choice in the direction of the people's real welfare. The best, the only way to be effective politically is through the medium of one of our two major parties. We cannot give a vigorous demonstration that we believe enthusiastically in our kind of government unless an increasing number of Americans become increasingly active in politics.

In creating a broader base of political participation it is vital that the young people of America should play a prominent part. Based upon a Census Bureau estimate of July 1949 there are some 24,000,000 people in this country between the ages of 21 and 30. It is only by strong infusions of new blood that the Republican Party will survive as a vital and effective political force. The Republican Party is, in its original concept and by its best traditions, the party of youth, the party of new ideas, the party of individual freedom. We are the young Turks, the insurgents. We are the party of reform.

Some Republicans contend that the reason for our lack of success at the polls is that the Republican Party has become infested with a point of view which has been labeled me-tooism. Others maintain that Republican defeats are due to a philosophy which has been described as reaction. The result of this pulling and hauling has been to create a spirit of division, defeatism, and defection which has prevented us from going forward as an integrated and dynamic team. It seems clear to me that if our choice is indeed between copying the Democrats on the one hand and a die-hard horse-and-buggy philosophy on the other, then we are deservedly doomed not only to defeat but to disappearance. Happily for the American people, this is not our choice. That this is not our choice is underscored by the interesting fact that an increasing number of northern Democrats, anxious to appease the growing apprehension among the people of our country, have been talking increasingly about the merits of the private-property free-enterprise system, about the need for economy in government, about our great tax burden and about a strong antiappeasement policy. In sober truth they are becoming me-too Democrats.

Now there is no occasion for us to respond defensively to the personal abuse and name-calling of the Democrats. If they choose to wallow in the weasel words of recrimination and demagoguery then let them be hoist with their own political profanity. We must attack. We must take the offensive. We must fight the great battles on the broad highways of Nation-wide debate and not in the side streets and back alleys of Pendergast politics.

There is no lack of momentous issues to be thrashed out during this election year. There are many grave public questions on which we can take a strong and vital stand without on the one hand betraying the timeless principles on which our party was founded or on the other hand espousing a weak and ignominious philosophy which would require us to rubber stamp every half-baked New Deal proposal.

For instance, we should take a strong stand on civil-rights legislation. The Democrats are weak, apologetic, and divided in this whole field, and while the Democrats have been arguing with each other and maneuvering for partisan advantage we have been acting in the best interests of all. We must continue this activity. It is right, it is just, and it is in the best Republican—Lincolnian—tradition.

On labor legislation we should floodlight the shocking hypocrisy of the Democrats. The Democrats have done great damage to the cause of labor by their determination to treat the welfare of the working men and women of America as a political football rather than as a matter involving the public interest. We should remind the voters that when the repeal of the Taft-Hartley law was brought to the floor of the House, out of 263 Democrats only 30 voted for repeal. We should recall that these same Democrats who voted against repeal campaigned on the cynical slogan that they favored repeal. These are the self-styled friends of the common man who referred to the Taft-Hartley law as a slave-labor law. And then we can point out that these same Democrats not only voted against repeal of the Taft-Hartley law but also voted against virtually all Republican-sponsored amendments which would liberalize the law, eliminate its most serious defects, and accommodate it to changing circumstances.

We can discuss the question of high taxes and point out the many hidden taxes which are depriving the people of this country of a large share of their earnings. It was Abraham Lincoln who said that a man is entitled to the fruits of his labor. While recognizing that our Government needs a large revenue at this time of crisis and change, we should point out that an early implementation of the Hoover Commission reports and recommendations can bring about great economies. We have a duty to do this in spite of the fact that the Hoover Commission reports and recommendations are not a partisan matter and because of the fact that there is a lamentable tendency in some administration bureaucrats to block a proper streamlining of our Government. Surely even those who want the Government to do so much must want it done without waste and with efficiency.

We can point out that job security is more important than unemployment compensation, however necessary that may be, and we can add that job security is fast disappearing not only because of the import of goods from iron-curtain countries but also because of the absence of adequate incentives for equity investments. The grab-bag policy of this administration deters our citizens from investing their savings and thus providing new jobs. It has been estimated that the average job in America requires a $6,000 investment. It is a disservice to labor to discourage such investments.

We can remind the people also that while the Democratic Party is talking loud and long about security, they are resorting to the very policies which undermine security. They are undermining it by a policy of deficit

spending which pumps into our national economy more money than the taxes can pay for and which, therefore, diminish the value of the dollar. This is inflation. Indeed, the American dollar has been cut 40 percent since before the war. This year we face a deficit of approximately $5,000,000,000, and this will further depreciate the value—the purchasing power—of our money.

Here one might ask how much security for the average citizen is there in a system which requires that you pay your taxes in a dollar worth 100 cents, that you pay for your social security in a dollar worth 100 cents, that you pay for your old-age and survivors insurance benefits in a dollar worth 100 cents, that you pay for your pensions and retirement funds in a dollar worth 100 cents, and then when you are old you receive payments in a dollar which, if present policies continue, may be worth only 15 cents? Is that security?

How much security is there for the many millions of American citizens who are living on fixed incomes, on endowment policies, and so on, when their Government is consistently eating away these modest incomes, not only by taxes but by cutting the value of the national currency?

The Democratic administration in Washington is attempting to bribe the people with the people's money to vote for the Democratic politicians. This is immoral; it is wrong; it is an issue.

And there is also a clear-cut cleavage on social legislation. Here the Republican Party is not, in my opinion, faced with a dilemma. We should not turn our backs on social problems where they exist; but neither should we feel bound to embrace the solutions offered by the Democrats. We of the Republican Party have the vigor and the talent and the intellectual creativeness to produce better solutions. But the fundamental and irreconcilable difference between the point of view of the Democrats and our point of view is that for us social legislation represents an attempt to respond to a human need, while for the Democrats it is usually part of a plot to concentrate additional power in Washington. Such concentration of power is, of course, entirely agreeable to the Communists since it enables them more easily to destroy the American economy and, what is even more important, cause a breakdown in the American character. It was Herbert Hoover who pointed out recently that if we continue along this profligate path, private charities will cease to exist and the element of human compassion, which is so wonderfully a part of our whole culture, will have been sacrificed on the altar of Government panaceas.

It is precisely because the Government must be the servant of the people that it must be wise enough and strong enough to respond effectively to the problems of the day. The Government must be flexible and alert in order to function in areas where our private-property system does not reach. But it should only run the traffic signals; it should not operate the automobiles. It may regulate; it should be reluctant to own. This is a delicate field in which the Government must seek to protect the freedom of the individual without crushing him. And then we must also bear in mind that however valid much so-called social legislation may be, the essential welfare of the American people depends upon the continuation and increase of the vital opportunities for employment and effort which are inherent in our free society. When a government attempts to redistribute to its citizens more than the citizens can produce, inflation and eventual dictatorship are the inevitable result.

These then are some of the great domestic issues with which we are faced.

Now let me turn for a moment to foreign affairs, mindful of the fact that these matters, involving as they do the grim issue of life and death, should be treated on what Senator VANDENBERG has appropriately referred to as an unpartisan basis. But let us not forget either that there is an inevitable interdependence between what we do abroad and what we do at home. Moreover, our standard of living, our social improvements, our prosperity will dissolve if we should have war. And so, while this overriding issue which broods over all our doings should be met without regard to party advantage, it is, I venture to think, more important to be right than to be bipartisan.

It so happens that I have been a nonpartisan supporter of foreign-affairs legislation ever since I have been in Congress. But I do not feel that because I am a Republican, therefore I have no right to criticize or to disagree. After all, the Democrats are not of one mind on these matters. Indeed, I am profoundly convinced that the American people are entitled to a second voice on these fateful questions. And I believe also that to attempt by cries of partisanship to deprive our people of these criticisms in matters of such importance is to subvert the great purpose of our political system at a time of increasing national peril.

If we Republicans abdicate our prerogatives in the field of foreign affairs, America will soon become an island of liberty in a sea of slavery.

While I am frequently in disagreement with members of both parties, a partisan attitude in this field is dangerously out of place. Accordingly, it is most unfortunate that our President has by his actions shown that he believes more firmly, more instinctively, in partisanship as usual, than in bipartisanship at the water's edge.

President Truman has accused certain Republicans of partisanship in their attacks on this country's foreign policy. He went further. He said these Republicans are making partisan attempts to sabotage the bipartisan foreign policy of the United States, and he is reported as saying that such efforts during the cold war are just as bad as trying to shoot our soldiers in the back in a hot war.

I deplore smear tactics. I deplore smear tactics whether they are employed by Republicans or Democrats, and particularly when they are employed by our President. I think it is a dangerous business to attempt to assess the motives of others. Moreover, while I do not believe in innocence by association, neither do I believe in guilt by association. Because of this I do not feel responsible for the positions taken by my colleagues in the Congress. But I do believe that our President must be held responsible for his own expressed attitudes, and I am convinced that such extravagant pronouncements at a time of international crisis and internal tension are not helpful to the cause of bipartisanship at the water's edge. They will accentuate the very condition which our President decries with such violence.

Indeed, such petulant outbursts as those recently made by our President exacerbate a situation which is already highly irritated. It is most unfortunate that our President should not use the prestige of his high office in efforts to bring divergent elements together instead of driving them farther apart by intemperate statements. Perhaps I may respectfully venture the suggestion that he should attempt to emulate General Eisenhower's behavior in the lamentable armed services controversy: Pour oil on troubled waters. For surely the President himself is open to the accusation of partisanship when he singles out Republicans for attack and does not also attack the Democrats who have joined in the outcry against the foreign policy of this administration. If the President felt called upon to attack the critics of the State Department, he should have included members of his own party.

But it would have been wiser had he not attacked at all. By such attacks he gives aid and comfort to the Communists at the same time that he accuses certain Republicans of being an asset to the Kremlin.

Furthermore, our President is in a most vulnerable position when it comes to such accusations. The cataclysmic results of the agreements made at Yalta, at Tehran, and at Potsdam are, I fear, of far more terrible consequence in the cold war in which we are inextricably engaged than are the statements now being made by certain Members of Congress. Certainly these historic arrangements have been an incomparable asset to the Kremlin.

And there have been other great assets to the Kremlin for which the Republicans cannot be held responsible. You will recall that it was contended a short time ago that the dictator of Russia was "good old Joe," and that we could "get along with him." It was also thought, as Hanson Baldwin has pointed out in an interesting article in the Atlantic Monthly, that the Politburo had given up its policy of world conquest and was sincerely desirous of having friendly relations with capitalist governments. And there were other mistakes for which we could hardly be held responsible, such as that Russia's entry into the war against Japan was essential to victory and was necessary to save American lives. You will also remember the apprehension that Russia might make a separate peace with Germany and the effect that this had on our strategists. These mistaken judgments have been real assets to the Kremlin. I mention these grievous and costly errors not in order to recriminate over what has been done, but simply to set the record straight. A dispassionate inspection of the past can perhaps help us to rescue the future.

Then, too, it is pertinent to recall that at the time that the Alger Hiss case first arose, the President made his celebrated red-herring statement. Subsequent events have amply demonstrated the dangerous inaccuracy as well as the political nature of this comment.

Due in large part to the Alger Hiss case many people in our country are deeply apprehensive regarding the Department of State. While this apprehension is natural, it is not sufficient reason for our President's outbursts of anger. I had hoped that our President would sympathize with that sincere apprehension and would himself take the necessary steps to increase confidence in our State Department. I had hoped that he would help the cause of unity by attempts at conciliation rather than assist the forces of division and agitation by recrimination and abuse.

I now recognize that this was hoping against hope. Indeed, there was, I suppose, little basis for such hope.

A cursory glimpse at the record will disclose that in the campaign of 1948 the President described the Eightieth Congress as a "do-nothing" Congress. This was the Republican-controlled Congress which at the President's request provided aid for Greece and Turkey, passed the Foreign Relief Act and the interim-aid bill, and created the Marshall plan. This was the Congress which, at the President's request, passed the selective service law and the measure providing for unification of the Armed Forces, and approved the loan of $65,000,000 for the construction of the new UN headquarters. These are but a few of the many notable accomplishments of the Eightieth Congress. The taxpayers of America who are paying the bill don't think that this massive legislative achievement is nothing. And if all this was nothing, then why did the President ask for it?

Unfortunately, this Presidential attitude is at least consistent. In the campaign of 1948 the President refrained from attacking the 106 Democrats who voted for the Taft-Hartley law and leveled his attacks exclu-

sively on Republicans who had voted the same way. He made it clear then that he does not believe that the welfare of the working men and women of this country is entitled to bipartisan consideration. I believe that it is. I believe that he has rendered a grave disservice to the cause of labor.

But be that as it may, the President has from time to time made it devastatingly clear that he is not so much interested in unity in confronting the Communist aggressors as he is in making political capital out of the unfortunate and dangerous situation which now exists in the Congress, a situation which, it can be said in all fairness, he has done much to bring about.

I may say that some of us Republicans anticipated this predicament and expressed our preoccupation last year during the New York senatorial campaign. Surely the President must have known that the great humanitarian and statesman, John Foster Dulles, an eminent Republican, could be of more value to him in the preservation of a nonpartisan attitude toward foreign affairs than could the distinguished Democratic Senator HERBERT LEHMAN, whatever his attributes. Yet, the President went out of his way, as did other leaders of the Democrat Party, to give John Foster Dulles the knife in a cynical and reckless exhibition of vicious attacks and partisan prejudices rarely equaled in the political annals of our country.

I am delighted that our President has recently appointed Mr. Dulles as a principal adviser to Secretary Acheson, and I am glad, also, that Mr. Dulles has accepted this appointment.

With this excellent selection, it was to be hoped that our President had at long last understood, and then, alas, just the other day our President chose to announce that he intends to campaign in the congressional elections this fall on foreign-policy issues. He said this at a meeting with members of the United States Commission to the United Nations. This was not only in very bad taste, since politics is supposed to have no place in international discussions, but his statement also produced the impression that he was criticizing the entire Republican Party, including those who have supported the foreign policy of the administration. As David Lawrence pointed out, the President made no differentiation between those Republicans who support the bipartisan concept and those who oppose it. Accordingly, says David Lawrence, he has given cause for the assumption that, no matter what support an individual Republican gives to the administration's foreign policy, the leader of the Democratic Party in the White House will refuse "to recognize such service in the only place where restraint has been urged, namely, in political contests."

It is also to be regretted that Mr. Averell Harriman, who, as Ambassador at Large, is our diplomat for the European recovery program—a creation of the much-maligned Eightieth Congress—should deliver himself of a speech as partisan as that which he made a week ago in New York. Such an utterance seems to me ill-timed and unwise.

Handsome is as handsome does. Bipartisanship must, by definition, be a two-way street. The foreign policy of our country is, under the Constitution, primarily the responsibility of the Chief Executive. The President must take the lead in creating a climate of unity. Perhaps, clever politician that he is, he feels that since the Dewey unity campaign failed in 1948 he will have no part of it. Perhaps his profound partisan predispositions incapacitate him for nonpartisan attitude. I do not know. But it does seem clear that, because of his partisan indiscretions, the President has made it difficult for himself to call upon the magnanimity of those Republicans who have been working for a nonpartisan approach to these great and challenging questions while he descends to the lower levels of political combat to thrash out these urgent matters in a partisan, knock-down, drag-out, no-holds-barred, brass-knuckle political brawl.

In the hope that he would see the light, I have remained silent while the President has made vociferous statements characterized by vindictiveness rather than by a lofty desire to reach useful solutions. I feel that the time has come for me to speak and I deeply regret the necessity to speak in these terms. But in sober truth the time is out of joint, and we live in the midst of restless events which surpass us all and which are no respecters of persons.

In reply to a shallow suggestion recently advanced by the senior Senator from Connecticut as a nostrum against war, Secretary Acheson said, and he said it well, that what we need in the cold war is steady nerves and firm resolve. Surely we are also entitled to expect some poise and some vision from the President of the United States. Total diplomacy must ultimately depend upon the united effort of the American people. It is a primary responsibility of the President so to conduct himself as to help in creating this unity.

While I do not always agree with the Secretary of State, for my part I shall continue a nonpartisan attitude in an effort to help achieve a policy which will enable us to win the cold war. For if we do not win the cold war, we shall have a war in which the penalty may be slavery or death.

I continue to harbor the fervent and prayerful hope that our President will consider the dangers to this Republic ahead of the political campaign of 1950.

For I need hardly stress the remorseless fact that we are in mortal danger not only in Europe but in Asia. And while, in general, I have gone along with the President's recommendations regarding the European area, I am convinced that in Asia the administration has been engaged largely in attempts to justify its errors instead of to correct them.

The Secretary of State, in my opinion, is most unconvincing on the Asiatic question. And, whereas in Europe we are bringing aid, in Asia we should, according to him, rely mainly on the defenseless anger of the Chinese to liberate themselves by the spread of Titoism. Yet at this very moment we have it within our power to help to safeguard southeast Asia—to help to liberate the people in China—by helping the anti-Communist forces on Formosa. It has been reliably estimated that an expenditure of two or three hundred million dollars could safeguard this island from Communist invasion. I recommend, not intervention, not the American Army, Navy, or Air Force, but aid on the Greek pattern. To date no satisfactory reasons have reached me why this should not be done.

We cannot base a successful foreign policy on a doctrine which calls for hunting with the hounds in Europe while we run with the hare in Asia.

The Republican Party must speak out on these and on all other matters involving the national interest.

The present administration has grown old and tired in office. While mouthing hypocritical incantations to freedom and liberalism and human rights, they have become the party of authority, of reaction, and of regimentation. It is in the interest of all the people that the Democrats should be defeated for public office next November.

Abraham Lincoln said: "Revolutionize through the ballot box, and restore the Government once more to the affections and hearts of men by making it express, as it was intended to do, the highest spirit of justice and liberty."

Dynamic republicanism is needed to accomplish this wholly desirable end. We Republicans can take heart from the sure knowledge that our opportunities for useful service are equal to our unprecedented responsibilities.

Ladies and gentlemen, this is the challenge to the young people of America; this is the challenge to the Republican Party. This is the challenge to America.

Tax Tricks—Millville Republican Comments on Congressman Hand's Recent Statement on Hidden Taxes Imposed on Low-Income Groups

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. MILLET HAND
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 11, 1950

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, the Millville Republican recently commented on my statement concerning indirect and hidden taxes, and I am including their editorial in the RECORD. I do so because of my conviction that we will never get away from extravagance, deficit financing, and high taxes until the average American family realizes that no matter how small their income is, they are paying their full share of the bill.

The editorial follows:

"If more Americans realized how much they pay in taxes—direct and hidden—each year, their clamor would force real economy in Government." That is the opinion of Congressman HAND.

A lot of people don't think they pay taxes, or at least very little, simply because they do not own their homes or because they pay only a meager or no income tax. Congressman HAND calls this "the greatest fallacy of modern times." He would like to make every citizen in this congressional district aware of how they are being victimized by tax trickery.

The Congressman in a recent public address cited the study of the American Taxpayers Association. This showed in actual case studies that a man earning $960 a year paid $123.08 annually in hidden taxes; a man earning $1,800 paid $243; and a man with $2,400 income paid $314.76 in hidden taxes.

The association's survey traced various products from the first step to the point of sale. There are 78 different taxes on a quart of milk, 151 on a loaf of bread, 100 on an egg, 125 on a woman's cotton dress, 118 on a man's suit of clothes, 154 on a cake of soap, and 201 taxes on a gallon of gasoline.

Hidden taxes, according to the study, take $10 of every $30 of rent, nearly $7 a year on every telephone, one-third of all normal day-to-day living expenses.

On a $7.85 cotton dress there are $2.20 in hidden taxes. An automobile that costs $1,600 to $2,000 is encumbered with 206 taxes amounting to from $355 to $466. A study made on a woman's hat showed that it carried 64 Federal taxes, 43 State taxes, and 41 local taxes.

Congressman HAND contends "until the majority of Americans fully realize the huge slice that taxes take from their annual incomes, until they realize that no one escapes hidden taxes, there can be but little hope for genuine economy in Government. It is easy to hide taxes on the things everyone buys in order to give the public all the services and things that so many people think they get for nothing from the Government."

President Truman's Speech at Seneca, Nebr., on May 8, 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 11, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the Presidential train, proceeding westward on May 8, 1950, stopped for a brief time at Seneca, Nebr., and was greeted by a cheering crowd who were privileged to hear the President make the following remarks:

I didn't think there would be very many people here this late in the evening. I am surprised and really appreciate your greeting me. I appreciate it more than I can tell you.

Since yesterday afternoon, I have traveled halfway across the country. I have met and talked with a great many people. There is no better way for a President to find out what people are thinking about, and what they think of the great problems of today than to come out here and exchange ideas with you.

Tonight I want to talk with you briefly about the greatest problem we have today. That problem is how to obtain a world peace. When you stop to think about it, there is nothing more important to us than that.

This is the fifth anniversary of VE-day. In the last 5 years we have learned that the road to peace is a most difficult and expensive one. Eventually we will get the kind of world peace we are working for. It will come when the great majority of the people in the world have learned that the kind of democracy we have in the United States offers more to the average citizen than any other system of government.

Some people forget that what we do here at home has a direct bearing on whether there will be peace in the world or not. Peace depends on our staying strong, and remaining prosperous, and making constant improvements in our democracy. That is why we need to see that business and industry continue to grow. That is why it is so important for us to press forward with better housing, better health, better schools for all our own people. That is why it is so important that we have strong and prosperous farms.

I am working for these goals because I believe that they will not only strengthen this country, but will provide the best means for achieving world peace.

I am more than happy that you came out here tonight, and I am more than happy that I stayed up to come out here and talk to you tonight. I started out on this trip to let you know that I am still working for the same goals, and trying to do the same things for the welfare of the country that I was when I was out here asking you for votes.

I think that we could accomplish the things that we really want to accomplish if we work hard enough to get them done. I tried to prove that to you in 1948. I think I did. We still have a great many things that need to be done in this country, and in the world.

I am going around to Grand Coulee Dam, and out to Wyoming, Montana, and North Dakota, Minnesota, and Wisconsin, and am going to finally wind up in Chicago; and when we get through, I think the people of the United States will understand that my position on the great issues which face this country and the world has not changed, that I am still working for the same goals, and I am doing my best to make this Government a government of all the people, that I am doing my best to attain world peace, a peace that will last and that is to the interests of all concerned.

I appreciate most highly your coming out here tonight, and I thank you very much for your kindness.

The Railroad Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BRICKER
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 11 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a series of telegrams which I have received from industries and businesses in my home State, showing the very serious unemployment situation now existing and which will become more serious as the result of the present railroad strike.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MANSFIELD, OHIO, *May 11, 1950.*
Senator BRICKER,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:
Mansfield is materially effected as a result of train stoppage on Pennsylvania Railroad. If your office can be helpful we solicit your cooperation.
MANSFIELD CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

WELLSVILLE, OHIO, *May 10, 1950.*
Hon. JOHN W. BRICKER,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:
Rail strike has paralyzed our operations affecting 700 employees as well as our customers since we are served only by Pennsylvania Railroad. Please use your best efforts to terminate this interruption.
STERLING CHINA CO.

STEUBENVILLE, OHIO, *May 10, 1950.*
Hon. JOHN W. BRICKER,
Senate Office Building:
Rail strike if continued will necessitate complete lay-off of all personnel.
H. W. HENNINGS, *President,*
CHICAGO WALL PAPER CO.

WARREN, OHIO, *May 10, 1950.*
Hon. JOHN W. BRICKER,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:
The strike on the Pennsylvania Railroad will shortly shut down our plant. After a steel strike and a coal strike this railroad strike is ruinous. We respectfully urge you to use your good office toward an early settlement.
J. N. KERR, *President,*
THE OHIO CORRUGATING CO.

CIRCLEVILLE, OHIO, *May 10, 1950.*
Hon. JOHN W. BRICKER,
Washington, D. C.:
As a patron located on the Pennsylvania Railroad at Circleville, Ohio, the trailroad trainmen strike starting 6:00 a. m. this morning will close our plant completely, depriving our customers of approximately 30 cars animal and poultry feed daily, badly needed for the production of poultry, eggs, meat and milk. Also approximately 200 men will be laid off. We urge you to take all possible action to effect settlement.
JOHN W. ESHELMAN & SONS.

COLUMBUS OHIO, *May 10, 1950.*
Hon. JOHN W. BRICKER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Strike of firemen and engineers already crippling and will soon result in complete shutdown of this plant affecting 1,500 employees. Request that you use every means at your disposal to terminate this strike at once.
BUCKEYE STEEL CASTINGS CO.,
F. H. BONNET, *President.*

ROSEVILLE, OHIO, *May 10, 1950.*
Hon. JOHN W. BRICKER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Your support solicited to settle railroad strike. Business suffering.
ROBINSON RANSBOTTOM POTTERY CO.

ZANESVILLE, OHIO, *May 10, 1950.*
Hon. JOHN W. BRICKER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Appreciate your best efforts for early settlement of present railroad fireman strike.
DRESDEN PAPER MILLS CO.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, *May 10, 1950.*
Senator JOHN W. BRICKER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Today's trainmen strike paralyzing certain of our railroads promises a chaotic condition within this territory and to our business. It is ridiculous that our Government would permit such disregard of public welfare and we must ask that you exert every possible effort to have this situation corrected without delay. We appreciate your position but we know only you as people to whom we can call upon. If there is anything we can do in any other fashion, won't you wire us what to do in order to end this unnecessary interruption to a business that is already staggering.
THE BAKER WOOD PRESERVING CO.,
R. M. HAMILTON, *Vice President.*

EAST PALESTINE, OHIO, *May 10, 1950.*
Senator JOHN W. BRICKER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Our plant with 100 employees is now shut down indefinitely for the duration of the strike in effect on the Pennsylvania Railroad. This will throw 100 people out of work and on unemployment compensation. We trust that you will use your best efforts to bring this strike to a conclusion.
ADAMSON CO., INC.,
D. B. GILLIES, *President.*

WAYNESBURG, OHIO, *May 10, 1950.*
Hon. JOHN BRICKER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Railroad firemen's strike and resulting shutdown of Pennsylvania Railroad west of Harrisburg is serious threat to continued operations of this company and to the local public interest in the continued industrial operations on which the people of this community are dependent. The executives of this company point out that industry-wide labor monopolies are permitted under present Federal laws to take action incompatible with public interest and believe they should be restrained and regulated by Federal law as industrial monopolies, including the railroad, long have been.
WHITACRE GREER FIREPROOFING CO.
D. D. WHITACRE.

WEST LAFAYETTE, OHIO, *May 10, 1950.*
Senator JOHN BRICKER,
Washington, D. C.:
What can you do to cancel this railroad strike? We can't even receive mail regularly.

More than a couple of days of this will cause severe losses to this company because our competitors are not affected.

THE JONES METAL PRODUCTS CO.,
E. F. MULLIGAN.

CANTON, OHIO, *May 10, 1950.*

Hon. JOHN W. BRICKER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Pennsylvania Railroad strike crippling economic life of our community. What immediate action can you take in Washington to end strike?

CANTON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
G. R. HOSTETLER, *President.*

NEWCOMERSTOWN, OHIO, *May 10, 1950.*

Hon. JOHN BRICKER,
United States Senate,
Washington D. C.:

The refusal of the railroad unions to abide by the recommendations of fact-finding boards is a serious threat to the economy of the Nation. We strongly protest the utter disregard of the public. The inaction of the Truman administration is beyond comprehension.

HELLER BROS. CO. OF OHIO,
GEORGE H. HODAPP, *President.*

SALEM, OHIO, *May 10, 1950.*

Hon. JOHN W. BRICKER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Continuation of rail strike will force complete shutdown of this plant with 800 persons employed within 5 days and result in shutdown of our two affiliated plants with 1,300 employees at Ford City, Pa., and Marysville, Ohio, immediately thereafter. We earnestly request your influence in obtaining immediate settlement of the rail dispute.

THE NATIONAL SANITARY CO.,
LOUIS PROBST, *Vice President.*

CANTON, OHIO, *May 10, 1950.*

Hon. JOHN BRICKER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

As shippers of glazed tile face and paving brick being used in essential construction including schools, hospitals, and public utilities, we urge all possible speed in early conclusion of rail strike and without further featherbedding. A continuation of strike means loss of production to us and of wages to our employees.

METROPOLITAN BRICK, INC.,
D. J. RENKERT, *President.*

PITTSBURGH, PA., *May 10, 1950.*

Hon. JOHN W. BRICKER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The railroad strike is seriously affecting operations at our East Palestine, Waynesburg, and Magnolia, Ohio, plants. We ask your good offices and efforts in restoring vital rail service to our country at the earliest possible hour.

NATIONAL FIREPROOFING CORP.,
R. A. SHIPLEY, *President.*

CLEVELAND, OHIO, *May 10, 1950.*

Hon. JOHN W. BRICKER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Eleven hours of railroad strike conditions resulting from unreasonable demands on part of one small group of workers demonstrate clearly paralyzing effects upon our national commerce. Respectfully urge governmental action to stop this hindrance which stands in way of normal conduct of business and spread through the welfare of all.

F. R. HYSELL,
General Traffic Manager, Glidden Co.

WILMINGTON, OHIO, *May 10, 1950.*

Hon. JOHN W. BRICKER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Current railroad strike imposing great hardship on our business. It appears to be without any just reason and we respectfully ask that you use your best efforts in urging termination.

THE IRWIN AUGER BIT CO.

CAMBRIDGE, OHIO, *May 10, 1950.*

Hon. JOHN W. BRICKER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We are greatly handicapped here due to lack of facilities of Pennsylvania Railroad caused by strike. Anything you can do to get railroads working again will be appreciated.

THE CAMBRIDGE GLASS CO.

WELLSVILLE, OHIO, *May 10, 1950.*

JOHN W. BRICKER,
Senator, Washington, D. C.:

Honorable Sir present railroad strike causing undue hardship to ourselves and customers. Why does the public have to be continually plagued with these hardships? Please use your efforts to get an early settlement.

WELLSVILLE CHINA CO.

TOLEDO, OHIO, *May 10, 1950.*

Senator JOHN W. BRICKER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

On behalf of the many business and industrial establishments who are highly dependent upon New York Central, Pennsylvania, and other rail service curtailed by strike of Brotherhood of Firemen and Enginemen. The Toledo Chamber of Commerce urges you to extend every effort to seek end of this stoppage.

WAYNE E. KAKELA, *Executive Manager.*
TOLEDO CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,

MANSFIELD, OHIO, *May 10, 1950.*

Hon. JOHN W. BRICKER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Our company is located on side track of Pennsylvania Railroad. The present strike on this railroad has greatly inconvenienced delivery of outgoing production of much needed building materials, baths, lavatories, and sinks. If continued for 1 week it will be necessary to lay off approximately 600 employees. The issues as we understand them are so fantastic that we urge that steps be taken immediately in the public interest to bring about the operation of railroads without penalizing the carriers.

THE HUMPHREYS MANUFACTURING CO.,
M. A. DOWNS, *Vice President.*

COLUMBUS, OHIO, *May 10, 1950.*

Hon. JOHN W. BRICKER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Must have early settlement. Rail strike crippling business and will cause untold suffering of millions by action of only a few. Use all power to settle without delay.

R. J. JOYCE,
Chairman, Car Efficiency Committee, Ohio Valley Transportation Advisory Board and General Traffic Manager, the Central Ohio Paper Co.

CLEVELAND, OHIO, *May 10, 1950.*

Hon. JOHN W. BRICKER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Imperative you do everything possible to expedite end of railroad firemen's strike seriously affecting our mine operation in Ohio.

CHESAPEAKE COAL CO.,
EDWARD R. SNEAD, *President.*

CANTON, OHIO, *May 10, 1950.*

Hon. JOHN W. BRICKER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Every effort should be made to terminate existing rail strike which is discriminatory between certain areas and railroads and is seriously affecting us as well as other shippers and receivers in this area. At present we have no passenger or express service. Mail is being seriously delayed. Freight service impaired. Every effort should be made toward an early settlement. We urge your support for prompt action.

HOOVER CO.,
J. F. HATTERSLEY,
Executive Vice President.

ROSEVILLE, OHIO, *May 10, 1950.*

Hon. JOHN W. BRICKER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Present rail strike paralyzing manufacturing business this district also delaying reconstruction of our pottery plant destroyed by fire recently. Please take necessary steps to relieve this serious situation.

THE NELSON McCOY POTTERY CO.

PORTSMOUTH, OHIO, *May 10, 1950.*

J. W. BRICKER,
Senator, Washington, D. C.:

Strongly urge you use all available effort to have President Truman as well as Senate and Congress take action to immediately end rail strike caused by striking locomotive firemen whose demands have no merit as evidenced by reports of Presidential Fact Finding Boards dating from 1946.

J. H. CROSS.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, *May 10, 1950.*

Senator JOHN W. BRICKER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Today's trainmen strike paralyzing certain of our railroads promises a chaotic condition within this territory and to our business. It is ridiculous that our Government would permit such disregard of public welfare and we must ask that you exert every possible effort to have this situation corrected without delay. We appreciate your position but we know only you as people to whom we can call upon. If there is anything we can do in any other fashion, won't you wire us what to do in order to end this unnecessary interruption to a business that is already staggering.

D. B. FRAMPTON,
President, D. B. Frampton & Co.

MASSILLON, OHIO, *May 11, 1950.*

Hon. JOHN W. BRICKER,
Senate Office Building:

Pennsylvania strike causing delay and prohibitive expense to our company; nonstriking railroads inadequate; urge immediate action your part.

SUPERIOR PROVISION CO.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, *May 11, 1950.*

Hon. J. W. BRICKER,
United States Senate:

Immediate action should be taken to terminate railroad strike at once, otherwise our

plant, along with many others, will close down completely.

THE JAEGER MACHINE CO.,
RAY MCLEAN, *President.*

NEW LEXINGTON, OHIO, *May 11, 1950.*
Senator BRICKER:

Railroad strike already jeopardizing our business.

EVANS REAMER & MACHINE CO.,
W. J. BLAZEK.

NEW LEXINGTON, OHIO, *May 11, 1950.*
Hon. JOHN W. BRICKER:

Imperative railroad strike end at once, our utility customers need our coal.

J. T. COAL CO.

Whither Are We Tending?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 1950

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, with the passage Wednesday by the House of Representatives of the greatest peacetime appropriation bill in history—to pay the cost of government—I am reminded of the ancient political cliché which has the speech maker asking; "Whither are we tending?" In ordinary English, this means: Where do we go from here? The question, at this time, is pertinent. Just where is this Nation headed? A truthful answer is vital now, as never before, to the welfare of the American people; if not, indeed, to the survival of the Republic.

I shall attempt here to provide that truthful answer, at least insofar as it is possible for anyone to do so. In order to simplify the answer, and thus make myself clear from the outset, I shall have to begin with a few quotations. If you will listen closely, I think you will find them far from tedious.

In his first interview ever given the western press, Nicolai Lenin, chief architect and first leader of Russian communism, as we know it today, declared back in 1923 that:

> Three steps block the progress of world communism from its present state to its ultimate objective.
>
> The steps are, first, to nullify the strength of the British Navy, through internal political action in the British Empire; second, to nullify the power of the Catholic Church by a world-wide campaign against religion; and third, to dissipate the savings of the American working class by inducing the United States to spend itself into the status of a third-class power.

In this interview Lenin predicted that the three objectives, to bring about the ultimate triumph of world communism, would be reached in the span of a single generation.

In his book entitled "The Economic Consequences of the Peace," the British economist, J. M. Keynes, had this to say:

> Lenin is said to have declared that the best way to destroy the capitalist system was to debauch the currency. By a continuing process of inflation, governments can confiscate, secretly and quite unobserved, an important part of the wealth of their citizens. By this method they cannot only confiscate, but can confiscate arbitrarily; and while the process impoverishes many, it actually enriches some.
>
> The sight of this arbitrary rearrangement of riches strikes not only at security, but at confidence in the equity of the existing distribution of wealth. Those to whom the system brings windfalls, beyond their deserts and even beyond their expectations or desires, become profiteers. They are the object of the hatred of the bourgeoisie, the middle class, whom inflation has impoverished, not less than they are the object of the hatred of the proletariat.
>
> As the inflation proceeds and the real value (the purchasing power) of the currency fluctuates wildly from month to month, all permanent relations between debtors and creditors, which form the ultimate foundation of capitalism, become so utterly disordered as to be almost meaningless. The process of wealth-getting degenerates into a gamble and a lottery.
>
> Lenin was certainly right, concluded Keynes. There is no subtler, no surer means of overturning the existing basis of society than to debauch the currency. The process engages all the hidden forces of economic law on the side of destruction, and does it in a manner which not one man in a million can diagnose.

It is a strange thing that J. M. Keynes, the man who wrote the words I have just quoted, should be the same man who persuaded a large section of the American people that deficit spending by our Federal Government and a consequent tremendous national debt are desirable because as they said "we only owe the money to ourselves." Keynes, as an economist, knew the inflationary effect of deficit spending by any government.

Yet it was Keynes whose blandishments encouraged Franklin D. Roosevelt to embark upon the Government spending spree which has now reached great height in the Truman Fair Deal "squandermania"; which now, indeed, threatens the very existence of the Republic. From this, you may be sure that Keynes came to America, not as an ethical and highly skilled economist, but solely as a propagandist; solely as a servant of the British Government, which needed then, as it needs now, to support socialism, larger and ever larger chunks of the money collected from American taxpayers.

Lenin said that the first step toward a world-wide triumph of communism should be nullification of the strength of the British Navy through internal political action in the British Empire. All of us by this time know that this step has been taken. The British Empire, through socialism, has fallen apart at the seams. The British Navy is largely obsolete or out of commission, and British seapower today is a mere shadow.

Lenin said that the second step toward world-wide communism should be nullification of the power of the Catholic Church. All of us know by this time of the unparalleled ferocity of the Communist attack on all religion. The Mindszenty case, the recent expulsion of Mormon missionaries from Czechoslovakia, and many other instances of the kind, involving all religious sects, but especially the Catholic, prove that the second step toward a Communist world is now being taken.

Lenin said that the third and most important step toward world communism should be dissipation of the savings of the American people by inducing the United States to spend itself into the status of a third-rate power. Keynes quoted him as saying also that the best way to accomplish this end, of dissipating the savings of all Americans, would be through inflation; by debauching the currency, as well as by endless deficit spending.

In view of our present 50-cent dollar, and in view of the senseless waste and deficit spending of the Fair Deal administration, can any one of you doubt for an instant that by means of inflation and the pouring of American tax money down political rat holes around the world, the third step toward world communism is well on its way? Since the war, the present Fair Deal administration has spent more money than did all the administrations preceding since the founding of the Republic.

Even the United States Treasury, which is dominated by the White House, estimates that the Federal deficit in the present fiscal year, which ends next June 30, will be $5,500,000,000. More likely it will be $7,000,000,000 or more. The Treasury estimates, on the basis of the President's budget, that the deficit next year will be at least $5,300,000,000. But the spending policies of the present Democratic Congress indicate that, in fact, it will be at least $8,000,000,000, and perhaps $10,000,000,000, or even more.

Last Wednesday, the House of Representatives passed the so-called one-package appropriation bill for the fiscal year of 1951 which begins next July 1. In spite of reductions of more than a billion dollars, the total appropriations for the coming fiscal year will amount to around $28,000,000,000, and this does not represent the total of spending by the Democratic Eighty-first Congress; not by a long shot. The President's budget, remember, is $42,500,000,000 and it appears now more than likely that in the end congressional spending will exceed the President's budget by a wide margin. Mark my word, the spenders are still in the saddle and in spite of a temporary set-back, are in the mood to carry on, on a grand scale.

President Truman and his Fair Deal supporters started at the beginning of the present session of Congress to whoop it up for bigger and better spending, for bigger and more disastrous deficits. Until recently, when the President's hand was forced, they supported his policy of reducing national defense expenditures, while increasing those for Fair Deal measures to socialize the American economy. Thereafter they fought to pile the increased expenditures for national defense on top of the other expenditures, the latter calculated only to advance Fair Deal political interests.

Republicans in Congress, almost to a man, have opposed this spending program. During consideration of the omnibus appropriation bill, Republicans offered 36 amendments involving reductions of about $2,000,000,000. All but three of them were voted down with a whoop by the Democrats. At the same

time, Democratic Members added amounts here and there through 45 amendments increasing appropriations, so the end savings that were accomplished were far less than they should have been.

Now, just what do you, as American citizens and taxpayers, think of a Democratic majority in Congress which would spend in excess of a Presidential budget? Especially when that budget is so large that the wiser heads, even in the Democratic Party, time and again have warned that it will lead to a disastrous deficit; when they have warned of its terrific inflationary effect? What do you think of a Fair Deal administration which would cut defense expenditures in a time of international emergency, while at the same time boosting expenditures for advancing the cause of socialism within our own borders? What do you think?

Up to this point, I have traced the manner in which the three steps to world communism, as outlined by Lenin, either have been or are now being completed. Lenin was the creator of communism as it is known today. He knew whereof he spoke, and his teachings are the only bible of his communistic followers.

British seapower has been virtually destroyed. The church is fighting in the last ditch in all countries behind the iron curtain. In the United States, inflation and deficit spending by the Federal Government have debauched the currency by reducing the dollar to little more than half its former purchasing power. The savings of the American people have been largely dissipated; confiscation of private property through inflation and excessive taxation is progressing apace. The national debt now exceeds $1,700 per capita; and $1,700 is pretty close to the average family's annual income.

Now what is your answer to all this? I think you will agree with me that the only possible answer lies in drastically cutting domestic expenditures by the Federal Government, through implementation of the Hoover Commission recommendations, as they actually are, and not as they are twisted by the President in his many proposals to Congress. The only possible answer lies, too, in throwing out of power political opportunists, the demagogues, the spenders, and fellow travelers, who are playing Lenin's game—Stalin's game—for the sake of their own greed for political power.

Disapproval of Reorganization Plan No. 21—Statement by Roscoe H. Hupper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OWEN BREWSTER

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 11 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by Mr. Roscoe H. Hupper in support of Senate Resolution 265 directed to the disapproval of Reorganization Plan No. 21 relating to transfer of the United States Maritime Commission to the Department of Commerce.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF ROSCOE H. HUPPER BEFORE UNITED STATES SENATE COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS, TO BE FILED PURSUANT TO LEAVE MAY 9, 1950, IN SUPPORT OF SENATE RESOLUTION 265 DIRECTED TO DISAPPROVAL OF REORGANIZATION PLAN 21 RELATING TO TRANSFER OF UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION TO DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

My name is Roscoe H. Hupper. I am a lawyer, member of the firm of Burlingham, Veeder, Clark & Hupper, 27 William Street, New York City, with which I have been connected since 1911, since which time I have practiced actively in various shipping, transportation and other commercial matters both before courts and commissions, including Interstate Commerce Commission and the Maritime Commission and its predecessors.

I make this statement principally as a citizen, and against the background of my experience and observation, for such aid as the same may be to your committee. I support S. Res. 265 but my doing so is not pursuant to any retainer or request by any particular interest; rather because of my personal belief that plan 21 as now before your committee should not be permitted to become effective because adverse to what I conceive to be the national interest in shipping. My views thereon appear in the several numbered paragraphs below.

My comments stem to considerable extent from my contacts with shipping men of many nationalities over a period of nearly 40 years and my representation of many of them in legal matters affecting ship affairs before courts and commissions; likewise from being counsel for many years to various conferences both in domestic and widespread foreign trades as established under section 15 of the 1916 Shipping Act. I have a further contact with shipping in that as trustee I am sole stockholder of Luckenbach Steamship Co., Inc., a seasoned common carrier (not subsidized) which owns and operates 16 substantially new C–3 and C–2 vessels (acquired under the 1946 Ship Sales Act) in our intercoastal trade and in foreign trades. It may be that substantially all its operations will presently be in the intercoastal trade. That company has not participated in announcements heretofore made on behalf of a considerable number of other carriers indicating that they did not intend to oppose plan 21. Their reasons for this view are naturally not my concern, but I can say that my contacts throughout the shipping fraternity have given me the distinct impression that there is a complete lack of enthusiasm for plan 21, and lack of faith in its purpose or power of accomplishment, amounting almost to a sense of frustration.

Coming now to certain major points:

I. WHY DISCARD OUR MARITIME COMMISSION?

The set-up of the Commission is that of an independent agency responsible to Congress created by section 201 of the 1936 Merchant Marine Act following the declaration of policy in section 101 thereof, following the most thorough investigation and consideration. It is specially to be noted that section 201 divides membership between political parties and staggers terms of the Commissioners; this doubtless to minimize political considerations and control.

Having noted the barrage of discontent which has been leveled at the Commission over a considerable recent period I find myself confused as to the reason for or purpose of the same. At any rate I condemn it as exhibiting a lack of fair perspective in respect of the functions and performance of this important governmental body. This I say notwithstanding that I have noted signs of discontent or friction within the Commission itself; but emphasis on such would also seem to me a distortion of perspective. Restoration of a true perspective, affected neither by praise nor blame, would appear to be most necessary. It is right to admit that the Commission, like most other bodies whether private or public, even on occasion Congress itself, have not always operated at the highest level of efficiency. This is but common human experience. On occasion the heart and incentive for highest efficiency and cooperation has rather been taken out of the Commission members and representatives by a form of treatment from a privileged seat which although probably not so intended could in a cooler moment be described as unduly harsh. Matters of criticism generally have two sides but it ought to be remembered that the Commission has had and still has stupendous duties to perform, quite enough to consume for some time yet the time and energies of its entire membership. There has been inevitably a heavy hang-over of affairs as aftermath of the war, among which may be mentioned the ship-sales program, the chartering program and the subsidy program, to say nothing of regulatory matters, the problems as to shipbuilding and a few considerations as to the future in international affairs where shipping is or may be involved.

Congress itself in these last few months has been making a considerable investigation into a long-range program. By plan 6 only recently put into operation the Chairman of the Commission was given enlarged powers, and the President doubtless has authority to go further in this respect. Besides it should be simple to amend the Merchant Marine Act if additional authority or enlarged compensation were deemed necessary by Congress.

The possible efficiency of the independent agency set-up of the Maritime Commission will be brought to mind and emphasized by recalling the performance of Joseph P. Kennedy as first Chairman, likewise the chairmanship of Admiral Land, likewise the valiant service of Admiral Vickery; also of many others who have held the post of Commissioner or other office in the Commission. I venture the thought that there can be no reason against constant attainment by the Commission of whatever efficiency is requisite. I have had the privilege of some acquaintance, as I recall, with every Commissioner of this body and with many of its other personnel from the time the Shipping Board was organized under the Shipping Act of 1916 up to the present date.

Against the background of all the foregoing I state that the current attacks on the Commission are substantially uninformed and ill-considered; and that the greatest spirit of helpfulness and cooperation should be evinced pending the reaching of a far better conclusion than the one projected before your committee by plan 21. Nobody has suggested yet what departure from the independent agency principle would gain for us; nor has any reason been suggested why Congress should permit its substantially direct control of this great national interest of shipping (just because of occasional hard problems, or shortage of patience) being renounced and turned over to some executive department.

In event that mistake should be made, who can say that sometime the inquiries of Congress might be answered only as from behind an iron curtain—with a genial suggestion that the executive is independent of the legislative.

It is appropriate to add here that the very pendency of this plan 21 has already been prejudicial to the functioning of the Commission and to important maritime interests. Proposed abolishment of the Commission (the Chairman only definitely to be retained in the proposed Maritime Board) has placed four worthy gentlemen in doubt as to their continuance with any part or character of the official status for which they were selected under section 201 of the Merchant Marine Act, and confirmed by the Senate. An unjust and unseemly situation has thus resulted in which it must be difficult for them severally to avoid pulling, if they could find one, some political string in aid of continuance in office. This by itself is bad enough but from point of view of the public interest it is much worse; seeing that these gentlemen since March 13 last can scarcely have had peace of mind adequate to give them complete devotion to their public duties. The resultant bogging down of public business has become rather apparent, and importantly noticed in the press. Procedural delays have already been far too great and costly to carriers and to the public even when our commissions have been functioning regularly. Something must surely be done about that before long, in any event; seeing that our administrative bodies now appear often to out-legalize and out-technicalize our courts. However, when a fairly complete bogging down results from such a proposition as plan 21 the situation becomes truly destructive and unendurable both as concerns the Commission and the public interest which the Commission is bound to serve.

II. OUR MERCHANT MARINE REQUIRES AN INDEPENDENT AGENCY

Our ships are now of superb quality, operated by men of the highest capability. There are great difficulties and obstacles particularly in the foreign trade resulting from almost overwhelming competition, due principally to much higher costs than the shipowners of other nations have to bear. This circumstance is at the base of our national subsidy policy, which has been deliberately adopted as matter of national necessity; in contrast to the policy of placing our reliance as to commerce and safety largely on the shipping of other nations through medium of charters, and so forth, which on many occasions would involve lower expenditures. Our world responsibility has substantially dictated our shipping policy. The myriad questions which attach to shipping whether foreign or domestic are of special content and quality which fit well into the functions and supervision of an independent agency, and for aid in which such an agency appears to be absolutely requisite for close collaboration with Congress. Many of us recall the great benefit of such collaboration which continued many years as between Senator White in the Senate and Mr. Bland, of Virginia, in the House both with the present Commission and its predecessors. Putting control of shipping into any executive department would be a complete back-track on the tried and true independent agency principle which had its first expression in the 1916 shipping act, after most extensive hearings and consideration beginning in 1911. The question and proposition then pending was as to whether this country should be important in maritime affairs or not. That we should become so important was demonstrated by the First World War and its aftermath and again demonstrated by the Second World War and its still pending aftermath.

The character of the Shipping Board as an independent agency was based on the pattern of the Interstate Commerce Commission as established in 1887 to deal principally with rail transportation. There is a parity of purpose and necessity as between land traffic and high-seas shipping which naturally calls for independent agencies responsible directly to Congress, without interference from other bodies. It would surely be scarcely endurable that the functions of the Interstate Commerce Commission should be turned over to any executive department; and less endurable if that should be possible as concerns the Maritime Commission. Both Commissions have performed well and justified their establishment and continuance, quite irrespective of defects in performance which show up from time to time, and which can always be cured by a refreshed sense of responsibility, whether on the initiative of Congress or from the side of a reasonably vocal public.

III. WHY SUBSTITUTE THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE FOR THE MARITIME COMMISSION?

The Department of Commerce was not established with any purpose that it would ever be called upon to carry out in any respect such functions as the Merchant Marine Act states. None of its personnel have ever shown any capabilities or sense of direction in the matter of our shipping or national shipping policy that would justify said Department in having the slightest measure of participation in or control over the making or fixation of shipping policy—any more than say the Department of Agriculture or the Post Office Department. Indeed any executive department we might name would be just about as well qualified for exercising ocean shipping functions in the national interest as a fairly capable lawyer, by virtue of his profession, would be qualified to be bishop of Washington. The achievements of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and comparably with it, those of the Maritime Commission, would never have been brought about under the aegis of any executive department, burdened with widespread interests and responsibilities which make impossible that quick focus on problems and necessities that characterize shipping affairs. We need not doubt the capabilities of the Department of Commerce in making important studies and reports but that is no qualification for exercising shipping controls.

That the Secretary of Commerce has in mind extensive control is demonstrated by his April 14, 1950, letter to Senator MAGNUSON in reply to the Senator's letter of April 5. The first portion of the Secretary's letter is gentle, genial and cooperative as concerns that remnant of the Commission characterized as "Maritime Board" but the latter portion (pp. 3–4) indicates rather completely the purpose of the Department to take over all the truly important functions now exercised by the Commission. The hearing on Monday, May 8, developed the view and purpose of the Secretary to take over subsidy control under items (a) and (b) of section 211 of the Merchant Marine Act. This purpose was not very apparent from anything said in his April 14 letter and its specific development at the hearing, although perhaps ascertainable by an informed and careful study of the letter, was almost surreptitious, which circumstance in itself justifies careful questioning of the whole proposition as concerns subsidy control. The purpose of the Secretary if permitted to be carried out would amount to nothing less than a fairly complete vivisection or evisceration of the subsidy provisions of the Merchant Marine Act in respect of their application and administration.

In contrast with the protections in section 211 of the Merchant Marine Act directed to avoiding political control, let it be remembered that administration of shipping affairs under the Department of Commerce could not have such protection. That Department and its personnel are subject to political winds, tides, and currents which are variable and no executive department yet has been able to avoid harboring now and then personnel of considerable political vigor and disposed to exercise the same in this, that, and the other direction. There is nothing to be gained for transportation and the public interest by such political controls and they should be avoided at all costs. A suggestion that Department of Commerce control would give our national shipping the benefit of Cabinet deliberations is without beneficial weight. The general subject matter is too involved and complicated to permit of helpful result from consideration by men having so many diverging interests and so busy as Cabinet members.

I remain ready to render any further assistance that your committee might request.

Two Worlds in Conflict

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 11, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, with permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I attach an excerpt from an article titled "Two Worlds in Conflict," published in the ALF's Labor's Monthly Survey for April–May. It is a penetrating discussion of the significance of the battle for Berlin and the need to formulate and carry out a constructive program for the whole of Germany. It furnishes instructive background material for the current discussions of Germany and related problems by the Big Three Ministers:

TWO WORLDS IN CONFLICT

American workers today realize that events in Europe and Asia are of utmost consequence to them in their daily lives. No longer can two oceans and four or five thousand miles of space make us secure against totalitarian communism which drives to close in on United States of America from two sides of the world, as well as through fifth-column activity within our shores. We know that communism means the end of freedom; under it workers cannot choose or change their jobs, no union can raise wages, anyone may be imprisoned for years without trial for such minor offenses as lateness and absence from work or through false accusations. The people, deprived of all voice in choosing their government, cannot remedy such evils. For all but a favored few, communism means a life of poverty, shadowed by the secret police, purges, concentration camps, a life of mental stagnation, where true facts are denied and the worker's mind is filled with false propaganda. Communist aggression is of utmost concern to all Americans. For, unless we stop losing the cold war and permitting ourselves to be outwitted in strategy, our whole Nation in self-defense will be forced into a shooting war in which bombs will fall on our homes.

Stalin's method, in his drive for world conquest, is to attack every strategic spot he thinks he can seize without starting a shooting war with the western powers.

BERLIN, ISLAND OF FREEDOM

Berlin's west sector is such a spot—an island of freedom completely surrounded by Soviet tyranny. If, under guise of the May 28 youth rally, 500,000 Moscow directed young German Communists peacefully march into western Berlin, they can install their agents, set up their cells and action committees, foment strife and civil war, and by familiar

methods attempt to complete their peaceful conquest by destroying its democratic government. Once allowed to enter, they could not be thrown out except by force. Gerhardt Eisler, top Communist escaped from United States of America, is master-minding this piece of trickery for Stalin. The Communists try to conceal from the outside world the fact (well known behind the iron curtain) that Gerhardt Eisler, Stalin's tool, makes good use of the secret police to see that these German youths carry out Communist orders. And back of the secret police is the Soviet terror and the concentration camp. The Soviet also conceals from the world its new use of the Nazi horror camps—Buchenwald and the rest. These camps have been reopened and are now filled to capacity with German anti-Communists, free trade-unionists and other men and women within Stalin's reach who have heroically stood for freedom.

ALSO KEYPOINT

Berlin is a keypoint in Stalin's effort to subjugate Europe. As their former capital, it has for Germans a significance beyond any other city. Seizure of Berlin would open the way for a Communist campaign of irresistible pressure to destroy the German Republic. But as long as western Berlin remains a symbol of hope and freedom to all Germans, Stalin cannot consolidate his grip on east Germany or subjugate the western republic. Germany is the heart of Europe. Stalin is reaching for the Ruhr, because a shift of its immense steel, coal, and other industrial capacity would change the balance of productive power from west to east, and after that the rest of Europe would fall easily into Stalin's hands.

West Berlin's 2,000,000 people have shown tremendous courage in their unflinching stand against communism.[1] Surrounded by communism, they know what democracy and freedom mean. Free trade-unionists who have suffered under Hitler's dictatorship have no desire to suffer under Stalin's. The United States Government has announced that the "peaceful" invasion of Communist youths will not be permitted. This is fortunate, for protecting the people of Berlin against "peaceful" conquest depends on the allied occupation forces.

NEEDED: A CONSTRUCTIVE POLICY FOR GERMANY

The German Federal Republic (west Germany) under the courageous leadership of Chancellor Konrad Adenauer, has left no doubt of its desire to cooperate with the western Allies. The people of Germany do not want an alliance with Russia.[2] But they are faced with many difficulties. Foremost is the problem of making a living. Germany has always depended heavily on trade with the east to provide a market for her products and jobs for her workers. Today trade with the east is reduced to a mere trickle. To revive it would open the doors to Soviet penetration, for the Soviet uses control over trade as one method of dominating a country. But Germany cannot support herself until other foreign trade is developed to replace the lost eastern trade. Meanwhile unemployment in Western Germany has increased every month since December 1948 and now (February 1950) affects 13 percent of the population, a level equivalent to 8,000,000 unemployed in the United States of America. In western Berlin, due to Soviet interference with trade, one worker in every four is unemployed. This problem of German export trade should be a first concern of the occupying powers—Britain, France, and the United States of America—for until it is solved the German people must depend for support on American taxpayers. Unemployment will continue and German workers cannot hope to raise their living standards. Since the occupying powers have not yet permitted Germany to set up diplomatic relations with other countries, the responsibility is theirs.

ON SAAR SEPARATION

Another serious problem is the action by France of separating the Saar from the rest of western Germany so that Germans see their country further torn apart. Britain continues to dismantle essential German factories in her zone. The American Federation of Labor has steadfastly opposed dismantling as an unnecessary burden on the American taxpayer and a crushing and needless blow to German working men and women. Dismantling destroys workers' means of earning a living, eliminates needed factories, adds to unemployment. The argument that dismantling destroys war potential misses the point; factories now slated for dismantling were never on the official list of war plants; they were declared surplus under the level of industry rule which restricts production, thus limiting employment and living standards.

While the Western Powers have not yet developed a constructive program for Germany, the Soviet beckons German industrialists to revive their trade with the East. Soviet propaganda ceaselessly promises the Germans peace and unity under the Communist banner, and Soviet military power grows from month to month creating in every German a paralyzing sense of insecurity. Refugees, fleeing Communist tyranny and persecution in East Germany, pour daily into the western republic, adding to the burden of unemployment; among them come Communist agitators, disguised as refugees, to work upon unemployed Germans with their lies about the Soviet paradise.

The German people do not want communism. But they desperately need the jobs that could come from industrial expansion and they want to share in the restored European economy and help make it a going concern, secure against Soviet infiltration and aggression. They want to revive German trade in order to maintain expansion. The 5,000,000 German trade-unionists and the Social Democratic Party have voluntarily decided that they do not want German rearmament—but they want a chance to produce adequate food, clothes, housing.

The real security is not in dismantling German plants or in separating off German territory, but in restoring the German economy, thus strengthening her present friendly government, and in enabling Germany to play a constructive part in building the new Europe.

[1] Report of the Federation's European representative.

[2] Report of the Federation's European representative after interviews with leading German trade-unionists and others.

The Railroad Strike—Article by Don Ross

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FORREST C. DONNELL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 11 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a news article entitled "Rail Service Cut in 27 States by Firemen's Strike on 4 Roads," by Don Ross, published in the New York Herald Tribune of today, May 11, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RAIL SERVICE CUT IN 27 STATES BY FIREMEN'S STRIKE ON 4 ROADS

OTHER LINES MOVE TRAFFIC—PENNSYLVANIA RAILROAD TAKES OFF 250 TRAINS—CENTRAL, 125—SOUTHERN USES OFFICIALS

Operation in 27 States of 4 of the Nation's major railroad networks—the Pennsylvania, the New York Central system, the Santa Fe, and the Southern—were disrupted yesterday by a strike of 18,000 firemen. Though passengers and freight movements were seriously hampered at many points, it appeared that no crippling blow had been struck at communications because of the many alternate routes available on other railroads and by other means of conveyance.

The strike, which became effective at 6 a. m. yesterday in each of the country's time zones, was aimed by the union, the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, unaffiliated, at the entire Santa Fe and Southern systems, which operate, respectively, from Chicago to the west coast and south of Washington. Only those portions of the New York Central west of Buffalo and of the Pennsylvania west and north of Harrisburg, Pa., were included in the strike call, which followed 25 straight hours of mediation in Chicago between the disputants and Francis A. O'Neill, Jr., Chairman of the National Mediation Board.

Effects of the strike were felt in the New York area, however, because of the cancellation by the Pennsylvania—largest railroad in the country—and the New York Central of many freight and passenger trains to the West. The Pennsylvania reported it had stopped 250 passenger trains out of 1,000 it runs daily over its entire system. The New York Central canceled 125 passenger and 300 freight trains. Both railroads placed embargoes on freight shipments.

The strike also involved portions of the Chesapeake & Ohio Railroad, which uses terminals of some of the struck roads. C. & O. trains serving Washington, Chicago, Toledo, Columbus, Ohio, and Grand Rapids, Mich., were taken out of service.

The strike was caused by the insistence of the union that the railroads hire a second fireman to work on multiple-unit Diesel locomotives. The railroads, describing this a "featherbed" demand, refused, while the union claimed that it was necessary for safety reasons. Presidential fact-finding boards have held that the railroads are justified in refusing the union demand.

Late yesterday, David B. Robertson, president of the union, said at a news conference in Chicago that the union had offered conditionally to drop its demand for a second fireman on all multiple-unit Diesels. The union had proposed instead that the railroads agree to arbitrate the question whether a second fireman should be hired only on high-speed Diesel hauling through-passenger trains, he said.

MEDIATORS GIVE UP

In Chicago Mr. O'Neill said that "we've given up" and that a report on the deadlock would be submitted to the White House. For the railroads Daniel P. Loomis, their chief negotiator, announced that the industry would hold out adamantly against this featherbedding drive even if the union should extend the strike to other roads.

Mr. O'Neill said later that he had conferred with Dr. John R. Steelman, an assistant of President Truman, over the long-distance telephone. Dr. Steelman is in Washington. The mediation board, Mr. O'Neill said, would remain in Chicago a few days to be available to the disputants for consultation.

The Pennsylvania and the New York Central reported that, in general, passenger and freight travel along the Atlantic coast would not be hampered by the strike, which is the first involving more than one major rail system since 1946. The roads also said that

their commuting operations into New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and New York State would not be affected. West of Harrisburg the Pennsylvania said no freight or passenger trains were moving.

The Southern Railway system said in Atlanta that it had begun running idle trains with supervisory employees as firemen and that it expected to meet "95 percent of our regular schedule within the next 48 hours." A railroad official said that all the work normally done by firemen will be taken over by managerial and supervisory employees as fast as they can be indoctrinated in their duties. Other railroads were also using supervisory employees as firemen on some runs.

The union's strategy of confining the strike to four networks, though it has the same grievance against most of the railroads, was said to be based on the belief that President Truman could not declare a national emergency and seize the roads. It was explained that essential shipments can be moved over other lines, while much freight could be shifted to trucks. The union also said that it had agreed to furnish firemen for trains carrying troops and medical supplies.

The Santa Fe announced that it had canceled four of its major trains between Chicago and the Pacific Coast. The road also placed an embargo on all carload and less-than-carload shipments of livestock and perishable freight. The Pennsylvania said that perishable freight scheduled to go over its lines would be rerouted to other railroads, while the New York Central said that freight permits would be issued in New York for perishables and other essentials.

LAYOFFS TO START TOMORROW

Figures on unemployment, other than that of the strikers, caused by the strike, were sketchy yesterday. The New York Central estimated that the strike would eventually cause the furloughing of some 50,000 of its employees. A large number of its employees would be laid off tomorrow, the Pennsylvania said, adding that the number was as yet undetermined.

Among the trains canceled by the New York Central for the duration of the strike were the Twentieth Century Limited, the Commodore Vanderbilt, the Cleveland Limited, and the Chicagoan. Only one main line train will operate over the Central lines from New York to Chicago. This will be a combination of the Pacemaker and the Commodore Vanderbilt which will leave Grand Central Terminal at 4 p. m. daily. At Buffalo, beginning of the strike area, supervisory personnel, will replace firemen, it was said.

The Empire State Express will continue to leave Grand Central at 9 a. m. daily. The section to Detroit will operate over the Canadian division of the line, which is not struck, but the Cleveland section has been canceled. Trains to Canada are unaffected. The Pennsylvania canceled 10 through trains to the West, including the Broadway Limited to Chicago, the Jeffersonian, and the Spirit of St. Louis to St. Louis, and the Red Arrow to Detroit.

Florida trains from Pennsylvania Station, which proceed south over the lines of the Atlantic Coast Line and the Seaboard Air Line, will run as usual. Mails for the strike area, the Pennsylvania said, will be sent to Washington and there be rerouted over the Baltimore and Ohio lines to the affected areas.

The Post Office Department in Washington and New York reported that mail shipments were being maintained with only a few delays. No unusual increase of activity was reported yesterday at New York's airports because of the curtailment of train service, but there were indications that airline travel would increase sharply if the strike were not speedily settled. Airline ticket offices reported an unusual number of calls for reservations. American Airlines said it had added one extra round-trip flight out of La Guardia Airport to Chicago, and that it would operate 11 extra flights to Chicago and other points tomorrow.

The Railroad Strike—Article by George Eckel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FORREST C. DONNELL
OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 11 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a news article from the New York Times of today, entitled "Railroad Traffic Is Disrupted as Firemen Strike on Four Lines." The article is by George Eckel.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RAILROAD TRAFFIC IS DISRUPTED AS FIREMEN STRIKE ON FOUR LINES

CHICAGO, May 10.—Large-scale disruption of traffic, together with scattered industrial shut-downs, cut-backs, and lay-offs, marked the first-day effects of the strike called this morning by the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen against four major railroads.

Hope for a settlement of the dispute appeared dim tonight after the principals had lashed at each other during the day.

Francis A. O'Neill, Jr., Chairman of the National (Railway) Mediation Board, who continued conferences nearly 4 hours after the walk-out became effective, made a report to Dr. John R. Steelman, the President's assistant, in Washington.

The Board will remain here for a few days to be available if its services are further desired, Mr. O'Neill said, but no further mediation conferences have been scheduled. He described the negotiations as "deadlocked."

The principal issue in the strike is the union's demand for a second fireman on multiple-unit Diesel locomotives. Two fact-finding boards have held that the demand was not justified. One of the panels was appointed in 1943 by President Roosevelt and the second was named last fall by President Truman.

The four strike-bound railroads are the New York Central west of Buffalo, the Pennsylvania west of Harrisburg, the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe and the Southern Railway. They normally carry 39.2 percent of the country's passengers and 24 percent of the total freight volume.

Other lines using the tracks of the four railroads or connecting with their affected trains, also discontinued or reduced service.

David B. Robertson, president of the brotherhood, said that the strike was "completely effective among the 18,000 firemen and enginemen affected on the four lines." Nevertheless, the New York Central and Santa Fe operated "skeleton" service through the use of supervisory personnel or engineers qualified as firemen.

Mr. Robertson said that no expansion of the strike was contemplated. The statement caused considerable interest in view of speculation on whether the extent of the present strike was sufficient to warrant Presidential seizure of the railroads on the basis of national emergency.

The union leader indicated at a press conference that the strike might have been averted if the railroads had accepted a union proposal to arbitrate after the union had modified its original demand by abandoning the request for a third fireman in all freight and passenger locomotives of the multiple-unit Diesel type. The arbitration would have related only to passenger trains, and among those only to high speed, streamlined and main line through trains, he said.

His arbitration proposal contained a condition, however, that a finding adverse to management would carry with it acceptance of a second fireman on the types of passenger trains in question, he added.

A management spokesman asserted that "this is offering to arbitrate after losing two court cases," referring to the two fact-finding board verdicts.

Mr. Robertson declared that while the railroads termed the union demand "featherbedding," they now had about 5,000 "special duty" men doing the same job the brotherhood sought for the firemen.

"Not true," a railroad spokesman said, adding that firemen were not qualified for the job done by Diesel experts now occasionally carried as a "third man" to observe performance of the engines. Mr. Robertson held firemen were qualified as "third men."

Today's walkout, which was postponed for 2 weeks on April 26, came after Federal mediators had worked nearly 2 days without sleep in an effort to head it off. They were led by Mr. O'Neill, who is 72 years old.

The strike is the largest rail tie-up since the 2-day country-wide walkout of the engineers and trainmen in May 1946, which ended in an "indefinite postponement" shortly before a seizure deadline set by President Truman.

Great demand was reported throughout the affected area for transportation by alternate rail routes and by bus and airplane lines.

While Chicago, the rail hub of the country and a terminal for three of the affected lines, was experiencing no immediate economic effects of the walkout, reports from other cities gave this picture:

The Fisher Body plant in Cleveland shut down, sending its 7 a. m. shift home after 4 hours when outgoing materials began piling up.

The Midland Steel Co., also in Cleveland, cut back operations 80 percent at noon, after an unsatisfactory experiment with truck transportation.

In Pennsylvania, coal began to pile up at once at the mine.

Automobile manufacturers in Detroit reported extensive plans to use trucks in place of trains, but several of them expected serious effects if the strike lasted long. Chrysler Corp., just resuming operations after a 100-day strike, said it would "try to operate for the rest of the week, but longer than that is very doubtful."

Thousands of commuters in Pittsburgh and Chicago had to seek alternate means of transportation.

As many as 200,000 employees of the affected railroads themselves will be thrown out of work if the strike continues more than a day or two, it was indicated.

The Pennsylvania has notified 75,000 of its 120,000 employees that their work will stop Friday morning. The New York Central estimates that about 50,000 are out of work.

Total or limited embargoes were put in effect by the roads, but mail service will be little affected, if at all. Such trains as are kept in service will carry mail to their capacity, and the Post Office Department will rely on its own and contract trucks to supplement the diminished rail service, it was announced in Washington.

The New York Central, which took off 125 passenger and 300 freight trains daily, said that it was operating today a combined

Pacemaker and Advanced Commodore between New York and Chicago; the New England States between Chicago and Boston; a combined Detroiter and Wolverine between New York and Detroit; and between Detroit and Chicago, the Mercury westbound and the New York special eastbound. All trains were scheduled to operate in both directions. Three freight and two mail trains also were sent out from Chicago.

Pennsylvania Polka

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 11, 1950

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I call attention to a very interesting article in the April 3 issue of Newsweek regarding the troubles of the Republican Party in Pennsylvania:

PENNSYLVANIA POLKA

The Republican Party is undergoing the shake-up of its life in Pennsylvania, one of its strongholds. Following is a report by Harold Lavine, Newsweek political writer, on the causes and effects of the commotion.

Gov. James H. Duff, of Pennsylvania, is a big, belligerent man, with a streak of stubbornness that wide and a temper as flaming as his nickname, "Red." A lawyer by profession ("and I was a helluva good one, too"), he spent most of his youth wildcatting in oilfields from western Pennsylvania all the way to Mexico. He drilled a few dusters, brought in a few gushers, and ended up with a million.

Then the 1929 crash came along and wiped Duff out. It left him neck-deep in debt, with nothing to show for his years as a wildcatter except an oilman's crackling vocabulary and an oilman's love of a brawl. As far as Duff is concerned, they were years well spent.

Last week Jim Duff was having the brawl of his life. It was a brass-knuckle battle with Pennsylvania's powerful Grundy machine, fought under boomtown-barroom rules. Everything went, including rabbit-punching, eye-gouging, and kneeing in the clinches. Duff swore that he would smash the machine into a heap of twisted junk. It was that, he said, or else the machine would destroy the Republican Party in Pennsylvania and nationally.

That was big talk even for Big Red. In one way or another, the Grundy machine has pretty much dominated the Republican Party in Pennsylvania for 30 years. Usually it has simply pulverized opposition. When it couldn't do that, it has pitched a little woo and married its opponents. The Grundy motto is that ancient political precept "When in doubt, deal."

Grundy leaders boast that no Governor has sat in the statehouse since 1922—except for Democrat George H. Earle—without the machine's O. K. In recent years it has just about named the Governor.

Nationally, of course, the Grundy machine isn't nearly as powerful as that, but it can still move mountains when the wind is blowing right. The Grundy machine was primarily responsible for making Warren G. Harding the Republican candidate for President in 1920. At 87, Joseph R. Grundy is the last survivor of the historic "smoke-filled room." And it was the Grundy machine that started the bandwagon rolling for Thomas E. Dewey in 1948.

If past performances mean anything, fighting the Grundy machine is a painful and rather violent form of political suicide. Nevertheless, Jim Duff has put up a full slate against the machine's candidates in the May 16 Republican primary. Duff himself is running for the GOP nomination for the Senate against the Grundy choice, Representative JOHN C. KUNKEL, a Member of Congress since 1938 and the latest in a long line of politicians starting with his great-grandfather, John Sergeant, who ran for Vice President with Henry Clay back in 1832. Duff's principal lieutenant, former Superior Court Judge John S. Fine, the boss of Luzerne County, is campaigning for the nomination for Governor against Jay Cooke, a retired Philadelphia investment banker and hero of two wars, who protests weakly that he's not a Grundy man but has the machine's open support.

The issue, says Duff, is Grundyism and Grundyism he defines as "the rule or ruin tactics of a small group of men, selfish and self-serving, one of the most reactionary groups in the Republican Party anywhere in America." The Grundy machine doesn't care about anything except the pocketbooks of Pennsylvania's big manufacturers, he insists. And he considers this not only wrong but politically insane as well. The Republican Party cannot hope to win in Pennsylvania this year or nationally in 1952, Duff maintains, unless it convinces the voters that it represents all the people and not just "the interests."

Who's a liberal? When Duff talks of himself as a liberal Republican and denounces his opponents as Old Guard reactionaries, the Grundy men look utterly bewildered. One of the machine's top leaders said last week: "I don't know what a liberal is and I'll give you a thousand dollars if you can define the word for me, but if that guy Duff is a liberal then I'm a liberal, too. He keeps calling me a reactionary. So far as I can figure out that's just a nice way of saying I'm an S. O. B."

The Grundy machine insists there's no question of principle involved. Duff's talk of liberal Republicanism the Grundy leaders say, is merely a cover-up for the fact that he wants to make himself dictator of the Republican Party in Pennsylvania. They call him power-mad, a would-be Caesar, a megalomaniac.

Actually, the issue doesn't appear nearly as simple as either side pretends. As usually is the case in political brawls, policies and personalities have become inseparably entangled. If Duff can make out a good case for his view of the conflict, the Grundy leaders can offer an equally good one for theirs.

However, Duff does have this advantage: Pennsylvania voters generally do regard the fight as one between liberalism and standpat Republicanism, although the Governor's critics contend that his liberalism is nothing but me-tooism and ask why he doesn't join the Democratic Party. Therein lies the national significance of the conflict. If Duff wins, his victory will be interpreted widely as a victory for liberal Republicanism And since the same issue has split the GOP elsewhere, that will have inevitable repercussions in other States, and especially at the Republican convention in 1952.

As a matter of fact, it's a cinch for any soap-box speaker to depict the Grundy machine as a stronghold of reaction. For the Grundy machine is simply the Pennsylvania Manufacturers Association by another name. The backbone of the organization is PMA's 17 branches. National Committeeman G. Mason Owlett, who runs the machine now that Uncle Joe Grundy has retired, doubles in brass as PMA president.

And PMA was founded on the assumption that what is good for its 8,000 members automatically is good for the State of Pennsylvania.

In the early days of the New Deal moreover, the Grundy machine stood steadfast against social and welfare legislation. Joe Grundy himself is almost the personification of Old Guard Republicanism, as well as the leading exponent of the GOP's traditional high-tariff policy.

Pro and con: That's only part of the story, however. For the PMA has mellowed considerably in recent years, and even Democratic critics admit that it has shown an increasing understanding of the workingman's point of view. And further to complicate Duff's black-and-white picture of the fight as being one between liberalism and reaction, the Grundy leaders offer two major arguments:

It was the Grundy machine, they say, which made Duff attorney general and which later threw him the nomination for governor. "If I've heard Duff say once I have heard him say 20 times: 'When God made Senator Grundy he threw the mold away'," Mason Owlett asserts, "and now he says, 'Our objective is to eliminate Grundyism'."

Moreover, although the PMA hasn't always approved of Duff's program, Grundy legislators nevertheless have supported him whenever his bills came up for a vote.

To both arguments, Jim Duff has ready answers:

To the first, he says: "I didn't know what those guys were like until after I was elected."

To the second: "Sure they voted for my bills. They were too yellow-livered to stand up and be counted against them. It was in committee they did their dirty work; behind closed doors they did everything they could to knife me."

According to Duff, his break with the Grundy machine came shortly before his inauguration. "Owlett barged into my office with a budget all figured out and an inauguration address all written. I wasn't supposed to ask questions. I was just supposed to sign the budget and read the address. The Grundy machine had done all my thinking for me. Now what do those guys figure they are—a supergovernment?"

The principal issue over which the break occurred was repeal of the 5-mill tax on manufacturers' capital stocks. Grundy leaders insist that Duff promised repeal. "Otherwise," they add, "we'd never have given him the nomination." Duff retorts: "They're liars. I never made any such promise." One of Duff's first acts had been to propose raising the cigarette tax from 2 cents to 4 cents a pack and putting a new tax on beer and soft drinks. "When Owlett came here and said he wanted the capital-stock tax repealed, I told him: 'If you think I'm going to give you a free seat in the grandstand at the same time I'm raising the price in the bleachers, you're crazy.'"

Duff says the Grundy machine has been fighting him ever since. Owlett, however, declares that, "although we didn't agree with the Governor, we went along." Duff snorts: "Nonsense."

As Governor, Duff has raised State aid to education, improved the mental hospitals, increased the State's nursery capacity, started cleaning up the Schuylkill River basin, built new roads, and made other improvements. He says the Grundy machine has fought him on every reform. Grundy leaders deny it. Duff's program is merely the program of former Governor (now Senator), EDWARD MARTIN, they say, and they supported it. They add: "The only thing we objected to was reestablishing the general State authority. That was just a subterfuge for running Pennsylvania into debt in violation of the constitution; it's deficit financing.

Duff answers: "Sure, they liked the program; they just didn't like the idea of paying for it. As for whether or not the general State authority is constitutional: The courts say 'Yes.'"

So the fight has raged with almost unparalleled bitterness. The Grundy machine charges that Duff has used the State police to gather evidence against county chairmen, which he uses to blackmail them into supporting him. This Duff point-blank denies. When Harry S. Truman humorously invited six Republican governors, including Duff, who had blueprinted a new GOP policy, to join the Democratic Party, the Grundy leaders shouted: "We told you so." Duff for his part has been lambasting the Grundy machine as vituperatively as any Fair Dealer might.

It is conceded that Duff will win the nomination for the Senate, but control of the State GOP is dependent on control of the State House, for that is where the patronage lies. The race for governor is a toss-up. And even if Duff's man Fine wins, he will still have to defeat the Democratic nominee, Richardson Dilworth, a Main Line Fair Dealer. The Grundy machine can survive a Democratic governor, since it has the PMA organization. The machine that Duff has built up probably can't.

Grundy leaders say that if Fine wins they'll back him, but the bitterness of the primary fight has been so great that whoever is the GOP nominee will have a great deal of ill feeling in his own party to overcome. It will be a miracle if Dilworth wins the governorship, but Dilworth watches the GOP primary fight with unconcealed glee, hoping that it will help make a miracle happen.

United States Economic Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 11, 1950

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of President Truman at Pendleton, Oreg., on May 10, 1950:

TEXT OF TRUMAN'S OREGON SPEECH ON UNITED STATES ECONOMIC PROGRAM

I am glad to be here in Pendleton today.

I am always happy to visit the Pacific Northwest. You know, I have come out here to dedicate Grand Coulee Dam tomorrow. On the way out, I have been reporting to the people on some of the problems that our Nation faces, and the progress we are making in solving them.

At different towns and cities, I have talked about world peace and the farm program, and the development of our national resources. All these things are tied together, because we need to build a strong United States; strong morally and strong materially, as the basis for our own expanding future, and as the basis for world peace.

Today, I want to talk with you about the economic progress of our country.

The growth of the Pacific Northwest is a symbol of the breath-taking economic progress of the United States.

In one century you have grown from a few people pushing back the wilderness to thriving States with several million people. One hundred years ago ox teams were the power for your covered wagons. Today you use the energy of the Columbia River and in a few years more you may be harnessing the tremendous force of the atom for peaceful work.

These changes did not come about by themselves. They are the result of the daring and independent spirit which has always characterized this area.

The people of the West have always looked ahead. In their private actions and jointly through their local state and Federal Governments they have been eager to take bold and imaginative steps toward a better future.

THE DANGER OF TIMIDITY

So long as we hold fast to the frontier spirit of the West, we need never fear the greatest danger that could overtake our Nation. That is the danger of timidity of being satisfied with things as they are; of failing to seek ever higher goals.

Throughout our history there have been timid people who have been afread to move forward. They opposed all the progressive measures we now take for granted. These timid folk once tried to reverse the trend toward free education and political democracy. They called this trend mob rule.

Today the spiritual descendants of this timid group are afraid of bold, progressive measures to achieve an abundant and expanding economy and to distribute its products more fairly among all our people. They call these measures statism or socialism.

The use of the powers of Government to achieve a higher living standard and a fair deal for all the people is not statism and it is not socialism.

It is a part of the American tradition.

Every day we should thank Almighty God that the progressive trends of American life and progress have never been stopped for long. We have moved steadily toward a higher conception of human needs and human freedoms and a greater appreciation of the rights of the average man.

This progress in American life has not not been accomplished without a struggle. It cannot be continued without a struggle. Repeatedly the common sense of a majority of the American people has had to assert itself in the face of the opposition of those who wanted to cling to the past.

Much of this struggle has dealt with whether our vast country with its wealth of resources should be developed for the benefit of the many or the few. The issue has been whether we should stop trying to provide all our citizens with a good standard of living just because a few people already had more than enough.

The timid minority do not believe that prosperity for all our people is a goal that we should fight for. Many of them are sincere and well-meaning individuals. The trouble has not been always with their hearts, it has been with their eyes. Not only were they blind to the prospects of the future, they could not even see backward clearly enough to understand what had already happened.

POINTS TO THE DEPRESSION

Let us look to the recent progress of the United States.

Twenty years ago we had entered upon the greatest depression in our history. We suffered huge losses for more than three long years. Then we began vigorous policies of recovery and reform. Our recovery was so successful that by 1939 our total national output of goods and services was actually higher than it was in the last boom year before the great depression.

Since 1939 we have gone on to make further gains—tremendous gains.

I am going to give you some facts.

The calamity howlers don't like to look at the facts because the facts prove how wrong they are when they tell you what a terrible fix the country is in. They have been saying over and over and over again, for years, that the country is being ruined. But facts show that things have been getting better. So what do they do? They just ignore the facts.

Well, we are not going to ignore them. We are going to keep the record straight. We are going to see what has actually been happening to our country.

The best over-all measures of a nation's economy is its annual output of goods and services. In the United States the annual output of goods and services has increased in the last 10 years about 60 percent.

Now how does this affect the individual citizen? You know a favorite theme of the boys who are always trying to run our country down instead of trying to build it up, is that the Government takes all our gains away by high taxes. But the truth is that the annual per capita income of our citizens after taxes has increased in the last 10 years by more than 40 percent.

And some of the people who are doing the loudest yelling are the very people who have got the biggest increases. Most of them are better off now than they have ever been before in their lives.

However, and for this I am very thankful, the increased incomes have not been confined to a favored few. Annual wages and salaries of employees increased almost 75 percent in the last 10 years.

The income of farm owners, although it has fallen off in the last 2 years and has fallen off more than it should, is still more than 50 percent higher than it was in 1939. You would think all this would be enough to convince anybody that the country is doing very well. But some people are hard to convince. They say this administration looks after labor and looks after the farmer but that it just doesn't give the businessman a chance, that business is being taxed to death.

PUTS INCREASE AT 100 PERCENT

Let's examine that. The fact is that the annual income of corporate business after taxes—I repeat, after taxes—have increased about 100 percent since 1939.

That's right—100 percent.

It seems to me that free private enterprise is doing pretty well.

I am glad that it is. I want business to be prosperous and I am going to do all that I can to see that it remains prosperous.

There are some die-hard reactionaries who won't give up even when all the facts I have mentioned are pointed out to them. So they say, "Well, maybe so, but the dollars people have won't buy as much as they used to." That argument is just as phony as all the rest of the arguments the pessimists use.

In all the figures I have given you, allowance has been made for changes in the purchasing power of the dollar. The increases I am talking about are real increases, not just dollar increases. In dollar terms the gains would be even larger.

During the last 5 years, we have successfully met one of the greatest economic tests that can ever confront a nation. We have come through the adjustments following a great war without a depression. We have had depressions after most other wars and many people expected that we would have one this time.

Instead, we have weathered the readjustment period with relatively few hardships. Almost every newspaper you pick up gives new evidence of increasing business activity.

We have avoided the calamity of a postwar depression because our whole economy has been strengthened by a program of action which began 17 years ago. This program has been directed toward the humanizing of our economy and toward the humanizing of Government. This program has been marked by such measures as bank deposit insurance, regulation of the security markets, old-age and unemployment insurance, minimum wages, slum clearance and low-rent housing, resource development and protective farm legislation.

We have had a Government that was and is working for the people, not for special interests.

These measures have helped to distribute buying power more widely among the people. They have provided larger markets for the increasing products of our factories and our farms. They have protected our economy against shock. They have provided business with a stronger banking structure and a more flexible credit system. They have helped to sustain farm income.

A LESSON TO BE LEARNED

These results have not been achieved through public action alone. In private enterprise as well, employers and workers have placed more emphasis upon the human element. They have learned more about how our economy functions. They have constantly adopted more enlightened and progressive policies.

There is a great lesson to be learned from what we have accomplished. We have learned that it is within our power as a people to make full use of our tremendous resources of farm and factory and human skill.

We can use that lesson and we must use it to build for the future.

There are two conflicting schools of thought about the future of our economy, just as there are about its present condition. Those who can see nothing but evil in the present situation can see nothing but gloom for the future.

They have been saying all along that our programs could not succeed, even though the programs were succeeding at the very time they were denying it. Now they are saying the same old things—that the country is going bankrupt, that depression lies ahead and that the only thing to do is to pull in our belts and save what we can from the wreckage.

I don't agree with them.

I believe that we know more now than ever before about how to keep our economy strong and prosperous. I believe that we can continue to rely on the programs that have served so well for the last 17 years—use them and improve them. I face the future with confidence that our Nation will continue to grow in freedom and in material and moral strength.

I am sure that the people of Oregon and all the Pacific Northwest share that confidence. It is the character of those of you who live in this region to dream big dreams and plan big plans. You will not join with the little men who throw up their hands and cry, "It can't be done" when we set up our goals for future prosperity.

I want to tell you about some of those goals. And I assure you that there is nothing fantastic about them. They are merely based upon the belief that we can improve as rapidly in the future as we have in the past. I am sure we can do that well and even better if we follow wise policies that are for the benefit of all the people and not just for the special interests.

GOALS OF NEXT 10 YEARS

Here are some of the things we can do.

In the next 10 years we can reach toward higher standards of living for all.

We can lift our annual output of goods and services to more than $350,000,000,000 by 1960—a one-third increase within 10 years. And I am talking about real output measured in dollars of today's purchasing power.

We can increase real wage and salary incomes, and farm incomes, as our economy grows. We can increase the profits of business, not through higher prices or higher profit margins, but through increased volume in a growing economy.

I have said before, and I repeat, that by 1960 we can and should achieve a far better standard of living for every industrious family in the city and on the farm.

Now I want to tell you about some of the things we must do to achieve these goals.

First, the efficiency and capacity of our industries must be increased. Despite the large investments which industry has made since the war, there is urgent need for further investment and improvement to meet expanding markets and to take advantage of the rapid gains in technology.

This is a job for private owners and managers in manufacturing, in power, in transportation, in many other industries. It is also a job in which the Government must participate through resource development, sound tax policies, housing and small business programs, and many other ways.

Second, purchasing power must be expanded to develop and maintain markets for our increased production of goods.

The final market for all products is the ultimate consumer. Our economy cannot expand as fast as it should as long as we have a large number of families with substandard incomes. One out of four American families now has an income of less than $2,000 a year.

Our goal over the next decade should be to lift every hard-working American family to an income of about $4,000 a year—not a mere dollar increase, but an increase in the real standard of living. We have the resources to do this by balanced national growth.

SEES BENEFIT TO ALL

Raising the standards of our poorest families will not be at the expense of anybody else. We will all benefit by doing it, for the incomes of the rest of us will rise too.

Third, we must maintain a sound balance in the programs of our Government, faced as it is with huge and unavoidable responsibilities.

Most people realize now that more than 70 percent of the Federal budget is required to pay for past wars and our work to prevent another war. However, they often fail to realize just how vital the other 30 percent is to our welfare and progress. The costs of sound programs to improve the Nation's health and education, to stabilize agriculture, and to develop resources, are sensible investments in a better future.

I want to balance the budget of the Federal Government just as much as anybody else does. I would like to see taxes reduced. We will do both of these things just as soon as we safely can.

We must continue to strive for every true economy in national affairs. But I will not join in slashing Government expenses at the cost of our national security or national progress.

Fourth, we must continue to improve our economic relations with the rest of the world.

We must develop a larger flow of international trade and international investment on a sound basis. This will result in larger markets for ourselves and larger markets for other free countries.

Just as our Nation has grown through enlarged production and trade from which all sections of the country have benefited, so the expansion of world production and trade can strengthen all the free countries. That is an essential step toward world peace.

We must not be turned aside or slowed down in our efforts to help the other free nations get back on their feet by those who would retreat into isolationism in order to save a few dollars. We would pay for that folly many times over. It would greatly increase the chances of a third world war.

PUTS WORLD PEACE FIRST

As long as I am President we are not going to put dollars above world peace.

These things that I have been talking to you about the growth of our economy and the policies needed to make that growth possible, have very definite meaning for you folks here in Pendleton as they do for people all over the country. They are not just abstract theories. They are matters that will have a very important effect on your daily lives.

Our wheat and livestock growers cannot prosper without good incomes and high consumption in the rest of this country and in the other countries, too. The same thing is true of the Columbia River fisheries. Oregon's lumber industry will have good times only if our Nation builds the houses our people need.

And it works the other way, too. The Nation needs the products of your agriculture, forests, and fisheries. The whole country becomes stronger when Oregon and the Northwest grow and prosper.

We are a Nation that advances by cooperation and mutual benefit. We do not want any State or any group to grow at the expense of another. Our strength, the strength of free men, is in a society that works to bring better living to all our people.

We have demonstrated in our country that we can all move forward together. I believe profoundly that this forward movement is going to continue.

I believe that ultimately it will extend to the farthermost corners of the earth and that with the United States as a shining example we shall succeed in bringing greater welfare and freedom to all mankind.

Curtailment of Mail Deliveries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 11, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and resolution:

ERIE COUNTY COMMITTEE,
THE AMERICAN LEGION,
Buffalo, N. Y., May 8, 1950.

Hon. ANTHONY TAURIELLO,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Enclosed, herewith, please find copy of a resolution pertaining to the cutback in the Post Office Department which was unanimously adopted by the Erie County Committee of the American Legion on April 27, 1950.

We shall appreciate your assistance in this matter.

Respectfully yours,
THOMAS F. CAULFIELD,
Erie County Commander.

Whereas a recent order of the Post Office Department has been sent to every Post Office to curtail the delivery of mail; and

Whereas this order would give only one delivery of mail daily in residential areas and two in business sections; and

Whereas the Post Office Department is the direct contact of the public with one another and is the most essential public service granted the peoples of our great country; and

Whereas the dire consequences of the elimination of this necessary public service cannot be measured in dollars and cents: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, that the Erie County Committee of the American Legion go on record condemning such contemplated action on the part of the United States Post Office Department; and be it further

Resolved, That we send a copy of this resolution to our two United States Senators, namely, the Honorable IRVING M. IVES, and the Honorable HERBERT LEHMAN, together with a copy to our local United States Congressmen; and be it further

Resolved, That we inform our local newspapers of the action taken in reference to this matter.

THOMAS F. CAULFIELD,
Erie County Commander.

Republican Party Should Stand on Personal Freedom as the One Great Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 10, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on last Saturday I addressed the Young Republicans in their annual State convention at Janesville, Wis. I am including the remarks which I made at that time:

As members and workers in the Republican Party, it is well that we consider the position we must take in the coming campaigns, 1950 and 1952. There are those who feel that the Republican Party has no future in view of defeats in past national elections. We should not be discouraged. Republicanism in the State of Wisconsin is in a healthy condition; here is the place to strengthen our great party. We must arouse those who believe in the principles we support. There is an imperative need for productive action. We cannot hope to win on the weakness of our adversaries or in advocating "me-tooism." We must have a program of positive action consistent with the principles of freedom. The question presented, therefore, is where do we stand on State and national matters? Let me suggest that there can be no more sound program than a platform for free Americans. Our position must be grounded in personal freedom. This means freedom to work on our own initiative at any honest occupation we choose. It follows that personal freedom means the right to keep what we have earned. The opportunity to save, to invest, or to engage in business, or to work in a factory or on a farm, and thus face the future as free men in a free land. This concept is indispensable to the basic principle of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. These are inalienable rights for all Americans. The founders of our Nation fought and died to obtain these rights and we, as Republicans, must wage a fight to transmit them to those who come after us—unimpaired.

To preserve freedom and for no other purpose the people of the United States created a government under our Constitution. They realized that no simple democracy could long survive the lure of political demagogues, leading to the dictator and they deliberately limited the power of their government and divided it into three separate parts; legislative, executive, and judicial. This was intended to be a check on each department so that no one of them might become supreme. The purpose of the Contitution was not to convey rights to individual citizens but to specify the limitations imposed by free citizens on government. Today we are cognizant that this limitation is being submerged by those who have become securely entrenched in government.

Our forefathers desiring freedom above all else and having won it with their blood did not propose to permit any new government to usurp authority or to interfere with their personal lives as free men. This principle, too, has been forgotten. Those who organized the Federal Government did so with the clear thought in mind of a government of limited powers in a general grant of sovereignty. You will recall that the Bill of Rights provides that the enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights shall not be construed to deny or disparage those retained by the people and further that powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution nor provided by it to the States are reserved to the States respectively or to the people.

One hundred and sixty-three years have passed. True only a brief period in the history of the world and what do we find happening to this Republic? There can be no doubt that the trend we are following is leading to the abolition of personal freedom and reliance upon omnipotent government under socialism. I hesitate to use that term for it is greatly misunderstood and people pay little attention to it. We know, however, that socialism is government ownership or management of the nation's economy. Socialism leads to the denial by the Government of the right or capacity of individuals to manage themselves and their property. In effect, socialism sets up a government which is the master of the people and not its servant.

Today a young man cannot work at a trade without the consent of a labor dictator to whom he must pay political tribute. Today a young man cannot conduct a business of his own without the consent of bureaucrats who tax away profits and leave him losses so that business cannot grow under his direction and management. In many fields of business the Government, through loans and subsidies of special favors, actually competes with a man in business. Government threatens the professions; medicine and education, and the minds of our children may be subservient to governmental duress. Without young growth a forest passes away and with young people, who will make the jobs for them in the future? Will it be Government or will it be enterprising young people who have vision and faith in these United States.

Let me remind you of certain facts that are discernible today. We know that other lands have greater natural resources than our own and larger populations. Yet with only 6 percent of the world's land area and less than 7 percent of the world's population, we have produced a standard of living that is the envy of the world. What have we had that other nations had not? It seems to me the principal ingredient has been liberty, freedom from the avarice of government. If there is one deterrent to the healthy rehabilitation of the nations of Europe and Asia, it is that of oppressive governmental organizations geared to the principle of state socialism.

In our own country we see personal and corporate savings for expansion purposes drained into unproductive governmental projects. The average man is working 2 days of every week for government before he can earn his own living. On Monday and Tuesday he works to pay for government. Wednesday he starts keeping what he earns as a free man should. Of course we need some government to keep us free and we are all willing to pay a reasonable sum for it, but there is a limit and we are rapidly reaching that point today.

In 1930 the national debt was $131 per person, now it is $2,000 for every man, woman, and child. Yet there are those who think they can get something for nothing just so long as it comes from the Government. This is a fallacy that people are just beginning to realize. Government has no money of its own, whatever it spends it takes from all the taxpayers in this country. There is and can be no national gravy train. No program can guarantee something for nothing, year in and year out. Taxes are derived from productive enterprises.

Only production stimulated by free markets can give us anything. Every hour taken up in Government red tape is an hour taken from production and produces nothing but scarcity. It is sad but true. There is no such thing as free money. Government can only print money, it cannot create a value for it. Now we find that Government is taking money from the people in three ways; by direct taxation, indirect taxation, and by paper-money inflation. Direct taxation is such as the income tax; indirect taxation is anything involved in what we buy; bread, clothes, autos, movies, in fact, all of our daily needs. The only other way that Government can get money is by the paper-money inflation route, which arises as a result of deficit financing. Today we have a 60-cent dollar, probably less. This devaluation of our money is actually a loss. It seems to me that the time has come to restore the value of that money by stopping deficit financing and by the establishment of a balanced budget. I think it is important to realize that Government can only support a favored few. It cannot support all of us. It has nothing to give but what it takes from the people. Our real security in this country must be measured by production. We cannot consume more than we produce. Whatever kills initiative and incentive kills security. All around us there is evidence that men and women in the past have been ambitious and willing to earn, save, and invest. England fell for the welfare state and today it lives its meager existence dependent upon our bounty, but it will not let a man build a chicken coop in his own backyard without governmental consent. Socialism kills the spirit of adventure by distributing our wealth in numerous ways and it finally ends by distributing poverty to all but the ruling class. If we slip into the twilight of socialism and economic conditions become difficult, what nation on the face of this earth is there to send us its bounty and support us on its charity?

All this adds up to the point that I have been attempting to make, namely, that in the light of our history as a guide to save ourselves and our country, the Republican Party must stand for personal freedom without equivocation; the right to work as we please without fear of domination or control from any source; a public policy rededicated to the protection of the right to acquire and own private property; a tax system that will restore incentive to production; a public policy containing and eliminating Federal subsidies; reduction of Federal expenditures in every department of Government; a balanced budget in time of peace and a prompt termination of wartime powers; a judicial system where judges rise above politics; withdrawal by the Federal Government from competition in private business; the restraint of all monopolies whether of Government, business, or labor, so that no man or group of men would have the power to tie up our national economy; a systematic plan for the payment of our national debt; and finally economy in government and the restoration of a sound monetary system.

Only by freedom can the energies of the people of this country be realized. We must restore the dignity of the individual and return again to the fundamental and basic principle that government is still the servant and not the master of the people.

The second principle of our platform, in order to preserve our freedom and our constitutional Government, it seems to me, is

insistence upon the sovereignty of the individual States. The Federal Government has no inherent sovereignty as I have already said. It only has limited powers delegated to it by the Constitution. The inherent sovereignty of each State goes back of the Federal Constitution and is, in effect, broader and more basic. It was Thomas Jefferson, author of the Declaration of Independence who realized that the Federal Government might become strong and oppressive. He said, "I see with the deepest affliction the rapid strides with which the Federal branch our Government is advancing toward the usurpation of all the rights reserved to the States and the consolidation in itself of all powers, foreign and domestic, and that too, by constructions which if legitimate leaves no limits to its power." We see today that the prediction by Jefferson has come into full bloom with a Federal Government attempting to usurp all rights reserved to the States under our Constitution. This is a situation that calls for drastic action. We believe as did the founders of our Nation in a Federal Republic of limited controlled powers and in the system of checks and balances between the legislative, executive and judicial departments—no one supreme, no packed court and no rubberstamp Congress.

It may seem strange but we know that an atom bomb might be smuggled or flown into this country and might someday explode in Washington, destroying in an instant, our President, our Congress, our Supreme Court, and our War Department, while saboteurs cut our communications. Is it not well then that our States retain their native strength and organization for independence so that an enemy may know that there is no simple path to the conquest of the United States? We have 48 States and thus we differ from European countries where the killing or the intimidation of central government officials has surrendered nations to communism. It is significant that all Communist policies favor centralization and the setting up of a strong centralized government. This is a matter that should have the serious thought of the American people immediately.

The third principle which we must consider if we are to preserve our personal freedom and the freedom of our States, deals with the freedom and independence of the United States against any foreign control whatsover. It can be said that there are two present threats to the independence of the United States—(1) military and (2) subversive activities.

We humbly confess that with our own aid Russian communism has grown enormously, while nations fighting it have been undermined and abandoned. We have poured billions of dollars worth of military supplies into Russia, when it seemed as though Russia would fall before the onslaught of Hitler's hordes. At Yalta, our statesmen delivered 7 nations and 85,000,000 people into the hands of communism including, our own ally Poland.

Betrayed without her knowledge, Poland was left to learn her fate from conversations in Moscow. When our armies drove rapidly against Germany toward the eastern border and were about to take Berlin, word from Washington halted them, saying Russia must enter Berlin first. That American General Patton saw his victorious sweep across Europe brought to a halt by diplomats who did not realize what they were doing. Patton was humiliated but the die was cast. We continued and still are continuing to pour billions of dollars into a continent where Russia can take over at will. And today we find that communism is being consolidated behind the iron curtain and we are forced again to expend billions of dollars more to prepare for the war that might come. We have been chagrined by the Berlin blockade which cost millions of dollars and took many American lives in an effort to keep food going into Berlin proper.

While subsidizing socialism in western Europe with a show of strength and insisting that Communists stay out of the Greek Government, our same State Department insisted that the Chinese should admit Communists to their government and when the national government refused, they opposed it with obstruction and delay. After giving Manchuria to Russia which did not belong to us but to China, we now find that the Communists have conquered all of China.

All this has been very satisfactory to Russia who preaches war against America and foresees us outnumbered, 10 to 1, by an enemy controlling the greatest land mass in the world. This presents a difficult question and calls for a higher order of statesmanship than we have had in the past. The problem will not be solved by indiscriminate spending in all quarters of the globe nor spending in areas where the benefit flows readily on to help the Russians. The Communists plan to defeat us by making us spend ourselves into bankruptcy and we have made a good start.

Former President Hoover was right when he recently said that if the Nation is to survive, no new special projects however worthy, should be undertaken until the cold war is ended, since $23,000,000,000 of our $45,000,000,000 budget is needed for defense in the cold war.

The danger that comes in our preparation to establish a defense sufficiently strong to meet any thrust by a potential enemy arises in the transformation of our industrial economy from a peacetime to a wartime footing. In this country we could easily be spending forty or fifty billions creating a condition which would not be healthy from the standpoint of a sound industrial economy.

Finally there is this threat to our independence by subversive activities within the United States. Those of us who live and work in Washington know that this threat is a real one. Russian Communists have made great inroads within our land. Yet the President of the United States denies such to be the fact. Aside from influencing foreign policy their immediate purpose in the United States is to weaken us internally by cultivating conflict between Americans. Trained trouble makers, who urge the Protestant to hate the Catholic, the black to hate the white, the employee, the employer; love for Russia, but not friendship and understanding among Americans. To delude our people they have developed the technique of the Communist front and their sympathizers are prominent in the literary, educational, religious, and scientific worlds.

It is a known fact that Russia organized cultural conferences in various countries, the American one at the Waldorf in New York, where writers, scientists, movie actors, and other such intelligentsia rush to attend. In this group there were 100 professors from 51 colleges in 21 States, and a former Vice President of the United States. Just a year ago our own Atomic Energy Commission entrusted our allies' fortunes and honor by presenting scholarships to known Communists and then defended its action in so doing. Activity in known Communist fronts becomes fashionable in educational and scientific circles and no bar to high official positions close to the atomic secret. Investigations are blocked or turned secret, and the President puts an official gag order on 2,000,000 Americans forbidding them to testify before a congressional committee without his consent.

I believe that the people of the United States want no secret government for it is alien to the American tradition. Subversiveness and corruption thrive in darkness and wither in the light. We want no iron curtain in our country. Good administrators should frankly cooperate with representatives of the people in investigations of corruption and subversion, particularly in their own administration. Good administrators don't cover up, they clean up and they are glad when others help them to find bad spots. That is the kind of administration we want and the people of this country are entitled to know what kind we have. After all it is our country.

Now let me summarize the points that I have been trying to make in this presentation:

(1) We stand for personal freedon to live and work as we please, subject only to laws designed to preserve similar freedom in others. We believe in the right of freemen to own and keep property, as indispensable to human rights. We seek a sound and frugal government, without which there is no security for any man. And we would restore the dignity of the individual and return to the fundamental principle that the Government is the servant, not the master, of the people.

(2) To preserve our constitutional government we would faithfully observe the checks and balances created for that purpose, and protect the rights of the States and the people in their freedom.

(3) To preserve our personal freedom and the freedom of our States, we stand for the freedom and independence of the United States and against any foreign control whatsoever.

(4) We will oppose communism. We will aid those who fight against it in China and Asia as well as in Europe; we will husband our resources and carefully prepare for defense; we will cease to coddle communism within our own gates. We will not submit to any world government or alien association; we would help the world by example, not by conquest; we do not seek to conquer, neither will we be conquered.

Integration of Heavy Industry in Germany and France

REMARKS
OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 1950

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the proposal made yesterday in Paris by the French Government to integrate the heavy industries of Germany and France is one of the most far-reaching and significant developments of our time.

It is doubly gratifying that our Secretary of State has immediately hailed the plan as entirely consistent with American objectives in Western Europe.

Mr. Speaker, the integration and confiscation of the 270,000,000 free peoples of Western Europe will defeat and turn back aggressive communism. There is cause for rejoicing in the free world today.

I include herewith a splendid editorial from the Washington Post of this morning. I also include the text of the French proposal as well as a news story giving the American reaction.

[From the Washington Post of May 11, 1950]

UNION IN WESTERN EUROPE

There's a logic about the French plan for supranational control of heavy industry in western Europe that will doubtless repel the opportunists and the doctrinaires and the

drifters in foreign-policy making. Let us examine the logic. The French are weak, the Germans strong. It is unrealistic to expect a Franco-German combine without either the entry of the British as a balancer or a real merger of the tools of war which would erase nationality. An inner advantage is that amalgamation would allow the French to absorb two or three million Germans in their population without fear of internal upset. Britain's cool and cautious attitude toward unity in Europe requires concentration on the alternative of a non-British continental authority.

Approach the problem in another way. There can never be any unity in Europe without the prior establishment of a vested interest in it. This thought was one of the great contributions to political theory of Alexander Hamilton. In assuming the preexisting debts of the constituent States, he built up a vested interest in Federal union on the part of the moneyed class of the young America. Similarly the control of heavy industry by the affected countries in unity would create a vested interest in European unity. So the French policy represents a contribution to integration of the utmost significance.

Our satisfaction is influenced by the fact that since the war ended the Washington Post has advocated exactly this plan as the necessary first step in establishing the European system in accordance with modern realities. It was given priority over Mr. Hoffman's payments union in our last comment. Mr. Schuman is still nuclear in concept. As a starter he would restrict control to Germany, France, and the Saar. Clearly the Foreign Minister wants first of all to overcome the stumbling block over the Saar which has created a new controversy between France and Germany. Incorporation in a wider union would simply swallow the Saar problem. In time, however, the authority would doubtless take in Luxemburg, Belgium, and Holland, for these three countries, now working toward unity themselves, have a vital stake in the Ruhr complex.

It has been our experience that two objections are usually advanced against such an economic union. One is fear of worker hostility, the other fear of cartelization. However, as to the workers, these have long been in advance of their governments. On March 15 a year ago, the union leaders of the metal workers of Germany, France, Luxemburg, Holland, and Belgium met to try to promote the idea of a continental industrial entity. The upshot was the establishment of the Joint Committee of the Metal and Mine Workers Unions. Headquarters are at Luxemburg, where the meeting was held, and there could have been no better place for the achievement of consolidation, for Luxemburg was the former headquarters of the Ruhr cartel.

Cartel! Does the word apply to the proposed new authority? Mr. Schuman takes specific pains to apply just the opposite description. He says it would be an anticartel authority, dedicated to free expansion, and in an effort to meet objection by the anticartelists, the United Nations would be invited to have a representative sitting with the authority.

In sum: Mr. Schuman has the root of the matter in him. A new Europe, as he puts it, will never be born by decision, but by action—action based upon what Metternich called "a unifying idea." The only "unifying idea" in a context of postwar modern life which has made prosperity and peace indivisible is unity itself. The Schuman policy is based upon the concept of a new Europe which shall be coprosperous and copeaceful. Many have had this idea before Mr. Schuman, including Messrs. McCloy and John Foster Dulles. It may be well here to pay tribute to one of them, for Washington will soon be the poorer because of his departure. This is the Netherlands' Ambassador, Mr. E. N. van Kleffens, who, as far back as 1943, proposed something very similar to the Schuman idea. It has been left to Mr. Schuman to spark a plan, which, we are confident, had been thoroughly studied and prepared before it was offered for public and ministerial consideration.

[From the Washington Post of May 11, 1950]

TEXT OF FRENCH PROPOSAL—POOLING WOULD UNIFY EUROPE AND KEEP PEACE, SCHUMAN SAYS

(Details of the plan for the industrial unification of Europe, as set forth by Robert Schuman, the French Foreign Minister, were made public here last night by the French Embassy. Schuman made the statement in Paris on Tuesday. The text follows:)

It is no longer a question of vain words, but of an act, a bold act, a constructive act. France has acted and the consequences of her action may be immense. We hope that they will be.

France has acted essentially for peace. If peace is to have a chance, there must first of all be a Europe. Five years almost to the day after the unconditional surrender of Germany, France is taking the first decisive act in the construction of Europe and is associating Germany with it. This act must necessarily transform European conditions. This transformation will make it possible to take other common action that has been impossible until now. Out of all this will emerge a sound, united, and strongly constructed Europe, a Europe whose standard of living will rise, thanks to the pooling of production and the extension of markets, which will bring about a drop in prices. In this Europe, the Ruhr, the Saar, and the French Basin will work together and their peaceful neighbors, followed by United Nations observers, will benefit all Europeans, eastern as well as western, and all lands, especially Africa, that look to the older Continent for their development and prosperity.

Such is France's decision, and these are the considerations that inspired it: World peace cannot be safeguarded without creative efforts proportionate to the dangers that threaten it. The contribution that an organized and vital Europe can make is indispensable to the maintenance of peaceful relations. As the champion for United Europe for more than 20 years, France has always had one main objective: To serve the cause of peace. Europe has not been organized; we have had wars.

Europe will not be built at one stroke or by means of one over-all structure. It will be built, first by means of concrete steps that create real solidarity. The unification of the European nation demands that the age-old enmity of France and Germany be eliminated. The action undertaken must apply primarily to France and Germany. To this end, the French Government proposes immediately to take action on a limited but decisive point. It proposes to place all French and German steel and coal production under a common high authority in an organization opened to the other European countries.

The pooling of coal and steel productions will insure the immediate establishment of common bases of economic development, the first stage in European federation and will change the destiny of these regions which have long been devoted to the manufacture of weapons of war, of which they themselves have been the most constant victims.

The solidarity of production thus established will prove that any war between France and Germany has become not only unthinkable but materially impossible. The creation of this powerful production pool opened to all countries that wish to participate in it and making available to all its members on the same conditions the basic necessities for industrial production will lay the real foundation for their economic unification. The output of this pool will be offered to the whole world without discrimination or exclusion as a contribution to the improvement of living standards and the advancement of peaceful enterprise. Europe will have increased means with which to promote the realization of one of her essential tasks; the development of the African continent.

The fusion of interests indispensable to the establishment of a broader and deeper community between countries that have long been kept apart by bloody conflicts will thus be realized simply and rapidly. By pooling their basic industries and establishing a new high authority whose decisions will be binding for France, Germany, and the other participating countries, this proposal will lay the first concrete foundation of a European federation which is essential for the safeguarding of peace.

In order to work toward the realization of the objective defined above, the French Government is ready to open negotiations on the following basis: the common high authority will be charged with insuring, in the shortest possible time, the modernization of production and the improvement of its quality, the supply of coal and steel on the same terms to the markets of France, Germany, and other member-countries, the increase of joint exports, the improvement and equalization of the living conditions of the industrial workers in the participating countries.

Since production conditions are very different in the member countries, certain conditional measures must be adopted to achieve these objectives: the application of a production and investment plan, the establishment of mechanisms to equalize prices, and the creation of the reconversion fund to facilitate the rationalization of production. All customs duties on coal and steel between participating countries will be abolished immediately and the same railway freight rates will be applied. Gradually, conditions will be created which will automatically insure the most rational distribution of production at the highest level of productivity.

In contradistinction to an international cartel which tends to divide and exploit national markets by restrictive practices and the maintenance of large profits, the proposed organization will assure the merging of markets and the expansion of production. The basic principles and engagements defined above will be the object of a treaty to be signed between the states and submitted to the Parliaments for ratification. The negotiations necessary to work out the measures of implementation will be carried on with the assistance of an arbiter designated by common agreement. It will be the arbiter's responsibility to see to it that the agreements reached are in conformity with the principles, and in case of a deadlock, he will decide upon the solution to be adopted. The common high authority responsible for the functioning of the whole organization will be composed of independent personalities designated on a party basis by the governments, and a president will be chosen by common agreement of the governments. This decision will be enforceable in France, Germany, and the other member countries. Appropriate provisions will insure the necessary means of appeal against the decisions of the high authority. A United Nations representative attached to this authority will make a report twice yearly to the United Nations Organization on the functioning of the new organization, especially with respect to the safeguard of its pacific aims. The establishment of the high authority in no way prejudices property rights in the enterprises concerned. In the exercise of its task,

the common high authority will take into account the powers conferred upon the international authority for the Ruhr and the obligations of all kinds imposed upon Germany as long as these obligations subsist.

FRENCH PLAN GETS BACKING OF ACHESON—BRITISH ARE CAGEY ON PROPOSAL FOR UNIFIED CONTROL OF HEAVY INDUSTRY

LONDON, May 10.—France and the United States appeared to be strongly united tonight on a policy of tying Germany into western Europe industrially and politically.

There was doubt, however, as to Britain's attitude.

Secretary of State Dean Acheson issued a statement giving sympathy and approval to the significance and far-reaching intent of the surprise French offer yesterday to pool French, German, and possibly other European coal and steel production.

This proposal dominated top-level diplomatic thinking today in London, where Acheson and British Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin held two long secret discussions on German and other phases of the cold war.

Acheson said of the French proposal: "It is plain from the announcement that the spirit prompting it was the furtherance of rapprochement between Germany and France and progress toward the economic integration of western Europe.

LONG FAVORED BY UNITED STATES

"These are objectives which have long been favored by the Government of the United States."

He added, however, that "thorough analysis and final judgment" must await further development of the plan.

Thus, for the first time since the war, France and the United States appeared to be going into a western Foreign Ministers' Conference with common aims. The conference opens Thursday.

French Foreign Minister Robert Schuman arrived from Paris tonight.

British officials did not seem to share the enthusiasm of one American diplomat who commented that "this is the first time the French have taken the initiative in a major constructive fashion to solve the German problem."

A British Foreign Office spokesman danced all around the subject when questioned by reporters. Most of the British press expressed reserve toward the idea.

ADDRESSES PILGRIMS

In an address tonight before the Pilgrims, a society to foster American-British friendship, Acheson said both the United States and Europe must sacrifice some national interests to make the world secure against war.

Acheson said the job of bringing Germany back into the family of western civilization "must be a cooperative enterprise in which the risks and responsibilities are shared by all."

Though remarking on the success of American economic aid to Europe, he said remaining troubles can be cured only through "cooperative international arrangements in which some sacrifices of purely national interest will be unavoidable for all of us."

A combination of French and German heavy industry, as represented by coal and steel, would outweigh Britain in the European scales. If Britain entered the pool, as suggested by Schuman, the Government would have to take account of the pronounced effect on its planned economy schemes.

Aside from still nebulous phases of the Schuman idea, there remained a question of the extent of support the plan will get from the French people.

The plan escaped an adverse slap by only one vote in the foreign affairs committee of the French National Assembly today. When a rightist deputy moved that the Government get prior approval from Parliament for any pooling scheme the committee voted him down 18 to 17.

The plan is the most daring ventured by any French Foreign Minister toward Germany since the war. It probably would have toppled any French Government if attempted a year or more ago.

Many French, as well as German Socialists, were expressing misgivings that the plan would cut across their ideas of public ownership.

At Bonn, however, the West German Chancelor Konrad Adenauer has called the plan a generous step. Western Germany would have little to lose. France is in control of the Saar coal mines, whose output would be thrown into the pool for German use. Germany's coal and steel from the Ruhr already are under an international authority.

The scheme closely fits Acheson's urgent aim of knitting Western Germany so closely to the west that there will be no question of her sliding into the Russian orbit.

The speed of Russian armament has impelled him to seek bold cooperation from America's partners in the Atlantic Pact.

Britain has given the impression that she is unmoved by the same sense of urgency. Consequently, few concrete decisions have been expected from the three-way meeting of Acheson, Bevin, and Schuman.

The French suggestion, however, may change that and give an impetus to the conference that was lacking before.

Acheson and Bevin ended their talks tonight. No definite agreements were reached, it was reported, although officials described the talks as satisfactory.

A wide range of subjects reaching from Europe and the European payments problem of the Marshall plan organization to the Middle East and Far East were discussed.

The morning meeting of Acheson and Bevin presumably was devoted to Germany, since advisers on German affairs were present. These included United States High Commissioner John J. McCloy.

The afternoon session turned to other world problems, including those in the Far East. Informed sources said they expected the three powers would make a joint declaration of aims in the Far East, and might work out a joint plan to aid anti-Communists in Burma, Indochina, Malaya, and other embattled countries.

Acheson went from Bevin's office shortly after noon to an audience with King George. Later he and Mrs. Acheson had luncheon with the King and Queen.

Investment in Friendship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. STERLING COLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 11, 1950

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, when the Philippine rehabilitation bill providing for $400,000,000 with which to restore war-ravaged properties of the Filipino people was passed, it was my pleasure to be a member of the House Committee on Insular Affairs, then having jurisdiction of the bill. I recall that at the time there was some indication that this sum would be insufficient to carry out all of the provisions of the act, and that a supplemental authorization bill may be necessary. Such a bill is now pending before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs providing for another $100,000,000, which I sincerely hope will receive early consideration, as being justified as expressed by the attached editorial:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of May 11, 1950]

INVESTMENT IN FRIENDSHIP

Since the Philippines were cut adrift on the rough seas of independence they have continued to look to this country as a friendly beacon in a storm-tossed world. They have made mistakes, but they have stood by us. It can be said with equal truth that we have stood by them. The United States has made a heavy contribution to the rehabilitation of the war-shattered economy of its former ward. Not all our expenditures have been wisely utilized. Tales of corruption and mismanagement have been too often substantiated to be ignored.

It must be admitted, however, that the fault has not always been on one side. That was shown in this newspaper's recent revelation of the dissipation and pilferage of surplus materials turned over to the Philippines after the late war. Although vigilance is necessary against a recurrence of similar incidents, these past happenings cannot deter us from fulfilling the special responsibility that we owe to a government and a people who fought loyally against the Japanese when collaboration was the rule rather than the exception in other southeast Asian countries and who now are endangered by Communist pressures, both from within and without.

The United States Congress is being asked for an additional $100,000,000 for rehabilitation under our war damage program in the Philippines. Frank A. Waring, War Damage Commissioner, has pointed out that a grant of this amount would make possible payments up to 75 percent of the allowed claim. Thus the proposed appropriation is in no sense an act of charity; it is, in fact, an obligation. The machinery set up for the carrying out of this program is such as to ensure careful and efficient dispensation of any funds that may be made available. These moneys would contribute to economic revival and general well-being in a hard-pressed country. If we are to keep faith with the Philippines and to keep them on our side, the proposed grant merits our fullest support.

Americanism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 11, 1950

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, the Hunting Park Post, No. 265, Veterans of Foreign Wars, of Philadelphia, Pa., in cooperation with the Philadelphia County Council, representing 83 VFW Posts in Philadelphia, recently conducted an essay contest on Americanism. The winning essays were submitted by two students of the Olney High School, one by Norman Kaplan, 4921 North Ormes Street, Philadelphia, entitled "Americanism, My Creed," the other by Sandra Gunther, 1869 Conlyn Street, Philadelphia, entitled, "Americanism, My Faith." These essays reveal gratifyingly the intelligent perspective of modern American youth, and it is gratifying to me that by permission of the House they may be

printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In submitting these essays, I also wish to say "Well done!" to the Veterans of Foreign Wars for sponsoring such contests and instilling in our youth the principles of Americanism. The essays are as follows:

AMERICANISM, MY CREED

(By Norman Kaplan, 4921 North Ormes Street, Philadelphia, Pa.)

Mr. Noah Webster defines Americanism as, "the doctrine of United States citizenship; patriotic attachment to the United States, its interests and institutions." To me, however, my creed, Americanism, has come to mean a number of things. It means going to a baseball game and singing the national anthem along with people of entirely different racial and religious backgrounds. It means going to an Easter sunrise service even though I was born Jewish. It means going to a Purim service with my friend, who was born Catholic. Religious freedom, however, is just one of the things that Americanism means to me.

To my uncle, who lives around the corner from me, Americanism means writing to his Congressman and telling him how he would run the Government. It also means signing his name to the letter without fearing any unwelcome guests at his door.

To my father, Americanism means free enterprise, the right to invest some money and become "your own boss." It means being one of the owners of the Bell Telephone Co., and having a certain amount of "say-so" in their doings.

To get back to myself, Americanism means going to a free public school. It also means doing 6 hours of home work occasionally, which is good or bad according to the perspective with which it is observed.

Americanism means individualism and competition. Because of the individualism in America, producers and manufacturers are subjected to competition which means that their product had best be good or they will not remain in business. Perhaps the manufacturers do not appreciate this phase of Americanism as much as I, but to me, it means that I am buying the best that there is to be offered.

It is for these reasons that when I am asked my creed, I will proudly reply, "my creed is Americanism."

AMERICANISM, MY FAITH

(By Sandra Gunther, 1869 Conlyn Street, Philadelphia)

Americanism means to me my entire existence. It means I may have a date Saturday night. I can go where I please, do whatever I please, and enjoy myself with a carefree mind.

I can go to a lecture where I can listen to another person's ideas, beliefs, and opinions, and from these formulate my own opinions. I can express these ideas, too, without fear of being condemned because my ideas do not coincide with some dictator's spiteful wiles.

After school, I can come home to a house where I can have privacy or company as my whims fancy. I have no fears that a knock on the door will mean disaster for my family and me. I know we are free to live a life of our own choosing.

I have the privilege of attending school and taking the courses of my own choice. I can read uncensored books, books free from political pressure, books written by freemen.

I cannot be told that when I grow up I am to be a worker on an assigned farm. If I desire, I may be a doctor or even President of the United States. I have the same opportunity to succeed in any enterprise I undertake as the man next door or the girl across the street.

I have an unequivocal right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. I have this right because my ancestors fought and struggled so that I may live a free person. They settled in this land as a people seeking liberty and justice. They made certain that they secured these privileges. They secured their endeavor and they preserved it for me—a free girl in a free land.

President Truman's Speech at Grand Island, Nebr., on May 8, 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the people of Grand Island, Nebr., were privileged to hear President Harry S. Truman, on May 8, last. His inspiring address was as follows:

When I was here last time, I was here on a Sunday in 1948. Time passes very quickly. You gave me a pair of spurs, and I told you I was going to make good use of them, and I did. I used them on the Eightieth Congress through the second term of the Presidency of the United States. I still have those spurs, and I am going to keep them as long as I live, because they were a symbol at that time.

I have just come from Lincoln, where I made a speech on the major farm problems which we face, and I made the speech in a terrific downpour of rain, and I got wet as a drowned rat, but I finished the speech, and I told them that I thought maybe they needed the rain more than they did me. They would not admit it, but they were very kind to me, and an immense number of that audience stayed in that heavy rain to hear what I had to say about the farm situation, and my program for settling it. I hope some of you heard that speech over the radio, and I hope you will all have a chance to read about it in tomorrow's papers.

There are four main principles on which our national farm program should be firmly based.

First. We must maintain farm income at high levels.

Second. We must expand the markets for farm products.

Third. We must conserve and improve our soil and water resources.

Fourth. We must preserve the American tradition of the family-size farm.

If we are to keep our farms prosperous, we can't sit still and do nothing while surpluses pile up, or when farm incomes drop, or when dust storms threaten. We have to take action, and that is exactly what I am proposing to do.

One thing we need is a system of production payments which will be beneficial to the farmer, the consumer, and the taxpayer alike. By using production payments, we can give farmers the proper incentive to grow more of the kind of food which the country needs, and less of the kind we don't need. We can prevent big surpluses. The consumers will get more food, and at lower prices. We shall get more livestock.

Some people will try to tell you that this idea of production payments is regimentation or socialism. The opposition has used language like that against every piece of progressive legislation for the benefit of the farmers or for the benefit of the people.

Back in 1933, after years of deep depression, when farm prices were at rock bottom, and your homes and farms were being foreclosed, the New Deal passed the Agricultural Adjustment Act.

What do you think the opposition said about the AAA in 1933? One Member of the Congress called the AAA "more bolshevistic than any law or regulation now existing in Soviet Russia." That was in 1933. Another Congressman predicted that the AAA would put the farmer "under bondage to the Government."

Well, you know that didn't happen after 1933, any more than it will happen now under this plan of production payments.

Whatever scare words the opposition uses, we intend to move forward with a positive program to keep high incomes for the farmers. We know that in order to keep the country prosperous, agriculture must be prosperous. And there is no surer way to guarantee world peace than to keep this country strong.

Now, there have been all sorts of conversation about farm programs and labor programs and business programs. In 1948 I went over the country and told you what I stood for. I am back here now, in 1950, reporting to you on what I have tried to do, reporting to you that the welfare of the country as a whole is my first job. I am your hired man. You hired me in 1948. I am trying to live up to the responsibility which you gave me. I am trying to obtain world peace. I am trying to keep the farmers prosperous. I am trying to keep labor on the same basis, and I am trying to keep business going as it should in this country.

And I think we have been very successful at it over the last 5 years. I want you to weigh the situation as you see it. I want you to look at the facts. I want you to know what the facts are, and that is the reason I am with you tonight. I am trying to tell you what the facts are. I am trying to tell you what I still stand for. I am trying to let you know that I came out here in 1948, and I was then running for President of the United States, and I was asking for votes on a certain kind of platform. I am out here now to report to you, to let you look at me, and to let you talk to me, and to let you know that I haven't changed since 1948.

I am still working for you and the welfare of the country.

Thank you very much.

Reorganization Plan No. 12 Will Promote Better Administration and Industrial Peace

REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, having seen the conflict and confusion that have resulted from the present division of authority within the National Labor Relations Board, we now come to the question of how Reorganization Plan No. 12 would cure that split. On this point, it is important at the very beginning to clear up a misconception that has been permitted to gain some currency.

Critics have suggested that the plan merely substitutes for unmanageable one-man rule of the general counsel a super-one-man rule by the Chairman. This assertion has no basis in fact. The plan contains no such proposal. The language of the plan itself is clear and unambiguous on this point; to dispel this misconception the Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board, speaking for the unanimous Board, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and the Attorney General of the United States have gone on record, clearly and unequivocally, to state that no such thing is contemplated or even suggested by the plan. The only powers of the general counsel transferred to the chairman are those of agency housekeeping and the administrative direction of the field and operating forces.

The general counsel's power over unfair labor practice charges is transferred to the five-member Board itself, subject of course to the internal separation of investigation and decision-making functions required by the Administrative Procedures Act. Moreover, the Board has announced that, when plan No. 12 becomes law, it plans to adopt safeguards for the rights of parties coming before it that will go even beyond the Administrative Procedure Act. These additional safeguards are intended to assure that there will not be even the shadow of a question of the agency's complete impartiality in the handling of unfair labor practice charges nor even the faintest suggestion of prejudgment of any case.

Under the Board's proposal its power of initial review—in the very small number of cases which might come to it initially as a policy question—would amount to nothing more than the power to say that, on the facts turned up by preliminary investigation, it looks as if the case merits a full-dress investigation and a formal decision based upon a sworn record. Reposing this power in the hands of an officer beyond the control of the Commission—as is the case today—is a quite different thing. In the hands of an independent officer, it amounts to the sweeping power to withhold from the Commission itself the power to implement and enforce the decisions and rules that it is empowered and directed by Congress to make.

Just how this can work was clearly revealed recently in the case of the building industry's plea to the Board for relief from turmoil which the industry's management and labor representatives said the union security restrictions of the law were causing. Appearing before the Board to make a statement on the issue, the general counsel simply announced he had adopted the policy of not issuing complaints where the activities of labor and management in the building trades were technically illegal but would have been lawful were they able to obtain the union shop elections that they have so far been unable to obtain because of certain seasonal and organizational factors in the industry. By the general counsel's announcement, in the course of his statement to the Board members, their consideration of the question became largely academic. The general counsel, acting well within his final authority over the issuance of complaints, had made it clear that the Board would never have the opportunity to consider the question. In fact, he revealed to the Board members and the interested public for the first time that he had been pursuing such a policy all along.

The Board, which has never passed on the issue, now will never have a chance to exercise the power Congress supposedly conferred only upon it and the courts to interpret our national labor policy. I mention this instance without passing in any way upon the merits of the matter or the soundness of the general counsel's decision. I mention the matter only as an illustration of how easily the general counsel, as a wholly independent officer, may completely close the door to a whole field of enforcement of a right in the Board's face. This can happen wherever or whenever the uncontrolled general counsel arrives at an interpretation of the law different from that reached by the Board. Moreover, his refusal to act, even through arbitrary, is unlimited and beyond any review whatever—either by the Board or by the courts. The Board and the courts will never have an opportunity to consider his refusal to act, let alone being able either to agree or disagree with him as a matter of decision.

This is one fantastic facet of the evil farce that Reorganization Plan No. 12 will demolish. It will replace this Alice in Wonderland comedy of divided and inverted authority with a unified administration of the national labor policy.

As the courts and this Congress have long recognized, the enforcement of the national labor policy is not a matter of private combat between private litigants, nor is it a matter for enforcement by public combat between the two segments of a double-headed administrative agency. Nowhere more than in the labor policy does uncertainty and confusion so plainly thwart the very purpose and intent of the policy itself. How can peaceful and fair relations between employer and employee be fostered when the very rules of such relationships are the center of a storm of friction between two segments of the agency which must enforce those rules. This objective can be achieved only when the policy clearly and unmistakably enunciated by the Congress is given a uniform enforcement by a single-headed agency. Industrial peace is not maintained or fostered by litigation, friction, and conflict. It can best be brought to flower by negotiation and settlement. But such adjustments become impossible when two authorities are given power over the applicable rules and they then come into conflict over the application of the rules.

That is precisely the situation that confronts us today in the National Labor Relations Board between the 5-member Board and the general counsel. It is that impossible situation which Reorganization Plan No. 12 remedies.

The Late Maj. Thomas B. McGuire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 11, 1950

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleague, Congressman CHARLES R. HOWELL, and I join in announcing to the Congress that on Wednesday, May 17, at 3 p. m., the body of Maj. Thomas B. McGuire winner of the Medal of Honor and one of the most outstanding and celebrated Air Force aces of World War II will be brought to Arlington National Cemetery in Virginia for burial. The decision to make Arlington the final resting place of the hero of the Pacific air war was made by his father, Thomas B. McGuire, of Ridgewood, N. J., who will fly to Washington for the ceremony with a number of relatives and close friends of the late Air Force officer.

My colleague joins with me in paying tribute to this great hero, as the Representative from the district where McGuire Air Force Base is located. This major Army Air Force base was named in honor of the valiant record compiled by Major McGuire during his period of service.

Major McGuire's body was recently returned from the Pacific theater, the scene of the combat exploits which won for him the highest honors awarded by the military services. At the time of his death, Major McGuire had destroyed 38 enemy airplanes in aerial combat, and had become legendary throughout the Air Force. He was awarded the Medal of Honor for conspicuous gallantry in action over Luzon, Philippine Islands, during December 25 and 26, 1944. During those 2 days Major McGuire shot down 7 Japanese fighters while leading a flight of 15 P–38 Lightnings flying as top cover for heavy bombers attacking Mabalacat Airdrome and Clark Field on Luzon. As the formation crossed Luzon on Christmas Day, it was attacked by 20 Japanese fighters. In the battle that followed, Major McGuire shot down three enemy planes. In two of the engagements he was outnumbered 3 to 1. The third plane was destroyed while attacking another pilot in McGuire's flight. Although McGuire's guns jammed, he continued to attack and brought another enemy plane into his wingman's line of fire, thus aiding in a fourth victory.

The following day he volunteered to lead an escort squadron to Clark Field. Over the target one of the bombers was hit by flak. As the bomber left the formation it was attacked by Japanese fighters. McGuire entered the fight and deliberately exposed himself to enemy fire to enable the crippled bomber to escape. He shot down one plane and was attacked by four more. He outmaneuvered the four, shot one down, and pursued the other three. He destroyed one of them before leaving the scene to join

his formation. On the way out of the target area, McGuire shot down another enemy aircraft, his fourth for the day, bringing his total to 38 enemy planes destroyed.

Major McGuire died attempting to save a fellow pilot. On January 7, 1945, he was leading a flight of P–38's over a Japanese held airstrip on Negroe Island, when a lone Japanese plane suddenly sprang from the concealment of the clouds. The Japanese began his attack while the P–38 formation was at 2,000 feet where it hoped to intercept enemy planes taking off. McGuire led his squadron into a tight Lufbary, snaring the Zero inside. The Japanese made a sharp turn in an effort to break out of the trap, but the P–38's stayed with him all the way down to 200 feet. The formation scattered and the enemy pilot maneuvered into position on the tail of one of the Lightnings. The attacked pilot called for help on the radio and McGuire responded. He was so close to the ground that his aircraft fell off and crashed. He was fully aware of the risk he took and knew full well the small likelihood of success in what he attempted, but in order to rescue his comrade he sacrificed his life.

Major McGuire, who was 23 years old at the time of his death, was born in Ridgewood, N. J., and lived in Paterson during his youth. Prior to Pearl Harbor he was an aeronautical engineering student at Georgia Tech. While in school he was an officer in the ROTC Coast Artillery Antiaircraft Unit. Upon completion of his junior year at college he returned to Ridgewood and entered the Army Air Forces in July 1941. He won his wings at Randolph Field, Tex., and was assigned to duty in Alaska, and thence to the Aleutians in May 1942. He returned to this country after 6 months' service, and after a short time at Glendale, Calif., was sent to New Guinea, and then to Leyte, which was the scene of much of his combat experience.

Major McGuire had been awarded besides the Medal of Honor, the Distinguished Service Cross, three Silver Stars, six Distinguished Flying Crosses, two Purple Hearts, two Distinguished Unit Badges, and the Air Medal with 14 oak leaf clusters.

Curtailment of Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 11, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and resolution:

CITY OF BUFFALO,
OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK,
May 9, 1950.

Hon. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At a session of the Common Council of the City of Buffalo, N. Y., held on Tuesday, May 2, 1950, a resolution relating to the proposed curtailment in postal service was adopted, copy of which is transmitted to you herewith.

Very truly yours,
DR. JOSEPH J. TRONOLONE,
City Clerk.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE COMMON COUNCIL, BUFFALO, N. Y., MAY 2, 1950

RESOLUTION 128—POSTAL CURTAILMENT

(By Mr. Cooley)

Whereas it has just been learned that the United States Post Office Department contemplates a curtailment in postal service; and

Whereas the curtailment of this important service will allow only one delivery of mail daily, which will cause serious inconvenience and hardship for business people and those using the mails for personal reasons; and

Whereas curtailment of postal services will result in unemployment: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Common Council of the City of Buffalo being opposed to any curtailment in postal service, hereby directs the city clerk to forward a copy of this resolution to the Postmaster General and to the area Senators and Congressmen.

Adopted.

Address of Hon. Paul G. Hoffman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 11, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Paul G. Hoffman, Administrator, Economic Cooperation Administration, before the Textile Workers Union, CIO convention, Boston, Mass., May 3, 1950:

I am delighted to be here at the invitation of President Rieve, since it gives me the opportunity of thanking your organization for the loyal support extended to the Economic Cooperation Administration and also of expressing my appreciation of the good work of some of your officers in our behalf.

Wesley Cook, national director of your rayon and synthetic yarns division, is with our mission in Austria; Ken Douty, your Georgia State director, is with us in France, both on leave of absence. Another of your officers, your research director, Sol Barkin, conducted a study of the British textile industry for the U. K. mission at the special invitation of our then mission chief, Thomas Finletter. We are grateful, too, for the cooperation and assistance of George Baldanzi.

So I feel that our organizations have strong bonds. I assure you that we count heavily on your understanding and continuing support. If any of your delegates to this convention entertain any doubts whatever as to the wisdom and necessity of our program I am sure it is because we have been at fault in not making our aims understood.

I realize that you are immediately concerned with the problem of unemployment in your industry. I know that you are naturally concerned with the impact that ECA programs, formulated with the purpose of balancing international trade at a high level, may have on unemployment.

However, before approaching that discussion, I would like first to describe the world situation as I see it.

On my return from Europe recently, I glanced at the first American newspapers I had seen in 10 days. The headlines were devoted to H-bombs, mysterious flying saucers, the latest spy hunts, and other sensational news. The second section bristled with ads of movies dealing with World War II, reviews of books on World War II, and so forth and so forth. Only in one or two papers did I see any articles stressing the fact that here and now we—the American people—are in the middle of the most titanic struggle the world has ever known.

That conflict is between the free world and the slave world of Russian communism. The stake is western civilization itself. The challenge is to the basic principle of that civilization—its faith in man as an individual. The realities of this fateful world situation are, I suppose, hard to grasp. There are few headlines and little obvious drama in what has been called the cold war. There are no jet planes, no guided missiles, no giant bombers. Yet the fate of free men everywhere hangs in the balance.

There are four fronts in this mighty conflict in which we are so intensely involved. They are economic, political, informational, and military. As in modern warfare, where the battles are fought on these same four fronts, the drama is confined to the spectacular fourth front—the exploits of the warriors with the modern engines of destruction.

But in this gigantic conflict between the free and the slave world it is crystal clear that battles are constantly being waged on the unspectacular three fronts—economic, political, and informational. And they must be won by us if we are to prevent the outbreak on that fourth front which would mean the change from the cold to the shooting war with all its terrifying implications for mankind.

If there is any doubt in your minds as to whether tangible results can be obtained from pressing the fight on the other three fronts—economic, political, and informational—I ask you to witness the fact that since 1945, when the end of the war came—but no peace—the Kremlin has extended its baleful domination, through the employment of its cold war techniques, to Bulgaria, Rumania, Hungary, Albania, Czechoslovakia, Poland, and Manchuria—without firing a shot. Without any action on that spectacular fourth front, Soviet Russia has obtained domination of more territory and more people than any nation in history has ever acquired through a shooting war.

We are winning the cold war in western Europe—and winning it by means appropriate to our end, which is a strong, free Europe able to be self-sustaining without extraordinary outside assistance after Marshall-plan aid terminates. Our methods have been to provide food for the hungry, clothing for the ill-clad, housing for the homeless, tools for the workers, essential machines for industry and agriculture, and the application of the most modern methods, through technological advice in both industry and agriculture, so that output per man-hour may be increased. We are winning—and our gains are evident—despite Soviet attempts to sabotage our efforts in every unscrupulous way imaginable.

With our help, this is what the peoples of western Europe have been able to accomplish: There has been a 20-percent increase in industrial production over the prewar level. Agriculture has been restored to approximately its prewar level. Inflation has been brought under control. There is food enough not only to give the people a better than sustaining diet but to provide workers with enough energy to apply themselves to their jobs and produce. Wages are higher and living conditions have improved. Communism has been held at bay, democratic institutions preserved, individual freedoms strengthened.

Nevertheless, all these encouraging achievements can be jeopardized unless these countries, by the time Marshall-plan

aid ends, find themselves in a position to earn the dollars they need to buy the vital necessities which they can obtain only from the United States. Their cotton mills can't operate unless they receive the raw material from us; modernization programs can't be carried out without essential machine tools that are procurable only from us; agriculture cannot develop to its full potential without the necessary modern implements that are obtainable only here.

If the dollar gap is to be closed without serious consequences, Europe, between now and 1953, must effect savings of more than $1,000,000,000 and at the same time increase her earnings by something less than that amount. She will have to buy a billion less and earn a billion more.

Provided these goals are achieved and a reasonable amount of capital investments are made abroad, I believe that trade between the United States and western Europe can be brought into balance at a figure between $3,000,000,000 and $3,500,000,000. That would protect our employment and at the same time create an economically healthy Europe.

Of the $1,000,000,000 in increased earnings required by Europe, not over $400,000,000 will come from additional exports, and considering our economy as a whole, that $400,000,000 cannot conceivably affect us adversely in view of the fact that production in the United States amounted to $140,000,000,000 in wholesale value in 1949.

If the dollar gap were to be closed as of this moment—if exports from dollar areas in Europe were reduced to what Europe can currently pay for with her present earnings—it would mean a $3,000,000,000 drop in exports—and that would obviously create unemployment here and generally threaten our prosperity.

Now I want frankly and firmly to grasp the thistle of serious unemployment in the textile industry. I know there are more unemployed in New England than in some other parts of the country, and I know a good many of those New England unemployed are in the woolen mills.

I have not been one of those who look upon unemployment merely as a statistical matter. An unemployed worker, without income, is not only in a tragic situation for himself and his family, but he is not a good customer for the products of industry. Working people need incomes to be customers, and businessmen need customers so they can employ workers.

I suggest that we look at the latest figures from the Department of Commerce about imports and compare them with figures on our domestic production. Let's find out precisely how much competition there is in the textile field.

Last year wool fabrics production in the United States was 356,100,000 linear yards. Total imports amounted to 6,000,000 yards, or 1.7 percent of our production. I wish to emphasize that most of these imports are special patterns and types of fabrics which are particularly adaptable to European production and not generally produced economically in the United States. Any increase in imports of woolen fabrics from Europe would undoubtedly be of those having these same characteristics.

Cotton fabrics production here last year was 9,296,000,000 square yards as against total imports of 19,743,000. These imports represented only 0.2 percent of our domestic production.

Production of rayon fabrics in the United States last year was 1,929,621,000 linear yards. Total imports amounted to 443,300 or 0.02 percent of our production.

Since these figures on imports represent the world-wide picture, if the data were confined to the European countries these tiny percentages would be even smaller.

It seems clear to me that we can't meet the problem of unemployment in the textile industry in the United States by cutting off this modest—this infinitesimal—volume of imports from western Europe.

In fact, it is perfectly clear that if we cut off imports—in any industry—we are going to have to cut down exports. And that would really create unemployment in this country. Not just in one industry, but in many. And it would spread. We all know about the chain reaction that unemployment in any one industry can create.

The way to solve unemployment in the textile industry—or again, in any industry—is to expand our domestic consumption, and increase our exports. That means that we must exploit our mass production methods to the fullest to produce goods at prices that people can afford to pay. And, it means that we must not—not even for a moment—forget that if other countries cannot sell to us, they cannot buy from us.

This I know sounds like an over-simplification of a problem. Actually, the problem is as simple as that—it is the solution that becomes more complex. There would not be time, at this large convention, to go into the details of a possible solution. But there is one, and it must not just be found—it must be put into effect. And it can be done by the industries and unions of this country. They have never yet failed to meet the challenge of changing conditions. I am sure that they will meet this one, and that they will not do it by what appears to be an easy out—surplus dumping. That would be a temporary alleviation—not a cure.

I do not wish to leave with you the impression that even if Europe, by 1952, is in a position to earn all the dollars she requires, all her problems will be solved. Fundamentally, there must be a closer union of the free nations of Europe, a willingness on their part to draw together and work together more harmoniously and purposefully than they are now doing, on the political and economic fronts. Even that will not be enough. We must help these nations in their ef Europe needs us, but we also need her. destinies are inevitably joined. I see chance for an enduring peace unless Europe becomes strong and prosperous. It was the poet, John Donne, who said a long time ago that no man is an island unto himself. That can be said with equal verity of nations. Today America is strong, prosperous, blessed above every nation on earth. But she is still not an island sufficient unto herself.

The free peoples of the world need each other. Economic integration in Europe, of itself and by itself, is not enough. There must be a knitting together of all these free nations, economically, militarily, and politically. Benjamin Franklin's words—we must all hang together or assuredly we shall all hang separately—are most apposite to this situation in which we find ourselves.

Together—and only together—can we win this cold war and build a peace so strong and lasting that no aggressor of today or potential aggressor of the future will dare to violate it.

A Courtesy Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 11, 1950

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include an interesting editorial containing a tribute to our youngsters which appeared in the May 10, 1950, issue of the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram.

In spite of many dire predictions to the contrary, most of our American youth today are Christian-minded and Christian-acting. The suggestion of the teenagers at Mount Vernon, N. Y., for a Courtesy Week is a commendable inspiration and might well be adopted by every community throughout the country.

The article follows:

A COURTESY WEEK

It is perhaps one of the more discouraging signs of our times that it became headline news when the citizens of Mount Vernon, N. Y., a Westchester County community, decided to try out the gentle art of being courteous to one another for a whole week.

Visitors to Mount Vernon this week are likely to be surprised to find how much real courtesy people can muster up, although it must be said that Mount Vernonites say they are usually pretty polite anyway. This week, however, they will be even more polite; there will be smiling traffic cops, eager assistance to help elderly folks across busy streets and a return to an era when folks seemed to take courtesy as a matter of course, and not something for which to be awarded a special medal.

It all started when a trio of teen agers, of all people, persuaded Mayor William H. Hussey that he should proclaim the week as a "courtesy week." The mayor agreed with the youngsters that perhaps much of the world's troubles do come from the fact that too many persons are inconsiderate of one another. Perhaps Mount Vernon could lead the way back to a courteous age, a period of gallant manners when life was casual and a lot happier.

It is to be hoped that this will be so. It is perhaps slightly encouraging that the idea for a courtesy week did come from some teen agers.

President Truman's Speech at Ravenna, Nebr., on May 8, 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 11, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, our people-minded President, Harry S. Truman, on his westward dedicatory tour, had occasion to stap at Ravenna, Nebr., on May 8, 1950, and while there addressed a splendid crowd, as follows:

Thank you very much, Mr. Mayor. It is good to see all of you here in Ravenna this evening. I want to talk to you about one of your major problems, soil conservation. I hope some of you were listening to my rainmade speech in Lincoln this afternoon. We had a terrific rain there, and my thought was whether they wanted rain more than they did the President or wanted the President more than they did the rain.

Our growing population and rising standard of living require better and better use of our farmlands. That is why the dust storms in the Great Plains this spring have caused concern everywhere in the Nation.

The farmers of this country know a great deal more about dust and other conservation problems than they did 20 years ago. Since the "black blizzards" of the thirties, farmers and the Government, working together, have developed an effective soil conservation program. As a result of the soil conservation districts, and the agricultural conservation

program, millions of acres of land are now being farmed with the best scientific practices.

In the Great Plains, an important aid to conservation is provided by shelter-belts of trees. Fifteen years ago last month the first tree was planted for the first shelter-belt. Now, I was in the Senate at that time, and I never heard as much argument against anything in my life. The arguments were just as if the world was coming to an end if we planted a few trees. We planted the trees, in fact 25,000 miles of shelter-belts were planted. You remember that many people scoffed at the idea of growing trees on the Plains. I wish you could have heard some of the Senators that are still there, making speeches against the shelter-belt. They said it was just a boondoogle. But today the trees are growing, and they are breaking the force of the wind. Of course, we have a long way to go yet before we lick the problems of dust and soil erosion, and floods.

We have got to move forward as far as we can, to find better conservation practices, and then put them into effect. We need more of the kind of pioneering work you people around here have long been doing with stubble-mulch farming. We have got to keep right on until we are sure there will never be another dust bowl.

There is another thing we have learned about soil conservation, that is that good conservation is good business. The man who manages his farm with good conservation practices will have a permanent and steady income.

We are going to keep right on moving ahead with soil conservation, just as we are with the other programs that will lead to more prosperity and a better life for all of us, such as improvements in our social-security system, Federal aid to States to help them improve schools, a broad Nation-wide health program, and better housing.

Above all, we are going to keep right on working for world peace.

Now, I am out here on this trip to tell you just exactly what is going on in Washington, to give you first-hand information about what I have been trying to do as President. I came out here over the country in 1948 and told you what I hoped to do. I talked to you very frankly. I talked to you as one of your citizens. I am talking to you now as your hired man. You decided to put me back in the Presidency, and I have come out here and I am going all the way across the country almost to the Pacific coast to tell you just exactly what I am trying to do, and I am telling it to you first-hand so it can't be garbled. I am letting you listen to me, and look at me and see if you still think I am the same fellow that was out here trying to get you to vote for me in 1948.

I am going to try to keep on working in the public interest. I am going to try to balance the economy of this country so that the farmers, the workingman and the businessman will have a fair share of the tremendous income that the country has now. We have the greatest national income we have had in the last 3 or 4 years in the history of the world, and that income has been rather equitably distributed—the farmers, the laborers, and the businessmen have all had their fair share.

Everybody has been put into the position of being a part of the economic situation of the United States. All I am trying to do is keep that up, and if we keep that up and improve it, we will come to the point where we will have peace in the world.

Because, our economic situation being strong, our defense situation being strong, the people in the world who are not for the things that we believe in will not directly attack us.

And we don't want to attack anybody. All we want is peace in the world, so that the distribution of things all over the world will be just like we want them here at home.

Now, if you people will support that sort of program, I am very sure that we can put it over. That is the reason I am out here, to tell you what it means.

I can't tell you how very much I appreciate the reception I have received today across the State of Iowa. Thousands of people stood in the rain at Lincoln to hear what I had to say about the farm program. People have come out to see whether their President is what he was when he was a candidate.

Now then, I am going to tell you just exactly what I stand for, I am going to tell the whole country what I stand for, I am going to tell the whole country what I am trying to do—and with your help I will get it done.

Thank you very much.

Tariff To Equalize Wage Rate Paid American Labor

REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. RAMSAY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 1950

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Speaker, in a recent issue of the trade magazine Made in America, there is an article pertaining to the tariff as a measure to equalize the wage rate paid the American worker. The article goes on to say:

> That under our foreign trade program, if we enter into a trade agreement, for example, with Canada or any other country, whose labor standards more nearly approach our own, the same reduction in the rate of duty extended to any of these countries is automatically extended to all other countries, such as Japan, etc. For example, on wool gloves which sell for $2.90 per dozen in Japan and $7.07 for like merchandise from all other countries, the same rate of duty applies to all imported gloves.
>
> That by doing this, we reward the low-cost producing countries, and, of course, it enables them to take over the American market, not only from the American producers, but from all other higher-cost producing countries, as well?

This is a true statement so far as it goes into the manner in which trade treaties fail to take into consideration the same wages and cost of production in the various governments of Europe, and the inability of trade treaties to meet such conditions.

However, it does not take into consideration the fact that the trade treaties are not all alike in the adjustment of the tariff rates upon the admission of goods and merchandise that are now admitted into our country.

Nor does it make plain that tariff rates under our tariff laws are based on the value of such goods when they reach America; that none are admitted on the values prevailing in the country of exportation.

In all our former tariff legislation, including our present tariff laws, we only exacted equal tariff rates, regardless of the cost of such goods in the country of exportation. Such tariff rates applied to all export countries, regardless of the low standard of wages earned.

It is extremely doubtful if Congress would or could, in the face of the existing favorite-nation treaties with certain foreign nations, break and destroy such solemn treaties and exact from low-standard countries a higher rate of tariff on imports than those exacted from countries of a higher standard of living solely for the purpose of equalizing the equality of competition.

Surely, the same favorite-nation treaties would prevent us from exacting different tariff rates from low-wage countries, as it now seems to do through trade treaties. If Congress can exact different rates, the same Congress can exact different rules and rates for admission of goods and merchandise into this country from abroad, by trade treaties and agreements.

If this be true, then Congress can, by legislation, determine the kind and character—yes, even the terms—upon which our State Department may enter into such agreements. And if Congress desires the State Department to abrogate all favorite-nation treaties heretofore made, who are now controlled by a totalitarian government it should say so by appropriate legislation.

Personally, I do not believe Congress will ever vote to ignore and destroy any treaty ever made by its government, with free and uncontrolled countries. If I am right about this, then we must look to other methods left to Congress and grant to manufacturers and producers in our country, other necessary relief that will enable them to continue to pay the highest wages in the world, that guarantees the highest standard of living.

We must examine thoroughly every avenue of aid and protection possible.

We cannot leave the whole problem to the ingenuity of the American producer and his employees.

Because there is a limit to self-aid, some of us believe it has reached its limit, and that within a short time all foreign manufacturers and producers will be enabled by the adoption of our manufacturing methods to produce vastly cheaper goods than they do today. We must meet this problem now. We cannot, we must not dodge it longer.

We can grant relief to the injured American manufacturer, whose production is threatened, by granting to him in the way of a subsidy, a part of the tariff revenue obtained by the Government through the importation of goods.

Congress can require by legislation the State Department to annul all trade and favorite-nation treaties now existing with countries behind the iron curtain.

We can tighten up the amount of goods brought duty free into this country by travelers and others.

We can demand and require our Treasury Department to place the exact American value on all goods imported.

We can demand that any country receiving loans or gratuities from us will only export to this country goods and merchandise we do not produce in large enough quantities to supply the American demand.

We could pass legislation, setting aside a day each year to be known and observed as Buy American Day.

All of us could concentrate on being better and more sincere Americans, and work for its full production and employment, so as to give us a true and lasting prosperity.

Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHASE GOING WOODHOUSE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 11, 1950

Mrs. WOODHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, on May 12, 1950, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation will enter upon its seventh year in which there has not been a loss to any depositor in insured banks. This remarkable record is commonplace today and we accept present bank stability as a matter-of-fact occurrence in our everyday life. But it is not many years since every new day brought stories of bank failures and tremendous losses and suffering to depositors. The small depositors suffered most and their losses were reflected in our wavering economy.

The FDIC was established in 1933 to protect the small depositor. That it has done its job well is attested by the record. Beyond that it has restored the confidence of all depositors—it has maintained our banking system on a sound basis and has helped to stabilize our economy.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Hartford Times, Hartford, Conn., of April 24, 1950, as follows:

SOLVENT AND SUPERSAFE

The soundest and most widely accepted original New Deal agency, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, continues to deserve this unqualified approval.

In its latest report the FDIC states that not one of the more than 100,000,000 depositors served by the insured banks has suffered a loss from bank failure in more than 6 years.

Total assets of all insured banks have reached an all-time peak of $170,000,000,000. These banks include 13,436 commercial banks and 192 mutual savings banks.

The feeling of security which this insurance system has engendered has made the thought of bank failures almost academic. In the words of Chairman Maple T. Harl, "This record of solvency and stability is without parallel in the Nation's history."

An important aspect of the FDIC's usefulness is that it works as a preventive. When people know their deposits are safe they don't start runs on banks. Thus the sense of panic does not spread because it does not even get a start.

Many a solvent bank was wrecked in the twenties because panicky depositors withdrew their funds for no reason except that of fearing the bank might close. They thus brought on the thing they most feared.

All that is a thing of the past. The FDIC's reserves are now so ample that the small assessments on the member banks may even be reduced and possibly be eventually eliminated. Interest income from the reserves may be sufficient to meet administrative charges. The original Government loan which was the initial capital of the FDIC has long since been repaid.

Veterans' Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 11, 1950

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, I heartily congratulate and compliment the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] for his fine work in bringing this bill to the floor of the House and so ably and clearly debating the issues involved.

It is high time that this House took notice of and effected a remedy for the present situation which permits so much misunderstanding, confusion, and dissatisfaction among veteran trainees and applicants under the GI bill. Every Member of Congress is familiar with the discriminations and injustices which have arisen from the administration of the vocational and educational features of this program.

I have been deeply impressed by the number of boys who have experienced difficulty in adjusting their training problems. Of course, there have been some instances of arbitrary decision by the VA militating against worthy, ambitious veterans. In the main, however, I think that VA officials have endeavored to be fair in passing upon these applications. Certain regulations interpreting organic laws have been misunderstood and have also worked palpable and substantial injustice and hardship.

It is this condition this bill seeks to remedy. It will regularize the status and eligibility of various schools providing veteran training. It will clarify the eligibility of the veteran himself and compel the VA in certain cases to recognize his entitlement to training. It will enjoin arbitrary, capricious action by VA officials in a large number of instances. It will improve, I firmly believe, the administration of the training program. Moreover, it is stated in this debate that it will not impose substantial costs upon the Federal Treasury.

Since I have worked for some time past for the principles of this bill, I intend to vote for it as amended. I believe it will be helpful to our veterans.

NLRB Administration Is Much Broader in Scope Than Prosecuting and Adjudicating

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD BOLLING
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 11, 1950

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, what is this "separation of functions" that we hear so much about?

It is the elementary principle that the same officer should not prosecute and then decide as to guilt or innocence. To protect this principle, Congress enacted the Administrative Procedure Act requirement that no employee who engaged in prosecution or investigation of a case may participate in or advise as to the agency decision. The Administrative Procedure Act was passed in 1946 and applies to all administrative agencies equally. By the time of its enactment the procedures of the Labor Board were already in full conformity with its requirements. The Labor Board was already operating under the internal separation of the functions required by the act.

This is not what we have over at the Labor Board today. If that were all, there would be no necessity for plan No. 12. Today a great number of the functions of the Labor Board have been taken away from that agency and concentrated in the hands of a single officer, whose actions and decisions are largely free from review.

Prosecution and adjudication in their narrow sense are only two of the functions of the agency. It has the problem of administering and applying the congressional policy of the Taft-Hartley Act. This involves a host of duties which are broader than either prosecution or adjudication of complaints. First, there is the entire field of so-called representation cases, the cases which look to an election to determine who shall represent employees for bargaining. This is the bulk of the agency's work. It is primarily administrative. Most of it is performed in the field offices. Theoretically, the final authority over representation cases is in the Board members. However, by statute the field staffs are all under the supervision of the independent general counsel, who frequently disagrees with the Board. This creates great confusion.

In the second place, there is the function of determining how far and how fast to go in applying the national policy to small employers and borderline industries; the question of whether to exhaust jurisdiction completely or whether to conserve appropriations by applying the mandate of the law where it will do the most good. The Board and the general counsel are in violent disagreement on this issue. The general counsel has sole and exclusive authority over complaint cases, because only he has power

to issue a complaint, and, although the Board disagrees with him as to the proper scope of the agency's activities, it can effectuate its collective views only in the area of election cases. It cannot prevent him from prosecuting cases, although it can later throw them out.

In the third place, there is the broad, over-all question of what kinds of activities are forbidden by the act. The Board may believe that certain practices are unfair and should be stopped. If the general counsel disagrees, they never will be stopped. He alone may bring a case before the Board. If he does not bring the case, the Board does not have it. Conversely, the Board may believe that certain types of activities do not constitute violations. It may feel that these should be allowed without interference. Nevertheless, if the general counsel feels otherwise, parties will be subjected to lengthy, expensive litigation, and possibly injunctions, only to have the Board throw out the case when it finally comes up for decision.

There is also the Board's function of defending the orders it issues before the courts of appeals. This requires the services of lawyers. Under this remarkable setup, all the agency lawyers are under the supervision of the general counsel. He may disagree with a decision of the Board. If he disagrees, the lawyers under his supervision are necessarily influenced by his attitude. Yet the Board is dependent upon lawyers assigned by the general counsel to defend the Board's own orders in the courts. The records before the committees of Congress demonstrate the friction and annoyance that has been caused when the general counsel, through members of his legal staff, has been called upon to defend Board positions with which he disagrees.

It is one thing, and a good thing, to isolate the actual prosecuting attorney from the trial examiner or other adjudicating officer with respect to a given case. It is an entirely different matter to concentrate tremendous powers of investigation, staff control, and administrative policy-making in the hands of one man under the guise of separation of functions. The present system at the Labor Board does just that. It places unprecedented power in the hands of the general counsel, and prevents the five-man Board from playing its proper policy-making role in the executive branch of the Government. The separate office of general counsel should be abolished.

Unless plan 12 is adopted, the people of the United States may soon be treated to the insane spectacle of a single agency of the Federal Government appearing in court on both sides of the same case.

The Board is empowered by the act to seek enforcement of its orders in courts of appeals. The general counsel, under the act, has supervision of all agency lawyers. As a result, the Board must use attorneys on the staff of the general counsel when it goes into court.

In several cases in which the general counsel has disagreed with the Board's decision, he has been reluctant to permit his legal staff to enforce the Board's order in court, claiming that it would be incompatible with positions taken by him, and would prove embarrassing. In two cases it was necessary for the Board to relieve the general counsel of the responsibility of enforcing its order. In one of these cases, the general counsel proposed, in addition, to present a brief to the court stating his views in opposition to those of the Board.

The case involved is that of the Halston Drug Co. The Board dismissed the complaint because it found that the interruption of the employer's drug-store business by a labor dispute would have "only a remote and insubstantial effect on commerce," whereas the general counsel believes that the Board lacks the power to dismiss for that reason.

The fantastic result, in which responsible officers of the same Federal agency find themselves on both sides of a lawsuit, cannot be charged to the personalities involved. It flows from the peculiar nature of the separation of agency functions. Any incumbent of the office of general counsel as now established might find himself in the position in which Mr. Denham now stands.

There can be no excuse for permitting this state of confusion to continue. Plan No. 12 affords Congress an excellent opportunity to remedy it by restoring a sensible organizational pattern in which the Board will have authority to direct its own law officer, and not be dependent upon him for favors.

Alaska and Hawaii Statehood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 11, 1950

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include an editorial on Alaska and Hawaii statehood from the May 1 issue of the Courier-Journal published in Louisville, Ky.:

HAWAII AND ALASKA DESERVE STATEHOOD

Bills granting statehood to Hawaii and Alaska have already passed the House, and if common sense prevails the Senate will concur. There have been loud objections, of course, to statehood for either Territory, and these will undoubtedly be raised again. Already in the Senate hearings all of the old and questionable arguments against admitting the Territories into the Union are being raised. Some of them are selfish, such as the protest of the Alaskan fishing industry spokesmen who fear tax increases and stricter Government regulation. Some are downright stupid, such as the white-supremacy objection to the non-Caucasian people of both Hawaii and Alaska.

But some of the arguments against statehood merit at least an answer. It is pointed out, for instance, that Alaska has only 100,000 people. Is this enough to support statehood? Apparently it is. Idaho and North Dakota had smaller populations at the time of their admission. And the blessings of Federal Government, including participation in the highway building program, will undoubtedly draw more people to Alaska. Neither should their separation from the mainland be a serious handicap. Juneau and Honolulu are both closer to Washington, from the viewpoint of communication and transportation, than were Ohio and Kentucky at the time of their admission.

There are, it is true, Japanese and Eskimos among the people of the two Territories. But their patriotic conduct during World War II dispelled any possible doubts of their loyalty to the United States. Both have shown their capacity for self-government, Hawaii having had an efficient republican form of government for 50 years. And it is noteworthy that our highest military men have repeatedly urged the acceptance of Hawaii and Alaska into the Union, and have insisted that both strategically located Territories could best be protected if they were working parts of this country. Against these persuasive arguments, race prejudice and the selfish interest of a few fishing companies seem rather empty.

May Day Demonstration at Mosinee, Wis.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 11, 1950

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a front-page article of the Mosinee Times giving a report on the May Day demonstration held in that city on May 1:

MOSINEE'S MAY DAY ENDS ON NOTE OF RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CHRISTIANITY AND DEMOCRACY

"We believe in the dignity of every human being in our United States of America regardless of his social or economic position; we believe in the existence of God and that all of the blessings we enjoy flow from God." With this thought Charles Larson, Wisconsin Department commander of the American Legion, began his stirring talk that climaxed the country's first attempt to teach Americanism by demonstrating what "a day under communism" was like here in Mosinee on Monday.

Commander Larson held his vast audience, during the evening's Americanism rally, by dramatically showing the relationship between the teachings of Christianity and the practices of democracy. At one point he said: "In sharp contrast to our fundamental philosophies, the Communists place the state in the supreme position and make all individuals subservient to the state. Personal dignity is unknown in a Communist land, and Communists teach, whether they believe it or not, that there is no God."

The Legion commander brought his fine talk to a conclusion with the thought that: "To preserve those freedoms for which our forefathers fought and died, those freedoms and that form of government under which our Nation has advanced beyond any in the history of the world we must do more than merely be law-abiding citizens. It is our duty to guard against subversion, to be actively interested in our Government, to be eternally vigilant. May God in His wisdom put an end to the scourge of communism.

May He bless the people of all lands as we are blessed."

SUNDAY NIGHT

The pageant really began on Sunday evening in the American Legion club when the 58 members of the press, radio, and movies, here to cover the event, were given a dramatization of the organizational preparations of communist party cells in Mosinee to seize the government of the city of Mosinee the following day. A large number of residents of the community attended this part of the press conference.

At 9:30 the same evening, with the public excluded, the press conference for the working press, was held with Francis Schweinler, general chairman of the event outlining the Monday activities; Paul Thielen, public relations director for the Wisconsin department of the American Legion, coordinating the activities of newspapermen and photographers, radiomen, and movie cameramen. Joe Kornfeder, Detroit, a former Communist organizer, and technical adviser to the committee, outlined the work of the real Communists in a project of this sort and pointed out where and why some of the real things couldn't be done on Monday.

MAY DAY

The activities of "A Day Under Communism" got under way at 6 a. m. on Monday with the arrest of Mayor Ralph E. Kronenwetter. (The schedule from here on is as it appeared on the schedule of events given to all the members of the press, but not released to the public in order to avoid crowds at the points of activities.—Editor.)

6:00 a. m. Arrest by Communist combat team of Mayor Ralph E. Kronenwetter at his home at 303 Fourth Street.

7:00 a. m. Arrest of Chief of Police Carl Gewiss at his home at 301 Fourth Street.

7:30 a. m. Scene at city hall. Police chief refuses to do as Communists command and is summarily dealt with.

8:00 a. m. Violent seizure of the powerhouse at Mosinee paper mill.

8:30 a. m.: Arrest of clergymen and confinement of them in concentration camp.

While all this is going on "Communist" action will be taking place in all parts of the city as road blocks are organized and manned; "activists" put up many different kinds of banners and placards and the "Red" flag is raised over the city hall and other public buildings.

9:15 a. m.: Parade to huge mass meeting of the populace in "Red Square." Parade starts at football practice field at Mosinee High School and moves as follows: North on Eighth Street to Main; east on Main Street to Fifth; south on Fifth Street to High; east on High Street to Fourth; north on Fourth Street to Main; east on Main Street to Water; north on Water Street to Buchanan; west on Buchanan Street to "Red Square."

9:30 a. m.: Mass meeting. Mayor is forced to make a statement and introduce "Chairman of the Council of Peoples" Commissars, Comrade "Joseph Zack Kornfeder," who reads brief dictatorial proclamation outlining what people of Mosinee, henceforth, must do. This will be followed by brief address on The Role of the Communist Party by the general secretary of the Communist Party of the United Soviet States of America, Benjamin Gitlow.

10:30 a. m.: Seizure of the Mosinee Public Library at east end of Main Street.

11:00 a. m.: Confiscation of sporting firearms at home of John Drengler above Drengler Tavern.

12:00 noon: Scenes at Princess Cafe and Quality Bakery.

1:00 p. m.: Social service class being taught "Communist line."

2:00 p. m.: High school, General Secretary Gitlow addresses YCL.

3:00 p. m.: Seizure of Mosinee Paper Mills with arrest of management and such of workmen as do not cooperate.

4:00 p. m.: Scenes at concentration camp. For the next 3 hours various dramatic scenes will be going on in different parts of the city—inspections of homes for anti-Communist literature, etc.

7:00 p. m.: Scene at theater. Seizure and confiscation of current film Guilty of Treason and substitution of film of Communist propaganda.

8:15 p. m.: Grand finale, Dessert Park. Loyal Americans from all parts of Mosinee and Marathon County gather; "Communists" cast aside their subversive roles and join in raising of the American flag. Boy Scouts burn all Communist banners, etc. in huge bonfire. Charles L. Larson, of Port Washington, Wis., Commander of Wisconsin Department of the American Legion will speak. Then whole multitude will join in singing God Bless America, and then start peacefully home thankful to God that they live in America.

THE SECURITY POLICE

The men who made up the security police for the day were from the local American Legion post and about 15 from the Wausau post. The political police were from many American Legion posts throughout the Wisconsin department. A large group came from Milwaukee post, and smaller numbers from Sheboygan, Fond du Lac, Waupun, South Milwaukee, and Seymour.

United States Maritime Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 1950

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, on April 6, 1950, I commented on H. R. 7786, the omnibus appropriation bill, which contained a suggested limitation on the granting of operating subsidies by the United States Maritime Commission. This objectionable limitation was the subject of consideration by the Committee of the Whole on Friday, May 5, at which time a substitute amendment was adopted which substantially relaxes the limitation. This modification resulted from conferences between the chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and the chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations.

The compromise adopted by the Committee of the Whole imposes an over-all limitation on the Maritime Commission, but expands the size of the limitation by fixing the total number of vessels which may be subsidized at an aggregate of the following categories:

(a) Vessels covered by existing subsidy contracts, authorizations, commitments, or obligations on January 1, 1950.

(b) Vessels under construction or contracts of construction on January 1, 1950.

(c) Vessels covered by subsidy applications filed prior to January 1, 1950.

I understand that a total of the foregoing categories equals or exceeds 281 vessels, and that this will permit the Maritime Commission to function until such time as the question of a long-range subsidy program can be fully considered by the legislative committees and appropriate action taken.

As I explained in my remarks of April 6, the merchant marine is faced with a major crisis which can only be resolved by greatly expanding our subsidy program in order to avoid annihilation of the unsubsidized portion of our merchant fleet. This position was developed before the Senate Committee on Commerce. I wish to quote the following paragraphs from a statement by one of the witnesses which, in my opinion, well states the problem with which the American-flag merchant marine is confronted and the dangers of imposing any limitations on the subsidy program through the appropriation-bill device:

According to statistics filed with your committee, there were on January 1, 1950, a total of 600 American-flag vessels, aggregating approximately 6,304,000 deadweight tons, employed in the foreign trade. This is a substantial reduction from the number employed in 1949. Of the 600 vessels, 62 are Government-owned, and most of these may be expected to be withdrawn from the foreign trade during the current year. Of the privately owned vessels (538 in number), only approximately 23 percent were receiving operating subsidies. Thus, on January 1 of this year over 300 privately owned American-flag vessels were operating in the foreign trade without subsidy. During 1949, when as many as 800 American-flag vessels were operating in the foreign trade, the total American-flag participation for both subsidized and nonsubsidized vessels was less than 50 percent, which is usually taken as the minimum objective of the act. The 235 subsidized vessels alone probably handled less than 25 percent of the total volume of export traffic. Therefore, any hope of accomplishing the over-all objective of 50 percent is dependent upon continued operations in the foreign trade by a number of vessels which are now operating without subsidy.

In our opinion, the period of profitable operation by unsubsidized vessels is rapidly coming to a close. Increasing low-cost foreign-flag competition has already resulted in substantial reductions in our basic freight rates, a trend which probably will become further accentuated in the future. This and other developments will deprive the unsubsidized high-cost American-flag operator of any hope of operating successfully without subsidy in the future. The choice before the United States Government, therefore, is to increase the number of subsidized vessels by an amount sufficient to insure 50 percent participation in the foreign trade, or to abandon that target, restrict subsidies to a smaller number of vessels, and accept a much reduced target for over-all American-flag participation in the foreign trade. The last alternative will automatically result in surrender of the seas to foreign-flag vessels and acceptance by the United States of a participation perhaps as low as 20 to 25 percent over all. Any such development will mean the failure of the American maritime policy. I am sure that no member of this committee or Member of Congress would advocate any such result. I am confident that when the House Appropriations Committee suggested a provision limiting subsidies to the number of vessels actually receiving subsidy on January 1, 1950, that the

committee was proceeding on the erroneous assumption that American-flag vessels operating in the foreign trade had already been granted subsidies for the most part, whereas the facts show that the major part of such tonnage has been operating without subsidy.

Hawaii Musicians Ask Repeal of 20-Percent Cabaret Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON
DELEGATE FROM HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 11, 1950

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to call to the attention of Members of Congress an appeal from 500 musicians in the Territory of Hawaii for repeal of the so-called 20-percent cabaret tax. Their letter follows:

MUSICIANS' ASSOCIATION OF HONOLULU,
Honolulu, Hawaii, May 3, 1950.
The Honorable Senators and Representatives,
The Capitol, Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: On behalf of 500 musicians who are members of local 677, A. F. of M., located in Honolulu, T. H., we are addressing this open letter to you for proper consideration:

Like the rest of the musicians encompassing nearly 300,000 members of the American Federation of Musicians, we are appealing to each and every one of you to study and reconsider a measure which was enacted during the war but which, at present, has become discriminatory and the cause of unemployment of thousands of musicians throughout the country. The 20-percent cabaret tax has not only brought a sad situation in the employment of musicians in cabarets, night clubs, and hotels, but has caused the liquidation of many an establishment.

The establishments, because of their inability to continue to hire live talent due to the above tax law have been forced to turn to other means for entertainment in their places of business which is another direct imposition and discrimination of the employment of live talent, the installation of canned music.

France, with all the ill effects of the last war, has enacted a law absolutely prohibiting the use of any canned device for amusement. It has a law that if you want entertainment and music, hire live talent.

With establishments resorting to canned music, there is no 20-percent tax rolling in, and with musicians being out of employment, the situation becomes all the worse.

There are a few items that should be explained, but by this time we realize that you have read of them from numerous locals and dispensers throughout the country. There are, also, figures which could be used to compare the unprogressive effects of the 20-percent cabaret tax to both the employer and musicians.

Therefore, we sincerely hope and pray that you gentlemen will give this matter your careful consideration and show the same response to the proposals now before Congress for the repeal of the 20-percent cabaret tax, the most discriminatory, nonproductive, and unjust law.

Sincerely yours,

ALVIN K. ISAACS,
Secretary-Treasurer.

Coal Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IVOR D. FENTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 11, 1950

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein in the Appendix of the RECORD, a letter which Mr. John Honicker, of St. Clair, Pa., addressed under date of April 27 to the editor of the Pottsville Journal, Pottsville, Pa., on the subject of Government controls in view of the proposed controls for the coal industry.

APRIL 27, 1950.

To the EDITOR, POTTSVILLE JOURNAL,
Pottsville, Pa.

DEAR SIR: For the last 20 years, with the exception of World War II, we have been afflicted with a disease called depression, and while we have been given hot foot baths, doses of antitoxin, and blood transfusions, we are still bedfast and have a high fever. Yet they tell us the cure, prosperity, is just around the corner. If it is, it is staying there and is well fortified and so far has defied all efforts of the PWA and WPA and the other dozens of different alphabetical agencies to dislodge it.

It is estimated there are 5,000,000 people idle in the country now, yet old Doc Truman assures us there is nothing to worry about and that everything is tip-top and the only fly in the ointment is coal, which, he says, is a sick industry and the only and sure cure is a Government control board. Here in the anthracite we have the bootleg problem. Specialists are springing up like mushrooms, who after taking X-rays and giving the patient the Wassermann blood test, have decided the only cure is Government or State control, as that will cure everything from a cold up to tuberculosis.

If State, or any government control, is a cure for all our ills, then why not put everything under State or Federal control, from a peanut roaster up to a locomotive works. Why not put sickness under control, as it is a well-known fact there are more people sick in the winter than in the summer. They could have a commission see to it that not too many of us get sick at one time, so we could keep the doctors steadily employed. Why not regulate and control the deaths so in case Jack Jones and I were both sick in bed, and both about to kick in, they could tell one of us to hold off and not both die at once so as to keep the undertaker steadily employed.

Now, I would like to ask those throat and bone specialists a few questions, and I want straightforward answers, not buts, ifs, nor ands about it. Is this control going to be the same as crop control in the West, where they killed pigs and sheep by the millions, ploughed the cotton under, and destroyed the wheat, or are they going to increase production? If they are, where are they going to find the market for it? Are they going to send it to the tropical countries, or the heathen Chinese, or Alaskan Eskimos, or dump it in the rivers, or use it for ballast on the railroads?

Maybe we can depend on the commission to effect a cure, or maybe take the advice of John L. Lewis, that mighty man who shakes the earth when he walks and people tremble when they hear his voice, who a few years ago made the statement there were too many miners and too many mines, and that the operators should shut down some of the mines and the men to go elsewhere. That is just what the operators did. The men were given a chance to go elsewhere and get a job, wherever that town or city may be. Yes; there are too many miners, and too many mines, too many carpenters, and too many plumbers. What are we going to do about it—knock them on the heads?

I am satisfied if this worthless coal-control bill is enacted into law it will not put one miner to work or sell one more ton of coal, but it will create an army of soft-job holders and mean thousands more votes to perpetuate the New Dealers in office.

You can't change the law of supply and demand by legislation, no more than you can change the seasons of the year or increase the average length of life. People are not buying straw hats in the wintertime or felt boots in the summer. That law has never been amended. All the Congresses and parliaments in the world cannot repeal it and no Supreme Court has declared it unconstitutional.

I am sending a similar communication to Congressman FENTON and Senator MYERS.

Yours truly,

JOHN HONICKER.

ST. CLAIR, PA.

May Day, 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 11, 1950

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial is from the Mosinee Times. This letter indicates the impression the May Day demonstration made:

AS WE SEE IT—MAY DAY, 1950

There are a great many things that we'd like to say about the experiences of "A Day Under Communism," sponsored here on Monday by the American Legion and people of Mosinee, but we've been at a loss as to how to go about saying it.

The answer to our problem came to our desk this morning in a letter from Josephine (Mrs. Louis) Kotora, of Knowlton. In our humble opinion, there is nothing more forceful to be said for the program on Monday, and for that reason we are making it our editorial on the subject. It brought tears to our eyes, and we hope that you will read it a couple of times to get the full impact and meaning in this fine letter.—Editor.

KNOWLTON, WIS., *May 1, 1950.*

DEAR MR. SCHWEINLER: This is to tell you what your May Day program brought one American family in this community.

As usual, at 8 o'clock in the morning we were all at the table eating breakfast, listening to the news on the radio. This morning there was a recording played of the meeting that was held in Mosinee last night and telling of the event that would take place today when a mock communistic party would take over the city. My thoughts were naturally of all the proceedings, food, clothing and gas rations, permits, the loss of freedom of speech, religion, concentration camps, etc. But what were the thoughts of my children? To find out, I asked them and they were as follows. Bob, age 14, said: "Well, baseball season is on and I hope when I enter high school next fall I can get on their team." Then I asked Dick, age 11: "Gosh, mom, I'm

thinking of ever so many things—you know school will be out in a couple of weeks and that means fishing, swimming and maybe a new bike to ride around on." And Louis, who is 7 years old, said: "Oh, I'm thinking of my next allowance and I'm going to buy five flying saucers, they're the new bubble gum they just got in at the store." And I didn't have to ask my 2-year-old daughter what was on her mind, sitting in her high chair, her eyes flashing, pigtails bobbing and simply furious because none of her brothers knew what "mow butta on me bwed" meant. I wished you could have seen her grateful smile when I put more butter on her bread. Then a glance at the clock, the boys grabbed their hats and coats and with a 'Bye Mom' dashed to school.

Then the usual, washing the breakfast dishes, making beds, dusting and marketing. After lunch I glanced at the day's mail, the daily paper, a letter from grandma, your issue of the Red Star and the telephone bill. The telephone bill always brings a smile to my face for I know already what's in store for me when the man of the house opens it. It's the same with every telephone bill. He hardly glances at the amount of the calls or their charges, but will notice the tax with raised eyebrows and again I'll hear of how unfair he thinks it is for me to be taxed when I'm not feeling well and call up to have my groceries delivered, or for him to have been taxed when he called the hospital 4 times in 5 hours to find out how his son was getting along after a tonsilectomy.

It was then that I realized what a wonderful country the United States of America is, how very proud I was to be its citizen and that all my loved ones were also citizens. That Bob could play baseball in high school, instead of a strict military schooling under a communistic rule; that Dick in his summer vacation could swim, fish and dream of riding a new bike. That flying saucers were in the form of bubble gum, and there's plenty of butter on the table to satisfy my daughter. That the man of the house could openly complain about the telephone taxes without being put in a concentration camp. Yes, indeed, this is a wonderful country to be from and to be in.

The day is almost over, the children in bed and I'm so absorbed in writing all this that I didn't hear my husband addressing me until I felt his hand on my shoulder and said: "Honey, writing your biography?" I looked up at him, smiled, and asked him to read what I had written. After reading it he, too, said: "Yes indeed, this sure is a wonderful country, and honey, why don't you call Stalin up and tell him what a heel we think he is." And all I could think of was to say: "But dear, think of the telephone tax on a call to Russia."

JOSEPHINE KOTORA.

Which Way Toward Peace and Freedom?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 27, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an address given by me at the thirty-fifth annual convention of Kiwanis International at Miami, Fla., on May 8, 1950:

WHICH WAY TO PEACE AND FREEDOM?

Throughout the whole world today a fierce economic, political, and ideological struggle is being waged whose outcome will determine who really won World War II and whether, God forbid, there is to be world war III.

In any time of uncertainty and danger, the first and most essential thing to do is to go back to fundamentals, make sure of our bearings, establish priorities.

What must be the first concern of any intelligent nation? Its security.

How can a nation best promote its security? There are two main methods. One is to try by all proper means to prevent the development or expansion of any nation or group of nations hostile to it. The other is to keep itself strong and to try by all legitimate means to keep as many other nations as possible strong and friendly to itself. In short, the first job of our diplomacy is to try to keep our side as big and powerful and united as possible, and to try by every legitimate means to keep all actual and potential enemies as small and weak and divided as possible. In a jungle world, such as we now live in, survival depends to a large degree on the ability to distinguish friend from enemy.

For many decades our forefathers saw that truth clearly in Asia. They realized that it was important to our security that the opposite shores of the Pacific be in the hands of friends and not under the control of enemies or potential enemies. That was the key consideration underlying our insistence for almost a century on the genuine independence of China, no matter what kind of government it had—the open-door policy.

We did not see it in Europe. For more than 100 years our policy was: Have as little to do with Europe as possible; retain our freedom of action; do not get entangled in any permanent alliance with any nation or nations there. Then we got into two World Wars in one generation, in part because intelligent concern for our own security dictated that we not allow the opposite shores of the Atlantic to come under the control of forces hostile to us and to everything we believe in and stand for. We are now acutely aware of the necessity of having friends on our side in Europe. But, oddly enough, at the very time we were belatedly discovering this on our east, we forgot it on our west and were complacently watching China come under the control first of one enemy, Japan, and then of another, the Soviet Union. I have never been able to understand why our Government cannot get policies that make sense in both oceans at the same time.

For 10 years the world tried to get peace with Hitler and the Japanese militarists by ignoring or appeasing them. It did not lead to peace and freedom. It led straight to war and perilously near to slavery.

No sooner were the aggressions of Hitler and the Japanese militarists defeated than we forgot the painful lesson and continued to appease everywhere another aggressor, world communism directed by the Kremlin—far more dangerous than Hitler or Japan, because it has greater resources and manpower and is so much more clever. We tried to buy the Soviets off by yielding to their demands and pressures. Despite the repeated and forthright declarations by Communist leaders, in the Kremlin and elsewhere, that their goal is elimination of every non-Communist government, we refused to believe it. Our own leaders pretended that Communists are not international gangsters, but just Jeffersonian Democrats. To prove to them our own good intentions and calm their alleged fears, we scrapped our enormous military superiority within 6 months after VJ-day. We offered the atomic bomb to all on terms of complete equality with ourselves. We also scrapped a lot of our principles and our public commitments, including those in the Atlantic Charter. In private conferences with Soviet leaders, we divided up other peoples' rights and territory—including those of loyal allies like Poland and China. To try to win over our avowed enemies, we sacrificed our proved friends. Such conduct, of course, did not lead to better relations; they grew steadily worse.

Finally, 3 years ago, our Government began to wake up to the fact that the Soviet Union is not a peace-loving democracy and does not respond to reasonableness. Step by step we have embarked on a fivefold program with relation to Europe, which I believe is sound as far as it goes and has promise of success if continued firmly there and expanded to include Asia.

First, rebuilding enough of our scrapped military strength to fulfill our commitments in Germany and Japan and to meet any probable emergencies or dangers. It is painfully clear that strength here at home is indispensable if we hope to have any influence at all with the Kremlin.

Second, resistance to any further spread in Europe and the Near East of the glacier of tyranny moving out of the Soviet Union into those areas. This began with the program of military aid to Greece and Turkey.

Third, economic assistance on a cooperative basis to certain independent European nations struggling to recover their economic stability and overcome Communist efforts to weaken and subjugate them from within—the Marshall plan.

Fourth, military assistance to certain western European nations—the North Atlantic Pact. From the beginning of the economic recovery program it was apparent that it could not move ahead at full speed without this additional step—a mutual defense program. A sense of security is essential if the people of Europe are to invest their resources in long-range productive enterprises, and put everything they have into the recovery effort. In fact, economic development without military security only increases their peril because they become so much more tempting a prize for a potential aggressor. No one of the nations of western Europe alone, nor all of them together, can become strong enough in the next few years to withstand Russian attack. They cannot achieve either military security or economic recovery, except by making a most vigorous collective as well as individual attack upon their problems—with our active support and assistance based on this sound and simple principle: we help those who will help themselves—increased production; and help each other—increased trade within Europe including Western Germany; and thereby help us. They cannot recover without our assistance; but even with our aid they cannot recover without far greater unity among themselves, both economic and military, than they have yet achieved. I hope and trust they will proceed more rapidly in that direction during the coming year.

But success in these mighty endeavors in Europe, even if completely successful there, cannot be enough. It is daydreaming to imagine the Soviets will alter their policies enough to come to real agreement with us on traffic rules for carrying on peaceful relations between their world and ours, as long as they are winning anywhere—and they are winning spectacularly in Asia.

For more than 3 years the Congress has tried in vain to get the administration to adopt and vigorously pursue policies in Asia similar to those it had adopted in Europe—while there still was time to prevent the present developments in China which constitute a catastrophe beyond estimation, both to our own security, to any hope of being able to reduce our military budget to manageable proportions, and to any prospect of having a balance of power in the world so strongly favorable to the free world that it can perhaps influence the Soviets toward cooperation rather than attempted conquest.

Tragically, our Government has followed opposite policies on the opposite sides of the world. To European nations striving to resist the Communist aggression, from within or from without, it said, "We will help you only if you keep the Communists out of your government."

To Chinese striving to resist Communist aggression our Government said, "We will help you only if you take the Communists in." The Chinese being somewhat simple-minded have had difficulty in understanding that. I hope you understand it.

In Europe we adopted a policy of resistance to communism and assistance to freedom—and are making real headway; in Asia we have followed the incredible policy of trying to appease communism, or of only half-hearted resistance, or of wait and see—with total disaster.

Unless immediately—and I have warned for 5 years that if and when China goes down completely, it may be too late—there is a drastic reversal of policy in Asia similar to that of 3 years ago in Europe, history can only record that we defeated Japan, but Russia won the war—certainly in the Pacific and not improperly in Europe, too. We and the free world lost it.

With China conquered and Communist satellites all along Russia's Asiatic border, she is free to turn to Europe or the Middle East without peril of a two-front war. She certainly will do so—in fact, already is. For the second time within a decade we are faced with the prospect of a world war because of the very same mistake—failure to appreciate how imperative it is to our own security that the opposite shores of the Pacific as well as of the Atlantic be in the hands of friends, not enemies.

Just as the decisive area in determining the enslavement or survival of a free Europe is Germany, so the crux of the problem of our security in Asia always has been and still is China. First, to mention a few of the reasons—because it occupies the strategically advantageous central position in east Asia. Second, because of its long border with Russia, which can serve as either an asset or a liability to Soviet plans for domination depending on whether the border is in the hands of friends of the Soviet Union or friends of ourselves. Third, because of China's vast manpower and resources. Fourth, because of Japan's dependence on China for materials and markets. Fifth, because of the influential role China has played for milleniums in determining the history of east Asia.

For several years administration spokesmen have talked almost casually of writing China off and then keeping the countries around her free. That is like letting the hub of a wheel be chopped out and imagining we can save or hold together the individual spokes—Korea, Japan, the Philippines, Indochina, Siam, Malaya, Indonesia, Burma, and India. Or to change the figure—how are you going to make much out of these countries which are the fingers, if China, which is the hand, is gone?

What is long overdue is a change of our basic policy toward Communist expansion in Asia from appease to oppose, just as we made such a change 3 years ago in Europe. The risk is greater if we do not make such an effort than if we do. For instance, the Communists are now at the doors of Hong Kong. One way for them to win the support, or at least the approval, of almost every Chinese, is for them to get Hong Kong, whether by boycott or attack. They will make that attempt whenever it becomes expedient to do so. Shall we then help white men shoot down Chinese and unite all Asia against us?

Again, the Chinese Reds are now in direct contact with strong Communist forces in Indochina. If they get all China subdued and organized, they can then move south in strength which cannot be stopped except by direct American aid to Frenchmen killing Asians. That could set Asia afire. Siam, Malaya, Singapore, and all the rest would almost certainly go under Communist control. Then how would France and England and Holland ever recover? England's largest source of dollars has been tin and rubber from Malaya. How could she become self-supporting with the loss of that source of the hard currency foreign exchange on which her very survival depends—unless we are able and willing to support her indefinitely? Our problems in China heretofore and in Asia now are as nothing compared to the difficulties complete conquest of China and Formosa will bring to us—in Europe as well as Asia.

In short, the establishment by the Communists of complete control in China will permit them to shift their efforts from the hub to the spokes in a way that will constitute a mortal peril to Korea, the Philippines, and all southeast Asia. Loss of southeast Asia will gravely endanger, probably make impossible, European self-support. Failure of western Europe to recover will constitute an obvious peril to ourselves.

Therefore, our first and most important task in Asia—not more important than our task in Europe but not less important—still is to try to keep the Communists from gaining complete mastery of China and Formosa. Opposition to the Communists within China proper is greater today than ever before. People there know the reality now, not the utopian propaganda that still beguiles some Americans. The farmers, workers, intellectuals, are poorer than ever before—and enslaved besides. Even the students are beginning to lose their illusions. There are known to be half a million guerrillas still resisting. We should take advantage of this reaction and move at once to encourage the Chinese to keep the Reds so busy in China that they will not be able to give full assistance to Communist forces in the countries on her borders, until we can perhaps be able to improve conditions in those countries.

The stubborn refusal of the Chinese Government to collapse according to the schedule our State Department has been periodically announcing for 6 years, directly or through inspired writers, has already won us more than a year of invaluable time in which much progress has been made in strengthening three countries—Indochina, Burma, and Indonesia. If Chiang Kai-shek and other Chinese who still resist no matter what the odds, can manage to hold on a while longer, despite our denunciations of them, then perhaps with the return of Mr. Jessup from his leisurely trip to Japan, the Philippines, Bangkok, and way stations, the paralysis of policy planners in Washington can be ended, and a positive program be thought up and inaugurated. If we make no effective effort to assist the armed forces which already exist in China and Formosa, how will we aid forces which don't exist in the neighboring countries?

Maybe even the point 4 program can become something more than words, if only continued Chinese resistance will buy us another year or so.

On the other hand, once the last stronghold of the Chinese Government, Formosa, is overwhelmed by the Communists, it will not make much difference whether we get a China policy or not, or even an Asia policy. The followers of the Kremlin will have power in China that cannot be challenged in any foreseeable future, no matter how unhappy or angry the Chinese people may be. American influence in that vast area will be almost a thing of the past. We will have suffered the greatest defeat in our history. Pearl Harbor was puny by comparison. It is relatively easy to rebuild a fleet; how will you recapture a continent?

But as long as Formosa stands as the final bastion of the free Chinese and resistance continues on the mainland, there is still a chance for the United States to play a decisive role in preventing such a catastrophe to our own interests. A decent concern for our security should dictate that we help the free Chinese maintain on Formosa the legitimate Government of the Republic of China, in order (1) to maintain a symbol of hope and encouragement to the hundreds of millions of our wartime allies now behind the Asian iron curtain; (2) to strengthen resistance to Communist seizure of Formosa which would give Russia such a valuable air and submarine base in the heart of our western Pacific security system; (3) to encourage Chinese to work toward eventually removing China from the Soviet side of the balance and returning her to the side of the free nations; and (4) to buy us time.

What is necessary to achieve these ends? The first requirement is that we wake up to the true nature of the Communist movement in China and to the fact that its real target is ourselves. The State Department and a handful of writers on China have for years followed the line that we should not give effective aid to the Government of China, but rather should be neutral in what they misrepresented as just a civil war, a war between alleged feudalism and alleged democracy; or should even favor the Communists, because, so they said, there was some hope in the Communists and none in the Chinese Government.

Many of us have maintained the opposite, namely, that there was and still is some hope in the Chinese Government, and none in the Communists, because the Communists are committed to the Kremlin, to dictatorship and to world conquest, including conquest of ourselves. Whatever confusion may have existed on this point heretofore, surely the facts are clear today—even to the blindest.

A policy of supporting the Chinese Government and all those who are resisting Communist subjugation will not require a large expenditure of effort, money, or materials on the part of the American Government and people as compared to what we are doing in Europe and to what it will cost us later if we do not make such an effort now.

It will, however, require positive action and a genuine determination to find ways to help effectively. Until there is such a will on our part, there can, of course, be no way. The biggest reason for our debacles to date is that there has been no will in Washington to discover and do the things necessary to prevent them.

Second, we should not grant diplomatic recognition to the Communist regime at Peking. Such recognition would bring us no benefits, and would greatly weaken the will-to-resist of the Chinese already under the Communists on the mainland, the free Chinese in Formosa, and the strong communities of Chinese in all the countries of southeast Asia. It would shake the confidence in us of other peoples in Asia—those still undecided. Our greatest immediate stake in Asia is to keep these seven or eight hundred million people on our side. If they witness official abandonment by the powerful United States of an ally which stood by us during the nightmare period following Pearl Harbor, can they then be expected to have any faith in American declarations that we will help resist the spread of Communist aggression beyond China into their own territories? Why should they resist communism when to do so brings trouble from their Communist minorities and no assurance of aid from the democracies; whereas going over to the Reds brings immediate Russian support, and then

recognition, trade and good relations with the democracies too. In short, recognition by us would prove to all that the way to get help from both sides is to go Communist. That is the real meaning and the pro-Communist effect of the negative policies in Asia advocated for so many years by the Lattimores, Fairbanks, Snows, and Peffers, the Institute of Pacific Relations and the Foreign Policy Association, as well as the Far Eastern Division of the State Department.

Furthermore, to recognize the Communist regime would put an avowed enemy instead of a proved friend in China's seat on the United Nations Security Council. It would put enemies instead of friends in all Chinese embassies, legations, and consulates all over the world, carrying on espionage, intrigue, and propaganda against ourselves in the very midst of the countries which we hope to keep out of their control. Surely that would not be in the interest of our country or of peace and freedom.

Third, we should make a forthright statement of support of the Chinese Government and all other anti-Communist forces in China in their struggle to remain free. Can anyone remember a single kind word for China from our Government since VJ-day, or one of understanding, sympathy, and encouragement? More than anything else, the Chinese—exhausted from over 12 years of war and invasion, discouraged because of double-crosses and abandonment by their allies—need moral support, the same sort of support we have given to the Greeks, Italians, Turks, and others in Europe engaged in exactly similar fights to prevent being taken over by Communists and made Soviet satellites. Some of those governments do not come up to our standards, either.

Western sentimentalists and shrewd pro-Communist propagandists harp on the theme that such action in China would aline us with a reactionary and undemocratic government and thereby injure our moral standing in Asia. Well, who thinks that after Yalta we have any moral standing in Asia, except in Japan, Korea, and the Philippines, and it is slipping rapidly in the latter. Few of the peoples of Asia have the slightest notion of what we mean by democracy. But to a man they understand the meaning of loyalty and faithfulness to friends. They know that, whatever the weaknesses and shortcomings of the Chinese Government, its loyalty to the United States has never been questioned.

They also know that, whatever the strengths or alleged virtues of the Communists, they are avowed enemies of the United States. Do you imagine we will hold the confidence of Asians, or win new allies there, by continued unfaithfulness to an old ally, China, which itself has been wholly faithful to us? I warn you that few, if any, in Asia are going to put much trust in the United States unless we change our policies, and fast. They may well conclude that we have lost the capacity to distinguish friend from enemy and are therefore too immature and undependable to tie themselves to.

Surely it cannot be wrong for people to strive to remain free—or for the land of the free to be openly on the side of those who are so striving, and to give them moral support and encouragement.

Fourth, we should extend effective military aid to the defenders of Formosa. By effective military aid I mean the same sort of military assistance program we have carried out successfully in Greece, but have not even tried in China since the recall of General Wedemeyer in early 1946—four long years.

Effective military aid includes, first of all, putting in over-all charge of America's security in that part of the world, the most experienced and successful man we have in dealing with east Asia. That man, of course, is General MacArthur.

It includes some top-flight American military spark plugs, like General Wedemeyer, Admiral Cooke, Admiral Badger, with adequate American staffs to train and advise the Chinese armed forces at all levels—and in strategy, tactics, and operations—which our previous mission in China was not permitted by our Government to do.

Surely it is of some significance that the seven American admirals, all men with brilliant records—Yarnell, Hart, Barbey, Kincaid, Cooke, Badger, and now Radford—who in succession have been in command of our Asiatic Fleet, have been unanimous in believing that such an effort should be made and could be successful, if made with a firm will to win victories rather than just to explain defeats. Generals MacArthur, Wedemeyer, and Chennault believe the same.

These men are hardly amateurs or armchair theorists or sentimentalists. Should we follow the judgment and advice of those who have been most successful in dealing with Asia? Or follow the judgment and advice of those who have been least successful—Generals Stilwell, Marshall, and Barr—and a few dozen pro-leftist writers, lecturers, and State Department men led by Alger Hiss who was a keyman in the Far East division from 1939 to 1944 when the policy pattern and the propaganda line which lost China to Russia were being established? These are the men who tell you on every occasion that nothing can be done. How do they know? They have never tried themselves or allowed others to try.

Effective military aid for Formosa includes a relatively small amount of munitions, light arms, equipment, and supplies carefully planned for the particular type of operation needed. It includes spare parts and fuel for the Chinese air force and navy, and a few hundred of our World War II planes now lined up on Okinawa and never to be used again by us. We are giving some to the Philippine air force. Why not to the Chinese? Perhaps 50,000 World War I type rifles and ammunition for them may be needed in addition to the 130,000 rifles already sent under the program the Congress voted in 1948. Money for all these has long been available. The road block has never been in Congress.

A military-aid program does not include American combat troops. I do not know anyone who has ever suggested that we should send American combat troops to Formosa, or that we should occupy it with American forces, even though the State Department frequently engages in shooting down that straw man set up by itself. It would be neither justifiable nor advantageous for the United States to occupy or seize Formosa for herself; but it is extremely important to our security that it be denied to our enemies. The way to accomplish that end, and at the same time to strengthen the spirit of resistance among all Chinese and other free peoples in Asia, is to help the Chinese and Formosans hold their island, as many of our best military students of the problem believe they still can do with such aid, although the time left is short indeed.

At this point someone always brings up the argument that we have given lots of aid and it was useless. It is unfortunate that so few people know enough about the facts in China to be able to refute the half-truths, even lies, on which such attempted explanations of our own failures are usually based. Some of them are:

1. That the Chinese have no will to fight. But in 1946 General Marshall was out there berating them because they had too much will to fight, and for a year insisted they cease fire, and embrace the Reds instead. We ourselves did more than anything else to destroy the will to fight, for which we now criticize them.

2. That all our aid has been wasted. The fact is that the Communists have officially admitted that Chinese Government troops killed 243,000 of their troops and wounded 650,000 more in the 3-year period, 1946–49, which is more than the Germans and Japanese were able to do to us in 3½ years. Apparently much of our aid was used very effectively indeed.

3. That we have given the central government enormous aid. Unfortunately it has not been possible to find out just how much of what items were actually delivered to whom in China on what date. Our Government talks in dollar figures, using the original cost plus transportation of a lot of stuff which was sent out by us for the war against Japan and later sold to the Chinese at a higher rate than we charged most of our other allies, although in the words of an American admiral on the ground, "at least half of it was junk." Besides most of it was not suited for the kind of guerrilla operations needed in China.

Since VJ-day all the military aid that has actually been delivered to China is substantially as follows:

One hundred and five million four hundred thousand dollars, mostly in 1945. Almost nothing in 1946, 1947, and the first 10 months of 1948—the three crucial years during which the decisive shift in the relative strengths of government forces and Communist forces in China took place.

One hundred and twenty-five million dollars' worth of new material since November 1948.

One hundred and forty-one million three hundred thousand dollars—the original cost of 131 old naval vessels which were turned over to China, partly because they were not valuable enough to justify our bringing them home from the far Pacific to put in moth balls here.

Total, at original cost prices, $371,700,000.

In addition, $335,000,000 was figured for services and expenses—mostly transporting Chinese troops from southwest China and Burma to eastern and northern China to accept the Japanese surrender. This represented a saving, not an outlay for the United States, because if we had not transported Chinese troops to take over from the Japanese, we would have had to send in and maintain American troops to do the job—at far greater cost.

Furthermore, when military aid was voted by Congress in April 1948, the administration systematically sabotaged it by delays, overcharges, and unbalanced shipments. For example, the Chinese were charged $85 per thousand for old .30-caliber cartridges as compared to $4.60 per thousand charged Greece and Turkey for the same type of ammunition whose original cost to us had been $46 a thousand. That is, $1 of American military aid for Greece delivered 220 bullets; but $1 of American aid for China delivered only 12 bullets. As a result of these and similar overcharges, China, with a population of 450,000,000, actually received less useful military supplies than Greece with a population of 7,000,000.

The further fact is blissfully ignored that to send even a surplus of some of the items essential for a given operation, but little or none of the other essential items may be useless, no matter how many millions the items which were sent had cost.

Again, the charge is made that the Chinese would never take our advice. The fact is that their biggest errors were the times when they did take our advice, such as agreeing to our iniquitous Yalta deal, giving Russia control of Manchuria after we had promised at Cairo it would be returned to China, and agreeing to the truce with the Communists in January 1946, when the

government forces had overwhelming military superiority, which truce the Communists used to expand their holdings fivefold—from 60 counties to more than 300. I can give you a dozen more instances if you desire. What kind of sportsmanship, not to mention integrity, is it to denounce the Chinese for the inevitable bad results of decisions which we made, not they?

In short, what China has most needed all along and most needs now is not more aid but proper aid. Proper aid is the kind we gave Greece, but have not given China since 1945. Munitions without such American advice and assistance in their use cannot succeed any more than advice without munitions could succeed.

If we had tried in China the sort of policy we have followed successfully in Greece, or if we had followed the recommendations made by General Wedemeyer almost 3 years ago, and still failed, then neither I nor any other person could say a word of criticism. But we have not tried. How does anyone know whether we can succeed or not, until we do try?

As a fifth component of an Asia policy, we should continue to give economic assistance to the Chinese Government on Formosa. One of the reasons the economy of the island is sorely strained is because it is having to export materials needed for home consumption, in order to get foreign exchange to buy commodities like cotton and oil which must be obtained from abroad. If we will help provide such commodities to Formosa—the money has been available for 2 years—exactly as we are helping provide them to Korea, Japan, and western Europe, the economy of Formosa can be made reasonably stable. Ordinarily it has a favorable balance of trade, in sharp contrast to that of England, for example, which we are helping even though it is doubtful whether it can ever again become self-supporting.

Economic assistance includes the so-called point 4 program of industrial development and technical assistance in the parts of Asia still free. We must get it going at once if it is to be of any value. It cannot be expected to produce substantial physical results, within several years, but the psychological lift could be tremendous.

Sixth, we should give leadership, encouragement, and assistance to the free peoples of east Asia in their proposal to get together in a mutual assistance defense pact, such as we have sponsored in the North Atlantic. Without some such cooperative effort to defend the whole area there is every reason to expect that the Communists will be able to pick the countries off, one by one. And let me repeat, if England, Greece, and Holland are deprived of access to the resources and markets of southeast Asia on a mutually beneficial basis, what chance is there for them and the rest of western Europe to become self-supporting? If we are then compelled to continue beyond 1952 the heavy burden of supporting the countries of western Europe, how long can we ourselves remain solvent and safe?

The Congress last year wrote into the declaration of policy in the Mutual Defense Assistance Act—the so-called military-aid program for Europe—a statement urging American leadership for organizing in Asia something similar to what we have helped develop in Europe.

That became the law of the land on October 6, 1949. Yet, the Secretary of State admitted recently before my committee—Foreign Affairs—that nothing had been done by his Department to implement the policy declared by the Congress. Why? It is unexplained, and, to me, unexplainable. Apparently, we are still waiting for more dust to settle—which means waiting for the patient to die. What, pray tell, can be done then?

That brings me to the compelling reason why I believe we must adopt in Asia some such positive policy as I have outlined in place of the wait-and-see, do-nothing-effective no-policy our Government has followed these last 5 years with such spectacular benefit to the Communists and such disastrous results to ourselves. That compelling reason is self-preservation.

I am not and never have been interested in any persons, groups, or parties in China or Asia. I am interested in the security of the United States of America, and in freedom, world order, and peace. It is the job of responsible American officials to find ways and means to achieve those goals; not excuses for not achieving them. Those who think nothing effective can be done in China, should step aside or be removed to make way for those who believe something effective can be done and must be done—and now.

It is not enough just to recite the weaknesses of China—the five adjectives which the apologists of our Government's negative policies always use as their excuse for not giving effective aid, namely that the Government of China is "inept, incompetent, inefficient, undemocratic, and corrupt." Certainly those conditions exist in China, just as they do in every Asian country—and everywhere else in greater or less degree, especially after long exhausting wars. They are the problems it is the business of responsible statesmanship to solve; not the alibi for failure to solve them, or for doing nothing.

The pro-Communists in this country are now skillfully promoting the same line with respect to Korea and the Philippines seeking to discredit those governments also and persuade us to forget again where our own self-interest lies. When they are ready to take over India the same line will begin with regard to its government which will become Fascist, reactionary, feudal, undemocratic, corrupt, and incompetent.

On the other side, I am fully aware of all the myths which have been so skillfully propagated regarding the Communists in China: For example, that they are not really Communists, but just agrarian reformers, patriotic peasants leading spontaneous revolutionary forces against alleged warlordism, landlordism, and feudalism; that they are not connected with or subservient to the Soviet Union; that they won't be able to organize and administer a government in China without our help, which will supposedly make them susceptible to our influence; that they will not be able to convert the Chinese to communism; that they will not be able to solve China's economic problems; that they will probably develop Titoism; that they will have to cooperate with the west. All of these myths have proved or are being proved cruel hoaxes. They were designed not to tell the truth, but to lull us to sleep while the Communists were getting control of China. They have been exceedingly successful.

If we cannot decide what is best in China and Asia because we think neither side is good, then let us decide what is worst, as a physician does when confronted with no good alternatives. What is the worst thing that can happen in Asia? There can be no question about the answer to that. The worst thing from the standpoint of our own interests, those of the people of Asia, and of world peace, is for China and then the other countries to come wholly under the Communists and become new satellites of Russia. Therefore, that is the thing which we must, if possible, prevent.

The first requirement of our security in the Pacific is not democratic governments or even better governments, but independent governments. The present disaster began when we abandoned in 1945, starting at Yalta, our historic policy of supporting resolutely "the sovereignty, the independence, the territorial and administrative integrity of China." That had been our consistent and sound policy previously—whether under John Hay in 1899, Woodrow Wilson in 1915, Charles Evans Hughes in 1922, Hoover and Stimson in 1931 or Roosevelt and Hull in 1941—and no matter how good or bad a government China had at the time.

We got off the track because from 1943 on some officials high in our Government for some unexplained reason failed to realize that the Communist movement in China and Asia is and always has been an instrument of Soviet aggression, and allowed themselves to be beguiled into thinking that it was just one faction in an internal conflict which was none of our business. Now it is plain to all that the Communists have as their aim not just China, but all of Asia and Europe, and then ourselves.

In such a situation it has always seemed to me the decision as to what we should do ought to be extremely simple: We should oppose whatever assists our mortal enemy; we should assist whatever opposes that mortal enemy. However great the risks and difficulties of such a positive policy may be, the risks of a negative and defeatist policy of doing-nothing-effective are greater.

However late it is today, it will be still later tomorrow. However much it will cost to make the effort now, our choice is not between that and something less; it is between that and something more. Which do we want?

There are two lessons we could still learn from our experience in Europe if we would. The first is that when Communist expansion is stopped, it begins to fall apart, because it cannot deliver on its fancy promises. The second is that it cannot be stopped except by resistance all along the line of its advance. That requires assistance to all in its path who will resist, even though some of the governments involved do not meet with our full approval. If we will apply those lessons with imagination and resolution in Asia as we are in Europe, the situation may still be retrieved. There is hope if we try; there is none if we don't try.

We have learned that to keep western Europe free there must be a regional effort—assistance to all in the given area. If we would keep Asia free, there must be a program of regional defense there also.

Ultimately, and soon, there must be global defense against the strong cruel enemy we and the free peoples of the world face; or else all of us, not just weakened and exhausted China and backward Asia, will fall before its ruthless and skillful onslaughts from within and without. Must we once more dawdle and daydream until after the blow actually falls, and then have to fight for our own survival under the most difficult circumstances possible?

That brings us to the last step in the overall foreign-policy program on which our Government has embarked and which is necessary if we hope to influence the thinking and the actions of both friends and enemies. The four steps I have already discussed—rearm, resist Communist expansion in Europe, economic and military assistance in Europe, Japan, and Korea—are mainly defensive or negative. We must have a positive program also. In addition to firm opposition to further extension of the Soviet system based on compulsion, we must gain a sense of mission to spread throughout the world our system based on free and voluntary cooperation. At last we are beginning to give to other countries a more adequate presentation of the thrilling story of what has happened here and can happen with them also under freedom. Through press, radio, films, books, and magazines, and exchange of teachers, students, scientists, and technicians, we must give hope to the oppressed peoples of the world and the undecided peoples by showing

them a better alternative—based on performance, not just promises. Our broadcasts should be called not the Voice of America, but the "voice of freedom." What has happened in the United States and Canada is not because we are Americans but because we have been free. The most explosive and dynamic idea ever turned loose in history is human freedom. The desperate measures Russia is taking to keep the story of freedom from getting through to those under her control and her own stupendous efforts in the propaganda field are the eloquent proof of how great is her faith in the power of ideas. The Russian rulers know what one man, Karl Marx, was able to start with an idea—and what two other men, Lenin and Stalin, have been able to accomplish with that idea.

They know what another man, Hitler, did with an idea.

They know what another man, St. Paul, did with an idea.

They also know what 100 other men and women, the Pilgrims, did when they came to this country over 300 years ago, with their idea—political liberty.

The greatest heroes in Russia are not scientists or industrial magnates or even generals. The heroes in Russia, and the highest paid persons in the land, are the skillful users of words—those who know how to take an idea, and no matter whether true or false, present it in attractive, convincing form. They have learned it is their most potent and effective weapon throughout the world, in softening people up preparatory to taking them over by force, which is the only means by which they have actually gained control of any country yet, beginning with Russia.

Why should we be less effective in getting across our basic ideas? We do not have to sell falsehoods about America. But we do have to present the facts about it—and present them repeatedly and convincingly, emphasizing the great advantages that have resulted under freedom—without in the least concealing the imperfections or lessening our efforts to correct them. Jesus did not say just "the truth shall make you free." Rather, he said, "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." How will they know if we do not do a far better job of telling it?

When our system is such that under it 7 percent of the people of the world have created more wealth and distributed it more widely than all the other 93 percent put together, is it not shameful that it is presented so inadequately that many people, not only abroad, but here at home, can be persuaded that it is progress, it is liberal, to advocate abandoning the system under which the 7 percent have accomplished so much and go back, not ahead, to one or another of the systems under which the 93 percent still struggle and suffer?

Why should anyone be so almost apologetic about a system which, while far from perfect, is still incomparably the best this earth has ever known—judged solely by results for human beings?

All of the above measures—military, economic, and ideological—are essential elements of a world policy—but they are not enough. They merely buy time for a final step—give us one more chance to get the world organized politically on a sounder basis.

If we hope to win the fierce economic and ideological war now raging throughout the world, before it degenerates into an atomic war with unforeseeable destruction, we must move boldly and imaginatively to try to strengthen the world organization so that it can handle effectively all threats to the peace from whatever source.

Concern for our own security has compelled us to assume in the present emergency the burden of assisting certain nations under Communist assault. But we cannot long carry that burden alone. We have neither the resources nor the wisdom.

The real task is to stop the assault. The peaceful peoples of the world placed their faith in the United Nations as the agency to do that job. The experience of the last 5 years has demonstrated that in its present form the United Nations cannot do it. In fact it is so constructed that any one of the Big Five, by its veto, can use the United Nations machinery to prevent the establishment of a just and peaceful order—to defeat the very thing it supposedly was set up to guarantee.

Most Americans were too naive to realize and too trustful to suspect that the Soviet rulers were coldly planning to use the big-power veto not to block war—which was our concept of its function—but to block peace. They have not used the veto once to prevent war or sanctions. They have used it more than 40 times to defeat agreements most of the free nations wanted because they were in the direction of peace.

At Tehran, Yalta, Potsdam, and elsewhere some of our leaders, in order to get Russia to come into the United Nations, yielded to her on matters of principle and even on our own solemn pledges to others, apparently assuming that if Russia joined it would be for the same reason we and others joined, namely, to help solve world problems. But it soon became clear to all who would see, that the Soviet Government came in for precisely the opposite reason—not to get agreement, but to ensure disagreement; not to make the United Nations work, but to be in the best possible position to make sure that it does not work. Why?

The reason is perfectly clear. The Kremlin already has a world organization of its own—the Communist Party. It has more than a dozen countries under its complete control, plus trained, disciplined units in every other country. Its world organization is already functioning, at full speed. It intends to win, and to do so it must keep any other world organization crippled and ineffective, which the veto machinery, drafted by Alger Hiss, enables it to do.

The remedy to such an intolerable situation is not to abandon the United Nations, or to continue to bypass it; but rather to improve it. We must get its structure modified so that it can and will work—with Russian cooperation if possible, but without it if necessary.

On one hand, we must initiate action toward getting the Charter itself amended to correct demonstrated defects. We should declare and pursue a policy of endeavoring to strengthen the United Nations and seek its development into some sort of world organization, open to all nations, with carefully defined and limited powers adequate to preserve peace and prevent aggression through the enactment, interpretation, and enforcement of world law.

Suppose Russia will not agree to Charter amendments that would make all members subject to the same world law, and vetoes such amendments. I have no doubt that her present leaders would do that—but I shall let them make that decision and announce it, not we make it for them. If they decide to exclude themselves from cooperation, then we do not need to withdraw from the UN or to drive the Soviets or anyone else out. We should just organize on a closer basis with all the nations that will agree—not outside the United Nations, but inside it.

That is, while seeking to strengthen the United Nations on the universal level, we must also work for better organization on a less-than-universal level within the organization. Just as the Communist-dominated members of the United Nations have always been "a club within the club," so, under article 51 of the Charter, all the free nations—beginning with the 12 in the Atlantic Pact but not limited to them—can unite firmly for collective self-defense in another "club within the club"—leaving the door open for Russia and any others to join if and when they are willing to agree and abide by the rules.

That is what our forefathers did at the Constitutional Convention. They did not secede from the Confederation, or try to drive out those who did not agree with the new proposal. They simply drew up a tighter, more workable plan of organization, and provided that whenever 9 of the 13 States ratified it, the new club would be set up—others to join or not, as they wished. All did within about a year.

As long as we indicate we will not do anything unless or until Russia agrees, of course she will not agree. Why should she?

But if we and the other free peoples demonstrate to the Russians, quickly, that we can and, if necessary, will move ahead without them, there is a chance—I suspect the only chance—that we may find it possible to get along better with them.

Whenever enough of the peaceful nations get together in a workable organization that makes it clear to the men in the Kremlin, first, that they do not need to go to war to get security or satisfaction of any legitimate grievances; and, second, that they cannot win even if they do go to war—at that point, and probably only at that point, is there any likelihood that they will begin to come along, because there would be nothing to gain and much to lose by refusing.

It is plain that we cannot get them to change from obstructionism to cooperation by persuasion, or exhortations, or bribery, or secret deals, or denunciations. These have all been tried in vain. The men in the Kremlin can be expected to cooperate only when we confront them with a set of circumstances where agreement is more advantageous to them than continued disagreement or attempted conquest.

No great military expansion in history has ever stopped until it was checked. Neither will or can the Kremlin's. War with it is inevitable unless we can check it by other means—or are willing to surrender and be enslaved. The only other means is a giant coalition of the free nations—not, I repeat, outside the United Nations but inside it.

The weaknesses which have brought our country to this ominous hour have not been primarily military or economic. Our greatest failures have been in the political and ideological and moral fields. Because for so long we had physical separation from the rest of the world, our young men and women were not challenged to become specialists in international relations and masters of the arts of diplomacy. Understandably we focused our efforts on the great task of developing this vast virgin continent and its resources.

As a result, how many Americans do we have in the field of diplomacy that are the equivalent of Marshall, MacArthur, Nimitz, Eisenhower, Spaatz, and scores of others in the military field? Or of the Fords, Firestones, Edisons, Ketterings, Rockefellers, and hundreds of other giants in industry and finance?

This grave deficiency in our human resources is not the result of anyone's design. It is the result of everyone's neglect. We have tended to concentrate so largely on our domestic life that we failed to realize that whether it is to have a chance to continue depends to a great degree on what happens abroad—or rather, on how effective we can become in influencing what happens abroad in directions favorable to world order, peace, and freedom. I congratulate Kiwanis for its magnificent program for youth, and urge you to challenge and train them to understand better the nature of the world in which they live, America's place in it, the conditions necessary for our survival, and how to fulfill the conditions.

Our hopes of avoiding disaster lie in mobilizing to the utmost our strength and skill in political, ideological, and moral fields, as well as economic and military. We will win only if we believe so intensely in those basic principles of freedom and federation on which the Nation was founded and which are responsible for its greatness, that we can outthink, outwork, outsacrifice, and outlast those whose world is founded on lies and violence.

Our difficulties are not insurmountable if we can develop, here and among the other free peoples, a moral compulsion to build in the world the sort of decent order which our forefathers had the will to build in these United States—the will to make our system work here at home and to spread it abroad.

It comes down to how sound and strong and deep is our faith. What our Nation and the world must have if they are to be saved is what Lincoln prayed for at Gettysburg. "Under God, a new birth of freedom,"—a new understanding of freedom—a new dedication to it.

Our fathers built the finest material civilization the world has ever seen—precisely because they sought first the dignity and freedom of individual man as a spiritual being. Because they put that first, not second, the political and economic system they established was one which released, as had never been done in any other time or place, the creative capacities that are in ordinary men everywhere. Thereby has our progress been achieved.

Shall we now focus our effort just on trying to preserve the material results? Or on reproducing the spiritual causes?

With all my heart I believe that the Constitution of the United States and the system of government by voluntary federation which our fathers established here, are the best set of political ideas ever put together in one place in the world's history. I think they are the hope of mankind. Our freedom and our peace depend upon the spread of those ideas—everywhere.

Aggressive citizenship to achieve these goals is indeed the safeguard of freedom, as your motto puts it. It is the only way we can ultimately turn back the tide of totalitarianism and tyranny which is sweeping over the earth and secure the blessings of liberty for ourselves and our posterity.

A Fighting Faith in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ALBERT
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 11, 1950

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert an address delivered by a young man in my congressional district, Mr. Eddie Menasco. This was a prize-winning oration in an annual oratorical content held at the Eastern Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College at Wilburton, Okla. The oration follows:

A FIGHTING FAITH IN AMERICA

Fear has won a beachhead in America, and the people of this country, although victorious in history's most devastating wars, are retreating before the shadows of an uneasy peace. Fear, unknown in war, is producing an astonishing paradox in the richest and strongest nation in the world—it is persuading the American people to talk themselves into a depression.

A defeatist attitude is encountered on all sides—from board rooms to barrooms. Whether it's a group of clerks in a cafeteria, or a group of corporation big-shots at a banquet, the main dish is likely to be despondency, seasoned with dire rumors, and garnished with gloomy statistics.

These dim views of America's economic health have apparently gained wide acceptance, although the facts of America's economic strength are known to everyone. On the radio, in magazines, in our newspapers, the basic soundness of America's economic position has been clearly pointed out. Because they do not fit into the melancholy fashions of the hour, such statements fail to register on the public mind. But they are startling facts and should be repeated again and again. Here they are:

1. Fifty-nine million workers on the job.
2. Two hundred billion dollars in liquid savings.
3. Two-hundred-and-fifteen-billion-dollar personal income for 1949.
4. High purchasing power—53 percent greater than prewar.

It would seem preposterous that anyone could manipulate these figures and come up with an answer that equals disaster. Yet, that is precisely what many Americans are doing. By emotional arithmetic, these viewers-with-alarm add two and two and get zero. But the record they scan is their own fever chart—not the record of America's economic health and vigor.

Now, you and I know that as a Nation we cannot afford to be economic hypochondriacs, because a country, like an individual, can worry itself sick.

The reaction of many Americans to the problems of this postwar period suggests something Thomas Jefferson wrote to John Adams in April 1816.

Jefferson wrote:

"I think, with you, that it is a good world. * * * There are, indeed, gloomy and hypochondriac minds, disgusted with the present, and despairing of the future; always counting the worst will happen, because it may happen. To these I say: What grief has been caused by the evils that never happened. I steer my bark with hope in the head leaving fear astern."

Today's counterparts of these gloomy individuals confuse fears with facts. Through knowing, in their hearts, the essential health and vitality of our free economy, they yield weakly to the counsels of despair. Seized with the jabber-jitters, they prattle about depression and collapse.

But how can we confuse shadows with realities? With our spiritual heritage, and with vast material resources at our command, how can we compromise our future by a liaison with fear?

The answer is lack of faith—for, only through a lack of faith in America and in ourselves, could we mark down the world's most dynamic economy.

Too many of us have accepted jabber-jitter estimates of what is wrong with America, such as welfare state, or any Government-provided benefits for that matter, instead of finding out for ourselves what is right with America, or what are some of the good points about our policy of government.

No one can deny that America faces many grave problems today, both at home and abroad. No one can deny that American business has an ample share of these problems which it must solve itself, if it is to continue its robust tradition of individual competitive enterprise. But I do deny, and most emphatically, that these problems present any logical reason for doubt. I deny that challenge is a cause for fear.

There is all the difference in the world between being aware of complex problems and being afraid of them. This moment demands a clear-eyed appraisal of the facts—not an emotional concern with shadows.

The history of America is an inspiring saga of great problems superbly overcome; of serious setbacks serving only as new beginnings for even greater achievements. I reject the thought that at the midpoint in this twentieth century, we will reverse the course of that history.

Not as a politician, not as a historian, not as an economist, but as a citizen, I call for a renewal of faith in the vitality of our American way of life.

By faith in America, I do not mean a listless reverence for the past or a mere submission to the present. By faith, I mean a certainty based on the principles for which America stands, by which it has progressed, and through which it will realize its full potential of greatness in the future. Faith in America is not blind acceptance of things as they are—it is the belief that we, in America, can make them better.

In declaring that today's opportunities can be made the basis for magnificent progress and achievement, I am simply expressing a citizen's estimate of what he sees through his own eyes. And what I see today, gives me unlimited confidence in tomorrow. Because for every minor symptom of decline, there are a hundred major elements of economic stability.

Now, of course, nothing in this world is perfect and the American economy is no exception. But, if we were perfect, there would be nothing left for us to do—and we can be well assured there is a great job to be done.

This may surprise those of us who believe that simply because we have the highest living standard in the world, we have everything we need. Some of us have become complacent through reading statistics about the number of bathtubs and telephones, motor cars, and radios, owned by Americans as compared with Russians.

Such comparisons are significant—yes. But they are phenomenal only by the Communist standard. By American standards they are not nearly good enough. Let's face the cold facts.

Twenty-seven million Americans have no kitchen sinks.

Eighteen million Americans lack vacuum cleaners.

One million American families need new homes this year.

Forty million Americans have neither bathtub nor shower.

So, let's not talk about what we've got. Let's be more concerned with what we haven't got. We must be concerned for two reasons: First, because these are human needs that should be met; and, second, because these needs provide dramatic illustration of the fact that we haven't finished anything—we're only beginning.

As Woodrow Wilson once said, "America is not anything, if it consists of each of us. It is something only if it consists of all of us; and it can consist of all of us only when our spirits are banded together in a common enterprise."

Today, our common enterprise is clear—let us go forward together, and, by bold action, reaffirm our faith in America and in ourselves—we, the people, who are America.

Inside Your Congress—True Liberalism and Human Welfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 11, 1950

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, at every whistle stop on his way to the West, Mr. Truman is asking the people to put their

faith not in themselves but in a little group of governing men. They are being promised that if they will submit to that group's management, control, and taxation they will double their income and have more houses and food, a higher culture, and better health. For nearly 160 years prior to this trip the freedom of the individual from such governing men had been a fighting matter. Every individual's liberty to be responsible for himself was thought to be absolutely essential to every American. He had no faith in anybody, even a President, to do better for him than he could for himself.

We have been taught up to now that the progress of people has been in direct ratio to the freedom enjoyed by them. Freedom was thought to be a precious substance like the precious elements in sunlight and air, in rain, in soil. When its elements were released and free, it was explosive like atomic energy itself, mysterious and capable of the most amazing results. Prior to the American discovery of liberty, for a thousand years, there had been no appreciable change in the condition of men. There had been famines about every 10 years. There were as many or more babies born as there are today but they died of hunger and cold. Life was the lifelong drab existence of grubbing in the earth for a bare subsistence. There was no surplus as it is known today. That experience of surplus is strictly associated with the American era of freedom. From the beginning of time down to the era of liberty not more than a billion people ever subsisted on the earth. There was no improvement in the cradle and the flail for a thousand years. In a little more than a century of liberty the population has doubled because of invention and science and an era of comparative peace under free enterprise.

What about the choice he must make now? Are the ideas, and inventions, the production and the surplus of the free to be slowed up and reduced by our governing men? Is it sensible for us to put our faith in our governing men who have no inventive, creative or productive capacity? Have they made any contributions to science? Can they add to the number and quality of houses and our foods? Can they extend our life and add to the health we enjoy? How about television and penicillin and poetry? None of these have come from our governing men yet.

If the free mind and spirit is the only substance from which they came, then everyone of us is concerned to protect the liberties of inventive and creative men. We all depend on them. Must we not therefore protect them against governing men who want to supervise, control, inspect, compel, and tax them? These governing men always work and fight to expand the power of their Government and to expand their business of governing. By so doing they always reduce the individual's freedom, his capacity, his productivity, his means of serving us.

Freedom is a word all too casually used. Its meaning was clear in 1776. In 1950 it is foggy and needs rethinking. Freedom is no musty sentimentality to sing hymns or write poetry about. Nor is it a constitutional game to be played by the powerful against the weak. Freedom is a most practical utility, precious to all conditions of humans. It is in truth the very practical source of food and houses and health and the good life, especially for the needy. Unless the imaginative, productive, inventive free individual produces a surplus over and above his own needs, there can be nothing for the needy.

Our governing men by the record of the Patent Office do not discover, invent or produce. In fact they are always destructive forces, unless they are confined to the maintenance, protection, and glorification of individual liberty. On the liberty of our individual free citizens depends even our safety from foreign enemies. The Patent Office again shows that our governing men have produced no instrument vital in the winning of a single war from the beginning of our history. We won because a farmer in Virginia dropped his old cradle and gave us the reaper, two bicycle makers from Ohio flew. A poor tinkerer from his mother's kitchen put a whole world on wheels.

Shall we keep our faith in ourselves under God and reject the false promises in exchange for our liberties?

Laurens, S. C., Wins Safety Award for Pedestrians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 11, 1950

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, the city of Laurens, county seat of Laurens County, S. C., one of the smaller but more progressive counties in my district, has again won an outstanding national honor. Surely, other cities, both large and small, would do well to follow the example of Laurens. As a part of my remarks, I attach hereto an editorial and other newspaper clippings:

LAURENS WINS SAFETY AWARD FOR PEDESTRIANS

Laurens has been named a grand award winner in the eleventh annual national pedestrian protection contest.

The selection was announced in Charlotte, N. C., Monday by Coleman W. Roberts, president of the Carolina Motor Club. The contest was sponsored by the American Automobile Association.

Laurens, which last year won first place for cities under 10,000 population, took top honors this year with the grand award for all cities under 100,000. San Francisco won the grand award for cities over 100,000 and Connecticut won the grand award for States.

Other Carolina cities placed in the contest, the Associated Press reported. Special citations for pedestrian programs went to both States and to the cities of Greenville, S. C., and Asheville, N. C., Easley, Marion, Union and Newberry, S. C., and Hamlet and Canton, N. C., received special citations for their accident records.

Entries in the contest were received from 1,627 cities throughout the Nation. There were 882 cities under 100,000 which entered the contest.

The 10-man committee of judges pointed to Laurens' record of no pedestrian deaths and noted the town's well-balanced pedestrian protection program.

The board of judges recognized the work of Chief W. R. Ivey of the Laurens Police Department, one of the key figures in the city's pedestrian safety record. Lt. George E. Hurteau, Jr., of the safety section of the South Carolina State Highway Patrol, was recognized for outstanding leadership in pedestrian protection.

LAURENS' FINE RECORD

Last year Laurens won top honors for cities under 10,000 population in the American Automobile Association's national pedestrian-protection contest. That was a splendid showing, for quite a few small cities and towns are in that category.

But Laurens wasn't content to take honors among the small-fry communities of the Nation and this year that safety-conscious and enterprising city of less than 7,000 in the census count of 10 years ago stepped out and won the grand award for all cities under 100,000.

South Carolina cities made a good showing in the contest with Greenville, Easley, Marion, Union, and Newberry receiving special citations for pedestrian-protection programs. But these and other municipalities of the State bow to Laurens for showing the way for the 882 cities under 100,000 over which Greenville's esteemed neighbor scored its impressive victory.

Laurens, it is recalled, made an impressive record with respect to traffic fatalities until a recent automobile-train collision marred a perfect score of several years' duration.

The award which Laurens received a few days ago was for the city's effective pedestrian-protection program. The board of judges specifically recognized the work of Chief W. R. Ivey, of the Laurens police department.

Other communities which are interested in improving their safety programs ought to be able to get some pointers from him and his associates at Laurens. Hats off to all the folks down there who have a part in the city's safety record.

LAURENS SMALLEST TOWN IN UNITED STATES TO WIN GRAND AWARD—OFFICIALS NOTIFIED OF NATIONAL PEDESTRIAN SAFETY AWARD RECORD

(By Manuel J. Rogers)

LAURENS, May 9.—The city of Laurens is the first city in the South to win the national grand award for pedestrian safety.

Laurens also is the smallest municipality in the United States ever to win the grand award and is the first town in the United States to win two consecutive awards.

Laurens won first place last year for towns under 10,000, but this year won the grand award for towns under 100,000 population.

OFFICIALS NOTIFIED

Chief of Police W. R. Ivey and Mayor W. T. Bolt have been notified of the high honor won as the result of efforts of the police department and will be notified soon of the date on which the official plaque will be presented.

To win the grand award Laurens had to take first place in all eight categories under which judging was carried on. These include death and injury records (no deaths, only four pedestrians injured), accident records, legislation and enforcement, engineering, organization of police department, school safety program, public information, and exhibits.

Under the school safety program signs have been placed in streets at school crossings, schoolboy patrols have been organized with the aid of Capt. L. R. Keeble of the Laurens Police Department and Corp. E. E. Bedenbaugh, State highway patrol, movies

on safety have been shown, bicycle safety clubs have been sponsored and other means have been employed for impressing the importance of safety on the children. The midget football team at the school has been coached by a policeman, Elmore Roberts.

Merchants cooperated by distribution of pamphlets and otherwise.

Pamphlets on safety have been distributed through all available means with the result that about 700,000 pamphlets and slogans have been placed in the hands of the public during the year. City water bills and electric bills of the Laurens Electric Cooperative, Inc., have been stamped with safety slogans. Chief Ivey drew special praise from the board of judges for his work in organizing the police department and carrying on the safety program. Today Chief Ivey praised the cooperation of merchants and citizens generally for the unusual record that has been established.

Mayor Bolt was elated over news that Laurens had won the honor.

PROUD OF CITY

"I am immeasurably proud of our city," he said. "I am proud of its police department and of its citizens for having won this Nation-wide recognition for the second successive year for its safety record. We even did better than our 1948 record, for in 1949 we also won the grand award in which the competition was among all cities under 100,000 population.

"The record of Chief Ivey during all of his years' service in the city of Laurens is climaxed by this signal recognition. He has shown himself well qualified in organizing and administering the complex affairs of the police department, and in gaining the cooperation of the entire citizenship in this safety campaign.

"Captain Keeble of the Laurens Police Department also deserves commendation for his having organized the material, photographs, and exhibits in making the most attractive presentation of our accomplishments. I also want to publicly thank every member of our police department and each of our Laurens residents and the visitors to our city who cooperated in helping us win this award."

George Attix, secretary of the Laurens Chamber of Commerce, commended the work of the police and citizens.

"As a safety engineer for 5 years," he said, "I can say that such a record as Laurens has made did not 'just happen.' It is the result of a lot of hard and consistent work.

"Our police department took the lead in this safety drive but our citizens and the people of our community also played an important part by responding to this leadership in that they cooperated and became safety conscious."

LAURENS WINS SAFETY AWARD

CHARLOTTE, N. C., May 8.—Laurens, S. C., has been named a grand award winner in the eleventh annual national pedestrian protection contest.

The selection was announced here today by Coleman W. Roberts, president of the Carolina Motor Club. The contest was sponsored by the American Automobile Association.

Laurens, which last year won first place for cities under 10,000 population, took top honors this year with the grand award for all cities under 100,000. San Francisco won the grand award for cities over 100,000 and Connecticut won the grand award for States.

Other Carolina cities placed in the contest. Special citations for pedestrian programs went to both States and to the cities of Greenville, S. C., and Asheville, N. C. Easley, Marion, Union, and Newberry, S. C., and Hamlet and Canton, N. C., received special citations for their accident records.

Entries in the contest were received from 1,627 cities throughout the Nation. There were 882 cities under 100,000 which entered the contest.

The 10-man committee of judges pointed to Laurens' record of no pedestrian deaths and noted the town's well-balanced pedestrian protection program.

The board of judges recognized the work of Chief W. R. Ivey, of the Laurens Police Department, one of the key figures in the city's pedestrian safety record. Lt. George E. Hurteau, Jr., of the safety section of the South Carolina State Highway Patrol, was recognized for outstanding leadership in pedestrian protection.

President Truman's Speech at Broken Bow, Nebr., on May 8, 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, on May the 8th, while making his western tour, our great President, Harry S. Truman, had occasion to be welcomed by the mayor of Broken Bow, Nebr., and in answer to the welcome of the mayor, had occasion to make the following remarks:

Thank you very much, Mr. Mayor. I have been traveling all day through Illinois, Iowa, and Nebraska, talking to people on the problems which this country faces. Somebody told me that this great city of Broken Bow had twenty-eight hundred people in it. It looks to me as if there are twenty-eight thousand here tonight. It has been a wonderful day for me to see all of you get out in this great agricultural area through which I have traveled.

I grew up on a farm in Missouri, and know first-hand what it is like. Of course, I am not up to date on the subject. You see, I lived on the farm from 1905 until 1917 when the First World War broke out, so I guess I would be a little out of date now.

I used to milk cows by hand. I used to plow with a four-horse team instead of a tractor. I used to sow wheat with a drill that had only 12 hoes on it, and I used to cut wheat on a binder that cut 8 feet wide. I would be completely out of date now, and I understand that because I have two nephews on the same farm that get much more out of that farm than I ever did. But they do it with machinery. They milk cows by machine, and they plow with a tractor and they plant with a tractor, and they bale hay with a tractor. I don't think that those boys could follow me up a corn row to save their lives, because they ride and I walked.

We have been doing a lot in recent years to make country life easier and happier—just like I have been telling you. One of the most important things has been to bring electricity to the farms. Electricity is a great liberator. On thousands of farms all over the country, electricity provides light, it pumps water, grinds feed, and milks cows—I used to milk them by hand—it provides power for your farm implement repair shops.

Your REA-financed cooperatives in this area are helping to bring more cheap electricity which will make life on the farm much easier.

Fifteen years ago, before we started the rural electrification program, only 1 out of every 10 farm families had electricity. Now 8 out of every 10 of the Nation's farms are electrified. That is real progress. I was in the Senate when the REA thing came up, and you should have heard the roar, you should have heard the quarrels that were carried on by people who said it was regimentation, that it shouldn't happen, that there was something wrong, that farmers shouldn't have cheap electricity. But you are getting it, and I am mighty happy that you did. I was on the investigating committee that looked after the holding companies who controlled nearly all of the electrical organizations in the country. People were not interested in giving the farmers electricity, so we started the REA, and now you have it.

I am glad to see that Congress has now authorized loans to expand rural telephone facilities. That is another step forward. This is meeting the same kind of opposition.

There are many other ways in which the Government is working with you to improve country life in the United States. We want to see that children have decent educational opportunities in rural areas, especially where they have long distances to go to school.

I am very much interested in the improvement of farm housing. The Housing Act that was finally passed last year—after the people replaced the Eightieth Congress with the Eighty-first—is helping to build better farm homes right now.

I regard Government expenditures for the improvement of rural life as an investment in the future of this great country. The next time you hear somebody talk about high Government expenditures remind him that when we spend money for raising the standard of living on the farm we are contributing to a greater nation, and that is the best way to preserve world peace.

Today is my birthday, and you people in Broken Bow have helped make my birthday a happy one by this fine reception—a remarkable one at this time of night—and I can't tell you how much I appreciate it.

I came out here to report to you. Two years ago I was riding around all over the country—in fact, I went 31,700 miles—and I spoke to about 7,000,000 people and I spoke to about 15,000,000 more over the radio, and they believed me. They elected me President of the United States in 1948.

And I am coming back now to talk to you and let you look at me and see if you think I have gone "high hat" on you. I am still working for your welfare and benefit, I am your servant. That is the reason I am taking this trip across the country. I want you to know what I think; what I am trying to do; that I am trying to carry out those things that are for the best interests of all the people; that will contribute to getting peace in the world that will be permanent; that is the thing I am interested in.

I fought in the First World War and I tried to fight in this one. You know, I went down to see General Marshall, when I was a United States Senator, and I was a field artillery captain in the First World War and had been studying field artillery and they had made me a colonel in the Reserve Corps up to then, and I said, "General, I would like very much to have a chance to work in this war as a field artillery colonel." This was just after we had passed the first Draft Act in 1940, and the general pulled his specs down on his nose like this and he looked at me over them and said, "Senator, how old are you?" And I said, "Well, I'm 56 years old." And he said, "You're too damned old. You'd better stay home and work in the Senate." Well, I did.

After events moved around, through no arrangement on my part, I became President of the United States and General Marshall was Chief of Staff. He was out in my office one day and my secretary, Mr. Connelly, said, "General, if the man in the other room—

which happened to be me—were to ask the same question now that he did in 1940, what would you say?" And the general said, "Well, I would tell him the same thing, only I would be a little more diplomatic about it."

I appreciate the cordial welcome which I have received in Illinois, Iowa, and Nebraska today. I think it shows that people understand what goes on in their Government, and I think the best way for you to understand that is for me to come out and report to you. That is what I am doing. I am here to find out how you feel about things. I am here to find out what ought to be done for the welfare of the country, and that is what I am trying to do. I am your public servant, hired by you in the election of 1948, and I hope that when we get through with this trip most of the people in the United States will understand that I am only working in the public interest and for your benefit and for the peace of the world. I can't tell you how much I appreciate this wonderful welcome here in Broken Bow, Nebr. Thank you very much.

Petroleum Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ELMER THOMAS

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 12 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement on petroleum imports presented at the midyear meeting of the Independent Petroleum Association of America, held at Los Angeles, Calif., on May 7 to 9, 1950.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT ON PETROLEUM IMPORTS BY THE DIRECTORS OF THE INDEPENDENT PETROLEUM ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA AT MIDYEAR MEETING IN LOS ANGELES, CALIF., MAY 7, 8, 9, 1950

The continued and increasing high rate of imports of foreign petroleum and its products into the United States presents a problem of growing seriqusness to the domestic oil producers and to our Nation. The directors of the Independent Petroleum Association of America are gravely concerned. This concern is based upon the serious injury, reaching far beyond the oil industry itself, now being inflicted upon the domestic economy and, of even greater importance, the weakening of the national security on which the American people rely.

An an element of the industry directly concerned with this problem, the independent oil producers recognize their responsibility to fully, fairly, and fearlessly make known to the American people and their representatives in Government the disastrous consequences of the continuation of the present excessive rate of imports.

Imports of oil currently are averaging in excess of 800,000 barrels daily. This reflects an increase of about 30 percent over 1949 and 60 percent over 1948. This rate of increase is alarming. It becomes of even greater importance when coupled with the rapid decline in exports of oil. As is shown in the attached sheet, containing the latest information on imports, foreign oil not only has displaced domestic oil from the foreign markets of the world but, in addition, has invaded the home market.

The resulting loss in income and purchasing power suffered by the domestic oil-producing industry is multiplied into a loss of billions of dollars that would otherwise be available for taxes, payrolls, and the goods and services of other industries throughout the Nation. This means a lower national income with additional and increasing unemployment, not only for the oil industry but for every industry and millions of citizens in every State.

The rapid trend in the displacement of the domestic oil industry must be corrected if the welfare of the American people in their peacetime pursuits and in their preparation against military conflict is to be best served.

Since World War II the domestic oil industry has demonstrated its ability to fully meet the requirements of our economy and to provide beyond such needs a reserve producing capacity to be readily available to our military in event of emergency. Today known reserves of oil are at an all-time high in the United States. Results attained during recent years show that there is no decline in the domestic industry's ability to find and develop new reserves of oil. In addition to being able to meet our daily peacetime needs, the domestic industry today has a reserve producing capacity of about 1,000,000 barrels daily. This reserve capacity can and will be increased if the domestic industry is not hampered by unsound policies such as excessive imports.

The facts concerning the import problem have been fully presented to all concerned including officials and agencies of the Federal Government.

The solution to the problem first is the responsibility of the few importing companies which enjoy the protection and benefits of the American way of life. The importing companies dominating the world oil industry outside the United States are the Standard Oil Co. (N. J.), Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Standard Oil Co. of California, Gulf Oil Corp., the Texas Co., and the Dutch-Shell group. Although promises by these companies that imports would not be permitted to injure the domestic industry and endanger the national security have been forthcoming now for many months, voluntary corrective action has not been forthcoming. Continued increases in imports to the current all-time high levels demonstrates that the importing companies cannot be relied upon in effectuating a solution of the problem.

During this meeting of the directors of this association, officials of most of the large importing companies have, at our request, advised us as to their present views on oil imports. The consensus of these views is that imports have not injured the national welfare and security. We disagree most strongly with that conclusion. We consider it further evidence of the futility of relying upon the importing companies for a solution of the import problem.

Since the importing companies have claimed their actions as having been partially inspired by the attitude and encouragement of certain officials and administrative agencies of the Federal Government, such officials and agencies must assume responsibility for action that will lead to early correction of the problem. The State Department and Tariff Commission have been urged repeatedly to recognize and take corrective action but they have adamantly refused to even recognize that a problem exists. On the contrary representatives of the State Department recently have demonstrated a subservient fidelity to the cause of the importing companies. Their position in defense of the current rate of imports has been an echo of that of the importing companies. This demonstrates the futility of longer hoping for, or depending upon, either the importing companies or the State Department for any relief.

Not only has the State Department failed to recognize the critical oil-import problem—it has actively pursued a program that means the certain destruction of American wage levels and American industrial activity throughout our entire economy. The Department has continued to promote a vast expansion in foreign oil producing and refining facilities, financed by American taxpayers' dollars, which if unrestrained will return home to invade and destroy the United States economy. In its blind efforts to close the dollar gap in world trade, the State Department has been indifferent toward the well-being of American labor and basic domestic industries, particularly oil. If all other industries had suffered injury comparable to that already inflicted upon the domestic oil producers, there would be no dollar gap as oil imports now far exceed oil exports. This inequitable burden being carried by the oil-producing industry in this country continues in disregard of its harmful effects upon our self-sufficiency as to oil.

In view of the failure to find the solution to the import problem through industry discipline or administrative action, the American people and the elements of our economy directly and indirectly affected must turn to the legislative branch of our Government for relief. The Congress has a consistent and continuous record of providing corrective measures needed in preventing undue industry aggressiveness and administrative indifference from endangering our economic welfare and national security. It again is now our only source for relief from the import problem.

There are now pending before the Congress several specific proposals for seeking relief from excessive imports. These proposals present three methods of solution: (1) establishment of a quota on imports of oil, (2) increasing the excise duty on imports of oil, and (3) providing a quantity balance between exports and imports of oil.

It is believed that any one of these three methods would provide relief from the present destructive situation. The Congress is urged to immediately give consideration to the proposals now before it and, in its wisdom, to enact into law the corrective method deemed most appropriate and effective.

UNITED STATES OIL IMPORTS IN 1950

Increasing imports of foreign crude petroleum and refined products are taking over the oil markets of this country, displacing and weakening the domestic oil industry, and thereby jeopardizing the Nation's safety and economic welfare. The following facts, based on Government statistics, support this conclusion. They show the problem is more serious today than at any time in the past.

1. Because of a world surplus of oil, imports into the United States have more than doubled since 1946, while exports have declined by about 35 percent. During the first quarter of 1950, the Nation was a net importer of oil to the extent of 555,000 barrels daily in contrast to net exports of 42,000 barrels per day in 1946. This is a trend toward greater and greater dependency on foreign sources of oil.

2. Increased imports are taking a larger and larger share of the United States oil market. Imports are now supplying 13.1 percent as compared with 6.9 percent in 1946.

3. In the face of increased imports, domestic production has been displaced and curtailed. United States production is 8 percent below the 1948 average and more than

1,000,000 barrels daily below efficient capacity. The loss in income to the United States oil producers as compared with 1948 amounts to approximately $1,400,000 per day, or more than $500,000,000 per year. The experience of the industry proves conclusively that loss in income means less exploration and development activity, less new oil discovered, and less productive capacity to meet the Nation's future oil needs.

The strength of basic industries in the United States is the best assurance of national security and world peace. Imports are seriously injuring the domestic oil industry, one of the most essential of our basic industries. The public interest demands a sound national policy as to petroleum imports.

United States petroleum imports versus exports

[Barrels daily]

	Imports of crude and products	Exports of crude and products	Net exports or (net imports)
Year 1946	377,000	419,000	42,000
Year 1947	436,000	450,000	14,000
Year 1948	514,000	368,000	(146,000)
Year 1949	641,000	327,000	(314,000)
First quarter, 1950	820,000	265,000	(555,000)

Total United States petroleum supply

	Domestic production of crude and natural gasoline		Imports of crude and products	
	Barrels daily	Percent of total supply	Barrels daily	Percent of total supply
Year 1946	5,073,000	93.1	377,000	6.9
Year 1947	5,452,000	92.6	436,000	7.4
Year 1948	5,922,000	92.0	514,000	8.0
Year 1949	5,470,000	89.5	641,000	10.5
1st quarter, 1950	5,450,000	86.9	820,000	13.1

Speeches by the President at Wendover and Rawlings, Wyo.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 12 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the speech delivered by the President of the United States at Wendover, Wyo., on May 9, 1950, and the speech delivered by him at Rawlings, Wyo., later on the same day.

There being no objection, the speeches were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT WENDOVER, WYO., MAY 9, 1950

I am going to tell you a story about Wyoming. I had a most wonderful meeting in Casper this morning. Your Governor was there as host for the State of Wyoming. My good friend JOE O'MAHONEY introduced me. JOE is one of the real Senators, who knows what it's all about. It was a pleasure for me to have him introduce me. I served in the Senate for a long time with JOE, and I know him. He's all right.

It is always good to come back out West, especially at this time of year. One reason I like Wyoming is the fact that you have a long tradition of really forward-looking, progressive legislation. Wyoming, as you certainly know, was the first State to give women the right to vote. And you had a woman Governor, who now runs the Mint of the United States; and every time I see her—and she is on this train—I ask her if she brought me a bag full of money. She never has.

Can you imagine what some of the stuffy reactionary easterners had to say about the fact that you had woman suffrage out here? Listen—listen to this—you will like this, you will want to remember it. The editor of a prominent magazine published in New York said about Wyoming, when you gave women the right to vote—now this is a quote: "This unblushing female socialism defies alike the apostles and prophets." The editor said, "Nothing could be more antibiblical than letting women vote."

So you see that the cry of socialism is as old as the hills. They used it against woman suffrage, against the Federal Reserve Act, against social security, and they are trying to use it again today, but I know you are not going to let them fool you any more than they fooled you when the State of Wyoming brought about woman suffrage as a pioneer in the United States.

Now every woman in every State can vote, and the country is much better off for that reason.

But the old fogies didn't think so, and there are still old fogies whenever you start anything new, I don't care what it is. You will find some people who think we had better stay with things as they are.

Just a few days ago I have been having press conferences in my office, and it is an oval room; it is kind of circular, and it is stuffy and you can't hear; and when you get in two or three hundred men in there, the fellows in the back row can't see me and they can't hear what is going on.

So I decided to set up a place to hold press conferences where all the boys could sit down and make their notes, and they could see me and they could hear what I had to say, and I could find out who was asking the question.

And, you know, some of them were just exactly like the old fogies who were opposed to woman suffrage; they didn't want to do it; they said it wasn't any good.

Well, we tried it twice, and I don't think they will want to change back. So progress has to be made by people who can see forward, who can look forward and see what the results can be if some slight change is made in the status quo. That is what the people who are looking forward to the welfare of the United States stand for. And I am out here, going across the United States—and I will go almost all the way across from Washington to Grand Coulee Dam and back again—trying to tell the people that I believe in change when it is for the welfare of all the people.

I am going to keep right on working for better houses, better schools, a better educational program, a better labor and social-security laws, and I don't intend to be scared away by anybody who calls that program socialism.

I always look back and think that what I am trying to do is no more socialistic than was woman suffrage in Wyoming when you passed it.

Thank you very much.

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT RAWLINS, WYO., MAY 9, 1950

Thank you very much. I have always enjoyed my visits to this section of the country. I have had a wonderful day today. I started in Casper, Wendover, Cheyenne, and Laramie. The Governor of Wyoming and Senator O'MAHONEY met me in Casper, and I was highly pleased and gratified that those two gentlemen were there. I have had a great day. I like your scenery. I appreciate your hospitality more than I do your scenery. I was in Rawlins 2 years ago, late on Sunday evening, and I am glad to be back again. At that time I could not make you a speech because it was Sunday.

I am sorry I will not be able to visit your great project to the northeast, the Kortes Dam, which we dedicated this morning in Casper. The people of Carbon County have reason to be proud of this dam. Kortes and Seminoe Dam will soon be furnishing power to this whole section, enough power for real industrial expansion.

Of course, these dams won't benefit just industry, they will help everybody—those of you in cities and those of you who live on ranches.

For a long time this State has been great livestock country. It produces an important part of the Nation's supply of meat, wool, and leather. And I have an idea that your livestock industry is going to be even more important in the future than it has been in the past. We had steaks tonight for dinner, and the Senator assured me that they were Wyoming steaks. I think they came from Kansas City.

Compared with the people of other countries, we Americans have good diets. But there is still room for improvement. The main thing we need for that purpose is more livestock products.

I am confident that the farmers and ranchers of Wyoming want to produce the abundance of livestock that we need. That is evident not only from the emphasis on sheep and cattle that has been traditional out here but also from your progress in water and range conservation.

Now I started yesterday at Lincoln, Nebr., on what I think is an economic program for this section of the country, from the Appalachian Mountains to the Pacific coast; and if you will pay close attention to the speeches which I delivered across the great State of Iowa and in Lincoln, Nebr., and this morning in Casper and Cheyenne, and at Laramie tonight, you will find just exactly what I think is necessary to continue this country as the greatest republic in the history of the world.

You people in this area naturally have a particular interest in sheep and wool. In wool production, Wyoming ranks at or very near the top among the 48 States. I know that when the war came along you had a terrific wool problem. You were helped out of that situation by the Government purchase program for wool. If you will think back, you will remember that in those days wool growers had virtually nobody except the Government to sell to.

The Government-owned stocks of wool are now down to about 20,000,000 pounds. Three years ago they totaled more than 500,000,000 pounds. Now I want to point out that these stocks were disposed of in trade channels and in such a way as to protect domestic wool prices.

Last year, the Congress passed new legislation that strengthened the wool program. Under this program, we have set the support level for wool at the maximum, 90 percent of parity. We are going to keep on making whatever efforts are necessary to give the wool growers of this country a really workable program.

This is part of our objective to build a strong and prosperous United States of America, so that we can preserve our own freedom and help to strengthen the cause of freedom all over the world.

It has been a real pleasure to visit with you here in Rawlins, and I hope to come back before very long on a political trip. This is a nonpolitical trip.

Hawaii's Claim to Statehood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 12 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of the statement which I made before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with reference to Hawaii's claim to statehood.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, Hawaii's claim to statehood is so overwhelming that it cannot in justice be longer delayed.

One hundred and two years ago the State I have the honor to represent came under the American flag. Two years later California was admitted into the Union without going through the apprenticeship of Territorial government. For a century we have been the closest neighbor to Hawaii and have some claim to knowing her best. It is with great pleasure that I appear today to plead her cause without any reservation whatsoever.

Hawaii has been an organized Territory for a longer period than any of the organized Territories ultimately admitted to statehood, with the single exception of New Mexico. With the lone exception of Oklahoma, it has more population than any of the others had at the time of their admission into the Union. Today it has more population than six of our States and is within close proximity to the totals residing in four more. In fiscal year 1947, Hawaii contributed in Federal taxes more than 12 of our States.

By official vote of her people she has requested admission into the Union. Certainly no individual poll of a few hundred people, a part of whom remain anonymous, can outweigh the recorded vote of the people.

I am firmly convinced that Communist activity is a no greater problem than it is in many other areas of our country. Because Hawaii happens to have some of these termites is no valid argument for delaying her admission as a State. To the contrary statehood will better fortify her people in dealing with a problem which is not just Nationwide but is world-wide in character.

The record of loyalty in peace and war by the people of the Territory of Hawaii cannot be challenged.

Both the Democratic and Republican platforms have pledged their support to statehood on several occasions.

For the reasons I have outlined and which will be covered more fully by other witnesses I believe that Hawaii should become a State now, without further delay.

However, there is another reason which should not be overlooked by the Congress or the American people.

The free way of life is under pressure from the Elbe to the China Sea. Six hundred million people are behind the Communist iron curtain as we meet here on this first day of May 1950. In the Far East several hundred million more hang in the balance. International communism is on the march and this may be the year of decision that will determine whether or not it will move on to new destruction or will recede in the face of the determination to maintain their way of life by a free world of freemen.

The people of Hawaii have much to offer in helping to interpret the spirit of America to the Far East, containing more than half of the world's population. They can do equally as much in helping the United States to understand the complex problems of that vast area of the world. Never before was it more important to the peace of the world and the very security of this Nation that such mutual understanding be achieved.

We dare not remain static while communism becomes the dynamic force in the world. To the contrary from the Arctic to the mid-Pacific we should resolutely and effectively proclaim to the world that these American citizens in our two organized Territories are no longer to be stateless persons.

Now is the time for us to clearly point out that the people in both these great Pacific territories, which are vital to the defense of the Pacific flank of the continental United States, are not just wards in a distant orphanage but are integral parts of the American family of States. We will no more tolerate an incursion against either Hawaii or Alaska than we would against any part of our Union.

Nineteen hundred and fifty is a year of decision for us, also let us not fiddle and faddle on the issue of statehood. If we fumble the ball now and let the play be taken away from us by those who detest the free way of life future generations may wonder what happened to the youth and vigor that made America great.

This year may well become one of the great turning points of history. We must not be complacent and self-satisfied for therein will be found the seeds of decay.

In life there is no such thing as a status quo. Individuals and governments either grow or they go into a decline and others rise to take their places. As a nation our country is still young. New horizons are still ahead of us.

In your hands rests a fateful decision. You can do much to serve notice on the world that America still retains the spirit and vigor of the pioneer. By your action you can help demonstrate that we have the vision and the faith to know that our new forty-ninth and fiftieth States are but at the threshold of a great development whose horizons are limited only by what a free and enterprising people can achieve when admitted to a full partnership under the Constitution of the United States.

Second Anniversary of Establishment of Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRVING M. IVES
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 12 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the Appendix of the RECORD the address delivered by Hon. Thomas E. Dewey, Governor of New York, at the mass demonstration and pageant sponsored by the Zionist Organization of America in celebration of the second anniversary of the establishment of the State of Israel, held at Madison Square Garden, New York City, Thursday, May 11, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am very happy to be here tonight to express the affectionate greetings of the people of the Empire State to the people of the State of Israel. In the short space of 2 years, a fledgling republic has grown to be a lusty child. As one who has spent quite a few years in the intricate business of modern government, I take my hat off to the men and women who have built so well in Israel.

We all know the difficulties and problems that beset the infant nation at its birth. Conceived in a great moral decision of the United Nations, it was born in the midst of strife. As it opened its eyes, it was met with the aggressive attack of seven Arab States.

The story of the military miracle performed by this handful of valiant men and women of Israel is one that will long live in history. It represents one of those high points in history when naked courage and will to live succeeded against the most tremendous odds. The world is truly proud of that kind of heroic achievement.

But the purpose of the people of Israel was not to gain laurels, by force of arms. It was rather to dedicate their future to the ways of peace. In the constructive achievements of the past 2 years, its people and all who helped them from abroad can take pride in the accomplishments to date. The government has been organized, its civil functions are being magnificently performed, and it has taken its place in the family of nations. It has begun to develop infant industries.

During all this period of struggle, the new State opened its frontiers to migrants from the four corners of the globe. It has taken this immigration in its stride. That immigration is not all self-supporting. It must include the aged and the children. It must include the weak and the sick and the hungry to whom Israel was their only goal. All this burden would be grave enough for an established nation. For this young republic, it represents a problem of the first magnitude. Your help—our help—can contribute the means for supporting these welcome newcomers. This may not be the time or the place, but I do bespeak your urgent help to the great cause of the United Jewish Appeal.

There is another matter of major importance at this juncture of events. That is the problem of arms—arms to protect the people and the homes of Israel. I speak of this question from the point of view of American security. Any trouble in any of the troubled spots of the world is a menace to American security. Any aggressive action that threatens the peace of an area threatens the peace of the world.

Israel stands in the center of the Near East. It is on the shores of the Mediterranean linking the west and the east. Any warlike action in that part of the world would only be an invitation to that kind of unrest and trouble that certain countries of the world want.

We in America want peace and stability. Some of the Arab nations in the past year have acquired modern arms, planes, and tanks. They have weapons which can serve not only for defense but for aggressive offense as well. Arms in the hands of any nation should only be used for defense of the peace. It makes no sense to leave the Israelis in a position of relative weakness. A weak Israel, like a weak Europe, or a weak America, is only an invitation to aggression. It is perfectly clear that Israel must be armed so that it can defend its frontiers against aggression. It is clear that making Israel strong is the surest guaranty to peace in the Near East.

With adequate defense, with the security of its frontiers protected, the people of Israel will move forward to a new and better day. They will stand with the free nations of the world, eager to resist the onslaught of totalitarianism. In their striving for better things and for a better life, we in America can render great and sympathetic aid. We can give them encouragement as friends and neighbors in the world community.

We can give them skills. We can help them with capital.

In joining this great celebration, all of us here tonight are doing more than extending our good wishes to the people of Israel. We are telling them we believe in what they are doing. We are telling them we will help them and stick with them in our mutual struggle for a free and peaceful world.

Unreasonable Restraints by Labor Monopolies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 12 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the editorial from this week's issue of Collier's endorsing my bill, S. 2912, to prevent unreasonable restraint of production or control of prices by labor monopolies. This bill was introduced on January 23, 1950. If the Senate, the House, and the White House had acted promptly on it, I believe it is safe to assume that the present crippling railroad strike would not have occurred.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT'S TO KEEP JOHN L. FROM DOING IT AGAIN?

According to journalistic tradition, this is not the time for an editorial on John L. Lewis. Such editorials are customarily written when Mr. Lewis has ordered his United Mine Workers to stay home, when hundreds of thousands on nonminers are thrown out of work by his decision, when the public and the Government are in a lather of indignation at Mr. Lewis' defiance of law, order, courts, Congress, and all rules of social responsibility.

It is also customary to forget Mr. Lewis between crises, like the one from which the country recently emerged. In that one Mr. Lewis indulged in almost a full year of uncertainty, contention, and confusion. Now the miners are again at work. But the problem remains.

The problem is well illustrated by an incident of last November. Mr. Lewis had just begun some fruitless talks with the head Government conciliator, Cyrus Ching. Reporters were pressing for a statement from the mine leader, who was playing hide-and-seek with them in taxicabs, elevators, and hotel lobbies. When he finally was cornered he told the press that they were "making a hippodrome of my private business." Thus Mr. Lewis disclosed his own estimate of his power and position. To him, the Government's effort to restore stability to a vital basic industry was a strictly personal matter in which the public had no right to intrude.

Perhaps it is impossible to bring normal vision to a man so blinded by egoism. But at least something must and can be done to curb his power before another crisis develops.

Mr. Lewis has not only denied miners and others the right to work. He has not only forced the country periodically to dance to his tune. He has seriously compounded the coal industry's trouble in adjusting itself to current realities. Coal no longer monopolizes the fuel market. The competition of oil and gas may have been inevitable. But the uncertainty of supply and price that Mr. Lewis has created gives coal's competitors an added advantage, and endangers the livelihood of thousands of his own union members.

Two things are needed to correct this situation. The first is legislation—legislation which will make John L. Lewis' actions subject to law without penalizing the miners.

We do not think that fair-minded Americans begrudge coal miners the substantial pay that they have gained under Mr. Lewis' leadership, for a dirty, dangerous job. We think that they can understand the miners' loyalty to him, even though they may feel, as we do, that the union paid a heavy price for its rewards when it surrendered its rights of self-regulation to a dictatorship over its members' economic life.

But we also think that the miners need protection no less than the mine operators and the public. Their right to work must be safeguarded when they choose to obey their country's courts rather than the orders of their economic lord and master. Such protection demands the immediate concern of the Government.

President Truman made a gesture of Government concern when, at the end of the latest coal strike, he asked Congress to set up a commission to study the basic problems of coal. We think the country needs another coal study about as much as it needs another coal strike

An exhaustive survey of the industry's problems was made nearly 30 years ago. During the 3 years that the coal industry was administered under the Guffey Act, the Interior Department collected thousands of pages of statistics. Last summer a congressional committee devoted 6 weeks of study to coal and coal strikes. What is needed now is action, not study. And action has been proposed in a bill introduced by Senator ROBERTSON of Virginia.

The Senator would simply make the United Mine Workers and all unions subject to the Sherman and Clayton Antitrust Acts. His bill would, in effect, reverse a Supreme Court decision of 1941 which freed labor unions from virtually all legal penalties so long as the unions acted in their own interests and not in conjunction with nonlabor groups.

Senator ROBERTSON'S bill is fair and reasonable. It does not consider human labor "an article or commodity of commerce." It does not restrain other union activities. It does not ban industry-wide bargaining. It does not permit employers to seek injunctions, but reserves that right to the Department of Justice.

Collier's thinks that the Robertson bill should be enacted. But even if that is done, there must be a will to enforce it. That will was notably absent in the recent coal strike.

Mr. Truman's repugnance to the Taft-Hartley law is well known. His late and reluctant use of it did nothing to ease the crisis or speed its solution. He delayed offending the Taft-Hartley opponents by invoking the law when it should have been invoked. He gambled that he could continue his political opposition to it without bringing on total economic paralysis. He gambled that the public would forget, before the November elections, the kicking around that it took. He knows that a powerful union official nurses hurt feelings longer than the average voter does.

But we don't think it will be easy for any politician to gamble with the Robertson bill without risking the embarrassing accusation that he is encouraging labor dictatorship for the sake of winning votes. Mr. Lewis and his peers in labor may dislike this bill, too. But at least they cannot shout "slavery" and "fascism" at a law which prohibits both business and labor from committing the same sin. And the common penalty for offenders—treble damages to the injured party—might make Mr. Lewis think twice before applying his thumb to his nose.

The Railroad Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FORREST C. DONNELL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 12 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two articles published in the New York Times of today, one beginning on page 1 and extending to page 21 entitled "Rail Strike Jobless Increase—Two Trains Shot At, Fireman Hit," and the other article appearing on page 20, and being entitled "Many Cities Feel First Effects of Railroad Tie-Up," in which article is set forth a series of telegraphic messages from various cities in the United States, may be incorporated in the Appendix of the RECORD of today.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RAIL STRIKE JOBLESS INCREASE—TWO TRAINS SHOT AT, FIREMAN HIT—KNOXVILLE PICKETS REPORT THEY WERE STONED—NO PROGRESS REPORTED IN RESOLVING DISPUTES WITH FOUR ROADS

CHICAGO, May 11.—The second day of the railroad strike brought gradually increasing unemployment, two instances of shooting at trains operated in defiance of the strike, and no progress in resolving the strike deadlock.

In the shooting, an employee of the strikbound Southern Railway received a flesh wound in the arm while acting as a fireman on a freight train approaching Knoxville, Tenn. Also, picketing firemen reported they were stoned near Knoxville.

A large increase in unemployment loomed over the week end, as the four struck railroads notified between 150,000 and 200,000 of their nonstriking employees of impending furloughs.

In Chicago, Francis A. O'Neill, Jr., chairman of the National Railway Mediation Board, denied reports that the dispute would be taken to Washington. He said no conferences were scheduled, however, with either the railroads or the striking Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen.

In Washington, John R. Steelman, assistant to President Truman, denied reports that any White House meetings were scheduled with either party.

The deadlocked issue is the demand of the union that a second fireman be assigned to multiple-unit Diesel locomotives. Two Presidential fact-finding boards have found this demand not justified, one in 1943 and one last fall.

The walkout began yesterday at 6 a. m., when 18,000 firemen struck against the Pennsylvania Railroad west and north of Harrisburg, the New York Central west of Buffalo, and the entire systems of the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe and the Southern Railway.

Today's shooting incidents took place at and near Knoxville, Tenn., where two freight trains of the Southern Railway were fired on. D. W. Brosnan, general manager of the railroad's central lines, at Knoxville, said one shot was fired at each train.

The brotherhood here denied responsibility for the shootings and for unspecified acts of sabotage which Mr. Brosnan reported.

FURLOUGHS DUE TODAY

Economic consequences arising in the second day of the strike were dominated by imminent lay-offs on the affected railroads.

The Pennsylvania will furlough at 8 a. m. tomorrow 85,000 of its 120,000 employees, including 3,700 striking firemen.

The New York Central has announced the furloughing of 25,000 of its 103,000 operating personnel, plus 20,000 clerical workers, adding that further lay-offs are probable by this week end.

The Southern Railway is expected to furlough most of its 38,000 employees.

The Santa Fe is notifying an unspecified number of its employees of furloughs.

Picket lines set up by the firemen varied from point to point, according to the brotherhood. In some instances they confronted members of other operating brotherhoods reporting for work, such as engineers, conductors, trainmen, and switchmen. In others the lines did not affect other employees than firemen.

The other railroad brotherhoods, notably the Locomotive Engineers, who have sought to place a second engineer on the big Diesels, are taking no part in the strike except as it involves crossing firemen's picket lines. This is because the brotherhoods are independent of each other, and are not bound by each other's actions, although they may agree to act in concert on common problems. The engineers' demand for a second engineer on Diesels has been turned down by a fact-finding board.

STRIKE CALLED EFFECTIVE

A spokesman for the firemen's union reported the strike continued completely effective this afternoon.

The New York Central and the Sante Fe, however, reported that they had dispatched passenger and mail trains from Chicago, presumably using qualified supervisory employees as firemen. The New York Central said it had sent out three passenger trains today, to New York, Boston, and Detroit; two freight trains to Buffalo, and two mail trains. The Santa Fe dispatched passenger trains to Los Angeles, Kansas City, and Galveston, and an unspecified number of freight trains.

Ernest E. Norris, president of the Southern Railway, announced that "the situation in our yards is improving and we are accepting an increasing volume of traffic." This is being moved as crews are available, he said, adding that "many of our firemen did not go out."

The Pennsylvania has stopped operations altogether in the strike zone.

MANY CITIES FEEL FIRST EFFECTS OF RAILROAD TIE-UP

BUFFALO, N. Y., May 11.—Several plant shut-downs and a growing backlog of freight shipments today gave evidence of the spreading effects of the rail strike on this major industrial area.

Although only 2 of the 11 trunk lines serving this rail center are directly affected by the firemen's strike, they are the ones normally carrying the bulk of the shipments. They are the New York Central and the Pennsylvania.

The Pennsylvania made no attempt to operate here, while the New York Central drafted emergency crews to maintain partial service.

Some freight shipments normally handled by these two lines are being diverted to other carriers, both rail and truck. Extra airliners and busses are helping to carry the passenger overflow.

The first serious industrial effects of the strike were felt in the milling industry today. A flour mill and a feed mill were closed and another flour mill will shut down tomorrow, making idle nearly 500 mill workers altogether.

Miles R. Dwyer, New York Central superintendent here, said supervisory personnel were being used to operate trains. He estimated freight traffic west of here was off 70 percent. New York Central lines east of Buffalo are unaffected by the strike.

TWO TRAINS UNDER FIRE

KNOXVILLE, May 11.—Two Southern Railway trains were fired on here today and a fireman was wounded in the arm shortly after union pickets complained that they had been stoned at the Southern's John Sevier yards. A. F. Coleman suffered only a slight flesh wound. A crewman on a second train escaped injury when another bullet was deflected by a timetable he was carrying in his pocket. Both bullets were reported to have been fired from a .22-caliber rifle.

Strikers reported that workers within the yards stoned pickets at 4:20 a. m. Passenger service was at a standstill and doors of the passenger station have been nailed up since the strike began.

The strike caught 54,000 newly hatched baby chicks packaged and ready for shipment on railway property.

The hatchery is in the midst of its hatching season and an estimated 500,000 chicks will make their appearance each week.

Several thousand Tennessee and Georgia schoolboys, members of the junior safety patrols, learned that their trips to Washington had been canceled because of the railroad strike.

HARRISBURG TRAFFIC DROPS

HARRISBURG, PA., May 11.—This railway crossroads city has suddenly become the end of the line. The normal flow of 180 trains a day has dropped to 20.

Harrisburg is the Pennsylvania's first division point west of Philadelphia and the junction of the Baltimore-Buffalo north-south feeder line with the main east-west trunk route.

To the east, the main lines are electrified and the Diesel engines on which firemen contend a third crewman is necessary are not an important part of the service. But eastbound traffic has been sharply curtailed.

The stoppage of rail freight has begun to affect other industries here. Steel plants have warned of impending lay-offs of thousands of workers if the strike is prolonged.

FOURTEEN MINES CLOSED

PITTSBURGH, May 11.—This industrial region is beginning to feel the effects of a rail strike that has cut off the service of the Pennsylvania Railroad west of Harrisburg.

In western Pennsylvania 14 coal mines, employing about 5,000 miners, have shut down, resulting in a loss of daily production of 24,000 tons.

The strike has had a noticeable but not a serious effect on travel, food shipments, and mail deliveries in this area.

The furloughing of clerks, shopmen, and trainmen in the Pennsylvania system will start today, releasing 85,000 of the company's 125,000 employees.

There is sufficient produce and meat on hand in Pittsburgh to last over Sunday. Parcel post deliveries have been delayed 12 to 24 hours.

City hotels are crowded to capacity because of businessmen and travelers stranded by the strike. Airlines have increased flights.

AUTO WORKERS LAID OFF

DETROIT, May 11.—The first mass layoff in Michigan resulting from the railroad strike was reported today when the General Motors body plant at Grand Rapids furloughed 500 men.

General Motors uses Pennsylvania Railroad lines at Grand Rapids to move its finished product. Another body plant there, operated by Nash-Kelvinator, said it would be able to store its product for the time being.

The threat to Detroit area industry was serious but less so than first reported. Chrysler Corp., reopening just this week after its 100-day strike, countered earlier reports of an impending shutdown by continuing to hire new employees.

Ford, Hudson, Packard, and nearly all other large industries in the area say they will produce as long as possible, but they will be affected in a matter of days. Kaiser-Frazer, at Willow Run, an exception, uses motor cargo carriers almost exclusively and will not be affected nearly so soon.

No shortages have been reported in foods and other human essentials.

ST. LOUIS EFFECTS DELAYED

ST. LOUIS, May 11.—First industrial lay-offs came to this area today as a result of the rail strike. Generally, however, officials believed it would be a week or more before widespread effects are noticeable, although New York Central, Pennsylvania and Southern Railway lines serve the area.

Ford Motor Co.'s Lincoln-Mercury assembly plant at Robertsville announced a cut workweek for 1,500 workers from 6 days to 5. Lay-offs were small and scattered.

RAIL SHOPS CLOSED

SANTA FE, May 11.—The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway, closing its divisional shops at Albuquerque, today threw between 800 and 1,200 men out of work in addition to the strikers.

As New Mexico has no heavy industries, Vincent Jaeger, executive secretary of the economic development commission, said the chief immediate effect of the strike will be to curtail shipments of potash, copper, and other minerals.

SEVEN THOUSAND IDLE IN COLUMBUS

COLUMBUS, Ohio, May 11.—Approximately 5,500 Pennsylvania Railroad employees here received lay-off notices today, bringing to 7,000 the number of railroaders made idle in this area by the strike.

Pennsylvania and New York Central divisions have shut down operations completely.

Passenger-train service here has been cut from a normal 60 trains daily to 8. These are operated by the Baltimore & Ohio and Norfolk and Western. Passengers for the four Norfolk and Western trains are transported by taxi to the eastern part of the city because firemen refuse to work on tracks to Union Station, leased from the Pennsylvania. Four passenger trains operated by the Chesapeake and Ohio were stopped for this reason.

Railway Mail Service has hired extra trucks to carry mail to small central Ohio towns. Bus companies have extra busses on many schedules and Trans-World Airlines and American Airlines have added extra flights.

The Pennsylvania has about 6,500 idle cars, 3½ times the usual number, in local yards, many loaded with perishable foods. New York Central divisions reported about 600 idle cars.

PENNSYLVANIA OFFICES CLOSED

PHILADELPHIA, May 11.—A Pennsylvania Railroad spokesman reported today that the road is making no effort to operate any trains in the strike area west and north of Harrisburg, and virtually all departments and offices throughout the area are being closed.

CINCINNATI LOSES TRAINS

CINCINNATI, May 11.—The railroad strike has caused the Southern Railway to remove all eight passenger trains that normally pass daily through Cincinnati and approximately 50 percent of the 100 freight trains, the road said today.

On the three roads affected here, a total of approximately 1,300 men were on furlough today.

ATLANTA SITUATION BETTER

ATLANTA, May 11.—The Atlanta passenger and freight situation on the Southern Railway was described late today as much better than it was yesterday.

Although the Southern has laid off 1,000 workers in this area, H. W. Bondurant, a

vice president, said the railway would restore its New York-New Orleans Crescent to service through Atlanta on Friday.

White-collar supervisors from Augusta, Macon, and other Georgia cities have been brought into Atlanta to shuttle freight in the big Inman yards here.

So far, a survey showed here, the strike has not yet had any crippling effect upon industries in the area.

CLEVELAND, May 11.—The New York Central Railroad tonight ordered an almost complete shutdown of its Cleveland facilities. About 4,500 of the road's 5,000 employees in this area were affected.

Earlier today the Pennsylvania furloughed approximately 950 employees.

Acting Postmaster Joseph Prosser said he had decided to delay for at least 24 hours a threatened embargo on parcel post shipments.

The Railway Express agency here is accepting no shipments for cities served exclusively by the struck railroads.

Two Cleveland concerns that yesterday laid off 5,000 employees recalled several hundred today after arrangements were made to move some finished products by truck. The concerns are the Fisher Body Division of General Motors, which laid off 3,500, and the Midland Steel Products Co., which furloughed 1,500.

Other Cleveland concerns are delaying layoffs in the hope of a settlement before the end of this week. In the event that the strike runs into next week, additional industrial layoffs of about 12,500 are expected.

The New York Central operated two mail trains and the Pacemaker to New York tonight. The Pennsylvania is not attempting to operate any trains.

Importation of Czech-Made Shoes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 12 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Czech Shoe Probe," published in the Boston Traveler of May 8, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CZECH SHOE PROBE

No more Czech-made shoes will be dumped in the United States. This is the gratifying result of the campaign of the New England Shoe and Leather Association. It takes the form of instructions to the United States appraisers of merchandise at the various ports to withhold appraisement of shoes from Czechoslovakia according to the terms of the Anti-Dumping Act of 1921.

The New England association has evidence at hand that shoes costing the equivalent of $7.50 in Czechoslovakia are being retailed at $2 in this country. Obviously that sort of business is not covered either by the laws of economics or the national objective of promoting foreign trade. Czechoslovakia is now a Russian satellite. It would be hard to find anything better calculated to help the Red cause than to cause unemployment and unrest in the United States by flooding us with the products of iron-curtain slave labor. It is one of the cold-war strategies against which we must be ever on guard.

National Citizenship Week—Understanding Checks and Balances

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 12 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have before me a very interesting editorial, published in the Washington Times-Herald in its edition of Thursday, May 11, pertaining to the Fifth National Citizenship Conference to be held here from May 22 to May 24. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of this editorial, as well as the text of a statement which I have prepared on the subject of having Americans inform themselves about their Government, their economic system, and way of life, through books and other helpful literature.

There being no objection, the editorial and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of May 11, 1950]

GOOD CITIZEN QUIZ

The citizenship committee of the National Education Association has put out a 14-question test by which you can help yourself decide whether you are a good citizen.

The questions will be discussed at the fifth national citizenship conference to be held here May 22 to 24. Some of the questions deal with things Washington residents hear about but have no opportunity to indulge in.

WHAT PART DO YOU TAKE?

They have to do with voting and registering and getting others out to vote and naming your Senators and Representatives. On the other hand, there are several questions in the quiz which are worth while for every Washingtonian to check himself on, such as:

"Can you give one good argument for or against any major bill before Congress, such as the farm bill, admission of DP's, or extension of social security?

"Can you list at least three of the rights guaranteed by the Bill of Rights in the Constitution?

"Are you an active member of any civic organization, such as citizens association, parent-teacher association, chamber of commerce, professional organization, labor union, service club, or League of Women Voters?

"Did you work on any local drives for welfare funds, civic improvement or the like?"

What are your answers to these questions?

SUPPLEMENTARY STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY ON UNDERSTANDING AMERICA

"What is the American way of which we hear so much?" "What is the free-enterprise system?" "What is this thing called the welfare state?" "What is Government paternalism?" "What are capitalism, socialism, communism?"

Mr. President, these are elementary questions, but it seems to me that every one of us can benefit by really knowing the answers to those questions. All of us take so many things for granted. We assume we know so much that I am afraid that we often lose sight of the real meaning behind the terms we use so glibly.

I have brought out that fact particularly whenever it has been my pleasure to address naturalization ceremonies before individuals actually take the oath of citizenship. In my statements at these inspiring ceremonies I have tried to point out that it is up to every citizen-to-be to truly understand his adopted land and its Government.

Mr. President, it is equally incumbent and far more so for those of us—including myself—who were blessed by being born in this wonderful land to understand our way of life, to be familiar with the true definitions of the terms I have mentioned, to appreciate the dynamic system of checks and balances in our Constitution, in our economic, political, and social life.

The national citizenship conferences are an excellent way by which every citizen can learn and relearn the truths of America.

"Give light, and the people will find their own way." This has always been the American ideal. All of us who believe in America and in its concepts of freedom are more firmly convinced than ever before that so long as the American people are presented with the facts they will be more than competent to make wise decisions on the basis of those facts.

CIVIC LEADERS HAVE RESPONSIBILITY TO INFORM

There is no more important challenge, therefore, to the civic leaders of America than to try to convey those facts to the American people, to try to convey true definitions of terms used so frequently today. It is particularly necessary that our people become acquainted with the little-understood economic facts of our American way of life—how we produce goods, how we distribute them, how we have attained the highest standard of living in the world. And moreover, it is particularly important that when the American people read this story that it be in a simple, clear form rather than in "jawbreaking" 15-syllable words which might be better entombed in a museum than submitted to the average American.

For that reason, I am particularly glad to have recently read the book, How To Stay Rich—The Story of Democratic American Capitalism, by Dr. Ernest L. Klein, of Chicago. This book (published by Farrar, Straus & Co., of New York) really tells how we can stay wealthy as a people, how we can continue to enjoy more conveniences, more comforts, more luxuries which are ever more widely distributed among the great masses of our people than anywhere else on earth, now or at any time in the 2,000 years of the present era.

Yes, I am particularly delighted that the message of this book is presented so simply, so clearly that the people can really find their way.

I hope that every businessman in the United States will read this book—every chamber of commerce, every trade organization, every civic group and service club, every librarian, every educator. I state this because I think that they will individually and collectively benefit from the book. And, too, I say it without detracting in any way from other helpful pieces of literature.

I have always felt it to be my job as a legislator to try to help shed light on important public affairs. I feel it is a legislator's responsibility, in turn, to utilize for this purpose every sound instrument, whether it be books, magazine articles, or newspaper editorials dedicated and devoted to the

I do not say that I agree with every single point made in the book, nor for that matter, that its readers will. Far from it, for, on the contrary, Dr. Klein would be the very first to state that healthy differences of opinion are constructive and all he is interested in is that there should be agreeemnt on the fundamentals of the free-enterprise system.

WE MUST BE ACTIVELY FOR OUR SYSTEM

Commenting upon the challenge which our way of life faces, Dr. Klein states:

"Silence will not help.

"Neither will destructive criticism of other systems serve to save our own.

"Being against communism or against anything else is not sufficient.

"We must be for something; we must be for democratic American capitalism.

"To be enthusiastically for democratic capitalism, we must improve our general understanding of it."

The topics covered in this book are as alive as tomorrow morning's newspaper headlines. The very issue now being debated on the Senate floor—compulsory FEPC legislation—is discussed in the book on page 159. The issue of socialized medicine is discussed immediately thereafter. In commenting upon these problems, Dr. Klein points out that one of the first steps toward totalitarianism is the assumption of governmental omniscience, the assumption that the Government knows everything and can do everything—that it can extract the citizens' money on the assumption that the citizen is too ignorant to dispose of his own assets.

Among other points mentioned in the book is the fallacy of a tax policy based upon destroying the very men who have helped create wealth and jobs, the fallacy of Government competing with private enterprise, the fact that ours is not just a profit system, but a profit-and-loss system in which a certain number of failures is almost inevitable, although we must try to make provision for the incompetent, the indigent, the disabled, the aged, the unemployed.

I was particularly interested in Dr. Klein's wisely pointing out that, amazingly enough, industries have been called to account by congressional committees in order to justify profits. In other words, the very basis of the American system is being questioned by those who do not appreciate the fact that industry must have profits if there is to be a free America and if there are to be American jobs.

Dr. Klein, a distinguished businessman, veteran, a widely traveled expert in government and industry, cuts to the very heart of the problem of the central issue of our times—just how far the Government should go in intervening in the lives of our citizens—whether government should become in effect a contestant in the economic game or whether it should remain (as he and I and all thinking Americans believe) as an umpire merely setting certain minimum rules of the game.

ENEMIES OF AMERICA FLOOD OUT HOSTILE LITERATURE

We know that the enemies of the American way continue to spew forth great floods of words in opposition to the American system. Always they couch their proposals in terms of glittering generalities. This book, however, shows the true meaning behind the false face of the enemies of the American way.

Every one of us, of course, faces the problem these days of having so many things to read, so many things to do, that it is hard to concentrate on the most important things. I, for one, feel however that every one of us who are living today is a trustee of America's future, a trustee of this priceless system of private initiative and private profit. As trustees we are guardians, and it is up to us to pass on our heritage to the American people intact and unimpaired. I think that How To Stay Rich—The Story of Democratic American Capitalism contributes to that end and for that reason, and that reason only, I am happy to invite attention to it.

Every day should in summary be citizenship day, a day of true rededication to American ideals.

The Railroad Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FORREST C. DONNELL
OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 12 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that into the Appendix of the RECORD there shall go an article entitled "Lay-Offs Near 158,000 Mark in Rail Strike," published in the Baltimore Sun of today.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LAY-OFFS NEAR 158,000 MARK IN RAIL STRIKE—PENNSYLVANIA RAILROAD TO DROP 80,000 BY TODAY—COAL OUTPUT REDUCED BY TIE-UP

CHICAGO, May 11.—Scattered violence and mass lay-offs today marked the second day of the Nation's biggest rail strike in 4 years.

Unemployment grew swiftly on the railroads and in the coal mines, and many industrial concerns reported they would be affected in a few days.

With no peace moves in sight, the strike of 18,000 firemen on four key rail lines began a crushing squeeze on employment and industry.

The four lines concerned ordered lay-offs that will leave more than 150,000 railroad workers idle by tomorrow morning.

Two freight trains were reported ambushed and fired upon near Knoxville, Tenn. An acting fireman on one train was shot in the arm. A spokesman for the Southern Central Lines said four shots were fired at one train, and about 15 minutes later a bullet pierced the locomotive of a second.

PICKETS DENY FIRING

Pickets outside the Knoxville yards denied they fired any shots or even were armed but claimed they were stoned. They said the stones came from the railroad yard.

An air-brake tester for the New York Central Railroad reported he was slugged with an iron bar when he attempted to make a routine inspection of a locomotive at Mishawaka, Ind. Police said a supervisory employee working the job of a striking fireman apparently failed to recognize him.

A New York Central freight train was stoned at Elkhart, Ind., but Capt. John K. Bergman, of the railroad police, blamed the incident on persons not connected with the railroad.

The dispute was deadlocked so completely that the National (Railway) Mediation Board was simply standing by—available for consultation if either side wants them.

The Pennsylvania Railroad said it would lay off 80,000 of its 125,000 employees by tomorrow morning.

The New York Central said 25,000 of its workers already were idle and that 15,000 more nonoperating employees would be laid off by tomorrow or Monday.

SANTA FE CLOSES SHOPS

The Santa Fe ordered its shops closed, affecting several thousand workers. The exact figures were not given.

The Southern Railway System said most of its 38,000 employees would be idle by tomorrow night.

The Southern estimated 18,000 of its employees already were out of work because of the strike.

The Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen called a strike against these lines yesterday to support its demands for an extra fireman on certain Diesel locomotives. About 18,000 firemen walked out.

At Washington, J. Monroe Johnson, Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, said the strike was creating an emergency in the cross-country movement of railroad freight cars.

COAL MINES SHUT DOWN

He expressed concern that a continuation of the walk-out might seriously affect movement of the winter wheat crop by interrupting the normal seasonal flow of cars to the Midwest to take out the harvest.

The strike has knocked out 12 percent of western Pennsylvania's coal output so far. Fourteen big mines and several small mines with an estimated combined daily output of 35,000 tons shut down because there were no empty cars to carry away the mined coal. The number of idle Pennsylvania miners may rise to 55,000 next week. The strike-bound Pennsylvania Railroad serves about 25 percent of the western Pennsylvania mines.

Detroit's automobile industry has not yet been affected, but most manufacturers say some trouble is likely if the strike lasts more than a week. Chrysler Corp., just back in production after a 100-day strike, said it might have to curtail operations sharply next week.

HOSPITAL BUILDING SLOWED

Produce and livestock markets reported they were feeling the pinch. Construction of a $20,000,000 veterans' hospital in Pittsburgh was slowed by the rail strike.

In the Buffalo area, the Nation's largest milling center, one feed mill and one flour mill shut down. A. Thomas Easley, general manager of International Milling, the city's third largest mill, said operations were continuing by truck, but added: "We can't go on like this indefinitely."

At a news conference today, Daniel P. Loomis, chairman of the Association of Western Railways, denied a union charge that the carriers normally used 5,000 supervisory personnel to do the work of a second fireman on big Diesels. He said this special personnel spends only a short time on the trains to check equipment.

The union said yesterday it had modified its original demand for an extra fireman on all big Diesels. The union said it is asking for the extra fireman only on fast, long-distance passenger Diesels.

WON'T GIVE IN

Discussing this, Loomis said: "If we gave in on that issue, the next move by the union would be the freight trains. We have no intention of giving in on that point."

Members of the National (Railway) Mediation Board are planning to remain in Chicago several days, but have scheduled no conferences. The board gave up the peace struggle as hopeless.

The Coffee Situation—Latin American Letter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GUY M. GILLETTE
OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 12 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD Hanson's Latin American Letter of May 13, 1950, which deals with certain investigations

being conducted by a subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture.

There being no objection, the news letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, *May 13, 1950.*

Considerable uncertainty still surrounds the estimates of dollar-exchange receipts from coffee. Colombia showed a $15,000,000 unfavorable balance of payments March 1 to April 5, which wiped out the $14,000,000 balance previously accumulated. The unattractiveness of coffee at the minimum prices set by the federation combined with excessive exuberance in issuance of extra-quota licenses to bring this set-back. It is true that the federation counts on moving coffee heavily at very high prices during the summer, but all appraisals of exchange availabilities for the coffee-producing countries hang precariously on the ability of the countries to support speculators in Brazilian coffee. That ability may not be as great as some currently think.

Last week a radio broadcast out of Sao Paulo blasted Anderson Clayton for allegedly seeking to push coffee prices down in Brazil until the crop had been bought up, after which it would work for high prices and sell at great profits. There is apparently a failure on the part of the Brazilians to understand that American interests are actually engaged in trying to influence the market on the up side, that the public statements out of New York have been bullish. Admittedly, the motivation in this whole business is very obscure, and must require digging even by Government investigators. For instance, it is easy to understand that the speculator—whether Brazilian or American—is interested in quick profits on a single crop. But the interest of the grower and of the American coffee trade consists in selling at prices that will insure steadily expanding markets for Latin American coffee. When the actions of these people seem to militate against that objective, it is inevitable that questions must be raised as to motivation.

Here is an example of the typical confusion. Last week the head of the A. & P. coffee subsidiary, the world's largest outlet for coffee, was quoted as asserting that consumption will have to shrink by more than a mere 10 to 15 percent before prices can be appreciably lower. Let us examine this public statement carefully. It has been repeatedly asserted before the Gillette subcommittee that one of the major factors accounting for the tremendous autumn 1949 rise in coffee prices was the liquidation of Brazilian stocks that had been overhanging the market. Now, these stocks had at the beginning of 1949 been put at 3,000,000 bags or less. At the beginning of the crucial period when the impact of the well-known influences caused the market to shoot upward, the stocks stood at perhaps 700,000 bags, and it is the announcement of liquidation of these 700,000 bags which was cited to the committee as the significant factor. Note well: the existence or nonexistence of only 700,000 bags of coffee, much of it of unsuitable quality for dollar markets, was cited as a vital factor in causing almost a doubling of coffee prices.

Now, the A. & P. asserts that a drop in consumption of more than 3,000,000 bags per year would not suffice to influence prices appreciably. It would not be a major factor in the market. It would take more than a 15 percent drop in consumption to do the trick. Does that make sense? Get the picture: (a) A commodity market in which prices are perched precariously at unprecedented levels. (b) A drop of 15 percent in consumption coming at the peak of prosperity in the United States, with every reason to expect that at the first break away from our high level of prosperity consumers might be stimulated to check their consumption further. (c) Is it conceivable that in a market in which definite manipulation is not under way, the free play of demand and supply would not cause a 15 percent drop in consumption to have appreciable influence on price? Especially when veteran traders have testified that a change of less than 4 percent on the supply side was a major factor in causing prices almost to double in a period of 2 months.

This is not to imply that the coffee trade will not be able to achieve a larger cut in consumption than has already taken place. It is entirely possible to discourage consumption in the United States further, if the trade continues present tactics. An official of the United States Department of Agriculture told us last Friday that there has been an increased show of interest by consumers in ways and means of economizing on coffee. The official pointed out to us that the Department's recommendations for amount of coffee used per cup, based on its experience, are 35 percent lower than what the Pan American Coffee Bureau has been propagandizing for consumption per cup of coffee. The same official noted that sales of chicory are increasing in the Washington area, told us the interesting fact that one of the great nationally known restaurants in Washington used chicory in its coffee preparation.

Since the Gillette committee is a subcommittee of the Senate Agriculture Committee, it could presumably encourage the Department of Agriculture to assist consumers with expert advice on coffee, to offset the propaganda of the Pan American Coffee Bureau, to the detriment of grower and coffee trade alike. It is a fearful error for any speculative group to believe that the United States is powerless to act in the face of any half-billion-dollar-a-year challenge to its purchasing power.

What is unfortunate in the Brazilian situation is that the Brazilian Government's activities are being directed at protection of a small group of speculators. The tactics are already indicated. A speeding up of barter arrangements with Europe in order to unload more coffee there and prevent surpluses, and release of more coffee for local Brazilian consumption with government subsidy. But it must be remembered that such activity has at best temporary effects on the commodity market. Ordinarily, markets discount the difference between a price in free dollars and a price in terms of German harmonicas or French unessentials or British overpriced goods. And subsidization of local markets is a strain on budgets already badly out of balance.

Eventually it is probable that the likely effect of war on the coffee market will be cited in the effort to firm markets at current levels. The Swiss are already reported to be interested in piling up stocks against the contingency of war. It should be noted, however, that war would be a bearish factor, after the first few weeks. When war comes, there will be a great deal less coffee imported into the United States under the regimentation of total war, and western Europe is not going to be importing coffee.

In October 1945 a prominent New York coffee house took large advertisements in the Washington Post. The purpose was to urge that Congress should promptly undertake a thorough investigation of the whole coffee problem as part of its duty to the American people. The ad went on: "CLINTON ANDERSON was appointed Secretary of Agriculture because he aggressively sought the truth about this country's food situation. Since coffee is not grown in the United States it was not made the subject of those public hearings and debate. Unfortunately, the truth about coffee seems to have been a secret deeply guarded from the American public."

Curiously enough, the secret is once again being guarded from the American public. If certain market practices had been more carefully scrutinized in 1945, there might be less occasion for an investigation today.

Community Leadership Counts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 10, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the fundamental bases of American life rest in our communities and although New York is often regarded as a vast aggregation of people it is not but rather a large group of communities each with its own character, its own local pride and its own achievements. It is in this spirit that the appended address by Mr. Floyd Cramer, president of the Washington Heights Federal Savings and Loan Association in my district, vice president of the New York State Savings and Loan League and a distinguished citizen of my district becomes so important. For Mr. Cramer was engaged in forwarding a community activity to establish a recreation center for elderly persons, a vitally necessary community activity in our present society, and one which would not be based on seeking Government aid. The nonsectarian character of this activity is also significant. The contemplated center is sponsored by the Jewish Community Council of my district and is not to be sectarian in operation, and Mr. Cramer himself is non-Jewish. I trust that the feeling of community responsibility and its vital place in our national life inherent in the remarks of Mr. Cramer will be of interest to members:

ADDRESS OF FLOYD CRAMER AT A DINNER IN HIS HONOR TENDERED BY THE JEWISH COMMUNITY COUNCIL OF WASHINGTON HEIGHTS AND INWOOD, INC., NEW YORK CITY, MARCH 16, 1950

I am deeply grateful to the communities of Washington Heights, Inwood, and surrounding vicinities for the honor bestowed upon me here tonight. I am especially grateful to the Jewish Community Council of Washington Heights and Inwood, who sponsored this dinner and to all the individuals who worked so hard to make it a success. I congratulate those of you who are endeavoring to create a recreation center for elderly persons, to which cause the proceeds of this dinner are to go, for your civic-mindedness and charitable outlook. I wish you success and pledge myself to help you to the best of my ability.

I would be less than human were I not to take note of the kindly remarks that have been made here this evening. You may be sure that I am also appreciative of the honors conferred upon me by these distinguished gentlemen. As for the handsome bronze plaque which your president has just presented to me I am completely unable to properly thank you. I am moved beyond words that you should present to he, a non-Jew, this great tribute. I can only say that I will keep it with me and that I will remember the thoughts that go with it as long as I remain on this earth.

But that which moves me more than anything else is the manner in which the people of our communities work together. It may seem odd to some persons that I should be given a dinner by a Jewish group with individual sponsors coming from all faiths. But to those of us who know Washington Heights, Inwood, and vicinity there is nothing unusual about it. I have been observing it for 20 years and have come to take it for granted.

It is not, however, done in all communities and is the crux of our social problems in the country as a whole. Failure of religious and cultural groups to work together in attacking community problems is causing a breakdown of local government. Many problems have been dumped into the hands of national authorities because of inability to solve them at home. This inability generally arises not so much for local lethargy or unwillingness as from lack of a coordinated effort on the part of all groups.

It is because I feel so strongly on this subject that I take the liberty of bringing it up here this evening. In fact, with your kind permission, I am going to expand it briefly. I am going to expand it enough to show you, I hope, where a great opportunity awaits us Americans. There are now about 150,000,000 of us in this country. We are the largest group of informed, well-fed, free and independent people on the face of the earth. Although we are only a small fraction of the 2,000,000,000 persons who reside on this planet, we possess the tools and equipment, the technical know-how to feed, clothe and house them all if we were called upon to do so. Never before in the annals of human history were so few so important.

Yet, despite all this, we find actual shortages of the necessities of life right in our midst. Try and find, for example, an apartment. I also seem to have a faint recollection of someone not having enough coal. Obviously, our enormous means of production are not functioning as they should.

If you ask me why this is so I can only answer that, in my opinion, a tug-of-war between powerful groups in our economic arena is now in a stalemate. Until we sweat this out there will continue to be shortages and economic strife from which few will prosper.

The simple truth is that various groups working at odds with one another whether in community affairs or in Nation-wide industries do no one any good. No one, no group can in the long run benefit at the expense of society as a whole. Any temporary gain at the expense of others must eventually prove a liability and a handicap.

Conversely, any bona fide improvement in the status of any group gained not at the expense of others helps the community as a whole. The success, for example, of the current drive for funds of the United Jewish Appeal is a victory not only for Jews but for all members of the community. Any improvements in the living standards of any particular group is an actual dollar-and-cent victory for all. Every slight gain by Negroes in the South spreads out to help not only whites in that region but actually the whole country.

In the struggle between management and labor we have had demonstrated for us the fact that no economic class can benefit at the expense of others. Up until about a generation ago—and unfortunately up to now in some instances—the theory was seriously held that management should get its labor for as little as possible and that no social responsibility whatsoever rested on the shoulders of employers. Now we have learned that this is false. The hunger and misery of unemployed or underpaid workers can quickly bring down the houses of the masters.

Undue power and abuse of it by labor can just as quickly destroy the jobs and well-being of those who compose the ranks of labor. It matters little who the aggressor is in a labor dispute. Any unfairness on either side is detrimental to both sides.

Now I realize that we live in a democracy and that in a democracy individuals and groups of individuals must fight for what they want. There is no paternalistic power at the top to mete out to each his just desserts. But I submit to you that in order to make our democracy work we must never lose sight of the common welfare of all of us. We must think of what is good for America.

This cannot be legislated. It cannot be decreed by anyone. It must come from the one sovereign power in our land—the people.

You and I in our respective communities must learn to respect each other and each other's interests. Jew and gentile must work together. Negro and white must work together. Business and the community must work together. Labor and management must work together. If we can do this—and I think we can—we will literally have heaven on earth. We have the people. We have the know-how. We have the tools. It's up to us.

And so, ladies and gentlemen, when I congratulate Washington Heights and vicinity for working together on its problems I really have reason for doing so.

During the last war we, a mere fraction of the peoples alined against the common enemy, furnished not only more than average manpower in the field but we were, as our President said, the "arsenal of democracy." Out of our shops, our plants, indeed out of the genius and industry of our people, there came the overwhelmingly large bulk of the tools of war that were used on the allied side. During hostilities and since their cessation American food has sustained life in large areas of the world beyond our borders. We are indeed today not only feeding but furnishing the supplies of peaceful industry and possibly of another war to most of mankind outside the so-called iron curtain.

I mention these things not critically but to emphasize the tremendous ability of our Nation. I mention them to show you, I hope, how full could be the lives of you and I and and the remainder of our people. You and I and all of us could live in a Shangri-La if we could only forget our petty differences throughout the country and work as one great citizenry for our common welfare.

But we cannot do it by working at odds with one another. We can only do it by working together in that great brotherhood which God intended for us. Jew, Gentile, Catholic, Protestant, Negro, white—it matters not. Unless we can mold them all into one great society we cannot possibly provide the world leadership that is so necessary today. (It is interesting to note in this connection that the white population of the world is about the same percentagewise as is the Negro population of the United States.)

But, my friends, if we can do it—if we can work together—there is much in store for us. Not only will we have the material things with which to enjoy ourselves, but we will acquire that spiritual confidence in ourselves which comes to men and women of good will. As individuals we will be sure of ourselves, and as a nation we will fear no aggressor. We will acquire a new purpose in life.

By way of closing, I would like to remind you that a great man once lived in this land who accomplished much by teaching and practicing the brotherhood of man. He was born 141 years ago and he lived long enough to eliminate human bondage from within our borders. He has now been dead 85 years and much of his work remains unfinished. Ladies and gentlemen, I submit to you that there is no greater heritage for the American than the opportunity to work on the completion of Abraham Lincoln's mission. It will do much for you as individuals. It will give you a spiritual strength that will enable you to face your daily problems with a confidence that knows no failure. I recommend it to you.

And now, to each of you let me thank you personally for the great honor you have bestowed upon me here tonight. May you enjoy yourself for the remainder of the evening, and may God bless you.

Johann Sebastian Bach

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CECIL M. HARDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 1950

Mrs. HARDEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to call to the attention of the Members of this body that this year the musical world is paying tribute to Johann Sebastian Bach—1685–1750—in recognition of the bicentennial of his death. In this connection, I include a tribute prepared by a resident of Lebanon, Ind., Mr. Herschell C. Gregory, which follows:

BACH'S WORKS OF THE CÖTHEN PERIOD

(Written for the bicentennial of his death in 1750)

The life of Bach, like that of Beethoven, is divided into three creative periods. The first period ends in 1717 when he resigned a position as organist and cappellmeister at the court of Wilhelm Ernst, Duke of Saxe-Weimar, a position which he had held for 9 years. Bach gradually became dissatisfied with the Weimar position and from the beginning he did not like the idea of receiving the Duke, together with the rest of the court musicians in servile garb.

In 1716 Johann Samuel Drese, court conductor, died suddenly, but the position was not offered to Bach. George Philip Telemann refused it and Drese's son, a mediocre musician who was also in the service of the Duke was selected. This appointment wounded Bach's pride but he did not permit the disappointment to move him to give up an assured income without having another position in view. Later in the year the Duke's nephew, Duke Ernst August, was married at Weimar to the sister of Leopold, Prince of Anhalt-Cöthen, and the latter, a musical amateur of more than ordinary ability, was present for the wedding festivities, and having met Bach for the first time was impressed by his genius.

Prince Leopold was an ardent music lover. He played the violin, the viola-da-gamba, and the clavier, and was a competent singer. His love and appreciation of music brought him to an appreciation of Bach's great gifts and on hearing that the latter desired a new position, offered him the position of cappellmeister at his own court. Bach eagerly accepted the directorship, and in August 1717 sent his wife and children to Cöthen, a town some 80 miles northeast of Weimar, and 20 from Halle. When he demanded his release it incurred the disfavor of Duke Wilhelm Ernst, who ordered Bach arrested on November 6. He remained in jail until December 2, and was granted a "dishonorably discharged" which fact was made public.

On Christmas day 1717, Bach took up his new position in Cöthen at 400 thalers per annum. At Weimar the larger proportion of Bach's works in fugal form for the organ had been composed. There was little encouragement given to him for this type of

work in his new position. Prince Leopold cared nothing for the organ, as his preferences were for orchestral and chamber music. The means at his disposal here were meager compared with those at Weimar. Bach had at his disposal some 18 musicians, 8 of whom were "chamber musicians" and who lived in Leopold's castle. The remainder were performers who resided in the neighborhood and who were given occasional employment. His orchestra consisted of strings, oboes, bassoons, horns, trumpets, and drums. Occasionally he also employed the oboe d'amore, oboe da caccia, and corno da caccia. There were also two voices and a dilapidated organ.

Some of the performers which constituted Prince Leopold's orchestra came from Berlin and their names are set forth in the draft of the salaries paid to the members. Dr. Charles Sanford Terry in his J. S. Bach, a biography, made some interesting comments concerning those who were priviledged to interpret the works that Bach composed during his life at Prince Leopold's court.

"The Protocal," he wrote, "records the names of those who first heard and performed the chamber music Bach produced at Cöthen, the sonatas, concertos, and orchestral suites. Imagination does not wander far from the path of probability in supposing that Josephus Spiess and Johann Ludwig Rose gave the first performance of the concerto for two violins, on some evening when the candles were lit in the great room between the high towers; that Schreiber and his colleague Krahl first sent their trumpets' rollicking notes to the rafters in the closing gigue of the Suite in D; that the Prince himself was active in the sonatas for clavier and violada-gamba; and that reinforced, as will be shown, by visiting players, the Capelle played the Brandenburg music before it was offered elsewhere. For its composition suffered little change as long as Bach controlled it."

Bach's taste for the composition of religious music and that for organ had been thoroughly satisfied during his service at the court of the Duke of Saxe-Weimar, but it was little considered at Cöthen. Prince Leopold was a Calvinist and the austere services in his chapel offered no musical opportunities such as Bach, a Lutheran, loved so much. The desire for chamber and orchestral music that Prince Leopold affected, is a circumstance that accounts for the large amount of instrumental music Bach composed during his years of service in Cöthen. His early training on the violin stood him in good stead at this time, for he produced works for violin, viola-da-gamba, and cello that only an experienced player could have written.

In addition to the works of Bach, compositions by Johann Fischer, Galuppi, Hasse, Vivaldi, Brescianello, Venturini, and others gave the prince the most pleasure when the concerts took place in the candle-lit hall of the castle. Rehearsals were held in Bach's apartments, which were probably in the castle and with Bach directing the music from the harpsichord, as was the custom in that period. We have Bach's own statement that the prince loved music, he was well acquainted with it; he understood it.

Among the important orchestral works of this period are four suites which consisted of groups of dances of the period, preceded by an overture, based on the French model, which founded by Lully began and ended with a slow section, and with a livelier section in between. We know that the first two suites were composed in Cöthen, but there is some uncertainty concerning the remainder. Spitta suggests that from the watermark on the music paper on which the third and fourth suites were composed that they may have been written during his long residence in Leipzig. However, this theory has been disputed by later authorities.

"It cannot be settled," wrote Albert Schweitzer, the Bach scholar, "whether the suites were written in Cöthen or in Leipzig. In any case Bach performed them not only before the prince of Cöthen, but also in the Telemann Musical Society at Leipzig, which he conducted from 1729 to 1736. He calls these works overtures, not suites or partitas, this being the customary name at that time for an orchestral suite, in which the introduction played the chief part. They are, however, just so much real partitas, as those in the 'Klavierübung,' except that the old dances—the allemande, the courante, and the sarabande—retire in favor of the newer and freer movements.

"The introductions are monumental movements, all constructed on the plan of the French overture. They begin with a stately section; to this succeeds a long and brilliant allegro; at the end the slow section returns. When Mendelssohn, in 1830, played to the old Goethe, on the piano, the verture of the first of the two suites in D major, the poet thought he saw a number of well-dressed people walking in a stately fashion down a great staircase. In 1838 Mendelssohn succeeded in getting them performed by the orchestra at the Gewandhaus, Leipzig. It was the first performance of any of these splendid works since Bach's death.

"In the dance melodies of these suites a fragment of a vanished world of grace and elegance has been preserved to us. They are the ideal picture of the Rococo period. Their charm resides in the perfection of their blending of strength and grace."

There was a feeling of cordial friendship at all times between Bach and Prince Leopold. When Leopold made a trip to Carlsbad, a fashionable resort of the German aristocracy, Bach and some members of his musical staff accompanied him. On one of these trips in 1719 Bach met a young Russian prince whose fad it was to collect concertos. This young prince was Christian Ludwig, Margraf of Brandenburg. He was a bachelor, living alternately in Berlin and on his estate at Malchow. He not only loved music, but he spent a large part of his income on it, and had acquired a remarkable collection of concertos by famous living composers. He maintained an orchestra which played for him the large collection of concertos and other works which occupied places in the court library. The chroniclers report that he was greatly struck by the abilities of Bach and gave him a commission to write some concertos for his orchestra. The concerto in that day did not imply a brilliant and difficult work for a solo instrument accompanied by orchestra, but a work used for a combination of instruments. Bach took his time in writing them, for it was in the spring of 1721 that he mailed the six concertos now known as the Brandenburg Concertos to Christian Ludwig. Apparently he felt that the Margraf's gesture was an empty one, so that there was no need to hurry. In mailing the new compositions Bach enclosed a letter written in French:

"MONSEIGNEUR: Two years ago, when I had the honor of playing before Your Royal Highness, I experienced your condescending interest in the insignificant talents with which heaven has gifted me and understood Your Royal Highness' gracious willingness to accept some pieces of my composition. In accordance with that condescending command, I take the liberty to present my most humble duty to Your Royal Highness in these concerti for various instruments, begging Your Highness not to judge them by the standards of your own refined taste, but to seek in them rather the expression of my profound respect and very humble obedience. In conclusion, Monseigneur, I most respectfully beg Your Royal Highness to continue your gracious favor toward me and to be assured that there is nothing I so much desire as to employ myself more worthily in your service.

"With the utmost fervor, Monseigneur, I subscribe myself,

"Your Royal Highness' most humble and most obedient servant,

"JEAN SEBASTIAN BACH.

"CÖTHEN, *March 24, 1721.*"

What Christian Ludwig wrote in reply to this letter or his opinion of the new works is not known but these concertos are without question the finest chamber music works composed by Bach during his 6 years in Cöthen. What he had really composed were experiments in various instrumental combinations and in instrumental colors.

In May 1720 Prince Leopold and Bach left for Carlsbad for a visit which was prolonged into July. On their return Bach discovered that his wife had died, leaving him with four children. (Three others had died in infancy.) On December 3, 1721, he married Anna Magdelena Wilcken, a union which proved very happy. She was the daughter of a court trumpeter and possessed an excellent soprano voice. She assisted him in copying his compositions, and it was for her that he wrote some of the French suites which are preserved today copied in her own clear hand. Bach also composed the celebrated Büchlein for his helpmate, from which came many of the delightful little pieces through which young people to this day gain first acquaintance with Bach.

Toward the latter part of 1720, Bach journeyed to Hamburg for another visit with Jan Adams Reinken, who was organist of the Katherinenkirche in that city. Reinken, then 97 years of age, heard Bach improvise on the sixteenth century melody, Upon the Rivers of Babylon, and remarked, "I did think that this art would die with me, but I see that you will keep it alive."

Bach composed fugues for the violin without accompaniment during his stay with Prince Leopold. He wrote only three, and he never tried to make music again in just the same way, but with these three he worked three separate miracles and created three fabrics of beauty the like of which are not to be found anywhere else. Several conditions made it possible for him to write fugues for the violin at this time, of which only two need be mentioned; one the German manner of playing the instrument, the other the survival in his art, even at this comparatively advanced period, of an early manner of fugal composition. The Cöthen period was like a special dispensation of fate to guarantee the full development of Bach's genius. By compelling him to pay exclusive attention to instrumental music, it drove him to an exhaustive assimilative study of the art of Italy, which was then the home of music of this class, its chosen instrument being the violin.

The Italians played with a bow where, as in the modern bow the hairs are screwed to the stick. This kind of bow makes for brilliance, clarity, and power; but it never lets the player touch more than two strings simultaneously, and often makes playing on those two a difficult task. The Germans played with a bow where the hairs were held by the fingers. The player could therefore relax the hairs at will, so that three, and even four strings could be struck at once. Also their bridge was lower so that the four strings were less sharply arched. The German tone was soft, but the harmony was full; and that agreed with the German temperament as did the polyphony their easier double- and treble-stropping made practicable.

The G-minor fugue with the prelude was probably composed in 1720, while Bach was

in Hamburg, while the G-minor fantasia and fugue according to Sir Hubert Parry belongs to the middle period of Bach's life and composed at the end of the Weimar period or whole he was at Cöthen. The six sonatas for violin solo were almost certainly written in this period as well as part of the six organ sonatas. The cello sonatas, works for violin and clavier, at least some of the partitas for solo violin, the D-minor concerto for two violins and string orchestra, the D-minor piano concerto, the three violin concertos, the six English and six French suites for piano, part of the sonatas and suites for violin and cello, the two-part inventions for piano and a series of occasional cantatas, especially for the Duke's birthdays and for New Year's Day were believed to have been composed during the 1717–23 period.

In 1722 Bach wrote the first part of his famous well-tempered clavier which some writers have called the testament of the new dispensation. He wrote out three or four copies of the original "24" and used the numbers in his home music and in his teaching. He would play a few of them to his pupils; and one pupil, Heinrich Gerber, tells us that Bach on no less than three occasions played the entire 24 to him from start to finish. Modern music dates from the moment Bach made equal temperament practical. If he or someone else had not done that we would not have the great music of Beethoven, Wagner, Mozart, Brahms, and Strauss.

Soon after Bach was married for the second time Prince Leopold married the daughter of the Prince of Anhalt-Bemberg. The Princess was frivolous, disliked her husband's musical activities, his attachment to Bach, and made her feelings known to all concerned. Bach sensing the trouble began to look for another position and in 1722 his name was presented to the Leipzig Town Council as one of the six candidates for the position of cantor of the Leipzig Thomas School, left vacant by the death of Johann Kuhnau. He was tried as a candidate on Quinquagesima Sunday, February 7, 1723 and ran second in the competition; but Christoph Graupner who won first place, withdrew, and Bach automatically entered upon the post.

In 1730 Bach wrote a letter to his friend Erdmann regarding his work of the Cöthen period. "I had there," he wrote, "a gracious, music-loving and discriminating prince, with whom I hoped to end my days, but it happened that my master married a Barenburg princess whose tastes were not in accordance with her lord's. She delighted in gaieties and worldly pleasures and gradually weaned my master from the loving interest he had ever shown toward our glorious art. And so God arranged that the post of cantor at St. Thomas' School should fall vacant. At first I did not think it becoming to relinquish the dignified office of Cappellmeister for that of a modest cantor. For this reason, therefore, I took 3 months to consider the future and was at last induced to accept, as my sons were inclined to be studious and I was desirous of affording them an opportunity of gratifying their bent by entering them in the school; and thus, in the name of the Most High, I ventured and came to Leipzig."

The Cöthen period does not mark Bach's greatest achievements, but it was a period in which much material was composed, and which is still the delight of concertgoers. Bach was distinctly a family man and went about his business undisturbed by whining babies, writing little tunes for his wife Anna Magdalena, and for his boys when they grew up. The preludes, fugues, toccatas, etc., for organ which remain the daily food for all good organists, as well as the suites, overtures, etc., for orchestra and various concert pieces composed for patrons and friends speak a language which goes straight to the heart of all people. He must be considered as the last of the great mediaeval craftsmen, men who did their work because they had to, and did it well because they loved it.

The Brannan Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 12 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, if the Senate is about to recess—and I have no objection to that—I should like to ask unanimous consent to have an article inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD. The article is entitled "Cheaper Food—Promise or Political Lure?" written by Allan B. Kline, and published in the Collier's magazine for May 13, 1950. Mr. Kline is president of the National Farm Bureau. I am informed that the article will take approximately two and a half pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and that the cost will be $205. Mr. President, I have read the article and it is about as good an explanation of the Brannan farm plan as any article I have read or any explanation that I have heard, and I think it would be well worth having it printed in the RECORD, so that more people may have an opportunity to read the article than would be the case otherwise. For that reason, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, in that connection I wish to say that certainly I agree that this is a very carefully thought out article. I believe it should be required reading for anyone who wishes to understand the Brannan plan. It is probably one of the best articles on farm legislation which the junior Senator from Louisiana has had occasion to read in a long time. I would recommend it to all Senators. I agree with the Senator from Minnesota that it is certainly worth many times the cost of printing the article in the RECORD.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, it is not a caustic article; it does not attack the Brannan farm program. It proceeds in an intelligent manner to make an explanation on the effect of the Brannan farm program as it would be applied to any phase of farm operation or our agricultural economy. I think it is well worth being printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHEAPER FOOD: PROMISE OR POLITICAL LURE?

(By Allan B. Kline)

If the American people want to keep on getting plenty of good food at fair prices, they should not swallow the sugar-coated pill known as the Brannan plan. This plan, if adopted, would be a raw deal for farmers and consumers alike. It won't stand the test of analysis. It won't give us cheap food.

The way to continue getting adequate supplies of good food at reasonable prices lies in high production per farmer and steadily increasing efficiency in farm production.

This has been our way up to now, and it is a way of progress. In 1850 the average American farm worker produced enough food for 5 people; in 1920, enough for 10; and by 1945, for 15. Common sense dictates that we should improve on our past successes, not take an entirely different course. The course being charted for us by Secretary of Agriculture Charles F. Brannan would beeline the farmers of this country in the direction of stabilized poverty.

Few consumers are aware of some significant Bureau of Labor Statistics figures which show that the prices they pay for food, when measured in the length of time they have to work to purchase that food, are lower than in any other major country. To earn enough to buy a pound of butter the average American works 32 minutes, the Canadian 45 minutes, the Frenchman 146 minutes, and the Russian 542 minutes. To earn enough to buy a pound of ham an American works 28 minutes, a Frenchman 80 minutes, an Englishman 44 minutes, and a Swiss 116 minutes. For just 4 minutes of working time an American can buy a pound of flour. The Chilean must work 13 minutes, the Frenchman 20, and the Russian 52.

Mr. Brannan has described his plan as one to give farmers "the opportunity to earn a reasonable return for abundant production" and at the same time give "taxpayers their money's worth."

A more accurate description of this utopian panacea would, I think, be "the promise of a Government-guaranteed profit for the farmer, cheap food for the consumer, and it won't cost anybody much."

SUSPICION IS JUSTIFIABLE

The Brannan plan has no antecedents in the platforms of either major political party. It was contrived without consultation with either congressional or farm organization leaders. One might appropriately ask: Is it really a farm program, or is it the most ingenious, insidious, and disarming political lure of our generation?

When the Secretary and those paid Department of Agriculture employees who are serving as salesmen for the Brannan plan talk to farmers, they talk about prices. Price is the core of the plan. Stripped of fancy language, the Brannan proposal is that Government farm price supports be high enough not only to maintain, but actually increase, the present surplus-yielding volume of production. Consumers allegedly would get food for the low price it might bring in a surplus-glutted market. Farmers supposedly would get, in the form of checks from Washington, the difference between these depressed market prices and the so-called Government-guaranteed prices.

When Mr. Brannan submitted his plan to the House Agriculture Committee on April 7, 1949, he said it was "not likely to startle anyone" because "I have no revolutionary ideas to present to you." In the sense that his scheme embraces elements that have been tried in a limited way, it is true that it is not new or startling. But in its total philosophy, the Brannan plan is a revolutionary departure from the basic concepts which up to now have been the foundation structure of the American economy.

Farmers view price supports as the counterpart of minimum wages for labor. They want to fit a price-support program into our peculiarly successful regulated free-enterprise system. They believe farm programs should be directed toward maintaining a fair-exchange relationship between the prices

of things farmers sell and the cost of things farmers buy.

The American Farm Bureau Federation does not consider it the Government's responsibility to guarantee profitable prices to any group. Instead, we view farm price supports as an appropriate and necessary protection against unreasonable price declines, which, if allowed to continue unchecked, would adversely affect the general welfare.

The Brannan plan is something altogether different. Under it the farmer's only hope for a fair income would depend on Government hand-outs via annual appropriations by Congress. Certainly it would be dangerously shortsighted to stake the future of agriculture on the mere hope that the funds would be voted each year.

Farmers are a minority group, about 19 percent of our population. Give the Nation a little adversity, and the farmer's chance of getting the sort of appropriations that would be required under the Brannan plan would be about as good as the well-known snowball in—you know where.

If the plan is put in operation on the basis on which it has been presented to farmers, very large congressional appropriations would be needed. Mr. Brannan to date has failed to comply with repeated congressional requests for an estimate of the annual appropriations that would be needed under his proposal. But recent estimates by congressional leaders and farm economists of the annual cost to taxpayers of the Brannan plan range from $6,000,000,000 to $19,000,000,000.

What would have happened to the 1949 potato crop if the Secretary's proposal had been in effect? Twenty-one percent more potatoes would have gone to market. Leading farm economists agree that these added potatoes would have driven the farm price down 35 to 50 percent. The average market price of potatoes in 1949 was $1.40 a bushel. A 35-percent drop would have pushed the average farm price down to 90 cents a bushel. But the Brannan plan support standard would have set the Government guaranty to farmers at $1.59 a bushel, a cost of 69 cents a bushel to be paid farmers out of the Federal Treasury.

This would have meant a total cost to taxpayers of about $277,000,000—three times the cost of the actual 1949 potato support program. While the present program needs correcting, there ought to be a better way to do it than to ask the taxpayer to jump out of the frying pan into the fire.

"Production payments," as proposed in the Brannan plan, cannot be accurately appraised without taking into account the level of prices allegedly guaranteed. Under the plan, this level is so high that it would be bound to cause a vast expansion in agricultural production, and unmanageable surpluses would result. A year or two of this might well drive farm prices so low as to make all the farmer's net income, and more, dependent upon his ability to get a Government check.

Take the case of a hog farmer. I am one. I know about hogs; I like them and they seem to like me. They paid for my family farm in Iowa. Under the Brannan plan, hog producers would be guaranteed prices high enough to cause them to step up production 20 to 25 percent.

The Government presumably would make up the difference between the market price and the price it promises farmers.

ENSLAVED BY THE SUBSIDY

This Government check would represent probably all the hog farmer's net income and possibly part of his costs. What would this mean to him? What would happen if the check didn't come through? It wouldn't involve just his ability to build a new barn or buy a new car. It would involve the difference between his staying in business and going broke; it would determine his ability to feed and clothe his family.

If I were a Government official looking for a way to bring the American farmer under my thumb, I'd use that method. When the time came, the farmer would either do as he was told, or would fold up for lack of a subsidy check.

The Brannan plan's income standard, as presented to Congress, proposes to set a price for hogs at about $19 per hundred pounds and a price of $1.46 for a bushel of corn. This is a corn-hog ratio of 13 to 1—13 bushels of corn would be worth 100 pounds of pork. In theory this is decidedly favorable to the hog raiser, who certainly would step up protection, knowing he could raise or buy corn for $1.46 and get a return of $19 for his hogs.

But do you think the Government could let a man raise all the hogs he wanted to raise at that kind of price? Of course not. Production would have to be controlled.

And these production curbs would have to be applied to other producers—poultrymen, dairymen, cattlemen and so forth.

The plan is pictured as being all things to all men. About his "income support standard," which would replace the present parity formula and provide the basis for guaranteed prices to farmers, Mr. Brannan says:

"This income support standard simply represents a realistic minimum below which it is not in the interest of farmers or consumers to allow farm prices to fall, and above which I would hope to find most farm prices most of the time." He adds that his proposed production payments "would allow farm income to remain at a high enough level to sustain abundant production while retail prices sought their supply-and-demand level in the market place. This level is bound to be reasonable for consumers because of the large supplies brought out."

But on the other hand the Secretary says:

"It is obvious, of course, that the use of production payments must be qualified in such a manner as to avoid extremely depressed prices in the market place, or a wasteful use of soil resources."

In other words, one minute Mr. Brannan expects farm prices to be above the proposed support level. The next, he holds out to consumers the glittering prospect of cheap food—so cheap we would have to establish safeguards against extremely depressed prices.

Which is it? It can't be both.

Some cynics say the farmer is interested only in price. When he sees the Brannan plan in operation, they say, he will think everything is just fine—that all he'll have to do is sell his products, keep his sales slips, turn them over to the Government and get the rest of his money through a subsidy check.

We feel sure that this would neither add up to a satisfactory income for the individual farm family nor make for a satisfied farmer.

Under the Brannan plan continuous and rigid controls over production would be inevitable. The result would be a ceiling on opportunity in agriculture. More and more, the right to produce—inefficient and costly as it might be—would be parceled out on a per capita basis. This would discourage the people who try to discover new and shorter methods of producing abundantly. The farmers would be lined up, and if one stuck his head above the others, he would be pushed down.

That is a policy of defeatism—a policy of supervised poverty for farmers. You can stabilize things so that it takes a long time to starve, but that doesn't create the dynamic agriculture essential to an expanding national economy.

During the war I visited a farmer in Scotland who had about 800 acres. He was a good farmer, a very good one. He asked how big my farm was and how many hogs I had. I told him 440 acres and five or six hundred head. He asked how many men I hired, and I said two. He had 82 men on his place and he could not believe that 2 men could take care of that many hogs.

My reply was, "We don't let two men waste time taking care of those hogs. It takes one of them a couple of hours a day."

High income for farmers depends upon the same kind of thing that it takes to get high income for other people—high production per man. You are not going to have a happy and prosperous farm people, individual farmers doing better all the time, unless you have increasing production per man.

This does not mean producing surpluses regardless of demand. It does mean making certain that we increase, rather than decrease, efficiency on American farms. If there are too many people in agriculture for all to earn a good living, then the national interest will be served best by providing other job opportunities for those farmers who cannot farm efficiently.

Go into any rural community, and if you find production per man very low, you will find the standard of living also low.

A BONUS FOR INEFFICIENCY

A high level of prices promised in the Brannan plan would tend to "freeze" in agriculture the inefficient producers. About half the people who live on farms produce 90 percent of the food and fiber that get into the channels of trade. Would a scheme like Mr. Brannan's be of much help to the other half, who produce only 10 percent of the commodities going into trade?

Suppose you lived in an area where the gross annual income averaged $800 per family. Say you got a guaranteed 10 or 15 percent increase in price for your products. What have you got? Another $80 or $100. What can you do with that? It wouldn't go far toward buying a new wardrobe, a new car, or sending the children to college.

The answer to this low-income problem is not price—whether figured by the present farm-parity formula or by Mr. Brannan's plan. The answer lies in increased opportunity to earn a higher total income. Much of this opportunity probably will have to be found outside of agriculture.

How would the consumer fare under the Brannan plan?

First, let's put the food picture in the proper perspective. Many customers don't know that food is relatively cheap in America. This does not mean that there isn't still room for improvement in production and distribution in America, but it does mean that—before we discard it—we ought to take a second look at the system which currently ranks at the top of the list of all nations in results.

In 1935–39, American consumers spent 23 percent of their disposable income for food; they could buy the same diet at today's prices for 19 percent of their income. Today they are spending 27 percent—but they are eating better.

RETAIL FOOD COSTS REDUCED

Food prices have come down substantially. At prices prevailing in July 1948, the average annual retail cost of the market basket of food for a family of three average consumers was $712. In October 1949 the same quantity of food could be bought for $637—a drop of $75.

It is interesting to observe that of this $75 drop the farmer absorbed $69, while charges made for services performed after the food left the farms declined only $6. Farmers receive an average of less than 50 cents of the consumer's dollar. The rest goes to pay for the freight, labor, wholesaling, processing, packaging, taxes, etc., between the farm and the ultimate consumer.

There is nothing in the Brannan plan that would reduce these after-the-farm costs which take the other half of the present-day food dollar—and it is well to remember that.

Under the plan someone would have to put up the dollars to pay the Government's

guaranty on my hogs, the Wisconsin farmer's milk, the New York farmer's eggs, the Californian's fruits and vegetables, the Texan's beef.

Suppose you pay the grocery store 40 cents a dozen for eggs and 15 cents a quart for milk, while the Government is paying the farmer prices which ordinarily would cause consumers to pay 60 cents for the same eggs and 20 cents for the milk.

Is your transaction finished? Let's not kid ourselves. Come March 15 and you'll have to make another ante on your grocery bill by way of your income tax—just as the farmer will have to turn back part of his check. Those Government payments would have to come from somewhere, and there is but one source—the taxpayers—which means all of us.

Never forget that you can't send a dollar to Washington and get it all back. That is a costly journey. Folks would be much better off to pay for their food at the grocery store.

The real cost of food—what the consumer pays both directly and in taxes—would rise immediately if the Brannan plan were in effect. Under Mr. Brannan's formula, for example, the income support standard price for hogs—$19 a hundred pounds—was more than $3 per hundred pounds above the actual average price of hogs last October, November, December, and January.

This means that taxpayers would have had to put out more than $3 a hundred pounds on hogs compared to what they actually did pay in these 4 months.

If the Brannan plan had been in effect in 1949, and hogs had sold at the average support price in effect in the fall of 1949 and winter of 1950, the production payments needed to bring farm prices on the hogs actually marketed to the Brannan support level would have cost taxpayers about $465,000,000. Under the same conditions the present support program wouldn't cost taxpayers a thin dime.

Furthermore, if the incentive prices promised by the plan increased production and marketing—and they would—the taxpayers would have to ante up for all the further declines in market prices—plus, of course, the cost of administration and the difficulty of getting along with the expanded bureaucracy involved.

Although there has been a support price on hogs, the Government hasn't had to make more than a token purchase, because market prices have been generally above support levels. Incidentally, there hasn't been, and there isn't today, any support price on beef, veal, and lamb. The Brannan proposal would provide supports and authorize controls for all of these.

The tentacles of a Brannan plan would spread. If you promise a high and profitable price to farmers, and cheap food to consumers, a lot of people other than farmers are likely to become involved.

What if the plan had been in effect during the recent 18-month period when the price of wheat to farmers fell 30 percent and the price of bread increased? Would not there have been a great temptation for the Government to step into the marketing, distribution and baking fields to try to make good on its promise that it could guarantee consumers cheap food by letting farm prices drop?

Let such situations develop in many commodities and the Government would have to take over transportation and distribution in order to control prices to consumers.

Labor, too, would get caught in the mesh. Unions would find themselves with a Brannan plan. It might take a while, but it would come.

It is quite possible that a paternalistic government for a time might give one group more than it earns. There are plenty of examples. But, if this is to remain a Nation of freemen, it is quite impossible politically for it to be done over the long pull.

WE GET ONLY WHAT WE EARN

Eventually, if all groups get in on the something-for-nothing take, we all will find ourselves poorer. In the final analysis, what all of us get is what all of us earn; no more.

We in the Farm Bureau are not contending that all consumer subsidies are bad. Several of them, when operated on the basis of need, make sense; a sound food stamp plan and the school-lunch program are examples. We should continue to study ways of raising dietary standards of the poorer-fed. At the same time we should be constantly trying to find new opportunities for them to earn a more adequate income.

But paying a part of everybody's grocery bill out of taxes would be mighty costly and extremely dangerous.

Farmers definitely want and need a sound farm program. Why? Because farm production is relatively stable, while farm prices fluctuate widely. In contrast, in a highly organized industrial economy, industrial prices and wage rates remain relatively stable while production and employment levels fluctuate.

Farm prices go up faster and further than the general price level, and farm costs go up more slowly. But farm prices drop faster and further than the general price level, and costs come down more slowly; and this makes farming especially vulnerable to swings in the business cycle.

It is in the general interest to provide a farm program which will put a brake on a downward swing in farm prices. Likewise, it is in the consumer's interest because it is his best possible assurance of a continuing supply of good food at reasonable prices.

But in considering what kind of farm program is best, we must remember one basic fact: The basis for rural prosperity is, first and foremost, high production per man and a well-distributed real income in the rest of the economy.

Nonfarm people are most of the people. They are the farmer's market; they produce his real wages. If factories are humming, employment is high, industrial labor is productive and well-paid, the stores will be filled with goods, and services will be freely available at reasonable prices. Demand for the farmer's produce will be strong.

This is the basis for real farm prosperity. You can't pull the farmer up by his suspenders if most of the people are hard up.

It is vital, then, that we maintain an expanding economy. There must be high productivity and full employment. We must exhaust every opportunity to stabilize the general price level. As we accomplish this, we reduce the need for commodity-by-commodity Government programs.

Too, we need desperately to maintain sizable exports of crops like cotton, wheat, tobacco, dried fruit, and lard. To do this we must develop an affirmative import-trade policy and aggressively seek the widespread public support such a policy deserves.

American agriculture can produce more than America can consume. To restrict our output purely to the needs of the domestic market is to sell American agriculture short. A desirable farm program should be designed to fit into a dynamic, expanding domestic and world economy.

By causing the level of price supports to vary with the supply of, and the demand for, each agricultural commodity we can provide farmers a cushion against unreasonable price declines. Flexible-price supports would assure consumers at home and abroad of the continued opportunity to share in the abundant output, efficiently produced, of American farms. The underlying philosophy of the present farm program, which has evolved out of our experiences since 1933, is consistent with this objective.

Flexible-price supports would stimulate production of livestock and livestock products, which would conserve the soil and upgrade the American diet. By permitting a downward adjustment in support prices when supplies become burdensome, the flexible program would encourage farmers to shift land from production of grain crops to grasses and legumes and promote better land use. At the same time, lower support prices for surplus grains would encourage grain feeding of livestock—resulting in more and better livestock.

WHEAT SURPLUS AND LIVESTOCK

An indication of how increased livestock production can eliminate grain surpluses is contained in a recent study made at Michigan State College. It shows that an increase of about 2 percent in our livestock production would have more than absorbed our surplus stocks of wheat in the period since 1930. Consumers should not miss the point that expanded production and use of livestock products make for better and more nutritious diets.

Farmers sincerely believe that flexible-price supports—endorsed in the 1948 platforms of both major political parties—would provide necessary safeguards to farmers, minimize the necessity of controls over production, and assure American consumers of a firm supply of nutritious food at reasonable prices.

The Agricultural Act of 1949, the present law, is not without defects. Its support prices are the highest in our peacetime history. Rigid price supports, temporarily continued on several commodities, are so high they will encourage overproduction and, at the same time, discourage both domestic consumption and export.

Thus, instead of increasing farm income, they may decrease it.

Congress postponed full application of the flexible price-support formula until January 1, 1952, and provided for the use of a dual parity yardstick through 1953. The American Farm Bureau Federation never agreed to this; we thought the flexible price supports should have gone into effect last year, as was originally proposed.

We in the Farm Bureau are convinced that the higher the level of price supports, the greater the controls and regimentation that will result. We recognize that some controls will be needed occasionally if we are to use price supports to protect farm prices against unreasonable declines. At the same time, with flexible price supports, we would hope to hold controls to a minimum.

The present farm program, approved by Congress in 1948 and amended in 1949, does provide a brake on sharp downturns in agricultural prices. This program ought to be given a chance to work. It has not yet had that chance.

The Brannan plan would stifle the farmer's initiative, and regiment him. It would bring a pyramided government piled onto the taxpayers' backs. It would in the long run mean lower per family income for farmers, higher-priced food for consumers and everybody would pay plenty.

Decentralizing the Federal Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 12 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the spring 1950 issue of the distinguished quarterly

journal Air Affairs published by the American Society of Air Affairs is devoted principally to a discussion of the implications of the atomic bomb. It is my pleasure to have contributed an article to this issue, based on a subject which I have taken up with Federal officials for practically the last 12 years, namely, decentralization of the Federal Government.

It is a subject which cynics have scoffed at and a subject which smug bureaucrats have ignored, but it is one which is increasingly coming to the fore in view of the critical world situation in which we find ourselves.

Incidentally the chairman of the board of the American Society of Air Affairs is the distinguished junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS]. The editor of Air Affairs is Mr. William D. Pardrige.

In the spring issue there are a series of very interesting articles by such outstanding Americans as Mr. Bernard Baruch, Mr. Seth W. Richardson, Gen. Carl Spaatz; the great explorer, Vilhjalmur Stefansson; the distinguished commentator, Mr. Quincy Wright; and my good friend, the able senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], among others.

It is a pleasure to be in such expert company, but more important it is an honor to have contributed this piece on what I regard as a crucial issue.

I ask unanimous consent, therefore, that the text of the article which I contributed to the spring issue of Air Affairs, which has just come out, be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DECENTRALIZING THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

(By ALEXANDER WILEY, United States Senator from Wisconsin)

"Those who fail to read and learn from the lessons of history and the mistakes of the past are condemned to repeat those mistakes."

Many times in American history we have indeed failed to read history's lessons and to profit by past mistakes, with the result that we have repeated our follies. We failed to prepare for World War I; consequently many of our ill-trained young men died unnecessarily. We failed to prepare adequately for World War II; result, Pearl Harbor and then mass "training" with dummy wooden weapons. Now, from this layman's standpoint at least, we are failing to prepare against the dread contingency of a third global conflict.

Obviously, I could not and would not think of condemning totally the present military planning of our defense chiefs—men who have devoted lifetimes to the service of their country. But at least in the single area of proposed up-to-the-minute planning and acting for dispersal of key Government agencies, I feel that I am fairly qualified to condemn the miserable stalling, buck-passing, and lack of imagination which have characterized the governmental approach to this crucial problem.

I

Dispersal of Federal installations inevitably involves three phases:

(a) The executive agencies.

(b) The legislative branch, meaning, basically, the Congress.

(c) The judicial branch, meaning, basically, the Supreme Court.

Dispersal of the key units in our 2,000,000-man executive branch becomes the major challenge, as against the comparatively lesser problem of dispersing the relatively few hundreds of key individuals involved in the other two branches of Government. But before proceeding let us analyze some of the basic premises of our thinking:

1. The United States is engaged in an ideological war against communism.

2. The entire literature of the Communist movement indicates that its leaders believe that an ideological war is but the opening phase of an eventual military conflict between the two rival ideas. These leaders thus hold, in spite of occasional soothing propaganda to the contrary, that communism and capitalism cannot coexist on a peaceful basis in the world.

3. Although we recognize that Communist literature and thinking lead to the Reds' fatalism about inevitable conflict, we in the United States are firmly committed to finding a path to peace. We have no alternative because we recognize that war would solve no basic issues and would only bring a more horrible holocaust of death, disaster, and chaos than mankind has ever known.

4. While striving for peace, it is our obligation to maintain the strongest possible defenses. Russia recognizes military strength of her potential enemies as the major deterrent against war. Her entire system of government is predicated upon the use or implied threat of force and violence. Therefore, she respects only the implied threat of force and violence on the part of other nations, as well as respecting their preparations against surprise blitzes.

5. Part of our armed strength lies necessarily in our preparations for civil defense. Thus, a weak civil defense means that our armed forces will lack effective backing-up on the home front, which is obviously suicidal.

6. In the event of an atomic emergency, it will be too late to decentralize Government. Key Federal installations will obviously be a prime initial target of atomic, even of bacteriological, attack. Experience shows that offices, files, and personnel cannot be moved in a few hours. Therefore, it is essential that ordinary decentralization begin now.

7. The difficulties of decentralization are so tremendous that obviously priority lists must be arranged so that agencies having greatest importance in an atomic struggle are dispersed first. Among such agencies are, of course, the Atomic Energy Commission, the central units of the Department of National Defense, the White House, etc.

Many other premises are involved in this line of thinking, but if the reader accepts the above assumptions, we may proceed together to explore this theme. I recognize that our minds almost rebel in turning our thoughts to this grim fact, but stern realism must be the order of the day.

Above all, in this process, we must view the problem not as an academic matter, not as an idle theory, but with a sense of urgency, a sense of emergency. That is the only kind of approach which will enable us to solve problems at the present stage which might otherwise seem insuperable.

II

Remember that when America dropped her atom bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, obviously she had the alternative of laying an atomic egg on Tokyo. Just conceive what would have happened to Japan if in one fiery radio-active blast, the Emperor, the Japanese Diet, most of the key military and naval leaders, most of the Japanese civilian leaders had been obliterated from the face of the earth. Not only would Japan have been knocked out of the war, but in effect, Nippon would have been knocked out of the peace for generations to come. Clearly, it takes a long time to develop new leadership in a nation even after the guns have ceased firing and the scars of war heal.

Now think what that lesson means to a potential aggressor like Soviet Russia. It means that if she could destroy the 5,000 or so key leaders of America's Government, not only could Russia probably quickly and decisively win an atomic war, but she could make America most assuredly a vassal state for generations to come. Why? Because most of America's leadership would be destroyed and it would take a very long time before new leaders, coming up from the local and State governments, could adequately take over the helm of the Federal Government, even of a satellite state.

The master minds of the Kremlin, we may be sure, are aware of these facts. Certainly, Moscow radio will, in the future, as it has in the past, scream against alleged war mongering on our part because we simply have dared to mention these obvious possibilities. Naturally, Pravda and Izvestia would like America to lullaby herself to sleep. Uncle Joe would like us to concentrate exclusively and smugly on talk fests in the United Nations. He would like us to centralize more thousands of key workers in sardine-packed Washington. He would like us to put off to a nebulous tomorrow all talk of dispersal.

But dare we pursue this course of folly, wittingly making ourselves a perfect target for potentially fatal atomic blows? Of course not.

To be sure, we must continue our sincere efforts through the United Nations, particularly as regards possible international control (necessarily ironclad) of atomic energy; we must strengthen our Voice of America program to reach the Russian people directly. We must hold out a sincere hand of friendship to Russia's enslaved millions. We must maintain our poise, our calm, never submitting to hysteria or undue alarm. We must implement the North Atlantic Pact. We must not, we dare not, forget about preparations for Federal decentralization.

III

Over a relatively long period of time I have had quite a series of letter exchanges and talks on this subject with the National Defense Department and previously with its component departments. I have corresponded with the United States Bureau of the Budget, with the National Security Resources Board, with the White House, with the Munitions Board, and with literally dozens of other Government agencies, Cabinet Department heads, etc., trying to emphasize the necessity of adequate planning now for decentralization. I have stated throughout this correspondence that certainly I, as an individual, could not presume to suggest to them comprehensive and detailed plans by which even a single department of Government could be decentralized, let alone the entire executive branch, or legislative branch, or judicial branch. What I have sought is to stimulate the most constructive thinking on the part of our Government leaders, so that they, in turn, who are more familiar with their respective establishments, could plan and act now against the dread contingency of a possible future war.

It is not, of course, enough to have plans on paper for, let us say, moving the Joint Chiefs of Staff from Washington, D. C., or moving the Supreme Court, or the Congress, or any other key governmental unit. It is not enough to have elaborate conference table discussions in one's department. What is needed is actually to lay the physical basis for decentralization. What do I mean by that? Well, obviously space must actually be provided in advance for decentralized Government personnel, for file systems, for special secret vaults, for offices. There must

be provided in advance a modern-type system of communication—teletype, direct telephone lines and other modern communication instruments. Personnel must be retrained to handle tasks on a decentralized basis. Certainly, too, Budget offices will have to get busy immediately in order to reckon the new costs that will be involved, and appropriation requests will have to be made to the Congress.

Is any of this planning going on now? The public is completely in the dark as to the answer to this question. Now, we would not want to be let in on any necessarily secret plans, but surely there is sufficient nonsecret data that could be made available to us, meaning to Congress and the people.

I have, it should be noted, received all sorts of assurances that some master plans do exist. So, what? Will they be activated when the first five atom bombs have pulverized Washington and burned up all the master plans, themselves?

Not long ago Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson wrote to me that: "Recognizing the fact that it is not beyond the bounds of possibility for Washington to be the target of a devastating or damaging attack, and that the seat of Government might have to be moved as a result, it follows that plans should be prepared to cover this contingency. Such plans are in the course of preparation."

Secretary of Defense Johnson went on to explain: "Specifically, these plans include the movement of three service elements of the Department of Defense to other locations and the designation of successors to military command."

I have a good deal of respect for our Secretary, but what visible evidence is there that any concrete dispersal actions have actually been taken thus far? None. Instead, Government employment continues to remain at around 210,000 in our jammed Capital, not to mention other huge Federal installations in such obvious targets as New York, Philadelphia, and Chicago.

IV

Decentralization thus is seen to mean more than spreading out from Washington: it means spreading out from every other bloated metropolitan target. Luckily, for us, decentralization will serve not only our military defense purposes but will serve other social and economic goals that are obvious to any student of modern day American society. Having Federal units (and payrolls) in small towns of 5,000 or 10,000 or slightly larger will not only pump economic vitality into the financial blood streams of those communities; it will, far more importantly, bring Uncle Sam closer to the people, closer to the grass roots; it will reactivate the interest of our people in their Government.

Moreover, there will be more than sufficient relatively nonessential personnel always remaining in Washington so as to prevent it from becoming a ghost town or from having its own economic life unduly impaired.

Where should the moved Government units be relocated? Obviously, several factors will affect the decision. It is clear, for example, that the Dairy Division of the United States Department of Agriculture could be decentralized into the dairying heart of the Nation and that goes on a comparable basis for other farm units—the cotton units, the wheat unit, etc. In the instance of other Government departments like the Atomic Energy Commission, the answer is not so clear. It would, of course, be a mistake simply to decentralize units to the geographic heart of the Nation, because that would only result in a new type of centralization. We must consider not only the question of space and distance (in the light of possible Russian guided-missile and air attacks over the North Pole or via Alaska) but we must also consider the question of the proximity of available defenses—anti-aircraft, radar, guided-missile stations, etc., to protect given units of Government.

What of the Congress? Could it disperse its Members to, let us say, 30 or 40 centers and legislate by television? What of the President and his staff? Could they govern from a moving train? These are not questions to be answered lightly, for they should result in intense study.

The idea of a mobile Capitol or White House is neither new nor improbable. Military leaders have often conducted operations from armored trains. Is this not a worthwhile phase for study, considering the fact that enemy planes and rockets would certainly be seeking out any fixed location of Congress and the President, as well as the Supreme Court, and train mobility (and/or legislation by television) might be the only answer.

Now, no one is suggesting that the Chief Executive move into a train right now. But now is the time for the Goverment's General Services Administration and similar units, its public buildings office, etc., to start laying concrete plans.

While on this phase of concreteness, the question naturally arises: Precisely how can Congress initiate steps to speed decentralization? May I suggest answers:

(a) As I have repeatedly recommended, every committee of the Congress should consult with the agency officials within its particular jurisdiction on dispersal problems. Thus, the Senate and House Judiciary Committees should review the question with the Department of Justice, the Finance and Ways and Means Committees should do so with the Treasury Department and so on down the line. The Senate and House Appropriations Committees, controlling as they do the purse-strings, will have over-all financial jurisdiction of this problem.

(b) The major long-range instruments for decentralization should, I believe, consist of legislation already pending before the Congress to set up a "little Hoover Commission." I am proud to have been one of the original cosponsors of legislation designed to set up such a National Commission on Inter-Government Relations. The purpose of this Commission would be to analyze the present status of Federal, State, local relationships; Federal, State, local taxes; the problem of increased Federal grants-in-aid; the problem of increasing Federal power.

One of the major units under such amended legislation should, I believe, be a Council on Decentralization, consisting of the finest brains of American military and civilian life in our Federal, State, and local Governments. This Council on Decentralization should submit its suggestions on an over-all basis to Congress and its committees and should coordinate the decentralization work in each of the units of the Federal Government.

Implicit in the idea of such a council and commission is the concept that it is not enough merely to disperse Federal functions; rather, on a long-range basis, it will be essential that some so-called Federal functions be turned back entirely to the States and localities in order to reverse the trend of Uncle Sam assuming power over everything.

Legal questions will arise not only in this long-range approach, but the very minute one begins to assume that atom bombs might one day rain down on Washington and other cities, obliterating many incumbents in Federal positions and making regular type Congressional-Presidential-Supreme Court government perhaps impossible. Already, scholars have begun to explore the legal problems of government in atomic emergency;[1] far more work must be done along this line by legislators and legal experts.

[1] Rossiter, Clinton L., Constitutional Dictatorship in the Atomic Age, Review of Politics, October 1949.

CONCLUSION

One almost pauses after reviewing even these few possibilities, to wonder if all this thinking is worth while or whether it is all a Buck-Rogerish nightmare. However, realistic reflection will show that this problem is unfortunately all too necessary a subject for review. Of course, each of us would prefer to concentrate on the problems of peace, to consider appropriations for social services, for an improved standard of living rather than matters relating to war. The consequences of such exclusive pacific concern are, however, clear to any realistic observer of history.

The Father of our Country, George Washington, rightly advised that "to be prepared for war is one of the most effectual means of preserving the peace."

It is most fitting that I submit these thoughts to the readers of this renowned publication, Air Affairs, because fortunately American aviation and its leaders have provided some of the most constructive, imaginative minds in our country. The aviation pioneers who barnstormed in flying crates, the daring young souls who flew over Chateau-Thierry and the Meuse-Argonne in what turned out to be flaming coffins, these young eagles set a standard for constructive experimentation that has carried over into many other fields of American military and civilian experience. I personally take inspiration from the great record of American aviation pioneering, particularly because in all the annals of American flying, there is perhaps no more glorious saga then that of a great son of my own State of Wisconsin, Gen. William Mitchell, familiar to every follower of aviation science, tactics and warfare.

Billy Mitchell taught us to think in terms of the future in preparing defense, rather than to prepare only for the previous war.

What would Billy Mitchell suggest to us by way of preparation against atomic warfare? This is the sort of question which I ask America's military leaders to ponder. What would other great pioneers in the field of legislation, in the field of military science, civilian government, industrial mobilization suggest to us? The answer is up to you, my friends.

Haile Selassie and the Idaho Miner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1950

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, while we are paying over $5,000,000,000 a year in interest on the national debt, it is interesting to learn of our Government's liberality in disposing of the surplus money metal—silver that for some reason the Treasury refuses to put in circulation in this country to pay Government expenses and reduce the national debt. The record discloses we have sent Ethiopia 5,425,000 ounces of silver—which we have coined for them in our mint now fully presented in the following statement:

While the Idaho miners were digging their silver out of the ground to sell to the Government for 65 cents an ounce and pay their taxes, the Government was balancing its books on its silver purchases by revaluing half the silver it bought, and putting its revalued silver in circulation as money in paying Government expenses with silver dollars

and silver certificates at exactly double the value it paid for the silver; and, at the same time, piled up the other half of the silver sterilized and unused.

Over in Ethiopia, Haile Selassie was driven from his throne and his country taken over by Mussolini and his Italian Government. After the war was won by the United States Army and the British military forces, Haile Selassie was restored to his throne without his striking a blow for the freedom of his people or giving any military assistance to the Allies.

With Haile Selassie back on his throne, our Government in its benevolence has taken from its supply of money metal and given Haile Selassie 5,425,000 ounces of silver which was coined into money by our mint and put into circulation in Ethiopia at $1.11 an ounce.

We are told that in making this donation, our Government went through the formality of an agreement for the ultimate return of all the silver sent over to Haile Selassie. However, to judge from the record, it does not appear that our Government intends to hold Ethiopia to their bargain.

The record discloses that the potential silver seigniorage table printed each month in the Treasury Bulletin has been reduced by the amount of the silver furnished Haile Selassie and the rest of the foreign countries that got our silver for their money needs during the war.

So we must assume that the silver dug out of the ground by the Idaho miners and sold to our Government for 65 cents per ounce and donated to Haile Selassie, who put it into circulation for 46 cents an ounce more than the Idaho miners got for it, will continue to supply the money function in Ethiopia and that Haile Selassie and his people will live happily ever after.

Question: What does free silver mean?

"Best Politician the Country Ever Had" Giving Himself a Real Test

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 5, 1950

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article by Lowell Mellett, which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of May 11, 1950:

ON THE OTHER HAND—"BEST POLITICIAN THE COUNTRY EVER HAD" GIVING HIMSELF A REAL TEST

(By Lowell Mellett)

President Truman's current excursion into the hinterland may reveal whether or not Presidential Candidate Harold Stassen spoke a half-truth the other day when he characterized Mr. Truman as the worst President and the best politician the country ever has had.

It could be a half-truth, but no more than that. The first half of the statement, of course, was only a bit of preposterous extravagance that might better have been omitted by the part-time politician, part-time university president. Aside from the matter of good taste, it raises again the question of Mr. Stassen's qualification for his own job—that of an educator. The wide-eyed students of Pennsylvania University must have been disturbed by the prexy's curious forgetfulness of history. The youngest among them are aware of the kind of Presidents we had as recently as the lamentable twenties, not to go back any farther, and some of the not-so-wide-eyed politicians of Stassen's own party would prefer not to invite comparisons with those Presidents.

POSSIBLE HALF-TRUTH

As for the possible half-truth, President Truman is now giving his proficiency as a politician the toughest of all tests. He is taking on a battle within his own party as a means toward helping the party to win this year and retain control of the Government. It is not a little battle; it takes in a lot of territory and involves sizable forces. Should he win and then obtain the fruits of his victory, history in due time will have opportunity to judge whether he was the worst of Presidents or one of the best; it will be compelled to recognize him as one of the most courageous, in any case.

For himself, the President is obviously willing to be the best of politicians, believing that if he is it will make him anything but the worst of Presidents.

The clue to the kind of politics the President is undertaking was given by his speech in Burlington, Iowa. "I will say one thing," he said, "and say it emphatically. The Eighty-first Congress has done a lot better than the Eightieth ever did and it is going to do a lot more than it has done up to date. The record of the Eighty-first Congress is not complete yet, but when it finally finishes its work and goes home, then I will be ready to come back and give you the full details, and let the chips fall where they may."

EFFECT ON HILL STARTLING

No other President in our time ever talked that kind of turkey to the members of his own party in Congress. The effect on Capitol Hill has been slightly startling.

Generally speaking the Democrats in Congress were happy to see the President take to the road, to see him seize the initiative for his party in this congressional campaign year. Some of them, however, determined to go their own way, regardless of the platform and other promises made in the party's name, are not so happy to have him take the initiative in the intraparty battle.

But even among the pussyfooters and the members fairly blind to the realities of this year's politics, there is recognition of the President's basic strategy. They know that he knows he cannot set the prairies afire again as he did in 1948 with promises, that this year the party will have to win on performance. What hurts is that the performance is up to themselves and that, as of today, they are away behind in their work.

Two years ago President Truman clinched his case against the Eightieth Congress by calling it back after it had adjourned with its work unfinished, just to dramatize its do-nothingness. There is nothing to prevent the President from keeping his own Congress here, campaign or no campaign, to force it to give him a record he can take to the country with some confidence.

The Railroad Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FORREST C. DONNELL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 12 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that into the Appendix of the RECORD there may go an excerpt from the ticker tape of today, from Chicago, the opening portion of which says:

Strike-crippled railroads laid off 141,000 workers today.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHICAGO.—Strike-crippled railroads laid off 141,000 workers today and spokesmen said they expected the number of idle employees to mount to 2,000,000 by the end of the week.

Industries in the areas affected by the firemen's strike also began mass layoffs.

At Detroit, meanwhile, reports persisted that the New York Central planned to halt all operations for the duration of the strike, but a company official denied such plans.

The New York Central furloughed 40,000 employees and warned that another 10,000 might be out of work by Saturday. The Pennsylvania Railroad laid off 85,000 and the Southern Railroad, 16,000. The Santa Fe closed all of its shops, but did not announce the number of workers idled.

The strike by 18,000 members of the Brotherhood of Railroad Firemen and Enginemen went into its third day.

The National Railway Mediation Board is still in Chicago, hoping that negotiations might be renewed to bring about a settlement.

However, a railroad official said management negotiators would refuse to consider the union's modified demand for an additional man only on fast through trains because they regard it as a strategic move to "get a foot in the door" on the original demand.

Order of the Sisters of St. Anne

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FOSTER FURCOLO
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 15, 1950

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, I have just been informed of a centennial celebration held in my district which I know will be of interest to the Members. The Sisters of St. Anne celebrated the one hundredth anniversary of the founding of their order with appropriate ceremonies, including a solemn high mass of thanksgiving at the Notre Dame Church, Easthampton, Mass., and, in view of the outstanding history of the order, I am proud to call it to the attention of the Members today.

The 75 nuns who are presently members of the Order of the Sisters of St. Anne, their guests and the residents of the area had a great deal to celebrate. This Order is composed mainly of teachers at the Notre Dame School in Easthampton, Mass., and, in the history of the school have taught many hundreds of residents of my district who have gone out into the world with this excellent educational background and have accredited themselves well in the American way. All of us in western Massachusetts are extremely proud of the devotion to duty of the members of the order and recognize their outstanding contribution to our area. They have dedicated their lives to helping others and the results of their efforts are ever present in the town of Easthampton and western

Massachusetts in the outstanding citizenry of their former students.

Therefore, it is a great pleasure for me to have this opportunity to make this known to my colleagues and I know all of you will join with me in congratulating the Sisters of St. Anne and wishing them every future success in their work.

James V. (for Victory) Buckley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 11, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that on Monday, May 15, my colleagues on both sides of the aisle would wish to join with me in extending hearty good wishes and congratulations to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUCKLEY], on the occasion of the fifty-eighth anniversary of his birth.

The Honorable JAMES V. BUCKLEY represents the fourth district of Illinois, beginning his service to the people of Chicago and nearby suburban areas with the Eighty-first Congress. He is known to many admiring constituents as JAMES V.—for Victory—BUCKLEY.

A happy circumstance of the day will be the presence of Mr. BUCKLEY in Chicago at the Jefferson Jubilee to join in the city's welcome to the President of the United States. President Truman celebrated his sixty-sixth anniversary on May 11, honoring which occasion Mr. BUCKLEY sent the following message:

The Honorable HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President of the United States,
White House:

Mr. President, congratulations on this anniversary of your birth. May future years promise abundant harvest as those passed have yielded the fruits of your good works, your great contributions to our Nation and our people as its President, counselor, and leader. In these days of reclamation of humanity from strife, prejudice, and misunderstanding you have demonstrated high purpose and worthy ideals in the service of your fellowman. May long life, happiness, strength, and wisdom to carry on be yours for all the years to come. May I add my sincere wishes that if you choose to run in 1952, victory will be yours by an overwhelming majority.

JAMES V. BUCKLEY,
Congressman, Fourth Illinois District.

Today, on the eve of his own birthday, our colleague from Illinois received this inspiring reply:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
ABOARD THE PRESIDENT'S TRAIN,
Washington, D. C., May 11, 1950.

Honorable JAMES V. BUCKLEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BUCKLEY: I cannot tell you how much I appreciate your message felicitating me on my birthday. Such generous words of commendation and good wishes have touched me deeply.

My thanks for your confidence in my leadership, and kindest regards.

Very sincerely yours,

HARRY TRUMAN.

And now may I give, Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, a brief sketch of the background of our coworker from Illinois. The Honorable JAMES V.—for Victory—BUCKLEY was born and reared on a farm in Saginaw County, Mich., the fifth of a family of 11 children. He attended public schools in his home area. He began his business career in the automobile industry. Then, for more than 20 years, he was a builder, engaged in the construction of thousands of homes in the Calumet region of Cook County, Ill., following which, during the war, with materials at a priority, he went into warplant production service, becoming president of local union 714, UAW-CIO. I might add that our colleague was a pioneer in the field of labor-management relations and that today he continues to enjoy the prestige of leadership in this field. No one can know the Illinois Member without recognizing him as a man of excellent administrative and executive ability.

I might mention, also, the commendable civic spirit of the gentleman we honor. He is active in school, church, community, and State affairs, and gives generously of himself and his talents in service to his people and his Nation. We wish our distinguished friend a very happy birthday with many fruitful and prosperous years to come. May the V in his name always portend the victory ahead for the reign of human understanding, under wise and constructive laws in the interest of all the people, to which he has devoted a lifetime of service.

What We Must Do To Stay Free

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 15 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, last month it was my pleasure and privilege to address the annual membership meeting of the Executive-Foreman's Club of Elizabeth, N. J. I have been provided with a stenographic report of this address, together with a transcript of the questions and answers which followed it, and I ask leave of the Senate to insert this entire transcript in the Appendix of the RECORD, since many of those who were present have written to me asking whether it would be possible to secure copies of what was said.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT WE MUST DO TO STAY FREE

Mr. STEVENS (president, presiding). I am glad for this opportunity as I feel we really owe a debt of gratitude to one of the men at the head table this evening, a man who is to introduce our speaker and who has been a real friend of this club although he does not live in Elizabeth, but whenever we want a top-ranking man we call George Stringfellow, vice president and division manager of the Thomas A. Edison Co. in charge of the storage battery division over in West Orange, and George will say to me, "Emery, he will be there," and he has never failed us yet.

I think it is only fair that I should say just a word about Mr. Stringfellow himself. He is not going to be the speaker, and I suppose when I get through with this four-page or six-page document, whatever it is, you will think I was introducing the speaker. I am not. He is going to do that, but I think it is only fair to him that you should know something about him and what he has done for our club.

I told you that he is division manager and vice president of the Thomas A. Edison Co. in West Orange. He is a director of the Mine Safety Appliances Co. of Pittsburgh, a member of the board of directors of the Mining Congress.

I could go on with this because there are over a hundred things on here. I cannot read them all. He is a member of the American Iron and Steel Institute and the American Institute of Mining and Metallurgical Engineers.

I think one of the greatest achievements—it just happened not very long ago and I was very much interested in reading it in the newspapers—he was made an honorary member of the New Jersey Medical Society. He is not a medical man. He is one of the three laymen in 184 years who has been made a member of the American Medical Association—and that is no mean honor.

Let me skip over the Taxpayers' Association and a few other things. He is a member of the board of managers of the New Jersey Home for Disabled Soldiers at Menlo Park and the Edisons Pioneers and the Old Timers.

He is the chairman of the board of trustees of Ithaca College, Ithaca, N. Y. He has received an honorary degree of doctor of fine arts from Ithaca and received an honorary degree of doctor of laws from the South Jersey Law School.

Some of you will be interested to know that he served two terms as potentate of Salaam Temple.

He is a member of the Imperial Divan of the Shrine of North America. I think he has 5 years to go and he is going to be upstairs.

He is a member of the board of directors and vice chairman of the executive committee of the American Cancer Society, and I could mention other things in connection with the American Cancer Society. I mention that to show you that he is a very busy man and does take time out to cooperate with our club, even to the point of giving up part of his afternoon and evening to come down here to be with us tonight.

I am very happy to present to you "Doctor" George Stringfellow, who will present the Senator. [Applause.]

Mr. STRINGFELLOW. Mr. President, distinguished guests, Senator MUNDT, and my good friend Emery Stevens, proof that he is a friend of mine is the commercial he gave me. [Laughter.]

I think the greatest deficit in the world today is not money but intellectual integrity, and I know of no man in all the world who is more richly endowed with this precious ingredient than Emery Stevens. [Applause.]

It was Aristotle, that great lover of democracy, who, in his wisdom, once said, "The greatest compliment one can pay another is to say that he is a good citizen." I think Emery Stevens is a good citizen.

Of course, I am delighted to present to you your speaker tonight, but when I bring you a speaker I usually bring a picket line, and I can think of no greater endorsement. [Laughter.]

Last year, you recall, I brought BOB TAFT, and we waded right through the picket line. Tonight as I brought Senator MUNDT through the picket line, or vice versa, one of the professional pickets said, "There goes Stringfellow." [Laughter.]

Now I could say much more about, and truthfully, too, about Senator MUNDT than I am going to say. This is a brief of the man's biography (illustrating a number of papers).

Senator MUNDT served 10 years in the lower House. He was elected and reelected five times and each time he was elected by a greater majority.

In 1948 he graduated to the upper House, or the United States Senate, and he led in his State the presidential candidate on his party ticket, Mr. Dewey, by about 50,000. Senator MUNDT is a man of courage, character, and the will to tell you how he feels and stands on almost any issue.

Following his address this evening, he will answer questions—and I said "answer questions." I hope you confine your remarks to questions. If you want to engage in a debate, make your own arrangements. [Laughter.]

I am going to ask you if you will not keep your remarks to questions, and sometimes that is hard to do.

Senator MUNDT has selected as his subject for this evening "What we must do to stay free."

It is indeed a pleasure for me and a great honor to present to you a real statesman and a true American who asks not who is right but what is right.

Senator MUNDT. Mr. President, Mr. Emery Stevens, Mr. George Stringfellow, and fellow Americans all: That was indeed a mighty fine and friendly and flattering introduction that I secured from Mr. Stringfellow, and I am deeply indebted to him for his thoughtfulness and his generosity. I am happy, too, that it was possible for me to get away from the hurly-burly activities of Washington this afternoon to come up here and break bread with you and to think out loud with this fine, distinguished aggregation of free wheeling and free enterprising Americans about some of the prodigious problems which plague and perplex us all in these trying times.

You know, down in Washington increasingly we who live there come to feel that we are a city of very important people. The city has a population now in its metropolitan area of a million human beings. As the Capital of this great free Republic it has become the focal point of world affairs and everybody down there is an important element in the capital city.

He either is important or thinks he is important, and it adds up to about the same thing either way. [Laughter.]

When you get off at Union Station and induce a taxicab driver to take you for 30 cents to the Statler Hotel or to the Senate Office Building or the White House—although I do not imagine many of you go to the White House—or wherever you happen to go for 30 cents in a taxicab ride, if you interrogate the taxicab driver about affairs, foreign or domestic, he will give you an apparently authentic answer without any doubt or mental reservations whatsoever on any subject that you care to ask him about. [Laughter.]

Every taxicab driver in Washington consequently is a mighty important individual. All the members of the House of Representatives down there virtually are candidates for the United States Senate, so they certainly are also mighty important people.

The Members of the Senate and the members of the President's Cabinet are all candidates for President, and so, consequently, they are mighty important people; and our Presidents of late years are coming to think that each of them is entitled to a lifetime lease on the White House, so they, too, are mighty important people. [Laughter.]

So, you see, we are an aggregation of important individuals, as we think down in Washington. One of the things I want to talk to you about tonight is this tendency on the part of people who are members of my fraternity, the political fraternity, to consider ourselves increasingly important.

I think it is an erroneous concept. I think the really important people of America are, or should be, individuals such as you in private business, in private professions—individuals who at one time in the history of this Republic were conceived to be the folks who ran the country. Unfortunately, in my opinion, in large part because of the lethargy on the part of ordinary individuals around the country, politicians and pressure groups and columnists and commentators today are running the Nation and you are increasingly finding yourselves less important and less influential in controlling the destiny of this Republic.

I think it is serious. I think you are partly to blame. I think unless you can correct the attitude which is universally sweeping across this country and which leaves public decisions almost exclusively to public men that we are going to continue in America to lose freedoms which once were so richly enjoyed by us all.

I know that down in Washington we can and should learn things from private individuals. A couple of months ago a man came down from Kalamazoo, Mich., to Washington. He was just an ordinary man, a "Joe Bloke" type of private citizen, but he had one peculiarity. He started out early in the morning the first day of his arrival handing out oversize tips to all the people that he met.

You may remember reading about him in the newspapers of the country. He gave the hat check girl at the Statler Hotel a $100 tip for checking his hat and coat. He went down into the Embassy Room and tipped the head waiter a couple of hundred dollars to get a good table and tipped the waiters who served him $100 apiece.

When the taxicab driver took him up to the Capitol the next morning he tipped the taxicab driver $200. He bought some finery for his family at Woodward & Lothrop's and tipped the saleslady $100, and was in the process of tipping the barber who had just completed shaving him and cutting his hair with $1,000 when, finally, the Metropolitan Police caught up with him, arrested him, and put him in jail not because, you understand, it is against the law to give money away down in Washington, but the politicians down there could not stand that kind of competition. [Laughter.]

As a matter of fact, I think they got him just in time. I understand that the President had the FBI looking for him; they were going to make him a member of the President's Cabinet. [Laughter.] I was kind of glad to see him locked up myself because the fellow was not quite playing the game according to Hoyle.

We have discovered down in Washington these late years, you see, that the best way in the world in which to get elected to public office is to give away the other fellow's money and to make promises to purchase things for the people of Elizabeth, N. J., with money which is to be collected exclusively from the people of Syracuse, N. Y. [laughter]; and when you are in Syracuse, you just reverse the process, and it seems to work mighty fine. But this fellow was sort of violating the code.

He was giving away his own money and we did not want that thing to become contagious down in Washington, so it was a good thing that they locked him up. [Laughter.]

I am serious when I say that while I have been down in Washington for 12 years, I still have enough of South Dakota in me to believe that the important people of America are, or should be, the farmers, the laborers, the business and professional people of the country, and not those who temporarily hold positions of authority and power down on what I refer to as the wrong side of the Potomac River. I think in large part because we have developed that atmosphere of importance down in Washington, however, which is shared by all who live there and enjoyed by all who make Washington their home that some difficulties are accumulating for the people of America which are growing increasingly large and increasingly imminent, week after week and day after day.

That is what I want to discuss with you tonight under the heading of what, in my opinion, primarily challenges the freedoms of America, because I think they are being challenged. We know they are being challenged from abroad. I believe they are also being dangerously challenged here at home.

They are being challenged by the marching armies and the intriguing conspiracies of the Communists in every foreign capital and on a great many foreign fronts.

Certainly our freedoms are being challenged when we live in an era of history when a gigantic totalitarian power is building and stockpiling atomic bombs, each of which in theory, if not in fact, is being fabricated for the purpose of eventually dropping them upon our country and our people. That tends to circumscribe our freedom, our liberty, and our happiness; and the more we ponder on it and the more we realize the atomic bomb is the first weapon in history which better serves the cause of tyranny than freedom, the more we recognize that the areas of our freedom are growing increasingly small.

You see, up until they built the bomb it did not make much difference what country first discovered liquid fire or a tank or some other kind of war weapon because the great industrial genius and productive capacity of America could redesign it, refine it, and break it up into a number of parts, and set up a production line and create a weapon which could last longer and shoot harder and straighter than that produced by any other country in the world. We can still do it.

We built the first bomb. We built the biggest bomb. We have built the most bombs, but we developed a weapon which is so destructive in its character that it depends in large part upon the element of dropping it by surprise for its efficacy because it might well be that the country shooting second in an atomic war shoots a thousand years too late—and democracies never shoot first.

While we debate our wars, as we should, and while we discuss the difficulties and differences of opinion which confront us before we go to war, as we must if we are going to stay free, surely any country which has fabricated bombs is going to start dropping them on us before we conclude the debate. So if you agree with me, as I think your common horse sense must compel you to do, you recognize that any country smart enough to make a bomb at all is wise enough not to drop any bombs until it drops enough bombs simultaneously to obliterate the targets; also, you recognize that living in an atomic age when we have nothing effective to curtail or curb the aggressions of communism or to protect ourselves against an atomic and hydrogen bomb does tend to limit the areas of freedom for us all because it shortens the life expectancy of each of us.

That, however, is not what I want to talk to you about tonight. Serious as I think that situation is—and I know it is much more serious than most of us dare even admit when we are confronted with the evidence—I somehow feel that the decisive battle for freedom in our generation is going to be won or lost on American soil, won or lost by men and women like you and by what men and women like you either do or fail to do within the next 5 years. I do not anticipate an atomic attack from any source in so short a time. I think it can be demonstrated that the areas of

human freedom all around the world have been growing steadily smaller for at least two decades and that America is no exception to the rule. What happens in the next 5 years may well fix the pattern for the next 500.

I think it can be demonstrated further that the reason why the areas of human freedom have been growing increasingly small all over the world is because out of Germany 100 years ago there came a new ism and a new creed which most of us do not understand and which most of those who parade in picket lines to support do not analyze and define, but because communism was launched 100 years ago and because it has been able to develop a great many collateral creeds and friendly fronts and confused and bewildered followers, I think we can prove demonstrably and geographically and factually that your freedoms and mine are in jeopardy and are growing less secure by the hour.

Now let me undertake to discuss with you those two rather hyperbolic statements; the first, that the areas of human freedom all over the world are growing smaller and the second, that the main reason for that decrease in the flourishing of human liberty is communism and the factors which it controls and the individuals whom it contaminates.

Twenty years ago everybody was not free. Twenty years ago these human freedoms which we cherish, most of us beyond life itself, were not available to everyone. Twenty years ago in Germany under Hitler and in Italy under Mussolini and in Russia under Stalin and in Japan under the Shinto priests and in certain other areas in various gradations and degrees, people were not completely free. But, by and large, except for the individuals in those four countries and in semicivilized areas, mankind had developed over a period of many centuries increasing control over his own future, his own destiny and his own behavior.

There was a marked degree of political and economic freedom all over the world flourishing under quite a variety of different types of governments. What is the picture today, 20 years later?

Twenty years later we find that Russia is still controlled by the Communists. We find Germany and Japan unable to exercise their own autonomy because they are the losers in a war which they precipitated, and we are responsible through our armies of occupation for what occurs in those countries. Italy, while it operates under a fine, young Christian leader by the name of De Gasperi, finds itself constantly threatened and imperiled by the communistic forces of Togliatti, the Communist leader, who controls some 40 percent of the individuals of Italy and who is able constantly to keep the De Gasperi government on the anxious seat so as to prevent De Gasperi from producing the economic and political reforms so essential in Italy if they are going to have stability and a sound and equitable system of economics and of government.

OUR AREA OF FREEDOM GROWS SMALLER

However, communism no longer is limited to Russia. We find now that instead of looking at Russia and saying, "There is the land in which the Communists control 195,000,000 human beings in Russia," that during these past 20 years communism has moved forward so fast that it now controls a great many other hundreds of millions of people. The first to go were Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, the three countries of the Baltic Republics. When I went down to Washington in 1938, I knew the Ministers of those Baltic Republics, I still know some of them who still reside in Washington. They are Ministers without portfolio because Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia were conquered by the might of the Russians.

The Russian Army moved in by force and took over those countries against their will, and very few areas of the civilized and democratic world even filed a protest at the rape of freedom and the disruption of liberty in those three little Christian, patriotic, democratic, and private-ownership republics.

Now, let us look to the south, where we have Albania. Twenty years ago Albania had a certain amount of rugged individual freedom which adheres normally for people living in mountainous areas. The royal house of the Albania family had sort of a limited kind of monarchy. They had a parliamentary procedure.

They had certain rights of freedom of movement, freedom of speech, freedom of religion, and freedom of ownership. By American standards they certainly were not free. By the standards of the Balkans, by the standards of the Middle East, however, they were substantially free. Now they are all under the control of a fellow by the name of Enver Hoxha, a dictator selected by the politburo of Moscow in the closing days of the war who controls the decisions and the lives of everybody in Albania, and there is not any freedom left anywhere in that country.

So the areas of freedom at least are smaller than they were 20 years ago by the loss of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, and by the fact that Albania has been pulled into the clutch of the Communists—but that is not all.

The Balkan countries—Rumania, Hungary, and Bulgaria—with their beautifully romantic cities of Bucharest, Budapest, and Sofia, that area of the world which has contributed so much to culture and to the medical profession and to the romance of the world, all of them today have been completely sucked into the Communist orbit against their will.

Different individuals tried to resist the trend, or should I say groups of individuals? Cardinal Mindszenty tried to keep the church doors open in Budapest and he found himself arrested and tried by a "kangaroo court" and incarcerated in prison where he is dying as a piece of human clay today simply because he wanted to keep the doors of his faith, the Catholic religion, open in Hungary. After that, 12 Methodist bishops of the creed to which I belong, tried to keep the Methodist Church doors open in Bulgaria. They were treated precisely in the same manner as Cardinal Mindszenty was treated in Hungary, thereby giving the eternal lie to those who would tell you that communism is simply against the Catholic Church or simply against the Jewish synagogue or the Protestant church.

Communism is against any church anywhere. It tries to make you believe that there is no God.

Now a little bit later I am going to show you why. Another fellow who tried to maintain freedom tried it in Hungary, a fellow by the name of Vogeler.

He was a businessman, a man of your profession. He wanted to maintain the right of private ownership and he did not escape in time, this American citizen, and so by being tortured by hot blades put in between his fingers and his fingernails, by all the kinds of torture that the fanatical Asiatic mind of the Communist leader can conceive, they compelled him to admit crimes which he had never perpetrated and he also has been incarcerated and locked up to die.

There is no freedom left in the Balkans, and they were remarkably free 20 years ago. Next to the Balkans comes Yugoslavia, where a lot of people who were of the old Austrian-Hungarian Empire tried to set up a government under King Peter and Prince Paul. They had a considerable degree of freedom in that enlightened era following World War I and now Tito runs it as a Communist dictator.

There you have Tito, the leader of the Communists in Yugoslavia, a creature of Stalin. At one time he was a member of the Secretariat of Moscow.

At one time he was Stalin's representative on the Communist side of the Spanish war; temporarily in disagreement with Stalin, to be sure, but there is no hope for those of us who oppose collectivism, no hope for those of us who oppose communism or socialism, in the fact there is an argument going on between Stalin and Tito because they are not arguing about the right things to satisfy us.

You can read carefully the reports of that debate. There is no difference of opinion between Stalin and Tito as to whether or not the churches should be open in Belgrade. They both agree that God is something which must be defamed and denounced to have communism.

They never argue about whether a peasant should own his own farm or a worker be permitted to select his own job or a shopkeeper or a manufacturer to run his own enterprise. They both agree that under communism only the state can make the decisions and the people must be chained to the job.

The argument is only about whether Stalin or Tito is to be the chieftain of the Red ship of state once it has conquered all the seas around it, and there is no freedom left in Yugoslavia.

Next comes Czechoslovakia, in some respects one of the most pathetic cases, and in some respects one of the most important, especially for Americans.

I have visited Czechoslovakia three times since the war. I watched the slow, sordid process by which Czechoslovakia lost its freedom and, mind you, there was a country that had almost the same degree of freedom that we have in America. After World War I, a great American idealist, the President of this country in World War I, Woodrow Wilson, wrote in his own handwriting much of the Constitution of Czechoslovakia. He helped set up a democratic government and that government produced freemen like Benes and Masaryk who became famous around the world for their dedication to the ways of freemen.

Czechoslovakia was, indeed, one of the bright spots and the big dividends of the first world conflict. I recall visiting it in 1947 as a member of a joint committee of the Senate and the House of which, incidentally, our present Vice President, ALBEN BARKLEY, was a member.

He was then the senior Senator from Kentucky, the greatest advertising agent that Paducah, Ky., ever had. ALBEN, in those days, to be sure, was more interested in affairs of state than he was in affairs amour, but he puts his heart into any project which he undertakes. He was a very valuable member of our committee. [Laughter.]

He and I and our colleagues sat around in state dinners in Prague and we had long talks with the present dictator, long talks with Clementis and Gottwald, the Communist leaders in the government, all of them giving ostentatious expressions of loyalty to Czechoslovakia—but what happened?

COMMUNISTS HAVE INFILTRATED WASHINGTON TOO

By the process of infiltrating the Government, by the process of putting Communists in certain key positions in the Government in Prague, by employing the formula of destruction item by item, measure by measure, plan by plan, in exact conformity with the proposals now being attempted by the Communists in France, in England, and in Washington, D. C., Czechoslovakia lost its freedom without the firing of a shot by a coup d'état, by weakening and sabotaging the forces of freedom, by perverting the foreign policy of Czechoslovakia, by diluting the decisions which might have enabled the Czechs to stay free.

It is no exaggeration, I assure you, to tell you that the situation in Prague which ALBEN BARKLEY and I saw demonstrated

clearly that they were following there the formula now being employed in Washington, D. C.

ALGER HISS

For a Gottwald, I give you, if you please, in Washington, D. C., Alger Hiss. Gottwald at his worst could not conceivably have done more to determine the course of history of his country than Alger Hiss did at Yalta as assistant to the Assistant Secretary of State and one of the main architects of the Yalta appeasement conference; Alger Hiss who, across the river from you, was convicted in a Federal court by 12 men of a Federal jury not for any charge of treason because of the statute of limitations, but convicted for lying about the fact that he was engaging in treason while serving as assistant to the Assistant Secretary of State.

HENRY JULIAN WADLEIGH

For Clementis, I give you Henry Julian Wadleigh who was a colleague of Alger Hiss in the State Department and who, like Alger, had graduated from our great universities with a Phi Beta Kappa key and summa cum laude, and who, even beyond Alger Hiss, had gone off to Oxford to study; a man who, unfortunately, in many ways has not attained the same degree of national attention as Alger Hiss because he did not happen to have a $20,000 a year job in a great American foundation, financed by American business incidentally, at the time they caught him.

When they caught Hiss he was working for the Carnegie Foundation. When they caught Henry Julian Wadleigh, he had a very unimportant job. So each case was not equally well publicized.

To protect his $20,000-a-year job with the Carnegie Peace Foundation, of which he was a leading light, Alger Hiss lied to the judge and the jury. With no job to protect and the House Committee on Un-American Activities closing in on him, Henry Julian Wadleigh confessed to his crime and said, "Of course, for hundreds of times I delivered security secrets from the State Department to Russian Communists in New York and in Washington."

He finally turned State's evidence and testified against Alger Hiss, his colleague, in the particular court case in which Alger Hiss was convicted.

CARL ALDO MARZANI

For Fierlinger I give you Carl Aldo Marzani now in the Federal penitentiary because he was caught by the FBI working as a Communist in our State Department in one of the key spots where he was trying to confuse and befuddle a country, to misinterpret the codes and to distort the messages being sent perhaps from our foreign dispatch offices in China and in Asia, thereby making it more probable that we would develop a program and an attitude and a policy toward China which would serve the Communists and sabotage the free. So it is no exaggeration to say the formula is the same here as the one used in Prague.

Czechoslovakia was closer to Russia than Washington. It was smaller. They did not have as long a history and background and experience in democracy as we did. So Czechoslovakia fell to the Communist conspirators.

I am not suggesting we are about to fall by a coup d'état to the Communists but I am suggesting that the Communists in our Government have had influence in the past so tremendous as to make us realize how easy it must have been for them to destroy freedom entirely and to sell countries out to their foreign masters when they served the government.

Poland is next to Czechoslovakia. I do not have to tell the people of Elizabeth, N. J., who live here in this great cosmopolitan area how the Poles throughout history have been devoted to freedom, dedicated to an indefatigable zest for freedom, and every time aggressors ground the Polish people down, they rose up like the courageous soldiers that they are to recapture for themselves the control of their own destiny. But this time something happened to the Poles because at Yalta where Mr. Hiss served so energetically, Mr. Stalin said to our leaders at Yalta that in the postwar world he thought it was only fair that the Communist government in Russia should have control of that portion of Poland after the war that the Russians had conquered fighting as an ally of Adolph Hitler in the first months of World War II.

Oh, how people such as those who financed the picket lines in front of this hotel tonight hate to be reminded of the sordid facts of history. They want us to forget that when the Nazis and Hitler so unjustifiedly attacked the Poles from the front and drove through Danzig and into Poland and when the Poles were defending so valorously Warsaw with the Hun at their gate, the Red Armies of Russia attacking Poland by surprise from the rear gave her the coup de grâce that destroyed the fighting capacity of the Poles and that the Russians attacked the Poles in conformity with the agreement between Hitler, Von Ribbentrop, Molotov, and Stalin which was the pact that gave birth to World War II.

HOW POLAND WAS ENSLAVED

The Communists do not like to be reminded of that but it is written in the red blood of history. And so Stalin said to our leaders at Yalta, "Since we fought for some time as an ally of Hitler's, since Communists and Nazis joined in an attack against the Poles, since in that conflict we conquered everything east of the Curzon line, that we expect to keep after the war is over."

We protested very feebly and very ineffectively and acquiesced to the eternal shame of our country and helped perhaps toward the building of the third world war. In all events, the Russians went in. They did not stop at the Curzon line. They drove right on and took all of Poland and went further than that, if you please, and took the eastern provinces of Germany. They have them to this date and this late hour and there is less freedom there than there was 20 years ago.

Now I come to China. There are some 450,000,000 human beings today under the yoke in China. Tonight's newspapers bring the report that they have captured the first big island as a stepping stone to Formosa and the timetable indicates that May or June will likely be the time when they will attempt to capture Formosa.

WHAT HAPPENED IN CHINA

Remember China. That is the only country in the world that ever fought a war for the United States. We have fought a lot of wars for other countries. We fought to liberate the people from the tyranny of Spain.

We fought wars for different causes and different creeds and for different areas of the world and have joined our force and prowess and idealism with like-minded people against common enemies time and anon, but let the oldest historian here, if he can, pass up a note asking your speaker to explain some exception that he thinks he has found to the generalization that no other country in history ever fought a war for us except China under the nationalistic government of Chiang Kai-shek.

At Pearl Harbor the bombs came dropping from the Japanese by surprise, butchering, and murdering hundreds and hundreds of American youth on a pretty Sunday morning. After we declared war on the Japs and the Germans and the Italians declared war on us and we declared war on them, we were in it in a two-front war.

Our military men very wisely, in my opinion, decided that the thing to do first of all was to defeat Hitler and Mussolini. They were the tough guys. So we sent an emissary to Chiang Kai-shek and said, "Look, fellow, we are all in this war together now. It is true the Japs have attacked us and we are fighting the Japs and while you are not fighting the Italians and you are not fighting the Germans, if you would just be willing to keep on fighting the Japs all alone for a while, sacrifice a few hundred thousand more dead Chinese soldiers and a few more provinces of China to buy time enough for us to defeat Hitler and Mussolini, we solemnly promise you that after that we will come back and help drive the Japs out of your country and help restore to your government the autonomy of China."

Chiang Kai-shek said, "Well, I will try, but we have been fighting a long time. Can't you give me a little more help than that?" And so in a moment of almost unprecedented magnanimity we said, "This is what we will do. Since we are now in the war against Japan ourselves from now on we will not sell the Japanese any more scrap iron and oil for the duration of the war," because we had been selling it up to 2 days before Pearl Harbor to help the Japs attack Chiang Kai-shek. Anyhow, the Chinese kept their promise.

They lost most of their provinces and they lost over a million men instead of the several hundred thousand we asked them to exchange for time. We kept part of our promise.

We defeated Hitler and Mussolini and we were planning to go over to help China but the Yalta Conference came along and at Yalta it is recorded in the agreement that Stalin said, "I want to have from China the heart of the country, the Ruhr of Asia, Manchuria."

He insisted and, for the first time in American history, we sold out an ally who had fought for us in a war and we turned to the country who had fought a war for us and said, "On second thought, you Nationalists are not as liberal as we thought you were. You are kind of reactionary and we do not believe you have a representative enough government," and so we sold out Manchuria to the Communists and they have been rolling through China ever since.

Those are facts from the book of records. To me it is particularly bad not only because of the infamy it has brought to us in the eyes of people all over the world who cannot understand that kind of ingratitude, but because it has plunged us into such a situation that as of last night, anyhow, our Department of State still has no policy toward Asia.

The last announcement by the Secretary of State was to "let the dust settle in our eyes."

I heard him in the Statler Hotel last Saturday night address the American Society of Newspaper Editors. The advance blurbs indicated he was going to talk about Asiatic policy, and that is why I went. But he told us nothing. There is not anybody in this room I know and there is not anybody in the United States Senate I know who could define for you what the American foreign policy is as of today toward half the people of the world, those who live in Asia. But tonight we want to talk about freedom, so I point out simply that there is no freedom of choice left for the Chinese, no freedom of choice for any Chinaman because the Russian Communists control the situation.

AMERICA CONFRONTS ITS GREATEST PERIL

Adding their 450,000,000 to the 195,000,000 of Russia and the population of the other areas I have mentioned and you now have for the first time in history over 800,000,000 human beings controlled and directed by a force which tells us and tells the world it intends to destroy Christianity and freedom in America.

We have never faced a peril like it before and that is why a great American, former Gen. George Marshall, told an audience the other evening that communism is the greatest peril that America has ever faced.

That is why there is some justification in the fact we are spending over $20,000,000,000 of your money this year to try to defend ourselves against communism abroad and to try to weed it out of positions of importance here at home. That is why I think it is tremendously important that every adult American citizen understands exactly what communism is, how it operates, how it establishes its friendly fronts, how it controls and contaminates people and gets some folks with good intentions to carry out its nefarious goals and purposes.

That is why I think unless we can conquer the Communist conspiracy at home and stop movements which tend to make it stronger, we cannot expect to remain free in America against that kind of peril, a peril so great that in just 100 years it has come to control the lives of almost exactly the same number of human beings as are today influenced by the great doctrines of Christianity in the 20 centuries that we have had the Christian religion.

In one-twentieth the time communism has come to influence as many people as the Christian Church, including all the Protestant denominations, the Catholic Church, and the Jewish faith combined, and it is gaining on us by the hour mostly, as I see it, because somehow or other we failed to be able to put into harness the great capacity for constructive good represented by individuals like you in meetings like this.

DO YOU KNOW WHAT COMMUNISM REALLY IS?

Now, what is communism? It is not the thing that Karl Marx and Dr. Engels wrote about 100 years ago when they issued Das Kapital and issued also the Communist Manifesto.

It is not an economic creed. It is not built on that original concept that they talked about that Communists should take from people according to their ability and give to people according to their need. There is nothing particularly inimicable about that. There is nothing in a creed like that even though they continued to practice it which would require appropriating $20,000,000,000 to defeat it or to stop it.

There is nothing in a creed like that which could conquer Poland and China and try to organize the world against us; just an economic creed which, in my opinion, could not work but, otherwise, nothing particularly wrong with it.

They departed from that concept long ago. When I visited the Russian equivalent of the Westinghouse plant in Leningrad in 1945, when I visited the production places of the big Stalin Motor Works in Moscow and the tank factory in Stalingrad, I found individuals working on the production line being paid by piecework under conditions of the speed-up which no American labor leader would dare to suggest for his people in this country. They have gotten entirely away from the economic factor. It is not an economic creed, neither is it a political party. That is the thing that somehow or other I have been trying to explain along with some other speakers in America for 20 years.

That is the one thing we are trying to get the Members of Congress and the country to understand so that we can have some such legislation as these pickets are protesting against out here because some bewildered individual, some great original member of the bewilderment bund has told them that it is a law which operates against a political party. We have got to understand if you are going to remain free that the Communist conspiracy is exactly that, that it is not a political party, that it has never operated like a political party, that it does not pretend in the confines of its own meetings even remotely to resemble a political party, but that it is something which you can now explain and define and observe in 14 different countries in the laboratory of life as an international conspiracy. So we know what it is.

A political party has candidates for office, has campaigns. It has campaign chairmen and propaganda and headquarters and conducts campaigns up and down the highways and the byways, but, above everything else, a political party is an institution which seeks to achieve its objective at the polling place, and if any institution in our midst is not endeavoring to reach its decisions at the polling places by the ballot, whatever else in the world it is, it is not a political party.

All right, the Communists have 14 countries. I have told you who they are, how they got that way. In not a single country of the world have the Communists ever gotten into power by ballot, nor have they ever conducted themselves like a political party, nor have they ever succeeded in electing their leaders to authority, and in not a single country of the world where they have gotten into power have they ever stayed in power by holding an honest election. So obviously they are not a political party.

What are they then? I think it is easy to define. I think it is vitally important to you men and women out there in the ranks grappling to retain some last vestige of freedom for yourself and your children to know exactly what it is that organizes the forces of collectivism throughout the world and would destroy you and the dignity of your position and the integrity of your enterprise.

AN ACCURATE WORKING DEFINITION OF COMMUNISM

Here is a definition that nobody can deny because you can find it proving itself in the crucible of life in every country which the Communists now occupy. Communism is a godless way of life that holds that all of the means of production, all the means of distribution, and the flow of capital shall be controlled in the capital city of the land by a selected group of individuals who permit no opposition and who join themselves with other Communists throughout the world in promoting a world-wide dictatorship under the control of the Kremlin. Let me say it again because if every American knew that, my fellow Americans, we would win this fight against communism.

If every American knew that, we would win the cold war quickly and completely:

If every American knew that, we could help explain it to the world and soon cause communism to dry and wither on the vine. Communism is a godless way of life. Why godless? Are they afraid of preachers particularly? No.

They are godless because they will not permit a Communist to serve two masters. They will not permit a Communist to believe there is anything higher than Joe Stalin and the head of the Politburo. Communism is a godless way of life in which a selected group of men in the capital city of the land permit no opposition. If you oppose them, you get locked up like Vogeler did or like the Methodist bishops did or like Mindszenty did. It is a godless way of life in which a selected group of individuals in the capital city of the land control—it does not say own—all of the means of production, the farms, the factories, the mills; all the means of distribution, the railroads, the ship lines, the telephone companies; the flow of capital, the banks, the insurance companies, the building and loan agencies, the entire economic fabric. They control it and they join themselves with like-minded men around the world to bring about a Communist dictatorship headed by Moscow.

IF WAR COMES, ALL COMMUNISTS WILL SUPPORT RUSSIA

How easily and quickly we Americans forget. About 18 months ago Stalin and the Politburo decided to make a demonstration around the globe that all Communists would work and fight for a common dictatorship. They sent out the order to Togliatti in Italy, to Jacques Duclos and Maurice Thorez in France, to Foster across the river from Elizabeth, N. J., and they said to each of them, "Within 72 hours tell the public in the countries in which you live what will happen in the event of a war between the Communists and your country." And Togliatti said, "I hope it never comes, but if it comes, the Italian Communists will fight on the side of their Russian brothers."

The French Communist leaders, Thorez and Duclos, said, "We hope that war never comes, but if it comes, French communism and Russian communism will be joined together on the same side of that great class struggle," and Dennis and Foster said, "In America if war comes, you can be sure the American Communists will not be found fighting on the side of the capitalistic American Government."

They told it to our face. They thumbed their nose at us, and still a lot of us are reluctant to do anything which might in any way inconvenience the Communists or the bleeding-heart sentimentalists, the pseudo progressives and the pseudo liberals, and the members of the bewilderment bund who help them achieve their nefarious purposes, who help them achieve their purposes right in the heart of the freemen of the greatest enterprise system in the world.

That is what communism is, and it is moving in our direction. Look at England, a great land of private enterprise, probably the most canny businessmen and tradesmen in the world, who built from a group of small islands a mighty empire because of their business acumen, and in the hour of victory after they had fought back the Hun and withstood the blitzkrieg and knocked back the buzz bombs, when those tight, little islands had rallied behind the dynamic and vital leadership of Churchill and brought England to its greatest purple hour of triumph, they discarded the formula of freedom that made them great and adopted in the hour of victory the formula of failure that brought Hitler to his knees.

Ask some German-speaking member of the Elizabeth community, and if he knows his German economic history, he will tell you that the word "Nazi" simply means a series of alliterations which represent the contraction of the words in German meaning the National Socialistic Party of Germany. That is what the word "Nazi" means, and that is what the British have adopted, and it is bringing Great Britain to her knees and destroying another great area of human freedom in the world.

A great New Jerseyite by the name of Albert Hawkes has been traveling around America a good bit, with a British scholar whom I knew in Britain and whom I have met over here, by the name of Dr. Palmer. I presume you have heard him. I hope you have. If not, I hope you do.

I remember so well what he told us one day at luncheon in the Senate Restaurant when I said to him, "Dr. Palmer, how is the British experiment with socialism working out?" and he said, "The British people are drinking the poisons of communism out of a cup called socialism."

HOW COMMUNISM IS LINKED TO SOCIALISM

We must remember that there is a silver thread of consistency binding together all these isms of centralized control. The differences and distinctions between nazism, fascism, communism, state socialism, nationalism, a welfare state, and a planned economy are much fewer and significant than the similarities which bind them together.

I want to get right down to brass tacks now and demonstrate the similarity between the first step, whether you call it a security state or a welfare state or a planned economy, and the last step which is nazism or communism or fascism. They are bound together inevitably by one simple, understandable philosophy, and that is the philosophy that businessmen such as you cannot be trusted to spend your own money wisely in

your own behalf so that you should consequently give increasing amounts of your money to politicians like me to spend for you because we will spend it more wisely than you can spend it.

It is the philosophy that tells you to your face and makes you like it that businessmen like you are too dishonest or too dumb or too crooked to be trusted to manage private enterprises in the public welfare so you should turn the management over to the politicians in jobs like mine from the Olympian heights of our established purity and we will do the job better for the general public. That is the basic tie that binds all of these various forms of collectivism together.

Washington and London today both are teeming with politicians who believe in their hearts that only men in political jobs are honest enough, ethical enough, and wise enough to spend the Nation's substance and to manage the Nation's enterprises.

I disagree with that philosophy but I think you will find that it is part of every one of those isms based on centralized controls in a central city.

Now I think I know how they get that way. I have spent a good portion of my life, longer than I have been in Congress, teaching economic and political history around the world. I know something about it. I received a master's degree at one time over at Columbia University. I never used to admit that, however, until General Eisenhower got to be president. [Laughter.]

ALTERNATIVE NO. 1

Let me make another generalization that somebody might want to question in our questions period. In all of human history, some 3,500 years of it, in which mankind in different areas of the world has been experimenting with some kind of national socialism, over and over again it has been tried, and every time it has always ended with one of two results, never anything else; sometimes at the end of the experiment you have found a people completely disillusioned, you have found them confused, you have found them approaching bankruptcy, you have found them escaping from the trap of national socialism 15 minutes before it is too late as the Australians and the New Zealanders did in the elections last fall.

The British brought socialism to a dead heat in their recent election as we Americans spewed it out after having tried it, please remember, as the first economic formula ever tried by white men on the North American Continent because after we signed the Mayflower Pact, those colonial forebears of ours established up on the cold New England coast a philosophy of socialism. They built the stockade to protect them. They sent our colonial forefathers out to gather things according to their ability to be distributed by the politicians of that stockade in accordance with the needs of the community. Some were assigned the job of catching fish, some the job of shooting wild turkey, some the job of trapping bear, and some the job of cutting wood.

Do you know what happened? History records a stupendous percentage of our early colonial forefathers starved to death that first rugged winter on the New England shores.

What was the reason? Then as now there were a lot of early American chiselers among the early American colonials and they did not want to go to work. [Laughter.] They were human beings like we are, that is all.

Some of them who were assigned the job of cutting down trees preferred to fish. Some of them that were assigned the job of going fishing preferred to bathe in the sea. Some of them that were assigned to shoot wild turkey did not like the blunderbuss as it went off against one's shoulder; and history further records we could not commemorate the first bountiful Thanksgiving Day, that great American holiday, on American soil until we discarded the philosophy of national socialism and adopted the philosophy of private enterprise instead, and we have been working at it ever since.

Strangely enough, in spite of all the carping criticisms of all the members of all the liberal philosophies of the world, by following the principle of private enterprise, this country in a century and a half has become envied by everybody. It is the only country in the world that has to establish immigration bars to keep the people out. The rest of them all put up the bars to keep the people in. They want to come over here and practice freedom and liberty and private enterprise.

ALTERNATIVE NO. 2

Without exception, I say national socialism has always ended that way or else it has ended this way: People have found that in order to get efficiency and in order to compel the chiselers to work and get things done, they had to increasingly give more and more power to fewer and fewer people at the top until a Hitler brought efficiency about in Germany by depriving the people of the freedom of choice, until a Mussolini made the trains run on time in Italy all right but nobody in Italy any longer had control of his own destiny, or until a Stalin demonstrates that he can produce with a great capacity all right, but he does it by the manhours of people working in the political concentration camps of the Siberian slopes where they now have some 12,000,000 or 15,000,000 human beings working as prisoners of the state because they disagreed politically with the party in power.

There has never been any exception to the rule. Do you know why? I think it was brought out in a debate that I had with one of the executive officials down in Washington some time ago, a very able fellow, an entirely patriotic fellow, one of these people who have been bewildered and confused by the preachments of the Communists but who considers himself a good American and who knowingly would not, for 1 minute, help the Communists. It is by confusing and controlling the thinking of good-minded individuals and pure patriots that the Communists achieve most of their objectives.

HOW A PLANNED ECONOMY LEADS TO TYRANNY

We were arguing about a planned economy for America. He said we ought to have one and I said we should not have one, and he was somewhat at an advantage over me because it was difficult for me to focus my eyes on him when he talked because I was being blinded by the light glistening from the Phi Beta Kappa key off his chain when he talked.

He was pushing people like you around, believing in his heart that there is not a man in this room who can be trusted to spend your own money or to run your own business as well as he could do it from the vantage point of that Phi Beta Kappa key.

So he said to me, "I can't understand how a Senator from a State like South Dakota would be against a planned economy. Certainly you must believe in planning, Senator, for yourself and your family, for old age, for a vacation, for the education of your children. Certainly, Senator, you must believe in planning ahead for the next election."

He was right on that one, you bet I do. [Laughter.] It is tough enough for a Republican to get elected nowadays and if we did not plan ahead, we would not have a chance.

He then said, "Without a planned economy, Senator, how can you be sure that all the people who make automobiles can sell all the automobiles that they make, that somebody will not make cars that he cannot sell? How can you be sure without a planned economy that steel will be equitably distributed among the people who need steel? How can you be sure that the little fellow who needs some steel to make razor blades and baby carriages and roller skates can get the steel he needs; that some big corporation making railroad rolling stock will not take all the steel and freeze out the little fellow?

"How can you be sure of that unless you have a planned economy?"

Then he sat down and it was my turn to talk. I was not in any hurry. He practically had me persuaded by that time. [Laughter.]

Believe me, when you bounce these seductive phrases up against the propagandized mind of the average American these days, you can sell him almost anything, especially if you do it from the wrong end of a train going west on a nonpolitical tour at public expense. It is an easy job, I assure you. [Laughter.] But the point I am trying to bring out is that he stopped there for me to answer his arguments and so I had to say something.

I was thinking and trying to figure out how to make the best approach because this was a debate a lot of people were attending and I was badly handicapped anyhow, he having been educated at Harvard University and having one of those Harvard accents. They always kind of frighten me, to begin with. I shudder sometimes to think how much a Harvard accent has cost the American taxpayer in the last 20 years. [Laughter.]

I was just a fresh-water Senator, so I said to him, "Let me ask you a couple of questions, Professor; you have been asking me a lot of them."

"Of course," he said.

I said, "I would like to know, in the first place, Professor, whether you would agree with me that a planned economy cannot achieve anything for anybody just as long as it remains a plan. A plan in a political platform wrapped up in some bureaucrat's desk drawer is not any good until you put the plan into use. Would you agree to that?"

"Yes, I agree to that," he said.

"I wonder, Professor," I said, "If you would agree with one other thing I would like to ask about it. Would you agree with me that a planned economy cannot possibly do any good for your family or solve the predicament with regard to the distribution of steel so long as the people who make the plan simply send it through the mail under the franking privilege or announce it over the radio, so long as people in America are still permitted to accept the plan or reject it as they choose, would you agree, Professor, that a planned economy cannot work until and unless you give the politicians who make the plan the police power to compel the rest of the people to go along with the plan or go to jail?

"Would you agree, Professor, that for a planned economy to work you have got to have that kind of pushy government, that kind of political control, that kind of coerced cooperation?"

And because he was an honest, respectable man, he said, "Of course, I agree to that but you have to remember to consider the greater good and not the individual good, and that in order to achieve the benefits of a planned economy, you must compel the stubborn individual who is a recalcitrant to go along or go to jail."

And if you think they are not talking about a planned economy now in what we still think is a free enterprise system, let me point out to you that on the floor of the Senate 2 weeks ago on two consecutive days, two United States Senators made two speeches wherein one of them said, "The time has come in America when we should establish some kind of law, some kind of regulatory board which would deny the steel industry the present authority it has to make unjustifiable profits. It is making profits which are so large it is jeopardizing the economy of America." We have to have politicians regulating it.

The next day one of his colleagues from the same side of the aisle got up and gave a speech and said, "The time has come in America when we have to have regulatory power, when we have got to let the politicians exercise authority on the coal industry because the coal industry is not making enough profit so that it can function as it should in our economy," So they get you coming and going. If you are making money they have got to control you because you are making too much and if you are not making money, they have to control you because they need more people to pay taxes.

WHAT YOU MUST DO TO STAY FREE

If you accept the philosophy that only a politician in a job like mine has any answers that will work, has any judgments that are sound, knows how to spend the money that you earn, then you accept the philosophy of the welfare state, of the security state, of the planned economy, of national socialism, of communism, of fascism, and nazism. They are linked together by that fundamental conviction which I consider a fundamental fallacy.

I have now been down in Washington for 12 years. In that time I have known all the Presidents we have had down there by their first names. I might say we have not had very many in that time. [Laughter.]

I have known all the Members of the House of Representatives and of the Senate. I have served in both branches and I am a sort of gregarious fellow. I know them, I like them, and I get along very well with them. I know the members of the President's Cabinet and I want to tell you, frankly, that in all the time I have been down there I have yet to meet the first politician, Republican or Democrat, in the White House or out of it, in Congress or in the civil service, any place any where, that I think is so wise and so good that I would like to turn over to him all of my money and all of my freedom and say, "You take the ball and run with it."

That is the thing they are talking about. That is the thing that it is up to you to stop. That is the thing that can be stopped only when men and women like you begin to resent articulately and in organized action any politician from any party who insults you to the point of saying, "I am going to take your money and your judgment and exercise them and spend them for you in your own behalf."

If we are going to have freedom in America, those who are presently the recipients of the benefits of freedom must speak out in its defense and its support and must unite themselves, it seems to me, in some kind of concerted effort to defend it. Let me now in 4 or 5 minutes suggest some practical things for the men and women of Elizabeth, N. J., to do in this connection and then I will be ready for your questions.

In the first place, it seems to me, that we have to recognize that if we are going to maintain freedom in America, it is essential that Americans generally understand exactly what it is all about and what communism is and how it works, that we have to conduct an educational campaign in our communities day by day and year by year, making sure everybody knows what those precious points are in the American success formula that we must save.

WE MUST PROTECT OUR AMERICAN SUCCESS FORMULA

These factors are private enterprise, individual initiative, political independence, simple little things like that. We have to protect them from attacks, from the malicious Communist conspirator no less and no more than we protect them from attacks by those who do not understand the purport of the things they do.

So I suggest that perhaps from the organizations of which you are members, if you belong to the American Legion or the Methodist Church, if you belong to the Veterans of Foreign Wars or the Kiwanis Club, if you belong to the Elks Lodge or the United States Chamber of Commerce or the Women's Federated Clubs, you might want to be sure that on May 13 and 14 that there is a representative of your organization at the La Salle Hotel in Chicago where under the able and courageous leadership of a great American, National Commander George Craig of the American Legion, the third and the most important meeting of the all-important American Conference to Promote Freedom and Defeat Communism is going to be held. The first conference was held in the Astor Hotel in New York City in January and the second conference in the executive committee rooms of the American Legion Building in Indianapolis in March.

BETTER JOIN THE ALL-AMERICAN CONFERENCE

This is the third conference. This is it. This meeting on May 13 and 14 is to determine whether there are in America enough individuals and organizations willing to join together in a common front against communism and for freedom to defeat these forces of collectivism moving in on us from every corner of the world. Either we succeed in Chicago in May or America continues to lack a united front and a cohesive weapon with which to combat communism.

We propose to set in motion this simple program: that the local members of such national organizations as Kiwanis, the A. F. of L., the United States Chamber of Commerce, the churches, the individual patriotic organizations of men and women, etc., shall form community-action committees in a city like Elizabeth, N. J., and see to it that at least these four things are done as part of the program of the All-American Conference:

The first is to have taught in every school in America a few rudimentary facts about freedom and what it means and how we got it and how we can keep it; of what private enterprise and political independence mean in America now and how to support them; a little quick capsule course to be added to what they are being taught so that every American who graduates from a public school will know in his heart why he is proud to be an American and what he has to do to keep America American and to avoid the pitfalls of all forms of collectivism.

No. 2, to have in every community of the land of 1,000 people or more a "Know Your America Week" in which a program by the whole community is developed for the purpose of making every citizen in that community understand better and appreciate more the principles upon which America depends and upon which our freedom now rests.

San Jose, Calif., is kicking off from July 2 to July 8 with 300,000 people in a "Know Your America Week" launched by the Kiwanis Club of that community. Memphis, Tenn., did the job a little while ago and I had the happy pleasure on Good Friday night of talking to 5,000 people in the city of Memphis about what it is we have got to do to stay free and how it is you can tell when something is moving us toward communism, because it always moves by the formula of taking money and power from individual citizens and giving that power and that money to the palace politicians. It never misses. This does not mean, and let me make that clear, that everybody who favors centralized controls, it does not mean that everybody who favors deficit spending, it does not mean that everybody who believes in building a great regulatory planned economy is a Communist. But it does mean exactly that every Communist in America without exception always favors all three of those encroachments upon your individual liberties. They never miss. They know political controls are the stepping stones toward communism.

A "Know Your America Week" would help in fighting these steps and trends, for example, through the newspapers and through the schools and on the radio. It could do some of the things which were done so splendidly by the Standard Steel Spring Co. with its series of advertisements which have been reprinted in this booklet entitled "Something To Think About" which you as executives can get free of charge by writing a postcard to the General Motors Corp., Detroit, Mich. They have made this available to do their part to help keep freedom so you can reprint in your newspapers without giving any credit to the Standard Steel Spring Co. or the General Motors Corp. or to the Hayes-McFarland Advertising Co. in Chicago which set it up, this dramatic lesson, sponsored by your local employers telling the story, "Socialism! Brother You Don't Know the Half of It."

Then this advertisement goes ahead and starts with this language: "Let's put away all the $10 words and call a spade a spade. Socialism in plain English is nothing more nor less than political management of the lives, the total lives, of all the people," and then down here in every paragraph, "Facts no American should ever forget."

A "KNOW YOUR AMERICA WEEK" IN EVERY COMMUNITY

In this "Know Your America Week" we are going to try to make every American always remember facts like these; that in Russia under communism a man who works a week earns 17 pounds of sugar, if he works a week in Great Britain he gets 282 pounds of sugar and if he works a week under the private-enterprise system of America at the same job, he gets 500 pounds of sugar. That is what the workingmen are interested in.

There would not be enough money in the Electrical Union in Elizabeth to hire pickets to be in front of this hotel tonight if the people in those picket lines really understood the kind of lives they would have to lead if communism were to prevail in America. But we have not taught the people the facts. We have not brought out these truths, "Facts No American Should Ever Forget."

The average number of hours of working time required to purchase a man's pair of shoes is as follows: In the United States, you can earn the shoes in 6 hours, in Great Britain, 25 hours; and in Russia in 145 hours. We would like to have all Americans know those facts, but it cannot be done unless or until men and women like you somehow or other get into the fight.

A politician cannot say it because people would think it is Republican propaganda. You can explain it. The schools can tell us. The churches can tell it.

So the second thing in this new program is to encourage and sponsor "Know Your America Weeks" throughout the country.

The third is to project the dividends from our freedoms more generally throughout our communities. Your preacher knows and I know, because at one time I taught school and he is a preacher and knows, that the dividends of freedom are not divided as fairly as they might be in Elizabeth, N. J., or in South Dakota. You have probably got some place here you do not take Aunt Mary to when she comes in from the country, and you show her the sights. There are some places in town that you are ashamed of; we have them in every community.

Let us see to it that by community action and not by bureaucratic control, not by a new set of taxes by which we collect a dollar from you and give back 25 cents to clear out the slums of Elizabeth, N. J., but by community action let us improve our towns and communities one at a time, making them better one at a time, like we started them in the first place, one at a time. Let us see to it that the children that need their tonsils

taken care of in Elizabeth, N. J., get it done by the collective generosity of the medical people of Elizabeth, N. J., and by community clinics and not by political doctors coming down from Washington. Let us cooperate in projecting the dividends of freedom increasingly for more and more people. That also helps to defeat communism.

Finally, and fourth in this proposed program, behind which we hope to put the united effort of organizations representing 60,000,000 Americans, come the middle of next month, is to alert ourselves to protect our freedoms.

FREEDOM IS WELL WORTH DEFENDING

It would not be fair, and I am not going to do it, to ask anybody here just what have you done, John Smith, to protect your freedoms since the war. What have you actually done to stay free? If all of us do nothing, of course, we are not going to stay free.

Freedom is everybody's job but unless everybody works at the job, nobody stays free, and so we hope to get people in every community alert to discovering who the people are in their localities who are the Communists and to identify them, and expose them. Do not arrest them, do not put them in jail, just focus the spotlight of public opinion on them and they will wither and die like any other disease germ in any other body, but let people know who they are.

Do not let them get into your school faculties, do not let them get into your unions, do not let them get into your women's clubs, or your business organizations or your churches. Protect America.

A simple thing could be to start with to find out from the Attorney General those organizations now numbering over 100 that the Communists control today and make sure that those organizations are known by name to all the people of Elizabeth, N. J., so nobody here is unknowingly helping those organizations to destroy freedom. In a capsule, that is the program. It is the only one available.

In conclusion, let me say that I am convinced that we are not going to win the battle for freedom simply by relying on fellows in the political profession in jobs like mine. If we save freedom now at this late date, it is going to be because individual citizens in towns like yours do something different somehow in the next 5 years from what has been happening in America in the last decade.

Thank you. I am now ready for your questions.

(Audience arises and applauds.)

Mr. STRINGFELLOW. We have a large number of questions, and, to save time, I do not think I shall read them. I will ask the Senator to read them, but I should like to say at the outset that I am having this speech and these questions recorded and I shall distribute them to you at an early date with my compliments. [Applause.]

I am mindful of the fact, as is the Senator, that there are a great many people in this audience who are saying to themselves, and probably to others at the table, "That was a great speech but he delivered it to the wrong audience." Well, let me say this to you, he delivered it to the only kind of an audience that can save America.

Another thing is that if you and others like you have as much love for America as our founding fathers had, then the kind of a speech that was given here tonight will make each one of us become Paul Reveres, and if there was ever a time in the history of this great Republic of ours when we need Paul Reveres that time is now.

As I listened to this marvelous address, I was reminded of a benediction which was given by a former chaplain of the United States Senate which I should like to read. It is composed of only five lines. The chaplain's name was Peter Marshall.

"Oh, God, our Father, let us not be content to wait and see what will happen, but give us the determination to make the right things happen. Give us the courage to stand for something lest we fall for anything."

I think that summarizes what the Senator was driving at tonight. Now I would like to ask the Senator if he will read these questions himself. That will save a little time.

Will you answer them, sir?

QUESTION-ANSWER SESSION

Senator MUNDT. All right, I will do the best I can. Here is the first question:

"Senator MUNDT, you have brought together a number of important historical items pointing up the dangers of communism. Can you suggest why this material is so often ignored by our most respected newspapers?"

It is difficult to know that. I am greatly disturbed about the way in which some newspapers have reported some of these Communist things. I did not realize it nearly as much until it fell to my unhappy responsibility to serve as chairman of the Un-American Activities Committee during the time we were having the Hiss investigation with Whittaker Chambers and the famous pumpkin papers, and we got a pretty bad kicking around on that committee, as you probably remember, up until the very hour that Hiss was convicted for the second time or convicted finally probably, I should say, after a hung jury resulted in the first trial at New York.

Since then there have been a lot of red-faced newspapers. The newspapers of America, insofar as they are published in communities of 100,000 or less, I think have done a pretty good job of explaining communism. When you get up into a great metropolitan paper, of course, you have a multi-million-dollar corporation which very frequently has its editorials written by $100-a-week individuals who do not have a complete understanding of the processes of private enterprise.

When you take away in the newspaper business the ownership relationship between the editorial writer and the paper you lose something which I think is highly valuable in American journalism. I do feel that newspapers generally, though, are coming to understand better what communism is. I have talked about this many times with J. Edgar Hoover, and I would be surprised if we have in America over 5,000 people—and I think that is a generous guess—who actually understand what communism is and how it operates and its whole historic background.

I think that men like Mr. Budenz and Mr. Gitlow, who have left the Communist Party and are explaining and opposing it, are doing a great deal to help make that thing generally understood, but it is not something on which most of us have had any occasion to devote any study and, consequently, there is a paucity of information about it.

QUESTION NO. 2

"Are our educational institutions, in any appreciable measure, weak points in our fight against communism?"

I would say "No," as far as educational institutions are concerned. There are educators in many of our institutions, of course, who have been bewildered and confused, and some of them definitely captivated by the Communist doctrine. You and I know of a case out in the University of Washington with regard to that.

I spoke out in Washington last fall, and, as a matter of fact, I spoke in every State west of the Mississippi River on this creed last fall. Out in Seattle, Wash., I learned from Dr. Allen about the three Washington University professors who finally were removed from their jobs because it was discovered they were Communists. The pathetic thing about it was that in the final day of testimony before these professors were finally kicked off the public payroll it was brought out that they had been teaching there for 20 years as Communists—each of them.

It is impossible to estimate the number of young boys and girls whose souls were sent plumb to hell by the perverted mentalities of those Communist professors.

In this program that I mentioned with respect to the fourth point, protect our freedoms, we believe it is part of the community's responsibility to make sure that in the schools and in the universities and in the institutions that your children attend, in the institutions which your money helps support, that there should be no Communist professors. We do not want to get a gestapo in this country, but we want an alert citizenry which will do its individual part to eliminate these insidious influences.

QUESTION NO. 3

"Do you think laissez faire economics would give us maximum freedom? Do you think we have a chance of getting back to a laissez faire economy?"

I do not think it would give us a maximum freedom. I hope we never return to it. I think the important genius of America is that, more than any other area of the world, we have kept a happy working equilibrium between a complete opportunity state and the complete security state.

We do not pretend to give individuals as much security as they get, for example, out in Alcatraz, where they have complete protection against the vicissitudes of life, free medical care, permanent retirement [laughter], protection from any kind of invasion, and good food. They have security, if that is what they want.

Nor do we pretend to give Americans the complete opportunity state which would be the laissez faire state. We do not give an opportunity to an American that he could get if he wanted to go out, for example, to the Caribbean, to the semicivilized islands and areas of the world; if he wants to live under the regime of laissez faire where the law of the tooth and the fang and the claw prevail—that is not in America.

We have laws that we must obey and we have codes of ethics. We have business practices. We have state and national regulations, but we have kept an equilibrium here. There is opportunity enough for any good man to succeed, security enough for any honest man to be protected against the greater evils and vicissitudes and dangers of life; better than any other country, we have maintained the equilibrium.

Sometimes we go too far in the direction, I think, of too much opportunity as against security. Sometimes we go in the direction of providing too much security at the cost of opportunity; but so long as we keep them in balance, I think, we will have free enterprise and freedom in America.

QUESTION NO. 4

"Who was the Assistant Secretary of State for whom Hiss worked?"

Francis B. Sayre.

QUESTION NO. 5

"How did the Communists get our atomic-bomb secrets?"

Through infiltration; through espionage; through Dr. Fuchs; through the contact with Dr. May and the other Canadian espionage agents in the Canadian spy trials; through Alex Androvich, one of the Communist espionage agents in this country; through other Communist espionage agents in this country, some of whom, incidentally, escaped and returned to Russia without getting caught; through men like the university professor in Minnesota University who was caught relaying secrets from the Berkeley, Calif., atomic ring to the Russians.

There were many leaks, and to that must be added that they worked out some of them

through their own genius because they captured a great many of the Nazi atomic scientists in the closing days of the war who are now working just as feverishly for communism as they worked for nazism and probably do not know the difference between the isms because it is measured only by the length of the mustaches of the two respective dictators [laughter].

They are just as happy one place as they were the other.

QUESTION NO. 6

"Would you care to give your opinion on the Senator McCARTHY episode?"

I will put that down for the moment and see if the other questions permit shorter answers.

QUESTION NO. 7

"You told us how communism through infiltration took over the government of many free and democratic countries. Why do our representatives in Washington condone the actions of individuals representing communism in this country?

"We spend millions of dollars and waste time through the slow legal approach to convict them. Why not fight fire with fire?"

That is a good question and it is related to the other. I will answer them both as the last question.

QUESTION NO. 8

"Is there, in your opinion, adequate legislation now available to deal with Communists in the Governments, Federal, State, and local? If not, what is lacking?"

That is related to the preceding two and it will be covered when I answer them.

QUESTION NO. 9

"What is the secret of successful resistance to the loss of freedom of such a relatively weak and vulnerable nation as Finland, particularly without open help from the United States in the way of ECA funds which seem to be so imperative to other stronger nations?"

I visited Finland on the same tour that I took with Vice President BARKLEY. We met President Paasikivi of Finland and spent considerable time with him. I remember one little humorous incident when ALBEN BARKLEY, in his big, fatherly way, said to him, "You are having a considerable amount of trouble in Finland and the heart of America beats for you. You paid your debts to us and we are always fond of you. We are sorry for the predicament in which Finland finds itself."

President Paasikivi is an old fellow and he has false teeth and he stutters a little bit.

"Yes," he said, "it is certainly true that things are pretty tough over here. We have been in two wars and lost both wars. War is a mighty bad thing, especially if you lose it."

I have thought about that many times. Wars are bad enough when you win, but when you lose them, they are pretty rugged, indeed. The secret of Finland, I think, is simply the fact that the Russians, of course, will take Finland when they want it, when they find it judicious to do so.

The Finns know that even better than we, but from the standpoint of infiltrating, from the standpoint of taking it over, they live so close to the Russians that they see the evils of communism so close to their own threshhold that they never voluntarily are going to grasp communism to their bosom. If and when the Russians decide to roll through Finland, there is not any amount of Marshall plan money, of course, or arms from this country that could conceivably stop that kind of an attack.

QUESTION NO. 10

"Is the Government supplying literature for distribution in plants such as ours for combating communism? If so, how can these be obtained?"

The Government is not, and in my opinion, the Government should not. If the Government distributes literature to the schools and the factories and to other people, it is almost certain to be contaminated and slanted by the particular political philosophy in power. I think those now in charge of the Government would do it and I think we Republicans would be guilty of falling for the same temptation if we should, by any chance, again ever control the Government. [Laughter.]

I would not myself have much hope for a free country like ours saving itself if it had to rely on politicians to the extent even of getting the Government to supply the information to relay to the workers in the factories. If we have not any more fortitude, if we have not any more spirit, if we have not any more gumption and plain old-fashioned South Dakota guts than to ask politicians to save us, to the extent that we cannot publish our own booklets and get our own facts as General Motors is doing and dig them out or write our Congressmen or Senators or have the Library of Congress supply us the evidence that we can reduce to print, I do not think we would deserve freedom and we would not postpone disaster very long with that kind of supine support.

QUESTION NO. 11

"What do you think of the World Federalists as a force toward world peace?"

The World Federalists along with the Ely Culbertson group and others have all proposed a number of interesting suggestions for meeting the problem of the atomic age.

In my opinion, the World Federalists fall down primarily in their failure to meet the biggest single problem that confronts us, and that is what to do about the atomic bomb.

Of all the groups that are struggling and grappling with some kind of program for collective security, I think the proposal recommended in part by the American Legion executive committee, recommended in part by Ely Culbertson's group, recommended in part by a group of 16 United States Senators—8 Democrats and 8 Republicans—is the best, This program proposes to call an international conclave of the world to which all the nations are invited, both those in and out of the United Nations, and in which the proposition is made to accept and adopt the Baruch proposal for atomic control, complete international inspection, complete demilitarization of the bomb, complete outlawry of it, complete protection by inspection and control against production of the bomb, and then after having agreed on that, ask all those countries of the world willing to join in such a collective organization for peace to step across the line and watch and wonder does Russia come across, does Tito come across, does Poland come across or not. If they do, by having the same kind of inspection that you have in your banks in New Jersey whereby the State banking inspector or the Federal bank examiner comes to the back door and says, "I am coming in and I am looking at the books," and whereby the president of the bank cannot say, "You can't come in Monday; come back Friday, I have got a little fixing to do on the books," it should work. [Laughter.] If we have the same kind of inspection the bank examiners make, we can, of course, protect ourselves against an atomic catastrophe. So, if Russia comes in, that problem is solved. If Russia does not come in, the problem is just exactly where it is now, except everybody knows what just a few people in the State Department and the Pentagon Building are now worrying about, and we then decide what to do with the free portion and the decent portion of the world toward organizing some kind of collective effort which is determined and proclaims so all can understand that Russia is not to be permitted to stockpile bombs enough to blow civilization off the face of the earth.

If we select that program, it is better than that proposed by the World Federalists, and it approaches the specific problem more directly, and that is a method showing how we can grapple with the problem of the bomb, and in my humble opinion, if we fail to grapple with that effectively some time within the next 5 years, we shall not have the opportunity to grapple with it once the Russians have outstripped us in the building of the bomb.

QUESTIONS NOS. 6, 7, AND 8

Now we have the three earlier questions which I will repeat and answer collectively and then at long last to your great relief, you will be permitted to go home.

8. "Is there, in your opinion, adequate legislation now available to deal with Communists in the governments—Federal, State, and local? If not, what is lacking?"

7. "You told us how communism through infiltration took over the government of many free and democratic countries. Why do our representatives in Washington condone the actions of individuals representing communism in this country? We spend millions of dollars and waste time through the slow, legal approach to convict them. Why not fight fire with fire?"

6. "Would you care to give your opinion on the Senator McCARTHY episode?"

I will take the Senator McCARTHY episode first. I am not a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee which is hearing the evidence presented by Senator McCARTHY. All I know is what I can pick up in the cloakrooms and hear in the committee meetings as a kibitzer and read in the newspapers, measured against my own experience as chairman of a committee for 2 years which dealt with the same specific problem when we were unearthing and convicting or getting confessions from Wadleigh and from Hiss.

I think that Senator McCARTHY in all probability at the end of his charges is going to render a public service in at least two ways. I believe the first is going to be a tightening of the loyalty screening by which the personnel of the State Department are selected.

It has been very embarrassing to the State Department to have to announce in response to McCARTHY'S charges that it has removed 205 security risks from the rolls of the State Department and to have to justify its removal of these people by saying, "Don't worry too much, they were not all Communist sympathizers, 91 of them were only homosexuals and sexual degenerates." [Laughter.]

Had it not been for Senator McCARTHY'S charges, probably nobody in this room would know about that except the Speaker who knew about it some time in advance in connection with another investigation. I think it is good that you should know those sordid facts.

I think it is good that Americans generally should know that since Yalta not only Hiss has been discovered and convicted and Wadleigh been smoked out, but that since Yalta 205 people have been removed; and if you are willing to accept the criterion employed by the State Department that the 91 moral degenerates were not necessarily security risks, it still leaves a considerable number.

All I can say after having talked with the fellows in the Kremlin a few times in 1945 is that I believe if you would let me put even 100 good American GI's who believe in our way of life in Joe Stalin's foreign office and keep them there for 90 days, I could have old Joe walking around Red Square singing Yankee Doodle Dandy at the end of that time. [Laughter.]

Therefore, in my opinion, even 100 disloyal State Department people are too many. McCARTHY smoked out these State Department figures. As to what he is going to find from now on, your guess is as good as mine. I think he rendered one other important service.

He focused attention on the policy of America toward Asia as it has never been

focused by any other spokesmen or series of events before. We know now that the Lattimore line was the State Department line in Asia.

We do not know, at least I do not know, whether Owen Lattimore was or is a Communist, but we have had presented before our viewpoint the whole series of Lattimore recommendations which one after another recommended that we pull out of China and turn it over to the Communist forces.

In my book, I am not so much concerned to find out whether Owen Lattimore is a Communist or an Eagle Scout as I am to know that his is the line followed by the State Department which has brought us close to disaster in Asia. That is history.

I think we have got to build a policy toward Asia. I think it should be an American policy supported without partisanship by both political parties; but I think it was good that we washed out the dirty linen and found out as a Nation, for once and for all, how we got where we are. We were licked by the Lattimore line.

It should make us more cautious. It should make us more constructive and it should make us more realistic about getting ahead in the future. One other thing I may say in passing is that I think McCARTHY suffers from one of the characteristics of most members of the Irish fraternity. I think frequently his testimony exceeds his evidence and he engages in extravagant statements.

I think by the same token the Tydings committee up until a few days ago was a pretty bad spectacle as to what the United States Senate should measure up to because it was too much of a partisan effort not to investigate the individuals named by McCARTHY, but to investigate McCARTHY and to try to discredit him. The country has finally made itself felt and its actions in Washington so that both McCARTHY and the committee realize it does not like to see a great political game played with something as serious as loyalty.

McCARTHY is consequently tempering his charges, making them more specific, and 2 days ago, at long last, the Senate investigating committee established a staff to look into the charges to make a report. Let me tell you now what I hope the outcome is.

WHAT THE SENATE INVESTIGATION SHOULD PRODUCE

I hope that the investigation is so thorough and so complete and so objective and so nonpartisan that at the end when the committee brings in a report, which I hope can be unanimous, you and I as ordinary American citizens can then have as much confidence in the loyalty of the members of the State Department still employed as we now have in the loyalty of the agents of the FBI. I do not think that is asking too much.

A NEW CRITERION OF LOYALTY FOR THE STATE DEPARTMENT

The FBI agent apprehends the kidnapper and catches the fellow who runs across a State line with a stolen automobile, but State Department officials these days make decisions affecting the lives of every individual in America and perhaps the lives of continents and civilizations. Therefore I do not think it is asking too much to give the same benefit of the doubt to the Government with regard to loyalty for the State Department officials that we have always given to the Government in analyzing the loyalty of agents of the FBI—and we have never had a disloyal agent in the FBI. So if you want to keep Reds out of the Government, you see, it can be done.

The other two questions lead me to a discussion of the picket line outside. It gives me a chance which I should not overlook. Perhaps some of you are going someplace, but I cannot go back to Washington until midnight anyhow, so I at least have got plenty of time. [Laughter.]

It gives me a chance which I should not overlook to offer at least some rebuttal to the arguments of the picket line outside of the hotel because these questions deal with whether I think there is adequate protection on the Federal statute books now to deal with the Communist conspiracy. My answer is emphatically no. I can prove it by the testimony of the Attorney General who testified that there are loopholes now which should be plugged up. One question asks whether I think we should fight fire with fire? I would not want to subscribe to believing that we should fight fire with fire, if whoever wrote the question sought to imply that we should treat the Communists in this country the way the Communists treat freemen in theirs. I would not want to do that. If by fighting fire with fire you mean do I think we should do something to protect ourselves, I certainly say yes or we do not deserve to be men and to be free.

I think the time has come, frankly, my good friends, when the individual citizens of America have got to begin measuring up to the dimensions of freemen and that means realizing that we are dealing with a conspiracy which is highly organized, well trained, knowing what it wants and having demonstrated in 14 different foreign capitals it has the capacity to get what it goes after.

THE MUNDT-FERGUSON-JOHNSTON-NIXON BILL

Now we propose, consequently, S. 2311, the bill publicized in the picket line as the Mundt bill—I do not honestly deserve all that amount of special attention because it should be called the Mundt-Ferguson-Johnston-Nixon bill, because FERGUSON, the junior Senator from Michigan; JOHNSTON, the senior Senator from South Carolina; and Congressman NIXON, of California, all joined with me in introducing the bill.

It passed the House of Representatives in the Eightieth Congress and you can find out who your Congressman is and see how he voted by looking at the record in the roll call vote which was 319 to 58. Before the Senate had any time to act it adjourned, so it was reintroduced in the Eighty-first Congress.

It has now been passed by the Senate Judiciary Committee with a vote of 12 to 1, only Senator LANGER, of North Dakota, having voted against it. Here is what the so-called Mundt-Nixon bill or the Mundt-Ferguson-Johnston-Nixon bill provides.

WHAT THIS PROPOSED NEW LEGISLATION WOULD DO

No. 1. That all Communists in America should be compelled to register their names and addresses with the Attorney General.

No. 2. That the Communist groups should be compelled to make a financial report each year as to where they get their money and how they spend it.

No. 3. That the Communists should be compelled to label their literature before it is shipped through the mail and to identify all broadcasts sent out over the radio.

No. 4. That Communists should be required to identify the front organizations which they subsidize and support.

Where do we get the idea for doing that? Does that sound like thought control? Is that an antilabor bill?

My good friends, that is applying as closely as you can to the Communists the same regulations now on the statute books applicable to the Republican Party and the Democratic Party. In most of the States of the Union, you have to register as a Republican or a Democrat to vote in the primaries.

In all of the States of the Union, you have to identify yourself as a Republican or a Democrat before you can go to a political convention and serve as a delegate selecting the candidates at a convention. There is nothing novel about that.

We require the Communists to move in the open like legitimate and loyal people do in political parties and activities. Under the Hatch Act and under the clean politics bill, Republicans and Democrats are required to file a financial report in Washington. Under the Hatch bill and the Clean Politics Act, Republicans and Democrats are compelled to identify their literature and their propaganda.

If we organize a Republican farmers' organization under the laws of the Union, we have to identify our connection with our front organizations. My bill provides the same rule for the Communists, no more, no less. I think the time has come when serious-minded citizens begin to recognize you cannot let these Communist weeds grow up in our garden of freedom forever without losing the rest of the functions of freemen. What else does the bill do?

The bill declares by law that no Communist shall be permitted to hold an appointive Federal job. Note the word "appointive."

We do not deny them the right to elect officials. I am one person who does not favor outlawing the Communist Party. I am one who believes that if the Communists can control 51 percent of the voters of America and they vote for Communists, they have a right to communize America. But I want them to do it in the open. I do not want them to smuggle their people into positions of power through appointive people. So we deny them the right to hold an appointive job and put a good fine on the fellow who surreptitiously gets a job and it is discovered he is a Communist, and there is also a fine on the bureaucrat who appoints him, knowing he is a Communist.

I see no more justification for compelling you and me to pay taxes to pay the salary of a public appointive official who is a Communist who has a job and who takes the job for the purpose of sabotaging our freedoms than I could see for the city council of the city of Elizabeth to pass a law compelling you to hire a kidnaper as a baby sitter in your own home. One is as absurd as the other.

The only other prohibition we make against the Communists is this: We deny the Communists the privilege to get a Federal passport to travel abroad because the FBI has discovered so many of them leaving this country with a passport and going to Moscow, participating in Communist conspiracies there, picking up new ideas to bring over here to help destroy our freedoms, carrying military secrets and political secrets from this country to Russia, running a conveyor belt for the purpose of destroying freedom in America. We do not tell our Communists as the Communists tell the people of Russia that they cannot leave. We simply say they cannot get a passport to travel abroad and they do not need a passport to leave America.

The only thing the passport is good for is to be able to get back in again and if they want to go there and stay there, that is O. K. with us, but they cannot get a passport to come back. [Laughter.]

That is the bill. The bill provides one other thing which we call the Hiss amendment. It was not in the bill that passed the Eightieth Congress, but it is in the new bill as the direct result of the Hiss case.

It makes it a crime, for the first time, in open-hearted America for a Government official in peacetime to take a security document marked "classified" and without authorization to turn it over to a Communist agent or to a foreign spy. We make that criminal in America and make it an offense and we expand the statute of limitations which is now 3 years on most of the crimes against the Government for 10 years for that particular kind of crime. We make peacetime espionage and peacetime treason punishable as clearly defined and described in section IV.

Now it is that bill that our friends on the picket line oppose. That is the bill—about which if you buy an issue of the Daily Worker published in New York City when you go to work tomorrow—you will find my name blasted all over the front of the paper.

It is that bill that you will find on the inside pages of the Daily Worker that the Communists of America are endeavoring to raise a million dollar slush fund to defeat. Why? Does anybody here believe that they are sincere when they say they are doing that to protect freedom in America, that they are doing that so private enterprise can flourish in America, that they are doing that so that there can be freedom all over the world or peace? Or justice? Or liberty?

They are doing that because they know our bill is going to destroy their racket in America. Unhappily, they have got a lot of preachers and school teachers and addleminded lawyers and some editors confused and they say, "My, you must not pass a bill like that against a political party. It is thought control."

We specifically provide that Communists can have the same access to the minds of men and women over the air and through the radio and in the battles of politics in this country as any Democrat or Republican today can have.

DON'T LET THE COMMUNISTS CONFUSE YOU

It is not the Communist that concerns me most in America but it is the people who are confused by the Communists, who do not think things out for themselves.

As J. Edgar Hoover told us one day, it is the people in the front movements that worry him more than the people in the Communist Party. Now if you believe with me that we ought to do something to stop Communists, you can help right now and every day until this bill is voted on by getting in touch with your Senators, both of them, and your Congressman and tell them you would like to have them support this bill, S. 2311. It is not a perfect bill. I think it can be made better through experience. But it is a start. And we are already very late in starting to do something about Communists.

I know that we have worked on it for 3 years and the American Bar Association has twice endorsed it at national meetings. I know we sent it to the firm of John W. Davis across the river from you and his firm of lawyers went through it and analyzed it and suggested some amendments which we made, and they then endorsed it.

We felt we did not want to have just a conservative law firm inspect it and so we went to Donald Richberg, one of the few honest liberals in America, the former head of the NRA, and he approved it suggesting a few amendments which we adopted; but if we can get some law like that on the statute books, we are prepared to start defending ourselves to help offset this wave of propaganda that the opposition is bringing up.

Now if you have not heard enough about that, if you want to tune your radios in at 10: 45 tomorrow night on the Mutual Broadcasting System or at 10:45 Friday night on the National Broadcasting Co. network, at both of those hours on both of those networks, I have agreed to discuss the Mundt-Ferguson bill in detail because they have had somebody on the other side talk about it and they want to keep the time equally divided. In essence, however, you have heard the issue, and I am not at all sanguine that we are going to get the bill through because the Communists are working so much harder than those on the side of the angels. They always do work harder than the free people of America so perhaps their tactics of delay and confusion will win for them again and until you get a bill compelling the Communists to operate in the open, you are never going to know where they are with their conspiratorial practices destroying freedom in America.

That concludes the questions; thanks a lot for your interest and your patience.

[Applause.]

Mr. PIDA. I know I speak on behalf of all the people here in the audience and up here at the Speaker's table when I say thank you very much for a very swell job.

Senator MUNDT. Thank you.

(Whereupon, at 10:30 o'clock p. m. the meeting adjourned.)

The Railroad Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FORREST C. DONNELL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 15 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by W. H. Lawrence which appeared in the New York Times of yesterday, one paragraph of which reads:

But while Democrats were talking about increased numbers at the polls, their own plans for making the Chicago parley the biggest political turnout of 1950 were being shattered by the railroad strike. Headquarters had reserved 2,500 rooms in advance, but one hotel that had set aside 800 rooms reported that cancellations had reduced the total to less than 150 expected to arrive. There were no official figures available, as yet, on registered attendance.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEMOCRATS CENTER FALL VICTORY HOPE IN HEAVY UNITED STATES VOTE—CANDIDATES TOLD AT BIG RALLY IN CHICAGO THEY MUST "RUN SCARED" TO WIN ELECTIONS—ILLINOIS A BATTLEGROUND—MAIN SITE OF WAR ON ISOLATION—PARTY WARNED BALLOT SLUMP MEANS LOSS OF CONNECTICUT

(By W. H. Lawrence)

CHICAGO, May 13.—Democrats pinned their hopes of increasing their House and Senate majorities today on the prospect of increasing the national vote to 50,000,000 in the 1950 congressional elections—a figure well above the normal midterm vote, when a light turnout probably would help the Republicans.

Democratic candidates for office were told that they must "run scared," avoiding the slightest chance of overconfidence, and that they must fight back vigorously against a revival of isolationism sponsored by Republican candidates across the Middle West.

A session of the Democratic National Committee to chart campaign strategy opened the 3-day Jefferson Jubilee here, which will be brought to a climax Monday night in a speech by President Truman, who is nearing the end of his "nonpolitical" swing across the country.

"If 50,000,000 people could go to the polls in 1950, I would have no fears as to what would happen to the Democratic majorities in Congress," said Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, of New Mexico, chairman of the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee. "Like the jackpot in a radio show, they would grow and grow and grow."

ANDERSON ASSIGNS QUOTAS

Senator ANDERSON gave some of the States specific quotas for increasing their vote in 1950 over the Presidential year of 1948 if they were to keep Democrats in office in some cases and turn out Republicans in others. He said Pennsylvania and Ohio each should cast about 1,000,000 votes more this year, while Indiana should show a gain of 460,000 and Connecticut balloting should be up by 116,000.

But while Democrats were talking about increased numbers at the polls, their own plans for making the Chicago parley the biggest political turnout of 1950 were being shattered by the railroad strike. Headquarters had reserved 2,500 rooms in advance, but one hotel that had set aside 800 rooms reported that cancellations had reduced the total to less than 150 expected to arrive. There were no official figures available, as yet, on registered attendance.

Opening day ceremonies were devoid of controversy. The States' rights Democrats, who deserted the national ticket in 1948, were not invited, and did not show up. There had been some talk of efforts here to restore Democratic unity in New Jersey, but these have not developed.

HAGUE DELAYED BY STRIKE

Mayor John V. Kenny, of Jersey City, was on hand, but former Mayor Frank Hague, the national committeeman and foe of Kenny, said he would not be able to arrive before Sunday because of the railway strike.

The only major business accomplished was the election of Mrs. India Edwards, former Chicago newspaperwoman, as vice chairman of the national committee, succeeding Mrs. Charles W. Tillett, of North Carolina, who resigned so she could campaign in a primary fight to aid renomination of Senator FRANK P. GRAHAM.

Mrs. Edwards, who has been director of the women's division, recalled that her own entry into active political work had been the result of a speech by former Representative Clare Booth Luce, of Connecticut, attacking President Roosevelt at the 1944 Republican Convention here.

"My only son, a boy of 19, had been killed a few months before, and when I heard a member of the Republican Party say that GI Jim would want Roosevelt defeated, I determined to help erect a living memorial to my boy by working to keep in the White House the man who was being attacked so viciously," she said.

The main news came from the campaign reviews offered by Senator ANDERSON and his opposite number, Representative MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, of Ohio, chairman of the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee.

What they said publicly was supplemented in a private session with the party's executive committee and individual State delegations who were trying to determine where the maximum effort should be made with the best prospects of success.

Senator ANDERSON'S speech clearly indicated Democratic preoccupation with reelecting Gov. Chester Bowles and two Democratic Senators Brien McMahon and William Benton, in Connecticut; with helping Senator Francis J. Myers win against divided Republican opposition in Pennsylvania, and with insuring reelection of Senator Scott W. Lucas, of Illinois, the Democratic majority leader.

Mr. ANDERSON said that the Lucas campaign would provide the principal battleground for the isolationist issue in the 1950 elections. Appealing always for a heavier vote, Senator ANDERSON conceded Connecticut would be lost if there was the usual midterm slump in voting turn-out.

He stressed with glee with which Democrats were watching the vicious battle between Gov. James H. Duff and the Joseph R. Grundy factions of the Pennsylvania Republican Party, and expressed his belief that "we can cook their goose" regardless of the ticket nominated next Tuesday. But a big vote, he said, might win one or two more House seats for the Democrats in Pennsylvania.

But Senator ANDERSON also saw a large vote giving the Democrats a chance to pick up senatorial seats in Colorado, where Representative John A. Carroll will oppose Senator Eugene D. Millikin; in Ohio, where State Auditor Joseph T. Ferguson is running against Senator Robert A. Taft; in Indiana, where the Democratic nomineee to oppose Senator Homer E. Capehart has not been chosen; and in Missouri, where Senator Forrest C. Donnell is up for reelection, but where the Democratic nominee has not been selected.

The New Mexico Senator added that there was an upsurge of Democratic sentiment in North and South Dakota to such a degree that "our Republican friends will be chagrined and surprised when next November rolls around."

Tonight William M. Boyle, Jr., chairman of the Democratic National Committee, was host at a buffet dinner and reception for visiting Democrats, including 11 governors and scores of other party dignitaries.

The President is due to arrive here at about 10:30 p. m., eastern daylight time, tomorrow, and will remain here for 24 hours before making his Chicago Stadium speech, after which he will entrain for Washington.

Mother's Day Address by Hon. Henry C. Dworshak, of Idaho

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 15 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me at the twenty-sixth annual Mothers' Day ceremonies sponsored by the American War Mothers on Sunday, May 14, 1950, at the Amphitheater in Arlington National Cemetery.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PATH TO PEACE

It is an inspiration to participate in this ceremony sponsored by the American War Mothers in this sacred retreat of the Nation's sleeping heroes. The American War Mothers held their biennial meeting in Sun Valley, Idaho, last October, and I was privileged to attend some of these sessions and to meet many of the national leaders. The people in our State are fully acquainted with the splendid work being accomplished by this organization.

We are humbly met today in this hallowed shrine for a sacred purpose. We honor those who paid with their lives in mortal combat that we might live in grateful peace.

Two thoughts come to mind as we meet here near the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier.

The first thought is how easy it is to be discouraged today with the prospects for enduring peace as we contemplate the tragic blunders of diplomacy and politics of recent years.

The second thought which occurs to me is that we must not lose confidence in the prospects for peace. We dare not despair in this chapel dedicated to the sacrifices of those who have died that you and I may retain our treasured way of life, and that this legacy will be assured to future Americans.

The patriotism, the courage, the faith, and the devotion to duty which have made America great are forever enshrined in this memorial. Here sleeps the Unknown Soldier of World War I. And soon, another unknown hero symbolizing the sacrifices of World War II, will rest in this national Valhalla.

A SHRINE OF CONFIDENCE

To me it is a significant thing that we can acquire at this shrine more confidence in the future of this Nation than we find in all the clamor of politics and diplomacy in the Nation's capital city. The spirit of this occasion dare not fail us, despite the shortcomings of leaders who have not measured up to the challenges of peacetime problems.

It is 5 years now since the guns were silenced on the world-wide battlefields of our latest war. The fruition of 5 years of peace is a cold hostility of such implications that men of all the earth await fearfully the outbreak of yet another conflict.

The joys of victory which we and our allies knew 5 years ago seem wholly dissipated. The security we felt as victors over a brutal and totalitarian foe has withered.

The leadership of this Nation as a champion for the basic rights of free men, now is challenged by the despotic tyranny of a Nation that acknowledges neither God nor the rights of man. In 5 years we have seen entire nations of men enslaved; we have seen governments, once our allies in war, subjected to the despotism of a Communistic state.

The Soviet Union, which ruled 170,000,000 people a few years ago, now holds in slavery some 800,000,000 people.

The treaties to guarantee the rights of this Nation and other free nations of the world have been ignored by secret commitments made at Tehran, Potsdam, and Yalta to surrender the sacred ideals for which our armies fought and died.

COMMUNISM THREATENS FREEDOM

In high places of government and in every segment of our national life, some men have given primary allegiance to the theories of communism which now threaten the existence of free institutions in our land.

The appalling tragedy of postwar developments has been that American citizens, reared in the same circumstances and traditions as those whom we honor here, have transferred their loyalty to the dictatorial powers that would destroy us.

These are the disturbing problems which beset our Nation today. But as we meet here we renew our faith in the devotion which American men and women have given, and will continue to give, that this Nation might be free and strong. We find here the courage to offset the discouragement we feel elsewhere when reviewing our postwar blunders and losses.

We renew here our determination that we shall do our utmost to preserve this heritage with which our Nation has been so richly endowed.

Our great Republic, with all its immeasurable strength and its proud history, must guard itself well against danger from within and danger from without. Eternal vigilance continues to be the price of liberty, and liberty shall forever remain the first mile of the pathway to peace. The pages of history, the wisdom of all philosophies, and the irrevocable laws of God hold this unalterable truth forever before mankind.

HONOR TO AMERICA'S WOUNDED

Not only do we honor today those who gave their all that America might be born and live; we also honor those who bear the wounds of battle. Those veterans of war destined to linger for life on beds of pain and those who work with maimed and distorted bodies have earned—and must always receive—the generous aid of a grateful nation. The widow and the orphan, too, have suffered and must receive the considerate care due them from an indebted Republic. For the widow and orphan have borne an irreparable loss for which protection and compensation is a necessity and an obligation.

Throughout America are chapters of American War Mothers represented here today whose members are inspired by patriotism to country and by service to mankind. In cities and communities throughout our land members of this great organization render devoted service for the preservation of American ideals and traditions in both peace and war.

The American War Mothers organization may not seek the spotlight of national leadership, but it does command the sincere respect of all who know its service and devotion. War mothers cherish peace. Always they show their gratitude to those who have worn the uniform of their country. War mothers do not forget, and in hundreds of communities they keep the faith, and exemplify that faith by unselfish service.

The American War Mothers are gathered here today to do honor to the heroic men and women who have offered their lives and their services in war so that this Republic might live. For the safe return of those who survived, all are deeply thankful. Our gratitude goes out to those for whose return their loved ones waited in vain. And, so our Nation dare not forget, in all the days before us, that supreme cause for which our honored dead gave the last full measure of devotion.

IDEALS SURVIVE WAR

In war, material possessions and mortal life itself are consumed in the triumph of a great cause; yet war does not, and cannot, consume our love, our faith, our hopes, and our memories. These priceless possessions and the certainty that life is eternal are left untouched by war. And thus we know that those who did not come back are waiting to welcome us in their homes beyond the sunset.

In a century and seventy-four years of national independence, the torch of our freedom has been fed from the fires of faith, courage, suffering, and sacrifice that have burned in the hearts of American mothers. It would be a blessing of untold value to them to have the certainty of an enduring peace in the years to come. So let us turn from the frowning face of war to the benign countenance of peace—that permanent peace we have so long been promised. Let us, therefore, seek the path to peace.

BEYOND THE HORIZON—PEACE

The creation and continuation of an enduring peace is a hope and purpose of supreme importance in the affairs of men, for in every home, in every land, people await peace, although with fear and foreboding. They await, as mankind has for ages awaited, the coming of peace. And peace—like a frail phantom without substance or shadow—continues to remain just beyond the horizon.

If nations are to live together in harmony—if there is to be peace, prosperity, and security for their peoples—we must find and follow the path to peace.

If we would follow this path, we must adhere to truth, and rid ourselves of those false beliefs and shallow schemes which have caused the failure of all efforts to achieve peace among the political powers of this world. There are forgotten facts and formulas which form the principles of peace, and to them we must return. Let us, therefore, strip from the edifice of peace all the falsities and deceptions which have been thrown about it. Only then may we behold peace in its proper setting of integrity and truth.

We can learn from the disappointments of our recent foreign policy and set aside the appeasement type of agreements which should be scrapped because of their war-making provisions. We must seek to work through the United Nations. Weak though it has been made by concessions to Russia, it still offers the mechanism for peace.

Man's immemorial strivings for power have reflected from age to age the innate and evil tendencies of his mind and the passing poverty of his soul. If his basic motives had changed even in a modest measure, we would have missed a hundred wars and all their horrors.

But education and spiritual enlightenment have slowly reached a point where they may enable many men to think upon a logical and lofty plane and to hold within reasonable bounds their lusts for power. If we are to contemplate realities, however, it is apparent that man has not yet lifted his thinking to a plane sufficient to outlaw brute force, and thereby assure permanent peace. The commission of crimes and the existence of prisons plainly point to the fact that far too many men still measure this life in terms of undisciplined force.

There is one, and only one, path to everlasting peace.

SYMBOL OF THE CROSS

At noon one day, 1,917 years ago, a young man was crucified at a place called Calvary. He was executed because He healed the sick, cleansed the lepers, raised the dead, and taught His followers that "they should know the truth, and the truth would make them free."

The cross on which that man died became the symbol of His words and works. It became, and has since remained, the emblem of all freedoms for which men can hope, and to which they can aspire.

Our four freedoms are nothing new; they are but a part of the other and greater freedoms whose symbol is the cross.

If we would have peace, we need not look far afield.

He who died on the cross well knew that men must lift themselves to better and brighter lives by the power of their own faith and their own thinking. So He taught His followers and believers the strength and power of mercy, justice, truth, faith, and love. And with these conceptions or implements of thought, He showed them the way to overcome fear, doubt, ignorance, hatred, superstition, and evil of every sort and form.

If the people of our land intend to give peace to all men, their course of action is planned and charted for them. Those in the rest of the world who are not free must engender the thoughts and faith which inspire freedom, for only upon the foundation of freedom can permanent peace be erected.

FAITH, NOT POLITICAL POWER

If we intend to make peace a living reality in the world of men, there must continue a crusade that has no end. Such a task is stupendous in its proportions, limitless in its time, and eternal in its reward. Mankind must know that there is no permanent peace in man's manipulations of political power; we must have faith in the face of all obstacles and all defeats; and we must be prepared to pick up Christ's cross and march forward—unafraid. No short and painless path to peace is before us. Peace must be earned. It must be deserved. It must be won.

And finally, my fellow Americans, as the political crucible of our Republic continues to forge our national destiny, let us fondly hope that we shall be guided upon the path of freedom and truth.

Let not the heat of political contention reconvert the jewel of eternal peace into the elements from which it was formed. For the path to peace lies not in the direction of socialistic doctrine or communistic paganism. The history of mankind reflects that experience. May our citizens turn a deaf ear to those who would weaken our Republic.

May we sternly resolve that our honored dead and the great cause for which our Nation's war mothers now firmly stand, may forever inspire us to achieve peace. May nothing swerve us from that path of freedom and truth and justice. For peace is of God and man cannot violate those eternal and divine principles without penalty and remorse. May our beloved America stand firm and forever strive toward an honest and just peace in harmony with the lasting principles of human freedom and eternal truth.

Today, as we gather at this national shrine, we must recognize our individual responsibility to keep alive that spirit of patriotism without which this Republic cannot endure. Each generation faces that same challenge which inspired Americans in 1776 to pledge their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor to make this the land of free men and free women; dedicated to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Let us resolve to preserve that heritage unblemished for future generations.

Address by Hon. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin, on First Flight's Day of Rock County Airport

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 15 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, yesterday, on May 14, it was my pleasure to be on hand for the dedication ceremonies of a vital new aviation link in the Badger State. May 14 was, therefore, a historic day in the history of southern Wisconsin, because it brought transcontinental air service to Janesville, Beloit, and surrounding area.

It was a real pleasure for me to speak at this ceremony and to be on hand for the addresses of the great air ace, Col. J. J. Foss; the distinguished president of Wisconsin Central Airlines, Mr. Francis Higgins; the able president of Northwest Airlines, Mr. Croil Hunter; the esteemed editor of Beloit, Wis., Mr. Walter A. Strong, the honored city manager of Janesville, Mr. Henry Traxler; Mr. Jess Phillips, the industrious chairman of the county volunteer air traffic committee; his hard-working associate, Mr. Alan H. Ryan, also of Beloit, chairman of the county board airport committee; and my able colleague, Congressman LAWRENCE SMITH, of Racine.

It is through vital advances such as the new Rock County Airport that Wisconsin intends to keep pace with aviation progress throughout the Nation, and to help contribute its share to winged progress in the world.

WISCONSIN CENTRAL AIRLINE FRANCHISE

I particularly invite attention to the fact that daily flights by Wisconsin Central Airlines will carry passengers, air express, and airmail to any place in the world through trunk-line connections at Madison, Chicago, and Minneapolis. Since this great feeder airline, Wisconsin Central, began in February 1948, it has flown nearly 3,000,000 passenger miles with a perfect record of safety. That is why, as I have commented on the Senate floor previously, we of Wisconsin feel it is so essential that the Civil Aeronautics Board grant renewal of the franchise to Wisconsin Central. We are similarly proud of the service rendered to us by Northwest Airlines which began operations all the way back in October 1926 and which has had spectacular growth since then.

We were particularly happy yesterday also to have had on hand our worthy Governor, the Honorable Oscar Rennebohm.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of my address delivered at Rock County Airport yesterday afternoon be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROCK COUNTY—NEXT DOOR TO THE WORLD

It is a real thrill for me to be on hand with this distinguished array of civic leaders for this inspiring dedication ceremony.

The great achievement which you are celebrating today represents a triumph of cooperation, and I personally am happy to have been able to contribute some small part to its success.

This is an historic day in the history of your county. The ribbon is being cut, opening up a whole new aviation frontier. First Flights Day marks your county's taking wings, so to speak, and rising above its previous accomplishments to a still finer future.

YOU ARE ONLY 60 HOURS AWAY FROM DISTANT SPOTS

It has been truly stated that there is no point on earth more than 60 hours away by air from any other spot on earth. This is particularly true insofar as high speed military aviation is concerned, and it is a matter of fact that with the advance of jet propulsion, the 60 hours flying time is being cut down to still shorter flying periods between any two spots.

Naturally, we here in America are interested in shortening the distance between points on the globe, but not in order that we can deliver bombs more quickly to outside areas, but in order that we can deliver fountain pens, tractors, cotton goods, pumps, woolen goods, shades, awnings, stokers, shoes, powdered milk, refrigerating units, dairy products, and a miscellaneous variety of manufactured goods such as pour forth from the splendid factories and the farms of the Janesville-Beloit-Edgerton area.

Yes, we want to be next door to the world for purposes of commerce, and we want to be next door to the world for purpose of exchanging ideas. You and I know when flint meets flint, when idea clashes with idea, that out of that clash comes a creative spark, a spark that leads to understanding and to an appreciation of the other fellow's problems.

WE WANT TO UNDERSTAND WORLD PROBLEMS

Yes, my friends, we need to be globally minded in this world. We need to lift our eyes and to see distant horizons. We need to understand the problems of foreign people; and at the same time, my friends, as important as it is to look over the back yard to our neighbor's—in Europe, in Asia, and in Africa and Latin America, still it is equally important, if not far more important, I'm sure you will agree, to tend to our own back yard also.

TENDING OUR OWN KNITTING

We must never become so exclusively infatuated with foreign green pastures that we forget that the American market is the greatest in the world. We must never forget

that America has the highest standard of living in the world, and we must keep it up as such. We must never forget that basically our obligations are to our own American people, first and foremost. We must never forget that, and although communism threatens us in Europe, threatens us in Asia, it threatens us even more in Latin America (right next to our own Panama Canal) and here in our own country. There is a Red menace on the home front.

This, my friends, is no exaggeration, no overstatement. A greater proportion of Reds now conspire in America than were in Russia at the time of the Red revolution.

CONSIDER RED MENACE IN OUR OWN HEMISPHERE

In recent weeks, I have pointed out in the Senate that there is a grave Communist threat in Guatamala—next door to Mexico—where the Government is feeling increasing pressure from Communist-controlled labor unions and where there is a constant barrage of red-inspired criticism of "Yankee capitalism" and of alleged American imperialism. There, too, the Government has arbitrarily in effect kicked out our United States Ambassador—an extremely able, conscientious diplomat, the Honorable Richard C. Patterson, Jr.—on the basis of phony, trumped-up charges which the State Department has categorically rejected. That is the sort of menacing situation we face in our own American back yard. Yet, we've shipped dairy cows and other items to Guatemala; we want to trade with her, to prosper with her, to enjoy the finest possible relations with her, but the Red conspiracy has shown its ugly head against our peaceful intentions and against the personal representative of the President of the United States.

Moreover, you need not look far, for there is a Communist Party in Wisconsin and a host of fellow-travelers here in our State as well as in other States.

WISCONSIN CENTRAL FRANCHISE MUST BE RENEWED

Yes, my friends, we are next door to the world, but let's never forget the problems in our own apartment and our own backyard.

Fortunately, by means of this model 780 acre airport, you are going to assure more excellent "made in Wisconsin" shipments turning up in more corners of America and the world. And let me say right now, my friends, that we're going to leave no stone unturned—and I'm sure this goes for Larry Smith, too—to make absolutely certain of the renewal of the franchise of Wisconsin Central Airlines which is doing such a great job in serving our State.

To me these ceremonies symbolize many things, and I should like to mention them now:

TODAY EVIDENCES RESULTS OF COOPERATION

1. Basically, this dedication ceremony symbolizes that cooperation really clicks, that team-work really triumphs.

When I look back in my office files and see the tremendous volume of correspondence, of telegrams, of references to phone calls, and visits which we have had over the years, I note again that Rock County would never have achieved transcontinental air service had it not been for the untiring and unselfish labors of your chamber of commerce, your newspapers, and your broadcasting stations, the hard-working efforts of your own Congressman LAWRENCE SMITH, the cooperation of your veterans posts, the assistance of your individual business leaders, the helpfulness of Wisconsin Central Airlines, and, yes, the aid and cooperation of the United States Civil Aeronautics Board. In other words, my friends, the lesson of cooperation for fulfilling a nonpartisan community need is the sort that all of us can profit from indeed.

Teamwork is an old American tradition dating all the way back to community barn raisings in colonial days. Let's never allow agitators or provocators to destroy our spirit of cooperation among all groups.

WE ARE LIVING IN AIR AGE

2. But I see, and I'm sure you see, a second basic meaning of this ceremony today. Wisconsin Central Airlines' service to Rock County Airport evidences that we are living in an air age today, and the communities which fail to expand their facilities to meet the challenges of that air age will wither on the vine.

You and I know that the area served by the Rock County Airport is tremendously rich in industrial, agricultural, and recreational resources; so rich that there is a tremendous potential traffic in freight, in express, and in passenger service. But if your leaders did not have the initiative, the vision, the energy to secure this air service, then you can be sure that Rock County would not have kept step with the march of Wisconsin progress, and the result would have been that your businesses, your farming, your recreational attractions would have suffered.

Whether we like it or not, this is the age of high speed, of fast transportation, fast communication. Businessmen, farmers, laboring people, depend for their prosperity on up-to-the-minute contact with the other areas of our State and Nation, and indeed of the world. These are the facts; this is the air age, and we must be adequate to it.

WISCONSIN HAS ALWAYS BEEN AVIATION-MINDED

3. I think that all of the aviation-minded folks of Wisconsin will rejoice in this ceremony today, because your airport here in Rock County has been stated to be the most modern airfield in Wisconsin. We have always been an aviation-minded State. As we all know, the Badger State furnished more pilots for the Air Force in World War II than did any other State of the Union, except the far more populous State of Texas.

No American forgets that the greatest of aviation pioneers in American history was our own great Billy Mitchell, the prophet, the seer, who was so far ahead of his time that the mossbacks, the swivel-chair generals, and the rocking-boat admirals (as I have called them on the Senate floor) cashiered and crucified him.

WE MUST BE VIGILANT AGAINST ALL MENACES

Now we have learned the truth of Billy Mitchell's lessons. We have learned as he and as every American patriot warned us—that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty—vigilance to the menaces from within and from without. From over the Alaskan frontier, from over the polar cap (the Arctic Circle), can come winged bombers, or guided missiles, carrying destruction to American cities and homes. It is essential, therefore, that we have a defense second to none, an invincible, impregnable defense to the greatest extent that human brains can devise. We plan no aggression, we even despise the very thought of war, but we are determined to preserve our freedom.

Rock County Airport, with its expanded services, will constitute a vital new link in American aviation defense as well as in industrial, agricultural, and recreational strength. May the wings over this airport always be the winged doves of peace. May all of Rock County's contacts with the next-door neighbors throughout the world be peaceful contacts.

Let me therefore convey again my good wishes and sincerest congratulations to all the scores of folks, known and unknown, who have contributed to the milestone and to the historic occasion which you and I gladly celebrate today.

Thank you.

Health Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 15 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on Saturday, May 13, I had the privilege of addressing the Greater New York Hospital Association on the knotty problem of medical care and the role of the hospitals in medical care. I ask unanimous consent that my remarks on that occasion be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HEALTH PROBLEMS

It is a source of deep satisfaction for me to be here tonight at this great gathering—I might even say at this triumphal gathering of the Greater New York Hospital Association. I use the words, "triumphal gathering" because this association at this annual dinner can look back at a year and at many years of notable contributions to the solution of one of the major problems of our time—the problem of bringing adequate medical care to the people.

The Greater New York Hospital Association, fine as it is, has not yet wholly solved this problem. But the Greater New York Hospital Association has blazed one of the paths which can lead to a solution. And when I refer to the Greater New York Hospital Association, I am referring, of course, to the 97 voluntary nonprofit hospitals and the 22 municipal hospitals which are members of this association, and which in their individual, as well as in their collective capacities have contributed so much to the progress which has been made.

As a United States Senator from New York, I take special pride in the fact that this association numbers among its members hospitals of every creed, and of no creed, and also in the fact that these hospitals serve their patients without discrimination as to race, color, or religion. Especially in the light of the debate that is now going on in the United States Senate, I am proud and happy to be in this atmosphere of nondiscrimination and of equal access of facilities to all our citizens. This atmosphere should be, but unhappily is not, the hallmark of all our institutions in every part of the country.

Tonight this association has honored two oustanding citizens of New York who have played major parts in the recent achievements in the field of hospital care in New York. As a New Yorker, I, too, am proud of the work of Dr. Marcus D. Kogel, commissioner of hospitals. I should like to add my tribute to those which he has received here tonight.

And to Louis H. Pink, long my friend and trusted associate in the State service, who is president of the Associated Hospital Service—New York's Blue Cross plan—I add my congratulations on the fine citation which he, in the name of his colleagues, has just received. His work and that of the Blue Cross planners in New York have pointed the way for the voluntary hospital prepayment plans all over the country.

The spectacular expansion of the Associated Hospital Service is an achievement of wonder and distinction. In 1935, the Associated Hospital Service paid approximately $50,000 to the hospitals of New York City and

the surrounding area. In 1949, just 14 years later, the Associated Hospital Service paid $42,000,000 to the hospitals of New York. In that space of time the enrollment has grown from 40,000 to 4,200,000. That hundredfold expansion furnishes its own commentary. It attests to both the merit of the service and the public need which that service seeks so ably to fill.

There is another and even more personal reason for my feeling of satisfaction at being here tonight. I am at home in this gathering of hospital officials, because for more than 80 years some member of my family has continuously served on the board of trustees of Mt. Sinai Hospital. I am proud also to have been active in the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies, which has given support through the years to several member hospitals of the Greater New York Hospital Association. And I am happy to say that throughout my public career, I have always taken the opportunity given me to encourage the development of the voluntary agencies of the three great religious faiths.

I wish to say at this point that I consider these voluntary agencies to exist not by the sufferance of Government but by right and by necessity. I consider that the participation of these agencies in health and other welfare activities is a right which should never be denied or curtailed by Government in any present or future program.

I see no reason why we should even think of the voluntary agencies and of the Government as being opposing forces in any way. They should be considered as cooperative forces, engaged in a sort of partnership. That partnership has never been more finely illustrated than in the Greater New York Hospital Association. The relationship between the municipal hospitals of New York City and the voluntary hospitals has always been close and cordial. Symbolic of that partnership is Dr. Kogel's presence here tonight as guest of honor.

Of course, the achievements of the Greater New York Hospital Association and of the Associated Hospital Service should not really be measured by their administrative achievements, by the size of their membership, or by their financial standing. Rather these achievements should be measured by the service which they have rendered and are rendering to the people.

I am not a medical statistician and need not cite figures on health and disease with which all of you are much more familiar than I. Yet there is one figure which so impresses me that I would like to mention it. The life expectancy of the average citizen of New York today is nearly 25 years longer than it was a half century ago. This is, in part, a tribute to the hospitals of New York City. It is also, of course, a tribute to the entire medical profession, as well as to the contributions of the public health and sanitation services supplied by government. But while left expectancy has been increased and the availability as well as the quality of medical and hospital care have been greatly extended—certainly in the New York area—the problem of adequate medical care for all our people is still far from being solved. I know you recognize this fact. I need not labor it. All of us are agreed that "something must be done."

The problem with which you and I are faced and to which we must honestly and courageously try to find a solution is the problem of the increased cost of medical care and the growing demand of the American people for more and better medical care. You and I know that this problem cannot be solved by any single magic formula or catch word. The solution lies rather in a number of simultaneous and consecutive approaches involving the medical profession, the auxiliary services of that profession, research science, the universities, the voluntary organizations, the hospitals, and finally, the Government at all its levels.

As a Member of the Senate I have been assigned—indeed I sought the assignment—to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I was delighted because this committee has jurisdiction over all general legislation affecting health. This is the committee which originally reported out the Hill-Burton Hospital Construction Act and the amendments to that act which were passed last year. This committee now has pending before it all the major health bills introduced into the Senate which have not yet been approved or passed upon. That, it is a matter not only of interest, but of duty for me to know and to appreciate your problems and the points of view which may affect you and every person in this country.

The big question facing us today is the manner and extent to which the affirmative interest of Government in the health of the Nation should be expressed. There is no doubt in my mind that an interest by Government must be expressed, and must be expressed by a broad and comprehensive program of activities in close association and cooperation with the health professions and the voluntary agencies, in a manner to assure to the people the medical care which they need and which the national interest requires that they have.

The health of the people can no longer be considered an individual matter. Laws and ordinances in the field of contagious diseases and in public health and sanitation have long been accepted as necessary, although these laws and ordinances do, in fact, constitute a kind of control over the individual in the interest of the whole community.

Today it is beginning to be generally recognized that the health of the people is as much concern of Government as their education or their working conditions. People in poor health not only cease to be a national asset, but they become a national liability. They are consumers of the national effort rather than contributors to it. The hospitals and the health professions constitute, in this sense, forces of conservation against the erosion of the nation's manpower.

But in this day of world crisis, when the survival of our country and of our civilization depends upon the combined efforts of every man and woman, the diminution of the national effort through illness is a threat to our very existence. It is a national concern and properly the concern of the Federal Government in the fields in which neither the voluntary agencies nor local governments desire to or can practicably operate.

Of course, these are generalities on which most of us will agree. Only the die-hards and extremists who insist that any government participation in the field of health constitutes regimentation will disagree with what I have said. I want to say at this point that I am not addressing myself to the extremists. They are fighting the battles that were lost a half century ago but they still do not realize it. These protagonists of unreason are trying to plug the dike against tides that will not be stayed. They are unaware of the fact that the dikes which they seek to save have long ago been inundated and submerged. These men do not even acknowledge the remarkable success your own association has achieved through the close partnership of government and voluntary hospitals.

No, I am addressing myself tonight to men of fair and inquiring mind who are searching, as I am sure all of you are, for real solutions to real problems. I, myself, have no ready-made solution. I am aware of the practical difficulties which confront us. But I insist that the problem of bringing adequate medical care to the people must be solved. If we continue to say merely that this problem cannot be solved—if we say that the present levels of medical care, because they are higher than those in other parts of the world, are high enough, then we will be paving the way for measures which may be neither right nor reasonable, but which will be impressed upon the medical profession by the force of an outraged public opinion.

I am searching for a solution, my friends, which will represent the best thoughts of courageous and unbiased minds, including the minds of forward-looking members of your profession and of the health professions generally.

I am sure that in this undertaking I and others of us who are searching for a solution will have the unstinted cooperation of all those connected with hospitals and hospital administration. I am aware that hospital groups have been leaders among the health professions in supporting constructive health legislation.

The great voluntary hospitals of this country gave the necessary impetus to the Blue Cross plans at a time when those who are now opposed to any form of Government assistance were saying that the Blue Cross plans were socialistic and were actuarially unsound and impractical.

I could cite other instances of progressive health plans and measures which have been and are being supported by the hospital authorities of the Nation. The hospital authorities are as conscious as any group in our population of the need for Government participation in a proper and sensible way in the solution of our national health problems. The hospitals are keenly aware of the fact that medical costs are rising in a steady spiral. How to meet these costs and how to add constantly and progressively to the quality of medical care while making medical care increasingly available to all the people is your constant concern, and it is the core of the problem that faces us all.

Let me say at this point, before I go any further—and I hope I can make myself perfectly clear on this—that I do not now, and never have, and never will, favor any solution which involves socialization of our hospitals. I am opposed, and always have been opposed, to any move that would involve Government control of our great and free system of voluntary hospitals. I am opposed, and always have been opposed, to any proposal that would place doctors, nurses, or hospital employees under the control of the Federal Government or make them employees of the Federal Government. I am opposed, and always have been opposed, to the regimentation of medical personnel. I hope that this statement is flat enough and simple enough for even the extremists to understand.

But I do favor and do advocate proposals for Government assistance to medical and nursing education as well as for scientific research.

I do favor Government assistance for the construction and establishment of health centers and clinical facilities.

I do favor Government aid for the reconstruction and replacement of obsolete hospital buildings in urban areas. I also favor as an immediate measure Government contributions through grants-in-aid to States for out-patient services.

I do favor more Government participation in these hospitalization fields in which the voluntary hospitals have generally indicated their acceptance of Government participation, such as mental disease and hygiene, tuberculosis, and similar ailments.

I do favor Government leadership and grants-in-aid for rehabilitation of the mentally and physically handicapped.

I do favor a comprehensive program of Federal aid to States and localities in the field of public health and sanitation.

I do favor and advocate the expansion of the maternal and child health and crippled children's programs started under the Social Security Act programs which I and others are fighting to broaden in the social-security amendments now being considered by the Senate.

In a few weeks or less the Senate will take up a series of amendments to the Social Security Act. These amendments deal, among other things, with social security for hospital employees, and with the child and maternal-care programs. These are programs in which you have a deep interest.

I had the privilege of adding my voice very recently in protest against a provision tentatively adopted by the Senate Finance Committee which would have effectively barred employees of hospitals controlled by religious denominations from being covered by social security. That decision has been happily rescinded, and although the provision as it now stands in the Senate bill is not entirely satisfactory to me, it is a suitable basis for compromise in the House-Senate Conference which will follow the Senate passage of the pending amendments.

This is a matter which you should watch and in which you should express your interest. You should also follow the other provisions of the social-security amendments which I have mentioned. These provisions are vital to the health professions and to the health of the Nation.

But these are all tangential approaches to the central problem—the problem of every-day medical care for the great bulk of our population—for that great mass of people who are neither wealthy nor indigent. These latter two classes are the only ones to whom all necessary medical care is now available.

True, there are available to the general public in most areas of the country not only hospital insurance plans, but medical prepayment plans. But all these plans—and I hope you will understand that I am not being critical but merely factual—are inadequate in an absolute sense. They are not the final answer. Most hospital insurance plans provide only limited service. Most medical insurance plans are likewise limited and cover only a small portion of the population. Finally, there are considerable areas in the Nation where medical prepayment plans are impractical and where even hospital insurance systems do not reach.

For these reasons and others, I am convinced that the public interest demands further Government participation in the national health effort. I think that such a development is inevitable. I hope that it will take place in an intelligent manner, in a constructive manner, and in a cooperative manner, with wisdom and with understanding. That is as much up to you as it is up to government.

Recently I read some very fine and thoughtful words on this subject by the renowned Dr. C. E. A. Winslow, professor emeritus, Yale School of Medicine, as published in the American Journal of Public Health of January 1950. Professor Winslow asked:

"Is it not possible that politics and polemics and paid propaganda may be laid aside and that the statesmanship of competent experts may establish a sound policy of directed gradualism leading to ultimate solution of this most urgent problem of midcentury public health?"

This is a question full of truth and wisdom. I trust and hope that the health profession will take it to heart. Certainly the mechanics of this problem can be worked out if we have the will and the ingenuity. Those mechanics need not and must not involve socialization of the hospitals and of the medical profession.

It will not be easy to determine these mechanics and even less easy to reach agreement upon them. It will require the closest understanding and cooperation between representatives of the public and the representatives of the various health professions. I call upon you assembled here tonight to give your most urgent attention to a real effort to solve this problem and to reach the broad agreement that is necessary both among yourselves and with the lawmakers in government.

I might tell you that I have been meeting with various leaders of thought and the medical profession on this subject. I have a deep interest in arriving at some solution which will meet the criteria I have outlined. There is still time for such a solution.

I am happy to know that there are very many among you who are working and devoting all your energies and thoughts to a solution. I offer my own help and cooperation in this direction. I urge with all the force at my command that you proceed in this task with an unflinching determination to persist in it until success crowns your efforts. Neither you nor I dare fail in this undertaking.

The Railway Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FORREST C. DONNELL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 15 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, it is my intention at this time to request unanimous consent for insertion in the Appendix of the RECORD of numerous articles, and so forth, which have to do generally with the railway strike and the need for additional legislation.

First, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD the ticker tape of this morning, of 9:45 a. m., and also the ticker tape of 10:30 a. m. of this morning, on the general subject of the railway strike.

There being no objection, the dispatches were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHICAGO.—Mediators said today that stripped-down negotiating teams were making definite progress toward settling the strike of locomotive firemen.

Three railroad negotiators and three representing the brotherhood of locomotive firemen and enginemen worked for 5 hours yesterday on a package proposal, and a railroad spokesman said he presumed the talks would be resumed today.

Francis A. O'Neill, Jr., chairman of the National Railway Mediation Board, reported that definitely some progress was made.

But the firemen extended their walk-out to five more divisions of the Southern Railroad, one of the five roads hit by the 6-day-old strike.

At Detroit, police posted a 24-hour anti-sabotage watch on three bridges over the Michigan Central tracks between the railroad's terminal and the Detroit river tunnel. The watch was established after rocks were hurled at Michigan Central trains arriving from Canada, police said.

The talks were curtained in secrecy, and both mediators and negotiators were reticent to talk about the nature of the progress being made.

But it was learned that the disputants have agreed in principle to submit the union's chief demand, employment of an additional fireman on multiple-unit Diesel locomotives, to arbitration.

Still at issue, apparently, was a union demand for a fireman on small Diesels used in yard switching. Currently the small engines operate only with an engineer.

HARRISBURG, PA.—The strike-crippled Pennsylvania Railroad, acting while pickets marched at railroad yards here, stepped up the movement of its freight trains to the west today.

The strikers, members of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, set up picket lines to protest the operation of trains to the west and north from this rail crossroads and to try to halt the railroad's operations to the east and south.

But the road continued to move out freights to the west and kept its eastern freight and passenger lines operating on schedule.

It declined to say who was operating the trains.

A Pennsylvania Railroad spokesman said he could not estimate how many trains the railroad will send west today, but he said the number will be greater than the 42 freights moved yesterday. Normally, the road sends out 1,500 freights a day on its strike-affected lines north and west of Harrisburg.

He emphasized that the road is not accepting any new shipments, but is moving perishables and other goods stranded when the strike became effective last Wednesday morning.

The Pennsylvania Railroad freights were running in the area bounded on the west by Chicago and St. Louis, on the north by Buffalo, and by Harrisburg on the east.

Railway Act No Longer Model for Labor Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FORREST C. DONNELL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 15 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Railway Act No Longer Model for Labor Laws—Recurring Failures To End Disputes Brings Demands for Revision," by Louis Stark, appearing in the New York Times for May 14, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RAILWAY ACT NO LONGER MODEL FOR LABOR LAWS—RECURRING FAILURES TO END DISPUTES BRING DEMANDS FOR REVISION

(By Louis Stark)

WASHINGTON, May 13.—The strike of railroad firemen and enginemen this week focused attention on the weaknesses of the Railway Labor Act and coincided with congressional hearings designed to amend this law so as to make it strikeproof.

The law dealing with disputes in the railway industry does not compel arbitration but comes so close to it that it is considered a quasi compulsory arbitration statute. Yet a dispute such as the current one affecting a demand for an additional fireman in multiple Diesel units may run through the lengthy processes of the law and result finally in a strike.

All that the law does is to set up a series of steps to create an atmosphere for settlement. If the parties cannot agree in direct bargaining the National (Railway) Mediation Board seeks a settlement. If mediation fails the Board proposes that the parties agree to arbitrate and accept the decision as binding.

UP TO THE PRESIDENT

Either side may refuse. In that event the next step is usually up to the union. If it threatens a strike and this threat is considered serious, the President may name an emergency or fact-finding board. But the emergency board has no power to arbitrate. It must merely recommend. However, public pressure is relied upon in crucial cases to compel acceptance of recommendations made by presidential boards.

During the war gaps in the handling of railroad labor cases were opened up when President Roosevelt intervened to modify fact-finding board recommendations. At the same time the recommendations of several such boards were set aside or modified by Wage Stabilization Directors James F. Byrnes and Fred M. Vinson, who succeeded him.

Presidential intervention was resorted to in order to get around the wage-stabilization policy. Messrs. Byrnes and Vinson, however, over-ruled fact-finding boards in order to make their findings, as they interpreted them, conform to the national wage-stabilization policy.

The unions, naturally, applauded Mr. Roosevelt's action since it was in their favor but frowned on those of his economic stabilizers because their acts meant wage awards lower than those proposed by the fact-finding boards.

In June 1943, Mr. Vinson vetoed a wage increase of 8 cents an hour for 1,100,000 nonoperating rail men under the "hold the line" order of April 1943. He argued that it was against the national wage policy. The unions insisted that it was for the President to make that decision because the wage stabilizer could not set aside a ruling made under the Railway Labor Act.

CARRIERS' VIEWPOINT

The National Mediation Board was ordered by Mr. Vinson to reconvene the emergency board which had made the 8 cents award. The mediation board said that only the President could do so. For some undisclosed reason the President did not reconvene the fact-finding board. Instead, he created a second such board. This one carried out Mr. Vinson's directive and recommended a wage increase of 4 to 10 cents an hour. This Mr. Vinson approved.

At the time of these incidents it was predicted in some quarters that the Administration's handling of the railway labor problem might result in the act's becoming a war casualty.

In the early days of the last war few cases went to Presidential boards. But since 1941 the unions have been restive and have pressed wage demands militantly. The result has been that some disputes have gone to strikes because unions have refused to abide by recommendations of the emergency boards.

The tally of such refusals kept by the carriers is that since 1941 the unions have rejected the findings of seven fact-finding boards in whole and one in part. The union argument is that the law does not compel acceptance so they withhold complete approval but use the proposals as a basis for negotiation and settlement.

Unquestionably, in many cases in recent years the fact-finding procedure has been used in comparatively trivial cases. In other cases these boards have been set up to adjust matters which should never have gone to them because other machinery exists for handling such disputes.

For example, once contracts are made between unions and carriers, disputes arising under these agreements go to what is known as an adjustment board. There are four such boards, each specializing in cases affecting certain crafts.

FOR DISPUTES AFTER CONTRACT

The law contemplates that decisions in disputes over the interpretation of agreements referred to the adjustments boards shall be binding. And that means there shall be no strikes. The theory is simple. If a contract is really worth the paper it is written on and if machinery exists to interpret grievances that arise while the contract is in force then, too, it stands to reason that neither of the parties shall resort to strike or lock-out over disputes of this nature.

And yet in the last few years the unions have increasingly resorted to strikes or threats of strikes to support the type of grievance which is normally referrable to adjustment boards. Why does this happen? The train and engine service unions complain that Division No. 1, which adjusts their disputes under existing contracts, is too slow, that the board has a large backlog of cases.

Therefore, the unions whose cases go to the first division now bypass this machinery. The law says that the parties may submit these relatively minor disputes to the adjustment board.

The unions interpret it to mean that they need not do so. They then set a strike date in order to create an emergency. Despite the relatively minor nature of many of these disputes the President names an emergency board to consider them when these top-level boards have always been intended only for the most pressing disputes.

The railroads, on the other hand, insist that if a union refuses to submit grievances that arise out of the contract to the Board set up to adjust these disputes, then it cannot, in all good conscience, resort to a strike.

Both railway management and employees' brotherhoods have in the past shied away from making the findings of emergency boards binding. However, management has now come face to face with an important decision as a result of the current firemen's strike. This week outstanding railroad operating chieftains told a Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee that they were in favor of amending the law to make reports of fact-finding boards final and binding. They supported a bill to this effect offered by Senator FORREST C. DONNELL, Republican, of Missouri.

PRICE FOR NO-STRIKE BAN

But Senator DONNELL's bill goes even further. He would have every dispute which the National Mediation Board is unable to settle turned over to a Presidential emergency board. That would mean creating thousands of such boards. The door would be opened to the diversion of many minor disputes to these boards.

This is the price the Missouri Senator is willing to pay for his no-strike objectives on the railroads.

His proposal may well turn over to the Federal Government many interunion disputes. At present the National Mediation Board takes the view that jurisdiction squabbles among unions are a matter of internal housekeeping among these organizations.

Some opinion in Congress favors removing the exemption of railway workers from the emergency provisions of the Taft-Hartley law. This would permit an 80-day injunction when a strike is threatened.

Labor in other fields is eyeing the move to ban strikes on the railroads with interest. It is concerned lest such a drastic step might spread to other essential industries.

On the other hand, the principle of adjusting disputes that grow out of contract appears to be spreading so rapidly that this phase of the Donnell proposal is unlikely to have any effect on unions and industries elsewhere.

Rail Walkout Hits Union Pacific Line

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FORREST C. DONNELL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 15 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Rail Walkout Hits Union Pacific Line; United States Parleys Begun," from the New York Times of May 14, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RAIL WALKOUT HITS UNION PACIFIC LINE; UNITED STATES PARLEYS BEGUN—FIVE BIG ROADS ARE INVOLVED IN FOURTH DAY OF WALKOUT—RISE IN JOBLESS EXPECTED—SERIES OF TALKS SLATED—ISSUES WERE DISCUSSED FULLY, FEDERAL MEDIATOR DECLARES AFTER 4-HOUR MEETING

(By George Eckel)

CHICAGO, May 13.—The National Railway Mediation Board held the first of a series of conferences today in an effort to settle the 4-day-old railroad strike that now affects five big roads and has thrown 200,000 men out of work.

Francis A. O'Neill, Jr., Board Chairman, announced at 4 p. m. that the Board had held "an informal joint conference of the parties" but "the case is not settled." He said the conference had lasted 4 hours.

"A full and frank discussion of all the issues took place," he went on. "The parties have now returned to their headquarters and are discussing the issues with their folks. This announcement is made to let the public know we are working on the case."

Both parties conferred with the Mediation Board again tonight. There was some reason to believe President Truman's impending visit might be speeding the machinery.

Mr. O'Neill said that additional conferences would be held in Chicago, either joint or separate, but that no dates had been fixed.

Asked if the strike was any nearer settlement because of today's conference, he first said, "No comment," then added:

"We said yesterday it was deadlocked. All we can say now is the case is not settled."

"Were any new proposals put forward today?" he was asked.

"No comment," he replied.

"How has the situation changed?"

"No comment."

Mr. O'Neill declined to identify those at the conference except to say they included representatives of both parties.

THE UNION PACIFIC INVOLVED

The day's strike developments included two moves by the striking Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen to bolster its position. One was at Harrisburg, Pa., and the other in California, where the Union Pacific, hitherto not involved, was affected. The union embargoed a 100-mile section of the Union Pacific trackage.

The other struck roads are the New York Central, the Pennsylvania, the Santa Fe, and the Southern.

Meanwhile, unemployment resulting from the walkout hovered around the 200,000 mark, with nonstriking railroad employees accounting for perhaps three-quarters of the total. No large increase in layoffs was reported today, but the total appeared due for substantial increases shortly if the strike was prolonged.

The Pennsylvania and the Southern roads, however, announced substantial increases of service in the strike area.

In Knoxville, Tenn., three switchmen of the Southern Railway were charged with having fired on freight trains Thursday night, slightly wounding one trainman acting as fireman. Arrested last night, they were reported to have signed statements admitting the shooting.

District Attorney General Hal H. Clements, Jr., filed shooting charges against Charles Anderson Watson, R. M. Norman, and Paul Brackett. They were arrested last night in an automobile in which two Japanese rifles and a .22 caliber rifle, and ammunition were found. Their statements reportedly said that one of them did the shooting, in which two Southern Railway Diesels pulling freight were ambushed.

The strike was called at 6 o'clock Wednesday morning against the New York Central west of Buffalo, the Pennsylvania west and north of Harrisburg, and the lines of the Atcheson, Topeka, and Santa Fe and the Southern Railway. Called out were 18,000 firemen.

At issue is the firemen's demand for a second fireman aboard multiple-unit Diesel locomotives. Two presidential fact-finding boards have declared the demand to be without merit.

The Union Pacific was involved in the strike by the union's announcement here today that firemen would not take U. P. trains over 100 miles of track between Daggett and San Bernardino, Calif. This trackage, it said, belongs to the Santa Fe. This provision was to go into effect at 6 o'clock, Pacific standard time, tonight. This track is on the U. P. route between Ogden, Utah, and Los Angeles.

FREIGHTS TO BE REROUTED

UP officials here and in Omaha, Nebr., said that freight trains would be rerouted over the Southern Pacific tracks but that some passenger service would be canceled. The Los Angeles Limited and City of Los Angeles left here today, with supervisory employees scheduled to take over as firemen on the struck trackage. But Los Angeles cars of the transcontinental Gold Coast will be dropped, it was announced.

At Harrisburg, Pa., picketing was begun against Pennsylvania Railroad traffic east and south of the city, an area previously unaffected. The road said service had not been affected thereby.

D. S. Herrick, a local official of the brotherhood, said that the Pennsylvania had violated a promise not to operate trains west or north of Harrisburg.

The picketing arrangement is designed solely to prevent crews taking trains at Harrisburg for runs east or south, according to a union spokesman here. A crew assigned to a train at Philadelphia could bring it into Harrisburg and take it back again without crossing picket lines, provided the crew did not leave the train while in Harrisburg.

Replying to the union, the Pennsylvania said that the union might have regarded as a "neutrality agreement" a public statement by Walter S. Franklin, president of the line, at the beginning of the strike. This statement, according to the railroad, was that if the strike were prolonged, it would probably be necessary to lay off a lot of people and stop all trains.

At Spartansburg, S. C., the Southern Railway said it was recalling Monday 460 of 750 employees in construction and maintenance shops. It was also announced that freight service in the area was "nearly normal" and that six of twenty passenger trains normally serving Spartansburg, on the main Washington-Atlanta line, were back in service.

Civil-Rights Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HOMER FERGUSON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 15 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, in accordance with the consent granted to me during the course of my remarks today, I present herewith for printing in the Appendix the speech delivered over the radio by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] on April 12, 1950, and the speech delivered over the radio by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] on April 17, 1950.

There being no objection the speeches were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY HON. LISTER HILL, OF ALABAMA, MONTGOMERY, ALA., APRIL 12, 1950

ALABAMA'S FUTURE LIES IN THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY

My friends, the people of Alabama face a most important decision. Will Alabama stay in the Democratic Party or will Alabama waste her strength and influence by walking into a Dixiecrat splinter party?

This is a decision of such importance to all of us that I cannot, as your Senator, sit silent in Washington while the question is being determined.

It is my duty to you, the people I serve, to speak out and tell you that I am convinced the interests of Alabama and the future of her people lie in the Democratic Party.

"I am a States' rights Democrat. I have fought the battle of States' rights. I have kept the faith. I tell you it is the power and influence of your Senators and Congressmen that has made possible the defeat of FEPC and the other so-called civil-rights bills, they hold this power and influence as members of the Democratic Party.

The anti-poll-tax bill is bottled up today in a subcommittee of the Senate Rules Committee. Senator JOHN C. STENNIS, of Mississippi, is chairman of this subcommittee because of his membership in the Democratic Party. If he were a member of a Dixiecrat splinter party he could not be chairman of this committee or any other committee. He could have little influence in the fight against the civil-rights bills.

The general civil-rights bill is bottled up today in a subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee. Senator JIM EASTLAND of Mississippi is chairman of this subcommittee because of his membership in the Democratic Party. If we were not a Democrat he could not be chairman of this committee or any other committee.

As a Democrat, I hold a place on the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I led the fight in the committee against the FEPC bill, and the committee adopted the bill like a foundling on the Senate's doorstep—without a word in its favor.

If our group of southern Senators is to continue to defeat these civil-rights bills, we must keep the power and influence we hold as members of the Democratic Party.

We know the Republican history of the civil-rights bills. When the people of the Second Alabama District first sent me to Congress some 25 years ago, the House of Representatives was engaged in a fight over the antilynching bill. It was a Republican bill, just as the antilynching bill on the calendar of the Senate today is a Republican bill, introduced by the Republican Senator from Michigan, Mr. FERGUSON.

The Republican Party brought the civil-rights bills into being and today the Republican leader in the House and the Republican leader in the Senate proclaim the Republican Party's solemn commitment to these bills.

You and I remember the days of the Republicans—the bitter days of the Hoover administration—when cotton was selling for 5 cents a pound; banks were failing one after another and the life savings of our people were wiped out; businesses went bankrupt and farms and homes were lost; thousands of men and women walked the streets looking for jobs and entire families knew hunger and misery.

We saw the Democratic Party change all this and save our free-enterprise system.

You and I know what the performance of the Democratic Party has meant to us in Alabama—

More jobs than ever before in Alabama's history. Payrolls and profits for Alabama's people last year at the high water mark of two and a half billion dollars. Business, small and large, has prospered as never before. The savings of every Alabama depositor are protected by Federal deposit insurance. Alabama's businessmen know a new freedom for their enterprise under my amendment to the Transportation Act removing freight rate discriminations.

Our farmers have prospered through support prices, farm credit, crop insurance, soil conservation, rural electricity, rural telephones, farm housing, and reduced tenancy. The income of our farmers is six times their income under the Hoover administration and they and their families know a new way of life.

Our industrial workers have won jobs, collective bargaining, decent hours, and minimum wages.

The county poorhouse of the Hoover days is gone and our people have social security. Our old people are protected against hardship and the workers are protected against unemployment. Dependent children and needy mothers are cared for, and crippled children and the blind are given care and training.

There is TVA with its benefits for all Alabama, created by the act I introduced in the House of Representatives. TVA power serves farm and factory and city. And with TVA the income of the people of the valley has increased more than the income of any other section of the country.

There are the thousands of new homes and apartments for Alabama's families.

There is the GI bill of rights which gives education and job training, and farm and home and business opportunity to our veterans.

Under the Hill-Burton Act, Alabama is building hospitals and health centers. By next January more than 60 Alabama cities and communities will have their own hospitals and health centers completed or under construction.

We see new school houses, hundreds of miles of hard-surfaced roads in every Alabama county, airports, city halls, and vast public works. Our children benefit from school lunches and vocational education. In the Senate we have twice passed the Federal-aid-to-education bill. As an author of the bill I look forward to the time when the House of Representatives will follow the Senate's good example and the bill becomes law.

The development of Alabama waterways for which we have worked so long—the Tennessee, the Tombigbee-Warrior, the Chattahoochee, the Coosa-Alabama—points the way to the conservation and development of all Alabama's resources.

The Democratic measures have brought new strength and new prosperity to Alabama—to our farmers, our workers, our businessmen, to all our people.

As your Senator, I have worked and labored and fought for these measures with all my heart and soul. As I talk to you at this

moment I fight to preserve them, that their benefits and blessings may continue to flow to you, to Alabama, and to all our people.

The Dixiecrat leaders would destroy these measures. They join hands with the Republicans and denounce the measures as socialism. The Dixiecrats and the Republicans seek to tear down that which the Democratic Party has built for us. Dixiecrats and Republicans are birds of a feather.

Alabama's Dixiecrat leader, the chairman of the State committee, advocates an open alliance of Dixiecrats and Republicans. Addressing the State committee in Montgomery on January 21 he proposed that Dixiecrats and Republicans nominate the same candidate for President in 1952. He suggested that Dixiecrats could "share" with Republicans "in the glory of electing a President."

The New York Times of March 9 carried the following story:

"Guy George Gabrielson, Republican national chairman, has met in recent weeks with some top leaders of the States' rights Dixiecrat movement to discuss a plan whereby Dixiecrat votes might be thrown to the GOP nominees in 1952.

"The plan would be based on a 'trial marriage at the top.'

"Under the scheme the States' rights Dixiecrats would nominate for President and Vice President the same men picked by the Republican National Convention."

And so, my friends, we have the strange doings of Dixiecrat chairman and Republican chairman to deliver you and your vote to the Republicans.

I do not believe that you, my Democratic friends, wish to be handed over to the Republicans.

You have not forgotten that the Republicans, when they controlled the Eightieth Congress, tried to sabotage the farm programs by slashing the funds for soil conservation, production and marketing, REA, school lunches, and farm ownership. They tried to sabotage TVA by denying the funds for the New Johnsonville steam plant which the Democratic Party has now given us. They blocked extension of social security, made a mockery of the housing program, and crippled our trade agreements.

Only a few days ago we had before the Senate our bill to adjust cotton- and peanut-acreage allotments and prevent discriminations and hardships to Alabama farm families. We won the fight for our farmers. But we won through the votes of Democrats—northern and southern—against almost solid opposition from the Republicans.

The Senators of the South know that we could not have won as members of a Dixiecrat splinter party. Senator RUSSELL, of Georgia, Senator CONNALLY, of Texas, Senators GEORGE and BYRD and HOEY, and the rest stand squarely in the Democratic Party. Former Senator Jimmy Byrnes has said that he will fight his battles in the Democratic Party.

In 1948 the people of Virginia, North Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Tennessee, Arkansas, and Texas were as much opposed to the so-called civil-rights bills as we were in Alabama. But they refused to walk out of the Democratic Party.

The refusal of these sister States to walk out of the Democratic Party was the death knell of the Dixiecrat Party. And it grows weaker as the days pass.

It was different when the people of Alabama went to the polls on November 2, 1948. The people of Alabama were not permitted to vote and make free choice as were their fellow southerners. Two years ago the Dixiecrat leaders on the State committee maneuvered Alabama out of the Democratic Party and led Alabama into a splinter party—the Dixiecrat Party.

This must not happen in Alabama again.

We must elect Democrats to the State executive committee. The members of the State committee are the trustees of the Democratic Party in Alabama. They cannot serve both the Democratic Party and the Dixiecrat Party.

We in Alabama cannot be both Democrats and Dixiecrats any more than we can be both Democrats and Republicans. We cannot be Democrats in Washington and Dixiecrats in Alabama. Either we are in the National Democratic Party or we are out of the National Democratic Party and in the Dixiecrat splinter party.

The Dixiecrat leaders tell you that this decision can be postponed until 1952. They want to put off facing the issue.

We cannot put off this decision. We live in the Democratic Party every day in the year. We meet our problems day by day—as Democrats. We won the fight for our cotton and peanut farmers—as Democrats. We hold the line against the civil rights bills—as Democrats.

In this touch-and-go hour in world affairs, as Democrats, we will not divide and split into factions and parties as did the nations that have fallen to the Communists. As Democrats we stand united for America's strength for keeping the peace.

We go to the polls on May 2, vote for Democrats for the State committee, and we remain in the Democratic Party.

We remain in the house of our fathers—the Democratic Party, the party of Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson, the party of Grover Cleveland and Woodrow Wilson, the party of Franklin Roosevelt.

SPEECH BY HON. JOHN SPARKMAN, OF ALABAMA

My fellow Alabamians, I am speaking to you from Mobile. For these few minutes I want to talk just as frankly and just as sincerely as I can about a matter of great importance to all of us in Alabama, that is whether we in Alabama shall go our way politically alone or shall be a part of the two-party system under which this country has become so great, so powerful, and so prosperous.

The Democratic Party is 150 years old. For 100 years there have been two great parties, Democrats and Republicans. From time to time third parties have been tried. But in every instance such splinter party has become a complete failure and of short life. The two most recent efforts have been the Henry Wallace Party and the Dixiecrat Party in the 1948 election. The Henry Wallace Party is dead. The present effort in Alabama is to keep alive the Dixiecrat Party. I believe that it will fail. I know that for the good of Alabama it ought to fail.

There are some things about the Democratic Party that I do not like; some parts of the platform that I will not accept; some of the legislative program that I will not support. We do not have to sacrifice any of our convictions. I am against the civil-rights proposals—always have been and always will be. One of the first votes I cast upon going to Congress 14 years ago was against one of these bills. Almost every year since then I have voted against such proposals.

To listen to some of those who would lead us into a splinter party, one would think that the civil-rights proposals were first made in 1948. They have been coming up with consistent regularity since shortly after the Civil War. During the time I have been in Congress I have voted against them more than a dozen times. In the 1890's, Alabama's great Democratic Senator John T. Morgan, led a successful filibuster against such legislation proposed by Republicans to punish the South.

The platforms of both great parties for many, many years have carried similar proposals for so-called civil-rights legislation. Every platform upon which Franklin D. Roosevelt ran contained such proposals—and Alabama gladly supported Roosevelt without question.

By the way, we southern Democrats had the chance to have the same language on civil rights, almost word for word, in the 1948 platform as was in the Roosevelt platform in 1944. I can say that the decision was Alabama's to make. I was in the hotel meeting of the Alabama delegation that hot Sunday afternoon when the proposal was made. But, unfortunately, half of our delegates had gone to that convention determined to walk out, and they were determined that nothing should happen to keep them from walking out. So they refused to accept the 1944 version and thereby brought about the fight in the convention that resulted in the more objectionable language in the platform. They took the position that they would not play unless they could write every single rule. That is the attitude that the Dixiecrats are taking today. You and I know that games are not played that way.

Even though the Democratic platform, as well as the Republican, carried a pledge for civil-rights legislation, no such law has been enacted. And I predict that if you do not take away from us who represent you in Congress the power that is ours as long as we can operate as Democrats—on the inside—there will not be any such legislation.

After all, civil-rights legislation is not defeated by Dixiecrat maneuvers in Alabama nor by threats of the formation of a splinter party. In the past it has always been defeated on the floor of the Senate. There, and there alone, must we look for its defeat in the future.

We southern Democratic Senators—21 of us—are banded together and pledged to use every parliamentary device possible to defeat civil-rights legislation. And listen to this: Every single one of those 21 southern Democratic Senators believes that we should stay in the Democratic Party. We know what our most important weapon is. It is the ability to work as Democrats.

Some seem to think that the Republicans are our friends in defeating civil-rights proposals. Such is simply not the case. I have before me an AP news item of April 12, the headline of which tells the story. I quote: "Republicans demand act on FEPC."

In recent months a civil-rights amendment has been offered to three different measures, all important to the South. In each instance, the amendment was offered by a Republican Senator, and in each instance the Republicans voted strongly for the amendment and the Democrats—northern and southern alike—voted against.

On a Republican proposal to tie the civil rights to Federal aid for education, not a single Democrat voted for it. On the Republican proposal to tie civil rights to housing, the Republicans voted almost solidly for it while only three Democrats voted that way. A similar Republican attempt to tie civil rights to the oleo tax repeal bill was strongly supported by Republicans, but opposed unanimously by Democrats.

Let us never for one moment be fooled into thinking that we can depend on Republican help to defeat these measures.

I repeat: We must depend upon our group of 21 southern Senators operating as Democrats inside the Democratic Party.

Alabama has much to lose in getting out of the Democratic Party.

And regardless of what may be said, the Dixiecrat program calls for our leaving the Democratic Party. We cannot be Dixiecrats in Alabama and Democrats in Congress. We simply cannot move in and out of the Democratic convention and Democratic Party at will. We must take our place—either in or out.

Following the 1948 defection it was thought for some time that we from the Dixiecrat States would not be regarded as Democrats. Certainly another such defection will not be ignored.

We are Democrats today by sufferance only.

Let us consider very briefly what this would mean to Alabama.

Just last week I was named chairman of the new Senate Committee on Small Business. This came to me without solicitation and indeed without notice. I am a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, one of the most important and powerful committees in Congress. I am chairman of the Housing Subcommittee. I am a high ranking member on the Public Works Committee having jurisdiction over Federal-aid roads, rivers and harbors, flood control, and public works generally.

Senator HILL holds high rank in the Senate and on some of the most important committees as a Democrat.

The same is true of our House Members.

If we were splinter party members—as the Dixiecrats would have us be—we could not have these assignments.

Let me make clear that I am not talking about the honor that may be ours individually to have these assignments. Committee assignments mean work and the higher the rank the more work. It would be much easier for us from an individual standpoint to have minor assignments or like the left-winger MARCANTONIO—the only splinter party in Congress today—to have no legislative committee assignment at all.

But I know you do not want Alabama represented that way. Alabama is entitled to the best representation possible. She is entitled to be heard in Congress. She cannot hope to get the representation to which she is entitled through a splinter party such as the Dixiecrats would have us adopt.

Patronage is not helpful to the individual Senator or Congressman from Alabama. I think every one of them would tell you so. But it is a matter of responsibility. It is a matter of considerable concern to the people of Alabama to have somebody in Alabama and answerable to the people of Alabama to approve of appointments to many responsible positions.

For instance, your postmaster in every community and your rural mail carrier. Do you want them named by your Congressman or by someone in Washington? Your collector of internal revenue, your Federal judges, your United States marshal, district attorney, and all of those who administer the Federal courts and enforce Federal laws in Alabama—do you want them selected by someone in Washington or by your United States Senators?

Senator HILL and I, as Democrats, have the responsibility of naming these. If we should make a bad choice, we are answerable to you, the people of Alabama.

Let us consider our Federal judges and other officers of the Federal courts. When an appointment is to be made now Senator HILL and I as Democrats make the selection. Make us Dixiecrats and the selection will be made in Washington by the Attorney General, who at the present time is Mr. Howard McGrath. Senator HILL and I are answerable to you. Mr. McGrath is in no way subject to your control or influence.

Neither we nor you care for the patronage. We are concerned with the responsibility of making such appointments. I do not believe you want to throw away this local control—this local accountability.

A majority of the House Members have spoken out strongly urging us to stay in the Democratic Party. Not a single one has spoken out in favor of the Dixiecrat proposal for a splinter party.

The Democratic Party was the party of our fathers. Under it the South has done well. It is a national party covering all parts of the Nation. It is made up of many different groups with widely differing views. It is big enough for us all to fight out our differences on the inside. There is where we should work exerting effort to clean up the parts we do not like. We can get nowhere by threatening.

Some dream of a tremendous balance of power. It is merely a dream and not at all realistic. Look at the other splinter parties we have known. Never did one of them wield the balance of power either in Congress or in the electoral college.

I opposed President Truman's nomination in 1948. But I always said that our fight should be in the convention and inside the party. I still believe in this principle.

May I say that I have no personal grudge in this fight. Many of my good friends differ with my views. They remain my friends. I cling to the hope that they will see the error of their ways, that before it is too late they will recognize for what it is the blind alley into which they would take the people of Alabama and that they may see the disservice they threaten to do to Alabama.

Let us preserve the two-party system. Let us not follow the will-of-the-wisp—that is all the Dixiecrat splinter party can be. Let us be Democrats or let us be Republicans. As for me I choose to be a Democrat.

This plea to stay in the Democratic Party comes to you, my fellow Alabamians, from one who was born and reared among you, one who believes deeply in preserving States' rights, one who is steeped in the traditions of the South handed down to me by my Confederate forebears, one who is dedicated to the cause of fighting for the traditions, the customs, the way of life of the South. It comes from one who is on the firing line and has been for 14 years. I know where this fight is to be won and by whom it is to be won. Do not take away from us the tools with which to do the job.

Jobless Rise Seen in the Rail Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FORREST C. DONNELL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 15 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Jobless Rise Seen in the Rail Strike," published in the New York Times for May 14, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOBLESS RISE SEEN IN THE RAIL STRIKE—NEW YORK CENTRAL TO LAY OFF 10,000 MORE BY TOMORROW—UNION ACCUSES PENNSYLVANIA RAILROAD

A sharp spurt in unemployment by tomorrow as a result of the national railroad strike was anticipated yesterday as the walk-out passed its fourth day.

Already some 200,000 persons have been made idle by the strike of 18,000 members of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen. With industry normally closed down for the week end, there were few reports of new lay-offs yesterday but many predictions that the situation would grow worse tomorrow.

The New York Central Railroad said 40,000 employees were not working yesterday and that this number would increase to 50,000 tomorrow if the strike continued. This would mean that almost one-half of the line's total of 103,000 employees would be out of jobs, most of them in the strike-affected area west of Buffalo.

In a move to curtail renewed movement of freight traffic by the Pennsylvania Railroad west of Harrisburg, Pa., the union organized picket lines at the road's key division point in that city. The action might halt passenger trains as well.

HARRISBURG TRAFFIC CUT

Under the original strike call, traffic east of Harrisburg to Philadelphia and New York and south to Baltimore and Washington was not affected but was cut after the walk-out began. On Friday, however, the Pennsylvania sent 10 freight trains westward and was operating 21 yesterday as well as performing switching service at a number of points.

Yesterday brotherhood pickets appeared at the line's main yards in Harrisburg used for dispatching train crews and at the big freight classification yards at nearby Enola. In explanation of the picketing, D. S. Herrick, a brotherhood representative, said:

"The Pennsylvania Railroad management has violated the provisions of that statement (not to operate trains west or north of Harrisburg) leaving us no alternative but to establish picket lines in the Enola, Pa., and Harrisburg district."

A railroad spokesman in Philadelphia reported the pickets had caused no changes yesterday in operations east and south of Harrisburg. Since the strike's outset five daily trains have been moving over the main line to and from Philadelphia and three to and from Baltimore.

INCREASED FREIGHT SEEN

In New York, a railroad spokesman said it was anticipated that freight service could be further increased today "with every effort being made to provide some service to industry and business along the Pennsylvania line to the extent possible under the circumstances." Normally the road operates 1,500 freights north and west of Harrisburg.

The New York Central announced new service cuts in New York State, discontinuing four trains beginning tomorrow.

These curtailments, for the strike duration, are in addition to earlier cuts made in schedules. A line spokesman said the previous service cuts had reduced traffic on the newly affected trains, thus making suspensions necessary.

Reports from up-State New York said 3,500 workers were idle yesterday as a result of the strike. Most of these were non-striking railroad workers.

The Boston & Albany Railroad, part of the struck New York Central system, laid off 850 employees in all departments. Harry D. Johnson, general manager, would not say how long the furloughs would last, but he attributed them to a sharp drop in passenger and freight traffic.

The General Motors assembly plant at Framingham, Mass., which laid off 1,400 workers on Friday, said it planned to resume production tomorrow. The Boston & Albany services the plant with raw materials from the Middle West.

At Washington's Union Station the rail strike has actually raised employment. The Washington Terminal Co., which runs the depot, said it had furloughed 100 maintenance men, but had hired 200 extra dispatchers to reroute additional mail coming in.

Three hundred members of the striking brotherhood on the St. Louis division of the Southern Railway joined the walkout at 6 a. m. yesterday. The 475-mile division extends from East St. Louis, Ill., to Louisville, Ky., thence southeastward to the terminus at Danville, Ky. This walk-out affects six freight trains daily in and out of East St. Louis. The single daily passenger train was canceled when the general strike began.

Indian Bureau Budget Proposals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 15 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very informative letter relative to the Indian Bureau and its budget proposals for the Indians of California. The letter is addressed to me under date of May 8, 1950, by Purl Willis, counselor, Mission Indian Federation, San Diego, Calif.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDIAN BUREAU BUDGET FOR CALIFORNIA
WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 8, 1950.*

Hon. HUGH BUTLER,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR BUTLER: This statement is presented in the belief that it will help to clarify and justify the testimony of a number of Indian delegates from southern California who appeared before the Subcommittee on Appropriations considering items affecting California Indians, on February 27, 1950, and urged the complete elimination of the proposed Bureau budget for the California Indian Agency for the next fiscal year starting July 1, 1950.

THE GREATEST HANDICAP TO INDIANS IS ENFORCED WARDSHIP

It is this writer's belief gained over a score of years intimate acquaintance with Indians and their problems, that the paramount issue confronting California Indians is this nightmare of wardship. We all admit that no people can advance and grow strong while under the handicap of perpetual wardship. California Indians became citizens under the terms of the treaty made with Mexico in 1848, and, although they were designated as "nations" in the treaties ordered to be made by the United States Senate in 1850 (but which were never ratified), the Indian Bureau arbitrarily took charge of all California Indians along with their ancestral lands on the basis that they were wards, meaning an incompetent people. We can find little attempt by the Bureau to aid and train California Indians in assuming the responsibilities of citizens during the past 100 years. The pitiful condition of most California Indians today is wholly the fault of the Federal Indian Bureau, and not because of lack of natural ability on the part of our Indians.

More than three-fourths of the enrolled California Indians are not under the direct influence of the Indian Bureau; yes, more than 15,000 California Indians live outside of the so-called Indian reservations. These Indians have long ago taken on the responsibilities of individual citizens. They have met the tests of citizenship responsibility and fully justify the testimony given by the Indian delegates who urged the complete elimination of the whole of the Indian Bureau budget for the State agency for the coming year. The verdict of every investigating committee of Congress has been the same—the universally poor condition found among Indians (ward Indians) has been charged to the manner in which the Indian Bureau has been handling this problem. Drastic changes have been ordered by Congress, but somehow the fundamental policies of the old Indian Bureau have not changed. Congress has been most tolerant and generous with the Bureau. If an accurate record be made showing the number of Indians in the Nation who should be classed as in need of Government supervision today, it would show, in our belief, that there are less than 200,000 who should be dealt with as wards. From all sides of this controversy, one hears the charge that the Indian Bureau is concerned first with its own plan to perpetuate itself. It has been the same under all administrations.

All America has an interest in this Indian problem. See the Nation-wide interest displayed within the last few years concerning the great Navajo Indians. For instance in southern California, right among the some 30 small bands of Mission Indians, where the witnesses who testified before committees recently live, a score or more trucks gathered donations of food, clothing and medicine, and funds and rushed them to the Navajo Indians, while the majority of the Mission Indians who are known as being in very great need gets little attention.

THE JOHNSON-O'MALLEY ACT OF 1934

As a result of the Nation-wide investigation by Congress about 1930, organized groups of friends of Indians demanded a new program toward Indians. Prominent leaders among women's clubs, welfare groups composed of leading educators in cooperation with welfare officials from several of the States, held many conferences and finally a plan was announced which its proponents acclaimed as the solution to the Indian problem.

The basic idea of this new plan was to have the States take over the principal services or aids needed by Indians. These services were education, welfare and medical attention. It was agreed that these fundamental needs were common to all Indians in all the States where Indians live. It was quickly appreciated by Government officials, and by State and county welfare officials that the Indian problem could now be reduced to a common-sense basis. Like in all vexing questions which go on and on without a solution, when approached on a sound basis, an answer is found. The policy and theory of the Indian Bureau across the years was to keep its control of Indian life, and it was obvious that in these three fields—Indian education, welfare, and hospitalization—the whole Indian life could be molded. Therefore, it was reasoned by these new friends, if these services could be taken over by the States, there would be few handicaps left; all Indians would soon be absorbed into the general population. Here follows the Johnson-O'Malley Act:

"(Public, No. 167, 73d Cong., S. 2571)

"An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to arrange with States or Territories for the education, medical attention, relief of distress, and social welfare of Indians, and for other purposes.

"Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to enter into a contract or contracts with any State or Territory having legal authority so to do, for the education, medical attention, agricultural assistance, and social welfare, including relief of distress, of Indians in such State or Territory, through the qualified agencies of such State or Territory, and to expend under such contract or contracts moneys appropriated by Congress for the education, medical attention, agricultural assistance, and social welfare, including relief of distress, of Indians in such State.

"SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Interior, in making any contract herein authorized with any State or Territory, may permit such State or Territory to utilize, for the purpose of this act, existing school buildings, hospitals, and other facilities, and all equipment therein or appertaining thereto, including livestock and other personal property owned by the Government, under such terms and conditions as may be agreed upon for their use and maintenance.

"SEC. 3. That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to perform any and all acts and to make such rules and regulations, including minimum standards of service, as may be necessary and proper for the purpose of carrying the provisions of this act into effect: *Provided,* That such minimum standards of service are not less than the highest maintained by the States or Territories with which said contract or contracts, as herein provided, are executed.

"SEC. 4. That the Secretary of the Interior shall report annually to the Congress any contract or contracts made under the provisions of this act, and the moneys expended thereunder.

"SEC. 5. That the provisions of this act shall not apply to the State of Oklahoma.

"Approved, April 16, 1934 (48 Stat. 596)."

THE INDIAN BUREAU THEORY OF THE INDIAN PROBLEM IS WRONG

It has now been more than 100 years since Congress turned over to this Federal agency the responsibility of educating and training Indians to fit them for citizenship. Today the Indian Bureau demands that it be given another 5, 10, or 25 years or even longer, before it is ready to release its autocratic control over Indians and their property. The Bureau calls upon Congress for larger budgets as it announces new regional district offices staffed with old employees who have been promoted—but the same old philosophy of never allowing the Indian a chance to help himself is an integral part of its every program.

Most all students of Indian life today, just as they did back in 1934 when the Johnson-O'Malley Act was approved by Congress, agree that the obligation of the Nation toward its Indian citizens is to extend them equal opportunity with the predominating white race. In our opinion, one of the most constructive steps Congress has ever taken toward solving the Indian problem was its enactment of the Johnson-O'Malley law. All agreed at the time that henceforth the states would assume the full responsibility of extending equality to Indians in the basic fields of education, welfare, and medical attention. Indian Commissioner John Collier, who was one of the leading proponents of this new plan, completely failed to give the law a fair chance. In California, like his program in certain other States, Collier refused to carry out the full intent of the act; he only made a contract there for the State to take over Indian education.

The Johnson-O'Malley Act was agreed upon by its sponsors with California in mind, as the three main services or agencies in the fields of education, welfare, and medical service in the State were extolled as of the highest in the Nation. This writer, along with numerous Indian leaders, urged Mr. Collier to make a contract with California for all three of the main services provided in the act. Collier's answer to us was that he also felt this would be best, but that he "did not run the Bureau, although he was the commissioner." We felt that then as now, the staff of intellectuals of the Bureau, actually set the policy of the Bureau. We can clearly see today that if the Secretary of the Interior would have complied with the real intent of the Johnson-O'Malley Act and turned over to the State of California the services intended, there would be little left to the California Indian problem. Although the Bureau had a contract made with California for Indian education only, in 1935, the Bureau today is to all intents and purposes in actual control of Indian education. It has changed the original plan, and has set up its regional and state staff, and directing how the fund of some $324,560 should be spent. We cannot see any reason why the Indian Bureau should be allowed to have anything to do with the education of Indian children in California. California public schools are free—there can be no

extra charges required of one group of citizens which are not demanded from others.

For instance, an item of some $800,000 was included in the Bureau budget by the Sacramento Indian Agency intended to be used by the Bureau in constructing a public school for the Hoopa Indian community. There are some 800 enrolled Indians in the Hoopa band; they have valuable lands, with a good stand of timber and other assets. White children attend the public schools at Hoopa, though the Indians are in the majority. The school buildings are old and in great need of repair or replacement. They were formerly an old Army barracks. It is the first duty of the local district and the State school authorities to furnish proper school facilities. I am very sure that the Hoopa Indians do not want the Indian Bureau to have anything to do with building a new school plant, or in any manner controlling their affairs. These Indian citizens are among the most able Indians of the State and for years have been looked upon as being fully capable of assuming all the duties of other citizens. In 1947, Acting Commissioner Zimmerman, testifying under oath, named the Hoopa Indians as one of the groups which should then be released from all forms of wardship.

If Congress desires to assist the Hoopa Indians in this school-building program, we submit that it would seem to be proper to make the fund available to the State, as the Johnson-O'Malley Act provides, and not give it to the Bureau.

THE WHEELER-HOWARD ACT SET INDIANS BACK 50 YEARS

We felt that in 1934, when the Indian Bureau upper staff decided to not give its full support to the Johnson-O'Malley Act in California and certain other States, it would bring out its own plan. The Johnson-O'Malley Act if enforced, would naturally and surely break up the old Indian Bureau policy. Early in March 1934, the Collier-Woehlke members of the old American Indian Defense Association, now in control, brought forth their own version of directing Indian life. It laid before the Congress its 50-page Wheeler-Howard bill, which after several weeks of intensive hearings was reduced to its present form of some 10 pages. Under it Indians were to set up laws and regulations apart from the other citizenry. It was an experiment which many officials charge follows the communistic theory. Of course, many of the leading groups of Indians voted the bill down: Notably the Navajos, the Hoopas, and the Mission Indians.

As stated above, practically every congressional committee over the years has condemned the Indian Bureau manner of handling the Indian problems. The tangled and confused mess in all Indian problems—welfare, school, health, and inheritance—is the result of the Bureau policy—its whole theory has been to perpetuate itself. It is a sad reflection upon the Congress, for Congress should be the policy-making authority. The more than a score of Indian communities or reservations mostly in the remote areas of southern California, present a case of abandonment. The Bureau has been in complete charge of these people. With scores of Federal housing projects being thrown on the surplus market, it would have been a comparatively easy matter to have made a few hundred of these houses available to needy Indians. Likewise surplus trucks, machinery, tools, etc. would have been transferred to these people if the Bureau would have heeded the appeal of Indians.

SUMMARY OF THE CALIFORNIA INDIAN PROBLEM

California Indians should have long ago been released from all Federal wardship, further delay will only complicate and confuse the program. All investigating committees have recommended that California Indians be taken from the enforced wardship status. California Indians are taxpayers, citizens, and voters. Only about 5,000 of the 20,000 California Indians live on restricted lands—the other 15,000 have always lived as individual responsible citizens, owning their own homes and paying all the taxes imposed on other persons. The Indian Bureau and not the California Indians would suffer if Congress stands by the decision of the House subcommittee to not approve any funds for the Bureau for the coming year. Under State welfare laws all needs for aid, hospitalization, etc. are made available to Indians on the same basis as to other citizens. California Indians have sustained irreparable losses to the Federal Government and to the State; once they were potentially among the wealthiest in the Nation, and today under the status of Bureau wards, most of them face the direst of poverty.

The greatest blessing any people can have is the right to live on equality with his neighbor, and, this writer is of the firm opinion, that all California Indians deserve to be released from the shackles of wardship. They will quickly take their places as responsible citizens. All other obstacles will soon be eliminated if they could now gain their freedom from this enforced un-American status of wards.

Respectfully submitted.

PURL WILLIS,
Counselor, Mission Indian Federation.

Strike Over Diesels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FORREST C. DONNELL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 15 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Strike Over Diesels," published in the New York Times of May 14, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STRIKE OVER DIESELS

The first Diesel (oil-burning) locomotives on an American railroad went into service on the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy in 1934. Since then the economical Diesel has been rapidly replacing the steam (coal-burning) locomotive. Diesels already account for about 28 percent of all locomotives in service. Of the 4,700 locomotives built since the war, 4,300 are Diesel.

The advent of the Diesels has long caused friction between railroad management and labor—particularly the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, most of whose 110,000 members are firemen. The principal point of contention has been the manning of large engines powered by two or more Diesel units. The brotherhood contends that these engines need two firemen—one to service the Diesel units, the other to stay in the cab with the engineer in case he should faint or be otherwise incapacitated.

The brotherhood's fear of technological unemployment plays a large part in the dispute; one large Diesel often is used on hauls which previously required two or more steam engines—and two or more firemen. Moreover, the brotherhood complained that the roads were giving to other employees the servicing work that could be given to firemen.

COMPANY POSITION

Management argued that even one fireman had little to do but help the engineer watch dials and track signals, since Diesels need attention only after thousands of miles. Two firemen, the railroads said, would be pure "featherbedding"—payment for work not done.

The brotherhood pressed its demand in 1943 and again in 1947. The dispute went through the procedures of the law governing railroad labor relations—the Railway Labor Act of 1926. The procedures are, first, mediation by a National Mediation Board, then recommendations for a settlement by a Presidential fact-finding board, with no requirements for either side to accept the recommendations. Last September, a Presidential board rejected the demand for an extra fireman. It said the demand was "devoid of merit." The brotherhood repudiated this finding. In Chicago efforts to mediate the dispute went on without results.

FIFTH ROAD STRUCK

Last week the Chicago talks broke down. At 6 a. m. Wednesday 18,000 firemen struck. For tactical reasons the strike was directed against only four major roads—the Southern, the Santa Fe (Chicago to the west coast), and the New York Central and Pennsylvania lines west of the Appalachians. These lines handle two-fifths of the Nation's passenger traffic and one-fourth of the freight. The strike quickly cut their traffic to a trickle and disrupted connecting lines. Freight shipments were stalled, particularly in the heavily industrialized Midwest. Predictions were that as a result hundreds of thousands of industrial workers would soon be laid off. Air, truck, and bus lines did a booming business. Yesterday the strike hit a fifth road—the Union Pacific—because it uses some Santa Fe trackage.

The firemen's strike tactics seemed designed to meet a special legal situation confronting railroad labor. The situation is this: The Taft-Hartley Act, with its provision for 80-day injunctions against national emergency strikes, does not apply to railroad labor. The Railway Labor Act has no injunction provisions. But 2 years ago in a dispute involving the firemen and two other rail brotherhoods, a Federal court ruled that the Government could enjoin a Nation-wide rail strike under its general powers, regardless of any statute. No strike, the court said, could be permitted to disintegrate society itself. The Supreme Court later rejected an appeal by the brotherhoods. In effect, this meant that unions that operate trains could not stage a Nation-wide strike. As a result the firemen's strategy apparently is to strike piecemeal, hitting various segments of the industry in turn.

Address by Bernard M. Baruch at the Thirtieth Anniversary of School of Business and Civic Administration, College of the City of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 15 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, on last Thursday, May 11, 1950, America's park-bench philosopher, the Honorable Bernard M. Baruch, spoke words of wisdom to the students of his old alma mater, the college of the city of New York. His treatment of the dangers of present-day economic trends in the United States should be brought

to the attention of all Members of Congress; therefore, on my own account and on behalf of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], I ask unanimous consent to insert his very wise speech in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, anything which Bernard Baruch writes or says is as good reading for the American people as are Adam Smith and Samuel Smiles, because Bernard Baruch understands the meaning of America and the worth of American institutions in the development of a vigorous, free citizenry. But since I am one generation later out of college and since my experience with universities is one generation earlier than the present group of students to whom Mr. Baruch is speaking I cannot refrain from saying the following:

The wealth of nations, self-help, and thrift have meaning only when money is stable and good, bank deposits are certain and sure. What is the use of teaching thrift if the place where one puts his profits is unsafe? What is the use of relying on self-help when one cannot do anything for himself because he either has to inherit wealth or belong to the group that controls it. The men and women who graduate from the universities today have some hope of future success, and they can save their earnings without fear of their being lost. That was not the case when I left my university position. The boys and girls I helped to graduate moved into a sphere of uncertain economy, an atmosphere of no faith in banks, and an almost jobless future. Government still has much to do for its citizens.

Mr. Baruch might have gone further and said what every graduate of any university knows that anyone who would like to see the downfall of the American Government is not only a traitor to his neighbors but he is a traitor to all civilization and to mankind because the world's hope today rests upon faith that American stability, American wealth, and the American dollar will see them through.

So, Mr. President, because of the universal interest which the address Mr. Baruch delivered at the thirtieth anniversary of the founding of the School of Business and Civic Administration, College of the City of New York, May 11, 1950, will have, I join in the request of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], that it be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is an honor to be here today. It recalls happy memories. Sixty-five years ago I was a student in the old City College building located here.

Every morning we filed into assembly. President Webb read from the Bible. A sophomore climbed the rostrum to deliver a declamation; then a junior and a senior an oration. When my turn came, how my knees trembled and my heart pounded, as they do now.

Of all my teachers, the one who influenced me most was Professor Newcomb. He was never strict about requiring attention to his lectures. Students who preferred to play chess could sit in the back rows and pass the chess boards across their desks. Professor Newcomb wouldn't bother them. The students interested in what he had to say sat up front. That was where I always sat.

It may strike you as quaint, even old-fashioned, that Professor Newcomb taught political economy, logic, ethics, philosophy, and psychology—all in one course. Today these subjects would be fragmented among several professors. Such specialization is not necessarily a mark of progress. Too many educators seem to have forgotten that you cannot teach good economics, good politics, good ethics, or good logic unless taught together as parts of one whole.

With overspecialization has come a tendency to mistake information for education, to turn out quiz experts, who are crammed full of useful detail but who have not been trained how to think.

Nor is this defect confined to our educational institutions. Washington today is a dismaying example of Dryden's observation about those "who think too little and talk too much." For 5 years we have been engaged in a mighty struggle for peace and survival—the cold war. Yet nowhere are all the tangled strands of that struggle brought together in one place to be woven into a unified global fabric. We continue to stagger from crisis to crisis, with the initiative left to the enemy. We remain too obsessed with today's details to think through the bold strategy so vital for tomorrow.

What is lacking is not so-called information. There has never been so much news, so many statistics, so many alleged real inside stories. Yet the public has never been more confused.

To print all the facts collected by our great communications agencies would exhaust our paper supply. Of what avail is a forest of facts if we have lost the art of sitting on a log and thinking the facts through? We appear to have lost our ability to distinguish between the true and the false, the good and the evil.

The object of all fact gathering is to furnish material for thought and reasoning to arrive at sound judgments which can lead to clear and constructive decision and action.

That ours is a well-intended confusion is significant. It indicates that the failure of our educational system is a double one, of bad moral habits as well as bad thinking habits. I refer to morals in the broadest ethical sense. Too many people seem to regard good morals and good intentions as the same thing.

Morality rests upon values; what we regard as good and evil, what we live for, what we would die for. Without such values, everything would be reduced to a cynical zero. Values, in turn, rest upon discipline, on regulating one's behavior by the light of one's values and the rights of others. Morality, in other words, requires both good intentions and the strong backbone of self-discipline. Yet how many of our schools and teachers attempt to teach values without discipline.

This dual educational failure, the failure to instill in students the know-how of thinking and a disciplined grounding in ethics, is all the more tragic because never were these two qualities in greater need.

I have already remarked on the folly of dealing with national and international problems on a piecemeal basis, without a thought-thorough strategy. Let me now turn to the moral dilemma which grips us all and which will grow ever sharper as the role of government grows.

Some of you who look to Government action as the cure-all for our numerous ills may be startled by this statement, that our moral problems will grow more acute the more the Government undertakes to do. With the revolt against the old laissez faire, do-nothing government philosophy has come a sense of community responsibility for the individual welfare, and rightly so. Civilized society cannot survive the jungle law of fang and claw, with its ruthless survival of the fittest.

But do-nothing government is dead. Virtually every phase of economic life is subject to some Government intervention or regulation. The issue we now face is whether, as some say, community responsibility should be everything—and individual responsibility nothing. This doctrine ignores the human law that there are limits to the burden a community can carry. There is a point of no return beyond which Government intervention and the lack of responsibility among nonproducers slow down all production and defeat their own purposes.

To lift the levels of human dignity and living is a proper function of government. I joined with both Woodrow Wilson and Franklin Roosevelt in their programs of humanitarian reform, in the Adamson 8-hour day, collective bargaining, economic equality for farmers, and other new freedoms. I opposed the conscription of labor in the recent war, even when President Roosevelt's liberal advisers favored it. I have favored pensions and care for the aged, infirm, and handicapped, and have urged that America take the lead in lifting wages and working standards all over the world.

Enormous advances have been made under our present system, the best in the world. These advances can be pressed further in years to come—as long as we preserve our form of government. But the way to protect human rights is not to socialize them. The chief threat to human rights is no longer one of too little Government, as it may have been 30 years ago when this school of business and civil administration was founded. Freedom's greatest threat today is too much government, that all limits to government action may be swept away.

Is there to be no line beyond which government shall not go, as it is in Soviet Russia, and becoming so in socialistic England? Is government action to be prompted by the sheer expediency of whichever greeds or pressure groups appear strongest at the moment? Or is it to be subject to higher ethical restraints, and if so, what are they to be?

That is the dilemma which will confront you through the rest of your lives. You will have to ask yourself not should the Government take action, but how can the Government's action be made just and fair to all?

Do-nothing government, we were told, was a cloak for powerful interests who wanted to be let alone to despoil the country's resources and the public. How unselfish are they who today invoke the power of government to further their own interests, or to get votes?

The plunder of our natural resources has been largely checked, though not entirely. Are we now to have a new system of plunder of the National Treasury?

Is the old let-me-alone philosophy to be replaced by nothing better than a gimme-mine philosophy?

Under the old philosophy of do-nothing government, it was not necessary to define or regulate social relations in detail. It was assumed that if each individual looked after his own interests, the end result, through a Darwinian process of natural selection, would be for the general good. That age had never met Hitler.

With Government regulation, we now must consciously define man's relations to his neighbors, of the various segments of society to one another. To consciously regulate ourselves poses enormously greater problems than when taking things for granted, trusting to the automatic workings of competition.

Look at the inflation that has wracked the country in recent years, with such injury to those with fixed incomes and wages—firemen, teachers, policemen, nurses, civil servants, pensioners, the aged, and others. This inflation has not been the result of do-nothing economics. It has come from

Government-managed economics, from Government favoritism to certain pressure groups, in disregard of the national interest.

To prevent this inflation, as you know, I urged that in war, priority controls be accompanied by an over-all ceiling over the entire economy, over all prices, all rents, all wages, all costs, with taxes high enough to eliminate profiteering. This plan would have treated everyone alike. It would have frozen all prices arbitrarily as of some fixed date. Adjustments could be made where essential to stimulate production and to relieve inequities.

Instead, under political pressure and only after much costly delay, a piecemeal price control plan was passed. This law legalized inflation. It allowed farm prices to rise to 110 percent of parity; it left wages free. When this broke down, the administration attempted to hold the line with an over-all ceiling, as had originally been recommended. By then the damage had been done.

With the war's end, we scuttled and ran. The process of inflation by pressure groups was given whirl after whirl with the end not yet in sight.

Millions have been penalized through a cruel reduction of their purchasing power. Was that just, or fair?

What moral would you draw from this inflation?

Only recently increased old-age pensions were voted. This justly recognized that since 1939 living costs have risen around 60 percent. What good will increasing pensions do unless the spiral of inflationary policies and deficit spending are halted and pressure groups fought off?

Every form of saving has been depreciated—life insurance, Government bonds, thrift accounts, annuities, and pension funds. Week after week, bit by bit, these sums were put aside by millions of persons for their old age, for buying a home, for sending a child to college. To the extent that these savings are cheapened, the ability of these millions to care for themselves and their families is weakened. They have been made more dependent upon the Government. They have been made more insecure.

Yet, all this has been done in the name of security.

This false gospel of security through deficit financing is evidence of bad-thinking habits. If men and women are to provide for their futures, they must be able to put aside part of the earnings of their most productive years and be assured those earnings will not be wiped out. Saving is the first bulwark of security. Inflation is the worst enemy of savings.

In Soviet Russia, the people saved up their rubles, the accumulated sweat and hopes of a generation of work and deprivation. Then, ruthlessly, the Soviet Government slashed the value of the ruble to one-tenth. For all Russians over 40, nothing was left but to work at a bare subsistence level until they died. They could never hope to regain the savings their government had wiped out.

In eastern Europe the Communists have demonstrated another form of tyranny—near-feudal slavery through inflation. Farmers, for example, are paid liberally for their crops. After the crops are collected the money is ruthlessly depreciated. To get working credit for a new crop, the farmer is compelled to join a Communist-dominated organization which controls his planting and returns.

Wherever they have come to power, the money. They have robbed savings of their Communists have wrecked the value of value and keep the people enslaved through a system of perpetual inflation.

Nothing quite so bad has happened here—yet. If American fiscal policy becomes a perpetual inflation machine—as deficit financing would make it—the result must be to enslave us to the Government.

One of man's oldest delusions has been that he could avoid the necessity of working and saving by some money trick—lowering its value, printing more of it, changing lead to gold, burying gold in caves or concrete dungeons. In every instance these efforts have brought ruin.

Moreover, deficit financing has convicted itself as a system of practical economics. It has been tried. It has failed. England, where Keynes and his school were born, cannot finance her own recovery by deficit spending. In this country when the recent war ended, the apostles of bigger and better deficits predicted a calamitous depression. Ten million were to be unemployed. Waging a campaign of fear against the American people, these deficit spenders pressured for and got tax reductions. Inflationary increases in prices and wages necessarily followed.

I opposed reducing excess-profits taxes after the war, an action which, to date, has cost the Treasury thirty to forty billion dollars. Even before the war ended, I stated that for at least 5 and possibly 7 years after the war, there would be more work than there were minds and hands to do—no matter what the Government did or did not do. After that it depended upon the peace. If those taxes had not been reduced, there would be no budget deficit today.

Now, what I have said here is not intended to suggest that a return to do-nothing government is either desirable or possible. Nor that we should cease to strive for a more equitable sharing of the fruits of our production. I do want to impress upon you that the mere shift from do-nothing government to Government intervention does not, in itself, solve our problems. Unless this ever-expanding Government activity is brought under the restraints of the highest moral laws, it will wreck our society.

Woodrow Wilson wrote, "It will be a bad day for society when sentimentalists are encouraged to suggest all the measures that should be taken for the betterment of the race."

Everywhere in the world today there is change. Nowhere is there peace. When I was a student here at City College, it was taken for granted that change was good, that change meant progress. None of us can believe that any longer. All of us have seen that change can be bad and oppressive.

Yours is a far more confused and difficult outlook than that which confronted my generation. You must stand amidst all the many changes pressing upon us and decide which are good and which are bad. You can take nothing for granted.

The world is always in need of leadership. Today the need is for self-disciplined leadership. With the training you have received here and the self-discipline which can only come from your own souls, you will find open to you positions of ever greater trust and responsibility—positions in which you, holding firm to the values and freedoms we cherish, can join in leading this country toward peace and a fuller life.

Mr. Truman Builds a (Figurative) Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN
OF VERMONT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 15 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Mr. Truman Builds a (Figurative) Dam," written by Edward H. Collins, and published in the New York Times of May 15, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. TRUMAN BUILDS A (FIGURATIVE) DAM

(By Edward H. Collins)

In an address here on May 2 Harold E. Stassen commented half humorously on President Truman's prospective swing through the West. Said the former Governor of Minnesota and contender in 1948 for the Republican Presidential nomination:

"He will go out to Grand Coulee Dam—the plans for which were proposed under President Hoover, the construction of which was carried on by President Roosevelt and the payment for which was voted by both Republicans and Democrats alike—and, standing on the edge of the dam, he will * * * act as if he had built it with his own hands."

Mr. Truman did make a speech at Grand Coulee Dam on Thursday of last week, and he didn't suggest that that project was his own personal handiwork. But when Mr. Stassen referred to Grand Coulee Dam he was, of course, speaking figuratively. Substitute Lincoln, Nebr., for Spokane, Wash., and the administration's farm program for Grand Coulee Dam and the accuracy of his picture becomes almost too painfully obvious.

Mr. Truman's thesis at Lincoln may be summed up roughly as follows:

1. "We" attacked the depression "at its roots" in 1933 and introduced a farm program that has been spectacularly successful.

2. When World War II came along this program "proved its worth all over again." The stored-up surpluses of cotton, wheat, and other crops, which had been bitterly criticized before the war, turned out to be extremely valuable."

3. However, the existing mechanism has revealed certain defects which call for correction. The best way to do this is by enacting into law the so-called Brannan plan.

4. It will be necessary "in some cases" to limit crop production * * * but this must not be confused with the idea of "regimentation." After all "under our system, quotas are not imposed unless two-thirds of the farmers affected vote for them."

Now this was quite a "dam" that Mr. Truman built before the eyes of his listeners in Lincoln, Nebr. But if Grand Coulee rested on no firmer foundation and if it had been built of equally flimsy materials it most certainly would have collapsed of its own weight long before it was finished. To see why this would have been so, let us examine briefly the four main points made by Mr. Truman.

1. Of the three agricultural programs introduced in recent years—the first AAA, the Soil Conservation Act and the second AAA—the most recent had become law 7 years before Mr. Truman came to office and the earliest 12 years before.

The fact is that, just as the plans for Grand Coulee were prepared under Mr. Roosevelt, so the foundations for the original Agricultural Adjustment Act had been laid more than a decade before even the advent of the New Deal administration of Mr. Roosevelt. The concept of parity, which is the backbone of the present farm policy, for example, was first introduced at a conference on agricultural policy called by a Republican Secretary of Agriculture, Henry C. Wallace (father of Mr. Roosevelt's secretary, Henry A. Wallace). Its authorship is generally ascribed to George N. Peek, another Republican. In March 1922, the Department of Agriculture began publishing a purchasing power index series in its publication, Weather, Crops

and Markets. The first specific proposal for securing equality for agriculture was the original McNary-Haugen bill of 1924, formulated by Mr. Peek and Gen. Hugh S. Johnson.

2. When he says that the farm program proved its worth in World War II Mr. Truman is undertaking to transform a major blunder into a far-sighted constructive achievement. Actually, as most persons, fortunately, know Government-held surpluses had reached unmanageable proportions when World War II came along and saved the administration from the consequences of its folly. Under Mr. Truman history is now repeating itself with respect to crop surpluses, but on a greatly magnified scale. Are we to assume that what Mr. Truman is suggesting is that we continue in the direction in which we are now going on the assumption that a Third World War will come along to bail us out once again?

3. Mr. Truman's assurance that the Brannan plan will remedy the defects in the present program has absolutely no basis in logic. The Brannan plan calls for support prices even higher than those provided under the present program; at the same time, it would effectively chloroform political opposition to these high-level price supports by subsidizing consumption of perishable farm produce, which represents 75 percent of the total.

4. There is nothing basically wrong with the concept underlying the present farm program. Its imminently threatened breakdown under the Truman administration has been purely the result of political vacillation. While the administration has been an eager advocate of plans for supporting farm prices at high levels it has persistently flinched from demanding their necessary corollary, production control. No change in the mechanics of the farm program can cure that kind of defect.

Mr. Truman denounced as preposterous allegations that there could be any regimentation in a plan under which marketing quotas may be applied only when two-thirds of the farmers agree to accept them. What the President did not add, was that failure on the part of farmers to vote for marketing quotas when they are called for means very heavy penalties, ranging from the withdrawal of benefits to the actual taxation of commodities produced on excess acreage. In the opinion of this writer, that is a thoroughly desirable arrangement. What is not desirable is for the administration to seek to sell the Brannan plan, or any other plan, on the ground that at one and the same time it will, and will not, provide for what some call marketing controls and other regimentation.

Markets Move Narrowly as Rail Strike Assumes Serious Proportions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FORREST C. DONNELL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 15 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Markets Move Narrowly as Rail Strike Assumes Serious Proportions—Output Holds High," by John G. Forrest, financial editor of the New York Times, appearing under the heading "The financial week," in the New York Times for May 14, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FINANCIAL WEEK

MARKETS MOVE NARROWLY AS RAIL STRIKE ASSUMES SERIOUS PROPORTIONS — OUTPUT HOLDS HIGH

(By John G. Forrest, financial editor).

Activity in financial markets was circumscribed last week by developments of a conflicting nature. The open season for political speeches coupled with another strike—this one more serious in its implications to the national economy than the recently-settled Chrysler dispute—sharply offset numerous favorable reports on business conditions. It was not surprising, then, that stocks moved narrowly and indecisively in less active tradings.

The strike against four of the major railroads, on the question of an additional fireman for Diesel locomotives, caused an immediate curtailment of train schedules. It also affected activities in many industries far removed from railroading. The full impact will be felt more by the automobile, steel, and coal industries than by other groups, but eventually every segment of the Nation will suffer if the strike continues for any length of time.

The high level of industrial production also was threatened by the possibility of a strike against General Motors if current talks between the company and the United Automobile Workers break down. The feeling persists nevertheless, that a settlement will be reached because of the experience in the costly Chrysler strike. It may be significant that, although May 29 is the deadline for changing the contract, the union has not yet announced its termination; this means that legally there cannot be a tie-up on that date, since 30 days must elapse after the filing of the termination notice before a strike can start. Some hint of progress may be revealed at the annual meeting of the company, which will be held on Friday.

However, if labor conditions were disquieting, developments in the political arena here and abroad were more reassuring. The omnibus appropriations bill, for the fiscal year beginning on July 1, was passed by the House after the total was slashed $1,000,000,000. The cut actually amounted to $600,000,000, but a compulsory reduction in personnel that has been ordered will reduce the Government's outlay by another $400,000,000. The big news from abroad was the proposal made by France that the coal and steel industries of that country and Germany are to be integrated. Considered one of the most dramatic developments since the announcements of the Marshall plan and the North Atlantic Pact, it is believed that this proposal, if consummated, would go far toward stabilizing Europe's economy.

Although the stock market, as measured by the New York Times averages, reached a new high for the movement since July of 1946, prices seesawed through most of the sessions in the smallest week's trading in a month. The volume remained below the 2,000,0000-share mark each day, indicating caution on the part of traders despite otherwise favorable conditions in the industrial picture. Special groups and issues were featured in the trading, while several former favorites were relegated to the background.

Steel production again was scheduled above 100 percent of capacity for the fourth consecutive week. Output in April was 8,196,050 net tons of ingots and steel for castings, the largest production for April in the history of the industry and the third time that output has topped the 8,000,000-ton level. Mills are running in excess of capacity in an effort to satisfy the tremendous demand, some of which is the result of inventory losses during the steel and coal strikes. With the conversion market booming and gray market activity increasing, the pressure is threatening to blow the top off scrap prices, but the question in the minds of operators is how long can the huge operating rate continue.

Trade statistics continue mostly favorable. Industrial output in April was higher for the fifth consecutive month. The Federal Reserve Board announced that the preliminary estimate put it at 88 percent above the 1935–39 monthly average. Demand for tin, lead, copper, and zinc also was heavy and price increases occurred in several metals. Production of all goods, in the first quarter, was at an annual rate of $262,000,000,000, compared with $258,000,000,000 in the corresponding period of 1949.

In some sections of the economy there were grounds for a more cautious appraisal of conditions. The Department of Commerce reported that business inventories reached $55,000,000,000, on March 31, an increase of $500,000,000 over February. The gain was principally in goods held by retailers and wholesalers. Net income of class I railroads for the first 3 months of this year aggregated $53,000,000, against $62,000,000 in the 1949 period.

Employment of Negroes in Boston Stores

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 15 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor on Wednesday, May 10, 1950, which I believe is pertinent to the debate on the FEPC bill.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BETTER JOBS FOR NEGROES WIDENING IN BOSTON STORES

(By Laura Haddock)

Widespread employment of Negroes in superior jobs in Boston's department and specialty stores is now an established fact, due to the work of the Urban League of Greater Boston toward this end since 1944.

The whole story is told in a booklet published by the league this week under the title "The Boston Drama."

Where once a Negro could expect to be employed in a department store only as an elevator operator, cleaning man or woman porter, maid, presser, janitor, matron, kitchen woman, bus girl, or stock clerk, today the field is opening wide.

The Urban League reports, "Now there are store buyers, supervisory trainees, salesgirls, salesmen, advertising personnel, clerical workers, clerical and sales trainees, and personnel workers."

The stores to which the Urban League gives special thanks for cooperation in this work are: Conrad & Co., C. F. Hovey, Gilchrist Co., Jordan Marsh Co., Leopold Morse Co., Lerner Shops, Raymonds' Inc., Touraine Stores, and William Filene's Sons Co.

All the fears expressed when the program was first tried have gone out the window, says the Urban League. It adds: "All stores as listed above now report unlimited opportunities for Negroes. Unions joined with management in making possible this progress.

"Management reports unified satisfaction, and in many cases the desire to do more in this field.

"From many quarters come reports of complete satisfaction with what has gone on in Boston. Customers write to management people. Fellow employees praise Negro workers. Personnel people discuss it together. In Boston there is a growing sense of pride that the community is finding the answer to a problem.

"Young colored Americans living in Boston can now feel that, with proper training, the doors are no longer closed in the retail sales field, and they are therefore preparing to become efficient workers in dignified jobs of their choosing."

There was of course, concern at first over the possible resistance of customers to dealing with colored sales clerks. On this point the Urban League says: "All stores have reported a sizable amount of favorable comment, both written and oral, when customers first saw colored salespeople and clerical workers in the stores.

"Management was, on the whole, overwhelmingly complimented on this policy. Some customers, feeling strongly, wrote employers not hiring Negroes in the better classifications, and transferred their accounts to more democratic stores.

"There were complaints from a handful of people who criticized the new policies."

The Glory of American History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 15 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Glory of American History," written by Harry H. Schlacht, and published in the New York Journal-American of May 8, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GLORY OF AMERICAN HISTORY
(By Harry H. Schlacht)

America sits with the dew of youth on her starry brow.

Americans should know their American history. Americans should thank God they are Americans.

There is no study more delightful, there is no study more profitable, than the study of American history.

Our youth should know the stirring saga of the birth and the pageantry of our blessed country.

Our history is comparatively brief but brilliant. Our history is without parallel.

Our youth should know we have won the right to live as free men and women.

Our youth should know how our sainted fathers laid the foundation of the temple of freedom before whose altar, in a little more than a century and a half, 150,000,000 Americans should bow.

America is like a gallant ship under full sail upon the stormy sea of time.

She bears a cargo costlier than the most precious rubies for millions yet unborn.

Her voyage is just beginning. Her sails are filled with heavenly breezes.

This glorious ship of liberty is destined to bear its benedictions for all humanity.

The Hearst newspapers have consistently and persistently advocated through the years the teaching of American history in all our schools and colleges.

A recent survey reveals the gratifying information that twice as many colleges require the study of American history today as compared with 8 years ago.

This is a magnificent tribute to the great editorial campaign initiated by the Hearst newspapers.

The study of American history should be mandatory in all American schools and colleges.

There is no excuse for any American to be ignorant of the land that gave him birth, of the land that gave him shelter and a home.

If we love America and its civilization, if we love its dream of humanity; we will instill in our youth a love of country.

Love of country is one of the loftiest of virtues. Love of country is one of the essentials of good citizenship.

He is not a good citizen if he does not love his country.

There are those in our midst who would pass an erasing finger over the memories of our glorious past; who would entice us away from our trophies, our songs, and our dreams.

They would drown out the music of the drums and the silver voice of the heroic bugle. They would leave us not a single melody or note to recall the visions of our saintly sires whse deeds should be glorious to Americans of today and to Americans yet unborn.

By educating our youth in American history we can defeat their nefarious purpose.

He is not worthy to bear the name American who does not make a glad and proud study of his history.

Let us see to it that the ideals of our fathers are not defamed. Let us see to it that the democracy does not fail. Let us see to it that the American beacon light shall shine o'er the earth.

Firemen's Warning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FORREST C. DONNELL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 15 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Firemen's Warning," appearing in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of May 11, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIREMEN'S WARNING

Railroad firemen have been given a warning of what may be in store for them and other laboring men if the strike against four major railroads is prolonged. Senator DONNELL has asserted that the strike emphasizes the need for his bill banning strikes on railroads or airlines.

That is not all. Railroad officials are urging Congress to pass the Donnell bill. If the strike continues, pressure for an antistrike law, which might be extended to other industries, undoubtedly will increase.

The firemen do not have much of a case to present to the public in this instance. Their principal demand—placing an additional fireman on multiple-unit Diesel locomotives—already has been considered twice and rejected twice by public boards of inquiry. In the absence of authoritative and disinterested evidence to the contrary, it looks as though feather-bedding rather than safety is the union's goal.

In their own as well as the public's welfare, the firemen should go back to work. They are running serious risk of having their right to strike taken away from them altogether. If that were to happen, then the merits of the case would not matter.

Campaign of Truth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM BENTON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 15 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Campaign of Truth," appearing in this morning's Washington Post. This editorial reinforces the urgent need for action in line with the objectives of Senate Resolution 243, calling for a "Marshall plan of ideas."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAMPAIGN OF TRUTH

The communiqué issued at London by the Foreign Ministers of the three big western powers underlines the need for joint efforts in what President Truman has called "a great campaign of truth." "Faith in freedom should not be taken for granted, but should be built into a dynamic force," the Foreign Ministers say, "and steps should be taken to increase public understanding of the exact nature, methods and dangers of the threat to its existence." From the State Department come reports that a new working agreement on counterpropaganda is in the making between the United States and Great Britain and perhaps with other North Atlantic Treaty countries. Such steps are long overdue. Since the object of the free world in the cold war is to protect itself against the encroachments of communism without resort to arms, harmony of effort in the informational field is of inestimable importance.

One of the immediate aims of the British-American negotiations, which Assistant Secretary of State Barrett hopes to bring to a head on a visit to London this week, is to increase from 73 to 100 the transmitters through which western information can be beamed upon the iron-curtain countries. Additional power as well as new transmitters is needed to prevent the Soviet Union from jamming the Voice of America and the British programs. Plans also call for British-American committees to exchange information and prevent conflicts in foreign policy broadcasts. These are important steps toward integration, but they seem to us inadequate. Nations that are in the process of unifying their military defenses must necessarily bring their informational services into harmony if their joint efforts are to attain maximum effectiveness.

Lack of harmony in the free-world propaganda broadcast to the countries behind the iron curtain suggests lack of agreement as to what the basic policies of the free world are. It is not to be supposed, of course, that any one unified agency could speak exclusively for all the diverse peoples in the free world. But so far as the foreign policy

of the Atlantic community of powers is concerned, the need for concerted efforts to enlighten people now in darkness is obvious. No nation, as we recently noted on this page, can effectively carry on such a campaign single-handed.

As for libraries and documentary films, the American people have scarcely begun to realize the possibilities of preaching the doctrine of freedom by these means. Perhaps there is less necessity for international cooperation in establishing libraries abroad and making available informational films, but the spectacle of free countries working together to promote the type of education that makes for peace is always impressive. Joint efforts to promote education about the free world ought to be vigorously promoted in the spirit of the Foreign Ministers' conference.

Legal—But Tragic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FORREST C. DONNELL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 15 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Legal—But Tragic," appearing in the Washington Daily News, a Scripps-Howard newspaper, for May 13, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEGAL—BUT TRAGIC

There is nothing illegal about the locomotive firemen's strike against four of the Nation's key railroad systems.

However gravely their strike may injure the country, the firemen are within their rights under the Railway Labor Act.

This law, enacted by Congress in 1926 at the joint request of railway unions and managements, does not prohibit strikes.

It provides a system of Government conciliation, mediation, and voluntary arbitration which for many years maintained an almost unbroken record of industrial peace on the railroads.

It puts no compulsion on either side in a controversy to accept the decisions of fact-finding boards appointed by the President of the United States. It relies solely on the force of public opinion to produce compliance with such decisions.

Settlements brought about by this law were not always satisfactory to one or both sides. But they were far less costly to labor, to management, and to the American people than strikes would have been.

The current firemen's strike, though legal, is nevertheless a tragic mistake.

For it is a strike in defiance of public opinion.

Two Railway Labor Act fact-finding boards, one named by President Roosevelt, the other by President Truman, have held that the firemen's demand—for employment of two members of their union on every Diesel locomotive—is without merit and should be denied.

The almost certain result of this strike, if it continues long, will be to destroy the Railway Labor Act and substitute for it a law to make railroad strikes illegal and require compulsory arbitration of labor-management controversies in the railway industry.

A bill for just that purpose is already before Congress—the Donnell bill, introduced by a Republican Senator from Missouri.

With each day that the firemen's strike continues, public pressure on Congress for enactment of the Donnell bill, or something like it, is sure to grow. A long strike could make that pressure irresistible.

The American people just won't stand for being badly hurt by a strike for featherbed jobs. The firemen's union, in this foolish, tragic strike, is inviting loss of infinitely more than it can possibly win.

Tariff Reductions on Rubber Footwear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 15, 1950

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a resolution passed by the Massachusetts Legislature in opposition to the further tariff reductions on imports of waterproof and canvas-rubber footwear.

The resolution follows:

Resolution memorializing the President of the United States and the Congress and certain departments of the Federal Government in opposition to further tariff reductions on imports of waterproof and canvas-rubber footwear

Whereas members of the rubber-footwear industry are greatly concerned and disturbed, based upon information which is considered authoritative, over the possibility that the Federal Government may put into effect further tariff reductions on imports of waterproof and canvas-rubber footwear; and

Whereas any further reductions in the tariffs on these items would produce an effect upon the American rubber footwear industry little short of disastrous, and it would be impossible for said industry to produce articles which could compete in price with the products of the nationalized industry of Czechoslovakia or with those of Japan with its debased oriental standard of living; and

Whereas the rubber footwear industry is an American enterprise about 100 years old and at one time it supplied most of the world, but since the early 1930's the American industry has been confined to the domestic market because of its inability to meet foreign low-wage competition; and

Whereas at present, such imports from these countries are priced at from 20 to 40 percent under the usual American prices, and the presence of even a small amount of low-priced goods in an industry as seasonal as rubber footwear can be a most upsetting influence on the market; and

Whereas in the decade of the 1930's, the threat to the American industry by the influx of rubber-footwear imports was so great that both President Hoover and President Roosevelt issued proclamations making duties on these products applicable on the American selling price basis, and the rates of duty which were 25 percent on waterproof and 35 percent on canvas remained unchanged, but they applied to the domestic selling price of American-made footwear similar to the imported articles rather than to the selling price of the foreign product; and

Whereas in 1937, when the Czechoslovakian trade treaty was under consideration, this policy was sustained by President Roosevelt, and in 1947, at the Reciprocal Trade Conference in Geneva, the American delegation granted concessions to Czechoslovakia on waterproof rubber footwear which, in effect, cut the American duty in half, which means that the duty on Czechoslovakian footwear was reduced to 12½ percent; and

Whereas this industry is one in which the labor cost, in proportion to the total cost of the product, is very high, namely, 47 percent, and an attack upon the price structure becomes therefore an attack upon the wage structure of the American worker in this field and is also a direct threat to his job; and

Whereas this industry at present is doing a business of about $100,000,000 annually, and employs more than 20,000 men and women, and this is of vital importance to New England and especially to Massachusetts, inasmuch as over 75 percent of this industry is located in southern New England, a small area already hard-pressed economically and struggling to maintain its position in the American scene, and a very substantial portion of this 75 percent, much more than half, is located in Massachusetts, which becomes, therefore, a matter of vital significance for this area, and some particular communities in it would suffer extreme hardship were this industry to become blighted; and

Whereas in view of the aforesaid facts, a vital New England industry, with a long history, is faced with a situation which would make sheer survival difficult and certainly make any prosperity impossible: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby expresses its opposition to any further tariff reductions on imports of waterproof and canvas rubber footwear; and be it therefore further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, Members of Congress from Massachusetts and the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States.

In house of representatives, adopted April 6, 1950.

LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
Clerk.

In senate, adopted in concurrence April 11, 1950.

IRVING N. HAYDEN,
Clerk.

Feather-Bed Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FORREST C. DONNELL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 15 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Feather-Bed Strike," published in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of May 11, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEATHER-BED STRIKE

The strike against four railroads, begun yesterday by the Brotherhood of Railroad Firemen and Engineers, will get little or no sympathy from the public. Nor should it. The issue is clear and of long standing. The union wants to force employment of a second

fireman on multiple unit Diesel engines. Company officials call this a feather-bedding program, and in this instance certainly they seem quite right.

The dispute has been hanging fire for years. When Diesels were first put into service, they were run by one man, an engineer. Under threat of strike, roads added a fireman. Then in 1939 the Brotherhood insisted another fireman be assigned to each Diesel. This insistence has been renewed from time to time.

Yet two presidential fact-finding boards, one in 1943 and another in 1949, held the demand for either an extra fireman or an extra engineer to be unneeded and devoid of merit. The argument of the union that more men in the cabs would promote safety was discredited.

Despite the findings of two boards, appointed by Presidents certainly most friendly to organized labor, the Brotherhood has struck, tying up schedules of the Pennsylvania, the New York Central, the Southern and Santa Fe roads. The Nation's transportation system is crippled and some 500,000 workers will probably be reduced to idleness. St. Louis, being a terminus of several roads, is especially hurt. Twenty-five passenger trains have been canceled, and freight service is blocked on three of the lines.

If the union should win its fight to add another fireman to Diesel units, the next step obviously would be to force use of an extra engineer. Experts have found these changes completely unnecessary. The Brotherhood only injures its reputation by this strike, which seeks made-work in the face of mechanical advances.

The strike calls attention to a bill sponsored by Senator DONNELL which would outlaw such walkouts, and force compulsory arbitration of railroad and airline disputes. Yesterday's development may force an early hearing and congressional action.

It would be interesting to see what the President would do had the strike been called on the road he is now using to "whistle stop" the country on how handsomely the country is faring.

Independence of Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 15 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, appearing in the Washington Post yesterday was an article by Paul C. Johnson entitled "It's High Time the Farmer Threw Away Crutches." I have known this young man from boyhood up, and have known his parents, and I know that Paul Johnson has his feet on the ground so far as agricultural questions are concerned. For that reason I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT'S HIGH TIME THE FARMER THREW AWAY CRUTCHES

(By Paul C. Johnson)

(The following is a digest of an address delivered by Mr. Johnson, editor of the Prairie Farmer, at the University of Minnesota editors short course, on May 5.)

Less than 100 years ago we were an agricultural Nation, with five families on the land needed to supply the food for one family carrying on industrial or city work. We have completely reversed that, so now it takes less than a fifth of our population to grow the food we need, with something to spare.

As a matter of fact, in our most efficient and most modernized farming sections, the ratio is more nearly 10 to 1. This means that 9 families out of 10, or 4 out of 5 for the country as a whole, have been freed to do other things besides grubbing a living out of the soil. They can build homes, manufacture automobiles and refrigerators, operate schools and hospitals. And these are the things by which we measure our standard of living.

Good farming has made it possible for the average American to take food for granted and go on to improve his living standard by the many other things he can earn.

Mr. Average American needs to spend about 25 percent of his income for food. In England, the cost is around 45 percent, including government subsidy. In Italy, it is around 70 percent. In countries like India and China, about 90 percent of the average man's income must go for the food to hold body and soul together.

While only about one-seventh of our national income is in agriculture, around 55 percent of all people in this country are farming or in work that is directly dependent on farming. It's interesting to know that of 9,000,000 individual businesses in the United States, 6,000,000 are farm businesses.

BAD STATE OF MIND

But there is danger in pounding our chests and expounding the indispensability of agriculture. I feel uncomfortable when a farmer declares that agriculture is the key to all prosperity and that the Government must take care of the farmer first. There is a good deal of truth in what the man says, but the state of mind is bad for everybody and especially bad for the farmer himself.

I have heard top-flight industrialists and economists say that the prosperity of agriculture is so important to this country that we can well afford to give agriculture preferred treatment. I cannot agree. I'm quite sure that hothouse treatment may actually destroy the productiveness which has made our agriculture great, and may result in progressive poverty rather than guaranteed prosperity.

There is a warning for us in the public reaction against farmers which has grown at an alarming rate during the past year or two. While much of this feeling it based on misinformation to which both the press and the radio have contributed, it is an ill omen of what may come if agriculture permits itself to be pushed out on a limb by politicians looking for votes and industrial people looking for an indirect guaranty of good business.

We are already too far out on that limb. We must revise our national farm program into something we can live with, something the public will support and, above all, something that will insure an increasingly productive and efficient agriculture.

FARMING FOR UNCLE

Why are we having so much trouble with our present commodity support programs? It's because they tell the producer a lie.

Whenever the support price is higher than what the market will support, then the producer is being misinformed. The minute the farmer starts raising products for Uncle Sam, we're in real trouble. Uncle can't pay Senators and Supreme Court judges in bushels of corn or sacks of potatoes.

Our leading farm organizations have not asked for the present farm-support levels. It is to the everlasting credit of farm leaders that most of them have tried to get rid of the subsidies. But the political ins want to stay in, and the political outs want to get in. Both seem to think that votes are to be had in exchange for Government checks and special privilege.

Our commodity support approach to the farm problem has been warped away from its original purposes. Too many people want to think of it in terms of an income guaranty from the Government to the farmer. Because the marketing problem has somehow become confused with a political philosophy, the various crops and commodities have been out of step with each other, and there has been too much disregard for a basic fact of a free economy: Increased efficiency must be shared.

THE BRANNAN PLAN

In this respect, our support programs have been pretty much in the same class with the much publicized Brannan plan.

Mr. Brannan proposed that we keep all our present supports on basic crops at levels even higher than those which have already gotten us into trouble. But he went beyond this and suggested that since perishables such as milk, eggs, and potatoes could not be successfully handled in storage, we should substitute the direct income payment to the farmer.

His plan had one very attractive feature. These products were to be turned over to the consumer at whatever they would bring. But remember that the farmer would be paid according to his production and Uncle Sam would foot the bill for the difference between what the farmer got in the market and what he should have had according to the standard set up by Mr. Brannan.

What's wrong with this plan? Well, many people, including myself, do not like the idea of the farmer being dependent on Uncle Sam for his income check. Any way you look at it, the income guaranty idea heads down the socialistic path toward stunted production and dependence on government.

Right now we are wrestling with acreage allotments. Hanging over this controversy is a fear that acreage allotments will not reduce production, and that the marketing quotas which are to follow can be enforced only by police state methods.

The Brannan plan would be no different, probably worse. The only way Uncle Sam could get off the hot seat and wean consumers away from their free food ride would be to slap severe quotas on farm production and reduce that production to the point where food prices would rise again.

POINT OF DEPENDENCY

At what point would it be politically expedient to stabilize these Government prices? If I read my political history right, they would try to stabilize them at the point where the farmer could not live without his Government check, but where he would be restrained from embarrassing his bureaucratic supervisors with too much efficiency or too great production. As production controls progressed from big crops to little crops and from feed crops to food products, there would be a thriving production of red tape, and much political pap to be distributed.

Do you know that down in the tobacco country your allotment, that is, the permission of the Government to grow tobacco, may be worth as much as $2,000 an acre on $200-an-acre land? I am told that the farmer committees which are administering the tobacco program are doing a nice job, but I cannot shake the fear that here is an opportunity for political graft which will catch up with us some day.

We are hearing more and more these days about the two-price plan, which you will recognize as the old McNary-Haugen bill

over again. This plan, too, has its attractive features, but its flaws are clearer today than in the McNary-Haugen days.

The two-price plan calls for dumping of some kind. We know now it isn't so easy to dump abroad. But it isn't easy to dump in our own country, either.

We could make a certain amount of corn and wheat into alcohol and pass a law that all gasoline would have to include a certain percentage of this fuel. But that would be robbing the fertility of our soil for an inferior and expensive purpose.

DISASTER UNLIKELY

All right, what should be done?

I believe that now is the time to move in the direction of a free competitive market and greater self-reliance on the part of agriculture. Of course, the patient trembles at the thought of throwing away the crutches. But if we don't do it now, we never will.

Our debt is in good shape. Our efficiency is high. Our customers have money in their pockets, and the city people are outnumbering the food producers by more and more every day.

We'll have some falls when we start taking away this makeshift scaffolding, but I doubt if there will be any widespread disaster. We can still take out certain insurance policies in the name of security and social conscience.

I would like to propose three ingredients of a sound, long-time farm program that could go nicely with a farm economy based on efficiency and the competitive market.

In the first place, I believe that the soil conservation principle is the only justification for Government payments to farm people. City people have a stake in the conservation of the land. The farmer is always under pressure to market the fertility of his soil as quickly as possible. The mortgage needs to be paid, and the children need college education. A carefully worked out system of conservation payments intended to rest and rebuild land would also relieve the farmer's pressure to cash in. The public would get its money's worth in the assurance of a future food supply.

In the second place, I believe the present support machinery should become a standby program for use only in emergency. I believe a price floor should be a floor and not an income guaranty. We had better set up the program in such a way that the politicians cannot change its original purpose.

MARGINAL FARMERS

In the third place, I believe that we should make a real study of the reasons for poverty among farm people. The problem of the marginal farmer is not one of price or of Government subsidy. It doesn't make so much difference whether you get $3 or $5 a hundred for milk if you are trying to support a family on three scrub cows.

No, the problem of the underprivileged farmer is one of education, or credit, of building his farm into a going concern. I believe the Government can do a great deal along this line without tying up the processes of agriculture in a rigid bureaucratic system. I believe we can extend our present activities through the Extension Service and the Farmers Home Administration so that we can meet this problem more adequately. We may want to go a step further and think in terms of building industries in rural areas to take care of people who cannot possibly earn a decent living from the land.

We have been drifting in our national thinking toward the notion that the means are justified by the ends. When you get down to cases, that's the philosophy of the Communist. We want prosperity on our farms, but the means by which we achieve it are important, too—very, very important.

The Medieval Joust

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FORREST C. DONNELL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 15 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter under the headline "The medieval joust," the author of which is Mr. E. C. Craig, who formerly was general counsel for the Illinois Central Railroad. The letter appeared in the Chicago Tribune of April 9, 1950.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MEDIEVAL JOUST

CHICAGO, March 10.—The settlement of disputes by "wager of battel"—"trial by combat"—which originated in the military spirit of early days, was introduced into England by William the Conqueror (1066). Blackstone describes the "trials" in great detail (3 Bl. Comm. 337). They took place in a field especially prepared for them in the presence of the judges of the court in their scarlet robes with learned serjeants of the bar in attendance. The parties fought with staves either in person or by champion. the "trial" began at "sunrising" and lasted "till the stars appear in the evening," or until one party earlier cried, "Craven," or was defeated. Judgment was entered by the court for the victor.

The right to the "wager of battel"—the "trial by combat"—was recognized by the English courts until abolished by an act of parliament. As late as 1817, the Court of King's Bench held the right to trial by combat still existed. In the next session of parliament the act was passed abolishing it (59 George IIIc, 46).

This form of trial could not be recognized in the United States due to the constitutional provision for trial by jury at common law (*Childress* v. *Emory*, 8 Wheat., 21 U. S. 642).

We have, however, "wager of battel"—"trial by combat"—not between individual litigants as of old where no one was hurt but the litigants or their hired champions, but in strikes, where everyone is hurt, especially the public—strikes national in scope, seriously affecting every man, woman, and child—which are increasingly being allowed to choke industry, create unemployment, and cause great economic and social distress.

There is more reason why "wager of battel"—"trial by combat"—should not be allowed where public rights are interfered with and sometimes destroyed, than where it is but a trial between private individuals. As our affairs become more complex, as our activities grow more interdependent, the reasons against this method of settling controversies increase.

We pride ourselves on our Constitution, our wonderful form of government; that this is the land where law governs and not individuals; that all men are created equal; that here exist equal rights to all and special privileges to none; that we settle all controversies between citizens and between Government and citizens in our courts, etc. Yet we allow these anachronous, obsolete, antiquated "trials by combat"—"wagers of battel"—originated by the vandals or some other barbaric tribe, to be used in settling questions which involve our very existence—questions which, as all others are, can be settled by orderly procedure based on facts and not on force.

If the "trial by combat"— "wager of battel"—was barbaric when applied to private litigants, how much more so are these appeals to force—these "wagers of battel," these "trials by combat," of our modern day. The English parliament abolished the one. Congress can constitutionally and entirely abolish the other, and would do so if the people of the country would demand it.

Why the public supinely tolerates these "wagers of battel"—these "trials by combat," with their destructive effect on our daily life, when they can be constitutionally and entirely abolished, is beyond comprehension. That they are permitted is solely due to the apathy of the people. Something should be done about it.

E. C. CRAIG.

Washington in 1800

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 15 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, on this May 15, 1950, I think that many of the Members of Congress would be interested in reading about the Washington of 150 years ago, on May 15, 1800. It is not only interesting to read of the contrasts of the Washington a century and a half ago, but also of the striking similarities of that 1800 Washington with the 1950 Washington of today. Even then Members of Congress had a housing shortage problem to contend with.

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an article by Alexander R. George, Associated Press staff writer, appearing in the Washington Post issue of May 8, 1950. It is interesting and enjoyable reading.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HALF-STARVED CATTLE ROAMING WASHINGTON STREETS IN 1800 GAVE EMBRYO CAPITAL A DISTINCTLY BUSH-LEAGUE ATMOSPHERE

(By Alexander R. George)

The Federal Government took to the woods 150 years ago this spring, moving from fashionable Philadelphia to the wilderness city that was Washington.

On May 15, 1800, President John Adams ordered the executive departments (some 150 officials and clerks and 12 boxes of Government archives) to move to the new Federal city in the Territory of Columbia. Congress had voted in 1790 to make the Territory, later the District of Columbia, the permanent seat of the National Government.

Government officials and clerks made the trip by stage coach, carriage, or horseback. The 140-mile overland journey between the two towns then took the better part of 3 days.

Government records packed in seven large boxes and five small boxes were shipped on a packet sloop down the Atlantic coast, up Chesapeake Bay and the Potomac River. Documents of the State Department included the original Declaration of Independence, the

Constitution, and the Articles of Confederation.

POPULATION THEN 3,000

The new Capital's population was 3,000, a small fraction of the number of sesquicentennial celebration visitors who now daily invade this Capital City of 1,400,000.

Washington was having a housing shortage in 1800. A survey showed there were 253 frame and 109 brick dwellings in the town. Secretary of the Treasury Wolcott, upon arrival here, reported:

"I do not see how Members of Congress can possibly secure lodgings unless they will consent to live 10 or 20 in one house. There are few houses in any one place and most of them are small and miserable huts."

The Congress House (Capitol), President's Palace (White House), and original Treasury building were near enough to completion to provide accommodations for part of the offices. Houses were leased for the State, War, Navy, and Post Office Departments.

Pennsylvania Avenue, connecting the President's Palace and the Congress House, was a dirt road which a writer of the time said was bordered by the forest primeval and swamps. The Avenue's dust, suffocating in dry weather, became a great bog after a rain.

"HOW COULD I DESERVE IT"

A European diplomat took one look at the new Capital City and said: "What have I done to be condemned to such a place?"

A visitor from England wrote that "half-starved cattle browsing among the bushes of the city present a melancholy spectacle * * * so very thinly is the city peopled, quail and other birds are shot within 100 yards of the Capitol."

Members of Congress lived two and three to a room in boarding houses. They swatted with kerchiefs at flies which came from nearby livery stables to bite the long-stockinged legs of the legislators.

New York's Senator Gouverneur Morris wrote in sardonic vein:

"It's the best city in the world—for a future residence. We want nothing here but houses, cellars, kitchens, well-informed men, amiable women, and other little trifles of this kind to make our city perfect."

Thomas Moore, the Irish poet, visited Washington in 1804 and wrote this verse:

"This embryo Capital where fancy sees
Squares in morasses, obelisks in trees
Which second-sighted seers even now adorn
With shrines unbuilt and heroes yet unborn."

Bewigged Government executives tried to keep an elegant appearance in their primitive surroundings. Hair-dressing shops on Pennsylvania Avenue featured large cupboards, with glass doors, containing freshly dressed wigs for the daily visits of their owners.

Most of the labor in the District of Columbia was done by Negro slaves who were leased by slave dealers for $60 a year. It cost persons who hired a slave an additional $35 a year to furnish his clothes and food, the latter consisting mostly of salt pork and Indian meal.

When President Adams and his wife Abigail celebrated their first Christmas in the White House it was an uncompleted palace hard by the Potomac swamps. Mrs. Adams had the family wash hung in the great audience room (East Room) on the first floor.

President Adams, however, had a nifty Christmas garb consisting of a black velvet suit, silk stockings, silver knee and shoe buckles, and white waistcoat. His hair was powdered.

The Government's expenditures in the year 1800 totaled $10,786,000 less than one-tenth of the Government's daily expenditures now. The Treasury that year had a surplus of $62,000.

Most of the Federal revenue was obtained from import duties. However, the Government levied internal taxes on land, dwellings, and slaves, on stills, distilled spirits, refined sugar, and pleasurable carriages.

Washington then was almost at the center of the narrow union of 16 States. George Washington has envisioned the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal and the Potomac River connecting West and East as the most practicable route to the Atlantic Ocean.

As people poured westward there was almost constant clamor to move the Capital west of the Alleghenies. However, the coming of the telegraph and the railroads did much to lessen the demands for a new site for the Capital.

Slaves Versus United States Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1950

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Victor Riesel, the newspaper columnist whose column, Inside Labor, appears in 254 American daily newspapers, has been doing an excellent job of calling the American people's attention to the dangers to our economy in the importation of canned crab, furs, and other goods from Russia.

Last year our imports from Russia, not counting those from any of her satellites, totaled $42,425,000, according to the Department of Commerce figures, while our exports to Russia were only valued at $6,646,000.

As a result of this balance of trade favorable to Russia, the Soviets had a surplus of more than $35,000,000 in American dollars and credits which the record shows she spent in France, Belgium, and Britain to purchase steel, iron, copper, zinc, lead, and other commodities which added to her economic strength and war potential. I ask, are we not, by carrying on this trade with Russia, repeating in effect, exactly what we did prior to Pearl Harbor, when we permitted the sale of scrap iron to the Japs?

Imports of canned crab from Russia during the 12 months of 1949 totaled 30,262 cases. In the first 4 months of this year we have imported almost 70,000 cases of this crab meat from Russia. In short, in the first 4 months of this year we have imported twice as much canned crab from Russia as we did in all 12 months of last year. Nor is the end in sight. I am reliably informed another 36,000-case shipment of this Russian canned crab meat is or soon will be enroute to the United States.

Our Atlantic and Pacific coast crabbing industry cannot compete with the labor in Russia's 17 slave labor fishing camps. We should not expect that they should. Unless Government executive agencies act to stop these imports of Russian crab, our American crab fishing industry will be destroyed, its thousands of cannery workers will become unemployed and its fishermen, many of whom have invested their life savings in fishing boats, will be financially ruined.

The New York Mirror, one of the large newspapers in America's largest city, recently carried an excellent editorial on April 21, 1950, on slaves versus United States labor. Under leave to extend my remarks and include extraneous material, I include this editorial in the RECORD:

SLAVE VERSUS UNITED STATES LABOR

Thanks to our ace labor writer, Victor Riesel, Americans are finding out some queer and curious things about their foreign trade:

1. In recent months, $3,000,000 worth of crab meat, or 59,000 cases, canned in Soviet slave-labor camps, has come into this country via Seattle and Boston.

2. The Russians are offering United States importers $20,000,000 worth more at prices no United States canner can meet.

3. More than $55,000,000 worth of Soviet furs are coming into this country annually—and these, also, have been processed in the Siberian labor camps for political prisoners.

4. Walnuts produced in Sovietized Manchuria pour into the American market in large quantities at 42 cents a pound, to compete with the American product which cannot be put on sale at less than 62 cents.

5. Communist Czechoslovakia, having nationalized (which means stolen) its shoe industry, is sending unmarked and unidentified footwear here.

We know, too, that imports from Communist Czechoslovakia are threatening the United States hat industry. That hits close to home. Thousands of jobs in Danbury, Conn., are menaced.

Smoked hams from Communist Poland are brought in to sell against the produce of the United States farmer.

What sort of two-handed diplomacy are we running?

On the one hand, we bitterly protest the downing of a United States plane and the probable murder of its 10 airmen; on the other, we offer Soviet Russia a market for her slave-made goods.

The vicious, inspired insults against us by Red Czechoslovakia make American blood boil; but we afford the commissars who rule that once-democratic country a juicy supply of United States dollars.

Does Acheson know what Snyder is doing? And does either reckon with Hoffman, of the ECA?

Let's go back to the 59,000 cases of Soviet crab meat. Direct from Siberia, 15,000 cases came into Seattle. But 44,000 cases came to Boston—from England.

England trades extensively with Russia. England needed salmon. Russia provided the salmon, but forced a tie-in of 80,000 cases of crab meat. England couldn't use all that, so she dumped 44,000 cases on the American market, and undercut our producers $2 a case.

This double play against United States industry and United States jobs was revealed when businessmen and Congressmen complained to Hoffman.

Maybe the State Department and the Treasury Department and the agency that overshadows both, the ECA, can explain these transactions.

Maybe they will say that the United States industries affected are only small fry.

That won't sound very good to workers in the cannery in Bellingham, Wash., which has announced it will close because of Soviet competition, or to the 197 fur breeders who have gone out of business for the same reason, or the Danbury hatters, or the New England fishermen.

Wipe out a few jobs here. A few jobs there. Create unemployment, and the fear of un-

employment. That's exactly what the Kremlin wants. Our policies, unwittingly or not, are sacrificing American labor to the support of slave-labor states.

NEWSPAPER CARTOON

Recently there appeared in hundreds of American newspapers a cartoon by Reg Manning depicting Uncle Sam carrying away a case of canned crab meat that was labeled "Produced at unbeatable low prices by Russ slave labor" and in the background stood Joe Stalin counting up a big pile of American dollars which Uncle Sam had just handed him for the crab. Standing nearby watching the transaction was a sad-faced man, in commercial fishermen's clothes, who was labeled "American fishing industry."

Uncle Sam, as he toted away his Russian canned crab was saying to Mr. American Fishing Industry, "Why can't you let me have bargains like this?"

The American fishermen can give Uncle Sam bargains like that in canned crab such as Stalin offers only if the American fishermen and cannery worker will accept "slave labor" working conditions. No sensible American wants or expects that he should.

A BREAK, MAYBE

Says the Aberdeen World, of Aberdeen, Wash., in a recent editorial:

In his almost singlehanded fight to save Northwest industry from foreign encroachment, Congressman RUSSELL V. MACK has finally won a promise from Treasury Secretary Snyder to investigate importation of Russian canned crab meat. Congressman MACK has asked Secretary Snyder to bar the Russian meat because the cheaply-produced product is undermining the domestic market for American packers.

Secretary Snyder promised to investigate whether or not the Russian product is produced by involuntary labor. There is an American law prohibiting importation of foreign products produced by such "slave" labor. We could make a good case based on the "involuntary" characteristic of the Soviet labor mass, but whether Snyder will do it or not is another matter. We know that Russian labor is not free, as we interpret the term. How much involuntariness we will tolerate is up to Snyder's interpretation. With the current trend to lower trade barriers and with an administration tendency not to rile Russia any more than possible, our hunch would be that Snyder finds Russian canned crab meat admissible. The condition of certain American industries doesn't seem to be of much concern to administration bigwigs in Washington.

LONGVIEW, WASH., NEWS

The Longview Daily News, one of the largest dailies of southwest Washington, editorially referring to Russian crab imports said:

A bulletin from the Nation's Capital says that during the past 6 weeks 59,000 cases of Russian canned crab, valued at $3,000,000, was imported into this country. The report says that the Soviets have 400,000 to 500,000 cases of this canned crab on hand and that there is danger of a great portion of this being dumped on the American market.

It would be interesting to know why we need to be catering to the Russians in this way or what they are buying from us in return. Let's hope it isn't weapons and ammunition.

We were a little surprised to see while browsing around a grocery store only Saturday, a brand of corned beef coming from Uruguay which bore an appealing label. When we asked the dealer about it he said it was a most popular brand, and that he had difficulty in keeping it in stock. We have to say in all candor that we know little about Uruguay, but we do hope that in canning meats sold in this country, it maintains the American standard of sanitation.

SEATTLE TIMES

The Seattle Times, one of the largest Washington State dailies, in a lead editorial in March had this to say about Russian crab imports:

COAST INDUSTRY HURT BY RUSSIAN PRODUCTS

Congressman MACK of Hoquiam, is rightly concerned over the volume of canned crab meat that is being imported into this country from Russia. MACK says these imports amounted to 15,000 cases by way of Seattle and 44,000 cases by way of Boston last month. At a value of $54 a case, the lot was worth about $3,000,000. If they are permitted or encouraged to sell their crab meat in the United States, MACK fears, the Russians will rapidly build up as big a market for their product as the Japanese enjoyed before the war.

In those days, Japan was providing 85 percent of all the canned crab meat marketed in this country. The low wages and living standards of the Japanese fishermen made it impossible for Americans to compete with them. During the war, however, the crab-fishing industry began to flourish along the Pacific coast. Some idea of its growth may be gained from the record on Grays Harbor alone. In 1940, fishermen at Westport landed 16,143 dozen crab. Last year 277,844 dozen were landed there.

The Japanese crab-fishing and canning industry had reached large proportions before Pearl Harbor. From 1927 to 1939, they had an average annual pack of 445,102 cases, reaching 600,000 cases in the best years. They sold about 250,000 cases, or about 55 percent of their pack, in the United States. Much of the fishing area the Japanese formerly controlled now has been turned over to Russia, and it is estimated Soviet canneries are producing as much as 500,000 cases of crab meat a year.

Congressman MACK is looking after the interests of an industry that is beginning to prosper in his own State when he insists that this new foreign competition be discouraged. Here is another of those situations where it becomes necessary to choose between encouraging foreign trade and supporting a domestic industry. As the Salem, Oreg., Statesman has put it: "If we have any foreign trade at all, some group is apt to suffer; but we are hardly ready to quit trading with foreign countries."

In this instance, however, a little more than that is involved. Protection of the growing Pacific coast crab canning and fishing industry would contribute to the American economy. The importation of the Russian adds a little something to American foreign trade, even to the volume of Seattle's foreign trade. It also contributes to the Russian economy by providing a market here for the Russian product. If we had to make the choice, we would string along with Congressman MACK, being considerably more interested in what helps Americans than in anything at all that may help Soviet Russia.

ILWACO TRIBUNE

The Ilwaco Tribune of Ilwaco, Wash., commenting on Russian crab imports, said recently, editorially:

The Japanese formerly sold 85 percent of their entire pack, about 250,000 cases a year, in the United States. The Russians will, I am sure, if we permit them to, sell an equal amount here. If they do, our prosperous Pacific coast crabbing industry, in which millions of dollars have been invested will be destroyed.

Our American fishermen and cannery workers cannot compete with the slave labor of Russia.

If our crabbing business is destroyed by Russian competition, what will our fishermen, who have invested their life savings in fishing boats and gear, do? A bureaucrat in Washington, D. C., several years ago suggested that workers displaced by foreign imports should get into other work, "making typewriters, for example." That isn't easy.

SOUTH BEACH NEWS

The South Beach News, of Westport, Wash., in a lengthy editorial deploring the increasing imports recently, said, editorially, in part:

We of the South Beach News have been perturbed for some time about the Russian crab imports and have done what we can to call attention to the situation.

It is a consolation to know that the threat is realized, but it would be more of one were we assured that something would be done about it.

There is every reason to believe that the Russian imports will not only continue but they will increase. Russia gained the Kuriles and other island bases close to profitable fishing bases of Japanese fishermen before the war. There is little doubt that as long as there is a market in the United States for Russian crab meat that they (the Russians) will exploit those fishing grounds to the utmost.

This is no news to the economists, the State Department, and the heads of ECA in Washington. Such being the case, it would seem that they would be perturbed to the point where some action would be taken toward imposing a tariff, but tariffs, it seems, are taboo in this enlightened age.

Rather than a protective tariff, the administration, or at least the State Department and the ECA, are in favor of what they call "relief" for those who are hurt by the tax-free imports.

We suppose this means that the Government will make up to the domestic processors the difference between the price which will be set by the imports, and that at which they would have to sell to make a fair profit.

Personally, it would seem much more sound to us if the Government would save its money, put a tariff on crabmeat that would protect local packers, and let Russia solve its own economic problems.

But, of course, we are not schooled in enlightened thinking.

RAYMOND HERALD

The Raymond Herald of Raymond, Wash., denouncing the growing importation of Russian canned crab, recently said editorially:

Our Third District Congressman RUSSELL V. MACK recently called attention to the fact that 15,000 cases of canned crabmeat from Russia had been unloaded at a Seattle dock. The Congressman's revelation was significant and distressing.

We recall that before the war most of our canned crabmeat came from Japan. Then, when that industry was put out of business at the outbreak of hostilities, American fishermen began building a fleet of boats to fashion our own crabbing industry, and fish canning plants installed facilities for processing the crabs brought in by our own fishermen.

Now that the war is over and something like normalcy restored, the Russians are planning to capture this industry. They will be able to do it, too, under the present free-trade

set-up and spineless foreign policy of our national administration, because of their low standards of living and slave-labor conditions. Unless some way is found to halt it, American labor, much of it right here in Pacific County, will be the victims.

CORVALLIS (OREG.) GAZETTE-TIMES

Concerning the increasing imports of canned crab from Russia the Corvallis Daily Times, published in the inland town of Corvallis, Oreg., said:

Congressman RUSSELL MACK, of the State of Washington, calls attention to the fact that recently 15,000 cases of Russian canned crabmeat were unloaded in Seattle. Before the war most of our canned crabmeat came from Japan. Then, when this industry was put out of business, Americans immediately began building a fleet of boats to fashion our own crabbing industry. Now that the war is over and something like normalcy restored, the Russians are planning to capture this industry. They will be able to do this under present free-trade policies because of their low standards of living and slave-labor conditions.

There doesn't seem to be much that can be done about it now. We are spending millions in western Europe to stop the forward march of communism and neglecting the back door nearer home, both economically and in our policy toward the Far East. Some day our international economic folly is going to catch up with us.

SPOKESMAN REVIEW

The Spokesman Review, published in Spokane, Wash., which is 400 miles inland from the Washington seacoast, likewise expresses alarm over the growth in imports from Russia. Editorially, it said recently:

Russian imports into the United States are increasing at such a rate that they may soon prove a serious threat to certain aspects of the American economy.

At present, congressional leaders are becoming increasingly alarmed over the appearance, in large quantities, of shoes, hats, crabs and furs from Russia and her satellites.

Mass produced by slave labor and benefiting from the Soviet state-trading program, such items can be sold in the American market at a low price which domestic producers cannot equal.

These goods threaten to drive domestic industries out of business if their import remains uncontrolled by tariff and regulatory measures. As is to be expected, this unfair competition is causing increased unemployment in the United States.

Ironically, while spending billions of dollars abroad to oppose communism, the United States is now helping to support certain industries in iron-curtain countries.

Of particular interest to the Northwest is the reported Russian penetration of the United States fur market. In recent years, Russian fur imports are said to have increased 800 percent. By contributing 30 percent to the United States fur-import total, it is claimed by domestic fur interests that Russia now dominates and controls the Nation's fur market.

The situation is arousing public indignation. However, all protests to the State Department appear to have gone unanswered. It has even been officially suggested that the Department is contemplating further tariff cuts, which would intensify Russian economic penetration.

Federal officials owe the Nation an explanation of their policy in the matter, consistent with the best interests of American industry, jobs and her anti-Communist foreign aid programs.

Rail Talks Resume; Industry Warns of Shut-Down in Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FORREST C. DONNELL
OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 15 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Rail Talks Resume; Industry Warns of Shut-Down in Strike," appearing in the New York Herald Tribune of May 13, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RAIL TALKS RESUME; INDUSTRY WARNS OF SHUT-DOWN IN STRIKE—MEDIATORS MEETING TWO SIDES SEPARATELY—G. E. APPEALS TO TRUMAN; SOME TRAINS RESTORED; NEW DISORDERS REPORTED

(By Robert A. Bedolis)

Mediation efforts to end the 3-day-old strike against four major railroads were resumed yesterday, with the National Mediation Board conferring separately with representatives of the railroads and the striking Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, unaffiliated.

It was understood that Francis A. O'Neill, Jr., chairman of the board, and its other members submitted settlement proposals. While early reports of developments toward a settlement were discounted last night, the renewed activity of the board stimulated some hope that an agreement may be found soon.

LAY-OFFS INCREASE

On the negative side, the day's developments included new reports of violence; a slowly increasing pinch on business, especially in parts of the 27-State strike area which depend on the struck roads for all or most of their rail transport; and increasing lay-offs and the prospect of more if the strike continues. It was hinted by some union officials that the strike against the New York Central system, which has been limited to divisions west of Buffalo, may spread eastward if a settlement is not reached soon.

A development on the positive side was the announcement that some additional trains are being restored by struck roads in the affected area.

The dispute involves the union's insistence on the employment of two instead of one fireman on many multiple-unit Diesel locomotives.

SABOTAGE CHARGED

In Cleveland, the front wheels of a New York Central two-unit Diesel locomotive pulling a 59-car freight train were derailed under circumstances which the railroad described as "a deliberate act of sabotoge." The train was moving slowly in the railroad's Collinwood yards and no one was hurt.

D. W. Taylor, New York Central police chief, said he summoned the Federal Bureau of Investigation to investigate. He said the derailment occurred because a piece of wood had been jammed into an automatic switch, keeping it from closing all the way. He said only the slow speed of the train at the time prevented injury to the 5-man crew and damage to the other cars. None of the freight cars left the rails. The union denied any knowledge of the incident, or that it was caused by strikers.

The New York Central also reported that a bullet was fired into the cab of a Diesel freight locomotive as it pulled out of Elkhart, Ind., and "barely missed" the engineer. The Southern Railway, one of the four affected, said that it stopped operations in its Knoxville, Tenn., division yesterday because of shots fired at trains in that city Thursday. A clerical worker serving as a fireman suffered a flesh wound then.

New York Central reported that another 15,000 of its employees stand to be furloughed over the week end if the strike does not end, which would bring this railroad's total to 40,000 laid off.

The Pennsylvania Railroad, which is struck west of Harrisburg, said the 85,000 employees it has furloughed may also increase by thousands. The Southern has reported 18,000 workers laid off because of the strike.

The fourth railroad involved, the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe, in the Middle and far West, has laid off many workers, but gave no total. It was estimated that more than 175,000 workers have been made jobless, including miners in western Pennsylvania and Indiana, where lack of coal cars has closed scores of mines.

The Pennsylvania Railroad, which had not attempted to run any trains in its struck divisions at first, announced that it operated 10 freight trains west of Harrisburg yesterday on its main east-west lines. The railroad said it expects to increase this number today. Few Pennsylvania freight and no passenger trains are operating in the strike area. The railroad said it restored the trains yesterday "in an effort to provide some service to industry and business * * * and to relieve to some extent public inconvenience and possible hardship."

CENTRAL PUTS TRAINS BACK

The New York Central announced that it added 2 passenger trains yesterday to the 10 passenger trains it has operated since the strike began. Another, the James Whitcomb Riley, which serves Indianapolis and Cincinnati, will be added today, the railroad said.

The union first demanded that all multiple-unit Diesel locomotives carry two firemen, but just before the strike conceded that it would accept an agreement calling for arbitration to decide whether a second fireman should be employed only on multiple-unit Diesels used on crack passenger runs. Arbitration would call for an impartial third party to make a binding ruling.

The railroads describe the demand as "featherbedding"—employment of unnecessary workers—and emphasize that two impartial Presidential fact-finding boards have ruled against the union. Under the Railway Labor Act, which provides for fact-finding boards, such recommendations are not binding.

The strike created a business boom for airlines, trucking companies, and nonstruck railroads which serve areas in which the four affected railroads operate. Airlines at LaGuardia Field said they added 42 extra flights yesterday because of the strike.

The General Motors Corp. reported that 4,900 of its employees, mostly in Fisher body plants, have been laid off because of the rail strike. General Motors, Ford, and Chrysler said a serious effect on their production was anticipated if the strike lasts into next week.

Harrisburg steel mills and those in other areas warned of possible lay-offs of thousands of workers if the rail strike continues. Buffalo reported 500 mill employees idle, in addition to rail workers. In western Pennsylvania 25 percent of coal production was reported tied up by the strike.

In Toledo, Willys-Overland Motors put 4,500 of its 7,000 production workers on a 4-day week "to conserve inventories."

A. M. Hartung, vice president in charge of personnel and public relations for the Railway Express Agency, said that an express embargo on shipments to towns served only by the struck roads has been imposed. But he said that shipments to cities which are also served by other railroads are being satisfactorily served by the express company, although there have been a few "slight delays." He described the situation as "not very harmful."

Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 15, 1950

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I am receiving dozens of letters and telegrams from the great industrial Calumet region of Indiana pleading for the extension of rent control.

The following article by William Green, president of the A. F. of L., sets out numerous facts explaining the necessity for rent-control extension:

RENT CONTROL MUST BE EXTENDED
(By William Green)

Within a matter of a very few weeks your Congressman and Senators will be voting on a subject of utmost importance—continuation of rent control for another year. Whether or not Congress decides to extend the rent-control law not only will affect the 8,000,000 members of the American Federation of Labor as well as all the tenants and landlords of this country, but also, because of its broad implications, will have an important bearing on the well-being of every man, woman, and child in America.

The sixty-eighth convention of the A. F. of L., which met last October, unanimously recommended that "until the supply of low-priced housing units can be equalized with the demand, effective rent control must be maintained so that families will not be faced with exorbitant increases in rents."

Following this convention action, the executive council, at its most recent meeting, unanimously adopted a statement emphasizing that until there is a large increase in the supply of homes for low- and middle-income families, an effective rent-control program must be continued. The executive council concluded its statement with the following sentence:

"We can safely remove rent controls in only one way—by building an adequate supply of homes that fit the pocketbooks of the millions of families who are without decent housing today."

Opponents of rent control have attempted to show that there is no longer any shortage of housing. The fact is that despite a recent spurt in residential construction, there still remains a severe housing shortage, particularly of homes and apartments renting at levels that low- and middle-income families can afford.

The Rent Control Act passed in 1949 contained a provision permitting local governing bodies of cities and towns to decontrol their own communities. This is the so-called local option provision.

If opponents of rent control were correct and there were no longer a housing shortage, the American people would have acted to take advantage of this very liberal local option decontrol provision. The fact is that very few cities have elected under this provision to remove rent controls.

Despite intense pressure from the real estate interests, the city councils of only 249 cities—only 6 percent of communities under rent control today—had elected to remove rent control by April 1 of this year. This total includes only 10 cities with more than 100,000 population and 13 others with over 50,000.

In order to determine just how the removal of rent controls would affect A. F. of L. members, the A. F. of L. Housing Committee has just completed a special survey of all communities throughout the country in which there are A. F. of L. central labor unions.

The survey shows that of the 691 communities which have ever been under rent control, 459, or two-thirds are still under rent control. Only 87, or less than 13 percent, were decontrolled by the local option method.

These over-all figures are supported by a State-by-State analysis indicating even more conclusively the catastrophic impact that sudden decontrol would have on A. F. of L. members. Thus there are 10 States and 1 territory where not a single community with a central labor union has been decontrolled. In some of the larger States only a few of the very smallest cities have been decontrolled.

This survey clearly indicates that the great majority of A. F. of L. members, including those in a great many relatively small communities, are still protected by rent control. The sudden removal of rent controls would inevitably be reflected in a sudden increase in family expenditures for millions of union families throughout the country.

The wisdom of maintaining rent controls becomes crystal clear when we discover what has happened to rents in some of the communities where rents have been decontrolled. In November 1949, the Department of Labor made a survey of residential rents in seven decontrolled communities. The survey showed that in those communities tenants whose rents had been raised were forced to bear an average increase of from 16 percent in Salt Lake City to 40 percent in Houston. Moreover, the rent increases affected from one-third to three-fifths of all the tenants in those communities.

The Labor Department's findings have been confirmed by a recent survey made by a very strange source, the National Association of Real Estate Boards, which is the backbone of the notorious real-estate lobby in Washington. Of 100 decontrolled cities in 30 States, the survey showed that rents increased for half of the tenants in decontrolled areas of over 50,000 and for 55 percent in cities of over 100,000, thus pointing out the tremendous number of families whose rents would be raised if all remaining rent controls were removed.

According to the survey, the average tenant whose rent was raised had to pay 22 percent more for rent after decontrol. Moreover, tenants in the smaller cities whose rents were raised sustained larger rent increases than tenants in the larger cities.

This indicates very clearly that rent control is by no means exclusively a big-city problem.

While these figures are significant in themselves, they are averages which tend to conceal the fact that decontrol hits low-income families the hardest. Low-income families spend a larger proportion of their income on rent than families in the higher income groups. The Federal Reserve Board reports that in 1948 families with annual incomes under $2,000 spent 23 percent on rent, compared with 12 percent for all families and only 9 percent for families with incomes of $5,000 and over. Thus it is clear that a rent increase for a low-income family looms larger in the total family budget than a comparable increase for a higher income family.

Yet, the Labor Department survey of decontrolled communities to which I have referred indicates that a greater porportion of the low-income families reported rent increases than those in the higher income groups. In the cities where income data was obtained, the proportion of families with incomes under $2,000 whose rents were raised ranged from 48 to 71 percent as compared with a range of only 22 to 37 percent for families with incomes of $4,000 or more.

Let us examine specifically what these increases in rent would mean to the average worker and his family. Let us use for our example a factory worker whose earnings are $50 a week, approximately the present Nation-wide average. Let us assume that this worker is spending approximately 20 percent of his income for rent, about $10 a week.

If rents in his community are decontrolled, the Department of Labor survey indicates that his rent would rise by at least 25 percent or $2.50 a week. This increase in rent is equivalent to a wage cut of 5 percent, or over 6 cents an hour, assuming a 40-hour week. Under these circumstances the implications for collective bargaining are bound to be quite far-reaching. From my long experience in the labor movement, I know that a widespread wave of sizable rent increases will inevitably be reflected in the demands of organized workers for higher wages.

Congress must face squarely this issue of rent control. It may well decide that Federal rent controls should not be extended beyond June 30. If it does make this decision, it must realize the full consequences of its action.

But this is not enough. I urge each and every A. F. of L. member to write immediately to his Congressman and Senators.

Let them know what the end of rent control would mean to you and your family and to other workers' families in your community.

Let them know that if Congress allows Federal rent control to lapse, it will mean substantial and widespread increases in rents, with the greatest burden falling upon those least able to withstand it.

Let them know that the workers in your community want Congress to extend Federal rent control for the next 12 months.

Curtailment of Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 15, 1950

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the Council of the City of Medford, Mass., as offered in the council by Mayor Frederick T. McDermott:

Be it resolved, That this council does hereby record itself as being incensed by the action of the Congress of the United States in the passage of any law or appropriation which results in the reduction of operational costs of the United States Post Office Department to the extent that the Department has been forced to resort to the dismissal of many veterans of World War II from employment; and

Whereas this curtailment of employment has resulted in the discharge of five amputee veterans from this district already known to the sponsor of this resolution, it is undoubtedly repeated in many other sections of the country, and constitutes a sad commentary of justice to those who made great sacrifice to their country in the Armed Forces: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this council does hereby seriously appeal to the Congress of the United States to take immediate steps to correct this unspeakable condition by an emergency appropriation of funds to provide for the reemployment of these men who have been forced into unemployment at the earliest possible time; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted upon its passage to the Members in Congress for their serious consideration and action thereon.

Bureau of Reclamation Promotes Two

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1950

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to learn the other day of the promotion of two worthy employees of the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation, and as one who has worked closely with that Bureau since coming to Congress in 1937, I have had occasion to know and appreciate the good people who work there. The two employees I refer to are Mr. Goodrich W. Lineweaver, who has been promoted from Director of the Branch of Operation and Maintenance to Assistant Commissioner of Reclamation and Mr. E. D. Eaton, who has been promoted from Assistant Director of Operation and Maintenance to Acting Director of that branch.

I quote from a release from the Department of the Interior, issued on April 28, 1950:

LINEWEAVER NAMED ASSISTANT RECLAMATION COMMISSIONER

Promotion of Goodrich W. Lineweaver to Assistant Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation was announced today by Secretary of the Interior Oscar L. Chapman. Mr. Lineweaver has been Director of the Bureau's branch of Operation and Maintenance for the last 5 years. At the same time, E. D. Eaton, who has been assistant director of Operation and Maintenance, was named acting director.

The appointments were the recommendation of Commissioner of Reclamation Michael W. Straus. Mr. Straus said an additional Assistant Commissioner is urgently needed to handle the expanding administrative burden of a water resources development program.

The new Assistant Commissioner, Mr. Straus said, will have immediate supervision of program and finance operations of the Bureau of Reclamation, including appropriation presentations before the Bureau of the Budget and the Congress in addition to special assignments.

Mr. Lineweaver has been with the Bureau of Reclamation since 1937 in various capacities and has been Director of the Branch of Operation and Maintenance since 1945. In this position he has supervised the opening to homestead entry, by war veterans, of more than 50,000 acres of public lands comprising about 500 irrigated farms on Western Reclamation projects.

Mr. Lineweaver first served the Federal Government as Secretary of the Federal Power Commission from 1934 to 1936, and has been associated with western resources development constantly since that time. He is a native of Harrisonburg, Va., and served as an officer in the United States Army during the First World War. With Mrs. Lineweaver, he resides at 3511 Davenport Street NW., Washington, D. C.

Other Assistant Commissioners are Kenneth Markwell and Wesley R. Nelson. Both continue their present positions within the Bureau with specific responsibilities little changed, Commissioner Straus said.

Mr. Eaton, the new acting head of the Operation and Maintenance Branch, has been with the Bureau of Reclamation since 1943. Prior to the war, he was with the Soil Conservation Service in Albuquerque, N. Mex., and elsewhere in the West.

He is a native of New York, a graduate of Cornell University, and resides with his family at 5305 Kirkside Drive, Chevy Chase, Md.

Industry Hard Hit by Rail Stoppages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FORREST C. DONNELL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 15 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD certain news dispatches from Detroit, San Francisco, Philadelphia, Schenectady, Pittsburgh, Los Angeles, and Charlotte, N. C., as they appeared in the New York Times of May 13 under the heading "Industry hard hit by rail stoppages."

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDUSTRY HARD HIT BY RAIL STOPPAGES—HEAVY LAY-OFFS SEEN AS VITAL SUPPLIES PILE UP—ROADS START SKELETON RUNS

DETROIT, May 12.—As the railroad strike continued to hit the automobile industry today, General Motors Corp. announced drastic cut-backs in overtime work, and furloughs for 500 employees in its Fisher Body Plant in Flint. The company had already laid off 400 yesterday at its body plant in Grand Rapids.

The Michigan Central Railroad, a subsidiary of the New York Central, completed the laying off of 13,500 of its 15,000 employees in Michigan, 10,000 of them in the Detroit area.

Truckers reported boom business. Howard Minnich, executive chairman of the Michigan Trucking Association, said that its members had not been nearly able to meet demands.

Competition for truckers' services was expected to mount so sharply as to limit deliveries only to highest priority items, he added.

FORD CRIPPLED IN WEST

SAN FRANCISCO, May 12.—Freight handling costs at the Ford Motor Co.'s assembly plant at Richmond, on the East Bay, have been quadrupled by the railroad strike, company spokesmen said today.

Ford receives 80 percent of its parts over the Santa Fe, and is now transshipping some materials by barge from the Western Pacific's tracks in San Francisco. Other materials are being trucked from railheads of the Southern Pacific.

Spokesmen for the Santa Fe had no official count of its workers involved in the strike, but estimates are that as many as 1,000 rail men in this area may be idle next week when the company's local shops and yards are shut down.

THE PENNSYLVANIA MOVES FREIGHT

PHILADELPHIA, May 12.—The Pennsylvania Railroad anounced it had started operation of 10 freight trains today on its east-west main lines, west of Harrisburg, Pa., and expected to increase the service tomorrow.

Movement of freight on the Pennsylvania Railroad west of Harrisburg has been at a standstill since the firemen and enginemen went on strike 3 days ago.

A spokesman said supervisory personnel were on the locomotives.

GENERAL ELECTRIC IS HIT

SCHENECTADY, N. Y., May 12—The General Electric Co. announced today that the company's plants very shortly will be paralyzed unless the railroad firemen's strike is settled.

The statement was made in a telegram to President Truman and sent by Harry L. Erlicher, vice president in charge of purchasing and traffic. Paralysis of the plants, he said, would cause immediate heavy lay-offs.

In a statement to the press, Mr. Erlicher added that, "we are so dependent upon hundreds of suppliers for materials which can be transported only by railroads that operations will stop in a number of places very shortly unless the strike is settled immediately."

He asserted that irreparable damage already had been done by a halt in shipments and supplies.

The Schenectady works, he said, employing about 32,000, would not be affected as much as other G. E. plants.

TWENTY-THREE MAJOR COAL SHUT-DOWNS

PITTSBURGH, May 12—Lack of empty railroad cars raised the total of major coal mines shut-downs to twenty-three today in the strike of railroad firemen. The number of small pits that have closed is not known. Coal miners made idle by the railroad walkout rose to at least 7,500. The daily production loss is estimated at almost 49,000 tons of soft coal.

LAY-OFFS LOOM IN LOS ANGELES

LOS ANGELES, May 12.—Lay-offs are expected to start next week in local industries that have begun to feel the crippling indirect effects of the strike of locomotive firemen and enginemen against the Santa Fe system.

Nash Motors, at Inglewood, notified its employees that it has supplies large enough only to carry the plant through Monday, and the employees were alerted to possible lay-offs.

A meat packer on Santa Fe lines said that all livestock is now being trucked to the plant.

A machinery company reported that operations might cease next week because carloads of supplies via the Santa Fe have been immobilized.

Many other plants reported that losses were mounting because they have to hire trucks to haul materials formerly unloaded from Santa Fe cars in their plants.

Santa Fe maintenance shop shut-downs in seven western cities have made thousands of rail workers idle.

CHARLOTTE, N. C., May 12.—The Southern Railway announced here today it was scheduling 32 additional passenger trains. Four-

teen of these trains serve the Carolinas. The announcement came from the system's Eastern Lines headquarters here.

Locomotives are being manned by regular engineers and carried firemen who disregarded the strike call or who normally were engineers or supervisory employees, the road reported.

Passenger service scheduled for restoration through the Carolinas included the Crescent, operating between New York and New Orleans.

The Kerr Natural-Gas Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT S. KERR

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 15 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I request unanimous consent for insertion in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from newspaper reports and comments, and certain quotations from certain Members of Congress concerning the Kerr gas bill.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICA AT CROSSROADS

We may as well make our choice now, whether we stop our drift into regulation, or we must just give up and regulate everything else. (Boston Herald.)

UNHOLY ALLIANCE

It is true that the industrial interests of the North and East formed a temporary alliance with the socialistic politicians to defeat the bill, feeling that it would raise the price of natural gas for their own use, but that does not alter the fact that the Federal Power Commission and its coworkers in the administration's program of nationalization have a long-range goal of a powerful socialized control. (Oklahoma City Times.)

MAIN SPEECH

KERR's ringing defense of the independent gas producers and the pending legislation represented his most important speaking appearance since he made the Democratic keynote speech at Chicago in 1944. This carefully prepared address on the Senate floor—weighted with documentary evidence and brightened with wit and anecdote—brought new zest to the dullness of legislative tedium and established the junior Senator from Oklahoma as one of the Senate's best performers. * * * By the sheer force of his own persuasion, Senator KERR pulled himself out of a defensive position. Turning the tables on the critics who have been trying to pit him against the American consumer, Senator KERR urged the passage of his bill "as the best insurance" for a continued growing supply of the best and cheapest fuel. Senator KERR's popular-styled speech, clarifying both the legal and practical basis for his case, drew an unusual response from a body conditioned to the best in oratory and legislative strategy.

UPHILL VICTORY

After an uphill battle against heavy odds, the Oklahoma author of the gas measure has scored a decisive personal victory and opened the way for expansion of the gas industry in the Southwest. Senator KERR, as a wealthy oil and gas operator and principal authority on the industry, has been made a chief target by the opposition who thus sought to discredit the legislation as an exploitation of the consumer. Hence, the Wednesday vote amounted to a vote of confidence in Senator KERR personally. (Tulsa Tribune.)

OPA WRONG WAY

We believe Mr. Truman has chosen the wrong way to insure people gas. If the OPA principle didn't work on meat and clothing, there is no reason to suppose that it will on fuel. (Chicago Daily News.)

FEDERAL ENCROACHMENT

It is clear that Speaker RAYBURN spoke the truth when he told the House, "This Kerr bill will not raise the price of natural gas to any consumer in the United States one red cent."

There remains, of course, the question of Federal encroachment upon the rights of States and individual citizens. Defeat of the Kerr bill would have meant that an already powerful Federal agency would have still more power. For that reason, also, it is good that the effort to defeat the Kerr bill has failed thus far and with President Truman's signature will fail completely. (Dallas Times-Herald.)

SUBJECT PROVINCES

So far as the people of the Southwest were concerned, the bill was "in the public interest." But we're outnumbered—there are more votes in the overcrowded cities.

And we're condemned to stand by and see our irreplaceable gas drained out from under us at a price set by a Government in control of those hostile to our best interests, drained to warm the inhabitants of eastern cities adjacent to the coal fields.

It sometimes seems that the people of the North and East regard the South and Southwest as subject provinces. (Texhoma (Okla.) Times.)

FALSE CLAIMS

The utter fallacy of claims of opponents of the Kerr bill that its passage would increase gas prices to consumers is so easily proven I can't understand why radio commentators and others fell for such misrepresentation of facts.

We feel false information was supplied radio commentators and others about the Kerr bill and that most of us who knew the facts, including this columnist, were extremely derelict. (Andrew Rowley, oil editor, Tulsa Tribune.)

PROPAGANDA CAMPAIGN

Seldom has the Nation seen such a cleverly organized propaganda campaign against a bill in Congress.

PERSONAL FIGHT

Fainter hearted figures would have quailed before the barrage of vilification and abuse heaped upon BOB KERR as he made his fight for the gas bill. All of Washington is talking now, though, about the brilliant fight he conducted for the bill during almost a week of debate, much of it marked by haranguing from the comma-counting crew led by Missouri's Republican Senator DONNELL. (McAlester (Okla.) News-Capital.)

BATTLE CONTINUES

Knowing BOB KERR as we do, and with a consciousness of his varied abilities, it is safe to say that the battle in behalf of the independent producers of natural gas is not yet over. And, up to now, it is an issue on which the powerful northern and eastern interests have outmaneuvered the people who own and produce natural gas for a great part of the Nation. The matter deserves more thoughtful attention than the people of Oklahoma have given it. And, when it again becomes an issue before Congress, it will be a matter that should be given forceful backing in behalf of a measure that is important to this State and its citizens. (Frederick (Okla.) Leader.)

SMEAR CAMPAIGN

Never within his memory, said Representative LYLE, of Texas, during House debate on the Kerr natural gas bill, has a measure been so falsely, maliciously, and deliberately misrepresented. This widespread campaign of distortion and misstatement continues while the bill is before President Truman for his approval or veto, matched only by the vicious personal attacks directed at sponsors of the legislation, and especially its author, Senator KERR, of Oklahoma. (Fort Worth Star-Telegram.)

REAL PURPOSE

The "billion dollar steal" cry had no more basis than the imagination of Congressman YOUNG and his associates. They had nothing to base it on except their own mistrust of the traditional free-enterprise system. They just prefer Government regulation to free competitive operation.

Speaker RAYBURN put his finger on their real objective when he said in reference to the position of another Clevelander:

"If I felt, as my distinguished friend from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER] has indicated he feels, that the Federal Government should own and control all the natural resources of this country, then my position on this and much other legislation certainly would be changed." (Cleveland News.)

FIELD GAS CHEAP

These housewives might be glad to know that 4 cents would be a generous estimate of the field price of the gas they use in a month's cooking. They might also be glad of the reassurance of Speaker RAYBURN, who is at least as well informed on the subject as Senator DOUGLAS, that the Kerr bill would not increase the price of gas by one red cent.

The Daily News is for low gas prices. We are convinced that the way to have them is to encourage producers to find more gas and to sell it to the pipelines. Transmission costs drop as volume increases, and the more high-priced manufactured gas that is displaced by natural gas, the greater the saving. (Chicago Daily News.)

[Congressional comment]

UNCLE SAM INVADES

Why must the forces of Uncle Sam march past the statehouse, past the county courthouse, on down to each farm and pasture and commissioner's precinct to apply a new cost formula when a proper Federal control already exists?

The consumer is protected from unreasonable prices. The fear of unreasonable prices is not a justification for defeat of this legislation.

OFF KEY

Remember, the producer sells his gas for an average of 5 cents per thousand cubic feet in the Southwestern States; the householder pays $1.25 for that gas. Some Senators say the consumer needs more protection. If the consumer needs more protection, I say the consumer needs more than 5 cents' worth. (Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, Democrat, Texas.)

NEW PRICE FIX

If we permit an OPA price to be placed upon the commodity of an independent gas

producer, through default of our congressional duties, that will be the only instance on our economy where a nonutility price is fixed. No present or foreseeable peril to the consumer exists which would justify such isolated price fixing. (Senator EDWIN C. JOHNSON, Democrat, Colorado.)

GENERAL INTEREST

Between 60 and 70 percent of the total area of continental United States is proven as potential gas-producing territory. This area is owned by tens of millions of Americans any one of whom has the right and privilege to prospect for and produce, if found, natural gas. And so, Mr. President, any American citizen becomes a potential producer of oil or gas, either on his own acreage or upon leases secured from others. Many Americans now have, or at one time did have, an interest in what is commonly referred to as a wildcat well. (Senator ROBERT S. KERR, Democrat, Oklahoma.)

SMALL OWNERS HURT

Gas fields are owned in the main by many small landowners, each holding a royalty interest in the production from the field or from his block. If Federal price controls should be imposed, production curtailed, and operators hamstrung by Federal edict, thousands of small farmers and landowners would be deprived of what has come to be part of their livelihood. The royalty income that farm owners now receive from natural-gas production, which in effect represents the price at which they sell their minerals—their own private property—would no longer be fixed by the law of supply and demand, but, instead, by an all-powerful Federal bureau. Should this bill be defeated, the door would be opened for Government regulation of sales of privately owned real-property rights, mineral leases, royalties, mineral rights, and even the minerals themselves. In one section of Louisiana, there are more than 1,500 people who own mineral rights in a single gas-producing unit. (Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER, Democrat, Louisiana.)

BUM STEER

If such a theory were a good one, a proper one, we might have the following situation: A man in Iowa might have some nice beef cattle which he was feeding Iowa corn. A man in Chicago might say, "I should like to have that beef steer." "But, it does not belong to you," someone might say. "It belongs to a man in Iowa." The Chicago man might say, "Yes, but he is going to ship that beef steer to Chicago. It is going to enter interstate commerce, and, therefore, the Government has the right not only to regulate its actual transportation but to regulate its price right down to Iowa, and Mr. Iowa Cattle Dealer, you must sell your cows, you must sell your steers, not at your price, not at the price the packer is willing to give you, but you must sell your cattle at a price fixed by a bureau in Washington, whose mind changes as it sees fit to change it." (Senator TOM CONNALLY, Democrat, Texas.)

NATIONAL DEFENSE

We used to say that an army traveled on its stomach; but today, Mr. President, an army also travels on gasoline and oil, produced by the same drill, in the same well, at the same time natural gas is produced. So, let me repeat that in view of all the problems confronting us today, we should be considering measures to increase, rather than reduce, the incentive for the development of natural gas. (Senator LESTER HUNT, Democrat, Wyoming.)

NO GOUGE

These facts do not support any theory that gas is a monopolistic operation or that it is engaged in a conspiracy to gouge the public through exorbitant prices. Quite the contrary. (Senator BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, Republican, Iowa.)

SOCIALISTIC SWEEP

Mr. President, this is a two-way road. If we regulate independent producers and gatherers at a time when they are doing a good job, and before it is proved necessary to regulate them, they will join other forces and say to the people, in the coal-producing States, and in the States producing other commodities, "We ought to regulate those industries."

The next step after complete regulation of industry is nationalization of industry. Let those who say there is too much regulation go back to their States and explain to their constituents why they voted to regulate an industry which has brought down the price of gas to the consumer 12 percent in 12 years. (Senator ERNEST W. MCFARLAND, Democrat, Arizona.)

DANGER SIGNAL

There are some who feel that everything should be regulated at the Federal level. Right now natural gas is their target. If they are successful in this attempt, who can predict what commodity will be next to be removed from private enterprise and placed under bureaucratic restrictions? (Senator EDWARD MARTIN, Republican, Pennsylvania.)

INDUSTRY PRAISED

The question before you is to determine whether you think it wise or unwise to impose Federal control on an American industry which, up until this time, has been a credit to its members, its producers, its engineers, and its staff workers, and whose product has brought no cause for justifiable complaint to any consumer anywhere. (Senator HARRY CAIN, Republican, Washington.)

GOOD COMPANY

In being for this bill, as I was when it originally passed the House, and as I am now in favoring concurring in the Senate amendment, I have some pretty good company. The Federal Military Establishment was asked about this bill, and this is the guts of what they said, after all elements of the Department of Defense has studied it: "Enactment of the bill will remove uncertainties now existing as to the extent of the application of the Natural Gas Act and will clarify its terms. Its effect should be to encourage the development of oil and gas resources and thus would be of benefit to the national security."

That is what our whole Military Establishment says about this legislation.

ONE RED PENNY

In my opinion—and I state this to you deliberately, I would not deceive you, you know that—this will not raise the price of natural gas to any consumer in the United States one red penny. I think this thing should be gotten out of the way. We should concur in this Senate amendment, and then have this study and see where we go from there. (Speaker SAM RAYBURN, Democrat, Texas.)

BEST DEAL

Who then, Mr. Speaker, could question the soundness of a law that has brought cheap fuel to millions of consumers?

I say to you with all the sincerity that I have, with a lifetime of study of this problem, that the passage of this measure will permit the industry to continue to supply millions of more people at rates considerably below that which they are today.

It not only will not increase the cost to the consumer but it will reduce the cost to the consumer. (Representative JOHN E. LYLE, JR., Democrat, Texas.)

VETO IN ERROR

Because many consumers of natural gas are of the opinion that the President's veto has warded off the threat of higher rates for this popular fuel, I believe that it is well that you should know that there is far more danger of higher gas rates now than there would have been had the President signed the gas bill. In spite of all the fog that was thrown up during consideration of the Kerr bill, it was purely a measure simply to retain to the various States the control over their natural gas resources they hitherto have enjoyed; also control of distribution of gas within their borders.

So, I submit to you, that a vote for the Kerr bill was a vote for lowering gas prices to the consumer, and for ever-growing supplies of gas. The Kerr bill was well designed to prevent further socialization of the natural gas industry and to maintain States' rights. It was a bill to protect gas consumers and not to exploit them. (Representative PAUL SHAFER, Republican, Michigan.)

Bill To Bar Rail Strikes Gets O. K.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FORREST C. DONNELL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 15 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Bill To Bar Rail Strikes Gets O. K.," by Robert P. Vanderpool, financial editor, published in the Chicago Herald-American of May 10, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BILL TO BAR RAIL STRIKES GETS O. K.

(By Robert P. Vanderpool, financial editor)

Senator DONNELL (Republican, Missouri) has introduced a bill which would outlaw strikes and lock-outs in the railroad industry. If disputes between labor and management could not be settled by negotiation, according to this bill, the two parties would be required to arbitrate and accept the result of such arbitration.

While leaders of both labor and management have constantly opposed previous efforts to outlaw strikes and lock-outs, the presidents of three of the country's leading railroads, Fred G. Gurley of the Santa Fe; Walter S. Franklin, of the Pennsylvania; and Gustav Metzman, of the New York Central, have just testified before a Senate labor subcommittee in favor of this proposed bill.

If the railway firemen persist in their misguided efforts to force at the point of a strike a second fireman in these Diesel locomotives, they may insure passage of this bill. In such case, the country will owe them

a vote of thanks despite their unjustifiable motives.

One can well wonder why such a bill should be confined to the railroads. The benefits to all concerned, including the workers, of arbitration as an alternative to strikes for settling labor disputes frequently have been discussed in this column. The faster we move in this direction the better it will be for labor, for capital, and for the Nation as a whole.

The South Looks Ahead—1950–60

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ELLIOTT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 31, 1950

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, from 1940 to 1950 the South had the greatest economic and industrial development in its history. Undoubtedly, this development will continue for the next 10 years or more.

Our people must continue to bring the great advantages which we possess to the attention of business and industry everywhere.

As a part of my remarks, I include an address by Dr. Paul W. Chapman, associate dean, College of Agriculture, University of Georgia, delivered before the 1950 annual conference of the advertising staff, the Progressive Farmer, Point Clear, Ala.:

THE SOUTH LOOKS AHEAD—1950–60

The business outlook for 1950 is bright, favorable, and encouraging. This is the consensus of virtually all forecasters, Government officials, and business leaders.

In postwar years, all of which have been prosperous beyond belief, a favorable forecast is unique. In no previous year since the close of World War II, has a note of hope, confidence, or optimism been sounded in outlook reports.

* * * * * * * * Grave doubts have been expressed as to the ability of corporations to maintain profits; yet earnings in the last year of the decade were twice as high as in 1945, and dividend payments to stockholders increased every year during the entire decade.

In spite of the fact that gloomy predictions of the recent past have been far from accurate, many forecasters, typically conservative, are still unwilling to extend their optimism, in terms of specific gains, further than 6 months into the future.

On the other hand, there is every reason for looking to the future with implicit confidence.

We should prepare now for a decade of growth and progress.

This conviction is based upon the record of the past decade and the irrefutable fact that economic history tends to repeat itself. The economic pattern following major wars is always the same; the only fundamental difference is timing.

After World War I, there was a short, sharp upswing followed by a sharp and equally short recession of adjustment period. The same pattern was followed after World War II; the only difference between the two was the degree of change and the length of the respective periods.

Then after World War I, it will be recalled that in 1921 there began, for the economy as a whole, an 8-year period of increasing business activity.

We are now entering upon the corresponding long-time prosperity period that may be expected if economic history repeats itself, as it invariably does.

The only difference between the current situation and the prosperity years after World War I is that our present growth or expansion period should be of longer duration, certainly from 1950 to 1960. Of course, we may expect minor fluctuations, but the trend of the decade should be steadily upward, unless a world-wide emergency occurs.

A DECADE OF PROGRESS

That we may look forward to what can be called a decade of progress has been recognized by a number of economists.

Some forecasters have said that prior to 1960, we may reasonably expect to attain a national annual income of $300,000,000,000. The President of the United States made such a prediction in a recent speech.

The figure is conservative. To attain the $300,000,000,000 income level in a period of such potential prosperity will not be an achievement of Government, but rather an obligation—an obligation to bring about such a favorable business atmosphere that the billions upon billions of new capital required to produce a higher income will be supplied by the American people.

Growth has always been the chief characteristic of our Nation's economy; growth will continue to be the outstanding characteristic so long as the population continues to increase and risk-capital is adequately rewarded.

A $300,000,000,000 income prior to 1960 will require a gain for the decade of $44,000,000,000. This is but one-fourth the gain made during the past 10 years. It is but 1.7 percent a year, as compared with the average annual gain of 2 percent that has been made every year since the prosperity peak of $83,000,000,000 was attained in 1929.

THE SOUTH WILL OUTGAIN THE NATION

But regardless of national business conditions that will obtain in 1950 and the years beyond, percentage gains for the South will, in all probability, be greater than those for the Nation as a whole.

The only difference between the last decade and the one we are now entering is that the South's progress in the future will go forward on a geometric ratio. This accelerated rate of gain will be the result of the sound foundation of economic adjustments laid during the past 10 years.

Every section of the South is making economic gains more rapidly than the Nation as a whole. * * *

* * * * * *

The following summaries of 10 factors support the belief that the South, in 1950 and throughout the current decade, will maintain its relative leadership in greater gains in earnings and business volume.

Factor No. 1: Industrial growth

The South continues to carry forward industrial growth and expansion at a more rapid rate than the Nation.

According to the most recent census of manufacturers, the South added more than 16,000 new establishments between the years 1939 and 1947.

When compared with the national gain of 65,000 new factories, it is found that the South made a gain of 50 percent during the period as compared with 36 percent for all other regions of the Nation.

An average of seven new industrial plants opened their doors for business in the South on every working day during the past 10 years.

In addition, for every $1,000,000 that went into new plants—that is, new corporations and concerns locating in the South for the first time—$15,000,000 went into the expansion of established industries long identified with the South.

* * * * * *

To cite any example of current growth is merely to detract from others of equal importance. But in Alabama, for instance, where 74 new industries located in 36 towns in 1949, the new $37,000,000 Coosa newsprint plant, operated by Kimberly-Clark Corp., opened its doors this year. This is but one of three new and important industries in the Childersburg area, which are parts of the same development program.

The rate of industrial expansion in 1950 will not be so great as the average for postwar years, but it will be of big-scale proportions. This is revealed by an analysis of the industrial expansion for any State in the South.

* * * * * *

Factor No. 2: New industrial jobs

Industrial expansion in the South has created, since 1940, approximately 1,250,000 new jobs in manufacturing.

More than 75,000 new jobs in manufacturing have been created in each of the following States: Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, North Carolina, Tennessee, and Virginia.

* * * * * *

Increasing industrial employment opportunities * * * are bringing—for the first time in the Nation's history—a well-balanced occupational pattern to the South. They are the keys to the higher regional income that is being realized; they are stimulating business activities along all lines and providing expanding local markets for farm products; they are contributing to a greater degree of economic stability throughout the entire Nation.

Factor No. 3: New business establishments

Industrial expansion is always associated with gains in business and service establishments; hence, it is no surprise to learn that in this factor the South, during recent years, has made more progress than the Nation as a whole.

The Survey of Current Business (December 1949) published by the United States Department of Commerce reports that, for the 5-year period 1944–49, the national gain in new business establishments and related enterprises was 30 percent. For the Southeast during the same period the gain was 43 percent; for the Southwest, 45 percent.

In all phases of business—wholesale, retail, service, financial, real estate, insurance, transportation, and all others—the South outgained the Nation during the postwar years by a margin of 14 percent.

In construction—a vital index to prosperity—the national gain in firms in operation at the end of the decade stood at 116 percent. For the Southeast the construction gain was 185 percent. For the Southwest, which ranked No. 1 among the Nation's seven regions, the gain was 229 percent.

In new business attracted the seven States—Alabama, Florida, Mississippi, Tennessee, and the Carolinas—led the Nation by a margin of 8 percent during the past 5 years.

Factor No. 4: Wages and salaries

It is estimated that spendable earnings from wages and salaries will increase in the Nation 10 percent in 1950.

But regardless of the rate of national gain, the percentage gain in the South will be larger than that for the Nation.

Total income payments to individuals during a recent 8-year period amounted to a gain of 172 percent for the Nation. In the Southeast the gain was 215 percent. And in the Southwest, the top-ranking region for the Nation, the gain was 223 percent.

The favorable outlook for the South is based upon this recent record, upon expanding industrial employment, and the application of the 75-cent-an-hour minimum wage law, which went into effect in January.

Only 1,500,000 workers will be affected directly by the law, according to the Department of Labor. But of this number, 900,000 live in 13 Southern States, the remaining 600,000 live in all other 35 States.

To meet the requirements of this new law, $300,000,000 will be added to pay rolls; $200,000,000 of this increase will be paid in the South. Of course, the total sum involved, in relation to the total national payroll, is small; less than one-half of 1 percent. But in the South the effect will be far reaching. Not only will the program raise workers now earning less than 75 cents an hour, but all wages and salaries in the plants involved must be adjusted upward.

When illiterate operatives at the simplest industrial jobs earn a minimum of $120 a month, there will develop competition for work in jobs covered by Federal law and also dissatisfaction with current rates of pay in some jobs requiring a high level of skill, training, and intelligence. We may look for higher wage scales and salaries in the South.

Most important among the industries that will loom large in the South are lumber, tobacco, fertilizer, furniture, and food.

Factor No. 5: Electric energy output

No index factor is a more reliable guide to growth and economic outlook for a locality or area than the demand for electric energy.

On the basis of this index, the South is the Nation's No. 1 region for 1950 and for the decade 1950–60.

In 1950 and the 2 years to follow, the South will lead the Nation in the percentage increase of kilowatt-hours made available through the completion of additional generating facilities.

* * * * *

Factor No. 6: Electrified farms

Electrification of the Nation's farms has been one of the significant developments of the past decade; 83 percent of all farms in the United States are now wired for electric service, according to the estimate of Electrical Merchandising, January 1, 1950.

Of the 4,863,266 farm consumers listed in the report, 48 percent were located in 14 Southern States.

Two Million Two Hundred and Forty Thousand Electrified Farms in the South—A 10-Year Increase of 1,820,000

Number of farms served in 14 Southern States (as of Jan. 1)

1950	2,240,976
1949	1,813,175
1948	1,510,900
1947	1,225,300
1946	1,010,000
1945	866,600
1944	770,377
1943	749,700
1942	698,417
1941	580,538
1940	420,700

Source: Edison Electric Institute and Electrical Merchandising.

No region made such rapid expansion in new farms wired in 1949 as did the South; yet no region has such a vast potential for future expansion. * * *

Rural electrification is important from a business point of view. For every dollar spent in extending electric lines, four or more dollars are spent for wiring and appliances.

Increasing farm uses of electricity will promote efficiency, reduce man-hours of labor, and increase income. The current policy of REA places increasing emphasis upon greater farm uses of electric energy rather than the extension of lines. In the decade of 1950–60, this will be the major development.

Factor No. 7: Rural telephones

Rural telephone service is being extended in the South faster than in any region of the Nation.

Every rural county served by the Bell System has been mapped. The potential development on a 5- or 10-year basis is known. Millions upon millions of dollars will be expended on new lines and new phones in the current decade.

Rural telephone expansion in the South is important for a variety of reasons, including the fact that telephone service is one item used in compiling the Index for Farm Living, published annually by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. In this development the South has lagged to such an extent that the item is lowest in the list from which the Index is computed, hence lowers Southern county ratings. With expanded phone service the rating of many counties will jump up five or more points within the next few years.

Factor No. 8: Index of farm living

In the Farm-Operator Family Level-of-Living Index, compiled by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, United States Department of Agriculture, the South has made greater gains for several years than other sections of the Nation.

* * * * *

Factor No. 9: Cash farm income

During the favorable years for farming that have existed since 1942, the South has made great gains in cash farm income. In 1943 it reached $5,000,000,000 and by 1948 had risen to the all-time high of $8,250,000,000.

Since 1940 the gain in cash farm income for the Nation has been 233 percent; for the South it has been 272 percent.

Recent price trends still find the South in a favorable position.

If the maximum decline in farm income predicted for 1950 should develop, southern farmers will still receive about three times the prewar level and $1,500,000,000 more than 1940 and 1941 combined.

Factor No. 10: Bright spots in the South's farm outlook

A. 1. Higher net income from cotton.
2. Higher income from peaches.
3. Higher income from milk.
4. Higher income from corn.
5. Higher income from beef cattle.
6. Higher income from sheep and wool.
7. Higher income from tung nuts.
8. Higher income from forest products.
9. Higher income from fruits and vegetables.
10. Higher income from poultry.
11. Higher income from livestock.

These are expressions from leading economists of the agricultural colleges of the South recently interviewed.

B. Expanding southern food markets: With the exception of a few on the Pacific coast, large cities are growing faster in the South than those in other parts of the Nation; wages and salaries, percentagewise, are increasing faster than in other regions; nonfarm employment is expanding at a rapid rate.

This favorable combination of conditions is improving local food markets in the South. In the typical southern city in 1950 sales of milk, meat, poultry, eggs, citrus fruits, and frozen foods will be 100 percent above the prewar level.

C. New markets through processing farm products: Of the more than 16,000 new industrial establishments that have opened recently in the South, 3 out of 4 are directly related to farming; that is, they either make farm supplies and equipment or buy and process farm products; approximately 50 percent buy raw materials for processing from local farmers. In this way many new and dependable markets for diversified products have been created.

* * * * *

Wood-using industries are increasing rapidly. In the paper industry, the South will soon hold the same dominant position among the regions of the Nation that it has held for many years in textiles.

* * * * *

286,000 more owner-operators, 951,000 fewer tenants and share croppers—14 Southern States

	1930	1935	1940	1945
Owner-operators	1,378,533	1,536,525	1,507,853	1,664,538
Tenants	1,776,036	1,815,754	1,435,358	1,153,856
Share croppers	774,407	714,320	539,422	444,985
	2,550,443	2,530,074	1,974,780	1,598,841
Average acreage per farm	106.5	110.2	123.5	131.7

D. Gains in farm management and operation: Gains in farm owner-operators have been going forward faster in the South than in other sections of the Nation. There is a marked decline in tenants and share croppers.

Financial status of farmers in the 14 Southern States

	1940	1948
Income	$2,437,487,000	$8,250,407,000
Time deposits	340,000,000	749,813,000
Savings bonds	68,729,000	1,553,096,000
Demand deposits	748,700,000	3,780,782,000
Total	3,594,916,000	14,334,098,000

Percent increase 1948 over 1940, 299 percent.

Working capital is being increased. In terms of greater earnings in the future, this is the most important trend of the century in southern farming.

Crop production is being balanced with animal production. Breeding stock is being increased on southern farms faster than in other sections of the Nation.

Most important of all in relation to soil conservation and livestock profits, feed production is keeping pace with gains in animal population. Many Southern States are organizing 100-bushel corn clubs; Georgia has inducted 200 members in 2 years.

Major emphasis is being placed on the development of improved pasture. The greatest opportunity lies in all-year grazing systems with maximum grazing in the winter months. Using such a system the South can produce cheaper milk and beef than most other sections of the Nation.

Poultry production is being expanded at a rapid rate. The South, in the Delmarva, Georgia, and Arkansas areas, is now supplying the major portion of the Nation's broilers. Dozens of new dressing, packing, and freezing plants were added to marketing facilities last year.

E. Rapidly expanding farm mechanization: Farm mechanization is going forward rapidly in the South.

With 777,016 tractors on farms in the South, July 1, 1949, a gain of 186 percent has been registered since 1940.

Southern farms account for 61 percent of the Nation's increase in farm-owned trucks between 1945 and 1948. This striking fact is disclosed by a survey made by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

This prograss toward mechanization of southern farming operations merely scratches the surface and lays the ground work for greater sales possibilities.

Today the South is the Nation's greatest farm power and machinery market. More than 2,000,000 additional farms must turn to power machinery and labor-saving equipment to meet demands for greater efficiency and lower production costs. Conversion to machinery is more important in a falling farm market than is one that is moving upward.

Mechanization of southern farms will continue to go forward at a rapid rate. This fact is recognized by the makers of farm machinery, virtually all of whom have located plants, or enlarged service warehouses or both, in the South during recent years.

F. Aggressive farmer-training programs: In all phases of agricultural education, research, and extension service, vigorous aggressive programs are under way in the South.

In no section of the Nation are so many young men registered in farm-training classes, including the vocational agricultural classes in rural high schools and veterans farm-training classes.

Of the 250,000 ex-servicemen enrolled in veterans farm training in the Nation, approximately 66 percent live in 13 Southern States. These young men are farming now under the supervision of college-trained, farm-reared instructors. An excellent job is being done. These veteran farmers are, for the most part, mechanically trained. They are livestock and poultry minded. They believe in diversified, balanced farming. They are buying farms, tractors, livestock. In fact, they are carrying forward livestock development so rapidly that in most Southern States the full time of one man is required to locate and buy breeding stock for veteran trainees. Within 6 years, it is possible that one farm out of every seven in the South will be operated by a graduate of the veterans farm-training program.

The 10 factors, discussed in this paper, high light economic trends in the South. They tell a story of growth, progress, and confidence in the future. They lead to the conclusion that 1950 will be a favorable year for the region and that 1950–60 will be another decade of progress.

Black-Eyed Peas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1950

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, certain acceptability tests recently have been made concerning black-eyed peas. I include for the record some facts about the tests:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE QUARTERMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., May 4, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: In accordance with your request, this Office has sponsored a test of the acceptability of black-eyed peas in Army troop messes.

The test revealed that this commodity is sufficiently acceptable to be included in the list of foods used to subsist the Army. Whenever black-eyed peas compare favorably in price with other legumes, they will be considered for inclusion in the Department of the Army master menu. As is shown on the attached listing, current prices preclude such action at this time.

Administration of the Army's rations provides for the revision of the master menu by station menu boards whenever such revision is considered necessary or desirable. Black-eyed peas are among those foods authorized for procurement to meet station requirements.

Sincerely yours,

W. H. MIDDLESWART,
Major General, USA, Acting the Quartermaster General.

Current prices of black-eye peas and certain other legumes available for Army subsistence

BASED ON OVERSEAS PRICING CATALOG (QM 5–1–P) F. O. B. DESTINATION

	Per dozen No. 2 cans
Canned black-eyed peas (grade unknown)	$2.28
Canned green peas (fancy grade)	1.44

BASED ON MARKETING REPORT AS OF APR. 25, 1950, F. O. B. SHIPPING POINT

	Per hundredweight
Dry black-eyed peas	$13.75–14.25
Dry green peas	3.75– 4.25
Dry baby lima beans	7.25– 7.35
Dry small white beans	7.40– 7.50

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., January 17, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: Reference is made to our letter of November 9, 1949, informing you that studies on acceptability of canned, fresh, green, shelled, black-eyed peas were to be conducted at three Veterans' Administration hospitals in the South, and that you would be advised of the findings.

The studies have now been completed and the information made available to this office. As you know from previous correspondence, the hospitals selected were Kennedy Veterans' Administration Hospital, Memphis, Tenn., a general medical hospital; Veterans' Administration Hospital, Dallas, Tex., a general medical hospital, and Veterans' Administration Hospital, Tuscaloosa, Ala., a neuropsychiatric hospital.

During the 30-day testing period, canned green black-eyed peas were served from two to four times, which approximates the frequency with which dried black-eyed peas are served. The serving portion in each hospital averaged 4 ounces. In the neuropsychiatric hospital, the canned peas were found to be acceptable by more than 90 percent of the patients served, whereas in the general medical hospitals the range of acceptability was from 80 to 85 percent. The average unit cost of the canned green black-eyed peas was $0.022 as compared with $0.008 for the dried peas.

At one general medical hospital, after contacting the patients served, it was learned that many of them were unable to tell the difference between the canned and the dried product. Approximately 50 percent stated they would like either the canned or dried variety served once a week. At the other general medical hospital, 42 percent of the patients indicated a preference for dried peas; 30 percent had no preference or indicated they did not like black-eyed peas; while 28 percent preferred the canned item. The majority of these patients expressed a desire to have either dried or canned peas served once a week.

In the neuropsychiatric hospital, 845 patients were contacted; the ratio was 2 to 1 preferring the dried peas to the canned. Here again, those patients indicated they would like either variety served once or twice each week.

It is believed that the information resulting from these studies indicates that canned green black-eyed peas are an acceptable menu item in areas where black-eyed peas are generally eaten, but that dried black-eyed peas are preferred by the majority of the patients. Since the unit cost is so much greater for the canned peas than for the dried peas, it is believed inadvisable to purchase this variety centrally at the present time, but rather to leave the matter of local procurement in quantities desired, to the judgment of individual hospital managers.

Very truly yours,

PAUL B. MAGNUSON,
Chief Medical Director.

TUSCALOOSA, ALA., *November 18, 1949.*

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Member of Congress, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: Under date of November 2, 1949, I replied to your memorandum of October 29, 1949, regarding the use of green, dried, or canned black-eyed peas at this hospital at which time I informed you that we had not previously used canned peas but did use green peas in season, but with the greater part of our consumption being black-eyed peas of the dried variety.

In connection with the above I have your notation on my letter requesting advice as to why we do not use canned or green peas and information as to the price we pay for the dried variety.

The chief, dietetic service, has advised that experience has shown that at this neuropsychiatric hospital the average patient prefers the dried variety, properly seasoned, to the green peas used in season when prepared under the same conditions. Almost immediately following my November 2, 1949, letter to you we received a request from our central office at Washington to give the canned variety a trial and report to the central office at the end of a 30-day trial period the results of our experience with the canned variety as against the dried variety commonly used. Accordingly, request was made by the chief, dietetic service, for a nominal supply of the canned peas and upon investigation I find that the order for the canned variety has just been filled by the contractor and the dietetic service will serve the canned variety in accordance with instructions received from the central office.

For your information I may say that canned peas have not previously been used by reason of the fact that our central office sets the standard for procurement of such items with station procurement being mandatory on such standardized items through the VA supply depot system. The dried variety was the type standardized by the central office for station use and under the system in use field stations were without authority to procure the canned variety in lieu of the dried variety stocked in the various supply depots for withdrawal by the supply service on requisition; however, the request from our central office that the canned variety be given a trial would indicate the possibility that both types will henceforth be stocked in the supply depot for withdrawal in which case it will be optional with the dietetic service as to whether they desire to use one or both types as each type will be available for requisitioning purposes.

The dried variety available through the VA supply depot system is billed to us currently at a cost of $0.109 per pound whereas our recent purchase of the canned peas was at a cost of $0.75 per No. 10 can and according to cost figures prepared by the chief, dietetic service, the use of the canned variety will be approximately three times that occasioned by use of the dried variety; however, we are very glad to cooperate with our central office in

giving the canned variety a thorough trial with the results to be submitted to that office at the end of the 30-day trial period. I am returning attached my letter of November 2, 1949, in accordance with your request.

Very truly yours,

M. B. HOLMES, M. D.,
Manager.

THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,
Washington, April 5, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: I wish to acknowledge receipt of your memorandum of March 21, 1950, concerning the black-eyed peas.

Extensive tests have been conducted to determined the acceptability of dried, canned dried, frozen green, and canned green black-eyed peas. Based upon these studies the acceptability of all four test samples of black-eyed peas ranks above the acceptability of kale, rutabagas, brussel sprouts, and turnips; is equal to asparagus, cooked celery, parsnips, and winter squash but is below that of lima beans, string beans, dry beans, beets, cabbage, carrots, cauliflower, corn, eggplant, onions, green peas, Irish potatoes, sweetpotatoes, spinach, and tomatoes. Based upon the results obtained in this comprehensive study, peas, string beans, corn, spinach, tomatoes, and potatoes have a higher percentage eaten of the amounts served than do black-eyed peas.

In contrasting the tests conducted at Charleston, Corpus Christi, Boston, and Bayonne, we find that the results were quite uniform and substantiated the findings stated above. In addition, it has been clearly shown that black-eyed peas, irrespective of method of preparation or whether canned, frozen, or dried, have their highest degree of acceptability among those men whose origin was from the south and southwestern portions of the United States.

Your memorandum of March 21, 1950, is returned.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN T. KOEHLER,
Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
BUREAU OF SUPPLIES AND ACCOUNTS,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: I wish to acknowledge receipt of your memorandum of March 21, 1950, concerning black-eyed peas.

Extensive tests have been conducted to determine the acceptability of dried, canned dried, frozen green, and canned green black-eyed peas. Based upon these studies the acceptability of all four test samples of black-eyed peas ranks above the acceptability of kale, rutabagas, brussel sprouts, and turnips; is equal to the asparagus, cooked celery, parsnips, and winter squash but is below that of lima beans, string beans, dry beans, beets, cabbage, carrots, cauliflower, corn, eggplant, onions, green peas, Irish potatoes, sweetpotatoes, spinach, and tomatoes. Based upon the results obtained in this comprehensive study, peas, string beans, corn, spinach, tomatoes, and potatoes have a higher percentage eaten of the amounts served than do black-eyed peas.

In contrasting the tests conducted at Charleston, Corpus Christi, Boston, and Bayonne, we find that the results were quite uniform and substantiated the findings stated above. In addition, it has been clearly shown that black-eyed peas, irrespective of method of preparation or whether canned, frozen, or dried, have their highest degree of acceptability among those men whose origin was from the south and southwestern portions of the United States.

As requested, your memorandum of March 21, 1950, is returned.

Sincerely yours,

C. W. FOX,
Rear Admiral (SC), USN, Chief of Bureau.

UNITED STATES NAVAL
SUPPLY RESEARCH AND
DEVELOPMENT FACILITY,
NAVAL SUPPLY DEPOT,
Bayonne, N. J., March 24, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: The following information is submitted in response to your letter of March 21, 1950, relative to the acceptability of black-eyed peas.

This activity has engaged in a comprehensive study of the acceptability of various vegetables. This study has also included the testing of black-eyed peas including dried, frozen green, canned green, and canned dried types.

Based upon these studies, the acceptability of all four test samples of black-eyed peas ranks above the acceptability of kale, rutabagas, brussels sprouts, and turnips, is equal to asparagus, cooked celery, parsnips, and winter squash but is below that of lima beans, string beans, dry beans, beets, cabbage, carrots, cauliflower, corn, eggplant, onions, peas, Irish potatoes, sweetpotatoes, spinach, and tomatoes.

This activity has no comprehensive data wherein the acceptability of black-eyed peas can be compared with any new Navy foods.

Sincerely yours,

C. L. AUSTIN,
Rear Admiral, Supply Corps, United States Navy, Officer in Charge.

UNITED STATES NAVAL
RECEIVING STATION,
Charleston, S. C., March 31, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: It was my pleasure and privilege to conduct an acceptability test of black-eyed peas in the general mess of the United States Naval Receiving Station, United States Naval Base, Charleston, S. C.

The acceptance by the personnel involved was slightly less than half, in general, either southern-born or southern-raised men accepted. It is firmly believed that the peas could readily be used as a rotating item to provide the general mess menu with additional variety.

Personally I like black-eyed peas very much and have them frequently in my home. Wishing you every success in your program for their adoption, I remain

Very respectfully,

G. L. HANSEN,
Captain, United States Navy, Commanding Officer.

UNITED STATES NAVAL RECEIVING STATION,
Boston, Mass., March 23, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: The following information is furnished in reply to your memorandum of March 23.

The tests on black-eyed peas were conducted at this station in accordance with the instructions received from the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts. Recommended receipts were used. The results of the tests indicated a favorable comparison with such other infrequently used foods as fresh turnips, canned beets, and canned spinach. As it happened the quantity of black-eyed peas ordered exceeded the amount required to conduct the tests. The excess peas have since been prepared and placed in the serving line with no indication of increased acceptance.

Various fresh frozen foods have been introduced at this station over the past few years. Those foods, which are acceptable as canned items, have generally proved to be even more acceptable as fresh frozen items. On the other hand, spinach, for which there is a negligible demand as a canned item, has come to be readily acceptable as a fresh frozen item.

In the interests of economy and morale every effort is made to prepare menus which will be to the liking of the greatest possible number. To this end personnel are questioned at random to determine their appraisal of the meal. A suggestion box is prominently located in the mess hall. Suggestions are reviewed and where practicable the recommendations are effected. It is regrettable to report that there have been on requests for additional servings of black-eyed peas.

Sincerely yours,

A. F. JUNKER,
Captain, USN.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
BUREAU OF SUPPLIES AND ACCOUNTS,
Washington, D. C., April 10, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: I wish to acknowledge receipt of your letter of March 27, 1950, concerning the acceptability tests on English peas similar to those previously conducted on black-eyed peas.

As pointed out in the Secretary of the Navy's letter of December 5, 1949, and my letter of December 21, 1949, an item must have an acceptability of at least 75 percent in order to be served regularly in the general mess.

English or green peas, whether canned, fresh, or frozen, approach Irish potatoes in their degree of acceptability, which exceeds 90 percent for all personnel irrespective of origin or childhood dietary habits of the individuals being served.

Your letter of March 27, 1950, is returned herewith.

Sincerely yours,

C. W. FOX,
Rear Admiral (SC), United States Navy, Chief of Bureau.

UNITED STATES NAVAL AIR STATION,
Corpus Christi, Tex., March 25, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: In reply to your letter of March 21, 1950, with regard to the general results of tests of black-eyed peas.

Based on the results obtained from tests recently conducted, black-eyed peas compared favorably with kale and Brussels sprouts and unfavorably with cauliflower and eggplant. It does not compare favorably with various vegetables which have been in use over a long period of time.

Sincerely yours,

J. B. DUNN,
Captain, United States Navy, Commanding Officer.

[Enclosure 1]

UNITED STATES NAVAL RECEIVING STATION, NAVAL BASE, CHARLESTON, S. C.—SUMMARY OF DATA OBTAINED DURING PERIOD JANUARY 6, 1950, TO FEBRUARY 2, 1950

1. Authorization: Letter from Chief, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, dated November 8, 1949, JJ56-2/L5 (SB-4).

2. Objective: To determine the acceptability of black-eyed peas by naval personnel subsisting in the general mess.

8. Introduction: Two samples of black-eyed peas were produced:

Type	Brand name	Price per pound	Packer
Frozen green	Honor Brand.	$0.275	Stokely-Van Camp, Inc., Oakland, Calif.
Canned green.	Pocahontas.	.12	H. A. Taylor, Jr., Richmond, Va.

4. Procedure: The study used enlisted personnel subsisting on the general mess of the receiving station. Cafeteria method was used for serving and men were allowed to accept or reject. Men entering the mess hall handed in to the MAA a slip of paper indicating their geographic location.

Each of the two types of peas were run twice during the tests with at least a week elapsing between servings. All tests were conducted during the noon meal to encircle the greatest number of men. Standard meals were served.

Preparation of the peas was according to recipes as furnished by the Bureau except in the case of frozen peas. Test No. 1 indicated that 30 minutes cooking time was more than ample; accordingly on test No. 2 for frozen peas the cooking time was reduced to 25 minutes instead of the 2 hours as indicated by the Bureau.

Geographic origination of test personnel participating in the black-eyed pea study at the United States naval receiving station, naval base, South Carolina

	Percent
Group I	21.9
Group II	22.1
Group III	43.1
Group IV	12.9

(a) Group I: Eastern United States consisting of First, Third, and Fourth Naval Districts.

(b) Group II: Midwestern United States consisting of Ninth Naval District.

(c) Group III: South and Southwestern United States consisting of Fifth, Sixth, Seventh, and Eighth Naval Districts.

(d) Group IV: Western United States consisting of Eleventh, Twelfth, and Thirteenth Naval Districts.

Recapitulation of test data

Type of peas	Test No.	Number of men present	Number of men accepting	Percent accepting	Pounds net prepared	Pounds net not served	Pounds net served	Pounds net served but not eaten	Percent served but not eaten
Fresh frozen black-eye peas	1	620	370	59.7	98	22	76	14	5.6
	2	695	432	62.2	106	9	97	12	1.4
Total		1,315	802	61.0					
Canned black-eye peas	1	757	375	49.5	78	0	0	13	1.7
	2	420	244	58.1	74	15	59	8	1.4

TEST NO. 1

FOR FROZEN PEAS (FROZEN OR CANNED)

1. Date of test January 6, 1950.
2. One hundred pounds net weight prepared (record number of pounds of peas used).
3. Ninety-eight pounds prepared drained weight (strain liquid from peas and weigh the drained peas after cooking).
4. Thirty-nine pounds liquid (weigh the liquid).
5. Not applicable.
6. Not applicable.
7. Not applicable.
8. Six hundred and twenty, total number of men present for meal (count the men as they pass through the line).
9. Three hundred and seventy, number of men who accepted a serving of black-eyed peas.
10. Thirty-three pounds of peas not served (weigh the peas left on the serving line and/or left in the kettle).
11. Twenty-two pounds prepared drained weight not served (strain liquid from peas and weigh the drained peas).
12. Eleven pounds liquid not served (weigh the liquid).
13. Fourteen pounds of peas served but not eaten (strain liquid from peas and weigh the drained peas).
14. One and one-half pounds of liquid from peas served but not eaten (weigh the liquid).
15. Menu for meal: Hot soup and crackers, French fried shrimp, tartar sauce, sliced lemon, French fried potatoes, black-eyed peas, French fried, cole slaw, M. D., peach pie alamode, hot rolls, butter, bread, cocoa.

FOR FROZEN, GREEN, BLACK-EYED PEAS

Recipe outline:

1. For each recipe consisting of 20 pounds of frozen peas, use 2 pounds of cured bacon or salt pork.
2. Dice the bacon and cook until slightly crisp.
3. Add the cooked bacon and the fat drippings to the peas. Place in kettle.
4. Add sufficient cold water to cover peas.
5. Season partly with salt and pepper.
6. Bring the mixture to a slight boil.
7. Reduce heat and simmer for approximately 30 minutes or until tender.
8. Taste and add more salt and pepper before serving if needed.

FOR CANNED PEAS (FROZEN OR CANNED)

1. Date of test January 18, 1950.
2. One hundred and fifty pounds net weight prepared (record number of pounds of peas used).
3. Seventy-eight pounds prepared drained weight (strain liquid from peas and weigh the drained peas after cooking).
4. Seventy-two pounds liquid (weigh the liquid).
5. Not applicable.
6. Not applicable.
7. Not applicable.
8. Total number of men present for meal, 757, (count the men as they pass through the line).
9. Number of men who accepted a serving of black-eye peas, 375.
10. Pounds of peas not served, none (weigh the peas left on the serving line and/or left in the kettle).
11. Pounds prepared drained weight not served, none (strain liquid from peas and weigh the drained peas).
12. Pounds liquid not served, 65. (Weigh the liquid.)
13. Pounds of peas served but not eaten, 13. (Strain liquid from peas and weigh the drained peas.)
14. Pounds of liquid from peas served but not eaten, 1. (Weigh the liquid.)
15. Menu for Meal: Hot soup and crackers, grilled breaded veal cutlets, brown gravy, mashed potatoes, black-eyed peas and sliced bacon, cole slaw, M. D., cherry pie ala-mode, hot rolls, butter, hot cocoa.

NOTE.—Canned peas 48 percent water.

FOR CANNED GREEN, BLACK-EYE PEAS

Recipe outline:

1. For each recipe consisting of 4 No. 10 cans, or equivalent in smaller cans, use 2 pounds of cured bacon or salt pork.
2. Dice the bacon and cook until slightly crisp.
3. Add the cooked bacon and the fat drippings to the peas.
4. Season partly with salt and pepper.
5. Bring the mixture to a slight boil.
6. After the mixture has just started to boil, reduce the heat and simmer for not more than 30 minutes.
7. Taste and add more salt and pepper before serving if needed.

TEST NO. 2

FOR FROZEN PEAS (FROZEN OR CANNED)

1. Date of test, January 25, 1950.
2. One hundred and twenty pounds net weight prepared (record number of pounds of peas used).
3. One hundred and six pounds prepared drained weight (strain liquid from peas and weigh the drained peas after cooking).
4. Forty-seven pounds liquid (weigh the liquid).
5. Not applicable.
6. Not applicable.
7. Not applicable.
8. Six hundred and ninety-five, total number of men present for meal (count men as they pass through the line).
9. Four hundred and thirty-two, number of men who accepted a serving of black-eyed peas.
10. Thirty pounds of peas not served (weigh the peas left on the serving line and/or left in the kettle).
11. Nine pounds prepared drained weight not served (strain liquid from peas and weigh the drained peas).
12. Thirty-five pounds liquid not served (weigh the liquid).
13. Twelve pounds of peas served but not eaten (strain liquid from peas and weigh the drained peas).
14. One pound of liquid from peas served but not eaten (weigh the liquid).
15. Menu for meal: Hot soup and crackers, pot roast of beef, vegetable gravy, French fried potatoes, French fried black-eyed peas and bacon, Waldorf salad, M. D., pound cake, ice cream, hot rolls, bread, butter, coffee.

FOR FROZEN, GREEN, BLACK-EYED PEAS

Recipe outline:

1. For each recipe consisting of 20 pounds of frozen peas, use 2 pounds of cured bacon or salt pork.
2. Dice the bacon and add to the frozen peas. Place in kettle.
3. Add sufficient cold water to cover peas.
4. Season partly with salt and pepper.
5. Bring mixture to a slight boil and then reduce heat.
6. Simmer for 2 hours before serving.
7. Taste and add more salt and pepper before serving if needed.

FOR CANNED PEAS (FROZEN OR CANNED)

1. Date of test, February 1, 1950.
2. One hundred and five pounds net weight prepared (record numbers of pounds of peas used).
3. Seventy-four pounds prepared drained weight (strain liquid from peas and weigh the drained peas after cooking).
4. Thirty-one pounds liquid (weigh the liquid).
5. Not applicable.
6. Not applicable.
7. Not applicable.
8. Four hundred and twenty, total number of men present for meal (count the men as they pass through the line).
9. Two hundred and forty-four, number of men who accepted a serving of black-eye peas.
10. Twenty-one pounds of peas not served (weigh the peas left on the serving line and/or left in the kettle).
11. Fifteen pounds prepared drained weight not served (strain liquid from peas and weigh the drained peas).

12. Seventy-eight pounds liquid not served (weigh the liquid).

13. Eight pounds of peas served but not eaten (strain liquid from peas and weigh the drained peas).

14. One and one-half pounds of liquid from peas served but not eaten (weigh the liquid).

15. Menu for meal: Hot soup and crackers, boiled fresh corned beef, boiled cabbage, boiled peeled potatoes, black-eyed peas with bacon, prepared mustard, sliced pickles, vegetable salad, F. D., cherry pie alamode, hot rolls, bread, butter, coffee.

FOR CANNED, GREEN, BLACK-EYE PEAS

Recipe outline:

1. For each recipe consisting of four No. 10 cans, or equivalent in smaller cans, use 2 pounds of cured bacon or salt pork.

2. Dice the bacon and add to the canned peas.

3. Season partly with salt and pepper.

4. Bring mixture to a slight boil and then reduce heat.

5. Simmer for 2 hours before serving.

6. Taste and add more salt and pepper before serving if needed.

NATIONAL CANNERS ASSOCIATION,
Washington D. C., April 25, 1950.

To canners of black-eye peas:

1949 BLACK-EYE PEA PACK

This report is compiled from reports to the Division of Statistics of canners packing fresh, green, black-eye peas in 1949.

Credit is given to the Southwest Canners Association, Tyler, Tex., and the Texas Canners Association, Weslaco, Tex., for the compilation of that State. The pack in Texas includes some purple hull peas as well as their black-eye pack.

1949 black-eye pea pack by can size

	24/2	48/1P	24/300	24/303	6/10	Total
Arkansas and Oklahoma	134,504	----------	19,667	3,275	23,429	180,875
Texas	420,612	12,115	480,368	----------	63,172	[1]976,267
Other States [2]	61,252	6,817	----------	----------	8,967	77,036
United States total	616,368	18,932	500,035	3,275	95,568	1,234,178

[1] Includes Purple Hull, estimated to be about 20 percent.
[2] Includes Georgia, Louisiana, Maryland, and Virginia.

Yours very truly,

DIVISION OF STATISTICS.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION,
Beltsville, Md., April 12, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: Your informal note of April 6 upon our letter of April 4 concerning Crowder, Purple Hull, and English peas is received.

Because of the relatively small importance of the Crowder and Purple Hull varieties they have not been analyzed and studied extensively enough to afford a sound basis for saying they are either superior or inferior to English peas as a part of the human diet. Since they are similar to the black-eye variety in many respects, they may be reasonably expected to resemble the black-eye in composition. It will be noted that although the composition of English peas and black-eyes are somewhat similar, there are differences in the percentages of the principal constituents that contribute to their respective food values. Furthermore, each kind of pea shows great differences in composition and energy value from one stage of maturity to another.

The available analyses suggest that at comparable stages of development, black-eyes and English peas are so similar that it would be difficult indeed to prove, in actual dietary studies, any superiority of one over the other. While young English peas may contain more of vitamin A and black-eye more of some other vitamin, there is no basis for saying which one is more valuable altogether. That would depend in part upon the nature of the many other foods entering into the diet.

Thus, on the basis of limited data available the Crowder and Purple Hull peas appear roughly equivalent to English peas, in food value, at comparable stages of maturity.

Your file of correspondence on this matter is returned.

Sincerely yours,

F. P. CULLINAN,
Acting Chief, Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils, and Agricultural Engineering.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
OFFICE OF DOMESTIC COMMERCE,
Washington, D. C., May 1, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This is in reply to your letter of April 22, 1950, inquiring for information on the consumption of black-eye peas.

As Mr. Hiday of the Stokely-Van Camp Co. correctly stated in his letter, neither the Department of Commerce nor the Department of Agriculture publishes consumption figures on black-eye peas. The reason for this is that the necessary statistical facts are simply not available.

Consumption figures on agricultural commodities and the products processed therefrom are what we call "derived data." They are developed by taking the known or estimated supplies at the beginning of the year (or other time period), adding the annual production, or pack, and subtracting the known or estimated supplies at the end of the year.

In the case of black-eye peas the beginning and ending inventory situations are not known and no reliable basis for estimating them is evident. Moreover, production is not reported by the various packers to any Governmental agency or to the National Canners Association.

We hope that the foregoing explanation satisfactorily accounts for the absence of information on this subject. If we can be of assistance at any time, please call on us.

Sincerely yours,

H. B. MCCOY,
Director.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
Washington, D. C., March 27, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: Receipt of your letter dated March 21, 1950, is acknowledged.

Research and conferences with qualified personnel have disclosed that Crowder and Purple Hull type of field peas fall within the same category as black-eyed peas, even to the similarity of taste. In view of the above, it has been determined that the same acceptability standards would apply to Crowder and Purple Hull peas as apply to black-eye peas. In connection with the letter, the results of tests and acceptability standards were transmitted to your office by our letter dated November 18, 1949, and enclosure hereto.

In accordance with your request the enclosure is returned herewith.

Sincerely yours,

OLIVER P. SMITH,
Major General, United States Marine Corps, Assistant Commandant of the Marine Corps.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., April 14, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: Your letters of March 25, 1950, March 10, 1950, and March 7, 1950, which letter consisted merely of a note on the bottom of a letter dated March 2, 1950, from Food Processors, Brownsville, Tex., to Gen. Carl R. Gray, all concerned generally with the procurement of peas by the Veterans' Administration, have been referred to this office for appropriate action.

With regard to the possibility of a test being conducted on the use of frozen blackeye peas, it is believed not such a test would serve any useful purpose since it has been determined that dried black-eye peas are preferred by the majority of patients, in addition to being considerably more economical as you were advised in letter of January 17, 1950, from the Chief Medical Director, Veterans' Administration.

This office has neither comments nor information to offer concerning Crowder and Purple Hull peas.

As requested, there is listed below the annual requirements of the Veterans' Administration for various packs of green peas procured centrally:

	Pounds
Dry split peas	200,000
Canned green peas (250,000 No. 10 cans)	1,735,000
Canned pea puree (150,000 No. 2 cans)	210,000
Total	2,145,000

The prices requested for the above listed items, other than canned puree, were furnished in my letter to you of December 7, 1949. The latest average cost of canned peas puree delivered to the Veterans' supply depots was $0.21213 per No. 2 can or $0.16976 per pound.

Very truly yours,

R. C. KIDD,
Director, Supply Service.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE QUARTERMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., April 10, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: Reference is made to your letter dated March 25, 1950, addressed to the Secretary of the Army, and memorandum dated March 31, 1950, relative to the annual consumption and price of canned and dried green peas.

The annual consumption of canned green peas for the Departments of the Army and

Air Force is approximately 12,000,000 pounds. The average price per pound for canned green peas, based on 1949 pack procurement, is approximately $0.106 delivered to depots.

The annual consumption of dried green peas for the Departments of the Army and Air Force is much lower than the consumption of canned green peas, and is approximately 700,000 pounds. The average price per pound for dried green peas is approximately $0.087 delivered to depots.

The correspondence forwarded with your memorandum is returned as requested.

Sincerely yours,

R. B. THORNTON,
Colonel, QMC, Executive Officer.

NATIONAL CANNERS ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., May 3, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: As you requested on the 28th of April, we are pleased to enclose a copy of the pack report on green peas for the year 1949 with a comparison with 1948. As you will note this gives a breakdown by grade, can size, variety and geographical area. The total pack for 1949 is stated in the last paragraph of the first page of the report.

It is a pleasure to serve you and if there is any additional information about the industry that you need, please call on us.

Yours very truly,

R. B. HEINEY.

Pack of green peas in cases all sizes for 1948 and 1949

	1948 pack		1949 pack	
	Alaskas	Sweets	Alaskas	Sweets
NORTHEAST				
New York and Maine	*Cases* 33,492	*Cases* 1,474,525	*Cases* 19,294	*Cases* 741,276
MIDDLE ATLANTIC				
Maryland	581,841	269,178	405,403	455,847
Delaware and New Jersey	40,765	57,920	39,401	(1)
Pennsylvania	132,152	581,334	123,652	420,390
Other States	16,121	20,250	38,908	8,415
MIDWEST				
Ohio	125,362	30,029	130,309	34,235
Indiana	196,798	14,693	281,879	(1)
Illinois	358,549	1,898,632	233,213	1,232,028
Michigan	8,292	441,280	(1)	189,551
Wisconsin	2,980,607	4,370,424	4,063,342	5,798,284
Minnesota	812,054	1,792,667	887,928	2,134,811
Other States	204,627	233,137	251,638	76,769
WEST				
Montana and Wyoming	*Cases*	*Cases* 184,846	*Cases*	*Cases* (1)
Idaho and Utah		1,227,705		1,906,363
Washington and Oregon	332,527	5,714,623	192,093	4,411,353
Other States	2,261	309,363		568,492
Total	5,825,448	18,620,606	6,667,060	18,277,814

Footnote at end of table.

Pack of green peas in cases all sizes for 1948 and 1949—Continued

[1] In "Other States."

This is a report of the 1949 pack of peas compiled by sieve sizes, alaskas, and sweets, and is based on actual reports of canners packing peas, together with estimates for six firms whose report were not received.

The total 1949 pack of green peas amounted to 24,944,874 cases of all sizes compared with the 1948 pack of 24,446,054 cases. On the basis of standard cases of 24/2's, the 1949 pack was 23,468,000 compared with 23,356,000 cases packed in 1948.

Very truly yours,

DIVISION OF STATISTICS.

1949 pea pack in Northeastern States (actual cases)

Sieve	24/2	48/8Z	48/1P	24/303	6/10	Miscellaneous	Total
Fancy Alaskas:							
1							
2						7,294	7,294
3							
4 and up							
Mixed						12,000	12,000
Extra standard Alaskas:							
1							
2							
3							
4 and up							
Mixed							
Standard Alaskas:							
1							
2							
3							
4 and up							
Mixed							
Total						19,294	19,294
Fancy sweets:							
1 and 2	39,179		15,381	9,944	206		64,710
3	71,362	5,630	6,479	2,102	3,088		88,661
4	60,620	5,755	8,199	3,717	6,237		84,528
5 and up	21,805		89	1,433	10,664		33,991
Mixed	69,360	17,389	52,779	33,606	13,430	739	187,303
Extra standard sweets:							
1 and 2	2,716		1,882				4,598
3	13,231		58	42	3,462		16,793
4	25,586		3,774		13,427		42,787
5 and up	22,173	907	87		33,632		56,799
Mixed	44,199	773	28,386	679	24,550		98,587
Standard sweets:							
1 and 2	118		171				289
3	1,757				782		2,539
4	8,377				2,496		10,873
5 and up	7,759				3,562		11,321
Mixed	30,758	6	2,486	287	3,960		37,497
Total	419,000	30,460	119,771	51,810	119,496	739	741,276

1949 pea pack in Mid-Atlantic States (actual cases)

Sieve	24/2	48/8Z	48/1P	24/303	6/10	Miscellaneous	Total
Fancy Alaskas:							
1	3,669		1,855	8,112			13,636
2	12,534		8,927	34,549	1,512		57,522
3	539		148	14,491	2,592		17,770
4 and up				1,007			1,007
Mixed	39						39
Extra standard Alaskas:							
1	1,189		46	116			1,351
2	23,109		427	2,822	68		26,426
3	17,777		10,143	26,557	40,340		94,817
4 and up	11,506		200	13,074	25,012		49,792
Mixed	16,780		2,346	5,390	9,742	2,370	36,628
Standard Alaskas:							
1	118			298			416
2	2,141						2,141
3	26,896			9,909	9,990		46,795
4 and up	50,283			15,449	40,618		106,350
Mixed	24,127			47,901	80,646		152,674
Total	190,707		24,092	179,675	210,520	2,370	607,364
Fancy Sweets:							
1 and 2	13,129			9,026	850	166	23,171
3	11,714	8,950		4,487	5,560	1,462	32,173
4	9,199	9,145		804	11,558		30,706
5 and up	6,891			9,199	14,057		30,147
Mixed	127,669		21,155	86,218	12,955		247,997
Extra standard sweets:							
1 and 2	1,610			7	2,550	14	4,181
3	7,943			5	7,106		15,054
4	16,570	3,900			17,283		37,753
5 and up	9,255		8,712	607	24,860		43,434
Mixed	132,746	3,684	3,323	52,592	54,839		247,184
Standard Sweets:							
1 and 2	19						19
3	314			131	54		499
4				1,679	2,624		4,303
5 and up	8,399			3,390	3,754		15,543
Mixed	49,248	9,000	3,076	71,684	19,480		152,488
Total	394,706	34,679	36,266	239,829	177,530	1,642	884,652

1949 pea pack in Midwestern States (actual cases)

Sieve	24/2	48/8Z	48/1P	24/303	6/10	Miscellaneous	Total
Fancy Alaskas:							
1	78,206	2,844	22,012	50,783	252		154,097
2	279,312	65,188	78,773	594,990	32,000	1,050,263	
3	153,142	118,395	40,384	433,338	57,793	10,496	813,548
4 and up	823		565	3,002	10,146		14,536
Mixed	1,011	4,869	2,603	8,428			16,911
Extra standard Alaskas:							
1	30,370		795	2,720	2,675		36,570
2	124,111	1,110	35,952	170,237	18,977		351,087
3	438,840	52,962	137,128	640,898	224,903	80	1,494,811
4 and up	57,418	7,117	11,161	153,741	86,776		316,213
Mixed	22,875			8,655	1,865		33,395
Standard Alaskas:							
1	766		101	269			1,136
2	22,547	469	500	20,087	687		44,290
3	178,581	11,398	21,482	132,202	90,580	117	434,360
4 and up	278,509	14,266	66,770	426,942	233,894	115	1,020,496
Mixed	38,117	2		28,063	414		66,596
Total	1,704,628	278,620	418,226	2,675,065	760,962	10,808	5,848,309

Sieve	24/2	48/8Z	48/1P	24/303	6/10	Miscellaneous	Total
Fancy sweets:							
1 and 2	111,797	1,850	21,552	83,152	9,984	264	228,599
3	197,335	4,619	45,992	75,111	28,359		351,416
4	194,004	15,724	44,437	95,336	40,877		390,378
5 and up	140,560	5,802	21,616	88,110	57,252		313,340
Mixed	133,376	767,790	92,528	3,560,561	56,745	92,028	4,703,028
Extra standard sweets:							
1 and 2	20,386		5,930	10,979	3,993		41,288
3	50,958	2,767	37,358	32,293	28,044		151,420
4	172,106	3,187	57,936	63,711	73,320		370,260
5 and up	220,039	9,194	46,267	252,284	159,933	84	687,801
Mixed	159,000	80,130	33,996	1,046,323	156,993	11,880	1,488,322
Standard sweets:							
1 and 2	1,824		56	616	11		2,507
3	7,549		1,457	3,427	3,639		16,072
4	63,581	1,166	5,885	13,112	19,874		103,618
5 and up	207,825	1,719	16,023	86,055	68,431	577	380,630
Mixed	80,374	16,483	13,751	382,804	43,003	584	536,999
Total	1,760,714	910,431	444,784	5,793,874	750,458	105,417	9,765,678

1949 pea pack in Western States (actual cases)

Sieve	24/2	48/8Z	48/1P	24/303	6/10	Miscellaneous	Total
Fancy Alaskas:							
1	6,473	854	4,634	6,928			18,889
2	17,565	13,377	1,385	41,776	1,060		75,163
3		2,559	12,026	15,192	10,557		40,334
4 and up							
Mixed							
Extra standard Alaskas:							
1							
2		4	515				519
3			325	26,131	9,203		35,659
4 and up	9				5,798		5,807
Mixed							
Standard Alaskas:							
1							
2				6			6
3				1,448	49		1,497
4 and up	179	2,016		8,388	3,636		14,219
Mixed							
Total	24,226	18,810	18,885	99,869	30,303		192,093

Sieve	24/2	48/8Z	48/1P	24/303	6/10	Miscellaneous	Total
Fancy Sweets:							
1 and 2	76,769	20,760	59,818	151,295	1,141	40	309,823
3	97,655	38,108	87,307	196,325	16,736	50	436,181
4	29,859	73,837	147,963	97,956	58,038	65	407,718
5 and up	24,410	19,300	47,838	81,773	32,610	200	206,131
Mixed	108,230	279,805	426,563	2,414,870	38,327	48,609	3,316,404
Extra standard sweets:							
1 and 2	12	63	471	2,214	296		3,056
3	5,843	77	6,898	5,467	24,719	283	43,287
4	28,388	4,864	17,436	40,881	174,142	1,178	266,889
5 and up	72,224	17,504	25,838	296,384	205,848	2,560	620,358
Mixed	30,632	8,448	28,798	338,974	226,247	19,659	652,758
Standard Sweets:							
1 and 2	1,332			78			1,410
3	28		1,040	294	557		1,919
4	6,053		430	3,829	43,514		53,826
5 and up	25,176	8,566	12,896	161,962	148,810	3,996	361,406
Mixed	9,243	7,166	1,962	118,584	67,545	542	205,042
Total	515,854	478,498	865,258	3,910,886	1,038,530	77,182	6,886,208

Biggest Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the eighteenth article by Mr. Frank C. Waldrop on the infiltration of communism in our country:

BIGGEST STORY

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

When will Stalin kindly go on and die? Who will succeed him? The old man has talked about that recently. He has said that he knows exactly what will happen, for he has arranged everything.

It may be, for Stalin has ruled now longer than any other important man alive. He is a tough old rooster who has a good personal working knowledge of the worst that human nature can do.

And he may have discovered the secret of perpetual motion for government to his taste.

Most people do not know it, but Stalin is not a Russian, any more than Hitler was a German. Furthermore, he has never in his life put foot outside the empire that he rules.

He has excellent spies and enjoys plenty of reading matter concerning the world outside, so he does not let his lack of travel distract him.

The makers of the revolution in Russia that was to start all the world to communism as a way of life, overnight, were of a different breed.

They were travelers abroad, and their main leader, Lenin, even said one time that he thought it likely the Communists in Germany would soon set the Russians aside and take charge of the world movement toward scientific Marxism.

Note that point well, for it has since been steeped in the blood of millions.

The makers of the revolution thought, back in 1917, that they need only kill a few blind men here and there who could not see the wisdom of the Marxist idea, and then everybody else would be on their side. They did not care whether the Communist movement really took all its cues from Moscow, just so communism should rule the world.

Stalin had a different view.

This extraordinary man was born at Gori, in Asiatic Georgia, on December 21, 1879. He was the son of an illiterate shoemaker, and it was a great thing in the family that his mother started him for a priest.

Georgia is not Russia. The village of Gori is farther from Moscow than is Berlin.

Georgia lies in the narrow neck of land that separates the Black Sea from the Caspian. Next door are Turkey and Armenia. Iran, Iraq, and Syria are just a jump away.

Up in the sky is Mount Ararat, where Noah landed his ark, and under the ground lies oil, so that into this region of primitive tribal life there has moved in the past 30 years a sudden overlay of the machine age.

Unlike Texas, which was rescued from skin-and-bones farming by the oil prospectors, the lands back of Mount Ararat are still dry with poverty. Moscow issues no royalty checks in return for the oil it takes.

Stalin, a natural oriental born in a countryside that takes feuds and hates to its heart, soon abandoned the idea of being a priest for that of killing and robbing. The excuse, of course, was to overthrow the czar so far away.

In Georgia, as in every other corner of the overblown Russian empire of conflicting races, religions and economics, there was a seedling local revolution brewing all the time.

It just happened that in Stalin's youth the revolutionary instinct was grafted onto the Marxist theory of a Socialist society run on Communist lines.

Stalin, who was christened Iosif Vissarionovich Dzugashvili, went as a sword for a throat to the violence Marx called for as the necessary groundwork for socialism.

He robbed trains. He robbed banks. He killed and plundered. The profits went to the gang, and Stalin went to prison. He came out tougher than ever. In fact, though he has since done all he could to obliterate every record of it, evidence still remains of his once actually being expelled from the Communist organization itself for "expropriating" as it was called, with unauthorized enthusiasm.

By 1917 Lenin, Trotsky, Kamenev, Lunacharsky, and all the other leading lights of the revolution were busily writing and gabbling with Communists from all over.

As they set up the first Soviet state in Russia they were careful, also, to build a

Comintern, the Communist International that was to blow up the governments abroad.

Stalin, in that time, concentrated on the local problem of Russia's diverse and conflicting races. He got the job of commissar of nationalities.

And so while the others were politicking the world at large, the serpent who looked ahead was politicking with the delegates from the grass roots.

From commissar of nationalities, Stalin moved to general secretary of the central committee of the Communist Party of the United Soviet Socialist Republics of Russia.

On the surface it looked like a meaningless bureaucratic post, something about like being secretary of the Democratic National Committee.

But in fact Stalin thereby set a model Communists since have aped all over the world, in everything from labor union locals to world government societies.

They shoot for the low visibility jobs, when they can.

Biggest Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 15, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the nineteenth article by Mr. Frank C. Waldrop on the infiltration of communism in our country:

BIGGEST STORY
(By Frank C. Waldrop)

How does a career of murder and violence end? Sometimes in justice at the end of a soaped rope.

Sometimes unpunished, in a comfortable bed at home.

Sometimes with a pickax through the brain, in a foreign land, by order of a more cunning gangster.

If you have had the patience to follow this review of the biggest news story of the twentieth century you will no doubt be glad to learn that now I begin to tie some running threads of narrative together and knot them into place.

Up to now characters have been introduced. Here are just a few: Karl Marx; Woodrow Wilson; Vladimir Ulyanov, who called himself Lenin; William C. Bullitt; Franklin D. Roosevelt; Lev Davidovitch Bernstein, alias Leon Trotsky; Alexander Kerensky; Vyacheslav Skryabin, so well known in the 1940's by his alias, Molotov.

And Iosif Vissarionovich Dzugashvili, now called Stalin "for steel."

When Lenin died, in 1924, the first Soviet Government in the world was already on the rocks. It had jumped cleverly out of the war of 1914–18, to make popularity at home.

It had beat down circling civil wars by promising land to the country people and bread to the city people.

It had started the Communist international organization against all other governments, had tried and lost a war against Poland that was to signal a world upheaval of people everywhere against their own governments.

But it had not been able to deliver either bread or peace at home, and the farmers taking over the land in tiny parcels, were stubbornly declining to obey Moscow's orders on what to grow or what to do with what would grow.

The ruling class in Russia before the revolution had been a landed aristocracy taking its cue from the inherited monarchy of the Romanov Czars.

After the revolution, a new ruling class came to power that called itself the "Communist vanguard" of world socialism, and like all new managers of power, this class had trouble learning its job.

But worse than that, it had a flaw in its basic notions. Some Communists wanted to be Communists of the world, first, and Communists in Russia second. To these belonged Trotsky. Others said that Russia must first be brought in discipline to the Communist heel at home, and then the rest of the world could be dealt with in due time. This was Stalin's view.

The result: For 4 years after Lenin's death, Russia continued to disintegrate and fall apart, while the palaces of the Kremlin, in Moscow, rang with shots and screams and quarrels.

Stalin finally won enough power to his side that he had Trotsky exiled, in January 1929. But it was a narrow squeak, and Stalin lived in actual terror of the slippery, fox-bearded little wizard of words and plots. He knew Trotsky too well. Trotsky was a born seditionist, breeder of trouble, and a supreme fisher in troubled waters.

First from nearby Europe, then from overseas, Trotsky continued to shoot arrows into Stalin's hide. He even spread the story that Stalin had tried to poison Lenin, once, and for all we know it was true.

This row exposed communism's rawest weakness to the world. Communism cannot endure competition, either of partisans for office in government or of constitutions and drafts of law. All opposition to the man in office is illegal and conspiratorial, for the system forbids legal competition.

So, Stalin sent out his teams of assassins to find Trotsky, wherever in the world he might try to hide.

And finally, in Mexico City, on August 21, 1940, a young man known as Jackson, slipped up from behind as Trotsky was correcting proofs of a biography of Stalin, and knocked out his brains with a short-handled pick. Jackson was sentenced to 20 years by the Mexican Government, friendly to Stalin.

Incidentally, Mexico was for years a favorite hangout for Stalin's murder squad on this side of the water.

One of their most spectacular stunts was that of blowing up a plane load of people at Mexico City, on January 25, 1945, in order to get rid of a fellow for Stalin—the Soviet ambassador to Mexico. Details later in this series.

All in all, Stalin had literally millions of Russians killed in the process of erasing Trotsky from public memory. The list included old Bolsheviks, aristocrats of the revolution who had been out front fighting in the streets while Stalin himself was hiding in a cave. They numbered generals and admirals, and the low as well as the high.

To see it, you must imagine that in the United States of America one man had wormed his way to power who would send out his gang to kill the Chief of Staff of the Army, half of the Presidential Cabinet, ranking Members of the Senate and House of Representatives.

And that the wave of blood would roll out to knock down little governors, mayors, writers, musicians, finally, factory hands, farmers in the field, and street-corner loafers.

That was the actual story of Hitler in Germany, and it was Stalin's in Russia, across the same, identical span of years. Two demons from hell—one of whom President F. D. Roosevelt chose above the other, when he need not have touched either.

Why? For an answer we begin to tie in another thread of this story.

The revolution was just really beginning to eat its children in earnest when this writer first ran across communism in 1930.

That year, as I began to study its peculiar nature in New York City, Stalin decreed that the government would seize the grain of the Ukraine, where the wheat farmers were rudely declining to give up the land they had grabbed at Lenin's suggestion in 1917–18.

And so, as I got acquainted with the Communists over here, some 12,000,000—that is as printed here, 12,000,000—Russian men, women, and children were starved in a single famine by order of Stalin.

Thus was the great revolution to "liberate" mankind making its way in the world.

Now it is time to tell the story of what the revolution was about in the United States of America. We will come back to Russia again, in the days of F. D. R.

Biggest Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 15, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the twentieth article by Mr. Frank Waldrop on the infiltration of communism in our country:

BIGGEST STORY
(By Frank C. Waldrop)

A new line of action for the Communists in the United States of America, was ordered in the May issue of their leading journal of instructions, Political Affairs.

In plain language, it is to drop everything else and find the American spy in their midst.

The fact is well known to communism from the Kremlin to the State Department, that the Federal Bureau of Investigation sits in the innermost councils of their conspiracy.

For the past 20 years, in the cruel and unknown war of spy and counter-spy men and women have been murdered in every important American city.

One was shot dead in a Washington hotel some years ago, in the crudest terms of melodrama that no movie would attempt as anything but farce.

Yet still the FBI keeps its solid seat in the most secret councils of the Communists and continues to build the record that has kept two Presidents of the United States awake at nights, wondering what could be done about "that man, J. Edgar Hoover."

The Federal Bureau of Investigation has to be understood just as much as the Communist organization itself, if you are to follow the unfolding of the twentieth century biggest news story.

This agency, so powerful and competent today, was hardly as well organized as the Communist conspiracy itself when these two enemies locked in combat during the last days of Woodrow Wilson.

And, down through the years since, Stalin has managed to destroy many antagonists all over the world. But one he has failed to get is J. Edgar Hoover, a native of Washington, D. C.

And so, in the telling here of communism's rampage in the United States or America for

the past 40 years you will find a weaving in and out of the life of the FBI and the unique individual who made it, Hoover.

First, some facts about the base line of communism in America. In the early years of this century there was a spattering of socialism in the rapidly expanding industrial cities touched only a little here and there by the mania of Karl Marx's science.

The seething and fermentation of American expansion from our earliest times has bred crackpots in politics as well as men of solid statesmanship. And so, once the Socialist idea got any attention at all, a lurid skyful of rockets began to go up in bid for notice.

Henry George produced the single tax. Gen. Jacob Coxey marched on Washington with his army. The Populists excited the farmers on the Great Plains. William Jennings Bryan and the nuttier Democrats enjoyed several noisy campaigns of defeat. The Industrial Workers of the World are remembered now hardly anywhere except on the west coast.

There were the many-factioned Socialists whose leading figure came to be Eugene V. Debs.

And there was the Syndicalist League, admired by a whole variety of anarchist societies.

But none of them, though two United States Presidents were assassinated and another wounded, actually represented a serious or sizable element of our national life. America itself was interested in other things, all concerned with self-improvement and growing national strength.

On October 1, 1910, the Syndicalist League of North America distinguished itself by extinguishing itself in a single action. The McNamara boys dynamited the Los Angeles Times building, to show how they felt.

The fact that 21 innocent people happened to get killed in the circumstances, did not concern them.

American opinion was outraged, and the McNamara boys were promptly collared and put in Folsom prison.

Then, on July 22, 1916, Tom Mooney and Warren K. Billings and others of the old syndicalist gang set off a bomb in San Francisco, killing 10 people and wounding 40. They went to San Quentin instead of the gallows.

When I came to Washington in 1933, they were still there. But by then the Communists had adopted Tom Mooney as one of their endless chain of money-raising devices.

"Free Tom Mooney" campaigns were common and at every Communist gin-drinking calypso concert, girls switched around shaking tin plates under people's noses and demanding—and getting—hard money.

Finally the old bomb thrower was released from prison by a soft-headed governor. How many dollars the Communists had milked out of Washington and other cities in his name by then, I can only guess, but it was in the thousands. It was all spent, I can guess, with educated judgment. Not for Mooney but for Marx and Stalin.

Biggest Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 15, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the twenty-first article by Mr. Frank C. Waldrop on the infiltration of communism in our country:

BIGGEST STORY
(By Frank C. Waldrop)

J. Robert Oppenheimer, the most distinguished physicist in the world, could do the United States a great service if he would. It would be a service far greater than any he has made—and he has made many—to understanding of atoms and their behavior.

Oppenheimer is suffering a painful experience.

He has been identified by a former Communist as having been present in Communist meetings on the campus of the University of California in 1941. The suggestion is that Oppenheimer is or was a Communist.

All the usual hand-wringers and tear-jerkers are now running around the country expressing anguish and indignation at the very idea. But Oppenheimer himself knows and indeed has long ago admitted, that he was once very much under the Marxist spell.

And his brother, Frank, also a physicist of considerable rank, has been proved on the public record to have been not only a Communist but also a liar.

Those who want to see the proof can do so by going to the Library of Congress and looking at the bound files of the Washington Times-Herald of July 12, 1947, June 14, 1949, June 15, 1949, and June 18, 1949.

The Times-Herald published Frank Oppenheimer's Communist card number in 1947. Oppenheimer called the Times-Herald a liar.

But when finally the House Committee on Un-American Activities got around to him in 1949 and asked him about the matter under oath, he caved in and confesed the truth.

Then he crawled out of town and the hand-wringers and tear-jerkers all said he should be allowed to go his way, unquestioned about his boyish indiscretion, as they now do (in re) brother Robert.

It is as if a man had come up to you and said, "I was in a mob of murderers planning to kill you, but I quit. Don't ask me who they were."

Whoever hesitates to turn every possible Communist, ex-Communist and associate of Communists upside down and shake him for the last shred of knowledge he may have, does not understand our times.

This is a struggle for the world. The object of the Communists is to destroy civilization and build another system on their own model. They mean to kill you, personally, if you object.

J. Robert Oppenheimer knows that. His brother, Frank, knows that. The fancy man from Manhattan who committed contempt before the United States Senate a few days ago, Frederick Vanderbilt Field, knows that.

Therefore, J. Robert Oppenheimer's duty, today, is to speak out in public to the people of the United States and tell them not only his present beliefs, which all who know him say are on the side of humanity and civilization, but also, to tell everything he knows about everybody under the Communist spell, past or present. Less than that is to do the civilized world a positive damage.

If you want to grasp the dimensions of this struggle, compare the Communist organization in the United States of America today, with that of 30 years ago.

The Communists in this country were not really a fully developed political and conspiratorial force until 1934. They got their growth under the patronage of F. D. Roosevelt.

In the period 1914–18, they were scattered through a spectrum of meddlers in terror, socialism, and anarchy, but in no way had a central command.

Then, in 1919, as the Soviet Government of Russia set up its Communist International to develop resolutions in every country of the world, there was organized in Chicago the first real Communist gang.

Around this, the embryo revolutionists quickly formed, and just as quickly the headquarters were shifted from Chicago to New York City.

The first general secretary of the Communist organization was Charles Emil Ruthenberg, of Cleveland, Ohio, who held that job until his death in 1927.

Like John Reed, the Harvard Marxist who was the first of many Communist couriers between New York and Moscow, Ruthenberg lies buried, today, in the Kremlin.

Thus, it has always been obvious and visible to anybody with an honest mind and heart, that Communists in the United States of America are all and always, the agents of that same Kremlin and dedicated to the ruin of this Nation. Yet in our schools that has not seemed to matter.

The Problem of Old-Age Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 15 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, recently the famed Harvard economist, Prof. Sumner Slichter, presented testimony before the Senate Finance Committee in support of an expanded old-age insurance program. Professor Slichter's conclusions are in line with amendments I have introduced for increasing old-age benefits. I ask unanimous consent that pertinent excerpts from Dr. Slichter's testimony be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PROBLEM OF OLD-AGE SECURITY
(By Sumner H. Slichter, Lamont University professor, Harvard University associate chairman, Advisory Council on Social Security, Senate Committee on Finance)

I

My purpose in appearing before you is to report to you on the work of the advisory council on social security, appointed by the Committee on Finance of the United States Senate, Eightieth Congress, under authority of Senate Resolution 141, and to answer your questions about the recommendations of the council.

* * * * *

The Advisory Council reached three basic conclusions concerning the problem of old-age security:

(1) That the foundation of the country's system of old-age security ought to be a Federal system of contributory social insurance with benefits related to prior earnings and awarded without a means test.

(2) That the present Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Act is failing to perform adequately the job that it was expected to do.

(3) That the present Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Act is sound in principle, and that its failure to do the job expected of it is attributable to three principal defects in the act, all of them easily remedied.

In order to remedy the defects in the old-age and survivors insurance plan, the Advisory Council made 22 recommendations for

changes in the act. On 20 of these recommendations the council was unanimous.

* * * * *

II

* * * * *

The 17 members of the council—employer members, labor members, and public members—were unanimous in believing that contributory social insurance should be the foundation of the country's system of old-age security. Furthermore, the same conclusion was reached by each of the two previous advisory councils—the Council on Economic Security, which helped draft the original law of 1935, and the Advisory Council appointed in 1939. There are four principal reasons why the Advisory Council of 1947–48 reached the conclusion that a contributory system of old-age pensions should be the foundation of the Nation's system for old-age security.

In the first place, the pensions provided by a contributory insurance system are not charity. No means test is used, but pensions are awarded as a matter of right. Furthermore, the cost is met from the worker's own production in the form of a tax on payrolls paid by the employer and a tax on wages paid by the worker. Hence the dignity and the self-respect of the worker are shown consideration. * * *

In the second place, old-age insurance encourages self-reliance and thrift instead of discouraging them. A man by being thrifty does not diminish the amount of the pension that he receives—he simply assures himself of a better standard of living in his old age. This is in contrast to old-age relief based upon a means test. When a means test is used, the man who has been thrifty and who has provided for himself gets nothing; the man who has partly provided for himself gets small benefits; the man who has made no provision for himself gets the largest grant. Such a system is equivalent to a series of rewards for not being thrifty and self-reliant. Old-age insurance by avoiding the use of a means test, avoids discouraging thrift.

In the third place, old-age insurance which relates benefits in some measure to the prior earnings of workers helps protect men from too drastic a drop in their standard of living on retirement. The standard of living of workers obviously tends to vary with their earnings. Since the purpose of old-age security is to protect men against having to make too drastic cuts in their standard of living when they retire, pensions should vary in some measure with past earnings. Flat benefits, which are not related to earnings but are the same for everyone, would assure that there would be only an arbitrary relationship between men's standards of living before retirement and their standards after retirement. * * *

In the fourth place, a Federal system of old-age pensions should be the foundation of the country's system of old-age security because it can be applied to all members of the labor force and can be made as broad, therefore, as the problem with which it is supposed to deal. This method of meeting the problem does not depend upon the willingness of an employer to grant pensions or upon the bargaining power of unions and their ability to compel employers to grant pensions. Furthermore, a system of old-age insurance can be applied to the self-employed as well as to employees. * * *

III

* * * * *

The members of the advisory council were unanimous in believing that the present Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Act is not doing the job expected of it. There were three principal reasons for this conclusion.

One reason was that, even after 13 years, only about 39 percent of the male workers who reach 65 years of age would receive benefits if retired. Hence, it is plain that many people who need to receive protection from the system are not getting it. The principal reason why they are not receiving protection is that the Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Act applies to only about three out of five jobs. Another reason is that eligibility to receive benefits is determined by the proportion of time that a man spends in covered employment, not by the proportion of time that he is at work. A man may be quite steadily employed and still not qualify for a pension if he is one of the many workers who move back and forth between manufacturing, which is covered, and agriculture which is not. At the present time, half again as many people are drawing old-age assistance as are drawing old-age pensions—2,700,000 are receiving old-age assistance and about 1,900,000 old-age pensions.

A second reason for believing that the Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Act is not doing the job expected of it was that the average pension is too small and is considerably less than the average payment for old-age assistance. The average pension for a single person averages about $26 a month and the average pension of a retired person with one dependent less than $40 a month. The average monthly payment under old-age assistance is about $44.50. * * * The principal reason why pensions are small is that the benefit formula is too low even for workers steadily employed in covered industries. * * *

A third reason for believing that the Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Act has not done the job expected of it was that the average monthly pensions under it have not kept pace with the rise in the cost of living or the rise in per capita income. Average monthly pensions have increased 14 percent since 1940 while the cost of living has risen over 68 percent, average weekly wages in manufacturing have risen 117 percent, and the average per capital income of the country has increased 132 percent. During the period that average monthly pensions were increasing 14 percent, average monthly old-age-assistance payments more than doubled. The purchasing power of pensions is 32 percent less today than it was 10 years ago.

Pensions ought to bear a more or less constant ratio to the average earnings of persons. Otherwise they do not give people the required help in maintaining their customary standards of living. Part of the explanation of why the increase in the average pension has been far less than the increase in the average wage is that, as monthly earnings rise from $50 a month to $250 a month, the primary pension increases only $10 for each $100 increase in earnings. * * * Another part of the explanation why the increase in pensions has lagged behind the increase in wages is that only wages up to $3,000 a year count in computing the average earnings on which pensions are figured. As wages have gone up, more and more workers earn more than $3,000 a year. In 1948, about one out of four among all workers earned more than $3,000. Still another part of the explanation why pensions have increased more slowly than wages is that pensions are computed on the average monthly wages of each worker over his lifetime. Although the average worker is earning more than twice as much today as he was earning 10 years ago, his lower earnings of 10 years ago help bring down the monthly average of earnings on which his pension is computed. All in all, the present methods of computing pensions assure that pensions will be slow to rise whenever wages increase.

IV

Why does the advisory council believe that improvement of the act along the lines indicated by its 22 recommendations would enable the Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Act to do the job expected of it and to become the foundation of the country's system of social security?

In the first place, the recommendations of the council would extend the protection of the act to virtually all of the 25,000,000 jobs not now covered. Obviously one cannot expect a program to give protection to people whom it does not cover. Consequently, expansion of coverage of the old-age and survivors insurance scheme is of basic importance. * * *

H. R. 6000 proposes that about 11,000,000 additional jobs be brought under the old-age and survivors insurance plan. This is a step in the right direction, but it would bring under the act substantially less than half of the jobs that are not now covered. Large and important categories, such as farmers, many farm laborers, and a number of professional groups, would still be deprived of protection of the scheme.

The incomplete coverage proposed in H. R. 6000 raises basic questions as to where and how uncovered groups would get security for their years of retirement. Nearly all of the groups left uncovered by H. R. 6000 are groups that cannot be expected to be covered by private pension plans, initiated by employers or negotiated by trade-unions. Apparently the philosophy of H. R. 6000, therefore, is that the uncovered groups should either be able to take care of themselves or should be expected to rely upon charity. * * * Certainly the people cannot expect old-age and survivors insurance to be the foundation of the country's system of old-age security if large parts of the population are excluded from the plan.

* * * * *

In the second place, the recommendations of the council would liberalize the eligibility requirements for pensions so that older workers who are newly covered by extension of the Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Act to new industries will soon become eligible for pensions. * * * It would obviously do little immediate good to extend the act to the 25,000,000 uncovered workers if the eligibility requirements for new workers remain as strict as at present. H. R. 6000 makes a little improvement over the present law, but even H. R. 6000 would require 20 quarters of coverage, or 5 years, for newly covered employees to become eligible for pensions.

The council recommends that the extension of coverage to new industries be accompanied by a new start in eligibility requirements that will require the same qualifying periods for older workers as was required for persons who were the same age when the system began operation in 1937. * * *

In the third place, the recommendations of the advisory council would substantially raise the average monthly benefits. * * * The primary insurance benefit for a worker with 10 years of coverage under the present act and with average monthly wages of $200 is less than one-fifth of his monthly wage, and if he has one dependent, his total benefits are less than 30 percent of his average monthly wage. Obviously such pensions are far too small.

The advisory council has made three types of recommendations designed to raise the average benefit. One recommendation is that the benefit formula be liberalized—that benefits be 50 percent of the first $75 of monthly wages instead of 40 percent of the first $50, and 15 percent of additional wages up to the amount of the tax base instead of 10 percent as at present. Another recommendation is that the benefit base and the tax base be raised from $3,000 a year to $4,200. Still other recommendations pertain to liberalizations in the benefits payable to dependents. The most important of these recommendations is that women may qualify for old-age benefits (either primary or supplementary) at the age of 60 instead of 65. * * *

The total effect of the recommendations of the advisory council would be to increase the average pension paid under the old age and survivors insurance scheme by about 100 percent. This would be an important improvement. Nevertheless, I do not believe that the recommendations of the council go far enough. To begin with, the formula proposed by the council is not sufficiently liberal, particularly for the workers earning above $75 a month. * * * This formula would give a primary pension of $37.50 for workers earning $75, of $48.75 for workers earning $150 a month, and of $63.75 a month for workers earning $250 a month.

H. R. 6000 proposes that the primary pension be $50 for the first $100 of earnings. Several members of the advisory council, Mr. Folsom of the Eastman Kodak Co., Mr. Rieve of the Textile Workers Union, CIO, and Mr. Cruikshank, the social security expert of the A. F. of L. have expressed agreement with this feature of H. R. 6000, and I share their views. The benefit formula of 15 percent of wages between $75 and $350 a month does not provide a large enough spread between the pensions received by persons with low earnings and persons with higher earnings—though the council provides a greater spread than the formula in the present law or that proposed by H. R. 6000. If pensions are to protect the standard of living of workers who retire, they must be fairly closely related to previous earnings. Certainly a rise of only $10 or $15 in pensions as average monthly earnings increase $100 does not provide a very close relationship between earnings and pensions, and is not fair to the skilled workers. * * * Two members of the council, Mr. Rieve and Mr. Cruikshank, have recommended that the rise in pensions above the basic amount be 20 percent of additional earnings. I am in favor of at least a 20 percent increase in pensions for each rise in average monthly earnings above the basic amount, but I believe that a 25 percent rise would be preferable. Such a rise would give a man with average monthly earnings of $200 a month a primary pension of $75 (assuming the formula provides for a pension of 50 percent of the first $100 as in H. R. 6000) and a man with average monthly wages of $300 a month, a primary pension of $100. Certainly such a spread in the pension received by men with a difference of $100 in monthly earnings is not too large.

Finally, I believe that the limit of $4,200 on the benefit base and the tax base recommended by the Council is too low and is unfair to many skilled workers and to foremen and others in the lower ranks of supervision. The upper limit of $4,200 in the benefit base means that no earnings of more than $4,200 a year produce an increase in a worker's pension. * * * In the year 1948, 17 percent of the male workers who earned wages in covered industries in all four quarters earned more than $4,200. Why refuse to count any of these earnings over $4,200 in computing the pension that the man receives?

The primary pension for a worker earning $5,000 a year, if the pension were 50 percent of the first $100 and 15 percent of the additional earnings up to $4,200 a year, would be only $87.50 a month. It is not satisfactory to expect all men who receive more than $4,200 a year to depend on individual savings or on company pension plans. * * * Business enterprises themselves do not expect these men to depend on individual savings because they establish generous pension plans for executives. But almost all of these company pension plans tie a man to one company and penalize the man who moves from one employer to another. When one considers the serious deficiencies of company pension plans, one reaches the conclusion that skilled workmen and foremen should not be dependent to any considerable extent upon them.

I am not in favor of increasing the tax base and the benefit base for the purpose of increasing the income of the pension fund. Nevertheless, if the benefit base is increased, the tax base should be correspondingly increased because the two should be the same. As a matter of fact, the increase in the tax base above $4,200 would not produce much new tax revenue.

V

When the present Federal old-age pension plan was drawn up about 15 years ago, the prevailing opinion was that it should be inadequate—that it should provide only a bare minimum of security and that it should be supplemented in various ways. It is understandable that back in 1935, when the idea of a Federal old-age insurance plan was new, many people wished to avoid placing too much reliance on it. At that time, the serious disadvantages of private pension plans as devices for providing old-age security were not clearly seen. Nor were all of the developments and problems of old-age assistance clearly seen.

The time has come, I believe, for a change in our thinking about these matters. It is high time to adopt the view that the Federal pension plan should be so close to adequate that only moderate supplementation by private pension plans or public assistance will be necessary. Of course, substantial supplementation by individual thrift will always be necessary.

VI

* * * * *

What would a more adequate system of old-age and survivors insurance cost? * * *

The best way to estimate the costs of an old-age insurance program is as a percentage of payrolls and of the income of the self-employed, in case the insurance plan extends to the self-employed. In the next 20 or 30 years there will be a very large rise in payrolls—partly due to the increase in the labor force and partly due to the rise in wages which must be expected to continue in the future as in the past. In another 30 years, for example, the labor force will increase by over 10,000,000, and, if wages rise as rapidly as in the past, hourly earnings will increase between 80 and 90 percent. One must expect that the benefits paid under the old-age insurance plan will bear a more or less constant relationship to average monthly earnings. As wage rates rise, benefits will be liberalized from time to time in order to maintain a more or less constant relationship between earnings and pensions. That is why the most realistic and conservative way of estimating costs is in terms of percentage of payrolls and the income of the self-employed.

The actuarial consultant of the Advisory Council on Social Security prepared a low-cost estimate and a high-cost estimate of the recommendations of the Council. He estimated that by the year 2000 the expanded program recommended by the Advisory Council would cost from 5.87 percent to 9.70 percent of payrolls. The range in his estimates of level premium rose from 4.90 percent to 7.27 percent. The more liberal benefit formula which I had suggested would cost somewhat more.

VII

Fortunately, the cost of old-age pensions can be substantially reduced by encouraging employers not to retire workers who are physically fit to perform their work. It is a cruel fiction that men on attaining the age of 65 suddenly become unfit to continue their jobs. * * *

Many people conceive the problem of old-age security as mainly a result of the aging of the population—that is, the increase in the proportion of the population of 65 years of age or more. As a matter of fact, the problem of old-age security is as much a problem of earlier retirement as a problem of the aging of the population. Back in 1890, 68.2 percent of all white males were members of the labor force. By 1930 this percentage had fallen to 54. By 1940, only 42.2 percent of all white males were in the labor force.

The drop in the proportion of the population of 65 years of age or more in the labor force is not the result of voluntary retirements. It is the result of lay-offs by employers. For example, among rural farm population, 69.3 percent of males 65 to 74 years of age were in the labor force in 1940, and even 31.5 percent of males over 75 were in the labor force. Among urban groups, on the other hand, only 46.9 percent of white males between 65 and 74 years of age were in the labor force, and only 15 percent of those 75 years of age or more. Many large companies have adopted the rule that everyone must retire at the age of 65.

The practice of earlier and earlier retirements is bad for the individual worker in most cases, it is bad for the country, and it greatly increases the problem of an old-age insurance plan. Retirement is bad for the worker partly because it reduces his income, but even more because it cuts him off from the contact of his fellows that his job gave him, and makes him feel that he is a has-been and is now on the shelf. He is unhappy and maladjusted. Often his health suffers. Earlier retirements are bad for the country because they deprive the community of the output that the retired workers might produce. At the present time, for example, there are about 2,800,000 workers of 65 years of age or more at work. They produce about $10,000,000,000 of goods. If the practice of universal retirement at 65 were made general, the country would be deprived of the output of these 2,800,000 men. In other words general retirement at the age of 65 would cost the country about $10,000,000,000 a year. Finally, earlier retirements greatly increase the cost of pensions. Life expectancy at age of 70 is about 3 years less than at the age 65. If most men retired at 70, therefore, the number of years pensions would be paid in the average case would be about three less than if most men retired at 65. Furthermore, contributions would be paid for more years. Consequently, the contribution rate that will buy a given pension beginning at age 65 will purchase much larger pensions beginning at age 70.

The time has come to halt the tendency for employers to retire men at an earlier and earlier age. This tendency is quite out of place in a community where health is improving, longevity is increasing and the remaining years of usefulness of workers at the age of 65 are growing. The Advisory Council on Social Security pointed out that the great majority of retirements are involuntary, and it recommended that the Federal Government establish a commission to study the broad problem of the aged in the community and the adjustment of aged to retirement. I believe that immediate steps should be taken, however, to help workers between the ages of 65 and 70 continue in employment instead of being forced to retire.

* * * * *

An incorporation into the Old-age and Survivors Insurance Act of an incentive for employers to keep workers beyond the age of 65 would be a major improvement in the country's arrangements for old-age security, it would open new hope and opportunity for millions of older workers. It would greatly reduce the cost of pensions and it would make it possible to give much more liberal pensions than are now available with only a moderate increase in the cost of pensions. It would increase the productivity of the economy. This increase in productivity would alone go far to pay the total cost of old-age security.

Truman Unlikely To Win Fight Against Taft Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FORREST C. DONNELL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 15 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Truman Unlikely To Win Fight Against Taft Act—Rail Strike Stirs Public Ire Against Labor Bosses," by Gould Lincoln, appearing in his column entitled "The Political Mill," published in the Washington Evening Star for May 13, 1950.

In the course of the article, these three sentences appear:

Obviously, with Congress in its present temper, there is no slightest chance of Mr. Truman being able to carry out his pledge to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act. Indeed, the vote in the Senate is merely a reiteration of support for the labor act. Further, if there is any new labor legislation, it will be in line with demands that the laws be amended so as to provide for compulsory arbitration in railroad disputes so as to prevent future tie-ups imperiling the entire country.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE POLITICAL MILL—TRUMAN UNLIKELY TO WIN FIGHT AGAINST TAFT ACT—RAIL STRIKE STIRS PUBLIC IRE AGAINST LABOR BOSSES

(By Gould Lincoln)

President Truman is crying aloud again his determination to repeal the Taft-Hartley labor law—notwithstanding the rash of important strikes this year, including coal, automobile, and railroad. The last is not calculated to put either Congress or the country in the frame of mind to turn the country even more completely over to the domination of labor bosses.

It is not surprising, however, that Mr. Truman still demands that the country return to the one-sided Wagner Labor Relations Act. It was one of his promises to labor in the 1948 political campaign—and this year he is fighting for the election of a Democratic Congress (more to his liking, he hopes, than the present one).

The promise of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Engineers to keep the President's special train rolling on his western trip—no matter what happens to other trains, freight and passenger, and to other would-be travelers—is a new kind of special privilege. It may be that it is more important for Mr. Truman to travel about making partisan political speeches than it is for trains to move carrying the great, necessary traffic of the country—but it is difficult to understand.

SUSPICION OF REWARD

The promise of the firemen not to interfere with Mr. Truman's movements may be predicated on a desire of the brotherhood to respect the office of President of the United States. But there is a suspicion that it is also intended to reward this particular President—who at one time threatened to draft into the armed forces all railroad men.

Just before the President uttered his pledge of unending battle to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act, the Senate, by a vote of 53 to 30, turned back his attempt to repeal part of the act by Executive order. The vote came on the resolution of Senator TAFT, of Ohio, to kill Mr. Truman's order, under the reorganization act, to do away with the present independent general counsel of the Labor Relations Board, and place all authority in the Chairman of the Labor Board. Robert N. Denham, general counsel, has, since his appointment, striven to bring about the enforcement of the Taft-Hartley Act. The sympathies of the members of the Board, however, have been those of Mr. Truman—against the Taft-Hartley Act.

Obviously, with Congress in its present temper, there is no slightest chance of Mr. Truman being able to carry out his pledge to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act. Indeed the vote in the Senate is merely a reiteration of support for the labor act. Further, if there is any new labor legislation, it will be in line with demands that the laws be amended so as to provide for compulsory arbitration in railroad disputes so as to prevent future tie-ups imperiling the entire country.

STRIKE HAD NO APPEAL

This particular railroad strike, to compel the employment of extra firemen on Diesel locomotives, has had no public appeal whatever. Two fact-finding boards in the past have declared such employment not necessary.

The course of the Truman administration, however, has been to give labor what it demands whenever it can. Cynically, why shouldn't it be that way? The CIO-PAC and A. F. of L.'s League for Political Education are adjuncts of the Fair Deal Democrats. In some States, they have virtually taken over the running of Democratic campaigns. There has grown up, too, a touching belief in Fair Deal circles that labor bosses can deliver the votes of union members.

One of the strangest happenings in recent days, on Capitol Hill, was the action of Representative LESINSKI, Democrat, of Michigan, chairman of the House Labor Committee, which prevented an immediate investigation of charges that John L. Lewis, by secret signals, had kept alive the coal strike last winter, when Mr. Lewis was publicly calling for a resumption of coal mining. Mr. LESINSKI accomplished this by removing subpena power from Chairman JACOBS, Democrat, of Indiana, head of a subcommittee, who was going to put Mr. Lewis on the grill. What will the public think of such tactics?

Card Clothing Machine Operators' Union Seeks Increase in Tariff To Protect Jobs of Its Members

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 15, 1950

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a resolution adopted by the Fall River, Mass., local of the Card Clothing Machine Operators' Union of America asking an increase in tariff rates on card clothing in order to protect the standard of living of its members:

Whereas we are a skillful technical craft that is absolutely essential to the manufacture of textile fabrics; and

Whereas during the last war our industry was rated A–A1 priority, proving how necessary we were to the war effort; and

Whereas the importation of card clothing has always caused us a loss of income and hardship in times of peace; and

Whereas foreign competition will eventually close our industry due to the differential of wages in foreign labor; and

Whereas to equalize this unfair competition and keep our industry in a position to help hold the economic condition of our country, we feel it necessary to increase the tariff on our product; and

Whereas since our Government accepts the principle of fair trade through subsidies to hold farm prices at home, it seems we should be guaranteed protection through tariff regulations to maintain fair trade for our industry; and

Whereas the present devaluation of the pound sterling and the contemplation of still lowering its value gives the importers of card clothing an unfair advantage over our American-made product: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the Fall River branch of the Card Clothing Machine Operators Union of America, wish to go on record as opposing any tariff revision that will jeopardize our present standard of living.

A Text for Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, May 6, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from today's Washington Times-Herald:

A TEXT FOR TRUMAN

President Truman is in Chicago after circuitous travels. His purpose in going there is said to be that of participating in a jubilee honoring the one hundred and fiftieth anniversay next March of Thomas Jefferson's accession to the Presidency. If a certain elasticity of the dollar is permissible among Fair Dealers, we suppose that the same liberties may be taken with time.

We are happy, however, to hear that politics does not enter into this visit, for Jefferson held strong views on the subject of political junkets, as witness his remarks in a letter of June 19, 1807, to James Sullivan, Governor of Massachusetts, after New Englanders had proposed a tour in that quarter.

JEFFERSON'S INTEGRITY

"I confess," said Jefferson, "that I am not reconciled to the idea of a chief magistrate parading himself through the several States, as an object of public gaze, and in quest of an applause which, to be valuable, should be purely voluntary. I had rather acquire silent good will by a faithful discharge of my duties than owe expressions of it to my putting myself in the way of receiving them.

"As I have never yet seen the time when the public business would have permitted me to be so long in a situation in which I could not carry it on, so I have no reason to expect that such a time will come while I remain in office."

For these reasons Jefferson felt obliged to refuse the proffered invitation to display himself at distant post horn stops. He said that "a journey to Boston or Portsmouth, after I shall be a private citizen, would much better harmonize with my feelings, as well as duties."

Whether it is 150 or only 149 years since Jefferson's accession, times have, indeed, changed.

Address of President Truman at Butte, Mont.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of the President of the United States at Butte, Mont.:

TEXT OF TRUMAN SPEECH TAKING TO TASK THOSE WHO CRY "SOCIALISM"

It is a great pleasure to return to Butte. I remember very well my last visit here, not quite 2 years ago. The grand reception you gave me then was an inspiration to me during the days that followed.

I came to the Pacific Northwest to dedicate Grand Coullee Dam. That dam is one of the most remarkable engineering feats ever accomplished. More electric power is generated there than in any other plant in the world.

It will bring immense benefits to the people in the region it serves and to our whole Nation. It is an outstanding example of how we can use our Federal Government to perform tasks that are so big they are beyond the power of any other agency through which the people can act.

This trip is giving me an opportunity to report to the people about their Federal Government. Every year, the President reports to the Congress on the state of the Union. That is a good thing. But it seems to me that it is just as important for the President to report directly to the people who elected him.

In our democracy the Government is responsible to the people, and they are entitled to know just what the Government is doing. I find that one of the best ways for me to report to you is to come out here where I can talk to you face to face.

I understand that some people have objections, but I think the real reason is that they are afraid the people might like it too well when the President comes out to see them.

ALL GROUPS ARE DEPENDENT

Today, I want to report to you on some of the Government's activities and programs that are of particular interest to working men and women. But, first, I want to remind you that the welfare of all groups of the population is inseparable. Workers, businessmen, and farmers all depend upon one another—they all prosper together or they all suffer together.

I understand that you have had a clear demonstration of that fact here in Butte within recent months.

This city depends very largely upon the production of copper. When the demand for copper fell off last year, it affected the Anaconda Copper Co. The results didn't stop there. The men who worked for the company also were affected. There were layoffs in the mines and smelters.

Now, things are looking up again. The market for copper has improved. The company's business is better again, and men who had been laid off have been put back to work. In fact, I saw where someone was advertising in a Colorado paper the other day to get more hard-rock miners to come up here to work.

I am mighty glad to hear that there are jobs for people in Butte, and I hope it will always be that way.

However, you cannot be prosperous here unless the rest of the country is prosperous. Your jobs and the company's profits depend on what people are able to buy in New York and Georgia and Texas and all over this great country of ours.

You have a vital and direct interest in the economic welfare of the entire Nation, and therefore you have an equal interest in what the Government does to maintain the economic welfare of the Nation.

The Federal Government has always taken a hand in the country's economic affairs. Indeed, one of the purposes for which our Union was formed was to promote trade and commerce among the several States. Some people seem to forget that sometimes, but it is true.

During the last 17 years, however, the Government has played a larger part in our economic life than ever before. There is a reason for this, and one that is not hard to find. The reason is the great depression of the early 1930's—and the lessons we have learned from that depression and from the events since then.

We have learned that in a dynamic, highly industrialized economy such as ours, the Federal Government must use its strength and resources to prevent violent cycles of boom and bust. We learned during the period from 1929 to 1933 what happens if the Government stands on the sidelines—with men in high places merely smiling cheerfully and saying everything is going to be all right. We have learned since 1933 that a Government which takes positive action can supplement and support the efforts of private business in such a way as to keep our economy steadily expanding.

GOVERNMENT SAVED BUSINESS

These lessons have been hard for some people to take. In fact, they deny them still. All of you, I am sure, have heard many cries about Government interference with business and about "creeping socialism."

I should like to remind the gentlemen who make these complaints that if events had been allowed to continue as they were going prior to March 4, 1933, most of them would have no businesses left for the Government or anyone else to interfere with—and almost surely we would have socialism in this country, real socialism.

The truth is that Government action during the last 17 years has been the salvation of private business in this country and has strengthened the private enterprise system against socialism, communism, and all other isms.

Don't let anyone tell you that the Government should retire to the sidelines while the national economy goes back to the days of "boom and bust." The power of the Government exists for the people to use. It would be folly for the people to be afraid to use their collective strength through the Government.

The strength of the Government is being used now—and, so far as I am concerned, it will continue to be used—to protect your jobs and improve your welfare.

Perhaps our most important single economic goal is to see that there are enough jobs for those who need them. This was the purpose behind the Employment Act of 1946. The act pledged the resources of the Federal Government for the maintenance of maximum employment, production, and purchasing power. We are now committed to keep our country prosperous. No one was more influential in getting that act adopted than your own Senator, JIM MURRAY.

You sometimes hear it said—and I think this comes mostly from the lunatic fringe among the reactionaries—that the Government promises to make it possible for people to live without working. They say our Government programs would make us a Nation of dead beats and loafers. That, of course, is absurd.

STRONG SHOULD HELP WEAK

I think it is the responsibility of Government to help those who because of old age or other disability are unable to work, and those who, through no fault of their own, are unable to find work. I believe that the strong should help the weak, and I make no apologies for that belief.

But for men who are able to work, I want jobs—not idleness. That's what they want, too—an opportunity to earn their own living. I have too much faith in the American workingman to have any doubt about his willingness to give full value received for the wages he is paid. There is one thing I am accused of sometimes to which I will have to plead guilty. I am in favor of good wages.

I think that the people who do the work are entitled to a fair share of the income from the product. I believe that they should share in the benefits of technological improvements and increased productivity. I believe that one of our goals should be a steadily improving standard of living for the American working man and his family.

TAFT-HARTLEY ACT CENSURED

Our main reliance for seeing that the workingman gets a fair share of the benefits of our economy, is upon collective bargaining between employees and their employers. This bargaining process is carried on between private parties, but it vitally affects the public interest. It is of the utmost importance to the whole Nation that negotiations between labor and management be conducted in good faith, with sincerity and patience, by parties who are able to bargain freely and as equals.

Before the passage of the Wagner Act in 1935, the status of collective bargaining in the United States was at a low ebb. Under the Wagner Act, great progress was made in the field of industrial relations. All too often, we fail to realize that the progress achieved under that act had a lot to do with the improvement in economic conditions we have enjoyed. Make no mistake about it, the Wagner Act was one of the bulwarks of American liberty and prosperity.

Then came 1947 and Taft-Hartley. The Taft-Hartley Act emasculated the Wagner Act and subverted its purpose. The avowed intention of its sponsors was to strengthen the hand of management. To do this, they devised a clever law which insidiously undermines the strength of labor unions.

The Taft-Hartley law hangs over the head of labor, threatening to destroy the gains of 15 years. There it will hang until we are able to replace it with a law that is fair to management and labor alike.

That is something we must do—not only for the sake of labor, but for the sake of the whole country. I believe profoundly that the Taft-Hartley law is a substantial infringement of the basic freedom to bargain collectively.

I will not cease to fight for its repeal.

In other fields, we have made considerable progress since I last visited with you here in Butte.

Last year, we increased the minimum wage under Federal law from 40 cents to 75 cents an hour. That probably did not have a direct effect on many people in this city. For, I am glad to say, most people who are employed here, in jobs which that law covers, already made more than 75 cents an hour. However, you will all benefit from the improvement it brings about in other parts of the country.

WIDER SOCIAL SECURITY URGED

In the social-security field, the Congress has been considering a bill to strengthen our system of old-age and survivors insurance.

You will recall that I have pointed out many times how pitifully small these social-security benefits now are, and how a great many people are left out altogether. I am confident that the Congress will complete action at this session on legislation which will do much to remedy both of these shortcomings. However, I must confess that I have been disappointed at the inadequacy of some of the provisions which are in the bill in its present form.

There is one governmental program with which some of you probably have had some first-hand experience lately—that is unemployment compensation. I am sorry if you had to fall back on it, but I am mighty glad that it was there for you to rely on, and I'll bet you are mighty glad of that, too.

This is an insurance system to help tide workers over periods when they are temporarily out of employment through no fault of their own. This system has thoroughly proved its value, both as a means of alleviating hardship among workers and their families, and as a support to our general economy by helping to maintain purchasing power.

However, this system—like the old-age insurance system—also needs modernization and strengthening. Benefit rates should be brought up to date, in line with today's prices. The duration of benefits should be extended. Additional workers should be given the benefits of the law's protection.

GAINS IN HOUSING RECALLED

I have made recommendations of this nature to Congress, and I hope that the necessary improvements in this law will be made.

I expect that you people are also interested in housing. You are interested in houses as homes for your families, and, if Butte is like other places, houses have been rather scarce lately.

Moreover, you people here in Butte have a special interest in seeing a high level of housing construction all over the country, because people who build houses use copper, and that's your main product here.

I have some things both good and bad to report about housing—mostly good.

Today home construction is at an all-time record volume. Now that did not happen all by itself. One of the main reasons for it is that the Government has been helping to make credit available at low interest rates and for long periods.

However, not enough houses are being built for low-income families and middle-income families, who too often cannot pay today's prices for housing.

We have made real progress on one of these points. Last year we passed a law to provide assistance to the cities of the country in building low-rent public housing. It took a long time to get that law passed over the opposition of the real-estate lobby, but we finally got it through in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress.

PROSPERITY, PEACE LINKED

So far we haven't done so well on our proposal to build more housing for middle-income families. But we are going to keep trying—just as we did for the public-housing bill—and I am sure that we will get it eventually.

I have talked mainly today about programs which are of special significance in a great mining and industrial center such as this one. But these programs are important not only in this community. They are part of a broad national effort to achieve higher incomes and better standards of living for all our people.

That is also important to us.

It is also important to world peace.

We are now engaged in a great world-wide struggle to demonstrate that the free way of life is the way to the highest level of well-being for all the peoples of the world. To that end, we must make our own economy ever stronger, and must constantly improve the welfare of our people.

This is a job for all of us, whether we are in private or public life. We will attain these goals by working together in the common cause.

Communist Activities in the Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 15, 1950

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am presenting two letters I received urging the continuation of the investigation of the charges of Communist activities in our Government.

There has been a tendency on the part of some individuals and organizations to discredit this investigation. I am sure my colleagues will see by these letters that the public is deeply concerned over the charges and want the facts brought to light.

The future security of the Nation is at stake in the cold war. It is of the gravest importance that a thorough investigation be made of subversives in Government. This mess of alleged espionage, treason, and perversion must be uncovered. The safety and preservation of our American way of life depends on it.

The letters follow:

Hon. WILLIAM S. HILL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR BILL: The governing board of the Denver Retail Merchants Association has instructed us to write to all Members of the Colorado delegation in Congress and respectfully urge that they exert their influence to see that the current congressional inquiry into espionage charges involving departments of the Federal Government be pressed with vigor and continued until such time as the truth or untruth of these charges has been clearly established.

In making such a request we are departing from a policy to which this association has adhered rather strictly for many years—that of taking a position on national affairs only in those cases in which the interests of retail business are directly involved. However, this request bears no particular relation to retail business. It might well be made by any group of American citizens who are increasingly concerned over the day-by-day reports out of Washington regarding influences that are claimed to be operating within departments of the Federal Government.

In view of the disturbing international situation, it seems to us that this country can ill afford to permit the continued existence of suspicion and distrust on the part of citizens of any arm of our Government. The only way to remove such suspicion and distrust is by an unrelenting inquiry to uncover the truth, and since the real question involved is one of national security we are confident that we can all agree that political or partisan considerations have no proper place in such an inquiry.

Very truly yours,
GEO. A. FLANNIGAN, *Manager.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HILL: It has come to our attention that there is a possibility of the so-called McCarthy committee hearings being discontinued.

If this is so, for the benefit of all concerned, we trust the same will not be done until a thorough investigation has been made.

Yours very truly,
FONTIUS SHOE CO.,
HARRY E. FONTIUS.

World Cooperation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 15, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of the President at Madison, Wis., on May 14, 1950:

TEXT OF PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S ADDRESS AT MADISON, WIS., ON WORLD COOPERATION

It is a pleasure for me to be here in Wisconsin, one of the great progressive States of the Union. And I am glad to be in Madison, a State capital and a university center in which so much has been done for the progress of our country.

I am happy to participate in dedicating Filene House, the international headquarters of the Credit Union National Association.

Credit unions offer people who have few resources a way of getting funds when they need them. I am told that last year, in the United States alone, credit unions had about 4,000,000 members and made loans totaling close to a billion dollars. This is a splendid record. It is a tribute to the values of thrift and self-help and mutual assistance.

This building will serve credit unions in the United States and Canada, and other areas in the Western Hemisphere. It will be a truly international headquarters and, as such, it symbolizes the international character of cooperative activities. In whatever country they may be found, these activities speak a common language and have a common goal.

Their common language may be found in the principles of self-help, mutual assistance, and democratic control. Their common goal is to solve, by joint action, problems which cannot be solved by acting alone.

The effectiveness of cooperative action has been demonstrated in many ways. In our country, farm cooperatives and cooperative stores have been successful. Use of the cooperative principle has brought electricity to rural areas. Use of the same principle offers new ways to solve the housing problem.

PEACE A TASK FOR MANY

In a broader sense, moreover, cooperative action is the method we are using to solve problems we share with other nations.

Today, the United States is engaged with other free nations in a great cooperative endeavor to preserve freedom and achieve peace in the world.

This is the greatest problem we face.

We cannot solve it unless we work together.

No one nation alone can bring about peace. Together, nations can build a strong defense against aggression, and combine the energy of free men everywhere in building a better future for all of us.

That is the way to achieve peace.

That is why it is in the interest of each of the free nations to help one another.

The United States is a part of a world made up of many nations and many peoples. This world is constantly being drawn close to us by improved communications and improved transportation. It is also being drawn close—dreadfully close—by weapons of destruction which become ever more terrible.

We could not, even if we wanted to, go our own way and let the rest of the world go its own way.

You remember the situation when our own country was formed. There were 13 separate Colonies scattered along the Atlantic coast. Each of them could have tried to get along as an independent nation. But they were wise enough to realize the folly of such a course. They decided to band themselves together in a common cause, and out of that decision has grown the greatest Nation the world has ever seen.

In many respects, the whole world is now in the same position in which those Colonies found themselves in 1776. Remember, you can now go from Madison to Moscow much quicker than a man could go from Philadelphia to New York in those days. We must recognize that the march of events has joined the peoples of the world together, in a common destiny, whether we like it or not.

COMMUNISTS ON THE OFFENSIVE

And yet the nations of the world are not ready, as the Thirteen Colonies were ready, to join together in one single government.

Indeed, one nation today is doing everything it can, short of war, to prevent common international action among nations. For the Communist philosophy feeds upon suspicion and hate and disunity. And the Communists are doing their best to break down the strength of the free nations of the world, in an effort to bring more people under the domination of their Godless creed.

This makes it more than ever necessary for us to work together with the other free nations, to preserve our freedom and to increase our common welfare.

If we are to achieve these ends, the free nations of the world must demonstrate that freedom leads to greater strength and a better life for the people.

One of the most important tasks that we must accomplish together is to create a sound economic system in the world. And to do that, we need to work together for more production in the free countries and more trade among them.

Our own country has grown strong and great by increasing production in all parts of the country and by expanding our internal volume of trade. The same kind of growth can occur in the world. All countries will benefit from a growing volume of international trade.

But that trade has to be on a basis of fair competition and mutual benefit among nations that stand on their own feet. That is what we have been working for ever since the war ended.

MARSHALL AID A VITAL FACTOR

Our first step was to aid the recovery of nations whose economic systems were shattered by the war. We have given substantial assistance in the restoration of devastated areas and in the rehabilitation of industry and agriculture. The greatest example of this type of activity is, of course, the Marshall plan.

That program has been an extraordinary success. Three years ago, many of the Marshall-plan countries were on the verge of collapse and absorption by communism. Today, with our help, every one of them is stronger and better able to resist communism than at any time since the war.

The success of the Marshall plan demonstrates the value of international cooperation. It demonstrates that helping people to help themselves is one of the best ways to maintain and strengthen freedom.

In the rest of the world, just as in Europe, joint action to increase production is the key to trade, progress and security. One reason why there is so much unrest and insecurity in vast areas of the world is their low productivity and their inability to trade profitably with us and with other countries.

The problem in most of the rest of the world is different from that in Europe. The primary problem in Europe is to reestablish and expand a modern industrial and agricultural economy. In the underdeveloped areas of the world, the primary problem is to build such an economy in the first place. And that requires a very different kind of action on our part.

HELP OF BENEFIT TO BOTH SIDES

The greatest needs of the underdeveloped areas are modern scientific and technical knowledge to increase their skills, and the investment of funds to increase their productive capacity.

Today, more than half the people in the world are undernourished. Millions of farmers in Asia and Africa and Latin America still turn the ground with crude wooden plows. They know little about improved seed. Their livestock is underfed and diseased. Many of them have never even heard of soil conservation.

As these people become better educated and healthier, as they get more roads and factories and power plants, as they increase their output of agricultural and industrial products, they will slowly but surely play a larger part in the community of nations.

In that way, they can attain progressively better living conditions and renewed faith in the promise of the democratic way of life. In that way, too, the United States and other free countries can acquire new sources of the things we need and new markets for the things we produce.

I am very glad that both Houses of Congress have authorized the Government to increase our program for aiding the underdeveloped areas to progress toward modern standards of health, education, transportation and production.

I am determined that this work shall go forward energetically. I regard it as one of the most important factors in promoting trade and one of the main hopes for world peace.

These cooperative programs to build a world economy which will bring increasing welfare to all free people are vital to world peace.

So, also, is the work we are doing to strengthen the common defense of free countries against aggression.

FORWARD DESPITE SET-BACKS

And so is the effort we are making to create an effective world political order through the United Nations.

All these steps are essential to freedom and peace. They are all ways of putting into practice, in our relations with other nations, the basic cooperative principles of self-help, mutual assistance and democratic control.

The measures we are taking to bring peace to the world are necessarily imperfect. We are working to solve a problem larger and more difficult than any other we have ever faced. We shall inevitably experience setbacks, as well as successes.

But we must continue to move forward, strongly and steadfastly, in cooperation with other free countries.

We have no other choice.

Isolationism is no alternative. Isolationism is a counsel of despair. Isolationism would bring on another war, and it would be a war in which we might stand alone against the rest of the world.

In our own self-interest, therefore, we must cooperate with other free nations. We must join with them in a common defense against aggression and in providing greater opportunities for human advancement.

But there is another reason why we must work together with the other free nations.

We have a moral duty to protect the exercise of freedom here and in other lands. As a nation we are committed to the principle of freedom because we believe that men are created equal. Freedom is a relationship between equals.

FOR A WORLD OF FREE MEN

We believe that men are equal because we believe that they are all created by God. The religious traditions which have flowed together to make the foundations of this Nation all emphasize that every individual is an expression of the spirit of God, and should be respected on that account.

Because of that relation between God and man, we believe that each man in himself has dignity and individual worth.

Because of that relation, we believe that all men are brothers, who must strive to live together in freedom and peace.

We would be unworthy of our traditions—we would violate our fundamental beliefs—if we failed to acknowledge and to live by the principles of brotherhood which bind men and nations together.

We must continue to exert our energy and our will, in cooperation with those who share our beliefs, that together we may create on this earth a community of free men, living at peace with one another and working together for the common good.

We must not falter or turn back.

We must go forward in the faith that we are following the commandments of God, who is the Father of us all.

Commercial Telegraphers' Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1950

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, few events have demonstrated the evils of the Taft-Hartley Act so dramatically as the current strike of the commercial telegraphers against the United Press.

It is not a strike that has made headlines—I will wager that there are Members of this House who do not know that it is going on, unless they happen to have run into the pickets in front of the National Press Building. Nevertheless, it has thrown into sharp focus the provisions of the Taft-Hartley law which can lead us into one of the greatest orgies of union busting this country has known.

The teletype and maintenance employees of the United Press went on strike on April 30 after weeks of fruitless negotiating. Since that date, practically all the news reports flowing over the wires of that great agency have been handled by scab labor.

SUPERVISORY SCABS

The company has maintained the fiction that its teletype work is being handled by supervisory employees. This is true only in the sense that the United Press has brought into its key centers news reporters from its smaller bureaus—bureaus so small that reporters are expected to handle telegraph wires as well as gather and write the news.

These reports are classified as supervisory only because such a classification

exempts them from the contract the United Press has signed with the American Newspaper Guild, a typical dodge. Aside from that, about the only "supervisory" right they enjoy is the right to fire themselves without going through the usual channels.

After a few days, however, the United Press dropped the idea of handling its news report exclusively through these men. The organization went into the open market and began hiring scabs wherever they could be found. I am reliably informed that these scabs are now working in the New York, Washington and Chicago offices of this organization.

TAFT-HARTLEY LAW INVOKED

It is at this point that the Taft-Hartley Act stepped in to take from labor one of its most cherished rights—the right to give help to brother trade-unionists.

Any Member of this House who has had experience with organized labor knows that nothing is more repulsive to a trade-unionist than to be forced to help a scab. That is precisely what is happening in this strike. In spite of the fact that practically all the news furnished to newspapers by the United Press in the past 2 weeks has been furnished by scab labor, other unions in the industry have been forced to handle these news reports.

Threats of injunction under the misnamed "antisecondary boycott" clause of the Taft-Hartley Act have met the protests of the fellow workers of the telegraphers. Stereotypers, typographical employees, pressmen, guild reporters—all union men—must swallow their natural resentment and prepare United Press reports for use in their newspapers.

Mr. Speaker, to me this has all the earmarks of old-fashioned union busting. On the one hand, we have the powerful newspaper industry which is not restrained from giving help to the management of United Press. On the other hand, we have the organized newspaper employees blocked at every turn from helping the commercial telegraphers union.

Here is a question which might well be examined by the House Committee on Education and Labor. How much help is being given the management of United Press by the powerful dailies and newspaper chains in their war with the telegraphers? How many newspapers have followed the deliberate practice of featuring UP reports during the past 2 weeks, even though those reports are necessarily limited by the mechanical difficulties brought on by the strike? It is obvious that United Press has been forced to curtail its services with inexperienced men operating its equipment.

AFL UNION INVOLVED

Here I wish to say a word about the commercial telegraphers union, which is on strike. It is a well-established American Federation of Labor union which has shown its good faith by 43 years of peaceful relations with employers. Its members are responsible men who perform a difficult and highly skilled job.

In recent years, and especially since passage of the Taft-Hartley law, like all unions it has found bargaining more difficult. During the past 6 years, according to the union leaders, it has been unable to obtain any realistic bargaining with the United Press unless it actually took a strike vote.

This year, negotiations for a new contract were preceded by a number of threatening moves on the part of management. More than a week before the expiration of the old contract, special machinery was moved into key centers which could, in a pinch, be used to replace men. This tactic has become commonplace in the newspaper business when contracts with the typographical union are due to expire. In no cases do these devices do a satisfactory job by ordinary standards, but they serve where an inferior product will be accepted during a strike.

Two days before expiration of the telegraphers' contract with UP, the so-called supervisory employees, ineligible for union membership and thus unable to present any organized protest, were brought into key bureaus. One, I am told, was imported from Puerto Rico. In addition, uniformed Burns detectives appeared on the scene the very minute the contract was up.

UNION-BUSTING TACTICS

All of these preparations, Mr. Speaker, have an ominous ring to those of us who have good reason to remember the union-busting that preceded passage of the Wagner Act. They are signs of the times, and should serve as a warning to all friends of labor that we are walking back down the road to the days of the open shop. Unless the Taft-Hartley Act is repealed, and repealed soon, the labor movement may be divided and crushed. The strike-breaker and the Burns and Pinkertons are coming back into their own.

This strike of the commercial telegraphers is over purely economic issues. The union is bargaining for more weekly pay for its members. For several months management has refused to make any offer at all, though it has boasted publicly that 1949 was its most prosperous year. Its final offer, made just before the strike on a take-it-or-leave-it basis, was a raise of $2.21 a week—just about 3 cents an hour.

The merits of an economic strike are something that can be argued forever. What interests us here is whether management was bargaining in good faith. There is a question raised by this strike which is of urgent concern to the American people. It can be summed up simply as this: Is the United Press using the Taft-Hartley Act as a shield under which it will spearhead a drive to bust unions in the newspaper industry?

Are We Headed for World War III?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1950

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following radio address which I made to the constituents of my district over the following radio stations: KBOL, Boulder; KCOL, Fort Collins; KFKA, Greeley; KFTM, Fort Morgan; KGEK, Sterling; and KLMO, Longmont. The speech follows:

Friends of the radio audience, this is your Congressman, WILLIAM S. HILL, speaking to you from Washington, D. C. Today I wish to speak on world peace.

Throughout the Nation today, the people are troubled. They are torn by the mixed emotions raging in their hearts over the threat to the peace we won at such a horrible price in lives, blood, and treasure. They realize that another war so close on the heels of the last one can well mean the end to our civilization. Another war is not necessary to settle the problems of the world. But the fear of the cold war suddenly bursting into flame is causing untold anxiety and concern in the homes of our people.

Dangers of the peace are increasing. The tip of the scale one way or the other, might touch off another war—a war more terrible and destructive than the last. It could be the war to end all wars. It could wipe out our civilization. The very thought is horrifying. Our finite minds are incapable of visualizing the consequences of an A-bomb or an H-bomb dropped on this country.

But the purpose of this warning isn't to scare you out of your wits. It is to awaken you to the idea that now is the time to speak up. Those of us who want peace must be heard. Our voices must ring out with an appealing force to halt the mad dash for superbombs and superduper death-dealing weapons of mass detruction.

Part of the guilt for the armament race is on our consciences. President Truman authorized the dropping of the atomic bomb on Japan. The late President Roosevelt initiated the scientific experiments and provided the finances for construction of the A-bomb during World War II. Now the President has given the green light for the building of the hydrogen bomb. We are out in front in the rearmament race, but it isn't, to my way of thinking, a thing to be proud of. We should be in the forefront of those in the world who want to maintain peace. Our leadership should be for moral and spiritual rearmament rather than military force.

In the world court of opinion, we have left our sincerity and high purposes open to question. The hopes and aspirations of the people, who overwhelmingly desire peace, must be brought out into the light for the world to see. Our diplomatic maneuvers and our military activities have cast a false reflection on the basic motives of this Nation. We are a peace-loving Nation; the majority of our people are most anxious and eager to spread to the four corners of the earth their expression of good will. But somehow this opinion becomes distorted and twisted by the actions of our political and military leaders.

It is time for a constructive call of the great political powers of the world to settle the problems of the cold war. Our leaders have attempted to assuage our conscience by rationalizing the use of the A-bomb and the H-bomb. Perhaps they are entirely right in their assumptions. But, we should, with equal vigor and honesty to ourselves encourage a policy of world disarmament. All of our efforts politically, economically, and otherwise have the single objective of stopping the Red tide of atheistic communism from engulfing the world. Russia is our enemy, now; in the war she was our ally.

What caused Russia to change her attitude toward us? Admiral Leahy, who was President Roosevelt's adviser at the Big Five conferences, until the late President's death, attributed the difficulty last week in an article as arising out of differences between

Stalin and Roosevelt. But it was 5 years later before the people were advised of these conditions through Admiral Leahy's magazine disclosure. Why weren't we informed long ago?

Former Prime Minister Churchill of Great Britain has thrown another light on American entry into World War II as a result of Pearl Harbor, in his current writings in Life magazine and the New York Times. He established the fact that for a year and a half before Pearl Harbor, December 7, 1941, he had pressed President Roosevelt to come into the war on Great Britain's side. At the Atlantic conference in August 1941, he said he informed Roosevelt's party and I quote—"that I would rather have an American declaration of war now and no supplies for 6 months than double the supplies and no declaration."

Churchill said that he related this incident to General Smuts, Prime Minister of South Africa, stating—and I quote again—"We must not underrate his (Roosevelt's) constitutional difficulties. He may take action as Chief Executive, but only Congress can declare war. He went so far as to say to me—this is Roosevelt speaking—'I may never declare war; I may make war. If I were to ask Congress to declare war they might argue about it for 3 months.'"

It will be remembered that the attack on the fleet at Hawaii was presented to the American people, who knew nothing at the time of our American economic sanctions, our unyielding diplomacy with Japan, and our other secret maneuvering, came as a shocking surprise—an act of treachery on—and I quote President Roosevelt—"a date which will live in infamy."

Churchill had this to say with reference to Pearl Harbor. And I quote him again: "I do not intend in these pages to attempt to pronounce judgment upon this tremendous episode in American history. We know that all of the great Americans round the President and in his confidence felt, as acutely as I did, the awful danger that Japan would attack British or Dutch possessions in the Far East and would carefully avoid the United States, and that in consequence Congress would not sanction an American declaration of war."

Quoting Churchill further, he said: "Roosevelt, Hull, Stimson, Knox, General Marshall, Admiral Stark, and, as a link between them all, Harry Hopkins had but one mind. A Japanese attack upon the United States was a vast simplification of their problems and their duty. How can we wonder that they regarded the actual form of the attack, or even its scale, as incomparably less important than the fact that the whole American Nation would be united for its own safety. Moreover, they knew, earlier than we in Britain could know, the full and immediate purpose of their enemy."

The armed power of the world is again divided into two camps. Is there a war party in this Nation, as there is in the Kremlin? Communist dictatorship is not only designed for a surprise attack with all the arms it has, but the Kremlin can violate any agreement it signs to gain advantage and abrogate at will the agreements it makes.

But our free people have greater productive and moral powers. We can unite our strength, unless it is undermined and weakened by secret action of our political leaders.

We must make our stand for peace through the United Nations. We must declare our intentions and desires. We have no assurance from available public reports that Russia would cooperate in an effort at disarmament in the strengthening of the objectives of peace, but that should not stand in our way. We should look into every avenue for a way to lasting peace. If our sincerity is clear, our reasons and examples steadfast, then before the eyes of the world we have made our case.

WE CAN DO NO LESS

Are we going to let someone push us into world war III? Is fear of the A-bomb or H-bomb going to deter us from striving for what we know is right, and what the peoples of the world all believe in—peace? Regardless of the actions of their leaders—and this includes Russia, too—I believe that all peoples of the world want peace. But they must speak up; they must be heard before powerful influences get us so involved in political and economic circumstances that resulting action winds up in war.

At present the United Nations is the only world organization in operation. Through it let us urge the representatives of the United States to work for peace. The adoption of certain measures would augment the efforts of the people in presenting our case to the peoples of the world. In the past Russia has overshadowed the rest of the nations participating in the UN and has effectively used it as a propaganda agency. If necessary, let the United States assume the Christian responsibility for guiding the UN into discussions of big-power politics in controlling the A- and H-bombs; renewing the forces of religious and spiritual leadership toward a new birth of moral indignation into the depravity of a superarmament program. Men must learn to live together. War is not the economic savior of broken and decadent political philosophies. This fact must be impressed on those who seek to fasten its chains upon the people.

Unless there is a quick turn in the course of events, the intensity of the cold war will surely increase. It is time for us to unite and demand that every effort be exhausted to maintain the peace. The hour is late.

The expenditure of huge sums for defense weapons or for the purpose of winning friends abroad is not the answer. The answer will come from the deep-rooted desire of all peoples to live together in friendship. Exploitation by political leaders for momentary advantage will not assure a period of international transquillity. But the earnestness and sincerity of the good peoples of the earth can bring about what selfishness, greed, and political chicanery cannot achieve. Until we have placed this country in the position of exhausting every possibility of peace so that our sincerity and honesty stand crystal clear before the rest of the world, let us not resign ourselves to the cynical attitude that the only solution to our problem is to arm ourselves to the teeth and develop an arms race which in the end can only mean the ultimate destruction of our civilization.

World Federation Opposed by the American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 15, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, recently the Foreign Relations Commission of the American Legion issued a statement of policy on the subject of a world federation or a world government at this time. National Commander George Craig has called my attention to the position of his great organization on this subject. It is short and to the point and without equivocation, as follows:

4. The American Legion is opposed to any form of world federation or government at this time.

David Lawrence Praises President's Small-Business Loan Recommendations—Column Hails Him as Deserving Nonpartisan Support—Private Banks Would Do the Lending—Also Favors Private Capital Banks, for Small Business, Within Federal Reserve System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 15, 1950

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the statesmanlike recommendations for small-business loan legislation made by the President in his recent small-business message are meeting with wide approval in many diverse quarters. This commendation is by no means confined to the rank and file of the Democratic Party nor to those who are generally regarded as loyal supporters of the President.

Mr. David Lawrence, whom no one would accuse of any partiality toward the President, or toward administration policies, devotes one of his columns, syndicated throughout the United States, to an endorsement of the President's recommendations. The endorsement appears under the significant subhead, "Credit financing plan should not be involved in partisan politics."

The President proposes that private banks be encouraged to make small-business loans, on a liberalized collateral basis, by authorizing RFC to take an increased participation in such loans—perhaps, I take it, up to 90 percent—and the President also proposes a small-business loan-insurance plan to encourage private bank loans. Secondly, the President proposes the chartering of capital-loan banks, privately owned, although within the Federal Reserve System, with authority to purchase stock in small-business corporations and to supply equity capital to small business generally.

As Mr. Lawrence states:

But Mr. Truman comes forward now with something which he and his advisers have striven to formulate in such a manner as to take the Government itself out of the loan business and to put the burden on private financing with Government coordination and Government insurance as a stopgap.

With the permission of the Members of the House, I append in full the text of David Lawrence's column, as it appeared in the Washington Evening Star on May 9, 1950:

EQUITY CAPITAL LOANS PROPOSED BY TRUMAN CALLED STEP TO RIGHT—CREDIT FINANCING PLAN SHOULD NOT BE INVOLVED IN PARTISAN POLITICS

(By David Lawrence)

President Truman's message to Congress recommending that equity capital and credit loans be made available to business through a new system of loan insurance and investment institutions goes to the heart of a problem which, in one form or another, has been before Congress ever since the depression of 1929–33.

In the melee of crusades and criticism, the so-called bank affiliates—the companies which were affiliated with banks and did much of the financing of American enterprises in the 1920's—were abolished. They have never been followed by any constructive substitutes. There has been a recurrent outcry since that some means should be provided to assure equity capital for the enterprises not big enough to warrant national attention through the floating of stock issues. This deficiency has led radicals to make many a proposal for Government financing or Government ownership.

But Mr. Truman comes forward now with something which he and his advisers have striven to formulate in such a manner as to take the Government itself out of the loan business and to put the burden on private financing with Government coordination and Government insurance as a stopgap.

LOANS OF RECENT ORIGIN

Broadly speaking, banks have hesitated for years to extend credits that are in fact capital loans. They have felt, and rightly so, that demand deposits should not be so used. But at the same time large loans in commercial financing have been syndicated by the banks or taken in their entirety by insurance companies. Likewise, although frowned upon in early years, installment financing of automobiles and many household products is now an orthodox credit device. There was a time when banks did not like installment financing.

Even the real-estate loans made under the so-called insured plan, whereby banks have made housing loans or have participated in the making of mortgage loans along with governmental agencies, are really of recent origin.

When the President, therefore, comes forward with what he calls a pioneer undertaking in the financing of business, it is natural that first reports should say that bankers are cool to the idea. As they examine and study it, perhaps making alternate suggestions, it may turn out to be the very thing that will increase the earnings of the banks without any such risks as would be involved in individual transactions as contrasted with group risks.

The principle of insuring a lot of loans through an over-all agency makes it possible for the income from the premiums and the interest on the successful loans to offset any that may go sour.

The plan has several parts. One relates solely to loans of $25,000 or less which would run for 5 years. No one in the Government would pass on such loans and the banks would take a minority percentage risk while the Government took the major percentage risk.

The second part of the plan is even more important. It proposes that national investment companies be set up in which the banks and private investors could invest. The major purpose of these companies, as the President phases it, "would be to provide equity capital and long-term loans for efficiently-managed business unable to finance themselves on reasonable terms through the organized securities markets."

PUBLIC WOULD INVEST

Actually the public and banks would invest in the national investment companies—buying their bonds—while the companies would, in turn, finance the equity-capital needs of worthy businesses. There is no limit placed here as to size of loans but it is assumed that the plan will primarily take care of the needs of business ranging from $25,000 to $1,000,000. This is the bracket of financing about which there has been considerable discussion in recent years, and the President says this phase of his plan "is designed to fill the most serious remaining gap in the business financial structure."

Coincident with these developments, the President proposes that both the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the Federal Reserve bank authority to make business loans be cut down, so that the latter may be abolished altogether and the former would be retained only for those rare cases where private investment companies find themselves unable to do the financing and yet where credit extension of large size may be needed.

The whole plan is designed to maintain a private-enterprise system of credit. It is the first important move toward the right in financing technique which the Truman administration has made, and it would be most unfortunate if consideration of such a plan became involved in partisan politics just because the President happens to sponsor it.

Strikes Against the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FORREST C. DONNELL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 15 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter to the editor of the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, by William R. Schneider, a well-known lawyer of the city of St. Louis. The letter appears under the heading "The Mail Bag," in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of May 7, 1950.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MAIL BAG

STRIKES AGAINST PEOPLE

To the EDITOR:

The bill introduced by Senator DONNELL to outlaw strikes on railroads is a timely and commendable manifestation of Grover Cleveland-like statesmanship.

Public utilities generally are given monopoly powers by the State. Thus they are able to enjoy a stability of business not generally enjoyed by other businesses. These quasi-public corporations and their employees therefore owe a greater duty to the public in return for the favors and special privileges they so enjoy at the hand of the people.

It ill becomes public utility workers to bite the hand that feeds them through the special privileges they so enjoy. When the employees of such corporations strike they are striking against the public welfare and against their own great benefactors, the people. Such workers, like police officers, should not have that right anywhere or any time. This perfectly obvious and sound position when stated by the Governor of Massachusetts was so popular with the people it made him President. Since then union labor has so abused its powers under the Wagner Act, you will find that position even more popular now.

The scope of the bill should be enlarged to include telephone workers as well as other public utility workers, whose work affects interstate commerce. Of course Senator DONNELL will be accused of sponsoring slave labor legislation and trying to deprive workers of their inalienable and constitutional right to strike. The simple answer to that is there never was such a constitutional right until the Wagner Act, by indirection, undertook to establish it after 6 Federal district court judges, 12 Federal appellate court judges, and 4 Supreme Court judges, 22 in all, held that act unconstitutional over the superior ruling of 5 frightened Supreme Court judges. Prior to that time a worker always had and now has the right to quit his job any time. But when he goes about inducing his coworkers to quit their jobs also to compel his employer by economic or property loss to accede to his or their demands, that always was a criminal conspiracy to deprive another of his property without due process of law and there are many Federal and State court decisions that so hold.

The bill should contain the penalty of forfeiture of seniority rights, and pension rights should date from the time of reemployment, if any, after a strike. If they take it upon themselves to arbitrarily indulge in the license to injure the public, then they must not be heard to complain that they are entitled to enjoy immunity from injury solely because they carry union cards. No other citizen enjoys such immunity from the injury and damage he intentionally causes to others.

WILLIAM R. SCHNEIDER.

The President's Speech at Dedication of Grand Coulee Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 15, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by President Truman at dedication of Grand Coulee Dam:

TEXT OF PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS AT DEDICATION OF GRAND COULEE DAM

This is an inspiring occasion. We have come here to dedicate Grand Coulee Dam—one of the mightiest structures man has ever built.

With this dam, man's ingenuity and perseverance have dramatically transformed the energy of a mighty river into a great new source of national strength.

At the foot of this dam is the world's largest power plant. It is already generating more low-cost electric energy than any other plant in the world.

Behind this dam is a reservoir which extends 151 miles to the Canadian border. The water in that reservoir not only generates electricity. It helps prevent floods. And soon, it will pour forth to irrigate thousands of acres of land which are now desert.

Grand Coulee Dam—with its tremendous power and irrigation benefits—is an instrument of our democracy, forged to contribute to a better life for ourselves and our children.

This dam was not built by accident. It is here because men with vision and determination fought for its construction. Men in the State of Washington—many of whom are here today—saw what this dam could mean to the Northwest and to the Nation. President Franklin Roosevelt, whose name honors the reservoir behind the dam, transformed their vision into reality.

BUILT DESPITE OPPOSITION

The dam had to be fought for. It had to be built over furious opposition. You

remember what its opponents said. One Congressman said:

"Up in the Grand Coulee country there is no one to sell power to except the coyotes and jackrabbits, and there never will be." Other opponents of Grand Coulee said it would be a "white elephant." They said it would be of no more value than the pyramids.

We can laugh today at such foolishness. Right now, the generators at this dam are being run at over capacity, straining to meet the soaring demands for power. All about us in the Pacific Northwest—in this land that was called the land of "coyotes and jackrabbits"—new jobs, new industries, new opportunities have been created.

Today, those who opposed Grand Coulee are trying to cover their tracks. They are trying to jump on the bandwagon.

But they can't erase the record. They did not understand then, and they do not understand now, the progressive steps that are necessary to keep our democracy strong, and confident, and moving forward.

The fundamental error of those who opposed Grand Coulee was their failure to understand that the United States is a growing, dynamic country. They saw no need to plan and work for a greater future. The way things were was good enough for them.

But the American people have never been satisfied with the way things have been in the past. Our whole history is a record of eagerly striving to make things better.

One hundred years ago, out here in the Northwest, men and women were opening up new frontiers along the Oregon Trail. They struggled and fought to create farms and cities out of the wilderness.

The opponents of progress would have you believe that the frontiers are closed. They think we should now relax and struggle no more. Those are the men of little faith.

STILL PUSH BACK FRONTIERS

I say to you that the American spirit, which blazed the Oregon Trial, is not dead. Here in the Northwest you are still pushing back frontiers.

There is no better example of that than this great dam. Less than 15 years ago, the energy of the Columbia River poured unused into the Pacific Ocean. It flowed past cities, which were hampered by lack of power, and past farmlands which had been abandoned for lack of water.

In those days, the people of the Northwest made their living primarily from timber and farming. They exported raw material and imported finished goods. They lacked the power needed to process and manufacture their own raw materials.

Yet, through the heart of their rich country flowed the greatest potential source of hydroelectric power in the Nation—the Columbia River system. This area, tremendously rich in natural resources, was stifled, its future was limited, because it was unable to tap its own native source of power.

Today, we are well on the way to harnessing that power. The imagination and vigor of free men have put the Columbia to work.

The results are clear. The Northwest is no longer a backward colony. It is now one of the fastest-growing parts of the country. In the last 10 years the population of Washington and Oregon has increased more than 30 percent.

Jobs—permanent, productive jobs—have been made available in new industries that have been established to use the Columbia's low-cost power. In the last 12 years 11 new plants alone have paid more than $135,000,000 in wages and nearly $50,000,000 in taxes.

Power from the Columbia has not only served industry. It has made life easier in homes and on farms. The use of electricity on homes and farms in the State of Washington is more than twice the national average.

When Grand Coulee was being built, some thought it would hurt other parts of the country by drawing plants and industries from them. Of course, that has not happened.

The plants that have sprung up here were not moved from other States. They are new enterprises, adding to the productive capacity of the whole country.

The growing payrolls of the Northwest have made bigger markets for producers in every State. The products turned out here are needed elsewhere. Nearly half the aluminum of the United States is produced along the banks of the Columbia. This aluminum is used everywhere in the country. A single rolling mill 90 miles from here—at Spokane—is providing basic materials for 600 factories, from Boston to San Diego.

What has happened here is what happens in the case of underdeveloped areas everywhere in our country and the world. Sound, productive investment always makes bigger markets and more jobs.

A PAYING PROPOSITION

Not only is Grand Coulee contributing to the growth and strength of the Nation. It is also a paying proposition from the standpoint of the taxpayers.

When the dam was being built, it was attacked as a colossal waste of public funds. Well, that was a colossal misstatement. The investment in the power facilities of Grand Coulee is being repaid right now, and with interest. And in a broader sense, the entire investment has already been repaid several times over in the increased national wealth it has brought.

We are not stopping our work at this point The Grand Coulee project, itself, is not finished. More power generators are being added. And over the next several years we shall begin to put water on the land below here. Thousands of family-size farms will replace the present sagebrush.

Elsewhere in the Northwest, work on other dams is proceeding. Hungry Horse Dam in Montana, Chief Joseph Dam just down the Columbia from here, and McNary Dam on the Oregon-Washington border, are all under construction. These and other dams are part of the great work that must be done to produce power, promote inland navigation, reclaim land for cultivation and prevent destructive floods.

But even more than this is involved in the development of the resources of this area for solid growth. Forest and grasslands should be conserved and improved. Fisheries should be protected and enhanced. Mineral resources would be reopened and developed.

All this work can and should go forward together. Resources that occur together in nature must be developed and improved together.

This is the goal we are working toward here in the Northwest. It is the same goal for which we are working in other parts of the country.

In the Central Valley of California, we are developing great power resources. With the help of that power, we are redirecting the available water of the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers to bring about the most productive agricultural use.

In the Colorado River Basin, we are working to achieve the most sensible uses of the very limited water supply, and to expand the power supply throughout the basin.

Down in the Texas, Oklahoma, and Arkansas area, a number of dams are producing power, and others are being built. In that area also, as in the lower Mississippi Valley, soil conservation, flood control, drainage and navigation work is going forward.

In the Southeastern States, we are moving ahead with the construction of flood control and power dams on the Savannah River, the Roanoke, and other streams. In that area, also, it is necessary to shift land uses to conservation farming and to restore the pine forests.

POSSIBILITIES IN NORTHEAST

The northeastern part of the country has great possibilities for the development of additional hydroelectric power resources. Power from the redevelopment of Niagara Falls and from the St. Lawrence project will be nearly as great as the power out here in the Northwest. It is badly needed. We should construct these projects as soon as possible. And there are also power sites on the rivers of New England which should be developed soon.

In the Ohio Valley, and around the Great Lakes, the principal work that is being done is on flood control, navigation, and soil conservation. There is also much need for reforestation.

The Missouri River Basin is so large it requires consideration of all aspects of resource development. From the high plains in the West to the humid areas of the lower Missouri, this basin presents perhaps the most complex problem of all. The work that is necessary includes extensive development of flood control, irrigation, and power works, as well as increased conservation efforts on crop and range land.

I have left till last mention of the Tennessee Valley. In that valley we have made more progress than in any other. There, the idea of coordinated planning for all resources was first worked out and most completely applied. The Tennessee Valley Authority has been outstandingly successful in its area.

We have worked out a set of recommendations for a Columbia Valley Administration which builds on that successful experience but recognized the different circumstances out here. Take one simple example. In this area, a farmer's right to the use of water is vital to his livelihood, and is protected by State laws. That is the way it should be, and the Columbia Valley Administration I have recommended would have no power to tamper with anyone's water rights.

The private power lobby, and other people who have selfish interests to maintain, say the Columbia Valley Administration would be a superstate. Of course, that is not true. Ask the people in the States in that valley whether State and local governments are stronger or weaker as a result of the progress TVA has brought. Ask them whether they have more or less influence on what happens in their valley with an agency that has its headquarters right there where they deal with it at first hand.

They will tell you that the TVA is the greatest thing that ever happened in their part of the country.

I believe the Columbia Valley Administration is a necessary next step in the sensible, democratic development of the resources of the Northwest. I believe the people of this area think so, too. And when they make their voices heard, I am sure the Columbia Valley Administration will be established.

We have embarked all over the country, on the task of fully developing our resources for all the people. This is a job that will take many years to comlpete. It will require sound and careful planning.

But it is a work that fires the imagination. We are undertaking to use the resources we have so that they will grow, and not diminish, over the years. We intend that our children, and their children, shall live in a more productive and a more beautiful land than we do.

POSITIVE ACTION NECESSARY

We shall not get the job done, however, by sitting still. We must continue to take positive action. And we shall have to continue to overcome the opposition of those

who do not understand the greatness of our goal, or who fear some impairment of their selfish interests.

We will meet opposition from the private power groups. Many of them—there are, of course, honorable exceptions—do not want the energy of our rivers put to use as power and sold to the people at cost.

We have already met this opposition in building Federal projects. And the people have met the same opposition in localities where they wanted to establish local public power agencies, such as public utility districts and REA (Rural Electrification Administration) co-ops.

This opposition of the private power companies is wrong. It would deny the people the benefit of low-cost power they themselves have brought about through public investment.

I am sure we will continue to overcome this opposition just as we already have done in building Grand Coulee—just as the people already have in Nebraska, in large parts of Washington and Oregon, and in other sections of the country, where they have decided to distribute power through the public bodies and cooperatives.

The benefits of public investment must be passed on to the people whose tax money is being used. Those benefits must not be diverted for private profit. We will continue to fight and win for that principle.

No doubt we shall also have to fight those who think expenditures of resource development are a waste of public funds. They should have disqualified themselves by now. Their fantastic claims about Grand Coulee proved that they can't tell the difference between a waste of funds and a sensible investment.

Finally, we will still have to fight those who imagine that every progressive action is another step down that famous "last mile to socialism." The facts continue to make that claim ridiculous. They called Bonneville and Grand Coulee steps to socialism. Now, I ask you, is private enterprise in the Pacific Northwest stronger or weaker as the result of those dams? Have you lost or gained industries and jobs? Do the people out here have less or more freedom? The answers are perfectly obvious.

It is clear that we must go ahead in every part of the country with our resource development work. And proceed we shall. We shall not be stopped by those who are timid or short-sighted or selfish. We shall not be stopped by discredited claims or by tattered slogans.

Our whole future depends on the wisdom and maturity we bring to bear on our national problems. We are engaged in a great struggle to achieve peace in a world beset with danger and threatened by Communist imperialism. We shall be engaged in the struggle for peace for years to come.

If we are to be successful, we must display the adventurous spirit and the firm courage of our pioneering fathers. We shall not succeed if we follow the advice of those who look backward, sighing for the fancied security of an earlier time. We must have strong minds, ready to accept the facts as they are, and to make bold, new plans based on the facts.

We shall need the same kind of vision that saw Grand Coulee Dam when there was nothing here but desert.

We shall need the same kind of steady perseverance that built this mighty dam over the opposition of men with narrow minds and faint hearts.

With that kind of vision and determination we can build a world in which men can be free under laws of their own making and can live at peace with one another.

Two Hundred Thousand Reported Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FORREST C. DONNELL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 15 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article under the headline "Two hundred thousand reported out," by George Eckel, appearing in the New York Times for May 13, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWO HUNDRED THOUSAND REPORTED OUT

(By George Eckel)

CHICAGO, May 12.—Persistent unofficial reports had it today that railroad officials and the National (Railway) Mediation Board were conferring on a new proposal by the locomotive firemen's union to settle the firemen's strike.

By tonight the strike had thrown an estimated 200,000 or more persons out of work.

The reports were denied by the Board and by spokesmen for the railroads and the union, but they appeared to have some claim to reliability. They originated with responsible railroad spokesmen but were contradicted in at least one case by an equally well placed railroad spokesman.

SERVICE IS INCREASED

While industrial stoppages and lay-offs due to the strike continued to increase, the strikebound railroads reported also increased train service in defiance of the walk-out. Three instances of violence were reported but nobody was injured.

The strike was called by the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen against the New York Central west of Buffalo, the Pennsylvania west of Harrisburg, the Atchison, Topeka, and Santa Fe, and the Southern Railway, with 18,000 firemen called out.

It was estimated that about 150,000 of those deprived of work were railroad employees.

Western Pennsylvania was hardest hit by the economic effects of the strike, which brought increasing idleness to railroad yards from Harrisburg and Altoona out to Topeka and Albuquerque.

Twenty-four major mines were closed down in western Pennsylvania, mostly along the Pennsylvania Railroad route. Thrown out of work were 7,500 miners. Daily coal production of 49,000 tons of bituminous coal was halted. Together with an additional 10,000 tons lost in the closing of smaller mines, this volume represents 20 percent of the production of the field.

FISHER LAYS OFF 500

The Fisher body plant at Flint laid off 500 workers at its No. 1 plant tonight. General Motors canceled overtime work for 20,000 employees at four Flint plants.

In Indiana, 4,000 coal miners were idle, and 60 communities in the State were without rail service.

The Southern Railway, which hitherto had not announced any report of the number of employees furloughed, said today that 18,000 had been laid off.

The New York Central first announced, then rescinded the announcement, that its coach streamliner, the James Whitcomb Riley, would resume service between here and Cincinnati tomorrow. The plans were canceled when firemen of the Nickel Plate road threatened to strike if the Riley passed over 18 miles of Nickel Plate track between Templeton and Lafayette, Ind., which is on the Riley's route.

A spokesman for the striking firemen announced tonight that 350 firemen of the Southern's Appalachia, Va., division would be called out on Sunday. He explained that the strike call against the Southern had not been a total call, although this impression had prevailed. He added that 300 firemen of the Southern's St. Louis division, previously unstruck, had walked off the job of their own accord today.

VIOLENCE REPORTED

The instances of violence were as follows:

A bullet was reported to have been shot through the cab of an east-bound Diesel freight train of the New York Central as it left Elkhart, Ind., about 2 o'clock this morning. The train continued. The report was made by George Moore, an assistant road foreman acting as fireman.

In Cleveland, the front wheels of a New York Central Diesel moving slowly through the Collinwood yards were derailed as they passed over a switch held open by a board. D. W. Taylor of the railroad police said it was a "deliberate act of sabotage."

In Knoxville, a group of firemen picketing the Southern said a railway employee had tried to run them down in his automobile last night.

Gustav Metzman, president of the New York Central, sent a letter to the railroad's employees in which he declared that the brotherhood's demands were characterized by an "utter lack of necessity or merit." Citing the fact-finding board verdicts, he said the strike was "against the public interest" and enclosed an editorial from Thursday's issue of the New York Times as representative of the adverse reaction to the strike.

A spokesman for the union said there was "no comment" on Mr. Metzman's views.

The President's Visit to Oregon and Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER NORBLAD
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1950

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith two editorials from the Oregon Journal of Portland, Oreg., which is the leading Democratic daily of the Pacific Northwest, on the subject of the President's visit to Oregon and Washington:

COURTESY AND POLITICS

Common courtesy would decree that when the President of the United States visits Oregon the Governor of Oregon would be invited to greet him. Such is not the case in the instance of President Truman's current visit to Pendleton.

The Governor was not even invited to welcome President Truman to this State, Lawson McCall, administrative assistant to Governor McKay, told the Oregon Cattlemen's Association convention at Klamath Falls.

E. B. Aldrich, chairman of arrangements for the Pendleton meeting, told the Journal that no formal invitation was issued to the

Governor. "I told him over the phone, however, that he would be welcome," Aldrich added.

To refresh your memory, Truman is a Democrat and McKay, a Republican.

And this is a nonpolitical tour, charged to the taxpayers.

TO A HOSPITAL COST OF A SPECIAL TRAIN

President Truman, special-training to the Pacific Northwest where he makes multiple dedication of multiple-purpose Grand Coulee on Thursday, hears a growing murmur from the Pacific Southwest as he travels on.

Southern California with growing intensity protests the President's order to evacuate Birmingham hospital for disabled veterans. The directive to move the patients at Birmingham hospital to the naval hospital at Long Beach merely adds to the anger.

Decision of the House Armed Services Committee to abandon its fight to halt the closing of five military hospitals doesn't discourage the campaign to retain Birmingham.

The Birmingham hospital in San Fernando Valley not far from Los Angeles is composed of buildings like those of Barnes Hospital near Vancouver. The Government calls them temporary, explains that maintenance is disproportionately great. It is a hospital of 1,650 beds.

Mayor Bowron, of Los Angeles, has wired the President on his special train that the buildings are good for 25 years. The patients are the wheel-chair brigade. They are victims of all kinds of disabling wounds and injuries received in combat. Some have broken backs. Some are minus arms and legs.

Some are able to reside outside the hospital. They are called out-patients. They have spent more than $2,000,000 on their small nearby homes. They have an enormous claim upon compassion which is not to be found in the evacuation order. Civilians have demonstrated sympathy. The Hollywood movie colony built a swimming pool. It and its building are permanent.

President Truman, making his report to the Nation with a visible political slant, and reviewing western development, aid to small business, and the virtues of his administration, has had his attention called to the luxuriously expensive mode of his transportation.

It is a 12-car special train, to cost about $250,000, charged to the Government because of Grand Coulee dedication.

Suppose—just suppose—that quarter million dollars had been used instead for veterans disabled by their wounds, to keep Birmingham Hospital in San Fernando Valley open for another year.

ITO Charter Is the Worst Document In World History—Socialist Economic Policies and Freedom of International Trade Do Not Mix—ITO Must Be Defeated

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, hearings on the bill for the approval of an International Trade Organization Charter have been in progress for some weeks. There are several inescapable facts that Members of this House should know about the legislation:

First. It calls for economic planning on a world basis, under the absolute control of the participating governments. This means that government would control the location of industry, foreign exchange, and the volume of investment. All this is geared to the socialistic concept that it is the duty of government to insure full employment.

Second. Control of international trade as called for under the charter of ITO means the application of exchange controls and import quotas. This is what ails western European countries today. So long as such unsound policies prevail, there will always be a balance of payments problem.

Third. A normal multilateral trade and the free convertibility of currency are not possible under socialistic governments, and the United States should understand this basic principle before it pours more billions down a European sink hole.

Fourth. The British know and realize the incompatibility between planned socialistic economic policies and freedom of international trade. They insisted, against the wishes of the United States delegates, on having articles 6 and 12, 4 (b) included in the charter. These provisions permit, with our consent, a perpetuation of import quotas and a rank discrimination against United States trade. It is obvious that these provisions are very dangerous to the United States.

Fifth. Approval of the charter would imperil the very existence of a free society. Instead of international economic cooperation, our announced objective, it would be a positive victory for economic nationalism. This must not happen.

Mr. Speaker, it does not seem possible that the State Department fails to see the full implications of the pending legislation as it affects our free society. It has the responsibility of withdrawing the bill from further consideration. The people of this country do not want socialism of our domestic economy nor of our international trade.

A Rail Taft-Hartley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1950

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston (Mass.) Herald:

A RAIL TAFT-HARTLEY

The Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen is engaging in a test of strength with the people of the United States. It wants the power to determine safety standards so far as they affect the employment of their members. To assert that power, it proposes to tie up all the railroads of the country in a creeping national paralysis if necessary. If the present four-line walkout doesn't win them a third man on multi-unit Diesels, they are prepared to strike other railroads in order, and the B. & M. is marked to be one of the next.

In its stark effrontery, this rivals anything that John L. Lewis ever did. If there were any justification on safety grounds for a third man on Diesels, and two Presidential boards have said there was not, the fact should be decided by an impartial agency, such as Congress, the Interstate Commerce Commission, or some special panel of experts. For the firemen to decide their own case and then force it on the country is monopolistic labor in flagrant restraint of trade.

The long record of featherbedding by the rail brotherhoods, usually under the guise of safety, is so well known that the firemen cannot claim any judicial right to decide this one.

If we let the big unions force unnecessary employment, permitting them to frustrate the immense gains of technological advance, we surrender a large segment of the national welfare into selfish hands. It must be obvious that unions must not have this power, must not be able to strike to enforce it.

The Taft-Hartley Act already partially recognizes this truth. It provides that management has the sole authority to say who gets the work. It is illegal "to cause an employer to pay any money for services which are not performed or not to be performed." This does not go far enough to cover precisely the fireman's case, but it is a principle which should most certainly be extended to the railway labor act.

And where does President Truman stand on this? Or is he too busy in his 1950 campaigning to return to Washington to deal with it, especially since the firemen will see his own special along on the way west? In his flat opposition to the Taft-Hartley Act and its anti-feather-bedding provision, has he not encouraged the firemen to strike?

Thanks to Feringa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1950

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a copy of an editorial from the New Orleans States of May 9, 1950, entitled "Thanks to Feringa" as follows:

THANKS TO FERINGA

The Morganza Floodway finally is becoming an actuality. Engineers say it will be ready for efficient operation by January 1953.

This means, if Ol' Man River sticks to his routine, that New Orleans will have pretty close to gilt-edge protection by the time the Mississippi goes on another rampage. Remember how major flood threats have been spaced—1927, 1937, 1945, and 1950?

For this pleasant outlook, New Orleans owes a rising vote of thanks to Brig. Gen. Peter A. Feringa, president of the Mississippi River Commission.

General Feringa took office in January 1949. He saw the need for the Morganza, and went to work. In just over a year he has been successful in arranging for the completion of a needed job that has been years in the planning, or "maybe" stage.

Our gratitude is due also to DeWitt Pyburn, Louisiana's member of the Mississippi River Commission, and to Col. Charles G. Holle, the district engineer. They have done their part well.

Mr. Speaker, all of the people of south Louisiana join with the New Orleans

States in thanking General Feringa and the Corps of Engineers, the Congress of the United States and others who have aided in the beginning of this important project to Louisiana, and we trust that the Congress will make possible the completion of this great undertaking by 1953 as stated by the editorial.

If this project is completed as scheduled it will relieve the annual threat of devastating floods to south Louisiana as it will be possible to take care of all the water coming from the north, and therefore, it will also relieve all of the country north of the Atchafalaya Basin.

Inexcusable Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 15, 1950

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of May 11, 1950:

INEXCUSABLE STRIKE

It would be hard to conceive of a strike with less merit, from the public standpoint, than that which has tied up four major railroads. The strike has been called by the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen to enforce demands for a second fireman on multiple-unit Diesel locomotives. That demand has twice been turned down by Presidential fact-finding boards on the very reasonable ground that there is little or no work for a second fireman to do. The crippling effects of the strike cannot yet be fully judged, but certainly they will be great. The New York Central, Pennsylvania, Santa Fe, and Southern are all trunkline railroads linking major cities; in many instances they afford the only direct route. A subsidiary effect of the walkout may be seen in the Chesapeake & Ohio order canceling passenger trains out of Washington because they must use Southern tracks.

From the standpoint of the firemen, the issue is twofold: Prestige and job security. There is an intense rivalry betwen the firemen and the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, who also have asked for a second crewman on Diesels but have not pressed their claim. Jobwise, most of the rail unions fear the inroads of Dieselization—for Diesels can haul heavier trains faster over longer distances, and there is a threat of potential displacement of some crewmen.

The fear of fewer jobs is behind much union featherbedding, but the means used to combat that fear are reminiscent of the Luddites, who broke the machines that displaced them. A major factor in declining rail traffic is the high cost of transportation. Diesels give promise of reducing costs and attracting new traffic—but economies can easily be nullified by featherbedding. Yet, increased traffic is the only real guarantor of job security. Is it not time for rail unions and managements to get together and affirm their faith in an expanding economy, meanwhile making some provision for retraining and relocating temporarily displaced workers?

By striking only four lines, the union undoubtedly hopes to avoid the cry that a national emergency exists. But these lines are vital arteries to many parts of the country, and some sort of seizure may soon be necessary. Indeed, we think Congress ought to take another look at the Railway Labor Act, which is predicated on reasonable acceptance of the facts. Compulsory arbitration of rail disputes would have many undesirable ramifications, but it might be inescapable as a means of protecting the public interest—especially against a strike such as this one which seems to have resulted primarily from a union attempt to save face.

Local Public Health Units Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. MILES
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 15, 1950

Mr. MILES. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks I have been in New Mexico recuperating from illness. During that time I had the opportunity to do considerable thinking about the health of the people of my State, as well as my own.

Although tremendous advances have been made in medicine in recent years through discovery and development of new methods, new drugs, and techniques, we have not seen a corresponding advance in bringing the benefit of medical care to all the people of this country. There is a great unfilled need in many States, particularly in the field of preventive care for the lower-income families of the Nation.

The Federal Public Health Service and that of the States was instituted to provide this service for our people who could not afford preventive care. The adequate protection of the Nation's health is a duty that our Government owes to all the people. Our present public-health systems for the most part are inadequate.

For 14 years various proposals to meet that need have been introduced in legislative form in Congress. Most of these measures, while meritorious in purpose, have attempted to encompass the entire field of medical and hospital care in a governmental program that would include all the people of the Nation.

I believe that our country should not adopt—and I feel that our people do not want—an all-engulfing, Government-controlled, health program such as the immense and costly British system.

There is a proposal before Congress at this time which I think will fulfill the needs of our people. It calls for an increase and improvement of public-health service in the States through increased Federal aid and cooperation to the States. This proposal is embodied in the Local Public Health Units Act, which has already been approved by the Senate and is awaiting action by the House of Representatives. I am hopeful the House will act on their measure, H. R. 5865, soon.

I should like to read to you a statement which explains just what the passage of the Local Public Health Units Act will mean to the people of New Mexico. This statement is a portion of a letter which I received from Mrs. O. E. Berninghaus, of Taos, N. Mex., who is legislative chairman of the New Mexico Congress of Parents and Teachers:

New Mexico residents would obtain practical assistance in meeting their public-health problems should the Congress enact the local public-health units bill, H. R. 5865, which was passed by the Senate last August, and now awaits favorable action by the House.

Through the Federal grant proposed in this bill, New Mexico would receive an estimated $100,000 to assist in financing local public-health services to benefit all her citizens.

At last report only three counties in New Mexico were sufficiently well staffed with public-health doctors, nurses, sanitarians, and clerks to meet standards recommended by the American Public Health Association for satisfactory local public-health service. This means that approximately 97 percent of our people in New Mexico lack basic public-health protection, even though as a State we have done relatively well in supporting public-health programs, for we rank twenty-first among States in this respect.

New Mexico's death rate for tuberculosis is 53.1 per 100,000, as against the national average of 30; and the State death rate for premature birth is 55.9, as against the national average of 26.7. Furthermore, diarrhea and enteritis, which are not among the 10 leading causes of death in the Nation, and so have ceased to be major national public-health problems, rank eighth among causes of death in New Mexico. Obviously, we cannot conquer public-health problems such as these without satisfactory full-time local public-health service.

Mr. Speaker, I urge you to support this measure. We do not need or want any federally controlled system of socialized medicine. I believe that this legislation, the Local Public Health Units Act, is the best answer to fulfillment of our Government's obligation to protect the health of our people.

The Eyes of the Nation Are Upon Illinois

REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 15, 1950

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the eyes of the Nation are upon Illinois today, and upon the big-top circus that is being staged in Chicago. It is a colossal performance. It is attracting no less than 14 governors and 145 Members of Congress. It is to cost a minimum of $150,000 and Uncle Sam—that means the American taxpayers—will foot the bill, because all contributions to the performance—so the letters soliciting subscriptions said—"are deductible as business expenses on your income-tax returns."

Why the three-ringed political circus in Chicago today? The answer to that question is: Ex-Congressman Everett Dirksen, Republican nominee for the United States Senate, who as of today stands better than a 50–50 chance to unseat Majority Leader Senator SCOTT LUCAS, thereby spoiling President Truman's

chances for reelection in 1952. A Dirksen victory this fall would destroy the whole program of the New Deal or Fair Deal and do more than any other one thing to keep America safe from socialism.

The eyes of the Nation, therefore, will continue to be upon Illinois until after the November election.

Mr. Speaker, in support of my contention that the eyes of the Nation are upon Illinois, I include as a part of my remarks a newspaper article entitled "Dirksen and the Big Top," taken from the Christian Science Monitor, Saturday, May 13, 1950:

DIRKSEN AND THE BIG TOP

(By Max Gilstrap)

CHICAGO.—It's as plain to midwest GOP's as the trunk on an elephant's physiognomy.

Astute, hefty, Everett M. Dirksen, Republican nominee for United States Senator in Illinois, sketched it all out on a notebook. "There," he boomed, "is what's behind the Democrats' glittering three-ringed political circus here in Chicago."

He plunked down a big black dot to mark the big top. A mere peek into the tent is enough to tell who's cracking the whip. Only the ringmaster himself could fill the stands and keep three rings lively with the entire Cabinet (minus one), 145 Members of Congress and 14 governors.

It's colossal. It would make Ringling or Barnum twinge with envy and admiration. And Everett Dirksen believes he can claim part of the credit. Of course no self-respecting Democratic performer swinging "through the air with the greatest of ease" would agree with him. After all, what has a circus' main performance got to do with someone carrying water to GOP elephants on the outside?

The fact is, Mr. Dirksen has been doing his job so effectively that one of the circus stars, Senator Democratic Majority Leader Senator SCOTT W. LUCAS, of Illinois, may need all of the help he can get if he is to go on with the show after the fall elections.

Mr. Dirksen lowered his pencil to make six additional dots around the big top. "Look," he said, inscribing a circle to connect dots marked Ohio, Indiana, Missouri, Colorado, Iowa, and Wisconsin. "These are the important political side-shows to be held this fall which the big-top performance is supposed to influence. It's only logical that the Democrats would hold their big show here in the middle."

Mr. Dirksen and other Republicans think the outcome of the senatorial contest in Illinois could decide President Truman's fate if he runs as expected in 1952. A defeat of the Senate Democratic majority leader would deal the Democrats their biggest blow. It could start a trend, they say.

Tousle-haired Mr. Dirksen looks like the Republicans' best bet at the moment. His record as an alert, able Congressman before he resigned in 1949 was outstanding. He's a smooth orator. "Too smooth," a friend said; "he ought to stumble just once." But "stumbling," Mr. Dirksen explains, "becomes a difficult chore for a man who made 590 speeches before the primary election."

He uses all of the pyrotechnics—consciously or not. Out roll seductive tonal qualities. He holds a glass of water suspended preparatory to drinking as his audience sits in rapt, pin-dropped stillness. A sample of his oratory when he gets warmed up was demonstrated at the recent Young Republicans Midwest conference. He excoriated the approach of those in power with: "They propose to level off the farmer with the Brannan plan. They propose to level off professional men with the socialization of medicine. They propose to continue high spending, heavy taxes, and continuing deficits. They propose loans instead of tax relief for small business."

Mr. Dirksen, thus far, has been running against President Truman. His attitude toward Senator LUCAS has been a sort of "oh well, after all." His first opportunity to swap verbal blows with the champ comes when he answers the President's Chicago speech 2 nights later at a convention of the Illinois Federation of Republican Women's Clubs in Springfield.

Meanwhile, Mr. Dirksen is bending an attentive ear to the big top. What goes on inside will determine his tactics. That is, all but one tactic, which he said remains constant. "I am determined," he explained, "to stand by principles I am willing to lose for."

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact he is violating the rules of the House by mentioning a Member of the other body. I shall not make a point of order but simply direct his attention to that fact.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired; otherwise the Chair might request the gentleman to speak in order.

An Explanation of the Lovre "Grass Roots" Farm Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD O. LOVRE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1950

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, today is a great day for me because it climaxes months of efforts on my part to present to the Congress what I feel to be a sound and sensible program for agriculture. I have today introduced in the House of Representatives a self-financing, full parity, farmer-managed plan to stabilize the Nation's agricultural economy.

Mr. Speaker, into this bill has gone the experiences of a lifetime of residence in the great agricultural State of South Dakota. Into it has gone by knowledge of farmers and their problems and the problems which I, as a farm operator, have been confronted with through the years. Also into this plan has gone the advice and the counsel of thousands of actual dirt farmers with whom I have talked, together with the thoughtful opinions of men who have devoted years to a study of the problems of agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to present this bill because I believe that it makes sense.

For years attempts have been made to solve the so-called farm problem.

All of these approaches have evolved around subsidies and grants and Government regulation to bolster farm prices and to control price-depressing surpluses. The result has been that billions of dollars have been expended without finding a permanent or sound solution to the complexities that are involved.

I have tried a new approach.

The bill I have introduced today provides for a program to be managed by the farmers themselves. They are its bosses through their elected county committees and State and national boards.

My plan is self-financing because the farmer himself would finance the disposal of surpluses.

The program which I advocate would assure the farmer of full parity of income because it establishes a means of collective bargaining in the farmer's market place. It thus assures a prosperous agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, before I explain this bill, I want to say that, in my opinion, legislation that provides for a prosperous agriculture is not simply legislation for the farmer alone. It is legislation for the benefit of the entire Nation, because history has shown that national income is usually just 7 times gross farm income. That is why stabilizing farm products at a proper level automatically becomes a floor under our national income, our wage level, business profits and the goods we consume. Thus if industry wants profits, if labor wants high wages and many jobs and if Government wants sufficient taxes to balance the budget and reduce the national debt, all of these groups should be among the first to insist upon fair and proper prices for what the farmer produces.

In previous attempts to deal with the price problems of agriculture, the solution has always been to dip into the coffers of the Federal Government and support prices through expenditures of tax money.

I say that it is foolish to believe that we can find a permanent solution to any problem by constantly running to the Federal Treasury for a monetary hypodermic.

I have offered a plan that for once solves an economic problem without using the taxpayers' hard earned dollars for subsidies and grants.

My plan has as its objectives: First, full self-financing, thus ending the use of tax money for subsidies; second, full parity prices at all times for normal domestic consumption; third, administration by the farmers themselves through elected county, State, and national committees; fourth, specific and real protection for the family-sized farmer; fifth, a two-price level the same as any other business uses; sixth, provision for distribution of food to needy people under a food-stamp plan; seventh, encouragement of nonfood commercial uses for surplus crops; eighth, exports on the world market coordinated with United States commitments; and ninth, a coordinated soil conservation program.

The measure I have offered simply makes use of the same old principle that the country merchant uses in the operation of his store. He offers the bulk of his goods to his customers at a price designed to give him a good profit. If he has any left over that he cannot sell, he holds a sale. This is exactly the principle of this "grass roots" farm program.

Here is the way my plan would work: Annually the National Farm Board would predict the amount of farm produce to be consumed in the United States and also that amount available for consumption. If the amount available were excessive—as defined in the bill—a refer-

endum would be held and if two-thirds or more of the producers voted in the affirmative the program would go into effect. This national parity quota—the predicted normal domestic consumption—would be apportioned to the State boards by the National Board and thence to the county committees and finally to the individual farmers on the basis of past production, present capacity and optimum production under good soil conservation practices. The farmer would be assured of full parity on his share of the national parity quota. If the farmer wished to sell more than his share of the national parity quota, he could purchase from his county committee additional marketing quotas. The proceeds received from the sale of these extra marketing quotas would be used by the National Board to finance the disposal of surplus.

Farm surpluses would be channeled into world trade in a manner consistent with the commitments of the United States or they might be distributed to the needy under a food-stamp plan, or through school-lunch programs. Another way that the Board would dispose of surpluses would be through development of new nonfood commercial uses for farm products.

If, at the end of the year, the National Board found that it had collected too much from the farmer for these surplus marketing quotas, the balance would be refunded. Sales of commodities would be governed by marketing certificates which would be controlled by the county committees. Trading certificates or the converting of them from grain to livestock or poultry products would be allowed. Comparative units for feed grains and pork, beef, poultry products, and so forth would be used. As an example, a farmer would be allowed to market his share of the national parity quota either as feed grain or converted into livestock or poultry, or combinations of both.

Full parity loans by the Commodity Credit Corporation would be allowed upon a farmer's quota and also on his surplus. However, to obtain a full parity loan on surplus he would be required to purchase additional marketing quotas from his county committee.

On-the-farm and existing commercial facilities would be used for storage. The National Board, under my bill, is directed to investigate the possibility of using private credit facilities to make insured loans to farmers.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to give you an example of this program in operation as it relates to the food-feed group. The food-feed group are such commodities as corn, wheat, barley, oats, rye, grain sorghums, hay, grass, and other products used for livestock feeding, and hogs, cattle, sheep, poultry, chicken eggs, and dairy products. Let us take the case of Farmer Jones. If the program were in effect the farmer-elected county committee would give Farmer Jones his quota for the year. This quota would come to him in such a form that he could market any or all of the items in the food-feed group. Let us assume that his quota is of an amount entitling him to sell 8,000 bushels of corn. It could also mean a comparable amount of the other items in the food-feed group.

We will assume that Farmer Jones elects to market his quota as corn; the parity price upon which at the time is $1.50 per bushel. He would have sufficient marketing certificates to sell his 8,000 bushels of corn at the market place. If that is all that Farmer Jones had produced, he would have to do nothing more than haul his 8,000 bushels of corn to market and collect the market price—which would be at least $1.50 per bushel.

But let us assume that Farmer Jones produced 9,000 bushels of corn, or 1,000 bushels more than his quota. If he wished to sell this additional 1,000 bushels, he would simply purchase from his county committee sufficient marketing quotas to sell this 1,000 bushels.

Let us assume that the county committee charged him 75 cents a bushel for additional marketing quotas. The National Board might use that 75 cents a bushel to finance a food-stamp plan or it might be used to develop new uses for corn or to export it.

The money the Board had left over from Farmer Jones' purchase of additional marketing quotas would be refunded.

Under the conditions I have just described, Farmer Jones would net at least $1.50 per bushel—full parity—for 8,000 bushels of corn, his share of the national parity quota. He would net only 75 cents per bushel for his 1,000 bushels which was the surplus.

Farmer Jones could also receive a full parity loan on his surplus corn after he had purchased additional marketing quotas.

Under this program acreage controls are eliminated. The farmer himself would control production. It is presumed that production of surplus would be discouraged because farmers would not receive as much for it and would cut down.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to stress one point that is important in dealing with any plan for agriculture. That is the role of the so-called family sized farmer. He is the backbone of America. I call your particular attention to the section of the bill which states:

> It is the prime purpose of this act to assure that existing family sized farms will continue to be independently operated, and to encourage the establishment of additional independent family sized farms.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that is a very important section because it is the little fellow who usually gets hit the hardest by any decline in prices. Therefore any farm plan must be predicated on the family sized operator.

Mr. Speaker, another important provision to which I respectfully call your attention is to the second title of the bill dealing with soil conservation. I believe we all recognize that the Nation's soil is its most valuable resource and realize that the Government must offer technical and financial assistance to promote its orderly development and conservation. I felt this of sufficient importance to clearly spell out the intention of the Congress and direct the National Board to make a thorough study and report its findings.

Through this grass-roots plan, the farmer would be assured of the level of income necessary to meet his cost of production and provide him with the things for himself and his family which he has a right to expect from life under a program managed by himself and his elected representatives without being constantly under the thumb of bureaucratic regimentation and control.

Furthermore, the rest of the American people could benefit from a prosperous agriculture without the financial burden of a heavy drain on the Treasury.

Mr. Speaker, there is an immediate problem which causes me a good deal of concern. That is the problem of the national debt and the financial program of the President which requires this country to engage in deficit spending. We have all sought ways of solving this problem. I call your attention to the fact that there is now between $4,000,000,000 and $7,000,000,000 tied up in farm surpluses—surpluses that are doing no one any good—but which are costing the taxpayers money every day. The plan that I offer provides a method of disposing of these surpluses in an orderly manner and preventing the reoccurrence of similar situations.

This feature alone would save enough tax money to balance the budget this year.

Mr. Speaker, consumers are not happy when they see warehouses bulging with surpluses, bought with their tax money, which are serving no useful purpose in the economic or humanitarian pattern of society. They cannot understand why they should be taxed for such a thing. My plan would solve this dilemma. It would lift the tax burden of useless surpluses from their backs and divert any excess production toward a more profitable and enjoyable life for all of us.

While I am speaking of consumers, I do want to make one point clear. That is that consumers do not gain from low farm prices. They always lose. At the bottom of the depression, although farm prices were disastrously low, the share of the consumers' total income required for food was the highest in a decade. This was because their total income was proportionately lower. In 1938, when farm prices dropped, consumers did not benefit from lower food prices. The shares of their income spent for food remained the same or was higher because their total income had declined in ratio with farm incomes. On the other hand, in 1943–44, although farm prices were at or above parity, the share of consumers' total income required for food was the lowest in history.

The basic reason for a farm program is to protect the farmer, who now is the one person in our modern economic pattern who has little or nothing to say about the prices he receives. He has to take what he can get. To overcome this stumbling block of our complex modern economic structure there must be a farm program. I believe I have a plan that will effectively serve the farmer and his

family and at the same time serve the best interests of the entire Nation.

In approaching any farm program we should strive for a solution that gives the highest degree of free enterprise and the fewest controls. It must be one that will react to the best interests of both producers and consumers. Furthermore, any farm program must be divorced from dependence upon the Federal Treasury for financing. Farmers do not like to be placed in this position and the howl that has gone up among consumers proves that they do not like it either. This resentment is proof of the dire necessity of a program free from the year-to-year whims of Congress and maneuvering by self-centered pressure groups.

As Joseph Davis, director of the Food Research Institute of Stanford University, some time ago said:

> America wants an agriculture that earns its way, instead of being continually and increasingly dependent upon Government props, vulnerable to political shifts, and forced to accept the accompanying regimentation. It wants an agriculture that, proud of its strength, competes in domestic and foreign markets on the basis of efficiency and fair play.

I believe that this program of agriculture should be based around 100 percent of parity for the farmer.

Mr. Speaker, here is why: Our economy can be compared to a large department store. If the store manager prices his products so law as, say, 75 percent of the needed price to operate properly—parity—he will land in the bankruptcy courts. In the same way, if the United States permits its price level to drop to 75 percent of parity, then we lose 25 percent of our ability to consume; we have 25 percent unemployment and national deficits which will eventually force us into bankruptcy.

With about 26,000,000 persons on the Nation's farms today, and millions more whose living comes directly or indirectly from farm production, it is apparent that prices must be stabilized toward a continual flow of new income from farm production. Price stabilization on these crops will also stabilize our credit dollar and the purchasing power of the wage earner.

Whether or not we like large expenditures for foreign aid, defense, and domestic programs, we have to face the hard, cold fact that we must have a high national income to finance such expenditures. I have pointed out that farm income and national income are closely related by a seven-times turn. Therefore, if we as a nation are to meet our obligations, we must have a high farm income.

Mr. Speaker, in these days of the cold war between the United States and Russia, it is desperately important to maintain American prosperity.

Joe Stalin is patiently waiting for an economic bust in this country as the opening crack in our cold-war defense. In the interests of peace we must keep farm income and national income high.

To maintain farm prosperity the farmer must have 100 percent of parity. In other words, he must make enough money so that he can buy what he needs and wants. Give him less than 100 percent parity—or buying power—and you give him that much less buying power.

It is my belief that it is impossible to operate the economy of the United States on a basis of full employment, a balanced national budget, and pay off the national debt unless an average of at least 100 percent of parity is maintained at the market place for agricultural production for domestic use.

Any compromise or influence that reduces farm prices below 100 percent of parity in the market place will reflect the same percentage in the loss of business volume and departure from full employment. The effect on the national income is just seven times what it is on farm incomes.

Mr. Speaker, when I was in South Dakota last fall between sessions of the Congress, I discussed this plan of mine with farmers in 32 round-table meetings. I received many good suggestions and I believe that the farmers who attended these meetings were in general agreement with my objectives.

Mr. Speaker, I do not say that this plan is the sole or only solution to the farm problem. I am positive, however, that its objectives are sound and that it is consistent with the free enterprise and pay-as-you-go system which we like to think of as being typical of the American way. I believe that the proposal I have submitted is worthy of careful consideration by all of us who are interested in sound economy for the farmer and continued prosperity in this great land of ours.

The First Dealer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 15, 1950

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston (Mass.) Herald of May 12, 1950:

THE FIRST DEALER

During nearly 20 years of dealism, New and Fair, Americans have forgotten the man in the White House who started this deal business. He was Theodore Roosevelt and his deal was Square. He was a great leader, a great President, and a great Republican, even if he did almost break up the party.

Many of us have forgotten, too, that the later Roosevelt by no means held a monopoly among White House phrase makers. No monopoly either on phrases that could ring with conviction and truth. It was well known among his intimates that the late Franklin Roosevelt had a near hero worship admiration for his illustrious cousin of the opposite party. Throughout his public life there were many evidences of the T. R. influence, not the least of which was his having a deal of his own. They were both country squires of suburban New York. Backgrounds very similar, too. T. R. built a trophy room jutting out from his Sagamore Hill home. Later F. D. R. did the same at Hyde Park. The similarities were superficial or affected. Philosophically, their differences were fundamental.

Franklin Roosevelt could never have believed the following even if he might have said something similar. The words are those of T. R.:

"Business and labor are different sides of the same problem. It is impossible wisely to treat either without reference to the interests and duties of the other—and without reference to the fact that the interests of the general public, the commonwealth, are paramount to both" (1917).

"No republic can permanently exist when it becomes a republic of classes, where the man feels not the interest of the whole people, but the interest of the particular class to which he belongs, or fancies that he belongs, as being of prime importance" (1904).

"I wish to preach, not the doctrine of ignoble ease, but the doctrine of the strenuous life, the life of toil and effort, of labor and strife; to preach that highest form of success which comes, not to the man who desires mere easy peace, but to the man who does not shrink from danger, from hardship, or from bitter toil, and who out of these wins the splendid ultimate triumph" (1899).

"We have inherited and developed a superbly self-reliant individualism in this country. I most earnestly hope that it will not be lost, that it will never be exchanged for a deadening socialism. The only permanently beneficial way in which to help anyone is to help him to help himself; if either private charity, or governmental action, or any form of social expression destroys the individual's power of self-help, the gravest possible wrong is really done to the individual" (1907).

The Nation should be indebted to the Roosevelt Memorial Association for purchasing the Theodore Roosevelt home at Oyster Bay, N. Y., to make of it a national shrine to a man whose high qualities of leadership his country could well use again.

Habana Charter of International Trade Organization Will Not Work—It Is Socialism Applied to Foreign Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 15, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am including as part of my remarks an illuminating statement by Mr. Elvin H. Killheffer who attended the Habana Conference as a member of the United States delegation, appointed by the State Department. As a result of Mr. Killheffer's experience at the conference he takes a strong and positive stand against the bill now before the Foreign Affairs Committee. His statement follows:

I attended the Habana Conference as a member of the United States delegation in the capacity of an adviser.

The organizations for whom I speak believe in the concept of world-wide economic cooperation and precisely for that reason oppose the Habana charter. Cooperation means to work together for a common object or objective.

It is claimed that such genuine cooperation is provided in the charter. We deny the truth of that claim.

There can be no genuine cooperation when there is no real agreement as to objectives. That there was no real agreement at Habana is obvious to anyone reading the charter,

which records and provides for continuance of the disagreements.

Moreover, the record as written in the charter is in language so ambiguous as to make certain there will be more and serious disagreement in the future—and I may add that much of the ambiguity is not accidental.

The London draft in article 22, paragraph 4, provided the sure foundation for eventual agreement among members to assist them in developing policies. Even in the London draft it was buried and in later drafts much of it was deleted. This idea was all disregarded at Habana and an attempt was made to force immediate agreement on policies and rules. The attempt was premature because of the lack of agreement on fundamentals.

Looking for a moment at some principal objectives, we find—

Article 20 forbids the use of quota restrictions. That is the United States position. Almost no one else agreed unless and until continuance of the forbidden practice was assured under the exceptions provided in articles 21, 22, 23, and others.

Article 17 providing for continuous tariff reductions is the United States position. Tariff reduction for other countries is meaningless because they can continue the more restrictive quotas, exchange controls, etc.

Article 17 provides for elimination of preferential tariffs. They are not eliminated but are continued under the exceptions of article 16 and new preferences are provided for in article 15.

United States opposes discriminatory practices. The charter in article 23 and elsewhere continues them.

The president of the British Board of Trade told Commons that Britain will use the alternatives provided in GATT and ITO "where by discriminations they can get additional imports." Delegates at Habana declared they would "give due regard" to the principle of nondiscrimination but would practice discrimination nevertheless.

United States and several others, notably Belgium, Sweden, and Switzerland, wanted equitable provisions protecting foreign investment. Other nations did not agree, hence article 12 written by the Australians. Why the United States did not stand and fight for its principles is a mystery to me. Certainly we will never be in a stronger position than when the whole world looks to us for financial aid.

Foreign investment provisions of the charter are written from the point of view of the recipient country. The protection afforded is to such recipient. In the opinion of those intimately concerned, the inducement and protection afforded for the investor is not adequate. The provision begins:

"The members recognize that international investment, both public and private, can be of great value in promoting" (art. 12–1 (a)).

The words "both public and private" are significant. With investment as with facilities, the mere possibility of their availability through government on less exacting terms and perhaps politically motivated, almost precludes satisfactory private agreements.

The recipient country has the right to expropriate or nationalize the investment now or in the future (art. 12–1 (c) (iii)). Resistance was determined and successful to any provision for fair and prompt compensation or expeditious transfer of funds in case of expropriation. To be sure there is provision that members by prior negotiation may secure more favorable terms. But that course is open without a charter.

Remember that members are governments. The trend is clear. If others want controlled economies, that is their privilege, but there is no good reason why we should adopt their concepts or obligate ourselves to provide the resources for their experiments.

The United States is opposed to cartels and chapter V embodies this but with dubious agreement by many delegations, particularly the United Kingdom who fought to prevent more expeditious treatment of complaints.

Moreover, chapter VI embodies the British ideas of intergovernmental commodity cartels. We have some familiarity with these on commodities like diamonds, tin, cocoa, sisal, etc.

We could say the charter is inconsistent in its creation in government hands and in more complete form what it holds to be iniquitous in private hands in any form. Yet the inconsistency resolves itself when we recognize the concept of world wide planned economy which is here outlined.

The United States does not agree with this concept. We know that private enterprise has produced more for more people than any other system ever tried.

The record I have cited is a record of disagreement. In no instance is there genuine agreement.

The most serious disagreement of all concerns a planned versus a free economy. The charter is a catalog of what governments will do. The members of the proposed international bureaucracy called ITO are governments. The charter recognizes state controls and ownership and state trading. This, in turn, requires state planning and all of this is state socialism the antithesis of private enterprise which we in the United States believe in.

There is provision for a whole series of such intergovernmental commodity agreements originally limited to primary commodities in burdensome surplus. That limitation has been removed (art. 56–3). Among the objectives of such agreements is this: "to provide, during the period which may be necessary a framework for the consideration and development of measures which have as their purpose economic adjustments designed to promote the expansion of consumption or a shift of resources and manpower out of overexpanded industries into new and productive occupations, including as far as possible in appropriate cases, the development of secondary industries based upon domestic production of primary commodities;" (art. 57 (b)).

Here we have government agreements which contemplate measures involving shifts of resources and manpower, as well as deciding which productions are overexpanded. It might involve cotton, wheat, lard, tobacco, or potatoes. In making such an agreement, provision is to be made so that there shall be increasing opportunities to supply markets from sources from which such requirements can be supplied in the most effective and economic manner (art. 63 (c)).

It is said that the commodity agreement is the framework or transitory measure affording time for the members to study the problem and arrange to take individual remedial action, hence there is no central planning or managing. That argument is not convincing. Members will study the problem as an ITO group. Assume that a cartel is created. The charter provides for a commodity council (art. 64–1), on which the interested members have representation (art. 64–2). The decisions taken by this council are obviously international and not national. Consuming countries shall also have a voice in the decisions on matters of substance. Their vote shall be equal to that of the producers who want to export the commodity (art. 63 (b)).

The decisions on the vital matters to which I have referred are certainly matters of substance. If then it was decided that cotton is produced most economically by India or Brazil or China, and that United States manpower should be shifted to something else, the United States might find itself a magnificent minority of one. And the decision would not be made by the United States. They would be made by this international ITO.

This is definitely a planned and managed economy. If you still doubt it, look at some of the other objective, such as developing natural resources and the expansion of production of primary commodities (art. 57–(d) (e)). These are not functions of government, national or international, in a private enterprise economy.

I want to call particular attention to a disagreement masquerading as agreement that is of vital interest to our industry.

You gentlemen may recall that it was a Democratic Congress that had the wisdom to recognize the key importance of the chemical industry in the national economy and security. In encouraging the building and growth of such industry it was determined to provide adequate tariffs. World conditions at that time were unsettled and values in foreign lands difficult or impossible to reliably determine. In order to overcome that difficulty and obtain an actual value at which the goods were sold in the ordinary course of trade under fully competitive conditions, American selling price was made the basis for valuation in fixing duties on competitive imports.

Despite charges to the contrary this worked out to automatically reduce the amount of duty every time prices were reduced through increased efficiency and the competition among the many American producers. And the Treasury could and did regularly inspect the books of the American companies to see that the prices were accurately given. Obviously, such checks of foreign records have been and are impossible.

The Habana charter forbids the use of such a value which is an actual one and would substitute as actual value that is defined in article 3 (b):

"'Actual value' should be the price at which, at a time and place determined by the legislation of the country of importation, and in the ordinary course of trade, such or like merchandise is sold or offered for sale under fully competitive conditions."

But this is no agreement at all, for different countries may designate different times and places. The words "at a time and place determined by the legislation of the country of importation" are susceptible of more than one meaning, although each in complete good faith. One country can designate the time and place as the time and port of export. This in essence is what we call foreign value. Another nation can designate time and place of import, thus arriving at some form of domestic value. This is not agreement. It is not a reliable definition, for it can and will be interpreted in opposite ways.

We should not be unmindful of the serious disagreements to come. There is a wide area of decision and interpretation inevitably to be made by the organization. Some are decisions specifically delegated, including releases from or waivers of obligations. The far greater number will be necessitated by ambiguity in language of the charter. It has been said in effect that much of this was intentional, that the charter is only a framework within which the substance will be developed through establishment of precedents and the growth of a body of cases. If this is the case, who will develop this substance? Obviously, it would be the ITO, in which the United States has one vote. It is fantastic to expect the United States to sign such a blank check.

If ITO, through its decisions, will create a body of new international law, it will in effect have legislative powers. That very definitely is an invasion of sovereignty. Moreover it would mean acceptance of administrative law in the international sphere. More government of men—less government under law.

The obligations of the charter are terribly one-sided now because of the exceptions

and escapes for other countries. And if new matters of substance could be introduced through the procedure of interpretation, the charter should be rejected forthwith. Unfortunately, just such procedure was followed at the recent meeting of the Interim Commission in Geneva. By means of interpretation, the concept of monetary compensation was introduced. The charter provides that where the interests of a member are prejudiced, only retaliatory measures for their redress should be resorted to, such as withdrawal of concessions. While the Australian delegate pointed out that the charter was being amended substantively through interpretation, the United States delegate agreed with the interpretation. You can guess the probable target for monetary damages.

A fundamental disagreement running through the whole charter cannot be stated too often. It is the conflict between the doctrines of State socialism and the professed objective of freer trade and exchange among nations. Greater government controls are the very essence of State socialism just as they are the antithesis of freedom and private enterprise.

In the Habana charter the doctrines of State socialism are paramount.

The charter concerns itself greatly with production and employment. For example, article 3 states that "Each member shall take action designed to achieve and maintain full and productive employment." Thus full employment would become an end in itself. This pledge would undoubtedly be accomplished by unbalancing the budget, inflating the currency and imposing exchange controls. But each of these in turn would lead to contraction rather than expansion of international trade which is the supposed purpose of the charter.

Under this chapter the United States would be required not only to take action to achieve and maintain full employment within its own territory, but also to cooperate with other nations through the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, on such international measures as might be determined desirable to produce the same full employment in all member countries. In view of the widely divergent opinions expressed by Members of the Congress at the time it was considering the Murray full-employment bill of 1945 and the Employment Act of 1946, and the unwillingness of Congress to legislate full employment within the United States, we certainly should not now accept any charter which would commit the United States to international full employment.

If a member's ability to achieve full employment without resort to trade restrictions is handicapped by a persistent maladjustment in balance of payments involving other members, such members respectively shall make full contribution and take appropriate action to correct the situation (art. 4–1). These vague terms must be interpreted by ITO. In a balance of payments situation like that between the United Kingdom and the United States, what is "appropriate action" by one and "full contribution" by the other? Even if clearly defined, it presupposes planned international economy coextensive with the commitments.

The provisions of the charter on economic development are duplications of what was promised as the function of the International Bank for reconstruction and Economic Development. The more recent point 4 attempts to deal with the same thing.

Of course the bank has tried to make sound loans. The authors of the charter provisions are more open handed.

The facilities for economic development and reconstruction are listed as capital funds, materials, modern equipment, technology and technical and managerial skills. Then this obligation:

"Members shall cooperate in providing or arranging for the provision of such facilities within the limits of their power" (art. 11–1 (a)).

These are hardly trivial obligations. What is the limit of the power of government? The facilities described are in the United States privately owned and operated, the very essence of private enterprise.

While the Habana charter is submitted for approval as an executive agreement, I predict that it will be regarded both abroad and in the United States for what it is—namely, a treaty. And as a treaty, it will be the supreme law in the United States and yet no individual has any legal recourse against the decree laws of this international bureaucracy. This is contrary to the rights guaranteed American citizens under the Constitution.

Some proponents advocate ratification, bad as it is, and then improve it by amendment. We say that it is wholly unrealistic to expect to alter a contract in your favor after you have signed it.

It is also suggested that the United States can later withdraw if it is not satisfied. That is not only a poor but also a very dangerous suggestion. Political considerations might make such a step impossible.

Proponents of the Habana charter are still talking in the attractive generalities of the prospectus. But the charter is the contract which either does or does not implement those high hopes. And I say that a careful study of the document shows that it does not do so.

We ask that the Habana charter be rejected as the first necessary step toward a good charter.

Our real choice is between an effort to obtain a charter of limited scope on which there would be genuine agreement and the Habana charter which embodies ideas and practices of state socialism which we in the United States do not want and are under no compulsion to accept.

It is our opinion that if we negotiated a new charter returning to the concept of an organization initially having only consultative and advisory functions, the very exercise of these functions could in time lead to genuine agreement on principles and on the rules stemming from them. But the agreed rules should then be submitted for approval to the legislative bodies of the members. Laws would then be made in orthodox fashion and unless so ratified by legislatures would not become law.

I realize that this is too slow for the world planners, but on the other hand, a mighty oak is not created in a few months or years. Most of the greatest successes any of us know grew from very modest beginnings.

How Safe Is America?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 15, 1950

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address made by me before the Nebraska State Medical Association, Lincoln, Nebr., on Wednesday, May 3, 1950:

HOW SAFE IS AMERICA?

Members of the Nebraska State Medical Association, it is a pleasure to be back in Nebraska, speaking before the association which honored me as their president in 1939. After 8 years in Congress, I am about convinced that I know more about the practice of medicine and surgery than I do about the practice of being a Congressman. It is interesting work, because in Congress you are giving service to 325,000 people, and this is not unlike the work you physicians do for your patients, except in Congress we are trying to relieve the economic and social ills of our Government and the world.

It was 25 years ago, this month, that I first gave a talk before the Nebraska State medical society on the subject of Uncle Sam practices medicine. I do not propose to explore this subject at this time. I prefer to group a few remarks around the subject, How Safe Is America? I wish my medical colleagues would remember that in this frustrated and troubled world, we must act, think, and believe in America. You ought to be either a Republican or a Democrat, or a Socialist if you desire, and you ought to vote, but first you ought to be an American. I trust you will not interpret my remarks as being partisan. I merely wish to point out some troubled spots in Government.

It is of passing interest that when I gave this paper 25 years ago, the Federal Government was then spending between three and four million dollars on public health work. At that time we had less than 500,000 on the Federal payroll; our debt was about $16,000,000,000. Today there are more than 2,000,000 working for the Federal Government, and we have a debt of about $260,000,000,000. It cost us about $5,000,000,000 to run all functions of Government 25 years ago, while today it is more than $43,000,000,000, plus a $7,000,000,000 deficit. Indeed the present administration, in 4½ peacetime years, has spent more than 32 Presidents spent in the first 152 years of our existence. We also went through several wars and depressions during our early existence. You should remember that the party in power has a majority of 90 in this Eighty-first Congress. They have the votes to put over anything the administration desires.

I remember when I gave my paper, Uncle Sam Practices Medicine, Dr. Young, who was then at Gering, and later moved to California, as well as Dr. Stark, of Norfolk, both of whom have gone over the Great Divide, suggested that I was a little too pessimistic—that the Government would never go in for caring for people on the scale that I mentioned. At that time none of us ever thought it would reach the spending of this year.

Let's take a look presently at the spending by Government for various forms of medicine and public health. It is more than $3,000,000,000 this year. Of the $3,000,000,000 two billion is Federal money and one billion is State funds. Those entitled to some part of this medical care total about one-sixth of the Nation's population. Active military forces are not included.

The great bulk of State medicine is for 18,250,000 veterans who are entitled to full care if they have service-connected disability. On March 1, 1950, there were 133 veterans hospitals in the United States, with 107,000 beds. At that time there were 99,000 veterans in these hospitals. It was estimated that 63 percent were there because of nonservice-connected disabilities. The veteran with a non-service-connected disability must swear he is unable to defray the cost of private hospital care. The remaining six or seven million fall into special classes, such as the 2,000,000 Federal employees, 400,000 Indians and Eskimos; and 700,000 mental cases which generally are a State obligation.

There are 40 Federal agencies which now give some medical assistance to employees and the citizens. There are nearly 8,000 doctors that work full time on the Federal and State payrolls. The Veterans' Administration, in 1949, paid $16,500,000 to private doctors for the care of veterans. About 75,000 private doctors have indicated a willingness to take part in the veterans program

outside of veterans hospitals. Indeed it has been amazing how Federal public health projects grow. The appropriation bill for this year shows a sizable increase for all forms of public health work. It includes poliomyelitis, heart disease, rheumatism, maternal and child health and many new research programs.

There are several measures before Congress, which in my opinion, are a part of socialized medicine. I refer to the examination and treatment of all children in public schools regardless of ability to pay. The social security bill has a disability clause which is socialistic. There is another measure which gives aid to medical schools, medical students, dentists and nurses. We also have the Hill-Burton bill, which has for its purpose making Federal funds available in order to provide hospitals in isolated areas. There is $75,000,000 recommended by the committee. This has been raised to $150,000,000. In my opinion it is time to fold up this program. Many communities are in a better-position to build their own hospitals without Government aid. In my district, the cities of Gothenburg, Chappell and Bridgeport have proceeded without Federal aid. Our Government is heavily in debt. We must stop looking to the Federal Government for assistance.

Now it would seem on the surface, that these preliminary remarks might not fit in too well with my subject on how safe is America. I have merely mentioned the growth of the Federal Government to bring home to you the fact that as Federal Government becomes bigger and bigger, you and I as citizens become smaller and smaller. The Government, instead of being our servant, can well become our master. When that happens you lose security and freedom. The course Government is now following may well mean that you can no longer live your life as you see fit, but you will be under the complete control of Government and the alien ideology which will direct your activities from the cradle to the grave.

When we consider how safe is America, we must consider the road which the Government is now following. We have several socialistic programs before the Congress. Of course, in your mind, socialized medicine leads the way. There is still much interest in this program. Mr. Oscar Ewing, and the administration, are plugging hard along, with the left wing organizations to get the program started. It is still very much alive, even though Dr. Henderson, president of the American Medical Association thinks it is not an issue in 1950. I am certain that the question of socialized medicine will be an issue in every congressional district. My opponent in the Fourth Congressional District has already made it an issue.

There is the Brannan Farm Program which is of unquestionable political interest and questionable economic soundness. It would bring about a complete regimentation and control of agriculture. If you doubt it, you should read the 15 pages of penalties in this 87-page bill.

There is socialized housing, and the Spence bill, which is nothing more than a superduper OPA, with all the trimmings.

I want to impress upon my medical colleagues, that you ought to be interested in all phases of legislation which would lead to further regimentation and socialistic trends. You should not forget that there are other measures which are just as socialistic as socialized medicine, and when once adopted, the country will find it difficult to retrace its steps.

My colleagues complain that doctors are not interested in politics and fail to help their friends. Good government goes farther than just an interest in socialized medicine. You have one Member of the Nebraska delegation who, it seems, is for compulsory health insurance. Elect 25 more members like him to the House and I predict the whole socialized program of the administration will be adopted. You doctors better wake up. You had better take an interest in good government and support your friends. You can be a powerful influence in every community.

When we talk about how safe is America, you naturally wonder about the spending of government. I have told you about the amount spent in 4½ peacetime years, more than $190,000,000,000. It is your money. You pay the taxes. The two Frankenstein monsters facing the public today are increased taxes and inflation. Either one of these can destroy the American economy.

In my humble opinion, our Government, banks, trust and insurance companies, who are unofficial custodians of the people's money, should have as their first concern, sound currency. If we continue on the road of reckless spending, with deficits as a way of life, it can lead but to one conclusion, inflation and increased taxes. There are bills now pending before legislative committees which, if passed by Congress, would raise the Federal budget more than $20,000,000,000.

In further exploring the subject of how safe is America, I wish to examine with you the number of subversives and security risks which are now, or have been, employed in the Federal Government. Mr. Peurifoy, the Under Secretary of State, testified before a Senate Committee recently that they found it necessary to fire or let resign 257 employees last year, and that 91 of this group were homosexuals. The Police Department of the District of Columbia estimates that there are about 5,000 homosexuals in the city and 75 percent are employed by government.

I discuss this subject of homosexuality with some timidity. In looking over the literature on this topic, I find that it is seldom approached, even by the psychiatrist, and, being first a surgeon, and second a politician, I find it difficult to explore. I will direct my remarks to their employment in government, plus a brief review of this problem.

Homosexuality can be defined as the attraction for individuals of the same sex to each other. The subject is as old as the human race. It is mentioned in the Bible, was recognized by the ancient Greeks, and is practiced extensively among the Orientals. It is important to note at this point that the Russians and the Orientals still look upon the practice with favor.

Mr. Goering of German fame and General Roehn, who were executed, kept the list of homosexuals for Germany. They also had a list of these individuals in the State, Commerce, and other Departments of our Government. The Russians undoubtedly have similar lists. These espionage agents have found it rather easy to send their homosexuals here and contact their kind in sensitive departments of our Government. Blackmail and many other schemes are used to gather secret information.

The homosexual is often a man of considerable intellect and ability. It is found that the cycle of these individuals' homosexual desires follow the cycle closely patterned to the menstrual period of women. There may be 3 or 4 days in each month that this homosexual's instincts break down and drive the individual into abnormal fields of sexual practice. It has been found that if the individual can be given large doses of sedatives and other treatments during this sensitive cycle, that he may escape performing acts of homosexuality.

The problem of sexual maladjustments are most urgent and still far from a solution. In the Army, several thousand men were discharged because of homosexuality. When caught in the act, these men were generally discharged without honor, which means the loss of citizenship and the right to vote, or to belong to any organization of veterans, or to receive many of the rewards which are granted to those who have served honorably. This is most serious. Many of the homosexuals failed to survive the rigors of warfare and the constant intimate association with men. They were painfully aware of their limitations. The majority were unable to conceal their tendencies and were eventually eliminated with disgrace, and a stigma to themselves, their families, and friends.

Jealousy is never encountered in true friendships. Never is the bond which unites two friends such that the acquisition of a new friend by one is regarded angrily by the other; but quite otherwise is the life among homosexuals. Here jealousy reigns supreme. It is similar to the love of a boy for a girl. Male homosexuals will not share their fairy with anybody. His anger is unlimited for anyone who seeks to possess the object of his love.

The sexual attraction exercised by a man on another male may be apparent in many ways. The homosexual will become excited by the mere presence of some man in a public place. They will often approach that man, even though he is a stranger. On streetcars, intimate advances are made. A taxi driver often finds his fare making indiscreet advances. The true homosexual seeks any kind of contact with the male he adores. He has no sensation whatever in the presence of the most beautiful and seductive female. Her amorous advances to him may even be repulsive.

The Bible apprises us of the fact that when the inhabitants of Sodom consorted physically with the angels who descended to the pious Lot, God, in His wrath, entirely destroyed the city. From here comes the origin of the expression "sodomy." Sodomy is used to designate a certain type of sexual pervert and homosexual.

In the Third Book of Moses (Leviticus), the Lord said to the stranger, "If man lay with mankind as he lieth with a woman, both of them have committed an abomination. They shall surely be put to death and their blood shall be upon them."

Perversion is found at all levels of society. Perhaps more frequently among the higher levels where nervousness, unhappiness, and leisure time leads to vices.

The homosexual takes on many indiscretions. He has a tendency to lie and to lie on all occasions. It is a part of their defense.

Two years ago, as chairman of the Committee on Public Health in the District of Columbia, I sponsored legislation directed at a new legal approach to the sex-pervert problem. There were so many sex crimes in Washington, our parks and loafing places were no longer safe for the citizen. The police blotters of Washington contain the names of many individuals, some prominent, who are repeatedly brought to court for actions of sex perversion. Most of them merely post a $25 collateral and are never brought to trial. Under that law these people may be treated as medical problems, and can receive treatment at the discretion of the court in one of the hospitals of the city. The results are encouraging.

Homosexuals are like birds of a feather—they flock together. Washington has several restaurants and dwelling places in palatial surroundings where these people worship at the flesh pots and cesspools of immoral sex demonstration. Recently the moral squad arrested 40 men in one house, worshiping at the flesh pots of iniquity.

In some respects they are more to be pitied than condemned. Some have a pathologic mind. They might be compared to the kleptomaniac, who must steal, or the pyromaniac, who sets a fire. Seldom a week passes but what Washington and the surrounding territory has several atrocious crimes closely related to sex emotions. It is only recently that the press has given some

freedom to the open discussion of the topic. The subject is still taboo among family newspapers.

It does seem to me that if we are to keep America safe this type of individual ought not to be permitted to serve in key positions of government. The Congress is writing into several appropriation bills a clause which will permit the secretary of a department to dismiss individuals who might be security risks. It always includes homosexuals.

In considering how safe is America we must also look at the report of J. Edgar Hoover and the FBI. They have a list of 54,174 known Communists who are in every State of our Union. These men possess a fanatic loyalty to their masters abroad. They have boasted that for every member of the party they have 10 willing and subservient stooges to carry on the party program. That would mean they have 544,000 people in the United States who support the Communist philosophy.

I have been asked about the McCarthy case. While I believe the Senator has old lists and named individuals who are not now in the employ of the State Department, there are Communists still in Government. It must be remembered that these same individuals, who are now trying to put McCARTHY in a pillory, were the same ones who defended the convicted Mr. Hiss and the 11 Communists in New York. While McCARTHY may have done some temporary damage to the State Department, it is absolutely necessary to expel these communistic skunks from Government positions. Communism is a blue-hued, cancerous growth that has for its purpose the overthrow of our Government.

Last week, Mr. Budenz, who at one time was one of the top Communists in this country, testified before a Senate committee, stating he was giving the FBI an additional 400 names of known Communists in the United States—some still employed by Government. It was the testimony of this same Mr. Budenz that convicted the 11 Communists in New York City.

Indeed, communism has grown since the end of World War II. At that time the Russians controlled about 300,000,000 people. Today it is nearly 2,000,000,000 people.

J. Edgar Hoover reported that while they had examined some 2,000,000 Federal loyalty forms, they had found only 11,403 marked for further investigation and considered subversives. This is rather a small number among 2,000,000 employees.

Mr. Hoover further reported that the Communists have intensified their program. There is still a great danger facing our country from activities of the subversives, who are trying to overthrow our Government.

These people find ways and means of entering the United States legally and illegally. There are more than 3,000,000 aliens in the country today. They come in as stowaways on vessels. They come in over our unprotected borders on the North and South. Last year the Immigration Service picked up and sent back 289,400 who had entered the country illegally from Mexico.

Mr. Hoover reported that there were 4,000 dangerous Communists in the country who ought to be deported. Approximately 100, who are faithful to their foreign ideology have been marked for deportation, but it has been impossible to get permission to ship them back behind the iron curtain. They are permited to roam our country, spewing their venom of hate for all to see and hear. Even the 11 Communists have asked the court for permission to go on a lecture tour. I trust the court refuses the request. Just how safe can our country be under these conditions?

The foreign agents are active in our country today seeking and getting information on atomic research, radar, jet propulsion, guided missiles, and securing topographical maps of our coastal lines, airports, and military landing fields. They gather information on biological warfare and on our industrial and military resources. They work day and night to secure our know-how and send it to the iron-curtain countries.

One of the greatest dangers of communism is the ability of its agents to infiltrate and corrupt various spheres of American life. They attempt to exploit youth, veterans, civil rights, foreign groups, educational and church organizations. They have the greatest propaganda machine of all time.

Mr. Hoover reports they are developing an underground apparatus which will decentralize their operations. They have tripled their Communist Party groups. They no longer carry cards. They have gone underground. These same Communists, pinks, and fellow travelers are trying to destroy the FBI. We can be thankful that we have men like J. Edgar Hoover and his group to help protect this country.

In considering, How safe is America? we must take into consideration that we are spending more than $13,000,000,000 at home in keeping prepared. We are spending another $5,000,000,000 on the Marshall plan and other foreign-aid programs. It should be remembered that 35 cents out of your tax dollar goes for defense and 18 cents for different foreign-aid programs.

I believe we have the top scientists, and the industrial know-how to keep far ahead in technical and scientific developments. The production of the atomic and hydrogen bombs is a reality. The recent development of jet planes, guided missiles, virus warfare and other, yet unpublished and still restricted, work should give us a comfortable feeling that those in charge of our Nation's defense are not asleep at the switch. Naturally, one is disturbed when he finds the President of the United States giving out optimistic reports on foreign affairs, and yet his advisers in the Defense Department informing Congress that conditions are worse now than at any time in the history of our country. They even talk of an early attack launched by Russia. Is it propaganda for more appropriations, or is the condition really serious? Certainly the President and his advisers are getting their information from different sources.

I am convinced that if the American people had knowledge of all of the new inventions and developments, not only for aggressive, but defensive warfare, they would have a comfortable feeling that the Congress and our military men are not leaving a stone unturned to protect our country. The awful destruction of the hydrogen bomb, plus virus warfare are capable of completely destroying civilization. It is my sincere hope that the leaders of the world may find it possible to sit down around a conference table and outlaw these weapons of mass destruction.

Eleven years ago, before this last World War became a reality, in my acceptance address as your president, I said that war then seemed imminent and that physicians must hold themselves in readiness to answer the call to our colors. War did come and I am proud that my profession turned in such a brilliant record in this great conflict.

Some dastardly act by the iron-curtain countries could precipitate another conflict at any time. The medical profession, I am sure, will not be found wanting.

I must also remind you that America has grown great because, fundamentally, we are a Christian Nation—a praying people. Our country has more than 266,000 churches, cathedrals, and synagogues, with more than 70,000,000 members. This brings a strength to a nation that cannot be measured in terms of dollars or material wealth. A Christian nation is a powerful nation.

We also have the know-how of production. Our scientific attainments stand out as a bright, shining beacon, pointing always to progress.

I would remind you that these great developments have been possible because free people, with free minds, have been able to work under our enterprise system. Adopt all the socialistic schemes that are presently on the trestle board of government and you will find that free enterprise—the will of free people to do things for themselves—will be greatly restricted or destroyed.

The medical profession has made more progress in the last two decades than it has made in the previous two centuries. Disease is being conquered. Research is probing the unknown—asking questions and finding answers. Life is being prolonged. Your profession is a part of this great human drama, marching down the road of progress. If we all work together—the citizen and the Government—we can build, not only here at home, but in the rest of the world, a new society which our children will enjoy and cherish because we of this generation have given our best.

Decisions on Southeast Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 15, 1950

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of May 15, 1950, entitled "Decisions on Southeast Asia":

DECISIONS ON SOUTHEAST ASIA

The communiqué of the Foreign Ministers of Great Britain, France, and the United States, issued at the conclusion of their conference on Saturday night, is necessarily general in its terms. In respect to the critical area of southeast Asia, whose problems were explored, there is no detailed plan of action given. Possibly that is because of the generality of the declaration and possibly also because there has not yet been formulated one single unified plan to be implemented. Concrete actions, such as the proposed United States aid for Indochina and Thailand and British reinforcement in Malaya, are still not welded together.

For that reason the communiqué will be explored for every sign of agreement in policy, since it is upon the basis of such an agreement that a workable single program can be evolved. According to the communiqué, there was a substantial area of agreement and several specific decisions were reached. They represent a major step forward in dealing with the area:

1. The three western powers agree to encourage and support the newly independent states in the region in their defense against the threat of Communist expansion. This obviously refers to Burma, Indonesia, and the Philippines and certainly in the French view would extend also to the Bao Dai government in Indochina and the new States of Laos and Cambodia. The promise of United States assistance seems to indicate that this country concurs in the French view.

2. The western powers are agreed upon the desirability of regional collaboration to develop the area and to raise standards of living. All governments in the area should work toward that end, it was stated, and

that presumably includes those not fully independent, such as Malaya and Indochina.

3. There was an interchange of information on steps being taken in the discharge of responsibilities. Such an interchange, if continued, can be of the utmost importance and without it adequate planning is impossible.

4. It was decided to coordinate efforts to prevent gun running into the area. An obviously sensible agreement.

5. It was agreed to intensify propaganda efforts directed against Communist imperialism and its false use of genuine nationalist feeling. There is a lot of catching up to be done on this score and some of the informational activity might well be exerted in the western powers themselves as well as in southeast Asia.

These areas of agreement and these decisions do not in themselves constitute a sufficient basis for a vigorous policy of the containment of aggressive communism, nor do they, as they stand, make a solid commitment to defend the area. They do, however, recognize the danger that exists and take some of the steps toward meeting it. They are positive, and not negative, in their character. Upon them much can be built, but there is much building to do and still further foundations to be laid for it.

The Biggest Family Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 9, 1950

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert herewith an editorial in the New York Herald Tribune of Saturday, May 6, 1950, entitled "The Biggest Family Party." There were 3,015 in attendance at the dinner held by the New York State Republican Committee which was the second largest dinner ever held at the Waldorf, and the largest political dinner held in the State of New York. It represents a resurgence of the Republican Party in New York.

My colleague, Chairman PFEIFFER, and Vice Chairman Jane Todd did a magnificent job in taking care of the enormous outpouring of Republicans. The large ballroom and the two mezzanine floors as well as three large dinner rooms were all occupied. The dinner was followed by an address by Governor Thomas E. Dewey whose speech on that occasion, inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Senator IVES on Monday, May 8, 1950, capped the climax:

The editorial is as follows:

THE BIGGEST FAMILY PARTY

A remarkable air not only of enthusiasm but of confidence infused the State Republicans as they sat down on Thursday to the biggest family dinner ever held by any political party in our State. Here were the accents of vigor, youth, imagination and, above all, of solid accomplishment. The Governor gave it to them hot. But it was not so much the characteristic sizzling sarcasm which he flung at the Democrats that awoke the response, as the long catalog of concrete achievements—housing, highways, hospitals, disability benefits, educational aids, job opportunity, all provided on a balanced budget with tax rates still held within reasonable limits. This is efficient government in action—efficient government, under an intelligent guiding head, dealing, without too much worry over theory, with the concrete problems of a community as they arise.

None of the biting jibes which Mr. Dewey tossed at the opposition was as effective as the simple and patent contrast between the way things are done in Albany and the way they are done—or too often not done—at the city hall. At Albany for some years we have seen clear and concrete policies pursued with energy and clarity of purpose to definite ends; we have seen at city hall a welter of conflicting political calculation, policies pursued by fits, starts, back-trackings and sudden inspiration, with results that have been sometimes good and sometimes lamentable. New Yorkers, who are dues-paying members of both institutions, can take their choice between the two methods of government. But the Republicans of this State have a record of effective service behind them which entitles them to all the confidence with which they face both the future and their fellow citizens.

So much for the problems of New York. Those of the Nation always loom behind every political development in the most populous and influential State. But the Republican role in the larger stage is bound to turn, in the end, upon the success with which the party demonstrates its competence in those areas where it is in control. Governor Dewey has devoted himself to showing that within the framework of its principles the party can, where it is in power, render efficient service to all the people and provide more of genuine welfare than is actually supplied by the doctrinaire and now rather tired disciples of the welfare state. And it is deeds which count.

Opposition to ITO Piles Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 15, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, opposition to the charter for an International Trade Organization is increasing. The bill now before the Foreign Affairs Committee should be killed in committee. I include as part of my remarks an editorial that appeared in the Washington Post today:

THOSE "YES, BUT BOYS"

The executive committee of the United States council of the International Chamber of Commerce has added its name to the lengthening list of opponents of ratification of the ITO Charter. Consequently it is now numbered among those "yes, but boys" whom President Truman denounces as economic isolationists. ECA Administrator Hoffman is one of the group's most prominent trustees, and he will, no doubt, be surprised to hear that he is allied with a short-sighted, selfish group that would cut down international trade, force down living standards of other free peoples and ours, too, and let the Communists take over. Perhaps Mr. Truman will be surprised, too, to hear that Mr. Hoffman is a very lukewarm supporter of the charter. Although he dissented from the executive committee position, Mr. Hoffman admitted that he was concerned about various provisions of the charter and realized that there were "very valid objections" to it.

As the council committee points out, many political changes have occurred affecting countries that participated in the drafting of the charter, making it obsolete and unsatisfactory as the basis for an international trade organization. It considers the charter dangerous, because it gives priority to centralized governmental planning of foreign trade, leaves the way open for discriminatory trade practices, and in effect commits all ITO members to state planning for full employment. Another strong argument advanced against ratification is that under the terms of the charter, other nations may discriminate against this country while it is extending most favored nation treatment to all ITO members. Adherence to the provisions of the charter would also make it impossible for the United States to follow independent policies to encourage multilateral trading.

We agree with the council's view that the ITO charter does not meet the needs of the present or the immediate future. Furthermore, the hands of the administration are full trying to create conditions at home favorable to trade expansion and to encourage other countries to abandon restrictive trade policies. Until more progress has been made in eliminating import controls and obstructive exchange regulations, an international trade organization would be comparatively impotent. The chances for establishment of a strong and permanent organization of this kind will be much better if we delay action until the world's trading nations are economically stronger and politically more secure.

As an alternative to ratification of the charter, the council members suggest that the United States take the initiative in establishing a commission on commercial policy under the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations that would be a meeting place for debating important issues "without incurring the liability of the existing charter." It is a proposal well worth consideration.

No Room for Compromise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 15, 1950

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of May 11, 1950:

NO ROOM FOR COMPROMISE

Ever since the First World War the Nation's railroads have been fighting with their backs to the wall against the rising tide of competition from newer types of transportation—the passenger car, the motortruck, the airplane, and the pipelines. This has placed a high premium on the achievement of increased operating efficiency. In recent years the carriers have found that one of the most effective instruments for this purpose was the introduction of Diesel-electric locomotives. Indeed, in the case of a good many roads, the shift to Diesels has just about meant the difference between earning a slight profit and operating in the red.

Since the movement toward Dieselization became general, however, two railroad brotherhoods—the firemen and the engineers—whose jurisdictional rivalry is only slightly less intense than that of a blood feud, have vied with each other to hijack the railroads, as it were, and appropriate for themselves

the economic benefits represented by this costly investment program. When Diesel power was first introduced on the Burlington system in 1934 the locomotives were successfully and safely operated with one man in the cab, an engineer. Shortly thereafter, however, the Burlington was compelled under threat of a strike to add a fireman to its crew. And now for nearly a decade the two unions have been trying to push still further this "packing" of the engine crews, the one demanding a second engineer, the other insisting on an additional fireman.

In 1943 a Presidential fact-finding board found that there was no justification whatsoever for adding either more engineers or more firemen. In other words, the demands were rejected as being purely featherbedding, or make-work proposals. Although nothing had changed in the meanwhile to alter the situation, the firemen renewed their demand in 1947. After negotiation and mediation had failed President Truman named another fact-finding board. Like its predecessor, this board, in a ruling handed down last September, declared that the union suggestion was devoid of merit. Although a Presidential fact-finding board is the court of last resort under the Railway Labor Act, the firemen's union appealed over the board's head to the White House, accompanying the appeal with threats of a strike in defiance of the labor act and the judicial opinion of the President's own appointive board. Yesterday the firemen put those threats into action. Their chieftain, David B. Robertson, pulled 18,000 members of the brotherhood off four of the Nation's key railroad systems in a strike which can only be described as a calculated outrage against the railroads, the Government and the American public.

Although the number of railway firemen affected in this walkout is comparatively small, it is regarded as only a question of time before the strike produces a national emergency, crippling production in all parts of the Nation. This is a walkout which was coldly embarked upon, not in an effort to remedy some injustice, real or otherwise, but to impose by economic terrorism a demand which had been twice adjudicated by the highest railway labor tribunal in the Nation and twice found to be completely without justification. It is a strike to test whether the interest of the community is, or is not, paramount to that of any labor group which happens to find itself in a position to exploit the public to further its ends, however demonstrably unworthy and objectionable these may be. And it should not be necessary to say that in such a test there can be no room for compromise.

An Urgent Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 15, 1950

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under the permission heretofore granted me by unanimous consent of the House I include with these remarks a splendid editorial which appeared in the Il Progresso Italo-Americano on May 10, 1950.

This editorial commends the distinguished and able gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], chairman of the Immigration Subcommittee of the House Committee on Judiciary. I join in expressing commendation of the splendid work of our colleague from Pennsylvania as chairman of this important subcommittee.

It is highly important that our present Immigration Act should immediately be amended so as to provide that the parents of children now residing in the United States be accorded the same preferential status for entry to this country that children living overseas now have. Such parents should be entitled to enter the United States as non-quota immigrants.

I venture to say that the chairman of the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives, the dean of our delegation in the House, my friend and colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], would favorably act upon such a suggested amendment to the immigration laws.

I wish also to commend the president and editor of the Il Progresso Italo-Americano, Mr. Generoso Pope, Jr., for his splendid editorial which reads as follows:

AN URGENT AMENDMENT

For some time we have been urging that our Government take the necessary legislative steps to permit the entry into our country of a number of immigrants equivalent to the quotas unused during the war. We always felt and continue to feel today that in advocating this measure we are asking for nothing more than simple justice and a warm human approach in the execution of our law as it is on the statute books today. In short, we have not been pleading for a fundamental revision but for a fundamental humanization of our execution of the existing law.

Here we hasten to add that the response in Congress to our proposals has been rather receptive. We did not look forward to unanimous acceptance. Of course, we did not expect to arouse the narrow-minded or bigoted. We realize that there are still some Members of Congress whose social-economic vision is yet to grow out of and beyond the pale of their own district. We understand that it takes time to grow out of the narrow limitations of local community politics, narrow neighborhood interests and approach. But, fortunately for Congress and the American people, there is still hope for an equitable and practicable decision to be made on the not distant future in regard to our appeal. In its handling of the entire question of immigration, the House of Representatives is to be commended and congratulated on having as the chairman of its special subcommittee the capable, earnest, and far-sighted legislator from Pennsylvania, Congressman FRANCIS E. WALTER.

IN THE RIGHT DIRECTION

Though we are hopeful for the future and will continue to work untiringly for the admission into our country of a number of immigrants equivalent to the number in the immigration quota unused during wartime, yet we realize that there are certain lesser phases of the entire present immigration law which need speedy attention and basic revision. We approach all such phases in the same spirit as we approach the major issue of using up the unused immigration quotas. We cannot repeat too often that it is our firm belief that America's best interests and ideals would be most served vis-à-vis Europe if we were to use up the unused quotas.

In the same sense and spirit do we now propose for immediate enactment the following provision as an amendment to our present Immigration Act: The parents of children now residing in the United States should be accorded the same preferential status for entry to our shores that children living overseas now have. These parents are to come to the United States as nonquota immigrants. Of course, as with children coming from overseas, those bringing their parents will have to assume full responsibility for their support so that they will not become a public charge.

Arithmetically speaking, the number of parents who would thus be enabled to come to the United States on the basis of the above amendment to our present Immigration Act may not be large. But the entire question is far more than a problem of numbers. It is much more than a question of arithmetic which confronts us here. It is a human issue that we face. We must meet it in a humanitarian manner. No matter how comparatively few may be the number thus admitted, or how little the misery thus eliminated, our country's demonstration of generosity of spirit and humanitarianism in action can only aid greatly the enhancement of America's moral prestige abroad.

WILL HELP AMERICA

Moreover, such an amendment to the present Immigration Act will also have a wholesome effect on the morale of our citizenry directly involved in and affected by the bringing in of their parents now abroad. There can never be too many humane ways in which the Government can and should lift the morale of our own people. A little consideration by our Government for even a limited number of its citizenry will go a long way toward raising the contentment of all the people in our land.

We sincerely urge every Member of Congress to heed our appeal. We urgently plead with Congressman WALTER to lose no time in introducing a bill which will amend the Immigration Act to provide for parents the same preferential status as nonquota immigrants that children now have. This amendment is to operate in all other respects in the same manner as the present provision covering children does.

We cannot emphasize too strongly that prompt favorable action on our proposal will serve as a timely, positive factor for improving the attitude and deepening the friendship of many peoples in Europe for our country and our Government. In this critical hour when our Nation is battling against the poisonous propaganda of barbarous and despotic communism, the enactment of such legislation will not only increase the number of our friends and augment the already existing friendship for America but will at the same time also strike a hard and telling blow at the Communist slanderers of the American people.

Supreme Court of Great State of California Has One Hundredth Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 20, 1950

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court of my native State of California had its one-hundredth birthday this March 1950.

So many Members of this great Congress are members of the bar of their respective States, I know they will be interested in this fact.

It is undoubtedly a fact that members of the bar who actively practice before our highest courts learn to cherish and

respect the great learning—and also the common sense—of our highest jurists.

Being myself a member of the California State Bar, I am pleased to call to your attention a most interesting article about the California Supreme Court and its first three chief justices, which was printed in the California Centennials, the official news letter of the California Centennial Commission. History records California as the thirty-fifth State and that President Fillmore did, on September 9, 1850, sign the measure admitting this sturdy infant to the Union. However, not until a month later, when the steamship *Oregon* docked in San Francisco, did the Californians know that they had been in the United States of America for a month previous.

How long will it take the residents of Alaska and Hawaii to know the news if they are admitted to Statehood?

The article is as follows:

CALIFORNIA'S SUPREME COURT IS 100 YEARS OLD MARCH 1950

A lawyer, citing authorities, would refer to it as *Smith et al.* v. *People* (1 Cal. 1).

However, no new or hitherto undefined principle of law was established in this case, so it is referred to infrequently, if at all. Actually, only the historian is even mildly interested in this, the first decision of the first Supreme Court of California. For the law set forth concerned a right that goes back to Magna Carta—the right of habeas corpus.

Even so, that right was applied somewhat in reverse. Appellants Smith, et al., were not exactly injured parties. They had engaged in a bit of Indian slaying and tepee burning in the Nappa Valley. But, circumstances being as they were, the sheriff of the district of Sonoma was directed by the Supreme Court of California to admit the defendants to bail, due to the fact that there is no jail or prison in which the prisoners can be kept with security.

The Supreme Court of California, together with nine district courts of first instance, was provided for in the constitutional convention at Monterey in the autumn of 1849.

The three justices of the first supreme court were named by the first legislature, meeting in San Jose December 15, 1849.

By March of 1850 the supreme court was holding its first session in San Francisco—and *Smith et al.* v. *People* was the first case heard and ruled upon.

S. Clinton Hastings was the first chief justice; Henry A. Lyons and Nathaniel Bennett, the first associate justices.

In his preface to volume 1 of the California Reports, Mr. Justice Bennett points out the handicaps under which the first justices of the supreme court labored in their efforts to establish a sound basis for legal precedent in California. Say Justice Bennett:

"All the other State of our confederacy had, previously to their admission into the Union, an established government, on which their State organizations were based. The people of California, however, were driven by extreme necessity, growing out of the political and legal chaos in which they found themselves, to the formation of a State government. A large amount of labor, consequent upon the unorganized state of society, was necessarily imposed upon the tribunal of last resort—the labor of searching for authorities in an unfamiliar language, and an unfamiliar system of jurisprudence; of ascertaining the law as laid down in the codes of Spain, in the royal and vice royal ordinances and decrees, in the laws of the imperial congress of Mexico, in the acts of the republican Congress, in Presidential regulations, in decress of dictators, and acts of proconsular governors.

"Many ordinances and decrees, claimed to have the force of law, had not been printed even in Mexico; and they, as well as all other books upon Spanish and Mexican laws, could be procured only with great difficulty and at great expense, and, indeed, at first they could not be procured at all. In addition to these causes of embarrassment, great doubts were entertained as to the force, as a rule of decision, which the laws of Spain and of Mexico, never but partially enforced in the remote province of California, should have, after the acquisition of the country by the Americans, in the construction of contracts made between American citizens who had settled in California in such numbers as greatly to exceed the native population."

Mr. Justice Bennett's labors did not cease with this task of running down the authorities. During his term on the supreme bench he was high man in production of opinions, turning out almost twice as many as the other two justices combined.

Serranus Clinton Hastings was born in Jefferson County, N. Y., November 21, 1814. He was admitted to the bar in Terre Haute, Ind., in 1836, removing immediately to Muscatine, Iowa, then a part of the Territory of Wisconsin. He was one of the two first Members of Congress from Iowa and served a year as chief justice of that State.

He came overland to California, arriving in August 1849. He served as chairman of a mass meeting in Sacramento to consider a State constitution in 1849, was elected almost unanimously by the first legislature to serve as chief justice. At the close of that term he was elected attorney general of California.

In 1878 Hastings gave $100,000 to establish Hastings College of Law as part of the University of California, and became first dean of the college. He died a millionaire in San Francisco, September 18, 1893.

Henry Augustus Lyons was born in Philadelphia in 1810. He came to California by way of the Isthmus of Panama in 1849, settling in or near Sonora. An unsuccessful candidate for State Senator from the San Joaquin district, he was elected by the legislature to the post of justice of the supreme court. He wrote only a few opinions during his term of office. It was said that he spent most of his time furthering private business interests.

Nathaniel Bennett was regarded by the legal profession as the strong man of the court. Born in Clinton, N. Y., June 27, 1815, he was first admitted to the bar in Ohio and later in New York. He came to California around the Horn, arriving in San Francisco in June of 1849.

He mined in Tuolumne for some months, with fair success, then was persuaded by a friend to join him in the practice of law in San Francisco.

Elected to the first legislature, he served on the judiciary committee, resigning when elected to the supreme court. He worked closely with the legislature the winter of 1849–50 for the adoption of the common law as the basis of California jurisprudence.

Justice Bennett died in San Francisco on April 20, 1886.

Truman and the Hoover Proposals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD H. VELDE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 15, 1950

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Peoria Journal of Saturday, May 13, 1950:

TRUMAN AND THE HOOVER PROPOSALS

President Truman has made a great show of endeavoring to reorganize the executive departments of the Government to promote greater efficiency and economy along the lines suggested by the Hoover Commission.

The truth of the matter is, however, that a considerable number of the reorganization proposals made by Mr. Truman ignore, rather than follow, the recommendations presented by the Hoover Commission.

A case in point is the plan submitted to Congress by the President this week for reorganization of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and assignment of some of its duties to the Commerce Department.

The Hoover Commission had made a recommendation for a change in status of the RFC but proposed its taking over by the Treasury instead of by Commerce. President Truman, for reasons not yet made clear, prefers that Commerce assume the lending duties of the Corporation which has served its purpose and is now apparently to be disbanded.

A similar case was the President's unsuccessful effort to abolish the office of general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board and to divide its present powers between the Board as a whole and its Chairman.

He included that recommendation among 20 others, many of which followed Hoover Commission proposals, which he submitted to Congress on March 13. The NLRB matter was inserted almost in the middle of the 21 recommendations as No. 12 and the general impression was given out that it was in line with the Hoover Commission's findings.

Such was not the case. The Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report refused to take any stand on plan 12 on the ground that it raised a question of national policy as well as one of organization. Mr. Hoover reported that the specific problem of the NLRB general counsel was not even discussed by his Commission.

Plan 12, of course, was an attack on the Taft-Harley Act. Balked in his efforts to bring about repeal of that piece of legislation, Mr. Truman sought to emasculate it by abolishing the office of general counsel which has been the sole agency to insist upon application of many of the principles of the Taft-Hartley law. The President tried to achieve his goal by including the NLRB proposal in a bunch of executive office reorganization plans that had been suggested by the Hoover Commission.

The Commission headed by former President Hoover embodied some of the best brains in the Nation, including some of the men upon whom Mr. Truman himself relies for advice and counsel. If their advice is not to be followed there was little reason for the Commission to be created.

Hon. Fred L. Crawford, of Michigan, Praised by Michigan Papers for Halting Spendthrift Arizona Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 15, 1950

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Speaker, the recent action of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] in the Public Lands Committee, which

put the brakes on the Nation's most expensive and infeasible project in central Arizona, was greeted with loud and deserved praise in the Booth newspapers of Michigan. The article appearing on April 28, 1950, in the Grand Rapids Press is as follows:

CRAWFORD'S COMMITTEE ACTION PUTS HALT TO WATER PROJECT

(By William F. Pyper)

WASHINGTON.—An example of what seniority and parliamentary know-how can do in the House of Representatives Friday had far westerners groggy.

Representative CRAWFORD, of Michigan, No. 1 Republican on the House Public Lands Committee, showed Californians and Arizonians how it is done. The result is the central Arizona project, calling for billions in taxpayers' money and for diversion of Colorado River water which had been earmarked for California, has been shelved, at least temporarily.

Californians on the committee who had been hoping for such an action with some misgivings jubilantly credited CRAWFORD with having killed the bill for this session. The next show-down, however, comes June 15.

Passed by the Senate, the central Arizona bill has been before the Public Lands Committee for more than a year. Its chief sponsor is Representative MURDOCK, Democrat, of Arizona, No. 2 Democrat on the committee.

The issue is of vast importance to the Southwest. Southern California years ago entered into an agreement by which the supply from the Colorado River was earmarked. Arizona refused to participate, but within the last few years has developed its project to divert some of the water. It would mean growing communities in California would be without sufficient water and that vast developed irrigation areas would dry up.

CRAWFORD had been expected to oppose the Arizona proposal, but his postponement resolution came as a surprise. It passed, 13 to 10.

What he proposed was that a list of statistical questions be submitted to the Director of the Budget. Pending reply, action is deferred to June 15. The questions are technical, and there remains some doubt the Budget Bureau can come up with the answers in 45 days. But every question is one which taxpayers in Michigan should like to have answered before contributing to the project.

The surprise move evidently hit the committee between the eyes. California supporters grasped it as the delaying action they needed. Arizona backers could hardly fight a move to get the facts.

"The truth of the matter is that we lack the facts," Representative CRAWFORD explained later. "Here is a highly controversial subject and the proponents haven't made their case. Representative MURDOCK couldn't have had his bill reported under the circumstances, and if it had reached the floor, it couldn't have passed.

"While the California people are hailing this action as a victory, I think I convinced MURDOCK and his supporters my resolution gives their bill its only chance."

An Indefensible Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 15, 1950

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of May 11, 1950:

AN INDEFENSIBLE STRIKE

The strike on five great railway lines comes at the end of a 2-week special truce and after exhaustion of all the processes of delay and mediation provided by the Railway Labor Act. It is not surprising, considering the position of the railway union, that negotiations have thus far been futile. For the union is concerned, not with hours, not with wages or working conditions, but with a simple measure of featherbedding. Twice impartial fact-finding boards have denied the need for a second fireman on Diesel locomotives; but the union continues unremittingly to demand this unnecessary and wasteful addition to the crew. What neither safety nor convenience requires, and what sound operating procedure emphatically rejects, the union insists upon, even at the cost of disrupting a large part of the economy of the Nation.

The conversion to Diesel locomotives has been one of the most hopeful signs in American railroading. The pressing need of improving service and lowering fares and freight rates, to meet competition from other forms of transportation, has found the promise of a real answer in the development of the Diesel engine. Private capital has supplied the necessary investment; the Government has encouraged the conversion. It would be an economic tragedy if the gains thus envisaged were to be cast away by union short-sightedness. Technological unemployment is resisted by labor with an ardor for which the public may frequently have sympathy; but where this resistance takes the form of featherbedding as crude as in the present instance, and where the gains of technological progress are so direct for industry—and in the comparatively short run for labor also—mere obstruction can seem a fatal policy. It is especially so in an area of labor where responsible unionism has long been the tradition, and where a widespread stoppage places such burdens on the public.

The present strike is indefensible. If the union has got itself into a position where negotiation is no longer fruitful, and where only retreat is possible, then for its own sake it will have to retreat.

Editor Has Indigestion—Hope It Is Contagious, by November Becomes Epidemic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 5, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, long, long ago, some here in Washington—it was my privilege to be one of the number—could not stomach New Deal political maneuvering which in those days, according to Democratic committees, used money appropriated for the relief of the unfortunate, to purchase political support.

Unfortunately, when we protested vigorously and continuously, all we got was a handful of mud from New Deal and pink publications and commentators.

But the tide has turned and some courageous editors are not only seeing clearly but writing frankly. An example is an editorial from the Detroit Free Press of May 9, which reads as follows:

OMITTED FROM THE "NONPOLITICAL" TOUR—MR. TRUMAN STEERS CLEAR OF THE MISSOURI "HEAT"

The leader of the Democratic Party is now making a nonpolitical tour of 16 States in an effort to elect a Fair Deal Congress in November.

Accompanying him are 60 or more persons. The cost of this 9-day political junket should be borne by the Democratic National Committee.

But Truman, with studied dishonesty and deliberate untruth, has sworn that his trip is nonpolitical.

Therefore, by this cheap trick he makes the taxpayers finance his circus.

Starting with a bald falsehood, can what he says be considered truthful? It is written in the ancient common law, "Falsus in uno, falsus in omnibus," which still stands in the law books of the United States: False in one thing, false in all.

Among the 32 States which Mr. Truman will not visit is Missouri.

The reason why he will not visit it has been in the news for weeks.

The ghosts of Charles Binaggio and Charles Gargotta might rise from their graves in Kansas City and ask why the President of the United States and the leader of the Democratic Party has not permitted the FBI to clear up the stinking mess that led to their political murder.

Gargotta and Binaggio, two criminal-political racketeers, were shot to death in the First District Democratic Club in Kansas City on April 5, 1950.

They had tangled with the Pendergast mob of which Mr. Truman is proud to be a dues-paying member.

The St. Louis Post-Dispatch points out neither President Truman nor his Attorney General has ordered a Federal investigation of the Binaggio-Gargotta murders.

The Justice Department said, at first, that a Federal grand jury had no jurisdiction.

Yet a Federal grand jury had subpenaed both men and intended to indict them.

The Post-Dispatch, a democratic newspaper, continues its editorial indictment:

"Now the Department refuses to order an FBI inquiry, for lack of concrete evidence that the killings were connected with the testimony of the murdered men. Does the Department expect the killers to step forth uninvited, or does it intend to excuse itself for lack of evidence which it will not even permit the FBI to look for?

"Federal justice was obstructed. Federal witnesses were shot down. Will the Truman administration let the underworld get away with bloody defiance of the Government?"

The Truman administration, with its alliance with notorious criminals, has made possible the escape of the gangsters who blasted the county vaults to steal and destroy the evidence of vote frauds perpetrated to defeat Congressman Slaughter, whose purge had been personally ordered by Mr. Truman.

That theft of evidence occurred on the night of May 27–28, 1947. The statute of limitations will make prosecution on the charges involved impossible after the night of May 27–28, 1950.

The Truman administration has had 3 years lacking a few days to clear up this case and bring the criminals to justice.

Just 18 more days for the gangsters to go free on a technicality.

Yet it has done nothing and will do nothing while there is still time.

Whether that administration will do anything to discover and punish the Binaggio-Gargotta killers is in the light of this record a purely rhetorical question.

The answer is: It won't.

It doesn't dare.

Any doubt on this score is resolved by the way the administration has rigged the Senate investigation of crime syndicates and their political contacts.

A real investigation of this underworld network by the Senate Judiciary Committee was proposed by Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, an earnest young Tennessee Democrat who takes his responsibilities seriously.

The administration was thrown into consternation by this nonpolitical suggestion. Senators FERGUSON, of Michigan, and DONNELL, of Missouri, two Republicans skilled in just such prying into the underworld of crime and politics, are members of the Judiciary Committee. They might ask questions. They might insist upon scraping the bottom of the cesspool for evidence.

Administration leaders avoided any such unpleasant possibilities by proposing a special, five-man committee to be named by Vice President BARKLEY for the sole purpose of keeping FERGUSON and DONNELL out of the inquiry. This ruse won only by the vote BARKLEY cast to break a tie.

Senator KEFAUVER will be chairman. The two Republicans will be the innocuous WILEY from Wisconsin and TOBEY from New Hampshire. The Democrats are O'CONOR from Maryland and HUNT from Wyoming who are expected to do as they are told.

The real investigation of the rising reign of criminal terror in the United States has been succesfully blocked.

What else can be expected, when the head of that administration has prevented the 1946 vote frauds in Kansas City from being cleared up in 3 years?

When he declares, with a poker face, that his current vote-seeking jaunt is nonpolitical in order to defraud the taxpayers of its cost?

At Lincoln, Nebr., yesterday, Mr. Truman opened his very first nonpolitical speech with the cliché that "if we are to win through to peace, we must maintain a healthy and strong economy."

A healthy and strong economy cannot be maintained on a foundation of moral rottenness.

Yes, there's an excellent and obvious reason why Harry S. Truman is not revisiting Missouri at this time.

Three paragraphs from Iffy, the Dopester, in the same paper, comment in this way:

A Republican has been elected to Congress from Texas so I guess it is all right to believe in them flying saucers and other strange things that are being reported.

When Harold Stassen said that Harry Truman was the worst President we ever had he must have meant the only one in our history who has deliberately protected well-known criminals. That makes him unique.

Kansas City is getting ready to celebrate its centennial. Will all visitors be asked to check their sawed-off shotguns?

Personally, I have some ideas about the way Mr. Truman's outfit has protected some racketeering labor leaders and gangsters, for I recall very distinctly the hearings I held in connection with the release of the notorious Capone parolees, who, through extortion, took something around a million dollars from the rank and file of a union.

Some of those gangster parolees are still at liberty, through the grace of Mr. Truman's administration.

Perhaps the gentleman who wrote the foregoing editorials will some day get around to support those who desire legislation—and its enforcement—which will protect not only the public but the rank and file of labor unions.

While there is life, there is always hope.

California: A State Full of Younger Folks, Too—Oldsters Percentage Decreasing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 27, 1950

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, here is a factual statement from the Long Beach Press-Telegram newspaper of recent date which will bring you and my colleagues in this House of Representatives the down-to-date fact, which is, that my native State of California is being occupied by a healthy, vigorous, youthful population—from other States, too.

But, then figures speak for themselves.

CALIFORNIANS YOUNGER

Although commonly believed, the notion that California is a State filled with old people is highly inaccurate, according to figures just released by the Social Security Board. And it is more inaccurate now than it was in 1940.

Most of the States showed a gain in the proportion of their population over age 65 during that 8-year period. California registered a decrease, so it now ranks twenty-second among all the States in that comparison. In 1940 it was eleventh.

The explanation is not that California is failing to attract oldsters. It is that the vast numbers of newcomers during the war and postwar years were workers. They made possible the industrialization of the metropolitan centers. Their decision to stay here after the war made California one of only five States to show a proportionate decrease in the elderly group.

Disregarding the percentages, however, California is still well favored by those who have reached the age of retirement. In 1940 it had 558,755 persons in that category. At the end of 1948 the number was 790,239. The California total, again irrespective of percentages, is topped only by New York, with 1,173,534, and Pennsylvania's 813,718.

In 1900 only 4.1 percent of the Nation's population was 65 or older. In 1940 the proportion had risen to 6.8 percent, and in 1948 to 7.5 percent. This remarkable gain in the number and percentage of elderly people in the last half century may be attributed to advances in medical science and, generally, to higher standards of living.

It has also introduced new problems of economics. The latest survey by the Social Security Board showed that 39 percent of this age group depended on public and private assistance, 34 percent worked or had a business, 18 percent depended on pensions, and 9 percent got along on income from investments.

Theories of the Amerasia Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD H. VELDE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 15, 1950

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Peoria Star, Wednesday, May 10, 1950:

THEORIES OF THE AMERASIA CASE

Events in Washington, day by day, indicate that the secrecy of the Amerasia case is going to be broken. We are not relying entirely upon Senator TYDING'S promise that his subcommittee would investigate the mystery. The interest in this 5-year-old State Department secret has grown to such an extent that the public will not be denied some kind of satisfactory explanation.

The gossip about the Amerasia mystery has reached the point where people are speculating on why the State Department hushed the scandal back in 1945.

Joseph C. Harsch, chief of the Christian Science Monitor's Washington news bureau, published three interesting theories recently.

The scandal may have been soft-pedaled, he says, to keep the Russians from learning at the time that their spy ring had been broken and its members were known to our intelligence agents.

Another theory is that it may have been considered impolitic in 1945 to have a Russian spy story breaking in Washington when official relations with the Soviet Union were friendly.

"Also," adds Mr. Harsch, "it might have been something more sinister."

His readers are permitted to guess what he means by "something more sinister." Were the employees of the United States Government who were arrested in the Amerasia case protected by Communists in high positions in the Government? Or did the Administration fear the political consequences of their exposure? Either explanation could come under the classification of "something more sinister."

The first theory would not explain the Adminstration's present reluctance to explain the mystery. The Communists have had several American spy nets broken. Why not one more?

Neither does the second theory explain why a congressional investigation is now necessary to dig out the facts. Revelation of all the facts in the Amerasia case would not make the Soviet Union more hostile than it now is.

It seems, by the process of elimination that the "something more sinister" theory is the most plausible of the three advanced by Mr. Harsch.

We have long believed that the key to much of the mystery of Communist operations within the Government in Washington is the Amerasia case. And we think it should be fully explained, no matter what the consequences may be.

Security First, Economy Second—Secretary of Defense Louis A. Johnson Makes Supplementary Report on Defense Spending: "We Must Be Strong Enough to Deter Attack, Capable Enough to Defend Ourselves Against Attack, and Powerful Enough Ultimately to Defeat (Any) Aggressor"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DWIGHT L. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 15, 1950

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, there is no greater need in the United States today than economy in the operations of the Federal Government; and

nowhere in the Government is true economy more necessary than in the Military Establishment.

Money spent on defense brings us no return except in security, and tax dollars appropriated for defense must be so spent in a way that can be justified to the American taxpayer. The maximum defense must be bought with every dollar spent. Defense is a business which must be operated with sound business methods.

A few weeks ago the Secretary of Defense published a report on 6 months of operations in 1949—specifically, the first half of fiscal year 1950 now drawing to a close. Only this week he has made a supplementary report in the form of an address before the 1950 convention of Kiwanis International at Miami, Fla. In view of the appropriations now under consideration by Congress, and matters of the gravest import with which we are faced on the international scene, Secretary Johnson's report is timely, informative, and encouraging.

In the first year of Mr. Johnson's tenure of office as Secretary of Defense he made notable strides in making unification, which was the intent of the National Security Act of 1947, a living thing. Often, in achieving unification, his more apparent success was in eliminating duplication. But all along, by taking corrective actions to eliminate rivalries, waste, and inefficiency, as well, in each of the three services he was achieving real unification of effort, effectiveness of operations, and true economy of result. He states of the three services:

> Now I can say without any reservation that with their loyal support tremendous progress has been made. Unification has become a fact. The combat efficiency of all of our forces has been increased. Hundreds of millions of dollars already have been saved. We are a team and we are working together to achieve our common objective of peace through strength.

Secretary Johnson, however, is not a man to rest on past achievements; nor can any of us, in these critical times, feel that any job has been completed until peace has been made more secure. Secretary Johnson continues:

> I am taking this occasion * * * to inform the American people and to serve public notice on the services themselves, that the achievements of the past are but a stimulus for more intense action, and that we will not be satisfied until we can stand up before the American people, the stockholders of our national defense enterprise, and say to them without any equivocation: "You are now getting the fullest possible defense out of every defense dollar you have entrusted to us."

Henceforth, therefore, we can expect even greater economy from Mr. Johnson's administration of the Department of Defense, because even greater economy is his announced goal. The emphasis will not be on the elimination of inefficiency so much as on more productive use of the defense dollar. By improved management techniques, money saved from administration will be applied to operations. In his address to the Kiwanis convention, Secretary Johnson cited among other examples the effect of one economy alone. By combining the service print shops of the three armed services, and placing that one print shop on a business basis, $118,000 has already been saved, and that $118,000 will buy the gasoline and oil for more than 1,300 flying hours of flying by a B–29 superfortress, the type of plane that dropped the atomic bombs on Japan.

Perhaps the achievements of the Military Air Transport Service, especially in conducting the Berlin airlift, are best known of all the examples of unification in the Department of Defense. But even in this organization new economies can be effected, and nonessential facilities, routes, and flights are already being eliminated. Economy and experience will add greatly to the effectiveness of this aspect of combined military defense operations. Savings in fuel, parts, supplies, and personnel for this year are reported to be in excess of $6,000,000; but more important is the fact that the reorganization of MATS will increase current readiness for D-day, if D-day should come.

Secretary Johnson reports that from savings made out of fat and not out of muscle, we have been able to allocate to the Department of the Army an additional $24,000,000 for research and development of special weapons, without adding a dollar to the budget; Marine air combat squadrons have been raised from 12 to 16; combat strength of the Army has been increased by 4,400; and an aircraft carrier and other vessels have been added to the Navy.

President Truman's dramatic announcement, on September 23, 1949, that an atomic explosion had taken place in Russia, has increased our awareness of the need for effective defense, and has necessitated an increase in the defense budget. Secretary Johnson, acting on the advice of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, has within the last 15 days asked for $350,000,000 in contract authority and in cash, above the budget submitted in January for fiscal year 1951. It is heartening to know that this money, as well as all funds appropriated by Congress to the Department of Defense, are being handled by a Secretary so conscious of the necessity of economy and of his obligation, as steward, to the American taxpayers.

With such a report as Secretary Johnson has just made before the Kiwanis International Convention, we should have no hesitation in appropriating the requested funds. We know that the Department of Defense is battling continuously against waste, inefficiency, and unnecessary overhead; and we know that it is striving constantly for increased combat efficiency.

Budget making, as Secretary Johnson reminds us, is a continuous process. Needs and plans are predicated on world conditions and anticipated emergencies which are either anticipated or actually arise. Current events appraise us of the need for additions to the budget in the light of changing conditions; the American people will approve of the additions as they understand the conditions and have confidence that the administration handling the funds will eliminate wasteful practices without eliminating one jot or iota from our total defense.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I insert the text of Secretary Johnson's supplementary report on economies in the Department of Defense in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The address by Secretary Johnson is as follows:

THE BUSINESS OF DEFENSE

I want to speak to you today in the spirit of Kiwanis. It is my understanding that your interpretation of the combination of Indian words that are pronounced in English, kiwanis, mean, in the literal translation that you have placed upon them, "to make oneself known by his deeds." That is, indeed, a worthy aim. The corollary must follow that Kiwanis not only wants to be known by its deeds, but hopes to be judged by its works. That is fair enough. That is a solid test of promise and performance for any organization that looks to the American public for confidence and support. That is the test that I trust every American citizen will apply to the administration of the Department of Defense, which I have the honor, privilege, and responsibility to head at this crucial time.

When I took over my duties a little more than a year ago I promised the American people a business administration in the Department of Defense. I pointed out that national defense was the business of freedom; that it was the most important business enterprise in American life today; that it was a business that touches the life and pocketbook of every citizen and had to be run on a sound business basis. I called attention to the rivalries, duplications, waste, and inefficiency then existing among the services, and expressed my faith in the readiness of the Army, Navy, and Air Force to forget their differences and to make unification work. I knew that every one of them was as anxious as I was to get more defense out of every dollar entrusted to them by the American people, and I counted upon their cooperation.

Now I can say without any reservation that with their loyal support tremendous progress has been made. Unification has become a fact. The combat efficiency of all of our forces has been increased. Hundreds of millions of dollars already have been saved. We are a team and we are working together to achieve our common objective of peace through strength.

Less than 3 weeks ago in the semiannual report for the period ending December 31, 1949, I gave the American people a detailed account of our accomplishments and the extent of our readiness. The newspapers gave extensive coverage to the report, which I trust most of you have read. I shall therefore not repeat any part of the report at this time nor call attention to the specific economies we already have effected. I am taking this occasion, however, to inform the American people and to serve public notice on the services themselves, that the achievements of the past are but a stimulus for more intense action, and that we will not be satisfied until we can stand up before the American people—the stockholders of our national defense enterprise—and say to them, without any equivocation: "You are now getting the fullest possible defense out of every defense dollar you have entrusted to us."

The job of achieving even greater economy than we already have attained will not be easy. It will require special efforts and special techniques, and we shall fit our processes to what the situations may demand. Hitherto, the crash technique may have sufficed. The areas of possible savings were visible on the surface. We had been confronted with duplications in ports, and landing fields, overlapping hospital facilities, obsolete military posts, and camps and stations selected originally for outpost service against Indians and air bases and navy yards beyond

present needs. Here were inefficiencies that any intelligent citizen could have recognized. Now we must go after less obvious, but still equally important, blocks to the attainment of our economy goal. We must find more productive use for every dollar not contributing directly to the security of our country and put it into channels of defense where it will contribute to the better advantage of national security. For the shock strategy of the past year, we are now substituting the scalpel tactics of today. It will take a surgeon's delicate probing and a surgeon's skillful knife to find and remove any tissues malignant or otherwise that still retard the development of a healthy national defense program.

The management committee of my office, who were my shock troops in the economy campaign of the past 6 months, are now at work, literally on 100 different projects, in the effort to bring about better use of defense dollars through the elimination of nonessential expenditures and through the application of improved management techniques. Their primary objective is to make available funds with which to increase combat effectiveness. What the results will be in total dollars, I cannot yet foretell. What I do want to emphasize is that the fight for economy and efficiency still goes on, and I hasten to add that the services themselves have joined in the spirit, and are coming up with plans of their own to effect these purposes.

A notable example is the Military Air Transport Service, or MATS as it is more popularly known. MATS is probably the earliest and certainly one of the more successful ventures in unification. It is headed by Maj. Gen. Laurence S. Kuter of the United States Air Force, but represents a joint Air Force—Navy effort where differences of services origin have little or no effect on operations. They work together. They live together. At Hickam Field, the Air Force base in the Hawaiian Islands, for instance, the admiral in command lives in a house built for an Air Force general. General Kuter is assisted by two admirals, and the unification is so complete that the admirals sign their names with the title "Rear Admiral, United States Navy" and "United States Air Force" in parentheses following the title.

At the time the management committee indicated an interest in MATS and considered the advisability of establishing task forces to analyze its activities, the Department of the Air Force that has the primary responsibility for the operation requested permission to conduct the investigation using its air staff and Bureau of the Budget as task force members. This request was in line with management committee policy to utilize existing agencies or groups in carrying out its mission wherever possible. Approval was readily given.

The Air Force is doing a fine job in reorganizing MATS operations. As a result, nonessential facilities, routes, and flights are being eliminated. A new priority system governing materials to be transported by air is being established. Military personnel saved as a result of these curtailments are being released for other assignments. Savings in fuel, parts, supplies, and personnel are reported to me to be in excess of $6,000,000 this year and the amount will increase as this job progresses.

Even more important than the dollar saving, is the fact that the reorganization of MATS will now permit it to meet initial airlift requirements under emergency conditions. In other words, equipment, fuel, spare parts, and maintenance funds saved by the elimination of nonessential MATS activities will be used to increase current MATS readiness for D-day. Here is an example of improvement in operations, and reductions in expenditures, at the same time.

A similar field for savings has been developed in the maintenance and operation of administrative vehicles. By an administrative vehicle, we mean a passenger or cargo truck of a commercial type as distinguished from a military vehicle such as a tank. In the shock phase of the management operation we eliminated 34,000 vehicles which were uneconomical to operate and saved more than $10,000,000 this year in gasoline, oil, maintenance, and other expenditures. Moreover, we released 2,136 military drivers for assignment to duty with combat elements.

These deactivated vehicles we are now selling. With the proceeds of the sales we will buy new vehicles. This process enables us to get additional modern equipment without calling for extra appropriations. This procedure, so obvious to the businessman, was a long time in coming to the Armed Forces. Now with the shock phase completed we are in the scalpel process of reducing waste and in the slower and more difficult search for ways and means of getting more defense out of every defense dollar. We are improving shop lay-outs, inspection systems, working standards, administration, and organization. Nothing that promises any savings is being overlooked. For instance, front wheel bearings of commercial type vehicles are now inspected every 6,000 miles. We are conducting tests to determine the advisability of changing the routine to every eight, ten, or twelve thousand miles. If these tests indicate that front-wheel bearings can be inspected every 10,000 miles instead of 6,000 without increasing additional risks, savings to the Department from that simple change alone will total many thousands of dollars annually.

The business of getting a maximum of service of a military nature out of every member of our Armed Forces is, to us, a prime objective. One of our services today has 2,600 general court-martial prisoners whose sentences specify that they shall be discharged from the service on the completion of their sentence. Of the 2,600, about 700 have a possibility of rehabilitation and are being trained and encouraged to resume their places on the military team. The other 1,900, hardened criminals, are dead weight and not only do they contribute nothing to defense, but they serve as a drain on military personnel, facilities, and funds. Now we are working on a project to have them transferred to the Bureau of Prisons and thus gain room in our ranks for 1,900 recruits of potential useful military service; and with 1,900 men properly trained we can man two additional battalions of infantry, or a Navy carrier, or a medium bomb wing.

The most promising field of great economy and efficiency, we are finding in military and naval operations of an industrial or commercial nature—closely akin to what there is in civil life by way of automobile overhaul shops, print shops, coffee-roasting plants, and similar units. For the most part, establishments of this nature among our services were not run on a strictly business basis. In fact, there was little incentive to save or improve operations. Funds came by way of appropriations. Expenditures had to be accounted for but performance was judged only in a general way. Let us take, as an example, the business of printing which, of course, is essential to the operation of any going concern, particularly one that handles billions of dollars.

Not so long ago there were in Washington three print shops, one Army, one Navy, and one Air Force. They received annual appropriations for operations. They kept informal inventories. They did not charge for their work. Any agency that needed forms, charts, or pamphlets merely called up the print shop and ordered the job done. The print shops performed the work, paid their employees, used the paper and the ink, and provided the machinery. They had no capital. They did not have to show any profit or loss in their operations.

Today, we have in Washington but one service print shop. It is operated by the United States Navy for all three services. Instead of more than 400 employees between the three establishments, we now have less than 300 in one shop. The print shop has been capitalized at $1,700,000. All of its stock has been carefully inventoried. More than $70,000 worth of machinery has been removed from the floors of these plants and put in storage for reserve. Now when a unit sends in a request for a job, it is informed of the cost and when the job is done, the print shop takes credit on its books for labor, supplies, and overhead and charges it against the entity for which the job was performed. It is surprising how quickly demands have been reduced, and to what extent the number of copies of each job have been curtailed. Already this one operation in Washington has saved $118,000 or the equivalent of the cost of gasoline and oil for more than 1,300 hours of flying by a B–29.

There are 197 print shops in the services. We are experimenting with consolidations and combining operations wherever possible, saving a dollar here and there, confident that the sum total will be considerable, and that operations will become more efficient and more stimulating to those engaged in them. What has been accomplished in the print shops is possible in every other activity in our defense structure of a commercial nature. There is no doubt of the existence of gold in these hills, to be extricated by way of savings, and thus made available as more money with which to buy so-called military or fighting hardware, and organize and train more combat units.

It is out of savings such as these, made out of fat and not muscle, that we have been able to allocate to the Department of the Army an additional $24,000,000, which it had not counted upon, for research and development of special weapons, particularly in the antitank field and their procurement for the use of ground troops. Out of such savings as these we have accumulated enough dollars to raise our Marine air combat squadrons from 12 to 16; increase the combat strength of our Army by 4,000 and add an aircraft carrier and other vessels to our fleet.

Thus, on the one hand, we battle continuously against waste, inefficiency and unnecessary overhead, enabling us to effect a reduction in our civilian employees of more than 170,000. On the other, we fight for combat efficiency and strive to divert every possible dollar from administration expenditures to the procurement of up-to-date efficient fighting equipment.

Budget making is a continuous process. Our needs are under constant study. Our plans are under continuous scrutiny. They are predicated on world conditions and our need to cope with emergencies. It might be interesting to see the evolution of our procurement program as an example of this continuous process.

When we were working on our budget in July, the Russian atomic explosion that was heard around the world, had not yet been confirmed. There was still resistance to communism on the Chinese mainland. We thought in terms of $1,100,000,000 for aircraft procurement for the Air Force and $700,000,000 for aircraft for the Navy, or a total of $1,800,000,000.

But when the time came for the President to submit the budget to the Congress in January 1950, the impact of unfavorable international developments had caused us to ask instead for $2,000,000,000 for aircraft—one billion three hundred and fifty million for the Air Force and six hundred and fifty million for the Navy. By that time, the atomic explosion in Soviet Russia had become a matter of record. Chiang Kai-shek

had withdrawn to Formosa. Poland had surrendered control over its armed forces to its aggressive imperialistic neighbor. By that time, too, we learned more about the development of the Russian submarine menace and the Navy was given a $79,000,000 increase for antisubmarine warfare equipment.

It is important to note that although we raised by $200,000,000 our requirements for aircraft production, we did not ask for an increase in the total amount of the budget. We were able to stay within the budget because of savings in other activities. Moreover, the $79,000,000 for antisubmarine warfare equipment was realized without any request for an increase.

Today, in the light of even bolder threats to our peace we have found it necessary to ask for even more.

About three weeks ago, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who are my military advisors, after a very thorough analysis of world conditions, reported to me that the time had come for a further augmentation of our strength, particularly our air power. As a result, it was concluded we needed one billion five hundred and fifty million for the Air Force and seven hundred and fifty million for the Navy for aircraft procurement. This was for contract authority for three hundred milfuture fiscal years and since the money could not be spent in 1950, we had to have contract authority therefor in the new budget. I lost no time in putting the matter before the President and appearing before the Congressional Appropriation Committee, I asked for contract authority for three hundred million above the budget submitted in January and fifty million in cash for conversion and operation of additional destroyers and small ships needed for antisubmarine defense. Fortunately, our January budget was planned so carefully and our savings in the meantime made so efficiently that the sum total of our added need can be accomplished by an increase of less than 2½ percent of our original figure.

These increased amounts that we have asked for in the last 15 days—the $350,000,000—will all be used for the procurement of matériel—two hundred million for aircraft procurement in the Air Force, one hundred million for aircraft procurement for the Navy, and fifty million in cash for conversion and operation of additional destroyers and small ships needed for antisubmarine defense. The need for these additions in the light of changing conditions I am confident are clear to the American people.

We must keep in mind always our primary mission—to be strong enough to deter attack, capable enough to defend ourselves against attack if it comes, and powerful enough ultimately to defeat our aggressor. To deter, to defend, to defeat continue to be our watch words. It is security first and economy second. We shall never deviate from these objectives. We shall always keep them in that order. I repeat—security first, economy second.

What we do now in our business of defense to achieve these objectives, and how we at this time protect the traditions of freedom bequeathed us by our forefathers will become the deeds by which we of this generation will be known to our posterity, and we are going to be proud to make ourselves known by our deeds because, in Kiwanis fashion, we are doing something constructive, vital, and durable. We are paving a road toward security and prosperity on a firm foundation of peace through strength.

We shall achieve it in the spirit of Homer, the immortal Greek poet, who expressed the faith that—

"By mutual confidence and mutual aid
Great deeds are done, and great discoveries made."

Call for Sacrifice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 15, 1950

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend by remarks in the Appendix, I include the following excellent editorial appearing in the Nashville Tennessean on May 11:

CALL FOR SACRIFICE

What is peace worth to the free nations?

Secretary of State Dean Acheson posed the question in London on the eve of the three power talks, and then gave the answer.

Peace is worth the greatest possible sacrifices, even to the point of affecting purely national interests. This does not, as we see it, mean the yielding of national sovereignty, but it does mean that there must be occasions when the good of all must take precedence over that of any single nation.

In effect, Mr. Acheson has told Britain and France that the United States would be pleased with more signs of cooperation and less of self-interest. And he has implied that the United States will not be found wanting whenever there is a desire for unity of action that means definite progress in winning the cold war.

Without vainglory, he might have added that the United States at the present moment is sharing as never before its wealth and strength to support associated democracies in their fight for survival.

In the same connection, Mr. Acheson asserted that Western Germany would be welcome as part of our company. This is a virtual invitation to this republican government to join as equals with friends of liberty for survival.

When the alternative is considered, this is a sound decision. For though the risks of making an ally of West Germany are obvious, the danger of leaving its government and people in a position where they will be continual targets for Russian pressure is greater. Five years after VE-day, it becomes inexpedient to temporize further with the issue.

Once West Germany has joined with the Western Powers, the plans of Russian unity are wrecked beyond repair. At some distant time, it may develop that the German Nation will be united again, but if allied plans bear fruit, it will be under the banner of liberty.

Our foreign policy begins to unfold, and it reveals courage and statesmanship. If it becomes the policy of the Big Three also, the problem in Europe will be clarified and the prospects of success greatly increased.

The Outlook for the Future—Text of the President's Speech in Pendleton, Oreg.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY M. JACKSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 15, 1950

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the press is unable to report completely the texts of the President's speeches on his trip to the West, I am inserting in the RECORD the text of a speech made by the President at Pendleton, Oreg., on May 10.

I should like to call one aspect of the speech to the attention of the Members of this House. There is a great deal of discussion about the so-called devaluation of the American dollar. It is generally assumed that the progress we have made here in America—in increasing average incomes as well as the total of goods produced—means very little, because the dollar is not worth what it used to be.

But the President has taken pains, in this speech, to take into consideration the purchasing power of the dollar in describing the progress that has been made in the past 10 years. Our total production has increased by 60 percent, average income for each citizen is up 40 percent, and corporate profits, after taxes, are up 100 percent. These are real increases and not inflated money increases.

I commend this speech to my colleagues.

I am glad to be here in Pendleton today.

I am always happy to visit the Pacific Northwest. You know, I have come out here to dedicate Grand Coulee Dam tomorrow. On the way out, I have been reporting to the people on some of the problems that our Nation faces, and the progress we are making in solving them.

At different towns and cities, I have talked about world peace, and the farm program, and the development of our natural resources. All these things are tied together, because we need to build a strong United States—strong morally and strong materially—as the basis for our own expanding future, and as the basis for world peace.

Today, I want to talk with you about the economic progress of our country.

The growth of the Pacific Northwest is a symbol of the breath-taking economic progress of the United States.

In one century, you have grown from a few people pushing back the wilderness to thriving States with several million people. One hundred years ago, ox teams were the power for your covered wagons. Today, you use the energy of the Columbia River—and in a few years more you may be harnessing the tremendous force of the atom for peaceful work.

These changes did not come about by themselves. They are the result of the daring and independent spirit which has always characterized this area.

The people of the West have always looked ahead. In their private actions, and jointly through their local, State, and Federal Governments, they have been eager to take bold and imaginative steps toward a better future.

So long as we hold fast to the frontier spirit of the West, we need never fear the greatest danger that could overtake our Nation. That is the danger of timidity—of being satisfied with things as they are—of failing to seek ever higher goals.

Throughout our history, there have been timid people who have been afraid to move forward. They opposed all the progressive measures we now take for granted. These timid folk once tried to reverse the trend toward free education and political democracy. They called this trend "mob rule."

Today, the spiritual descendants of this timid group are afraid of bold, progressive measures to achieve an abundant and expanding economy and to distribute its products more fairly among all our people. They call these measures "statism" or "socialism."

The use of the powers of Government to achieve a higher living standard and a fair

deal for all the people is not statism and it is not socialism.

It is a part of the American tradition.

Every day, we should thank Almighty God that the progressive trends of American life and progress have never been stopped for long. We have moved steadily toward a higher conception of human needs and human freedoms, and a greater appreciation of the rights of the average man.

This progress in American life has not been accomplished without a struggle. It cannot be continued without a struggle. Repeatedly, the common sense of a majority of the American people has had to assert itself in the face of the opposition of those who wanted to cling to the past.

Much of this struggle has dealt with whether our vast country with its wealth of resources should be developed for the benefit of the many or the few. The issue has been whether we should stop trying to provide all our citizens with a good standard of living just because a few people already had more than enough.

The timid minority do not believe that prosperity for all our people is a goal that we should fight for. Many of them are sincere and well-meaning individuals. The trouble has not been always with their hearts; it has been with their eyes. Not only were they blind to the prospects of the future; they could not even see backward clearly enough to understand what had already happened.

Let us look at some of the recent progress of the United States.

Twenty years ago, we had entered upon the greatest depression in our history. We suffered huge losses for more than three long years. Then we began vigorous policies of recovery and reform. Our recovery was so successful that, by 1939, our total national output of goods and services was actually higher than it was in the last boom year before the great depression.

Since 1939 we have gone on to make further gains—tremendous gains.

I am going to give you some facts.

The calamity howlers don't like to look at the facts, because the facts prove how wrong they are when they tell you what a terrible fix the country is in. They have been saying over and over again, for years, that the country is being ruined. But the facts show that things have been getting better. So, what do they do? They just ignore the facts.

Well, we are not going to ignore them. We are going to keep the record straight. We are going to see what has actually been happening to our economy.

The best over-all measure of a nation's economy is its annual output of goods and services. In the United States the annual output of goods and services has increased in the last 10 years about 60 percent.

Now, how does this affect the individual citizen? You know, a favorite theme of the boys who are always trying to run our country down instead of trying to build it up is that the Government takes all our gains away by high taxes. But the truth is that the annual per capita income of our citizens—after taxes—has increased in the last 10 years by more than 40 percent.

And some of the people who are doing the loudest yelling are the very people who have got the biggest increases. Most of them are better off now than they have ever been before in their lives.

However—and for this I am very thankful—the increased incomes have not been confined to a favored few. Annual wages and salaries of employees increased almost 75 percent in the last 10 years.

The income of farm owners, although it has fallen off in the last 2 years—and has fallen off more than it should—is still more than 50 percent higher than it was in 1939.

You would think all this would be enough to convince anybody that the country is doing very well. But some people are hard to convince. They say this administration looks after labor and looks after the farmer, but that it just doesn't give the businessman a chance—that business is being taxed to death.

Let's examine that. The fact is that the annual income of corporate businesses, after taxes—I repeat, after taxes—has increased about 100 percent since 1939. That's right, 100 percent.

It seems to me that free private enterprise is doing pretty well.

I am glad that it is. I want business to be prosperous, and I am going to do all that I can to see that it remains prosperous.

There are some die-hard reactionaries who won't give up even when all the facts I have mentioned are pointed out to them. So they say, "Well, maybe so, but the dollars people have won't buy as much as they used to." That argument is just as phony as all the rest of the arguments the pessimists use.

In all the figures I have given you allowance has been made for changes in the purchasing power of the dollar. The increases I am talking about are real increases, not just dollar increases. In dollar terms, the gains would be even larger.

During the last 5 years, we have successfully met one of the greatest economic tests that can ever confront a nation: We have come through the adjustments following a great war without a depression. We have had depressions after most other wars and many people expected that we would have one this time.

Instead, we have weathered the readjustment period with relatively few hardships, and now we have good prospects for continued prosperity. Almost every newspaper you pick up gives new evidence of increasing business activity.

We have avoided the calamity of a postwar depression because our whole economy has been strengthened by a program of action which began 17 years ago. This program has been directed toward the humanizing of our economy and toward the humanizing of Government. This program has been marked by such measures as bank deposit insurance, regulation of the security markets, old-age and unemployment insurance, minimum wages, slum clearance and low-rent housing, resource development, and protective farm legislation.

We have had a Government that was—and is—working for the people, not for special interests.

These measures have helped to distribute buying power more widely among the people. They have provided larger markets for the increasing products of our factories and our farms. They have protected our economy against shock. They have provided business with a stronger banking structure and a more flexible credit system. They have helped to sustain farm income.

These results have not been achieved through public action alone. In private enterprise as well, employers and workers have placed more emphasis upon the human element. They have learned more about how our economy functions. They have constantly adopted more enlightened and progressive policies.

There is a great lesson to be learned from what we have accomplished. We have learned that it is within our power as a people to make full use of our tremendous resources of farm, and factory, and human skill.

We can use that lesson—and we must use it—to build for the future.

There are two conflicting schools of thought about the future of our economy, just as there are about its present condition. Those who can see nothing but evil in the present situation, can see nothing but gloom for the future.

They have been saying all along that our programs could not succeed—even though the programs were succeeding, at the very time they were denying it. Now they are saying the same old things—that the country is going bankrupt, that depression lies ahead, and that the only thing to do is to pull in our belts and save what we can from the wreckage.

I don't agree with them.

I believe that we know more now than ever before about how to keep our economy strong and prosperous. I believe that we can continue to rely on the programs that have served so well for the last 17 years—use them and improve them. I face the future with confidence that our Nation will continue to grow in freedom and in material and moral strength.

I am sure that the people of Oregon and all the Pacific Northwest share that confidence. It is the character of those of you who live in this region to dream big dreams and plan big plans. You will not join with the little men who throw up their hands and cry, "It can't be done" when we set up our goals for future prosperity.

I want to tell you about some of those goals—and I assure you that there is nothing fantastic about them. They are merely based upon the belief that we can improve as rapidly in the future as we have in the past. I am sure we can do that well and even better if we follow wise policies that are for the benefit of all the people and not just for the special interests.

Here are some of the things we can do.

In the next 10 years we can reach toward higher standards of living for all.

We can lift our annual output of goods and services to more than $350,000,000,000 by 1960—a one-third increase within 10 years. And I am talking about real output, measured in dollars of today's purchasing power.

We can increase real wage and salary incomes, and farm incomes, as our economy grows. We can increase the profits of business, not through higher prices or higher profit margins, but through increased volume in a growing economy.

I have said before, and I repeat, that by 1960 we can and should achieve a far better standard of living for every industrious family in the city and on the farm.

Now, I want to tell you about some of the things we must do to achieve these goals.

First. The efficiency and capacity of our industries must be increased. Despite the large investments which industry has made since the war, there is urgent need for further investment and improvement, to meet expanding markets and to take advantage of the rapid gains in technology.

This is a job for private owners and managers—in manufacturing, in power, in transportation, in many other industries. It is also a job in which the Government must participate—through resource development, sound tax policies, housing and small business programs, and many other ways.

Second. Purchasing power must be expanded to develop and maintain markets for our increased production of goods.

The final market for all products is the ultimate consumer. Our economy cannot expand as fast as it should as long as we have a large number of families with substandard incomes. One out of four American families now has an income of less than $2,000 a year.

Our goal over the next decade should be to lift every hard-working American family to an income of about $4,000 a year—not a mere dollar increase, but an increase in the real standard of living. We have the resources to do this by balanced national growth.

Raising the standards of our poorest families will not be at the expense of anybody else. We will all benefit by doing it, for the incomes of the rest of us will rise, too.

Third. We must maintain a sound balance in the programs of our Government, faced as it is with huge and unavoidable responsibilities.

Most people realize, now, that more than 70 percent of the Federal budget is required to pay for past wars and our work to prevent another war. However, they often fail to realize just how vital the other 30 percent is to our welfare and progress. The costs of sound programs to improve the Nation's health and education, to stabilize agriculture, and to develop resources, are sensible investments in a better future.

I want to balance the budget of the Federal Government, just as much as anybody else does. I would like to see taxes reduced. We will do both of these things just as soon as we safely can.

We must continue to strive for every true economy in national affairs. But I will not join in slashing Government expenses at the cost of our national security or national progress.

Fourth. We must continue to improve our economic relations with the rest of the world.

We must develop a larger flow of international trade and international investment, on a sound basis. This will result in larger markets for ourselves, and larger markets for other free countries.

Just as our Nation has grown through enlarged production and trade, from which all sections of the country have benefited, so the expansion of world production and trade can strengthen all the free countries. That is an essential step toward world peace.

We must not be turned aside or slowed down in our efforts to help the other free nations get back on their feet by those who would retreat into isolationism in order to save a few dollars. We would pay for that folly many times over. It would greatly increase the chances of a third world war.

As long as I am President, we are not going to put dollars above world peace.

These things that I have been talking to you about—the growth of our economy and the policies needed to make that growth possible—have a very definite meaning for you folks here in Pendleton, as they do for people all over the country. They are not just abstract theories. They are matters that will have a very important effect on your daily lives.

Your wheat and livestock growers cannot prosper without good incomes and high consumption in the rest of this country, and in other countries, too. The same thing is true of the Columbia River fisheries. Oregon's lumber industry will have good times only if our Nation builds the houses our people need.

And it works the other way, too. The Nation needs the products of your agriculture, forests, and fisheries. The whole country becomes stronger when Oregon and the Northwest grow and prosper.

We are a Nation that advances by cooperation and mutual benefit. We do not want any State, or any group, to grow at the expense of another. Our strength—the strength of free men—is in a society that works to bring better living to all our people.

We have demonstrated in our country that we can all move forward together. I believe profundly that this forward movement is going to continue.

I believe that ultimately it will extend to the farthermost corners of the earth, and that, with the United States as a shining example, we shall suceed in bringing greater welfare and freedom to all mankind.

Symington Energizes Resources Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 15 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I know the Congress and the entire Nation are very proud of the way in which Stuart Symington, former Secretary of the Air Force, and now chairman of the National Security Resources Board, has gone about revitalizing the work of that very necessary organization. Mr. Symington's activities in that connection are very well described in an article which appeared in the Washington Sunday Star of May 14, written by Raymond P. Brandt, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SYMINGTON ENERGIZES RESOURCES BOARD—NEW ADMINISTRATOR IS BORN SALESMAN, QUICK THINKER—DEFINITE ACTION TAKES PLACE OF CAUTIOUS FACE IN PLANNING

(By Raymond P. Brandt)

During the past 3 weeks the National Security Resources Board, the body that drafts plans for coordination of military, industrial and civilian war mobilization, has been revitalized by Chairman W. Stuart Symington of St. Louis, dynamic former Secretary of the Air Force and former administrator of the War Surplus Property Board.

Even the dark hallways of the old State Department building seem lighter and NSRB officials and employees walk faster now that the 48-year-old industrialist-turned-public servant has taken over the management of the powerful planning group that will advise the President on how American manpower, money and materials can best be switched from civilian to war production.

Under Reorganization Plan No. 25 which President Truman sent to Congress, Mr. Symington would have greatly enlarged power. The functions of the board would be exercised by the chairman, and the several cabinet members, supposed to direct the board's operations, would become advisers. The plan, which will go into effect within 60 days unless either House vetoes it, also provides for a vice chairman at $16,000 a year.

The reorganization proposal indicates that Truman and the present board have realized that the existing setup, first headed by Arthur M. Hill, transportation executive, as chairman and then by Dr. John R. Steelman, assistant to the President, as acting chairman, could not meet the demands of the cold war or plan for the possibilities of a shooting war.

POTENTIALLY POWERFUL GROUP

Mr. Truman said that "the tremendous responsibilities of the National Security Resources Board and the heavy workload on the chairman fully warranted" the appointment of a vice chairman.

Although President Truman in the past has persistently undervalued this agency, created by the National Security Act of 1947, it is potentially one of the most powerful groups in Government. Should there be a war, its recommendation would determine how much every American would eat, work and earn, and what percentages of every vital resource would be devoted to war and to civilian production.

Under the reorganization plan, Mr. Symington, as Chairman, would have the practical direction of the Board, composed of Secretaries Acheson, Snyder, Johnson, Chapman, Brannan, Sawyer, and Tobin. This, in effect, is a War Cabinet representing the State, Treasury, Defense, Interior, Agriculture, Commerce, and Labor Departments.

Mr. Symington will also be an active member of the top policy-making National Security Council, headed by President Truman and composed of Vice President Barkley and Secretaries Acheson and Johnson and himself. Other Cabinet officers and agency heads are called in when international problems affecting their jurisdictions arise. He will also attend Cabinet sessions on appropriate occasions, meaning when war questions are up for discussion.

He will work closely with the Defense Department's Munitions Board, headed by energetic Hubert Howard, Chicago industrialist, which has to arrange for the use of America's great industrial machine for war production in the event of an emergency. Since its creation, the Munitions Board has made far more detailed plans within its zone of operation than has the NSRB.

The extent of Mr. Symington's success will depend on how far he is supported by President Truman and how much cooperation he is able to get from the established departments, which have always jealously guarded against invasion of an outsider.

Immediately after his appointment, he declined to discuss his plans for his new assignment, saying that he wanted to case the joint before he started talking for publication.

This free and easy use of the vernacular was typical of Symington, the wealthy Yale man who was able to talk the same language as Communist Bill Sentner of St. Louis, when Symington's Emerson Electric Co. was having labor troubles while working on war contracts. It also endeared him to the Air Force flyers, whose budget battles he fought in Congress and before public forums. Behind his gum-chewing, smiling face, there is the quick mind of an experienced administrator and of a born salesman.

AIMS FOR GOOD STAFF

After 3 weeks, he could only give the broadest outlines of his plans.

"My first job," he says, "is to see that we have good staff men. For the most part we have good men and they have done an excellent job—far better than most people realize. But we have to get a few more men outstanding in their professions and then we have to get practical plans—not plans just for planning's sake.

"This job is necessarily advisory to the President, not an operational affair. Otherwise we would have to have many more than our 250 employees. Essentially, our recommendations will be concerned with allocations of power—who is to do what in event of war.

"After we get our staff in shape, we must reappraise the plans already made to see if they are practicable and fit existing and prospective situations. Then there must be a tremendous 'selling' job within the Government and among the people, especially in business, industry, and in labor organizations, so that all will know what is needed of them in the event of war."

TWO EXPERTS BEFORE HIM

Always the diplomat and discreet public official, Mr. Symington will not comment on

the records made in the NSRB by his predecessors, Hill and Steelman, or speculate on why Mr. Truman wanted his old senatorial colleague, Mon C. Wallgren, of Washington, in as chairman.

This writer, however, has observed the NSRB since its establishment under the sponsorship of the late Secretary of Defense James V. Forrestal, and can offer some comments of his own.

Mr. Hill was a transportation expert rather than an industrialist, and although he had served the Government well in wartime he was a novice when it came to dealing with established Government agencies, particularly the all-powerful Budget Bureau.

Without any specific direction or approval from the White House, he attempted to set up the NSRB as an "operational" rather than as an "advisory" organization, which meant that had his plan been put into effect he would have invaded the province of many established departments. After he made a few actual moves in this direction, he was stopped cold by Mr. Truman and several Cabinet officers. He resigned in a silent, dignified huff and refuses to discuss his differences with the White House.

The President revealed his underestimation of the board's importance by appointing his Presidential assistant, Mr. Steelman, as acting chairman. Steelman is a labor expert and an experienced career man who knows the intricacies of governmental bureaucracy but lacks industrial and management experience. He could talk with Cabinet members on an almost equal level. Mr. Truman further disclosed his own conception of the board's value when he tried to appoint former Governor Wallgren to the chairmanship. His major qualification was that he was a crony of the President and could talk with him on intimate terms.

DEALT WITH SMALL BUSINESS

Because of his business and Government experience, Mr. Symington appears to be the ideal man for this big job. Born of wealthy eastern seaboard parents, he was in World War I while in his teens and after his graduation from Yale, where he was in the exclusive clubs, he joined his family businesses as an executive. Leaving these establishments, he soon made a name for himself as a rehabilitator of depressed small businesses. It was in this capacity that he came to St. Louis in 1938 to be president of the Emerson Electric Manufacturing Co., which had been having serious trouble with CIO United Electrical and Radio Machine Workers of America. William Sentner, an avowed Communist, was a power in the St. Louis local, but Symington was able to work out an amicable deal with him so that Emerson became a robust small business that developed into a fairly large business during the war.

Before Pearl Harbor, Mr. Symington demonstrated his business acumen by going to England to study the latest airplane turrets and came back with orders for Emerson that eventually made it one of the largest airplane appliances plants in the country.

His success at Emerson and his work for the Office of Production Management prompted Mr. Truman to offer him the chairmanship of the three-man Surplus Property Board in June 1945. Here he began the disposal of almost a hundred billion dollars' worth of Government war properties. Shortly after he was confirmed for this position, Congress abolished the board setup to give him the sole direction of the organization.

He continued in this job until February 1946, when he was named Assistant Secretary of War for Air. There had been no scandals in the Surplus Property Board despite the billions that had to be supervised. In September 1947, he became the first Secretary of the Air Force under the unification plan.

BACKED 70-GROUP FORCE

As Assistant Secretary for Air and as Air Secretary he became the idol of the flyers because of his aggressive insistence for a 70-group Air Force as recommended by the presidential committee headed by Thomas K. Finletter of New York, Mr. Symington's choice as his own successor. Even now, with the defense budget down to less than $14,000,000,000, he is arguing that we should have the 70 groups as soon as the national economy permits.

Mr. Symington has demonstrated that he knows business and labor organizations, governmental procedures, including appearances before congressional committees, and has a global viewpoint of defense planning.

He has another intangible quality in greater degree than his predecessors—his ability to get along with people and make a favorable impression. Although he did not get along so well with Defense Secretary Johnson personally, he carried his fight for the Air Force to Congress and the public. He is on familiar terms with almost every high official in Washington.

As the functional head of the NSRB, he will have far more authority than his predecessors but probably will need more tact and salesmanship than they exercised.

The problems of the job are tremendous and intricate. One of his first objectives will be to get a definite war plan from the Joint Chiefs of Staff to enable him to plan the maximums and minimums for civilian and industrial mobilization. Here, because of his service in the Pentagon, he can talk the language of the military and make them be specific where, in the past, they have been general.

There is also the civilian defense program, which has recently been put in charge of Paul J. Larsen, formerly head of the Atomic Energy Commission laboratories in New Mexico. This program has been languishing and only a few of the governors, upon whom the responsibility has been placed for civilian defense, have done anything in their own localities to prepare for war. Mr. Symington promises to have a full-scale program drafted by September 1.

As examples of the details of coordination needed for civilian defense are the discoveries by the NSRB that various cities and towns have varying sizes of fire hoses and connections and that one atomic explosion over a single city would require all of certain medicines that are now available throughout the entire country. The problem will be to simplify fire hoses and connections so nearby cities can help each other in event of an attack or sabotage and to build up stockpiles of medicines required after an atomic explosion.

Another difficult problem is the drafting of legislation needed in the event of an emergency. The NSRB has made several detailed drafts for freezing of wages and prices and rents so that no one can profit from war and for allocations of materials. One of the subsidiary questions is whether to ask Congress to enact general legislation now, as strongly recommended by Mr. Baruch, to give the President power to act immediately on these items in the event of an emergency, or whether to have the detailed bill acted on at the serious threat or the actual outbreak of the emergency.

Mr. Symington belongs to the White House school that believes the tentative drafts should be continuously under revision for immediate introduction in the event of an emergency. He says that even general legislation would arouse special interest groups such as farmers, labor organizations, property owners and other businessmen who would combine to defeat the measure.

Under Acting Chairman Steelman the draft for the mobilization was classified confidential and not submitted to the Cabinet members on the Board for their rejection or approval. Mr. Symington promises that the latest draft will be circulating at the Cabinet level within 2 weeks and that after practical revisions he will have an approved copy by July 1.

Symington is not daunted by the size or the complexities of his new challenge. After all, he handled billions of dollars worth of property in the Surplus Property Board and supervised the spending of billions for the Air Force. He says the job is like the long-range budgeting and selling surveys of a gigantic business firm, such as Sears, Roebuck, where there must be planning of factories, transportation, acquisition of materials, consumer markets and continuous sales over long periods.

Loans for Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ELLIOTT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 2, 1950

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, this country cannot afford to have a full-scale depression. We must continue to have a high level of employment.

To provide a high level of employment our economic system must continue to expand.

Small business will play a great part in this expansion.

Much attention is being given presently toward providing a practical system of loans for small business.

This is a matter of great and growing urgency throughout the country.

The situation in the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama is acute, because of the great unemployment with which we are afflicted.

I trust that this session of the Eighty-first Congress will give full consideration to the financial problems of small business, and work out a system of loans that will stimulate our economic system to provide more employment for our people.

I include an editorial from yesterday's Washington Post which deals with the problem at hand:

SMALL BUSINESS

At least three of the five major measures proposed by President Truman to overcome the financial handicaps of small business appear to us to meet long-felt needs. They are the recommendations for (1) Federal insurance of commercial bank loans up to $25,000 patterned after FHA-insured loans for home improvements, (2) establishment of national investment companies to provide equity capital and long-term loans for small business, and (3) a plan for setting up a clearing house in the Department of Commerce to collect and supply scientific, engineering, and managerial information to small concerns that cannot afford to employ expensive research staffs of their own.

There is a question as to whether the provision for limiting the maturity of the proposed type of insured loans to 5 years may not be too restrictive. The Federal Reserve officials, for instance, allege that the 5-year

limitation on industrial loans for working capital purposes that the Federal Reserve banks are authorized to make, or to underwrite when made by member banks, is too severe. The President proposes to repeal this Federal Reserve loan provision and substitute a self-sustaining system of loan insurance by private banks, subject to compliance with federally approved standards. Under proper safeguards this insurance plan would, in our opinion, strengthen, rather than weaken, the private banking system. For it would enable private commercial banks to grant loans to small businesses for working capital purposes that they would not dare to undertake in the absence of such protection, thereby reducing the pressure for direct Government loans.

The proposed national investment companies are designed to meet a different kind of need—provision of equity capital and long-term loans for small business. Our commercial banks are not in a position to assume the risks of financing the long-term capital requirements of small business. Moreover, it is virtually impossible for small or even medium-sized businesses to sell securities in the open market. The cost of loan flotations in small amounts is prohibitive, and the issues of small companies are hard to sell.

In the past small businesses have usually been financed out of the savings of owners and local people. But the so-called small business of today would have been considered a few decades ago a big business. Costs have mounted, too, thus increasing the capital needs of going businesses and the capital required to start a business. National investment companies would, therefore, fill a gap in the financing structure by providing a channel through which pooled savings available for long-term use could be more safely invested.

In the beginning such companies might not attract private investment support, since it will take a good deal of time to build them up, and the risks of loss, especially at the experimental stage, are considerable. For that reason, the initial capital of the new investment companies would probably have to be provided by public or semipublic agencies, such as the Federal Reserve banks. However, if successfully launched, commercial banks would doubtless find it to their advantage to invest in the new investment companies, even if the direct returns from their holdings were small, for they would benefit indirectly from the strengthening of the capital resources of local industries that are their customers.

There is slight danger that the plans would lead to further Government encroachment in the private banking field, if private banks actively cooperate with the new investment companies and if private funds, supplied by banks and other investors, are forthcoming. Admittedly the proposal is experimental and there is some danger of its being launched on an overly ambitious scale. Color is given to this fear by the emphasis put on the importance of the program for increasing the credit aids to small business as a means of insuring a steady expansion of the economy and providing increased employment for a growing labor force. The program is rather a long-range reform that should contribute to the ultimate attainment of those objectives by strengthening the competitive standing and ability to survive of small businesses. But it would not have much immediate effect on employment or afford any great immediate stimulus to business expansion. It is not a relief measure, but a means of providing more appropriate and more adequate types of financing for small-scale enterprise at all times through private banking channels, with a minimum amount of support and supervision by Government agencies.

Addresses of the President in Idaho

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1950

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, the people in the State of Idaho recently had the great honor and privilege of hearing several addresses made by the President of the United States during his trip through our State. The following addresses were made by the President at Pocatello, Shoshone, and Glenns Ferry, Idaho:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT POCATELLO, IDAHO

When I was here in 1948, along about early in the morning, I think it was 7:50, I remember they told me there wouldn't be anybody up; and they were darn sure there wouldn't be anybody up this morning, but you fooled them—and you fooled me, too, I don't mind telling you. You may have heard I am an early riser. I get up early every day—ask these photographers and newsmen about that. I am used to tackling problems no matter what time it is.

This morning, even though it is only 6 o'clock, I want to talk to you about the greatest scientific discovery of the century—or in history, in fact: atomic energy.

The first atomic explosion in history took place down in the deserts of New Mexico in July 1945. I was in Potsdam and had been in conference with Winston Churchill and Joe Stalin, and we had been discussing world peace programs.

When this notice came to me that the atomic explosions had taken place, I called a meeting of our military advisers—General Marshall, General Eisenhower, General Bradley, General Patton, Admiral Nimitz, Admiral King and several other able and distinguished gentlemen, including the Secretary of State and the Secretary of War at that time—and we discussed the situation and how we should approach the use of it.

And I informed those gentlemen at that time that I would do my utmost to see that this new discovery was used in a way that would make the world a better place in which to live.

I have been working at that ever since.

I had to issue the order for the dropping of the first two atomic bombs on our enemies. And I made that order after due consideration and in conference with all our military leaders. When they informed me that the landings in Japan would probably cost the lives of 200 thousand of the cream of our American soldiers and sailors, I made up my mind that the best way to save the lives of those young men—and the best way to save the lives of the Japanese soldiers, also—was to drop those bombs and end the war.

And I did it. And I would say to you I would do it again if I have to.

We have been making real progress in putting atomic energy to work. Already, atomic research has led to important discoveries in medicine, and there is real promise that it will lead to much better grains and livestock on our farms.

Up in Arco, the Atomic Energy Commission is now constructing a reactor testing station. From the knowledge we gain there, it should be possible to develop machines to generate useful power to drive ships and airplanes.

You know, nearly all the destructive weapons that have been discovered in times past have eventually been put to use for peacetime purposes. Now, if we are not ingenious enough and have not the sense to do that same thing with the most awful release of the atom, then I am here to tell you that we probably ought to be destroyed. And I am here to say to you that we are not going to be destroyed, we are going to use this great energy for the welfare and benefit of the human race and not for its destruction.

Arco is a truly cooperative venture. It represents the combined efforts of the Atomic Energy Commission, private industry, and universities and research institutions from coast to coast. We are pooling all the resources we have in this great undertaking to harness atomic energy for the beneficial use of mankind.

Throughout our history, scientists and scientific knowledge have contributed to our progress as a nation. If you want to keep up that progress, we need to stimulate scientific discovery and research, and train more young men and women for our laboratories and research centers.

To carry out these objectives, I have just signed the National Science Foundation Act of 1950. This act is of tremendous importance, because it will add to our knowledge in every branch of science.

I am confident that it will help us to develop the best scientific brains in the Nation. It will enable the United States to maintain its leadership in scientific matters, and to exert a more vital force for peace.

Whatever the future may hold, we must bend every effort toward our major objective, and that major objective is world peace and the welfare of all mankind, no matter what his race, creed, or color may be, no matter what part of the world he may live in.

Now I am making this trip around all over the United States to report to you as the President of the United States. I came out here in 1948 asking you for votes. I am back here now, as President of the United States, not running for any office but to report to you as I report to the Congress every year under the Constitution. I am making to you personally and giving to you personally a message on the state of the Union and what goes on, and what I believe, and what I am trying to do.

And if I tell it to you, it can't be garbled, because when you hear me talk nobody can transfer those remarks to mean something else.

When I come along later in the season, we will do a little politicking. But right now I am reporting to the Nation on its condition, on what it needs, and what I hope I can give it for its welfare and benefit, on what I hope to contribute to world peace, and what I hope to obtain for—as I said a minute ago—the welfare of all mankind.

I can't tell you how very much I appreciate this early turnout. It is surprising to everybody—I think it is surprising to yourselves, but I appreciate it most highly.

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT SHOSHONE, IDAHO

I got up rather early this morning and had a meeting at Pocatello at 6 o'clock, and I never expected to see that many people out at that time of day. And here it is 8 o'clock in this great city, and more than ever am I surprised—and agreeably surprised. And this will surprise some of my reporter friends, too, who are along with me.

I am glad to be in Shoshone, in this rich farming section of the Snake River Valley. I want to talk to you this morning about one of Idaho's great crops, potatoes.

I was up in Maine in the middle of the war, along about 1943, inspecting an air base at Presque Isle, and they were telling me about a boy from Idaho, a private in the Air Force there, that had been sent to the guardhouse because he refused to peel Maine potatoes. Of course, I didn't blame him much.

Idaho has good reason to be proud of its potatoes. Your growers have done a fine job

of growing high-quality potatoes and marketing them in an efficient manner.

The potato growers of Idaho and other States have been attacked a lot in recent months. There has been so much discussion all over the country about the potato situation and so much false information about it that I want to give you the facts.

First of all, it is certainly not right to make the potato growers "whipping boys" for the costly potato surplus when basically the trouble is due to the laws which were passed back in 1947 and 1948. They provided potatoes with a mandatory support price, but they gave no effective production and marketing controls. Instead, Congress said, "Try price supports without controls; give them a trial run."

Well, that is exactly what we have done for 2 years, and you know the result. I tried to get that changed just a short time ago and did not succeed in getting it done. It is just as we warned against.

The Government has been required by law to buy millions of bushels of potatoes in order to maintain prices, and most of the potatoes bought by the Government have had to be disposed of for uneconomical uses, wasting millions of dollars. That sort of program is not in the farmer's interest, it is not in the Nation's interest. It can lead to public repudiation of the whole farm price support program.

That is why the Secretary of Agriculture has pleaded with Congress to change the price-support laws on potatoes so that we could control production and marketing more adequately and thus avoid these big surpluses. Most of that surplus, of course, has to be destroyed. You can't safely drive a wagon or a car without a brake.

The Congress has recently passed a law providing that support prices shall not be in effect for potatoes after this year's crop, unless marketing quotas are also in effect. But marketing quotas for potatoes are not permitted under the present law. This is obviously only a partial solution.

I have been urging the Congress to authorize both marketing quotas and direct production payments, in order to support potato prices without accumulating wasteful surpluses. This will bring a fair return to the farmers and at the same time benefit the consumers and the taxpayers.

I hope you people of Idaho will rise up and demand that such action be taken by Congress. It is certainly in your interest to do so. You see, the situation as it developed is such that they could make a great big "bugaboo" out of potatoes. They are doing it with the idea of discrediting the whole farm program of the administration.

Now it is to your interest to see that we get the farm program which we are trying to get and which will work not only in your interest but in the interests of everybody in the United States—all farmers everywhere, not only the potato growers, but wheat growers and cotton growers and tobacco growers, and everybody else. I have been fighting for that ever since January 1, 1949. And if you will read my message on the state of the Union in January 1949, you will see there that I advocated a program that would have prevented all this talk about potatoes. That is entirely in your interest.

I came out here to tell you what the facts are. Nobody else will tell you what the facts are, because those people who control the methods of communication want to see the farm program ruined and put out of business. And I am out here to tell you what the facts are.

If you will use your head and your own judgment and work in your own interest, we will get this thing settled in such a way that the farm program will continue as it ought to.

Now it is a pleasure to me to be here with you this morning in this beautiful city. And I hope—I hope—that you will inform yourselves completely on just exactly what we are trying to do for a farm program that will work. When you know what the facts are, you can not help but go along with what I am advocating; and I want you to know the facts, that is the reason I am here.

I came out here to tell the people just exactly what I stand for, and why. I am not running for anything. I may come back a little later and try to influence you on what is to your best interests, but I will try to tell you the facts.

I have found in my long political experience—and it has been over 30 years—that when you know the facts, honest men have no trouble in agreeing on what the results should be.

Thank you all very much for this pleasure.

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT GLENNS FERRY, IDAHO

It is a pleasure to be here this morning, I can assure you. It is also a great pleasure to me to have warm weather again. When I left Washington it was 92 in the shade, and when I got out here to western Nebraska and Wyoming it was snowing. It is hard to tell what kind of clothes to wear in such changes of weather.

Since early this morning, I have been traveling across southern Idaho through this great Snake River Valley. Here it is, only a little after 9 o'clock, and I have already made speeches in Pocatello and Shoshone. Now I am glad to be able to stop here for a few minutes at Glenns Ferry and talk with you about some of the problems that this country faces today, problems in which you are vitally interested and in which I am vitally interested. The reason I came out here was to give you my viewpoint and to find out what your viewpoint is directly, so there can be no misunderstanding of what we are trying to do and what we are trying to say.

The biggest problem we have is that of maintaining world peace. We can build a peaceful world only if we remain prosperous and well off here at home.

There is a very direct connection between farm prosperity and world peace. Farm prosperity is the foundation of the national economy of the United States. That was certainly true 20 years ago when the farm depression of the 1920's led to the great depression.

I think that the farm home and the small country town are among the strongest bulwarks of our democracy. We have got to see to it that our farmers prosper on farms which they own themselves. We shall certainly go downhill if we ever have a large rural floating population who have to earn a living by working in the fields of a few large-scale landowners.

That is why I look with grave suspicion upon the development of the so-called industrialized agriculture, the operation of farms that are nothing but factories for the production of crops. What makes this a great Republic and a great country are the small landowners, men who have property of their own on which they live and make a living.

These farm factories depend for their prosperity upon a large force of landless and underprivileged workers. These workers have to migrate from place to place without any opportunity for a decent life for their wives and children.

The Federal Government has been doing a great deal in recent years to help men and women to own and improve their own farms.

You folks here in Idaho know all about the new farms that are opened up by reclamation projects in former sage-brush areas. One of the most important things to remember about our reclamation program is that it safeguards the family-sized farm, and does not give encouragement to the growth of these huge corporate farms I was talking about earlier. That is not all we have been doing.

In the State of Idaho alone, more than $34,000,000 has been loaned for agricultural and home operating needs, and for purchase and enlargement and development of farms.

We have also lent Idaho farmers over $1,000,000 to install needed irrigation and water facilities. The Farmers Home Administration is also helping hundreds of new farm families, a large number of which are veterans, to get started on new farms.

When we first started doing something to help farm tenants buy their own land, back in 1935, you should have heard the outcries coming from the opposition. In those days the reactionaries set up an outfit which they called the American Liberty League. They issued a long blast against the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, calling it a socialistic experiment.

Those words have been used ever since we started to work for the farmer back in 1887. A fellow by the name of Hatch from the great State of Missouri got a bill through the Congress to appropriate $15,000 to each State that wanted an experimental station in connection with its agricultural college, and he was called a Socialist and a man who was going to tear down the Government of the United States. Yet nearly every agricultural college in the United States now works under that same Hatch Act.

They said the farm-tenant program was Russianization of agriculture. Well, you people know that our farmers' home program was and is nothing of the sort. Instead of being socialistic, it has been a real force in preserving and strengthening free enterprise. Now, I hope you didn't believe that silly nonsense about socialism in 1935. I know you didn't believe it in 1935, and I am very sure you don't believe it now.

No matter what such people say, we intend to go right ahead and improve the condition of agriculture, and carry out the whole Fair Deal program to secure good housing, good health, education, and social security.

These are measures which will help us to preserve world peace—our greatest objective; and if we are going to get world peace, we ourselves must be economically strong. We must be in a position where our people are better off, have more things, and live better than any other people in the world. They are that way now, and we want to keep that up.

It is my idea that if we can inform the people of those countries that are under tyranny of the facts of life as we see them here in these great United States, we will not have any more difficulty about getting a world peace that will last.

My one ambition has been, ever since I inherited the Presidency on April 12, 1945, to obtain world peace—a peace that will last, a peace that will help us all, a peace that will make all the peoples of the world happy.

Now, I know that is not beyond the bounds of possibility, and I know you believe me when I tell you that is exactly what we are working for. And we are going to keep working for it until we get it.

You know, I have been up against some very, very hard propositions. I think you remember back in 1948, it was said that it was an impossibility for me to go riding all over the country to convince the people that I was on the right track and for their benefit.

I did convince them, and we did win.

Now we want to convince the world in exactly the same manner that we are on the right track, and we will win—because I think God is with us in that enterprise.

I certainly appreciate the cordiality with which I have been treated in Idaho. I am out here—as I told you in the beginning—to tell you what I think, and what I am trying to do.

I tried to convince you of that while I was out here in 1948 running for President, and trying to get votes. I am not running for anything now. I am out here to report to you on exactly what I am trying to do, and I want your help to help me put it over. I may come back a little later and talk a little politics to you, but I am not doing it now.

Thank you very much.

Assistant Secretary of Interior William E. Warne Speaks on Public Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 15, 1950

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I place in the Appendix of the RECORD an address made by Assistant Secretary of the Interior William E. Warne at the thirty-eighth annual meeting of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States here in Washington, D. C., on May 2, 1950, in regard to the Government's program and aims in regard to power development, which I am sure will be of general interest:

THE GOVERNMENT'S PROGRAM AND AIMS IN POWER DEVELOPMENT

Two weeks ago, the National Association of Electric Companies invited the Washington press corps to breakfast. Representatives of several large electric-power companies, in a series of speeches, accused the Federal Government, and more specifically the Department of the Interior, of all manner of crimes against the country in general and the utility industry in particular. It was charged that the Government's power policies were confusing and needed clarification; that public power programs were "contrary to the public interest"; and that these program were "leading the country into socialism."

I am glad indeed to be here today to clear up some of the confusion which seems to trouble the privately owned electric utility industry.

To appraise the problem of energy production and distribution in the United States in its true dimensions, we need some perspectives.

Consider first the enormous growth of electric power development in this country since the First World War. In 1920, electric utility plants had an installed capacity of about 13,000,000 kilowatts. By the end of 1949, capacity had increased nearly five times—to sixty-two and one-half million kilowatts. And while capacity increased fivefold during the 30-year period, the output of electric energy from the generators multiplied about seven times—from 40,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours in 1920 to 291,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours in 1949.

The plain fact is that, except during periods of severe economic depression, supply of electric power in this country has never caught up with demand. Today, in spite of the very large additions to generating capacity made both by private industry and by Government during and since World War II, we are still short of power.

This is so, despite assurances to the contrary. We were told that we would not live to see the day that the Government would market all of the power to be generated at Hoover Dam on the Colorado River, the first large-scale Federal hydroelectric installation. Yet the generators at Hoover Dam have been operating at top capacity ever since the first unit was installed in 1936. Still other dams and other generating plants have been required and provided in the area. We were told also that Grand Coulee Dam on the Columbia River would turn out to be a gigantic white elephant, and yet demands for power from Grand Coulee constantly have raced far ahead of supply.

The war effort of the United States would have been severely restricted had it not been for the large blocks of electric power generated at Hoover and Grand Coulee, at Bonneville, and at the dams operated by the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Since the war, while some utility executives have been assuring us that the power emergency is over, demand for electrical energy has continued its upward spiral. At hearings before the House Appropriations Committee in 1946, the president of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. was asked whether there was any shortage of power in the Central Valley of California. He replied, and I quote: "There is none now; there has been none; and there will be none in the future." Less than 2 years later, while the Central Valley was experiencing one of the most acute shortages in history, P. G. & E. found it necessary to pull switches on its overloaded lines and to cut down deliveries to its customers. As most of you know, brown-outs have plagued many other sections of the United States in the last few years, and shortages still exist due both to lack of supply and transmission facilities.

The Federal Power Commission reports that in 1948, the last year for which complete figures are available, nearly half of the country's major utility systems had to make maximum-load curtailments—that is, to cut power deliveries to their customers below demands at peak periods. These curtailments occurred in every region of the United States. In total, they amounted to 2,571,000 kilowatts, or about double those of 1947.

Unfortunately, these figures by no means indicate the true dimensions of the country's power shortage. Our actual deficit of electrical energy is much larger than is generally realized. It is a concealed shortage, because it must be measured in demands that never develop because the power is not there to meet them.

In the Tennessee Valley and in the Pacific Northwest, abundant low-cost power supplies, by stimulating industrial and agricultural development and raising living levels, create power markets that never before existed. And they create these demands by creating business and industrial opportunities in large numbers for private citizens.

In addition, as electric power rates go down, the use of electricity goes up. In 1925, for example, with electricity selling at a little over 7 cents a kilowatt-hour, annual domestic consumption in the United States averaged only about 400 kilowatt-hours per customer. But by 1948, with the average rate down to approximately 3 cents domestic consumption per customer had quadrupled, amounting to about 1,563 kilowatt-hours a year. This means more comfortable and better living in millions of homes.

Considering all of the dynamic factors involved, the Federal Power Commission foresees the country's annual electric power requirements adding up to the enormous sum of 600,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours by 1960. Electrical output of this magnitude would require 134,000,000 kilowatts of capacity installed in both utility generating stations and industrial plants. This means that power plant capacity by 1960 must be expanded to twice its present size and three times its size in 1940.

Doubling the size of the country's power plant in the next decade and preparing for still greater future expansion is a task which calls for all of the ingenuity and resourcefulness which private industry and the Government can bring to bear upon it.

In World War II the Federal dams proved the key to large parts of our armament problem, and they provided the power for the atom bomb. Since VJ-day, they have been utilized and desperately needed in our national economy. In the future, which we hope will be peaceful, they and many more will be needed. If the cold war becomes hot, which God forbid, electrical energy supply will immediately become a crucial problem despite all that anyone is doing or planning to do now.

The private companies are planning substantial additions to the generating capacity of their plants within the next few years. But within the next decade they will be faced with the necessity of retiring about 10,000,000 kilowatts of existing capacity because of age and obsolescence. Net additions to plant by private industry in future years will fall far short of the amount needed to close the gap between power supply and demand. For this reason alone, and there are a number of others, the job of plant expansion can only be done by industry and Government working side by side.

The question is not whether public and private power agencies can live together, but whether public and private agencies, working together at top speed, can expand power output fast enough to sustain our dynamic American economy.

In the building of a national power plant adequate to meet future needs, the river basins of the country will play an indispensable role. The Federal Power Commission estimates that, if sound, multipurpose methods are applied to their development, our rivers can be harnessed to provide nearly 77,000,000 kilowatts of additional hydroelectric capacity. A large share of this vast potential is located in the West. The State of Washington alone has undeveloped hydro capacity amounting to more than 15,000,000 kilowatts. But there are substantial reservoirs of undeveloped water in other parts of the country as well. More than 3,000,000 kilowatts of capacity can be installed, for example, on the Androscoggin, the Penobscot, the Merrimack, the Connecticut, and other rivers flowing through New England. The rivers of the Middle Atlantic States have a potential capacity of more than 5,000,000 kilowatts, and those of the South Atlantic States nearly 7,500,000 kilowatts.

There are compelling reasons why we should put our rivers to work. Most of the power which energizes America today is produced by drawing upon fuel resources we cannot replace. Forty-six million kilowatts of our national capacity are installed in plants which feed upon coal, oil, or gas. Only 16,000,000 kilowatts of capacity make use of our renewable river resources. Of the 12,000,000 kilowatts added to national capacity since the recent war, 11,000,000 kilowatts have been installed in steam plants driven by fuel and only about 1,900,000 in hydro plants. To produce in steam plants as much electrical energy as we can develop by tapping our unused hydroelectric power resources would require on the order of 800,000,000 barrels of oil a year.

It was partly his concern for conservation of our dwindling fuel reserves that led Secretary of the Interior Oscar L. Chapman to say recently that with our peacetime economy expanding we should certainly install at least 25,000,000 kilowatts of additional hydro capacity within the next 15 years.

While development of our rivers will be important in our efforts to meet power requirements of the future, of much greater significance to the public even than this is that use of the hydro potential is important in the public development of the river basins.

Power production is the key with which we can unlock the priceless resources of our

river valleys for the achievement of other important conservation objectives—irrigation, domestic water supply, flood control, navigation, recreation, salinity control, fish and wildlife protection, and pollution abatement. Coordinated use of the water impounded in storage reservoirs enables us to meet all of these urgent needs, with revenues from power development paying a substantial part of the check.

No private enterprise can finance an integrated, multiple-purpose river basin development. This is the job of the Government, and it is inescapable.

In the West, many of whose citizens have had a chance over two generations to share in the manifold benefits of reclamation and related programs, the importance of basin-wide water and resource development is now well understood. The average westerner realizes that the Federal power and reclamation program is an integral part of the overall basin development program. This western program, as it is now developing in the Missouri, Columbia, Colorado, and Sacramento-San Joaquin Valleys, could not exist without the power features—and for the reason that power revenues pay an essential part of the cost. With the irrigation job in the West but half done, we are approaching the point at which we must undertake projects where the payoff will be smaller than in our earlier programs. In these circumstances, power production assumes crucial significance. Without power revenues, some of our future projects would be economically unsound and great developments serving many public benefits would be lost.

We need more, not less, planning and construction to make full use on an integrated basis for all purposes of our rivers, and we need it in the East as well as the West. Our water problem is no longer sectional and confined to the arid West. It is in the eastern city which is the pride of the whole Nation, New York, where today you must ask for a glass of water in a restaurant and are officially frowned upon if you take too many baths.

When spokesmen for some of the power companies opposing public power development raise the cry of socialism, they seek to obscure the real issue. The river resources of the country belong to all of the people. While the Federal Government is not proposing a public monopoly of hydro power nor proposing to prevent privately owned utilities appropriately to use these resources, the Government cannot permit private companies to skim the revenue-producing cream off our national water resources. Nor can it allow piecemeal, single-purpose river development to foreclose the opportunity to undertake bold, efficient, and truly economic multiple-purpose programs directed toward the whole range of our conservation objectives. We still have magnificent opportunities in this great country and we must not fritter them away by such narrow actions. The public interest clearly demands public developments.

For the reasons I have outlined, among others, public power is here to stay. But we in the Department of the Interior do not believe that the development of integrated river-basin programs by public agencies spells the doom of private enterprise. Recent history does not support the view that public power is pulling the props out from under the electrical-utility industry.

Thirty years ago public power made up only 4 percent of our total annual output of electrical energy. Last year public power's contribution amounted to 20 percent of the national output. Measured in relative terms, private power lost ground. But the industry's markets actually expanded more than six times over the years. The output of privately owned plants jumped from 38,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours in 1920 to 233,000,000,000 in 1949.

Since the Holding Company Act was approved by Congress 15 years ago, Government regulatory agencies have forced private-utility companies to write off $1,500,000,000 in inflated stock valuations, according to the Securities and Exchange Commission. Despite this, net income of private utilities in 1949 amount to $753,000,000. This was nearly 55 percent more than they earned in 1938. And this rise in profits took place during the period in which public power was making its most rapid growth. This is hardly a calamitous situation for the utility industry.

In 1940, with Federal power development on the Columbia River in its early stages, the Big Five companies in the Northwest—Pacific Power & Light, Washington Water Power, Puget Sound Power & Light, Portland General Electric, and Mountain States Power—showed a combined net income of $7,866,000. By 1948, public-power plants at Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams were turning out 10,900,000,000 kilowatt-hours of energy. The output of the Big Five, excluding their large purchases of Federal power, had risen from 3,000,000,000 to 4,400,000,000 kilowatt-hours and their net income of $13,484,000 was almost twice their 1940 earnings. As compared with a return on capital and surplus of 4.8 percent in 1940, their investment paid off at the rate of 8.55 percent in 1948.

No wonder that the vice president of Pacific Power & Light told breakfasting Washington newspapermen 2 weeks ago, and I quote: "It is obvious that the (Pacific Northwest) region must have more and more power to support its growth. * * * That is why we of the private-electric companies of Oregon and Washington have been coming back here to Washington from year to year, urging the Appropriations Committee to keep the Government's power-plant program on the Columbia going forward on schedule. * * * It has been a little difficult for some of our associates in the electric industry to understand our position."

Less than a week after Mr. John Dierdorff made this statement, Pacific Power & Light made its annual report to stockholders for 1949. Net income of this company, operating in an area where more public power is produced at lower rates than anywhere else in the United States, was up 44 percent over 1948.

So, in the Pacific Northwest where the Government has its largest block of power and its most extensive transmission grid, instead of dissension and disagreement, we now find in that area an effective working partnership between the Government's wholesale electric system, the power companies, and the public distribution agencies, all of whom operate in a single power pool.

Viewed in this light, the long-standing opposition of New England utility companies to public-power development there has penalized not only the citizens of that region but the utilities themselves.

Look at some figures. Using the years from 1929 to 1947 as a yardstick, power-generating capacity in the New England States, owned entirely by private companies, increased 48 percent. For the country as a whole, the increase averaged 77 percent, for the TVA States 140 percent, and for the Pacific Northwest 146 percent. In this same period, total income in New England rose 91 percent while the increase for the country as a whole was 129 percent, for the TVA States 198 percent, and for the Pacific Northwest 202 percent.

These comparisons make plain why two New England governors have recently gone on record as favoring river development including electric-power production and why Senator GREEN, of Rhode Island, has introduced legislation in Congress which would establish a New England commission of Federal and States representatives to investigate available water-power resources in that region.

Let me turn now to Federal power policy, which has been reiterated by the Congress for more than four decades and is said to be confusing some of the utilities. This policy can be simply stated. Federal dams shall include, where feasible, facilities for generating electrical energy. Preference in power sales shall be given to public agencies and cooperatives. Power disposal shall be for the particular benefit of domestic and rural consumers. Power shall be sold in wholesale quantities at the lowest possible rates consistent with sound business principles. It should be noted that the Federal Government is not in the retail distribution business. Disposal shall be such as to encourage widespread use, and to prevent monopolization.

I find nothing confusing here. These principles are clear-cut. Their basic soundness is apparent.

Some of the utility companies, conceding only that the Federal Government can build great dams, would have the Government turn over to them at the bus-bar the power generated at public expense. But if control over public power were relinquished at the point of generation, many of the purposes I have stated could not be so well served.

To carry out the mandates of Congress, construction of Federal backbone transmission lines is required. Generating stations, for efficiency, must be tied together, and the responsibility of the Department of the Interior does not end until the power has been made available to the consumer, preferably through public agencies or cooperatives, under circumstances that encourage use and prevent monopolization, and at rates consistent with sound business principles.

In some instances the need for investment of Federal funds in transmission facilities can be obviated through the use of proper wheeling contracts. These are arrangements by which utilities agree to deliver public power over their lines to public distributors. Such contracts, several of which have been signed within recent months, help to integrate private and public power supplies for the benefit of consumers and give the power company a part in the continuing effort to serve the respective regions.

The guideposts I have enumerated are those by which the Department of the Interior, which markets Federal power outside the Tennessee Valley, conducts its business through the Reclamation Bureau, the Bonneville Power Administration, the Southwestern Power Administration, and the newly established Southeastern Power Administration.

Under these principles the program is carried out not just to produce kilowatts of energy, or to make the Treasury whole, important as these objectives may be, but in addition to aid the general economic business and industrial development of the regions where the power is produced and to benefit the people as directly as possible. I think we can report good progress in attaining these goals, which seem wholly desirable to me and in conflict with no American principle.

Chancelor of Great University Says Worth Thinking About—Education Not Repression Is Progress

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1950

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, at Easter recess I again had the inspiration of attending church services in my home city

of Long Beach, Calif. The Pilgrim is the name of the church bulletin or calendar of events. The distinguished and beloved pastor is Dr. Stuart LeRoy Anderson, D. D. Quite regularly this church paper, the Pilgrim, also carries some short but appropriate words to think about other than just the local church events. The bulletin for Easter carried the following statement by Dr. Robert M. Hutchins, chancelor of the University of Chicago:

WORTH THINKING ABOUT

(By Robert M. Hutchins, chancelor, University of Chicago)

It is now fashionable to call anybody with whom you disagree a Communist or a fellow-traveler. So Branch Rickey darkly hinted the other day that the attempt to eliminate the reserve clause in baseball contracts was the work of Communists.

One who criticizes the foreign policy of the United States, or the draft, or the Atlantic Pact, or who believes that our military establishment is too expensive can be called a fellow-traveler, for the Russians are of the same opinion. One who thinks that there are too many slums and too much lynching in America can be called a fellow-traveler, for the Russians say the same. One who opposes racial discrimination or the Ku Klux Klan can be called a fellow-traveler, for the Russians claim that they ought to be opposed. Anybody who wants any change of any kind in this country can be called a fellow-traveler, because the Russians want a change in this country, too.

The Constitution of the United States guarantees freedom of speech and the right of the people peaceably to assemble. The American way has been to encourage thought and discussion. We have never been afraid of thought and discussion. The whole educational system, and not merely the University of Chicago, is a reflection of the American faith in thought and discussion as the path to peaceful change and improvement.

The danger to our institutions is not from the tiny minority who do not believe in them. It is from those who would mistakenly repress the free spirit on which those institutions are built. The miasma of thought control that is now spreading over the country is the greatest menace to the United States since Hitler.

There are two ways of fighting subversive ideas. One is the policy of repression. This policy is contrary to the letter and spirit of the Constitution of this country. It cannot be justly enforced, because it is impossible to tell precisely what people are thinking; they have to be judged by their acts. It has been generally thought that the widest possible latitude should be given to freedom of speech and publication, on the ground that the expression of differing points of view, some of which are bound to be unpopular, is the way to progress in the state. Hyde Park Corner in London, where anybody may say anything, has long been a symbol of the confidence of the Anglo-Saxon world in the ability of democratic institutions to withstand criticism, and even to nourish itself upon it. There are numerous laws already on the books which provide for the punishment of subversive acts.

The policy of repression of ideas cannot work and never has worked. The alternative to it is the long, difficult road of education. To this the American people have been committed. It requires patience and tolerance, even in the face of intense provocation. It requires faith in the principles and practices of democracy, faith that when the citizen understands all forms of government he will prefer democracy and that he will be a better citizen if he is convinced than he would be if he were coerced.

Pacific Northwest Growth Has Solidity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 15, 1950

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, we of the Pacific Northwest are proud of its rapid and substantial growth. We feel that our part of the United States has a great future in store for it which will redound not only to the people of that area but to the people of the entire Nation. I include herein an article written by Mr. Hal Boyle, Associated Press staff writer, entitled "Pacific Northwest Growth Has Solidity." This article appeared in the Seattle Daily Times, May 11, 1950. It follows:

PACIFIC NORTHWEST GROWTH HAS SOLIDITY

The great Pacific Northwest is beaver busy today.

It feels it is the promised land of the American future. But it is something like a young boy reaching the weed stage, who is growing right out of his clothes.

The area is developing so fast it is finding it difficult to keep up with the demands of its postwar expansion. It is still building like mad.

Almost everywhere you look, you see trees going down and homes going up, as the cities reach out into the woods. And new factories are springing up to serve a mushrooming population.

The power supply is already strained in some sections, and dozens of dams are being built, or are in the planning stage, to tap fresh might from the Northwest's roaring mountain streams.

To a casual visitor there appears to be no let-up in the postwar boom. But it is curiously unlike other booms in United States history. There is an unmistakable solidity about it.

You get the feeling there are almost as many real-estate offices about as there are filling stations. But the land salesmen aren't serving free lunches or hiring jazz bands to lure the customers in, as was customary in Florida during the hectic boom there in the 1920's.

It's a high-priced area and the wages generally are high. I found this out when I got a shoeshine at the Seattle-Tacoma airport, and the boy said: "Two bits please." That didn't include a tip, either. But they don't tip as much out here as they do in the East.

There are short cuts to keep down the costs. People in the Northwest seem to know how to do more things for themselves than they do in some other sections. At one small party I attended, for example, two of the men were building their own homes. They didn't see anything unusual about it—and they were white-collar workers.

Even in Portland, the city of lovely homes, they will tell you—without envy—that Seattle probably will be the real metropolis of the west coast.

"Seattle is sure to pass Los Angeles and may even in time outrank New York," said one man, who has made a study of the region's resources.

"It has unlimited water and power supply to draw on—Los Angeles hasn't. And Seattle is the nearest big port to the Far East, a trading area with 800,000,000 people. That's a potential market much bigger than Europe."

Such bright visions don't thrill as many residents here as you might think. The booster attitude isn't particularly strong in the Pacific Northwest.

Those who live here like it because the recreational facilities of seashore and mountain and forest are unspoiled—and uncrowded. They fear that if millions of other Americans move out here to enjoy the mild climate—who minds if it drizzles on many, many days?—they themselves will be engulfed. Their attitude is that of a family which settles down to enjoy a fresh picnic site, only to have six other families come whooping up to share it, too.

"The real trouble is so many people are coming out here it's hard to adapt them all to our western way of life," sighed one lady. "They're beginning to swallow us—and we were here first."

But it is doubtful if that will slow the boom in the Pacific Northwest. It has a crowded time a-coming.

Resolutions of Thirty-fifth Convention of Kiwanis International

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. WILSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 15, 1950

Mr. WILSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of the resolutions adopted by the Thirty-fifth Convention of Kiwanis International which has just been concluded at Miami. I believe the first eight of these resolutions to be of such general interest to merit the study and consideration of Members of Congress as well as the people as a whole.

They are as follows:

RESOLUTIONS BY THE THIRTY-FIFTH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF KIWANIS INTERNATIONAL

1. THE HOME, THE CHURCH, AND THE SCHOOL

Whereas the home is the cradle of our liberties; and

Whereas the school is a complement of the home, and shares the responsibility of perpetuating the ideals of a free people; and

Whereas the church is the tabernacle of truth and faith and the greatest force for the promotion of the moral welfare of all the peoples and the fostering of true brotherhood: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Kiwanis International reiterates its most sincere belief in these institutions and recommends to all Kiwanians, their families, and friends, that their continuing wholehearted support be pledged to the end that they may always be fundamental in our way of life.

2. YOUTH SERVICE

Whereas Kiwanis International recognizes its obligation of training young people so that they are better prepared to take over the responsibility of leadership of tomorrow; and

Whereas it is the belief of Kiwanis International that the education of youth in the principles of our way of life is a means of better preparing them for their future responsibilities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Kiwanis International does hereby reaffirm its belief in character, leadership, and moral training engendered by such youth organizations as Key Clubs, Circle "K" Clubs, and all other similar organizations: and be it further

Resolved, That Kiwanis International does hereby pledge its support to promote and

assist all youth activities which strive for the education, training, character building, and leadership training of the youth of today.

3. STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA AND HAWAII

Whereas Kiwanis International in convention assembled at Los Angeles, Calif., in June 1948, did by proper resolution, petition the Congress of the United States to give prompt consideration to the admission of Hawaii and Alaska as States of the Union; and

Whereas we believe statehood for these Territories would be mutually beneficial: Therefore be it

Resolved by Kiwanis International in convention assembled, That we urge the Eighty-first Congress to take immediate favorable action on their petitions for statehood.

4. INDIVIDUAL ENTERPRISE

The peoples of Canada and the United States are by birth, tradition, and training, believers in the basic concepts of a free society of freemen. Thousands of men and women of both nations have given their lives to insure the continued blessings of liberty to those of us who cherish it and who, too, are willing to fight and die for it.

Linked inseparably with individual freedom is our system of free, competitive enterprise—a system that has brought our two nations to world leadership, economically and industrially, and has raised the living standards of our peoples to where we are the envy of the world.

Free enterprise has carried our Nation through two world conflicts. It furnished not only food and materials of war for our allies but is now rehabilitating our former enemies as well.

We are proud of a system that is responsible for keeping the torch of liberty burning in most of the nations of the Western World.

Gradually, but inexorably, we are being led, perhaps unconsciously, toward the socialized state. Witness the growing power of government over the people; the expansion and waste in government; the increasing tax burdens; the substitution of an artificial economy for a natural economy; the assumption by the state of financial responsibility for the health and welfare of every human being; the arraying of economic and social groups, one against the other; and the continued inroads of government into the fields of private enterprise: Therefore be it

Resolved by the delegates assembled at the thirty-fifth annual convention of Kiwanis International at Miami, Fla., That we vigorously emphasize our belief in and support of the free enterprise system, and that we condemn the efforts of individuals and groups that would have us substitute state socialism for our present system and form of government; and be it further

Resolved, That we express to our duly elected representatives in the Canadian Parliament and the Congress of the United States, an emphatic protest against any effort toward the socialization of any industry or profession or groups of workers.

5. ECONOMY IN GOVERNMENT

Whereas efficiency in Government and balanced budgets are now major concerns of our peoples; and

Whereas no individual, private corporation, or Government can long continue to spend more than its income without a collapse of his or its business structure; and

Whereas a large portion of the Government tax collections is being spent, and a larger portion thereof is proposed to be spent for more and bigger Government and extended Government controls and operations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by Kiwanis International, in convention assembled at Miami, Fla., That a major objective of Kiwanis International shall stress efficiency in Government, and balanced Government budgets.

6. HOOVER COMMISSION REPORT

Whereas the Congress of the United States has, after exhaustive study by the Hoover Commission, adopted the Reorganization Act as recommended by said Commission; and

Whereas certain sections have been implemented by order of the President of the United States, and there are many provisions which have not as yet been acted upon: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by Kiwanis International in convention assembled, That the President and the Congress of the United States be commended for the action heretofore taken and it is recommended that further action be taken which will result in greater efficiency and economy in the administration of the executive branch of the Government.

7. COMMUNISM

Whereas the United States of America and the Dominion of Canada as the world's great bulwarks of freedom are confronted with the menace of communism which ideology is foreign to our way of life; and

Whereas its influence seeks to undermine free enterprise, destroy individual initiative, deny the right of free speech, and banish religion; and

Whereas communism is seeking among other things to distort the mind of our youth and to destroy righteousness, patriotism, and good will which are fundamental to the growth of liberty-loving peoples; and

Whereas the proponents of communism are engaged in seeking to corrupt the education of the youth of America, basically affecting the moral precepts of the ennobling objects and objectives which we of Kiwanis International cherish and promote; and

Whereas we hold sacred those great human and inalienable rights vouchsafed unto us, and upon which solid foundations our governments have progressed and found favor in the family of nations; and

Whereas communism does present a real challenge to the peoples of the United States and Canada: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Kiwanis International reaffirms its belief in and support of a representative form of government and our way of life and we denounce communism as opposed thereto; and be it further

Resolved, That we enlist the aid and assistance of all patriotic citizens to the end that through eternal vigilance, liberty may be preserved and the forces which seek to undermine and destroy us as a free people, be not permitted to exist anywhere throughout our great nations.

8. WORLD PEACE

Whereas history shows that peace is the product of law and order, and that law and order are the products of government; and

Whereas disarmament and world peace can only be achieved by world order, under international law; and

Whereas the peoples of the United States of America and Canada, while now enjoying peace and security under the laws of their local, State, provincial, and Federal Governments, deeply desire the guaranty of world peace; and

Whereas the United Nations is an organization in being, and its Charter is capable of amendment so as to make it an effective instrument for the maintenance of world order; and

Whereas the United Nations, as presently constituted, though accomplishing great work in many fields, lacks authority to enact, interpret or to enforce world law and under its present Charter is incapable of restraining any major nation which may foster or foment war: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this thirty-fifth annual convention of Kiwanis International in Miami, Fla., reaffirms its confidence in the purposes of the United Nations and gives wholehearted support to its constructive work; and be it further

Resolved, That Kiwanis International calls upon the leaders of government in the United States and Canada to initiate such amendments to the United Nations Charter as will strengthen the United Nations and make it capable of enacting, interpreting, and enforcing international law to insure world peace and guarantee to all peoples their right to maintain their own domestic, political, economic, social, and religious institutions; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Prime Minister of Canada and all members of the Federal legislative bodies of both countries.

Presidential Veto of Kerr-Harris Amendment to the Natural Gas Act of 1938

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM PICKETT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 15, 1950

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Speaker, on the 15th day of April 1950 the President vetoed the Kerr-Harris amendment to the Natural Gas Act of 1938. In his message vetoing the amendment the President made certain assumptions and advanced certain arguments which are refuted by a critical examination of the facts. Below is a statement of each of his principal reasons for vetoing the bill and of the facts to show that the veto was not in the public interest.

First. The President stated that the bill would preclude the Federal Power Commission from regulating sales of natural gas by independent producers and gatherers to interstate pipeline companies for resale in interstate commerce. This is a correct statement of the principal object of the bill. However, the bill would in no wise change the original intent of Congress in passing the Natural Gas Act in 1938 or the interpretation the Commission has heretofore placed upon the act. The Commission has not undertaken to regulate a single sale of natural gas by an independent producer to a natural-gas company. Indeed, in its order No. 139 of 1947 it disclaimed any power, authority, or intention to do so. Despite this fact, the Commission states with obvious satisfaction that the price of gas to consumers has decreased 12 percent since the act went into effect in 1938. It appears conclusively, therefore, that experience has demonstrated there is no necessity for regulating the price at which producers sell their gas to interstate pipelines in order to prevent price increases to consumers.

There is a good and sufficient reason for this decrease in price to consumers, even though the demand has greatly increased and the average field price, now only about 6 cents per thousand cubic feet, is considerably above what it was when the Natural Gas Act was passed. The transportation of gas yields to the

economies of large-scale operations. With increased volumes, the unit cost of transportation has materially decreased. The pipeline companies have been able to install larger lines, more compressors, and to operate their lines at close to 100 percent capacity. Since the Commission regulates the rates at which the pipeline companies sell gas to most of their customers, these economies in transportation are passed on to the ultimate consumers.

To illustrate the effect of volume upon domestic consumers prices: According to a statement filed by Mr. Leland Olds with the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee when he testified during the hearings on the Kerr bill in the Senate, the average cost of 1,000 cubic feet of 1,000 b. t. u. gas to consumers in the city of Washington, D. C. on sales of 2,000 cubic feet per month is $1.355 per thousand, but if the customers' consumption increases to 20,000 cubic feet per month, the price drops to $1.079 a thousand. Bear in mind, Mr. Speaker, that the independent producer receives an average of 6 cents per cubic foot at the well. Volume, not well-head price, is the controlling factor in the determination of consumer prices.

There is every reason to believe that if producers were left free to sell their gas at competitive prices, abundant supplies would be forthcoming and the pipelines could continue to buy and transport gas in increasing volumes, thus further reducing the unit cost of transportation. The field price of gas is only a fraction of the price paid by the ultimate consumer; and economies realized in handling increased volumes of gas should more than offset any probable increase in field prices incident to augmented demands.

Second. The message asserts that authority in the Commission to regulate sales by independent producers is necessary in the public interest, because pipelines are not able readily to find new sources of supply, thus creating an inflexibility which ties the pipeline down rigidly to a limited number of suppliers.

This argument completely misconceives the factual situation which exists in the great gas-producing areas in the Southwest. There close to 175 trillion cubic feet of gas are available largely in Texas, Oklahoma, Kansas, and Louisiana. Vast reserves are found in the Hugoton-Panhandle area and others in Carthage, Katy, Pledger, and all up and down the coastal area in Texas and Louisiana, to say nothing of the enormous volumes of gas produced with oil in these States. Furthermore, there are thousands of gas wells in Texas alone which have no market outlet; although most of them are readily available to pipelines. General Thompson of the Texas Railroad Commission is authority for the statement that there are over 3,000 of such wells in Texas alone. The pipelines running from Hugoton to the north and east, from west Texas to California or from southwest Texas through the Gulf coastal area to the north and east will be able to tap almost unlimited supplies of natural gas; and it is pertinent here to state that natural gas is being discovered several times faster in these areas than it is being utilized. Many trunk lines constructed as indicated, as many of them already are, can, by making relatively short extensions of feeder lines, have available to them abundant supplies of natural gas.

The necessity for laying such short feeder lines offers no impediment to the gas companies in obtaining an abundant supply of gas. They could and would lay these lines if conditions were such as to induce producers to sell their gas. There are two great obstacles which discourage producers from selling gas. One is the insistence by FPC that interstate pipelines show supplies available for operations over 15 to 20 years before granting certificates of convenience and necessity, and by gas companies that the producers sign long-term contracts. Producers hesitate to sign such contracts, largely because they are unable today to know at what price they would be willing to sell 10, 15, or 20 years from now, in the face of increasing costs, mounting tax burdens, and possible inflation. If they sell on long-term contracts, prudent producers will wish to insert provisions, such as inflation and price escalation clauses, which will protect them against these hazards. The other obstacle, the threat of regulation by the Federal Power Commission, is a real deterrent to the sale by producers of their natural gas in interstate commerce. The burdens incident to FPC regulation are so onerous and the risk of confiscation so great, as will be shown below, that many producers simply are afraid to sell their gas to interstate pipelines.

Third. The message states that competition is further limited by the degree of concentration of ownership of natural-gas reserves, and that a relatively small number of producers own a substantial majority of the gas reserves. It reasons that "there is a great possibility that competition will not be effective, at least in some cases, in holding prices to reasonable levels," and that to remove the authority to regulate does not seem to be a wise public policy.

The ownership of gas reserves is widely dispersed in the hands of multiplied thousands of operators and royalty holders. While only relatively few companies and individuals sell to the natural-gas companies, this is only because most of the gas must be processed before it is taken into the pipelines. The gas is purchased from the owners by the operators of the processing plants, and in turn is sold by them to the pipelines. All of these producers, large and small, are competitors in the sale of their gas; and while a considerable amount of gas reserves are held by some 20 or 30 producers, they are in stiff competition with each other and all other producers in making sales.

Competition has been very effective in holding down the price of gas in the past. As is stated above, the average field price of gas today is only about 6 cents per thousand cubic feet, which is the equivalent of 36 cents per barrel of oil when comparative heat units are considered, and is only a small fraction of parity with coal.

If the obstacles to free competition mentioned above in point 2 are removed, it will continue to be effective in the future. The price of no other commodity which enters interstate commerce is now regulated by the Federal Government. OPA controls have long since been abandoned under the pressure of public opinion, and Congress has refused administration requests for stand-by authority to impose such price controls. The wisdom of this policy has been amply demonstrated, because under the spur of competition adequate supplies of all commodities entering interstate commerce have been forthcoming. This is the way our competitive free economy works. It has supplied natural gas at low prices in the past and can be depended upon to supply it at reasonable field prices in the future, unless arbitrary bureaucratic price controls are imposed or threatened by the Federal Government.

Fourth. The message argues that standby authority in the Commission to regulate field prices of natural gas will not discourage exploration and development of new reserves, because the Commission can be depended upon to apply price controls only to such extent as will prevent the producers from making unreasonable increases in their prices. The message concedes, however, that the Commission has not found it necessary to regulate prices charged by independent gas producers and gatherers, that producers' prices have risen and that this process of adjustment should properly continue "if held within reasonable limits." It concedes that producers and gatherers are finding strong incentives to search out new sources of natural gas, and asserts that power in the Commission to regulate sales of gas by independent producers offers no danger to continued growth of sales of gas in interstate commerce. It expresses the opinion that the Commission, if clothed with this price-fixing authority, would apply standards of regulations which would take account of the peculiar circumstances of natural-gas production.

These statements are based upon the assumption that any regulation by the Federal Power Commission would be a simple matter, that it would be benevolent, that producers of natural gas would have no fear of the consequences of such regulation and that they would continue to produce and sell gas in interstate commerce despite threatened or actual price regulation by FPC.

Producers and royalty holders who sell natural gas are numbered in the multiplied thousands. They are ready and willing to sell their gas under reasonable terms and at fair prices under competitive conditions. They have risked their capital in a very hazardous business, and have no desire to subject themselves to regulation upon utility principles. To discover a gas field it is necessary on the average to lease vast areas, to incur great exploration costs, to drill at least four dry holes for each discovery, and otherwise to invest great sums of risk capital.

Gas producers know they cannot stay in business if their operations are subjected to regulation by FPC on utility principles. There are several reasons for this.

Each producer and royalty holder would be required to keep complicated books of account as prescribed by FPC. He would be required to make numerous and burdensome reports to FPC. FPC would be in a position to prescribe the price at which each producer or royalty holder would sell his gas to an interstate pipeline. In order to determine this price FPC would have to hold a rate hearing, and the producer or royalty holder would find it necessary to employ an attorney and accountant to go with him to Washington and attend a long, detailed and complicated hearing.

Furthermore, if he desired to invest in new leases or to drill additional wells, he being a utility, would find it necessary to obtain from FPC a certificate of convenience and necessity before making the investment. How in the world could he hope to compete with others not subject to FPC regulations under these conditions? There would be thousands of other producers and royalty holders in the same situation, and a long jam of hearings would be created causing maddening delays.

Furthermore, each seller would be regulated on utility principles by the FPC yardstick which would allow him a 6-percent return on the depreciated cost of the properties placed in his rate base. There is no assurance that he could recover the cost of bonuses and rentals paid on wildcat leases and exploration costs incurred in other areas. His 6-percent return on depreciated cost of producing properties would not recover risk capital. The cost of gas produced with oil under the Commission's formula could be thrown largely, if not completely, upon oil. Under these conditions the producer would be required virtually to give his gas away. He would face bankruptcy; and in disgust, if not despair, he would be driven out of the producing business.

All of this would result in chaotic prices among producers and royalty holders, for the Commission's formula would result in fixing a separate price for each of them. Only by accident would the price of one seller be the same as the price of another seller under FPC regulation. Some prices would be very high, so high in fact that the pipelines would no doubt refuse to take the gas; while prices of most of the sellers would, while variable, be so low as to deter them from making sales at all.

There is no warrant for believing that FPC regulation would be benevolent. If the future is to be judged by the past, the foregoing presents a true picture of what would happen. Furthermore, the experience with price control by OPA after the war cannot justify any such assumptions.

While many producers have sold their gas to interstate pipelines in the past, they have done so in reliance upon the belief that FPC had no authority to regulate them, and upon FPC's Order No. 139 made in 1947 which expressly stated that it did not have the right and would not undertake to exercise control over independent producers. The Commission in specific cases has repeatedly held it has no jurisdiction over arm's-length sales by independent producers to pipelines. Naturally, under these circumstances many producers were willing to sell. But conditions now are quite different, in that a majority of the Commission have announced that if Congress does not amend the Natural Gas Act so as expressly to deny to them authority to regulate field sales by independent producers, they will regulate such sales.

In some of the debates in Congress great resentment was shown when it was suggested that producers would be unwilling to sell their gas to interstate pipelines if subjected to FPC regulation. Producers of gas are only human. They have no desire to be subjected to confiscatory regulation. They have risked their capital in finding gas reserves, and may be pardoned if they object to having their gas reserves partially or largely confiscated by a Federal agency.

No other producer of raw materials who ships them in interstate commerce is subject to Federal price controls. A producer of natural gas wonders why he should be singled out and branded as a culprit if he objects to Federal price controls which he honestly believes will be ruinous to him.

He cannot justly be criticized if he too desires to live in a competitive free economy, and to let the price at which he sells his product be determined by the interplay of forces of supply and demand. This sort of economic freedom has been sufficient to bring forth the present supplies of natural gas, and if allowed to continue, can be depended upon to maintain future supplies. If prices should temporarily rise beyond a reasonable level, new exploration and development will be encouraged to such an extent as to cause the discovery of new supplies and the readjustment of prices to desirable competitive levels in a free economy. With thousands of producers of natural gas anxious to sell their product and with the enormous untapped gas supplies readily available under competitive conditions, the consumers have no basis to fear runaway prices. But they should entertain grave fears of shortages in supplies of natural gas if FPC price controls are inaugurated or threatened.

The Kerr-Harris bill would only have continued conditions as they have existed in the past. Gas producers have been able to find supplies sufficient to maintain field prices for natural gas at a comparatively low figure, far and way below the well or mine price of competing fuels. The public may safely place their trust in competitive free economy to continue to produce adequate supplies if economic forces are permitted to have full play in the gas-producing industry.

Fifth. In the message reference is made to "imaginary fears" and to the Commission's record of accomplishments thus far in administering the Natural Gas Act.

As I have illustrated, the fears entertained by producers are by no means imaginary, and again it must be pointed out that the record of accomplishments made by the Commission thus far has been made by abstaining from any effort to regulate the price at which the independent producers sell gas to natural gas companies. If this condition has brought about such desirable results, there is every warrant that it should continue. If the Kerr-Harris bill had become a law, it would only have maintained these conditions which have produced what the President calls very desirable results.

The President Reports to the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 16, 1950

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am inserting in the RECORD copies of speeches made by President Truman in the State of Montana.

From Paradise in the west to Fort Peck in the east, the President was received by large and enthusiastic crowds. The people liked him and they appreciated the fact that he was reporting to them directly in his official capacity.

We, of Montana, feel honored that he came out to see us, and we are proud of a leader who calls his shots as he sees them.

Come back to Montana again, Mr. President. The latchstring will always be out for you, Mrs. Truman, and Margaret.

The speeches follow:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT PARADISE, MONT., MAY 11, 1950

Governor, I appreciate that introduction very much, and I hope that every governor in the country will feel the same way about the way they are treated.

I always like to come to Montana. The people of Montana were very kind to me when I was out here 2 years ago and gave me a fine welcome. From the looks of this crowd here tonight in Paradise, it seems to me that you are going to outdo the welcome of 1948. And that is what I like.

You live in one of the most beautiful parts of the United States. I wish I had time to go up to Glacier National Park. I spent a great many summers in the national parks. When I lived in Missouri, I used to drive to the Rockies every summer with my family.

This time I am not out here on a vacation. I have been making a cross-country trip to talk to the people, and to tell them the facts and give them a report on the state of the Union. You know, the Constitution requires the President to give a report on the state of the Union once a year to the Congress. I do that, but I don't think it is enough. Not very many people get a chance to read that message to Congress, so that is why I like to come out and let you take a look at me and let you hear just exactly what it is that I am working for.

In my speeches, I have described the kind of farm laws we need that will put farm prosperity on a permanent basis. I have described the work we need to do to make better use of our natural resources—our rivers, our forests, and our minerals.

I want a small-business program, the kind of laws that will help businessmen get the financing they need so that they can compete with the big, rich corporations.

All these things are of real importance to you people here in Paradise. We can be well off only when all parts of the country are

well off, and all groups of people in the country are doing well.

When we are all prosperous, we shall be able to keep the United States strong enough to maintain world peace—that is certainly the most important thing in the lives of all of us.

It has been a wonderful thing to see you here at this time of night. I was told that there wouldn't be anybody out here. I have been told that at nearly every place I have been, but people always fool the prophets. I found that out in 1948.

Now, I have a telegram here from the senior Senator from Montana, which says:

"Deeply regret that Mrs. Murray's critical illness prevents my being on hand to extend in person a cordial and warm welcome to the State of Montana. On behalf of all the people of our great State, I wish to express the sincere hope you will enjoy Montana's traditional friendliness and hospitality during your visit. You may be sure that the people of Montana fully support your leadership in the never-ending struggle to keep America strong and free.

"Kind regards and cordial best wishes.

"JAMES E. MURRAY."

I appreciate that telegram, and I am sorry that Mrs. Murray is ill. I hope that she will be all right, and I hope it isn't fatal.

Now I am ready to present to you Mrs. Truman.

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT MISSOULA, MONT., MAY 12, 1950

After that introduction, I will have to deliver the goods, won't I.

This is a grand reception, and I appreciate your willingness to come out at this hour of the day—of course, we farmers think this is pretty late in the day—but I do appreciate the fact that you were willing to come out at this hour of the day to listen to what I have to say.

I was glad to meet your Governor yesterday at Grand Coulee. It has been a pleasure to see Mike this morning, and I am extremely sorry that Senator MURRAY'S wife is sick so he can't be here.

I am told that this is one of the wonder cities of the great State of Montana, and looking at this crowd, I am inclined to believe it. One reason I like this city is because it has given me one of the finest men I know in public service, and that is my good friend MIKE MANSFIELD. Mike works not only in the interests of his district in Montana, but Mike has a national outlook that is for the welfare of the country as a whole. He is not sectional. There are few men in this country, in the Congress or out, who can equal him in the farseeing grasp he has of the country's international and domestic problems.

You know, some people will take a look at an acorn and all they can see is just an acorn. But people of MIKE MANSFIELD'S type are something different. They can see into the future. They can see a giant oak tree, with its great limbs spreading upward and outward coming from that acorn.

In Washington there are some men, no matter how hard they try, who can only see little acorns. I don't have to call any names, you know who they are. Even give them a magnifying glass or even a pair of spyglasses or even a telescope, they just shake their heads and all they can say is, "I'm sorry, I can't see anything but an acorn there."

Let me give you an example of how this little mind works. Down on the Colorado River, there is a structure of which you are all proud—Hoover Dam. Here is an interesting thing. When that dam was being planned back in 1928, it was violently fought by special interests. One Congressman from the same political party as the gentleman after whom the dam is named, had this to say about it in Congress: He said it would damage industry, it would waste the taxpayer's money, and it would lead us into communism. That's real acorn thinking, I think.

Hoover Dam was built. I don't need to tell you that this democracy of ours is the world's greatest bulwark against communism, and it is stronger because of the great reclamation, irrigation, and power and flood control projects like that dam, and like the one I dedicated yesterday.

Not so far north of Missoula, up near Glacier National Park, we are building another great dam—Hungry Horse. It will be one of the largest concrete structures in the world. They told me yesterday that Coulee was the largest in the world, so you have got to make a pretty big one to make it larger than Coulee. And it will provide vast new benefits to this entire region.

Hungry Horse Dam will produce 285,000 kilowatts of power itself, and we will begin getting that power just 2 years from now. This is a key project in the long-range program for harnessing the great water power of the Columbia River Basin. It is a major step toward the full development of Montana's water resources, much of which now lie idle and unused.

Hungry Horse Dam will be valuable not only in bringing cheap power to this area, but it will aid in the production of additional cheap power at some of the present and proposed dams farther downstream. It will be helpful in cooperating with them in giving cheap power all over this whole district. Its beneficial effects will snowball all the way along.

I am interested in seeing some of this power used to develop the important phosphate industry, that will bring new jobs to this State of Montana, and it will be a great boon to farmers all over the Western States. Hungry Horse will also be valuable for flood control.

When I was out here in 1948 I could see that the big floods on the lower Columbia River were really started by the upstream tributaries. We shall be able to control some of these streams by dams like this at Hungry Horse.

Like Hungry Horse, these dams have many values. And they are paying propositions for the taxpayer. The investment in power and irrigation are repaid direct, and the entire investment is repaid over many, many increases in the national wealth.

People don't take into consideration that the construction of public works such as Hungry Horse and Grand Coulee and Hoover Dame create industries, which create new jobs, which create prosperity for immense numbers of people.

Many people who talk loosely about the size of our national budget forget that many of our expenditures are investments which will make a stronger and a better country.

I often think that projects like this must make the Communists wonder. They must wonder how it is possible for free men, in a democracy, to plan and develop a vast country, and do it in ways which increase the liberty and the welfare of all the people. The Communists think the only way to run things is from the top down. Our system proves that it is much more effective to run it from the bottom up.

We will never be in danger from communism in this country as long as we keep looking forward and doing things to increase the welfare and freedom of our people.

I hope the country never gets into the hands of little men with acorn minds. Let us keep it in the hands of men who can see the trees and who will work for a nation and a world at peace.

You people have been grand to me here in Montana, and I appreciate it, and I hope that on this trip I can persuade the people of the Nation that it is their welfare we are working for.

I am out here to make a report to you, just as I would make a report to Congress, and I think you have a perfect right to that report. And I know you are interested in it, or you wouldn't get up this early in the morning to hear what I have got to say about it. And I thank you very much.

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT GARRISON, MONT., MAY 12, 1950

I am so happy to see all you school children out here this morning. I imagine you must have had a holiday today, didn't you? We have been traveling around over the country meeting people and explaining to them various aspects of the Government, because we believe that people are really interested in the Government.

I am more than happy this morning to have the Governor of the great State of Montana and MIKE MANSFIELD, the Congressman from the First Montana District, here with me.

We have some tremendous problems facing us in the operation of the Government of the United States. The Government, as you know, is your Government. The President is your President. He is the only national official besides the Vice President who is elected at large by the whole country.

I deem it my duty, and it is a constitutional necessity for me to make reports to the Congress once a year on the state of the Union. This time I am going around over the country trying to make a report on the state of the Union to the people themselves.

I am glad to see you all this morning. I have been discussing the farm problems, reclamation, the national resources of the country; and yesterday I dedicated Grand Coulee Dam to the uses of the people. That is one of the greatest projects in the history of the world. When it is finally finished, it will create more than 2,000,000 kilowatts of electricity. That is a wonderful thing. It was running yesterday at the rate of 1,580,000 kilowatts, and there were all sorts of gadgets for us to look at.

Not only does that dam create power for use in that section of the country, but it will also eventually lift water into the desert and put a million acres into cultivation. Sometime beginning in 1952, I think, the first irrigated farm will be opened up.

Now you have projects like that in Montana. Hungry Horse is one of them. That great dam will create 2,285,000 kilowatts when it is finished. It will create jobs. It will create cheap power. It will help this part of the world go into industry, and you can't lose anything by it, and neither can any of the rest of the country.

I explained yesterday that we have a northwest power construction, and a southwest power construction, a southeast power construction, and we hope to have a northeast power construction, if we can ever get the St. Lawrence development as it should be.

Then we have the Mississippi, Missouri, Ohio River Valleys which can be developed in exactly the same way. All that will create wealth, create jobs, create industries; and it helps the country.

There are some people who think that these things ought not to be done, because they like to have things stay just as they are. I am not one of them. I believe in progress, and I am happy to say that your Congressman, MIKE MANSFIELD, believes in progress, too. He is one of our ablest public officials in this country, and I depend on him a great deal, because I know he has good judgment. I know his heart is right, and I know he believes in doing things for the benefit of all the people.

It has been mighty nice of you to come out here this morning. I am more than happy to see all of you, and I am glad I got

this 5-minute stop here, so that I could get a chance to say a few words to you.

Thank you very much.

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT HELENA, MONT., MAY 12, 1950

Governor, Congressman MANSFIELD, and ladies and gentlemen, I appreciate very much this fine reception which the people of Helena have given me today. I certainly am glad to be here on Vigilante Day. I wish I could have seen that parade. I was glad to get a chance to see those floats alongside the train on each side. I think my family has enjoyed them as much as anything they have seen on the trip.

I appreciate also the introduction from Governor Bonner. I think he has given me a little too much credit, but I appreciate it just the same.

The Governor was with me yesterday at Grand Coulee, when I had the privilege of dedicating Grand Coulee. Today that dam is just about the biggest man-made structure in the world; it is generating more power than any other power plant in existence, and in a few years it will be providing water for hundreds of thousands of acres.

Grand Coulee is a product of the vision and farsightedness of the people of the Northwest, people who can make bold plans for the future, and who not only can make the bold plans but who have the courage and the energy to carry them out.

I am glad that Canyon Ferry Dam is being built not far from here. While Canyon Ferry Dam is not as big as Grand Coulee, it will be of tremendous importance and benefit to all this area. It should provide water for nearly half a million acres, and the power from Canyon Ferry will mean low-cost electricity for farms, city homes, and new industries.

Projects like Canyon Ferry benefit everybody in the country. They are a real investment in the future of the Nation as a whole.

You only have to travel across the country, as I have been doing this week, to realize what a wonderful future is ahead of us. Everywhere I have been, I have seen encouraging evidence of expansion and growth, and preparation for future prosperity.

Of course, I have met a few skeptics who have been saying that the country is going to the dogs. They say that we are going bankrupt, or that we are headed straight for socialism. But the fact is, these calamity howlers have been saying the same thing for years. They have always been wrong in the past, and they are just as wrong now as they were in the past.

Let us take a look at some of the recent progress we have made—progress, by the way, that we have made in spite of those same skeptics. Twenty years ago, we were at the beginning of a terrible depression that lasted over three long years. Beginning in 1933, we began a vigorous reform. By 1939 we were producing more goods and services than we had in the last boom year before the depression. Since 1939, we have done even better. Since 1939 the annual per capita income of our citizens, after taxes, has increased by more than 40 percent.

The income of farm owners, although it has slipped some in the last year or so, is more than 50 percent higher than it was in 1939. And annual wages and salaries of employees have increased about 75 percent. And, despite terrible howlings from some quarters, the annual income of corporate businesses, after taxes, has increased 100 percent since 1939. Doesn't look very much to me like the country is going to the dogs.

I am convinced that we can do just as well in the future as we have done in the past. I am convinced that we can lift our annual output of goods and services to more than $350,000,000,000 by 1960. This will be a one-third increase, and that increase will be good for everybody. Farmers and workers and businessmen can and should all prosper together.

I am convinced that by 1960 the standard of living of every industrious family in the country will be far better than it is now. I wish I had time to give you some statistics that come to me each month. I know, if you had a chance to study them, you would be just as optimistic and enthusiastic about our future as I am. Every month, and then quarterly, I receive an economic report from the economic advisers to the President of the United States, and that report goes into great detail on the situation as it develops in the country each monh.

The reason I am optimistic, this report shows that employment is on the rise, that income is on the rise, and that prices are holding steady. It shows that unemployment is far less than it was at the beginning of the year. It shows that the output of goods and services is far greater than it was at the beginning of the year.

This report is a combination of all the reports in the country, made up from reports by the Securities and Exchange Commission, reports of the Department of Labor, reports of the economic experts, on the Board of Trade, on the New York Stock Exchange, reports by the Chicago Board of Trade, reports from all the departments of the Government—the Department of Commerce, the Treasury Department—the reason I was delayed a little bit, the Secretary of the Treasury had to call up and talk to me about some business that had to be transacted over the telephone; but the report gives the complete picture of the economic situation in the United States every 30 days.

And I know what I am talking about when I talk to you optimistically about what the future holds. And don't let anybody tell you anything different but that this Republic, the greatest in the history of the world, is on the road to becoming greater and greater. And when we do that, we will get peace in the world.

Of course, this won't all happen by just sitting down and waiting for it to happen. You have got to do something to make it happen. We must work toward the kind of farm program that will put farming on a permanently sound basis.

We need to expand and extend our social-security laws; we need a housing program that will enable low- and middle-income families to own their own homes.

We must conserve and develop our national resources to better advantage, and that must be developed in the public interest and not for the greed boys.

We must see that our children get a good education.

If we have these measures, and others like them, then the United States will continue to grow and to prosper, and our Nation will continue to exert a strong force for peace in the world.

Since September 2, 1945, my whole time has been spent in an effort and an endeavor to get a lasting peace for the world. One of the first decisions I had to make when I was sworn in as President of the United States on April 12, 1945, after President Roosevelt had died, was the decision as to whether we should hold the San Francisco Conference and form the United Nations. I said "Yes, we will go forward with it," and we were successful in organizing the United Nations, and we are going to be successful in making it work for peace.

To do that, we must have the wholehearted support of the people of the United States for that purpose. That is the reason I am going around over the country reporting to you on just what conditions are, and what is necessary to obtain the world objective for which we work and pray.

I hope that you will inform yourselves completely on all the issues. I hope you will find out just exactly what is meant by the messages which I send to the Congress. I hope you will find out just exactly what the debates in the Congress mean. And I hope you will study very carefully those people who are trying to overturn our interest in the United Nations, and who are trying to put us back in the 1890's.

We are not going back—we are going forward, to 1960, and 1970, and 1980, and 2000. We are going to be better after each decade than we were when we started on that decade.

We can do that, if you will wholeheartedly help to do it, and work to do it—and that is what I am asking you to do. And that is the reason I am out here.

Washita Agricultural Flood Control Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 1950

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, the Washita drainage area was authorized for an agricultural flood control program about the beginning of the war but due to the war work was not prosecuted extensively until the last 2 or 3 years. Since that time, the Soil Conservation Service in cooperation with organized soil conservation districts, have constructed a considerable number of small projects, which have amply demonstrated the importance and value of the program. For example in Washita County on Cloud Creek, some detention structures have been built which are amply demonstrating that the program of the Soil Conservation Service in cooperation with the local farmers can control soil erosion and floods. The Department of Agriculture has selected two watershed areas in the Washita drainage basin to concentrate their work on during the next 2 or 3 years. One of these is Mill Creek in Johnston County and the other is Sandstone Creek in Roger Mills and Beckham Counties.

It was determined after the general Soil Conservation Service flood-control program was initiated that additional authorizations should be made by Congress in order to allow detention reservoirs to be constructed on the tributaries down stream to the point where the Army engineers take over with their flood-control program. Senator KERR and Senator THOMAS submitted an amendment to the rivers and harbors and flood-control bill to accomplish this purpose but were unsuccessful in securing the adoption of the amendment. Congressman TOM STEED has introduced H. R. 8404 and I have introduced H. R. 8531, which bills are identical to the Thomas-Kerr amendment and these have been referred to the Public Works Committee. If passage of these bills can be secured, it will allow considerable expansion on the Washita program.

The work planned by the Soil Conservation Service on Sandstone Creek is estimated to cost $1,568,552 but the benefits to be derived from this expansion are

equivalent to two and one-half times that amount. The structures to be constructed are 21 detention reservoirs, 15 drop inlets with fills, 1 mile of channel improvement, 1.3 miles of floodwater diversions, 5,783 acres of seeding retired area, 48.7 acres of farm waterways, 432.9 miles of terracing, 17.1 miles of farm diversions, 125 farm ponds, 48.7 miles of farm fencing, and 65,013 acres of farm and ranch planning and application. The total cost of these structures is estimated to be $1,568,552; $195,046 of this amount will be borne by the farmer.

The present rate of appropriations for the agricultural flood-control program on the Washita is approximately $1,000,000 per year and at that rate is expected that it will require 15 or 20 years to complete the program even with the efforts of the individual farmer and the soil-conservation districts; however, it is anticipated that the Sandstone Creek watershed will be completed as one of the first units in order to thoroughly demonstrate the value of a completed watershed program. The Washita River drains a portion of five counties in the Seventh Congressional District of Oklahoma. I have been one of the outstanding proponents for the project, even before I became a Member of Congress and while I was connected with the State of Oklahoma in an official capacity. Having been raised in western Oklahoma and having observed drouths, floods, and sandstorms, I naturally was intimately acquainted with the waste each year and the destruction of the farmers' crops; therefore, I determined that if there were a means by which this waste and destruction could be stopped, I would pursue it to a successful conclusion. I have been outspoken at every opportunity before the Appropriations Committee and before the Agricultural Committee in favor of the type of program now being carried out by the Soil Conservation Service. As proof of the benefits that can be derived from this program, I point to the annual estimates of the Soil Conservation Service for the Sandstone watershed:

Flood-control benefits:	
Reduction in flood damages	$57,461
More intensive land use	11,019
Total	68,480
Conservation benefits	88,039
Total	156,519

The farmers and landowners of Sandstone Creek and the Washita River know that I will be fighting their battle for adequate appropriations to carry on this program at every opportunity.

American Policy Toward Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY W. WIER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 16, 1950

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a resolution expressing concern over the policy of our country in the Middle East.

Day by day, over a long period of time now, this Nation has been sitting idly by with full knowledge of England's action in arming and preparing Egypt and the Arab States for a shooting war.

The resolution was prepared and is supported by thousands of good, peace-loving citizens in my district.

The resolution is as follows:

RESOLUTION ON THE ARMING OF THE ARAB STATES BY GREAT BRITAIN

We are deeply concerned over the American policy with respect to the rearmament of Egypt and the Arab States by Great Britain, and we are greatly disturbed because of the threat to the peace of Israel implicit therein.

The United Kingdom insisted that any supply of arms sent by her to those middle-eastern states would be for the internal security and defense requirements only.

However, the purchase by Egypt of 100 jet planes, 10 Centurian tanks, and 260 Sherman tanks, as well as pocket submarines and torpedo boats from Britain, Belgium, and Italy, far exceeds armament necessary for the purpose of maintaining internal law and order.

Estimated figures cited by the Royal Institute of International Affairs show that Egypt's budget for armaments for 1 year actually exceeds total estimated costs of resettling all the Arab refugees.

The fact that it is Britain which is extending this aid to the Arab States should not obscure the fact of indirect American participation, for it is American Army equipment that is being used in many cases, and it is thus that the United States is providing arms for countries which divert their stocks to the Near East.

We respectfully urge our Government to reconsider the problem in the light of the facts herein set forth. We ask that it use its great influence to avert the dangers to the peace of Palestine involved in the situation which is being created; and that the United Kingdom be requested to discontinue this extensive shipment of arms to the Arab states, while imposing an embargo on the supply of arms to the State of Israel.

We also submit that this critical situation is greatly aggravated by the fact that our own State Department also refuses Israel's request for arms for its defense.

We urge that in the name of justice and peace Israel be permitted by our State Department to purchase arms from the United States, as, in the face of strongly armed Arab States, arms for Israel are essential for the maintenance of peace in the Middle East.

The Recent Bus Ride

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 16, 1950

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, as I think back over the passage of the omnibus appropriation bill, I cannot refrain from pondering how appropriate is the title "omnibus." The bill just passed reminds me of a nice, new, shiny bus. This omnibus, jet propelled and steam heated, started out with the brave legend, "Economy or bust," stenciled on the side. At the end of last week, it limped back into the Senate garage covered with dust and amendments, and all you could read was the bust.

The weary taxpayers, who had been taken for this expensive ride, were astounded at the fare which the driver demanded. They had had been told that this year they were going to get the economy size ride and had been promised that the fare would not be more than they had in their pocketbooks. It had been explained to them that the bus had been very expensive to operate in wartime, what with shortages and high operating costs, and that the bus company had come nowhere near breaking even, but they had been told that was a temporary condition which would now be corrected. They had understood that the stop at the Pentagon would still be very costly, but, outside of that, the gentleman from Missouri who scheduled the tour promised that every effort would be made to cut corners on spending.

The start was promising. The first stop was at the Nation's Capital where 10 percent was cut from the estimated cost. The riders were elated and applauded, and even when Capitol Hill itself was reached, the driver remained economy-minded. Things were looking up. But then as they rolled down Pennsylvania Avenue toward the Government departments, the riders seemed to sense that the driver was feeling more expansive, and had read the travel posters and promises issued by the agencies.

All of a sudden, with a whoosh, the bus roared off, heading south and west. The trip out West was a mad whirl of parks, reclamation, irrigation, and power projects. The sales talk at each project was terrific, and the taxpayers heaved a sigh of relief when the bus turned its nose east again.

At the very last minute the driver relented and scaled down his estimates of the gas necessary to visit all the Government departments and agencies. Somewhat relieved, the passengers settled back and counted the dollars they had saved.

But they were still overburdened with subsidies, pet projects, and other mementoes of their trip. Thus, they had come to the end of their bus ride. The trip had cost less than they had feared, but much more than they could afford. And they still ran the chance that after they thought they were safely home, they might get an added bill for repairs from the Senate garage. Every passenger ought to sit down and write to the repairmen at the other end of the Capitol that they hope, when the bus is overhauled, it will be found that riders have a refund, rather than a further charge, coming to them.

Slow Down Resolution on Ireland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 16, 1950

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I include the following article from the Boston Post of May 10, 1950:

SLOW DOWN RESOLUTION ON IRELAND—ACTION RUNS INTO JAM IN HOUSE FOREIGN AFFAIRS GROUP

WASHINGTON, May 9.—Resolutions to put Congress on record as opposed to partition of Ireland have run into a jam in the House Foreign Affairs Committee that could block action this session.

WIDE SUPPORT

The antipartition move, which had vociferous support at a hearing April 28—particularly from Irish-American groups from Massachusetts and Rhode Island—has been put aside temporarily while the committee considers international trade organization proposals.

A committee aide said today that when the hearing on the ITO legislation is completed the committee probably will turn to measures dealing with military aid for participants in the North Atlantic Treaty.

This activity, the committee spokesman said, has prevented the committee from considering any action on the Irish resolution.

DORCHESTER SPEAKER

The testimony given April 28 led House Majority Leader MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, to tell the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Representative KEE, of West Virginia, that he would seek quick House action should the committee approve a resolution denouncing partition of the "gallant little island."

Support for the proposal to have Congress advise Great Britain that it favors unification of Ireland came from Representatives LANE, of Massachusetts; FOGARTY, of Rhode Island, and KENNEDY, of Massachusetts.

Other supporting witnesses before the committee hearing included Daniel Doherty, of Dorchester, Mass., representing the Central Council of Irish Country Clubs; and Thomas H. Buckley, Massachusetts commissioner of administration and finance, representing Gov. Paul A. Dever.

Home of Credit Union National Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, 2 days ago, Sunday, May 14, the people of Wisconsin and of all America rejoiced in the dedication of the new international home and headquarters of the Credit Union National Association, an inspiring building dedicated as a living memorial to its founder, a great American, Mr. Edward A. Filene. The President of the United States was on hand to dedicate the building, and it was my pleasure to have received an invitation to the ceremony. While I was unfortunately not able to be on hand because of a previous commitment for the dedication of the Rock County Airport in the southern part of Wisconsin, I was indeed happy to send my greetings to the Credit Union National Association and its many friends.

Naturally, we of the Badger State were particularly glad that the capital city of Wisconsin should have been honored by the location of this vital headquarters. Madison is more than just the capital of our State, the seat of our great State university, and the county seat of Dane County. It is a symbol of the productive, agricultural, industrial, social, and intellectual wealth of Wisconsin.

With the exception of the huge, sprawling area of Los Angeles County on the west coast, Dane County produces more milk than any other county of the more than 3,000 counties in the United States. This renowned county also rates as one of the highest of all American counties in the annual value of its agricultural products. But Madison is not only a great dairying center. It is founded on a prosperous, stable variety of wholesome industries, over 110 different plants, most of them of medium size. The distinct cultural leadership of the city consists, of course, in major part from the presence there of the great University of Wisconsin, with its esteemed faculty and its student body of over 18,000, a university which has made magnificent contributions in every phase of American life. One of the vital features of Madison research is the great Forest Products Laboratory housed in a million-dollar plant and radiating scientific research and demonstrations in forestry and forest products to all the world.

Madison is these things and many more. It is an insurance center and a convention center which is reputed to entertain more conventions than any other city of its size in the United States. It is a great transportation hub, a major wholesale and distributing center.

Enhancing all these features is its beautiful geographic location, lying on a scenic isthmus between two lovely lakes, Mendota and Monona. Supplementing the natural beauty of the location is the great park and playground system and the beautiful capitol grounds, all of which contribute many reasons which justify Life magazine telling the world, as it recently did, the opinions of countless folks that Madison is the best city in the United States in which to live.

Progress in Madison is sparked by the live wire Madison and Wisconsin Foundation, which is always ready, willing, and able to cooperate in the constant improvement of that great center. In the latest bulletin of the foundation there is a very interesting lead article on how the civic-minded folks of Madison carried on a continuing effort to locate and keep the headquarters of the credit union movement there. I believe that this article will be of interest to all friends of the credit union movement and of the vital cooperative movement of Wisconsin.

It lends a fascinating historic footnote to the memorable event of Sunday, May 14. I ask unanimous consent, therefore, that the text of this article published in the May 12 issue of the bulletin of the Madison and Wisconsin Foundation be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

There occurs in Madison this Sunday, May 14, 1950, an historical event that deserves recording in the saga of Wisconsin's capital and university city. The Credit Union National Association (CUNA) dedicates its international home and headquarters as a living memorial to its founder, Edward A. Filene, distinguished merchant philanthropist of Boston.

A great humanitarian, Mr. Filene believed he could help his fellow men most by enabling them to help themselves. Knowing that almost all employees must borrow money to pay for illness, new babies, household furnishings, living expenses, or other needs, he conceived the plan for CUNA. His purpose was to enable worthy borrowers to secure the money they needed at lowest interest rates and on repayment terms they could meet. To set up the program throughout the country Mr. Filene contributed a million dollars. Came the time to establish a national office for the organization he created. Since Wisconsin was the first State to enact legislation favoring credit unions, it had strong appeal to him as a desirable location.

In 1934 word came that Madison was being considered. The late Paul E. Stark, one of Madison's foremost builders, went east to investigate. Later, Roy F. Bergengren, Mr. Filene's representative, came here. A site was tentatively selected—the old Boyd home on Wisconsin Avenue. While negotiations were being carried on at long distance, others made a cash offer for the Boyd property. Conditions made it necessary to accept that offer. The CUNA people were greatly disappointed and almost gave up Madison because they thought no other place as suitable could be found. The old Carl A. Johnson home on Langdon Street adjoining the governor's mansion was accepted as even better for them than the Boyd property. But CUNA was on the march, and within a few years outgrew those quarters.

Then Mr. Filene died. The battle to keep the headquarters at Madison began. Again and again it became necessary to sell and resell Madison as the best location. CUNA had spread throughout the United States and Canada, which made Madison the geographical center of their entire membership. The old Fuller and Johnson office building on East Washington Avenue was up for sale and with a good bit of team work, it was acquired for the CUNA headquarters. And it was soon outgrown.

Then came plans for a new building—a living memorial to Edward A. Filene. Again flared the battle to take it from Madison. Again Madison rallied to its support. The CUNA board of directors—100 men from over the North American Continent—came for what was hoped to be the final decision. They were shown a dozen sites and agreed that if Madison was to be the city, the old Malt House property on Sherman Avenue was the spot on which to build. Thereupon Madison proposed to buy that sight as an outright gift to CUNA—a rather large undertaking as the price was $20,000. Madison responded nobly. Men in all walks of life—including local members of CUNA—joined forces. The money was raised, the property was purchased, and tendered to the international organization. Again, the old battle for removal flared up, but eventually it was accepted.

Then began the campaign to raise the building fund of $350,000. Fortunately for all concerned, our Joseph R. Rothschild was selected as one of three trustees to manage that building fund. When everything appeared set to go, the old fight to move it from Madison blazed once more. But fireman Joe put it out—for keeps.

Today CUNA has 6,000,000 members in 13,000 credit unions in every State and in every Province of Canada. Forty-six Madison credit unions have 12,305 members and $2,000,000 resources. They loan $2,000,000

annually, and have loaned over $12,000,000 to their members. From its modest start here in 1934 CUNA has grown to such a gigantic force, with a billion dollars of resources, and $452,000,000 insurance in force, that the President of the United States and the Premier of Canada came to Madison to dedicate its memorial home. All's well that ends well, but when Madisonians contemplate this splendid asset let them realize it represents a tremendous amount of time, thought, energy, and $20,000 devoted to its creation. To that the Madison and Wisconsin Foundation contributed 16 years of constant work.

Government Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 16, 1950

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Paterson (N. J.) Evening News of May 15, 1950:

HIGH TIME TO STOP WISHFUL THINKING AND TO VIEW THE FACTS REALISTICALLY

Congressman B. W. KEARNEY says he's worried over the attitude of the American public as a whole toward present day excessive Government spending. He said in Washington, "I can only conclude that most of us, for tolerating such mammoth expenditures, have taken leave of our senses." Regarding the bills introduced every day for more and more reckless expenditures, Mr. Kearney said, "My way is clear: On each and every unnecessary proposal I shall vote "no."

We're happy to see PAT KEARNEY among the ranks of those who believe a halt must be called and who are willing to help in halting it. It is not a desire for penny pinching that prompts such demands. All of us realize it takes billions of dollars to run the country. But some of us have thus far been unwilling to face the fact that a nation cannot spend more and more without producing more and more and the trend in recent years has been to spend recklessly without regard for capacity to produce for revenue.

In this matter, Congressman KEARNEY is no doubt well aware that it's not enough to reel off a lot of enormous figures in effort to impress the voter and taxpayer. The word "billions" no more impresses the man in the street today than "millions" did 20 years ago. Somehow, the citizen has to be shown in words of one syllable what it will mean to him and his family if the United States spends itself into economic collapse. The people are willing to be led.

Civil Service Survivorship Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT A. TAFT
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "S. 878 Should Be Enacted Into Law," published in the Postal Record of May 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 878 SHOULD BE ENACTED INTO LAW

Retired letter carriers recalling the valiant part that Senator TAFT played in the enactment of Public Law 426 will hail the following statement as a rainbow in the legislative sky.

The statement of Senator TAFT follows:

"I favor the enactment of S. 878 which provides that survivorship benefits shall be paid to the survivors of retired civil-service employees, in addition to the cost-of-living increase in their annuities. These employees will thereby receive a somewhat greater amount from the Treasury than that contemplated in the payments made during their service. The change in the value of the dollar, however, and the great increase in the cost of living made the original pension wholly inadequate and unfair. We are raising the payments under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance fund, for the same reason, to millions of citizens over 65. Surely the Government has a special obligation to its own employees.

"I might point out that the surviving spouse of a retired civil-service employee is one of the few widows in America today who does not receive some sort of an annuity. Social Security provides annuity for all wives of employees covered under the Social Security Act on reaching the age of 65.

"In February 1948, the Congress passed Public Law 426, a very fine bill modernizing the civil-service retirement system, and I was proud of the part I played in the enactment of that legislation.

"That law did recognize the increase in the cost of living but did so by providing that civil-service employees then on the retirement rolls could either accept an increase in their annuity of 25 percent, not to exceed $300, or turn down this increase and establish survivorship rights for their wives. The average annuity of the civil-service employee then on the rolls was approximately $900. Through stark necessity, 80 percent of these retired employees were compelled to take the increase.

"It is my opinion that, when these old people were given the difficult choice of deciding whether they should have a little bread-and-butter money, or whether they should gamble on the future and provide an annuity for their wives, they were given too hard a choice.

"Last year S. 878 was held up on the unanimous-consent calendar because there was a dispute as to the amount of the cost, and because the retroactive policy under the Social Security Act had not been determined. There is no longer any reason for delay. I hope we will have an opportunity to vote on it in the near future."

Selling American Farmers Down the River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Selling American Farmers Down the River," written by my colleague the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] and published in the May 1950 issue of the National Republic, of Washington, D. C.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SELLING AMERICAN FARMERS DOWN THE RIVER

(By WILLIAM E. JENNER, United States Senator from Indiana)

In the highly productive American agricultural area of which my own State is an important part, there is grave concern today over the general farm outlook. But it is not the farmers alone who are worried. We all have learned through bitter experience that what affects agriculture affects every one of us.

Farm income in 1949 dropped alarmingly below the high level achieved during 1947 and 1948—the years of the Republican Eightieth Congress—and it is continuing to move lower. This is happening at a time when the income of other sections of the population remains at or above the rate of earlier years.

There is no quick or easy solution to the farm problem, but I believe it is becoming abundantly clear that it will not be solved either through the free-trade policies of the Truman administration or such panaceas as the Brannan plan.

Speaking at Dexter, Iowa, during the 1948 Presidential campaign, Mr. Truman said:

"Today farmers are faced with the threat that markets will fail to keep up with their production. * * * But the Democratic Party has a constructive way of preventing such a collapse. We are reaching out to develop world markets which will absorb production above America's own needs."

Despite this promise, administration trade policies are fast making the United States a dumping ground for foreign agricultural commodities and at the same time we are subsidizing exports of foreign producers in direct competition with American farmers.

For example, since ECA began functioning in 1948, this international give-away organization has supplied Great Britain with $529,000,000—more than half a billion dollars—just to buy wheat. American wheat, you might think, American wheat which is currently glutting our markets to a point where domestic producers have been ordered to curtail their acreage sharply this year. It would seem reasonable that this wheat should have come from the United States. It didn't, however. It came from Canada, where farmers are free to grow as much wheat as their lands will produce. More than half a billion American dollars spent for Canadian wheat in just 2 years. That is one major contribution of the Truman administration toward the solution of the American farm problem.

In Washington, D. C., today, even in the Senate's own dining room, when I order American fried potatoes, the chances are they'll be Canadian fried instead. While our own Department of Agriculture is dumping surplus potatoes for livestock feed and industrial alcohol purposes, Canadian spuds are flooding the country. Some 7,000,000 bushels already have moved in and it is expected that a total of 15,000,000 bushels will arrive during the current marketing season.

If you want potatoes for livestock feed you can buy the American variety from the Government for 1 cent per 100 pounds. If you want potatoes for human consumption, you can buy the Canadian-grown variety in Washington today for about $4 per 100 pounds.

The Henry Wallace followers who still infest the Department of Agriculture may be able to explain this successfully to each other—but I am sure the American people will not understand the explanation.

In my own State of Indiana and in the surrounding States farmers produce many millions of bushels of oats, barley, and rye. The prices of all of these commodities are currently well below parity and all are being supported through loans and purchase agreements by the Department of Agriculture. Nevertheless, during the 6-month period, July 1, 1949, to December 31, 1949, we imported from Canada 9,500,000 bushels of oats; 8,000,000 bushels of barley and 7,500,000 bushels of rye. Little wonder then, American farm prices are moving lower in spite of the hundreds of millions of dollars which are being spent by the Government in a vain effort to bolster domestic prices.

Now, of course, Canada has a surplus of virtually the same grains that we do. But do you know what would happen if we attempted to dump any of our surpluses there? They would halt the importation of even as much as 1 bushel of wheat, oats, rye, barley, or potatoes by the simple expedient of refusing to permit payment for the goods. They would not allow the money to move out of Canada and consequently our grains could not move in. I believe we might learn something from our neighbors to the north.

Just a year ago, when legislation to extend ECA operations was pending, I attempted to write into the basic law an amendment which would have prevented such deals as the expenditure of $529,000,000 of American funds for the purchase of Canadian wheat. My proposal would very simply have directed ECA not to authorize the purchase off shore of any commodity which had officially been declared surplus in the United States or which was currently selling below the parity price. It seemed to me this would only insure simple justice for American producers and taxpayers. I don't suppose I need to tell you what happened when that amendment came to a vote on the Senate floor. The Fair Dealers beat it down.

But I see a ray of light breaking through the clouds. The American people are awakening to the dangers we face.

I can see the time coming soon when they will realize they cannot entrust the future to those who have betrayed the past and they will take the destiny of this Nation back into their own hands.

I am firmly convinced that so far as America and the world are concerned, there is just one basic thing wrong now. Somebody has sent Uncle Sam into exile. He has become a man without a country, and what the American people must do now is to send out a searching party to find him and bring him home.

I believe Uncle Sam is coming home from his wanderings sooner than many of us believe, despite the fact that President Truman has promised to campaign again this fall as he did in 1948, making every whistle stop to promise the American farmer a continuance of wartime prosperity prices if he were only elected to the Presidency on his own. This promise has borne bitter fruit and the taste still lingers. Victory will take a lot more fruit-selling on Mr. Truman's part this year. And I am one of those who believe that the unexpected 1948 result was due not so much to Mr. Truman's political effectiveness as to Republican overconfidence and lack of political effectiveness during the campaign.

Out in the grass roots one may sense a rumbling of the people against the continuous whirligig of fear, crises, high taxes, and high prices, of hot wars and cold wars in which they have lived for 17 years—a determination on their part to throw off a government that pioneers in the manufacture of the atomic bomb and the only government in the world that ever dropped it—and at the same time, works assiduously to keep its own people in the deadliest fear of it.

Despite Mr. Truman's apparent cockiness at this time I believe you are going to see a great awakening on the part of the American people come next November. And this, in spite of Mr. Truman's proposed talks at the whistle stops; despite the promise of the Fair Dealers that we are to see a much bigger man this time, a man grown in stature and very likely the Indispensable Man of 1952, a man who understands the Marshall plan, the Brannan plan, and the A and H bombs, one who has become acquainted with foreign diplomats.

As a closing reminder let me advise the readers of the National Republic, if there could be any doubt in your minds that the Fair Deal program, if completed, would spell bankruptcy and extinction of our form of government, consider the Spence bill under which, by a single stroke of a pen, the President would be able to achieve totalitarian powers which it took Hitler years to wrest from the German people, and would permit nationalization of industry and complete control of our economic system. Study this one carefully.

Statement by John J. O'Connor, Concerning Reorganization Plan No. 21, Relating to United States Maritime Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OWEN BREWSTER
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the statement made by John J. O'Connor, former acting majority leader of the Democratic Party in the House of Representatives and former chairman of the House Rules Committee, dealing with Senate Resolution 265, disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 21, relating to the United States Maritime Commission, in which statement Mr. O'Connor favors the adoption of the resolution.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My name is John J. O'Connor. I am a lawyer, with offices in the Washington Building, Washington, D. C., and at 29 Broadway, New York City.

I represent Isbrandtsen Co., Inc., of New York, the largest independent, nonconference, nonsubsidized American-flag steamship owner and operator. I also appear here, today, on my own account, as a citizen and a lawyer, and because of my interest in such matters, over the past 20 years.

We support this resolution to reject Reorganization Plan No. 21, but only on these particular two grounds:

First, while the United States Maritime Commission, as presently functioning and performing, should be subjected to a major operation, to rid it of its festers and malignancy, this, in our opinion, is not the way to do it; and

Second, this particular Reorganization Plan No. 21 is invalid and inoperative, because it does not comply with the precise provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1949.

1. The Maritime Commission deserves reorganization or other drastic treatment, but not this particular prescription. Mr. Edward P. Tastrom, an editorial writer on shipping, in the New York Journal of Commerce has written, "Reorganize the Maritime Commission, if necessary, and certain changes could very well be made in the present setup."

As typifying the atmosphere surrounding this particular agency of Government, is the belated and amusingly circumlocutory approach toward fixing (and I use that word advisedly) to scuttle this plan. On March 13, and in every minute of every hour since then, everybody connected with shipping, officially or industrially, have been dead set against this plan, but not until nearly 2 months later, were any of those chiefly concerned, courageous enough to stand up and be counted, in the open, as being in opposition. Instead double-talk representations have been made to the White House, to officials of the Commission, and to Members of Congress, as to the attitude of the ship-operating companies, for instance, especially the Big Twelve, and their so-called "leaders," and perennial and interminable lobbyists. For some reason, they have had an agueish cringing against speaking out in town meeting, while in every club, alley, back room, and cafe, here and in New York, they have denounced the plan in words which could not be reported in your official records.

Mr. Walter Hamshar, one of the country's leading writers on matters maritime, correctly wrote in the New York Herald Tribune of May 3, 1950:

"Whether ship operators will actively assist in the opposition drive (against the Reorganization Plan No. 21) was uncertain yesterday. Although the majority of this phase of the maritime industry is privately opposed to the Commission's relegation to being a minor bureau of the Department of Commerce, the National Federation of American Shipping, representing a majority of the operators, announced in March it would not oppose the reorganization."

This resolution has one merit, at least—that it has smoked out some of those interested, into the open glare—and if this distinguished committee did have the time and the patience, it could get to the bottom and discover the timorous but factual attitude of all parts of the possibly affected industry by subpenaing their "leaders" and omnipresent lobbyists and putting them on the spot.

I forcibly stress this point because it is so inseparably tied in with the influences which have brought the Maritime Commission to the low estimate in which it is held today by many, including the Chief Executive, the Comptroller General, congressional committees, and courts.

Its deterioration can be debited against the exploiting perversion practiced by the "big shots" of the maritime industry, especially the subsidized lines, generally referred to, especially within the four walls of the Commission, as "the twelve apostles." I apologize for the sacrilege—they themselves revel in the impious grouping.

These favored few to whom operation subsidies have been practically restricted have elbowed out of fair entree to the Commission the other 40 or 50 American-flag operators. This "knot, a baker's dozen," as Rabelais counted, have mouthed much and long about promoting an American merchant marine, while, at the same time, they have accomplished the reverse—the increase in foreign merchant marines—and this partly by their subservient submission to these foreign lines, which overwhelmingly dominate every one of the 100 or more steamship conferences, or cartels, to which they all belong.

One truly anomalous situation is, that one of the favored few, probably the most active operator in opposition to any independent line, is none other than a company now controlled by the Commission, itself, and headed by a former treasurer of a national political party. Not only has this ownership control put the Government in

business—shipping—without any authority in law, but the chief contribution (?) of this political steamship line to the development of an American merchant marine is to afford world-round cruises, of 3 months or more, on lush ships, at rates of $4,000 and up to the few of our citizens who can afford such extravagances—after taxes—another example of how the whole maritime structure has collapsed—as the Comptroller General has pointed out—and more than once.

The influence which these presently subsidized lines possess, within the agency, confirms a statement made some years ago by the distinguished former Senator, Burton K. Wheeler, who said, in effect:

"It seems to almost invariably happen, that when Congress attempts to regulate some group, the intended regulatees wind up doing the regulating."

Let it be understood at the outset, however, that any remarks herein of a critical nature are not directed personally against any one of the present five Commissioners.

The sty was, as is, when they took over. The present Chairman and some of the other Commissioners have attempted to accomplish some disinfecting. Their heritage acquired its tarnish, however, back over 15 years, as I personally know. In the thirties, even before the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, meetings were held before the Rules Committee of the House of Representatives, of which I was then chairman, at which officials of the then Shipping Board, the predecessor of the present Commission, and later, after 1936, the Commission officials, were questioned as to certain practices and proceedings of their agency and of themselves. As I recall, those meetings were held in executive session, because of the nature of the matters under inquiry.

COMING OR GOING

Over the years one has not been required to have a very extended contact with the Commission and its offices to become aware that much of its personnel has either come from the big operators whose affairs are subject to the Commission's regulation or are going to those shipping companies when they quit or retire from the Commission, all as per prearrangement, for favors delivered. Subsequent happenings have often corroborated the latter end of this route. Again, the Commissioners cannot be included, at least as to the beginning of these journeys, because they have been practically ineligible for appointment if they came from the industry. As matters have worked out, however, in some instances, the practical benefits of this disqualification have, at times, been at least dubious.

LIKE UPROOTING A TREE

To dig out this Maritime Commission, however, and replant it—bodily, personnel, and what not—except that two of its five principal roots are sawed off—is like transplanting a badly tainted tree, merely to some new location, without even spraying it, or pruning it. It will still be the same old eyesore. The jungle of the Commerce Department will be penetrable to all who needs approach the new Maritime Board of three, merely reduced from five. They will not even leave the building they're now in—or even the corridors, now cluttered with the bowing and scraping contact men of the chosen.

No improvement, over the present objectionable situation will result, since the new maritime board, of three members will have sole jurisdiction, and final say, concerning the most important, fundamental questions involved, the granting of subsidies and the regulation of conferences and their practices, As the plan clearly states, and as the Secretary of Commerce has so interpreted it, in his recent letter to Senator MAGNUSON, he, the secretary, will have no voice, or even influence, in the determination of these vital questions.

The Big Twelve can remain in the saddle with only three targets to shoot at, instead of five.

There is also a serious question, whether the world-flung Department of Commerce is not already top heavy enough, without absorbing new responsibilities and supervision, as it would clearly, over the acts of the new maritime administrator.

The recommendations of the Hoover Commission (No. 2, Rept. No. 10 on Department of Commerce) have some features preferable to this plan No. 21. As pointed out, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 21, 1950 (p. 3702), by this committee's distinguished chairman, who was a prominent member of the "Hoover Commission," that extraordinarily capable group "did not recommend establishment of a maritime board within the Department of Commerce."

That Commission's recommendations were most important in providing for a real separation of the ordinary administrative features from the quasi-judicial functions of the Agency.

A transportation Department, newly created, within the Cabinet, as often suggested, might well afford a more appropriate department of Government, in which to set up some maritime agency, or bureau, in succession to the present Maritime Commission.

In surveying all possible solutions, of course, one always comes back to the first obvious vehicle, an independent agency of Congress, separate from the executive department, such as the present Commission, after of course, it is thoroughly overhauled and regenerated.

Until there is some such approach to the vexing problem, however, this particular plan No. 21, should not be permitted to become effective, and Senate Resolution 265 should be reported favorably by this committee and adopted by the Senate.

The second reason we advance for the rejection of the plan is:—

2. Reorganization Plan No. 21, of 1950, is invalid and inoperative, because it does not comply with the provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1949. That act, in the parts material to this point, provides, in section 2 (a), "The President * * * shall determine what changes * * * are necessary to the following purposes" (six in number), and in section 3, "Reorganization plans: Whenever the President * * * finds that" (any one of six purposes) "is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes of section 2 (a), he shall prepare a reorganization plan for making of the reorganizations as to which he has made findings and which he includes in the plan, and transmit such plan * * * together with a declaration that, with respect to each reorganization included in the plan, he has found that such reorganization is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes of section 2 (a) * * *. The President, in his message transmitting a reorganization plan, shall specify * * * the reduction of expenditures (itemized as far as practicable) which it is probable will be brought about."

The "Message from the President * * * transmitting Reorganization Plan No. 21", states:

"To the Congress:

"I transmit herewith."

On page 5, in the second paragraph, it is stated, in said message:

"After careful investigation I have found and I hereby declare that each of the reorganizations contained in this reorganization plan is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes set forth in section 2 (a)."

In the last paragraph on page 5, of the message, it is stated:

"While it is impossible to estimate in advance the savings which will be brought about by this plan, the improvement in administrative efficiency resulting from it should produce substantial reductions in expenditures for the programs transferred by the plan."

The plan is invalid for the following reasons:

While the President finds the necessities, his findings are set forth in his message (not in the plan), which message may, possibly meet the requirement of a declaration, to be sent to Congress, together with the plan, but the President has failed, entirely, to comply with the strict requirement of the act, that the findings, which he has made, be included in the plan—and which he includes in the plan, being the language of the act.

The plan is completely devoid of any findings whatsoever. It merely prescribes the operation of the reorganization—with no reasons given.

This is a fatal defect, that is not curable by this committee, or by Congress, except by legislation, and questions might well be raised in court, against action taken under the reorganization. Many proceedings are pending before the present Commission.

It should also be noticed that the President has not followed, at least, the spirit of the act, in that he has not complied, in his declaration (his message) with the requirement with respect to each reorganization—he has found that such reorganization is necessary to accomplish one or more of the six purposes of section 2 (a).

In his message (p. 5) the President merely states the language of the act:

"I have found that each of the reorganizations contained in this reorganization plan is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes set forth in section 2 (a) * * *."

Which one? If more than one, how many, and which? Or all six?

Nor is it any justification that practically identical, blanket language, quoted from the act, is used in all 21 reorganization plans, submitted to Congress on March 13, 1950.

Surely Congress is entitled to expect some specification rather than this sextet generality.

Like criticism can be directed against the President's failure to comply with the directive of the act (sec. 3) that he "shall specify * * * the reduction of expenditures (itemized as far as practicable) which it is probable will be brought about."

Instead of "specifying," and with no "itemization," whatsoever, the President assumes, under advice, of course, to comply with this precise requirement, to "specify," by stating in his "message," as in connection with all the 21 plans—

"While it is impossible to estimate in advance the savings which will be brought about by this plan, the improvements in administrative efficiency resulting from it should produce substantial reductions in expenditures."

Congress should not be satisfied with this generality, as constituting even a partial compliance with the extraordinary, drastic privilege, lodged in the Executive, to reorganize the branches of Government, which have been duly set up by legislation enacted by Congress, itself.

We respectfully submit that this criticism of the President's method of reference to the "purposes" of the plan, or the "reductions in expenditures" to result, is not hypercritical quibbling. One recalls Disraeli said, "It is much easier to be critical than to be correct," but at least Congress, itself, is entitled to approximate correctness, in such consequential matters, and Congress should not countenance any evasion of that reasonable requirement.

In any event, however and beyond question, the complete failure of the President to include "findings" in the "plan," is irremediably fatal, and in itself should compel

this committee, and Congress, to reject this Reorganization Plan No. 21.

It is not asking too much, even of the Chief Executive, that he exercise his prerogatives, in accordance with the law which Congress has enacted, and which he, himself, has approved.

The President Reports to the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 16, 1950

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following addresses made by the President at Great Falls, Big Sandy, Havre, Fort Peck Dam, and Glasgow, all in the State of Montana:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT GREAT FALLS, MONT., MAY 12, 1950

Thank you, Congressman MANSFIELD. It is a very great pleasure to have had the opportunity to ride across the great State of Montana with your Governor and with Congressman MANSFIELD. The Congressman is one who really knows what it's all about, and who works at it. I like him very much.

I appreciate this welcome very much in this largest city in Montana. It seems to me that this great city knows how to do things. I have had a most successful and satisfactory trip across the country during the past week, and now I am on my way back to Washington.

On this trip I have been giving a first-hand report to the people of the great Northwest and the Middle West about the problems this country is now facing, and what we are doing about them, and what we need to do in the future.

Here in Great Falls you are fortunate in having a fine newspaper, the Great Falls Tribune. I wish there were more Great Falls Tribunes around the country so the people could get the truth.

In the past few days I have been describing the great work we have been doing in conservation, irrigation, reclamation, electric power, and flood control. We have been building some magnificent structures like the Grand Coulee Dam, the Hungry Horse Dam, and Canyon Ferry Dam here in Montana. But these are only the beginning of the coordinated development of all of our national resources. We need to speed up the development of our resources, if we are to keep our economy prosperous and expanding.

Down in Butte this morning, I explained what kind of labor-management laws we need on the books, and I explained why it is necessary to extend our social security system, and to expand and increase our systems of old-age insurance and unemployment compensation.

We have done some fine work in the housing field since the war, but we are still far short of our goal of having a decent home for every family in the country. Here in Great Falls, a city that has grown so rapidly in the last few years, you can certainly appreciate how badly we need a long-range, low-income, and middle-income housing program.

In Lincoln, Nebr., the other day, and at a number of other towns since then, I have explained the kind of farm legislation we need to put on the books. Our present price support laws have kept farmers' incomes from dropping as badly as they did after the First World War. But they are not good enough. In the last 2 years, farm income has dropped substantially.

One of the main improvements we need to make in our present laws is to provide for a system of production payments. This would help us make sure that the incomes of farmers would stay at prosperity levels, that we would get greater amounts of the kinds of foods we need, and we would avoid huge surpluses.

You know, to read some newspapers, you would think that no one supported the system of production payments to farmers that I just described. But the fact is, more and more people all over the country are realizing that production payments are exactly what we need.

For example, after my Lincoln speech the other day, I got a telegram from the master of the Ohio State Grange, and he told me that he was very much in favor of the system. I have the telegram right here, if anybody has any doubts about it.

Also, at the Minnesota State Fair last fall, they held a—what you might call a poll, but this was an actual poll, the people were there, and they voted themselves; and it came out nearly 2 to 1 for production payments, but they didn't say anything about it in the papers that were against it.

The American people support the programs I have been discussing, when they learn the true facts about them. When the people understand these measures, they realize that they are vitally important to the future growth of this great country.

It is just as important to see that people in other countries learn the facts about the United States, and what we are doing for world peace.

We face a great problem these days: the menace of Communist aggression. The Communists want to take over all the world, and they are trying to win converts to their side by telling preposterous lies about the United States.

Out of one side of their mouths they say we are weak and that we are going to collapse. Out of the other side they say we are strong and we are getting ready to wage an imperialistic war. These lies are dangerous because there are millions of people in the world who don't have accurate sources of information, and who simply don't know the truth about the United States. And there are a lot of people right here in the United States that don't know the truth about their own country, and I am trying to teach them.

That is why I have been urging a great campaign of truth. I would like to see our newspapers, our magazines, our radios, and our motion-picture companies join with the Government in spreading the truth to Europe, Asia, and Africa about what we are really like in this country.

I think that when the people know the truth about the United States they will turn to our side, not the side of communism. The Communists are an organization which do not believe in morals or ethics or truth. They work with lies, and they try to mislead people, and when they get control they are just a plain police state. You can't go anywhere or do anything or talk to anybody without permission from those up above. That is not the kind of country we fought for and worked for since 1776.

I think we have got the greatest government in the history of the world, and I am trying to support that Government with everything I have. I have sworn to support and defend the Constitution of the United States, and that is what I am doing as President of the United States.

I am out here telling you the facts as I see them. That is my job. Every year I make a report to the Congress called the message on the state of the Union. I have made a trip around the country this time, giving the message on the state of the Union to the people themselves, so they will understand what I am trying to do, and I believe they do understand it.

Thank you again for this wonderful reception. I appreciate it more than I can tell you.

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT BIG SANDY, MONT., MAY 12, 1950

You know, I have been reading a lot of stories about Big Sandy, Mont., and most of them were most interesting. I have always wanted to see this location in the United States that was once one of the most famous cow towns in the country. I also heard from the brakeman on this train that this town during the war bought more bonds per capita than any other town in the United States, and I congratulate you on that, too.

Everywhere I have stopped on this cross-country trip of mine, large crowds have come out to see me. I appreciate that very, very much.

I think it means that the people are interested in their Government, and that they want to learn what the facts are about, what our Government is doing, and what I am trying to do, and what I am fighting for.

One of the subjects in which I am vitally interested, and which concerns you people here in the West very directly, is reclamation and irrigation.

Here at Big Sandy, you people are in the area which will feel the direct benefits from our construction of Tiber Dam, west of here on the Marias River. We have got a river of that same name in Missouri, also—named by the same Frenchman, by the way, too.

I understand that actual construction of Tiber Dam will begin this summer. Great reclamation developments like this all over the country seem to cost a lot of money, but they bring back big returns. They are investments, not expenditures.

Tiber Dam will mean better incomes for the farmers now here, and opportunities for new farmers to come. It will help you build a bigger and more prosperous community.

By carrying out the projects like Tiber Dam, we are building a stronger and more prosperous country. We are laying the foundations for lasting farm prosperity. I am very much interested in seeing farmers well off. I grew up on a farm myself, and I know how hard a farmer's life can be. But a farmer's life these days is nothing like the life I had to spend. I have got a couple of nephews running the old farm together, and they do most of their farming sitting down. I used to stand up and walk to do mine.

We have been doing a lot in recent years to make farm life easier and happier. Bringing electricity to farmers has made them much more productive, and it has certainly made life on the farm much more pleasant.

Fifteen years ago, when the REA started, only 10 percent of the farm houses had electricity. Now 80 percent of farm homes have electricity.

Congress is authorizing a program—a Federal program—to extend rural telephone facilities. I am very pleased to see that, because I know how much telephone service means to people who are isolated, especially in areas where there are long and severe winters.

Government money spent to help improve rural life is one of the best investments we can make in the future of the United States. Better farmers mean a stronger Nation, and a strong United States is the best hope of a lasting peace in this world.

What I want to see is a balanced economy in this great United States of ours. I want the farmer to have a fair share of the national income of this country. I want to see labor receive good wages so that they can buy farm products, and I want to see business, both big and little, prosper and able to carry on

the necessary distribution of the things that we need.

That is what makes a great country—a country in which all the people can share alike in its wealth. If we do that, then we are in a position before the world to say that our system of government is the best in the world—is the best in the history of the world.

If we can do that, eventually we will get a world peace without the necessity of having our young men slaughtered as they have been in the past.

Thank you very much for coming out here tonight. I appreciate it. It has been a pleasure.

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT HAVRE, MONT., MAY 12, 1950

Thank you very much, Governor, for that cordial introduction; I appreciate it most highly. It is a pleasure to have the Governor and Congressman MANSFIELD on the train today in the trip across Montana. I had thought at nearly every stop that all the people of Montana were there, but apparently they weren't, because most of them are here tonight.

Of course I am more than happy to be here this evening, and to see so many musicians in the audience. I understand that you are going to have a musical festival tomorrow. My only regret is that I can't stay over. Maybe you have heard that I like music, too. The fact is that my whole family is musically minded.

As I have traveled across the country in the past few days, I have been deeply impressed with the new opportunities that are opening up for the young people of this country.

Many of you can't remember the days in the early 1930's, when young men and women were roaming the streets, looking hopelessly for jobs which never turned up. Those were days of despair, when the future looked black for everybody.

I hope you never have to go through a period like that, and I don't believe you ever will. We know now more about how to keep our country prosperous than we did in those days.

The young people who are growing up in this country now have many advantages that their parents did not have. All of us want our children to have a better life than we had, and it should be the constant aim of each generation to make things better for the next. It has always been a part of the American dream, and I think we have been successful in accomplishing it to a most remarkable degree.

However, I am very much afraid that we are in danger of losing ground in one field which is of greatest importance, and the one where we have taken great pride in our past accomplishments. That is the field of education.

You know, there is no person has more influence on the life and outlook of the young—besides his mother—than his teacher. His teacher usually has a lasting influence on how he conducts his life after he is grown.

I can remember my first-grade teacher, and my second-grade teacher, and my high-school teachers, and the ideals they tried to instill into me I still remember and try to live up to.

Our schools are already in difficulty in many parts of the country, and the greatly increased number of young children who will be reaching school age during the next few years will place such a load upon them as to bring on a real crisis.

At the present time our schools are bursting at the seams. Buildings are at times too old, or too crowded, and we do not have enough teachers, and those we have are overworked and underpaid. Educational opportunities in rural areas do not measure up to those in the cities.

We urgently need to construct more schools, and to provide the transportation necessary to bring the children to the schools.

We also need to expand our vocational education program. Last year only one-half the high schools in the country were able to provide a vocational education program for their students.

The plain truth is that the cost of providing adequate school systems has long been beyond the financial resources of many of our States.

I have proposed to meet this crisis through a program of Federal financial aid to the States and Territories.

The Senate has already passed such a bill, and I hope that the House will press forward to enact a law to aid education at this session.

Some timid people have raised the false bugaboo of Federal control over education. I do not believe in Federal control, and I do not want Federal control in the schools. I am wholeheartedly in favor of continuing State control over education.

The right way to meet this crisis is for the Federal Government to provide financial assistance to the States, and let the individual States decide how the money shall be spent.

This country has always been a land of opportunity, and I intend to do my part to keep it that way. The American people are deeply devoted to the ideal of universal free education. We must make sure that each boy and girl does get a good education.

Money spent for education is a valuable investment in the future of this country. We should move forward and secure a brighter future for the generations in the coming years that will guide the Nation. There is nothing that could be more important to our country's welfare.

You know, the next generation will either face the greatest age in history, or it won't. And it is up to that generation itself to decide on the course it will pursue.

I think we are on the threshold of an age that will make the past 50 years look like the Middle Ages. I want to see this country go forward to the ideal condition which I know it is capable of. And I know that you young people can take us to that goal, if you go ahead with the proper education, if you learn to be the right sort of citizens of the greatest Republic in the history of the world.

There is nothing in the world to keep us from doing all the great things that are now before us—to work for peace in the world, and eventually we will get that peace, because it is right, and we are on the right side in trying to get it.

Thank you very much.

(A little later:) I forgot to mention the fact that Senator MURRAY'S wife is exceedingly ill. He hasn't been able to be out here today because she has undergone a very serious operation. And I have had two telegrams from him stating that he would have been here had it not been for the illness of Mrs. Murray. I am certainly sorry about it.

(As the train pulled out, 9:25 p. m.:) Thank you all again. I appreciate those bands and the drum corps very much. I want to thank the Chief for that bonnet and that peace pipe. I hope we can always smoke the peace pipe with the rest of the world.

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT FORT PECK DAM, MONT., MAY 13, 1950

Governor Bonner, General Pick, ladies and gentlemen: I have known General Pick for a long, long time. I knew him when he was engineer in charge down at Omaha. I knew him when he went to Burma and built the Lido road, and I had the privilege of making him chief of engineers when he came back. I think he is one of the ablest men in public service.

We have paid a visit to the greatest concrete structure in the world—the greatest concrete dam that ever has been built, over in the State of Washington.

I made up my mind that I was going to come by and see the greatest earth construction in the flood control business that has ever been constructed in the world. I was in the Senate when this proposition was first considered, and there have been just as many misstatements and garbled stories about Fort Peck Dam as there have been about any of the other constructions for the welfare and benefit of the people of this part of the country.

I made up my mind I would come by and see just exactly what it looked like so I could understand the statements that are sometimes made about it, and that is why I am here.

I should like to congratulate the Corps of Engineers and all the people who worked on this project on what has been accomplished here. Projects like Fort Peck have contributed to the welfare of the entire Nation. Fort Peck itself has helped prevent floods, has helped navigation downstream, and is producing great quantities of electricity.

We don't have enough Fort Pecks, however, to give us the protection that we need. We still have serious floods in many sections of the country.

I am deeply concerned with the reports I have received about the floods in North Dakota and Minnesota, and about the recent floods in southeastern Nebraska. We need a great many more flood control projects before we can be safe from catastrophes like these.

In the 13 years since Fort Peck Dam was first put into operation, the benefits from its flood control features alone have been estimated at $50,000,000. I am told that this figure is the damage which the Missouri River Valley would have suffered from the floods if this project had not been built. Flood heights have been reduced as much as three feet downstream at Omaha.

Fort Peck has also helped navigation. During the war years, for example, the Fort Peck Reservoir supplied enough water to float landing craft, built at inland shipyards down the Mississippi.

Two years ago, when there was record low water on the Mississippi River, Fort Peck Dam made it possible to continue navigation on the river. Otherwise, river navigation might have been seriously hampered for several months.

Fort Peck is supplying power in North Dakota, Montana, and South Dakota. All told when tied in with the other main stem projects now under construction, I understand that we can get 185,000 kilowatts from Fort Peck.

In addition, the reservoir behind the dam is becoming a great recreational center for this whole region. I am told that 90,000 people visited here last year, and camps for Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts and other groups are being built.

This is an example of how we get many different kinds of benefits from sensible planning and development of our natural resources. This shows that the funds we spend on flood-control, reclamation, irrigation, and public-power facilities are not expenses. They are investments in a bigger and better country.

People who criticise the Federal budget often overlook these facts.

When a manufacturing corporation builds a new factory, that is not just an expense, it is a capital expansion. The company may have to float a bond issue and go temporarily into debt. The board of directors of the company are willing to go into debt, because they

know that they will more than get their money back as the company grows and produces more products.

Projects like Fort Peck are investments in the future of our country, just as a new factory is an investment in the future of a corporation. You should keep that fact in mind when you examine the Federal budget.

We need more projects like Fort Peck.

I just want to say a word to you about this great Valley in which we landed yesterday—I guess it was about the time we left Butte and came over the Divide—we came into the drainage area that is known as the Missouri Valley.

The Missouri Valley is a tremendously rich valley, and in connection with the upper Mississippi Valley, north of Cairo, and the Ohio Valley from Pittsburgh down, it is the greatest bread basket in the world. It has difficulties to face in the form of flood control, communication, and transportation.

I have been exceedingly interested in the proper development of all these great river valleys. I was in the Columbia Valley the other day, and made some suggestions about proper procedure for developing that valley. I have made some suggestions about the Central Valley of California. I have made some suggestions about the Connecticut Valley in New England, and I have made some suggestions about some of the southeastern rivers, and the Arkansas and Red Rivers in Texas and Oklahoma and Arkansas.

This Missouri Valley development is a three-way proposition. It is radically different from a great many of the other rivers in the country, for the reason that it has navigation to consider, it has flood control to consider, and the other power facilities, such as are at this dam. The flood-control dam, can also be used as a power facility, as you can see.

The difficulty with the Missouri River is from Sioux City to St. Louis. It is a mud river—carries more silt than any other river in the world. Even the Yangtze doesn't carry any more silt than the Missouri. Mark Twain once said that in a wet season you could pour the water of the Missouri from one vessel to the other, if you pushed it and stirred it around enough.

I have seen dust storms rise up right out of the water of the Missouri River. You can't understand that, but the reason is there is a sand bar out in the middle of the river, and when the wind blows, it comes right up out of the middle of the river.

What I want to do is create a situation for the development of the Ohio, Mississippi, and Missouri Valleys on the basis of the great Tennessee, and what I have suggested for the Columbia, but it has to be done in a different way, for we have a different project and proposition to look at.

Flood control is of vital importance to the Missouri River, from Sioux City to St. Louis. Now, in 3 years in that valley, due to floods, some $500,000,000 worth of crops were destroyed. Five hundred million dollars properly spent would prevent that flood situation in the whole Ohio, Mississippi, and Missouri Valleys, and twice that much would accomplish the purpose which we have in view. And there have been in the last 10 years enough crop losses to have paid for the development of all three of those valleys.

I think I understand the situation, to some extent, for I spent most of my life on the Missouri down in Kansas City. Independence, rather—Kansas City is a suburb of Independence. I know something about how it happened, and I know something about what ought to be done to cure it.

Now, there is a reclamation proposition in the thing. There is a flood-control proposition in the thing, and there is a navigation proposition in the whole set-up. And Reclamation, and the engineers, and all the other departments of the Government interested in this sort of development ought to cooperate to get it done. And if I can succeed in getting all those agencies to cooperate, and then get about 15 or 20 governors of the States in the frame of mind to look after their interests, I think sometime or other we will get this job done as it ought to be done.

This is the first step out here. This is only the first step. Now let's go ahead and finish the job, because it means the proper development of the great Mississippi Valley, and if the great Mississippi Valley doesn't wake up and do its proper development, all these great developments in the other parts of the country are going to take the population, they are going to take all the industries, they are going to take everything we have.

And if we do the valleys of the Mississippi, Ohio, and Missouri on the basis that they should be, we can look forward to the ability to support the immense populations which we will have in the year 2000 and 2050. That is what this generation should be looking after, and that is the idea I am trying to put over on this trip around the country.

I want to thank you very much.

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT GLASGOW, MONT., MAY 13, 1950

We have a very short time to spend here; I am sorry, but I do appreciate this wonderful welcome we have had here.

I also appreciate most highly the privilege of having seen Fort Peck Dam, with the man who is in charge of it, the Chief of Engineers.

I have a recollection of this town of Glasgow, along about 1906 or 1907. I came up and registered for a claim on the Rosebud Indian Reservation. I didn't get the claim—my number was about 59,000—but I enjoyed the trip, anyway.

I am glad to be back once more.

I appreciate again very much the cordiality of your reception here.

A. F. of L. Union Industries Show

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of a brief article entitled "Big Fair Here Is Tribute to United States System," written by Sylvia Porter, and published in the Philadelphia Inquirer of Wednesday, April 12, 1950. It concerns the mammoth A. F. of L. union industries show which was recently held in Philadelphia, Pa.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIG FAIR HERE IS TRIBUTE TO UNITED STATES SYSTEM

(By Sylvia Porter)

Early next month the greatest display in American history of what United States management-labor cooperation can produce in goods and services will open in Philadelphia—in the form of the mammoth A. F. of L. Union Industries Show.

Over the week end I learned the details of the show, the tremendous business-union preparations that are going into it.

After hearing the story it seems to me this event is more newsworthy and holds more significance for our future than a dozen-and-one strike headlines.

For this unique show, staged voluntarily by hundreds of leading corporations in association with over 100 unions, is a dramatic illustration to us and the world of what free cooperation between management and unions is achieving.

More, it is a challenge to all segments of our economy to think in the exhilarating terms of what can be achieved.

As President Truman put it to the A. F. of L.'s Matthew Woll, "it'll be one of the finest demonstrations of the value of teamwork between management and labor, a good object lesson in democracy and tangible evidence of the economic progress that is fostered in our free-enterprise system.

This unique industrial carnival, highlighting the value of the union label as an emblem of decent working standards and industry-labor harmony, is propaganda for the American system that will dwarf truckloads of high-sounding speeches and pamphlets.

And as Woll put it, "our continued prosperity is based on the increased production of American workers plus their ability, through high-wage purchasing power, to buy what they produce."

Almost always, the emphasis these days is placed on management-labor conflict, its causes, pro and con.

And this is understandable, of course. There's plenty of conflict and a good fight usually makes a better headline than a continuingly cordial friendship.

But at least now and then, a reminder of how much management-labor cooperation does exist and what that cooperation is producing is imperative for our own perspective.

The fair will smash all records in every direction. It'll take over Philadelphia's huge Convention Hall and its Commercial Museum, too, will run for 8 days from May 6 through May 13.

Glass blowers are set to blow fine glass objects. Expert meat cutters are preparing to turn prize steers into scientific cuts. New gas and electric ranges are to be put together on an assembly line. A complete sanitary laundry is to be in operation.

And garment workers will show ladies' styles, bakers will bake cakes, the Allied Printing Trades will produce a tabloid newspaper, cigar makers will manufacture cigars, potters will cast china, bricklayer apprentices will compete in a bricklaying contest, the Armed Forces will show union-made weapons, etc.

There'll be more than 700 exhibits stretching over a mile and a half of booths. Quite a spectacle indeed.

But this is just the superficial aspect of the show. The fundamental story lies in the fact that the fair is designed solely to illustrate what management-labor harmony can produce.

The provocative angle lies in the fact that it is an entirely voluntary effort.

In no other country has anything like this ever been attempted. Fairs usually are put on to sell specific products or specific services or entertainment—not to pay tribute to an economic system and to the essential components of that system.

In no other country actually could anything similar to this be staged. America's industrial know-how, labor skills, and living standards have no parallels.

In enlightened, voluntary cooperation between management and labor lies the key to America's industrial strength.

In this strength lies the key to world stability and peace. With a strong, prosperous economy, we still have a real chance for global peace. Without it, America is sunk—and the world is sunk with us.

Perhaps I am whistling in the dark as I seize upon this coming event as an instance of growing enlightenment on both sides.

But I'm inclined to think it's more than a frightened whistle. It's a song of hope.

The President's Western Tour

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address delivered by me from Chicago on May 13, 1950, dealing with the President's western tour.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We have been hearing Mr. Truman brag and tell about himself and his type of government on his present political trip.

Now, it is up to you and me to ask ourselves:

Can we afford Truman socialism?

In order to answer that question you will have to have more facts than Mr. Truman has seen fit to give to the American people in his nonpolitical talks.

You must know, first of all, what his Brannan farm program is going to cost you.

The farmer already knows that it will cost him a good share of his liberty and freedom.

In fact, it will cost him all of his freedom if he violates any one of the scads of regulations to be set down by a bureaucrat who will run the farms of the country.

How much will it cost the taxpayer?

Mr. Truman can't tell you.

Mr. Brannan can't tell you.

They like to have you believe that everybody is going to get something for nothing.

Let me give you some idea of how consistent and trustworthy Mr. Truman has been in the past about the farm program.

From this record, perhaps, you can better evaluate his promises on many things.

In his Lincoln, Nebr., farm talk last Monday he criticized the present farm program which was passed by his own Eighty-first Democrat Congress.

Well, we can have a little laugh over that criticism.

You see, back on May 14, 1948, Mr. Truman wrote a letter to the Republican Eightieth Congress in which he said:

"Many shifts in production will have to be made and flexible price supports will help us make them in orderly fashion."

The Eightieth Congress went ahead to adopt the Hope-Aiken farm bill, a long-range measure based on flexible price supports.

In the fall of 1948 Mr. Truman campaigned in the farm States on a platform calling for rigid price supports and said a Democrat Congress would repeal the Hope-Aiken Act before it ever became effective.

What happened, Mr. and Mrs. Farmer?

You remember that Mr. Truman turned right around and told his Democrat Eighty-first Congress he was for flexible price supports.

I am not just telling you this. It is in the record.

He said it in his budget message to his own Democrat Congress.

We know, of course, the Hope-Aiken Act was repealed and the Democratic Congress enacted its own farm program.

Now, Mr. Truman is for neither flexible nor rigid farm price supports.

He is for the socialistic Brannan plan.

Why has he been so consistently inconsistent about a farm program?

Mr. and Mrs. Farmer, can you afford to believe anything Mr. Truman says about a farm program?

Can you afford socialized farming?

Why is your Government spending millions to flagrantly lobby for socialized farming under the Brannan plan?

Why is your Government spending millions to flagrantly lobby for socialized medicine?

You know about the great paid meeting in St. Paul, Minn., where Mr. Brannan and Senator HUMPHREY, who likes British socialism and says so, spoke so eloquently about the Brannan farm program.

You know, too, that many of the more than 2,700 publicity and public relations workers on the Federal payroll are daily spreading propaganda in support of these two particular socialistic programs.

Mr. and Mrs. America, can you afford to let these changes be made in the American system?

President Truman has also been talking on his nonpolitical tour about the great prosperity under his administration.

He hasn't mentioned, of course, that despite this great prosperity your Government's financial situation is the worst in history.

And he didn't mention, either, that he has no plans for improving that financial situation in the near future.

Let's look behind his nonpolitical words and get the truth about this prosperity we are having.

We'll take our information from Mr. Truman's own Labor Department reports.

Back in 1939 when we still had 9,000,000 unemployed after 8 years of Democrat depression, the average gross weekly earnings of production workers in the United States was $23.86.

On the basis of 1939 dollar buying power that left a worker with three children a weekly spendable total of $23.62.

Now, 11 years later we find that the average gross weekly earnings for production workers is $56.33, more than double what it was in 1939.

But, the Labor Department reports show that the index of spendable earnings has jumped from 100 in 1939 to 236.1 in January of 1950.

So, that leaves the spendable earnings today of a production worker with three children at $32.60.

His weekly earnings increased $32.47 in those 11 years, but his spending power increased only $8.98.

The buying power since 1939 has only increased $3 for school teachers; a little more than $1 for retail workers; $3.50 for automobile workers; less than $1 for railroad workers; less than $4 for steelworkers.

These figures were arrived at after Federal taxes were deducted.

After all, the production worker has been helping to pay for a very expensive Government.

He has helped to pay for a Truman spending program that cost more than $191,000,000,000 in 5 years.

That is $12,000,000,000 more than was spent by 32 Presidents in 156 years up to 1940.

Mr. and Mrs. Production Worker, can you afford that type of Truman Government?

On this nonpolitical tour Mr. Truman has given no indication whatever that he would practice economy in government so that some of that real wage increase for the workers could be turned into spendable income.

On the contrary, he has criticized the Republican Eightieth Congress for giving the production worker some tax relief.

He has also contended that the failure to collect enough money from the people in taxes has been the reason for an unbalanced budget and deficit spending.

The Eightieth Congress balanced the budget in addition to cutting taxes. In fact, it created a surplus.

Why can't the Eighty-first Congress do as well?

Speaking of Mr. Truman's criticism of the Republican tax reduction and blaming that reduction for creating the latest deficit brings to mind an interesting action which Mr. Truman does not like to mention for a couple of good reasons.

The incident was the 5-percent tax reduction voted by the Democrat Congress in 1945.

The next year the country had a deficit of more than $20,500,000,000.

First reason Mr. Truman neglects to mention it is because the administration was guilty of using the tax reduction for political purposes and gave no consideration to the financial status of the country.

Second reason he neglects to mention it is because the reduction was a flat 5 percent which gave the big-income groups the greater benefits.

He was President at the time, of course.

Now let's take another look at the record and see just what has caused the deficit which may run as high as $5,000,000,000 this fiscal year which ends next June 30.

In the first year of the Republican Eightieth Congress expenditures were held to $39,000,000,000 and the income totaled forty billion, which left a surplus of nearly one billion.

The second year of Republican control, 1948, the expenditures were cut to less than $37,000,000,000 and the income rose to over forty-two billion, leaving a surplus of more than $5,000,000,000.

The 1949 fiscal budget, the last over which the Republican Congress had any control, was held to $37,000,000,000 and even with the tax reduction limiting income to $38,000,000,000, the country was solvent for the year with more than one billion surplus.

But in the 1950 budget Mr. Truman's Democrat Congress expanded the spending program to more than $43,000,000,000 and the income remained at thirty-eight billion, accounting for the anticipated $5,000,000,000 deficit.

There, Mr. and Mrs. America, you have the actual figures and you have the actual cause for the deficit under Mr. Truman and his Democrat Congress.

I ask you:

Can you afford to permit this type of spending and financing to continue?

Can you afford to go along with the Truman program?

In his nonpolitical talks, Mr. Truman was extravagant in his use of the word "isolationist" in castigating those who do not agree with his international policies.

It is quite interesting to note the change that comes over a man when he assumes domineering power.

I recall a very significant speech Mr. Truman made as a United States Senator in 1942.

His speech was in defense of Senator Burton K. Wheeler, who had not seen eye-to-eye with President Roosevelt's foreign policy in the 2 years prior to the recent war.

Mr. Truman felt that Mr. Wheeler was being made the victim of unjustified criticism.

These are the words of Mr. Truman—as a Senator—with respect to the right to take exception to foreign policy.

Listen closely:

"There are still some in this country who feel bitterness against Members of the Senate and House of Representatives and against others who do not hold public office, who were opposed to any aspect of the President's foreign policy during the last 2 years."

Mind you, now, this is Senator Harry S. Truman speaking. I continue the quote:

"I was gratified to observe that Winston Churchill, when he was in this country, took a far different attitude.

"I know that many Members of the Senate who supported the President's foreign policy throughout deem such recriminations unwise and unjust."

Now, get this next line from Mr. Truman's talk. This is good—coming from him.

"I have throughout supported the President's policy, and I also believe that recriminations of the nature referred to are unwise and unjust."

Then, Mr. Truman referred to Abraham Lincoln as follows:

"It should be borne in mind that even Abraham Lincoln criticized the entrance of our country into the Mexican War in 1848; yet no one doubts his patriotism."

Yes, he spoke in different tones before he assumed imperious powers.

Let me continue with the last two sentences of this same speech made on the Senate floor on February 3, 1942:

"It is time that men cease to challenge the patriotism and loyalty of some of their fellow Americans simply because on some issue of the present day there happens to be some difference of opinion and an honest difference.

"It is to preserve the right to hold differences of opinion that we are entered upon the mightiest effort of our national career."

Those are the words of the same man who today, as the would-be creator of all opinion on foreign affairs, chastises and belittles and ridicules those who do not agree with his dictates.

Mr. and Mrs. America, can you afford to go along with a man who—by his own words—is unjust and unfair?

I have had time to discuss only a very few of the vital issues which Mr. Truman has placed before the citizens of this country in his nonpolitical talks on his present nonpolitical trip.

However, in each of these instances I have used the record for the basis of my discussions.

I have not resorted to assumptions and coincidences as Mr. Truman has done.

Had I been of the mind to follow Mr. Truman's tactics I could easily have called to mind his Pendergast connections; his infamous red herring application to the Alger Hiss case; his continued disrespect for the efforts of some to protect our country from subversives within the Government, and the many cases of gratuities for the privileged few.

But I am willing to stick to the record and from that let you get your answer to this question:

Can you afford to go along with Truman socialism?

Investigation of Interstate Crime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. KEM
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Kansas City Stares at the Kefauver Committee," which appeared in the Courier-Journal of Louisville, Ky., on May 14, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KANSAS CITY STARES AT THE KEFAUVER COMMITTEE

Senator KEFAUVER and his special committee to investigate interstate crime are now ready to go to work. The task that awaits them is involved enough in its own right. But it is at the moment unfortunately enmeshed in politics to a degree that must tax all the patience and ingenuity of the membership.

Republican members of the Kefauver committee are the amiable and well-mannered Senators WILEY, of Wisconsin, and TOBEY, of New Hampshire. The Republicans had wanted either their ace investigator, FERGUSON of Michigan, or Missouri Senator DONNELL who faces reelection this year. There is no reason to suppose that the committee as now constituted will pull any punches or shy away from delicate areas, but the problem of Kansas City will haunt it from the very start.

Kansas City represents the political headquarters of President Truman. It has been the scene of an extended grand jury investigation of rackets and their political influence, an investigation requested by President Truman. But the successive juries have unearthed little that is concrete in the slimy mystery of Missouri's politico-criminal alliance, and five jury witnesses have met sudden and violent deaths. These deaths are included in a total of 22 unsolved gang murders within the city's jurisdiction, and the latest of them were the spectacular slayings of Charles Binaggio and Charles Gargotta in the First District Democratic Club.

Furthermore, as Republicans have not failed to point out, the theft of evidence bearing on the Kansas City ballot frauds of 1946 was a Federal crime which has never been solved and in which prosecution will be barred by the statute of limitations on the 27th of this month. In all of these cases the Federal Government is open to a charge of slow and reluctant action. In the ballot fraud theft months went by before the FBI was even instructed to investigate. It has never been told to intervene in the murder situation in Kansas City, although the murder and sudden deaths of witnesses before a Federal grand jury surely constitute sufficient excuse to replace the inefficient and reluctant local police with trained Federal investigators.

Whether the Democrats like it or not, the unsavory Missouri picture will be a factor in congressional elections this fall. Republicans are already wheeling up their choicest guns for the campaign. The Democrats may have the situation for themselves, not by soft-pedaling a national scandal or trying to hush up further investigation, but by pushing the sternest effort now toward a clean-up and prosecution of all guilty individuals, whoever and wherever they are. The FBI should long ago have been ordered into the Kansas City picture; there is ample precedent for its interference in a case which involved Federal witnesses and the theft of evidence in a Federal investigation.

It may be that every effort has already been made behind the scenes to get at the truth in the Kansas City story. But the average man does not think so, and it is difficult to see why, if this were the case, the Department of Justice would continue to shrink into its shell whenever reporters for the Kansas City and St. Louis newspapers ask pertinent questions.

Kansas City is certainly not an ideal starting point for the Kefauver committee, and it is one that the Senator himself would probably rather pass up. But it cannot be passed up or ignored, even temporarily, if its political implications are not to become ammunition for the Republican campaign. No committee, however zealous, can be expected to enter a community as heavily involved in a criminal-political conspiracy as Kansas City and to dig out the truth in one shining nugget within a couple of weeks. There is probably nothing it can do at this late date to spark a last-minute investigation of the ballot-box thefts in time to bring its participants to trial. But it can show that a senatorial committee, when manned by able and conscientious men, can rise above partisanship and serve the truth, however unpalatable.

Effect of Strikes on the Democratic Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FORREST C. DONNELL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be set forth in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Wave of Crippling Strikes Hurting Democratic Party," written by David Lawrence, and published in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat on May 12, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAVE OF CRIPPLING STRIKES HURTING DEMOCRATIC PARTY

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, May 11.—President Truman had better hurry back home. An absentee leadership is a leadership in a vacuum. What votes Mr. Truman may be gaining for his Congressmen in the West may be offset by large losses in the Midwest and East. For the Democratic Party is bound to suffer in the congressional elections this autumn because, as the party in power, it has been in a position to discourage strikes, but has failed to do so.

The wave of crippling strikes which has been inflicting almost as much damage on innocent bystanders as on the disputants themselves is due primarily to the ingrained belief of labor-union leaders today that President Truman doesn't really care if they exercise a monopoly power.

The constant reiteration by the President and by his Cabinet that the Taft-Hartley Act must be repealed, together with sabotage of the act itself by governmental agencies through indifferent enforcement, has bred a spirit of irresponsibility among labor unions. They feel they have virtually bought the administration with political support and with campaign contributions and that the Democratic Party must do the bidding of the union chiefs. There is heard even the blackmail threat of a third political party to be formed out of labor-union membership if the administration doesn't hew to the line.

The railroad strike is an example of the breakdown of the Railway Labor Act, which up to now has been hailed as a splendid piece of labor-management legislation. But with the encouragement that comes from a labor-union-dominated administration, it is natural that the findings of all boards and tribunals recommending settlements will be disregarded by the unions. The issue in the rail strike—whether a third man should be required on the Diesel engines—has been passed upon and the proposal rejected again

and again by boards appointed under the procedures of the Railway Labor Act.

Then why do the firemen insist on a strike? The answer is that economic power as exercised by unions today knows no limit. There is a prevalent feeling of self-assurance in going to extremes because of a belief that the Truman administration will not dare to ask Congress to stop such tactics. It is significant that the presidents of the Pennsylvania, the New York Central, and the Santa Fe Railroads have all told a congressional committee this week that they no longer have faith in the Railway Labor Act and that they favor the bill introduced by Senator DONNELL, of Missouri, Republican, which proposes compulsory arbitration of disputes on railroads.

This means that collective bargaining has broken down among the railroads, just as it has broken down in the steel, coal, and motorcar industries, respectively. The Nation has suffered incalculable economic losses.

It is plain to see that legislation regulating and restricting labor union power to damage the public interest awaits only the election of a Congress courageous enough to stamp out monopoly. The Supreme Court may be expected to declare such legislation constitutional. Clearly the labor union chiefs are overreaching themselves and making anti-Democratic Party votes every day, particularly among the families of the workers themselves.

Background on FEPC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM BENTON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter published in the New York Times this morning, written by one of the most distinguished citizens of my State of Connecticut, Mr. Walter White, whose recent reelection as executive secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People assures the people of the United States of his continuing leadership of those great causes with which the people of the United States associate his name.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BACKGROUND ON FEPC

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

I ask permission to submit some first-hand evidence in support of Senator BENTON'S assertion that we need legislation to lessen violations of civil and human rights and thereby take away from Soviet Russia and other critics their most valuable ammunition against us in areas such as Asia, Africa, and Latin America, which contention Arthur Krock derides in his column of May 11.

On a recent tour of the Caribbean, on a trip around the world last year, on a European tour in 1948, and on two trips overseas as a war correspondent, I witnessed tragic evidence that both nonwhite and white peoples believe less and less we are telling the truth about our devotion to freedom and equality as long as racial and religious discrimination continues here at home. American Ambassadors and other officials overseas told us everywhere that this is the $64 question with which we are confronted all the time.

Even less explicable is Mr. Krock's statement that "according to available records, a detailed demand for the FEPC and other antidiscrimination laws in behalf of Negroes first appeared in the Communist Party platform of 1928 * * *."

This is a McCarthyism if ever there was one. I was present at the White House conference in 1941 when for the first time a Fair Employment Practices Committee was created and named. It came into being as a result of a threatened march on Washington which was conceived by that most anti-Communist trade-unionist, A. Philip Randolph, president of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, an AFL union.

Such aims were voiced 19 years before the Communists did so in 1928 in the call which resulted in formation of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People in 1909. Negro churches and other organizations have cried out against denial of the right to work by employers and labor unions long before the October revolution and even before Marx and Engles began to write. Mr. Krock does a dangerous disservice to accuracy and reason when he states that Negroes and other Americans opposed to job discrimination aped the Communists instead of its being the other way around.

WALTER WHITE.

NEW YORK, *May 11, 1950.*

Big Gas Companies Real Scuttlers of Kerr Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, an honest fearless militant Progressive clears up the Nation's $65 puzzle. Eugene Cervi, a fighting crusading liberal Democrat puts the finger on the opposition to the Kerr gas bill which was vetoed by the President last month. In an editorial in Cervi's Rocky Mountain Journal whose publishers have the nerve to call a spade a spade when he sees a spade, says the big pipelines who own large gas reserves plus the pipelines serving them "were directly responsible for the request of 18 mayors to the White House to veto the measure." It is a serious charge to say that the 18 mayors of our great cities were yes-men for the big natural gas companies in seeking a veto, but I believe Eugene Cervi is absolutely right when he accuses them of doing so. I ask unanimous consent to insert the Cervi editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD where it may stand as a rebuke to the greedy gas companies and their too willing helpers.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIG GAS COMPANIES REAL SCUTTLERS OF KERR BILL

It's all over—at least until next year—but the key fact in the fight over the Kerr-Harris natural-gas measure never was reported to the press.

The chief opposition to the bill came from a few big natural-gas companies engaged in producing and transporting natural gas who would have gained no benefits from the measure.

Led by Pan Handle Eastern Pipe Line Co., and United Gas Pipe Line Co., these segments of the industry inspired much of the opposition to the measure that led to a Presidential veto. They were directly responsible for the request of 18 mayors to the White House to veto the measure.

The veto came only because the storm of opposition mounted into a widespread clamor for rejection of the House and Senate passed proposal.

The opposition of the big pipe-line companies sprang from the fact the Kerr-Harris measure would have stymied legislative plans of their own. When they produce their own gas, it is under price ceilings, giving their producing and transporting operations as a whole a certain percentage of profit—generally about 6 percent. By defeating this bill, they hope for a broader measure in a year or two, that will take off FPC controls from gas sales by their own integrated production operations.

Transfer of Watson Laboratories

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRVING M. IVES
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a news story appearing in the Rome Daily Sentinel of April 29, 1950, under the title "Foster Urges Lab Transfer in Nation-wide Broadcast," which refers to the transfer of the Watson Laboratories from Eatontown, N. J., to the Griffiss Air Force Base at Rome, N. Y.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOSTER URGES LAB TRANSFER IN NATION-WIDE BROADCAST

The Watson Laboratories transfer situation was carried to millions of listeners yesterday over the Nation-wide hook-up of the Mutual Broadcasting System.

In his 1 p. m. broadcast, Cedric Foster, Mutual news commentator, speaking from WKAL, said a tour of Griffiss Air Force Base left no doubt in my mind as to why Watson Laboratories should be moved from New Jersey to this up-State New York city * * *. In the interest of economy and efficiency it is the logical thing to do.

TOURED BASE

Mr. Foster told his listeners from coast to coast:

"Here in Rome, N. Y., I visited Griffiss Air Force base, which is one of the outstanding Air Force bases in the world, in a tour of inspection which left no doubt, in my mind, as to why Watson Laboratories should be moved from New Jersey to this up-state New York city.

"Griffiss Air Force base was originally constructed as an aircraft maintenance and supply depot at a cost of about $36,000,000. The replacement cost is estimated at sixty-six million.

"The base comprises an area of five square miles. The buildings are of permanent construction and they are in excellent condition.

They are air-conditioned, centrally heated, and extremely well-lighted. They are surrounded by excellent concrete highways and the base is amply served with rail and truck terminals.

"IN POOR BUILDINGS

"In addition to this, the base has a first-class airport with runways and aprons. The air base is complete with administration building, signal tower hangars which can be used in connection with the type of work done at Watson Laboratories. The hangars are right now being used and they are housing the experimental type of aircraft which are necessary to the work of the Watson Laboratories which are in New Jersey.

"The Watson Laboratories in Eatontown, N. J., are housed in temporary quarters built during the last war, made out of wood siding and tar paper construction. There is no landing strip at the Watson Laboratories so you have to drive 40 miles to McGuire Air Force base * * * if you want to engage in active test work.

"It is no wonder the majority report of the House Armed Services Subcommittee recommended that Watson Laboratories be moved to the Griffiss Air Force base here in Rome, N. Y.

"In the interest of economy and efficiency it is the logical thing to do.

"What will be the work that is done here * * * electronics. At this magnificent field the Air Force can concentrate its electronics experimentation work and it is to be hoped that the Congress will see to it that this work is carried out at Rome, N. Y."

The Railway Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FORREST C. DONNELL
OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be set forth in the Appendix of the RECORD the lead editorial of today in the New York Times entitled "The Railway Strike," the concluding four sentences of which read:

The present strike may be said to represent the logical culmination of a labor trend that has been in progress on the railroads now for a decade. More and more the unions have moved in the direction of abiding by the decisions of fact-finding boards only when those decisions were favorable. But if the enactment of the Taft-Hartley Act in 1946—

That should have been 1947, Mr. President—

proved anything it was that sooner or later labor legislation catches up with trends of this kind. If the railroad unions will not accept decisions which are not legally binding, then nothing could be more certain than that ultimately they will have to reconcile themselves to a labor-management policy under which decisions will be binding.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE RAILWAY STRIKE

On May 23, 1946, two of the big railroad brotherhoods—the trainmen and firemen—walked off their jobs in protest against a decision of a fact-finding board awarding them a wage increase of $1.28 a day instead of the $2.50 they had demanded. In a Nation-wide radio address the following evening President Truman appealed to the membership of the unions over the heads of their leaders. His strong speech won immediate support from the Nation and broke the back of the strike. Among those who were outspoken in support of the President in his appeal to "get transportation moving" was the head of another of the Big Four railroad brotherhoods. This union leader was David B. Robertson, chief of the railroad firemen. Interviewed by newsmen, Mr. Robertson publicly denounced A. F. Whitney, leader of the trainmen, and Alvanley Johnston, head of the engineers. They were, said he, two men who were "grasping for power."

Ironically, it is this same David B. Robertson who has now called members of his own union off the job in open defiance of the decision of a Presidential fact-finding board and of the public welfare. True, in the case of the 1946 strike the Government had seized the railroads 5 days before the walk-out took place. So in that case it might be said that technically the two brotherhoods were striking against the Government. But the "seizure" of the railroads in cases such as this—as the brotherhoods themselves have frequently protested—is essentially a legal device employed for the protection of the public. In his radio appeal to the Nation 4 years ago the President denounced the walk-out as a challenge to the Government, but his principal stress was on "the specter of starvation and death that will result from the course which Mr. Johnston and Mr. Whitney are following."

It may be argued also, that in contrast with the walk-out of 1946 the strike of the firemen which began last Wednesday is not Nation-wide in scope, but is confined to four railroads. That argument, however, does not stand even the most casual scrutiny. In the first place, the only reason that all the railroad firemen have not been called off the job is that, as their leader knows from earlier experiences, such as that of 1946, such action would automatically bring the Government into the picture. Mr. Robertson apparently is convinced that he has discovered a new and clever technique which, like John L. Lewis' 3-day week, will enable him to put the squeeze on the railroads, industry, and the public without precipitating an immediate country-wide crisis. In this he is no doubt counting to a considerable extent upon the negative support of the administration, which, as we have seen in the case of Mr. Lewis, is notoriously slow to recognize the symptoms of a national emergency. But the four roads against which the strike was originally directed (it has now flowed over into a fifth, the Union Pacific) are the Pennsylvania, the New York Central, the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe, and the Southern. And it is hardly necessary for the public to be told that, in the words of the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, "You can't strike on these four railroads without demoralizing the entire industry."

Meanwhile, if there are differences of degree of irresponsibility among strikes entered upon in a defiance of the public and the constituted authorities, then in one respect this strike of the firemen surpasses any of its predecessors. Hitherto, major railroad strikes have been resorted to only when debatable differences of opinion existed over such issues as wages and hours. What sets the present walk-out apart more than any other thing is that the issue is not even arguable. The union has struck because the railroads will not assign two firemen to every Diesel electric locomotive, although Presidentially appointed fact-finding boards have ruled flatly, not once, but twice, that there is no earthly justification for this brazen proposal for "featherbedding."

The present strike may be said to represent the logical culmination of a labor trend that has been in progress on the railroads now for about a decade. More and more the unions have moved in the direction of abiding by the decisions of fact-finding boards only when those decisions were favorable. But if the enactment of the Taft-Hartley Act in 1946 proved anything it was that sooner or later labor legislation catches up with trends of this kind. If the railroad unions will not accept decisions which are not legally binding, then nothing could be more certain than that ultimately they will have to reconcile themselves to a labor-management policy under which decisions will be binding.

The "Economy Brands" Make Their Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The 'Economy Brands' Make Their Case," dealing with the subject of a tax differential for economy cigarettes, published in the Richmond News Leader of May 10, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE "ECONOMY BRANDS" MAKE THEIR CASE

In voting 13 to 12 last week in favor of reducing the Federal excise tax on "economy brand" cigarettes, the House Ways and Means Committee struck a blow for fair play that has been 16 years in coming. Since 1934 the makers of Dominoes, Wings, Marvels, and other low-priced cigarettes have been fighting for an equitable readjustment in tobacco taxes that would permit a more wholesome price competition in the cigarette industry. Their battle still is far from being won.

All cigarettes now carry a flat Federal tax of $3.50 per thousand, or 7 cents a package. The bill approved by the committee last week would retain this tax level for the dominant brands that sell ordinarily for 17 or 18 cents, but would establish a tax of only $2.45 a thousand, or not quite 5 cents a package, on the "economy brands." In short, the bill would apply the familiar ad valorem basis to cigarette taxation, and thus would bring cigarettes into the same tax structure under which most other commodities now are taxed by the Federal Government—fur coats, for example, and cigars, theater admissions, railway tickets, telephone bills, and night-club checks. It manifestly is unfair for the cheaper cigarettes to carry the same dollar burden of taxation as that carried by the more expensive brands. Under the pending bill, their tax rates would be the same—some 41 percent of the retail price.

At the peak of their popularity, in 1939, the "economy brands" claimed only 14.8 percent of the total United States retail cigarette market. Now they have less than 1 percent of the market. Unless tax relief is provided, some of the remaining 18 manufacturers may "give up the ghost" and let their brands go the way of Richmond Straight Cut and Melachrinos. The Treasury Department, which suddenly reversed its favorable view of this bill last February, has a strange notion that the tax cut might result in the "economy brands" taking 25 percent of the

market, with a resultant tax loss of $90,000,000 a year. This sounds like pipe-dream forecasting to industry observers — they reckon the loss at $10,000,000 at most—and from one standpoint is irrelevant, anyway: If the tax is unjust and regressive, if it tends to protect the status quo under which five companies claim 95 percent of all sales at the expense of smaller companies, then the tax should be adjusted to a more equitable figure. Some brisk competition among the "economy brands" would have a healthy effect on the cigarette industry's "big three" or "big five," and might well result in greater sales for the industry as a whole with corresponding benefits to growers and a gain in revenue, instead of a loss, for the Treasury. This is a good bill, aimed at correcting an ill-advised tax discrimination. We commend it respectfully to our readers and to the Virginia Congressmen who are concerned, not only with fair play but also with the good health of an industry that means so much to this State.

For a Free and Independent Slovakia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, at the request of Mr. John Sedlacek, chairman of the Southern Illinois Slovak Federation, 1321 North Thirteenth Street, East St. Louis, Ill., and under leave to do so, I herewith extend in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which appeared in Jednota, largest Slovak Catholic weekly in the United States, published in Middletown, Pa., by the First Catholic Slovak Union.

I am personally well acquainted with Mr. Sedlacek. I know of his high standing in his home community and the fine character of this man. He is among the Americans of Slovak ancestry who would like to see their countrymen rid themselves of the communistic yoke. I have the feeling that men like Mr. Sedlacek and those who work with him in this country, through their encouragement to their relatives and friends in the old country, will provide the spark that will give these people the courage to continue their resistance to communism and eventually gain real freedom for their native land.

The article follows:

FOR A FREE AND INDEPENDENT SLOVAKIA—THE ORIGIN AND AIMS OF THE SLOVAK NATIONAL COUNCIL ABROAD

(By Peter Pridavok)

I

Prior to the Munich crisis in 1938, there existed—as is commonly known—a very strong autonomist movement in Slovakia, aiming at home rule within the framework of a dual Czech-Slovak state, as it had been originally conceived by the great majority of Slovaks, and also by many Czechs. But for a long time there was nothing that could be called an open mass-movement among the Slovak population for the complete separation of their country from the former Bohemian crown lands to which it has been annexed as a result of the dismemberment of Austria-Hungary in 1918. The attitude of the racial minorities, especially of the Magyars, was, of course, different. They had never completely given up their hope for a reunion with Hungary, their mother country, and even if they did adopt an autonomist attitude for immediate practical purposes, their long-term policy was separatism.

One can hardly speak of a unity of purpose between the Slovak autonomists and the Slovakian Magyar separatists—but in one thing they certainly were united, in their intense dislike and resentment of the strongly centralistic rule of the Prague administration which looked upon Slovakia as a Czech colony and under which the autochthonous Slovaks and Magyars suffered equally, though their grievances were not always of the same order. Had it been possible to coordinate the basic policies of the two discontented racial groups (the German minority played only a minor role in Slovakian political life prior to 1938), Czech centralism and unitarism, i. e., the false ideology of a united Czechoslovak nation, could not have survived for very long in its guise of a democratic government. It would have been forced either to yield to the overwhelmingly anticentralist vote or else to discard the mask of democracy altogether and to resort openly to sheer coercion and dictatorship. A glance at a few election figures will show how hopeless would have been the position of the Czech Government in Slovakia, had her autochthonous inhabitants been able to find a common platform. The anticentralist (autonomist and separatist) political parties, such as the Slovak People's Party, the Slovak National Party, the Christian Social Party, the Magyar, and the German National Parties, plus the Communists who, until 1935, when the Czechoslovak-Soviet Pact was concluded, were vociferously separatist, denouncing the Slovak autonomists as traitors for having only demanded a home rule, and not a separate Slovak state—in all parliamentary elections, with the exception of the 1920 ones which, however, cannot be regarded as normal democratic elections, received an overwhelming majority of votes (though not of seats)—owing to clever gerrymandering.

	Total of valid votes recorded	Autonomist and separatist votes
Election year—		
1920	1,341,191	378,958
1925	1,425,595	918,995
1929	1,434,926	801,931
1935	1,625,549	[1] 991,551

[1] This figure includes the number of votes cast for the Communist Party [210,785] which, on Moscow's orders, joined the centralist camp, after Dr. Benes had signed a treaty of alliance with Stalin in 1935.

The progovernment (centralist) vote would have been even much smaller but for the more than 200,000 Czech colonizers settled in Slovakia by the government for the purpose of Czechizing the Slovaks, and for the intimidation (or bribing) of voters dependent on the government, such as civil servants, teachers, etc.

The homesickness of the Magyars was quite understandable from their point of view. But it necessarily became the main, if not the only reason for the slovaks' refusal to join forces with them against the odious Prague centralism. The resentment of the Slovaks against the betrayal by Masaryk and Benes of the Pittsburgh Agreement and of numerous other Czech-Slovak compacts between various bodies and individuals abroad during the war years 1914–18 was great, and anti-Czech feeling ran, at times, deplorably high. But their fear and anxiety, lest Slovakia should once more become a dependency or province of Hungary, was even greater. Thus, although they were far from feeling happy in the new, diminutive Czechoslovak replica of the former Austria-Hungary, they considered it a lesser evil than the possible return to Hungary, and accepted the Czecho-Slovak State as a temporary expedient, created without their active consent by the Paris peacemakers, but regarded as necessary while the peace settlement prevailed.

This temporary acceptance of Czecho-Slovakia (supposing it would have more far-reaching changes in its constitutional structure) did not mean, of course, that the Slovaks were prepared to give up their aspirations for a fully free and independent nationhood within the limits compatible with a wider federal organization comprising as many of the central European nations as possible; it only meant acquiescence in a postponement of the realization of their ultimate national ideals, for no nation renounces its freedom and independence voluntarily and forever. The Pan-Czechs, such as the Czech politicians who tried to increase the numbers of the Czech nation by a simple arithmetical operation, namely (by the addition to it of 3,000,000 Slovaks), did their utmost to convince the Slovaks—and the world at large—that it would have been for their own good, if they had assented to national extinction, but without any success. The Slovaks did not forget that once upon a time, more than 1,000 years ago, their ancestors had had a State of their own (the Nitra Principality) which, in its later development (as Great Moravia) was—although only for a short period of about one century—the most powerful State in central Europe, comprising besides modern Slovakia also the greater portion of modern Hungary, a good slice of Poland, the whole of the modern province of Moravia, which then extended into Austria, and had, for a brief period, conquered also the Czechs of Bohemia.

Nations, like the proverbial elephant, have long memories, which are even strengthened when adversity befalls them. It is therefore understandable that the Slovaks, after the downfall of Great Moravia, circa A. D. 906 have never ceased to dream and to sing about the glory that was Nitra, Prince Pribina, and King Svatopluk.

The memory of a once free Slovak nation appealed to them even throughout the eight centuries during which their national consciousness was being reduced to an almost thanatoid state in the feudal kingdom of Hungary, the official language of which was Latin. And when the French Revolution roused the sopite national feelings of the until then, almost amorphous masses of central European humanity, the Slovaks, too, began to return to national life. At that time their popular leaders did their best to revive and to strengthen the Great Moravian tradition. It was in this sense Juraj Fandli (1754–1810) wrote in his popular works on husbandry, and it was these past memories the poet Jan Holly (1785–1849) glorified in his epic poems modeled on Homer's Iliad.

The memory of the past national greatness also prompted the army of Slovak insurgents against Magyar domination, in 1848–49, and the political leaders who demanded from the Emperor of Austria the setting up of a Duchy of Slovakia as an autonomous province of his dominions. This same idea was expressed in a memorandum submitted to the Emperor Francis-Joseph in 1861, pleading for the "recognition of our national individuality on the territory inhabited by our people," the creation of a (Slovakian) province of upper Hungary and the division of the country into counties readjusted on nationality lines.

Even the Slovak emigrants who had left Hungary to become citizens of the New World where there was more freedom and more bread for them, nurtured the idea of a free Slovakia in their newspapers and other publications, and at the beginning of this century founded an organization (the Slovak League of America) whose aim was—and still is—the liberation of the old country. Toward the end of the First World War,

when the edifice of the Habsburg monarchy was crumbling, Dr. F. Juriga, then the only Slovak representative in the Hungarian Parliament, voiced the true sentiments of his people when he declared before angry Magyar deputies (October 19, 1918), that the Slovak nation wished to establish a national state of their own on the tradition of the Great Moravian Empire of Rastislav, Svatopluk and Cyril and Methodius.

These ideals fell short of realization at that time, mainly because of the machinations of Masaryk, Benes, and their associates who had succeeded in convincing the Entente Governments, on the one hand, that the Czechs and Slovaks were in fact two branches of the same nation (cf. Masaryk's fallacious assertion: "The Slovaks are Bohemians in spite of their using their dialect as their literary language," in his memorandum submitted to Sir Edward Grey in April 1915), and, on the other, the Slovaks, that the creation of a Czecho-Slovak state was their only chance and the only way of release from the Magyar bondage.

At first the Slovaks accepted this Czecho-Slovak solution, but only on the supposition that Slovakia would be a fully self-governing part of the dual Republic. When, however, they became acquainted with the real aims of the Czech ruling group (amalgamation of the Slovaks with the Czechs in a single national unit), and when they saw the colonizing policy of the Prague administration, they grew more and more convinced that Czecho-Slovakia promised as bad a prospect for the future of the Slovak nation as Hungary had before. Andrej Hlinka, the most popular national leader, from a Czech prison, foretold the fall of Czecho-Slovakia as early as 1920. The shortsighted and extremely selfish policy of the Prague rulers precipitated the complete disruption of the brotherly links between the two kindred nations, so that already in 1933, when Slovakia celebrated the one thousand one hundredth anniversary of the Slovakian Prince Pribina, Czecho-Slovakia was morally finished, insofar as the Slovaks were concerned. Only their fear of Hungarian revisionism prevented them at that time from shaking off the Czech overlordship. But from that year onward the dissolution of the unhappy Czech-Slovak marriage was a foregone conclusion—it was only a question of time and of circumstances. An opportunity presented itself in the troubled months between September 1938 and March 1939, and the Slovaks seized it, as would any nation in a similar predicament.

II

It was a misfortune for the young Slovak state, that it has come into existence on the eve, and not on the morrow, of a great war that was bound to reshape the map of the world, and a tragedy that Hitler had been its godfather. The cause the Slovaks had been fighting for was as just as any great national cause in history. But the circumstances in which its temporary victory had been brought about, were sufficient to discredit it in the eyes of the western democratic world, ignorant of the plights of the Slovak people in the "model democracy" of Czechoslovakia. This the Slovak leaders, and even the people at large, knew only too well. But they could neither halt nor alter the course of events, for after Munich, the smaller nations of central Europe were left without any alternative to determine their actions. And so the joy of the Slovak people at the rebirth of their nation after more than 1,000 years was mixed with great anxieties with regard to the future.

Perhaps other people in central Europe were in such a bad predicament; they had been fighting for their freedom and independence, yet the democratic West, which was engaged in a deadly struggle in the defense of freedom, had turned deaf ears on them, while Hitler, the self-confessed destroyer of freedom of all non-Teutonic nations, as well as of Christianity to which they were deeply attached, had—for his own, and only temporary reasons—adopted the championship of their freedom. They had no illusions whatever that if Hitler had won the war, their independence, such as it was, would have been destroyed in the same way as the independence of Poland was destroyed. On the other hand, they were being told, day and night and in and out of season, that if the Western Allies won the war, Benes and his following would be given a free hand to take their revenge on the Slovaks for having dared even to dream of freedom, for which the former purported to have been fighting.

And Benes (with all his following) was seething with revenge. When the author of these lines—who had left his country immediately after the outbreak of the war, in order to work for the freedom of his people on the side of the Allies—arrived in Paris on October 15, 1939, he was greeted thus by the commanding officer of the Czechoslovak military units which were then forming in the southwest of France: "Well, I hope you have come to join our ranks and that you will have nothing in common with that autonomist scum. For I must tell you, that after the war, we are going to settle the so-called Slovak problem very thoroughly and for good: we'll shoot or hang some thirty to forty thousand Slovak separatists, and the question of Slovak autonomy or independence will be rid of forever." Although Benes was then not yet recognized as President of a nonexistent Czechoslovakia by any of the western governments, this democratic attitude, voiced by one of his lieutenants, was surely alarming enough, and for good reason, for later, when Benes had succeeded in establishing his position with the western governments, the anti-Slovak tone became frequent in the Czechoslovak press and radio propaganda.

In the evening of the same day, the present writer met Dr. Milan Hodza, the former Prime Minister of Czechoslovakia, himself a Slovak, and told him about his experience with that liberating hero. Of course, he was outraged and disgusted, but did not think that the time was ripe for starting a separate Slovak political action as had been suggested to him by the present writer.

A few months later, however, Dr. Hodza himself initiated the formation of a Slovak National Council, which was duly established at the beginning of January 1940, with Dr. Hodza as President, and the present writer as General Secretary. At that time it was not possible to inaugurate in France a political action for a separate Slovak state, for several reasons. First, there were very few politically minded and educated Slovaks in France. Second, Dr. Hodza, though after his long experiences with the pan-Czechs was quite favorably disposed to the idea of a free Slovakia, felt that as a former Cabinet Minister of long standing, and later Prime Minister of Czechoslovakia, he could not well engage himself in an action that would have belied his political past. And last, but not least, Dr. S. Osusky, who since the disintegration of Czechoslovakia was continuously recognized by the French Government as Czechoslovak Minister, warned Dr. Hodza, the present writer, and the handful of the Paris Slovaks, against any separatists Slovak action, asserting—quite falsely, as he himself confessed later—that the French Government would review it with the utmost disfavor and hostility.

The Slovak National Council therefore restricted its political postulates to the October program, that is to the wide political autonomy within a federal Czecho-Slovak Republic which has been achieved in October of the previous year. It therefore joined up with the preparatory committee for a Czech National Council constituted in the meantime by a Czech group disapproving of the policy of the Benesites, which had accepted this Slovak program, and the two bodies acted henceforth as the Czecho-Slovak National Council in Paris, each of them retaining its distinct individuality in matters concerning their respective nations. At that stage the council considered its task was mainly to counter—with the very limited means at its disposal—the authoritarian and violently anti-Slovak activities of the Czechoslovak National Committee formerly under the auspices and actual headship of Dr. Benes. Considering that in the given circumstances and in the atmosphere which then prevailed at the Quai d'Orsay, the only possible way of fostering its ends would be to play an active part in the national committee, which in the meantime had been recognized—thanks to the efforts of Mr. Osusky—by the French, and consequently by the British, Governments. It therefore announced its establishment to the national committee (Dr. Osusky was informed beforehand), as well as to the French Government, and demanded an adequate representation on it. By a letter dated January 16, 1940, Msgr. Sramek, the nominal head of the committee, refused, on consulting Dr. Benes, to recognize the council and to deal with it, but—characteristically for the mind of the whole group—invited Dr. Hodza personally to join the committee which he declined.

The Czecho-Slovak National Council in Paris could not develop any large-scale activities, mainly because the Benes committee, being recognized by the French Government as an allied quasi government (though not on the same footing as the Polish Government of President Raczkiewicz), made use of this situation and of the various wartime regulations restricting political activities, and by denouncing the council as disruptive and even pro-Nazi, succeeded in checking and isolating it almost completely. The following little incident illustrates the situation which then prevailed in Paris. Some time in February or March the council had agreed to issue a proclamation to the Slovaks and Czechs residing in France. Its text was sent to the printers, where it was confiscated and the setting up destroyed by the French police on the instigation of the committee who had somehow got wind of the proclamation through one of the spies in the printing works.

After the collapse of France the council ceased to exist. Only one of its members, the present writer, succeeded in escaping to Britain (Dr. Hodza was living in London), and he was interned on his arrival by the British authorities, who had been told by the Benes committee that he was a Nazi agent, and was held in detention for 10 months. Some of the members of the Czech National Council were treated similarly.

Russia—and Alaska Statehood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1950

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee has completed hearings on the Alaska statehood bill following passage of that measure by the House on March 3. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a statement which Julius Epstein of the Friends of Democracy, Inc., of New York City, had planned to submit to the Senate committee in support of the issue

which is so important to the Nation, as well as to Alaska. That statement was not submitted as the hearings had closed, but I am particularly anxious to have it made available because it contains information not previously brought together as to the views of Soviet Russia regarding Alaska:

Mr. Chairman, I greatly appreciate the opportunity to testify before your committee. I am here to testify in support of granting full statehood to Alaska.

Alaska is our direct frontier with the Soviet Union. Only 4 miles of water, which is ice the larger part of the year, separate Little Diomede Island, which belongs to Alaska, from Big Diomede Island, part of the Soviet Union. The International Dateline which is also the border line between the Western Hemisphere and Asia, runs between these two islands.

Today, I do not want to dwell on the rather well known strategic importance of Alaska. As long as more than 30 years ago, the prophetic Gen. Billy Mitchell predicted that the nation that holds Alaska, can rule the world if it chooses. He also called Alaska the Achilles heel of America.

I do want to call the attention of this committee and the public to the rather forgotten fact that there is evidence for the existence of a Soviet campaign for the recovery of Alaska.

Time and again the greatest American newspapers which are well aware of their responsibility referred to this campaign. From my big file on Alaska, accumulated during the last 10 years, I just want to quote a few—and there are many more—examples.

On June 29, 1940, the New York Herald Tribune carried an article written by its staff correspondent Ansel E. Talbert. The article appeared under the date line Nome, Alaska, June 28. Its title was "Alaska Puzzled by Reds Moving to Nearby Isle." I quote:

"On Tuesday, in Juneau, the Alaskan capital, Gov. Ernest H. Gruening told this correspondent that the reason for the sudden Russian activities on Big Diomede, of which he had been told by Nome residents, constituted one of the greatest mysteries in the north. Prof. Cecil F. Robe, of the University of Alaska, a noted student of Alaskan and Russian history, also expressed surprise, but pointed to a recent story in Pravda, the official Communist newspaper. The story, Professor Robe said, asserted that the sale of Alaska to the United States was illegal and a robbery because the Russian Czar did not consult the people about the transaction."

A few weeks later, to be accurate, on August 11, 1940, the New York Times published an article by its famous correspondent and writer Hallett Abend under the headline: "Threat to Alaska seen in red force." After dealing with the military preparations on the east Siberian coast, some 50 miles from Alaska proper, Hallett Abend continued:

"The United States does not threaten Russia's position in the northeastern part of Asia, and the region is far from Japan's plans for Asiatic mainland expansion. In the opinion of military and naval men here, this vast and secret military development can mean only a Soviet design against sparsely populated and poorly defended Alaska, which was Russian territory before the United States bought it.

"Soviet newspapers and magazines have been devoting much space to Alaska and its riches while articles extol the deed of Czarist generals and admirals of a century ago. There is an intensification of the campaign for 'recovery of rich lands that once belonged to Russia but do not belong to the USSR because they were ineptly lost or corruptly sold later when the dynasty became decadent.'

"Since the only territory that Czarist Russia ever sold outright was Alaska, the implications are plain.

"The thousands of young Russian men and women who are being settled in northeast Siberia are all representatives of the 'younger generation' that has matured entirely under Soviet control. They are said to be carried away with the idea that they are to be the glorious conquerors of the world, that they must sow the seeds of revolution everywhere, and that, to quote from a Vladivostok newspaper, their mission 'first of all is to get their hands on Alaska which idiotically was sold to capitalist America by the Czarist Government.'"

Six years later, in August 1946, the Scripps-Howard newspaper chain sent its staff writer Jim G. Lucas to Alaska in order to make a thorough inquiry into the political and economical problems of the country with special stress on Soviet-Alaskan relations.

Jim G. Lucas did an excellent job. He wrote a series of six articles under the headline, "Alaska—First Line of Defense." In New York, Lucas' articles appeared in the World Telegram. Publication started on August 26, 1946.

It is right in the first article that Lucas states, I quote:

"The Soviets never have conceded the Czar's right to sell Alaska. Russian airmen and seamen stationed in Alaska during World War II openly referred to it as Russian territory.

"Along the Siberian coast, Russia has hastened completion of at least one major air and naval base.

"Her patrol planes fly daily over American bases in the Aleutian Islands, while at the same time our planes are denied the air over Siberia.

"At Umiat, where the United States Navy is drilling for oil in its 35,000 square-mile Barrow Basin, trouble may be brewing. The discovery of high-grade petroleum in commercial quantities conceivably can arouse the cupidity of other nations."

In his third article, appearing on August 28, 1946, Lucas has the following to say:

"Navy's discovery of a 'second Iranian oil field' in its 35,000 square-miles reserve around Point Barrow and Russia's stubborn refusal to admit legality of the Alaskan purchase in 1867 may soon bring tension to a new high."

Lucas' fourth article which appeared on August 29, 1946, deals with the attitude of the many Russians who came to Alaska during World War II. He has this to say:

"Native Alaskans have been told for many years that the U. S. S. R. does not admit legality of the Czar's sale of Alaska in 1867. An authority who spent 3 years at Cold Bay supervising the transfer of lend-lease ships to the Russians said he failed to contact one Russian officer who did not refer to Alaska as Soviet territory."

Latest reference to the Soviet refusal to admit legality of the United States' Alaska purchase of 1867 can be found in the March 19 issue of this year of the New York Journal-American and the other Hearst papers. I mean an excellent article by Gov. Ernest Gruening. This article by the present Governor of Alaska was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 20, 1950, by the Honorable E. L. BARTLETT, Delegate from Alaska. I just want to quote four short paragraphs from Governor Gruening's article. Here they are:

"We are in grave peril of losing another year. We are inviting attack through our back door, left conspicuously ajar.

"It is left ajar for invasion by an enemy who does not acknowledge the validity of the sale of Alaska by the Tsar.

"It is, from the Soviet standpoint, still 'Russian America.' They mean, if we will let them, to hold that part of America physically, permanently.

"Statehood—the full incorporation of Alaska into the Union—is the one clear answer America can make to this oft-uttered threat of annexation following invasion."

The quotations quoted in this statement represent only a very small part of my file on Alaska. However, they suffice to illustrate the point that there can be no reasonable doubt whatsoever that the Soviets carry on with their campaign for recovery of Alaska. Since Stalin is certainly more intelligent than Adolf Hitler, his ally of 1939, he did not yet register any official claim to the Territory of Alaska. But, as the quotations contained in this statement indicate, Stalin obviously not only permits such a campaign but wants it carried out, at least for inner consumption.

America could pronounce no clearer "hands off Alaska" than by granting full statehood to Alaska, and by granting it now.

Resolution on Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1950

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the other day the newspapers carried a news item that was an insult to every free man and woman. A dispatch from Bonn revealed that 13 out of 14 newly appointed diplomatic officials of the West German Government were former Nazi diplomats. Thirteen faithful servants of Joachim von Ribbentrop, who was hanged for conspiring to make Germany rule the world, are going to represent what is considered the democratic Bonn government.

The fact that such appointments are being made by the Germans is in itself sufficient reason to appoint an investigating committee such as my resolution envisages. Actually, the case of the diplomats merely highlights the degree to which Nazis have infiltrated into German political, judicial, economic, educational, and cultural life, obtaining in many cases the most important positions. It would literally take days to only read to the House the names of Germans whose membership in the Nazi Party has proved an asset rather than a liability in their postwar careers.

Over a year ago a high Bavarian official reported that 90 percent of the judges in Bavaria are former Nazis. An on-the-spot investigation by Dr. Joseph Mire, American trade-union official, disclosed that 50–70 percent of all Bavarian government positions were being held by former Nazis. On the one hand, 32,744 Bavarian officials were former party members; compare these figures to the 1,095 officials who had been persecuted during the Hitler regime.

In almost every section and sphere identical Nazi infiltration obtains. Three presidents of denazification courts in Germany denounced the travesty of justice that goes under the name of denazification whose result has been, they pointed out and I quote, "That many state offices have become restricted

Nazi organizations." Almost 600 mayors in Hessen are former Nazis. Or, to take another typical case, the mayor of Schwaebisch-Gmuend who was elected with a plurality of 75 percent is a former SA Oberfuehrer. In the field of education many thousands of ex-Nazis have returned to their old teaching jobs. One of them, according to Dr. Alonzo G. Grace, former Director of the United States Education Division in Germany, teaches the alphabet as follows, "A is for Adolf, H for Hitler, G for Goebbels."

In the great industrial center of the Ruhr, most of the managers of the giant iron, steel, and coal enterprises are former Nazis. They represent the interests of the very same industrialists who put Hitler into the saddle as they have powered Germany for three wars through their alliances with various nationalist and militarist groups. Some appointments have been so shocking that Germans have struck in protest, as when former SA Obersturmfuehrer Grewe became a member of the Ruhr Board of Transportation. With the approval of American occupation authorities top experts who helped Hitler run his war economy now run the economy of the West German state—as if men like Maltzan, Dinkelbach, Abs, Albert, and Puender were trustworthy allies and guardians of a peace-loving, democratic, and spiritually rejuvenated Germany.

Can anybody doubt that the mass return of the Nazis presents as great a challenge as a major military defeat? To leave that challenge unanswered would be a calamity of the first order and completely nullify our victories on the battlefield. I for one propose, in concert with the Members of this House who are cosponsoring this resolution, that an investigating committee be sent to Germany at the earliest convenience of the President of the United States.

Welcomed to Nebraska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 16, 1950

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the President is returning to Washington today from a "nonpolitical" trip made at the expense of the taxpayers. While it was a costly junket and ended up in a political rally in Chicago, I am hoping that President Truman and his advisers learned what the people think about the free spending, Government-do-all policy he is promoting, which is throwing the Federal Government further and further into the red during a period of prosperity in which we should be paying off our huge debt. If they learn this lesson the money for the junket may not be ill spent.

The President had a good opportunity to learn their thoughts as he traveled through my State and district. We are a thrifty people and still believe in the old-time virtues of thrift and individual initiative in the solution of our problems. We believe in matching the things we would like to do against our ability to pay for them. But let the editorial in the Alliance (Nebr.) Times-Herald of May 9 tell the story:

GOP WELCOME MESSAGE TO TRUMAN IS MASTERPIECE

The National Republican Committee can take a leaf out of the book of the Nebraska wing of the party in confronting the Truman "nonpolitical" tour. Instead of waiting for the President to make some slip, such as: "I like Ol' Joe Stalin," the Nebraska committee used the Truman visit to Nebraska to go on the offensive. Heading an advertisement: "Welcome Mr. President to Nebraska * * * the State with no bonded debt * * * no sales tax * * * and the lowest per capita tax in the Nation," the President was greeted in eastern Nebraska Monday with the following message from the State GOP committee that rings the bell of politics, propriety and hostship:

"The founding into the Constitution that Nebraska could have no bonded debt, aside from $100,000 in case of emergency.

"How wise they were. It made the voters tax conscious. 'Pay as you go' has been our policy of government.

"Look about you! The artistically beautiful and practical Capitol costing $10,000,000 was paid for when finished. The outstanding State University and Teachers Colleges accommodating 15,000 students annually have been built and maintained on a cash basis. Same with the penal and charitable institutions. The State has paid its share in cash for a 9,500 mile highway system that compares with neighboring States.

"And, Mr. President, all of this has been and continues to be done with the lowest per capita State tax of any State in the Nation. It was $35.92 for 1949 compared with a national per capita State average of $57.43, and that includes a 1.1 mill levy for a $25,000,000 program to improve the physical plants of our mental institutions, university, teachers colleges, and other State activities.

"Nebraska is a progressive State; progressive in the sound economic sense of working, saving, and living within its means. It accepts wholeheartedly the philosophy expressed by Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1932, 'Any government, like any family, can, for a year, spend a little more than it earns, but you and I know that a continuance of that habit means the poorhouse.'

"It is a young State, admitted in 1867, and continues to be young by giving to each generation the assurances of a divine providence that 'as a man soweth so shall he also reap.' The young people as they go out on their own know that the minimum of their income will be taken in taxes for running the State.

"Yes, sir, Mr. President, Nebraska was so founded and has lived and progressed that her people never need fear being robbed or deprived of their cherished liberties. They know by experience that independence for themselves is not born of dependence upon the State.

"You find here a forward-looking people whose love of personal freedoms and independence has not shorn them of the vision so essential to the welfare of their fellow man. They look beyond the boundaries of the State and Nation with charity for all. Never forgetting, however, that charity begins at home.

"So, Mr. President, we ask of you and all of your successors, the preservation of those rights inherent in our form of government—to do our best for ourselves, and run our State within the all-wise plan that was intended when the Union was founded. That is the basis upon which we have prospered and progressed. It is the basis upon which we have been able to make our contributions to the Nation and all others.

"In all earnestness and sincerity, Mr. President, we welcome you to our Commonwealth. We want you to know from being among us that our interest is uppermost in preserving here and throughout America those principles of government upon which we have been privileged to live and build, not for ourselves alone but within the precepts and teachings of a mighty Prince of Peace who went before.

"May God attend you on your journey."

Biggest Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 16, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the twenty-second article by Mr. Frank C. Waldrop on the infiltration of communism in our country:

BIGGEST STORY

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Stealing the atom bomb is by no means the main accomplishment of the Soviet agents in America.

Long before that, they had stolen something far more important.

The thing they stole, of course, was the attention, intelligence, and loyalty of American school and college teachers, who in turn delivered into communism all they could of a generation of American youth.

When the history of our times is finally written, this story of communism's influence in the American educational system from 1920 to 1950, and its consequences, will be the undoubted climactic chapter.

How did it happen? Why did it happen? What is the cure?

That it happened, all of us know. The waves of sickly pacificism, internationalism, the youth movements, and the denials of American factual history, the blushing at the facts of American successful life, the groveling submission to mass slogans, and the parroting of these as gospel, all can be clearly identified as Moscow-made.

Never in our country's history had anything like it occurred before. And never was there such a catastrophe of lost personality, lost moral and intellectual stature, and lost time.

Never did a generation suffer such ravages of alcoholism, insanity, suicide, divorce, and dissipated character.

I am speaking, now, of the generation that got into college about 1925 and of those in the 10 years or so following. Other generations I know only at second-hand and can judge only by examining the literature and visible behavior of their time.

But the generation that passed through college between 1925 and 1935, I have lived in, and all who have lived in it with me know what it has lost at the hands of the Marxists.

Karl Marx taught that religion, any religion, is the enemy of enlightened intelligence. He described the family as a degrading evil, represented individual initiative, enterprise, and ownership of wealth as the total enemy of human welfare, and taught the destruction of religion, family life, capitalism, and every other institution of civilization as we know it.

Furthermore, that they must be destroyed not in words, but in bloody action.

There is nothing new in such a demon suggestion. It is a line of thought that has

lived in the dark side of man's nature always, in some form or other.

But until the Communists who claimed Marxism as their philosophy fell by accident and unprepared, into control of the government of Russia, never did this dark and dirty instinct hold the reins of actual government over a great empire of human beings.

And so a group of educators in America abandoned their duty to stand against the destroyer, but instead delivered into its power the best-fed, best-clothed, and most envied young people in all the world.

No wonder the victims lost their way, and turned so frequently to self-destruction.

School and college classes of present times cannot begin to imagine what they have escaped. For that they can thank Stalin, not anybody else.

For Stalin, by his actions, has proved the lie that was always at the bottom of the Marxist story of the world.

Russia, today, with atom bombs in one hand and germ bombs in the other, calculating with icy logic just when it would be most profitable to make the final assault, does not square with the fairy tale.

And a President of the United States who says one day "I like Joe Stalin" and the next sends his Secretary of State screeching around the earth in search of alliances while at the same time frantically clawing at the poison fleas other people spot on his own shirt front—he, too, gives away the truth behind the scene.

As this story runs on, I have to tell the facts of a degrading and humiliating episode in American history. The names and the dates and the actions, as I promised in the beginning, are all coming from the public record.

The Federal theater project, for instance, that mocked and ridiculed the very taxpayers whose money paid the authors and actors living off it—that was no secret.

It was a project of the United States Government itself, the government that Washington and Franklin and Jefferson and Adams built for us, that Lincoln preserved, and that millions of Americans down through the generations had revered and lived by and for which many a one had died.

But as I tell these facts, I hope for one accomplishment, to move the reader to a determination that the past does teach the present and guide the future. The influence of Marx on the United States of America has to be broken or we are a finished people.

The Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and statement:

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF
POST OFFICE CLERKS,
Washington, D. C., May 15, 1950.

Hon. A. F. TAURIELLO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am herewith transmitting a statement adopted unanimously by the National Executive Committee of the National Federation of Post Office Clerks which met in the city of Washington, D. C., on May 10 and 11, 1950.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM OTTE,
Secretary-Treasurer.

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF
POST OFFICE CLERKS,
Washington, D. C., May 13, 1950.

The executive committee of the National Federation of Post Office Clerks, having considered the release of the Postmaster General, the Honorable Jesse M. Donaldson, under date of May 11, 1950, relative to the curtailment of service by the Post Office Department, makes the following observations:

While it is true, as the Postmaster General states, that the report of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives does not carry the usual statement indicating that if the Department's business continued to increase, "consideration would be given to supplemental appropriations," it is also true that nowhere in the report of the House committee is there any statement indicating that such supplemental appropriations will not be granted, if the facts justified such action. Certainly the statement by the Appropriations Committee that "this amount should suffice to render adequate service without requiring the Department to come in later for deficiency requests" is not to be construed as a prior rejection of supplemental appropriations.

While it may be futile for critics to claim that the Post Office Department can make savings by administrative action in any other way than by curtailing existing services and reducing the number of people employed, it nevertheless is true that the Congress has never at any time in the history of the Post Office Department determined that the Post Office Department was anything but a service organization, primarily designed to serve the American people efficiently. Many of the services performed by the Post Office Department could never be expected to become self-supporting, regardless of any rate likely to be established by the Congress. However, it is interesting to note that the program for curtailment of service, which the Postmaster General has outlined, does not reduce the services in those areas where no reasonably conceivable postal rate would make them self-supporting, but rather reduces the services in the metropolitan areas which, by and large, actually pay their own way. There can be no doubt that service on rural routes, services at post offices of the fourth class, and services at most post offices of the third class, not only are at present unprofitable but could never be made profitable, no matter how high postal rates might be set. The Postmaster General has called attention to the fact that almost one-fourth of the population receives its mail on rural routes and, according to the latest available report of the Postmaster General, more than 30,000,000 individuals receive their mail on such routes. It should be obvious that the volume of mail originating on rural routes and the volume of mail delivered to patrons of such routes could not under any circumstances, or any rates likely to be established by the Congress, pay the cost of service rendered. If the Post Office Department "must readjust its affairs on a businesslike basis," as the Postmaster General states, he would not eliminate service at the points where the revenues were produced but would eliminate the service at the points where actual losses occurred.

In the establishment of city delivery the Congress refused to authorize the establishment of such service unless the revenues of a particular office would pay for it. However, in the establishment of rural delivery which was opposed on the floor of Congress by many Members on the grounds that it would be a costly operation and that it would bankrupt the Government, such rural delivery service was established, despite the fact that it was well known that it could never pay its own way. In other words, the Congress knew it was spending money for a service which would never produce anywhere near sufficient revenue to pay its own way. For the current year that loss is figured at not less than $150,000,000, or more than twice the amount necessary to be saved, according to the Postmaster General.

The statement by the Postmaster General that the curtailment of collections from street letter boxes will not cause any serious inconvenience to the users of the postal service, appears to be extremely wide of the mark. Actually, the average citizen now may attend to his correspondence after having finished his dinner and take the letter out to his street letter box with every assurance that before morning that same letter will either be ready for delivery in his own city or will be well on its way to delivery in a city many miles distant. By restricting collections from street letter boxes to those reaching the main office not later than 8:30 p. m., practically all mail posted after 6 o'clock p. m. will lie in the street letter box until sometime the following day, causing an initial delay of from 12 to 20 hours in every instance. This is certainly far from the ideal of an expeditious service.

With the rapid development of air transportation, the American public has been turning in increasing numbers to air mail service. At the present time, air mail service is reasonably fast and a letter mailed practically anywhere in the country with air mail postage affixed will be delivered at any other address in the continental United States within not more than 36 hours. With the restricted collections and the restricted deliveries required by the orders of the Postmaster General, air mail letters may be initially delayed for 12 or more hours before even reaching the post office, and if such letter reaches the office of address anytime after 7 o'clock in the morning it would be further delayed a minimum of 24 hours before being delivered to the addressee.

While the Postmaster General has based the necessity for the order on an alleged failure of the Congress to appropriate sufficient revenues, it is interesting to compare his statement now with his statements on the same subject one short year ago. At that time (February 10, 1949) the Postmaster General in a statement to the House Committee on Appropriations stated "over the years we have had to obtain deficiency appropriations because of understatement in our estimates and I am satisfied that if this committee gives us the amount that we are requesting here today, and the increased volume of mail that we originally estimated materializes, that we will always have the kind ear of this committee as we have had in the past and I have no fear of failure to obtain sufficient funds to operate the postal service."

However, in the most recent statement of the Postmaster General, he is trying to convey the impression that the curtailment of service has been forced by the refusal of Congress to provide the funds necessary to maintain satisfactory service. The most casual study of the facts would prove this to be untrue. The Post Office Department will not begin to operate on the appropriations that he makes reference to in his statements until July 1, 1950. It is true that some action toward reducing the amount of appropriations originally requested by the Postmaster General has been taken by the House. However, when appropriations for the Post Office Department have been considered by Congress in past years, the amounts have invariably been jockeyed up and down. The present curtailment order was issued prior to the final determination of the amount to be appropriated for the maintenance of the postal service for fiscal year 1951. The Postmaster General certainly has not helped to secure the appropriation which he claims he needs by cutting the service below the minimum required.

It should be made clear that the work performed by the so-called temporary employees was necessary labor that should have been performed all along by classified civil-service employees. Yet, the Postmaster General has

admitted that even the earnings of many present classified employees will also be reduced as the result of these orders.

The Postmaster General has stated that it is the temporary employees who will be affected to the greatest extent by any reduction in force. Based on our observations and past experience, in many instances classified employees will be entirely without work opportunities over long periods of time. At a time when the volume of mail is the highest in the history of the postal service, it ill becomes the Post Office Department to reduce the number of employees, thereby greatly increasing the work load on those who remain. According to the Postmaster General's own statements, while the revenues increased more than 110.72 percent and the number of pieces handled increased 64.70 percent, the increase in the number of employees was less than 48.43 percent. This indicates that the employees have over the years gradually increased their efficiency all out of proportion to the increased volume of mail and are today rendering even greater service than at any time in the past. The increase in the volume of mail, together with the elimination of proper pick-up and delivery, combined with the reduction in the number of employees below the minimum required to handle the mail and give adequate service, will cause a congestion and delay that will decrease the efficiency of the postal service and will contribute to increasing costs rather than effecting economies.

Texas in Our Blood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL J. KILDAY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 16, 1950

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, as a part of the recent Fiesta San Jacinto in San Antonio, Tex., the Battle of Flowers Orotorical Contest for 1950 was held. Mr. Jack Yonge, of Abilene, Tex., was awarded first place for his oration, Texas in Our Blood. He has given us a beautiful outline of the history of Texas and some famous Texans. I include his oration, as follows:

TEXAS IN OUR BLOOD

There are over 7,000,000 people in Texas, people of all occupations, all trades, farmers, ranchers, business wizards, laborers; people of varied character, of high and low ideals. But from El Paso to Texarkana, from the borders of Mexico to the upper reaches of the Panhandle, from Sabine Pass to the battlegrounds of San Jacinto, no matter what the difference in the people, if they live within these boundaries, there's Texas in their blood.

A true Texan can't disguise his feelings when thousands in the Cotton Bowl or Memorial Stadium rise and in one tremendous voice sing The Eyes of Texas slowly and magnificently. Or when a friend is buried on the side of a Texas hill and sand blows across the grave before the funeral is over. Or when he rides across the sun-drenched Texas prairie and his chest swells with pride at its vastness. Or when he passes the red-granite capitol and sees the Lone Star flag being lowered to half-mast in mourning for one of its citizens. A true Texan simply has Texas in his blood.

And the vitality of the State has a life-blood all its own. At the Texas borders, instead of a port of entry, there's a mat reading "Welcome." Texas, with friendliness as its heartbeat—vast, hospitable, full of euphoria, and blushing with beauty—its vitality can be expressed historically, geographically, in terms of politics, economics, raw materials, folklore, and education.

In the files of the Texas saga, in the not-long-bygone days when the territory was without definable limits, when the homesteaders were restless, straining to become a republic—in this atmosphere our land was conceived and made a reality. This reality was only a potentiality to the men who first sacrificed their lives so that it might come into being.

It came into being in a little chapel in old Mission City on a spring morning in 1836. As dawn and the attack approached, the sky glowed crimson; the Mexicans' eyes, sanguinary, and the blood of Texans ran cold.

Bowie, the Louisiana backwoodsman, had the roughness of a frontier fighter, yet a love for his friends which compelled him to remain and fight with them for his bed.

Crockett, the Tennessee scout, tall, handsome, a crack shot, defended the open part of the wall.

Travis, the soft-spoken colonel; his sincerity equaled only by the tenacity for what he knew was his duty.

Bonham, the dauntless adventurer, with a white handkerchief around his neck, thundered wildly back through Santa Ana's cutthroats to die for the reality.

They listened for the hoofbeats of relief, but there was no relief; there was only death. With almost superhuman effort, they slaughtered one Mexican after another before their lives were expended in defense of the Alamo. They had real Texas in their blood. They contributed in those last hours enough bravery and fortitude into the bloodstream of Texas for all mankind to be proud.

The Raven, 6 feet 6, his massive shoulders clad in buckskin, a hard-living, hard-drinking, hard-eating chieftain who had big tawny hands and big worries, worries big enough to make wrinkles in his forehead that spelled misery for Santa Ana, he was the undisputed boss of the Texas revolution. Charging to shouts of "Remember the Alamo," "Remember Goliad," and to the strains of a flute playing Won't You Come to the Bower? he led 740 Texans to victory over twice as many Mexicans at San Jacinto. President of the Republic and governor after statehood, a shrewd judge of men, he could be a lion or a fox and was as occasion demanded. So came our champion to fill the needs of the time. And when he passed in 1863, we lost a full-blooded Texas son.

The roll call of those who lived and died for the reality of the Republic includes thousands from Capt. Dick Dowling to the cattlemen—Charles Goodnight, Sol West, Charles Moss; to the settlers who cleared the Brazos River bottom, and the countless who forged a link in the chain to greatness. Always among those and often unremembered are the Texas women. Their part of the story is as important and colorful as the battles, the diplomacy, the bloodshed. We're hunting for the lady represented by the statue of the pioneer woman on the capitol grounds.

Perhaps it's the mother of Texas, Jane Wilkenson Long, wife of the famous doctor and partner to him in the fight for independence.

Or perhaps it's Sarah Cannon, who held off the Comanches all afternoon with only a flintlock before an arrow stopped her.

Or it's the devoted mothers of the first 300 families that came into the new frontier under the empresario system—women of steadfast purpose, of infallible morals, of high ideals.

Probably it's significant of everyone of them, for it was the women who inspired the heroes to come to Texas, clear the land, plant the crops, mold an empire from a forest or a desert; the women who were the eyes of conscience testing every cause to determine its worthiness in building a Christian civilization. And the women who mothered the sons and instilled in them the virtues of honesty and fidelity.

The personalities of a colossal past have been diverse, and we remember:

O. O. Henry, the writer.

Elizabeth Ney, the sculptress, making immortal the features of Texans with the tediousness of Michelangelo carving the face of Christ.

H. Y. Benedict, who fought against the three P's: Politics, prejudice, and poverty, so that a dream might come true—the dream of a university of Texas.

Anson Jones, last President of the Republic, who toiled assiduously for a goal and when it came, arose with tear-brimmed eyes to tell the crowd gathered around the cabin-capitol in deliberate and solemn tones, "Gentlemen, the Republic of Texas is no more."

History fades and materializes into today and tomorrow.

We are beginning the second century of statehood. The brawn that cleared the timber, fought the Indians, established settlements like Nacogdoches and San Antonio is constructing skyscrapers, doing the big shoulder work of the oil fields, quarrying gravel for the highways. The brains of men like Cameron, Fannin, Fisher, and Austin are transplanted as if by blueprint to form the structure of our own minds. The simple inventions and mechanisms of the pioneers are transformed into dynamos of sizzling progress.

Our symbols are as varied as ranch brands, the Buckhorn Saloon, smokestacks, braggarts, cowboy hats, oil derricks, cotton, cattle, millions of acres, and the bristling energy of the people. And you can throw in Florida's winters and California's sunshine and a list of other things long enough to cover the 1,000 miles from Brownsville to Dalhart, and you haven't begun to show our thousand faces. There's more good humor and common sense packed into our veins than could ever be measured by inventory or conceived by foreigners.

Our landmarks are as obvious as if there were a giant "T" embroidered with pecan trees and mockingbirds and a chorus of a trillion voices singing Texas, Our Texas in the blue skies over every town—where we have our Will Rogers, our Lincolns, the sons of our Crocketts, our Travises, our Houstons. We have our tycoons, our executives, our publishers, our professional men, and most important, our little people, who claim none of the glory but who are the pulse of our Texas civilization 24 hours of every day.

Foreigners marvel at the fortuitousness with which wealth has accumulated. In 1884 there were $84,000,000 in bank deposits; in 1949, over three and one-half billion. Some people think the land of the Texas wealth is a dollar sign with a halo over it. But it's red-blooded men—working, sweating, figuring in a world of finance and industry—striving to better themselves and their State. For this is a place where a milkman, a farmer, or a Houston dry cleaner can become a millionaire overnight; where the Texas blood of a ponderous oil tycoon still tingles at the sight of a gusher spiraling toward the heavens, where the languid beauty of the piney woods is matched only by the waving wheat of the plains, where one city can be a baby Manhattan, a genuine metropolis packed with glitter and charm, another city only 33 miles away—a cattle annex—a meat-packing town, a town of smiles and windy streets, where the Gulf wind makes the nights cool, where copper, sulfur, petroleum, barbed wire, synthetics, grain, lumber, natural gas, and railroads are products that emerge from throbbing industry, where sleek Herefords or slate-colored Brahma bulls flourish on the King Ranch, the world's largest beef factory, where a valley of oil, roses, and rain make life beautiful and people happy, where a bow in the legs, adventure in the soul, and a canter off into

the sunset are all ingredients that make Texas a paradise.

Men sacrificed on the Texas frontier. They traded part or all of a lifetime for the land that gives Texans pearl-gray Stetsons, hand-tooled boots, Cadillacs, the right to work, and freedom from oppression. The loyalty of a people to their State is equaled only by the size of the Texas moon, by the heritage of an illustrious past.

It's a real thrill to see a dust storm at Amarillo, a cattle auction at Abilene, a fruit harvest in the Rio Grande Valley, or an old-settlers' reunion in Buffalo Gap. But the biggest thrill of all is after visiting foreign States to come across that Texas border; if the air smells fresher, if the sun shines brighter, if your soul feels friendlier, if you long to see the sun rising on a hill smothered in bluebonnets with dew in each bloom sparkling like a diamond, then you're home, pardner, and you've got Texas in your blood.

Discrimination in American Universities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, on last Washington's Birthday I issued a statement denouncing discrimination and coercion at the George Washington University, and was in turn criticized by one or two well-meaning innocents.

A short time later I inserted in the RECORD the findings of the Anti-Nazi League in regard to discrimination at City College of New York, and again was subjected to criticism.

On Friday, May 12, 1950, the Washington Post printed an editorial headed "Bias in colleges" in which, with its usual clarity and economy of expression, the Post says precisely what I was saying, and specifically points to the failure of the George Washington University to take part in a conference here to combat discrimination in colleges. Under leave I am inserting that editorial in the RECORD. I am also inserting a news story from the Washington Evening Star of April 25.

I expect to have more to say about discrimination, wherever it occurs, but especially in educational institutions, from time to time.

The individuals, or groups, who believe in a hush-hush policy on discrimination will get little aid or comfort from me.

The matter referred to follows:

[From the Washington Post of May 12, 1950]

BIAS IN COLLEGES

Delegates from 28 colleges located in Maryland, Virginia, Delaware, and the District of Columbia meeting here recently for a regional conference, took an unequivocal stand against discrimination in higher education on grounds of race, creed, or national origin. Every major institution of higher learning in Washington was represented—with the single conspicuous exception of the George Washington University. The attitude expressed by the educators seems to us extremely heartening and significant on two counts.

It reflects, in the first place, a recognition that scholars have a responsibility for leadership in their communuities. The academic function is not fulfilled by a mere acceptance of prevailing mores; the plea, too frequently advanced in the past by timorous educators, that they must abide by unjustifiable prejudices out of deference to local opinion, is an outright abdication of responsibility. It is precisely to its institutions of learning that a community is entitled to look for guidance in sloughing off outworn and invalid patterns. The examples set by such institutions constitutes a powerful educative force.

The action of the regional conference reflects, in the second place, a recognition that discrimination on account of race, religion, or national origin is indefensible so far as the universities themselves are concerned. It runs directly counter to what they teach. The educators called for repeal of State laws requiring segregation at the college level. The indication that the teachers themselves are ready to initiate this process—instead of waiting until they are forced to do so by the Supreme Court—is most encouraging. Their view should carry weight with the State legislatures and will serve, we hope, to accelerate a trend toward genuine equality in educational opportunity which has already gained great momentum.

[From Washington Evening Star of April 25, 1950]

COLLEGE PARLEY URGES BAN ON DISCRIMINATION—LAWS TO OPEN SCHOOLS TO MINORITIES ASKED BY REGIONAL GROUP

Representatives of 28 District, Maryland, Virginia, and Delaware higher education institutions have gone on record opposing discrimination against any minority group in college admissions.

The conference of educators and students, meeting at American University yesterday, advocated repeal of any laws requiring segregation in colleges and universities. The group added that "positive" laws forbidding schools to turn down applicants on grounds of race, creed, or color "may be one of the desirable means of ending discrimination."

Both Virginia and Delaware require segregation of races in education.

Dr. Walter E. Hager, president of Wilson Teachers' College, who was chairman for the day-long session, told the conferees, "You have faced the problem squarely."

EIGHTY-FIVE ATTEND PARLEY

"We have gone on record much more vigorously than I anticipated we could at this conference," he asserted.

The conference was sponsored by a group of Washington area educators to consider problems of discrimination in higher education. It was the first regional conference of its kind, advocated last fall by the American Council on Education. About 85 educators, students, and others connected with schools were sent to the conference by the heads of their institutions.

The elimination of a qualified college applicant on grounds of race, creed, or national origin "is unjustified and un-American," a majority of the conferees agreed.

They urged institutions in this area to reexamine practices and policies regarding admissions with a view to ending discrimination.

Dr. Hager, in a summing-up talk, said the conferees recognize it may take a long time to accomplish their ideals. It will be necessary, he said, to lead up to the ideals through education.

STEPS SUGGESTED

Some of the steps suggested to carry out the program are interracial workshops at colleges, opening of more college activities to the community, exchange of students among various institutions, and leadership training of students.

It was felt the major barriers to ending discrimination exist among boards of trustees, residents of a college community, and others outside of the student body.

Dr. Hager was authorized to appoint a committee to plan with national organizations how discrimination in education can be combated.

The conferees felt they did not have enough information to consider discrimination in hiring teachers. They suggested colleges could experiment by placing representatives of minority groups in important faculty positions under conditions carefully planned to assure success of the experiment.

The recommendations adopted at the closing general session were prepared by four groups that had met separately earlier in the day. Dr. Hager explained the group reports represented a majority opinion and were not necessarily unanimous. The full meeting adopted the reports by a voice vote without much discussion.

CALLED DANGEROUS WEAPON

In the opening address, a University of Maryland dean described racial and religious hatred weapons as more dangerous to America than those of steel, flame, or nuclear fission.

Dr. Harold Benjamin, dean of Maryland's College of Education said "these shadowy enemies can do tremendous things to our people. They can take differences in color, magnify them until we have a whole system of economic and social barriers. They can transform good men into cruel monsters."

Dr. Benjamin said dynamic education was necessary to combat the fear and ignorance which lead to hatred. He added that "divisiveness stares me in the face" at the University of Maryland, but did not elaborate. Negroes are not admitted at College Park.

NINE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SCHOOLS REPRESENTED

Heads of the four group sessions were Dr. M. Weldon Thompson, of Lynchburg (Va.) College; Dr. Allan P. Colburn, president of the University of Delaware; Dr. F. Wilson Shaffer, of Johns Hopkins University; and Dr. F. G. Livingwood, acting president of Washington College, Chestertown, Md.

Nine District schools were represented, 15 Maryland, 3 Virginia, and 1 Delaware. George Washington University was the only major Washington university that sent no delegates.

The planning committee which sponsored the conference was composed of Dr. Hager and Dr. H. F. Cotterman, University of Maryland; Dr. Roy J. Deferrari, Catholic University; Dr. Donald Derby, American University; Dr. Hugh G. Price, Montgomery Junior College; Dr. Edwin H. Sponseller, Hood College; Dr. Charles Thompson, Howard University; and Alex Weinstein, of the Washington office of the Antidefamation League.

Dead Animals on Our Public Highways Dangerous to Public Health

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 15, 1950

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, on January 30, I made some remarks on the subject of dead animals on our public highways, in which I pointed out their dangers to the health of the Nation. Those remarks were published in the April issue of the American Highways magazine,

with the result that I am receiving letters from all over the country relative to this matter.

While the medical profession, and especially the Public Health Service, seem to have succeeded in conquering, or eliminating, at least to a large extent, certain diseases, such as yellow fever, typhoid, and malaria, we are still plagued with many other maladies, some of which are probably more devastating, such as tuberculosis, cancer, heart disease, polio, paralysis, hydrophobia, and so forth.

Let me call your attention to the fact that smallpox was never controlled, and it is doubtful if it ever would have been controlled even by vaccination, if it had not been for the installation of waterworks and sewerage systems in the great cities of the world.

On May 10 I received a letter from Mr. S. W. Jackson of Franklin, Pa., district engineer in district 1–0 of the State highway department of that State, showing the number of dead animals removed from the public highways in his district of seven counties during each month of the year 1949, and also the total for the year, and showing the total of dead animals found on those highways during the years 1941 to 1949. District No. 1–0, contains seven counties—Crawford, Erie, Forest, Lawrence, Mercer, Venango, and Warren.

I am inserting Mr. Jackson's letter in the RECORD and also that portion of his annual report showing the total number of dead animals, both wild and domestic, removed from the highways in his district. You will note that for the year 1949 in these seven counties they removed the bodies of 20,081 wild animals and 3,569 domestic animals—making a total of 23,650.

In this connection, let me call your attention to the fact that a statement in the same issue of the American Highways magazine, on page 14, shows that during the first 4 weeks of this year there were 4,417 animals killed on the highways in Virginia.

Pennsylvania and Virginia are not exceptions to the rule. The same condition prevails in every State in the Union.

Every automobile that rolls over one of these dead animals picks up whatever disease germs it may contain, and probably exposes to that malady every individual who touches the tire that comes in contact with that carcass—to say nothing of the rest of the car.

The letter of Mr. S. W. Jackson, district engineer for the seven counties in Pennsylvania, reads as follows:

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA,
DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS,
Franklin, Pa., May 10, 1950.

Hon. JOHN E. RANKIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. RANKIN: I have noted with interest the article in the April 1950 issue of American Highways covering your remarks before the House relative to the removal of dead animals from highways.

I have, as district engineer of the Pennsylvania Department of Highways, made a study and hobby of collecting data on this particular subject for the past 9 years, and I have sent out copies of our annual reports covering this matter to the Game Commission of Pennsylvania and several other States, as well as to conservationists and sportsmen's associations. So far as I know, no other record of this kind has been collected by any agency in this country.

I have charge of State highway work in seven counties in northwestern Pennsylvania with a State highway mileage of 4,100 miles, and this data is furnished to me monthly by our highway caretakers, who make from two to five trips per week over each highway, and among their responsibilities is the removal and disposal of the bodies of wild and domestic animals and birds killed by the operators of motor vehicles. This report is an actual count of the bodies removed and is not an estimate.

You will note the main part of the report shows the details according to species of animals involved in each county for each month, and at the end of the report is shown the totals for the year 1949. I have also appended to the report the totals for each of the years from 1941 to 1948, inclusive. You will note there was a decrease in the wild animals killed during the war years and until 1948, since when a material increase has been shown probably due to increased traffic and increase of some of the species of animals, especially opossums.

Possibly you might be interested in referring a copy of this report to your conservation department or local sportsmen's association, and I am enclosing a couple of extra copies for your use.

I trust this information may be of interest and use to you.

Sincerely yours,

S. W. JACKSON,
District Engineer, District 1–O.

Here is an excerpt from Mr. Jackson's report, showing the number of dead animals removed from the public highways of his district, by counties, in 1949, and also showing the totals. It also shows the number removed from the highways in that district every year since 1941.

The report referred to follows:

Record of dead animals and birds removed from State highways, District 1–0, Pennsylvania Department of Highways, Franklin, Pa., S. W. Jackson, district engineer

Species	Total for year by counties							District total for year—								
	Crawford	Erie	Forest	Lawrence	Mercer	Venango	Warren	1949	1948	1947	1946	1945	1944 [1]	1943 [1]	1942 [1]	1941 [1]
Wild birds and animals:																
Rabbits	2,737	1,715	584	1,444	2,520	1,502	1,225	11,727	8,734	5,428	6,603	6,894	6,525	7,155	9,125	8,728
Woodchucks	134	126	112	39	93	105	240	849	610	310	546	520	433	385	415	464
Squirrels	37	22	19	46	146	25	72	367	327	167	259	230	175	170	159	174
Skunks	211	335	100	158	233	113	352	1,502	1,205	516	801	925	1,065	1,417	1,797	1,748
Raccoon	27	22	14	32	70	17	50	232	100	31	60	37	36	43	25	27
Deer	9	10	16	1	6	15	85	142	103	61	40	29	37	21	23	31
Bear														2		
Opossum	830	530	282	514	1,191	559	497	4,403	2,358	906	899	692	1,095	977	695	298
Weasel	3	8	1	7	23	10	1	53	34	10	12	26	20	33	18	10
Muskrat	32	12		9	36	9	7	105	87	54	80	71	73	141	59	49
Mink	1					1	2	4		2			1	2	2	1
Fox	1	4	2			1	5	13	12	1	5	3	1	8	4	3
Porcupine		1	57		2	13	68	141	135	56	69	41	36	46	17	16
Grouse	4		34	1		13	32	84	41	34	34	25	22	25	36	35
Quail		1	1	3	3	2	1	11	1	3	6	6	3	6	23	29
Ringneck pheasant	78	43		94	188	22	3	428	314	126	145	165	102	150	157	203
Woodcock	3	3	2		4	4	4	20	31	4	8	23	35	13	20	8
Beaver									4				1	1		
Total	4,107	2,832	1,224	2,348	4,515	2,411	2,644	20,081	14,096	7,709	9,567	9,688	9,660	10,594	12,575	11,824
Domestic fowl and animals:																
Chickens	106	62		28	113	51	11	371	394	251	356	359	345	382	442	348
Ducks	3			1	2	2		8	14	8	17	15	21	9	10	19
Geese					1			1	6	2		11	3			
Turkeys				1				1	1		3				3	6
Guinea fowl		1			2			3	5	1	6	15	15		2	
Cats	331	510	18	303	544	238	157	2,101	1,823	1,040	1,171	1,006	724	844	1,011	1,178
Dogs	146	261	11	209	262	118	71	1,078	954	641	666	594	418	510	504	544
Horses					2			2	2			1	1		2	5
Sheep									1			6	3	2	1	3
Cows					1			1	1	3	5	3	6		4	5
Pigs				1	1	1		3	1	4	9	7			2	3
Mules									1						1	
Goats									2		2					
Total	586	834	29	543	928	410	239	3,569	3,205	1,950	2,259	2,026	1,536	1,747	1,982	2,111

[1] District totals for years 1941 to 1944 inclusive do not include Lawrence County.

As I pointed out, there were 20,081 wild animals and 3,569 tame animals, removed from the highways in those seven counties in 1949, which is almost double the number removed from the highways in the same district in 1941.

This is a very serious matter, one that affects the health, even the life, of every human being in the United States.

I trust that the rest of the Nation will follow the example set by Pennsylvania, and see that these dead animals are promptly removed from the Nation's highways in every State, as well as in the District of Columbia.

Addresses of the President at Boise and Nampa, Idaho

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 15, 1950

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, to insert two further addresses by the President of the United States on his recent trip through Idaho. Following are the addresses made by the President at Boise, Idaho, and Nampa, Idaho:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT BOISE, IDAHO

I am very glad indeed to be here this morning. I certainly appreciate your most cordial greeting. It is very impressive to come into this rich valley. Here you have an empire which is made possible through the miracle of reclamation. It all comes from having water. Your great program of irrigation in this area has brought prosperity to your farms and your cities. I am told you have some 350,000 acres irrigated in this section. This is a tremendously valuable addition to the economic well-being of the whole country.

I think there is a deeper significance in what you have achieved here than you people may realize. A relatively small amount of Government money for reclamation has brought rich returns to the whole area and to the whole Nation.

When people talk about the size of the Federal budget, they forget that when we set aside money for things like reclamation, it is just like investing money in gilt-edge securities. The money invested for the development of this valley is an investment, it is not an expenditure.

Reclamation means richer farm lands, more prosperous cities and industries, cheaper power, and healthier opportunities for a better standard of living in this whole area.

The penny pinchers who want to cut off funds for reclamation simply do not understand good business principles.

The future has in store rich potentialities for the Boise area, for Idaho, and for the whole Northwest. We have done a great deal of good pioneering work in resource development, but we need more power dams to develop mineral resources, and to bring cheap power to all the communities of this area. We need more sound reclamation projects, we need better soil and forest conservation.

To do these things right, we need a coordinated program for the development of the entire Columbia River Basin, including the Snake River Valley.

In order to harness the mighty resources of land, water, forests, and minerals, we must tackle all phases of this development simultaneously.

There is a direct relation between what we do in all sections of the Columbia Valley, if we are to get cheap power, flood control, rich soil, and all the other benefits which flow from a balanced program.

I am convinced that the only way to get such a balanced program is through the establishment of a Columbia Valley Administration, which will treat the region and its resources in a way which will bring greater benefits to every section.

Don't let anybody tell you that the Columbia Valley Authority I have recommended would be socialistic. It would not have a bit more authority than the present Federal agencies have. It would specifically prohibit interference with anybody's water rights, or any other rights you may have already established.

The Columbia Valley would be firmly under the control of the Congress—the elected representatives of the people—just like all other Federal agencies are now.

Instead of moving in the direction of more centralized Government, the Columbia Valley Authority would move in the direction of less centralization. The Columbia Valley Authority would have its headquarters right out here in the Columbia Basin, where the people can deal with it first-hand. In such a situation, the State and local governments can participate much more effectively in resource-development work. The experience of the Tennessee Valley proves that conclusively. And we had a lot of old mossbacks that did everything they possibly could to tear down the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Without a Columbia Valley Authority we will continue to have a scatter-shot approach to resource development, with one phase emphasized at the expense of another. You can see that by what happened to the rivers and harbors bill the Senate passed a couple of weeks back. They put in part of a program, and left out other parts, like Hells Canyon Dam, which are just as important. The results of such a policy are wasteful and uneconomic, and I hope you will join me in working for the Columbia Valley Authority. This will stop all the fuss between Reclamation and the Army engineers and all the rest of the bureaus in Government, by having it right out here where you can keep your finger on it.

Above and beyond the immediate benefits to this area, the success of projects like these will aid in strengthening the entire country.

I want to say to you that if we hadn't had the power projects in the Tennessee Valley, if we hadn't had the Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams and other power projects, it would have taken us much longer to win the war. But, having these projects and plenty of power, we were able to set up those great establishments which contributed to the immediate winning of the war, and the saving of young American lives.

Now, I want to see a Northwest power development, a Southwest power development, a Northeast power development which will include the St. Lawrence Seaway project and the Bay of Fundy project and the Connecticut River project, and we will have the great networks in the Southeast, the Tennessee Valley project now being built in South Carolina and Georgia.

I want to say to you that if we get that done, if we get the proper development of the Missouri Valley, the Ohio Valley, the Mississippi Valley, nothing in the world can prevent this country from accomplishing its purpose. It will mean an economic development that will keep us the most powerful nation in the world, and a nation which works entirely for peace and not for any selfish purpose.

That is what I have in mind. That is what I am out here to tell you. That is what I want you to understand: that I am working for world peace on a basis that will make our economic set-up the greatest in the history of the world, as it is right now. I want to keep it that way. I want to keep on developing it.

Now with your help we can do just those things.

I can't tell you how very much I appreciate this turn-out. I am more than happy you have been so kind to me and so very cordial. I am out here to let you know what I am thinking; I am not running for office, I am on a nonpolitical tour now, but I may see you a little later on that subject.

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT NAMPA, IDAHO

I can't tell you how much I appreciate this reception. This is a wonder; it gets better and better as I go along through Idaho. I got up this morning at 6 o'clock, and I have been going ever since, and it seems as if the crowds get bigger and the weather gets better and the welcome more cordial. And I appreciate it.

I understand that today the Boy Scouts are sponsoring the dedication of a replica of the Statue of Liberty here in Nampa. That is a wonderful thing; that is a wonderful thing.

In this fortieth anniversary of scouting in America, it is certainly fitting that the Boy Scouts are carrying on a crusade to strengthen the arm of liberty.

You know, I am the honorary national president of the Boy Scouts of America, and I congratulate you on your enterprise that you are putting on here.

I can think of no more important task than to strengthen the arm of liberty.

There are many ways in which we must work to strengthen that arm. We have to maintain a strong defense organization, and above all we need to stay strong in our desire to preserve peace in the world.

One very important element in the strength of the United States is the high standard of living we have established for the people of this country. Through our social-security program, farm legislation, fair-labor standards laws, housing acts and other progressive legislation, we have helped to make this country the richest in the world. We have made it possible for our people to live decent, worth-while lives, to live them without undue interference.

With the world in a troubled state, it is even more essential that this country continue to grow in strength. Our national strength depends on our keeping all groups and sections of the country prosperous. I want to see farmers, businessmen—both big and little—and the working men and women all well off.

I am greatly encouraged by the reports I have been hearing about the expanding industrial prosperity in the great State of Idaho. Despite some recent downturn in farm income, the average income of each person in the State of Idaho increased over 170 percent between 1940 and 1949.

Even more important, the average per capita income in this State increased at a much faster rate than the average increase throughout the country. Now, isn't that remarkable? That is remarkable—I don't think you appreciate what that means.

I am glad to see that Idaho is showing the way.

That is the goal toward which I am working all over the country—toward a balanced

prosperity for all the people. If the farmers have good incomes, and labor has good incomes, and business is prosperous, then that makes the whole country prosperous, and gives us a chance to continue our position in the world, as the leader of the whole world, working for peace.

Never again will we go back to the days when the robber barons stuffed themselves with riches and the little people got just a few crumbs. Those days are gone forever—and I am glad of it.

We are strengthening the arm of liberty in our country economically, militarily, and spiritually. Let us never forget that when we strengthen liberty at home we strengthen peace in the world.

We stand for something. We stand for the moral well-being of the world. We have a system of morals which believes in honor and ethics and upright living. We are in a controversy with a country that has no ethics and no morals. Because we have the ethical standards that we have, I am just as sure as I stand here that in the long run Almighty God is going to give us an opportunity to get peace in the world.

We don't want to conquer any nation; we don't want to exploit anybody. We want everybody in the world to be happy, just as we are.

I hope you Boy Scouts will keep up the good work. This is a fine step you are taking here today. I hope it will be possible for me to attend the National Jamboree at Valley Forge next month. I am counting on it. But the President never can tell where he is going to be or at what time. He has to meet conditions as they come up. But I hope I will see some of you at that jamboree.

Thank you very much.

Resurgent Nazism and Communism in Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 16, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the General Court of Massachusetts:

Resolution memorializing Congress to study and review the problem of resurgent nazism and communism in Germany

Whereas there are growing reports of the resurgency of nazism and communism in Germany: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts urges the Congress of the United States to institute a thorough-going study and review of the resurgence of nazism and communism in Germany; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent forthwith by the State secretary to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

In house of representatives, adopted April 26, 1950.

LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
Clerk.

In senate, adopted in concurrence May 3, 1950.

IRVING N. HAYDEN,
Clerk.

Saving the "Lost" Wartime Immigration Quotas for the Desperate War-Impoverished Peoples of Europe and Nonquota Status for Parents of Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, my sympathetic interest in all immigration matters is so much a matter of public interest that Commissioner Watson B. Miller jokingly calls me his best customer.

It was, therefore, that I discovered in an editorial from Il Progresso Italo-Americano, the largest and most influential Italian-language daily in the United States and perhaps in the world, warm endorsement of two of my favorite proposals—throwing open to use the "lost" wartime national immigration quotas, and permitting parents of American citizens to enter as nonquota immigrants.

Only 3 weeks ago I introduced H. R. 8209, which would, if enacted, amend the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, to add to the definitions of nonquota immigrants "the mother or the father of a citizen of the United States."

Under leave, I am inserting the editorial, which follows:

AN URGENT AMENDMENT

For some time we have been urging that our Government take the necessary legislative steps to permit the entry into our country of a number of immigrants equivalent to the quotas unused during the war. We always felt and continue to feel today that in advocating this measure we are asking for nothing more than simple justice and a warm human approach in the execution of our law as it is on the statute books today. In short, we have not been pleading for a fundamental revision but for a fundamental humanization of our execution of the existing law.

Here we hasten to add that the response in Congress to our proposals has been rather receptive. We did not look forward to unanimous acceptance. Of course, we did not expect to arouse the narrow-minded or bigoted. We realize that there are still some Members of Congress whose social-economic vision is yet to grow out of and beyond the pale of their own district. We understand that it takes time to grow out of the narrow limitations of local community politics, narrow neighborhood interests and approach. But fortunately for Congress and the American people, there is still hope for an equitable and practicable decision to be made in the not distant future in regard to our appeal. In its handling of the entire question of immigration, the House of Representatives is to be commended and congratulated on having as the chairman of its special subcommittee the capable, earnest, and farsighted legislator from Pennsylvania, Congressman FRANCIS E. WALTER.

IN THE RIGHT DIRECTION

Though we are hopeful of the future and will continue to work untiringly for the admission into our country of a number of immigrants equivalent to the number in the immigration quota unused during wartime, yet we realize that there are certain lesser phases of the entire present immigration law which need speedy attention and basic revision. We approach all such phases in the same spirit as we approach the major issue of using up the unused immigration quotas. We cannot repeat too often that it is our firm belief that America's best interests and ideals would be most served vis-à-vis Europe if we were to use up the unused quotas.

In the same sense and spirit do we now propose for immediate enactment the following provision as an amendment to our present Immigration Act: "The parents of children now residing in the United States should be accorded the same preferential status for entry to our shores that children living overseas now have. These parents are to come in to the United States as nonquota immigrants." Of course, as with children coming from overseas, those bringing their parents will have to assume full responsibility for their support so that they will not become a public charge.

Arithmetically speaking, the number of parents who would thus be enabled to come to the United States on the basis of the above amendment to our present Immigration Act may not be large. But the entire question is far more than a problem of numbers. It is much more than a question of arithmetic which confronts us here. It is a human issue that we face. We must meet it in a humanitarian manner. No matter how comparatively few may be the number thus admitted or how little the misery thus eliminated, our country's demonstration of generosity of spirit and humanitarianism in action can only aid greatly the enhancement of America's moral prestige abroad.

WILL HELP AMERICA

Moreover, such an amendment to the present Immigration Act will also have a wholesome effect on the morale of our citizenry directly involved in and affected by the bringing in of their parents now abroad. There can never be too many humane ways in which the Government can and should lift the morale of our own people. A little consideration by our Government for even a limited number of its citizenry will go a long way toward raising the contentment of all the people in our land.

We sincerely urge every Member of Congress to heed our appeal. We urgently plead with Congressman WALTER to lose no time in introducing a bill which will amend the Immigration Act to provide for parents the same preferential status as nonquota immigrants that children now have. This amendment is to operate in all other respects in the same manner as the present provision covering children does.

We cannot emphasize too strongly that prompt favorable action on our proposal will serve as a timely, positive factor for improving the attitude and deepening the friendship of many peoples in Europe for our country and our Government. In this critical hour when our Nation is battling against the poisonous propaganda of barbarous and despotic communism, the enactment of such legislation will not only increase the number of our friends and augment the already existing friendship for America, but will at the same time also strike a hard and telling blow at the Communist slanderers of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, Il Progresso Italo-Americano is, of course, the newspaper brought to its full flower of circulation and influence by the late Generoso Pope, my good friend and adviser. His place has been ably taken by his son, Generoso Pope, Jr., who is obviously emulating his father's policies of enlightened assistance to Americans of Italian derivation.

I would, if I could, go much further than is proposed in this editorial. I would like to throw open to use all the unused immigration quotas which lapsed during the war years, without regard to national origin. By following that policy, we could have avoided the necessity of enacting the Displaced Persons Act; but, since that could not be done, I have thrown my full support behind the enlightened amendments contained in the House bill to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948.

On January 23, 1947—3 years ago—I introduced a bill which would have provided, if passed, for using all unused immigration quotas for all nationalities to the end of the fiscal year of 1947, to be used for admittance to the United States of victims of war displacement without regard to nationality.

Obviously, this would primarily have benefited those victims of the Hitler madness defined as displaced persons; but it also would have benefited Italians, Greeks, Turks, and Spaniards, with their pitifully small annual quotas.

On the same day I introduced two other bills differently worded, but having the same ultimate effect, which would have been to make the unused "lost" national quotas usable for the relief of those who most needed relief; on March 11, I introduced a bill which would make the treatment of illegal entrants—stowaways—less harsh and less similar to the brutal methods of Nazi Germany or Soviet Russia; and on March 29, 1948, I introduced House Joint Resolution 434 to suspend the operation of section 401 (e) of the Nationality Act of 1940 as to American citizens who lost their citizenship by participating in the Italian elections.

In the present Congress I continued my strenuous efforts to effect a liberalization of immigration laws and of administrative policy.

It is clear that there is a great deal of doubletalk in the executive agencies chiefly involved in immigration matters, which are the Department of Justice and the Department of State.

While our policy-making officials from the President down are proclaiming the welcome we should give to new citizens and visitors, officials at lower levels are doing their utmost to frustrate the official policies.

As an example, the visa division in 1949 circulated to consuls a letter written by a Republican Member of Congress in 1948, and is using that letter as a basis for denying visitors' visas to Catholics and Jews. Greeks, Italians, Spaniards, and Jewish and Catholic refugees from Nazi and Communist persecution in central Europe are the chief victims of this discriminatory closed door policy, which has been encouraged by influential Members of Congress.

Accordingly, it has been my satisfying duty during the last 18 months to protest and argue against this un-American attitude both on the administrative and the legislative levels.

Since the beginning of the Eighty-first Congress I have introduced the following public bills, all intended to ease the plight of the intending immigrant to the United States:

House Joint Resolution 372, to suspend the deportation of all persons who have filed form 500, under section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act, until the Senate has finally disposed of the pending bill.

House bill 2027, to amend section 3 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917.

House bill 1234, to authorize the admission into the United States of persons indigenous to Indonesia, to make them racially eligible for citizenship, etc.

House Joint Resolution 30, to suspend the operation of section 301 (e) of the Nationality Act of 1940 in certain cases.

House bill 1915, to amend the Nationality Act of 1940.

House bill 1649, to repeal section 342 (h) of the Nationality Act of 1940.

House Joint Resolution 239, to suspend the operation of section 404 of the Nationality Act of 1940 in certain cases.

House bill 8209, to admit parents of citizens as nonquota immigrants.

House bill 8268, to repeal section 404 (c).

In the same period, I introduced 46 private bills in behalf of aliens; some of these are duplicative, and some were withdrawn; but the fact remain that, in the effort to be helpful to distressed people of foreign birth in the United States, I have introduced more private bills in this Congress than any other Member but one.

In normal times I might not regard this as a favorable distinction; but in this postwar era when so many people are suffering through no fault of their own, I believe that anything I can do, without impropriety, to help those who need help is worth while.

The World State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RAYMOND W. KARST

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1950

Mr. KARST. Mr. Speaker, the following print, which was delivered in April 1930 by Joseph P. Donovan, C. M., J. C. D., now rector of Kenrick Seminary, in my district in St. Louis County, is today very timely. So far as logic goes his argument for world state is flawless. When this speech was made in 1930 his remarks were probably considered fantastic. Today it will provoke thought and sound thinking as a foundation for everlasting peace.

THE WORLD STATE

(By Joseph P. Donovan, C. M., J. C. D.)

The strange thing that strikes us as we consider the widespread and honest efforts of the present day for international peace is the fact that every method but the most obvious one has been advocated and to some extent employed to bring about the reign of peace foretold by the prophet Isaiah 2,700 years ago—and he spoke in a literal sense—"They shall turn their swords into plowshares, and their spears into sickles: nation shall not lift up the sword against nation, neither shall they be exercised any more in war." The poet has sung of the parliament of man, the federation of nations; and statesmen and peoples are actually engaged in perfecting a league of nations. But an international or world state, in the strict sense of that term, is not thought of. Reliance is placed upon agreements that in their nature are private, although the parties thereto are sovereign nations.[1] At the same time an assumption is entertained that law, emanating from genuine public authority, as a remedy for the evils nations are beginning to groan under, is not only nonexistent but also nonexistible.

Yet does it not behoove us Catholics, with our high traditions of juridical achievement in public as well as in private law, to inquire into the likelihood of the contrary assumption? Is it not time for us to ask ourselves if the day is not approaching, perhaps is already here, when conditions will exact that nations begin to do what families have long since done? For thousands of years now families have been gathered into state or governmental units in order to obtain a temporal good otherwise impossible, namely, the administration nationally of civil and criminal justice and the promotion nationally of the common welfare. Therefore, may not the time be already ripe for those national units formed by the necessary union of families to coalesce in turn under a second compulsion of the law of nature into a larger form of civil society, into a society springing from secondary though absolute needs and empowered to administer internationally civil and criminal justice and to promote internationally the common temporal welfare of nations and, as a subsidiary function, to supply the deficiencies of individual nations and groups of nations?

This counterassumption of ours first calls for clearing up of the confusion that prevails on the notion of society. The well-known definition—a union of persons pursuing one end by a community of means—signifies to one group of thinking and nonthinking people that such a union can do anything the component persons want done. To another group of thinkers and nonthinkers, the same term "society" connotes a gathering that can accomplish nothing in practice but everything in theory. Yet the truth is that society is truly mighty while not all powerful. Here it is well to remark the fundamental distinction that public jurists have always made between the various unions that individual man can or does enter into. Amicable and juridical, according to those publicists, are the basic kinds of society; but these kinds are worlds apart. The amicable society, association, or union of persons is from below; the juridical society, from above. Man enters amicable society of his own initiative in order better to use gifts or endowments of nature or grace at hand. The entrance into amicable society confers no new right. It merely enables him to use that previously possessed right jointly, and thereby gain accidental advantage over what would have been the use of that same right singly. Amicable society is verified at the one extreme in the white man and the black man who went in cahoots to hunt possums. It is verified at the other

[1] When I prepared the above paper I was unaware of the striking proposal put forth by the Reverend Father Delos of the University of Lille at the French Social Week of 1926. That distinguished churchman proved the need of an international state from the existence of a distinct international good. He proceeded in an inductive way, whereas I proceeded deductively from the notion of perfect society through apparently international facts to the need of a world state. I am aware that noted publicists try to make out that both Victoria and Suarez taught a community of nations, but a close scrutiny of their respective contexts indicates that they spoke in a racial, and not in a juridical sense.

extreme in the merchant princes who enter into a partnership to trade on a national or international scale. Of amicable society only is the adage, in union there is strength, literally true. For it increases strength but gives no new source of strength.

The latter, the other grand division, juridical society, does do. And because juridical society does give new strength, does confer new rights, it has to come from above and be a creation of law, and not proceed solely from the will of man. Even where amicable society has a personality distinct from the persons composing it, that personality it owes to law. The business corporation differs from the business partnership because law has intervened in the first case and not in the second. Yet this giving of legal personality doesn't essentially lift the group enjoying it out of the category of amicable society; for this personality is granted only to serve the pooling of individual rights.

But where juridical society is entered, social rights and duties, or social privileges straightway spring up. Conjugal society, marriage, is our first instance of juridical society in time and in growth. For conjugal society expanded into the family acquaints us with the initial form of juridical society in the temporal order and becomes the occasion of the second form of juridical society taking on actual existence. The individual man by entering conjugal society acquires a new character. He becomes husband. The individual woman by getting married is no longer just woman. She is wife. Through the marvelous creation of natural law perfected by divine positive law, two persons seeking individual perfection suddenly find themselves promoting social perfection. They are, in consequence, forthwith clothed with new rights and new responsibilities. They who were and still are personally equal have at once become socially unequal. Since there is a true union, a real society, here, there must be authority to rule. And by the very necessity of things the headship has to lodge in one and the subjection in the other, yet always are the obedience exacted and the obedience yielded measured by the needs of this actually little but potentially great society. The husband is authorized to command only for the common good; the wife is enjoined to obey only for the common good, and that as appraised by a human and not an abstract standard. The union has been entered into by way of contract, yet the union is no mere contract, but a natural institution deriving the laws of its life from the purpose the Creator has revealed in His necessary and free legislation on conjugal society. Because the modern de-Christianized state and the modern de-Christianized individual overlook this juridical phase of marriage, they see no contradiction in dissolving it for cause, contract like. They make marriage only amicable society in practice, therefore in morals no less than in logic are debarred from punitively distinguishing between the use and the usurpation of conjugal rights. For the society that the individual can legislate for is in the very nature of things of his own creation, is an amicable society, a union of persons all but infinitely removed from the inviolability of juridical society, whatever may be the rank of the latter's righteously sacred grouping.

God provided, we may say, that the human race would physically live by society just as the individual physically lives by food and air. But as the families multiplied a new juridical creation in the temporal order was disclosed. There was discovered a need for what might be called, continuing the food and air figure, a hygiene service for the race. For it was seen, as the families began filling in the vacant spaces of the world, that another social instrumentality would have to be requisitioned to insure a food supply commensurate with the increase of population, a thing that in the beginning the family seemed clearly sufficient for. The earth's surface would eventually have to be scientifically cultivated, and the families by themselves could not bring this about. But instantly imperative was an authority for regulating interfamily relations. Where all were equal, no one commanded. Where affairs pertained to everyone, no one discharged them. Unsettled disputes and unprevented or unpunished crimes would alone be the black death of the race. So there was evinced a juridical need for a public society to do for the family what the family could not do for itself. This gives us the juridical origin of civil society, God's authorization of the state. That authorization was incidentally bestowed by the Creator when He constituted man capable of earthly perfection and put him under obligation to pursue that perfection, without however jeopardizing his heavenly perfection. The grant of civil powers was enfolded in the needs of the race. Historical events would do the unfolding.

The juridical origin of civil society, then, is clear. But the historical origin, owing to the lack of human records, remains hidden in obscurity. When Abraham came out of Ur of the Chaldees, he left behind him a people among whom civil society was fairly evolved. When he went down to Egypt to sojourn, he came in contact with a state that had long since passed out of its childhood. But even up to the late day of Roman development the ruling power of civil society imitated the personal authority of the father rather than the public authority of the commonwealth. Territoriality was slow to enter into the composition of the state as an essential element. And some will have it that the Greeks and Romans required that power be fixed to the soil by a people before that people could be called civilized. Yet the potestas patria long bore traces of the precivil era when self-defense sometimes justified the father in exercising the right of life and death over the unruly son, and when more often a half conscious intimation of the public society to come was the urge that brought about the wielding of the jus gladii.

No great flight of imagination is required to picture the vicissitudes that the race went through from the time that single families living in isolation experienced no need for necessary association with other families until closely mingled families found themselves merged into a larger and inseparable unity that philosophers afterward called the State. Still the pre-civil stages of the family have cropped out in subsequent history as often as the accidents of colonization or political transition have thrown families on the fringe of civilization. Abraham himself, hot in the pursuit of the marauding kings, was an example of families leaguing together to safeguard life and property. Even the people of Israel under the Judges might be said to have lived a family rather than a civil existence. And in feudal days private warfare was much the rule and public warfare the exception. Feudalism itself in giving way to popular monarchy seemed hardly more than the theory of civil society yielding to the fact of civil society. In other words there was always an appreciation of a need of public authority before the tangible instrumentalities of that authority were evolved. Coming events cast more than shadows, they cast part realities before.

And are not things much the same in the international order? Heretofore in the world's history national contacts were moral rather than physical. Distances were enough to make the clash of interests only occasional, even if these occasions did occur periodically. Now the distances have disappeared. The contacts are physical. Accordingly, the conflict of interests is constant. As a result nations have begun to put more energy in protecting their life than in living their life. They want peace. To secure it they are by turns soft spoken, blustering and bullying. But peace itself is a negation, and were it attainable by either Sunday school methods or rowdy methods the positive element in international life would still be missing. And that positive element of progress is a sufficient promoting of the common good to insure adequate temporal welfare. Who in the intrastate sphere would rely upon private arbitration to settle disputes, cooperative effort to prevent crime and self-defense to ward off attacks? Yet with the interstate sphere growing into a like complexity, we are loath to think we require the voice of authority to determine and the arm of authority to execute in matters equally beyond private control. When disarmament is suggested to the nations now, they naturally take the attitude that the early families would have taken had some primitive pacifist pointed out how beautifully deadly brawls could be avoided, if only each family would cease to arm itself. Those families would not have understood how this new condition could save them from armed robber bands. With Russia ready to range amuck over the world and other untoward contingencies equally probable, modern nations cannot be persuaded to go defenseless. But were the menace of war to disappear by some stroke of magic, there would still be the artificial barriers of commerce to tear down. What private efforts, what amicable society among nations would be sufficient for the accomplishment of this greatly desired end? The only juridical form of society conceivable in the premises is a public society perfect in the international jurisdiction as the nation is perfect in the national or domestic jurisdiction. And that form of perfect juridical society can be aptly called the world state. Our only abhorrence of such a necessary society is what might be called our perverted innate fear of lawful authority. If the families had not found themselves in civil society before there was any prevision of their incorporation, they too would have been most eloquent in conjuring up the tyrannies that the great superfamily could be guilty of. Yet their prematurely mourned loss of liberties would for the most part have consisted of rights altogether beyond the original domain of the family.

To acknowledge the right of a world state is comparatively easy; but to bring about the fact of a world state will be a task of the most delicate statesmanship. Alliances, treaties, the present league, are all so many points of departure. International trade, international finance, and other economic activities are attempting to solve problems as intricate in their department of human life. What at the outset must be remembered is that the world state will start from the actual and work toward the ideal. By the time it reaches its permanent status, there will be a true equality in the coalescing nations. In its provisional status, however, it will move from present inequalities toward the aimed at equality. The same happened in our own Union. We went from minority white suffrage to universal manhood suffrage and then to universal equal suffrage. We progressed from a Nation of 13 States and Federal territory through States and territories to a Nation with one unbroken stretch of States. Civil society itself everywhere came into existence under numerous kinds of inequality. If things had been otherwise we would have witnessed an unreality.

The timid Catholic, of course, will be fearful that his advocacy of a world state would bring him in conflict with the claims set up for the Pope as the head of a Christian ethnarchy. Yet no loyal Catholic has any intention to abridge either the direct or indirect prerogatives of the Pope. Let the seceded nations return to Christian unity tomorrow and the pagan and moslem nations

embrace the faith, and a Christian ethnarchy we shall have with the Pope as the active subject of authority. But this ethnarchy would have authority in international affairs, barring a real relation of faith or morals, only by way of devolution. And substitutes suppose the absence, not the presence of native authority. The Pope, as well as churchmen in humbler stations, prefers to be left alone that he may be able with undivided energy to conduct the affairs of that kingdom which is not of this world. He does not wish to be drawn away from spiritual affairs to become engrossed in unfinished temporal affairs. Merely because the church's organization has taken over the duties in times past of temporal rule where civil society failed, no one has thought that the church should therefore bear the double burden of sovereignty as a normal condition of things. Because the church, like her Divine Master, has gone about doing good in the way of giving relief from evils that otherwise would have remained unlifted, it does not follow that she countenances human laziness. When human ailments knew no scientific remedy, she counseled people to pray for their cures. But now with medicine and surgery developed, she would charge with superstition the person who would want to forego the aid of science in order to exalt the power of prayer. A juridically undeveloped world the church hastened to help. She had been uncharitable or even unjust, if she had not, but she doesn't proclaim a juridical Sabbath, so that she may still have scope for her international ministrations.

Perhaps when Pope Alexander VI drew his line of demarcation between the Spanish and Portuguese fields of future discovery, he was consulting for the higher good of Christendom, therefore exercising distributive justice in the spiritual order. In that hypothesis even there was only a devolutive and not a direct duty, for the spiritual problem was caused by a deficiency in the temporal order. Had the nations already had a true juridical tribunal before which their international difficulties were justiciable, the Pope would have had no occasion to intervene. In that case only an outraging of faith or morals by the International Society would have given the Pope jurisdiction. It is no objection, then, to a world state that its emergence would diminish the Pope's rights by devolution. That very diminution would spell an intensification of the native rights of the Pope, and be an indication that nations and individuals were coming by moral health. The Pope would be the first to rejoice that he was no longer called upon to mediate between nation and nation; for in this he would behold the wider truth of the inspired utterance, "He hath made of one blood all the nations of the earth." And he would understand that in the state, too, there is neither Jew nor Gentile, bond nor free.

And what an illustration our own national experience affords of the international consummation that soon may be. On the morrow of independence gained we were, as our constitutional philosopher, the illustrious Brownson, will not let us forget, "A Nation of States." But there was only a dim consciousness of our nationhood. Each of the former Colonies continued to administer its intrastate affairs; but the interstate affairs were either not administered at all, or they were inadequately administered by a Continental Congress based on the assumption that the States formed only an amicable society, or worse yet, there was an attempt on the part of several States to administer them severally, a pure usurpation of authority, just as that of the families in the precivil days who would have tried to regulate interfamily affairs. There was the right and fact of nationhood; yet there was practically no distinctive exercise of national sovereignty. As far as appearances went all but the domestic phase of sovereignty had been vacated. The new Nation was quiescent. The high powers of sovereignty might be thought absent. But, lo, a faint consciousness begins to develop. The conviction grows that the States together can and must do what pertains to the good of each and all, a thing that singly they were powerless to achieve. Only an agreement is needed on how this Nation is to act. A genius has already sketched organically a form of government. Common counsel gives it political perfection. It is put into operation. So instantaneous is its success that a people who were shortly before at the edge of political and private disaster begin wondering why an engrossed parchment can work such an unbelievable transformation. But a parchment had not wrought the change. The recognition of a fact had brought order where before there was chaos. Thirteen States made a Nation one and inseparable. That was the fact. The adoption and the carrying out of the Constitution was the recognition. The unexampled success of the endeavor established the fact if the establishment was necessary.

The nations of the world for upward of 4,000 years have been doing what the enfranchised Colonies of America were perilously trying to do for 4 years. God by His creative act has seemed to give the bond of world union. Has not the experience of those unhooped staves been long enough and bitter enough to result in a call for the adoption of a written constitution in order to give expression to the natural constitution long ago bequeathed by the providence of God in a wondrous succession of historical events?

Time for Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 5, 1950

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial written by Tommy (T. W.) Thompson, president of Ford local 600, UAW-CIO. This article appeared in Ford Facts, the official organ of local 600:

TIME FOR ACTION

A little over a week ago a renegade took the witness stand at a Senate investigating committee meeting.

He was Senator JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY'S chief witness in his attempt to smear President Truman by attempting to show that Owen Lattimore, a high State Department adviser, was a top Soviet espionage agent and a Communist.

I don't know whether or not Owen Lattimore is or was a Communist or a Soviet agent, as Senator MCCARTHY has charged. But I do know that some very important and reliable Americans have said that he is not. It is also common knowledge that the FBI and Army Intelligence have cleared him as a loyal American.

And what about Louis Budenz, Lattimore's accuser?

He was born and raised a Catholic. He forsook his religion and left the church. In 1945, after 10 years out of the church, he got religion and returned to the Catholic faith.

He was born an American in Indianapolis, Ind. Yet in 1936 he became the internationalist editor of the Communist Daily Worker. In 1945, at the same time, he reembraced the Catholic faith, he suddenly became a good American again.

Apparently Mr. Budenz could be anything or stand for any kind of principle which suited his own best interests at any particular time. He can turn it on or off at will.

Since his reformation, Louis Budenz has written a book and numerous magazine articles; another book is to be published in May 1950. A very lucrative bit of writing in these congressional crusading days.

Despite these facts indicating Budenz' unreliability as a witness under ordinary standards, and the bias that becomes apparent when we remember the publication date of his new book, that august committee of the Senate allowed Senator MCCARTHY to conduct his circus (with cameras, microphones, and news reporter) and do irreparable damage to the reputation of Owen Lattimore, an American who has brought his great talents to the services of his country.

But the greatest travesty of justice is that the Senate committee permitted Budenz to clutter up the committee's record with common gossip. Somebody said that Lattimore was a Communist agent is the extent of the Budenz testimony. "Hearsay" evidence is what lawyers call it. No court in the land would permit this gossip into evidence in any case tried under sound and tested rules of law.

Why should we as workers and union members be concerned with what is happening to a man named Lattimore in far-off Washington?

Simply this: Certain committees of the Congress of the United States have been conducting "witch hunts" for many years.

Up to the present it has been the Communists in Government; soon it could be the Communist among labor-union officers and membership; later it could be Socialists; and still later anybody who would dare raise his voice to speak out for the workers.

And that's where you and I come in.

You may be inclined to think that a little remote.

A CASE IN POINT

But the Ferguson one-man grand jury in Michigan is a case in point.

If you recall, former Circuit Judge HOMER FERGUSON slid into the United States Senate and his special appointed prosecutor became a Wayne circuit judge on the publicity resulting from their one-man grand-jury activity in convicting grafters in public office.

While the Ferguson one-man grand jury ran roughshod over the politicians and other grafters, we all sat snugly by and smiled. When defense attorneys shouted to the high heavens concerning the violation of the grafters' constitutional rights by the one-man grand-jury system, we paid no attention. The fact that no other State in the Union had sanctioned such arbitrary power in one man bothered us not a bit.

We overlooked one significant fact. The one-man grand jury was an innovation of the Republican Party in Michigan. It was spawned by a Republican legislature—attained its greatest impetus under a judge who was Republican and a Republican special prosecutor right here in Detroit.

That infamous one-man grand jury system would still be with us, except for two incidents.

The first was that a one-man grand jury was set up to investigate Michigan sales tax frauds in 1948.

The first dip of the net brought up the biggest fish. The automobile dealers who had reaped the grand golden harvest from a car-hungry public after the war.

But the car dealers of 1948 happened to be the financial angels of the Michigan Republican Party. Five dollars from the sale of each car since the end of the war found

its way into the treasury of the various dealer associations. How much of that went to the Republican Party only the Republicans know.

In 1948, as today, the strongest and most effective Republican political group in Michigan was and is the organized auto dealers.

They were astounded to learn that their books could be seized by a one-man grand jury; that their constitutional rights meant nothing once the one-hand grand jury swung into action.

But unlike the politicians and grafters who had been forced through the one-man grand jury wringer before them—the auto dealers could do something about it. Wasn't the legislature controlled by the Republican Party and didn't they have a strong hand on the purse strings of the Republican Party?

Then came the second incident. A one-man grand jury case from Pontiac was appealed to the Michigan Supreme Court, which followed the pattern it had established and upheld the power of the one-man grand jury. The case was appealed to the United States Supreme Court, which reversed the Michigan Supreme Court in March 1948.

The United States Supreme Court said: "Michigan's one-man grand jury * * * combines in a single office the historically separate powers of grand jury, committing magistrate, prosecutor, trial judge, and petit jury. This aggregate authority denies to the accused not only the right to a public trial, but also other basic protections secured by the Sixth Amendment (U. S. Constitution)."

Armed with this United States Supreme Court decision, the auto dealers (aided by Michigan liberals, who had fought against the one-man grand jury for years) prevailed upon the 1949 Michigan Legislature to restore the constitutional rights of Michigan citizens by taking the teeth out of the one-man grand jury law.

For years we sat idly by while the cancerous one-man grand jury law whittled away our constitutional rights.

Shall we continue our do-nothing attitude while infinitely more dangerous Republican unconstitutional practices whittle away our constitutional liberties by congressional committee action?

No one can deny that committees of Congress should be permitted to investigate into matters of legislative concern.

But where does the legislative concern end? Shall the legislative branch of Government be permitted to take over the executive powers of Government under the guise of investigating for legislative purposes?

What about the constitutional rights of citizens involved in congressional investigations? Is the Congress above the Constitution which created it?

Yes, we can all agree that the Congress should be permitted to investigate matters of legislative concern but it should be done in an orderly manner, under established, tested rules which will protect citizens from being unjustly accused and unfairly held up to public ridicule and sworn.

Since the days of Martin Dies, a superduper American Gestapo has been superimposed upon us under the guise of congressional committee investigations. All they lack is the secret police and the power to condemn to death or they may have made Himmler's Gestapo seem like a Boy Scout troop by now. We can assume that from the reckless disregard of the rights and reputations of American citizens under their present procedures.

If the American Gestapo gains full maturity, you can bet that it will be used by the money barons to destroy the labor unions and again impose the industrial tyranny that existed prior to 1932.

Is what is happening to Owen Lattimore in far-off Washington of importance to you and me as union members?

You can bet your life that it is.

We dare not sit idly by and permit these witch hunts to continue.

What happened to the auto dealers under the one-man grand jury could happen to us in Washington.

I was most interested in what staid, conservative Atlantic magazine had to say about the McCarthy investigation in its May 1950 issue which came out last week:

"The atmosphere in the Capital, in consequence of this parading of names in loyalty investigations, is becoming unhealthy. Little heed is paid to the fact that the victims of the name-calling, unless they are eminent enough, are damaged in their lives and positions. Congressional immunity is a shield for the reckless accuser. For an analogy to these times, historians are turning back to the days just before the opening of the nineteenth century when the alien and sedition bills were under discussion. The warning raised by Edward Livingston that we should not 'excite a fervor against a foreign aggression to establish a tyranny at home,' can be stressed again with some justification. The tyranny today is the tyranny of the legislature."

Then again, under Mood of the Capital, Atlantic magazine concludes with:

"Soon if we don't watch out, Congress will foster a secret police on the citizenry on the worst totalitarian model, and it will be done over the head of the FBI itself."

To all of which I say a loud "Amen."

When the stench of what is happening in Washington becomes unbearable to conservatives, it is long past the time for liberals to swing into action.

It is time that all union members and other liberal-thinking Americans began demanding that the Congress adopt rules for its investigating committees to end the witch hunt type of investigations; to protect Americans from false, unjust, and unfair accusations by publicity-seeking committee members and book-publishing and magazine-article-writing witnesses.

It is about time that the Congress of the United States began practicing a little of that American democracy that they love to talk about.

Spence Bill for Rent-Control Extension

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 11, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include the following editorial from the Washington Star of May 8, 1950, supporting the Spence bill for the extension of Federal rent control which is now the subject of public hearings in the Banking and Currency Committee:

FUTURE OF RENT CONTROL

If national rent control is extended once again after June 30, the extension is apt to follow the lines of a compromise suggested by Representative SPENCE, of Kentucky. Under his plan, Federal rent control would automatically end after 1950, except for those communities that in the meantime took the positive step of asking that it be continued.

The compromise seems reasonable and carries a persuasive appeal. That Federal rent control is still very much in the picture is shown by current estimates that some 29,000,000 people, living in nearly 4,000 incorporated cities, towns, and villages, including 63 out of the 92 cities of 100,000 population, are still protected by Federal rent control. Only 4 States and a relatively small number of towns and cities have chosen to end rent control. Two States have adopted rent control laws of their own, which are superseding Federal law. But if failure throughout the country to end rent control indicates anything, it would seem to be that control is still needed in many localities. That control, under the Spence plan, could be retained by any city or town that asked for it.

The District law, of course, is entirely separate from the national rent-control law. If Congress ended national rent control by failure to extend it, the same thing might be expected to happen with the local law. But the wiser way of reaching a decision on extending or ending local rent control is to rest that decision on what the facts may show. It would be well if hearings were begun soon on pending House legislation to extend local rent control and every effort made to obtain through testimony an accurate picture of things as they are.

Few cities of the country, if one includes metropolitan areas, have exceeded Washington in the amount of new construction in relation to population. Last year alone 16,989 new units were completed here. Rentals in this new construction are far above those in controlled buildings. Those who favor it argue that control for another year will tend to bring down the rents in new construction; those who want to end control argue precisely to the contrary, claiming that only when rents in new construction are subject to competition from rents released from control will the level of new-construction rentals begin to fall. Nothing is proved one way or the other by such opinions, and a congressional hearing could at least obtain pertinent facts on the need for continued control.

Bullitt Says Dupes in State Department Do Soviet Agent Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEWEY SHORT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 24, 1950

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following newspaper article from the Washington Evening Star of April 1, 1950:

BULLITT SAYS DUPES IN STATE DEPARTMENT DO SOVIET AGENT JOB

A former Ambassador to Russia charged last night that dupes of Soviet propaganda are doing the work of Russian agents in the State Department.

The critic was William C. Bullitt, who told a Georgetown University audience in Gaston Hall that the United States cannot expect to win its struggle for survival against Russia until the State Department rids itself of Communist sympathizers.

"These naive Government officials entered the Department through improper screening during the war," Mr. Bullitt asserted. "They remain there now," he said, "because Secretary Acheson and his closest associates and friends have a vested interest in their own mistakes."

The former diplomat declared that the Secretary had been pursuaded by his counselors, befuddled by Soviet psychological warfare, to cease economic and military aid to China. "In any European parliamentary democracy, a minister of foreign affairs who had tossed a great ally like China into the

hands of Stalin, would have been dismissed from his post," he added.

He said he regards Indochina as the most critical area in southeast Asia and urged the immediate dispatch of arms aid to that country. He also proposed increased American support of a western European federation and of resistance forces in satellite countries.

Turning his fire on President Truman, Mr. Bullitt said:

"Our President has not understood that an over-all plan for defense, not only of our own country, but also of those countries which still remain outside Stalin's domain, is essential. The President has not yet found within himself the intelligence and spirit to take the offensive effectively against Soviet expansionism."

Report on President Truman's Visit to Pacific Junction, Iowa, on Monday, May 8, 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 16, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I wish to call the attention of the House of Representatives to a very revealing news item and editorial dealing with President Truman's recent visit to Pacific Junction, Iowa, which is just across the Missouri River from Plattsmouth, Nebr., and the congressional district which I now represent in the Congress of the United States, to wit, the Second Nebraska District. This news item and editorial appeared on May 11, 1950, in the newspaper known as the Farmer-Labor Press of Council Bluffs, Iowa. Its verbally hard-hitting and most able editor, the Honorable George Woodward, Sr., is a tried and true Democrat of the old school, who garnered his full share of political and other wisdom as he traveled along the journey of life. His fair and fearless journalistic estimate of our greatest President is well worth his time and effort put into same, and is well worth the careful consideration of true Americans, not of the "help Joe Stalin type," who now are encased in the ignoble lower bowels of reactionary republicanism, which has nothing left to talk about but unfortunate sexual misfits in the departments of Government, Reds who are not Reds at all, and Fascist economy which will, if put into effect, give bloody Joe an advantage in the cold war which he never expected or ever deserved.

Years ago when I was a cowhand we met and treated in our own very proper and most convincing way these same kind of fellows who were always soiling normal thoughts of decent men and women with sex perversion subjects.

This is the way we handled their cases. You see we felt always that these kind of fellows should be watched very closely, because we believed in the old saying that what was closest to the mind was dearest to the heart, so consequently we made those kind of talking fellows always ride sidesaddle with their pants on, so that people would meet and know them as they really were.

In Omaha there is the greatest saddle-making firm the wild and woolly West ever knew or saw. It is Alfred Cornish, 1306 Farnam Street, Omaha, Nebr., and they still make the sidesaddles which the proper females of yesteryear were wont to use. I would suggest that all reactionary Republicans get their orders in before the rush. From my casual observations, and I am a pretty good judge of hindquarters, it will take a pretty big saddletree to fit some of these fellows' ponderous midsections, but Alfred Cornish will, I am sure, take care of their riding needs no matter how big they come. Remember this please, when we get you riding sidesaddle, the way you really should go, you will never fool anybody any more. Just remember that when you point one finger at the other fellow there are always three of your own fingers pointed at you. Self-protection is always the first law of nature so please get natural in every way before you unfortunately expose yourself.

I now present the news item and the editorial.

The news item:

TRUMAN BACKS NEW DEAL ON CURRENT TRIP

President Truman has come out swinging in behalf of his Fair Deal, the major portions of which have been accepted and endorsed by organized labor. In the Iowa portion of his current cross-country tour, the Chief Executive left little doubt that he considered his own program an extension of Franklin D. Roosevelt's New Deal and perhaps that is the way the President would really like to have his efforts described—that he is endeavoring to carry on where F. D. R. left off.

At Creston, the President assured a crowd of seven to eight thousand who braved the rain and cold to hear him speak that the Federal Government was not trying to take everything over. He also noted that Iowa seemed to have plenty of water and that good use was being made of it. The President also declared that the REA, one of the rather early New Deal measures, was still bringing needed power to Iowa farms where there was none before this agency came into being.

At Pacific Junction where the President was met by a considerable delegation from Council Bluffs and southwestern Iowa, and the crowd numbered over 3,000, the President reminded his listeners that bank failures were practically unheard of these days and that this healthy condition had existed since the creation of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Government agency which insures bank deposits. He said at the time of the establishment of the FDIC dire predictions were made that the plan wouldn't work but that this was around the time also that Iowa farmers were in pretty bad circumstances, in fact, the President recalled, an Iowa judge was almost hung because he ordered foreclosures on certain farms where the farmers had been unable to make their payments.

The President concluded his Pacific Junction talk by saying that he was the same fellow who came around 2 years ago looking for votes and that he still considered himself a "servant of the people."

Prominent among those welcoming President Truman at Pacific Junction was Democratic senatorial candidate Otha Wearin, former Congressman from this district, who also chatted briefly with his old congressional colleague, former Washington Governor Mon Wallgren, Tom Keleher, local druggist and Democratic candidate for State representative, and Democratic County Chairman Dave Burrows and Vice Chairman Dora Sowden, did the honors in presenting the President with a huge ice cream birthday cake. Other candidates including Jim Hart, who is running for Congress on the Democratic ticket, shook hands with the Chief Executive.

The editorial:

PRESIDENT TRUMAN VISITS OUR PART OF IOWA

Like him or not, the President of the United States is a very human sort of fellow. He is not stuffed shirt and he talks and acts like a down-to-earth person his intimates say he is and yet there is a quiet dignity about him. Despite the many cares of his office, the most important governmental post in the world, the President impresses you as the type of man who would always have at least a couple of minutes to listen to your own personal problems and offer a friendly bit of advice.

In fact, we are pretty certain that the Chief Executive has one quality that perhaps has generally escaped his admirers and foes alike and that is this: At any given time, he would be talking to average Joe Doakes he would be giving Joe the same attention and treatment that he would give, say Joe Stalin or Winston Churchill, at a high level conference involving the fate of nations. Call this the common touch or what you will, it undoubtedly has won the President friends and supporters among all the Joe Doakes and to tell the truth he seems mainly interested in the average Joes.

Personally, President Truman is the picture of health and even his most bitter foes, if they are honest about it, would have to agree with his Pacific Junction statement that although he was 66, he didn't look it.

On the cross country tour the President is making, he evidently is going to remind the Nation of where it now stands in comparison with 18 years ago and offhand we would say that a lot of us need reminding. President Truman, like his peerless predecessor, is continually being attacked by the special interests who yearn for a return to the good, old days. These good, old days, of course, were also the days of low wages, law farm prices, and low income for the small-business man.

Labor, of all segments of the population, is perhaps most familiar with what happened prior to the New Deal and maybe before it is too late, all of us had better take stock and see if we hadn't better heed the President's warnings. If we do, then we'll vote for a Congress this November which will be pledged to the maintenance of economic conditions as they are and not as they were in 1932.

State of Our Defense: An Audit and Appraisal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEWEY SHORT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 24, 1950

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article by Hanson W. Baldwin,

which appeared recently in the New York Times:

STATE OF OUR DEFENSE: AN AUDIT AND APPRAISAL—STRENGTH OF ARMY, AIR FORCE, AND NAVY FOLLOWING REDUCTIONS FOR ECONOMY

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

The state of the Nation's defenses came into the congressional spotlight last week as General of the Army Dwight D. Eisenhower suggested the addition of about half a billion dollars to the 1951 defense budget. General Eisenhower's concern with our "disarmament"—which he heavily qualified, however—was immediately discounted by President Truman, who categorically but politely denied that any of our defenses had been reduced below the safety limit. At the same time, the President expressed the opinion that there was no fundamental difference between himself and General Eisenhower, who, as temporary presiding officer of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, has been generally credited with having prepared the military budget.

The continuing debate about our security program, which has been in the headlines ever since the Navy-Air Force differences last fall, centers around armed forces that now total about 1,490,300 officers and men. The Army has more than 600,000 men, organized in 10 divisions, plus smaller units; the Air Force has some 414,000 men, with 8,800 operating planes; and the Navy and Marines have about 460,000 men, operating 652 ships of all types; 5,900 active planes, and two marine divisions.

BACKED BY RESERVE UNITS

These Regular forces, far larger than in any prior period of our peacetime history, are backed up by Organized Reserve and National Guard units that also are larger than ever before and that are being increased in strength in the next fiscal year.

The Regular forces—and particularly the Navy and Marine Corps—have been in the process of contraction for some time, however, and cuts scheduled for the 1951 fiscal year (starting July 1)—the budget for which Congress is now considering—were particularly severe, and were one of the reasons for the Navy's resentment as expressed last fall in congressional hearings. Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson has lightened somewhat the reductions scheduled then, but the bulk of them have gone through, or are scheduled to.

The Navy is to operate fewer carriers than last year; 30 fewer destroyers, vital in submarine warfare, and fewer submarines. A major cut also has been scheduled in naval and marine aviation. The Army anticipates that the reductions will "of course, have an influence on our over-all combat effectiveness, but we are endeavoring to minimize the impact on our immediate combat potential." The Air Force remains at about the same size next year as this, but its hoped-for progress toward the 70-group goal, recommended some years ago, has been frozen under the prospective budget to 48 groups.

IMPROVED TRAINING

The state of training, organization and equipment of these forces is far better than it was in the postwar demobilization period, and there has been definite modernization and improvement in the past year. But there are, of course, many weaknesses. Nearly all units are well below strength. Only part of the Strategic Air Command, the First Division, and Constabulary in Germany and the Eighty-second Airborne in this country, and the Navy's Mediterranean and far eastern task forces could be considered approximately ready for war. The Army has virtually no new postwar tanks or antiaircraft guns; only a relatively few ships and naval planes are equipped with the newest radar and sonar, vital in combating submarines; and the close-support tactical and troop-carrier planes of the Air Force are relatively few in number, somewhat deficient in training, and perhaps not entirely satisfactory in quality.

One of the greatest weaknesses, the effects of which will be felt most seriously only some years in the future, is the current and projected rate of aircraft procurement—about 2,048 to 2,200 military and naval planes of all types per year. This rate is so low that unless it is increased it will not be sufficient to replace old aircraft, and by 1954 or 1955 or even earlier, a sizable part of our Air Force and Navy planes may be obsolete.

The necessity of peacetime economy has imposed certain other weaknesses on the Armed Forces. The virtual withdrawal of the Navy from Midway and from the outer Aleutians is part of the calculated risk that any peacetime defense budget must assume, but there is no doubt that both positions—particularly the Aleutians, which tend to neutralize one of Russia's most important submarine bases, at Petropavlovsk—would have to be reoccupied and strengthened in case of war.

EISENHOWER'S RECOMMENDATIONS

These and a great many other weaknesses have been pointed out by various critics of the administration's defense policies. General Eisenhower last week added his voice, though moderately, to those of the critics. He cited particularly the need for the procurement of more planes for the Air Force, and suggested a 3-year program for strengthening Alaska, more expenditures for antisubmarine warfare, and a strong economic and industrial mobilization program and a better intelligence service. His testimony was immediately followed by a plan advanced by the House Armed Services Committee to add $647,000,000 to next year's budget to strengthen Air Force and Navy and Marine Corps air arms and to help to provide a radar fence for the country.

These attacks upon the administration's defense program have a considerable foundation in fact, although some of the attacks undoubtedly have exaggerated our weaknesses, and have been overly critical of Secretary of Defense Johnson's economy program. The cuts in our defense funds have resulted in the sloughing off of some service "fat," but when some 20 percent of our troop strength can be allocated to housekeeping duties to replace civilian personnel who have been dismissed, it is hard to substantiate Mr. Johnson's contention that our over-all combat effectiveness has been increased. In fact, there is no doubt but that our total active military strength is less today than a year ago and will be less still a year from now if the projected 1951 military budget goes through without change.

REMEDIAL MOVES

But the cuts in combat strength that are being made are not so important—except perhaps in the naval and Marine Corps air arm—as other definite and continuing weaknesses. These weaknesses include: The intelligence services, economic and industrial mobilization planning, civilian-defense planning, aircraft procurement, antisubmarine radar and sonar, a radar "fence," tanks and antiaircraft guns, tactical and troop-carrying aircraft, Alaska, and Okinawa.

Even before General Eisenhower's testimony, work had been started to remedy some of these deficiencies; to take care of them all would cost much money, and in peacetime there never is in a democracy what any military man would consider a truly adequate defense. The peacetime military budget must always represent an accommodation between economy and security, and unless we are to become a bankrupt state or a garrison state we can never even attempt to buy absolute security.

A defense budget, moreover, must be flexible and relative to the world situation and the Nation's economic condition. The budget for 1951 is based upon an assumption of continued prosperity in this country and upon the estimate that war in the foreseeable future—the next 2 years or even 5 years—is unlikely.

A Hearty Welcome to You, Mr. President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, a number of persons and business institutions of Lincoln, Nebr., ran the following full page advertisement in the Lincoln Star of Lincoln, Nebr., which was headed by a large sized picture of our President and the greeting extended to our Chief Executive, in spite of the rainy weather, was tremendous:

A HEARTY WELCOME TO YOU, MR. PRESIDENT, AND A HAPPY BIRTHDAY

The people of Nebraska and the people of Lincoln are happy that the Chief Executive of the United States has chosen these spring days to visit a section of the great American breadbasket, whose broad fields of grain feed hundreds of millions of people.

The Midwest—and no region is more typically midwestern than Nebraska, which contains the geographical center of the United States—its cities, towns, farms, and people are a part of the heart of America where since the early settlements the common aspirations of freemen and freewomen have been held in high esteem. Its people have built fine homes, fine business institutions, fine communities. They know that these days immediately ahead will be a source of inspiration to you in your travels because here the spirit that has been consecrated in American thought flourishes.

The people of Lincoln are happy that you have chosen the capital city of Nebraska for one of your major stops that you may visit with them and they may visit with you. In the spirit of democracy, the strength of free institutions rests upon the opportunity of men and women of all political beliefs to meet and talk. It is to the glory of America that since the very beginning a nation that has fulfilled the hopes of destiny continues to be an example of comfort and strength to the world. Here in a community which takes its name from one of America's immortals, freedom of conscience and mind continues to be man's greatest heritage, a life of dignity and purpose.

This is your sixty-sixth birthday.

In the spirit of the hour, the people of Lincoln and of Nebraska extend to you, and to the high office which you occupy, neighborly felicitations.

American Stores Co., Lincoln Packing Division; Ben, Your Hairdresser; Best Laundry & Cleaners; Consumers Public Power District; The Famous, by Phil Byron; The Gas Co.; A Friend; Hompes Tire Co., H. Hompes; Kimmel Country Club Co.; The Lincoln Journal; Lincoln Market, Sam J. Gatte; Mowbray Lyon Co.; Northwestern Iron & Metal Co., Inc.; O'Shea-Rogers Motor Co.; The Lincoln Star.

The Lincoln Journal's Account of President Truman's Visit to Lincoln, Nebr., on May 8, 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the Lincoln Journal, of Lincoln, Nebr., a liberal Republican newspaper, edited by Hon. Ray McConnell, had this to say concerning President Truman's visit to the capital city of Nebraska:

TRUMAN, GOOD RAIN GET ENTHUSIASTIC WELCOMES—PRESIDENT URGES BRANNAN PLAN WAY TO PROSPERITY

(By Dean Pohlenz)

ABOARD TRUMAN TRAIN.—A Nebraska cloudburst and grinning, friendly President Harry S. Truman arrived in Lincoln at the same time—and both received an equally enthusiastic welcome from the State.

Standing partly unsheltered in the face of a driving downpour, the President again and again expressed to his audience his appreciation for their lasting out his Nation-wide major address plugging for the adoption of his administration's Brannan farm plan.

A crowd first estimated by Lincoln police at about 8,000 gradually dwindled to 3,000 to 4,000 on the invitation of the President that he would not be offended if the rain-spattered audience left.

He said he himself must stay and make the speech, since it had already been given to the newspapers.

Many took him at his word and left.

Some of the Presidential party and the press corps were in grumpy mood as they boarded the train for the jump to Grand Island.

A White House staffer acknowledged that the crowd had been inattentive because of the rain, but hoped that the newspaper and radio coverage would offset this to a large degree.

Although the President studiously avoided labeling the advocated farm program as the Brannan plan, he urged its doctrine as the way toward well-being and abundance and the only way to assure peace and prosperity for ourselves and for the world.

The President stressed the importance of the welfare of the farmer to the economic stability of the Nation needed to insure the success of our program for peace.

The President asserted:

"The plain fact is that the production-payment plan is the best plan yet proposed for getting an abundant production of perishable crops consumed without knocking the bottom out of the farmer's income.

"It is in the farmer's interest. It is also in the consumer's interest. I firmly believe it should be made a part of our national farm program."

Mr. Truman's speech was the first of a series of nine major addresses scheduled for his 6,400-mile cross-country stumping tour.

The trip has been generally recognized as the opening of an administration campaign to pick up additional strength in the November congressional elections.

The Brannan plan is one of a number of Mr. Truman's Fair Deal proposals which the present Congress has pigeonholed.

He scolded that the same charges of socialism and regimentation now being leveled at the Brannan plan had been hurled at the New Deal's AAA farm program in the 1930's.

Instead of being communistic, these previous farm programs, he said, strengthened the foundations of democracy by making the farmer more secure in the ownership of his land.

They also allowed the farmer to regain control over his own destiny and enjoy more liberty and a better life than ever before in history, said the President.

The President based his plea for the Brannan plan on four ideas:

1. Fair income to the farmer.
2. Increased food to the consumer at lower costs.
3. Increased conservation.
4. Maximum benefits to the family-size farm.

In responding to the Lincoln welcome and a 50-pound, red, white, and blue birthday cake presented to him, the President spoke of Lincoln as the center of the Nation where the Corn Belt merges with the Great Plains.

He said Lincoln was typical of a city's dependence upon greatness and the importance of American agriculture.

"This is the pattern all over our country," he said.

He said that Lincoln is also directly affected by what is happening in Berlin, Paris, and Singapore.

As President Truman descended the presidential train about 5:05 p. m., he was met by a welcoming committee of State, city, and democratic officials and escorted to a specially constructed speaking platform at Seventh and Q.

He was tightly guarded by police and secret-service men to the disappointment of autograph enthusiasts.

Lincoln's Mayor Clarence Miles introduced the President. Lancaster County Chairman Willard Townsend congratulated the President on his sixty-sixth birthday upon presenting the cake on behalf of the people of Lincoln and the State.

Mr. Truman was also welcomed by Democratic National Committeeman James C. Quigley and Nebraska's Republican Governor, Val Peterson.

Earlier a gala parade of welcome moved down O Street from Fifteenth Street to the station.

President Truman's address emphasized the relation of falling farm prices to depression dangers. Although net farm income dropped 50 percent after World War I, he said that after World War II prices have dropped only more than 20 percent in the last 2 years.

He emphasized that the present farm-price support program is failing to provide a satisfactory basis for dealing with perishable crops. Terming the potato situation "shameful," he said that it is foolish for the Government to buy and store or buy and destroy food that people want to eat now.

After conceding that the Brannan plan would require crop production limitation, he lashed out at critics calling this regimentation. He said this principle is at least 20 years old and incorporated in all the major farm support programs in recent years.

He singled out for special criticism the calculation of support levels on data of some out-of-date historical period. His reference was to the 1910–14 farm price index. The administration is asking for a reference period of 1939 to 1948.

He said the farmers had to approve production controls by a two-thirds majority and asked how this could be called regimentation. Rather, he said, this is in the full tradition of self-government.

He emphasized the Brannan plan advantage to the consumer.

As to the cost of the plan, he said those people making fantastic estimates just don't understand how it would actually work. He made no estimate of the plan's cost, but prophesied that the plan would cost no more than the present system.

He said the plan also would shift food production from crops to livestock and stimulate better conservation practices.

Although he said we should not ignore the welfare of the large farms, he added "it is only sensible where public funds are involved to provide a higher degree of protection for the family farm."

He punctuated the end of his speech with the unscheduled statement:

"Now, my friends, in farewell, that's a farm program that will work, and I welcome your support."

It also said the following editorially on May 9, 1950:

MEMO TO THE PRESS CORPS

A memo to the newspaper correspondents and columnists aboard the President's train:

Gentlemen and Miss Fleeson, the last time a large number of you were here covering a political event, one of the more enterprising of your calling hired a cab and drove out south of town to the first farm he came to (I trust it wasn't the State pen farm), interviewed a nonplussed man in blue jeans, then wrote an elaborate analysis of farm sentiment.

We call this technique in political writing "catching a farmer" or "pulling a grass root." It is a great improvement on your interviewing each other at the bar. But you are here so short a while you may not have time to shoot out to the grass roots at the city limits and back, so we thought a few tips from us as to what we think folks are thinking, etc., might help you pad out your pieces a little.

First, a word of caution. When you write about farm sentiment, to which President Truman is making an appeal, don't make the mistake of thinking there is any such thing in one lump. There are farmers and there are farmers. There are farmers and ranchers who are well fixed, who are sitting on their piles, whose property is all paid for, and who want no part of price supports of any sort. At the other extreme are farmers who are struggling to get a start—young fellows, some of them—who will lose their shirts (to the well-fixed ones) if the bottom drops out of the market. Roughly, very roughly, reaction to any Government agricultural program tends to divide along those lines, and that goes for the Brannan plan.

HILL AND VALLEY FARMERS

It is a tendency, no more, because farmers are not just economic robots any more than you are—or are you? Still, the saddest mistake you can make in writing about the way the President's advocacy of the Brannan plan is received, is to generalize on farm sentiment by listening to one or two farmers and forgetting to inquire as to their economic status.

A friend put it another way, reporting that, roughly, in his rural locality, the valley farmers are against the Brannan plan and the hill farmers are for it. This is another way of saying that the administration's greatest appeal among farmers tends to be to the little fellow, the marginal farmer. That is a fairly obvious point, but, oh, well, I guess the President has been reminding you of that enough.

REPUBLICAN, BUT—

Nebraska as of now is predominantly a Republican State, but it was among these less-well-fixed farmers of Nebraska—more than among the farmers of any other Midwestern State—that the Republican Party lost the most heavily in the 1948 election. This is according to Elmo Roper's post mortem. This newspaper is highly critical of the Truman administration on any number of points. We are deeply troubled by the drift toward more and more Government enterprise. We are deeply troubled, and so are many, many of our readers, by the ghastly size of nondefense Federal expenditures. We want Senator MCCARTHY to press to the utmost his effort to ascertain the extent of Communist infiltration in Government, and we can't accept the proposition

the President asked the public to accept in his speech to the Federal bar—that there was nothing to worry about on this score. We are appalled, sometimes, by the apparent evidence that the White House doesn't know what its own administration advisers and leaders are doing in Congress, particularly with reference to the cold war, and we said so last week in an editorial headed, "Does the White House know the score?" And so on—we don't want to spoil the President's birthday.

Nevertheless, to be honest, this newspaper recognizes both more sense in the Brannan plan than its more vocal opponents will admit, and, as we get out among farmers, a greater readiness among many farmers to consider it than some of their spokesmen would have us believe.

We talk about the cost of the Brannan plan, but has anyone ever figured the cost of the present price-support program, if something went haywire, say, in wheat, instead of in potatoes? From our point of view the greatest danger is that the cost of any price-support program will be misinterpreted to the consuming public by eastern publications lacking much idea of the midwestern farmers' problems, whipping up sentiment against any Government farm program. Maybe the Brannan idea to let perishables seek their market level offers some insurance against this. At any rate, Republicans haven't yet come out with anything better.

"Cleveland Is One of the Most Enlightened and Appreciative Library Communities in the World; Experts Agree That the Cleveland Public Library Is a Live, Dynamic Force, Offering a Great Variety of Books, Services, and Information to Everyone"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 16, 1950

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, these words I have just spoken appear in a most provocative article, What's Wrong With Our Public Libraries, written by Jack Harrison Pollack and appearing in the current May issue of the Woman's Home Companion.

These words of praise about the Cleveland library system, our handsome main building in the heart of the city, with its 34 branches conveniently located throughout the community, have particular meaning because they are in vivid contrast to library conditions as they have been found in most parts of our country.

The public library inquiry, soon to be released, is an exposé of the true conditions of our 7,500 libraries in America. Sponsored by the eminent Social Science Research Council and financed by the Carnegie Corp., this thorough study will have some startling critical conclusions, and reveal not only that too many of our libraries—metropolitan and rural—are musty, ill-run, poorly stocked nineteenth-century mausoleums, but some of the reasons why millions of Americans have not been inside a public library since they left school, and why today only 1 in 10 adults uses a library more than once a month.

I commend to every Member in this House the reading of this very enlightening article, and I should like also, to extend to each of you the invitation proffered by Mr. Pollack to his readers: "Come visit the modern Cleveland Public Library, which experts agree is one of the best in the country."

The article from the May 1950 issue of Woman's Home Companion follows:

WHAT'S WRONG WITH OUR PUBLIC LIBRARIES?

(By Jack Harrison Pollack)

How long since you visited your local public library? If it has been a long time, you have plenty of company. But is it because the library location is too inconvenient? Hours too limited? Chairs too hard? You can't smoke there? The new books you want are never available?

Or is it because you're a lowbrow—and don't care about libraries?

To hear the cynics talk, it's the last reason. We have the libraries, they argue, but the libraries don't have the customers. Conclusion: People are lowbrows.

But the cynics' whole argument is based on the false assumption that all our 7,500 libraries are what they ought to be—useful and efficient. It's high time the depressing truth was known about America's horse-and-buggy libraries.

A lot of eyes should be opened by an authoritative new study of libraries all over the United States—the public-library inquiry—soon to be released. Some of its startling critical conclusions are now reported for the first time in a popular magazine. This thorough study, sponsored by the eminent Social Science Research Council and financed by the Carnegie Corp., which has built nearly 1,700 American libraries, reveals unmistakably that too many of our libraries—metropolitan and rural—are musty, ill-run, poorly stocked, nineteenth-century mausoleums.

No wonder millions of Americans haven't been inside a public library since they left school. No wonder, as the inquiry reveals, only 1 in 10 adults uses a library more than once a month. Perhaps going to the library may not be your idea of a good time. Yet it can be that—and a whole lot more—as you'll see later in this article.

The men and women who intensively investigated America's libraries for 2½ years were recruited from leading universities. Dr. Robert D. Leigh, the inquiry director, is one of the country's top political scientists, a former college president, Government administrator, and director of the famous freedom-of-the-press inquiry released several years ago.

"A handful of our libraries are magnificent institutions," Dr. Leigh told me. "But the overwhelming majority fall far short of what they could be."

The American Library Association, the national organization for librarians, admits, "More than half the available service is substandard." Other authorities declare, "Today 9 out of 10 American libraries are inadequate."

Even worse, 35,000,000 Americans living in 600 of our counties have absolutely no library service. This is true in rich urban North, East, and West, as well as in the poor rural South. In wealthy Iowa and Nebraska, for example, 44 percent of the population lack any kind of library service. In only a few States do all of the people have at least some library facilities.

Other studies at the Universities of Michigan, Chicago, Denver, and elsewhere tell the same shameful story—poor public relations, old books nobody wants to read, lack of funds and trained personnel, unattractive quarters. And my recent visits to numerous libraries throughout the United States confirmed this.

I was appalled, for example, at how many libraries are housed in outmoded memorial tombs instead of cheerful, well-lit, modern structures. Most libraries were built before 1918, when the fashion was huge-domed ceilings and a long, discouraging flight of stone steps. At least one librarian I know of—and nobody knows how many patrons—had to stop climbing such steps on doctor's orders.

As for lighting, in one Ohio library (built originally as a theater) miners' lanterns on extension cords are actually used to find books in the stacks. The stacks themselves rise five levels to dizzy heights around the former auditorium and are reached by spiral staircases and catwalks with knee-high railings. "Lit" by a dirty skylight, the whole room is in perpetual twilight. One page boy fell four levels; it's a mystery why more people haven't been injured in this eerie, Edgar Allan Poe monstrosity.

At another extreme, in a Southwest city of 50,000 the local library is situated in several tiny rooms in the county court house, with gossiping, tobacco-spitting court hangers-on to discourage women and children from patronizing it.

Library public relations are, in general, so poor that even when a library is equipped to offer services other than lending books, most people don't know about it. For example, lots of information is available by telephone from many libraries—checking a recipe, finding out how to remove a stain or getting guidance in buying books for home or office. Yet millions of people don't know they can phone or visit their libraries for such information. Women, especially, make very little use of their library's reference facilities, the Inquiry found.

Luckily the picture isn't all dark. There are some bright spots.

Come visit the modern Cleveland Public Library, which experts agree is one of the best in the country.

Though most libraries are traditionally low-pressure institutions, this dynamic one is a live community force, offering a great variety of books, services, and information to everyone.

"Cleveland has the most enlightened and appreciative library community in the world," a British visitor observed.

A Cleveland housewife told me, "Since I've started going to the library I've improved my cooking, learned how to make my home more attractive, take better care of my children and have more to talk to my husband about."

What makes this library outstanding? Here are some of the reasons:

It has a handsome easy-to-use main building and 34 convenient branches—all of which recently had new fluorescent lighting put in. What's more, the library maintains over a hundred book stations in stores, factories, schools and fire stations.

It owns and circulates more books per person than any large library in the country. It also lends thousands of phonograph records, 16-millimeter films, and reproductions of fine paintings—all on your library card.

It has lectures, exhibits, concerts, movies, and discussion groups on topics ranging from current events to mothers' problems, during its nine-to-nine day.

Its cozily furnished Robert Louis Stevenson young people's room is a favorite hangout of teen-age poets (who even published their own book) and competes with the local ice-cream parlor for all adolescents' leisure hours. The Cleveland library also runs the school libraries, so often neglected in other cities.

The Cleveland Library answers questions, by telephone or mail, on subjects ranging from household repairs to the latest in child care. I heard women ask questions about nursery schools, party planning, gardening, jewelry making, jobs, how to dress for a

church wedding, and even some intimate aspects of sex and marriage. Mother-in-law trouble, backward children, husbands who drink, are a few of the problems Cleveland librarians are asked to help solve. Sometimes, even, stenographers who can't read their notes and don't dare ask their bosses, have them deciphered by the librarians.

The library operates one of the most extensive information services regarding local businesses of any public library—and some companies located in Cleveland because of this. Before purchasing a new vacuum cleaner or toaster the Cleveland housewife will frequently ask this department for advice.

The foreign-language division has almost 250 newspapers in 23 languages for Cleveland's 40 nationality groups. It translates thousands of foreign letters received locally. I heard one woman ask, "My uncle in Holland wants me to send him some shoes. He says he wears a size 43. What size is that in this country?" The library found the answer: size nine.

A travel bureau helps Clevelanders plan trips. If you're moving to another State you can get information about the climate, schools, shopping, and similar things.

Speakers and exhibits are sent out to women's clubs, church, labor, civic, fraternal, and other groups all over the city. The library will give you pointers on how to be mistress of ceremonies, introduce a speaker, pronounce foreign names. Branch libraries have clubrooms for community gatherings.

There are three sprightly 15-minute weekly radio programs and frequent use of educational films (supplemented by talks) on health, science, nutrition, family, and community problems.

The library has the largest chess and checker collection in the world and holds tournaments on Saturday afternoons.

It delivers books to shut-ins in institutions and in their own homes. Its ceiling books—texts projected overhead—are godsends to many bedridden Clevelanders.

Of course all this didn't just happen. Cleveland is a teamwork town where—according to a stock joke—citizens, before retiring at night, prayerfully ask themselves, "Have I cooperated well today?" The cultural spark plug of this community spirit is Cleveland's librarian, Clarence S. Metcalf, an unpretentious warm-hearted man who would circulate his old hat if anybody would wear it.

A number of leading librarians are hard-hitting men—Baltimore's Emerson Greenaway; Detroit's Ralph Ulveling; Los Angeles' Harold Hamill. Only true missionary spirit keeps many on the job. Librarians—who never go on strike—are one of the most underpaid, unappreciated, selfless groups in America. Today 15,000 library workers are needed but because of the scandalously low salaries few are entering the profession.

Library trustees can be a headache too. Most of the country's 35,000 board members are helpful. But some autocratic trustees, especially in smaller towns, consider libraries their private palaces, even dictating what books should be bought or displayed. That's why some libraries keep controversial books off the shelves.

Censorship is a big problem for librarians. Last year during the trial of the eleven Communists, New York Public Library Director Ralph Bates was asked to explain in court why he circulated Marxist books.

"We have four and a half million volumes," he replied. "Some are on polygamy and murder—but that doesn't mean we're in favor of polygamy and murder."

Some indifferent trustees snooze through board meetings and privately boast of never having read a book. One small-town trustee insists all his library needs is "a Bible and a dictionary." Another big-city trustee on the library board for over 20 years didn't start coming to meetings until very recently. A Midwest city hasn't built a new building because each trustee wants it near his own office.

Libraries as a rule are free from unsavory politics, partly because the meager budgets promise little graft for the corrupt politicians. But occasionally, as in one large Midwest city, the political machine even invades the public library, keeping the staff in an atmosphere of continual crisis.

It's a miracle that with all these handicaps as many libraries as do render such excellent service.

Baltimore, like Cleveland, has a wonderful modern library, the Enoch Pratt, which not only serves but leads the public. Its peacetime atomic energy series is widely hailed as a pioneer achievement in popular education. When I visited the main branch recently, a huge sign outside challenged, "Atomic Energy: Better World Ahead?" The magnificent building is on street level so that women can even wheel their baby carriages into the foyer, where a guard is on duty. The library has a dozen changing window displays—just like a department store. No wonder newspapers assign reporters to the Enoch Pratt as a regular news beat.

A few other scattered big-city libraries know their communities as well as their books. When race riots broke out in Detroit several years ago the library issued a leaflet of tolerance quotations which ran through three printings in a week. Compare this to some southern libraries which deny books to Negroes "because they are unsanitary."

Some smaller-town libraries are also on their public-relations toes. The Montclair, N. J., library puts brief messages on book tabs, such as, "Do you know the library has 200 cookbooks?" Once when a woman asked for help in naming her Persian cat the library's reference section suggested "Azada," the name of an ancient Persian princess. Then, to dramatize the extent of the library's service to the community, it persuaded the Persian (Iranian) Ambassador to participate in a public cat-naming ceremony.

Any publicity about libraries is all to the good because it helps bring people into the library.

To attract youngsters, some libraries have used soft-drink bars, jive concerts, snacks, and even dancing. I know a small-town library where mothers can leave their preschool children while they shop—or visit the hairdresser.

Louisville, Ky., now has 3 television sets in its main library and one in each of its 10 branches. Librarian Clarence R. Graham reports, "The added attendance has greatly stimulated interest in other library services." The Lincoln, Nebr., and Peoria, Ill., libraries have set up "bookaterias"—self-service book stations in neighborhood grocery stores.

But "trick stunts" can merely supplement a sound library program. They are no substitute for really serving a community.

Unfortunately the typical American library today is both too small and too poor to give you effective service. They're frequently understaffed, understocked, and not open full time. "The little independent library is really no modern library at all," reminds Dr. Leigh. "And giving funds to it is a waste of public money. Certainly, keep the little libraries—but make them parts of larger units."

Instead of 7,500 anemic libraries as at present, the American Library Association recommends that we have 1,200 healthy consolidated county libraries, with as many branches as necessary.

California has shown the way in starting such first-rate county libraries. Virtually all of the State's 58 counties now have them.

Nevertheless, even county libraries can't always solve the problem, because of their small size or poverty. Dr. Leigh says, "We need library districts or regions large enough to provide a hundred-thousand-dollar annual budget from local taxes and appropriations. This doesn't mean a hundred thousand dollars for each community library but that sum for groups of cooperating libraries which pool their books and professional personnel—whether in a city, county, or region."

Does this sound like a revolutionary concept of the public library? It's the best modern thought on the subject and something that should be of special interest to women.

Many of our libraries grew out of women's reading clubs at the turn of the century. Today, neglected and desperately needing a transfusion, they offer a new challenge to the women's clubs of America to perform the finest type of community service.

What can you do to help improve your local library?

1. Work through a Friends of the Library group. If your town doesn't already have one, the American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill., will tell you how to start one.

2. Regardless of whether your library ultimately ties up with a county, district, or regional library, help it get more funds today. Good library service costs money but it's worth it. Many counties today spend more money for their beach commissions, rest rooms, and dog catchers than for their libraries.

3. Urge your State legislators to appropriate more money for libraries. Twenty States give absolutely nothing today. And look into the possibility of greater Federal aid.

Some final words: Don't let the cynics mislead you. Once people enjoy good library service they refuse to be without it. You'll know what I mean if you've ever seen book-hungry Louisiana women pushing baby carriages a mile over a gravel road to meet the bookmobile. Or watched eager Vermont youngsters waiting in the snow for the arrival of their "library on wheels."

A top Nazi once warned of the American public-library menace. Yes, books are weapons. But they are more than that. Andrew Carnegie, who gave away $56,000,000, once said, "The person who enters a library is in the best society this world affords."

Isn't it about time we made libraries rising instead of falling stars in American life? If they continue to be meaningless appendages to commercial media instead of dynamic educational instruments, they may fade away.

The public library inquiry has sounded the alarm. Will we heed it?

The Tour at Its Climax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAY LeFEVRE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1950

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article appearing in this morning's New York Herald Tribune.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the meat of this editorial is in the last paragraph. The President's tour has come to an end but the people have not been enlightened on the real problems and dilemmas confronting them. We are still faced with deficit spending and heavy taxes. It was with great regret when I read that the Committee on Ways and Means had agreed to impose a tax on the net accumulated income of mutual savings

banks and building and loan associations. To me, this is gross discrimination. Not to consider taxing co-ops, unions, and charitable institutions for profits made in competition with private enterprise is not justifiable. In fact, I cannot find any grounds for such action. If there is going to be an honest effort to replace the taxes lost by reducing the present emergency excise taxes, in order to satisfy Mr. Truman, the Committee on Ways and Means would be justified in taxing the mutual organizations in business for a profit, on the same basis as private enterprises are being taxed today. Business, especially small business, cannot continue bearing this burden alone forever and I believe if private enterprise is to survive, other organizations competing in the profit system must pay their legitimate share of the taxes.

THE TOUR AT ITS CLIMAX

The President's arrival at Chicago was carefully prearranged to coincide with one of those large party gatherings which the Democrats manage with uninhibited glee. The unbridgeable fissions within the party might reveal themselves; a local clergyman, hitherto friendly to the Democrats, might denounce the proceedings as a tasteless desecration of the Sabbath. Yet the leaders and the rank and file, the Cabinet members and the crowds in the street, gave themselves over wholeheartedly to what was in part a conference and in part plain circus, with the novel magic of television being combined with techniques as old as the torchlight parade. Coming from a country-wide tour, after scores of speeches and innumerable public appearances, President Truman stepped for his major address into an atmosphere that must resemble the politician's idea of heaven.

What Mr. Truman might say on such an occasion was of less importance than the appearance of the man himself, and what he represented in the minds of his followers. There have been times when he was considered less than an asset to the party. In this same Chicago he had been nominated almost absent-mindedly for the Vice Presidency; in Philadelphia, 4 years later, the party leaders kept him waiting ignominiously in a hotel room for his final selection as presidential candidate. But today Mr. Truman is surrounded by the kind of spell possessed by those who have been successful, and the party leaders are ready to cheer him, as they did last night, to the echo. He stood then, not only at the climax of his current tour, but at what may very possibly be the highest point of his career.

The President set forth confidently from Washington 8 days ago, and it would be hard to deny that the tour has been, on narrow grounds, a success. Mr. Truman's speeches—even the off-the-cuff speeches—have been carefully prepared, so that there have been no bad slips; the itinerary was arranged to take him through areas that do not often have a chance to greet a President, and before the audiences that gathered in shirt sleeves, leaving their spring chores as the Presidential train came by, Mr. Truman has been at his homely best. In his more important speeches he has stressed those programs, like the Brannan agricultural plan, which appear to make good talking points even though almost no one wants to see them enacted; he has spoken in broad terms about the need for international concepts and action; he has stressed the themes of conservation and power development, which have a deeper hold on the West than we in the East probably realize.

Needless to say, there has been little illumination cast on the real problems and dilemmas confronting the Nation. Mr. Truman remains at the end enmeshed in the same contradictions which have marked his whole administration—the same undefined and apparently unlimited commitments, with good and bad inextricably mixed, and both canceled out by the danger of rising deficits and heavy taxes. Mr. Truman has had his chance to see and to be seen; the Democrats have had their day of pageantry. Now the country returns to the issues which cannot be exorcised by incantations, and upon the intelligent solution of which our safety and welfare depend.

Reduction of the Cost of Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 16, 1950

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I am inserting in the RECORD the following editorial entitled "Make It Stick" from the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer of May 12:

MAKE IT STICK

Here they are, the seven timorous Ohio Members of the House of Representatives who were unable to summon the courage to vote for a reduction in the cost of Government that wasn't even tied to specific projects, but designed merely to lower, slightly, the ceiling on bureaucratic expenditures as a whole:

ROBERT CROSSER and MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, of Cleveland; EDWARD BREEN, of Dayton; THOMAS H. BURKE, of Toledo; WALTER B. HUBER, of Akron; MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, of Youngstown; and JOHN MCSWEENEY, of Wooster.

These seven Democrats—and their constituents should mark this well—cast their votes against the $600,000,000 reduction in the omnibus appropriation bill, which was approved by an overwhelming bipartisan majority of the House.

Accurately sensing, we are certain, the desire of the people they represent and the need of this Nation for more economical operation of the Government, 14 other Ohio Congressmen voting on the measure—4 of them Democrats—voted for the budgetary reduction. We mention, in a commendatory way:

Representative at Large STEPHEN M. YOUNG, of Cleveland, and Representatives JAMES G. POLK, of Highland, ROBERT T. SECREST, of Senecaville, and EARL T. WAGNER, of Cincinnati, Democrats; FRANCES P. BOLTON, of Cleveland, WALTER E. BREHM, of Millersport, CLARENCE J. BROWN, of Blanchester, CLIFF CLEVENGER, of Bryan, CHARLES H. ELSTON, of Cincinnati, THOMAS A. JENKINS, of Ironton, WILLIAM M. MCCULLOCH, of Piqua, J. HARRY MCGREGOR, of West Lafayette, JOHN M. VORYS, of Columbus, and ALVIN F. WEICHEL, of Sandusky, Republicans.

By voting the $600,000,000 slash in the omnibus money bill, by approving a compulsory reduction in Federal personnel designed to save another $400,000,000, and by sending to the Senate an appropriation measure some $2,000,000,000 under President Truman's budget request, the House did not achieve the millennium in Government economy. Let's be realistic about that.

Horizontal cuts in operating expenditures and personnel are not the forthright scientific way to attain sound economy in Government. The way to have done that would have been to prune away specific functions that are outright frills; to apply the economy shears to specific bureaus that are notoriously top-heavy in personnel, that are staffed with propagandists devoted to fighting against Government economy.

The way the House took was the way of expedience, for, as one Washington correspondent correctly noted, the horizontal reductions attracted the support of "members who in previous tests had balked at supporting cuts in specific programs that they deemed essential or politically advantageous."

But the action of the House was significant because it showed that a majority in the House is sensitive to the public's demand for economy.

The big task now is to make the House economy action stick in the Senate. It will stick if the people of the United States—the individual citizens, the voters of America—make it unmistakably clear to the Members of the upper Chamber that governmental economy, almost ruthless economy, has their approval.

Speech of the Late Senator David I. Walsh, of Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 24, 1950

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am having reprinted in the RECORD a speech delivered some time ago by the late and lamented Senator David I. Walsh, of Clinton, Mass.

It is especially appropriate that this great fighting speech by Senator Walsh, which was the last major speech he delivered in the United States Senate after long, honorable, and outstanding service in that body, should be recalled at this time when the town of Clinton is celebrating its centennial anniversary.

Senator Walsh was Clinton's most illustrious son—distinguished legislator in the general court, Lieutenant Governor, Governor, and Senator from the State of Massachusetts for almost 30 years. The people of Clinton are proud of his contributions, proud of the great gifts which he consecrated to his country's welfare, proud of his courage and his stirring patriotism, and proud of his devotion to Clinton and its people.

The speech follows:

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, at this late hour after midnight, I hesitate to take the time of the Senate to make some observations that the unusual proceedings, the exciting and tense debate on this issue, have prompted. I had not intended to address the Senate at this time, but I cannot longer remain voiceless when the deep-seated convictions I entertain over what is transpiring here seek expression.

Mr. President, the Senate has in recent days been passing through a most unusual experience. I have been here a long time, and I have never seen the proceedings in the Senate assume the extraordinary character they have during this debate and especially tonight. We have seen an antilabor coalition ride roughshod over a minority to the extent that even a motion to lay on

the table has been made against amendments in the interests of, and proposed by friends of, the workers, without permitting even debate or a vote on their merits. It is clear that there is a solid bloc of Senators, including members of both parties, determined to vote for almost any amendment restrictive of the rights of the workers. Of course, they urge that their purpose is to correct the excesses of labor unions, but that does not change the fact that their opposition is against every man and woman who belongs to labor organizations or who may choose to join them in the future. The atmosphere of the Senate appears to be charged with a determination to pass legislation impetuously and primarily for punitive ends. Calm and wise judgment has disappeared. As the roll is called, the question seems to be not so much on the merits of individual amendments but on a determined intention to classify Senators into two categories—one, the representatives of the employers, and the other, the representatives of the workers. By innuendo, if you happen to be a Senator championing the cause of the workers, you are a strike sympathizer and should receive the condemnation and contempt that some people hold at the present time toward John L. Lewis.

Instead of the ordinary procedure of discussing and analyzing the problems that affect labor and industry, of trying to prevent or remove the abuses that exist in both groups, the issue here is to seize the present opportunity to curb and restrict the rights now enjoyed by the workers. Senators who heretofore have boasted of their loyalty to the working class are gleefully rushing to vote for amendments that every man and woman in every labor organization in the country considers hostile and detrimental to the rights of the working class. Senators who were elected as friends of labor have succumbed to the hysterical emotions of the hour, and have joined the procession supporting the antilabor amendments. For the first time I have witnessed an attitude of indifference, if not real hostility, toward any expressions of sympathy with, or support of, the causes that Senators heretofore have been proud to advocate. There is a subtle attempt here to imply that those who speak against these repressive measures are either disloyal or wild-eyed labor agitators.

It is to be noted that every amendment to place management and trade associations in the same status as labor organizations, in regard to management of their group funds or reports of their joint membership, has been rejected. It appears to be a determination to punish labor, and labor only.

In contrast with the situation in this Chamber in regard to the legislation at hand, I recall the long struggle of the workers for social justice, for the opportunity of obtaining a decent livelihood, for a fair and just share of the earnings resulting from their toil.

I recall that in my own State it took 60 years of agitation to enact reasonable child-labor legislation. I can remember as a youth scenes in my own community where I saw young girls, 13 and 14 years of age, going out in the darkness of the early morning to work in the cotton mills for 10 and 12 hours, returning in the darkness of the evening. I have heard from their lips stories of how they ran every inch of the way from their homes to the mill gates because they were frightened. Who brought about the changes that have resulted in today's improved working conditions? Who has accomplished the shortening of work hours and the improvement of working conditions? It was done through the organization of the workers, through unions, and other associations that they set up for using their collective power to influence employers who were often of the absentee landlord class.

I recall, in the eighties, the enthusiasm with which the workers received the establishment of the organization known as the Knights of Labor, and their espousal, under difficulties and persecutions, of the cause for shorter working hours, better wages, and better living conditions. Much progress has been made, but the credit is due in large measure, if not in full measure, to the unions and labor organizations that the workers themselves set up.

I recall witnessing—I can picture some of them now—many of them I knew by name—women 75 and 80 years of age—trudging the streets in summer and winter, year in and year out, from the mills to their homes, with bent backs and gnarled fingers due to ceaseless toil over the spindles, looms, and machines in the factories and workshops of New England. Who lifted their voices and used their efforts to help bring about better living conditions, shorter hours of work, and the securing of safety appliances? The workers' organizations.

I remember as a young lawyer prosecuting cases in the courts for damages sustained by employees—one a young woman whose scalp was torn from her head because the hair became entangled in the machinery due to the lack of proper safeguards. I remember other cases seeking compensation for loss of arms, for loss of fingers, and other disabilities. In all of them I found raised in defense the doctrine of "assumption of risk"—that the employees assume the risk involved in their work. These and other victims of industrial injuries were often obliged to turn to public charity or to members of their families for support. Sometimes when a father was seriously incapacitated the children were forced to leave school and to go to work to support him.

Who led the fight and brought about legislation that eliminated the doctrine of "assumption of risk" and made it possible for these victims of industrial life to become other than a public charge? It was labor, organized labor, union labor.

The long and at times discouraging struggle made by labor organizations, against what seemed insurmountable obstacles, to elevate the workers from almost a state of servitude to the improved position that they now hold through legislation requiring safety appliances, better working conditions, and shorter working hours, is an inspiring one. It is indeed a story of the glorious victory of human rights.

I inject a personal story about two factory workers who had reached old age. I had forgotten them, though in my early youth I had carried a dinner pail to them from their homes to the factory gates during the noon hour. One day a few years ago a welfare agent called upon me to inquire about their needs. He expressed pity for their plight because they had once lived fairly comfortably on their meager income. He said, "I never knew till I met these ladies that it is a crime to live to an old age." I asked, "What do you mean?" He said, "Why, these women have toiled for nearly 60 years, and they saved enough money in that time to take care of themselves and to provide for their old age, but they lived too long. Had they died a few years after advancing age forced them out of the factory they would have gone to their graves without public charity. However, because they have lived too long, over 80 years, they are now experiencing the trials and tribulations of poverty." He made another observation, "I never knew before that people could be poor and aristocratic as well. These ladies are aristocrats." They were indeed, aristocrats, sweet, kind, lovable characters; and there are hundreds of thousands of women, and men, too, who during our lifetime have experienced the same hardships I have just described. These are some of the types of people this legislation will affect by curtailment of the workers' rights.

The amendments before us affect every worker and every organization, the innocent as well as the guilty, if there are any guilty, of excessive and unreasonable demands and procedure. I am not defending John L. Lewis, but, Mr. President, I will not be a party, because of Lewis, to enacting laws which will restrict the rights of those honest working men and women who have labored so unceasingly during the war, who gave their sons to the service of our country in our hour of need. I shall not offend or shackle them by telling them that their bargaining rights are to be restricted, that they cannot be relied upon to carry on the candid and open relationship which should exist between employee and employer in collective bargaining.

Mr. President, have we forgotten the obligation, the great debt we owe to the workers of this country? All the vast wealth we have accumulated has come from the toil, sweat, and blood of the workers.

Their strength, their vigor, their health, their labors, have opened up the vast wealth that the Almighty planned in the bowels of the earth for our benefit. They have tilled the fields so that we might have the rich harvests with which we are blessed. They have exhausted themselves in the workshops, factories, and industries of the country. How meager has been their share of the prosperity that has resulted from their toil and sacrifice.

Have they no claim to our sympathy and assistance? Must we be heedless of their social advancement and welfare because some leader may have misjudged his obligation to them or his responsibility to the public? Labor leaders are not immune from the faults, failures, and mistakes or even the misuse of power which is observable in other phases of life.

Even those in the public service, whom we sometimes call politicians, make serious mistakes and fail to promote the public welfare.

I have witnessed the struggle of the workers for recognition of their rights up to this very hour, and I regret to see in this Chamber efforts to restrict the progress that has been made—efforts that indicate a lack of sympathy, a distrust of the workers' organizations, a hindrance to further progress—efforts to place limitations on their rights to organize and to engage in collective bargaining.

Mr. President, I regret to see in this Chamber what seems to me to be a determination to turn back, an attempt to undo some of the helpful things that have been accomplished through years of effort. Indeed, I think I observe here a spirit of passion, a spirit of intense hostility, a desire to get even with someone. We are acting as if we were looking for blood. I fear, instead of helping to end strikes and bring about peaceful and harmonious conditions, we may be moving toward more turmoil, more strikes, and more hostility between capital and labor.

There is a mistaken notion here that some of the amendments which are proposed will prevent or end the present strikes. Not one of these amendments which are being proposed here will affect John Lewis or the leaders of the Railway Brotherhood; but they will affect every man and woman who toils and who chooses to belong to a labor union now or in the future. It is to be noted also that workers who are not members of labor organizations receive benefits attained by the efforts of unions. You cannot get even with John L. Lewis or other strike leaders through these amendments. You can, however, break the spirit, dishearten the working class for a time, but their cause is so humane and just that, like a volcano, the eruption is only being postponed.

Mr. President, not all employers are petitioning for this legislation. There are many, very many who deal fairly and justly with labor. Many of them have a sincere and deep sympathy for their workers. Many of them have often voluntarily expressed this in bonuses, pensions, and in various other benefits to the workers. Let us counsel with these representatives of the employers and we will find them cooperative. Not one of them will ask us to repeal collective bargaining or the right of the worker to strike.

Hundreds, yes thousands, of disputes and differences between labor and industry have been peacefully and successfully adjusted. Because there have been a few failures and hardships have resulted and the public interest has been jeopardized does not, in my opinion, justify the putting of all labor in a strait-jacket.

One would be led to believe, listening to the debate here, that there is no class consciousness on the side of management; that it is all on the side of labor. In my opinion, there is as much class consciousness on the one side as on the other, and in my opinion some labor unions remain militant because, forced to deal with a hostile employer, they believe that the labor union can survive in no other way.

In the final analysis, it is my opinion that the sympathetic attitude of management toward unions is the key to sound industrial relations, and, if the employers wholeheartedly accept the philosophy of collective bargaining, our labor unions would rise to the responsibilities which they have and fulfill their rich promises.

Unless there is a sharp change for the better in industrial relations, I fear industry and labor will wake up some day to find a new philosophy, an extreme philosophy promulgated through the Nation. In my opinion, radical economic changes will come if labor and industry cannot find a way peacefully to adjust their differences. The success of the American way of life is not through extreme restrictive measures, but through management and labor solving their individual problems through self-government and through industrial democracy. The preservation of the American way of life depends upon their success in solving their mutual problems.

Mr. President, let us think of the workers other than John L. Lewis' as we discuss this legislation. There are millions of them who are law-abiding and who seek and desire industrial peace. Men are fallible and so are leaders, whether they are in the labor, the industrial, or in the political life. Rash and extreme measures that affect and injure the welfare of the people are taken even at times by men in public service.

Let us remember there is another day coming when the present labor turmoil will have subsided. Industrial peace will come, and the workers, in my opinion, desire it and want it just as much as management.

Let it not be said of us when our record is scanned that in the heat of passion we attempted to undo the progress that labor has made through its long up-hill hike for industrial freedom, that we have in a moment of excitement sought to abridge and reduce the rights of workers.

Let us consider these measures calmly. I cannot emphasize too strongly the fact that no amendment proposed here by the coalition can in any manner affect or change the present strike situation. Nor could these coalition amendments, were they the law today, have prevented the present strikes. The amendments are proposed now in the belief that the present hysterical state of mind will give the support that the amendments would not get in normal times. In fact, some of the proponents of these amendments privately concede this.

These proposals will result in arousing the antagonism and resentment of all workers, who are innocent parties to present labor disturbances, when they know the motive behind these proposals and their true significance.

The Lincoln Star's Account of President Truman's Visit to Lincoln, Nebr., on May 8, 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 16, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the Lincoln Star, of Lincoln, Nebr., a Democratic daily newspaper, edited by Hon. James E. Lawrence, had this to say in a news item about President Truman's recent visit to Lincoln, Nebr., on May 8, 1950:

LINCOLN WELCOMING TRUMAN—PRESIDENT ROLLS WEST—WARNS ISOLATIONISM RETURN MIGHT PROVOKE A THIRD WORLD WAR—FARM PLAN TOPIC OF ADDRESS—FIRST MAJOR SPEECH TO BE GIVEN HERE

Nebraskans from surrounding areas were crowding into Lincoln today to hear the Chief Executive of the United States speak here on the topic which probably affects them most—farm income.

And in the capital city of the State, all was in readiness as President Truman's special train rolled across Iowa and into Nebraska. The only thing undecided was the weather, and even that was as well prepared for as possible.

At Seventh and Q Streets, where a platform has been erected for the President's address, a canopy is ready to protect Mr. Truman and other dignitaries who will be with him on the platform.

SIXTEEN STATES

The address by the President here today is the first of nine major speeches he expects to make during his swing across the country. During the trip he will tour 16 States. And in Lincoln he will tell what his administration thinks must be done for the farmer.

His train is scheduled to arrive here at 5:05 this afternoon and will leave at 5:45. The President is expected to talk about 20 minutes. After that he is scheduled to use the time before the train leaves shaking hands with the party heads in the State and getting a slant or two from them on the Democratic picture in Nebraska.

The President will be presented with a 50-pound red, white, and blue iced birthday cake in honor of his sixty-sixth birthday. Introducing the President will be Mayor Clarence Miles, a fellow Democrat.

PARADE

Before the President's arrival there will be a parade, starting at 4:15 p. m. at Fifteenth and O, preceding down O to Ninth, then north to Q and west to the platform at Seventh Street.

Among the group welcoming the President will be Democratic National Committeeman James Quigley, Valentine; and State Chairman Clayton Shrout, Omaha. County Democratic Chief Willard Townsend is in charge of arrangements for the Lincoln stop.

In the welcoming parade will be the University of Nebraska, Nebraska National Guard, Lincoln High School, Northeast High School, and Syracuse High School Bands, and the American Legion drum corps and color guard.

PRESIDENT'S ESCORT

Escorting the President from his train car will be Governor Peterson, Quigley, Chief Justice Robert G. Simmons, and Mayor Miles. On appearance of the President the university band will strike up Hail to the Chief.

The 60-member reception committee will be seated immediately upon arrival at the platform, about 4:45 p. m. The National Anthem will open the program, followed by announcements by Chairman Townsend.

He will hen present the Governor and Mayor Clarence Miles, who will then introduce the President.

Members of the Presidential party included Mrs. Truman, Miss Margaret Truman, Mr. and Mrs. Mon Wallgren, Bill Bray, Dewey Long, Charles Ross, presidential press secretary, George Elsey, and Commander H. War.

Members of the local reception committee were: Gov. Val Peterson, Mrs. Grace Barmore, Clayton Shrout, Mrs. Grace Young, Gordon Preble, James E. Lawrence, Judge Delehant, Willard Townsend, Mrs. Essie Davis, Ernest Schiefelbein, Raymond McConnell, Jr., Neal Meisbach, Mrs. Frank Morrison, Mrs. J. P. Jensen, Mrs. Carl S. Gjerloff, Frances Zachek, Mrs. Florence Howe, Paul M. Dennis, Fred J. Sassidy, Michael McLaghlin, Leo J. Beck, Joseph T. Votava, Clarence Clark, Frank Sorrell, Mrs. Lenore Clark, Charles Barth, William H. Smith, P. J. Heaton, Dr. Leo Beattie, F. H. Chapelle, B. L. McMullen, Ceil Fitzgibbon, Edwin Dosek, James C. Quigley, Chief Justice Robert Simmons, Mayor Clarence Miles, Ted Sick, Bishop Kucera, William Meier, Mrs. Mary B. Allen, Hugh Riley, Rev. Thomas Barton, Frank Cronin, Mrs. Frank Sorrell, Kenneth Lewis, John T. Kerns, H. C. Larsen, Lloyd C. Thomas, Robert Tondreau, Mrs. Mina McReynolds, Mrs. Alma Eitel, A. Clifford Anderson, Mrs. Marguerite Stubblefield, Thane Devis, Frank Golden, Joseph Boehler, Fred Deutsch, Otto Kotouc, Jr., J. B. Farris, Ed Moran, Robert Downing, Henry Ley, Anton F. Munch, Sam Josephson, George O'Malley, Charles Ledwith.

It stated the following editorially:

WELCOME, MR. PRESIDENT

The President of the United States came home to his own Monday in a trip devoted largely to the midwest.

He chose Lincoln, the capital of Nebraska, for his major address. And as his train rolled westward, he was to stop at other Nebraska points and to pass through the fertile fields which now in the first flush of spring are donning new coats of green.

Great is the responsibility which rests upon the shoulders of President Truman on this, his sixty-sixth birthday. The head of no other government in the world daily carries such burdens, for here the hopes and faith of free peoples are centered. Here in America is the warming light, beckoning to all men and women the world over who aspire to dignity, to the free conscience and heart that gives them their own self-respect, and enriches their lives with a sense of true, noble purpose.

This paper, which has found much to commend in President Truman against the criticism hurled at him by loose and irresponsible critics, takes this occasion to say to the President that it rejoices in his continued confirmation of the faith that his people have placed in him. There was only recently a striking example of his concern for the welfare of his people in his courageous veto of the Kerr bill. That act of his did call for the highest spirit of public service, and in terms of Nebraska, it may have saved this State large sums of money.

This paper hails Mr. Truman's handling of foreign affairs in a period of great difficulty and danger, and assures him that it is grateful for his unwillingness to depart from true American tradition in combating a sanguine war against communism.

Nebraska is a neighbor of Mr. Truman's home State of Missouri. Stretching through years of territorial and State existence, warm have been the bonds and common interests between these good neighbors.

It was from St. Louis from whence Lewis and Clark took forth for the first detailed survey of northwest territory; it was from Missouri points that the great overland trails took form and thousands crossed the plains, many to remain and to construct the foundations of this State.

The President of the United States by the nature of his office, is a lonely man, hemmed in and cut off from the normal contacts human companionship crave. So it is a splendid thing that the President of the United States can visit his people, and talk with his people, to become the better acquainted with them and with their problems.

A happy birthday, Mr. President, and in neighborly spirit, Nebraska extends its arms to you in warm, neighborly welcome and greeting.

On May 9, it also stated the following editorially:

WHAT MAKES THE PRESIDENT TICK

(By J. E. Lawrence)

It was a drenched, bedraggled corps of newspapermen, who tumbled from President Truman's special train for a look-see at the crowds at the Burlington depot in Lincoln Monday night. The photographers swung into action but the best picture was not snapped. That could have been a shot of a bunch of cameramen trying to take pictures in the rain.

One of the first to step off the train was an old acquaintance, Bert Andrews, head of the Washington bureau of the New York Herald Tribune, the bible of the Republican Party. I asked Mr. Andrews about the crowds. He flicked a couple of raindrops out of his eyes, looked off into space, and said that he could not understand them. The President, he reported, had been greeted by huge throngs in Iowa, but had not been uproariously cheered. "It is that which I cannot understand. They come to see, and they listen to every word." But as a newspaper veteran of many presidential campaigns, Mr. Andrews seemed to feel that the spontaneity of other days was absent. Is that bad, or is it a part of the times?

Another news man on Mr. Truman's train, John Edwards, born and reared in Lincoln, a graduate of the Lincoln high school and the University of Nebraska, and a former member of the Star staff, now with CBS, was pumping hands of old-time acquaintances, who crowded around him at the depot. Mr. Edwards was visibly impressed with the crowds through Iowa. At Pacific Junction, he said, in a very informal fashion the President referred in homespun language to his sixty-sixth birthday and his words caught the fancy of the crowd.

Is he doing himself good by this trip through 14 States? The answer naturally will lend itself to partisan interpretation. But Mr. Truman's popularity with the crowds that gather to hear him is not difficult to explain. He is an unaffected, folksy, warm-hearted man—the kind of American who in simple, earnest, and sincere fashion, seems to be enjoying himself every foot of the way. He had a solid, substantial speech on the farm program here. The test of it can be made by the reading of the complete text. Mr. Truman does not rely upon oratory to sway his people. There was a notable absence of the sharp jibes that he tossed to millions of people in the campaign of 1948, but in his discussion of agriculture, there was an apparent honesty in every word that his political enemies will find difficult to attack.

What makes the President an effective campaigner? Chiefly the fact that he is always himself from his head to his toes—no politician in the orthodox sense with gifted political intuition, but a man who obviously believes in the fight he is making and has a faith in the American people that when the facts are laid before them, they will go with him.

President Truman's Point 4

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask permission to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a brief statement summarizing a speech made by Dr. Dewey Anderson, the director of the Public Affairs Institute, at the annual meeting of the Nation Associates in New York on April 29. Few Americans have done more constructive thinking in the field of national and international economics than Dr. Anderson. His recently published series of eight studies on point 4, the bold new program of aid to underdeveloped countries, has been widely acclaimed as a challenging proposal to eliminate poverty, and bring peace to the world. This speech sets forth that proposal in brief, readable terms. It is because it should be made available to Members of a busy Congress that I want it to appear in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Nation of May 20, 1950]

A REALLY BOLD NEW PROGRAM

(By Dewey Anderson, director of the Public Affairs Institute)

When we speak of point 4—the bold new program for technical and financial cooperation with underdeveloped countries—we are proposing to change the face of the earth with something other than the H-bomb. In addition to some $15,000,000,000 of our national budget already devoted to military preparations annually, we are discussing with a dozen European nations a rearmament program for them calling for twelve to fifteen billion dollars to be spent in the next 5 years.

But even a speeded-up arms race is premised on some period of peace. Whatever its length, I submit that we had better fill that time with constructive efforts which will win us democratic allies, and by their peaceful nature, perhaps lead away from war.

The underdeveloped countries in Asia, Africa, and Latin America are distinguished from other areas in that three-fourths of their working population is engaged in agriculture, largely on a primitive, noncommercial, subsistence level. Twenty-eight of the fifty-three independent countries of the world are underdeveloped in this sense. Their per capita incomes average much less than the equivalent of $100 a year, with our own more than 10 times as great. They form two-thirds of all the people on the earth.

By the year 2,000 the world may have 3,870,000,000 inhabitants, an increase of 1,490,000,000. Of this number 1,310,000,000 will have been added to the already dense populations of the underdeveloped countries. This pressure of people on living space and food supply may well transcend in importance any single problem of the next 50 years.

Are these people in the underdeveloped countries to become merely pawns in a world power struggle? Or are they to have an opportunity under peaceful conditions to emerge from their blighted past? The answer rests largely with our own conception of point 4, how boldly we formulate it, and how cooperatively we put it into practice.

A boldly planned point 4 is essential to the success and development of the United Nations. Only the United Nations can operate an effective program of investment for underdeveloped countries, for only there do the great and small sovereign nations meet to pool their strength and take action on a cooperative basis.

American assistance sincerely given through the UN will be less subject to the charge of Yankee imperialism. World sentiment will rally to the support of such a position. The goal of an adequate point 4 program should be to raise the income and affect the standard of living of all the people steadily and rapidly for the next 50 years. This will be best accomplished by shifting about a fourth of the workers from primitive subsistence agriculture to industrial work, the professions, and other pursuits. At the same time the food base will be strengthened by improvements in agriculture.

Our own experiences and those of other advanced nations indicate that the rate of population growth is slackened noticeably with the shift from primary occupations to industry and other services, and with the increase in living standards that results from this more productive use of manpower. Such a change should strengthen the democratic forces in the underdeveloped countries and give them a greater stake in freedom and peace.

We conceive of this bold new program as requiring a get-going period of 5 years, during which the volume of effort, beginning small, will expand as rapidly as projects are engineered, personnel chosen, and financing secured. Two sorts of technical aid are needed:

1. High-level technical aid. These are the technicians, scientists, administrators, engineers, teachers, cultural anthropologists, agriculturists, surveyors, and researchers working at the UN and in the field who can give advice and assistance to underdeveloped countries in formulating development plans for their countries, moderate intemperate enthusiasm, and project long-range programs.

We estimate that $600,000,000 would be required to finance the work of the several thousand high-level technicans who could become available during the first 5 years. We suggest that this be granted money—$373,000,000 by the United States, $227,000,000 by other United Nations countries.

2. Low-level technical aid. Of equal importance is technical help at a lower professional level which will give the masses of people more proficiency in their work and better living conditions. Specifically, we propose that 250 or more work centers be established in underdeveloped countries. Doctors and nurses, agricultural agents, and machine-shop foremen will start doing and teaching in the villages and the back country. In 5 years a mass shift into more productive and healthful ways of living would occur, and the march toward the goals laid down for the bold, new program would have started. We estimate that a reasonable expectation of growth would require a total

of $1,000,000,000 or more for the 5-year period, to taper off thereafter as these centers accomplished their first major purposes. We suggest that this sum be provided as grants, half to come from the United States, half from other countries.

No technical-aid program by itself will set in motion those desirable changes. Both public and private capital in large amounts are essential. Many needs can and should be met only through Government loans. Only when these investments result in social improvements and increasing stability of governments, in wealth upon which to base other business venture, can it be expected that any large-scale private capital will find its way into the underdeveloped countries.

We suggest several types of government loan funds, tailored to meet specific needs.

1. Across the globe one poor country after another has chopped down its trees for fuel and allowed its land to become barren. To create the basis for a decent life for the people a vast conservation and development program must be undertaken. We suggest the establishment of an International Resources Conservation Corporation with a capital stock of $2,000,000,000, half to be subscribed by the United States, the other half to come from other member countries of the United Nations. This Corporation would be chartered by the United Nations and operated under its supervision. It should provide government-to-government long-term loans for conservation purposes at the cost of money plus the cost of servicing loans.

2. Even in this country, with its numerous banking and lending facilities, vast areas have been in need of capital to launch profitable and much-needed enterprises. We suggest that the United Nations establish a cooperatives' revolving fund to $2,000,000,000, half to be subscribed by the United States and the other half to come from other United Nations countries. Low-cost loans from this fund would be made to underdeveloped countries upon certification by the FAO that feasible cooperative projects were at a stage requiring such capital.

3. The Export-Import Bank makes loans to underdeveloped areas. But its present practices do not entirely fit the needs of these countries for long-term, low-interest-rate money. We suggest that the authorization of the bank be expanded by act of Congress by $2,500,000,000, specifically earmarked to meet these needs on terms calling for return of principal plus a modest servicing charge.

This new authorization should be open to American private interests which wish to use it for productive purposes approved by the country of investment. Moreover, it is suggested that the bank participate in technical-aid missions provided by the American point 4 program.

4. The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development is a United Nations institution. Its strict banker attitude has ruled out any large volume of loans to underdeveloped countries. Its charter should be broadened to provide low-cost loans tailored to the needs of development projects.

5. American private investment in underdeveloped areas has been running currently at about $800,000,000 annually, including reinvestments. This will decrease as the oil companies, which account for a large share of it, finish their foreign developments. If the United States underwrites a bold new program of point 4 activity, it can be expected that, even in the intial stages, an expansion of private business investment will take place. If this basic underwriting is not provided soon, and in volume, then because of the unsettled condition of the world, no large amount of private investment in underdeveloped countries will be made.

Point 4 will probably become law in the United States within a few weeks now. The legislation which is likely to be passed will launch the new program, partly as a United Nations enterprise, partly as a bilateral technical-aid scheme conducted by the United States Government. But the measure will not provide the underpinning necessary to carry out the investment features outlined above. That essential part of the program will probably await action of the Eighty-second Congress next year.

The technical-aid bill will provide some funds for UN agencies, which should allow a small beginning after other nations have made their contributions. To this extent our action will implement point 4 at Lake Success. It will also provide funds for United States agencies operating in the same field. An attempt is being made by proponents of the program to provide the first machinery for cooperation and clearances between these two efforts. Most important of all, as this legislation passes and becomes operative under the direction of the UN and the President, we must make certain that we have launched an effort that is not prevented by law from advancing to fill the need in underdeveloped countries. But this will not happen without much organized understanding and support within both the United States and the other members of the world family of nations.

Address by Dr. Abba Hillel Silver on the Second Anniversary of Establishment of the State of Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT A. TAFT
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Dr. Abba Hillel Silver on the second anniversary of the establishment of the State of Israel. The address was delivered at Madison Square Garden, New York City, on May 11, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY DR. ABBA HILLEL SILVER ON THE SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF ESTABLISHMENT OF THE STATE OF ISRAEL, MADISON SQUARE GARDEN, NEW YORK CITY, MAY 11, 1950

Two years have elapsed since the reestablishment of the State of Israel. We cannot as yet have a true perspective on what has taken place and all of its tremendous implications, but enough has taken place to justify the joyous celebration here this evening and similar celebrations throughout the world.

It is customary and quite natural for us to think of what we have done for Israel. I should like to speak this evening briefly of what Israel has done, is doing, and will continue to do for us. American Jewry has, of course, done much for Israel. Without the decisive political mobilization and action of American Jewry, the State of Israel would not now be in existence. Without its large and sustained economic support, the development of the state, the absorption of immigrants, as well as its military defense, would have been nigh impossible. It will remain to the everlasting credit of the American Jewish community that the greatest challenge in Jewish history did not find it unprepared or reluctant to assume the burdens and responsibilities of leadership.

But great as were the services which we rendered to the State of Israel, greater by far have been the services which the State of Israel has rendered to us and to all the Jewish people in the Diaspora. What has transpired in the last 2 years is not only an impressive chronicle, but an inspiring epic. Close on to 400,000 homeless, menaced or war-ravaged Jews have been given a home in Israel. The great nations of the earth in possession of vast and empty territories did not offer any sanctuary to them. Israel, and Israel alone, opened its doors wide and welcomed these men and women, many of whom had languished for years in the concentration camps and the hellholes of Europe. I recall that in 1943 at the American Jewish Conference I stated that the problem of Jewish refugees would never be solved until the Jewish State is established. There were practical men in those days and men of affairs who presumed to know better. They denounced us as political extremists for raising the issue of the Jewish State at a time when Jews should be concentrating all of their energies on the demand for admission of Jewish refugees to Palestine. They withdrew from and destroyed the American-Jewish Conference over this issue. But these men, who now pride themselves upon being among the guiding spirits of the new State of Israel, were dangerously blind guides in those days, and it was fortunate that the Jews of America did not follow their leadership. The stone which they rejected, the Jewish State, has now become the chief cornerstone in the solution of the world problem of Jewish refugees.

In order to absorb these hundreds of thousands of immigrants who have poured, and are pouring, into that little state Israel has established 200 agricultural settlements, expanded its agriculture and industry, built tens of thousands of homes, and provided for them health, education, and social services. These immigrants, be it remembered, are our charge and the responsibility of Diaspora Jewry. It is we who placed this terrific economic burden upon the young republic, at a time when its resources were being heavily drained to maintain a large defense army, when it had to build from the ground up its administrative and parliamentary machinery, and wrestle with inflation, the high cost of living, and a most unfavorable balance of trade.

Israel gladly assumed the crushing immigration load, aware that it would force a lower standard of living upon its own people and a rigid regimen of austerity which would beggar even the austerity program of England during the war. In accepting this responsibility in the face of these besetting hardships and sacrifices, Israel has rendered a unique and unforgettable historic service to world Jewry. In 2 years Israel became the Eretz Miklat for world Jewry. It is prepared to continue to perform this service for still other Jews—Jews from Iraq, from Rumania, from Hungary, from Moslem countries where they are in imminent danger.

Before 1948 there was no place for such Jews to go except to the gas chambers. Today there is the free and welcoming land of Israel. When, therefore, I hear American Jews say, "How long will Israel continue to ask us for help?" I counter by asking, "How long will world Jewry continue to ask Israel for help?"

The Jewish people established the State of Israel not merely in order to have a state. This in itself is important—to restore to the Jewish people a normal national existence and international status, which it had lacked for 2,000 years. It established the state in

order that there might also be a place of ingathering for those of our people from all parts of the world who may have to go there or who may wish to go there. Having begun this tremendous and revolutionary enterprise, we cannot now stop midway. We assumed tremendous commitments when we set in motion great forces which culminated in the establishment of the state. Because the men and women of Israel believed in the earnestness of our purpose not only to create a state but to help maintain and defend it, they fought so valiantly, inspired not only by the justice of their cause, but also by the knowledge that behind them, in reserve, were the vast material and spiritual resources of the great Jewish community of America. In the same manner, they welcomed the overwhelming number of immigrants and risked all the serious complications to their national economy not only out of a sense of Jewish loyalty and solidarity but because they relied upon our continuous support.

The enemies of Israel are hopeful that we will now leave Israel in the lurch, that we will grow tired of supporting Israel. This would lead to a political collapse, and this is what they are waiting for. This is the reason why they are not now making peace with Israel. They are waiting for that disastrous economic and political debacle which would be for them the signal for a new attack on Israel. In confident anticipation of such an eventuality, they are rearming themselves to the teeth, with the aid of Mr. Bevin and with the quiet concurrence of our own State Department.

However, if I know my people—and I believe that I know them well—they are too loyal, too resolute, and too wise to fall into such a trap. They will not destroy with their own hands what they have so sacrificially and so lovingly built. On the contrary. Our people will help Israel to take care not only of these hundreds of thousands whom they have already sent there, but of the many hundreds of thousands more who are yet to come. They will want Israel to become economically sound, politically stable, and numerically so strong as to discourage for all time the annihilationist hopes of political adventurers in the neighboring Arab countries.

There were three things which we Jews had to do in recent years. First, we had to show the world that we wanted the State of Israel. On a vast scale we organized and made vocal the will of our people and persuaded men of good will everywhere of the sincerity and steadfastness of our purpose. Through many ways, athwart many obstacles, outmaneuvering many conspiracies, we pressed on indefatigably and relentlessly until the United Nations in November 1947 gave sanction to our historic claim for the reestablishment of the State of Israel.

Our people then had to show the world that it was prepared to fight for the State of Israel. And so, unaided by any of the United Nations who sanctioned the establishment of the State, and seriously hampered by an arms blockade, our valiant sons and daughters in Israel for 8 months fought off and kept at bay and finally defeated decisively the armies of six invading Arab States. In the sacrifices and in the blood of these Israeli minutemen were the foundations of the state firmly laid.

And now we must demonstrate to the world and to ourselves—especially to ourselves—that we are prepared staunchly, resolutely, and patiently to sustain that State in all the difficulties and dangers which beset every young State newly come into being, that we are prepared to help it with our resources both material and human. It was Thomas Jefferson who said: "We are not to expect to be translated from despotism to liberty in a feather bed." Certainly we Jews are not to expect to be translated from homelessness, to nationhood, from servitude to freedom in a feather bed. Never in all our history was our lot an easy one. We may be God's chosen people, but we are certainly not God's pampered people. Our ancestors under Joshua had to conquer Palestine foot by foot. Under Zerubabel they had to rebuild Judea, with one hand laying the stones and the other holding the sword. Spiritually our history has always been one of conflict and struggle—a life of swords. To wrestle with gods and men and to prevail—that is the very meaning of the name, Israel. We are not to be pitied because of this. The nature of our experience through the ages has toughened us. It has made us the "am k'she oreph," the stiff-necked people. It is that quality which enabled our people to rise from the ashes and ruins of two world wars which wrecked and ravaged European Jewry and destroyed one-third of our people and undefeated triumphantly to build in the midst of chaos and terror and battle a new state.

A few days ago, on the occasion of its second anniversary, the Government of the State of Israel issued an independence day proclamation in which, after recounting the truly remarkable and magnificent achievements since the establishment of the State, it declared: "However, the road ahead is still long and hard. Our enemies continue to threaten us, our very existence, our independence, and the borders of our State."

The existence of the State of Israel is still being threatened. There is no peace on the borders of Israel. The majority of the Arab States have not yet reconciled themselves to the existence of the State of Israel. What is being done today by the unreconciled Mr. Bevin is shipping military aircraft—108 jet planes, more than half of them already delivered—gunboats, tanks, and other military supplies to Egypt, Iraq, and Jordan, and to Syria with which Great Britain has no treaty obligations and in refusing to supply arms to Israel until—and here is the bitter irony of it all—until Israel is at peace with the Arab States," is not only not contributing to the reconciliation of these countries to the ineluctable fact of the existence of the State of Israel, but is encouraging among them desperate hopes for a renewed offensive which might yield them now what was denied them a year or so ago.

One wonders why the Security Council of the United Nations was so precipitous last August in lifting the arms embargo in the Near East after the victories of the Jewish forces when it had so stubbornly refused to lift the embargo when Israel, dangerously unarmed, was fighting against the Arab armies who had invaded Palestine bent upon undoing by violence the resolution of the United Nations. If pacification of the Near East was the real objective, why was not the embargo kept in force until peace treaties were finally concluded? And why did the United States support Great Britain in rushing through, against the earnest solicitations of the State of Israel, a premature abandonment of all restrictions on the shipment of arms to the Arab countries? Was not the covert intent to change radically the military balance between Israel and the Arab States? No foreign armies were threatening the peace and security of the Arab States. These states do not today need jet planes, bombers, and fighters, tanks, heavy guns, and warships to maintain domestic peace and security at home.

Does anyone perhaps imagine that these arms are intended and will be used by the Arab States to defend democracy and freedom in the Middle East in any future emergency? Only purblind statesmen of short memory who have already forgotten the experience of the Allied Nations with these same Arab States during the last war will persist in entertaining such bizarre hopes. These states who welcomed the Fascist and Nazi enemies of the democracies and were the centers of revolt and sabotage against Allied military operations in the last war, will prove broken reeds indeed for a free world to lean on in any future conflict.

These arms are being assembled against Israel. Mr. Bevin is blunderingly helping to prepare the next war against Israel. Our State Department, by withholding a reply to the request of the Israeli Government to acquire arms in the United States is helping to keep Israel weak in the face of the mounting rearmament threat of the surrounding Arab countries, and is encouraging, wittingly or unwittingly, their intransigence and their refusal to conclude an honorable peace with Israel.

There are forces in the State Department which have not reconciled themselves to the establishment of the State of Israel. It was these same forces which were responsible for the astounding reversal of our Government in March of 1948, when after having voted for the partition resolution of the United Nations, it suddenly announced that it was no longer prepared to go along with it and requested a special session of the United Nations to nullify that resolution. It is these same forces which are now supporting and justifying the supply of arms by Britain to the Arab States. It is the same forces which have been responsible for the ominous silence of our Government on the request of Israel to acquire arms in this country. The explanation given by our Government spokesmen is specious and artful. It is maintained that the security of Israel, surrounded as it is by neighbors which refuse to make peace, which are heavily rearming themselves, which are maintaining a blockade against Israel, and which are propagating for a second round, is really not being threatened.

Similarly disingenuous was the reply given by the State Department to the suggestion of 51 Congressmen that aid under point 4 be extended only to those Arab States which have reached peace settlements with Israel. The State Department believes that it would be undesirable to use this program as an instrument of political pressure. In God's name, since when is the withholding of aid to states which refuse to make peace an undesirable and unjustified form of political pressure? Is our Government not using its financial and material aid in other parts of the world at this very time to exert political pressure? What government in the world today dissociates aid from foreign policy?

Will the United States of America, which was the first country in the world to give official recognition to the newly established State of Israel, stand idly by and see this menace of war mount and magnify until it is beyond control? Is it to the best interests of America to see the young state, which everyone recognizes as an outpost of freedom and democracy in the Near East, weakened and endangered? Does the United States favor a continuation of the present policy of Arab rearmament by Great Britain? This rearmament could not go on without its tacit approval. Does it wish the economically hard-pressed State of Israel to continue to drain off so much of its limited resources on arms instead of using them for its economic reconstruction and the pressing human needs of its vast immigration? Do the American people really want it? Ought not rather the power and the prestige of our Government be used in such a manner as to insure that the Arab States shall negotiate a peace settlement with Israel forth-

with by bringing about a cessation of arms shipments to these Arab States, or by making it possible for the State of Israel to acquire arms in this country, thereby serving notice on the Arab States that any new military adventures on their part will find Israel fully prepared and would prove no more successful and no less costly to them than their earlier futile attempts.

We owe it to Israel and to our own beloved country to make our voices heard so that an end may be put to this dangerous policy which is now being pursued by our Government. Bevin's way has always been the wrong way in Palestine, the stupid and bloody way. Our Government should not follow the lead of this embittered politician whose Palestine policies have been so thoroughly discredited.

On this second anniversary let us give evidence to the fine men and women of Israel that we are not unmindful of the problems which beset them, that we are determined to stay with them through all their political and economic vicissitudes until security and peace finally come to them abidingly. Let us tell them of our gratitudes for what they have done in such a generous and sacrificial manner for our fellow Jews from so many parts of the world and for what they are prepared to do. Let us tell them of our gratitude for what they have done for us—for the new dignity which they have brought into our lives. Who can estimate the worth to us and to our children of the new pride which has come into our souls? What is it worth to us that after the silence of the centuries, the voice of Israel can be heard again, free and authentic, speaking in the council of nations? We are moving proudly and hopefully into a new day because Israel is there. The road may be long, but it is the road which leads away from darkness to light, from debasement to dignity, and from insecurity to peace.

Persons Naturalized in Fiscal Years 1948 and 1949

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of table 44, sent to me by Hon. Watson B. Miller, Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, listing by States the number of persons who have been naturalized and have become American citizens during 1948 and 1949. This table, I know, will be of interest to Members of the Congress.

In order to fulfill their obligations as American citizens these peoples should register so that they may participate in our National, State, and local elections. Let me give an illustration. To vote in Rhode Island, one must register before June 30 of an election year. My colleague the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LEAHY] and I are stressing very strongly the importance of registration, not only by our new citizens, but also by all the voters of our State.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 44.—*Persons naturalized, by States and Territories of residence: Years ended June 30, 1948–49*

State of residence	1948	1949
Total	70,150	66,594
Alabama	102	109
Arizona	305	329
Arkansas	30	60
California	9,194	9,370
Colorado	243	324
Connecticut	1,987	1,861
Delaware	77	85
District of Columbia	350	430
Florida	823	1,069
Georgia	62	157
Idaho	125	76
Illinois	3,259	3,297
Indiana	505	418
Iowa	245	224
Kansas	159	159
Kentucky	68	55
Louisiana	342	273
Maine	517	556
Maryland	539	509
Massachusetts	4,618	5,021
Michigan	3,665	3,301
Minnesota	560	660
Mississippi	47	60
Missouri	413	483
Montana	172	193
Nebraska	148	135
Nevada	116	71
New Hampshire	322	371
New Jersey	4,114	3,448
New Mexico	98	117
New York	25,238	21,174
North Carolina	103	126
North Dakota	148	141
Ohio	1,848	2,285
Oklahoma	110	120
Oregon	482	301
Pennsylvania	2,698	2,685
Rhode Island	598	650
South Carolina	55	69
South Dakota	65	46
Tennessee	58	92
Texas	784	1,122
Utah	124	105
Vermont	283	277
Virginia	208	331
Washington	1,445	1,345
West Virginia	168	166
Wisconsin	741	726
Wyoming	51	46
Territories, etc.:		
Alaska	105	87
Hawaii	1,442	1,362
Puerto Rico	95	73
Virgin Islands	19	37
All other	77	7

Source: U. S. Department of Justice, Immigration and Naturalization Service.

Invocation by Rev. George G. Higgins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the invocation delivered at the National Convention of Americans for Democratic Action in Washington on April 1, 1950, by the Reverend George G. Higgins, assistant director of the Social Action Department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference.

There being no objection, the invocation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INVOCATION DELIVERED AT THE NATIONAL CONVENTION OF AMERICANS FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTION, WASHINGTON, D. C., APRIL 1, BY THE REVEREND GEORGE G. HIGGINS, ASSISTANT DIRECTOR, SOCIAL ACTION DEPARTMENT, NATIONAL CATHOLIC WELFARE CONFERENCE

In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

O God, the Father of all men—the Father of Jew and Gentile, of Negro and white, of Americans and Russians, of all men everywhere—we dedicate this convention to Your honor and glory.

We need Your divine assistance. We need it desperately. Witness the cold war. Witness the hydrogen bomb. Witness 5,000,000 unemployed and other millions working for substandard wages. Witness the scandal of racial injustice. We need Your divine assistance, and we are not ashamed to say so publicly and in the open. Help us then to be better men and better women—men and women of personal honor and integrity. Help us to be better husbands and better wives, better fathers and mothers of families. But help us also jointly and cooperatively to build a better society, a society more in keeping with the dignity of man, who is created in Your own image and likeness.

Help us to have the courage of our religious convictions in the field of race relations. Help us in particular to look upon our Negro neighbors and our Negro fellow citizens as our brothers in Christ, equal to all the rest of us in every last respect in human dignity and worth. Help us to realize that racial discrimination is a sin in the theological sense of the word—a serious sin against the virtues of justice and charity, a grievous insult to our common Father. Help us to be tolerant, but help us to be more than tolerant. Tolerance is negative. Tolerance is neutral and indifferent. Tolerance is sometimes supercilious. Help us to be positive and constructive. Help us to do more than tolerate one another. Help us to love one another as brothers and sisters of one common family.

Help us to be sensitive to the rights and the needs of the poor and the underprivileged. Give us the moral courage to continue to work for the economic betterment of the masses of men and women who make up the backbone of American society. We pray for the coming of a better day when organized labor will be permitted to sit down with management as an equal partner in industry and, together with representatives of the public, plan intelligently for the general economic welfare—for the common good. To this end we pray for the organization of the unorganized workers of America. We pray for the coming of economic democracy.

We ask You to bless our Chief Executive, the members of his Cabinet, our legislators, our judges, and our administrative officers. Theirs is a noble vocation. May they carry it out with honor and unimpeachable integrity and may the public, in turn, accord them the cooperation and the respect to which they are entitled. Give our Senators and Representatives the wisdom and the courage to legislate effectively and without unnecessary delay for the economic betterment of those hundreds of thousands of American workers whose incomes are still at substandard levels—for decent and adequate housing, for civil rights, and for greater economic and social security for all our citizens. At the same time give them the humility and the common sense to realize that legislation is not the only answer, and not always the best answer, to our problems. Help them to realize that individual freedom must be regulated in the interests of the general welfare,

but help them to realize, too, that freedom is as fragile as it is indispensable for the welfare of individual men and women and for the welfare of society. Help them to strike the proper balance between security and freedom, and help them to see the importance, in a democracy, of voluntary associations—the importance of unions and cooperatives, to cite but two examples.

Finally, we ask You, Lord, in fear and trembling, to bless the efforts of our Nation toward the establishment of a just and lasting peace. Help us to be humble in the presence of the hydrogen bomb. Grant that we may not give to either appeasement or aggression. Protect us against the spirit of pessimism and despair and against the spirit of hysteria. Help our representatives at the United Nations and the representatives of all other nations to strive with constancy and courage for the establishment of an international order which will be founded on justice and which will guarantee to the suffering peoples of the world economic and political security, together with that full measure of freedom to which every human being, as a child of God, is entitled and without which life is hardly worth living. Help us to be as wise as serpents in our dealings with the enemies of our Nation, but help us also to be as simple as doves—prepared, if necessary, to defend ourselves and other nations against aggression, but prepared also to conciliate our differences whenever this can be done without sacrificing our own freedom or the freedom of any other nation. Help us to be generous in our financial assistance to less fortunate nations and much more generous than we have been thus far in welcoming displaced persons to our shores. These people are Your children, our brothers and sisters. Grant that we may treat them accordingly.

We ask these favors and these blessings in the name of Thy Divine Son, our Lord, Jesus Christ, who Himself taught us the perfect prayer: "Our Father, who art in heaven, hallowed be Thy name; Thy kindom come; Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread and forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those who trespass against us, and lead us not into temptation but deliver us from evil. Amen."

In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

Use of the Atom Bomb When Not Necessary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT A. TAFT
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "The Horror of Having Used the Atom Bomb When It Was Not Necessary," published in the Ashland Daily Press for May 11, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Ashland (Wis.) Daily Press of May 11, 1950]

THE HORROR OF HAVING USED THE ATOM BOMB WHEN IT WAS NOT NECESSARY

"I would use the atom bomb again if I have to."

These words, spoken yesterday, could have been used by only one man in the whole history of the human race, for only one man authorized the use of the atom bomb. That man was President Truman.

Upon his conscience must be a nightmarish, soul-tormenting weight, for one by one the authorities close to the war are confessing that the use of the atom bomb was not necessary at all.

Admiral Leahy, our own Ashland High School graduate, and Ashland's leading native son, was the first to honestly and publicly state the facts.

In his book, I Was There, on page 441, he states:

"It is my opinion that the use of this barbarous weapon at Hiroshima and Nagasaki was of no material assistance in our war against Japan. The Japanese were already defeated and ready to surrender because of the effective sea blockade and the successful bombing with conventional weapons."

Admiral Leahy goes on to say:

"It was my reaction that the scientists and others wanted to make this test because of the vast sums that had been spent on the project ($2,000,000,000)."

Admiral Leahy continues:

"'Bomb' is the wrong word to us for this new weapon. It is not an explosive. It is a poisonous thing that kills people by its deadly radioactive reaction, more than by the explosive force it develops.

"The lethal possibilities of atomic warfare in the future are frightening.

"My own feeling was that in being the first to use it, we had adopted an ethical standard common to the barbarians of the Dark Ages.

"That is why I come to the end of my war story with an apprehension about the future."

Hanson W. Baldwin, military expert for the New York Times, who received a Pulitzer prize for his reporting of World War II and is considered an authority on modern warfare, writes in his book, Great Mistakes of the War:

"The blockade alone could have defeated Japan. * * * Admiral Leahy was right; invasion was not necessary.

"It is therefore clear today—and was clear to many even as early as the spring of 1945—that the military defeat of Japan was certain; the atomic bomb was not needed.

"It is my contention that in the eyes of the world the atomic bomb has cost us dearly; we have lost morally; we no longer are the world's moral leader as in the days of the Wilsonian 14 points."

Retired Admiral Ellis M. Zacharias, former Deputy Director of Naval Intelligence, this week added his testimony by stating that he and other Government officials had definite information that Japan would have surrendered before the bomb "if we only had given her a chance." The United Press dispatch, quoting Admiral Zacharias, adds: "He blamed the White House and other leaders for not seizing the opportunity."

What the ghastly, horrible blunder of authorizing use of the first atom bomb in human history meant—and doing this when its use was of no material assistance in winning the war—is most graphically described in John Hersey's book, Hiroshima, which by its stark simple realism forever scars the conscience of everyone who reads it.

"A year after the bomb was dropped," he writes, "Miss Sasaki was a cripple; Mrs. Nakamura was destitute; Father Kleinsorge was back in the hospital; Dr. Sasaki was not capable of the work he once could do; Dr. Fujii had lost the 30-room hospital it took him many years to acquire, and had no prospects of rebuilding it; Mr. Tanimoto's church had been ruined, and he no longer had his exceptional vitality. The lives of these six people, who were among the luckiest in Hiroshima, would never be the same.

"Mr. Tanimoto wrote in a letter to an American some words which expressed this feeling: 'What a heart-breaking scene this was the first night. About midnight I landed on the river bank. So many injured people lie on the ground that I made my way by striding over them. Repeating "Excuse me," I forwarded and carried a tub of water with me and gave a cup of water to each one of them. They raised their upper bodies slowly and accepted a cup of water with a bow and drunk quietly and, spilling any remnant, gave back a cup with hearty expression of their thankfulness, and said, "I couldn't help my sister, who was buried under the house, because I had to take care of my mother, who got a deep wound on her eye, and our house soon set fire and we hardly escaped. Look, I lost my home, my family, and at last myself bitterly injured. But now I have gotten my mind to dedicate what I have and to complete the war for our country's sake. * * * Next morning I found many men and women dead to whom I gave water last night.'"

The man who authorized all this, when it was not necessary, is the man who is now saying to us, "I would do it again if I have to."

Proposed Transfer of Watson Laboratories

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD three separate communications which have recently been sent me urging the transfer of the Watson laboratories from Red Bank, N. J., to Rome, N. Y. One communication is from the American Legion post at Clark Mills. The other two communications are from local 907 of the National Federation of Postal Employees at Scotia, N. Y., and from the Syracuse Chamber of Commerce, also outlining reasons why the laboratories should be moved to Rome.

In addition to these communications, the Rome Daily Sentinel carried an article on April 29 quoting at length from a Nation-wide broadcast by Cedric Foster over the Mutual network in which this noted commentator stated that the laboratories should be located in Rome for reasons of both economy and efficiency. I ask unanimous consent to have the article from the Rome Daily Sentinel inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the communications and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES,
Scotia, N. Y., May 1, 1950.

The Honorable HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: The membership of Local 907 National Federation of Federal Employees respectfully request that you fully support the move to transfer the Watson Laboratories from Eatontown, N. J., to Rome, N. Y. and oppose any liquidation contrary thereto.

The membership feel that the interests of national defense and of economy should prevail over private interests.

JOHN PALMER,
President.

SYRACUSE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Syracuse, N. Y., May 2, 1950.

Hon. HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Rome's neighboring city of Syracuse is concerned about what we believe is a development in Congress contrary to the best interests of the national security.

We refer to the pending congressional action on the proposal of the Department of the Air Force to transfer its electronics research and development installation, known as Watson Laboratories, from Eatontown, N. J., to Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome, N. Y.

Details of the proposal were sent to you by Mr. James M. Kennedy, president of the Rome Chamber of Commerce, in a letter dated May 1, 1950, and in a copy of the majority report of the subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee supporting the Air Force plan to move Watson Laboratories to Rome, N. Y.

In view of the fact that the transfer has been approved by the Senate in the military public works bill and that the subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee, after investigation of the Air Force plan for the moving of Watson Laboratories to Rome, N. Y., also fully supported the transfer, the Syracuse Chamber of Commerce concurs with Rome in urging carrying out of the plan.

Our reasons are substantially the same as Rome's and are based on need, suitability of the Rome location, economy, and the fact that we believe, as apparently did the Senate and the House subcommittee, that the Air Force is in a better position to know its own needs for research and development than employees of Watson Laboratories or private citizens concerned only with keeping the installation in its present location.

We believe we have another important reason. Syracuse, only 40 miles from Rome, is the home of Electronics Park of General Electric, the country's largest electronics producer, and Syracuse University, with its famous industrial-research facilities. We understand that Watson Laboratories plan to do considerable business with both Electronics Park and Syracuse University.

We believe that we cannot permit national defense or the safety of our Nation to be jeopardized by a group of private citizens whose thinking is contrary to that of the Department of the Air Force, the Senate, and the House subcommittee who have carefully studied the matter.

We earnestly advocate the transfer of Watson Laboratories to Griffiss Army Air Base in our neighboring city of Rome, N. Y., as being in the best interests of national security.

Cordially yours,
FREDERICK E. NORTON,
Secretary.

AMERICAN LEGION,
CLARK MILLS POST, NO. 26, INC.,
Clark Mills, N. Y., May 4, 1950.

Hon. HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
Senator from New York State,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LEHMAN: At our regular meeting held on May 1, 1950, at Memorial Hall, Clark Mills, N. Y., the following resolution was adopted:

"Whereas the best interests of national economy and defense would be served by moving the Watson Laboratories from Eatontown, N. J., to Griffiss Air Force base at Rome, N. Y.; and

"Whereas nearly 1,000 veterans, most of whom have purchased homes and have families in this area, would be seeking employment on an overcrowded labor market in the event this move is not effected: Therefore be it

"*Resolved,* That the Clark Mills American Legion Post, No. 26, go on record as favoring this move; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That a copy of this resolution be sent to our two United States Senators and our local United States Congressman, and that said Senators and Representative be and are hereby respectfully requested to use every effort at their command to have this move effected."

Very truly yours,
EDWARD J. SPELLMAN,
Commander.

[From the Rome (N. Y.) Daily Sentinel of Apr. 29, 1950]

FOSTER URGES LAB TRANSFER IN NATION-WIDE BROADCAST

The Watson Laboratories transfer situation was carried to millions of listeners yesterday over the Nation-wide hookup of the Mutual Broadcasting System.

In his 1 p. m. broadcast, Cedric Foster, Mutual news commentator, speaking from WKAL, said a tour of Griffiss Air Force Base "left no doubt in my mind as to why Watson Laboratories should be moved from New Jersey to this upstate New York city. * * * In the interest of economy and efficiency it is the logical thing to do."

TOURED BASE

Mr. Foster told his listeners from coast to coast:

"Here in Rome, N. Y., I visited Griffiss Air Force Base, which is one of the outstanding Air Force bases in the world, in a tour of inspection which left no doubt in my mind as to why Watson Laboratories should be moved from New Jersey to this up-State New York city.

"Griffiss Air Force Base was originally constructed as an aircraft maintenance and supply depot at a cost of about $36,000,000. The replacement cost is estimated at sixty-six million.

"The base comprises an area of five square miles. The buildings are of permanent construction and they are in excellent condition. They are air conditioned, centrally heated, and extremely well lighted. They are surrounded by excellent concrete highways and the base is amply served with rail and truck terminals.

IN POOR BUILDINGS

"In addition to this, the base has a first class airport with runways and aprons. The air base is complete with administration building, signal tower, hangars which can be used in connection with the type of work done at Watson Laboratories. The hangars are right now being used and they are housing the experimental type of aircraft which are necessary to the work of the Watson Laboratories which are in New Jersey.

"The Watson Laboratories in Eatontown, N. J., are housed in temporary quarters built during the last war, made out of wood siding and tar paper construction. There is no landing strip at the Watson Laboratories so you have to drive 40 miles to McGuire Air Force Base * * * if you want to engage in active test work.

"It is no wonder the majority report of the House Armed Services Subcommittee recommended that Watson Laboratries be moved to the Griffiss Air Force Base here in Rome, N. Y.

"In the interest of economy and efficiency it is the logical thing to do.

"What will be the work that is done here * * * electronics. At this magnificent field the Air Force can concentrate its electronics experimentation work and it is to be hoped that the Congress will see to it that this work is carried out at Rome, N. Y."

FOSTER AIRS WATSON SITUATION

Cedric Foster told his Mutual Broadcasting System listeners from coast to coast yesterday the Air Force should be permitted to transfer Watson Laboratories to Griffiss Air Force Base at Rome.

Mr. Foster is a news commentator who knows from personal knowledge the dangers that face this country. He is an impartial observer in this Watson controversy. His only interest here is in the welfare of his country.

His opinion coincides with the judgment of the Air Force and the majority report of the House Armed Services Commitee, which made a full investigation of Air Force plans. Mr. Foster's opinion is not based on sectional prejudice or selfish interest.

The only consideration in this Watson transfer situation must be that of national defense, economy, and efficiency. The Air Force must not be handcuffed by localized pressure so as not to be able to accomplish its mission—the defense of the United States.

Two Worlds?—Or One? Or None

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Two Worlds?—Or One? Or None," by Betty Knowles Hunt, which appeared in the New Hampshire Morning Union of May 13, 1950. This article deserves the thoughtful reading of every American.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWO WORLDS?—OR ONE?—OR NONE

(By Betty Knowles Hunt)

Herbert Hoover has taken a cold sober look at our globe, and noted that we do not have one world, but at least two, and that these two are utterly and hopelessly incompatible. Most of us agree with him, but somehow, it is disturbing to hear it said right out loud. So we pretend that the one world of our balmy, wartime marriage to the Soviet Union still exists. To be sure, every speech and act on both sides advertises our mutual hatred. We shout and scream and shake our fists. We have discarded our Cupid's arrows for planes and bombs, and each of us watches the other with undisguised antagonism.

But when Herbert Hoover calmly suggests a clean-cut divorce, our leading spokesmen shudder and sputter in alarm. They insist that we must keep up the pretence of this mock-marriage at any cost, and that we must preserve the fictional One World United Nations no matter how futile it is. If Russia blocks all constructive action by vote, or walks out whenever she is outvoted, then we

must dicker and compromise, wheedle and bribe, and otherwise beg her to rejoin a family in which she does not belong.

If children acted like this, we would think they were idiots. If the neighborhood bully persisted in heaving insults and rocks at the other kids, and stalked out of the yard when they demanded he quit, would we expect the kids to plead with him to please come back and play some more? We would not. But isn't that exactly what we keep on doing with Russia?

What solitary shred of evidence is there that the Soviet Communists will discard their inhuman slave system, or desist from trying to impose it upon the rest of the world by deceit, infiltration and force? What solitary shred of evidence is there that they will ever have the slightest regard for liberty, decency, or human dignity? What solitary shred of evidence is there that they would keep a promise, even if we could persuade them to make a new one? And if there is no evidence of these things, then what sense is there in more debates, or negotiations or treaties between us and them?

Since VE-day, Russia has gained control over 4,197,340 human beings. As Jan Ciechanowski, former Polish Ambassador, says:

"Surely there is no chance of any participation by the United States and its allies in the organization of the Sovietized portion of the globe. * * * Why then should the United States and its allies continue to invite and urge totalitarian Communist Russia to participate in organizing what still remains of a free and democratic world merely for the sake of keeping up the pretence of a one-world UN?"

Our diplomats are imprisoned, our citizens are convicted of phony crimes, our property is confiscated, our unarmed fliers are shot down in neutral territory, and a once-proud America is reduced to sending futile notes of protest, knowing in advance that they will only be ridiculed and ignored.

Herbert Hoover is right. We must face the obvious realities of the world as it is. To all those who frantically shout: "It will mean war," I can only ask: "Can an impotent UN guarantee peace?" Besides, it is already war, and people have died and are dying in it. To those who crave peace at any price, I can only say: "The issue is far greater than peace or war, the issue is liberty or slavery, human decency or human degradation."

I have three little girls, 9, 7, and 6 years old. A war with atom bombs, which might obliterate the lives of these three innocent, beloved children, is so ghastly as to be unthinkable to me. And yet, even this is preferable to seeing them become the living slaves of anything so beastly and godless as Soviet communism.

I love life, but I would rather die fighting for the things in which I believe, than to trade them for peace without liberty or justice. I love America, and all it has been and still hopes to be, but I would rather see America wiped out in a noble and honest defense of its ideals, than to see it grovel and sell its soul for mere existence.

The lights of hope are going out all over the world. China and half of Europe are already lost. Next on the Soviet schedule are Germany, Indochina, Burma, Formosa, Japan, India, the Philippines. Does anybody know what we intend to do—or when—or how? And isn't it about time we did know?

Or will we just go on shouting peace, when there is no peace, and playing the game of United Nations, where there are only disunited nations?

Flood Control, Irrigation, and Power Projects in Oklahoma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER THOMAS

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement relating to flood control, irrigation, and power projects in the State of Oklahoma.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Statement relating to the present status of flood control, power, irrigation, domestic and industrial water-supply projects located in the State of Oklahoma

Project	County	Purpose	Status	Cost
1. Pensacola	Delaware and Ottawa	Hydroelectric power and flood control	Completed and in operation	$22,000,000
2. Markham Ferry	Mayes	do	Now being surveyed	[1] 37,100,000
3. Fort Gibson	Muskogee and Wagoner	Flood control and hydroelectric power	Practically completed	49,900,000
4. Webbers Falls	Muskogee	do	Now being surveyed	[2]
5. Tenkiller Ferry	Sequoyah and Cherokee	do	75 percent completed	24,250,000
6. Short Mountain	Sequoyah and Haskell	do	Now being surveyed	[2]
7. Eufaula	McIntosh and Pittsburg	do	Survey practically completed	[1] 130,000,000
8. Denison	Red River between Oklahoma and Texas.	do	Completed and in operation	61,595,000
9. Oologah	Rogers and Nowata	Flood control	Now under construction	38,760,000
10. Keystone	Tulsa, Creek, Pawnee, Osage	Flood control, hydroelectric, domestic and industrial water supplies.	Now being surveyed	89,500,000
11. Hulah	Osage	Flood control	Completed	12,226,000
12. Heyburn	Creek	do	do	2,830,000
13. Wister	LeFlore	do	do	11,055,000
14. Hugo	Choctaw	do	Authorized but not completely surveyed.	[2]
15. Boswell	do	do	Survey being completed	[1] 21,300,000
16. Tupelo	Coal	do	Authorized—survey incomplete	[2]
17. Great Salt Plains	Alfalfa	do	Completed	4,842,000
18. Optima	Texas	Flood control and irrigation	Survey being completed	[1] 18,540,000
19. Fort Supply	Woodward	Flood control	Completed	7,535,500
20. Canton	Blaine	Flood control, irrigation, and domestic water supply.	do	10,000,000
21. Cobb	Caddo	Flood control and irrigation	Survey practically completed	[2]
22. Mountain Park	Kiowa	Irrigation, flood control, and water supplies.	Being surveyed	[2]
23. Castaneda	Cimarron	Irrigation	do	[2]
24. W. C. Austin	Jackson	Irrigation, flood control, water supplies.	Completed	13,205,000
25. Mangum	Greer	Flood control and irrigation	Being surveyed	[2]
26. Englewood	Harper and Beaver	Irrigation and flood control	do	[2]
27. Foss	Custer	do	do	[2]
28. Union City	Grady and Canadian	Flood control, irrigation, and water supplies.	do	[2]
29. Bradens Bend	Sequoyah	Protect river bank	Money being appropriated	1,421,000
30. Kaw		do	do	252,400
31. Oklahoma City floodway	Oklahoma	Flood control	Construction authorized and appropriation made to start work:	
			Federal	10,460,000
			Oklahoma City	6,000,000
32. Sand Springs levee	Tulsa	do	Work completed	6,000,000
33. Jenks	do	do	Project completed	•
34. Bixby	do	do	Being surveyed	[2]
35. Cherokee	Alfalfa	do	Ready for construction	[2]
36. Kingfisher	Kingfisher	do	Project being surveyed	[2]
37. Pauls Valley	Garvin	do	do	[2]
38. Little River	Cleveland, Seminole, Hughes	do	Project under consideration	[2]

[1] Estimated.

[2] Not yet determined.

[3] No money appropriated.

To complete the program for flood control, hydroelectric, irrigation, domestic and industrial water-supply projects will cost a total of some $500,000,000.

To date the Congress has appropriated and expended over $225,000,000 toward the construction of the several projects as itemized above.

To finish the program it will require additional appropriations in the sum of approximately $275,000,000.

At the present rate of construction, it will require some 15 years to complete the program.

Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Mr. Murray Kempton which appeared in the New York Post of May 8, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWUA IGNORES RIGHTS BARRIERS

(By Murray Kempton)

BOSTON, May 8.—Very few major unions hold conventions these days without passing a resolution to support the President's civil-rights program.

The CIO Textile Workers passed one here last week, but before they were finished it had become an action that was a little more than routine.

No other union of substance has to be quite so concerned with the mores of the South as the textile workers must. The South is an occupied country they have to conquer. It has 625,000 nonunionized textile hands, a figure larger than the union's entire membership. And most of them are white.

A convention committee drew up a resolution pledging the union's support to a fair employment practices act, an anti-lynching law, and repeal of the poll tax.

Sol Stetin, a TWUA vice president, presented the resolution in a speech fully conscious of the democratic verities. But Stetin is from Pennsylvania, and what he said was hardly unexpected.

Then to protest there rose up Ed Kirkland, of Columbia, S. C., who said that the CIO's stand on Negro rights was its major handicap in the South. So far as he and his local were concerned, he declared, even if an FEPC law were passed, "where I come from, we would probably defy the law."

When Kirkland was finished, there was a slightly embarrassed silence as TWUA President Emil Rieve recognized "Delegate No. 2."

Delegate No. 2 was as southern as Kirkland. He was C. L. Ross, of Rome, Ga., and his speech was very short. Ross admitted that civil rights were a controversial issue in his part of the country and that some southerners might defy any law that was passed to assure them.

"But the things that bring that about," said Ross, "are not going to be corrected by overlooking them. There will be some type of battle from now on until we see workers all over the Nation treated the same.

"As a member of the Textile Workers Union interested in organization, I feel that certainly this body owes a vote of thanks to the colored people in the South. Every time a ballot is taken for a union or no union you can count on the colored vote before it starts. They're solid.

"It would be well for all of us to recognize that those who have the least—those who need help the worst—are those who have the right to our first consideration."

Rieve spoke next and said that if the union had to organize the South "at the expense of humanity," then "I don't want that type of organization."

Then George Baldanzi, TWUA's executive vice president and director of the CIO's southern drive, spoke for the resolution and the southerners came back.

Lloyd Gossett, of Atlanta—yes; Atlanta—got up to say, "Let's practice this resolution and put it into effect."

C. M. King, of Rome, Ga., rose and said:

"The children, if they are not taught, would not feel any racial differences. I see white boys and Negro boys in Rome, Ga., playing football together, but we have laws and until those are broken down there is nothing we can do about it. We must all resolve in our hearts to support this type of resolution—this type of legislation."

Howard Robinson, of Danville, Va., told how he was raised in a county where no Negroes were allowed to live. Then he went in the Army and lived with Negro troops.

"And I found out that they're good. They're as good as I am or anyone. The only thing is they've got to have equal rights."

When he had finished, the civil-rights resolution was adopted without dissent.

That was Rome, Ga., and Atlanta and Danville talking. The next time anyone argues that any part of the country isn't just a little better because there's a union there just tell him that story.

International Affairs Platform of the American Veterans Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM BENTON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the international affairs platform of the American Veterans Committee. I call attention particularly to the section headed "Free flow of information," which supports point No. 1 in Senate Resolution 243 calling for a Marshall plan in the field of ideas. Point 1 calls for maintenance, through the United Nations and through our own diplomacy, of a steady and steadily increasing pressure in behalf of world-wide freedom of information.

There being no objection, the platform was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS PLATFORM

PREAMBLE

We of the American Veterans Committee believe in the coming victory of world democracy.

We believe that world democracy can and must be established without world war.

We believe that the way to resolve conflicts is to promote economic, social, and political democracy throughout the world.

In holding these beliefs, we support the following basic principles:

STRENGTHENING WORLD ECONOMY

A continuously rising standard of living among all peoples is the best means to world democracy. It demands these actions of America:

Carrying out the European recovery program in full and without reductions, provided it not be used as a coercive measure to direct the political or economic character of the recipient nations.

Expanding point 4 into a major program of technical assistance including public and private investment in underdeveloped areas, chiefly through the United Nations.

Increasing American imports by cutting tariffs and extending the reciprocal trade program.

Integrating the economics of the democratic nations through greater freedom of exchanges, investment, and immigration, and expanding world trade with all nations.

STRENGTHENING WORLD DEMOCRACY

The survival of the democratic nations depends upon an ever-increasing degree of cooperation. This cooperation demands of the United States:

Encouragement of European federation.

Encouragement and support of democratic forces throughout the world.

STRENGTHENING WORLD SECURITY

Negotiations with Russia, directly or through the United Nations, to prevent an uncontrollable armaments race are imperative. Nevertheless, action for adequate defense of the United States and other democracies should continue to the extent that such negotiations do not succeed. This policy requires:

Negotiation with Russia, directly or through the United Nations, on the basis of equality, to secure a convention outlawing the use of atomic weapons, and the creation of effective world control of atomic energy and weapons of war. The preparation and implementation of a unified strategy for the common defense of the democracies.

STRENGTHENING WORLD ORGANIZATION

We reaffirm our conviction that lasting peace in the world can be achieved only through the establishment of a genuine federal world government, and we continue to work for the development of such a world government. However, until the establishment of such a world government, the United Nations Charter is the one code of international conduct that all nations must recognize.

The well-being and growth of the United Nations require:

Full United States support of the United Nations as the invaluable meeting ground where conflicts can be resolved without resort to force.

Full United States support of the subsidiary organizations of the United Nations.

The creation of a United Nations police force.

Revision of the veto power, looking toward its eventual abolition.

RESOLUTIONS

North Atlantic Pact

We endorse the North Atlantic Pact.

We believe it to be a necessary adjunct to the Marshall plan and to the movement for the unification of Europe. We urge that the pact be administered democratically and that all Fascist elements, such as Franco Spain, be kept out. We deplore the inclusion of Fascist Portugal.

Atomic energy

Negotiations for the international control of atomic energy have been at an impasse for 3 years. The UN majority proposal, which we have consistently supported, cannot gain political acceptance in the world as now constituted. We therefore call upon President Truman to create a new commission with the broadest terms of reference to reexamine the American position in the light of the present deadlock.

We endorse the efforts of General Romulo and the smaller nations in the UN to effect a truce in the atomic armaments race. We urge that negotiations be undertaken in the United Nations to reach an acceptable compromise agreement.

Germany

The problem of Germany can be fully solved only in the ultimate integration of Germany into a peaceful Europe. The economy of Germany must be exploited in the interests of the general economic development of Europe as a whole. Germany must remain unarmed. We disapprove of the armies of German police maintained by the Soviet Union as we would disapprove any plan for the use of Germans in the western zone as mercenaries.

We further recognize the importance of giving encouragement to those democratic elements in Germany upon which the future of freedom in Germany and perhaps of the world depends.

We urge Congress to make a complete and thorough investigation of the present denazification and decartelization in Germany and to make public all reports of such investigations, and to correct any attempts to weaken the original intentions of the Potsdam agreement in this regard.

China

If in fact the Communist regime is the Government of China, we urge recognition of that Government and the establishment of normal trade relations. We take this stand not because we condone the armed seizure of power by the Communists, but because we believe that in the long run our most effective method of helping the truly democratic forces in China is by showing our good faith to all of its Chinese people.

International resources development (the point 4 program)

We endorse the concept of international resources development, through the United Nations, and we call upon the United States Government to draft plans for both a large-scale program of technological aid and public investment in the under-developed areas. Four principles must be borne in mind in preparing the program.

1. Scope: The contemplated program must be world-wide, geared to the needs of the under-developed areas, and must concern itself with the further development of the United States.

2. Relation to the two-power blocs: The program cannot succeed if it becomes merely another instrument in the existing negative power struggle. Work undertaken in the under-developed areas, especially in Asia, must not be controlled by considerations rising out of the European cold-war alliance. The success of the program as a whole will be dependent largely upon its adoption being coincident with a conscious shift of emphasis in present United States foreign policy.

3. Channeling of the program: The program cannot be planned or permitted to develop through uncoordinated private initiative. It should be channeled through the United Nations.

4. Method of financing the program: Germinal funds for carrying out the program must be public funds. Public investment will stimulate and provide the atmosphere for private investment. Such private investment, however, must also not be permitted to create social, economic, or political conditions which run counter to the over-all cooperative plan or to the interests of the peoples concerned. The same safeguards, of course, must apply to public investment as well.

Spain

The concepts of justice, human dignity, and freedom are utterly rejected by Franco Spain. Franco's government is economically, socially, politically, and morally bankrupt. The constitution of Franco Spain specifically prohibits the introduction of democratic rights and procedures in Spain.

All efforts to come to terms with Franco for reasons of military advantage or private profit will be interpreted as an abandonment of western Europe and a betrayal of democratic principles. We deplore the actions of Americans who advance Franco's cause. We applaud our Government for refusing to grant public loans to Franco and for opposing his efforts to gain admission to the specialized agencies of the United Nations, but urge that it also oppose the granting to Spain of private loans. We urge on our Government a policy of no retreat in insisting on friendship only with a democratic Spain.

Israel

We believe that as a prerequisite to any permanent settlement of the outstanding differences between the State of Israel and the Arab countries of the Middle East, the United States and the United Nations should provide technical and financial assistance to the peoples of Israel and to the other countries of the Middle East.

We call on the United States Government to reject the proposed plan of the United Nations Palestine conciliation commission which would cut off Jerusalem from the State of Israel as being impractical, totally unjust, and as endangering the security of the State of Israel, the only democratic bastion in the Middle East.

We recommend the preservation of the international character of the holy places in Jerusalem by placing them under the supervision of the United Nations with the necessary agreement and cooperation of the State of Israel.

We recognize both the urgent problem of the displaced Arab population of Palestine and also the dangerously serious problem facing the State of Israel by forcing upon it large numbers of these refugees. We therefore recommend that the United States Government support, as just and reasonable, the present offer of the government of Israel to settle the refugee problem.

We call on the United States Government to oppose any move intended to alter the present boundaries of Israel.

Free flow of information

A free flow of information among the people of the world is requisite to the competition of ideas in the market-place of thought and thus to the possibility of human growth. We therefore urge the United States to use all powers at its dispcsal to facilitate the unimpeded movement of ideas expressed through the press, radio and movies, and unhampered travel and access to information of writers and journalists.

Human rights

We reaffirm our opposition to totalitarianism in any form, whether of the left or of the right. We urge United States support, consistent with the United Nations charter, of policies toward each country which will help to maintain or bring about a genuinely democratic government.

We believe that the dignity, freedom, and equality of the individual are the foundations of democracy. This concept is of universal application and we condemn any violation of it whether in the form of religious or racial discrimination in this country, or political, ethnical, or class suppression in others.

We support the universal declaration of human rights and accept it as a standard to judge every government's relations toward its people. We condemn the use of forced labor and the class and religious persecution now being carried out by several eastern European governments in violation of their solemn, international obligations.

We urge prompt Senate ratification of the United Nations covenant on genocide and of the proposed United Nations covenant on human rights, and we urge prompt enactment of effective legislation to implement these covenants and to secure to all persons under the jurisdiction of the United States the realization of the rights contained therein.

Japan

To achieve a democratic Japan, we advocate:

1. Continued vigorous implementation of the 1946 land-reform program.

2. Nationalization of the heavy industries formerly controlled by the Zaibatzu.

3. Complete support of a democratic labor policy which will embrace collective bargaining including the rights of all labor and government employees alike.

4. More emphasis on the functions of the allied council for Japan.

5. The maintenance of the demilitarized status of Japan.

6. The making of a peace treaty with Japan which will assure a democratic political system and the perpetuation of the Japanese constitutional reununciation of war as an instrument of national policy.

7. The substitution in the occupation of civilian for military control.

Colonial peoples

We urge immediate political emancipation of colonial peoples.

UN trusteeship affords opportunity for such emancipation.

We urge such trusteeships until the time when these colonial peoples choose for themselves the manner in which they wish to govern themselves.

Adopted by fourth annual convention, Chicago, Ill., November 1949.

The St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement prepared by me relating to the proposed St. Lawrence seaway, a statement by Mr. George M. Humphrey, president of the M. A. Hanna Co., on the need of the American steel industry for new sources of iron ore, an editorial from the April 1950 issue of Great Lakes Outlook, and a list of American leaders who serve in the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Association.

There being no objection, Mr. WILEY'S statement and the other material were

ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FAILURE TO PASS ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY LEGISLATION IS A DISGRACE, OUTRAGE, AND INSULT TO AMERICA

(Statement by Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin)

Mr. President, I should like to state that the failure of this Congress and of previous Congresses to ratify St. Lawrence seaway legislation is a national disgrace, outrage, and insult to the American people. The ability of a sinister combination of blind, selfish, obstructionist interests to sabotage this legislation is a shocking commentary on the congressional process. The refusal of other areas of our Nation to recognize the legitimate interests of the 50,000,000 people in the valley of the Great Lakes—this refusal is one of the most colossal, selfish, and unfair attitudes ever adopted by other sections of the Nation toward one particular geographic region.

Mr. President, the Middle West has always battled for the Great Lakes waterway because it knew that its economic future depends on the seaway. But it knew that far more important than its interests alone were the national interests involved.

The Middle Western States have always been lax and apathetic in organizing for their own self-interest, while other States of the Nation—the Mississippi Valley States and other geographic units—have zealously organized to secure billions of dollars of appropriations for their area. I am not, of course, suggesting that the Middle West organize for a raid on the Treasury. I would fight against such a move with all the power at my command, but I do issue an appeal to every governor, every legislator, every trade association, every chamber of commerce, every union, every veterans' organization, every farm group, every women's group in the Middle West to mobilize together in a midwestern regional council to battle for the national interest and for the consistent regional interest in a project such as the St. Lawrence seaway.

This waterway will not cost the American taxpayer a single red cent. It is self-liquidating through ship tolls and power revenue. The Northeast is starving for electricity. The Middle West is starving for expanded commercial traffic with the deep-water ports of the world. The Middle West must organize, organize, organize, if we are to avoid the continued rebuffs by a disinterested Congress.

All of us, Mr. President, must share the blame in this staggering defeat of the national interest which is involved in the failure to ratify the seaway resolution. Those of us who are proponents of the bill have not done all that we could to mobilize sentiment in the Senate and House. Those who are opponents of the bill will, I believe, receive a verdict from history of colossal and monumental negligence in meeting a national need.

Blame must also be shared by the executive agencies of the administration. It is a bitter fact that the State Department, the Department of Commerce, the Maritime Commission and other agencies which bat 100 percent in requesting the passage of certain bills in the Congress which are in turn almost immediately passed invariably—that these agencies should somehow be so unsuccessful when they appeal for the seaway. I say, Mr. President, that these agencies are either not trying and are pulling the wool over the eyes of the American people, or the personnel which they have assigned to the seaway are horribly inefficient. Whichever of these alternatives is true, I say the time has come to correct that situation. If the administration actively believes in President Truman's endorsement of the seaway, then it is up to the administration to show the goods. Moreover, I say very frankly to my own Republican party that while this is a nonpartisan issue, the effects of continued failure on the part of certain Republicans to recognize an historic fact is proving of serious disadvantage to the party's interest. I think that my party, generally speaking, has a splendid record in promoting the waterway, but it too must share a part of the collective blame.

I do not want to point an accusing finger but it is merely citing a fact when I state that the business groups of America have not united, the labor groups have not united, in promoting the seaway. Fortunately, the great farm organizations of America have a splendid record of unity and cooperation for the seaway.

Now, Mr. President, I do not mention this as a mere academic matter. I have in my hand a brilliant statement by one of the great industrial leaders of our country, Mr. George M. Humphrey, president of the M. A. Hanna Co., on the subject of the imperative need of the American steel industry for new sources of iron ore. This statement has together with it certain maps which I wish could be reproduced in the RECORD, but even though we are unable to do so, I think that the clarion facts presented in this statement will be of tremendous interest to the Nation. I ask unanimous consent therefore that the text of Mr. Humphrey's comments be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed with that statement a hard-hitting editorial published in the April 1950 issue of the Great Lakes Outlook, published by the Great Lakes Harbor Association, and edited by one of the most outstanding port authorities in the United States, Mr. Harry Brock of Milwaukee, and that there be appended to it a list of some of the great American leaders who serve in the Great Lakes–St. Lawrence Association, located in the Mayflower Building, Washington 6, D. C., which is spear-heading the fight for the seaway. This group, composed of leaders in both political parties, bespeaks the eloquent support of the seaway among all segments of our society.

The iron ore statement by Mr. Humphrey supplements the comments I made on the national defense aspects of this situation in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 16, 1950.

NEW SOURCES OF IRON ORE FOR THE AMERICAN STEEL INDUSTRY

(Statement by George M. Humphrey, president of the M. A. Hanna Co., on iron ore reserves, benefication, new discoveries in Labrador and Venezuela, the St. Lawrence waterway, and the national defense.)

About 75 percent of the blast furnace capacity of the steel industry of the United States lies within the area from Buffalo and Pittsburgh on the east through Ohio and Indiana to Chicago on the west. This area is the center of the greatest manufacturing region in the world, which lives on steel as its principal raw material.

The principal raw material of the steel industry, in turn, is iron ore—a ton of ore for every ton of steel produced. The steel industry of this region gets more than 95 percent of its iron ore from the ranges of the Lake Superior district, from which 2,500,000,000 tons have been mined and shipped.

We have already entered the period when the steel industry serving this great manufacturing area can no longer look solely to iron ore from the Lake Superior district for its ore supply, and thus cannot continue to fill the ever-expanding requirements for steel unless new low cost sources of iron ore can be developed.

The great ranges of the Lake Superior district have already passed their prime. Their total reserves are variously estimated at from 1,300,000,000 to 1,600,000,000 tons as against 2,500,000,000 tons already shipped. Annual shipments reached a peak of 93,000,000 tons during the war, and average more than 74,000,000 tons a year from 1946 through 1949.

Even these over-all figures do not tell the whole story. The backbone of the Lake Superior ore supply has in the past been the open-pit ore found mainly on the Mesabi range in Minnesota—ore that could be stripped and mined by power shovels. Today the open-pit reserves of Minnesota are 584,000,000 tons, according to the records of the Minnesota department of taxation. Five hundred and eighty-seven million tons of open-pit ore have been shipped from the district since January 1, 1940, and shipments from open-pit mines are continuing at the rate of 50 to 60 million tons a year. New discoveries and process improvements will probably substantially increase ultimate recoveries of open-pit ore over present estimates. Even allowing for these factors, however, it is certain that the open-pit reserves of the district will continue to decline.

This situation is not new. It has been foreseen for years by those in the steel and ore business, and they have been engaged in seeking solutions for it along two main lines—beneficiation of lower and lower grades of iron-bearing material, and world-wide search for high-grade ore. Although the M. A. Hanna Co. and its associates have substantial reserves in the Lake Superior district, we have been active for years both in research for improved beneficiation and in the search for new sources of ore. We now operate fifteen beneficiation plants employing every presently known commercial process, and are constantly engaged in advanced research in our laboratories to discover new methods of beneficiation. We have also actively participated in the far-flung search for new sources of iron ore.

Beneficiation: Many methods of beneficiating lower-grade ores are now in operation. There are in the Lake Superior district large reserves of taconite, which cannot yet be commercially used in steel production. Research on taconite, in which we are participating and which we think is vital, has been going forward for a number of years and will ultimately, we believe, be commercially productive. However, the processes required are costly and will require expensive beneficiation plants, now estimated to cost from $10 to more than $20 per ton of annual productive capacity. It is highly desirable that these experiments be continued; but the most optimistic estimate from informed sources now is that, in the normal course of development, production of ore from taconite will not exceed 10,000,000 tons per year by 1960. Other estimates are considerably lower. Nothing indicates that the requirements of the ever-expanding steel industry can possibly be met by beneficiating the taconites of the Lake Superior district.

Other sources of ore: On the North American Continent several deposits outside the Lake Superior district have been known for many years: in Newfoundland, where the lower grade Wabana ore extends out under the sea; in the Adirondacks, where about 2,500,000 tons a year are beneficiated to usable form; in northern New Jersey and Pennsylvania, which produce about one and a half million tons a year; in Alabama, where lower grade deposits can be locally used; relatively small or lower grade deposits in Texas, Missouri, southern California, Colorado, and Utah; and possible showings in Mexico which so far have not been commercially developed. These deposits, however, all involve either physical or commercial complications which make it desirable to have some better source to fill a gap created by a decline in shipments from the Lake Superior district.

Outside North America and available for shipment to this country in relatively limited tonnages, there is ore from Sweden, Chile, northern Africa, and Cuba. Brazil is known to have large reserves, and there are other large reserves in even more remote locations; but commercial and transportation problems have so far prevented their development on any substantial scale.

Exploration for new ore reserves is a tedious and costly job, in which success comes only to a few. All the work and all the money expended over the last several years have so far developed only two new major sources of ore supply: one on this continent, in Labrador and Quebec; and the other in Venezuela.

In Venezuela United States Steel Corp. has announced the discovery of new ore deposits, where it is said that by early 1949 about half a billion tons had been proved by drilling. Bethlehem is opening a smaller deposit not far away, and Hanna has concessions adjacent to those of Bethlehem discovered nearly 20 years ago.

In Labrador and Quebec, the Hollinger interests of Canada and Hanna had by the end of 1949 proved, by drilling, reserves of over 350,000,000 tons of open-pit ore, 10 percent higher in grade than standard ores now being shipped from the Mesabi. Only a small fraction of the area has yet been explored. Recently a group of midwestern steel companies, including Armco, National, Republic, Wheeling, and Youngstown Sheet & Tube, have joined in further exploring this region and preparing for commercial production. An initial production of 10,000,000 tons per year is planned.

Both the Labrador and the Venezuelan ores are adequate in quantity and quality to serve as substantial supplementary sources to the steel industry of this country as shipments from the Lake Superior district decline. The main problem for both of them is transportation to the mills where steel is now made.

TRANSPORTATION

It is 2,206 statute miles from Trinidad to Baltimore, and 2,229 miles from Trinidad to Philadelphia. It is clear that Venezuelan ore will be cheaper at seaboard ports than if delivered by rail to inland steel plants. United States Steel Corp. has recently announced the acquisition of a site for a steel plant on the Delaware River near Trenton.

Seven Islands, the St. Lawrence port for Labrador ore, is not as far as Trinidad is from these coastal ports, being 1,550 statute miles from Baltimore and 1,366 miles from Philadelphia. In the other direction, however, via the St. Lawrence and the Great Lake, Labrador ore is only a little farther than Lake Superior ore, in terms of water transportation distance, from the steel mills of the central region running west from Pittsburgh and Buffalo. The map indicates that the port of Ashtabula, Ohio, is 876 miles from Duluth and 952 miles from Seven Islands. The St. Lawrence trip can be made at present through a canal system accommodating boats of only 14-foot draft, which substantially limits the tonnage of iron ore that can now move over this route. However, the entire route is now available for use by the largest lake ships except for a distance of about 100 miles just west of Montreal. If the St. Lawrence seaway at this point is completed to a channel depth of 27 feet, any of the boats of the present Great Lakes ore fleet could go to Seven Islands and return, taking any required quantity of Labrador and Quebec ore to Lake Erie ports, from which it would move to the mills of the central steel-producing area over the same loading facilities and railroads that are now handling ore from the Lake Superior district.

There are two other routes by which Labrador ore could move to the central consuming region.

The first is from Seven Islands by ocean freighter to an Atlantic seaboard port such as Baltimore or Philadelphia, and thence inland by rail. The water distance from Seven Islands to Baltimore is 1,550 statute miles, and to Philadelphia is 1,366 miles, as compared with the Seven Islands-Ashtabula distance of 952 miles. Because the sea voyage would be made at higher speeds in larger boats, the cost per ton of transporting ore from Seven Islands to Atlantic ports should not greatly differ from the cost of transportation from Seven Islands to Ashtabula.

From the standpoint of the blast furnaces located directly on the lakes, which had a 1948 capacity to melt 19.9 million tons of iron ore, the seaway route would deliver ore directly to their docks, whereas the ocean route would involve an additional rail haul of from 430 miles (from Baltimore to Erie, Pa.) to more than 625 miles (from Baltimore to Detroit). This same rail haul would be required for Venezuelan ore.

For furnaces located in the valley district, with a 1948 capacity to melt 13.5 million tons, the seaway route would require a rail haul of about 70 miles (Cleveland or Ashtabula to Youngstown), whereas the rail haul from Baltimore to Youngstown is about 400 miles.

For furnaces in the southern Ohio district, with a 1948 capacity of 3,000,000 tons of ore, the seaway route would require a rail haul of from 180 to 250 miles, as against a rail haul of 450 to 580 miles from Baltimore.

To the Pittsburgh district, with a 1948 capacity of 27,000,000 tons of ore, the rail haul from Lake ports is 126 miles, and from Baltimore it is 328 miles. To eastern points, both Labrador and Venezuelan ore will move cheaply via seaboard ports.

The other route is from Seven Islands to Montreal (a distance of 484 miles) by water and thence by rail to consuming centers. The rail haul required by this route is about 700 miles to Pittsburgh and is for the most part the same as that over which beneficiated ore now moves from the Adirondack district.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

The construction of the seaway should also be considered indispensable as a measure of national security and defense, to give access through protected waterways to the only substantial source of high-grade open-pit ore on the North American Continent outside of the Lake Superior district.

In the past, the open-pit ore of the Lake Superior district has been the only reserve from which production could be quickly expanded to meet a national emergency. In a few years (probably not more than five and certainly less than ten) the capacity to expand this open-pit production substantially in an emergency will be greatly curtailed.

Production of the Lake Superior ranges was just over 64,000,000 tons in 1940, of which about 19,000,000 were from underground mines, and about 45,000,000 from open-pit mines, most of it from the Mesabi Range. In 2 years, under the stress of war demand, the total production of the Lake Superior district was raised from 64 to 93 million tons. Ninety percent of this increase, as a matter of necessity, was from open-pit production. Underground mines cannot be quickly expanded; in the peak war year of 1942 they bettered their top peacetime volume by only 3,000,000 tons.

Taconite production, like underground mining, cannot be relied upon to provide the necessary expansion in an emergency even after a successful standardized process has been worked out, because of the tremendous plants and facilities which it requires. To add 20,000,000 tons of capacity would take 2 or 3 years, during which plants would have to be built at a cost of from 200 to 400 million dollars, with all that this implies in consumption of critical materials and manpower during the emergency. Moreover, because three tons of taconite would have to be mined and beneficiated to produce one ton of ore concentrate, actual production requires several times as much manpower as the equivalent open-pit tonnage.

The nearest available deposits in Chile, Venezuela, and Brazil are far away and involve political and transportation problems which may make them again unreliable in time of war, as they quickly proved to be in the last war.

Fortunately, the large reserves now proven in Labrador and Quebec are minable by open-pit methods, so that the presently planned production of 10,000,000 tons per year could quickly be doubled or tripled in an emergency by adding more trucks, shovels, and transportation facilities. However, without the St. Lawrence seaway, most of this ore would have to move by sea more than 1,350 miles through the Gulf of St. Lawrence and the Atlantic Ocean to east-coast ports. With the seaway, all of it could move from Seven Islands westward to Great Lakes ports through what are designated by the military authorities as protected inland waterways.

The comparative cost and burden on the national economy of expanding these two routes in time of war involve a number of factors, some of which are easily evaluated and some of which only the military establishment can appraise.

In peacetime, the transportation of 10,000,000 tons of ore per year from Seven Islands to Baltimore or Philadelphia would require from 10 to 12 oceangoing ore ships of 33,000 tons capacity each. This fleet would have to be doubled or tripled to accommodate a corresponding increase in ore production for an emergency and might have to be still further expanded to allow for convoying and sinkings. The military authorities can best determine the degree of needed expansion and the expense and difficulty of protecting the traffic under wartime conditions.

The added ships to carry larger war-emergency production, and to allow for convoying and attrition, would have to be constructed under wartime conditions, again at the expense of other needs for critical materials, manpower, and seacoast shipyards. On the other hand, if the seaway were then available for use, the present Great Lakes ore fleet, which has carried over 90,000,000 tons of ore in a single season of lake navigation, would be available for carrying Labrador as well as Lake Superior ore. Moreover, shipbuilding facilities of the Great Lakes would be available to supplement the ore fleet. Protection from submarine attack, if required at all, would be limited to a short distance west of Seven Islands, and casualties, if any, would be relatively far less important.

The seaway is obviously the only satisfactory way of assuring in peacetime the major part of our needed wartime expansibility of ore production with the least burden on the wartime economy. The United States share of the cost to complete the navigation facilities for a 27-foot channel is estimated at less than $400,000,000. The seaway will be of major use in peacetime, and with it in existence, expansion of Labrador ore production involves relatively little effort and cost in time of war. To secure equivalent expansibility with taconite means either the construction of stand-by plants costing from $200,000,000 to $400,000,000 which would lie idle except in wartime, or, in the alternative, their construction under wartime conditions with an immense burden to an already overstrained economy. Reliance on ocean transport of Labrador ore would be just as inefficient; it means either a stand-by ocean-going ore fleet almost as expensive as the taconite plants, or the construction of such a fleet under wartime shortages of men, materials, and shipyards, plus in either case a tremendously increased wartime burden on the railroads to transport the ore from seacost ports to steel mills in the Great Lakes basin.

LETTER TO SENATOR WILEY

On February 19, 1949, Mr. Forrestal, then Secretary of Defense, in his published letter to Senator WILEY, referred to the advantages of access through the seaway to Labrador iron ore, which, he said, "may soon be a vital source of iron ore to the Lakes steel industry to supplement or replace in part the ore now being supplied from the rapidly depleting sources in the Lake Superior district." That time is now here.

As President Truman said in his budget message on January 9, 1950:

"I repeat most emphatically my previous recommendations for approval of the St. Lawrence waterway and power project. Authorization of the seaway, with its related power facilities, is a matter of urgency for our peacetime industry and our national security. In particular, each succeeding year reduces further our domestic reserves of iron ore and increases correspondingly the importance of the seaway as a means of economical access to the proven ore deposits in Quebec and Labrador."

[From the Great Lakes Outlook of April 1950]

THE COLD HARD FACTS

Important and possibly revolutionary changes are confronting the steel industry. The facts are that without the St. Lawrence seaway cost of iron ore will be much higher in the Middle West than on the east coast, and, therefore, there will be strong tendency for steel productive facilities to move to the coast. The ultimate effect of this will be to put the Middle West through the same kind of economic squeeze as suffered by New England when the textile mills moved South. This can be prevented by the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and the improvement of Great Lakes harbors for deep-draft navigation.

Why have we not made more progress on getting national approval of the St. Lawrence seaway project? Every time an impartial congressional committee has held hearings on this subject, in 1933, 1941, 1946, and 1947, it has been approved overwhelmingly on its merits. But as soon as the legislation gets to the floor of either Senate or the House all kinds of discredited arguments are made against it; and even though opponents know better, they are forced to vote against the measure because of "home" pressures. These pressures are strongest in the East and South, but they are also present in the Middle West and the Plain and Mountain States of the West. A persuasive case for the seaway has been made effectively in Washington. We have failed to withdraw the opposition, or to counteract it.

The principal opposition to the St. Lawrence seaway and power project comes from the eastern railroads and electric utilities. Starting with this handful of business enterprises, the opposition spreads through affiliated interests in banking, insurance, suppliers, holding companies, and trade associations to all parts of the country.

The result is that whenever the St. Lawrence matter comes before Congress, railroad presidents and workers, coal operators and miners from every district of the country swarm the halls of Congress, buttonholing their Congressmen and Senators. Bankers and chambers of commerce executives from Seattle to Houston, from Los Angeles to Baltimore, write, wire, phone their Congressmen pleading against the project.

As against the Nation-wide organization and personnel and resources of a powerful seaway opposition, the movement for the seaway has been powered almost by a one-cylinder engine with small resources of money and manpower. We have made good use of those limited resources. The seaway has been twice successfully steered through the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. The project has been kept before the public. The seaway has earned the support of many farm and labor organizations, and they have been kept interested, but the seaway movement has lacked sufficient resources to publish literature, to send speakers into the hinterland, and to make new converts.

The seaway project must succeed on its next congressional drive. The southern Democrats, who control the committees of Congress, will take every measure to prevent congressional action in this closing session of the Eighty-first Congress. Our sights must be set on 1951–52. The plans must be drawn now for final victory in the Eighty-second Congress. No effort must be spared to build up public opinion in the crucial States which will decide the destiny of the project.

Public opinion throughout the United States and Canada is overwhelmingly in favor of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. President Truman and high leaders of both political parties have repeatedly urged the project upon Congress. Insofar as the President is concerned, his vigorous endorsement of the seaway project is being sabotaged by members of his own party. The vast ground swell of American public opinion for the seaway is being thwarted by a small but well-financed opposition. The friends of the seaway must marshal their vast resources in the way of public opinion, press support, and legislative leadership to a degree sufficient to swamp the opposition. Public opinion inevitably prevails in a democracy.

It has many times been said that the St. Lawrence seaway project is an inevitable fact of geography. Even the enemies of the project are beginning to concede its inevitability. The Workboat magazine, mouthpiece for the inland waterway interests of the Mississippi Valley recently warned its readers that, "the St. Lawrence * * * ultimately will be carried through; it will be just too hard to kill in the long run." The Workboat advised its readers to plan quietly and thoroughly as to what may be done after the seaway down the St. Lawrence is finally approved and in operation; the thought may not be pleasant, but some timely planning at the present may more than make up for that ultimate defeat.

We are glad to have the assurance of the Workboat that the seaway must inevitably be built. As to the Workboat's thought that this happy event may have unpleasant consequences for the Mississippi Valley, we hasten to reassure the Workboat's editor and the entire Mississippi Valley that the St. Lawrence seaway can have nothing but the most pleasant and beneficial consequences for the Great Lakes region, the Mississippi Valley, and all of the United States and Canada.

GREAT LAKES-ST. LAWRENCE ASSOCIATION, MAYFLOWER OFFICE BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Executive committee: Lewis G. Castle, chairman; Julius H. Barnes; F. Hugh Burns; Walter Olen; N. R. Danielian.

Committee on the treasury: Walter Olen, chairman; Henry Laliberte; Foster Winter.

Directors: Julius H. Barnes, chairman of the board, Klearflax Linen Looms, Inc., Duluth, Minn.; Harry Brockel, director, Port of Milwaukee Commission, Milwaukee, Wis.; F. Hugh Burns, director, Northern Federation of Chambers of Commerce, Ogdensburg, N. Y.; Harry Bullard, president, Northern Federation of Chambers of Commerce, Potsdam, N. Y.; Lewis G. Castle, president, Northern Minnesota National Bank, Duluth, Minn.; W. C. Cowling, director, Port of Detroit Authority, Detroit, Mich.; John Cowles, publisher, Look Magazine, Minneapolis, Minn.; N. R. Danielian, executive vice president, Washington, D. C.; Harlan Hatcher, vice president, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio; Daniel Hoan, attorney at law, Milwaukee, Wis.; Henry Laliberte, president, Cutler-Magner Co., Duluth, Minn.; Julius Meltzer, Springfield, Mass.; Tom Moore, president, Coca-Cola Co., Minneapolis, Minn.; Walter Olen, president, the Four Wheel Drive Auto Co., Clintonville, Wis.; O. S. Warden, publisher, Great Falls Tribune, Great Falls, Mont.; William L. White, author and publisher, Emporia Gazette, Emporia, Kans.; Foster Winter, treasurer, J. L. Hudson Co., Detroit, Mich.

Apprentices in Government Service to Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on May 4 I submitted minority views on S. 3050, now on the calendar of the Senate. In that connection I made it clear that the bill would drastically interfere with and seriously hamper the Government apprentice programs.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter dated May 3 which I have received from the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics expressing disapproval of S. 3050. I should like also to have printed the names of the distinguished members of this committee.

There being no objection, the letter and names were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL ADVISORY
COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS,
Washington, D. C., May 3, 1950.

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: H. R. 7185, to limit the appointment of apprentices in the Government service to veterans, has just passed the House, and an identical bill, S. 3050, has been favorably reported in the Senate.

If enacted in its present form, this bill would immediately impede and, in a few years, terminate our apprentice-training programs that are essential to the staffing of the fine trades and crafts in our scientific research laboratories. There would be no compensating advantage to veterans as a class, nor to the public service generally. This is because: Apprentices are usually hired between the ages of 18 and 22; the average age of veterans is now about 32 years, with only about 4 percent under 23; there is no new supply of young veterans coming along; and older veterans cannot be expected to make good apprentices, nor to accept the low starting pay of an apprentice.

It is strongly recommended in the public interest that the bill be not approved. The Bureau of the Budget advises that its enactment will not be in accordance with the program of the President.

If nevertheless it be the wish of the Senate to approve the measure, it is urged that it be amended to provide that it shall have no application with respect to apprentice positions under the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.

J. F. VICTORY,
Executive Secretary.

The names of the members of the committee are as follows: Jerome C. Hunsaker, Sc. D., chairman; Alexander Wetmore, Ph. D., vice chairman; Hon. John R. Alison; Detlev W. Bronk, Ph. D.; Karl T. Compton, Ph. D.; Edward U. Condon, Ph. D.; James H. Doolittle, Sc. D.; Ronald M. Hazen, B. S.; William Littlewood, M. E.; Rear Adm. Theodore C. Lounquest. U. S. N.; Vice Adm. John D. Price, U. S. N.; Maj. Gen. Donald L. Putt, U. S. A. F.; Arthur E. Raymond, Sc. D.; Francis W. Reichelderfer, Sc. D.; Hon. Delos W. Rentzel; Gen. Hoyt S. Vandenberg, U. S. A. F.; and Theodore P. Wright, Sc. D.

Address of the President at Sandpoint, Idaho

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 15, 1950

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, it is a privilege to insert the address made by the President of the United States at Sandpoint, Idaho, on the occasion of his recent western trip:

Thank you very much, Mr. Mayor. I appreciate this privilege. I have just received the finest welcome I think I have had anywhere in my whole career, during this trip; in Iowa, in Nebraska, in Wyoming, in Idaho, in Oregon, and in Washington. Now I want to thank you very much for this fine reception. You have given me the same kind of welcome I had yesterday morning when I made a number of stops in southern Idaho. I traveled all along the Snake River, and now it is grand to be up here in this rugged country around Sandpoint. I have just been watching the scenery, and I never saw anything more beautiful in my life, and my whole staff feels the same way. I am sorry it will be dark when this train goes through Cabinet Gorge. I would certainly like to see that. I have been reading about it all my life.

I have celebrated two birthdays on this trip across the country. My own—for 66 years—was last Monday. Today is the fifteenth birthday of the Rural Electrification Administration. I helped to celebrate that by dedicating Grand Coulee Dam—a wonderful project which is already supplying tremendous quantities of cheap electricity to thousands of users.

Here at Sandpoint you have the headquarters of the first REA-financed cooperative in the Rocky Mountain region. This was the second cooperative west of the Mississippi, and it is nearly as old as the REA itself.

I hardly need tell you what benefits cheap electricity means to a region. In addition to making life easier in homes and farms, it brings new industries and lets old ones expand.

One of the industries in this part of the country that needs a great deal more power is phosphate mining. There are tremendous phosphate resources down south of here in Idaho and Montana. Farmers all through the West and Middle West need lots more phosphates. The power that can be brought into this region through great Federal projects like Grand Coulee and Hungry Horse should make it possible to develop a big phosphate industry.

I have been greatly impressed on this trip by what I have seen and heard about the wealth of mineral resources in Idaho, Montana, and Washington. These minerals aren't important just to you people, they are important to the national economy as a whole, and to the whole world.

There was a time when big-time operators stalked through the Northwest, exploiting the cream of our mineral resources. They were men who exploited for their own profit, without thinking of the generations to come after them.

I have always maintained, and I always will fight for the policy that natural resources must be used so as not to destroy their value, and they should be used for the benefit of the Nation as a whole and not for any special individual.

In order to supplement our resources of critical minerals, we must take vigorous steps to add to our supply. The stockpiling program is designed to meet our national defense needs. Other measures are equally necessary. We must expand research to make better use of submarginal mineral deposits. We must search for new deposits of minerals. We must avoid waste in the mining, production, and use of minerals. We must find ways to use substitutes for critical minerals.

I have been greatly encouraged by the development of the cobalt-copper deposits here in the forest areas of Idaho. We have not had nearly enough cobalt production in this country. You know, we get most of it from Africa—most of the cobalt comes from Africa, and I would like very much to see some prospector find enough ore for use here at home. It is important to national defense for us to speed up the development of new sources of cobalt in the district just north of here.

When we get more power into this area, and when we begin to develop the mineral resources here in the Pacific Northwest as they should be, there will be a tremendous industrial expansion.

When we get low cost power in greater quantities into this area, it will aid the metal mining industry through the establishment of lead and zinc smelting plants.

You know, there was a time when Missouri was the greatest producer of lead and zinc. That is not true any longer, because those mines are exhausted. The mines in Oklahoma are almost exhausted, so it is up to you to see that we have plenty of lead and zinc. It will be carried out in cooperation with the producers throughout Idaho, northeastern Washington, British Columbia, and Alaska. This will mean new prosperity and new wealth for all of you. It will mean a more prosperous and a stronger nation. We need both prosperity and strength if we are going to keep our position of leadership in the world, so that we can work for world peace.

You know, there are people in the world who do not appreciate our viewpoint, they don't understand how we can live as a great country and still let the individual be his own boss. They don't understand that our democracy is one which comes from the people up and not from the top down.

What I am trying to do is to keep our economic situation in such a condition that we can remain strong enough to show those people that our plan is much better than any other plan in the world.

We are for the welfare of the people of the whole world. We have no desire to exploit anybody. We want to help people. We want to make the world a better place to live in. We want to give everybody an opportunity to live as a man, and to live with his neighbors amicably. And that will make for peace in the world. That's all I am working for.

I appreciate very much your coming out here.

The President Visits Montana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 16, 1950

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to call to the attention of the House, editorials on President Truman's visit to Montana carried in the Montana Standard, of Butte, the Great Falls Tribune, of Great Falls, the Daily Missoulian, of Missoula; and an article by Joe Harsch in the Christian Science Monitor.

It is a source of personal pleasure and pride to me that Montana extended such a spontaneous and wholehearted welcome to our President. The man of the people reported on the state of the Union to his constituents—and they liked it.

[From the Montana Standard, Butte, Mont., of May 12, 1950]

AS BUTTE WELCOMES PRESIDENT HARRY S. TRUMAN

The friendly and hospitable people of Butte will turn out today to welcome their President. Perhaps remembering the most generous reception the people of the mining city accorded President Harry S. Truman on his last visit here in June 1948, the Nation's chief executive again chose Butte as one of his major stops on a tour of 16 States along the northern tier of the Nation. The present tour of the President has many striking resemblances to the one just short of 2 years ago when he launched the spectacular drive which won him the Presidency in his own right.

So there is no doubt that the people of Butte are linked in happy associations in the presidential memory. Mr. Truman had come to Butte previously as a candidate for the vice presidency on the Franklin D. Roosevelt ticket. One of Mr. Truman's notable characteristics is that he remembers his friends.

Local committees, under the cochairmanship of Lt. Gov. A. Cannon and William A. Curran, have prepared a sparkling reception for the Nation's chief executive in keeping with western hospitality and friendliness. Led by Gov. John W. Bonner, dignitaries from the far reaches of the Treasure State will be in Butte to take part in welcoming the President, Mrs. Truman, their daughter, Margaret, and other members of the presidential party.

Most of Butte will knock off for a time at midday to take part in welcoming President Truman. When the President steps to the platform erected in front of the Northern Pacific depot to make one of nine major addresses scheduled on his 6,500-mile tour, he will look out on a colorful and friendly crowd. The Butte High band, which drew from him words of high praise 2 years ago, will sound off with the familiar Hail to the Chief.

As President Truman leaves, he will bear away numerous gifts and mementos which have special significance relative to this mountainous and mining region.

The presidential visit will stand as another memorable day in the long and colorful history of the mining city.

[From the Great Falls (Mont.) Tribune of May 12, 1950]

MONTANA WELCOMES PRESIDENT TRUMAN

Montana today bids proud and enthusiastic welcome to President Harry S. Truman.

In his trip across the country the President has been talking to the people about governmental relations with which we are most vitally concerned. He has been talking directly and quite informally to the people

and that is the way this western region likes to talk.

Here in Montana we are naturally concerned about the farmer and about the continuing stability of farm markets. We are concerned also about the wage and salaried workers in our cities and towns; in the mines and processing plants and in our other enterprises. President Truman has demonstrated his concern about these things and his determination to put into operation Government programs to protect both the farmer and the consumer.

Some critics have been crying it can't be done. But President Truman believes there is a way to combine farm production and market stability with a fair deal for the wage-earning consumer. He believes such a plan should be made a part of the national farm program. The Tribune heartily endorses the President's conviction that this can be done.

President Truman has shown himself to be a sincere and understanding friend of both reclamation and conservation, and of that Montana and other Western States are rightly appreciative.

Just before he started on his cross-country tour the President gave Congress a plan to stimulate small and independent business and asked for its passage at this session. At Cheyenne Mr. Truman talked about this program. His recommendations rest on three simple principles—that the small-business man needs long-term credit, he needs venture capital, and he needs technical assistance.

The President believes that "if we are to have an expanding economy small business must provide its share of additional jobs needed"—and that proper government measures can assist.

The Tribune says "Amen" to that.

The President takes no stock in the belief of some that a boom-and-bust pattern is inevitable in American economy. And he has been proving that it is not. He deserves a large measure of credit for that, as he would get a large measure of blame if the reverse were true.

Montanans, along with the millions of other Americans, are concerned about national security and world peace and about the Communist menace to free nations and free peoples. We are cheered by the President's expressed conviction that elsewhere in the world the goals of stability and peace are "clearly within reach."

We are quite willing to accept the President's further admonition that there is no quick or easy way to end the present world difficulties. The way to win, Mr. Truman says, is for the world's free nations to "clearly demonstrate the superiority of freedom over the iron hand of tyranny."

President Truman has refused to be stampeded or discouraged. He comes to Montana with a report that is both encouraging and inspiring.

The Tribune is proud and happy to be numbered among the ardent supporters of President Harry S. Truman and to bid him welcome to the Treasure State.

[From the Daily Missoulian, Missoula, Mont., of May 12, 1950]

WELCOME, MR. PRESIDENT

Western Montanans, regardless of political affiliations, welcome President Truman and his entourage and regret that their visit here this morning cannot be more extended.

We have high respect for the Office of Chief Executive and admiration for the grim determination with which Mr. Truman fought his way to election in 1948 in a campaign in which the prophets didn't give him a chance.

As the President makes his way across Montana he will find typical Treasure State welcomes at every stop.

It is Missoula's rare privilege to be host to the President this morning. Welcome, Mr. President, and come again.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Boston, Mass., of May 15, 1950]

STATE OF THE NATION

HARRY TRUMAN, TOWN BOOSTER

(By Joseph C. Harsch)

CHICAGO.—Speaking of President Roosevelt, Republicans used to say: "You can't shoot Santa Claus."

Today it should be rephrased to read: "Nobody boos the town booster."

That is, I think, the most accurate way to describe the Harry S. Truman who has joined forces here in Chicago with the big and little leaders of his party for the openly political climax of his cross-country tour.

Victor A. Johnston, official Republican observer of this tour, has labeled it a "traveling medicine show."

Mr. Truman himself invariably has called it a "report to the people."

Those designations best suit the views of the individuals making them. But they equally miss, or obscure, what actually has happened. Mr. Truman started the trip preaching "growth, expansion, and progress." In varying forms he has preached it all the way across the country and back here to Chicago. He has made himself the town booster of every town in the country and of the whole country put together.

And there hasn't been a boo in the whole trip—with one exception, to his advantage. That was in Madison, Wis., where a dozen shabby and obviously very left-wing pickets paraded in front of the university field house, where he was speaking, with placards objecting to Mr. Truman's foreign policies.

It has been an exercise in town boosting from cold-war victory without war and endless prosperity without loss of freedom to protection of pitchfork handles from grasshoppers.

It has been one of the smoothest dress rehearsals of all political time. The train has been on time at every stop. A smooth-working presidential staff, which makes it a business to know the interests of every community before it is reached, has a speech ready and keyed to local interest. As the train rolls on the mimeograph machines do, too, and within an hour every correspondent has a true copy of what the President had said, including the extemporaneous remarks. Even the weather seemed to be under the town-boosters' control, for drought turned into rain and winter into spring in the path of his progress.

The Truman manner is easy and natural. At Spokane a prize-winning 4–H sheep waiting to be beribboned by the President made loud disapproving noises. "That must be a Republican sheep," said Mr. Truman, and everyone laughed.

Harry Truman is the genial town booster. He is Rotary, Kiwanis, and Lions Club rolled into one. He preaches progress like a man who believes. He preaches it in the vernacular. "That's a mighty pretty pig you raised." And when he says reservoir it comes out "reservoy." He doesn't high-hat anyone. He doesn't show annoyance, if he ever feels it, but he can be firm. At Great Falls, Mont., the train pulled a car's length beyond the band and reception committee. It was ordered back and went back.

How does one campaign against the town booster?

America believes in growth, expansion, and progress. America is made up of Rotarians, Kiwanians, and Lions—of people who make a religion of preaching a better and safer and more prosperous tomorrow and of going out and trying to do something about it. Mr. Truman has tuned himself to the gospel of every chamber of commerce in the country. You can't be against what he is for without being against the chamber of commerce and the American dream of wider horizons and happier people. You can call it pie in the sky and a traveling medicine show, but you can't be against it. And it would be hard to preach it with more conviction or confidence than does Mr. Truman.

At Pasco, Wash., Vic Johnston watched the crowd watching Harry Truman.

"Nobody hates him," he observed.

That's about it.

The Argument About Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Argument about Socialism," written by Walter Leckrone, which appeared in the Indianapolis Times on May 14, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ARGUMENT ABOUT SOCIALISM

(By Walter Leckrone)

Perhaps without meaning to, President Truman last week got right at the root of the argument about socialism.

The President recalled that away back in 1887 somebody proposed that the Federal Government give each State $5,000 with which to set up an agricultural experiment station. One Kansas Senator who opposed the idea, charged that it was interference with local government and would lead to destruction of individual freedom.

The bill passed anyway, the State got the money and many of them did set up their experiment stations, and nobody lost their freedom because of it, the President said. And that, he went on, is just the same argument he gets today, whenever he proposes any "bold progressive measures." The opposition just yells "socialism."

There are, though, some thoughtful citizens who believe today that the Kansas Senator was more right than he even realized himself back there in 1887.

Anyway the President did point up rather graphically the fact that only sixty-odd years ago it was considered a pretty radical move for the Federal Government to give a State even a little bit of cash for any purpose.

Few would pay any attention to a $5,000 hand-out today, of course. Now it hardly rates a headline unless the hand-out runs into the billions. From giving a little money to each of the States the Federal Government today has taken to handing it out not only to States, but to cities and villages and even millions upon millions of individuals.

SMALL START

From that little $5,000 start for an experimental farm in 1887 the Federal Government has gone on to giving money for highways, schools, health services, poor relief, house building, retirement pensions, old-age assistance, airports, to start new businesses, to expand old businesses or to bail out failing businesses, and to pay for potatoes and butter and other crops that nobody

wants to buy, so the prices won't come down, and Mr. Truman wants to give more.

The point is it didn't all begin at once. It started with just a little hand-out, as little as $5,000 to a State, for a purpose that seemed worthy. Soon there was another purpose that also seemed worthy, and another, and a lot of others. So many that at length Congress barely raised an eyebrow at $25,000,000 to finance a venture as wild as Lustron Homes, or to put a new automobile on the market or to pay a crowd to attend a political speech by a Cabinet member. After all, it had been done before. Once the States had their $5,000 for their experiment stations it was just a matter of amount, and not of principle any more.

Of course any one who stopped to think at all knew quite well that there is no such thing as a gift or a grant from the Government to the people. The Government has no money of its own. All it has it gets from the people as a tax on what they earn or what they have. All it could ever give them back would be part of their own money, less, of course, whatever it costs to collect and pay out that money.

As President Truman says, it isn't likely anybody lost his freedom just because each of the States got $5,000 out of the United States Treasury back in 1887, or at least not enough freedom that he could miss it.

The States, though, pretty soon found out that their own freedom of action began to be limited when they received Federal funds. The Federal Government that gave cash to a State for relief, for instance, soon began to tell the States just how it should be spent and if the State didn't obey the money was cut off. When a Federal bureau didn't like a county welfare director, right here in Indianapolis, it ordered him fired, and held up the grant of money till he had been fired. The people of Indianapolis hadn't much to say about their county welfare director.

MANAGING FARMS

The farmers who get Federal hand-outs now are beginning to run into the same thing as individuals. The government that guarantees them a high price for their potatoes or their eggs also tells them how many potatoes they can grow, and how many hens they can have, and year by year reaches further into the managing of their farms.

The government which pays a worker a retirement pension (out of his own money, of course) already tells him how much he has to be paid and how much of it he can keep for himself.

Every time, indeed, that anyone—State or city or individual—has got a grant or a gift or even a loan from the Federal Government he has got a directive, too, that tells him just what he can or cannot do, and to some degree limits his freedom.

So he has by now lost quite a lot of the freedom of action he once had. Just a little at a time, of course, so gradually that already he finds it hard to understand what the Senator from Kansas was talking about back in 1887. And the more he gets the more he loses.

No matter what the men in Federal Government want to do, this is what they must do—it can't be handled any other way. The government which guarantees a worker a pension or a doctor bill has to decide what he does with his time and money. The government that guarantees a farmer a certain price for his crops has to decide how much of a crop he can grow.

President Truman objects to folks calling this socialism, and we agree that it doesn't much matter what you call it, although socialism is what they call it in England and in Russia.

MORE MONEY FROM PEOPLE

The issue is the same, under any name, and President Truman's speech about the grants to the States back in 1887 has helped to make the whole thing clearer.

His administration proposes to take more and more money from the people who earn it and give more and more money back to them for what the Government feels they need, imposing whatever controls over their lives this makes necessary.

His opposition proposes that the people just keep their own money in the first place and spend it the way they want to spend it, without making all this Government control of their lives necessary.

That, mostly, is what the election is about.

Effect of Proposed Tariff Reduction on American Leather-Glove Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have in my hand a very terse and hard-hitting analysis by the National Association of Leather Glove Manufacturers located at 52 South Main Street, Gloversville, N. Y. This statement very clearly points out the grave implication of proposed tariff reduction on the American leather-glove industry.

I should like to ask unanimous consent now to have this statement reproduced in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This supplements my previous comments on the Senate floor pointing out the damaging impact of tariff slashes on the Wisconsin shoe industry and to Wisconsin tanneries, as well as other industries. As I have previously emphasized, I believe that our greatest obligations are to our own American people, to American businesses, and to American workers. We cannot build the prosperity of the world on the basis of destroying the prosperity of our own country. We cannot create jobs abroad by closing factories here at home, because in the long run, reduced purchasing power on the part of the American people will inevitably be reflected in depression abroad. We want to promote world trade and commerce, but not through the crucifixion of vital American industries.

I appeal, therefore, to those gentlemen of the State Department and of the Tariff Commission to consider very carefully the results of actions which they may choose to take at the tariff conference table.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EFFECT OF PROPOSED TARIFF REDUCTION ON THE AMERICAN LEATHER GLOVE INDUSTRY

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF LEATHER GLOVE MANUFACTURERS, INC.,
Gloversville, N. Y., May 5, 1950.

This brief statement has been prepared and approved by the employers and employees of the American leather-glove industry and civic leaders in the communities where leather-glove plants are located. It is prompted by the fact that the State Department has placed men's and women's leather dress gloves on the bargaining list for further tariff rate cuts this year.

1. Employment: In Fulton County, New York State, one of the principal manufacturing areas, we have at the present time almost 7,000 people unemployed out of a 9,000 working population. Of these, 1,328 have exhausted their unemployment benefits, which means that they have drawn the full 26 weeks of benefits permitted by law. Of this group 78 percent are directly employed in the glove industry and the balance are dependent upon the industry for a livelihood.

2. Unemployment trend: During the past 3 years, monthly Fulton County unemployment has averaged: 2,476 in 1947; 1,726 in 1948; 3,715 in 1949; and 5,615 to date in 1950. The current claims are in addition to the 1,328 exhaustions for the benefit year 1949–50, which will end in June.

3. Earnings: Male workers in the leather-glove industry average $1.60 per hour and female workers 92 cents per hour. This is in sharp contrast to the rates paid in England, which is one of the highest-cost leather-glove-producing areas in Europe. There male workers are paid 33 cents an hour and female workers 20 cents an hour. In addition to this, the English Government recently negotiated an agreement with a glove manufacturer in England, giving him exclusive rights to glove production on the Isle of Malta for 10 years. No actual wage schedule exists; however, the manufacturer estimates that it will amount to about 25 percent of the labor rates in England; or, stated in another way, male workers would receive approximately 9 cents an hour and female workers 5 cents per hour. It should be noted that the production of gloves on the Isle of Malta is being developed primarily for the United States market.

4. Conditions of manufacture: Leather, the raw material used in making gloves, is a product of nature and varies in size, shape, texture, and weight according to the animals from which it is taken. Consequently, the cutting of gloves must be a handcraft operation, the same the world over. This statement is made to describe briefly the operations in the industry and, at the same time, to eliminate any misunderstanding that might arise when we speak of a handcraft industry. The word "handcraft" should at no time be associated with inefficiency.

5. Industrial comparison: American leather gloves are the product of a factory industry, which operates at a higher unit cost of production than is necessary abroad, because of our higher wages, overhead, and social benefits for the workers. American factory standards cannot be compared with foreign "factories," which are merely raw-material depots and collection and distribution points for home work. Glovemaking has been known traditionally as a cottage industry throughout Europe.

6. Subsidy: Apparently, also, the American worker is competing with a subsidized foreign industry. Gloves that French manufacturers quoted at $15 per dozen in 1930 are quoted at the same price in 1950. As that is patently impossible, it seems that they must buy their raw materials with ECA credits or funds, and sacrifice the price of the finished product to earn dollars. This is obviously unfair competition with the product of American labor. It raises this question: when does a foreign price reflect true cost, and when is it merely a merchandising price?

7. Constant tariff reductions: Since passage of the Tariff Act of 1930, when rates on imported leather gloves were calculated to equalize the difference between costs of production here and abroad, United States labor costs alone have increased more than 114 percent, while our measure of tariff protection was lowered in the French agreement of 1936, the United Kingdom agreement of 1939, and again at the Geneva Conference in 1947.

8. Hidden tariff cuts: In addition to tariff-cut concessions given by the United States, currency devaluation abroad has already added directly to the tariff cuts this industry has suffered. Further currency devaluation, which is predicted, will only tend to aggravate the tariff rates already cut, without granting any further concessions this year.

9. Foreign monopoly: Consideration of any further tariff cuts will only displace more workers and, in practical application, give European producers a monopoly in the domestic glove market. American industry would be so hopelessly out of competition that only foreign merchandise would be salable.

10. International contribution: American leather-glove manufacturers purchase 95 percent of the raw skins used in the manufacture of leather gloves from foreign countries and make a substantial contribution to international trade. A dislocation of the American leather-glove industry will only reduce this expenditure and, if anything, widen the dollar gap. At present an average of $50,000,000 a year is spent in the purchase of raw skins in the backward countries, which have little other capacity to earn dollars. The transfer of the American glove-manufacturing industry to Europe would eliminate the dollar earning power of these areas, as their customers would be the soft currency countries of Europe.

11. No export market: The American leather-glove industry is primarily prevented from exporting due to our higher costs, caused by the differential in labor rates and factory overhead in this country, versus the lower labor rates and lower overhead in foreign countries. In addition to this, under customs regulations in most foreign countries gloves are barred from importation, being classified as a luxury item. These are the same countries which are interested in gaining a market here and asking for broad tariff concessions, while refusing us a market in their own countries. Consequently, the exports of American-made gloves have amounted to only a fraction of 1 percent of production.

12. Tariff no barrier to imports: To date, present and past tariff rates have only tended to keep the labor cost of imported gloves somewhat in line with American labor costs. At no time have our tariff rates proven a barrier to imports. Last year the ratio of imported women's leather gloves to domestic-made gloves was 27.1 percent, while before the war foreign countries sent us more than double our production under tariff rates that were higher than those rates which prevail today. Why, therefore, is it proposed that the rates be again lowered?

13. Business mortality: According to actual figures in glove-producing areas, 78 concerns have gone out of business since 1946. Any prolonged continuation of present conditions can only mean that others will have to consider a similar move before the end of this year. Therefore, any unwarranted concessions given to foreign producers can only aggravate a situation which is already critical.

14. National defense: The threat to the continuance of this industry which is inherent in further tariff cuts must be considered in the light of its importance to the national defense. All armed services procurement officers have unequivocally stated that food and clothing are of the first importance in arming our Nation. Even now, gloves rank No. 14 on the quartermaster's priority list of critical items. During the last war, the services procured over a half a billion pairs of gloves from the American industry. It would, therefore, seem that this is no time to jeopardize the life of an industry so important to our national defense.

In conclusion, the issue may ultimately be defined as whether or not the glove industry is to remain in this country. Past experience has proven that we cannot consistently concede the major portion of our domestic market to imports. We have no export markets in which the reciprocal lowering of tariffs by other nations might benefit us. We must, therefore, look to our own market; and, if our portion of it is so reduced in size that the small volume remaining precludes payment of overhead, we must accept extinction.

Radio Broadcast by Senator Taft—Do You Want Rubber Stamp Congress?—Reply to Truman's Socialist Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, on Tuesday night, May 16, one of the finest addresses it has been my privilege to hear was broadcast over the major radio networks of the Nation by that great American statesman, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

The content of that address formulated a message of great importance to the American people; it exemplified the principles of my party, principles which I have always supported, and which I will continue to support.

I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PRESIDENT DEMANDS A RUBBER-STAMP CONGRESS

Fellow taxpayers, the President of the United States has just completed a 6,000-mile trip at our expense and made 57 speeches, most of them political. He must have had some very important purpose in mind, for there was plenty to occupy him in Washington. He left Congress in session rejecting administration plans of vital importance, at least to him. Most of the principal railroads of the United States were closed down while his train ran on. The Foreign Ministers in London are considering the most vital decisions of recent years in foreign policy. But the President's purpose is now clear. He admits that he has been on a 10-day crusade to elect an Eighty-second Congress in November which will do his bidding in every respect. Every "obstructionist" is to be removed from Congress.

True, we already have a Democratic Congress today, but it won't pass the socialistic measures which Mr. Truman has long advocated. He bitterly criticized the Eightieth Republican Congress because it did not agree with his CIO-PAC philosophy of government. He treats the Eighty-first Congress more tenderly—for the present—but promises criticism in the future. But the fact is that the Democratic Eighty-first Congress, except for the spending of money, has rejected the Truman program as definitely and conclusively as the Republican Eightieth. I don't believe for a moment the people of this country approve the Truman program. I don't believe for a moment they want an Eighty-second Congress subservient to Mr. Truman, prepared to rubber stamp that program.

TO ENACT A SOCIALIST PROGRAM

What is that program as shown by the speeches of this past week? A part of it, of course, is just irresponsible promising. Our annual output of goods and services is to be $350,000,000,000 by 1960. Every American family is to have an income of at least $4,000 a year. Everyone is to be healthy, and rich, and happy as Harry. Of course, this kind of thing is bipartisan policy. In fact, I don't see why the amount can't be $5,000 a year. I don't know about these greedy, selfish reactionaries that the President talks of, because I have never met them. The President is always imagining bogymen under every bed. I do know that every Republican Congressman is just as anxious to reach these goals as the President himself. There is no particular reason why we shouldn't reach them, for they do not reflect any greater rate of growth and improvement than we have had since this Government was founded in 1789. But common sense tells us we can only count on the same rate of improvement if we follow the same principles of liberty and rewards for ability and hard work and genius, the free life, on which American progress has always been founded.

But that's not Mr. Truman's program. He wants to bring the Government into every field of individual and community and national life. Our governments are already spending more money than we have ever spent in peacetime, more than 25 percent of the national income. We all are working more than one day in four for Government and less than three for ourselves. The Federal Government is the biggest monopoly and the biggest spending institution in the world. The public debt stands at $256,000,000,000 and is increasing at the rate of $6,000,000,000 a year. Every time the sun sets our Government is $15,000,000 deeper in debt. How long can it last?

But that is just the beginning of the spending. The President insists on the Brannan plan to pay the farmers 100 percent of parity and sell the crops for anything the consumers will pay for them, the difference to be charged to the taxpayer. If we do it on the same scale as Great Britain, it will cost us $5,000,000,000. And who is the taxpayer? Why, of course, the farmer and the consumer who are supposed to get the benefits. Do you want a Congress which will spend that $5,000,000,000 more?

Then we have the program of socialized and nationalized medicine, on which the President is treading pretty lightly on this trip. But he has heretofore endorsed it three times enthusiastically, and we can assume that if he ever gets a Congress which will do his bidding and that of the CIO-PAC that he will return to his first love. He proposes that we levy another $6,000,000,000 of taxes, set up a vast Federal bureau to employ all the doctors and all the hospitals in the United States to give medical care to 150,000,000 people, including all those who are perfectly able to pay for it themselves. It would destroy the freedom of the medical profession and supersede the tremendous system of community and charitable health service which has given this country the best health of any comparable country in the world. Do you want a Congress that will go out and spend that $6,000,000,000 more?

And then we have the field of Government controls. To carry out the Brannan plan, the Government must limit the production of corn and wheat and cotton and every other crop. In England they even regulate the number of chickens. As Senator WHERRY, the Republican floor leader of the Senate, said Monday, "Under the Brannan plan producers of perishable commodities would become wards of the Government. The Government would manage their farms, and tell them what to plant and how much. Then it carries fines and jail sentences for

farmers who refuse to goose-step upon command of Washington bureaucrats." Under the medical plan, every family must be told by detailed regulation just what kind of medical service they can get and what they can't get. Mr. Truman attacked the Eightieth Congress because it refused to give him power to fix prices and fix wages and allocate and ration commodities, all the old OPA powers of wartime—"police state controls," he called them himself. Prices have been going down so we haven't heard much of these lately. But the Spence bill is still pending and a $6,000,000,000 deficit is bound to bring inflation again. Do you want a Congress that will bring back the OPA?

Combined with the Brannan plan, the Spence bill would give Washington bureaus the job of regulating in detail all commerce, industry, and agriculture in this vast country. It could not be effective without regulating all wages also, telling every workman for how much he shall work, and every housewife what she shall cook.

And last year the President asked for power to put the Government into any business, like the steel business, where some Government economist told him the industry wasn't expanding fast enough. Of course some things can only be done by the Government like the construction of huge dams on navigable rivers. But if we are going to keep free industry, the Government can't get into competition with its own citizens. No one can compete with the Government, prepared to lose all the taxpayers' money necessary.

The labor leaders are powerful. Therefore, Mr. Truman proposes to repeal the Taft-Hartley law and restore a condition of the most complete special privilege the law has ever given in this country. Before that law, union officials were not liable on their contracts. They weren't liable for the acts of their agents. They weren't liable for damages to those they injured or put out of business. They were not liable to their own members. Those workingmen who defied them could be driven from the union and from their jobs. They weren't liable to the Nation itself—for strikes which crippled the economy and threatened the safety and health of 150,000,000 people.

The President sabotaged the law in failing to deal effectively with the coal strike. He only appoints members of the National Labor Relations Board if they are approved by the CIO and A. F. of L., and he refuses to accept the principle of the law that the Government shall hold the scales of justice even between labor and management. The Department of Justice fails to enforce the anti-Communist oath provision.

The Taft-Hartley law is based on free collective bargaining and freedom to strike. It protects the workman against arbitrary treatment by his labor union bosses. It is wholly wrong to say as the President said last night that the Taft-Hartley law infringes the basic freedom to bargain collectively. Of course no one will believe his claim that it has undermined the strength of labor unions. Do you want a rubber-stamp Congress which will restore those special exemptions of labor leaders and their power to dominate their men, and all but the most powerful employers?

The general program of the Truman crusade is clear. Promise everyone everything and back it up with Government money. Every American knows in his heart that such a policy will wreck the United States and reduce it to bankruptcy. It will bring, first inflation, and then depression.

The President asks how your liberties have been limited or the country socialized. Of course the first answer is that since Mr. Truman was first persuaded by his left-wing followers that his political future depended on accepting the CIO policy on every major issue, both the Republican Eightieth Congress and the Democratic Eighty-first Congress turned down all the principal features of his program, except the pleasure of spending which the first session of the Eighty-first Congress could not resist.

YOU PAY FOR IT ALL IN TAXES AND HIGH PRICES

But your freedom has been limited by a huge taxation. Just add up the money deducted from your pay over the year, and then remember that when you buy food or clothing or shoes or anything else, the price includes about 20 percent of taxes paid along the way by the farmer, the railroad, the manufacturer, the retailer and all the rest of them. Altogether the governments take more than 25 percent of the national income in taxes, and most of this is passed on to the poor old consumer. The Government is taking from you the freedom to spend the money you earn by the sweat of your brow. You've lost about a quarter of your freedom if we go on with the present spending program. In England they have already lost 40 percent of their freedom to spend their own money. If we go on spending Fair Deal, we will all soon lose most of our freedom. I don't know any better way to deprive a man of all freedom than to take over for him the spending of practically all he earns.

The people can't hope for any real increase in their standard of living on this kind of program. Every increase in wages is balanced by higher prices and higher taxes. It's all done with mirrors. Something for nothing to everyone. Parity prices to the farmer, unlimited loans to little business, free medicine to all, unlimited power to labor to obtain any wage they desire, free gifts to the entire world. Even the taxpayer can't stand it in the end. It can only be done by printing money and killing the value of the dollar. No people in this world ever got something for nothing.

And the present annual $6,000,000,000 deficit is bound to bring inflation, reduce the value of savings and insurance and savings bonds, and lead to a false boom and a depression.

This is not all the false glitter of the Fair Deal or of this nonpolitical trip. The political immorality of the Truman administration has shaken the confidence of the people in their Government. It has shocked the sensibilities of Americans who have always believed in law and order, in justice, fair play and equality, and in hard work and thrift.

The President says the Democratic Party today still believes in giving the facts to the people. But do they? Not a word was said by the President of the delivery of top secret State Department documents in the Hiss case or the Amerasia case in which every effort was made to suppress investigation amid Presidential shouts of "red herring." Every file and every fact which reflects on the past policy of the administration is ruthlessly suppressed and refused to Congress.

Every kind of civil-rights measure is promised by the President knowing that half his party bitterly fights his program. And he supports a Democratic candidate for the Senate in Missouri who is openly hostile to civil rights.

He accused his opponents indiscriminately of greed and privilege, but he said not a word about greed and privilege in his home bailiwick of Kansas City or in the White House itself. Mr. Truman himself spoke in behalf of Mr. Tom Pendergast on the Senate floor after Mr. Pendergast's conviction in a Federal court, as Senator FERGUSON pointed out this week in the Senate. Senator FERGUSON inquired also regarding the privilege represented by Mayor Curley of Boston, pardoned by the President for mail frauds, of those four members of the Capone gang paroled from the penitentiary, or Mr. John Maragon, the friend of General Harry Vaughn. What about the vote frauds and ballot-stealing cases in Kansas City quietly passed over by the Department of Justice?

The President busily told the people in the West of the tremendous progress made in that section in the 17 years since 1932. From Mr. Truman's western speeches, one would think that the West began 17 years ago. But as Senator MILLIKIN said this week, "The President neglected a great opportunity to pay deserved tribute to the free American men and women who made their danger-ridden trek to that part of our country, whose unsubsidized bivouacs and pioneer cabins were the citadels of their dauntless hope, courage, and independence, who settled the lands, utilized the waters of the stream, built up their herds, opened the mines and oil fields, and developed a superior civilization long prior to 17 years ago." It will be hard to persuade the West that it was New Deal handouts rather than liberty and self-reliance which laid the basis for their progress.

Until Mr. Truman attempted to make a political issue out of reclamation, it was a bipartisan policy, founded by Republicans when they were in power. And the Republican Eightieth Congress actually appropriated 50 percent more money for reclamation than any previous Congress.

It is somewhat hard to see why the President wants all the additional spending and power he demands, for he tells us that the country today has reached a prosperity beyond the dreams of avarice, and that he and his friends created this prosperity. One would think that he would leave well enough alone. But he knows as well as anyone that there is something false about the economic prosperity resulting from war, inflation, and a huge debt. The 10-year improvement in income of which he boasts came about not from the New Deal but from the war.

In spite of their present income, the people are full of fear and apprehension about the uncertain basis of their prosperity.

Even more, the people are concerned with the threat of a third world war. I am myself hopeful that it will never occur, but it is the foreign policy of the Democratic administrations which has made it possible. By our constant building up of Russia, by the pro-Communist attitude of Wallace and Hopkins, culminating in the secret agreements of Yalta, confirmed at Potsdam, we have placed Russia in a position where it is a threat to the world. By the pro-Communist policies of our State Department, we have permitted Russia to take over all of China and threaten to absorb the entire Far East. By the time Senator VANDENBERG was able to reverse that policy in Europe, the Russians were established in Berlin and Prague and Vienna whence they could shut us off from eastern Europe and threaten the safety of the west.

Our foreign policy is still full of contradictions. We loan money to Tito, and we refuse to loan money to Franco. We defend Indochina, but we do not defend Formosa. Our taxpayers feed Germany while we dismantle their plants and create unemployment.

The President talks glibly of peace being assured by the reduction of tariffs and the International Trade Organization. This last ITO agreement is opposed by nearly everyone who knows anything about it because it reduces our tariffs and ties our hands, but gives every other nation countless loopholes through which it may avoid its obligation to admit American goods. But certainly the administration free trade policy is no insurance of peace. The Democrats came in in 1913 and passed the Underwood tariff for revenue only. Within 4 years we were in the First World War. In the thirties we adopted the reciprocal trade agreements

program and by 1941 we were in the Second World War. Whatever the arguments for free trade, it is a pipe dream to imagine that it will make the Russians less likely to start an aggressive war.

One thing is certain, the election of a Congress subservient to Mr. Truman will remove all the necessity he feels today to consult with Congress on foreign policy. It was the imaginary mandate from the election of 1948 which led him to abandon the so-called bipartisan policy and go it on his own. I don't believe the people want a Congress subservient to Mr. Truman in foreign policy any more than they do in the domestic field.

And so we face next November a fundamental issue. Shall we turn the country over to Mr. Truman and a rubber-stamp Congress, or shall we elect a Congress that believes in liberty and Americanism and sound fiscal policy? Even a Democratic Congress with a strong Republican minority can be that kind of Congress, but just to be certain the people would feel a lot safer if they give both Houses a substantial Republican majority.

Mr. Truman wants to purge all the Congressmen whom he refers to as obstructionists and isolationists. An isolationist today appears to be anyone who disagrees with his particular brand of foreign policy at the moment. An obstructionist is anyone who disagrees with Truman's Socialist program. What about Senator LUCAS? He has been an obstructionist against the Brannan farm plan, but the President urged his reelection. Apparently it is just Republicans the President had in mind. But apparently the people of Florida had another and better idea—they have begun the purge with Senator PEPPER.

The President implies that he deserves some credit for the few accomplishments of the Eighty-first Congress, which he lists. As a matter of fact, most of these accomplishments are simply continuations of the policy of the Eightieth Congress. The Eightieth Congress started the ECA. It initiated the idea of the Atlantic Pact and extended the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. The only change made in that act by the Eighty-first Congress is to remove the peril-point amendment so that foreign goods manufactured by cheap foreign labor can come into this country even though they destroy the existence of an American industry and throw thousands of people out of work as in the pottery and glass and coal and oil industries today.

Reclamation and the Rural Electrification Administration were widely extended by the Eightieth Congress, and the Eighty-first only followed in its train. The National Science Foundation bill was passed by the Eightieth Congress, and would have been law long ago except for President Truman's veto, which demanded more power over the Foundation for himself. As for the increase in the minimum wage to 75 cents, the public housing program, and the hospital construction program, these were put through the Eighty-first Congress because the Republican leadership supported them. Two of them I sponsored myself.

A REPUBLICAN POLICY

What kind of policy will a Republican Congress carry through? In the first place, it will back up Mr. Truman or any other President in his foreign policies as far as they stand foursquare against the spread of communism anywhere in the world. It will welcome any efforts toward peace which he deems to be practical by direct negotiations with the Russian leaders. It will provide an all-powerful armed force for the United States. It will insist on the elimination from Government, and particularly from the State Department policy-making group, of every man who thinks that communism has about it any of the elements of true Americanism.

A Republican Congress will insist upon the maintenance of liberty, freedom of speech and of the press, freedom of the individual to choose his own occupation regardless of the dictation of government or labor leaders, and spend his earnings as he desires to spend them, freedom of the local community to work out its own systems of education and health and welfare with Federal assistance, if necessary, but without Federal control. We believe in the free life.

A Republican Congress will maintain civil equality for all races and will prevent special privileges, both for big business and big labor. It will not hesitate to use the power of Government to prevent the abuses and excesses of a laissez-faire economic system, to protect a proper minimum wage, to protect farm prices in the market place that will maintain agricultural purchasing power in reasonable relation to other groups in the population, and prevent any destruction of that purchasing power which could bring about another depression. It will guard against the development of monopoly and insist on the maintenance of free competition, but avoid in every case except public utilities the deadening regulation of Government bureaus attempting to fix prices, practices, and quotas in free industries.

Such a Congress will return to the principles of thrift and sound fiscal policy on which this Nation was built up. That is the best method of providing a foundation on which the economic machine can be kept running at a high rate of speed, with full employment. It will readjust the tax system to reduce taxes on incentive and create the channels through which the earnings of all income groups may flow into the productive enterprises which alone can make jobs.

Finally, a Republican Congress will be interested, as every man concerned in Government must be interested, in promoting better education, better health, better housing, better security for our people, and better equality of opportunity for our children. The Federal Government can aid by research and education. It can give financial assistance where it is absolutely necessary and where it can be done without destroying incentive or placing too great a drain on the Treasury. We believe that hardship and poverty can be eliminated, without extending Government welfare service and regimentation to the whole population, for such universal free service can bankrupt the Government while it destroys the freedom and the character of the people to whom it is extended.

Now is the time for the people of this country to begin the discussion of the kind of Congress they wish the Eighty-second Congress to be. Socialism is the constant extension of government power, and government operation, and the spending of government money. Great Britain has gone a long way down that road, and there is no return once you have gone. It is the road which Mr. Truman is urging upon us while he paints the picture of Utopia. It has never yet increased the standards of living of the people, but it has over and over again destroyed their freedom. It is all the more dangerous because the administration advocates of these schemes try to conceal the government spending and bureaucratic controls which they involve. I really don't believe Mr. Truman realizes what the inevitable results are. But in England they frankly speak of them as socialism, and admit their cost in cash and regulation. Finally, and above all else, socialism is a threat to the basic institutions of our modern civilization. It is materialism at its worst, undermining and weakening the character and the moral fiber of the people. It tends eventually to weaken the basic unit of our society, the home; it relegates religion to the realm of the horse-and-buggy days.

The great need in the world today is a rebirth of morality—a fresh morality. A government's word in international matters should be its bond. A government's integrity and stability in domestic affairs should be its principal virtue. Whether or not Mr. Truman realizes what socialism means—one thing is clear: If he gets the rubber-stamp Congress he is now demanding that the people give him, dominated as it would also be by the top brass of the unions, we would have a completely controlled people and a hand-out state, as long as there is any money left in the land to be taxed away.

If we hope to progress in the future as we have in the past, we can only do so if we elect a free Congress, one which will carry out a program of progress based on the principles of liberty and justice and equality on which this Nation was founded.

Brigham Herd Smashes Records

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, May 6, 1950

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Jersey Bulletin of March 25, 1950:

BRIGHAM HERD SMASHES RECORDS—SETS ALL BREED RECORD FOR HERDS ABOVE 100 COWS, NEW 10-YEAR RECORD—FRUIT OF 27 YEARS' TESTING

A Jersey herd of 104 cows milked twice daily averaged 11,703 pounds of milk with 616 pounds of butterfat on Herd Improvement Registry in 1949. This herd, owned by Elbert S. Brigham of St. Albans, Vt., is the first herd of 100 cows of any breed to average over 600 pounds of butterfat on official test regardless of the number of times milked.

Mr. Brigham is president of the American Jersey Cattle Club. His herd has averaged 538 pounds of fat and 10,268 pounds of milk per cow for 10 consecutive years. Every cow in the Brigham herd has been tested since 1922 when private records were started. In 1925 the herd was entered in the local Dairy Herd Improvement Association.

Look at this record of production since 1937 when the herd was entered in the herd improvement registry test of the American Jersey Cattle Club.

Mr. Brigham purchased his first Jerseys in 1904. His breeding program ever since has been built on this simple but highly effective principle: Breed high producing cows to proved sires that will raise the production of their daughters to a still higher point.

In practice Mr. Brigham buys some young sons of tested sires. He breeds these sons to enough cows to get 10 or 12 daughters. After that, the bull is not used until the daughters begin milking and show whether they are giving better production than their mothers.

Especially interesting to dairymen is the fact that every female has been bred on the farm since 1918. Brigham has purchased no female stock from outside the herd since that date. The cows are milked twice a day, and left in stanchions except when in pasture.

Mr. Brigham in speaking of his dairy program says, "We chose the Jersey breed as best adapted to our conditions. Our dairy program has been designed to secure low cost production. To obtain this we breed cows with capacity for high production, grow a large percentage of our feed in the form of good quality palatable roughage, and we give the herd good care."

Brigham's herd has more tested dams than any other Jersey herd in the United States. Forty-three tested dams have 137 tested progeny averaging 10,987 pounds milk and 584 pounds butterfat. Ninety-four cows have received the coveted Ton of Gold award—more than any other herd in the Nation.

Mr. Brigham has had an active career in public service. He was Vermont commissioner of agriculture for 11 years. Then he served as United States Representative in Washington for three terms. After that the National Life Insurance Co. at Montpelier elected him a director. In 1937 he was named president of the company.

In 1948 the Jersey breeders of the United States elected him president of the American Jersey Cattle Club and they reelected him in 1949. He was named as a master breeder by the Jersey breeders in 1947.

Brigham Farm herd averages

Herd-improvement-registry test year ending—	Number of cows	Pounds of milk	Pounds of fat
1949	104	11,703	616
1948	105	10,934	588
1947	111	9,942	530
1946	92	10,259	543
1945	96	10,058	527
1944	91	10,171	520
1943	92	10,058	529
1942	98	10,116	517
1941	92	9,734	512
1940	84	9,441	483
1939	78	8,796	455
1938	79	8,398	438
1937	70	7,617	385
13-year average	92	9,892	517

Effect of the Present Excise Taxes on New York State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 8, 1950

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent heretofore granted, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement of Commissioner Keller, of the Department of Commerce of the State of New York, on the effect of the present excise taxes on the Empire State:

The economic strangulation of small business throughout the length and breadth of the Nation is becoming of ever increasing danger to the well-being of the Nation. This stifling of initiative, suffocating of the drive to improve one's station in life, is swiftly coming to a climax unprecedented in the history of the United States. Not the least of the many forces bearing down on the small-business man today is the growing burden of excise taxes imposed on manufacturers and as retail taxes.

The many advocates of these taxes will argue that the money to support our many and varied operations in the field of government must come from some source. But I ask you, must it come at the expense of those businesses operating in the margin of desire? Excise taxes whether passed on directly to the consumer through retail sales taxes or indirectly through higher prices resulting from manufacturer's taxes result in reduced sales. As prices rise former purchasers either find a substitute or a cheaper commodity.

All too familiar with this principle are the entrepreneurs in the leather goods, sporting goods, jewelry, and photographic industries. They have suffered severely from the harsh excise taxes imposed as a wartime measure. Let us examine the measure's effects in my State. The following table shows how large a part of these industries is represented in New York State:

Principal manufacturing industries affected by wartime excise taxes

	Tax rate	Employment in New York State, 1947 [1]	New York as percent of United States [1]
Manufacturer's tax:	Pct.		
Sporting and athletic goods	10	3,951	13.3
Photographic equipment	(2)	34,566	67.9
Radios and related products	10	33,412	18.7
Phonograph records	10	1,193	11.9
Musical instruments and parts	10	3,002	17.8
Consumer's tax:			
Furs	20	17,835	77.4
Watches and clocks	(3)	6,865	19.8
Jewelry (precious metal)	20	7,269	28.4
Costume jewelry	20	7,252	28.6
Luggage	20	3,918	24.4
Handbags and purses	20	12,988	64.0
Toilet preparations	20	7,783	29.9
Grand total	-----	140,034	20.6

[1] Source: U. S. Bureau of the Census.
[2] Cameras, lenses, and photographic equipment have a 25-percent tax. Unexposed films, plates, or sensitized paper have a 15-percent tax.
[3] 10 percent on alarm clocks selling below $5 and watches selling below $65. 20 percent on all other watches and clocks.

I am informed by the New York State Department of Commerce that at the present time only 65 percent of the photographic industry workers are employed while only 77 percent of the furriers are busy. Likewise, the cosmetic industry is at only 33 percent of full strength and 55 percent of the leather and luggage workers are idle. Approximately 71,000 persons were employed in these industries in 1946 in New York State. Today these industries, suffering from the harsh flat 20-percent excise tax, employ only 53,000 persons.

This situation in New York State is not local. It is rather Nation-wide. The regeneration of business in the several industries following a sharp reduction in the present levies is a picture that I would find very pleasant. Like the pebble tossed in a pool, it promises a "shot in the arm" to other allied and associated industries. Increased sales, a higher level of employment, greater production in a variety of fields are all something that can be looked for.

Excise taxation has until comparatively recently been left almost wholly to the States; Federal excise taxes, on the other hand, were resorted to as regulatory measures in rare cases and as revenue sources in times of war. No other attempt was ever made, however, until 1941 when the existing statutes were extensively revised. This past year brought an all-time high in excise-tax revenue for the Federal Government. More than $7,500,000,000 was derived from this source alone, more than five-fold the amount derived from similar sources 10 years ago and approximately 14 times that derived from excise levies 20 years ago.

The tax on whisky imposed in 1791 proved so unpopular that it led to the famed Whisky Rebellion in 1791. Three years later, however, the young United States levied on other commodities, sugar, snuff, carriages, auction sales, and liquor as well (the previous tax having been repealed). This entire system was abandoned in 1802 only to be revived and supplemented in 1812. The Civil War, Spanish-American War, and World War I periods were marked by the addition of numerous tax levies on the statute books. With the exception of those designed as regulatory measures, these taxes were almost universally abandoned when the conflict terminated.

Such was also the expressed policy adopted in World War II. In 1947, many of the wartime provisions were continued despite clauses in the statutes calling for reduction 6 months after the end of hostilities. The present session of Congress has before it a number of bills to reduce or abolish these excise taxes which fall to so great an extent on the people of our Nation unfairly. The character of the excise tax will always of necessity be regressive. This is true since the taxes strike so sharply at the individual with the lower income, not only the employee and the small-business man but the consumer as well. It is not to be forgotten that the prospective consumer who does not buy due to the higher cost induced by excise taxes is deprived of the use of the commodity. This results in a lower standard of living for the community.

Recognition of the problem has come from many sources within and without the structure of Government. Respecting the several varieties of excise taxes, no less an authority than the Treasury Department (Federal-State Tax Coordination, 1949 revised edition) suggested that the admission tax field is barred to the States by the present high Federal tax. Certainly then, the Congress must hear the pleas of the assembled governors in 1947 when Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, of New York, said:

"We find at the present time that the National Government has almost preempted certain sources of revenue. Some of these sources of revenue are basically local. They include taxes on local businesses, local places of resort or amusement. They are sources of taxation which could more easily be administered by the people in the city, the county, or the State."

In conclusion may I heartily recommend to your attention those bills which provide for a reduction or elimination of these taxes which are withholding the very means of livelihood from untold thousands of skilled craftsmen throughout our land. At work, they add millions of dollars weekly in production, they spend millions in trade. Idle, these workers are an adjustment problem that taxes capacity of the States beyond compare. The solution is in your hands.

Need for Marine Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Nation Needs Marines," from the Terra Haute Star, of April 18, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATION NEEDS MARINES

When unification of the military services was effected in 1947, a mistake was made which Congress now has an opportunity to correct. The mistake was to put the United States Marine Corps in such a subordinate role that its extinction in the course of time was likely.

The correction is incorporated in a bill by Representative CARL VINSON, of Georgia, chairman of the Armed Services Committee of the House. He would amend the Unification Act to include in the Joint Chiefs of Staff the commandant of the Marine Corps. It now includes representatives of the Army, Navy, and Air Force. The threat to the marines is that the Army and the Air Force could combine against the Navy to whittle the marines down to nothing.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff are advisory only, but with the marines having a full vote on organization, strategy and other matters, it would be in position with Navy help to hold up its end of the allocation of men and material which spells the difference between strength or weakness for any branch of the armed services.

The Marine Corps has a proud record and its achievements have written many thrilling chapters of United States military history. The Navy must have an amphibious arm and the marines in the past have discharged that function to perfection. It will be a sad surrender of splendid tradition and a potential weakness in future conflicts if this arm is allowed to wither.

The Nation needs the marines, of whom it has so often been said they "have landed and have the situation well in hand."

The Late Schuyler Otis Bland

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 1950

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND, late a Representative from the State of Virginia

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, with the passing of the Honorable SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND, the State of Virginia lost one of its most distinguished sons. It was with sadness that I learned of his passing for during the war period and the readjustment he gave untiringly of his great ability to creating the American merchant marine necessary to our success in war as well as in peace. It was this super effort put forth during those troubled days that took so much of his strength. Upon coming to the Congress, I had the privilege to serve with Judge BLAND on the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries where he was a most able chairman and a gracious gentleman. He was especially considerate of the new Members of Congress, and I shall not forget his warmth of friendship extended to me, as a freshman in the Congress.

His continuity in the House of Representatives from July 2, 1918, is a glowing tribute of the high esteem in which he was held by his native State. He will be long remembered as a distinguished legislator whose life interest was the establishment and continuity of an adequate American merchant marine, and I want to join with his colleagues from Virginia in mourning the passing of a most distinguished Member of the Congress whose name will live as the father of the American merchant marine.

Organization of All-American Conference To Combat Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by me relative to the recent organization of the All-American Conference To Combat Communism, and including the statement of policy of the conference, a list of its officers, and certain other material.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MUNDT

Mr. President, last week end in Chicago a new American organization came into being and went into action—I refer to the All-American Conference To Combat Communism which held its sessions on May 13 and 14 with delegates present from more than 50 national organizations including a total membership of more than 65,000,000 good, patriotic American citizens. At this meeting a statement of program and purposes was formally adopted, bylaws were established, a budget approved, and national officers elected. For the first time in American history, therefore, our country now has a vehicle for offering a united front against communism and for providing a new challenge to tyranny in every form.

For those who have not been closely following the development of this new movement, perhaps a few words of background information are in order. On January 28 and 29, in New York City, the first meeting in the series of events leading up to formation of the continuing All-American Conference was held in the Hotel Astor. Participating in that meeting were representatives of organizations and associations including a membership of more than 50,000,000 citizens. The New York City meeting was called through the leadership and under the direction of George N. Craig, of Brazil, Ind., the national commander of the American Legion. Included in the speaking program for that 2-day conference were Lt. Gen. W. Bedell Smith, former United States Ambassador to Russia; George Sokolsky, noted columnist; Dr. Francis L. Bacon, professor of education, UCLA; in addition to Commander Craig and your present speaker, the junior Senator from South Dakota.

OPENING STATEMENTS

In opening that historic January meeting in New York City, Commander Craig said, in part:

Commander CRAIG. For many years you in your organization and we in ours have envisioned an occasion for the majority of the American people to sit down and through their representatives consider the benefits and dividends of our great democracy. This occasion, we feel, presents an opportunity where the representatives of a majority of the people of the United States, interested in perpetuating Americanism and defeating communism and communistic influences may through counsel and consideration bring about unity of purpose to the end that this Nation, this land of ours, may always be secure. Thus we may maintain those principles of faith in God and a unity of purpose.

In addressing the closing session of the New York City meeting, I made the following statement which I quote from the transcribed record of that January session:

Senator MUNDT. I urge that from this conference there will grow and develop a national movement comprised of representatives of many cooperating groups and operating at the grass-roots level through the active participation of the local units of these national groups, directed and led by community committees comprised of delegates from each participating national group, so that the forces of those who would remain free may finally have at least as much cohesion and concentration of power as the forces of those who would enslave us have employed for many, many years. Fortified by such organized support, I feel confident we can win against communism at home and curtail it abroad by means short of a fighting war. I trust and pray that out of this conference will come the beginning of a continuing and permanent all-American movement which will forever help to keep all Americans free.

At the conclusion of the New York conference, Mr. President, a committee on continuing organization was appointed and on March 26 the following members of that committee met in the executive committee room of American Legion headquarters in Indianapolis, Ind., for the purpose of drawing up a statement of purposes and program and to map out an action agenda for setting up this new organization: Mr. W. C. "Tom" Sawyer, for the American Legion; Jackson J. Holtz, for the Jewish War Veterans; Lewis Hines, for the American Federation of Labor; Dr. Ernest E. Irons, for American Medical Association; Miss Olive H. Huston, for Business and Professional Women's League; Rev. Daniel A. Poling, for Federal Council of Churches; Rabbi Benjamin Schultz, for Jewish League Against Communism; Alexander T. Wells, for Lions International; Paul Wamsley, for National Education Association; Senator Jack B. Tenney, of the California Legislature; and Senator Karl E. Mundt, for the United States Congress. Senator Tenney was elected chairman of the committee; Alexander T. Wells was made chairman of the Finance Committee; Senator Karl E. Mundt was made chairman of the committee on policy and program. All actions at Indianapolis were subject to change or confirmation by the Chicago conference which was called for May 13 and 14 in the LaSalle Hotel.

Mr. President, it is with genuine pleasure and great hopefulness that I now call attention of the Congress and the country to the fact that a continuing, ably officered, carefully planned, generally inclusive All-American conference to combat communism was brought into reality at the Chicago conference and is now a functioning and significant organism for promoting freedom and defeating communism.

Commander George Craig again presided at the Chicago conference. The reports of the committees headed by Chairman Tenney, Chairman Wells, and Chairman Mundt were all accepted without significant alterations after due deliberation by the delegate assembly.

There follows at this point in my report to the Senate the statement of policy and program as it was prepared at the Indianapolis meeting and amended and adopted at the Chicago conference. Point 4 deals with finances as recommended by the committee of which Mr. Wells was chairman.

STATEMENT OF POLICY OF THE ALL-AMERICAN CONFERENCE TO COMBAT COMMUNISM

I. NAME OF ORGANIZATION

The name of the organization shall be The All-American Conference To Combat Communism.

II. STATEMENT OF POLICY

The constituent bodies in the All-American Conference To Combat Communism support wholeheartedly the basic liberties which are assured by the Constitution of the United States—freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of assembly, and freedom of religion.

They will continue to strive for equal justice for all citizens without discrimination on grounds of race, color, national origin, faith, or creed.

They will strive, in all areas of life, to strengthen American democracy and thereby demonstrate its moral and spiritual, as well as economic, superiority over any totalitarian regime, whether it be Communist, Fascist, or Nazi.

The conference recognizes that its functions are informational, educational, and advisory.

The immediate, specific, and united task of this conference is to unite in one all-American organization those groups of good repute desiring to coordinate their activities in a Nation-wide crusade to defend and promote our freedoms and to expose and curtail communism and other subversive elements in this country. The All-American Conference proposes to carry out its campaign through National, State, and local efforts. It will stress the use of effective means of education and publicity directed at the local grass-roots level by the cooperative leadership of the groups which are associated in the national program of the All-American Conference.

Among the responsibilities to be undertaken by the All-American Conference are:

1. The sponsorship and encouragement of a Nation-wide series of community-by-community programs which will preserve our freedom and combat communism by:

(a) Recommending appropriate courses and activities in our schools and other institutions of learning;

(b) Recommending commemoration of a Know Your America Week in every community for the purpose of aiding everyone in the locality to rededicate himself to the preservation of the basic American principles which will be exemplified and dramatized throughout that week;

(c) Projecting the benefits of our free way of life and its opportunities increasingly to more and more people of every American community as a consequence of community-directed steps toward that objective; and

(d) Protecting our freedom through aiding Americans to become more alert to the personalities, purposes, programs, and front organizations of the Communists in this country.

2. This conference recognizes that communism, fascism, nazism, and all other forms of un-Americanism are equally abhorrent, and each is destructive of the rights and dignity of the individual. Therefore we pledge our efforts to combat all as inconsistent with the democratic way of life. While we are equally opposed to all, we recognize the clear and present dangers of communism and the necessity of meeting it with a positive and militant program as described herein, and whenever fascism or nazism or other forms of un-Americanism threaten all or any segment of the American population we likewise will meet it with the same positive and militant program.

3. The operation of a central national clearing house to collect, prepare, and distribute, through the respective organizations or by direction of the All-American Conference To Combat Communism, printed material, motion pictures, radio and television programs designed to acquaint the average American with the true nature and purposes of the Communist conspiracy and which will portray dramatically and understandably the values and virtues of our free American institutions and organizations.

4. Helping to create and inform public opinion and assisting in the prevention of secret infiltration of our institutions and organizations by Communist agents.

5. The holding of national, State, and regional meetings to unite and crystallize the efforts of those desirous of advancing nonpartisan programs of value in bringing about a better understanding of the basic American concepts which have built America and for expanding the benefits of our American success formula.

6. The continuing organization shall not have authority to and will not speak for any of the cooperating organizations.

III. EXPANSION

With regard to expanding the conference sponsorship, in addition to the present sponsoring organizations, it is resolved that organizations selected for inclusion in the conference shall—

1. Be generally recognized as representative and national in scope;

2. Be excluded if they combine an attack upon communism with an attack upon races, faiths, either or both; and

3. Be restricted to those organizations which express a determination to combat communism and accept the principles, ideals, and objectives as set forth by the All-American Conference To Combat Communism.

IV. ORGANIZATIONAL PATTERN

An organizational pattern is adopted consisting of an executive council composed of one national chairman, five national vice chairmen, one national secretary, one national treasurer, and seven other conference members—no two members of the executive council to be delegates of the same member organization.

V. DELEGATE REPRESENTATION

Each affiliated organization shall be entitled to three delegates to the conference, these delegates to have full voting powers.

Provision shall be made for associate delegates to the All-American Conference To Combat Communism who will serve in an advisory capacity. The selection shall be made by the executive council, subject to approval of the full conference.

VI. FINANCES

1. Each supporting and affiliated organization within the conference shall pay an annual fee of $100 and be asked to make such voluntary contributions as it may be able to make.

2. The continuing organization shall be provided with a minimum budget of $50,000 for its activities for the remainder of the current calendar year.

Adopted May 13–14, 1950, LaSalle Hotel, Chicago, Ill.

Following the adoption of committee reports on the acceptance of the statement of policy and program, the delegate assembly adjourned for the conference banquet which was addressed by Benjamin Gitlow, former Communist organizer, whose long services against communism have won him renown, and F. Joseph Donahue, special assistant to the United States Attorney General who handled the Government's recent case resulting in the conviction of Harry Bridges in the west-coast trial.

Typical of the spirit and optimism prevailing throughout the conference was the statement of Attorney Donahue in his banquet address when he said:

This meeting may well be the most important conference ever held in the United States.

Throughout the New York City meeting, the Indianapolis meeting, and the Chicago conference, the emphasis was on mapping out and carrying through a genuinely practical, realistic, and effective program to protect and promote our freedoms and to expose, identify, and defeat communism and its collateral creeds and friendly fronts.

On May 14, officers were elected as the initial leaders of this All-American Conference To Combat Communism. The spirit of unanimity and cooperation which brought together more than half a hundred great national organizations with varied interests and divergent points of view on many issues but with a determination to unite and solidify their strength in fighting communism was demonstrated by the fact that all officers were unanimously elected.

The following officers were chosen to head the All-American Conference which will hold its next national meeting in Buffalo, N. Y., next November:

OFFICERS OF ALL-AMERICAN CONFERENCE

The following is a list of the names, with addresses, of the national officers and the executive council of the All-American Conference To Combat Communism:

Dr. Daniel A. Poling, chairman, editor, the Christian Herald, 27 East Thirty-ninth street, New York 16, N. Y.

W. C. "Tom" Sawyer, secretary, national Americanism director, the American Legion, 777 North Meridian Street, Indianapolis, Ind.

J. George Fredman, treasurer, Jewish War Veterans, 18 Seventy-sixth Street, North Bergen, N. J.

Five national vice chairmen:

Lewis Hines, first vice chairman, American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue, Washington 1, D. C.

Rev. John F. Cronin, S. S., director, National Catholic Welfare Conference, 1312 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington 5, D. C.

Dr. Frederick C. Fowler, president, National Association of Evangelicans, 324 Zara Street, Pittsburgh, Pa.

Mrs. Marie L. Sheehe, national president, American Legion Auxiliary, 531 Indian Terrace, Rockford, Ill.

Alexander T. Wells, past national president, Lions' International, 41 East Forty-second Street, New York 17, N. Y.

Seven general conference members:

Gerard M. Cahill, representative, Association of Motion Picture Producers, 1600 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

Robert W. Hansen, editor, magazine, National Fraternal Order of Eagles, 212 West Wisconsin Avenue, Milwaukee, Wis.

Miss Olive H. Huston, executive director, National Federation Business and Professional Women's Clubs, 1819 Broadway, New York 23, N. Y.

Rabbi Benjamin Schultz, executive director, American Jewish League Against Communism, 220 West Forty-second Street, New York 18, N. Y.

Rear Adm. Charles S. Stephenson, national medical director, Disabled American Veterans, United States Navy, Marine Corps, retired, 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

Hon. Jack B. Tenney, member, State senate, California, 112 California State Building, First and Spring Streets, Los Angeles 12, Calif.

Paul Wamsley, representing National Education Association of the United States of America, 281 Hartwell Road, Buffalo, N. Y.

In recognition of the pioneer work done by National Commander George Craig, of the American Legion, and Senator KARL MUNDT, of South Dakota, in the formative stages of the All-American Conference, Commander Craig was elected as honorary chairman and Senator MUNDT was elected as an associate delegate of the continuing conference, in which capacities they will serve as consultants and advisers, with the executive functions to be administered by the national officers and the executive council. Correspondence concerning the new organization, its program, its purposes, and the procedures

for affiliating or cooperation with it should be directed to Mr. Sawyer in Indianapolis, Ind., which is the temporary headquarters of the conference.

ACCEPTANCE SPEECH BY NATIONAL CHAIRMAN DANIEL A. POLING

After his unanimous election as national chairman of the All-American Conference To Combat Communism, Rev. Daniel A. Poling addressed the delegate assembly, saying in part:

This marks the first dynamic new unity of the American people to carry the fight to communism everywhere in the United States. We have mobilized here today a mighty task force to wipe out every Communist beachhead in our land.

The All-American Conference To Combat communism is an American unity, not a Soviet conformity. Among organizations and organizationally it will be the master of none, the servant of all and through all its constituent groups and agencies it will seek to be the stout defender of American freedom.

The spirit manifested here, the willingness to meet minds, the charter and structure finally achieved, justify every patriotic organization in the United States and every American of good will in joining with us. I believe that when these facts are fully known only the subversives will be our enemies and no worthy citizen or group will wish to remain aloof.

Here is a unity in which all faiths, all races and colors and all religious, industrial, economic, fraternal, labor, professional, civic, and social groups may comes together to strengthen American freedom and to help save America and the world from communism.

Following the adjournment of the Chicago conference, a meeting of the executive council was held and the following business was transacted:

ABSTRACT OF PROCEEDINGS, ALL-AMERICAN CONFERENCE TO COMBAT COMMUNISM, EXECUTIVE COUNCIL, CHICAGO, ILL., MAY 14, 1950

The chairman was authorized to appoint such committees as, in his opinion, he deems necessary to facilitate the operation of the conference programs, the membership of these committees to be chosen from the general conference membership.

The date for the next general conference meeting was set for November 18 and 19, 1950 (the site was previously determined by conference action to be Buffalo, N. Y.).

The next meeting of the executive council was set for New York City July 15 and 16.

Instructions were given to establish temporary headquarters in Indianapolis.

Lewis Hines was designated as vice chairman of the council.

The treasurer was authorized to draw warrants for obligations of the conference and the executive council upon the demand of the chairman and the secretary.

Mr. President, many Senators and others are likely to receive correspondence from those desiring to affiliate with this great, new, vital force to preserve our American success formula against the forces of tyranny and the conspiracies of communism. To such inquiries the following reply would be accurate, brief, and helpful: "The All-American Conference is an organization of organizations—not of individuals." At the conclusion of these remarks, I am attaching a complete list of the organizations represented by delegates at the Chicago meeting; a few others may since have affiliated with the All-American Conference, but if your association, your service club, your religious denomination, your farm or labor organization, your lodge or fraternity is not included among the affiliated groups, you should have the local unit of such organization communicate to its national officers your desire to join up in this all-American crusade. An annual membership fee of $100 is assessed against each participating national organization—beyond that, the budget will be raised by voluntary contributions from member organizations and from patriotic groups and individuals desirous to help advance this program.

In brief, the All-American Conference To Combat Communism will employ the idea used so successfully by the community chest program in fighting poverty and underprivilege; the conference similarly will unify and unite into a concentrated effort the strength, determination, and efforts of those desiring to fight communism and its kindred creeds. Further information on how to affiliate and how to cooperate with the All-American Conference can be obtained by writing our national secretary, Mr. W. C. "Tom" Sawyer, American Legion Building, Indianapolis, Ind., or to Rev. Daniel A. Poling, national chairman, 27 East Thirty-ninth Street, New York City 16, N. Y.

Now, Mr. President, I call attention to the list of organizations participating in the formation of this All-American Conference:

ORGANIZATIONS PARTICIPATING IN THE ALL-AMERICAN CONFERENCE TO COMBAT COMMUNISM, CHICAGO, ILL., MAY 13–14, 1950

Althusa International.
American China Policy Association.
American Federation of Labor.
American Federation of Soroptimist Clubs.
American Hungarian Federation.
American Jewish Committee.
American Jewish League Against Communism.
American Legion.
American Legion Auxiliary.
American Medical Association.
American War Mothers.
Amvets.
Association of American Physicians and Surgeons.
Association of Motion Picture Producers.
Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks.
B'nai B'rith.
Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers.
Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.
Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America.
Chamber of Commerce of the United States.
Committee To Defend America by Aiding Anti-Communist China.
Common Cause.
Conference of American Small Business Organizations.
Daughters of the American Revolution, National Society.
Disabled American Veterans.
Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America.
Fraternal Order of Eagles.
Freedoms Foundation.
General Federation of Women's Clubs.
Grand Lodge of Free and Accepted Masons.
Improved Order of Red Men.
Independent Order of Odd Fellows.
Interfraternity Research and Advisory Council.
Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America.
Kiwanis International.
Knights of Columbus.
Knights of Pythias.
Legion of Guardsmen.
Lions International.
Loyal Order of Moose.
Military Order of the Purple Heart.
Modern Woodmen of the World.
Mothers of World War II.
National Association of Evangelicals.
National Association of Manufacturers.
National Catholic Welfare Conference.
National Education Association of the United States.
National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs.
National Grange.
National Interfraternity Conference.
National Panhellenic Conference.
National Small Business Men's Association.
National Sojourners.
Society of Former Special Agents of the FBI.
Sons of the American Revolution.
Sons of the Revolution, General Society.
United Spanish War Veterans.
Veterans of Foreign Wars.

N. B.—Several other organizations were represented by observers, but requested not to be identified until they have had an opportunity to report to their respective executive bodies.

Finally, Mr. President and Members of the Senate, I call your attention to the following news story appearing in the May 15 issue of the Chicago Tribune, which contains the press report relating an account of this organization meeting of the All-American Conference To Combat Communism:

SIXTY GROUPS FORM BODY TO COMBAT AMERICAN REDS—DR. DANIEL POLING NAMED FIRST PRESIDENT

An organization with a potential power of more than 80,000,000 Americans behind it was organized officially yesterday to combat communism in the United States.

The group, which adopted the name of the All-American Conference To Combat Communism, was organized by the unanimous votes of delegates from more than 60 organizations of all types, meeting in the La Salle Hotel. The Reverend Dr. Daniel A. Poling, of New York City, editor of the Christian Herald and a commentator and author, was made first interim national chairman. He will serve until the next meeting of the conference, November 18 and 19, in Buffalo.

MARKS DYNAMIC UNITY

"This marks the first dynamic unity of the American people to carry the fight to communism everywhere in the United States," Dr. Poling said.

Under the new organization all faiths, races, religions, professions, and all economic, industrial, labor, and social groups can come together to strengthen America and save our country and the world from communism, he said.

The conference authorized a $50,000 interim budget for its immediate activities, and then directed that a subcommittee work out plans to aid key Government witnesses whose testimony helped convict Harry Bridges, president of the CIO longshoremen's union, in his recent perjury trial in San Francisco.

Joseph Donahue, special assistant United States attorney general who prosecuted Bridges, had told the delegates Saturday night that 6 of the 10 key witnesses had lost their jobs as a result of their testimony, and said the Government was helpless to assist them.

CRAIG'S EFFORTS RECOGNIZED

George N. Craig, national commander of the American Legion, was elected honorary national chairman of the group in recognition of his efforts to bring the member organizations together in a united front against communism. The Chicago organizational meeting was an outgrowth of a similar Legion sponsored meeting in New York last January.

Also elected were five vice chairmen: Mrs. Marie Sheehe of Rockford, Ill., national president of the American Legion Auxiliary; the Reverend John A. Cronin of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, Washington; Dr. Frederick C. Fowler of Pittsburgh, president of the National Association of Evangelics; Lewis Hines of the American Federation of Labor, Washington; and Alexander T. Wells, of New York, past president of Lions International.

SENATOR MUNDT ELECTED

W. C. Sawyer, of Indianapolis, director of the American Legion's National Americanism

Commission, was elected secretary, and J. George Fredman, of Union City, N. J., a member of the Jewish War Veterans National Executive Committee, was elected treasurer. Senator MUNDT, Republican, of South Dakota, was elected an associate member of the conference. He was a member of the 17-man policy committee which drafted a policy statement and planned the Chicago meeting. A five-member executive committee also was chosen.

The policy statement outlined plans to fight communism in every locality of the United States. Literature and radio and television programs will be channeled from a central clearing house. National, State, and local meetings are planned. Other organizations in sympathy with the conference will be invited to join.

Idaho Opposition to Proposed Columbia Valley Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 18 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, the people of Idaho are grateful for the services of the President in pointing up for the coming campaign an issue involving the Columbia Valley Authority. Idaho editors are commenting on this development of the President's recent trip to the Northwest. Typical of this comment is an editorial published on May 14, 1950, in the Idaho Sunday Statesman at Boise, Idaho. I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. TRUMAN'S TRIP MAY NOT BE POLITICS FOR DEMOCRATS BUT HE SURE DID THE REPUBLICANS A BIG FAVOR IN BOISE

Mr. Truman has come and gone. Not too many Idahoans appeared for a glimpse of the Nation's Chief Executive. It was true that the schedule brought him into eastern Idaho early in the morning, which would explain the attendance at Pocatello, but the crowd at Boise lends credence to national reports that the President is not as popular as he used to be, and that he keeps on slipping.

Mr. Truman did nothing for his popularity with his speech at Boise. He came out for the Columbia Valley Administration (Authority). In a scolding manner, he seemed to suggest that here we just don't know what CVA is, or what it would do.

The facts are that we understand perfectly what CVA happens to be, and understanding, we want to be everlastingly sure that CVA never has a chance to get control of Idaho.

Mr. Truman denied the contention that CVA has special powers. Either he has not read the bill, or he is avoiding the truth.

Mr. Truman also said CVA would be administered here, rather than in Washington. But answerable only to Congress. And composed of political appointees of the President. Former Idaho Senator James Pope was named to the Tennessee Valley Authority after Idaho defeated him for the Senate. Idaho could not expect CVA administrators any better than Mr. Pope was for Tennessee. We might might even get someone from Missouri to run CVA. We have just had a man from Missouri telling us we have to have CVA.

The President says the reason CVA is needed is to stop the fuss between the Reclamation Bureau and the Army Engineers.

Why doesn't the President stop this fuss himself?

The Reclamation Bureau is a part of the Interior Department. The Secretary of the Interior is appointed by Mr. Truman. Mr. Chapman, another CVA promoter, is in control of any Reclamation Bureau fussing.

The Army engineers, we are quite certain, could be told to stop fussing by Mr. Truman. Seems he's the head man there, too.

So what do we have here?

We have a President admitting failure on his own part. So he wants CVA rather than do his job.

It is also to be noted that Mr. Truman does not say "Columbia Valley Administration."

He says: "Columbia Valley Authority."

That's the one place where he sticks to facts.

"Authority" is correct.

That's why Idaho says no.

The President, however, did make one substantial contribution to Idaho's future, as far as Government is concerned, when he made CVA the issue. To date Senator TAYLOR had avoided CVA. And this was practical politics. The Senator knows, from actual experience, that Idaho does not want CVA. Mr. TAYLOR campaigned the State, in an election in which he said CVA was the one and only issue, and he knows the results. The CVA candidates were soundly whipped.

Therefore Mr. Truman's projection of the CVA issue at this time, with an election in the offing, makes it once more the big topic, and, at the same time, a most welcome development for all Republicans in Idaho.

Mr. Truman may not, as he claims, be on a political trip, but he certainly got into politics in Idaho. He definitely helped Idaho Republicans who were hopeful CVA would be the campaign issue once more.

The easy way to whip the Democrats in Idaho is for them to come out whole hog for CVA.

A Concurrent Resolution Protesting Against Census Procedure in Allocating Residence of Students in Educational Institutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL C. MICHENER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 18, 1950

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, in the Second Congressional District of Michigan, which I have the honor to represent in Congress, are located the great University of Michigan at Ann Arbor, the State Normal College at Ypsilanti, Siena Heights Girls' College at Adrian, Adrian College at Adrian, the Cleary Business College at Ypsilanti, as well as other institutions of learning.

The students attending the schools do not as a rule have permanent residence in the city where the school is located. In these circumstances, the new regulation allocating students in college to the population of the city where the college is located rather than in the cities, villages or townships where the students have their domiciles is, in my opinion, an error and should be corrected.

The Legislature of the State of Michigan has passed a concurrent resolution pointing out the fallacy of the regulation and directive of the Bureau of the Census in changing the traditional, time-honored and sensible allocation of students temporarily in college to the population of the communities where they actually reside and have their homes. This concurrent resolution points out the injustice of the present policy of the Census Bureau and how it will affect the distribution of State tax money in Michigan. I am in receipt of a certified copy of the concurrent resolution and, pursuant to permission granted by the House I include that resolution which reads as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 23

Concurrent resolution protesting against census procedure in allocating residence of students in educational institutions

Whereas under the present Federal census taking procedure by directive from the Census Bureau in Washington, all students at the University of Michigan, Michigan State College, and other such institutions of learning are being registered as residents of the cities and counties in which such institutions are situated; and

Whereas the constitution of this State, section 2, article III, contains the following provision: "No elector shall be deemed to have gained or lost a residence * * * while a student at any institution of learning"; and

Whereas, by law, the residence of minor students, unemancipated, is that of their parents; and

Whereas section 23 of article X of the State constitution, the so-called sales tax diversion amendment, provides for a distribution of tax receipts on a population basis and adopts the Federal census of population as a base in the following language: "Population computation shall be based on the last Statewide Federal census for purposes of division among counties * * *" and said tax is so distributed, as well as other revenues which are distributed by statute on the same basis; and

Whereas the Federal census procedure in this regard will redistribute part of the State tax receipts, not on a basis of the real population of counties, cities, villages, and townships, but in the case of thousands upon thousands of students, upon a temporary residence in an institution of learning, thereby upsetting the intended method of distribution of tax money; and

Whereas because of this method these places in which are situated such institutions of learning will receive many thousands of dollars not justly due to them and deprive the actual places of residence of such students of an equal amount which should, under State law, be paid to them: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the Members of the Michigan delegation in the Congress be requested to see that the directive described be changed so that this virtual amendment of laws and constitution of this State by a Federal Bureau be changed, and that the census be accurately taken so that the true residence of students be accredited to the various counties, cities, villages, and townships as has heretofore been done; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each Member of the Michigan delegation in Congress.

Adopted by the house April 27, 1950.

Adopted by the senate May 4, 1950.

FRED I. CHASE,
Secretary of the Senate.
NORMAN E. PHILLEO,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Citation Given M. L. Goodman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY P. O'NEILL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 18, 1950

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Scranton Tribune, dated April 27, 1950, honoring Mr. M. L. Goodman:

CITATION GIVEN M. L. GOODMAN—HONORED AT CAPITAL FOR 50-YEAR RECORD

WASHINGTON, April 27.—M. L. (Mike) Goodman was honored tonight by the Atlantic Coast Independent Distributors Association for 50 years outstanding service to the newspaper and magazine distributing industry and his rise from newsboy to publisher of the Scrantonian and the Scranton Tribune.

Goodman was honored at a dinner at the fiftieth annual convention of the ACIDA in the Mayflower Hotel, Washington. He was presented a life membership in the association and a plaque, his picture mounted on it, with the following inscription:

"In recognition of more than a half century of service to independent distribution."

S. F. Gingold, New Haven, Conn., in presenting Mr. Goodman the plaque described him as humanitarian, distributor, publisher, and civic leader.

He said Goodman arrived in America at age 9. In 1898, at 17, he acquired the distributing agency for the Philadelphia North American and launched his career as distributor. Gingold said:

"Mike's early start was in the days of the push-cart era, and since that time has built one of the largest distributing agencies in America."

Gingold said Goodman became publisher of the Scrantonian, 1920, and the Scranton Tribune, 1937.

"Through all these busy years he was mindful of his civic and humanitarian obligations * * * activities: Community chest, chamber of commerce, United Jewish Appeal, and founded Temple Israel.

"His friendship and counsel to his hundreds of friends in this industry has endeared him to the hearts of everybody.

"Mike, we in this industry are proud to pay you honor and salute you."

Murray Kissen, of the Kissen News Agency, Port Jervis, N. Y., wrote and read the following poem in honor of Goodman:

"Fifty years a newsboy I'm asking you Mike,
is that bad?
Fifty years a newsboy
Ever since you were a lad.
Remember how you used to yell out
'Extra'—hey, what do you read?
And all of the famous old headlines
Bout the battleship *Maine*—and Boss Tweed.

Selling papers is one thing
We all know you did that darn well
But selling yourself that's another
And there's where you really excel.

When you started out on the sidewalks
Away down in Scranton, P. A.
Did you ever dream that there'd be a club
Like the ACIDA.

Among newsboys you are an exception
I'm sure everyone will agree,
A newsboy—wholesaler—publisher—
And damn if you ain't the whole three.

Where else in the world could that happen?
Well I'm happy to stand here and say
It could happen in any old hamlet
Of our glorious U. S. A.

In the hall of fame for newsboys
Your name will be right on the door
And may God be kind and keep you
With us for 50 years more."

Members of his family present were: Judge and Mrs. David Rose; brother, Morris and wife; son, Herman; and Mr. and Mrs. Ralph Furman.

Rabbi Simon H. Shoop, of Temple Israel, Scranton, sent this telegram:

"Temple Israel adds voice to the many honoring M. L. Goodman. We honor a pioneer who cleared the frontiers of a large industry and helped to build it. We honor a man whose fighting instinct and dauntless courage propelled him from poverty to a position of outstanding leadership. We honor the fine, gentle, affable founder of our temple whom we fondly call Mike. May God grant him many additional years of strength and happiness."

The Amerasia Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 18, 1950

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I have been reading the articles on the Amerasia case which are appearing in the Washington Daily News and other Scripps-Howard newspapers under the byline of Mr. Frederick Woltman.

Mr. Woltman, I need not inform this Chamber, is no Red baiter. He is a newspaper reporter of the highest repute, the recipient of the Pulitzer prize for just such newspaper reporting as he is doing now.

When Mr. Woltman was chosen for the Pulitzer prize a few years ago, some national magazine—I believe it was Time—observed that many journalists had attempted to report the tricky subject of Communist infiltration, but that only one person had done as careful a job as Mr. Woltman.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Woltman and his editors are performing a major service to American freedom by bringing up the Amerasia case at this time.

For weeks we as a Congress and a nation have been confused by charges and denials that certain individuals influential in the conduct of our foreign policy were either Communists or akin to Communists in their methods and purposes.

Unfortunately, there is no easy way of saying who is and who is not a Communist. In the final analysis, it often rests upon highly subjective interpretation of acts and words. Since there is always room for two opinions, this kind of discussion tends to deteriorate into useless name-calling.

But the Amerasia case is another matter.

The Amerasia case is a matter of actual court record. It bristles with hard, ugly facts. It raises ugly questions as to the reliability of persons who have held and still hold our highest national offices. It cries out even now for a clarification.

Mr. Speaker, I need not recall that in the Amerasia case more documents—and more important documents—were purloined than in the famous Chambers-Hiss case. Just as the Chambers-Hiss case did much to clarify America's thinking on the menace of communism, so I believe that the full exploitation of the Amerasia case will clear up our doubts about the charges raised in the McCarthy-Lattimore case.

I venture to say that if the Congress and the administration will make an effort to get to the bottom of the Amerasia case, this Nation will know beyond a shadow of a doubt whether Communist sympathizers or concealed Communists in our Government engineered our diplomatic defeat in China and the enslavement of millions of our oriental friends.

If the charge is false, there can be no objection from anyone into looking into the situation.

If it is true, then all the Members of this Congress have an equal duty to develop the facts.

Mr. Speaker, even now the people of my district and of the districts of my colleagues are living in dread of another war. We have heard from Mr. Acheson himself that the events of May 28 in Berlin may quickly decide whether there is to be a third world war starting in 1950.

Surely, the hour is passed for worrying whether the truth can hurt particular parties or particular candidates. This is no time to condemn earnest, sincere Americans who are deeply concerned about this Nation's security—and even survival—as engaging in "politics" or attempting to drag out "red herrings."

This kind of approach is unbecoming to those officials whom the people of this Nation have placed in our highest elective offices. I devoutly hope that we have heard the last of such excuses.

Meanwhile, I believe that a determined nonpartisan effort to uncover the decisions that led to quashing the Amerasia case will do more than anything to enlighten and unify the people of this great Nation.

If our Government was right in handling the case as it did, then our corroding doubts will be removed. If individuals in our Government did wrong, we shall know where we stand and what steps to take to assure the preservation of freedom in a world where the area of freedom is becoming smaller every day.

Know the truth, Mr. Speaker, and the truth shall set you free.

Democratic Platform in the Congressional Campaign of 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the platform of the Democratic Party in the presidential campaign of 1948 is the platform of the Democratic Party in the congressional campaign of 1950.

The following is the text of the resolution adopted by the Democratic national resolutions committee at Chicago on May 15, 1950, on the occasion of the celebration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the election of Thomas Jefferson as President of the United States:

Whereas the Democratic National Committee has met in Chicago in connection with the Jefferson Jubilee and has here again rededicated itself to the ideals Thomas Jefferson espoused; and

Whereas the Democratic National Committee has met on the eve of one of the most significant campaigns in the history of our Nation; and

Whereas powerful enemies of the Democratic Party are already embarked on a serious campaign to reverse the mandate for progressive liberalism which the voters gave to President Harry S. Truman and the Democratic Party in 1949: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Democratic National Committee adopt the following set of principles;

The Democratic National Committee reaffirms its support of our President and of the Fair Deal program as espoused by our President and by the sound, liberal platform adopted by the Democratic National Convention in 1948 and we pledge ourselves to press with continued vigor to reach the goals espoused in those programs drafted to benefit all Americans, regardless of their origin, color, race or religion.

FUNDAMENTAL GOALS LISTED

The following remain our fundamental goals:

To exert the leadership of our ideas and our ideals so that the sinews of our free-enterprise economy will continue to work for a lasting and just peace based upon the freedom of the individual to enjoy the rights and liberties of which he is deprived under communism or other forms of totalitarianism;

To maintain our own defense so that no foe of the American way of life—a democracy of free citizens and a free-enterprise economy—shall dare to seek to conquer us by military force;

To make our democratic Government and our free-enterprise economy dynamic so that we shall continue to improve the lot of all of our citizens and to increase our national production to provide jobs for an expanding population, and by creating a constantly expanding economy to avoid the old cycle of boom and bust.

The Democratic Party believes that this can best be achieved when the businessman, the farmer, and the workingman act as a team with the cooperation of government which provides the climate in which business can thrive and the individual can live in reasonable freedom from the fear of economic disaster.

We proudly cite the achievements of our Nation in the past 17 years as an example of what can be achieved under such a program.

We are proud of an administration under which national income has more than tripled in 17 years and we offer it as proof that wise, liberal government contributes greatly to the growth and prosperity of our free-enterprise economy.

We wish to take formal notice of the charge that our party is a welfare party. We are proud that we have measured up to the authority and duty of the Government as set forth in our Constitution to promote the general welfare and we propose to continue to promote the general welfare—the general welfare of all Americans.

PRESIDENT IS PRAISED

We are proud that this has been done without depriving one single American of one single liberty and without the socializing of any aspect of American life. We propose to continue to protect the rights of all individuals and to preserve our free enterprise economy.

We commend our President for his courage in calling for the necessary Federal expenditures to promote international cooperation toward peace and the containment of communism and a budget which will also allow the essential Government expenditures that contribute to the welfare of the American people.

We are in full agreement with our President that the way to balance the Federal budget is by expanding our economy rather than by weakening our defenses, surrendering to Russia in the cold war, and reverting to isolationism.

We agree with our President that we must not abandon the important domestic programs which have rescued our Nation from a depression and brought it to the highest level of prosperity any nation in the world's history has ever known.

We are strongly in favor of the right kind of economy—the kind practiced by this administration in reorganizing the Government to achieve greater efficiency and in practicing constant vigilance to find ways to reduce expenses without impairing vital services.

More specifically:

In the field of foreign relations we reaffirm our support of bipartisan cooperation and we praise wholeheartedly those Republicans who have refused to let partisanship or political bias affect their support of a sound international policy.

We are in full support of the President and the Secretary of State in their efforts to aid freedom-loving nations and to roll back the tide of Red totalitarianism.

BELIEF IN UNITED NATIONS CITED

We continue to believe firmly that the United Nations can be developed into the greatest organization for peace the world has ever known and we look to the day when it can protect oppressed groups now ground under the heels of police states in countries behind the iron curtain.

We urge ratification of the Convention on Genocide to stop the destruction of subjugated peoples. We reaffirm our desire to help to the fullest extent possible those made homeless by the war and to admit displaced persons into our Nation under a liberal program which will permit us to continue to receive the great contributions made to our society by persons of foreign birth.

We pledge ourselves to finish the job now under way by the Economic Cooperation Administration and to continue an effective program of military assistance to friendly nations.

We pledge our full support to the point 4 program enunciated by the President in his inaugural address. We believe that this program of technical assistance and capital investment to the underdeveloped areas of the world will be a major contribution to lasting peace.

In the field of domestic legislative activity we shall continue the balanced program of conservation and integrated development of our natural resources which are the bedrock foundation of our economic society.

This means that we shall continue reclamation and flood control projects and that we shall continue to harness the energy of our streams to create the cheap electrical power that has been so important in encouraging economic expansion over many areas of our Nation.

We believe that the pattern of integrated valley development pioneered by the Tennessee Valley—a project which has created wealth and productive capital far beyond its original cost—be continued in the valley of the Columbia River and in other areas where such a project is found feasible.

We recognize the croplands must be protected against the ravages of misuse or overuse by a program of soil conservation conducted vigorously and we also recognize that our farm economy must be kept healthy if the Nation is to continue to progress.

We view as a serious problem the drop in the income and purchasing power of American farmers and reiterate that the Democratic Party believes in supporting farm income at a fair level at a time when that support is needed and rejects the idea that supports should be high when they are not needed and low when they are needed.

PRODUCTION PAYMENTS BACKED

We believe that our party should always be alert for methods to improve our farm program and we believe that a system of production payments on certain commodities as proposed by the President offers an excellent opportunity to improve our present program and should be given a test at the earliest possible opportunity.

We believe that competition is the life blood of our free enterprise economy and we stand for continued vigilance by the Department of Justice and other agencies charged with the job of preventing monopolistic practices and of encouraging competition.

We believe that changes improving the present antitrust laws can be of great value in preserving competition and assisting small business.

Further, in the field of small business, we call for a Federal program which will enable private financial institutions to provide small business with the capital it needs to compete successfuly with larger concerns.

We do not believe that big business in itself is bad for our economy, but we believe that small business must be given the opportunity to grow and thrive so that our economy can expand as our population increases. We must preserve the kind of an America where a man with big and good ideas but small capital can succeed in the world of business.

We believe that the workingman must receive a fair return for his labor if our economy is to remain in balance.

We hail the contributions minimum-wage legislation has made in this field and believe that existing laws should be under constant study so that they may be changed as conditions warrant.

We believe that growth of the trade-union movement has contributed greatly to economic stability and to the expanded economy and higher standards of living which all Americans now enjoy.

FOR TAFT-HARTLEY REPEAL

The Taft-Hartley law is unfair to labor unions and imperils the contributions which organized labor has made to our society. We urge its repeal and substitution therefor of legislation which will be equally fair to worker and to management and will protect the public interest by encouraging genuine collective bargaining.

Our employment insurance program should be strengthened as a cushion against temporary recessions or local unemployment.

The program of Federal assistance to the housing industry and to public agencies desiring to construct low-cost housing for low-income groups has contributed greatly both to the economic good health of our Nation and to the personal welfare of our citizens by encouraging the family life in good surroundings that is a tradition of our Nation. This program must be continued and additional steps should be taken to enable middle-income families to achieve better homes at prices that will not work hardships upon them.

Until the housing shortage which still exists in many areas is alleviated, it is necessary to provide a reasonable system of rent controls in order to prevent severe economic dislocation and actual hardship on many families. The present law provides for equitable adjustment of rents and for orderly decontrol and should be continued until the present housing shortage is ended.

In other fields which contribute to the personal welfare of our citizens this Nation has made great strides but our successes in these fields should not cause us to become complacent but rather to spur us on toward even greater achievements.

Increased activity by the Federal Government is necessary in the field of education to provide every American with the opportunity for a decent minimum of education.

Our social-security system needs to be broadened and its benefits increased.

In the field of health, we need more hospitals, more doctors, dentists, and nurses, more medical technicians of every kind, more research, and more public-health activities in connection with medical care which will protect our citizens from the financial disaster which illness can now bring to millions of families.

HEALTH PLAN ENDORSED

In order to avoid socialized medicine in the United States, we endorse the President's program for broadened Federal activity in the entire field of health and medical care and the adoption of a pay-as-you-go insurance program to put better medical care within the financial reach of all Americans.

We endorse in general the program of Government reorganization along the lines recommended by the Hoover Commission, and we commend our President for his earnest efforts to bring about governmental reforms and reorganization to promote Federal efficiency. We condemn the actions of those who make speeches in favor of economy and efficiency but vote against it for partisan reasons when major aspects of the reorganization program are up for a vote.

We urge that S. 1527, relating to suffrage in the District of Columbia, be discharged from the committee and passed by the House of Representatives in concurrence with the Senate.

We urge statehood for Alaska and Hawaii without delay.

In conclusion, we believe that the person is more important than property; that the rights of humans are the basic rights which have made our Nation strong, and this has been a major tenet of the Democratic Party.

A careful study has shown that, even with vigilant enforcement of existing laws, our program of protecting human rights is not perfect and that additional legislation is needed.

We affirm specifically that portion of the Fair Deal and our 1948 platform which said, "The Democratic Party is responsible for the great civil-rights gains made in recent years in eliminating unfair and illegal discrimination based on race, creed, or color. The Democratic Party commits itself to continuing its efforts to eradicate all racial, religious, and economic discrimination. We again state our belief that racial and religious minorities must have the right to live, the right to work, the right to vote, the full and equal protection of the laws, on a basis of equality with all citizens as guaranteed by the Constitution."

We commend President Harry S. Truman for his courageous stand on the issues of civil rights.

We are, of course, opposed to any Communist being employed in our Government and we will not tolerate Communist interference in any way. It is the duty of every citizen who has evidence of disloyalty to furnish any such evidence to the Government, and we condemn efforts to gain partisan advantage by smears and innuendoes which hamper our Government and blacken the characters of innocent citizens.

HITS RUMORS, DISTORTIONS

We reaffirm our belief in fair play and honest factual investigation and we believe that development of facts better serves the interests of our people than development of headlines based on rumor and distortions.

The Democratic Party will never advocate fighting communism with the police state terrorism which communism imposes upon its own victims.

The honesty, patriotism, and sound judgment of the American people show plainly that our strongest defense against those who rob us of our freedoms is to retain and protect those freedoms.

To this we pledge ourselves once again.

The St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 18 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement favoring the development of the St. Lawrence seaway, by Clyde T. Ellis, executive manager of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, before the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives on May 9, 1950, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF CLYDE T. ELLIS, EXECUTIVE MANAGER, NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION, BEFORE THE PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, MAY 9, 1950

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, my name is Clyde T. Ellis. I am executive manager of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, which is the service organization of the rural electric systems of the United States. Eight hundred and fifty-nine systems are members of their service organization, with a consumer membership of approximately 2,500,000 farm families in 43 States and Alaska.

STRUGGLE IN ST. LAWRENCE AREA

The rural electrification program is having its most difficult struggle in the St. Lawrence area. For the purpose of this discussion, we have defined the St. Lawrence area as including New England, New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania, for we believe the St. Lawrence development will vastly improve the power supply situation and the power cost situation in most of this area.

REA Administrator Claude R. Wickard stated to the Agriculture Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee on January 30, and I quote from page 1036 of the record:

"I referred this morning to the New England area and that is where we are meeting the most difficult situation now in trying to improve the situation financially. The cooperatives are small and have been harassed by the spiteline activities of the power companies. * * * Their wholesale costs are going up."

I do not know whether Mr. Wickard meant to include New York in the term "New England area," but his statement would certainly apply with equal force to New York, and to a smaller extent, to Pennsylvania and New Jersey.

The rural electric systems of the country conduct their own annual survey as of January 1 each year to determine among other things their needs for further loan funds to achieve area coverage and their power supply requirements. There are 28 rural electric cooperatives in the St. Lawrence area, and 22 of them returned their survey questionnaires. We arrived at the figures I shall give you here by averaging the 22 and projecting them through the 28. This method has always given us very accurate figures.

Our 28 systems were serving 69,237 farms and rural establishments on January 1, but they stated that within their system areas there are still 40,984 which they desire to serve. In other words, they had achieved only 63 percent area coverage within their system areas. REA estimates that nationally approximately 85 percent of the farms and rural establishments were served on January 1. I hasten to point out that most of the St. Lawrence area is and has always been above the national average in percent of farms electrified, but the areas served by our rural electric systems are below the national average. Twenty-seven percent of our systems in the St. Lawrence area report a present inadequate supply of wholesale power. This is higher than the national average.

A similar number of our systems in the St. Lawrence area (27 percent) report that they don't have enough power in sight for future growth. This is higher than the national average. Forty-five percent of these systems report restrictions on the use of power they do buy.

But here are the two figures that hurt most. Eighty-six percent of our systems report that their power costs went up in the past year, as compared with 34 percent nationally which report an increase, and as you know, our power costs went down in several areas in the country last year. Our 28 systems report that they paid an average wholesale power cost of 13⅓ mills per kilowatt-hour last year, and this 13⅓ mills compares with 9.9 mills national average.

I believe you can see from these figures that our power situation is very difficult in the St. Lawrence area. There is always the constant danger that our systems may run completely out of power, for they are having to depend on sources that are generally unfriendly—indeed the very sources that tried to kill many of them off.

Let me give you a few examples of our desperation:

1. The Maine Public Service Co. in the fall of 1949 offered the Farm-Home Electric Cooperative of Patten, Maine, a wholesale rate of 2 cents per kilowatt hour, provided the coop would sign a 10-year contract, and gave the cooperative the only alternative of accepting its other filed schedule at a rate of 3½ cents per kilowatt hour. No rural electric cooperative can long survive under those conditions, and the power company knows that.

2. The power company which is supplying the New Hampshire Electric Cooperative is on the one hand opposing an acquisition

which would make it possible for the co-op to virtually achieve area coverage in the State, and on the other hand, at the same time, it is seeking to raise its wholesale rate to the co-op, and its rate is already one of the highest. The power company is also, at the same time, engaged in the process of "pirating" the co-op's member customers.

3. In Vermont, Washington Electric Cooperative's power supplier has refused to rehabilitate the transmission lines serving the cooperative in order to render decent service, and at the same time has strenuously opposed the co-op's efforts to develop some small hydro potentialities in the area.

4. In New York, the rural electrification program was seriously crippled and almost killed by intense power company activity. One co-op was spitelined to death, and the five remaining ones were seriously crippled. The power companies are charging the co-ops one of the highest wholesale rates in the country, and their recent offer of a slight reduction is so filled with jokers that our systems hesitate to accept it, much as they need a reduction.

5. In Pennsylvania, the same New York power company that has been the worst enemy of rural electrification in New York sells power to the Northern Pennsylvania Power Co. at a rate so high that the Pennsylvania company's resale rates to the three northern cooperatives in Pennsylvania are prohibitive.

MUST HAVE POWER AT OUR LOAD CENTERS

Perhaps I should say a word about getting our power delivered to the load centers. All our distribution systems are necessarily designed with load centers into which the power must be fed. Our generation and transmission co-ops and the Federal Government make a practice of selling their power delivered to our distribution co-op load centers. Private companies deliver it to our load centers in some cases, but in a large percent of the cases the private companies require us to build our own transmission lines from our load centers to their substations in order to pick up their power.

We are paying the Federal Government an average of 5 mills per kilowatt-hour for wholesale power in other sections of the country, delivered at the load centers. We are paying the private companies in the St. Lawrence area 13⅓ mills, much of it not delivered to our load centers.

POWER COMPANY RESTRICTIONS ARE DICTATORSHIP

Perhaps I should say another word also about restrictions. Whereas our generation co-ops and the Federal Government do not restrict our use of power, do not tell us to whom we may sell it. many of the power companies do restrict us, and this is true in nearly half of the cases in the St. Lawrence area. The power companies scream free enterprise on the one hand (always carefully omitting the word "competitive"), while subjecting us to totalitarian practices on the other hand. They go so far as to tell us whom we can serve and whom we can't, and for how much. They demand to be the only grocer in several counties and yet they prohibit us from feeding one child at all, tell us how much we can feed another and penalize us for feeding a third. Their monopolistic practices are dictatorial, unscrupulous, and un-American.

SAVINGS AND AREA COVERAGE AT TVA RATE

I am listing here our 28 cooperatives in the St. Lawrence area, showing the amount of power they purchased last year, July 1, 1948, to June 30, 1949, what the cost to the co-ops would have been at the TVA rate, and the savings at the TVA rate. I believe the Ontario rate just across the St. Lawrence River from this area is about the same. I believe it is fair to use the TVA rate as the comparison because we understand that St. Lawrence power can be produced at a cost much less than that of TVA, largely because of the tremendous flow of the St. Lawrence and because of the fact that there is practically no fluctuation in the stream flow.

Cooperative	Kilowatt-hours	Fiscal 1949 billing	Billing under TVA rate	Savings under TVA rate
New York:				
Otsego	2,934,800	$40,733.00	$17,542.80	$23,190.20
Delaware	3,906,400	52,414.00	22,810.00	29,604.00
Steuben	2,523,000	35,914.00	15,259.80	20,654.20
Chautauqua	715,100	9,976.00	4,696.40	5,279.60
Oneida	962,525	13,376.00	6,323.30	7,052.70
Total	11,041,825	152,413.00	66,632.30	85,780.70
New Jersey:				
Monmouth	2,703,600	36,202.00	16,266.00	19,936.00
Sussex	2,459,900	33,602.00	14,908.50	18,693.50
Total	5,163,500	69,804.00	31,174.50	38,629.50
New Hampshire: Merrimack	6,041,934	84,958.00	33,646.04	51,311.96
Maine:				
Penobscot	1,524,036	18,811.00	9,692.51	9,118.49
Aroostook	937,094	18,185.00	6,156.78	12,028.22
Washington	747,368	9,531.12	4,911.87	4,619.25
Hancock	314,660	4,106.00	2,068.64	2,037.36
Total	3,523,158	50,633.12	23,829.80	27,803.32
Vermont:				
Orleans	5,695,850	68,570.21	31,884.42	36,685.79
Washington	4,444,820	57,137.48	25,570.85	31,566.63
Windham	776,600	11,933.00	5,104.40	6,828.60
Total	10,917,270	137,640.69	62,559.67	75,081.02
Pennsylvania:				
Crawford	16,630,800	167,573.00	85,030.00	82,543.00
Indiana	10,589,020	107,347.00	56,699.00	50,648.00
Sullivan	2,518,385	37,818.00	15,235.00	22,583.00
Tioga	10,924,163	152,732.00	58,390.00	94,342.00
Clearfield	3,824,615	38,804.00	22,517.00	16,287.00
Bradford	12,264,428	182,559.00	65,065.00	117,494.00
Armstrong	14,190,000	123,077.00	73,873.00	49,204.00
Warren	3,058,320	31,840.00	18,237.00	13,603.00
Blair	8,280,480	84,614.00	44,988.00	39,626.00
Somerset	6,303,600	62,566.00	34,970.00	27,596.00
Jefferson	4,166,600	42,410.00	24,130.00	18,280.00
Bedford	4,609,280	46,092.00	26,371.00	19,721.00
Adams	9,269,595	122,007.00	56,010.00	65,997.00
Total	106,629,286	1,199,439.00	581,515.00	617,924.00
Grand total	143,316,973	1,694,887.81	798,357.31	896,530.50

It is our opinion that if our cooperatives in the St. Lawrence area could purchase their power at the TVA rate they could achieve area coverage and still be in the black. With present rates, some of them are now in the red, and they probably can never serve the more thinly settled areas.

OTHER REASONS OUR PEOPLE FAVOR ST. LAWRENCE

The St. Lawrence area is the largest area in the country that has had no Federal power development. Farmers, particularly in the New England area, are becoming concerned about their markets. When the mills close down, their milk sales go down; the whole economy is affected.

Our people in this area, like all people throughout the country, are also interested in the fact that should war come again the St. Lawrence development would supply power requirements that we might not be able to get from another source.

NOT ADVOCATING NATIONALIZATION

The power companies are spreading a lot of propaganda to the effect that some people are advocating nationalization of power. I want to make it clear that I know of no farmer among our two and a half million farm families who is advocating nationalization of the electric-power industry. We do not advocate it, and I do not advocate it. We believe the power companies will get along as well or better when the St. Lawrence is developed, for the power companies usually manage to benefit from the Federal power projects in many ways. The Federal Government is not in the retail power business anywhere. We do not want it in the retail power business. But these farmer-owned cooperatives do want to purchase adequate wholesale power, delivered to their load centers without restrictions, at reasonable costs.

We hear there is little chance that this committee might vote this bill out this year for action. Nevertheless, we appeal to you to do that very thing.

How the New Deal Has Changed Life in the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 18 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by myself concerning life and events in the South, together with a poem published in the Daily Tribune of Bay City, Tex.

There being no objection, the statement and poem were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW THE NEW DEAL HAS CHANGED LIFE IN THE SOUTH

Mr. President, a southern friend of mine has sent me the following bit of verse, author unknown but not unknowing. It was first printed in the Daily Tribune down in Bay City, Tex., and while it is apparently intended to point out to our good southern citizens that more than any other group in the United States of America they are responsible for both the New Deal and the Fair Deal, the moral of the verse also seems applicable to many in the North who have

placed partisan prejudice above the principles of thrift and independence.

However, Mr. President, for the RECORD and for historic reference it should be noted here that, regardless of whether the New Deal-Fair Deal drive for political authority, its wasteful extravagance, its sneering contempt for State's rights, its affinity and affection for national socialism and the other aspects of its zeal and zest for big government constantly expanding larger and expending more, is chronicled by historians as the golden era or the era of good-by to freedom, one stark, stern, stubborn fact must stand out beyond and above all others. Whatever the outcome of these many long, expensive years of new dealing-fair dealism, it is the South which must assume and accept full responsibility for the consequences.

Mr. President, plaintive calls for aid from our southern friends, and vocal protestations that in Dixie they do not believe in FEPC, state medicine, "squandermania," the Brannan plan, and all the many other facets of the Roosevelt-Truman royal regimes neither change the course of history nor convince the politicians in the palace.

VOTES ARE WHAT COUNT

Whether stubbornly, sullenly, cringingly, courageously, dolefully, or gleefully Americans south of the Mason-Dixon line have consistently voted for what they've gotten and have been the biggest single factor in perpetuating the Roosevelt-Truman philosophy of winner take all. Consequently, my Texas friend is probably right in dedicating the following poem to Dixie:

THE SOUTH NOT ONLY ASKS BUT PLEADS FOR SOCIALISM

Mr. President, there is one thing about this grand and glorious country of ours on which we can all agree. We always get exactly the type of government we vote for; we can have any type of government we want; we live under precisely the kind of governing concepts and officers that we deserve.

Maybe the South really wants FEPC and so-called civil-rights legislation and socialized medicine and the Brannan plan and perpetual and prodigious deficit spending. Maybe it wants for once and forever to put a complete and total end to the concept of States' rights. How can we know? It talks against these things but it votes for them.

Small wonder indeed that northern Democrats laugh up their sleeves and behind their hands at the protests and plaintive objections of their southern colleagues who complain while they are being kicked around, pushed back, sneered at, used as a public whipping boy, condemned as obstructionists, Dixiecrats, reactionaries, tories, horse-and-buggy citizens, and being completely ignored when it comes to writing the planks in a Democratic National Convention platform or selecting national Democratic candidates. If the once proud and independent Southern States would just once vote like they talk; if they would just once proudly demonstrate with their votes that they could no longer be kicked around and insulted with impunity we could put an end to all these socialistic trends and return to the progressive and fundamental brand of Americanism which built this country strong and made it great. Until then, of course, the trend of the times must continue to move unerringly against the South because voters who are always "in the bag" have lost both their freedom and their influence and are snubbed as blatantly as they are seduced by the big Democratic machine bosses of the North.

IT'S THE WAY THEY VOTE THAT COUNTS

If such able Senators and great Americans as HARRY BYRD, WALTER GEORGE, SPESSARD HOLLAND, JOHN MCCLELLAN, RICHARD RUSSELL, JAMES EASTLAND, and many others who could be named are right when they caution their colleagues against socialism and big government—and I feel confident they are—then those in the South who consistently vote for a national administration which in essence is no more Democratic than Henry Wallace's Progressives were liberal (in fact, a comparison of the platforms and purposes of the two groups shows more similarities than dissimilarities) should search their souls, consult their basic principles, recapture their independence, and reassert their influence by joining other areas in this country in voting against that which they so vigorously and eloquently condemn with futile words. Surely there is no hope for the South—or for America as a whole—if citizens consistently support with their votes the principles and the politicians they condemn so uselessly with only their voices.

In all events, Mr. President, this verse from the Daily Tribune of Bay State, Tex., may be lacking in poetic quality but it packs a punch which should cause the voters of the South to find some manner or method for harnessing their voices and their votes to the same end.

Florida has demonstrated one way to do it; in the last election four proud and independent Southern States demonstrated another way it can be done; a congressional district in Texas recently rebelled against being used as the tail of the Democratic donkey forever and demonstrated a third method of asserting its independence. I have long admired the spirit and the qualities of southerners. I cannot cease to hope and believe that before it is too late—but time is fleeing rapidly—that great section of the country will free itself from the voting strait-jacket into which the New Dealers and Fair Dealers have forced it and that southern citizens will yet strike a blow for freedom which will restore America to its time-honored principles and practices. Until this happens, however, Dixie must continue to feed the Democratic donkey and to carry its tail; it can never lead it or tell it what to do or where to go.

"POOR FATHER

(Dedicated to our southern Democrats)

"My father, poor, misguided gent,
Wasted his life, a life misspent
By working hard and working late,
From 6 a. m. 'till way past eight.
Poor Dad! He'd fuss and fret and toil
And burn the blooming midnight oil.
For nothing but a litle cash
To buy the daily beans and hash
Poor Dad! He was so mild and meek
He'd work 6 days in every week
And 14 hours every day
To try to keep the wolf away.
Now Father, meaning well, but dumb
Amassed a rather tidy sum
With which he planned to buy some beers
To brighten his declining years.
Then the New Deal came; simple Dad,
Who worked so hard for all he had,
Awoke one morn to find that he
Was now a public enemy,
A louse, a Scrooge, a national cyst,
An economic royalist!
So, Dad, industrious but dumb,
Is now the source from which will come
The coin to buy the gasoline
For some underdog's machine,
To bring the more abundant life
To every loafer and his wife;
From Dad will be extracted sums
For radios to ease the hells
Of all the chronic ne'er-do-wells;
Poor Dad, a faithful, trustful goon,
Was born just 30 years too soon!

L'envoi

A moral lurks along the hall
In all this fancy fol-de-rol,
And it is this: That any cheat
Who says you ought to work to eat
Is simply nuts, out of his head;
Sit on your tail or stay in bed;
The Government will see, by gad,
That you get yours from chumps like Dad!"

—*Author unknown—but not unknowing.*

Turkish Election Should Make Wallace Eat Hard Words

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 18 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Turkish Election Should Make Wallace Eat Hard Words," by Milton Berliner, appearing in the Washington Daily News of Friday, May 12. The article is a very interesting one, and I hope all Senators will read it.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TURKISH ELECTION SHOULD MAKE WALLACE EAT HARD WORDS

(By Milton Berliner)

On Sunday an event will take place that should cause Henry Wallace and fellow left-wingers to eat some of the political invective they hurled so indiscriminately 2 years ago.

At that time, it will be remembered, the Progressive Party's choice for President stormed across the country and even into Europe denouncing the Truman doctrine as a device to bolster reactionary governments all over the world.

But on Sunday, one of the countries so characterized, Turkey, will hold a general election that will mark the country's greatest step toward democracy in its 500-year-old history.

Far from bolstering a reactionary government, United States aid has been a striking factor in accelerating Turkey's march toward true democracy. It is safe to say her first nation-wide election in which several independent parties will participate would have been long delayed but for the close cooperation between the two countries during the past few years.

The give-and-take among the candidates for 487 seats in the Turkish Grand National Assembly (from which the president and cabinet are selected) has been so free that the Turks themselves have been amazed.

At Izmir, recently, President Ismet Inonu, who ranks with Kemal Ataturk as a Turkish hero, even joked about the possibility of his losing office if the Republican People's Party were overturned.

"I accepted all your criticism when I was in power. Let's see what will happen when I will be on the opposition," he said with a smile.

The chance of the Democrat Party or the Nation's Party winning a majority is considered remote, but the point is that such levity about political power from a Turkish leader has been unheard of until the present election.

Sunday's balloting will take place under new laws guaranteeing Turkish citizens complete secrecy and ruling out any discrimination based on religion, race, color, sex, or even

illiteracy. Members of judiciary will do the counting. The Democrat Party, which in 1946 complained that the People's Party had rigged the election rules, agree on the judiciousness of the new law.

There is little doubt that the freedom of political criticism (American style) that has been allowed since the 1948 by-elections has caused the People's Party, which has been in power since 1923, to liberalize its position.

But whatever the differences, Turkey's political parties all agree that continued friendship with the western democracies is their country's best defense against the threat of Russian imperialism.

Encroachment of Government on Private Utility Field

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ZALES N. ECTON
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 18 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "CIO Union Scores Federal Utilities," published in the New York Times on Sunday, April 30, 1950. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix the text of a resolution and statement of policy adopted by the CIO Utility Workers of America at their convention in New York on April 30. The statement of policy is reasonable, sound, and sensible. It would be good common sense and a wise policy for the Federal Government to conform to these recommendations in any present and future plans to invade the utility industry.

There being no objection, the news article, resolution, and statement of policy were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of April 30, 1950]

CIO UNION SCORES FEDERAL UTILITIES—CONDITIONS INFERIOR TO THOSE IN PRIVATE INDUSTRY ALLEGED AT CONVENTION HERE

Further encroachment of the Government on the legitimate field of privately owned electric utilities was condemned yesterday in a unanimous vote by 400 convention delegates of the Utility Workers Union of America, CIO, at the Commodore Hotel.

In a resolution reflecting views contained in the officers' report, the "creeping paralysis of nationalization of the industry" was called "the first step down the socialistic highway."

"Control of the electric industry is the key to control of the major industries of the Nation; the control of transportation, mining, agriculture and all basic industry," the report said. "The Government is already in the utility business to quite an extent and, unless we are on our guard, will soon own most of it. This will be the first step down the socialistic highway. Then transportation, communication, steel and the rest will follow to put an end to our American way of life."

The theme of the second day of the three-day convention, as expressed by top Congress of Industrial Organization officials, was that the CIO had made great strides toward winning rank and file support in unions dominated by Communists.

Speakers included Allan S. Haywood, CIO vice president and director of organization; Jack Kroll, CIO-PAC director; James B. Carey, CIO secretary-treasurer, and Joseph Curran, president of the National Maritime Union, CIO.

RESOLUTION ON UTILITIES

Joseph A. Fisher, head of the utility workers union, presided. He said the resolution of the special committee on public ownership of utility companies, headed by Andrew J. McMahon, had the full support of all the officers.

The resolution looked with alarm upon Government power projects that seem to be unnecessary and are in direct competition with light and power companies with whom we hold contracts. It said the union believed that while water-development programs in most cases should be undertaken by the Government, these worthy projects should not be the means of destroying taxpaying utility companies who, under proper regulation, are furnishing adequate service.

Noting the increased trend toward Government participation in the utility business in competition with private industry, the resolution declared that if this were permitted to continue we will soon have authorities, not elected but appointed, who will constitute a supergovernment with control of practically all the electric power in the Nation.

Mr. Haywood told the convention that the Communists had failed in an attempt to gain control of the light, heat, and power industry in America. The new International Union of Electrical Workers (IUEW) formed by the national CIO after the expulsion of the United Electrical Workers Union, represents 28,000 workers, against 14,000 in the old union, he asserted.

DEVELOPMENT OF RESOURCES

The Government, the resolution said, should develop only those projects that would result in a definite gain in the resources of the country.

Declaring that job security, promotional opportunity, and working conditions too often became the tools and plums of politicians and that wages and working conditions were fixed by political management, the resolution said that union members employed by Federal agencies and municipalities that operate their own light and power businesses work under conditions inferior to those enjoyed by our members employed in private industry.

Public power employees, such as those of the Tennessee Valley Authority, have little or no job security, in that they are not covered by contract or by civil-service laws, it was declared.

The CIO, contrary to the belief of some individuals, has never gone on record in favor of nationalization of the utility industry or any other industry nor does it favor a socialist form of government, the resolution said.

Organic unity will be achieved by labor in this country in time, Mr. Haywood declared, referring to the projected coalition between the CIO and the American Federation of Labor.

"If you bring about that unity," he said, "you will have 16,000,000 men with their wives and families marching together."

Mr. Curran declared that the only way Communists could be driven out of the labor movement was by extermination.

TEXT OF THE RESOLUTION PASSED BY THE CIO UTILITY WORKERS OF AMERICA AT A CONVENTION IN NEW YORK APRIL 30

By virtue of the responsibility vested in the public power committee by the appointment of the national president, our committee, after long and careful consideration on the question of public power, feel it is necessary to declare the reasons which impelled it to make the recommendation contained in the report on this highly controversial subject.

We believe that the policy of the Congress of Industrial Organizations in past conventions and in statements of policies, has advocated and expressed repeatedly its fundamental concern with orderly, regional development of waterways and resource conservation.

Such development and conservation affect the industry that provides for the welfare of several hundred thousand workers in the light, heat, water, and steam industry to which Utility Workers Union of America has been granted jurisdiction by the Congress of Industrial Organizations. By virtue of this jurisdiction by the Congress of Industrial Organizations, Utility Workers Union of America shall be ever mindful of that obligation and the constant objective of our union shall be to correct and continue to improve the wages, working conditions, and policies which affect the security of all employees of public utility corporations throughout this Nation.

Your committee has analyzed and looked with alarm upon the efforts of those socialistic and even more collective minded form of government advocates, who would have us surrender our basic concept of the American way of life, to the creeping paralysis of the all-powerful state. They would destroy the philosophy of our forefathers, built upon the system of free enterprise, which has made our standard of living the highest in the world, and which has made us the leader among the nations of the world.

It is our theory that Government is the servant of the people, not our master.

Therefore, basing our belief on this principle, we hold and advocate that the God-given resources of our Nation should be developed and used for the benefit of all and we further agree that the water resources properly belong to all of the people of this Nation and that water development programs can be most successfully developed and accomplished by the Government in order to overcome floods, aid navigation, prevent soil erosion, supply water for irrigation, and other purposes outside the realm of private industry. However, the development of these worthwhile projects should not be the means of eliminating taxpaying utility companies who, under proper Government regulation, are furnishing adequate, efficient service to their consumers and dealing fairly with their employees.

Job security, promotional opportunity, and working conditions, all too often become the tools and plums of political-minded individuals who would deny to the worker either his economic or legal appeal against the Government. However, we further believe that privately owned public utility corporations should cooperate with the Government in the utilization of the natural resources by offering to buy power from Government projects for transmission and distribution to consumers in the area of the project so that the basic interest of all the people of our Nation shall have been served and the purpose of Government shall be to conserve and utilize our natural resources without becoming engaged in competition with investor-owned utilities except for national defense or where private industry fails or refuses to provide adequate generation of electrical energy.

We believe in the United States of America, we believe in its people, we believe in the right and ability of the American people, especially those in organized labor, to ascer-

tain and elect to public office only those people who comply with and subscribe to the American way of life and our democratic form of government.

We do not believe in, nor do we subscribe to the theory of some leaders of CIO who advocate the policies of their own unions to the detriment of other national unions. For example, the argument has been set forth, if a power authority were created in one part of the country, it would help the economic position of the workers and enable the manufacturers who employ them to compete successfully with another part of the country where living standards are below normal. The truth of the matter is simply that, even if electricity were furnished free, the manufacturers still could not compete with the South until such time as the economic conditions of the workers in the South have been improved. Therefore, the fallacy of this argument is apparent and the motives of those using this argument becomes crystal clear and quite obvious.

Moreover, it is the thought of the committee that nothing herein contained should be construed as giving aid or comfort to the power interests or any of their associates as such. However, the fact that the power interests might happen to be on the same side of this question may cause some to look askance on the recommendation of this committee. The committee took this into consideration and, after carefully weighing this situation, came to the conclusion, despite the possible implication, we had no alternative but to take a courageous position which, though it may prove unpopular in some circles, is in the final analysis, in the best interests of our country, our membership, and future generations.

In conclusion, this committee unanimously recommends that the following statement of policy with respect to public power be adopted by this convention:

"STATEMENT OF POLICY

"1. Where power is generated in conjunction with worth-while water projects, the transmission, distribution and sale of such energy should, under proper regulation, be allocated to the private utility companies.

"Where investor-owned companies fail to provide for the distribution and sale of electrical energy then, and then only, should the Government undertake such duties.

"2. Approximately one-fifth of the power generated in America today is distributed and sold by Government agencies. We believe that further encroachment of Government into the utility industry should be discouraged except in cases of national emergency.

"3. It is our firm belief that the best interests of all of the people of this Nation can best be served and secured through collective bargaining in investor owned public utility corporations.

"4. We shall continue to advocate that the water resources of the Nation be developed. However, we shall object to any move that will result in these worthy projects being used as a means of destroying taxpaying utility companies, who, under proper regulation, are furnishing adequate service.

"5. We further recommend as a matter of policy that the national officers, the local officers and members use every means available to prevent further nationalization of the utility industry and

"We further recommend as a matter of policy that we insist on fair and proper regulation of the utility industry and that every effort be made to compel utility managements to fulfill their obligations to the consumers and to their employees."

Fair Employment Practice Commission Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLYDE R. HOEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 18 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix to the RECORD several editorials and special articles dealing with the Fair Employment Practice Commission Act.

All these articles present different phases of this question, and voice the viewpoint of citizens in varied walks of life and different sections of the country.

Some of these editorials are from North Carolina newspapers in different parts of the State, and these editorials were selected at random. It is the unanimous voice of the press of North Carolina that this proposed measure would be detrimental to the common good and would hinder and retard the progress which is being made in good race relationships, and therefore it would be most unwise to enact the bill.

Some of these articles are from newspapers like the Evening Star and Washington Post, in the Capital City. Another article is by Raymond Moley, a well-known writer and a man well-versed in civic affairs and deeply concerned in promoting harmony and good will among all the people.

I am submitting these articles in the hope that they will be read by those who take such an extreme view of this situation and are so rampant in their advocacy of this revolutionary measure which, if adopted, would set back our progress by at least 20 years.

Only eight States in the American Union have adopted this measure or one similar to it. The legislatures of 19 States in the North and West have rejected it. A bill of this character was defeated by the voters of California by a majority of over a million. This measure could not be adopted in a single State in the Union if submitted to a popular vote of the people. Why, then, is there the pressure to try to drive a bill of this character through the Senate and deprive the American people of their constitutional and individual rights?

There being no objection, the editorials and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(The following editorial is from the Laurinburg (N. C.) Exchange, which is edited by Hon. Odus L. Moore, a member of the Legislature of North Carolina and an outstanding editor:)

WHAT FEPC MEANS

The United States Senate is staging a bitter fight on FEPC this week with southern Senators battling with all their might against it. In that fight they will have aid and comfort from men of other States and regions, but they must bear the brunt of the battle themselves.

And what is FEPC? Why all the fuss and fury about it? It is legislation, based on political motives, which would set up arbitrary and arrogant controls over and interference with the private affairs of the American people and their private business. It is nothing less than that, and it is even a good deal more than that, for it implies an unlimited and arrogant police power which would be put in the hands of partisan and biased men who in turn would acknowledge no responsibility or obligation to anyone except their political masters.

And when you undertake to regulate the private lives of people and their private business with political and police power you are creating a dangerous situation.

FEPC would give a federally appointed and controlled commission power to regulate employment, and the hiring and firing of employees. Its purpose is to force employers to employ persons whom they might not want in their employ. It specifically says that no person shall be denied employment because of race or color.

And how would FEPC be enforced? By the courts? No. By trial by jury? No. By one's peers and his fellows, as the Constitution prescribes? No. But by bureaucrats. By men clothed with Federal police power whose arbitrary orders and decrees would have all the force and effect of law.

What chance would any employer have who wanted to run his own business according to his own wishes? He could go to court, yes; if he wanted to spend a fortune, suffer humiliation, and be subjected to all the smear tactics that smart lawyers and politicians can devise.

Southern people are opposed to FEPC. North Carolinians, who are tolerant and broadminded, find FEPC and its political implications too crude and arrogant. FEPC seeks to cure something by law which law can't cure. It would remedy one evil by arbitrarily imposing a greater evil. It would have the Federal Government play god over the people and dictate to them how they shall manage their personal and private business. It would take the individual's liberty and his right of choice away from him in order to confer a political favor upon another.

(The following editorial is from the Greensboro Daily News of May 16, 1950, which is one of the leading dailies of North Carolina:)

SOUTH'S RIGHT TO BE HEARD

Whatever may have been the motives which prompted North Carolina Democratic National Committeeman Jonathan Daniels to speak out at a Chicago panel discussion on FEPC, it took courage to step into the staged event, as he did, and give something of the South's feeling on and attitude toward this controversial measure.

What Mr. Daniels voiced was opposition to compulsory FEPC, an opposition which exists not merely in the deep South but in more progressive North Carolina and which must be reckoned with in any practical consideration of the issue and its ramifications. Even those Tar Heel leaders who approve the principle involved are realistic enough to know that the cause can be pushed only so far and so vigorously without setting up a chain reaction and undoing the progress that has been made in racial relations hereabouts throughout the years.

The Chicago panel, at which the Tar Heel committeeman seized upon the occasion to speak, was further evidence of the manner in which the South, its viewpoint and its problems are left out in party councils and programs. The other side of FEPC was

wholly unrepresented in the Chicago discussion; yet it is difficult to think of a genuine panel in which all sides of the topics being discussed are not represented. That is indicative of what has happened all along and has thus served further to arouse southerners. After all, the South's views, right or wrong, on FEPC or any other issue are the views of a sizable tier of States and some millions of people, and as such they deserve consideration in Democratic conferences and policies. Naturally it arouses southerners when they are disregarded. Their views become meaningless, while a political sop is thrown out to several hundred thousand persons in a few key congressional districts in doubtful States which may thus be swung into the party fold. Such differentiation may be good politics, but it is not founded in basic fairness or consideration of all groups and sections in party councils. Certainly the area which has to wrestle directly with the most acute problems and situations growing out of FEPC has a right to speak its piece and exert an influence commensurate with its numerical strength and its long-time contribution to and sustenance of the Democratic Party.

Mr. Daniels was justified in speaking out. But it is not until the southern view is taken into more serious consideration and treatment that last week's assurance of Keynoter Thad Eure at our own State Democratic conventions that the Democratic Party is big enough for all shades of opinion and schools of thought can be said to have national acceptance and application. All that we are talking about is the South's right to be heard and have its practical problems considered in their true worth and effect in the councils and fabrications of the party that it has supported, through thick and thin, all these years. The F in FEPC really ought to apply to a fairness that is not wholly confined to employment as such.

(The following editorial is from the McDowell News, published at Marion, in western North Carolina, and one of the leading semiweekly newspapers of the State:)

THE WEAK LINK IN THE FEPC

No matter how desirable the proposed Fair Employment Practice Act may appear on paper, there is a practical hitch that will ruin the whole scheme.

The hole in the dyke is: What will prevent an employer from having his business operations wrecked by a swarm of fraudulent discrimination claims whenever he hires or fires a worker.

Objective of the controversial measure now before Congress is to prohibit discrimination in employment because of "race, color, religion, or national origin." It applies to any employer engaged in commercial operations who employs 50 or more individuals.

The way we see it, the legislation is so broad that it will be impossible to determine a legitimate complaint of discrimination from an unreasonable or personal grudge.

This is what could happen to an employer: He has a job opening and 100 aspirants apply. Naturally, only one man can have the job. Then the 99 disappointed job seekers could, if they chose, file complaints with Fair Employment Commission agents, and the harassed employer would be forced to suspend his own work and be hailed into court to answer the mass charges.

Such a set-up would invite thousands of trumped-up lawsuits by unscrupulous lawyers. It would set the stage for a new era of racketeering and blackmailing in America.

The Fair Employment Commission agents might exercise the greatest possible care in examining each complaint. But, by law, it will be mandatory for the agents to make thorough investigations of each complaint before making a decision.

Furthermore, it's a hundredfold easier for an employer to be accused of racial or religious discrimination than it is for him to prove himself innocent of the charge.

Let's take an example. Suppose a small factory owner employs 100 workers. Twenty percent of them are Chinese, 10 percent Negroes, 40 percent are Methodists, 20 percent Baptists. Any Negro or Baptist who was refused a job could file a complaint. The claim would be that there are more Negroes and Baptists in this country than Chinese and Methodists, and yet, in this instance, they would be employed.

In such an instance the employer would find it hard indeed to prove himself innocent of intentional discrimination.

Sounds fantastic, doesn't it? But it could happen, and something like it undoubtedly would in hundreds—maybe thousands—of instances. The employer might get a clean bill of health on the first complaint, the second, third, or even fourth, but eventually the trap would ensnare him. Anyway you look at it, he can't win.

Businessmen and farmers have a big enough problem already in trying to succeed in their enterprises, pay taxes, provide jobs, and help maintain a strong economy without having the FEPC added to their burdens.

(The editorial entitled "The Senators Have a Text" is from the Wilmington Star-News, a leading daily, published in eastern North Carolina:)

THE SENATORS HAVE A TEXT

As the long-delayed fight over the Fair Employment Practice Commission bill gets under way in the United States Senate, the great majority of North Carolinians are glad both their Senators are committed to vote against this legislation.

Because of previous consideration of the issue in Congress, Senator HOEY'S stand has been known for a long time.

The junior Senator, FRANK P. GRAHAM, has let it be known in the strongest way possible that he is against FEPC. As recently as last Thursday, in his address at the Wallace festival, he reiterated his opposition as he said:

"We here in North Carolina are getting ahead for both races without any Federal laws of compulsion. We in this State are gaining our ends through proper understanding and cooperation. Our Nation must follow that pattern if any good end is to be achieved."

But North Carolinians are expecting their Senators to do more than merely vote against this unnecessary and disturbing legislation. Because of the clear sentiment of the State they are beholden to speak out at those times when their words will mean the most toward defeat of this effort at infringement upon individual rights.

And if and when they speak, there could be no better text for their assertions than the first two paragraphs of an Associated Press news story which appeared in Friday morning's newspapers under a Raleigh dateline. They read:

"The State board of education today approved allocations totaling $3,328,752.45 from the State's $50,000,000 school plant construction, improvement, and repaid fund.

"The allocations, recommended by the board's building committee which met yesterday, totaled $1,848,878.75 for white schools and $1,479,873.70 for Negro schools."

Compare the two amounts for white and Negro facilities. The one for white projects is greater by only $369,005. Surely the proportion of population would encourage a larger figure. But the building committee, free to act without interference from law or any other authority, delegated the money only on the basis of need and without consideration to race. Thus, in this one case alone, it scored a triumph in raising the standards of North Carolina's Negro schools.

This disregard for race has been apparent since the school board took up the big task of distributing the $50,000,000 where it is needed most. In New Hanover County, the first projects to be considered were not for white but Negro children. Here, too, the authorities considered only the factor of need.

In public housing, approval of a proposed expansion project in Charlotte was held up in Washington for sometime because practically all the units were for Negroes. This, so the planners in the Capital thought, was discrimination against the white population. But, there too, the local decision was based on need and not race.

North Carolinians should be proud of these facts.

They illustrate, better than millions of words of debate and argument, the tremendous social, economic, and other progress made by the State without regard to race. They offer powerful ammunition to explode the false charge of discrimination in North Carolina sometimes lodged by outsiders ignorant of true conditions or anxious to ignore impressive facts.

There are numerous other cases Senators HOEY and GRAHAM could cite to their colleagues.

As these illustrations prove North Carolina and other States do not need FEPC, the two Senators should also drive home the fact that its dangerous compulsion would prove the most damaging of all influences upon sound and progressive racial relations.

(This editorial entitled "FEPC Dilemma," is from the Washington Post of May 17, 1950:)

FEPC DILEMMA

Jonathan Daniels' outspoken speech at a Chicago forum featuring the President's Cabinet brings into sharp focus the dilemma facing the administration in connection with the FEPC bill. At no time has the administration had the votes to pass the bill in the face of the bitter opposition from the southern wing of the Democratic Party. It has used FEPC as a handy political issue, without any real prospect of turning promises into legislation. President Truman has pretended that it was a question of pushing the measure through over the opposition of a few reactionary Dixiecrats. But Mr. Daniels' opposition is plain notice that the liberal elements in Mr. Truman's own southern following are fighting him on the issue of making the FEPC compulsory.

Mr. Daniels, as he pointed out in his speech, was one of the few southerners to vote for Mr. Truman's nomination at Philadelphia in 1948 and to take an active part in his campaign. Like other progressive leaders in the South, however, he fears that the FEPC fight will strengthen the cause of the Dixiecrats and enable them to hide behind the civil-rights issue while they fight every progressive measure. In other words, the administration is pressing the fight for civil rights at the point where the greatest opposition is encountered. Instead of moving step by step toward attainment of its laudable goal of eliminating discrimination, the administration has got itself entangled in a mere vote-making maneuver.

The Senate will vote Friday on the limitation of debate on the motion to take up the administration's FEPC bill, and Senator TAFT has announced that he will support cloture. Even if the preliminary filibuster is thus broken, however, it will break out again so long as the administration's compulsory bill is before the Senate. The Republicans, who are also playing political football with the issue, are not likely to agree to a limitation of debate for the sake of getting the Democratic bill passed. They have their own measure to push and will undoubtedly try to substitute it for the administration bill if cloture switches the debate to the merits of the legislation itself.

The House has already accepted the counterpart of Senator TAFT'S voluntary FEPC. Apparently the administration will have to

accept this measure or withdraw from the fight to avoid wrecking the remainder of its program. The choice thus open to the President is not a happy one, but he should have realized that he cannot make campaign promises which his own party has no prospect of fulfilling without placing himself at the mercy of the Republicans.

We have felt that, because of the gravity of the international situation and the demoralizing effect of a filibuster, the Senate should promptly accept the House bill setting up a voluntary FEPC. Mr. Daniels' thinking seems to be running along the same line. The President could salvage some credit for himself and his party by asking his Senate leaders to eliminate the compulsory provisions of the bill. The alternative promises to be another fiasco that would give a hollow sound to fresh promises from the stump.

(The editorial entitled "No Argument for FEPC" is from the Washington Evening Star of May 14, 1950:)

NO ARGUMENT FOR FEPC

Senator BENTON'S appeal for adoption of a compulsory FEPC bill was not based entirely on the fact that Russian propaganda plays up racial discrimination in this country. But the Connecticut Senator's argument, to the extent that it was based on this ground, is unworthy of serious attention.

It is true, of course, that there is racial discrimination in the United States. It is also true that the Russians are doing their best to make capital out of that fact. But it hardly follows that we should try to combat Russian propaganda in other parts of the world by passing a law which can be expected to do a great deal more harm than good in this country.

In this newspaper's opinion, a compulsory FEPC law, wholly aside from its dubious constitutionalty, would be thoroughly bad in its effect on race relations in this country. Because the Senate bill does not cover employers of fewer than 50 persons, Senator BENTON makes the curious secondary argument that it is unobjectionable because it would not apply to 93 percent of the enterprises in this country. What does he think the Russians would say if we were to pass a law ostensibly safeguarding the rights of people in 2 percent of our business establishments and ignoring those in 98 percent?

The real ground for opposing the FEPC bill, however, has nothing to do with the number of enterprises that would be affected by it. If the bill is passed it will have to be enforced, and it is ridiculous to suppose that it will not be enforced. But in the South and perhaps in some other sections of the country it could be enforced only at a price of dissension and bitterness far exceeding anything seen in this country for many a long year. That is not the way to improve race relations. If we want to wipe out the progress that has been made and foment racial hostility the way to do it is to pass the Senate FEPC bill. And if Senator BENTON is worried about the Russian propagandists, he ought to think of what they could do, not only before, but after the FEPC bill became law.

(A very splendid article appeared in a number of newspapers written by Raymond Moley and entitled "FEPC Faults," which is as follows:)

FEPC FAULTS

(By Raymond Moley)

Several arguments have been advanced for the fair employment practices bill, now before Congress, that should be dragged out for close examination. For if a piece of legislation is enacted under the persuasive influence of fallacious reasons, we shall have fallacious law.

The President's Committee on Civil Rights, from which this measure was derived, included lawyers, and at least one was a good lawyer. But it argued in a manner that would hardly be adequate in any court. It used the old tricks of political dialectic. One argument, embellished with a fine chart elaborately drawn, was intended to show the great number of discriminatory acts by employers and others. This showed business to be the greatest offender, with labor comparatively sinless. These compilations of alleged cases of discrimination also showed cases by race and religion. This illustrative material was drawn from the records of the old Fair Employment Practice Committee set up by President Roosevelt to deal with discrimination in the war effort.

The cases cited were complaints. They were not proved cases. In short, the word of the complainant is taken as proof of discrimination. This would be like calling an error on an umpire every time Manager Leo Durocher makes a complaint.

Another argument seriously advanced is that it is a good thing to pass a law in the hope that it will never be used. Thus, Congress is asked to pass a law with severe penalties in it and involving a big bureaucracy which after all is designed merely as a piece of moral advice. But all experience shows that laws that are unenforced are worse than no laws. They remain as festering sores, often the means of blackmail and a broad invitation to corruption. If it is possible to end discrimination by law, which is very doubtful, let the law be enforceable and let it be enforced. A law which is intended as a bluff, which is merely passed to appease some minority group, is a snare, a delusion, and a fraud.

Another argument advanced by the new Senator, BENTON of Connecticut, is that Russia and other nations reached by the Voice of America—which the Senator used to run—will be deterred from accusing the United States of denying people their civil rights. Aside from the ridiculous idea that Russia could impress even its satellites with a tale about civil rights, this argument is rooted in the proposition that laws are seriously to be passed by Congress not for the maintenance of peace and justice at home, but for use as propaganda abroad. It is, however, exactly what might be expected from a professional propagandist trying to act like a lawmaker.

Another fallacy implicit in all the arguments for the bill is the suggestion that because there is discrimination, the only way to deal with it is by law and Federal law at that. To argue that a Federal law is necessary because a State law won't work is to say that such pious gestures as the New York law won't work. Well, it doesn't work well. It, too, is a bluff, because no serious supporter of the law, including Governor Dewey, expected it to work. It was a watered-down version of what minorities wanted passed to win their political support.

Separation of Mail Pay From Airline Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 18 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in American Aviation on May 15, regarding my plan for separating the mail pay from the subsidy.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THANKS, SENATOR

(By W. W. P.)

At last there is official recognition in high places that the airlines of the United States are not being subsidized by mail pay.

If there is any subsidy involved in air-mail payments, the subsidy is on behalf of the communities and users of the air service.

No less than a report of a committee of the United States Senate puts this issue squarely on the record for the first time where it really counts.

Senator EDWIN C. JOHNSON, Democrat of Colorado, chairman of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, has just made an interim report on the separation of air-mail pay from subsidy.

"The subsidy need is clearly not a subsidy to the airline, which is merely rendering a public service for a fair return," his report says, "but goes to the passengers, shippers, and air-mail patrons of the communities the airline serves."

So Senator JOHNSON proposes to charge up to the communities that don't pay their way the additional costs involved in the air service. That's beginning to call a spade a spade, to place the burden of cost responsibility where it belongs. It is refreshing, for once, to see a report that doesn't accuse the airlines of gorging themselves at the public trough.

Senator JOHNSON said that a careful reading of the testimony before his committee last year revealed that there was agreement in general that airlines carrying only long-haul business and servicing only a few high-density points could operate profitably without subsidy; or, to put it another way, that the certificate requirement compelling the airlines to serve a large number of small stations, or to carry predominantly short-haul traffic, absorbed most of the profits earned in the long-haul high-density business and was the basic reason why subsidy was required.

Thus, he added later, if management economy and efficiency are attained, the subsidy rests squarely upon the community whose revenues are insufficient to pay the cost of airline service.

Senator JOHNSON is now proposing that subsidy for domestic air transportation should be specifically identified and presented to Congress on a community basis, and he is recommending that legislation be passed by Congress directing the determination by communities of the amount of subsidy required to support the airline services presently certificated to each community within the United States.

While we commend the Senator most heartily for his frank and honest attribution of air-mail costs to communities, is there not a danger in carrying such an allocation to an extreme?

The airlines were once a political football, up to the creation of the Civil Aeronautics Board. What is needed is a stable national transportation system—something that can't be tinkered with each year by a partisan appropriations committee of Congress bent on removing air mail from communities in States that happen to be dominated by the minority political party at the time. Any return to the insecurities and inequities inherent in political control would be tragic.

However, the Johnson report is salutary in many respects and begins to finalize the question of costs of air service to small towns. As we have pointed out many times before, the national airline system could be made immediately self-supporting and immediately profitable—without mail pay—by

confining it to high-density routes. We still believe that the CAB is the proper agency for determining what service needs to be continued, but Senator JOHNSON'S committee is to be commended, at this point at least, for bringing some vital issues to the front.

Our Great American Heritage: Liberty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 18 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a winning essay by Jeanette Stanzil on the subject Our Great American Heritage: Liberty, from a recent issue of a Three Lakes, Wis., newspaper.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WINNING ESSAY IS PUBLISHED

The essay of Jeanette Stanzil, Three Lakes, Wis., which won first place in the American Legion essay contest on Our Great American Heritage: Liberty, is reproduced in full as follows:

" 'Four score and seven years ago our fathers brought forth on this continent a new nation conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal.' These were the immortal words spoken by a truly great American, Abraham Lincoln. Consider the many battles fought, lives lost, tears shed, and speeches made simply for this one word—liberty. Just a seven-letter word but from it a host of ideas have been drawn, and by it millions of people have lived. However, the meaning of this word could never be completely contained in books or manuscripts for it is indeed a part of all persons living in this free country, today. Liberty is so much alive in every being that it has become a portion of the people's soul and mind. For what could be accomplished without such a heritage? Nothing, because our laws, government, and actions are all influenced by the fact that we are a free people of America. We are greatly indebted to the men who came before us, that were always striving to reach this goal of freedom, and to us it was given and accepted with a deep appreciation.

"Let us then, for a better understanding of this thing termed 'liberty,' break it into proportions more understandable to us. Try to imagine that L stands for love, for it is love and not hate that is the foundation upon which good feelings toward our fellowmen are built. I represents independence, a type of freedom that allows us to develop as we are naturally inclined, and also eliminates a feeling of restraint in all things we attempt, within the margin of the rules and laws. B could mean beauty, the satisfying ray of impressive light that radiantly shines in the eyes and upon the countenance of a person who is free. E for equality, the living symbol of a freedom maintained by opportunities for all, disregarding race, color, or creed. R brings to mind rights and privileges, bestowed upon us by legal documents which were written wisely by the preceding generations. The intelligence and forethought of many famous men has given us such important papers as the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. Next T expressing truth, for anything based on this cannot die or be destroyed, but lives forever. Last we come to Y which shows us youth, the coming generation which must uphold this great heritage by a greater faith and even stronger courage, perhaps, than others before them did. The responsibility of a free nation rests upon the shoulders of youth and is placed there with care and confidence!

"Whether Abraham Lincoln realized it or not, the words of his Gettysburg Address are still living today, in the hearts and minds of all American people. We should proudly and valiantly protect and defend the undying principles of this Nation if we hope to retain our great heritage—liberty."

Ship Operating Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES J. MURPHY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 18, 1950

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I have been thinking further about the debate which took place on the floor of the House on May 5 in connection with an amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] reading as follows:

Provided further, That no part of the foregoing appropriation shall be available for obligation, nor any obligation made, for the payment of an operating-differential subsidy for any number of ships in excess of the number of ships which are entitled to receive an operating-differential subsidy pursuant to provisions of any contract, authorization, commitment, or obligation by the commission in existence on January 1, 1950, including within said limitation as to number any ships being constructed or contracted for on said date under a construction-differential subsidy contract, and including also any ships the operation of which may be authorized by the commission under any contracts which may result from any formal applications filed with the commission prior to January 1, 1950.

Mr. THOMAS stated that this amendment was offered in substitution for language contained in the bill on page 304, beginning at line 5 and ending with "1950." in line 10. The gentleman from Texas further stated that the language he was asking the committee to consider is the language submitted to the committee by the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries "with only a slight variation."

I am a little concerned that there shall be no misinterpretation or misconstruction of the meaning of the language, particularly the "slight variation" referred to by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

I wish to say for the record that as a member of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, it was my understanding that the appropriation referred to shall be available for the payment of operating subsidy for ships not in excess of the number which first, "are entitled to receive an operating-differential subsidy pursuant to provisions of any contract, authorization, commitment or obligation by the commission in existence on January 1, 1950," second, being constructed or contracted for on said date under a construction-differential subsidy contract," and third, "any ships the operation of which may be authorized by the commission under any contracts which may result from any formal application filed with the commission prior to January 1, 1950."

I believe that the amendment as adopted by the House has the effect which I have just stated. However, if there be any question that it has a more limited effect, then I wish to express my belief that the amendment differs in principle and essence from the language submitted to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] by the chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee. I further would like to say that it is my belief that my colleagues of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee believed that the amendment adopted had the meaning which I have just stated and was so considered by them in registering their vote in the House.

A Scandalous Situation: The Knauff Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. D. ROOSEVELT, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 18, 1950

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix to the RECORD, I insert the statement issued yesterday by Mr. Justice Jackson, of the United States Supreme Court.

Several times now, I have called to the attention of the House the case of Mrs. Ellen Knauff, a war bride who has had an incredible time since she entered this country as the wife of an American veteran. The latest act in this scandalous situation was played yesterday when the Department of Justice, with unseemly haste, tried to rush Mrs. Knauff out of the country before her legal remedies had been exhausted. The statement of Mr. Justice Jackson makes plain what an unconscionable flouting this was of both the Supreme Court and the Congress.

It was the Knauff case that brought up again the whole question of the power of the Department of Justice to exclude an alien—even a war bride—without a hearing. It has been my continued view that the issue here is far more important than this one case. I say as flatly as I can that the Immigration Service is guilty of arbitrariness in its handling of this case. I say that this highlights a threat to the whole philosophy on which our Government is based—the system of checks and balances. It is time we checked these misusers of a power they were given as a wartime measure. It is time we took this power from them and properly exercised our duty to protect the country against arbitrariness in the executive branch.

To accomplish this, I have introduced H. R. 7476, which has been referred to the House Committee on the Judiciary.

I hope that this latest demonstration of the need for this legislation will speed the committee in its deliberations.

TEXT OF MR. JUSTICE JACKSON'S STATEMENT GRANTING STAY

As circuit justice for the second circuit, it is my almost invariable practice to refuse stays which the court of appeals or its judges have denied. This because they are closer to the facts, have heard the merits fully argued, and because I have confidence that they would grant stays in worthy cases. This rare departure from practice may call for a word of explanation.

The decision of the court of appeals denying petitioner relief on habeas corpus was handed down yesterday, and about 4 o'clock yesterday afternoon stay was denied. The court suggested to counsel that he could apply "at Washington" for a stay, and counsel announced a purpose to do so. Immediately, however, the Department of Justice notified petitioner to be ready to be shipped on a commercial plane leaving New York this morning at 11 o'clock. This scarcely gave counsel time to prepare an application for stay here and no time for me to hold a hearing on it. As the case comes to me, I am informed that preparations are complete at the airport to deport her in a matter of minutes.

Bundling this woman onto an airplane to get her out of this country within hours after the decision of the court of appeals, if accomplished, would have two consequences. First, it probably would defeat this court's jurisdiction to consider her petition for review. Second, it would circumvent any action by Congress—which the Department has vigorously opposed—to cancel her exclusion, already unanimously taken by the House of Representatives. In this connection the Department of Justice was given hearing by a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives. After considering the objections of the Department of Justice, the committee, nevertheless, reported favorably on the bill and the House of Representatives, with rare unanimity, decided the exclusion order should be canceled. That bill, together with a like measure introduced in the Senate, is now before the Senate Judiciary Committee for consideration. There appears also to have been an agreement by the Department with the Congress to withhold action under such circumstances, but I have been unable in the time allowed to ascertain its text.

If the Department had at any time shown even probable grounds to believe that presence of this woman a few days more in this country might jeopardize national security, even infinitesimally, I should refuse the stay. But the Department of Justice has not only had opportunity, it has been importuned to show courts or Congress any reason for its exclusion order.

Not only is the petitioner unable to learn what the specific charges against her are, but neither can the courts which are asked to play at least a consenting part in her exclusion, nor the Congress, which is in the midst of an effort to stop it. It overtaxes credulity to believe that it would jeopardize the security of the United States to impart to coordinate branches of the Government some inkling of the charges against this woman.

That the purpose of this haste to rush her out of the country is to defeat any effort to have this Court review her present habeas corpus proceeding, appears from statements apparently made to the press by the Government's counsel in the court of appeals. We are not ordinarily satisfied with newspaper evidence, but the speed of events has left no time for verification. The statements of several reputable newspapers are in substantial accord: After the court suggested that petitioner's counsel could apply at Washington for a stay and he said he would do so, the Government attorney answered, as quoted in an Associated Press dispatch appearing in the Baltimore Sun, "She may not be here then." The New York Herald Tribune attributes to him the statement that she may be deported by the time action is taken and that the case would then be academic. The New York Times quotes him as later stating he would advise the Department of Justice that "There are no legal impediments at this time which would prevent her immediate deportation." This leaves no doubt that the purpose is to defeat the jurisdiction of this Court as well as the determination of Congress.

It may well be that this removal eventually will be sustained. But to consummate it while the right to do so is still in litigation cannot be permitted, and to attempt to do so after a bill to forbid it has already passed one House by unanimous vote and while it is pending in the other is alleged to be a most unusual departure from administrative practice. Nothing has been produced to show why this particular petitioner should be so discriminated against. To stand between the individual and arbitrary action by the Government is the highest function of this Court.

It is not for me to now reach any conclusion as to the merits of the decision below. But to grant writs to protect the Court's jurisdiction to inquire into the matter is one of the most usual functions of an individual Justice. Because the Government's action since decision by the court of appeals would have the effect of foreclosing petitioner's right to be heard in this Court, I grant the stay.

ROBERT H. JACKSON,
Associate Justice, Supreme Court of the United States.

MAY 17, 1950.

An Iowa Farmer's Farm Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 18, 1950

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my own remarks in the appendix of the RECORD, I do so for the primary purpose of giving well-deserved publicity to a timely article written by a real dirt farmer and which appeared in the Malvern Leader, of Malvern, Iowa on April 6 last, sent to me by my friend, Ed E. Eaton, of Sidney, Iowa, as will be noted. His letter in part and Mr. Gregory's plan follow:

MAY 4, 1950.

Mr. BEN F. JENSEN,
Congressman from Iowa,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR BEN: I have taken an article from the Malvern Leader, Malvern, Iowa, issue of April 6, 1950, which I am enclosing and asking that you give it special attention.

This article was written by one of your Mills County constituents living on a farm abutting Highway No. 275 just north of Tabor, Iowa. He is extremely bright and a progressive farmer. His article is so sensible that it has been extremely well received wherever it has come to attention.

Incidentally, the article would seem to me to rather substantially support the position you have taken with regard to the proper method of approaching the flood control problem as I have noticed from various press releases.

In my opinion, BEN, this article should at an appropriate occasion be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I have Mr. Gregory's permission that this be done and I personally feel that your use of it in this manner would bring to it some deserved attention and also the thinking that is becoming more and more prominent in this section.

If you do not feel that you can make any use of the article, I would appreciate your so advising me as it actually is my intent to assist in giving it the highest publicity possible. I would feel that you should be first granted the opportunity of making whatever use of it you might find desirable.

I must close at this time. With best personal regards, I remain

Yours very truly,

EDWARD E. EATON.

[From the Malvern (Iowa) Leader, of April 6, 1950]

AN IOWA FARMER'S FARM PLAN

(What do operating farmers who also must pay taxes think of the various farm plans which come from Washington? Recently Warren Gregory wrote the following article on this subject and the Leader at once asked permission to publish it. Mr. Gregory's farm lies just north of Tabor in an area which is known as the most intensively conserved neighborhood in Iowa. He knows at first hand the problems of both the soil and profitable management of a farm. The Leader believes the enactment of a proper farm legislation one of the most vital problems facing the United States. We cordially urge our readers to study this and invite comment on it, no matter whether you agree or not. Reproduction rights of this article are reserved.)

(By Warren Gregory)

The farmers of this country have been wooed and proposed to with numerous plans; some, no doubt beneficial and most of them very costly. Why must all of these plans emanate from Washington? Why not from the farmer? Has he been asked what he desires? We need nothing so ghastly as the Brannan plan, which calls for much unnecesssary, luxurious Government assistance. We need no pay for planting a crop, primarily for our own good, no payment for legume seedings to plow for our own soil fertility benefit.

Have we any surpluses? The food and agricultural organizations of the United Nations are worrying themselves with the problem of increasing world food production. They maintain this is a problem of education, engineering, and science. They also maintain that unless the world food problem is solved, there will be another world war, which will end civilization.

Our so-called emergency measures cannot continue indefinitely without socialism resulting.

Washington says the Republican Party has no farm plan; they say the Farm Bureau and other farm organizations have no farm plan, even though they are very critical of other plans. If we, of the Midwest agricultural regions wish a plan (instead of a dole); if we wish free enterprise (instead of Government dictatorship) and finally, if we desire to be the self-reliant people we once were, we must come forth with a workable project for agriculture of our own. We must consolidate our desires and needs immediately. These fraudulent Government programs must be halted now and something conservative, understandable, and practical instituted in their stead.

The population of the United States is increasing by leaps and bounds—about two to two and one-half million people per year. How can we feed this increase in the future? Must we semistarve our people for 10 years, because the population and production curves cross, in the near future?

Our Government seems to operate on two principles—scarcity and fear. Surpluses do not go along with socialism, any more than cats go along with rats. Scarcity is socialism's mate. No socialistic government, or country, has enough to eat, to wear, or to consume, without governmental subsidization and resulting suicidal taxation, borne by the consumer. Fear is the greatest weapon of our Government— fear of surpluses, fear of war, fear of depression and fear of long-continued peace and the loss of usurped power, under multitudinous emergency acts.

Our surpluses are all fictitious, so far as food is concerned. The Government has billions of dollars of the taxpayers' money invested in monuments to poor farm management and has control of our so-called food surpluses, as the farmer and feeder will learn much too late. Our livestock population is at a low ebb. We have fewer head of livestock, per capita, than we had in 1918. Our national income is still at an all-time high. Our gainfully employed are, practically the same number, if you consider the people who actually want to be regularly employed. R. C. Pollock, of the American Meat Institute, estimates we will have 171,000,000 people by 1960 in this country. We must gear our conservation practices and future production to meet that number if Mr. Consumer is ever to have Mr. Brannan's so-called cheap food.

Our Government in Washington seems to aggravate strikes and, certainly, stands at the top of the list in perpetuating labor strife. We cannot blame labor or management for this. The blame lies in mismanagement of labor's problems, and interference with management's difficulties, by our many Washington agencies.

We stand at the goal line of the most prosperous years and the greatest industrial expansion this Nation, or any other, has ever known. Let's not drop the ball.

We realize, only too little, how near we are to complete socialism. The control of industry and labor and Mr. Brannan's plan are all we need to complete it. The Government is, each day, destroying initiative to work, to produce and to operate one's own business in a businesslike manner, by bureaucratic meddling.

Why have all these plans when they are all on a day-to-day, month-to-month basis?

Why not forget the MVA? It will only mean more TVA and control of the vast resources of the Missouri Valley by Government. Why not continue with the Pick-Sloan plan, which is already under way? This question also applies to the Ohio, Mississippi and all other river projects.

Let us have one long-range plan, the farmers' own plan.

We have one heritage in this country and have been rapidly depleting it. "Your land and mine," as Henry J. Taylor so often calls it. We do not seem to be profiting by experiences of other peoples, who now are afflicted with famines. This heritage does not belong to us. We merely have the use of it—either to spoil and waste or to improve and conserve. We came here with nothing and when we leave this earth can take nothing with us.

It is not feasible to solve these agricultural problems jointly? The problems are: surpluses (if any), cheaper meats, flood, food prices and costs of production.

We need to conserve our soil—the greatest of all our resources—and improve its productivity and tillability. Our heritage will then be passed on to our children in better condition than when we, of this generation, received it. Two simple words will cure these and many of our other ailments: Soil conservation. Practice of soil conservation and proper rotation practices in all agricultural regions will solve these problems and many more.

1. They will hold down the production of surplus crops on marginal land.

2. They will furnish pasture and forage to enable us to increase livestock.

3. Fertility will be increased manyfold, in case of war or other need for greatly increased production, in line with population increases.

4. The cost of production of meat animals will be lowered for the farmer.

5. The cost of food, including meat, will be less to the consumer, without the imposition of other taxes.

6. Food production will increase, whereby we need not starve for 10 or 20 years, in a helpless state, striving to make the production curve again parallel the population curve—instead of cross it.

7. It will, as has been proven, minimize dust storms and crop failures, so far as human effort is concerned.

8. It will tend to stabilize and raise our water level and forestall water shortages.

9. It will put agriculture on a better basis financially; not dependent upon any one crop in particular.

10. It will create a more stable demand, by agriculture, for industrial products—such as automobiles, appliances and home improvements.

11. It will control flooding of rivers and streams, by eliminating run-off, in making the rain and snow soak into the soil, when they fall.

12. It will do away with Government subsidy payments on agricultural crops, which payments are made at the expense of the taxpayer.

13. It will tend to stabilize population in the rural areas, as farming will be more attractive to the younger generation on a good fertile farm, than one of those submarginal, eroded, semi-arid ones.

14. It will discourage Government interference with farming operations, so the American farmer may be happy, prosperous and on good terms with labor (his consumer).

15. Our streams will run clear once more, unhampered by silt and debris, abounding with fish, as they once were.

16. Recreational facilities will be increased, on large farm ponds, rivers and in our farm wood-lots and forests.

17. Wildlife protective cover will be improved, which will automatically restock our game birds and animals.

18. Farming will require less man hours, less cash outlay for expensive, seldom used equipment, but savings will be offset somewhat by construction of new fences and conservation work.

19. It will require two things to bring about all of these improvements: the technical assistance of our Soil Conservation Service and the will of the farmer to stand on his own two feet.

20. Last, but not by no means least, it will create that thing toward which we are all striving: A stable agricultural economy.

Why Not Repudiate Yalta's Betrayal of Poland, and Weaken Soviet Grip?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FOSTER FURCOLO

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1950

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, by request, I am including the following editorial from the May 13 issue of the Saturday Evening Post:

WHY NOT REPUDIATE YALTA'S BETRAYAL OF POLAND, AND WEAKEN SOVIET GRIP?

(By Ann Su Cardwell)

America, struggling against an adversary that is deadly serious, is looking for friends, and our Government has declared its intention of attempting to win the peoples in the satellite countries for the west even though their puppet regimes remain tools of Moscow. Poland is a case in point.

A conference between Churchill, Roosevelt, and Stalin in the Crimea resulted in what is known as the Yalta agreement (February 11, 1945). This agreement was never presented to the Senate for ratification, and was not a treaty but only an agreement between the three Chiefs of State. The Yalta accord specified that the "Provisional government [set up by Stalin] which is now functioning in Poland should therefore be reorganized on a broader democratic basis," and that this new government shall be pledged to the holding of free and unfettered elections as soon as possible. Furthermore, the three heads of government (Churchill, Roosevelt, Stalin) consider that the eastern frontier of Poland should follow the Curzon line, with digressions from it in some regions of from 5 to 8 kilometers. They recognize that Poland must receive substantial accessions of territory in the north and west * * * final delimitation of the western frontier of Poland should thereafter await the peace conference.

This Yalta accord, making Stalin a present of over 47 percent of Poland, conspired with geography, circumstances, the Red army and the NKVD to make it possible for Stalin to transform what remained of the helpless country into a Soviet province in everything but name. Soviet citizens masquerading as Poles now govern Poland according to Moscow's instructions. Nothing was guaranteed Poland in the west. Stalin gave Poland some German territory east of the Oder and Neisse Rivers, and this act, as well as the expulsion of thousands of Germans from western Poland, was confirmed at Potsdam.

Yet Poland, although handed over to the Kremlin, need not be lost to the west unless the west so wills. The Polish people remain pro-American in sympathies, separated from us only by the Yalta betrayal, the heaviest blow dealt them during all the war and occupation years. Polish distrust of us will persist as long as our Government regards the Yalta agreement as binding. Repudiation of Yalta would sweep it away and give a lift to lowered American prestige not only in Poland but throughout all eastern Europe.

What could Moscow do? It could multiply lies and vituperation. But it could not present a case against the United States, because Stalin has never made any pretense of living up to the Yalta terms. Out of nearly 40 Yalta agreements, according to President Truman, Stalin chose to honor only that concerning Japan. In so doing he was acting to his own advantage and our hurt.

The question arises: Has an agreement any validity when its conditions are ignored or deliberately misinterpreted by one of the contracting parties? For 5 years, to our great disadvantage, we have honored the Yalta agreement. And we may expect to be bullied, deceived, insulted or outsmarted as long as we hold to that phantom accord. At Yalta the Moscow men thought they had taken our measure. The records of the conference suggest that they were right.

Stalin's plans, as later events disclosed, required his possession of Poland, "the keystone of the European arch." On that subject he was adamant. Reporting to Congress on his Yalta trip, President Roosevelt said, "The whole Polish question was a potential source of trouble in postwar Europe * * * we came to the conference de-

termined to find a common ground for solution, and we did." The Big Three thought that by assuming the peacemakers' authority they could settle the "Polish question" once and for all by turning Poland over to Stalin while the Poles had no means of appeal.

Thus the Atlantic Charter was abandoned. At Yalta, America was made an active participant in an act of aggression against Poland and obligated to see that act executed.

Now, in 1950, America wants the friendship and support of the Nation betrayed in 1945. To get it we must make what restitution we can. Our repudiation of Yalta would revive faith in America and create insuperable difficulties for those entrusted with the execution of the sovietization program. It would regain for us the friendship of more than 20,000,000 highly useful people, and permit us to respect ourselves—which, incidentally, is one thing Mr. George Kennan says we must do if we are to insure our own security.

Armed Forces Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS B. HELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 11, 1950

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, recently the public has been confused because some utterances of important public persons have indicated that the international situation is more dangerous for us than at any time in recent years, and yet President Truman has said that the world situation is far, far better than in 1946.

What both parties say is true.

In a sense the situation is worse than before, because the Communists have completed or almost completed their control of China, with 450,000,000 more people added to their empire, and that unhappy country, with its enormous manpower and other potentials, in their hands. At the same time our hold on Berlin, always precarious, is threatened anew.

Yet what the President says is also true, because Communist power in Europe, which affects western civilization far more importantly than China, was at its height in 1946. Yugoslavia was strongly allied to the Soviet Union. The Red Army was still in Iran despite the United Nations. Jews and Arabs were preparing for armed battle in Palestine. Egyptians were in open revolt against Britain. The independence of India was threatening civil war. The world grain supply was three and a half million tons short. The economic condition of Europe was worsening rapidly.

Every one of these situations has taken a turn for the better since. There is probably no immediate likelihood of war, though it is always a possibility.

Probably the biggest single factor in the change is the fact that whereas in 1946 the United States was in the midst of the most rapid and wasteful disarmament in history, now we have rearmed and at the same time allied ourselves with the countries of western Europe in what is not only an economic and political tie but a military one as well.

In this present situation of international tension it is our defense forces which will do most to keep the peace. At the first aggression our Air Force will take to the skies with instruments of swift destruction to enemy centers. This is a great deterrent to war because aggression always feels out weakness.

After that all three arms of our defense services will play a balanced, cooperative, and powerful part in war. The Navy will keep the seas open and with its carrier take mobile air bases over the world. The Army with its ground troops and the Air Force with its tactical support and its transport will be able to launch offensive movements against the enemy. Meanwhile, we are building stout radar and tactical defense to protect our own homeland against enemy strikes. We may well hope and pray there will be no new war, but, if it should come, we are not now helpless and confused as we would have been in 1946, and that fact itself is our best ground for confidence that there will be no immediate war.

The Hitlers and Stalins of the world never start a war unless they think they can win. It is for us to see to it that they know they cannot win. "The strong man armed" will keep his own house, as the Bible says. It is for us all, as Americans, to see that this strength of our defense forces is maintained and incremented as long as the threat of Soviet domination hangs over the world.

Pie in the Sky

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 18, 1950

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I listened to the President's speech at the Democratic rally in Chicago and I read it in the RECORD. Mr. Truman attempted to write a prescription for the Nation that would let the people have their cake and eat it, too.

The President called his party a "party of dreamers." I guess we are all dreamers, and it is well that we are. We want better living conditions for all. We want to conserve our resources. We want to be a Christian nation. Indeed, the President painted a flowery picture of our aspirations. But there are certain hard realities of life that we must face without cringing. Our ancestors did not build the greatest nation on earth, with the highest living standards the world has ever known, by squandering their hard-earned savings in socialistic schemes. I am sure our people would feel a lot better if they knew we had somebody at the helm with a clear understanding of the hard facts that face us and a determination to solve our problems with the help of the best brains available, rather than resorting to political maneuvering for the purpose of perpetuating his party in office.

He held out glittering promises of future well-being if the people would elect to Congress the candidates who believe as he does. He offered something to everyone. He promised Federal aid to education, socialized medicine, socialized housing, the Brannan farm plan, and a lot of other costly schemes. He left the impression that the Government can give them all these without cost. He failed to tell the people that the adoption of this program would add another $25,000,000,000 a year to the Federal budget. He failed to mention the hard fact that Government produces nothing and can give the people nothing without first taking it from them in more and higher taxes or by increasing the debt. He carefully avoided telling the people about the huge deficits he is piling up each year. He did not mention the fact that in 4½ peacetime years he spent more money than the first 32 Presidents spent in 152 years of our Nation's history. He failed to explain that this deficit spending is debasing our dollar and that the $100 bonds they bought in 1940 for $75 will today only buy $60 worth of goods in the market place.

Mr. Truman failed to clear the air of the doubts we have in regard to our international problems. In recent speeches and whistle-stop talks he said that conditions are much better than they were in 1946, but his military and foreign affairs advisers warn us that conditions are very critical. The military are asking for more money for defense and a continuation of conscription. He avoided mentioning the "Pinks" and those in Government who have been playing "palsey-walsey" with the Communists. When the Committee on Un-American Activities was attempting to route these "Pinks" out of Government, he said, on 9 different occasions, that the Republicans were digging up "red herrings." He did not announce that his Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, and himself were now ready to turn their backs on these traitors. Nor did he assure the people that his hand picked Committee in the Senate would now cease its attempts to smear those who brought charges against certain persons high in policy making Departments and begin to make a real investigation.

He failed to tell the people about the Pendergast machine in Kansas City, how it first placed him in office and later helped him to purge an able Member of the House of Representatives who didn't take orders. He carefully avoided mentioning the tie-up of his Administration with gangsters and gamblers who completely control political machines in the big cities.

Conspicuous by its absence was any mention of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission for reorganizing the Executive Branch to effect a saving of billions of dollars in the cost of Government. He has sent several plans up to the Hill but in most of them the President says, "The taking effect of the reorganization included in this plan may not in itself result in substantial immediate

savings." But "substantial immediate savings" are what the people are looking for. No, the President is giving lip service to the recommendations of the Hoover Commission but his Department and Bureau Chiefs are vigorously opposing any changes in their agencies which would cut expense and thousands of employees off the swollen payrolls.

The President spoke glowingly of Thomas Jefferson and how the Democratic Party stood for the principles of Jefferson. He failed to mention the fact that Jefferson had a consuming fear of big government as expressed in his statement that "Those people are best governed who are least governed" and, "I place economy among our first and most important virtues, and public debt as the greatest danger to be feared." I am sure, Mr. Speaker, if Mr. Jefferson were to return to this earth and would see how the Democratic Party has been debauched, he would have an attack of angina pectoris or suffer a heart block that would be fatal.

Mr. Speaker, the Democratic Party has no monopoly on being against sin, or on wanting this Country to be a strong Christian Nation. It has no monopoly on the desire for a peaceful world and a prosperous economy. It is nice to be an idealist and a dreamer. There are certain facts we cannot ignore and we must face up to the hard, cold realities of life. The President failed to present these facts to the people. His speech in Chicago and his whistle-stop talks were of a "pie-in-the-sky" and "heaven-above-all" type designed to promise something to everybody without cost. He should remember he cannot "fool all the people all the time."

Whistle Stop at Wendover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS B. HELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 11, 1950

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of May 11, 1950:

WHISTLE STOP AT WENDOVER

Wendover, Wyo., is just a railroad division point with a population of 22 persons, but there were 400 people on hand when the Presidential train (Presidents do not have to worry about railroad strikes) pulled into the yards on Tuesday. Mr. Truman appeared upon the rear platform to speak warmly of "my good friend, JOE O'MAHONEY, who happens to be a Senator from this State." It was always good, he said, to come back out West. Wyoming was a progressive State—the first, in fact, to give women the right to vote. "Can you imagine," the President asked, "what some of the stuffy reactionary easterners had to say about the fact that you had woman suffrage out here? Listen—listen to this—you will like it—you will want to remember it. The editor of a prominent magazine published in New York said about Wyoming when you gave women the right to vote—now this is a quote: 'This unblushing female socialism defies alike the apostles and the prophets.'"

The chronology, it seems, was a little out of kilter. It developed later that the President was quoting from Harper's New Monthly magazine of November 1853, whereas Wyoming did not grant suffrage to women until 16 years later. However, the President has made his point: The rugged West and the effete East—the new frontiersmen of the ever-expanding exchequer and the old fogies of the balanced budget.

"Just what is an off-the-cuff whistle stop speech?" wrote our correspondent in his story. "President Truman delivered one today that is regarded on this train as a classic."

"Jumping Joe in Action Again"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 10, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, with permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I attach the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of May 8, entitled "Jumping Joe in Action Again." It points up neatly the kind of demagoguery of which the junior Senator from Wisconsin is capable by quoting from an article which he read into the RECORD in June 1949, opposing opening of the FBI files. Without an excuse or a reason, he now demands the files be opened.

"JUMPING JOE" IN ACTION AGAIN

"If the State Department loyalty files are opened, then my charges will be proved," Senator MCCARTHY has been shouting since he started his campaign against the State Department.

Now President Truman has authorized the State Department to open its files in the cases of the 81 individuals that MCCARTHY has termed loyalty risks.

Is MCCARTHY satisfied?

Of course not. Now he charges that the State Department files are phony, that they have been tampered with and that the President is guilty of deceit and dishonesty in making them available.

And he demands that the FBI files be opened. These will prove his charges, he says in effect.

Less than a year ago MCCARTHY was against opening the FBI files. On June 16, 1949, he read on the Senate floor an article by David Lawrence explaining in detail the great damage that would be done by such action. The article pointed out that publicizing of FBI files harms the FBI, endangers its informants, and imperils the reputation of innocent persons.

Yes, the man who didn't believe FBI files should be opened last June now wants them opened.

And does anyone think for a moment that if the administration did decide to open the FBI files (which it shouldn't and wouldn't) MCCARTHY would be satisfied. Of course he wouldn't. He'd shift ground again. He would retreat to some further position, hurl some new charges or find some new names to throw at the administration.

They tell a little story about "Jumping Joe" in Washington these days. It fits him perfectly. It goes like this:

"MCCARTHY is a slippery fellow. Every time you think you've caught up with him, he's down the river on another cake of ice."

Taxation of Mutual Savings Banks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 18, 1950

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, it is a pleasure for me to insert the following thought-provoking address delivered by our distinguished colleague, WALTER A. LYNCH, before the dinner meeting of the Savings Banks Officers and Auditors and Comptrollers Forum at the Hotel Astor, New York City, on May 16, 1950. Representative LYNCH is the New York majority member of the Ways and Means Committee and to his subject he brings a full and seasoned viewpoint founded upon broad experience in the practice of the law and especially in the field of banking and of taxation. His subject was most timely in view of the pending proposal to tax earnings of mutual savings banks about which I shall undoubtedly have more to say at a later date in opposition to the proposal. It would serve all well to read carefully the following obviously well-prepared address:

Mr. Chairman and members of the forum, it gives me great pleasure to be with you today. A life-long ambition of mine has been fulfilled. At long last I find myself in a group of men with so much money under their control that they do not know what to do with it. I do not know whether my choice as the speaker of the occasion is altogether fortuitous from your point of view, especially when you men learn that I am a member of that group of tax gatherers known officially as the Committee on Ways and Means of the United States House of Representatives. I might say that it is a most cooperative committee. I happened to mention to some of the members in the early part of last week that I was scheduled to speak before your group today and that I was at a loss for a topic. With characteristic thoughtfulness for a member of their committee, they came to a tentative agreement last Friday by a vote of 13 to 10 to tax mutual savings banks—thus giving me not only a topic for my address before you today, but also a very good reason for being here.

Before I discuss, however, the question of taxation of mutual savings banks, I think it might be well if you bankers knew something about the Committee on Ways and Means. It is the oldest committee in our Government and is charged with the responsibility of raising revenue for the operation of the Government. It is composed of 25 members, 15 from the majority side and 10 from the minority. Modesty forbids me to extoll the capabilities of the members of this committee, lest you get the impression that I would bathe in their reflected glory. Suffice to say that Presidents and Vice Presidents have, in the course of their congressional careers, been members of this committee and the present Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court recalls with real enthusiasm the not too distant days when he served on Ways and Means. The problems that confront the committee are many and complex and the pulling and the tugging of conflicting interests is beyond adequate description.

In the category of bills assigned for its consideration are the tax bills of the country, the customs and tariff bills, reciprocal

trade agreements, unemployment insurance, social security, and bills of like nature, all involving revenue. A bill comes before us in one of three ways. It is either introduced by a Member of the House and referred to our committee, or it is prepared by one of the departments and is introduced by the chairman of the committee as an administration bill, or, recommendations are made by the President in his message and from those recommendations the committee works out a bill of its own. Although we talk about the "tax bill of 1950" today, actually no such bill has been introduced. We are still in the deliberative and formative period of the bill and have only reached tentative agreements thereon. When we have come to final conclusions on the various matters that are to go into the bill, it is referred to the drafting service. After it is returned from the drafting service we again go over the bill for final correction and it will then probably be introduced by the chairman of the committee, if he is in favor of the bill. Following this formality, the bill is then referred back to the Ways and Means Committee; we take a formal vote upon it and favorably report it out. We then go before the Rules Committee to get a rule which determines the length of time that will be allotted for debate on the bill and the conditions under which the debate will be held. Usually when a tax bill is reported, we obtain what is known as a closed rule—at least that is what you call it on the majority side—while, if you are in the minority, you protest vigorously against the gag rule. The purpose of the closed rule is to prevent any amendments from the floor and you must take it or leave it. You can imagine the precarious position of those who are caught in the present net that has been spread to catch the so-called loophole tax evaders when these provisions are tied up with provisions that would reduce obnoxious excise taxes. Whether or not there is a loophole, or whether the committee discovers new sources of tax revenues heretofore not tapped, the situation is equally precarious for those who have previously legally enjoyed tax exemption.

In view of the fact that the proposed 1950 tax bill will contain substantial excise tax reductions, it is fair to assume that in an election year the Congress will vote for a bill that will reduce taxes, even though there may be some things in the bill with which they might not generally agree. When the bill has passed the House it is sent to the Senate and referred to the Senate Finance Committee which, in turn, goes through a procedure somewhat similar to that before the Ways and Means Committee. After the Senate has exercised its prerogative as "elder statesman" and has amended the bill to the collective satisfaction of its Members, it goes into conference and then the hatchet work is done. I might say that the conferees are selected by seniority. So that you might understand more clearly what this means, I have been in Congress 11 years—I am now in my eighth year on the Committee on Ways and Means—and for the first time I was selected as a conferee on the recently passed tax bill affecting life-insurance companies. I might say that I was selected for the reason that some of my seniors stepped aside so that I might be chairman of the conferees. I recite this to you in order that you might know—and particularly that the presidents of savings banks in Bronx County might realize—the importance of a conferee and might understand the necessity of urging the reelection of your speaker of the evening.

We go into these matters rather thoroughly and it was from a study of the history of mutual savings banks that I learned, for instance, that the original founders of mutual savings banks were religious leaders and that the members of your organization have some of the solid religious convictions of your forebears in the mutual savings banks industry.

Moreover, I, being both a lawyer and an elected public official, and at the same time having very firm religious convictions of my own, needed only to consult the counsel of Thomas Jefferson regarding the close tie between thrift and religion. Jefferson wrote John Page, "Would a missionary appear, who would make frugality the basis of his religious system, and go through the land preaching it up as the only road to salvation, I would join his school, though not generally disposed to seek my religion out of the dictates of my own reason, and feeling of my own heart."

Of course, as demonstrated by the fable of the ant and the grasshopper, thrift is not universally embraced as a virtue. From Publius Syrus, the Roman, we have the assertion that frugality is misery in disguise.

Now I must confess, in all candor, that my own view lies somewhere between Thomas Jefferson on the one hand and Publius Syrus on the other. I would not accept the view of the philosopher that, "Let us all be happy and live within our means, even if we have to borrow the money to do it with."

But I believe my own conviction was best expressed by Samuel Johnson, that "A man who both spends and saves money is the happiest man, because he has both enjoyments."

I make no pretense to having the fervent, rigid adherence to thrift that may be required for membership in your association. I must say that I admire the beneficent works of the Reverend Dr. Henry Duncan (who perhaps appropriately founded the first modern savings bank at Ruthwell, Scotland, in 1810), as well as his counterparts in this country, including New York's own Thomas Eddy and DeWitt Clinton.

But to come back to 1950—as you know, the Committee on Ways and Means is in the process of drafting a major tax bill. The committee's work was initiated in response to a Presidential message suggesting that some excise tax reductions were in order at this time, provided the resulting loss of revenue was made up through the enactment of loophole-closing legislation. The committee is aware, as I am sure you are also, of the desirability of reduction in the excise field in order that we may stimulate business and maintain a high level of employment. The excises are still at their wartime peak and in many cases the rates are almost punitive. Some of these rates were imposed during the war in an effort to discourage the consumption of strategic material and the use of labor needed in the war industries. These rates are inappropriate at the present time. We are in a so-called peace economy, in which we are endeavoring to stimulate production and to absorb in employment, not only those who were in the armed services, but the 500,000 or 600,000 of new annual entrants into the employment market. We are confronted with depressed business activities in certain fields and while the latest labor reports show that 60,000,000 people—the largest in the history of our country—are now employed, we must see that there is no deterioration in the standard of living of this increased labor group. To do that we must stimulate business, particularly in those depressed lines, such as jewelry, furs, leather goods, and other similarly affected industries. In some cases involving the admissions tax on movies, theaters, dining room service in hotels, where a singer is engaged to sing the Star Spangled Banner, and in so-called cabarets and night clubs which employ hundreds and thousands of people, the 20-percent tax falls unduly heavily. In other cases involving the tax on transportation of persons a real hardship is experienced, while the tax on transportation of property is so recurrent that in the case of a manufactured article it constitutes a substantial portion of the cost of production, as the transportation of each part is taxed as well as the finished product. In other cases such as in beer and light wines, the taxes unquestionably discriminate against persons of comparatively modest means. In short, there can be no doubt that excise revision is highly desirable.

The task of the Ways and Means Committee in its endeavor to reduce excise taxes might indeed prove somewhat pleasurable if, first, we could satisfy anyone without complete elimination of the tax on the article in which he is most interested, and, secondly, if we were relieved of the responsibility of raising, otherwise, taxes in an amount equal to the excises we reduced, in order to prevent the national deficit from growing greater.

Major tax reductions have already been made in two primary sources of wartime revenues, namely, the taxes on corporate and individual net incomes. The feeling throughout the country is today that excise reduction is overdue by reason of the fact that the last wartime increases in the excise rates, made in 1943, were enacted with the clear and distinct stipulation by the Congress of the United States in solemn assembly and enacted into law by the signature of the President, that these excise taxes would be removed within 6 months after the cessation of hostilities.

While the Committee on Ways and Means recognizes the strong merits of an excise reduction program, it is also acutely aware of the fact that the Federal Government is running a deficit of major proportions in the current fiscal year and may show an even larger deficit in 1951 if expenditures are not held to the budgetary levels or business conditions begin to slack off. The staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation has estimated that the deficit for the fiscal year 1950 will be $6,700,000,000, and that the deficit for 1951 will be $7,300,000,000 even if expenditures are held to the levels contained in the President's budget message. Hence the committee is making a vigorous effort to work out a balanced tax program in which the excise reductions which the committee has tentatively agreed upon and which, as you probably know, involve an annual revenue loss of about $1,000,000,000, will be offset by increased revenues from other sources.

I am sure that you will recognize that it is not an easy task to raise that much additional revenue, particularly from a tax system which is already overburdened and which, through its depressing effects on both consumer purchasing power and incentives, threatens to become a real obstacle to the continued progress of our country.

It is especially difficult to raise additional revenues of this size by the loophole-closing route. Many of the suggestions which the committee has received appear to be meritorious but promise no substantial amounts of revenue. Other suggestions have to be discarded because of the serious administrative difficulties which they would produce, and a good many are unacceptable because they involve changes in the fundamental principles of the income-tax law which are not acceptable to the committee.

Because of this situation it is not surprising that the tax exemptions provided in section 101 of the Internal Revenue Code have received close scrutiny. A good deal of revenue is involved, and, as you know, interest in these exemptions has been stimulated by a well-organized and determined agitation on the part of a group of businessmen who regard the exemptions as a loophole and believe they have fostered unfair competition. While the center of the stage

has been held by the dispute over the exemption of farm cooperatives, and the spectacular tax-avoidance schemes such as the lease-back arrangement used by certain educational institutions and insurance companies, it was inevitable that the committee's studies should extend to the other institutions which benefit under section 101, including the mutual savings banks.

I am impressed with the history of faithful public service of the mutual savings banks in providing a safe and secure depository of the small sums saved by the journeymen, the coachmen, the chambermaids, and the artisans. Without the savings banks in the days before series E savings bonds, these workmen of humble background would have had no safe place to keep their savings.

When one views the 133-year history of successful operations of the mutual savings banks, however, I believe that he is likely to be impressed with a paradox difficult to explain. Why is it that there is about one account for every three inhabitants of the territory that savings banks serve (and in New England and New York the proportion is even greater), yet the operations of savings banks are limited to only 17 States, and the majority of them are in the New England and Middle Atlantic States.

I know that the textbook writers explain that the pioneer country had great demand for the money and credit which ordinary commercial banks would provide while savings banks, being more conservative in lending policy, could not meet the need. It has been suggested that the farmers and miners of the West have an independence of spirit and a recklessness for adventure that did not require the protection afforded by the savings banks in the eastern cities for industrial employees.

The testimony before our committee emphasized the cooperative nature of mutual savings banks, the fact that they have no capital stock outstanding and are operated by trustees, and that ultimately all of the assets belong to the depositors. Emphasis was placed also upon the character of the business done. The small size of the average deposits was stressed, as was also the fact that these deposits were by and large held by persons of comparatively modest means. In particular, attention was directed to the importance of school savings and Christmas club accounts. The honorable history of these institutions and the long-standing character of their exemption under the Federal income tax was pointed out. Finally, it was argued that any tax imposed on mutual savings banks would reduce their ability to accumulate surplus which, in connection with a continued expansion in their deposits, would tend to weaken the banks and increase the risks of their depositors. It was pointed out also that State laws required the accumulation of a surplus for the protection of the depositors and that a conflict would exist between these laws and a tax which impeded the accumulation of the desired surplus. These are indeed impressive arguments.

Your general counsel, Mr. Fred N. Oliver, accompanied by Mr. Earl B. Schwulst, Jr., President, Bowery Savings Bank; Mr. A. George Gilman, Malden Savings Bank, Malden, Mass.; and Mr. Henry Powell., executive secretary, Savings Banks Association of the State of New York, gave us the following statistics—that as of December 31, 1949, the total deposits of savings banks amount to over $19,000,000,0000, the total assets, $21,500,000,000, total depositors over 19,000,000, and an average deposit per account of approximately $1,000. Now, the record of safety and security of the mutual savings banks in handling the deposits left with them by small depositors is admitted. I should point out that these depositors received on the average an interest rate of 1.78 percent in 1948. In contrast, the yield on series E bonds held to maturity is approximately 2.9 percent, and even series F and series G bonds yield 2.5 percent. I repeat, therefore, why should small investors leave their savings with the mutual savings banks? Why is it, and why should it be, public policy to grant an express exemption from Federal corporate income taxes for mutual savings banks? I ask these questions appreciating full well your great record of nearly a century and a half of service. I do so as a friend, however, to suggest that perhaps investment practices which result in more than 52 percent of the assets of mutual savings banks being invested in securities of the Federal Government might be reexamined.

Your representatives told the Committee on Ways and Means that there is a shortage of sound investments yielding a higher rate of interest. They related the experience of the Bowery Savings Bank in purchasing at premium prices FHA insured mortgage loans and your current efforts to negotiate with the Federal National Mortgage Association to buy a substantial amount of their portfolio. The real question, it seems to me, is whether the mutual savings banks have an additional obligation to make available their best judgment in seeking out on a selective basis investment opportunities for the great number of low- and middle-income wage earners and salaried employees.

Unless the savings banks can provide a service in this respect which these people cannot provide for themselves, why should they share with the savings bank the return which they can obtain through a direct investment in a Government savings bond or in some other investment guaranteed by the Government.

This leads me to the next question—if mutual savings banks are no longer providing to the public the service which led to their great growth and expansion on the eastern seaboard, why should they be given any special consideration under the internal-revenue laws? I think it is generally acknowledged that the corporate tax should not be imposed on amounts distributed to depositors, but according to the information given to the Committee on Ways and Means by your representatives, mutual savings banks now have retained reserves in excess of $2,000,000,000. According to your representatives, savings banks' earnings in 1948, after expenses, totaled $423,000,000, yet only $302,000,000 were actually paid to depositors. In view of the fact that savings banks are now investing primarily in Government bonds and Government-guaranteed obligations, it is claimed that there is little justification for the accumulation of the large reserves that have been wisely available in the past. Consequently, a tax policy which provides a tax exemption for such accumulated reserves is understandably under close scrutiny at a time when the present high tax rates on the tax-paying sector of the economy are bearing so heavily. The need for Federal revenue makes it essential to scrutinize tax exemptions at the present time much more closely than has been done in the past.

Gentlemen, I have given you the pros and cons as faithfully as I am capable of the question of the taxation of mutual savings banks. I presume that you have all answered the question in the negative, probably without taking into consideration the viewpoint of the affirmative. I think you would be interested in knowing that I voted against this tax. I voted against this tax for a number of reasons, some of which are as follows:

Savings banks are essentially a regional institution and fundamentally there is no difference between the mutuality of a savings bank and the mutuality of a farm cooperative—and I am opposed at this time to taxing the people in the cities and urban districts of the New England and Middle Atlantic States and letting the farmers in their mutual organizations go free. Furthermore, I am fearful that by this tax we will encourage the distribution of income rather than to build up the reserves and that after all insurance is only a secondary objective and the real bulwarks against depression are the original assets of a bank. My third objective is that in my opinion this might amount to taxation by entrapment. In other words, as I understand it, today 69 percent of the savings banks are insured in FDIC. It seems to me apparent that the insuring company has the right to determine what reserves should be set up by those companies which it insures. It is apparent, therefore, that the greater reserves demanded by the Federal agency for insuring savings banks will result in greater revenue through income taxes for the Federal Government. This does not take into account the various State laws that establish reserves and this proposed provision may very well be used to beat the States into submission to conform with the reserve policy of FDIC which, in turn, might well be determined not by the safety ratio, but by the political necessities.

Even though it be the eleventh hour, I suggest that you reexamine your whole structure and see whether or not you are today performing the function for which you were established and for which tax exemption was granted. In your conservative appraisal of your investments have you restricted yourselves so that instead of being helpful to the development of your community you are more intent to invest your deposits largely in Government bonds and Federal secured mortgages. I fear you have been lulled to sleep by the morphine of Federal security. Are you now so addicted to conservatism that you are willing to sacrifice the institutions which you have established and maintained, so that by your conservatism you may escape the criticism of possible loss. Many a person has died becaues they have not had the will to live. Have you the will to survive or are you going to let the Federal Government continue the mortgage loan business and savings business? Don't you say you can't compete. You can, if you will, but you haven't shown the will. If you want security, you can have it for a price—that is extinction. The time will come, and in my opinion it is not far distant, when your depositors will prefer postal savings or Government bonds to your meager interest rate. The mortgagees will demand that the Government take over their mortgages and eliminate the middle man, the savings bank, to which the mortgagee pays what he considers high interest for a loan of money guaranteed by the greatest country on the earth.

Look at your portfolios—not with an eye to the proportion of Government securities and Government guaranteed mortgages to total assets—but with an eye to the ratio between Government securities and Government guaranteed mortgages acquired since war's end to your new investments of the same period, and determine for yourselves whether you will fight for survival in competition with the Government, or whether you will peacefully succumb to the opiate of governmental beneficence.

Gentlemen, this is the time for courageous, determined, and decisive action. This is the time when the glorious history of our industry should embolden you to fight for the principles upon which your institutions were founded. The zero hour has not struck. It is still not too late, but it is later than you think.

Attack on Louis S. Budenz by Hon. Dennis Chavez, of New Mexico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 18 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement of the Reverend Laurence J. McGinley, S. J., president of Fordham University, in reply to the attack on Louis S. Budenz by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ].

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF THE REVEREND LAURENCE J. MCGINLEY, S. J., PRESIDENT OF FORDHAM UNIVERSITY, IN REPLY TO THE ATTACK ON LOUIS F. BUDENZ BY SENATOR DENNIS CHAVEZ, OF NEW MEXICO, ON THE SENATE FLOOR

Prof. Louis Budenz joined the faculty of this university in 1946. Since that time he has given complete satisfaction in the discharge of his academic duties. Within the limits imposed on him by his obligations as a scholar and teacher, he has at times complied with the requests of public and private agencies to lecture on the philosophy of communism and on the subversive techniques of the Communist Party. This was done with the knowledge and consent of the university authorities. During his years at Fordham, Professor Budenz has deserved and continues to enjoy the full confidence of the university—both as a teacher and as a Christian gentleman.

From time to time, much to his own inconvenience and the occasional inconvenience of the university, Professor Budenz has been subpenaed by the Government to testify in cases involving alleged Communists or Communist activities. It has always been his wish that such information as might be sought from him by the Government be given solely on his own responsibility. He foresaw that he would be subjected to violent attack from Communist quarters and he did not wish to involve the university.

It has remained, however, for a member of the United States Senate to bring this personal vilification of Professor Budenz to a point even lower than that reached in the columns of the Daily Worker. It might fairly be said that never within recent memory has a Member of Congress so used his immunity in personal attack upon the character of a fellow citizen. The Senator had the effrontery, moreover, to pose as a Catholic while publicly enacting this vicious offense against Christian charity. As a priest of the Catholic Church, and as president of the university of which Professor Budenz is a respected faculty member, I cannot allow so slanderous and cowardly a demonstration to go unanswered.

Under Government subpena, Professor Budenz has appeared as a witness in many trials over the last 5 years. He has, as was to be expected, when he testified against Communists or Communist activities, been castigated both here and abroad by those whose conspiracy he was called upon to expose. Never, to my knowledge, have responsible officials of our own Government or members of the American press had other than praise for his conscientiousness as a witness.

It was not until he went recently to Washington—once again not at his own request but under subpena from a Senate committee—to testify in an inquiry into alleged Communist influences in our own Government, that those who should have been his friends turned on him with that weakest and most cowardly of all weapons, slanderous attack on his character and his family.

As an American and a teacher of young Americans, I find Senator CHAVEZ' attack disturbing in the extreme. As a priest, I must denounce the hypocrisy and uncharitableness that characterized it.

Whatever mistakes Professor Budenz has made in the past are an open book. Unfortunately for him, he has had to live under the constant threat of Communist reprisals, and to bear in silence the sneers of modern pharisees who are always ready to point a self-righteous finger at their fellow man.

The Catholic Church, convinced of the sincerity of his repentance, welcomed Louis Budenz back into the fold. Let those who in the name of the church of charity presume to shout another man's alleged transgressions from the housetops, look instead into their own hearts.

Communism at Home—FEPC—White Americans Betrayed

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 18, 1950

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, it is not only useless, but ridiculous, for the administration, or anyone else, to advocate spending billions of dollars of the American taxpayers' money in foreign countries under the pretense of fighting communism abroad, and at the same time attempting to impose communism upon the American people here at home.

These attempts to ram the FEPC down the throats of the people of this country is simply following the Communist line; and this persecution of the white people in the District of Columbia through this so-called antisegregation movement has reach a state of degredation that I never dreamed I would ever live to see in the Nation's Capital.

Remember the Communists, their stooges and fellow travelers, do not give a "tinker's dam" about the Negroes. They are simply using the Negroes as a smoke screen to force this communistic program on the American people. It is a part of the Communist program for the destruction of this country.

Thomas Jefferson would turn over in his grave, if he could hear this communistic FEPC program advocated in his name and hear his words twisted or misinterpreted to fit a program of communistic compulsion, by which white Americans in the District of Columbia are persecuted as they have never been persecuted before—and see the attempts made to extend this persecution to white Americans everywhere.

Whether the President knows it or not, this is a communistic scheme to undermine this country and destroy the white man's civilization throughout the world. It is being fostered and pressed by alien-minded minorities that have for their purpose the amalgamation of the races and the destruction of the white man's civilization, and wiping Christianity from the face of the earth.

Here in the District of Columbia white children are driven from their playgrounds and swimming pools, white people generally are driven from certain theaters and other places of amusement.

These alien-minded real-estate agents are driving the white people of the District of Columbia out of their homes and forcing them to move over into Virginia for protection, by selling Negroes homes in their midst—thereby bringing about a condition that causes white people to have to sell their homes and move across the Potomac River.

As I have said before, these Communists do not give a tinker's dam about the Negroes. They are simply using them as a smoke screen to carry out their infamous designs against the white people of this country. They are doing the Negroes infinite harm.

If President Truman does not know what is going on, he had better get some advisers who can give him the facts. If he does know what is going on, then he ought to call a halt.

I exposed this communistic FEPC on the floor of this House 2 years ago. When Mr. Dewey, Governor of New York, signed the bill imposing that vicious measure upon the people of New York, I said at the time, that "all the perfumes of Arabia would not sweeten his little hand."

Something like a million copies of that speech have been printed and circulated throughout the land. Everywhere this vicious measure has been introduced in the State legislature, and the Members have read copies of that speech; they have killed the measure in every single instance.

If it was referred to a vote of the people in the various States and they were informed as to what it means, they would do just what they did in California—defeat it by an overwhelming majority in every single individual county. They would kill it so dead you would never hear of it again.

They have this vicious law on the statute books in the States of New York, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island, and New Jersey, and have spent millions of dollars trying to force it on Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan, Illinois, California, Minnesota, Colorado, and other States; and, as I said have failed in every instance.

The best service the Legislatures of the States of New York, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island, and New Jersey could possibly render their people would be to repeal this vicious measure at once and stop giving aid and comfort to those enemies of America that are trying to impose it upon the entire Nation through the Congress of the United States.

In my speech in the House on February 13, 1947, in discussing this measure, I said:

I want to read you some of the regulations that are now being imposed upon the people of the State of New York under this vicious

law. Businessmen from New York tell me that the way they are getting around this measure is by operating through employment agencies, because no intelligent businessman would go to a State with that kind of law on its statute books and attempt to establish a new business or a new enterprise, especially with the regulations or rulings under it which I am now going to read to you.

Remember they put this measure on the ticket in California and the people voted on it in the last election; and it lost in every single individual county in California. It was beaten in the entire State by about 3 to 1.

You simply destroy business with a measure like this. That is what the FEPC did here. Men have gone out of business all over the country in the last few years because of the persecution that was carried on by this outfit here in Washington, the personnel of which I shall insert later on.

A few people are going around urging us to pass it as a national law, to put everybody else in the same predicament. These people who are carrying on this racial agitation are using the Negro as a smoke screen. They do not give a tinker's dam about the Negro. They are not trying to help the Negro. They are doing them more harm than anybody else has done in the last 50 years, and the decent law-abiding Negroes know it.

But let me show you what they have done in New York, and let me give you some of the regulations or rulings, as they are called, and ask you if you would like to have them in your State. I want to ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen] how he would like to have them in Illinois, or how you would like to have them in Ohio, Indiana, Pennsylvania, or in Missouri, or in any other State in the Union.

Here are the regulations, or rulings, issued by the State of New York. They are headed:

"State of New York Executive Department. State Commission against discrimination. Rulings."

Here are the rulings:

I want to show you some things you cannot ask in the State of New York when you go to employ a man.

Remember that State has no gas, coal, or oil, and very little water power. The rest of the country does not have to go to New York, or to any other State, to get what it needs in the years to come. The American people in every section of this country are in a position now to take care of themselves. You put this measure on in one State after another and you will simply penalize those States beyond reason, and when they ask you to pass it for the whole United States and put it on the entire American people, after the fiasco they have made of it here in Washington in the last few years, it is simply unthinkable to a man who knows what he is doing and has the interest of the people of the country at heart.

Here are some of the things you cannot do under the law of New York:

UNLAWFUL EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES BEFORE HIRING ANYBODY

Those words are written in capitals. Here is the first unlawful practice:

"Inquiry into the original name of the applicant for employment, whose name has been changed by court proceedings or otherwise."

If you inquire as to his name or what his name used to be, you violate the law. You commit an unlawful practice. For instance, take this man who writes for PM, who calls himself I. F. Stone. His name was Isadore Fainstein, as Cordell Hull once pointed out. Suppose he comes to you asking for employment and you ask him that question. Then you will have committed an unlawful act.

Here is the next one:

It would be unlawful practice to make—

"Inquiry into the birthplace of the applicant for employment, the birthplace of his parents, spouse, or other close relative."

How would you like that in Iowa, Illinois, Texas, or Nebraska? In California I know you do not like it, because you have just voted on it.

Here is the next unlawful practice.

"Requirement that the applicant for employment produce a birth certificate or baptismal certificate."

That would be an unlawful practice under this FEPC Act in New York.

I was surprised to see Governor Dewey get his mustache in the wringer on this proposition. I do not see how he is ever going to get loose from it.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. MASON. What about this requirement during the war that every person employed in certain industries had to prove that he was born here before he could get a job?

Mr. RANKIN. Certainly. If we had this law all over the country then, the Japs would have had a spy at the elbow of every man in a key position; so would the Germans, and so would every other enemy country.

I thank the gentleman from Illinois for his timely suggestion.

It is an unlawful practice in New York, under this law, to make—

"Inquiry into the religious denomination of an applicant for employment, his religious affiliations, his church, parish pastor, or religious holidays observed. Inquiry into whether an applicant for employment is an atheist."

Inquiry into whether an applicant for employment is an atheist is forbidden, although you may be publishing literature for the Methodist Church, the Baptist Church, or any other denomination.

Another thing, an applicant for employment—and I am reading from the rules laid down by this Commission:

"An applicant for employment may not be told that this is a Catholic, Protestant, or Jewish organization."

In other words, if you are in the business of publishing religious literature you cannot even give him that information under this law which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen] now proposes for the whole country, including Illinois.

Here is another unlawful practice:

"An applicant for employment may not be told that the following holidays will be observed by the firm and no others, naming the holidays; e. g., Decoration Day and July the Fourth, etc."

You cannot tell them under the laws, rulings, and regulations of the State of New York that they may observe the Fourth of July.

Here is another unlawful practice:

"An applicant for employment may not be told that employees are required to work Rosh Hashana and Yom Kippur."

Frankly, I did not know there were any such days until the last few years.

Another thing, it is an unlawful practice under this New York law to make—

"Inquiry into the complexion of an applicant for employment."

Inquire into his complexion and you are likely to get yourself tangled up with the law of the State of New York.

Here is another unlawul practice:

"Requirement that an applicant for employment annex a photograph."

That would be an unlawful employment practice. You are not supposed to know how he looks.

Remember, this is not in Russia, but in New York.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. MASON. And yet the State Department in order to grant a visa requires a photograph of the person to be presented with his application.

Mr. RANKIN. Certainly, and they ought to do so. Much as I respect the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON], I certainly would not want to employ him unless I knew how he looked. If I had never seen him, I would certainly want to see his picture.

Here is another unlawful practice:

"Inquiry whether an applicant for employment is a naturalized or native-born citizen; the date when the applicant acquired citizenship; whether the applicant's parents or spouse are naturalized or native-born citizens of the United States; the date when such parents or spouse acquired citizenship."

You cannot inquire into those questions under this FEPC law in New York.

Here is another unlawful practice:

"Requirement that an applicant for employment produce his naturalization papers or first papers."

He may lie to you and tell you that he is a naturalized citizen, but you cannot ask to see his papers.

Another unlawful practice in New York is to—

"Inquire into the lineage of an applicant for employment, his ancestry, or national origin."

You remember a few years ago the Dallas News inserted an advertisement for a colored janitor, and this FEPC outfit down the street ordered them to take it out, said it was an unlawful practice.

One member of this FEPC outfit here in Washington went into the office of Swift & Co. in Chicago. This FEPC man asked them: "How many Negroes do you have on your board of directors?"

The answer was "None."

Then the FEPC man asked him: "Why haven't you?"

That was the FEPC down here in Washington a few years ago before it died because a few radicals could not browbeat Congress in perpetuating it.

But it is now in force in the State of New York.

Here is another unlawful practice under the New York law:

"Inquiry into the location of places of business of relatives of an applicant for employment."

It is an unlawful practice to make—

"Inquiry into the place of residence of the parents, spouse, or other close relatives of an applicant for employment."

I am reading from the records at Albany.

Here is another unlawful practice:

"Inquiry into the maiden name of the wife of a male applicant for employment and/or inquiry into the maiden name of the mother of a male or female applicant for employment."

The other day we had the Eislers down here. One of them has been shown to be representing the Comintern, according to his sister's testimony. He has a brother out in California, who seems to be poisoning the public mind through the moving-picture industry. He tries to defend his brother and refers to this woman as "my former sister." If you wanted to employ any of them and check the name of at least one of them as given here, you could not inquire into those names at all—if you are trying to do business in the State of New York—even though one of them has a half dozen aliases. You could not even ask where they came from or when they got here or when they changed their names.

Here is another unlawful practice, in New York:

"Inquiry into the general military experience of an applicant for employment."

I wish every ex-serviceman could read that, and the next one.

Here it is. It is an unlawful practice to make—

"Inquiry into the whereabouts of an applicant for employment during the First

World War, i. e., during the period from 1914 to 1919."

In other words, inquiry as to his whereabouts in the period from 1914 to 1919 is forbidden as an unlawful practice in the State of New York.

Is that what you want in Colorado? Is that what you want in Massachusetts?

Mr. GIFFORD. We have it.

Mr. RANKIN. Get rid of it, and we will help you.

Is that what you want in Kansas, in Ohio, and in other States?

Let your States vote on it. Michigan is going to vote on it right away. If you will tell the people of Michigan the whole truth, let them know the whole truth about this monstrosity. I will guarantee you they will beat it worse than they did in California.

Here is another unlawful practice:

"Inquiry into the organizations of which an applicant for employment is a member, including organizations the name or character of which indicates the religion, race, or national origin of its members."

I presume, if they should ask me if I am a member of the Masonic lodge, I could have them jerked up and brought before this inquisition board or probably prosecuted at various places throughout the country.

Mr. Speaker, I am not criticizing the people of New York. I have long since learned in going from one State to another that real Americans are about the same everywhere. I believe, if they had a vote on it, the people of New York would beat it, just as they did in California.

They are having a vote on it in Michigan because a little minority group has been attempting to browbeat the Legislature of Michigan into passing it. I dare say when it goes on the ballot in Michigan and the people of Michigan understand what it means they will defeat it more thoroughly than they did in California. The same thing would happen in probably every other State in the Union.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman tell us what the penalties are in New York?

Mr. RANKIN. In addition to being harassed to death with orders and directives to cease, desist, rehire, etc, there is a punishment provided of "imprisonment in a penitentiary or county jail for not more than 1 year or by fine of not more than $500, or both."

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. I want to remind the gentleman that we have that law in Massachusetts.

Mr. RANKIN. I was afraid of that.

Mr. GIFFORD. I was thoroughly amazed when I looked into it; I had not learned what the rules were. But, perhaps we carried it too far. I am so sorry, and I have been, and I am not in favor of this, I can assure the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. I know the gentleman is not, and I am sure the people of Massachusetts would not favor it if they had a vote on it.

Mr. GIFFORD. Employers always inquire and must know whether you come from a respectable family or not. They are so careful. Perhaps they overdid it. But I think a man ought to be able to find out whether he came from a respectable family.

Mr. RANKIN. There are a great many questions that should be asked, which are forbidden under this law.

Mr. Speaker, in order to give the new Members an idea of what a mess this FEPC was here in Washington during its existence under Executive order, I insert a speech I made on this subject in 1945. It reads as follows:

"FEPC A BETRAYAL OF WHITE AMERICANS

"(Speech of Hon. JOHN E. RANKIN, of Mississippi, in the House of Representatives, Thursday, July 12, 1945)

"Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, the passage of a law at this time legalizing this so-called FEPC would be a betrayal of the white people of the country. If every individual in the United States could understand just what it means, there would be such a roar of protest coming from every State in this Union that it would never see the light of day.

"If every Member of Congress would 'screw his courage to the sticking place' and vote his convictions on this so-called FEPC, it would not get 50 votes out of the entire membership of 435.

"It is a most dangerous and brazen attempt to fasten upon the white people of America the worst system of control by alien or minority racial groups that has been known since the crucifixion.

"When I read the names of the personnel of this outfit you will understand what I mean.

"To sanctify this organization by law would give the lie to everything we have told our American boys they were fighting for. Instead of coming back to liberty, freedom, and democracy, they would find themselves sold into this bondage, herded, humiliated, and regimented by alien influences directed by a foreign comintern representing the deadly doctrine of Karl Marx that is based upon hatred for Christianity and for everything that is based on Christian principles.

"It is a manifestation in legislative form of that infidelity that has closed thousands of Christian churches in Europe and been responsible for the murder of untold millions of Christian human beings.

"This measure is not directed altogether at the white people of the South. If it were, you folks in the North would not have so much ground for alarm. We in the South know how to combat subversive elements. As Henry Grady once said, we wrested the South from such domination 'when Federal drum beats rolled nearer and Federal bayonets hedged closer to the ballot box of the South than it ever will again in this Republic.'

"But you people in the North have not had that training, and this FEPC is likely to bring grief, strife, hatred, race riots, and chaos in your northern cities if this vicious agency is perpetuated and sanctioned by your votes.

"Do not forget that the returning servicemen know what this thing means, and they are going to call you to account next year—beginning with the primary. They are not going to wait until the general election.

"Do not forget that every businessman, every farmer, every professional man, and every other independent individual whose blood glows with the instinct of American liberty, is going to join these men, and those other patriotic forces that are fighting to save American institutions for which these boys have been fighting and dying upon every battlefield in the world.

"If every man and every woman in the United States could just read the list of individuals that compose the personnel of this crazy FEPC, and its subdivisions throughout the country, I dare say there would not be enough of you left who vote for it, even if nominated in the primaries next year, to form a corporal's guard.

"For your information, and for the information of the American people generally, I am going to read you the official personnel as it exists today. Remember, this list is taken from the official record. This is the group that wants to nose into and control every business in the United States. Remember, they can search the files and records of every business establishment in America where some disgruntled individual is willing to trump up a charge of discrimination. They can drag them all over the country and try them, and in that way destroy any ordinary business concern.

"The next thing they are going to try to do is get control of your schools and force their communistic henchmen into the schools and teach your children their subversive doctrines.

"Read these lists carefully, which, as I said, are taken from the official records here in Washington, and you will see that not one out of ten on these rolls is a white gentile American.

"Here is the official list:

"Committee on Fair Employment Practice, Washington, D. C., Office of the Chairman

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Ross, Malcolm	Chairman	White	$8,000
Johnson, George M.	Deputy Chairman.	Colored	8,000
Hubbard, Maceo	Hearings examiner.	do	5,600
Bloch, Emanuel	do	White	5,600
Copper, Evelyn	do	do	5,600
Berking, Max	Assistant to Chairman.	do	3,800
Alexander, Dorothy	Secretary to Chairman.	Colored	2,600
Clifton, J. Jeanne	Secretary to Deputy.	do	2,000
Brooks, Mary	Clerk-stenographer.	do	1,800
Banting, Myra	do	White	1,800

"You will note that in this office of the chairman, consisting of 10 people, there are 5 Negroes and 5 white people, most of whom have foreign names. One of the whites is a stenographer who receives the smallest salary of anyone on the list.

"Remember that the members of this group preside over the destiny of every business enterprise in America, and are using their assumed powers to harass white Americans out of business.

"This is the organization Members of Congress are being asked to perpetuate by the passage of this bill.

"FIELD OPERATIONS

"Here is the Division of Field Operations:

"Field operations

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Maslow, Will	Chief	White	$6,500
Mitchell, Clarence	Principal fair-practice examiner.	Colored	5,600
Davidson, Eugene	do	do	5,600
Beall, W. Hayes	Senior fair-practice examiner.	White	4,600
Mercer, Inez	Fair-practice examiner.	do	3,800
Rogers, Eleanor	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored	1,800
Saito, Otome	do	Japanese-American.	1,800
Thompson, Mildred	do	Colored	1,800
Cornick, Emma	do	do	1,620

"You will note that it consists of nine people—five Negroes, one Japanese, and three others—two of whom have records of affiliations with Communist-front organizations, according to the reports of the Dies committee.

"Imagine this group going about over the country riding herd on the white American businessmen of the Nation, telling them whom they shall employ, whom they shall promote, and with whom they may associate.

"It would be interesting, and probably enlightening, to check up on these people and see how many of them are native-born Americans.

"Members of Congress had better do this now, before they get caught in this trap, because this question of un-American activities is going to be an issue in every congressional district next year, beginning with the primaries.

"The people are not going to wait until the general election for someone who holds a commission as a result of the pernicious activities of Sidney Hillman and his gang to wrap the party cloak about him and shout to the people of his district that 'I am a Republican' or 'I am a Democrat.'

"More than 2,000,000 young men have already been discharged in this war, and they are organizing now to try to save America for Americans. They are going to read your records, and they are likely to ask you some very embarrassing questions when you get home.

"REVIEW AND ANALYSIS DIVISION

"Now look at this list and see who reviews all these records of racial discrimination when they come to Washington, and you will understand how the editor of the Dallas News felt and how other white gentiles feel, including Cecil B. DeMille, the great American movie producer, when they are harassed out of business.

"Here is the list:

"Review and Analysis Division

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Davis, John A	Chief	Colored	$5,600
Lawson, Marjorie	Research analyst	do	3,800
Colightly, Cornelius	Compliance analyst	do	3,200
Hemphill, India	do	do	2,600
Coan, Carol	do	White	2,600
Davis, Joy P	do	Colored	2,600
Hoffman, Celia	Clerk-stenographer	White	1,800
Spaulding, Joan	do	Colored	1,800

"You will note that it consists of six Negroes and two white people, one of whom is named Carol Coan and the other Celia Hoffman, a white stenographer receiving the lowest salary on the list.

"Now, if you sign the petition to bring out this bill or vote for this monstrosity, do not forget that when you get home those white American businessmen who help to sustain this Nation in time of peace and whose sons are fighting its battles in time of war are going to want to ask you some questions that you may not be able to answer.

"LEGAL DIVISION

"But if you want a real laugh, look at this Legal Division.

"Legal Division

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Reeves, Frank D	Attorney	Colored	$4,600
Stickgold, Simon	do	White	4,600
Gordon, Jernevive	Clerk-stenographer	Colored	1,800

"You will note that this so-called Legal Division consists of two Negroes and a Simon Stickgold.

"INFORMATION DIVISION

"Now we come to the Information Division. If you want information about this outfit write to this Division:

"Information Division

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Bourne, St. Clair	Information specialist	Colored	$3,800
Whiting, Margaret	Clerk-stenographer	do	1,800

"You will note that it consists of two Negroes, one registered as an information specialist and the other as a clerk-stenographer.

"BUDGET AND ADMINISTRATION

"Now we come to the Budget and Administration Division. This Division not only makes up the budget but administers the regulations. Here is the list:

"Budget and Administration

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Jones, Theodore	Chief	Colored	$5,600
Jeter, Sinclair	Assistant administrative officer	do	3,200
Baker, Vivian D	Clerk-stenographer	do	2,000
Jackson, Bosales A	Clerk-typist	do	1,620
Paynter, Minnie A	do	do	1,620
Hollomon, Irving	Clerk	do	1,440
Selby, Ralph R	Chief, fiscal	do	2,600
Ross, Sylvia B	Voucher auditor	do	2,000
Nelson, Otelia	Accounting clerk	do	1,620
Carpenter, Elizabeth	do	do	1,620
Brent, Pearl T	do	do	1,620

"This outfit, which is composed of 11 Negroes, and no whites at all, not only makes up the budget for financing this aggregation, but it seems to have the power of administration. I hope you will read this list to your white businessmen, farmers, and ex-servicemen at home when you get back and ask for renomination in the primaries next year.

"MAIL AND FILES DIVISION

"Now, here are the ones that have control of the mails and filing system:

"Mail and Files

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Douglas, Lela	Chief, Mail and Files	Colored	$2,000
Welch, Selena	Docket clerk	do	1,800
Gamble, Jessie	File clerk	do	1,620
Phillips, Rose	do	do	1,440
Reed, Charles	Messenger	do	1,380
Mitchell, Regina	File clerk	do	1,440

"You will note that this division is composed entirely of Negroes—six Negroes, and no whites at all. I wonder why they discriminated against the white race in setting up these two powerful branches of this most dangerous agency?

"REGIONAL OFFICE, NEW YORK

"Now, let us turn to the regional offices and see who is going to harass the business people back in the States. Here is the list for the State of New York:

"Regional office, New York

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Lawson, Edward H	Regional director	Colored	$5,600
Jones, Madison S	Fair-practice examiner	do	3,800
Jones, Robert G	do	do	3,800
Donovan, Daniel R	do	White	3,800
Irish, Miriam	Clerk-stenographer	Colored	2,000
Asepha, Tillie	do	White	1,620
Schwartz, Sonia	do	do	1,620

"This is the list that is going to help Governor Dewey harass the white American businessmen of the Empire State. You will note that it is composed of four Negroes and three white people. Please read the names of the three white people and see if you can figure out their antecedents.

"Businessmen of New York are going to have a hard time after this war without having all this communistic conglomeration to deal with, to say nothing of the one which Governor Dewey and his political henchmen have now heaped upon them.

"REGIONAL OFFICE, PHILADELPHIA

"Now, let us turn to Philadelphia, the birthplace of the Constitution—the City of Brotherly Love. At the risk of causing glorious old Benjamin Franklin to turn over in his grave, I read you the list:

"Regional office, Philadelphia

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Fleming, G. James	Regional director	Colored	$5,600
Greenblatt, Mildred	Fair-practice examiner	White	3,800
Manly, Milo A	do	Colored	3,800
Risk, Samuel R	do	White	3,800
Grinnage, Willard	do	Colored	3,200
Gorgas, Helen	Clerk-stenographer	do	1,800
Klinger, Karyl	do	White	1,800
Brown, Grayce	do	Colored	1,440

"You will note that it is composed of eight individuals—five Negroes and three whites, Mildred Greenblatt, Samuel R. Risk, and Karyl Klinger.

"Don't you know there will be some brotherly love when that crowd gets going on the businessmen of the Philadelphia area?

"REGIONAL OFFICE, WASHINGTON, D. C.

"Now, here is the regional office in Washington, D. C., the Nation's Capital, where there has been so much persecution of white gentiles in the last few years. Here is the list:

"Regional office, Washington, D. C.

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Evans, Joseph	Regional director	Colored	$5,600
Houston, Theophilus	Fair-practice examiner	do	3,200
Kahn, Alice	do	White	2,600
Chisolm, Ruby	Clerk-stenographer	Colored	1,800
Urback, Dorothy	do	do	1,620

"You will note it consists of four Negroes and Alice Kahn. Just what chance a white gentile will have with this group is entirely problematical, to say the least of it.

"REGIONAL OFFICE, CLEVELAND

"Now, let us move out where the West begins and take a look. Here is the list in the Cleveland regional office:

"Regional office, Cleveland

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
McKnight, William	Regional director	Colored	$4,600
Abbott, Olcott R	Fair-practice examiner	White	3,800
Glore, Lethia	do	Colored	3,200
Kelley, Berniza	Clerk-stenographer	do	1,620
Wasem, Edna	do	White	1,800

"You will note that this group is composed of three Negroes and two whites, Olcott R. Abbott and Edna Wasem.

"Don't you know the white people of Cleveland will enjoy being dominated by them?

"CINCINNATI REGIONAL OFFICE

"Cincinnati seems to be largely under the jurisdiction of the Cleveland office since it only has two people:

"Cincinnati

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
James, Harold	Fair-practice examiner	White	$4,600
----------	Clerk-stenographer	----------	1,800

"DETROIT REGIONAL OFFICE

"Now let us move on to Detroit, Mich. Here is the regional office for Detroit:

"Detroit

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Swan, Edward	Examiner in charge.	Colored	$4,600
Sese, Doris K	Clerk-stenographer.	Japanese-American.	1,620

"You will note that it is composed of one Negro and one Japanese. I know the businessmen of Detroit are grateful for this consideration.

"I should like to hear some of the comments they will make to you gentlemen from Detroit when you get home next summer, if you support this vicious measure.

"REGIONAL OFFICE, CHICAGO

"Here is the list of the regional office in the Windy City:

"Regional office, Chicago

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Henderson, Elner	Regional director.	Colored	$5,600
Gibson, Harry H. C.	Fair-practice examiner.	do	3,800
Schultz, Joy	do	White	3,800
Williams, Le Roy	do	Colored	3,200
Zeidman, Penny	Clerk-stenographer.	White	1,800
Ingram, Marguerite S.	do	Colored	1,620

"You will note it is composed of four Negroes, Joy Shultz, and Penny Zeidman. I am told that a representative of this group went into the office of Swift & Co. and asked how many Negro members they had on their board of directors. The answer was, "We have no Negro members on our board of directors." Then the question came back, "Why haven't you?" This just shows what this supergovernmental set-up is driving at. They want to communize America and destroy everything which our glorious ancestors have left us and for which our boys are now fighting and dying all over the world.

"REGIONAL OFFICE, ATLANTA

"Here is a list of the Atlanta office:

"Regional office, Atlanta

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Dodge, Witherspoon.	Regional director.	White	$4,600
Hope, John	Fair-practice examiner.	Colored	3,800
McKay, George D	do	White	3,200
Chubb, Sally	Clerk-stenographer.	do	2,000
Ingram, Thelma	do	Colored	1,800

"You will note that it consists of two Negroes and three whites; the most important post in this office, that of examiner, is held by a Negro. I wonder how the people of Georgia enjoy the domination of this group. I may have more to say about them later.

"REGIONAL OFFICE, KANSAS CITY

"Here is the list of the Kansas City office:

"Regional office, Kansas City

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Hoglund, Roy A	Regional director.	White	$5,600
Ormabee, Eugene	Fair-practice examiner.	do	3,800
Jones, Mildred	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored	1,620
Schlien, Helene G	do	White	1,620

"You will note that this office force consists of three whites and one Negro. You can read the list of whites yourself and then judge how many of them really represent the people of that area.

"ST. LOUIS REGIONAL OFFICE

"Here is the list of the regional office at St. Louis:

"St. Louis

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Theodore Brown	Examiner in charge.	Colored	$3,800
Morris Levine	Examiner	White	3,200
Armatha Jackson	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored	1,620

"You will notice that it consists of two Negroes and Morris Levine. Just how they came to select these particular individuals to preside over the destiny of the white businessmen of the great State of Missouri I cannot understand.

"REGIONAL OFFICE, DALLAS, TEX.

"The members of the regional office at Dallas are as follows:

"Regional office, Dallas

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Castenada, Carlos	Regional director.	White	$4,600
(Vacancy)	Fair-practice examiner.		3,200
Gutleben, Willetta	Clerk-stenographer.	White	1,800

"You will note there is one vacancy. Last year that position was held by a Negro, namely, Roy V. Williams. The other two members, Carlos Castenada, the regional director, and Willetta Gutleben seem to be in charge of the office at the present time. This is the regional office that attacked the Dallas News last year for carrying an advertisement for a Negro janitor. This fellow Castenada, the director, held the same position that he holds now. If this set-up is made permanent, then I presume the rest of the white American businessmen in Texas may expect to be harassed just as the Dallas News was.

"REGIONAL OFFICE, NEW ORLEANS

"The regional office at New Orleans consists of the following members:

"Regional office, New Orleans

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Ellinger, W. Don	Regional director.	White	$3,800
Morton, James H	Fair-practice examiner.	Colored	3,200
Ronning, Evelyn	Clerk-stenographer.	White	1,800

You will note that there are two whites and one Negro in this office. As the Negro is the fair-practice examiner, just what the decent people of Louisiana may expect at the hands of this outfit is something to contemplate.

"REGIONAL OFFICE, SAN FRANCISCO

"The San Francisco office consists of the following individuals:

"Regional office, San Francisco

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Kingman, Harry L	Regional director.	White	$5,600
Rutledge, Edward	Fair-practice examiner.	do	4,600
Ross, Bernard	do	do	3,800
Seymour, Virginia	Administrative assistant.	do	2,000
Mazen, Jewel	Clerk-stenographer.	do	1,800

"This is the only office we have found yet that consists entirely of white (?) people. Just what the background of each one of them is I am unable to say.

"LOS ANGELES REGIONAL OFFICE

"The Los Angeles regional office consists of the following:

"Los Angeles

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Hunt, A. Bruce	Hearings examiner.	White	$5,600
Brown, Robert E	Fair-practice examiner.	Colored	3,600
Lopez, Ignacio	do	White	3,800
Vetter, Vera G	Clerk-stenographer.	do	1,800
Lerna, Marie	do	do	1,620

"You will note that there are four whites and one Negro in this office, the Negro being the fair-practice examiner. I do not know what consideration the white businessmen of the Los Angeles area are receiving at the hands of this group, but from what I can hear there is considerable gnashing of teeth over the situation.

"Mr. Chairman, this FEPC is a supergovernment of commissars, with more power for evil than any other agency that has ever been created in this country. If Congress should ratify it and make it the law of the land, then we will have sacrificed and destroyed that sacred freedom for which our brave men are now fighting and dying on every battle front in the world.

"We have no right to pass such a drastic, revolutionary measure that literally changes our way of life, as well as our form of government, while these boys are away from home in uniform fighting to sustain American institutions.

"As I said before, we are going to carry this battle against such un-American activities into every congressional district in the United States next year, in the primary, so that no one can crawl behind the party cloak and claim immunity at the hands of any segment of our people.

"This is a battle for the survival of free constitutional government, for the survival of the American way of life, for the survival of free enterprise, for the survival of American liberty itself.

"It is a battle to save America for Americans."

Maritime Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in including in my remarks the following editorial from the Washington Post of May 13, 1950, I wish to remind the House that my distinguished predecessor as Representative in this body from the Second District of Illinois, the Honorable Raymond S. McKeough, so admiringly and affectionately remembered by Members of seniority and who on the Maritime Commission has rendered such outstanding service to the Nation, is not a member of Maritime Commission majority.

MARITIME REVOLT

Advocates of all-out governmental subsidies for the merchant marine have had tough going recently with both Congress and

the administration. Perhaps the crowning blow was the endorsement yesterday by Senator MAGNUSON of Reorganization Plan 21, which would abolish the Maritime Commission and reconstitute its functions in the Department of Commerce. Senator MAGNUSON, who is known as a friend of the merchant marine and is himself the author of a long-range shipping bill, gave as his reason the mounting criticism of and unsatisfactory relations with the Maritime Commission.

This criticism has been building to a crescendo. Last summer the Comptroller General blasted the Maritime Commission for irregularities in granting overly large ship construction subsidies. His objections were upheld and amplified by the House Executive Expenditures Committee after protracted investigation. The President himself showed concern over uncontrolled subsidies in his budget message. He translated this concern into action with Reorganization Plan 21. Now the Hardy subcommittee of the House Executive Expenditures Committee is readying another report covering the entire subsidy operation of the Maritime Commission, both operating and construction, for fiscal 1949 and 1950. Indications are that this report will be even stronger than the last.

That suspicion of shipping subsidies has permeated the House is shown by the approval of the Thomas amendment to the omnibus appropriations bill putting a ceiling on the operating subsidies that may be granted by the commission. Incidentally, the House also deserves credit for finally knocking out the amendment by Representative HALE BOGGS—which had been tentatively approved—granting an unasked increase in funds for maritime training and reactivating two closed training stations.

There is a reason for this rising hostility, and it is not that most Congressmen or administration officials are opposed to a strong merchant marine. It is simply that a large part of the shipping industry—which despite a recapture clause enjoys substantial subsidies and even more important tax advantages—seems too anxious to shift more responsibility to the Government and to get its hand further into the public till, and that the Maritime Commission majority seems only too eager to help. For example, there is no indication that the Commission has paid the slightest heed to criticism so far. In short, the confusion of the public interest with private interests is altogether reminiscent of the atmosphere which led to the famous Black report of 1935. Confidence will not be restored until there is a drastic shakeup and, more important, until Government aid to shipping is in the hands of men who are both disinterested and competent.

Besieged by Terror

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 18, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the Boston Sunday Post, Boston, Mass., May 14, 1950:

WE CANNOT BE COMPLACENT

There is no reason to be complacent. Communism beaten back, driven underground or scattered to the four winds which blow around the globe, never gives up.

The reason is that the Reds, casting religion adrift, must yield to the inner compulsion of the human heart to worship something. If it isn't God, then new gods must be made. Savages down the long centuries, with their absurd and preposterous idols, manufactured or observed in nature, prove it.

So they genuflect to a political system and having doubts about it, since nowhere in all history has it had a semblance of success, they become fanatical like the whirling dervishes or the holy rollers.

That accounts for the endless pressure which the devotees of Marxism exert. It accounts for their ruthlessness to their enemies and to their own colleagues. It accounts for their willingness to lie, cheat, deceive, and slay as they press on to impossible ends.

There are signs, despite all the conquests made out of the chaos of the postwar years, when bewildered, war-weary people were willing to lean even on reeds, that they are losing the battle. Yet no one should be complacent.

For all their triumphs, the Reds have suffered fiascoes. They have lost west Germany. The final straw was the announcement by Pravda that all German prisoners had been sent home. Germany, in angered grief, retorted that 1,500,000 Germans are still unaccounted for.

The only conclusion can be that, taking German exaggerations into account, at least hundreds of thousands of German prisoners were either slain in cold blood, allowed to starve to death, or are imprisoned forever in slave labor camps beyond the Urals.

In Italy was fiasco number two. The first shipment of American arms under the North Atlantic Pact stirred the Reds into action. They mobilized dock workers to stop the disembarking. They invoked strikes.

Italy responded by calling up the police in battalions, holding the army in reserve and then, with the help of loyal dock workers, unloading the weapons and transporting them to a safe, guarded place.

Reports out of Hungary of workers being recalcitrant and even threatening to strike, adds up. In China, Red tax collectors have been beaten off by half-nourished peasants and driven out of the mudwall towns to the security of the cities.

A year ago, Communist might in France being so strong, the government would not have dared to announce a willingness to make an industrial pact in steel and coal with Germany. The same is true of Belgium. An election to decide what to do with the exiled king would not have been attempted.

Allied anti-Russian propaganda is having its effect. Russia's expressed willingness to hold elections in Berlin and settle the Trieste question, even though her terms were preposterous, demonstrates a recognition of the fact that she cannot bull her way through these problems.

Yet we cannot afford to be complacent. Communism has nine lives. We must press on against the doctrine of heaven on earth in a slave camp, by armament, enlightenment, and also by letting the Kremlin dig their own graves all over the world.

Oil and New England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 18, 1950

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including an editorial entitled "Oil and New England" which appeared in the May 16 issue of the Boston Herald. The problem of the impact of imported oil upon our economy is not a simple one. I recognize that there are those who are sincerely concerned about the effect of imports in an unwise amount upon a healthy domestic production. Yet, as the editorial indicates, there are other considerations which must be given full weight in terms of an over-all healthy economy.

OIL AND NEW ENGLAND

The way high-tariff chickens come home to roost is well illustrated by the current controversy over oil imports. Because of a world surplus in oil production, prices have been dropping sharply and some domestic producers have been having trouble meeting the competition of foreign imports. Inevitably there has been a demand from the small and marginal producers for protection in the form of quotas or tariff increases against imported oil.

But the demand has stirred up strong opposition from a number of sources. The bulk of our present imports is from the overseas production of American companies, and, since these companies are already meeting serious discrimination in foreign markets, they are naturally dead set against import bans at home. Domestic consumers have also registered opposition to losing the price advantage they now enjoy on imported fuels for the sake of "protecting" home producers. And conservation interests, notably the military, have questioned the wisdom of cutting off imports of oil in peacetime and thereby reducing our over-all reserves against future emergency need.

All of these practical and immediate arguments have backed up the State Department's long-term opposition to steps which restrict imports and thereby cut down the ability of foreign countries to buy goods in our markets.

It is gratifying that in this case New England has been quick to see what roost the chickens were headed for and has acted to meet the situation. At its last quarterly meeting the New England Council resolved to oppose "any measure designed to restrict or reduce oil imports into the United States" on the ground that it could only do harm to this "fuel deficit area."

Expressing satisfaction at the Council's alert action, a spokesman for the State Department's petroleum policy staff last week wrote that among the many disadvantages of the proposed import restrictions might be noted "the probable increase in fuel costs for industrial and public-utility plants, particularly in areas like New England, increased fuel costs for ships, and the probable diversion of some ships' bunker business to foreign ports."

If the time actually comes when the domestic petroleum industry is threatened with extinction as a result of foreign competition, New England will join with other areas in authorizing legitimate protective measures. There is no doubt that the country has a great stake in the industry both as a provider of jobs and as a defense instrument. But there is no very convincing evidence yet that it needs either quota or tariff protection to get through its present troubles.

We must go slowly in applying remedies which produce a dozen new problems for each one they solve.

I also wish to include here the text of the resolution adopted by the executive committee of the New England Council at its meeting in Providence, R. I., on March 23. It reads as follows:

Resolved, That approval by Congress of any measure designed to restrict or reduce oil imports into the United States will be contrary to the best interests of New England.

The London Conference—Double Feature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 18, 1950

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include a very timely and interesting editorial, entitled "The London Conference—Double Feature," which appeared in the May 16, 1950, issue of the Christian Science Monitor. The article follows:

THE LONDON CONFERENCE—DOUBLE FEATURE

The two big features at the Big Three meeting in London were the French proposal to unify the French and German coal and steel industries and the Big Three decision to speed up the return of Germany as an equal member of western society.

That was the order of their showing, but not necessarily of their significance. It is altogether probable that so clear a decision on Germany could not have been taken had it not been accompanied by a plan to give the French real hope of making Germany safe for world democracy. That is one of the main hopes in the coal-steel program as propounded by French Foreign Minister Robert Schuman.

But while the direction in which the west now invites Germany to travel is plain enough, timetables have not been thrown away. Not all reliance for a correct German development within the western community is placed on the Schuman plan. The very facts of life preclude this, and it is only realistic of West Germany's Chancelor Adenauer to accept them optimistically along with their implications.

The chief of these facts is the present division of Germany. That means an indefinite postponement of a German peace treaty and therefore a continuation of an occupied status for Germany, with consequent supervision of the main streams of political development, though with increasing self-rule for the western Germans.

The concessions which the Big Three felt able to make to the West German Republic in this situation should help Dr. Adenauer against his political opponents in western Germany as well as help the west's position generally against Communist propaganda.

Another very big fact is the need of western Germany for defense against possible military aggression. The military implications in the continuance of a modified occupied status are that western Germany will be defended by the west against attack from the east. On this point, as on self-rule, Dr. Adenauer can claim a victory.

The Schuman plan filled a diplomatic gap at London for Dr. Adenauer as well as for M. Schuman, for Dr. Adenauer had several times urged some such integration of industry. He can now point to this program as the reason why the French-German dispute about the Saar should become a secondary issue for Germans.

The total of the achievement of London, as it is immediately visible, therefore, is to provide a strong base for gaining the offensive in the "cold" battle for Germany. The double isolation of western Germany—from eastern Germany on the one hand and from the western community on the other—may now be relieved, and the good wishes of the western nations for the democratic elements in western Germany made plain.

This will still take some doing, to be sure, as will the decisive strengthening of democracy within Germany. The London meeting has at the very least created an international atmosphere more favorable to these hopes than any that has existed since the war.

Criticism of Public Officials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD H. VELDE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 18, 1950

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Peoria Star of May 15, 1950:

ON CRITICIZING PUBLIC OFFICIALS

A plea by State Department Counselor George F. Kennan, in an address before the Institute on United States Foreign Policy, deserves some attention.

"The Government may lose many of its best qualified people," said Mr. Kennan, "if abuse and derision heaped upon officials grows much worse."

It is not difficult to understand why loyal and honest employees of the State Department find their situation disagreeable these days. None of them can entirely avoid some of the public suspicion which has fallen upon the Department and the work they do cannot be done best under present conditions.

"The strains under which our leading officials work," said Mr. Kennan, "leave them a very slender margin of physical and spiritual energy to absorb abuse and derision from the people for whom they conceive themselves to be working. I must tell you that the atmosphere of public life in Washington does not have to deteriorate much further to produce a situation in which very few of our more quiet and sensitive and gifted people will be able to continue in Government."

These officials, the loyal ones, deserve the sympathy of the people. But two questions are raised by Mr. Kennan's address. First, who is to blame for the deterioration of the atmosphere of public life in Washington? And second, how can undesirable employees be removed from their jobs without creating the disturbances which embarrass good officials?

It has been proven beyond the slightest doubt that espionage was carried on within the State Department with the cooperation of disloyal employees. These incidents opened the doors for speculation as to whether disloyal persons still held jobs in the Department. If it had not been for the Alger Hiss and the Amerasia incidents, for example, the charges of Senator MCCARTHY would not have received so much attention.

The blame for the condition which fostered the atmosphere of suspicion must be placed upon those whose negligence permitted disloyal persons to hold jobs in the department. If it is argued that top officials cannot be blamed for a situation of which they were unaware, the reply is that top officials were notified and warned several times about Alger Hiss. Three times President Roosevelt was appealed to in that case. He ignored each appeal, even laughing at one of them. And Dean Acheson quickly restored John S. Service to his State Department job after Service had been arrested in the Amerasia case. The status of Service is yet to be determined, when the secrets of this incident are exposed, but it cannot be said that Mr. Acheson was unaware that Service's loyalty might be questioned in the future.

The theft of hundreds of secret State Department documents can be charged only to top level negligence. Such negligence led to public scandals which, in turn, led to further charges. Members of Congress could be charged with compounding that negligence if they allowed their suspicion of other disloyalties to remain unspoken.

As to the second point, how are disloyal employees, if such hold jobs, to be removed without public charges, Senator MCCARTHY has given an illuminating answer. He preferred, he has said, to proceed quietly but learned that nothing could be accomplished that way. The people now know what extreme methods became necessary and how long it took to convict Alger Hiss. The people have also seen a demonstration of official resistance to the current State Department probe. Even in the Senate Committee assigned to the investigation there was powerful resistance. Washington officialdom, therefore, must be blamed for the necessity for public accusations which make the lives of loyal Government officials miserable these days.

Mr. Kennan is pointing the finger of blame at the wrong persons. The men who have sat in the White House and who have occupied the office of Secretary of State are responsible for the deterioration of the atmosphere of public life in Washington.

Americans Against Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 10, 1950

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article, written by Victor Lasky, feature writer for the New York World-Telegram. It appeared in the May issue of the American Legion magazine:

AMERICANS AGAINST COMMUNISM
(By Victor Lasky)

At long last the American people have awakened to the menace of communism and they're doing something about it. Sixty-six great American organizations, representing about a hundred million people in every field of endeavor, have come together against a common enemy—world communism.

On assignment from my newspaper, I covered the birth of this great citizens' movement last January. However, the story did not end with the close of this American Legion-sponsored All-American Conference, for since its inception the movement is having an amazing growth. And so powerful is its potential for the good of this Nation that the Communists and their dupes, both knowing and unknowing, are moving heaven and earth in an all-out attempt to smash what grew out of the 3-day conference.

I watched the Communist and non-Communist press coverage of the event. At first I was amused, then disgusted. For in their frantic efforts to smash the new all-American movement the Communists are resorting to their typical lies, deceptions and distortions of what took place, in an effort to put class against class, faith against faith, and organization against organization. Typical headlines in such papers read: "Labor sits down with labor-baiters," "B'nai B'rith sits down with Jew-haters," and "Veterans united with those who would curtail their privileges." Understandably hysterical, too, was the Soviet radio commentator Zaslavsky, who on February 4 screamed from Moscow: "The assembly in New York considered itself to be a step toward the formation of a Fascist Party in America. The speeches were Fascist, they shouted like the Nazis. The entire set-up was borrowed from Hitler and was a mixture of pogrom-mongering and self-induced hysteria."

What actually took place? Leaders of the great labor, business, industrial, fraternal and religious groups got together to discuss a common problem—how to combat communism. It was agreed by the participants that many of the organizations normally have conflicting interests, but all the groups were willing to unite in the fight against those who would destroy the liberties of all Americans.

The speakers represented labor and capital as well as government and religion. All were in agreement that communism was seeking to undermine everything this Nation has stood for in the world since our Constitution was drafted.

The delegate then passed a historic resolution calling upon all loyal Americans to join the battle against "the steady infiltration of communism into our schools and colleges, into our press, radio and screen, into our labor and business and into our Government itself (constituting) an immediate, serious and growing menace to the very existence of the America that we know and love."

A continuations committee composed of a cross section of the participating groups was empowered "to act as a clearinghouse and information center through which the various organizations may be informed and advised of the activities and experiences of other organizations, all upon the understanding that such committee shall recognize the full independence of the various organizations and shall not attempt to control or supervise them."

High above Times Square, where the All-American Conference took place, I had a chance to talk to some of the men and women who passed this resolution. No matter from where they hailed, they were concerned over the extent of subversion in their respective communities. And they've been doing a lot of hard thinking. They know that mere hatred of communism is not enough. Too often, they realize, unchanneled anti-Communist feeling and action play right into the hands of would-be martyrs of the Paul Robeson stripe. Somehow such emotional reactions must be transmuted into an effective plan of action—action that will meet community needs in a positive, rather than negative manner.

Basically, the people I talked to agreed that a plan was needed to make Americans in Maine, New York, California and Alabama enthusiastic about the American way of life. That resounding phrase may be an abstraction, but it was once used with deep meaning by generations of Americans who taught their children to revere its tenets and, on unhappy occasions, to shed their blood in its defense.

The phrase can't be defined easily; but, in essence, it means democratic living in a free society under the protection of the laws of the land. No swashbuckling dictators to tell you what to do. Yet, in recent years, too many Americans have become confused, uncertain and hesitant in defending their heritage against the wiles of the Communists and fellow travelers.

How these insidious intellectual con-men set up innocent sounding organizations as traps for every section of the population was fully described by the distinguished speakers at the All-American Conference. They told how the Reds, seeking a shield of respectability by associating themselves with decent causes, bore from within established political, labor and social organizations. FBI Chief J. Edgar Hoover recently estimated there were more than a half-million Communists and fellow travelers in the country.

You'll find their spokesmen on the air, the public platform and in the press. You'll even find them running nursery schools, represented on school boards and in parent-teacher associations and officiating at lodge meetings. It takes only one dedicated Stalinist to spread poison and cause dissension in any neighborhood or group. He's the eager merchant peddling easy answers to all problems, and he's always looking for dupes who unwittingly will advance the Kremlin cause.

Tireless, resourceful, crafty and dedicated to the godless ideals of Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism, the Communists are a tough crowd to buck. However, with a united front to oppose them at the grass-roots level they can be defeated.

Those present at the All-American Conference had no qualms about the future. There wasn't any question in their minds about making a clean sweep of the commies; the primary problem was that of the approach to be used.

I spoke to one man representing a large fraternal organization who said he felt that voting was one of the first problems which would have to be tackled by the conference. Pointing out how lightly Americans take this vital right and privilege, he reminded me that during the 1948 Presidential election almost half of those eligible to vote had failed to cast their ballots. At the same time, he said, the commies worked day and night to pile up the vote for their favorite, Henry A. Wallace, and spent an estimated $3,500,000 in their attempt to put Wallace in the White House.

As the delegates were told by Dr. Francis L. Bacon, professor of the college of education of the University of California at Los Angeles, most Americans have got to learn—or be taught anew—the basic facts about our democracy. They must realize how the individual citizen can literally move governments. The machinery of our Government is poised purposefully so that the tiny but insistent pressure of a single citizen can be felt not only in city hall but in the White House. You can be assured that a letter to the mayor, and even to the President of the United States, will receive attention. How well the subversives know these elemental facts.

Another important job will have to be done in our school system. This is a ticklish job since Communist teachers, who make no bones about hating America and loving Russia, have managed to penetrate our schools. The intellectual balderdash of Marxism, unfortunately, appeals to or confuses many educators.

That Communists have no place in the school system has been stated by the educational policies commission of the National Education Association. But whenever action against them is taken there are high-pitched screams that academic freedom and free speech are being impaired. In many cases these come from Americans who should know better. This argument recently was answered by Dr. Earl J. McGrath, United States Commissioner of Education. In a major statement of policy, Dr. McGrath asserted:

"Children are not sent to school to be indoctrinated with a closed system of philosophy or the political views of the teacher. The Communist embraces and teaches dogma. He is, by his party membership and sympathy, committed to a closed system of thought.

"He is not free to serve the truth as evidence may uncover the truth. He has, therefore, surrendered his right to teach in a nation of free people. Communist influence, if it began to find expression in our schools and colleges, would be inimical to the development of the minds and characters of American youth, on whom the future depends."

But the anti-Communist movement must steer clear of those who, in the name of Americanism, would put shackles on our schools, Dr. McGrath warned.

"Our efforts to avoid one danger," Dr. McGrath said, "must not betray us into adopting measures of censorship and control, which are the essence of the police state. Some persons have the unfortunate tendency to label as communistic every idea which they happen to dislike. This form of intimidation through vilification is just as objectionable and just as stultifying as the closed-mindedness of the Communist."

The Communists have long viewed the schools as their best recruiting grounds. For decades they have sent "organizers" into the high schools and colleges to spread the Marxist gospel.

But the delegates I spoke to recognized that driving the Commies out of the schools is not enough. Too many Americans, they pointed out, are unable to defend their heritage with facts and intelligent interest. One possible reason has been suggested by Benjamin Fine, education editor of the New York Times. His investigations indicate that the study of American history in American schools has fallen off considerably.

His ideas were amplified by an educator I met at the conference who told me emphatically that parent-teacher groups should wake up. Schools, he said, should and will teach what parents think is vital in education. Your board of education needs you to tell it what to do. If parents are active, well-informed and interested in democracy, the board will respond to their needs. Otherwise it will be sheer luck if you get good schools.

There should be more scholarships, this man continued, for students to study the glories of America's past. Books outlining the virtues of the American way should be subsidized. They should be as readable as books decrying the American way, many of which manage to reach best-seller proportions. Essay contests on such subjects as Our Community's Place in the Story of the Nation's Freedom should be encouraged. The winning essays, he concluded, should be published in the local newspapers.

As a newspaperman, I'd like to amplify that last point. Your newspaper editor will be glad to cooperate. He's not the cigar-chewing tyrant the movies make him out to be. He's got a stake in the American way, too. The American press is the freest in the world and your editor wants to keep it that way. He'll play ball.

And don't overlook the importance of radio in your community. A powerful blow against communism can be struck by broadcasts of recordings prepared by the Office of Education in Washington. Such scripts as American Heritage, Democracy in Action, The Bill of Rights, Americans All—Immigrants All, are available for the asking. Forums in which pro-American spokesmen can thresh out local problems are certain to prove popular.

Pressure should also be exerted at the community level for the production of motion pictures which dramatize American history. Such films can do much in inspiring American youth, and yet too few have been made. This is curious, too, since good historical motion pictures such as Cimarron, Gone With the Wind, Drums Along the Mohawk, and Northwest Passage have made millions for their producers. More such films are needed instead of the stuff that Hollywood grinds out, and also needed are more short features dealing with our country, its history, its people, and its traditions.

Too many films deal with America's imperfections. The Grapes of Wrath type of Hollywood product does accurately reflect a phase of American development, but it was, after all, a minor one. Small wonder that the Russians love to show films like the Grapes of Wrath to their people as an indication of what American life is like.

Not that America is perfect. But modern man has reluctantly come to the realization

that absolute perfection of any kind is impossible. Americans, however—unlike the Russians—freely admit their imperfections and have never made any secret of them. It is obvious that the time has now come when the emphasis has to be placed not on what is wrong with this country but what is right with it.

And that is the job ahead for the Americans who are lining up in the fight against communism. There can be nothing passive about it. As more than one of the speakers said: "This fight cannot be won by adopting resolutions and letting it go at that." From what I observed, and from the temper of those present, it is not going to end with resolutions adopted in committee rooms. This battle is going to be fought, and won, in thousands upon thousands of American communities. And the commies are going to be licked at the grass-roots level by such men as Big Jim Levinson, whose story was told to me by one of the delegates to the All-American Conference.

Big Jim Levinson is the head of the Levinson Steel Co. in Pittsburgh. This is a small company compared with the giants of the industry, but few of its 170 mill hands would care to work anywhere else. Big Jim came to America as an immigrant boy. He soon developed a passionate love for his adopted land. Equality of opportunity more than anything else impressed him. Where else could an immigrant boy, through hard work, rise as quickly in the community as he had?

So it was not surprising that Big Jim never asked a man his race or nationality when he hired him. All he was interested in was, would he make a good worker? And not only was Big Jim the easiest boss in the world to talk to, but he was always looking out for their interests—whether they were in the shop or community. Big Jim always tried to transmit his own zeal for Americanism to his employees through posters, bulletin board announcements, and a house publication. He was always stressing the responsibility of every American to vote, to perform jury duty, and to take an active part in community affairs.

When his son, S. M. Levinson, took over as president of the company, the same labor-management relations continued. So that when the trade magazine, Printer's Ink, and the American Heritage Foundation jointly sponsored a contest in industry the Levinson employees were among the first to participate. They had had good training from Big Jim Levinson.

And they put that training into use. They launched community clean-up campaigns, organized children's ball teams, aided the Community Chest, the March of Dimes, and other civic ventures. They distributed the posters in behalf of religious tolerance, encouraging voting in primaries and promoting a score of other worth-while causes such as blood banks, CARE packages, and chest X-rays for detecting tuberculosis.

Yes, the Levinson employees took first prize in the American Heritage contest and Big Jim's son, in announcing the great honor which had come to them, told his employees:

"If your interest in your American heritage ends with this program, our efforts will have been in vain. This country and its stand for 'life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness' didn't just happen. It took sweat, blood, and intestinal fortitude. They gave us a heritage which you and your children must protect and foster."

In Big Jim Levinson's words, that is what the All-American Conference is all about. It's a job that the delegates can start, but which all loyal Americans—the Americans against communism—will have to work at from this time forth, every day in every year.

What Is the Future of the Steam Locomotive With the Advent of Diesel Power?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 18, 1950

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, with the advent of the Diesel engine much discussion is taking place regarding the future of the steam locomotive in its relationship to the coal industry.

Recently I accepted an invitation from a group of B. & O. Railroad employees to address B. & O. Night on May 17 at Du Bois, Pa.

I took the occasion as an opportunity to discuss the future of the steam locomotive and the competition it is receiving from Diesel power.

My address follows:

ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, TWENTY-SECOND CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT BALTIMORE & OHIO NIGHT, HELD AT ELKS BALLROOM, DU BOIS, PA., MAY 17, 1950

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, coming here tonight as your Representative in Congress, I am also appearing before you as a fellow railroader and one who is deeply concerned over the future of the railroad industry in America.

My railroad experience began in July 1916, when I entered the employ of the Pennsylvania Railroad as an apprentice boy in the Altoona shops. After having served in various departments of the Pennsylvania Railroad I held the position of district passenger agent when elected to Congress in 1938.

In accepting the invitation to address you, I did so because I always feel at home with a railroader and his family. This is true because we speak the same language, even though you represent the B. & O. and my railroad employment has been with the Pennsylvania system.

I would like to talk to you this evening about the future of the railroads in America as it applies to the use of coal as a source of power, and the substitution of the Diesel engine for steam locomotives.

I have selected this subject because of the great importance of coal and steam locomotives to not only Du Bois, but to other railroad communities in this congressional district.

I am sure you will agree that when the miners dig coal and railroaders have jobs, it means a healthy economy for our area in Pennsylvania.

While other sources of power continue to make inroads upon the use of coal it is important to remember that coal still is our largest single source of fuel and power.

In 1948 production of bituminous coal in this country was 600,000,000 tons, and we produced more than 57,000,000 tons of anthracite coal. In 1949, of course, production of both bituminous and anthracite was much lower.

Of the total production of bituminous coal in 1948, railroads purchased almost exactly one-sixth. Their total purchases somewhat exceeded 102,000,000 tons, a figure you should keep in mind, to have a correct idea as to the fuel and power situation on the railroads.

The Diesel locomotive has advantages which railroads cannot afford to overlook. Then, too, there have been notable increases in recent years in the use of Diesel power on the railroads.

The fact remains, however, at the beginning of 1950 the railroads still owned 28,800 steam locomotives, compared with approximately 7,500 Diesel locomotives.

With growing pressure of competition, the railroads are obliged to take advantage of every opportunity for increased economy and efficiency, and in some situations the Diesel is of advantage to them.

However, not all of the advantages in the field of locomotive power are with the Diesel. One important fact is that a Diesel locomotive costs considerably more than a steam locomotive of equivalent power.

In order to overcome this higher cost, the Diesel must be intensively operated, so that the higher initial cost can be spread over a greater road mileage or greater number of switching hours than the steam locomotive, thereby equalizing the unit cost.

However, we all know that the situations where locomotives can be thus intensively utilized are not unlimited on the railroads; there are a good many runs and yards where it just is not possible to have around-the-clock operation of a locomotive.

For this reason, the idea that steam locomotives are due to disappear from the railroads in the next few years may be too pessimistic.

Moreover, it is the natural thing that steam would be first replaced by Diesel power on those runs where the opportunity for intensive utilization is most advantageous to the Diesel.

Thus, such replacements tend to take place in a descending order of relative comparison, so that as time goes on the situation tends toward stabilization.

That is, the Diesels have found their place in those fields where the utilization factor favors them, and the steam locomotive retains its place where situations in turn favor it.

Nor should it be supposed that the death knell has been sounded for coal as a source of fuel on the railroads and nothing is being done to delay or halt the funeral. In point of fact, quite the contrary is the case. Perhaps under the spur of competition from the Diesel, a great deal of work is being done to improve the efficiency and performance of the coal-burning steam locomotive and to develop new types of locomotives using coal as fuel.

It has already been found, for example, that a coal-burning steam locomotive of modern, efficient design, with good upkeep and servicing, can closely rival the Diesel for percentage of available miles run per month.

Let it not be forgotten that the railroads still have a good-sized investment in steam locomotives, and they are not going to sacrifice any part of this investment unnecessarily.

The railroads also are actively at work on the development of new types of steam locomotives which will develop greater efficiency in extracting power from coal and delivering it at the drawbar.

One of the great advantages of the Diesel is that it is about four times as efficient as the conventional reciprocating-piston type of steam locomotive in delivering power relative to fuel consumed.

New designs of locomotives are being tried in an effort to narrow or overcome this handicap. Such new designs include steam-turbine and gas-turbine locomotives, to burn coal.

The steam-turbine locomotive differs from the reciprocating-piston type in that the steam under pressure is directed against blades of a turbine wheel, instead of against pistons operating in cylinders.

Steam-turbine locomotives thus far have been of two types, direct-geared and turbo electric.

In the first of these types, the turbine is mechanically geared direct to the driving

wheels. In the turbo-electric type, the turbine drives electric generators, which in turn drive motors which are geared to the wheels.

The first American direct-geared steam-turbine locomotive was placed in service in 1944. It developed 6,900 horsepower, and new designs of this type are expected to deliver up to 9,000 horsepower.

The first steam turbo-electric locomotive was placed in service in 1948. It is designed for high-speed passenger service and depends on a 6,000-horsepower turbine which delivers a total of 4,960 horsepower to the eight driving axles.

Much research and experimentation also have been devoted to the development of a coal-burning gas-turbine type of locomotive.

In this type, combustion gases power the turbine directly instead of being used to convert water into steam. Thus, coal is used to power an internal-combustion engine somewhat similarly to the manner in which gasoline powers an automobile engine.

A group of nine railroads is cooperating with five coal companies in the development of the gas-turbine locomotive.

The railroads concerned are the Baltimore & Ohio, Chesapeake & Ohio, Illinois Central, Louisville & Nashville, New York Central, Norfolk & Western, Pennsylvania, Virginian, and the New York, Chicago, & St. Louis.

The coal companies are the M. A. Hanna Co., Island Creek Coal Co., Pocahontas Fuel Co., Pittsburgh Consolidation Coal Co., and the Sinclair Coal Co.

President Roy B. White, of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, has been chairman of the locomotive development committee since its formation in 1944.

The incentive for the development of these new types of locomotives is that bituminous coal continues to be the cheapest locomotive fuel.

Since 1945, the cost of coal per million B. t. u. (British thermal unit) has risen from 12 cents to approximately 18 cents, while the cost of Diesel fuel has climbed from 50 cents to 69 cents per million B. t. u.

However, the cost of fuel required to pull a train depends as much upon the efficiency of the locomotive in extracting power from the fuel and delivering it at the drawbar, as upon the price of the fuel.

As we have just seen, the steam locomotive is much less efficient than the Diesel in this respect. However, the gas turbine, because of its ability to use low-cost fuels with good efficiency, bids fair to be a strong competitor of the Diesel-electric locomotive for road service.

Except when idling, the coal-burning gas-turbine locomotive is expected to cost much less to operate than any of its competitors.

In road service where the average load is 60 to 75 percent of full power, the coal-burning turbine should save $12 to $15 per hour under the Diesel's fuel cost, or any annual saving based on present fuel prices of $50,000 per locomotive can be expected.

This saving is the key to the interest displayed in the development of the coal-burning gas turbine.

In the development of this locomotive, many technical problems of great difficulty have been encountered.

One has been the pulverization of the coal to the extreme fineness required and its delivery to the combustion chamber.

Another has been the question of fly ash left after combustion—its disposition and its possible corrosive effect upon turbine blades.

The third has to do with the extremely high temperatures of operation. However, tests have shown that pulverized coal can be fed continuously to a combustion chamber and burned efficiently under a pressure of 60 pounds per square inch.

One of the advantages of the gas-turbine locomotive is that its power plant is extremely light and compact in comparison with the locomotive-type Diesel engine.

The 2,000 horsepower power plant now on test is only 26¼ feet long, 3½ feet wide, and 6 feet high.

Two such units might be placed side by side in a locomotive, with a center aisle, permitting 4,000 horsepower of prime-mover capacity in approximately 26 feet of locomotive car length.

This power plant weighs less than half as much per horsepower as the locomotive-type Diesel engine.

Another interesting fact is that the gas-turbine locomotive develops considerably more power in cold weather than in hot weather, because cold air is of greater density.

A gas turbine that develops 2,000 horsepower when the air is 80° (F.) develops 2,500 horsepower when the temperature falls to 10° above zero.

This characteristic makes the gas-turbine type of locomotive especially suitable for operation in cold climates.

These activities in the development of new types of coal-burning locomotives show that the railroads are doing their part to help coal retain its place as a source of fuel and power.

In this matter they have a stake of no small value.

In 1948 the class I railroads of the country hauled a total of about 8,700,000 carloads of coal (anthracite and bituminous), amounting to more than 500,000,000 tons.

From this coal traffic the railroads derived a revenue of more than $1,300,000,000, and because of the value of this traffic, they are putting their full weight behind measures to protect it.

In these activities of the railroads they deserve and ought to have—as I am sure they do have—the hearty cooperation of the coal producers.

These measures to protect the railroad industry include opposition to the construction of the proposed St. Lawrence seaway, which has been more aptly described as the St. Lawrence "iceway."

This project is estimated to cost this country, in addition to what has already been spent, anywhere from $573,000,000 to $1,049,000,000, depending on the depths of the channel.

These are estimates by the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army, and in the past their estimates have always proved to be subject to considerable increase when the bills came to be paid.

Among the important items of traffic which would be handled by the St. Lawrence seaway is foreign coal.

One student of the subject has estimated that if this project should be completed an immediate annual loss of from ten to seventeen million tons of coal exported to Canada can be expected.

Moreover, this loss would be exclusive of the actual coal imports into this country through the waterway, and also exclusive of the replacement of steam power by water power over a considerable area.

These losses would not only injure the coal industry but would bring with it the displacement of workers in the coal industry and on the railroads which carry the coal, and, as I mentioned, who purchased more than 100,000,000 tons of coal in 1948.

The interest of all coal producers in cooperating to help prevent this lavish waste of tax money to take away the livelihood of many of the taxpayers ought to be fully apparent.

Another step in which producers of coal ought to be glad to cooperate is in helping to improve the situation with respect to the abuse of the highways by huge freight trucks, in competition with the railroads.

This is another case in which the coal producers have a two-fold interest—as taxpayers and as beneficiaries from the use of coal by railroads.

Let it be understood at once, that there is no objection on the part of any fair-minded person to the use of the highways, and the terms on which they are used by farm trucks, city pick-up and transfer trucks, and the usual run of light trucks.

The only objections against the huge road-busters, which are estimated to comprise only about 5 percent of all the trucks on the highways, is that they are responsible, according to many authorities, including Governor Duff, of Pennsylvania, for major deterioration and damage of the highways.

It is only pointing out the truth—to suggest—that the taxpayers of the country—and that means just about all of us—have an important pocketbook interest in putting an end to this sort of damage.

Moreover, studies in several States have shown that in relation to the use they make of the highways, and the strains they impose on it, these roadbuster freighters pay less in taxes for highway purposes than the owner of a passenger automobile pays.

Moreover, truckers are constantly trying to have maximum load limits increased—so that they can impose even heavier loads on the highways—and do even greater damage to them.

Here in Pennsylvania, they are especially active in that direction, although Pennsylvania's maximum limit of 45,000 tons for tractor-semi-trailer combinations would appear to be liberal.

And even with this liberal weight allowance, there is constant chiseling by truckers to evade the law by overloads above the legal limit.

You can all recall the controversies with truckers on the Pennsylvania Turnpike in regard to these overloads.

In fact, at times their activities have practically amounted to defiance of the law, if not open revolt.

Aside from their damage to the highways, these big freighters also are the focus of the problem of diversion of freight traffic from railroads to highways. Statistics show that while these big highway freighters amount to only 5.2 percent of all trucks registered, they operated 29 percent of all truck-miles on main rural highways and carried 72 percent of all highway freight ton-miles in 1948.

As I have already said, railroads in 1948 used 102,000,000 tons of coal, or one-sixth of the total production. The trucking industry uses no coal. In the light of these figures, the interest of coal producers in helping to keep coal on the rails would appear to be obvious.

In my opinion, it behooves the American people, and especially those of us who belong to the great railroad family of America, to lend our assistance, to the railroad industry in its fight for what appears to be its very existence.

Those of you who are here tonight as employees of the B. & O. Railroad are to be highly commended for your keen interest in railroad problems.

I know you will continue this fine spirit of cooperation, which is so essential if the efforts to stabilize the railroad industry and safeguard the jobs of its employees are to prove successful.

How Far Should Government Control Go in Advertising?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include

the following address of Mr. Daniel J. Murphy, Chief of Trial Division, Federal Trade Commission, before the Golden Jubilee Advertising Convention, School of Commerce, Accounts, and Finance, New York University, May 12, 1950, at the Park Sheraton Hotel, New York, N. Y.:

HOW FAR SHOULD GOVERNMENT CONTROL GO IN ADVERTISING?

May I, at the outset, refer to a definition of terms, "Government control." What do we mean by that expression? It appears to have rather sinister implications—to some it may suggest state socialism—in some new, real, or imaginary, form—to others, it may imply some new kind of governmental interference with the lives and affairs of its people. The word "control" may mean to govern, direct, rule, subdue. Surely the Government has not in the past and has no desire in the future to so "control" advertising. It only seeks to prevent or to lessen that advertising which is false and misleading. And in making this attempt the individual whose advertising practices and representations are questioned is afforded every guaranty of his constitutional rights and protection.

Thus may I suggest that here we are discussing governmental "regulation" of advertising rather than controls, and that the question should really be, "Should the Government go any further in the regulation of advertising?" Before answering this question, we should first examine a little historical background. The Federal Trade Commission is the only governmental agency equipped by statute, procedure, organization, and purpose, to protect the consumer and competitor from false and misleading advertising. Thus the Government acts through the Federal Trade Commission in attempting to regulate advertising in conformity with established law.

Prior to the establishment of the Federal Trade Commission, there was no such regulation of advertising. The prevailing practice was "Let the buyer beware." For example, in 1900, the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit[1] refused to grant injunctive relief to a manufacturer of aluminum-faced washboards in restraining a competitor from using the word "aluminum" on boards which contained no aluminum, saying that "if * * * all persons (are) compelled to deal solely in goods which are exactly what they are represented to be, the remedy must come from the legislature and not the courts."

Following this decision there was a growing demand for legislation against untruthful advertising. Expressions of this demand were voiced increasingly in newspapers and trade journals. A few such expressions are as follows:

In 1904, the Atlantic Monthly magazine reported "Swindling in newspaper advertising * * * has grown to be a public menace."[2]

In 1905, editorials appeared in the Ladies Home Journal (by Edward Bok) dealing with patent medicine advertising and the dangerous character of some medicines, and the methods used to convince people that they had ailments for which the medicine was recommended as a cure.[3]

In 1914, an article in Inland Printer magazine, entitled "Death Knell of Untruthful Advertising," said, in part, "A wave of reform is now sweeping the country—with the purpose of sweeping it of all dishonest advertising."[4]

In 1914, the Federal Trade Commission Act was passed. Congress, in enacting the Federal Trade Commission Act, wrote into its section 5 the prohibition against all unfair methods of competition in commerce, stating in its Senate and House reports that it was not practical or possible to define all such methods and that if it did, new ones would continually arise. It left to the Commission for its determination what practices were unfair.

The Commission was organized March 16, 1915, and on November 23 of that year the Association of Advertising Clubs of the World, at a hearing before the Commission, urged it to take steps toward suppressing untrue advertising as a form of unfair competition. The first two formal cases decided by the Commission involved false advertising.[5] The first Commission case to reach the Courts involved the false advertising of food.[6] The Court in that case said:

"The Commissioners * * * are to * * * stop all those trade practices that have a capacity or tendency to injure competitors directly, or through deception of purchasers, quite irrespective of whether the specific practices in question have been denounced in common law cases."

The Commission has proceeded over the years to establish literally hundreds of new landmarks in the field of unfair competition for industry guidance and consumer protection, through the courts, until its right to proceed for consumer protection alone without proof of substantial injury to competition was threatened by the Raladam decision.[7]

The Supreme Court held in that case that false advertising must be shown by proof to threaten to injure or to injure present or potential competition.

This was remedied by the enactment of the Wheeler-Lea amendment in 1938, which did away with the requirement of the proof of injury to competition by making unlawful unfair or deceptive acts or practices. Thus the consuming public who might be deceived by false advertising was made of equal concern, before the law, with the merchant or manufacturer injured by the unfair methods of dishonest competitors.

A comparison of the present standards of advertising and business ethics with those prevailing prior to the enactment of the Federal Trade Commission Act clearly demonstrates a remarkable progress. It seems almost incredible that the high concept of responsibility on the part of business to the consuming public and to competitors as now exists were possible of achievement.

As a distinguished professor of law in a neighboring university in New York (Milton Handler, Associate Professor of Law at Columbia University, New York), in appraising the work of the Commission in the field of false advertising, said (1929):

"The Trade Commission has performed yeoman service, and, while it has attempted to stem a seeming Niagara, with proper judicial support additional prodigies are not beyond possibility."[8]

And after passage of the Wheeler-Lee amendment:

"The condemnation of false advertising constitutes one of the signal achievements of the Commission * * *."

"Despite the magnitude of the task, the Commission has made considerable progress in the elimination of false and misleading advertising. The fact that much still remains to be done does not detract from the importance of its achievement."[9]

And:

"The most fruitful as well as the most voluminous work of the Commission has been in this field.[10]

The Courts have also been generous in their praise of this phase of the Commission's work and have noted that the Commission is peculiarly adapted to do it.

Chief Justice Stone expressed this idea in these words, speaking of the Commission:

"It was created with the avowed purpose of lodging the administrative functions committed to it in a body specially competent to deal with them by reason of information, experience, and careful study of the business and economic conditions of the industry affected.[11]

In the Commission's work directed toward the stopping of false advertising or preventing its use, it follows three well-defined courses of procedure. One might somewhat descriptively refer to them as the consent method, the compulsory method, and the cooperative method.

The consent method may be used when the offender desires to agree voluntarily to discontinue the representations complained of, and to enter into an agreement, called a stipulation, to cease and desist from using them any more. When this procedure is initiated, the Commission's attorneys who prepare these agreements have before them the information which has been gathered by investigations of one sort or another. Since there is always the possibility that some of this may be incorrect or has been rendered out of date by advances in scientific knowledge, the advertiser is given the opportunity to come and discuss the matter with one of the attorneys of the Bureau of Stipulations and present his side of the matter. The procedure is quite informal, and if the advertiser can satisfactorily justify the representations he has made, he will be out of the woods. If he cannot do so, he may, if he elects, agree to cease and desist from their further use. If he continues to assert that his advertisements are not false, and the Commission is of the opinion that they are, the issuance of a complaint follows the compulsory method.

This opportunity to dispose of a matter by stipulation is not a matter of right, but a privilege extended by the Commission. It is the policy of the Commission to extend it only in cases where it is of the opinion that under all the circumstances, such a disposition will effect a prompt correction and fully protect and satisfy the public interest. It is not extended when the Commission is of the opinion that the advertiser has undertaken to perpetrate a deliberate fraud or when danger from the use of the product is to be anticipated.

If the opportunity to stipulate is not given by the Commission, or if it is offered and refused, a complaint is issued.

The law provides that the Commission shall issue and serve complaints whenever it shall have reason to believe that false advertising has been disseminated and that a proceeding in respect thereof would be in the public interest. Of course, the Commission would have reason to believe both of these things before the opportunity to stipulate was extended.

The complaint states the charges against the advertiser, whom we call the respondent, and is served upon him. He may be represented by counsel and file an answer to the complaint. Thereafter, hearings are held at which the testimony of witnesses is taken under oath. The proceeding is before an officer called a trial examiner, and the respondent has all the rights of any party to

[1] *American Washboard Company* v. *Saginaw Manufacturing Company* (103 Fed. 281, 285 (C. C. A. 6)).

[2] August 1904 Atlantic Monthly magazine.

[3] March and April 1905 Ladies Home Journal.

[4] March 1914 issue of Inland Printer.

[5] *FTC* v. *Circle Cilk Co.* (1 FTC Dec. 13); *FTC* v. *A. Theo Abbot & Co.*, (1 FTC Dec. 16).

[6] *Sears, Roebuck & Co.*, v. *FTC* (258 Fed. 307, 311 (C. C. A. 7, 1919)).

[7] *FTC* v. *Raladam Co.* (283 U. S. 643 (1931)).

[8] 39 Yale Law Journal 44 (1929).

[9] 8 Geo. Wash. L. Rev. 399 (1940).

[10] 8 Geo. Wash. L. Rev. 405–6 (1940).

[11] *FTC* v. *Keppel & Bro., Inc.*, (291 U. S. 304).

litigation in court. The case ultimately comes before the Commission for its decision upon the record, briefs by both sides, and oral argument if requested. If the complaint has not been sustained, it will be dismissed. If it has been sustained, the Commission will make its findings as to the facts and issue its order to cease and desist, which is reviewable by the United States circuit courts of appeal or the United States Supreme Court if an appeal is taken from it.

A third procedure available for the elimination of false advertising and the consequent promotion of fair standards of business ethics is provided by the Commission in the trade practice conference plan. This is what I have referred to as the cooperative method. Such trade practice conference procedure has for its purpose the wholesale elimination of false advertising by industry-wide cooperation with the Commission and collaboration of all groups in interest in the formulation, establishment, and observance of fair-trade practice rules governing the conduct of the industry and trade in question. Under the plan, joint action among competitors with the supervision and aid of the Commission is possible, and experience has proved the efficacy of this method in more than 100 industries as an adjunct to the compulsory procedure which I have outlined. The Commission is now, with the sanction of the Congress, enlarging this method of procedure.

Conference proceedings are conducted on a basis of voluntary participation; though the Commission may initiate the conference, it cannot compel attendance or participation. Parties in interest are at all times free to advise and consult with the Commission's representatives in the matter. Where necessary or desirable, informal meetings or preliminary discussions may be arranged to formulate tentative drafts of rules or to develop, through an exchange of ideas, a clearer understanding of the problems involved and the assistance which can be rendered by the Commission in their solution. The conference considers and proposes rules for submission to the Commission for its approval. Before rules are finally approved or promulgated by the Commission, they are subjected to public hearings at which all interested or affected parties are afforded opportunity to present their views. They may submit such in writing or be heard orally as desired. Through such conferences and hearings, all groups in interest have the opportunity to be heard and to consult with us in the matter, even though they may not happen to be classed as members of the particular industry or trade involved.

In passing upon the rules proposed for approval, the Commission applies the test of law. In other words, the rules must not sanction practices which are contrary to law or which, when put into effect, may bring about a result which is illegal or opposed to the public interest. The purpose of this is, of course, obvious. It is not within our province to sanction violations of the law, but on the contrary we are directed to promote law observance, to the end that honest business may be liberated from the waste and fetters of unfair practices, and the rights of the public may be protected.

Advertising is big business. Approximately $2,000,000,000 are spent annually in advertising media—radios, television, newspapers, periodicals, etc. I think the average businessman wants to fairly and truthfully advertise his product. However, you will always find individuals in almost every industry who become a little slick in exaggerating and misleading in their advertising of their product. Sometimes this causes others in that industry who want to advertise truthfully to adopt a similar exaggerated and misleading course in order to keep competitive.

Under the regulations presently imposed by law, considerable progress has been made in seeing to it that advertising is truthful. The machinery set up in the Federal Trade Commission appears to be sufficient and adequate to enforce these regulations. In all probability, if the Federal Trade Commission had more money appropriated to it by Congress for this work, the regulations could be more extensively and expeditiously enforced. However, under all the circumstances, a good job is being done.

With the complete cooperation of business and its advertising advisers, specifically in the field of trade practice conference work, much more may be accomplished. Incidentally, let me here state that advertising agencies who sell advertising copy to business and persuade business to so advertise are just as responsible as business when that advertising is false and misleading, and advertising agencies would be so held to equal accountability.

Advertising is one of the, if not the, greatest living forces in business. Business, and that includes advertising agencies, and the Federal Trade Commission should cooperate to the fullest, not only in keeping advertising great but in making and keeping it truthful.

Labor-Management Responsibility—True Liberalism Which Exalts the Rights of Individuals Versus Phony Liberalism Which Subtracts the Rights From Individuals a Real Issue in American Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 18, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am including as part of my remarks an editorial by that outstanding writer, David Lawrence, which appears in the United States News and World Report for May 19, 1950. Mr. Lawrence points out that political power calls for great responsibility to the public. The article in question follows:

POWER IS NEVER WITHOUT RESPONSIBILITY

Coal strikes, steel strikes, auto strikes, railroad strikes. Year in and year out, this is the spectacle of our postwar life. The power to strike has been utilized by some of the big unions to enforce demands beyond all reason and equity.

From compulsory collective bargaining, we are now but a short distance away from its dreaded sequel—compulsory arbitration. Reliance on reason and volition is less and less as reliance is more and more on coercion and compulsion.

So far as the Constitution is concerned, the Supreme Court of the United States is keeping in tune with the mood of the times, which recognizes the power of Congress to foist almost any form of restriction it chooses upon individual citizens. The gulf grows wider and wider between true liberalism which exalts the rights of individuals and the phony liberalism of today which at every turn subtracts rights from the individual.

We are faced with an era of coercion. Trade unions have only themselves to blame for this backfire because they have insisted first on the sanctions of the Wagner Labor Relations Act and now, with the support of a sympathetic administration, they have begun to tear down all safeguards against union abuses which the Taft-Hartley Act sought to correct.

The Supreme Court only last week unwittingly portrayed the lengths to which that institution is ready to go to uphold the power of Congress. A law to forbid labor unions to strike at all is within the power of Congress now. A law to forbid companies to choose as their executives men with a disbelief in collective bargaining is within the power of Congress now. Congress need only find that disruptive strikes can be the result of cherishing disbeliefs in collective bargaining or in any other device designated by Government to promote industrial peace.

The Supreme Court majority has said that Congress may require labor-union officers to take an oath saying they are not members of an organization which seeks the overthrow of our Government. But Justice Black, in his dissent, twits the Court for disapproving what our forefathers believed in 1776.

We can hardly deny in the face of the record since 1937 that the Supreme Court is following precedent in sanctioning the right of Congress to regulate all phases of labor-union activity. As Justice Jackson said last week in agreeing to ban from appearance before the National Labor Relations Board any union officers who refuse to take the non-Communist oath:

"I cannot believe that Congress has less power to protect a labor union from Communist Party domination than it has from employer domination. This Court has uncompromisingly upheld power of Congress to disestablish labor unions where they are company-dominated and to eradicate employer influence, even when exerted only through spoken or written words which any person not the employer would be free to utter."

But granting that Congress has the right to legislate a restriction, is such restrictive legislation imperative? It is—if reason fails, if freedom within labor unions disappears, and if elimination of Communist officers cannot be accomplished any other way.

The crux of the matter is in the development of a sense of responsibility by labor-union members and officers as well as by employers. Irresponsibility always leads to restriction of freedom because the alternative is chaos and the destruction of all liberty. We may all ponder, therefore, this warning which came last week from Chief Justice Vinson in that same opinion of the Supreme Court upholding non-Communist oaths:

"Under the statutory scheme, unions which become collective bargaining representatives for groups of employees often represent not only members of the union but nonunion workers or members of other unions as well. Because of the necessity to have strong unions to bargain on equal terms with strong employers, individual employees are required by law to sacrifice rights which, in some cases, are valuable to them. The loss of individual rights for the greater benefit of the group results in a tremendous increase in the power of the representative of the group—the union. But power is never without responsibility. And when authority derives in part from Government's thumb on the scales, the exercise of that power by private persons becomes closely akin, in some respects, to its exercise by Government itself.

"We do not suggest that labor unions which utilize the facilities of the National Labor Relations Board become Government agencies or may be regulated as such. But it is plain that when Congress clothes the bargaining representative 'with powers comparable to those possessed by a legislative body both to create and restrict the rights of those whom it represents,' the public interest in the good faith exercise of that power is very great."

The warning is plain—power begets responsibility, and irresponsibility leads to a forfeiture of power.

Commemorative Stamp in Honor of the Late Heywood Broun

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 18, 1950

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a resolution adopted by the American Newspaper Guild at the 1949 convention and another by the Newspaper Guild of Boston at a membership meeting, April 27, 1950, urging a commemorative stamp in honor of the late Heywood Broun.

So many newspaper men and other citizens all over the Nation are interested in the subject matter of these resolutions that I am bringing them to the attention of the House and referring copies thereof to appropriate officials of the Post Office Department, with the request that every possible action be taken looking toward the realization of the objectives set forth in these well-considered resolutions.

I am constrained to do this in response to urgent requests notwithstanding the present policy of the committee not to consider legislation providing for such stamps except in extraordinary instances with the thought that the Department may be disposed to initiate action.

The following resolution, presented to the American Newspaper Guild 1949 convention, was passed unanimously:

Whereas this year contains the tenth anniversary of the death of our beloved first president, Heywood Broun; and

Whereas December 18, 1949, will be the anniversary date; and

Whereas the United States Post Office Department is issuing a profusion of stamps commemorating various people representing a variety of phases of American life: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the American Newspaper Guild convention, in session at Columbus, Ohio, does call upon the proper officials for a bill in Congress to issue a commemorative stamp in honor of freedom of the press, with a likeness of Heywood Broun on said stamp; and be it further

Resolved, That the top officers of the guild contact proper officials and assist them in determining the design of said commemorative stamp; and be it also

Resolved, That the locals of the ANG contact their Congressmen when such a bill is introduced and request that they vote approval; and be it finally

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the proper officials, favorable Congressmen, known to the top officers, guild locals and to several of the larger philatelic magazines.

The Newspaper Guild of Boston, at a membership meeting April 27, 1950, on motion of Past ANG Vice President George A. Harris, passed by unanimous vote the following resolution:

Whereas the American Newspaper Guild has gone on record, by a unanimous vote of its 1949 convention, for the issuance of a Heywood Broun commemorative United States postage stamp; and

Whereas said resolution instructed its locals to contact their Congressmen with a view to obtaining assistance in the Government issuing such a stamp; and

Whereas the working newspapermen of the fourth estate have done much for freedom of the press and democracy in these United States; and

Whereas Heywood Broun is an outstanding example of the principles of newspaperdom, in that he represents the newspapermen in his works, deeds, and ideals: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Newspaper Guild of Boston heartily affirms the resolution passed by the American Newspaper Guild convention, and respectfully requests that all Congressmen in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts receive a copy of this resolution, and lend their efforts, as our representatives, to placing a bill before Congress that will instruct the post-office officials to plan for and issue a commemorative stamp in honor of the late Heywood Broun. We also suggest that it be issued on December 18, 1950, the anniversary date of his death.

Water-Resources Projects and the Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEWEY SHORT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 18, 1950

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Elmer B. Staats, Executive Assistant Director of the Bureau of the Budget, before the fortieth annual convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, Washington, D. C., March 24, 1950:

WATER RESOURCE PROJECTS AND THE BUDGET

I am very happy to have the opportunity to discuss before the Rivers and Harbors Congress some of the current issues before the Nation with respect to our water resources programs.

The President, in preparing his budget, faces few more difficult problems than the development of a balanced program for the Federal Government's part in conserving and improving our natural resources. As you know, he has expressed his belief on many occasions that these resources should work for human benefit. Only recently, he said: "In our present dynamic society, the task for conservation is not to lock up our resources, but to develop and improve them." Yet, in moving toward that objective, the President must constantly weigh and balance desirable proposals for resource development against many other pressing national considerations. While individual agencies rightly present specialized program viewpoints, the President's decisions, as reflected in his budgetary and legislative recommendations, must always be made from the standpoint of general welfare of the whole Nation.

The opportunity to address this convention is particularly welcome since it permits me to discuss the interest of the Bureau of the Budget in the field of water resources.

The Budget Bureau is the staff agency principally responsible for assisting the President in reviewing the budgetary and legislative proposals developed in the Executive Branch. Thus, it is our job to analyze and review the broader issues which the President must face in relating an individual program, like water resource development, to national programs and objectives. Today, I hope to discuss with you some of these objectives and show how they relate to current issues facing us in our water resources programs.

The Budget Bureau's responsibilities to the President in the field of water resources are unlike those of any other Federal agency. As the agency principally responsible for the coordination of water-resources programs proposed by other agencies, it is inevitable that the Bureau's findings and recommendations may differ with the findings and recommendations of the proponents of a particular policy or piece of legislation.

It is also inevitable, therefore, that in the minds of some people the Bureau is considered as being interested only in the dollar costs of such proposals—that we are unable to focus on anything except the possibility of eliminating or reducing items in the budget. However, I believe I can demonstrate that this view is erroneous and that the Budget Bureau understands that the sound development of water resources is far more complex than just the size of the budget estimate presented by the President to the Congress. Along with the operating agencies and the committees of the Congress concerned, we are seeking a positive, constructive solution to our water-resources problems, recognizing that there are many factors which must be taken into account other than the size of the budget.

For the next few minutes, however, I would like to discuss the fiscal and economic background against which all Federal programs must be measured at the present time.

Someone has said that we have lived 100 years in the last decade. Even a casual examination of our new national responsibilities and commitments would seem to bear out this statement. Within the past 10 years we have seen a dramatic change in the direction and character of the Government's activities. Today we are supporting programs at a level unthought of in 1939; we are moving forward rapidly in areas of human and physical development unknown 10 years ago. The new emphasis and increased size of the Government's activities have produced new problems and new challenges in the formulation of national fiscal policies and the creation of a properly balanced Federal program.

We cannot escape the sobering fact that it is not possible to view any Federal activity, including our water-resources program, solely from the viewpoint of its contribution to our economy or national well-being. Because of overriding national considerations, every decision on individual programs must be a compromise—a compromise between what we would like to do and what we actually can do in the light of existing commitments and the insistent demands from other segments of our society.

I am sure you are all familiar with the budget figures for the fiscal year 1951 which were transmitted to Congress last January. Under those estimates, the Federal Government's expenditures will amount to approximately $42,400,000,000 and receipts to $37,300,000,000. Thus, we face an estimated deficit of $5,100,000,000 for the year which ends June 30, 1951. The deficit for 1951 is expected to be only slightly less than the deficit of $5,500,000,000 estimated for the current fiscal year.

You may well ask why your Government is spending more than four times what it spent 10 years ago. The answer is not hard to find. In 1951 a total of $30,000,000,000, or approximately 71 percent of the money spent by the Federal Government, will go to meet the cost of past wars and to pay for insurance against future wars.

In terms of your understanding of the President's budget problem and your problem as citizens directly interested in a particular Federal program, that is the most important single fact in my statement today. It is the crux of the budget problem in these

postwar years. It is of fundamental importance to a discussion of the relationship of our water-resources program to our overall national interest and policy.

Specifically, we will spend about $13,500,000,000, or 32 cents out of every tax dollar, on national defense in this fiscal year. These are direct expenditures for defense. They do not include many other large Federal programs, which, while essentially civilian, are closely related to defense needs, such as the development of atomic energy, the maintenance of our merchant marine and the provision of strategic highways.

Another $4,700,000,000 is needed to meet present commitments in the international field. The European-recovery program and our expenditures for government and relief in the occupied areas of Japan and Germany will account for most of this total. In terms of the budget dollar, our expenditures for international affairs and finance will amount to 11 cents.

Thus, two large Federal programs—national defense and international affairs—are consuming about 43 cents out of each dollar spent.

To meet interest payments on our national debt will require $5,600,000,000 or 13 cents of every dollar in 1951. This does not represent, of course, any retirement of the debt, but merely the payment of interest.

Finally, there is another large program which will take an additional 15 cents from each dollar. This is our program of veterans' services and benefits amounting to $6,000,000,000. Included in this program, as you know, are pensions, medical care, education, and other national commitments made to our veterans.

Those four programs—all of them related to past wars or our efforts to prevent a future war—amount to $30,000,000,000, or 71 cents out of every dollar the Federal Government will spend in 1951.

I might add, parenthetically at this point, that the income taxes which you paid this year, together with the income taxes paid by all corporations, after deducting refunds, are estimated to fall $2,250,000,000 short of paying for these four items directly related to past wars and efforts to achieve a peaceful world.

Out of the remaining $12,000,000,000—or the remaining 29 cents, if you will—all the demands of our highly diversified economy must be satisfied. This sum must finance all programs devoted to the development of our natural resources, to the advancement of health, welfare, and education, to the improvement of our transportation and communication facilities, and to carrying out the services which the citizen has long expected from his Government, such as carrying the mail, making and enforcing the laws, collecting taxes, and providing aids to industry and agriculture.

This $12,000,000,000 figure gives us a better perspective for considering our activities and commitments in the public-works field. Our public-works programs, drastically curtailed during the war, have been steadily expanding for the past 4 years. Despite a restrictive policy on new starts, the pressure to move forward on essential projects and the inauguration of programs arising from the war, such as atomic energy, have meant a constantly growing volume of public works under way. To maintain an economical rate of construction on these going projects, therefore, has required a steady rise in current expenditures.

For the 1951 fiscal year total civil public works expenditures under the budget will amount to $3,100,000,000. Thus, in relation to the $12,000,000,000 in the budget for essentially domestic programs, public works represent approximately 25 percent of the total. And within the total of $3,100,000,000, expenditures for water-resources development amount to $1,200,000,000. These are 1951 expenditure figures. It is also important to realize that to complete projects and other commitments already under way in the public-works field will require almost $12,000,000,000 in expenditures in the years ahead.

The decisions we make with respect to our policies for developing water resources and with respect to the rate of progress in constructing individual projects are highly important decisions. They vitally affect the size and character of the Federal budget not only for this year but for a number of years to come. They underscore the complex problem the President faces in preparing his budget under present-day conditions. He cannot escape the fact that the costs of four large programs related to past wars and our efforts to preserve the peace have increased to more than 11 times their 1939 total. All other activities of the Government are not quite twice as high as they were then.

Let me put it another, and perhaps more dramatic, way. The Government spent $8 for national defense in 1939 for each man, woman, and child in the country; in 1951 it will spend $89. The Government spent 15 cents for international affairs 12 years ago; today the cost is $31. The Government spent $4 for veterans' programs in 1939; in the 1951 fiscal year the cost to each person will be $40. To service the debt cost $7 per person before the war; it will cost $37 in 1951. For all other activities of the Government in 1939, the cost per person was $49. In 1951, in sharp contrast to other increases, that cost will rise only to $81 per person.

Let us look at that increase in all other Government costs from $49 to $81 for a moment. When we consider that in this 12-year period our population will have increased by over 20,000,000, that our national income will have more than tripled, and that the Government, like the housewife, must pay more for the goods and services it purchases, we can see how tightly the domestic activities in the budget have been held down.

These figures all serve to dramatize the fact that the fiscal limits within which the President must plan his domestic program are extremely narrow.

When the citizen, interested in an individual project or service which seems eminently worth while and a sound expenditure to him, hears that the Federal Government is spending $42,400,000,000, it is difficult for him to understand why that project or service, which may cost but a few thousand or a few million dollars, is not promptly provided.

The President, however, in considering each proposal, must not only weight it against similar proposals, but also against the demands of scores of other unrelated programs. I can assure you that if the President had accepted all the recommendations that were made to him for highly desirable expenditures in the fields of defense, natural resources, health, and many other activities of Government, the budget for the fiscal year 1951 as transmitted to the Congress would have been nearer $60,000,000,000 than $42,000,000,000.

Thus, the tremendous problem facing the President is the development of a domestic program which properly balances and adjusts these competing demands, for less than 30 percent of our total expenditures.

The budget process is the principal device available to him in achieving a realistic and proper balance among Federal programs. Viewed in this light, you can see that the budget of the United States is not an auditing report or an account of what has happened. Instead, it is essentially a statement of program recommendations. When the President transmits the budget and the Congress acts upon it, they are making decisions on how much of the Nation's resources should be devoted to each Government activity. Thus, the budget is a medium for bringing about balanced decisions in the light of economic, social, and political conditions in this country and throughout the world.

I stated earlier that the change in direction and size of the Federal program had produced new problems and new challenges in government. Let me enlarge upon that statement for a moment. Today, while the citizen is demanding increased governmental service on the one hand, he is, at the same time, becoming increasingly insistent that sound policies, sound organization, and sound performance characterize the services he is receiving. The work of the Hoover Commission is the result of this insistence, not the cause. Thirty-five years ago, when our national budget amounted to less than $3,000,000,000 or about 4 percent of the total national income, there was comparatively little interest in the processes of the Federal Government. Today, with a budget of over $40,000,0000,000 or about 18 percent of our total national income, the policies and performance of government are rightly receiving the attention of an increasing number of citizens.

The size and scope of Government activities today underscore the need for carefully interrelating desirable programs; for undertaking them in logical and orderly sequence; and for scheduling them to conform with the fiscal and other limitations. Even more basic, however, is the requirement that the policies and assumptions underlying these programs are soundly conceived.

Let me turn now to a consideration of our water resources programs as they relate to some of the larger national issues I have just outlined.

There is little question that there is a pressing need for a new examination of the basic policies and assumptions upon which our water-resources programs are built. Within the past year a number of unresolved issues have been raised which have repeatedly underscored the existence of basic conflicts in Federal objectives, as well as in agency jurisdictions. We have been unable, in the absence of a consistent statement of national water-resources policies, to evaluate certain individual proposals properly in the light of the national interest. An integrated resources policy is needed, therefore, if we are to promote and sustain a responsible, stable, and effective development program.

These problems come to our attention in the Budget Bureau not only because of our responsibility to advise the President on budget estimates, but also because of our responsibility to review and analyze, for the President, legislative proposals and proposed reports to the Congress on public works and other improvements.

In carrying out these responsibilities the Bureau's role is essentially one of coordination, review, and advice. It must be mindful not only of the specialized viewpoint of the individual agency, but of the broader national issues with which the President must deal. We recognize that national policies for the development and utilization of our water resources must constantly change as our needs change and our technical skills increase. Continuing review, analysis, and planning are needed if the various individual programs are to be based on common assumptions and are to yield maximum benefits to the broadest segments of our economy. In this process, the Bureau assists the President by bringing together, adjusting, and reconciling the views of the Federal agencies involved in the resources field.

Efforts have been made from time to time to adjust our resources policies to new concepts and new needs and to bring about the desired coordination and cooperation between agencies and interests. Generally, these efforts have been made in connection with individual project proposals, or from the point

of view of a single agency. While these efforts are commendable, they have not been satisfactory because of the absence of a clear-cut and established national policy covering the several benefits and objectives to be attained.

During the last session of Congress, the President on several occasions called attention to the lack of certain basic policies with respect to our expanding program of water-resources development.

Among the issues to which the President specifically called attention were the following:

First, what broad policies should govern in determining the use of water and land for purposes, other than agriculture, having important public values, such as flood control, hydro-power production, navigation, recreation, etc.? How does the increasing demand for water for industrial and other purposes affect these other demands?

Second, what uniform policies should be applied to the calculation of benefits and costs in general? What policies should govern customer preferences and the establishment of public power rates, repayment rates for reimbursable services, the allocation of water for industrial uses, and many other issues? What economic and social principles should govern the assignment of the burden of cost among the several beneficiaries of multiple-purpose projects?

Third, is there a governmental public-utility responsibility in hydroelectric power development in various parts of the country? To what extent should hydroelectric power revenues be used to defray the cost of other programs such as land reclamation?

Fourth, what are the proper considerations with respect to the timing of various resources development programs in order to promote economic stability?

The President on several occasions has expressed belief that, in some cases, to attack these problems on a piecemeal, or project-by-project basis, in the absence of established national policies, will only serve to confuse the basic questions involved.

With this in mind the President appointed on January 3 a Water Resources Policy Commission of seven members to study and make recommendations to him on existing Federal legislation and policies in the water resources field. He has asked that the Commission give particular attention to the extent and character of water-resource programs, the priority of these programs from the standpoint of economic and social need, and the criteria and standards for evaluating the feasibility of individual projects. This study is scheduled to be completed by December 1 this year.

It is recognized, of course, that permanent answers cannot be provided to our water-resources policies, any more than to any other area of governmental activity. However, the need today is for immediate answers to some of the more serious policy questions in order that Federal programs in this field may move continuously forward.

The need for carefully considered policies is also underscored by the tremendous expansion in these programs in the past 10 years. In 1939 water-resource programs accounted for $280,000,000 in the Federal budget. In 1950 these increased to approximately a billion dollars. In 1951 these programs, despite a highly restrictive policy on new starts, will involve expenditures, excluding operation and maintenance, of $1,225,000,000. It is interesting to note that expenditures for rivers and harbors projects have just about doubled, while the construction-cost index has risen at the same rate, leaving little net gain in physical volume. Flood control and Bureau of Reclamation expenditures, however, increased sevenfold and fivefold, respectively. This shift in emphasis reflects the growth of the concept of multipurpose river development.

The amount the President submitted for 1951 for water programs represents an increase over 1950 due to projects started in 1950 and the prior years. The rate of expenditures for 1951 for these projects has been held to a minimum, consistent with the most economical rate of construction. There are no new water-resource projects in 1951 except for additional facilities in power-shortage areas such as the Tennessee and Columbia Valleys. Expenditures for flood control were estimated in the budget to increase from $459,000,000 in 1950 to $534,000,000 in 1951 and will probably continue at this level in 1952, despite the fact that no new starts are contemplated in 1951. The Bureau of Reclamation's expenditures will increase within the same period from $307,000,000 to $354,000,000; similarly, small increases are projected for other programs. These figures reflect the policy set forth in the President's budget message as follows:

"Despite the large number of highly meritorious projects which have already been authorized for construction, we should not at this time add to the present high level of commitments This policy is necessary both because of our over-all fiscal position and in order to provide the greatest possible measures of stability, under present economic conditions, in the rate of Federal public works expenditures."

One of the major problems involved in the development of water resource programs is that we provide adequate funds for the continued orderly and economic development of all of the various phases of these programs, keeping in mind the element of time and the desirability of advanced planning and engineering. An adequate reserve of carefully planned public works is an important factor in obtaining a balanced and flexible program which will serve the interests of national security, provide for a means of productive economic development of the Nation, and a means for employment stabilization if and when the Congress determines that a major public works program is desirable to meet the general unemployment situation. On the basis of present prices, we now have nearly $11,000,000,000 of projects authorized but not yet started and $20,000,000,000 of projects under consideration but not yet authorized. These are principally water resource improvements. In addition, it will require more than $7,500,000,000 after this year to complete water resource projects already under way. Thus the implications for the economy and the fiscal policy of the Nation are great.

Now out of these figures and questions as to future policy I want to cite one governing consideration: The budget for water resource programs represents a major investment by our people in the economy and the future strength of our country. Whether we invest wisely or not will depend upon the understanding and assistance of groups such as yours and the full cooperation of the executive and the legislative branches. In the final analysis, the true test of a project is not whether it is a good project, but whether it is the best project possible, and whether it contributes the maximum amount to our national needs and the well-being of our people.

The Lippmann Thesis on Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am including as part of my remarks a portion of an article entitled "The Lippmann Thesis," which appears in the May 17 issue of the Christian Century. I commend it to the attention of all Members of Congress who are interested in the important problem of foreign policy in view of world conditions:

II

Mr. Lippmann has outlined his thesis for an intelligent and effective foreign policy in an article, Breakup of the Two-Power World, which appeared in the Atlantic Monthly for April. He has reinforced the arguments in that article in several of his syndicated columns which appear in more than a hundred daily newspapers. Briefly, the Lippmann thesis is this:

The Truman doctrine and the policy of a military containment of Russian communism are failures. They are not only failures; they have become irrelevant and outdated in the light of six major developments of the past year. These are (1) the Russian A-bomb; (2) China; (3) the dissolution of the British and Dutch Empires in south Asia; (4) the chaotic developments in Indochina, Malaya, and Burma; (5) Tito and the Titoistic tendencies in Poland, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia; (6) the revival of Germany. The combination of these "has created a radically new situation that will compel all the governments to reexamine their estimates of the cold war and their calculations and their policies."

One thing these events show, says Mr. Lippmann, and that is that the assumption, made by both Russia and the United States, that the whole world must line up either in the Russian world or in the American is a fallacy. The common factor in all except the first of the six events listed is that one side in this struggle has lost control of an important region without the other side gaining certain and permanent control. This can prove true even in China. In addition, the loss of America's atomic weapon monopoly fundamentally alters the military situation, especially in Europe. It renders the North Atlantic Pact of very doubtful value, for the military stalemate between the American strategic Air Force and the Red army has been broken. If we invite nations on Russia's periphery to join us as military allies, we must now offer them defense not only against the Red army but against atomic bombardment. This we can no longer do. An invitation to a military alliance with us is an invitation to make themselves the bull's-eye for Russian atomic blasting. No nation in its right mind can be expected to be attracted by such an invitation.

What, then, is likely to happen? "The Germans are a highly intelligent people," writes Mr. Lippmann, "especially in military matters when they are not befuddled by demagogues like Hitler. They are confronted with a dilemma and they know it, and there is only one way out of it open to them which offers them any prospect—even if it is not a certain prospect—of security. The Germans will take that way out because there is no other way out. They will recognize that they lie between two armed coalitions, each attempting to win them over to it. They will exploit this middle position to recover their national independence by making demands and gaining concessions from both sides. They will shake off the controls of the occupying powers. They will get rid of the military occupation. Then they will develop their middle position in the heart of Europe outside either alliance, and in between both alliances, to regain their power and influence in Europe."

A similar policy, Mr. Lippmann believes, will evolve in most of the other nations which are now under pressure to join either the Russian or American power blocs. It is the policy already announced by India, Pakistan, and Indonesia. It is the policy

others are longing to adopt—and that includes Japan. "It is the policy of avoiding entangling alliances in a two-power world."

And what should American policy be if these things are true? Not to try to form a world-compassing, hard-and-fast global coalition against the Russians. To do so would be to hasten war, and at the coming of war most of our reluctant allies would be revealed as military liabilities. Our proper policy should be "to frustrate and to disorganize and to disintegrate any Soviet attempt to form a global coalition." "That would mean," says Mr. Lippmann, "that we put our influence and power behind the general tendency toward national independence, toward military neutrality, and toward diplomatic disentanglements—a tendency which is manifest in almost all of Asia, and in much at least of central and eastern Europe. I believe that in the last analysis the matter reduces itself to this: that since we cannot encircle the Soviet Union by a military coalition, we should cultivate and exploit all the national forces, all the human impulses to escape from the havoc of war, in order to prevent the Soviet Union from forming its coalition and in order to disintegrate its military alliances in eastern Europe and those which it hopes to achieve in Asia.

III

To us, this makes sense. And before the reader comes to a different conclusion, we trust that he will read Mr. Lippmann's complete argument in the Atlantic and follow with care the corollaries of that argument as he develops them in the daily press. If the Lippmann thesis does make sense, it follows that the premises on which the United States is proceeding at London are mistaken. The world need not be divided into two armed camps. The cold war need not go on until it turns into a hot war. The United States need not risk bankruptcy and ruin to pay for ghastly expensive military alliances as the only means of halting the Communist advance. There are far more promising ways to deal with the current world crisis than those which are now coming out of the Pentagon and State Department. And if the men who are meeting in London will not listen when a man with Mr. Lippmann's standing tries to tell them this, then we hope that at the next Assembly of the United Nations those countries which are being driven by our policy and Russian's between two lines of fire will seize that platform to make this thesis heard throughout the earth.

Soviet Gold Smuggling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 26, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Sylvia F. Porter from the New York Herald Tribune of May 16, 1950:

SOVIET GOLD SMUGGLING
(By Sylvia F. Porter)

Russia is now smuggling vast fortunes in gold bars and coins to her agents in key spots of the world—in Sweden, France, Italy, Switzerland, Tangiers, Hongkong, Macao.

Inside reports are that the Soviet's shipments of this most precious of all monetary metals just in the last 15 weeks run far above $200,000,000, may even surpass the $300,000,000 mark.

This places her gold shipments on an extraordinarily high level, for in these times, gold movements of this magnitude are rare for any nation except America.

They're virtually unprecedented for the Soviet Union.

The gold is being taken out of her metal reserves, is being loaded on Russian steamers, is being shipped from such ports as Vladivostock to such ports as Marseilles and is then being rerouted to the Soviet's financial agents in the chosen areas.

It is not being done officially; no announcement of the shipments has been made, of course.

But from Zurich comes the story of large arrivals of gold bars in transit. And the bars have been identified as Russian.

From Tangiers and Macao comes the tale of the sudden appearance of big bags of gold coins and bars. And the bags bear not only the stamp of the U. S. S. R., but also carry the stampings of the original owners—"Reichsbank, 1912." "Federal Reserve Bank, 1932." (It was in 1932 and 1933 that gold was fleeing the United States for safer havens.)

When General Eisenhower addressed the Nation's newspaper publishers in New York recently, he urged them to seek clues to Russia's plans in her commercial and economic transactions. For, often deals in this area reveal more than a thousand diplomatic maneuvers.

What then has the Politburo in mind here? What might these vast gold shipments imply to us?

We know how deeply the Soviet treasures her gold hoard—variously estimated at from 2 to 5 billion dollars. Why then is she sending such fortunes outside her borders and doing it unofficially too?

We know that spies are traditionally paid in gold and Russia surely pays off hers in metal as we surely pay off ours. But what sort of espionage could possibly warrant this level of smuggling?

I've been checking with financiers who study and deal in these mysterious markets. They see three explanations.

First, Russia is building up gold hoards in key spots for future dumping purposes—is getting set to dump gold in the global markets to drive down its price at crucial moments.

She already has dumped plenty of the metal. Her sales in Paris, Tangiers, etc., during February and March were a major factor in the sensational slump in the world black-market prices for gold.

The reason: To bewilder and terrify the industrialists of Europe and Africa who completely distrust paper money, have faith only in gold as a measure of value and their own fortunes. When the world gold price crashes, their confidence is bitterly shaken, their willingness to invest in and continue business activities is deeply undermined.

Officially, Russia would not sell gold on the black markets. Unofficially, she could—and she has dumped and she will dump to wage economic and psychological warfare on the West.

Second, Russia is creating these hoards in outside spots so she can pick up foreign currencies when she wants them—the pound, the dollar, etc.—at prices much below the official rates.

For gold still will buy any currency at a discount in the world markets. And again, the economic and psychological advantages to the Soviet are clear.

Finally, Russia is getting in position to wage a ruble offensive against the pound and the dollar, to back her currency with gold in fact as well as fancy—when and if she's ready to move.

The ruble bloc will go on the offensive against the dollar and sterling blocs when Russia can swing it. It is another clue.

This is international money juggling in the classical tradition. A pattern of competition and conflict is being drawn—and Russia is seizing upon every weapon the capitalist nations ever devised.

If we fail to act positively on our own in this sphere, we will commit an unpardonable blunder—no, a criminal blunder.

Winning a Defeat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 18, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks I am including an editorial that recently appeared in the Milwaukee Journal. It points out that we are soldiers winning the war and our politicians have lost the peace at a terrific price. Now the facts are coming to light. Mr. Roosevelt who believed that he could mold Marshal Stalin in his own image and thinking, failed to do so, and in addition, Stalin walked off with half of the world at Yalta.

The editorial follows:

WINNING A DEFEAT

Having triumphantly won the global war this country is now—at enormous expense—ingloriously losing the global peace.

This is not the fault of our strategists. Their campaigns were ably organized and brilliantly conducted.

But our generals and admirals went where they were sent: they themselves were commanded by politicians, most of whom lacked military or diplomatic experience: and it was political leadership which, in the very course of victorious war, laid the bases for our ultimate defeat.

Obviously, therefore, if postwar disaster is to be averted, the wartime errors committed in our name must be understood so that their worst consequences may perhaps be tardily eliminated.

During the war, because of censorship and secrecy, the American people had virtually no knowledge of their political misguidance.

But the facts have been coming to light.

For example, the Atlantic Monthly has published and the Reader's Digest had epitomized, a revealing article entitled "Our Worst Blunders in the War" by Mr. Hanson W. Baldwin, military editor of the New York Times.

This article, with other writings, shows clearly that, by his political conduct of the war, President Franklin D. Roosevelt was mainly responsible for our postwar dangers.

The first error was Mr. Roosevelt's child-like belief in the integrity and good will of Marshal Stalin and the Politburo.

The President actually believed that Soviet Russia had forsaken its objective of world communism—and could be trusted.

The President actually believed that our wars could not be won without Russian support, when actually the opposite was true.

Influenced by these delusions, the President rejected the British plan for a Balkan invasion, which would have excluded Russia from central Europe, and bribed Russia—with gifts of Chinese territory—to enter the

Japanese war when Japan was already beaten.

Our political objective was speedy victories by any ruthless means, not a just and durable peace.

As a result, Russia stands poised today for the conquest of all Eurasia.

Two other political errors need to be considered.

One was the unrealistic doctrine of unconditional surrender lightheartedly proclaimed by Mr. Roosevelt at Casablanca.

This doctrine made a German surrender impossible until Germany had been totally wrecked.

And, in the words of Liddell Hart, the British expert:

"War to the bitter end was bound to make Russia top dog on the continent."

The second error—equally disastrous in Asia—was the Rooseveltian policy of anticolonialism.

Borrowed directly from Marxism, Mr. Roosevelt's insistence on the abolition of the colonial system was responsible for the revolutions in south Asia.

Hence has come about the great weakening of the British and Dutch empires—for centuries, stabilizing and civilizing influences in the east—which is truly one of the goals of communism.

There is still time to rectify—at least to modify—some of the evils caused by political mismanagement of the war.

But this will require a different kind of management from the kind we have now.

What a Farmer Thinks of the Extravagances of Truman and His Cabinet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 16, 1950

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to say that Mr. Louis Bromfield in addition to being a very successful author of a number of popular books is also a citizen of Ohio and is a big farmer. A few days ago in his column he took upon himself the task of showing to the public the extravagances of the administration high officials. He does a fine job of it. The following is what he writes:

At last Congress has shown signs of moving in on the leaders of Mr. Truman's administration and the Democratic National Committee. For months and years now every taxpayer, regardless of his feeling toward Mr. Truman and his socialistic platform, has been paying his share of the expenses to promote Mr. Truman, his friends and his ideas. How? Through the old Pendergast ward politics system of charging up expenses of political campaigning to the Government itself.

Let's look at the record. For months now Mr. Brannan, Secretary of Agriculture, has been touring the country, making speeches, attempting to sell Mr. Truman and his welfare state to hundreds of thousands of citizens. There has been and there can be no pretense as to what he is doing. The attitude is wholly partisan both as to ideas and as to politics. The Democratic National Committee rather than the taxpayer should be paying the bill which runs in a year or so into hundreds of thousands.

Mr. Tobin, Secretary of Labor, has been following the same pattern, rarely making anything but partisan political speeches which sound as if he were a paid propagandist for the big officials of organized labor whom the Democratic Committee woo so passionately. Who paid for it all? You and I.

Mr. Ewing, Federal Security Administrator, tours not only this country but Europe with special attention to the socialist government of Great Britain. On his return he did quite a bit of traveling and talking in praise of British socialism and in particular of socialized medicine, which is simply a back-handed way of making hay for Mr. Truman and his program. Who paid for it? You and I.

And so on and on it goes throughout most of the Democratic officeholders in Cabinet and administrative posts. Virtually every one of them is guilty, and when we add up the total, including Government planes which are freely commandeered in the interests of the Democratic Party, the bill comes to many millions of dollars. Who pays for it? Not the Democratic Party campaign fund, but you and I every time we pay our income tax or go to a movie or send a telegram or ride on a train or buy a cigarette.

Under law and Constitution, all the posts represented in this spending of taxpayer's money for the benefit of Mr. Truman and his friends were set up as administrative posts, clearly established as nonpolitical. Under the long 17 years of the Democratic rule they have turned more and more simply into debased political sounding boards in which the administrators spend more and more time away from their inefficient, expensive, and confused departments in making political speeches.

The Department of Agriculture, for example, was clearly established by law, and for many generations by honest precedent, as an agency for research and education beneficial to American agriculture. The present Secretary is a New Deal Denver lawyer without direct contact or experience with agritulture or any of the farmer's problems. How much time does he spend trying to straighten out the administrative mess into which his Department has been made by successive political appointees? How much time does he spend pressing research and education? And how much time does he spend on the road selling Mr. Truman, the welfare state, and Socialist ideas which would completely regiment the farmer in return for an inadequate check paid out of taxpayers' money?

Only recently at a Minnesota meeting, farmer members of the Production and Marketing Organization (incidentally the worst political set-up in our Government) were given per diem pay and expenses by car, train, and in hotel, to travel considerable distances in order to hear Mr. Brannan make a political speech in favor of the welfare State, the Brannan plan and Mr. Truman. Who pays for this skullduggery? Guess. It is not the Democratic National Committee.

The President himself is no better. Recently it was recorded that he winked at reporters when he mentioned his forthcoming nonpolitical trip to the Northwest and back again with speeches at every whistle stop. The trip will cost well in excess of a hundred thousand dollars. Who pays for it? Guess who. You and I. When clearly it should be charged to the Democratic Party campaign fund.

This is the kind of thing we get when we place in office men who are essentially professional and sometimes cheap ward politicians.

Fortunately Congress has begun to take notice of these practices which honest citizens can regard only as an outrage, not only against themselves but against decent democratic government. Mr. Stalin and his friends operate on the same system but more frankly and honestly. It might just be that this situation is a good subject for a letter to your Representatives in Washington. That's the only way we shall stop what is one of the cheapest and most shameful practices in American history, as subversive to good government and good democracy as anything the Communists have ever attempted to pull off in our midst.

Secretary Chapman Favors Arizona Despite Budget Bureau, Says Arizona Paper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 18, 1950

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the following editorial from the Arizona Republic for May 12, 1950:

GAIN FOR ARIZONA

Arizona gained an advantage in the debate on the list of factual questions to be submitted for governmental agency answers before the House Public Lands Committee vote on the central Arizona project authorization bill. Not only are the questions the ones that are expected to produce answers favorable to the project, but they are going to a friendly camp—the Department of the Interior.

California's original success in pointing its list of questions to the Budget Bureau was swept aside in the latest conference. This agency at the beginning of this session of Congress virtually blackballed the project and was then persuaded to replace its blast with a second report from which the barbs had been extracted. Even in its revised form, it was politely non-committal, rather than favorable.

Since that time, a new Secretary of the Interior—Oscar Chapman—has taken his place in the Cabinet. He is known to be exceedingly friendly to Arizona. Besides, the questions probably will be answered by the Department's Bureau of Reclamation, which has warmly endorsed the project. Thus Arizona's best interests are probably served in by-passing the Budget Bureau.

By eliminating the policy questions that might draw unhelpful replies, and basing the requests for data on engineering and financial considerations from the Reclamation Bureau, Arizona's cause stands to be strengthened when the bill comes up for a committee vote after June 15. There is reason for optimism in that no other barrier seems to stand in the way of a committee recommendation at that time. A day or two may be required to go over the submitted material, but a vote could be expected soon after the project is resubmitted.

The only barrier then standing in the way of final acting in Congress will be getting a place for the bill on the House calendar. The measure having already passed the Senate, if given a favorable recommendation by the House Public Lands Committee, a place would probably be found for it.

References made by the President on his western tour indicate an apparent friendliness to reclamation projects such as the one Arizona sponsors. If it received an encouraging White House nod in June, the project might clear its high hurdles smoothly.

The Wounded Don't Cry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 18, 1950

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, in the furor that has been raised by the order inactivating Valley Forge General Hospital, which is located in my district, I have attempted to point out the economic fallacy in the closing of this fine institution and the evidence of political maneuvering in the simultaneous erection of another multimilion dollar facility in Philadelphia, less than 20 miles away. In this connection I cannot praise too highly the outstanding work done by our colleagues the Honorable L. MENDEL RIVERS and the Honorable LEON H. GAVIN, chairman and member, respectively, of the Armed Services Subcommittee, who have presented to this House such telling arguments for keeping Valley Forge open.

The one aspect of this closing order which has been generally overlooked has to do with the complete breakdown of the morale of our disabled servicemen who now face the bleak prospects of being shunted to remote hospitals, where they will be confronted with new and strange doctors and nurses, who, naturally, will not be acquainted with their cases. It is a sad commentary on a Government which seems to be ready to spend billions on the citizens of other nations but at the same time seeks to effect savings at the expense of those who continue to suffer from the wounds incurred in defending that same Government from those who would destroy it, in the helping of whom we are now so lavishly spending our substance. The most factual, and certainly the most poignant, picture of the plight of these displaced patients has been given us by Mr. Ivan H. Peterman in the Philadelphia Inquirer for May 15. I commend it to your attention as a recital of just how thoughtless bureaucrats can be in the prosecution of their ill-advised planning:

VETS GET DP TREATMENT IN VALLEY FORGE OUSTER

(By Ivan H. Peterman)

"The wounded don't cry," they say, and after 5, 6 or 7 years groping through war's aftermath, they don't talk much, either. If they did, some could recite a story of this great United States Government, which lavishes billions on others who never heard a shot fired, while shoving these, the most deserving, from hospital to hospital, with callous indifference.

For that is the story of Valley Forge General Hospital's new DP's—the legless, the armless, the incapacitated, and even the blind. Over the combined protests of relatives, friends, Gold Star mothers, welfare workers who in the postwar years have adopted many so that their life has become more bearable, over the American Legion's demurrer, and the efforts of Phoenixville's civic associations who now regard the "boys on the hill" as part of the town, the Defense Department is closing Valley Forge at the end of June.

Many familiar figures have gone. There are no blind boys fishing this spring in Dr. Gotwals' pond. They loved that. About the only sport a blind serviceman could enjoy. At the Army's center for the blind in Chicago, there is no fish pond. No country atmosphere. No familiar paths and walks which only time can restore to a man whose sight went with the blast of a shell.

But Secretary Louis Johnson, whose hurry-up economy order didn't pause to consult with medical officers of either Army or Navy, decided Valley Forge must close. When you call Washington to find out why someone didn't investigate first, or why some arrangement hasn't been made to keep these helpless near their friends and families, there's a lot of evasion, but few adequate answers. Nobody's very proud of this move.

Army and Navy have long been silenced by top administration order. Explanations, when given, don't face the issues. Office of Defense decided one military hospital—Walter Reed—was enough this side of the Mississippi. A few post hospitals like Fort Belvoir, and the residue—like those luckless lads found in burning Belle Vista sanitarium recently—shunted to private institutions. Some have been quartered at the State Hospital for the Insane in Norristown.

In the meantime, a new veterans' hospital is about to rise in Philadelphia. More efficient, requires less personnel, is the reason. But not long ago the Veterans' Administration was willing and ready to take over Valley Forge. Last October, the Army said it would remain. In February, Secretary Johnson changed his mind. On May 3 came the decision to clear out, if possible, by June 15.

The soldiers' wishes? The dilemma of dozens of veterans' families who, thinking Valley Forge was permanent, had bought homes and moved to Phoenixville to be near wounded husbands and sons? The whole problem of sudden, unexpected dislocation, breaking of companionships among the patients? There was no thought of this. And under the Fair Deal's growing gestapo fear, nobody had the courage to speak out. But nobody likes it.

Some were shipped to Chicago. Some to San Antonio and California. The Veterans' Administration, which at most had comparatively few patients in Valley Forge, on April 18 had only 54 patients there, all but 8 of whom were general medical cases. The public is widely mistaken on Valley Forge. It is not a Veterans' hospital at all, and most of the blind, orthopedic cases you've been seeing at Franklin Field, at the ball parks, the tracks and Arena, and Stadium, are technically not veterans, but still active service men, at service pay and subject to Army orders. The Veterans' Administration is wholly blameless in this matter. The order traces directly to the Secretary of Defense, and the wishes of President Truman.

It was the President, remember, who last week on his quarter million dollar, tax-paid junket, proclaimed that while he hoped some day to balance the budget, there would be no sparing of dollars at the expense of the people's welfare. That sounds mighty fine to uninformed listeners at a whistle stop. But it must bring bitter smiles to Valley Forge's 1,500 wounded of the Second World War, displaced by his own economy order.

But it's a long cry from a wounded vet's dull day to the high-pressure office of national defense. Louis Johnson, for all his qualities, never crouched in a wadi after bomb shock and watched the light fade at sunlit noon. I have, and I know the gratitude when you can see again, and the understanding you must always have for those who weren't so lucky.

If there's anything but politics left in Washington, those responsible for the Valley Forge situation will listen to public appeal, and rectify this hasty move. The State of Pennsylvania wants to take over the hospital; arguments that it is inefficient, a fire hazard, etc., are strictly phony. It's a splendid place for these patients. If Army medics can farm out such boys, they can also arrange to return or keep them at Valley Forge, pay their way in cooperation with the State, and avert one of the harshest deals yet handed those who all but died for the country.

Do I hear any objections?

Justice for Ireland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 18, 1950

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include the address I delivered to the members of the Clan-Na-Gael at their annual banquet in Worcester, Mass., on the evening of May 14, 1950.

This meeting was held in commemoration of the Irish martyrs who gave their lives to perpetuate a great ideal, during the Easter Week uprising of 1916. The address follows:

Again we meet to pay reverent tribute to those Irish martyrs who gave their lives in the Easter week uprising of 1916 in carrying forward a great ideal. Men who passionately loved Ireland and human freedom; men who unselfishly dedicated their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor in order that the bitter, bloody struggle of over 750 years should one day be crowned with the brilliant achievement of deliverance from bondage, and the glories and triumphs of self-government and independence.

These men sought no selfish gain nor personal aggrandizement; they sought no territorial conquest save what was their own. They sought what the human soul has sought since the dawn of history—the right to be free; the right to be delivered from cruel and tyrannical rulers; the right to speak their own minds, to worship the God of their choice; to set up the government of their own selection; in a word, to find self-expression, self-realization and self-development through the medium of free institutions.

Great events are often moved by a few. The people, as a whole, are often inspired by a small group. The number of these heroes of the Irish volunteers and citizens' army was not large, but the spirit of freedom, sacrifice, and gallantry which they displayed animated and infused their fellow citizens with an insuperable courage to go forward, never to give up the fight for freedom until it had been won, never to cease resistance until their liberties had been secured, never, never to know the meaning of the word "defeat."

From those dark days of 1916 there has been a steady march forward in the affairs of the Irish Government. Led by a succession of brilliant, far-sighted statesmen, endowed with great talents, zeal and courage, Ireland has steadily developed its free institutions, its resources, its native capacity for self-government, and today stands as a free and independent nation among the governments of the world.

Although Ireland is now enjoying a new birth of freedom, there is one essential characteristic of democracy that is still lacking,

and that is its God-given geographic unity. That right has been willfully and deliberately denied to Ireland in contravention of every principle of democracy, every canon of self-determination and every tenet of justice as they are known between men and nations.

Ireland was deliberately divided and partitioned by the designing and arbitrary action of a superior and powerful imperialistic force in 1920, when the British gave a separate government to the six counties in the north.

An imaginary geographic line was drawn across the nation in such a manner and with such a purpose as to include the maximum territory that could be included without endangering political control, and although the so-called great democracies of the world are decrying communism and fascism, this northern government has been operating on the Fascist model for over 27 years, and the British Government which set up and which supports it has not lifted a finger to do anything about it.

When I read of Ireland's reluctance to become a member of the Atlantic Pact, I could readily understand the reason. When we find signatories to that pact maintaining such monstrosities as the so-called government existing in the north of Ireland, originated as a result of crass gerrymandering, where the majority is being controlled by a minority, the explanation of the Irish attitude, on that score, is clear.

It is my considered opinion that the objectives of this organization have not been, and will not be, attained until we can persuade every lover of true democracy and freedom to do all in their power to bring about the eliminatian of the partition which now keeps the Irish people from being one nation, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

Biggest Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 18, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the twenty-third article by Mr. Frank C. Waldrop on the infiltration of communism in our country:

BIGGEST STORY
(By Frank C. Waldrop)

The record of American gullibility and self-deception concerning Soviet Russia is so remarkable that it would be incredible, except for the hard facts of public record.

No wonder Stalin was so confident of his power when he sat down at Tehran and Yalta with President Roosevelt.

He knew that he had before him the supreme example of that sort of American who had for 30 years been hugging illusions in the place of fact, concerning the Soviet system.

Consider here these known and public facts. The first Soviet Government took control of Russia by force of arms on January 18, 1918, after having lost the elections the year before.

It set about at once the suppression of all political activity in the Russian empire and instead, undertook to make a private organization, the Communist party, superior to the official government.

To understand the importance of this, you must keep in mind the actual structure of the Government itself. This, as organized by the Communists, was set up as a system of soviets, meaning councils.

These soviets were set up first in the villages and neighborhoods, with higher and higher ones made up of delegates from below.

The supreme Soviet, at the seat of the national government, combined within itself all three functions, legislative, executive, and judicial.

But were elections to any of these rising circles and councils free? Could anybody run for office? Could competing politicians organize in parties and contest for office with regular platforms, campaigns, and free speech to criticize and expose the acts of one another?

Could voters have secret ballots and private choice of their representatives?

The Communists, who had lost every election up to the day they were able to buy enough men and guns actually to seize the government offices and kick out the legally elected members of Parliament, made sure that could not happen.

One of the very first things they did was to declare all opposition a major crime.

They made their own rules from the top down as to who could qualify for membership in the Communist organization, itself. You couldn't just announce that you had decided to be a Communist, then roll around to the nearest party office, register, declare your allegiance, and ride the gravy train.

Oh, no. Joining the Communists was joining the aristocracy in power, and they took in members on a rule stricter than that of any private club.

Yet, through their use of the guns and the power seized by revolution, they made sure their private club actually had superior authority over the system of soviets supposedly the legal government of the nation.

Thus, in every soviet, it was not the actual membership in office that made policy, but the Communist fraction. Remember the word for it was in time to be a plague to American labor unions and all other organizations Communists would seek to dominate. The Communist faction gave the decisions and all the rest just rubber stamped.

Such was the government set up in Russia by Lenin, Trotsky, and the others who seized control in 1917–18.

It was a government in which the taxpayers not only were deprived of property and the privilege of free elections, but also had to pay through their taxes for the single political party that ran the Government from the top down, and elected its own membership into both Government and party, also from the top down.

All this was visible from the start. It was no secret. Indeed, Lenin declared that the Communists would by such means not only govern Russia but the whole world.

Could Americans fall for that after having been brought up in the tradition of government operated by checks and balances between independent branches of legislative, executive and judicial officials?

Could Americans abandon the proved value of keeping political parties in competition with one another and never allowing any one set of politicians to settle into power secure against exposure and dismissal by the voters?

Well, the Soviet system was hardly declared in Russia and the international Communist movement organized in Moscow before the uproar began here for our Government to recognize the Soviet system and make the Communist work for our destruction easier.

Now begins the story of the real Russian invasion. And in typical fashion it began by indirection. On May 6, 1919, there arrived in New York City one Ludwig A. Martens, presenting credentials as the diplomatic representative of the Soviet Union.

Biggest Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 18, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the twenty-fourth article by Mr. Frank C. Waldrop on the infiltration of communism in our country:

BIGGEST STORY
(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Now in this strange, eventful history comes a chapter of events as ludicrous as they are bitter. It is the story of the American businessman taken for a sucker by the Communists seeking diplomatic status for their Soviet regime in Russia.

Well do I remember, in early 1943, the Honorable Averell Harriman reading a riot act to a number of us whose hearts remained hardened against his friend in the Kremlin.

Mr. Harriman at that time was the golden Ambassador of lend-lease in Moscow and his heart was full of simple faith. Five years later he testified to a congressional committee:

"Stalin is a greater menace than Hitler ever was."

But in 1943, Mr. Harriman's mission from Moscow was to make the ignorant in and around Washington realize that the Russians only needed a little loving kindness shown to become partners after the war.

They had known he was coming and had baked a cake.

Indeed, if you will trouble to look in the old World Almanac for 1928, you will see just how far back they had seen him coming. For the almanac of that year has the notes on a little venture organized in New York City by Mr. Harriman and friends, a corporation to explore for and mine gold in Siberia for good old Joe.

It was a great adventure, and fortunately the parties to it had plenty of shirt to lose. But it is something to think about, that so astute and experienced a banker as Averell Harriman could forget the events of 1926–27–28, in the fun of 1943.

All this fantasy of doing business with the Communists began in the spring of 1919 when one Ludwig C. A. K. Martens produced credentials as the first Ambassador from the first Soviet government in the world.

Marten's who had been here since 1916 as a Russian engineer, presented his credentials to the State Department on March 19, 1919, and was politely told to take himself off.

How did Martens get in here in the first place? This is one of the many little side mysteries of those days even yet not solved in full.

Make of it what you will, but one Leonid Krassin, another engineer, was one of the Communists' most famous secret prerevolutionary agents in Russia.

Krassin, like Alger Hiss, was outwardly the very model of respectability. Yet undercover he organized bomb throwers and illegal agents of all kinds.

He even turned in about $1,000 a month of funds to the Bolsheviks, furnished by his employer, himself one of Russia's idle rich in love with revolution.

As soon as the State Department declined Martens the status of diplomat he opened propaganda offices in New York.

He began a magazine, Soviet Russia, the ancestor of Soviet Russia Today that remains a chief apologist for Stalin to this

very day. And then he let slip the word that the Soviets intended to pick up where the Czars had left off, at granting foreign development companies access to Siberia.

Juicier than that, he invited manufacturers of everything from pig iron to iodine to come in and make him bids for sales contracts.

Before anybody could say "Dzughasvili," he had issued some $30,000,000 worth of these.

Unfortunately, all these contracts had a clause explaining they were at the moment purely tentative, and indicative, not hard-rock. The reason, of course, was that the United States and the Soviet government had no lawful basis for exchanging their separate kinds of money. Diplomatic status, he indicated, would cure everything.

But the United States of America, as a large creditor of the czar and the government that followed him, had on its mind something near to a couple of hundred million dollars' worth of private and public debts due from Russia.

Would the Soviet government honor these? It said it would not. Yet the businessmen who thought the Communists would soon come around, were jumping for contracts. Finally, the State department issued categorical warnings that any American extending credit or accepting any obligation to pay, by the Soviets, would do so at his own risk.

A New York State committee raided Martens' office. He was called down here before a couple of congressional committees, served with deportation warrants and generally made highly visible so that his agitation and propaganda work suffered. So on January 22, 1921, he gave up and went home. His place was taken by another curious character, Boris Skvirsky, of whom much more, later.

Nearly 15 years later, Martens was back in the news.

In Britain as in the United States of America, business and industry had been sucked into development work for Soviet Siberia. Somewhere around 1930, Stalin figured it was time to break off.

So then we hear of Mr. Ludwig C. A. K. Martens as a member of a people's court before which six British citizens, engineers for the famous Vickers company, were dragged on charges of espionage.

New Pattern for Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 18, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Altoona Tribune of May 15, 1950:

NEW PATTERN FOR DEMOCRACY

Government's refusal in recent years to follow the accepted American precepts of standing aside, protecting only the freedom of the American people to live, work, and do business lawfully, and their right to go about such business unhampered has resulted in a vicious circle, an apparently endless race by the American people to keep up to the cost of living.

Coupled with this is the Government's concern for foreign relations, which has been taken to the extreme length by the President of the fantastic point 4 by which Mr. Truman would have us pay to develop the underdeveloped portions of the globe.

Americans have been paying out billions in recent years to sustain European governments and economic systems, both of which are rotten in their underpinnings, and actually can be strengthened only by the unity of their own respective peoples.

From these two modern aspects of American Government has evolved an un-American governmental principle which appears to be a confused version of equalitarianism.

We find it emanating largely from Government officials and bureaus. While both spout democracy, they present it in the form of socialism, sharing-the-wealth Government-will-take-care-of-you programs, all overlaid with vague hintings against the prosperous or the wealthy, which is given point by the soak-the-rich theory.

In other words, the ultimate objective seems to be to reduce America, through this new democracy of equality to the place where every man earns the $4,000 a year suggested by Mr. Truman the other day, and probably, only the top upper crust of governmental bureaucracy may be entitled to attain to more than that, in either power or money.

We are presenting this as bluntly as we can, because we see the picture this way. The Government is not quite so frank. It talks about democracy, or democracy in action, while what it proposes is a paternalistic welfare state. The British, for example, don't quibble about it. They acknowledge they are trying a welfare state.

We are told, for example, by the State Department and the President, that we must make every concession we can make for world trade. Of course, trade is vital. But, if it costs us more than it repays, it certainly is not good for America.

Mr. C. W. Gustkey, of the executive committee, National Labor-Management Council of Foreign Trade, told a House subcommittee the other day that imported glassware last year cost American workmen $4,000,000 in wages. Wage losses this year, he said, may total $12,000,000. Employment in that industry, he said, has been cut in half by imports from Europe. He testified, in fact, that such imports threaten the very existence of the handmade glassware industry in this country.

From New York comes the report that threats of new competition from abroad are harassing the textile industry. It is estimated that at least 50,000 jobs in the textile industry are directly at stake through rising imports of cotton goods, and cuts in our own exports as a result of increased foreign production built up by United States dollars.

Coal industry estimates have suggested that some 50,000 miners will lose their jobs because of the importation of cheap foreign oil into this country.

From Czechoslovakia is coming a flood of felt hats, an increase of 300 percent last year. That hits American industry.

And, while famine haunts China, from some strange reason, our Government is importing dried eggs from that stricken land—some 2,000,000 pounds, the equivalent of 12,000,000 dozens, in 8 months. And the Government is loaded with surplus dried eggs it has bought from our own people and can't sell or give away.

Government warehouses are filled with surplus wheat, barley, and rye, but we are reported importing them, also.

What about a program for future world trade that is reducing American jobs now? What about a State Department theory of foreign trade that ruins American industry now with an influx of cheaper imports?

Will the net result of this Government policy, in all truth, be to reduce the American standard of living, to "equalize" the American people to the point where they have no opportunity, nothing beyond the calculated limit of earnings which the Government may allow them?

Is that the kind of democracy we are to have?

If so, a vast and terrible change will be taking place in our great free Republic.

McGregor Will Hold Conferences in District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 18, 1950

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, since I have been in Congress I have always attempted to keep in close contact with the people of the Seventeenth Ohio District, whom I represent.

I have used many methods of obtaining their opinions on various matters, including the questionnaire, letters, and personal contact. Each year I arrange meetings in the courthouses of the six counties in my district, publish the dates of those conferences, and urge everyone to meet with me and talk over any subject they choose.

This year I will again follow this procedure during the period of our official congressional recess. I have made arrangements to be in the courtrooms of the six county courthouses from 9 a. m. to 5 p. m. each weekday. Saturday conferences will last only until noon when the courthouses close, and no sessions will be held on Sunday.

I have established the following schedule:

Monday and Tuesday, August 21 and 22, Ashland, Ashland County.

Wednesday and Thursday, August 23 and 24, Mansfield, Richland County.

Friday and Saturday, August 25 and 26, Mount Vernon, Knox County.

Monday and Tuesday, August 28 and 29, Delaware, Delaware County.

Wednesday and Thursday, August 30 and 31, Newark, Licking County.

Friday and Saturday, September 1 and 2, Coshocton, Coshocton County.

Many constituents have shown interest in these courthouse visits in the past, and I have been very pleased with the results. It is surprising how much can be accomplished when a citizen and his Congressman can sit down and talk over national and personal problems.

No appointments are necessary for these conferences, and I hope to see a large number of people. All of us have problems we would like to discuss, and this discussion will be of mutual benefit.

I urge any or all of my constituents to meet with me on the date most convenient to them. With the knowledge thus obtained, I know I will be better able to truly represent them in the Congress of the United States.

The Late Hon. Bainbridge Colby

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINGATE H. LUCAS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 18, 1950

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, Bainbridge Colby, the last Secretary of State in the late Woodrow Wilson's administration, died on April 11, 1950. In his long lifetime covering some fourscore years, Mr. Colby accomplished many things equal to the greatness of his capacity. But one of the most important faculties he possessed was his foresight and understanding of human emotions and desires.

Perhaps, if we had remembered in the thirties the warning that he issued in 1920, we would not have the trouble with Russia that we are having today. At that time, he issued a masterly summation of the reasons why we could not do business with Russia either economically or politically. His statement was a correct evaluation of Russia and Soviet psychology. I refer to the statement that Mr. Colby, as Secretary of State, made in a note to Baron Cammillo Romano Avezzana, the Italian Ambassador to Washington. At the time that he issued the note, negotiations were under way for settlement of the Polish-Russian conflict that followed the end of World War I on the eastern front. Poland had set itself up as an independent republic, and under the great Polish leader, Pilsudski, had attacked the Ukraine. The Bolshevik Government retaliated. It almost crushed Poland, and its armies reached the outskirts of Warsaw, the Polish capital. The Polish Government offered peace, and assistance from America staved off complete defeat for Poland at that time.

Italy, through its Ambassador here, inquired of our position in the matter. In substance, Mr. Colby replied that we favored maintenance of the territorial integrity of both Poland and Russia. Greatest friendship for the Russian people, as such, was expressed by our Government in the note which also stressed our friendly relations with them in the past. But Mr. Colby, speaking for our Government, said that entirely apart from the political views of the minority (Soviet group) which had seized power in Russia, we could not deal with them on the ground that they openly renounced adherence to the moral code which governs comity between nations.

I will not produce the entire text of the statement here, but just the pertinent excerpts. These excerpts show the wisdom of Bainbridge Colby as well as the lack of wisdom displayed by this Government when it recognized the Soviet regime in the early thirties. I commend to you the reading of these excerpts as follows:

It is not possible for the Government of the United States to recognize the present rulers of Russia as a government with which the relations common to friendly governments can be maintained. This conviction has nothing to do with any particular political or social structure which the Russian people themselves may see fit to embrace. It rests upon a wholly different set of facts. These facts, which none disputes, have convinced the Government of the United States, against its will, that the existing regime in Russia is based upon the negation of every principle of honor and good faith, and every usage and convention underlying the whole structure of international law; the negation, in short, of every principle upon which it is possible to base harmonious and trustful relations, whether of nations or of individuals.

The responsible leaders of the regime have frequently and openly boasted that they are willing to sign agreements and undertakings with foreign powers while not having the slightest intention of observing such undertakings or carrying out such agreements. This attitude of disregard of obligations voluntarily entered into, they base upon the theory that no compact or agreement made with a non-Bolshevist government can have any moral force for them. They have not only avowed this as a doctrine, but have exemplified it in practice.

Indeed, upon numerous occasions the responsible spokesmen of this power, and its official agencies, have declared that it is their understanding that the very existence of bolshevism in Russia, the maintenance of their own rule, depends, and must continue to depend, upon the occurrence of revolutions in all other great civilized nations, including the United States, which will overthrow and destroy their governments and set up Bolshevist rule in their stead. They have made it quite plain that they intend to use every means, including, of course, diplomatic agencies, to promote such revolutionary movements in other countries.

* * * * *

Inevitably, therefore, the diplomatic service of the Bolshevik Government would become a channel for intrigues and the propaganda of revolt against the institutions and laws of countries with which it was at peace, which would be an abuse of friendship to which enlightened governments cannot subject themselves.

In the view of this Government, there cannot be any common ground upon which it can stand with a power whose conceptions of international relations are so entirely alien to its own, so utterly repugnant to its moral sense. There can be no mutual confidence or trust, no respect even, if pledges are to be given and agreements made with a cynical repudiation of their obligations already in the mind of one of the parties. We cannot recognize, hold official relations with, or give friendly reception to the agents of a government which is determined and bound to conspire against our institutions; whose diplomats will be the agitators of dangerous revolt; whose spokesmen say that they sign agreements with no intention of keeping them.

A Very Bad Idea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAY LeFEVRE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 18, 1950

Mr. LeFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article taken from today's New York Herald Tribune.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that the House Committee on Ways and Means is putting in many weary hours trying to improve on our present tax laws. They have a terrific problem and in their effort to satisfy Mr. Truman to make up the loss in excise taxes, I fear the provision recently adopted to collect 10 percent from corporations to catch a possible $150,000,000 in dividends not reported will be expensive economy. A large portion of those dividends are going to institutions presently exempt. Without a doubt, many small stockholders depend on the dividends for day to day expenses. This move will only add confusion to an already chaotic situation and I hope the members of the Committee on Ways and Means will recognize this error before it is too late.

The article referred to follows:

A VERY BAD IDEA

The House Ways and Means Committee, seeking additional revenue to offset a billion-dollar cut in excise taxes, has hit upon a plan for withholding a 10-percent tax on dividends. The 10 percent would be collected directly from the corporations; they would mail a receipt to each stockholder with every curtailed dividend payment; the stockholder must save the receipts throughout the year, mail them with his March 15 income tax. If he owed no taxes on his dividends, the Income Tax Bureau would in due time mail a refund.

Here is new complication, new forms for the companies, new trouble for the taxpayers, more bookkeeping for the Treasury. Here, too, is hardship for the man of small income whose dividends will be cut whether or not he owes taxes upon them and whether or not he depends upon them for day-to-day needs.

What will be gained from this added trouble? Its sponsors say $150,000,000. They point to $1,400,000,000 paid out in corporation dividends which fail to show up on income-tax statements. A substantial amount estimated at close to half, of the "lost" revenue can be accounted for in the tax-exempt dividends paid to charitable, educational, and religious institutions, and there must be many small stockholders, among the retired, for instance, who have insufficient income to require a tax. Actually the device seems to be aimed at small stockholders, since corporations report all dividends of more than $100 for check against individual tax statements. One wonders, therefore, whether the Representatives have not overestimated that $150,000,000.

The House move is destined to make sorer one of the sorest spots in the whole tax field—the double levy on dividends. As every stockholder knows, the corporation itself pays up to 38 percent on the income from which dividends are paid, and they pay again on their income-tax returns. Withholding is, moreover, at best a device of expediency. We see no justification for its extension to a new field, or for further bedevilment of the taxpaying citizens.

Omnibus Appropriation Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 18, 1950

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the drastic effect of the Taber-Thomas and

Jensen amendments to the omnibus appropriation bill is becoming apparent.

An article in today's Washington Post by the able columnist, Jerry Klutz, analyzes some of the drastic effects.

The House and Senate conferees will, I hope, eliminate the provisions contained in these amendments.

The article referred to follows:

THE FEDERAL DIARY—POSTAL, VA SERVICES FACING DRASTIC CUTS

(By Jerry Kluttz)

The Senate Appropriations Committee yesterday was warned that the House-approved Taber-Thomas amendment by itself would:

Drastically reduce postal services; force the firing of about 57,000 postal workers, and cut the Department's budget more than 200 million dollars under present operations.

The committee also was told that the Jensen turn-over amendment, also approved by the House, by itself, would:

Force the Veterans' Administration to abolish more than 23,000 jobs during the 1951 fiscal year; 15,000 administrative, and 8,000 in its medical department, and cripple operations to the extent that service couldn't be given veterans as required by law.

And those cuts would be merely the beginning. Both VA and Post Office would have to make additional job cuts under a combination of the Taber-Thomas and Jensen riders, as would most other Federal agencies.

"The effect of the two amendments, taken together," Budget Director Frederick Lawton told the committee, "cannot be estimated and unfortunately will require additional personnel to assure compliance with the limitations.

"The effect," he added, "might well be even more serious than anyone presently suspects."

That's the tip-off that the riders would knock off far more than the estimated 200,000 Federal jobs in the next year.

In a 3-hour session with the full Senate Appropriations Committee, Lawton and his staff dealt mainly with the many confusing, bewildering, and conflicting problems raised by the two House economy amendments. He asked the committee for clarification on scores of points.

EFFECTS SUMMARIZED

The Jensen amendment, Lawton said, would have this effect on these few selected agencies:

VA: A total reduction of personnel in all programs of slightly more than 23,000. The amendment excludes doctors, nurses, and other medical personnel, but not service employees in the hospitals.

"It is obvious," Lawton said, "that these reductions to the programs for handling veterans' claims, insurance matters, applications for education and training, for loans, etc., will cripple the Administration to the extent that service could not be rendered to veterans as required and as is due them under laws enacted by the Congress.

"The reductions in the medical program," Lawton pointed out, "will make it absolutely impossible to activate new hospitals which will be available for operation during the 1951 fiscal year, will further curtail outpatient medical care to veterans with service-connected disabilities, and will tremendously increase the backlogs of veterans awaiting hospitalization or out-patient care."

HURT MILITARY POWER

Defense agencies: The Budget Director told the committee that they would be forced to fire civilians and to replace them with military people, thereby reducing military striking power. "This," he said, "would be in conflict with the existing policy against filling civilian billets with military personnel."

Lawton added that custodial help in ordnance plants and navy yards had a high turn-over which would result in maintenance problems. Also, that turn-over among skilled workers averaged about 30 percent annually. To cut this staff, he said, would have an adverse effect on the production, rehabilitation, and repair of weapons.

General Services: This agency, Lawton brought out, has a turn-over in custodial jobs up to 200 percent a year. As a result, he added, "it is expected that by the end of the fiscal year 1951 the level of maintenance and security operations in Government office buildings would be reduced to an extremely low level." He also said it would be impossible to maintain some operations on a 24-hour basis as they are now.

MUST FILL SOME VACANCIES

Post Office: The Budget Chief said that many of its 42,000 offices have less than 10 employees. "Inability to fill vacancies," he said "would present a major problem since the transfer of personnel between such offices would be difficult and expensive." He also said that rural mail routes were a one-man operation and unless vacancies in them could be filled that routes would have to be consolidated to an impracticable point.

It was clear that Lawton and his staff had far more misgivings about the Taber-Thomas amendment than the Jensen rider. He told the committee that he didn't know how it could operate in many circumstances. The committee, incidentally, has invited both Chairman CANNON, of the House Appropriations Committee, and Representative TABER (Republican, New York), to explain what the House had in mind when it approved the amendment.

Selecting a few agencies, Lawton told the committee the Taber-Thomas rider would have these effects:

Federal security: That St. Elizabeths and Freedman's Hospitals here would have to cut service to patients, and that Public Health hospitals would have to reduce food, drugs, clothing, etc., for its staff and patients. PHS doctors, nurses, etc., are exempt. A reduction would have to be made in the administrative staff of the old-age and survivors insurance despite the fact that their salaries are paid from a trust fund. This would result, Lawton said, in reduced service to beneficiaries who have contributed to the trust fund and who are entitled to prompt payments.

Defense agencies: Civilians serving in Army and Navy hospitals aren't exempt as are strictly medical employees in VA and PHS hospitals. The defense agencies also would have to put in an additional system of accounting to keep tab on the amendment.

FUNDS FOR RENT CUT

General services: The amendment cuts funds to pay rent. Lawton points out that 90 percent of the leases are on from 2 to 4-year terms, and that the leases can't be canceled without added cost to Uncle Sam.

Post office: A cut of $200,000,000 and 57,000 employees as noted above. Postal transportation costs couldn't be cut as required by the amendment as they are determined by volume of mail and rates fixed by regulatory agencies. Leases on already inadequate postal facilities would have to be canceled. The procurement of both stamps and money orders would have to be curtailed.

VA: Its budget would be cut about $53,000,000 and $35,000,000 of it would apply to personnel. So, an additional cut of 12,100 would have to be made; 7,600 in administration, and 4,500 nonmedical people in the Department of Medicine and Surgery.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FUNDS DISCUSSED

Lawton asked the committee if reductions under Taber-Thomas would be made in appropriations for the legislative and judicial branches and the District of Columbia government, and by whom, if it is determined they are to be covered.

He points out that the Library of Congress, Government Printing Office and other such agencies appear to be covered by Taber-Thomas. On the other hand, the Jensen rider clearly exempts any agency in the legislative or judicial branches, or the District government.

"With respect to the District of Columbia," Lawton testified, "it is considered that the intended action should be clearly spelled out." He referred to the Taber-Thomas amendment.

The Jensen turn-over amendment exempts scientific and technical jobs in the Atomic Energy Commission and the armed services which Lawton said "indicates a desire not to jeopardize employment of such personnel in the interests of national defense."

But the Budget Chief explained that the Bureau of Standards, the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics and the Research and Development Board does work for these agencies, and their personnel would be covered by the rider.

A copy of Lawton's statement on the House-approved budget was given to each member of the Senate committee. A committee member allowed this reporter to study his copy.

Living in a Glass House and Throwing Stones

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is about time that the mask be stripped from our political and mud-slinging President. I am inserting an editorial from the Washington Times-Herald which at least has made a beginning in this important service to the American people:

DR. DREAMBOAT AND MR. PENDERGAST

Mr. Truman's speech at the Chicago stadium represented a tremendous effort to make people forget that he is the Pendergast gang's President, that he was a key figure in the Pearl Harbor conspiracy, that at Potsdam he was the architect of the brutal peace, and that his State Department is under the domination of the Communists and the English. It was an effort to make people forget the vast corruption and the vastly corrupting influence of his Administration.

TRUMAN ASKED FOR OPPOSITION

He should be promptly challenged by the Republican opposition on all of these charges and compelled to answer them—if he can. After all, Mr. Truman repeatedly asserted that he was talking facts and that he and his party "believe in giving the facts to the people." The facts about Mr. Truman are the facts he never mentioned.

It is all the easier for the Republicans to challenge Mr. Truman for he departed from his text to write the challenge. He expressed, as "a personal wish," the hope that the "opposition would come out for something and be a real opposition." Citing the death of parties in the past which failed to satisfy the people's needs, Mr. Truman said:

"We need a strong two-party system in this Republic of ours, and I sincerely hope the Republican party will profit by the examples I have cited."

That is a sufficient invitation for the Republican Party to start acting like an opposition, to forget the echoing "me too" of Willkie and Dewey, to throw overboard the Truman snare that it is high minded and patriotic to swallow the follies of the New Deal foreign policy by being bipartisan, and to challenge Truman on every one of the countless issues on which he is vulnerable.

Mr. Truman was not willing to discuss his lifetime association with the gunmen and vote thieves of the Kansas City mob. The Republicans should discuss it for him.

Mr. Truman was not willing to try to justify the monstrous deceit by which his predecessor and his party brought down the Pearl Harbor holocaust on America and threw this Nation into a war which has left the world immeasurably worse then it was before.

It will be remembered that, in 1945, when he finally released the secret reports of the Army board and Navy court which reported on the responsibility for Pearl Harbor, Mr. Truman said that the blame did not belong to his party and its leaders, but to the American people themselves.

"I think the country is as much to blame as any individual in this final situation that developed at Pearl Harbor," Mr. Truman said. "I came to the conclusion that the whole thing is the result of the policy which the country itself pursued."

REPUBLICANS MUST SPEAK

Mr. Truman in Chicago was unwilling to develop this thesis of the war guilt of the American people. It is the duty of the Republicans to counter this shameful libel.

Mr. Truman did not speak of his ratification at Potsdam of the Roosevelt deals at Tehran and Yalta which have sold half a billion of the world's inhabitants into the hands of the Soviet slavemasters—the very result which he is now using in justification of the outlay of more than $20,000,000,000 a year to prosecute the cold war. If he won't talk, the Republicans must.

Mr. Truman wended his way through the whole State of Wisconsin without ever once mentioning Senator MCCARTHY or the Wisconsin's Senator's charge that Communists have infiltrated his State Department and are determining policy there. It is up to the Republican opposition to bring out the facts. Mr. Truman says he likes facts.

Mr. Truman crossed the whole country without ever referring to the English parentage of his Secretary of State and of a policy pursued by that Secretary which preeminently and at all times is in the interest of England and is dictated by England when it is not being dictated by Communists. These are facts for Republican challenge.

Mr. Truman never discussed the enormous corruption which characterizes his administration, from petty smuggling and 5 percent rakeoffs by White House pets, through tolerated gambling which feeds the Democratic coffers in every big city and almost every State, down to the bribery of every segment of the body politic implicit in the operation of the Marshall plan.

He did not once talk honestly of the debasement of the currency through inflationary spending which robs every man, woman, and child of a little more of his savings each year this corrupt regime lasts.

If Mr. Truman won't speak, Republicans must.

Mr. Truman was willing only to talk about dream castles and to pledge himself to help everybody's dreams come true. Never could a stranger "genie of the lamp" be conjured up than this busted haberdasher who all his life has consorted with the scum of the Kansas City gang.

The New Deal, in fact, is less a political philosophy than a blight. It will kill the country if the country doesn't vote it out of power.

Blow to Kings Point

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY J. LATHAM
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 18, 1950

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to set forth in the RECORD the following editorial which appeared in the May 14 issue of the Long Island Daily Press:

BLOW TO KINGS POINT

The end of monthly allowances for cadets at the Kings Point Merchant Marine Academy is a serious blow to that important institution in Great Neck.

In voting down an appropriation bill, Congress may have sounded the knell of training for merchant marine officers comparable to that given Army officers at West Point and Navy officers at Annapolis.

In any event the Academy cannot now fulfill commitments which induced many of the cadets to enroll there. At the same time, the end of the allowances may result in a sharply reduced enrollment in future classes.

In voting down the maritime training bill, Congress cut off the $65-a-month allowance to the cadets. It is that allowance which makes it possible for a large portion of the Academy's student body to attend classes there. Without it, many of them may be unable to go on with the specialized education the Academy offers. Boys who must have financial help if they are to enter the Academy no longer will be able to enroll.

The allowance ends July 1. If it is to survive, Kings Point will now have to seek applicants for admission whose family financial status makes it possible for them to attend college without the governmental allowance.

Defeat of the maritime training bill was a serious mistake.

Martin Gorski

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. CHAUNCEY W. REED
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 17, 1950

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. MARTIN GORSKI, late a Representative from the State of Illinois

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the sudden and unexpected death of our esteemed colleague, MARTIN GORSKI, filled my heart with sadness. Born in Poland, he came to Chicago at the tender age of three. Without the advantage of wealthy parents, he determined nevertheless to secure for himself a good education. After graduation from high school he attended first, a business college and then the Chicago Law School from which he received his bachelor of laws degree in 1917. These were evening schools and he was thus enabled to earn his way by working during the daytime. As a member of the Chicago Bar, his progress was rapid. He became successively an assistant State's attorney and master in chancery of the superior court of Cook County, which latter office he held for 14 years.

In 1942 the people of his congressional district chose him as their representative and he came to Washington as a Member of the Seventy-eighth Congress. He was re-elected to the Seventy-ninth, Eightieth, and Eighty-first Congresses. During the 7 years that he served he and I were drawn closely together. Although of different political faiths, we had a number of things in common. We were both from Illinois; we were both lawyers, and the congressional districts we represented, although not adjoining, were but a few miles apart. I had been a member of the Committee on the Judiciary for several years and was delighted when, during his first term, MARTIN GORSKI was elected to membership in that great committee. Then, again, he was immediately appointed by chairman Hatton W. Sumners, as a member of the same subcommittee to which I had been assigned. We served together on that subcommittee during the entire remainder of his congressional career and I came to know him well. He was modest, unassuming, conscientious, and gentlemanly. It did not take long for the members of our committee to appraise his real worth. That he was an able lawyer, there could be no doubt. Often he accepted assignments for special studies of proposed legislation and the opinions which he rendered on the legal questions involved, won for him the respect of every member of our committee. We have missed him since his demise and shall never forget his outstanding service. It was my sad duty to be one of the official party from this Congress to attend his funeral. The outpouring of people in all walks of life who assembled to pay their respects to his memory was ample evidence of the veneration in which he was held by those who knew him so well.

Some time, some day, our eyes shall see
The faces kept in memory;
Some day their hands shall clasp our hands
Just over in the morning land.

President Tells Western Farmers How He Would Run Their Farms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. JENISON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 18, 1950

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, there have been some revealing results in the wake of President Truman's so-called nonpolitical trek across the country. One significant and encouraging result has been the increasing tendency of the people themselves to weigh more carefully the campaign oratory pouring from the rear platform of the cross-country train being financed by taxpayer dollars.

There is increasing evidence of determination to think through many of the pleasant-sounding proposals skillfully

compounded to attract votes in the President's expressed program to drive from the Congress those obstructionists who do not believe in squandering the resources of the present and the future to maintain temporary political power.

In the great middle-western agricultural belt the President had much to say about his newest bid for farm support, the Brannan plan. An interesting commentary on this is to be found in an editorial from the Danville (Ill.) Commercial-News, one of the Gannett group of newspapers, and the largest newspaper in the congressional district I have the honor to represent. Conscientiously devoted to the interests of the rich agricultural area it serves, the Commercial-News offers a revealing editorial comment on the administration's program deserving of consideration by all Members of the Congress. For that reason I am including it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under permission granted to me in the House. The editorial follows:

PRESIDENT TELLS WESTERN FARMERS HOW HE WOULD RUN THEIR FARMS

The President, whose administration is spending in this one year more than the value of all the farms in this Nation, went out to Lincoln, Nebr., to tell the farmers how he'd run their business if they'll let him.

He acclaimed Federal farm policies as an unparalleled success, but admitted they have to be changed.

There is a great clamor, he said; production patterns have not been readjusted to peacetime needs—as, indeed, they could not under Federal price supports; stockpiles of wasted food threaten to become "too high" and farmer income has declined 20 percent in spite of $4,750,000,000 spent in taking food off the market and an additional $2,000,000,000 declared necessary for this year.

So without naming it, he again proposed the Brannan plan, which, he said, would check the decline in farmer income and at the same time make food cheap enough so that all the food products that cannot be put in caves will be used.

The Brannan plan is one that would continue price supports on basic crops—the President declined to specify which are basic—at a higher level than at present, and let perishables find their own level on a free market, the taxpayer paying to farmers the difference between the market price and a "fair return."

The President admitted that this scheme would require the Government to assume some measure of control over how a farmer could use his acres. But it would be nothing like, he said, those horrid labels that farmers themselves have attached to it—regimentation or socialization.

British farmers could dispel any doubts about that. They have been operating under a Brannan plan for some years and have no control over their plantings.

The President said this plan would swing more acres into production of livestock and animal products—a goal much to be desired. But he did not explain the first question that will occur to any Illinois farmer, namely, how to prop feed prices sky high and at the same time increase livestock production.

The Democratic Eighty-first Congress already has turned down the Brannan plan, even for a trial run. The major farm organizations oppose it. The citizens can only conclude that it is being urged by the President only because it is a politician's dream, a promise of high prices to the farmer and low prices to the city consumer.

Mr. Speaker, all of us are familiar with the wisdom of the familiar traffic warning—stop, look, and listen. In the present situation confronting the Nation, it is equally prudent to add one more word. We must stop, look, listen, and think. Our economic survival depends on it.

Explanation of a Proposed Bill To Establish a More Effective Secondary Market for Home Loans Insured or Guaranteed by the Veterans' Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 18, 1950

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the proposed bill is to provide a permanent and more effective secondary market for veterans' home loans.

A section-by-section analysis follows:

Section 1 of the bill cites the contemplated act as the "Veterans' Secondary Market Act of 1950."

Section 2 of the bill amends section 301 (a) (1) of the National Housing Act so as to limit the purchases by the Federal National Mortgage Association to loans insured or guaranteed by the Veterans' Administration. The Congress would thus recognize that the 4 percent interest rate on the VA loan, having a less attractive yield than other Government insured mortgages, necessitates the support of a Government secondary market in order to maintain a reasonable flow of private capital into the veterans' housing program.

This section also declares that it is the intent of the Congress that the Federal National Mortgage Association so conduct its purchase and sales program as to more effectively operate a revolving fund for the purchase of GI mortgages.

Section 3 of the bill amends section 301 (c) of the National Housing Act by substituting the Chairman of the Board of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the Federal Housing Commissioner as the one in whom would repose the authority to dissolve the Federal National Mortgage Association. This is deemed advisable because for several months almost 97 percent of the association's purchasing activity has been in VA loans, and the bill would contemplate limiting the Association's activity entirely to VA loans.

Section 4 of the bill amends section 302 of the National Housing Act by increasing the authorization of the Federal National Mortgage Association to $3,500,000,000 from the present $2,750,000,000 and would require that the Association make available for purchase by the public, the notes, bonds, debentures, or other such obligations which it may from time to time issue. This would eliminate the necessity of reflecting the Association's increased authorization in the Federal budget.

Section 5 of the bill amends section 306 of the National Housing Act by clarifying the authority of the Chairman of the Board of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation with respect to the Association, by prohibiting liquidation or winding up of its affairs so long as sections 501 and 502 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act are still in effect.

Let Congress Decide

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 18, 1950

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to an editorial that appeared in this week's issue of the Disabled American Veterans' Semimonthly entitled "Let Congress Decide."

There has been criticism directed at the proponents of the 16,000-bed hospital bill passed by the House recently. In my opinion, it has been unwarranted criticism and is due to a lack of knowledge of the facts as they exist.

There is not a Member of Congress who does not have hundreds of veterans' claims pending in his office—cases that at this moment are non-service-connected but after careful handling and proper presentation stand an excellent chance of being adjudged to be of service origin. A great many of these veterans are in poor physical and mental condition and need immediate hospitalization. It was to these sick veterans that I called the attention of the House when I supported the bill in question on the day it was before us. I stated then that the Veterans' Administration had a waiting list of 25,707 applicants for hospitalization, most of them potential service-connected cases. As vehemently as I could I called attention to the added burden that will be placed upon the VA hospitals through the closing of certain large service hospitals. I know that Congress does not intend that physically and mentally ill veterans should walk the streets without the care and treatment they deserve because of their war service.

The editorial follows:

LET CONGRESS DECIDE

A ray of sunshine brightened the critical VA hospital situation last month as the House passed a measure authorizing the restoration of 16,000 hospital beds eliminated by President Truman last year. Although the bill faces an uphill fight in the Senate, substantial progress was made in replacing these vitally needed facilities.

The bill had hardly cleared the House, however, when it was viciously attacked by the very man who should most want its provisions carried into law—that is, if he believes in performing the duties of his office. The person referred to is Dr. Paul B. Magnuson, medical director of the Veterans' Administration, upon whose shoulders rests the responsibility of providing adequate hospitalization and medical care for this Nation's disabled veterans. His immediate superior,

General Gray, also voiced opposition to the measure.

Unless someone is doing the thinking for these officials, their line of reasoning just doesn't make sense. With full knowledge of over 25,000 sick and neglected veterans walking the streets, dying with tuberculosis, and suffering from seriously aggravated mental conditions, these officials blandly state that additional facilities should not be approved by Congress.

These sick men who are presently walking the streets are the same men who sacrificed their health in defense of this country. It is a well-known but little-publicized fact that thousands of these so-called non-service-connected veterans have service-connected disabilities which are not yet adjudicated. Others have at least one service-connected disability but are denied hospitalization because the tuberculosis or mental condition they are afflicted with is adjudged non-service-connected.

The DAV claims service is constantly being flooded with letters, wires, and phone calls relating such tragic cases. Many are practically on their death beds before service-connection is granted. Many more are permanently removed from productive, useful lives because their disease is allowed to become chronic. They are granted non-service-connected pensions far more costly to the Government than prompt hospitalization.

Certainly this is not the kind of treatment expected or deserved by some 15,000,000 defenders when they were called into uniform to win World War II.

General Gray and Dr. Magnuson wail that it is impossible to staff the proposed 16,000 beds. Yet, with almost the same breath, they fire nearly 5,000 medical personnel. Although the layoffs have been postponed, the ax still hangs heavy over the heads of vital VA medical workers. We wonder if these officials think tactics of this sort will solve their problems in acquiring needed doctors, psychiatrists, and nurses.

The final decision must be made by Congress. If the 16,000 beds are to be restored and disabled veterans given a decent break, the DAV must offer these legislators conclusive proof that the situation warrants additional hospital beds. Our national commander and members of his staff have the proof and will present it to Congress.

President Truman's Address at Madison, Wis.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 19, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of the President at Madison, Wis., on Sunday, May 14, 1950, on the occasion of the dedication of Filene House, of the Credit Union National Association:

It is a pleasure for me to be here in Wisconsin, one of the great progressive States of the Union. And I am glad to be in Madison, a State capital and a university center in which so much has been done for the progress of our country.

I am happy to participate in dedicating Filene House, the international headquarters of the Credit Union National Association.

Credit unions offer people who have few resources a way of getting funds when they need them. I am told that last year, in the United States alone, credit unions had about 4,000,000 members and made loans totaling close to a billon dollars. This is a splendid record. It is a tribute to the values of thrift and self-help and mutual assistance.

This building will serve credit unions in the United States and Canada, and other areas in the Western Hemisphere. It will be a truly international headquarters—and, as such, it symbolizes the international character of cooperative activities. In whatever country they may be found these activities speak a common language and have a common goal.

Their common language may be found in the principles of self-help, mutual assistance, and democratic control. Their common goal is to solve, by joint action, problems which cannot be solved by acting alone.

The effectiveness of cooperative action has been demonstrated in many ways. In our country, farm cooperatives and cooperative stores have been successful. Use of the cooperative principle has brought electricity to rural areas. Use of the same principle offers new ways to solve the housing problem.

In a broader sense, moreover, cooperative action is the method we are using to solve problems we share with other nations.

Today, the United States is engaged with other free nations in a great cooperative endeavor to preserve freedom and achieve peace in the world.

This is the greatest problem we face.

We cannot solve it unless we work together.

No one nation alone can bring about peace. Together, nations can build a strong defense against aggression, and combine the energy of free men everywhere in building a better future for all of us.

That is the way to achieve peace.

That is why it is in the interest of each of the free nations to help one another.

The United States is a part of a world made up of many nations and many peoples. This world is constantly being drawn close to us by improved communications and improved transportation. It is also being drawn close—dreadfully close—by weapons of destruction which become ever more terrible.

We could not, even if we wanted to, go our own way and let the rest of the world go its own way.

You remember the situation when our own country was formed. There were 13 separate colonies scattered along the Atlantic coast. Each of them could have tried to get along as an independent nation. But they were wise enough to realize the folly of such a course. They decided to band themselves together in a common cause. And out of that decision has grown the greatest nation the world has even seen.

In many respects, the whole world is now in the same position in which those Colonies found themselves in 1776. Remember, you can now go from Madison to Moscow much quicker than a man could go from Philadelphia to New York in those days. We must recognize that the march of events has joined the peoples of the world together in a common destiny whether we like it or not.

And yet the nations of the world are not ready, as the 13 Colonies were ready, to join together in one single government.

Indeed, one nation today is doing everything it can, short of war, to prevent common international action among nations. For the Communist philosophy feeds upon suspicion and hate and disunity. And the Communists are doing their best to break down the strength of the free nations of the world in an effort to bring more people under the domination of their godless creed.

This makes it more than ever necessary for us to work together with the other free nations, to preserve our freedom and to increase our common welfare.

If we are to achieve these ends, the free nations of the world must demonstrate that freedom leads to greater strength and a better life for the people.

One of the most important tasks that we must accomplish together is to create a sound economic system in the world. And to do that, we need to work together for more production in the free countries and more trade among them.

Our own country has grown strong and great by increasing production in all parts of the country and by expanding our internal volume of trade. The same kind of growth can occur in the world. All countries will benefit from a growing volume of international trade.

But that trace has to be on a basis of fair competition and mutual benefit among nations that stand on their own feet. That is what we have been working for ever since the war ended.

Our first step was to aid the recovery of nations whose economic systems were shattered by the war. We have given substantial assistance in the restoration of devastated areas and in the rehabilitation of industry and agriculture. The greatest example of this type of activity is, of course, the Marshall plan.

That program has been an extraordinary success. Three years ago, many of the Marshall-plan countries were on the verge of collapse and absorption by communism. Today, with our help, every one of them is stronger and better able to resist communism than at any time since the war.

The success of the Marshall plan demonstrates the value of international cooperation. It demonstrates that helping people to help themselves is one of the best ways to maintain and strengthen freedom.

In the rest of the world, just as in Europe, joint action to increase production is the key to trade, progress, and security. One reason why there is so much unrest and insecurity in vast areas of the world, is their low productivity and their inability to trade profitably with us and with other countries.

The problem in most of the rest of the world is different from that in Europe. The primary problem in Europe is to reestablish and expand a modern industrial and agricultural economy. In the underdeveloped areas of the world, the primary problem is to build such an economy in the first place. And that requires a very different kind of action on our part.

The greatest needs of the underdeveloped areas are modern scientific and technical knowledge to increase their skills, and the investment of funds to increase their productive capacity.

Today, more than half the people in the world are undernourished. Millions of farmers in Asia and Africa and Latin America still turn the ground with crude wooden plows. They know little about improved seed. Their livestock is underfed and diseased. Many of them have never even heard of soil conservation.

As these people become better educated and healthier, as they get more roads and factories and power plants, as they increase their output of agricultural and industrial products, they will slowly but surely play a larger part in the community of nations. In that way, they can attain progressively better living conditions and renewed faith in the promise of the democratic way of life. In that way, too, the United States and other free countries can acquire new sources of the things we need and new markets for the things we produce.

I am very glad that both Houses of Congress have authorized the Government to increase our program for aiding the underdeveloped areas to progress toward modern standards of health, education, transportation, and production.

I am determined that this work shall go forward energetically. I regard it as one of the most important factors in promoting

trade and one of the main hopes for world peace.

These cooperative programs to build a world economy which will bring increasing welfare to all free people, are vital to world peace.

So also is the work we are doing to strengthen the common defense of free countries against aggression.

And so is the effort we are making to create an effective world political order through the United Nations.

All these steps are essential to freedom and peace. They are all ways of putting into practice, in our relations with other nations, the basic cooperative principles of self-help, mutual assistance, and democratic control.

The measures we are taking to bring peace to the world are necessarily imperfect. We are working to solve a problem larger and more difficult than any other we have ever faced. We shall inevitably experience setbacks, as well as successes.

But we must continue to move forward, strongly and steadfastly, in cooperation with other free countries.

We have no other choice.

Isolationism is no alternative. Isolationism is a counsel of despair. Isolationism would bring on another war, and it would be a war in which we might stand alone against the rest of the world.

In our own self-interest, therefore, we must cooperate with other free nations. We must join with them in a common defense against aggression and in providing greater opportunities for human advancement.

But there is another reason why we must work together with the other free nations.

We have a moral duty to protect the exercise of freedom here and in other lands. As a Nation we are committed to the principle of freedom because we believe that men are created equal. Freedom is a relationship between equals.

We believe that men are equal because we believe that they are all created by God. The religious traditions which have flowed together to make the foundations of this Nation all emphasize that every individual is an expression of the spirit of God, and should be respected on that account.

Because of that relation between God and man, we believe that each man in himself has dignity and individual worth.

Because of that relation, we believe that all men are brothers, who must strive to live together in freedom and peace.

We would be unworthy of our traditions—we would violate our fundamental beliefs—if we failed to acknowledge and to live by the principles of brotherhood which bind men and nations together.

We must continue to exert our energy and our will, in cooperation with those who share our beliefs, that together we may create on this earth a community of free men, living at peace with one another and working together for the common good.

We must not falter or turn back.

We must go forward, in the faith that we are following the commandments of God, who is the Father of us all.

Mothers Are Our Natural Peacemakers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 19, 1950

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpt from Drew Pearson's last Sunday's broadcast over the American Broadcasting Co. network.

I was impressed by Mr. Pearson's tribute to mothers the world over, and for that reason I ask for and secured his permission to insert this timely Mother's Day statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

It follows:

Sometimes as we look at the problems I've just described, I can't help but think that the world's diplomats, especially behind the iron curtain, could take a little advice from those we honor today—our mothers.

For mothers are our natural peacemakers. Because they bring forth life, they set the highest standard on life. They are diplomats in family disputes, chief of staff in the kitchen, wizards of finance; they can mend anything from broken toys to broken hearts. Yet they never get a Congressional Medal or a Silver Star for just being a mother. They accept criticism or complaint, thoughtlessness or selfishness, and just go on being taken for granted.

Mothers are pretty much the same the world over, because they have a common bond—the desire to raise their children in peace. And if we could apply their philosophy to the rest of the world—a little wisdom, a little patience, a lot of common sense and much goodwill toward men—that would be the greatest guaranty that peace and democracy would not perish from this earth.

The President's Message to 1950 Conference of Mayors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the message sent by President Harry S. Truman to the 1950 annual conference of the United States Conference of Mayors which was held May 11 to 13, in New York City. This statement discusses problems of mutual concern to the cities and the Federal Government.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT TO THE ANNUAL CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES CONFERENCE OF MAYORS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Last year when the United States Conference of Mayors met in Washington I had the opportunity of addressing your meeting in person. I regret that I cannot be with you this year again.

I understand that, as was true last year, you have with you distinguished municipal leaders from cities in other countries. To these I extend the cordial welcome of the United States Government.

Strong cities are essential to a strong nation and a well-ordered world. Our cities are vital centers of a peaceful society, where our democratic rights and opportunities are expressed and practiced. They are the heart of our commercial and industrial life. They are strategic cores of our national defense and our internal security.

We have passed the time when we can think of the various elements of our political economy as unrelated or conflicting. Each is an organic part of our national life, fed by a common bloodstream. Urban insecurity makes all of us insecure. Our cities, on the other hand, are dependent for survival on the preservation and use of our land and natural resources and on a sound national economy.

The national concern for the well-being of our cities was illustrated last July when I signed the Housing Act of 1949. That act enables cities to begin clearing their slums and to provide decent housing for more low-income families.

That legislation is now being carried into action as you in your home towns determine and develop your own plans for your communities. Last year you looked to Washington to get you the help you needed. Now you have the opportunity for action on your own part.

I am pleased to learn that you are meeting this responsibility. Nearly 600 communities have already officially applied for Federal aid to provide public housing for low-income families. Although the slum clearance and urban redevelopment program is new and complex, some 375 localities have expressed interest in undertaking local projects, and about 80, exclusive of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, have already acted officially to obtain Federal funds for their initial projects.

This year, through the Housing Act of 1950, we have added to and expanded other types of housing assistance, particularly for lower cost and lower rental housing. That act has also set up practical machinery for further use and disposal of war and veterans' housing in your communities.

One proposal that I recommended this year did not pass the Congress—a proposal for Government help to housing for families in the lower middle-income range, particularly to cooperative housing. I am afraid the lack of such assistance may prove a real handicap not only to many families who need housing, but also to many of your cities in the relocation of families from slum areas you seek to clear. I am going to continue to seek more help for these families, but it is also partly your task to let the Congress know of the seriousness of this middle-income housing problem in your cities. We must not delay, however, in putting into effect the important housing measures we now have.

One of the major goals of our housing program is to increase the supply of rental housing and permit the orderly decontrol of rents without excessive hardship to tenants. As you know, I have recommended to the Congress the extension of rent control until June 30, 1951, as a protection to the tenant in a short housing market, and as a stabilization measure for the national economy. Along with the extension of controls we must continue our present policy of granting justifiable increases in rent to the landlord. Any rent-control policy must be fair to the landlord and to the tenant alike. Although it is, and will continue to be, our policy to decontrol rentals as the supply of housing in any community comes into reasonable balance with demand, it is estimated that as of June 30, 1950, 8,000,000 rental units in 40 States, 63 cities, and thousands of smaller communities will still require protection against the hazards of an acute housing shortage with all that portends for inflated rentals.

Under your vigorous leadership, I am confident that we are on our way to decent housing and better cities for our people.

Last year I discussed some of our joint financial problems. I am happy to report that progress is being made in developing proposals to alleviate tax losses that occur when the Federal Government acquires real

estate and reduces the property-tax base from which local governments derive their revenues. It is hoped that a legislative proposal may be ready for submission to the Congress at its present session.

Many of you are seriously concerned with prospective water deficiencies and are making great efforts to overcome them. The Federal Government is aware of the problems you face and has a very real interest in the availability of water for the peacetime needs of its citizens and for national security. Accordingly, you may be sure that the Public Health Service, the Water Resources Division of the Geological Survey, and other Federal agencies concerned with water, will be glad to assist you any way they can in solving your water-supply problems. In addition, I have appointed a temporary Water Resources Policy Commission to advise me on national policies in this field. I am sure that that Commission and all other Federal agencies will welcome suggestions from your group for ways to solve our water-supply problems better and faster.

I would like to call the attention of this conference to the national interest in peacetime planning for civil defense.

Civil defense is a mutual task in which the Federal, State, and local governments must share responsibility to the people. Since last October the Federal Government has transmitted a substantial amount of guidance material on the subject to the governors of the States for subsequent transmittal to their local governments.

Moreover, the Federal Government plans to release later this year a suggested plan for civil-defense organization which will serve as a guide to the States and municipalities.

In the meantime, I urge that you, as municipal leaders who will have primary responsibility for implementing civil-defense plans in the event of need, proceed with your local civil-defense planning in cooperation with State authorities and the Federal Government.

May I suggest, too, that in your city planning and building activities you pay particular attention to the municipal problems of strategic dispersion. Unless absolutely necessary, it is unwise to continue the building of vital municipal facilities in the center of cities already congested. The present trend toward municipal dispersion should be continued for civil-defense reasons.

The national interest is an inescapable part of your local responsibilities, just as the welfare of the community as a part of the responsibility of the Chief Executive. Your assistance to me, individually and through the United States Conference of Mayors, has been invaluable, and I am sure you know that my primary concern has always been the interest of the people to whom you and I alike are accountable.

Letter From Hon. William Benton, of Connecticut, Favoring FEPC Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter written by our colleague the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] favoring the FEPC bill, which was printed in the New York Times of yesterday.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEPC BILL FAVORED—SENATOR BENTON URGES ENACTMENT OF LEGISLATION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Arthur Krock's interesting column of May 11, criticizing my speech on the FEPC bill, should be contrasted by your readers with your editorial of May 10 on the FEPC. Reasonable and honest men may disagree on this issue, and Mr. Krock clearly seems to disagree with your editorial, at least in part. Your editorial says:

"Common sense, as well as experience in State and local legislation of this sort, indicates that the enforcement agency should be able to fall back on legal sanctions if its efforts at persuasion fail. There is no tyrannical power here, unless Congress and the Federal courts be viewed as instruments of tyranny."

The editorial further argues that an FEPC would "show the world outside our borders that we really mean it when we say that we believe in equality of opportunity." My Senate speech on May 9 documented the international implications of the legislation. Let me now answer those who object to the FEPC bill, as interpreted by Mr. Krock.

EXEMPTION OF EMPLOYERS

Is the exemption of employers with fewer than 50 employees unconstitutional? The Supreme Court upheld the Federal Unemployment Insurance Act, which exempts employers with fewer than 8 employees as well as all farmers and domestics. It upheld the Wagner Act, which applied only to employers, the Petrillo Act, which applied only to broadcasting employees; the Guffey Act, which applied only to the bituminous coal industry; the Sugar Act, which established quotas for offshore refiners but not for those on the mainland. We are all familiar with the many precedents upholding chain-store regulation and taxation according to size. Chief Justice Hughes said: "Congress may consider and weigh relative situations and needs. Congress is not restricted by any technical requirement but may make limited applications and resort to tests so that it may have the benefit of experience in deciding upon the continuance or extension of a policy which, under the Constitution, it is free to adopt. As to such choices, the question is one of wisdom and not of power."

Is the exemption of employers with fewer than 50 employees a "bad domestic policy"; is it either "a sham" or "an outrider for another bill which will affect all employers"? The opponents who are quoted by Mr. Krock have missed my point here. Although exempting the smaller-type employer, in store or factory or farm, the bill applies to around half of American nonfarm employees and this half is employed by a relatively small number of corporate units.

APPLICABLE TO LARGE GROUPS

By exempting employers of 50 or more, the bill brings the administrative problem within feasible bounds. But the exemption of smaller firms is based on policy more vital than mere administrative convenience. The bill is designed to apply only to the larger corporations and the labor unions, where the owners and bosses don't know and cannot know their employees. It is difficult for a small employer to fire an efficient worker because of racial prejudice, as it is difficult for him to desert loyal employees in ill health or old age. He knows his men and he has a feeling of responsibility and often of affection which vanishes in the personnel and employment offices of the big corporations, where employment policy tends to be discriminatory as well as soulless.

Are my conclusions sound as to the international impact of discriminatory practices at home? Here I can only refer him to the evidence exhaustively collected in my speech, including testimony by Dean Acheson, John Foster Dulles, and others responsible for our foreign policy. My position was not that we conduct our foreign policy merely in terms of its effect on Communist propaganda. Senator RUSSELL'S query as to whether we should repeal our Constitution was of course a gibe rather than an argument. We can never hope to win Communist approval, no matter how spotless our record; but we cannot afford to give a whip with which to flay us to our enemies who would destroy us. Our failure to pass the FEPC Act will hurt us abroad among the very peoples whose alliance we most want and need in the cold war. We can no longer afford to give reasonable men anywhere the ground for reasonable suspicion or justified criticism in this vital area of civil rights.

ORIGIN OF BILL

Where in fact did the FEPC bill originate? Mr. Krock says that according to available records the modern drive for this legislative concept seems to have had its inception in the Communist Party platform of 1928 and in the Daily Worker of the same year. Walter White, president of the National Association for the Advancement of the Colored People, replies to Mr. Krock on this point in the Times of May 16 by tracing the movement back to 1909, and even before. I prefer to believe that the FEPC idea really began in the Book of Genesis itself, where it is written that God created man in his own image. FEPC is reflected in the Sermon on the Mount and in all true Christian teaching ever since. And FEPC was first translated into political terms by a document somewhat antedating the Daily Worker, a document which declared as a self-evident truth that all men are created equal.

Our unfinished business is all too obvious. The FEPC bill and the rest of President Truman's civil-rights program should be enacted into law. Entirely apart from the fact that justice demands it—that we betray our democratic ideals if we refuse it—our national security is involved to a far greater extent than has been publicly recognized. There is no time to lose.

WILLIAM BENTON.
WASHINGTON, *May 13, 1950.*

What's Good in Labor-Management Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 19, 1950

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, when we hear of strikes, we sometimes forget that most employers and most workers have peaceful industrial relations. We also tend to forget that it is collective bargaining in good faith between management and labor that avoids labor disputes and that settles strikes when they do occur.

On April 14, my friend, Millard Cass, addressed a church group here on "What Is Good in Labor-Management Relations." Referring to his speech, the Labor Leader, published by the Association of Catholic Trade Unionists, said:

Millard Cass, Assistant to the Under Secretary of Labor, gave an effective and common sense answer to the proponents of the

theory of continuing class-warfare in a talk 2 weeks ago.

I believe the Members of the Congress will find Mr. Cass' speech interesting and enlightening. Under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including Mr. Cass' address as follows:

It is still dark most days when America's farmers rise for their chores. And it is not too much brighter when their fellow-workers start out to make our great industrial machine run. Hours later, when the sun has sunk below the rim of San Francisco Bay, the farmers and industrial workers who are the backbone of our country wearily seek the rest earned by honest labor.

Farmers and workers plant crops and run machines, harvest grain and assemble products, run tractors and build houses. From Bangor to Seattle, from Miami to Los Angeles, from Chicago to New Orleans, the heartbeat of our country is strong and warm and rhythmical.

Ours is a land of myriad differences and astounding similarities—but through it all runs a common thread. From the Atlantic to the Pacific, from the Great Lakes to the Gulf, we are a single, united people. We come from many lands, many strains, and many races, and we worship God in different ways. We speak the same language, but we speak it with a variety of accents. Nevertheless, in 48 States and the District of Columbia, the words "democracy" and "freedom" have the same spine-tingling effect. This is "the land of the free"—this is a people with a common goal and a great destiny.

Our greatness is not merely a matter of Federal and State constitutions and natural resources. It is primarily a matter of folks—farmers and workers and businessmen—millions of fine, independent Americans. They have a common interest in a better way of life for all our people. Those who have made our country great have a real community of interest—whether they be farmers, industrial workers, or businessmen. They grow the food, produce the goods, and consume the products of America's great agricultural and industrial machine. They constitute the consumer demand that makes us prosper.

Sometimes we forget these good things about our country and our way of life. All too often we take our great achievements for granted and merely criticize our imperfections and weaknesses. To be sure, a critical review of our society, our economy, and our democracy is always in order. Good as it is, our way of life is not perfect. Growth and development are a mark of the democratic system. We must be constantly vigilant to improve, expand, and strengthen our democracy.

Nevertheless we need not be unduly modest about our accomplishments. We would be unrealistic, unpatriotic and ungrateful if we did not feel proud of our democracy and our economy. In spite of its imperfections, ours is the greatest and best country in the world. Make no mistake about that.

We have been lucky. That we must admit. We are endowed with great natural resources, large and diversified areas and a wide and healthful range of climate. We did not suffer devastation from the two World Wars. Nevertheless, these factors do not even begin to explain or account for our greatness. Many other countries have all of these assets, but have failed to achieve our political or economic strength or our democratic freedoms.

We have been lucky, but we have also been industrious, courageous, and ingenious. We have worked and fought and sacrificed for what we got. We have developed the highest standard of living the world has ever known and the greatest productive machine extant. We have retained and protected individual freedom and kept our faith in God. And we are dedicating a significant share of our bounty to help other nations preserve their democratic freedoms and strengthen their economies. This is at the same time both an act of generosity and an investment in our own well-being.

With all this we sometimes tend to forget the good things about our country. This is as true in the field of industrial relations as in any other. We read about strikes and lockouts and hear about industrial disputes, but we seldom know when a contract is signed peacefully. We hear a great deal about disagreements between employers and workers, but we seldom are informed about labor-management cooperation. As a result, some people conclude that employers and workers are opposing classes having antagonistic interests. This was the false premise adopted by Marx and Engels over 100 years ago. It is even more wrong today than it was then.

There is in the United States a large and relatively unpublicized amount of labor-management cooperation. It is this industrial harmony that I want to discuss today. It is this good side of labor-management relations that has helped make us great. We could not have achieved our great production or distributed our largesse as widely among our people if we had not enjoyed a high degree of industrial peace and a large amount of joint endeavor by management and labor.

Labor-mangement cooperation is not dramatic. It seldom has news value, but that does not mean it is unimportant. Sometimes, our emphasis on news value warps our sense of lasting value. By devoting our attention to the sensational, we lose some of our sense of perspective.

We have carefully documented labor-management disputes, tried them in the newspapers, dramatized them with headlines, and compiled statistics with respect to their extent, duration, and cost in man-days of idleness. Only recently, however, has there been a widespread attempt to present the positive side of labor-management relations. It was the extensive and continuing dramatization of industrial disputes that led the National Planning Association, on the suggestion of Mr. Clinton Golden, to start a series of inquiries into the extent and causes of industrial peace. Some schools and colleges and some individuals from management, labor, and the Government have also decided to publicize the peaceful developments in the field of labor-management relations. Under the leadership of Secretary Tobin, the Department of Labor is taking an active interest in promoting and publicizing industrial peace. It is good to see that groups like your own are also interested in this positive side of industrial relations.

At the outset, it should be noted that union-management cooperation connotes an active policy of collaboration for the purpose of promoting the common interest of both management and the workers in a plant or industry. It is reflected by honest and sincere collective bargaining resulting in contractual relationships between the parties. It involves such things as participation by labor and management through joint committees in the elimination of wasteful methods of operation and plant inefficiency, in the introduction of new machinery or processes, and in the formulation of sales-promotion programs. It has even involved the lending of union funds to the company, the services of union specialists in production problems, and joint support of legislation in the interests of the industry.

Every year many thousands of collective-bargaining agreements between management and labor are peacefully negotiated. The number of such contracts has been variously estimated as from more than 100,000 to half a million. Tens of thousands of disputes and grievances are settled annually without a strike or lock-out. Hundreds of joint labor-management committees are still operating effectively. There are, under the auspices of the United States Department of Labor, 6,500 local joint apprenticeship committees. The 33,000 members of these committees, representing management and labor, work together to promote apprenticeship. Hundreds of persons from the ranks of management and labor are working together to promote industrial safety through the President's Conference on Industrial Safety. This is a continuing program sponsored by Secretary Tobin at the request of President Truman. In all of these fields workers and employers are working together to develop good human relations.

Shakespeare has said that: "The evil that men do lives after them. The good is oft interred with their bones."

This, unfortunately, seems to be the case in industrial relations. For example, how many of you know that the Crown Zellerbach Corp. and the Pacific coast pulp and paper industry have not had a single day's interruption of work for 14 years caused by a dispute between a paper mill and its employees? During this period only two grievances have been submitted to arbitration. No unfair labor practice charge has been filed under the National Labor Relations Act, and during World War II only one dispute was presented to the War Labor Board. All of this occurred in an industry which has region-wide collective bargaining. It occurred in a highly unionized industry where over 98 percent of the eligible workers belong to the International Brotherhood of Pulp, Sulphite, and Paper Mill Workers or the International Brotherhood of Paper Makers, which jointly possess the exclusive bargaining rights. Similar industrial peace has been achieved between the Hickey-Freeman Co. and the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, who have enjoyed a 29-year strike-free period of labor relations; the Nashua Gummed and Coated Paper Co. and seven AFL unions, which have had a 15-year-old collective-bargaining relationship with no strikes or lockouts; the Sharon Steel Corp. and the United Steelworkers of America, which have had only two strikes or work stoppages—both industry-wide steel strikes—during their 12 years of collective-bargaining relationship; the Lockheed Aircraft Corp. and the International Association of Machinists, which have settled 30,000 grievances over a 12-year period without a strike or lock-out; and the Dewey & Almy Chemical Co. and the International Chemical Workers Union, which have had a 9-year record of peaceful collective bargaining. These are a few examples of industrial peace taken from the studies by the National Planning Association on this subject.

The association has noted a number of factors normally existing in cases where there is a healthy labor-management relation. These are:

"Management—from top to bottom—genuinely accepts the process of collective bargaining, and the union as an institution.

"The union fully accepts private ownership and operation of the industry.

"The union is strong, responsible, and democratic.

"Mutual trust and confidence exist between the management and the union.

"Neither party has adopted a legalistic approach to the problems of collective bargaining.

"There have been no serious ideological incompatibilities between the company and the union leaders, nor within the union itself.

"Negotiations are 'problem centered'—the management and the union spend more time on solving concrete problems than they do on defining abstract principles.

"Grievances are settled promptly within a flexible procedure—many which could be processed through the grievance procedure clear to the top are handled quickly and informally.

"There are effective two-way communication channels between the management and the union.

"Management consults the union and encourages its participation in the making of important decisions.

"The line management organization, down through the foremen, fully accepts responsibility for industrial relations."

While emphasizing the absence of industrial disputes between the companies and unions which it is studying, the National Planning Association has noted that the lack of strikes is not the only criterion of healthy industrial relations. It has also noted that occasional strikes do not prove conclusively that labor relations are unhealthy.

Labor and management have a real community of interest, but their interests are not identical. As a result, there is bound to be some conflict in the course of day-to-day association in an industrial democracy. The important thing is whether the relationship which exists remains healthy, in spite of occasional conflict, or whether it deteriorates to warfare despite a common interest in industrial peace.

In this connection, it is worth noting that strikes today are very different from strikes a few years ago. As recently as the 1930's, strikes were frequently marked by violence and bloodshed. Today, on the other hand, peaceful labor disputes are the rule. Formerly the basic distrust and misunderstanding of the parties and the opposition of employers to collective bargaining by their workers made labor disputes virtually civil wars. Today, with each side recognizing the other, strikes are normally merely a test of economic power to achieve desired results and do not involve ancillary physical force. The result of this has been that strikes no longer breed the mistrust and hatred they formerly engendered. They no longer upset collective-bargaining relationships and disrupt them as they once did. The aftermath of strikes in continued grievances and continued suspicion has therefore, to a large extent, been eliminated.

In spite of the attention and publicity given strikes, they involve only a small percentage of the total work force and of the estimated total working time. In 1946 strike activity was at a peak. Even in that year, however, the percent of estimated working time lost by strikes was only 1.43. In 1949, when major stoppages accounted for over three-fifths of all man-days of idleness, only 0.59 percent of estimated working time was lost as a result of labor disputes. These work-stoppage statistics are an indirect method of demonstrating the high degree of labor-management cooperation during the year. By simple arithmetic, it is apparent that 99.41 percent of estimated working time was utilized productively, without work stoppages. That means that in 1949 labor relations were almost as pure as Ivory soap.

This labor peace reflects the desire of management and labor generally for industrial harmony. Both sides are well aware of the cost of strikes and lock-outs. They know that while the public suffers from labor disputes, it is the parties themselves who suffer first and most.

Workers do not treat lightly the stopping of their income, with all its attendant consequences. It is not easy to take a step that will cut off the funds necessary for food, rent, and clothing, and that may jeopardize the equity in a home or car, a radio or a refrigerator. Workers turn to the strike weapon only as a last and desperate resort. Strikes are not born full bloom. They grow from disputes, inequities, or injustices. They are a gamble on economic force to which workers sometimes turn when all else has failed to resolve a dispute.

Employers also have much to lose from industrial warfare. During strikes or lockouts, they find themselves without income but with continuing responsibilities and expenses. Owners demand profits, and stockholders require dividends. Competitive position can be impaired and markets for products can be lost during a prolonged cessation of operations. It is clear that economic necessity requires labor and management to seek industrial peace.

Richard Steele wrote in the Spectator in 1744 that "The noblest motive is the public good." This concept has been responsible for much industrial harmony. A trade-union statesman recently said: "In a free society, workers have the right to strike and employers the right to suspend an operation. But neither possesses the right to injure severely or irreparably innocent fellow men. Both owe a prior obligation to society." Recognition of this obligation has induced the parties in many instances to agree to voluntary arbitration, fact-finding boards, or postponements of strike action or shutdowns. Both sides have frequently demonstrated real statesmanship in this regard. One caveat should be noted, however. It is unfair and unwise to count upon workers or employers to shoulder the full cost of promoting and protecting the public interest. For example, if workers believe they need and deserve a wage increase, it is fine to say that they should not strike to get it because the public interest requires continued operation of that industry. From the employees' standpoint, however, it will appear that the public is demanding of these workers greater sacrifices for the public good than it is demanding of other segments of the population. The public should have as great an interest in right and fairness as it has in continuity of operations.

Mutual understanding is a prerequisite to labor-management cooperation. An industrialist recently stated that: "When management and employees understand one another, have mutual respect and mutual confidence in one another, and when both management and employees feel that they are getting a fair deal from the other side, * * * we have made one important step toward achieving labor peace." That need for understanding and confidence is a fertile ground for all who are really interested in industrial peace. There is still much to be done to bring the story of labor to management and the story of management to labor.

Development of mutual understanding is not achieved in one day. It comes from long and honorable association and is founded upon good faith. There can be no understanding where management is antiunion or labor is not sympathetic to the need for profit in a free enterprise economy. There can also be no continuing understanding where the rules of the game inspire distrust. Legislation that inspires animosity, distrust, and fear is, therefore, an impediment to industrial peace. It is for that reason, among others, that the Taft-Hartley Act has not promoted labor-management cooperation.

Mutual understanding must be based upon knowledge as opposed to ignorance—facts as opposed to fiction. It is up to employers and workers to supply each other with the information necessary to an understanding of their respective problems and needs.

I do not look at the world through rose-colored glasses. I did not arise this morning singing a song from Pippa Passes, and concluding that "All's right with the world." Nevertheless, I do believe that there is much that is good in labor-management relations. Emphasizing healthy industrial relations will not only help us see ourselves in truer prospective but will assist us in our quest for sound and enduring industrial peace.

The Statehood Bills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 19, 1950

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Washington Daily News of May 16, 1950:

TIME'S RUNNING OUT

Several Members were absent when the United States Senate's Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs held its weekly meeting yesterday.

So the committee did not take up the bills, already passed by the House, to grant statehood to Alaska and Hawaii.

Senator O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, the committee's chairman, said he hopes the statehood bills will be considered next Monday.

Surely they should be—and not merely considered but approved and made ready for an early vote in the Senate.

Time is running out. A few more weeks, and Congress will be itching to adjourn so its many Members who are seeking reelection can go home and start campaigning.

It will be a sad thing if the statehood measures get lost in the shuffle.

Sad for the people of Alaska and Hawaii, who are hoping that Congress at last will keep the promises of both major political parties and give them statehood.

Sad for the people of the United States, who need these two great Territories in the Union now as bastions of national defense and as evidence that America means what it says when it professes devotion to the principle of self-government.

Revision of Administrative Procedure of Customs Bureau

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRVING M. IVES
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD, following this brief statement, the context of a resolution of the board of directors of the Greater Endicott Chamber of Commerce, of Endicott, N. Y., in opposition to a bill to revise administrative procedure in the Bureau of Customs.

Mr. CONNALLY. Reserving the right to object, is the matter which the Senator submits to be printed in the Appendix?

Mr. IVES. It is a resolution, Mr. President, from a chamber of commerce, and it is addressed to the Congress.

Mr. CONNALLY. Did the Senator request that it be printed in the Appendix?

Mr. IVES. I requested that it be printed in the body of the RECORD.

Mr. CONNALLY. I object.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, so long as there is an objection, I am perfectly willing that the resolution be printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE GREATER ENDICOTT CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

At a regular meeting of the board of directors of the Greater Endicott Chamber of Commerce held at the Hotel Frederick on the 12th day of April 1950, the following resolution was duly offered, seconded, and unanimously carried, to wit:

"Whereas it has become known that a bill to revise administrative procedures of the Bureau of Customs is now being prepared in Washington; and

"Whereas such bill provides, among other things, for the elimination of the American selling price principles as heretofore established and a reduction of the protective tariffs with regard to rubber and rubber soled canvas footwear; and

"Whereas such proposed legislation is contrary to the long-established tariff policy of the Federal Government; and

"Whereas such legislation if adopted, would directly affect the manufacturers of rubber and rubber soled canvas footwear in this community, and would eliminate the jobs of an estimated 1,500 employees: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Greater Endicott Chamber of Commerce go on record as being opposed to the proposed changes above mentioned and that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to our Representatives in Congress and other interested executives of the Federal Government."

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution duly adopted by the board of directors of the Greater Endicott Chamber of Commerce, at a regular meeting thereof held on the 12th day of April 1950.

FRANK J. BALL,
Secretary, Greater Endicott Chamber of Commerce.

Remarks of President Truman at Breckenridge, Minn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the remarks of our President, Harry S. Truman, which were made on May 13, 1950, on his visit to Breckenridge, Minn.

There being no objection, the President's remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am glad to be back here in Minnesota once more. I had a grand time here about 2 years ago, when I was running for office.

During the past week I have traveled across the great plains and the Rocky Mountains nearly to the Pacific Coast, and back again through Montana and North Dakota. I have been reporting on what the Government is doing and how it is working with your State and local governments to build a better America. In the last few days I have been talking particularly about reclamation and flood control.

What has been happening this last month in northern Minnesota, in North Dakota, and in Canada, proves the necessity of our going ahead with flood control projects on a national basis.

North of here, along the Red River a great many cities and towns have been overrun by devastating floods. The Army, the National Guard, State governments, the Red Cross and other agencies are all working together to relieve the distress. I have allocated $150,000 from the President's emergency fund to help restore some of the damage done by these floods in Minnesota. I have a very small emergency fund, and I have given you all I can.

But relief after floods have come does not help much more than locking the barn door after the horse has been stolen. These tragic floods bring home to all of us how important it is to prevent costly floods in the future. I have been glad to see your own Senator HUMPHREY taking the lead in working for flood-control projects. And he happens to be on the train with me tonight.

Unfortunately, there are always some people who are afraid to plan for the future. Every time the Federal Government looks very far ahead, some of our opponents will yell it costs too much, we have got to cut the budget. And they have been trying to cut my budgets ever since I have been President. They always come up with a little more than I ask them to give me on a subject that I am not interested in, but they try to cut the things that help the country.

I happen to know that some people have tried to say that to Senator HUMPHREY, but I am glad to know that he doesn't pay any attention to these cries of false economy. I am proud to say that he knows that a few dollars spent on flood control today will save a great many dollars in the future—not to mention homes, farms, industries, and even lives.

The same thing goes for all of our domestic and international programs. Some people cry that we should cut down on education, housing, and health. I say that this is the worst form of false economy. A few dollars spent here will pay rich investments in the future in building a higher standard of living, and a stronger Nation.

The economizers—they are not really economizers, they are anti-Trumanites—also cry that we must stop spending money on our national defenses and stop sending money abroad. This, too, is another form of false economy. It is going to be difficult and expensive—make no mistake about it—to get the world back on the road to peace.

But the expense is nothing at all compared with the catastrophe of a third world war. We have got to make sure that for every dollar we spend we get a dollar's worth of value. We have to have true economy by making sure we don't spend money on anything we don't actually have to have.

But we can't stand false economy if we are going to succeed in building a stronger United States and a peaceful world.

Now, I have been spending my time since Japan folded up in September 1945, trying to get a peaceful world. I have done everything I possibly can, and those who have been with me in the Cabinet have done everything possible, to obtain peace in the world.

Now, to obtain peace in the world, the United States must remain strong itself. In order to remain strong, we must have a national defense establishment which is strong enough to meet the aggressors. We must have an economic set-up that is strong enough to keep the country prosperous. That's all in the world I am working for.

I took this trip around the country just to explain to the people exactly what I am trying to do and what the Government is trying to do to obtain peace, and to maintain that strong economy.

You know the Constitution provides that the President of the United States once a year goes down and speaks to the Congress on the state of the Union. Well, now, what I have done since I left Washington, a week ago—it will be a week tomorrow—I have been facing the people and giving the people a message on the state of the Union, and what I think will be best for the welfare of this country and what I think will contribute to peace in the world.

I am here for that purpose, and I want you to see what I look like, and I want you to understand that I am not running for office. I ran for office in 1948 and had right good luck. I am merely reporting to you as the head of the Government and as your servant. The President and the Vice President are the only men in the United States who are elected at large by the whole people of the United States, and I think it is right and proper that a report should be made to you every so often, personally, by the man who is responsible for carrying on the executive branch of the Government.

I can't tell you how very much I appreciate this wonderful and cordial reception into Minnesota. This sort of reception has met me everywhere—at Galesburg, Ill.; in Ottumwa, Iowa; in Lincoln, Nebr.; in Casper, Wyo.; in Pendleton, Oreg.; and Grand Coulee Dam, in Washington—Butte and Grand Falls, in Montana; at Minot, in North Dakota. And at Fargo, N. Dak., just a while ago, they told me that they had the biggest crowd that Fargo had ever had in its history. And it looked to me like all the people in North Dakota were there.

Now, here I have come into Minnesota, almost at midnight, and it looks to me as if everybody in this great State of Minnesota is here. They tell me there are more people up ahead of the train than there are behind it. I appreciate that more than I can tell you, and I am more than happy to have your Senator HUMPHREY with me on the train tonight. Thank you very much.

I am sorry that I can't present to you Mrs. Truman and Margaret. They have had a most terrific day, and they had to go to bed.

Diamond Jubilee, Sons of the American Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me before the Diamond Jubilee Convention of the Sons of the American Revolution, May 15, 1950, at the Claridge Hotel in Atlantic City, N. J.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Gentlemen, I want you to know that I feel deeply privileged by the invitation to address the diamond jubilee of the Sons of the American Revolution, an organization

which has always stood for America—American first, last, and always.

It is truly an honor to meet with you, the descendants of men who successfully fought against almost insurmountable odds to establish a free nation dedicated to the dignity of man and the freedom to worship God—you, whose forefathers established a free nation in a world of despotism, a nation which was destined to grow to be the most powerful on earth.

Your organization was born of a revolution—a revolution which gave birth to freedom and independence. Today the world is torn by another revolution, one which threatens to destroy what was won by your ancestors whom we today honor.

Before discussing this modern revolution of destruction and the impetus given it by some high officials in our Government, I would like to take a few moments to clarify two things which I am asked about most often.

The first has to do with the skeleton files which the President has given to the Tydings committee, which was created to investigate my charges of communism in our Government. Rather than take your time on the subject of files, or express my personal opinion thereon, I have made photostats of the reports made by the chief investigator of the House Appropriations Committee which investigated those files. This report is based partly on an FBI investigation of those files made shortly before that time. This FBI report, you understand, was made before the present fight about files. I have made sufficient photostats so that as many of you as care to may take them along with you. But for the benefit of the listening audience who cannot see those photostats, I might say that they set forth in some detail that the files were inadequate, in that many of them had been completely rifled, that practically everyone in the division had complete, free access to take material from the files whenever he cared to, and, in effect, that there is no way of knowing whether or not any file was complete. And, gentlemen, those are the files which the President is giving the committee.

That is one of the reasons why I repeatedly warned the committee that in order to arrive at the truth, they must get not only the skeleton State Department loyalty files, but the civil service and the FBI files. So much for that.

Another question often asked is in regard to the methods employed. A number of my friends say, "While we agree you are getting the job done, McCARTHY—a job that is 16 years overdue—we wonder if it couldn't be accomplished by some other method."

Gentlemen, this is the roughest fight I have ever been in—and it has only started. As we cut nearer to the quick and more seriously threaten the plans of those traitors to America, the squealing will become louder and the fight will become tougher.

Gentlemen, when I was a small boy on the farm, mother raised chickens. The eggs and meat furnished groceries and much of the clothing for our family of nine. We lived fairly close to the woods, and weasels, snakes, and skunks would steal the baby chicks from beneath the mother hen and kill them.

One of the jobs which my three brothers and I had was to dig out and destroy those killers. It was not a pleasant job—and sometimes we did not smell too well when the job was finished. But the skunks were dead and the chickens alive.

A much more dangerous and smellier breed of skunk is now being dug out in Washington.

And to those of you who say that you do not like the rough tactics—any farm boy can tell you that there is no dainty way of clubbing the fangs off a rattler or killing a skunk.

I intend to continue with this job. It cannot be done with kid gloves. It has been a bare-knuckle job. It will continue as such.

I have also been flooded with questions as to my reaction to the paranoic attack by Senator CHAVEZ last Friday on Louis Budenz, who testified that the State Department's high policy adviser, Owen Lattimore, was a member of a Communist cell.

CHAVEZ was supported on the Senate floor in his attack on Louis Budenz by the administration leader, Senator LUCAS, and the chairman of the investigating committee, Senator TYDINGS.

Obviously, in this rugged fight, the Kremlin is reaching into high places for dupes to spew its malignant smear.

On May 25 when I am to speak before an editors' convention, I intend to answer in detail this vicious assault made on a witness upon whom the Department of Justice and the FBI have placed great reliance in the prosecution of dangerous enemies of the country, like the 11 top Communist leaders found guilty before Judge Medina.

Had it not been for the hundreds of hours of help given by Louis Budenz to the FBI and the Department of Justice, many of the Communist conspirators now in jail would still be free to do their dirty work of undermining the United States.

I would like to discuss with you gentlemen today the details of a most dangerous hoax—a most vicious fraud which is being perpetrated on the American people by men of little minds who have been honored with important jobs in our Government. It is a conspiracy conceived in the dark, hidden corridors of communistic treachery—a conspiracy which, if not destroyed, will condemn to death millions of American young men. But the sands in the hourglass of time are fast running out. If this conspiracy is to be destroyed, the job must be done now; not years from now; not months from now, but within a matter of weeks, days, or even hours. Before spelling out the details of that conspiracy, let me first give you some of the background setting in which it was conceived.

Six years ago, at the time of the first conference to map out the peace (Dumbarton Oaks), there was within the Soviet orbit, 180,000,000 people. Lined up on the anticommunistic side there were in the world at that time, roughly 1,625,000,000 people. Today, only 6 years later, 800,000,000 people are under the absolute domination of Soviet Russia—an increase of over 400 percent. This indicates the swiftness of the tempo of Communist victories and American defeats in world war III.

While this is a long step forward in the Godless communization of the world—the avowed aim of the Communist Party—it cannot, of course, be successful until the United States is conquered. Twenty years ago the Communists officially decided that a necessary step prior to the destruction of the United States was the conquest of China—the remaking of it into a Red China, which could be controlled from the Kremlin—and then the transformation of the Pacific into a Red lake.

Communist determination to conquer America is not new. The determination to rip from the heart of America the rights for which freemen now stand is as old as communism, but yet as new as the latest edict from the Kremlin to its puppet traitors in our Government today.

A Red China and a Red Pacific are so necessary to the success of the Communist plans for world domination that Premier Stalin has always personally taken the responsibility for controlling the China and Pacific policy for the Comintern. In 1931, he instituted a most concentrated campaign to make the Pacific a "Red lake." In 1931 he moved the Pan-Pacific Secretariat from Shanghai to San Francisco. This meant that all the infiltration activities in the Asiatic colonial war, plus that into Japan and Australia, and the new infiltration into China was to be operated from the United States. This called for development of the Communist organization in the Northwest region of the United States, on the coast and in the Hawaiian Islands—all synchronized as closely as possible with the communization of China and the Islands of the Pacific. But the key to success was China and as Stalin realized without a Red China, his plans for a Red Pacific and world wide communism would fail.

Stalin's plan to create a Red China and to make of the Pacific a Red lake, as a prelude to taking over America, is no more secret than Hitler's aims were secret in Mein Kampf. No man who claims to be even remotely worthy of a job in the Far Eastern Division of our State Department can claim to be ignorant of that fact. It can be read in the official Communist program, which is available to anyone in the Department.

In this connection it is interesting to note that Senator STYLES BRIDGES, approximately 3 years ago, when questioning the fitness of John Carter Vincent, who at that time was head of the Far Eastern Division, pointed out in a letter to Dean Acheson that Vincent had been following the officially published Communist program for the conquest of Asia down to the last comma. The Secretary of State's answer was, and let me quote it:

"Mr. John Carter Vincent (Mr. Acheson's top advisor on Chinese affairs) advises me that he has never even read the two Communist documents under reference. I have never read them myself."

This coming from men who are supposed to be leading 152,000,000 people in a fight against Communist aggression—this coming from men in charge of the spending of billions of dollars to fight communism—certainly does not require comment.

Let me repeat Acheson's words:

"Mr. John Carter Vincent advises me that he has never even read the two Communist documents under reference. I have never read them myself."

To those in the State Department who say that Soviet Russia's aims have changed in the last few years and that she no longer wants to enslave America, let me quote what Stalin said, not 20 years ago, not 10 years ago, not during World War II, but less than 3 years ago:

"To think that the Communist revolution can be carried out peacefully, within the framework of a Christian democracy, means one has either gone out of one's mind and lost all normal understanding, or has grossly and openly repudiated the Communist revolution."

Gentlemen, can there be anyone here today who is so blind as to fail to see that the war is on? Unless we blind our eyes and close our ears, we must realize that the Communist world has said that the time is now—that this is the era of the Armageddon—that final all-out battle between light and darkness foretold in the Bible. This is not of our choosing, but face the fact we must.

Gentlemen, the chips are down; they are truly down. Unless we do face the facts as they are, not as we would wish them to be, we shall pay the price that is paid by those who wait too long.

Now, the Russians have one important task yet before the Communist waters of a red lake begin to wash our shore with their atheistic corrosion. That task is the destruction of the remnants of Chiang's anti-Communist armies—500,000 strong—the largest force which stands between the Soviet Union and total success in the entire Far East. The Communists have officially declared that the total destruction—the mopping up of those anti-Communist forces on the island

of Formosa—is the No. 1 plank in their platform; and, incidentally, as you know, this is the No. 1 plank in the written platform of the State Department adviser, its architect of our far eastern policy, Owen Lattimore.

How near the Communists are to having complete victory within their grasp is painfully clear. The extent of the aid which the Communists are getting from those who shaped our foreign policy for the Far East is equally clear.

As you know, we have been engaged in the difficult task—before a hostile committee and with all the power of the Government against us—to prove that some of these men were traitors and others were fools.

Today, however, I intend to discuss the results of their actions rather than their motives—for the results are the same regardless of whether they are the acts of traitors or dupes.

The only thing the big gangster in the Kremlin is interested in is results. He cares not how sanctimonious or how depraved are the men who get him those results—results which he certainly has gotten from dupes and traitors within our Government.

I said earlier that I wanted to discuss with you a vicious hoax and fraud that is being perpetrated upon the American people. Now let us take a look at the master plan for that hoax. It is the Lattimore-Acheson plan for the Pacific. It is a clever, evil thing to behold. It is gigantic in its fraud and complete in its deceit. It camouflages ruin. It will wreck nations and enslave millions. It deceives and betrays America and promotes communism. It is the strategy of the Lattimore-Acheson axis of hitting Communists at the front door with a silk handkerchief while they beat the brains out of your friends at the back door.

Mr. Lattimore master-minded it. He admits it. He not only has confessed, but he proclaims it as the child of his brain. Now hear this; this is Lattimore talking: "The thing to do, therefore, is to let South Korea fall, but not to let it look as though we pushed it."

Did you hear what Lattimore is saying? Does the hideous impact of that utterance hit you where it hurts? It should, for here in a sentence we have laid bare the whole scheme of ideological barbarism that would betray us.

This is what he means: Spend American dollars and American lives to hold South Korea, but just enough to make it look like we are trying.

"With my left hand," says Lattimore, "I will push Korea toward its doom into the hands of the Communist masters in the Kremlin, but with my right hand I will extend enough aid to camouflage the sell-out—to make it look good enough to fool the suckers paying for it—good enough to fool, if you please, those who shall die because of it."

This, gentlemen, is the plan conceived by Mr. Acheson's architect, Mr. Lattimore, conceived and publicly advocated by him for part of the Pacific area. Mr. Acheson has bought it and applied it to the entire Far East.

Now let us discuss this viciously deceptive plan of the Acheson-Lattimore axis. The plan which stated in its plainest terms is to deliver vast areas and millions of people into Communist slavery without, in the words of Lattimore, having it appear that we pushed them. That was the plan for China. That is Lattimore's plan for South Korea. That is now the plan of the Lattimore-Acheson axis for the entire Far East.

Now let us examine the details of the Pacific plan of the Lattimore-Acheson axis.

More than a year ago the American Congress voted $75,000,000 to fight Communists in the Pacific. As of today, not a cent has been spent.

Not a nickel has gone to the troops on Formosa, not an ounce of powder.

In this connection I would like to briefly quote from a story of January 6, which appeared in the Washington News, which set forth in detail the fact that the Defense Department strongly urged the necessity of this and other help to Formosa.

General Bradley, usually only a fair speaker, was reported to have made an impassioned plea for this aid at the National Security Council meeting at the White House.

Therefore, we find both the Democrats and Republicans of both the Senate and the House almost unanimously saying "give all the necessary aid to the anti-Communist fighting forces in the east." We find the Chiefs of Staff of our Military Establishment approving. All evidence points to the fact that General MacArthur considers Formosa in friendly hands vital to the defense of the Pacific. However, Mr. Acheson said, "No, not one ounce of gunpowder must be given to those troops who are fighting the Communists"—for, after all, doesn't Mr. Lattimore, his architect of our Far Eastern policy, say in his secret instructions to the State Department that those troops must be destroyed.

The Lattimore-Acheson axis then wrote Truman's declaration of January 5, which vetoed the intent of the House and the Senate—Democrats and Republicans alike—the declaration which vetoed the demand of the American people that we assist our allies in such a manner as to stop the forward march of communism—the declaration which vetoed our great war leaders who should certainly know better than the Lattimore-Acheson axis what is needed on the firing line.

Recently, however, public opinion has forced Mr. Acheson to make an about-face on the position he had followed during the sell-out to China, and to appear to be attempting to stem the flow of communism across the Pacific. And this is the point at which the Lattimore plan of "Let them fall but don't let the American people know we pushed them" suddenly developed full blown as the Lattimore-Acheson plan for the Pacific. But how to put it into effect so that it would not be too difficult? Mr. Acheson suddenly discovered there was a place called Indochina, an area in which there is no fighting force to even remotely compare to the troops on the island of Formosa, but a good vehicle for the new plan of murder, but make it look like suicide. Therefore, here is where he will dissipate American dollars and materials for defense—materials needed so urgently by the fighting forces on Formosa. But not a farthing, not one shot, not one ounce of powder will be sent to help the anti-Communist forces on Formosa. However, enough will be given down in Viet Nam to disguise the real motives and convince the American suckers that we did not push the vast Pacific into the Kremlin arms.

The plan of betrayal is the same as that used in China, but it is to be dressed up with a little more effective deception this time.

Now this, gentlemen, is the plan. Do we like it? Do we want more of it? Does the spectacle of men who screamingly proclaim their love of the flag which they are hauling down while they push free lands into the Kremlin net convince you that the time has come for action? By their actions those men have outlawed any right which they had to public confidence. They have outlawed their right to speak for America. They should be silenced, gentlemen. They should be silenced now.

To show the "Dutch Twins" type of thinking of the Lattimore-Acheson axis, let me quote briefly from the public utterances of these two men. First from Lattimore: In referring to the Communist victory in China, he says, "Throughout Asia there prevails today an atmosphere of hope not despair. What they (the people of Asia) see opening out before them is a limitless horizon of hope; a hope of peaceful, constructive activities in a free country, and peaceful cooperation among free peoples."

And now to the other half of the axis, Mr. Acheson: he says (on January 12 of this year before the National Press Club) "a new day has dawned in Asia. It is a day in which the Asian peoples are on their own and know it, and intend to continue on their own."

Gentlemen, those are their own words publicly spoken. Lattimore refers to the 400,000,000 people sold into communistic slavery as "free peoples"; Acheson says they are "on their own and know it." Acheson speaks of communism in China with bated breath as the "dawning of a new day"; to Lattimore it is a "limitless horizon of hope"—and unless the Lattimore-Acheson Pacific plan of "allowing our allies to fall to communism but not having it appear that we shoved them"—unless that plan is stopped in its tracks—unless it is stopped now, then as certain as you sit here today, gentlemen, Acheson's "great new day" and Lattimore's "limitless horizon of hope" shall dawn in the Philippines, India, and thence across the Pacific to our shores.

To give you an even clearer picture of the architect of this new Lattimore-Acheson Pacific plan and how he views communism, let me quote from a broadcast prepared under his supervision while he was head of the Pacific division of OWI, and beamed to the Asiatic people on July 23, 1944—and listen to this if you will—"The Chinese Communists have established four colleges. Education is compulsory behind Communist lines. The schools are free. Once this was a poverty stricken region. Today everyone works or fights. There is no opium traffic. There is little vice. There are no laggards, for only those who believe in the cause of Chinese liberation are here. This is the Chinese Communist Government. The Communists have worked out the problems of all the people, living, working, and fighting together. * * * If we are to succeed, we must organize the workers politically. The Chinese Communists want political rights for themselves and all the people. They want a thorough-going Democracy."

Gentlemen, this tops the pinnacle of all the foul products of fouler corruption.

I have on numerous occasions discussed in detail a third member of the Lattimore-Acheson axis. I would like to very briefly deal with some of the facts concerning this man. He is Phillip Jessup, another of the great experts on the Far East—the President's roving ambassador.

I have presented to the committee checks totaling $3,500, which represented Communist money paid to his organization, the Institute of Pacific Relations, whose publication was being supervised by Mr. Jessup. This money was paid prior to and during the time that this publication was being used to spearhead the smear against the anti-Communist forces in China and to sell to the State Department and the American people the idea that we must cast our lot with the Communists in China because they were not Communists at all.

Testimony has been presented to the committee that some 17 Communist writers were used by this publication to sell the Communist Party line. Since I appeared before the committee I have gotten photostats of additional checks which now total $6,500 of Communist money paid his organization. The checks are signed by Frederick Vanderbilt Field, who has proclaimed himself as the Nation's leading Communist and who has been named by Louis Budenz as a Soviet espionage agent. When the original checks totaling $6,500 were called to the President's attention, by way of answer he immediately

gave Mr. Jessup top-secret clearance to all A- and H-bomb information—dangerously mischievous playing with the security of 152,000,000 people.

I have here with me several hundred photostats of those checks if any of you care to take them along with you.

Mr. Truman, the time has come to stop your whistle-stop campaigning and come home.

But before you come, Mr. Truman, look into the faces of the mothers standing by your train tonight. Are they to weep again for their sons who must fight and die for the failures of dishonest or incompetent men? Are their sons next when the Red hordes trample over the bodies of 500,000 Chinese dead who perished for lack of arms?

Come on home, Mr. Truman, you have a lot to do. Tell Mr. Jessup, for instance, that this Government no longer has a place for men whose organization takes money from Communists. You can tell him you have the photostats of checks from Communists paid to the publication he served—the publication that peddled the Communist cause. I am sending them to you, Mr. Truman.

Come home, Mr. Truman, and halt Mr. Acheson's veto of everything America stands for.

Come home, Mr. Truman, and tell the Lattimore-Acheson axis to give effective aid to the anti-Communists in Asia. Order them to supply the rear guard on Formosa with the sinews those fighting men need.

Come home, Mr. Truman, and fire the Pied Pipers of the Politburo. Fire the headmaster who betrays us in Asia. Fire the collectors of corruption, those prancing mimics of the Moscow party line in the State Department.

Policies and Procedure in Income-Tax Fraud Cases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAT SUTTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1950

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, the Members of Congress and numerous taxpayers over the Nation will be interested to know the policies and procedure in connection with income tax fraud cases. The Honorable Turner L. Smith, Chief of the Criminal Tax Section of the Department of Justice, is recognized as an authority on tax problems. Because of his vast experience as a lawyer and as Chief of the section which he heads in the Department of Justice, he is probably more qualified to speak on the subject of procedure and policies concerning income tax fraud cases than any other man in public life.

On May 6, Mr. Smith delivered an address before the Second Annual Legal Institute sponsored by the College of Law, University of Notre Dame, in conjunction with the Indiana State Bar Association.

Since Mr. Smith discusses his subject in great detail, I am placing his remarks in the RECORD, and congratulate him upon his fine work.

His address follows:

Gentlemen, I am delighted and honored to have your invitation and be present on this occasion to take part in the Second Annual Legal Institute as sponsored by the College of Law of the University of Notre Dame and the Indiana State Bar Association.

When your kind invitation came through the dean of Notre Dame, I gathered from his communication that it was the plan of those arranging the program to focus attention this year primarily upon the side of the actual general practice of law, as distinguished from addresses on highly technical or specialized subjects.

With this thought in mind, I have attempted to prepare for this occasion a paper which might be helpful to you practicing lawyers when you are employed by a taxpayer to represent his interest and defense at the time a criminal-tax case is under consideration for prosecution by the Department of Justice.

Until very recent years there were comparatively few Federal prosecutions for income-tax evasion. It is unlikely, therefore, that all of you here today have had occasion in the past to represent a client who was on the verge of a tax-fraud prosecution. Since this crime now seems to be on the increase, the probabilities of your being so employed are considerably strengthened.

It would thus seem appropriate for me to anticipate some of the questions arising in your mind as you undertake to prepare administratively to defend the client before the Government agency making the decision for or against prosecution. Undoubtedly, some of the questions you would ask yourself in the first instance of employment would run along these lines:

Can I go to Washington and by offering to pay to the Bureau of Internal Revenue or Department of Justice any and all tax deficiencies, penalties, and interest, save my client from indictment and prosecution? Will any Government attorney listen to any defense I may have to offer? If so, to whom should I write or communicate with to assure a hearing before an indictment has been sought? Should I seek to get character letters and otherwise document the good name and reputation of my client in preparation for a hearing at the Department of Justice, or would my time and energy be more profitably spent in studying taxpayer's books and records to determine if there is defense in merit to the Government's claim that my client intentionally and with deliberation understated his income? Should I prepare for oral presentation alone or should I take along a brief with affidavits and exhibits setting forth in writing the taxpayer's position?

Is it of any advantage to me if I learn that my client is suffering with a severe heart ailment or other serious illness; and if so, what should I do about it?

Under what circumstances and conditions will the Department of Justice accept an offer in compromise in a criminal tax case? Before which Government agency should I urge the defense of voluntary disclosure?

To what extent will the Government reveal its case at the conference in Washington? After studying client's tax affairs and upon concluding that no reasonable defense can be offered, will I be permitted to waive indictment and enter plea to an information; and if so, will the Government accept a nolo contendere plea, and in what type of cases?

Some or all of these questions which have been selected and set down at random will arise in every criminal tax case in which you become engaged. I am not addressing here, of course, the courtroom conduct of your defense. These remarks apply entirely to what is commonly referred to as administrative tax practice.

So it is with these general and essentially practical problems in mind that I discuss briefly in this paper what happens when the Department of Justice is working on a tax-fraud case. And what you can do about it.

From the moment of receipt from the Bureau of Internal Revenue of a tax-fraud accusation by the Tax Division of the Department of Justice, its handling is vitally affected by a number of administrative policies. These policies have developed or have been adopted in an effort to make the enforcement of the criminal laws for the protection of the revenue both fair and effective. If, however, these ends are to be attained, the policies and procedures of the Tax Division must not remain hidden in the files of the Department; they must be known by the members of the legal and the accounting professions who represent taxpayers accused of criminal fraud.

ORIGIN OF CASES

It is perhaps needless to relate for the benefit of tax practitioners that tax-fraud cases are not initiated in the Department of Justice, that is to say, Justice has no investigative force with general authority to unearth, investigate, and report on alleged evaders. These audit and investigative functions are vested respectively in the revenue agents and the special agents of the Bureau of Internal Revenue within the Treasury Department. Bureau agents alone initiate and conduct audits and fraud investigations. Every practitioner should know such investigations are thorough; that they are summed up in carefully prepared reports, and backed up by a file of evidence. It is only after the reports and exhibits have been reviewed in the Penal Division of the Bureau and formally transmitted by a letter from the Commissioner of Internal Revenue recommending prosecutive action that the Tax Division of the Department of Justice takes complete jurisdiction of a case.

The number of income-tax evasion cases received from the Commissioner of Internal Revenue has increased significantly during the past 8 years, as demonstrated in the following table:

Calendar year:	*Number of cases*
1942	79
1943	93
1944	71
1945	203
1946	241
1947	523
1948	691
1949	420

This very substantial increase in the number of cases referred for prosecution is variously attributable to the increase in tax rates, the excess-profits tax on corporate income, and the prevalence of black-market operations which participants sought to conceal during the period of the OPA. Not to be overlooked also is the very large addition of agents in recent years to the Bureau's enforcement staff.

Taxpayers, it seems, wished to hang onto a larger proportion of war-boom receipts. At the same time, the wartime and postwar need of the Government for increased revenue became greatly enlarged. As a result, the processing of the tax-crimes case load has now become a major activity of the Tax Division.

Each case transmitted by the Bureau of Internal Revenue to the Department of Justice is assigned to an attorney in the Criminal Section of the Tax Division. It then is his responsibility to review completely the reports of the special agent and of the revenue agent and to determine from those reports and the supporting exhibits whether, in the light of the law involved, a case can be made out which can reasonably be expected to result in a successful prosecution.

CONFERENCES

In the usual case, the attorney assigned is materially assisted in reaching a sound conclusion by a conference with counsel and accountants representing the taxpayer. Defense evidence which may have been overlooked by the investigating agents is often so convincingly presented that the Division

attorney recommends that prosecution be declined. On the other hand, he may be able to dispel a supposed defense by an explanation to defense counsel or by a supplemental investigation. This may result in the taxpayer ultimately entering a plea of guilty, thus obviating the mutual expense of a trial which would most likely result in a conviction.

It was formerly the practice in the Tax Division to afford conferences to taxpayers' representatives only if requeseted. Then, as now, alert attorneys sought to press their defense in conferences at every stage, in the agents' offices, in the regional offices of the Bureau's decentralized Penal Division, and in the headquarters of the Penal Division in Washington. In such cases, the Tax Division has generally received a written request for a conference by the time the file is referred to it by the Commissioner, and oftentimes a year or so in advance of referral.

But it was found that many times taxpayers without counsel first learned that they were subject to a Federal tax-evasion indictment when the United States marshal hauled them unceremoniously before a committing magistrate. The present head of the Tax Division, Assistant Attorney General Theron L. Caudle, felt that a disparity of treatment necessarily resulted when some taxpayers had counsel and conferences in the division and others had neither—much less notice that they were in trouble. In this connection, it should be borne in mind that tax investigations usually involve returns dating back 1 to 5 years; that a year or more can and does pass before the results of investigations reach the stage of consideration for prosecution in the Justice Department; and that, unlike the celebrated prosecution of Al Capone, the usual tax evader is not an underworld character or criminal in the usual sense.

The temptation to cheat on taxes, it appears, preys on respectable citizens, the business man, the professional man, yes, even lawyers, doctors, accountants, and judges. Mr. Caudle, therefore, established the policy that, when it did not appear from the file that the taxpayer had had the benefit of counsel, the Criminal Section attorney assigned to such case must notify the taxpayer that prosecution was being considered. This notice includes an offer of an opportunity for a conference in the Department if one is desired. Should distance, or the relative lack of means of the taxpayer (the file reflects this occasionally), or the necessity for speedy handling to avoid the bar of the statute of limitations make an offer of a conference in Washington impracticable, then the United States attorney is asked to afford the necessary preprosecution conference opportunity. While this policy puts an added burden on the Tax Division staff, it has been generally recognized as a contribution to the fair administration of criminal justice in the tax field. Hence, the first action taken in the department is to find out whether the taxpayer has an attorney and whether a conference request is pending.

NUMBER OF CONFERENCES

It is also the policy that conferences should, as far as possible, be limited to one. Only where the necessity for the presentation of substantial additional evidence becomes apparent at the first conference is a second one properly granted. Memoranda recording conferences are written by the staff attorney, and these are available to the section chief, the first assistant, and the Assistant Attorney General when the staff attorney's analyses and recommendations are forwarded for review and for ultimate approval or disapproval by the Assistant Attorney General. There is, therefore, little purpose to be served by successive conferences over the same material with the reviewing officials. There is even less utility in successive platoons of counsel asking a hearing on identical contentions.

DEFENSE CONTENTIONS

This suggests that a comment is here in order concerning what is expected of taxpayer's representatives when they appear for conferences. As already noted, the tax division has before it a considered recommendation of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, based on reports that almost universally show arduous, careful investigative work. The supporting exhibits give tangible proof of something seriously wrong, taxwise. This is what the taxpayers' counsel must be prepared to explain away, preferably by equally tangible proof. If a legal argument is to be made, it is expected that it should be sound enough to bear submission in writing. The attorneys in the criminal section are well experienced and disposed to consider reasoned documented contentions. But practitioners are apt to find something less than an interested reception if they present only a dissertion on what a good churchgoer the taxpayer is, how well respected he is, or that he is not the type to have an intent to evade. That taxpayers are likely to lose a business or a license to practice, or that a jail sentence will disgrace their families or work a great hardship on minor children are considerations which are properly for a court at the time of sentencing and could have weight on a decision to prosecute only when the merits of the substantive case for prosecution are in doubt.

HEALTH CONSIDERATIONS

If a case is made out in the reports and exhibits which cannot be explained away, policy requires that a prosecution be undertaken, unless it appears that the individual taxpayer's life will be endangered by criminal prosecution because of some serious mental or physical condition. The prosecutors in the tax division and the several United States attorneys do not want to be responsible for the death of a taxpayer. The Bureau of Internal Revenue has a like policy. The revenue does not need such protection. Hence, a documented contention by defense counsel that a taxpayer is dangerously ill and that he could not survive a trial will be scrupulously examined and given thorough and serious consideration. A Public Health Service medical examination will be conducted, and sometimes because of distance or other factors arrangements are made for the United States attorney in the taxpayer's district to select an outstanding medical specialist to conduct the necessary examination at the taxpayer's expense.

When all other defense positions advanced by taxpayer's counsel appear to leave a decision by the Department to prosecute unchanged, it has been a growing practice on the part of the tax bar to urge the bad health of the taxpayer as a last resort. Permit me, therefore, to spell out this health policy by saying: one, that this defense to prosecution will not be considered unless a private doctor has in the first instance certified in writing to the fact of a serious illness involving a probable ultimate loss of life; and two, prosecution will not be declined until this private medical report has been verified by a thorough examination of the taxpayer by some doctor, likely a specialist in his field, selected and appointed by the Government to conduct the examination, and make a report.

Thus, it may be stated in summation, that the decision by the Department to prosecute or not to prosecute rests entirely and squarely upon the merits and evidence available in a particular case, excepting only in circumstances where a competent doctor conducting the examination at the Department's request certifies that prosecution and trial would constitute a clear and present danger to the prospective defendant's life.

This one exception to prosecution noted here does not embrace, of course, the voluntary-disclosure policy which has been enunciated by the Treasury Departmuent and which has no application to the case once it has been transmitted to the Justice Department.

VOLUNTARY DISCLOSURE

Another bar to an otherwise apparent fraud case is the so-called voluntary-disclosure policy of the Treasury Department. The contention is frequently raised during the consideration of an income-tax evasion case in the Tax Division of the Justice Department that the taxpayer had made a voluntary disclosure. It goes without saying that in tax-practice parlance this means the policy of the Treasury Department to grant immunity from prosecution to tax evaders who within the period and under the conditions prescribed by that Department make a clean breast of their misdeeds. Former Secretary of the Treasury Vinson, in a press conference on May 28, 1945, crystallized this practice into definite policy. But, observe that this immunity to timely repentant tax evaders is strictly the policy of the Treasur Department. It is absolution implemented solely by this agency, and the means of implementation is simply not to send voluntarily disclosed tax-fraud cases to the Justice Department for prosecution. There is, therefore, a reciprocating policy in the Tax Division in Justice to accept the decision of the Bureau of Internal Revenue as to whether a voluntary disclosure has or has not been accomplished. If the record coming from the Bureau does not disclose a decision on this point, the fact of referral of a case is considered to evidence such decision. Only the possibility that the agents may have elicited the necessary incriminating evidence by an express or implied promise of immunity can be properly considered by the Tax Division. As a matter of policy, again, the Department of Justice will be reluctant to prosecute if there is persuasive evidence that such a promise of immunity was given.

OFFERS IN COMPROMISE

Still another administrative defense approach to the Department is by way of an offer in compromise of the criminal case, together with the civil liability. In criminal cases the policy of the Department has received some airing among the practitioners and in legal periodicals. Despite this, the attorneys in the Criminal Section of the Tax Division are constantly asked whether "we can't compromise this case by paying the tax and penalties." They must answer this by saying that the policy of the Attorney General and Assistant Attorney General Caudle is not even to consider compromising a criminal tax case except when the defendant couples his offer to pay the tax or such portion of it as he has ability to pay at the time with an unconditional offer to enter a plea of guilty to a major count of the indictment. In short, compromise of a criminal case must result in a conviction. But whether that portion of such an offer as concerns the tax liability will be accepted is, as a matter of policy, usually dependent on whether it is acceptable to the Bureau of Internal Revenue. That agency is primarily responsible for the collection of the tax and the civil penalties. Its recommendation is always sought on offers in compromise and is followed save in the rarest of exceptions.

SUBMISSION FOR PROSECUTION

After a criminal section attorney has reviewed a case in the light of all the defense contentions raised, he submits a recommendation through channels to the Assistant Attorney General. If he finds that the evidence discloses a violation of the evasion

statute (26 U. S. C. 145 (b)), or the failure-to-file statute (26 U. S. C. 145 (a)), or the false-execution statute (26 U. S. C. 3809 (a)), or the aiding-and-assisting-in-the-false-preparation-and-presentation statute (26 U. S. C. 3793 (b) (1)), as the case may be, and that there is a reasonable probability of a successful prosecution, then he will recommend submitting the case to the appropriate United States Attorney to institute criminal action. This recommendation is reviewed by the Chief of the Criminal Section and by the First Assistant in the Tax Division, and a final decision is then made by the Assistant Attorney General, on whose approval the case is transmitted to the United States Attorney concerned and counsel are notified.

In the usual case, the United States Attorney proceeds in due course in his district to obtain an indictment, and then to trial if no guilty plea is entered. At this stage, after transmittal of the file to the District Attorney, the Tax Division is frequently importuned to grant a further conference and to recall the file. There is a policy on this, too: it is that the file will not be recalled from the United States Attorney. If weighty reasons are given for a conference, the United States Attorney may be asked to defer action, but the delays involved in recalling the file and in again resubmitting it are scarcely ever incurred. Generally, the taxpayer's representatives will be told that further conferences in the Department would be fruitless and that any further conferences should be with the United States Attorney.

CONCLUSION

This discussion of policy should not end on the preceding stony-hearted note. It can be stated by way of conclusion that, in considering cases with defense counsel, there is a general policy to discuss rather more freely the merits of the proposed tax case for prosecution than the usual criminal case. This statement should not be construed as a commitment to reveal fully the Government's hand. An honest effort is made, however, to outline the Government's contentions, so that conferences are not sterile and in order that the possible existence of bona fide defenses may be explored. Common sense dictates the limitations on the disclosures made to counsel, but in this, as well as in the formulation of the other policies and procedures mentioned, the objective is the fair and efficient conduct of the prosecutor's duties.

Such Is a Union's Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FORREST C. DONNELL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in the Kansas City Star of May 13, 1950, entitled "Such Is a Union's Power."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUCH IS A UNION'S POWER

Slowly the wheels of industry are dragging toward a stop along the lines of four major railroads. At this early stage 200,000 persons are out of work. Unless the latest move for a quick settlement succeeds this is only the beginning.

The railroads are the lifeline of our national economy. Without the cars to move coal the mines shut down. Without the flow of their materials factories must close. Along the Santa Fe lines farmers are worried about the movement of the wheat crop. The inconvenience to railroad passengers is a small thing compared with the silence in the freight yards.

The firemen's brotherhood has cut the lifeline provided by four roads. There is talk of moving on to other roads to make the paralysis complete. But this far the brotherhood has already gone to put a third man in every multiple unit Diesel locomotive.

It has nothing to support its argument except force. This is no complicated, highly technical argument involved with a lot of "ifs" and "buts." It comes down to a simple proposition of what a third man could do. And the answer is "nothing."

Two presidential fact-finding boards have heard the brotherhood's argument of additional safety and found nothing to support it.

The union leadership is prepared to spread this devastation to have its way without an argument, without logic or a moral principle to support it.

Such power in the hands of one organization is an omnious thing to this land of the free. What it can do on four roads it can do on all roads. This is a demonstration of power for the American people to swallow.

As of today there is no greater power on the side of the people—definitely not the Government of the United States. President Truman has said he lacks the power to take action and, as far as we have heard, he hasn't asked for more power. Publicly he has shown no concern. Congress can do nothing except write new legislation, and there appears to be some real interest in Senator DONNELL'S compulsory arbitration bill.

But for today there is no way to meet force with the force of public interest. The hope for the national economy along four major railroads rests entirely with the talks around the table.

Regardless of the outcome of this strike the demonstration should have been driven home to the American public. Over its vital economic lifelines no little group of men can be permitted absolute power.

Amendment of Social Security Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, yesterday I issued a statement announcing that I would introduce a bill to amend the Social Security Act extending the public-assistance provisions to the people of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. This would be in accordance with the action already taken by the House. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD my statement, which also includes some comments on the social-security bill reported by the Senate Finance Committee.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR HERBERT H. LEHMAN ON SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS TO H. R. 6000 AS REPORTED BY THE SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE

A number of aspects of the amendments to the Social Security Act reported out by the Senate Finance Committee are very disappointing to me, although the action by the committee in working out this difficult and complex piece of legislation was, on the whole, very constructive and salutary.

I expect to introduce a number of amendments from the floor and to join with other Members of the Senate in urging increased benefits and expanded coverage.

One point on which I have already expressed myself very strongly and on which I propose to insist as vigorously as I know how is the extension of the provision for public assistance to the people of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. If there are any groups of American citizens who are particularly in need of the aid extended by this provision, it is the people of these islands who, through no fault of their own, are confronted with economic conditions with which the local government can deal only in part.

The local governments in Puerto Rico and in the Virgin Islands have made outstanding progress toward the solution of basic economic problems. The extension of the public-assistance provisions to the Social Security Act to these people would be a notable and constructive contribution and would, at modest cost to the Federal Government, provide essential support to the efforts which the local governments are making to bring to the underprivileged groups on these islands the basic needs of livelihood.

Approval of this extension of coverage, as already agreed to by the House, would signify to all the people of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands the fundamental desire of the Federal Government to grant equality of treatment to all its citizens and special consideration for those citizens who are in particular need through no fault of their own.

I am not urging the Senate to approve this on the basis of charity or beneficence, but rather on the basis of right. I think these American citizens have a right to the same treatment by the Federal Government as the American citizens on the mainland. I hope the Senate will amend the action by the Finance Committee and restore coverage to Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

Boys' Clubs of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY DARBY
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. DARBY. Mr. President, Hon. Herbert Hoover, former President of the United States, and Director J. Edgar Hoover, of the FBI, are among the most distinguished Americans who have rendered valuable service to their country in assisting our youth to become better citizens. The former President has served as chairman of the Boys' Clubs of America for 14 years, and last night awarded to the Director of the Federal Bureau of

Investigation the coveted Golden Keystone Award for his splendid contribution to the Boys' Clubs of America. The Honorable Herbert Hoover and Mr. J. Edgar Hoover both made fine and appropriate addresses on the occasion of the final meeting of the annual convention of the Boys' Clubs of America in Washington on May 18, and I ask unanimous consent to have these addresses inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY HERBERT HOOVER

PAVEMENT BOYS—WHAT WE ARE DOING

I am proud that this is my fourteenth year as chairman of the Boys' Clubs of America. We have doubled in potency in this period. But the real record is that of your president, William E. Hall. He entered that office 34 years ago and has nursed this effort up from its swaddling clothes. But Mr. Hall and your directors and I are unanimously agreed that the greatest punch and spirit of this national organization comes from your director, David Armstrong, and his able staff.

The Boys' Clubs of America are a great school. They might even be called the university of the pavements, for our purpose is mostly directed to the pavement boys in our congested areas.

Here are linked together over 325 institutions with 300,000 to 350,000 boys, with an equipment that $60,000,000 could not replace and with an annual budget of $7,000,000. There were 24 building projects nearly completed in 1949 and 18 more are under way, costing a total of about $5,000,000. All these great sums are made possible by generous people who love boys.

If you need some more statistics, I may tell you that there are 35,000 adults giving generously of their time to the Boys' Clubs as boards of directors or auxiliary organizations. The clubs are guided by over 6,000 trained adult leaders who are the "faculty."

This education includes self-organization and their own discipline in the conduct of their clubs. It includes testing out their natural bents in shops, crafts, music, and the professions. It includes medical inspection and training in health. It involves every known indoor and outdoor game and sport, except horse racing and golf. It even includes the flying trapeze.

There is no discrimination as to religion or race. Theirs is that equality which is the foundation of free men. The greatest moral training, except for religious faith, comes from training these boys in teamwork and sportsmanship.

We do not claim that the boys' clubs substitute for either mother or the public schools. We are concerned with the kid from the hour when school is out until he goes to bed or when he gets a holiday. When a boy is inside our doors, mother has no worry. The police have no worry from some of his primitive instincts.

We have a right to brag a little. We have produced some major league ball players and some great editors and artists. In the last war draft the total number of rejects among our graduates was less than 5 percent as against the national average of over 30 percent. I could tell you of districts where we have reduced delinquency by 75 percent. Over the years we have brought joy into the lives of millions of boys.

You will anticipate my next remark. We need more money and lots of it, for there are 2,000,000 of these pavement boys whom we have not taken care of.

HIS RIGHTS, CHARACTERISTICS, ENVIRONMENT, AND HOPES

The work of the boys' clubs is geared to certain ideas.

First. When the founding fathers announced the unalienable rights, they laid proper emphasis on the pursuit of happiness. I have no doubt any lawyer would construe that as especially intended to include boys. However, we are not so worried at the moment with his unalienable rights to the pursuit of happiness as we are with his processes in the pursuit.

Second. In pursuit of happiness, the boy has two jobs. One is being a boy and the other is training to be a man.

When the boys' clubs contemplate his jobs, we take into account certain characteristics of the animal and his environment. Some years ago I made some observations on these essentials. I have combined them with some further observations to bring you up to date in this important matter.

Together with his sister, the boy is our most precious possession. But he presents not only joys and hopes, but also paradoxes. He strains our nerves, yet he is a complex of cells teeming with affection. He is a periodic nuisance, yet he is a joy forever. He is a part-time incarnation of destruction, yet he radiates sunlight to all the world. He at times gives evidence of being the child of iniquity, yet his idealism can make a great nation. He is filled with curiosity as to every mortal thing. He is an illuminated interrogation point, yet he is the most entertaining animal that is.

The whole world is new to him. He must discover it all over again. All its corners and things must be explored or taken apart. Therefore his should be a life of discovery, of adventure, of great undertakings. He must spend much time in the land of make-believe, if he is to expand his soul. One of the sad things in the world is that he must grow up into the land of taxpayers.

He is endowed with a dynamic energy and an impelling desire to take exercise on all occasions. He is a complete self-starter, and therefore wisdom in dealing with him consists mostly in what to do with him next. His primary instinct is to hunt in a pack and that multiplies his devices. He and his pack can go on the hunt either for good or evil. Our first problem is to find him constructive joy, instead of destructive glee.

To complicate this problem, this civilization has gone and built up great cities. We have increased the number of boys per acre. We have paved all this part of the land with cement and cobblestones. Of these human organisms, perhaps two and a half million must find their outdoor life on these pavements and confined by brick walls. Much of their life is concerned with stairs, light switches, alleys, fire escapes, bells, and cobblestones, and a chance to get run over by a truck. Thus these boys are today separated from mother earth and all her works, except the weather. In the days before our civilization became so perfectly paved with cement, he matched his wits with the birds, the bees, and the fish. But the outlet of his energies in exploring the streams and the fields is closed to him. The mysteries of the birds and bees and fish are mostly denied to him.

The normal boy is a primitive animal and takes to competition and battle. If he doesn't have much of a chance to contend with nature, and unless he is given something else to do, he is likely to take on contention with a policeman.

I dislike to refer to these boys as underprivileged. That is only a part truth. He has better facilities for education and better protection of health than boys in any other country in the world. He suffers less from mumps and measles than his grandfather did; more quickly do we heal his broken bones. He will live longer, and if his start is blighted, the Nation will have to board him longer in jail.

He has other gains. The electric light has banished the former curse of all boys, of cleaning lamps and everlastingly carrying them about. The light switch has driven away the goblins that lived in dark corners and under the bed. It clothes drab streets with gaiety and cheer by night. And it is the attraction of these bright lights that increases our problem.

But we are concerned with the privileges which all these bricks and cement have taken away from him. The particular ones with which we are concerned bear on his character and moral stature. This brick and cement foundation of life is a hard soil for his growths. Somebody will say morals are the job of parents. But the best of parents cannot keep him indoors all the time. And the world in the streets is a distorted and dangerous world which the parents cannot make or unmake. So it becomes a job of public relations.

But there is more than that. The fine qualities of loyalty to the pack are not so good on the pavements. For here the pack turns to the gang, where his superabundant vitality leads him to depredation. And here we make gangsters and feed jails. The way to stop crime is to stop the manufacture of criminals.

This is only a marginal problem to the total boys in the United States. If we can start this marginal group right on the road to character, we will have done more to cure our national ills than either subsidies or so-called security.

And there is more to this than even exercise and morals. There is the job of stretching his vision of life. The right to glimpse into constructive joy, the right to discover an occupation fitted to his inclinations and talents, and the right to develop his personality. The priceless treasure of boyhood is his endless enthusiasm, his high store of idealism, his affections, and his hopes. When we preserve these with character, we have made men. We have made citizens and we have made Americans.

ADDRESS BY J. EDGAR HOOVER, DIRECTOR, FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

The Golden Keystone Award is indeed a cherished honor. As its recipient I know that this great honor would never have been accorded me had it not been for the tireless and unselfish assistance and devotion to duty of my associates in the FBI. For them, as well as for myself, I accept this honor with pardonable pride and gratitude.

The fact that the award is presented by Hon. Herbert Hoover, chairman of the board of directors of the Boys' Clubs of America, gives it even greater significance to me. It has been my distinct privilege and pleasure to have served under Mr. Herbert Hoover for many years in my official career and later to be associated with him in the boys' clubs work. His life symbolizes the precepts of this great Nation. Inspired by our finest traditions of liberty and freedom and justice for all, he stands foursquare against every disrupting force. His contributions to our Nation's welfare have been outstanding; his great heart and soul are attuned to the needs of humanity which he has served so nobly over the years. May God grant him many years to counsel our country through these troubled times.

There is a parallel between the aims of the Boys' Clubs of America and the FBI. We work on different fronts, but toward a common objective—a more secure America. One of the great tragedies of our generation has

been our lack of vision. As a people we have prospered materially. We have harnessed our vast industrial potential; we have penetrated the mysteries of science. We have achieved a standard of living which is unequaled the world over. The defects of our social order are gradually being overcome. We have more leisure time and opportunities for recreation than people in any civilized land in the world. But we are sadly neglecting our most precious asset—the citizen of tomorrow.

We are witnessing, too often, a gradual dissolution of the traditional American home. The American home too frequently has become merely a place to eat and sleep instead of a place of moral development and spiritual growth. Adult America in too many instances has failed miserably in its responsibility to youth.

The tendency to coddle youth or treat their problems with indifference manifests itself in too many communities. Instead of giving young people leadership through example and discipline, too frequently we permit them to run rampant in the uninhibited expression of their impulses—a practice which has led to disastrous consequences.

The awesome spectacle a few weeks ago in one of our cities, of scores of young people swept by a mob spirit flaunting the forces of law and order by rioting in the streets, and equally startling and frightening spectacles in other cities, are sufficient to make us pause and take stock. The unlawful activities of too many of our young people are a national disgrace. We who are engaged in law enforcement see the results daily in the ungoverned activities of teen-age boys and girls who are responsible for a percentage of crimes out of all proportion to their age group. This is indeed a serious indictment of parenthood.

In fact, some 50 percent of all crimes against property are committed by young people under 25 years of age. In 117,562 cases last year involving young people under 21 years of age, law enforcement agencies regarded the offenses sufficiently serious to take the fingerprints of the offenders for inclusion in the fingerprint files of the FBI. These represent some 15 percent of all persons arrested. Yet, as a group, persons under 21 years of age accounted for 43.8 percent of all persons arrested for auto theft; 38.2 percent of all persons arrested for burglary; 30.4 percent of all persons arrested for rape; 26.7 percent of all persons arrested for robbery; and 11.9 percent of all persons arrested for felonious homicide.

This sad spectacle of misdirected energy is an unwholesome blemish on the American scene. Perhaps the disappearance of the woodshed of my generation has had its effect. I have heard too many sorrowful confessions of parents who "spared the rod and spoiled the child" not to be convinced that a firmness and a determination to enforce discipline and order have their merits. There is no satisfactory substitute for discipline in developing character. Hard work, even if it is considered old-fashioned in some quarters, is a stepping stone to achievement.

The breakdown in some of the homes and the lack of facilities in the schools to fully administer to the fundamental needs of youth have made necessary such a youth-serving agency as the Boys' Clubs of America.

In the brief span of their existence, the boys' clubs of the Nation have left an indelible imprint for good upon the 325 communities where they exist. The 330,000 members of the boys' clubs are being given opportunities which they would not otherwise have. Make no mistake—each of these boys will become a better citizen because some adults have had vision and have been willing to devote their time and energies to providing these young men with opportunities which are their inherent right.

The program of the boys' clubs has conclusively proven its worth by satisfying the basic desires of youth in offering opportunities for new experience, recognition, response, and security which come from group activities. In making this possible, I want to commend the 6,088 professional and volunteer workers who have carried forward this program in 37 States. Back of these men who give of their time and energies is another group, totaling some 35,000 members of boards of directors and auxiliary organizations in the various communities where boys' clubs flourish.

These men, many of whom are here tonight, by their daily deeds are living up to the responsibilities of good citizenship. Their contribution toward the building of a better America sets an example for others. The achievements of the boys' clubs invite the scrutiny of every community in the land. The annual expenditure of some seven million dollars—the cost of maintaining the boys' clubs—is returned manyfold in the results of its constructive work. The experience of one neighborhood where the number of juvenile delinquents dropped from 222 to 28, an 87 percent decrease, after a boys' club moved into the community, I am sure, is the rule rather than the exception.

The operation of the Boys' Clubs of America is basically American. They embody some of our finest traditions by working in the locals where they can render the greatest service. Our Nation has flourished because of that principle—the serving of local needs. In the final analysis, America is the aggregate of all of our people; it is the aggregate of all of our towns, cities, counties, and States. America is only as strong as all of our people and our communities working together in unity toward a common goal.

Good citizenship, like charity, begins at home. That is why, for example, I have always opposed the concept of a national police force. The best type of law enforcement is the home-town police. Any other system would be alien to our American way of life. Each community not only deserves exactly what it receives in terms of law and order, but also has within its power the ability to have law observance and good law enforcement if it so desires.

There is not a city, town, or hamlet in the Nation which could not strike a telling blow against the forces of lawlessness within 48 hours if its people had the will and determination to eradicate the breeding places of crime. The law-enforcement agencies in the land, with few exceptions, are thoroughly competent and capable. They are willing to do their job if they are unshackled and supported as they should be by an aroused citizenry which will brook no interference and tolerate no alliance between the upper world of officialdom and the underworld of corruption.

Similarly, the youth problem in crime would disappear quickly if each parent and adult recognized his responsibility and made an honest effort to do his duty. I look forward to the day when the number of Boys' Clubs will double, triple, and quadruple. A crying need exists for an extension of this most worth-while endeavor. You, the leaders of this movement, have done your job well but you have scarcely scratched the surface. There is still much unfinished business.

Now is the time for action. The need for giving American youth what is justly his—guidance, training, discipline, proper surroundings, incentive, moral and spiritual development—is more important than ever before in the history of our Nation. The strength, the security, and the future of America depend upon the character and the quality of our youth. In the face of attacks from subversive forces which would destroy our American way of life, we must strengthen and expand those organizations which aid in molding our youth into good citizens.

The Boys' Clubs of America must go forward if other boys are to be given the opportunities of democracy in action—the type of democracy which flourishes in the atmosphere of liberty and freedom in the United States.

Protection of Wisconsin Dairy Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I was glad to note in the May 15, 1950, issue of the newspaper Herald-Telegram, published in Chippewa Falls, Wis., a very fine and deserved editorial entitled "Waging Courageous Fight," recounting the splendid work of our colleague the senior Senator from America's dairyland, the State of Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAGING COURAGEOUS FIGHT

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY'S courageous fight in the United States Senate to aid Wisconsin dairy farmers was called to the attention of the local Kiwanis Club and their farmer guests Wednesday night at Eagle Point.

Milo Swanton, executive secretary of the Wisconsin Council of Agricultural Cooperatives, praised Wisconsin's senior Senator for what he termed his yeoman service in the farmers' battle against the manufacturers of dairy substitutes.

Swanton's remarks drew spontaneous applause from the more than 100 men present at Wednesday night's meeting, indicating that the farmers were appreciative of WILEY'S fight for the dairy industry.

Now, a communication from Washington reveals that the Badger Senator is waging a terrific fight on the floor of the Senate on behalf of boot and shoe manufacturers in his home State.

This should be of particular interest to Chippewa Falls businessmen, since huge numbers of some of the finest boots and shoes in the United States are manufactured right here in our own community.

Senator WILEY is genuinely alarmed at what he terms the indiscriminate lowering of trade barriers, which allow cheap foreign-made boots and shoes to flood American markets.

The Senator read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter received from the Boot and Shoe Workers Union, Local 705, South Milwaukee, Wis., in which the workers complained of the steady flow of foreign shoes into the country at prices far below the domestic retail price.

WILEY, in presenting this problem to the United States Senate, has this to say, and there is no question but what his remarks are well worth repeating for readers of the Herald-Telegram:

"Our basic obligation is to afford reasonable and legitimate protection for American jobs and American producers, as against unfair competition from floods of cheap foreign imports.

"To the greatest extent possible, consistent with that point, it has been my aim to try to increase trade with other countries, particularly in commodities that are not produced here at home, and where there is an unfulfilled need.

"I have received many messages from Wisconsin businesses which are deeply concerned with recent policies adopted by the administration for the reckless slashing of trade barriers. These folks, both businessmen and unions, as well as individual workers, are concerned lest in our zeal to promote world commerce we lose sight of the following facts:

"(a) America has the highest standard of living in the world.

"(b) American wages are, generally speaking, the highest in the world.

"(c) The largest element in the cost of any commodity is, generally speaking, the cost of labor.

"(d) If foreign countries using inexpensive labor at what amounts to serf prices, can have tariffs lowered appreciably, they can literally flood many American items off the markets.

"Mr. President, I am not an alarmist, but I do not want to underestimate this situation * * *. I have protested many times to the United States Tariff Commission against particular tariff slashes, but usually my protests have fallen on deaf ears, and the same holds true in the case of my appeals to the White House."

Senator WILEY then read the Boot and Shoe Workers' letter into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, commenting that "the letter speaks for itself about cheap foreign shoes flooding American markets, and that is why I have requested unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD."

It is encouraging to note that Wisconsin's very able senior Senator has taken up the fight for the State's boot and shoe workers with the same zeal and enthusiasm which characterized his fight for the dairy farmers of Wisconsin.

Manufacturers, individual workers, and the State's thousands of farmers should take heart in the knowledge that Senator WILEY is doing more than just passing the time of day in the United States Senate. Residents of Chippewa Falls should be doubly proud of the courageous fight which ALEXANDER WILEY is waging to protect the interests of his constituents.

Force Against the Public

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FORREST C. DONNELL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in the Kansas City Times of May 11, 1950, the concluding sentence of which refers to the firemen's recent strike, saying:

If the Federal Government is unable to protect its people in such an emergency, the time has come for new legislation.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FORCE AGAINST THE PUBLIC

On an outright featherbedding issue the firemen's brotherhood has stopped service on four major railroads. From coast to coast hundreds of cities and towns are left without railroad service. Industries depending on these four lines face the prospect of shutdown. Passenger travel is disrupted.

The responsibility for drastic action checks to Washington. If the President has no power to act, as he claims, then the issue is in the lap of Congress.

Until now there has been no way to compromise with the union. It has delivered an ultimatum and stands on it. The key demand which is a third man on each Diesel locomotive, is the strategic point of attack in a general movement to spread the featherbedding practice through the Nation's railroad systems.

The brotherhood couldn't have chosen a clearer example to show the American public how featherbedding works.

A second man, a firemen, is already carried on a Diesel as a safety factor. An engineer alone could operate the locomotive with normal safety. If he should suffer a heart attack or lose his faculties for any reason the automatic device is on hand to stop the train as soon as his foot leaves the pedal. But where many lives are involved the precaution of an extra man is justified. Automatic devices sometimes fail. So a second man is on hand for some rare emergency.

A third man could serve no purpose whatever. He would just go along for the ride and draw his pay. That is featherbedding. The third man on all the Diesels would account for an annual expense of $40,000,000 a year.

If the firemen's brotherhood can have its way on this issue it has softened the resistance to many other demands. Its drive is to make jobs for extra men. The only way the railroads could pay such mounting costs is by increasing freight rates and fares that are already too high.

The claim for a third man on a Diesel has not been supported anywhere outside the brotherhood's leaders. It has gone to two Presidential fact-finding boards and has been turned down by both.

The movement started back in 1939. A board appointed by President Roosevelt held that no purpose would be served by a third man on a Diesel. The demand persisted. In 1949 a board appointed by President Truman heard the arguments and found against the brotherhood.

This is no ordinary labor dispute in which you have good arguments on both sides. Left without any support for its argument the firemen's brotherhood is determined to have its way by force. The victims are literally millions of people who depend directly or indirectly on the service of four major railroads.

If the Federal Government is unable to protect its people in such an emergency the time has come for new legislation.

Point 4 and Southeast Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, when President Truman launched the idea of the point 4 program, to give technical assistance to underdeveloped areas of the world, he summed up the American hope for world stability in these stirring words:

Democracy alone can supply the vitalizing force to stir the peoples of the world into triumphant action, not only against their human oppressors, but also against their ancient enemies—hunger, misery, and despair.

These words gain their fullest meaning when the problems of the underdeveloped areas are brought out into the open and studied from the viewpoint of the people in those areas.

Raden Sudjatmoko, acting chief of the Indonesian Observer's Mission to the United Nations, made a statement on April 15, 1950, before the fifty-fourth annual meeting of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, giving his own viewpoint on the point 4 program in its relation to the problems of southeast Asia.

Because I believe our participation in the point 4 program must be guided by the fullest knowledge of the problems we face, I wish to call attention to Raden Sudjatmoko's views and ask unanimous consent that excerpts from his address Point Four and Southeast Asia may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POINT 4 AND SOUTHEAST ASIA

Before beginning my remarks, I want to make it clear, that what I have to say tonight is entirely my own personal view, and does not in any way reflect the views or opinions of my government.

Point 4 is the assertion of faith in a world based on the recognition of mutual interdependency of all nations, economically and politically. It is inspired by the belief that if a new world is to emerge from the present chaos, it will have to be a world of peace and general prosperity so that the peoples of the world can live in freedom and dignity. The opportunities are there. In southeast Asia especially, where the people have shaken off their chains and laid the first political foundations for such a life, they are eager to get to work and reap the material and spiritual fruits which freedom can bring.

The opportunities are tremendous, the responsibilities are equally great. Once this program is undertaken, we cannot afford to fail. The political loss to this country, to the nations which would benefit from this program, and to the rest of the world, would be far too serious.

All this puts a burden of tremendous responsibility on the governments and peoples which will participate in this venture. For the United Nations, this means the necessity of reconciling the basic conceptual differences still present despite the unanimous vote of acceptance of the United Nations technical assistance program. It will be the task of the United Nations to keep this endeavor as much as possible out of the areas of conflict besetting the world organization.

For the governments of the underdeveloped countries participating in this program, the responsibilities are equally clear. These would entail the necessity of achieving political stability, the necessity of fulfilling honorably and scrupulously their international obligations, and the early establishment of well-functioning administrations. But they also entail their responsibility toward their own peoples, the necessity of ensuring their own economic development and the raising of their own peoples' standards of living. It will be the responsibility of these governments to carry through those changes in the social and economic structure which

are indispensable for solving the problems of poverty in these areas, and to stimulate and channel the constructive forces in this direction.

* * * * *

The reemergence of Asia in the world is a permanent phenomenon. Asia's political crystallization and stabilization, its economic development are bound to take place in the irreversible course of history. The big question facing both the peoples of Asia and the peoples of the economically more advanced countries is how this crystallization and stabilization and how this economic development will be consummated, and in what direction they will go. The political and social forces now at work in southern Asia push for an early solution to the problems of immense poverty aggravated in many parts of that area by a tremendous population pressure, to the problems created by the out-dated, out-moded methods of production and the general low productivity of labor, to the problem of land tenure, and in general to the problems created by the distorted colonial economy, and to the problems arising out of the aftermath of World War II. No government in that area of the world can hope to achieve stability if these problems are not faced and solved in some manner or other. It was the fact that these problems could not be resolved within the framework of the colonial relationship that made the revolution in Asia a historical necessity. Now that the release from colonal domination has been won, the answers to these problems can only be found within the framework of a new society, through social reforms, and through economic development. But how can these goals be achieved? Once this is clear: The main burden will fall on us, but the question of whether we will be aided by other countries in this process will be of crucial importance.

* * * * *

The problems of southern Asia are there, cold war or no cold war. The question of how we will solve these problems, how soon, and by what means, the answers to these questions will determine what southeast Asia's position will be in the struggle between dictatorship and democracy. Therefore, the fate of southeast Asia will not be determined by its alinement with any power blocs but by the outcome of our own war, our own war against poverty and misery. Or, to put it another way, the political and social structure with which Asia will eventually emerge will be that structure which gives the answer to the problems of poverty.

It should not be overlooked that by the very nature of the revolution in Asia, which is a struggle for a life of freedom, there is an inherent determination to reject subservience to foreign domination or foreign influence, be it from The Hague, London, Paris, Washington, or Moscow. It is perfectly clear that one of the elements of the upheaval in southern Asia is the desire for greater popular self expression, and therefore for democracy. Thus, the best contribution that southeast Asia can make to the cause of peace and democratic development is to answer successfully the immediate political and economic problems with which she is confronted. This preoccupation with national problems is not only justified, but is the only course open, and no government there could survive the relegation of these problems to a secondary level. Therefore, attempts to draw the countries of southern Asia into the immediate orbit of the cold war, as, for example, the pressure on these countries to recognize Bao Dai, can only deflect them from following the sole constructive course open to them.

It is against this background that point four has been launched. The psychological and political pattern of the southeast Asian scene demonstrates that in the eyes of the peoples of southern Asia, point four cannot be separated from their reactions to other policies toward this area. If point four is launched on the assumption that economic aid is the best means of bringing about early stabilization and democratic development, then it should be made clear to them that the other aspects of American policy in southeast Asia are consistent with this program. The time is past when policy with regard to southeast Asia could be based exclusively on the requirements of policy in Europe.

These political realities must be taken into account; they have to be dealt with before we even start thinking about implementing point four. But apart from these political factors, there are also equally important social and economic factors involved in the revolution in Asia, and planing for point four must embrace consideration of these factors as well.

Colonial society, the legacy left to us, was a plural society without any organic coherence. It was comprised of distinct social strata, fundamentally separated by the differentiation of economic functions, a division which actually tended to fall along racial lines. There was the top layer composed of Europeans, who maintained the estates or other businesses, or were involved in the administration of the colonial government. The middle class consisted almost entirely of nonindigenous Asians, usually Chinese or Indians, who were mainly concerned with local retail trade. On the bottom layer was the native population which was tied up with the economic machinery only insofar as that contributed to the functioning of foreign capital enterprise. In many ways this third layer lived in an entirely different world, in a precapitalistic one, on the fringes of the economic processes taking place in that country. Because there was no organic coherence among the social strata, the different races lived side by side, tied to each other only by the common desire for gain. The center of economic and political activity was located entirely in the European upper class and the foreign Asiastic middle class. The native population played a passive role: they were the object of economic forces over which they had no control. On the part of the native population there was no sense of participation in or responsibility for the functioning of the machinery of state or its economic processes. Life for the native was senseless and purposeless.

The total reaction against this personal and collective frustration is the most dominant and the deepest-rooted feature of the present revolution in Asia. The reach for power on the part of the native population is in fact the reach for a new life. It is the dominating urge of a people for self-expression. The revolution in Asia was born out of the peoples' desire for responsibility for their own lives, opening up old sources of creative energy. This psychological element in the rebirth of Asia should not be underestimated in any evaluation of the forces at work in Asia today. Collectively this upheaval in Asia also means a new surge toward unity, toward social coherence, a desire to break up the social organization and stratification of the past and achieve a new social reintegration. It means the formation of a society which will be the expression of the indigenous peoples themselves, a society in which the people can participate fully with a true sense of purpose. Social change is therefore the essential, the premordial element in this re-emergence of Asia.

* * * * *

The direction in which the political and social forces in Asia move, is clear. To cope with the present situation in Asia, any government will first of all have to exert every effort to transform the distorted colonial economy into a well-balanced, diversified one. The choice of the resources to be developed must be determined by the human needs of the area involved. Never again will alien economic forces be permitted to work without social control, taking into account their responsibility for the social and economic consequences of their activities for the indigenous peoples. There must be found a new and equitable balance between the function and the remuneration of foreign capital. All economic enterprise will have to be part of the total economic and social fabric and cannot be allowed to operate as alien entities. Economic processes in these new states of Asia will have to encompass the people as a whole. One cannot underestimate this trend. It is a fact, it is one of the fundamental realities of the situation in southern Asia. It reflects the fundamental attitudes which were conditioned by the bitter experiences of our own contact with outside economic forces in the colonial era in the past. Now we will have to find a new basis for our relationship with foreign capital, a basis which at the same time would provide foreign capital with a foundation upon which it can fruitfully and safely build for mutual benefit.

To ignore these trends as they present themselves in southern Asia would mean building in the air. Instead of thinking in terms of the interests of the foreign investor exclusively, as was the case under the colonial set-up, we should now think in terms of mutual interests. Instead of exclusive foreign ownership of the new enterprises we should rather think in terms of joint ventures, providing opportunities for indigenous capital accumulation, local managerial training and the development of local skills. We will also have to find those forms of economic enterprise in which the population itself will participate to a greater degree. Such joint ventures will be an important contribution to over-all stability. In this way foreign capital's apprehensions about the dangers of nationalization will be greatly diminished.

It will also be necessary for the local government to stimulate indigenous economic endeavor. Because of the lack of local capital, it may be necessary in the beginning for the Government to step in temporarily to provide the necessary capital. The Government shares of such enterprises could then be floated at a later date. Those forms of economic enterprises will then have to be found which will leave a sufficient margin for capital accumulation for the indigenous economy. The absence of any native economic bargaining power will make it impossible at this moment to work on the basis of an economic free-for-all. It is essential that those goods be produced and those resources developed which are most needed by the people. A system of priorities will therefore be necessary.

* * * * *

Economic development necessarily brings in its wake social dislocations of a more or less serious nature. In fact, the whole process is in the first place a social process, the speed and success of which are determined not only by purely economic factors but by the factors which are related to the psychological atmosphere, the level of education, the level of health, etc. Because of this wide impact, the whole process of economic development calls for an integrated approach. In many ways we will have to find, as we go along, those forms of economic enterprise which are equally beneficial to the foreign investor and to the indigenous peoples, and which still retain sufficient attractiveness for foreign capital.

Incentives for foreign capital will not be lacking, incentives in the form of transferability of a substantial part of the profits, and repatriation of invested capital. The

governments will also have to safeguard the interests of foreign investors and guarantee that there will be no expropriation without fair and reasonable compensation. The procedure for nationalization is not, after all, an arbitrary step taken by a government, but a parliamentary measure. The investor should have guaranties from the Government that when, for reasons of public interest, nationalization must be decided upon, the investor would receive compensation in the currency of the original investment and not in local currency.

But the best guaranty for safeguarding foreign interests is sound political development. Foreign investors cannot fail to realize that the raised standard of living and the increase in political stability in these areas will lead to greater markets and a tremendous expansion of world trade. But it only stands to reason that before private capital can really begin to operate on projects of sufficient maturity, the basic human and material resources of many parts of that area will have to be developed first, for example the harbors, roads, communications, public health programs, education, etc. The development of these fundamental resources will of course not be sufficiently attractive to the average private capital investor; therefore public or private loans on a long-term basis will be needed to meet these ends. At the same time, part of the expenses of these basic projects will have to be met through domestic financing.

The legislation on point 4 now under discussion, envisages a program for technical assistance and measures intended to widen the powers of the Export-Import Bank. The export of technical skills to these underdeveloped areas will be invaluable for coming to grips with the problems before us. But without a revival of the flow of investment capital to these nations, there are definite limitations to what this technical assistance can achieve. The fate of the point 4 program, therefore, will not be determined primarily by the degree and amount of technical assistance available, but rather by the question whether enough capital will move into these areas, and under what conditions it will operate. The question of the revival of the flow of private capital, under the terms of the present proposals, will be dealt with at a later stage after a favorable atmosphere for foreign investment will have been created.

I think it is clear from what I said before about the nature and the elements of the upheaval in southern Asia, that the old concepts regarding private investment find no place in the world today. Capital coming in under point 4 should not merely replace colonial capital. What is needed instead is a new outlook, a new concept of investment for the underdeveloped areas all over the world. The concepts and the forms of economic enterprise of the colonial era have become obsolete with the disappearance of that era. These forms of economic enterprise are no longer politically acceptable to the underdeveloped countries. Foreign capital investment will have to take place in such a way that the necessary social changes in these areas will occur and will be stimulated, not impeded, by the role of foreign capital.

* * * * *

The success of point 4 in southern Asia, insofar as it is launched as an American program, will depend on whether the political background of southern Asia and also the implications of United States foreign policy in that area, are fully understood. It is essential that southeast Asia should not be left in any doubt as to America's intentions in her approach to the problems of that area, and that the United States, recognizing the facts of the situation, is willing to come to grips with the problems of southeast Asia as problems in their own right. This means that the plans for economic development and the time schedule envisaged in this program of aid should not be determined by the cold war. Thus, for example, what is required in southern Asia is not merely the reaching of prewar levels of production, nor the rehabilitation of the old economic framework as a useful factor in the cold war in Asia or Europe. What is needed, instead, is a complete revision of the production patterns and of the resources which are to be developed. Foreign capital cannot afford to insist upon conditions which would perpetuate rather than change the old colonial social and economic structures. The United States must identify herself with the necessity for social change, and the abolishment of colonialism.

The opportunities which lie before the entire Western World as a result of President Truman's bold new program, offer a challenge not only to America but to all the west in dealing with the rest of the world. This is the challenge which will have to be met for the survival of freedom and democracy in this world. The opportunities to find new foundations and new bases for cooperation between the developed and the economically underdeveloped areas exist. It is the obligation of the governments and the peoples of both groups of countries to work together to seek to build upon these foundations. The stakes are high. This is the challenge for freedom.

Plight of Dairy Farmers in New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I have recently received a very interesting letter from Mr. William E. Maier, one of my constituents who is a subdistrict president of the Dairymen's League Cooperative Association.

Mr. Maier, who is a highly respected dairy farmer in Cattaraugus County, wrote to me concerning the plight of the dairy farmers in New York, with special reference to two resolutions I have introduced on this subject.

His letter is so pertinent that I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD pertinent excerpts from this letter.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DAIRYMEN'S LEAGUE COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION, INC., DISTRICT NO. 18,
East Otto, N. Y., May 10, 1950.

Certainly we must do everything in our power to protect and preserve our animal agriculture, of which dairying is such a vital part.

India and China are today the most famine-ridden and disease-ridden countries in the world because they have allowed their animal agriculture to disappear.

Is it any wonder that the Communists have taken over China and are attempting the same in India?

Communism thrives in the heavy clay of hunger, want, suffering, and hardship.

Today, our American animal agriculture is providing our Nation with the finest diet of any country in the world. It is also maintaining and improving our soil fertility with indispensable organic fertilizer in the form of livestock manure.

We Cattaraugus County dairy farmers sincerely thank you for your deep and abiding concern over our industry and our welfare.

While you were Governor of our State, you signed the Rogers-Allen law and the State milk marketing order No. 127.

Today, these laws are still operative and as a result we dairymen, whose milk is marketed in Buffalo and Rochester, are enjoying the best prices of any major market.

Again, let me thank you, on behalf of the other 700 league farmers in my county for the great service you are rendering dairymen.

Would appreciate your keeping me informed on the progress of Senate Joint Resolution 162.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM E. MAIER.

The Railroad Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FORREST C. DONNELL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I have secured unanimous consent that an editorial of May 17 with respect to the termination of a strike, the unemployment caused by which appeared to have passed the 200,000 mark be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD. On this day, May 19, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a news article in this afternoon's Evening Star of Washington, D. C., entitled "Switchmen's Strike 'Wholly Unjustified' Railroads Protest." This article refers to a strike threatened to begin at 6 o'clock in the morning of Tuesday next, the twenty-third of May.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SWITCHMEN'S STRIKE "WHOLLY UNJUSTIFIED," RAILROADS PROTEST

CHICAGO, May 19.—The threatened strike Tuesday of A. F. of L. switchmen against 10 railroads "is wholly unjustified," the Western Association of Railways said today.

"This strike threat," the association said in a statement, "is a reckless drive for prestige—an attempt by one small union to outsmart and outdo a big rival union."

Only Government intervention could avert the scheduled walkout—set for 6 a. m. (local time) against the 10 Midwestern and Western lines. Although no word came from the White House after the strike call Wednesday night, the National (Railway) Mediation Board was expected to be called in and attempt to settle the wage-hour dispute.

WAGE INCREASE INVOLVED

The A. F. of L. Switchmen's Union of North America said the strike would involve 6,000 members. A rail spokesman said 4,000 would be affected. The union's principal demand is for a 40-hour work week at the pay now received for 48 hours.

Daniel P. Loomis, the association's chairman, said the union's demands also include a 44 percent increase in the basic daily wage rate and other items which are equivalent to a wage boost of about 50 percent.

Mr. Loomis said the switchmen's union represents less than 5 percent of the ground men (not yard engineers and firemen) in

switchyards throughout the country. The other 95 percent, he added, are represented by another operating union, the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. A few are members of the Order of Railway Conductors.

"The railroads involved are caught in the middle," Mr. Loomis said.

SAYS UNION HAS COMPLIED

Arthur J. Glover, switchmen's president, said the union had complied with all mediation requirements of the Railway Labor Act and was free to strike legally.

Roger I. McDonough, chief justice of the Utah supreme court and chairman of the fact-finding board, said: "If the switchmen strike, they walk out without ever having presented the merits of their case to our board."

Lines involved in the dispute are: Chicago Great Western; Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific; Davenport, Rock Island & Northwestern; Denver & Rio Grande Western; Great Northern; Minneapolis & St. Louis; Northern Pacific Terminal of Oregon; St. Paul Union Depot Co.; Sioux City Terminal Railway and Western Pacific Railroad.

The Siren Song of Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I have just quoted, word-for-word, an editorial which appeared in the Indianapolis Star under date of Tuesday, May 16, 1950. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which also appeared in the Indianapolis Star on the same date, the editorial being captioned "The Siren Song of Socialism."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SIREN SONG OF SOCIALISM

President Truman dropped all pretense about the "nonpolitical" nature of his barnstorming trip at the taxpayers' expense last night. Accompanied by a rain of $2 bills to lure his audience, by a 21-gun salute, a $250,000 political sideshow, a torchlight parade, and cowboys and Hollywood girls, Harry Truman launched into one of the most partisan political speeches he has made yet.

He called for reelection of Senator LUCAS, of Illinois. He called for a Fair Deal rubberstamp Congress. He told his audience that the Democratic Party has been responsible for every progressive Government action in American history and that the Republican Party is made up of reactionaries and doubting Thomases.

He then appealed to every special interest group in the Nation, to small businesses, to farmers, to labor, to the aged, the sick, the minority groups and the educators by offering them bigger and better bribes in return for votes. The bribe has become the most potent political weapon in the Truman war chest. It was quite fitting that his party should give away $2 bills to attract a big audience to hear the party's leader. What else might you expect from a Pendergast politician?

The President not only gave the Democratic Party credit for everything good that has happened to America since Jefferson's day. He also gave himself and his administration credit for the profits of industry and the wages of labor, profits that were earned in spite of the highest corporation taxes in history through the genius and planning of American business, and wages that were earned in spite of the highest income taxes in history by the most productive labor force in the world's history.

The President promised a wonderful future for America to be achieved by him and by the Democratic Party. He has forgotten that the wonderful past and present of America were made possible by the absence of the very burdens which he proposes to impose upon our free system—taxes, deficits, Government controls, state ownership of power, labor monopoly, and the socialization of medicine.

"Give me the votes, give me the money, give me the power," he is saying to us, "and I will make you happy." He is asking us to sell ourselves into total dependence upon him and upon Government for our lives, our property, and our liberties. He sings the siren song of socialism, and if we listen and follow, we shall, like every other people before us, end on the rocks of poverty and slavery.

Acheson Must Go

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in the Washington Times-Herald on May 19, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ACHESON MUST GO

Secretary Acheson has set up at London the framework of a world-wide Communist state.

It is not enough to call it socialistic. The Truman-Acheson regime was recently termed by John Strachey, the former Communist now in the British Labor Cabinet, as "more to the left" in economic views than most continental European governments. He didn't know the half of it. Mr. Acheson's program would go beyond this to concentrate power in a western imitation of Moscow's Politburo.

SUPERGOVERNMENT IS NOW PLANNED

This affection for Communist methodology comes naturally to Acheson. He was up to his ears in the Hiss case, and has kept himself involved in it by his voluntary public statements.

He is the most dangerous man in America. If Truman won't fire him, Congress should impeach him or cause his removal by withholding funds from the State Department and its projects.

In view of the scandals within his department, Acheson obviously felt the need of a diversionary tactic, in the form of some spectacular proposal at the London foreign ministers' council. The plan he has brought forward is an effort to smuggle the United States into a world supergovernment through the back door.

By his promises of more American billions, Acheson won the approval by the European foreign ministers of a committee of "supercitizens," as they were described by Arthur Veysey of the Chicago Tribune London bureau, to rule both the military and economic affairs of the 12 Atlantic-pact nations.

An American is to be chairman, since we shall be putting up the money, and a civilian is suggested, but Gen. Eisenhower is named as the probable nominee in the next breath. Presumably a couple of years on the Columbia University campus makes a civilian of a nonretired general of the Army.

At a time when Congress is growing more and more restive over the Marshall plan waste, Acheson won support for his proposal by suggestions that the United States not only will increase its present gift of a billion a year for European arms, but will continue Marshall-plan subsidies to European living standards after that plan expires in 1952. He admitted that he could not bind Congress, but he held out the warmest hopes, nevertheless.

When the Atlantic pact was presented to the Senate for ratification anyone should have been able to see that it was only nominally a military alliance. In addition to putting us into any European war at the first shot, it pledged signatories to safeguard the freedom, common heritage, and civilization of their peoples and to promote stability and well being in the North Atlantic area.

The treaty provided for continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid—with conspicuous lack of any reservation confining that aid to the military field.

It is idle to think that control of economic affairs of this Nation can be turned over to an international committee without yielding political sovereignty to that body.

HE'S PLAYING STALIN'S GAME

If there is any doubt as to what Acheson has in mind, it should be resolved by the statement of the correspondent of the New York Times, a fervent supporter of his policies, that the scheme involves some sacrifice of national sovereignty.

This is a magnificent understatement. The Constitution of the United States and the Acheson politburo cannot exist in the same world, but the means that will be used in the attempt to reconcile them can be predicted with some confidence.

Obviously no international committee can commandeer the resources and men of this country, but Congress will be told that the committee, acting under a treaty that is the supreme law of the land, has made drafts that cannot be refused without national dishonor.

Congress will be told also that it must go along with Acheson's folly or destroy the confidence of the world. Any attempt at objective consideration of the scheme will be cried down by the administration propaganda machine and the internationalist press as playing Stalin's game.

Actually it is Acheson by his efforts to destroy constitutional processes and bleed America white, who is playing Stalin's game. Unless the Nation is freed of his false leadership, we may yet fall, exhausted, to the Communists.

Removal of Exemption Applicable to Public Contracts Performed in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement I

issued yesterday commenting on a proposal by Secretary of Labor Maurice J. Tobin to remove the administrative exemption which has been applicable to public contracts performed in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. I also ask consent to have included in the Appendix, in connection with this statement, the announcement by Secretary Tobin.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, is it made clear that the insertion is a statement, not a speech? The Senator stated he had issued a statement.

Mr. LEHMAN. I issued a statement.

Mr. CONNALLY. Will it appear in the the Appendix of the RECORD as a statement, not a speech?

Mr. LEHMAN. It will appear as a statement, together with the order which was issued May 17, 1950, by the Secretary of Labor.

Mr. CONNALLY. Very well.

There being no objection, the statement, together with the announcement by Secretary Tobin, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF HERBERT H. LEHMAN ON ACTION OF LABOR DEPARTMENT TO REMOVE PUBLIC CONTRACTS ACT EXEMPTION FOR PUERTO RICO AND THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

I was pleased to note the announcement by Secretary of Labor Maurice J. Tobin that the Labor Department proposes to remove the administrative exemption for public contracts performed in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

I have long felt that there should be no distinction whatsoever between the application of the Walsh-Healey Act to Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands and to other parts of the United States. This act already applies to the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii. I see no reason for making a distinction between the Territories, or for that matter, between the Territories and the mainland of the United States.

I understand that every opportunity will be given to interested persons to submit arguments on the proposed change. I certainly support Secretary Tobin's action in this regard and shall express to him my strong feeling that his proposal be given final effect.

I would urge this both in my capacity as a member of the Labor Committee and as a Member of the Senate from New York, many of whose citizens are of Puerto Rican origin. I do not think that any distinction should be made between Puerto Ricans in New York and Puerto Ricans in Puerto Rico. The same goes for the Virgin Islands. They are all citizens under the American flag whether they be in New York or in Puerto Rico or the Virgin Islands.

My attitude is the same whether it involves the Public Contracts Act or social security. I think Secretary Tobin's act is a hopeful augury for the removal of all discriminations of this kind.

[U. S. Department of Labor, Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Divisions, Washington, D. C.]

SECRETARY TOBIN WOULD REMOVE PUBLIC CONTRACTS ACT EXEMPTION FOR GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS IN PUERTO RICO, VIRGIN ISLANDS

Secretary of Labor Maurice J. Tobin today announced his proposal to remove the administrative exemption under which the Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act has been inapplicable to contracts performed in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

Effect of the proposal would be to make the act, which provides labor standards for Government manufacture or supply contracts of more than $10,000, apply in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands to the same extent that it applies in the continental United States and in the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii.

The administrative exemption for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands has been in effect since 1936. Secretary Tobin pointed out that information currently available indicates no compelling reasons why the exemption for contracts to be performed in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands should be retained.

Formal notice of the Secretary's proposal is scheduled to appear in the Federal Register on Thursday, May 18. Interested persons will be given until June 15 to submit data, views, or arguments pertaining to the proposed change.

The Railroad Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FORREST C. DONNELL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, on May 16 the people of the United States learned that there had been terminated the firemen's strike, because of which the total unemployment appeared to have already passed the 200,000 mark. I ask unanimous consent that there be incorporated in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch on the next day, May 17, 1950, entitled "Now That the Strike Is Over."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOW THAT THE STRIKE IS OVER

Trains on the New York Central, Pennsylvania and other affected railroads are moving again after having been strike-bound for almost a week. Needless to say, this is good news, especially for the thousands of persons who, while in no way parties to the dispute, were seriously hampered by it.

The Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen has announced a "modification" of its demand for a second fireman on multiple-unit Diesel engines. The issue in its reshaped form is to go to an arbitration board, and its decision is to be binding on both sides.

So, once again, the old question arises: If this solution is as good as both sides now seem to feel, why did they not resort to it sooner? Why did there have to be a strike? If this had been a private head-butting contest between two stubborn adversaries, the public might have refrained from asking the question.

But there can be no such indifference toward a strike which impinges on the public interest—especially not when one party does not make a stronger case than that of the firemen. The harmfulness of railroad strikes was recognized long ago and railroad labor was made the subject of special Federal legislation.

We do not say that this legislation has always been an automatic guaranty against injustice. In recent years many complaints have been made—especially against the slowness of its administration. But a strike such as this one does not help. It ought to be all the inducement Congress needs to see whether the machinery of the Railroad Labor Act may not be improved.

A better law may be no consolation to a fireman who faces the loss of his job. Nor will it help him much to point out that the Diesel engine is not the first technological improvement which threatened to displace labor. Almost all such improvements opened up more jobs in the long run than they wiped out. Unfortunately, an individual cannot live in the long run. Good personnel practice certainly indicates the desirability of finding a useful place for him in some other capacity. But a strike is hardly calculated to bring about such a policy.

Perhaps those involved have salvaged some measure of good will by calling off the strike when they did. If so, we hope that it will help toward a solid solution of their problems—the kind of solution which seldom comes from industrial warfare.

Helping the DAV and DAV Service Foundation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an appeal which I have made in the past and which I am happy to renew now for the purpose of mobilizing aid for the DAV organization and for the DAV Service Foundation.

There being no objection, the appeal was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HELPING THE DAV AND DAV SERVICE FOUNDATION

Mr. President, on June 17 it will be my pleasure to address the annual convention of the Wisconsin Department of the Disabled American Veterans. There are many fine groups in the State of Wisconsin whom it has been my privilege to appear before, but I must confess that I get a particular thrill when I talk to the group of heroic men who bear on their bodies the scars and wounds of battle in the uniform of their country.

What higher honor can there be for me as a citizen who has been elected to serve his people than to appear before those who preserved their government and their free way of life by their sacrifices? What greater honor can there be to come to a human being than to comrade with the men who preserved mankind's freedom—the freedom of civilization—on the land, on the seas, and in the skies in two global wars?

Mr. President, I express therefore this sincere tribute to this organization and to the trustee of the DAV, the Disabled American Veterans Service Foundation.

MY PREVIOUS TRIBUTES TO DAV

It has been my privilege on several previous occasions, for example, on July 2, 1945, on June 8, 1948, on May 6, 1949, to call attention of the Congress to the work of the DAV. I have on these occasions made an exception to a rule which I personally have followed, of not discussing the financial needs of a private

organization on the floor of the Senate or in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This exception has been made because I think that certainly if there is any private organization whose financial needs should indeed be discussed, it is the DAV Service Foundation, which, in turn, meets the needs of America's war-wounded and disabled veterans.

How can anyone say such an organization is "private" when, obviously, its responsibility to the heroes who carry wounds and scars of battle is our responsibility? No, its so-called private role is indeed a semipublic or truly public role. Why? Because if this Nation were ever to forget its public debt to those who saved it by offering their very lives to shot and shell, then our country would be on the road to extinction.

LET'S NOT FORGET HOSPITALIZED VETS

Here is a question which I submit to every American: Have you ever visited a veterans' hospital? You know, my friends, it is 32 years since the guns ceased firing in World War I. It is 5 years since the cannon were stilled in World War II, but in a certain sense, the sounds and sights of war can still be heard and seen in the veterans' hospitals of America, and, for that matter, in hundreds of thousands of private homes where men bear with them the broken limbs, empty sleeves, the sightless eyes, the scarred features, the paralyzed organs, the shattered minds, the pain, the hurt, the suffering of weapons of steel.

While not all Americans could answer the question "Yes"—that they have visited a veterans' hospital, there isn't a man, woman or child among us who has not seen a wounded veteran walking down the street in our home town, living as every other ordinary American, and yet in a certain sense, and inevitably so, in a class apart because that veteran's body has been the target of shot and shell.

WORTHY DAV APPEALS FOR FUNDS

About a year ago, I advised my colleagues that the incorporated trustee of the DAV, the Disabled American Veterans Service Foundation, was then dramatizing its appeal for much-needed funds by full-page display advertisements in many magazines and newspapers, featuring 330 cash prizes, totaling $100,000, which were awarded in an intriguing mosaic patterned word-puzzle contest. So successful was the DAV Service Foundation in this new formula of raising badly needed money for a worth-while cause that it acquired more than $2,000,000 net profits from its first two annual contests, out of which its board of 13 trustees has so far allocated the sum of $1,100,000 to the national headquarters of the DAV for its Nation-wide service activities on behalf of war-disabled veterans and their dependents.

THIRD PUZZLE CONTEST UNDER WAY

This successful experience encouraged the DAV Service Foundation to conduct a third word-puzzle contest, which started during the latter part of January 1950, to which original puzzle-solution entries were submittable up until before midnight of May 1, 1950. Judging by the full-page display advertisements that have appeared in many prominent magazines and metropolitan newspapers throughout the country, the third national puzzle contest conducted by the DAV Service Foundation will probably also prove to be successful.

JUNE 30 DEADLINE

I understand that official substitute solutions may be submitted by the contestants up until June 30, 1950, after which there will be an evaluation of the relative solutions, with the possibility that the top tied valid high scorers will have to compete in the solution of from one to four sets of five tie-breaking puzzles before the winners of the 1,002 cash prizes, totaling $100,000, and of the three automobile promptness prizes will have been awarded.

FAIR HANDLING OF CONTEST

Inasmuch as my long-time friend, the very able Millard W. Rice, is the executive secretary of the DAV Service Foundation (he was formerly national commander and national service director of the DAV, as well as national legislative director of the VFW), I am particularly confident that very meticulous care will be taken in the evaluation of the relative solutions by the contributing competitors in this third puzzle contest—just as was the case as to its first two puzzle contests—in determining the final winners. This will be in accordance with the rules of the contest, without any consideration whatsoever as to the location, race, creed, color, or financial or educational status of the respective contestants, but only on the basis of their relative skills in their valid puzzle solutions, which should have been completed by sometime next fall.

I am sincerely hopeful that the DAV Service Foundation will have been enabled to raise several hundred thousand dollars from its third puzzle contest, just as it did on its 1948 and 1949 contests, notwithstanding the fact that other organizations have patterned after the formula thus proven to be feasible for raising funds for service-giving purposes.

DAV IDENTO-TAG PROJECT

Many of my colleagues will no doubt recall having received miniature automobile license tags during the last several years, from the Disabled American Veterans. This is another unique and highly constructive method of raising funds. The DAV endeavors to send out such Idento-Tags to all automobile owners, as a result of which it returns about 5,000 sets of keys each month to their respective owners—a very effective Nation-wide key insurance—which results in substantial net profits to the DAV, after payment of all expenses incident to the accurate manufacturing and assembling of the individualized Idento-Tags, processed mostly by handicapped veterans and the dependents of veterans.

I would like to point out that if 100 percent of the recipients of these neat little key ring Idento-Tags were to return 50 cents or more, the DAV would have no financial problem in maintaining its staff of nearly 300 full-time national service officers.

These two unique methods of raising funds have heretofore made it possible for the DAV to maintain its invaluable Nation-wide service activities. But such finance-raising projects have not yet been sufficiently successful to enable it to build up as extensive a service set-up as the needs warrant or to build up a much-needed reserve trust fund for the future.

Judging by the experience as to World War I veterans, it will be necessary to maintain expert national service officers for the benefit of our World War II disabled veterans for the next 30 years or more.

Although most of my colleagues in Congress, as well as State and local governmental officials throughout the country, probably already know something about how ably and faithfully the DAV serves those Americans who were wounded, injured, or disabled while fighting in our country's wars, I believe that because of the magnitude of its task it is desirable to explore the subject more fully.

OUR GOVERNMENT'S LIMITATIONS

Although virtually all Americans believe that one of the primary obligations of the Government should be to see to it that all of our country's disabled war veterans and their dependents should be adequately provided for, I fear too many of them have erroneously assumed that such obligation must have been already fulfilled. Much as our Government has done for veterans, it has not, cannot, and really should not be expected to provide for an automatic solution for all of the problems of all disabled veterans and their dependents.

It is neither practicable nor desirable that the Government should underwrite all of the problems of all disabled veterans; such an easy method would be detrimental both for the disabled veterans themselves and for America's taxpayers.

The Government could not, and should not, provide sufficient compensation to every disabled veteran to obviate completely the necessity for receiving income from other sources.

The several Administrators of Veterans' Affairs, during the past 30 years, have repeatedly stated that the task of rendering adequate service to America's disabled veterans is a job far greater than can be taken care of merely by the Veterans' Administration.

The services of a nongovernmental congressionally chartered, volunteer organization, such as the Disabled American Veterans, are essential, if our disabled veterans are to become and to remain adjusted to useful civilian living, through suitable, gainful employment. Only thus can our disabled veterans be saved from dependency upon Government compensation, and be enabled to live as happy, self-supporting Americans.

ASSURING GAINFUL JOBS OUR RESPONSIBILITY

If American citizens, as employers, should fail to provide ample opportunities for the suitable employment of partially disabled veterans, then obviously such disabled veterans would have no other alternative than to seek to become completely dependent upon Government doles. That is not the American way. That is one of the reasons why I have introduced in the Eightieth and Eighty-first Congresses legislation to encourage employers to hire handicapped veterans.

Less than 7 percent of the nearly 2,000,000 service-connected compensated disabled veterans are rated by the Veterans' Administration as being totally disabled. The remaining 93 percent are considered as only partially disabled and therefore receive lesser rates of compensation. Their inadequate income from disability compensation must obviously be supplemented from some other source, preferably from suitable, useful, gainful employment.

WHY GOVERNMENT NEEDS DAV HELP

In accordance with its congressional charter, the DAV cooperates with the United States Veterans' Administration and all other public and private agencies devoted to the cause of improving and advancing the condition, health, and interests of wounded, injured, or disabled veterans.

The fact that America's war-disabled veterans saw fit to form their own organization—the Disabled American Veterans—should not, therefore, be regarded as an implied criticism against any Federal agency.

During the last 30 years, the DAV has been extending, free of any charge, much needed advice, counsel, and assistance to scores of thousands of disabled veterans in technically establishing their legal entitlement to governmental benefits to which, under certain legal limitations, restrictions, requirements, and provisions, they may be lawfully, equitably, and factually entitled.

Acting as the defendant, the Government is called upon to pay the damages—in the form of disability compensation for service-connected disabilities, medical treatment, hospitalization, vocational training, and other benefits provided by law—to the successful claimants.

It would be very inconsistent to expect the Government also to furnish the attorney for the claimant.

OFFICIAL COMPLICATIONS UNAVOIDABLE

Officials and employees in governmental bureaus must necessarily operate under complicated, technical regulations, legal interpretations, precedents, schedules of disability ratings, service letters, and other guiding policies and procedures in their administration and application of the some 800 laws pertaining to veterans and their dependents.

Lest he encroach upon the jurisdiction of some other governmental official within his own section, division, or agency, or with the policies and procedures of some other Federal agency, the jurisdiction of any one governmental official or employee must, naturally, be narrowly circumscribed.

My colleagues have all had sufficient contacts with governmental officials to be well aware of the full significance of this division of responsibility. No matter how much we might simplify government—as constantly advocated by myself and by my colleagues in the two Houses of Congress and outside of Congress—such division of authority is, to some extent, unavoidable.

PROCEDURE BAFFLING TO VETERAN CLAIMANTS

It just is not, and probably never will be, completely feasible for any veteran to go to one governmental official, or even to one Government office, to find out what he may be entitled to under any one or more of the numerous laws which might be pertinent, any more so than such an ideal situation can ever prevail as to any corporation which conducts business operations in more than one State.

Our Federal Government is exceedingly complicated, and its requirements are oftentimes utterly baffling to the average disabled veteran. He needs expert counsel as to the proper preparation, presentation, and prosecution of his claim for any benefit, privilege, or preference, to which he may be potentially entitled under any appropriate Federal law.

WHY A DAV

It was because of the realization of this difficulty—that the Government could not, and should not, be expected to take care of all of the complex, varied problems of America's disabled war veterans and their dependents—that the DAV was formed, some 30 years ago, by distressed, disappointed, disillusioned, disabled veterans of World War I.

Distressed disabled veterans need the helping hand of their own organization, the Disabled American Veterans, formed in 1920, congressionally chartered in 1932, and specifically designated in several Federal laws as a spokesman for America's war-disabled veterans.

THE DAV'S SERVICE SET-UP

Consisting exclusively of America's war-wounded and disabled veterans, the congressionally chartered Disabled American Veterans has, for 30 years, been specializing in extending its vital rehabilitation services, free of charge, to all disabled veterans and their dependents.

The DAV has been freely extending badly needed services to scores of thousands of disabled veterans each year, through its nearly 300 trained, experienced, full-time national service officers (all themselves disabled veterans) stationed in DAV service offices located in all of the Veterans' Administration's regional, district, and central offices throughout the country. Supplementing their work, the DAV also has more than 1,800 department and chapter service officers.

All of these service officers are skilled and experienced in the work of helping disabled veterans technically and factually to establish entitlement to any governmental benefits to which they may be lawfully and equitably entitled, such as service connections, disability compensation, medical treatment, hospitalization, and vocational training.

These service officers also use great resourcefulness to assist their disabled buddies to acquire and to retain adjustment to usefulness and self-support through suitable productive employment.

Let me point out that the peak service load will probably not be reached until 1960. Moreover, it is a fact that inasmuch as sharp curtailments in its budgets have caused the VA to trim its staff of contact men, a heavier load has been assumed by the volunteer service organizations, of which the DAV is outstanding.

Specifically designated in several Federal laws as a spokesman for America's war disabled veterans, and dedicated to the program of rendering needed service to, for, and by America's disabled war veterans, the DAV has been serving the men to whom the Nation owes a debt beyond payment.

The DAV maintains national headquarters at 1423 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati, Ohio, and its national service headquarters at 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

Its immediate past national commander is that great American, Gen. Jonathan M. Wainwright, the hero of Bataan and Corregidor. David M. Brown, a World War I disabled veteran, of Akron, Ohio, is its present national commander. Vivian D. Corbly is the national adjutant. Its national legislative director is Francis M. Sullivan; its national employment director is Kenneth C. Bradley; and its national director for claims, Cicero F. Hogan.

The organization publishes a newspaper—the DAV semimonthly—devoted to the interests of disabled veterans.

INCORPORATED TRUSTEE FOR DAV

As related in my statement concerning the same question 5 years ago, the DAV decided, back in 1931, that the potential donors who support its service program should have the assurance of a continuity of policy as to the expenditure, by the DAV, of all funds contributed. Therefore, the DAV formed a trusteeship, under the laws of the State of Ohio, known as the Disabled American Veterans Service Foundation.

The primary purpose of the DAV Service Foundation is to receive donations from interested social-minded Americans, and then periodically to make allocations, from its accumulated trust funds, to the national headquarters of the DAV—as the operating congressionally chartered membership organization of America's disabled defenders—to enable it to continue to maintain and further to expand its Nation-wide set-up of full-time, expert national service officers, national civil-service officers, and national employment officers.

In order to be enabled to carry on this service activity on a basis commensurate with the responsibilities assumed, the DAV, it has been estimated, should be enabled to expand its service budget up to at least $2,500,000 per year.

Under the terms of a trust agreement with the DAV, all foundation funds are placed into separate State trust-fund accounts, according to the States of origin of the funds raised.

The activities of the foundation are under the supervision of 13 trustees, 10 of whom each serve for 5-year periods, 2 expiring each year, with the other 3 consisting of the incumbent national commander and the chairman of the national finance committee of the DAV, and 1 other.

The president of the foundation is Miles H. Draper, a prominent attorney and friend of mine, of Tampa, Fla. Maj. Gen. Irving J. Phillipson, of New York City, director of industrial relations of Botany Mills, is chairman of the foundation's finance and budget committee, with Lewis L. Clarke, former president of the American Bank of New York City, and Arthur W. Procter, New York attorney, as fellow members.

Daniel Bell, president of the American Security & Trust Co., of Washington, D. C., is the chairman of its trust-fund investment committee, with Gen. Frank T. Hines, former Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, and Mr. Lewis L. Clarke as fellow members.

The DAV Service Foundation maintains offices at 808 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington 6, D. C., and also at 11 West Forty-second Street, New York 18, N. Y.

NEEDS ARE GREAT

According to the trustees—all prominent and conscientious civic-minded citizens—a trust fund of several scores of millions of dollars should be built up to provide for the DAV's needed annual service budget of $2,500,000 in future years.

Every social-minded individual and corporation has the opportunity to support this important work through generous donations—to the DAV Service Foundation—of money, real or personal property, shares of corporation common stock, preferred stock, bonds, and debentures, assignment of Government bonds, designation in insurance policies and wills, by purchase of its permanent personalized service plaques, by becoming a contributing competitor in its annual puzzle contests, and by other methods.

Other constructive plans of raising funds are now being considered by the DAV Service Foundation; and if the public is fully informed of the purpose of such funds, I am sure an enthusiastic response will follow.

CONCLUSION—LET'S CONTRIBUTE GENEROUSLY

As a United States Senator and as an American, I urge my fellow citizens to contribute out of their generous hearts to the need of our disabled veterans. I know how the average citizen these days is overwhelmed by many appeals from worth-while organizations. I know too that the average citizen has his own financial problems during these inflationary times.

But we must never forget that we would not be enjoying our liberty today but for the fact that these veterans were willing to sacrifice their health, their bodies, their very lives on the land, on the sea, and in the sky in order that this Nation might endure.

It is our creed, therefore, that we must fulfill the needs of those men who came back from the war with the scars and pain of battle. Let us fulfill our creed by our deeds. Let us honor our dead heroes by serving our surviving disabled war veterans. Let us help America's disabled veterans to help themselves. Let's not just pay token tribute to disabled veterans. Our ex-servicemen don't need a lot of hot air. They don't need a lot of talk, however sincere. They do need constructive aid to help make them self-supporting Americans. They ask so very little and gave us so very much.

We here in the Congress are challenged to enact legislation that will assure their welfare. Over in the House of Representatives now pending before the Veterans' Affairs Committee are a considerable number of bills in their interest. I personally, as I have indicated, have introduced legislation to help them and I will continue to do all that is within my power. It was my pleasure to address the graduation class here in Washington, D. C., of a service officer class—many young men who had lost an arm or a leg and yet who are functioning as whole men, stout-hearted, grave, conscientious, and who were embarking upon careers to help their buddies, yes, to help make their buddies adequate.

In the interests, therefore, of our disabled veterans, I have taken the liberty of referring to this organization and indeed to its financial needs. I know that the American people

will endorse my action just as they endorsed in hundreds of letters my previous statements pointing out very frankly the problems of this great group of veterans, the DAV and the DAV Service Foundation.

I believe the following endorsements will be of real interest to my colleagues and to the American people because they indicate the tremendous and unanimous support of outstanding authorities in this field:

ENDORSEMENTS OF DAV

Gen. Carl R. Gray, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs:

"Veterans who are disabled as the result of service in the defense of our Nation can never be repaid for the sacrifices they have made. In acknowledging this, our Government accepts a sacred obligation. That obligation is embodied in Public Law No. 16, which provides for the physical and occupational rehabilitation of disabled veterans whose abilities for earning a livelihood have been weakened or destroyed through service to the Nation in war.

"The Veterans' Administration is dedicated to carrying out to the utmost the determination of the American people to provide practical and permanent rehabilitation "for those who gave most," the disabled veterans of our Nation.

"In this task the Veterans' Administration is receiving valued cooperation from veterans' organizations, employers, and public and private agencies in local communities throughout our land. The help afforded by the Disabled American Veterans is an essential part of this common American enterprise.

"As Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, I know what the cooperation of the Disabled American Veterans has meant to Veterans' Administration in fulfilling its mission. I am sure that the help that the Disabled American Veterans Service Foundation gives to our disabled veterans is an important service to the cause of veterans' affairs."

Gen. Omar N. Bradley, former Administrator of Veterans' Affairs:

"The Disabled American Veterans represents in its name, in its purpose and its accomplishments those veterans who have been disabled in the service of their country. They—more than any others—deserve first call on all we can do.

"The DAV has been a great help to us in this important work. We welcomed this help in the past. We count confidently on it for the future.

"I am pleased to add my endorsement of the National Service Fund of the Disabled American Veterans. Certainly, this program, which has for its objective the rendering of service to those who served, is a worthy one. It merits the support of all who are interested in the welfare of our disabled ex-servicemen. Your efforts are commendable and I wish for your program the success it deserves."

O. W. Clark, Deputy Administrator, United States Veterans' Administration:

"The job of providing physical and occupational rehabilitation for America's war-wounded and disabled veterans can be accomplished only with the effective cooperation of many other public and private agencies, citizens, and employers. Among the cooperating associations, the Disabled American Veterans has been outstanding.

"The DAV helps the Veterans' Administration to help America's war-disabled veterans. Its incorporated trustee, the Disabled American Veterans Service Foundation, in turn helps the DAV to maintain its Nation-wide set-up of nearly 300 full-time, trained national service officers. Their technical information, advice, and assistance to individual disabled veterans, and their practical liaison with governmental agencies and prospective employers, has been of such great value as to have justified the Veterans' Administration in furnishing office facilities for them in all of its regional, district, and central offices.

"Generous public support of the DAV Service Foundation will assure continuance of the DAV's valuable service activities for the benefit of America's war-wounded and disabled veterans and their dependents."

Oscar R. Ewing, Federal Security Administrator:

"I want to express to you my admiration of the services which the Disabled American Veterans is giving to disabled veterans. Being a World War I veteran and also a lawyer, I can appreciate what your organization is doing.

"It stands to reason that if such disabled veterans are to obtain the full protection that Congress intended, many of them will need the advice and help of persons fully familiar with the laws governing the rights of veterans. I do not believe that this is the type of service that usually could be rendered by the ordinary practicing lawyer. Too often the time spent by the lawyer would be out of all proportion to the amount involved and either the lawyer would be underpaid or the veteran overcharged.

"It has been suggested, I know, that the Government might employ persons to act as counsel for the disabled veterans. This would, I am sure, be impracticable. Such employees of the Government almost inevitably develop a psychology which causes them to try to save the Government money instead of seeing that absolute justice is done to the veteran.

"Your organization's method for solving this problem is admirable, namely, the training of war-handicapped men as specialists in veterans' legislation who can advise and help a disabled veteran in securing the benefits that Congress and a grateful America want the veterans to have. Your program deserves the support of all."

GENERAL EISENHOWER'S COMMENTS

Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower:

"I am delighted to hear that you are taking effective steps to raise substantial sums for this purpose. Your efforts will be fully rewarded in the lasting appreciation of veterans who will have sacrificed so much for the cause for which we are fighting."

Gen. Douglas A. MacArthur:

"I accept life membership in the Disabled American Veterans with a sense of distinction. Membership in no group in the world carries greater honor than does membership in the Disabled American Veterans."

AFL AND CIO PRESIDENTS' MESSAGES

William Green, president, American Federation of Labor:

"Be assured that we of the American Federation of Labor who have long relied upon the principle that unity develops strength look with favor upon the valuable service-giving activities of the Disabled American Veterans organization."

Philip Murray, president, Congress of Industrial Organizations:

"This is to express my appreciation for the important work undertaken by the DAV, on behalf of those who have given more to their country than can ever be fully repaid. Labor's heart goes out to the disabled veterans, many of whom come from its own ranks, and we are eager to do everything we can to help those handicapped veterans and their dependents to secure the fair and generous treatment to which they are entitled."

Robert R. Wason, former president, National Association of Manufacturers:

"The DAV is not appealing for your sympathy nor to your patriotism, but is presenting a practical plan for making useful, independent citizens of our disabled veterans. It is to be commended for its excellent work."

Editorial, the New York Times:

"The Nation's first obligation surely is to stand by its fighting men disabled in the line of duty. The DAV's success in this drive should be desired by all citizens, for an adequate DAV staff will mean that those who have bravely fought and bled for us all will not be disinherited and forgotten. Many pleas are made to the American public. This is one campaign that surely merits the generous support of every one of us."

STATEMENTS BY TWO PRESIDENTS—ROOSEVELT AND TRUMAN

The late President Franklin D. Roosevelt:

"The purpose of your Nation-wide rehabilitation program * * * to extend needed assistance to members of our armed forces who became disabled, as well as to disabled veterans of the World War and their dependents, is, indeed, a worthy one and merits the full support of our citizens."

President Harry Truman:

"The Disabled American Veterans are performing a most useful function in helping disabled comrades to help themselves. As I told you during your visit to the White House, our disabled veterans deserve every assistance within the power of the American people.

"Surely, in this postwar reconversion period there is no more important and timely work to be done than that of assisting disabled veterans. All Americans should cooperate in the great task of helping these veterans to make as complete a transition as possible to productive civilian life.

"I feel certain that all organizations and individuals who are interested in the welfare of our country will assist you."

GENERAL WAINWRIGHT'S MESSAGE

Gen. J. M. Wainwright, past national commander, DAV:

"The DAV maintains a Nation-wide staff of trained service officers. These men, disabled veterans themselves, are on constant duty in all Veterans' Administration offices * * * to help their disabled buddies with all their problems * * * employment, compensation, insurance, hospitalization, and social. They have rendered effective, material assistance to more than a million disabled veterans in their fight to regain independence, security, and happiness, to again lead normal, wholesome, productive lives.

"So, as a good American, will you cooperate by helping us to continue this vital, humanitarian work for the boys who fought for you?"

Citizens who are grateful for the sacrifices of America's disabled veterans will, I feel sure, generously support the vitally important service program sponsored by the Disabled American Veterans Service Foundation.

Toilers in the Theater

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 21, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the bills for a national theater introduced by me in the House and by Senators IRVING M. IVES and ELBERT D. THOMAS in the Senate have aroused much interest and discussion. The appended article is very valuable as defining the position of the

actor in the theater today and in a national theater:

TOILERS IN THE THEATER

(By Louis M. Simon, executive secretary, Actors' Equity Association

Opportunity to see legitimate theater has shrunk so much and has become so expensive that it is very doubtful that any large part of the wage-earning population knows much about it except as a remote and possibly glamorous tradition.

Loss of patronage from among the ranks of the average workingman and his family has seriously crippled the theater. For the number of union members who struggle to earn a living in the theater has not diminished in the same proportion, nor have these members' earnings increased in a ratio proportionate to the increased cost of theatergoing or to the cost of living.

The result is that in times that are considered to be very prosperous generally, the theater continues in its chronic state of distress and unemployment—chronic because it has improved only very slightly since the worst days of the bitter depression of the thirties.

It is obvious that the theater has had to meet tremendous competition in the form of movies, radio, and, more recently, television. Nevertheless, it will be worth while to examine a little more carefully into what the results of this competition actually have been.

It has been going on ever since 1915 when movies emerged from their nickelodeon stage of development. Yet during the fabulous twenties, when motion-picture exhibitors, backed by tremendous capital resources, built strings of luxurious movie theaters throughout the land, there was no noticeable shrinkage in theatrical production.

As a matter of fact, during the twenties production reached all-time highs and in New York, at least, theater construction continued at a headlong pace. But throughout the rest of the country a very significant change was occurring. Legitimate theaters were being turned into picture theaters at a very rapid pace.

Perhaps the boom conditions in New York were responsible for blinding New York managers to the significance of what this evaporation of stock companies and road houses really meant. It meant, for one thing, that jumps between engagements were so large that touring an average show became impossible. And as the country became a theatrical desert, the entertainment habits of the country were being radically altered. A whole generation grew up to whom movies—and then radio—became the major source of family recreation.

Theatrical management apparently forgot that even in New York long runs were not sustained solely by the metropolitan audiences but were supported to a large extent by out-of-towners who attended legitimate theaters when they came to New York. New York used to be the mecca for large numbers of people of relatively moderate means who were theater-minded, who knew the tradition and lore of the theater and who quite naturally wanted to see the latest in the theater when they came to New York. Even the average tourist used to flock to the theater the way the present-day tourist flocks to Radio Center. The thirties gave radio its big chance to build because it was free to the consumer. Then the war years, which were again boom years for the New York theater, finished the road completely because of the restrictions on travel.

Today we find professional theater pretty well confined to New York and further confined to an avid audience who want to see only the hits and whose pocketbooks allow them to indulge in the fantastic prices that must be paid to see the half dozen hit shows.

It would be easy enough to sum this situation up merely by reiterating the truism that theater is a hand-made product rapidly losing out in a world of machine-made product, and let it go at that, except for one remarkable fact. Theater, the fabulous invalid, refuses to die. Curiously, the theater has resisted following the pattern of the horse-drawn vehicle, the pot-bellied stove, and other such relics of former and less progressive or, more correctly, less efficient times.

Although ailing for three decades, the theater has refused to die completely because it is something more than a utilitarian development of mankind. Although it cannot be classified as utilitarian in the narrow sense of the word, the theater nevertheless serves a useful purpose.

Theater is a social activity of mankind that answers a basic need in all peoples, no matter what stage of cultural or economic development they are in. Its roots lie in the same impulses that make religion a necessary expression of man. And, of course, theater in its earliest forms was indistinguishable from religious ceremony. (This is neither the time nor place to explore these psychological aspects of the theater, but I mention them to explain the fact of the theater's survival at all under economic conditions which rationally do not permit of its survival.)

At the psychological level there is no real comparison between the experience of seeing a movie or a telecast or listening to the radio and that of going to the theater. It would be like trying to compare the experience of going to church with that kind of listening to a fine sermon delivered over the air. The whole inexplicable experience of participation just isn't there when it comes to the mechanically reproduced or mechanically distributed media of entertainment.

* * * * *

This article cannot attempt to discuss differences in artistic or cultural values as between the amateur and the professional theater. Its fundamental purpose is to disclose the fact that the emotional experience of theatergoing is not one which the American people will deny themselves, no matter how many or how excellent the various mechanical substitutes may be. Too many people want to go to the theater as well as to see movies and television.

Proof of this lies in the fact that the Federal Government is collecting many millions of dollars in excise tax on legitimate theater tickets, of which more than half is collected from admissions to nonprofessional legitimate theater. From this indication alone we can see that the vacuum that was created when the professional theater virtually disappeared from the smaller cities of the country was rapidly filled by the amateur theater.

* * * * *

Actors' Equity does not want to stifle this theater, nor should the other crafts of the theater. For the past year Equity has been studying this whole situation very intensively in the expectation that eventually, through cooperation with the more enlightened managements of college and community theaters, and with equal cooperation from the other craft unions concerned, an intelligent solution can be found.

At the present time many so-called little theaters are anxious to have Broadway stars play with local amateurs. Actors' Equity considers each of these requests very carefully and, if conditions warrant, we allow our stars and featured players to accept engagements with an amateur company.

We know that in some quarters this practice is frowned upon. But we consider that our people have become very good ambassadors for the cause of trade-unionism. In many instances Equity members are succeeding in breaking down the psychological barriers that have created antiunion feelings among the nonprofessionals. Furthermore, in this way we are able to collect valuable data. For permission is never granted to a member to play in a nonequity company unless we get all the economic facts that govern the operation of the theater in question.

In time we hope to create a much larger traffic in the employment of our members with amateur companies. By the same token, we hope to stabilize some of these theaters and to raise both the financial and artistic levels on which they operate, and eventually it is expected to make the process one of gradual but complete unionization that will prove its benefits not only to Equity members but to all our fellow union members as well.

It is fitting that this process begin with the actor because the actor is the most indispensable worker in the theater. Without in any way belittling the contributions made by any other worker in the theater, we must realistically make use of this advantage. We know that the public is drawn to the theater to see a given cast of actors performing a given play. The actor may even be considered to be more essential than the dramatist. Given a good company of actors, there are plenty of plays of the past that can be performed. But the dramatists of the past cannot have their works performed without living actors. It is a singular fact, peculiar only to the performing artist, that the public pays only to see him at work. He has no physical product to put on a counter for sale nor does the public want anything else from him. Herein lies his strength as well as the torturous dangers of the most erratic of all professions.

Another and more distant horizon toward which Actors' Equity has turned its gaze is the Federal Government. Joining with the American National Theater and Academy, we are now making plans for holding a national theater assembly in Washington next January.

We are confidently expecting that this assembly will focus the attention of the lawmakers on constructive ways in which the American theater can be resuscitated.

In England the Arts Council is doing a very able job of preserving the heritage of theater of which our English cousins are so justifiably proud. From Equity's point of view, the most admirable feature of the Arts Council program is that, in giving financial aid to any qualified theater group, it makes the maintenance of trade-union wages and working conditions a primary requisite.

We could do far worse in this country than to examine carefully the progress that has been made in England and to profit, whenever we can, by the example they have set for us.

Against Postal Cuts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 19, 1950

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include an editorial entitled "Against Postal Cuts," which appeared in the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram, Thursday, May 11, 1950.

The editorial follows:

AGAINST POSTAL CUTS

That nine-to-nothing vote of the Senate Post Office Committee in sending to the Senate floor legislation to countermand Postmaster General Donaldson's sweeping cuts in postal service was a direct reflection as to how public opinion has rallied against any reduction of post-office service.

This vast country economically dependent on speedy means of mutual communication, not only wants, but must have, a post-office service of the best possible kind—something it already pays well for.

If Postmaster Donaldson's motive was to shock the country into a realization of its post-office service, he succeeded all right. When people began to realize that mail deliveries would be drastically reduced, and that post-office service windows would close down early and at inconvenient times, they became keenly aware of what the post office means to them in their everyday life and work. If the Postmaster General's intention was to blackmail Congress into restoring a Post Office Department budget cut, then his scheme has boomeranged right in his face in a way that may produce a real explosion in his whole department.

For Mr. Donaldson did succeed in focusing the eyes of the whole country on this particular Government department. The taxpayers have heard—many of them for the first time—about the antiquated bookkeeping system, dating back to the early years of the 1800's, by which the Post Office tries to keep its accounts straight. People have heard emphasized the Hoover report recommendations by which the Post Office Department could, if it would, save millions of dollars without impairing service to the public at all. Efficiency in its operations should be the watchword of the Post Office Department—not curtailment of its public service.

The Senate committee vote, of course, does not force the Postmaster General to restore full service. It will take action by both Houses of Congress to do that. Just the same, it is a sign that the people want good post-office service. In efficiency may be found the economy that Mr. Donaldson professes to want.

The St. Louis Star-Times Receives Missouri University Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. KEM

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Elzey Roberts, publisher of the St. Louis Star-Times, upon the occasion of the St. Louis Star-Times' being honored as the American newspaper to receive the 1950 Missouri University award for distinguished service in journalism, at the University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo., on May 5, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Dean Mott, ladies, and gentleman, since this audience includes a large number of graduates about to enter newspaper work, it occurred to me that you might like to hear a few words on what it is really like inside the newspaper world from someone who has been in it for quite a few years. I will tell you briefly how the newspaper now known as the St. Louis Star-Times came into being. Then I will relate several episodes that served as milestones in its history. And I will wind up with a few thoughts on what is happening to newspapers in general.

My father, John C. Roberts, one of the founders of Roberts, Johnson & Rand Shoe Co., the predecessor of International Shoe Co., came from a farm in Tennessee, but it was in St. Louis that he made his fame and fortune. He was greatly disturbed by the way selfish interests were throttling the natural growth of his adopted city. He wanted to own a daily newspaper that would give him the power to do something about it.

At that time the Terminal Railroad had a monopoly which enclosed St. Louis in a ring of steel. It was levying tribute on every ton of freight moving in or out of the area. This levy was called the bridge arbitrary charge.

Also, in that day a group of financial interests, frequently called the Big Cinch, controlled a number of St. Louis industries. Their only wish was to perpetuate their hold on the community. They wanted to keep out competition.

In addition, there was an alliance between politicians and criminals, whose members were called "boodlers." They could be roughly compared to the members of the politico-criminal combinations that are active in Kansas City and St. Louis today.

John C. Roberts wanted a newspaper to combat these evils. He almost bought the old St. Louis Republic, which died about 31 years ago. He would have done so, except that he made the mistake of consulting me about it. Although only 18 years of age at the time, I dissuaded him from purchasing it.

Perhaps that is why in 1913 he bought the St. Louis Star without letting me know anything about it. The first I knew of it was through reading it in a St. Louis newspaper when I was a sophomore in Princeton.

During the 11 years that my father lived after the purchase of the old St. Louis Star he imbued it with the same high purpose that had moved him to buy it. He surrounded himself with a group of men stimulated by that same spirit of accomplishment. They worked together as a team and started the newspaper on the path of progress it has followed ever since.

I want to describe to you some of the characteristics of the Star-Times and the philosophy behind them.

The Star-Times has always shown great concern for good local government. It has taken pride in being a crusading newspaper, both in its news and its editorial columns.

I could cite various Star-Times campaigns that were successful in bettering the community. For example, the fights to break the prohibition against the employment of married teachers in St. Louis, for a clean restaurant law, for a standard milk ordinance, for the improvement and protection of civil service. But these are not the kinds of incidents that in retrospect make an interesting talk. Instead, let me use the basic formula of newpapermen—human interest.

Back at the time of World War I, a 3-year-old girl named Hellas Mattler was kidnapped in St. Louis. After a 5-day search the police were without clues. The veteran reporters of the Star also found themselves up blind alleys. At that point the managing editor called in a cub who had been graduated only a year before from a copy boy. He followed a lead given him by a streetcar conductor—a lead which the police had spurned. It took him to Granite City. He found that a girl answering the description of the missing child had been there at a cheap hotel with a man and woman. The couple, however, had checked out the day before the cub reporter arrived. The reporter found them, and then posing as a bill collector he gained admittance to their room and saw the child. He phoned his city editor, and within minutes detectives closed in and arrested the kidnappers. The child was returned unharmed to her parents. All this had been accomplished within a space of 5 hours.

I tell this story because that cub reporter, Aaron G. Benesch, is now the city editor of the Star-Times, the same man who, the day after the bodies of Charles Binaggio and his bodyguard were found, revealed that Binaggio had known for 3 months that he was going to be murdered. According to the story, Binaggio had collected money from the underworld during the 1948 campaign on his assurance that if the Democrats won the Governorship St. Louis and Kansas City would be opened up to the gamblers; he was unable either to deliver on his promise or to return the money; he went to St. Louis in an attempt to make peace with his fellow gangsters and gamblers; instead they read him his death sentence. This Star-Times story hit the front pages of nearly every large newspaper in the country. It was carried in great volume over the wires of all the press associations—credited to the Star-Times. It was top news for the big broadcasting chains.

Incidentally, Mayor Kemp, of Kansas City told almost the identical story before a United States Senate Committee a week ago today.

In the early twenties another bad gang situation existed in St. Louis. An open feud was fought in the streets by the rival Egan and Hogan gangs. The Star induced the leaders of both gangs to sign a dramatic peace pact. The signing took place on an Easter Sunday. Later the Star persuaded Ray Renard, the Fox, chief lieutenant of the Egan gang, to confess his organization's crimes. Renard's confessions ran daily in the Star. As a result of them, 22 murder mysteries were solved, and bank, pay roll and mail robberies totaling more than $5,000,000 were cleared up. Renard's testimony in Federal court convicted every member of the Egan gang except one, who fled from justice.

The Star's reporter who served as peace emissary between the gangs and who persuaded the Fox to confess was Harry T. Brundidge. This same reporter, posing as Harry Thompson, became a full-fledged "doctor of medicine" in 57 days during the fall of 1923. In this time, besides learning all there was to know about medicine, he learned the inside of the diploma mill racket that was grinding out murderous quacks upon the American public. As a result of the Star's exposé, the United States Senate investigated the teaching and practice of medicine. Hundreds of quacks were eliminated from practice in Missouri, Kansas, Connecticut, New York, Massachusetts, Arkansas, California, Florida, and elsewhere. Ringleaders of the racket were convicted and sent to prison. Low-grade medical colleges throughout the land were closed.

A series of news stories and editorials in the Star-Times about the spread of marijuana traffic among St. Louis youth moved the State of Missouri to pass a law in 1935 outlawing the cultivation, possession, gift or sale of this harmful drug.

Undoubtedly some members of this audience, when members of the Armed Forces, found themselves personally concerned about how good a job the people who made arms and munitions were doing. Well, late in 1942 the Star-Times investigated reports that thousands of defective cartridges were being passed as good ammunition by inspectors at the St. Louis ordnance plant. Our reporters interviewed numerous employees of the plant. They collected many statements supporting the charges. The Star-Times printed its disclosures based on the affidavits

of five inspectors at the plant. As a result of the exposé, a special board of ordnance reviewed the plant. A change in the command of the plant took place and nearly a score of improvements in production and inspection methods were made. For this the Star-Times and two of its reporters won the National Headliners' Award for outstanding public service during 1942. The two reporters also were given the Sigma Delta Chi award for distinguished service in general reporting.

Another characteristic of the Star-Times is its championship of civil liberties, particularly when the rights of the so-called little man are being violated and when the freedom of the press is in danger.

In the summer of 1947, a Negro by the name of Harvey Jones, an ex-GI living near Ahoskie, N. C., held a $1 lottery ticket on a Cadillac automobile. He won the automobile, but when the award committee found out he was a Negro, it drew again, and awarded the Cadillac to a well-to-do white doctor.

Despite a law denying the use of mails to newspapers carrying news about lottery awards, the Star-Times printed the story. We did so, not because it concerned a lottery, but because it related an injustice. Many large newspapers did not dare touch the story. The St. Louis postmaster wrote The Star-Times a letter stating that we had violated the law and warning us not to do it again. The Star-Times publicly announced its intention to continue printing such news even though they might involve lotteries and in the following words defied the Post Office to do anything about it: "The Constitution of the United States guarantees a free press, Mr. Postmaster. It is not a free press when any public agency attempts to tell a newspaper that it cannot inform the public of discrimination against a Negro because of his race."

Other newspapers, Senators, Representatives, labor leaders, businessmen, citizens from all walks of life rallied behind the Star-Times. Exactly 29 hours after this incident the Postmaster General reversed his interpretation of the law so that newspapers could mention lotteries incidental to other issues.

Note that in this case the Star-Times was championing not only the rights of a Negro who had been deprived of his rights because of his race, but also the rights of all the newspapers that had failed to publish the story out of fear of the Post Office Department.

In this instance, freedom of the press really was involved. Unfortunately some newspapers sometimes cry "wolf" when there is no wolf. A newspaper is at the same time a business like other businesses and a unique public service. Some publishers and editors try to gain special privileges for their newspapers as businesses by wrapping them in the Bill of Rights. Our formula for the preservation of the freedom of the press is, first, don't abuse it; second, don't pretend that it is in danger when it is not; and, third, fight with everything you have when it is at stake.

The last characteristic of the Star-Times I shall mention is its independence. We have supported both Democratic and Republican candidates for the offices of President, governor, and mayor.

The essence of the story of the Star-Times is competition. When it was purchased 37 years ago a dying paper suddenly became a vigorous young challenger. Not only did it serve the community, but also it caused competitors to report facts they had previously ignored and to champion causes they had formerly opposed or been indifferent toward.

I believe that competition is essential to keep the bloodstream of newspapers virile. A city seeking its news through a single newspaper ownership is like a one-eyed man, whose vision lacks perspective even though the single eye may be good. Yet 20 American cities of more than 100,000 population have a single newspaper ownership. These cities are Memphis, Louisville, Atlanta, Norfolk, Richmond, Va.; Reading, Providence, Worcester, Springfield, Mass.; Utica, Rochester, N. Y.; Toledo, Duluth, Minneapolis, St. Paul, Spokane, Omaha, Des Moines, Kansas City, and Oklahoma City.

The impact of this development in the field of journalism will be felt, not only by you who will devote your business lives to newspapering, but by every man, woman, and child in the United States.

In 1937 there were 1,933 English-language daily newspapers of general circulation in the United States. According to the Editor and Publisher Yearbook, as of January 1, 1950, there were only 1,780, a loss of 153.

The situation is worse than the statistics suggest. Twelve States suffered a decrease of one or more dailies during 1949. This is hidden by several factors—the starting of dailies in towns or small cities that used to be served by weeklies, the transferring of publication from Saturday or Monday to the Sunday field, corporate mergers that end editorial competition even though no newspaper is discontinued.

Nineteen fifty has already seen two famous casualties. On January 4 the New York Sun sold out to the World Telegram. March saw the announcement that the Atlanta Journal had merged with the Constitution, dropping one Sunday paper. The trend toward monopoly situations is growing at such a rate that if it is not stopped it may change the whole complexion of American journalism.

The two most important factors heightening the expense of publishing a newspaper are, of course, labor costs and the cost of newsprint. The men and women who make newspapers have a most demanding and most important job. They are and should be paid well.

The March Survey of Current Business, published by the United States Department of Commerce, lists the average weekly earnings in American newspapers during 1949 as $78.50, the highest in all the classifications of employment in the highest-paying Nation on earth.

Just how far the newspaper wages can run ahead of wages in comparable industries and still leave the newspaper industry solvent is something for the statisticians to figure out. But the principle of competitive costs is no different in newspapering from what it is in, shall we say, the coal industry.

John L. Lewis has taken the wages of the coal miners from poverty to high hourly pay. When one considers the toil, the discomfort, and the hazards of their occupation, no one will say the miners are not worth it. But is coal as a fuel worth it? Aren't natural gas, electricity, and other sources of energy steadily forcing coal into the background so that it is now a sick industry, one of the Nation's top economic problems?

The same thing, I believe, is happening to newspapers. The monopoly that newspapers had on news was broken years ago when radio came into being. Radio was able to take hundreds of millions of dollars from newspaper advertising without vitally affecting the newspaper structure. The fact that this loss could be borne showed the underlying stability of the newspaper industry.

But there is a limit somewhere to what newspapers can stand in the way of increased costs that must ultimately be passed on to the reading public and the buyers of advertising. Newspaper publishers should be proud that they pay the top wages of any big industry in the country. But they should be fearful lest these wages mount so high that their readers and their advertisers refuse to bear them. I believe the death of the New York Sun, the merger of the Fort Wayne newspapers into a single publishing company, and the merger of the Atlanta Journal with the Constitution attest to this fact.

A companion factor in the increased costs of publishing a newspaper is the rise in the price of newsprint. As recently as 1945 newsprint was selling at $59 a ton. Within 5 years the price had jumped to $101. Whether or not $101 a ton is too high or too low a price for newsprint is a question I shall not attempt to answer. It is plain, however, that the newspapers of America are paying about 70 percent more for every ton of their basic raw material than they were paying in 1945. Anyone familiar with the newspaper business knows that few have had revenue increases even closely approaching this increase in the cost of newsprint.

Of course, newspapers in the monopoly cities can pass this cost along to their advertisers and readers. Also the huge newspapers that own their own paper mills are utterly unconcerned about the increase in the price of newsprint. The higher it goes, the more money they make, and the tougher things are for their competitors. But most newspapers must make up the difference between cost and revenue from their resources, not from their earnings. How long they can endure this load is something for the future to reveal.

I have alluded, by analogy with the coal industry, to competitive methods of accomplishing what the newspaper does today. I want to touch on this factor now.

There have been important changes and many refinements in the methods of publishing a newspaper since the invention of linotype, but the basic machines of about 60 years ago still remain. There has been no technological revolution comparable to what has taken place in the metals industry, in chemistry, plastics, and farming.

For example, the New York stock table is taken from the stock exchange ticker in New York; transmitted line by line over a telegraph wire; received on another telegraph printer, sent to an editor, from the editor to the compositor, who sets it line by line, from the compositor to a proofreader, who reads it line by line and marks errors; sent back for resetting as many times as necessary; and the type finally arrives in a form on the make-up table. That performance, repeated in hundreds of newspapers, could be obviated entirely by the simple process of setting the New York stock table once in the city of New York and sending it by a refined method of wirephoto. There are other processes as simple as wirephoto that could be adopted tomorrow if newspapers were not wedded to horse-and-buggy methods.

Some of the blame for this backwardness must rest on the many publishers who have been more interested in using newspapers for purposes other than as a public service and a private livelihood. Part of the blame must rest on restrictive agreements between management and labor. But the consequence is that newspapering is technologically archaic. It stands on the brink of vast technological changes. Some of these changes are in the realm of photographic reproduction; others are in the realm of electronics. I want to mention just one of the latter kind.

Right here in Columbia there has been under way for the past 2 years the study of a new method of producing and distributing newspapers. I refer to facsimile newspapers—newspapers broadcast over the air and reproduced in the home. About 5 years ago a number of newspapers joined together to see what could be done with facsimile as a new method of newspaper reproduction and distribution. These newspapers included the New York Times, the Washington Post, the Chicago Tribune, the Boston Globe, and the St. Louis Star-Times. I cannot

truthfully say that we accomplished very much toward commercial realization of the project. Later the Star-Times turned its facsimile equipment over to the Missouri School of Journalism for experimentation, and for nearly 2 years now the work we initiated has been continued on this campus.

I have never felt that the individual production of a newspaper on a facsimile machine or by any other method could compete with mass production of newspapers as long as they are circulated in a densely populated area. I still doubt it. Those of you who have toured the Star-Times plant have seen new presses in operation each of which can turn out newspapers at the rate of 45,000 an hour. While the actual production, of course, does not reach this capacity figure, it comes fairly close to it, because the presses are equipped with devices which change 2,000-pound rolls of paper at nearly full speed.

However, in this atomic age it may be that survival will be possible only by spreading out our factories, our vital facilities and our residences over large areas. Perhaps, instead of being bunched in thickly populated centers that are attractive targets for an atomic bomb and even more attractive for a hydrogen bomb, we will be scattered over miles and miles of countryside. It is not inconceivable that in such a day it will be more feasible economically to deliver an individual newspaper on a facsimile machine.

I do not pretend to know what the future holds in store. But I do know that we must keep up with progress and changing social conditions, and that is what the Star-Times had in mind 5 years ago when we joined with other newspapers in trying to develop facsimile.

And that is also what we had in mind a few years ago when the Star-Times became the first newspaper in the world to use two-way radio-telephone equipment in our news gathering operations. Today such equipment is also in the automobiles used by some of our photographers and circulation department employees.

I could speak for another half hour—don't worry, I shall not—on the virtues of the American press and prove to you that regardless of the tribulations it faces it is still the best in the world. I have merely been concerned with the problem of keeping it that way.

A democracy to survive must look to its arms. A free press to survive must look to the soundness of its economic foundation. However, the military arm must serve the civilian body, and not the other way around. Similarly, the free press must serve the public. Editorial integrity is an asset that cannot be measured in circulation figures or advertising lineage, but only editorial integrity can win public confidence. With public confidence a newspaper can weather many dark days. Without public confidence a newspaper is dying, even though it may appear in the fullness of its strength. It may take years for a once-great newspaper that has lost its editorial integrity to wither, just as it takes years for a giant oak to fall. And it may take years for a young or revitalized newspaper to build itself up, just as it takes years for an acorn to grow. Editorial integrity is to a newspaper what the essence of life is to a tree.

To you young people who have decided on newspapering as a career, I say, based on a lifetime of work in journalism: You have made a wise choice. You will have a ringside seat at the battle, the tragedy, the comedy, the circus of life—call it what you will. Whatever it is, there you are in the front row.

The rings are not merely three—they are beyond counting. The daily shows are not two, but a continuous one, day and night, never ending, of infinite variety, ranging from the simple routine of the humblest to the pomp and pageantry of the most mighty.

You will find high monetary compensation compared to other industries. But you will find also the satisfaction of taking part in one of the most important and interesting forms of work in the world. I can wish no more for any one of you than that you may receive this satisfaction as fully as I have.

The Country Needs H. R. 7151

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 19, 1950

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, to date, no committee action has been taken on H. R. 7151, and the copper market is being adversely affected. Congress must take cognizance of the dislocations which will result from failure to continue suspension of the tax on copper imports, and remedy this situation by enacting H. R. 7151 in the immediate future. Two statements in this vein are inserted; one, an editorial from the American Metal Market and the other a news story from the May 18 issue of the New York Times:

[From American Metal Market of May 3, 1950]

CONGRESS SHOULD PASS H. R. 7151

The bill H. R. 7151, introduced into the House by Representative PATTERSON, which would insure the tax free entry of copper into the United States for a period of another two years from June 30, 1950, should receive the hearty support of the great majority of the members of the industry and of the Congress. If this bill fails to pass, an import-excise tax of 2 cents per pound under the Reciprocal Trade Agreement will take effect as of July 1.

We are urgently in need of a great deal more copper than our mines can supply and a protection of 2 cents would probably have only a negligible effect in stimulating production. Let it be remembered that from February 1942 through 1945 when premium prices were paid, almost 80 percent of the country's output sold at the OPA ceiling price of 12 cents and on less than 2 percent was a premium of more than 5 cents paid. The production figures were as follows:

In tons of 2,000 pounds]

	At ceiling price 12 cents	At premium price 17 cents	At premium price 17.01 to 27 cents
1942 (February to December)	881,711	102,352	716
1943 (full year)	841,286	217,382	14,003
1944 (full year)	722,791	194,483	26,168
1945 (full year)	561,851	179,389	22,917

The figures for 1946 and for the first half of 1947, when the payments of premiums ceased, are not comparable because with the lifting of price controls in November 1946 the copper market underwent a considerable advance.

Up to the outbreak of World War II in 1939 the United States had always been an exporter of copper, but in latter years its production has fallen far short of home requirements although augmented by the great recovery and reemployment of scrap. In 1949 our imports of refined copper, plus the metal content of ore, matte, and blister amounted to 545,000 tons against which 137,000 tons were exported in the form of refined ingots and bars and some 50,000 tons in the form of rods, sheets, etc. It is estimated that this year we will have to import between 350,000 and 400,000 tons on balance if industrial and stockpiling needs are to be met.

With the metal commanding 19½ cents, it cannot be argued that domestic producers are in need of protection as was the case during the height of the depression in 1932 when an excise tax of 4 cents was first imposed. At that time the price was at its historic low level of 5 cents with a thoroughly unhealthy situation prevailing as an aftermath of the abortive attempt in 1929–30 to peg the market at 18 cents. But while this 4-cent protection effectively prevented foreign copper from competing with domestic producers in the home market, it did not correct the supply and demand situation and the United States continued to export copper on balance. In other words, the foreign producers were barred from entry into our market but our producers continued to enjoy the right to invade other consuming markets, particularly in Europe, and availed themselves of same. The exports of domestic produced copper continued, and in 1934 when the price here was 8½ cents they amounted to 125,000 tons, while in 1938 and 1939 they averaged about 130,000 tons a year.

What gave the copper market its first boost was the Government-sponsored trade restriction action under the NRA code whereby all except blue-eagle copper was outlawed from home usage and a fixed price of 9 cents was maintained from April 26, 1934 until May 27, 1935, when the legislation was ruled unconstitutional. This recital of past events is for the purpose of emphasizing how radically different the situation is today than what it was when copper producers called for help and received same.

From the beginning of the century up until 1947 there were only 5 years when copper averaged more than its present price of 19½ cents, namely in 1906–7 when Amalgamated Copper Co. was manipulating the market, and 1916–18 during World War I when at one time the Allies were forced to pay the atrocious price of 37 cents. If the 2-cent duty is reimposed, it may enable United States producers to get a higher-than-necessary price for their product or what is more likely, will short-change those countries upon whom we are dependent for supplies. The principal countries shipping copper to us are Chile, Canada, Peru and Mexico, all good neighbors. It would be impolite, to say the very least, if we were to slam the door in their faces when they are bringing us materials which we need so badly. We also depend on them as outlets for a good portion of the manufactured articles which we make from the raw materials they send us.

A large part of their dollar incomes is derived from the copper which they export to the United States. The Chilean Government, in particular, derives a large measure of its revenue from the taxes paid by the American-owned copper companies. Cut off this source of revenue and the present government which is favorable to the United States will be seriously weakened financially. The strong Communist element which exists in Chile might not lose any time nor spare any effort to throw the country into political turmoil. What is true in Chile is also true to somewhat lesser extent in the other countries south of the border which could not be expected to greet with open arms the prospect of a substantial reduction in dollar income.

Canada depends on the dollar income from the sale of copper and other raw materials to provide the means to buy from us many manufactured articles which are the necessary adjuncts to a civilized life. The passage of H. R. 7151 will help to keep the copper coming down here and the dollars flowing

northward only to return in exchange for the products of our manufacturing plants.

The passage of H. R. 7151 will not only have an effect on the Western Hemisphere but will also have a beneficial effect on the countries of Europe outside the iron curtain, and may even have some influence in keeping the iron curtain from further encroachments on western Europe. We are supplying a very great number of dollars to the Marshall plan countries. They in turn are buying from us many items designed to help them get back onto their own feet. Among these items are electrical machinery and other goods which contain appreciable amounts of copper. Once in possession of more of the guts of production it will not take so long for the western European countries to become self-supporting—and the sooner we will be able to stop sending monetary aid. With the ability to stand on their own feet, the free countries of Europe will be better able to face the pressure from Russia.

The Department of the Interior, the Department of State and the Department of Commerce have all gone on record in favor of the continued suspension of the excise tax on copper imported into this country and the Munitions Board has stated that its passage will not have any ill effect on stockpile objectives. In view of all this supporting material for the passage of H. R. 7151, it would be a shame if it were defeated.

[From the New York Times of May 18, 1950]

COPPER DUTY SEEN COSTLY FOR CHILE—CONSUL GENERAL HERE SAYS UNITED STATES REINSTATEMENT OF LEVY WILL MEAN $5,000,000 BURDEN—ECONOMIC PACT IS PRAISED—COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY GROUP TOLD THAT IT IS SOLUTION TO PROBLEMS ABROAD

Automatic reinstatement of the United States duty of 2 cents a pound on copper imports on June 30 will be a severe blow to Chile, Alfonso Grez, Chilean Consul General in New York, said yesterday.

He told a meeting of the Commerce and Industry Association, 233 Broadway, that failure to continue suspension of the duty would cost Chile $5,000,000 yearly on the present tonnage of copper shipped here.

Chile, he said, already is hard pressed by a dollar shortage, and the extra $5,000,000 burden of the copper duty will be in addition to a dollar deficit of some $38,000,000 in the 1950 budget of the country.

"When the President of Chile, Gabriel Gonzalez Videla, returned after his recent visit to this country he believed the United States duty on copper would not be reestablished," Mr. Grez said. "However, the prospects have changed and it appears that Chile would get a slap in the face."

Mr. Grez said "political considerations" were to blame, attributing the likelihood of the duty reinstatement to Senators from the copper-producing States in this country. He pointed out that "positive action" by Congress was necessary to continue suspension of the duty, and unless such action was taken the duty would become effective.

As a result of the dollar shortage, he continued, Chile is "tightening its belt" in order to be able to pay for the goods it buys in the United States. He said import controls restricted purchases here to essentials. He added that the recent drop of $12 to $13 a ton in the price of synthetic nitrates here was another severe blow to the Chilean economy. One bright spot is the production of oil in the southern part of the country. This oil being sold to Uruguay.

ECONOMIC UNION PRAISED

L. C. Ameye, economic adviser to the Banque de Bruxelles, another speaker at the meeting, said that the proposal to extend the Atlantic Pact to the economic field was one of the "best solutions" put forward to solve the European problem.

President Truman's Sophistry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, no matter what form it may take, inflation is the most ruthless destroyer of savings and of liberty yet devised by man. Inflation is insidious and steals upon a nation like a thief in the night. Mr. Mark Sullivan, with his usual power of analysis and clarity of expression, brings the Truman sophistry of the Truman Fair Deal into full public view.

Under leave to extend, I am inserting in the RECORD the article of Mark Sullivan published in the New York Herald Tribune under date of May 19,.1950:

TRUMAN 10-YEAR ECONOMIC PLAN CALLED PERIL TO NATION'S SAVERS—MARK SULLIVAN SAYS PROGRAM, MAPPED BY FAIR DEAL SOPHISTICATES, WILL MEAN HARDSHIP TO MILLIONS

(By Mark Sullivan)

President Truman has now stated, with a definiteness achieved by much repetition, his appeal to the people to vote for a Congress favorable to him; it amounts to an economic plan for the next 10 years. Without jibing at all—this is no time for jibing—it is material to say that the program Mr. Truman put forward is not one evolved by him; it is the creation of persons in the Fair Deal administration or of persons having access to it, who are sophisticated ideologically. The role of Mr. Truman, for which he is adapted by both his temperament and his limitations, is that of folksy salesman to the people.

The program, and the salesmanship, are illustrated by two sentences in the speech Mr. Truman made at Pendleton, Oreg., May 10:

"Our goal over the next decade should be to lift every hard-working American family to an income of $4,000 a year. * * * One out of every four American families now has an income of less than $2,000 a year."

It is of the utmost importance that our people examine this prospect with exact thought: that they dismiss for the moment theoretical considerations about what a fair wage should be under given conditions; that each individual dismiss for the moment the application of the prospect to himself personally, that he think of it in relation to the economic good of the people as a whole, the general welfare. This calls for a difficult and not often practiced intellectual exercise—to shift one's thinking from terms of dollars to terms of goods, and to see that what is income to one is outgo to another.

SAVINGS NOT AFFECTED

The $2,000-a-year worker today, whom Mr. Truman proposes to elevate, now works for $1 an hour. Anyone who buys his services, who hires him, pays him a dollar an hour directly. Anyone who buys goods that he makes, as in a factory, likewise pays him a dollar an hour indirectly.

Now turn to the end of the 10 years of Mr. Truman's plan. The worker we are speaking of has now become a $4,000-a-year man, he gets $2 an hour. Anyone who buys his services, who hires him, pays him $2 an hour directly. As to anyone who buys goods made by this worker in a factory, there may be by 1960 improvements in industrial processes which may increase output of a worker. Yet, broadly speaking, anyone who in 1960 buys goods made by the factory worker here used as an illustration, will pay him $2 an hour indirectly.

Mr. Truman, commending his plan to double the wages of workers, says that "we will all benefit * * * for the incomes of the rest of us will rise, too." But there is one large class of our people who cannot share the benefit Mr. Truman envisages, whose incomes will not rise. These are savers who depend for their living on their savings or on the income from them, and whose savings are in bonds, life-insurance policies, and the like. The interest on a bond does not increase, nor does an annuity received from a life-insurance policy. Such persons will at the end of Mr. Truman's 10-year plan have the same incomes in dollars, but the purchasing power of those incomes will, according to Mr. Truman's prospect, have been cut in half.

LOSS TO SAVERS NOTED

This has already taken place in the past. In Mr. Truman's presentation of his plan he dealt with total national income. He said that by 1960 this will have increased from a present two hundred and thirty-four billion to three hundred and fifty billion. To show that this can happen in the future he cited the past, he pointed to an increase of over a hundred billions in national income during the 10 years since 1939.

But what has happened to the saver during that 10 years? A person who in 1939 put a hundred dollars into a bond, put in terms of dollars say one-tenth of the price of a good automobile. Today that hundred dollars is only about one-twentieth the price of the same automobile. What has happened to savers during the last 10 years was stated by Mr. Bernard M. Baruch in a speech made during the same week as Mr. Truman's:

"Every form of savings has been depreciated—life insurance, Government bonds, thrift accounts, annuities, and pension funds. Week after week, bit by bit, these sums were put aside by millions of persons for their old age, for buying a home, for sending a child to college. To the extent that these savings are cheapened, the ability of these millions to care for themselves and their families is weakened. * * * They have been made more insecure."

It is not merely the hardship brought upon millions of savers. The great danger is that the people may become discouraged about the worth-whileness of saving, that saving as a foundation stone of the national economy may be impaired.

I Am an American Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1950

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to say that the third Sunday in May has been designated as "I Am an Amercan Day" by act of Congress of May 3, 1940, and this year this day will be May 21.

Mr. Speaker, I have been thinking of something appropriate to say to bring this special day to the attention of the Congress, and I am frank to say that I have found no words more appropriate at this time than the immortal words of Rev. Samuel Francis Smith, who in 1832

wrote the words for our national hymn America, as follows:

AMERICA

My country 'tis of thee,
Sweet land of liberty,
Of thee I sing;
Land where my fathers died,
Land of the Pilgrim's pride,
From ev'ry mountain side
Let freedom ring.

My native country, thee,
Land of the noble free,
Thy name I love:
I love they rocks and rills,
Thy woods and templed hills:
My heart with rapture thrills
Like that above.

Our fathers' God, to thee,
Author of liberty,
To thee we sing;
Long may our land be bright
With freedom's holy light,
Protect us by Thy might,
Great God, our King.

Less Mail Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL C. MICHENER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 19, 1950

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress are receiving many, many letters protesting against the curtailment of mail delivery service pursuant to the economy order of Postmaster General Donaldson. Employees of the post office affected by the order are violently protesting. Indeed, in some localities friends of the employees are circulating petitions among patrons demanding that the former scheduled deliveries be reinstated. On the other hand, I have received numerous letters telling me that the writers miss the extra delivery service, but complimenting the Postmaster General on his courage in instituting this economy measure. These writers want the budget balanced and our expenditures brought within our income before we have mail delivery service that is not essential, even though it is desirable.

My attention has just been called by a writer from my district to an editorial appearing in the Adrian (Mich.) Daily Telegram. In keeping with permission granted by the House, I am including that editorial which is as follows:

LESS MAIL SERVICE

The curtailment of mail service as ordered by the Post Office Department will determine just how badly Americans want economy in government. The orders of Postmaster General Donaldson provide for substantial cuts in postal service. One delivery a day will be the rule in residential areas. The post-office windows will be open shorter hours. Mail will be picked up less frequently. Postal staffs will be reduced in numerous cities.

The purpose, of course, is to cut the costs of the Department. The United States post office is one of the biggest businesses in the world. About 500,000 persons are employed in 42,000 branches with 24,000 buildings. The Department owns 10,000 cars and trucks, with an average age of 15½ years. About $1.3 billion a year is spent in operating this business. The Department has been a notorious money loser. In 1949, for example, the losses were estimated at about $500,000,000. Americans made up the deficit out of tax money—income taxes, luxury taxes, and dozens of other taxes levied by the Federal Government.

The post office delivers 37,000,000,000 pieces of mail every year and handles 800,000,000 other items like money orders. It operates a savings bank with 4,000,000 depositors. Almost every department of the postal business loses money. Air-mail services went into the red about $32,000,000 last year; $155,000,000 was lost on second-class mail service; $30,000,000 on money orders; $45,000,000 on postal cards; $87,000,000 on third-class mail, and more millions on insurance, c. o. d. mail and postal orders.

Some of those losses probably can be traced directly to poor management. The Hoover Commission said the Department could save a great deal of money by good management. Still more money could be saved by modern methods and tools in handling mail and increased rates for some types of service. The Hoover Commission said that the Department should be out of politics; that postmasters should get their jobs on the basis of ability. It would also cut down the 900-page book of rules for the operation of the Department.

Well, it looks as if Postmaster Donaldson is taking the bull by the horns in the order curtailing service. That is one way to reduce expenses. It also is a quick way to cut costs and reduce the Department's huge deficit. There are two other methods that can be applied. Congress can adopt some of the efficiency suggestions proposed by the Hoover Commission. They probably would require time and more study. Congress also could cut post-office losses by increasing postal rates.

The mail service curtailment order in the long run should be beneficial. It will help crystallize sentiment among all those who use the mails—and that includes just about everyone in the Nation. A great many complaints over reduced service already have been received. Reduced service may bring more pressure for the incorporation of the Hoover Commission's suggestions in the operation of the Department. It also will let Government officials know whether the public wants the service it has been receiving at the expense of an increase in rates. A little experience with one mail delivery a day and shorter post-office hours will enable the public to reach the right verdict. The test period may show that we need a little of everything.

The Evils of Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES H. MORRISON
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 19, 1950

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, what is communism? What is its background? How does it affect us today? The world is groaning under the burden of the disastrous results of communism, nazism, and fascism. The United States is the only major country that is not scratching in the earth to find means of building up a broken economy. The crumbling walls of ruined cities cry out to the beholder: "Shame to civilization." Standing amidst a rubble and stained glass windows, lonely church spires seem to reach to God for help.

In our land of plenty, granaries are bursting at their seams and with a new golden crop in the offing. Our factories, humming with activity, are producing those things that make for progress as well as the finer things of life. And of this we are ready to share with suffering nations for in the abundance we have we can help build other nations to be self-sufficient. This is one mode of attack against communism in countries who are too weak to protest against the inroad of its infestation. In free countries lies our strength.

COMMUNISM NOT AN IDEOLOGY

Communism is not an ideology born of the Russian Revolution. It has existed since the early days of history when people lived in groups for protection against enemies and they shared equally in land and produce. Some planted, some produced the necessary things for households, some fished and hunted for game, and others were used as guards to protect the community. From this ancient civilization grew the desire to better their condition in agriculture, achitecture, maritime activities, the arts, and so forth.

Some people were laggards and they lived in want, while others worked diligently until they had worldly goods pleasing to mankind. From this point capitalism began. But the condition of the poor grew worse and, eventually, in some countries they constituted what could be called slaves in some sections.

RUSSIAN REVOLUTION

When the Russian Revolution came ending czarism, it brought into power Bolshevism, later called communism. This change of government gave some relief to many of the lower class or proletariat but greater power to those in high government offices. Under this dictatorship came the great purge in which thousands of the bourgeoise were imprisoned or liquidated, their property confiscated to become Government property. Those holding office were directly responsible to Stalin. In fact all Russians were ruled with an iron hand to such an extent that one word or act against the Government meant prison or death. The banks, factories, and all business was taken over by the government. It is that way today with favoritism shown toward few but a desolate way of life for the many.

If communism were to be our mode of government let me list a few burdens we would have to bear. We could own no land or property, for it would belong to the Communist Government. You could rent the land but would be told what to plant and then what to sell the produce for. Your bank account would be taken from you, leaving you only a small amount. Police permission would have to be obtained in order to travel from one place to another. Practically all churches would be closed and used as buildings and storehouses. Children and adults would not be allowed religious training. All Bibles would be destroyed. There would be no church weddings, baptisms, or funerals. Priests and ministers of the Gospel would be

persecuted and all church property would be taken over by the government. All fraternal organizations like the YMCA, American Legion, Rotary, and Chamber of Commerce, would be destroyed. The Communist government would limit education and designate what should be studied and how long a student may study. Lenin has said, "Give us a child 8 years and he will be a Bolshevik forever."

ELECTIONS A FARCE IN RUSSIA

Elections would be a farce, as in Russia today. There would be only one political party, namely, the Communist Party. Even music composers in Russia are censored and compelled to write only music with a rhythm that workers could keep time to or hum as they work in order to increase production. Even the code of morality and ideals are dictated by the communistic government. The communistic picture is complete when all freedom is destroyed.

Have you heard of the Parade of the Happy Workers? In Moscow these parades last as long as 5 hours and all men and women from all the factories, fields, and so forth, must march or they will lose their day's pay, besides being fined. Imagine trudging along for 5 hours and being happy about it. This is one of the supposed pleasures or recreations. Old women do all the street cleaning. With crude brooms made of switches tied to a handle, they sweep the streets, many of them cobblestone. In winter they shovel all the snow, which is pushed down manholes. Women run all the streetcars, clean locomotives, paint, and even do building, including scaffolding.

Soviet Russia proclaims everything is being done for the benefit of the proletariat, or the poor class, but it takes people who have lived there to see the falsity of this. The proletariat are exploited; men and women are in rags with nothing to change to. In winter the men tie rags about their feet and legs for protection. Quilted cotton coats are the only warmth the average Russian woman has to shield her from the bitter cold Russian winters. As for food, cabbage and black bread are principal foodstuffs. Foreigners coming from there say they will never eat cabbage again for they saw so much of it. Cake is made of cornstarch and is very unpalatable.

The proletariat buy at certain designated stores and pay enormous prices for what little food they can afford to buy, standing for hours in a long line to be waited upon.

RUSSIANS ARE HUNGRY

Russians are so hungry for the good things of this world and they have so little. When a Sears, Roebuck catalog gets into their hands, they are astounded that Americans can buy all the things listed.

One observer attended one of the few churches in Moscow, and he said he was amazed at the grandeur of the church and the richness of the priests' robes, while outside the church the poor stood in rags. Can this be called communistic equality?

In 1935 the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International met in Moscow. The streets were gay with red bunting while pictures of Stalin were in every shop window. It has been said that pictures, 30 feet high, of Stalin were hung from many buildings. Thousands of delegates from countries where communism had taken root were present at this great demonstration. Among the delegates were Earl Browder, general secretary of the American Communist Party; William Z. Foster, James Ford, and other noted Communist members sat on the speakers' platform with Stalin. At the end of a 2-hour speech George Dimitroff, a Bulgarian Communist, told the story of the Trojan horse, comparing it to the strategy that Communists must use to overcome the enemy in foreign lands. This idea he evidently put across because that is the method that the Communist Party has used so successfully here and elsewhere.

AMERICAN YOUTH CONGRESS

An important Communist group was organized at the New York University, New York City, in 1934, called the American Youth Congress. It was instigated by Miss Viola Ilma. Many youth groups were represented. It started out with high ideals for the advancement of youth, but, by the usual subversive procedure, the group in time came under the control of the Communists and was used to cover up un-American activities.

In 1937 the American League Against War and Fascism changed to the American League for Peace and Democracy.

The third annual congress of the league decided as their main issue that more groups of the Communist Party were to organize and work in factories, especially munitions plants, and to organize the league among marine and transport workers.

The Communist program is based on the teaching of Karl Marx, founder of the International; Friedrich Engels, also an important member of the party; Vladimir Lenin, founder of the Third Communist International and first Premier of the Soviet Government; and Joseph Stalin, now Premier. The movement meant the complete social control of economic life, including ownership of all property by the Government and the revolutionary reaction for the violent overthrow of capitalistic society.

HISTORY OF COMMUNISM

Let us trace the history of the Communist movement in the United States. It held its first convention in September 1919. Most of the delegates were foreigners. On September 18, 1945, the Communist Party celebrated its twenty-sixth anniversay at Madison Square Garden in New York City. Later the American Communist Party—United Communist Party—was raided by Attorney General A. Mitchell Palmer and had to hold secret meetings. Later two parties were formed, the Workers Party of America and the Communist Party of America, which was finally combined to form the Communist Party of America. In 1948 at a convention the Communist Party of America was reconstituted, and Earl Browder was replaced by William Z. Foster as leader.

The American Communist Party platform is—

First. An organization operating under centralized discipline, subordinated to the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the single and ruling party of that country.

Second. A section of the World Communist Party, controlled by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

Third. An organization whose basic aim, whether open or concealed, is the abolition of our present economic system and democratic form of government and the establishment of a Soviet dictatorship in its place.

Fourth. An organization resorting to deception, evasion, illegal methods, violence, and civil war.

The Communist Party of the United States is a division of the International Communist Party founded by Vladimir Lenin during World War I.

First of all, he sought to destroy the capitalist system and government under which it operates, in order to include the nations of the world in the Socialist Soviet Republic. Again, he wished to defend a wobbly Soviet Government by causing dissension among hostile nations and bringing about strife. Later the party took the name of the Russian Communist Party. The Russian Revolution aided in the growth of the party in other nations. A large sum of money was assigned to carry out propaganda in foreign countries. Strikes were incited in Berlin, Glasgow, London, and Liverpool through Communist efforts.

HATRED OF FREE ENTERPRISE

The party principles indicated a hatred of free enterprise or capitalism. Members were not required to observe honesty and though taking the oath of allegiance, they need not stand by it. The party stood above all. Members were taught sabotage, spying, use of passport frauds, counterfeiting, rioting, disloyalty to army, navy, and air force. They were instructed to stay within the law and outside the law, to work for key places in schools, farm organizations, labor unions, and so forth.

The Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace met in New York City in March 1949. The purposes of the meeting were:

First. To provide a propagandist forum against the Marshall plan, the North Atlantic Defense Pact, and the American foreign policy.

Second. To promote the foreign policy of the Soviet Union.

Third. To mobilize intellectuals for their program, teaching civil disobedience against the United States Government.

Fourth. To prepare for the coming world peace conferences, with promotion of communism in view.

Fifth. To discredit American culture.

The State Department indicated that—

None of the cultural leaders of eastern Europe who attended were free to express any view other than that ordered by Moscow.

The three professors dismissed from the University of Washington were on

the speakers' platform, all having had connection with the Communists.

Dr. Ernest Boas, of Columbia College of Physicians and surgeons, said that in the Soviet Union—

Science has become the servant of the state to such an extent that the only science is that approved by the leaders of the state.

COMMUNISM INCREASING IN UNITED STATES

Communism is increasing here in the United States in great and alarming strength. Working as they do in secret groups, carefully selecting and training men and women and placing them in strategic offices in organizations, they build from these small cells until control is obtained and honest, patriotic workers are crowded out.

Members of the party are sent to the Lenin Institute, in Russia, where they are trained in sabotage, to capture railroads, shipping, radio stations, power plants, in fact everything that could paralyze a nation in time of war or revolution. There have been a large number of schools of such training here in the United States sponsored by the party. They teach members to fill key positions in organizations, factories, and so forth. The party pays all expenses. The United States Government closed 29 of these schools in 1949, many of which were named after famous American people as a cover-up of the communistic doctrine they were teaching.

The Daily Worker is the Communist paper in the United States, and is published in New York. Articles in the Daily Worker by many well-known Communists were the means of finally proving their connection with the party, in spite of denials. That is what is so dishonest about the Communists. Truth means nothing; lying, deceit, and subterfuge are their watchword for the progress of the party.

COMMUNISTS ARE SLICK AND TRICKY

Another trick of the Communists is to hide their activities behind the skirts of some organization with a high sounding patriotic name and have innocent and prominent men who are non-Communists address the meeting. Outstanding Americans often are used as dupes.

Pending legislation in Congress compells all Communists to register with the Attorney General and indicate all propaganda as their own. Passports are forbidden to Communists and they cannot work on United States Government jobs. It also states that it is illegal for anybody to set up in the country a totalitarian dictatorship having any connection with a foreign power. In spite of this, many Communists obtain false passports to foreign countries, some members having made trips a number of times on false passports. Families of Russian Embassy employees are not free to be brought over to the United States. The freedom and the pleasant way of living in the United States is too much of a contrast to that of Russia. The friendliness of the Americans reaches out to all. The restaurants do not find Russians sitting on one side of the dining room and Americans on the other. There is free exchange of speech and sociability. The Russians can make real friends here while in Russia sociability is rare and dangerous to both Americans and Russians alike for the MDVK is ever on the alert for spies and sabotage in Russia.

COMMUNISTS ARE WELL TRAINED

There have been many cases of espionage in the past months brought before congressional committees. There have been many accusations of espionage among intelligent and brilliant men. But so well trained are the Communists that their statements, at the hearings, tell little of the truth. A good definition for Communist would be: "A Communist is a person who sells his soul for the advancement of his party."

Russian espionage is the great concern of the day. And, in spite of all precautions, there have been leaks in this country. Men and women of unusual intelligence and personality give or sell information to the Communists. They seem to have no fear of the law of God or man. It is to Soviet Russia they appear to owe their allegiance.

The peculiar thing about communism is that brilliant men and women from many walks of life are included in the party and though they take an oath of allegiance to the United States, that means nothing to them except that all suspicion as to their loyalty be allayed. Here we find professors, writers, and a whole host of others, representing some of the best intellects in our Nation.

Communists are known to be in cable offices, radio-control towers, merchant ships, and commercial air fields. In case of war or revolution within our country, these men hold positions that could result in terrible catastrophes to our country. As mentioned before, the Soviet Union has ordered members to infiltrate into all important positions, to be ready in case they are needed for revolutionary purposes.

HOOVER HAS DONE A REMARKABLE JOB

J. Edgar Hoover, head of the FBI, to whom this Nation owes so much, has done a magnificent job in using his most efficient organization to drive out communism. He explains it is the duty of all loyal citizens to act before it is too late. I quote Mr. Hoover:

I have always entertained the view that there are few appellations more degrading than Communist and hence it should be reserved for those justly deserving degradation.

California University has just ruled that all members of faculty should pass the loyalty test or be dismissed. University of Washington and Washington State College have followed suit. All such organizations and institutions should demand the loyalty test and stand by to enforce it to the limit.

This is a country of plenty and everyone has a right for redress of wrongs, we have more freedoms than any country on this earth. Let us keep it free for our children and posterity.

Until recently little has been known of the concentration camps and slave labor camps of Russia, but escapees from these places of horror, tell of the cruel treatment received at the hands of guards and of the thousands who die yearly from overwork, illness, and starvation diets. Hundreds of thousands of prisoners are forced to work on gigantic projects such as building railroads in Siberia, canals, and working in mines, etc. The Russian Government has been able to accomplish a great deal with no expenditure for labor, only expenditure of human flesh and life. Often half of the workers are women who toil with the men. Long columns of ragged women marching four abreast under armed guards are familiar sights in Russia.

PEOPLE COMPLETELY DISAPPEAR IN RUSSIA

When there is need of enlarging the number of forced laborers, men are arrested on city streets and under pretext of having committed some crime, are sentenced to these slave camps. Relatives never see them or hear from them again. This is just an inkling of what takes place behind the iron curtain. We understand the dead of Russia are cremated. Do you wonder, with all the millions of people dying or being liquidated each year that every foot of Russian soil must cover a skeleton.

The Russian people seem to be stricken dumb with fear and want. Affection in home circles is chilled by the oppressive atmosphere, where secret police prey upon innocent and guilty alike.

God forbid that that should be our lot. It will be if we are not on the alert. Stalin's evil forces are on the alert to make us and the rest of the world subservient to Soviet Russia, if they can.

From a small beginning, communism has reached gigantic proportions. It will work as insidiously and fast as a cancerous growth to sap the life of our liberty-loving Nation, if we do not gather all our forces together to defeat it.

William Penn once said, "Men must be either ruled by God or they must be ruled by tyrants." We, the people of America, believe that with wisdom and godliness, courage and self-reliance together with tolerance, our Nation will stand indestructible with liberty and justice for all. We prefer to be ruled by God.

Biggest Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 19, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the twenty-fifth article by Mr. Frank C. Waldrop on the infiltration of communism in our country:

BIGGEST STORY

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Communists in the United States of America have been singing low now for 20 profitable years about taking the Government by force and violence. Since F. D. Roosevelt's day they have found it easier to work within our Government than to try knocking it down from the outside.

But back in 1919 they were less sophisticated.

After all, they were a newly formed and inexperienced force then, pulled together out of a menagerie of anarchists, Socialists, IWW, and syndicalist bomb heavers and the inevitable covey of Harvard radicals.

One of the most interesting of all histories on the organizational operations among the Communists of those times was put together by—believe it or not—John L. Lewis, president of the United Mine Workers.

He did it to show the Communists were to blame for the "Herrin massacre" of July 1922, in which some 22 miners not out on strike with the UMW, were shot dead at Herrin, Ill.

His account was first published by the UMW in newspaper advertisements, then finally as an official pamphlet of the United States Senate (S. Doc. 14, 68th Cong., 1st sess.), on January 3, 1924.

It is one of the ironies of our time that Lewis, who told a documented and impressive story in 1924 of the Communist drive to capture the American labor movement and lead an open war on the Government, would, in 1934, invite the Communists to come on in and organize the CIO for him.

He can offer only one possible explanation, if not excuse.

The President of the United States had by then let the Communists in on the Government itself.

But in 1924, Lewis' published record not only made a national sensation—it confirmed in detail an already obvious fact.

Lewis told how the Communists in 1919, led by one William Z. Foster, had precipitated strikes in the meat-packing and steel industries, not to advance the interests of the workers but to cause riots and death in the streets. They were all too successful in that.

He told of the railway switchmen's strike of 1920 and the railroad and coal strikes of 1922, all run by the Communists to the same end, and of $1,100,000 sent in from Moscow by way of Canada for buying control of the UMW.

He quoted the famous declaration of Gregory Zinoviev, president of the Communist International, on the mission to arouse "the revolutionary spirit of the workers and prepare them for the coming revolution in America."

People in America had plenty of reason to know that Lewis had the facts.

The period, 1919–1920, had been one of real and reasonable national alarm. For instance, somebody put something like 30 bombs in the mail in New York City in April 1919, addressed to prominent citizens all over the country. Most were discovered in time, but one actually exploded in the home of a Senator and wounded a maid.

On September 16, 1920, there was the episode of the bomb in Wall Street that blasted the Morgan corner, knocked chunks off the buildings that can be seen to this day, killed 30 and hurt 100.

The whole Nation was seriously disturbed. After all, the government of a great empire, Russia, had been overturned in just such a kind of uproar, and here were people in our midst declaring their intention to do as much here.

And so, in 1919–20, while the earlier mentioned Ludwig Martens was whipping up agitation for United States recognition of the Soviet Union by conjuring up dreams of rich business for United States industry, one J. Edgar Hoover, then a young lawyer in the Department of Justice, was preparing briefs for the deportation of undesirable aliens.

Hoover's job was the presentation of cases for the Department of Labor, then in charge of immigration and deportation. One William J. Flynn was head of the "United States Bureau of Investigation," now the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Flynn made wholesale arrests, Hoover made enough cases stick, and boatloads of queer fish were sent outward-bound, among them Emma Goldman and Alexander Berkman, the most widely known of all the anarchists.

Emma went to Russia expecting to find one thing. What she found she told in two books, My Disillusionment With Russia, and My Further Disillusionment With Russia.

That was all in print by 1924, when John L. got his own version into the form of an official United States Senate document.

You may ask why I drag out all this mention of things past.

It is simply to show that when F. D. Roosevelt came to the Presidency in 1933, no American could say that the facts on communism were in doubt. Yet they were ignored.

Export Trade Support of the International Trade Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 21, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, recognition is becoming general that the freeing of the channels of trade of the free world so essential to our own security and that of the world is directly tied into the approval of the International Trade Organization charter. The appended editorial from the May 1 issue of the authoritative journal, Export, Trade, and Shipper, makes this clear:

DESPITE ITS OBVIOUS IMPERFECTIONS WE URGE SUPPORT OF ITO

The Habana Charter for the International Trade Organization is currently under consideration by Congress. Its ratification has been urged by administration spokesmen including the Secretary of State. William L. Batt, as chairman of a committee which includes many of this country's most prominent and active business leaders, has presented strong testimony in its support.

It is common knowledge that opinion is rather sharply divided for and against ratification. Several national business and trade organizations are on record against it. Significance of their opposition is offset, in part, by the approval of other organizations, but more effectively by the fact that many of the most prominent members of the opposing organizations are among the most ardent supporters of the Charter.

Nobody claims that the Charter as now drawn is ideal. It is loaded with exceptions, reservations, and escape clauses for a number of which the United States itself is responsible, which weaken its effectiveness. Were there an alternative proposal, less vitiated by loopholes, we might well prefer it to ITO.

No such alternative plan, however, has been suggested. Rejection of the Charter would, therefore, be tantamount to deciding in favor of bilateral deals, at a time when American world traders are in fact bitterly opposed to bilateralism. Failure at this time to establish an international body, through which to attempt the ironing out of world trade problems on a multilateral basis, would in our opinion constitute a serious setback to the general program for world economic recovery.

We have heard no valid arguments against ITO based on any positive threat or danger. Intelligent criticism has been directed rather at the weaknesses and omissions in the proposed Charter. These defects, we believe, are readily susceptible to gradual correction and improvement, after the Charter has been adopted. A start must be made and now is the obvious time to make it. We favor ratification of ITO.

Stonecutters Ask Tariff Protection To Preserve Their Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 19, 1950

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter which I have received from the employees of the Adolf Meller Co., of Providence, R. I. These workers are semiprecious and synthetic stonecutters. They are asking a tariff adequate to preserve their jobs. It is a new industry and has already been obliged to reduce its force 50 percent. The letter follows:

ADOLF MELLER CO.,
Providence, R. I., May 17, 1950.

Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We, the undersigned, who are semiprecious and synthetic stonecutters, living in Providence, R. I., are the remaining help left from a large force of employees formerly employed by the Adolf Meller Co. This concern fabricates and cuts genuine black onyx and synthetic gem stones.

We have signed this petition requesting you to oppose any legislation which would further reduce the already low tariff on synthetic gem stones, which, in turn, affect our job security.

Our livelihoods are already threatened by the disastrous effect which has been brought about due to the existing large-scale importation of synthetic gem stones.

We respectfully petition the tariff committee to increase tariff on synthetic gem stones to offset the wide fluctuation of German currency in relation to the dollar, the low standard of living, and wages paid in this similar industry in Germany.

Thanking you for your interest in behalf of our families, we remain

Sincerely yours,

Robert Meller; Helen L. Bamford; Delia R. Dube; J. Gertrude Fitzgerald; Mary Izzi; Paul Pollak; Raymond J. Kern; Martin Himmels; Mary Teafford; Mary A. Hannon; Lean Celona; Henry Hamburger; Arthur Zander; Anthony Del Greco; Agnes Kemma; Anna Izzi; Mary DeCecio; Joseph St. Laurent; Carl Pickert; A. Lincoln Clark; Joseph E. Iavarone; Joseph Silva, Jr.; John Killon, Jr.; Edward J. Gendron; Mario A. Aetruda; Theodore Grenier; John Basmajian; James L. Oliver; Floyd H. Graham; Walter Bond; Eugene C. F. Cameron; Anthony D. Santis; Theodore Zimmer; Moses N. Perry; Edward C. Hamburger; Max E. Meller.

Woman's Place in Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDNA F. KELLY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 19, 1950

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to insert my remarks in the RECORD, I include the speech, Woman's Place in Government, by our distinguished colleague the Honorable MARY T. NORTON, at the National Democratic Conference and Jefferson Jubilee in Chicago, May 14, 1950. Mrs. NORTON knows her subject well, having devoted the major portion of her life to politics.

The speech follows:

I am deeply grateful to you, Mr. Chairman, and to the Chicago Host Committee for the privilege of addressing this distinguished audience of Democrats from all over this country. In appearing before you I feel quite at home and that I am among dear friends. You have sent able and distinguished men to the Senate and to the House of Representatives. They have been my colleagues during my long service in the Congress. Tonight you have on your program our beloved Vice President. I am sure he will discuss some of the issues of the campaign this year. Any discussion by me would therefore seem superfluous, and I shall confine my remarks more particularly to the women present. I feel so strongly that our woman power could be used more effectively to advance the Democratic Party, if women would realize how deeply Government cuts into their own personal lives, and how very much President Truman's program will help them to achieve the things they so ardently desire for themselves and their families.

Thirty years ago a vast responsibility was thrust upon the women of America when through the nineteenth amendment we were given the right of suffrage. Up to that time men alone had controlled politics from the beginning of the Republic and the entrance of women into this field was a new experience for them, too. We came to the men of our party unhampered by any traditions, unbound by any pledges. We had high hopes that women everywhere would respond to the privilege of voting and answer the call for service in politics. In fact, we even looked forward to the day when women would be actively considered in framing party policies, and dreamed of the time when many women would be given consideration in the selection of candidates for public office.

The history of the past 30 years has shown how disappointed we have been in these hopes. Women have not achieved their rightful and true place in the political arena. Unfortunately, it is still a man's game, with women playing all too minor a part. Although we women may be prone to feel that the men of our party have lost none of their strength in party circles, I believe we must face the issue squarely and ask why women have not made more progress. I think that we can blame ourselves that so few of us have been elected during 30 years to public office, where our influence could be felt.

While it is true that in some parts of the country women have been discouraged from seeking party nominations, I feel that if their hearts were involved in their desire to become candidates, they would succeed in reaching their objective.

Recent elections have shown that women make sincere, intelligent and vigorous candidates, who can carry a message to the people as enthusiastically as men.

During my years in Congress, I have received a great many letters from women evidencing their interest in politics and asking how they should proceed in attempting to enter the field. Of course, like any other goal, there are a great many ways of reaching this objective, but to all inquirers, I can give only this sure reply—to work within our party and work just as hard as we would to gain success in any other field. There is no royal road to success. In politics, as in every other activity, work and more work is the answer. I realize that the path is often rough and difficult and the goal apparently too distant to attain. I, myself, have often become discouraged but I say, after 30 years in politics, that the objective is worth every effort expended.

This particular year offers an excellent opportunity to any woman who is anxious to assume her full share in party work and especially to a woman who aspires to public office, because in these complex times there have developed so many problems which touch her personally—and foremost of all is the goal so precious to all women—the problem of a lasting peace in the world, and what we can do to strengthen that instrument for establishing the peace, the United Nations. If only women would give their wholehearted and active support to this organization, its position in the world today would be so much stronger and its program so much more effective. Women did not share the responsibility for the "death" of the League of Nations, but if the UN should fail in its lofty goal, women cannot cast aside the blame which would be theirs in not supporting it to the fullest.

Statistics have shown that there are more women in the United States eligible to vote than men, yet women so far have failed to organize their strength to sway public opinion. There is no doubt that women want peace, but how indifferent they often are to the forces which seek to destroy it.

Nor have women in general used their strength to support qualified women candidates for public office. I have often said that a woman should not be supported in an election because she is a woman but because she is as well qualified, and sometimes even more capable, than the man who is opposing her. The record of the number of women in public office is not one to which we can point with pride. Even in 1949 only 214 women were elected to State legislatures and in 1948 only eight women to the House and one to the Senate. In fact, in 30 years only 39 women altogether have served in Congress.

In view of this sad picture, my purpose in addressing you tonight, and I am speaking especially to the women present, is to urge you to do all in your power to organize women to become active in the Democratic Party. What organized women can accomplish was ably demonstrated 2 years ago in Maine when a woman defeated two other strong Republican Senatorial candidats, both men, in a vigorous State-wide campaign. I am hoping that the same result will be achieved this year in California where a well qualified woman, HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS, is a candidate for the United States Senate.

Our party has much to offer women and has demonstrated during the last 18 years that there is a very definite place in its economic and humanitarian objectives, where women are particularly fitted to serve—for example, our labor, health, social security, foreign aid, school, and children's programs, all of which require the type of ability so many women possess. I believe that it is generally conceded that women have contributed much not only to the initiation of these programs but to their successful operation.

We are happy that in the past few years and under the leadership of President Roosevelt and President Truman, women have been recognized and appointed to positions of great importance and responsibility. We earnestly hope that as these women "make good" in their different positions, the President will be encouraged to name more qualified women to high office. Women presently in politics and Government by their splendid example of public service can be the opening wedge whereby many other women will find their true place in public life. Success among these women will engender interest among their sisters in the causes of civic improvement, honesty in politics, and good government.

While it is true that every woman cannot be a leader, it is also true that every woman has something to contribute to government and in the precincts and wards of our cities, there is much to be done to spread the gospel of democracy. Women must not only vote themselves but must enlist the votes of other women who may still be reluctant to use the privilege they gained through the nineteenth amendment. There are still far too many women who do not use this prerogative on election day.

In a practical way, women can do much of the so-called spade work in their home communities. They can take an active, intelligent interest in all issues involved, can disseminate literature, organize, and address meetings, pull doorbells and be missionaries for the Democratic Party even among their neighbors. Every individual in her own way can help and it is a well known fact that the work done by devoted women who love our party has paid great dividends in votes. To these unselfish women I would like to pay my tribute of appreciation for the big part they have taken in promoting the Democratic Party and rolling up the majorities which have made victory possible. Many of these women are here tonight.

May I at this time plead with you to continue your efforts in a cause which will mean so much to every American this year—the election of a Democratic Congress to give the President the necessary tools with which to work, and enable him to insure the success of his great Fair Deal program.

The President deserves the whole-hearted support of every individual who believes in freedom of opportunity in a peaceful and free world. I know all women sincerely believe in that principle. President Truman has done much to promote freedom throughout the world, and we, who have the blessings of liberty, must stand with him in the magnificent program to which he has dedicated himself. His great courage and steadfast purpose should be an incentive to every person who loves democracy. As long as democracy prevails, we need have no fear of communism. There is no place for any foreign ideology in the Americanism which President Truman represents, regardless of the hate propaganda that has been organized and disseminated by certain bitter Republicans and, I regret to say, a few Democrats. These venders of hate stop at nothing to attain their objective and it is well for the women of the country to be aware of this type of attack. We are experiencing something in our American life which is very dangerous. How long will we be able to enlist the services of men to accept high office in government when they know that their regard will probably be savage attacks from those who disagree with them. It is not difficult to destroy the reputation of any man and apparently there are people in public life who do not hesitate character assassination to gain for themselves a doubtful type of publicity. However, I do not think that the women of the country are easily sold to that type of propaganda and I am sure that the campaign of hate that is so well organized to defeat the objectives of President Truman in his desire to give the

people of the country the kind of administration they so ardently desire will not be successful. Those of us who remember the bitter fight on the League of Nations cannot avoid comparing it with what is going on today to try to destroy the United Nations.

President Truman is our great leader in the fight to maintain a free world, a world we women sincerely want for ourselves and our children. We are convinced that this goal can be best attained by the program of the Democratic Party and by the election of a Democratic Congress. Our job this fall is a big one and is a battle in which every individual can contribute a share. Our course is clear. We must not fail.

Resolution by Hadassah on Arab Arms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 4, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have spoken out on a number of occasions in recent months on the question of Britain's rearming of the Arab states and the threat this action entails for the future existence of Israel as an independent state. I have asked time and time again that our Government take the necessary steps to insure lasting peace in the Middle East by bringing together the Arab states and Israel for the purpose of peace negotiations and final peace agreements between them.

Israel is anxious for peace and would rather invest its limited funds into aiding the hundreds of thousands of immigrants who have entered the Jewish state in the last 2 years to establish themselves on the farms and in the cities, than spending that money on military equipment. One of the organizations that is doing a marvelous job in aiding the newcomers to Israel, particularly in providing them with medical care, is the women's organization in this country known as Hadassah.

There is a very fine chapter of this organization in my district, the Bensonhurst Group of Hadassah, which numbers 885 members. At their meeting on May 10, 1950, this group adopted the following resolution, which I desire to place in the RECORD:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE BENSONHURST GROUP OF HADASSAH (885 MEMBERS) AT A MEETING ON WEDNESDAY, MAY 10, 1950

Whereas for some time it has been known that Britain has been engaged in the arming of Arab countries much beyond the need for local or internal security; and

Whereas such arming by Britain has been publicly acknowledged by the United States Government; and

Whereas there exists a very definite threat by the Arab League to organize all the Arab states in a strong united front militarily and economically against the young struggling democracy, Israel; and

Whereas we are profoundly convinced that our Government is greatly concerned about the peace and security of the Middle East: Be it therefore

Resolved, That we of the Bensonhurst Group of Hadassah at a meeting assembled on this day of Wednesday, May 10, 1950, do solemnly call upon our Government to make good its avowed purpose of maintaining the peace in the Middle East by approving Israel's persistent pleas for permission to obtain arms here for defensive purposes, the only course best calculated for the maintenance of stability, peace and security in the strategically important Middle East.

ELSIE STRYKER,
President.
BELLE KIMMELFIELD,
Chairman, Public Relations.

Why Penalize a Reserve for Being a Reserve?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 15, 1950

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I present an advance copy of an article which will appear in the June 1950 issue of the Reserve Officer magazine, the official publication of the Reserve Officers Association of the United States. This article is entitled "Why Penalize a Reserve for Being a Reserve?" by Col. Melvin J. Maas, United States Marine Corps Reserve, a former member of the Congress of the United States. The article is as follows:

WHY PENALIZE A RESERVE FOR BEING A RESERVE?

(By Melvin J. Maas, colonel, U. S. Marine Corps Reserve, chairman of the legislative committee of ROA)

There is wide divergence between the services in the matter of adjusting the position of their Reserve officers when called to active duty. The Army and the Air Force credit only active duty performed in grade toward arriving at the relative precedence of reserve officers among themselves and with Regulars when the Reserves are mobilized or otherwise report for active duty. The Navy and the Marine Corps in general, place their Reserve officers on the precedence list according to the dates of their commissions.

What this means is that a Reserve officer of the Army or the Air Force, with only the usual 2 weeks' annual active duty, will be ordered to active duty way down on the list of officers of the same grade and date of commission in the Regular services, and, as to Reserve officers of like service in the Navy and Marine Corps.

As an example: Officer "A," a captain in the Army Reserve, whose commission is dated July 1, 1946, has had 15 days' active training duty in 1946, 1947, and 1949. He has, therefore, performed a total of 45 days' active duty. Officer "B," a captain in the Air Force Reserve, also commissioned a captain on July 1, 1946, performed 2 years' active duty, and on July 1, 1948, went on inactive duty. Officer "C," a captain in the Marine Corps Reserve, with the same date of commission as his brother Reserve officers "A" and "B," performed 15 days' active duty during each of three intervening years, so he, like "A," has a total of 45 days' active duty.

On July 1, 1950, all three are mobilized. Let's see what happens to their relative precedence.

"A" takes his place in the Army behind the captain in the Regular service who was promoted to captain 6 weeks before: That is the middle of May 1950. "B" takes his place in the Air Force behind the Regular who was made captain July 1, 1948. "C" on the other hand ranks with a Regular Marine captain commissioned July 1, 1946.

"A" has lost all but 6 weeks of 4 years on the lineal list. "B" has lost 2 years. "C" has lost nothing and has kept up with his running mate in the Regular Marine Corps. (The Naval Reserve officer of comparable rank has held his Regular Navy running mate like the Marine Reservist.)

A more extreme example but a typical one would be—

An Air Force Reserve captain who reached that rank on July 1, 1946, has had 2 weeks' active duty each subsequent year or a total of 2 months. An Army Reserve captain was promoted to the grade on April 1, 1950, and immediately reported for 90 days' active duty. They are both mobilized on July 1, 1950. The Army Reserve captain immediately takes precedence over the Air Force Reserve captain who was promoted to captain nearly 4 years after the Air Force Reserve officer.

Apparently the theory of the Army and the Air Force is that only active duty contributes to the value of a Reserve officer for his war assignment.

The Navy and Marine Corps on the other hand believe that a Reserve officer is growing and expanding in his general knowledge, abilities, and capacity for leadership. They believe that a successful civilian career also contributes to a Reserve officer's ability to quickly adjust himself to the new problems of the military which always develop in time of war. They are also new to the Regulars.

Those officers of the Regular Establishment who insist on denying parity to Reserve officers in time of war, use as their main argument that a Reservist, training only part time, cannot possibly be as competent as a Regular who puts in full time in the military. This is not necessarily true at all. The Reservist certainly is not so well trained as the Regular, but this is not necessarily a gage of either's competence, once in a war. None of us contend that the Reserve officer is as well trained as the Regulars, grade for grade, but that is not the issue. The test should be rather—is the Reserve officer competent to perform the duties of his rank?

If he is not, he should not be continued in the Reserve at all.

It is up to the Regular Establishments to institute and conduct training programs that will qualify the Reservist for his duties and which will also result in a constant weeding out of those who are found unwilling to or incapable of becoming competent.

This is exactly the attitude and program of the Navy and Marine Corps for their Reserve. In this policy the Naval and Marine Reserves concur wholeheartedly. The Navy does not expect its Reservist to be the equal of their Regular running mates upon mobilization. They do expect the Reservist to be capable of performing the duties to which he will be assigned.

They expect to eliminate the incompetents among us through the selection-for-promotion system. This will produce a Reserve capable of immediate and complete integration with the Regular Establishment upon mobilization. So thoroughly does the Navy believe in this that they propose that there be no distinction whatever upon general mobilization and then the Reserves become in every sense part of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps during their war service. To have such a Reserve requires that the date of commission of the Reservist determine his position on the combined lineal list in peace and in war.

Any other system results in a Reserve officer being from two to five or more years older than his contemporary of the regular service. From the highest authorities in the Navy came testimony after World War II that Reserve officers, 3 months after mobilization, were indistinguishable from Regulars in the duties for which they were assigned. Thereafter, both Regular and Reserve learned their war duties from the war itself.

No less an authority than Admiral Nimitz made this statement repeatedly. If this is true, then there is no justification for permanently penalizing the Reserve officer from 2 to 5 years of age in grade compared to the Regular. The result is that a Reserve officer of the Army or Air Force upon reporting for active duty is penalized thousands of numbers on the precedence list which is far, far more drastic than a stiff court martial would award as disciplinary punishment. Once lost, these numbers cannot be made up.

This penalizes a Reserve officer for being in the Reserves in peacetime. A civilian commissioned during a war, suffers no such penalty. The day he is commissioned and reports for active duty, determines his place on the lineal list. The Reserve officer who has contributed liberally of his time and effort during peace to prepare himself for war, may be placed with a regular who is years his junior.

Such a system as is in force in the Army and Air Force does not assure getting the most competent officers into the right spot. A lieutenant colonel in the Air Force Reserve, who has commanded an Air National Guard squadron, for instance, for 6 years with the usual 15 days annual field training would immediately become junior and lose his command to a Regular major who had only reached the rank of lieutenant colonel 3 months before and had never had command of a squadron. Who will say that the Regular under such circumstances, 6 years younger and with little if any squadron command experience, is better qualified to command the squadron than the Reserve who has had 6 years experience and training in actual command. Yet that is what the Air Force says. The Army likewise contends that a Regular lieutenant colonel who has just been made colonel a few months before is more competent than a Reserve or National Guard colonel who has been commanding a regiment for 7 or 8 years. I don't believe it, and furthermore, the record doesn't warrant the conclusion reached by the Army and the Air Force.

The "only active service" theory of the Army and Air Force as applied to Reserve is narrow and unrealistic for at least two apparent reasons. First, a comparatively small amount of a Regular's service is spent in strictly field military duties or with troops. Actually, taken all in all, much of an officer's career in peacetime is spent in administrative and other duties. Secondly, there is so much that is fundamentally the same in civilian experience and the military service in time of peace that both the regular and Reserve come out at any given time with pretty much the same basic mental equipment, that there is no justification for the vast gap created between the two as results from the present Army and Air Force system.

Of course, the Regular service provides more valuable training for war than is possible in the Reserve, but we don't maintain the military for the prestige or personal aggrandizement of the individual, whether he is a Regular or a Reserve. The Regular's compensation is a paid career. The Reserve, on the other hand, contributes his time from his career and family life in order to prepare himself for war. The drill pay that a portion of the Reserves receive, doesn't constitute even a semicareer compensation. It seldom covers the actual expenses of a Reserve for participating in the program.

These factors should not enter into the question of an officer's place on the lineal list. The governing factor should be the officer's value to the over-all war effort. We think that this being true, there should be no penalty imposed upon a Reserve officer by reason of his being a Reserve officer and that the precedence of all officers should be determined by the date shown on the commission.

For Action on Coal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD BREEN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 19, 1950

Mr. BREEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Dayton (Ohio) Daily News of Tuesday, April 25, 1950:

FOR ACTION ON COAL

During the recent coal strike, many Congressmen were extremely critical of the President. They accused him of dallying with the issue, of waiting too long to invoke the Taft-Hartley law, of letting the crisis swamp him, and finally forcing a power solution that increased the strength and prestige and arrogance of John L. Lewis.

For this criticism there was some justification.

But when the President did come to grips with the crisis, he did one important thing. He looked beyond the symptoms of the coal disease to the causes. He saw that coal was a sick industry. He realized that, although stockpiles dwindled dangerously when the industry was on strike, they accumulate dangerously when the industry is in full production. He recognized that there are simply too many mines and too many miners when measured against the market—a market which the irresponsible actions of John L. Lewis, to be sure, had played a part in shrinking.

Taking the long view, the President asked Congress to create a fact-finding commission to survey the entire coal situation and make recommendations in terms of economic, social, and national security. This was a proposal which had been made as long ago as the 1946 coal strike by former Gov. James M. Cox, of Ohio. But the coal industry had been left to rock along from crisis to crisis. The President finally put the weight of his office behind the search for a comprehensive, clinical solution.

It has been almost 2 months now since the end of the coal strike. What has happened to the Congressmen who were so critical of the President for doing nothing? As far as meets the eye, nothing has been done by Congress toward creating a long-range coal commission. Yet already the industry is slipping back into crisis.

Stockpiles have been rebuilt to the point at which the market is failing. In terms of tonnage, the industry has not yet made up the losses of the strike period, but in terms of market—allowing for the relatively slim demand of spring and summer—it has more than covered them. Companies which sought to raise the price of coal, to cover the wage and pension benefits won by the mine union, have had to retract the increases. In some cases they have cut prices to a level lower than they were before. Miners have been laid off in West Virginia. Some of the marginal mines have been closing.

In 1947 America's 8,000 mines and 400,000 miners produced 631,000,000 tons of coal. Last year 430,000,000 tons were produced despite the strikes. Yet the estimated current market is now around 400,000,000 tons annually. It is going to go lower, due to progressive conversion to oil and gas by industries, railroads, public utilities, and householders. If John L. Lewis doesn't close the mines for a portion of 1950, the operators will have to. If they don't there will be mass mine failures and random unemployment that will leave the industry in chaos.

The National Coal Association estimates that 50,000 miners will be without jobs in the coming months, in turn throwing out of work some 50,000 transport workers who haul coal from mine to market. Dr. James Boyd, Director of the United States Bureau of Mines, has warned the industry to get ready to retrench.

What will have to be done, of course, is to make a long-term adjustment of production to sales potential. This will mean squeezing out the marginal, high-cost mines, letting their employees drift into other employment. It will mean also squeezing some of the workers out of the healthier mines. Operators will have to mechanize increasingly and to learn to produce at costs that have a chance of holding coal's competitive position.

The only question is whether this is to be done in an orderly way or whether it is to be done in a chaotic way that might easily wreck the industry and cause heartbreaking dislocation in the lives of 100,000 or 200,000 men who mine coal.

Is our record on coal to be summed up in the old saw:

"The Devil was sick, the Devil a monk would be;
The Devil got well, the Devil a monk was he."

Are we going to wring our hands and call frantically for action when the coal crisis erupts in strikes that are inevitable in the present situation, and then sit back complacently between strikes and do nothing to arrest the disease?

Tribute to Maximilian Moss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 2, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, one of the finest citizens of Brooklyn, Mr. Maximilian Moss, has been reelected for a second term to the high and responsible post of president of New York City's Board of Education. It is an unpaid post, which involves painstaking work and great civic responsibility, both of which Mr. Moss ably discharged during the past year. An able lawyer by profession, Mr. Moss is active in various philanthropic and civic groups, and is president of the Brooklyn Jewish Community Council.

I take this opportunity to extend my felicitations and good wishes to him for the coming year. A fine tribute has been paid to him in an editorial published in the Brooklyn Daily Eagle, May 12, 1950, which follows:

THE REELECTION OF MR. MOSS

One of the most difficult and most thankless jobs in the city government is that of president of the board of education. Of late, its duties seem to have become even more onerous than ever. It is therefore most fortunate that the man who has been occupying it the past year, Maximilian Moss, of Brooklyn, has been especially conscientious and hard-working. Certainly the members of the board used fine judgment at this week's meeting in reelecting him for a second term as their president. Words of the highest praise were spoken about Mr. Moss' ability and of his work. In contrast to the bitter division of a year ago, there was no other

candidate and all those present—two being absent abroad—voted for him. They are to be congratulated, as is also Mr. Moss.

In view of the constant parade of highly controversial problems in the board, one would hardly be expected to be in agreement with all of Mr. Moss' decisions and policies. But in some of the most vital ones he has certainly been completely right, especially in his warm support of Superintendent William Jansen's current endeavors to oust pro-Communist teachers.

Mr. Moss is one of Brooklyn's ablest lawyers, is a devoted charitarian and is president of the important Brooklyn Jewish Community Council. He is a firm but fair presiding officer—and he has certainly had to handle some tough situations that would try the patience of a Job. How he is able to devote such a large share of his time to this job without affecting either his law practice or his health we do not know.

And it must be remembered that this is an unpaid post and President Moss' painstaking discharge of his duties is in actuality unassailable evidence of the seriousness with which he takes his civic responsibilities. The city could use many more like him.

Segregation in Swimming Pools in Washington, D. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 19, 1950

Mr. BARRETT of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I want to sound a loud alarm to those people of America who are convinced that any weakening of our democratic way of life in these anxious days constitutes an added danger to our Nation. I want to let them know that, even as we struggle to meet the onslaught of totalitarian ideals and methods from without, there is occurring in Washington a series of shameful events that is opening a wide crack in the foundation of our democracy.

I know that our citizens, no matter where they live, will raise their voices in a mighty protest when they understand the real design and purpose of the bill, H. R. 5968, reported out by the House Committee on the District of Columbia. I am equally certain that they will want and demand to know the attitude of the Commisisoners of the District of Columbia on the issue of racial segregation which forms the background of this proposed legislation.

This bill is designed to transfer control of the Capital's swimming pools, built by money from taxpayers of all races, colors, and creeds, from the United States Department of the Interior to the District's Recreation Board. On its face it appears innocent in motive and without mischief, and thus masquerades as a mere organizational shift of responsibility. Behind it, however, is a history of broken faith, autocratic order-giving, vicious racial intolerance, and a gratuitous judgment-of-men-by-men wholly offensive to the spirit of our Declaration of Independence and our Constitution, and in direct contradiction to the established policy of the President.

This bill, if approved, will put the stamp of the Congress on the transfer of these pools from Interior to the District's Recreation Board. Is this all? It is by no means all. If the Congress grants this transfer, it will be giving its approval to a completely undemocratic and dangerous solution to a problem which the Department of the Interior has already settled in a completely democratic manner. Even more deplorable will be the implied reinforcement by the United States Congress, before the eyes of the world, of the blatant intolerance which their "servant," the District of Columbia government, has seen fit to permit.

The Department of the Interior has offered to turn over the operation of these swimming pools with one proviso—that they be opened on a basis of nonsegregation. The District's Recreation Board has stated its desire to engage in such operation, but has refused flatly to be responsible for them unless races are segregated.

This stand has been taken in spite of the prevailing pattern of use of Federal lands in the District by all races. In August 1949, the Recreation Board entered into a formal agreement with the Department of the Interior to conduct recreational programs in various Federal parks and grounds, agreeing to the stipulation that all recreational facilities were to be on a non-segregated basis. As early as 1939, the Department of the Interior had ordered a discontinuance of compulsory racial segregation in the use of picnic groves.

My colleague from Pennsylvania, Representative CHUDOFF, reported to the House on May 9 the glowing success of those recreational programs in the District which have been continuously pioneered by the Department of the Interior. Operated without segregation, these are programs in which all may participate without some being branded by ostracism as second-class citizens. He has told of the unhampered and free activities of all groups utilizing the public lands which belong to them all—utilizing them without conflict or strife. Adults and children, white and Negro, have accepted the real meaning of democracy in this use of the parks and grounds for which all have contributed, and they have done so with a fine respect for the rights and the happiness of each other. There is no argument involved—these things that belong to the people are used by the people, and color or race cannot determine whether a person can play tennis or golf, or whether he can build a picnic fire and enjoy what the Creator provided for all.

The decision of the Recreation Board respecting the publicly owned swimming pools of the District is as destructive of a fine and proven tradition as it is offensive to decent men and women. It proclaims that the land may be used by all, the trees and flowers seen by all, the birds and the waterfalls heard by all, and the warm green grass touched by all. But the water—this, it believes, is for the white only, unless those whose skins are colored are willing to paddle around in water prepared for them alone.

Have the gentlemen of the Board forgotten that the Negro children, as well as the white children, suffer from the heat of Washington? Can they truly search their souls and find justification for insisting that Negro children merely stand and look through the fence as the children with white skins enjoy the pools which the money of all has constructed? This, Mr. Speaker, is not the kind of democracy I believe in.

To give protective color and logical justification to this despicable prejudice the Recreation Board states that it fears an opening of the pools to persons without regard to race or color will result in violence. It contends that its decision for segregation is in keeping with the community standards of Washington, despite overwhelming evidence to the contrary. As a last resort it announces piously that, if Interior opens the pools to all citizens without manufactured restrictions, the Board cannot be responsible for what may occur.

The Secretary of the Interior, Oscar Chapman, has announced that these pools will be open to all Americans this summer in keeping with the completely satisfying pattern soundly established for other recreational facilities.

The House Committee on the District of Columbia now reports out its bill to transfer the pools to the District—and the nefarious and undemocratic game of the Recreation Board is almost played out to its end.

I think, however, that the game will not be finished. Any proposal as repugnant as this to the men and women of good will who are the fiber of our democracy must be repudiated by the collective sense of decency of our Nation. I call upon our citizens to whom democracy is a living and vital way of life to join me in protesting the proposed passage of this bill, H. R. 5968. In so doing, they can know that they have strengthened democracy before all the peoples of the world; yes, even before the eyes of those black, brown, and yellow men and women whom we invite to become democratic nations along with us that together we may save our way of life.

I do not personally intend to stand by silently when I sense an opportunity to aid in keeping communism from America by strengthening our democratic patterns and by making the fruits of democracy available to all men, regardless of race or creed. And as a representative of our people, I believe that this is the growing determination of America. This bill must not pass.

Against those spokesmen for the District government who have been responsible for establishing and maintaining this undemocratic and intolerant prejudice I have described, the American community should feel a deep resentment.

The people of the United States who help to support the District of Columbia government in the management of their Capital have a particular right and an obligation to insist that the District's official representatives observe the strictist adherence to those democratic ideals and provisions which our Constitution has established.

This issue, exploited by the Recreation Board, has stirred up unnecessarily passions of hate, fear, and intolerance at a

time when the Department of the Interior had resolved it in an atmosphere of calm and peaceableness and in a manner fully in keeping with our established and cherished democratic traditions.

The time has come when the people of America should be informed of the position the Commissioners of the District Government take on this issue. They have been strangely silent in the face of this assault on our democratic way of life. On May 9, a resolution was introduced before the Recreation Board which would offer that Board's full cooperation to the Department of the Interior in its operation of these pools. It is indeed significant that the District Government's official representative successfully opposed this resolution, stating that the public judges us by our actions, not by resolutions.

Does this statement by their representative mean that the Commissioners themselves uphold this vicious policy of segregation and undemocratic discrimination? In view of their silence, do we not rightly assume that he was speaking for them, and that they condone his attitude as their own?

Have the Commissioners forgotten that the President has stated the policy of the Federal Government to be strictly against discrimination in any form? As employees of the Federal Government, how can they explain this overriding of the President's policy? Do they consider that, in dealing with the District's problems, their judgment is superior to that of the President? Apparently they assume that they have the authority to revoke the President's policy on any matter where their judgment differs. I think there is no room for insubordination on this issue.

Does the District government work for the people of this country, or does it serve only certain special groups from chosen races?

These are questions that the people want answered, and democracy gives them the right to have them answered. It is time for the Commissioners to state whether the views of their representatives are actually their own views, and whether he was speaking and acting for them. The people who breathe the air of freedom in this Nation must demand and insist that the District of Columbia government cease for all time the toleration of official views that democratic principles must not pollute the air over Washington. I think the people want to know, and want to know now, exactly when the District government is going to begin to demonstrate that it acts for democracy, and not for some shoddy system of regulations and rules that veer dangerously toward the concepts of totalitarian states.

Mr. Speaker, we all know that every possible inducement is being offered to ordinary people, in this Nation and throughout the world, to move over to the side of the Communists to seek security. We know that democracy will win this battle for men's minds only if it demonstrates that its precious gifts of freedom and equality truly exist for all men and women without distinction.

Every new evidence of discrimination in this country, and every story of the parceling-out of freedom, is immediately spread throughout the world as a symbol of the fallacy of democracy's strength. We can be sure that the nations whose people have a color that is not white are not closing their ears to this kind of propaganda.

We cannot afford discrimination among our people on the world's stage today, if for no other reason than that of our own security. We certainly cannot afford it morally, for intolerance and racial segregation eat out the fiber of our human conscience until suspicion and hatred start to grow within us. Democracy is based upon the essential dignity of all men, not just some of them. Each time that we deny that dignity we weaken democracy even as we keep on trying to build it.

The bill coming before us must be defeated. I call upon all men and women of good will and decency to join me in making known their demands for its defeat before we drill another hole in the structure of our democracy.

And I also call upon them to demand that the District of Columbia government abolish forever the support of a system that tries to establish second-class citizens, and that it remove from office forthwith any of its representatives who find democracy painful and offensive.

Red Proposals Selfish

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 19, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial that appeared in the Daily Evening Item of Lynn, Mass., May 13, 1950:

RED PROPOSALS SELFISH

Two new Russian proposals, one on Berlin and one on the long-delayed Austrian peace treaty, show very neatly how hard it is to negotiate seriously with the Soviet Union.

On Austria, Moscow wants any pact to be preceded by Allied troop withdrawal from Trieste, former Italian port slated to be a free territory. This is demanded as evidence of good faith that "under one pretext or another Austria shall not also be transformed into an Anglo-American war base."

Never before, in all the years an Austrian treaty has been hanging fire, has Russia dragged Trieste into it. Now it suddenly becomes a critical point on which the whole issue pivots.

As for Berlin, the Soviet Union has accepted the idea of city-wide elections but has laid down seven specific conditions which must be met before the balloting can begin.

It isn't necessary to examine the full list. The Russians want all occupying powers to remove their forces from Berlin. They call for abolition of the so-called occupation statute under which the western nations govern their control zones of the city. They ask that "democratic" organizations be given freedom of activity in those zones.

The tricks in these proposals are pretty obvious. If Russian troops left Berlin, they would still be on the outskirts of the city in the Soviet-controlled eastern portion of Germany. But withdrawing Allied soldiers would have to pull back more than 100 miles to the main western area of the country.

Freedom for "democratic" groups in all Berlin means license to Russian-inspired Communist activities aimed at bringing the city completely under Moscow's domination.

Like the Austrian suggestion, these conditions are all designed to weaken or eliminate western control of critical European sectors. What the Russians could not accomplish by the Berlin blockade they now would seek to gain by other means.

It is not likely the Russians expect us to take these proposals to heart. They are following their usual formula of asking, as a very minimum, sacrifices they know the West cannot afford to make.

The newest moves are just further threads in the skein of propaganda by which Moscow eventually hopes to weave strong pro-Communist support in Germany—against the day when Russia's chances of taking over might be stronger. They know the Germans want foreign troops out of Berlin and ultimately off all their soil.

In the case of Austria, the Soviet leaders apparently have no real desire to negotiate a treaty, since that would compel them to remove their own troops from adjoining Hungary and then Rumania. When you do not want to do something, it is not hard to find excuses for inaction. That is, if you are a Russian.

Some Figures on British Arming of the Arabs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 11, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the question is often raised about the extent of British arming of the Arab States. I am placing in the RECORD an editorial on the subject of Arab armament which contains some interesting figures relative to the supply of arms to the Arabs and the type of such arms. I believe these figures speak for themselves. If today anyone still questions the truth about British arms shipments to the Arab States and the extent of such shipments, these are some, though not all, of the figures. Since these figures became known, we have also learned that Britain is building a factory in Egypt to produce jet planes.

I desire to commend to the attention of my colleagues the following editorial from the Jewish Advocate of Boston, May 11, 1950:

ARMS FOR ARAB STATES

Middle-eastern policy is one of the items on the agenda for the meeting of the Foreign Ministers in London, and it may well be that as a result of the discussions, particularly between Mr. Bevin and Mr. Acheson, some new approach to this problem will emerge.

In spite of de jure recognition of Israel by Britain, there is as yet no indication that British policy in regard to the supply of arms to the Middle East is changing. The Foreign Office has, however, shown some signs of embarrassment at the unceasing campaign in London, Tel Aviv, and Washington against the supply of arms to the Arab States while they are still refused to Israel and has been put on the defensive

by the repeated publication of the alleged quantities being sent to Egypt and elsewhere.

In the House of Commons, Mr. Churchill referred to 110 jet planes supplied to Egypt. Last week, a Reuters story from Tel Aviv said that "sources close to the Israel Foreign Office" alleged that Britain had intervened to stop a west-European country from selling jet planes to Israel and had exerted pressure on the United States to prevent the sale of arms to Israel.

Israel military experts claimed, the Reuters story continued, that 48 jet aircraft—18 Vampires and 30 Meteors—had been delivered to Egypt since January and that 12 of each were ready for delivery. Britain had also, it was stated, delivered to Egypt a number of Lincoln bombers and Mosquitoes, six Furies, and three Tempests. Besides purchasing aircraft and arms from other sources, Egypt had received from Britain up to February 1950, 150 Bren carriers, 90 heavy-armored cars, 50 artillery vehicles, 30,000 Enfield rifles, and 10,000,000 rounds of ammunition; 1 destroyer, 1 sloop, 4 frigates, and 1 corvette.

In addition, it had bought a small frigate from America and a number of torpedo boats elsewhere. It was also alleged that Egypt had earmarked nearly £10,000,000 for armaments, had purchased a small-arms factory from Krupps at the end of 1949, a cartridge plant from France, and an explosives factory from Sweden and was negotiating with Italy for the purchase of a machine-gun factory.

It was also stated in Tel Aviv that although there were no treaties with Lebanon or Syria, Britain was building up a small Lebanese air force and had already delivered to Syria six jet aircrafts, with eight more to follow. Syria was also making purchases elsewhere, while Britain had sent 270 armored cars to Jordan last year and 200 this year; four Fury aircraft and 20 tanks to Iraq.

So far as Israel is concerned, one of the main considerations prompting the Foreign Office refusal to sell arms was stated to be that Israel could obtain them from other sources, which the Arab States, being short of currency, were unable to do. In the opinion of the Foreign Office, Israel is already well armed; and to supply her with further quantities would only foment an arms race in the Middle East.

Our correspondent in Tel Aviv reports: A further Israel Foreign Office statement issued here reaffirmed that "a west European country" had offered jet fighters to Israel, provided that Britain did not object to the sale, and that when approached officially by the Israel Government the British had prohibited the transaction.

Address by Dr. Walter Adams, Assistant Professor of Economics, Michigan State College, at the Annual Convention of Independent Bankers Association, Des Moines, Iowa

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES H. MORRISON
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 19, 1950

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in the RECORD the following article by Dr. Walter Adams:

Mr. President, officers of the association, ladies and gentlemen, "Truth," said Mr. Dooley almost half a century ago, "is a cruel boss. He don't even pay you board wages and if you go to work for him you better have a good job on the side." The fight against monopoly falls in much the same category; for, while there are many who pay lip service to the idea of free enterprise, there are few who are willing to support effective measures to preserve it, especially when their own vested interests are at stake. Nevertheless it seems to me that if we are to perpetuate our system of economic, political, and social values—the kind of values that have made America great—we must avoid the road to further concentration of power, the very road that has led to disaster in Italy, Germany, Russia, and Japan. And if our businessmen are to avoid suffering the same fate as did their brothers across the sea, it seems reasonable that the enforcement of free competition is the least regulation that they can expect; it is a minimum amount of regulation which, for the sake of survival, they must accept and accept cheerfully.

As a nation we have traditionally been suspicious of concentrated economic power whether such power is in the hands of the Government, individuals, or large corporations. We have feared concentrated economic power because it eventually tends to result in centralized political control—fascism or communism at worst or democratic socialism at best. That is why, in contrast to most other nations in the world, we have tried to curb not only excessive governmental power but also excessive private power; we have tried to maintain and preserve a system of free competition in industry, trade, and finance on the basis of the fundamental belief that enterprise which is not competitive cannot for long remain free. It is for this reason that our Congress passed the first antitrust law in 1890.

Yet today, 60 years after the Sherman Act became law, we are confronted with a concentration of economic power unparalleled in our history. What is worse, the trend in that direction has been accelerated in recent years. Independent businesses are succumbing to the encroachment of their larger rivals at an alarming rate. In industry after industry, a handful of concerns enjoy an exclusive position or are sufficiently dominant so as to enforce conformity among their smaller competitors. Whether we turn to steel or aluminum, to automobiles or petroleum, to motion pictures, or cigarettes, to chemicals or tin cans, there is the same sad tale of overwhelming size and entrenchment in strategic economic position. So serious is the situation that poor economics instructors are hard-put to find concrete examples of old-fashioned price competition with which to illustrate their lectures.

To be sure, we no longer have to contend with monopoly in its cruder forms. No longer is our economy infested with organizations like the pre-1911 Standard Oil and American Tobacco companies. No longer is monopoly of the simple variety where a single firm dominates an industry. What we are confronted with instead is a type of market organization where a few sellers are dominant—the so-called Big Four and Big Five; a type of market organization where the entry of newcomers is effectively deterred—not so much by the threat of economic reprisals as by the size and entrenched power of existing firms. It is a type of market structure under which a seller no longer can afford to be independent in his price policy and under which he must, of necessity, take the reaction of his rivals into account. Thus United States Steel, for example, knows that price cutting will inevitably cause its large competitors to follow suit with the result that the market is shared as it was before—only at a lower level of prices and profits. It is this certainty that price cuts will eventually be met; it is this fear of retaliation, that leads to conservative and nonaggressive price policies in industries dominated by the Big Four and Big Five.

The result is a system of friendly competition. The result is a situation similar to that which would obtain if but a single concern dominated a field. Thus we get collusion—not in the common sense meaning of the word to be sure—but parallel action, nevertheless, as far as the effects of market behavior are concerned. As a very astute economist has observed recently: "A covenant signed with blood, an agreement signed with ink, an understanding without written words, concerted acts approved by a wink or a nod, a common course of action followed without physical communication—these may be different methods of collusion but the differences are irrelevant if the effects are the same."

The dangers implicit in this system of friendly competition, this concerted action in the market place, should be abundantly evident. Where a handful of firms are in a position of dominance, consumers are not always protected—as under competition—against excessive prices and artificial shortages; the public is not assured that technological innovations will promptly be introduced and the economy allowed to remain dynamic and progressive; newcomers, while enjoying legal freedom of entry into markets and access to raw materials, are often deprived of the economic freedom to introduce themselves, their organizations and their ideas.

It is the last point which looms especially significant, because the preservation of free enterprise requires that new men and new ideas and new firms constantly have the opportunity to challenge the position of those already entrenched in an industry. It is this freedom of opportunity that has permitted America to climb to a position of preeminence in the field of industry, commerce, and finance. It is this freedom which must be maintained and expanded if we are to perform as well in the future as we have in the past. And in order to do this, in order to keep the channels of opportunity open and free, we must make sure that power remains essentially decentralized and that the right to make decisions in the field of industry, commerce, and finance is dispersed among as many individuals and corporations as possible.

Let me illustrate what I mean by drawing an example from a field with which you are especially familiar—the field of finance. Under a regime of competition, we assume that producers are responsive to the wishes of consumers as expressed by the latter's choices in the market place. We assume, for example, that if the demand for nylon increases, the price of nylon will rise, the profits of manufacturing nylon will also rise, and that new producers will therefore be attracted into the nylon field, with the result that nylon production will increase and the price of nylon and the profitability of nylon making will return to normal again. While new resources flow into the nylon field they will be drawn from other fields—say silk—where consumer demand has gone down. Thus, under competition, the kind of goods which consumers desire will be produced and they will be produced in quantities which consumers, through their choices in the market place, have indicated they want.

There is only one hitch in this scheme of things. In order to embark upon a career of producing nylon—assuming the absence of other artificial restraints—a new firm needs financing. If it can obtain such financing from a large number of soures, it is not dependent on the whim or caprice, the doubts or conservatism of any individual banker. But when the supply of loanable funds is concentrated in the hands of a few, a potential newcomer to an industry might no longer be able to obtain the needed funds. He might find that insurance companies, investment bankers, or other large financial

institutions are already allied to existing nylon producers and therefore reluctant to provide the funds with which their previous investments would be jeopardized and with which their older clients would be made to suffer the unpleasantness of competition. They might be reluctant to deal with a little fellow, preferring to lend out their money in large chunks to big boys who can afford to borrow in quantity. They might be reluctant to venture forth into the hinterlands where the little producer is located, preferring to protect the interests of a region or locality with which they have been affiliated in the past. For these and similar reasons, loanable funds may be withheld from potential newcomers in industry when the supply of such funds rests in the hands of a few. For these and similar reasons, competition in industry may be restrained and the freedom of economic opportunity curtailed, simply because the decision to lend or not to lend is a matter of discretion for a few people or concerns to exercise.

That this is not idle speculation is borne out by the facts. Thus it is a fact that the 16 largest insurance companies in America control over 80 percent of insurance-company assets. It is a fact that of the 730 members of the Investment Bankers Association, 38 houses transact 91 percent of the investment banking business, and the Big Six of Wall Street 57 percent of the total business. The significance of this financial concentration was stated by the Justice Department in 1947 when it asked a grand jury to return an indictment against 17 Wall Street houses. The Justice Department at that time charged the investment bankers wtih power to decide which industries were to be helped in expanding and which industries were to be retarded. The Department accused these bankers of determining areas for competition and monopoly, of fixing prices, of deciding which technological improvements and patents should be made available to the public and which to be retarded or suppressed altogether. The Department concluded that here, at the pinnacle of industrial and financial power, there was almost complete monopoly, there was suppression of free enterprise, and that all this was being accomplished in violation of our antitrust laws.

In the commercial banking field similar tendencies are making themselves felt—as you know from your personal experience. Here the onslaught of monopoly is being led by branch banking, chain banking, and holding-company banking, which have an especially strong foothold on the west coast. I need not elaborate on this subject any further in view of the fact that your organization was formed for the express purpose of preserving our system of independent banking by keeping the ownership and management of banks well diffused. It is your organization which has realized that if banking becomes closely held and a few large systems dominate the banking field of the country, we will eventually wake up to a banking monopoly that would dwarf into insignificance any monopoly so far seen—a banking monopoly that would extend into all other segments of our economy as well.

Granted then, that concentrated economic power—whether in the field of industry, commerce, or finance—is dangerous for the continued existence and health of a free-enterprise system; what can be done about it? Can the trend be reversed and can it be reversed without resorting to Government ownership or strict Government control? I think it can be and on the basis of this belief I have, last December, presented a proposal for a new antitrust law to the Congress of the United States.

My proposed law, which would deal with nonfinancial corporations only, has a double purpose: To preserve, wherever feasible, a competitive structure of industry while at the same time providing safeguards against an interference with business efficiency. In cases where these basic goals come into conflict, the proposed law would forsake competition and choose efficiency as the objective of public policy.

Specifically the bill provides that corporations which control 10 percent or more of a commodity's supply (or corporations with assets totaling more than $25,000,000) must register with the Securities and Exchange Commission. These corporations must then file pertinent data so that the Commission can determine—in a case-by-case approach and in accordance with specific standards set forth in the bill—whether the corporate structure of a given firm, its position in the industry, or its business policies and practices have a detrimental effect on the interests of investors, consumers, or the general public. If they do, the Commission can, after opportunity for hearing, order the dissolution of such a firm or the divestiture thereby or divorcement therefrom of any property, assets, securities or other holdings which are not reasonably incidental, or economically necessary or appropriate to its efficient functioning * * * or which tend to hinder, obstruct, impede or render difficult the maintenance or achivement of effective competition in one or more lines of commerce.

This simply means that, if the Commission were to discover that the du Pont control over General Motors and United States Rubber was not economically necessary or appropriate to the efficient functioning of a chemical firm—or that such control was motivated primarily by a desire for monopoly—the Commission might order du Pont to rid itself of the General Motors and United States Rubber holdings. Similarly, if the Commission were to find that General Motors was indeed an efficient producer of automobiles but that its manufacture of Diesel locomotives, refrigerators, electric appliances etc., merely represented an attempt to aggrandize the firm's size and economic power, the company might be forced to confine its operations to the automobile field. Finally, if the Commission were to find that a firm like United States Steel could operate as efficiently but less monopolistically at one-third its present size, an order to that effect could be issued.

Here then is the central provision of the proposed law: It permits an administrative authority, subject to judicial review, to order a giant firm to "unmerge," wherever the effect of such an order is likely to stimulate competition and/or increase efficiency. But the bill goes further. It leans over backward to afford companies protection against wanton and arbitrary atomization. This protection is provided in the form of escape clauses under which an industrial giant can avoid dissolution or divestment orders by the Commission, if it can demonstrate that its present size is necessary for the attainment of efficiency or that its business performance in the past has materially benefited the general public. Contributions to the public interest can be established simply by showing that the company in question has participated in technological progress, passed on savings in cost to consumers, provided enough plant capacity to fill consumer needs and actually used such capacity to the fullest, earned a normal rate of profit as compared to competitive industries, and has benefited consumers by price reductions as well as by advertising competition. When a company, judged by these standards, can show that the manner of its past performance has been in the public interest, it escapes dissolution or divestment—regardless of its monopolistic position in the economy.

The main advantages of the proposed bill are threefold: First, it is not a general dissolution decree against all industrial giants. It is not a death sentence for big business merely on the grounds that it is big. Instead, the bill provides for a careful, selective, case-by-case approach to cope with such concentrated economic power as is conducive neither to a maintenance of efficiency or the encouragement of competition. Secondly, the bill proposes to benefit not only consumers and the general public but corporate investors as well. It does so simply by requiring that no business be so big that its component parts could function more efficiently as separate units than as parts of the whole. That this is not an idle claim was amply demonstrated in the public-utility field where a similar law (the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935) produced a considerable increase in efficiency of operation. This was reflected by the security values of those operating companies which were divorced from their parent organizations. Thirdly, the bill implements dissolution proceedings by more sophisticated techniques than the hammer and tongs method available under the Sherman Act. Whereas the Sherman Act equips the Justice Department with a blunt ax, this bill provides the enforcement agency with a set of fine surgical instruments. By contract with the Sherman Act, it sets up standards which are sufficiently clear and concrete to obviate confusion and uncertainty as to what is lawful or unlawful conduct in the market place. In this connection it might be noted that Senator TAFT recently recommended that our lawmakers "should consider whether we should place a limit on the proportion of any industry which can be controlled by any company and whether it is possible to make the Sherman Act more definite and effective." While my proposed bill is by no means a panacea for our monopoly problems; while it should not preclude adoption of measures designed to aid the small-business man or to reform the patent laws; while it should go hand in hand with statutes designed to prevent further concentration in the financial field; it must, nevertheless, constitute the core of any comprehensive antitrust program.

In conclusion, let me repeat the warning of Senator MURRAY who some years ago said: "If we believe that our system of free enterprise should be preserved, if we believe that the American economy should be the expression of a free society, then we cannot stand idly by and watch the march of monopoly to power. We cannot risk the consequences—for in this struggle, if we are too little and too late, there will be no second chance."

Rural Electrification and Rural Telephones

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. CHRISTOPHER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 19, 1950

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Speaker, electricity has become a necessity of modern life. Cheap electricity to the consumers of this country will make it possible for them to use the appliances that are so necessary to make their home pleasant, comfortable, and attractive and relieve the burdens of drugery which the average housewife, without electricity, is compelled to endure. I have no apology for the battle I have waged for REA and Southwestern Power. TVA is the outstanding development of its kind in the entire history of the world and many other rivers are being and will continue

to be harnessed to serve mankind by generating cheap hydroelectric power. The forces of greed and exploitation will fight a losing battle against these great public improvements. The water power of this land belongs to the Federal Government and the current generated by the multipurpose dams constructed by the Army engineers belongs to the people of the United States and not to the Power Trust. REA Co-ops are preferential customers under existing law.

The electricification of farm homes in my State is little more than half completed and, like JOHN RANKIN, of Mississippi, I want the fight for REA and rural telephones to continue until a rural telephone line and REA line reaches every rural home that a draft board can find in the time of war or a tax collector can find in time of peace.

Residential users of elctric current in the State of Missouri in 1948—which is the last year for which I have complete figures—paid $36,185,900 for electrical current. If they had been able to secure that current at TVA rates it would have cost them $20,227,918, or $15,957,982 less than they paid. If the commercial users of electrical current in the State of Missouri in 1948 had been able to secure the current at TVA rates, they would have saved $15,781,867. The industrial and other users of electrical current would have saved another $14,258,713, which makes the staggering total of $45,998,562 that the Power Trust overcharged the users of electrical current in my State during the year of 1948, measured by the TVA yardstick. It is out of that overcharge that the cost of full-page ads, appearing in hundreds of papers all over the State, are being paid. With an overcharge like the above which runs to the staggering total of $2,097,071,724 for the United States as a whole—no wonder the Power Trust can buy full-page ads, keep the mails full of propaganda, and employ lobbyists in the Nation's Capital, the yearly salaries of some of whom run as high as $6[illegible],000 per year plus an expense account. It is the overcharge to the consumer of electrical current that is presently financing the propaganda of the Power Trust in the press, the radio, the mails, and personally in the cloakrooms of the Nation's Capital.

So long as the Power Trust was confident that it would be able to grab at the busbar every kilowatt-hour of current generated by the hydroelectric dams, they were in favor of the Army engineers continuing to build these dams. But now that it appears that there is more than a possibility that REA will be able to pick up at least a part of this cheap current at the dams, they are turning their attention to attempting to kindle widespread opposition to any further construction by the Army engineers.

If private power companies would sign a contract with the REA co-ops in the State of Missouri binding themselves to furnish to these co-ops all the firm current they needed for a period of 30 years at 6 mills per kilowatt-hour, wholesale, and deliver the current to the points of need, I would see no reason for the construction of the two proposed lines across the State of Missouri. But I see no indication that the power companies would be willing to sign such a contract or that they would be able to make good on it if they did. A great hue and cry has gone up against the building of those two lines in Missouri and the construction of the two steam plants to firm up current from Bull Shoals and Norfolk on the White River.

Forty-two cities and towns in the State of Missouri have municipal plants and generate their own current. My home town of Butler, Mo., has such a plant. The list includes such towns as Carthage, Chillicothe, Columbia, Hannibal, Higginsville, and even Independence, and it should be remembered that Independence is so close to Kansas City that the towns have built together until you have to watch the markers on Truman Road in order to know when you leave Kansas City and enter Independence. These forty-two towns and cities in my home State have every right to generate their own electrical current and incidentally they feel they can generate it more cheaply than they can buy it. But, if it is all right for these towns and cities in my home State to own their plants and generate their current why is it socialism, communism, and boondoggling for all the farmers in all the State of Missouri to borrow enough money from the Federal Government to construct two lines across the State and two steam plants to firm up the hydroelectric current generated by the White River so that REA may have dependable sources of cheap electrical energy that they know will not be taken from them?

Do not let anyone tell you that these lines and plants will be built by the Government and given to REA. REA will pay for the current generated on the White River, to energize these lines the same as any other purchaser. The money used in the construction of the lines and the two plants will be repaid with interest to the Federal Government. REA has been and is ahead on its payment schedule and will continue to maintain that position unless throttled and strangled by the power trust. We are only seeking in Missouri, as well as other places all over the United States, to get for REA a dependable source of electrical energy at a wholesale cost that will permit the co-ops to buy it and repay the Federal Government the cost of constructing their lines so that the farmers of America may own their electrical system.

I want to impress on all farmers, and those in my home State particularly, that there is a tremendous battle being waged between REA co-ops and the interests that seek to maintain and continue their monopoly on the current that is and will continue to be necessary to keep the lines energized. The average farm user of electrical current will be using 2 to 10 times as much current 5 years from now as he is today if he can get that current at a price he can afford to pay.

The power trust is planning a propaganda program, the cost of which will run into the millions of dollars. It has been reported that a motion-picture film is to be made the title of which will be, If You Don't Watch Out. This film is purported to depict what the Power Trust choose to refer to as "galloping socialism." This shows the length to which the power monopoly is willing to go to deceive the American public. Users of electrical current should remember that they are being forced to pay for this propaganda barrage that is being used against them. It will be well if farmers who have REA service and other farmers who hope to receive such service in the near future will make enough inquiries that they will know who are their friends and who are their enemies.

The figures quoted above are taken from tables presented by the Honorable JOHN E. RANKIN, of Mississippi, and made a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Friday, July 1, 1949.

Tariff Tinkering

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. GRANT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 19, 1950

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, there is scheduled to be another round of tariff tinkering in September. Our working people and manufacturers are threatened with possible plant closure, personnel reduction and competition most difficult to meet.

We cannot maintain American standards on a basis of foreign manufacturing costs. That is a self-evident fact. To flood our markets with cheaply produced foreign products is to strike a blow, for some a death blow, to our economy.

The Committee for Reciprocity Information will begin hearings on May 24. This committee is charged with the responsibility of holding hearings with regard to tariff changes, to gather information and to digest and transmit it to the Committee on Trade Agreements, which is the same group as the Committee for Reciprocity Information. The Committee on Trade Agreements has served notice of intention to negotiate with 17 other countries in England in September, under provision of the Trade Agreements Act of 1934, as amended.

A lengthy list of products imported into the United States on which United States tariff concessions may be considered touch many industries—chemicals, metals and manufacturing, agriculture, textiles and ceramics.

Wholesale large-scale reductions would open our doors to a dangerous flood of cheap foreign products and might well mean disaster to many of our industrial plants and the loss of jobs to millions of workers, both skilled and unskilled.

I represent a district in which numerous textile mills are located. I feel these mills, already threatened with shrinking domestic markets, with a shrunken American dollar, with increasing unemployment and blighting competition from Japan foisted by our military government in that country, should be spared further harassment and material

difficulties. I oppose with all the vigor I possess, any further lowering of our tariffs until conditions are more equitable as between the participating nations and the resultant competition of a more legitimate and reasonable nature.

I do not subscribe to the philosophy of "letting the manufacturer look out for himself—he is able to do it," when that doctrine might throw millions of workers out of employment. It is a blighting philosophy.

I should like to read you some of the messages I have received from my district regarding this important matter:

Here is one from Mr. A. C. Smith, president of the First National Bank, of Greenville, Ala.:

Local unit of Alabama Mills is devoted exclusively to manufacture of corduroys. This payroll is a vital factor in economic welfare of Greenville and Butler County. Understand Committee for Reciprocity Information to make recommendations to President for reduction in tariff on corduroy. Important that tariff not be reduced. Would seriously affect mills operation and payrolls. Please do what you can to prevent changes in present tariff. Advise us.

And here is a wire from the Greenville Junior Chamber of Commerce:

Please refer to plan of Committee for Reciprocity Information, advising President to reduce tariff on corduroy. This action seems unfair and discriminatory. We request you oppose this matter. Our local mill with $750,000 annual payroll will be closed or greatly handicapped.

Another one from Mr. Howard Haygood, secretary of Greenville Chamber of Commerce:

Please refer to plan of Committee for Reciprocity Information, advising President to reduce tariff on corduroys. We consider action damaging, unfair, and discriminatory and urge your opposition and efforts against same. This telegr.m authorized by 143 members of chamber of commerce as it will probably close local mill with $750,000 annual payroll.

And here is one from Mr. Jeff P. Beeland, a businessman of Greenville:

In 1934 Congress gave the President authority to increase or decrease tariff rates on goods coming into this country from foreign countries. Present information is that the Committee for Reciprocity Information will recommend to the President that the tariff be removed from corduroy. There are very few manufacturers of corduroy in America, and our manufacturers of this fabric will be compelled to curtail, or even shut down, if the President decides to eliminate the tariff on corduroy. The local mill, which has an annual payroll of $750,000, will very likely be forced to close. Surely this is damaging and harmful authority that seeks to establish the textile industry of Japan in competition with American labor. We can readily see that if applied to all textiles it would ruin the laborers of America. If carried out on one textile, it is certainly discriminatory. It should not be permitted, and with all sincerity I urge your untiring efforts to assist in preventing same from happening. Will you introduce a bill, remove this authority, and place such authority back in the hands of Congress? This should be done for the protection of the laborers of America. Will you do it?

Mr. Speaker, I hope this threatened assault upon the working people and the businessmen of America will not be perpetrated.

"I Am an American" Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 19, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following timely editorial that appeared in the Boston Daily Record of May 18, 1950:

"I AM AN AMERICAN" DAY

The American people, by their annual observance of "I Am An American" Day, which will be observed next Sunday, earnestly and enthusiastically welcome all new citizens to active participation in the affairs of the Nation.

There are many millions of such new citizens each year, mostly by virtue of the fact that so many young men and women become of legal voting age and thus enter upon the estate of active and responsible American citizenship as a matter of heritage.

But, in addition, a large number of foreign-born residents of the country have made themselves competent to perform the duties of citizenship and have made themselves worthy of the high estate to which they have aspired.

The pride with which every American is able to accept and discharge the responsibilities of citizenship is properly and rightfully expressed on such an occasion as "I Am an American" Day.

Those of us who were born to that estate of patriotic responsibility should be mindful of the debt of gratitude we owe to the happy circumstance of birth which has no greatly enriched our lives.

Those who achieve that place among us of their own volition, and are only asked as a condition thereof that they pay the tribute of loyalty to their adopted country, are often first among us in their understanding and appreciation of what a good and grand and beautiful thing it is to be an American.

Such a man was the late Emil Schwarzhaupt, a native of Germany who died this year after 40 years of residence in the United States as a naturalized citizen.

Mr. Schwarzhaupt prospered more than most men in consequence of his life in America, but it was not his great wealth which marked him for national attention at the time of his death but the legacy of appreciation and gratitude he left as an example and inspiration to all who have the right to call themselves Americans.

The truly precious and priceless thing about America which had been disclosed to him was the gift of dignity and of opportunity and of challenge to personal worthiness attendant upon American citizenship.

So the bulk of his fortune, more than $4,000,000, was set aside for the establishment of the Emil Schwarzhaupt Foundation, to which he ascribed the following purpose:

"The upbuilding and betterment of American citizenship and increasing among all American citizens and especially among the foreign born the knowledge of the history of the United States Government and the meaning and obligation and privileges of citizenship in the United States of America."

The purpose and spirit of "I Am An American" day have never been given better expression than by the proud and grateful words of this man who became an American by his own choice.

Let all of our new citizens be made welcome and given a special place of honor among the patriotic people of our land.

Let "I Am An American" Day be observed by all of our people with respect for the free institutions of our country and with reverence for the traditions of human brotherhood and justice which distinguish and sustain it.

Honor to Mr. Whittington, Chairman, Public Works Committee, House of Representatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 18, 1950

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under authority granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD I wish to call to the attention of the Congress the crowning accomplishments of a service rendered to his country at the end of his retirement from the Congress by a distinguished American, Hon. WILL M. WHITTINGTON, chairman of the Public Works Committee of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, since 1928 Mr. WHITTINGTON, as a member and as chairman of the Flood Control Committee, and presently as chairman of the Public Works Committee of the House, has guided every piece of legislation in regard to flood control through the Congress.

On May 17, the President signed H. R. 5472, the omnibus flood-control and rivers and harbors authorization bill of 1949–50, included in which are projects in every State in the Union amounting to $1,731,251,825, and the President presented to Mr. WHITTINGTON one of the pens with which he signed the bill.

Mr. Speaker, today Mr. WHITTINGTON, as chairman of the Public Works Committee, has most ably presented the Federal-aid road bill providing for $660,000,000 Federal aid to the highways of the Nation, and the bill was passed almost unanimously.

Mr. Speaker, no encomium is required by me for the work in the Congress of Mr. WHITTINGTON, for I think that the demonstration several days ago in the House by his colleagues is sufficient testimony of the appreciation and esteem in which he is held by the membership. I would like to submit a copy of a resolution adopted by the National Rivers and Harbors Congress at its annual convention in Washington, as follows:

RETIREMENT FROM CONGRESS OF HON. WILLIAM M. WHITTINGTON

Since the Government of the United States has recognized its obligation and responsibility in regard to the development and utilization of our water resources, and over a period of nearly 30 years in the Congress of the United States there is one man who, at great personal and financial sacrifice, over and above all others has made the greatest contribution in the study, initiation, securing authorizations, appropriations and completion of the great programs and projects of navigation, flood control, power development, irrigation, and water resource development.

During the long period of years as member and chairman of the Flood Control Committee of the House of Representatives, and later upon the reorganization of House committees, as chairman of the Public Works Committee of the House, his unlimited energy, outstanding ability, sound judgment, administration and guidance has made possible great public works which will inure and endure to the benefit and protection of our country and people, and which will be living and lasting monuments to their author and champion.

In our organization his service covers State vice president for the State of Mississippi, national director, and senior national vice president.

The National Rivers and Harbors Congress regrets profoundly the announcement of the decision of Hon. WILLIAM M. WHITTINGTON, of Mississippi, to retire as a Member of the Congress of the United States, for especially at this time the country can ill afford to lose in the Congress the presence and influence of such a statesman and patriotic American of the stature of our friend and coworker.

Our gratitude goes to Mr. WHITTINGTON in his unselfish contribution to the cause to which he was devoted, and we extend our sincere wishes for his health and happiness, and notwithstanding the above, we express the sincere hope that it may yet be possible for him to reconsider his decision to retire.

Mr. Speaker, as a further evidence of the esteeem in which Mr. WHITTINGTON is held, I wish to say that on the occasion of Mr. WHITTINGTON'S seventy-second birthday, on May 4, 1950, the Members of the House Public Works Committee tendered a testimonial dinner to Mr. WHITTINGTON at the Statler Hotel, and I would like to include an excerpt from the remarks of Mr. DONDERO, ranking minority Member speaking for the committee, as follows:

It is with deep personal emotion that I rise to extend greetings and congratulations to my personal friend, my illustrious colleague, and my noble and able chairman, the Hon. WILL M. WHITTINGTON, on this, the seventy-second anniversary of his birth.

His has been a successful and distinguished career—teacher, lawyer, State legislator, and Member of Congress for a quarter of a century. He has contributed much to leadership and legislation of national importance—legislation which has been of great benefit to the Nation.

There is one thing that is admired above all others in men, and that is success. There is an old saying that "nothing succeeds like success." It matters little along what line of human endeavor a man's talents lie. The fact that he succeeds is the all-important thing. It proves that in his field of activity he did "build a better mousetrap than his fellow man."

We respect his ability and his zeal. He is a benefactor to mankind not only for his contribution to the enterprises of the world but for the inspiration we derive from the lofty example he sets for others.

All that I am saying in truth represents our distinguished colleague.

Many people believe success is largely due to luck or to birth or to circumstances. But it takes ability to shape circumstances. It is true that there is a tide in the affairs of men which, taken at its flood, leads on to fortune. Only an able and wise man, however, knows when the tide is at its flood.

Our friend and colleague, our distinguished guest and chairman, has achieved a large measure of success. His success has been political, legislative, and material. But that success was not achieved by luck. I am sure it came as the result of hard work and diligent application.

Undoubtedly, early in his life he learned one thing that is now one of his fine characteristics, namely, thoroughness. He has earned true greatness and we, his friends and colleagues, who have been so closely associated with him, at least for a part of his life, rejoice that this is so.

We are honored by his presence here tonight and, also, that of his family. We hope that this modest occasion is expressive of that esteem and affection in which he is held by all of us who know him so well.

I can think of no word or line more appropriate on this occasion and, in contemplation of his withdrawal voluntarily from public life and in contemplation of his return to his Mississippi home where he and his good wife walked in full strength of their years, than the sentiment expressed by General Lee to his army at Appomattox, when he said: "You will take with you that satisfaction which proceeds from a consciousness of duty faithfully performed."

Speaking for the committee, of which you are our honored chairman, I congratulate you again upon your seventy-second birthday. Somewhere the poet has said:

"Age is a quality of mind.
If you have left your dreams behind
And hope is cold;
If you no longer look ahead
And your ambition's fires are dead;
Then you are old.
But if from life you take the best
And in life you see the jest,
And love you hold;
Then no matter how the birthdays fly,
No matter how the years roll by;
You are not old."

Address of Hon. William J. Green, Jr., of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 19, 1950

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR., Congressman, Fifth District of Pennsylvania, at the forty-eighth annual convention of the Pennsylvania Federation of Labor at the Benjamin Franklin Hotel, Philadelphia, May 8, 1950:

Mr. President, honored guests, and friends, at the very outset, let me remind you that this is a political year. Instead of being coy and shadow-boxing, I will tell you right now that my remarks will be largely political. Everything that labor has gained over the decades has been achieved through wise labor leadership and by the ballot box. So there is no more appropriate place to talk politics frankly.

In a world which never before knew such fear and uncertainty, it is a pleasant contradiction that organized labor is in better shape than at any time in its history. This is a tribute to many leaders and workers who have crossed to the great beyond and also to men like Jim McDevitt and you who are still fighting the good fight. America is strong economically and politically. Never before was our wealth so widely diffused, and at no time have we been as free from the menace of "isms."

There are far more employables now than in previous times, which explains in large measure the unemployment picture. But every responsible adviser believes this lag is on the way to being wiped out. Ordinarily I avoid quoting statistics in a speech. But here are a few which are dramatic in their importance. They cover most of the very 48 years in which you have been meeting annually. You and your predecessors did much to bring them about.

Columnist Sylvia F. Porter, writing in the Philadelphia Inquirer, said:

"For a long time I have been seeking some hard facts on the buying power of work, then and now, for that is a major yardstick by which to measure the true prosperity of the majority of Americans. Today I have those facts * * * via the National Industrial Conference Board * * * which has just finished surveying what an hour's work would buy in 1914 and what it would buy in 1948. At the start, let us say the disclosures are exhilarating. For, since 1914, the purchasing power of an hour's work in our country has just about doubled. In this period the average factory worker's wages have risen twice as much as prices. Today's factory worker has to work only about half the number of hours that the 1914 worker did to pay the family bills. * * *

"Today's Americans are so far ahead of their 1914 equivalents that any nostalgia about the good old days is ridiculous. In those good old days of 1914 the average wage earner had to work over 51 hours a week, and some other member of the family had to earn additional income to supply the average amount of goods. He received 25 cents an hour and earned a total of $12.72 a week. He needed $16 to support his family, however. So, to make ends meet, other members of his family had to work an extra 14 hours. Today's factory worker has to work only 34 hours to supply his family with the higher living standard now considered average. He receives $1.47 an hour and earns a total of $58.52 a week. Thus, he has a surplus he can use for saving or for improving his living standard.

"Consider food costs as an illustration. The dollar cost of food has skyrocketed since 1914. As I read some of the food prices prevalent then, I find it difficult to believe they were real. But the average food basket cost the average worker 29.4 hours a week. Today's typical basket costs today's worker 12.4 hours. Or consider clothing costs * * * and, again, the soaring prices of the last decade have obscured the basic long-term gains. To clothe himself and his family cost the average factory worker 9 hours in 1914. Today's wage earner can finance his clothing expenses with less than 5 hours a week. And so the comparisons go down the line in housing, transportation, fuel and light, household operation, and furnishings. And they are still valid after deduction of the income tax, our new form of family expense."

Now, these figures deal with the average American who is a worker. They depict better than any oratory how the average employee has improved his lot since 1914. Most of that progress has been made since the Wagner Labor Relations Act was written into law. Labor unions, bargaining within its framework, have been the force which brought it about. This fine statement of our economic health is made just 18 years after Herbert Hoover predicted that grass would grow in our streets and that America was about to embrace state socialism. Mr. Hoover will be remembered for many things, but I always think of him as the man who gave Republican candidates their bird call.

Little city children who never heard a screech owl, or a whippoorwill, or a robin in its vesper song, are familiar with the Republican candidates cry of socialism. It is uttered in a loud voice, from the bottom of the throat, each October and early November; it becomes particularly shrill in the week imediately preceding the Tuesday

after the first Monday in November. This is usually followed by a great hush which occurs on Tuesday night or Wednesday morning. In 1948 the bird cry grew dim after midnight and at five in the morning was reduced to a whisper. As an indication of the fall season you can be more certain of this call than the frost upon the pumpkin, or the world series.

They cried "socialism" when we wrote the Social Security Act. They cried "socialism" when we wrote the Wagner Labor Relations Act. They cried "socialism" when wages and hours standards were set. They cried "socialism" when the security exchanges were regulated. They cried "socialism" when decent housing became a matter of Government interest. And without benefit of a crystal ball we can predict that the old familiar bird call will ring out when they discuss the welfare state next fall. They will still yell "socialism" in spite of the steady earnings and dividends and the backlog of orders in business. They are still in charge of their businesses and Government imposes regulations only when it is in the public interest. And that is a duty of government.

When the cry of "socialism" pierces the autumn air I think the orators should define the word for us. Certainly any Republican candidate should be willing to accept Senator TAFT's definition, given in a recent telecast. He said: "Socialism is where the Government runs everything." That is terse and accurate. It has no application to a welfare state which both Churchill and Attlee endorsed. They divided on the Government taking over businesses, which is socialistic. This has been done in Great Britain to perhaps a degree of 20 percent. The conditions which brought it about are strictly British and have no counterparts here.

Before the Republican candidates practice their bird call let me tell them this: I have never met and talked with a responsible Democrat, from President Truman down, who would not bend every effort to prevent socialism from replacing our private enterprise system. I talk to many labor leaders and I have yet to encounter one who would change our private enterprise method. I will go further; I have many conversations each day with just plain Americans, and I have yet to meet one who wants socialism. And let me add, after 18 years of the same dismal November wail, nobody is scared any more. We are doing too well.

I recently passed a Carnegie library in my district. It brought to mind the many surveys covering the first half of the century, which appeared in our newspapers on New Year's Day. The little steelmaster was an industrial giant during an important part of that period. He left library buildings to perpetuate his memory. He built the enduring part of his monument. And with Scotch canniness, let the city taxpayers provide the perishable books. It is unfortunate that the library did not evoke the thoughts of fondness and endearment which monuments usually do. Instead I kept thinking of how the Carnegie fortune was amassed. In the place of pondering on Mr. Carnegie my thoughts dwelled upon his ruthless era. Here was the trickle-down period when great fortunes were set up for the few, with the thought that some small portion would trickle down to the rest of us. This was the heyday of Republican high protective tariffs, maintained long after our industries needed protection. Through this Republican device, Mr. Carnegie sold steel for cheaper prices in Europe than you could buy it in Pittsburgh.

I thought of how ready Republican Governors always were to call out the National Guard in a strike. My mind dwelt upon those dismal company towns with their racketeering company stores, their heavily armed company police and sometimes, even a company-dominated church. I thought of how Mr. Carnegie's companies kept labor under thumb by recruiting in European countries. Ellis Island was the convenient answer to any labor unrest. Also to mind came thoughts of blacklisting, yellow-dog contracts, labor spies, and strikebreakers, at a time when Republicans were elected in Pennsylvania with sickening regularity.

And that fact brought to mind the ballot-box frauds in Philadelphia and other cities of our State. Also the Bois Penrose assessments upon members of the Pennsylvania Manufacturers' Association to pay for all this. During this shameful period in Pennsylvania labor history, we had nothing but Republican Governors, yet you have been gracious in inviting our present Governor and he has shown typical consideration in accepting. But as I review the labor record of his party, I feel something akin to sympathy for him. Despite his well-known calm, he or other Pennsylvania Republican politicians must feel very much like a whisky distiller addressing the Women's Christian Temperance Union, when they talk to a labor group.

Next November Republican money will be poured into this State by interests opposed to labor. When the familiar bird-cry is at its loudest it is possible that you may read of some alleged labor leader who has decided to throw his influence (which is usually negligible) to the Republicans. He will claim that he is doing this in the cause of the workingman. This will fool nobody. He is acting in his own personal interest. For the moment he will achieve headlines and then sink to well-earned oblivion.

Right now there is a primary fight between two factions of the Republican Party backed by Mellon, of Pittsburgh, and Grundy, of the Pennsylvania Manufacturers' Association. This is the equivalent of choosing between smallpox and diphtheria. Neither the tycoons, or the candidates they endorse, have ever shown any interest in the workingman, except in November.

In Senator MYERS you have a definitely known quantity. Read his voting record and then emphasize it among your worker friends. FRANK has become a real power in Washington and he has won that high esteem in the short space of 6 years in the Senate service. No matter where you live in the State, make it your business to know your Congressman's voting record in the House.

Statewise, we never entered an election with as much confidence. You will hear that Richardson Dilworth should serve out his term as Philadelphia city treasurer. Even as a candidate for that office he advocated that it be abolished. He said then, before his election, that the treasurer was only a glorified cashier and urged that the office be absorbed by the comptroller. Dick really ran last November to show what a shellacking he could administer to the Philadelphia Republican gang. It is the one they will never forget and may not even survive.

What a competent Governor Dilworth will make.

In closing, let us reiterate to each other that we want no part of socialism and that welfare features do not produce that kind of government. Neither do we want any return to that form of rugged individualism that became too rugged for us under Hoover. We are all out for enterprise that is decent, that serves the people well, and which accords labor the dignity to which it is entitled. With the memory of the Eightieth Congress and the infamous Taft-Hartley Act, we know that this position can only be maintained by voting the straight Democratic ticket.

Speeches by Hon. Joseph E. Casey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 19, 1950

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein two excellent speeches delivered some time ago by my valued friend and our former colleague, the Honorable Joseph E. Casey, my distinguished predecessor as Representative of the Third Massachusetts District:

SPEECH MADE ON THE DAY THE UNITED STATES DECLARED WAR ON JAPAN

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, prior to yesterday we were a divided Nation with respect to our foreign policy. That division of sentiment has interfered with the efficient marshaling of our energies and our resources. America has been a sleeping giant. This attack by the Japanese has awakened us. We are no longer divided. We are one people. We are a Nation galvanized into action. The whole world will soon learn that a truly peace-loving Nation can strike with awful force when thoroughly aroused.

Mr. Speaker, we, Americans all, at this critical hour in the life of our Nation, place all that we hold dear—our lives and our sacred honor—upon the altar of our country and at the feet of our country's cause. God helping us, we will not fail. (Source: CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, House, December 8, 1941, p. 9521.)

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 31, 1939]

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

"Amendment offered by Mr. Casey of Massachusetts: Page 1, line 8, strike out '$825,000,000' and insert in lieu thereof '$850,000,000', and in line 9 strike out '$100,000,000' and insert '$125,000,000.'"

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, this amendment in the sum of $125,000,000 offers us on this side of the aisle a common ground upon which to meet. Make no mistake about it, this is an important vote, an important vote for those who come from the industrial centers of the country and an important vote for those who come from the agricultural districts of the country. More than that, it is an important vote so far as the Democratic Party is concerned. Here we have the party that was put into power because during the crisis the Republican Party failed miserably to meet the exigencies of the situation created prior to 1932. I have heard arguments against the WPA. Of course, relief is an unpleasant topic, and it is an unpleasant situation with which we have to deal, needy men and women. We would like to walk away from it and just say, "Let them take care of themselves." Relief and WPA were never intended to restore prosperity to this country. It is not an economic panacea. It is, however, our method of saying that we believe it to be the duty of the Government to give needy men and women whom private industry cannot employ an opportunity to exist and support their dependents until these distressful times have passed.

Throughout the world men and women, through no fault of their own, through no fault of any political party, were thrown out of work. It became a problem for every other nation as well as this country. The totalitarian nations have solved it by putting their

unemployed in as shock troops and putting them to work under direct Government supervision in the Army. England tried to solve it by the dole. From authoritative sources I have read and have been told that the dole system has been demoralizing; that men are growing to middle age now who have never seen their fathers earn a single dollar and who have themselves never earned a dollar, but merely march up once a week and get a pittance from the Government without doing anything for it.

The WPA, with all its faults, and they have been set forth clearly and fully, is a much better method of relief than has yet been brought forth in any nation on the face of the earth today. Of course, there has been criticism. "Swing" Mikado, building world's fairs, and so forth, but there has not been a single word said in its favor about the hospitals, about the schoolhouses, about the sewer and water systems that all of you know have been erected in your districts by WPA. I say, in view of the enormity of this program, Nation-wide in its scope, trying to deal with the misery and suffering of millions and millions of unemployed, it has stood the test of being brought into the light of day. Surely there has been travel pay that has seemed exorbitant. I do not defend that, but even in private industry you have heard salesmen talk about swindle sheets. Of course, there has been waste and extravagance, but there has been much good done, not toward restoring prosperity but toward helping these distressed people and helping to take care of the needy and unemployed. That is all it was meant for. That is all that can happen with WPA.

The Republicans failed. We have put this into effect. The President said, "We need $150,000,000." There are others who said, "We need $100,000,000." Now, where shall we go? We have denied the President $150,000,000. Let me say to you Democrats that I never believed before 1932 that there was any great fundamental difference between Republicans and Democrats, but President Roosevelt breathed meaning into the Democratic Party [applause] and gave it life and made a clear and fundamental difference that enabled a great many liberals and people who believed that the weaker should have some protection in government and who did not care about political ties to join with him. It enabled those north of the Mason and Dixon's line to send Democrats to Congress because of their faith in progressive government and not merely because some of us were born Democrats. I say to you, let us meet on this common ground and not undermine the Democratic Party, which has been instrumental in enacting into law progressive, far-reaching measures that not even the Republicans, if they ever regain power, will dare repeal. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

(Source: CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 76th Cong. 1st sess., vol. 84, pt. 4, pp. 3667-3668, March 31, 1939.)

Economy and Service to the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 11, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, we hear so much about economy in Federal expenditure these days that I often wonder whether those who keep up the cry of economy fully realize that by reckless action we may cause the disruption of many important services which our Government is rendering to the people of this country. Without sufficient forethought or exact analyses of the effects of this so-called economy, we may wake up one day to find that we have committed irretrievable harm to these services and that it will then cost us considerably more to reestablish them. Under such circumstances the economy will prove to be very costly.

It must be remembered that besides the promise of economy, we owe the people whom we represent certain elementary governmental services and functions. If we should fail to give them these services, we will not be doing our duties as representatives of the people and we will be weakening the Government and the services it is supposed to administer and perform for the benefit of our citizenry.

In connection with this vital matter, I desire to draw the attention of my colleagues to a brief article by the noted columnist, Ernest Lindley, in the Brooklyn Daily Eagle, May 14, 1950. His article, Congress Deals Frivolously With Nation's Finances, is as follows:

CONGRESS DEALS FRIVOLOUSLY WITH NATION'S FINANCES

(By Ernest Lindley)

The "across-the-board" cuts in Federal expenditures voted by the House were made, of course, in the name of "economy." Actually no one knows precisely what their effects would be. In all probability they would disrupt some services which are now efficiently and economically rendered. Other necessary or useful activities might not be seriously impaired. No one knows. Indeed, even after detailed study, the exact effects may not be predictable.

Obviously, this is not an intelligent way to try to achieve economies. And because it is unintelligent it is likely to be ineffective. Many who voted for the sweeping amendments realize this. They simply thought it was good politics to put themselves on record dramatically in favor of economy. They were acting irresponsibly.

The sweeping amendments were tacked onto an omnibus appropriation bill—the first of its kind—which had been reported after long and careful work by the House Appropriations Committee. The committee had effected economies. The chairman of the committee, Representative CLARENCE CANNON, of Missouri, had fathered the idea of an omnibus bill as a means of attaining a more responsible treatment of the Federal finances by Congress. The result at the moment is a murky mess.

If economy is to be sought by across-the-board cuts such as the House approved, there is no point in having an Appropriations Committee. There is no point in requiring representatives of the various executive agencies to spend their time, or that of the committee members, in explaining or justifying their budget requests.

The other side of the Federal financial problem—income—likewise seems unlikely to receive responsible treatment. The House Ways and Means Committee is still working on a bill. It has agreed tentatively upon cuts of approximately $1,000,000,000 in excise taxes. These appear to have been agreed upon by familiar log-rolling methods. The committee has made no headway as yet in finding alternative sources of income. Yet the Federal Treasury faces a big deficit this year and again next year.

Some excise taxes should be cut and some should be removed altogether. These changes should be made with a view to promoting general prosperity and eliminating taxes which are more annoying than lucrative rather than with a view to pleasing the lobbies which have the most friends on the committee or can put the most pressure on it. But the Government cannot stand the loss of revenue. So other tax increases are necessary. Many Members of Congress are, however, reluctant to approve them. The upshot of this political and frivolous approach is likely to be no change in taxes at this session.

1950 Census Uncovers Serious Unemployment Problem in City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINGATE H. LUCAS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 19, 1950

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Weatherford Democrat by Claud Garner:

1950 CENSUS UNCOVERS SERIOUS UNEMPLOYMENT PROBLEM IN CITY

When the personable young lady census taker started on her rounds to take the 1950 census of Weatherford, Tex., one of her first visits was to see my good friend, Lloyd Doughty. She found Lloyd loafing around the house, keeping his father company.

"What is your profession, Mr. Doughty?" asked the attractive young lady, after she had covered the dining table with her big four-page census form.

"Well, I used to be in business, but at present I am staying here with my father."

"Did you spend any time last week at your regular business?"

"No, I stayed around the house all week."

"How about the week before? Did you spend any time at your regular work?"

Lloyd looked a little shame-faced but answered truthfully, "No."

"Would you consider yourself employed at the present time?"

"No. I guess you would class me as being unemployed."

The young lady failed to ask Lloyd how much time he spent during these 2 weeks counting the money he had received from rents, dividends, and other investments.

The well-mannered young lady finished her work and gathered up her materials and went about her business. Her next stop was to see our world renowned portrait painter Douglas Chandor.

Two weeks before, Douglas had returned home from New York, where he had spent 6 months in his Waldorf Astoria studio painting portraits of only such people as were able to be listed in Who's Who In America. Douglas looked the part of a dirt farmer, he was dressed in his wrinkled work clothes, wearing a pair of old scuffed-up shoes and a slouch hat that looked like one of the old hats Fred Cotten brings out occasionally. The artist was busy inspecting one of the many rare plants in his beautiful and exotic garden, when the census taker found him.

"What is your profession, Mr. Chandor?" asked the attractive young lady as she struggled to hold the oversize Federal form with one hand while she wrote the answers with the other.

"I am a portrait painter."

"Did you work at your profession last week?"

"No, I spent last week working in my garden."

"How about the week before? Did you spend any time working at your regular profession?"

"Practically none. I had just gotten home and spent the week looking over the place."

"Then at the present time, you are not gainfully employed?"

"You are right. Working in my garden doesn't make me money, but it costs me plenty, so I guess you would call me unemployed at the present." Douglas didn't mention the fact that he had painted portraits of the crown heads of England, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, his wife Eleanor, and many other dignitaries. Ina, the wife of the artist, who handles all the bookkeeping wasn't at home and couldn't tell what became of the $25,000 Bernard Baruch paid for one of Chandor's portraits of Winston Churchill.

The census taker asked many questions. She wanted to know how many hogs, sheep, goats, cattle and horses he had on the place. She even asked if he had any hives of bees to help pollenize his flowers. Douglas was glad to help the young lady gather up her armload of census forms and books of instruction so she could be on her way and he could get back to work.

A few calls later the census taker dropped by the home of Douglas Gibbs, but Douglas was out of town on one of his tomcatting jaunts and wasn't there to answer her questions. This was lucky for Weatherford, because Douglas would have added one more to the city's list of unemployed.

It took two trips to the Doss house before she caught J. H. at home. Mr. Doss spends much of his time walking the streets between his home and the bank, because when he gets to the bank he finds that his son, James, has taken over the business and there is nothing for him to do, so he walks back home. The library table wasn't big enough to hold all the various census forms, so the young lady spread them out on the floor and started asking questions.

"What is your business, Mr. Doss?"

"Well, I used to run the bank, but my son took my job, so at present I am unemployed."

Many of the questions asked on the census form seemed a bit foolish to Mr. Doss but he liked the efficient manner the young lady handled her job. When she asked him for the total amount of his 1949 earnings, he had to give her an estimate, since the adding machine he had at home wouldn't add figures in that amount. When she finished her work she gathered up her things and the information contained in the form would indicate another unemployed for Weatherford.

She had no trouble finding Clay Waller at home and proceeded to spread her huge census forms out on the big davenport and started asking for information.

"What is your business, Mr. Waller?"

"I used to be in the grain and feed business but the long hours on my feet made me give up the business."

"Do you have any other business?"

"I used to fool with cattle but since I can't ride horseback I quit that too."

"Did you spend any time during the last 2 weeks working at your business?"

"No, I have spent almost all my time here at home."

"Then at present you are not employed?"

"No, I might be classed as being unemployed," admitted Clay regretfully.

Clay should have told her that those fallen arches came from carrying too heavy a money bag and that he had gotten callouses from riding over his big ranch trying to count all his cattle.

No doubt, when our experts in Washington finish their tabulations of the 1950 census, many of our best citizens will fall in the category of the unemployed. I happen to know that E. A. Frantz has not invented anything new for a long time and I never catch him at work, so he too, will likely be classed among the unemployed.

Fortunately, I live outside the city limits and will not add to Weatherford's growing list of unemployed. In this connection, I want to compliment our census takers, they performed their duty efficiently and did a fine job, and followed the instructions sent them by our Federal Government.

If when the final figures are released and our efficiency experts have finished with their tabulations, we find the number of unemployed running into the millions, do not be alarmed. These census figures may not be accurate, but they will be just about as reliable and accurate as other figures and statements coming out of our Nation's Capital.

Yours for what it is worth.

CLAUD GARNER.

"Country Not Going to Hell" H. T. Tells Cheering Crowds—Boldly Champions Every Fair-Deal Issue; Even Unfriendly Press Concedes Trip Was Success

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 5, 1950

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article by Raymond Lonergan, which appeared in Labor, a national weekly newspaper published in Washington, D. C.:

"COUNTRY NOT GOING TO HELL," H. T. TELLS CHEERING CROWDS—BOLDLY CHAMPIONS EVERY FAIR-DEAL ISSUE; EVEN UNFRIENDLY PRESS CONCEDES TRIP WAS SUCCESS

(By Raymond Lonergan)

"Truman has crowds eating out of his hand." That's a headline in the Sunday edition of the conservative Washington Post. The story is written by Robert C. Albright, whose father was a conductor on the Southern Railroad. Bob is as conservative as his paper. He accompanied the President on his swing to the Northwest and reports the facts as he saw them.

On the same train was Joseph A. Fox of the still more conservative Washington Star. In the Sunday edition of his paper Cox wrote:

"President Truman is pulling them in at the whistle stops. Newsmen with him 2 years ago and again this time see no difference in either the size or the attitude of the crowds; they turn out at all hours of the day and night; they listen with quiet attention to matter-of-fact discussions of the global problems with which the President deals daily and they react with the customary outburst to the homely sallies punctuating his talks.

"If the President has lost ground in the past 2 years, it is not evident in the reception he has received from the Mississippi to the Puget Sound country."

COURAGE IS THE WORD

The American people admire courage. During his long trip, meeting all kinds of people, the President never once pulled his punches. That's why the crowds warmed up to him.

He demanded the repeal of the Taft-Hartley law and the enactment of a substitute, fair alike to labor and management.

At the mighty Coulee Dam he went all-out for public power development, reclamation of arid lands and flood control. The Secretary of the Interior, who accompanied him, described Grand Coulee as an enterprise with a cash register attached.

That meant it was paying for itself. In fact, the demand for power is so great that it cannot be satisfied.

The President ridiculed those who say that the country will be ruined if we buy goods from our friends in Europe and Asia. "We can't sell to them unless we buy from them," Mr. Truman emphasized.

WE'RE NOT GOING TO HELL

Everywhere he pleaded for world peace. America must be strong in order to check the advance of communism.

He advocated more low-rent housing, the Brannan plan to safeguard the farmer and at the same time give consumers cheaper food, broader social security, and every other feature of the New Deal program.

"I don't believe the country is going to hell," he told one laughing crowd.

The Taft-Republicans, after many conferences, worked out a plan to stop Truman. They picked Victor Johnston, a high-pressure publicity man, who once worked for Senator JOE MCCARTHY and was also on the payroll of the Northwest Grain Associates—a polite name for the lobby which represents the grain gamblers and the flour interests—gave him an airplane and instructed him to follow Truman's train, distributing answers as he went.

TOO MANY SLOGAN MAKERS

The President and his lieutenants publicly invited Johnston to stop risking his neck in the air, buy a ticket, and get aboard the presidential train. They even went so far as to get the Secretary of the Interior to help distribute Johnston's releases. The newsmen treated Johnston's performance as a joke.

In the meantime, back in Washington, two or three times a day Republican leaders rallied the newspapermen and told them it was all a part of the President's socialistic program.

Of course, those tactics were not effective. Apparently there is no one at Republican headquarters who is capable of making an effective appeal to the voters.

Chairman Gabrielson has never been in touch with the plain people. He was given his job because he was believed to be a money raiser. He had been a lawyer on Wall Street and knew the men who hated Truman and feared reform of any kind.

He has raised a good deal of money and he has used it to hire a lot of high-pressure publicity men like Johnston, and they are really manufacturing the slogans and planning the campaign of the Republican Party. To one who has observed political battles for many years it doesn't look very smart.

Truman's trip was such an outstanding success that even those newspapers which hate him have been compelled to give him the finest kind of publicity.

Here is a sample of the way President Truman presented his case to the enormous crowds which flocked to hear him:

"The use of the government to achieve a higher living standard and a fair deal for all the people is not statism and it is not socialism. It's part of the American tradition.

"The best over-all measure of a nation's economy is its annual output of goods and services. In the United States the annual output of goods and services has increased in the last 10 years about 60 percent.

THOSE WHO YELL LOUDEST

"Now how does this affect the individual citizen? A favorite theme of the boys who are always trying to run our country down, instead of trying to build it up, is that the Government takes all our gains away by high taxes.

"But the truth is that the annual per capita income of our citizens, after taxes, has increased in the last 10 years by more than 40 percent.

"And some of the people who are doing the loudest yelling are the very people who have got the biggest increases. Most of them are better off than they have ever been before in their lives."

"WIPE OUT OBSTRUCTIONISTS"

The wind up of the Truman tour came in Chicago. Democratic leaders staged a 3-day show, including a meeting of the Cabinet, where the various Secretaries "made reports to the people."

The affair was dragging a little until the President appeared on the scene. It is estimated that half a million watched the parade and, of course, the stadium was packed.

The President had some good things to say about the present Congress, but he appealed to his hearers to "wipe out the obstructionists." He thought it would be a good thing to start in Illinois by reelecting Senator SCOTT LUCAS, Democratic floor leader in the Senate, over former Congressman Dirksen, who is just as reactionary as "BOB" TAFT.

"DREAMING" NOT A BAD THING

"Our sour critics say our hopes for the future are just idle dreams," said the President.

"The Democratic Party would deserve to be retired from office and hustled off to the ash heap of history if it ever stopped dreaming of what we can do to make our country better."

Naturally, the crowd came to its feet to cheer that one, and it continued to cheer as the President added: "I do dream of making our country a better place to live in."

The two biggest jobs, he said, involve lifting the standard of living of the American people and collective action to insure peace of the world.

IT'S "IMMORAL" SAYS TAFT

On Tuesday night TAFT replied to Truman in a Nation-wide broadcast.

The Ohio Senator repeated his charge that Truman is leading us to destruction. In fact, he declared the program put forward by the man in the White House was immoral, as well as socialistic.

My guess is the American people can't be scared by that kind of talk.

United States Customs Reform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues the following article which appeared in Foreign Commerce Weekly for the week of May 8, 1950, written by Nathan Ostroff, general counsel, Office of International Trade of the United States Department of Commerce:

UNITED STATES CUSTOMS REFORM: CHARACTER AND PURPOSE OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION—H. R. 8304 AIMS AT IMPROVEMENT OF CUSTOMS SERVICE AND MINIMIZING OF COST

Our customs practices and producers are generally agreed to be unnecessarily onerous, and many of them derive from laws long antedating the basic Tariff Act of 1930. It is true that the importer and the foreign exporter are directly concerned with the costs and burden of customs formalities, but it must also be kept in mind that the domestic consumer and the taxpayer ultimately pay the bill for the expense, delays, and uncertainties that are inherent in present practices. It would seem, therefore, to be in the public interest generally that this situation should be changed.

In this connection, it should be noted that the Congress, in 1947, provided a special fund to the Treasury Department for the purpose of making a study of the possibilities of simplifying and reducing the cost of customs operations. In addition to its own specialists from the Customs Bureau, the Treasury employed a nationally known management firm to assist in this work. Also, other Government agencies, notably the Departments of Commerce and State and the Tariff Commission, made suggestions, as did a number of private trade groups familiar with importing problems.

A number of recommendations which could be accomplished by administrative action have already been put into effect, and some are still under study. And now the Secretary of the Treasury has sent to the Congress a proposed bill that would take care of those recommended changes in present practices which require statutory authority. It should be emphasized that this bill would not change the present rate structure. Rather, it is concerned with the mechanics of importing, with the objective of giving improved service to the importer and minimizing its cost to the public. Mention might also be made of the fact that enactment would be in fulfillment of the customs administrative provisions of the proposed charter for an International Trade Organization which is now before the Congress, and likewise would enable the Government to make effective the administrative provisions of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. More important, however, and to repeat, the proposed bill is offered and should be considered on its own merits as being calculated to simplify, improve, and make less costly the customs service of this Nation.

The following is a brief explanation of the major provisions of this bill which are of general interest:

VALUE

Under existing law, the value of imported goods for duty purposes is based upon "foreign value" or "export value," whichever is higher. If these are not ascertainable, then the "United States value" is used, and if that also is unascertainable, "the cost of production" governs. The proposed law would eliminate "foreign value" and rely primarily upon "export value," and where the latter is unascertainable, the standards in order of application would be "United States value," "comparative value" and "constructed value."

Elimination of foreign value and use of export value as the primary method of valuation should expedite customs administration and reduce its cost. It would minimize the need for determining facts and conditions in a foreign country—which is often time-consuming—and, instead, rests upon transactions in our own import trade well known or readily ascertainable by importers and customs officers. It would incidentally elimninate the present arbitrary practice of including in dutiable value internal taxes applicable only to domestic sales within the country of origin.

"Export value" is defined as the market value or price, at the time of exportation to the United States, at which the merchandise is freely sold or offered for sale in the principal markets of the country of exportation in the usual wholesale quantities and in the ordinary course of export trade.

"United States value" is to be determined by reference to the prices, at the time of exportation, at which the merchandise is freely sold or offered for sale in the usual wholesale quantities to the principal United States market for domestic consumption in the ordinary course of trade, with allowances for actual commissions or profits, and general expenses. (Under present law, such allowances are arbitrarily limited, such as 6 percent for commissions and 8 percent for profits.) Inland transportation expenses and import duties or taxes are also allowable. In determining "United States value" of goods in which there is no previously established trade, the proposed law would authorize consideration of actual sales of the merchandise undergoing appraisement or similar merchandise if made within 90 days after importation.

"Comparative value" would be ascertained from sales or offers of other merchandise comparable in construction and size. "Constructed value" is simply a more descriptive term for cost of production, but this new term is further defined so as to eliminate the present minimum limits allowable on general expenses and profits.

All of the significant terms and phrases used in these standards are defined in the proposed law so as to clarify their intended meaning and, incidentally, to override existing inconsistent interpretations. For example, usual wholesale quantities is defined so as to mean the price at which the greatest volume of the particular goods is sold, rather than, as at present, the price at which the greatest number of individual transactions occur. Similarly, the new definition of freely sold or offered for sale would, contrary to existing interpretations, permit reliance upon sales or offers which are unrestricted except for restrictions imposed by law, or which limit the resale price of territory, or else are trivial with respect to the value of the goods to the wholesale purchaser.

REPEAL OF AMERICAN SELLING PRICE; PRESERVATION OF PROTECTION

In a few special cases under present law, dutiable value is based on the American selling price. This standard would be repealed by the proposed law, but provision is made to preserve existing tariff protection by requiring the Tariff Commission to fix new duty rates calculated to produce an equivalent degree of protection to that now afforded to the articles affected by this change.

AMENDMENT OF ENTRIES, AND DUTIES ON UNDERVALUATION

Existing law provides for an undervaluation duty of 1 percent of the final appraised value of merchandise for each 1 percent that such value exceeds the entered value. It also authorizes seizure and forfeiture of the merchandise in cases where the appraised value exceeds the entered value by more than 100 percent, such entries being presumptively fraudulent. Existing law also provides that assessment of duty shall be on the basis of the entered or appraised value, whichever is higher. In effect, therefore, the importer is now in this embarrassing situation: If he enters his goods at too low an amount, he incurs an undervaluation duty; if he enters them too high, he loses the benefit of the lower final appraisement. To relieve the harshness of this situation somewhat, the present law authorizes amendment of entries at any time before appraisement. However, such amendments represent a heavy burden of paper work and are costly and time-consuming to the customs service and the importer.

The proposed law would eliminate such amendments, but at the same time would eliminate or minimize the need for them by providing that the undervaluation duty shall apply only in cases where there is not only an undervaluation but also a willful failure by the importer to furnish the appraiser with all relevant information available to him at the time of entry or within a reasonable time thereafter. The proposed law would also provide for deletion of the presumption of

fraud and requirement of seizure in the case of 100 percent undervaluation and, further, would permit the appraised value to be used when lower than that entered. In effect, under the proposed law the importer would not be penalized if he acted in good faith and furnished all information in his possession and reasonably available to him. It was felt unwise to provide for outright repeal of undervaluation duties, as recommended by the Import Advisory Committee of the Department of Commerce, because of the importance of obtaining the fullest disclosure of value information from importers, without which customs administration would necessarily be more costly and slow.

IMPORTS OF SMALL VALUE; ADMINISTRATIVE EXEMPTIONS

Under existing law, Customs officers are authorized to disregard differences of $1 or less between estimated duties and duties deposited or tentatively assessed and the duties actually due. They may also waive the duty when the expense or inconvenience of collecting it is disproportionate to the amount involved, up to a limit of $5 in the case of articles for personal or household use, or $1 in any other case. The proposed law would increase the first provision mentioned from $1 to $5, and would allow persons to bring with them, or import by mail, up to $10 for their personal use, and otherwise up to $5. Liquor or tobacco products are specifically excluded from the latter provisions.

INFORMAL ENTRIES AND CERTIFIED INVOICES

Under existing law, imports up to $100 in value may be covered by informal entries prepared by Customs officers, and they do not require certified (consular) invoices. The proposed law would raise this amount to $250.

COMMINGLED GOODS

Under existing law, goods subject to different rates of duty, but so packed or mingled that the quantity of each cannot be determined, are dutiable at the highest rate applicable to any part thereof, unless segregated by the importer under customs supervision within 10 days after entry. The proposed law would allow 20 days for such segregation. Where a part of the dutiable portion of the goods is commercially negligible and the commingled goods will not be segregated prior to use, it is further provided that segregation may be waived if it would be too costly and it appears that commingling was not done with intent to evade duty. Such goods would then be considered as a part of the merchandise subject to the next lower rate of duty (including a free rate) with which it is commingled. Segregation might also be waived in those cases where duty is readily determinable by sample, by entry documents, or by means of recognized commercial settlement tests.

DRAWBACK ON REEXPORT OF GOODS NOT ORDERED

Under existing law, drawback of duties paid, less 1 percent, is allowed upon goods not conforming to sample or specification and returned to Customs custody for reexport within 30 days. The proposed law would extend this provision to cover also goods not ordered and would increase the time period to 90 days so as to allow for possible discovery of latent defects or those ascertainable only by test or use.

CURRENCY CONVERSION

As the primary method of conversion, the proposed law would eliminate the present system of quarterly findings by the Director of the Mint of rates of exchange based upon the metal content of coins which, as a matter of fact, has had no practical application since 1934 when the United States departed from the gold standard, and instead it would provide for the use of par values as established by the International Monetary Fund or pursuant to any special exchange agreement. Where multiple rates exist, provision is made for the Secretary to issue regulations relating to their use for customs purposes, or, in the absence thereof, for the Federal Reserve Bank of New York to certify one or more of such rates to the Secretary for such purposes.

CORRECTION OF ERRORS AND MISTAKES

Under existing law, only purely clerical errors are subject to correction. The proposed law would permit correction of clerical errors, mistakes of fact, or any other clear inadvertence (but not involving construction of law) which is adverse to the importer.

REQUIREMENT OF MATERIAL INJURY BEFORE IMPOSING ANTIDUMPING OR COUNTERVAILING DUTY

Under existing law, a finding of injury is a condition precedent to the assessment of special so-called antidumping duties on imported goods found to have been sold at less than their fair value. However, duties to offset foreign subsidization (so-called countervailing) may be imposed without such a finding. Under the proposed law, such duties would be assessed only upon a finding of material (rather than mere) injury to a domestic industry. In addition, the new law would specifically prevent the imposition of both countervailing and antidumping duties in the same case and would not permit the imposition of a countervailing duty based on an exemption from a tax or customs duty by the exporting country.

REPEAL OF SPECIAL MARKING REQUIREMENTS

Under existing law, certain imported articles, principally cutlery, surgical and scientific instruments (including hypodermic needles and thermostatic bottles), must be marked with the name of the manufacturer or the importer as well as the country of origin. These requirements would be repealed by the proposed law, leaving in effect, however, the general mark of country-of-origin requirement applicable to all imported articles.

CUSTOMS SUPERVISION

In cases where customs supervision is required, the proposed law would authorize spot checks when the expense of continuous supervision is disproportionate to the amount of revenue involved. Generally speaking, that is the existing practice, but in some instances—for example, marking of goods after importation—customs supervision has been required to be direct and continuous, which is, of course, quite costly.

FREE-ENTRY PROVISIONS

The proposed law would permit the free entry without bond of nonresident travelers' automobiles or other means of conveyance. Also, up to the value of $200, it would eliminate the present requirement of bonded transportation applicable to articles such as gifts carried by nonresidents in transit through the United States.

The proposed law would provide for cancellation after 5 years of bonds required for articles imported duty-free for noncommercial exhibitions. This would minimize record-keeping by customs made necessary under existing law which requires such bonds to be unlimited in duration. It would also permit free disposition of such articles after 5 years.

Temporary free entry under bond for not more than 1 year is provided under existing law for certain articles, not for sale in the United States. The proposed law recognizes that, in the case of such articles as samples imported into this country for exhibit at trade fairs, the duration of the present bond is insufficient, and, accordingly, it would extend the period to 3 years.

AMERICAN GOODS RETURNED

Reimported American goods are subject to duty equal to the sum of any drawback allowed upon their original exportation plus any applicable internal-revenue tax. The proposed law would simplify the entry of such goods, which at present entails considerable paper work and certain other practical complications, by giving the Secretary of the Treasury and the collectors more administrative authority to determine the applicable duty.

INTERNATIONAL TRAFFIC AND RESCUE WORK

A new provision is included to permit free entry of search, rescue, and salvage aircraft, and the temporary entry of equipment and supplies for fire fighting and disaster relief.

SIGNING AND DELIVERY OF MANIFESTS

The present provisions concerning the entry and clearance of vessels are inconvenient with respect to certain aircraft, because the pilot of a plane is not always able to perform some of the functions of the master of a ship. The proposed law would permit the authorized agent of an air carrier, as well as the pilot, to be responsible for signing and delivering the plane's manifest.

SUPPLIES AND EQUIPMENT FOR VESSELS AND AIRCRAFT

Existing law provides for the free entry of equipment and repair parts for foreign aircraft only, and this would be extended to cover such equipment for foreign vessels as well. In addition, free entry is also extended to ground equipment for foreign aircraft with respect to duties and any other import taxes.

Continuation of the Draft Law—"Yes, But" Men Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 19, 1950

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to insert under an extension of my remarks two editorials from Connecticut newspapers, one on continuation of the draft law is from the May 12 issue of the Bridgeport Telegram; the other very aptly points out that it is not "yes" men needed in Congress; rather it is "yes, but" men contrary to the President's statements on his "nonpolitical" tour.

I commend the staff member of the Ansonia Sentinel responsible for this fine editorial.

[From the Bridgeport (Conn.) Telegram of May 12, 1950]

CONTINUATION OF DRAFT LAW

Perhaps most of us are wrong in thinking of the present as a peacetime period. If we were actually at peace, there would not be so much need for vigilance about what is going on in so many parts of the world. There would not be so much need for defense preparations, not only in our own country, but also in those nations abroad which live in daily fear that they will be invaded.

It is because of the world picture, and because of numerous events which have taken place during the past few weeks and months, that Congress is changing its mind, and inclining toward more preparedness, rather than less.

Only the other day, Representative PATTERSON, Republican of Connecticut, referred in Washington to the change which had come over him personally. "When the Director of Selective Service," he explained, "some months ago called for a further extension of the draft law, I was skeptical, to say the least. Enlistments in every branch of military service had increased; the draft itself was on a stand-by basis; and our relations with Russia, while not improved, seemed no worse than had been the case for some time."

In the view of Representative PATTERSON and of many other capable observers, however, during the past few weeks there has been a distinct change for the worse, so far as world affairs are concerned. Things are not getting better, in fact, it is much easier to draw the opposite conclusion. And it is because of the changed situation, and the warnings of Defense Department officials, that Representative PATTERSON voted with the majority of the House Armed Services Committee for continuation of the draft law.

There is something very significant about some of the developments which have taken place within recent weeks in widely scattered parts of the world. Viewed separately, many of these incidents are apt to be tossed off by the average observer, as of no consequence. Under normal peaceful conditions, trifling incidents can be adjusted or composed to the satisfaction of all parties concerned, without too much difficulty.

But there is something more than normality in many recent events, and when they are put together logically, they invariably form a pattern which assumes threatening proportions. That is why officials of the Defense Department have been emphasizing the need for this country to build up its strength beyond its present proportions.

The continuation of the draft law, with no immediate prospect of its early application, seems to be warranted by threatening conditions which are indisputably beyond our control.

[From the Ansonia (Conn.) Sentinel of May 16, 1950]

DARN RIGHT WE'RE "YES—BUT MEN"

In his Fargo, N. Dak., speech, President Truman said that "fundamentally there is no more reason to be afraid of fair competition from foreign goods than from domestic goods."

He suggested that those who do not see eye to eye with the administration's "experts" on tariff policies are "isolationists" and "yes—but men."

With the reasonableness of fair competition from abroad, a great many will agree, provided the President makes it clear what he means by fair. But is it fair that American industry and American workingmen should compete in our own American market with products of slave labor entering this country from iron-curtain countries under lowered tariffs?

Czechoslovakia has slave labor in the sense that the ursurping Communist minority which rules it has become the employer, and its working people work when and where the Government tells them to; the state fixes their hours of toil, determines what they shall be paid and how much their earnings shall be worth.

Most Americans will be neither flattered nor misled by having the President hang an "isolationist" tag on their vary natural concern about protecting their jobs from this sort of slave-labor competition.

And most Americans will glory in being termed "yes—but men," which merely means that they are not "yes men."

They are "yes—but men" in that they are intelligent enough to see the distinction between "fair competition" from abroad and slave-labor competition from iron-curtain countries, which is manifestly unfair. "Fair competition? Yes. Slave competition? No."

It is quite true, as the President pointed out, that one of the reasons this country became great is that it has had no barriers to trade between its States. But there are many other reasons for that greatness, chief of which is that since the Civil War our laws and economy are those of a free people and do not support the institution of slave labor.

President Truman will find that most of his fellow Americans agree with him in favoring promotion of international trade on a "fair" basis.

But he will also find that great numbers of them do not regard it as "fair" that imports of goods made by slave labor in iron-curtain countries should put them out of a job or on the WPA.

Instead of saying "yes" to letting stooges of Stalin, exploiting their own people, close down American factories, Americans will be proud to be regarded as "yes—but men," with loud and ringing emphasis on the "but—" and what follows it.

"But no subsidizing Stalinist slave labor at the cost of American jobs."

Blood, Sweat, and Tears

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARDIN PETERSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 19, 1950

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, the phrase "blood, sweat, and tears" has come to have historic significance. The following rather interesting article appeared in the Jacksonville Journal, Jacksonville, Fla., on April 5, 1950, which chronicled the use of the phrase by Hon. Frank A. Kennedy, prior to the Prime Minister's speech, May 13, 1940:

WHO COINED THAT PHRASE OR WHO JUST COPPED IT?

(By Tom Logue)

This is the kind of story that may reverberate in two of the great capitals of the world, London and Washington.

But, on the other hand, it may not. You never can tell about these things.

We stumbled on it just a few days ago.

No; that's not right, either. You couldn't call it stumbling. Frank A. Kennedy, the Journal's Washington correspondent, pushed us, or else Winston Churchill pushed us. That's the whole trouble. We can't figure out who that guy up there is.

Breaking the problem down a little, for greater clarity and confusion, here's the setup:

The man who originated the phrase "blood, sweat, and tears" was Winston Churchill.

But Frank A. Kennedy originated the phrase "blood, sweat, and tears."

Therefore, Frank A. Kennedy is Winston Churchill.

Kennedy, or Churchill, as the case may be, did this thing in the Clearwater Sun, 21 years ago, in the final stanza of a piece of doggerel about the tearing down of the old Clearwater Island toll bridge.

To be exact, it was on September 1, 1929, and we have a photostat on hand to prove it. The photostat was furnished by the unknown party in Washington, D. C.

The full poem is entitled "Horatius at the (Clearwater Island Toll) Bridge." It is rather long and we are not about to print the whole thing. Here's the passage in question:

"But quail'd he not, nor duck'd the job—
Of better stuff was he
Than he whose ancient name he bore,
Who only fought, you see,
And shirked the greatest task of old,
The task that no one cheers—
The task of pulling down the bridge,
In blood and sweat and tears."

Of course, it may be that the other fellow, the leader of His Majesty's loyal opposition—Kennedy or Churchill or whatever his name is—picked the thing up from the Clearwater Sun and filed it away for future reference. Significantly enough, he was in this country at about that time, crossing from Canada at Niagara Falls on September 19, 1929. According to the best available statistics, it takes just 19 days for a copy of the Clearwater Sun to get into general circulation in Niagara Falls.

Maybe we'd better start at the beginning and find out what Kennedy did in the Boer War.

Frank Kennedy, referred to therein, is a rather remarkable newspaper man. He has been in Washington for a number of years and has earned acclaim as a reporter. It is with considerable pride that I call attention to the fact that he came to Washington from the great first district of Florida, which I have the honor to represent. The original article referred to by Mr. Logue was published in the Clearwater (Fla.) Sun, on September 1, 1929, and in view of its historic significance, I am including it here:

MARGINALIA

HORATIUS AT THE (CLEARWATER ISLAND TOLL) BRIDGE

(News item:—"Work of demolishing the now unused wooden toll bridge to Clearwater Beach began yesterday. Since the erection of the million dollar causeway, this ancient structure has been in disuse.")

Up rose the brave Horatius,
His hacksaw in his hand,
And march'd him forth upon the bridge,
Perdidoes to disband,
Crumbling piling ring'd him round,
Barnacles tore his side;
And spikes there were, to slash him, too,
And pierce his bleeding hide.
The ugly splinters of the boards
Tore off his fingernails,
And while he labor'd might and main,
The blisters rose in bales.
To irk him in his bloody fight
To clear the channel clean,
The tide began to foam at him
To threaten, low and mean.
And overhead, the broiling sun,
In skies without a fleck,
Beat down in blazing fury on
The hackles of his neck.
And as he pull'd and heav'd and swore,
To pull the pilings up,
The woeful 'skeeters rose in swarms
To overflow his cup.
The ants and bugs and other things
That lived in rotted wood,
Began to swarm upon his back
To hurt him all they could.
As one by one the piling fell,
And boards he split in twain,
Horatius mopped his sweating brow,
And garnered in more pain.
High rose the sun, likewise the tide,
And now to ink him more,
A jellyfish, with fiery touch
Prick'd him in rear and fore.
And as the tide came surging in
To wash him off his feet,

A swordfish thither wander'd, too,
In search of fresh, raw meat.
Horatius, with a mighty lunge
Dispatch'd this fish of prey,
And used the sword he thus came by,
The boards to pry away.
So brave Horatius struggl'd on,
His battle not half o'er;
The mile-long file of piling stood
To snatch out all his gore.
The gnats were there the flies were too,
But Horatius didn't mind;
He clutch'd his crowbar once again,
Another pile to find.
And many were there, yet to fell,
In all that long array,
But brave Horatius raised his bar
And tore one more away.
The sandflies rambl'd over him,
And set him all afire,
But brave Horatius beat them off,
And forced the fighting higher.
And to these woes Horatius turn'd
A red and blister'd face,
And tore, with scarr'd and blister'd hands,
A piling out of place.
He tore and ripp'd and pounded, too,
The bridge to pull apart;
Impal'd he was on bolt and nail
That pierced him like a dart.
But always brave Horatius dar'd,
With greatness in his heart,
To put his shoulder to the job,
And take another start.
Through weary hours, and tortur'd days,
Horatius toiled in pain;
He toil'd in heat, in blood, in tears—
Next day he came again.
And as the battle wax'd and wag'd
The shrinking piling fled,
With none to mark the gory place
Where brave Horatius bled.
But quailed he not, nor duck'd the job—
Of better stuff was he
Than he whose ancient name he bore,
Who only fought, you see,
And shirked the greater task of old,
The task that no one cheers—
The task of pulling down the bridge
In blood and sweat and tears.

"Simpatico's" one and only fan-mail letter which appeared several days after publication of the "Horatius" poem:

APPRECIATION

EDITOR, CLEARWATER SUN:

Well, "Simpatico" certainly covered himself with glory, and we give him loud acclaim, for his parody on Horatius at the Bridge was a masterpiece and covered the case most excellently and fully, for we had heard of those details so well set forth, and all for 25 cents an hour. The misery of it. To think that any man, no matter what his color, should have to suffer like that. Can you really picture it? And to think a hundred men needed and asked for a job like that.

If it were being done in the winter season, it might have been a trifle less uncomfortable, but hot sun, now and then a shower, heavy timbers to be handled, bugs galore, not to mention mosquitoes. The pity of it, and yet each man was and is just as valuable as any other of our citizens.

We will forgive you all other utterances, "Marginalia," and forget the past, for you have a heart and a soul, when you can see things as they are, and tell us in such a splendid way. We read a short time ago that these days we should be hard-headed, but not hard-hearted, but you are neither, praise be. Tell us some more truths, and may every reader take it all to heart.

"PEN" PENNINGTON.

It will be noted that the Kennedy poem, published 11 years before the Prime Minister's speech, used the expression "He toiled in heat, in blood, in tears," and in another place the expression "In blood and sweat and tears." In Mr. Churchill's book Blood, Sweat, and Tears—Putnam, 1941—the original use of the phrase is quoted as "blood, toil, tears, and sweat," page 276, Prime Minister, May 13, 1940:

I would say to the House, as I said to those who have joined this Government: "I have nothing to offer but blood, toil, tears, and sweat."

It will be noted that the Prime Minister used in the original statement the word "toil" just as the Kennedy poem nearly 11 years before had used the same word.

In view of the fact that my friend and constituent, Frank Kennedy, and the newspaper published in my district first published these historic words, I felt it rather important that we record the facts for the pages of history.

Eulogy at Requiem Mass for Rt. Rev. Walter S. Carroll, D. D.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 19, 1950

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, at the requiem mass for the Right Reverend Walter S. Carroll, D. D., in St. Matthew's Cathedral, Washington, D. C., on last February 27, the eulogy contained so much beauty and character that I thought it should adorn the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It was delivered by the Most Reverend John H. Wright, D. D., Bishop of Worcester, Mass.

Monsignor Carroll served in the important position of Vatican Secretariat of State, and at his office in Rome he not only carried out duties exclusively of a religious nature within the Catholic Church, but he also was active in the battle against the forces of communism in Europe—a campaign which is of such vital concern to the Members of this Congress. He died at the age of 41, while in the midst of this crusade.

Monsignor Carroll's mother, Mrs. B. Margaret Hogan Carroll, is a resident of Pittsburgh, Pa. His brother, Msgr. Howard J. Carroll, is general secretary of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, with offices in Washington, and another brother, Rev. Dr. Coleman F. Carroll, is pastor of St. Maurice Church in Pittsburgh.

This inspirational sermon by Bishop Wright is a highly deserved tribute to this beloved member of an outstanding American family:

"I have fought the good fight. I have finished the course. I have kept the faith."

It is my sad privilege to speak this morning a few words of fraternal tribute to Msgr. Walter Carroll and of Christian comfort to his loved ones.

I speak as the representative of monsignor's classmates and of his priest friends. However, if I may intrude a personal note, there is a slight reason why I might appropriately be one appointed to serve to interpret the sympathy of all to monsignor's family.

In the first days after our ordination to the priesthood Father Walter Carroll and I offered our masses simultaneously one morning in Saint Ignatius' great Roman church. Father Walter's mother was present at those masses, and afterward, out in the sunshine of a Roman square, we had a reunion which she will remember as lighthearted with the joy of new priests, genial Roman customs and the happiness of first masses.

The mass in Washington this morning is one of requiem—but it is the same mass as rejoiced us that day in Rome. The same Christ is offered. The same priesthood is His instrument. The same Roman faith is expressed. The same God is pleased. The same persons are present for this moment of passing sorrow as were present then on that morning of springtime priesthood.

The mass which Father Walter then offered himself is not less efficacious now that it is offered for him by the representative in America of Christ's vicar on earth. The same Christ with whom Father Walter was then united at the Roman altar is even more intimately his life and his being now that he is united to Him in eternity. Roman faith has been transmuted for him into a yet more perfect form of knowledge in the vision of that divinity of which we saw only the broken reflections when we were students those years ago in holy Rome.

The God who gave joy to our youth and to Walter's mother on that morning 15 years ago, is with us yet, to give us another joy, a joy more subtle, more profoundly spiritual, the joy of resignation to God's will, of confidence in Christ's promise that whosoever believeth in Him, though he be dead, shall live; He shall not die, but shall have life everlasting.

It is easy to see in false perspective the dignities and distinctions which came so early in his life, but perhaps so fatally for the health of Monsignor Carroll. One might be tempted to say: how wonderful that one so young should have honors so great and be entrusted with responsibilities so serious. Yet such a speaker would reveal no understanding of the crushing weight of some honors, the toll that such responsibilities take of those who bear them. On the other hand, another might be tempted to say: how sad that one so young should die, should be taken in the very maturity of his priesthood. Such a speaker would reveal no understanding of what a privilege it is to be worn out in the service of Christ's Vicar and Christ's church, to be quickly, eagerly spent in the service of Christ Himself.

The time of a good priest's death is always in the hands of God and we must never speak of it as premature, however young, however gifted, the priest may be. When Giosue Borsi wrote his spiritual testament in the very springtime of his life, yet the eve of his death, he set forth sentiments which come even more spontaneously to the lips of the good priest, such as Monsignor Carroll most certainly was: "A better end could not have crowned my life, and I feel the pleasure to have made a good and generous use of it. * * * Do not weep, for it was written in Heaven that I should die. Do not mourn, or else you would regret my happiness. I am not to be mourned but envied . . . My daily death shall have come to an end, and I shall be face to face with the Judge whom I have greatly feared, with the Lord whom I have greatly loved."

If the devout Italian soldier so wrote, surely this devoted priest would have spoken in no less patient and joyous resignation to God's Holy Will. Think of how many things, much more difficult than dying, he did out of love and loyalty for Christ and for His church!

Two years ago in a London bookstore I was fingering through the war memoirs of a British Army officer in Africa and Italy. I

was suddenly startled to find in the index the name of my classmate, Walter Carroll. The references were few, but significant. Reading around them and between the lines one could imagine the firmness and fortitude with which Monsignor Carroll, like so many of the representatives of the Holy See and of Christ, was obliged to resist political maneuvers when these would do violence to the law of God or the true welfare of men—to state, simply yet strongly, the position of the church and therefore of God when this might otherwise have been forgotten or neglected or despised.

Reflecting on the priestly career that Monsignor Carroll was destined to have, especially during the recent war, I thought of the words in which St. Paul proclaimed the glory—the hard-earned glory—of his apostolate: What journeys I have undertaken, in danger from robbers, in danger from my own people, in danger from the Gentiles: danger in cities: danger in the wilderness.

Surely the parallel is clear. What journeys Monsignor Carroll undertook on errands for the Holy See and in the service of the church and therefore of Christ. Journeys under wartime conditions and with all the hazards of war. In danger, in a sense, from his own people whenever, as must frequently have been the case, it was necessary in the name of religion and of the church to resist plans or policies conceived in mere political or military convenience, in short-sighted reasons of state, not to say prejudice, irreligion or ignorance. In danger from other nations constantly. In danger in cities as an agent for Christ in the midst of intrigue. In danger in the wilderness as an envoy from Christ to soldiers far from home and far from normal spiritual controls the while they did the brutal work of Caesar.

So Monsignor Carroll can also say now with St. Paul, as he lays down his arms from strenuous service: I have fought the good fight. I have finished the course—Bonum certamen certavi. Cursum consummavi. Fidem servavi.

So we come back to the thought of his journeys, all the journeys from Rome to Africa, to parts of Europe, to America, journeys which were to be the threads out of which was woven his apostolate, an apostolate unique among the priestly careers of our classmates. On each of these journeys friends would see him off as the boat sailed or the plane left the ground. And each time that friends would see him off they thought the thoughts which people have always thought, from the beginning of time, when loved ones go forth on a journey. We stand on the pier, or on the ramps above the airfield, or on the railroad platform. The ship moves slowly away from us; it gains the great ocean. The train slides from its terminal, gently at first, then it gathers speed and rolls rapidly on its way. The plane vibrates, eager to leave the earth; it skims along the field, it is lifted skyward, it recedes further and further into the blue. At length we no longer see the loved ones who have ventured forth on their journey. First they, then the ship, the train, the airplane become mere specks and disappear beyond the horizon where earth and sea and sky all meet and merge with one another.

Then someone always says: "There! He's gone."

Gone where? Gone on his journey—out of our sight, that's all. And even as we say "He's gone," we think to ourselves and we remind one another of those who shall be awaiting at the other end, waiting to meet him, to welcome him, to learn of him the details of the journey.

The ship, the train, the plane—though now they seem mere specks—are as large in dimension, as strong in force, as able to bear their load of living freight as they were when they stood by our sides. Their diminished size as they fade from view is in us, not them. And just at the moment when we cry out: "He's gone!"—other voices, beyond the limit of our sight, are ready to cry: "Lo, he comes!"

So it was with the wartime journeys which constituted so great a part of Monsignor Carroll's apostolate. So must it be with journey by which his journeys end.

We stand by the side of death and, in language like that of the traveler's friends when they see him off, we cry: "There He's gone." Gone where? Gone from our sight—that's all.

Gone on the journey which ends where all journeys must: in God—in Eternity—with Christ. Gone to be welcomed by all those who before him made that same journey—but especially, in the case of Monsignor Carroll, by those who prepared for eternity by doing work like to the work that he did: the unique work of special service to the Holy See.

Surely Christ must have some particular welcome for those who collaborated with His Vicar at the heart's core of His Church. Surely the Holy Apostles, Peter and Paul, must receive with special warmth one who labored so long, so hard in the City that is theirs. Surely all heaven much acknowledge the right of Monsignor Carroll to echo the words of the Apostle even before God's Judgment Seat: I ha fought the good fight. I have finished the course. I have kept the faith.

Eternal rest grant unto him, O Lord. May he rest in peace. May his soul and all the souls of the faithful departed through the mercy of God rest in peace. Amen.

Official Position of District of Columbia Recreation Board on Swimming Pool Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 19, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave, I include here as part of my remarks the report made by Mr. Harry Wender, Chairman of the Recreation Board, to the Board on May 9, 1950, without comment of my own for or against the statements therein, except as they show clearly that the Recreation Board cannot accept operation of the pools at this time, and to applaud Mr. Wender's declaration that he opposes segregation.

This supports my contention that the passage of H. R. 5968 is unnecessary and unwanted.

REPORT OF BOARD CHAIRMAN

Today marks the one hundred and twenty-first stated meeting of this Board, concluding 8 years of unparalleled growth and accomplishment toward the building of an adequate and modern recreation system for the Nation's Capital.

It is significant that Mr. James E. Schwab, vice chairman, and Mrs. Alice C. Hunter, secretary, have served with me as the Board's only officers since its inception. I am truly grateful for the confidence our colleagues have indicated in vesting us with the honor and responsibility of leading the Board through these formative years.

It is extremely fortunate that a majority of the Board's membership has remained constant since our formation, thus insuring a better understanding of our problems and a continuity of sound policies and purposes.

As Mr. Schwab's second 4-year appointment is about to expire, it is incumbent upon me to repeat the tributes I have previously made to his loyal, conscientious, and indefatigable service to this Board and the entire community. Only the Superintendent and your Chairman are fully aware of his tremendous capacity for work and his willingness to accept difficult and time-consuming assignments at great personal sacrifice, physically and financially. Although we have not always agreed, I have always fully respected his independence of thought and vigorously defended his right to express a point of view which is undoubtedly shared by a large percentage of our citizens who are justly entitled to representation on a democratically selected, wholly independent Board such as this. I am personally indebted to him for sharing many of the heavy responsibilities of Board leadership which other members have been unable to assume. Although in previous years he has frequently evidenced a strong desire to resign because of family and business duties, it is a source of gratification to me that he has remained to assist in the solution of problems which still beset the Board. Hence I unhesitatingly acknowledge the tremendous value of Mr. Schwab's uncompensated and little publicized public service. He represents a valuable and tangible asset to our community life, worthy of commendation by all and of further retention in office.

Mrs. Hunter's long Board experience has demonstrated her fine resoluteness of character and outstanding civic virtues. Her Board activities have never been confined to narrow racial representation, while her liberal views have strongly influenced the Board's disposition to assume leadership in the removal of segregation and discriminatory restrictions. Whatever may be our differences of opinion as to the best time and methods to be pursued, I fully endorse her aims and objectives, for her guiding principles are noble and irrefutable.

Mr. Walter L. Fowler, District budget officer, has admirably and ably represented the District Commissioners, giving us invaluable assistance from the beginning by reason of his broad knowledge of District affairs. We are likewise deeply appreciative of the generous support and understanding accorded our policies and our budget requests by the District Commissioners.

Mr. Irving C. Root, Superintendent of National Capital Parks, an ex officio member of the Board from the outset, served the Interior Department with distinction until April 12, 1950. On that date your chairman was advised by letter from Mr. A. E. Demaray, Associate Director of the National Park Service, that Mr. Edward J. Kelly, Special Assistant to the Superintendent of National Capital Parks, would henceforth represent Mr. Root on the Board. Legal precedents justifying this substitution were forwarded by Mr. Demaray. Without any reflection upon Mr. Kelly, intended or implied, your chairman and the superintendent were concerned with the legal problems involved, and on April 18 the Commissioners at my request authorized the corporation counsel, Mr. Vernon E. West, to rule upon Mr. Kelly's appointment. Mr. West informally advised me on Apri 25, confirmed by his letter of May 4, that the issues raised are complex and difficult to determine, involving extensive research which require considerable time to conclude. Since a Board poll, as well as this meeting, were imminent he suggested that I recognize Mr. Kelly's credentials at this time subject to his later findings and opinion which will be binding upon the Board.

Therefore, we welcome Mr. Kelly, with whom we have had a long and pleasant relationship, to the Board on the basis of the foregoing and extend to him our complete

cooperation and the opporunity of full participation in the Board's activities. We recognize that the past 8 years have produced many sharp disagreements between the Board and the Interior Department. Nevertheless we are delighted that virtually all of our differences have been reconciled. We trust that within a short time those that remain will be finally resolved, so that the Board may once again resume a unanimity of action that uniformly obtained during its first 5 years of operation.

Mr. Albert S. Steinem, prominent local attorney, is the present representative of the board of education. He has proven a worthy successor to three eminent predecessors; Dr. Frank W. Ballou; Mr. Robert L. Haycock, former superintendent of schools; and Mr. C. Melvin Sharpe, who served with us most ably until his election as president of the board of education in May 1949. Mr. Steinem's keen interest in our work has brought about an even closer relationship between the two boards than ever before. The effective cooperation and the mutual respect and understanding which have been manifested between these two public agencies have been remarkably satisfying, meriting emulation and approval throughout the country.

Mrs. O. G. Hankins, an outstanding citizen and parent-teacher leader for many years, is the latest appointee to lay membership on the board. On June 24, 1949, she succeeded Mrs. Andrew Saul, who was compelled to resign because of ill health. Mrs. Saul had replaced Mrs. George Garrett when the latter's husband was appointed minister (now ambassador) to Eire. Both ladies rendered distinguished service to our board. Mrs. Hankins, in the comparatively short period of her membership, has acquired extensive knowledge of her duties and of the department's constantly expanding programs and facilities. Despite numerous other important civic responsibilities, she has shown a devoted attention to the board's problems for which we are extremely appreciative.

We have been equally fortunate in the high caliber of alternates who have served at times in place of official representatives on the board. The board of education alternates have included Mr. Haycock, Dr. Robert A. Maurer, Mr. Steinem, and the incumbent, Mrs. Elviria Z. Magdeburger. Mr. Root's alternates have included his able assistants, Messrs. Harry Thompson, Frank Gartside, and Edward Kelly. Mr. Geoffrey Thornett, secretary to the board of commissioners, has been Mr. Fowler's regular alternate since 1942, except when Deputy Budget Officer William Wilding has attended in h[illegible] absence.

Probably the most fortunate circumstance attendant to the Board's successful development has been the acquisition and retention of a loyal and devoted staff, highly skilled and experienced in meeting the changing recreation needs of our community. Every employee has been engaged entirely on the basis of merit and ability without regard to pressure either within or without the Board's membership. The continued wise leadership from the very beginning of Mr. Milo F. Christiansen, our superintendent, one of America's foremost recreation statesmen, and his fine principal assistants, Miss Sibyl Baker and Mr. John L. Young, has proven a constant source of inspiration and comfort to the members of this Board, as well as to their professional colleagues. One cannot help but feel a friendly sense of personal regard for them as a result of our mutual association these many years in an enterprise of such vital importance to every citizen. I know that I speak for each member of the Board in expressing to each member of our staff our deep and abiding thanks for their great loyalty and devotion to duty, ofttimes under trying and difficult circumstances.

Having endeavored to describe and evaluate the Board's past and present personnel, I am impelled to take notice of serious and alarming charges which have emanated in recent weeks from various sources. Because of their grave nature, it is my duty to reply formally at this time.

Despite past criticism by individuals and organizations, the Board has advanced substantially during the past year in liberalizing program and eliminating segregation in many spheres of activity. On June 14, 1949, the Board adopted a policy later incorporated in the bylaws, article II, section 2, as follows:

"The Board will make every possible and realistic effort toward the removal of racial segregation in public recreation in such sequence and at such rate of progression as may be consistent with the public interest, public order, and effective administration. The Board by majority vote of the whole Board at a stated meeting shall from time to time issue necessary orders to the superintendent to implement this policy."

This statement met with universal approval of liberal elements and was endorsed by the Secretary of the Interior, the District Commissioners, and all of our daily newspapers. The Board has striven tirelessly and continuously to carry out this policy. It was not to be expected that anything we did would meet with the hearty approval of those who sought immediate elimination of all segregation practices. Some 22 specific instances were recently cited to the Secretary of the Interior indicating our progress in implementing the policy. Secretary Chapman has privately and publicly stated his satisfaction with the results of our efforts to date and the evident good faith with which we proceeded.

The sole area of difference between the Secretary and the Board lies with the policy to be pursued in the operation of the six swimming pools now under GSI management. We have never fully operated them in the past, but only during morning periods, 5 days a week. We do not now have funds or personnel to operate them fully. The Secretary offered them to us on the basis of full-time management on a wholly nonsegregated basis. For a variety of factual reasons, including insufficient funds, likelihood of financial loss, inadequacy of trained personnel, the lack of absolute control over our employees, and the possibility of controversies ensuing from an operation by us under the Secretary's terms, your concessions committee agreed with the Secretary that the Board could not accept his offer at this time and that the Department of the Interior should assume responsibility for full operation this year. This conclusion was approved by five members of the Board. We are reliably informed that the Secretary of the Interior has made careful plans to provide for the safe and efficient operation of all pools this summer. Although the Board has requested the Commissioners to seek legislation vesting administrative control in the Board of all swimming pools and lands assigned to the Commissioners by the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, pursuant to the intent of our organic act of 1942, it is generally recognized that no legislation could be adopted in sufficient time to affect 1950 operation.

Nothing that this Board or your chairman has said or done remotely implies (a) that the Department of Interior should not operate the pools in accordance with that Department's announced policies, (b) that the Department cannot be successful in such operation, or (c) that the Board or your chairman are hopeful that incidents will again arise this summer which will fan racial hatred and strife, resulting in the closing of the pools. Nothing can be further from the truth than the fantastic assertion that this Board and your chairman "have a vested interest in violence" and that "we are practically giving the green light to troublemakers to see to it that something does happen."

It is an obvious and reasonable conclusion that the Board's reluctance to accept responsibility for the Secretary's swimming-pool policy was because, although it lacked confidence in its own ability to discharge that policy satisfactorily, it could rely upon his assurance that he was prepared to do so with complete safety to the thousands of citizens who need and will use the pools if they are adequately protected in their right to use them.

For myself, I quote from the minutes of the Board's April 11 meeting when the committee report was adopted:

"He (Mr. Wender) stated that he hoped the operation of the pools was going to be successful as well as the education program so that the pools can be used without difficulty.

"The committee feels and the Secretary himself stated he agrees that the Recreation Board is not ready to take over the pools at this time under the terms offered by the Department of Interior."

I have endeavored to demonstrate my personal devotion to democratic principles during half a lifetime of civic activity. I have resolutely tried to drive out segregation and discrimination in all of the many organizations with which I have served. My abhorrence for segregation has been repeated over many years in the press, at public gatherings, and at the Board meetings. My support of the administration's civil-rights program has long been known to those familiar with my activities even though I have stated my opinion that the methods utilized by the President's Committee on Civil Rights in acquiring facts concerning Washington resulted in some unfortunate inaccuracies relating to recreation. I am proud of the progress the Board has made thus far in removing segregation, partly due to my own efforts and convictions. Hence I have no apology to make to anyone for my attitude on this matter even though my views are undoubtedly too liberal for a great many and not progressive enough for others.

This statement is made so that no doubt can remain even in the most prejudiced and distorted minds—I despise violence, disorder, and mob control for any purpose—most of all by those who would deny others their legal freedom of action. I denounce any person or organization who would interfere with the Secretary's determination to make any or all of the six park pools available this summer on an open basis. It is my earnest hope and plea that all citizens will cooperate with the Secretary in making his program successful and that in the deplorable event that any stupid, ill-advised hoodlums should attempt to harm or interfere with the peaceful enjoyment of the pools by those who want to use them, they will be summarily arrested and prosecuted, without pity or consolation from any decent citizen.

In view of the foregoing I have prepared a resolution which I recommend be considered and approved by the Board at this time:

RESOLUTION

"This Board wishes to dispel conclusively any suggestion that it is antagonistic to the Department of the Interior's plan to operate the park swimming pools this year on an open basis. Such unfounded implications are false and without fact. This Board offers its full cooperation to the Secretary and Department insofar as it is able to assist them in their operation and control of the pools. We deplore any suggestion that we are desirous of implementing, aiding, abetting, or in anywise encouraging disorder at the pools or abstention from their use by any person. On the contrary, the Board urges all persons to deport themselves lawfully and with dignity so that no further untoward incident

may occur, resulting in disgrace and shame to the Nation's Capital, and thereby marring the fine reputation for peace and good order which should belong to a community of law-abiding and reputable citizens."

HARRY S. WENDER,
Chairman, District of Columbia Recreation Board.

Restoration of Independence of Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 19, 1950

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, the New England district, Knights of Lithuania, recently met in annual convention in Waterbury, Conn., and adopted the following resolution which reaffirms the principles to which we all subscribe. Truly, there can be no just peace in the world while people are oppressed by dictatorial rule as is the case in Lithuania.

To: The President of the United States, the Honorable Harry S. Truman; the Secretary of State, the Honorable Dean Acheson; the two Senators from the State of Connecticut the Honorable Brien McMahon and the Honorable William Benton; the House majority leader, the Honorable John W. McCormack, from the Tenth Congressional District of Massachusetts; the Congressman from the Fifth Congressional District of Connecticut, the Honorable James Patterson; the Congressman at Large from Connecticut, the Honorable Anthony Sadlak; and to the press:

The priests, delegates and guests of the annual convention of the New England District of the Knights of Lithuania, congregated at St. Joseph's auditorium, Waterbury, Conn., on May 14, 1950, unanimously passed the following resolutions:

"Whereas members of the Knights of Lithuania, all of whom are Americans of Lithuanian descent and are deeply concerned about the present sad plight of Lithuania, the land of their forebears; and

"Whereas the delegates to the convention realize that the complete and untarnished independence of Lithuania has since been suppressed and is being suppressed by an insidious and Godless Soviet Communist horde and its satellites, now threatening and beating on our shores; and

"Whereas the delegates appreciate the support and assistance given the Lithuanians by the Federal, State and local Governments of these United States, and

"Whereas the delegates are in favor of and desire the continued support and assistance for the independence of Lithuania, now more than ever, of the Federal, State and local Governments of these United States: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the delegates to the Annual New England District Convention representing the following local councils of the Knights of Lithuania: Lewiston, Maine; Brockton, Mass.; Cambridge, Mass.; Waterbury, Conn.; Hartford, Conn.; Lowell, Mass.; Worcester, Mass; Providence, R. I.; Athol, Mass.; Westfield, Mass.; South Boston, Mass.; Lawrence, Mass.; Norwood, Mass.; be on record as favoring and having these United States of America affirmatively assist and take action in regaining and restoring the complete and untarnished independence of Lithuania as well as that of all shackled and suppressed peoples dominated by the Soviet Communist and Godless hordes; be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be sent to the President of the United States, the Honorable Harry S. Truman; the Secretary of State, the Honorable Dean Acheson; the two Senators from the State of Connecticut, the Honorable Brien McMahon and the Honorable William Benton; the House majority leader, the Honorable John W. McCormack from the Tenth Congressional District; the Congressman from the Fifth Congressional District of Connecticut, the Honorable James Patterson; and to the press."

JOSEPH A. LOLA,
President.
ANGELA MASONIS,
Executive Secretary.

Proposed Transfer of District of Columbia Recreation Areas to Control of Commissioners Is Unnecessary and Should Be Defeated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 19, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, there is a bill pending on the Union Calendar which I hope sincerely will never be called up for consideration in this Congress.

I refer to H. R. 5968, a bill to invest in the Commissioners of the District of Columbia control over all public swimming pools, playgrounds, and parks situated in the District of Columbia.

Fundamentally, my opposition to the bill is based upon democratic principles to which I adhere against all assaults because of the hidden retrogressive purposes of this measure.

I have a deep respect and affection for my chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, and I expressly disavow any intent of personal animadversion or controversy. I will not believe that this bill was introduced, as has been charged, with the deliberate intention of putting every Member of Congress, Democrat or Republican, who believes in American principles of democratic action, on a political hot spot, nor will I accept or credit the suggestion that my chairman is attempting to split the Democratic Party in the House by this issue.

PEOPLE WITH AXES TO GRIND

The fact is, of course, that there are people with private axes to grind who are trying to make capital out of this bill, and are industriously sowing rumors and false reports.

To repeat, Mr. Speaker, my fundamental objection to this bill is one of principle. Its real purpose is very much different than its ostensible purpose.

There are, however, sound practical objections to its consideration now or in the future.

First of all, it is totally unnecessary. There is ample existing authority, under legislation which Congress has enacted, whereby the District Recreation Board and the District Commissioners can obtain full utilization, or even jurisdiction, if jurisdiction is necessary, of the pools or any other recreation facilities in the parks. Congress has already enacted legislation enabling such transfers to be made by agreement between the District Commissioners, the Recreation Board, and the Department of the Interior. These acts are the act of April 29, 1942 (56 Stat. 261), the act of May 20, 1932 (47 Stat. 161, 40 U. S. C. sec. 122), and the act of July 1, 1898 (sec. 4, 30 Stat. 570). These statutes fully and completely cover the subject of transfers of land between the District and the Interior Department. There is no need for this bill, if it is intended solely to transfer jurisdiction.

What, then, is the purpose of this bill? H. R. 5968 has only one purpose: It is designed and intended solely to designate the use of the swimming pools on the basis of race and not on the basis of need. It is this matter of racial discrimination, which the Recreation Board has so vigorously sought to impose on the public swimming facilities in this, our Nation's Capital, that has been the only obstacle to an agreement between the Recreation Board and the Department of the Interior. The Secretary of the Interior has frequently and publicly offered to let the Recreation Board operate the swimming pools and other recreation facilities in the park lands, provided only that the Recreation Board admits all law-abiding citizens without regard to race. This the Board has refused to do. It desires to impose racial discrimination on these public facilities which are now administered without regard to race.

Second, it is very ill-timed. The Recreation Board had no money for administration of the recreation areas when the bill was introduced; and if the cuts which the House Appropriations Committee injudiciously imposed just the other day on the District of Columbia appropriation bill are confirmed by the House and the Senate, it seems unlikely that the Recreation Board will be able to carry out its present responsibilities.

Third, the bill is not desired even by the Recreation Board. Just a few days ago the Chairman of the Recreation Board flatly stated that the Recreation Board does not want to have the swimming pools transferred to it. This is what he said:

We do not now have funds or personnel to operate them fully. The Secretary [of the Interior] offered them to us on the basis of full-time management on a wholly nonsegregated basis. For a variety of factual reasons, including insufficient funds, likelihood of financial loss, inadequacy of trained personnel, the lack of absolute control over our employees, and the possibility of controversies ensuing from an operation by us under the Secretary's terms [the Recreation Board's] Concessions Committee agreed with the Secretary that the Board could not accept his offer at this time and that the Department of the Interior should assume responsibility for full operation this year. This conclusion was approved by five members of the Board. We are reliably informed that the Secretary of the Interior has made care-

ful plans to provide for the safe and efficient operation of all pools this summer. * * *

Nothing that this Board or your chairman has said or done remotely implies (a) that the Department of the Interior should not operate the pools in accordance with that Department's announced policies, (b) that the Department cannot be successful in such operation, or (c) that the Board or your chairman are hopeful that incidents will again arise this summer which will fan racial hatred and strife.

Fourth, this bill is wholly inconsistent with the basic principles of the bill for home rule for the District of Columbia (S. 1567) which is now pending in the Committee on the District of Columbia of this House. The home rule bill does not attempt to transfer lands from the Federal Government to the District government. It leaves any such transfers to be accomplished by agreement under the acts of April 29, 1942, May 20, 1932, or July 1, 1898, which I have just referred to. Section 904 (b) of the home rule bill specifically provides that the Federal Government shall remain responsible for the jurisdiction, maintenance and improvement of grounds, buildings and other recreational facilities in the parks; and section 904 (b) further provides that the proposed District of Columbia Department of Recreation may use such park lands and facilities by making agreements with the National Park Service of the Department of the Interior under the act of April 29, 1942 (56 Stat. 261).

OPPOSED BY NEGRO ORGANIZATIONS

Fifth, passage of the bill will be taken by all Negro organizations as a colossal affront to them and to our democratic principles, regardless of political affiliations, because of the hidden purpose of the bill to turn back the clock to antebellum days. It so happens that my political and personal convictions coincide with opposition to this bill; and regardless of its final disposition my opposition to it will meet with the approbation of my constituents and it will help me to live with myself.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, there are at least three-fourths of the membership of this House who are committed, morally and politically, against the principles of this retrogressive bill. It is highly objectionable to their constituencies. The political reverberations will be powerful and of long duration; a vote for this bill will, in at least 35 States of this Union of ours, call forth the angry protests of the voters.

LET THE BILL DIE ON THE CALENDAR

Mr. Speaker, the kindest thing that can be done with this Trojan horse measure is to allow it to die on the calendar; if its few proponents insist upon bringing it to a vote, then I can only foretell that it will be defeated. And this is a measure upon which a record vote will be demanded.

Aside from the fierce opposition of every Negro organization to this bill, and the fact that its passage would be a dire insult to every Negro citizen, it is strongly opposed by religious and liberal groups as uncharitable and un-American.

I can say that every religious organization of which I have knowledge is strongly opposed to the bill, and I have received many telephone calls and letters expressing that opposition.

The great strength of the Christian churches in America, Catholic and Protestant alike, and of the Jewish synagogs, is united against the measure as immoral and deliberately intended to make a mockery of the indivisible brotherhood of man.

Illustrative of this deep-seated opposition are the following statements and communications which I have received.

MRS. ROOSEVELT AGAINST BILL

I include an extract from the daily column, My Day, written by Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, widow of the great wartime President, as published in the Washington Daily News, of Wednesday, May 17:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA IS NOT A PLACE WHERE SEGREGATION SHOULD FLOURISH

(By Eleanor Roosevelt)

NEW YORK, Tuesday.—I have just had a letter from the National Committee on Segregation in the Nation's Capital, Inc.

The Capital of the United States is not a place where segregation should flourish. While it is often spoken of as a southern city, it is nevertheless, the Capital of the whole country, and the place where foreigners from all over the world must come to transact much of their business, regardless of their race, color, or religion. They should come to a city where all human beings are equal before the law, and where men and women treat each other in the spirit of brotherhood.

The Interior Department has under its jurisdiction in the District of Columbia certain recreational facilities which it makes available for the benefit of all people without segregation. Repeatedly, the Interior Department has offered to transfer all these facilities to the local Recreation Board provided that the Board will keep them open to all citizens. A bill will shortly come up in Congress, sponsored by Representative JOHN L. MCMILLAN, Democrat, of South Carolina, chairman of the District of Columbia House Committee, which will, if passed, transfer all recreational facilities now operated by the Interior Department to the District Commissioners.

It sounds innocent, but what it really does is to place in the hands of officials the power to enforce racial segregation. This seems a pity in the Nation's Capital.

UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION OPPOSES BILL

I also include in my remarks a letter addressed to me by Mr. Merrill E. Bush, director of adult education and social relations for the American Unitarian Association, Boston:

AMERICAN UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION,
Boston, Mass., May 17, 1950.

The Honorable ARTHUR G. KLEIN,
Representative from New York,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. KLEIN: It has been brought to our attention that the House Committee for the District of Columbia has reported out H. R. 5968.

We hoped that any legislation involving jurisdiction of the District of Columbia swimming pools would protect the nonsegregation practices, and it has been brought to our attention that there is considerable question whether H. R. 5968 does offer adequate protection of the nonsegregation principles.

The American Unitarian Association has gone on record as opposed to all practices of segregation, and in October 1947 passed a resolution specifically dealing with the District of Columbia:

"SEGREGATION IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

"Whereas segregation is a violation of the principles implicit in the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man; and

"Whereas segregation and discrimination are manifest in the businesses and institutions of the District of Columbia, making it impossible for Negro residents and visitors to have equal access to hotels, restaurants, and other public places in the Nation's Capital; and

"Whereas at the one hundred and twenty-second annual meeting of the American Unitarian Association on May 22, 1947, it was resolved to seek to schedule Unitarian conferences, conventions, and other meetings in hotels and other public places which do not discriminate against racial, religious, or national minorities: Be it therefore,

"*Resolved*, That the general conference of the American Unitarian Association assembled in Washington, D. C., on October 15–17, 1947, commends those individuals, businesses, and institutions in the District of Columbia which are eliminating segregation and urges those which are segregating to cease such practices; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the general conference urges the Congress of the United States early to enact a civil rights statute for the District of Columbia."

Very truly yours,

MERRILL E. BUSH.

COMMUNITY CHURCH OPPOSES BILL

I am next including a letter addressed to me by Mr. Arthur William Randolph, secretary of the social action committee of the Community Church of New York, made famous by its pastor emeritus, John Haynes Holmes, whose tradition is ably carried on by the Reverend Donald Harrington and the Reverend Maurice A. Dawkins:

THE COMMUNITY CHURCH OF NEW YORK,
New York, N. Y., May 17, 1950.

Representative ARTHUR KLEIN,
House Office Building, Washington D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KLEIN: It has come to the attention of this committee that the House Committee for the District of Columbia has reported out H. R. 5968, and that this bill will be up for action on May 22. This bill, if passed, would transfer jurisdiction over swimming pools in the District of Columbia from the Department of Interior to the Commissioners of the District. Because of its innocent-sounding provision the average Congressman may not be aware of the dangers of such a bill. It is not merely a transfer of jurisdiction but is rather a device to take control of these pools from those who have maintained a policy of nonsegregation, and transfer the power to the Recreation Board of the District, whose officials have over the years maintained a policy of segregation. If they have the least opportunity to do so we may be sure that these officials will then operate the pools on a segregated basis.

The Nation's Capital should be a model of brotherhood, for the impressions that many visiting foreign travelers and diplomats get from Washington are published throughout the world. Also, we may be sure that the Communists will not be slow in realizing how great a propaganda tool will be such proposed action.

The measure will come up for study and discussion on Monday, a day when it is customary for the House to discuss and handle District legislation. This is also a day when

many eastern representatives are not present, and when precisely those who oppose fair civil rights for all are dominant. Therefore, the Social Action Committee of the Community Church of New York urges you to be present on Monday, May 22, in order to vote against this vicious measure.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR WM. RUDOLPH,
Secretary, Social Action Committee
of Community Church of New York.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT POLICIES

Next, I insert the press release issued by the Department of the Interior announcing the last offer which Secretary Chapman made to the Recreation Board to operate the pools:

Secretary of the Interior Oscar L. Chapman today offered full operating control of the six National Capital Parks swimming pools to the District of Columbia Recreation Board subject to the condition that they continue to be operated as nonsegregated pools. The offer was made at a conference between the Secretary of the Interior and members of the District of Columbia Recreation Board held in the Interior Building.

Secretary Chapman explained to the Board members that the policy under which these swimming pools are operated was formulated in recognition of the Government's obligation under the Constitution to guarantee equal rights to all citizens. "The President has clearly enunciated a national policy that all public services shall be administered without distinction of race, color, creed, or national origin," Mr. Chapman stated. "I strongly believe that it is imperative that this policy be clearly demonstrated in the District of Columbia. The eyes of the entire world are fixed upon our National Capital. Every act of the officials responsible for the administration of public facilities becomes a symbol of our ability as a Nation to function in strict adherence to the principles of our democracy.

"It is the duty of the Government to provide swimming pools and other recreational facilities which are essential to the public welfare and to make them available to all of the people. By the same token, the Government does not compel people to use these facilities. It is, however, the responsibility of the Government to protect the rights of all of the citizens who choose to use such public services."

Secretary Chapman called the attention of the Board members to a swimming pool operated by the Navy at the training center located in Anacostia Park. The area is on National Capital Park lands, which since 1941 has been used by the Navy under permit. This swimming pool, located in the recreation building, is operated on a nonsegregated basis, naval personnel, both white and colored, and members of their families having access to the facilities on an equal basis. The Interior Secretary said that he had been informed by naval authorities that no racial tension has ever been generated through the nonsegregated use of the pool, thus it would appear that with the cooperation of all concerned the same situation could be obtained at the pools operating in the National Capital parks.

In his discussion with the representatives of the District of Columbia Recreation Board, Secretary Chapman explained that it has been the traditional policy of the Interior Department to cooperate with District of Columbia authorities in the conduct of the recreation program for the National Capital. For many years prior to the establishment of the District of Columbia Recreation Board, the greater part of the program conducted by the former District of Columbia Playground Department, was carried on on lands within the National Capital park system through the cooperation and consent of the National Capital Parks. In an effort to foster unified recreation for the District of Columbia, the Department of the Interior on April 1, 1940, agreed to permit the then existing District of Columbia Community Center and Playground Department to assume operational functions, including the issuance of permits, supervision, and leadership in connection with the program of supervised recreation in the National Capital parks. The facilities involved included an archery green, 4 badminton courts, 18 baseball, and 27 softball diamonds, 2 basketball courts, 7 croquet courts, the Palisades Fieldhouse, 11 football gridirons, 4 hockey courts, 34 horseshoe courts, 4 marble rings, 79 picnic groves, 2 shuffleboard courts, 3 soccer fields, a speedball court, 50 tennis courts, and 5 volleyball courts.

Responsibility for the foregoing facilities previously had been a function of the National Capital Parks Recreation Division.

The District of Columbia Recreation Department succeeded the Community Center and Playground Department in 1942, continuing to operate the afore-mentioned facilities as agents for the National Capital Parks.

On August 29, 1949, a formal agreement between the Department of the Interior and the District of Columbia Recreation Board, as provided by the act of April 29, 1942, which created the Board, gave the Recreation Department permission to conduct a recreational program in Anacostia Park, Archbold Parkway, Barnard Hill Park, Barry Farms Playground, Battery Kemble, Fort Bayard Park, Fort Bunker Hill, Fort Dupont Park, Garfield Park, Glover Parkway, the Mall, Montrose Park, the Washington Monument grounds, Oxon Run Parkway, the President's Park, Rock Creek Park, Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway, West Potomac Park, and Fort Stanton Park.

The recreational facilities within these areas include many which previously had been operated by the District of Columbia recreation authorities by permit.

The agreement of August 29, 1949, also provided that other National Capital Park areas might be made available to the Board from time to time and that the facilities operated by concessioners under contract with the Interior Department would be made a part of the agreement as soon as arrangements could be made with the concessioners. These included golf courses, tennis courts, boating and bicycle concessions. The Department of the Interior regulation specifying that all of the park facilities should be operated upon a basis of nonsegregation was accepted by the Recreation Board and the agreement further provided that the Board would make every possible and realistic effort toward the removal of racial segregation in public recreation with respect to the facilities, public activities, and programs which it now supervises on areas not under the jurisdiction of the Interior Department.

The swimming pools were not included under this agreement because of the unwillingness of the District of Columbia Recreation Board to operate the pools as nonsegregated public services.

The Recreation Board has been in negotiation with the present golf course operator with a view to assuming responsibility for the operation of the golf courses.

The Board has not yet obtained funds to liquidate the claims of the present operator as provided in his contract with the Department of the Interior but is hopeful of doing so in order to take over the golf course operation by January 1, 1951.

The Board has indicated that it will assume operation of bicycle, boating, and tennis facilities now operated by Government Services, Inc., upon the expiration of the contract between the Department of the Interior and Government Services, Inc., in 1951.

Also of interest to the Members of this House is the following summary of the contributions which the Department of the Interior has made to democracy in the Nation's Capital:

PROGRESS IN THE MOVEMENT TO GUARANTEE EQUAL RIGHTS FOR ALL CITIZENS IN THE NATIONAL CAPITAL

For the steady movement toward equal rights for all citizens in the Nation's Capital, no one group or agency can claim exclusive credit. However, the contribution of the Department of the Interior has been clear and sustained. Notwithstanding the pressures of interested groups and timid traditionalists, the Department has moved to implement democratic values and to clarify the role of the public agencies in their administration of tax-supported facilities. The objectives and example of the Interior Department may be briefly summarized in the principle so often stated by the President and the Supreme Court, namely, that the power of government in a democracy must ever be exercised to insure the equal enjoyment by all citizens of publicly supported services and that the government must refrain from using its powers to deny any racial, religious, or ethnic group free access to and enjoyment of such facilities.

The Department of the Interior has been steadfastly mindful of the special significance of Washington as the Nation's Capital and its unique role as the symbol to all the world of America's democratic ideals.

1. PUBLIC RECREATION FACILITIES

The Capital has never had a rigid or complete pattern of enforced segregation in any area of its public or private life. But in the two decades after 1925, the various authorities administering public recreation facilities adhered quite uniformly to the practice of keeping Negroes and whites apart in their use of such facilities. When the Department of the Interior in 1933 was assigned control of the local park system, it inherited practices of compulsory segregation. But in that same year the Superintendent of National Capital Parks announced that "There is no legal way to prevent law-abiding citizens from using the parks, regardless of their race."

This judgment that the Federal Government lacks authority to make distinctions of color in its administration of park lands was reiterated in 1935 by the then Acting Superintendent of the National Capital Parks.

Concrete action to implement this basic policy in the use of park facilities began in 1939, when the Secretary of the Interior ordered the discontinuance of compulsory racial segregation in the use of picnic groves. Permits have since been issued for all picnic areas without regard to the race of applicants. No racial frictions have arisen. On the contrary, the people of Washington have demonstrated that white and Negro groups can picnic harmoniously side by side.

Since 1940, by order of the Secretary of the Interior, the Washington tourist camp, long maintained as an exclusively white facility, has been operated on a basis of availability to all citizens without distinction of color. Here, again, no incidents of racial friction have been reported since that time. Also, in 1940, the Secretary ordered that the lighted tennis courts in West Potomac Park and the 17 courts on the Mall be opened to all applicants without distinction. They had been operated for white players only. Not a single incident of conflict based on race has occurred in 10 years.

In 1941 the Secretary ordered that the federally operated golf courses similarly be opened to all citizens. With the exception of a minor incident associated with the public announcement of this order, both races

have used the golf courses since that time freely and without friction.

The six swimming pools on park lands have also been open to all citizens for a decade. Until 1949 Negroes applied to swim only in two of the pools. In that year colored swimmers used two others. At only one of these—in Anacostia Park—interracial friction developed which resulted in the closing of the pool.

Since 1941, the Department's contracts with concessioners in the national parks have required them to operate in accordance with Interior policies; since 1945 all such contracts have carried provisions explicitly guaranteeing the right of all citizens to receive service from concessioners without distinctions of race, creed, or national origin. Throughout this entire period, the National Capital Parks outdoor nature and history interpretive programs have been open to all citizens.

The Department's basic policy—that it cannot enforce racial segregation in granting the use of public facilities and that it must protect all citizens in their right to use the parks—has now been in successful daily operation for a decade. Because of this record, the Department in recent years has repeatedly urged the District of Columbia Recreation Board to abandon the rigid policy of compulsory segregation under which it has operated since its inception.

In June of 1945, the Recreation Board, which had been created 8 years earlier, incorporated in its by-laws a provision that racial segregation must be enforced in the use of all recreational facilities under its control. The Acting Secretary of the Interior in a letter dated July 10, 1945, reaffirmed the policy of the Department as one calling for the unrestricted use of areas under its jurisdiction, and stated that this policy must prevail in all areas under the control of the deparment even if administered by the recreation board.

Since that time, the Secretary of the Interior has taken every action within his legal authority to require that the recreation board administer facilities on park lands in accordance with the national policy. Thus, in February 1949, the Secretary ordered the recreation board to cease discrimination in the granting of permits to play tennis on 18 courts located on park lands, and to grant them without disinctions of race.

The Department's efforts, however, were greatly hampered by a procedure of the National Capital Parks and Planning Commission whereby it assigned park lands to the District Commissioners who then turned them over to the Recreation Board for operation under its policy of enforced segregation. A cover of legality was provided for this action by the Planning Commission's arbitrary designation of certain areas exclusively for white recreation and others exclusively for Negro recreation. Action instituted by the Assistant Secretary of the Interior on March 15, 1949, led to the removal of such designations from the Commission's maps and plans.

Two months later, the Chairman of the District Recreation Board issued a public report acknowledging that the Board's policy of enforced segregation was out of tune with accepted practices in the community, and that the action of the Planning Commission had removed the last barrier to its modification. Thereupon, the Board (a) for the first time authorized the evening use of public-school buildings by interracial groups, (b) adopted a bylaw under which it is pledged to apply as rapidly as possible a policy of granting to all citizens equal access to all its facilities, and (c) permitted the Society of Friends (Quakers) to operate two playgrounds throughout the summer on a nonracial basis. Both the example and the voice of the Department of the Interior were instrumental in realizing all these advances.

These signs of progress were climaxed in August of 1949 by the signing of a formal agreement under which the Recreation Board is to operate recreation programs on 19 park lands. Additional lands may be made available to the Board from time to time, and facilities operated by concessioners under contract with the Interior Department—golf courses, tennis courts, boating and bicycle concessions—are to be made part of the agreement as soon as arrangements can be made with the concessioners. The crucial significance of this agreement lies in the provision that the Recreation Board shall operate all these facilities in accordance with the Department's policy, i. e., "none of them shall be restricted to use by any people on the basis of their race, creed, color, or national origin."

2. PUBLIC ACCOMMODATION

In recent years the auditoriums in Federal buildings have not enforced segregation in their audiences. But because of its size and ready availability to the public, the Interior Department's auditorium was regarded for several years as almost the only place in which interracial events could be staged. Year after year, the Watergate concerts, ceremonies and celebrations on the Washington Monument Grounds, at the Lincoln Memorial and in other park areas have further demonstrated to Washingtonians the practicality of a policy of nondiscrimination in public entertainment. In particular, Secretary of the Interior Ickes drew national attention to the conflicting patterns of race relations existing in Washington in 1939: Miss Marian Anderson, great Negro contralto, had been denied the use of a private hall and then of a public school auditorium, when the Secretary offered to arrange a concert on the steps of the Lincoln Memorial. Committees on arrangements for all such observances have included Negro representatives. More recently, a nondiscriminating summer theater has been established at Meridian Hill Park. At none of these functions has the racial trouble anticipated by pessimists arisen to frustrate expression of the democratic creed.

The views of Secretary Ickes with respect to the enforcement of racial segregation were so well known in the Department that no specific order was necessary to insure equal access to the cafeterias in the new Interior Building when it opened in 1937. Interior led the way in the trend which soon developed to guarantee free use by all employees of the eating facilities in Government buildings. More recently, in the wake of this development, other Federal agencies have opened to all patrons in the restaurants at the National Airport and National Zoological Gardens.

Over the years the Department's demonstration of the practicability of democracy in recreation and in admission to entertainment and eating places has exerted a steady influence on the practices of private proprietors in the District. In recent years several downtown movie theaters have opened their doors to all comers; Washington's new legitimate theater is operating successfully without enforced segregation; university auditoriums have been opened; a major sports arena has stopped segregating its patrons. Restrictions imposed by local bodies on interracial competition in amateur athletics have been removed. With one major exception, Washington's universities have opened their doors to students of different races. Most recently a large number of downtown restaurants have ended the practice of turning away Negro patrons. While Interior has been only one among many contributing forces in this unmistakable trend, its example and its voice have played a vital part in creating the atmosphere in which progress can occur.

As recently as the autumn of 1947 the policy and practice of the Interior Department were one of the few encouraging signs that the President's Committee on Civil Rights could find to offset the otherwise "intolerable * * * failure of democracy" in the Nation's Capital (To Secure These Rights, pp. 87–95).

3. FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES

As early as 1934 Secretary Ickes appointed to his staff an advisor on racial matters in the field of public works—the first such appointment in a Federal executive agency. This practice spread widely in the next few years and contributed substantially to the gradual improvement of administrative and personnel practices in the Federal establishment. Thus, Interior was the first agency to insert in all its contracts a clause requiring nondiscriminatory practices in employment by the contractors. Long before the issuance of an Executive order on the subject in 1941, Interior articulated the policy of fair employment in its own operations. The United States Park Police demonstrate the validity of this policy every day in the performance of their duties.

4. OTHER ACTIONS

The Department of the Interior has constantly sought to implement further the President's program of civil rights. It contributed actively to the preparation of the Government brief in the District of Columbia restrictive covenant cases before the Supreme Court. The Department supported Senator NEELY'S bill to establish a Human Rights Commission for the District, which the Senate District Committee recently reported favorably to the Senate. Wherever racial discrimination has raised its ugly head in Government affairs, Interior has been in the forefront of those combating it.

CONCLUSION

Much progress has already occurred in the racial practices of the Nation's Capital. More far-reaching developments are just over the horizon. The Department of the Interior has shown by gradual, revolutionary action that democratic principles work in Washington. Events have fully justified our faith in the good sense and decency of the people of the District when forthright leadership is provided. The Department will continue to express the high principles of the Constitution and the Chief Executive; it will continue to work to the end that the Nation's Capital shall be a living symbol of the American democratic faith.

AMERICANS FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTION

The Washington chapter of Americans for Democratic Action has written the following letter and statement to me:

WASHINGTON CHAPTER,
AMERICANS FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTION.
Washington, D. C., May 5, 1950.

Congressman ARTHUR G. KLEIN,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KLEIN: The Washington chapter, Americans for Democratic Action urges you to be on hand when the McMillan bill—H. R. 5968—comes up on Monday, May 8, and to vote against it.

We were shocked that this bill was voted out of the District Committee when only 14 members were present and in spite of the fact that the public hearings which were promised were not held.

H. R. 5968 would vest in the Commissioners of the District of Columbia control over all public swimming pools, playgrounds, and parks situated in the District of Columbia. The effect of this will be to administer the pools on a segregated basis.

We believe that such a bill would set a dangerous precedent and would be detrimental to the District of Columbia. In fact, it seems to us to have been timed to cause the maximum confusion in an already difficult situation.

As you know, the Department of Interior, as a Federal agency, could not possibly turn over facilities of any kind to the District on a discriminatory basis. Federal facilities must be offered on an inclusive basis. This bill would attempt to reverse this well established and accepted principle.

Advocates of the bill will say that a question as controversial as that of the swimming pools should be handled by the local officials. We say that in the first place, we have no local officials in the true sense. These people are appointed and cannot be said to represent the citizens of the District. In the second place, many local officials favor the policy enunciated by the Department of the Interior. We say that in the Nation's Capital, we should not try to bypass the democratic policy established by the Federal Government.

Enclosed is a statement which we have prepared on this subject and also a progress report prepared by the Department of the Interior. We hope that this will be helpful to you in fighting the McMillan bill.

Sincerely yours,

BENJAMIN C. SIGAL.

WASHINGTON CHAPTER ADA STATEMENT ON THE SWIMMING POOL CONTROVERSY

The Washington Chapter of Americans for Democratic Action strongly supports Secretary Chapman and the Department of the Interior in its position regarding the swimming pools. We believe that the Secretary acted in accordance with long-established and democratic practices in insisting that swimming pools turned over to the Board of Recreation be nonsegregated.

It has been an accepted principle that the Federal Government serves all of the people without regard to race, color, or creed. When the Federal Government has turned over such recreational facilities as golf courses, tennis courts, boating, and bicycle concessions in the District during recent years, the Recreation Board has accepted the condition that these facilities should be operated upon a basis of nonsegregation. As far as we know there has been no incident or any kind of trouble as a result of this.

Now when the Department of the Interior has offered to turn over six swimming pools provided that they be operated in this same fashion, the Recreation Board has refused and charges are being made that Secretary Chapman is attempting to impose a policy which the community is not ready to accept. How could a Federal official possibly act in any other way? Secretary Chapman stated the position honestly and precisely in his statement to the press when he said, "It is the duty of the Government to provide swimming pools and other recreational facilities which are essential to the public welfare and to make them available to all of the people. By the same token, the Government does not compel people to use these facilities. It is, however, the responsibility of the Government to protect the rights of all of the citizens who choose to use such public services."

We believe that it is the responsibility of the civic groups and newspapers and radios in the community to help carry out this policy. This can be done in a quiet, orderly way as it has been done in many other communities in the United States.

For its part, the Department of Interior is preparing staff and police for the summer swimming-pool program. We call on responsible elements in the community to support and help carry out this program.

Will All Our Labors Be Lost?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. GRANT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 19, 1950

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, Hon. STEPHEN PACE, recently addressed the fourth annual convention of the National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, in Atlanta, Ga.

This speech was well received by those present and as it is upon a subject of national interest, I am sure that the Members of Congress as well as those of us who are interested in conservation throughout the Nation will be impressed with it.

Mr. PACE has given much study to this subject and he speaks with authority and sincerity.

His address follows:

WILL ALL OUR LABORS BE LOST?

Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to join with other Georgians in welcoming you to our State. I hope your visit to Georgia will be pleasant and of some benefit to you. I am delighted that I could be here tonight for many reasons. I wanted to come and see how you look. But for quite different reasons from that indicated by an Atlanta businessman some months ago. He met on Peachtree Street a beggar in rags. The beggar accosted him and asked him for a dollar. The businessman said, "I am sorry, I am constitutionally opposed to giving beggars money." He then looked at the fellow and said, "I reckon you want money to buy some liquor. Come on down the street and I will buy you a drink." The beggar said, "Thank you, sir, but I don't drink." The businessman looked up surprised and said, "Well, maybe you would like to have a cigar. Come on by the drug store and I will buy you a cigar." The beggar said, "Thank you, sir, I don't smoke." The businessman looked at him rather concerned and said, "Well, maybe you are decent in spite of your clothes. I am going down the street to a vaudeville show, come on and I will take you to the show with me. There are pretty girls in the show." The beggar said, "Thank you, sir, I am not interested in pretty girls." The businessman stepped back and looked at him and said, "My friend, you have stopped me and asked me to do you a favor. Now I want you to do me one. I want you to come to my home tonight and have dinner with us." The beggar appeared surprised and asked, "You want me to come to your home in this condition: Why do you want me to do that?" The businessman said, "Well, my friend, I'll tell you. I want my wife to meet you and see you. I want her to see a man who doesn't drink, a man who doesn't smoke, a man who is not interested in pretty girls, and I want her to see what happens to him." [Laughter and applause.]

No, it was not for that reason that I wanted to see how you looked, but I wanted to come here and look in the eyes and strong faces of those who without compensation, voluntarily, along with eight or nine thousand others across this broad land, are devoting their time and their effort to try and protect and preserve our greatest natural resouces.

My friends, do you have an understanding of your responsibilities, of what rests upon your shoulders, the preservation of the security of the Nation. I doubt that very many people of the Nation realize or have an understanding of the debt they owe to you. May I, in behalf of the millions and millions of people who must receive their food from the land of this Nation, acknowledge our debt to you. I wish I could say something to make you understand the importance of what you are trying to do and what I know you will do.

I want you to excuse me from making a speech tonight. First, I don't feel like it, and second, I do not like speeches. I heard a story not long ago that I am going to carry down through the years with me and which I hope will have a great deal of influence on my talking. The story is about some city like Atlanta. It was having a great businessmen's banquet and there were hundreds of people attending. They had notable speakers, great men from other cities. They had a program and they gave their addresses. It was about time to close when the toastmaster thought of a young man who was present and who had recently graduated from Yale with great honors. He was a credit to the community. So the toastmaster thought as a matter of courtesy he would present the young man for at least a bow and he introduced the young man to the audience as a recent graduate and outstanding graduate of Yale. The young man arose and seized his opportunity. He spoke of his life at Yale. He spoke of what a great university it was. After some 15 or 20 minutes he said the "Y" of Yale stands for youth. And for some time he discussed the virtues and values of youth. Then he said the "A" stood for ambition. Here he went on a long discourse about ambition. Then he said the "L" stands for loyalty. And he gave a great essay on that subject. Then he said the "E" stands for enthusiasm. Finally, after more than an hour he took his seat. The toastmaster realized that he must make amends as quickly as possible and said, "We will be dismissed by Reverend Brown." Reverend Brown arose, lifted his face to the heavens, and said, "Dismiss us without Thy blessings and accept our thanks, O Father, that this young man did not graduate from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology."

For a few minutes I would like to discuss with you some of your business, the situations and some of the problems that face those whom you represent this evening. I should first like to mention something that isn't yet, and I don't think fully appreciated, and that is the rapid and terrific drop in farm income. Do you understand what is going on? I jotted down some figures. I don't want to tire you with figures, but you need to listen to these. Both you supervisors and directors and other businessmen who happen to be present. Listen, my friends. Cash receipts from marketings in 1948 was thirty million five hundred thousand. In 1949 it was twenty-seven million five hundred thousand. That is all cash marketing off the farm. Production costs in 1948 was eighteen million five hundred thousand. Farm income went down three billion and cost of production went up five hundred million in 1949. Net income, that is what pays off. That is what you support your family with. And the net income in 1948 was thirteen billion two hundred million and the new income in 1949 was nine billion and five hundred thousand. The net income estimated for 1950 is seven billion five hundred million. Income at the end of this year will be down over 33⅓ percent. What else has happened? While your income has gone down a third, the per capita nonfarm income, the people not on the farm, it has gone up from 8 to 10 percent. What else has happened? The real estate mortgage debt has increased in the last year 10 percent, to five billion five hundred million. Short term

farm debt has increased another 10 percent, to five billion three hundred million, and to top it all from November 1948 to November 1949, land values have decreased 6 percent. Do you get it? Now to aid you a little better, let me rapidly call off a few commodities, the highest prices since January 1946 and the prices in December 1949, and the percentages in decline. Wheat down from $2.81 to $1.93, 31 percent; corn down from $2.46 to $1.13, 54 percent; oats down from $1.27 to 70 cents, 45 percent; barley, from $2.06 to $1.09, 47 percent; grain sorghums, $3.77 to $1.79, 52 percent; cotton from 37½ to 26½ cents, 30 percent; cottonseed from $96 a ton to $43, 55 percent; soybeans from $4.11 to $2.09, 49 percent; potatoes from $2.09 to $1.31, 36 percent; hogs from $27.40 to $14.08, 46 percent; cattle, from $25.20 to $19, 25 percent; eggs from 59 to 40 cents, 31 percent. Now do you understand that is one of my and your problems? That is a trend we must stop. No farmer can do a complete job, no farmer can maintain the fertility of his soil and preserve water resources unless there is some profit in farming. It costs money.

Now the next problem is that of surplus. Let me say this is a strange world. Here we have such an abundance and yet throughout this world there are so many people who don't have anything to eat. May I very briefly run through the surplus problem? Last year we produced nearly a billion two hundred million bushels of wheat. January 1 we had a carry-over of 390,000,000. The spring crop estimate was 250 and the winter was 885, more than 1,125,000,000 bushels. I might stop there. Does anybody have any idea what we can do with it? We don't use in this country for food, for feed, for industrial uses, we don't use but 700,000,000 bushels. Yet we are producing a billion two hundred million. This year we started off with a surplus of 390,000,000 and will wind up with a surplus of over 500,000,000.

Some of you maybe don't like ECA, European recovery. Although personally I think it has turned the tide of communism in Europe, whether you like it or not, tell me what are you going to do with agricultural surpluses the day ECA stops. You have been getting rid of 5,500,000,000 bushels of wheat. You have been getting rid of three to five million bales of cotton. ECA will end in 1952.

Corn. Last year we produced 3,400,000,000 bushels of corn. What are you going to do with it. Are you going to feed it to the hogs? You know you don't have any cribs to put it in and if you feed it to the hogs you wouldn't have any pens to put the hogs in. [Laughter.]

Another good crop coming up this year is cotton. We have a supply of 21,000,000 bales and we use only 8,000,000 bales in this country. Through ECA we hope to export 5,000,000 bales and have a carry-over on the 1st of August of 8,000,000 bales.

There is a peanut surplus of over 300,000 tons.

What does that all mean? The farmer in cooperation with the Government is now beginning to limit the production of some of these surplus commodities. The wheat acreage has been cut down to 73,000,000. I think that marketing quotas next year may be around 65,000,000 acres. Let me say in passing that the control programs in 1950 have taken out of production some 30,000,000 acres of land. Next year it may be far in excess of that figure. Corn has come under acreage allotments. We had 27,000,000 acres in cotton last year and it has been cut to 21,000,000 acres this year, and the prospects are it will be cut to 17,000,000 or 18,000,000 next year. Peanut acreage has been cut from 3,300,000 to 2,100,000 acres, and next year will probably be cut to 1,800,000 acres. And rice comes under acreage allotments this year. Does that mean anything? I don't know, but here is what I think: My friends, it seems to me this is the hour. May I repeat that? This is the hour. All across this broad land the farmers of this Nation are now giving consideration to the problems of what shall I do with the land taken out of production. It's made for you. All of the farmers are complaining of what can be done, what can the idle acres be used for now. The old submarginal land that never did produce much, put it in trees. It does two things. Trees are a crop just like wheat and corn, and at the same time it slows down the movement of that water on the hillside. Take other land that is not needed for cultivation of crops and put it in pasture. Put it in pasture, do you understand. I don't know, my friends, but if there was ever a case made for you, if there was ever a time fixed, that is it.

Here in Georgia there will be hundreds of thousands of acres taken out of production of corn, wheat, cotton, peanuts, and all across this broad land of ours.

But what I really want to talk to you about in the few minutes I have is what you need now. The first thing I think you need is a soil conservation type of credit. May I repeat that? I think you need a type of loan that adapts itself to soil conservation. It takes time to convert. I takes time to shift. It takes time to learn new skills. It takes time to build pastures and fence them and fertilize them. It takes time to secure or increase your livestock herd.

Now my friends, here in Georgia, and I presume throughout this broad land of ours, the banks have been most cooperative under this program. But I came here tonight on bended knees to beg that the banks of this Nation immediately adjust their lending policy to take care of a loan for soil conservation farming. [Applause.] I think the banks should do it. I hope the banks will do it, but if that is not done, in my judgment the Congress will provide that type of loan. I introduced a bill 10 days ago for a 7-year loan with the right to waive all payments for the first 2 or 3 years until this shift in planned farming and conservation farming can get under way and then extend it an additional period of 5 years. I want to salute the banks of this Nation for their cooperation and I want to ask them to provide this type of credit for the farmers of this Nation. In all kindness, this may not be done under the bank laws and rules and regulations. I think to do a complete job, to protect the land and water resources, Congress must come in.

The next thing I think you need is a substantial increase in the appropriation for the Soil Conservation Service. [Applause.] My friends, your farm planning is going too slow. You are doing all you can with the help you have, with the technicians you have, but the hour is growing late. For 100 years we have cleared those hillsides and we have permitted that erosion. There should be adequate funds to plan every farm in the United States within the next 3 years. [Applause.] Let me say this now. I was never more serious in my life. Within a few weeks we will appropriate $20,000,000,000 for our armed forces to protect the security of this Nation. My friends, it is just as important, it is just as important that we protect the fertility of our soil and the resources of our country. Listen, my friends, you know this. You know that it is impossible, without great loss and great cost, to build up stockpiles of food to feed our people in time of great wars and distress. But you know what you can do. You can stockpile the fertility of the soil. If the hour of crisis ever comes, the farmers of this Nation can then produce whatever might be needed to feed and clothe, not only the people of this Nation, but our allies as we had to do before. [Applause.]

Now I am not scaring anybody, but I say this to you, nobody knows and you needn't go to Washington and ask because they don't know when, what, or how it may happen. But I know this, I know it is just as vital to the safety and security of this Nation that we protect the fertility of our soil as it is that we appropriate for our armed forces. That's right. [Applause.]

Now the next thing you need—now don't misunderstand me too quickly. The next thing you need is an increase in appropriation for conservation payments. That's right. [Applause.] I don't know how you are out in California or up in Maine and in New Hampshire. Most of the farmers I know can't afford to do a full job and a complete job without some help. We appropriate $250,000,000, and you know it is a funny thing, a lot of these economical businessmen—God bless them—if we didn't have them I don't know where we would be, but you know it costs almost as much—I don't know whether you know it or not—but it costs almost as much in subsidies to keep our ships, those merchant ships on the seas. Do you understand that? We are subsidizing every ship that rides the sea and every plane that rides in the air and every newspaper and magazine that is published. Funny, isn't it? When we provide $250,000,000 to help protect the soil fertility and protect the security of this country, they throw up their hands in horror. I feel I can get somewhat further with you, my friends. I haven't done much in the last 14 years, but I have studied some problems. I think that of the money we appropriate for ACP payments, not one single dime should be paid until it has been approved by the supervisors of the respective soil-conservation districts. [Applause.] Here is a group of men giving their time and their talent to protect our soil without hope of reward. Here is the technical service preparing your farm plan. And here comes another agency that determines what practices we still pay you for and how much, but has absolutely no connection with the farm plans that you and your technicians have approved. You should have that authority, and I am willing to help you get it, that is, for the district supervisors to approve the payments.

You know what I want to be the first payment you approve? It's to the farmer who starts way up yonder at the hill top. You know my friends, it doesn't make sense to to me that most of the money is spent down in the valley. It's up yonder, where the water falls—it's up yonder where the erosion has started. That water dashes down the hillsides so rapidly when the trees and grass are gone. It should be slowed down to seep into the ground, to provide moisture and to prevent erosion. May I repeat that if it was my will there would not be a darn dime paid on the farms of this Nation unless the protection of our soil and water resources started on the high ground.

The fifth and last thing I think we need, and I hope I don't make anybody mad tonight. The fifth thing we need, and I might say we must have it, is better coordination between the Soil Conservation Service, the Production and Marketing Administration, and the Extension Service. [Applause.] Let's talk about my State. I could talk about some other States—but I am going to talk about mine. In most counties there is fine coordination between the respective agencies, but I know where the head of the Soil Conservation Serivce and the head of the Extension Service and the PMA don't even speak. Yes, you can say: "Mr. PACE, you have been in Congress 14 years, why haven't you done something about it?" Well, I want to tell you I tried, but I must tell you that Congress will never do it. There are just too many influences at work. There are only two men living who can do it, one is named Brannan and the other is

named Truman. I think my friends that to be the Secretary of Agriculture would be the last job I would ever apply for, but often I have wished I could be the Secretary of Agriculture for just 1 day. Before the sun went down that day the three great heads of these agencies would be working hand in hand or we would have three new heads for these agencies. I hope you understand. I think the time has come to do some straight talking about this. I think it is outrageous for the Production and Marketing Administration to try and send their men out yonder to do farm planning when we need the technical service of men trained to do that job. [Applause.] The farmers I know—I don't know about the ones you know, but I do know the farmers I know are getting sick and tired of this confliction and overlapping, of having two or three Government agents drive up to their home the same afternoon trying to do the same job. Do you understand?

Now my friends I am about through. I have only one more thing I want to say. Down at the bottom of the program Kent sent to me about a month ago—I don't see one here tonight, but the words went like this, "With the right to own goes the duty to protect." I want to talk to you about this a minute. You know we have a great country, the greatest Government on earth. We want to keep it that way. You and I go out and buy a hundred or a thousand acres of land; we beat our breast and say, "It's mine, from heaven to hell." That's right, and don't you want to keep it that way? I believe we do. I am not going to take your time to tell what has happened to our soil in the last 150 years. The Congress has been very patient. You own some land, but did you go check your titles to see where it came from? It came either from the United States Government or your State government, and you know you can be safe and secure in your possession because the laws of this land protect your title. That's right. But our population is increasing from two to two and a half million every year, and the way things are going now it won't be too long before the question arises of how are we going to feed our own people instead of this abundance. When men stand by and see that rich topsoil wash away to the sea—let's say you are Members of Congress and that you are now in session. I'll ask you, how much longer would you put up with this? How much longer would you stand by and see your greatest natural resource wash away? Is there any responsibility on your Government and on your Congress to look ahead to your children and your children's children that they be provided with food and fiber?

You know my friends, we don't want to go where Mr. Attlee's government has gone. You know over there in England they give a man a farm plan and they say, "Mister, our experts say that this is what is necessary to be done to your farm and, Mister, I want you to understand if you don't do it, we will come and do it for you and send you the bill." We don't want that, do we?

My friends, I want to help you awaken the farmers of this Nation. You know in George Washington's time 95 percent of the population were farmers. Washington was a farmer. Jefferson was a farmer and in his time at least 90 percent of the population were farmers. My friends, do you know who you represent here tonight—only 19 percent. Did you ever stop to think about what the other 81 percent is thinking about? They are paying some of the money for ACP payments. They are paying some of the cost of soil conservation farm planning. When are they going to get tired? When are they going to get concerned? When are they going to get afraid? Is our trusteeship being exercised properly? You know my friends. I think everybody here tonight could repeat after me the opening line of the Twenty-third Psalm, "The Lord is my shepherd, I shall not want." We know that because it was taught us at our mother's knee. How many of you can repeat the opening line of the next psalm, the Twenty-fourth? "The earth is the Lord's and the fullness thereof." My friends, don't you suppose when the Lord gave us this great land, the richest farm land on earth, don't you sort of reckon He thought maybe we would have enough appreciation, we would show enough gratitude to keep it and save it and protect it? Don't you suppose as He watches over us that He too is concerned about the job we are doing and whether or not we shall be in want? My friends, there has been placed in your hands the responsibility, in the hands of the farmers, the people who own the lands of this Nation, the duty to protect and to preserve forever the soil. "The earth is the Lord's and the fullness thereof." Good night. [Applause.]

The New South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 22 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a splendid address by John J. Snyder, Secretary of the Treasury, delivered before the sixtieth annual convention of the Tennessee Bankers' Association, at the Hotel Peabody, Memphis, Tenn., on Thursday, May 18.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a real pleasure for me to join in this annual meeting of the Tennessee Bankers' Association.

As you may know, I spent my early banking days less than 50 miles from Memphis—across the border in your sister State of Arkansas.

Over a span of years, these States have been referred to as part of the old South. But in coming back to this region today, it is with the appreciation that this is no longer the old South but the new South.

The unparalleled prosperity of this section of the country today has come primarily as a result of industrialization. Manufacture has added new wealth, and this, in turn, has made possible ever-increasing standards of living and greater opportunities, both on the farm and in the city.

Tennessee holds a strategic position in this flourishing South and Southwest. The material progress which has come to this State in recent years—by phenomenal industrial expansion and better utilization of your rich agricultural soils—is in many ways typical of what has happened and is happening all over this section of our country.

While Tennessee industry has its roots in colonial days, it is only in recent years that you have attained the position of an industrial area. For, your most impressive gains have come in the past decade.

Since 1939 you have had over a 50-percent increase in number of manufacturing establishments—more than 10 percent over the national average. Values added by Tennessee industries have tripled in the same period. Compared with other major geographic areas of the country, the southern States show the greatest growth in population engaged in manufacturing. The Cotton Belt is rapidly becoming a power-driven industrial area.

I do not mean to infer that agriculture is losing its importance in your State or in the South's economy. On the contrary, it will continue to be one of your most important sources of income. But industry and agriculture are intermeshed. Here is a two-way road in an expanding economy, with both industry and agriculture translating benefits to each other. It brings mechanized farming, soil conservation, more output per acre, greater marketing facilities. Increased industry generates the purchasing power to consume the more abundant products of the soil. On the other hand, with increasing incomes, the farmer is enabled to buy more and more products of industry.

The great strides you have made in both agriculture and industry in recent years have stemmed in large measure from the development of the Tennessee Valley Authority. Here was the proving ground of one of the Nation's greatest coordinated agricultural and industrial deevlopment programs through hydroelectric power.

It ushered in a new era of scientific agriculture. It also attracted many new industries to your State. The availability of low-cost TVA power, for instance, fostered the building of your chemical plants. Today this industry constitutes your State's leading manufacturing group.

The South's industrial expansion was, of course, given tremendous impetus by the urgent needs of all-out war production. Billions of dollars were spent during the war by the Federal Government in the expansion of the South's manufacturing facilities. Close to one-third of a billion dollars was spent in Tennessee alone. And, that excludes the Oak Ridge atomic project—the largest single industrial operation in the world's history. This industrial expansion was a demonstration to the entire Nation of what this region could do.

The close of the war brought serious challenges to our economy. Would America be able to maintain its tremendous production gains? Today—5 years later—we have the answer. We have not only been able to maintain our gains, but our productivity is constantly on the increase. Since the close of the war, I understand that at least 700 new industries have been established in your own State.

Yet it is not the material gains which you have already achieved that have given this region the title of the "New South." It is rather in the realization of the potentialities that lie ahead for still further expansion and progress.

Your State particularly has tremendous potentials for further development. Agriculture should, and is, turning to higher-value crops and products. The advance which you have made in dairying is an instance in point. By "marketing your grasslands" you have become the South's leading dairy State.

In similar fashion, there is great opportunity here for industrial expansion in finished products. Your industrial output is still primarily in the producton of raw materials, of semifinished metals and textiles, and chemical intermediates. By converting your natural resources into finished wares, your annual income can be increased extensively.

You, as bankers, will play a major role in this further expansion of your State's economy. Much of the capital required will be furnished by your institutions. From earliest days banking has supported the growth of your commercial endeavor. The southern banker was a pioneer in the financing of foreign trade. He issued the drafts covering shipments of cotton to far-distant points. The bill of exchange, the controlling medium of the entire foreign-exchange system as we know it today, was part of the daily business of the southern banks over a century ago.

In serving your customers today, however, the problems and responsibilities which face you are far greater than those that faced your predecessors of even a generation ago. For today, you must be specialists in the whole broad field of business analysis. To evaluate the opportunities for growth in your communities and to judge which of those opportunities offer the best prospects for sound development, you must be able to interpret the changes occurring in business conditions not only in your own State but in the Nation and in the world.

In my opinion, there is sound basis for confidence in the business outlook for our Nation. We are well into the second quarter of this year, and it is becoming evident that 1950 will be one of the most profitable business years in our history.

Industrial production is not only back to last year's level, but is now rising, in contrast to the decline last spring. Business profits this year are less likely to be held down by inventory losses since commodity prices have shown a firm trend for nearly a year, and inventories have been greatly reduced.

The renewed upturn in capital goods, now under way, raises the question whether earlier estimates of a substantial reduction in new capital expenditures this year may not have been somewhat exaggerated. New orders for machinery have been rising sharply since the third quarter of 1949. New construction contract awards for nonresidential building were 30 percent higher than in the same quarter last year, and the increase is widening.

I am particularly impressed, as I know you must be, with the construction outlook. New home construction is at the highest level in our history. Moreover, new contracts awarded for future construction of residential units continue at a spectacular pace. New contracts awarded so far this year for public-works construction and public-utility construction likewise show substantial gains over the comparable period last year.

The construction industry is highly important in your own State's economy as well as the Nation's. Currently, construction is giving direct employment to around 32,000 Tennesseans, and indirect employment to an even greater number in your lumber and other construction-related industries.

Automobile production is also one of the strong points in the current business picture, and I am told the demand is far from satisfied. In only one month so far have we exceeded the 1929 peak in our output of passenger automobiles. And again, we must remember that we have 30,000,000 more people today than in 1929.

I know that you are eyeing this industry with considerable interest, for the manufacture of automotive parts is one of the promising fields for future major industrial expansion in this area. Southern ownership of cars and trucks in the 10-year period 1938–48 increased over 44 percent compared with a national average increase of 28 percent. As a result of this growing southern market, many automotive assembly plants have been established in the South. Your local enterprise is taking advantage of the profitable opportunity to supply a considerable part of the requirements of these assembly plants.

In the last analysis, of course, it is the individual consumer who represents the major market for our goods and services. It is not only his ability to buy but his willingness to buy that supports American business.

Ability to buy is evidenced by the current record level of personal incomes, which continues to run well over the $200,000,000,000 mark. In addition, personal savings, which represent potential purchasing power, are higher than ever before. Liquid assets of individuals amount to over $200,000,000,000, in contrast to only $68,000,000,000 when we entered the war in 1941. And this is not the full measure of the improvement in people's financial resources. Their investments in life insurance, homes, and real estate, corporate securities, and other less liquid assets far exceed the prewar total.

Willingness to buy is reflected in the current volume of retail trade and consumer expenditures. Total retail sales, in actual unit volume, are running about 6 percent higher than a year ago. Consumer buying for the country as a whole is currently running at a record annual level of $181,000,000,000.

The fact that last year's business readjustment did not unsettle the economy has created a justifiable feeling of confidence.

Another factor in the business picture—one of the Nation's biggest assets for future progress—is our growing labor force. To realize our full potential for business profits and national income, new jobs must be developed in step with our growing population. In the longer run, as our population grows, new jobs must be created by the initiative and vision of both management and job seekers.

To benefit by our tremendous opportunities, it is essential that we keep our economy strong, healthy, and growing. We must be ever watchful of developments which might tend to throw it out of balance. I am certain that you bankers will continue to be constantly on the alert for any financial trends that might threaten our continued prosperity. For upon America's domestic strength rests not only our own future peace and security but that of all free nations of the world.

Equal Pay for Women

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 22, 1950

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me over Station WJR, Detroit, Mich., on May 19, 1950:

Ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience, a subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor has today concluded hearings on H. R. 1584 and H. R. 2438, bills providing equal pay for equal work for women.

Price tags have no sex differentials. When the butcher, the baker, the candlestick maker, and all other merchants sell their wares, the asking price is the same to all persons—men and women alike. Yet, when women go out into the business, professional, or industrial world, they often find that a job carries one salary for a man and another for a woman.

According to the Women's Bureau, United States Department of Labor, in many instances, the jobs are identical—in others, the skills required are equal. In such cases, does the woman receive the same rates as the man? Sometimes, but not generally.

Equal pay for women means a rate based on the job—not on the sex of the worker. For many years women's organizations, labor unions, fair-minded employers, and various persons in the Government have worked for the equal-pay principle.

The bills introduced into the present Congress have bipartisan sponsorship. They would prohibit payment of a lower rate to women for work of comparable character on jobs where the performance requires comparable skills.

Our own State, Michigan, is a pioneer in the equal-pay field. We had the first equal-pay law that existed in any of the industrial States. Michigan and Montana were the only two States that had equal pay laws at the beginning of the Second World War.

Back in 1919, the Michigan State legislature enacted a law saying that "any employer of labor in this State, employing both males and females in the manufacture or production of any article, who shall discriminate in any way in the payment of wages as between sexes or who shall pay any female * * * a less wage * * * than is being paid to males similarly employed * * * shall be guilty of a misdemeanor."

As you may remember the Michigan equal-pay law was tied up in the courts for about 5 or 6 years with suits over its constitutionality. In 1940 the Supreme Court declared the law constitutional, making it possible for the State Labor Department to carry on active enforcement.

In the early days of the Second World War, Michigan, through its equal-pay law, did a lot of active work in trying to eliminate wage differentials, because we were aware of the tremendous effect this would ultimately have on war production.

Applying the equal-pay principle removes a great source of irritation during periods when the need for all-out production is critical. It is just as vital when economic forces have swung to the opposite extreme. In times of mass unemployment, men workers may be displaced by women workers because women can be employed at lower rates of pay. It was this practice, as some of us in Michigan well remember, that led to the reenactment of the equal-pay law in 1931. It was the practice in those days to lay off men with heavy family responsibilities who were making 45 to 50 cents an hour and to replace them with women, usually single girls with no family responsibilities, at 25 to 30 cents an hour.

During the depression we had to fight continuously against such efforts to push our wage levels downward. That was the time we really began in earnest to try to make the equal-pay law work. Today, nearly 20 years later, we are, I think, ready to point to our record and say to persons skeptical of the new proposed Federal law, "It can work and it is working in Michigan today."

There have been some interesting cases where our equal-pay law has averted strikes. During the war, an aircraft plant was on the verge of a strike over wage differentials for women. When the Department of Labor pointed out that such differentials were illegal under the State equal-pay law, the strike was avoided. This story definitely shows that the State law has been a stabilizing influence in employment.

Here is an illustration of how our equal-pay law takes away the sting of threatened wage cuts. At a large automobile factory, there was a serious strike several years ago. There they offered the men a choice of taking wage cuts to meet the differential women had been working under or of being laid off. Again the equal-pay law was on the job and this problem was ironed out.

There is an interesting story in connection with this case. This same company had one department that was completely manned by men on the day shift, and almost completely by women on the second shift. The third or swing shift again was an all-male one. The only difference among the three shifts was the 10-cents-an-hour flat differential paid to the women on identical jobs.

Michigan's pioneer efforts toward achieving equal pay for equal work have been outstanding. Today it is one of 12 States that have equal-pay laws. The others are Montana, Washington, New York, Illinois, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, New Hampshire,

Pennsylvania, California, Connecticut, and Maine.

As a result of these State laws, thousands of women are receiving equal pay for their work in private industry. It would be very easy to sit back and point to what has been accomplished and to talk about the many women who receive equal pay under these laws. But I am not going to do this. Some of us in the Congress and elsewhere in Government and many in industry and labor are aware of the great numbers of workers who are not protected by equal-pay laws of any kind.

Equal pay is a basic issue, one of the most important in the whole labor field. It is important to women as a matter of simple justice; it insures women receiving what they are entitled to for their work. It gives men greater wage and job security. It discourages employers from hiring women for less money; and it discourages replacing men with women at lower rates. It protects fair employers from the unfair competition of those who attempt to use women as undercutters of men's wages. It means more economic security for families, for it protects the wages of male heads of the family.

It is unfair to pay women less on the theory that men have dependents whereas women do not. A single man is paid as much as a married man for doing the same job. The level of wages cannot be justified on the basis of need beyond what is necessary for decent adequate survival. In any case, the old argument that women support only themselves or work to give their families luxuries is completely wrong. The Women's Bureau of the United States Department of Labor made a study during the war which showed that 84 percent of the women workers included in this study were working to support themselves and others. Fifteen percent of the women who lived in family groups were the sole wage earners contributing to household expenses. Ninety-two percent of the employed women who lived with their families contributed regularly toward family expenses. Over half of them contributed between 50 and 100 percent of their earnings to the family group.

There are 18,500,000 women workers today. If we are going to leave them in a position where they could undercut men's wages, think what a dangerous competitive factor they could be in our wage structure. Women workers do not want to be in a situation where they can be used as a club to force down wage levels. A Federal equal-pay bill would do much to remove this possibility.

We hear a lot today about the importance of keeping consumer purchasing power at a high level. In plainer language this means that if people have the money to buy goods, then factories will have the money to continue producing goods and to pay labor, and labor will again, in turn, have money to buy goods. This is a reasonable theory.

It is apparent that women's earnings must be considered when we think of consumer purchasing power, because there are so many women workers and they do support dependents. Consequently, equal pay for women is an important aid to maintaining consumer purchasing power.

The proposed Federal bill would cover about 6,000,000 women workers. It would make it unlawful for any covered employer to pay wages to any female employee at a rate less than that he pays to male employees for work of comparable character on jobs where the performance requires comparable skills. The bill also makes it unlawful for any covered employer to lay off, discharge, or otherwise discriminate against any employee for giving assistance in enforcement of the act.

Responsibility for enforcement of the act would be placed with the Secretary of Labor. The bill establishes procedures for hearings on charges of violation. It authorizes the Secretary of Labor to issue "cease and desist" orders, including reinstatement of employees with or without back pay. It provides for court review and enforcement of such orders, and for appeal by any injured party. Penalties are provided, of fine or imprisonment or both, for willful resistance to or interference with the officials administering the act, or for failure to keep required records or to make necessary reports. It prohibits award of a Federal contract to any employer found to have violated the act, during a period of 3 years after the violation, unless otherwise ordered by the Secretary.

Will this Federal bill be effective in eliminating discriminatory wage practices against women? I think it is a good bill and a very necessary one, an important addition to the body of Federal law designed to advance the welfare of workers and to stabilize the economy.

I feel that it is to Michigan's advantage to support a Federal equal-pay bill applying to the entire country. I think also that we must continue to be vigilant about the equal pay situation in our own State. Even though we have a good State law, I still get complaints on unfair wage differentials between men and women workers. Unions and women's organizations too have first-hand information which shows that much remains to be done in Michigan to assure complete application of the equal pay principle. I hope that the people of Michigan will keep on pushing for full and vigorous enforcement of our State law.

Why is equal pay important? To sum up again; (1) It is important to women as a matter of simple justice; it insures their getting what they are entitled to for the work they do. (2) It is important to men because it helps sustain men's wage rates. It discourages the employer from hiring women for less money. (3) It is important to everybody because it will increase consumer purchasing power, stimulate full employment and increase the economic security of workers' families.

"The laborer is worthy of his hire." If women turn out the same quantity and quality of work, they should receive the same compensation.

For these reasons I am supporting the bills now before Congress proposing a Federal law to require equal pay for equal work. I am sure that with our long history of support for the equal pay principle in Michigan, the people of Michigan will urge their Senators and Congressmen to support this Federal legislation.

My sincere thanks to WJR, the good will station, for the opportunity to speak this evening over their facilities.

Thank you and good night.

Writings of Owen Lattimore Reflect Pro-Soviet Views

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 22 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Writings of Owen Lattimore Reflect Pro-Soviet Views," by David J. Dallin, from the magazine the New Leader for May 13, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WRITINGS OF OWEN LATTIMORE REFLECT PRO-SOVIET VIEWS

(By David J. Dallin)

A new and highly significant article has come from the pen of Owen Lattimore. In this latest offering, which appears in the March issue of United Nations World (a magazine of limited circulation and expensive format edited by the devious Soviet sympathizer, Louis Dolivet), one almost fancies for an instant that the leopard has changed his pro-Communist spots. The article actually contains a faint breath of noncommunism, a fleeting hint of disapproval of Soviet policies. Comparison of the professor's arguments with the current far eastern line of the Russian press, however, swiftly dispels any illusions.

The official Soviet version of the upheaval in China is as follows: First, the Communist victory is exclusively the product of internal Chinese revolutionary forces, unaided by Moscow; and, second, the Communist regime in Peking is a sovereign government which takes no orders from the Kremlin. The press does not admit the presence in China of Russian advisers.

Now let us see what Mr. Lattimore has to say on the subject. He is certain, to begin with, that Russian intervention was insignificant in China. How can he be sure? If it had been otherwise, he explains, we should have intelligence information. As a matter of fact, the wretched caliber of American intelligence in the Far East is notorious. The U. S. S. R. rendered decisive assistance to the Communists in Manchuria right after the war by turning over massive stocks of captured Japanese arms. There were also Soviet advisers at Communist headquarters.

Again, Mr. Lattimore asserts: "The power of control [in Communist China] has not passed into the hands of Soviet Russia." I do not question Mr. Lattimore's integrity in making this statement, but it is false, biased, and harmful, nevertheless. Indeed, he could not be serving the Kremlin more effectively were he on Stalin's payroll.

Today, Soviet advisers are swarming across China. Some Russians and some Chinese Soviet citizens, they are arriving daily in Tientsin, Shanghai, Canton, and Nanking. The Soviet Ambassador wields vast influence in Peking. Russian military instructors are busy reorganizing the Communist army. Moscow's denials, of course, were expected and discounted in advance. Yet, here we have an American professor echoing the Moscow line under the sheltering mantle of scholarly objectivity and independent judgment.

Mr. Lattimore's views also mesh too closely for comfort with the grand design of Soviet policy on Japan. As the last potentially powerful anti-Communist bastion in Asia, Japan is clearly marked for mounting pressure. The recent Sino-Soviet treaty is actually an alliance against Japan. Moscow knows that the latter's present position is economically untenable: she cannot live without resumption of large-scale trade with the Asiatic Continent, particularly northeast China. The Soviet-Chinese bloc will agree to trade with Japan, but on its own terms only. And these terms will be aimed straight at the American occupation forces, and Japan's ties with this country.

Mr. Lattimore has a simple prescription for Japan in this dilemma. "Japan," he writes, "must negotiate for the raw materials it needs on terms that are acceptable to the suppliers of the raw materials." He then observes, accurately enough, that "the option of rebuilding the power of Japan no longer lies with Japan." Quite true; it obviously lies either with the United States or the

Soviet-Chinese bloc. Evidently, Mr. Lattimore's preference is for the latter.

The Senate subcommittee currently probing Owen Lattimore's attitude toward communism has been driving its plow through a sandy beach. Its failure to produce any proof that he is a Soviet spy or Communist Party member should surprise only uninformed persons like Senator McCARTHY.

Mr. Lattimore has declared: "I am neither a Communist nor a fellow traveler." The first part of his statement is correct; the second is false. His most recent article on Asia—pious professions of democratic, anti-Communist convictions coupled with concrete proposals which miraculously coincide with the official line handed down from Moscow—is a splendid new sample of the mentality of the American fellow traveler.

Anthracite Coal

REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 1950

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I have just introduced a bill to authorize, for a temporary period, the purchase by the Government of anthracite in amounts sufficient to maintain normal production and employment in the anthracite region, to promote the general national welfare, and for other purposes.

Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government has a great burden of responsibility to the anthracite industry. To a great extent, the major part of the economy of the northeastern United States is dependent upon the mining of anthracite in the anthracite coal fields of Pennsylvania. And my congressional district, centered in the Wilkes-Barre-Hazleton metropolitan area, is the very heart of these coal fields. Here lies the principal source of energy and heat for the most densely populated and most intensely industrialized section of our Nation.

To prevent the loss to the national economy of this vital natural resource and economic disaster to millions of our citizens, Mr. Speaker, I have introduced this bill.

The problems of this vast mining industry are not alone those of economics and technology—preservation, readjustments, improvements—these call for legislative assistance.

Use of abundant supplies of energy resource materials has made the United States of America the great world power it is today. In times of peace and war these materials have multiplied the strength of our manpower to provide for us the highest standard of living in time of peace and the greatest degree of strength in time of war.

A major readjustment in the fuel-energy economy of the country has been taking place during the past several decades. Economic factors and the necessities of international affairs, rather than the sound dictates of industrial prosperity and security have been at work adversely affecting our coal industry.

War and the postwar over-all prosperity for a time mitigated the degree and effects of these changes. Lately, however, the seriousness of the situation has reflected itself so forcibly upon the anthracite industry that it threatens the industrial and civilian economy of an important segment of the country.

Last year anthracite production dropped to a point lower than at any time since 1902. In 1949, the industry supplied only 3.4 percent of the national energy requirements, compared with bituminous coal, petroleum, natural gas, and hydroelectric power, on an equivalent heat-unit basis, as shown in the following table:

National supplies of energy requirements

Source of energy	Percent supplied	
	1949	1948
Anthracite	3.4	4.0
Bituminous coal and lignite	35.9	42.9
Petroleum	36.4	34.0
Natural gas	19.4	15.1
Hydroelectric power	4.9	4.0
Total	100.0	100.0

Within recent years a definite trend has been established toward a petroleum and natural gas economy. Unfortunately, this represents great national dependence upon two fuels of limited reserve, but more importantly, fuels which are of special strategic significance to direct military and security defense.

No authority disputes the ultimate return of the country to an enlarged coal demand. Just how far away this day may be no one accurately knows, but in the two-world pattern of today it is imperative that immediate effort be directed to preserve the anthracite industry and the potential industrial capabilities of this region.

A sudden reduction of the importation of foreign oil or a war emergency would place considerable of the northeastern section of the United States in urgent need for anthracite. Accordingly, something must be done to keep this industry healthy and strong for the job which might be placed upon it while it is readjusting itself.

The production of 42,664,000 tons of anthracite estimated for 1949 is about 20 percent lower than during the depth of the 1933–1936 depression. Employment during the year was approximately 74,000 men.

Total reserves of anthracite are estimated at between 160 and 180 years of expected life. For petroleum and natural gas comparative figures are 12 and 30 years respectively.

In 1947 fuel oil for the first time surpassed anthracite consumption in the primary anthracite market area and in 1948 accounted for 52 percent of the total consumption of fuels there.

The impact of these changes upon the fortunes of anthracite producers, on national security and defense planning strikes heaviest and first on the civilian economy. In the event of a sudden war emergency wherein importations of oil would be restricted and considerable amounts of domestic oil allocated for war purposes, a shift back to coal would put a large burden upon anthracite production.

Improved metallurgical processes, scarcities of important mineral resources, expanded and adjusted transportation routes, and research and development in entirely new fields all point to opportunities for improvement in the industrial economy of the anthracite industry and area in a distant future.

Today, however, the need for preservation of this industry is urgent. It has been and still is the backbone of our national industrial strength and prowess. Its problems and challenges have been many and varied. Out of this industry have come the techniques and industrial solutions which have made some of our greatest industries. Its mass-production methods have been the basic pattern for our automotive industry; its early flame-proof electrical equipment and gas protective apparatus have enabled the development of our oil and gas industries; to say nothing of the industry's contributions against poisonous gases in industry and war.

Now the day has arrived when the country is called upon to preserve this industry for the perpetuation of the over-all national prosperity and security.

Our national security and defense is predicated upon the development of a strong industrial economy. All across the country we endeavor to strengthen our industries. In the international field we spend billions to better the economies of friendly nations. In doing this we purchase their products, some of which come into competition with our industries, such as is presently the case with the importation of foreign fuel oil. These are the things we must do to create a better and safer world. It was not the intent or purpose of those who designed our foreign-aid program that these efforts should redound to the detriment of our own industries. Instead, it was and is intended that our own economy and industries should adjust themselves and rise to greater success and importance.

Under these circumstances, the direction in which the anthracite industry must go to recapture its share of success and position for the betterment of the national economy is clear. But to attain this end it must have a new partnership with the Government. It seeks not a dole but an opportunity to contribute that which is peculiarly its part.

During 1949 production of anthracite fell 25.3 percent below that for 1948; similarly bituminous-coal production dropped 27.4 percent. Production figures for these two fuels during 1948 and 1949 are as follows:

Coal production statistics [1]

Year	Anthracite tons	Bituminous tons
1949	42,664,000	435,000,000
1948	57,140,000	599,518,000

[1] Bureau of Mines Reports W. A. C. R. 652 and W. C. R. 1686.

In 1918 anthracite supplied approximately 12 percent of the national energy requirements, but in 1949 it accounted

for only 3.4 percent, representing a loss of about 70 percent in its relative position. In actual tonnage this was a reduction of from 98,826,084 tons in 1918 to 42,664,000 tons in 1949, or a 57 percent decrease in production.

This slumping off of the anthracite industry is a serious matter to the peacetime economy and security of the country. It has dragged down with it a most important area of the country and a segment of its population which once was industrially and technologically on a pinnacle.

One could argue long and bitterly the reasons why the anthracite industry and area are so distressed today. However, for the job of reconstruction ahead only those points which can set the course for repair and progress need be considered.

The world today has approximately 2,000,000,000 people. Using only rough estimates, it is clearly evident that numerically we have recently moved rapidly into reverse in our race against communism. The Soviet with about 250,000,000 people, China and northern Korea with nearly 500,000,000 people, the satellite and doubtful states with 150,000,000 people, and India, Burma, and other Far East countries already close to communism with another 500,000,000 people, this gives the Communists a potential control of 1,400,000,000 people. It also leaves only a mere 600,000,000 people for us to consolidate for our side. With these odds, and many others already against us, is not the need to spur ourselves great enough? Can we afford the luxury of a blighted fuel industry and its ghost towns?

Hence, the opportunity exists and the occasion demands that a constructive and objective course be set for the rehabilitation of the anthracite industry.

A forward view of the anthracite area envisions a pleasant region of high-level, well-organized, industrial power in the channels of trade and commerce, across the country and seas, again setting the pattern of progress in the production, engineering, construction, and research fields, as it did in the past.

No panacea for anthracite industrial ills exists or can be concocted. Though that is true, certain palliatives can be administered which hold promise of restoration of a high degree of health.

Luckily, for this area it is strategically located where neither those interested in the prosperity of the national economy or security can long avoid giving it appropriate consideration. The area is located where its strength and position is the keystone of our whole national power.

Specifically, the more I study the difficulties of the anthracite region the more sure I am of the theory that its recovery and restoration of health depends upon its integration with other projects, programs and plans possible of being brought to bear on this country's ills by no one person, corporation or industry. The day has arrived when the problems of this industry require the guidance and aid of Government surveys, direction and aid just as surely as it exists today for wheat, potatoes and eggs. Fortunately, however, the correctives to be employed for the anthracite industry are of a type which when properly correlated lend strength and security to the country on a self-paying basis.

In the world of today we tread a difficult road, and we would be unwise to add to our difficulties by neglecting to husband the strength of the various parts of our great industrial economy, or fail to build back into it those things which have made it so great.

Let us not forget that this anthracite area, at the turn of the century, provided approximately 23 percent of the national energy requirements which gave the Nation its present great industrial strength. The country does owe the anthracite area and its people a chance under the sun!

Overloaded Trucks on Our Highways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 22, 1950

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to call to the attention of the House some of the persistent violations of State laws regarding the weight of trucks. In this connection, I include an article from Transport Topics of October 24, 1949. This article deals with the sixteenth annual convention of the American Truck Association held in Boston in October 1949. In this article, Mr. H. D. Horton, then president of the American Truck Association, now chairman of the board, called upon his associates for overscrupulous adherence to State weight laws, in the following language:

> In the final analysis, these laws are as much protective of our industry as they are of the public. There is no final profit for anyone in law violation of any kind. To cope with this problem, I believe this industry must dedicate itself to a vigorous, Nationwide program of self-policing. It is not enough for each of us to keep our own company house in order. We stand or fall with the performance of all trucks on the roads and streets. We must indeed, be our brother's keeper.

I also include an article from the Baltimore Evening Sun of April 25, 1950—just 6 months after the ATA convention—listing some 63 truck firms that paid fines for operating overloaded trucks on the highways of Maryland alone during 1 week—April 8 to 15, 1950.

In this list appears the Associated Transport, Inc., of Charlotte, N. C. The drivers of this firm have been convicted in 116 cases in the State of Maryland in a period of 14 months—since February 14, 1949. The president of this firm is the same Mr. H. D. Horton who addressed the American Truck Association 6 months before on the need for obeying State weight laws.

Mr. Henry E. Howell, vice president of the company, "passes the buck" on the great number of offenses by blaming it on "inaccurate weighing by shippers." Regardless of how it comes about, Mr. Horton's firm is not practicing what he preached, and in the meantime, the highways continue to take a beating at the expense of the taxpayers.

The article above referred to follows:

SIXTY-THREE TRUCK FIRMS PAY FINES FOR OVERWEIGHT

The State of Maryland collected fines from 63 transportation firms charged with operating overloaded trucks on highways during the week April 8 to 15.

State roads commission weight checkers arrested another driver of Associated Transport, Inc., Charlotte, N. C., the trucking concern which has been the most persistent violater of Maryland laws regulating the weight of trucks.

During the past 14 months, drivers of this firm have been convicted in 116 cases. Henry E. Howell, vice president of the company, attributed the large number of offenses to inaccurate weighing by shippers.

FOUR QUINN CONVICTIONS

The Quinn Freight Lines, of Brockton, Mass., with four convictions, led other shippers in the number of offenses committed during the week reported. Its total since February 14, 1949, is 27 convictions.

Conviction records for the week were:

Owner	Week's convictions	Week's fines	Convictions since Feb. 14, 1949
Abco Lumber Co., Baltimore	1	(1)	1
Akers Motor Lines, Inc., Gastonia, N. C	1	$26.75	30
Curtis Albright, Aras, Ala	1	26.45	1
J. E. Andrews & Co., Cambridge, Md	1	57.90	1
Associated Transport, Inc., Charlotte, N. C	1	26.45	116
John W. Atkins, Frostburg, Md	1	51.45	1
Baker Trucking Co., New Castle, Del	1	26.45	1
Lee Bandenburg and F. Ferrigen, Sumter, S. C	1	15.75	1
Claude Baugh, Washington, Ga	1	50.75	1
Victor Bernst, Hamilton, Ont	1	26.45	2
Bethesda Cinder Block & Supply Co., Bethesda, Md	1	51.45	1
Lloyd W. Biesecker, Hamilton Square, N. J	1	11.45	2
James F. Black, Baltimore, Md	1	51.45	20
Forrest E. Broadwater, Salisbury, Pa	1	10.75	2
Burris Equip. Rental Co., Milford, Del	1	51.45	58
H. T. Campbell, Towson, Md	1	(2)	1
L. E. Carter, Branchville, Md	1	51.45	16
Toni Cataldo, Columbia, S. C	1	35.75	1
J. Coray Trucking Co., Fall River, Mass	1	15.75	3
Davidson Transfer & Storage, Baltimore	2	62.95	39
Elliott Bros. Truck Co., Easton, Md	1	51.45	22
George D. Evans, Sr., Mardella Springs, Md	1	[1]51.45	1
Farm Bureau Cooperative Association, West Chester, Pa	1	26.45	2
L. Folker's Sons, Phoenix City, Ala	1	67.25	6
Blaine H. Friend, Friendsville, Md	1	10.75	1
Floyd Gates, Monroesville, N. J	1	26.45	1
General Supply Co., Winter Haven, Fla	1	11.45	5
Glotvelty Lumber Co., Oakland, Md	1	10.75	1
Lewis B. Guignard, Banner Elk, N. C	1	26.45	2
Alvan R. Haines, Hagerstown, Md	1	51.45	1
F. G. Hampton, Norfolk, Va	1	11.45	2
Douglas P. Hardy, Hampton, Fla	1	40.75	2
Hubert L. Harper	1	51.45	1
George F. Hazelwood, Cumberland, Md	2	25.75	2
Inman Transfer Co., Rowland, N. C	1	11.45	1
Eugene Jerkins, Phoenix City, Ala	1	55.75	1
William C. Kennedy, Brooklyn, N. Y		11.45	1
Koppers Co., Inc., Pittsburgh	1	4.75	1

[1] Suspended. [2] Not guilty.

Owner	Week's convictions	Week's fines	Convictions since Feb. 14, 1949
John Kostek, Hamilton, Ontario	1	$11.45	1
L. A. Murrah, Orlando, Fla.	1	51.45	7
K. C. Palmer, Montgomery, Ala.	1	22.75	1
D. S. Parsons, Candor, N. C.	1	25.50	3
H. L. Pettit, Granstville, Md.	1	10.75	1
Enoch P. Price, Frostburg, Md.	2	26.45	4
B. F. Priddy, Crab Orchard, W. Va.	1	11.45	1
Quinn Freight Lines, Inc., Brockton, Mass.	4	255.80	27
Francis H. Raley, Columbia, S. C.	1	2.75	1
Guy G. Reed, Riverdale, Md.	1	26.45	2
W. Jasper Riley, Oakland, Md.	1	51.45	1
Walter E. Roe, Chestertown, Md.	1	[1]51.45	1
Smith & Solomon T. Co., New Brunswick, N. J.	1	51.45	7
Oren Smith, Uniontown, Pa.	1	15.75	1
Southern Motor Corp., Baltimore	1	11.45	6
John Spear, Markleysburg, Pa.	1	15.75	1
Sprow & Zimmerman, Washington	1	20.75	3
John A. Stanford, Lake Alfred, Ala.	1	51.45	5
Roy Stone Transfer Corp., Martinsville, Va.	1	26.45	4
Superior Produce Co., Orange, Fla.	1	19.75	1
Texas Supply Co., Towson, Md.	2	22.90	6
E. M. Whittenton, Dunn, N. C.	1	15.75	4
James R. Varnado, Winter Garden, Fla.	1	26.45	2
Wooleyhan Transfer Co., Wilmington, Del.	1	26.45	7
C. O. Young, Ocala, Fla.	1	22.75	1

[1] Suspended.

The Grant and Roosevelt Memorials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 22, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper article by William Fulton:

FD SHRINE A CONTRAST TO GRANT'S TOMB
(By William Fulton)

NEW YORK, May 21.—This is the story of two memorials and how they grew. One is the unfinished, neglected tomb of General Grant here in the city and the other is the plush, well-appointed shrine of the late President Roosevelt at Hyde Park.

New York has failed to live up to its promises to complete the Grant Monument perched on the heights over the Hudson River. Each year the city doles out a pittance to keep three employees there. The Federal Government has never given a nickel toward this memorial for the general who welded his country together on the battlefield.

On the other hand in the last 3 years alone the Federal Government (taxpayers) has shelled out $463,621 for the maintenance of the Franklin D. Roosevelt national historic site and library. It is the only memorial started by a President during his lifetime to perpetuate his name.

MORE THAN 50 EMPLOYEES

More than 50 guards, historians, librarians, and maintenance men are employed at Hyde Park. It takes two different government agencies to run the show. The National Park Service maintains the home and the grave, while the National Archives operates the library of Roosevelt papers with the attached museum of his efforts starting out with a baptismal gown.

Perpetuators of the Roosevelt legend, such as Robert Sherwood, the playwright, point out that $360,629.95 was taken in from the sale of admission tickets at 25 cents per head the first 3 years. Even so the cost to the taxpayers is far outstripping public interest and the gap is expected to widen when the newness wears off.

Superintendent of the Hyde Park administrative force is George A. Palmer, who hails from Columbia City, Ind. Palmer was formerly boss of the Statue of Liberty in New York Harbor.

THREE AT GRANT'S TOMB

Heading the staff of three at Grant's Tomb is the curator, George Burnside. His father's cousin was Gen. Ambrose Burnside, one of Grant's major generals. He has an assistant curator and a maintenance man to clean up inside the memorial.

"Of course, I think it's a shame the memorial has never been completed, said Curator Burnside. "It should have been taken care of a long time ago."

No admission is charged at Grant's Tomb and more than a quarter million visitors, mostly school children, view it each year. Outside of an annual $9,000 handout by the City of New York, the memorial is administered by a private organization, the Grant Monument Association, the president of which is Cornelius W. Wickersham (lieutenant general, New York National Guard, retired).

Farmers Home Administration Has Splendid Record of Achievement—Needs More Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 22, 1950

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, of all Federal Government agencies operating in my District, none has the splendid record of the Farmers Home Administration. Their courteous, efficient, yet business-like operation, has won the hearts of all people as a real friend in need.

Thousands of family farms are in existence today in northern Wisconsin only because of help and guidance from the Farmers Home Administration. Drought stricken farmers found a place of refuge in the FHA. Thousands of veterans were rehabilitated on farms because of help from the FHA.

With so splendid a record at no actual cost to taxpayers in the end, it is tragic that this agency is short of loaning money about six months of the year. One of the greatest things this Congress could do is to appropriate sufficient funds to this agency for full operation the year round.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following tables showing in no uncertain terms the good this agency has done and what its needs are for full-scale operation:

TABLE I.—*Production and subsistence operating loan activities during first 9 months of the 1950 and 1949 fiscal years—10th Congressional District, Wisconsin*

County	Veteran and nonveteran								Veteran only							
	July 1, 1949, to Mar. 31, 1950			July 1, 1948, to Mar. 31, 1949			Estimated requirements from Apr. 1 to June 30, 1950, for which no funds are available		July 1, 1949, to Mar. 31, 1950			July 1, 1948, to Mar. 31, 1949			Estimated requirements from Apr. 1 to June 30, 1950, for which no funds are available	
	Number of applications received	Loans made		Number of applications received	Loans made		Number of applications	Amount funds needed	Number of applications received	Loans made		Number of applications received	Loans made		Number of applications	Amount funds needed
		Number	Amount		Number	Amount				Number	Amount		Number	Amount		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)
Ashland, Iron and Bayfield	110	69	$113,815	79	53	$65,290	62	$103,500	52	40	$69,855	37	27	$38,930	25	$46,000
Burnett and Washburn	71	37	52,740	124	78	79,655	81	101,000	28	21	30,190	49	36	35,615	29	30,000
Douglas	18	1	1,000	0	0	0	44	63,600	7	1	1,000	0	0	0	15	22,000
Lincoln and Oneida	75	28	43,410	59	38	50,500	61	107,000	41	16	26,060	37	20	29,730	40	68,000
Vilas and Price	93	53	48,945	116	96	40,530	44	87,000	55	31	26,660	54	45	23,685	25	49,000
Polk	109	69	92,750	110	62	69,350	101	176,000	57	48	69,360	54	39	38,930	33	63,000
Rusk	45	44	56,465	87	65	64,115	50	74,000	24	23	32,010	49	39	44,150	22	42,000
Sawyer	53	33	44,800	51	50	53,640	32	56,000	16	14	21,000	14	18	25,200	12	23,000
Taylor	133	79	93,105	104	90	85,230	61	111,000	67	37	64,160	35	29	41,120	34	72,000
Total	707	413	547,070	730	532	508,710	536	879,100	347	231	340,295	329	253	277,360	235	415,000

TABLE 2.—*Farm ownership loans, cumulative from inception of program through Mar. 31, 1950—10th Congressional District, Wisconsin*

County	Total number of borrowers	Borrowers paid in full	Borrowers with outstanding loans			
			Number	Amount loaned	Amount paid (principal and interest)	Amount paid in excess of maturities
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Ashland, Iron, and Bayfield	46	18	28	$79,899	$18,127	$3,797
Burnett and Washburn	86	33	53	174,157	45,548	11,489
Douglas	31	13	18	52,085	16,831	5,714
Lincoln and Oneida	72	36	36	129,154	26,610	5,134
Vilas and Price	76	46	30	67,584	30,498	6,794
Polk	54	14	40	261,242	41,072	10,830
Rusk	79	25	54	180,851	42,574	8,484
Sawyer	35	11	24	86,679	12,302	794
Taylor	161	52	109	311,134	76,509	6,483
Total	640	248	392	1,342,785	310,071	59,519

TABLE 3.—*Disaster and fur loans made during first 9 months of the 1950 fiscal year (July 1, 1949–Mar. 31, 1950)—10th Congressional District, Wisconsin*

County	Number	Amount
	(1)	(2)
Ashland, Iron and Bayfield	51	$76,160
Burnett and Washburn	77	110,785
Douglas	5	6,915
Lincoln and Oneida	6	5,660
Vilas and Price	35	29,500
Polk	16	27,320
Rusk	28	20,985
Sawyer	46	48,005
Taylor	96	79,090
Total	360	404,420

Protection of the Lace Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 1950

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters:

STATE OF RHODE ISLAND
AND PROVIDENCE PLANTATIONS,
Providence, R. I., May 18, 1950.

Hon. JOHN E. FOGARTY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JOHN: Recently I appeared at the forty-eighth anniversary celebration of the Amalgamated Lace Operatives of America at the Narragansett Hotel.

It was quite evident to me from the speeches that were being made that there is a great deal of apprehension among the workers in the lace industry in Rhode Island that the conferences to be held in Torquay, England, in September to discuss the further lowering of tariffs will do irreparable harm to our economy and result in the loss of jobs to lace workers.

There are 5,000 people in Rhode Island who are employed in the lace industry, and while I understand that there must be some reciprocity with reference to imports and exports, I feel that the Federal Government in dealing with the tariff situation should seriously consider the fact that we in Rhode Island have already been classified as a distressed area.

Only the other day a group of the workers called on me and appealed that I appear before the Committee for Reciprocity Information and lay before its members Rhode Island's plight with reference to this situation, which I have promised to do. In the meantime, I am enclosing herewith a photostatic copy of the memorandum that was submitted to me by the representatives of the union locals in the hope that you will do everything within your power to see to it that this industry is protected in every way possible.

Sincerely,

JOHN O. PASTORE,
Governor,

AMALGAMATED LACE OPERATIVES
OF AMERICA,
Philadelphia, Pa., May 17, 1950.

GOV. JOHN O. PASTORE,
State House, Providence, R. I.

YOUR EXCELLENCY: We represent the Rhode Island branches of the Amalgamated Lace Operatives of America, lever section, which is the national union, composed of skilled lace makers throughout the United States.

There are four branches in Rhode Island. Branch No. 6 in Pawtucket and Central Falls, of which I am secretary; branch No. 7, representing union members in the whole Pawtuxet Valley; branch No. 16, representing the workers in Bristol County; and branch No. 19, representing the workers in South County.

We are calling on you, Governor, to take advantage of the offer of help you made us recently when you were kind enough to speak at the forty-eighth anniversary dinner of branch No. 6 in the Narragansett Hotel on April 15.

You were kind enough to say at that time that "the lace industry is very important to the State of Rhode Island and if there is any way that I can help you, my address is Smith Street and I am generally there at 9 o'clock in the morning."

Your past activities have proven to us that you are a man of your word, and that is the reason we feel confident that when we have explained our situation to you, you will be glad to add the strength of your high office to the work which we are trying to do.

We are very much worried that the present program of some persons in Washington to arrange to lower tariffs at conferences which will be held in Torquay, England, in September may result, as it has done before, in depriving us and our associates of the opportunity to work full time at our trade.

During the past year the importation of laces from France, which is our chief competitor, has increased immensely and already the effects of this increase in importations has been seriously felt by our members. Many lace mills in Rhode Island have been on short time during the last few months and we have been reliably informed that a number of the smaller mills in West Warwick will shut down shortly for lack of orders.

You can readily realize what the consequences to us will be if the imports of French and British laces are permitted to increase further over the large amounts that are now coming in. We are informed on good authority that already, in certain types of laces, the market in New York is glutted with lace.

The spokesmen here today represent approximately 5,000 highly skilled workers located in the Pawtuxet Valley, in Pawtucket and Central Falls, West Barrington, Bristol, and the South County. A large majority of us have voted for you in the past and hope to have the pleasure of voting for you again. We are truly your constituents. We seek your aid.

We remember you stating at our dinner that you had heard the statement that "in order to export you had to import" so often that you were getting a little tired of it. We admit that importation is necessary to every country but we feel that foreign countries have a tremendous advantage with devalued currency, low wages, and long hours, and we cannot see why, if they already have these advantages, they should be given any more. We are very certain that we wish to keep our high standard of living and not be forced, as we were in the dark days from 1936 to 1939, to accept reductions in wages so that our employers could sell their goods in competition with France.

The members of our union earn approximately four times as much for a 40-hour week as their English friends and about five times as much as their French competitors.

We have with us today the wage scale paid in the Calais area of France for the same work we do in the United States of America and it is so low we wonder how these people can live. We think the attack on this problem should be for the lacemakers in France and England to endeavor to bring their wages up where they belong instead of dumping the goods which they manufacture in the United States where the prices will only help to force down the American standards which we have fought many years to obtain. We are firm believers in fair competition but we are not at all sure that fair competition exists under the present conditions.

The Amalgamated Lace Operatives of America, lever section, has been in existence for over 50 years. All of the twisthands in the United States belong to it. We were one of the first unions to engage in industry-wide collective bargaining and with one exception, in 1917, there has never been a break in the pleasant relations which have existed between our union and the manufacturers.

Our members are the highest paid and most highly skilled of any persons employed in the textile industry. We have contributed our share to social security and are proud to say that because our people have been steadily employed, we have collected few benefits.

We are proud of our record in the purchase of savings bonds. We have waived our rights in order to help veterans learn a good trade and have permitted many more than the usual number of apprentices to enter the trade.

All of these things we want to continue. We believe our Government should make it easy for us to continue to work and support our families instead of putting obstacles in our way such as tariff cuts which simply means that our Government is making it easier for our competitors abroad to do the work which we are willing and able to do.

Our national president, Mr. Frederick Dixon, has already been in Washington and will be there again presenting before the Committee for Reciprocity Information and other appropriate bodies, the protest of our united membership against any further reductions in tariffs. We feel that if we could have your help it would carry a great deal of

weight and go a long way toward making our protest successful.

On March 15, 1938 the Honorable Robert E. Quinn, at that time Governor of the State of Rhode Island, appeared in Washington as he stated, "On behalf of a great majority of the citizens of Rhode Island" and made a strong and thoughtful attack opposing downward revision of tariffs. Governor Quinn stated at that time that "reductions or concessions in rates will prove harmful to our industry," a statement which we can assure you is as true today as it was then. Governor Quinn ended his plea by stating "surely our Federal Government is not going to do anything which would lower our present standard of living. We have faith in our Federal officers. We believe that they, like us, are determined to build up and not destroy this faith. Our hopes and aspirations are for still more of the better things of life. We fear that any lowering of the present tariff rates would at this time bring about a still further decrease in employment."

Governor Quinn's suggestions were not followed. Tariff cuts on laces went into effect. The French devalued the franc. The only thing that saved the American lace industry from complete dissolution was the advent of the war which came about a year following his remarks.

We feel very sure that our national representatives would welcome your appearance before the Committee for Reciprocity Information where you might repeat your observations made at our dinner on April 15 when you stated in substance that with 43,000 out of work in Rhode Island it was the duty of those persons in Washington bent on further reducing tariffs, to stop and think what effect it might have on employment in industry in this State.

If the pressure of official business makes it impossible for you to make a personal appearance in Washington we feel very sure that you will take other appropriate action to help protect the jobs, the families, and the livelihood of us, your constituents.

Respectfully submitted,

Branch No. 19 (Alton), George L. Noyes, secretary, T. H. Smith, president; Branch No. 16 (West Barrington and Bristol), Edgar J. Wiggin, president; Henry C. Walther, secretary; Branch No. 7 (West Warwick, Coventry, and Washington), Douglas Jackson, president, Raymond Bradley, secretary; Branch No. 6 (Pawtucket and Central Falls), Louis Playe, secretary-treasurer, George Helsens, assistant secretary; for the Rhode Island branches of the Amalgamated Lace Operatives of America, Lever section.

Segregation in Washington Swimming Pools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SIDNEY R. YATES
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 22, 1950

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Sun-Times of May 16, 1950:

WATCH FOR H. R. 5968

In Washington, D. C., there are six swimming pools in recreation areas operated by the Federal Government. Prior to 1940 there was a policy of segregation in effect. Since that time, the Government has refrained from using its power to enforce segregation. This policy is based on the belief that the Government should not discriminate against any of its citizens because of their race.

From time to time the Interior Department, which operates the parks, has offered to transfer all of such Washington facilities to the local District recreation board, provided that a policy of nondiscrimination was followed. The local board agreed to allow persons of all races to use such facilities as tennis courts without a pattern of segregation. But it refused to follow the same policy regarding swimming pools.

For that reason the Interior Department has refused to allow the local board to operate the pools. Last year, for the first time, some trouble was experienced at some of the pools. They were closed down. This year the Interior Department is prepared to operate all pools and assign enough police to stop trouble. Anyone who objects to nonsegregated bathing can stay home.

An attempt to get around the Interior Department's position will be made in the House of Representatives next Monday. A bill to transfer all the recreational facilities of the District of Columbia from the Interior Department to the local board will come up for a vote.

The sole object of the bill is to place control in the hands of officials who would enforce racial segregation.

An attempt may be made to sneak it through without much discussion and in the absence of strong "equal rights" Representatives.

Congressmen who believe in the principles of equal rights regardless of race or creed will make a special effort to be present in order to vote the bill down. The number is H. R. 5968.

Federal Aid for Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 22, 1950

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, for several years the schools of America have been confronted with the need for additional funds with which to properly educate our youth.

In most school districts the people recognized the need, promptly accepted the local responsibility and provided the needed funds.

The people in such districts well knew that the funds provided at the local level would be more wisely and economically spent than would be the so-called easy money from Washington. Furthermore, they knew that funds provided at the local level would insure local control of their schools.

In the few school districts where the people failed to accept their local responsibility too many of the people have been looking to Washington for funds.

The Columbus (Ohio) Citizen and the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer, by way of the editorial page, have clearly and logically pointed out the fallacy and the danger of looking to Washington for funds to finance the schools.

In accordance with permission granted by the House, the editorials follow:

[From the Columbus (Ohio) Citizen of May 18, 1950]

HELPING SCHOOLS

Recently when their schools were in danger of closing for lack of money, the people of Kansas City voted to raise their taxes.

Women played a big role in the campaign. They rang doorbells, called city-wide rallies and preached their cause wherever they went. With other civic-minded citizens, they got the parents out to vote. This meant victory for the schools—which will remain open.

That's the way they should be kept open everywhere. When men and women are really interested in local affairs, those affairs usually are well run. Lethargy follows the rush to Washington for hand-outs.

As the Government takes over our responsibilities, we become less capable of handling them. And gradually the coma of regimentation sets in, and we grow more apathetic about our own business.

The money voted for schools by Kansas Citians will be spent at home. It leaves their pockets and goes directly into school funds. There is no journey to the National Treasury and back, with scores of persons taking their bit along the way. This expense, which in many cases is unnecessary, is one thing that makes our taxes so burdensome.

And the schools never will be well run unless the parents are sincerely concerned about the way they are managed and what they teach. It is not sensible of us to turn such things over to Washington officials, no matter how well-intentioned they may be.

This country is too big to have good centralized Government. And Government is never good when the people are not interested enough in local business to wish to run it to suit themselves.

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer of May 15, 1950]

FEDERALCRAT PHILOSOPHY

In one of his whistle stop speeches in Montana, President Truman, unwittingly perhaps, revealed the moral bankruptcy of his spendthrift administration.

He was discussing what he described as "a real crisis" faced by the Nation's schools. Congress should remedy that situation, he said, by an appropriation of Federal money to the States.

No doubt there are many people who will see no harm in this philosophy. To them it will seem like a simple proposition—if the schools need money, let the Federal Government provide it.

This philosophy is based on the erroneous assumption that the Federal Government possesses a bottomless cornucopia into which Congress can dip as it pleases, scattering wealth and abundance over the land, relieving this and that situation, satisfying this or that group.

That is the federalcrat philosophy—the philosophy that everyone should turn to the Federal Government for help in times of stress; that the Central Government in Washington should provide aid for all who seek it, even though they have the means to help themselves.

It is a false philosophy because the Federal Government does not possess unlimited resources. In fact, it has no money of its own whatsoever. It can get money only by taking it away from the people in the form of taxes or by engaging in deficit financing, a process which robs the people by causing inflation and depreciating the purchasing power of their savings and earnings.

Now in the case of the schools, the amount of money the Truman administration wants

to give them is not so much, compared with other Government expenditures. But one thing is certain, a $300,000,000 appropriation this year would be followed by demands for $500,000,000 next year and constantly increasing amounts thereafter.

But why should the Federal Government provide any money for local education? The Federal Government already is $256,000,000,000 in debt. This year it is expected to spend from six to eight billion dollars more than it takes in; next year the administration has planned another deficit of more than five billion. Decidedly this is not the time for the Federal Government to undertake any new expenditure that is not necessary to national survival.

In contrast, nearly all the State governments are solvent. Few of them still have the large surpluses they accumulated during the war, but most, if not all, of them are financially stable and capable of supplying the needs of their own schools if they want to. There is no justification whatever for the Federal Government taking more money away from the people, or piling up more debt, in order to give the same money back to the States, less the amount the bureaucrats retain for their own maintenance.

There is another serious aspect to the proposal of Federal aid to schools. That is the issue of Federal control versus State control. Truman said he was "wholeheartedly in favor of continuing State control over education." The Federal Government should give the money to the States and let them decide how to spend it, he said.

The President's assumption that Federal control would not be a concomitant of Federal aid was no more than a pious hope, or an expression of opinion. His assumption is contrary to all the past history of Federal aid programs. In 1938 the Federal Government withheld $1,300,000 from the Ohio old age pension fund because it was not being administered according to Federal regulations. Did anyone ever hear of Federal highway funds being used for projects not approved by the Federal Government? No, Federal control always follows Federal aid, in spite of Truman's attempt to delude himself and others into believing otherwise.

In these whistle-stop remarks, we see the true nature of the federalcrat philosophy—keep giving away the people's money, even though you have to rob them in order to get it.

"The Need To Encourage Our Friends Among the Nations a Compelling Argument for the Extension of the Selective Service Act of 1948"—Speech of the Secretary of Defense at Armed Forces Day Dinner—A Report to the People and the President on a Matter of Legislative Priority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 22, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday, the 20th of May, the people of the United States paid tribute to the Armed Forces of the United States. They paid tribute not to the Army, not to the Navy, not to the Air Force, but to all the Armed Services, united in one defense team. I can imagine no more heartening or significant display of our unity as a Nation and in our determination to establish an adequate defense for our Nation than the expression of that unity that took the form of observances of Armed Forces Day in most of the cities and towns and in all of the States of the Nation.

The Nation-wide observance of the first Armed Forces Day began with a dinner held here in Washington on the eve of Armed Forces Day, at which distinguished representatives of all the services and of the congressional committees charged with military affairs were present. This was a dinner under the joint sponsorship of the Navy League of the United States, the Military Order of the World Wars, and the Air Force Association. Dr. Vannevar Bush, who has contributed so notably to the cooperation of American scientists with the Defense Establishment, was master of ceremonies. The speakers of the occasion were the President of the United States and the Secretary of Defense. What they said at the Armed Forces Day dinner in Washington, D. C., on the night of May 19 will echo for some time to come and we will be hearing the echoes in this legislative chamber.

The address of the Honorable Louis A. Johnson was notable as a report to the Nation by the Secretary of Defense on the state of our defense and the needs of the Defense Establishment. After reviewing his decision to replace the separate celebrations held in other years for each of our Armed Forces with a single day of commemoration, Mr. Johnson reviewed the difficulties encountered in choosing a suitable day. It was the practical and distinguished chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. Omar Bradley, who made the suggestion that led to the choice of the third Saturday in May, which will henceforth be celebrated.

The creation of such a single day of celebration seemed called for by the fact of unification itself. And just as unification inspired the splendid displays and the magnificent demonstrations of unification that took place on Army posts, Air Force bases, and at Navy installations throughout the country, so unification has produced a healthy state of preparedness, tailored in accordance with our traditional American philosophy of national defense. But even that preparedness must be strengthened.

Ours is a philosophy of defense—

Said Mr. Johnson.

It does require that all the men and all the munitions necessary to conduct an all-out war be ready in full capacity at all times. What we seek first by way of preparedness is a force of sufficient strength to deter aggression and to make impossible the defeat of America by any blitz attack of any dimensions. The lessons of two world wars have shown the world that in a prolonged contest our production, our skill, our organization, and our resources will make us hard to beat What we need, therefore, is a sufficiency of defense of such formidability as to convince a possible aggressor that we also cannot be beaten quickly on a hit-and-run basis.

Our needs have been translated into a defense program which the President has approved. It is now before the Congress. It takes into full account the fiscal position of our Government and the military necessities for our defense. We have asked only for what we absolutely need and can advantageously spend.

Mr. Johnson expressed his confidence of congressional support because of the consistency with which Members of Congress have always supported defense measures, and shown their interest in the needs and comfort of the splendid American men and women who serve in our armed forces.

This support is required now for the extension of the Selective Service Act of 1948, due to expire this year. The President has asked for such an extension in his message on the State of the Union. The measure is now before the Congress. The Department of Defense has urged its adoption. Mr. Johnson advanced four sound arguments for extending the act.

Mr. Speaker, the most compelling of the arguments, in the words of Mr. Johnson, is the psychological one, the need to encourage our friends among other nations who with courage and fortitude are striving to remain calm under the pressure of a potential aggressor.

Those friends of ours overseas—

Said Mr. Johnson—

are stout-hearted men devoted to democracy and peace. So far they have successfully charted their course between the honeyed promises of Utopian communism and the bitter facts of aggressive imperialism. They have held communism at bay. With our support they have gained the economic strength which is the best guaranty to the stability of their Government and to the elimination of the misery and the poverty on which the Communist bacillus thrives. Now we are extending them a helping hand with military aid to make them stronger and even more independent.

To them our continuance of selective service means more than a guaranty of sufficient manpower to keep the ranks of our Armed Forces filled. It symbolizes, beyond that, the readiness of free men to give of themselves. No amount of economic and military aid, important as each of them may be, carries with it the spirit of personal sacrifice that is inherent in a selective-service system, adopted by the free choice of a free people. Money, flour, cotton, machinery, guns, planes, ammunition—these and other items are physical needs, indispensable to economic recovery and military strength. Such requirements we can meet without oppressive hardship out of our economy and out of the rich bounty that a divine providence has granted the American people. Selective service implies a spiritual contribution. It presents the young American giving of himself, his time, his comfort, and his chosen way of life to prepare himself for his military duties as a citizen in defense of his country. Our friends overseas who have given so much and have suffered so much understand that service to be genuine must call for real sacrifice, the kind of sacrifice that is inherent in duty with the colors. Whether we need in fact to employ selective service to fill our ranks or not, the important consideration that we have it on the books and can invoke it when necessary will prove a constant reminder to all that we are conscious of our duty and that we shall remain true to our obligations.

The other arguments for the extension of the Selective Service Act of 1948 can be listed briefly, Mr. Speaker. They are, second, to provide a means to save time

in mobilization; third, to guarantee our retaining the full strength we need in our Armed Forces; and, fourth, to assist in the maintenance of strong Reserve forces.

All of these are valid arguments and in normal times would be sufficient to urge the maintenance of preparedness. But these are not normal times. We are already in a cold war, a war in which we must win and hold allies, for if we do not we shall face the enemy alone.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include in the Appendix of the RECORD, as an extension of my remarks, the full text of the remarks of the Secretary of Defense, that all Americans can read the report of the man best qualified to know, on what is, in his opinion, our most pressing present need.

The address follows:

We have gathered here at the National Capital, on the eve of America's first Armed Forces Day, to honor all of the men and women who wear the uniform of our country—Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force Regular, National Guard, and Reserve. Armed Forces Day replaces the separate celebrations held in other years for each of our armed forces. It is a symbol of their unification in the public service.

It is especially appropriate to have with us on such an occasion the one man who is most responsible for the unification of our armed forces—our Commander in Chief, the President of the United States.

History will record that unification was planned and achieved under the leadership of President Truman. Moreover, it will recall that long before he became President, the idea of unification had appealed to his logical mind. It is worth pointing out, that, in August 1944, when he was still United States Senator from Missouri, Mr. Truman had marshaled his arguments into an article which stands out even today as one of the most cogent briefs for unification.

Let me quote a few extracts from this article which appeared in a national magazine 1 year before VJ-day.

"For years," said Senator Truman, "the American Legion, out of the membership's first-hand knowledge of the need, has urged the unification of the country's fighting forces. I helped to frame this Legion policy and endorsed it without reservation. As a Senator, faced daily with the confusions and conflicts inherent in separated commands, what was a belief has grown into a sincere conviction. But if this background had been lacking, what happened on December 7, 1941, would have made me the ardent champion of a single authority over everything that pertains to America's safety."

In this article, Senator Truman then went on to give example after example of indecision, waste, duplication, and extravagance in the conduct of war that unification might have eliminated. He closed his article with a plea for concentration of America's defensive and offensive strength under one command ending the present jangles and jumbles and a return to the single authority inherent in the establishment of 1789 of one War Department over both ground and sea forces.

Mr. Truman meant what he said, and as soon as he was placed at the helm of authority, he set machinery in motion to achieve unification of our armed forces. The first result was the National Security Act of 1947. When that statute failed to achieve adequately the kind of unification he had in mind, he pressed for amendments and got them. Last year we obtained what we further needed by way of legislative authority to make unification work; and today it is working.

A year ago the very concept of unification was still being challenged. Today, it is no longer an issue. It is a fact. We have a national-defense team, in every sense of the word. We have eliminated a great deal of waste and duplication. We have defined roles and missions for the respective services, and each is exerting its full energies to perfect its techniques and its tactics to perform the duties assigned it. The over-all agencies, such as the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Munitions Board, the Research and Development Board and the others have proved by the efficient and equitable administration of their duties that unification can be fair and just to all three services, that it can save hundreds of millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money, and that it can, at the same time, give America the kind of defense we need in this troubled world of today.

It has been my duty and privilege for the past 14 months as Secretary of Defense to carry out this public mandate to achieve greater unification, as a means toward greater efficiency and greater military strengtl..

My job has not always been easy, but it has never been dull. It has been challenging and stimulating. We have not even yet attained all the ultimate goals of unfication, but it is becoming easier every day to bring the three Services closer together and have them compose any differences which may arise in an atmosphere of cooperation, without rancor or suspicion on the part of anyone. That kind of spirit of team play took time to develop.

In fact, when I first took over my duties as Secretary of Defense, the simplest projects of unification invariably ran into unexpected snags. As an example, let us take the very matter of the Armed Forces Day itself.

It occurred to me shortly after taking office that it might be a good idea, as a symbol of defense unification, to have one Armed Forces Day instead of each service having a special day of its own. I found that a similar idea had been current for at least 18 months without any action being taken. It appeared that one service wholeheartedly favored it. Another was at first noncommittal but later enthusiastic for it. The third was still unalterably opposed. I read all the studies and all the reports on the subject. They presented a rather healthy volume. I discussed the matter with the three secretaries of the Military Establishment, with the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and with various other members of my staff. I felt that the subject had been under study long enough and warranted a definite decision without further delay. So in the course of the Army Day parade last year I mentioned the matter to President Truman. I did not have to present any arguments to him at all. The idea appealed immediately. Enthusiastically, he approved the project.

I came back to the Pentagon highly pleased with my accomplishment, but only to find that my troubles had just begun.

"Yes, you have authority for an Armed Forces Day, but what day will it be?" asked my staff.

The most obvious day seemed to me to be September 18. That was the day the National Military Establishment had come into existence—but that was also the day the United States Air Force was born, I was reminded. September 18 was therefore ruled out lest it be misconstrued as favoritism to the Air Force. For similar reasons, we immediately had to throw out of consideration Army Day, April 6, and Navy Day, October 27.

Then came the suggestion to combine Armed Forces Day with an already accepted date in American history—Armistice Day, Memorial Day, Independence Day, Constitution Day. After some consideration we concluded that any effort to build up a double commemoration for such a day might detract from its significance for either purpose. So these days, too, were ruled out.

Further suggestions included D-day, VE-day, VJ-day, Pearl Harbor day, and others, but objections arose in each case. D-day, it was said, would appeal only to those who reached Europe across the English Channel. VE-day, it was urged, would commemorate only the achievements of our forces in the European theater. VJ-day, on the other hand, it was argued, was more particularly meaningful for those who had served in the Pacific. Pearl Harbor day was a date of national disaster, totally unfitting for patriotic celebration. And, thus, one day after another had to be ruled out.

Finally, someone suggested March 23. That was the day on which Patrick Henry exclaimed: "Give me liberty or give me death!" That date seemed highly acceptable and some headway had been made, until someone came up with the full text of Patrick Henry's speech, and we found it was a strong appeal for an out-and-out war. Such a theme, we felt, was not consistent with our present concept of national defense which aims to build our forces to deter war, to become strong enough to discourage aggression, to achieve peace through strength and only as a last resort to engage in combat. Other objections arose. March presented an unfavorable weather risk. March was the month for the annual Red Cross drive. March 23 would normally coincide with the Lenten season, if not with Holy Week. So, the date of March 23 had to go into limbo alongside the suggestions that had been made earlier.

At this time I turned the subject over to our practical Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. Omar Bradley. He came up with a suggestion of some Saturday in May. Here, too, there were possible conflicts. There was Mother's Day and Memorial Day to consider. The third Saturday in May, however, seemed to present no conflict.

I was at the point of adopting the date when someone reminded me that the third Saturday in May this year is May 20 and May 20 is the anniversary of the Mecklenburg Declaration of Independence. To lend additional authority to the coincidence of dates, I was told that May 20, 1775, appears clearly on the State seal and the State flag of North Carolina to commemorate this event.

There probably is no document in American history that was the subject of greater controversy in the early days of our Republic than the Mecklenburg Declaration of Independence. Its strongest supporters contended that it was the source and inspiration of the Declaration of Independence. At this point I sought the advice of a distinguished son of North Carolina, Gordon Gray, who was then Secretary of the Army. He assured me that May 20, 1775, was a significant day in the history of North Carolina but that it was not unduly celebrated even in that State and would most certainly not interfere with any Armed Forces Day. We had jumped the last hurdle. I approved the date. The White House endorsed it. It was my privilege to announce it at the American Legion convention last fall.

So, tomorrow, accordingly, we shall celebrate Armed Forces Day in a spirit of national unification. Led by military, civic, and veterans' organizations throughout the land the American people will make the day a memorable one. They will use the occasion not only to honor the men and women in the service, but also to take stock of the

state of our readiness to defend ourselves against aggression.

They will find an Army, Navy, and Air Force in a healthy state of preparedness, tailored in accordance with our traditional American philosophy of national defense. Our historic philosophy is opposed to aggression, and consistent with that democratic principle, we are against the maintenance of large bodies of troops in peacetime for immediate offensive action, lest the very size of our forces create unwarranted suspicion of our intentions.

Ours is a philosophy of defense. It does not require that all the men and all the munitions necessary to conduct all-out war, be ready in full capacity at all times. What we seek first by way of preparedness is a force of sufficient strength to deter aggression and to make impossible the defeat of America by any blitz attack of any dimensions. The lessons of two world wars have shown the world that in a prolonged contest our production, our skill, our organization, and our resources will make us hard to beat. What we need, therefore, is a sufficiency of defense of such formidability as to convince a possible aggressor that we also cannot be beaten quickly on a hit-and-run basis.

Our needs have been translated into a defense program which the President has approved. It is now before the Congress. It takes into full account the fiscal position of our Government and the military necessities for our defense. We have asked only for what we absolutely need and can advantageously spend.

We are confident of congressional support because we have learned by experience that when it comes to national defense our representatives in the Senate and in the House are first, last, and always of one mind. As loyal Americans, they think and act only in terms of adequate security in the national interest. No matter how they disagree on other issues, as Republicans and as Democrats, they throw aside their differences and work whole-heartedly when they consider our requirements for the common defense. It gives me great pleasure at this meeting, with so many Members of the Congress in attendance, to acknowledge publicly their enthusiastic support of the national defense, and their interest in the needs and comfort of the splendid American men and women who serve in our armed forces.

The healthy spirit of unification which we have fostered among the Army, Navy, and Air Force has proved contagious. It has spread not only across our regular forces; it has shown itself in the way Congress and the Department of Defense work together. It has manifested itself in the relations between the Regular forces and the Reserves. It has been exhibited in the diplomatic-military team of the State and Defense Departments in the military-aid program, in the North Atlantic Treaty operations, and in all matters jointly affecting the two Departments. The State Department announcement of military aid for French Indochina has the full support of the Department of Defense. Finally, there is this meeting itself. It constitutes to me the very essence of unification, with the Navy League of the United States, the Military Order of the World Wars, and the Air Force Association all working together with a singleness of purpose to make a memorable success of our first Armed Forces Day.

I come now to ask for the whole-hearted support of another worthy national defense project fully deserving of the unified backing of the American people. I refer to the extension of the Selective Service Act of 1948 due to expire this year.

The President has asked for such an extension in his message on the State of the Union. The measure is now before the Congress. The Department of Defense has urged its adoption. I have already made known my own views in the matter and shall merely touch upon them tonight. When I appeared before the Armed Service Committee of the House of Representatives in January I asked for an extension of Selective Service, first, to encourage our friends among the nations; second, to provide a means to save time in mobilization; third, to guarantee our retaining the full strength we need in our armed forces; and fourth, to assist in the maintenance of strong reserve forces. All four are sound arguments for extending the Act.

At the moment the most compelling is the first one, the psychological one, the need to encourage our friends. The shadow of sprawling imperialism creeps dangerously close to their borders. With one hand it beckons them toward a perfect classless society without conflict, with all the land divided, and all the wealth shared. With the other hand, it raises a threatening club with which to beat its neighbors into submission. It takes courage and fortitude for these nations to retain poise and to remain calm under such pressure.

Those friends of ours overseas are stout-hearted men devoted to democracy and peace. So far they have successfully charted their course between the honeyed promises of Utopian communism and the bitter facts of aggressive imperialism. They have held communism at bay. With our support they have gained the economic strength which is the best guaranty to the stability of their government and to the elimination of the misery and the poverty on which the Communist bacillus thrives. Now we are extending them a helping hand with the military aid to make them stronger and even more independent.

To them our continuance of Selective Service means more than a guaranty of sufficient manpower to keep the ranks of our armed forces filled. It symbolizes, beyond that, the readiness of free men to give of themselves. No amount of economic and military aid, important as each of them may be, carries with it the spirit of personal sacrifice that is inherent in a selective service system, adopted by the free choice of a free people. Money, flour, cotton, machinery, guns, planes, ammunition—these and other items are physical needs, indispensable to economic recovery and military strength. Such requirements we can meet without oppressive hardship out of our economy and out of the rich bounty that a divine providence has granted the American people. Selective Service implies a spiritual contribution. It presents the young American giving of himself, his time, his comfort, and his chosen way of life to prepare himself for his military duties as a citizen in defense of his country. Our friends overseas who have given so much and have suffered so much understand that service to be genuine must call for real sacrifice, the kind of sacrifice that is inherent in duty with the colors. Whether we need in fact to employ selective service to fill our ranks or not, the important consideration that we have it on the books and can invoke it when necessary, will prove a constant reminder to all that we are conscious of our duty and that we shall remain true to our obligations.

So let us dedicate this Armed Forces Day not only to recall the gallant sacrifices of past generations of our fighting men, but also to remind our young men of today and their fathers and mothers that they, too, have an obligation to serve, and that by their readiness to serve, they will best help keep America at peace—strong and free—and assure the preservation of our civilization for posterity.

The American Merchant Marine in War and Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. HART
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 1950

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, the National Rivers and Harbors Congress recently held its fortieth annual convention in the city of Washington. Among the addresses delivered was that by Mr. John Forney Rudy, director of public relations, National Federation of American Shipping. The subject of his address was the American Merchant Marine in War and Peace. The address follows:

Mr. Chairman, gentlemen, your very good friend, and mine, Bill Webb, asked me to appear before you this morning to talk about our American merchant marine, in peace and in war. He particularly wanted me to make special reference to the relationship of ocean shipping to a subject dear to your hearts, the rivers and harbors of the United States.

To talk about shipping without mentioning rivers and harbors might be compared to a train without a terminal. Without rivers and harbors, and their tremendous development in the United States, our merchant marine would be unable to exist.

As a matter of fact, much of the existence of the merchant marine results primarily because of the facilities of our great natural waterways, not in spite of them.

For example, American steel has long been a very heavy item of export. Much of it is exported due to American methods of mass production and efficiency. There is also a great volume exported due to its carriage from such inland producing centers as Birmingham, Pittsburgh, and other cities by the comparatively inexpensive water transportation available from those centers to our great port areas.

There is no doubt that a great deal of steel made in Pittsburgh is sold in foreign markets largely because it can be transported by barge at half the cost per ton to seaport as by rail carriage.

Today we find many of the harbors on our Gulf coast teeming with activity, handling millions of tons of cargoes they didn't dream they would handle a few decades ago. Why? One need only to look to the development of the great river systems draining what has been called the Mississippi Valley with its tremendous production, and the great rate differentials enjoyed by the natural waterways over other forms of transportation, to understand immediately why our Gulf ports are enjoying unprecedented activity.

The work performed by the National Rivers and Harbors Congress is therefore of great importance to American shipping. Likewise I feel that you should know the importance of American shipping to our harbors and great inland waterways. We have a definite mutuality of interest and concern over both the rivers and harbors and the American merchant marine.

There was a time that, for lack of a large, regularly scheduled American merchant marine, tons and tons of the products of our great inland areas, brought to the seaports over the inland waterways, rested on our docks and jammed or choked our flow of commerce. Foreign ships, seeking higher rates elsewhere in the world due to emergency conditions, had forsaken our ports.

And we had no merchant marine worthy of the name.

There have also been times that, for lack of regularly scheduled American shipping services to the important areas of the world, American business and agriculture have been unable to guarantee prompt delivery of their products. Consequently the transportation companies utilizing our inland waterways and harbors were faced with depressed business activity, even heavy losses in revenue and profits.

Today it is no secret that many an American business is enabled to bid successfully against his foreign competitor for the sale of his products in lands overseas due to two extremely important factors:

(1) His reliance upon the much cheaper inland waterway transportation to get his products to seaboard, and the consequent modern, efficient harbor facilities available to handle his products; and

(2) His dependence upon fast, efficient, regularly scheduled American-flag liners to transport his products safely and reasonably to any area in the world.

Since our American merchant marine is therefore of such great importance to you who deal with our vital rivers and harbors, perhaps a few facts about our American shipping will be of interest:

Today's United States merchant freight fleet is the finest any maritime nation ever had, and outstrips the greatest days of United States historical pride, the clipper-ship era. American shipping organizations have developed qualified executive officers and trained personnel to manage United States shipping at home and abroad. These organizations materially aid United States world trade and foreign commerce.

This situation did not always obtain, however. About 15 years ago American shipping was in a deplorable financial condition. When the Chairman of the then newly created United States Maritime Commission examined an economic survey of the American merchant marine, he is reported to have said that he wouldn't invest a plugged nickel in American shipping.

It was about this time, that many newspapers and columnists editorially bemoaned and deplored this unhealthy condition, and the low ebb to which shipping had sunk.

The Merchant Marine Act of 1936 is today looked upon as the "Magna Carta" of the merchant marine. It was this act which set up conditions by which American shipping could accumulate reserves, which would permit private enterprise to build, operate, and maintain a strong merchant fleet, adequate for our national security and our economic needs.

The net worth of American shipping today is double that of 15 years ago. Unlike the middle and late thirties, most American steamship lines are in sound financial condition. Many look forward to continued operation, building, and maintenance of their services.

Unfortunately there are those today who would have you believe that it has been a crime for American shipping to have made profits, and to have invested since the end of the war upwards of $1,000,000,000 in ships and equipment with which to furnish our American business and agriculture with dependable, efficient, safe, steamship services, and at the same time contribute to the national security of this Nation.

Although the policy of Congress with regard to subsidy to the American merchant marine is abundantly clear, we hear today many snide remarks, and wholly inaccurate and unfair allegations about the administration of such Government aid.

My remarks here this morning cannot set at rest such allegations, but they may at least provide you with accurate facts.

In the past 10 years the Government has spent a considerable sum for construction subsidies, about $338,000,000. That may sound large, but it is less than 2 percent of the 15 billions spent for potatoes, cheddar cheese and a host of subsidies to other business and agriculture. The potatoes, the cheese and the many items subsidized are gone, but we can show you 250 modern, efficient, fast American ships for the money spent by the Government on construction subsidies.

With your indulgence I'd like to explain how this money is spent. No construction subsidy money is paid to American shipowners, but to the American shipbuilder who uses the funds to pay the higher labor and materials costs of United States construction. The shipowner buys his vessel from the United States Maritime Commission at the same price he would have to pay for it were it constructed in a foreign shipyard.

Why do American vessels cost more to build? One item alone is sufficiently illustrative; American shipyard workers average about $60 a week, British shipyard workers about $15 a week.

Likewise there have been some pretty strong statements made about operating subsidies. Again, a few facts. In this same 15-year period when a total of about 15 billions were paid out by the Government for all types of subsidies, the net amount paid to the American shipowner was about one-seventeenth of 1 percent of the total. And operating subsidies, so far as we know, are the only subsidies subject to complete recapture by the Government. Compare the average $1,700,000 a year paid out by the Government for operating subsidies to the same amount paid out every week for potatoes. To my mind ship-operating subsidies are pretty small potatoes.

Ship-operating subsidies do not guarantee a profit for the United States operator, but are used to pay the higher costs of American crew wages, subsistence, maintenance, and insurance. Again one item alone is sufficiently illustrative. The average American A B seamen earns about $300 a month, compared to about $75 a month for his British colleague.

Even with these payments, the shipowners receiving such aid must repay to the government any profits in excess of 10 percent of the capital employed in his business. And in the last 12 years more than 70 percent of all such subsidies have been recaptured by the Government.

I'd like to go one step further. During the period that the United States Maritime Commission was paying out approximately $68,000,000 in operating subsidies, these same recipient steamship lines were paying into the Federal Treasury more than $100,000,000 in taxes. Moreover, the same steamship lines paid back more than 70 percent of the 68 millions granted to them under provisions of the Merchant Marine Act. I am waiting for some Government agency to show an example in another field anywhere near comparable.

But this isn't all. Only recently the United States Maritime Commission made its annual report to the Congress for the fiscal year 1949. The report showed during that year the Commission returned to the Federal Treasury a total of one-third of a billion dollars. This money had been received largely from private American shipping in the form of proceeds from the sales of ships, from recaptures of subsidy moneys it had paid to American steamship lines, and from charter hire received from United States flag shipping for vessels it had rented to them that year. Again, I am waiting for some other Government agency to show a similar example.

Such economic benefits are undoubtedly of great importance. To my mind, however, there are other reasons of transcending importance. They are simply expressed. Either we shall have dependable, regular steamship services for our business and agriculture, or we shall not have such services. And either we shall have, in event of a national emergency, a strong merchant fleet and shipbuilding facilities to serve our military needs, or we shall not have them.

Sometimes it appears almost ludicrous that we in American shipping should have to argue about such things. The record is clear that two world wars were commenced when the United States merchant marine had dropped to its lowest ebb, and the aggressor nations believed the vast resources of men and material of the United States could not be made available because the Nation had no shipping. Captured documents of the German Nazis prove conclusively that Germany egged Japan into her Pearl Harbor attack on the assumption that we had insufficient shipping to move great numbers of troops and supplies to counter-attack.

Even now, I am of the opinion that Russia is far more cognizant of the fact that we are again woefully inadequate in the number of passenger ships that could be used for troop transports than is our own Government. Especially when reports are heard that we should count upon the availability of merchant vessels of friendly foreign nations in event of an emergency. Official Government reports will disclose to anyone seriously concerned that during World War II the United States spent or gave under lend-lease more than four billions in ships and shipping services to nations that happened to be friendly at the time. In addition to this amount, not peanuts even by today's national budget, we transferred to these friendly allies 643 merchant ships, while they made available to us 110 such vessels. And in addition to this largesse, we still had to construct more than 5,000 ships in order to meet the enemy on his soil and defeat him.

Certainly in the face of this record you may well wonder how anyone can place reliance upon the shipping resources of other nations rather than upon a healthy, strong, well-balanced American merchant marine.

Such a fallacy as described strikes at the heart of the problem we have in the American merchant marine today. It is a problem long since licked by the British, that of instilling national pride in and acceptance of what shipping services can do for a nation. Again the record will show back through history that nations which ignored their maritime strength and allowed it to dissipate soon lost both their political and economic influence and power. They became has-beens.

The strength of the United States for 150 years has been inextricably bound up with water, in its enormous system of inland waterways, its many fine harbors, its thousands of miles of seacoast, and a huge foreign trade dependent almost entirely upon ocean shipping. Truly one can say with modesty that the United States is a great maritime power.

It would seem that the bitter historical experiences of two world wars paid for by human lives and tremendous debts, which were necessitated in great degree by our lack of an adequate merchant marine, would be a lesson never forgotten. The development of atomic power and other news events have tended to obscure the slower, but nevertheless relentless, pressure of sea power as a vital component of our national security.

Likewise, the enormous contribution of our ships and maritime industry, and I speak of all segments of the maritime industry, to all phases of our business, industry, and

agriculture, should be proof enough that it is to the public's own selfish interest to demand that we possess a strong American merchant marine. With your understanding and your help, we can accomplish that objective.

Maj. Gen. O. E. Sandman, Great Citizen Soldier, Retires

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LEROY JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 22, 1950

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, on June 1, 1950, the name of Maj. Gen. Otto E. Sandman will be placed on the retired list of the Army of the United States by virtue of the provisions of Public Law 810 of the Eightieth Congress.

This is not just another name going on the list. The retired list on which General Sandman's name is being entered was provided for by Public Law 810 of the Eightieth Congress. That is the law that provided modest retirement pay, starting at age 60, for those who had accumulated active and reserve duty of 20 or more years. Here is a man that typifies the kind of men and officers whom Congress, when it passed this law, hoped would grace that list.

It happened that I was the chairman of the subcommittee that conducted the hearings and wrote Public Law 810. I listened to every witness that submitted testimony to our committee. They ranged from enlisted men to five-star generals. All tried to impress on the committee the extreme importance of continuity of service in the Reserve components. Many times we heard the statement in various forms "one man who serves 5 years is worth much more than five men who serve only 1 year." They emphasized that complete readiness was essential to our safety and preparedness for any future conflict. The cushion of time and space which we had had in two big wars was completely gone. Pearl Harbor rudely pointed out how any future war would start. Hiroshima and Nagasaki gave a slight inkling how destructive and devastating one attack, including the first, could be. The importance and absolute necessity for having strong Reserve components, including the National Guard, was emphasized and explained over and over. That group is the one that gave the added strength and size to the Armed Forces to assure victory twice and if we should be so unfortunate as to get into another conflict they would again be the ones required to win.

Consequently, all the witnesses emphasized that we must furnish an incentive for continuous and long service and that this type of legislation furnished it.

General Sandman personifies the type of men we hope will get the benefit of Public Law 810. He took his first military training in 1908 as a member of the University of California Cadets when he was a freshman at the university. When he graduated in 1912—with Gov. Earl Warren—he went to his home town of Stockton, Calif., and there enlisted in Battery C of the California National Guard. He went to the Mexican border in 1916 as a first lieutenant in Battery C of the One Hundred and Forty-fifth Field Artillery. He entered the Federal service in 1917 with his regiment. He took a course in aerial observation and later became a member of the Air Service. At the end of the war he was in command of the One Hundred and Thirty-fifth Aero Squadron, one of the few squadrons that had American planes—DH-4's with Liberty motors.

Following the war the California National Guard was reorganized and Sandman again became a part of it and soon was the colonel of the One Hundred and Forty-third Field Artillery. This regiment became one of the finest in the country. When World War II approached, the Fortieth Division was called into Federal service. The regimental commanders were switched and Sandman became the commanding officer of the One Hundred and Forty-fifth Field Artillery of the Fortieth Division. This regiment embarked for Hawaii—on the way to the Philippines—the night before Pearl Harbor and while at sea got the message of the attack. The ship was unarmed, so at Colonel Sandman's direction it turned back to San Francisco. The regiment and its equipment was loaded on another ship and soon was on its way to Hawaii again.

While there the regiment—One Hundred and Forty-fifth Field Artillery—received a new colonel because it was thought by those in command that "Sandman is too old for combat service." The blow almost broke his heart. The one thing, above all others, that he wanted to do was to take his regiment into action, and what a leader he would have made. Soon he was appointed the commanding officer of Schofield Barracks. This was a stupendous job, as the hundreds of thousands of troops moving out into the Pacific area stopped at Schofield where they received assignments for duty in the various theaters. As usual, he did a magnificent job and with a very small staff. He was decorated with the Legion of Merit. When the war ended he returned again. Again he helped reorganize the California National Guard and quickly stepped up to the rank of major general and the commanding general of the Forty-ninth Infantry Division, which post he is relinquishing on May 31, 1950.

But far more important than the length, volume, and diversity of his military service is the quality of it. I know of no man—and I have known many able and unusual men—that has the capacity to inspire loyalty and devotion in men like he has. When he was the commanding officer of the One Hundred and Forty-third Field Artillery, every man you met always thought of himself as working for and fighting with Sandman. The men had that personal loyalty to their colonel that makes great fighting units. When he was made the commanding officer of the One Hundred and Forty-fifth he went with an entirely new outfit. But it was not long before the men of that outfit soon had the same feeling for him as the men of the One Hundred and Forty-third. Everybody I met from Salt Lake told me how the boys in the One Hundred and Forty-fifth Field Artillery were crazy about Sandman. He had the same knack that General Patton had of making every man believe that he and Sandman—or Patton—were fighting together. He would have made a wonderful division commander, both in training and in combat.

General Sandman's lifetime hobby has been to help keep America prepared and strong. He has given of his time and his extraordinary talents to make and keep America ready for trouble, so no aggression will come our way, because of respect for our strength. He wants peace passionately and is willing to give of his time and ability to make us able to take care of trouble, and thereby perhaps not get it.

This is the kind of men that we of our committee hoped Public Law 810 would furnish an incentive for long and continuous service in the Reserves. But General Sandman did not have that stimulus and did not need it. He will welcome the slight monetary benefit which Public Law 810 will give him but he does not need it and his long and capable service did not contemplate anything of the kind.

Military service may have intrigued General Sandman when he was a young man. But as he went on and continued to serve he had a deeper motive than pure personal interest. He saw through this service a vehicle that enabled him to protect and preserve America through preparedness. In this explosive, small, and shrinking world we must be prepared to protect ourselves. We need more men with this motive, if the world is to be peaceful and Christian. Washington in the early days of the Republic preached the doctrine of preparedness in time of peace and Sandman practiced it for 40 years.

While raising four fine boys, he still found time to help keep America prepared. His wife deserves a medal for not blocking or hindering his desire to be active in the National Guard. Two of his sons are in our Armed Forces. I had the pleasure of appointing one of his boys to the United States Military Academy. He graduated and is now Lt. James G. Sandman of the United States Air Force. My pleasure in appointing him has now turned to pride as I watch him carve out a successful career for himself. His oldest boy I consider one of my personal friends and he is doing splendid work as a major in the United States Air Force and will continue to keep the name "Sandman" respected by the record he will make.

We salute our hero and wish for him many years of good health and happiness. But nothing that anyone can or may say about him and his extraordinary service will give him the satisfaction that is his, knowing that for 42 years he served faithfully and well the country that gave him his chance to become a leader among men.

Youth and the Community

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. KINGSLAND MACY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 22, 1950

Mr. MACY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a speech I made at the Southeastern Regional Youth Conference under the auspices of the Long Island YMCA at Huntington, Long Island, N. Y., on Saturday, May 20, 1950:

Mr. Chairman, delegates to this great gathering, and guests, my address tonight will be given in a spirit of deep humility, since I face you from the doubtful eminence of several decades more of living than most of you have experienced. Being with you tonight refreshes my spirit, because you represent the tomorrow in our country that we must work toward today.

I hope, because I have an edge in age over most of you in this room, I haven't degenerated into the mold of the inflexible reactionary who is against everything new merely because it is new, and who wants to fight a last ditch fight for everything old just because it is old, and regardless of whether it may be outmoded. There is a middle ground between the very new and the be-whiskered old that I try to achieve in my official and private thinking on social, economic, and political questions.

My humility stems largely from the fact that here tonight I am talking to tomorrow's leaders in business, professional, and political life in what we know is one of the most important areas in the United States. I understand that you hail from my own county of Suffolk and from the neighboring counties of Nassau, Kings, Queens, Westchester, and the mid-Hudson area, and that you represent the amazing total of 50,000 young men and women—an enormous, ununiformed peaceful army for God and country.

You are young adults, already beginning to take an important place in the life of your communities. And bear in mind whatever you do to make your community a better place in which to live strengthens the fabric of our country because the United States of America is in essence but a collection of communities. The measures we adopt as a Nation; the attitudes we have as a collective people grow from our thoughts and our acts in our home towns.

The humility I spoke of in beginning this talk further results from my realization that I am facing in this room the parents-to-be of still another generation, members of which will one day sit, as you are sitting in this audience, hearing your version of Youth and the Community, the topic that has been assigned to me. It is highly complimentary that you and your leaders who have fashioned this up-to-now very interesting program, feel that I may have something to impart that may be interesting or instructive, or both. Frankly, I don't know whether I will be able to. I certainly want to.

I recall, when I was at your age level, I heartily disliked the pontifications of my elders when those pontifications became just categorical "yesses" and "noes" on problems on which I needed real enlightenment. So, although I am a member of the board of regents of the State of New York, a body which, as you know, fixes the educational standards of New York State from the elementary schools right through postgraduate work, I will try to avoid the pedagogic approach in discussing matters with you.

I really believe, as of this hour in our national life, it would be more fitting if the 300 or so of you at this great meeting would tell me what is on your minds. If I could have the benefit of your views it would help me in my duties as a Representative of the First New York District in the Congress of the United States.

Yours is a clean page. But you have lived long enough to acquire the high ideals that go with youth, and you are justifiably anxious to translate those ideas into practical courses of action.

It is to your present advantage that you have not lived long enough to commit the tragic errors of judgment that have made our globe a world of uncertainty, oppression, and terror. My generation will have to accept full responsibility for much of what is wrong with this day. And before my generation there were other oldsters who contributed an oversubscribed quota of mistakes.

You members of this generation—you who are as current as the latest edition of a metropolitan newspaper—must do better than your predecessors have done if this world of ours is to continue to be a habitation for the human race. I literally mean that preceding sentence. Scientific developments have reached such full and destructive flower that some men of high eminence in the field of science and invention believe we may be reaching the point at which the world and most living things on it can be destroyed by man-made implements and scientific devices.

Only yesterday was I, with my colleagues on the board of regents, over for a visit to Brookhaven National Laboratory, which, incidentally, we chartered several years ago. It was the first time that the regents have had a meeting on eastern Long Island, and during this stay we went through the fine Agricultural and Technical Institute nearby at Farmingdale, and the beautiful ornamental horticultural laboratory, the estate of William R. Coe, known as Planting Fields, on the north shore of Nassau County, deeded to the regents at the death of the owner. However, we saw at Brookhaven National Laboratory the strange new mammoth machines and constantly increasing experimental devices for research into nuclear energy which mystified us and left us in wonder and fear of what man, with his inventive genius in this extraordinary age, might bring forth.

It is no longer a question of who will be the winners or losers in the greatly-to-be feared next global war. It is becoming a question of what percentage of total populations, belligerent and nonbelligerent—military and civilian—will survive at all if the atom bomb, the hydrogen bomb, the disease germ and noxious, killing gases are loosed on the world. A wild deer or bird does not know the borders of the states having different protective measures affecting its own continued existence. If they knew the areas of greater safety, they could stay in them. And in another world holocaust who can define, or stay within, definite borders in an all-out killing war that may be started by some military maniac or Godless nation? As always, the innocent will suffer when the dogs of war are loosed. And the next war could be the final war—not the idealistic war to end wars, but the war to end the world as we know it—Armageddon, no less.

But enough of these forebodings. There is no point in underlining them even though we must think of them. We should not dwell tonight at too much length on the terrible things that can happen. It is better that we now examine what we can do to strengthen our community fiber, thereby strengthening our Nation. To do this, it seems obvious that your generation must think clearly, live fearlessly, and walk abroad in the land as free men and women, thus setting an example to the young and old of all races and all nations.

To set this example, to stimulate worldwide emulation of our free American processes, we must begin at home, in our cities, towns, villages, and neighborhoods. We must strengthen our time-tested institutions and make them even more effective.

Our liberties, our institutions represent much sacrifice. Men and women have died that we may inherit them. Major wars have been fought to guarantee their continuance. Youth's blood has been shed for them. We want no more wars, but we must be eternally vigilant to retain those fundamental things in America that have contributed to our spiritual and moral greatness.

In this changing day we must take nothing for granted. Destructive, atheistic forces are ready at all times to capitalize on our indifference.

We must support our churches. We all belong to some church. Too many of us are merely nominal members of a church organization. It isn't enough that we support the church financially. If the churches receive nothing but financial support they will in time become merely monuments to the ideals of another day—mausoleums for precepts preached but not practiced. Now, as never before, we should become active participating members of our church organizations. A church ties in closely with all better phases of community life and welfare. So, when the youth of our land support the church, they enrich the life of the community and strengthen the national character.

I am a great believer in all character-building youth organizations because I believe in an accent on youth and all that pertains to it. Parenthetically I have three children of my own and seven grandchildren.

I could dwell at length on what I know the Young Men's Christian Association has meant in the lives of millions of fellow Americans of yesteryear and what that organization means to hundreds of thousands of young men throughout the land today. I do not need to do that here tonight. You are the living, vibrant examples of the result of the highly beneficial programs of the YMCA. And what I am saying about the YMCA applies equally to the Young Women's Christian Association.

Further, I am happy that we live in a country in which millions of boys and girls belong by free choice to the Boy Scouts, the Girl Scouts, the boys' clubs, the Camp Fire Girls, and similar organizations devoted to the growing boy and girl. Organizations of that kind are not tolerated by dictators. Hitler and Mussolini abolished them by decree. The youth organization, American style, stimulates free thinking and individual action. Such heresies are not tolerated by the Hitlers, the Mussolini's, and yes, the Stalins. It is true that the Russians have a youth organization called the Young Pioneers, but that organization is not comparable to our organizations for the young, because it is entirely an instrument of state and not a voluntary organization of the free young. The Russian Young Pioneer is merely a Soviet soldier in the making.

So, as a part of our community life, as a part of the process of creating an ever-stronger free United States, it is incumbent on us all, young and old, to support our youth organizations. Elders can support youth movements with their money, their time, and their often wise counsel. Boys and girls and young men and women can support them by belonging to them, by being active participants in their programs. As those present pile up the years, my plea to you is not to settle into the quiet groove of complete contentment and feel that the church, the YMCA, the YWCA, and similar

organizations can function without your active continuing interest. If those organizations are to continue to be effective instruments for community and national welfare, they must be supported by you, and have your deep interest, for as long as you are active in the arena of American life.

Youth can do more for youth than age can. Age can sympathize. Age can offer advice, counsel, and financial support. But youth can be reached—truly reached—only by youth. And if youth is reached, its idealism quickened, its feet planted firmly on the solid ground of respect for all religions and informed love of country, then youth will patriotically be serving the community and the country.

All of us, in our spheres, in our own backgrounds must do our utmost to convince the thoughtless and the careless that the paths of rectitude are just as exciting, and more rewarding, than careless, defiant, or immoral living. And we—and by we I really mean you—must convince the great body of youth that careless living is unpatriotic living; that defiance of decent and accepted standards which from our earliest days have contributed more than anything else to the welfare of our country, is not smart, but just "corny," to use present day parlance.

We are potential evangelists for the building of stronger communities and a stronger Nation. It may be that the middle aged and the old, can furnish more know-how in some matters by merely drawing on more experience than their children, but one thing is crystal clear to me and that is that the young man and the young woman will contribute more in the way of idealistic thinking and effort than the oldster. Without idealism our communities will become just dreary places of abode. Without youth, with its shoulders squared and its head thrown back, everlastingly and eternally insisting idealistically on a better community in a better Nation in a better world, there will be no progress. Why is that? I believe it is because age brings caution—too often a dismaying over-supply of that useful quality. Age usually wants status quo. And we must not be content with status quo. Youth must—and does—press ever forward for improvement. And to the credit of youth it must be conceded by the thoughtful and fair-minded that youth is more idealistic than age. Its flaming, resolute idealism is needed more now than ever in our national history. It is needed in our communities to guarantee that we do not become too smug or too self-satisfied with the status quo.

So, if I have any plea to make to you in this room, it is that you, and the 50,000 young contemporaries you represent, who already have your hands to the community and civic plow, keep them there until the programs you have instituted become glorious realities. And when those programs near fruition, by then you will have developed other and equally important programs.

I believe we are all worried about the gangs of young men and women, most of them of adolescent years, that have arisen menacingly in the great world metropolis only a few miles distant from this peaceful and law-abiding community. Shootings, stabbings, sexual immorality and defiance of the law are the modus operandi of these gangs. I believe the gangs can be broken up. There are two ways to break them up. One is through officers of the law with nightsticks and guns taking summary, drastic, bloodletting action—treating these boys and girls as they would treat the Al Capones, the Frankie Yales and other professional gangsters. And, in extreme emergencies such protective action may be necessary. But that isn't the final or desirable answer, is it? Violence breeds violence. Brutality breeds brutality.

No, violence, harshness, and official edicts won't put the gangs in Brooklyn, Manhattan and elsewhere out of business. But you can, you have no guns, no switchknives, no brass knuckles and no belief in violence as a mode of life.

You can, with helpful design on behalf of your community, if you come from points where these gangs exist, consider the breaking up of these gangs as one of your chief responsibilities. If you are smug in the feeling that you are one of the saved and have no interest in the less enlightened, you should extirpate that smugness from your thinking immediately. Also, you can do more than merely deplore. You can act. You can devise programs calculated to expose and bring these presently wayward boys and girls to your own fine way of life. And after devising these programs, considering each step proposed very carefully, you can effect a union with all agencies, official and unofficial, that are trying to grapple with this problem of juvenile delinquency. But you can take the lead.

Because you are young and know something of the motives and frustrations of the young, your viewpoint—your approach to this problem—will be highly valuable. You may come up with the solutions. I would rather trust in your judgment to effect eventual cures than in the dull thud of a policeman's club.

Mentioning the word "judgment" prompts me to digress for a moment. No one can readily describe "judgment" and it is hardly within the orbit of that which can be taught. Someone said that it is acquired through the experience of exercising bad judgment. It spells the difference between success and failure, and probably the best definition is sound common sense. Then, too, everyone strives for success, but the road is not clearly marked with signs, else everyone would be successful and that we know is not so. The route is a devious one and must be searched for diligently. However, easy accomplishment does not give satisfaction, which really only comes genuinely after hard struggle and the surmounting of difficult obstacles. Nevertheless, what causes us to exert ourselves and put forth our greatest effort is the appeal of just this challenge.

Now, going back to the business of law and order, if in your investigation and research into the reasons for these gangs—and you'll have to find the reasons before you can help invoke a cure—you find their existence results from poor housing, lack of parental interest, a weakness in our public school system, an inadequate number of YMCA and YWCA branches and Boy Scout and Girl Scout troops, your findings will be valuable, wherever they may lead. A fact is one of the greatest things in life. If you can get the facts and properly evaluate them, you are in a position then to move toward curatives and palliatives. As a lawmaker, and one who helps guide our State's educational system, I would like to know the facts. So would you.

Am I recommending too big a program? I can't think so, when I think of the group here as the direct representatives of 50,000 young men and women in your age brackets, imbued with similar enthusiasm for the welfare of the community and Nation and motivated by the highest, finest ideals.

I'll say, somewhat challengingly I'll admit, that unless thoughtful, clear-headed, God-fearing American youth, such as is represented here tonight, analyzes youth's problems fairly and squarely and institutes and works hard at programs calculated to help all youth of our land, regardless of its social and economic strata and environment, it is not facing up to its own citizenship responsibilities. And the young American, as well as his senior, has responsibilities.

Lawlessness on the part of a small segment of our youth, always highly publicized, is seized on eagerly by the Godless materialists behind the iron curtain as a symbol of what they have termed the "fundamental gangsterism of the United States."

We know we are not a gangster Nation. We know, as we who live here should, that the great majority of youth are law-abiding. We sorrowfully and with shame confess the presence of some gangs. It is our job to educate the young gangster out of his present role of mock heroics and into the higher strata of good citizenship. And you can do it. You can do it by your total all-out determination to bend your every effort to accomplish it. By so doing you can do for your communities something that the oldsters have failed to do because they haven't the understanding to enable them to do it.

There is much more I could say, but I am drawing toward the end of the time allotted me.

I have talked about a few of the things that are on my mind. I don't want you to feel that, while presenting some serious aspects of present-day life, that I am insensible to the pleasures of living. You like to swim, play baseball, hunt, play tennis, and fish. And I hope I never live so long I won't enjoy doing most of those things or watching others do all of them. Healthy minds grow out of healthy, active, well-conditioned bodies. And let us, while we are young and have the equipment with which to do it, and the stamina and youth to enjoy it to the fullest, be as athletic as our time, circumstances, and environments will permit.

But let us not, as American citizens, young or old, place undue emphasis on the physical. The physical pleasures we derive are satisfying, but momentary. The long-range, permanently satisfying things are the things of the spirit.

Love of God and love of country are things of the spirit. They ennoble us. They set us apart from what we like to term the lower forms of creation. Our love for God and His bounties and blessings keeps us on the high road of decent, honorable living. Our love of country makes us want to do our share to make it a better country. And we can only contribute to the welfare of our country by engaging in the worth-while activities of our community, our neighborhood. By so doing, each of us, no matter how humble or uninfluential we may feel we are, has a beneficial impact on the present and future welfare of our country.

None of us can make too early a start toward becoming conscientious humans, able to think for ourselves, able to meet our own problems, thus equipping ourselves to solve the larger problems of our community and our Nation. By your very presence here, you young men and women, meeting under the auspices of one of the great character-building organizations of our times, prove yourselves conscientious humans. By the grace of God you will find the wisdom and strength in the years ahead to solve your own problems, and in so doing completely equip yourself for patriotic and civic service on behalf of your community and our great Nation.

Being with you tonight has been one of the great pleasures of recent days for me. I thank you for the interest you have taken in my remarks.

Mrs. Leroy Johnson Wins Praise of Sacramento Newspaper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 1950

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I wish to include an editorial which appeared in the Sacramento Bee of May 9 in praise of Mrs. Leroy Johnson, the wife of the distinguished Representative from the Third Congressional District of California.

The editorial is as follows:

PREJUDICED BUT RIGHT

Mrs. Leroy Johnson is here conducting the reelection campaign of her Congressman husband from the third, Sacramento, district while he remains on the job in Washington.

That makes a good deal for everyone concerned, because not only is Mrs. Johnson an effective campaigner but the district can enjoy uninterrupted representation in the National Capital.

Mrs. Johnson, too, can enter wholeheartedly into the campaign activities because she is thoroughly sold on the merits of her candidate. On this subject, she stated:

"I feel the people in this district are darned lucky to have such a good Congressman.

"ROY is a hard worker, he is honest, intelligent, and intensely patriotic and he is conversant with the problems of the district. He knows water law and water problems and that is most important to this district. On top of that I think he's wonderful."

Of course, Mrs. Johnson may be a little prejudiced regaring Congressman JOHNSON. But the interesting thing is that her appraisal is not much more flattering than that of Washington observers who view the work of Congressmen objectively.

The voters must sort of be of that opinion, also, since they have elected him four times.

In Defense of Politicians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 22, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a constructive article—one appropriate at any time—entitled "In Defense of Politicians," written by an outstanding statesman and scholar, Hon. Claude G. Bowers, American Ambassador to Chile and former American Ambassador to Spain. This positive article is worthy of reading by every American.

The article follows:

IN DEFENSE OF POLITICIANS

(By Claude G. Bowers)

Recently I took up for a rereading that charming and illuminating work, The Endless Adventure, the monumental masterpiece of the brilliant Scotch historian and philosopher, Frederick Oliver, dealing with the Walpolean period of English history, and I was startled by something I had missed before—his pages devoted to "praise of politicians."

No doubt my attention was attracted on the second reading because in recent years the tendency in America to sneer at political parties and politicians has seemed to have gained momentum in the popular mind. That, and the fact that in recent years I have been in the storm centers of the attacks on democracy by the Fascist, Nazi, and Falangist forces that set out a few years ago to erect the most autocratic and tyrannical totalitarian governments on the ruins of democratic institutions. I have observed, close hand, that invariably the preliminary campaign has taken the form of a denunciation of political parties and "corrupt politicians." The assumption of the Goebbels propagandists is that a political party not dominated by the state is a faction, and that all politicians are incompetent and corrupt. The effect intended is to destroy the faith of the people in party government and in their political leaders. In view of their records as corruptionists, pillagers of private property, and armed thieves, it ought to be amusing to find men like Hitler and Goering piously denouncing politicians as corrupt. But one only need read the newspapers and books and see the plays, musical comedies, and jugglers of the vaudevile stage in America to reach the conclusion that this Fascist line of attack on democratic institutions has become quite commonplace here.

The effect, if not the purpose, and in most cases I do not think it is the conscious purpose, is to weaken the faith of the American people in the institutions of the founding fathers. For common sense must make it clear that in a nation of 130,000,000 people reaching from coast to coast over thousands of miles of mountain and valley, democracy could not function in orderly fashion without political organizations holding concrete views of national policy to be pressed upon the people through the constitutional instrumentality of the polls.

There certainly are some corrupt politicians, just as there are corrupt financiers, corrupt merchants, corrupt industrialists, and corrupt preachers, but no one is so unfair as to draw a sweeping indictment against these sectors of society because they contain, here and there, a corrupt man. Only in the case of politicians is the charge made general. And that, of course, is a fantastic falsehood. When we reflect that in the case of men engaged politically in the public service the spotlight is constantly thrown upon them and the microscope used in eager search of evidence of wrongdoing, we tremble to think what might be the result if all the other elements of society were subjected to the same constant and intensive scrutiny.

And nothing could be more amusing than the notion that with the elimination of politicians, which could mean the extermination of democracy, corruption would disappear from government. It is common knowledge that the leaders of fascism in Italy and Germany have accumulated vast fortunes through the ungentle art of stealing by force; and in the stealing of the property of the citizens, these nabobs of tyranny also deprive them of their natural rights, their liberties, and their human dignity. This astounding pillaging of the state, and of individuals, by the totalitarian dignitaries would be quite impossible where the people can pass on such crimes through legal and political action.

A few weeks ago an American politician who had resorted to corruption to enrich himself died in miserable isolation and in poverty, despised by his countrymen, after serving a term in prison, but under a Fascist or Nazi regime the corruptionists are the untouchables and there is no limit to the wealth they can accumulate through robbery by force. Yet these are the men—the Hitlers, Mussolinis, and Goerings—who have thundered so righteously against representative democratic government because of the "corrupt politicians."

There are politicians and "politicians," just as there are bankers and embezzlers, and some of the politicians will graft just as some bankers have filched from the depositor. The greater part of the grafting comes from men far down in the scale of politicians, and it was not these petty politicians that the Hitlers and Mussolinis were trying to destroy, but the real leaders of popular government, the men who fought and wrought intelligently for democratic principles. They were the dangerous ones, because they led the people; and therefore the first step in all Fascist movements is to destroy the people's faith in their honest political leaders and to "liquidate" them.

Now the theoretical critic, having in mind the political leaders who have led mankind onward and upward in the democratic way to liberty and opportunity, are prone to describe them as "statesmen," not politicians; and yet almost all of the greatest British and American statesmen have been consummate politicians, and have reached the place where they could serve mankind through political methods. Oliver reminds us that Adam Smith, who was a highminded theorist, an economist, and a man of the closet, refused to discriminate between the politician and the statesman and lumped them together as corrupt. He denounced them as "that insidious and crafty animal vulgarly called a statesman or politician." And that, of course, was stupid in Adam Smith. For without statesmen, there would be no one skilled and trained in the art of government; and without these, society would revert to chaos.

Yet it has become a cheap fashion in America to parrot this propaganda of the Fascist-minded. The villain in the romance is apt to be a "politician," and the guilty in the detective story in which a politician is one of the suspects is almost certain to be. The comedian in the musical comedy can always get the loud laugh that speaks the vacant mind by a fling at "these politicians." Even the more precious element in the academy shrugs its shoulders and exclaims, "Ah, the politicians."

II

Let us call the roll of the greatest of Americans to whom we are indebted for our democratic liberties and institutions, guaranteed by law, for the protection of the citizen against the abuse of power. Who and what were they? They were these very much maligned politicians.

The most consummate of them all, perhaps the most consummate in modern history, was Thomas Jefferson. It was he more than any other man who formulated the way of life known as the American way. He was a businessman, in that he was a successful planter until public service deprived his business of his supervision, but as such he could have done nothing toward placing the imprint of his philosophy on our life. He was a philosopher, but there have been other philosophers with a philosophy making for the good of society, who did not know how to reach the public and put their philosophy into effect. Because he was a practical man, Jefferson did not take refuge in his closet and whine his criticisms of the men in public life. He sallied forth into the political arena with his battle ax and became a politician. He knew that a philosophy tucked away among the cobwebs in the closet will remain a curiosity and never become a reality. And being a politician, he was a realist.

As a politician he was a propagandist with few peers; a practical organizer unsurpassed; a diplomat with an intuitive knowledge of human nature, making it easy to work with and direct the activities of others. Thus during the first 12 years of the Republic he made it definitely a democracy; and through political inspiration and direction from afar, he and they who thought with him, also politicians, forced into the fundamental law the Bill of Rights. Had he not been a skilled and practical politician working for the welfare, the rights, and liberties of the people, our national destiny might have been vastly different from what it became.

There are two majestic memorials on the Mall in Washington to express the appreciation of a Nation for services to country and humanity—and one is to Jefferson, the politician.

The other is to another politician—Lincoln. After Jefferson, it would be hard to find another American so consummate as a politician. He has been so disguised by sentimentalists that few appear to know that in the Illinois of his day where politicians who knew all the answers flourished like the green bay tree, he was the most cunning and skillful of them all. I know of no biography that so perfectly reflects the man and his methods as that of Beveridge, who, being a politician himself, could sense and see the art with which Lincoln advanced to power. He, too, understood the politician's art of propaganda, the politician's science of organization, and he knew how, when necessary, to work under cover and get results. I am sure it is because Beveridge's book so clearly reveals his hero as primarily a politician that the sentimentalists frown upon it. History credits him with the emancipation of the slaves and the preservation of the Union; but never could he have attained the power to render these incalculable services had he not been a clever politician; and even in power, his wisdom, superior to that of others, is manifest in his political methods.

Because of their success as politicians they were hated by their opponents in their day, but there are no national memorials to their critics on the Mall.

To Jefferson and Lincoln we may add Andrew Jackson, who rendered immeasurable service to the people in defeating the machinations of an embryo plutocracy through his genius as a great politician. His greatest battles were fought in the arena of politics, and there he was a master, clever, resourceful, militant, and even ruthless.

To sum up, all the great idols of the British-speaking peoples who have left indelible impressions on the two nations through the policies they sponsored and furthered have been professional politicians—men trained in politics, and that means in statecraft. From Walpole, in England, down through Pitt, Fox, Burke, Palmerston, Gladstone, Disraeli, and now Churchill, and in America from Jefferson and Sam Adams down through Monroe, Jackson, Lincoln, Johnson, Theodore Roosevelt, and now Franklin Roosevelt, the outstanding servants of the public good have been politicians.

At once someone will note the absence of Woodrow Wilson. His position is unique. A colossal figure, he will grow greater with the years. He was that rarest of all things—a statesman who had never been an active, experienced politician, and that makes him unique. But this calls for reservations. From his youth on, his mind was occupied most with the politics of statesmanship. His studies were in this sphere. But it was not until the eve of his elevation to the Presidency that he ever participated in political activities. Until then he had never made even a political speech, or faced the populace on the hustings, or sat in caucus in devising ways and means of political action. He had an incurable distrust of men who had actually worked in politics, born of the cloistered life of the academy, and he thus deprived himself at a critical juncture of the advice of men grown old and wise in political struggles. I have never doubted that with all his genius as a statesman, and his advantage as an idealist, he might have succeeded in defeating the maneuvering of his enemies had he been trained more in the school of practical politics.

III

What *is* politics? Webster's definition says it is "the science and art of government; the science dealing with organization, regulation, and administration of state * * * the theory or practice of managing or directing the affairs of public policy or of political parties."

Then what is a politician? The same authority says he is "one versed or experienced in the science of government."

There surely is nothing particularly disreputable about that, though Adam Smith might think so. But the sort-sighted scoffers and the Fascist-minded insist that a politician is a mere seeker after office for the sake of the salary. It is true, of course, that among the thousands holding minor offices many, if not most, are motivated partly by the salary. Incidentally, droll as it may seem, it is the salary that draws men into counting rooms and banks and factories. However, if the man who gets the office earns his salary by performing his duties satisfactorily, he is discharging a necessary function in organized society. But in the higher ranks I know scores of men personally who enter politics, become politicians, and take office at a financial sacrifice because they are primarily interested in principles and policies they think for the good of the country; and among these are many who have sacrificed not only money but also health and strength in the service of the state—and all were politicians.

Possibly conceding all this, the critic falls back on the politicians of the lower ranks, the precinct committeemen, often dubbed ward heelers. I am unable to find anything disreputable in serving a party organization in this lowly position—since it is necessary. The statesman who began at the bottom in the organization may be all the better for it. The businessman makes a point of insisting that his men shall learn the business from the bottom up. Only in politics are the good men expected to begin at the top. These generally soon reach the bottom, since they have no real foundation of knowledge.

IV

This brings us to the pet anathema of the theorist and the Fascist-minded—the political parties. Mussolini would have none of them—none but his own; Hitler would have none of them—none but his own; Franco would have none of them—none but his own. None of these could afford a party of opposition. It would interfere with the destruction of human rights, with the suppression of liberty, and might make the liquidation of political opponents through bullet and bludgeon, and the stealing of the hierarchy, dangerous. It is significant of the wise thinking of the English that whatever party may be in power, the opposing party in minority officially is called His Majesty's opposition. And it is recognized that His Majesty's opposition performs a high function in the state. It exposes blunders, demands explanations, keeps those in power on their mettle, and illuminates the political scene for the benefit of the public which has a right to know what is transpiring, since government is their business.

Sad experience has shown that stockholders in a corporation would often have been safer if there had been a party of opposition on the board of directors.

Without parties in a democracy there would be chaos; with but one party maintained by force, there is fascism and tyranny.

Political parties, then, are necessary, but if there are to be parties there must be party leaders, and if there are party leaders, there must be politicians. If these party leaders are worth their salt, they must be trained and experienced politicians. Oliver, philosopher, not politician, but wise with the wisdom of the historian says that "the notion that we can save ourselves without their help is an illusion; for politics is not one of those crafts that can be learned by the light of nature without an apprenticeship."

A democracy must fail without leaders of courage, intelligence, and character. The assumption of Jefferson and Lincoln was that the mass mind can be trusted, or its instinct trusted, if provided with the facts; and but for political parties contending for the mastery, and engaging in polemics, the cause of liberty and human rights would perish because there would be no great organization concerning itself with the dissemination of the facts. Aguirre Cerda, a great Chilean President and statesman, framed an imperishable sentence when he said that "to educate is to govern." And he meant not only education in the schools, but education from the political hustings. That is the reason that the totalitarian cannot tolerate parties, for parties mean the open submission of facts and policies to the arbitrament of debate. The dictator must suppress political parties because he must impose silence. With but one party, and that an organ of the government, the rulers can keep the people in ignorance of the fact that their pockets are being picked and their liberties are being taken away.

If there is any better way to govern a democracy than through the instrumentality of parties, it is still a secret of the gods.

Party government means ballots; Fascist government means surrender or bullets.

V

Experience shows that without organized and capably led parties the most outrageous persecutions of a people cannot be repelled. Look at the record in Italy and Germany. The scattered protests of individuals only result in their instant liquidation. Happily in America we have had little experience in dealing with tyranny because there has been so little of it. But in the one experience we had there is a lesson. The Federalist Party, disdaining democracy, contemptuous of the common lot, and thoroughly organized as a party brilliantly led, resented the creation of a party of opposition, and described it as a faction. Consciously or not, federalism tended toward fascism. Thus the sedition law of the Adams administration, the persecution and imprisonment of editors who dared challenge the pretensions of those in power, was an attempt, through terrorism, to close the mouths of critics. The men singled out for persecution would have been helpless, acting as individuals, just as the victims of tyranny in Italy were helpless in combating the tyranny of Mussolini. But happily, in America, a party of opposition had been created under whose banner all the victims of oppression could constitutionally assemble for concerted, wisely directed, and stubborn action. That attempt to set aside the Bill of Rights was defeated by a political party.

It was after the collapse of the Federalist Party, when an era of good feeling had developed, that some urged the amalgamation of all parties into one and others rejoiced that there was but one party. This amalgamation could not be perfected by governmental decree, as in Italy, Germany, and Spain, but only by consent of the people. Jefferson opposed this idea utterly. "I am no believer in the amalgamation of parties," he wrote, "nor do I consider it as either desirable or useful for the public. * * * They [parties] are censors of the conduct of each other, and useful watchmen for the public." And again he wrote: "In every free and deliberative society there must, from the nature of man, be opposite parties." And again: "The division [into parties] ought to be fostered instead of being amalgamated; for take away this, and some more dangerous principle of division will take its place." And again: "Men have differed in opinion and been divided into parties by these opinions from the first origin of societies, and in all governments where they have been permitted freely to think and to speak."

With a full realization that in the composition of any political party there inevitably will be men who are mere self-seekers, not concerned with principles and policies, except insofar as they may advance them to public station, Jefferson knew that the divi-

sion into parties is based primarily on principles and concepts of government. Thus he wrote: "Both of our political parties, at least the honest part of them, agree conscientiously in the same object—the public good; but they differ essentially in what they deem the means of promoting that good. One side thinks it best done by one composition of the governing powers; the other by a different one. With whatever opinion the body of the Nation concurs, that must prevail."

Thus does Jefferson describe the only practical, if not possible, way in which a democracy in a great country can function. Eliminate parties, and democratic countries, the people unorganized, undirected, undisciplined, would fall into chaos, and thus pave the way for the man with the bludgeon to establish "order"—resting on the buried liberties of the Nation.

But if political parties, so much derided by arm-chair theorists better acquainted with books than with men and more familiar with theories than with realities, are an essential part of the democratic machinery, there must be party leaders—and these are politicians.

VI

Even the most rigid of the critics are driven to admit that leaders in the higher strata of the parties may be of some service to the country; so they fall back on the assumption that the minor party workers down the line are engaged in rather disreputable business. The leader they praise at the top could not be there but for the tireless and usually unrewarded work of the minor politicians at the bottom. An organization, to be effective, must extend down to the lowest political unit—the precinct. The precinct committeeman, to be effective, must have the respect of the people in his precinct where everyone is known. He may be a young lawyer, or the corner grocer, or the village blacksmith, and in 9 cases out of 10 he is not an aspirant for office. He accepts the drudgery of the work because he is good party man, interested, if only instinctively, in the principles and policies it proclaims. "Politics is a duty," said Jefferson; and the precinct committeeman renders a service to the State.

If true of him, it is equally true of every other member of the party hierarchy; for without these local politicians parties would speedily disintegrate, and with their disintegration democracy inevitably would fail in functioning.

In the higher ranks of the hierarchy, the political leaders attain their position through a demonstration of their political capacity. On these devolve the task of formulating the political policies on which the party makes its appeal to the people; and the more consummate they are as politicians, the greater will be the effort to adopt policies in conformity with the public good or the public will. And that is democracy in action.

The sweeping charge of "corruption" against politicians is pure poppycock. Not that there are not corrupt politicians, any more than that there are not corrupt businessmen, corrupt financiers, and immoral preachers. After all, the corrupt action of three shipbuilding companies which, through collusion in bidding, stole millions of dollars from the taxpayers was exposed and stopped by Josephus Daniels—a politician. And the corrupt action of some very respectable oil men in the case of Teapot Dome was exposed and stopped by Senator Tom Walsh—a politician. Cases where corruption among businessmen and financiers have been exposed by politicians acting for the Nation could be multiplied in America innumerable times.

Equally superficial and unfair and untrue is the charge of the theorists that politicians are "incompetent." Too popular is the silly notion that while, of course, a doctor cannot take over the management of a factory, or a banker substitute for a lawyer, or a manufacturer assume the teaching in a studio, the doctor, the banker, and the manufacturer can, by some magic, master the intricate mysteries of government without experience or training. The drawing-room statesman in his library, the dilettante theorist in his study, and the village roustabout in the poolroom are often impatient with the "incompetence of politicians" and "only wish they had a chance" to straighten out the muddle. Such are living in a fool's paradise and suffering from a delusion of grandeur. After all, it was a man who had devoted his life to politics, not the financiers, who snatched the Nation from the edge of the precipice in the spring of 1933.

It is interesting to find that a man of the study, but an historian, like Oliver, shares this impatience with the critics when he says:

"If we eventually escape from our present perplexities, it will not be because theorists have discovered some fine new principle of salvation; or because newspapers have scolded and pointed angry fingers at this one or that; or because we, their readers, have become excited and have demanded that 'something must be done.' It will be because these decent, hard-working, cheerful, valiant, knock-about politicians, whose mysterious business it is to manage our affairs by breaking one another's heads, shall have carried on with their work as if nothing extraordinary was happening * * * and shall have 'jumbled something' out of their contentions that will be of advantage to their country. The notion that we can save ourselves without their help is an illusion; for politics is not one of those crafts that can be learned by the light of nature without an apprenticeship."

VII

It may be possible to lift the average in political life but it never can be done so long as able young men, intellectually and temperamentally fit for public service, are led to believe that there is something rather shameful about it. How different in England where a political career is considered one of service to the state and to society, and where the old nobility are prone to dedicate one of their sons to politics as a patriotic duty. The young man so dedicated begins his preparation at Oxford, concentrating on the studies that may be useful to the state, distinguishing himself perhaps in the debates of the Oxford Union, and passing speedily from the academic halls to Parliament where he makes his career. Nothing in the old nobility of England sets it so much apart from that of other nations as its recognition of an obligation to participate in politics as a patriotic duty. The son is not thought vicious and smearing the family name or lowering its prestige by rendering public service in the halls of Westminster. The political tradition to generation as in the case of Robert Cecil, the Minister of Elizabeth whose descendants have carried on down to Salisbury, Balfour, and Lord Robert Cecil of today. Chatham meticulously trained his son, William Pitt, and Holland found time to drill his son, Charles James Fox, and so, too, Gladstone, Chamberlain, Asquith, MacDonald, and Churchill have carried on the fine family tradition of giving in their sons men of great capacity to the State.

One finds it hard to understand the prejudices of Americans who think of themselves as sensible men, against political ambition in the young. Is it possible, as our enemies say, that we really feel that the only road to real distinction is in the acquisition of money, and that the prejudice against public life is because you can't make money in politics? Is it possible that the average American really feels that the accumulation of wealth is the only career worth while? Or that the American does not compare with the English in feeling any responsibility to organized society? Or does it spring from the fact that newspapers, columnists, the wisecrackers of stage comedies, and even novelists by insinuating that men in politics are fools or crooks have made the impression on half-baked minds that there is something low in public life?

That, I am sure, was not the opinion of Jefferson who urged the young to enter political life, drilled not a few, including Monroe, for public service, and hoped that the University of Virginia he was sponsoring would become a training field for public service.

What we need in America today is not the elimination of politicians but more politicians thoroughly trained for public service. There can be no finer career. But to render such service in the highest sense calls for a preparation beyond that of our forebears. The complications of modern social and business organization present intricate problems requiring special knowledge. Our fathers dealt with fundamental political principles but we of today, within those principles, can and must find solutions for economic and social problems. It is not enough now to saturate oneself in history and political philosophy; one must master the mysteries of economics and of sociology to deal with the political problems of this new day. And since modern invention has wiped out distance and made all nations neighbors, interdependent upon each other, the young man preparing for a political career should make a special study of international relations.

Thus prepared intellectually, he should study political psychology to the end that he may advance his cause intelligently through honest and wise propaganda. And nothing is more vital than a study of the science of political or party organization down to the precinct, for only through victories at the polls can he reach or hold a position in public life in a democracy. In brief, he must study to be a politician.

VIII

To recapitulate: Democracies operate best through political parties.

Political parties function only through politicians.

Eliminate politicians and you wipe out parties.

Wipe out parties and you throw democracies into a state of unorganized, undisciplined chaos.

And when in a democracy the people are unorganized, undirected, undisciplined, the Fascist has his excuse and the tyrant appears to dominate the Nation by brute force.

That is the reason the Mussolinis, Hitlers, and Francos hate and exterminate the politicians; and that is the reason it is so stupid in a democracy to join them in their hue and cry.

And that is the reason why the theorists and scoffers who sneer at representative government, political parties, and politicians are consciously in some cases, and unconsciously, let us hope in most, making their contribution to the Fascist effort to destroy democracy in the United States.

The Hiss Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 22 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Hysteria of the Hisslings," by Norbert Muhlen, from the New Leader.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE HYSTERIA OF THE HISSLINGS

(By Norbert Mahlen)

Memories of public life are notoriously short. Political events not personally experienced are scanned in today's papers and forgotten by the time tomorrow's hit the streets.

Thus many people believe that rowdy congressional investigations are a new invention, a vicious weapon of the cold war. But congressional investigations have been ferreting out undue, illegal, and sometimes criminal group influences on the life and liberty of the Republic for more than three decades.

From 1909 to 1937, the suspicion that big money corrupted national politics led to at least a dozen such investigations of business leaders—from the Pujo Committee To Investigate the Concentration of Money and Credit through Teapot Dome to the Special Committee To Investigate the Munitions Industry (of which Alger Hiss was counsel).

These probes were frankly partisan affairs; for the most part, the Democratic and Bull Moose legislators were out to prove wrongdoings in the Republican administration. The investigating Congressmen and legislators were exempt from libel, and fortunately so. Otherwise they could not have financially withstood the interests they attacked. The fiery accusations and the cheap oratory that went with them often overshot their mark. At the time they certainly seemed to do great harm to business, if not to the community at large. Often grave charges were leveled at innocents and reputations were smeared. But, as we can see today, all the noise did not harm the innocent victims, one of whom was Bernard Baruch.

These partisan investigations publicly aired every shred of suspicion, every conceivable bit of evidence. They led to several court convictions; a few financiers and high Government officials were sent to prison. New laws were drafted which forestalled repetition of the scandals; and the social climate, as well as the economic intercourse of the country was revitalized in a cleaner and healthier way.

In recent years, the attention of congressional committees has been directed toward the infiltration and misuse of government by giant dictatorship rather than by big business. With the battle being run along partisan lines, its tough fighting has unfortunately sometimes clouded the Communist issue itself, which is equally vital for both parties. But the most abused of congressional committees unearthed the treason of Alger Hiss, whose guilt was finally confirmed by a court. And while that committee and other committees did attack presumably innocent people, those people received every opportunity to defend themselves publicly in the press and even in the committee rooms.

The investigation is directed against two groups of fraudulent Communist helpmates in government—first, the agents who are unfit according to law; and second, the fellow-travelers and dupes who seem unfit, according to common sense (for a while at least), to hold positions of political trust. The present probe has followed the course which the prewar investigations of fraudulent big money had healthily taken. Although such investigations start rather late, are sometimes handled in unskilled, silly and worthless ways, and have a lot of regrettable accompaniments, yet few Americans can have any quarrel with their main purpose and effect: to keep this country from being turned into a concentration camp, and to save freedom from being submerged by fear.

What is amazing is the extent to which many well-meaning non-Communists give emotional support to those suspected of Communist collaboration—and even to those who have been found guilty of high crimes. To the same extent, we find widespread hostility against the men, media, congressional committees and courts of law who have been prosecuting those Communist collaborators. The passionate sympathy shown in some quarters for Alger Hiss is the perfect illustration of this attitude.

The excess of tears shed by some people for Mr. Hiss is sometimes explained as genuine charity for a sinner's tragic self-destruction. But why, then, do the same people exhibit such frantic hatred of the confessing and repentant sinner, Whittaker Chambers? A look at the Hiss partisans and Chambers-haters is most revealing. To explain the motives of the majority of Hiss' defenders, let us examine the argument heard most often in his defense. "Hiss," say his sympathizers, "has done only what was very decent and patriotic while he did it—he believed in friendship with the Soviets just like everybody did at the time." Except for the fact that his special usefulness to the Russians led him to a friendship considerably closer than that of the average sympathizer, it is undeniable that Hiss played with communism when playing with communism was most fashionable, from the ambassador down to the last little analyst. And for precisely this reason, the vast mass of former sympathizers and ex-fellow travelers identify themselves—subconsciously at least—with Alger Hiss.

But the conflicts and confusions which turned them into fellow travelers originally are still at work—inside them, now, when they have ceased being full-fledged fellow travelers. They have not yet solved their constant wavering between moral ends and immoral means. Because they "believed" in American democracy as well as in Communist comradeship, they still hold a muddled allegiance to a number of contradictory ideas. Their loyalty to America provokes their bad conscience, because of their past and, to some extent, present allegiance to ideas of the united front and wartime alliance. Identifying themselves with Alger Hiss, they feel that the public judgment on his guilt is a judgment on their own past guilt.

But they are unable to frankly admit their guilt as a thing of the past, which they have got over with and regret. Since, on the other hand, they have moved too far from procommunism to still proudly defend treason, they remain in an emotional quandary.

Chambers was able to do what these former sympathizers could not do. He finally and completely broke with his aberrations. He found a home in a new security. This was enough for the ex-fellow travelers. Having identified part of their selves with Mr. Hiss, they identified the other part with Mr. Chambers, and directed all their resistance against him. This is the psychological mechanism of exteriorizing transference and ensuing aggression, a mechanism which delivered the former sympathizers from their predicament. They could now hate the man who made a clean breast of his guilt—which was their guilt. And they would defend the man who was publicly convicted of his past doings—which were their doings.

There are two archetypes of the former fellow traveler of 1950. There is Mrs. Bleeding-Heart who, in the 1930's joined so many committees for good causes whether they were run by and for Communists or not. Then there was Dr. Win-the-war, in the 1940's, who deliberately repressed his resistance to, and even courted, communism, while the strange alliance between the Babbitt and the Bolshevik lasted. These two are still articulate figures on the American scene when it comes to the defense of the past as an issue of the present. In the conflict between their new anticommunism and their past procommunism, they must, as the psychological textbook predicts, have recourse to rationalizations to defend their contradictory and irrational views.

Few people have the strength to revise their past opinions, even if they directly contradict their present views. So we hear again the old united front and wartime alliance slogans, in lusty discord with the present resistance to tyranny line. And these are fortified by ideas borrowed from the integral pacifists and civil libertarians (a group of watchdogs valiant and useful by themselves, though rather alien to the crowd of Hisslings). To defend the vestiges of procommunism in an anti-Communist society, the Hisslings rationalize that some procommunism—about as much as they themselves have practiced—must be part and parcel of our democracy. This, of course, is nonsense, but it helps political neurotics feel comfortable amid their conflicts and confusions. It also helps the Communist conspirators continue their present work.

Twisting their image of political reality until it fits into and confirms their conflicting political emotions, the Hisslings regard the investigation of suspects as a witch hunt, the prosecution of legally indicted suspects as the persecution of innocent heretics. The guilt of the conspirators for slavery disappears in their minds behind the personal (and therefore incidental) depravity of a few anti-Communists, and the defamation of character and motives of all anti-Communists. The partisan investigation is transformed in their minds into nothing but a free-for-all between two parties for their own sake. In the end, they are completely able to forget that this country is defending itself—so far with restraint—against the agents of the concentration camp state.

To repress the facts which would make a shambles of their carefully constructed defense mechanism, they have been supplied (from Communist Party sources) with a magic word. This word marvelously does away with all irritating insights. The word is "hysteria." Whatever is done in defense against the Communists is hysteria. When a New York teacher who lied about her Communist past is fired, the Hisslings call it persecution of free inquiry. When an applicant for a job with the supersecret Central Intelligence Agency is turned down for unknown reasons, the banal happening is described in a series of pitiful and insinuating articles designed to make the reader indignant over the injustice done his fellow man (as if every non-Communist had a right to be employed as a spy, and as if it were hysteria to pick the best man). A few isolated incidents like these are all the Hisslings need to prate noisily about hysteria in the United States.

Equally repressed in the minds of the Hisslings is the fact that the Communists—by their very doctrine—have to try desperately to get footholds everywhere including the camp of the enemy, including anti-Communists if you will. There is sufficient proof that they have succeded here in this effort. The great amount of pro-Soviet propaganda appearing in conservative and even reactionary newspapers and magazines is ample evidence of this fact. Even Alger Hiss, let it be remembered, never joined a front organization or publicly extolled the politburo. The investigation of Communist auxiliaries becomes hysterical only if one disregards this fact and the facts of the planned Soviet aggression (as the Hisslings and their mentors try to do).

At its summit, the fellow-traveling propaganda for American submission to Moscow had taken in almost a third of our population. Given the tremendous turn-over of sympathizers with Communist aims over the last 20 years, almost one out of two Americans may at one time cr another have been

caught to some degree in the Communist web of lies. While many of them have completely recovered from their one-time mistakes, quite a few others still cling to the petrified ideas of their past, feel guilty about their conflict, and try to save their conscience by a relapse into new delusions. Just as they once clamored for Moscow triumphs leading to Yalta and Potsdam, they now clamor for the rights and privileges of the Communists to conspire in our midst without being hindered by investigations and eventual prosecutions. If they had their way, the consequences of their own present hysteria might be as grave as the consequences of their past delusions are today.

The Hisslings are always ready to yell hysterically about "hysteria," and to rally behind any argument, man, or movement which obstructs the weeding out of Communist agents and influences on our politics. For their own delusions, dreams, and areas of ignorance concerning world communism, as well as present American reality, have not yet been weeded out.

Science Foundation's Goals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 18, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, with permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am happy to attach an editorial, Science Foundation's Goals, from the Milwaukee Journal of May 12.

It reveals an understanding of the very great importance of this legislation, in whose sponsorship and enactment I was pleased to play an active role.

As a member of the conference committee which reached the compromise agreement on the final version of the measure signed by the President, I hope that its advantages and potentialities will continue to get intelligent exposition of this kind.

The editorial follows:

SCIENCE FOUNDATION'S GOALS

When President Truman signed the bill establishing a national research foundation he called it a major landmark in the history of science in the United States.

The principal features of the bill and its prime purposes have been considerably obscured. This has been largely due to the hubbub raised over the questions of secrecy and of loyalty tests for scientists and scholars who would conduct research under foundation grants. Those collateral issues seem now to have been satisfactorily settled by compromise in the final measure, after 5 years of controversy.

The function of the new foundation is to promote basic research in such fields as medicine, biology, engineering, physics, and the like. Such research is aimed at discovery of basic facts without particular consideration for possible later application, usefulness, or profit. It provides the raw material on which applied science works in the development of all sorts of new machines, materials and techniques, for peace or war.

America has excelled in the field of applied science. America has lagged in the field of basic research and leaned heavily on Europe. Even the atomic bomb was developed on basic research that had been done abroad. War and the iron curtain have dimmed hope that we shall benefit from much new basic scientific research in Europe for some time, however.

For security and progress, our Nation must provide a stockpile of basic knowledge so that applied science and invention may be productive. That is the purpose of the new National Science Foundation.

It will take nearly a year to set up the machinery. After that, the foundation is expected to be ready to distribute some $15,000,000 a year to scholars, scientists, laboratories, and colleges for selected projects in basic research. It will collaborate with the Defense Department and the Atomic Energy Commission, which have their own research programs.

There is no denying that the last war, the cold war, and the possibility of future war provide the most impelling reasons for setting up the new program. A happier aspect is that the results, in the long run, may mean far more in terms of human welfare than in terms of weapons.

The New Threat From Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 22, 1950

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including excerpts from an address delivered by Arthur L. Mayer at the meeting of the executive committee of the American Jewish Committee, April 30, 1950.

Mr. Mayer, who is chairman of the committee on Germany of the American Jewish Committee, served abroad in 1943 and 1944 as assistant to Basil O'Connor, chairman of the American Red Cross. In 1944 and 1945 he was film consultant to the United States Secretary of War, Robert P. Patterson. In 1948 and 1949 Mr. Mayer was chief of the motion-picture branch of military government in Germany.

The remarks of Mr. Mayer are as follows:

The new statute of occupation has recently gone into effect. Under its terms we have returned to the German people a close approximation of complete control over their political and economic affairs and an absolute control over their educational institutions. This will not come as a surprise to anyone who participated in military government, for at all times the task of reconstructing the German mind was deemed secondary to the task of reconstructing German industry and finance.

Under the Army regime only one-third of 1 percent of the total American expenditures in Germany was for educational purposes. We have restored Germany to 100 percent of its prewar industrial strength but left it with 100 percent of its prewar spiritual weaknesses. Of course, the factories had to be reopened, transportation had to be reestablished, the people had to be fed. But they should have been fed not only the vitamins of fresh vegetables and health-giving fruits, but also the vitamins of fresh faiths and health-giving standards of conduct.

In the terrific pressure of the early days of the occupation, these basic needs could understandably be overlooked, but it is inexcusable that at this late date we have completely surrendered to the Kultur ministers of every German state—many of whom, if not ex-Nazis, are rabid nationalists—undisputed authority over curricula, textbooks and the selection of teachers. I do not need to describe to you the inevitable consequences of such a complete surrender of education on our part.

Immediately upon the cessation of fighting, the Russians entered Germany with carefully prepared textbooks. At the end of 2 years they had eight textbooks per child in their zone, while we had only one and one-half. The Bavarian Kultur minister, Dr. Hundhammer, boasted that he had personally blocked spending a mark on new textbooks. When I left Germany 5 months ago, we were still using some textbooks dating back to Nazi days, but a bright military mind had arranged that pages containing harmful material be pasted together. Kids are the same all over the world, and you can guess what pages they read most assiduously. The schools were honeycombed with ex-Nazis. Out of 12,000 teachers dismissed from the Bavarian schools in 1945 for national socialist affiliations, 11,000 were back on the job. We passed a compulsory education law for all boys and girls up to 16 years of age but we failed to build the schools that were necessary to make the law a reality rather than an agreeable dream.

The Russians in their zone may not be making much progress in converting the adults, but they are teaching the kids that communism is the sole answer to their natural craving for more food, better housing and jobs for all, while we are failing utterly to instill in the children of the Western zones any faith or even understanding of the blessings of free speech, representative government, and the protection of minority rights. It is high time in Germany that we spent less energy saying how bad communism is and spent more energy showing how well our system works.

* * * * *

CRITICAL SITUATION

The rationalization for our premature release of power to the Germans over their political, economic and educational life is that democratic principles as well as the acquisition of experience in self-government requires the operation by the Germans of their own affairs. This is much like saying that little Johnny, although he is still an ill-trained, bad boy, should be allowed to decide when to go to bed, whether to go to school and what guns to play with. It assumes that the Germans are prepared for self-government, an assumption which few of us who have actually labored in the vineyard rather than read reports in Berlin headquarters were prepared to accept.

What has happened was exactly what we predicted. The Allies can no longer command; they can only exhort and try to persuade. There has been a tremendous resurgence of reactionary nationalism and militarism with strong Nazi overtones. Democracy in Germany has been utilized to bring National Socialists back into important private and public positions. For instance, in the Bavarian ministry, 60 percent of the employees in the finance department are former Nazis, 77 percent in food and agriculture, and 81 percent in justice. Out of 31 senior members of the embryo foreign service of the new Republic, 14 are reported to be ex-Nazis. The return of power to German hands has meant the restoration of a narrow-minded hierarchical civil service of the traditional German variety, lacking any concept of democratic principles or ideals. It has permitted nationalist parties and neo-Nazi groups to come burgeoning back into existence.

There are at present three major groups of this nature which we estimate represent approximately 6,000,000 people. They have

not yet been able to coalesce and form a united front, but with the inevitable advent of some talented demagogue there is grave likelihood that they will be able to do so, and the German people are as ready today, as they were before Hitler, to sell their souls for assurances of security, race superiority, and plenty of loot. Our hands are tied in great measure by the fact that we must cooperate with the present leading parties in the German Parliament as our only potential democratic bulwark against these intense reactionaries of the right and of the left and, consequently, any Allied rebuke to the government redounds to the benefit of the extremists.

Unfortunately, moreover, not only have the neo-Nazis made progress in recent months, but, even more disquieting, German politicians who had been considered comparatively safe and sound middle-of-the-road conservatives are giving evidence of arrant nationalism. When, in a tactfully worded letter, Mr. McCloy asked for reconsideration of an income tax reduction measure, which would, in the absence of compensating revenues, have added to the financial assistance we are extending Germany, he was accused by the German government of unwarranted interference and an affront to the government's financial experts. Unemployment has been growing steadily—it has now reached close to 2,000,000. German industrialists and businessmen, who are surreptitiously extending credits behind the iron curtain, weep crocodile tears that United States controls are ruining their business with the east while the British and the French stifle German competition in the west. The government is running out of sops to throw to the German population, such as the recent elimination of rationing.

German politicians have not been entirely successful in their efforts to shift all the blame for economic difficulties to the United States. So new diversions are called for. Adenauer is making desperate efforts to rally support on issues of foreign policy; hence the Saar uproar, hence his repeated calls for a united Europe with Germany as an independent equal. Other politicians find it easier to make the good, old-fashioned nationalist appeal: to cry that war guilt is not confined to the Germans alone; to insist that they were always right about the Russian menace. Germans used to say with a wry grin to me, "Germany is always ahead of the United States. We have our ruins 5 years before you have yours."

Actually, we are making our concessions to the Germans and building up their industrial potential, which can easily be converted into a war potential, in the conviction that in any future emergency they will surely be on our side. It is undeniable that the overwhelming majority of Germans are bitterly anti-Communist, but they, like others before them, are victims of the dangerous fallacy that you can use the Communists rather than be used by them. Neither past history nor a careful appraisal of the possibilities for future trade and territorial concessions, which the Soviets can offer in competition with the Western World, justify any certainty that the Germans will surely select us as the more desirable ally. We are making an error for which our children may pay with their lives if we permit any remilitarization of Germany, or a level of steel production in excess of peacetime needs, or any further weakening of our present far too weak controls.

What we are preparing as a bastion may well prove to be a boomerang if we proceed on the assumption, as we seem to be doing, that we can win the support of the German people by cooperating with the small group of cartel-minded industrialists and pork barrel politicians, whose devotion to our institutions is in direct proportion to the amount of our annual appropriations, but whose deep rooted antagonism to a democratic way of life found clear expression during the German election last fall. Concessions on the dismantling of factories, the internationalization of the Ruhr, or the value of the mark, are not interpreted by the Germans as gestures of good will, but as manifestations of apprehension.

If after five brief years we are ready to swap our bitterly bought laurel leaves for an olive branch, let us at least be sure to extend that branch to the right and not to the wrong people. Postwar profiteers and the still wealthy industrialists who financed Hitler are gorging themselves with rich foods in the luxurious restaurants of Frankfurt and Hamburg, while the workers and professional classes and their children are still undernourished.

The Germans, on the basis of the Weimar and Bonn republics, associate democracy with incompetence, insecurity, and human misery. They fully intend by blackmail, cajolery, or double dealing to utilize the American-Russian impasse to reestablish their own European hegemony. They may hate communism even more than they distrust democracy, but in choosing between them they will be guided not by ideological considerations, but solely by motives of self-interest—and by self-interest I do not mean the best interest of the German people but of their politicians, their landed aristocracy, and their militarists who, under the new regime as under the old, are still their undisputed masters.

ANTI-SEMITISM IN GERMANY

Approximately 45,000 Jews still live in Germany in a population of 65,000,000, but the malady of anti-Semitism lingers on. Of those who remain, 20,000 are German Jews and the remainder, displaced persons. Most of them are well advanced in years—34 percent of the Jews in Berlin, for instance, are over 55 years of age. Personally, I think all except those too old or too infirm to emigrate are ill-advised, not to mention lacking in self-respect, to remain in Germany. Anti-Semitism has not yet assumed a definite organizational form but it has become again one of Germany's major "exports." Not only does it penetrate such neighboring countries as Belgium, France, and Switzerland, but it contaminates our occupation troops in Germany. There is complete absence of organized liberalism to combat its spread and to denounce its manifestations adequately.

These manifestations take various forms: the desecration of synagogues and cemeteries, usually ascribed falsely by the police to adolescents; insults to inoffensive, helpless people by housing officials, railroad conductors, restaurant owners; disturbances at public gatherings by hoodlums, who shout: "The trouble with Hitler was he didn't kill enough Jews," actual riots such as I saw in Munich, with mounted police charging unarmed Jewish DP's parading peacefully to protest an anti-Semitic letter in a newspaper; most ominous of all, ovations to men like Veit Harlan, producer of the notorious film, Jew Suess, when he was declared innocent of charges of anti-Semitism; and of the rabble-rouser, Herr Hedler, a member of the Bonn Parliament, against whom an unsuccessful action was instituted when he stated that "Hitler's anti-Jewish laws were all right, although, maybe, gassing was not the right method to enforce them."

A BROAD PROGRAM

The problem of Germany is, however, far more than a threat to Jewish welfare; it is a world problem, and in our effort to cope with it we cannot let it appear for one moment to be a purely Jewish matter. At the first meeting of our committee, which, let me point out, is not entirely a Jewish committee and whose non-Jewish membership we propose to broaden, our purposes were stated as follows:

1. To formuate a specific program to which all liberal-minded men could adhere for the building of a free Germany, which will add strength (moral as well as physical) to European democracy, and reinforce effective opposition to all forms of totalitarianism;

2. To arouse the American public to an awareness of the dangers inherent in the resurgence of extreme German nationalism, the failure of the denazification program, the return of former active Nazis to positions of power, proposals for the reestablishment of a German army and air force, and the neglect of the reeducation program;

3. To cooperate with other organizations similarly minded as our own in obtaining representation in Washington and abroad, and support in the press and on the radio for publicizing and furthering our program.

I should like to emphasize, however, that, in contrast to some other groups in this country, ours is definitely not a fault-finding committee. We have faith in Commissioner McCloy's high ideals and genuine zeal for humanitarian causes. He is in no way responsible for the present German dilemma and is doing everything within his power, in our opinion, to stem the tide of reaction.

No clearer expression of an approach, in the best American tradition, to the German issue has ever been offered than Commissioner McCloy's Stuttgart speech and his recent testimony before the House Appropriations Committee in connection with his proposed budget. This budget proposes to appropriate $18,000,000 for educational purposes and although this is still far from adequate, in our opinion, it is a big advance over previous budgets and probably all that could possibly gain congressional approval at the present time.

Indeed, that battle for congressional approval is the first one into which our committee has thrown itself. A letter recently appeared in the New York Times, prepared by General Taylor and signed by several other members of the committee together with Mr. George Brett, of the Macmillan Co.

We believe that this letter, urging that the full educational appropriation be granted, is a demonstration of the type of support we are seeking to extend and will continue to extend as far as possible to the State Department.

* * * * *

A resolution has been offered in the Senate by Senator GILLETTE, in conjunction with several colleagues including administration stalwarts like Senators LEHMAN, PEPPER, DOUGLAS, and KILGORE, which requests President Truman to create an investigating committee to separate facts from rumor in Germany and to learn how grave is the threat of various conspirational movements in that country.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely believe that an objective and dispassionate review of the facts and trends in Germany, conducted by a highly qualified nonpartisan group of leaders in American public life, and supported by an expert technical staff, would produce salutary results in the form of statesmanlike recommendations with regard to the future conduct of American policy in Germany. My hope is, therefore, that this constructive proposal for a nonpolitical, fact-finding presidential commission will find favor with both the Congress and the administration. It is a proposal which deserves the support of the American people, and it may prove a major contribution to the democratic effort to win the peace.

ABC Takes Wise Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 18, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, with permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I attach an editorial, "ABC Takes Wise Action," from the Milwaukee Journal of May 16.

It is a matter of justifiable pride that Milwaukee and Wisconsin played an important part in ending long-standing discrimination in the American Bowling Congress. The State's attorney general had pressed the matter vigorously with State ABC officials. Milwaukeans had signified a real interest in seeing that the ABC meeting in 1952, scheduled for the city's new arena, would be free from the discrimination which has marred the event in the past.

We promise an ABC promoting American sportsmanship for all Americans on an equal basis a real welcome in 1952.

The editorial follows:

ABC TAKES WISE ACTION

In a gratifying and almost unanimous vote the American Bowling Congress has opened its membership to all men without regard to race, creed, or color.

It is an act of Americanism and sportsmanship that is welcomed by everyone who has been opposing the ABC race ban, which limited membership in bowling's ruling organization to white males. It is another victory in the war against discrimination in America and an act that cannot fail to benefit the ABC.

They were, as Michael Dunn, ABC attorney, told the recent ABC convention, "sound, practical reasons" for the rule change. The ABC was engaged in costly court battles aimed at its practice of discrimination in at least four States and was expecting similar suits in other States. It had already lost its fight in the State of Illinois, where the ABC was chartered. And, as Dunn said, even if it won all its court fights it would "still lose in the court of public opinion."

But there were moral reasons for the change, too, and opponents of the race ban are willing to assume that those reasons were as compelling as any of the more "practical" reasons. There is reason to hope and believe that the ABC acted not through force but because its members accept the fact that discrimination is not moral, is not good Americanism and is not good sportsmanship. It remains for the future actions of the ABC to justify that hope.

Battles over race problems are never pleasant and almost always bitter. The ABC has taken the major step in healing the scars of the race battle in which it was involved. Its critics in that fight must heal the wounds further by accepting the ABC action in good faith, by congratulating the ABC for its sportsmanship and by hanging out the welcome mat in the cities where the ABC, for the last several years at least, has been something less than welcome.

Milwaukee, where the fight has been heated, can feel greater satisfaction than most communities in the ending of the ABC race ban because this is the organization's headquarters. This community commends the ABC for its straightforward action and will give a warm welcome to the organization's 1952 tournament here.

"Tin Hat" Antique in Civilian Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 22, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I commend to my colleagues in the House as profitable reading an article written by the Honorable CHET HOLIFIELD, Representative of California's Nineteenth District, and which appeared in the Washington Post of yesterday, Sunday, May 21.

I have read this splendid article carefully and with much interest, because of my own deep concern over the subject covered by Congressman HOLIFIELD.

No one in Congress is better qualified than our colleague from California to discuss civilian defense. It has been one of his prime interests, beginning with his first term in Congress. Few there are who have given the time and study to this most important problem in these past few years. No one realizes better than Congressman HOLIFIELD that civilian defense planning cannot wait until disaster strikes. He has become a leader in the fight to make certain America does not start too late in this field.

It has been my personal pleasure to serve with the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD], first on the former Military Affairs Committee, in 1945 and 1946, and since 1946 he and I have served together as two of the nine House Members on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. I, therefore, feel that I know the important role our colleague from California has and is playing in formulating plans for our Nation's security.

Mr. HOLIFIELD's article follows:

"TIN HAT" ANTIQUE IN CIVILIAN DEFENSE

(By CHET HOLIFIELD, Member of Congress, Nineteenth District of California)

In this atomic age, civilian defense is a matter that strikes home to every individual.

The possibility of mass destruction by the most terrible weapons ever devised—with even deadlier ones on the drawing boards—cannot be put aside as a mere fancy. The possibility is real; it hovers about us in the shape of a huge mushroom that could blot out cities and peoples.

And, because everyone is exposed to the potential horror, everyone shares in the responsibility for civilian defense. No longer can we assume that defense is wholly the job of soldiers in uniform. Civilian defense is a pervasive kind of activity that must reach into the community, the neighborhood, and the home.

Civilian defense must also become a new kind of activity. The tin hats and sand buckets of the last war would seem rather pathetic in the awful glare of an atomic blast. New techniques and instruments must be made available for widespread use in the event of an emergency. Radiological monitoring sounds like gobbledygook; the Geiger counter and the dosimeter are gadgets unfamiliar to the ordinary citizen; but these terms will become household words in any adequate program of civilian defense.

It was well stated by a witness before the Congressional Joint Committee on Atomic Energy that the science of protecting and saving people is years behind the laboratory science of killing people. Our military leaders like to boast now and then about how much damage we could inflict on an enemy. More sensible discussion, as this witness pointed out, might well be applied to the matter of protecting ourselves. He estimated that 30 percent of the casualties at Hiroshima and Nagasaki could have been prevented by adequate preparation.

The effective development of a civilian defense program is staggering in its complexity. Not only must the scientific findings of the laboratory be translated into instruments of common use, but intricate problems of Government administration must be solved. All levels of Government are necessarily enmeshed in this program. How shall we coordinate these diverse activities while preserving the basic rights of American citizens and our traditional structure of democratic government?

What responsibilities shall be allocated to the Federal Government, what to State and local governments? How can each complicated network of community facilities and services be adapted to perform in emergencies without impossible burdens of cost? How shall the Federal Government arrange its own administrative organization for efficient civil-defense planning and operations? Is new legislation needed to back up this administrative organization? These are some of the questions which must be answered, and Congress as well as the executive branch is grappling with them now.

While we can agree that the need to take effective measures of civilian defense is urgent, we must realize that the job cannot be finished overnight. Civilian defense is hard and prosaic work; it is continuing work. So long as we live in a world troubled by the prospect of atomic war, we must work at this steady occupation called civilian defense.

Where do we stand today on this whole matter? In the Federal Government, we are mainly in the planning stage. Of course, there are many criticisms that the plans are deficient in one or another respect, and there is an understandable insistence that we talk less and do more. However, the fact that progress is slow should not be taken to mean that the Government is indifferent. Rather, it reflects the magnitude and difficulty of the task.

On the legislative side, we are studying civilian-defense requirements with great care. The Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, of which I am a member, is conducting hearings, some in executive session, some public, on civilian defense as it relates to atomic attack. The Senate Armed Services Committee is examining military aspects of this matter.

Serious attention is being given to my bill for the creation of a special commission to study the feasibility of an alternate capital for use in case of an attack on Washington. I propose this purely as a precautionary measure. The continuous operation of Government, in the event of devastating atomic attack, is vital to continued national survival.

On the administrative side, the National Security Resources Board, an agency charged with broad responsibilities to advise the President concerning defense and security needs, is heading up civilian defense affairs. This Board is working under a directive from the President to assume leadership in civil-defense planning and to develop an adequate program.

Major departments and agencies of the Government are being assigned different parts of the planning job. For example, the General Services Administration was given the primary responsibility for planning for wartime civilian disaster relief. The GSA says it will develop plans for civilian and military participation in activites designed to minimize the effects of enemy attack upon our civilian population, facilities and services, and for repairing the damage resulting from such attack.

Because civilian defense must be considered largely a matter of atomic defense, the basic information for planning and operating derives largely from the Atomic Energy Commission. The Commission has been assigned the important task of supplying authoritative data concerning the effects of atomic explosion. What happens to people or to buildings or to cities when an atomic explosion occurs, are questions on which the AEC has already provided considerable information in published form.

RUGGED INSTRUMENTS

Detection of radiation is a basic factor in civilian defense. Obviously, we can't train everyone to be an atomic physicist. Therefore, instruments of detection must be developed to withstand hard knocks and to be operated easily after brief instruction. The Commission reports practical results, in the manufacture of low-cost, rugged instruments to detect the danger spots caused by deadly gamma rays after an atomic explosion. The Commission is establishing short training courses in laboratories throughout the country for doctors and radiological monitoring experts.

Private companies also have been stimulated to experiment in producing radiation detection instruments. When the AEC took over the atomic program in 1947, there were about 9 companies manufacturing about 19 different types of instruments. Presently there are about 60 firms in this field, including those that manufacture accessories or components

Follow-up studies on the survivors of Hiroshima and Nagasaki are providing important information on the after effects of exposure to radiation. Although newer and more deadly bombs make these observations dated, there is a note of encouragement in the fact that the survivors of Hiroshima and Nagasaki appear in pretty good shape. No increase has been noted in abnormalities in new-born children. It was found that the lens of the eye is particularly susceptible to radiation, and form of cataract is now afflicting the Japanese survivors.

Efficient methods of decontaminating food and water and objects exposed to radiation are being studied by the commission. New drugs to control infection and to treat bleeding are being developed. Anemia will be controlled by transfusion. And these radiation studies undoubtedly will result in new medical discoveries of far-reaching importance in the treatment of disease.

BASIC PRINCIPLES

In concluding this article, I would like to suggest a few basic principles of civilian defense which seem persuasive, the more I study this problem.

First, the measures must be practical. We cannot allow ourselves to become panicky and resort to fantastic and impossible schemes. America is not about to go underground or become a nation of cave dwellers. We must work within the framework of the existing economy and with the resources and facilities that are or can become available to us without inordinate financial outlays. Civilian defense should proceed by steady, careful, and well-integrated stages, rather than by erratic spurts in all directions at once.

Second, the major part of the work must be done locally. We want no top-heavy bureaucratic control in Washington imposing orders on everybody. The mainspring of civilian defense lies in the initiative and energies of the people themselves and in their local facilities for community service. Of course, the Federal Government has an important responsibility for effective planning, guidance, and assistance. But no Government agency at the top can substitute for the resourcefulness and teamwork that must be applied at the bottom—where civilian defense measures are expected to work. The interest and constructive criticism which municipal officers like Mayor Fletcher Bowron of Los Angeles have brought to bear on civilian-defense planning, indicate that many local units of Government are prepared to assume their rightful share of responsibility in this task.

Third, civilian defense must be managed by civilians. This job is too far reaching in its impact, too close to the daily lives of our citizenry, to be delegated to the military. Indeed, I am convinced that the military authorities do not want the heavy added responsibilities that civil defense entails. They have enough to do in their own sphere of responsibility for national defense.

Some proposals have been made that civilian-defense planning be placed within the Department of Defense. I cannot agree with this line of thinking. All the objections that can be made to the control of civilian defense by a rigid bureaucracy in Washington apply with even greater force to military control. Let the "garrison state" be confined to military life and let it not be extended to American life as a whole.

Fourth, and implicit in the three preceding principles, civilian defense must be carried out in the American, democratic way. With the new possibilities of atomic warfare have come new burdens which strain our resources and our institutions to the utmost. I am confident that America can carry these burdens without losing hold of the ideals and the ideas by which we live. The self-reliance of our people, their common sense, their resiliency, their tremendous capacity for cooperative endeavor at the community level, augur well for the future.

Atlantic Integration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 22, 1950

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the New York Times of May 22, 1950, entitled "Atlantic Integration":

ATLANTIC INTEGRATION

With the momentous decisions of the London conferences of the Atlantic powers spread upon the record of history, there devolve upon the Atlantic governments and peoples the task and the duty to take speedy and concrete action to transform the paper agreements into living reality. These decisions are the logical and inevitable consequences of the present international situation, in which the only remaining militaristic and aggressive power—Soviet Russia—challenges the rest of the world. But they are also so far-reaching and carry such broad implications, that they break through all traditional thinking and make unprecedented demands upon the statesmanship, the faith, and the realism of all the nations concerned.

For what they do is to carry the concept of the Atlantic community to a point inconceivable a few short years ago. Hitherto, under the Marshall plan, the West-European Union and the Council of Europe, the idea of political, economic, and military integration has been largely confined to Europe, with the United States providing both aid and encouragement in these projects. Even the North Atlantic Pact was originally conceived as a traditional defensive alliance between completely sovereign and independent nations, with each reserving the right to pursue independent policies and to determine the nature of its action in case of attack.

But under the London decisions the concept of economic, military and, at least in foreign policy, political integration has been extended from Europe to the whole North Atlantic community. And of all these projects, the proposed military integration is the most important because it involves and necessitates the other two. This military integration is implied in the project to create balanced collective forces by means of the most economical and effective utilization of the forces and the material at the disposal of the North Atlantic countries, which amounts, in effect, to the creation of a multinational but integrated and virtually supranational military establishment. Under this plan the United States will expand its Air Force and its Navy, rather than its ground force, and assume responsibility for strategic, including atomic, bombing, and, in combination with European naval forces, for keeping the ocean lanes open. The European nations, in contrast, will assume the prior task of forming large ground forces, and Britain and France will also assume the task of developing tactical airpower in support of such forces.

This is quite in keeping with the North Atlantic Treaty, which pledges the pact nations to "unite their efforts for collective defense and for the preservation of peace and security," and for this purpose, "by means of continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid, to maintain and develop their individual and collective capacity to resist armed attack." But it is also self-evident that if the fulfillment of this undertaking is to rest not on the joint action of balanced national forces, as formerly, but on a collective force organized according to national specialization, the effectiveness of the whole will inevitably depend on the effectiveness of any part of it. No chain is stronger than its weakest link, and that maxim, when applied to the integrated collective force of the North Atlantic community, carries with it certain corollary obligations which it is necessary to keep in mind.

One of these obligations is the duty of each and every nation to do its full share toward the development of the military specialty allotted to it. Another is the duty of all pact nations to contribute toward mutual aid according to their best ability, both in the matter of military supplies and in everything essential to economic progress, on which depend both the political stability and military reliability of the individual nations. A further obligation would seem to be for all the pact nations so to concert their foreign policies as to present, at all times, a solid front. But the first and foremost of all these obligations would seem to be that, beyond all previous technical reservations in the North Atlantic Pact, all the nations providing the collective force must be ready to act in concert the instant any one of them is attacked. That does not and cannot abrogate the exclusive right of Congress to declar war—a right which loomed so large during the pact debate. But it does strengthen the moral obligation to use armed force, if necessary, as provided by the pact. For the defection, or even hesitation, of any one nation would immediately and inevitably wreck the whole collective force and expose all to defeat and subjugation. That is a risk which must be avoided at the cost of every sacrifice, including the sacrifice of some measure of national sovereignty which this obligation may involve.

Essays by Barbara Hayes and Sue Bammesberger, Students of North Syracuse Central School, North Syracuse, N. Y., on Democracy Versus Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. R. WALTER RIEHLMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 1950

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to extend my remarks and include the following essays delivered by Barbara Hayes and Sue Bammesberger. I had the pleasure of hearing these essays delivered. The former won first prize and the latter second. Two hundred and thirty-five boys and girls from the towns of Clay and Cicero participated in the contest conducted by the Lake Shore Republican Club. The gratifying fact to me is that every one of these boys and girls wrote on the subject which is in the minds of every American these days—why they prefer democracy to socialism.

My concern over the Nation's drift toward socialism is somewhat lessened by this youthful demonstration that those who preach absolutism have not pulled the wool over the eyes of our youth. Those who have attempted to call socialism by so many other names have not been able to demonstrate to our younger generation that our hard-earned democracy should be cast away no matter what the blue-sky promises of Fair Dealers may be. I think that a great deal of credit, and our thanks, should be given to Mr. C. R. Robbins and Mrs. Marion Rich, principal and teacher, of North Syracuse Central School for their fine training of these young people. Following are the essays:

WHY I PREFER DEMOCRACY TO SOCIALISM

(By Barbara Hayes)

Did you ever stop to think of how lucky you are to live in a democracy? No, I don't believe very many of us have. Let us compare democracy with some of the dictated forms of government and see just how lucky we are.

A democracy is a representative form of government. The people may govern themselves directly through town meetings, or indirectly through elected representatives in city, State, and national affairs.

The basis of our democratic form of government for a period of over 150 years, has been the Constitution. This document, adopted in 1789, is comprised of our many freedoms and liberties. Even though it was written for the benefit of a nation of 4,000,000, it is expandable enough to serve today a Nation of 150,000,000. The main parts of our Constitution are the preamble, the body (consisting of seven articles), and the amendments. The first 10 amendments are referred to as the Bill of Rights. The importance of the Bill of Rights can scarcely be overrated. It serves as the cornerstone of American democracy. Under its protective freedoms and guaranties, Americans can resist the abuses and injustices which people of dictator nations have been forced to accept. Liberties which the Bill of Rights guarantees are freedom to act, think, believe, speak, write, hear, read, worship, assemble, and possess. The importance of these liberties lies in the fact that they are guaranties to everyone.

In no other country in the world could people live their lives with such an air of independence. Even the youngest school children have had some contact with their Government. They have seen policemen directing traffic at busy corners; they have heard the President of the United States speak on the radio; they have heard of judges, trials, juries; or have seen people stand in line at the polls to vote on election day. However, the heads of all governments do not always report to the people on the affairs of the nation. The people in other nations do not always have the chance to elect the officials who govern them. These privileges are granted only to people in democratic countries.

Socialism, on the other hand, is in an almost direct contrast with democracy. It is quite difficult to define the word socialism in such a way as to include all the shades of meaning which have been given to that word. Some consider it a very dangerous and revolutionary idea. Others believe it to be a desirable way of life and they presume it would bring about a better way of living than any other form of government.

Socialism is often confused with communism. The main difference between them is their viewpoints on government-controlled goods. Socialists believe that the government should control and regulate only producer's goods. They include railroads, machinery, factories, and raw materials. Communists believe that the government should control not only producers' but consumers' goods. Consumers' goods consist of food, clothing and shelter.

The father of modern socialism as well as modern communism is Karl Marx. Marx felt that the only way to overcome the evil struggle between classes was to have only one class—the masses of workers. The Communists believe in bringing about this overthrow quickly through revolution, as has been done in Russia. The Socialists would bring about this change through constitutional means.

In spite of much opposition it is certain that the theories of Marx and his followers have greatly influenced thought in the modern world.

In a totalitarian state the government is the master of the people, who exist for the benefit of the state. While in a democratic state, the state is the servant of the people and exists for their good. This principle is based on the great faith placed in the individual in a democratic state. Also, in a socialist state all reading and culture is dictated by the government. This is due to the fact that everything is led by one party and the people are powerless.

However, even if the defects of capitalism are admitted, capitalism has brought about a much higher standard of living for a larger number of people than any other system. This has been due to two very powerful factors—individual initiative and the right to private property. These are the forces which develop individual responsibility, energy, inventive skill and a progressive spirit. Although socialism would not crush out all private property and initiative, most Americans feel that freedom in these things has been the driving force that has made America great.

WHY I PREFER DEMOCRACY TO SOCIALISM

(By Sue Bammesberger)

America, our country and our people—we are a great Nation. But are we great enough to overcome the problems of the day that swirl about us? It depends upon whether we look at the whole fruit of the work of free men or see only the blemishes. We know we have not reached every one of our high ideals, but we are still trying. Today we face the problems much the same as our forefathers did. There has always been a struggle, but we didn't quit; we have kept on working and striving.

Today there are two theories of government competing with each other in the world—Communist ideas against democratic ideas. The split-up of the world into two rival blocs is the most serious single problem facing us today. The solution of specific problems, such as the control of atomic energy, conclusion of peace terms, reconstruction of devastated areas and others, is affected by the rivalry between the United States and Russia. Soviet determination to expand its sphere of influence is matched by American determination to "make the world safe for democracy."

As the leading spokesman for the democratic nations we oppose the spread of communism by other than lawful means. If a nation of its own free will chooses to accept communism, our policy is not to interfere in what we consider basically a domestic matter. But if communism is forced on weaker countries by outside military pressure or infiltration of foreign agents, our policy is to oppose such aggressive expansion.

So much is said against communism, just what is it and why are we the people of America so intent on keeping it out of our country and the countries of our allies? It is hard to give one single definition because it means so many things. Often it means one thing in theory and another in practice. Communism is a complicated web of ideas, many of which have come from the past. In the 1800's there was a strong Socialist movement under the leadership of Karl Marx. In France in 1870 this movement split into the Socialist and Communist branches, the latter being more radical. Only in Russia and its satellite countries did it result in the establishment of "a dictatorship of the proletariat" when the czarist regime was overthrown by the Communist revolution in 1917. Communism has since spread in varying degrees to many countries. One principle all Communists, or Socialists, agree upon is that governments or the representatives as a whole, should own all the means of production, such as factories, machines, farm land, banks and should operate them for the benefit of all rather than the profits for the few.

When the Communists speak of democracy they obviously do not mean our version of the Bill of Rights. They believe that the state is omnipotent and that individual human beings are unimportant. This belief is exactly the opposite of the democratic idea which has been the basis of our democracy; of our freedom, of our educational system, and our social customs; an idea which not only has made possible our way of life but has been largely responsible for economic progress and our wealth as a Nation. What is this idea? It is faith in the possibilities of human personality, that given the opportunity, men and women have the ability to take charge of their own lives. Proof of this idea is our United States Constitution which has served as the basis of our Government for over 150 years. The Communists say that their new Russian constitution is an excellent one. They point to the civil rights it promises—freedom of speech, of the press, of assembly, of street processions. The Communists call these pledges of freedom, but if anyone took them seriously he would not last long. These civil rights may be used only to strengthen the Communist system. They were not granted to give the people liberty. The preamble of our Constitution states as one of its clauses that the Constitution was established in order to secure the blessings of liberty to curselves and our posterity. In a real democracy, freedom means liberty to

criticize and oppose, as well as to support. Our Government was set up to guarantee these liberties to us and it actually tries to carry out this guaranty. Most of us believe it does so to an extent never before equaled in the whole world. And we also believe that any form of censorship of creative ability or of criticism is dangerous. A democracy cannot flourish without criticism.

Also, according to the Communist constitution of Russia, the citizen is given the right to rest and leisure. So the Government sees that he gets it. And he gets it through organizations that control his leisure from the time he is 8 years of age. Plays, songs, and movies in Russia are used for more than entertainment. Their primary purpose is propaganda—to glorify the state. We Americans are free in our leisure time. How good or how bad our neighborhood becomes depends on each of us—individually.

Some critics of our democracy say that because the world is so complex now, the individual citizen ought not to have a voice in his own government. In Russia there are what they term "free elections," but there is only one party—the Communist Party. Voters are allowed to vote only "yes" or "no." In America the people exercise their sovereignty by voting for candidates on either of two major parties or from several minority parties. Voting is a privilege conferred on the people by the state—it is not a right of citizenship. All those who are qualified to vote may use the privilege or not, as they choose, but it is generally understood to be the duty of citizens to exercise the privilege if our democracy is to function in the interest of the majority.

After thoughtfully comparing life in a democracy with that in a Communist dominated country, I am proud to proclaim that I am a part of a government of the people, by the people, for the people. On every horizon new frontiers beckon to the young people of America who are now in school or college. In an atmosphere of freedom of thought, word, and deed, the growth and development of human character is made possible, giving boys and girls a chance to dream dreams and make those dreams come true. That is why I prefer democracy to socialism.

Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE D. O'BRIEN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 1950

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Richard J. Gray, president, Building and Construction Trades Department, American Federation of Labor, before the House Committee on Banking and Currency:

I appreciate this opportunity to testify because I feel that the subject of rent control is vitally important, not only to the 8,000,000 members of the American Federation of Labor, but to the lives and welfare of all American families.

We are very pleased that a number of Congressmen have introduced bills to extend rent control, and we particularly appreciate the tremendous interest which the chairman of this committee has shown in this important problem.

It would seem appropriate in presenting this testimony to discuss briefly a few of the chief arguments that have been advanced by the real estate interests in their effort to prove that there is no need for extending Federal rent control beyond June 30, 1950.

The first point which real estate people emphasize is that there is no longer any shortage of housing. They point to the record volume of home building last year when the building industry began the construction of over a million homes, and to the continuing high level of construction during the first 4 months of this year. In their opinion, this makes unnecessary any continuation of Federal rent control.

However, this analysis overlooks several important points. It overlooks the fact that last year's volume of housing construction was not very much higher than 1925, a year when there were 35,000,000 fewer people in this country. It also overlooks the fact that the overwhelming proportion of the housing built during the past year has been for sale and not for rent.

More fundamentally, the analysis of the real estate interests underestimates the character and extent of the desperate housing shortage this country has been facing in the postwar period. Even with the record volume of new construction, the housing shortage is still very much with us. Its existence cannot be denied. The Bureau of Labor Statistics recently conducted a survey of vacancies in 25 metropolitan areas in all parts of the country. Some of the vacancy rates disclosed by this survey are as follows:

	Percent
Atlanta, Ga.	1.1
Buffalo, N. Y.	1.2
Chicago, Ill.	.8
Indianapolis, Ind.	1.1
Minneapolis and St. Paul, Minn.	1.0
New York City, N. Y.	.8
Pittsburgh, Pa.	.9
St. Louis, Mo.	1.3

Of the 25 cities surveyed, only two had vacancy rates of over 3 percent and only 5 others had vacancy rates between 2 and 3 percent. In all of the remainder, the vacancy rate was less than 2 percent. This compares with a normal rate of 5 to 6 percent. Moreover, it is important to remember that the figures cited represent the over-all vacancy rate. They do not indicate that this percentage of dwelling units were actually available for rent. As a matter of fact, the habitable rental vacancy rate in these 25 cities was 1 percent or less for all except two of the areas. These figures certainly show that the housing shortage is still very much with us.

A second argument which the real-estate interests use against rent control is that it is unfair to the Nation's landlords. Yet, the facts are that today's rent-control law permits the landlords to obtain all increases in rents to which they would be entitled in a normal rental market.

Rent increases can be obtained for any of the following:

1. For any major improvement which the landlord makes in the dwelling unit.

2. For increases in the price of fuel or any other operating cost which the landlord has to pay.

3. For cases in which the landlord was unexpectedly faced with a very low rent on the maximum rent date.

4. For cases in which the landlord is not receiving an adequate return for his property.

During the past year the Housing Expediter has had to interpret the formula for "fair net operating income" written into the law last year. Under the law the Housing Expediter ruled that this requirement would not be met unless the landlord was obtaining a net income equal to 30 percent of his gross income for small buildings and 25 percent for large buildings. I want you to know that the A. F. of L. felt that these requirements were unduly liberal, and when this procedure was announced a public protest was issued. Under the circumstances it is difficult to see how anyone can argue that the landlords are being treated unfairly by the provisions of the present law.

Another argument which opponents of rent control are using concerns what is described as a "vast groundswell of public opinion" against rent control. According to this theory, it is only the heavy hand of the Washington bureaucrats which has forced rent control upon the unwilling American people.

Let us examine this argument more closely. We must realize that there is included in the present rent-control law a very liberal section providing for decontrol of rents by the "local option" method.

If opponents of rent control are correct, the American people would have acted to take advantage of these local-option decontrol provisions of the 1949 rent-control law. The facts are directly the opposite. Only a very few cities have utilized these provisions to remove rent controls. Despite intense pressure from the real-estate interests, the city councils of only 262 cities—only 7 percent of communities under rent control today—had elected to remove rent control by May 10 of this year. This total includes only 11 cities with more than 100,000 population and 14 others with over 50,000.

It might be desirable for me to point out how these decontrolled actions have affected members of the American Federation of Labor. Recently we have made a special survey of all communities throughout the country in which there are A. F. of L. central labor unions. The following table indicates how many of these areas have been decontrolled and how many are still under rent control:

Status of rent control in communities where there are A. F. of L. central labor unions, May 1950

	Number	Percent
Total central labor unions in United States and Alaska	791	
Communities never under rent control	100	
Total communities under rent control	691	100.0
Decontrolled by local option	89	12.9
Decontrolled by Housing Expediter	80	11.6
Decontrolled by recommendation of local rent advisory board	13	1.9
Decontrolled by State action	22	3.2
Decontrolled by Emergency Court of Appeals	1	.1
Under State rent controls	65	9.4
Still under Federal controls	421	60.9

You will note from the total that more than three-fifths of the communities (421 out of a total of 691 which have ever been under rent control) are still operating under Federal rent control. It is significant that only 87 or less than 13 percent have been decontrolled by the local option method.

These are the over-all Nation-wide statistics. When we examine the figures for particular States, it is easy to see how any sudden decontrol would fall with catastrophic impact upon A. F. of L. members. In Illinois, for example, there are 53 communities in which there are A. F. of L. central labor unions. None of these communities have been decontrolled by local option, and only nine of the smallest areas have been decontrolled by the Housing Expediter. In Minnesota, where there are 17 central labor unions, only 2 of its communities have been decontrolled, neither as a result of local option. In Michigan, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Minnesota, New Jersey, Missouri, North Carolina, Washington, and West Virginia, only a handful of communities have

been decontrolled. In fact, there are 10 States in which not a single community with a central labor union has been decontrolled.

This information very clearly refutes the contention of the real estate interests. Although there have been the most liberal arrangements for decontrol under the present law, only a very few cities have decontrolled rents under the local option method. The vast ground swell of public opinion which the real estate interests have tried to create simply does not exist.

When your committee was considering the question of rent control last year, very few communities had as yet been decontrolled. Many of us felt then that decontrol would have a very serious effect on rent levels, but the actual facts in decontrolled communities have turned out to be even worse than our fears.

We no longer have to guess about what happens when a community has been decontrolled. Within the past few months the Department of Labor has surveyed 14 communities where Federal rent controls have been removed to determine the effect on rent levels. In 12 of the communities there are no longer rent controls of any kind while two of them, Milwaukee and Madison, Wis., are under a very weak State rent control law. The Department of Labor found that rent increases in these communities for those units for which rents were raised ranged from more than 12 percent in Madison, Wis., to nearly 41 percent in Beverly Hills, Calif. The survey also showed that from 17 to 64 percent of all the tenants in those cities were affected by rent increases.

These facts have received support from a survey made by an organization which is thoroughly opposed to rent control, the National Association of Real Estate Boards. The NAREB recently made a survey of 100 decontrolled cities in 30 States. It was found that rents increased for one-half of the tenants in decontrolled communities with a population of over 50,000 and for 55 percent in cities of 100,000 or more. The average increase for tenants who were forced to pay rent increases was 22 percent. Interestingly enough, the survey showed that rent increases were higher in the smaller cities than in the larger cities. The NAREB survey points unmistakably to two conclusions: (1) Nationwide decontrol would result in rent increases for millions of families. (2) Rent control is just as much a problem in many small areas as it is in the large cities.

Thus far, I have been citing overall figures covering tenants in all income groups. I want to stress the fact, however, that the removal of rent controls would have the most serious effect on families in the lower income brackets because rent payments loom as a larger proportion of family income for low-income groups than for higher-income groups. This is indicated by a survey made by the Federal Reserve Board indicating that in 1948 rent constituted 23 percent of family income for families with incomes under $2,000 as compared with 12 percent for all families and only 9 percent for high income families with incomes of $5,000 or over.

However, even this is not the whole story as to the particularly severe effect that rent decontrol has on low-income families. The Department of Labor surveys previously mentioned show very clearly that in a clear majority of the cities where income data were obtained, a larger percentage of families in the low-income groups were affected by rent increases than the higher-income families. For example, in Topeka, Kans., 48 percent of families with incomes under $2,000 had their rents increased after decontrol as compared with only 22 percent of the families with $4,000 or more.

Knowing the significance of housing costs in the budgets of union members, the A. F. of L. has been deeply concerned with the problem of rent control. This has been evidenced in a number of official actions which the A. F. of L. has taken during the past year. I would like to briefly mention these statements.

The sixty-eighth convention of the A. F. of L., which met last October in St. Paul, Minn., urged without a dissenting vote that "until the supply of low-price housing units can be equalized with the demand, effective rent control must be maintained so that families will not be faced with exorbitant increases in rents."

This action by the most recent A. F. of L. convention has been supplemented by statements issued by the executive council at the two meetings it has held since the convention. At its January meeting the executive council issued a statement urging the need for continuance of the rent-control program until there is a large increase in the housing supply for families in the low- and middle-income groups. At its meeting held only 2 weeks ago the executive council again emphasized the need for continuance of rent control. At that time the council said: "* * * as long as the housing shortage exists, Federal rent control will be needed to prevent exorbitant increases in rents."

I can assure you that these official actions which the A. F. of L. has taken in support of rent control have not been intended to sustain any theory of Government control over our economy. On the contrary, the A. F. of L. has never been in favor of Government controls unless they were absolutely necessary. It is only because we are convinced of the extremely harmful effect which would result from the sudden removal of all Federal rent controls that we are now urging the extension of rent controls for another year.

The cold facts are that the removal of rent controls at the present time would have the same effect on millions of workers as a Nation-wide pay cut. This is what might be expected to happen. The average factory worker today doesn't make much more than $50 a week. A worker with a weekly income of $50 spends 20 percent of his income for rent. That amounts to about $10 a week. A rent increase of only 25 percent would be about $2.50 a week, and bear in mind that 25 percent is much less than the average increase in many of the communities surveyed by the Department of Labor. A $2.50 a week increase would represent 5 percent of his weekly income, and if it is assumed that he works 40 hours a week, it is the equivalent of a pay cut of 6 cents an hour.

You gentlemen are certainly familiar enough with the history of the labor movement in this country to know that American workers simply will not take that kind of treatment without protest. If rents are decontrolled on a Nation-wide basis, I am absolutely certain that unions all over the country will demand an increase in wages in order to maintain the current purchasing power of their members.

We can reach only one conclusion and that is that Federal rent controls must be extended for another year. While the A. F. of L. has criticized the present rent control law, we think that it does constitute a minimum basis for an effective rent control program. We are, therefore, recommending only one change in the present law.

We believe that the local option provisions in the present law should be changed so that local option could be made a two-way street. Under the present law a community has no means of restoring rent controls once it has used the local option method to decontrol rents in its area. We believe that this should be changed so that communities could bring about recontrol by local option in the same way that they are now able to accomplish decontrol. We think that they should have this right to recontrol by local option regardless of whether the decontrol was by previous local action, State action, or upon the initiative of the Housing Expediter.

I should like to state briefly our position on the provision in H. R. 8276 which would remove Federal rent controls in any local community which failed to declare prior to December 31, 1950, by resolution of its governing body or by popular referendum, "that a shortage of rental housing accommodations exists which requires the continuance of rent control." In view of the very simple method of obtaining decontrol available to every community through the local option method, we are frankly at a loss to understand why it is necessary to consider a proposal of this kind. Moreover, there is grave danger that unless such a proposal is surrounded with adequate safeguards, rent control will go by default in many communities even though a majority of the citizens recognize a continued need for it. A lethargic city council or one in which real estate interests were heavily represented might fail to take the necessary action required to retain rent controls in its community. We feel, therefore, that the present local option method is sufficiently flexible to permit any community where rent controls are no longer necessary to take the necessary action to remove Federal rent controls. This is no time to take chances with the welfare and prosperity of the American people.

We, in the American Federation of Labor, believe that the issue is clear. Federal rent controls must be extended beyond June 30, 1950. The failure to extend rent controls would mean sudden, large, and widespread increases in rents for millions of families who would be completely unprepared for such a blow. This must not be allowed to happen. We, therefore, urge that you recommend to the Congress that Federal rent controls be continued for another year.

Political "Medicine Show"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 22, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am including as part of my remarks an editorial which appeared in the Racine Journal Times, of Racine, Wis., on Tuesday, May 16, 1950, apropos the President's political junket across the United States at an expense of $250,000 of the American taxpayers' money:

POLITICAL "MEDICINE SHOW"

President Trumans' tour, which ended at Chicago last night in a blaze of fireworks, real and political, has been called various things. He labeled it "nonpolitical." His critics marked it down as a "barnstorming junket" to get votes for his party. But the Indianapolis News has picked another name for it—a "medicine show.'

We don't like to mention a President of the United States in the same breath as one of those old-time shows, with "the doctor" selling a "matchless remedy good for all the ills of man or beast," under gas lights in a tent between and after performances by second rate jugglers, comedians, singers, banjo players and other artists. But the News, it seems to us, has put the thing rather neatly, in this fashion:

"In his opening speech Monday night at Lincoln, Nebr., and in two of three addresses

Tuesday in Wyoming, the President played politics of the most obvious sort. His strategy is simple: To make at least one speech pink with promises for each of the economic or regional groups in the Nation.

"Before a farm audience at Lincoln, he vowed that farm income would be raised even higher, mainly through that economic nightmare, the Brannan plan. At Casper, he employed the ancient political trick of playing off one region against another. The East, home of the selfish and shortsighted, is against the development of the natural resources of the West, he said. The Government, he assured the westerners, is the best means 'for development of power, navigation, and irrigation.'

"Since Cheyenne is a fairly sizable community, the President brought out his panacea for small business. The little merchant, he maintained—like the farmers and the ranchers—needs only to put his trust in the administration and Harry Truman. There was no mention of the real troubles of small and big business alike—the confiscatory taxes made necessary by his supergovernment and wild-spending administration.

"The President could answer a very real need on this trip if he would only discuss the issues that worry every citizen these days—the staggering size of the national debt, the growing inflation stoked by deficit spending, revision of the Taft-Hartley Act, the seemingly endless strikes, the Communist threat, both at home and abroad. The people of the Nation want to hear these problems discussed clearly and honestly. The man who should take the lead in presenting them is the President of the United States.

"Instead, he is putting on a medicine show. And implicit in all his talks is the dangerous medicine that you don't have any troubles that the Government can't cure. Individual responsibility, personal initiative and enterprise are played down for the universal palliative of a supergovernment. Even more alarming, it appears that Mr. Truman is personally convinced that the Government can run people's lives better than they can run their own. Such a man does not belong at the head of what is still a Nation of free people, for people are no longer free who look to government, not themselves, for salvation."

Excise Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 22, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following radio address I delivered over station WMEX, Boston, Mass., Monday, May 22, 1950:

REPEAL EXCISE TAXES

Ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience, broadly speaking, business is booming at most levels, with the exception of some retail outlets on Main Street, U. S. A.

The housewives of the Nation who, by instinct and necessity, will not pay more for any article than it is worth, are staging a quiet but effective buyers' strike. This is hurting many small-business enterprises through no fault of the operators themselves.

Why?

In definite protest against excessive taxation.

As responsible citizens they recognize the need for a Federal income tax, a corporation tax, for gift, estate, and other direct taxes to pay for those public programs which they approve.

This money is spent for the purposes of general government, to pay the interest on the public debt, for public works, education, housing, labor, to develop our natural resources, for military preparedness, foreign aid, help to veterans, social security, and aid to farmers.

The average American, however, does balk against the now-you-see-it-and-now-you-don't taxes variously referred to as hidden, wartime, luxury, or excise.

Excise means: "An inland tax imposed on certain commodities of home production and consumption as tobacco, spirits, etc."

What we are mainly concerned about is this et cetera business, under which so many items have been added that the total result is a jigsaw puzzle that no one can put together coherently.

It has been proposed by the President that a number of these nuisance taxes be eliminated to the extent that the resulting loss in revenue is replaced by revenue obtained from closing loopholes in the present tax laws.

Without getting lost in the dense jungle of those tax laws, whose loopholes the average American can't seem to find, I wish to say that the Congress will go the President one better and do a real bulldozing clearance on excise taxes. If the President should veto such savings, I believe that the Congress will override his blockade.

Originally excise taxes were supposed to be regulatory. We remember the taxes on tobacco and liquors, even before we had a Federal income tax. Of course in wartime they must be placed on all so-called civilian goods, so that the raw materials and the productive energies of these industries shall be channeled into the war effort.

In peacetime there is no justification for such regulatory taxes except to provide extra money to play around with, for those in Government who want to spend over and above the needs for special programs.

For our own information and guidance, it is a pity that every article that is sold in the United States does not have affixed to it a stamp showing the total percentage of Federal taxes represented in the cost of each item. Then we would react promptly to the true score and as a Nation, we would not spend beyond our means.

Where the excise take is clearly stated as in the purchase of fur coats, leather goods, and that et cetera business again, the consumer rightly gets up on his high horse and refuses to buy these penalties.

When it comes to a loaf of bread or an egg or powder for the baby, the Government hasn't got the nerve to tell people what it is taking from them for these basic necessities of life. The trick is to keep these taxes hidden. But I say that we should bring these out into the open so that public resentment will demand elimination or at least reduction of all consumer levies.

Hold on to your pocketbook as you hear these facts, revealed by a private research organization known as the Tax Foundation.

That loaf of bread on the table contains something besides wheat. You can't see but maybe you can feel the 151 different taxes that inflate its price. "The Egg and I" is not as simple as all that. One hundred anonymous taxes are also wrapped up in that little shell.

Or the house in which you are now living. If it is a fairly new one, it has from 700 to 1,000 invisible rat holes through which your money has run out in taxation and is still running out.

Perhaps you have a martini or a glass of beer in your hand. Don't drop it when you hear that Uncle Sam gets a real flick out of taking each year well over $2,000,000,000 in taxes on liquor.

The lady in the house together with her sisters throughout the Nation pay out in taxes each year $210,000,000 on jewelry, $34,000,000 on cosmestics and toilet articles, $32,000,000 on furs, and $82,000,000 on luggage. And that is only the beginning of a long line of other confiscations.

No wonder its so hard to make both ends meet in our family budget, when Uncle Sam, our problem relative, picks up so much unguarded change around the house when we're not looking.

Sometimes we wonder what the baby is crying about. Maybe its the pinch of taxation that is bothering him, and, even though he doesn't understand what its all about, he's being hurt and he's letting us know about it.

Perhaps we, who are grown up, and can trace the origin of our financial anemia, will also complain, and insist that this excise blood-letting be stopped, so that economic health and purchasing power will be restored, to us, and the Nation.

American housewives, who do most of the purchasing for 150 million people are holding back until these wartime levies are crossed off the books and prices come down. They expect this to be done and they are waiting until it is done, before they will buy freely. Their common sense is far ahead of the lawmakers.

These unrealistic levies slow down trade. Shrinking demand from retail outlets, reaching back to the factories, curtails production and causes unemployment that is wholly unnecessary.

As an example, let us look at the fur and leather goods industries because of seasonal factors affecting them, and because their products are an important item in the average woman's budget.

At the present time there is a 20 percent wartime excise tax on fur- and leather-luggage products.

Summer is usually the busy season in the fur industry, and if any relief is to be provided, it should be done without further delay.

In the summer of 1949, one-third of the workers were unemployed, one-third were working part-time, and only one-third had steady jobs.

This industry employs over 100,000 persons, not counting the hundreds of thousands of farmers who serve as suppliers for the industry during the winter months. There are over 5,000 small firms engaged in fur dressing and dyeing, manufacturing, and retailing. Last year they suffered from a drastic 30 percent drop in sales.

Tax receipts went down accordingly. From the fiscal years 1947 to 1949, inclusive, they receded from $97,000,000 to $79,000,000 to $53,000,000.

The effect on the labor force in this trade is tragic. Most of the workers are middle-aged or over, having devoted their best years in acquiring a highly specialized skill. It is impossible for them to get employment elsewhere. The burden of maintaining them is an added expense to Government which would not be necessary if they were given an opportunity for productive employment.

The unfair competition in the present tax law is dramatically revealed by the fact that a $200-cloth coat with fur trimming is tax-free, but a fur coat costing $100 has $20 added to the price to pay for the Federal tax.

In the northern half of the United States where extra-warm coats are a necessity, an office girl or mill worker in order to buy a relatively cheap fur coat costing two to three hundred dollars would have to work an extra 2 weeks just to pay the tax. This is a mighty high tariff to impose on our own working people.

The luggage industry is also stricken by the excise taxes which discourage buying. Winter and summer, the American woman must have a durable leather handbag. In it she carries and protects a wonderful assortment of articles necessary to her morale,

from assorted keys to beauty aids to charge cards and checkbooks, without it an American woman would be lost, and so would retail business which puts so much merchandise into that handbag and takes so much money out of it.

But the Government insists on a prior claim to its purchasing power, leaving less and less to the merchant who would give far greater value in return. It not only taxes the contents but the leather container itself. As a result, there was a 30 to 40 percent curtailment in production last year in those plants manufacturing handbags, luggage, suitcases, and personal leather goods.

Even the Government's cut went down, which does not seem to be a successful result, even from a tax viewpoint. When it takes too much the source dries up.

But when it comes to classifying oils, creams, and powders that are necessary for a baby's health and comfort as luxuries, with a 20 percent tax added, we cannot find words to express our exasperation. The taxation without representation against which our forefathers rebelled was nothing compared with this all-time low. Unless we reverse the tax trend, some ingenious tax spender may yet come up with the idea that we should tax babies for being born.

Even the poor man's entertainment, the movies, are saddled with a tax bite that makes a young fellow reach for a $2 bill before he can think of taking his best girl to the neighborhood theater.

But, you ask, how is the Federal Government going to get by if these special levies are canceled?

There are some obligations which cannot be repudiated. In other fields some economies could be effected through elimination of duplicating functions. This could be done gradually in some agencies without causing harm to anyone, by a go-slow policy in filling vacancies.

How much revenue would the Government lose if the wartime excise taxes are repealed? About one and one-half billion dollars.

Where will the Government get the money to replace this loss, assuming that there is no reduction in Government expenditures?

Let's take a look at the budget.

It now includes the sum of one billion, nine hundred and twenty million to make loans and to purchase certain assets, many of which are already guaranteed by Government agencies. Guaranteed mortgages and loans comprise a major part of this item.

What does this mean?

In this case the Government is counting loans, as money spent beyond recall. But this is a recoverable asset. Most, if not all of this so-called expenditure will be paid back.

Therefore, the actual expenditures in the budget can be reduced by this amount. And this sum alone is greater than the net loss of all wartime excise taxes. Therefore, we can eliminate these nuisance taxes without putting the Government further into the red.

There is one other important point which the tax gatherers overlook.

Tax reduction stimulates business activity. It enables manufacturers, merchants and operators of service establishments to offer the public lower prices. This encourages people to buy. The volume of economic activity rises.

And the Government is happily surprised to find that the larger turn-over of goods and services, thus inspired, increases the revenue it gets through normal income tax channels.

This relief for a Nation can be accomplished without any sacrifice of essential Government services.

We have only to look at England, where everyone is so burdened down by ever-present regulations and taxes that they have all they can do to get by without getting ahead, to learn that such a system is not the way for us.

Excise taxes in the United States must be cleaned out.

So that the housewife can buy, so that her husband may have satisfying employment, so that business may prosper, so that the United States which means all of us, can enjoy the incentives that make for genuine progress.

Biggest Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the twenty-sixth article by Mr. Frank C. Waldrop on the infiltration of communism in our country:

BIGGEST STORY

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

The natural imbecility of communism was never more clearly demonstrated to the world than in the matter of seeking diplomatic recognition for the Soviet regime in Russia. It wanted status, yet its acts every day were a warning to all against it.

Here was a government which, in blood and terror, had seized power by revolution against the majority will of the people, had abolished all rights of property and individual freedom and had set up as its diplomatic weapon, an international Communist conspiracy to sovietize the whole world.

And as soon as possible, it had begun using Communist branches in every country possible, actually to precipitate those revolutions.

In the United States of America, those early acts of terrorism involved bombs in the mail, wholesale strikes that wrecked the unions involved and cost the industries irreparable harm, and the general public much more.

In Germany, already shaken and rattled by defeat and the abdication of the Hohenzollern monarchy, the Communists were even more violent. Their Spartacus Bund drove police out of station houses, threatened the control of the cities, and came very near indeed to tearing the very foundations of organized government apart.

As a matter of fact, the German Communists of the period immediately at the end of World War I, not only came very near to taking over Germany but also the international Communist movement itself.

They were defeated only by the narrowest margin simply because the Russians had a head start on prestige in the central agency, the Communist International.

And so there developed the first big fracture in Communist international solidarity. What Tito did to Stalin in the period 1945–49, the Germans foreshadowed in 1919–22, and the Communists of America repeated in a few years more. A chapter on this American episode follows in a few days.

These internal fights demonstrated that communism's international power plays would sooner or later have to be operated for the gain of one country against all the rest and that for all the big talk of Lenin, Trotsky and the others about the "international brotherhood of man." Communists, like everybody else, would have to choose between nations.

Nothing was ever more important than this early disclosure of difference between Communist theory and Communist fact.

For in the theory of Karl Marx's socialistic science, nations and national interest were supposed to fade out in the face of communism. The "oppressed workers of the world" would join with one another, irrespective of national identity, and all of mankind would be equal.

But when fact collided with theory in the years following, it was theory that took a licking.

International communism quickly degenerated to a weapon of national foreign policy for the government of just one nation, Russia.

Thus, a Klaus Fuchs, stealing an atom bomb, did so not for the international brotherhood, but merely as a Russian spy.

Three United States Secretaries of State refused to be fooled by the Soviet appeal for diplomatic status here. First, Robert Lansing, who warned caution to American businessmen against extending credit or taking Soviet promises to pay.

Lansing found it impossible to get along with Woodrow Wilson, then sinking into his last illness, and was succeeded by Bainbridge Colby. The first really analytical review of Soviet activities I have come across in my time was Colby's letter to the Italian ambassador, on August 10, 1920.

Colby pointed out that the United States of America had been the first nation in the world to recognize the parliamentary government set up in Russia after the abdication of the czar, Nicholas II, and that our interest was wholly for a Russian republic on western lines. The Bolsheviks, he emphasized, had taken by force and after two and a half years still had not allowed a popular election.

Still, England, France, and European nations were, after their custom, inclining to go along. True, the utopian story was already falling apart. Decrees were being issued for punishment of workers who were 10 minutes late for work. The 10-hour day was extended to 12 hours. Eggs were nationalized.

But in England a Socialist government took office in 1924 and that broke the last ice. The mere de facto trade agreement that had been executed in 1921, became a formal exchange of diplomatic envoys. It was this same Socialist government, too, that put Russia's friend, Hewlett Johnson in office as dean of Canterbury. A sketch of this odd character will be given later.

The presidential election of 1920 came and went. In the course of it, the State Department let its polished foot slip and tried to smear Harding by releasing a little story to the effect that a Mr. Washington D. Vanderlip had been rummaging around Russia trying to talk, in Harding's name, about Russia buying a lot of railroad engines here and thus warming American inclinations toward diplomatic recognition.

But that bit of inexcusable mud didn't stick.

Harding was elected, Charles Evans Hughes became Secretary of State and Samuel Gompers, head of the American Federation of Labor, asked him what the outlook would be for Soviet recognition.

On April 18, 1921, Hughes wrote Gompers his famous letter setting forth the common sense and more than that, the moral basis of judgment to be applied. Hughes stuck to that position against propaganda from all sides.

One Alton B. Parker, on behalf of the National Civil Federation, and the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom—familiar sounding titles?—each tried him and got the same answer. So did various committees of Congress.

Hughes laid it down that the Soviet regime was built on involuntary servitude—slavery—and that it represented not an advance toward the light but a retreat toward worse darkness than before. His doctrine fixed a course for the United States of America, that had Stalin backed in a corner,

by 1933, for without United States recognition, the Soviet world operation was fatally crippled.

F. D. Roosevelt changed the course.

And here is one little bit of history never before disclosed. The man who wrote Hughes' first draft brief on the Communist issue was J. Edgar Hoover, now head of the FBI.

Biggest Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the twenty-seventh article by Mr. Frank C. Waldrop on the infiltration of communism in our country:

BIGGEST STORY

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

A fish peddler, a shoemaker, and a Harvard professor can best be thanked for the worst that happened to the United States of America in 1920.

The first two were Niccolo Sacco and Bartolomeo Vanzetti. The Harvard professor was Felix Frankfurter.

Sacco and Vanzetti were typical anarchists of that time, simple-minded believers that killing and robbing in the name of revolution would bring the United States to its knees.

Frankfurter—well, someday I hope to get back to a study of this interesting gentleman's career that I started some years ago. Those who are interested in the work thus far can read in the Times-Herald of November 1, 1942, the article The New Deal Richelieu, Justice Felix Frankfurter.

At any rate, Frankfurter in World War I was rummaging around Washington at works that have never been sufficiently well examined.

And by 1920, he had run out of other things to do except to run around Boston admiring himself in the shadow of Mr. Justice O. W. Holmes.

The Russian explosion and its echoes in Europe and in the United States were undertaken without anybody getting Prof. Narcissus Frankfurter's consent.

And then on April 15, 1920, in South Braintree, Mass., somebody held up and shot dead Paymaster Fred Parmenter and Alex Berardelli, his helper, and made off with two cash boxes.

Vanzetti was already under indictment for another hold-up in Bridgewater. And all this happened, you must remember, in the period of bombs in the United States mails, in Wall Street, and general violence.

The minds of professors were unsettled, all around. They couldn't explain what had happened to the celebrated democracy the United States of America was supposed to have made the world free for, in the just-ended war.

Woodrow Wilson, their immaculate ideal, the fellow who had made it from the halls of ivy to the hall of fame, was running out of gas.

He had got the United States into a war it didn't want, but he couldn't get it to swallow either his Treaty of Versailles or his League of Nations.

The biggest victory won out of the war of 1914–18, except for communism, was the imposition of prohibition on the American Nation.

Even that wouldn't have been possible if the brewers of the United States of America had been Irish, French, or British, instead of having such names as Fleiglehammer, Bosch, and Schtinkel.

About the only game left in town, therefore, was the Communist development, but it had room only for professionals. And the American intelligentsia were still pretty much under the influence of the genteel tradition.

An outfit that openly mocked at God Almighty, had just set up to destroy all vestige of private property, that was allowing people to marry by mere application at one desk and to divorce by equally simple application at another, had little enough charm for most.

But then came Sacco, Vanzetti, and Frankfurter.

The first two were nailed by the cops in short order after the shooting in South Braintree. And when it was discovered they were not only hold-up suspects but also anarchists, people in and around Boston got good and excited.

Their case fit in with the May Day bombs and the strikes and the stories everybody remembered about revolutionary "expropriations," polite word for murder and robbery in prewar Russia.

Arguments broke out as to whether Sacco and Vanzetti were guilty of anarchy or of murder and armed robbery. Just the kind of dish for a Frankfurter, as see his appearance 29 years later in defense of Alger Hiss, the Harvard traitor and Russian spy.

In no time at all, the American intelligentsia had a cause. They could escape the embarrassments of Wilson and his peace by fixing on the martyrdom of Sacco and Vanzetti. They jumped in and built a $50,000 defense fund for the "martyrs."

The case came on before one Webster Thayer, of Massachusetts Superior court, on May 31, 1921. On July 14, after a horse opera at least as wild and emotional as the Hiss case, both were found solidly guilty.

Behind the yells and screams and campus ragings that attended all this the hand of Frankfurter was everywhere.

The eminent poetess, Edna St. Vincent Millay, shed tears in public. The notoriously clear-thinking and accurate journalist, Heywood Broun, even managed to get himself arrested as thousands cheered.

Biggest Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the twenty-eighth article by Mr. Frank C. Waldrop on the infiltration of communism in our country:

BIGGEST STORY

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

What gave communism the emotional horsepower that sent it whirling across the American college campus in the happy years, 1920–30? What made it fashionable to talk the radical jargon?

I suppose one explanation involves the mere novelty of it.

But the more visible, potent influence was the celebrated trial of Niccolo Sacco and Bartolomeo Vanzetti, two anarchists charged with the hold-up and murder of a payroll clerk and his helper at South Braintree, Mass., April 15, 1920.

Many a word has been written about that case, just as many a word will undoubtedly be written about the modern instance of Alger Hiss. And as in his, the arguments revolve around a claim that the accused was tried not for his acts but for his politics.

That, of course, is not a novel claim, nor is it always a false one. Men have been tried and sentenced and shot for what they believe, rather than for anything they have ever done.

Joseph Stalin has had more people killed just for wrong thoughts, than any tyrant in modern times. Hitler was a piker, beside him.

As to the case of Hiss, that is fresh enough for everybody to remember that he was given as fair a chance against the evidence as any man can ask, and yet he lost.

The Sacco-Vanzetti evidence has long since faded from public memory and it is too intricate and protracted to review here. The main thing is that the record was all made in public before Judge Webster Thayer of the Massachusetts Superior Court and the defendants had ample funds and defense counsel. And that they were held guilty.

But that was not enough for Prof. Felix Frankfurter of the Harvard law school. Here was a chance for him to become a campus hero, to draw the scandalized criticism of established, settled adult Boston and be Achilles with the sophomores.

There is one like that on every campus, and at Harvard there have always been young men with more money than brains, ready for any kind of idea or action that will express emotional revolt.

The campus radicals adopted the Sacco-Vanzetti case as their own. It had everything. There was opportunity to hiss and boo established authority. A full professor of law was in charge of the phrase making, and the silly rich could blubber in their prohibition hooch about the persecuted fish peddler and the downtrodden cobbler.

The fact that Sacco was not only a fish peddler, but also a believer in anarchy and that Vanzetti's shoemaking was just a cover for his attachment to violent revolution, meant nothing.

And so, when the brace of them were found guilty, the campus cry was "frame-up." As the appeals against the verdict hammered against the doors of the court, the Sacco-Vanzetti trial became a world cause among radicals of all kinds in all countries.

Frankfurter wrote a dissenting opinion on the opinions of the established courts—though nobody asked him to—and things got so noisy that the Governor of Massachusetts finally had the case reviewed.

He assigned it to the president of Harvard university, the president of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and a respected retired judge. They said the trial was fair and the record sound.

Sacco and Vanzetti finally went to the chair, on August 23, 1927, in the midst of an international uproar.

American embassies were assaulted in several countries.

Crowds moaned in the streets of Boston. Bombs were set off in New York and Philadelphia—and finally somebody was thoughtful enough also to blow up the home of Judge Thayer.

And still the case remained a perennial Harvard cause. When the college celebrated its three hundredth anniversary in 1936, up popped some Sacco-Vanzetti clubmen with a memorial entitled "Walled In This Tomb."

All in all, Frankfurter had managed to get himself thoroughly publicized. Sacco and Vanzetti had enjoyed 7 years of magnificent attention from romantics of all kinds, debutantes to millionaires.

And the Communists had just what they wanted—some fashionable martyrs.

Who, as it happened, were not Communists at all, but their mortal revolutionary enemies, anarchists. But that didn't matter at all. As in the Hiss case, today, it wasn't the facts but the fancy, that counted.

It was not the facts of the Sacco-Vanzetti case that made it one of the most powerful of all weapons ever to fall into the hands of Communist boob-snatchers on these shores.

It was simply that the collegiate glory-hunters such as Frankfurter charged it with such emotional high voltage and thereby attracted the class of person—such as we always have with us—who so easily identifies one set of facts with another set of feelings.

To challenge the record of the Sacco-Vanzetti trial was to show your colors in revolt against the Babbitts and the stuffed shirts—whom we also always have with us—and in a matter of two pints of Prohibition rye, to be singing the Internationale.

Discouraging Thrift

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 22, 1950

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Edson B. Smith in a recent issue of the Boston (Mass.) Herald:

DISCOURAGING THRIFT

The House Ways and Means Committee tentatively has decided to impose the corporation tax at the existing rate (now 38 percent) on the retained income of mutual savings banks and savings and loan associations.

This, in our opinion, would be thoroughly bad legislation. Savings banks and savings and loan associations are not profit institutions. In the case of a savings bank most States compel the transferrence of a certain percentage of income to reserves to build up a fund for the protection of depositors. It seems ironical that the Commonwealth of Massachusetts tell a savings bank that it must set aside a certain percentage of its income as a reserve and then the Federal Government come along and slap a tax on it.

If the undistributed earnings of savings banks are taxed it will mean inevitably that either dividends will have to be reduced or the amount transferred to surplus be cut. The first would reduce the incentive to save and the second would weaken the condition of the banks.

It ought to be pointed out that the money deposited in savings banks already has been taxed.

If the Federal Government really wants to discourage thrift, we can think of no better means to accomplish this end than by this proposed legislation.

A Historic Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 22, 1950

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article taken from the New York Times of May 21, 1950:

A HISTORIC WEEK

This has been a memorable week for the Western World. Insofar as the great accomplishments of these days are due to any one man, our Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, deserves the most credit, and it is especially gratifying to be able to note this at a time when small men, constricted by partisanship and isolationism, have been doing their best to discredit him and the State Department. Americans have reasons for deep satisfaction in these recent developments, but it should be a sober satisfaction, leavened by a large dose of caution. As we consider the present situation in the light of the past we see how far the United States has traveled toward a leadership by participation in world affairs. As we contemplate the future we can know that the road still to be traveled is long, hard and dangerous.

The opportunity that was lost by the United States at the end of the First World War, to the immense cost of every man, woman, and child in the world, has been grasped brilliantly and forcefully, if somewhat erratically and fitfully, in these last 5 years. Woodrow Wilson and the League of Nations were repudiated in 1919. Our tariff walls, our isolation, our neutrality as Germany, Italy, and Japan rose to their baleful power, were simply high lights in the sin of washing our hands while crimes against humanity were committed by Hitler, Mussolini, Franco, and the Japanese militarists. Under our Neutrality Act we would not sell a rifle to be put into the hands of those fighting for freedom—and it was our freedom, too. We sold scrap iron to Japan, and it was not until the bombs and shells made from it fell on our fleet at Pearl Harbor that the call to greatness was answered.

How different a Nation this has been since that rude awakening. No country did more to make the United Nations possible. UNRRA was, in large part, ours. The Marshall plan saved western Europe from economic collapse. With the Rio de Janeiro Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance we joined in the mutual defense of the Western Hemisphere; with the North Atlantic Pact we left behind us, no doubt forever, the illusion that we can live in peace and freedom if even one country of western Europe is invaded and enslaved. We helped to save Greece and Iran from Communist domination; we strengthened Turkey; we have pledged our aid to Indochina and the other free states of southeast Asia.

And today? As he was leaving London on Friday amid the plaudits, heard and unheard, of the democratic world, Secretary Acheson could truly say: "I have used this occasion to inform the other governments that the United States has a continuing interest and stake in European affairs which will not end with the termination of the European recovery program." He went on to reaffirm our deep interest in, and the determination to help Greece, Turkey, Iran, and Indochina.

The series of conferences that had just ended saw the thrilling offer of the French to pool their coal and steel industries with Germany's, the series of measures pointing toward a greater participation of western Germany in European affairs, the North Atlantic Treaty conference with its decision to create a permanent board of strategy, the invitation to the United States and Canada to engage in a working relationship with the Organization for European Economic Cooperation, agreements on Austria and on shipping. Western Europe and the United States had truly made a marked advance, as the final communique put it, toward genuine collective security and economic integration.

One cannot point to any postwar period of a week or 10 days in which so much was accomplished. Yet all this and more will be lost if we do not realize how much remains to be done. No meeting, no decisions, no plans can by themselves bring strength and peace to the democracies. They can only plot the paths to be followed and give a pledge of the determination to carry on to the journey's end. The events of this week would prove a tragic delusion if Americans or any of the peoples involved thought that by giving expression to worthy goals those goals had already been reached. The President, the Secretary of State, and all their advisers will need public support and understanding more than ever in the months to come.

What Americans have to understand most of all is the tremendous strength and complexity of the forces that we are fighting. They are not to be overcome in weeks or months; they cannot be solved by brilliant improvisations or daring maneuvers. They are world-wide in scope; they reach deeply into the fields of economics, politics, military defense, social security, and spiritual and cultural relations from the handful of rice that a coolie must gather in the paddy-fields of Indochina to the hydrogen bomb. A feat of organization unparalleled in world history faces us all.

The United States has been called by destiny to bear the largest burden, but we would all fail without the support of the other free nations of the Western World. It is because this week has seen real progress toward the organization of the Atlantic community that one is entitled to call it an historic week.

I Am an American Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NEIL J. LINEHAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 22, 1950

Mr. LINEHAN. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed unfortunate that in our day and time the idea of freedom has been taken for granted by Americans. The recent war did awaken us to the realization that our freedom is a priceless treasure; but once again we are lapsing back into our old indifferent stupor. Freedom is not always clearly understood; it is not an unrestrained liberty to do anything, anytime and anywhere. It is a controlled privilege where individuals must respect their fellow man's rights and desires. Our restrictions and controls, after all, were established not by one person but by all of us. As a basis for our belief in freedom, we must establish two things: that our freedom is largely the right to choose and decide, and secondly, that man is capable of continuing improvement.

These two ideas are firmly entrenched in our political system of democracy. Our entire Government is built on the idea that men are capable of making decisions. And our way of life proves that men may continue to grow and improve. Our democratic society is concerned with the development of people. Compare that with the aim of a totalitarian society—to build up the powers of the state. Is there any wonder that freedom in such a situation is practically nonexistent?

It is with pride and humility that I recall that this country is also willing to fight for freedom in those totalitarian

countries. In our short history, the Nation has fought repeatedly to defend human rights, to preserve our freedom, and to help other countries obtain or preserve theirs.

But why all this talk about freedom, you ask? We have it; that is enough. But it is not enough; we must respect it, we must practice it, we must be aware of it.

We are here today to celebrate I Am an American Day. This recognition of new citizens has occurred in some form or another for many years. In 1940, however, President Roosevelt issued a proclamation to the effect that the third Sunday in May of each year should be set aside as Citizenship Day and it be designated as I Am an American Day. He further suggested that, at an appropriate ceremony, someone address the new citizens on the privileges and responsibilities of citizenship. So that, today, is my task.

In welcoming new citizens to our fold, I am addressing two groups. The larger group consists of native-born Americans who have attained their full rights of citizenship, having reached the age of 21. Thus they have shed their status as minors and are ready to accept the responsibilities of adulthood.

The second group of citizens is composed of men and women born outside the United States. These people did not automatically become citizens when they arrived in our country. They had to go out and seek it. First they were obliged to prove their fitness for assuming the responsibilities of citizenship. Practically all of them have attended naturalization schools, where they studied the Constitution and history of the United States. Only after proving themselves qualified, were they granted full citizenship rights.

Now that you have become citizens of this Nation, do you realize what is entailed? Some of the privileges you will enjoy are actually basic principles of our Government. We have freedom and equality before the law. This does not mean that all of us are born free and equal. It does mean, though, that there is opportunity for growth and development if the individual wants it. In this country we have supremacy of the law—we are governed by laws which we have helped to make. We know that the Constitution is a living document, that it is a charter of human rights. There is religious freedom here—complete freedom exists in our religious thinking. The press has absolutely no fetters and everyone in our country has complete liberty to say what he wishes. In addition, groups may assemble for meetings without fear or censorship. Privacy of one's home and property is respected; individuals are protected. The right to a fair trial is granted each man or woman; but a person cannot be brought to trial unless he has been charged with some offense by another person and indicted by a grand jury.

These are some of your new privileges, but now let us see what America expects in return. America is as strong as its citizens; therefore, America expects citizens to offer a strong personal character. Certainly, a sense of values is demanded. Values wise enough that you place duty above privileges, wisdom above cleverness, quality above quantity, and truth above mere phrases. Unity, too, is required. America expects unqualified allegiance to this country; you must leave political conflicts, age-old feuds and hatreds behind you. Your new country expects knowledge—of our history, our literature, our language, and our ideals. Faith in our form of government and also faith in your ability to be a part of that Government. This involves your right to vote—a right which you should definitely exercise wisely. Remember, the right to vote is the right to rule. Effort is next. Our freedom of opportunity is interwoven with effort, or work. Above all, your new country expects patriotism. Not just on certain holidays such as today and July 4—but every day. It expects you to live so that America may grow and be a better place. It expects you to attest an unswerving devotion to America.

When we say our country is a democracy, we mean more than the form of government. We mean a way of life—an attitude that is quite religious. We see something divine in man; that quality makes us tolerant, understanding, reasonable, and proud. Proud that even though America is a Nation of people composed from different lands and origins, we are united. United in a determined effort to keep democratic principles alive—those same concepts upon which our Nation was founded and has since thrived and prospered.

This is not a perfect country but it is good; it is kind; and it offers a good deal. Remember that you have a job in running our Government and building our Nation.

Making Child Desertion a Federal Offense

REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM STEED
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 22, 1950

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, the following statement was made by me before the Hobbs subcommittee on the House Committee on the Judiciary in support of legislation proposing to make the crime of child desertion a Federal offense when such deserting parent crosses a State line.

I am gratified at the growing interest, not only in Congress but throughout the country, in this important subject. I hope the information I have presented in this statement will be of value and interest to the Members.

The statement follows:

Mr. Chairman, this opportunity to testify on behalf of my bill, H. R. 5974, and similar bills now pending before this subcommittee on the general subject of child abandonment is a happy one, and one which I appreciate very much.

In my opinion, this legislation is of unusual importance for several very outstanding reasons.

First, it is important because it proposes to put the force of the Federal Government behind the enforcement of laws against those who commit the crime of child desertion.

Second, it is important because it offers one more means by which the constantly growing demands upon Federal and State tax funds to meet the child welfare problem can be curbed, if not actually reduced.

Third, it is important because anything we do to curb the crime of child abandonment is a most worthy contribution in a moral sense to better American home life.

With your indulgence, Mr. Chairman, I desire to outline briefly some facts which prove these assertions.

Looking at the record, we find the aid to dependent children rolls, under the social-security program, carrying the names of around 600,000 children and costing a total of around $140,000,000 during the comparatively unprofitable year of 1941. Today, these rolls have grown to an estimated 1,658,000 children, costing upwards of $400,000,000.

Obviously, economic conditions are not as bad now, nor have they been as bad in any year since, as they were in 1941. It is safe to assume, then, that this increase of 1,000,000 children on these ADC rolls cannot be attributed entirely to economic conditions. Basic laws governing this program have not been changed since 1941, so it also follows that a more liberal law has not opened the door to a greater child case load.

As we study the trends, we find that the impact of demand for funds under the ADC program has not yet been completed—in fact, the demand is growing instead of decreasing. To prove this more clearly than my own words, I desire to quote a better authority, Miss Jane Hoey, Director of the Bureau of Public Assistance, testifying before the Fogarty subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations, earlier this session. On page 792 of these hearings Miss Hoey made this statement, and I quote:

"It is estimated that the average number of recipients per month of old-age assistance in 1951 will be 2,860,000, an increase of 130,000, or 4.8 percent over the revised estimates for 1950; in aid to dependent children, the number of children to be aided is 1,658,000, an increase of 188,000, or almost 13 percent more than in the preceding year; and in aid to the blind the number of 78,500, an increase of almost 7 percent, or 5,000."

This same statement showed an estimated need of $250,500,000 in Federal funds for dependent children for the 1951 fiscal year, which does not of course include any State funds for this same purpose.

By examining these figures on the assistance program we see that in the most recent months, the dependent children rolls have been growing at an alarming rate—13 percent in a year, an unprecedented gain. How can this classification increase at a percent of approximately twice the gain for the dependent blind and nearly three times the rate for old-age assistance?

There is only one answer, Mr. Chairman, that I have been able to find. I shall turn to reports and surveys made in my own State of Oklahoma to substantiate my view in this regard. At my request, some extensive research on this subject has been carried out by the Oklahoma Public Expenditures Council. I have here a report issued by that organization dated April 1950, which contains some startling figures:

On page 34 of that report, the subject of dependent children is dealt with. This report shows that Oklahoma has the greatest percentage of its child population depending upon the welfare rolls than any other State in the Union, the percentage being 7.8 as compared to the national total of 2.9 percent. Kansas to the north of Oklahoma has 2.4 percent, Texas to the south has 1.8 per-

cent, Arkansas to the east has 3.9 percent. States supposedly much less favored economically than Oklahoma such as Mississippi are far below the Oklahoma average. Mississippi has 2.5 percent of its children on the rolls, etc. This research organization has made a continuing and intensive study of the situation in Oklahoma. As a result, it estimates that, conservatively speaking, at least 35 percent of the children on the rolls in Oklahoma are there because they have been abandoned by able-bodied parents who could and should support them. This survey also reveals that an overwhelming majority of these deserting parents have fled to California and other States, beyond the reach of the law enforcement officers of Oklahoma counties. Even in those cases where an effort is made by these counties to return these offenders against State law, the county all too often is without sufficient funds to pay for the return of the criminals.

There are other reasons, of course, for part of this case load, such as bastardy and deliberate divorce maneuvers on the part of parents to become eligible for aid under the law. Some of this problem obviously cannot be dealt with by Congress.

But it seems to me that Congress can and should do something about the largest contributing group to this chiseling of public funds—those able-bodied parents who desert their children and escape across State lines to avoid criminal prosecution. I am convinced that a precedent for this sort of law is found in the auto theft law and the livestock theft law. Surely, it is as much a Federal offense to steal the home from a dependent child and cross a State line as it is automobiles and livestock. I think it is a greater crime, because in the case of the dependent child the taxpayers are compelled to take up a burden of supporting the child.

Until and unless Congress can give State and local authorities some help in curbing this rapidly growing crime of child desertion by such a law as is proposed here, I think it is safe to say that the burden of supporting these children at public expense will continue to increase. More parents are tempted to walk off and leave their children when they see the first offenders escape any kind of criminal prosecution.

If time would permit, I could read to the committee scores of letters from citizens throughout this Nation on this problem. I have here letters from judges, prosecuting attorneys, bar associations, welfare organizations, educators and many others endorsing this kind of law because these citizens are fully aware of this growing and unprincipled practice.

This is something more than a mere matter of dollars, Mr. Chairman. It is bad enough, I'll admit, to see the American taxpayer digging deeper and deeper every year to carry the load of dependent children, thousands of whom have parents who could and should support them. To me, it is even worse for a program as worthy and as commendable as our aid to dependent children program becoming an instrument through which we are actually subsidizing the breaking up of homes.

We have made it so easy for a parent to walk off and leave his children for the public to support that we have created a temptation. I cannot understand a parent who has so little regard for his own flesh and blood, but the facts cannot be denied and we must face the fact that we do have countless thousands of such sorry and worthless citizens among us.

We may not be able to instill any common decency or responsibility in this type of parent, and we may be compelled because of our Christian spirit to take care of needy children, regardless of how worthless their parents may be. But certainly, if we pass this law proposed here, we can make sure that a major percentage of such persons will languish in jail while we do take care of their children. By so doing, we can at least cut off the source of supply which is now producing so many children in this category.

I am not going to burden the committee or the record with a recitation of individual case histories. I do assure you gentlemen, however, that I have made a rather extensive survey in my own State and district—and I have been supplied information from almost every State by those who share my views—and I state here with as much emphasis as I can command that we are faced with a dangerous and despicable evil in this country. The time is long since passed when we should have done something about this mess. To delay further is, it seems to me, a thing we simply must not contemplate.

Mr. Chairman, I want to emphasize that I favor giving every needy child in this country all the help it needs, regardless of its parents. But I also want to make sure that every parent guilty of criminal neglect of his children is punished to the full extent of the law. In the interest of common sense, common decency, national economy and Christianity, I appeal to you to act favorably upon this legislation. Let's enact a law that will help purify these child dependency rolls and that will punish the sorriest citizens among us—deserting parents.

Unification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 22, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the Lynn Telegram-News, Lynn, Mass., Friday, May 19, 1950:

STEEL FRAMEWORK FOR PEACE

The French Government has proposed a program which could be made the basis for a real start toward an economic United States of Europe.

The proposal calls for the governments of France and Germany to place their coal and steel production under unified direction and a single system of regulations.

The French Government's statement on the proposal is imbued with the spirit of unity and concord, yet is aware of the realities:

"A united Europe will not be achieved all at once, nor in a single framework. It will be formed by concrete measures which first of all create a solidarity in fact. The uniting of the European nations requires that the age-old opposition between France and Germany be culminated: The action to be taken must first of all concern France and Germany.

"To that end, the French Government proposes that immediate action be concentrated on one limited, but decisive point: The entire French-German production of coal and steel be placed under a joint authority, within an organization open to the other European nations."

These words should be most welcome to all who want to see an end to the perilous division of Europe into competitive, suspicious and warring national states.

Along with the hope and the promise, however, one must not overlook the very great difficulties that stand in the path of the proposal.

Powerful vested interests in western Europe will fight it. The proposal depends for success on free convertibility of money in Europe. Prices and labor costs will present knotty problems.

The unification does not of itself guarantee increased efficiency in production methods. Nor does it automatically assure more steel products and lower prices for them for the masses of people in Europe. Consumers ought to have a voice in the new authority.

It will take a lot of thought and work and planning to achieve real benefits for consumers.

Such benefits should be a chief aim of unification. If they cannot be achieved, the unification will itself become a super-cartel instead of what it should be—an agency to block the rebirth of the old steel and coal cartels which were a cancer on European economic and political progress.

Obviously an immense amount of enlightened self-interest on the part of many nations will be required to form the combine. Britain, at this point, seems cool. Here's a chance for John Bull to show his willingness to go along on a concrete proposition for European unification.

American support should be generous and firm. We, too, probably will need to resist vested interests. Certainly we share with forward-loking Europeans a vision of an effective European federation which, as French Foreign Minister Schuman says is indispensable for the preservation of peace." (Chicago Sun-Times.)

The St. Lawrence Seaway—In Support of House Joint Resolution 271

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 5, 1950

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a statement which I made before the House Committee on Public Works on May 10, 1950, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, I wish to state briefly the principal reasons why I feel that your committee and the Congress should act favorably upon the Canadian-American agreement for the construction of St. Lawrence seaway and power project the earliest opportune moment.

The record of hearing before the Committee on Public Works as well as other congressional committees on previous occasions has amply proved the following points:

1. From an engineering point of view, the highest authorities in the United States and Canada, including United States Army Engineer officers, have approved the feasibility and have perfected their plans so that from 60 days after appropriations are made available, contracts may be let for the construction of the project.

2. From an economic point of view, repeated surveys have indicated the availability of traffic and the economic advantages of direct shipping via the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence River. Beginning with the International Joint Commission in 1920–21, the Department of Commerce under Herbert Hoover in 1926, the Corps of Engineers in 1933, the Department of Commerce under Hon. Jesse Jones in 1941 and under Hon. Charles Sawyer in 1947 and 1949, have all proved that substantial traffic is available to justify the construction of the seaway.

3. From a national defense viewpoint, it has been repeatedly asserted by the War Department when Henry Stimson and Robert

Patterson were Secretary; by the Navy Department under Frank Knox and James Forrestal; by the National Defense Establishment under James Forrestal; and the present incumbent, Secretary Johnson; by the Joint Chiefs of Staff when Admiral Leahy, General Eisenhower, Admiral Nimitz, and General Arnold were members; by the present Joint Chiefs of Staff and the National Defense Security Resources Board, that the construction of the seaway will make an important contribution to the national security of the United States by (a) providing an additional transportation route, (b) permitting ship construction in the Great Lakes, (c) making new sources for raw materials, particularly iron ore, available to the war industries in the Middle West, and (d) supplying large quantities of low cost electric power in an area which has been short of such power for over a decade.

4. From a political point of view it is a matter of record that leaders of both parties and party platforms have endorsed the St. Lawrence seaway project. Every President of both parties in the past 30 years has been strongly in support of this essential undertaking.

In the light of the irrefutable case for the construction of the seaway one must wonder why this project is delayed from year to year, particularly when the Congress has been so free-handed in approving many other public works in the East and South and the West.

The answer, Mr. Chairman, is in the fact that the few opponents wield such economic power that they are able to propagandize throughout the country in a manner which neither government nor the proponents, although they have the merits of the project on their side, are able to match. The opponents are mainly located in Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and New Orleans. Their interest is centered in the railroad lines which serve from Chicago to these cities, and in the power companies which serve New York and New England. They are the parties at interest and they are the ones that agitate the opposition throughout the country.

When I note expressions of opposition from the South, the Middle West, the Mountain States, or any area outside of those named, I recognize the manifestations of economic controls from the eastern financial centers to the outlying regions of the country. Policies made by financial and economic interests in these centers of control, find expression in the South, the Prairie States, the Southwest, or the Northwest because many of the economic enterprises in those areas are controlled from the East. The opposition in those areas therefore, does not express local opposition but merely derivative opposition from the east coast.

I bring this matter to the attention of the members of the Public Works Committee and the Congress because they must judge accurately the incidence and effect of the seaway on each part of the country; and they must assess the significance of the opposition they hear from sources not directly involved in this controversy.

The real issue before the Committee on Public Works is whether the St. Lawrence seaway will hurt or benefit the eastern trunk lines and the New York power companies. If the answer is "No," the opponents have no case; if the answer is "Yes," that possibly the seaway may be detrimental to these interests, then the committee must judge whether the national interest is superior to the particular individual interests involved. It is my contention that the eastern railroads and power companies are mistaken in their opposition, because without the seaway industry is likely to drift away from the places where these utilities derive their greatest revenues. It is not the first time in our history that the eastern railroad and utility managements have been wrong about their own and their country's interest.

Mr. Chairman, I thank you for the kindness you have shown me and for the manner in which you have conducted the hearings, and I hope that your committee will consider the issues I have presented.

Tariff on Rubber and Canvas Footwear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 22, 1950

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusets. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters:

RUBBER WORKERS UNION,
FEDERAL LOCAL 21914, A. F. OF L.,
Watertown, Mass., May 19, 1950.

Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ROGERS: Enclosed is a picture of a very few of the more than 20,000 men and women employed in the rubber- and canvas-footwear industry. The picture also shows cases containing more than 56,000 cards sent to President Truman protesting changing the method of assessing tariffs on rubber and canvas footwear from the American selling price to that of foreign value.

The enclosed copy of letter to President Truman is explanatory and we hope that we can depend on your support to help us keep our jobs and to maintain the American standard of living.

Sincerely yours,

S. A. PERCOCO,
Business Agent.

RUBBER WORKERS UNION,
FEDERAL LOCAL 21914, A. F. OF L.,
Watertown, Mass., May 9, 1950.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Bill H. R. 8304 is pending in Congress entitled "Customs Simplification Act of 1950" which would eliminate what is known as the American selling price principle that is now used to compute costs in order to arrive at an equitable basis of applying tariffs on imports of canvass and waterproof rubber footwear.

We are opposed to the abrogation of the American selling price principle because we are convinced that it will lead to drastic reductions of import duties on competitive footwear produced in low-labor-cost countries of Japan and Czechoslovakia.

We are satisfied that no workable system can be designed to give the same protection as we have under the American selling price. We have been advised by experts in these matters that any such scheme would be impracticable. We fear that the only results that can be expected from the abolition of the American selling price are further reductions in the duties on imports.

As you know, the process for applying duty on imported rubber footwear is simple under the American selling price policy. The imported shoe is compared with its American equivalent for which the manufacturer's price is easily determined, and the duty is assessed on that price. It is obvious that any other scheme intending to reach the same result would lead to impossible complications.

We see nothing wrong with the American selling price method and see no reason to change it. This method of assessing import duties is a sound way toward equalizing low labor costs abroad with the higher labor costs in American industry. Labor constitutes 47 percent of our factory cost. This is the labor of American workmen, and wages paid in our industry in this country are far higher than those in any other country.

The materials used by American manufacturers of rubber and canvas footwear are with the exception of crude rubber, American made, and here again we are at a disadvantage. Materials produced in foreign low labor cost countries are much lower in price than the materials we use.

The manufacture of rubber footwear is an essential part of our national economy. It is vital to our national defense. During the last war our industry furnished our armed forces with more than 45,000,000 pairs of rubber footwear. We also made life rafts, fuel cells, raincoats, and life vests. Without a going rubber footwear industry our National Defense Program would be seriously impaired.

Thirteen companies are engaged in the manufacture of rubber and canvas footwear and employ more than 20,000 men and women, with sales of approximately $100,000,000.

Foreign manufacturers have copied our styles and methods. Their low labor rates and cheap materials combined with lower tariffs would mean the loss of jobs to thousands, not only in our own industry but in the factories of our suppliers, and in the stores and shops in our communities which serve our workers.

The more than 56,000 protests sent to you today is indicative of the fears of our citizens about the loss of their jobs and standards of living, if through any means, tariff protection on canvas and waterproof rubber footwear is changed to permit imports that will destroy our industry.

The rubber and canvas footwear industry is worth saving. Your help in seeing to it that the tariffs we now have are not lowered will certainly be appreciated by thousands of loyal American men and women workers.

Respectfully yours,

S. A. PERCOCO,
Business Agent.

Arab Rearmament

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 22, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following resolution that I have received from the Lawrence Chapter, Senior Hadassah, Lawrence, Mass.:

LAWRENCE, MASS., *May 20, 1950.*

Hon. THOMAS J. LANE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LANE:

Whereas it is known from reliable sources that arms of a quality and quantity indicating intended use beyond the purpose of internal security are being supplied to the Arab states in the Middle East, most particularly to Egypt, by Great Britain, and

Whereas this Arab rearmament by Great Britain has the acknowledged approval of the United States Government, and

Whereas at the same time, Great Britain has denied Israel arms for its defense, and

Whereas the Arab League has proclaimed its intention to organize a united economic

and military front of all Arab states against the struggling State of Israel, and

Whereas we are convinced of the genuine concern of the United States for the peace and security of the Middle East: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, Lawrence Chapter, Senior Hadassah, in meeting in the Jewish Community Center, May 16, 1950, do call upon the United States to implement its proclaimed concern and desire for peace in the Middle East by providing Israel with arms to defend itself, thus lending its strong influence to the maintenance of peace in the Middle East.

Respectfully yours,

CHARLOTTE R. ROSENTHAL,
Secretary, Lawrence Chapter,
Senior Hadassah.

Thomas Jefferson Still Survives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 5, 1950

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article by Henry Steele Commager that appeared in the New York Times of Sunday, May 21, 1950:

THOMAS JEFFERSON STILL SURVIVES

(By Henry Steele Commager)

Jefferson is the central figure in American history and—if freedom and democracy survive in our generation—he may yet prove to be the central figure in modern history. He was not only one of the founding fathers, the source and inspiration of much of American democracy and of American nationalism; he was, too, a world figure. Certainly no other public man contributed so richly to so many chapters in modern history.

He was, of all the founding fathers, indeed of all the men of the eighteenth century, the most contemporary. Both in his public and his private life he addressed himself continuously to problems of permanent and universal interest. What he wrote and what he did—about the nature of society and of government, the relations of man to government, the meaning of republicanism and democracy, the significance of education and of toleration and of experimentation to democracy—is as relevant today as it was in the eighteenth century. It is, notwithstanding profound changes in politics and economy, as relevant for France and Germany and Italy as it was for the young United States.

Nor has any other American revealed himself or illuminated the history of his age more fully in his writings. Even his public writings constitute a record of incomparable importance: imagine our history without the Declaration of Independence, the Virginia Statute of Religious Freedom, the Ordinance of 1784, the Bill for the Diffusion of Knowledge, the Kentucky Resolutions, the First Inaugural Address, the Louisiana Treaty.

These, however, represent only a small part of Jefferson's total contribution to our history. His writings are essential, too, for an understanding of many things which he did not himself create or sponsor. Thus, for example, the Northwest Ordinance, the Bill of Rights, the Virginia Constitution, the Monroe Doctrine; thus, too, such institutions or movements as the political party, the attack on slavery, the role of the judiciary in our constitutional system, and a variety of humanitarian and reform movements.

When to all this are added private writings on almost every aspect of American society and culture, and correspondence (a correspondence singularly elevated and felicitous, with hundreds of public men at home and abroad), we can see that Jefferson furnished both the soil and the seed from which many of our national institutions grew.

No one has yet exhausted the richness of that mind, a mind in many respects the most interesting of modern times. Jefferson's versatility is by now a familiar, almost a hackneyed, subject. He was a scientist and an inventor; he was the greatest American architect of his day; he was a farmer, experimenting endlessly with crops and stock; he was a man of letters; he was a bibliophile, collecting not one but two of the greatest private libraries in the country; he was something of a philologist; he was a student of the classics—as who was not in that age—and of the Bible, compiling his own for good measure; he was a lawyer and a collector of law reports.

Also, he was something of a musician, playing the fiddle and collecting music and musicians; he was the first great educational statesman, not only the founder of the University of Virginia, but the sponsor of far-reaching educational reforms; he was a horticulturist, and his garden book has permanent value. What was he not? Even in an age of versatility his catholic interests are a matter of perpetual astonishment.

Fortunately he was, too, an indefatigable letter writer. His famous epistolary record runs to over 600 closely written pages. Nor were his letters merely the hasty scrawls of a hurried man; many of them were minor treatises on politics or law or religion or education or philosophy.

How he found time for it all, even in a life of 83 years, is one of the mysteries of history; perhaps it was that he was untroubled by modern labor-saving devices and innocent of those squads of secretaries with which every modern statesman and businessman surrounds himself.

Nor were all these interests, so richly revealed in his writings, the expression of dilettantism. It was said of one of the Lord Chancelors of England that if only he knew a little law he would know a little of everything. That could not be said of Thomas Jefferson. He was curious about almost everything, but his curiosity was rarely irrelevant.

Whatever he learned, whatever he knew, fitted into and enriched his philosophy. For of all American statesmen, Jefferson was the most philosophical. One abiding purpose runs through his whole life, one pervasive philosophy dominates it.

He insisted that man should be free, and he was persuaded that, once free, mankind would progress toward happiness and virtue. He was enraptured with the vision of mankind free from political tyranny, from the bondage of superstition and of ignorance, from the sins of the past, from poverty, from war. He had an eighteenth-century faith in the perfectibility of man, but it was not merely a visionary faith; it was faith rooted in the reality of New World experience.

For here in the New World mankind had been given a new chance—mankind free from the tyrannies and oppressions, the poverty and ignorance of the Old World. Here men could live close to nature, cultivate the soil, raise large families, keep what they earned, benefit from learning and from science, escape war, advance—as was aid in the great First Inaugural Address—"rapidly to destinies beyond the reach of mortal eye."

And as America was to be a model for the world, to prove what man was capable of when free, Jefferson devoted himself passionately to strengthening this Nation, expanding its territory, building up its resources, maintaining its security, fostering its culture and its virtue. The first strokes of his mature pen were a call for freedom; his last written words recalled that earlier faith.

It is eminently fitting that The Papers of Thomas Jefferson should be launched as a national enterprise. All who cherish American traditions, all who are zealous for the maintenance of freedom and democracy in the world, all who retain their faith in reason and morality, will rejoice at this reaffirmation of devotion to the principles to which Jefferson dedicated his life. "Thomas Jefferson still survives," said John Adams on his deathbed; it was a prophecy which each generation must justify anew.

P. O. Davis on Heart Disease and Cancer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ELLIOTT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 22, 1950

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable P. O. Davis, able director of the Alabama Extension Service, devoted his column Along the Way in the May 1950 issue of This Month in Rural Alabama to the dread diseases of the heart and to cancer.

He points out that nearly half the deaths of persons over 45 years of age are caused by heart disease. When we add to this figure the deaths caused by cancer, we reach the alarming result that most deaths of persons over 45 years of age in this country are caused by heart disease or cancer.

If these scourges of mankind could be eliminated, undoubtedly we could lengthen the life span of our people in this generation.

Though a balanced budget is much to be desired, I do not believe that the American people want us to stop the research presently being carried on by this Government in an effort to conquer these death dealers, heart disease and cancer. Rather, our support for research in these fields should be expanded so as to hasten the day when these dreaded diseases, and others, may lay as dead corpses at the feet of American medical ingenuity.

I include the article of Director P. O. Davis as follows:

ALONG THE WAY

(By P. O. Davis, Director, API Extension Service)

One inevitable fact is that each person must die sometime, somewhere. There is, of course, nothing new in saying this; but there are new facts as to causes of death.

And there are new and important facts as to how to avoid illness and how to live longer with better health. These facts are of vital concern to each of us.

The United States Public Health Service has statistics on diseases and other things that end the lives of people. Three years ago (1947) diseases of the heart and blood vessels ended the lives of 626,000 people, or nearly 2,000 people daily in the United States. This group topped the list of human killers.

No less than 21 distinct types of heart diseases are known, but three of them caused 90 percent of all damaged hearts. Cancer was next with 190,000 deaths in 1 year. Alabama had 2,800. Broken down, this means

three deaths per day in Alabama, or one for every 8 hours, for cancer alone.

Accidents killed about half as many as cancer, the total in this group being 100,000. Nephritis (kidney disease) killed 80,000, pneumonia 62,000, tuberculosis 48,000.

Nearly one of each two deaths, after the age of 45, is caused by heart diseases. Add to these those caused by cancer, and we find that most people after middle age and older die of one of these two diseases—heart and cancer.

This raises a question as to what we individually can do to prevent any illness but especially heart disease and cancer. Specifics are not available but certain things are essential to healthy bodies and minds. They are:

1. Enough but not too much good food, containing all of the elements essential to a strong and healthy body.

2. Moderation in all that we do. Intemperance in anything is bad and harmful.

3. Sanitary conditions for living and working.

4. Plenty of outdoor exercise without excesses.

5. Regular attention to all body needs.

6. Regular contact with a family physician for advice and service.

I like to emphasize food. It is easy for anyone to get basic facts as to what foods to eat and amounts needed to supply the daily needs of a child or a grown person, either man or woman. (See your home demonstration agent.)

People who do heavy physical work require, of course, more food than those who don't. Information is available as to food needs for people living and working under different conditions.

A quart of milk a day, for example, is needed by each child or young person. Older people don't need as much. Eggs are an excellent food. A combination of milk, eggs, meat, cereals, and vegetables are, of course, big essentials.

People who eat improperly endanger themselves by inviting diseases and illness. This applies to too much, too little, or the wrong kind.

A check-up by a physician as often as advised by him is a mighty good practice. Often in this way trouble is found before it goes too far and is corrected before great damage is done.

Cancer is a notable example of this sort of disease. It is not fatal, as many people believe, if it is discovered in its early stages and treated properly. If it is not discovered until it goes too far it is fatal.

I Am An American Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 22, 1950

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, citizenship is not a task to be taken lightly. We have many privileges and freedoms in our country; we also have duties and responsibilities. "I Am an American Day" serves to identify and clarify just what our country does expect of us. It is a day set aside to welcome the new citizens of our country.

Our new citizens each year come from two vibrant sources: The youth of America who have reached the age of legal maturity and the people who come to our country from foreign shores. Both groups bring great offerings to our country; we are, indeed, proud to honor them on "I Am an American Day."

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial which appeared in the Independent Press of Bloomfield, N. J., under date of May 19, 1950, expressing its sentiments on what this day means to all of us in this great country of ours:

I AM AN AMERICAN

On Sunday, by virtue of a proclamation of the President of the United States, we celebrate I Am an American Day.

To those young men and women who for the first time take on the full obligations of citizenship in a democracy it is a day of solemn implication. For those mature men and women who have foresworn their allegiance to the old, to give their full measure of loyalty to our own democracy, it is a day of prayerful thanksgiving. And for those of us who have long been able to proudly proclaim "I am an American" it is an opportunity for a rededication to the ideals and principles upon which this country was founded and which through travail and trouble it has tried to learn to express.

There are many scoffers who say that our democracy is a mockery—because it is not complete—because in spite of its high boasts of life and liberty for all, it has discriminated in many instances against groups of its citizenry—and because it has not given equal opportunity to all. Certainly our democracy is not perfect, but a democracy, being composed of individuals, is a living, growing thing, and it has progressed and is still progressing steadily. Despite any defects, the American form of democracy still offers to everyone a greater measure of freedom and opportunity than any other country on earth.

But I Am an American Day is not a day on which to discuss what democracy has or has not done for its citizens. Democracy is composed of its citizens, and it is up to them as individuals to live up to the ideals of their country and so to raise the standard of the country as a whole.

When we say "I am an American" we make it an individual matter. It becomes an individual right and an individual obligation. And for the duties involved in such a proclamation we can do no better thing than to turn back for our instructions to the epistle of Paul to the Romans, when he counseled them:

"Abhor that which is evil; cleave to that which is good. Be kindly affectioned one to another with brotherly love; in honor preferring one another; * * * rejoicing in hope; patient in tribulation; continuing instant in prayer; * * * Be of the same mind one toward another. Mind not the high things, but condescend to men of low estate. Be not wise in your own conceits. Recompense to no man evil for evil. Provide things honest in the sight of all men. * * * Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good."

Upholsterers International Endorses Fogarty Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 22, 1950

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, May 5, the Upholsterers International Union of North America held their convention in the city of Philadelphia. Among the various resolutions which were adopted on this occasion was one which placed the union on record in favor of House Resolution 270, which I introduced and on which hearings were held before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs recently.

In speaking, I wish to express my appreciation to my distinguished colleague, the Honorable JOHN KEE, of West Virginia, the chairman of the committee, for his splendid courtesy in making the recent hearings possible. For 5 hours a succession of witnesses presented statements and gave testimony in favor of the Congress taking action in behalf of a united Ireland. It is, therefore, most gratifying to me to find that continued endorsement and approval is being given to my resolution by various societies and organizations throughout the country, especially by labor organizations, which are ever vigilant of the needs of the oppressed and are eager to support the cause of freedom and independence throughout the world.

It is not surprising then to find labor organizations protesting against the unjust partition of Ireland and the continued maintenance of a dictatorial type of government in the northeastern six counties of Ireland. For the benefit of my colleagues I take pleasure in having the resolution of the Upholsterers International included in these remarks. The text of their resolution is as follows:

Whereas the restoration of freedom and nationhood to subjugated peoples and the protection of minority groups wherever they exist are ideals to which our people have pledged themselves and to which our Government is officially dedicated: and

Whereas our Nation is currently engaged in an intense struggle throughout the world to effectuate this policy: and

Whereas our own security and way of life will benefit in proportion to the degree to which our foreign policy succeeds; and

Whereas the Irish people are unwilling victims of a policy of imperialism by which their country is partitioned, and by which the democratic rights and privileges of the partitioned populace are denied them; and

Whereas the situation was condemned by the American Federation of Labor at their recent national conventions; and

Whereas our continued indifference toward this matter gives the lie to our protestations of sincerity and weakens our own security by making it impossible for the Irish Nation to join in the common defense of western civilization: be it therefore

Resolved, That we petition the House Foreign Affairs Committee at Washington to take favorable action on the Fogarty Resolution, House Resolution 270, which seeks to extend to the people of Ireland the right to decide how their country shall be governed; be it also

Resolved, That we petition Chairman TOM CONNALLY of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to call open public hearings on a similar resolution by Senator LEHMAN, which has been referred to his committee; in addition be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State and the State Department, and to the metropolitan press and the press agencies.

London Talks Add to Prestige of United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 22, 1950

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article taken from the New York Times of May 21, 1950:

LONDON TALKS ADD TO PRESTIGE OF UNITED STATES—EUROPEANS SAID TO HAVE MORE CONFIDENCE IN ACHESON AS RESULT OF PARLEYS

(By Raymond Daniell)

LONDON, May 20—The series of diplomatic conferences just ended in London has produced new confidence in United States policy in the chancelleries of western Europe. It also has brought about a new respect for United States diplomacy, which throughout the meetings was conducted with skill and finesse by Secretary of State Dean Acheson and his delegation.

The program that was adopted with more unanimity and wholehearted support than had marked most post-war meetings of foreign ministers was essentially a United States program. Mr. Acheson may not be taking home with all that he sought when he came here but he has gained a good deal more than many observers thought he would before the meetings.

Western Europe has accepted the United States thesis that security must have equal priority with economic recovery. It has acknowledged that all must bear a fair share of the burden of rearming. And the western nations have accepted the principle that they can become strong most economically and efficiently by building their forces with the view to their being used jointly against a common enemy.

Before the conferences there was a feeling in Europe that there was no concerted United States policy in foreign affairs. That illusion has been dispelled.

Briefly stated, the policy that has emerged from these series of meetings is that the United States wants to bring Germany into a permanent and profitable association with western Europe.

In the Far East the United States seeks to assist in the development of the new democratic native states, while recognizing legitimate European colonial interests.

In the Near East the United States seeks to preserve the status quo by encouraging the national governments there to improve the standards of living of their people and at the same time give them a tacit guaranty of security.

The idea long held in Washington that the security of western Europe could be guaranteed only by linking western Germany irrevocably with the West has been endorsed and steps have been taken to treat Germany less and less as a cobelligerent in the cold war. The United States on its part has weakened the position of the advocates of a policy of neutrality in the struggle between the east and the west by declaring its continued interest in Europe after the Marshall plan expires.

What may prove to have been the most important piece of unfinished business of the conference was the French plan for the integration of the coal and steel industries of France and Germany under an international authority. This was not even on the agenda but it has provoked a good deal of discussion and almost certainly it will come up for discussion and perhaps decision at subsequent meetings of the western Foreign Ministers.

Although there is no reason to doubt that the announcement of the plan by Robert Schuman, French Foreign Minister, was as great a surprise to Mr. Acheson as it was to Ernest Bevin, British Foreign Secretary, the fact remains that similar ideas had been expressed by United States officials as long ago as 1947, long before the French were willing to consider any kind of partnership with the Germans.

At any rate the picture has changed from that of a France fearful of a renascent Germany and reluctant to form any association with her to one in which the British Foreign Secretary is under pressure from both Paris and Washington to "make good his famous pronouncement of January 1948, in favor of European unity," to use the words of the New Statesman and Nation.

Perhaps that is putting it too bluntly but it is certainly true that the Schuman idea has received warmer and less qualified support from Mr. Acheson than from any British source.

To Britain's Labor Government it raises grave problems in connection with its controls and full-employment policies in the event of joining in the plan and of ruinous competition if Britain remains outside.

There is no doubt that the Labor Government would feel easier about the proposal if there were some assurance that the German iron and steel industries were to be nationalized under a popular mandate and that trade-unions received assurance of their right to participate in the projected international authority. That may be one reason behind the calling of the International Socialist Conference in London to discuss the plan.

Both the United States and Britain will want to be assured that the proposed international control is not a mere camouflage for a new cartel to restrict markets and hold up prices. This is the main economic issue involved, and M. Schuman has given his assurance that the concept aims not at the restriction of production but to increase efficiency, lower costs, and expand export markets.

In support of this, the sponsors of the plan say that the original concept proposes absolutely free trade in the products of heavy industry and that the participating countries would agree to forego customs tariffs or import quotas on coal, iron, and steel.

There is a political question that may have to be weighed more carefully in Washington than in London, however. That is the effect of laying the foundations of a separate European bloc that agitators for "neutrality," especially in France and western Germany, might use as a means of trying to withdraw Europe from the cold war. There is strong public opinion in both countries for dissociation with the United States in its struggle with the Soviet Union, however unrealistic it may seem and far as it may be from an understanding of the Soviet tactics of expansion.

One of the decisions reached at the conference was that the west should do more to mobilize public opinion on its side. Edward W. Barrett, Assistant Secretary of State in Charge of Public Affairs, arrived today and consulted with Christopher Warner, head of the British Foreign Office information department, on plans for countering misrepresentations by Communist sources of the objects of the North Atlantic Treaty.

Displaced Persons and the Problem of Europe's Uprooted Millions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 22, 1950

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by the Honorable Edward M. O'Connor, Commissioner, Displaced Persons Commission, before the civic dinner, Marianist centennial celebration, University of Dayton, Dayton, Ohio, on May 16, 1950:

It is my privilege to present to you this evening an analysis of one of the largest and most humane of the postwar problems confronting the nations of the western world. It is a problem marked by considerable misunderstanding due to misinformation generated for the most part by selfish prejudice. It is also a problem which goes right to the core of the desperate struggle we now engage in, with the cooperation of other freedom-loving nations, for the preservation of western civilization. This is the problem of displaced persons—those unfortunate people who have been torn from or forced to flee from their homelands by one or another form of totalitarian aggression. These people cannot now return to their homelands for fear of their lives and liberties because of race, religion, or political belief.

For an objective understanding of the problem of Europe's uprooted millions we must turn back the pages of history to 1934. The scene is Germany, where an evil tyrant has come to power. The false theory of a superior race is being put into practice. The equally false theory of an inferior race is also being put into practice, and the Jew is made the scapegoat. These practices caused thousands of Jews to flee Germany and to seek haven in other countries of good will. The passing of a few years found hundreds of thousands of Jews incarcerated in concentration camps and those who survived became displaced persons at the end of hostilities. Before the fall of the Hitler regime thousands of Christians were also put into concentration camps because of their active opposition to the Nazi regime.

The second stage of development was 1939, the year Poland was invaded by prearranged plan and agreement between Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia. Poland was invaded simultaneously from the west and the east. Here we find a small nation caught between the powerful pincers of two totalitarian states. After several weeks of valiant but hopeless resistance, the Republic of Poland was conquered. Hundreds of thousands of Polish people fled eastward seeking to escape the invading Germans only to be greeted by the invading forces of the Soviet Union. It is estimated that well over 500,000 Poles entered territory under military occupation by the Soviets. Due to the intervention of General Sikorsky, supported by representations from the Government of the United States, these Polish refugees were allowed to make their way as best they could across the vast expanse of Russia until they eventually reached the hospitable border of Iran. It is a well-established fact that thousands upon thousands of those refugees died along the way due to lack of food, clothing, and adequate shelter. Those refugees who did reach Iran were given temporary haven in that

country as well as in Egypt, Palestine, and the territories all along the eastern coast of Africa. A good many of the survivors of this tragic journey eventually were able to take up arms in the cause of the Allies by joining the Polish Army reorganized under the command of General Anders.

In the meantime, with the German occupation of western Poland, there began the mass deportation of people to Germany for slave labor purposes. No able-bodied person between the ages of 14 and 60 was considered exempt and thus lived in constant fear of being seized in the middle of the night and deported to Germany.

By mutual agreement between Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia and Baltic States of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania were occupied by the Soviet military forces. This military invasion was done under the guise of giving protection to these Baltic states. This action brought about additional thousands of refugees who were forced to flee their homelands.

The third phase developed when Nazi Germany invaded and conquered France, Belgium, Holland, Denmark, and Luxemburg. The occupation of these countries was also characterized by the mass deportation of natives of those countries to Nazi Germany for slave labor purposes. The political dissidents were also rounded up and taken to concentration camps.

The fourth stage came when the alliance between Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia broke down and the Soviet Union was invaded. As the German military forces advanced eastward hundreds of thousands of Ukrainians and White Russians were deported westward for slave-labor purposes. The superior-race theory held that only those of German blood were worthy to be part of the conquering armies and all other people were to be treated as inferiors but required to labor for the war machine.

The fifth stage developed when the tide was turned against Nazi Germany. The rapid and unrelenting military advances of the western allies made possible, in turn, the advance westward of the Soviet military forces. As the Soviet military forces advanced toward the Baltic states, Poland, Hungary, and Rumania, large segments of the civilian population still remaining in those countries fled westward. Being aware of what it meant to be under Soviet rule and domination they took to the roads in an effort to reach the territories liberated by the western allies. Those who reached the western parts of Germany and Austria were afforded haven by the military forces of the United States, the United Kingdom, and France and were put in the displaced-persons camps with millions of other unfortunates like themselves.

As a result of these events the western allies were faced with the problem of caring for approximately 8,000,000 persons immediately after the surrender of Germany. These 8,000,000 people were made up of those liberated from concentration camps, forced laborers brought into Germany, refugees who fled westward before the Russian armies, and prisoners of war. The first requirement was that of providing immediate care and maintenance to sustain life. This task was accomplished in a most commendable manner.

The next requirement was to arrange for the repatriation of these uprooted people to their native lands. Some were returned under plans established by the allied armies, while still others, impatient to rejoin their families and relatives, took to the roads in a seemingly unending stream of people with their few remaining earthly possessions strapped to their backs or carted in small wagons and baby carriages. This impatient movement of humans was for the most part headed westward toward France, the low countries, and Italy. The natural impatience to return home which characterized the western Europeans was not found in those whose homes were to the east.

After long months of tedious efforts to bring about the voluntary repatriation of all the displaced persons to their native lands in June 1946, there still remained approximately 1,200,000 who refused to repatriate. It is interesting to note that those who refused came from Poland, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, the Ukraine, Hungary, Rumania, and Yugoslavia. They gave as their reasons for not returning, fear of their lives and liberties because of race, religion, or political beliefs.

A solution to the problem of the displaced persons had to be found. The following alternatives were offered:

1. Forced repatriation. This would have required the western allies to use physical force in bringing about their repatriation. This was rejected as thoroughly alien to the basic tenets of western civilization.

2. To remove them from the camps and assembly centers and throw them upon the economies of Germany, Austria, and Italy. This was rejected because those countries could not take care of their own natives who were faced with near starvation diets and with industry and commerce at a complete standstill.

3. They could be maintained indefinitely in the camps and assembly centers. This was rejected because the cost was prohibitive and it offered a most unnatural solution.

4. New homelands could be found for these people in countries willing and able to accept them.

The fourth alternative was recognized as the only practical solution to this vast human problem. Consequently the International Refugee Organization, to which the United States gave real leadership in its formation, was established within the United Nations. It is significant to note that the International Refugee Organization has since its inception been supported only by the countries of the western world which have found it necessary to bind themselves together for common security against the latest world aggressor. Neither the Soviet Union nor any of her satellites have played an active part in the operations of this organization. On the contrary, they opposed its establishment and continue to oppose its humanitarian and charitable function.

The United States has to date offered haven to 174,862 displaced persons. Other cooperating nations of the world have taken in a total of 548,963.

The solution to the problem of displaced persons is in sight. The Congress of the United States has extended and liberalized the original Displaced Persons Act. This legislation is at present in conference and is expected to be brought before both Houses of Congress for final action in the immediate future. The provisions of this new legislation together with the continuing cooperation of the other nations of good will gives high hope that this problem will, for the most part, be resolved by June of 1951.

The story of the displaced persons does not complete the analysis of Europe's uprooted millions. There remains two important phases of this problem which merit the serious attention and concern of the American people.

Shortly after the surrender of Germany, the Soviet Union began the forced deportation of all persons of German ethnic origin from the countries their military forces occupied. All persons of German ethnic origin were thus expelled from Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, the Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, and Yugloslavia. The forebears of a great number of these people settled in those countries as long as 400 years ago. Nevertheless their land and all their possessions were expropriated and they were expelled to Germany and Austria as paupers.

A special subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives made an extensive study during 1949 of the problem of expellees and refugees of German ethnic origin. This encompassed approximately 2 months' field study in Germany and Austria together with the examination of all available official documents and the taking of extensive expert testimony. The outstanding conclusions reached by this bipartisan committee are:

1. That indisputable facts clearly show the fallacy of the theory of American co-responsibility for the uprooting of millions of German expellees and refugees. The Soviet Union without consultation or advance notice began the mass expulsion of these people long before the Potsdam Conference.

2. That the United States delegation to the Potsdam Conference, led by the President of the United States, was faced with what amounted to a fait accompli in this matter. The efforts of the United States delegation, therefore, were directed toward doing everything possible to make more orderly and humane the inevitable expulsion of these people and to open occupied Germany to those who would otherwise be faced by deportation to remote sub-Arctic territories of Soviet Russia, an equivalent to annihilation.

3. That it is highly improbable under existing conditions that the German expellees and refugees may be peacefully returned to their former residence.

4. That efforts must be made to establish an economy in Germany which will absorb approximately 7,000,000 of the expellees and refugees.

5. That it will be necessary to develop immigration opportunities for over 1,000,000 of these expellees and refugees.

In the amended displaced-persons law passed by the Senate on April 5, 1950, two special provisions were added which relate to the problem of expellees and refugees of German ethnic origin. The first amendment calls for the admission into the United States of 54,744 expellees for whom home and job assurance are to be provided by American citizens. The second amendment authorizes the participation of representatives of the Government of the United States in an international conference, the purpose of which is to study this problem and to develop practical means for its solution.

Some idea of the importance and relation of this problem to the establishment of an economically sound western Europe may be gathered from the fact that it was given special recognition at the meeting of the foreign ministers of the United States, Great Britain, and France, held in London last week. The communiqué issued by this conference indicated that the respective Governments were appointing representatives who were to immediately begin a study of the problem with a view to its solution.

The last phase of the refugee problem arises from the events which have taken place in the so-called satellite countries since the end of active hostilities. Despite agreement solemnly entered into by the Soviet Union that the governments of these countries would be truly representative of the freely expressed wishes of their people, we find the opposite to be the case today. The leaders of parliamentary government in each of those countries together with their active supporters have been forced to flee and to take haven in the western zones of Germany, Austria, and in Italy. In each of those countries parliamentary government was eliminated by a coup backed by the ever-present military might of the Soviet Union. These people have been forced to flee their homelands because of religious and political persecution. They are as homeless and dispossessed as the

original displaced persons and the expellees and refugees of German ethnic origin. They have little left but their faith in western civilization and the hope that one day in the not-too-distant future the basic freedoms for which the last war was fought will be enjoyed by all people in every country of the world.

In summarizing these events which had led to the brutal uprooting of more than 25,000,000 people, I believe several valid conclusions can be made. The first is that the creation of this tremendous problem must be placed fairly and squarely at the hands of the dictators, those who brought about World War II, and those who now stand in the way of peace with justice and freedom for all. It was a ruthless dictator who initiated this problem just as it is a ruthless dictator who enlarged it and today continues its existence.

The second is that the problem of Europe's uprooted millions is an integral part of the desperate struggle which we are now engaged in to strengthen and preserve western civilization. If we are to win the struggle, we must guard against the development of any malignant growth or development within western civilization itself. We must see to it that all persons regardless of their race, religion, or ethnic origin are afforded the opportunity to a decent and self-respecting way of life. The attainment of this goal will give concrete expression to our belief in the worth and dignity of man. Only by establishing this essential dignity for all mankind may we attain a peaceful world.

In commemorating the Tricentennial of the Marinist Order we can learn many fundamental lessons from the 100 years of service which have been completed. There is, I feel, one especially noteworthy event in this glorious history.

Father Meyer, accompanied by Brother Schultz, arrived in Cincinnati on July 16, 1849. Upon arrival they found an epidemic of cholera raging in Cincinnati and in the surrounding towns as far as Dayton. At the request of Bishop Purcell, Father Meyer and Brother Schultz journeyed to Dayton to administer to the victims of this epidemic. There they met a Mr. Stuart, a descendent of the Stuarts of Scotland. It so happened that Mr. Stuart owned 125 acres of land known then as Duberry Farm, which he was offering for sale. Father Meyer considered this tract of land ideal for the purpose of establishing a headquarters for the Marinist Fathers in the New World. A sum of $12,000 was being asked for the property which, while reasonable, was far beyond the resources of Father Meyer, who had arrived here with but a few dollars left in his pocket.

On March 19, 1850, the Feast of St. Joseph, Father Meyer had a most important conversation with his newly acquired friend, Mr. Stuart. He told him of his great dream of acquiring the 125 acres of land and of his confidence that St. Joseph and the Blessed Mother would bless and prosper the work of the Marinist Fathers in the New World. When Mr. Stuart asked Father Meyer what collateral or other security he had to offer for the purchase of this land, Father Meyer offered a medal of St. Joseph. Mr. Stuart accepted the medal of St. Joseph as security and immediately turned over the deed to the property to Father Meyer.

In this little story we find the lesson of faith, that virtue which is basic to the establishment of mutual trust and confidence. There can be no lasting or peaceful relations between men without mutual trust and confidence. It is equally true that there can be no lasting or peaceful relations between nations without mutual trust and confidence. Let us hope and pray that soon all nations will return to the faith in God-given principles so that peace with justice for all may prevail in the world.

Contribution of My Generation to Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. NOLAND
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 22, 1950

Mr. NOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the following essay was written by Sara Sue Phegley, 16-year-old junior in the Carlisle-Hadden School. As winner of this essay contest which I sponsored in the Seventh Congressional District of Indiana, Miss Phegley showed real insight into the background of the democratic processes. With the youth of this Nation rededicated to the maintenance of democracy, we need not fear for the future of America.

I am very proud of the response of Seventh District high schools in participating in this essay contest on the Contribution of My Generation to Democracy. Sara Sue Phegley is to be highly congratulated for her fine essay.

THE CONTRIBUTION OF MY GENERATION TO DEMOCRACY

The future of democracy and the happiness of the world depend upon the contribution of my generation to democracy.

Our parents have given us first-hand information of a depression and its demolalizing effects. They have lived in a period when some communities were dominated by intolerant groups. We know the cost of war in life and money and the fallacy of believing any good can be derived from the use of force. We have seen people unfit for office elected and dominated by undemocratic groups.

All these problems are to fall upon my generation. We must conscientiously and intelligently understand these issues of our times to preserve the freedom without which there can be no security in any nation.

I believe my generaiton will profit by the mistakes of our predecessors. We bring with us confidence and intelligence. Our many youth organizations—Scouts, 4-H Clubs, Hi-Y, Y-Teens, and others—train in citizenship and leadership. We are not afraid to stand and express our convictions without being swayed by the opinions of others. We know that the primary principles of freedom are self-development and self-expression. I believe we are intelligent enough to recognize the fact that no group, no individual, or branch of government should dictate our lives.

It behooves us to secure a good government by carefully exercising the rights of the ballot. We must see that only those who put personal and political gains second to our best national interests and the welfare of their fellow men may gain office. We must maintain an active interest in government and support our leaders, yet at the same time make them aware of our opinions on public issues. We should not hesitate to fill public offices if we are qualified; moreover, none of us must shrink from such public duties as serving as witnesses or on juries.

Many of the trying questions now facing this Nation such as the atomic and hydrogen bomb, mercy killing, and the prevention of crime, will confront my generation. We must not let the many communistic leaders of our time weaken the democratic ideals our forefathers have handed down to us.

We will bring with us deep religious convictions. Only God-loving, God-fearing people can deal justly with their fellow men. We must have a known code of morals. God forbid that we trade the freedom of opportunity, freedom of speech, freedom of press, and freedom of religion for false security, force, and dictatorship. May God help us to preserve the democratic government our ancestors have fought for and are now putting into our hands for safe keeping.

All Pretense Lost

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 22 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "All Pretense Lost," published in the Wall Street Journal of May 17, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALL PRETENSE LOST

If candor is a commendable quality, Mr. Leon Keyserling merits a medal for some of his comments the other day on the administration's spending policy.

He does not countenance the wishful thinking that present deficits are just to meet emergencies. He says quite frankly that the administration plans to keep spending for spending's sake and will diligently search out all opportunities for so doing. He puts at rest any fears that the administration might return to any such old-fashioned thing as economy in government.

Since Mr. Keyserling is the chairman of the council that advises the President on economic policy, and has lately demonstrated that he has Mr. Truman's confidence, what he says is worth listening to.

For instance, we have heard it said—by the President himself, among others—that the reason the budget cannot now be balanced is that there are extraordinary demands for foreign aid and the cold war. We have been told that as soon as these temporary demands are ended there can be a return to economy.

Foolish promising, says Mr. Keyserling. When the costs of the cold war and foreign aid can be safely reduced there will be no cuts in spending. The administration will just take this saving and use it to expand its domestic programs. Anyone who hopes for economy then is simply deluded.

Indeed, Mr. Keyserling is honest enough to prophesy that the administration is never going to cut its spending and frank enough to argue it ought not to even dream of it.

The liberal spending of the Roosevelt and Truman administrations is basically right, in his opinion. Armament spending is not an undesirable burden undertaken out of necessity and with prayers that it may someday be reduced; it is economically essential and saves the trouble of thinking up some other spending outlet. The same is true, he argues, of the Government's spending for veterans, for farmers or for other groups.

Mr. Keyserling also explains quite plainly that if the administration ever does balance the budget it will be done only by increasing tax revenues. The formula he offers is to spend our way to economy.

A few people have long felt that this administration had no intention whatever of cutting the Government's spending, that spending itself was the goal and the particular projects merely excuses. But it was difficult to combat the protestations that all would be well tomorrow.

Now the thing is plainly spoken. Spending is good; economy is bad. The administration will work industriously at the first and avoid the last like the plague.

Mr. Keyserling's candor, at any rate, ought to be welcome. The meritorious thing about it is that it strips pretense from the administration's intentions and leaves no room for illusion.

Louis Budenz

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 19, 1950

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include George Sokolsky's column, These Days, which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald. It is an excellent defense of Louis Budenz and a complete answer to Senator CHAVEZ' criticism of Budenz:

THESE DAYS
(By George Sokolsky)

Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR CHAVEZ: I have for several days pondered your speech in the Senate concerning Louis Budenz. From a psychological standpoint, it was interesting because you involved yourself not in politics but in canon law.

I have never met Louis Budenz. When he was editor of the Daily Worker, he used to write excoriating articles about me, calling me a reactionary, a Fascist, and a tool of the National Association of Manufacturers.

I did not mind the name-calling, because, Senator, the record always shows what the facts are. Of course, I could have called names back, as you have done, but that strikes me as childish.

You and I and Louis Budenz and Joe McCarthy will soon enough go our way to eternity, but the struggle between Marxism and Christianity will continue as the struggle between good and evil, between God and the devil will continue. I refer you to the Book of Job on the subject—it was written long before anyone thought of us.

However, when Louis Budenz was reconverted to the Roman Catholic church, I sat back and waited. I wanted to be sure that that conversion was not false. As a Communist is, by definition, an atheist, his oath can never be accepted per se. I felt that I had to be sure of the sincerity of Louis Budenz.

His conversion was effected by Monsignor Sheen, a cherished friend, but I have never once spoken to Monsignor Sheen about it. For a year, Louis Budenz was at Notre Dame struggling with his soul. I am an alumnus of Notre Dame (by the back door of an honorary degree), but I have never spoken to President Cavanaugh about it.

I wanted to see what practical application Louis Budenz made of his conversion. I wanted to see a test made of his sincerity.

You say that you are a Roman Catholic and that for the first time in 19 years, you arose in Congress to speak as a Catholic. I take it that that was a rhetorical expression. A man of God is a man of God all the time, not once in 19 years.

Furthermore, yours is a hierarchical church, and therefore you could not speak as a Catholic, ex cathedra. Only the Pope can do that in a matter of faith and morals. Yet you do try to give the impression that you also have a right to do that. You impugn the confessional; you deny repentance and penitence; you deprive a man of absolution. You go too far, if you go as a Catholic.

If you had said that, man to man, you would never believe Budenz, that is your right. When, however, you said that you, as a Catholic, rejected his conversion, you invaded a realm which, as a Catholic, you know is not yours. Your church denies that there are gods on earth, even in the United States Senate.

Now, by what yardstick do I conclude that Louis Budenz is sincere—utterly, completely, totally sincere? By his acts since his conversion, Senator CHAVEZ.

Budenz was the first man to name Gerhart Eisler as the No. 1 Communist agent in America. His exposure of Eisler was justified by the course of events. Eisler is today the top Communist in east Germany and our greatest enemy in Europe, next to Stalin.

Budenz identified J. Santo and J. Peters as Communist agents. Both voluntarily left the United States, which they should not have been permitted to do.

Budenz testified in the two trials of Harold Christoffel. Both trials resulted in conviction.

Budenz was a witness before the House Committee on Un-American Activities in the Alger Hiss case.

Budenz was the Government's chief witness for 10 days in the trial of the 11 Communists before Judge Medina. They were all convicted.

Budenz was the witness before the House Labor Committee five times concerning the United Electrical Workers, which was expelled from the C. I. O., confirming Budenz' testimony.

Budenz has spent more than 100 hours in giving data to the F. B. I., which they have used advantageously.

He could have been silent, teaching economics at Fordham University. Instead he risks just such attacks as yours. By his deeds you shall know him.

Sincerely yours,
GEORGE E. SOKOLSKY.

The Railroad Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FORREST C. DONNELL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 22 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "That's That," written by Bruce Gustin and published in the Denver Post of April 27, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THAT'S THAT
(By Bruce Gustin)

Union leaders acted wisely and with regard for the public interest in postponing the railroad and telephone strikes which had been called for Wednesday. Such interference with transportation and communications as was threatened by these strikes should not be tolerated. Walk-outs of this nature should be outlawed. The fact that the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen agreed to a 2-weeks' truce, postponing the railroad strike, and the CIO Communications Workers postponed indefinitely the telephone strike should not deter Congress from taking action to protect the public interest.

Senator DONNELL, of Missouri, has introduced an amendment to the Railway Labor Act to outlaw any strike, slow-down or other concerted interruption of operations by employees, or any lock-out by a carrier, resulting from any dispute falling within the purview of the Railway Labor Act. This amendment is based upon the sound theory announced by the late Calvin Coolidge, former President of the United States, that "there is no right to strike against the public safety by anybody, any time, anywhere."

The amendment proposed by Senator DONNELL is fine, as far as it goes. But it doesn't go far enough. Any strike or lock-out which seriously interferes with either transportation or communications should be banned. Those are two services which vitally affect the whole Nation. It is Senator DONNELL's contention that there is no absolute right to strike. And in support of that he quotes from the United States Supreme Court decision in the case of *Dorchy* v. *Kansas* (272 U. S. 306), that "neither the common law, nor the fourteenth amendment, confers the absolute right to strike."

Old Man of the Sea?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 22, 1950

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Times-Herald of April 29, 1950:

OLD MAN OF THE SEA?

Are we never going to stop playing sucker to European come-on schemes? At first, right after the war, our yearly multibillion foreign-aid program was sold to the country on the plea that other nations needed our help to rebuild their production.

This they proceeded to do.

Now, according to administration figures, Europe's industrial production is 20 percent higher than before the war, her food production is back to prewar levels, and her export trade is greater than before 1939. So what about more Marshall-plan aid? Can it be cut off?

PRODUCTION IS AT PEAK

Certainly not, administration masterminds now tell us. Because in the course of supplying other countries we have built up our own production so much that if Marshall plan operations were cut off, we would be stranded with huge stockpiles of farm produce—our markets would be glutted—there would be unemployment, depression, collapse.

So, say they, the ECA program must have another $3,400,000,000 for next year.

They are right, of course, in saying that so many surpluses exist—as every sad taxpayer who has read of our production of surplus potatoes knows.

But they are as wrong as wrong, these masterminds, in their bland assumption that this situation is necessary and must be continued.

CUT THE CLOTH TO FIT THE PATTERN

We don't have to keep producing surpluses to give away. We can, and should, cut farm supports to fit our own needs only. If we did this, then the weird business of dodging a depression by depending on other people to accept our charity would very soon cease.

And everybody, including those charity patients, would be better off. For our farmers could then turn to growing more of the things we want—and as for Europe, "poor sick Europe," without our everlasting crutch that wobbly old lady would learn to walk a sight faster, we're thinking.

SINBAD WAS A PIKER

The whole thing reminds us of the story of Sinbad and the Old Man of the Sea. You remember how that old man asked Sinbad to take him piggy-back across a river—and then nearly strangled Sinbad and rode around on his neck for years.

Well, they saddled us with the Marshall plan on the plea that it was needed to get Europe over the immediate war-caused economic crisis. And now that we've toted it across, will it get off? Ha, move over, Sinbad—you were only a piker. We not only have to carry our old man around, we have to feed him and listen to his blather.

Budget for Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 22, 1950

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following from the New York Times of April 23, 1950:

BUDGET FOR GERMANY—SUPPORT URGED FOR FUND REQUEST TO CONTINUE EDUCATION PROGRAM

(Of the signatories to the following letter, Mr. Taylor was formerly Chief of Counsel for War Crimes at Nuremberg; Mr. Brett, consultant to General Clay, Germany, 1948; Mr. Greenstein, former adviser to General Clay on Jewish Affairs; Mr. Mayer, former Chief of the Motion Picture Branch of Military Government in Germany; Mr. Padover, author of Experiment in Germany.)

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The recent testimony of John J. McCloy (United States High Commissioner for Germany) before the House Appropriations Committee lays commendable emphasis on the vital significance of our occupational "program of education designed to assist, advise and persuade the German Government and people to take the democratic road." This official recognition of the reeducation program's overriding importance, which received all too little attention in press accounts of Mr. McCloy's statement, will be welcomed by many who have served in the occupation and who have been dismayed at the relegation of educational activities to a back seat.

For, as Mr. McCloy declared, "everything depends, the whole concept of Western Europe depends, upon" the establishment of stable democracy in Germany:

PURPOSE OF PROGRAM

"If we have a free Europe the German people themselves must individually accept the way of life that is the solid basis of western Germany. A Germany whose citizens have not demonstrated their acceptance of these values can never be a strong link in the association of western nations. A Germany whose citizens have learned to understand and accept these democratic values will be a bulwark of peace and strength against the Communist menace from the east. It is therefore of great importance to help the Germans come to such an understanding and acceptance. It is not something which can be imposed or something which can be compelled, but it is something which can be nurtured by helpful exposure and example. This is the purpose of our public affairs, of our education and information programs.

"I wish to emphasize that we cannot put over this program by fiat or decree. We are seeking to develop it in a spirit of friendship and understanding. We are giving our advice and assistance wherever it is sought. We are providing materials and opportunities.

"We are helping the German schools and universities, the German church and community groups, to regain the best in the German tradition, and to learn the new and the good in American, British, and French civilization."

These words, buried in a 600-page volume of testimony, penetrate to the core of the "German problem." Their far-reaching implications, and the magnitude of the educational undertaking, are most inadequately reflected in the occupational budget for 1951 which Mr. McCoy himself presented.

ACTIVITIES COVERED

Less than $2,500,000 for all press, radio, and motion-picture activities; about the same amount for information centers such as the "Amerika Hauser." A few millions for the student and "leader" exchange program. Less than $1,500,000 for direct aid to German schools and universities; this is about 50 cents for each of the 3,000,000 school children in the American zone, excluding the universities entirely. The entire proposed appropriation for educational, cultural and informational activities is just under $12,650,000.

Even with a generous additional allowance for administration and other overhead expenses, this is less than $1 per capita in the American zone. By way of comparison, the same volume of hearings contained the testimony of Paul Hoffman in support of an ERP subsidy to Germany of $552,900,000.

Disappointingly inadequate as Mr. McCloy's educational budget for 1951 is, it represents an increase over that for the current year. Nor can Mr. McCloy be justly saddled with much of the blame for its shortcomings. At least he has officially and publicly established the primacy of the educational program, and no doubt his estimate took into account the probability of unfavorable congressional reaction to a larger request, as appears between the lines of his later testimony that "it is quite possible that the money we seek may not be enough. * * * I am sure that I could effectively spend more."

RELUCTANCE TOWARD APPROVAL

In the light of the prevailing congressional temper, his caution is understandable. The reaction of the Congressmen before whom he appeared was at times perfunctory, at other times suspicious or hostile, but never enthusiastic. Rumor hath it that Mr. McCloy's presentation encountered even rougher going before the Senate Appropriations Committee, under the far from benign aegis of Senator MCKELLAR.

In short, unless Mr. McCloy's budget receives timely and effective support, there is no assurance that even this sadly circumscribed program will be approved. This is not the stuff of which sensational headlines are made, but it is the cornerstone of our German policy. It is a crucial phase of the campaign to win the peace. We urge prompt and vigorous representations to all Congressmen and Senators in aid of the McCloy budget for Germany.

TELFORD TAYLOR,
GEORGE P. BRETT, Jr.,
HARRY GREENSTEIN,
ARTHUR L. MAYER,
SAUL K. PADOVER.

NEW YORK, *April 21, 1950.*

Misleading Publicity From the Defense Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 22, 1950

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House to an editorial printed in the American Aeronaut under the date of April 18, 1950. The American Aeronaut is the official union paper of Aeronautical Industrial District Lodge, No. 727, International Association of Machinists, at North Hollywood, Calif.

This editorial very properly criticizes a recent announcement to the press indicating that new orders for several millions of dollars' worth of airframes had been placed with California aircraft factories. Investigation following this announcement disclosed that the orders had actually been placed several months previously, and that there was in reality no new work involved. The editorial, which I include in the RECORD accompanying these remarks, points out the harmful effects to labor and the aircraft industry of such misleading publicity. I suggest that those responsible give serious consideration to timing and content of future releases in order that the confusion resulting from the false hopes aroused be avoided.

The editorial follows:

WHO'S KIDDING WHOM?

We have stated before, and we repeat, "You can't fool all of the people all of the time, but you can try." The most recent glaring attempt to pull the wool over the eyes of the aircraft workers and the public, generally in the vicinity of the airframe factories on the west coast, is the announcement relative to the placing of orders by the Navy for planes with Lockheed, Douglas, and other factories in California.

When some 10 days or 2 weeks ago, the daily press all carried the news that Lockheed had received orders for some $25,000,000 and Douglas something over $30,0000,000 for aircraft, the workers employed in the industry and those who have been laid off during the last few months all were enthused as they foresaw continued work and employment.

When union officials began to inquire about these so-called new orders they learned that they do not exist, that they are merely repeat announcements of orders for planes that they have been working on since last fall. It is our understanding that much of the work on these planes has been completed and some of them may already be in the air. That the orders for these planes were included in the backlogs of work reported in the first of the year statements by the various companies.

We ask, "Who is kidding whom?" We note that none of the airframe companies have

taken it upon themselves to correct the erroneous idea that the plants would be busy with work, but we find them making out surplus lists, preparing for large lay-offs. And when we hear the claim that the announcements were not made for security reasons, we again ask, "Who's kidding whom?" Any potential enemy of the United States (and we have only one) no doubt knows more about the number and type of planes being manufactured in our factories than do many of the workers in the plants.

When we consider the subject from all angles, we are inclined to look upon the incident as a further attempt on the part of the forces who are back of the plant dispersal and work removal programs, to sabotage the fight that is being made to keep our California aircraft plants busy and the economy of our craftsmen and the district on a stable basis. The public, having read the misleading reports in the papers, have seen no contradiction and assume a rather indifferent attitude to the campaign of the Council of Aircraft Unions to keep the west coast aircraft industry intact and functioning rather than its removal to Government-owned plants in the Midwest, which is looked upon by many as the first step toward the nationalization of the industry.

Another evil of such untrue publicity is the fact that the reports of the contracts, or plane orders, that do not exist are read by the unemployed in other sections of the country and these workers rush in here seeking employment only to be met with lay-offs where they expected jobs. Many are without funds and become subjects of charity and the many other circumstances brought about by widespread unemployment.

One man who was dealing for a house had the price raised 10 percent. When he asked about the raise he was told that it was due to the fact that Lockheed had received all those new plane orders. Merchants believing what they have read are inclined to overstock and make investments they would not have made had they known the truth.

We ask, "Who's kidding whom?" Is it the procurement agencies of the Armed Forces? Is it the airframe factories, who apparently seem wishy-washy in their opposition to plant dispersal? We cannot blame the newspapers as these releases were furnished them. However, when the union called a press conference to give them the real facts none sent representatives and it may be they have had their orders of hands off.

Consolidated Vultee at San Diego received an order for some work that it is claimed will put about 3,000 men to work but it is the only aircraft concern on the west coast that has been given anything that could be construed as a worth-while order.

We repeat, "Who's kidding whom?" and why?

As we go to press, the Daily News announces that the Army has given orders for $120,000,000 for F-94 night fighters and $26,900,000 for T-33 jet trainers.

We ask, "Are these not orders for the same ships upon which we have been working since last fall?"

The Railway Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FORREST C. DONNELL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 22 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Railway Strike," published in the Albuquerque Journal of May 11, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RAILWAY STRIKE

Five great railway systems, including the Santa Fe, are paralyzed by the strike of locomotive firemen and enginemen.

This strike can but have an immediate and disastrous effect on the public interest.

Mediation has failed. The dispute is a long one. For years now the controversy has raged over the demand of the brotherhood for an additional fireman on multiple unit Diesel engines; also demand that a fireman be placed on switch engines and electrically operated locomotives.

The railroads charge the demand comes wholly under the heading of feather bedding, the practice of creating jobs where there is no necessary work to be done. Or in others words, job padding.

The fact-finding boards have held that the extra fireman is not needed as a safety measure.

The rail strike, if it continues for any length of time, will still almost every train in America. Thousands and thousands of railway workers and other thousands and thousands of workers in related industries will be idle.

The loss to property and production will be enormous.

A great many people, including Congressmen, believe that strikes and lockouts in such vital industries as the railroads should be outlawed.

It is certain that the strike will see demands for legislation in Congress that calls for compulsory arbitration as a last resort in rail disputes. Such legislation would be approved by a large segment of the public. It is clear that this Nation in such cold war and perilous times as these cannot tolerate for long strikes that affect the Nation's very existence.

Defense of Western Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 22, 1950

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Arthur Sears Henning from the Washington Times-Herald of May 22, 1950:

ACHESON PLAN TO ARM EUROPE FACES BIG FIGHT IN CONGRESS—INTEGRATION OF MILITARY FORCES, HIGH COSTS OF SCHEME BRING OPPOSITION

(By Arthur Sears Henning)

The undertaking to defend and pension western Europe indefinitely, to which Secretary of State Acheson committed the United States at the London Conference last week, will meet with tremendous opposition in Congress, it was learned yesterday.

Many Democrats, as well as Republicans, are aroused over the plan to integrate the American Army, Navy, and Air Force with European forces in an international army entailing a surrender of American sovereignty.

The creation of a governing council, headed by an outstanding American, to direct the military and economic arrangements, which has been hailed by the internationalists as the nucleus of a world state, will come under the fire of the nationalists as a step toward the extinction of the United States as an independent nation.

COST WOULD BE COLOSSAL

Even stronger and more widespread opposition will be evoked by the colossal cost of the undertaking to American taxpayers. Acheson committed the country to a continuation of economic aid to Britain, France, and other nations of western Europe after the termination of the Marshall plan in 1952. This presumably would cost the United States about $3,000,000,000 a year.

Acheson also committed Uncle Sam to pick up the check for the cost of rearming and defending western Europe against possible aggression by Russia. American surplus aircraft, ships, tanks, artillery, and other arms are now being furnished to Britain, France, and other Atlantic pact nations under an initial $1,750,000,000 program of military aid.

It was estimated at the London Conference that it would be necessary for America to step this outlay up to three or four billions a year if western Europe is to be adequately prepared for war.

Altogether, therefore, the Acheson commitment means six or seven billions a year indefinitely in the American budget, which is now in the red to the extent of about 14 billions for 1950 and 1951.

TAX INCREASE NECESSARY

Military authorities estimate that it would cost the United States not less than $50,000,000,000 to make western Europe invulnerable to attack. This would be exclusive of foreign economic aid on which the United States already has poured out 35 billions since the end of the war.

Any notion of reducing taxes to stimulate business has gone glimmering under this colossal foreign aid program. It will be necessary to increase taxes, unless President Truman intends to continue deficit financing.

"The whole program that has come out of the London Conference is utterly fantastic," said Representative WOODRUFF, Republican of Michigan, a member of the House Ways and Means Committee now framing the tax bill. "It merely will hasten the day when the United States will go on the financial rocks. We'll go down into the depths and I doubt that we will ever straighten out our affairs until that event takes place."

Indications are not wanting that the Nationalists in their opposition to the London program will receive the support of numerous internationalists who are no longer a unit on the Truman doctrine of American protection of every nation from Russian aggression.

The hostilities will begin when Acheson arrives home and makes his report on the London Conference to the President and, presumably, a radio broadcast to the public. He is now aboard ship writing his report.

Fate of Railroad Labor Act Hangs in Balance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FORREST C. DONNELL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 22 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Fate of Railroad Labor Act

Hangs in Balance," published in the Salamanca (N. Y.) Republican-Press of May 9, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FATE OF RAILROAD LABOR ACT HANGS IN BALANCE

The heart of the problem of assuring the American public of uninterrupted service on the great transportation lines—a service which cannot be stopped without national disaster—was exposed in testimony Monday before a Senate labor subcommittee. The committee is holding hearings on a bill by Senator DONNELL, of Missouri, to make strikes and lockouts illegal in railway labor disputes.

When the Railway Labor Act was passed many years ago, and for some years after its enactment, belief was widespread that the danger of great railroad strikes had been eliminated. This act often was cited as furnishing a pattern that well could be followed in the case of other industries. When the Taft-Hartley law was proposed and being debated in Congress, one of the arguments against it was that there was no need for such legislation—that all that was required to prevent disastrous strikes in industry was to provide for all industrial disputes a procedure like that set up for the railroads and their employees in the Railway Labor Act.

The Railway Labor Act provides that if and when other efforts to settle disputes between the carriers and their employees fail, the President shall appoint a fact-finding board, and that pending the report of this board railroad service shall not be interrupted. The public's faith in this law was based on belief that neither the railroads on the one hand nor their employees on the other would refuse to abide by the report of such a fact-finding board. Both railroad management and labor leaders must realize, the argument ran, that in the last analysis public opinion would be the decisive factor in a labor dispute involving the transportation lines. Hence, it was argued, neither would dare risk the defeat that would surely follow for the side that refused to accept the decision of a fact-finding board.

For several years nothing occurred to change this belief on the part of the American public in the efficacy of the Railway Labor Act. Railroad employees shared in this confidence that there never would be another great rail strike. The public, the railroads, and the workers all believed that a great transportation tie-up was unthinkable.

This confidence, however, has been completely shattered by events of the past few years. Three times, rail-labor unions have refused to abide by the decisions of fact-finding boards, and after such refusal the threat of a tie-up has been used as a club to win concessions denied by the fact-finding boards. The imminence of such a tie-up on the most recent occasion led President Truman to threaten to draft railroad workers into the Army.

In the current dispute the basic issue once again is whether the decision of a Presidential fact-finding board shall be accepted by both sides. The railroads have always accepted the findings of these boards. A walkout has been called against several major roads by the Brotherhood of Firemen and Enginemen over the question of forced employment of a third man on Diesel locomotives. The unions demanded that a third man be employed. Two Presidential fact-finding boards have held that there is no need for a third man. The brotherhood has refused to abide by the report of the board in the present case and has called a strike, scheduled for tomorrow, on several lines. The presidents of these railroads, pointing to firemen's action, told the Senate committee that railroad labor organizations no longer accept the recommendations of fact-finding boards, but threaten walk-outs in the expectation of winning greater benefits. Hence, they argue, there is need for legislation to make strikes and lock-outs illegal. The brotherhoods have given the railroads their strongest argument for such a law.

Mr. Truman, Just Who Are the Isolationists?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 22 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement prepared by me on the foreign policy, together with an editorial from the Daily Plainsman, published in Huron, S. Dak.

There being no objection, the statement and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MUNDT

Mr. President, under leave granted me by the Senate, I am submitting for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point a thought-provoking and realistic editorial from the Daily Plainsman, published in Huron, S. Dak. It is an editorial every American should read.

In his recent stump-speaking tour of the United States, President Truman occasionally—in Fargo, N. Dak., for example—attempted to discuss foreign affairs. As this editorial suggests, he really should leave such a discussion to more talented and successful spokesmen. Since a good foreign policy is one which preserves the peace, protects the strength and security of a nation, creates international good will and unity, and aids a country to stay solvent and contented, it would seem that the foreign policies of the Roosevelt-Truman era have failed dismally and woefully on every count. Whatever else historians may say about the Roosevelt-Truman era, it appears clear they must record it as an era of backing and twisting, of appeasing and reacting, of much war and little peace, insofar as leadership in foreign policy is concerned.

Even waiving all consideration of such sordid incidents as the case of Alger Hiss, of Henry Julian Wadleigh, of Carl Aldo Marzani, of Yalta, and of Potsdam, the fact that American foreign policy since 1932 has failed to keep us out of either a hot war or a cold war and has failed to procure even an official peace up to this late date, indicates that in foreign affairs Presidents Roosevelt and Truman have most completely failed.

For Truman now to try to cover his current miscalculations and misplaced confidences by attacking those who expose or criticize him, is consequently scarcely likely to delude any but the most gullible or to silence more than the most timid. As the Daily Plainsman so effectively points out, the time has come for straight talking on matters of foreign affairs if the ghastly blunders in our foreign policy are not again going to plunge us into the blood bath of another global war. Certainly there is nothing in the record of our current administrative spokesmen on foreign policy to give Americans assurance that their judgments are infallible or their programs so sound that they dare not be questioned or examined.

[From the Daily Plainsman, Huron, S. Dak.]

JUST WHO ARE THE ISOLATIONISTS?

In Fargo, N. Dak., on May 12, President Truman said that persons criticizing and opposing the administration's foreign policies and other policies were "isolationists" who would "let the Communists take over other nations and run the world."

To anyone who has compared maps of the world as of 1944 and then as of 1950, who has seen the steady march of communism abroad helped by the treaties of Yalta and Potsdam and seen the court proof as in the Hiss case of Communist influence working in the State Department, the Fargo speech of the President is completely baffling.

For the President is the man who was the United States representative at Potsdam, where the United States was put behind the eight ball in Berlin, where agreements were made which resulted eventually in all of Europe east of Germany coming under Communist control. He is the man who said the Hiss case was simply a red herring, and the Chief Executive of an administration which refused to prosecute the Hiss case until the House un-American Activities Committee dug up microfilmed evidence, evidence which the administration already knew about but which it had not acted upon because no one else knew about it at first.

He is the man who accepted the recommendations of State Department emissaries that the United States let China fall unsupported, and who rejected the recommendation of Gen. Albert Wedemeyer that the United States take the same action in China—at a time when it was possible—that it actually did take in Greece.

He is the same man who has headed the Government of the United States which in the past 5 years has found itself crowded, shoved, and forcibly ejected from country after country; which has found its embassies closed in iron-curtain countries; which has found the world of its activity constantly growing smaller and smaller and that of communism larger and larger.

His administration has fashioned the foreign policy which has shrunk the sphere of United States activity to a point where the United States is almost brought to the point of making itself a garrison state for continental defense and that surely is nothing more nor less than isolationism. It is an isolationism, however brought close only because of the Truman administration's foreign policy.

So when the same old man who has been responsible for bringing a once invincible America to that point says in Fargo that isolationists are endangering his program and that his opponents would let communism take over other nations and run the world only one of two conclusions is possible.

Either he and his advisers do not or will not face what has happened because of United States foreign policy; or

He is trying to pull one of the most magnificent switcheroos and hoaxes in political history by blaming his opponents for the very evils his administration has created.

The Railroad Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FORREST C. DONNELL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 22 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Railroad Strike," published in the Lancaster (Pa.) Intelligencer-Journal of May 11, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE RAILROAD STRIKE

The railroad strike is on.

Firemen, disgruntled because the railroads refuse to put another fireman on Diesel engines, have walked off the job on four major systems.

The entire national economy is affected, and the situation will become critical in a short time.

It is nothing short of a crime.

But it is the old, old story.

So long as strikes against the public welfare are permitted, situations such as we are now experiencing will continue.

There will always be those who will go to any extreme to try to win their point.

There is only one way to handle the matter and that is to outlaw strikes against the public welfare.

It can be done.

It must be done.

And what is more, it must be done on the national, State and local level, if it is to be 100 percent effective.

The Lady With the Lamp

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 22 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, last Thursday, May 11, was National Hospital Day, which is the anniversary of the birth of Florence Nightingale. My good friend, Harry Schlacht, made Hospital Day the occasion for an interesting column in the New York Journal-American. I ask unanimous consent to insert this column celebrating Hospital Day in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"THE LADY WITH THE LAMP"
(By Harry H. Schlacht)

"Lo! in that house of misery
A lady with a lamp I see
Pass through the glimmering gloom,
And flit from room to room.

"And slow, as in a dream of bliss,
The speechless sufferer turns to kiss
Her shadow, as it falls
Upon the darkening walls."

—*Longfellow's Tribute to Florence Nightingale.*

Today is National Hospital Day. Today is the anniversary of the birth of Florence Nightingale.

She was born 130 years ago in Florence, Italy. She was educated in the nursing standards of her time. She was hailed as the ministering angel during the Crimean War when she afforded comfort to wounded soldiers.

Florence Nightingale has been portrayed in history and poetry, in art and literature, as "The Lady with the Lamp."

The lamp became a symbol for the light which she shed.

Her life became the ideal and the inspiration to the profession of nursing and to hospital services everywhere.

She gave of her heart, she gave of her soul, she gave of her life to this cause.

Well may the speechless sufferer turn "to kiss her shadow as it falls upon the darkening walls."

Her work illuminates the path of the voluntary hospitals. It glows on the records of these great institutions.

History will record no finer accomplishment than that of the voluntary hospital services during the last half century.

They serve humanity without regard to race, color or creed. They recognize no religious sect. They recognize no economic position.

White man and colored man, millionaire and pauper, all find refuge and health within their portals.

The American people are the owners of the voluntary hospitals.

It is not a product of Government subsidies. It is the product of magnificent philanthropies. It is the product of free American citizens. It is the product of free American enterprise.

The voluntary hospitals have been outstanding in maintaining our democratic spirit.

The strength of the American system stems from the character of the American people.

It is a character born in freedom, nurtured by American initiative, developed by American incentive, which blossomed into full fruition under an American system which assures the dignity of the individual.

The Greater New York Hospital Association today in tribute to Florence Nightingale's birthday seeks to arouse public attention in the work of the hospitals and similar institutions.

May the life of that God-loving soul be an inspiration in quickening within us a fixed determination that voluntary hospitals shall prosper and hold out the green branch to every despairing heart.

Let us all aid the voluntary hospitals.

They need our support. They need our help.

With the memories of yesterday fresh in our minds, with tomorrow challenging us at every turn, we can look forward to a day for health in which voluntary hospitals will enjoy the full recognition commensurate with the need for their great services.

The hospital is everybody's business. The problem belongs to you and me.

A strong America is a healthy America.

The Railroad Strike Hits National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FORREST C. DONNELL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 22 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article entitled "Strike Hits Defense, Says Munitions Chief," published in the New York Times of May 13, 1950.

There being no objection the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STRIKE HITS DEFENSE, SAYS MUNITIONS CHIEF

PITTSBURGH, May 12.—The railroad strike was cited as a blow to national defense by Hubert E. Howard, chairman of the United States Munitions Board, in a speech today before 300 industrial executives of the Pittsburgh area in the Duquesne Club. It was the first major utterance of Mr. Howard's 5-month tenure in office as head of the munitions board.

"Russia has foretold a world conflict but she has also taught that capitalism will fall of its own weight and own sins," he said. "She cares not how she accomplishes world domination and our economic collapse would be a safer and far less dangerous course for her.

"From this point, therefore, as far as we can see, we walk an economic tightrope faced with the fateful decision of spending sufficient moneys on armament to deter an attack and yet not spend so much that we make our economic collapse inevitable."

Mr. Howard then went on to mention the railroad strike. Elaborating a point he had made at an earlier press conference, he said:

"Two dangers loom. First we must scrutinize more closely than ever before all Government expenditures to see that we do not waste our substance on nonessentials and second, capital and labor must place loyalty to their country above selfish interest by avoiding all costly strikes and interruptions to production."

"We can no longer afford the economic waste and loss resulting from strikes," Mr. Howard added, "nor can we risk the possible misunderstanding of unwarranted conclusions therefrom."

American Bowlers Discard Segregation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I was greatly heartened to read in the press the other day that the American Bowling Congress had decided to discard its policy of segregation and will no longer restrict its membership to "white males" only. This is another important step in the direction of attaining equal rights for American citizens of all races and creeds. The next, and one of our major steps, should be the enactment of FEPC legislation to eliminate all forms of discrimination in employment and keep this country the finest democracy on the face of the earth—one for the whole world to emulate. I am placing in the RECORD a brief editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of May 14, 1950, regarding the action taken by the bowling congress:

THE BOWLERS CATCH UP

It took considerable shoving, but the American Bowling Congress finally stepped in line. The restriction of membership to "white males," dating back to 1916, has been dropped. The action was taken voluntarily by the ABC convention at Columbus, but the bowlers were under heavy pressure. Public opinion was against them; the ideal of fair play in all sports, generated by the Negro example in baseball, has taken root. Legal actions in New York, Illinois, Ohio, and Wisconsin were breathing hard on the ABC's neck, and it was clearly only a matter of brief time before the national organization actually would have been pushed out of business. The heat was on, and the bowling congress had to relent with the best possible grace.

The underlying force was social pressure, but it took an organized kick in the pants to accomplish reform. Here we have an example of what can be done by compulsion. Education prepared the ground for acceptance, but the final push came by force. When the law stepped in, and prosecutors and judges ruled that public policy was violated by this callous infringement on fair play, the battle was at last won. In bowing to the inevitable, the ABC lawyer, Michael J. Dunn, commented that in the years before 1916 "there was no 'white male' in our rule book, and we got along fine." From now on the American Bowling Congress will get along even better. Every time that another bar is knocked down in the senseless division of Americans and refusal to grant equal rights to all races the whole country can feel that it is stepping forward.

Full Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 22 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on Thursday, May 18, I was privileged to speak before the annual convention of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers Union, in Cleveland, Ohio. My subject was full employment, and the dangers we faced from creeping unemployment. I also outlined a program of action to avert this danger. I ask unanimous consent to insert my speech in the Appendix of the RECORD.

This morning the New York Times published on page 1 an article reporting, from official sources, on the trends in unemployment. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, at the conclusion of the speech to which I have just referred.

There being no objection, the address and the newspaper article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR HERBERT H. LEHMAN

In standing on this platform with the officers and leaders of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers Union, and facing the delegates and guests of that union, I recognize that I am among old and true friends. I have been associated in one capacity or another with the leaders of the Amalgamated, and with your union, itself, for more years than I need to count. We have fought many good fights side by side, and have won our share of them. On occasion, we have had our defeats. But you and I have always been on the same side.

At this convention, you have already heard speeches by many distinguished Americans. This afternoon you will have the privilege of listening to my good friend and yours, and my presiding officer, Vice President ALBEN W. BARKLEY. I can scarcely hope to compete with him in the speech-making field. So this morning, my remarks will be more in the nature of a talk with old friends and coworkers. We will talk about a few of our mutual problems and define a few of our mutual goals.

Speaking of goals, it sometimes seems strange that the further we proceed on the road of progress, the wider the horizons grow, and the greater the number of new goals which stretch out before us. The explanation of this paradox is simple. We—you and I—subscribe to a dynamic faith and to a dynamic concept of society. We believe that in a swiftly changing world, we, the human beings who inhabit that world, must adapt ourselves to those changes instead of trying to restrain them.

We do not seek to achieve the millennium in a day. We do not seek to uproot established institutions. But neither do we cling to every custom, mode, and tradition which may have been sufficient for a previous generation but is clearly outdated for this. We try to adapt our institutions, through the methods provided by our Constitution, to modern-day conditions and circumstances. And, thus, moving steadily forward, we keep pace with the times.

This is the way of progress. This is the way of evolution to meet the challenge of revolution. This is the way of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers Union and it is also my way. It is the philosophy of the Democratic Party, both under President Franklin D. Roosevelt and under President Harry S. Truman.

One of the goals toward which we have been working for many years is the achievement of what we have called full employment. The opposite side of this coin is the abolition of general unemployment. To this goal you and I are firmly committed.

You and I were thrilled when, in 1944, one of the greatest Americans who ever lived sent to Congress an economic bill of rights which began with the declaration that "Every American has the right to a useful and remunerative job in the industries or shops or farms or mines of the Nation." For this, if for no other reason, the people of America will never forget the name of Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

You and I were delighted when one of the great legislators of American history took the leadership, as chairman of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, in the fight for full employment legislation. For this, if for no other reason, the working men and women of our country will never forget the name of Robert F. Wagner.

You and I know that it was an important step forward when the President signed the Employment Act of 1946, which committed the Federal Government to coordinate and utilize all its plans, functions, and resources for the purpose of creating and maintaining useful employment opportunities for those able, willing, and seeking to work. We had hoped that the legislation would have been more comprehensive. But we knew that the real strength of the Employment Act of 1946 would depend on the courage and vision of those responsible for its administration. And we have seen in recent years how, under this act, there has developed an historic and unprecedented program of legislative proposals designed to promote an expanding economy that would provide jobs for all. This program will go down in history to the credit of our great leader and President, Harry S. Truman.

But there are those in this country—happily no longer great in number—who do not believe in jobs for all. They prefer jobs for some.

They think that the women of America should go back to the kitchen.

They would consign our elder citizens to the poorhouse.

They like the prospect of a floating pool of unemployed, so that they can frighten the workers into working harder for less wages and hold the threat of lay-offs as a club over the heads of the unions and their leaders.

I am afraid that this prospect is slowly becoming a reality. I am afraid that we are seeing today the gradual formation of a floating pool of unemployed.

It is not coming dramatically. If it were, it would be easier to deal with. It is coming slowly, creeping upon us stealthily, a little at a time.

It is not even coming steadily. One month there is more unemployment, another month a little less. But a general trend is nonetheless there—a slow and dangerous trend toward increased unemployment.

Judging by all the standards of the past, the state of the American economy today is good.

The latest estimates of the Council of Economic Advisers indicate that for the first 3 months of 1950 the market value of the Nation's output of goods and services reached the annual rate of more than $262,000,000,000. This represented a substantial increase over the rate of economic activity during the last 9 months of 1949 and a full return—plus a little more—to the high levels of activity of the first quarter of 1949.

Employment, too, has reached high levels. The figures for April of this year showed 58,700,000 people at work. This contrasts with only 57,800,000 at work in April of last year.

But while employment has risen, unemployment has also risen. In April 1949, with a million less people employed, there were only 3,000,000 people unemployed. In April of this year, there were 3,500,000 unemployed.

I have seen many learned experts shake their heads in wonder at this seeming paradox. But you men and women from the shops know why it is happening.

You and I both know that the reason for this creeping danger is the fact that our entire economy has not quite kept pace with either the growing productivity of our workers or with the addition to the Nation's labor force of new workers who are coming out of the schools and into the labor market.

In the first quarter of this year total output of goods and services should have run at a rate of $270,000,000,000 rather than $260,000,000,000. In April of this year we should have had not merely 58,700,000 jobs but 60,000,000 jobs. This is the number of jobs which should be available today. Next year the number needed will be even greater. And unless we take steps, unless we act with all the vigor and all the resources at our command, this small shadow of unemployment which now overcasts our prosperity may grow to critical and even disastrous proportions.

During recent weeks in the same period when unemployment was crawling up past the 4,000,000 mark, the press carried reports showing record-making profits by our great corporations engaged in many different industries.

To cite one instance, Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, chairman of the Joint Congressional Committee on the Economic Report recently disclosed that in the steel industry, profits have continued to increase despite increased wages and that employment costs in that industry actually constituted in 1949 a smaller fraction of the sales dollar than at any time in the past 30 years. All these factors clearly indicate that the national economy is running in high gear at its productive end and at its profit end. Our economy is producing more than ever, and providing higher profits than ever. Yet unemployment hangs on.

I know of several areas in my own home State of New York, and I know of areas in Connecticut and Rhode Island, where unemployment is of critical proportions. I cannot reassure these people and their representatives who come asking for assistance from the Federal Government, by citing the fact that there are 58,700,000 people already

employed in America. I cannot tell these unemployed that they should not feel badly about being unemployed in New York or Connecticut because things are booming in Oregon or Oklahoma.

No, for those who are unemployed, for those who live in areas of critical unemployment, the personal effects are almost as serious and as demoralizing as if unemployment were a general instead of an isolated situation. There are the same effects on the individual, on the family, and on the community—effects like ripples from a stone thrown into a pond.

We cannot afford this wastage in human resources. We cannot afford the consequent decrease in purchasing power and in consumer demand.

I have seen figures showing that in several States of the Union, including my own, the amount of money that is being paid out for unemployment benefits is considerably greater than the amount of money coming into these funds in the form of payroll contributions. In New York in 1949, $2.13 was paid out for every dollar received. In Rhode Island the ratio was $3.79 paid out in unemployment benefits for every dollar received. In very few States of the Union, in 1949, was more money collected than was paid out. The situation was exactly the reverse in 1948. We need not take fright from these figures, but we should be concerned.

I do not think that this country can afford any avoidable unemployment. The hallmark of a dynamic economy is labor shortage and not labor surplus. We must move constantly in the direction of more jobs. In an expanding economy, there should be more jobs than people to fill them and not vice versa.

While you and I recognize this fact, there are many who do not. There are many who feel that unemployment is a natural phenomenon which, while unfortunate for the individuals concerned, should not call for government action. Of course, this is the same point of view which was prevalent in 1929. Even a depression is a natural development, according to these people. They consider a depression as an essential adjustment in the cycle of boom and bust, and hence to be accepted like the weather.

Years ago the Mississippi used to overflow its banks almost every year, causing damage to farms and homes throughout a great part of our country. Many of you will remember the annual pictures in the newsreels, as regular as the seasons themselves, showing houses and barns floating down the raging rivers. But today we have learned to control these floods. Along all the rivers where the Federal Government has established great reclamation and flood control works, floods no longer menace the lives of people. Only along those rivers where such projects have not been undertaken do these floods persist. The inference is obvious.

If we can build successful defenses against the forces of nature, we can certainly build defense against economic forces. We can and must provide precautions against the overflow of our economic system. To wait until the flood tide of depression hits us is both stupid and wasteful. We cannot afford it.

When I say we cannot afford it, I am thinking not only in terms of our domestic economy but also in terms of the world situation. The totalitarians are telling the underprivileged peoples of the world that the free-enterprise system is a system for the benefit of the few and the exploitation of the many, that this system carries within itself the seeds of its own disintegration, and that unemployment is as essential a part of that system as profits. You and I are determined to prove that these reactionaries of the left are as wrong as the reactionaries of the right. We must and can prove that we can retain the individual-enterprise system without tolerating unemployment. All this, I believe, can be achieved through the participation of Government in the planned cooperation of all sectors of our economy.

One country in Europe today which typifies the extremes of what we wish to avoid is Germany. In the Soviet zone of eastern Germany there is no unemployment, but forced labor exists. We do not wish full employment of that kind. In western Germany, under the so-called free-enterprise system, unemployment is widespread. We in America must show that full employment may be achieved without the incredible evil of forced labor and that free enterprise may be preserved without the tragic incidence of unemployment.

I have described, from its most important aspects, the problem we face. It is necessary to know the problem in order to understand the importance of doing something about it now—today—before it is too late.

But what are we to do, and why have we done so little to date? The answer is simple. We have actually done a great deal. But many proposals for essential action still lie dormant in congressional committees.

What we have done—what the Roosevelt administration accomplished in rectifying our economic system before the war, and what the Truman administration has achieved since the war—has been largely effective in preventing the disastrous postwar depression which so many people prophesied.

But what has been left undone is responsible for the great dangers which we face today. There are many undefended and vulnerable areas in our economy today. We are today spending a vast amount of money on the cold war. But, of course, we must continue to do so until the threat to our security ceases—any other course would be disastrous. Should the necessity for that spending suddenly stop, as I hope with all my heart it will, we would face a real economic crisis unless we were prepared—as we must be prepared—for concerted economic action to meet this or any other emergency.

I should like to refer briefly to some of the programs which the administration has proposed in the recent past for meeting the problem of economic expansion and unemployment—programs which are still awaiting congressional action and approval. And then I shall refer to steps which must be taken, even beyond these administration proposals, if we are to meet the challenge of this dangerous period.

The administration has long been proposing the development of our great river valleys—the Columbia and the Missouri, to name only two. These developments would be similar to the TVA. If these proposals had been written into law, the effect would have been to stimulate economic activity throughout the country, and to give new strength, balance, and resourcefulness to our national economy.

President Truman proposed a program of cooperative housing for persons of middle income. If this had been acted upon favorably, a new stimulus would have been provided for the entire construction industry.

President Truman has urged—as you and I have, too—the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act. One of the effects of this act has been to slow down the organization of the unorganized, particularly in the South, and to hamper the process of collective bargaining throughout the country. In economic terms this has meant a smaller share of the national income for working men and women and a lower level of purchasing power for the Nation's chief consumers.

I repeat a pledge I have frequently made, to do my best, along with you, to secure the total repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act.

There are, of course, many other pending administration proposals which have not been acted upon or are still under consideration by the Congress. But there is no point or purpose in reviewing what might have been done or what should have been done. We who are gathered here today must take counsel on what must be done.

I

We must study and review very carefully our entire tax structure. During the Eightieth Congress, an ill-timed and ill-advised change was made in our tax laws. That change was a windfall for the rich and a mere sop to those of small and medium income. The result was a great saving for a few, but provided very little added buying power for the many. I am not criticizing corporate profits. What does alarm me is the fact that take-home pay of American farmers and workers has not kept pace. Today we must correct that situation.

We must eliminate or drastically reduce excise taxes which are a burden on the lower-income groups.

We must enact into law a reasonable excess-profits tax, which will yield compensatory revenues but which will not be injurious to business incentive.

II

We must expand our social-security program and increase old-age benefits. With adequate old-age pensions, the aged group in our population will continue to be customers for the products of farm and factory instead of living wretched and minimum existences on public relief or charity.

III

We must launch a vigorous program of encouraging and supporting small business along the lines recently recommended by the President.

IV

We must develop a large reserve shelf of public-works projects which will allow us to do better long-range public-works planning and permit us to meet emergency situations in special local areas where unemployment develops.

V

We must promote and expand our program of water-power development so that cheap power in increasing quantities will be available to lower the production costs of industry and provide higher wages for workers and lower prices for consumers.

VI

We must continue to search for an improved formula for agriculture, so that the prosperity of our farmers will be preserved and increased, maintaining their purchasing power but finding some way to link increased farm production with lower costs to the consumers.

VII

We must expand our public housing program, and must promote through cooperatives and other measures, the provision of adequate housing at reasonable rentals for the vast middle-income sector of our population. We must eliminate slums, wherever they are found.

VIII

We must adopt a scientific approach to our budgetary problems. We must economize wherever possible on wasteful and inefficient operations of Government, but we must be strictly selective in our economies. We must avoid reckless and indiscriminate slashes in our budget, with consequent repercussions in the entire national economy. We are not in a normal economic period.

The advocates of indiscriminate slashing cite the fact that World War II has been over for 5 years and that the budget must get back to normal. But $3.60 out of every $5 that our Government spends today is devoted either to paying for previous wars or for preparing against future ones. In such a situation, we dare not economize at the expense of either our national security or our national economy. To do either would lead to disaster both at home and abroad.

IX

On the international front we must take all necessary measures to draw the entire world—or as great a part of it as possible—into a cooperative effort to raise the general level of production everywhere. In this endeavor, more than in any other, our economic skills and capacities can find an outlet. In this endeavor, we can give a dynamic cast to our economy and provide an almost unlimited horizon for its expansion.

The immediate program which has been recommended by the President to achieve this latter purpose is popularly called the point 4 program. It is included in the Foreign Assistance Act which is expected to be finally approved by the Congress and signed by the President in the course of the next 2 weeks.

This program, for which only $35,000,000 is authorized in the pending legislation—considerably less than it should be in my opinion—provides for technological assistance to other countries, especially to undeveloped areas, for the stimulation of their economic and productive efforts.

I am wholeheartedly in favor of this program. I think that from the productive development of the undeveloped areas of the earth will come a vastly increased and mutually profitable trade which may, I hope, pave the way for that peace which the diplomats have thus far failed to win, but which the ordinary men and women of the world may yet secure.

X

Finally, we must develop all our undeveloped resources, but conserve the expendable ones. Our greatest resource and our least expendable must be considered our human resources—the lives, energies, and happiness of our people. And although I have not referred to it in detail, or as a separate program, this means carrying through a full and undiluted civil-rights and human-rights program.

This is my program not only for full employment and for the control of unemployment, but for a dynamic future for America. It is the same philosophy which President Truman, in a speech at Butte, Mont., last week described as "the way to the highest level of well-being for all the peoples of the earth." It is the way to that freedom from fear and want of which President Roosevelt spoke so eloquently 10 years ago.

As I stand here on this platform, in the good company of friends, and as I define this program and this philosophy, which I know you share, I can almost hear the approving voice of my old friends and your great leader, whose living monument is this mighty union of 400,000 working men and women. But Sidney Hillman's monument is much more than just the Amalgamated Clothing Workers Union—as noble a monument as it is. Sidney Hillman's true memorial is in the impetus he gave to liberal causes and principles in this entire Nation of ours. He stands in that Valhalla of mighty men who enabled our country to emerge from a chaos of despair into a new era of strength and vigor. That strength and vigor brought us victory in war. The greatest monument that waits still to be erected to Sidney Hillman is the use of that strength and vigor to bring peace and justice and well-being to all mankind.

[From the New York Times of May 22, 1950]

JOB OPENINGS TRAIL RISE IN LABOR FORCE—ANNUAL INCREASE OF 800,000 TO 1,100,000 WORKERS POSES PROBLEM, SAYS RESERVE BODY

WASHINGTON, May 21.—Important questions of economic policy are posed by the failure of employment opportunities to keep pace with the 800,000 to 1,100,000 persons added to the Nation's labor force each year, the Federal Reserve Board said today.

The Reserve Board's monthly bulletin said an increase of 1,000,000 was expected in the labor force this year.

At current high levels of activity, the problem of reducing unemployment is difficult partly because the programs appropriate for treating large-scale cyclical unemployment appear to be largely inappropriate for dealing with the present situation, it was added.

The unemployment problem so far has not been sufficiently acute to require broad Federal action, but it has been serious for some areas and, of course, for the workers affected, the bulletin said.

Unemployment increased in the first quarter of this year to the highest levels since before the war. The high point was reached in February when the total unemployed was 4,700,000 persons. By last month the total had declined to 3,500,000, partly as a result of seasonal factors.

Rising productivity due to the record amounts of money spent by industry in recent years on "new machinery and equipment of highly efficient design" accounts largely for the fact that production has increased more than employment since last summer, the Board said.

The recession early last year intensified competitive pressure on management to reduce costs, partly by curtailing employment and by utilizing those employees more efficiently.

The Nation had a total labor force last year of 63,600,000, or 58 percent of the population 14 years of age and over. This was 7,600,000 more than in 1940 when 56 percent of the population of working age was in the labor force.

The bulletin reported that although employment generally was below the 1948 peak there was one outstanding group in which it was higher—Government workers. The number of Federal civilian employees has declined somewhat since mid-1949 but State and local government employment, after rising until the end of 1949, has shown little further change. Two other categories also showed slight increases—employment in finance and in domestic service.

More than 7,000,000 workers received unemployment compensation benefits last year. About 2,000,000 exhausted their benefit rights (averaging 12 weeks' duration), compared with 1,000,000 in 1948.

AVERAGE WEEKLY BENEFIT $21

The average weekly benefit for those receiving unemployment compensation was $21 a week, or about one-third the average weekly wage in covered employment, it was added. Because earnings have risen more rapidly than benefits allotted, however, the percentage of wage loss covered by unemployment was held to be smaller than in prewar days.

Payments out of the unemployment trust fund since early last year have exceeded receipts. For the year 1949 more than $1,700,000,000 were paid out in unemployment benefits under State programs, while tax receipts and interest earned totaled only $1,000,000,000, with the result that the balance in State accounts in the trust fund was reduced from the high level of $7,600,000,000 at the end of 1948 to $6,900,000,000 at the close of 1949.

In the first quarter of this year unemployment benefits averaged $2,200,000,000 at an annual rate and were about double the receipts. The disparity between receipts and claims has compelled a number of States to increase tax rates on employers.

Railway Strike Ban

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FORREST C. DONNELL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 22 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Railway Strike Ban," published in the Los Angeles Times of May 10, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RAILWAY STRIKE BAN

Let us hope that common sense leads the Senate Labor subcommittee to approve the bill of Senator DONNELL, of Missouri, which will outlaw railroad strikes once and for all. DONNELL'S measure would make strikes and lockouts in railway disputes illegal and force the contending parties to compulsory arbitration.

The Donnell bill follows general acceptance that the Railway Labor Act, once regarded as a model measure for labor disputes, has failed adequately to protect the public interest. As testimony before the committee showed, the unions have refused to accept decisions of fact-finding boards, using these decisions as a line of departure from which to pursue their demands.

Obviously, new legislation must replace the Railway Labor Act.

Because railroads operate in the public interest and the movement of their trains is absolutely necessary for the protection of the public health and safety, very rigid control was established over them years ago by governmental agencies. Railroad presidents may not arbitrarily close down their lines as a shopkeeper may roll up his shutters.

Therefore it seems logical that railway labor may not flout its obligations to the public and arbitrarily strand trains. But such is the present case in the matter of four major systems where the firemen demanded an extra fireman on Diesel locomotives to help the regular fireman look out the window—or else.

This line of reasoning applies equally to public utilities on which the Nation relies for its transportation, communication, light, heat, and power.

Prepare, America!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 1950

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on my recent trip to Florida a number of people asked that I submit for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL

RECORD the following able speech by Hon. John F. Selle, of Gainesville, Fla. I think that its contents will be valuable to the readers of the RECORD:

PREPARE, AMERICA!

(By Lt. John F. Selle, United States Naval Reserve)

The people of the United States have added a new day to their list of national observances. The President has designated Saturday, May 20, as Armed Forces Day, and for the first time in history the Nation has been called to pay tribute to all its armed forces on the same day. This concept of unification is further symbolized by the slogan for the first Armed Forces Day—Teamed for Defense.

By the recent unification of our land, sea, and air forces into one integrated defense organization we have done much to strengthen the teamwork and cooperation so vital to the protection of our national security. But the team which must accept this tremendous responsibility cannot be composed of only our Army, our Navy, and our Air Force. You and I and every other loyal and responsible citizen of these United States must, of necessity, be members of that team.

In a sense, even though we are civilians, we are the most important element in our defense mechanism because we call the signals for the Military Establishment. By our election of public officials, by our expressed attitudes and through the actions of those officials, we determine the extent of the military program. Whether our Armed Forces are to consist of a half million, a million, or five million men is for us to say. Whether they will be properly equipped with the latest developments of modern warfare, or armed with obsolete and ineffective equipment depends upon our decisions. And since we hold the responsibility for making these extremely important decisions it is absolutely essential that we make them after careful and intelligent consideration of many diverse factors.

In the past we have been prone to confuse our potential capacity for waging a war with our current military strength. We felt that we were strong simply because we knew that we could become strong. It might be argued that we were right in this confusion because we won our wars. This is true. But it is equally true that we could have avoided those wars completely and won them without fighting had we been a little stronger all the time.

In 1914 Kaiser Wilhelm took the calculated risk that the United States shockingly unprepared, could not muster her potential military might quickly enough to interfere with his program of conquest. It should be small comfort to us that we proved him wrong. By being a little stronger in 1914 ourselves, he would not have been tempted by what seemed to be such favorable odds.

If we had had an army of 3,000,000 men in 1939 efficiently trained and properly equipped, would Adolf Hitler have taken his calculated risk? It is a shameful thing to have to admit that we placed such a temptation before him. At a time when manpower, and the industrial plant necessary to equip that manpower were rotting in idleness we watched the war clouds gather in Europe and did almost nothing about it until we were caught in the deluge ourselves.

True, we proved that Hitler was not infallible when it came to predicting the skill with which we could convert potential strength into strength in being. But we had to fight a terrible war to prove it.

Today, in 1950, history is repeating itself. A powerful aggressor, having repeatedly expressed its intention to destroy our democratic way of life, is arming itself at a fantastic rate. For what purpose—national defense? Are the Russians seriously afraid that the United States with its mothball fleet, its pitifully few modern planes, and its half-million-man army is planning a war of aggression against such a well insulated enemy? There is only one conclusion which can be reached by any man willing to face up to unpleasant facts. Russia is preparing for war. War against whom? Regardless of where and against whom the first shot is fired or the first bomb dropped, the war will be directed against us. Without our active assistance no single nation or group of nations could resist the Russian onslaught. And since we cannot tolerate the loss of any of our few allies, we would have to fight at their side and win or lose together.

If history were to repeat its full cycle we would hold our defense program to a minimum; sacrifice our allies while arming ourselves, and after a bloody struggle emerge once more victorious to face the task of once more rebuilding a shattered world. It would cost us many millions of human lives, untold suffering, and countless billions of dollars. And at best we would have proved that the Russian high command had again, like Kaiser Wilhelm and Adolf Hitler, underestimated our capacity for converting our economy and manpower to a war basis. But can we dare assume that the whole cycle will repeat itself in toto? It is not impossible that just this one time our enemy might have calculated his risks a littler more accurately than we did our own.

Today we have peace, an uncertain and tenuous peace, but nonetheless peace. If war comes to snatch peace away from us we will fight desperately to regain it. We will sacrifice our wealth, our natural resources, our very lives to restablish peace. And the peace we have today is infinitely more desireable than the best peace that could possibly result from another war even if we won our victory—and can we be so sure of that victory? Why not fight for that peace while we have it so that we can keep it, instead of waiting until we lose it.

Our fight to keep our peace cannot be won by negative measures, by too little, too late. It must be an aggressive and mighty effort. Its first step must be military preparedness on such a scale that an aggressor will not dare take the calculated risk of effectively winning a war before we can muster our latent strength. Admitting that such a military program is wasteful and costly, it is still less wasteful and less costly than war. And it costs nothing in lives and bloody agony. Whatever it costs, if Russia can afford her scale of military might we can afford to come near enough in matching it to prevent an armed test. We must rebuild our moral strength and become real Americans who are willing to pay the cost of peace and freedom. The whole free world depends on us today. If we cut the odds too fine in our calculated risk the free people of the world suffer defeat with us.

We must prepare our defenses on such a scale that we will not only be able to win any war forced on us, but will be able to make our strength so apparent that no one, no matter how optimistic, no matter how blind, can mistake it for anything else than an invincible force. There is no such thing as too much preparedness. The better prepared the better we have won our war for peace. Military preparedness is costly, and the more effective it is the more wasteful it is because we will never have to use it. The costs are high but the stakes are higher. What is it worth to you, as you listen to this radio program, to know that the United States is safe against war? So strong that war is unlikely to occur, and so strong that victory is assured if a foolhardy aggressor chooses to test that strength.

During this fiscal year we are spending about 7 percent of our national income on our defense program. It is reported that Russia is devoting about 25 percent of her national effort to military programs. Can we afford to match such a schedule? Let's ask ourselves instead—can we afford not to match it?

In 1942 we did not say how much war can we afford. We asked ourselves, what must we do to win the war—and then did it. We are at war today, fighting to keep something we value highly and we must ask ourselves the same question. The natural odds are with an aggressor nation which can choose the time and place for the beginning of a shooting war. It is not enough therefore that we match our military potential. In every field we must be superior, on land, on sea, and in the air. There are those who say that such an effort would bankrupt us. Is it bankrupting Russia? If it is, it would seem wise to force her to even greater efforts and thus hasten the process. And if it is not, we can afford more than Russia. We must use care and judgment in our defense program, of course, so that we do not waste our irreplaceable natural resources, but we must not begrudge our labor, our time, and our manpower. Our reserve progams should be encouraged and expanded. Last night as a Naval Reserve officer I spent an evening with nearly two hundred other young men of Gainesville in our new training center.

The young men of this Nation can perform no better national service than participation in such programs as conducted by each of the three services. But it is up to us as taxpayers and citizens to see that they have the equipment and facilities they need. When war comes, if it does come, and as it surely will if we gamble with our national defenses, it will come swiftly. We owe it to the young men who must fight it, that we prepare them for the risks they must then take.

Let history never record that the United States of America, once the greatest among the nations of the earth, risked an atomic war and lost it, or even risked it and won it because it was soft and loved its pleasures, its leisure, and its comfortable way of life so much that it failed to prepare for a conflict which was inevitable in the face of such failure to prepare. As I close, ask yourself this question: Am I confident in my own own mind that the United States has taken adequate measures to prevent war, or to win it if all means of prevention fail? Am I certain of victory in the war for peace, either to keep it or to restore it? and if you cannot answer with a confidently "Yes"—do something about it. Exercise your prerogatives as a citizen. Let your legislators know how you feel.

We call the plays. Let's back up our Armed Forces, effectively and unstintingly. Let's show them—and for that matter the whole world—our friends to encourage them, our enemies to discourage them—that we, the people of the United States are teamed for defense.

Amendment of Railway Labor Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FORREST C. DONNELL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 22 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "To Amend Railway Labor Act," published in the Beaumont (Tex.) Enterprise of May 3, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO AMEND RAILWAY LABOR ACT

For years the Railway Labor Act was pointed to as a model piece of legislation, effective in preventing strikes in the rail transportation industry. This is true no longer.

The Railway Age, which speaks for the Nation's railroads, says: "The only practicable solution of the present dangerous drift in industrial relations on the railroads lies in substantial amendment of the Railway Labor Act."

To accomplish this purpose, Senator DONNELL of Missouri has introduced a bill in the Senate which would outlaw railroad strikes or lock-outs called in defiance of the awards made by Presidential boards.

When the device of appointing Presidential boards was incorporated in the Railway Labor Act it was assumed that the Board's findings would be respected by the railroad industry. Here of late the American people have learned that the Railway Labor Act, with its provisions to delay strikes until a settlement can be reached, no longer protects them from disruptions in transportation which in turn affect large segments of the Nation's industry and business.

Whether or not it is true, as charged, that the railroad workers are no longer afraid a strike will jeopardize their jobs or their seniority, it is a fact that the "mobilization of public opinion" by the President and the authority of the President himself no longer can prevent strikes.

The Railway Labor Act was satisfactory up to about 9 years ago. It is rather significant that since a threatened walk-out in 1941 caused Mr. Roosevelt to ask his "Emergency Board" to favor the railroad workers, the railroad unions have shown unwillingness to abide by the provisions of the Railway Labor Act.

In 1946 there was a Nation-wide strike of enginemen and trainmen. Another strike of these workers is threatened over the issue of three men on a Diesel locomotive, probably one of the most unreasonable demands railroad workers have ever made on railroad management and pronounced by two impartial Presidential boards as without merit.

The railroads have established a good record for accepting decisions of the boards in major disputes. This the railroad unions have not done. As a result legislative action is now threatened which will, if enacted, deprive union leaders of the power they have misused.

Ninety-sixth Birthday Anniversary of Andrew Furuseth, March 12, 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. HART
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 22, 1950

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit herewith the address delivered on Radio Station WNYC, New York, N. Y., on the occasion of the celebration of the ninety-sixth anniversary of Andrew Furuseth, March 12, 1950, and certain excerpts from an article appearing in the National Association of Claimants' Compensation Attorneys Law Journal, by Silas B. Axtell, one of its editors:

ANNOUNCER. The first speaker is Mr. Willy Dorchain, seasoned labor leader and the representative in the United States of America of the International Transport Workers Federation of the World, with which the maritime unions of the United States are affiliated. Mr. Dorchain himself has been a seaman. Aside from his duties as representative of the International Transport Workers Federation he is manager of the seafarer's section of the Belgian Transport Workers.

Mr. DORCHAIN. I feel honored by this opportunity to pay tribute to the memory of a great man and union leader, Andrew Furuseth. He devoted the greatest part of his life to the emancipation of the seafarers with tenacity and great courage. His only happiness and pleasures were the successes he achieved. The disappointments and failures were only greater incentives for further striving to attain his goal, the freeing from bondage of the seamen from all over the world.

Many fantastic stories have been written about the men of the sea but what actually happened to many of them in the so-called good old days of iron men and wooden ships surpasses the imagination of the most inspired of writers. Ordinary slavery ashore was sometimes a paradise compared to the treatment received by the sailors at the hands of some inhuman and brutal ship masters of the old days. It is because of men like Furuseth and the seafarers' trade unions that those inhuman conditions have been swept away and that seafarers now find comparatively easy living and working conditions on board of most ships.

National and international laws have been changed and adopted to protect the rights and freedoms of the seafarers obtained at such a high cost and much sacrifice. In the achievement of these laws a number of able and inspired attorneys of several maritime countries have devoted themselves to the cause of seamen by assisting the trade-union leaders in legal matters and new legislation. The late Andrew Furuseth, with his logical mind, saw the necessity of advantage of such assistance and found an able and faithful collaborator and stanch friend in the person of the then youthful Mr. Silas Axtell, who still now spares no effort to keep the memory of his lifelong friend in the honored place it deserves.

The seafarers of today, although much better off than in the old days of bondage should not forget the lessons of the past and those that are taught us from day to day. Our freedom that we all cherish so much, if not closely and constantly watched and protected, is much easier lost than regained. If, in one section of this world, be it large or small, freedom and economic well-being for the workers is being suppressed or is nonexistent, the people of the rest of the world are in constant danger of losing theirs. In this advanced mechanical and scientific age this danger is more real than ever before. The seafarers, through the nature of their trade, are perhaps more vulnerable than workers ashore, they feel the effects of change in other parts of the world sooner. They are not yet fully protected internationally. A large number of adopted international conventions have not yet been ratified by a sufficient number of governments of maritime nations to make them effective.

National and international laws are being flouted and evaded by certain shipowners in search of easy wealth, disregarding thereby the responsibilities and duties that entail such a privileged position in the society of man in democratic countries where free enterprise still exists. Many countries still lag behind in their maritime laws or the enforcement of the existing ones. A number of shipowners from different countries take advantage of this sorry situation to register their ships under the flag of these countries, in order to exploit the seafarers' labor at inferior conditions, and are gradually trying to swing back the time to 50 years ago, against the interest of their own countries and against the interest of democracy and freedom. At great expense, they transport complete crews from countries where they can hire seamen cheaply while unemployment of seafarers continues to increase in the very harbors where those ships are manned. Crews are especially sought from those countries where dictators have suppressed the free trade-unions for many years, or where trade-unions are still in their infancy. Many of these seamen have never, or only for a very short time, known real democratic freedom and the kind of free trade-unions that Andrew Furuseth fought so hard to maintain.

We cannot permit the great sacrifices and struggles of Andrew Furuseth and thousands of true men of the seas to be fruitless. Seafarers from all over the world organized in their free national trade-unions, united internationally through their affiliation with the International Transport Workers Federation, will back their representatives to the limit to continue the fight until the fulfillment of their aims on a world-wide scale. Unfair competition carried out on the backs of the seafarers, slave labor, bad food, and accommodations will not be allowed to take root again on the high seas. Be it by independent international shipowners or groups of shipowners, be it by dictator government or feudal lords, it will be fought wherever it is found. Freedom and economic well-being is a powerful incentive for any human being to join in this struggle. Support for changes and additions in the maritime laws of countries where such laws are outmoded or lacking, strict vigilance in the application of existing international laws and the ratification of new international conventions, denunciation of evaders and, if necessary, joint economic action for the protection of seafarers' right will be our main strength for achievement. Organizing the unorganized, helping the laymen and the weak, should be our motto. The hard lessons of the past shall not be forgotten and we should profit from them. The examples set by Andrew Furuseth should be our inspiration, the International Transport Workers Federation our appropriate tool, and, if necessary, our effective weapon.

I thank you.

ANNOUNCER. The next speaker is Mr. Homer H. Bishop, president of the National Association of Claimant's Compensation Attorneys, of Seminole, Okla.

Mr. BISHOP. The personal sacrifice of Andrew Furuseth, with its resultant service to the seaman, the individual, the Nation and the world is at once an inspiration and a challenge. The testimony of Silas Blake Axtell and others who worked with him, strikes with terrific impact against all forms of oppression. It is well for us today to pay tribute to him, who on March 12, 1854, was born in Norway. When the future historian comes to write the story of Andrew Furuseth he will find his character rising like a huge mountain above the level of average humanity; and he will be compelled to look upward toward the stars to catch its summit.

For 14 years, as a sailor under the flags of 6 nations, he personally suffered the appalling mental and physical brutalities meted out to those who sailed the ships of the seas. Motivated by love for mankind and hatred of tyranny he resolved to strike the shackles of slavery from the sailors of the world. His resolution was transformed into action. We see him as he goes forward into this battle. A crusader of righteousness he entered the arena. Arrayed against him were the crimps, the organized ship owners and the minions of wealth and power. For 19 years, with unfailing courage, he presented the cause of the enslaved sailor to the Congress of the United States. Victory, freedom and reward were attained when on March 4, 1915, Woodrow Wilson, President of the

United States, signed the bill of emancipation.

Thus it is evident that equality before the law did not follow the surrender at Yorktown. To this day man has not yet fully secured economic freedom from the industrial master. True, in some portions of the world, political freedom and equality of religion exist. Only at the price of death in Nero's gardens were such victories obtained. Along the centuries thousands died that others yet unborn might live.

Today the third and last battle in the execution of the marching order of democracy is approaching its climax. The economic freedom of all the world must be secured in order that the equality of man be achieved. The feudal lords and kings have been swept away by the political revolution. Yet in this age great corporations control more employee subjects in the production of goods than the feudal lords of the medieval ages. At the machines of industry each year millions of workers are the victims of occupational disease and industrial accidents. These wrecked bodies are the byproducts of industry.

Lawyers have always been the champions and legal advocates of the oppressed and injured. The Magna Carta, the Declaration of Independence, and the four freedoms were the product of legal minds motivated by the spirit of equality and justice. In order to defend the penniless, the sick, and the injured, the attorneys of the United States are permitted to do so upon a contingent-fee contract. It is impossible for the injured worker whose savings, if any, are exhausted by medical and hospital bills and in payment for the bare necessities of life, to pay retainer fees to attorneys. It is tragic that in any part of this world, legal barriers, regulations, and codes of ethics prohibit the attorney from extending his service to those who need it; to those unable to pay for it. Such a condition leaves the injured worker solely at the mercy of the claim agent, skilled attorneys for the corporations, the casualty-insurance companies, and the lords of industry. This is just another barrier which bars the way against the equality of man.

These barriers must be swept away. Such appalling injustice is a challenge to the lawyers of the world, dedicated to the principle of freedom. Let us as lawyers answer the cry of the oppressed. Let us unite to strike down this instrument of economic slavery. The contingent-fee contract must be put into world-wide practice. In unity, under this contract, the lawyer and the client work together in close personal harmony and friendship. It is a contract of partnership. United they battle in the courts. Together they secure compensation for the injured worker and his family. The contongent-fee contract in the United States has secured for the orphans of industry fair compensation. It has relieved the widow of industry from the fear of poverty. It has been the instrument by which the education of orphan children has been secured.

An enlightened civilization cannot permit the industrial master to employ attorneys by advanced retainers and at the same time deny to these byproducts of industry, his orphan and widow, the right of counsel. In no other way can these helpless ones secure legal protection. This kind of contract is a stepping stone toward victory in the struggle for the economic equality of man.

Inspired by the example of Andrew Furuseth let us carry on the work by him so nobly performed, for the way, the truth, and the life are in this service, written.

ANNOUNCER. Mr. Samuel B. Horovitz, noted attorney of Boston and editor in chief of the NACCA Law Journal, has requested us to announce that in addition to the Gleason lectures on workmen's compensation, this organization has arranged for the delivery of Furuseth lectures on admiralty law by a professor of one of our leading law schools.

NOTE.—Since both speakers refer to the importance of the contingent fee attorney in the enforcement of seaman's rights, we quote from pages, 245, 246, 247, 248, and 249 of an article by one of the editors of the NACCA Law Journal, Mr. Silas Blake Axtell, 15 Moore Street, New York City:

"The framers of the Bill of Rights contemplated equal law enforcement, based on truth that justice be accorded to all citizens, seamen included.

"The contingent fee made it possible for the pauper, the penniless seaman, as he usually was, then, to obtain a fair trial and usually justice. You know, in the beginning, our Federal courts were not open to seamen without the prepayment of fees and costs, as they are today. No, indeed, the seaman who entered the Federal court had to take a pauper's oath, and his lawyer also had to swear that he was to receive no compensation at all for his services.

"Until the Seaman's Act was passed, the Legal Aid Society lawyer had a monopoly of seaman's cases. The doctors and surgeons who do a certain amount of clinical surgery and diagnosis, work without any compensation, and make up for it, I suppose, by charging their well-to-do patients higher fees. The lawyers, or some of them, paid dues to the Legal Aid Society, and thus made some contribution to the ideal of our Bill of Rights—'Equality of all men before the law.' The decision, *Abdu* v. *Nigretia*, (247 U. S. 27), led to the opening of our Federal courts to seamen without the prepayment of fees and costs. Justices Brandeis and Clark dissented, and that decision helped us to get the words 'appellate courts' added by Congress on July 1, 1918 (ch. 11e, sec. 1, 40 Stat. 683), so that section 837 United States Code Annotated, now reads:

" 'Courts of the United States, including appellate courts hereafter shall be open to seamen without furnishing bonds, or prepayment of, or making deposit to secure fees or costs, for the purpose of entering and prosecuting suits in their own name, and for their own benefit, for wages or salvage, and to enforce laws made for their health and safety.' (June 12, 1917, ch. 27, sec. 1, 40 Stat. 157; July 1, 1918, ch. 113, sec. 1, 40 Stat. 683).

"Our seamen, including delegates and union officials of those days, had been trained in foreign vessels where they had been subject to arrest and imprisonment for desertion. They were and really had been wage slaves, and they were glad to recommend counsel who had helped to make the Seamen's Act effective. Since the last war, with the upsurge in shipping, and the terrific increases in wages of merchant seamen and officers, the law is taken for granted, and the new seamen have experienced little of the hardship of the old days.

"The trend here and abroad is for the union to hire lawyers to do their bidding as to law enforcement. Of course, no fighting lawyer can or does divide his fees with a layman—much less employ runners or touts to steer cases, and thousands of seamen in our hospitals can be brought as witnesses to prove that they are not advised or interfered with by anyone, in the choice of counsel. They can and do write to any lawyer they desire to see. Adjusters of insurance companies are not permitted to contact the injured or sick seamen while they are in hospitals. All orderlies and hospital attendants, and ambulance drivers and nurses are strictly forbidden to advise seamen to retain any particular lawyer. The fact that the insurance carriers have for years maintained a secret service, and have been able to control the demands of attorneys who might transgress, has resulted in more and larger verdicts. All this is due, I think, to the contingent fee, and the opening of the Federal courts to seamen without prepayment of fees.

"Due to the Seamen's Act, the seaman not only has rights and remedies and a jury trial, but he has the means of effective enforcement.

"The United Nations already have a bill of rights—these rights are of course, the rights of individuals. I have already directed the attention of those leaders of world government in the free countries—England, France, Benelux, and Scandinavia (who will lead no doubt in the building of Western Union)—of the need of modifying the ban on the contingent fee, prevalent in British and continental jurisdictions. Most American lawyers of this era accept the contingent fee as a matter of course, but an English solicitor is forbidden to make any such contract.

"A client who retains a lawyer on a contingent basis reposes great and complete confidence in his lawyer. I rejoice that the instances are very rare indeed, where there has been an occasion for complaint by a client or regret by the lawyer.

"Andrew Furuseth believed that the public interest would be served by the enactment of the Jones Act, which made the Railway Safety Act applicable to seamen by reference. Only by this means, he contended, under the profit system, could safe conditions be created in hazardous industries. He said: 'Make negligence expensive, and care will pay dividends. The burden of the taxpayer will be lighter because there will be fewer cripples to be supported at public expense, fewer widows on pensions, and fewer children left as public charges.'

"Considering that the rights of men, or individuals for their equality of opportunity before the law, must depend upon the existence of independent lawyers, considering the tendency of collective groups of employers and of employees to want to control lawyers by annual retainers, would it not be a good ideas to give workingmen in all industries in all our States the right to elect and pursue remedies under 'Jones Acts,' or elect to take compensation under the State compensation act, if it was to their interest to do so?

"If the reports of the National Safety Council are accurate, this is the best way to discourage negligence under our free enterprise system. The mere fact that this would increase the insurance premiums need not be a bar. One advantage would be to create and maintain a group of independent lawyers, who would by their very freedom and independence, be a tremendous influence for better government in town, the city, the State, in Washington, and in the seat of world government when that place is located. Only by law can we abolish war; only by lawyers can that law be made effective.

"The crying need today is leadership in public affairs by lawyers who can be economically independent. Lawyers to be independent must have work to do. The right of workers to sue for damages—the common law defenses being removed—would with the use of juries help to keep Government in the hands of the people."

Railroad Strike Peril

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FORREST C. DONNELL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 22 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial

entitled "Railroad Strike Peril," published in the Oregonian of April 21, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Portland Oregonian of April 21, 1950]

RAILROAD STRIKE PERIL

Railroad firemen and enginemen might win the strike they have called for next Wednesday by paralyzing rail transportation and causing unemployment and business recession throughout the Nation. But it might prove to be a costly victory for the union. Congressional response probably would be to tighten the National Railway Labor Act, forbidding strikes, making arbitration binding on both parties, and providing penalties for flagrant violations which could bankrupt and destroy stubborn unions.

The railroads are public utilities. If the extreme step of nationalization is to be avoided, it is necessary that these lifelines of the economy be kept operating at all times by regulatory means.

Under the present act, the union has the right to strike since it went through all the preliminary stages of negotiation and arbitration. The main issue is the demand of the firemen and of the engineers' union that an extra man be employed on multiple-unit Diesel locomotives. Two fact-finding boards appointed by the President under the act have ruled with the railroads that an extra man is not needed, and would constitute union make-work or feather-bedding.

Since the unions failed to prove their case before impartial boards, there will be no public sympathy for the strike. Rather, there will be a demand that Congress enact legislation to prevent such interruptions over issues which can be settled by arbitration.

[From the Denver (Colo.) Post of April 22, 1950]

THAT'S THAT, SAYS BRUCE GUSTIN

It is very much to the credit of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers that their President Johnston has announced they "will continue to work, and can cross picket lines, if set up," in the event the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen carry out the threat to strike four major railroads next Wednesday. That should make it possible to keep trains running. If the firemen strike in an attempt to force the railroads to put an extra fireman on big Diesel locomotives, they may learn that these locomotives can be operated without any fireman.

Report About President Truman's May 8, 1950, Speech at Grand Island, Nebr., as Related by the Grand Island Daily Independent

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I received today through the courtesy of Editor Arch W. Jarrell, two newspaper accounts and an editorial which appeared respectively in the May 9 and May 10, 1950, issues of the Grand Island Daily Independent, which newspaper serves not only the city of Grand Island, Nebr., but also a large part of surrounding territory.

The news accounts are as follows:

SPURS STILL RECALLED BY TRUMAN—PRESIDENT SPEAKS DURING 10-MINUTE STOP IN CITY

President Truman still remembers that he was given a pair of spurs in Grand Island 2 years ago.

"I promised," he said last night during a 10-minute stop at the Burlington station, "to make good use of them. And I did. I rode the Eightieth Congress to a second term in the Presidency of the United States. I will keep them as long as I live."

Estimates of the crowd that greeted the Chief Executive of the Nation last night varied from one guess of about 8,000 downward to as low as 3,000. Anyhow, it was a large crowd to whom he spoke and to whom, afterward, he introduced Mrs. Truman and Miss Margaret Truman.

RAIN LET UP

A heavy rain, which totaled .70 inch during the afternoon and early evening, stopped only a short time before the special Presidential train arrived. There was an occasional light sprinkle, but nothing like the downpour in Lincoln, of which the President said "I got as wet as a drowned rat."

A welcoming committee, wearing large "Welcome Mr. Truman" badges, was at the trainside when it arrived. Stanley Long, Democratic county chairman, introduced the President, and Mrs. Charles G. Ryan, for many years Democratic national committeewoman, presented Mrs. Truman and Miss Truman with bouquets.

Just before the train left, at 8 o'clock, the welcoming committee boarded the rear platform and shook hands with the Trumans. The municipal band was on hand to provide a musical welcome. The youngest welcomer was 2-year-old Gregory Long, son of Mr. and Mrs. Jack Long and grandson of the county chairman.

Yesterday was Mr. Truman's sixty-sixth birthday, and several shouts of "Happy birthday!" were heard. No one, however, gave him a birthday cake, which probably pleased him as he had been given birthday cakes all along the line.

The 10-car train was filled with secret-service men, newspaper reporters, radiomen, and members of the President's personal entourage. It pulled into the station at 7:45, about 5 minutes ahead of schedule.

Fifth National Guard men, commanded by Capt. John F. Cleary, as well as members of the city police force, were on duty.

Mr. Truman called attention to his Lincoln speech about the Brannan farm plan, and said that the administration's program had four principles: To maintain farm income, to expand farm markets, to conserve and improve soil and water resources, and to preserve the American tradition of the family-size farm.

"One of the objects of the program," he said, "is to give the consumer more food at lower prices." Production payments must be used to give the farmer an incentive to raise more of what the country needs and less of what we do not need.

SPEAKS OF OPPOSITION

The President did not mention the Republican party by name, but spoke of the opposition. The trip is ostensibly "nonpolitical."

"Regimentation and socialism are words always used by the opposition," he declared, "on every piece of legislation for the benefit of the people. But whatever scare words the opposition uses, we intend to move forward with a progressive program.

"I am trying to obtain world peace, keep the farmers prosperous, keep labor on a fair basis, and business going as it should. I think I have been successful over the last 5 years.

"Two years ago I came out to Grand Island seeking your votes. This year I am making my report. There is no change in me since you saw me in 1948. I am still working for you and the welfare of the country."

TRUMAN SAYS HE WILL PUSH DEVELOPMENT OF WEST DESPITE FOES—TEAPOT DOME DEAL AIRED BY TRUMAN—PRESIDENT COMES OUT AGAIN IN FAVOR OF BRANNAN PLAN

(By Ernest B. Vaccaro)

ABOARD TRUMAN TRAIN, May 9.—President Truman declared today his administration will push the development of the West over the opposition of reactionary forces of privilege and greed with their philosophy of Teapot Dome.

The President carried his day and night cross-country stumping tour into Wyoming after telling an agricultural crowd at Nebraska enactment of the controversial Brannan farm plan would help assure peace and prosperity for ourselves and the world.

In a speech prepared for an audience today as Casper, Wyo., the Chief Executive described the new Kortes Dam, 50 miles away, as a source of wealth and strength for the people of the world.

And he scoffed at those who cry socialism, regimentation, or boondoggle at Government water and land resource development.

As the day proceeded he continued to talk to large and apparently happy crowds who jammed the tracks around his private car in the chatty, neighborly fashion that was his vote appeal in 1948.

Like at Pacific Junction, Iowa, yesterday where he told them he wanted them to look at their hired man to see if he is the same fellow who came out looking for votes 2 years ago. He added he was 66 even if they thought he didn't look it.

Mr. Truman revived the old Teapot Dome oil scandal at Casper, contrasting the philosophy of Teapot Dome with that behind the construction of the Kortes Dam.

The solemn note he sounded in speeches yesterday in Illinois and Iowa, where he warned the Midwest that a return to isolationism could bring on a third world war, crept into his Casper talk.

"We are engaged in a world-wide struggle to bring lasting peace to the world," he said. "In that struggle we are being opposed by a cynical imperialism which asserts that freedom and democracy are soft and incapable of strong action."

By developing projects like the Kortes Dam, Mr. Truman continued, this country "can prove how false, how hollow, are the claims of communism."

In the Democratic tradition, he added, "we shall move forward on the path of freedom and peace."

In the same vein, Mr. Truman told his farm audience at Lincoln last night that the production payment plan sponsored by Secretary of Agriculture Brannan "is the best plan yet proposed for getting an abundant production of perishable crops consumed without knocking the bottom out of the farmer's income.

Under it the Government would pay the farmers the difference between what they receive at the market for perishable crops and a predetermined fair return.

In Washington, Senator WHERRY, Republican of Nebraska, denounced the Brannan plan as "that economic monstrosity carrying fines and jail sentences for farmers who refuse to goose-step upon command of Washington bureaucrats.

"The President is obviously playing politics with the farmers' problems," WHERRY said, "trying to please CIO bosses and Americans for Democratic Action with dirt cheap prices for food and win the farmers' vote with offers of bribery from the Public Treasury."

Mr. Truman assured the Casper audience today that the Eighty-first Democratic-controlled Congress has been moving forward—not backward.

"The contrast between the enlightened, Democratic approach to the use of our natural resources, and the selfish, anti-Democratic approach, is plain here in Wyoming," he said. "About 50 miles north of Casper lies Teapot Dome. About 50 miles southwest is the new Kortes Dam.

"The name Teapot Dome stands as an everlasting symbol of the greed and privilege that underplay one philosophy about the West."

He said under his own philosophy the Kortes Dam will add 36,000 kilowatts of electricity to our national store of energy when its three turbines go into operation.

Mr. Truman said that soil and forest conservation, flood control, and the development of power, navigation, and irrigation in the Missouri Valley "must all be tackled and solved together."

He did not say whether this should be done by a Missouri Valley Authority or under what set-up, but he added:

"We have learned that a great river valley cannot be developed in piecemeal fashion."

Speaking of the serious aspects of the water problem, he referred to the huge reserves of oil shale in Colorado.

"In the years to come, we may well need to obtain oil from that shale." Mr. Truman warned. "It will take a lot of water to do so, however. And there is a real question whether there is enough water for that purpose."

He said that is one of the problems being looked into by the Water Resources Commission he appointed earlier in the year.

He said the United States must forge ahead with water and land development.

"There are still reactionary forces that oppose every forward-looking proposal to develop the resources and increase the prosperity of the West," the President went on. "The philosophy that produced Teapot Dome is not dead."

The editorial is as follows:

THE PRESIDENT'S VISIT

A 10-minute speech, such as Harry Truman delivered at the Burlington station Monday night, isn't intended to set the world on fire or start a controversy. He hasn't time to develop a serious theme.

So we shouldn't be critical of the talk given here by the President. He came out firmly for prosperity, soil conservation, and peace. Because his trip is nonpolitical, he didn't mention the hated Republicans by name. He only called them the opposition. And he said he would work for the welfare of the people, a promise with which no one can quarrel.

Mr. Truman appeared healthy and rugged. He looks as if the Presidency agreed with him, and as if he liked the job which at first he accepted so hesitantly. The surprise election of 1948 had a definite effect upon his personality. He has developed the "I did it" philosophy which success in winning political elections so often gives a man. No longer does he question his capacity to be the President. Mr. Truman knows he's good, and admits it.

Dr. Clanton W. Williams Proposes a Possible Way of Avoiding World War III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 19, 1950

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, we all realize that the heart of America yearns for a peaceful world. We want a world in which our children can grow up with an opportunity to reasonably reach the fulfillment of their dreams.

The bravery and ability of our armed forces, backed by the great resources and industrial ingenuity of our people enabled us to win two great World Wars.

Five year after the close of World War II we have seen many of the fruits of victory slip as sand through our fingers. Time is running out.

Dr. Clanton W. Williams, professor of history at the University of Alabama, in a bold and thought-provoking approach has outlined a possible way of avoiding world war III.

Dr. Williams is widely recognized as an outstanding historian and philosopher. He is a thorough scholar and a great teacher.

I include a recent address of his entitled "A Possible Way of Avoiding World War III":

A POSSIBLE WAY OF AVOIDING WORLD WAR III

(By Clanton W. Williams, professor of history, University of Alabama)

Mr. President, fellow Kiwanians, ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience, your program committee has asked a historian to talk to you at this time—to offer some thoughts on the possibilities of avoiding war with Russia.

No historian should engage in predicting. Our business has to do with the past. But I dare say that most students of man's affairs would hold that constantly recurring warfare is part of the pattern of all animal life and that it is a decree of nature that the human species shall continue to fight more or less devastating wars. That wars are becoming increasingly devastating is incidental. It is but a part of the general upward curve of everything in this particular era. Having reached a high point of destructiveness, the curve of destructiveness will likely then descend until man has recuperated sufficiently to start once more the increase in devastation.

That thesis, it seems to this historian, is subject to debate. But I admit that I see only one area of refutation to that fatalistic pessimism. It lies in this fact: While the curve of destructiveness of warfare is ascending, so too there is an increasing determination among human beings to put an end to this vicious recurrence. The general rise in the curve of democracy now approaching international democracy offers great possibility, it seems to me, that the so-called decree of nature just mentioned may be countered, may be proved to have been only ostensible. Man has triumphed over nature in other fields. Why should he not find the means of doing so here?

The chances of permanent peace, I admit, are not great. The odds are greatly in favor of the continued recurrence of war. But it so happens that the good Lord has allowed to emerge in this pin point of time a Nation which in physical prowess completely overshadows all others—a Nation with a generally high moral code, a Nation whose economic influence is far out of proportion to its numerical strength, a Nation with a political philosophy of high order. Whether or not this Nation can muster the requisite intelligence and crusading spirit to perform its wonted mission remains to be seen.

I am speaking to an intelligent patriotic segment of our people. The very fact that they are leaders in this community throws upon them a heavy responsibility to keep themselves informed and to develop among themselves and their fellows the crusading spirit required. Toward that end the following facts are presented:

World War I cost $100,000,000,000, not counting interest and veterans' care. World War II saw expended about $1,500,000,000,000, or about 50 times as much money as the total gold reserves of all the nations on earth. Florida's share of this was $7,183,609,404. Bay County's portion was $79,506,000. This is some four times the assessed value of all your real estate. This still does not include interest on the debt nor expenditures for veterans.

In fiscal 1950, a year of peace, the Federal, State, and local governments expect to collect about $55,000,000,000. This is about $1,447 per family. Eight hundred and thirty dollars of that will go for wars, past and prospective, or possibly avoidable.

To this point I have talked only in terms of money—money which itself actually did not disappear, did not even leave this country—money which is registered, nevertheless, as the major portion of our national debt.

There were only 27 nations engaged in World War I and only 8,500,000 people were killed. Seventy nations fought in World War II and some 22 millions were killed. World War I saw the development of machine guns, long-range cannon, poison gas, light tanks, and submarines. World War II saw these weapons become many times more effective, while on the sea this latter war saw the coming of aircraft carriers. Moreover, in the air, long-range bombers and other aircraft grew in awesome numbers as the hell they rained on earth grew proportionately.

World War I came to a close with the airplane's just beginning to be recognized as a weapon of offense. So World War II came to a close just as jet propulsion and guided missiles and electronics began to astound laymen with their potentialities. World War II came to a screeching conclusion as the scientists of the victorious side suddenly presented to human beings a new gift—the atomic bomb.

Although the expression "push-button warfare" was already being bandied about in military and scientific circles before World War II had ended, there had not then been developed the science of combining the principles of guided missiles and atomic fission and biologicals. But by the middle of the twentieth century God's little bugs on earth are making nice progress toward this end.

Is it trite here to interject the thought that the physical sciences are outstripping the social sciences and that the social sciences dictate the use of the products of the physical sciences? Here, parenthetically, I must mention again the figure $830 per family in 1950 for war. I should like to mention also the proposed figure, $7.50 for Federal aid to education. Of course, there are State and local funds for education, all pathetically inadequate, but I am speaking here specifically of national responsibilities. That $7.50 will probably not even be appropriated at this session of Congress. This is incidental; but it is an indication of where we are putting our national emphases. Eight hundred and thirty dollars to $7.50 in America—in gold-rich America—the Nation whose public opinion reflected in Washington controls the destiny of mankind!

The cost of World War II to the peoples of Europe and Asia was nearly two times the $530,000,000,000 we spent on war from 1940 to 1946. That's the cash cost—not the cost in sorrow over their twenty-one and a half million dead loved ones, nor the cost in destruction of buildings, homes, churches, and schools, and of business establishments, nor the cost in the attendant warping of mind and body and spirit of those who lived. The decrease in culture and mental development was matched only by the increase in immorality and in inability to judge values—values in everyday associations, values in political philosophies and propaganda.

It may seem superfluous here to review these facts—the cost of war in money and blood and sorrow and in general degeneration. Yet it seems to be in order to note the historical tendency wherein wars are becoming greater, more all-embracing, increasingly menacing to all higher values. It needs to be noted again and again, especially by parents and teachers, that new generations are coming along continuously—young people who lack this historical perspective, who did not know 1861–65, 1870–71, 1898, 1914–18, 1939–45. It needs to be noted again and again, too, that the wartime good resolutions: "to make the world safe for democracy"; "to institute the four freedoms"; "to win the peace"—these great resolutions fade as we move each year a bit further from the periods in which we held them most intently. Man's forgetfulness, indeed, his fickleness here, is in effect tragic. The educator's responsibility here is apparent.

It is good to note, I repeat, that with each successive war in recent decades the accompanying determination to end warfare has grown in proportion approaching the intensity of war itself. International organization for preservation of peace is no new concept. Its roots go back to Pax Romana. The medieval Roman Catholic Church with its peace of God and its truce of God; the nebulous Holy Roman Empire; the 15-nation Christian republic of France's Henry IV and his Minister Sully in 1610; the law of nations for a society of states as written by the great Dutch lawyer, Grotius, during and after the tragic Thirty Years' War; Alexander of Russia's Holy Alliance and Castlereagh of England's European concert and his conference of ambassador with its permanent secretariat, all following the convulsions of 1789 to 1815—these are manifestations of a basic knowledge among men that wars must be prevented. Toward the end of the nineteenth century came the Hague Conference and the Permanent Court of Arbitration. Here it is to be observed that arbitration in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries prevented the outbreak of war some 200 times. Then came the explosion of 1914–18. It was followed by creation of the League of Nations. But the League died, struck by three mighty blows: (1) it had no police power, (2) American irresponsibility, and (3) the general unwillingness to apply the economic boycott during the great depression.

It is difficult to think of Franklin D. Roosevelt as a timid man. Yet his audacity left him at a crucial moment of history. Fearful of a repetition of Wilsonian defeat at the hands of isolationist Senators, he failed to advocate the surrender of a large portion of American national sovereignty to the prospective United Nations. Doubtless Britain, too, and surely the U. S. S. R. would not have surrendered the requisite amount of national sovereignty to make of the United Nations an effective world government. Perhaps Roosevelt knew this and decided to try to make the most of what he could get. At any rate, the UN was born crippled, crippled by the rule of unanimity among the permanent Big Five of the Security Council. There would be no international police power now; there would be continuous sabotage by that power which had vowed death to bourgeois democracy; if there were to be internationalism it would not be democracy international.

Internationalism in general is no new concept. Alexander set out to conquer and to Hellenize the world. Rome conquered and Romanized the western and near eastern world. The term Caesar was in time imitated in the titles of Tsar and Czar of all the Russias. It is still alive in Shar of Iran. Then there were the Kaisers of the Germans who sang songs about "Deutschland uber alles." Even Haile Salassie's title includes "King of Kings." There have been others besides royalty who entertained ambitions to unify the world under their personal dictatorship and interestingly enough each had some ideological urge. Napoleon rode the wave of "Liberte, Fraternite, Egalite." Mussolini talked of reestablishment of the Roman Empire as an all embracing "corporate state." Hitler and his "Herrenfolk," "master race," still sang "Deutschland uber alles" as they talked of a "new order in Europe." The Russians today have a stirring anthem which they sing with deep reverent fervor:

"'Tis the final conflict
Let each stand in his place.
The International Party
Shall be the human race."

The fact that no king or dictator since the Romans has brought internationalism to fruition does not gainsay the possibility of some such temporary success.

I say temporary because men cannot be held in bondage indefinitely. Individualism, freedom, and justice are age old. Indeed, they are coexistent with the laws of nature. It follows that if permanent internationalism is to be realized it will not be brought about by conquest or intimidation or coercion, nor through wholesale violation of the natural laws inherent in the terms individualism, freedom, and justice, and certainly not when there is applied the unmoral principle that the end justifies the means and other materialistic dogmas. Russian communism hasn't a chance of more than temporary success, but it does have that chance, and temporary could mean several centuries.

But international democracy does have a chance of permanent success. Indeed, the realization of world republicanism appears to be fairly close at hand. I think I might say flatly that if this great Nation had by now developed a crusading spirit for such, that it could be realized in our own day—and quite likely without world war III.

Unfortunately, there is no great leadership at our helm, and, equally unfortunate, there is a timidity among strategically placed persons who do understand the gigantic problem. When I say strategically placed persons, I mean not only the State Department and the Congress but also all molders of public opinion and creators of public enlightenment. It was painful for me last year, as I took part in a Washington conference on the "zeal for democracy" program, to note that the atmosphere was permeated by a defensive attitude. Mind you, these conferees were educators from all levels of education brought together by the Commissioner of Education. They agreed that the school should fight communism and by contrasting it with democracy. But there was hesitancy about showing it up as the loathesome thing it is. This might lead to the accusation of a lack of objectivity. This, to me, is asinine. There was zeal for democracy, to be sure, but only for democracy at home. Practically nothing was said about international democracy. Oh, there should be taught the structure and functions of the United Nations, but its weaknesses were to be ignored or excused as shortcomings of its youth. There was nothing said about its deformity at birth. In short, there is no purposeful advocacy of an educational program whereby our children may be taught the stark facts, and our adults made more conscious of the yawning gulf in the United Nations between its ideals and the practical constitutional progresses whereby the realization of those ideals might be pursued. Our educators, like our politicians, are grossly guilty of ostrich-like evasion of the greatest issue of our age, while the rest of humanity waits for American leadership. And apparently few of our ministers know their responsibility here. But if there is no grass-roots program aimed toward revamping the United Nations, to make it what it is wont to be—a powerful world government—and international democracy, the greater shame lies in Washington. Mr. Marshall, we remember, turned down as premature the idea of elimination of the veto. To be sure, he realized that Russia would veto any move to remove the veto and he was afraid that if he should push such a move Russia and her satellites and at that time maybe also the Arab states would withdraw from the UN. Then, too, there was no assurance that the United States Senate would approve such a surrender of our national sovereignty, and so we drift along the familiar road, so well known to historians—simple rearmament.

Trygve Lie was irked last April when the signing of the North Atlantic Pact stole the headlines from the opening of the spring session of the UN General Assembly. Why? Because it was all too evident that though the pact was within the letter of the UN Charter it was an instrument completely outside the functions of that organization which was supposedly designed to win the peace. But the United Nations as now constituted cannot preserve the peace, and we know it, and therefore ratified the Atlantic Pact. We based our whole national and foreign policy on the principle that the Politburo could not be deferred in their program except by their fear of the atom bomb.

And so we approve of huge appropriations for war or for the prevention of war, we don't know which. In effect we have fallen back upon the first law of nature, self-preservation, and its corollary, survival of the fittest, and I for one must concur. I approve of the fact that we have told the Russians in effect that we will blast their cities with atom bombs should their armies invade any of the signatory powers to the North Atlantic Pact. What our attitude will be when we know that the Russians, too, have the atom bomb remains to be seen. Meantime, I suppose we may say that we are creating world understanding of a sort, a sort which the Kaiser lacked when he believed the statement of his advisers that he need not fear American participation in World War I, because at the moment the United States should declare war, then Texas would secede and go back to Mexico. It is a sort of world understanding which Hitler lacked, though Ambassador William E. Dodd did tell him in 1938 that he had better study some history. He had studied one phase of history; Frederick II was his idol, Frederick with his philosophy that that whatever succeeds is right, a materialistic philosophy, incidentally, which Frederick's fellow Prussian Karl Marx shared. It needs to be added that the Jap militarist did understand that we would fight when we had our face slapped. But it is hard to believe that they understood the war potential of an aroused America. It is now difficult to believe that the Russians with all their spies in our midst do not understand that potential.

Shall we tell them, too, that we will fight if they invade Greece or Turkey or any of the Middle East? Shall we have also a Pacific alliance?

What I am trying to say here is that while I approve of this policy of firm containment, it is in the long run only a stop gap program. It can only defer war.

But look, having stopped Russian armies by threat of war, this shall not have stopped the indirect conquest. Witness the demise of Nationalist China now transpiring. It is painful indeed to see 450,000,000 Chinese people added to the 300,000,000 already brought under the control, as far as concerns international affairs, of those 12 or 13 Bolsheviks, several of whom started out just 32 years ago with but 30,000 followers—but a well indoctrinated and coordinated 30,000. It is painful to note the inconsistency in our policy of firm containment. We are containing the expansion of Russo-communism in Europe and the Mediterranean through the Truman doctrine, the Marshall plan, and the North Atlantic Pact. Not so elsewhere. Not

in China. Not in Indochina or Burma or Malaya or Indonesia or Siam (where the subcapital of the Communist International is the Russian Embassy at Bangkok). Communists today are working nicely in the Philippines, in the Middle East (the subcapital is the Russian Embassy at Beirut, Syria), in the heart of Africa, and far up the Amazon. The recent pronouncements of Communists everywhere, including Paul Robeson, that they would fight for Russia in event of war between their own nations and the citadel of the International were not made unadvisedly, nor as a result of any frustration. It has long been a policy of the revolutionists to purge their ranks, to keep their organization stern and sinewy, and with raised fist to let the world know that sooner or later they were going to win. Just when is not important. Marx's pronouncements about "economic" and "historical determinism," whereby it was foreordained that bourgeois democracy should fall before his dictatorship of the proletariat, was not idle chatter. He sincerely believed it, and so do his followers today. Lenin's law of ebb and flow has been reiterated by word and action of Joseph Stalin and by his minions.

They expect to meet temporary defeats, even to make strategic retreats here and there. But there is no doubt in their minds that sooner or later "the international party shall be the human race." This shall come to pass even if Russia as a nation should suffer military defeat. I am afraid that most of our people do not even know the simple fact that the self-perpetuating Politburo is not a part of the Government of Russia, that it is the "central authority," as Marx put it, of the International, the policy-making body of all Communist groups, the Russian being only one of them. And so the Kremlin is a dual capital—and perhaps a temporary one. Since the First International was formed in 1864 there have been five capitals: London, The Hague, New York, Philadelphia, Paris, and now Moscow. It may very well be moved back to Paris before the century is done. It could eventually be moved to the new United Nations Building in New York.

Right now, though, it is in Moscow and the poor Russian people are being made its immediate tools. Russian nationalism, plus American repugnance for war, plus our ignorance of the fundamentals, plus the awful fact that we have already garnered 73.4 percent of the world's gold reserve and don't know that the poker game has almost been broken up, plus the deformity of the United Nations—those five things have given Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism a series of breaks such as to make old Karl grin through his rotting beard and hiss, "I told you so. See, it's inevitable." And we wonder why some half-baked intellectuals are jumping on the bandwagon.

I submit, my fellow Americans, my fellow bourgeois Democrats, that it is not a question simply of stopping Russia. That is but the first of a series of steps long overdue. Sure, we are meeting the U. S. S. R. as a nation head-on and stopping her military expansion to the west. We are not meeting the International "ipse" save where the stop-gap Marshall plan has been instituted.

And how long do we intend to continue this stop-gap ERP, just giving people dollars so that we can prolong the one-sided poker game—a desperate game for them and for us? There must be an answer somewhere. But the failure to find that answer is certainly one primary reason we refused to let China stay in the game, only we used another analogy about pouring money down a rat hole.

Eight hundred and thirty dollars per family per year indefinitely. That's an ugly thought. But still uglier is the thought of what that bill may be when Canada and the Australians and the Latin Americans and 400,000,000 Indians have run completely out of chips. Some say the trouble is that Englishmen are living beyond their means, that they have got to lower their standard of living. These people should be consistent and say that this is true also of Frenchmen and all western Europeans and Canadians and Mexicans and also those 400,000,000 half-starved Indians. What sweet music to those old Bolsheviks sitting in their temporary Kremlin citadel.

Eight hundred and thirty dollars per family, this year, we should say. That's bad enough. Mind you, I am not considering the rest of our tax bill, just that part having to do with foreign affairs and this year. Did I say "per family"? What families? Need I say what we all know, that the vast load here is being borne by people who might otherwise invest this money in bourgeois enterprises which would produce for the masses in greater abundance and at even lower cost per man-hour worked the good things all men want and would buy if they had purchasing power? Here I could quote directly from Marx' Address of the Central Authority to the Communist League, April 1850, or from writings of his apostle Lenin on how to force democratic nations to tax capitalism to death. I will quote Marx here. This is fundamental. It was written from London 100 years ago:

"We have seen how in the coming movement the democrats will come to power (that's not a capital "D"). * * * if the democrats themselves move for a moderated progressive taxation (Communists), must insist upon a tax whose rates are so steeply graduated as to bring ruin to big capital."

Need I say, my fellow Americans, that with the failure of this Nation to face squarely the issues, to examine honestly its tremendous role in international economics, to note frankly wherein its own selfishness, its tariff policy, its refusal to allow even an equal balance of trade, its asinine gold-purchase policy, its refusal to surrender an iota of its national sovereignty to the United Nations—that all these things are to be taken into equal account along with the dynamic crusading drive of Communists bent on destruction of our system.

Need I add that many an athletic contest, many a war has been lost because one side was intellectually inferior, or was conscience stricken, or lacked a dynamic spirit of its own? May I add that the United States today not only has no crusading spirit for its own ideology but apparently even lacks a grand strategy? Are we sauntering nonchalantly along in blissful overconfidence because we have the atom bomb and $23,000,000,000 in gold when the economic and political world stands on the verge of crashing about our ears? If we are going to think this thing through, if we are going to develop any grand strategy and crusading spirit before it is too late, here are some fundamental things which must be considered—deep underlying things:

1. This bourgeois democratic system with its emphasis on the individual and his freedoms and its mass production industry gushing forth its good things, this bourgeois system, with all its faults, is by far the finest politico-economic system so far achieved. It is worthy of preservation and perfection and expansion.

2. It is in danger of destruction—not by Russia, even with the atom bomb—but primarily because our people do not understand the great issues, do not understand the nature of the opposing ideology, do not understand our awful responsibility in the realm of international economics, do not understand that when the purchasing power of the other 93 percent of the human race has been wrenched from them by our economic electromagnet that the others will inevitably turn on this irresponsible creature—Marxism or no Marxism, Lenin-Stalinism or no Lenin-Stalinism. But Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism will be ready. The Kremlin is already offering itself as a rallying point, an enthusiastic leader bent upon achieving its avowed end—an end already being avidly pursued.

3. This great Nation has already reached the sight of the end of the road it is traveling. With all its wealth, the prospective taxation of its investing element to ward off economic stagnation throughout the world, plus more taxation to carry its own and others' huge military burden (past, present, and prospective), is an ever-widening malignant cancer bent upon death not just to free enterprise but to all that democracy involves.

4. World war III would have to be financed almost entirely by that nation which has the capital, and its capitalists as such would be doomed whether or not we won it.

My subject was how to avoid world war III. Obviously avoidance of that war is but one of the problems before us. The little recession from which we are apparently now emergeing may well have been a red beacon flashing—flashing. Should this rich Nation have a real depression what do you think the others would have? What do you think they are already having? They are grateful that we are making it possible for them to stay in the game, but they know who has garnered all their chips. Some of them are proud people and resent very much the position they are in, but they dread the arrival of the moment when Uncle Sam himself should become critically ill and say, "That's all, boys." Need I add that Uncle Sam might share that dread, for that moment may not be far removed? Have you read what Stalin has been writing since 1925 about the spread of the International through "a series of ebbings and flowings," "a wave-like rhythm" after each war and after each financial panic? Well, read it, translated for you in the January, 1949, issue of Foreign Affairs.

It is presumptous for me, a historian, to offer a program of action at this late hour. I do so with the hope that you will carry on from here in your thinking—in your molding of public opinon—public opinion in the gigantic democracy which at this hour controls the destiny of mankind.

How to avoid world war III? Yes, that and much more. I offer a seven-point program, part of which is already in operation, part of which our State Department and the President apparently are contemplating but to this moment have done little or nothing about, because they fear Congress:

1. Continue to keep ourselves militarily strong while letting the Kremlin masters know through a chain of defense alliances that any further military aggression on the part of Russia or any of her satellites will mean war in which the United States would participate and would not hesitate to use the atom bomb and other horrible weapons at our command. This is a stop-gap measure.

2. A vigorous and proud launching of a bold new program to encourage investment of private capital and to bring to the underdeveloped areas of the world, as Mr. Truman put it in his inaugural address, the capitalistic technology which to this point has made of us the most powerful, prosperous people in history. Mr. Truman's puny request for $40,000,000 ($1 per family) hardly falls in the category of relative boldness. This would be no stop-gap measure. This should be our long-awaited answer to the challenge of communism. This is where our $830 should be going.

4. A complete revision of the Charter of the United Nations—such revision to be based upon the tried and proved principles of democracy—a bicameral system and majority or large majority rule. Should Russia veto this move to make the UN a real "Democracy International," and she would,

then call a new world constitutional assembly, draw a new constitution, and upon ratification by the United States Senate, then secede from the United Nations with invitation to others to follow us in the establishment of an effective world republic. Membership would be restricted to those nations whose local governments are operating under the principles of democracy as defined in the English Bill of Rights, or in the French Declaration of the Rights of Man, or in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

5. There must repose in that World Republic real powers which all governments must have—legislative power, even including a limited power of taxation; judiciary power; and executive power, including full investigative and police powers.

6. In that World Republic there would be not only the present World Bank with capital vastly expanded, but a strong treasury department—the depository of gold reserves. Let it buy gold and issue currency, and more and more of it as it acquired gold. This, I think, is essential. There can never be any circulation of an International currency nor may we logically hope for economic stability without some such drastic move. Then, in that World Republic, there must be a world department of commerce with powers to act. The socio-economic aim of this World Republic would be a repudiation of totalitarianism in all forms and a substitution therefore of a dynamic bourgeois capitalism to bring about an increasing mass consumption of the good things all men want purposefully being mass produced in regulated quantity. There is no end to potential markets. Distribution of purchasing power can be stimulated. Sure, this cannot be done except through planned economy—planned as any grand strategy must be planned, as any board of directors must plan. Let those who despise centralized planning think of the alternatives and of the red beacon right down the road flashing—flashing.

7. Meantime, a revolution must be produced in the minds of men. In Europe, in Asia, in America. Truth and morality must become paramount or democracy will die as it died in Germany, as it has died in eastern and now is dying in central Europe, as it is dying elsewhere. Two world wars and a spreading economic cancer have dominated this century. The cutthroat practices, the flood of falsehoods, the scheming and plotting of Fascists, Nazis, Communists, and others has left a deep imprint upon our age. Men must understand that tyranny and war and depression can be eliminated. They and their children can be taught the fundamentals of political science and economics. We must reverse the trend wherein the physical sciences are outstripping the social sciences. American children must be well taught for they will control man's destiny. But before that may be approached, American fathers must somehow get it through their thick skulls that good teaching cannot be bought in bargain basements. Eight hundred and thirty dollars for wars—and Congress falls between stools over the proposition that $7.50 ought to be spent to assist in educating the Nation's youth.

It is quite possible to teach the propaganda-ridden people of the earth that bourgeois democracy is not the evil thing it appears to many to be. But it means a drastic departure from our present course, and time is running out. The poker game is already artificial, and we have moved into the atomic age.

Does this seven-point program shock you? Does it shock you to know that 3 out of every 4 dollars of Federal appropriation this year is being spent for war purposes and that the chances are that this amount must be increased until Marx's predictions come true? Does it shock you to realize that with the Communist conquest of China that the self-perpetuating Politburo within 32 years shall have established its system over one-third of mankind, whereas with all the progress of the centuries, since long before Magna Carta, only one-fifth of humanity today lives under the rules of democracy, and that most of these democratic peoples plus the other 45 percent, now vacillating, are being bled white by their leaders—a leader which even neglects the education of its children?

It is shocking, isn't it, my fellow Kiwanians, my fellow Americans?

Rail Labor Law Failure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FORREST C. DONNELL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 22 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Rail Labor Law Failure," published in the Los Angeles (Calif.) Times of April 21, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RAIL LABOR LAW FAILURE

Every time the railway labor law has been amended it has been hailed as the model labor law, setting a pattern for all management-labor relationships.

SANTA FE IS LISTED

That it is not this perfect model is again being demonstrated by the strike call of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen against a list of selected railroads. Though the Santa Fe is the only one in the list which serves this territory, either the UP or the SP or both may be involved later.

First, it should be said that this is a pure featherbedding strike; it is not for any legitimate end. What the union demands is that a third fireman be employed on Diesel-electric multiple-unit driving systems, which actually use no firemen at all.

Diesel-electric drives have been successfully operated with only one man in the cab. That engine crews should have two men, though nothing is required of the second but that he be ready to take over in an emergency, is reasonable enough. The public safety calls for such a precaution, so that the lives of passengers may be protected if one man becomes disabled. The second man should be provided for the same reason that a passenger airplane has a copilot.

UNION CASE IS WEAK

But there is no good reason for having three men; and a Presidential fact-finding board has so declared, after a careful examination. Since 1933, all such fact-finding boards have been loaded in favor of labor organizations, so that when one rejects a union's contentions the union must have a weak case indeed.

But the second consideration in connection with this strike deals with a really basic matter; this is a strike against a public utility, and a strike against a public utility is intolerable.

It is at this point that the law is weakest. The law will continue to be fatally at fault until it is amended to provide for some form of compulsory arbitration. Men working for a public utility cannot be permitted to strike, though they must, of course, have the advantage of proper machinery for the redress of grievances.

To argue that compulsory arbitration sets up a form of "forced labor" or "involuntary servitude" is to argue nonsense. No man has to take a job in a public utility; nor, having taken such a job, does he have to keep on working. He can quit. But the members of the BLFE do not wish to quit; they want to hold their jobs and they would object strenuously if anybody was put to work in their place.

EVADING SEIZURE

Is it too much to ask that if they, as public utility employees, do not want to quit, they submit their disputes with management to impartial judgment so that the public will no be put to great loss and inconvenience?

In this particular case, the impartial judgment has already been given, and it is against the union. The fact-finding board says there is no merit in the union contention that a third man should be hired, to help a second man do nothing nine-tenths or more of the time.

The union is attacking a few railroads at a time so it can avoid, if possible, government seizure on the plea of national emergency. But the threat is to all railroads and to the public.

The Railway Labor Law has fallen down before. Its object is to provide a rule of reason and avoidance of strikes in rail transportation. But instead of a rule of reason it has proved to the unions in the past that, no matter how unreasonable they are, the Government will force a settlement in their favor rather than permit a strike. It's time it was changed.

Concerning President Truman's Speech at Lincoln, Nebr., May 8, 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 22, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to an article which appeared in the May 12, 1950, issue of the Unionist, a weekly newspaper which has been in existence for over 26 years, and which is the only official newspaper of the Nebraska Federation of Labor, and the only official American Federation of Labor newspaper in either Omaha or Lincoln, Nebr.

This article is indeed a splendid one, and is as follows:

THOUSANDS HAIL TRUMAN'S SPEECH—DRIVING RAIN FAILS TO DAMPEN ENTHUSIASM OF CHEERING THRONG IN LINCOLN

(By Kenneth Lewis)

All in all it was quite an occasion when the President came to town. For several hours before his train pulled in the Lincoln Hotel was a scene of great activity. The FBI had long before checked those who were to be admitted beyond the guard rope.

Democratic big-wigs were everywhere. It was fun to meet people who had been only names in the papers up to that time. A lot of the labor boys were on hand. John Frahm had been running errands and working for the good of the cause since about noon. Bill Noble came in about 3:30 and

had no difficulty getting one of those exclusive badges pinned on him. Al Witzling came later, and there were several from railroad (including Fred Chapelle, Anton Munch, Ed Lafferty, and others) and other organizations. Lots of old friends.

WANT EXCLUSIVE BADGES

I guess Democrats are just like others, in some ways. Some of the gentlemen about the hotel were moaning long and loud because they didn't have one of the exclusive badges, denoting a member of the Presidential reception party. But eventually most of them were satisfied, or at least quieted.

This preliminary part was much like a convention—you just met people, and introduced those you knew to others. It was a pleasure to introduce Al to Mayor Miles, but they soon discovered they had been on the same program in opposing the repeal of rent controls. Judge Quigley wasn't at all like I had imagined—but don't know what I really had in mind.

Then came the call for the parade—and "exclusive" badge wearers were loaded into cars according to prearranged schedule. Then to the platform to await the President. Bill had left his raincoat in the car. Didn't think he'd need it. How wrong he was. After we'd met a lot more people, and just before the President came, it started to rain. The bands came marching in, their various colored uniforms adding color to the occasion. Their music lifting those spirits that may have sagged because of the rain.

THRILL TO SEE PRESIDENT

The band played the national anthem, and made you tingle a bit with the pride of the thing.

It was quite a thrill to see the President coming from the railroad yards, just below us, then up into the stand. He wasn't just a name in the papers, or an actor in a newsreel—he was a real live man. Somehow it's hard to make real people out of some of the names we read. But there he was—just like the rest of us—getting rained on. There was Mrs. Truman, and Margaret. They were real, too. Here was the Truman family—a family just like yours and mine. Funny, isn't it—some things you know are true, are a little different after you see proof.

Then the introduction by mayor of the town shielding his manuscript from the rain. The thunder interfered. The noise of the rain interrupted. But out in the rain, with no protection, about four thousand stayed of the many thousands who came and went—just to see the President—then get out of the rain.

"REALLY HAS SOMETHING"

I tried to listen carefully to his speech. It dealt with the farm program of the administration. He plugged for the so-called Brannan plan. To me it sounded logical. He sounded honest. I liked what I heard. But I don't know much about farming programs. So I asked an expert—Stan Matzke farm editor of the Journal—what he thought of the speech. "Excellent," said Stan. "The old boy really has something. I would like to see such a program tried. If eggs dropped to 5 or 10 cents a dozen, I think a lot more people would eat eggs. Then the price would naturally come back up to a level to make them equal with other commodities. Meanwhile food would be cheaper, and the farmer would still be getting a fair price. I'd like to see a program based on production payments tried out." Stan rates pretty high in my book in the matter of judgment. So this reaction from a Republican farm editor confirms my uninformed opinion that it was a good speech.

After he finished speaking, the President and his family were hurried to the train to get them out of the rain, and give them a chance to get into dry things.

One of the most interesting features of the afternoon was the steps taken to safeguard the President. From where we sat on the stand, you could see police or secret service men all around. In the railroad yards, on every building for two blocks, on fire escapes two blocks away, and closer, in strategic windows. They overlooked no bets.

BAND PLAYS IN RAIN

Then uptown to catch a bus. Crowded with people soaked, but glad to have seen the President. Most of them glad about being part of the crowd that listened while the University band, in a driving rain, played, paraphrased and sang, "We knew you were coming, so we baked a cake." Then the whole crowd joined them in singing "Happy Birthday." The fellow next to me, hanging on to the streetcar rail, was the engineer who had brought in the President's train. He told about things that happened along the way, and the people who were out to get a glimpse of the President.

All in all, it was a great occasion, when the President came to Lincoln.

Public a Third Party in Any Rail Dispute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FORREST C. DONNELL
OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 22 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Public's a Third Party in Any Rail Dispute," published in the Louisville Times of May 9, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PUBLIC'S A THIRD PARTY IN ANY RAIL DISPUTE

A bill to ban railroad strikes has made a timely appearance in Congress, coming as it does in the face of a threatened walk-out by firemen on four major lines. Offered by Senator DONNELL, of Missouri, as an amendment to the Railway Labor Act, it would substitute compulsory arbitration as a final means of settlement if collective bargaining and mediation failed to end a dispute. How it fares before the lawmakers may be determined to a large extent by what course the firemen's dispute takes during the next 2 weeks.

By then the last-minute truce agreement, postponing a strike originally set for today, will have expired. If the firemen's long-pending demand for an extra man on multiple-unit Diesel engines is settled amicably in the meantime, Senator DONNELL's bill probably will lie forgotten in a committee pigeonhole. On the other hand, if a strike is called, the measure may become a matter of immediate concern to lawmakers, much as some of them would like to avoid such a political hot potato in an election year. (Senator DONNELL, incidentally, is among those up for reelection this fall.)

The idea of compulsory arbitration as a preventer of strikes and lock-outs in vital industries is not new. It was proposed for railroad workers when the 1920 transportation bill, forerunner of the present railway labor law, was before Congress. The Senate was for writing a strike ban into the 1920 law, but the House objected. As finally passed, the measure required that deadlocked disputes be submitted to a railroad labor board, but the board was given no means of enforcing its decisions.

The present law was enacted in 1926. As amended in 1934, it provides machinery for arbitrating disputes over interpretations of existing labor contracts. Within this restricted field, arbitration is compulsory to the extent that either party to a dispute may invoke its provisions with the understanding that, even if the other party does not agree, the awards of the arbitration board become binding on both parties and enforceable by court orders.

For disputes involving issues other than contract interpretation, settlement is sought by mediation. If these efforts fail, the National Mediation Board attempts to induce the two sides to submit their differences to voluntary arbitration. If this offer is rejected by either or both, the President names an emergency board to investigate and make recommendations for settlement. This has the effect of delaying any strike action at least 60 days, with the Board required to report within the first 30 days of the waiting period.

This 1926 act was long regarded as model labor legislation. In the first 15 years of its operation no serious threat of a rail strike developed. Since 1941, however, there have been three such threats, not counting the present one, and one actual tie-up. Plainly the law leaves something to be desired. Never was this more evident than in 1946 when a walk-out by engineers and trainmen created such an emergency that President Truman was moved to ask Congress for the power to draft railroad workers. A draft bill was rushed through the House, 306 to 13, but the Senate, after a week end to think things over, displayed calmer judgment and killed the measure.

The incident is illustrative of Congress' sensitiveness to current happenings in the matter of labor legislation. When no storm is brewing it isn't interested in putting a roof on the house. When a storm breaks it is likely to rush to any extreme to get in out of the rain.

If the threatened firemen's strike, now set for May 10, comes off, we wouldn't want to see lawmakers rush to any extreme. We would, strike or no strike, like to see them give serious thought to the problem which the strike threat poses. The Donnell bill affords an opportunity for discussion. If it is not the best answer, at least it is a starting point toward finding a proper solution—if not for this dispute, for future ones.

To be sure, the President has the authority under still existing wartime emergency powers to seize the railroads if that becomes necessary to protect the public interest. But this is not an ideal solution, nor is it one that can be counted upon to last unless we are to assume that the emergency will go on indefinitely.

Moreover, a rail strike can be injurious to a large segment of the population without actually creating a national emergency—or what the President might readily recognize as a national emergency. Remember how long it took Mr. Truman to recognize the recent coal strike as an emergency deserving his official action?

The strategy in the threatened strike is to limit it to selected lines, instead of making it general, in the hope of avoiding Government seizure. That does not mean, however, that it would not injure a large number of innocent bystanders who have a right to expect protection.

Five Hundred Companies Charged With Illegal Price Fixing and Violating the Antitrust Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN
OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, in the April 13, 1950, issue of the Machinist, a weekly newspaper published in Washington, D. C., by the National Association of Machinists, the following article was published, which discloses an appalling situation. It is very disheartening, indeed, to find so many business institutions throughout the Republic accused of failing to respect and obey the law of the land. It is little wonder that crime is on the increase at gangland levels when talented men so generally ignore the law.

When I was a young man my mother taught me to respect respectable men and women because she thought that they had achieved greatness because of personal goodness, and a willingness to obey instead of to thwart or circumvent the law.

The article is as follows:

Illegal price fixing has become virtually a standard operating procedure for American business corporations, analysis of Justice Department files disclosed this week.

An exclusive survey by The Machinist showed that the Government brought to court more than 500 different business firms and 13 trade associations in the past 2 years. Last year alone, 263 corporations were charged with attempting to eliminate competition in violation of the antitrust laws. Price fixing, to prevent price cutting, is charged by the Justice Department in a majority of these cases. Other illegal transactions included boycotts, price discrimination against independent retailers, industry-wide cartel agreements under which corporations pledge themselves not to compete in one another's territory.

The complete list of corporations and trade associations charged with antitrust violations during 1949 appears on pages 4 and 5 of this issue of The Machinist.

Actually, authorities agree that the Justice Department is able to prosecute only a fraction of the violations. Some authorities report that the Department's appropriation permits it to investigate only about 10 percent of the complaints received.

Herbert A. Bergson, chief of the Department's antitrust division, compares enforcement of the antitrust laws to an iceberg, at least two-thirds of it is below water, where it isn't seen. The Justice Department's antitrust division has an annual budget of about $3,750,000—less than most cities spend on their police departments.

Illegal price fixing and other attempts to throttle business competition have reached such proportions that Attorney General J. Howard McGrath has labeled antitrust violations "the most pressing domestic problem of our time next to unemployment."

Here are some specific examples of the illegal business methods used to keep prices high as exposed in criminal and civil suits brought by the Justice Department last year:

Department stores: Five Philadelphia department stores (Gimbels, Lit Bros., Snellenburg, Strawbridge & Clothier, and Wanamakers), were charged with participating in an illegal agreement to refrain from selling any merchandise at prices between 90 and 97 cents. If 89 cents isn't enough, the stores agreed to jack up the price to 98 cents or more, the suit charged. The stores were charged with having a similar agreement not to price merchandise in the $1 to $10 price bracket in fractions of a dollar between 86 and 97 cents; and on merchandise selling for more than $10, not to use fractions of a dollar between 50 and 94 cents. That means if an item is worth $22.55, it would automatically be priced at $22.95. This agreement acted to raise prices from 11 to 45 cents on all articles in these price ranges, the Justice Department said.

Gasoline, oil, and auto supplies: The Sun Oil Co. of Pennsylvania has been charged with forcing 10,000 independent filling station operators to handle only Sun Oil products. Under their contracts, these dealers were prohibited from shopping around for products of other companies that they might sell to their customers at lower prices. The Justice Department charges that the Sun Oil enforced this agreement by threatening to cancel operators' leases and supply contracts on 24 hours notice and threatened to raise service station rentals or shut off their supply of gasoline if they handled any other competing products.

Small loans: A multimillion dollar network of high-interest small-loan outfits operating in 23 Southern and Western States has been charged with keeping interest rates high by dividing up territory among themselves to prevent competition, by agreeing to pad their rates with brokerage fees even where no broker is involved, and by contributing to a fund to influence city councils and State legislatures seeking to regulate interest rates on small loans.

Eyeglasses: Bausch & Lomb Optical Co., a group of its affiliates and a long list of doctors from many States have been charged with participating in a kick-back arrangement through which the doctor receives a kick-back of $10.95 from the optician selling the glasses recommended by the doctor. In some cases, the kick-back going to the doctor was more than the actual retail price of the glasses. For example, a pair of glasses for which a patient paid $18.25 should have cost only $7.30. The other $10.95 went to the doctor who had already charged the patient a fee for examining his eyes and for prescribing the glasses. Some doctors, the Justice Department says, make as much as $20,000 a year in illegal kick-backs.

Now turn to pages 4 and 5 for the complete list of companies charged with antitrust violations last year.

WHAT'S BEHIND THE HIGH PRICES YOU PAY?

Here are the 263 corporations and 13 trade associations who were hailed into court last year on charges of violating the Nation's antitrust laws. All these charges were brought by the United States Department of Justice.

In the civil actions the Government is seeking court orders to force corporations to cease their alleged illegal activity—to require them to dissolve a price-fixing agreement, or to free a subsidiary company if that is necessary to break up a monopoly.

In the criminal actions the Government is seeking punitive damages—fines, and in some cases prison sentences for corporation officials who have been responsible for the illegal activity.

Under the law the maximum fine that can be levied in criminal antitrust cases is $5,000 on each count. Prison sentences are also authorized under the law, but in all of the 50 years' history of antitrust prosecution, not a single businessman has ever been sent to jail on antitrust charges.

The Department of Justice has asked Congress to increase the fines to a maximum of $50,000 for criminal antitrust violations, and to strengthen the law to prevent corporations from forming monopolies through the purchase of the assets of another corporation.

So far these requests have been ignored, but the Department of Justice hopes that through vigorous action against illegal price fixing agreements, it can help cut prices.

Criminal cases

Cleaning and dyeing: Twenty-three cleaning and dyeing companies and one association pleaded no defense to criminal charges of price fixing in the wholesale dry cleaning business. They paid fines totaling $23,375; Philadelphia Wholesale Cleaners & Dyers Association; A–C Cleaners & Dyers; Ararat Dye Works, Inc.; Atlas Cleaners and Dyers Co., Inc.; Bell Cleaners & Dyers; Centennial Cleaners & Dyers, Inc.; Eagle Cleaners & Dyers, Inc.; Levont Cleaners and Dyers, Inc.; Master Cleaners & Dyers, Inc.; North Cleaners & Dyers, Inc.; Norway Service Cleaners, Inc.; New West-Park Cleaners, Inc.; Philadelphia Dry Cleaners, Inc.; Philadelphia Cleaners & Dyers; Quality Cleaners & Dyers, Inc.; Queen Cleaners & Dyers, Inc.; Regal Cleaners & Dyers, Inc.; Star Cleaning & Dyeing Co.; Tri-State Service, Inc.

Cold storage: Four corporations were charged with criminal conspiracy to fix prices in the sale of cold storage doors: Jamison Cold Storage Door Co.; National Refrigerators Co.; Streator Products Corp.; York Corp.

Department stores: Five department stores pleaded no defense to charges of criminal conspiracy to fix prices and paid fines totaling $12,500; Gimbel Brothers, Inc.; Lit Bros.; N. Snellenburg & Co., Inc.; Strawbridge & Clothier; John Wanamaker, Philadelphia.

Fish: The Stern Fish Co. was charged with criminal conspiracy to eliminate competition in the sale of wholesale fish.

Ice: Seven corporations were named in criminal charges of monopolizing the ice industry: Atlantic Co.; Chattanooga Ice Delivery Co.; City Ice Co.; City Ice Delivery Co.; Ice Service Co.; Orlando Ice Delivery Co.; Southern United Ice Co.

Fire Extinguishers: Four corporations have been charged with criminal conspiracy to fix the prices of fire extinguishers: American-La-France Foamite Corp.; C-L-Two Fire Equipment Co.; The General Pacific Corp.; Walter Kidde & Co., Inc.

Gas refrigerators: Two corporations were charged with criminal conspiracy to eliminate competition and fix prices in the sale of gas refrigerators: Motor Parts Co.; Philadelphia Gas Works Co.

Glass lenses: The Univis Lens Co. has been charged with contempt of court in violating a consent decree entered into in 1942 prohibiting price fixing.

Grape juice: Four corporations were charged with criminal conspiracy to maintain noncompetitive uniform prices in the purchase of grapes: Church Grape Juice Co.; Hyland-Stanford Corp.; Tea Garden Products Co.; True-Ade, Inc.

Iron foundries: Eight foundries and one association have been charged with criminal violation of the antitrust laws through price fixing on gray iron and castings: Acme Foundry Co.; Apex Foundry, Inc.; Atlas Foundry Co.; Central Iron Foundry Co.; Detroit Gray Iron Foundry Co.; Eureka Foundry Co.; Motor and Machinery Castings Co.; Stuart Foundry Co.

Kitchen equipment: Four corporations pleaded no defense to criminal charges of illegal price fixing in the kitchen equipment industry and paid fines totaling $30,000: Victor V. Clad Co.; W. F. Dougherty & Sons, Inc.; Nathan Straus-Duparquet, Inc.

Linen supply: Thirteen corporations and one trade association pleaded no defense to criminal charges of price fixing in the linen supply industry: Apex Coat, Apron, Towel & Linen Supply Co., Inc.; Central-Victory Coat and Apron Supply Co., Inc.; Commercial Towel Service, Inc.; Crown Coat, Apron & Towel Service Co.; Davis Coat & Apron Supply Co., Inc.; Globe Coat & Apron Supply Co., Inc.; Gordon-Nick Linen Supply Co.; The Initial Towel Supply and Laundry Co.; Jenkins Linen Service, Inc.; Lehigh Valley Coat and Apron Supply; National Coat and Apron Supply, Inc.; Pennsylvania Coat and Apron Supply Co.; Penn Coat & Apron Supply Co.

Plumbing supplies: Fifteen corporations and one trade association have been charged with criminal conspiracy to fix the prices of plumbing supplies: Northern California Plumbing and Heating Wholesalers Association; Coast Pipe & Supply Co.; Crane Co.; Dallman Co.; Dalziel Plumbing Supplies; Deltz Pipe & Supply Co.; Grinnell Co. of the Pacific; Heieck & Moran (Oakland); Heieck & Moran (Sacramento); Heieck & Moran (San Francisco); P. E. O'Hair & Co.; Pacific Can Co.; Slakey Bros., Inc.; Thomas F. Smith, Inc.; Tay-Holbrook, Inc.; Western Plumbing Supply Co., Ltd.

Phonograph records: Four corporations and one trade association pleaded no defense to criminal charges of price fixing and boycotting in the sale of phonograph records. The association was ordered dissolved and fines totaling $11,600 were imposed: Tri-State Retail Record Dealers Association; Burton Radio & Appliance Co.; Ludwig Hommel & Co.; McAllister's, Inc.; Record & Gift Center, Inc.

Storage batteries: Twenty-two corporations and one trade association were indicted on charges of seeking to eliminate competition in the sale and distribution of storage batteries: The Association of American Battery Manufacturers; the Electric Auto-Lite Co.; the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co.; Gamble-Skogmo, Inc.; Globe-Union, Inc.; the B. F. Goodrich Co.; the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., Inc.; J. & R Motor Supply Co.; Kansas Hide and Wool Co., Inc.; Morris P. Kirk & Son, Inc.; Lead Disposal Co.; Jacob I. Malschick, Inc.; Maw Metal Co.; Montgomery Ward & Co., Inc.; National Battery Co.; National Disposal, Inc.; National Lead Co.; Sears, Roebuck & Co.; Southeast Lead Co.; West Side Battery Lead Co. (Mass.); West Side Battery Lead Co. (N. J.); Western Auto Supply Co.; Willard Storage Battery Co.

Turbines: Twelve corporations and two associations were charged with price fixing on vertical turbines: National Association of Vertical Turbine Pump Manufacturers; Turbine Pump Manufacturers Association; the American Well Works; Aurora Pump Co.; A. D. Cooke, Inc.; the Deming Co.; Fairbanks, Morse & Co.; Food Machinery & Chemical Corp.; Byron Jackson Co.; Johnston Pump Co.; Layne & Bowler, Inc., (Memphis); Layne & Bowler Corp. (Los Angeles); Winthroath Pumps, Inc.; Worthington Pump & Machinery Corp.

Wall paper: Ten corporations and one trade association pleaded no defense to criminal charges of price fixing in the industry and paid fines totaling $50,000: Asam Wallpapers, Inc.; B. & D. Wallpaper Co.; Cook Paint & Varnish Co.; D. Schultz & Co., Inc.; Fisher Wallpaper & Paint Co.; Isgo Wall Paper Corp.; James Davis, Inc.; Richard E. Thibaut, Inc.; the Globe Mills (Inc.); the H. Blonder Co.

X-ray film: Six corporations pleaded no defense to criminal charges of price fixing of medical X-ray film and paid fines totaling $22,000; General Electric X-Ray Corp.; Keleket X-Ray Sales Co., of Los Angeles; Kelley-Koett Manufacturing Co.; R. L. Scherer Co.; Western Surgical Supply Co.; Westinghouse Electric Corp.

Civil cases

Abrasives: Six corporations have been charged with illegal price fixing and patent pooling in the coated abrasives field: Armour & Co.; Behr-Manning Corp.; Durex Abrasives Corp.; Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co.; the Carborundum Co.; the Durex Corp.

Artificial eyes: Two companies have been charged with illegal price fixing in the manufacture and sale of plastic artificial eyes: Paul Gougelman Co.; Mager & Gougelman, Inc.

Building products: Thirteen corporations have been charged with illegal price fixing in the sale of hard building products by the use of uniform price lists and uniform discounts: City Material & Coal, Inc.; Clifton Coal & Supply Co.; Collinwood Shale Brick & Supply Co.; Cayahoga-Dunham Supply Co.; Geist Coal & Supply Co.; Goff-Kirby Co.; Ideal Builders Supply & Fuel Co.; Mayfield Builders Supply Co.; Pacific Builders Supply Co.; Queisser Builders Supply Co.; St. Clair Coal & Supply Co.; South Euclid Concrete Co.; Zone Coal & Supply Co.

Canning industry: Four companies have been charged with illegally suppressing competition in the canning industry by refusing competitors use as a peach-pitting machine which is essential in the canning of peaches commercially: California Packing Corp.; Food Machinery & Chemical Corp.; Libby, McNeill & Libby; Pacific Machinery Co.

Cast-iron pipe: Four corporations found guilty of conspiring to monopolize the cast-iron-pipe market through the illegal use of patent license agreements. The court ordered dissolution of the Sand Spun Patents Corp., and that 19 patents held by this firm be made available free of charge to anyone who wants to use them: American Cast Iron Pipe Co.; Florence Pipe Foundry & Machine Co.; Sand Spun Patents Corp.; Warren Foundry & Pipe Corp.

Cellophane: Five corporations have been charged with conspiring to monopolize the cellophane industry: Christiana Securities Co.; Delaware Realty & Investment Corp.; E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.; General Motors Corp.; United States Rubber Co.

Concrete blocks: Two corporations were charged with conspiring to monopolize the concrete-block industry: Besser Manufacturing Co.; Stearns Manufacturing Co.

Dentures: Austenal Laboratories, Inc., has been charged with price fixing in dentures and dental alloys used in filling teeth through an illegal patent license agreement.

Drugs: Two corporations have been charged with conspiring illegally to restrain trade and monopolize the market in hard gelatin capsules: Eli Lilly & Co.; Parke, Davis & Co.

Fish: Stern Fish Co. has been charged with illegally buying off competitors in order to establish a monopoly of the wholesale fish industry.

Gasoline: Sun Oil Co. has been charged with illegal exclusive marketing practices in the marketing of gasoline, motor oils, and automotive accessories.

Glassware: Holophane Co., Inc., has been charged with engaging in world-wide illegal cartel agreements to monopolize the prismatic glassware and illuminating appliances field.

Groceries: The New York Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co., Inc., and nine of its subsidiaries have been charged with monopoly in the grocery field. The Justice Department is seeking to divorce A. & P.'s manufacturing and processing business from its buying and selling business, and the separation of its seven retail divisions into independently owned retail food chains: The Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co. of America; The Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co. (New Jersey); The Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co. (Arizona); The Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co. (Nevada); The New York Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co., Inc.; Quaker Maid Co., Inc.; American Coffee Corp.; Nakat Packing Corp.; White House Milk Co., Inc.; Atlantic Commission Co., Inc.

Hosiery: Four corporations have been charged with monopolizing the hosiery industry through control of hosiery machinery: Davis Co.; Interwoven Stocking Co.; Scott & Williams, Inc.; W. B. Davis & Son, Inc.

Ice: Seven corporations have been charged with unlawfully combining to monopolize the ice industry: Atlantic Co., Chattanooga Ice Delivery Co., City Ice Co., City Ice Delivery Co., Ice Service Co., Orlando Ice Delivery Co., Southern United Ice Co.

Milk: Two corporations have been charged with limiting production and price fixing in the goat milk industry: Meyenberg Milk Products Co.; Special Milk Products, Inc.

Newspapers: The Lorain Journal Co. has been charged with illegally seeking to monopolize the dissemination of news, advertising, and other information.

Plumbing and heating: Fifteen corporations have been charged with illegal practices to eliminate competition among wholesalers of plumbing supplies in northern California: Coast Pipe & Supply Co.; Crane Co.; Dallman Co.; Dalziel Plumbing Supplies; Delta Pipe & Supply Co.; Grinnell Company of the Pacific; Heick & Moran (Oakland); Heick & Moran (Sacramento); Heick & Moran (San Francisco); P. E. O'Hair & Co.; Pacific Can Co.; Slakey Bros., Inc.; Tay-Holbrook Inc.; Thomas F. Smith, Inc.; Western Plumbing Supply Co., Ltd.

Rayon: Celanese Corp. of America has been charged with trying to monopolize the industry by acquiring the stock and assets of its chief competitor.

Storage batteries: Twenty-two corporations and one trade association have been charged with combining illegally to eliminate competition in the sale and distribution of storage batteries: Electric Auto-Lite Co.; Firestone Tire & Rubber Co.; Gamble-Skogmo, Inc.; Glove-Union, Inc.; B. F. Goodrich Co.; Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., Inc.; J. & R. Motor Supply Co.; Kansas Hide and Wool, Co., Inc.; Morris P. Kirk & Sons, Inc.; Lead Disposal Co.; Jacob I. Malschick, Inc.; Maw Metal Co.; Montgomery Ward & Co.; Inc., National Battery Co.; National Disposal, Inc.; National Lead Co.; Sears Roebuck and Co.; Southeast Lead Co.; West Side Battery Lead Co. (Mass.); West Side Battery Lead Co. (N. J.); Western Auto Supply Co.; Willard Storage Battery Co.; Association of American Battery Manufacturers.

Telephone equipment: Two companies have been charged with a monopoly of telephone equipment, telephones, and material: American Telephone and Telegraph Co.; Western Electric Co., Inc.

Transportation: Two corporations were charged with violation of the Sherman antitrust law by illegally requiring certain shippers to use only the facilities of these companies; Northern Pacific Railway Co.; Northwestern Improvement Co.

Turbine pumps: Twelve corporations and two trade associations have been charged with price fixing to suppress competition in the manufacture of vertical turbine pumps: American Well Works; Aurora Pump Co.; A. D. Cook, Inc.; Deming Co.; Fairbanks, Morse & Co.; Food Machinery & Chemical Corp.; Byron Jackson Co.; Johnston Pump Co.; Layne & Bowler, Inc., (Memphis); Layne & Bowler, Corp. (Los Angeles); Wintroath Pumps, Inc.; Worthington Pump & Machine Corp.; National Association of Vertical Turbine Pump Manufacturers; Turbine Pump Manufacturers Association.

Welding equipment: Morton Gregory Corp. has been charged with illegally allocating world markets for stud welding equipment through patent and trade-mark license agreements.

Rail Strike Threat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FORREST C. DONNELL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 22 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Rail Strike Threat," published in the Greenville (S. C.) News, of April 22, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RAIL STRIKE THREAT

The country is again threatened with a strike on four big railroad systems which could easily lead on to a general paralysis of railroad transportation service.

And since it appears that the entire process of the Railway Labor Act has now been worked through on this particular dispute without a settlement, there seems no further means in this law of preventing the strike.

This section of the country would be seriously affected if this strike materializes, since the Southern Railway is one of the four systems affected.

The prospect of such a grave interference with railroad transportation services seems to emphasize once again the need for a more definite public policy eliminating the right to strike in public utility services indispensable to public welfare.

In this instance, the demand is for the employment of a second fireman on Diesel locomotives. A Presidential fact-finding board has held that this demand is not justified.

The railroad men evidently feel that their demand is meritorious, despite this finding. This newspaper is not undertaking to pass on the merits of this particular issue. But the vital public interest in the maintenance of essential public services like railroad transportation should be paramount, and public policy with respect to labor disputes in such industries should be such, we think, as to demand that employment in them be conditioned upon the settlement of such disputes in some other way than by penalizing the public through strikes.

The railroad unions, apparently, are determined to paralyze the entire railroad transportation system of the country in an attempt to enforce this demand. For the president of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Fireman and Enginemen is quoted in a New York Times dispatch as describing the prospective walk-out as the beginning of a strike against all railroads in the United States. This, of course, would be an intolerable situation, but our present laws acknowledge the right of the unions to stop all railroad transportation if the Railway Act's processes fail to bring a settlement.

This law was formulated in the assumption that the processes it provided would eliminate any likelihood of a railroad strike. But it has become apparent that this was a false assumption. If we really mean to establish a legal barrier to such strikes it is time we were saying so plainly in the law.

The New Political Hysteria or Delirium

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 22, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, there never was a time during the history of our country when the political opposition was so lacking in decency and common bay-horse sense as it is at the present moment.

The press of other nations stands aghast at what is going on in the United States of America and what is really wrong with the keepers of the boiling witchpot of reactionary Republican statecraft.

Today, reactionary republicanism could be called, very properly, political delerium. Whether they are aware of the fact, or not, they are doing a superlative disservice at this time to the Republic. From my own careful study and observation of the faces and doings of the mentally bereft I recognize that there is now in existence in the Nation not dementia Americana, the "conjured up for the defense" type of mental irresponsibility, pulled out of the legal trick sack in New York City years ago by California's Delmas in the case of the People against Harry K. Thaw, but a new type of mental derangement which should be called rodentia dementia republica, the general symptoms of which are manifested by a shortness of vision and a running of the mouth.

The hoof beats of the frenzied four horsemen, the Smearies, Loopies, Piffle Faces, and Daubem Reds are fairly making the peaceful welkins ring with their nonsense and gibberish. Their antics should suggest to the writers of amusing fiction four new comic strip characters. Isn't it a laugh to expect that sane people would line up behind such nauseating leadership?

In passing, we should not forget the antics of Vickey the Nutty, who hovered like a bird of ill omen over the Presidential train full of curiosity like the bear which went over the mountain to see what he could see.

I have been told by a great authority on birdlore that there is only one bird, the raven, which is possessed of sufficient I don't care a whit attitude as to sit in and deliberately foul its own nest. It seems, however, that some human "birds" have been overlooked. They come crazier and nastier by the hour, sans all political home hygiene.

On my last trip to Omaha I met an old gentleman who expressed the thought that he would much prefer to be a maggot in the carcass of an ownerless dead mule than be any one of the foregoing totally irresponsible groups, and I agree that he is right.

If they are looking for leadership in the mentally decayed roistering reactionary Republican Party they should have sense enough to know that it cannot be secured by the kind of individuals presently in the Republican saddle as the Pennsylvania and Oregon primaries reflect so clearly.

The issue is not the improperly created slogan, Liberty versus Socialism, but is much simpler than that. It is Democratic sanity against reactionary Republican political hysteria and prolonged 20-year political delerium.

The following instructive article which appeared in the May 12, 1950, issue of the Unionist, published in Omaha, Nebr., is well worth reading and pondering over:

THE DEVIL IN WASHINGTON

(By Edward A. Harris)

WASHINGTON.—Pathological fear gripped the townsmen of Salem Village late in the seventeenth century when a little group of neurotic teen-age girls fell into hysterical fits as if possessed of the devil. Breaking the bonds of strict Puritan discipline, the girls talked blasphemously during their fits and cried out against those in league with the devil who were afflicting them.

Few escaped the spiteful vengeance of the girls, who suddenly found all the attention they had ever craved. A pious pure-hearted old grandmother, Rebecca Nurse, was cried out against by the girls as a witch, and carried from her sickbed to be hanged. An old man, sound in body and mind despite his age, was pressed to death because he remained mute, refusing to confess his witchery. The constables righteously piled rocks upon his chest as he lay prostrate until the mounting weight crushed him. Children as young as 5 years of age were carted to dank and foul prisons as bedeviled.

The madness and panic were contagious. As soon as one villager was named as a witch, corroborating witnesses marched to court to detail acts of witchery of the accused. These witnesses were not malicious liars; they fervently believed their own tales, as embellished by sick imaginations, and their hearsay gossip was accepted as evidence in the sick atmosphere of the day.

The Salem court, however, convicted the witches mostly on spectral evidence. What good was it for accused witches to swear to their innocence when even at that moment the teen-age girls rolled on the courtroom floor and shrieked wildly that the spectral shapes of the defendants were then afflicting them?

To some observers there appears a striking parallel between the Salem pathology and the current spy hysteria in Washington. A new book, The Devil in Massachusetts, by Marion L. Starkey comes as a fresh shock in its vivid portrayal of the depths of cruelty and irresponsibility to which human beings can sink in the spell of fear and ignorance.

Then, as now, the accusers were the exalted, including exwitches who recanted and pointed their cleansed fingers at former conspirators. It was safe, even noble, to be an accuser; there was no risk to it, but there was fame and glory. Spectral evidence was accepted then, even as hearsay evidence is today spread across the Nation's press.

Those who dared criticize the teen-age neurotic girls were promptly—within seconds—themselves branded by the girls as witches and hanged. Anyone who dared to defend the good name of the accused was at once cried out against by this little feminine band of life-and-death givers.

There is no gallows as yet in the Washington manhunt, but character assassination serves as effectively. Here, too, it is safe to be an accuser, and perilous to back the good name of the accused. As to the accused himself, how can he ever prove he is not a witch? How can Professor Owen J. Lattimore, of Johns Hopkins University, or Secretary of State Dean Acheson, for that matter,

prove beyond a shadow of doubt that they are not Communists? It cannot be done.

The accusers must be well aware of this. But lest the trap be not tight enough, ex-Communist Louis Budenz has conveniently made it escape proof. The truly dangerous Communists, he avers, do not carry party cards and may never join the party. They even remain aloof from the fringes of the party and in order to conceal their true identity may pose as anti-Communists or supporters of the Marshall plan.

If Lattimore's writings show a party line, he stands condemned; if they show anti-Communist sentiment, the clever scoundrel is doubly damned. The trap is sufficiently elastic to apply to anyone.

In 5 years of constant communion with the FBI, Budenz would have the public believe that he did not have time to mention the name of Lattimore. Only after it was charged that Lattimore was the top Red espionage agent did Budenz find his memory refreshed and his time ample for long public dissertations on Lattimore.

The corroborating witnesses may continue to parade to the side of frenzy as the accusations are hurled. But more and more observers are wondering why the word of admitted ex-Communists is sanctified over the word of other citizens. Would not the same character markings that first led them into communism carry over to an intemperate opposite extreme? Here is the admission of one noted ex-Communist, Author Koestler, in this respect:

"Those who were caught by the great illusion of our time, and have lived through its moral and intellectual debauch, either give themselves up to a new addiction of the opposite type or are condemned to pay with a lifelong hang-over."

Secretary Acheson, in a stirring speech before editors and publishers in Washington, described the crusade as mad and vicious. In Salem Village many long years ago the madness was ended only when intelligent men and cool heads emerged from their neutral retreats to speak their minds, aware at last that no one was safe from such pathology. Until such an awakening takes place on a large scale, the Washington bedlam will go unchecked. Acheson has shown the way, but many more as courageous as he must speak up if common sense is to prevail over the devil in Washington.

The Rail Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FORREST C. DONNELL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 22 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Rail Strike," published in the Youngstown (Ohio) Vindicator-Telegram of May 10, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE RAIL STRIKE

How indefensible the railroad firemen's strike is may be seen in a glance at railroad history since Diesel locomotives were first used on the Burlington system in 1934.

The strike is intended to force the employment of a third man in the cab of a Diesel locomotive. Three times this demand has been turned down by a Railway Labor Act fact-finding board. Actually, the locomotives were operated at first by a single man. Ever since then the unions have tried to force the roads to pack the Diesel crew with additional and totally unneeded men.

In 1943 a Presidential board found that there was no need for either an extra fireman or extra engineer. In 1947 the President named another board which declared flatly that the union demand was devoid of merit.

After union pressure forced the roads to hire two men, the engineers and firemen joined to campaign for a third or even a fourth man. They argued that the power units demanded such frequent inspection visits from the cab that the one fireman had to be absent much of the time. The fact-finding boards denied this. The fireman, they said, has little or no need of going back to the power units.

When the present strike was threatened, still another emergency board reported that the firemen's brotherhood "actually seeks to break what it considers the traditional combined fireman (helper) job into two jobs with one fireman assigned to each." The board pointed out that on every other type of locomotive the fireman regularly performs a combined job made up of the two general functions.

Another board reported that the Diesels had already increased the number of railroad jobs by producing more business for the roads. The Government, through the Interstate Commerce Commission, has constantly encouraged the railroads to expand their Diesel operations in order to cut operating costs and so effect economies which are urgently needed if the carriers are to hold their share of the Nation's freight and passenger business.

It has been said that the strike, with its crippling effect on the lives, welfare, and safety of millions of Americans, is not a railroad strike at all, but a railroad hold-up. It is more—it is a hold-up of a large part of the Nation. It is another argument for the proposed bill to outlaw rail strikes and require compulsory arbitration as a last resort in railroad disputes. Such a measure, with its curtailment of freedom, ordinarily is undesirable, but the rail unions have shown such irresponsibility in recent years that they may make it unavoidable.

"We Are a Prosperous People—We Attribute Our Material Success Not Only to the Spirit of Free Enterprise That Is So Characteristic of Our American System but to the Bounteous Gift of a Divine Power That Has Given Us Such a Rich Country in Such a Healthy Environment in Which To Grow"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD L. O'TOOLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 23, 1950

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, I know I express the sentiments of a great cross section of my colleagues in saying that a single Armed Forces Day such as was participated in by all three of our armed services last Saturday shall henceforth become an annual event.

There was and is real cause for celebration. At long last, all of our military services are united in one team, and certainly that unity could not be realized at a better time.

As the strategy of all defense agencies have been unified, so have their fiscal affairs. On every front Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson has succeeded in meshing every gear concerned with national security into one business-administered, efficiently and effectively operated national defense program.

I have just come upon a copy of a speech delivered by the Honorable Louis Johnson in New York City on Saturday last. Secretary Johnson may well be proud of the job which he perfected in the field of administration, a job only in small part reflected in the defense budget for this year.

Truly Johnsoneque, the address made by the Secretary carried no one boast of the tremendous task accomplished in these last 14 months. Rather, it pictorialized the moral, the spiritual, and the military might of our people and our armed services in securing the peace of our own country and the well-being of the world.

Mr. Speaker, it was a great talk. It was a talk made straight from the shoulder by a great administrator. There was no "viewing with alarm," rather, there was a soul searching of values by Secretary Johnson that reached into every phase of American life. In his talk he chose to emphasize, not the disturbing factors that even now tend to keep our own people apart, but rather to stress the common interests that cement us into one mighty and the greatest nation on the face of the earth.

It is because of these observations made with respect to Secretary Johnson's Armed Forces Day talk that I am asking the unanimous consent of this House to extend my remarks and include therein the address made last Saturday by the Honorable Louis Johnson.

I sincerely commend the reading of this talk to every Member of the House:

REMARKS BY LOUIS JOHNSON, SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, ON ARMED FORCES DAY, NEW YORK CITY, SATURDAY, MAY 20, 1950

On the streets and sidewalks of New York, in the skies overhead, and close to the shores of Manhattan, we beheld today a striking demonstration of unification in action—the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Air Force "teamed for defense" and the American people stanchly behind them in full support. It was a heart-warming sight that we shall always remember, and one that those who would trespass against us would do well never to forget.

There were ships, and planes, and guns—arms and equipment of all sorts for people to see—and one piece of protective indestructible armor whose inner strength had to be felt. It is a force that always has been and still is our strongest weapon, and it is so much a part of our American life that some of us may not realize its full value and significance as a weapon of national defense. I refer to our national unity.

In the crowds here today, there were men and women of diverse origins, of separate races, and of different religions, but a spirit of unity seemed to permeate their souls and send thrills through their bodies as one sample after another of the might of America passed before them in review. Their strong, happy, healthy faces eloquently bespoke

their pride in our country, their love for our institutions, and their faith in our American code of reason.

Those who do not understand America, and those who would plot our destruction, see only the diversity of American life and expect to find in it a weak spot, the Achilles heel of our body politic. They have tried to exploit it before to make us suspicious of each other but they failed disastrously. They failed because they were too blind to see that our inner strength was found not in a hidden cache of secret weapons but in an open and fully revealed attitude of mind and way of life, a spirit of unity and fair play.

We are a happy people, and we find our greatest joy in sharing our happiness with others. We are a peaceful people and we strongly support any genuine effort to eradicate the evils that cause war. We are a generous people and we give with our hearts. We have shared freely of our worldly goods with less fortunate peoples and we have not done it in a patronizing way. Nor have we done it merely to save ourselves, as some sinister propaganda would have our European friends believe. We are a prosperous people, too, and we attribute our material success not only to the spirit of free enterprise that is so characteristic of our American system, but to the bounteous gift of a divine power that has given us such a rich country in such a healthy environment in which to grow.

We are a spiritual people. We are a religious people. We are not ashamed to live by the Golden Rule, and our friends overseas and even the people behind the iron curtain deep down in their hearts are aware of our sincerity of purpose. They know and the world knows that it is not our aspiration to live under conditions where in self-protection "every man hath his sword upon his thigh because of fear in the night." But we are not afraid to do something about it. We already have set up the standard upon the walls. And we propose to make the watch strong.

Nor do we prepare alone. Lined up beside us in a solemn pact are 11 other North Atlantic nations which have a similar stake to ours in the preservation of peace. They may be smaller in territory. They may have less of worldly goods but they, as we, have the same thing to lose and the same thing to protect—freedom. It is freedom that all of us seek—freedom from the boring of Communist termites into the foundations of our institutions and freedom from the threat of Russian imperialistic aggression against the ramparts of our territorial integrity.

Our friends overseas are closer to the catastrophic danger of Soviet Russian policy than we are. They have seen free and independent states crumble from Communist infiltrations. They have near them the examples of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Rumania. They have noted Russian arms take over Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania, and other countries and incorporate them into their Soviet orbit. They behold the fate of far-off China. They have seen millions of people betrayed by the blandishment of economic and political equality only to find themselves trapped—hungry, naked, and disillusioned.

Our treaty partners know just what they may expect in the wake of a Communist victory whether by force, the threat of force, or as a result of boring from within. They know, too, that if aggression should come they would be the first to feel its impact. For 5 years they have fought off the Communist menace, and with our help have grown stronger in their capabilities to resist. You can be sure that they are not going to default to communism now. More than ever before they realize that their future physical safety and the security of the ideals they live by, depend on their ability to discourage aggression and to hold communism at bay.

I have every faith in our partners. I believe they are ready and willing to carry their proportionate share of the armament burden that is so necessary to deter aggression and to maintain the peace. They have a right to expect a great deal of us and they are getting it. We have a right to expect their fair share of contribution to their common defense and that, too, I am confident, will be forthcoming. We are working together. We are planning together. We are sacrificing together, and if it ever becomes necessary, we will be fighting together.

Gen. Omar Bradley, our Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who presides over the Military Committee under the North Atlantic Treaty organization has already reported that defense planning has reached a new peak of international cooperation. Such an evaluation coming from a man of General Bradley's integrity and his experience in combat with armed forces of many nations, augurs well for the potential effectiveness of the pact as deterrent and a defense to aggression.

Hubert Howard, the Chairman of our Munitions Board, who presides over the military production and supply board of the North Atlantic Treaty organization, has reported to me to similar effect. Mr. Howard is an outstanding executive from Chicago with a reputation for forthright integrity. He reported that the major deficiencies in military equipment among our North Atlantic partners for the support of the defense plan have now been ascertained. Transfers of equipment surplus to each country's needs have been started. The survey of production capacity in Europe has been completed. The machine tools and matériel given by the United States for additional military production have been put to use. Mr. Howard indicated that a definite increase in the tempo of military production has been attained. Plans, he said, have been made, and in some cases production has already been started to supply spare parts for American equipment. The Board is now engaged in working out means of standardization of equipment, wherever possible, for interchange among the 12 partners under the treaty.

When it comes to arms and equipment in quality and in the vast quantities demanded by modern conditions, the pool of skill, ingenuity, and experience possessed by the North Atlantic Treaty nations should weigh heavily in our favor. We are exploiting the scientific and industrial capabilities of America in our intensive search for more effective weapons of defense and offense.

Mr. William Webster, who was recently appointed Chairman of the Research and Development Board, reports a full and energetic program of weapons research in progress. We are making every reasonable effort to maintain a margin of technological superiority. We shall need it to offset the probably numerical superiority of an aggressor. Devices and techniques are being developed in our laboratories to neutralize the effectiveness of mass weapons. In recent months encouraging gains have been made along lines that offer promise of solutions for some problems of high priority.

In the final analysis, however, it is the ability of troops to exploit fully the strategic, tactical, and technical advantages afforded by these superior weapons that will make the difference between victory and defeat. Training, therefore, becomes the keystone of our defense.

Our armed forces have always taken considerable pride in the quality of their training. They have prepared their individual fighting men to face the supreme test of battle with full confidence in themselves, their leaders, and their weapons, and have gone into action determined to outfight, outsmart, and outlast their adversaries. How well they succeeded is chronicled in the record of two World Wars.

We did not win every skirmish, nor every battle, nor even every campaign. In fact, we took a few very bad lickings, especially in the early days of World War II. Even now these defeats are hard to explain to the satisfaction of the American people; and they are even more difficult to condone.

War, however, as any other human effort, has its defeats as well as its victories, and we must reconcile ourselves to the likelihood of an occasional set-back. What we cannot and must not reconcile ourselves to is a failure to profit from error. In that respect our armed forces proved themselves apt pupils. They learned considerably from each of their defeats. They corrected their mistakes, and then ran up a string of victories that drove their opponents to their cellars and their forests, frantically seeking shelter. On the ground, at sea, and in the air our Army, Navy, and Air Force completely defeated the military forces that were pitted against them, and thoroughly destroyed the enemy's will to continue the fight.

The most important lesson of war which we learned and which is just as significant today as it was the morning after December 7, 1941, is the need for teamwork in combat. The lesson was not lost upon us during World War II, and toward the end we had reached a degree of interservice teamwork, mutual understanding, and confidence never before attained in our own history and perhaps in the history of the world; for basic rivalries among armed forces to the detriment of teamwork are nothing new. They have been proverbial and are as old as the services themselves.

Quite recently there came to my office a letter from Bermuda which illustrates the effect of this traditional service rivalry upon military efficiency during colonial days. It appears that when the English ship *Sea Venture,* en route to Virginia, was wrecked upon the shores of Bermuda in 1609 all hands were saved. Among them were Sir Thomas Gates, a lieutenant general of the army, and Admiral Sir George Somers, in charge of the fleet. There were eight other vessels, but they safely reached Virginia without serious mishap.

According to William Strackey, secretary for the Virginias, Gates, of the army, forthwith set one Frobisher, an experienced shipwright, to building a pinnace to replace the wrecked *Sea Venture.* Somers, of the navy, decided that the lines of the pinnace were not just right, so he built another bark of his own design on one of the other islands. Strackey was evidently having a hard time explaining this apparently wasteful duplication of time and effort and finally came up with this entry in his log in the Elizabethan style of the period:

"There was, however, a secret explanation: The sea and land commanders, being alienated one from the other—a quality over common to the English—and fallen into jealousies, thought it better to direct their efforts from different places."

There will, however, be no direction of efforts from different places in our Armed Forces; and our training program today is to make sure that they will not become alienated from each other and fall into any more jealousies but work together wholeheartedly for the common defense.

With that objective in mind we conduct as often as practicable joint exercises to train our forces to work together. They vary in magnitude from "Camid," a project designed to help the cadets of West Point and the midshipmen of Annapolis get better acquainted with each other and learn how to get along together during the early stages of their careers, to the major joint exercise such

as "Swarmer" which called upon sixty thousand from the Army and the Air Force, and the grand joint exercise such as "Portrex" including 80,000 men of all services.

The planning for these exercises is a tremendous job in itself. Representatives of the Army, Navy, including the Marines, and the Air Force work for months at a time to develop situations that will test the combat capabilities of the participants, their organization, their strategy, their tactics, their weapons, and their equipment, and above all, their capacity for teamwork. These exercises are tough. Their aim is not to see how well performance can be expected under normal conditions, but how far we can go, what limits there are for humans and machines beyond which one dare not venture without serious consequences. What is the breaking point—that is the basic test.

Because these joint maneuvers are in a sense contests between forces representing an aggressor and a defender, there is a temptation in a sports-conscious country like ours to look for winners and losers. But the only losers that interest us in this matter are our potential enemies, whom we hope to be in a better position to defeat because we have had such exercises, and have profited by the experience we have gained through them.

While these are realistic exercises, conducted for military purposes, we have nothing to hide and, on the contrary appreciate the great public interest in our activities and in the American men and women who make up our Armed Forces. Representatives of the press and other information media are welcome to witness these maneuvers. But these joint exercises are not intended to present mere spectacles for visitors, the Secretary of Defense included. And where I have noticed any evidence of such a tendency, I have issued instructions to the services to adhere only to realistic presentations and to omit all frills and thrills and entertainment that are not germane to the problem and to the test.

These exercises are designed to point up weaknesses. Our umpires understand this. They know it is not their function at the end of a joint exercise to show up with a rosy report that all is well. What we want to know is—what is wrong? The reports, I am pleased to note, have been constructively critical and the three services and the Joint Chiefs of Staff have learned lessons from them which in time will be implemented into sounder battle doctrine, more effective organization, improved weapons and equipment and above all more efficient fighting men with a higher morale and better discipline with which to face whatever may lie ahead.

We are fortunate in the quality of our fighting man today. He approaches the best we had in wartime. He is far superior to what we ever had in peacetime. More than half of our soldiers, sailors, marines and airmen are less than 24 years old with that enthusiasm and energy that goes with youth and makes for the most efficient type of fighting man. Our men are relatively a highly stable group. Thirty-five percent of them are married. Twenty-five percent of them have families with children. They are experienced in military skills and responsibilities. More than one-half of them have been in the service 3 years or more. They enjoy an educational level far above the national average. Forty-three percent of our sailors and marines, 42 percent of our airmen and 26 percent of our soldiers are high school graduates. But why go on with more statistics? Look at the men yourselves. See them on furlough. Talk to them. Occasionally, of course, you may find an exception, as in every other walk of life, but usually you will have a man you would certainly be proud to meet as a fellow American.

I wish we could have more of them. I wish we could afford to acquire every young American to serve in the ranks for a time, under a universal military training program.

The least we can do at this time is to give every encouragement for the training of those who do volunteer to serve—not only the regulars but also the reserves.

It is important to know that under our present program the volunteer civilian components of our armed forces are an essential element in our national defense team and that these reserve forces must be maintained in the most efficient state of trained readiness. To achieve the maximum proficiency to enable them to take their places beside the regular forces in time of national emergency, they must be properly trained; and that means leaving their normal jobs for a time for active duty with the colors.

Last June I appealed to the employers of the United States to adopt liberal policies in the granting of special leaves of absence, to allow members of the civilian components of our armed forces to participate in short annual periods of training duty. I was pleased to note that a large number of employers cooperated fully and I take this opportunity to thank them and the veterans organizations, Chambers of Commerce, and other clubs and groups for their splendid support of this patriotic endeavor.

This year I again requested and strongly urge that every employer accept his duty and responsibility to our common defense by granting similar special leaves of absence.

In conclusion, I wish to reiterate that the ideal of unification that this Armed Forces Day so inspiringly symbolizes for us extends far beyond the regulars and reserves, far beyond the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps and the Air Force. It reaches into every phase of American life. Real unification means national unity—let us hope that in time it will also become the basis for global unity.

For in our aspiration for the unification of man we are not discouraged by the disturbing factors that still keep peoples apart. We are encouraged by the wholesome interests that bring them together. There is no more diversified people in the world than those who live here in metropolitan New York, yet they work together, play together, and strive together for a stronger and happier America. Our political, social and economic climate here and throughout America lends itself readily to the free association of free men and women. But the salubrious qualities of our environment in the United States can also be enjoyed world-wide. What we are accomplishing in New York, what we are accomplishing for all of America, can also be accomplished throughout the world as a whole. The unity of our people on Armed Forces Day is therefore not only a demonstration of our determination to achieve peace through strength—it is a mark of our dedication to the ultimate goal of man—of peace on earth and good will to all.

Grass-Roots Comment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 23, 1950

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include two letters commenting on farm policy in general and the Brannan plan in particular.

The letters follow:

YAKIMA VALLEY TRAFFIC ASSOCIATION,
Yakima, Wash., May 4, 1950.

Congressman WALT HORAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR WALT: In reply to your request for comments on the proposed Brannan plan, a copy of which you sent to me, I find that in its objectives and procedures it is much like the farm program of Rome of many centuries ago. You will recall the fall of Rome after this once great nation had spread law and order throughout the then civilized world, built up one of the greatest civilized economies the world had ever seen, developed its domestic and export trade, built up an efficient transportation system, and through individual initiative and responsibility gained for themselves many comforts never before enjoyed by any previous people.

In their forward progress, according to history, the Roman people had gained their material and spiritual abundances by preservation of their individual initiative and responsibility. And so long as the Romans took upon themselves their obligations to themselves and to the state, Rome prospered and was strong.

Then history records that the citizenry relaxed, became complacent, and gradually shifted their responsibility to the state. Thus, in its ideology the Brannan plan is not a recent idea. For example, the Roman Government—just as the Brannan plan proposes to do—bought wheat at a high price from the farmer and sold at a low price to the city worker. And history records that in due time the Romans, who were concentrated in the cities, came to expect that they would be fed by the government, educated by the government, sustained by the government, and entertained by the government.

Under the welfare state of that day the Romans lived so easily they eventually allowed the government to assume all the responsibilities of its citizenry, and it came to pass that they lost their representative form of government, not suddenly but gradually, the Roman republic slipped into statism and then into totalitarianism.

In concept, political and economic, there is but little, if any, difference between the Brannan plan and the Roman farm program. The methods and procedures are identical. Moreover, it is my opinion that the Brannan plan will, if enacted into law, lead this country down the same road that led to the downfall of Rome because such a plan cannot function without taking authority away from the individual and concentrating it under a central government.

The founders of this country knew the history of the rise and fall of nations that preceded them. And from this knowledge of the past they established a form of government under which this country progressed and prospered because the form was predicated on centering responsibilities in the citizenry rather than government.

While I do not approve, I am not particularly concerned about the transition now taking place in our form of government insofar as it relates to my own welfare. I'm well into the last lap of my allotted "three score and ten," and therefore the "welfare state," if it comes, can never affect me to any great extent. My concern, a very real one, is, however, What does this trend portend for the future of this country? What does it hold in store for those who will follow?

The Brannan plan is only one threat, only one straw in the wind of totalitarianism. For instance, growing demands by special group interests for Government-sponsored

slum clearance, public housing, hospitalization and medical care, farm-crop price supports, surplus commodity purchases, to name a few, are other impressive signs of the trend away from the American way of life.

As our minds adjust to one step toward the welfare state, it puts us in shape to adjust ourselves to the next, and after that it still is another, which yesterday would have seemed impossible, yet which tomorrow will be done. It is not today but day after tomorrow that we should keep in mind unless we're hell-bent on trading off our American heritage for a mess of Roman (meal) pottage.

Should the Brannan plan be enacted into the law of the land it will fail just as miserably as did the Roman farm plan of many centuries ago. Under total Government direction and operation, and there is no other way the plan can function, it will inevitably break down.

Whenever the Government takes over the direction and operation of the Nation's food supply, the program will bog down just as sure as day follows night. When this happens, men, for their own self-preservation, will commence to take from others what they need. And that is when the Government comes into the picture armed with police power. One does not need to be a prophet to make such a dire prophecy. The fulfillment thereof is found not once but many times in the recorded history of men and nations.

But to be more specific, more to the point—here is why the economics of the Brannan plan will inevitably fail. Let's be realistic and accept the proposal for what it is—political in concept rather than economic in objective. It must, therefore, first serve its political ends—win votes by the process of satisfying the needs and desires of a majority of farmers and consumers. It must succeed in doing this or else it will become a political liability. Perish the thought.

To be realistic in this analysis, we must also accept the fact that there are more inefficient than there are efficient farmers. And there are more low-income than high-income consumers. In consequence of these facts, the two principal beneficiary groups under the Brannan plan—the inefficient farmers on the one hand, and the low-income consumers on the other—will become the common denominators of prices on the farm and in the food store.

In consequence of this, the prices guaranteed or paid to farmers must satisfy the needs, not to mention the desires, of the inefficient group of farmers. And in the food store the price of farm products must be cheap enough to satisfy the low-income group of consumers, even down to the worker who spent his last week's wages in a beer parlor. There is no other method whereby the Government can satisfy a majority of both groups, and satisfy them the Government must if it is to win friends and hold votes.

In its operation, the Brannan plan would practically guarantee the efficient farmer a fabulous profit, the rich man cheap food (food prices would be fixed to fit the poor man's pocketbook), and the taxpayer would be left, to put it mildly, with the check. Once economic compulsion for people to earn a living is out the window, the taxpayer's costs of providing a field day for farmers and consumers would progressively grow more expensive. This is axiomatic. As the economic incentive to work to live lessens, the beneficiaries of the Brannan plan will not be long in finding out the value of the wail. And once wailing becomes par with work, we will have arrived at the destination of the Brannan plan—the police state. In all history this has been the grand finale of all similar programs.

I agree with the proponents of the Brannan plan that the primary concern of this country is to continue to raise the standard of living provided it is not in a manner which will destroy the moral fiber of our people. If my thinking is sound, the basic answer to our social and economic progress is greater productivity.

All this clamor and pressure for the Brannan plan and other phases of the welfare state, to my mind, is the real cold war. It is right here within our borders, if you please.

We can accept the Brannan plan along with other welfare proposals and thereby exchange our responsibilities for so-called security and easy living. If so we will be headed down the road toward paternalism and regimentation, for sure. Or we can retain our responsibilities and thereby preserve what we term our American way of life. If we do this, it will bring us advances in production, in wages, and in standard of living. The choice is ours.

I want no part of the Brannan plan. My choice is freedom and prosperity based on productivity because this country can't compromise with basic economic principles and win.

I trust I have not bored you too much by going around Robin Hood's barn to answer your simple request for comment on the Brannan plan. But the very thought of the potential impact of this plan, should it become the law of the land, sends my blood pressure above the boiling point.

With best regards, I am,

Cordially yours,

F. W. SHIELDS,
Secretary-Manager.

LAKESIDE, WASH., *May 18, 1950.*

Hon. WALT HORAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HORAN: I am pleased that you have asked for my comment on bill, S. 1971. On the surface the Brannan plan appears very rosy. But I firmly believe it is not what the people want. In promising the farmer a strong price for his produce, it will attract his vote, and likewise the vote of the consumer by promising him lower prices. But, it is quite evident that we cannot have both high prices for the farmer and low prices for the consumer unless the farmer and consumer pay by an exorbitant increase in taxes. The bureaucracy set up to regulate the plan would cost millions, to say nothing of the billions necessary to pay subsidies. If crops were to be controlled to where there would be no surplus, there would be a grave danger of a shortage which is a far greater ill than a surplus. This could easily happen because as yet the Government cannot control the weather, and as we are all aware, floods, droughts, and even insects can wipe out a total area in a very short time.

There is at present a danger of a wheat shortage due to acreage allotments and drought in the Plains States.

Such a plan would be detrimental to our true American way of life. I am opposed to having controls set up for the farmers. The main reason for my choosing farming as my vocation was the opportunity of freedom and independence. The plan puts too much power into the hands of one man, the Secretary of Agriculture. I don't believe the Brannan plan will work satisfactorily, as it will completely upset the functioning of the law of supply and demand. If there were no present support on wheat it would undoubtedly be cheaper, thus creating a wider market demand. The present price of wheat makes it prohibitive for cattlemen to use it as a grain for fattening cattle. Likewise, the poultrymen are having a hard time due to high support price on wheat.

The country will be a lot better off if we stay away from controls and expensive bureaucracies to control them. After all, freedom has been the No. 1 issue of the American people and the basis for the founding of this Nation and as for me, I'd like to see it stay that way.

Sincerely yours,

ROGER HALE,
Master, 25 Mile Creek Grange, 1096.

Third Man Show-Down

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FORREST C. DONNELL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I desire to ask unanimous consent, and do, for the insertion in the Appendix of the RECORD of quite a number of editorials. I shall call them one by one. The first is an editorial entitled "Third Man Show-Down," from the St. Louis (Mo.) Star-Times of May 10, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIRD-MAN SHOW-DOWN

A 13-year-old dispute between railroads and the Brotherhood of Locomotive Enginemen and Firemen came to a head today with a strike on four major systems. The railroads began placing embargoes on freight and passenger traffic yesterday in preparation for the 6 a. m. deadline. If the strike continues, it will be only a matter of days until there will be wholesale lay-offs along all of the affected lines.

At issue is the seemingly simple question of whether an extra fireman is needed on multiple-unit Diesel locomotives. The firemen contend that the third man in the cab is essential to maximum safety of operation. The railroads say there is less need for a third man now than in the days when the fireman spent most of his time shoveling coal. Two Presidential fact-finding boards have ruled against the firemen, but the union has kept up its demand.

The strike has been carefully planned. It affects the entire systems of the Southern and Santa Fe and the western divisions of the New York Central and Pennsylvania. By avoiding a tie-up of all railroads at one time the union hopes to hedge against the possibility of Government seizure and nullification of its effort. But if the strike can hurt the railroads, it can hurt the public. A line that serves a vast area cannot be crippled without crippling that area. The fact that paralysis hits only one region of a nation is no consolation to that region. And a blow to only one part of the country can nevertheless damage the whole Nation. The Santa Fe, for example, is responsible for movement of a big portion of the wheat harvest, and certainly the orderly handling of that crop is vital to the Nation.

If the strike continues and is effective, the Government will be forced to take action one way or another; it should do so sooner rather than later.

Meanwhile, Senator DONNELL can point to the situation in support of his bill to outlaw all railroad strikes. The union apparently has weighed that risk. But railway labor should not risk the loss of its right to strike over as debatable an issue as the need for a third man in a locomotive cab.

Seventh Architect of the Capitol

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 23, 1950

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include an article from the Washington Sunday Star pictorial magazine. Everyone—and everyone does—who knows Dave Lynn and Gus Cook will enjoy this.

The article follows:

SEVENTH ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL
(By Lucy McClenon)

Two men in a basement room of the Capitol study a drawing board. The taller of the two comprehends the plan quickly, comments concisely and moves to the telephone to take a call on a different matter. He is David Lynn, whose multifarious duties make his title, Architect of the Capitol, somewhat misleading.

The telephone caller, it turns out, wants to discuss arrangements for exercises to be held in the rotunda of the Capitol on June 1 for the unveiling of a statue of Brigham Young, contributed by the State of Utah to Statuary Hall. Mr. Lynn, as architect, "acting as an agent of the Congress, has charge of the structural and mechanical care of the Capitol, together with arrangements, in cooperation with the proper authorities, for ceremonies and ceremonials held in the building and on the grounds." These events range from the type under discussion to such others as summer concerts by service bands or the landing of a helicopter to present tree seedlings on Arbor Day. (Mr. Lynn's latest annual report to Congress includes, incidentally, an accounting of all trees and shrubs on the Capitol Grounds.)

On completion of the telephone conversation, Mr. Lynn speaks briefly with an associate about cabinets recently constructed for a congressional committee room by the carpenter shop under his direction. A magazine writer wants to know who occupied the rooms just above the Architect's office before Senator MCMAHON moved into them. Mr. Lynn obtains a three-page history of the rooms' occupancy from his staff. Two men in the office discuss with him a newly arrived art work. (The Joint Committee on the Library has supervision of all works of art in the Capitol, but arrangements for their erection, placement, and unveiling are handled through the Architect's office.)

So far Mr. Lynn's day has dealt only with Capitol matters, but he is also charged with the structural and mechanical care of the following: Senate Office Building, Old and New House Office Buildings, Capitol power plant (which supplies heat, light, power, and air-conditioning refrigeration for the preceding and the Capitol; heat, light, and power for the Library of Congress Buildings, Botanic Garden, Supreme Court Building and the legislative garage, and steam heat for the Government Printing Office and City Post Office); legislative garage, Library of Congress Buildings and grounds, Supreme Court Building and grounds, Court of Claims Building, District Courthouse, Court of Appeals Building and Columbia Hospital for Women. He is also charged with the operation of the House restaurant and is acting director of the Botanic Garden. In some of these duties he is subject to various congressional committees and authorities on matters of policy. Much of his time is spent at, or in preparation for, committee meetings.

Mr. Lynn is a member of the three-man Capitol Police Board, the District Zoning Commission and the Commission for Enlarging of the Capitol Grounds. In addition he is charged with the planning and construction of such buildings and other improvements as may be committed to his care by Congress from time to time. Since Mr. Lynn became Architect in 1923 the New House Office Building, the Supreme Court Building, and the Library of Congress Annex have been completed under his direction, and other large-scale projects—such as the recent remodeling of the House and Senate Chambers of the Capitol—have been carried out. The latter project is now complete down to the gallery seat levels. Plans call for extensive additional work, including new seats for the House, to be undertaken during the next congressional recess.

Mr. Lynn is the seventh Architect of the Capitol. Like his three immediate predecessors he would like to see the east front of the Capitol extended to the line of the Senate and House wings and this old, central portion of the building rebuilt of marble to replace the gradually disintegrating sandstone of which it is made. The project was first suggested by Thomas U. Walter, who served as Architect from 1851 to 1865 and who designed the present wings and dome. His successor, Edward Clark, held the office when Mr. Lynn first came to the Capitol in 1901. Mr. Clark was followed by Elliott Woods, under whom Mr. Lynn served in a supervisory capacity until Mr. Woods' death and his own appointment to the post.

The Functions and Problems of Higher Education Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 23, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a very interesting and instructive address entitled "The Functions and Problems of Higher Education Today" delivered on May 5, 1950, to the delegates attending the New England Conference on Graduate Education by the Very Reverend Father William L. Keleher, S. J., president of Boston College.

The address follows:

THE FUNCTIONS AND PROBLEMS OF HIGHER EDUCATION TODAY
(By the Very Reverend William L. Keleher, S. J., president of Boston College)

This year of 1950 has flooded your desks and mine with all sorts of midcentury surveys and reports, most of them pointing to the tremendous successes achieved by our American enterprises. Almost daily, we are reminded that we have attained to the highest material standards of life ever known to mankind. At least every week we read that our mills and factories are geared to the greatest peacetime production level. And with constant regularity we learn again and again that we have reached the broadest coverage in the matters of social and economic security. Truly a happy picture, when we read the proper journals. Of more significant importance to us, another set of reports points out that our generation witnesses the most far-reaching and most substantial program of educational opportunities for the youth of our land, and that, at every level. In a word, if we screen the journals we read, we might be tempted to relax into a smug complaisance, quite satisfied that we have been privileged to have been part of this outstanding movement. Could it be that some of us might think the world fortunate that we were in charge when the opportunities for such advances presented themselves?

At the same time, even a casual reader cannot fail to note the emphasis in these same surveys on the ever increasing complexity of the problems of our times, problems that are political, social, and economic and with it an increasing awareness of the acute need of greater knowledge, of broader understanding, of a more courageous and more intelligent leadership in our approach to the solution of the problems confronting us. Too often, we must admit, solutions are arrived at and policies fixed, not from reasons of principle, but from the pressure of immediate expediency; decisions so reached cannot stand the test of time or the scrutiny of history. We must admit, too, that in our own work, changes in curricula, alterations in programs, are at times brought about for reasons that might not stand a careful scrutiny a few years from now.

Our country is unique in the fields of freedom and prosperity. No nation in history has known so much over-all happiness and success. But today, and let us be very frank about it, our people are worried, restless, upset in heart and mind. Anxious about loyalties and security, uncertain about our role in the family of nations, we seem to be losing confidence in ourselves. When the rest of the free world looks to us for guidance, for courage, for leadership, because of our unique prosperity and freedom, they find that we are not at peace with ourselves in heart and mind.

There has been among us a growing awareness of the crucial importance of human resources, and with it a frequent recognition of the fact that our human resources and qualifications are, as they have always been, slow and difficult to provide. Today these resources have been vastly expanded and with that expansion has come the increased demand on us to see that they are kept at the proper high level, just one more toll of the modern complex society in which we move.

So great a challenge has been put to us as educators, to maintain and even increase the fields of knowledge; to provide the skills and methods to handle the ever increasing problems; to develop the minds as well as the manpower of our country; that government and the community in a constantly increasing measure have undertaken to sponsor, to finance, to regulate and to control this truly strategic and critical source of supply, including the field we call higher education. There is no point to express regret or show resentment at the efforts of government to participate in higher education. For there is magnitude as well as depth in the problem, and it is a matter that concerns the welfare and the security of the land. It would seem almost an obligation of the Government to interest itself in the efforts of those who are vitally interested in a problem that concerns all so deeply.

But it is of major importance for us to consider and to clarify for ourselves, and for the community, the function and the contribution of private and voluntary institutions in the total program of higher education at this time. For what we do, and what we

represent, is linked in the highest degree with a public interest. Voluntary associations though we be, working in this free society, we have inherited a public trust. Ours is a serious obligation, and one we have met courageously. In our New England association, out of 34 member colleges and universities, only 6 are supported in their efforts by public funds. The rest of us, and I think we can be satisfied that we have done a good piece of work, must carry on our efforts on our own. We draw no comparisons, but I think you will agree with me that the products of our private colleges, as men and women of the country, have proven themselves as loyal, as true and as American, as the graduates of any school.

It is the continuing function, and obligation, of our institutions of higher learning to maintain our status of freedom and independence so necessary for the exercise and preservation of freedom in a free society. It is our task to develop the free men and women who are the genuine strength and life of our community. Nor is this an easy task when our institutional independence can be made to seem a luxury, or when proffered aid and assistance would lift a real financial burden. I doubt that there is a single college or university across the country which would not be better prepared to do its work had it just a little more financial backing. For this reason we would like to see the Government support our endeavors. But there has seldom been a time when Government aid did not mean Government control, at least to the extent of limitations in the area of independence. At a time when the magnitude of the costs and the diversity of efforts would call for help and assistance, we have an obligation to maintain our independence. As the pressure of dependence grows, so will grow our responsibility to be free. God grant that the spirit which moved our founders to establish the colleges in a spirit of freedom will give us the courage to keep them so.

All will agree that we must provide our youth with an education that will build a better and stronger citizenry. And that we do. No one will deny that we must equip our youth with a knowledge of their responsibilities in the matter of community living. And that we do. But an education that stops there, making our youth aware of their privileges and obligations to the state and the community is not fulfilling its duty, for we have not brought out the final goal of man. Just as a better citizenry is not the goal of mankind, so a preparation for that end cannot be the goal of higher education. Man was not created nor is he destined just for the state and his fellowman. His own salvation, and the honor and glory of His Creator are ends that must be faced by the individual, ends that we must have in mind when we are preparing these youths for life and eternity. A system of education which would ban all sorts of religion from the classroom, a system which forgets the supernatural end of man, a system which neglects the concept of God as Creator and Ruler of the universe, is false to the ideas of our country. Yet such a system coul deasily develop were our educational aims and goals to be turned over to a group of men or agencies which would be thinking in terms of expediency only.

It is only too obvious today that government adds to its political power an increasing control over the physical resources of the people and the community, and this to a degree that makes it increasingly urgent that government be kept subservient to free men. I think most of us would be content to see the general supervision and direction of the physical resources go on, provided it will be done for the best interests of all, but we cannot allow such a control that will bring about the control of mind and heart. All too vivid in our memories are the pictures of what happened elsewhere in the not-so-distant past. Human nature is the same the world over and what happened once can happen again. We, who will shape the minds and develop the thoughts and ideas of generations to come, must protect our freedoms and assure the generations yet unborn that they too may enjoy the life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness we have known.

It appears that the policy of the Government is to continue to demand of our institutions an ever-increasing role of positive participation in the programs of the Government. To this we take no exception. In fact we are happy and prepared to cooperate in all such roles. But in this cooperative role, we must be certain that our total function in the field of higher education is protected and preserved by our freedom and independence. Doesn't it strike you as a bit inconsistent, when we follow a highly specialized type of program, developing authorities in special fields, only to find that our own products are not measuring up to the ideals we held out for them? We send to the people of this country and the lands abroad men who are missionaries for a special type of work or study, but men who do not bring to these same strangers the picture on which our own land was founded. In the first writings of the fathers of our land, in the Constitution, we find reference after reference to the place and need of religion, the freedom to worship, and today, too many of us have relegated such thinking to the dim past. "Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God the things that are God's" was once an accepted truism. Today we think only of Caesar—of various Caesars. Ours is the sacred duty to instill in our students the whole truth, so that when they take their place in the world, they may work for Government, for public or private enterprise, and always remember this, that they will render to Caesar the things that are Caesars but to God the things that are God's. Their own peace of mind, their eternal welfare and salvation, cannot be lost sight of, in their efforts to serve well their immediate aims. Free to follow our traditional course of education we can prepare our students to face such a life. But if we are to sacrifice our independence and freedom for temporary aid or assistance which means control, then our own cause is lost and the results of our efforts cannot but add to the chaos and indecision surrounding us.

Historically it can be established that the freedom of our land, the greatest blessing we cherish, is the product of the self-respect, the confidence, and the strength of our men and women. And it is equally true that this self-respect, confidence, and strength are qualities of the mind and of the soul. The underlying font of our true greatness is the dignity of mankind, a dignity we can appreciate and enjoy. It is a quality found only in free men and women, who, responsible under God, know and cherish their freedom, who face their responsibilities and obligations; who know too, that this precious freedom is something that can be lost, and with it goes beauty, goodness, and truth. Ours then is a sacred trust, to maintain that quality of mind and heart, to foster and spread that spirit, to preserve the dignity of man as the greatest heritage we can have. This is the everlasting function of the schools of higher education; through it we make our greatest contribution to the strength and welfare of the community. God grant that in our rush to develop specialists, we do not overlook the more important and more lasting work—the development of the whole man.

To the Firemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FORREST C. DONNELL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "To the Firemen," published in the Toledo (Ohio) Times of May 15, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO THE FIREMEN

There is plenty of evidence that many of the Nation's railway firemen are personally opposed to the crippling strike which their union officials have forced upon them. They are worried by much more than the loss of pay, for they realize that the union can present no sound case which will justify the strike in the minds of the American people, who now are fretting greatly because of the inconvenience caused them.

Our own mail shows this. We do, of course, receive some bitterly critical letters, the theme of which is that the truth is not in us. But we have received a number of letters, signed by firemen, who say we are right in maintaining that the strike is indefensible.

These men know something about the economic and financial problems the railroad companies confront. They also know that an aroused public is likely to force enactment of legislation prohibiting strikes against the railroads.

As a matter of fact, there is a considerable movement under way for precisely such a law. Indeed, Senator DONNELL, of Missouri, has introduced a bill banning strikes on railroads or airlines, and he is pressing hard for consideration of it. A number of railroad officials are asking Congress to pass it.

Certainly, the strike emphasizes the need for such action, since a crippled transportation system adversely affects all business and industry. Coming so soon as it does after the Chrysler strike, it also emphasizes the need for some restrictions upon unions in the matter of strikes.

In recent years, the union leaders have abused the right to strike. John L. Lewis, Philip Murray and Walter Reuther have been particularly conspicuous in their arrogant disregard of the public.

They always glorify the right to strike, and manage to wangle superfervid support for it from most of the columnists and pundits of the country. They better not misprize the public, however, for there are growing signs that it is becoming tired of having its credulousness debauched.

Lest the picket line mistake these words, we hasten to say that this does not mean the people would destroy the right to strike. Neither would we advocate such a thing. Not at all. But there are other rights, and labor must respect them. If it insists upon public respect for its exercise of the right to strike, then its exercise must be limited by respect for other rights.

After all, the blessings of the Constitution are ecumenical, and it is time that the administration and political leaders were clear in their minds about that. Time the labor leaders were, too.

The Armed Forces: A Sound National Investment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ZALES N. ECTON

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me on May 20, 1950, Armed Forces Day, at the United States Naval Powder Factory, Indian Head, Md.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ARMED FORCES: A SOUND NATIONAL INVESTMENT

Fellow Americans, it is indeed a pleasure to be present here today and to participate in this first observance of a Unified Armed Forces Day. It is a double pleasure for me to be introduced by your genial Commanding Officer, Captain Voegeli. He and I attended the same public school and high school in Montana. We played baseball together when we were considerably younger than we are now. Ladies and gentlemen, today we are all playing on the same ball team of National Defense and are concerned with adequate protection for the United States of America.

The Navy is performing a most commendable service in operating the powder factory here at Indian Head. In viewing the extensive operations of production machines this morning, manned by efficient and competent civilians, I am convinced that the cooperation and coordination evidenced here is a practical demonstration of what is being accomplished by a Unified Armed Force. I congratulate the Navy and the officers and civilians working on this tremendous enterprise for the benefit of all.

It is particularly fitting that this first observance of our unified defense forces take place at Indian Head, where for half a century there has been genuine coordination of effort in production of the principal item of defense for all of our armed services.

It was here at the Naval Powder Factory that this service was inaugurated 50 years ago, a service that has been vital, progressive and in keeping with the scientific development that has made our Nation the leader and hope of world freedom.

I know every one of you feel as I do, that it is an honor and a privilege to be known as an American. We are not perfect, of course, Neither are we all-wise. Perhaps if we considered ourselves such we would be on the other side of the barrier where every problem is approached with the answer already determined, where facts are spurned if they do not conform to the doctrine of totalitarianism.

We have come to pay tribute—not just to the Army, the Navy, the Marines and the Air Force, but to the sum total of ideas and ideals of American industry, tolerance and justice that today constitutes the world's only barrier between barbarism and civilization as we know it—between Pagan practices and Christian principles—between serfdom and freedom.

Next month marks the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of America's first Armed Services on a national scope. But our first investment in our way of life was made 155 years before that fateful spring of 1775.

Since that day in the spring of 1620 when a small group of men and women invested their all in a bid for human dignity and individuality and set sail for America, man has been obliged to wage a constant battle for the right to live in peace and freedom.

From Plymouth Rock to Rheims and Tokyo Bay there are many milestones in the age of modern man, although they may be brief ripples in the sands of time. Nevertheless, they constitute historic steps in the march of progress in the New World.

The investment those hardy people made 330 years ago in behalf of a new way of life has paid dividends far in excess of anything they ever anticipated.

Generations before us have renewed that investment from time to time and the legacy is ours—ours with which to build for succeeding generations as our fathers built for us. It is to their credit that our forefathers did not invest on a marginal basis. They paid in full although their means were meager.

Time and time again we have been called upon to renew that investment and sometimes we have been content to do little more than put up the necessary margin to bind the bargain and leave to succeeding generations the task of redeeming our pledges.

On occasion we have listened to the siren song of a false pacifism, and endangered the independence so dearly bought for us by those who passed this way to heroic rest.

On such occasions, when our investment in freedom was permitted to fall below the level of security, we paid harsh penalties—the lives of our finest manhood, the "expendables" as they have since been recorded in history.

Those "expendables" volunteered as road blocks and gave up precious time in which to consolidate our forces and begin the march that stopped only when the tyrant's fire ceased.

Pearl Harbor! Bataan! Corregidor! With them will ever be associated four words that are seared in the memory of all who listened, read, wept, hoped, and prayed. Yes, those four words, "Too little, too late," hold a meaning for us that Americans never must forget.

They must remain with us as a reminder of an investment we neglected—an investment made for us more than 300 years ago from which we have drawn continual dividends until our liberty, our system of free enterprise and the freedoms that go with them became a wealth and a privilege too many of us take for granted.

The tyrants of a mere decade ago concluded America had grown too rich and indifferent, too soft and lethargic to defend even ourselves, let alone give aid to the defenseless.

They had reason to believe that.

An adequate armed force equal to our responsibility in the association of nations might have averted that European debacle. But, then as today, we had many who indulged in wishful thinking, idle boasting, and selfish action. "They wouldn't dare" to strike at us. We have never lost a war. It is a crime to waste money preparing for a war that will never happen.

You and I heard that kind of talk. We heard it from the uninformed; we heard it from the boastful; we heard it from those who wanted only to enjoy the temporary security others had paid for. And, unfortunately, we heard from pressure groups of those who served foreign doctrines in this cosmopolitan land.

Too many were unmindful of the fact that the tyrant and the bully strike viciously when the innocent drop their guard. We had dropped our guard. Seeking no gains from war, we had begun to believe that a token army was sufficient—that an adequate armed force was an expense, not an investment in security.

That belief cost us $400,000,000,000 and the lives of half a million of our sons. It cost us more than that. It put upon the shoulders of present and unborn generations a terrible debt—a debt that will never be paid if ever again we permit our defenses to become as vulnerable as they were when either of the last two wars began.

The mere absence of a shooting war does not necessarily mean peace. It does provide an opportunity for reasoning and discussion on how best to prevent a shooting war.

Unfortunately we have not always won the peace. Circumstances intervened over which our armed forces and the people did not have control. The physical and moral engagements won by the military and the people have been, speaking charitably, omitted from the picture on the council table of nations. And now we must gird ourselves to even maintain the status quo.

In order to maintain the peace which all Americans desire today, we must have that which the aggressor respects most—strength, supplemented by the implements of science and the means to use them promptly and effectively.

Our first line of defense is the character and integrity of our own people—all else is predicated on that.

Today the right to live as men should live, is again challenged, this time by a force even more sinister than that which ruthlessly put the torch to Europe 11 years ago. Whether or not the cold war will suddenly erupt in the form of vicious assault with the deadliest weapons known to man, no one can say.

The world knows that tyrants attack only when they believe they can conquer. Smaller nations have their eyes on America—the one bulwark of freedom on God's earth. When and if we must bear the impact of might from behind the iron curtain, our armed forces must be strong enough to take the first blow and then carry the attack to the enemy.

Too little then may prove too late for the last time. Life as we know it in America could be lost to the world.

It can happen if we neglect the responsibilities we automatically assume as a fortress of freedom.

It can happen if we fail in the duty we owe to mankind.

It can happen to an America that takes its freedom for granted.

In a world of atomic energy, radar fences, guided missiles, jet propulsion, supersonic speeds, breathing submarines, chemical turbines, rocket power and robot devices, the stakes are high. When the show-down comes it is bound to be cataclysmic.

We simply must hold the winning hand or lose all. We are a contestant, whether or not we so choose. There can be no turning back. Obviously we hope to settle all differences around the table of international understanding. But we have learned that not all nations can be trusted to respect agreements. That leaves no alternative other than to put our house in order for the future.

For years the broad oceans afforded us defense in space. No longer does space afford the time it did in wars of the past. We must be able to meet the most sudden attack with greater speed and greater force.

We must possess the courage to face the facts of today, the courage to sacrifice a share of our labor and fortune in support of the services which have preserved our freedom in the past. We must never again willfully depend upon expendables.

Our vigilance, resourcefulness, ingenuity, productivity, and courage must be united as an indestructible force.

Too often the investment in freedom is confined with the term "expense" in the minds of many people.

There is no investment under the sun that can assure to us dividends in safety and our concept of liberty other than an adequate investment in trained personnel implemented with the scientific brains, resourcefulness and

productivity of our American people as a whole.

As we invest in the implements necessary to our vocations, in the homes we build for our families, in the institutions of education in this Republic, we must be continually mindful of the over-all fact that none of these blessings may be lasting if we fail to invest in that with which to defend them.

We do not build costly structures and then neglect to protect them against fire and the elements.

We do not plan orderly government and neglect to invest in law-enforcement units for its protection.

Neither can we expect to perpetuate a way of life that is the envy of all other peoples unless we set up defenses against those who would destroy it.

There should be no doubt in the mind of any American as to the purpose of an American armed service second to none.

No American worthy of the name harbors the thought that this Nation of ours plans a war of aggression. Our tolerance toward the blatant Marxists within our own boundaries should furnish sufficient proof of our desire to live peaceably with men of all nations and people of all political and economic ideologies.

But we must not let that tolerance deteriorate into complacency and weakness.

Twenty million American men and women in two World Wars risked more than dollars. They were not warmongers. They made an investment for national and individual freedom in order that we might work at our chosen vocations, to worship as we please, to think and write and speak as our own conscience dictates.

Countless thousands sacrificed their lives as an investment in human life and the dignity of man.

Never again must this Nation hear the echo of those four words "Too little, too late."

May we have the wisdom to maintain our Nation's armed forces, which we honor today, commensurate with our abilities and opportunities. An adequate unified armed service on land, sea, and in the air is a sound investment in freedom for tomorrow, an investment in the way of life our forebears planned for us, an investment in love for our fellow man, and in the peace of the world.

Address of the Most Reverend Richard J. Cushing, D. D., Archbishop of Boston

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an address made by his excellency, the Most Reverend Richard J. Cushing, D. D., archbishop of Boston, at the annual dinner meeting of the Eire Society, at Boston, Saturday, May 13, 1950:

I must begin by expressing my gratitude to the Eire Society of Boston for this latest mark of their friendly esteem and devout fidelity. It is an honor indeed to be honored by men and women of the high ideals and lofty purposes of the Eire Society. I want our new Ambassador from Ireland, Mr. Hearne, to know that Ireland has no more exemplary representatives in America than the members of our Eire Society and that the truest interests of Ireland are nowhere better served than they are by this society.

Next, I would like, if I may, to pay a word of tribute to his excellency, the Ambassador from Ireland, for the magnificent impression created by his talk to the National Press Club Wednesday of this week. I have no doubt that many on every side have congratulated him on his statesmanlike declaration concerning both the determination of the Irish people to achieve their national unity and their determination to achieve it without violence.

The Ambassador told his audience at the Press Club that never in their history were the Irish people so united on the policy which he summed up in one single, superb sentence: "We want unity, but we also want peace; we are determined to achieve unity without a civil war."

We were all delighted to read in the general press the reactions to the Ambassador's remarks. We are persuaded that the rounds of applause given him by his immediate audience last Wednesday will be echoed in that favorable public opinion which, as the Ambassador pointed out, must in the long run be the determining factor in the solution of Ireland's national problem.

Two paragraphs from the Ambassador's talk sum up both the wisdom of the case for national unity in Ireland and the folly of the arguments against it. The Ambassador said:

"National unity is the chief aim of the Irish people. The whole soil of Ireland is the property and domain of the whole Irish people of today.

"Those who will tell you it is a complicated problem and plead for a division are as false as the woman who wanted to solve the problem of ownership of a little child in King Solomon's day by cutting it into two pieces."

That is statesmanlike talk. What is more important, it is also sensible talk. We wish the Ambassador every blessing in his effort to fulfill the legitimate aspirations of his nation within the framework of a policy inspired by a love for peace and a determination to preserve it.

Such a policy, I am persuaded, would commend itself to the great saints of Ireland, the saints of whom our people are so intensely proud. One holy man in particular would welcome with pious applause the statement and the spirit of Ireland's new Ambassador.

I propose to speak to you briefly about that man tonight. He is Blessed Oliver Plunket.

Last fall we went to Ireland on a great come-back-to-Erin pilgrimage. We visited many beloved spots in the isle of saints and scholars, but none more profoundly moved me than did the modest shrine in great St. Peter's Church, Drogheda, where the head of Blessed Oliver Plunket is preserved for veneration.

I visited this shrine in the Oliver Plunket Memorial Church under singularly favorable circumstances. We were accompanied by the present successor of Blessed Oliver as archbishop of Armagh, the gracious, scholarly and warmly loved Dr. D'Alton. A great throng of the honorable people of Drogheda turned out to meet our pilgrimage party and thousands overflowed their imposing church as we knelt in prayer before a human head so literally lost for love of Christ.

I must confess that I had known relatively little of the detailed, dramatic story of Blessed Oliver Plunket. I knew, of course, that he had died a martyr. I knew the injustices of which he had been the victim. I had some knowledge of his place in the history of Ireland's sorrows and struggles, and I naturally shared the hope that his beatification, so long in coming and so enthusiastically received when finally it took place May 23, 1920, would soon be followed by the canonical evidence required for his ardently desired canonization.

These things I knew. But it is surprising to reflect on how little people outside Ireland appear to appreciate the tremendous stature and historic significance of this great archbishop, patriot, and personality. It would, I think, be most appropriate if the Eire Society would interest itself in the cause of blessed Plunket and perhaps arrange for a lecture or some other occasion on which to do proper homage to the memory of this saintly hero of the Irish people.

My purpose in suggesting such a reawakened interest is not to recall the injustices of the past nor otherwise to inflame partisan or political sentiments in the present. Quite the contrary. It is no longer necessary to rehearse the travesty of justice which was his trial nor the incredible barbarities which accompanied his execution.

My purpose would rather be to present Blessed Oliver Plunket as an outstanding example of what the true Christian should be at all times and as a symbol of the spirit in which the true Irishman seeks the interests of his nation. It is the spirit set forth in the policy enunciated by Ambassador Hearne last week.

As a Christian, Blessed Plunket was kindly and considerate. He was humble in his great learning. He was assiduous in the fulfillment of duties of his state in life. He was filled with a holy peace, and he saw all events of life in a completely spiritual perspective. Few men in history have accepted injustice and even a brutally unjust death with such magnificent dignity and devout resignation.

The manner of his so-called trial, the prejudiced charge to the jury, the evil temper of the times, all these made the verdict against him inevitable. But he waited serenely for the cruel sentence which only a miracle could avert. The president of the court charged the jury: "Gentlemen of the jury, look you here, Mr. Plunket here is indicted for high treason; and it is for conspiring the King's death, and endeavoring to bring the French Army into Ireland to invade that Kingdom and establish therein the Roman religion. If you believe these witnesses that have attested these things against him, you must find him guilty. It is pretty strong evidence, and the prisoner does not say anything against it but that his witnesses are not yet come over."

From the dock, the grave voice of the prisoner replied, "I can say nothing to it but give my protestation that there is not one word of this said against me true, but all plain romance. I never had any communication with any French minister, cardinal or other."

The jury took a quarter of an hour to bring in their verdict. It was "Guilty." A week later the prisoner was brought to the bar to receive sentence. He knew the savage formula by heart and was calm. The world knows it, and shudders—hanged, drawn, disemboweled, quartered. "Deo gratias" was the exultant cry. It was the martyr's crown for which he had long prayed.

He was a martyr for his faith. So far as we may use the word, he was also a martyr for Ireland. But his love for Ireland, it must be noted, did not make him the enemy of any other land. On the contrary, Blessed Plunket exemplifies the truly Catholic spirit in which differences between nations must always be resolved no matter what the previous history of injustice or of bitterness on either side.

Blessed Plunket was put to death by the English. He must have been painfully aware, however, that imperfection was by no means limited to members of the nation which had persecuted his people and which had sentenced him to death. He had also been sorely vexed by disloyalties within his own flock and he had tasted, as every leader must, the sour wine of perfidy and intrigue among his own. For all that, they were his own and he loved them passionately and served

them without cease. In his will he could boast, in homely, touching language: "I stuck to my care and my districts until death"

Ireland was much in his thoughts in the harassed last hours of his life, even those in Ireland who had kept silent when he needed defense and who seemed to fail him in his hour of need.

And by the same token, he was preserved by his personal sanctity from falling victim to any intemperance in his attitude toward the enemy nation. The English Catholics, at least, had stood by him through all his difficulties, giving him friendship, money, and sympathy. He could not entirely hate a nation which included so many devout and generous personal friends. His last will and testament includes a touching tribute to these good people. It is worth remembering, because it reflects again the spirit in which we must all approach partisan differences. He wrote: "The English Catholics here were most charitable to me. They spared neither money nor gold to relieve me, and in my trial did all for me that my brother would do."

One of these Catholic English, a convert to the faith, a Benedictine monk and a fellow-prisoner, became the special friend of Blessed Oliver. They were separated by the walls of their prison cells, but they corresponded in the last days of Plunket's life. In one of his letters Blessed Oliver wrote to Dom Croker: "Being the first of my countrymen to suffer here, I desire to lead the way to others; and it is right I should strengthen by my example those in Ireland whom I have so often exhorted by word of mouth."

Dead now almost 300 years, he still exhorts us by his example and by every circumstance of his life and death.

Ireland was sustained by the example of his heroic fortitude through all the slow anguish of the penal laws. Imitating his heroism, Ireland accomplished 1782, 1892, 1932. He had said: "The most faithful nation must not die." Ireland understood—and persevered.

But Blessed Plunket taught another lesson beside that of fortitude and heroic resistance. He taught the lesson of clemency, of Christian forebearance, and flaming charity. Father Croker watched from the prison windows for the last sight of him as he was executed. With Croker were other priests and laymen, all English, sentenced to death by the same spirit of injustice which had doomed Blessed Plunket. Croker described the end as follows: "I neither can nor dare undertake to describe the signal virtues of the blessed martyr." There appeared in him something beyond expression, something more than human. The most savage hearts were mollified at the sight of him. Even the most timorous were in love with him. When he was carried out the priests' yard for execution, he turned toward our chamber windows, and with pleasant aspect and elevated hand, he gave us his benediction."

Oliver Plunket teaches us this same lesson of peace and Catholic spirit even by the circumstances of the disposition of his mangled body after his death. His blessed head is prized by the people of Drogheda and is preserved in the great shrine which I visited in Ireland last fall. But he is no less venerated in England and particularly at the Benedictine Abbey at Downside. Foremost among those who pray constantly for his canonization are the English monks at Downside, a curious, consoling, and entirely Catholic circumstance.

Were Blessed Oliver Plunket among us today, I know he would hail the wise words in which, as we have already said, Ambassador Hearne has summed up the attitude of Ireland on the thorny, highly emotional question of partition.

May the spirit of Blessed Plunket, firm but fair, courageous but most kind, indomitable but understanding, prevail among those who must solve in this century the problems of Ireland and her neighbors. May the high-minded policy enunciated by the ambassador have its echo among the statesman on every side.

Blessed Oliver Plunket, pray for Ireland—and pray for us all.

Donnell's Rail Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FORREST C. DONNELL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Donnell's Rail Bill," published in the Bristol (Va.) Herald-Courier of May 13, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DONNELL'S RAIL BILL

Senator DONNELL, of Missouri, has introduced a bill to outlaw railroad strikes and a Senate labor subcommittee has started hearings on the measure. It would outlaw railroad walkouts by providing for compulsory arbitration. A Presidential board would decide the issue in a major dispute and both sides would have to abide by the decision.

It is unfortunate that the present Railroad Labor Act is not sufficient to maintain our railroad commerce at all times. We repeat a former statement that compulsory arbitration seems the best answer, and the present strike justifies Senator DONNELL's bill.

Invalidation of California Land Act Under United Nations Charter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article which relates to the recent decision of the court in California invalidating the California Land Act because of a provision in the United Nations Charter. The article, which is written by Mr. Arthur Krock, is entitled "More on Treaty Supremacy Over Existing Laws," and appeared in the New York Times of today.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN THE NATION—MORE ON TREATY SUPREMACY OVER EXISTING LAWS

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, May 22.—In this space there was published on May 16 an analysis of the decision of the California Court of Appeal that invoked a general pledge in a treaty signed by the United States to invalidate a specific California statute. It was noted that, when this court held that the State law which restricts Japanese from owning land was nullified by our promise in the Charter of the United Nations to promote nondiscrimination and take * * * action to eliminate it, to that end it opened the way to the contention that all discriminatory laws and practices in this country were automatically made illegal when the Charter was ratified.

But it was pointed out that the California decision, which the attorney general of the State has asked the court to rehear, was confronted with two great obstacles to affirmation by the Supreme Court if the issue ever gets there. One is Chief Justice Marshall's ruling in 1829 that only self-executing treaty provisions supersede existing statutes as the supreme law of the land. (Arts. 55 and 56 of the Charter, the basis of the California decision, are not such.) The other was that by its pledge to promote antidiscrimination in all forms and to take * * * action the United States made it clear that legislation by Congress will be required to materialize the promise, and this has not been done.

But if the Supreme Court should repudiate Marshall or hold that articles 55 and 56 are self-executing, then it could be impressively argued that the President's civil-rights program requires no legislation to put it into effect except that creating machinery for enforcement. For example, all forms of local segregation would instantly be illegal and the Federal Government would be obliged to penalize them. And, automatically, no employer or labor union could exclude (from employment and membership respectively) any applicant who could attribute the exclusion to racial, religious, sex, or color discrimination, etc.

This would be carrying the decision of the California Court of Appeals to its logical destination because it was founded on these specific articles in the Charter to which the United States has subscribed. Hence the importance of that decision, and the necessity of final judgment on the issue it raised, are obvious.

The dispatch in which this was pointed out produced the information from a reader that the Supreme Court of Ontario, in November 1945, took a position almost like the California court did and that this has not yet been appealed. In a past issue of the American Scholar Prof. Malcolm Moos of the Johns Hopkins University Department of Political Science reviewed this ruling.

He called it a remarkable prelude to the 1948 decision written for the Supreme Court of the United States by Chief Justice Vinson in the Covenant cases. (In these the court held that, while restrictive housing covenants may be made and voluntarily abided by without breaking any law, they are legally unenforceable.)

The Ontario case, In re Wren, arose out of the fact that a Canadian citizen by that name, who owned land under a deed that bound him, his heirs and assigns, not to sell to Jews or persons of objectionable nationality, was permitted to bring an action to void it in the Supreme Court of Ontario. Mr. Justice McKay not only held it void, but against public policy "which [wrote Professor Moos] rested squarely on a tripod composed of the United Nations Charter, the Atlantic Charter, and two provincial statutes. [But] the court looked first to the United Nations Charter * * *. Thus * * * the learned Justice is * * * breaking new ground." The Court was obliged to move to that because the two provincial statutes cited merely make it illegal to publish or display anything discriminatory or for an insurance company to discriminate in risks on a racial or religious basis.

Professor Moos, writing before the California decision, shrewdly foresaw the McKay

ruling as one which may well serve as a road marker for subsequent and perhaps more important decisions that seek to internationalize human rights. But late in 1948 another justice of the supreme court of Ontario took a different view on the precise issue raised by In re Wren and shunned the dictum of Justice McKay with respect to the application of multiple treaties, including the Charter. Justice Schroeder held valid a restrictive covenant at a summer resort forbidding the sale of land to Jews. This has been appealed, and doubtless the high court of Canada will one day pass on the dispute below as the American high tribunal will pass on the California court decision if the attorney general of the State fails to have it modified.

Members of Congress, not confined to those from the South, are beginning to take uneasy notice of the California ruling and its momentous implications because of its central thesis—which the Senate anxiously discussed last Friday—and because of its threat to Marshall's distinction between self-executing treaties and those which are not. The lawyers among them know, as Prof. Henry Reiff of St. Lawrence University wrote 10 years ago, that "theoretically," these "should be readily distinguishable but in practice they are not; John Marshall found it so, and the courts since then have often had similar experiences."

If the California ruling were adopted and broadly applied by the Supreme Court our part in the delicate treaty structure of the United Nations would be under heavy and immediate fire at the Capitol.

Chicago Cool to Fair Deal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 23, 1950

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Bill Cunningham which appeared in the Boston Herald of May 16, 1950, is an estimate by a very shrewd observer:

CHICAGO COOL TO FAIR DEAL—NEWSMEN REVEAL BLASTS AT PRESS IN WHISTLE STOPS

(By Bill Cunningham)

CHICAGO, May 15.—Maybe this is only an impression, but it seems to this reporter he's seen second-rate prize fights draw more enthusiastic crowds into this battered old godown than the one enticed here tonight by the personal appearance of the President of the United States, plus all the colorful bait set out by the sponsoring committee. There was bait. There was a parade, featuring 7,000 members of the Illinois National Guard, their weapons, and mechanized equipment for one thing.

There were bands, floats, drum and bugle corps complete with shivering, but strutting drum majorettes. There were 3,000 bearers of torch lights, mostly out of step, and terrific fire works displays at certain points along the line of march. Toy balloons, to an announced number of 35,000, were turned loose into the chilling wind at various locations.

GIVES APPEARANCE OF OVERFLOW

The reason was they were trying to get as many people around this building as possible in order to make it look as if there were a tremendous demand to get in, and a vast and frustrated congregation to constitute a teeming overflow. That would be for the sake of the news reels and photographers. To make certain, they tried to deliberate an utterly synthetic subterfuge. Borrowing the give-away idea from radio, they advertised extensively that a certain number of these balloons—one announcement said 2,000—would carry tickets entitling the lucky recoverer to $2 in cash.

This all came under the head of drumming up an audience for the President, and, since yesterday's vast collapse of the public meeting of the Cabinet, they were drumming harder than the heathens of darkest Africa trying to get a message across the intervening hills. To be fair about that really historical Cabinet meeting—the first ever held outside Washington—the combination of the lovely day, and television probably explains why the 3,600-seat opera house was only one-third filled, and why the army of police assembled to handle the expected overflow stood around outside looking silly.

They did get their crowd here tonight. Much of it was partisan and professionally enthusiastic, but most of it seemed to respond more eagerly to the Hollywood stars and the reasonably well-done pageant devoted to the life and times of Thomas Jefferson. The climax came with the Presidential address, which you heard, or can read, but, as above, I saw a bigger crowd, heard more noise and was actually frightened by more excitement in this same hall the night the late Ernie Schaaf fought a local hope named Tuffy Griffin with Al Capone at the ringside.

This is nothing like that, but such as it is, it's the first sign of life this general hoedown has shown. The various delegates probably have got something out of it, but the public has generally ignored it, the local papers have treated it with no more respect than they accord a visiting baseball team, and the entire conclave has been so flat journalistically that the reporters have stood around trying to interview each other. There hasn't been a quote in a carload.

REASON FOR TRIP CALLED PHONY

The general reason for what, without too much exaggeration, could be called the contempt of the community, and the press, for this entire performance, seems to rest in its insincerity and its extremely light regard for the truth. To begin with, nobody here, and probably nobody in the country, considers the Presidential speech-making trip, ending in this hall tonight, "nonpolitical." They consider the gentleman as having deliberately resorted to subterfuge, and the reaction here is that of any public that considers its intelligence challenged, its gullibility taken for granted.

They consider the reasons officially stated for holding this jamboree at this particular time as phony as the Presidential explanation of his vote fishing trip. The Democratic sponsors call this the Jefferson Jubilee, "held in honor of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of Jefferson's accession to the Presidency" the actual anniversary of that doesn't come until next March.

Loud doubts are being raised editorially and vocally as to whether Jefferson would even recognize the Truman Party.

Straight at the Truman junket, and even granting it "nonpolitical" was an editorial in one paper today, quoting the reply of President Jefferson to the invitation of his excellency, James Sullivan, Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, when Governor Sullivan invited Mr. Jefferson to visit New England in 1807.

"I confess," wrote Mr. Jefferson, in a letter dated June 19, 1807, "that I am not reconciled to the idea of a chief magistrate parading himself through the several States, as an object of public gaze, and, in quest of an applause which, to be valuable, should be purely voluntary. I had rather acquire silent good will by a faithful discharge of my duties than owe expressions of it to my putting myself in the way of receiving them."

Added to this now is a general burning of most of the press over the theme consistently followed by Mr. Truman in his off-the-cuff speeches farther back out toward the cactus. The correspondents unloading here from the train are beginning to unload on what was said from that train. At stop after stop, the President told the assembled multitudes he was forced to come out and give them their news straight, and first hand, because they couldn't believe what they read in the newspapers—in short that the press was lying to them about what was happening in Washington and the rest of the world. He didn't use the fighting word, but that was exactly his meaning.

REPORTERS QUOTING SPEECHES VERBATIM

The correspondents, many of them versed in shorthand, took him down verbatim, and now they're quoting exactly what he said, and where he said it. He professed repeatedly to his listeners to be a wonderful man, running a wonderful Government, but with the true facts distorted and kept from the people by an iron curtain of the press. That's exactly the line Henry Wallace used when he was campaigning in 1948.

Probably the most striking rebuke to the entire performance was given here yesterday from the pulpit of a fashionable church, the Fourth Presbyterian. The speaker was the pastor, the Reverend Dr. Harrison Ray Anderson. He was the Democratic convention chaplain, when Mr. Truman was nominated for the vice presidency in this same auditorium in 1944.

"As the man who prayed for him—President Truman—years ago," Dr. Anderson said to his congregation in his regular Sunday sermon, "I counsel the President to quit playing with truth. The earnest people of America have too great a respect for the office of President. President Truman would be welcome in any city or town in a political or nonpolitical trip. But why call this last journey and this Chicago weekend anything other than what it is?"

He spoke of the humility of Mr. Truman in 1944, and then went on without naming him further to assail the lust for power, and what it does to men who run the state, causing people to see humble, finite men become masters. "When the state becomes God," he said, "morals seem to go."

That's the way it's been going, and but for this whoopla tonight, which is as synthetic as all the rest, it's been about as productive of general cheers as a canners' convention. Maybe they fell for the Fair Deal farther west, but this part of the West seems to have fallen on it.

Withholding on Dividends

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSEITS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 22, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the Boston Herald, Boston, Mass., of recent date:

THE INVESTOR

(By Edson B. Smith)

WITHHOLDING SNARL ON DIVIDENDS CERTAIN

The House Ways and Means Committee has tentatively approved a 10 percent withholding tax on dividends. It is estimated that this tax will bring in $100,000,000 to

$150,000,000 additional revenue through closing the loophole of people who overlook reporting some of their dividends in their income tax returns.

No one can object to the proposal in principle. Just how it is to be worked out in administrative detail is far from clear. Presumably the distributing corporation will deduct 10 percent from the dividend due each stockholder and send the money to the collector of internal revenue. The corporation would, of course, also have to send to the Collector a certificate showing the amount held back from each stockholder on each dividend date. Also, obviously, the corporation would have to send a similar memorandum to the stockholder to aid him in preparing his own income-tax return.

When it comes to a company like American Telephone with 900,000 stockholders this runs into quite a bit of additional clerical work. If an individual happened to have 73 shares of Potomac Electric Power, which pays a dividend of 22½ cents every 3 months, his present quarterly dividend would be $16.42. Under the corporate withholding tax he would get $16.42 minus $1.64, or $14.78. When he came to figure his income tax he would have to multiply this $14.78 by tenninths to find out what the dividend actually was so that he would be able to report the $16.42 actually declared in his favor and then he would take a credit on the return for the $1.64 which the corporation had paid for him.

Well, this is one dividend on one stock. If a man had 50 different stocks paying quarterly he would have 200 of these computations to carry out. If the work time of the income taxpayer were figured at anything, we venture to say that the total cost of administrating the tax to individuals and corporations would be vastly in excess of the amount the Government would obtain.

It may be that the bright boys in Washington can figure some way of simplifying the practical aspects of the tax, but on the basis of the way it looks to us the Bureau of Internal Revenue better start hiring a lot of new clerks because practically everybody's income tax is going to be hopelessly snarled up.

Taconite Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1950

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, on May 15 I introduced H. R. 8512, a bill to provide RFC loans of 30 years' maturity for the development of taconite and other strategic minerals. This proposed development of taconite brings up the question of the adequacy of existing iron-ore supply and the cost of production of taconite as a new source of iron. In this connection I have received a most informative letter from Mr. Arnold Hoffman, a mining geologist, whose business address is 452 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include this letter of April 24, 1950, written by Mr. Hoffman:

APRIL 24, 1950.

Hon. JOHN A. BLATNIK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I read with great interest in yesterday's New York Times that you are shortly introducing a bill to the House which would liberalize the present RFC law, namely, to increase period of loans from 10 to 30 or 40 years in order to provide necessary funds and time to permit the immediate construction of plants to mine the magnetic taconites in Minnesota. I wish to congratulate you on your foresight, for such an act is one of the most vital requirements to safeguard the future of this country.

No doubt you are in possession of full data on the taconite situation. As one who has studied the situation for the past 10 years, however, I am taking the liberty of summarizing the situation on the chance that one or two points may be of use to you.

As you know, the approaching iron-ore crisis has resolved itself into a study of the relative merits of foreign high-grade ores as against the development of lower-grade domestic ores, called taconites. Much has been written and said about foreign ores, the latest being the suddenly publicized Cerro Bolivar mine in Venezuela.

It is now obvious that the steel industry must immediately decide whether to place dependence upon foreign ores or turn to the taconites of the eastern Mesabi Range. The best opinion seems to favor a combination of both to take up the slack of approaching exhaustion of the direct shipping ores of the range, but in most discussions there is a strong accent on the high cost of taconites. I believe this conclusion as to costliness is more of an opinion than a fact. Further, close examination of the situation gives strong evidence that the taconites can be mined at a cost competitive with the underground mines of the Lake Superior region. The added cost of beneficiation will be amply compensated by the many advantages accruing from the production of a final hard, high-grade product made in a form especially adapted to more efficient blast and open-hearth furnace use.

By this time, most of us are familiar with the arguments against the total use of foreign ores for our domestic steel needs: Vulnerability of sea lanes in wartime, instability of foreign governments, the enormous capital investment required, the varying constituents of foreign ores which would require modifications in our furnace techniques, the impossibility of moving our steel plant to the east coast to accommodate water-borne ores, the immense difficulties and expense of building a St. Lawrence waterway to provide transportation for Canadian ores which are still of questionable economic value, the great capital outlay in building fleets of large ocean-going ore boats, the dearth of trained personnel abroad accompanied by the insistence of many foreign governments that native engineers be employed, the constantly changing policies of taxation and confiscation, usually for the worse, etc. Such considerations have led most iron and steel men to the admission that the taconites point to the logical solution of the iron and steel dilemma. But most of these people caution that this would be an expensive alternative, resulting in costlier iron and, consequently, steel, though they all seem to agree that the taconites alone can supply our great and growing iron-ore needs for more than 100 years.

You are no doubt aware that the Mesabi Iron Co. mined taconites at Babbit, Minn., in the early twenties. The ore in crude form ran from 25 to 35 percent iron, but the beneficiated product was close to 65 percent, far greater than the 51 percent direct shipping ores of the range. While the superiority of the product was universally admitted by the iron industry, the cost was high in relation to the then price of iron ore and operations were suspended in 1924.

Today, the situation is vastly different. The direct shipping iron-ore reserves are approaching measured exhaustion, the price of iron ore is higher, and the scarcity of lump ore and scrap makes the mining of taconites a national necessity. Above all, the magnetite taconites can be mined profitably at present schedules of iron-ore prices and prevailing costs. As an indication of this, the Picklands-Mather Co., which has been mining magnetitic taconites experimentally the past year or more, is about to launch a full scale 25,000- to 50,000-ton daily operation. The United States Steel Co. is now engaged in building a taconite beneficiation plant in Virginia City, Minn., capable of producing 1,000,000 tons of sinter and/or agglomerates annually. The Reserve Mining Co. which has leased the lands of Mesabi Iron Co. is, I believe, in the process of obtaining the funds necessary for a minimum 50,000-ton daily production of taconites, and its vast reserves, containing more than 2,000,000,000 tons of ore, no doubt give impetus to the bill for liberalizing the terms of RFC loans.

It is now apparent that Mesabi Iron Co. was ahead of time in mining taconites. Today, however, it stands ready to save our iron situation, along with Pickands-Mather and other companies which have farsightedly been working on taconites. In the old days the high cost of mining, due to the hard, flinty character of the ore, was a deterrent to the mining of taconites. Thanks to the Linde Air Products Co., jet piercing can now literally burn holes in the taconites at a speed of more than 25 feet per hour as compared to 18 feet daily cut by the conventional churn drills, resulting in a drastic decrease in mining costs.

In the beneficiation process, the hard taconites must be crushed and ground to required fineness before the magnetite can be effectively recovered. While this is costly, the iron is cheaply and effectively recovered by magnetic rolls. No expensive flotation installations are required. Also, giant electric shovels can now open pit the ores at a very low cost.

The taconites are ready to go. The only element in the situation which is still fluid is the experimental work now going on to determine the best form of final product, pellets, agglomerates, sinter or briquettes. However, herein rests one of the great advantages of mining taconites; there is a flexibility in the beneficiated product which can be adapted for the special requirements of the furnaces.

What price taconites? On the following page, I am submitting a schedule of costs and profits, based on a concentrating ratio of 2.75 tons crude ore to 1 ton of pellets or sinter. In the case of the Reserve Mining Co., up to 35 percent of the gangue, or waste will be eliminated at the mine in Babbit before the ore is shipped to the treatment plant at Beaver Bay. Costs have been determined from presently available data and comparative figures of various open-pit operations in the United States. The final profit figure is an operating one, that is, after all charges but before income tax. It indicates that the taconites, once equipped, can stand on their own feet.

Mining and milling per ton concentrate, 2.75 x 65 cents	$1.79
Pelletizing per ton concentrate	1.00
Local and State taxes per ton concentrate	.15
Royalties at 8 cents per ton crude ore, 2.75 x 8 cents	.22
Haulage, Babbit to Beaver Bay, 2 tons at 1 cent per ton-mile, 55 miles	1.10
Haulage, Beaver Bay to Ohio port	1.16
Amortization at 18 cents per ton crude ore, 2.75 x 18 cents	.50
Total cost per ton pellets	5.92
Value ton 51 percent iron ore at Ohio port	7.70

Value ton 65 percent iron ore at Ohio port at 15.1 cents per unit above 51 percent	$9.81
Operating profit per ton pellets	3.89
Operating profit per ton crude ore	1.40

This $1.40 makes no provision for a possible premium on pellets, but this is a possibility, since pellets or sinter are preferable to direct shipping ores in the furnaces. A hard and high-grade form of ore in the blast furnaces results in greater unit production of pig iron in the charge with consequent reduction in costs. The introduction of pellets in the open-hearth furnace can reduce scrap requirements to a level where "home" scrap from fabricating plants should meet such needs. Pellets make an ideal substitute for scarce and expensive scrap, also lump ore. With such advantages the beneficiated taconites can well command a premium.

There is, also, an important saving in the cost of transporting pellets containing up to 65 percent iron as against the direct shipping ores which are only one-half iron.

The taconites can be operated commercially on almost any desired scale. Capital investment in plant is admittedly large, $15 to $20 per ton pellets, but this would be considerably less than the cost of building a fleet of ore boats capable of handling the equivalent amount of production abroad. United States Steel, for example, must build a considerable fleet of large, ocean-going ore boats to transport 10,000,000 tons of iron ore from Venezuela each year. This would cost upwards of $200,000,000, more than the capital outlay required to obtain the same tonnage of pellets from the taconites. Need I point out how much more feasible it would be to make this investment in Minnesota? Ideally located with respect to transportation and nearness to the central steel plants of the country, the taconites could serve and continue to serve the furnaces of the valley area for many generations to come.

Very truly yours,

ARNOLD HOFFMAN.

Asking for Trouble

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FORREST C. DONNELL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Asking for Trouble," published in the Akron (Ohio) Beacon-Journal, of May 13, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ASKING FOR TROUBLE

Because the railroads have long been recognized as the arteries which carry the lifeblood of the Nation's economy, particular efforts were made years ago to avoid stoppages of service by reason of labor disputes.

The Railway Labor Act carefully protected the rights of employees to engage in collective bargaining while at the same time providing certain final steps designed to prevent disagreements over wages and working conditions from finally reaching the strike stage.

For years this law was pointed to as a model, both by the railroads and the unions. But now it is headed for the discard, and something less favorable to labor is likely to be enacted simply because organized firemen have persisted in inflicting their wishes on their employers and the public—regardless.

Their short-sighted attempt to create jobs where there is no work to be done is paralyzing a large part of the Nation's economy.

A strike in one or a dozen retail stores can go on indefinitely without hurting anyone but the immediate participants and their employers. The public can go elsewhere to buy.

A strike in a manufacturing plant, such as Chrysler, has wider ramifications because it hurts suppliers at one end of the production cycle and dealers at the other, in addition to the firm's employees, managers, and stockholders. But such a strike can be tolerated by the public, because they can buy new cars elsewhere or run their old ones a while longer.

A railroad strike is different. The individuals directly involved are only a small fraction of the thousands of suppliers, producers, and consumers who are harmed in one way or another.

The public has a stake in the crippling of the Nation's transportation system. And the public won't tolerate such a strike very long without demanding that laws be passed which will keep railroaders from striking.

Such laws will inevitably restrict and hamper many more working people than just the recalcitrant firemen who are at fault in this dispute.

What a foolish strike.

The Glove Industry Is in Peril

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEAN P. TAYLOR

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1950

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a resolution of the Glove Cutters' Union, of Fulton County, N. Y., which indicates concern on the part of glove workers who have already felt the pinch of foreign competition in the glove-making industry. The effect of this competition has been felt by the glove makers for the past several years, as evidenced by the fact that in one area alone—Fulton County, N. Y.—there were, as of May 1, 1950, 5,000 glove workers drawing unemployment benefits, and more than 1,600, in addition to the 5,000, who have exhausted their benefits.

The making of gloves is a highly specialized trade. This industry employs thousands and thousands of persons within the United States. Only disaster and chaos will follow if the State Department and the Tariff Commission continue to permit foreign countries employing unskilled, low-paid labor, to compete with the domestic manufacturers of gloves.

The employees and the manufacturers of leather gloves are not the only ones affected by the attitude of the State Department and the Tariff Commission. For the past several months we have witnessed the keen competition of the Japanese with the American producers of woolen gloves. Now comes the threat of Communist-controlled China where embroidered, knitted wool gloves and mittens are being manufactured to compete with our own production in that field. Under the provisions of article XIX all of the concessions in the General Agreement are intended to be included in the "escape clause" and the United States has the absolute right, and it was the intention of the Congress, that it should withdraw or modify any concession in Schedule 20 of the Agreement if an increased import of a product resulting from unforeseen developments and from the concession granted on it would cause or threaten to cause, injury to the domestic industry producing like or similar articles. There is a threat to the domestic industry and there is absolutely no reason, therefore, why the rate should not be put back to 90 percent.

Insofar as leather gloves are concerned, the Members of Congress would aid in the preservation of that industry if each individual Member would express to the State Department, his desire to have leather gloves deleted from the list of commodities on which tariff rate cuts are to be negotiated. It is time the President of the United States, the State Department, and the Tariff Commission is brought to the realization that the glove industry in America is in danger of extinction and only by an immediate and forceful and sensible approach to this problem can the industry be saved.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE CONSOLIDATED GLOVE CUTTERS AND SHAVERS UNION OF FULTON COUNTY, NEW YORK STATE

The following resolution was offered by Mr. Hallenbeck, who moved for its adoption:

"Whereas the Committee for Reciprocity Information notified the 1,500 glove cutters and shavers in the union that further tariff cuts were to be considered by this committee and recommended to the President for adoption, our organization, after giving full consideration to the facts involved, submits this resolution to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and to the Committee for Reciprocity Information; and

"Whereas during the past two and a half years, the leather-glove industry located in the area of Fulton County, New York State, has suffered a serious injury caused by general economic conditions beyond its control, to such an extent that, as of May 1, 1950, the entire glove industry had in excess of 5,000 workers drawing unemployment benefits and better than 1,600, in addition to the above 5,000, who have exhausted their benefits; and

"Whereas a large portion of this group are cutters who have devoted their lives to the leather-glove industry, and who face extinction should any further tariff cuts be imposed that will aggravate the actual existing acute situation: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Consolidated Glove Cutters and Shavers Union of Fulton County are unanimously opposed to any further reduction in the tariff; and the membership votes that a group composed of officers and directors do everything in their power to prevent such cuts from being enacted; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the glove cutters recommend that, in view of the serious situation already existing, leather gloves be removed from the bargaining list; and, finally, be it

"*Resolved*, That a certified copy of this resolution be forwarded to the following: The President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the Committee for Reciprocity Information, United States Senators Irving M. Ives, Herbert Lehman, and George Malone; Congressman Bernard W. Kearney; James H. Casey, Jr., secretary of the National Association of Leather Glove Manufacturers; and to the entire membership of the House and Senate of the United States."

Norway's Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER A. CHESNEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 23, 1950

Mr. CHESNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to extend to His Excellency King Haakon and to all the people of Norway my warmest greetings on their celebration of the anniversary of Independence Day on May 17.

The American people have always had a warm affection and a great respect for Norway. Many of our finest citizens are direct decesendants of the heroic Viking land. During World War II we became more cognizant than ever before of the valor of Norwegian fighting men and women, and of the Norwegian population. The courage and fortitude of the Norwegian people by practicing the strictest economy, rigidly denying themselves of the smallest luxury in working out their economic recovery has gained them the admiration of all honest people.

During these troubled times the bravery of these people in boldly entering into the North Atlantic Pact along with her sister Denmark is most remarkable when one stops to consider their close proximity to the Russian hordes. May this brave country under the able leadership of King Haakon hold determinedly to its independence and to the traditional freedoms of its citizens.

I know the members of this legislative body will join with me in sending our warmest congratulations and wishes for a greater prosperity and a lasting peace.

The Foreign Aid Bill, or the Folly of a National Inferiority Complex

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BYRNES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 23, 1950

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a radio broadcast I made over stations in my district on April 18.

When the foreign aid bill was originally before the House, Members will recall that I spoke against the bill and voted against its final passage. Because of my previous support of the Marshall plan, I felt that my constituents should be informed promptly and in detail of the reasons for my position. Those reasons, applicable perhaps in greater degree to the conference report which we consider today, are covered in my April 18 broadcast to my district.

The broadcast follows:

YOUR WASHINGTON OFFICE

This discussion tonight might be titled either "Compromise as a Political Weapon" or "The Folly of a National Inferiority Complex."

I would like to talk about danger of compromise tonight as well as the folly of a national inferiority complex in relation to the recently passed foreign-aid bill. This is the bill which authorizes our 1951 participation in the European recovery program, as well as a number of other foreign projects which I will discuss later. This bill has passed the House and will shortly be considered by the Senate.

I was one of only 86 Congressmen who voted against the bill. My vote was a protest against the use of compromise as a political weapon and against the folly of building up a national inferiority complex as a basis for promoting our foreign policy.

By far the most important part of the foreign-aid bill was the authorization for a 1-year extension of the European recovery program, popularly known as the Marshall plan.

SUPPORTS MARSHALL PLAN

As most of you know, I have consistently supported this program. As a matter of fact, and as coincidence would have it, the same day that former Secretary of State George Marshall made his now-famous speech at Harvard in June of 1947 calling for the self-help approach to European recovery, I was making a speech in Milwaukee before the National Convention of the Young Republicans, calling for an end to the piece-meal approach to European recovery, and asking for a "bold program for peace" geared to a single administration of European recovery programs based upon rehabilitation rather than relief.

In general terms, the Marshall plan followed this approach, and I supported the original program and have voted for its extension since. I have praised the program, when I felt it deserved praise, and I have criticized it when I felt that it deserved criticism. I feel that it has accomplished a good deal in the recovery of Europe, but I do not hesitate to point out that it has not done all I had hoped toward the integration of European economies. The removal of intra-European barriers to trade, such as blocked currencies, embargoes and the like has not proceeded at anywhere near the rate we had the right to expect when we undertook the program.

NEW PROGRAMS ADDED

Still and all, it is my firm belief that we have a definite commitment to the free countries of Europe, that it is to our self-interest to keep them free and strong, and that the Marshall plan should be continued until its planned expiration date in 1952. This does not mean that Congress should not carefully scrutinize each year's authorization to revise the program or to determine how much can be constructively spent or how much this country can safely afford. We have no commitment, in law or in fact, to any exact sum or any set provisions.

In other words, it was my intention to support the extension of the Marshall plan for another year, voting for those reductions in funds which could safely be pruned without impairing the effectiveness of the program.

But—and here is where compromise as a political weapon comes in—I had no opportunity to vote on the Marshall plan, standing alone on its merits. Instead, if I wanted to take the Marshall plan, along with every other Member of the House, I had to take three other programs of dubious merit along with it. (These other three programs were aid to Palestine refugees, most of them Arabs, a $200,000,000 far-eastern assistance program, including $100,000,000 for Korea, and $45,000,000 to get the President's controversial point 4 program under way.) These three programs were thrown into the Marshall-plan authorization by the administration knowing that if they had to stand on their own feet, they would have had a hard time standing up.

LEGISLATIVE TRICK

This is an old legislative trick. It has been used frequently in this Congress and will probably be used again. The idea is to gain votes for programs with little or questionable support by including them in bills for which there is substantial and widespread support. Standing alone, I do not believe more than a handful of Congressmen would have opposed or voted against the Marshall-plan authorization. Similarly, standing alone, as they should have done, these three new foreign-aid programs, would probably have not garnered sufficient votes to pass or would have been changed radically in the process. Put together, however, the whole program, while gathering substantial opposition, passed the House easily.

The question, here, is, "How far must a Congressman go in accepting the bad with the good?"

Let's consider the facts in this case. There is much talk about a bipartisan, or an unpartisan, foreign policy. We may say, I believe, that in its inception the Marshall plan was an example of the highest expression of this kind of policy, since it was developed by a Republican Congress with the support of a Democratic administration. Bipartisanship in foreign policy means more, however, that just Republicans and Democrats voting together for foreign-policy measures. It means that Republicans and Democrats alike must participate in the formulation of those measures, in their development, and in their final acceptance. Bipartisanship is a two-way street.

HARMS BIPARTISANSHIP

I can think of no better way to kill the spirit of bipartisanship in foreign affairs than to jam new programs down the throats of Members of Congress, whose party leaders have not been consulted in the formation of these programs and who are given the stultifying alternative of either voting for these programs, or of casting a vote against a program they may believe in. Vote, we were told last week, for all of these programs, including the ones of which you are skeptical, or you vote against the Marshall plan. I refused to be blackmailed in this manner. The point 4 program, one of the included programs, for instance, while calling for only a nominal sum the first year, has been estimated by the Senate Expenditures Committee staff to entail future spending totaling at least $500,000,000 every year. There are broad and important questions of policy to be determined in the original authorization of such a program. The House, dawdling along while it waits for the Senate to catch up, has plenty of time to give full-scale debate to such a momentous issue. The only possible reason for including it with the Marshall-plan authorization was that its proponents were afraid it could not stand up alone, and that it could only be passed if included with must legislation.

Compromising, in this case, I firmly believe, did almost irreparable harm to the spirit of bipartisanship in foreign policy, prevented full discussion of a vital foreign policy determination and saddled us with three new foreign commitments of dubious merit. It is for these reasons that I refuse to lend my support to the use of such compromise as a political weapon, and it was for these reasons that I voted against the entire bill.

THE HONEST WAY

But, what about the effect of my vote? What if my vote had served to defeat the entire measure? Well, in the first place, I can assure you that if this bill had been defeated largely because of loading it down with new programs, we would have had a new bill, this time dealing only with the Marshall plan, so fast it would have made monkeys out of

those who have said that Congress is a slow-moving body. And further, the new bill would have passed the House with many less votes against it. In fact, I am sure that at least four or five Members from Wisconsin who voted against the bill as presented to us would have voted for a bill dealing only with the Marshall plan. Such action would have been a rebuke to those who speak of bipartisanship but sabotage that policy by autocratic and partisan actions.

However, if this basically honest way of handling this legislative problem had been followed, you and I can hear, even now, the cries that would have arisen in the State Department and from certain segments of the so-called liberal press and among the commentators.

"What will Europe think?", those voices would say. "Congress has repudiated the Marshall plan. Congress has gone back on its friends. Congress has sabotaged our foreign policy. What dopes our friends in Europe must think we are now. Of course, we can remedy this by passing a new bill, but the harm has been done. Our friends in Europe will never trust us again." Thus, the wail would go up in this country, and the tears would flow copiously throughout the land. The sure knowledge of this reaction led many Members to vote for the bill even though they were opposed to many of the things in it.

INFERIORITY COMPLEX

I say to you right now, however, that this wail, which we have heard frequently in the past, is nothing more nor less than an inferiority complex which is doing more harm to this country and its foreign policy than almost any other single factor.

Are we so ashamed of the workings of our representative system of Government that we gage the results of our legislative actions not upon their merits but upon the reaction of other governments to our deliberations?

Are our elected representatives to decide issues, not upon the basis of their understanding of them, but upon the basis of what other nations and governments will think if Congressmen vote "aye" or if they vote "no"?

If our foreign policy has not the strength, if our appeal to other nations in this titanic struggle for the minds of men is so weak, that neither can withstand the pull-and-tug of the legislative process in a representative republic, then certainly we have little hope for success in coming battles of the cold war.

I, for one, have enough confidence in the intelligence of the citizens of Europe to believe they will judge us upon the end result, rather than upon our method of achieving that end result. And, I believe even more strongly, that that end result will be better for us and for the other nations of the world if we meet our problems by recognizing the genius of the American representative system of government instead of stifling that genius by holding the extraneous issue of world opinion over the heads of our legislators.

Too often, in the past, we Members of Congress have been asked to pass foreign-policy legislation, not upon the basis of its merits alone, but upon the basis that we cannot afford to risk lowering our prestige in the world by failing to pass it. There are some members of the State Department, and some Members of Congress, who shudder to subject tender foreign-policy bills to the rough handling of the legislative process for fear that some Member will give foreign nations the wrong impression during debate.

SELLING FREEDOM

In my view, we will win the cold war, God willing, not by gagging free debate, violent though it may be, in order to impress peoples that we are solidly united, but by showing them that we are not afraid to subject the most delicate issue to the crucible of full discussion. We are selling freedom in this cold war; we won't find any buyers for freedom if we enter the arena of conflict with an inferiority complex toward the institutions of that freedom. If our diplomats continue to manifest their distrust of Congress, if they continue to have an inferiority complex toward its actions, they are ill-equipped to sell American freedom to those who must make the choice between it and communism.

Truly, in my opinion, those who have adopted compromise as a political weapon and those who foster a national inferiority complex to promote foreign policy are serving neither sound political action nor a dynamic foreign policy.

Federal Aid and Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS H. WERDEL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1950

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Speaker, as we walk about the halls adjacent to this Chamber, we hear it often said that the hour of this second session of the Eighty-first Congress is growing late, and that Federal aid to education is as dead as slavery. As the author of a bill to provide Federal aid in those areas of the United States which cannot supply a reasonable minimum standard of education for themselves, I am deeply concerned by these statements. If they are true, then I firmly believe it is the result of the selfish desires of certain proponents of similar legislation. It is undoubtedly true that the American public is becoming more critical of Federal tax moneys raised on their home in order to give supervised aid to their home. I am reminded of the published quotations from Andrew Jackson, in the United States News of December 28, 1936. That publication quoted ex-President Jackson as saying:

SPENDING PUBLIC FUNDS FOR POLITICS

We have it constantly before our eyes that professions of superior zeal in the cause of internal improvement and a disposition to lavish the public funds upon objects of this character are daily and earnestly put forth by aspirants to power as constituting the highest claims to the confidence of the people. Would it be strange, under such circumstances, and in times of great excitement, that grants of this description should find their motives in objects which may not accord with the public good?

Those who have not had occasion to see and regret the indication of a sinister influence in these matters in past times have been more fortunate than myself in their observation of the course of public affairs. * * *

LIMITATIONS ON AUTHORITY OF EXECUTIVE

In the regulations which Congress may prescribe respecting the custody of the public moneys it is desirable that as little discretion as may be deemed consistent with their safekeeping should be given to executive agents. No one can be more deeply impressed than I am with the soundness of the doctrine which restrains and limits, by specific provisions, executive discretion, as far as it can be done consistently with the preservation of its constitutional character. In respect to the control over the public money this doctrine is peculiarly applicable. * * *

The duty of the legislature to define by clear and positive enactments, the nature and extent of the action which belongs to the Executive to superintend springs out of a policy analogous to that which enjoins upon all the branches of the Federal Government an abstinence from the exercise of powers not clearly granted. * * *

The same rule of action should make the President ever anxious to avoid the exercise of any discretionary authority which can be regulated by Congress. The biases which may operate upon him will not be so likely to extend to the representatives of the people in that body. In my former message to Congress I have repeatedly urged the propriety of lessening the discretionary authority lodged in the various departments. * * *

EQUAL LOADS INTENDED FOR THE STATES

The shortest reflection must satisfy everyone that to require the people to pay taxes to the Government merely that they may be paid back again is sporting with the substantial interests of the country, and no system which produces such a result can be expected to receive the public countenance. * * * A distribution to the people is impracticable and unjust. * * * It would be taking one man's property and giving it to another. * * * We know that they contribute unequally, and a rule, therefore, that would distribute to them equally would be liable to all the objections which apply to the principle of an equal division of property. To make the general Government the instrument of carrying this odious principle into effect would be at once to destroy the means of its usefulness and change the character designed for it by the framers of the Constitution. * * *

It was certainly the intention of that provision of the Constitution which declares that "all duties, imposts, and excises" shall "be uniform throughout the United States" to make the burdens of taxation fall equally on the people in whatever State of the Union they may reside. But what would be the value of such a uniform rule if the moneys raised by it could be immediately returned by a different one which will give to the people of some States much more and to those of others much less than their fair proportions? * * * It would be easy to show how by the operation of such a principle the large States of the Union would not only have to contribute their just share toward the support of the Federal Government, but also have to bear in some degree the taxes necessary to support the governments of their smaller sisters.

SYSTEM NOT SANCTIONED BY FOUNDERS

A system liable to such objections can never be supposed to have been sanctioned by the framers of the Constitution when they conferred on Congress the taxing power, and I feel persuaded that a mature examination of the subject will satisfy everyone that there are insurmountable difficulties in the operation of any plan which can be devised of collecting revenue for the purpose of distributing it. Congress is only authorized to levy taxes "to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States."

There is no such provision as would authorize Congress to collect together the property of the country, under the name of revenue, for the purpose of dividing it equally or unequally among the States or the people. Indeed, it is not probable that such an idea ever occurred to the States when they adopted the Constitution. But however this may be, the only safe rule for us in interpreting the powers granted to the Federal Government is to regard the absence of express authority to touch a subject so important and delicate as this is as equivalent to a prohibition * * *

All will admit that the simplicity and economy of the State governments mainly depend on the fact that money has to be supplied to support them by the same men, or their agents, who vote it away in appropriations. Hence, when there are extravagant and wasteful appropriations there must be a corresponding increase of taxes, and the people, becoming awakened, will necessarily scrutinize the character of measures which thus increase their burdens.

By the watchful eye of self-interest the agents of the people in the State governments are repressed and kept within the limits of a just economy. But if the necessity of levying the taxes be taken from those who make the appropriations and thrown upon a more distant and less responsible set of public agents, who have power to approach the people by an indirect and stealthy taxation, there is reason to fear that prodigality will soon supersede those characteristics which have thus far made us look with so much pride and confidence to the State governments as the mainstay of our Union and liberties * * *.

BAD EFFECT OF THE POLICY ON LEGISLATURES

The State legislatures, instead of studying to restrict their State expenditures to the smallest possible sum, will claim credit for their profusion, and harass the general government for increased supplies. Practically there would soon be but one taxing power, and that vested in a body of men far removed from the people, in which the farming and mechanic interests would scarcely be represented. The States would gradually lose their purity as well as their independence; they would not dare to murmur at the proceedings of the general government lest they should lose their supplies; all would be merged in a practical consolidation, cemented by widespread corruption, which could only be eradicated by one of those bloody revolutions which occasionally overthrow the despotic systems of the Old World.

The safest and simplest mode of obviating all the difficulties which have been mentioned is to collect only revenue enough to meet the wants of the Government, and let the people keep the balance of their property in their own hands, to be used for their own profit. Each State will then support its own government and contribute its due share toward the support of the general government.

BIG NATIONAL DEBT A PERIL FOR COUNTRY

The experience of other nations admonishes us to hasten the extinguishment of the public debt. No political maxim is better established than that which tells us that an improvident expenditure of money is the parent of profligacy, and that no people can hope to perpetuate their liberties who long acquiesce in a policy which taxes them for objects not necessary to the legitimate and real wants of their government.

Flattering as is the condition of our country at the present period because of its unexampled advance in all steps of social and political improvement, it cannot be disguised that there is a lurking danger already apparent in the neglect of this warning truth, and that the time has arrived when the representatives of the people should be employed in devising some more appropriate remedy than now exists to avert it. * * *

WORKERS ARE HARDEST HIT BY INFLATION

The progress of an expansion, or rather a depreciation, of the currency by excessive bank issues is always attended by a loss to the laboring classes. This portion of the community have neither time nor opportunity to watch the ebbs and flows of the money market.

Engaged from day to day in their useful toils, they do not perceive that although their wages are nominally the same, or even somewhat higher, they are greatly reduced in fact by the rapid increase of a spurious currency, which, as it appears to make money abound, they are at first inclined to consider a blessing.

It is not so with the speculator, by whom this operation is better understood, and is made to contribute to his advantage. It is not until the prices of the necessaries of life become so dear that the laboring classes cannot supply their wants out of their wages that the wages rise and gradually reach a justly proportioned rate to that of the products of their labor.

When thus, by the depreciation in consequence of the quantity of paper in circulation, wages as well as prices become exorbitant, it is soon found that the whole effect of the adulteration is a [drain] (word inserted) on our home industry for the benefit of the countries where gold and silver circulate and maintain uniformity and moderation in prices. It is then perceived that the enhancement of the price of land and labor produces a corresponding increase in the price of products until these products do not sustain a competition with similar ones in other countries, and thus both manufactured and agricultural productions cease to bear exportation from the country of the spurious currency, because they cannot be sold for cost.

When the agents for the collection of taxes due to the Federal Government go forth to make their collections from our citizens, they return with more money from my State of California than from any other State in the Union, except Illinois, New York, and Pennsylvania. From my State, those agents collected, in 1949, $2,955,909,545. The total income of the State of California was only $14,000,000,000 last year.

When the cost of State and local government is added to the $3,000,000,000 collected by the Federal Government in California, it is apparent that the people of that State are paying approximately one-third of the State's total income for costs of government.

Before discussing the Federal-aid-to-education bills, I want to point out to the House certain glaring realities in regard to Federal grants-in-aid as they affect California. California received back from the Federal Government, for all purposes, in 1949, only $372,984,862. In other words, California received back from Washington 12.27 percent of the money collected by the Federal Government in that State.

If we deduct 70 percent of the total paid by California for the cost of Federal Government, as California's proportion of the cost of past wars, public debt, cold wars, and all of the costs of the general administration of Government, including the 2,080,000 Federal employees in the general administration of Government, you have left $886,000,000 paid by California as its proportionate cost of the Federal grants-in-aid program. They cover old-age assistance, roads, veterans' rehabilitation, soil conservation, agriculture extension, school-lunch programs, vocational education, public health service, child health service, unemployment compensation, National Guard, and many others, totaling about 50 such programs.

By deducting what California actually does get back, namely: $372,984,862 from $886,000,000, you will see that California loses in the whole Federal-aid manipulation, about $513,015,138 each year. That is approximately more than 57 cents out of every dollar. In other words, 57 cents out of every dollar collected in California by the Treasury Department for Federal grants-in-aid programs are not returned to California.

The citizens of California are beginning to realize that the words "Federal aid" are a deception, and that for California taxpayers, the belief that there can be Federal aid, is an illusion.

There is no doubt but what the Federal Government is constantly impoverishing the States and the local State subdivisions, so that they cannot adequately provide for their own self-government and desired local government projects. Agencies of the United States Government are successfully using Federal aid projects as an excuse for taking money from California citizens for other purposes. In other words, California is paying annually for Federal-aid projects, $513,788,000 that by rights should go back to California. That is a sum equal to about twice the original estimated cost of the Central Valley project. It is paid annually by the people of California and voted by this Legislature away from California in vote-getting projects in other parts of this Nation as prophesied by Andrew Jackson. We have about 2,000,000 heads of families in California. By its secret tax-collecting methods, our National Government collects $1,500 a year out of the standard of living of each family in California. It returns back to California only $186 per family. It collects for so-called Federal-aid projects $443 per family per year and spends $257, per California family, of the amount collected in other parts of the United States, for the political purposes of the National Government.

It is small wonder, therefore, that the California housewives who must balance the family budget are awakening to the fact that there is no such thing as Federal aid for California. The citizens of California are awakening to the fact that they would be much better off to keep their own money, manage it themselves, and raise their own teachers' salaries, out of their own funds.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I want to make reference to the table printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at page 5316, on April 29, 1949. The table was prepared by the Council of State Chambers of Commerce, based on data prepared by the National Education Association, in conformity with provisions of S. 246, as amended February 4, 1949. This table differs somewhat from table 2, shown in the Senate Labor and Welfare Committee report on S. 246, which fails to show the penalty amounts deducted in the case of 10 States under section 4 (D) of S. 246. The figures in the table showing what each State's taxpayers would pay are based on tax-distribution formula used in Spending Facts Bulletin No. 36. The table purports to show what each State gets and what each State will

pay under Senate bill 246. I, therefore, quote it as follows:

What each State gets and what each State pays under S. 246

	What each State would receive	What each State's taxpayers would pay toward the program	Net gain (+) or loss (−)
Alabama	$14,451,000	$3,056,000	+$11,395,000
Arizona	1,500,000	911,000	+589,000
Arkansas	11,708,000	1,716,000	+9,992,000
California	8,435,000	22,304,000	−13,869,000
Colorado	1,240,000	2,171,000	−931,000
Connecticut	1,685,000	4,638,000	−2,953,000
Delaware	280,000	1,072,000	−792,000
Florida	2,365,000	3,458,000	−1,093,000
Georgia	14,163,000	3,780,000	+10,383,000
Idaho	625,000	804,000	−179,000
Illinois	7,490,000	21,125,000	−13,635,000
Indiana	3,825,000	5,978,000	−2,153,000
Iowa	2,625,000	3,968,000	−1,343,000
Kansas	1,880,000	3,110,000	−1,230,000
Kentucky	13,367,000	3,137,000	+10,230,000
Louisiana	10,370,000	3,003,000	+7,367,000
Maine	945,000	1,206,000	−261,000
Maryland	2,010,000	4,557,000	−2,547,000
Massachusetts	4,115,000	9,571,000	−5,456,000
Michigan	6,235,000	12,546,000	−6,311,000
Minnesota	2,920,000	4,960,000	−2,040,000
Mississippi	15,469,000	1,743,000	+13,726,000
Missouri	3,790,000	6,890,000	−3,100,000
Montana	585,000	858,000	−273,000
Nebraska	1,305,000	2,359,000	−1,054,000
Nevada	125,000	349,000	−224,000
New Hampshire	505,000	777,000	−272,000
New Jersey	3,840,000	8,713,000	−4,873,000
New Mexico	3,130,000	697,000	+2,433,000
New York	11,925,000	41,499,000	−29,574,000
North Carolina	21,070,000	4,209,000	+16,861,000
North Dakota	860,000	911,000	−51,000
Ohio	7,320,000	15,629,000	−8,309,000
Oklahoma	8,350,000	2,868,000	+5,482,000
Oregon	1,410,000	2,708,000	−1,298,000
Pennsylvania	10,120,000	20,803,000	−10,683,000
Rhode Island	645,000	1,555,000	−910,000
South Carolina	13,365,000	1,930,000	+11,435,000
South Dakota	1,080,000	885,000	+195,000
Tennessee	10,629,000	3,565,000	+7,064,000
Texas	10,845,000	10,804,000	+41,000
Utah	1,170,000	885,000	+285,000
Vermont	390,000	483,000	−93,000
Virginia	4,074,000	3,968,000	+106,000
Washington	2,250,000	4,236,000	−1,986,000
West Virginia	9,360,000	2,305,000	+7,055,000
Wisconsin	3,325,000	5,522,000	−2,197,000
Wyoming	290,000	429,000	−139,000
District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, etc	8,622,000	3,432,000	+5,190,000
Total	268,083,000	268,083,000	

I direct your attention to that part of the table disclosing the figures in connection with California. You will observe that under Senate bill 246, California would pay in $22,304,000, and would receive back only $8,435,000. California would annually lose in this transaction $13,869,000.

I also direct your attention to the fact that S. 246 now only purports to appropriate about $300,000,000 per year, and that the eventual purpose of some of its proponents is that the total appropriation approach the sum of $5,000,000,000, in a few years. The Federal Government and the planners of the Central Valley project have been working on and expanding the cost of that project for almost 20 years.

From the foregoing figures, it can be seen that S. 246, under the guise of Federal aid to education in California, would deprive California taxpayers in the period of time that the Central Valley project has been in the course of construction of a sum equal to the original estimated cost of that project. That is to say, the difference between what California would pay for Federal aid to education and what it would receive in the program, as it appears in its infancy under S. 246, would, in 20 years, deprive California of approximately $280,000,000. If the reported purpose of some of the proponents of the legislation is accomplished, it would deprive California annually, under the formula of S. 246, of the sum of $236,000,000.

I know of no person in California who does not desire to improve our public-school system and pay teachers' salaries in sufficient amount to justly compensate them for their years of education and to adequately staff our California schools with competent teachers. However, many of our California citizens are being misled by some of the proponents of this legislation. The argument is that the amount a State receives out of Federal-aid projects cannot be measured only in dollars and cents. The very worth-while argument is presented that ignorance is a national problem important to all local areas because uneducated persons can and do travel across State lines and wherever those persons are located in their adult years they cannot meet their requirements of citizenship. I believe we must all admit the fact that certain areas of our country with low income and large numbers of children are not able to adequately finance education at the local level. If we admit that condition and also admit that it creates a national problem, then, of course, California should acknowledge its just expense in alleviating the condition.

However, I want to refer you again to the table that I have heretofore mentioned in my remarks. I also want to direct your attention to the fact that S. 246 sets forth a formula admittedly based on the so-called rich State-poor State concept. The original allotment to each State is either, first, the amount by which $50 multiplied by the number of children from 5 to 17 years of age in the State exceeds a sum equaling 1 percent of a 5-year average of aggregate individual income for that State; or, alternatively second, a flat amount of $5 per child from 5 to 17 years of age, whichever is greater.

You will note from the third column of the table that the amount is set forth by which all of the States would either gain or lose under the formula. There are 18 States that gain and there are 30 States that lose money under the formula. In theory, the States that lose money are the richer States, and, therefore, should aid the 18 States that gain money. Under the theory of the bill, the 30 States that lose money are all able to finance their own education systems within their States. If we divide the amount that a State pays, by the total estimated cost of $268,083,000, we will determine the percentage that the aggregate taxpayers of each State pay on the total appropriation. In the case of California, that is 8.2 percent. Then, if you will total the amount of money to be paid to the poor States, you will find it to be about $120,000,000. In other words, the proponents of the bill, under the guise of aiding education in the United States, are raising only $120,000,000 for needy areas and yet raise $148,000,000 for States that admittedly can finance their own school systems. By multiplying the $120,000,000 by 8.2 percent, it is readily discernible that the State of California would pay $9,840,000 of the sum raised to aid the needy States. It is, therefore, also apparent that California pays $12,564,000 into the $148,000,000 pool, to be distributed to States that admittedly can finance and operate their own schools, and yet receives back only $8,435,000. In other words, after paying its just portion to aid the needy States, California still pays $12,564,000 annually to help the Federal Government infiltrate education in States that can operate and finance their own schools, and only receives back 57 percent of that amount. This amounts to an annual appropriation from the taxpayers of California for the political purposes of the Federal Government, to be handed out to States which, like California, admittedly can finance their own school systems, the sum of $3,129,000. This is a deliberate fraud and theft of California taxpayers' money and if some of the proponents of the bill accomplish their purpose, to increase this total appropriation to $5,000,000,000, the fraud in California will be stupendous. In addition to paying its just portion to aid the needy States, it will be annually deprived of $53,000,000, to be sent to States that admittedly have no more need for aid than California has.

Under such circumstances, it is readily understandable why the State government officials of California, like those of all the other States, have made no request for Federal funds to aid the schools of their States. At the present time, the children of school age are increasing in California at the estimated rate of 40 percent every 2 years.

No person who understands the provisions of S. 246 and is aware of the circumstances that place urgent demands on California schools, could reasonably support S. 246. The cost of educating a child in average daily attendance, in California, is estimated at $180 per year. It seems unbelievable that persons attached to the California school system should support a powerful teachers' lobby in Washington, when they know that California can only receive $5 per school child under the terms of S. 246. In compliance with the desires of that lobby, they are now politically active in California. They are propagandizing the taxpayers of that State and recommending that our presently over-burdened taxpayers pay $13,869,000 per year to the other States of the Nation. They do this knowing that California is now being flooded with new families from those other States, increasing our school responsibilities at an alarming rate. These new children will cost California at least $180 per year to educate. Some of these proponents undoubtedly act on selfish motives—perhaps, they eventually hope to earmark funds received from Washington for teachers' salaries. An analysis of S. 246 will demonstrate that such

persons are shortsighted. Out of a selfish motive, they are deliberately aiding in setting up a Washington bureau that will further disable California in its ability to pay higher teachers' salaries and increase other public school facilities.

A review of the history of public education in California will conclusively demonstrate that both the people and the legislature of that State are desirous of improving our excellent public schools and increasing teachers' salaries to where they are fair and reasonable. There are still other persons attached to the California public school system who support S. 246 as a political stepping stone for themselves. We hear reports that some people in the education field in California are mouthing falsehoods and half-truths conceived by some of their Washington lobbyists. They are willing to prostitute their prestige for personal political gain, and knowingly make confusing statements on this subject, which is difficult for the average person to understand. To be a demagogic functioning part of such a lobby as a salaried employee in the field of education in California is a situation that I cannot find words to describe.

The only conceivable purpose of the provision granting $5.00 per child of school age in S. 246 to States that admittedly can finance their own education, is to open the door to a selfish lobby in the future. I have received the following wire from one of such persons. He is presently the County Superintendent of Schools of Kern County, Calif. The wire as received by myself, reads as follows:

APRIL 22, 1950.

HON. THOMAS H. WERDEL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Two years ago you pledged yourself to support Federal aid to education without Federal control. Your single vote in committee defeated S. 246 which did not contain Federal control. I have liked you and your family. Members of my family are your close friends. From my point of view you have not carried through on your pledge to education and I can be satisfied with results only. Passage of the Burke bill will, however, clear your record since you single-handedly defeated S. 246. You have the obligation of seeing that an adequate Federal aid bill without Federal control is passed into law before honor is restored with Catholics, Masons, teachers, trustees, etc., all opposed to Federal control of education. It is obvious that Federal aid to education can be continued after a history of 165 years' support with Federal control.

JESSE D. STOCKTON,
County Superintendent of Schools,

I cite the wire to show how far the National Education Association has gone in organizing the country for political activity. It also demonstrates how they will use elected school officials in the States, who are themselves politically ambitious, to aid in setting up a Washington Bureau intended to accomplish the eventual control and centralization of education in the United States. The wire states that I pledged myself to vote for a particular measure before I was elected. This is false. S. 246 had not even been drafted at the time I am alleged to have made the pledge. The State law of California makes the solicitation of such promises, as well as the giving of such promises by a candidate, a crime. Perhaps, that is too much to expect the Kern County Superintendent of Schools to know, so I will quote the California law in that regard:

SUBSEC. 5006. Soliciting or giving pledge to vote in specified way on certain prospective measures (acts constituting misdemeanor): Every person is guilty of a misdemeanor who, either individually or as an officer or member of any committee or association, solicits or demands of any candidate for the legislature, supervisor, school director, or for any legislative body, that he vote for or against any particular bill or measure which may come before the body to which he may be elected. Every candidate for any of such offices is guilty of a misdemeanor who signs or gives any pledge that he will vote for or against any particular bill or measure that may be brought before any such body.

(Excepted pledge or promise:) The provisions of this section do not apply to any pledge or promise that any candidate may give to a convention by which he may be nominated for any such office, or to those who sign a certificate for his nomination. (Enacted 1939.)

The wire also insists that in order to salvage my lost honor, I aid in the immediate passage of the so-called Burke bill. It is my considered opinion that neither the author of the wire, nor anyone else in America, understood the language of the Burke bill at the time the wire was sent. The only thing that was certain in the Burke bill was that the desires of the CIO and certain elements of the National Education Association would be accomplished. For political purposes, the bill did earmark about $300,000,000 for school teachers' salaries. It is a definite deliberate step away from local control of education. It is an expression of National policy that the local school boards will not be fair and reasonable in determining how local school funds for their respective school districts should be expended.

The gentleman from the Tenth District of Ohio [Mr. BURKE] is the author of the Burke bill. The congressional directory discloses his many official connections with the United Auto Workers, CIO. The fact that the CIO are actively supporting the gentleman's bill cannot be denied.

In the last sentence of his wire, the Kern County superintendent of schools uses the common tactic of demagog politicians by referring to groups and classes of honorable American citizens to which we all owe and give respect.

The fact is that on numerous occasions I have written the Kern County superintendent of schools, enclosing copies of proposed legislation, expecting to receive comments from him as to how such legislation would affect Kern County, Calif. On those occasions I also anticipated that I might receive an opinion in the interest of California schools, expressed by a person qualified on the subject. I received few replies. They were expressed in generalities and it now seems clear that even at that time the author of the wire had alined himself with the left-wing invasion which has already taken control of the Democrat central committee in that county. He is apparently willing to dignify their cause by having the title "County Superintendent of Schools" attached to it. He is apparently willing to participate in their demagoguery by aiding in their programs of falsehoods, half-truths, confusion, corruption, and Federal control.

The wire also states that I single-handedly defeated S. 246. This is also false. I am not advised whether the Kern County superintendent of schools knew the statement to be false when he made it or not. It is possible that he was acting on the advice of the power-hungry element of the National Education Association lobby. The fact is, I could not support S. 246 without amendments to protect California. It is also a fact that, in my opinion, S. 246 was so amended in the House Education and Labor Committee that no person could reasonably support it when the motion was made to vote it out of committee. It is a fact that on March 15 I cast the controlling vote to keep the subject of Federal aid to education open for further discussions in the House committee, including S. 246.

I could not support S. 246 in its present form because it discriminated against California schools as hereinabove set forth. I also could not support aid to States who admittedly can finance their own education. Such action, in my opinion, is only requested by proponents of this legislation so that an existing vicious lobby can use it for selfish political purposes. In my opinion, if the selfish purposes were accomplished, it would not benefit the school teachers of my State. In this connection, I am also unwilling to participate in a movement by that lobby group to so earmark funds as to take them from under the control of the local school board of trustees.

I also oppose any provision which would give money to a State on the basis of children of school age in that State, rather than on the basis of children actually attending school. The Southern States have enjoyed a long history in our country. They were not always "poor States." However, in all that history, some of them have not seen fit to pass truancy laws and require a certain degree of education of their children of school age. I believe that if we handed ten or fifteen million dollars per year to some of the political machines of the Southern States, to be used as they saw fit without truancy laws, we would be creating the very situation that would soon demand Federal control of education in those States. The demand would come from the other States of the Nation that are paying the bill.

The education discussions in the House committee charged with the responsibility of hearing that legislation have been interesting. I am one of those who could not support a requested amendment providing for bus transportation for private schools. I want to make it clear that I do not believe that there were any proponents of such amendments that desired Federal aid to

private schools. In fact, I am firmly convinced that those groups that expressed the desire for Federal assistance in transporting children to private schools would actively and strenuously oppose the principle of Federal aid to private schools, as such. However, I could not agree with such groups that transportation to school is an auxiliary service to be rendered to the individual child. I felt that such service would be cumbersome and difficult to render. It would be unreasonably costly. I also felt that adequate teachers' salaries, playground facilities, school buildings, and so forth, could be classified as benefits to the individual child, as well as hot-lunch programs, medical attention, and transportation. The question in my mind was: Is bus transportation not only of benefit to the individual child but is it also a benefit to the private school? I felt that it was. I believe that private schools would be developed in the future in reliance upon bus facilities. They would be geographically located for efficiency purposes in reliance upon school transportation facilities supplied by Washington. I believed that a threat of discontinuance of such services in the future, after private schools had oriented themselves to the granted services, would conclusively demonstrate that they would affect the private schools of the future. It is the threat of discontinuance of Government hand-outs that leads to eventual Government control and direction.

It is my honest opinion that the Federal lunch program and physical and medical examinations extended to children through school facilities are not education and are not of particular benefit to a school so as to alter its economic condition. The transportation amendment is to be distinguished from these two services in that it is not only of benefit to the individual child, but it is a definite economic benefit to private school education, and could not help but alter the financial policies and school plans of such schools.

Mr. Speaker, I am one of three Members of this House who introduced identical bills providing for Federal aid to needy States. The number of my bill is H. R. 7221. It has been before the Committee on Education and Labor, but no appreciable time was allotted by the chairman for its consideration. That bill is free of the following objectionable features of Senate bill 246:

First. It does not grant aid to areas of the United States which admittedly do not need such aid. It grants aid in proportion to the respective States' efforts to aid themselves.

Second. It covers all States whenever the income of the States falls so low that such States cannot finance a minimum standard of education by spending that percentage of their State income spent on the average by the other States of the Nation. It, therefore, would not lead to greater and greater Federal control. The respective State departments of education would have complete control of the funds.

Third. H. R. 7221 is not both unfair and dishonest as is Senate bill 246. It is an honest proposal. According to its avowed purposes, it would distribute money only to those States that are put forward as indigent cases. In this connection, Senate bill 246 rests on the same purpose by way of argument, but by its language it takes from all of the States and gives back to all of the States. Senate bill 246, therefore, runs up a heavy bureaucratic expense and thus demonstrates that its proponents want an overall distribution so as to eventually exercise over-all control.

Fourth. H. R. 7221 is not a group pressure movement. Although in fact it accomplishes the purposes expressed Nation-wide by the National Education Association, it is not supported by that lobby. There is no probability under this bill that the powers of local school trustees would ever be curtailed by earmarking the funds for the purposes of some lobby.

Fifth. The bill would adequately finance the needy States at a total cost of only $120,000,000. The principles expressed in the bill would not require or permit the appropriation to grow into billions in a few years. There is nothing in the bill to induce proponents to grow bolder.

Sixth. Instead of undermining State responsibility and encouraging indifference at the local level, H. R. 7221 actually stimulates local responsibility and effort.

Seventh. By its formula, it only gives aid to the respective needy States on the basis of children actually attending school, as distinguished from grants for all children in the State of school age. This provision would stimulate the respective States to require the attendance in school of the children of those needy States.

The bill I introduced admits that the inability to give adequate education in low-income areas of the country creates a national problem. It admits that the State of California has an obligation of about $9,000,000 per year in that regard. But it saves $13,000,000 a year of California income to be expended in that State as its citizens might desire.

I want to point out again that I believe the Federal Government, by its policies, is bleeding the States of the Nation white. Consumers in the low-income areas of our country are paying exorbitant taxes, collected by the producers of automobiles, washing machines, and even food that poor families must eat. I believe the whole necessity of Federal aid to education could be alleviated by a change in those spending policies. The adoption of all of the Hoover Commission recommendations and the effective use of the Hoover Commission plans by the administration would save the Nation at least $2,225,000,000.

If Congress believes that all of the States or any of them is unable financially to provide an adequate system of public education, then there is a way that Congress can help. It would be more effective than through any Federal-aid-to-education bill providing for $300,000,000 to be distributed among the States. For instance, it is estimated that S. 246 would provide $11,708,000 to the State of Arkansas; it is one of the poor States. Of this appropriation, Arkansas taxpayers would contribute $1,716,000. Thus, Arkansas would gain about $9,992,000 at the expense of taxpayers of other States, including California. There is a much better way to help Arkansas, California, and all of the other States, too. It is a very simple method, except that it might cost this administration some votes. The Hoover Commission reports can be adopted and honestly put into effect by this administration. We could also save the entire Nation over $2,225,000,000 in Government payroll alone. This saving to Arkansas taxpayers would be approximately $14,000,000. Arkansas could then increase her own State support to education by that amount, which is over $4,000,000 more than the Washington planners intended to give her from my State and the other so-called rich States. This would not put any greater burden upon Arkansas than it now has and it would put no burden whatever on taxpayers of the other States. Certainly, there would be no threat of further centralization of education. If this policy could be adopted, then California would not pay in an additional $22,000,000 as required under S. 246, but she would actually be taxed $267,000,000 less than she is at the present time. California then could raise that amount without any additional burden on the standard of living of her people and build her own reclamation projects comparable to Central Valley, or, she could enter upon some other projects deemed by the local people to be in the general welfare.

I, of course, insist that this is the right way for Congress to help my State and at the same time, help the States of low income. As I have heretofore pointed out, California is now paying $2,955,909,545 a year to the Federal Government. Of that, she gets back about 12 percent. S. 246 provides that the Federal Government take still more from California and give back only about 32 percent.

Mr. Speaker, what would we think of a doctor who drained three pints of blood from a man already weak, and then exclaimed, "Why, you look anemic. I am sorry for you. You need aid. I am going to give you a transfusion of a pint of blood from my plasma bank."

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely believe that the first step in solving some of our so-called minority problems is to insure available education facilities so that free men have a full opportunity to demonstrate their individual excellence. I believe that the "gimme mine" philosophies of the pressure groups that made this administration possible have forced upon our country a spending program that is unjustifiable. If our country survives, it will be looked upon as scandalous. That political program of tax and spend forces producers of necessities to act as tax collection agents for the Federal Government in the areas of our country that have low incomes. Under those circumstances, I not only believe that a lack of education in those areas is a national problem, but I submit to you that it is obvious this situation has been created

in the well of this House and in the other body by the tax-and-spend program of this administration and its predecessor. The pressure groups have provided a compass, now being used by this administration's ship of State—the four points of that compass are well marked; they point in all four directions—to Government confusion, corruption, communism, and control.

The prophecies of Andrew Jackson are coming true. Government policies of cheap money and low interest rates have destroyed the effectiveness of private-school endowments. High income taxes and high inheritance taxes have also greatly shrunk the sources from which gifts for private schools have heretofore come. A threat of Federal control and centralization of public-school education heretofore operated by local cities, towns, and school boards is a justifiable warning to the fathers and mothers of over 2,000,000 children annually attending private elementary and secondary schools. There are those in the education field who even desire to extend Washington subsidies and controls to junior colleges and colleges.

It is poor deception for the drafters of legislation to put a clause in a subsidy bill providing for no Federal control as was done in Senate bill 246. The language of the bill, delegating and withholding powers, is the controlling feature. We have only recently received a Supreme Court decision in that regard. When farmers accepted subsidies they also got controls; when some of them objected to the controls a test case went to the Supreme Court. Justice Jackson ruled: "It is hardly lack of due process for the Government to regulate that which it subsidizes."

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I desire to quote a portion of the remarks of the gentleman from New York, the Honorable RALPH W. GWINN, found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for Saturday, July 26, 1947. In those remarks, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GWINN] ably expresses his conclusions in regard to the lobby now desiring to mold the Federal aid to education bill. Those remarks are as follows:

In this connection, it is most enlightening to see how the lobby works and also to see revealed in its public statements the character of the people who expect to control the vast money power of Federal aid and control when and it if is ever granted.

The principal registered lobbyist for Federal aid is the National Education Association. It has a membership of 386,643 paying dues for the year ending May 31, 1947, of $1,138,100. Their headquarters and personnel are greater than the Republican and Democratic Party headquarters combined. It is one of the most active power lobbies in Washington and has been for many years. Through its Journal, of national circulation among teachers, it announces:

"Arrangements have been made to throw every resource of the NEA [National Education Association] back of the campaign for Federal aid to education." (NEA Journal, February 1943, p. 35.)

"Activities [summarized] of the Director [Howard A. Dawson, director of rural education, NEA], in behalf of this bill [the Harrison-Black-Fletcher bill, 1937] as follows: Conducted negotiations for sponsorship and introduction of the bill in both Houses, through executive secretaries of State education associations and State chairman of the legislative commission arranged for controlling of candidates for Congress, for the United States Senate, and for governor in a majority of the States." (NEA convention board, Cleveland, 1937 report, p. 946.)

The lobby speaks again:

"We have powerful friends in Congress. * * * The power of the organized teaching profession has but begun to find expression and I predict that before next November 7 (election date) there will be many people in the Nation aware that the school children of America have a voice of justice and equity as well as a voice of power and of influence." (Dr. Howard A. Dawson, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 1944, p. A4258.)

Its Journal constantly hammers away for federalization, as follows:

"October is an important month for the campaign on behalf of S. 637-H. R. 2849, because it is the month before election. * * * Candidates who oppose this legislation or who are indifferent to the public schools should be defeated wherever possible." (NEA Journal, September 1945.)

We observe that whether the year be 1937, 1943, 1944, or 1945, the partisanship and intimidation remained the same. Who believes that this self-righteous and haughty spirit might change in 1948 or any other future year when the will of this organized minority of "benevolent" seekers after goodness through Federal compulsion, exercised by Federal bureaucrats, has been imposed upon American education? Imagine them as the educational controllers in Washington dishing out billions and staying content to exercise "no control." Imagine them as administrators of Federal education changing into bureaucratic lambs that would never think of encroaching upon the rights of free citizens to run their own schools, administer their own funds, and control the education of their own children in their own communities.

Then imagine what will happen when a million school teachers, tens of thousands of janitors and assistants, all educational personnel, have become the direct beneficiaries of appropriations which they might get by such organized pressure politics. Will they not quite generally support the candidates for Congress who make the biggest promises? Each succeeding election our Central Government will become more nearly controlled by employees and beneficiaries from appropriations. It is the vicious circle of statism. Add to the present 2,000,000 Federal employees a million Government-controlled or influenced teachers and public-school personnel. Then add a million tenants in the proposed Federal public housing, and you have attained the socialized state, which you will probably have to keep indefinitely.

In the face of such a way of feeling and thinking, it is imperative that we remind ourselves of the brutal truth that the modern state today everywhere is killing off a free society. Wherever the government legislates and appropriates it curtails and extinguishes still another realm of personal and communal liberty, responsibility, and economic capacity. In all languages and among all peoples, big government, however created, means less freedom. The nation is always taken over, not by the good but by the roughest and toughest when the one-party overpowering police state is finally organized.

We should constantly remember that in our country, until now, two areas of the human spirit have been left alone by our Central Government. Two areas have been left free in which the citizens themselves have governed—namely, their religious institutions and their free schools. Protecting the religious area there is the specific provisions of the Constitution itself, forbidding the Government to make any laws restricting freedom in religious matters. Above any law of the state, man's obligation and loyalty to God stand.

Having thus safeguarded the religious freedom by explicit language, our Constitution proceeds to treat Federal interference in education with a dignified and eloquent silence. This silence reflects the fundamental faith of the early American Government in its free citizens as the proud and responsible custodians of their children's education. Until now the individual States, their legislatures, counties, towns, and cities have stood fast in the maintenance of their constitutional liberty against each encroachment by Federal authority in the field of education. Since this is an established fact the insidious pressure groups demanding the unconstitutional interference with local self-government of schools, based upon local support and responsibility, stand revealed as being unauthorized and unrecognized by any political subdivision of any of the States.

They must be stopped. They must be stopped by a growing passion for self-government and by a resulting fear of the power and propaganda of the Federal Government.

Modern history proves with tragic clarity that where a nation's education is placed under a federally controlled system, freedom dies out. May the Federal Bureau of Education never become the Federal Commissar of Education in America.

In the light of the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. GWINN], it is apparent why H. R. 7221, introduced in this Congress by myself, and other legislation properly confining aid to the areas that need it, have not had consideration. To my knowledge, none of the States of this Nation have asked for Federal aid. The proponents of this subject are the above-mentioned lobby and other spending pressure groups. They do not want permanent legislation covering all States of the Nation when either at the present time or in the future, they need reasonable assistance for adequate education. They are not content to retain what we have and improve upon it. They want to destroy and recreate. Such action is vulgar in its conception and perilous in its execution.

Milk for the Kiddies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED MARSHALL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1950

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the House an editorial written by Alfred D. Stedman, in the St. Paul Sunday Pioneer Press of May 21, 1950. What Mr. Stedman says is important to every person in Washington, as well as every Member of Congress:

MILK FOR THE KIDDIES

(By Alfred D. Stedman)

Unless things have improved mighty fast lately in Washington, it is not far from the spreading sycamores that shade the Capitol approach to sights that are by contrast pitiful. The limousines with their coats of arms, bearing high-ups and their ladies southward to yacht landings for a holiday sail on the broad Potomac, must indeed be skillfully chauffeured to miss the slums.

And now a question arises as to how many of the kiddies, white or black, in those teeming, tumbledown tenements, are coming up to minimum health requirements in milk to drink. Having too little else that goes along with sanitary and healthy living, often not even decent water closets, these myriads of youngsters or their parents don't have money to buy a lot of nature's finest food. All Americans, rich, poor, and medium, are averaging only half of health needs. Thus hordes of people in seaboard cities are a vast potential dairy market. Washington therefore symbolizes one side of a two-sided story.

The other side is that Midwest dairying is crying for bigger markets for milk and cream. We would like to sell in seaboard cities paying twice the price in outlying areas here. But we're barred—barred not just by freight or other actual, legitimate cost differences, but by legal and artificial and misused sanitary barriers that amount to tariff walls.

But why pick on Washington that, after all, is only one among many seaboard markets?

Well, for one thing it's the National Capital we're talking about. There if anywhere Americans might expect that commerce would be free. Also Washington's city council is the National Congress. So people "out in the sticks" can properly have some say about what goes on there. Further, the Congress operates under the Constitution. And the Constitution happens explicitly to forbid the imposition internally of import and export exclusions of commerce among States.

And now a geographic tariff wall has been put around Washington's surrounding dairy area in Virginia, Maryland, and nearby Pennsylvania and West Virginia in a very simple way. This is done by prohibiting milk and cream shipments from outside that area after July 1, or until further notice beyond that date.

That's the effect, by the District health officer's own statement to this writer, of action he has taken under sweeping powers conveyed on him by Congress. His order effectively bars milk and cream shipments from outside of Washington's inspection area. The exclusion operates absolutely irrespective of compliance of outside shipments by areas designated by the United States Department of Agriculture with quality requirements of State boards of health—requirements officially recorded as previously acceptable to Washington health authorities.

The Washington trade barrier is a sample of the walls being erected by municipal and State regulations, now being increasingly fortified by Federal milk price orders in seaboard cities. A camouflaged import duty is now even levied upon distant shipments into New York City—a penalty assessed and paid into the market fund and explained as being necessary to equalize costs of distant shipments purchased at a bargain.

And while such tariff-like barriers are being raised around seaboard centers against Midwest milk, other tariff actions of an international nature impend in Washington, where expiration of United States import licensing authority and a 50-percent cut in the 14-cents-a-pound butter import rates are scheduled for June 30.

Thus while doors are being closed and walls raised to reduce milk and cream shipments to seaboard cities from the Midwest, the barriers are being lowered to allow more dairy imports into the United States from other countries. So we're doubly on the short end.

But someone asks whether the eastern cities' high prices behind their barriers really affect us much after all, since the freight rate on milk of around $2 a hundredweight fully covers usual price differences between here and Washington or New York, so we couldn't ship there anyway.

The answer is that those things do affect us in vital ways. One is that, except for the barriers, cream could be shipped even at the present freight costs from many points including here at a profit, and a sharp cut in freight rates is pending. Also means of concentrating frozen milk as well as cream are on the way.

More importantly, the eastern high prices serve as a brake on milk consumption there. Also, they attract sales of our dairy cows out of this area. With the huge production of milk generally per cow, that means a large volume of milk both here and at seaboard. Then the barriers there back up milk close outside. That in turn piles up and so on progressively until there's a huge supply of Midwest milk and cream to go into cheese and butter. And then the Government's flat price support system on butter works out to hand over more and more of that market to seaboard, thus completing the disruption of Midwest dairying.

In describing a New York State dairy promotion campaign, Jacob Pratt, president of Milk for Health, Inc., of Syracuse, has written, "There's one liquid shortage New Yorkers aren't worrying about. That's a milk one. For the 70,000 dairymen of the New York milkshed find themselves with quite the opposite situation. Their cows are producing more and more milk. But people aren't drinking up the increased production. Rather they're not even consuming as much milk as in the past. So while the New York State consumers haven't a milk shortage to disturb them, the producers have an oversupply that wrinkles their brows. These producers could and have disposed of a large amount of milk to manufacture cheese, butter, and other dairy products. But this gives them less money than by selling it in fluid form."

So there's a dramatic demonstration right out of New York State as to how the East's milk is backing up. The Midwest in the critical flush period ahead is sure to take the brunt of the effects when the backing-up proceeds far enough.

But the Midwest has weapons to do something to rectify this situation, if it wishes to use them. We have some good dairy farmers in both the Senate and House of Congress, Washington's city council. Also the Constitution happens to give the United States Supreme Court original jurisdiction in constitutional questions in which States are parties. So, if the Midwest should want to start a legal fight to knock out State, municipal, and District of Columbia tariff walls, the way should be open to take the case right to the highest tribunal without the usual tortuous appellate processes.

Some of our Midwest States' dairy officials might try bringing the legal question to a head by selling some of our approved and inspected grade A milk and cream on the streets of Washington or New York or Boston to folks who don't feel able to pay eastern prices. Or maybe better ways than that could be found to bring the milk tariff walls tumbling down and to get some more milk into the stomachs of the hungry kiddies.

That Part of a Minister's Compensation Paid in Lieu of Furnishing Him a Dwelling Should Be Tax-Exempt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 23, 1950

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on April 25 I introduced H. R. 8405, a bill to amend section 22 of the Internal Revenue Code, which has been referred to the House Committee on Ways and Means.

Under existing law, the rental value of a dwelling house and appurtenances thereof furnished to a minister of the gospel as part of his compensation is excluded from taxable gross income.

Prior to the addition of this exclusion such rental value was considered part of a clergyman's income and was considered as cash and taxable.

In 1942 a Federal income-tax ruling provided that despite the exclusion of the rental value of a dwelling house actually furnished "allowances to a clergyman given in lieu of providing him with a parsonage are not so exempt."

In my opinion the present income-tax law with respect to tax on a minister's dwelling represents inequality and should be amended to include exemption from gross income the rental money given a clergyman in lieu of actually furnishing him a dwelling house.

My bill, H. R. 8405, will end this discrimination and will help hard-pressed ministers of all faiths. I am hopeful that Congress will realize the justice in approving this legislation.

Summary of Progress in Housing in Connecticut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM BENTON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter by Hon. George E. Carr, chairman of the Connecticut State Housing Authority, which appeared in the Hartford Courant on May 13, 1950. In this letter Mr. Carr gives a brief summary of the outstanding housing program which has been carried on by the Connecticut State Housing Authority under the direction of Gov. Chester Bowles.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY OF PROGRESS BY STATE HOUSING AUTHORITY

To the EDITOR OF THE COURANT:

Mr. Howard Hayes, in a letter printed in the Courant Sunday, May 7, puts forth the interesting thesis that the reason we need rent control in Connecticut is that the Connecticut State Housing Authority is not functioning as it should.

Since the present State housing program calls for construction of a total of 10,000 family units and most experts agree there is a shortage of about 70,000 family units in the State, it is obvious that even when completed, the State housing program will not solve the housing problem for the whole State. It is, however, providing substantial relief to the problems of some 10,000 families.

Mr. Hayes makes a great point of the fact Governor Bowles had proposed a housing

program to build 56,000 homes, but the housing authority has not produced them. He does not mention the fact that the Republicans controlling the house of representatives in the general assembly refused to adopt that proposed program and that the present 10,000-unit program represents the bipartisan compromise program finally approved by both Republicans and Democrats in the legislature.

In his letter Mr. Hayes seeks to give the impression the Connecticut State Housing Authority has made no progress in pushing forward the State housing program. Let's take a look at the record:

Last July, when the present State housing authority took over the expanded moderate rental housing program, 168 units were occupied after 2 years of operating the program, 1,821 units were under construction, and 170 units were ready to go into construction. Now, 10 months after the present staff took over the program, more than 70 percent of the units then under construction are completed—approximately 5,800 persons are living in 1,455 family units. Nearly 3,000 units are under construction with occupancy schedules set up to provide homes as quickly as possible, a total of 2,206 units have gone under construction since July. Another 1,500 units are slated to go into construction in May and June. More than $63,000,000 of the $65,000,000 available for moderate rental housing is under signed assistance agreements with local housing authorities, as contrasted with about $21,000,000 under signed assistance agreement last July of the $45,000,000 then available. The reorganized State housing authority has speeded up progress on the moderate rental program all along the line by working more closely with the local housing authorities.

The other facet of the Connecticut housing program, the home-ownership program, was enacted by the 1949 general assembly. When the present State housing authority took over last July, this program was still just a section of the statutes. Since that time, the program has been set up completely, regulations drawn up, staff assembled, State loan correspondents appointed, applications processed and certificates of eligibility issued, and builders and prospective home buyers informed of the working of the program.

Nearly 7,500 certificates of eligibility for State mortgage loans have been issued. Loans to 164 individual home buyers have been approved, loans to operative builders for construction of 388 houses have been approved, and application for loans from hundreds of eligible families and several large-scale operative builders now are being processed. The home ownership program, as the building season reaches its height, is accelerating at a rate that makes it seems probable that most of the $30,000,000 available for State mortgage loans will be committed by the middle of the summer.

I think this record is an enviable one and a record in which every citizen of the State can take pride. I do agree with Mr. Hayes that the Connecticut housing program will not eliminate the need for rent control, but I think it is essential to point out that the 10,000 homes to be provided under the program will represent a sizable move toward relieving the hardship and actual suffering the housing shortage is causing.

Rents paid by families living in moderate rental housing projects and the 1½ percent interest paid by families obtaining State mortgage loans on new homes will pay back, with interest, the money borrowed by the State of Connecticut to finance these programs and other expenses of operating the programs.

GEORGE E. CARR,
Chairman, Connecticut State Housing Authority.
HARTFORD.

The Public Right

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FORREST C. DONNELL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Public Right," published in the Greenville (S. C.) News of May 12, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PUBLIC RIGHT

It is of course not surprising that the bill by Senator DONNELL of Missouri to prohibit railroad strikes is bitterly opposed by spokesmen for the railroad unions.

But it must be said that this country needs a more effective policy than it now has to protect the vital public interest in uninterrupted operation of such indispensable utility services.

Spokesmen for railroad executives have appeared before the Senate Labor Subcommittee in favor of this measure which would compel settlement of such disputes by arbitration. And it is significant that one of these witnesses admitted that the railroad managements would not have approved compulsory arbitration some years ago.

He pointed out that while both railway management and labor realized that the recommendation of Presidential boards, under the Railway Labor Act, were not binding, both sides formerly believed that railway strikes were "unthinkable." It thus was generally accepted that the processes of the law in effect prevented railway strikes because of the willingness of both sides to abide by these methods of getting settlement of disputes without a strike.

But the labor groups no longer have that view, the witness said, and more definitely compulsive legislation is necessary.

And it is a logical position, we think, that where absolutely essential public utility services are involved, if both sides will not voluntarily abide by these legal processes to settle disputes without a strike, the public interests demands a definite requirement for settlement by fair process of arbitration when negotiations fail to bring agreement.

Such a public policy now clearly seems in order not only as to railroads but to other public utility services actually essential to public welfare. With respect to these services it is the right of the public to demand that disputes must be settled without penalizing the people.

Maintenance of Peace in the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 23, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and resolution:

HANITA GROUP OF THE PIONEER WOMEN,
Buffalo, N. Y., May 19, 1950.
President HARRY S. TRUMAN,
White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I respectfully forward the enclosed resolution which was unanimously adopted at a recent meeting of the Hanita Group of Pioneer Women of Buffalo, N. Y.

We hope you will give this matter favorable consideration.

Sincerely yours,

LORETTA ROGERS,
President, Hanita Group of Pioneer Women.

RESOLUTION

Whereas it is known from reliable sources that arms of a quality and quantity indicating intended use beyond the purpose of internal security are being supplied to the Arab states in the Middle East, most particularly to Egypt, by Great Britain; and

Whereas this Arab rearmament by Great Britain has the acknowledged approval of the United States Government; and

Whereas at the same time Great Britain has denied Israel arms for its defense; and

Whereas the Arab League has proclaimed its intention to organize a united economic and military front of all Arab states against the struggling State of Israel; and

Whereas we are convinced of the genuine concern of the United States for the peace and security of the Middle East: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the Hanita Group of Pioneer Women, in meeting in Buffalo, N. Y., on May 17, 1950, do call upon the United States to implement its proclaimed concern and desire for peace in the Middle East by providing Israel with arms to defend itself thus lending its strong influence to the maintenance of peace in the Middle East. The officers of the Hanita Group of Pioneer Women are instructed to forward this resolution to President Harry S. Truman.

President Truman's Dream Was Jefferson's Nightmare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. KEM
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "President Truman's Dream Was Jefferson's Nightmare," published in the Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch of May 17, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S DREAM WAS JEFFERSON'S NIGHTMARE

"We are a party that is not afraid to dream," President Truman told his Jefferson jubilee audience in Chicago Monday night.

This popular note drew applause. This was the sort of talk people like to hear, as those who composed that theme song for Mr. Truman knew only too well.

The President's summary of the over-all political-economic philosophy of the Fair

Deal was accurate. Much of it is such stuff as dreams are made on.

A dream is a series of thoughts, images, and emotions occurring during sleep. If it is pleasantly optimistic, we hate to be rudely awakened.

Mr. Truman wants everybody to feel confident that everything will come out all right. He tells us not to worry. Just let "the Government" take care of everything, and everything will be just fine.

But it is impossible for a people, who are normally skeptical when awake, to keep on dreaming forever. A sporific is indicated. A narcotic, like opium, which in time becomes habit-forming, and causes the patients to call for more of the same utopian stuff in increasing doses, until like confirmed drug addicts, they become moral imbeciles, their will power shattered, maudlin slaves to the master's will.

The ultimate result is what an eminent Presbyterian minister denounced as "state idolatry." The Reverend Harrison R. Anderson earnestly implored Mr. Truman to "quit playing with the truth." Apparently Mr. Truman failed to listen in on Mr. Anderson's sermon, for the very next day, he opened the big wind-up speech of his nonpolitical tour with the following words:

"The American people have chosen our party as their instrument to create the kind of Nation Jefferson dreamed of."

It is true that the great Virginian, with almost clairvoyant power, foresaw the kind of Nation Mr. Truman would make of us.

"I see with the deepest affliction," he wrote, "the rapid strides with which the Federal branch of our Government is advancing toward * * * the consolidation in itself of all powers, foreign and domestic. * * * The multiplication of public offices, increase of expense beyond income, growth, and entailment of the public debt * * * (these) are indications soliciting the employment of a pruning knife."

Yet those who would wield the pruning knife are condemned by Mr. Truman as "backward-looking obstructionists."

And the Fair Dealers had the consummate gall to advertise that Chicago rally as the Jefferson Jubilee.

Any Other Way?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FORREST C. DONNELL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Any Other Way?" published in the Petersburg (Va.) Progress-Index of May 12, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANY OTHER WAY?

The strike of locomotive firemen which is paralyzing four major railway systems has the marks of an unnecessary and a potentially disastrous affair.

The featherbedding which is the basic issue in the firemen's demands makes no appeal to public sympathy, nor are the railroads generally in a financial position which permits them to engage in uneconomic practices in order to avoid trouble. A public which is already paying a high price for rail transportation should look with no favor on the creation of unnecessary jobs which would force rates higher or at least operate against eventual reduction.

With the railway mediation board having abandoned the case as hopeless, and with doubt existing that the President could, if he would, take emergency action to restore service, no end is in sight for the strike. It is entirely legal. It could be contagious, in which event it would play havoc with the Nation's economy. Such results would be bad enough at any time, and they are made intolerable by the present tenseness of the world situation.

Consequently Senator DONNELL's bill to outlaw railroad strikes by establishing compulsory arbitration, under which both parties would have to abide by the decision of a Presidential board in case of major disputes, has more appeal than it otherwise would have. Compulsory arbitration has not been looked upon with favor in the United States, but in instances where the public interest is directly affected the slugging-it-out or sitting-it-out processes cannot be accepted as normal. Since neither side likes the idea of compulsory arbitration the existence of such a law should make for a more reasonable spirit at the bargaining table.

Maintenance of Peace in the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 23, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and resolution:

AMERICAN ZIONIST COUNCIL,
BUFFALO COMMITTEE,
Buffalo, N. Y., May 19, 1950.

President HARRY S. TRUMAN,
White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I respectfully forward the enclosed resolution which was unanimously adopted at a recent meeting of the Buffalo Zionist Council.

We hope you will give this matter favorable consideration.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID REIFER,
Chairman, Buffalo Zionist Council.

RESOLUTION

Whereas it is known from reliable sources that arms of a quality and quantity indicating intended use beyond the purpose of internal security are being supplied to the Arab States in the Middle East, most particularly to Egypt, by Great Britain; and

Whereas this Arab rearmament by Great Britain has the acknowledged approval of the United States Government; and

Whereas, at the same time, Great Britain has denied Israel arms for its defense; and

Whereas the Arab League has proclaimed its intention to organize a united economic and military front of all Arab States against the struggling State of Israel; and

Whereas we are convinced of the genuine concern of the United States for the peace and security of the Middle East; Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the Buffalo Zionist Council, do call upon the United States to implement its proclaimed concern and desire for peace in the Middle East by providing Israel with arms to defend itself thus lending its strong influence to the maintenance of peace in the Middle East. The officers of the Buffalo Zionist Council are instructed to forward this resolution to President Harry S. Truman.

Opinion on McCarthy Splits Along Party Lines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAY LeFEVRE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 23, 1950

Mr. LeFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article taken from last evening's New York World-Telegram.

Mr. Speaker, I was back in my district over the week end and I was surprised to find so many people ready to offer their opinions on Senator McCARTHY's charges against the Department of State. Not long ago, some letters from constituents would indicate that some felt that Senator McCARTHY's charges were only an effort on the part of the Senator to seek publicity. The majority of the people today are taking this matter more seriously and very definitely let you know they are for investigating all Government departments if it is necessary to rid Government agencies of subversive elements. With this much background on the subject, I think the following article bears out the situation as I have found it among my own constituents:

OPINION ON McCARTHY SPLITS ALONG PARTY LINES—DEMOCRATS DIVIDED, REPUBLICANS VOTE 2 TO 1 THAT CHARGES ARE HEALTHY

(By George Gallup, director, American Institute of Public Opinion)

What you think of Senator JOSEPH McCARTHY's charges against the State Department is likely to depend to a great extent on whether you are a Democrat or Republican.

A Nation-wide opinion survey by the institute finds that Democrats who have heard or read about the charges are evenly divided in their opinion as to whether they are a good thing or a bad thing for the country.

Republicans, on the other hand, by a 2-to-1 ratio, think the airing of the McCARTHY charges has been a good thing.

More than 8 out of every 10 persons (84 percent) questioned in the survey said they were acquainted with the Wisconsin Senator's charges. In comparison with the public's knowledge of other national topics, this is a high proportion.

The McCARTHY affair has many ramifications, with his supporters saying that the Federal Government has been lax about Communists while his critics say the McCARTHY charges are fantastic, are handicapping our conduct of foreign affairs and playing into the hands of Russia.

Anti-McCARTHY forces also declare that the issue is not so much whether there were Communists in the State Department as it is whether the number there was any greater than in any other Government department of comparable size, or in private business organizations employing as many people.

While the average American has no first-hand knowledge of the situation regarding Communists in Government, he can pass

judgment on the question of whether Senator McCARTHY's charges are doing more harm than good.

That question was put to voters in the institute survey in the following manner:

"Some people say these charges are doing the country more harm than good. What do you think?"

Here is the national vote:

	Percent
Harm	29
Good	39
No opinion	16
Haven't heard of charges	16

The sharp difference of opinion according to political affiliation is seen in the following vote of persons who, in answer to another question on the survey ballot, classify themselves as either Democrats or Republicans.

	Republicans	Democrats
	Percent	Percent
Harm	22	33
Good	50	35
No opinion	15	14
Haven't heard of charges	13	18

The survey is the first test of national sentiment on the McCarthy charges.

Among college-trained persons interviewed, 41 percent said they thought the McCarthy charges are harmful, while 46 percent said they are a good thing, and 11 percent gave no opinion, leaving 2 percent who had not heard of the charges at the time of the survey.

It Goes Right to White House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FORREST C. DONNELL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "It Goes Right to White House," published in the Muncie (Ind.) Star of May 12, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT GOES RIGHT TO WHITE HOUSE

The railroad firemen's strike is a perfect example of the dangerous monopoly powers exercised by many labor unions. In the interest of the general welfare these powers must be restricted. But we shall have to look elsewhere than President Truman for relief. He is afraid of losing votes if he acts to protect the general welfare, as he is sworn to do.

The firemen's brotherhood is striking for a third man on multiple-unit Diesel locomotives. Two Presidential fact-finding boards, functioning under the Railway Labor Act, have found no justice whatever in this demand and have rejected it.

Therefore the firemen are really just trying to featherbed the Diesels. To gain their end they are using their power to strangle the economy of large sections of the country and to cause widespread public suffering.

The Railway Labor Act was once regarded as a model of its kind. It worked well for many years. But the indulgences of Presidents Roosevelt and Truman undermined the Railway Labor Act. When a brotherhood didn't get exactly what it wanted from a Presidential fact-finding board it struck, and then got what it wanted from the President. The situation has now reached the point where a union is willing to paralyze the economy in order to win a featherbedding demand.

That is what happens when Presidents are more interested in votes than in the general welfare. Properly administered, the Railway Labor Act probably would still work. But it won't be properly administered under Mr. Truman.

New legislation is therefore needed to protect the American public from disastrous railway tie-ups. Either there must be real compulsory arbitration to prevent the unions from high-handedly rejecting the rulings of mediation boards and calling a strike, or the unions must be shorn of their power to strike whole networks of railroads vital to a region's economy. Relief can come only through a public demand which will convince Congress that Mr. Truman is wrong when he thinks irresponsible strikes win votes.

Communism Feeds on the Absence of Reforms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 23, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of a recent address by Delbert Clark of the New York Times who, in his usual incisive way, says a great many things that I have been saying for a long time; but I confess that frequently he says them better.

Delbert Clark will be remembered as the brilliant New York Times correspondent in occupied Germany who, for several years, was the vocal conscience of our military authorities, and who repeatedly and mercilessly exposed the failure of the denazification and decartelization programs. I wish that he were still performing that function in Germany, where his voice is greatly needed. I have made two minor deletions out of deference to the rule of comity; the remainder of his address follows as reproduced by the Times:

DEMOCRACY ON THE DEFENSIVE

(By Delbert Clark, director of educational activities)

There are now, and have been for a long time, substantial groups in the United States who wish to change our familiar society from what it has been to something quite different. Their influence rises and falls in direct ratio to the rise and fall of tension in international relations and in domestic economics.

These groups divide, roughly, into Communist and Fascist, and they are not always easy to identify. But they all have one aim in common—the substantive alteration of the institutions which have made America great and prosperous.

Between these extremes of right and left, both hostile to American ideals, are the rest of us, the vast majority. Most of us advocate no substantial change, nor any change at all. Our one great desire is to continue more or less intact the forms and principles to which we have become accustomed over a century and a half, because they are comfortable and generally satisfactory.

But among us there are some, a relative few by comparison, whose background, education, and general view of community life impel them to think more in terms of "the general welfare" than the rest of us. These individuals advocate neither fascism, communism, nor as a rule any 'ism' at all, but only adjustment of specific operational faults, plus a general improvement in our democratic system, so that life may be even better than it is for a larger number of people. Not all their ideas are necessarily sound, but they are acting in the best and most patriotic tradition, upon which the Republic was founded and has prospered.

At one time in our national history such people would have been called liberals, at another time progressives; what they stood for might have been opposed by some, but few would have dared condemn them as bad citizens. Yet in the past few years they have found it more and more economically and socially unsafe to continue as in the past. They find themselves criticized as Communists or fellow-travelers for supporting equality of opportunity for all; for believing what the Constitution says about civil rights; for publicly preferring peace to war; for espousing Federal aid for low-income housing; for believing in Government-sponsored health insurance; for supporting the idea of world government. And within the past month we have even been subjected to the spectacle of high-minded, patriotic citizens being denounced as traitors because the foreign policy they advocated in a specific instance had not worked out.

So, by a deadly appeal to fear and ignorance, fostered in some cases by organizations in themselves violently anti-American, the only means Americans have of seeking constant improvement in a system in which they believe enough to want to see it improve, is removed or rendered hazardous. And the way is paved for the United States to slip into something resembling a Fascist state without the addition or repeal of a single law or of a single clause in the Federal Constitution.

Fascism, said Prof. Charles A. Siepmann, of New York University, is the ultimate upshot of growing to like what you get, and he might well have added that its development is greatly facilitated when those who do not like everything they get are scared out of saying so. We are confronted with the necessity for accepting the leadership of one set of enemies of democracy to avoid being classed as followers of another set, and between these millstones large numbers of decent, loyal Americans are being ground.

The political middle class, which includes most of us, is in serious peril of being wiped out, casualties in a cold civil war. When it is, and not one dares any longer to criticize for fear of losing his livelihood, then the unmasked forces of communism and fascism will be free to fight their obscene battle over the corpse of the oldest and largest democracy in the world.

I should like to state at this point that all antidemocratic, totalitarian thought and action is abhorrent to me and should be to all Americans. The Platonian theory of government by an elite group, based on the conviction that the great mass of the people aren't bright enough to govern themselves, is very much with us today, among people who never heard of Plato. It is the opposite of democracy, and so far as I can see, there is no essential difference, operationally or philosophically, among its advocates. They may be Communists, or members of the German-American Bund, or members of the Christian Front, or knights of the Ku Klux Klan, the white camelia, the purple stinkweed, or whatever botanical specimen they happen to choose. All, in the last analysis, want the same thing—the destruction of democracy.

As it has worked out in America, many prominent citizens, deeply concerned with

the simple fact of having to earn a living, have chosen to forego all other activity, to become nonentities, so far as exercising the normal duties of citizenship is concerned. Some, to reinforce their spiritual air-raid shelters, have gone so far as to denounce publicly all that they have stood for in the past. But a few, less timid or more confirmed in their views, have refused to join the league of frightened men and have stood their ground. They have refused to concede that democracy is a dead duck, and are convinced that what is happening to a few can happen to everybody, if nobody is interested enough to fight back.

A short time ago there was a mass assault upon the artists of America, and particularly film and theater actors, led by one Myron Fagan, a disappointed playwright, whose book, "Red Treason in Hollywood," listed 150 people as Communists, starting with that pillar of conservatism, Louis B. Mayer. He received liberal financial aid from Gerald L. K. Smith, former spiritual gadfly for Huey Long, and now leader of one of our several American fascist movements.

It was obvious that the average American pays more attention to the political opinions of a film star than to those of the wisest political scientist on earth, and that if the film stars could be forced to shut up, it would be a great victory for the haters of democracy. I don't say all film stars are politically pure, but the Fagan list was ridiculous.

A wave of fear spread over the film industry. Many ducked into the nearest foxhole, or joined their accusers in denouncing what they had previously advocated. Those who did, seemed to find their paths miraculously smoothed, financially speaking. Those few who did not, continued to be subjected to the worst sort of smear publicity.

One member of the Hollywood community, Jack Tenney, delivered in 1939 a speech before the Hollywood Anti-Nazi League in which he denounced the House un-American Activities Committee in unmeasured terms. Ten years later Tenney, now a State Senator, was branding as pro-Communists individuals who had been members of the Anti-Nazi League at the very moment he was addressing it in 1939. And the committee he headed was a carbon copy of the one he had then attacked.

It is common talk that the most frightened class of people in America today is the great body of Federal employees, who feel their loyalty is being investigated in accordance with extremely vague criteria. Yet the Federal employee has a minute source of comfort, so far as job security goes, in the existence of elaborate appeal machinery which is frequently effective.

No such machinery exists for the privately employed citizen who is accused, not by an official agency, but by an irresponsible newspaper, by Fulton Lewis, Jr., by Westbrook Pegler, or by some sinister pamphleteer or confessed traitor squatting snugly behind the statute of limitations. It can be argued that a citizen so maligned has recourse to civil suit. But he cannot bring a libel charge against a witness before a congressional committee, or a Senator speaking on the floor wrapped in his toga of immunity. Even if he has the opportunity, it takes a lot more money than most people can afford or even lay their hands on and until that suit, if any, is decided, the smear campaign goes on.

Paul Draper, the dancer, a while back brought suit in Connecticut against a woman who publicly called him a Communist. I don't know Draper, nor do I know whether he is or is not a Communist. But I do know that a large and extremely noisesome newspaper chain whipped up a violent campaign of synthetic fury against him before the case was heard in court, and frightened a broadcasting company into reprimanding the conductor of a program who had invited Draper to appear.

This is the very nearly perfect illustration of the new and terrifying notion that a citizen is no longer innocent until proved guilty, a logical corollary of the doctrines of guilt by association. Thus a popular New York newspaper was able to say in all apparent seriousness that Alger Hiss had ample opportunity to prove himself innocent.

This alarming state of affairs has come about as a direct result of our cold and very uncivil war with the Soviet Union. We have come to accept, for all practical purposes, what amounts to Soviet direction not only of our foreign policy, but of our internal practice as well. When people get the idea that their physical safety is in danger, anything connected with that threat tends to become an object of fear and loathing. And when the threat depends for its existence and expansion upon a body of ideas, as does communism, then the hatred and fear are multiplied, because you cannot kill an idea with a gun.

We talk a great deal about arming for defense against Russia, but we are pretty sure, if we stop to think about it, that were it not for the ideological weapon of communism Russia would not be a serious threat. It is a weapon which is sharpened by human misery, as we have recognized in our point 4 and Marshall plans. We may by a show of force prevent Soviet armies from marching, but no conceivable multiplication of military alliances alone can stop an idea from marching.

Now it so happens that the Soviet Union has appropriated to its own purposes the sponsorship of many reforms which hitherto had been considered not at all disreputable and which have long been advocated by respectable people the world over. Yet in the year 1950 we incline to denounce these very desiderata for no other reason than that the Communists also say they believe in them.

Anyone familiar with the writings of Marx and Lenin knows perfectly well that the last thing the Communists want is peaceful reform, for if human grievances are adjusted, human misery mitigated, by civilized means, then the proletarian revolution is indefinitely postponed if not actually canceled. That is why, in every country they take over, the Communists move first of all against the middle-class liberals who are trying to achieve reforms without setting up a dictatorship.

Unfortunately, and in shame I say it, this cold civil war is being intensified by the activities of certain newspapers and newspaper writers and radio commentators who either have an ax to grind or who are criminally irresponsible. And I appeal to you, in this critical period in our national history, to refrain from forming judgments without adequate evidence. Don't assume you know all about a Senate investigation by reading a headline in the Morning Smear over someone else's shoulder in the subway. Don't set some fellow-American down as a traitor because of another headline in the Daily Slanderer. Take the time, as a patriotic duty, to read and evaluate the facts as set forth in an honest, responsible periodical. Try to use your intelligence, not merely your eyes and your emotions. If you don't, the day may come when you will be sorry.

Those who hate democracy, be they reactionaries of the right or of the left, are fighting, not really one another, but all believers in that cooperative freedom. They are fighting with the weapons of blind prejudice, ignorance, and fear of the unfamiliar. They have seized upon our external peril and the resultant popular confusion as a device for altering our traditional institutions. And I can assure you, you would not like to be governed by either of them. The only essential difference is the color of the shirt.

The essence of a democratic society is that it is not assumed to be perfect operationally, that it is on the contrary susceptible of continuous improvement without physical revolution or fundamental structural change. With this as a first principle the fact of political activity, of constant constructive criticism, becomes a prime obligation upon every citizen. This is a matter of common knowledge with all of us, yet in the recent past too many of us have abdicated the right and duty to oppose and criticize because they were scared.

Assuming that there is merit in the position that a Communist-dominated—and I mean dominated—organization is no place for a true American, no one has yet come forward, to my knowledge, with acceptable criteria for judging whether the organization in question is so dominated. A public-spirited citizen considering a contribution to the American Red Cross, the Boy Scouts, the Infantile Paralysis Foundation, as access to a body of information based on a long public history. But what of the numerous ad hoc groups, newly formed, and with something entirely laudable as their only announced objective? How can one find out about them?

Martin Dies once advised a friend of mine to solicit and accept the advice of the local American Legion post or chamber of commerce. This needs no commentary—it is simply a means of never running counter to the views of a powerful, organized and generally orthodox group. A simpler device would be never to say or do anything not essential to keeping physically alive.

The history of subversive organizations is interesting and complex. Some were originally not in this category but were later taken over through the negligence of their members, yet self-constituted leaders of public opinion take no note of this in condemning anyone who ever had anything to do with them. Others, while perhaps actually organized as "fronts," were of such a character, so far as publicized aims were concerned, that only one who recognized a Communist by his red tie or his long hair could possibly have been suspicious.

It is generally far easier to detect the true character of a subversive organization of the Fascist type than one devoted to the propagation of communism. The first almost invariably has certain visible signs, such as racial and religious hatred and xenophobia which mark it for what it is. The other seldom has such outward birthmarks, and it may take a long time for its true nature to become generally known. I know of no positive test, nor does anyone else I ever heard of.

In the last analysis, the real issue in this cold civil war of ours is not national security. No good citizen can be against that. It is not communism versus capitalism, although that certainly is the issue in the struggle between the United States and Russia. Here at home the issue is, in plain words, whether Americans shall be able to continue to be good citizens or whether they must become a nation of furtive mice, frightened into silence by extralegal terrorism against which there is virtually no defense.

What we need to realize, and keep remembering, is that communism feeds, not on reforms, but on the absence of reform. By silencing all honest reformers, we make things far easier for the Communists, and advance the opening date for the class war we all want to avoid.

The National Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FORREST C. DONNELL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The National Interest," published in the Rockford (Ill.) Register-Republic, of May 12, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NATIONAL INTEREST

Once again a section of the American public is beginning to suffer from the effects of a strike that was carefully planned so as not to be against the national interest, or so the union hopes.

As in the coal strike earlier this year, there were demands for stern measures by the Federal Government. Since one issue of the railroad firemen's strike is the employment of an extra fireman on Diesel locomotives, the matter already has been before Presidential fact-finding boards. In this case the boards have ruled twice against the union, and the railroads' refusal to try the issue again appears to be justified.

The Donnell bill, proposed by the Missouri Republican Senator, would require compulsory arbitration in railway labor disputes. This would be a far-reaching measure, but pressure for it will increase as industries affected by the strike are forced to close down, throwing thousands of employees out of work.

It also is unfortunate that Chrysler Corp., just resuming production after a 100-day strike, faces curtailments in case it cannot receive necessary supplies delivered by rail.

Just how extensive must a strike be in order to be against the national interest? Most of the recent Nation-wide strikes have affected other segments of the United States economy. The time is here for devising legal settlement machinery which will go into operation as soon as a strike in one industry begins to affect related and dependent industries.

Congress Please Note

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 23, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Christian Science Monitor:

CONGRESS PLEASE NOTE

Of all the new courses we've heard of that are going to be added to already bulging college catalogs, Harvard University's on fundamental human rights sounds among the more significant.

"The course is designed," the university says, "to consider how the principal human rights in the United States Constitution got there and what has happened to them since." It would be difficult to imagine a more appropriate time for such study.

With Zechariah Chafee, Jr., Harvard's noted law-school teacher and a vigorous defender of human rights, presiding, it is likely that the students will hear as much about what has happened to fundamental human rights in recent years as they will about how they got in the Constitution in the first place.

This is all to the good. Today's congressional hearings tend to take increasing liberties with personal reputations and basic legal rights. In another area, prominent natural scientists are protesting that on nonsecret information the Atomic Energy Commission is following a program of censorship secretly conceived and never justified to the American public.

Fuller understanding of human rights—and responsibilities—is urgently needed. Such a course as Harvard plans should be taught in all schools and colleges. A special evening session for Congressmen might help, too.

Biggest Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 23, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the twenty-ninth article by Mr. Frank C. Waldrop on the infiltration of communism in our country:

BIGGEST STORY
(By Frank C. Waldrop)

The sweated pennies of the working man did not buy communism its seat in the Government of the United States of America. After all, people who work in this country have better things to buy.

Communism, in its day, has spent millions to corrupt American minds with its own rewriting of history, its own version of all the arts and sciences, and to corrode labor unions, Government offices and homes.

How did it get in a position to do such things? It is a libel on the poor to say they are to blame. The dollars that hired the halls and bought the paper and paid the speakers and hid the spies came from well-lined pockets.

There will be a real study made, one day, of the millions in American money that have gone into Communist organizations and to the fantastic collection of front organizations carrying out Communist policy but not in communism's name.

No propaganda in history has turned over so many dollars and supported so massive an army of riffraff writers, speakers and Mr. Chairmen, Madame Secretaries and faceless, silent treasurers, who receive contributions but make no reports on expenditures.

Nor did it all come from Moscow. I have before me as I write this, the sworn testimony by a former general secretary of the Communist Party of the United States that in his day Russia sent over only about $100,000 a year and that just for headquarters work.

This same man, on the other hand, estimated that the friends of the Soviet Union raised over a million dollars on one campaign to save the starving Russians of the 1920's, yet, he swore, the cash only circled back to the agitation and propaganda offices in New York.

American consideration for the suffering poor abroad was turned on America. American money given in the spirit of charity was used to attack the very foundations of our civilization.

The Sacco-Vanzetti case I mentioned in this space yesterday, the "free Tom Mooney" campaigns earlier described, were typical devices for concealed Communist money-raising—until the Communists got on the United States payroll. Then they got a better system.

It is impossible to review and encompass all the multitude of money-raising machinery that Americans fell for.

A fair sample of good American money gone is that of the "Garland fund."

In that instance a foolish young man in New York City gave some $900,000 of first-class securities, his total inherited fortune, to a set of trustees to be used in effect for the good of the cause. The values of the securities rose to something like $2,000,000 before they got rid of it all. No doubt he felt he had done a good thing.

Or you can consider the case of Corliss Lamont. Here is the son of Thomas Lamont, one of the ablest bankers the United States ever produced. Corliss Lamont has never worked for his living. His father gave it to him. Lamont was one of the early Marxists and still is.

His influence in raising millions for Marxist purposes has been enormous.

Then there is that other prize package, Frederick Vanderbilt Field, whose family names are solid gold. To what has this man given his life? You get an idea from the fact that he refused, a few days ago, to talk to a Senate committee about the Amerasia spy case.

One way or another, less of all this money goes to the Communist Party's official bank accounts than to the operations in the mysterious shadowland of the front organizations that play on human decency.

That mission for relief of the starving back in 1922 was headed by Herbert Hoover. Rev. Edmund Walsh, S. J., now vice regent of Georgetown University and a world-renowned authority on the facts of Marxism, went deep into Russia distributing food and saving human life.

Little did Mr. Hoover and Father Walsh know that behind their backs and the backs of all those undertaking a humane mission for the relief of the starving, Communists in America were swindling people in their name.

Yet the fact is sworn to in the official records.

It was early, and typical of the differences between Communist ideas of ordinary decency and our own.

By 1933, when F. D. Roosevelt came to the White House, that sort of Communist duplicity had been demonstrated a thousand times over. More than that, the Communists had blown their own organization wide open with a reeking scandal for all to see.

By then, anybody could know, who wanted to, that communism and civilization were totally incompatible.

Yet Roosevelt gave them priceless prestige, for which they would one day show their thanks by gathering on the White House lawn to mock him to his face.

The Public's Stake

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FORREST C. DONNELL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Public's Stake," published in the Charleston (S. C.) Post, of May 12, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PUBLIC'S STAKE

Such indefensible strikes as that which the Brotherhood of Enginemen and Firemen is conducting against four railway systems may impel Congress to enact compulsory arbitration or even stronger legislation to protect the Nation against disastrous disruption of its economy.

Two Presidential commissions have found the demands of the brotherhood unjustified, declaring that an additional fireman on Diesel-operated locomotives is unnecessary. The strike stands as an attempt to force the railroads to accept featherbedding—the employment of men not required for safe and efficient operation.

To whatever extent the four railway systems are tied up, business and industry will be slowed down and thousands of workers not a party to the dispute will be thrown out of jobs. The entire Nation will be adversely affected by a work stoppage that is essentially a strike against the public. Were the firemen to win their point, the public, through higher rates, would be called upon to pay for the needless jobs.

There is now before Congress a bill to outlaw railroad strikes. It calls for compulsory arbitration, with the decision of a Presidential board being binding. Proponents of this measure are impelled by a sense of public interest. The existing legislation does not impose upon the brotherhoods a due responsibility to the Nation. A few thousand men can tie up vital transportation and, if permitted to go their way unchecked by law, can force acceptance of exorbitant demands due to their monopolistic power.

This is an intolerable state of affairs that cannot be permitted indefinitely.

Let's Stockpile Fabrics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 23, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Evening Tribune, Lawrence, Mass., for May 20, 1950:

LET'S STOCKPILE FABRICS

Stockpiling of raw wool helps the sheep but makes goats of textile workers. Raw wool is a durable commodity, not perishable like eggs and potatoes, and the Government undoubtedly takes comfort from this fact. There is, at least, not the tremendous shrinkage involved in other efforts to bulwark weak areas of our economy. But the Government does deal in perishable items, and if there is anything more perishable than a human being out of work, we would like to know about it. Sheepmen can convert some of their wool into homespun cloth, if their need is great enough, and they can eat their sheep. The farmer's problem is not that he is underemployed but overemployed; he produces too much. At the worst, he has things to eat, even if his level of subsistence is marginal. But the textile worker has no capital of raw material to be subsidized; he has only the skill of his hands.

If the Government stockpiled cloth—the finished product instead of the raw material—it would, in effect, be stockpiling textile workers—which, even if it is an undignified, analogy—is a practical one. The day will never come when this country, or the world, will be able to get along without the skill of textile workers. Textiles is as basic an industry as the production of food. In fact, it is one of the few really basic industries. Autos are important and useful, true, but a good percentage of that industry's creativeness is in the luxury category. The same thing applies to another spiraling activity—television. Television adds to the richness of life, but life doesn't depend on it. Cloth, fabrics of all sorts, is an indispensable necessity, not only for reasons of modesty, but as an extra skin against the rigors of climate—heat as well as cold. If all this is true, and we don't see how it can be controverted, stockpiling raw wool puts the cart before the horse.

The idea that it is a more practical expedient to stockpile fabrics, rather than wool, is the brainchild of the Greater Lawrence Citizens Committee for Industrial Development. And it has already found supporters in the State legislature where a resolution has been filed urging the Federal Government to give serious consideration to the proposal. The resolution lays emphasis on the fact that the Government would be far better off, in time of emergency, with a reserve of finished cloth on its hands than it would with acres of unprocessed wool. We agree, although it seems that this approach falls somewhat short of the real purpose of such stockpiling, which is to help textile workers in time of crisis. It isn't necessary to make a particular point of the fact that textile workers are good, productive, and skillful citizens. Everyone agrees that they are. Why wouldn't it be a good idea to give them the same deal that farmers and poultrymen get? Textile workers vote too. And they have to eat.

A Guarantee of Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FORREST C. DONNELL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Guarantee of Service," published in the Charlotte (N. C.) News of May 11, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A GUARANTEE OF SERVICE

When, at 6 o'clock yesterday morning, the paralyzing tide of the railroad firemen's strike against four major rail systems began rolling west from the Atlantic coast, stranded commuters at suburban stations were the first to understand the ominous significance of the strike.

But as the day wore on citizens with less apparent need for rail service began to wonder how it was that 18,000 railroad firemen could launch a strike which might bring hardship to millions.

And, when, at midday, hopes for immediate settlement of the strike went aglimmering, citizens listened with more care to a railroad executive's warning that the strike against the Southern, Santa Fe, New York Central, and Pennsylvania systems will "have an immediate and disastrous effect on the public interest."

The executive was Harry A. De Butts, former Charlottean and now vice president in charge of operations for Southern. He warned further:

"It would bring about almost instantaneous paralysis of the life of the large parts of the country served by these four major systems, bringing the terror of starvation and disease to great numbers of citizens."

If, as members of the striking locomotive firemen and enginemen would have it, starvation, disease, and economic paralysis are not around the immediate corner, it is all too true that a prolonged Nation-wide railroad strike would endanger public and economic health. This single union now has the power to bring about such a strike; no single group should wield so mighty a weapon.

The railroads are essential to the Nation. They bring food to market, workers to their plants and offices, pharmaceuticals to drug stores, tractors to farmers; they bring mail, industrial equipment. We have, all of us, become dependent to some degree on railroad service.

We must have a guarantee that that service will not be withdrawn.

We must not be victimized by such featherbed demands as that which prompted the firemen to quit work yesterday morning. (The firemen had demanded an extra fireman aboard multiple unit Diesel locomotives. Twice the Presidential fact finders have ruled that the union demand was not justified. But after the long, careful process of the Railway Labor Act had found them at fault, the firemen struck anyway.)

Southern executive De Butts has already sounded the cry for passage by Congress of a bill to outlaw rail strikes. As a result of the hasty action of the firemen's union (and past violations of the public interest by unions like John L. Lewis' United Mine Workers), such a bill will find much favor with the public and with Congressmen.

A likely result of the firemen's strike will be the passage of a bill calling for compulsory arbitration as a last resort in rail strikes. A law guaranteeing the continuance of this essential public service has long been needed. It should, of course, provide for justice to both employer and employee. It should insist upon fair wages and satisfactory working conditions, but it should also restrain unions from irresponsible strikes against the public interest, which even officials of other rail unions have recognized the firemen's strike to be.

Planned Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD H. VELDE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 23, 1950

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Peoria Star of May 12, 1950, entitled "Planned Inflation":

PLANNED INFLATION

In his speech (ostensibly nonpolitical) at Pendleton, Oreg., President Truman promised that the average American family's income could be doubled by 1960, if the whole country tries.

Some people might think that is an extravagant promise for the President to make, but it isn't. The average family's income can easily be doubled by 1960 or long before 1960. It can be done without effort by the whole country. In fact, it is being done now and the people are hardly conscious of it. It is being done through the cheapening of money, the debasing of the value of the dollar. Every time the Federal Government spends more than it collects (deficit financing) it clips the value of the dollar. Next year the Government faces a deficit of $7,000,000,000, with the President urging even a larger gap between income and expenditures.

To say that the average family's income may be doubled, however, is to tell only half the story. Inflation increases income, in terms of dollars, but it correspondingly increases the cost of living. The dollar today is worth only a little more than half what it was worth 10 years ago. Continued deficit financing can easily make the dollar worth only one-fourth what it was 10 years ago.

The trouble with raising apparent income by debasing the currency is that people who depend upon fixed values in bonds, savings deposits, annuities, life insurance values and pensions are financially ruined. The man who bought $10,000 in life insurance in 1940 knows today that it will accomplish only about half of what he expected it to accomplish. Let inflation again "double" incomes and that man's life insurance will be worth only about $2,500 in terms of the 1940 dollars in which he was calculating the future needs of his family.

What President Truman proposes is ridiculously easy. Printing-press money is limitless.

But here is the question President Truman should be asked: "Can you, Mr. President, while doubling the average family's income, also proportionately increase the income of those who depend upon pensions, annuities, bonds and savings?"

If this cannot be done, then the promise of increasing average family incomes is nothing more than a fiscal trick from which none will benefit and many will suffer.

Portuguese-Americans Protest India's Purpose To Annex Territory of Goa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 23, 1950

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter which I have sent to Secretary of State Acheson, informing him of the strong opposition of Americans of Portuguese descent against the proposal of India to annex the territory of Goa.

My letter to Mr. Acheson follows:

MAY 22, 1950.

Hon. DEAN ACHESON,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In behalf of the thousands of Portuguese-American citizens of my district and of New England, may I enter with you a protest against the acquisition by India of the territory of Goa.

For nearly 500 years, the territory has been under the Portuguese flag. Its 650,000 people are loyal to Portugal, as indicated by the fact that only a scanty military force is kept in the territory. Fifty thousand people from Goa work in Bombay, but few have relinquished their citizenship.

This little territory was secured by Portugal in those early days when the hardy mariners from Portugal went to all parts of the world and planted the flag of civilization.

During the last war, Portugal aided materially in the Allied victory. Its air bases in the Azores were a vital part of our offensive.

To take the territory of Goa away from a loyal ally and give it to a country with which it has had no legal ties for 500 years would be unfortunate. It is difficult to believe India would be short-sighted enough to ask it.

On the past Sunday, a mass meeting of Portuguese-Americans of Fall River, Mass., strongly expressed their opposition to the intentions of India. I transmit to you their sentiments, which I heartily endorse. I hope the Government of the United States will use its great moral influence in world affairs to persuade India that its plans with respect to Goa should be abandoned in the interests of international justice.

Sincerely yours.

A Strike Against the Public Is No Private Affair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FORREST C. DONNELL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Strike Against the Public Is No Private Affair," published in the Louisville (Ky.) Times, of May 10, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A STRIKE AGAINST THE PUBLIC IS NO PRIVATE AFFAIR

Strange bedfellows are made almost every time compulsory arbitration is proposed as a strike preventive in vital industries. When the question was before the Senate Labor Committee in 1947, for example, AFL and CIO leaders were no more outspokenly opposed to the proposal than were such conservatives as Senator TAFT and Ira Mosher of the National Asscciation of Manufacturers. That was not surprising. As a rule, management and labor are equally opposed to a third party settling their disputes, being inclined to regard them as private quarrels regardless of the effect on the public's welfare and convenience.

Thus the fact that three of the nation's top railroad executives, appearing before a Senate subcommittee on the eve of today's walkout, urged compulsory arbitration for rail disputes is news of more than passing interest. No doubt they, too, would hesitate to support such legislation as a remedy in all industries, or even in all vital industries. But railroads are in a special category. They are a public utility, and as such are subject to governmental rules and restraints that are not applicable to other industries.

In his testimony 3 years ago, Mr. Mosher expressed the fear of big business when he declared that compulsory arbitration would invite government control of prices and markets. That argument, whatever its validity in general application, does not fit the situation of railroads. They, like other public utilities, have been under such controls for years—without, incidentally, losing their identity as instruments of free enterprise. Railroads are not free to charge whatever rates they like, or to run their trains whenever and wherever it suits their fancy.

To some extent, regulations designed to protect the public now cover employer-employee relations on the railroads. The National Railway Labor Act, with its cooling-off periods and mediation machinery, was enacted more than two decades ago for the purpose of preventing strikes or lockouts. It, however, stops short of forbidding such strikes, which is what the Donnell bill now before the Senate would do. It would substitute arbitration as a last resort after collective bargaining and mediation had failed.

Compulsory arbitration for public utilities and their employees rests upon the sound principle that the public interest must come before any private interest. It was upon this principle that a committee appointed by President Woodrow Wilson recommended compulsory arbitration for such services in 1919. It said:

"The continuous operation of public utilities is vital to public welfare. As the capital invested is employed in public use, so is the labor engaged in public service; and the withdrawal of either with the result of suspending service makes the people the real victim."

Stop Rail Strikes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FORREST C. DONNELL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the El Paso (Tex.) Times of May 2, 1950, entitled "Stop Rail Strikes."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STOP RAIL STRIKES

Railway Age has come out editorially for a substantial amendment of the Railway Labor Act.

Because America depends so heavily upon its railroad system every citizen should be interested in any effort that possibly could have a bearing on preventing future strikes on the railroads.

Railway Age in its current issue says in part:

"The only practicable solution of the present dangerous drift in industrial relations on the railroads lies in substantial amendment of the Railway Labor Act.

"Senator DONNELL, of Missouri, has introduced a bill, S. 3463, to outlaw railroad strikes or lockouts in defiance of awards by Presidential boards. Without weighing the merits of the bill's specific provisions, its basic approach is unquestionably sound.

"The threatened strike of railroad firemen—postponed for 2 weeks a few days ago—is no isolated phenomenon. It is far more important as a symptom than as an actual danger in itself. The really significant fact is that the much-praised Railway Labor Act has completely broken down as a mechanism for protecting the public from railway strikes. As a consequence strikes on the railroads must now be recognized as a constant danger. They will continue so until the law is changed.

"The reason the country now suffers from frequent railroad strikes, and from almost constant threats of them, is that all fear has been removed from railroad unionists that they will lose anything by striking.

"The railroads have never refused in a dispute of any significance to abide by the decisions of these boards. The unions, on the contrary, have hardly ever, since 1941, accepted any of the board's decisions if they have had any reason whatever for dissatisfaction."

The Times always has looked upon the railroad brotherhoods as being on the conservative side of organized labor. This newspaper would suggest to the brotherhoods at this time, however, that they be a little more careful.

There was a period not too many years ago during which both sides lived up to findings of arbitration boards called in when a railroad strike was threatened. That period should be brought back. Otherwise it may be necessary to enact legislation such as that proposed by Senator DONNELL to outlaw railroad strikes or lockouts in defiance of awards by Presidential boards.

Our economy cannot stand disastrous tieups of our rail transportation system.

Compulsory Arbitration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FORREST C. DONNELL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Compulsory Arbitration," published in the Glens Falls (N. Y.) Post-Star of May 12, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPULSORY ARBITRATION

A report from Washington written prior to the railroad strike declares that some Government officials believe compulsory arbitration may be the only solution to strikes against public utilities. Both labor and management are opposed to the idea. Management's opposition stems from the fact that compulsory arbitration would deprive it of more of its already limited right to manage and that unions would be tempted to "make" disputes in the expectation that they would gain something through each arbitration board's attempt to compromise the case. On their side the unions fear that if arbitration were substituted for the strike force, they would not get as much as they otherwise might.

Now, there should be no pretense about this question of compulsory arbitration. It would not be the perfect solution to labor-management relations in public utilities and it would be only as fair as the arbiters themselves were fair. However, it does not follow that because an administration is outspokenly favorable to labor as the Truman administration is, and the Roosevelt administration before it was, that an "impartial" board of arbitration would be similarly inclined, or vice versa.

For example, boards acting under the authority of the Railway Labor Act have twice rendered decisions on the subject of this strike which was called for the purpose of compelling the railroads to hire an additional fireman for Diesel locomotives. Both boards said the demand was without merit. A railroad strike of a few years ago was called after such a board made a wage award in which management concurred but which the unions refused to accept.

For a great many years the Railway Labor Act functioned very well. It broke down only when the administration in Washington gave labor every encouragement to strike and led the unions to take a cynical view of the act and the voluntary responsibility to accept arbitration which is the essence of it. What made this act good was the assumption that both union and management would accept the arbitration findings whatever they might be. This assumption was based on the further assumption that arbitration would be fair, and as far as we are aware it always has been.

It would be possible and it might not be bad at all to amend the act in one principal manner, making compliance with the arbiters' findings compulsory rather than voluntary. The point is that strikes against the public interest can be justified and at the same time disastrous to that interest. Actually three interests are involved in every public utility strike, labor's, management's, and the public's, of which the latter is most important. If public health, safety, and prosperity are not to be unduly damaged by strikes, compulsory arbitration may be the only answer short of Government ownership. Congress could do worse at this time than introduce the subject for discussion.

Cardinal Spellman's Poem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS B. HELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 1950

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, on May 14, 1950, the new Alfred E. Smith Memorial Building at St. Vincent's Hospital, New York, was dedicated. Many church and State dignitaries participated. The most poignant point of the ceremonies came, however, when His Eminence Francis Cardinal Spellman spoke of the late Al Smith, and included in his address a poetic tribute to the former great Governor of New York State. Following is the Cardinal's poem, which I commend to the reading of my colleagues:

CARDINAL SPELLMAN'S POEM

We must not think of this high lifted mass
In terms of steel, concrete, and carven stone,
Of rooms and corridors, of halls and clinic space.
This building is a living thing, it has a soul,
It breathes the spirit of a man who walked
A friend of all, an enemy of none—
For bigotry—the realm of little men—
Too great; in vision—for the grasp of time—
Too large. And so in this memorial
Al lives again, extends to those in need
His friendly hand and lends a willing ear
To every human woe. Here may he soothe
The fevered brow, his smile again give light
His courage steel the spirit wavering,
His charity and faith sustain us all.
No lifeless stone today we dedicate
But that wide spreading of a great man's soul,
That seedling upwards from a city street
And nourished by the deep-thrust roots of faith
Did reach its branches to a grateful state,
And dying, lives again within these walls
That breathe Al's spirit and proclaim his creed—
God made us all, God loves us all, and we
As brothers must within these troubled years
Protect, maintain Al's heritage and ours
Devotedly in service to our fellow men.

Roughneck Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1950

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, several months ago James S. DeLaurier, publisher of the Hammond (Ind.) Times, started a campaign to curb lawlessness and immorality which has been spreading among our American youth.

The following is an editorial from his paper which set out some of the reasons why the national Government should take steps to curb this deplorable juvenile problem:

ROUGHNECK YOUTH

In Los Angeles the police are having trouble with gangs of tough boys who roam the streets, beating any man, woman, or child with whom they come in contact at night. And for no apparent reason, at all.

A few days ago some of these young hoodlums slugged a policeman and then dragged a 43-year-old woman into a car, fractured her jaw and whipped her unmercifully.

In Tolleston a few evenings ago some young rats, swilling up on canned beer, noticed a youth coming from a wedding. Taking a dislike to his formal attire they started to muss him up. His father and mother were in a nearby car and the father, a police sergeant off duty, went to his son's assistance and was knocked unconscious when hit over the head by an iron pipe.

All good citizens know that the police will make every effort to round up these young brats and see to it they are put out of circulation for some years to come.

According to the New York Times, Brooklyn, with more teen-age gangs than any other borough, has the most highly organized form of street and park warfare in all New York City.

The Brooklyn roughnecks battle with knives, zip guns and bigger weapons than used elsewhere, although they are not as murderous as young toughs in the Bronx.

Many of the 3,000 active members of Brooklyn's teen-age gangs are tough girls, some of whom are not listed as virtuous. The problem of young roughnecks has indeed become a matter of grave concern to the New York City police department.

However, all of the young toughs are not confined to the streets. Take the 200 hoodlum students at Ohio State University who invaded the girls' dormitories of the college, as well as those of the sororities.

After this criminal trespassing the Ohio State University toughies doused the pajama-clad coeds in showers and fled with the girls' underclothing.

This is what the people of the United States read on May 5 when a UP dispatch gave the news about the Buckeye State university rowdies.

After the disgrace of one of its students being tried for an alcoholic-haze murder and with mobs of men students crashing

into women's dormitories in predawn hours, one would think the Ohio Legislature would order the State university cleaned up, some of its authorities fired, and the hoodlums kicked out.

It must be a matter of concern to fathers and mothers of girl students at Ohio State to have to worry over the gangster element that seems to have a free hand at the tax-supported university.

Railroad Men Should Submit to Compulsory Arbitration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FORREST C. DONNELL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Railroad Men Should Submit to Compulsory Arbitration," published in the Pasadena (Calif.) Star-News, of May 12, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RAILROAD MEN SHOULD SUBMIT TO COMPULSORY ARBITRATION

In view of the locomotive firemen and enginemen striking against four major railroad systems, crippling the Nation's transportation network, and through the Santa Fe affecting the Pasadena area, and threatening to idle half a million other workers, it is to be hoped common sense leads the Senate labor subcommittee to approve the bill of Senator DONNELL, of Missouri, which would make strikes and lock-outs in railway disputes illegal, and force the contending parties to accept compulsory arbitration. The Nation and the people's interests need such a law.

The demand—that railroads employ two firemen on the larger Diesel locomotives—is without real merit. Two Railway Labor Act fact-finding boards, one appointed by President Roosevelt in 1943, and the other by President Truman in 1949, have so held after careful consideration.

Now Mr. Truman can perform a valuable service by making plain he stands firmly on the report of his own 1949 board which said unanimously:

1. That replacement of steam locomotives by Diesels, instead of knocking firemen out of jobs, creates more jobs. The Diesel's high efficiency should attract more freight to railroads and enable them to compete more successfully with highway truckers.

2. That two firemen are not needed for safety. Rates of train and crew accidents indicate that Diesel operation (with one fireman to a Diesel) is "safer than steam locomotive operation."

This strike has nothing to do with hours, nothing to do with working conditions. It is simply an effort to impose upon the railroads by force a "featherbedding" proposal, one without basis in reason or logic. When Diesel power was first introduced on the Burlington system in 1934 the locomotives were operated safely and efficiently with one man in the cab—the engineer. Shortly afterwards the Burlington, under threat of a strike, was forced to add a fireman. The firemen and the Brotherhood of Engineers have intermittently sought since then to "pack" the Diesel crew with additional and unneeded men.

The Government, through the Interstate Commerce Commission, has constantly encouraged the railroads to expand their Diesel operations on the premise it would cut operating costs, thus making possible rate reductions urgently needed if the rail carriers are to hold their share of the Nation's freight and passenger business and employment.

The railroaders are now serving notice that these two unions intend, if possible, to nullify these operating economies by an indefensible program of "featherbedding," to flout the previous findings of Presidential fact-finding boards and to defy public opinion.

Because railroads operate in the public interest and movement of trains is absolutely necessary for protection of the public health and safety, rigid control was established over them years ago by governmental agencies. Railroad chiefs, for instance, may not arbitrarily close down their lines, as a shopkeeper may roll up his shutters.

Therefore it is logical that railway labor may not flout its obligations to the public and arbitrarily strand trains.

Time for Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 23, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Time for Decision," which appeared in the May 19, 1950, issue of the East St. Louis (Ill.) Journal:

TIME FOR DECISION

The time has come for Americans to face squarely up to this hysterical business of the Communists in Government.

We have had enough of the accusations and insinuations. We have had enough of the smears. We have had enough of the charges that are not, and perhaps cannot be, proved. We have had more than enough.

The time has come for this country to settle down, now, and face this issue calmly. The time has come to stop acting hysterically, to stop reacting emotionally to every charge and every denial. The time has come for some common sense to enter the picture.

But how is common sense to enter the picture? What will it take to lay this cloud that is not only confusing our citizens and frightening them but is undermining whatever position of leadership we may have had in the world?

George N. Craig, national commander of the American Legion, says, "If there is communism in the State Department, the public is entitled to know it. If there is not communism in the Department, the public should know that." He says the public wants the unvarnished facts and they are entitled to them.

So much is certainly true. But what will satisfy people? What kind of proof must we have?

For example, if we get proof that there have been Communists in the State Department, can we get rid of them and have that be the end of the business. And also, if it is proved that there has been no communism in the State Department, will the accusers then be still? Or, if they will not be still, will they be ignored?

In other words, what will it take to settle the hysteria, to uncover the facts in a calm and quiet manner, and let the public have them and then go on from there?

Obviously all present approaches to this problem are proving unsatisfactory. Would an investigation by an impartial, nonpolitical commission do the trick? Or must we admit that we are, as a Nation, too immature to cope with such a problem as this one?

History Repeats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 23, 1950

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include an excellent article, written by Ralph Boyce, entitled "History Repeats," which appeared in the April 22, 1950 issue of the Vet-Times.

This young man, a veteran himself, with a very promising journalistic future, here presents a brilliant and poignant editorial feature about the "unknown soldier" which merits wide circulation and I am pleased to commend it to your reading. The article follows:

HISTORY REPEATS
(By Ralph Boyce)

At long last, he is coming home.

A little more than a year to wait now, and we shall see him laid to rest, to a peaceful slumber deepened by the eternal tread of sentries' boots and the hushed murmurs of those who come to stand in mournful tribute.

They call him an "unknown" hero of World War II. But they are wrong. He is not unknown. We knew him like a brother. He's that 18-year-old kid from next door who never got off the beach at Anzio; he's that farm boy from the Midwest who crashed in a flaming glider in Normandy; that Brooklyn kid whose numbed hands slipped from the life raft many hours after the ship went down; that lanky Texan whose patrol was caught in an ambush along a winding trail on Bougainville.

Yes; we knew him well. And now he is coming home. We wonder if he ever had a chance, in life, to visit the birthplace of the freedom for which he died—Independence Hall in Philadelphia. He will visit it now, in death, and his buddies from all of the armed services will be there, and thousands of us will wait long hours in line for the privilege of sharing his visit.

And later he will come to the Capitol of the United States. Maybe, when he was in school, he visited Washington during Easter vacation on a bus filled with school buddies and toured the Capitol. Maybe that time he sat briefly in the gallery of the historic Chamber of the House of Representatives where later the solemn vote was taken that called upon him to lay down his life for his country.

He will not visit that Chamber this time. Instead, he will lie in state in the great rotunda, where perhaps his school-days' guide once pointed out the blank spaces in the murals around the ceiling which tell the history of our Nation. Blank spaces that eventually will record the progress of the freedom for which he died.

And thousands upon thousands more of us will stand in line for the privilege of visiting with him at the Capitol and our ranks will be joined by the great and the near-great and the never-to-be-great, all equally

humble in his presence and in the knowledge of his sacrifice.

Finally, on Wednesday morning, the 30th of May 1951 (how old would he have been on this date, we wonder?) the guns will begin to boom from Fort Myer, across the Potomac. The gun bursts will echo and die away throughout the entire morning. Meanwhile, from out of the Capitol the funeral cortege will begin its last journey—probably led by the President of the United States.

As the casket on the black-draped caisson is drawn down the broad, tree-lined avenue by six coal-black horses, escorted by prancing cavalry, and followed by a parade of the highest dignitaries of the land, television cameras will pick up the scene and flash it instantly around the Nation.

I guess he never saw television. He'd heard about it, even talked about it—but probably wouldn't have believed that so soon after the war we would be watching baseball games right in our own living room.

But now the miracle of television he never saw will make it possible for an entire Nation to be present at his funeral. Millions who knew him well will share the grief of a Nation, alone and together pay him this belated tribute.

The millions will be with him as his caisson rolls slowly and smoothly past the White House—refurbished and rebuilt since he went away—past the monument to the father of our country, to circle the awe-inspiring Lincoln Memorial where the benign and gaunt figure of another martyr to American freedom looks down in solemn majesty.

The guns will crack loud in the television sets as the caisson rattles across the rough stones of Arlington Memorial Bridge and up through the wide, gold encrusted gates of Arlington National Cemetery.

Perhaps the still-to-come miracle of color television will pick up the riotous color of the azalea bushes—and the breath-taking formal garden of tulips bowing their tribute—as the cortege winds its way to that hallowed place where he is to lie with an older brother who also died for freedom, and came to his final rest in this same spot 30 years before. How often must history repeat itself?

And then, before his casket is lowered into the ground, the President of the United States will pin the Congressional Medal of Honor—highest military honor of all—on the casket. The President will be followed by leaders of allied nations, bestowing similar high honors—until the casket gleams with more decorations than any man has known in life or death.

But please, God, let there be no speech-making. He never was much of a one for speeches, anyway. Deeds, not words, were his way of life, and his way of death.

Let it be recorded that the tears in a nation's eyes and the prayers in a nation's heart were the ultimate, silent honor that brought him, at last, to rest.

Rail Strike Accents Need for Law Protecting Public Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FORREST C. DONNELL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Rail Strike Accents Need for Law Protecting Public Interest," published in the Long Beach (Calif.) Press-Telegram of May 12, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RAIL STRIKE ACCENTS NEED FOR LAW PROTECTING PUBLIC INTEREST

The current strike by 18,000 railway firemen—affecting the major railroad systems, crippling the Nation's transportation network, and threatening to idle half a million workers—focuses attention on a bill by Senator DONNELL of Missouri. This measure would make strikes and lockouts in railway disputes illegal and force the contending parties to accept compulsory arbitration.

It is regrettable that such drastic legislation must be suggested. Collective bargaining, if conducted in a spirit of fair play and graceful compromise, should forestall these great disruptions in our national life. But the stark truth is that this conflict has not been resolved and it has now reached a stage where enormous public harm is threatened. Because railroads are so vital to the national economy, it is inevitable that the Congress will turn to more stringent legislation to protect the public interest.

What is the merit of the demand that railroads employ two firemen on every Diesel locomotive, the crux of the present issue? The answer has been written by two Railway Labor Act fact-finding boards, one named by President Roosevelt in 1943, another by President Truman in 1949. After careful consideration, these boards decided the two-firemen proposal is untenable.

Now Mr. Truman can perform a valuable service by making plain he stands firmly on the report of his own 1949 board, which said unanimously:

1. That replacement of steam locomotives by Diesels, instead of knocking firemen out of jobs, creates more jobs. The Diesels' high efficiency attracts more freight to railroads and enables them to compete more successfully with highway truckers.

2. That two firemen are not needed for safety. Rates of train and crew accidents indicate that Diesel operation (with one fireman to a Diesel) is "safer than steam-locomotive operation."

This strike has nothing to do with hours, nothing to do with working conditions. It is simply an effort to impose upon the railroads and the public by force a "featherbedding" proposal. When Diesel power was first introduced on the Burlington system in 1934, the locomotives were operated safely and efficiently with one man in the cab—the engineer. Shortly afterward the Burlington, under threat of a strike, was forced to add a fireman. The fireman and the Brotherhood of Engineers have intermittently sought since then to "pack" the Diesel crew with additional and unneeded men.

The Government, through the Interstate Commerce Commission, has constantly encouraged the railroads to expand their Diesel operations on the premise that this would cut operating costs, thus making possible rate reductions urgently needed if the rail carriers are to hold their share of the Nation's freight and passenger business and employment.

The railroaders are now serving notice that these two unions intend, if possible, to nullify these operating economies by flouting the previous findings of Presidential fact-finding boards.

The Donnell bill follows mounting evidence that the Railway Labor Act, once regarded as a model measure for labor disputes, has failed to adequately protect the public interest. Unions have refused to accept decisions of fact-finding boards, using these decisions as a line of departure from which to pursue their demands. That new legislation should replace the Railway Labor Act thus becomes a public necessity.

Because railroads operate in the public interest and movement of trains is absolutely necessary for protection of the public health and safety, rigid control was established over them years ago by governmental agencies. Railroad chiefs, for instance, may not arbitrarily close down their lines as a shopkeeper may roll up his shutters.

Therefore it is logical that railway labor may not flout its obligations to the public and arbitrarily strand trains. But such is the case in the present dispute where the unions demand an extra fireman on Diesel locomotives—to help the regular fireman look out the window.

This same line of reasoning applies to other public utilities on which the people rely for their transportation, communication, light, telephone, heat and power.

For a Free and Independent Slovakia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 23, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, at the request of Mr. John Sedlacek, chairman of the Southern Illinois Slovak Federation, 1321 North Thirteenth Street, East St. Louis, and under leave to do so, I herewith extend in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which appeared in Jednota, largest Slovak Catholic weekly in the United States, published in Middletown, Pa., by the First Catholic Slovak Union:

FOR A FREE AND INDEPENDENT SLOVAKIA—THE ORIGIN AND AIMS OF THE SLOVAK NATIONAL COUNCIL ABROAD

(By Peter Pridavok)

III

An internment camp is not a very suitable political platform, and the only thing Benes adversaries there could do was to protest against their detention and against the recognition of Mr. Benes' government by the Government of the United Kingdom. This latter protest was made in a telegram sent to Mr. Churchill from the Lingfield Race Course Aliens Internment Camp in July 1940.

When the present writer was finally released from internment in April 1941 and came to London, he had ample opportunity to observe at close quarters Dr. Benes' anti-Slovak policy. The step taken by the British Government in recognizing Dr. Benes' government as representative of the Czecho-slovak nation, followed subsequently by the United States, the Soviet Union and by the Polish Government (both of them having previously recognized the Republic of Slovakia), as well as by all the other Allied governments-in-exile, was of course a terrible blow and an insurmountable obstacle. The dilemma which presented itself was to give up the struggle and keep silent, or to challenge the whole allied world in an absolutely hopeless struggle and to face persecution, derision and slander? A handful of patriotic Slovaks chose the latter, disregarding all consequences. This writer and his few friends tried to inform the Allied governments and public opinion by memoranda and press articles, but with very little visible effect. More favorable results were obtained in America, where they succeeded, after several years'

hard work, in winning over for the Slovak cause the almost one million strong Slovak-American community, which had previously been confused by the Benesites and intimidated by their influential friends and supporters in the various agencies in the West.

To revive the Paris Council was not possible for the reason already stated. In addition, Dr. Hodza, its president, proved to have been too much entangled with Dr. Benes, and was not a free agent any longer. And anyway, in the following year he left for the United States, where he died shortly afterward. A new group was therefore formed, under the name of "Slovak National Union," with the present writer at its head. Its aims were twofold: To counter the propaganda of the Czechoslovaks, which had progressively become more and more anti-Slovak, and to foster, in cooperation with similar organizations of other nations the idea of a central European federation. For this purpose an independent central European association was established early in 1943. The objects of the association were "the struggle for a new national, political, economic, and social organization of the central European area on a Federal basis * * * and for national freedom, the right of self-government and full nationhood for all nations in central Europe and the rejection of any imperialistic or hegemonic attempts, either external or internal, within its territory." (Cf. Commonwealth of Central Europe, London, 1943, p. 13.) This association later transformed itself into a central European federal club, which became the mother organization of numerous other central European federalist organizations operating today all over the free world.

It may be perhaps worthwhile noting that within the association the first genuine and sincere Czech-Slovak agreement was reached between the Czech and Slovak national unions. On March 9, 1943, these two unions signed a declaration, according to which they mutually recognized the right of the Slovak and the Czech nations to full national freedom and independent, i. e., to a Slovak and a Czech state respectively, within the framework of a central European federation, and pledged themselves to render mutual assistance and support in defending the vital rights of both neighboring sister nations. This agreement which still holds good between the successors of the two national unions, is to this day considered the best workable basis for a Czech-Slovak reconciliation and cooperation, and as far as the Slovaks are concerned, the only acceptable one.

Dr. Benes' sinister influence upon European affairs, exercised by him ever since 1916 (cf. R. Arnold Jones in "Dublin Review," January 1945), which resulted in disaster in 1938 and 1939, reached its climax in December of 1943, when he concluded, against the strong warnings of the British and American Governments, what he tried to present as his magnum opus, i. e., the treaty of friendship, mutual help, and postwar cooperation between the then still nonexistent Czechoslovak Republic and the Soviet Union, so disastrous in its consequences. The Moscow pilgrimage of the self-styled President of Czechoslovakia prompted the handful of Slovaks organized in the National Union to act and to denounce, in the strongest manner possible, this charter of enslavement, if only to put a Slovak protest on record. At a meeting held January 9, 1944, the union formed itself into a Slovak National Council, and in an open letter addressed to Mr. Anthony Eden, the Foreign Secretary of the United Kingdom, and published a few days later, announced that it had assumed the defense of Slovak interests on Allied soil until the Slovak people would be able to speak for themselves through their democratically elected representatives. The present writer was elected its chairman, and Mr. Karol Vychodil its secretary. In its open letter, the Slovak National Council "declared most solemnly that (the Moscow Treaty) was null and void, and did not bind the Slovak Nation in any way," insisting that "the President of the Czechoslovak Republic and Mr. Fierlinger * * * acted as unauthorized negotiators * * * and could not be regarded as authorized negotiators with juridical or political title to represent the Slovak Nation." Besides being a protest against Dr. Benes' compact with Stalin, the document was a plea for the defense and maintenance of the Slovak State as a separate unit in a future Central European Federation. This document, a thoroughly democratic and patriotic plea on behalf of the Slovak Nation, let loose the fury of the Benesites. In their press they denounced it as a "document of national treason." and accused its author of open hostility toward the British Government. (Nove Ceskoslovensko, February 19, 1944.) They went even further and demanded of the British authorities—this time, however, without any results—the imprisonment of the "traitors."

These and other intrigues, in which the Czechoslovaks enlisted the active assistance of Mr. Maisky, the Soviet Ambassador, did not deter the Slovak National Council from further work. When every opportunity presented itself, they did everything to put the case for a free Slovakia before the Allied Nations and their representatives. Had its various proposals and suggestions been accepted at the time, much bloodshed and horror could have been avoided not only in Slovakia, but in other countries of central Europe as well, and probably the whole central European picture would be different today.

The work of the Slovak National Council in London could not end with the termination of the war, because the Slovak people were not given the opportunity to decide freely about their future. In complicity with his Soviet protectors and their misled stooges, Dr. Benes destroyed the Slovak state and started in Slovakia a bloody reign of terror and revenge. Until February 1948 the cruel persecution of Slovak patriots was being carried on under the well-worn mask of democracy. When Dr. Benes' policy, too clever by half, ended in complete communization of his "people's democracy," when Gottwald completed the work started by the presidential decrees of his predecessor and fresh refugees began to pour into the western countries, the numbers of exiled Slovak politicians of various parties and convictions forced to leave the "wonderful republic" increased, and many of them expressed the wish to join the Slovak National Council in London and to support its policy as being in accordance with the desires of the people and with their own convictions.

Taking into consideration this new situation, as well as the magnitude of the tasks before it, the council decided on August 11, 1948, to enlarge its ranks and to reorganize itself completely in order to become the central and leading organ of the Slovak emigration in its struggle for an independent, democratic Slovak state within the framework of a central European and European federation. The name of the council was modified into Slovak National Council Abroad, and chose a new president in the person of M. Karol Sidor, the wartime Slovakian envoy to the Holy See, who is generally considered the most popular and trusted of all the surviving Slovak leaders. The former president of the Slovak National Council in London (the present writer) was elected general secretary, and prominent politicians, diplomats, and other figures of Slovakia's public life entrusted with offices in the presidium and in the various committees of the new council, and with the task of representing it in many of the capitals of the free world.

The purpose in reconstructing the council was announced to the Western Powers and to the exiled representations of other nations now under Soviet and Communist oppression in the following terms:

1. That measures shall be taken for coordination of the struggle by Slovak national elements toward democracy that can be identified with freedom and independence.

2. That measures shall be taken to seek a solution or closer approach to solution than is at present possible of the unsettled national problems in central Europe which have continuously been the source of international trouble; and to that end our opinion is expressed that such problems may become solved only by a policy which in operation would bring about a federation in central Europe, composed of separate states of the nations involved.

3. That this step shall be regarded as a practical and balanced impulse toward cooperation with bodies representing other central European nations for the creation of a democratic federation or commonwealth of central Europe and will thereby serve to harmonize such efforts with further objectives toward the integration of Europe as a whole.

The Slovak National Council Abroad is reliably assured that its national and federalist policy meets with the most wholehearted approval of the Slovak people at home. It has the backing of the overwhelming majority of the Slovak emigration and of the Slovak-American and Slovak-Canadian organizations which recognize the council as "the only institution having every right to act in the name of the Slovak nation and to voice its convictions, will, and desires and pledge it their full moral and material support." (Cf. resolutions of the 30th congress of the Slovak League of America held at Chicago, Ill., Mar. 3, 1949, and of the 8th congress of the Canadian Slovak League, held at Winnipeg, Manitoba, from the 25th to the 27th of July 1949.)

Being not only a national, but a federalist institution as well, the Slovak National Council Abroad realizes the importance of close cooperation with the free representatives of Slovakia's neighbors and prospective partners in the central European commonwealth all of those nations envisage and desire. To this end it has established normal relations and fruitful collaboration with the Czech National Committee in London, with the Hungarian National Committee in Washington, with the legal government of the Polish Republic, the Ukrainian National Council, and with the Government of the Byelorussian Republic, and is in close contact with many national and federalist organizations of various nations. The only group with which the Slovak National Council Abroad does not and will not entertain any relations are the so-called Czechoslovaks, for they do not represent any nation, not only the sad heritage of their discredited leaders and of a bankrupt ideology which has been the main source of discord among the nations of central Europe. (Reprinted from Eastern Quarterly, London, January 1950.)

It's Time To Call a Halt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FORREST C. DONNELL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial

entitled "It's Time To Call a Halt," published in the Beaver Falls (Pa.) News-Tribune of May 12, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT'S TIME TO CALL A HALT

People of the Beaver Valley who did not bother to become concerned over the developing strike threat of the Railroad Firemen's Union have been rudely shaken out of their complacency. They now fully realize, along with the rest of us, before the strike has even entered its third day, that the work stoppage and tie-up of transportation lines is much more than a national problem. It effects, with increasing impact, every home in every hamlet and town; if not quickly settled it will seriously affect our pocketbooks and the economy of the entire Nation.

It is not only the railroad systems involved and their employees that will suffer because of this ridiculous strike of the firemen's union that is an affront to every citizen of the Nation. Steel mills and coal mines, but recently back into production after strike-induced idleness, will very shortly feel the pinch of curtailed raw supplies and shipping facilities. Sharp cuts in production are not only likely, they can be definitely expected. Multiply this effect by the number of smaller, dependent fabricating plants and kindred industries and the dire consequences of featherbedding become apparent in all their startling reality.

Before the second day of the strike was over, such a commonplace, yet vitally important, facility as mail delivery was badly disrupted and practically at a standstill. Delivery of foodstuff will next be impaired since truck-delivery facilities cannot possible be expanded enough to accommodate the heavy demands that will arise.

The bald, unadulterated truth of the matter is that the Nation's economy is being dealt a serious body blow by this strike that is not more money, not because of hours, but only for soft featherbedding spots for additional unnecessary firemen to go along in Diesel locomotives just for the ride.

And what is behind it all? The reckless leaders of the firemen's union want to force down the throats of the railroads and the public a ridiculous make-work proposal which has been twice ruled out by Presidential fact-finding boards duly appointed under the provisions of the Railway Labor Act.

This demand of union leaders for additional and unnecessary firemen to ride in Diesel locomotives was rejected—after months of hearings—by a Board appointed by President Roosevelt in 1943.

It was again rejected in 1949 by a Board appointed by President Truman.

Recent meetings with the National Mediation Board have brought no change in the attitude of the union dictators.

The union leaders helped write the Railway Labor Act. Yet in an attempt to jam through this scheme of pure featherbedding by leading the members of their union out on strike and threatening paralysis to large areas of the Nation, they are defying the spirit and intent of the very law which they helped to create.

The strike is not for higher wages. It is a strike to force the railroads to employ many more thousands of firemen who are not needed. It would be indefensible waste. The railroads have refused to place this additional and unnecessary burden on the public.

But more important than any other consideration is the action of these few irresponsible union leaders in seeking to force a crippling strike upon the Nation for their own selfish purposes.

It is time to put an end to such un-American demands. As was stated in testimony before a Senate Labor Subcommittee hearing on a bill banning rail strikes: "A strike in no other industry can so quickly and so thoroughly paralyze the Nation and bring such disaster to its economy and general welfare nor work such havoc in its defense program or its efforts in the world today."

Point 1 in a Policy for Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS B. HELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 1950

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times magazine of May 14, 1950:

POINT 1 IN A POLICY FOR ASIA—WE MUST INSIST ON SOCIAL AND POLITICAL REFORM OR INTERVENTION WILL FAIL

(By Nathaniel Peffer, professor of international relations at Columbia University)

It seems certain that the United States is going to do something systematic in southeast Asia. Why, is clear enough—to stop the advance of communism and Russia in Asia. But what the United States is going to do is less clear, though more important.

We appear to be thinking now in terms of money and advisory commissions, both military and civil—and even more in Indochina—and it is better at the outset to ask whether that is enough. We did that in China and the results are painfully evident: Two and a half billion dollars thrown away, a Communist regime sitting in the national capital and the implacable hostility of the government. The same measures in southeast Asia will have the same effect, and if we are to learn anything from the fiasco in China we shall have to do more or do less.

First of all it is necessary to estimate the task correctly and to recognize the obstacles. If we are to succeed in keeping all of Asia except the Indian subcontinent from going the way of China we have three enemies to overcome. The first is Russia. The second is the native Communist Party in each southeast Asian country. The third is the ruling class in each country. And of these three the last is the most important, the most difficult to deal with, the most formidable. If we can deal successfully with it—that is, persuade or force it to follow a course it has never yet followed and is reluctant to follow—we may be able to withstand Russian incursion; if not, not.

In consequence the second need is to acknowledge, to ourselves even more than to others, that the course on which we are embarking is one of intervention. It will be charged against us anyway, and we may as well acknowledge it frankly, justifying it to ourselves by the urgency of the world conflict and to others by what we aim to achieve.

Now, there is a good case to be made against intervention, in any country, at any time, in any circumstance. On all the evidence of history it seldom comes off. There is a good case to be made, to, for intervention that is effective. But there is no case whatever to be made for ineffectual intervention. That only results in futility and the hostility of those against whom we have intervened—a dangerous combination, more especially when the world is choosing up sides, as it is now.

This is the prime consideration to be borne in mind before we set out on any positive course in southeast Asia, and the choice is between going in with intent to use all the means required to bring about a political and social structure impregnable to Communist intrusion and not going in at all.

What does this mean? What are the conditions that invite communism in southeast Asia? It is not enough to cite the Communist victory in China and the danger of infection or invasion from there. As a matter of fact, the growth of communism in southeast Asia had set in before the Communists won in China. Indeed, communism has spread in southeast Asia for the same reasons that it won in China.

There are two main reasons:

First, the whole of southeast Asia is or has been colonial. Thailand was independent by permission. Those countries in the region that have not yet won independence are resentful of foreign control and those that have recently won it are suspicious of its return. The Russians have skillfully exploited native nationalism since the first World War. They have ostentatiously taken on the role of defender of oppressed peoples against western empires, and the colonial powers have played into their hands by making no concessions, or belated concessions, to their dependent peoples.

Second, and much more important, is the question of livelihood. The huge majority of individuals in southeast Asia live on a standard that has now come to be accepted as beneath human worth or dignity in other parts of the world, and the ease of communications in our time has made them aware of it. This, too, has been left to the Russians to exploit, and the native Communist leaders trained by them have won followers by the promise of a better material lot.

Nationalism is, on the whole, a dead issue now. Indochina and Malaya are the only countries in which independence has not yet been won. In Malaya nationalism is not yet virulent, because consciousness of unity is of recent origin, and a crisis could be avoided by concessions in time. In Indochina alone is the crisis sharp on the issue of independence versus continued colonialism, and precisely for that reason communism will be most difficult to stem there, with or without American help. Indeed, unless American help is combined with pressure on France of the same kind that was applied to Holland in Indonesia in order to bring about a compromise, American help will not only be futile but will make the Indochinese people bitterly anti-American.

The crux is the social issue. On this it will be determined whether southeast Asia goes Communist or not. And on this American aid, whether in the form of money or the aid of technicians, is not necessarily decisive. In fact, it might only result in accelerating the advent of communism. In this respect it is immaterial whether the area in question is newly independent or still colonial.

There has long been a comfortable liberal belief that if colonial peoples were only emancipated they would be free from exploitation and contended. That is an illusion. The opposite might be true. Western countries, in all of which opinion has been formed by the influence of nineteenth century humanitarianism and twentieth century liberalism, might be—and probably are—more restrained in exploitation than native rulers and landed proprietors who still have the social ideas of a thousand years ago and corresponding attitudes toward the mass of their people.

Now suppose the United States does decide to embark on a large-scale program in Indochina, or Burma, or Indonesia, or all three. Suppose it appropriates large sums to build railways and power plants, irrigation and

reclamation works, hospitals, and schools and numerous industrial establishments. And suppose thereby it does create higher productivity and a manifold increase in production and the national income. Will that work for the benefit of the mass of the people? Not necessarily; it might do just the reverse. It might make the rich much richer and the poor even poorer, and thus inflame popular discontent and make easy converts to communism. In fact, unless definite efforts were taken for prevention, it would do that.

Much is being talked about point 4, and the most important thing to say about it is this: It can be the most enlightened social measure in modern times and it can produce the conditions of peace in large parts of the earth; but also, unless administered with foresight, determination, vigilance and understanding of social fundamentals in undeveloped areas, it can serve as the spearhead of communism and Russian expansion.

The explanation is simple. If industries are established with American capital and the rich classes get in on the ground floor—as they can, since they have money and knowledge—they will reap the huge profits always yielded in the first stages of industrialization, and with those profits invest in more enterprises and make still more. If at the same time the poor, whether former urban handicraft workers or workers brought in off the land, are paid the subsistence wages they have been accustomed to and worked the traditional 14-hour handicraft day, they will be worse off than before.

They will then have to work at the pace of the factory, live in urban slums, acquire urban demands which they have to satisfy by paying with cash instead of making things with their hands on the farm. The disparity between the classes will become even wider than it is now, but it will be more glaring and obvious than now, because industrial workers soon acquire sophistication, even in the Orient. Discontent will fester and the voice of the Communist will have a siren lure.

In the land it can be even worse. The countries in question are all agricultural, their people almost all peasants. The main problem therefore is the agrarian problem. If by irrigation and other projects we improve the fertility of the land, but leave untouched the system of landownership, land rent, usurious rates of interest and disproportionate taxation, the benefits of increased fertility will accrue to the landowner exclusively. In fact he will be able with his large profits to buy in more land, and more peasants will become rack-rented tenants.

Peasant discontent is endemic in such countries. It will become more virulent as conditions worsen, and everywhere communism's first and most successful appeal is to the peasants. With or without industrial development there can be no stability or internal peace in southeast Asia unless the agrarian problem is drastically dealt with.

In short, to put American money into development of technologically backward areas while leaving as they are the internal distribution of wealth and power and the existing relation between the small omnipotent minority and the impoverished majority is to aggravate conditions already so bad as to be volcanic.

The moral is plain. If we go in at all it is intervening. It is intervening for the purpose of keeping Russia out. Then it had better be intervention with a prospect of success. That means we have to use power as well as dispense money. If we want to undercut Russia we have to remove the grounds on which it can work. That means we have to bring about conditions that will leave the mass of native people no reason to lend a sympathetic ear to Communist exhortations or promises. We cannot do that if we leave decision to those who now have power in such countries, whether they still are colonial under French or British jurisdiction or are independent, as in Indonesia or the Philippines or Burma.

The Philippines can be taken as an example here. They are now free and independent. And it is generally recognized that communism has gained since emancipation in 1946 and is still gaining. The Hukbalahaps, who are Communist led but in the main not Communists, are suppressed at one point and pop up at another point. They do so because the mass of the people, especially on the land, are disaffected. They are disaffected because the government, controlled mainly by large landowners, has taken no step to improve the peasants' lot; if anything, to the contrary. Nor does it show any inclination to do so.

That being the case, it can be confidently predicted that communism will grow, regardless of whether or not America provides additional financial help. In other words, continued colonial status or emancipation is irrelevant. In fact, we may be more helpless in countries that are now independent.

No matter which country and what its status, financial aid of any kind—whether ad hoc or under a formal point 4 program—must be accompanied by pressure; not military pressure against local Communist guerrilla forces, not pressure against local Communist parties, but pressure against native classes holding power of decision.

In newly established industries we must insist on fair wage scales and working hours more nearly in keeping with Western standards. On the land we must insist on reform in the organization of land ownership, including redistribution where necessary, on reduction of land rents, on reduction of rate of interest for peasants, on elimination of the various forms of manipulation whereby peasants have to pay exorbitantly for what they buy and get too little for what they sell.

Both in industry and on the land there must be equitable taxation. This comes close to the heart of the matter. There must be an end to the system under which those who have least carry the burden of paying for such public services as there are, while those who have most go almost scot-free. For example, there is no excuse for the negligible income taxes paid by rich Filipinos, while the peasants have to pay their share of the cost of government.

Any belief that the economically powerful groups in each country will do this voluntarily is illusory. They will do it only if compelled, and we alone can compel them if we intervene at all with money and technical assistance. We can do so by keeping our representatives on the spot, watching the exception of the program, threatening to withdraw unless the measures we demand are carried out, and withdrawing both in money and personnel, if they are not.

In that case we may succeed. The perquisites growing out of the development made possible by our funds will be valuable, legitimately, to those who now have most wealth. The fear of losing those perquisites gives us a powerful weapon. Furthermore, they have more to lose from the advent of communism than we have. They will hesitate if we are firm, and they recognize that we mean business. We may get our way then—and only then. Intellectual persuasion and moral suasion are futile. Only threat of withdrawal can possibly be effective.

In short, the way to intervene is to intervene. If we are not prepared to do that, it is better not to start.

It can be taken for granted that if we intervene there will be a loud outcry of American imperialism, raised first in Moscow and then echoed by local Communists and perhaps taken up at the outset by many who are not Communists. But whether it carries conviction and wins adherents in the end depends on whether or not our pressure gets the kind of results we aim at.

The oriental peasant, though illiterate, is not ignorant. He has an intellectually unreasoned but sure sense of what conduces to his welfare and what does not. If he sees that by virtue of our action, however much compulsion is used on his own influential classes, he has more land, pays less rent when he rents land, is freed from usurious interest when he has to borrow till his crop is harvested and pays lower taxes—at least lower than the rich—the cry of imperialism will carry little persuasion. He will be aware that the kind of imperialism that gives him enough to eat does him no harm.

Nor will the cry be too persuasive to the intellectual classes, those most responsive to nationalism, most sensitive to the threat to independence or most dedicated to recovering it where it has been lost. If they see that American intervention is confined to bringing about modernization and laying a foundation of a better social order and that America demands neither political prerogative nor economic perquisites, they, too, will be unmoved by the cry of imperialism. They will perceive the distinction between that kind of intervention and the old orthodox colonialism.

The Chinese people would not have resented our interference if, in 1945, when we started pouring money and arms and supplies into China, we had insisted that the Chiang Kai-shek regime put an end to carpet-bagger looting, throw out those palpably guilty of profiteering, appoint men of another stripe and institute the agrarian reforms plainly called for. Had we told Chiang Kai-shek that unless he did these things, not another dollar or gun would be forthcoming and he would be left to the mercies of the Communists, he might have yielded—it is not sure, but it is possible.

If he had yielded, Mao Tze-tung would not be sitting in Peiping now. And for that, the Chinese people would hold no grievance against us. As it is, they do have resentment—and not only the Communists among them. Indeed, it may be the non-Communists and anti-Communists who resent us most. We intervened, supported Chiang Kai-shek, made no conditions, gave the corruption and malpractice of his regime our economic underwriting, and thus produced the disaffection of the Chinese people and opened the doors to communism. Now both Communists and anti-Communists are embittered.

Imperialism in our time is a word that can have any content one chooses to give it. Intervention is as it does. It is questionable at best, risky at best. It can be justified or not, according to what it produces. In itself point 4 is a high social concept, with the potentiality of making a better dispensation the world over. But it can also operate to its own frustration.

So could the program now proposed for southeast Asia. If that program is carried out with a clear recognition of the needs to which it is applied and firmness in overcoming the obstacles, no matter how highly placed their origin, we may succeed in throwing up barriers that will arrest the Communist tide. If not, it will be self-defeating. We shall have wasted money, incurred the enmity of all sides, and both southeast Asia and ourselves will be worse off. Russia will be the gainer.

Rail Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FORREST C. DONNELL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Rail Strike," published in the Johnstown (Pa.) Tribune of May 11, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RAIL STRIKE

Each strike, of course, stands alone, since the issues differ in each case. But the combination of strikes which has afflicted the country in the last year—and which have particularly afflicted this part of Pennsylvania—has had a seriously discouraging effect on business, industry, and the public in general.

The latest strike affecting this district has tied up the Pennsylvania Railroad west of Harrisburg, along with part or all of three other railroads in the country. Together these roads handle an estimated one-third of the Nation's passenger traffic, and one-fifth of its freight. This area, dependent upon Pennsylvania Railroad for most of its heavy transportation—coal and steel—is particularly hard hit. And yet it can do nothing but wait until the strike is settled on the national level.

Approximately 18,000 members of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen have brought this partial paralysis upon the country. They seek an additional fireman on multiple-unit Diesel locomotives. The firemen and the engineers have a long-standing feud on this question, each seeking to compel the railroads to employ an additional member of the union on the big Diesels.

In 1943, a Presidential fact-finding board found no justification for adding either an additional fireman, or an additional engineer to the train crews. The demand was raised again by the firemen, and another Presidential fact-finding board held that the union's argument of safety was "devoid of merit." That was last September. Since then the dispute has lingered on, culminating at last in a strike. To avoid Federal interference on the ground of national emergency, the strike has been called against only part of the national railroad system, but that part is extremely important.

This is another instance in which a relatively few men in a key industry can bring the economy of the country to a halt. For the stoppage of transportation means that very soon other industries must close down too. In this area, coal is piling up and mining, which suffered a 9-month partial or complete stoppage in the last year, must soon cease major operations again if the rail strike persists. Steel, also, may soon be compelled to cease production.

The Railway Labor Act was devised to avert such shut-downs of transportation in this country, but like other measures of this kind it merely delayed strikes, without forbidding them. We have accepted for many years the principle that the strike is a legitimate economic weapon. But when that weapon is wielded irresponsibly by small key unions, the safety and the welfare of the country takes precedence over the right to strike.

Congress is weighing a law for compulsory arbitration of railroad labor disputes, and yesterday a spokesman for the Southern Railway system said he had been brought reluctantly to the conclusion that such a law is needed. If there were any other solution, he said, the railroads would be for it, but "we have no other solution." If such strikes as this one continue, it is highly possible that public opinion will support a measure to outlaw railway strikes, even though compulsory arbitration is not an entirely satisfactory substitute for sound, responsible bargaining between employers and employees.

Railroad Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FORREST C. DONNELL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Railroad Strike," published in the New London (Conn.) Day of May 13, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RAILROAD STRIKE

This country seldom has a railroad strike of any consequence. To the credit of the rail unions, they ordinarily manage to settle their differences with management through the means of the special board established for the purpose of adjusting such dispute, although it certainly is not a fact that the members of the union have suffered greatly in this process. They have done pretty well in their bargaining of recent years, particularly in the operating unions. The significant point, though, is that the methods provided for discussion and adjustment of differences, between the unions concerned and the management of the railroads, usually have worked admirably. This is one time when they did not work. The country faces the prospect of increasing inconvenience and then paralysis of business because 120,000 locomotive firemen are on strike on some roads.

The dispute concerns the presence of a third man on Diesel-powered locomotives, two instead of one firemen on multiple-unit Diesels. The strike is confined largely to a few railroads, for instance, the Pennsylvania on its divisions west of Harrisburg and the New York Central divisions west of Buffalo. The net effect of the shut-down of service (in many areas other railroad employees refused to cross picket lines to operate equipment that was not involved in the strike) has been to cut down shipments of vital necessities, in some parts of the country, and to put various workers in totally unrelated industries on the lay-off list. For instance, the strike is already being felt in New England in some industries, because of lack of delivery of supplies, etc. In Detroit it was said that automobile production would be cut down at once, and shut off altogether soon in all likelihood, because of the transportation difficulty.

The railroads call attention to the fact that the strike issue has been thoroughly arbitrated, and the union involved has been turned down—not only by the regular railroad arbitration agency but also by a special committee appointed by the President. Yet the strike took place. The railroads make no bones about contending that this is a case of featherbedding employees—providing unnecessary or unusually easy jobs for them, or paying higher wages than the actual hours worked, etc. The union responds that it is completely unreasonable to expect one fireman—who in the last analysis apparently becomes more of a mechanic than a fireman on the new Diesels—to watch, oil, and otherwise service one of these multiple-unit locomotives. The suggestion is raised, too, that safety is involved—that the fireman is required to be well away from the controls of the engine, much of the time, and that he is hence not apt to be available to do whatever is necessary to be done, for the sake of safety, if something should happen unexpectedly to the engineer.

The deplorable part of this whole dispute is that the public, as usual, gets it in the neck when the men walk out. Not only are many thousands of employees in other industries going to lose wages because of the strike—unless it is settled promptly—but the general public will suffer. The railroads, as a vitally necessary part of life, cannot stop operating for long. Strikes in this field ought to be outlawed, with reasonable provision made for settling them by conferences.

For a New Rail Labor Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FORREST C. DONNELL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "For a New Rail Labor Act," from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of Saturday, May 20, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOR A NEW RAIL LABOR ACT

Sentiment is mounting in Congress, and the Nation, for a Federal statute that would outlaw rail strikes and enforce compulsory arbitration. Labor hates such a prospect uncompromisingly. Yet unions in the railway industry are doing more than any other source to bring about such an act.

The A. F. of L. Switchmen's Union by its strike order against 10 Midwest and Western roads has heaped new fuel under the issue. Only Government mediation seems able to prevent a second rail stoppage, first called for Tuesday, now postponed to June 1. One of the most unpopular strikes in recent years was the walk-out to obtain an extra fireman on multiple Diesels. This ended in the union's agreement to accept arbitration. Other railroad strikes in the last few years have whipsawed the economy and raddled public patience.

The present Railway Labor Act, long regarded as a model law, has broken down. Its fact-finding machinery has been ignored by unions, or repudiated. So persistent has been

the list of the law's failures, spokesmen for the Pennsylvania and the New York Central roads have asked Congress to pass the bill sponsored by Senator DONNELL, of Missouri. This would prohibit rail strikes and compel acceptance of arbitration.

Rail management was formerly as rigidly opposed to such a statute as labor. The roads want to do their own bargaining, make their own labor deals. But that has increasingly grown precarious, or virtually impossible. So they now plump for Federal arbitration as an only out. Unions still are dead set to fight the legislation.

The roads, labor, nor the public like enforced ruling by Presidential fact-finders. This could open the way to Government domination of industrial wages and prices, to Washington control of industry. Such an act might be the wedge to open other industries to compulsory Federal arbitration.

That possibility must not be allowed to materialize. But the Nation and its economy cannot persistently be stagnated and crippled by transportation tie-ups engineered for advantage of a relatively small segment of the people. Pillory of the economy and the public cannot be justified by self-interests of a small minority, no matter how valid might be their claims. And many of these claims are dubious or frankly excessive.

A new labor-rail act is demanded and should be passed.

We like compulsory arbitration no more than the unions. Yet unless some better program is devised, and none seems in the offing, the Donnell bill should be adopted. The rights of labor or management must be subservient to the rights of the Nation, and it is time Government accepts this policy.

The Railroads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FORREST C. DONNELL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Lynchburg (Va.) Advance of May 11, 1950, entitled "The Railroads."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE RAILROADS

The Presidential fact-finding boards have declared that the demand of the striking railroad workers for an extra fireman on Diesel locomotives is not justified. The railroads make the same contention. Yet the workers strike and tie up four major railroads. Passengers, freight, express, and mail are blocked in the areas these railroads serve. The workers will lose money, the railroads will lose money, and many other persons and interests will lose money. There is not likely to be any gain for anyone. That is, unless the public and the Government are made aware of the necessity for keeping the trains running and demand that they be kept running.

The railroads are our basic transportation. They already suffer from many ills and injustices. The Second World War showed the job required of them and the job they can do, which can be done no other way. Since the war there have been huge expenditures for equipment and improved services. But there has been no tax relief and no relief from subsidized competition. Now comes a strike which is wholly unjustified.

Experts on union tactics find a special technique in this strike. They consider it to be a means of browbeating four lines and, if successful, "softening up" the other lines for similar or more drastic demands.

The practice promoted in the union demand is known as featherbedding, which means employing superfluous workers. That costs the railroads extra money, if practiced, and the extra cost eventually is paid by patrons of the railroads. At the same time the railroads lose business to competitors, trucking lines for example, not burdened with featherbedding, with road-bed maintenance, with excessive taxes.

As long as there is a strike it should be faced down until the union knows it can not force superfluous workers on the railroads—and expect the public to pay the bill. Meanwhile the Congress is faced once more with the need for legislation to keep essential services in operation. No help can be expected from the President. He aids and abets strikes, justified or plainly unjustified.

Home Building Activity at New Peak

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1950

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I insert the following report of the United States Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, on the number of housing starts in April—126,000 dwelling units—the highest number in the history of the United States. Private industry in the United States is still on the march. This year it will, I believe, again break another all-time record.

The report follows:

HOME BUILDING ACTIVITY AT NEW PEAK—126,000 NEW DWELLING UNITS STARTED IN APRIL

Home building activity for the first third of 1950 reached new record proportions, according to preliminary estimates of the United States Labor Department's Bureau of Labor Statistics. In April alone, builders started 126,000 new permanent dwelling units, an increase of 16,000 (15 percent) over March, and 37,700 (43 percent) over April 1949.

So far in 1950, each month has been record-breaking in number of new dwelling units started. From January through April 1950, new housing units totaled almost 395,000, which surpasses 1949 activity for the same months by 53 percent. Last year, the half-million mark was reached in July; this year it seems quite likely that a half a million new dwelling units will have been started by the end of May.

The acceleration in home-building activity was country-wide, according to preliminary reports from local building-permit officials. When the first 4 months of 1949 and 1950 are compared, the most striking advances this year were reported for the West North Central, Middle Atlantic, East North Central, and West South Central States. In all of these areas the number of new dwelling units authorized for construction was about double the volume for the January–April period in 1949.

For the first 4 months the east north central States led all other regions this year in the volume of new dwelling units for which permits were issued, followed closely by the Pacific, middle Atlantic, and west south central regions. Last year for the same period the Pacific States led by a wide margin.

Among some of the larger cities reporting, the number of units authorized was double, and even triple last year's volume for the first 4 months. Marked increases were reported for Washington, D. C.; Chicago, Ill.; Wichita, Kans.; Baltimore, Md.; Kansas City and St. Louis, Mo.; Oklahoma City, Okla.; Philadelphia, Pa.; Dallas, Tex.; and Milwaukee, Wis.

TABLE 1.—*Number of new non-farm-dwelling units started 1948, 1949, and 1950*

1948	931,300
January	53,500
February	50,100
March	76,400
April	99,500
May	100,300
June	97,800
July	95,000
August	86,600
September	82,200
October	73,400
November	63,600
December	52,900
1949	1,025,100
January	50,000
February	50,400
March	69,400
April	88,300
May	95,400
June	95,500
July	96,100
August	99,000
September	102,900
October	104,300
November	95,500
December	78,300
1950:	
January	[1] 78,700
February	[2] 80,000
March	[1] 110,000
April	[2] 126,000

[1] Revised.
[2] Preliminary.

Strike Without Reason

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FORREST C. DONNELL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Strike Without Reason," published in the Commercial Appeal, of Memphis, Tenn., on May 11, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STRIKE WITHOUT REASON

The strike which the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen have called against four of the Nation's major railroads

and three subsidiaries is utterly without reason and should be countered with all the means at the Government's disposal.

It is slowly crippling the American railroad system. It will drastically affect the normal economy of the South. Eventually, the economic paralysis will creep over the Nation. Again we say, this vast stoppage is without slightest justification and therefore completely undeserving of public support. It makes the processes of the National Railway Labor Act a failure and destroys whatever was the merit of Presidential fact-finding boards.

The firemen and enginemen sought a second fireman for multiple-unit Diesel locomotives. The demand has received exhaustive consideration by two Presidential fact-finding boards and, in each instance, was rejected. The railroads' position that the demand is nothing but featherbedding and job making is undeniable. About all that a second fireman could do on a Diesel would be to get in the way. His contribution to the safety factor would be nil. The last fact-finding board held that Diesel locomotive usage by the railroads was actually making jobs. Better schedules made possible by their use have attracted more freight and passengers.

The rule or ruin attitude of the striking firemen suggests the cure. There is now pending before the Senate Labor Committee the so-called Donnell bill requiring compulsory submission of railroad labor-management disputes to fact-finding boards whose decisions would be binding. Disputes involving wages and working conditions would be submitted to Presidential fact-finding boards. Those involving interpretation of agreements would go to the Railroad Adjustment Board. Court decisions on appeals taken from board decisions would be final.

The record shows that the railroads have consistently accepted the recommendations of fact-finding boards while the opposite is true of some of the unions. This and the background of the present stoppage clearly emphasize the need of the companies contained in the Donnell bill. The national welfare is not well served by any process which permits of strikes even though fact-finding agencies have denied the claims and demands of unions. In this instance national welfare is being greatly damaged and national safety seriously endangered.

Ultimately, national welfare and safety are going to require a prohibition against strikes in the communications and transport industries—the two through which revolutionary communism moves first.

Contracting of Mexican Farm Labor in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 1950

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an analysis recently made by Dr. Ernesto Galarza, director of research and education for the National Farm Labor Union, of the procedures followed, and the resultant effects of the policies used, in the recruitment of Mexican workers for employment in agriculture in the United States. This recruitment program, inaugurated as a wartime measure, has been extended and entrenched until now, in view of the excess of domestic agricultural labor available, it is having a drastic effect upon the situation of farm labor, not only in California but throughout the South and West. This effect is felt indirectly in the industrial labor market also. Dr. Galarza's program for reform of the procedures should be given serious consideration by every Member of this House with a real interest in maintaining and improving living and working conditions of which we need not be ashamed. Recent Nation-wide publicity in the press and magazines gives real evidence that we do now have real reason to feel shame.

Dr. Galarza's analysis follows:

MEXICAN-UNITED STATES LABOR RELATIONS AND PROBLEMS

(By Ernesto Galarza, director of research and education, National Farm Labor Union, Washington, D. C.)

Since 1942 the recruitment of Mexican workers for employment in agriculture in the United States by intergovernmental executive agreements has become a settled policy. The first agreement of that year was an emergency war measure. The last one, signed on August 1, 1949, indicates how the Governments of Mexico and the United States propose to carry out their normal, peacetime labor relations.

It seems unnecessary to say that the circumstances which led to the 1942 agreement were not the same as those which appear to have justified that of 1949. The real shortage of manpower in this country and the heavy demand on our food resources were obvious to all of us. We supported this policy in the war years in spite of the faulty administration of the original agreement as well as the injustices, graft and irresponsibility that attended certain phases of the program.

We have now had nearly 8 years of experience with this type of international labor policy, and half of that experience has occurred since the end of World War II. It is time that we consider fully some of the practical effects of these agreements on labor and inter-American relations. For those who have not read the text of the August executive agreement and related documents, it may not be amiss to summarize their provisions.

The agreement itself is supported by an individual labor agreement and a joint interpretation of the international executive agreement. All three documents are binding. They provide for the legalization of the so-called wetbacks or illegal entrants and give them precedence for farm labor contracts. Although the employers and workers are parties to the individual labor contract, they cannot change the terms of the contract without the consent of the United States and Mexican Governments. The United States Employment Service is designated as the agent of the employers.

These documents further provide that processors, as distinguished from growers, of food may employ Mexican contract workers and the USES is given the role of promoter among United States growers to encourage the hiring of nationals. The USES is also given the authority to determine which employers in this country are to be permitted to sign contracts as well as the power to certify as to the need and non-availability of workers in the United States. This concurrence by the USES is made a condition of the enforcement of many of the critical clauses of the agreement.

The documents authorize the signing of labor contracts up to a period of a year, except for the cotton and beet crops, where contracts may run for as short a period of time as 6 weeks. Workers may elect their own representatives to deal with employers except for purposes of collective bargaining. Compulsory arbitration is imposed on both the growers and the Mexican nationals.

Under the head of minimum living and working conditions, the agreement prohibits racial discrimination and promises the worker full advance information on wages and other conditions at the place of employment before he arrives there. It assures the payment of the prevailing wage for a given class of work and establishes compulsory accident insurance, calls for decent housing, makes available free health examinations and free medical services, eliminates deductions from wages for savings funds and guarantees safe and adequate transportation, the 8-hour day, maximum cost of meals and no work on Sunday as well as employment for three-fourths of the total period stipulated in the contract.

On paper, these and other provisions represent an attempt to correct many serious objections that were present in previous agreements and, on paper, there is much to commend them. Indeed, the agreement extends to alien workers employed in the United States certain rights which domestic workers do not enjoy. The 8-hour day, free medical service and compulsory accident insurance provisions are examples of this inequality.

We are now concerned, however, with something more than the paper weight of these agreements. We in the National Farm Labor Union want an honest appraisal of the facts, not the promises. In this interval of precarious peace, we want experience, not expediency, to guide our decisions.

First of all, there is no question that the effect of these agreements on farm wages, especially on the corporation type of farms, has been decisive. During the war years, the effect was to discourage wage increases among domestic farm laborers in the Southwest. In the postwar years, the agreements have constituted an effective diplomatic support for the wage cutting that has come about, notably during the past few months.

In California the corporation farms have been carrying out this policy of wage reductions. Last September they tried to put over a 17-percent squeeze on the pay of cotton pickers. A few weeks ago they decided to cut the wages of Filippino workers by 10 cents an hour. Throughout the Central Valley of California wages have fallen from 85 and 90 cents an hour to 75, 70, 65, and even 50 cents an hour. In Mississippi, cotton wages fell from $3.25 per hundred pounds to $2.10 in 1949. In Arkansas the rate fell from $3.25 to $2.65. Time after time we have found situations of this kind, where the domestic worker either has had to work for 10, 15, or 20 cents an hour under the 1948 wages or relinquish his job to a Mexican national or "wetback."

The illegal or wetback is mentioned in this connection because of a certain provision of the August agreement. This provision permits the legalization of wetbacks who were in the United States as of August 1, 1949. In California alone this paved the way for the legalization of more than 40,000 workers who had entered the country illegally. Since it is impossible to determine when an illegal crosses the border, this provision is practically an escalator clause on which wetbacks may ride to legality in the future.

It has become a common experience of members of the National Farm Labor Union to be told by corporation farms that they can either work for less or go home, since plenty of Mexican contract workers are available. But there are additional facts to be placed on the record in this connection.

It is becoming more difficult for domestic workers with families to get jobs in competition with imported contract labor. In some areas of California it is a definite handicap, often a fatal one, for a farm worker to have a family and to be a local resident. Contract workers are preferred because they are single and must live on the farm. They must room in the corporation bunkhouse, thus becoming internes who are unfamiliar with the customs, practices, and standards of the outside community and who for that reason are easy marks for the many subtle forms of exploitation practiced upon them.

We of the National Farm Labor Union have no hesitation in saying, in the light of our experience over the past 4 years, that the labor-recruiting agreements have been used to support a Nation-wide attack on the wage scales of farm labor. A major part of the present crisis in the Central Valley of California is due to the immediate and direct, as well as to the remote and indirect, effects of these agreements. The conversion of the great Central Valley into a hunger bowl during this winter is a national spectacle for which the authors and administrators of those agreements must take a large share of responsibility.

Obviously, these wage cuts could have been accomplished only by the weakening of the bargaining power of the domestic agricultural workers. This, too, has been a practical byproduct of the agreements. The DiGiorgio Fruit Corp. of California used more than a hundred contract nationals behind a picket line at the most critical point in a strike that has now been going on for more than 2 years. More recently, legalized "wetbacks" and nationals worked behind the picket lines in the September 1949 strike of cotton pickers, who successfully resisted the attempt of the corporation farmers to reduce the wage scale from $3 to $2.50 per hundred pounds.

There is no large-scale farm enterprise in the United States where a peaceful, lawful effort to maintain wages of domestic workers is not threatened with failure by the actual or potential use of Mexican contract labor.

Guided by our own experience in this matter, we can already suggest some of the practical results of the agreements as they affect labor. These agreements have already accomplished, in greater or lesser degree, the following:

1. They have excluded organized labor from the negotiations preceding such agreements.

2. They have undermined wages and collective bargaining for domestic farm workers.

3. They have encouraged the infiltration of other crafts and trades such as building and food processing, by underpaid, unorganized and unorganizable labor.

4. They have facilitated the dumping of Mexican unemployment into the United States.

5. They have set up the principle of the determination of domestic wage scales in a foreign country exclusively through government channels.

6. They have set up the practice of government officials negotiating for workers without the right or power of the latter to change or revoke the resulting agreements.

7. They have established the principle of compulsory arbitration.

8. They have enabled the National Government of one party to the agreements to surrender the constitutional rights of its citizens

9. They have made illegal entry into the United States the basis of a labor contract.

10. They have set up different standards for wages and working conditions for domestic and foreign workers.

11. They have invested government officials with the right and duty of acting as agents for finance farmers and other corporate interests who operate on a national and international scale.

12. They have prohibited the collection of union dues.

13. They have evaded domestic law and existing international machinery bearing on the matters with which the agreements have been concerned.

14. They have restricted collective bargaining by the supposed beneficiaries of the agreements.

15. They have fostered and given wide currency to misconceptions and fallacies which will not stand up to honest reporting and forthright analysis.

On each of these counts, a good deal might be written. Suffice it to stress two of them.

The violation of existing laws is, I think, involved every time foreign labor is contracted without the previous public hearing and investigation by the United States Attorney General called for by Federal statutes. In addition, the legalization of the status of illegal entrants for the purposes of a labor contract is a usurpation of congressional authority. Had the Federal Congress wanted to amend the immigration law to make illegal entry into this country anything other than a felony, undoubtedly it would have done so. The amendment, however, was accomplished by an executive agreement at the recommendation of the Department of State.

On a different plane we can say, with justification, that the negotiators of these agreements also evaded or ignored existing international machinery that by this time might have been adapted to the proper, orderly and necessary movement of farm workers between Mexico and the United States. But here also the negotiators have chosen to follow a bilateral, semisecret course. The Pan American Union and the International Office of the United Nations exist for the declared purpose of achieving international friendship through the protection and improvement of living standards. However, in the matter of the recruitment of Mexican workers for employment in the United States both institutions have been ignored.

More extensive comment is called for under the head of misconceptions, fallacies, and economic myths which have been given currency by the apologists of these agreements. These myths are four in number: (1) that contract workers have not displaced domestic workers; (2) that domestic workers are not available; (3) that the need for contract labor is determined by the free play of the labor market, and (4) that wages for foreign contract labor are set on the basis of a domestic prevailing scale.

The agreements have specifically prohibited the displacement of domestic workers by contract laborers. Displacement, nevertheless, has been and is taking place on a large scale. There is direct displacement, as in California, where nationals and legalized "wetbacks" are given jobs at lower wages when domestic labor refuses to work for those wages. We have checked field crews in which the proportion of nationals to domestic workers was as high as 6 to 1. Direct substitution of nationals, however, is the lesser of the forms of displacement. There is indirect displacement which takes the form of a series of waves of migration of domestic workers from the border areas northward. These migrants are retreating from the low-wage pressure created by nationals, principally in the Imperial and Rio Grande areas. The Mexican colonies in California's Central Valley are growing rapidly by the accretion of families long established in communities just north of the border. This chain reaction has forced thousands of families to take to the road again, forming a body of displaced persons for whom Congress has as yet provided no relief.

The notion that domestic workers are not available and that therefore the importation of contract labor for agricultural employment is justified rests on a personal interpretation by Federal officials as to what constitutes availability. The following interpretation was set forth by one employment official of the State of California when he said that "foreign labor will not be used except as a supplementary labor force when domestic workers are not available and willing to accept the job offering."

Now, this job offering is never made in terms of a decent minimum wage or other minimum standards. To these officials the refusal of a domestic cotton picker in 1949 to work for $2.50 a hundred pounds would constitute unavailability and would justify certification of need of foreign labor. That is what has happened also in the Citrus Belt of California and in the Cotton Belt of the South.

There is no such thing as availability pure and simple. Conditions are always inherent in a job—wages, hours, treatment accorded employees, etc. Stripping the employer-worker relationship to an economic fig leaf is merely a device to protect negotiators of international labor agreements from indecent exposure.

Third in the list of current myths is the one that runs to the effect that certification of need is determined by the free play of forces in the labor market. But determination and certification of need do not run this inexorable course. In California, certification of need actually starts with the county farm labor advisers. It rises through echelons of other advisers, past State employment officials who believe it to be an axiom that some crops and certain areas require foreign contract labor, and up to the USES and the Department of State, whose approval is automatic. Certification of need under these procedures is not an economic but a political process loaded against the workers. In brief, there are no agreed standards subject to open hearing and public inquiry by which need can be measured and certification justified.

Finally, there is the fallacy that foreign contract workers do not push farm wages down or serve as instruments for depressing labor conditions because they are paid the prevailing wage in the area of employment. This is the argument that has been most persistently thrown at organized labor by government and corporation farming apologists of the agreements.

Outside of agriculture, the concept of the prevailing wage is clear enough. The Davis-Bacon Act and the Walsh-Healey Act, for example, both specifically state that the prevailing wage in a craft or trade is the wage which has been set by the Secretary of Labor. The determination is made after a check of wage rates based on union contracts. In California, the labor code specifically states that the prevailing wage is the wage determined by the public body which awards the contract. It seems obvious that outside of agriculture the elements of a prevailing wage are, first, determination of wage rates for the given type of employment as set forth in collective bargaining agreements, and second, a declaration by a public agency fixing the actual level of the prevailing wage.

Neither of these conditions exists in California agriculture, nor, so far as I know, anywhere else. There is no public body that makes a declaration fixing the prevailing agricultural wage. There are no union contracts upon which such a declaration might be based. The State Department of Agriculture of California has said that there is no so-called prevailing wage in that State. The United States Department of Agriculture has said that there is no so-called prevailing wage in agriculture. Every official agency of the Federal Government seems to know that

there is no so-called prevailing wage for farm labor—everyone, that is, except the United States Employment Service and the Department of State. The closest the State employment service of California comes to this concept is the "most common wage rate" which it uses in its weekly reports.

Since the prevailing wage does not exist in United States agriculture, the use of that expression must be regarded as an unconscious or deliberate economic myth. Why is it so persistently used as such?

The answer seems to be that it distracts attention from the actual, practical methods by which wages are set in agriculture. This is the way it is done in California.

Wages are set by meetings of growers in each major crop. These meetings take the form of "wage conferences" for cotton, grapes, raisins, and other products. The conferences are held under the auspices of organizations directly influenced by or highly sympathetic to the labor views of the Associated Farmers of California. Workers and labor contractors are invited to these conferences, but neither of these groups may vote. Resolutions and action upon proposals may be taken only by the growers' delegates.

The aims, methods, and intent of these "wage conferences" have been aptly described by one who has had much experience in organizing them in the following words: "(the conferences) are subject to the wishes of the growers." Their object is "to enable growers to discuss and recommend a prevailing wage rate covering the harvesting of their crop."

Here, then, is the real prevailing wage rate. It is the rate set by the growers under the auspices of a private organization controlled or influenced by corporation farming.

Then, by what would appear to be sheer coincidence, some Mexican Government official announces in Mexico City that his government is willing to accept a certain prevailing wage for contract laborers. Thus, in the spring of 1949, when the wage-cutting offensive in California was just getting under way, the Mexican Government announced that it would accept a minimum wage of 60 cents an hour. This was from 20 to 30 cents an hour less than farm labor was receiving in various parts of California.

Again, in September 1949, there was the same notable coincidence. While the corporation-dominated San Joaquin Valley Agricultural Labor Bureau was reducing cotton picking rates from $3,00 to $2.50 a hundred pounds, the United States and Mexican negotiators of the current agreement had agreed on $2.50 a hundred as the rate to be paid the contract Mexican workers. It would appear, therefore, that the so-called prevailing wage is the scale fixed by finance farming, certified by our Federal Government and approved by the Mexican Government.

In the face of all this, we continue to read statements coming from Washington and Mexico City that the Executive agreement of August 1, 1949, is actually helping to raise farm wages in this country; that domestic workers are not being displaced; that domestic workers are not available; and that prevailing wages are being respected. But since these assertions do not fit the facts, a theory is needed to explain the tenacity with which the agreement is defended.

The only theory that seems to be in accord with the facts as the National Farm Labor Union sees them is this: the Department of State is keeping the Mexican-United States labor recruiting machinery in a state of what might be called activated moth balls. The Department appears to be expecting a return, sooner or later, to a crisis like the one in which the original agreement was born. When that next crisis is reached, this labor-recruiting machinery can simply be expanded. It need not be negotiated, arranged, or assembled.

This, it would seem, is what makes the American farm worker a peacetime expendable in the eyes of the State Department. If that is the way it is, let us face it and stop kidding. However, let us also face the consequences, immediate and possibly remote.

First of all, there is the possibility, slowly emerging as a fact, that the machinery of diplomacy may be used throughout the Western Hemisphere to undermine living standards and labor's rights. There is more than one example of this on the record besides the Mexican-American labor agreements.

Secondly, by this device encouragement is also given to undermining the faith of the workers in international, multilateral arrangements which are supposed to work for their good and welfare. Today the farm workers of the United States and Latin America have no reason to place their trust in either current diplomatic practices or in existing inter-American or international institutions that are so far removed from the pressing, everyday problems of bread and butter, of good faith, and mutual consideration.

The National Farm Labor Union proposes a reconstruction of the entire approach to the recruitment and employment of foreign farm workers in the United States. That reconstruction should be made along the following lines: Certification of need of foreign workers should be made by public body of which the American Federation of Labor should be represented. Determinations should be made after public hearing and through investigation of agricultural labor conditions. Wage rates should be based on prevailing wages as established in collective bargaining agreements with the corporation type of farms. Availability of domestic workers should be determined on the basis of compliance by employers with standards as to wages and living conditions as set in collective bargaining agreements.

If it is established that under these safeguards there is an actual, demonstrated need for foreign-contract labor, such labor should be contracted on the basis of equal conditions for all. Bona fide, free trade-unions should be parties to the agreements. Workers should be members of such unions with transferable membership for the duration of the contract. The unions should also have full status for active participation in the negotiations for such contracting.

We believe that these premises are sound. They would work under changing conditions. They would make it possible to entrust the routine administration of such agreements to competent international organizations.

They would also remove Mexican-United States labor relations from the dubious company of economic arrangements between both countries which today make the farm workers the pawns in the game. The union would welcome a factual investigation by the Congress of the United States of those arrangements between the two Governments which on the hand push the people of Mexico into steadily more desperate poverty and on the other drive them out of their country to seek temporary relief on the farms of the United States. There is a connection, we contend, between the exodus of Mexican workers to the United States, and, for instance, the steadily rising electric light and power rates in Mexico, and the critical shortages of meat and other staple foods.

During the dangerous days of World War II hundreds of thousands of Mexican citizens helped save the crops in the United States. They also helped to swell the profits of corporation farms that have made the last 10 years a boom decade in American agriculture.

We of the National Farm Labor Union do not propose to forget, however, that in both Mexico and the United States farm workers are dying in poverty and starvation. We do not propose to forget that thousands of farm families in both countries are living in shacks and even under trees. We do not propose to let the diplomats of either or both countries force the workers of Mexico and the United States to share a deepening poverty. We, as workers and citizens of the Americas, will find the way toward a more decent life for all. But to find that way we must first dispel the fog in which we find ourselves today.

I Am An American Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 1950

Mr. HELLER. Mr Speaker, it is on I Am an American Day that all citizens of our great and beloved country become acutely conscious of their precious democratic heritage of freedom. On this day all Americans—whether Catholic, Jew, or Protestant, and no matter of what national descent—rise to acclaim the ideals and truths embodied in our Constitution and symbolized in Old Glory. It is in this spirit that I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an inspiring I Am an American Day speech by his eminence Francis Cardinal Spellman, archbishop of New York:

FREEDOM BY RIGHT DIVINE

(Address of His Eminence Francis Cardinal Spellman, on the occasion of I Am an American Day in Lawrence, Kans., April 29, 1950)

I am come to Lawrence to be one with you who have gathered here from many corners of this heartland of our country, proudly to participate in the observance of I Am an American Day.

The name "Lawrence" has a familiar ring to me, for the city of Lawrence is not far from the New England village where I was born and educated in our blessed American way of life. Your city of Lawrence not only carries the same name as the great industrial center in my native Massachusetts, but it was, I learned, actually settled in the mid-nineteenth century by pioneers from the Bay State, men and women who bravely made their way across vast, unsettled regions, to what is now this State of Kansas, in the very center of our glorious and free United States. In devotion and gratitude, fervently I implore God to bless, protect and prosper the people of Kansas, and all America's varied peoples who, living and working as one, make great our free and noble Nation. And I ask you to join with me in thanks to God for His many gifts to us, and make of gratitude a litany; for liberty more dear than life, for faith and strength to face the problems of a world adrift. For these and other priceless gifts, let us now bow, and pray for all our Nation's valiant sons who fought and died to win and save for us God's gift of liberty, the liberty that gives to you and me, and every man down through the centuries to be blest by birth or adoption, the privilege to say "I am an American."

Liberty is America's beacon flaming from every hill and spire. Liberty is America's pledge to peoples yet unborn, both near and far, to pass on God's torch of freedom, its

light undimmed by the mock-light of atheist minds. Liberty is America's glory, for, in this land liberty was born; in this land freedom to exercise God-given rights was won; in this land hunted minorities found haven and homes; in this land enterprise and labor have prospered.

Throughout the life-span of our United States unnumbered millions of America's sons have bravely died, as unnumbered millions have no less nobly lived in sacrifice, those millions who have lost their loved ones, those veterans who have lost their limbs, their eyes, their normal lives, to preserve for us our liberty—and—they hoped and believed, our peace. Hosts of these soldier-dead stand suppliant beside us, countless trumpets warning us not to retreat but staunchly to live and united work for peace, lest their triumph dearly bought for us with priceless blood should yet be lost. What they did yesterday for us, we now must do for them, and bear the burden dropped from out their devoted, dying hands, lift up the torch that they put down, this torch—America—the hope of all the world.

But if we are to endure as a Nation of free, strong-hearted men, we must, in unity, stand sentinel against the potent, growing dangers of faithless, traitorous Communists and Communist-sympathizers who are using their freedom to destroy our freedoms. They are the host of traitorous men and women who, living beneath the protection of our American flag, enjoy the priceless privilege of being citizens of our republic, while their own allegiance is actually pledged to an emblem representing a theory of government opposed to everything for which Old Glory stands. And on this I Am An American Day, and every day of our years, it is the privilege and the duty of statesmen entrusted with the richest heritage of any people in the world, as well as the duty of every man who tills the farm, who toils in the factory, who tends the shop, who teaches in the school, who preaches in the pulpit, who graces the home, to pledge his plighted word devotedly to live and work courageously to fight and bravely to die if necessary, to protect America from violation, this America, our America, the world's treasure-house of freedom.

From the very birth of our country all her varied peoples have lived and worked together to make and keep our country consecrate. Yet we, their heirs, have often failed to put the proper price upon the precious things of life that our forefathers and sons bought for us with blood. Freedom is one of these. But freedom is not a treasure, which, once possessed, cannot be lost, and it will be lost for us and for our children and their children unless it is cherished, defended and preserved as it was fought for and won.

Loudly, proudly man may proclaim "I am an American." But that is not enough. Men must prove their pride and love for America by daily deeds of loyal, selfless living. They must remember that the very history of our United States is the story of the ceaseless struggle to keep alive the ideas and ideals of liberty and democracy and to defend them from enemies within and outside our borders. We must awaken to the truth that America is not immortal. Is America any safer from mastery by communism than was any European country where we witnessed the killing and enslavement of whole peoples by Communists who, with the shedding of blood, became as if drunken with it?

I have seen the ruins of great cities and countries, civilizations that were seemingly indestructible, yet ruined through internal decay. And we Americans must not delude ourselves that we can go on forever despite our enemies, and, above all, despite ourselves. In this atomic age of discord, with nations not only warring against one another but divided within themselves, where men make mockery of the meaning and majesty of faith, America stands before all nations and peoples, envious of none and fearing none, desirous of nothing from other nations save their respect and cooperation in the rehabilitation and salvation of mankind. We shall ourselves be guilty of contributing to our country's destruction if we do not protect her against the lust-born hates of Communist treacheries sweeping like scythes across the world, marring and despoiling even the fair face of free America.

For we are free men with the right to be free, defending the American way of life; free to adore the true God, loving His heart and believing His mind; free to overcome want for body and soul by sweat of our brow in gainful pursuits; free to conquer fear of losing God-given rights through godless laws and ungodly foes. Our rights are ours by right Divine, eternal to have and to hold against all aggression; to be cherished not as grants by law or gifts of men of power for we are free men because God is free—and we are His image and likeness.

From out the loins of every land under the sun came forth men and women of all races and peoples made one by the common will of all their sons, freely to work and worship as they built their common home—America. Their strong backs bent beneath the log chain and the tow rope. They toiled beneath the blazing benediction of the sun, and their arms and faces bronzed in the wheat fields and the logging camps. They teemed into this promised land of America from across the far plains of Europe, from the Mediterranean basin to the storm-beaten shores of Baltic countries—scene of the recent murders of the latest of America's martyrs. They came, labored, and suffered as all men are fated to and they sought and found here their daily bread as they had done of old in their fatherland.

There was, however, this difference: They earned their bread here sweetened with the hope of security and personal liberty, a people conscious of the Fatherhood of God, willing to contribute humbly yet generously to the brotherhood of man. And it should be the self-imposed command of every American citizen and patriot to live, to love, and if need be to fight and to die for God's glory, our country, and our brother, as, with avowed allegiance to his faith, his flag, and his fellow man, he aspires to become as were his forefathers the inspiration, not only of his own generation, but generations of Americans yet unborn.

Yes, to fight and to die for a cause is heroic; but to love and live for God, country, and neighbor is no less glorious. Therefore, do I pray you all, open wide your hearts to God, let His love pour in and nourish you as in the full-bloomed glory of His grace you find within yourselves a strength beyond even the strength to die; a strength which is the strength for what we love, to live.

This was the supreme spiritual strength which fortified our forefathers as they trod their way of the Cross, bearing in their bosoms the torch of freedom which God Himself lighted with the fires of His Spirit. Heirs are we of the bequeathing ages as our country stands today on the top of time, on its sunlit summit looking down the slopes which humanity has scaled from base slavery to rightful liberty. Heirs are we of the God of freedom; free men by law and by God. And free men we shall always be or die mingling our blood with the blood of our sires, who chose a thousand glorious deaths to the inglorious life of slavery. We dare not be traitor to their sacred trust—our Nation's heritage and the world's hope. We dare not barter liberty for lunacy. We dare not sell free rights for the gold of conquest, defying God, who from Mount Sinai flashed His will to be free through sinless sons living by His ten laws; betraying the hardy patriots of old who blazed the trail to freedom through the Magna Carta; playing false to the trust of American patriots who framed the Bill of Rights on the wall of history.

Standing here among you on this full, fertile, grain-giving, life-sustaining, yes, this sacred soil of Kansas, I long that each of my fellow-Americans realize that no man of any other land is so rich as the poorest of us; none greater than the last of us. For within the protective mantle of this mighty Nation, though a man may by circumstance be stripped of wealth, land, home, or fame, nothing and no one can strip from him that right in which are rooted all the God-given liberties of man—the right proudly to say, "I am an American," for liberty is ours by right divine. Liberty is God's gift to America, and faith in God is America's might.

"America, our America!
Thou art not alone,
Nor can'st thou ever be,
Helpless and hopeless,
The prey of fears within,
The pawn of plots without,
Amid the tumult of nations,
Wandering like homeless waves,
Roaring like hungry winds,
Breaking against thy coasts,
Spirits of the vasty deeps,
Leaping to rend thee.

"America, our America!
Thou art not lonely,
Nor can'st thou ever be.
Thine eyes look to the hills
Untroubled against the sky,
Whence help shall come,
Aglow with radiant light,
Itself the shining shadow
Of the matchless vision
That companies thee always
In places dark with death,
In hours weary with wars.

"America, our America!
Thou art not lonesome,
Nor can'st thou ever be.
The vision is thy sentinel,
Circling thy borders,
Guarding thy threshold,
Shedding rare light
That is life itself—
The life that lives on love,
The Voice ever beating out
On souls, the song of songs,
On hearts, the song of service.
May God bless America,
May God keep America—America!"

Address of Hon. Edward J. Hart, of New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 23, 1950

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, it is an honor for me to be permitted to insert the following address delivered Friday, May 19, 1950, by our distinguished colleague, Representative EDWARD J. HART, before the Propeller Club of the Port of New York at the annual dinner in commemoration of Maritime Day. Representative HART has made a forceful address pointing to many of the problems facing the American merchant marine and about which problems all phases of the industry should be, and undoubtedly are, deeply

interested. Those of us who know Representative HART know that he will most competently discharge his duties as chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and will be a worthy successor to his predecessor, Hon. Schuyler Otis Bland. The address is as follows:

Mr. Toastmaster, it is with a deep sense of appreciation that I stand here tonight as a guest of the Propeller Club of the Port of New York. I assume that the invitation to be your guest came to me primarily because of my recent assumption of the chairmanship of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. That chairmanship devolved upon me as the result of a circumstance injurious to the whole country, but especially to be regretted in its relation to the welfare and progress of the American merchant marine. I refer to the lamentable death of our late, great chairman, Hon. Schuyler Otis Bland. Mr. Bland was a great gentleman—a great man. He was a man of high principle, of splendid endowments, of true wisdom, and of generous heart. For 15 years I served with him on the Merchant Marine Committee, all but 2 of them under his chairmanship. His passionate regard for our merchant marine was matched only by his amazing knowledge of the complexities of the shipping industry and the unsparing energy with which he applied himself to the solution of the intricate and sometimes baffling problems which constantly confront both.

During these many years of service together, I was content to follow his judgment and support his leadership. It is my hope that in that time I have acquired something of his spirit and also much of his faith in the capacity of our merchant marine to grow increasingly greater, and more and more fitted to contribute to the power and influence of the Republic.

I think it may be truthfully said that the membership of the committee which I head have, to a man, an absorbing interest in the future of the American merchant marine. Why should not such be the case? It is a truism to say that its commerce is the lifeblood of a nation. And an American merchant marine, adequate to the tasks that lie before it, is indispensable to our country if her commerce is to be served and promoted at the highest level of benefit to her own interests.

The importance of the shipping industry in and to our national economy is most pronounced. It can, and should, be greater. It represents a money value of well over $2,000,000,000. Last year, the total wages derived from it amounted to almost one and a half billion, and it directly produced tax revenues for our Government well in excess of $200,000,000. But most important of all, a fact admitted to be the basis of our merchant marine legislation, and so often asserted by our top military and naval authorities as to be now axiomatic, an adequate, wisely balanced American merchant marine is absolutely vital to our national security and an indispensable arm of our national defense apparatus.

While our merchant marine may be even now an object of pride for all Americans, it is not all it should be, nor, if we are wise, is it what it must become. While it may be true that the existing American fleet of merchant freighters and tankers is the finest in history, as is so often stated, we must not lose sight of its shortcomings nor be lulled into a false feeling of satisfaction and security.

On the facade of a certain public building in my State, there is carved a legend. It reads: "If you stand well, stand still." Nothing more fallacious was ever written anywhere. Paradoxically, one can continue to stand well only if he moves. The movement must be ever forward and in pursuit of progressive ideas and policies.

Two questions we must keep before our minds are these: (1) Is our merchant marine adequate to fulfill its rightful part in the realization of our commercial potentialities? (2) Is it as ready as it can and should be to serve in the highest possible degree the requirements of our national defense? Unless affirmative answers can be confidently given to both questions, then work remains to be done.

Before this audience, knowledgeable as it is in such matters, it is neither necessary nor desirable to dwell upon the low estate to which the shipping industry had fallen before World War I, and again in many of the years preceding World War II. It is painfull to recall the vast expenditures our Government was compelled to make when both these calamities befell us, in order to bring our merchant marine in line with our desperate requirements. Lack of planning and lack of intelligent interest in our merchant marine were primary causes of the appalling waste involved. However that may be, we have every right to be proud of the achievements of our merchant marine in eventually meeting our wartime needs. When the end of hostilities came America was the leading maritime nation of the world. According to figures recently submitted, American flag vessels, in 1946, carried 67.6 percent of our foreign trade. But in each succeeding year this percentage has dropped severely, until in 1949, our ships carried less than 50 percent of our foreign trade. This ominous fact should cause us to stop, look, listen, and act.

Yes, the picture has changed very, very substantially in just a few short years. Other maritime nations have been striving with might and main to narrow the gap between themselves and us. And they are fast approaching the point where it will be closed altogether. Today they have ships more capacious, more up to date, and speedier than any we can boast of. More and more the advantages provided by their respective governments are enabling these foreign fleets to displace American vessels in the carriage of great segments of the world's trade.

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries is aware of these conditions. Its chairman, I assure you, is aware of them. Likewise, we are aware of other conditions equally dangerous, or nearly so, to the maintenance of such a privately owned, privately operated merchant marine as America must have at her service if she is not to lose the mantle of leadership with which events, under God's providence, have invested her. Lastly, we are aware of the obligation of our Government to furnish such assistance as is demonstrably necessary to prevail over these conditions.

I, for one, desire to see in America a self-sufficient merchant marine. I want no dependence placed on the ability of so-called friendly nations to furnish us with desperately needed ships during a war in which, if it should come, our very existence shall be at stake—on nations which hitherto have been unable to supply their own wants in this respect in their time of direst need.

I want to see a better balanced merchant marine. I want to see more passenger vessels flying the American flag in peacetime, of such a character as can be quickly converted to effective troop transports capable of carrying our forces wherever they may be needed for the defense of that flag in wartime. I want to see our domestic shipping services brought out of the doldrums and made again an active, virile force in the upbuilding of our national economy.

I want to see a speedy revival of our shipbuilding and ship-repair industries which shall not only afford employment to thousands of men now idle, but shall foster and maintain the technical skills indispensable to a satisfactory merchant marine.

I want to see renewed the stabilization of our entire merchant marine policy so that men of vision and faith may be further encouraged to supply the capital necessary for the expansion of the shipping industry in all of its various branches.

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries has before it many problems of grave import for its consideration. It will address itself to these problems with an equally grave consciousness of its responsibility to the country and of its duty to afford the necessary degree of cooperation to each and all of the elements of the shipping industry—ownership, management, and labor—without which no American merchant marine, worthy of the name, can continue to exist.

Don't Sell the American People Short

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 8, 1950

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, having received unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix, I insert herewith portions of a speech by my friend, Rogers C. Dunn, head of the Dunn survey, of Greenwich, Conn., delivered at Canton, Ohio, on April 12, 1950. In my opinion there is a lot of truth in it whichever side you are on. Following and attached to the speech is a copy of an editorial from the New York Journal-American of April 28, 1950, approving the speech.

The speech and editorial follow:

DON'T SELL THE AMERICAN PEOPLE SHORT

(By Rogers C. Dunn, of the Dunn Survey)

I shall tell you about some of the facts we have found, and the conclusions I think they justify.

First of all, it seems to me that each of us should try to understand what is the basic struggle now taking place in American Government.

I think the answer is clear. We are in a fight that is determining shall the American people be master of their Government, or shall the Government be master of the people.

This is the basic struggle.

All issues and all men in public life should be accepted or rejected on their position in this fight.

History shows that the so-called welfare state is only the sugar coating serving as bait for totalitarian government, which means the government is master of the people.

Both the New Deal and Republican leaders are educating you to believe the American people have endorsed a system of Government handouts that make the welfare state.

This belief is false. It is not founded on fact.

But as you, and each citizen, accept this idea, the welfare state becomes stronger. For when we lose faith in the character and intelligence of our fellow Americans, we are admitting that the people are not qualified to be masters of their Government.

If any of you have come to believe that a majority of voters have abandoned the traditional concept of American Government, I want to say I think you are mistaken.

The people are lost in the wilderness of propaganda because they have been deprived of the opportunity to choose between two ideals or philosophies of government.

This is because the leadership of the opposition to the New Deal has lost its bearings and doesn't know where the American people stand. This failing is covered up by blaming the people for falling for the siren call of the handout state.

Up to now, there have been two ways of gaging what the American people want of their Government.

1. Analyses of the vote cast in national elections.

But, very strangely, the public has rarely been given cold election figures to prove that the voters are for or against the welfare state; for or against special privileges for union leaders; for or against special handouts from the Federal Treasury for farmers and other organized groups.

2. The acts of Congress.

Since 1937, hardly a piece of New Deal legislation, conspicuous to the public, has been passed by Congress, except as it was cloaked in war-emergency programs.

If you stop to think about the legislation Roosevelt and Mr. Truman have insisted that Congress pass, you will see that the real political division in this country is between two parties which I shall call the bureaucrat deal and the peoples' representatives.

WORKERS

It is generally accepted that the bureaucrat deal has won a great gain in labor vote. This gives an excellent illustration of how propaganda can hide the truth.

Congress passed the Wagner labor law in 1935. Labor leaders called it labor's Magna Carta. It gave union leaders great powers. Union membership increased from 4,700,000 in 1936 to 15,600,000 in 1948.

How did this affect the vote? You have been told that the great gain in labor vote was a major factor in electing Roosevelt and Truman.

Well, the cold facts tell the opposite story. And here they are:

The Census Bureau lists 96 counties that comprise the 33 largest industrial areas in the country. This is where the great concentration of labor is. It includes cities like New York, Pittsburgh, Chicago, Detroit, and San Francisco.

In 1936, before there was a CIO-PAC, Roosevelt won 65 percent of the vote in the industrial area. His voted dropped to 57 percent in 1940. And it dropped to 56 percent in 1944. And it dropped to 51 percent in 1948 for Mr. Truman.

The Democratic vote dropped 14 percent in 12 years in the great labor centers, despite all the benefits and organizations of labor unions.

In the great labor citadel of Detroit, the Democratic vote has declined, in spite of a growth in labor population. In 1936 Roosevelt won 68 percent of the vote. In 1944 he had 63 percent. And in 1948 Mr. Truman got 58 percent.

So, when you look at the facts, you will see that the bureaucrat deal has been losing, not gaining, the confidence of the American worker.

If similar declines in the vote had occurred in Republican communities, CIO-PAC and everyone else would say that Republican leaders were losing the confidence of the voters.

Both labor leaders and Republicans have told you about the great job CIO-PAC has done in getting workers to the polls. I don't believe that anyone here would challenge that view. But, the facts tell a different story.

In 1936, before there was a CIO-PAC, 10,700,000 Democratic votes were cast in the industrial areas. By 1944, only 10,200,000 Democratic votes were cast. In 1948, with all the efforts and money of CIO-PAC, the Democratic vote continued to go down, and was only 10,100,000.

Thus, in spite of the growth in labor population, and in spite of the activities of labor leaders, the facts show that the rank-and-file worker has been turning away from the bureaucrat deal and away from the political views of top union leaders.

I think that many local union leaders know this, but they can't speak.

A precinct-by-precinct study of the vote that we have been making for the past year is showing that the Democratic vote in the labor precincts has changed substantially the same as it has changed in the wealthy residential and white-collar precincts.

The country will soon be interested in primary elections. Most of you know that a primary election affords an organized minority its greatest opportunity to be effective at the polls. Have labor leaders delivered the vote they claim to speak for? They have not.

In 1948, 332 Members of Congress who voted for the Taft-Hartley law sought renomination. Only 12 who were opposed by CIO-PAC were defeated, and of these only 3 came from communities where there was a substantial labor population. Only 3 out of 332.

The CIO-Political Action Committee is the great American hoax. It is not a voting machine. It is a propaganda machine—but a most formidable one.

I believe its long-range objectives will be reached, unless the opposition—

1. Wakes up to the fact that fewer workers are voting today than voted 10 years ago—and the significance of this fact.

2. Wakes up to the fact that the great body of American workers has not accepted the political views or leadership of the bureaucrat-labor-leader combine.

3. Wakes up to the fact that the door is wide open for the Republican Party to fight as the champion of the American worker.

I want labor leaders to stand up and fight for what they believe is good for the workers and for the country. And I want an opposition party which will stand up and fight for what it believes is good for the worker and for the country. We do not have the latter.

I would be pleased if what I have told you would lead you to think that perhaps the worker hasn't changed any more than most of us in this room.

FARMERS

I would like to touch on the farm vote for just a moment.

In January 1948, when we reported that Mr. Truman would win and a Democratic Senate and House would be elected, we stated that Republicans would lose votes in the farm and suburban areas. This proved correct.

It was our view that throughout all economic groups there had developed a discouragement and disgust with the Republican Party for its failure to be an opposition party; and the consequent loss of Republican votes would be most conspicuous in the strongest Republican communities—the farm and wealthy residential areas.

After the election, Republicans have told you that the vast handouts from the Federal Treasury "bought" the Democratic farm vote. Although still incomplete, our study is showing that for every 100 Democratic votes in the farm precincts in 1940 there were only 84 in 1948. Democrats lost 16 farm votes for every 100 they had in 1940.

No opposition party can be successful if its leaders constantly misappraise the American people.

PAYROLL VOTE

The greatest misrepresentation of the will of the American people has resulted from the use of the Federal payroll vote to win national elections.

This completes the meaning of, "Tax—spend, and elect."

I shall try to give you the high lights, rather than discuss the many details of mechanical operation.

Statistical studies, confirmed by the accuracy of our pre-election reports on the vote, show that Federal employees account for an average of four Democratic votes apiece.

Two million Federal employees mean eight million Democratic votes.

The employees can be distributed among the States with an exact knowledge of the number needed to win each State.

I am sure that tens of thousands of Federal employees either do not vote, or vote Republican—but the average is four Democratic votes.

For any Republican who would doubt our statistical finding, I point out that before the 1944 election and before the 1948 election, we asked Republican Senators, Congressmen, governors, State chairmen, and national committeemen for their estimate of the payroll vote. Ninety percent of those replying estimated an average of three, four, or five Democratic votes per Federal employee.

Fifteen years ago we first found that there is a way to have a constant knowledge of the division of the Republican and Democratic vote in each State.

This has shown that from 1936 through 1948 Roosevelt and Truman received never more than 44 percent of the vote cast by those not directly influenced by the Federal payroll.

This is the maximum vote that Roosevelt or Mr. Truman would have received without the Federal payroll vote.

This means that a maximum of only 44 percent of the voters have ever endorsed the acts and policies of the New Deal or the welfare state.

Since 1940 the highest Republican leaders have refused to even study the relation of the Federal payroll to national elections.

As a result, every time the New Deal wins 51 percent or more of the vote Republican leaders generally acknowledge that the voters have endorsed New Deal issues.

This is why there is no opposition party with the intelligence or courage to go to the American people fighting for a program in contrast to the welfare state.

CONCLUSION

Substantially all that I have told you the Dunn Survey first pointed out and warned against in 1938—and many times since.

As for the future, I continue to expect the tentacles of totalitarian government to grow stronger and reach further—unless Republican leaders soon recognize that they have been constantly misinterpreting the vote, therefore misinterpreting the will of the American people.

When this is recognized, a whole new vista of the American people will be revealed.

It will be seen that the majority of American people still cherish and want the concept of government that was America from 1776 to March 4, 1933.

Republicans would no longer feel required to indulge in the expediency of "me too, but."

And when Republican leaders wake up to this, they will see the means to make this majority opinion effective at the polls, and in the Congress.

In the meantime—each of you can make a great contribution to your country by renewing your faith in the character and spirit of the majority of American people—and by getting behind those people who are fighting with this faith.

[From the New York Journal-American of April 28, 1950]

WIN WITH AMERICANISM

A misreading of election results in the years of New Deal-Fair Deal ascendancy has corrupted the effectiveness of the political opposition.

As a result of the me-too approach, the stay-away vote has become of colossal proportions.

Rogers C. Dunn, of the Dunn survey, in a recent speech at Canton, Ohio, gave the statistical basis for an effective campaign of genuine opposition based on authentic Americanism.

Unless the Republican Party has the wit and the courage to develop this patriotic theme, it will die on the vines of ineffectiveness.

Mr. Dunn revealed that between elections realists in Congress have found an effective way to block New Deal-Fair Deal legislative panaceas through a coalition between Republicans and southern Democrats.

"Since 1937, hardly a piece of New Deal legislation, conspicuous to the public," Mr. Dunn said, "has been passed by Congress, except as it was cloaked in war-emergency problems.

"You will see that the real political division in this country is between two parties which I shall call the bureaucratic deal and the people's representatives."

Mr. Dunn revealed that the New Deal-Fair Deal never again received as big a slice of the labor and farm votes as in 1936.

Referring to the 95 counties comprising the 33 largest industrial areas, where the biggest concentration of union membership dwells, Mr. Dunn disclosed that in 1936, before there was a CIO-PAC, Roosevelt won 65 percent of the vote in the industrial area. His vote dropped to 57 percent in 1940, and to 56 percent in 1944. Mr. Truman's vote fell to 51 percent in 1948.

The Democratic vote, Mr. Dunn showed, fell 14 percent in 12 years in the great labor centers, despite all the catering to the unions.

Mr. Dunn reported a similar drift in the farm vote, saying "although still incomplete, our study is showing that for every 100 Democratic votes in the farm precincts in 1940 there were only 84 in 1948."

Mr. Dunn concluded that a maximum of only 44 percent of the voters (not including those directly influenced by the Federal payroll) has ever endorsed the acts and policies of the New Deal, or the welfare state.

Mr. Dunn concluded that the New Deal-Fair Deal has been winning elections through the bought vote of those on the Federal payroll. He estimates that each payroller brings in four votes.

Mr. Dunn concluded that when the effect of the payroll vote is fully evaluated, a whole new vista of the American people will be revealed.

The statistician said:

"It will be seen that the majority of the American people still cherish and want the concept of government that was America from 1776 to March 4, 1933.

"And when Republican leaders wake up to this, they will see the means to make this majority opinion effective at the polls, and in the Congress."

Mr. Dunn's analysis reveals how to get the wasters and the political blue-sky operators off the backs of the American people next November.

Truman Pulls Rug From Under American Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 19, 1950

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, President Truman and his Fair Deal, through the so-called reciprocal trade agreements, is pulling the rug from under the workers of America. Some union leaders will admit this is true while there are others who will not.

I have here a letter from Harry H. Cook, president of the Flint Glass Workers of America, AFL, mailed from its headquarters in Toledo, Ohio, to retail merchants throughout the United States threatening a boycott of all merchants who handle and promote the sale of imported glassware.

This letter cites the excessive unemployment existing now in the flint-glass industry as the result of importations of cheap glassware from countries abroad. The letter states that it is the intention of the glass-workers union to enlist the entire membership of the American Federation of Labor, numbering 8,000,000 workers, in this boycott.

Whether inadvertently or intentionally, Mr. Cook's letter to me and the letter sent to the retail merchants, makes no reference to the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. Probably Mr. Cook is not aware that this Fair-Deal-conceived measure, which is the real cause of the large unemployment in the flint-glass industry, was enacted in part at the insistence of the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

At any rate, Mr. Cook has gotten his cart before the horse in writing his letter to retail merchants threatening a large-scale boycott if they continue to handle and promote the sale of imported glassware. He attributes the unemployment in the flint-glass industry to the eagerness of merchants to give their customers glassware at the lowest possible price, but he fails utterly to attribute the situation to a law which actually encourages importations of cheap-labor glass products from countries where wage rates average less than 25 percent of those in the United States.

For the benefit of Mr. Cook and Members of the Congress, I wish to point out that the ad valorem rate on glassware in 1930 was 60 percent and continued to be so until the Department of State chose to use the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act to cut the ad valorem rate one-half. It is now only 30 percent. So it is that foreign glassware producers, paying wages that average 90 cents a day, are able to pay American import duties and still undersell glass made in America, where the same industry pays its workers from $9 to $10 a day.

Of course, the State Department, which most of us know has little knowledge of tariffs and cares less, uses this power over American import duties in part as a diplomatic weapon in the cold war; but the State Department also uses this power in part as a domestic political weapon against what the Fair Deal administration calls big business or these selfish interests.

It strikes me it is about time for industrial unionists to get wise to what is happening. It is time for them to realize that sooner or later, as things are going now, they will be ground to pieces between two millstones—the one being the hatred of successful free enterprise in the hearts of the Fair Deal Socialists; the other being the policy of the Fair Deal internationalists to build up foreign industry, even though at the expense of industrial job holders in America. It is time for unionists to combat this reciprocal trade-agreement business as something far more inimical to their interests than to those of anyone else.

That some trade-union leaders already do realize their mistake in supporting the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, and are honest enough to admit their mistake, is shown by copies of letters sent to President Truman by the Consolidated Glove Cutters Union of Fulton County, at Gloversville, N. Y., which recently fell into my hands. This AFL union came out decisively against the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

The glove cutters union based their demand for a change in our tariff policy on the fact that more than 5,000 union members currently are drawing unemployment benefits, while an additional 1,600 have already exhausted their benefits. This they pointed out to President Truman is the direct outgrowth of trade agreements whereby import duties on leather gloves have been drastically reduced.

But the glass workers and the glove cutters are not the only American industrial workers now suffering miserably as a result of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, which in turn stems from socialism and internationalism in the Fair Deal and in union leadership. There are thousands of shoe workers in Massachusetts and other States, jobless because of low tariffs which permit importation of slave-labor-made shoes from Czechoslovakia at prices American industry cannot hope to meet, unless American shoe workers are willing to work for far less than a dollar a day.

Still another instance of the subversive effects of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act is provided by the fine watch industry of the United States. In this instance, the consequences are likely to be extremely serious as affecting national security. Already the Waltham Watch Co., one of the oldest in America, has gone into bankruptcy, and other companies of the kind have been forced to seek Government loans—all because import duties on watches and watch parts have been reduced to a point where American companies cannot compete against the low-wage industries of Switzerland and some other European countries.

I have said that the failure of American watch manufacturers—and more may fail unless tariffs on watches and watch parts are moved upward—will adversely affect our national security. Such failures would do so simply because these companies are the only ones which have the equipment and the know-how to make fine radar equipment and the delicate precision parts of Norden bombsights and the improvements thereon.

Many other American industrial companies than those I have named here already are feeling the effects of the mistaken Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and the ill-judged administration of that act by the State Department. More and more Americans are being thrown out of work. The time has come for a change.

For a long time I have felt that tariffs are not the province of the State Department, or any other department of Government. That is one reason why I have always opposed the reciprocal trade agreements bill. We have a United States Tariff Commission. Why not let it do its job? Some new blood, and perhaps a little more authority, is all the Commission needs to enable it to do the tariff job on a scientific basis. Then we might be able to use trade agreements as a potent weapon in the cold war, without penalizing American industry and American workers for the benefit of slave-wage employers abroad.

We Believe in the Inviolate Rights of Men, Women, and Children To Live in Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 23, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, that my independence of thought and action has more than once brought me into conflict with various organizations, even with some with which I usually agree fully, is a matter of general knowledge. It was not many weeks ago that I had a disagreement with the national organization called B'nai B'rith over a specific incident when I decided that the organization was following a wrong procedure.

However, in the current issue of the National Jewish Monthly, an official publication of B'nai B'rith, I have found a statement of the principles and objectives of the organization which is simple, dignified, and profoundly moving, and insures my continued cooperation with B'nai B'rith.

These words are from the message of the national president, Mr. Frank Goldman, to the triennial convention here in Washington last month. I am happy to insert them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that the world may know of the noble objectives of this Nation-wide organization of responsible American citizens, rejoicing in the democratic processes of our country and looking forward always to a fuller realization of our opportunities for service:

WE HAVE OUR WORK TO DO

We are not an organization in search of a program. We have a program. So long as there is a Jewish people, so long as human rights are not everywhere fulfilled, and the recognition of human dignity is not a tenet of universal faith, we have our work to do. We need plow no furrows save those which move straight to objectives clearly understood. We need tack our sail to no wind save that which blows in the direction of service to our fellow man. The whole of humanity is our workshop, and the eternal principles of Judaism are our guide and lodestar.

There is but one B'nai B'rith. It is the same B'nai B'rith in every town and hamlet in this country. It is the same B'nai B'rith on this continent and in lands overseas. We believe in the dignity of the human being. We believe in the brotherhood of man. We believe in the inviolate rights of men, women, and children everywhere to live in freedom, but with full understanding that as there are rights, so there are obligations. We believe in a community of interests among all citizens of all states—and of the state's responsibilities to its citizens. We believe that B'nai B'rith came into existence because it was needed—because it fulfilled a basic need among our people. We believe that it has been blessed with a long and vigorous life because it has continued to fulfill that need. Our program flexible, our many instrumentalities of service ever aware and ever alert, our order plays a high and significant role in Jewish life.

Surely B'nai B'rith must never stand still, never mark time; it must be in action always, in repose never. It must move forward, not backward; it must serve in the truest and purest meaning of the word.

To all men and women who are joined together in this splendid order, let me say this: in B'nai B'rith we possess, and we are breath and bone of a precious thing. It is each of us, and all of us. Ours is the obligation; ours is the challenge; ours is the opportunity. Let us, in the days to come, not fail to be worthy of whatever we may be called upon to do; and may it never be said of us that whatever was done was less than the very best that we could do. (From President Frank Goldman's Message to the Triennial Convention of B'nai B'rith.)

Addresses on the Occasion of the Publication of Volume 1 of the Papers of Thomas Jefferson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address delivered by the President at the Library of Congress on the occasion of the publication of volume 1 of the Papers of Thomas Jefferson on May 17, 1950, and also the address of Douglas Southall Freeman entitled "The Paradoxes of Jefferson" delivered at the same ceremony.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT

I accept with great pleasure the first copy of volume 1 of the Papers of Thomas Jefferson. On behalf of the people of the United States, I congratulate Princeton University and the Princeton University Press on undertaking to edit and publish the great series which this volume begins.

I should like to add a personal word of appreciation and encouragement to the editors for the years of hard work that are still ahead of them. I am very well acquainted with what many people call paper work, and I appreciate the immense amount of painstaking effort which each of these volumes requires.

We should also be grateful to the New York Times for the financial assistance which that newspaper has given to help compile this complete edition of the writings of one of the greatest Americans. This edition will be of lasting value to our Nation for generations to come.

As many of you know, I returned to Washington yesterday from a visit to the Pacific Northwest. Traveling at what is today a very leisurely rate, in 9 days I went nearly 7,000 miles through 16 States. In 1803, President Jefferson sent out two young pioneers to explore the same area I had just been through. Jefferson wanted to find out what was in the great new territory he had just bought from Napoleon. Meriwether Lewis and William Clark took 28 months to make the round trip from the banks of the Mississippi to the mouth of the Columbia River on the Pacific coast. Where they found only Indian villages, herds of buffalo, and trackless wilderness and sagebrush, I saw great cities, immense structures like Grand Coulee Dam, and rich farm land. These sharp contrasts are only a few of many that point up the dramatic changes that have occurred in our country since Jefferson's day. Since the United States today scarcely resembles the United States when Jefferson knew it, why should the publication of his letters be so important to us?

The answer should be obvious, as we turn the pages of this first volume. Throughout his life, Jefferson waged an uncompromising fight against tyranny. The search for human liberty was a goal which he pursued with burning zeal. The spirit of democracy shines through everything he ever wrote.

Today, when democracy is facing the greatest challenge in its history, the spirit which Jefferson expressed in his battle against tyranny, and in his search for human liberty, stands out as a beacon of inspiration for free peoples throughout the world.

Jefferson lived in a time of great struggle, when this Nation was trying to establish itself as a democracy of freemen. We today, in a different time and under different conditions, are in a great struggle to preserve and expand human freedom.

Our stage is larger—our struggle must be waged over the whole world, not merely in our own country. But the essential nature of the struggle is the same; to prove, by hard work and practical demonstration, that freemen can create for themselves a good society, in which they live together at peace, and advance their common welfare.

When freedom is at stake, we need to draw upon every source of strength we can. Jefferson thought deeply about how to make liberty a living part of our society, and he proved the rightness of his thinking by practical demonstration. That is why I think it is particularly important that we are reasserting Jefferson's ideals by publishing these volumes.

History can be fairly written only when all the facts are on record. Jefferson has suffered at the hands of unscrupulous biographers and biased partisans ever since his death. The publication of his papers should correct the mistakes that have been made about him and should help prevent misinterpretations in the future.

There are others like Jefferson whose lives have enriched our history, but about whom we know too little. Many of them have been victims of unfair treatment at the hands of historians; others have been neglected because the record of their work is scattered about in remote places.

I hope that this edition of the writings of Thomas Jefferson will inspire educational institutions, learned societies, and civic-minded groups to plan the publication of the works of other great national figures. In far too many cases, there are incomplete and inaccurate editions of the writings of the great men and women of our country.

In some distressing instances, we have only fragmentary records of men whose ideas and actions have helped shape our history.

I am convinced that we need to collect and publish the writings of the men and women who have made major contributions to the development of our democracy.

I am, therefore, requesting the National Historical Publications Commission, under the chairmanship of the Archivist of the United States, to look into this matter and to report to me. I am sure this commission will wish to consult with scholars in all fields of American history, and to report what can be done, and should be done, to make available to our people the public and private writings of men whose contributions to our history are now inadequately represented by published works.

I am interested not just in political figures, but in the writings of industrialists and labor leaders, chemists and engineers, painters and lawyers, of great figures of all the arts and sciences who have made major contributions to our democracy.

Obviously, we cannot hope to collect, edit, and publish all the writings of all such leaders, but we can and should select the works of those who have been too long neglected and who need to be better known if we are to understand our heritage. This is a big undertaking. It will take a long time. It should be done as far as possible by private groups and not by the Federal Government, although the Federal Government can and will be of assistance whenever possible. The editions should be in every instance completely objective and should maintain the same high editorial standards that are evident in this first volume of the Papers of Thomas Jefferson. They should aim to place the facts beyond debate and distortion.

At a time when democracy is meeting the greatest challenge in its history, we need to turn to the sources of our own democratic faith for new inspiration and new strength. These volumes of Thomas Jefferson will be a great reservoir of hope and faith during the critical years ahead. I sincerely hope that similar editions of the writings of other great men and women who have made our Nation what it is today can be placed with them.

I shall give my full support to this endeavor.

Thank you very much.

THE PARADOXES OF JEFFERSON

(Address by Douglas Southall Freeman, in the Library of Congress, May 17, 1950, at the ceremony marking the publication of the first volume of the Papers of Thomas Jefferson)

Is it possible for Princeton scholars, well furnished though they are, to make grist for the American mind from the vast plantation Thomas Jefferson cultivated? John Foley, using the sickle on the high heads only in the fields of Jefferson's wisdom, gathered 9,228 maxims into that tight bin he called the Jefferson Cyclopaedia. These cradlers, Dr. Julius P. Boyd, Dr. Lyman H. Butterfield, and Mrs. Mina R. Bryan, are to harvest and glean 18,000 letters and are to gather them into the barn of 52 volumes, provided from funds generously given by the New York Times and by Princeton University.

The editors know that the cloak on Jefferson's shoulders gave him what appears to be the scholar's stoop but that he had the florid robustness of 6 feet 2½, that he was scarcely second to Washington as a horseman, that he made it his inflexible rule to rise as soon as he could see the hands on the mantel clock, that he said the sun never caught him in bed in 50 years, that as a student he worked 15 hours a day, and that from the time he discovered as a boy the delights of reading, he never sat in idleness an hour.

This unexcelled energy, this awesome diligence of Jefferson will not frighten students who almost rival it. They sense his invincible zeal and understand precisely what he meant when he said, "I fear that my zeal will make me expose myself to ridicule * * * but this risk becomes a duty by the bare possibility of doing good." These scholars will not fail to follow Jefferson through the five languages he mastered and the diversified subjects he had investigated so thoroughly that it was easy for him to make one function of the Presidential office the discriminating patronage of all the arts and sciences. The editors appreciate, as every American gratefully may, what Benjamin Rush meant when he said "The objects of Jefferson's benevolence were as extensive as those of his knowledge." The spiritual life and the long faith of Jefferson similarly are patent. They were compassed in as plain words as ever an honest statesman wrote: "Love your neighbor as yourself and your country more than yourself. Be just. Be true. Murmur not at the ways of providence." He meant precisely what he said when he wrote his daughter Martha from a Paris already muttering of the grievances that went into the cahiers, "Be good and be industrious and you will be what I most love in this world." It will not be difficult for Dr. Boyd and his staff, to see in one profile of Jefferson the Pico della Mirandola, the uomo universale, of the revolution. Significantly and by avowed preference when Jefferson was in England, he wrote of gardens, not of the Guildhall or even of Westminster. He could say in one breath, "Music is the favorite passion of my soul" and in the next, "Nature intended me for the tranquil pursuits of science, by rendering them my supreme delight." Readers and editors alike will understand how Jefferson came to loath the calumny of politics and to realize that distinction did not compensate for vilification. "There are minds," he groaned as early as 1788, "which can be pleased with honors and preferments; but I see nothing in them but envy and enmity." Although he had told Dr. Rush he would "go to hell to serve his country," he protested to Madison in 1799, "I am giving everything I love in exchange for everything I hate."

Thus far and even further it is possible to penetrate and to understand. In much that Jefferson wrote there is clear light "unto the feet" of those who follow after, and unto the eyes of all who read; but when the fold in the last of those 18,000 letters of his is opened and the final reflection from 25,000 incoming papers is put in focus, is the entire man there? Can editor or biographer assert, "Here is Jefferson; this is the image of his soul; see in these words, the kernel of his creed?"

If that can be said of any complex personality—and what personality is not complex?—it is an achievement. In the case of a man like Jefferson, who wrote for more than half a century of revolutionary change, it will be a superlative triumph of scholarship. Were there no other obstacles, the apparent contradictions in Jefferson's own writing are well nigh countless on superficial view, and, if taken from their context may appear to prove either side of scores of propositions Jefferson put forward. In that very fact may be one secret of the man. You dwarf him if you demand of him the "consistency . . . of little minds." His political philosophy bespeaks not confusion but experimentation. His greatness is, in part, his willingness to face the inherent paradoxes of government and the always-dangerous adventure of administration. Who contended more vigorously than did he for the "natural rights of man"; but did he not write officially in 1790, "All natural rights may be abridged or modified in their exercise by law," and as late in his career as 1816, did not he draw a sharp-edged distinction: "No man has a natural right to commit aggression on the equal rights of another, and this is all from which the laws ought to restrain him"?

Again, hear him on the paradox of science and art in government, "Freedom is the first-born child of science," he said, but he held that government, the guardian of this freedom, was an art and "that the whole art of government consists in the art of being honest." To Jefferson, likewise, we owe perhaps the clearest statement of the paradox of leadership and representation. In the year the Philadelphia constitution was drafted he thus perfectly expressed one of its high and hard ideals: "To inform the minds of the people and to follow their will is the chief duty of those placed at their head." This manifestly calls for patience and self-control beyond the reach of time-serving mediocrity. Yet, the very word "inform" is a signpost to another cross-road paradox, that of education and ignorance, of attempted self-government in the face of indifference. "Government cannot be good," Jefferson told John Adams in 1819, "but under the control of the people," and again, "the natural progress is for liberty to yield and government to gain ground," but over against that set his familiar and eternally glorious declaration of faith: "truth is the proper and sufficient antagonist to error, and has nothing to fear from the conflict, unless, by human interposition, disarmed of her natural weapons, free argument and debate".

To the attainment of truth, the way was that of education. Where are words that sound with loftier challenge the bugle call to war on ignorance? "For promoting the public happiness, those persons whom nature has endowed with genius and virtue, should be rendered by liberal education, worthy to receive, and able to guard the sacred deposit of the rights and liberties of their fellow citizens; and they should be called to that charge without regard to wealth, birth, or other accidental condition or circumstance."

He believed in stability—"My God," he cried to Monroe from France, "how little do my countrymen know what precious blessings they are in possession of, and which no other people on earth enjoy"; but he said unhesitatingly, "a little rebellion now and then * * * is a medicine necessary for the sound health of government," and he cheerfully, aye, happily, told John Adams in 1796, "this, I hope, will be the age of experiments in government, and that their basis will be founded on principles of honesty, not of mere force."

All the while, and to the end of the tests and ventures of his own public service, he warned America: "To take from one, because it is thought that his own industry and that of his fathers has acquired too much, in order to spare others who, or whose fathers, have not exercised equal industry and skill is to violate arbitrarily the first principle of association." That there might be no doubt what he considered this first principle of association he wrote it down forthwith—"the guarantee to every one of a free exercise of his industry, and the fruits acquired by it." These "rights of the people to the exercise and fruits of their own industry," he told Isaac Tiffany that same year, 1816, "can never be protected against the selfishness of rulers not subject to their control at short periods."

Here, as Jefferson saw it, stood government in the grapple with greed and in the contest with circumstance that neither can be foreseen nor deflected. The paradoxes of Jefferson do not end with those of natural right and law, of leadership and representation, of political science and governmental art, of self-rule and personal ambition. You will find like paradoxes in Jefferson's concept of benevolence and political partisanship, of continuing Federal debt and the

unescapable mortality of the generation that creates the debt, of the general welfare as desirable in se and as "lace[d] * * * up strictly" to use his own metaphor, "within the enumerated powers of the Constitution." Few men lived, as Jefferson did, to the fiftieth anniversary of their greatest declaration, and fewer still to see the work of their hands prosper in the peace of a nation. Eighty-two when he died and afflicted with personal misfortune beyond the meet and measure of most men's woe, he kept his faith in America. The spirit of his last years, the spirit of this hour, is that of one of the final lines of a lovely letter to Mme. de Corny in Paris, October 1787: "The sky is clearing," he said, "and I shall away to my hermitage." For us as for him, the sky will clear; and he will remain with us in his new hermitage, this book.

Contributions of Hon. Herbert H. Lehman, of New York, to the Dairy Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Metropolitan Milk Producers News, a publication of the dairy industry in New York, recently carried an editorial praising the contributions of our colleague, the junior Senator from New York, Senator LEHMAN. I think the RECORD might very well include this editorial from this very fine and outstanding publication. I ask unanimous consent to insert this editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR LEHMAN WOULD KNOW FACTS

With due respect to other Members of the United States Congress, we feel safe in saying that no other has the intimate, first-hand knowledge of the complex problems of milk marketing as does Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN, of New York. Neither has anyone had closer knowledge of the problems of the common man and the underprivileged, than he.

This knowledge has been gained by his early determination to use his ability and his opportunities to the fullest possible extent in being of service to others. To do this he first makes sure that he thoroughly understands the problem and then he squarely shoulders every responsibility that is his. His responsibilities have been heavy, his accomplishments have been worthy.

He became governor of New York State at the low point of the depression (1933) when the dairy industry was at the lowest ebb in its entire history. He served as governor for 10 years during which time the pioneering of Government assistance in helping cooperative associations handle their marketing problems was started. By trial and error the present system was developed, protecting, as he insisted, the principles of cooperative marketing.

It is, therefore, not surprising to us that it was Senator LEHMAN who quickly diagnosed the problems arising from the unrestricted sale of yellow oleomargarine, and who put his finger on the two vital points that require careful study.

In introducing the two resolutions, which are printed on pages 2 and 7, Senator LEHMAN said, "These resolutions would provide the necessary protections for the consumer on the one hand, and the necessary information on the basis of which we might take steps to avert serious damage to American agriculture on the other."

The action that he has taken is that of a statesman who is determined to serve all citizens and who appreciates the vital position occupied by dairy farmers.

The resolutions are typical of the man who introduced them. We are fortunate and grateful.

Ohio Poll on Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BRICKER
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a press release from C. Maurice Wieting, director of information, Ohio Farm Bureau Federation, and a preliminary report of a poll taken in Ohio by the Ohio Farm Bureau as to what the farmer membership of the Farm Bureau in our State desires in regard to the farm program. I do this largely because of the advance information which was given publicity in the Washington papers and other newspapers of the country generally as to the result of the poll approving the Brannan plan. The poll clearly shows that there is a very small percentage of the farmers who are in favor of any such plan as that.

There being no objection, the press release and poll were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OHIO FARM BUREAU POLL SHOWS SENTIMENT FOR AMENDING 1949 FARM LAW

WASHINGTON, May 24.—Preliminary returns from a poll now being taken by the Ohio Farm Bureau Federation show there is strong sentiment among farmers for amending the present Agricultural Act of 1949.

John W. Sims, executive secretary of the Ohio Farm Bureau, told the Ohio congressional delegation at a luncheon today that "many Ohio farmers believe that the present farm program is not working well; 50 percent of those we polled want amendments made and only 13 percent favor the Agricultural Act of 1949 as it now stands. However, it should be remembered that this poll shows that 63 percent support the principles of the present law."

Sims is heading a delegation of 43 Ohio Farm Bureau men and women who are the congressional spokesmen and home and community congressional representatives of that organization. These people met this morning with their own Congressmen and then entertained the entire Ohio delegation at a luncheon at the Congressional Hotel.

The Ohio Farm Bureau representatives met with President Truman this noon and commended him for his support of farmer cooperatives. They also had an appointment with Secretary of Agriculture Charles F. Brannan, at which time they discussed with him farm programs. Conferences were also scheduled with Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, Republican, of Vermont, and Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH, Republican, of Maine.

"While there is widespread discussion in Ohio concerning the Brannan plan, only 15 percent of those farmers voting in the poll favor it when identified by name," Sims reported. "However, it is significant that 39 percent believe that production payments should be used for perishables. One conclusion is that farmers think the 100-percent price supports guaranteed by Government are too high, since only 25 percent agree with that provision of the Brannan plan."

One of the most unexpected results of the poll, the farm leader said, is that 32 percent of the farmers are for no Government plan at all. "Perhaps this is a reaction against the confusion which has surrounded the writing of farm programs and not a true indication that farmers want no Government plan at all," Sims stated.

Though instructed to vote on only one plan, about 10 percent checked two possibilities.

"Farmers in Ohio, as revealed in this poll, have definite ideas about the principles upon which a farm program should be built," Sims told the Ohio Congressmen.

FARM SURPLUSES

Asked in the first section of the poll what should be done with farm surpluses, farmers made these suggestions:

(1) Promote research to find new uses for surpluses (76 percent); (2) store enough of the storable crops to stabilize supply (65 percent); (3) encourage the establishment of more cooperatives (57 percent); (4) distribute surpluses to State and county relief agencies (56 percent); (5) encourage the establishment of an animal agriculture (46 percent).

On the other hand farmers are reluctant to vote marketing quotas (15 percent) or the use of acreage allotments (22 percent).

SUPPORT LEVELS

The second section of the poll deals with the level at which the Government should guarantee farm income. The largest vote is for a price level to prevent national farm income from reaching depression levels (38 percent). Flexible price supports ranging from 75 to 90 percent of parity received the nod from 26 percent of the farmers, which when added to the 38 percent asking for a guaranty against depression levels makes 64 percent favoring flexible price supports at some level.

A quarter of the farmers (25 percent) think that farm income should be supported by the Government at a rate equal to the average of the first 10 of the last 12 years, which is practically 100 percent of parity. This is one of the proposals which has had the strong support of the Secretary of Agriculture.

At the other extreme 27 percent of all farmers want no Government guaranty at all, while 13 percent of those polled made no answer to these questions.

HOW A FARM PLAN SHOULD OPERATE

Farmers are asked in the third section of the poll to give specific suggestions on how they thought a farm program should operate. Though they answered other parts of the poll 25 percent left this section blank.

Of those who answered, 39 percent think that a combination of price supports for storables and production payments for perishables is feasible. Again 36 percent want no supports at all, 17 percent said use price supports only; while 8 percent want to use production payments for both storables and nonstorables.

VOTE ON SPECIFIC PLANS

Asked to vote for the farm program they favored most, 21 percent of the Ohio farmers who had answered other parts of the poll left this section blank. One conclusion that can be drawn is that farmers are greatly confused by the present farm debates now going on in Congress and over the country.

While only 13 percent favor the present Agriculture Act as it now stands, an additional 50 percent will go along with it if amended. Some of the amendments favored

are: Establishment of a bipartisan agricultural committee to advise with the Secretary of Agriculture, with wide discretionary powers in determining the methods and level of price supports (32 percent); put flexible price supports into effect now (17 percent); and use modernized parity formulas only (10 percent).

No Government plan at all is the answer given by 32 percent of the farmers polled.

The Brannan plan receives the support of 15 percent of the farmers when it was listed by name. However, it is interesting to note that two features of the Brannan plan: support of farm income by Government at 100 percent of parity receives the vote of 25 percent; and that production payments for perishables is approved by 39 percent.

HOW THE POLL WAS CONDUCTED

Sims stressed that these returns are only preliminary and that many more polls are still to be received. The questionnaire was printed in the May Ohio Farm Bureau News, official publication of the Ohio Farm Bureau, and went to all 63,000 members.

The poll was also sent to some 20,000 Farm Bureau families who participate in home discussion groups called Advisory Councils. A discussion guide, Building a Sound Farm Program, is being used by these 1,500 groups during May.

Final results of the poll will be reported to the Ohio Farm Bureau board of trustees at their June meeting.

Returns have been received thus far from 3,233 people, and an additional 3,000 returns are expected to be received by June 1.

PRELIMINARY RESULTS OF AN OHIO FARM BUREAU POLL—WHAT KIND OF A FARM PROGRAM DO YOU WANT?

I. What do you think we should do when we have farm surpluses? (Check all those statements you agree with.) (Total of 3,233 returns, 4.1 percent failed to answer this question.)

	Percent
1. Store enough of the storage crops to stabilize supply	65
2. Distribute surpluses to State and county relief agencies	56
3. Vote marketing quotas upon ourselves to keep production down	15
4. Use acreage allotments to prevent the production of surpluses	23
5. Distribute surplus abroad through CARE, CROP, etc	38
6. Maintain one price at home and sell at a lower price abroad	11
7. Use a food-allotment plan to get food to low-income families	35
8. Promote research to find new uses for surpluses	76
9. Encourage the establishment of more cooperatives	58
10. Encourage the establishment of an animal agriculture	46
11. Let surpluses take care of themselves	27

II. At what level should we ask the Government to guarantee farm prices or income? (Check one item.) (Total of 3,233 returns, 12.8 percent, failed to answer this question.)

	Percent
1. There should be no Government guaranty at all	27
2. Farm income should be supported at a level which would guarantee farmers a rate equal to the average of the first 10 of the last 12 years, which is practically 100 percent of parity	25
3. There should be flexible price supports (ranging from 75 to 90 percent of parity) depending upon supply and changes in cost of production	26
4. A price support to prevent national farm income from reaching depression levels	38

III. How do you think a Government program should operate? (Check one item.) (Total of 3,233 returns; 24.7 percent failed to answer this question.)

	Percent
1. Use price supports only	17
2. Use production payments only for both perishables and nonperishables	8
3. A combination of price supports for storables and production payments for perishables	39
4. No supports at all	36

IV. Which of these proposals for a farm program do you favor most? (Check one item.) (Total of 3,233 returns; 21 percent failed to answer this question.)

	Percent
1. Do you favor the Agricultural Act of 1949?	13
2. Would you favor amending the Agricultural Act of 1949 as follows	50
(a) By putting flexible price supports into effect now	17
(b) By using only modernized parity formulas	10
(c) By establishing a bipartisan agricultural committee to advise with the Secretary of Agriculture, with wide discretionary powers in determining the method and level of price supports	32
(d) By other amendments	4
3. Would you favor the Department of Agriculture plan proposed by Secretary Brannan?	15
4. No Government plan at all	32
5. Other suggestions	9

NOTE.—Because of the fact that some checked more than one item, the response in percentages may total more than 100 percent.

National Affairs Platform of the American Veterans Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD the national affairs platform of the American Veterans Committee, adopted by its fourth annual convention held at Chicago, Ill., in November 1949.

I am informed by the Public Printer that the manuscript will make approximately 2¼ pages of the RECORD, at a cost of $184.50.

There being no objection, the platform was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL AFFAIRS PLATFORM

PREAMBLE

We believe that the United States, having the greatest productive capacity in the world and a heritage of freedom and democracy, has outstanding opportunties and responsibilities to set examples of high social, political and economic standards which can lead mankind to a freer, more abundant life. In order to strengthen our democracy and our economy so as to enable us best to carry out and fulfill these responsibilities and opportunities, we support the following basic principles:

ECONOMIC SECURITY

Economic security and personal freedom are consistent objectives which can and must be achieved in an ever fuller degree.

Full employment and full production: In the tremendous productive capacity of the American economy we have the potential to eliminate want and to provide a decent living standard for all our citizens. To achieve these ends we must maintain a high level of production, full employment, and opportunities for all our people to share fairly in our vast production of goods and services. Particularly, we must utilize all public and private means consistent with the preservation of essential individual freedoms to prevent recurring depressions with resulting mass unemployment, widespread business failures and devastating losses of our productive resources.

Private responsibility: Labor, management, farmers and consumers must cooperate toward achieving a constantly expanding and stable economy. To facilitate this cooperation, the Federal Government must assure a free and strong labor movement, eliminate monopolies and restraints of trade so as to restore and strengthen competition, assure opportunities for private business expansion, take other action to aid and assist small business and assure a fair return to agriculture for abundant and efficient production. The Federal Government must assure the conditions under which a free and strong labor movement can exist.

Government responsibility: All governments, Federal, State, and local, must provide the environment necessary for sustained prosperity. The ultimate responsibility for full employment and full production, however, rests with the Federal Government. The Congress and the executive branches of the Federal Government have and must exercise the powers to accomplish the full and efficient utilization of our human and material resources through such measures as:

(a) Monetary policies;
(b) Taxation;
(c) Spending programs;
(d) Credit control;
(e) Trade policies;
(f) Conservation and development of natural resources;
(g) A long-range Federal program of atomic research and development for peacetime purposes.

INDIVIDUAL SECURITY

Individual economic security is predicated on a stable and expanding economy.

Equality of opportunity: The rights to equal economic opportunity for all are essential not only to individual security but also to a strong and free democratic economy.

Private responsibility: In our complex and interdependent economy the ability of the individual to provide personal economic security is limited. Therefore, in their economic relationships with each other, labor, management, and farmers must provide ever-increasing protection against such economic hazards as old age, accidents, ill health, and seasonal unemployment.

Government responsibility: The ultimate responsibility for a reasonable minimum level of economic security for all individuals rests with government. The entire government economic and social security program should be greatly expanded with respect to persons covered, level of benefits, additional types of risk such as illness, adequate public housing, and educational aids. A successfully functioning American economy can well afford to provide security for all its people.

CIVIL RIGHTS

The fullest measure of individual liberty subject only to the minimum restraints necessary to assure maximum freedom for all the people must be our goal.

Protecting civil rights: It is vital to our free democracy that we resist all attempts to

make inroads on our basic civil liberty. We have complete confidence in the intelligence and discernment of the American people to reject undemocratic ideologies and in the efficacy of our Constitution and judicial system to protect our democracy without hysteria and thought control.

Expanding civil rights: Discrimination, segregation, and intolerance have no place in a democratic society. They must be fought aggressively by legislation, education, and in the courts.

CONCLUSION

We reiterate our faith in a free democracy and a vigorous competitive economy. We pledge ourselves to fight for expanding civil rights and against all inroads designed to weaken or destroy civil liberties.

RESOLUTIONS ON ECONOMIC AFFAIRS

Housing

Housing Act of 1949: We commend the Congress for its enactment of the General Housing Act of 1949, which lays the basis for a national housing program by providing for slum clearance and urban redevelopment, low rent, federally subsidized public-housing projects, additional farm housing aids, and increased housing research. We now call on local communities to take prompt action to implement the provisions of this act by applying for Federal loans and grants and we urge AVC chapters to take the lead in bringing action by local housing authorities, municipal councils, and State legislatures.

Middle income housing: We do not believe, however, that the national housing job is completed. Millions of our fellow citizens, including many veterans, in the middle-income brackets, need nonsubsidized housing at rents they can afford. We therefore call on Congress to enact promptly the so-called Sparkman bill, S. 2046, which provides for direct Government long-term loans at a low rate of interest to housing cooperatives.

Standardization: We urge revision and increased standardization of building codes throughout the Nation so as to lower the cost of housing by taking advantage of recent technological advances.

Temporary housing: We ask for an investigation of the permanence of temporary housing facilities to determine how long they may be used for decent, sanitary housing.

Discrimination: We further urge that there shall be no discrimination or segregation in the sale or rental of housing units, financed or aided by public funds, for reasons of race, creed, color, national origin, political beliefs, or family status.

Rent control: We call for the strengthening and continuation of rent control in all areas where there is a continuous shortage of adequate housing at reasonable rents. We specifically urge local AVC chapters to be on the alert to prevent selfish interests taking advantage of the local-option clause to lift controls where they are still needed.

TAXATION

National Taxation Commission: One of the most pressing needs of our Government today is a revision of the National, State, and local tax programs to gear them to the needs of a fully employed and expanding economy with special reliance on the principle of taxation according to ability to pay. Toward this end, we urge the President of the United States to appoint a special nonpartisan, technical tax commission similar in principle to the Hoover Commission, this commission to work with the Council of Economic Advisers to set up a sound, just, and stable tax program.

Sales taxes: We oppose Federal, State, and local sales and excise taxes because they fall proportionately more heavily on lower-income groups, not being based on ability to pay. We urge the immediate repeal of all wartime excise taxes and substitution of more progressive taxes to make up the losses in government revenues.

Taxation stabilization: As recommended as early as 1947 by the Committee on Economic Development, we urge the revision of our present national taxation policies by stabilizing various income and other tax rates for a period of 5 years, based on an agreed desirable level of employment and annual national income to be stimulated by all means possible.

Equity investment and small business: With a view toward giving incentives to equity investment and new and small businesses, we urge the following revisions of our present national taxation policies:

(a) Formulation of a program permitting profit carry backs and loss carried forward for new small businesses.

(b) More effective enforcement of section 102 of the Internal Revenue Code, with the appropriation of additional funds for this purpose if necessary.

COOPERATIVE MOVEMENT

We endorse the cooperative movement as an extension of economic democracy. We recognize the value of the farmer-owned and farmer-operated cooperatives and urge closer relationship with urban and rural agencies. We support the Rochdale type of urban consumer cooperative. We oppose any proposed taxes on the funds of cooperatives used to pay patronage refunds. We oppose specifically the tax proposals of the National Tax Equality Association.

AGRICULTURE

We urge the continued national stabilization of farm purchasing power through adoption of a plan such as proposed by Secretary of Agriculture Charles F. Brannan.

PUBLIC WELFARE

Department of Public Welfare: We recognize the need for and urge the creation of a Federal Department of Public Welfare under a Secretary with Cabinet rank.

Social security: We urge the United States Senate to enact the "Social Security Amendments of 1949" (H. R. 6000) as passed recently by the House of Representatives, expanding the coverage of workers.

Unemployment benefits: We support the extension of unemployment benefits to persons who are unemployed because of illness or injury not connected with employment.

Health insurance: We support legislation providing for national compulsory health insurance to be incorporated within the Federal social security program.

LABOR

In order to implement the policies of AVC with respect to labor, we seek to accomplish the following objectives:

(a) Immediate repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act and reinstatement of the principles of the Wagner and Norris-LaGuardia Acts.

(b) The appointment of a General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board under the Taft-Hartley Act will impartially represent the best interests of labor, management, and the public as a whole.

(c) Elimination of jurisdictional strikes.

(d) A universal minimum wage under Federal and State laws of not less than $1 an hour.

(e) Enactment and enforcement of Federal and State laws establishing adequate safety and health standards for all workers in hazardous industries.

(f) Transfer of functions of State unemployment offices to the Federal Government.

PUBLIC WORKS

We strongly urge the President to have the administration of the Public Works Agency immediately undertake in cooperation with State and local agencies the planning of an adequate public-works program. These shall be aimed at providing a potential shelf of public works and jobs to be used in time of possible economic depression. We support this in order to encourage State contributory programs.

NATURAL RESOURCES

Columbia Valley Authority: Recognizing the necessity for efficient development of the natural resources of the Nation, we urge immediate establishment of a Columbia Valley Authority as a logical next step in carrying out the principles and procedures so successfully demonstrated by the Tennessee Valley Authority. We specifically urge passage of the CVA bill (S. 1645) which in addition to providing for a better development of natural resources, would help to maintain full employment and strengthen national defense. Such an agency should continue the present Federal policies of favoring widespread public distribution of electric power and the development of family-size farms.

Reclamation: We support the present Federal irrigation, reclamation, forestry, and grazing policies, and favor retention of the 160-acre irrigation and reclamation limitation.

David E. Lilienthal: We commend, upon his resignation as Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, the outstanding public service of David E. Lilienthal. We are confident that the relinquishment of his present burdensome responsibility, which he has so ably executed in the face of persistent attacks by those less far-seeing than he, is only the beginning of a new phase of his long career of devoted public service.

ECONOMIC CONFERENCE

We recommend that the National Planning Committee invite all major like-minded organizations in this country to participate in a national economic conference to be held some time during the first half of 1950. The purpose of this conference will be to discuss and formulate ways and means of avoiding another disastrous depression such as the world experienced in the 1930's, these findings to be publicized through the press and the organizations represented at the conference, so that influence may be brought to bear on our legislators to see that they are fully aware of their responsibilities in this critical period in our history.

EDUCATION

Federal aid to States: While we are opposed to segregation and discrimination in schools, we support as the best bill possible at this time the Thomas bill, as passed by the Senate in 1949, which provides:

(a) Aid to States in terms of the need for such assistance and the ability and willingness of the States to cooperate in the program.

(b) That segregated schools must be given their proportionate share of Federal assistance in States where such funds are used.

(c) That as to auxiliary services to nonpublic schools, the question of Federal aid is to be left to the States.

We call on Congress to establish a system of Federal financial assistance to qualified students without regard to race, creed, or color seeking college and advanced training.

Social science research: We further call on Congress to appropriate funds to foster research in the social sciences.

We urge the passage of State fair educational practice laws similar to those laws passed in New York and Massachusetts.

AMERICAN TERRITORIES

We urge Congress to enact legislation promptly:

(a) To enable the Territory of Hawaii to become a State.

(b) To enable the Territory of Alaska to become a State.

(c) To provide organic acts for Guam, American Samoa, and the trust territory of the Pacific islands and to provide adequate funds to effect the orderly transfer of administrative responsibility for these is-

lands from the Navy Department to a civilian agency.

(d) To extend the benefits of Federal grants-in-aid programs to territories under United States jurisdiction to the fullest extent possible.

RESOLUTIONS ON CIVIL RIGHTS

The American Veterans Committee believes that the dignity and freedom of the individual citizen are the foundations of democracy, both at home and abroad.

In furtherance of these beliefs we espouse the following resolutions:

RACIAL AND RELIGIOUS SEGREGATION, DISCRIMINATION, AND INTIMIDATION

We oppose all forms of racial discrimination and segregation—in housing, education, the armed forces, places of public accommodation, employment, and in all walks of life. Distinctions based on race are contrary to the ideals upon which this country is founded. We urge the following measures to narrow the gap which now exists between those ideals and the practice of discrimination and segregation which is now unfortunately so widely prevalent in our country:

(a) The repeal of all State statutes and municipal ordinances which compel discrimination and segregation based on race.

(b) We urge the immediate adoption of effective measures to curtail filibusters and the enactment of Federal laws requiring fair employment practices, punishing lynching, outlawing poll taxes, protecting the right to vote, and the creation of a civil rights division with adequate funds in the Department of Justice.

(c) The extension of Federal, State, and local civil-rights laws.

(d) Inclusion in all Federal legislation making grants to States, cities, or private institutions of a provision requiring the benefits of those grants to be used without discrimination or segregation on the basis of race or religion.

(e) Termination of all Federal tax exemptions of institutions practicing racial or religious discrimination, whether by segregation or otherwise, except religious or sectarian institutions discriminating only on the basis of religious creed.

(f) Amendment of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 to end discrimination against Catholics and Jews.

(g) Passage of antimasking legislation where necessary and enforcement of antimasking legislation already passed as a means to check the Ku Klux Klan.

(h) Action of AVC'ers to boycott the American Bowling Congress and the American Contract Bridge League and other similar national bodies which practice discrimination.

(i) We urge a Federal program of promotion of the attainment of full rights of citizenship and economic self-sufficiency of the American Indians through existing Federal agencies.

(j) We urge the end of segregation and discrimination as practiced in the Panama Canal zone and urge the abolition of those conditions that give rise to the term, "Gold and silver standard."

(k) We urge that economic discrimination be combatted by requesting the manufacturers and retailers so to label their goods clearly to indicate that they are made under conditions free from practices of discrimination based on race, creed, or color and by bringing pressure through consumer groups to purchase only products so labeled.

(l) Appropriate legislation or judicial action to compel the Federal Housing Administration to operate in accordance with the Federal Constitution by ceasing to guarantee the loans of financial organizations which in turn refuse loans to applicants because of race or color or which grant loans to minority groups only on houses in areas inhabited by nonwhites or to building and developers who practice discrimination because of race, creed, or color.

(m) Cooperation with other organizations in conducting community civil-rights audits similar to the Montclair, N. J., project, covering various phases of discrimination in housing, education, medical care, employment, and social attitudes toward minority groups.

(n) Enactment of legislation removing the last vestiges of discrimination against orientals in the Federal immigration and naturalization law and in the Federal Reclamation Act.

EDUCATION

We urge that no educational institutions shall henceforth accept grants which are not available to members of minority races and that no nonsectarian educational institution shall henceforth accept grants which are to be available only to members of certain religions.

We oppose all discriminatory practices in our educational institutions that deprive Americans of the right to an education because of race, religion, or national origin. The quota system and every form of racial segregation must be eliminated from the educational system of this country. We urge AVC to take action to achieve these objectives, including obtaining public statements from educational officials on this matter and seeking to have eliminated from application blanks any questions relating to race, religion, or national antecedents, and any photograph requirements.

We recognize the right of sectarian institutions to prefer students of their own religious affiliation.

We urge that until segregation in schools is eliminated in those States which now require it the Federal Government should impose strict supervision to insure the equal distribution of Federal aid-to-education funds to white and Negro schools.

MILITARY AFFAIRS

We urge NPC and all the chapters to gather and publicize documentary evidence from all veterans in their respective communities regarding discrimination on basis of race and religion in the armed forces at the present time and during the war.

We are encouraged by the progress already made by Secretary of Defense Johnson toward the elimination of discrimination in the Navy and the Air Force, and we urge the immediate extension of this policy toward a final successful end with the full inclusion of the United States Army.

We call upon the various State councils and their constituent chapters to adopt a vigorous program aimed at legislative action to eliminate discrimination in the National Guard units in their respective States and to pattern this legislation after the laws in regard to the National Guard units in the States of Massachusetts, Connecticut, New Jersey, Wisconsin, and Minnesota.

CIVIL RIGHTS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The District of Columbia, which should be a symbol of democracy, is a graphic illustration of decay in our great tradition of civil liberty. Racial discrimination and segregaton in our Nation's Capital adversely affect our international relations and impede progress in racial relations throughout our country. AVC, therefore, urges, in addition to other civil-rights measures which we request for the country, that Congress enact legislation establishing a Commission on Human Relations for the District of Columbia and that such legislation authorize appointment of the Commission's members by the President of the United States and not by the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, which now sanctions racial segregation in the District of Columbia.

We endorse the bill, passed by the Senate and now before the House of Representatives, to grant to residents of the District of Columbia the right to local self-government and the right to vote. We urge all chapters to call upon their Representatives in Congress to sign the discharge petition so that the bill may be brought to the floor of the House for vote.

FREEDOM OF SPEECH AND CONSCIENCE

We oppose the hysterical attempt at thought control evidenced by bills introduced in the Congress, in numerous State legislatures and city councils, which would require teachers and other Federal, State, and city employees to take loyalty oaths.

We urge the abolition of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

We oppose attempts by congressional committees to force Americans to state publicly their political affiliations under penalty of being cited for contempt.

We urge the repeal of those provisions of the Smith Act which endanger freedom of speech and freedom of political opinions and beliefs.

We urge that Executive Order 9835, establishing the Federal loyalty program, be amended to require that no person shall be discharged from Federal employment on loyalty grounds except where such employment jeopardizes the national security, and then only on the basis of competent evidence and in accordance with a procedure which provides for a fair hearing based on specific written charges, with full opportunity to answer all charges and examine all witnesses, and the right of administrative and judicial appeal. We further urge that no organization be branded subversive without a fair hearing.

We deplore such outrageous assaults on minorities by subversive mob action, as at Peekskill, N. Y., Groveland, Fla., and in Chicago, Ill. We condemn the tacit approval of such assaults on decency and democracy by the officials concerned. We denounce Governor Dewey, Mayor Kennelly, and other officials concerned for crass neglect of duty in failing to enforce the law or even rebuke the mob-cooperating officials under their control.

We commend Mayor Zeidler, of Milwaukee, and his commission on human rights for his courageous, effective, and prompt action in halting mob rule by anti-Democratic elements in his city.

Spending Ourselves Into Prosperity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpts from a speech by Albert C. Agnew, vice president and general counsel of the Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco, delivered before a convention of the American Institute of Banking at Salt Lake City, Utah, May 17, 1950:

IT IS TIME TO DEBUNK FALSE DOCTRINE OF SPENDING OURSELVES INTO PROSPERITY

Not many months ago we were told that economy was the order of the day and that substantial reduction of our national mortgage was on the program. But now we hear again that old, repudiated and discredited cry, "We will spend ourselves into prosperity," and more of that buncombe to the effect that, since we owe the money to ourselves, the size of the national debt is immaterial.

Federal debt can only be paid by spending less than we collect in taxes. Practically speaking, not one cent of new wealth is produced by Government. The tax bill in this country has almost reached the point of diminishing returns and, unless we call a halt, will reach the point where private incentive is destroyed and the risk of new capital is no longer attractive because of tax burdens. The next step is repudiation or still further dilution of dollar value, followed by economic chaos.

The money representing the $256,000,000,000 Government debt has been spent. It has been consumed. It is gone. It went for shells and office supplies and welfare projects and Government salaries. Where did it come from? It came from you and me, from American individuals and organizations who turned over their capital to be consumed by Government. In exchange for this capital they received Government bonds and notes which can only be repaid by further surplus production and earnings of the people.

If a nation is to have better housing, more food, clothing, and shelter for its underprivileged, higher real wages for its workers and pensions for its aged, such good things can be had in only one of two ways, through increased production of economically useful things and services, or through the redistribution of what's available; forcibly taking from those who have and giving to those who have not. The latter course is clearly the one being pursued by our Federal Government today.

Herculean efforts are being made to sell the idea of the so-called Brannan plan to the American farmer. I am told that special pamphlets, adapted to differing communities, are being sent out by the millions in an effort to popularize this idea. What is it? Merely that all agricultural products shall be sold on the open market at whatever price they will bring in competition and the difference between the price thus realized and that fixed by the Government as "fair" shall be paid as a subsidy.

At about the same time that this proposal was placed before this country, Sir Stafford Cripps, the British Chancelor of the Exchequer, presented the new budget to the British Parliament. He said that the food-subsidy program had grown far beyond any expectation. Losses for the current year, he said, were estimated at $2,250,000,000. "That," said Sir Stafford, "just can't go on." He also said, "When I hear people speak of reducing taxation, when at the same time the cost of social services is rising in response to the demands of the same people, I sometimes wonder whether they understand the old adage that we cannot eat our cake and have it too."

Then Sir Stafford told the British people that there would be a rise in regulated prices and that the tax rate must remain at the same devastating level, 40 percent of the pay of the average worker. And mind you, we are only 15 percent behind Great Britain in this regard, for our tax bill is now 25 percent of national earnings.

So far we have dealt with figures, but what about the more important if less tangible moral degeneration of our people which has been the inevitable byproduct of the loose thinking, profligacy, and violation of fundamental economic precepts which, for the past decade, we have witnessed in Government? Fifty-eight percent, or 83,000,000 of our population have no adult experience with a prewar administration. Most of our teen-agers have lived their entire lives under the cloud of some sort of ism—socialism, collectivism, spendism, wasteism, taxism, or Uncle Sam will provide for you from the cradle to the graveism. They have been taught to spend as they go, and take no thought for the morrow, to consider frugality an out moded custom and to demand more and more pay for less and less work.

Nor have these soporifics, administered in overdoses from Washington, been confined to our youngsters. Many of us oldsters have, perhaps unconsciously, come to applaud each successive assumption of State, local, and individual burdens and obligations by government until we are well on the road to complete bureaucracy.

Slowly but surely, over the past 16 years, we have been approaching the so-called collectivist state. One by one the areas formerly subject to exclusive State control have been taken over by Government. Public housing, minimum wages and hours, education, social security, and crop control are a few examples. Socialized medicine is next on the proposed agenda.

I sincerely hope that none of us will ever forget the fact that once the dead hand of government is laid upon the private lives, the private fortunes, and the private enterprises of our people, it is never released. So-called welfare and socialistic schemes have only one gearshift; forward, never in reverse. One of the favorite and well-known techniques of those who would sell us down the river of socialism is to drive an entering wedge by obtaining a relatively small appropriation from Congress just to try out some cockeyed scheme leading to utopia and then urge that because we have gone that far, the money would be wasted if we did not go on. No; my friends, beware of trial baloons in socialism and managed economy. They are filled with a powerful gas that will take us to heights a fall from which spells utter ruin.

Address of Hon. Clare Boothe Luce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 1950

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following address by Hon. Clare Boothe Luce at the gold-medal-award dinner to Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt at the Hotel Waldorf Astoria in New York City on Sunday, May 21, 1950:

Ladies and gentlemen, no award is more prized in this great city than the Williamsburg gold medal. And surely you have chosen the perfect recipient for it—Mrs. Roosevelt.

Perhaps not everyone tonight feels you have chosen the right speaker to give witness to this happy event. Then, they do not fully understand why, among women, Mrs. Roosevelt is the best loved woman in the world today. She is and always has been glad to meet anyone on the common ground of charity. And anyone who wants to stand on that high ground is always honored to meet there the first lady of the world.

Who can, in so short a time as 10 minutes, enumerate the many other reasons why Mrs. Roosevelt is so admired by her sex?

You can't even speak in that time of her extraordinary career. By count she has made the world headlines in 18 careers. The mother of five children, and a grandmother, she was the world's best known wife. And she has been, to use a popular expression, the most operative first lady in history. She has been a school teacher, a business woman, a world traveler, a propagandist, and a charitarian—or if you prefer, a crusading reformer—an editor, author, columnist, radio speaker, television broadcaster, and now, in the United Nations, a stateswoman.

Here is a life as variegated and colorful as Joseph's coat. And like Joseph's coat, it has sometimes inspired envy, less of itself than because it covered such a multitude of virtues.

I can do no more than hint at two or three of these enviable virtues.

Perhaps after the virtue of charity, which she possesses in abundance, one should put her extraordinary serenity. Said Thomas a Kempis, a saintly old Dutch monk of the Fifteenth Century: The person with "large tranquillity of heart * * * heeds neither praises nor censures." Surely, Mrs. Roosevelt has had more of praise and blame than any other living woman.

There are some people who still refuse to admire Mrs. Roosevelt for any reason whatsoever. These are, for the most part, unhappy folk who have no higher concept of liberty than the right it gives them to heap personal insults on public characters with impunity. Such people often try to justify their malice by attributing to the characters whose public acts they dare not attack, the basest of private motives.

This habit of imputing to our neighbors wholly evil motives for good deeds is a peculiarly modern one.

It is a common thing these days to hear people say: "Oh, yes; he is 'generous,' and gives lots of money away, but it's just a guilt complex about the way he treated his family."

Or: "Oh, yes, she does spend herself visiting the poor, but that's just because she's hungry for power over her inferiors."

Or- and this must ring a bell—a loud bell—for Mrs. Roosevelt: "Oh, yes; he (or she) is on the right side of the issue—but it's just because they're trying to get votes."

Of course, only the saints do things purely for the love of God, and solely for the love of neighbor. That is precisely why they are saints! But the majority of mankind acts from somewhat mixed motives. And that is why honesty, if not charity, counsels all of us to refrain from judging the rest of us harshly.

Now the plain fact is, Mrs. Roosevelt has done more good deeds, on a bigger scale, for a longer time, than any woman who ever appeared on our public scene. No woman has ever so comforted the distressed—or distressed the comfortable. It follows, in an increasingly un-Christian world, that the interpretations of her activities are often as mean as they are silly.

Perhaps that is because our generation has forgotten—or mustn't we honestly admit, it was never taught in our public schools: "Judge not, lest ye be judged."

In the salty language of Al Smith, let's look at the Eleanor Roosevelt record. Since girlhood, the thread of compassion for unfortunate and innocent victims of society has been dominant in the pattern of her life. Tonight she is being given a gold medal for a lifetime of work among the underprivileged. She began, as a shy girl of 18, at the University Settlement on New York's lower East Side, teaching gymnastics and dancing to the city's poor children.

No one can say how many individuals, as well as groups, she has since helped with her hands, her purse, her voice, her pen—and when necessary, her political influence.

In my own short public life I was constantly made aware of how many people she had succored. And who knows how many more of these victims of the palpable injustices that abound in our social system she tried to help, and could not, because no one person can do it all?

I hope Mrs. Roosevelt and I are agreed that most of these injustices can be corrected short of stepping up the trend toward state socialism. The work of Williamsburg Settlement itself is proof of the dynamic effectiveness of voluntary social-aid patterns. Though may I say, in passing, even if we were not agreed, it is another of Mrs. Roosevelt's virtues, that she would not mind my differing with her. She has always tolerated contrary opinions with good humor, even when they fundamentally disagree with her own, as—it is no secret—one or two of mine do.

But to the virtue of tolerance, Mrs. Roosevelt adds that of fortitude. She has faced not only contrary and reasonable opinions with great sweetness, but—what is harder—harsh and irrational opposition with calm inflexibility.

For example: Consider the criticism—which often degenerated into foul abuse—that she suffered for her steadfast championship of minority racial groups. Certainly not the bitterest foe of her political party or of her personal ideologies can deny that, since Abraham Lincoln no one has done more to lift the hearts and raise the heads of the Negro people.

I spoke a few nights ago with a Roman Catholic bishop from the African missions. He told me of the great intellectual ability of some of his young colored priests in his Tanganyka dioceses. He said they conversed fluently in four languages, passing their philosophy examinations—in Latin—with grades that would be the envy of most white seminarians. We agreed that the failure of our colored people to "register" intellectually was the result of their being persistently treated like third-class citizens—which is to say, not like citizens at all. He said that what is called the racial inferiority of the Negro is not the cause, but the result, of the discrimination practiced against them, even in our so-called democratic public-school system. But what we agreed on most heartily was that no woman in all American history had tried harder or done more to break down racial discriminations, through an appeal to humanitarian ethics, than the winner of tonight's award.

If Mrs. Roosevelt had never done anything else in her whole career, if indeed all else she has ever done had been ill done, there would remain the story of her fight for this cruelly used 10 percent of our population. It alone would earn her a glorious place among the heroines of democracy.

But much else has been well done. No less an authority than Time magazine has called Mrs. Roosevelt "the greatest female political force in the world." She has recently enlisted this great force against communism abroad. As one of the five United States delegates to the United Nations Assembly, and during her tenure as Chairman of the Human Rights Commission, she came to know, the hard way, how Soviet communism seeks to sabotage or denigrate American democracy. And she saw at last how it would destroy those very human rights for which she has fought her whole life long.

Since then, in the United Nations, she has over and over again thwarted, and beaten down, and outargued, and when all else failed—outsat the Soviet delegates.

In her column, in her speeches and broadcasts, she is the oracle to millions of American housewives. She influences millions of American homes. When her justly notable tolerance and patience with the Communists finally gave out, that day tolerance of communism in America ended officially.

It is safe to say that her resistance to Soviet communism is a more potent factor in winning the cold war than an extra billion dollars of Marshall-plan aid.

"Who," asks the Prophet, "shall find a valiant woman? Far and from the utmost coast is the price of her." Well, far and to the utmost coasts, anyone who can read or write, and who is not iron-headed or iron-hearted can find, with no trouble at all, a very valiant woman—in the beloved and familiar figure, Eleanor Roosevelt.

Sigh of Relief Day

REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 1950

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, I want to propose a new national holiday. It will be called Sigh of Relief Day, and it will be celebrated every year on May 28. The purpose of the celebration is to commemorate the fact that on May 28 the Truman administration, and especially the Justice Department, will be able to relax completely for the first time in 3 years.

In case anyone has forgotten, it was on the night of May 27–28, 1947, that somebody dynamited the election commissioners' office in Kansas City and stole the crooked ballots that constituted the evidence in the 1946 Democratic primary vote frauds. That was the primary in which Representative Roger C. Slaughter was defeated on the direct orders of President Truman. For these frauds 71 persons were indicted. Everyone implicated have gone scot free, thanks to the ballot thefts.

From that day to this, not a single person has been arrested for the ballot thefts. On this Sunday, May 28, the 3-year statute of limitations will run out, and the criminals will then enjoy complete immunity for the rest of their lives.

Yes, there will be many sighs of relief on Sunday, and they will come from some of the best-known people in Washington and Kansas City. I am sure they will want to remember Sunday, and hence I think the day should go down in history as Sigh of Relief Day.

Mr. Speaker, I include as a part of these remarks an editorial from the Detroit (Mich.) Free Press, which discusses this unsavory episode in a somewhat more pointed way than I have done:

FREEDOM FOR THE CRIMINALS—SIX MORE DAYS

This will be a critical week in Washington for the Truman administration.

In six more days the statute of limitations—3 years—will have been reached and the criminals who exploded the vaults of the county house at Kansas City, to steal evidence of vote frauds in connection with the purging of Congressman Roger Slaughter, ordered defeated by President Truman, will be free of all danger of prosecution.

Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, Saturday—what a celebration the underworld bosses of Kansas City can put on.

The Presidential grin will be beaming down at them lithographically from the walls as "a dues paying member of the club"—his proudest boast when he pardoned all the Pendergast gang and ostentatiously attended the funeral of his teacher and sponsor, the notorious Pendergast himself who grafted uncounted millions from every known form of corruption.

The St. Louis Post-Dispatch will say, again, today:

"SIX DAYS

"On the night of May 27–28, 1947, a safe in the Kansas City election commissioners' office was blasted and vital evidence in the 1946 Democratic primary vote frauds was stolen. From that day to this, no agency of the law, not even the celebrated FBI, has brought about the arrest of the guilty person or persons. Since the statute of limitations takes effect after 3 years, the FBI has 6 days to solve this outrageous crime against the cornerstone of American democracy—free and honest elections."

In fairness to the heroic members of the FBI with their high vision of civic duty and their integrity, let it be said here that the St. Lous Post-Dispatch errs in one slight degree.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation has no power to act.

Under the law, all that J. Edgar Hoover and his men can do is to investigate and report to the Attorney General.

Director Hoover and his staff are not allowed to even make recommendations. He is helpless.

The Senate Committee on Crime should demand the FBI files on the whole Kansas City parade of corruption which has been so desperately covered.

See if Mr. Truman will also refuse that.

The always careful and painstakingly accurate weekly review, Newsweek, says in the current issue that administration leaders are determined to keep President Truman's name clear of any involvements in the exposure of Kansas City crime and its connection with Kansas City politics.

How can such a thing be done in any honest investigation?

Who ordered Congressman Slaughter purged?

When the Kansas City Star exposed the vote frauds, why was it necessary to dynamite the county vaults to steal the evidence?

Who killed Charlie Binaggio and four others who were called to testify before a grand jury which, with only partial evidence, shocked all Missouri with its report of vice and corruption?

Why were these people murdered as part of 23 politico-gangster killings in 2 years with none ever solved?

The people can keep on asking this as there is no statute of limitations on murder.

Why, and why again, did Vice President BARKLEY violate custom and tradition, if not law itself, in picking his own, or the Truman administration's, committee of five to go through the motions of investigating the national crime syndicate which has its tentacles deep into Kansas City?

In violation of all senatorial protocol he himself picked the two Republicans to serve on the feeble little committee of five.

Always before a minority party has been allowed to select its minority members.

Ray Moley, of Newsweek, famed authority on the science of government, calls upon the American newspapers to do the investigating into the Kansas City mess, wherever it may lead. He says:

"It is a story of high politics and low living, of great influence, badly placed loyalties, safe blowing, murder, gambling, hoodlumism. * * * In the national interest it should be rooted out and told. * * * It is becoming clear that the sordid tale will not be elicited by official investigations."

There is here a Pulitzer prize for a good reporter; but, as the Kansas City gunmen shoot straight and often his accolade might have to be pinned to his shroud.

The Battle of the Budget Bulge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER FERGUSON
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, on May 2 I had the great pleasure of addressing a luncheon meeting of the United States Chamber of Commerce, which was in session here in Washington. The subject was the Battle of the Budget Bulge. I took as my theme the vital importance to American institutions of that battle, just as was the Battle of the Bastogne Bulge in France. I sought to stress that the reduction of the Federal budget, with the ending of deficit financing, is a three-way effort. It involves Congress, which has constitutional authority over fiscal policies through its control of appropriations. It involves the President, who evolves policies and actually allots the money for spending. It involves the public, who ratify the policies that call for either big government and big spending or retrenched government and limited spending.

I am happy to report that the response to my remarks has been enthusiastic and gratifying. I think the people are recognizing that they have to pay for every bit of government they get, and that if they want to pay less they will have to take less. It remains for Congress and the executive branch to see that idea through, and to put forth our every effort in this Battle of the Budget Bulge which alarms the people.

I now have a transcript of my informal remarks before the United States Chamber of Commerce, and I ask unanimous consent that they may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BATTLE OF THE BUDGET BULGE

Members of the United States Chamber of Commerce, I come here today as one of those public officials who happens to be in the front-line trenches as far as the battle of the bulge of the budget is concerned.

I have just come from a meeting of the Senate Appropriations Committee, where we were considering the rivers, harbors, and flood-control appropriations. I can tell you that the mud in those trenches is knee deep, and we are not doing very well as far as the battle of the budget bulge is concerned.

We have just heard from the Department of Defense on its budget. I am not going to criticize the Department of Defense. All of us want to have the best defense possible, but I think that you have heard in a way what we who are in the trenches are up against when it comes to trying to reduce the bulge in the budget. It would appear that every dollar is essential in this national defense program. Of course, we heard the same thing before we found that they could reduce the civilian personnel in the Services by 163,000, which took off, as our good friend here has told you, just about a half billion dollars in the payroll.

We need a strong defense. But we are talking about a budget that is taking just about a third of your income. We are in a cold war. It is cold and getting even colder. When speaking of defense I think America must recognize that there is a great defect in our armor unless we can reduce the size of this bulge in the budget. Yes; we are told on Capitol Hill, and you are told out in the field, that 71 percent of the $42,000,000,000 that is asked to be appropriated is for nonreducible items, the cost of past wars, and future preparations. Seventy-one percent of the budget. However, it all depends upon what you call nonreducible. I would call truly nonreducible the $5,600,000 of interest to those who have put up those different bonds as being a nonreducible. I would say that certain salaries like that of the Supreme and the other courts, the reduction of which the Constitution prohibits, are nonreducible. Beyond those items that are irreducible by law there is nothing so sacred that it can't stand scrutiny.

The whole problem, my friends, is just this: We have a budget, which, as the President said when he sent it up to us last January, would call for a deficit of $5,100,000,000. But the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue has just recently told us at the present rates of receipts and expenditures the deficit will not be $5,100,000,000 but $7,300,000,000. Now, I haven't any idea just how much money that is. It happens to be very close to the total assessed valuation of my State of Michigan. It has taken the citizens of Michigan since 1837 to accumulate taxable estates of around $8,000,000,000. Here we are going to have almost that much in deficit spending at a time when we are said to be the most prosperous that we have ever been. Those are the figures that we are facing, and something, in my opinion, must be done about them.

If I didn't think there were chances of us losing this battle of the bulge of the budget, then I would say let's go ahead on this spending spree; but when I see ahead what it means to lose this battle, as our distinguished general saw over in France that to lose that Battle of the Bulge meant the loss of the war, I say to you today that if we lose this battle of the bulge of the budget, it can mean the loss of the great institutions of the United States of America. And don't forget it. General MacAuliffe said at Bastogne, and from my position in the trenches on the Hill I see the same thing. The institutions of America, the individual enterprise system of the United States of America, can disappear from the face of this globe. And don't say for a minute that it can't happen here. No, we can't just say, "Nuts," and let it pass over. General McAuliffe didn't just say "Nuts." He used his talents and his men to win that battle. I ask you this day to use your talents and your men out in the field to win this battle that we have to fight.

I am pleased to be on your program today with our distinguished economist, Edwin G. Nourse, who was Economic Adviser to the President. He left that position 6 months ago, and he is going to speak to you today, quite frankly I know, about this battle of the bulge in the budget.

Dr. Nourse said this up in New York to the Economy Club—and he didn't say it just because he was speaking to an economy club because I know that he believes in it as he, too, has been in the trenches—he said that "the first order of business for this country in 1950 is to turn from the easy acceptance of deficit spending as a way of life to the making of specific and hard-headed balance and getting back to black ink and a long-run program of sound debt management." That was a warning. That was something that should be heeded. That was something that showed to everyone ahead that we were, if not careful coming into deficit spending. That was also a warning of inflation.

Oh, yes; we have had a lot of preaching since 1932 about deficit spending. Lord Keynes was the hero on deficit spending. He told you that you could spend your way along to prosperity, that you had nothing to fear, that you could spend and spend, and no matter how large your budget would get, no matter how large your national debt would get, it was of no great concern because you owed it to yourself. Well, if that is true, with our $257,000,000,000 of debt we all ought to be getting rich very fast because we have certainly been increasing the debt to ourselves. But be that as it may, be that the wisdom as he may have told us about it when we were in a depression, I say to you that it does not apply when we have the greatest employment and greatest dollar prosperity that we have ever had. Yet we are increasing our spending so that we are taking a third of the national income, and increasing our debt accordingly.

I want to read you something that was said by Franklin Delano Roosevelt about deficit spending. Of course, this was in 1932 when the President was a candidate and not when he was in office, but I think he was sincere and it has a lot of wisdom in it. He said this: "If a nation is living within its income, its credit is good. If within some crisis it lives beyond its income for a year or two, it can usually borrow temporarily on reasonable terms, but if, like the spendthrift, it throws discretion to the winds, is willing to make no sacrifice at all in spending, is taxing up to the limit of the ability of the people to pay and continues to pile up deficitis, it is on the road to bankruptcy." There is a lot of wisdom in that.

Now, we have a lot of expenses besides the $12,000,000,000 that we have just been hearing about as defense costs. The budget is going to run better than $42,000,000,000. So if you are satisfied with every dollar for the national defense, let's talk about the other $30,000,000,000, and see what about those.

This statement that I have just read to you said that the Nation would be on the road to bankruptcy. Well, I don't think we can exactly apply this term "bankruptcy" to a nation. A sovereign power, such as the United States, will not go into bankruptcy as you and I might go into bankruptcy. Bankruptcy means the inability to pay your debts and your creditors start to press you. That doesn't happen in a Government such as ours. If the bondholders start to press the United States Government, we will just print more money, commandeer more credit. The President can request that more money be printed. You are not going into bankruptcy. You will print more currency, you will refund your bonds, you will extend the payment on them, you will pile up this deficit spending on top of this $257,000,000,000. That, my friends, is not bankruptcy. But it is inflation.

You know what has happened since 1939. As far as currency is concerned, one of the hardest things that we have in Congress—and I know you have this back home—is to have people appreciate what a dollar is. To many, many people it is merely the name, a dollar, and if they are getting a dollar for something, they are not concerned with what that dollar may buy.

Let's just take what has happened since 1939. Let's say that you bought—and I have a friend who did—$10,000 worth of Government bonds at a cost of $7,500. In 10 years he was to get $2,500 dollars interest. He cashed them in in 1949 and he then had $10,000 on his table. But let's look at the purchasing value of the dollar between 1939 and 1949. I will take the Government's own figures from the Labor Department. They placed the value of a dollar at 100 percent at that time and they now place the value at 59.9 percent. Let's use the figure 60 for a round figure. The man got back in buying power $6,000. Not only did he lose the amount of his interest, but he lost $1,500 of his capital. I asked that man what he was going to do with his $10,000 and he

said, "I am going to buy Government bonds again with it." Why? Because there are very few places that he feels he can invest that money and the tax gatherer wouldn't take it all instead of him losing the $1,500 dollars. He lost all his interest and a good part of his capital, but it was still better than confiscatory taxation.

If we will take the pattern that is laid down in Great Britain we will see where they have taken by taxation all of the surplus money so that there was no place the people could really have any money to invest as so-called risk capital. The people of the United States today are spending more money on horce-racing and gambling and so forth, than they are putting into what you and I used to think was risk capital. There is a reason for that, and taxation is one of the reasons for that. Confiscatory taxation, like inflation, is the by product of deficit financing.

So we come down to this: How are we going to cut the budget? Well, I think that we can say that the budget calls for two types of functions in government, those that already have existed and those that we want to add. You are going to get the amount of government you pay for—well not quite, and at times I think it is a very good thing that you don't get all the government you pay for, because if you did you would be worse off than you are today. [Laughter.]

But let's look at these functions that we are talking about, that you are paying for. You are paying for them because Government thinks or likes to think that you are demanding them.

As far as I am concerned there are three groups of persons that have to do with the reducing of this bulge in this budget. I am going to say to you that the people of the United States of America are No. 1. Your representatives in Congress are No. 2. The President, who symbolizes and is in effect the executive branch of the Government, is No. 3. All together are the Government, and each has its part to play in this battle of the budget bulge.

Now, I wonder whether or not you have ever known a candidate to either the Senate or the House who was defeated in his home district or State because he got big appropriations for his district or his State. Have you ever known an organization to go out to fight a man for reëlection because he was getting them big appropriations for their district or their State. No, but you have all known men who were defeated because it was felt that the Senator or Congressman wasn't able to get enough for their particular district or enough for their particular State. Now, you all have heard that politicians buy votes by these appropriations. You have heard the term pork barrel appropriations. But I want to say this to you, if votes are bought, they are only bought from those who cast them, and they happen to be the taxpayers of the United States of America.

If you ever come down here from your own district to insist upon getting something for nothing from Government, you are going to find out that you are going to pay more in tax dollars than you ever get back. I remember the cartoon recently in one of the papers which showed John Q. Public and Uncle Sam together. Uncle Sam was handing the tin cup out to the taxpayer, saying, "Put the money in the till, put the money in the cup. I have got to have more taxes." Under Uncle Sam's arm was another arm from John Q. Public, back to Uncle Sam, with the same kind of tin cup, saying, "Put it in there, Uncle; I have got to have more subsidies." That is exactly what is happening, except the tax eaters on the public payroll have to take theirs out before either one of them gets the services or the money that they expected.

So I want to tell you that you, the public, have a big part in this battle of the budget bulge. If you want Government services and supports, you'll pay for them. If you don't want to pay for them, you'll have to tell Government that you don't want some of those services and supports.

We in Congress have our full responsibility, of course. I don't want to avoid any of that responsibility, and I didn't come here to make any apologies. I think it may help if I tell you of some of our difficulties when it comes to putting Government economy into effect.

I want to tell you what can happen to you when you are on the Appropriations Committee—to show you how difficult it can be.

I remember once when we were talking about cutting some item out of the appropriation bill for the United States Post Office. It happened to be an executive hearing. I tell you, gentlemen, if you want a thing to get out quickly and go far, just say you have got an executive or secret meeting. The word seems to travel much faster and much better than if you held it in the open and published it. This was an executive hearing, and it was a question of cutting out some items of the Post Office appropriation. In a very short time my telephone started to ring, and it seemed that all the lawyers in Flint, Mich., started to call me. They said, "What is the matter with you down there in Congress? What is the idea of breaking up the mail service?" They told me, "You have practiced law. You know what it is to go to court in the morning without having received your mail, when you are apt to lose a good case just because you had to go over to court and stay there until noon, and you didn't get your mail until noon." Well, the first call kind of surprised me, and I said, "What are you talking about?" They said, "We just got word from the Postmaster that you are trying to cut an item in the Post Office budget, and they have stopped the morning mail delivery up here in Flint as far as the businessmen are concerned."

It was not a very subtle way, but it was a very effective way of putting pressure on members of the Appropriations Committee.

With all due respect to my good friends in the Defense Department, I just happened to check one interesting item before I came over. Do you realize how many public-relations men they have on their payroll? Well, I am going to read it to you. They have a total of 2,706, and their payroll is $8,162,505. That means there are 2,706 people who can go out into the highways and byways to propagandize the American people for that one department. And that's just one department. The last time I could get the figures on public relations and propaganda, do you know how many were on your total Federal payroll? There were some 24,000, and the payroll was $74,000,000. There were 1,080 people on the payroll of the executive offices of the White House alone whose duty it was to give you the propaganda and to tell you, among other things, why you couldn't reduce the bulge in the budget of the United States of America. [Applause.] There is one big source of our difficulty in Congress.

Yes; we have some remedies. I conceived one a few months ago, and I got a couple of Senators to go on the bill with me. It was a Senate concurrent resolution, No. 35, which would do this: Before any bill could be reported by any committee of Congress it would have to get from the agency involved an estimate of the cost of the administration of that law for the first 5 years of its existence. Wouldn't that be a good law?

I sit in the Appropriations Committee and I hear the same question coming up every day. I ask why this or that increase is needed, and they will say, "But, Senator, new duties have been added by virtue of bill so-and-so. Extra duties or new functions have been added." So I say, "Why don't we find out what it is going to cost to administer a bill before we pass it?" That may slow up the spending process at its initial and perhaps most important stage. Well, we have been able to get that bill onto the Senate floor. The first time it came up it was blocked by the majority leader. Let's say they need a little time to study it. But I hope they will study it before the next call of the calendar and that it will go through so that we may determine what a law is going to cost us before we put it on the books. That is fundamental and basic. It will save Congress a whole lot of later skirmishes in the budget battles.

Here's another item that illustrates our difficulties. We appropriated money last year to the Housing Administrator, who runs rent controls, because they told us that each employee would have to have 26 days off and 17 days for illness. A few weeks ago a bill came in for deficiency in that Agency. It seems the employees didn't take this vacation, they didn't take their sick leave, and now, when the rent control is about to end—and let's hope it does end on the 1st day of July—[Applause.] Well, they came up for $1,600,000 to pay for this leave that the men felt they had coming because they hadn't taken their time off. To me, it was no more or less than padding the budget of the United States of America to the tune of $1,600,000, so we started looking further. Do you know what the record now shows that is due and will be due in the future on this item for all Government departments? Better than a billion dollars for this so-called sick and annual leave that you have already appropriated money for but hasn't been taken. Did anybody come in and say we will reduce the budget that much? Oh, no, certainly not.

Now, there is one other matter I want to talk about and to stress. That is the distinction between an appropriation and an expenditure. I said the President had something to do about this business of economy, along with you and me, and he does. In an appropriation bill we say no more or less than "We will put this amount of money in the bank." It is like telling your wife you will give her so much money for the expenses. Now, some of our wives, naturally, want to spend all that is in the bank. [Laughter.] They say that if the bank gives them blank checks there must be money in the bank, or the bank wouldn't give them blank checks. [Laughter.] Well, that is the same way up in Congress. Congress is the banker. They spend the money and then they come back and say, "We have overdrawn. We have got a deficiency."

Now, what is the difference between appropriations and expenditures. I said an appropriation was only putting the money in the bank. Expenditures are the withdrawals on that account. The Department of Defense did pretty well with its bank account last year. You know the House, the Congress, insisted that they take $735,000,000 for a 70-group Air Force. One hundred fifty-seven million of it was cash and 577 million was for contract authority. They didn't use a bit of that money.

I say to the President of the United States today the mere fact that your Representatives put all that money in the bank is no excuse for him to squander and waste it. Moreover, it is no demand that he spend it. He could do just like he did on the 70-group Air Force if he has a will to do it. He can save. So equally responsible with the Congress—and I will take my responsibility and my blame—is the President of the United States when he uses money out of an appropriation. It is within his power to reduce expenditures even more effectively than for Congress to reduce appropriations.

Now, my friends, I am not going to take much longer, but I want to leave some of

these thoughts with you. We are on the battle front and we need your help. You are the reserves. This is your Government, after all. It doesn't belong to those who are 2,000,000 strong on our public payroll. You have to pay the bill, but as long as any of you are coming down and demanding this item, this subsidy and that subsidy, and this payroll or that payroll, someone has to pay.

I will never forget what an editor once told me about Louis Johnson cutting these 160,000 off the Defense payroll. He went in a barber shop out in Jackson to get shaved. After he got down in the chair he thought the barber was going to slash his throat. The barber said, "You are a fine citizen of the United States of America. Here you have been advocating this economy. You have been advocating this Hoover program. You laid out on the streets in Jackson petitions to the Congress to reduce the cost of Government, and what happens? This morning my son, who was on the Federal payroll in the Armed Services, is back home, and I am going to have to support him. You are a fine citizen." All this was said while the barber's razor was skimming my friend's neck. So, you see, it isn't all roses.

No, this is a big job. This is a real battle. There is a real bulge in this budget. We face a deficit of $14,000,000,000 this year and next, and it could be more.

How can we win the cold war if we are going to give to Russia the greatest secret weapon she could wish from anyone, and that is an economically unsound America? My judgment is that Russia will never fight with the weapons of a shooting war when she can see America going down the road to an insolvency that will create more confusion and allow her to penetrate the United States of America, as she did the other nations, with her subversive elements and take over. Let's consider that we must defeat her by depriving her of the use of this great weapon, an insolvent America.

It is up to you, it is up to Congress, it is up to the President, it is up to every citizen of the United States of America to help win this battle. [Applause.]

Happenings in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD my twenty-fifth radio broadcast from Washington on the subject Happenings in Washington.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAPPENINGS IN WASHINGTON

(Program No. 25)

My fellow Pennsylvanians, this is ED MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital, and bringing you another discussion of happenings in Washington.

A little more than a month ago, on one of these broadcasts, I discussed the social-security law. I explained its weaknesses and the new amendments now being written in Congress. I told you about the bill which the House of Representatives passed and how the Senate Finance Committee was striving to improve it. I am a member of that important committee.

You know of my fight for a sounder, safer foundation under the social-security structure. I believe the workers whose wages are subject to social-security deductions should have complete assurance that they will receive the benefits when they become eligible without being taxed a second time. But, as I said in my earlier broadcast, that cannot be accomplished in this Congress.

Since that time, I've had thousands of letters from Pennsylvanians. They expressed great personal interest in the law and the proposed changes. Many sought further information.

I am therefore taking this occasion to report once more on the latest developments. Of course, the bill is a considerable distance from becoming law. Some changes must be expected. But its general form is now sharp enough to give a reasonable picture of what the social-security future holds in store.

In my opinion, the bill which emerged from the Finance Committee is a better bill than the one approved by the House. Several important improvements have been made.

The first would greatly increase the number of persons to be covered under old-age and survivors insurance. The House would have taken in eleven million. We finally decided upon the addition of nine and one-half million to the thirty-five million now covered.

Mostly they would be the self-employed, except for professional men and women. The House bill would have forced in hundreds of thousands of State and local employees now already protected by sound pension systems of their own. These people appealed to us not to make them lose what they had for the lesser Federal benefits. In the Senate bill, public employees already under a retirement system are not included on a compulsory basis. Voluntary coverage would be available for the million and a half State and local government employees who are not under a retirement system.

The House would also have forced in those whose income comes largely from tips and gratuities. Spokesmen for these people appealed to us to exclude them. They are not in the law now and, at their request, we have kept them out.

The question of farmers and farm labor was handled much the same by the Senate Committee and by the House. Farmers and farm labor are excluded from provisions of the law. However, the Senate committee agreed to cover certain border-line agricultural workers.

For the first time there will be coverage for domestic workers, except on farms. This will apply to both full-time and day workers but not to those who do a day's work in one house and a second day in another.

The second big change is in the amount of the benefits to be paid. As we all know, prices of everything have been greatly inflated since the law was first enacted in 1935. Benefits which were regarded as good in those days are too small by today's standards. So the Senate committee voted to increase benefit payments an average of 90 percent. Actually, those receiving the largest benefits under existing law would receive increases of about 60 percent. Those in the lowest brackets would get increases of 100 percent.

The 90-percent average increase in benefits provided by the Senate committee compares with increases averaging 70 percent, provided by the House.

Although the benefits are greatly increased, the Senate committee decided that no higher payroll deductions would be needed until 1956. At that time the present 1½-percent rate will be raised to 2 percent and then would increase gradually until 1970 when it would reach 3½ percent.

Many people think of social security only in terms of its most important feature—the old-age and survivors insurance.

But this law includes other things. One of these is the public-assistance program, in which Federal funds are put up to match State contributions for the needy aged, blind, dependent children, and certain other smaller programs.

Now, when the social security law was passed in 1935, Congress had two principal things in mind.

The first and long-term feature was the old-age-insurance feature, which called for contributions from the employer and the employee, and no Government handouts.

The second, the public-assistance feature, was a purely temporary program. Let me emphasize that word—temporary.

Under this the Federal Government would make matching contributions to the States to help the needy aged and other beneficiaries. But as soon as the insurance system was well established Uncle Sam would get out of the business of providing local assistance. That, it was felt, was a job entirely for the States and local communities.

But things didn't work out that way. The old-age and survivors insurance has been in existence for 15 years. It is far bigger than when originally created, with more than 35,000,000 men and women under its coverage.

Yet, despite this fact, old-age assistance and other direct relief programs, with matching Federal contributions, have continued to grow at such a rate that its beneficiaries now outnumber those of the insurance system.

Do you know, for instance, that in the State of Louisiana 8 out of every 10 persons 65 years of age or older gets old-age assistance more than half of which comes from Federal tax money?

Do you know that 6 out of every 10 in Oklahoma and 5 out of every 10 in Georgia and Mississippi are given this old-age assistance?

In our State of Pennsylvania, which contributes such a large share of the Federal tax money, only 1 out of every 10 persons over 65 years old receives these funds. And the Federal Government bill for public assistance is over $1,100,000,000 a year.

Well, that was the way the so-called temporary feature has continued to grow. The bill which passed the House would have made it still larger. It would have the Federal Government pay more and more into the fund.

One firm advantage of the Senate bill is that it reverses the trend. It seeks to do what was intended in the first place—get more people under the social-security insurance plan and fewer under old-age assistance. By a change in eligibility requirements it provides that 500,000 more aged individuals would come under the insurance plan in 1951 alone.

That is a sound and constructive move.

In a number of other things, where there was a real need and where the strain on the taxpayers was moderate, the Senate committee has been more generous than was the House.

For instance, our committee increased Federal assistance to dependent children. Blind persons will be eligible for pensions even with earned incomes up to $50 a month.

Pennsylvania receives no Federal funds for its aid-to-the-blind program because we do not conform to the Federal pattern.

We permit blind persons who earn as much as $1,116 a year to get the full $40-a-month State pension because we believe it gives encouragement to the blind to become self-supporting, in part, at least.

We doubled the modest program for child welfare services in rural areas and increased from seven to twelve million dollars a House-approved fund for child welfare services to combat juvenile delinquency.

We are recommending larger Federal grants to provide medical, surgical and other services for needy, crippled children.

So you have now a picture of what the law is likely to be when congressional action is completed.

But it will continue to be far from a perfect law.

To operate successfully the system must be made sounder financially and more along actuarial lines than at present. It should be on a pay-as-you-go basis.

I believe the administration of the law must be made as simple as possible.

I believe a definition of employee must be written into this bill which will prevent future confusion. There has been much confusion and misunderstanding in the past.

The common-law definition of an employee is probably the best we can do at the present time.

Social security and public assistance must be kept separate.

Public assistance is essentially a local function. It should be taken care of by the local community, with financial assistance from the State. Only during great emergencies should the Federal Government step in and provide funds.

Sound retirement plans now operating for the benefit of State and municipal employees, teachers, policemen and firemen should not be forced into the Federal system.

I believe the next Congress should give thought to the steps necessary to modernize social security and set it upon a firm, broad foundation.

The working man who pays for old-age insurance by regular weekly payroll deductions should get what he is paying for. Under the present system the Government takes this money and spends it for anything from submarines to flood-control projects. Then when the worker reaches the age of 65 and wants his insurance payments, the Government taxes all the people to get the money to pay him and others.

The worker will pay some of those new taxes. So in effect, he will be paying twice for his social-security benefits. That problem must be faced and solved before it rises up to plague the Nation as assuredly it will one day.

My friends, I shall continue to fight for sound social security as long as I remain in Congress.

This is ED MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital. I will be with you again in 2 weeks. Thank you for your attention.

Lynch Law for Ducks and Geese

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article I have prepared entitled "Lynch Law for Ducks and Geese." It deals with a meeting of sportsmen in Annapolis for the discussion of shooting regulations, at which the senior Federal judge of Maryland, Hon. William C. Coleman, of Baltimore, is alleged to have made the astounding statement that he did not intend to enforce the Federal regulations which prohibit the shooting of ducks and geese over baited waters.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LYNCH LAW FOR DUCKS AND GEESE

For the past 35 years I have been active in the cause of wildlife conservation. When I was a candidate for the State senate in 1915 one plank in my platform was the creation of a State game department. It was my privilege as a member of the State senate in 1916 to sponsor that legislation. In 1926 Gov. Harry F. Byrd appointed me chairman of the Virginia Commission of Game and Inland Fisheries and for the following 6 years I headed that agency. In 1934 I sponsored a resolution to create a House Select Committee on Wildlife Conservation and for the following 12 years served as chairman of that committee. When the Senate Select Committee on Wildlife Conservation was abolished by the Reorganization Act of 1946 I was instrumental in having organized a Subcommittee on Wildlife of the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments of which I was then a member.

God blessed the North American Continent with a great abundance of wildlife and a habitat well suited for its maintenance. But in our mad rush to convert natural resources into gold we greatly damaged that habitat by the destruction of our forests, the pollution of our streams, the drainage of marsh areas, and the erosion of our topsoil through improvident farming. And that damage to our renewable wildlife resources was greatly accelerated by an ever-increasing number of those who loved to hunt and fish, who were skilled in the use of modern firearms and who were for the large part unmindful of the heavy inroads upon brood stock that were being made.

That is especially true of our migratory bird population Fortunately, Congress recognized the value of that natural resource and the importance of preserving it and under the guidance of a conservation-minded President ratified a migratory bird treaty, first with Canada and then with Mexico, under which the Federal Government gained the power through Executive orders to be issued by the President, to control the future hunting of migratory birds. The treaty in question prohibited all killing of migratory birds except to the extent thereafter authorized by Executive orders of the President.

In the years immediately following the ratification of that treaty the supply of migratory birds and especially of ducks and geese was still so plentiful that liberal regulations for hunting were issued. The season was 90 days, the bag limit was 25 per day on ducks and 4 per day on geese and it was permissible to shoot over baited waters. The destruction under that program, coupled with some adverse breeding seasons and an alarming increase in the drainage of nesting and feeding marshes, made curtailment in hunting privileges an absolute necessity. That curtailment, however, was accompanied by the passage of the Pittman-Robertson Act, which I cosponsored with the distinguished late Senator Pittman, to create funds for the States for the improvement of the game supply and by the passage of the Duck Stamp Act which was sponsored by my House Select Committee on Wildlife Conservation to create a special fund all of which would be used for the benefit of migratory birds. And during the depression years those funds were augmented by allocation of special relief funds by President Franklin D. Roosevelt for the acquisition and development of refuge areas in the United States.

Sportsmen interested in the problem of saving our ducks and geese organized a splendid association which they call Ducks Unlimited. That organization has used money raised in the United States primarily for the purpose of developing and protecting essential breeding areas in Canada.

But, in spite of all of these efforts, our supply of ducks and geese has continued to decline and further restrictions had to be imposed upon the kill to keep the essential brood stock from being exterminated. The very destructive practice of luring ducks and geese to the blind by the use of corn and chopped sweetpotatoes was prohibited. Shooting after 4 p. m. when ducks were returning to their feeding areas was prohibited. The daily bag limit on ducks was reduced to four and the open season reduced to 30 days.

These restrictions upon the kill would have been effective but for an unfortunate development of a spirit of lawlessness and a deplorable disregard for constituted authority, to say nothing of a disregard for the future of a great natural resource. Well-informed witnesses testifying this year before the Senate Committee on Wildlife estimated the unlawful kill at 25 percent of the total kill. It naturally follows if that type of lawlessness could be stamped out we could either have a longer season and a more liberal bag limit for legitimate shooters or we could to that extent increase the available supply.

In order to increase the effectiveness of law enforcement which was urgently needed, the Congress last year increased the price of the duck-stamp licenses from $1 to $2 which doubled the funds available to the Fish and Wildlife Service for the employment of enforcement agents in the field. Those agents, while still entirely too few in number, have shown a commendable activity in apprehending violators but unfortunately in some jurisdictions they have encountered Federal judges who, instead of discharging their sworn duty to uphold the law as well as setting an example for obedience to constituted authority, have deliberately adopted a contrary course.

A notable example is Hon. William C. Coleman, of Baltimore, Maryland's senior Federal judge. The following is an excerpt from a recent issue of Conservation News of the National Wildlife Federation, a privately financed institute dedicated to the conservation of America's renewable wildlife resources. It relates to a recent meeting of sportsmen or those who claim that title, in Baltimore at which the shooting regulations of the Federal Government was the subject of discussion.

"MARYLAND WATERFOWL MEETING A RIOT

"The waterfowl forum recently conducted at Annapolis, Md., turned into a riot and bitter criticism of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, reports the National Wildlife Federation. Dr. Clarence Cottam outlined the status of waterfowl as determined by the winter surveys in order to give the Marylanders the picture and then threw the meeting open for discussion. Hon. William C. Coleman, Maryland's senior Federal judge, was the leader in leveling criticism at the waterfowl management program. He favored baiting ducks throughout the area, claiming that 95 percent of the ducks killed in Maryland are shot over baited waters anyway. He called for a longer season of 60 to 70 days with rest days and a larger bag limit than 4, stating that 4 ducks are not enough to make it worth while to go out hunting. He stated further that the district attorney had come to his office about a month ago with 67 cases of baiting ducks, but he did not think it worth while to bring them to trial. With only a few exceptions the meeting seemed to be unanimous—so far as expressions were made—in favor of a longer season for more killing of ducks. At the conclusion of the meeting it was put to an expression and it voted in favor of more shooting days and a bigger bag, in spite of the warning that this might result in a

closed season for 1951. Glenn Martin, president of the Maryland League of Sportsmen and well-known manufacturer of aircraft, was among the few who urged those present to temper their demands and listen to reason. J. Hammond Brown said in his newspaper story covering the meeting, 'there is little doubt that, if the Federal authorities satisfied the demands made at the meeting, most of the continent's (waterfowl) population would be wiped out utterly within 30 days.'"

I am inserting this statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the information of the Members of Congress and the twenty-five or thirty million true sportsmen of America in order that they may get a clearer picture of some of the problems confronting us in saving our ducks and geese. If this notice to the Federal judges of the United States proves to be inadequate, I shall at some appropriate time present to the Senate a detailed account of every violation in which a Federal judge ignores his oath of office, ignores the Constitution, ignores statutory law, and metes out lynch law to the ducks and geese.

The Role of the Democrat in World Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD remarks I made on May 19 before the Women's National Democratic Club, of Washington, D. C., on the role of the Democrat in world affairs.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mrs. Lehman and I both thank you very much for the opportunity to be here with you tonight, and we are grateful to you for your very friendly welcome. Neither of us is a stranger among you. The only new aspect of this occasion is my being introduced to you as a Member of the United States Senate. That makes this a special occasion. At least, coming here as a Senator ought to make me feel a little different. But to tell the truth, it doesn't. It merely feels good, as it always does, to be among friends.

I never fail to obtain a great satisfaction from meeting with the National Democratic Women's Club, and to see this continuing evidence of the vitality of the Democratic Party. Your organization is a witness to the leading part which the women of the Democratic Party are now playing in the affairs of the Nation.

It has not always been so. I recall that as recently as 25 years ago women, at least in my State, were given virtually no place in the party organization. They had little or no representation on the State committee, and their political influence was almost negligible. It was only when Franklin D. Roosevelt was elected Governor in 1928, that the importance of women as a political force was recognized and they were encouraged to demand full participation in the political organizations. Under the leadership of Mrs. Roosevelt, Mrs. Henry Morgenthau, Jr., Mrs. Harriman, Mrs. Good, Miss Marbury, Mrs. O'Day, and others, women were finally given equal representation on the State committee. But it took a lot of fighting with old-line political leaders to accomplish this.

The title I originally gave to my remarks tonight was The Democratic Woman in Woman in World Affairs. I hope you will not be too displeased if I change this title a little, and speak on the Democrat in World Affairs. I really cannot see the difference between the role of a democratic woman and the role of a Democrat period. So, tonight, I shall speak to you not as women but as citizens, as citizens who have had the sound judgment to aline themselves with the Democratic Party.

Titles given to speeches are not taken seriously anyway, certainly not by the speaker. Those of you who have read the life of William Lloyd Garrison, the Abolitionist leader, may recall Mr. Garrison's famous remark when he was invited by an organization—perhaps it was a woman's club—to make a speech, and was asked whether he could speak on some topic other than abolition, and if so, what his lecture fee would be. Garrison's reply was, "If I speak on abolition, I will charge no fee. If I speak on any other topic, my fee is $200. But whatever the topic, I assure you that the subject will be the same."

So tonight, although I have changed the topic, the subject will certainly be the same.

As a nation, we have never given as much attention to world affairs as we should. The fact that our immediate neighbors both to the north and the south of us were and are good neighbors, and the fact that on the east and on the west we bordered on vast oceans, gave us a false sense of security and detachment from world affairs. This illusion of separation from the rest of the world was reflected in the policy of which the Republican Party became the principal protagonist, the policy called isolationism. But there is no doubt that this isolationist policy was deeply rooted in the feelings of the overwhelming majority of the American people during the twenties.

You may be interested to know that the Republican Party was not the originator of even the name for the isolationist policy. The publisher of the Chicago Tribune and the junior Senator from Nebraska might both be horrified to know that the term "isolationism" was actually borrowed from Great Britain. Around the turn of the century, a British foreign minister, Mr. Joseph Chamberlain, father of the Neville Chamberlain of Munich fame, called upon his country to hold itself aloof from the quarrels and alliances of the European Continent, and to remain wrapped in what he called "splendid isolation." England, at the peak of her power after the Napoleonic and post-Napoleonic wars, regarded the English Channel and the British Navy as certain guaranties that this splendid isolation could never be violated.

England, of course, was awakened from her dream of isolation not long afterward, but not until her isolationism had very nearly destroyed her and the rest of the freedom-loving world.

We in America were awakened from our dream of isolation, too. But if it had not been for the great courage and foresight of Franklin D. Roosevelt, we, too, might have been engulfed and totally destroyed, and the whole Western World with us. Happily we awakened just in time. But today there are those who would have us return to the same illusion which once almost spelled our doom.

Our modern-day isolationists, however, are not quite as simple or as consistent as the isolationists of 20 years ago. The current crop of isolationists are only partial isolationists. They are opposed to helping western Europe economically, because, they contend, it is a waste of money. They are also opposed to helping western Europe militarily because, they say, that, too, is a waste of money. But they are not absolutely opposed to helping Europe.

Oh, no. They are willing to help western Europe help us against Russia, providing the following conditions are met:

1. That western Europe agrees to pay us back for all our help.

2. That western Europe agrees not to ship into the United States any goods that can compete with American goods.

3. That Europe agrees to buy from us most of our surpluses.

4. That western Europe agrees to discontinue much of its normal trade with eastern Europe.

5. And, finally, that western European countries agree to make all the changes in their political and economic philosophy that certain political sages in this country think are desirable for Europe.

So the latter-day isolationists are willing to save Europe from Russia, but only on terms which no self-respecting European nation outside the iron curtain could ever accept.

That, in essence, is the European policy of the isolationists. But, for Asia, the isolationists have quite a different policy. For that continent, the policy changes from timid to bold, and from halting to headstrong. Into those distant parts, the isolationists would send troops, guns, planes, ships, naval, air, and military missions, and dollars without limit. They would thus refrain from helping the traditionally democratic governments in Europe, and would instead commit our resources to the support of an autocratic regime which has a political structure, but no people, the Chinese Government of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek.

For those who disagree with these Formosa firsters, for those who point out that such a policy has no hope of success but can only lead to the catastrophe of war, and war on the worst possible terms, the isolationists reply with accusations that their critics are Communists or are following the Communist Party line.

It is strange, indeed, that the neoisolationists are able to stir up this entire country, and place our entire foreign policy in jeopardy with unsupported accusations of communism rampant in the State Department, based solely on the circumstance that the State Department opposes our total involvement in a hopeless adventure in China. What is the main evidence against the State Department? The main evidence is that the Communists also oppose giving aid to Chiang Kai-shek.

But it is an equally interesting fact—and yet seldom noted—that in Europe the Communists favor almost exactly the same policy that our isolationists do. The Communists, too, are against the Marshall plan, and the Atlantic Pact, and the arms-aid program. Is this not evidence, by the same sort of reasoning that is now so current, that Senator MALONE and Senator WHERRY and Senator JENNER are following the Communist Party line? I, for one, am willing to absolve them of such an accusation. I do not think that they should be investigated on this basis. Still I fail to see why sauce for the goose isn't sauce for the gander, too.

I hope that I have not given the impression that this latter-day isolationism is a philosophy peculiar to or is even exclusively identified with the Republican Party. Certainly we Democrats have our own neoisolationist fringe. But the Democratic Party as such stands for an enlightened and liberal foreign policy, but a foreign policy based on bipartisan support.

I, myself, am a firm believer in a forward-looking bipartisan foreign policy. I think that in the present state of the world, we must show as little disunity on foreign policy as possible. I know that on the broad principles of foreign policy, the overwhelming majority of the American people—of whatever political party—are firmly united. They are united for the defense not only of our

way of life but of the right of every people to be secure from external aggression.

This singleness of sentiment in our country is reflected in the present bipartisan foreign policy in the Congress. I want to emphasize that this bipartisan policy was not and should not be achieved at the price of surrender of vital principles. But the bipartisan policy does require some compromise, just as world peace requires a degree of compromise. We should be willing to make proper concessions both at home and abroad where necessary to win or to secure peace with justice. Flexibility is a mark of strength and not of weakness.

But the isolationists want compromise neither on the home front nor on the world front. Thumbing their noses at the rest of the world, they demand its unconditional surrender. They want no part of this bipartisan foreign policy.

They are as much opposed to the views of Senator VANDENBERG as they are to the views of Secretary Acheson. They are the true irreconcilables, whose attitude is just as intransigent at one pole as is the attitude of the Communists at the other; as I have just indicated, these two extremes meet more than occasionally.

But I have talked enough about the isolationists. I haven't talked at all about our positive role in world affairs or the role which the rest of us must play in order to enable our country to discharge its inevitable responsibility in the present world situation.

We must reject, not only passively but actively, the inconsistent philosophy of the isolationists. We must oppose and break the reign of terror which these harbingers of hysteria have succeeded in setting loose in this country.

We must support with all our vigor and energy the democratic principles which we advocate in the world today. Civil rights and human rights for all our people here at home and for all the peoples everywhere in the world must constitute our platform in world affairs.

We must support the principle of world cooperation for peace with justice, of intimate cooperation with all freedom-loving peoples, and of guarded cooperation with all others in the interests of peace and world security, for each as well as for all.

We must be ready and willing to surrender some of the extreme aspects of national sovereignty in favor of world peace and order. This is the basic principle of the United Nations. It is the only way to a lasting peace. Just as State's rights have had to yield in some respects to national rights, so national rights must also give way, under all necessary safeguards, of course, to world rights. These are concepts even more basic today than national rights. Our banner in world affairs must be human rights.

In passing I might mention an international agreement which is, at this time, under the consideration of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and which has been attacked in some legal quarters as a partial surrender of our sovereignty. I refer to the Genocide Pact. This great and historic document declares it to be an international crime wilfully to destroy groups of individuals because of their race, creed, or color, or to inflict conditions leading to the destruction of such groups.

The purpose of the Genocide Pact is to outlaw such bestial crimes as the mass murder of the Jews of Germany and of eastern Europe. It would also place beyond the pale of organized and civilized society such destruction of peoples as is now said to be going on behind the iron curtain in the Ukraine and Poland and the Baltic States.

I hope with all my heart that this Pact will be approved. For the United States to refuse to approve it, merely because it involves the surrender to an international body of the right to sit in judgment on such crimes within another country—even within our own country—is a sorry reflection not only upon our democracy but upon our sense of justice. I hope that you and the Democratic Party of the entire Nation, and all like-minded individuals of all parties, will insist that the Genocide Pact be approved without further delay.

I have not tried tonight to give you a complete description of what I consider to be our proper role in world affairs. I have merely sketched in a few high lights, some of the more important obligations which we as citizens and as members of the Democratic Party must assume.

We are in this undertaking together—as fellow Democrats, as fellow citizens, and as fellow human beings. There are really no party lines, State lines, or national lines across which the perils of this day will not pass. If we would save ourselves from deadly danger—and I believe it is a danger far greater than that which has ever been faced by the peoples of the world in my time and perhaps in all time—we must accept and seek the help of all men and women of good will, of every part of our country and of every part of the world.

Compulsory FEPC Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL
OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Senate in Mourning," from the Washington Star of May 21, 1950, relating to a proposed compulsory FEPC law.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE IN MOURNING

Having never been among those who believe or who profess to believe that a compulsory FEPC law would be good legislation, this newspaper is not to be listed among those mourning its defeat in the Senate. The most sincere believer in the merits of FEPC, however, would be hard put to join in the Senate grieving.

The FEPC defeat came in the form of failure to adopt a proposal to limit debate on a motion to call up the FEPC bill. The vote was 52 for and 32 against. Since 64 favorable votes were needed to invoke cloture, this means that FEPC is dead for this session. Majority Leader LUCAS talks bravely of trying again, but the plain fact is that the FEPC advocates have not the necessary votes, and they know it.

In the Star's opinion not more than a corporal's guard of Senators really believe in and want to adopt a compulsory FEPC. No other issue has been so shot through with partisan politics as this one, and that is something which has to be kept in mind when, in the wake of the vote, the senatorial pot begins to call the kettle black.

The Republicans obviously are trying to make all of the political capital they can out of the administration's embarrassment. The President has put FEPC at the head of his civil-rights program, although it is by far the most objectionable of those proposals. When the test came only 19 Democratic Senators voted for cloture and 26 voted against. So it is not surprising, our politics being what they are, that the Republicans should be pounding the partisan drums.

Senator TAFT is taking the lead. He points out, in doleful tones, that the Democrats could muster only 35 percent of their total strength for cloture, that the President did not put pressure on his party members, that Majority Leader LUCAS did not bring up FEPC at the beginning of the session, etc. But how is this to be taken? Senator TAFT heretofore has advocated a voluntary FEPC. Does he now favor compulsion? Would he vote for such a bill on a final test? On both counts the true answer probably is no. The Ohio Senator, by implication, rebukes the President for not putting pressure on the Democrats. Would he feel the same way if the issue had been repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act and the President had refrained from pressuring the Democrats? And why chide Senator LUCAS for waiting to bring up FEPC? The votes for cloture would not have been forthcoming at any time, and to have brought FEPC up at the beginning of the session would have delayed and might have killed other more important legislation.

So as the Senate goes into mourning over this matter the people have reasons to frown on the whole performance. It is a performance which, on both sides of the aisle, unmasks politics in its drabbest form. The only Senators who can be said with certainty to have voted according to their convictions are the 6 Republicans and the 26 Democrats who combined to beat the cloture move.

"Who Killed Cock Robin?"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY
OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. WHERRY. Who killed Cock Robin?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair does not know. [Laughter.]

Mr. WHERRY. The Vice President did exactly what I thought he would do; he said he did not know. So I want to give him the information.

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Wilmington (Del.) Journal-Every Evening for May 20, 1950. The editorial is headed "Who killed Cock Robin?" and in the opinion of the junior Senator from Nebraska correctly places responsibility for failure of cloture to be applied on the motion to consider the FEPC bill.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHO KILLED COCK ROBIN?

As a result of a test vote in the Senate yesterday the FEPC bill, heart of the President's civil-rights program, now becomes officially "unfinished business." That's a misnomer. The correct word is "finished"—meaning that no further attempts can usefully be made this session to translate the measure into law.

We can understand the disappointment many persons feel today in consequence of the failure of a Democratic Senate to redeem one of the main pledges of the Democratic Party's platform. But the vote yesterday shows well enough where the blame lies.

Only 19 Democrats supported the motion for cloture, while 26 opposed it. On the other side of the Chamber there were 33 Republicans in favor and only 6 against.

If, therefore, the FEPC bill is dead for this year—as is now generally agreed—it was the Democratic majority which killed it. The record is clear and it will remain there for all to read.

In view of this latest development it may well be asked if President Truman is still insisting, as he kept repeating on his nonpolitical western tour, that the present Democratic Congress is infinitely better than its Republican-controlled predecessor. And, by the way, who are the obstructionists now?

Grievances of the American Chamber of Commerce of Morocco

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I would like to call the Senate's attention to page 25 of the House statement regarding treaty compliance, especially that part stating:

The committee of conference took note of a reassuring letter of May 5, 1950, from Administrator Hoffman * * * which letter is quoted.

Mr. Hoffman is quoted as saying:

A similar amendment was carefully considered by the Foreign Relations Committee which decided that it was not necessary in view of arrangements made with the French Government to deal with this situation by the Department of State, the Department of Commerce, and ECA. These arrangements have been operating since December 31, 1949.

Mr. President, I have before me a copy of a letter written on May 12, 1950, by the president of the American Chamber of Commerce of Morocco, a member of the United States Chamber of Commerce. This gentleman says:

The entire membership of the American Chamber of Commerce of Morocco was surprised to learn that a formal claim had been made to the effect that our grievances had been or were being remedied by official action in Morocco or in Paris. You will recall that similar claims have been made each time Congress became interested in the Moroccan situation to the point of seriously considering legislation that will remedy it.

Mr. President, the chamber of commerce lists 11 grievances which the Department of State has been unable to remedy. I am sure that it will convince anyone who reads it that the conference decision unfortunately relied too fully on ECA and State Department statements.

As a matter of principle, I am averse to restrictions in appropriation measures which bring about results that are more appropriate in authorization acts. In this case, however, I strongly recommend to the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee that his committee take cognizance of these two documents and remedy once and for all the rank injustice which they indicate and which the Senate was unfortunately deterred from remedying by action of the conference whose report is before us now. I ask that these documents be included in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpt and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From hearings on the Foreign Economic Assistance Act of 1950]

Treaty compliance: The Senate version (sec. 106) sought to add to the act (sec. 115) a provision forbidding the expenditure of counterpart funds by any country having a dependent area which fails to comply with treaty obligations to the United States. The Senate version (sec. 107) also sought to add a provision to the act stating: "The terms of any treaty to which the United States and any participating country are parties shall remain in full force and effect until superseded by a new treaty ratified by the Senate unless, prior thereto, it expires by its own terms."

The House version contained no such provisions.

The conference agreement omits them.

The relevant provision of the Senate version was designed to deal with a situation in Morocco, where a number of Americans have complained of alleged discriminatory acts of local officials against United States nationals engaged in business. This topic was discussed briefly above in connection with the language pertaining to discriminatory trade practices. As noted, the language of the Senate version, strengthened at the instance of the House members of the committee of conference, has been included in the conference agreement.

The committee of conference took note of a reassuring letter of May 5, 1950, from Administrator Hoffman to the Honorable TOM CONNALLY, chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, which letter is quoted. (The amendment referred to in the letter is the above-discussed amendment in the form prior to the addition of strengthening language in the committee of conference):

"An amendment has been proposed to * * * which would prohibit release of counterpart funds to any country so long as there exists a violation of a treaty between the United States and a dependent area of that country.

"This amendment is aimed at alleged discriminations against American businessmen in Morocco. A similar amendment was carefully considered by the Foreign Relations Committee, which decided that it was not necessary in view of arrangements made with the French Government to deal with this situation by the Department of State, the Department of Commerce, and ECA. These arrangements have been operative since December 31, 1949. They provide a consultative machinery in which American consular representatives can take part in the consideration of actions of the local French authorities in Morocco with respect to the granting of import and exchange licenses in circumstances where discrimination against American traders in the area is claimed to exist. If such local consultation does not satisfactorily take care of any particular complaint, the matter can be raised on a diplomatic level with the French Foreign Office and this has, in fact, been done when it appeared necessary. ECA is of the opinion that these arrangements should be adequate to protect American citizens against improper discriminations, and that a mandatory requirement to immobilize the entire counterpart account (which is used for large and important projects connected with the recovery of the entire French union) is a wholly excessive sanction.

"Furthermore, the * * * amendment * * * gives the Administrator an explicit basis in granting dollar assistance or in acting on proposals to release counterpart, for taking action to see that discriminatory business restrictions against United States citizens are terminated. Under this provision, I would consider myself bound to take suitable action in accordance with the intent of this provision in cases where it is established to the satisfaction of the responsible United States Government authorities that such discriminations are not corrected. Hence the * * * amendment gives assurance that discriminations against American businessmen can be dealt with promptly and effectively."

The committee of conference took note also of a memorandum of May 9, 1950, from the Department of State reviewing the problem in detail and stating the same conclusions as the above-cited letter.

In view of the above communications the committee of conference concluded that no provision additional to that added to the act in relation to discriminatory trade practices would be necessary.

AMERICAN CHAMBER OF
COMMERCE OF MOROCCO,
Casablanca, May 12, 1950.

Mr. ROBERT E. RODES,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR BOB: The entire membership of the American Chamber of Commerce of Morocco was surprised to learn that a formal claim had been made to the effect that our grievances had been or were being remedied by official action in Morocco or in Paris. You will recall that similar claims have been made each time Congress became interested in the Moroccan situation to the point of seriously considering legislation that will remedy it.

There follows a list of current complaints which have not been remedied and which, we are all convinced, will never be remedied until stiff legislation is passed which requires Morocco to live up to its treaties:

I. Customs are still valued by local authorities at the port of entry, whereas treaties require their valuation by an international commission on a long-term basis. While these valuations are not as flagrantly discriminatory as they were when the Department of State promised to remedy them a year ago, there still is much discrimination and much delay in customs that will not be avoided until treaty provisions are strictly applied. Furthermore, no provision has been made for refunds of any of the overassessments which were admitted by the Department of State.

II. "Consumption taxes" which applied to certain necessities like lubricating oil, supplied principally by the United States, and do not apply to French luxuries like furs and jewelry, still are being collected in spite of the fact that they are in addition to the treaty-fixed 12½ percent customs duty and despite the fact that our members were officially informed in writing by the Consul General that they were in no way required to pay these taxes.

III. Final agreement by the Department of State with the Protectorate was, in my opinion and that of the membership, a complete victory for French interests. However, as unfavorable as it is, it is not being applied honestly by Protectorate officials. Americans repeatedly have been refused licenses authorized under the agreement, and licenses actually granted have been subjected to delaying tactics. On the other hand, licenses not permitted by the regulations have been granted to favored persons.

IV. One of the most recent cases of license refusals is preventing an American from obtaining spare parts necessary to operate his bus line. The same American has likewise been delayed for months in obtaining licenses for spare parts for the Piper Cub

planes for which he is agent. The effect of this will be to cause future purchasers to turn to other makes.

V. Reverting to the regulations themselves, they are drawn in a way that is intended to give almost all business to the French syndicates and cartels. Most of the products selected for unrestricted import are those which were controlled largely by French interests. The fact that the list includes manufactured tobacco products should be ample proof that more concern was shown about profits to favored concerns than to the economic requirements of the country. As you know, Morocco has ample tobacco manufacturing facilities for ordinary products. The imported products will be primarily luxuries, and will, of course, profit only the tobacco monopoly, in which the Paris and Netherlands Bank have a heavy interest. On the other hand, cotton textiles, used clothing, and most other necessities formerly sold by Americans still are under rigid embargo.

VI. The agreement absolutely overlooks the fact that independent Americans did one-third of Morocco's total import business in 1948, when free competition prevailed. We should have been assured an over-all volume that represents the 1948 percentage. I believe that our negotiators tried to make this arrangement, but were rebuffed by the Protectorate government. As it now stands, most of the business that we did with our own dollars has been wiped out by the embargo. The influx of official dollars made possible by ECA is diverted to our former competitors. This is done by claiming a "historical basis" of allocations with provisions usually of 15 percent of the total to be shared by all "new importers." French new importers by far outnumber American importers. When one remembers that Marshall-plan money has increased imports in some categories to 10 times the prewar figure that determined the historical pattern, it will be easy to see how wealthy and powerful some of these cartel members are becoming, while their former American competitors are being driven out of business.

VII. There are many other discriminatory provisions in the agreement. For instance, importers of tractors must have repair facilities which the cartel considers adequate. Since the cartel members have large shops which were necessitated by the requirements to keep up old equipment during the war and postwar period, this is merely another way of ruling out our members. Obviously, if a user wishes to buy tractors and keep them up himself, we should be able to compete for this business.

VIII. One of our members who represents Remington-Rand consistently receives an allocation of official dollars for office equipment, which is about one-tenth of that of his French competitor, who represents Underwood.

IX. The regulations cite the Compagnie Marocaine des Transports as a priority user of certain products purchased with ECA funds. This company was created by the French administration with the intention of giving it a monopoly on transportation. The United States has repeatedly refused to recognize the legality of the position claimed for it. The recognition in the final agreement is the first step toward breaking down our resistance.

An example of how this company operates can be seen from the bus situation. Morocco needs additional bus service desperately. Some Americans here have been successful in providing American-type bus service with superior American equipment. They are unable to expand their services because the authorities have arbitrarily decided to limit the number of total passenger capacity allotted to Americans to a few hundred, while the Compagnie Marocaine des Transports, a non-American firm, has an allocated capacity of 17,000 seats, of which only 10,000 are in operation.

X. To add to the other difficulties which have been placed in our way, the French Government now is encouraging barter transactions which are costly to the whole French economy and which virtually freeze out normal enterprise. In order to be sure that Americans do not compete in this, the products offered in barter are not Moroccan products, but are taken from other colonial locations where Americans have no treaty rights and are not allowed to operate.

XI. During the discussions that followed the State Department's temporary acceptance of the decree of December 28, 1948, which put a ban on imports without official exchange, the American members of the so-called mixed commission, required that American citizens be granted the right to import any article they need for their personal use, with assurances that they would not to be resold. The Protectorate Government acquiesced to this clause, which, however, was not honored in practice. As soon as the Protectorate Government obtained the State Department's extension of the preliminary acceptance of the edict, it refused to permit the entry of any article that was not in the list of free imports.

As an example, Americans have been and still are being, refused the importation of a personal car, which invariably is essential for the conduct of their business. Mr. Edwin Sendro, an American citizen, established in transport business in French Morocco, in returning from the United States brought with him his personal car. He has recently been ordered by the Cherifian customs authorities to ship the car out and pay a fine of approximately $25. The enclosed letter signed by Mr. Sendro is self-explanatory on this subject.

Another example of this type: In returning from Tangier recently, my personal car broke down in Spanish Morocco. I managed to reach Casablanca, where, upon inquiry, it was discovered that replacement parts for the car were not available either in French Morocco or in Tangier, and that their shipment from the United States would require 2 to 3 months. As president of the American Chamber of Commerce of Morocco, the car was indispensable both for my business as well as for the chamber. A letter to the consulate general (copy enclosed) brought a negative reply from the local customs authorities. Simultaneously, a request to official Rabat for a car, even on temporary admission until my car was repaired, met with as little success. In the meantime I was obliged to rent a French-manufactured car that cost me $10 a day. The attitude of the French administration on this matter is most incomprehensible. We, however, can draw our own conclusions.

In summarizing, you may be assured that any change in our situation since January 1 has been for the worse, that no special machinery for adjusting claims exists that did not exist before (conferences between consular and residency officials involve the same personnel and lead to the same frustrating results even though they are now called deliberations of a mixed commission); that no attempt is being made to obtain reimbursements of the millions of francs that we have paid under protest, with United States official advice to do so; and that nothing is being done to ameliorate our situation.

Very truly yours,

GUS G. STRATTON,
President of the American Chamber of Commerce of Morocco.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Washington, D. C., May 17, 1950.

Mr. ROBERT E. RODES,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. RODES: This is to inform you that the American Chamber of Commerce of Morocco, of which Gus G. Stratton is president, is a member in good standing of the United States Chamber of Commerce.

Cordially yours,

SAMUEL S. ERICSSON,
Assistant Manager, Foreign Commerce Department.

Wisconsin Essay Contest on Employing Physically Handicapped Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have prepared a statement on the subject of a wonderful institution, so to speak—a Nation-wide essay contest—which has developed in the crusade for employment of physically handicapped Americans. I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ALEXANDER WILEY ON EMPLOYING PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED

"Hire the handicapped, it's good business."

This is the title of the 1950 contest sponsored by the President's Committee on National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week, associated with the United States Department of Labor. This essay contest is open to students in public and private high schools in the eleventh and twelfth grades throughout the Nation. These original essays of 1,200 words or less are to my way of thinking a brilliant way of spotlighting the attention of the 48 States on this critical subject.

As I was happy to do last year, I should like once again to invite the attention of the Senate to the splendid way in which this essay contest has been conducted in my own State of Wisconsin. Our able Governor, the Honorable Oscar Rennebohm, appointed a committee on employment of the physically handicapped. Its secretary is Mr. A. L. Beier. As in 1949, when I commented on this issue in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I feel that this committee has carried through its assignment with exemplary skill.

The State prizes and honorable mentions have now been awarded, and I want to express my sincerest congratulations to the Governor's committee, to the winning youngsters, to their proud parents, to their teachers and principals, who also feel justifiable pride. I want too to express my felicitations to the Wisconsin Association for the Disabled which made available the State cash prizes as well as to the members of President Truman's committee, the International Association of Machinists, and the Disabled American Veterans through whose courtesy the national cash prizes were made available. Let me express by congratulations, too, to the members of the Governor's committee of the physically handicapped, to the interagency committee, and to the 1950 essay contest judges.

These three groups comprise an honor roll of some of Wisconsin's most outstanding citizens—men of all political faiths, men devoted to the great goal of the essay contest.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be appended to my statement a

fact sheet, listing the prize winners, as well as a list of the distinguished panel of leaders who serve in the various capacities I have mentioned, and that there follow this list the 1950 Wisconsin first prize essay by young Miss Betsy Ann Barland, age 16, of Eau Claire, Wis., Senior High School.

The matters referred to follows:

FACTS ON ESSAY CONTEST, "HIRE THE HANDICAPPED. . . IT'S GOOD BUSINESS"

WISCONSIN STATE PRIZE WINNERS

First prize, $50 United States Savings Bond; entrance in national contest: Betsy Ann Barland, age 16, Eau Claire Senior High School, junior class. Parents: Mr. and Mrs. George C. Barland (occupation real estate, Eau Claire).

Second prize, $25 cash award.

Barbara Alice Murray, age 16, Wauwatosa Senior High School—junior class. Parents: Mr. and Mrs. Ned Murray, (occupation, sales engineer, West Allis).

Third prize, $20 cash award.

Byron Lee Barrington, age 17, Little Wolf High School, Manawa—senior class. Parents: Mr. and Mrs. Harold Barrington, (occupation, instructor in agriculture).

Fourth prize, $17.50 cash award:

H. James Smith, age 17, McDonell Memorial High School, Chippewa Falls, senior class. Parents: Mr. and Mrs. Levi E. Smith. Occupation, logger, Chippewa Falls).

HONORABLE MENTION

Audrey Clemens, Hartford High School, Hartford.

Donald S. Clow, St. Francis Seminary, Milwaukee.

Leon David Hamilton, Appleton Senior High School, Appleton.

Kenneth Hintzman—St. Francis Seminary, Milwaukee.

Charles Lipscomb, Wauwatosa Senior High School, Wauwatosa.

Betty Mayer, Hartford High School, Hartford.

CERTIFICATES OF MERIT

State prize winners will receive parchment awards signed by the President of the United States. Contestants selected as State prize winners and for honorable mention will receive certificates of merit signed by the Governor of Wisconsin and the committee chairman.

THE GOVERNOR'S COMMITTEE ON THE EMPLOYMENT OF THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED

Oscar Rennebohm, Governor; Harry Lippart, chairman.

Members: Harry Lippart, chairman, Madison; C. H. Crownhart, Madison; George Haberman, Milwaukee; John M. Sorenson, Milwaukee; William J. Petersen, Madison; Robert A. Ewens, Milwaukee; William F. Faulkes, Madison; Harry A. Nelson, Milwaukee; William H. Siemering, Madison; A. D. Kvool, Milwaukee; Ben E. Kuechle, Wausau; D. Weston Day, Milwaukee; Arthur F. Trebilcock, Madison; Jack Spore, Milwaukee; Robert W. Hansen, Milwaukee; Max Ninman, Reedsburg; Fred MacMillan, Madison; Milo Swanton, Madison; O. H. Plenzke, Madison; Joseph D. Mackin, Marinette; Mark R. Byers, Wausau; Sid Bliss, Janesville; A. L. Beier, secretary, Madison.

INTER-AGENCY COMMITTEE

Hobart Bondi, Veterans' Administration; Joseph Brown, Vocational Rehabilitation; L. T. Burdick, Veterans' Employment Service; Max Hays, Wisconsin State Employment Service.

ESSAY CONTEST JUDGES, 1950

Hon. Lyall T. Beggs, past national commander, Veterans of Foreign Wars. Hon. Walter S. Bottsford, secretary, Wisconsin Free Library Commission. Hon. Harry J. Burczyk, commissioner, Industrial Commission of Wisconsin.

CASH PRIZE DONOR

Wisconsin Association for the Disabled, R. E. Balliette, president.

THAT IS WHY THE IMPAIRED WORKER DOES BETTER WORK

(By Betsy Barland, Eau Claire (Wis.) Senior High School; David Barnes, principal; Ethel M. King, English instructor)

America cannot be called the land of opportunity unless it means an opportunity for all people regardless of whether they have a physical disability or not. Each year approximately 250,000 more men and women are added to the ranks of the handicapped. These Americans have as much right to be independent and self-supporting to their fullest capacities as they have to freedom of speech and freedom of worship. The problem of finding a job is a very serious one for these people. The American system of initiative and free enterprise is not working for them if they fail to find some sort of job with which they can provide for themselves and their families.

Today's handicapped have the full support of the United States Government. For more than 26 years there have been rehabilitation programs going on in one form or another. Sometimes the progess has been slow, but it has always been going forward. Now today, thanks to several bills passed by the Government, which provides "an effective job counseling—service," many more of the nation's handicapped are finding good jobs. The heaviest burden of the disabled is their idleness. Through the rehabilitation programs they can have the privilege of going forth each day to their chosen work. That is the greatest gift that free men may enjoy in a democratic society. There are no financial yardsticks to measure the difference between a self-reliant, happy worker carrying his own responsibilities, and a glum, depressed citizen depending on others for his everyday needs. The difference is more than in dollars and cents. It is in happiness, good citizenship, and social usefulness.

Rehabilitation means the "restoring of the handicapped to the fullest physical, mental, vocational, and economic usefulness of which they are capable." The services provided by this program vary with the individuals who are served; but in each case the particular difficulties and aptitudes of the persons concerned are the factors which determine which services are necessary. One person may need an artificial limb, another may need just advice and counsel. While one may need training for a job, another may need just a change in the type of work he is doing. No job can be considered entirely suitable for a given person until his remaining abilities have been found sufficient for that job. When the handicapped person is properly trained and properly placed, he can work as well as anybody. Production records prove it. It's not what a man has lost, but what he has left that is important. With proper placement, disability disappears as a job factor. The ability to do a thing is much more important than the disability.

Before the war, the normal tendency of the employer was to place the impaired worker in clerical or sedentary work. However, times have changed, and the handicapped are now taking the actual manufacturing and productive jobs. During the war when there was a scarcity of manpower, an armed America, stimulated with the urgency for maximum production, scraped the bottom of her manpower barrel and uncovered a veritable gold mine. The handicapped were called at last to the production benches, because there was no one else. In the war years there were three-quarters of a million impaired workers working in war plants. Their performance was praised by the management, and they made a marked contribution toward the winning of the war.

During these hard-pressed years, the employer found out a great deal about the impaired worker. Many jobs thought previously to need two hands, were found to be done just as well with one hand and a hook. In quite a number of jobs it was found out that the handicapped do better. For instance, midgets were found to be very useful and suitable for working in small spaces. The blind have developed an almost "supersensitive" feeling in their fingers, doing very well in jobs requiring a highly-developed sense of touch. The deaf do very well in large, noisy factories where the noise doesn't bother them, permitting them to concentrate much better. There is much less nervous strain on the deaf in these jobs than there is on the normal worker. In having lost the use of his eyes or ears, or having lost a limb, the impaired worker seems to have gained courage, stamina, responsibility, mental alertness, and stronger motivation. Most individuals use less than 10 percent of their physical potentials. Only in emergencies do they call on all of their tremendous reserves. When one organ is injured, nature automatically compensates psychologically. The same occurs with the loss of skills and abilities. When greater demands are placed on the different limbs, they become more sensitive. Fingers become dextrous, arms and shoulder muscles are abnormally powerful. That is why the impaired worker does better work.

A national survey was conducted recently by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. It was so organized that the difference between the impaired and the unimpaired worker was focused solely on the existence of the impairment. He was matched with someone of his own approximate age and work experience. These are the results of the survey:

1. Handicapped workers come to work regularly: 55 percent were absent less frequently than the able-bodied. Forty percent had the same record, and 5 percent of the impaired had worse records.

2. Handicapped workers stay on the job longer: 82 percent stayed on the job longer. Sixteen percent had records as good as able-bodied workers, and 1 percent had worse records than the unimpaired.

3. Handicapped workers are equally as efficient or slightly better: 66 percent were equal with the unimpaired. Twenty-four percent were better, and 10 percent of the handicapped were worse.

4. Handicapped workers have better safety records: 56 percent had fewer accidents. Forty-one percent had as good records as the able-bodied, and only 2 percent had worse records than the nonhandicapped.

These facts show that the impaired worker should not be set apart from society as a group for whom special privileges must be sought. The evidence of the survey showed that the impaired worker had a slight edge over the unimpaired. This can be explained by the fact that most of the impaired workers got their impairments through accidents, causing them to be extra careful so as not to let it happen again. They stay on the job longer because many of them know how it feels to be dependent upon someone. To be dependent upon anyone is the last thing that the handicapped person wants.

No forward-thinking company can ignore the employing of the impaired. The employer is the vital factor in the whole rehabilitation program, but in practice he is often considered by himself and others as an outsider. A great many large business concerns, such as the Ford Motor Co., the Bulova Watch Co., Western Electric Co., Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., and many others, employ substantial numbers of men and women with impairments and say that they are just as good as, or even superior to, able-bodied workers.

With suitable jobs, handicapped Americans are an asset to their employers, communities, and Nation. Through a survey taken, it was shown that there was a major economic and moral gain in the Nation. If there were no work for the handicapped, he and his family would have to go on relief. This would cost the Nation an average of $1,248 a year for each family. This cost would go on year after year. It costs an average of $260 for rehabilitation and is paid only once. After rehabilitation 50,000 men and women were paying $5,000,000 a year in Federal taxes plus county, State, and local taxes. As can plainly be seen, the total cost of rehabilitation is repaid many times over in increased income tax payments alone. If able to work, the physically impaired are entitled to employment security and the opportunity to help the community and Nation produce needed goods and services. The employer does himself a genuine service by hiring the handicapped, as they ask for jobs not as a matter of charity, but on the basis of their abilities to deliver the goods.

The handicapped are not excluded when the brotherhood of man is spoken about. The Declaration of Independence was designed to give justice and freedom to all Americans, not just the nonimpaired workers. Show your faith in democracy by hiring the handicapped, because our democracy rests upon the belief in fundamental worth of every individual. Our Nation would be materially strengthened and our democracy enriched if all citizens capable of performing any sort of useful labor were afforded the opportunity of having employment. At a time when Europe and the hungry world need our help, we should indeed utilize the ability of every American willing and able to work.

Hiring the physically handicapped is not a risk, it is a sound investment.

Proposed FEPC Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Proposed FEPC Bill Is Unwise Legislation; It Should Not Pass," published in the Deseret News, of Salt Lake City, Utah, May 10, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROPOSED FEPC BILL IS UNWISE LEGISLATION; IT SHOULD NOT PASS

Just what political advantage the White House can find in forcing Senate Majority Leader LUCAS to bring a Fair Employment Practices Commission bill before the Senate at this time is not clear to the nonpolitical mind.

There must be some. Mr. Truman is a shrewd politician. But the only practical effect of this move that the layman can see is that it will stop all Senate consideration of legislation which is immediately and urgently important, while the southern filibusterers talk FEPC to death.

Filibuster is a dangerous weapon because it is plainly tyrannical when used by Senators more deeply pledged to selfish interests than they are to the national good. But if ever its use is justified, it must be in this case.

FEPC is morally and socially and humanly wrong.

It is wrong because it purposes to use an unconscionable means to force a social change which can come properly only by social evolution.

It purposes to use informers, Government spies, and the State police power, to force employers to hire people whom they may not want in their employ.

The FEPC issue is as simple as that. The southern filibuster will be widely deplored again as another example of anti-Negro intransigence; and some of the southern resistance to FEPC may be exactly that. But that is an instance of being right for the wrong reason. Given time, prejudice will yield to reason but those who are on the right side now will stay there still. Mandatory legislation implemented with the apparatus usually assigned to the use of a despot's police is not correct.

The measure which has been presented for consideration by the Senate would set up a five-man Federal board, called the Fair Employment Practices Commission; make it illegal for an employer to refuse to hire a jobseeker because of his color, religion, or race; and give the FEPC—meaning, this Federal agency—power to compel an employer not to discriminate in the selection of the workers he hires.

If a worker felt that he had been denied a job because of his color, race, or religion, he could hie to the nearest agency of the FEPC and lodge a complaint. He would be encouraged by that apparatus to become a stool-pigeon for the FEPC.

The board would then look into the case. That would mean that its police would enter the employer's premises—farm, school, factory, store, office, mine, mill, or very household—and pry about to find whether he was a discriminator or not.

Once police are granted such a power any abuse is possible; the rifling of the content of records; violation of trade secrets; whatever else venal thought might conceive.

Every effort doubtless would be made to make the FEPC's agents persons of character above reproach; but black sheep do slip in. Consider some of the prohibition agents during the life of the eighteenth amendment. Consider the current case of Dr. Fuchs.

If, in the board's opinion, the employer did exercise discrimination in his choice of an employee, the FEPC could ask a Federal court to compel the employer to stop discrimination in his hiring practice.

So the employer would have an expensive lawsuit to fight—or he would have to give in and hire whoever the FEPC told him to hire, whether they were satisfactory employees in his case or not.

This newspaper believes absolutely without quibble, that any American is entitled to be hired on his merits for the job for which he is fitted better than other applicants for the same job, and not on the basis of race, creed, or color—except in such instances as some such element is an essential to the job.

If, for example, it should be useful that a secretary be able to speak fluent idiomatic Yiddish—or Persian—or Japanese, a highly skilled Negro who might know well a half dozen other languages but not the one desired, might be refused the job.

And he might feel that he was refused because of his color. And he might so report it to the FEPC. And the FEPC would send its police into the organization to investigate.

Absurd? Of course it is. Outrageous? Precisely. Impossible? Not at all.

Such things happened in New York when that State adopted such a law and put it into operation.

Utah's Senator ELBERT THOMAS, chairman of the Senate Labor Committee which reported the FEPC bill out for Senate consideration, says that the measure is "designed to right a wrong which shouts for a remedy."

The wrong that FEPC cannot correct, but rather must make worse, is this: If five people representing as many races, colors, religions—each all three—apply for a job the person who can do it best should get it. Doing it best includes satisfaction of the employer.

A law may force employees on an employer, who are unsatisfactory to him. Under such circumstances an employee of decent sensibilities would hesitate to take the job. He could not be satisfied in it because he would know, constantly, without surcease, that however hard or even well he worked, his employer still would not be satisfied. Some are not equipped with such sensibilities. They become FEPC "informers." Then follows the tyranny of this antisocial law.

Perhaps Senator THOMAS was thinking of mass employment in certain mass industries. We are thinking of human beings as people.

Proposed Transfer of the Navy Special Devices Center From Sands Point, Long Island

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRVING M. IVES
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an editorial entitled "Johnsonian Economy," published in Newsday of Garden City, Long Island, on Friday, May 19, 1950, expressing opposition to the proposed transfer of the Navy Special Devices Center from Sands Point, Long Island, to the Washington-Philadelphia area.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOHNSONIAN "ECONOMY"

While we have always been sold on unification of the Armed Forces, we deplore the asinine byproducts of unification. The old service tradition of R. H. I. P. (rank has its privileges) is hard to control, particularly when it originates at the top of the unified command. Interservice operations too often express interservice jealousies—and the results are unfortunate for the services. We have on Long Island this month an example of how unification can give service operations a set-back instead of a stimulant.

Today we expect official decision on whether the Navy Special Devices Center is to remain at Sands Point or be uprooted and moved to the Washington-Philadelphia area. The move is advocated by Gen. J. T. McNarney, an Army efficiency expert intrigued with the idea that it would save a lot of paper work. If nothing else were involved in the transfer we could see good sense in it. But it is by no means a major consideration.

The Navy has leased its establishment from the Institute of Aeronautical Sciences and invested public money in adapting and improving the plant. The Institute will sell

the property, a 161-acre waterfront estate, to the Navy if the House passes an appropriation bill providing $350,000 for the purchase. As a real estate transaction that would be a good buy. The estate is worth far more and will increase in value.

Furthermore, it is conceded at the Special Devices Center that to move would mean a 2-year setback in its work. Of 500 employees, mostly Navy reservists, who work there, 82 percent would quit their jobs rather than move. They have bought homes here on GI loans. They intend to stay here. These are highly trained personnel, many of whom have been at the Center for 7 years. The Navy therefore opposes the move because it would break the back of its research program—and the Navy should know this better than the Army, which benefits equally from the results of that program without being responsible for it.

If McNarney wins he can boast a paper saving, while the Navy must explain a failure to progress. Boasts ring louder through the halls of the Pentagon, and are broadcast to the Nation from the Office of Defense Secretary Louis Johnson. The Sands Point project is something to keep in mind when the Secretary brags of his achieved economies. How much waste is behind the rest of them, and how much more development has been stymied?

Tribute to Address of Hon. William Benton, of Connecticut, on FEPC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Minneapolis Morning Tribune in its editorial of Saturday, May 13, 1950, entitled "Cousinly Resemblance," paid appropriate tribute to the brilliant address on fair-employment practices legislation by Senator BENTON. Senator BENTON, through his experience in the State Department as Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs, has an intimate and practical understanding of the psychological aspects of the cold war. His address on fair-employment practices legislation demonstrated his clear understanding of the weaknesses in our foreign policy which are a result of our failure to guarantee equal rights and equal opportunity to all people regardless of race, color, religion, or national origin. The relationships between a domestic program and a foreign policy are inseparable. We cannot effectively champion human rights in the councils of the United Nations on the one hand and refuse to take positive action for the guaranty of human rights in the Chambers of the Congress on the other hand. I join with the editor of the Minneapolis Morning Tribune in paying a deserving tribute and thanks to the statesmanlike remarks of our colleague, Senator BENTON.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the editorial entitled "Cousinly Resemblance."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COUSINLY RESEMBLANCE

Senator WILLIAM BENTON, of Connecticut, a former Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs, was discussing this country's civil rights problems in the upper House the other day. Our racial and other discriminations, he said, are providing Russia with propaganda ammunition that is having a dreadful impact in Europe and Asia. It is true, he said, that Soviet propaganda of the sort consisted mostly of lies; yet it bore "a cousinly resemblance to things which have true, or have an element of truth in them."

It is this "cousinly resemblance" which is so disturbing in terms of American foreign policy and the cold war. It would be far easier to combat this Soviet propaganda if it were completely unrelated to the truth; what damages is the hard little kernel of fact at the center of each mass of lies.

This kernel of fact usually involves the denial of certain rights to Americans because of the color of their skin, and is artfully distorted by Soviet propagandists to prejudice millions of nonwhites against us.

Senator BENTON happened to be arguing for a compulsory fair employment practices bill, but whether one believes in such a step or not, no serious observer of Russian tactics in the cold war can fail to be distressed by the effective uses to which they put our treatment of minorities, particularly the Negro.

It is this gap between democratic profession and democratic practice which must be steadily closed if we are to roll back the Russian propagandists on this cold war front. Much progress has already been made in closing it, but much progress remains to be made, too. The "cousinly resemblance" that BENTON speaks about is still too strong for comfort.

James Madison and the American Ideal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY P. CAIN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Washington was recently privileged to be a member of the Board of Visitors during its annual visit to the United States Military Academy at West Point. During this all-too-brief tour through an outstanding American institution, I spent one evening in listening to an oratorical contest in which Cadet Walter C. McSherry, of McAlester, Okla., participated. Cadet McSherry did not win the first prize, but he brought a full measure of credit to himself and the uniform which he wears so proudly. Cadet McSherry spoke of his hopes for the future and of his desire to compete among free men for success and his living. I was moved by his remarks because his faith is in liberty and a freedom of action rather than in security. What stimulated my admiration for this young American may arouse a similar feeling in others, and I ask unanimous consent that the McSherry oration be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the oration was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JAMES MADISON AND THE AMERICAN IDEAL

(By Walter C. McSherry, class of 1950)

During the early days of our Republic giants walked the earth. Our young Nation was fortunate in having such men to guide its destinies as George Washington, Benjamin Franklin, Patrick Henry, Thomas Jefferson, Alexander Hamilton—to mention merely a few. And among the greatest of these was James Madison. He had a very long and distinguished career in service to our country. He drew up our Bill of Rights, was a leader in our first House of Representatives, founded one of our first political parties, was Secretary of State under Thomas Jefferson, negotiating the Louisiana Purchase, and finally served for two terms as President of the United States, guiding our young Nation through its most critical period, the War of 1812. Yet it is for none of these great achievements that James Madison is remembered—his name comes down to us for the first great achievement of his life, his work in the Constitutional Convention of 1787.

Let us go back to that year and consider the situation which confronted the delegates to that Convention. The 13 American Colonies had emerged from the Revolution as 13 separate sovereign States, with their own governments, their own currencies, their own tariffs, their own petty jealousies. These 13 States had never agreed under the Articles of Confederation, and yet this Convention was to reconcile the differences of these 13 disunited States and mold them into one nation. This was certainly a task for great men. And great men were present at Philadelphia. George Washington, who, as Commander in Chief, had led the Revolutionary armies to victory, was there; the wise and experienced statesman, Benjamin Franklin, then 82 years old; Robert Morris, who had financed the Revolution; John Rutledge, Roger Sherman, Gouverneur Morris, and many other men of wide experience and reputation. Yet to none of these older and more experienced men was there accorded the leadership of the Convention. That position was held by James Madison, a man with little experience save in the Virginia State Legislature, a man unknown outside his home State, the second youngest delegate at the Convention. It was this young man whose work at the Convention earned for him the title of "the father of our Constitution."

It is fortunate for us today that James Madison guided the making of our Constitution. For he was a young man, who built a document for the future in which he was going to live. He was looking forward to the ideal of a great and united America, not backward to the experience of the Revolution. His was a young and adventurous spirit which looked to the future, and built a Constitution to endure. And the value of his vision has been proven—that Constitution has endured longer than any other written document under which a nation exists today.

Our Nation needs more Madisons—more young men who look forward to a growing America and not backward, to rest on past achievements. Perhaps we as a Nation find ourselves today committing the error of looking backward. The cry today is not the cry of James Madison, not the cry of a young and adventurous spirit. It is instead the cry for security: our unions for noncontributory pensions, our electorate for social security, unemployment compensation, subsidies for particular groups. Our economists tell us that our economy is "mature"—in effect, that we have gone as far as we can go. Our philosophers tell us that we should be more concerned with the distribution of what wealth we have than with the creation

of new wealth. Our citizens are apathetic toward their blood-bought right to vote, and then tend to use it in favor of the party that can give them the most promises. Each of these "programs" may be fine in themselves, but are not they all symptomatic of a nation which is looking backward, which has stopped its headlong progress, which is resting on the achievements of its great and glorious past? Yes, we are in need of more Madisons, more young men—you and me—to take an interest in our Government and to help build for that future in which we are going to live.

Perhaps the most fitting tribute paid to James Madison was that of Fisher Ames: "Here was a man to whom principles came first." To us also should come first that principle which James Madison cherished: the principle of liberty, and not the desire for security. It was that principle which underlaid the young and adventurous spirit of James Madison, a spirit which never said we have gone as far as we can go, a spirit that was the great American dream, that is the great American dream, and that always will be the great American dream—so long as there are Americans who believe in it.

Rejection of Reorganization Plan No. 12, Relating to NLRB

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on Saturday, May 13, 1950, there appeared an editorial in the Washington Post dealing with a recent decision of the Senate to reject Reorganization Plan No. 12. I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

At the same time, I want to associate myself with the opinion expressed in the editorial that the President of the United States remove Mr. Robert N. Denham from his office as general counsel to the National Labor Relations Board. I am convinced, in the light of my experience as a member of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee as well as a member of the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments which held hearings on Reorganization Plan No. 12, that Mr. Denham is chiefly responsible for the friction within the National Labor Relations Board which impedes its effective operation. I join in the request to President Truman to remove Mr. Denham from office.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

NLRB: WHAT NEXT?

Now that the Senate has rejected a plan for reorganizing the NLRB in a way that would enable the Board to exercise general supervisory powers over prosecuting activities, its operations are likely to be severely hampered so long as General Counsel Robert N. Denham remains in office. For Mr. Denham has been openly critical of Board decisions. He has issued complaints that he knew the Board would dismiss, causing a waste of time, energy, and money on the part of the Government, as well as private parties, and creating uncertainty as to the rights of labor and management under the law. As a result, the work of the Board has been needlessly increased and its efficiency has been impaired.

The conflict of personalities exacerbated by Mr. Denham's disposition to play the role of a mentor instead of a cooperator is chiefly responsible for the internal friction that has interfered with efficient administration. The defects of the existing organizational setup call for a thoroughgoing reform along the lines of the rejected plan to remove the danger of future conflicts. Meantime the appointment of a successor to Mr. Denham who could be relied upon to work with the Board instead of obstructing its activities would enable this "two-headed freak" to function with some degree of smoothness. We hope the rumor that President Truman is contemplating such a move is well founded.

Hon. Raymond S. McKeough

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 24, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of great pride to me that a distinguished predecessor of mine, as Representative from the Second District of Illinois, the Honorable Raymond S. McKeough, has emerged from the clouds of criticism long surrounding the Maritime Commission as a knight with white and unspotted armor.

In recognition of the great and fearless public service he has rendered as a member of the Maritime Commission, and which has won him the acclaim of the Nation, the Illinois Democratic delegation in the Congress, both Senate and House, waited on the President to congratulate him on having in the service of the Nation in a post of high responsibility and during a trying period such a stalwart of integrity and such a force of brilliant ability as our former colleague, the Honorable Raymond S. McKeough. The delegation was composed of Senators SCOTT LUCAS and PAUL DOUGLAS, and Representatives SABATH, O'BRIEN, GORDON, PRICE, BUCKLEY, CHESNEY, LINEHAN, MACK, YATES, and O'HARA, all of whom joined in the hope that the President might avail himself of the service of Mr. McKeough as the new Chairman of the Commission.

I may say only that the President's reception of our delegation was most pleasant to all of us, and his words left no doubt of his high esteem of the character and ability of our fellow-Illinoisan and his personal affection for him. We have the happy assurance that the great abilities, the loyalty, and the integrity of Raymond S. McKeough will not be lost to the Government, and that in whatever place of great responsibility he is called upon to labor he will continue to reflect bright credit upon the administration of President Truman.

I extend my remarks to include the following editorial from the Washington Post of May 23, 1950:

MARITIME SCANDAL

The new and searing blast at the Maritime Commission by the House Executive Expenditures Committee has had immediate impact in the acceptance by Congress of the President's reorganization plan abolishing the Commission. The unanimous committee report covering Maritime Commission ship subsidy and sales operations, though temperately worded, is crushing. It chronicles a record of incompetence, procrastination, and evasion rarely equaled in a Government agency. Some of the statements are disturbingly reminiscent of the Black report of 1935, which exposed the then current scandals and led to the passage of the Merchant Marine Act.

The Hardy subcommittee conducted lengthy hearings at which Commission members testified in detail. These hearings, stimulated by the findings of the Comptroller General, probed into the contention that higher ship subsidies than the law contemplates were justified because virtually every case was "exceptional." It concludes that: (1) Maritime Commission administration has been "deficient"; (2) better information on foreign costs could have been obtained for construction subsidies; (3) aid for reconstruction and reconditioning has been based on "unwarranted assumptions and error"; (4) operating differential subsidies are "inadequately supported"; (5) the record is replete with "inordinate delays" and "administrative lassitude"; (6) there has been reshuffling of personnel of "doubtful qualifications and competence."

In light of the Commission majority's efforts on behalf of shipping companies which complain about profit recapture provisions, the figures on one company's benefits from tax advantages under the law are most interesting. Since 1936 that company has paid $570,000 in Federal taxes; without tax benefits the same company would have paid $13,846,000. That record speaks for itself in showing the real nature of the huge subsidies, and it supports the recommendation that the tax advantages and intent of the 1936 act be restudied.

Particularly shocking is the trap Chairman Fleming made for himself when he wrote a letter justifying past subsidy excesses while pretending a short time later that the matter was still being studied. This letter is described by the report as merely an attempted defense of the Commission action which your committee concluded on the basis of earlier hearings to be fraught with error; characterized by administrative incompetence and ineptitude of the worst order; and unsupported by facts of the record. Indeed, the only member not coming in for censure is Commissioner McKeough, who has a consistent record of dissents. Along with the recommendation that the Civil Service Commission examine qualifications of Maritime Commission personnel (who, incidentally, have been under supervision of the Maritime chairman) the report calls upon the Chairman and the Commission to devote themselves to remedial endeavor instead of justifying past actions found to be faulty.

Congress has done its duty in approving the reorganization plan. It is now up to the President to staff the revamped Maritime Board and Maritime Administration with the fearless, uncompromising men, unsusceptible to the insidious influence of selfish interests which the Black report called for 15 years ago. That cannot be done by carrying over to the new set-up men who, with the conspicuous exception of Commissioner McKeough, have shown themselves unable to discharge their public responsibilities.

Seeds of Treason

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY P. CAIN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which recently appeared in the Review which is a weekly newspaper published in Rosemead, Calif. I know the publisher, Mr. T. A. Stevenson, as a distinguished and completely patriotic American. In his editorial he has reminded all of us of those sentiments which bring real meaning to citizenship. I think that his suggestion that we read Seeds of Treason is deserving of our consideration.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEEDS OF TREASON

If you are the type that would really enjoy hearing Charles Laughton recite The Face on the Bar Room Floor;

If you would rather hear Lawrence Tibbett sing Home on the Range than O Sole Mio;

If something inside you swelled up when you first heard Kate Smith sing God Bless America;

If you preferred hearing Lionel Barrymore in the Mayor of the Town to Jimmie Fidler or Louella Parsons;

If you have a little difficulty in remembering the names and correct pronunciation of "cavvier-r" and "orr-derves";

If you like your corn on the cob without the inadequate man-made handlebars on the ends;

If you like your chicken drumstick sans knife and fork;

If you like the covered-wagon movies and the rhymes of Eddie Guest;

If all these things fit your mien and manner, then lift up your chin, brother—you have about everything but wings.

We hope all such people, from Maine to California, will buy or borrow the current issue of Reader's Digest and read Seeds of Treason. It is the story, and it is well written, of the Communist cells in the bosom of our Government down in Washington.

It is not a political yarn. It is true detective and the creator of Sherlock Holmes never dreamed up anything so gripping. May God help the United States if we fail in our efforts to unveil and contain these traitors who would destroy the Government as we have known it since '76.

Read this story, please.

Mundt-Nixon Bills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 24, 1950

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Lutheran for May 17, 1950:

MUNDT-NIXON BILLS

Washington has produced more than its share of hysteria lately. Senator JOSEPH MCCARTHY'S charges and the public reaction to them are symptoms of a state of pathological fear. These Communist jitters seem strangely inconsistent with the soundness of American economy and the strength of United States national defense.

The latest contribution to this alarm psychology is the passage by the Senate Judiciary Committee of the Mundt bill (S. 2311), known as the Subversive Activities Control Act. This bill, together with the almost identical Nixon bill (H. R. 3342) in the House, purports to protect the country against communism by requiring the registration of subversive organizations. Actually, passage of these bills would aim a severe blow at the freedoms on which our country was founded and would place sinister power in the hands of a few men.

PROVISIONS

The Mundt-Nixon bills call for the setting up of a Subversive Activities Control Board of three men appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. This Board would be responsible for drawing up two lists, one of Communist political organizations and one of Communist-front organizations and of ordering them to register.

Groups which register would be required to submit annually a complete financial report. A Communist political organization would have to submit the names and addresses of all its members. A Communist-front organization would have to report the names and addresses of all its officers during the past year. These lists would be made public.

The criteria by which the board would determine which groups should be on this blacklist are vague and inconclusive. Failure to register would be punishable by $5,000 fine and 5 years' imprisonment, with each day of failure to register and each member's name left off the list constituting a separate offense.

Every piece of mail sent by a registered agency would be labeled "Disseminated by ———, a Communist organization." Members of these organizations would be denied passports to travel abroad. Public inspection of membership lists might be expected to result in loss of jobs and persecution of individuals and their families.

IMPLICATIONS

The basic danger in this legislation is that it attempts to control the things a person may believe and the company he may keep. It substitutes guilt by association for guilt on the basis of overt acts. It introduces the principle of government by intimidation rather than by impersonal legal processes. In seeking to fight communism, it has adopted communism's own favorite tactics.

Part of our country's strength lies in the fact that here a man is free to differ from the majority in his beliefs. If the power which it is proposed to vest in the Subversive Activities Control Board were to fall into the hands of prejudiced and unscrupulous men, no group of dissenters from majority opinion would be safe.

Two years ago a similar bill was introduced by the same two men. It passed the House, but was buried under an avalanche of popular protest in the Senate Judiciary Committee. A similar expression of sentiment may be needed to reassure the men in Congress of the essential level-headedness of the American people.

Honors for Scranton Times Newsmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY P. O'NEILL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 24, 1950

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Scranton Times honoring Scranton Times newsmen as follows:

HONORS FOR TIMES NEWSMEN

Scranton Times newsmen—reporters to you—are tops in their calling. As proof of that claim can be cited seven awards—two first prizes and five honorable mentions—in a State-wide writing contest sponsored by the Pennsylvania Newspaper Publishers' Association and the department of journalism at Penn State College. The seven awards, by far the largest number received by a regional newspaper in any year of competition, were by four prominent members of the Times news department.

To J. Harold Brislin, Times general assignment reporter, goes the honor of having won two first prizes. He is the first writer in the history of the contest to win more than one first prize in a single year. His awards were in the category of municipal or government story division and in court coverage classification. In addition he received first honorable mention in the public service campaign or crusade series. Nice going.

Other Times men receiving honorable mention were Neil L. Whitney, Times court reporter; John E. Mulherin, labor reporter, and George P. Walsh, general assignment reporter. Good work, boys.

To merit consideration each story had to meet three key tests—quality of writing, sustained reader interest, and general effectiveness. Quality of writing was the basic requirement. Judges in their comments said the entries demonstrated an increased interest among reporters to "go beneath the surface through independent research on the reporter's own initiative." In newspaper circles that has always been the standard by which a reporter's effectiveness and capableness are judged. He must be a digger.

The honors which have come to the Times newsmen are all the more gratifying when it is kept in mind that more than 1,100 entries were submitted for consideration, the greatest number in the history of the contest. Needless to say the Times management is mighty proud of the achievement of its staff members. Fellow workers also received the news with great satisfaction.

Only recently the Times received honorable mention in the Ayer Cup award contest for typographical excellence in first-page make-up in competition with many of the great papers of the Nation. It is writing of the type recognized by the contest judges which has helped to make the Times such an attractive and popular newspaper.

It is worthy of note that Mrs. J. Harold Brislin, woman's page editor of the Scrantonian-Tribune and wife of the Times staff writer, also won a PNPA honor, having been awarded first place for a news story in the field of women's activities. Mrs. Brislin was a winner in other years. Mrs. Brislin's father and brother are likewise newspapermen. It would appear that good writing ability runs in the Brislin family. Robert Mang, court reporter and political writer for the Scrantonian-Tribune, received honorable mention in court coverage classification.

Socialized Medicine's Ills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 24, 1950

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to insert my remarks in the RECORD and to include the editorial from the Christian Science Monitor on the subject of socialized medicine's ills.

Mr. Speaker, a careful reading of the editorial points out the difficulties that England is having with her socialized-medicine program. It has always been true that sickness and days lost from work goes up under any system of government-sponsored medicine. It was true in Germany and has been true in every country that has tried compulsory health insurance.

Mr. Speaker, the President's national health program goes beyond politics. It is a bitter fight by misguided radicals of the New Deal to foster left-wing legislation which would destroy the bulwark of freedom and our American way of life. Its proponents give it a high-sounding name and claim that it is not socialized medicine. They do not tell the people it is compulsory. They do not tell the citizens that out of their pay checks will come the funds and that the citizens will have to comply with Federal regulations.

These left-wing proponents even tell you that there is a free choice of doctors. This is not true. Limits would be placed on the number of patients a doctor could serve. You might want the good physician "A," but he is overworked and his panel is full, so you must select some other physician.

The better doctors in England find long queues of patients; some who are neurotic, some with minor ills, and some very ill. The patient becomes a mere number. The doctor can give but a few minutes to each patient. The quality of medical care is lowered. It takes a great deal of time to fill out required endless forms.

The program sponsored by the administration becomes a political set-up with a horde of clerks and inspectors trying to keep track of 150,000,000 people.

Medicine in the United States, under our free institutions, has advanced the healing art until it is the envy of the world. We have the finest hospitals, the best medical equipment, technicians and the finest scientific research in the world. This did not come about under national health insurance; it came about because free men with free minds were permitted to work unhampered by Government regulations. Socialized medicine always destroys freedom of action. It is an assembly-line type of medicine. It destroys the personal relationship between doctor and patient.

The practice of medicine is personal. There comes a time in the lives of all of us when cold facts of science do not prevail. The people want personal service with sympathy, pity, cheerfulness, and confidence in the doctor. No amount of scientific efficiency can take its place in the dark hours of sorrow and trouble so common in the experience of all of us. These are intangible things and only your physician knows that, through the troubled situations of life, fame dies, honor perishes, but loving kindness is immortal.

I hope my colleagues will read carefully the following editorial which so truthfully points out the many problems England has encountered in her national health insurance program:

SOCIALIZED MEDICINE'S ILLS

The increase in reported sickness during Great Britain's first full years of socialized medicine has its significance for the United States. Much of the British program is embraced in the proposal of government medical care insurance which the Truman administration is promoting. This part of British experience with the system will hardly recommend it to Americans.

Sickness among adult Britons rose 8 percent and workdays lost through illness 22 percent, according to a government-sponsored survey. The increase occurred for the most part among women. The workdays lost by young women climbed 32 percent and by elderly women 41 percent, while the workdays lost by men went up 8 to 9 percent. Officials credit the growth of reported illness mainly to economic reasons—people now getting medical service who previously could not afford it.

But there are additional reasons. In the experience of European countries with compulsory sickness insurance it has long been observed that when workers are taxed for medical care they often claim it unnecessarily. That is the only way that many figure they can get something back for their money. The situation encourages a flood of patients with minor illnesses for which they would not ordinarily seek medical attention. Some doctors are consequently overworked to the point of hasty, careless diagnosis and treatment.

It is also a standard part of the government insurance system to give weekly cash payments to claimants. The chance to stay at home and live for a while with the aid of state funds frequently militates against a speedy return to work. In many instances the cash benefits delay recovery.

The more workdays lost through illness, the smaller the production and the lower the general standard of living.

These and other disadvantages of a national system of government insurance for medical care are getting no publicity from the Truman administration. British experience, however, is bringing out some of the missing facts.

Statehood for Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS B. HELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 11, 1950

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, the question of statehood for the Territory of Alaska is no longer only the concern of the people in Alaska. It has become the concern of every American citizen whether in Alaska, Florida, Texas, New York, or elsewhere. The Second World War emphasized the Territory's strategic location and importance to the United States. It is the only part of the American continent that reaches into the Eastern Hemisphere. Across narrow Bering Strait, Siberia can be seen with the naked eye. Alaska lies on the great circle route to the Orient. Its Pacific coastline is longer than that of the three Pacific States of California, Oregon, and Washington combined. It is truly America's last frontier.

Alaska's importance to the United States does not rest solely on military considerations. It is a vast storehouse of largely undeveloped resources. These include fish and fish products, furs, hides, minerals, oil, forests, and hydroelectric power. One of the reasons why these resources are only partially developed is Alaska's Territorial status and the discriminations against her which result from this status.

Alaska was purchased from Russia on March 30, 1867, for $7,200,000. Until the discovery of gold in the Klondike in 1898, Alaska's impact upon the United States was practically nil. The purchase had been termed "Seward's Folly" by some, a contemptuous name derived from the fact that William H. Seward, Secretary of State at the time, had been chiefly responsible. During the years 1867–84, the area was under the control first of the United States Army and then the Navy. In the latter year, however, Congress passed the first organic act providing solely for the administration of justice in Alaska, and including no provisions concerning legislation. The general laws of Oregon were extended to Alaska as far as they were applicable and not in conflict with the laws of the United States. The first criminal code was enacted in 1899 and the first civil code in 1900. Alaska was granted a Delegate in the Congress in 1906, and in 1912, another organic act set up a formal Territorial government. Though amended several times since 1912, this act still provides the basic law under which Alaska functions. It has never been thoroughly revised to keep pace with changing conditions in the Territory.

In effect, the organic act has been discriminatory in character and operation. Under it, the legislature may not authorize bonded indebtedness or create any debt. It may not alter, amend, repeal, or modify the fish and game laws passed by Congress. The amount of general property taxes which may be levied is fixed by Congress instead of by the local legislature. The latter body may not provide for county government within Alaska without congressional approval. Restrictions such as these are not the attributes of free people. Alaska has served a very long period of tutelage in a Territorial status—longer than all but four of the States that have "graduated" from Territories to statehood. Until she is permitted to settle her own local problems, all our protestations

about the self-determination of peoples must continue to have a hollow ring.

There are a number of arguments advanced by the opponents of statehood. Most of them can be refuted with not too great difficulty. The proponents of statehood fail to understand why the fact that Alaska does not touch an existing State at any point should be an argument against her admission to full participation in national affairs. In point of time, Alaska is closer to the seat of Government than all but the immediately adjacent States were when Washington first became the capital city of the United States. Using modern means of transportation, it is possible to travel from Juneau to Washington in less than 24 hours. Facilities exist for rapid communication by telephone, telegraph, and mail.

There exists within the Union, as parts of States, several areas of noncontiguous territory. In addition to islands, these include two portions of the North American mainland separated entirely, as is Alaska, by interventing Canadian territory. One is the portion of Minnesota lying north of the Lake of the Woods. The other is the peninsular portion of Washington, containing the village of Point Roberts, which is cut off from the rest of that State by the forty-ninth parallel and Boundary Bay. At one time, Congress considered seriously, and apparently without mental reservations, a proposal to annex all of Alaska as a county of the State of Washington. If, in principle, parts of States may be noncontiguous with the rest of the Nation, why not entire States?

Eight of the present States were not contiguous with the body of States at the time of admission, for example, Louisiana and California. The latter was separated from the nearest State—Texas—by more than 450 miles. That was in 1850, when many weeks of difficult overland travel were involved in covering the distance. Only 515 miles of friendly Canadian territory separate Alaska from the present body of States.

One of the arguments most frequently advanced against statehood for Alaska is that the population of the Territory is too small. The 1940 census recorded a population of 72,524. In the years since then, Alaska's permanent population has steadily increased with estimates now placing it anywhere from 95,000 to 105,000. In relation to Alaska's vast area—586,400 square miles—her population is small. Twelve States had smaller populations than the Territory at the time of their admission, however. Historically, there always has been a rapid increase in population through settlement upon admission of a Territory to statehood.

What are the advantages of statehood for Alaska? There are many indeed, both for the Territory itself and for the Nation as a whole.

A rapid increase in the number of permanent inhabitants will follow statehood. This will mean an increase in the investment capital available and the establishment of new industries which are essential for Alaska's development.

Statehood will mean that Alaska will have a State constitution drafted in terms of the needs of Alaska rather than an organic act outmoded in many of its provisions and not tailor-made for Alaska even when first enacted.

With the advent of statehood, Alaska will automatically become entitled to the benefits of the Federal Highway Aid Act. With the help of this act, an adequate network of roads can be constructed and maintained, linking centers of trade with outlying districts and acting as an incentive to larger communities. As a State, Alaska will also become entitled automatically to benefits under other Federal grants-in-aid programs that are carried on in the States. This is in sharp contrast to Alaska's experience as a territory, when it either did not become entitled to them, as in the case of the Highway Aid Act, or waited for years for extension of such legislation, as in the case of the Adams and the Smith-Lever Acts for agricultural development.

As a State, Alaska will be entitled to two Senators and one Representative, elected by the people of Alaska, chosen to represent them, familiar with their constantly changing problems, and able to exercise much greater influence in the enactment and administration of national legislation affecting the welfare of Alaska.

Under statehood, it is to be expected that Alaska's judiciary and police systems will be expanded and adapted to the physical conditions of the area. At present, the District Court of the United States for Alaska combines the normal jurisdiction of similar Federal courts in the States with a general jurisdiction of all civil, criminal, equity, and admiralty cases. Court is regularly held at but four places in the whole vast Territory of 586,400 square miles, with additional terms left to the discretion of the judicial council.

Alaska as a State would be permitted to borrow for State purposes, pledging the faith of her people. This is a common practice among the States at the present time, but under the organic act is forbidden to the Territory. Alaska is able to raise the revenues necessary to support statehood. This is evidenced by the recent enactment by the Territorial legislature of an income tax on personal and corporate income at approximately 10 percent of the Federal levy, and a general property tax, the first such taxes in Alaska's history.

It must be remembered that not all Federal services and activities will cease with statehood any more than they have ceased in continental United States. Expenses of activities peculiarly the problem of local administration will be shifted to the State, but Federal-aid programs will continue.

Mr. Speaker, all Americans agree in principle on the desirability of self-government and the largest possible measure of home rule. The advantages of statehood for Alaska seem obvious. The time has arrived when she should enjoy these advantages. She has served her apprenticeship faithfully and well. She should be welcomed into the Union and given full partnership as our forty-ninth State.

Hauling the Mails

REMARKS
OF
HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 1950

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, on May 4, 1950, I questioned the Postmaster General's effort to economize on postal expenditures by curtailing mail deliveries. I suggested that the Postmaster General revoke his order of April 18, 1950, making the letter carriers the scapegoats of a delusive economy measure. My remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, on pages A3277–A3278, concluded as follows:

> If he is sincere let him do what he can to economize by paying the railroads no more than the law entitles them to.

In the course of those remarks, I called attention to the overpayments which the Postmaster General was giving the railroad carriers. I quoted his own testimony to the effect that he was paying them for about twice as much car space as the mail actually used. I quoted also from the General Accounting Office Report showing that the Postmaster General was paying de luxe passenger rates for mail carried in refrigerator and other kinds of freight cars. With mail payments to the railroads running about a quarter-billion dollars a year, these overpayments struck me as a very serious matter.

In a statement to the press released May 12, 1950, and styled "a factual statement to clarify the situation," the Postmaster General took up my remarks. He did not deny that he pays passenger rates for mail carried in freight cars. Nor did he claim that the law requires him to do that. The Postmaster General's position was that it is "futile to say that the Postmaster General should take some action to reduce the payments to railroads."

Regarding the enormous waste of mail-car space, he said the law requires him "to pay for space in two directions when it is ordered in one direction." To imply that the Department can correct this situation, he went on, is error.

Briefly, then, the Postmaster General did not deny my statements about overpayments made by him to the railroads. Instead, he derided them as "facetious statements."

I am serious about these surcharges which the Postmaster General magnanimously pays the railroads. I see nothing droll or comical in a tight-fisted policy being applied to letter carriers while at the same time railroad carriers receive

millions of dollars of public funds under an open-handed policy that deliberately overpays them. I doubt very much whether this Congress or the people to whom it is responsible appreciate that brand of humor. Let us take a look at the record and see the actual situation.

First, take the Postmaster General's statement that he cannot correct the situation which finds him paying for about twice as much car space as mail actually uses on the trains. The General Accounting Office report submitted to the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee earlier this month, which I quoted in my remarks, states, on page 8, as follows:

Congress has established two necessary standards for the payment of railway mail service:

1. The service must be prescribed by the Postmaster General (39 U. S. C. 545).

2. The service is to be increased, reduced, or discontinued (necessarily by the Postmaster General) with pro rata reductions as the needs of the postal service required (39 U. S. C. 564).

In other words, the Postmaster General, according to the General Accounting Office, controls the amount of service the railroads are to be paid for. This appears to have been Mr. Donaldson's own view about his authority when he was still new in the office of Postmaster General. In reporting on the Railway Mail case now pending before the Interstate Commerce Commission, his 1948 annual report, on page 70, stated:

As a result of studies made by the Department in the course of the pending proceeding, the Postmaster General, on July 2, 1948, filed with the Commission a new comprehensive plan for the transportation of mail by railroad. The purpose of this plan, which supersedes the original plan filed in 1917, is to enable the Commission to fix fair and reasonable rates for the transportation of mail in accordance with the service prescribed by the Postmaster General, and to revise and improve the manner and conditions of the service to meet modern postal needs. By order dated August 30, 1948, the Commission recognized the new comprehensive plan as effective October 1, 1948, and ruled that rates for the services prescribed thereby must abide final disposition by it of the pending proceeding.

What happened to this comprehensive plan of the Postmaster General which, less than 2 years ago, was announced to be a significant improvement in the railroad mail situation? Let us go back to the General Accounting Office report again. That report states:

By the act of 1916 the Postmaster General is required (39 U. S. C. 546) to file with the (Interstate Commerce) Commission a comprehensive plan for the transportation of the mails on said railroads and shall embody therein what he believes to be the reasonable rate or compensation the said railway carriers should receive.

The Postmaster General, under date of July 2, 1948, filed a comprehensive plan with the Interstate Commerce Commission which provides a basis for the changes necessary in the rules of the post office to ameliorate the difficulties attendant upon the round-trip provisions and otherwise. * * *

The next step in implementing the measures recommended by the Postmaster General would, of course, be the establishment in the Post Office Department and promulgation to the railroads of the necessary rules and regulations to bring the plan to practical operation.

This plan would not eliminate the round-trip provisions but would work toward better control and greater utilization of the space paid for under the provisions * * * (pp. 31–32).

However, no regulations have been issued under the plan but the Interstate Commerce Commission by order of March 30, 1950, has set hearings for September 19, 1950 * * * (p. 3).

Pending changes which may be made in the law it would appear to be highly desirable that the possibilities under the comprehensive plan be realized immediately so that an early and clear picture of the unjustified deadheading be obtained and so that difficulties in the way of proper audit of railway pay matters be eliminated (p. 36).

In other words, less than 2 years ago Postmaster General Donaldson started out to effect big economies in railroad mail service through a new comprehensive plan therefor. He was required by law to file such a plan with the Interstate Commerce Commission and he did so. The Commission recognized the plan as effective October 1, 1948. That was just before the last general elections. All that remained to put the plan into practical operation was "the establishment in the Post Office Department and promulgation to the railroads of the necessary rules and regulations." Almost 2 years later, however, the General Accounting Office reports to the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee that "no regulations have been issued under the plan" although "it would appear to be highly desirable that the possibilities under the comprehensive plan be realized immediately."

Now, what does the Postmaster General say about the railroad mail situation today? He says it is a situation that can be corrected only by Congress or the Interstate Commerce Commission, but is beyond his power to correct. He does not mention his comprehensive plan at all. Much less does he explain why he has not issued the regulations to put the plan into practical operation.

Does not the Postmaster General believe that Congress and the people are entitled to know what he has done or intends to do about his comprehensive plan for economies in railway mail payments, and what his reasons are? Self-styled "factual statements" of the kind recently released by him do not "clarify the situation" to my way of thinking. I, for one, would like to know why it is "futile to say that the Postmaster General should take some action to reduce payments to railroads," particularly when the Postmaster General himself has gone on record with an elaborate plan for that very purpose which the Comptroller General strongly recommends should be put into practice immediately. When we pass a law in Congress and the President approves it, it is effective unless a court sets it aside. I think Congress and the public are entitled to know why the Postmaster General still has not put into effect his railroad mail service economy plan which the Commission recognized as effective October 1, 1948.

Note that under this economy plan, the Postmaster General would not be paying passenger rates for mail carried by freight. The new plan stipulates that "the character of trains carrying the mails shall be that of passenger train. In the event mails are transported in freight trains, no more than the usual and just freight rates shall be paid in accordance with the classifications and tariffs approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission." This can hardly be called radical. Why, in the name of common sense, would anybody pay passenger prices unless he got passenger service, anyway? It looks wrong on its face. If there is any reason other than a deliberate policy of overpayment to railroads, I, for one, would like to know what it is.

Here again the Postmaster General's "factual statement" does not "clarify the situation" for me. It does not deny that he pays passenger rates for mail carried in refrigerator and other kinds of freight cars. Nor does it claim that the law or the Commission require him to make such overpayments. It may well be that it is necessary for the railroads to carry mail in "nonstandard equipment," as said in the "factual statement," but where is the necessity of paying deluxe passenger rates for such service? If it isn't in the law or in the Commission's rate orders, the only place it can be is in the Post Office Department's policy of deliberately overpaying the railroads.

Let me emphasize that I am serious about these surcharges which the Postmaster General magnanimously pays the railroads out of public funds while he justifies reductions in mail deliveries as a necessary economy measure at the expense of letter carriers. I stress again that this entire matter should be thoroughly investigated by the General Accounting Office, the agency of Congress charged with the duty of supervising payments by the Post Office Department. And to the Postmaster General, I say again that if he is sincere, let him do what he can to economize by paying the railroads no more than the law entitles them to.

James Madison, Father of Our Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 1950

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article by Mr. Harry Schlacht, which appeared in the New York Journal-American of May 10, 1950:

JAMES MADISON, FATHER OF OUR CONSTITUTION

(By Harry H. Schlacht)

The orator is the voice of the Nation.

We congratulate the young American orators who participated in the Hearst newspapers' forensic competition of 1950.

We commend the high-school and college students who were privileged to speak on the subject of James Madison, the father of our Constitution.

Our young Americans have done themselves proud. All Americans are proud of them.

They will be among the leaders of tomorrow. They will be among the defenders of democracy.

The Hearst newspapers' oratorical competition is sponsored in the interest of better speech, in the interest of better citizenship, in the interest of better Americanism.

As the poet derives from reading the poetry of the masters, as the painter derives from studying the great paintings, as the composer derives from listening to musical masterpieces, so our young speakers improve by taking part in oratorical contests.

This is the object of the Hearst oratorical competition.

Great men are the guideposts and landmarks in the Nation.

James Madison—gifted, favored, venerated man—father of our Constitution, fourth President of the United States, friend of liberty, friend of peace.

He was one of the pillars of his country. He was one of the ornaments of his age.

We see him playing a glorious role in the War of Independence. We see him fearless in his fortitude. We see him bidding defiance to the arms of power. We see him confident in the righteousness of his cause.

We see him toiling in war and in peace to form and perpetuate a Union to secure for an invisible posterity the priceless blessings of inseparable liberty and law.

We see him standing beside the Constitution as with a naked sword flaming with truth to protect it from desecration. We see him sounding an instant loud alarm to awake the hosts of the Nation to its rescue.

We see him as President of the Republic with a presence of purity, elevation, and moral dignity.

We must catch the spirit of his noble ideals. We must rise to the contemplation of the conscious virtue that inspire them.

It is our duty to preserve and cherish our inheritance which our forebears have bequeathed to us.

It was won by their toil. It was watered by their tears. It was fertilized by their blood.

James Madison was the father of our Constitution.

That document is the inspiration of our American way of life.

James Madison was the voice of peace, harmony, and union.

And may we, his fellow Americans, to the last second of recorded time, fix our eyes upon the memory of, and even listen with our ears to the life and achievements of this great American.

He glorified the generation in which he lived. Future generations will be honored by his glory.

British Income From Latin-American Investments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the subject of investments of American capital in foreign fields is one of wide interest in connection with the development of point 4 of the President's plan and the Export-Import Bank loan guaranty bill which was approved by the Banking and Currency Committee of which I am a member. Part of our loans are going, and will continue to go with increased volume should the bank guaranty bill be passed, to the countries of Latin America. As contributing, therefore, to the fund of information on the general subject available to the Members of the House, I am extending my remarks to include the following article by J. Fred Rippy, the eminent Latin-American scholar and professor of American history on the faculty of the University of Chicago, from the April 1950 issue of the Journal of Business of the University of Chicago:

BRITISH INCOME FROM LATIN-AMERICAN INVESTMENTS, 1939 AND 1948

(By J. Fred Rippy, professor of American history, University of Chicago)

In explaining the economic difficulties of the United Kingdom, the proponents of the Marshall plan have strongly emphasized the recent shrinkage in British foreign investments and the consequent loss of income. Testifying before the Senate Committee on Appropriations on June 17, 1949, for instance, Paul Hoffman, Administrator of the European reconstruction program, stated that British "overseas investments" had "all been washed out" by the recent war. (Hearings on the foreign aid appropriation bill (81st Cong., 1st sess.), p. 446. Mr. Hoffman probably meant to say that the United Kingdom's foreign debts now exceed its foreign investments. According to Cleona Lewis, the United States and the Foreign Investment Problem (Washington, D. C., 1948), p. 60, British overseas investments declined from £4,600,000,000 in 1939 to £3,300,000,000 in 1947.) This article will examine the extent to which that statement holds true in respect to British investments in Latin America. (The statistics which follow have been compiled from the South American Journal (London) for 1939, 1940, 1948, and 1949. Stock-Exchange Official Year Book (London) for the same years has been utilized for background and some checking of detail.)

It may be stated at the outset that there had not been any marked decline in the net earnings of British capital in Latin America since 1939. The net income from this investment in 1948 was £18,536,620. It was £19,010,329 in 1939. The difference is only £437,709!

A decided decline in the nominal value of the aggregate investment had occurred, but the average yield had improved, rising from 1.6 percent in 1939 to 2.9 percent in 1948. Nearly 62 percent of the total British investment in Latin America yielded no return in 1939; the capital earning no income was less than 40 percent in 1948. The total investment had been considerably reduced, but there had been more than a corresponding shrinkage in the "sour" part of it. The Latin-American segment of the British overseas investment had not been "washed out." It had been pared down by expropriations, redemptions, liquidations, purchases, and various other means, but the net yield on what remained had gone up, especially the returns on shipping, banking, mining, petroleum, and various miscellaneous enterprises. All statistics in this analysis dealing with income refer to net income after payment of Latin-American taxes.

British capitalists received an income of £4,030,466 in 1939 from an investment of £324,149,858 in Latin-American government bonds. The rate of return was approximately 1.2 percent. In 1948 they received an income of £4,248,693 on a nominal investment of £206,145,017 in these government securities. The rate of return was more than 2.1 percent. A total of £210,891,878 invested in government bonds in 1939 yielded no income; this "bad" portion of the investment in governments had been reduced to £5,457,460 by the close of 1948.

A nominal shipping investment of £12,753,348 in the Latin-American sphere in 1939 yielded an income of £593,241, or 4.65 percent. The yield in 1948 on a nominal capital of £10,404,468 was £719,199, or 6.9 percent. An aggregate of £1,407,054 invested under this heading in 1939 brought no return; the comparative figure for 1948 was zero.

British investment in Latin-American banking, £8,977,630, returned an income of £202,000 in 1939, about 2.25 percent. In 1948 income was £242,400 on a nominal investment of £4,040,000, making a rate of return of 6 percent. The unprofitable segment of the banking capital, which stood at £4,937,630 in 1939, had disappeared by 1948.

Owing to sales negotiations and delays in liquidation, the return on railway capital was smaller in 1948 than in 1939. The British investment in Latin-American railways has not been profitable for many years. A nominal capital of £477,765,391 yielded only £5,773,648 in 1939, approximately 1.2 percent. The return in 1948 was £1,080,599 on a nominal investment of £176,215,257, considerably less than 1 percent. Rail capital, yielding no return in 1939, totaled £336,032,299, as compared with £152,865,562 in 1948.

On a miscellaneous investment of £304,258,078—in mining, petroleum, agriculture, manufacturing, public utilities, trading, and a few other enterprises—the return was £8,410,974, around 2.9 percent in 1939, with £144,799,022 paying no dividends. Income under this category in 1948 amounted to £12,245,279 on a nominal capital of £236,018,132, the yield being 5.1 percent, and only £93,438,089 failed to return dividends.

Omitting the bad investments, which will be referred to again in another connection, the salient details are set forth in table I.

TABLE 1.—*Income from British investments in Latin America: Distribution by types of investment*

	1939			1948		
	Capital	Income	Rate	Capital	Income	Rate
Government bonds	£324,149,858	£4,030,466	1.2	£206,145,017	£4,248,692	2.1
Railways	477,765,391	5,773,648	1.2	176,215,257	1,080,599	.6
Shipping	12,753,348	593,241	4.65	10,404,468	719,199	6.9
Banking	8,977,630	202,000	2.25	4,040,000	242,400	6.0
Miscellaneous [1]	304,258,078	8,410,974	2.9	236,018,132	12,245,279	5.1
Total	1,127,904,305	19,010,329	1.68	632,822,869	18,536,620	2.9

[1] Includes mining, petroleum, agriculture, manufacturing, public utilities, trading, and a few other enterprises.

The major British investments in Latin America, in both 1939 and 1948, were in Argentina, Brazil, Mexico, Chile, Uruguay, Cuba, and Peru. But the best rates of return were not obtained from those countries, where much of the capital was invested in Government securities, railroads, and other public services. The highest yields came from Bolivia, Venezuela, and Ecuador and from petroleum and mining enterprises. The comparative data for all but three of the countries are presented in table 2.

TABLE 2.—*Income from British investments in Latin America: Distribution by countries*

	1939			1948		
	Capital	Income	Rate	Capital	Income	Rate
Argentina	£428, 518, 172	£10, 984, 919	2.56	£88, 145, 690	£3, 390, 377	3.8
Brazil	260, 790, 683	1, 093, 419	.42	207, 973, 684	6, 643, 312	3.1
Mexico	172, 573, 838	489, 734	.28	141, 809, 181	1, 368, 305	.9
Chile	85, 878, 232	1, 501, 340	1.75	47, 180, 823	925, 666	1.9
Uruguay	39, 281, 186	1, 111, 614	2.82	28, 888, 503	1, 435, 927	4.9
Cuba	34, 403, 941	365, 335	1.06	27, 503, 497	254, 041	.9
Peru	29, 321, 862	313, 349	1.07	25, 133, 624	344, 904	1.3
Venezuela	18, 888, 408	1, 390, 714	7.35	18, 353, 300	1, 825, 791	9.9
Guatemala	10, 738, 300	207, 008	1.92	9, 908, 480	231, 082	2.3
Colombia	5, 797, 087	77, 985	1.35	5, 334, 047	202, 973	3.8
Costa Rica	4, 701, 600	118, 460	2.51	4, 459, 960	42, 575	.9
Bolivia	4, 481, 469	326, 063	7.27	3, 070, 817	675, 000	21.9
Ecuador	4, 363, 609	165, 000	3.77	4, 362, 815	175, 143	4.0
Paraguay	3, 185, 080	53, 500	1.67	3, 324, 170	15, 446	.4
Honduras	1, 728, 400	Nil	Nil	889, 820	Nil	Nil
El Salvador	1, 105, 240	Nil	Nil	1, 698, 690	30, 827	1.8
Nicaragua	416, 220	16, 648	4.0	341, 300	13, 652	4.0
Total	1, 106, 173, 327	18, 215, 088	1.6	618, 378, 400	17, 575, 021	2.8
Shipping	12, 753, 348	593, 241	4.65	10, 404, 468	719, 199	6.9
Banking	8, 997, 630	202, 000	2.25	4, 040, 000	242, 400	6.0
Grand total	1, 127, 904, 305	19, 010, 329	1.68	632, 822, 869	18, 536, 620	2.9

A comparative view of the British capital yielding no income in 1939 and 1948 is presented in table 3.

TABLE 3.—*British capital returning no income: Distribution by countries*

	1939		1948	
	Amount	Percent of total investment	Amount	Percent of total investment
Argentina	£188, 762, 997	44.0	£37, 837, 121	42.8
Brazil	233, 574, 950	89.5	33, 973, 276	16.3
Mexico	162, 494, 546	94.1	97, 752, 152	68.9
Chile	15, 139, 349	17.8	10, 427, 844	22.1
Uruguay	13, 199, 149	33.8	Nil	Nil
Cuba	27, 150, 361	78.8	23, 166, 975	84.2
Peru	22, 059, 100	75.2	19, 159, 764	76.2
Venezuela	9, 222, 812	48.8	9, 962, 347	53.9
Guatemala	6, 300, 000	58.6	6, 288, 228	56.0
Colombia	4, 065, 038	70.1	1, 143, 647	21.4
Costa Rica	1, 628, 900	34.6	3, 804, 960	85.3
Bolivia	720, 817	16.0	1, 720, 817	56.0
Ecuador	2, 236, 380	51.2	2, 236, 380	51.2
Paraguay	2, 235, 080	73.3	2, 809, 280	84.5
Honduras	1, 728, 400	100.0	889, 820	100.0
El Salvador	1, 105, 240	100.0	703, 500	41.4
Nicaragua	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil
Shipping	1, 417, 054	11.1	Nil	Nil
Banking	4, 937, 630	55.0	Nil	Nil
Total	698, 077, 803	61.9	251, 806, 111	39.8

Tables 2 and 3 should be scrutinized together. They disclose striking differences in the yield of investments among the 17 countries and within each country. (Although no satisfactory statistics are available for Panama, Haiti, and the Dominican Republic, which are therefore not included in the tables presented here, it is likely that the British have some capital in all three of them.) If the income on the aggregate investment had been as large as the income on nearly 60 percent of it, the return in 1948 would have been approximately 4.4 percent on the total investment. If the yield on the aggregate capital had been as high as the return on the Venezuelan portion, British income in 1948 would have amounted to around £62,000,000. If the income on all the nominal capital had been as large as it was on the Bolivian investment, British investors would have received some £138,000,000.

Englishmen would have been fortunate if all their capital in this and other outlying regions had been invested in tin, quebracho, petroleum, and other monopolistic enterprises. Instead of drawing a good part of their income from their colonies, as in the past, the inhabitants of the United Kingdom, if they could greatly expand such investments, might obtain their income from a much wider area by monopolizing some of the world's most necessary commodities. British income from Ecuador, Venezuela, and Bolivia in 1948 should be examined closely. The return on nearly half of the Ecuadoran investment averaged above 8 percent. The yield on 46 percent of the Venezuelan investment was only a little short of 22 percent. It pays to invest in petroleum. British income from 44 percent of the investment in Bolivia was at the rate of 50 percent. Capital invested in tin brings good returns. There was a time when the yield of nitrate capital in Chile was equally profitable, but the competition of synthetic nitrates destroyed those bountiful yields. (I have dealt with British nitrate profits in an article published in Pacific Historical Review, XVII (November 1948), 457–465.)

It is obvious that most of the "sour" investments in the 2 years under consideration were in Argentina, Brazil, Mexico, Cuba, Peru, and Chile and that the major part of them were in government bonds and railways. The Peruvian Corporation, a giant organization which owns most of the Peruvian railways and a few other enterprises, has never been profitable except to the managers and the debenture holders. The United Railways of Havana, the biggest railroad enterprise in Cuba, has rarely paid dividends on its stock. The Argentine railways, enormously overcapitalized, yielded only scanty returns for decades, and the same has been true of the municipal transport system of the city of Buenos Aires. Only the São Paulo Railway, among railroads owned by the British in Brazil, has been profitable, and that has been sold to the Brazilian Government, which, after several years of default, reduced both the principal of and the interest on its government bonds held by foreign investors. Mexico not only has followed the same course, but its Government-controlled railways have paid almost no dividends in more than three decades. Cuba, however, requires further comment. The return on British capital not invested in Cuban railways was approximately 21 percent in 1948. The investment was in two American-controlled firms manufacturing tobacco—another virtual monopoly.

Regarding the remaining countries, little needs to be said. According to the South American Journal, the British investment in Honduras yielded no income either in 1939 or in 1948. This capital is involved in scandalous issues of government securities sold in the late 1860's and the early 1870's, but at least a part of the principal is being returned. The bad investments in Costa Rica, Guatemala, El Salvador, and Paraguay are in rails and government securities. The capital yielding no returns from Bolivia seems to be invested in gold mines and forest enterprises. In Ecuador a large part of it is in government bonds.

Further light may be thrown on this "sour" segment by approaching it from another angle. Table 4 distributes it among the five types listed in table 1. The "sour" investments in the miscellaneous group are mostly in public utilities and port works.

TABLE 4.—*British capital yielding no income: Distribution by types of investment*

	1939	1948
Government bonds	£210, 891, 798	£5, 457, 460
Railways	336, 032, 299	152, 865, 562
Shipping	1, 407, 054	Nil
Banking	4, 937, 630	Nil
Miscellaneous	144, 799, 022	93, 483, 089
Total	698, 077, 803	251, 806, 111

Finally, it may be rewarding to view the data in a tabulation combining the leading countries and the major types of investment. Table 5 is an effort to present this combination.

A careful examination of tables 4 and 5 will reveal two important facts. The main problem of low returns and complete lack of returns from British investments in Latin America arises in the fields of government securities and railways and in some sectors of the broad miscellaneous group, and the solution of low returns will have to be found, if any solution is possible, mainly in Argentina, Brazil, Mexico, Chile, Cuba, Peru, and Venezuela. Although the percentage of the investment yielding no returns or low returns is as high or higher in some of the other countries, the total investment in them is much smaller.

TABLE 5.—*British capital yielding no income: Distribution by principal countries and types*

Country and year	Government bonds	Railways	Miscellaneous
Argentina:			
1939	Nil	£156, 864, 364	£31, 898, 633
1948	Nil	3, 513, 987	34, 328, 134
Brazil:			
1939	£158, 528, 518	25, 963, 616	49, 082, 816
1948	654, 700	28, 489, 852	4, 828, 724
Mexico:			
1939	38, 597, 130	89, 541, 495	34, 355, 921
1948	Nil	73, 151, 940	24, 600, 212
Chile:			
1939	Nil	11, 400, 544	3, 738, 805
1948	Nil	7, 615, 344	2, 812, 500
Cuba:			
1939	Nil	25, 991, 661	1, 158, 700
1948	[1]	23, 166, 975	Nil
Peru:			
1939	5, 559, 100	[2] Nil	[2] 16, 500, 000
1948	2, 416, 000	[1]	[2] 16, 743, 764
Venezuela:			
1939	[1]	1, 999, 482	7, 222, 330
1948	[1]	1, 628, 922	8, 263, 365

[1] No investment.

[2] All except one of the British-owned Peruvian railways were listed by the South American Journal in 1939 under "Miscellaneous," and all were so listed in 1948. They are controlled, it will be recalled, by the Peruvian Corp., which accounts for nearly all the unremunerative capital attributed to Peru in this table.

Mexico, Brazil, and Peru accounted for £202,684,748 of the total of £210,891,798 defaulted Latin-American government securities held by the British in 1939. Chile's governments were paying the British only 2.1 percent that year; Argentina's yielded them 4 percent, and Cuba's 4.6 percent; they had no investment in Venezuelan Government securities. Peru and Brazil accounted for £3,070,700 of the British-held Latin-American government bonds in default in 1948, more than half the total of £5,457,460 for that year. The amount of bonds in default was far smaller than in 1939. But the yields were low: Argentina, 4.1 percent; Brazil, 2.2; Mexico, 0.9; Chile, 1; Peru, 0.6; there was no British investment in 1948 in Cuban or Venezuelan Government securities. By presenting the British bondholders with the choice between continuation of defaults and reduction of interest rates or principal, or both, many of the Latin-American countries have succeeded in reducing both their English-held debts and the interest rates thereon; but can principal and interest, once pared down by negotiation, ever be raised by the same process? The average return of 2.1 percent on Latin-American government securities held by the British in 1948 was low; but by what means can the rate of return be increased?

The average yield on the British railway investment, 0.6 percent in 1948, compared with 2.1 percent in 1939, seems preposterous. Perhaps the ultimate solution, except in Mexico, where the British investment is now in government railways, will be found in the sale of these British lines to the governments of the countries in which they are located; and it may be that the same solution can be worked out for the public utility and the port segment of the miscellaneous group.

In the rail and miscellaneous classifications, as in the case of government bonds, the problem is again largely concentrated in the nations listed in table 5, although the Argentine railway problem, so far as the English are concerned, has been practically solved by the recent sale of the major British lines. More than 95 percent of the British capital yielding no income in both these categories, in 1948 as well as in 1939, was invested in the seven countries listed in this table.

The average yield on the British railway investment in six of these seven republics was as follows: Argentina, 1.7 percent in 1939 and nothing in 1948; Brazil, 0.6 percent in 1939 and 0.9 in 1948; Mexico, no returns in either year; Chile, 1.5 percent in 1939 and 1.9 in 1948; Cuba, 0.5 percent in 1939 and 0.3 in 1948; Venezuela, 0.4 percent in 1939 and slightly more than 1 in 1948. The earnings on the Peruvian railways are not available, but they are known to be very small.

Average yields on miscellaneous investments were better, especially in 1948: Argentina, 3.7 percent in 1939 and 3.9 in 1948; Brazil, 1.2 percent in 1939 and 6.7 in 1948; Mexico, 1.1 percent in 1939 and 2.8 in 1948; Chile, 1.6 percent in 1939 and 4 in 1948; Cuba, 3.1 percent in 1939 and 20.7 in 1948; Venezuela, nearly 8.5 percent in 1939 and 11.5 in 1948. Average returns on the British miscellaneous investment in Peru were brought down by including under this heading the capital in the Peruvian Corp., most of which was actually in railroads; the percentages were 1.2 in 1939 and 1.4 in 1948.

Is there anything which the United States might do, by persuasion or investment, to improve the yield of British capital operating, and in some cases practically sunk, in Latin America? There is much talk these days of relieving the dollar shortage in the United Kingdom by pumping United States capital in the underdeveloped areas of the British Empire. Could the same objective be attained in part by employing this or some other means nearer home?

Address by Hon. Emanuel Celler, of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 1950

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to insert my remarks in the RECORD, I include the speech made by our distinguished colleague, the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER, of New York, on May 20, 1950, on the occasion of the first dinner given by the Association for the Help of Retarded Children.

This association is an organization of parents, those with normal children, and those of the pitifully handicapped little ones, the mentally retarded. These are the forgotten children and for them we are trying to make a better life and a better world. The dinner on May 20 was not only to inaugurate a campaign for financial assistance, but also to acquaint the public with the conditions surrounding these children and with our plans to help them.

As cochairman of this organization for Kings County, Brooklyn, I am privileged to ask that you read Congressman CELLER'S inspiring address:

It is heartening to know that at long last, the parents of mentally retarded children have reached the point in their travail where it is possible for them to submerge their personal sorrow at the fate thrust upon their offspring and band together with others equally burdened in an effort to bring to the attention of all members of our community the touching, the overwhelming plight of some of our children. When a new-born child is abandoned on a doorstep or under a bush somewhere, we all shudder at the desperation, perhaps the innate cruelty inherent in the act. Our sympathy for a child so victimized by human irresponsibility is instinctive and instantaneous. Fortunately, most mentally retarded children are not thus deprived of the love, the comfort, and the devoted interest of mother and father. But they do suffer the indifference, the neglect, the lack of understanding on the part of the general public.

We have homes for foundlings and a progressive program of care for foster children. Our energies have been directed toward the improvement of the physically handicapped child, who has proved to be considerably enhanced and psychologically sustained by our educational projects. But the problems attendant upon mental deficiency and mental instability, on all levels seem to founder us. While there has been a tremendous improvement in the housing and treatment of such individuals, we still appear to resist coming to grips with these situations. Perhaps it is the vast complexities involved and the inability on the part of the afflicted to give us much cooperation. However, in the field of care for mentally retarded children, we have had, here and there, the ardent pioneers who refused to be licked by the apparent impossibility and the apparent hopelessness of the task. Motivated by a deep-seated sympathy, an unusual insight into the emotional reactions existing in these little souls hold these courageous people to their ideal of trying to establish some standards, some procedures, some techniques with which to aid in rehabilitating and alleviating the condition of backward children. Perhaps the most beneficial result was the dissipation of many of the superstitions, the taboos, surrounding mental incapacity. Pearl Buck, the distinguished author and one of the sponsors of the Association for the Help of Retarded Children, in a recently published article, has written from the depths of a full heart of the anguish she endured in seeking an adequate adjustment for her dear daughter. No one could treat the subject more eloquently. We are tremendously impressed by her inspired and intelligent efforts to seek the most comfort, the most love, that could be found anywhere for her child. As she knows, her child will never know the joys and sorrows of a full life, but Mrs. Buck has achieved, for herself and her child, as much a measure of happiness as is possible under existing conditions. Her great heritage is hope—and I am very much encouraged to know that she joins with us in this movement, as I feel we will all benefit immeasurably from her personal experience.

In casting about for solutions one surveys the programs inaugurated in other countries. In reviewing the English experience one is struck by the fact that a very definite emphasis is placed upon the differences existing between mental deficiency and lunacy. The British Mental Deficiency Act of 1913 was a very ambitious program, but it was almost lost in the exigencies of World War I and mounting costs. The basic act was amended in 1927, but again mounting costs curtailed the plans. Although local educational authorities were empowered to provide special schools, occupation day centers, etc., activities have been run for the most part by voluntary mental welfare associations attempting to supply supervision and control.

Some European countries have a fine record of assistance to the mentally retarded children. The Scandinavian countries, I believe, have a good system of special schools and special institutions, universally recognized. In Brussels there is the famous institute at Gheel. As I understand it, those responsible for the very successful experimental work at Vineland studied closely the methods pursued at Gheel. Before the war Germany, too, had a very fine system of educational and occupational programs for the mentally deficient.

In the United States the care of the mentally deficient children has been relegated entirely to the individual States. In 1940 there were only 61 State institutions throughout the United States for such care. In New York State today there are only six institutions for the care of mentally retarded children and daily applicants are refused for lack of space and trained personnel.

This tragic dearth of facilities is most discouraging to the parents of a child needing such treatment. However, this lack may be due in part to the fact that it has been almost impossible to determine with any degree of exactitude the number of deficient children. Many parents are reluctant to reveal that their child is so afflicted. Many parents do not recognize such an incapacity at an early age or are unaware that such a handicap may be helped by new methods and educational efforts.

The problem is twofold. First, we must establish the over-all need as accurately as possible. Some authorities believe there is basis for the assumption that almost 1 person in every 100 is mentally retarded,

and of these the majority are retarded from noninherited causes. Secondly, we must spark public interest to the point where remedial efforts will gain wide support. To do this, those most concerned must be convinced that something can be done. Parents must be encouraged by the fact that groups such as ours are springing up all over the country; that there is a distinct possibility that their child may be aided to meet the criterion of social adequacy and adapt to the requirements of what we accept as a normal environment. Parents must recognize that psychotherapeutic help is absolutely essential to any solution of this problem. We must not allow ourselves to be hampered by a limited horizon. We must avoid reproducing the mistakes of the past in this field. As we now have something definite to look forward to, we must assume the role of pacemakers. As you may know, scholarships and fellowships for individuals, grants to colleges and industry for basic research, aid for scientists, are to be provided in the future through the new National Science Foundation. This is the first time the Federal Government has ever directed itself to the basic sciences out of which may come the discovery of the causes of and the cures for disease and physical and mental maladjustments. It is, indeed, a great forward step, although the liberals in Congress, like EDNA KELLY, myself included, had to battle against terrific odds to get the bill through. The President has just approved this act creating the National Science Foundation. Five hundred thousand dollars will be available to set up an organization and to start operations. It will be July 1, 1951, however, before cash can begin to flow in any appreciable quantities to individuals and institutions interested in research in basic science. There will be $15,000,000 to spend in the first full operating year and $15,000,000 a year after that. Money will go to aid research in basic sciences as they relate to mathematics, engineering as well as physics, biology, biochemistry, medicine, psychiatry. Almost any individual or institution qualified to carry on research might be in line for a grant from the Science Foundation. At the moment it is assumed that most of the research will be done in universities, with emphasis upon fellowships and scholarships. A university may apply for a grant to carry on a particular line of research, or it will be selected so to do. As to scholarships, the plan is to make cash grants to individuals entirely on the basis of merit and ability. In most instances, however, it is believed that the grants will be given to experienced persons carrying on postgraduate studies or research. It is hoped that out of these inquiries and research may come the cause and cure of the mentally retarded.

I think it is clear to all of us here tonight that we can no longer afford the short cuts. We must have the clinics, the guidance bureaus, the special schools, the research, the educational training, and the occupational training. We must see to it that trained personnel are developed to handle such an ambitious project. We must secure the assistance of scientific investigators to explore the possibilities of the development of psychiatric techniques, both with individuals and with groups. New methods must be devised to cope with the individual, the institutional, and the community problem of the mentally deficient. Too much?

Not at all. It is only the beginning—and the National Science Foundation is the first step in many which should help the Association for the Help of Retarded Children toward its final goal—the elimination, if humanly possible, of all types of congenital and postnatal brain impairment. Not one of us can reach this objective alone. We must all work at it together.

The Delaware River Basin Integrated Water Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. H. LICHTENWALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 10, 1950

Mr. LICHTENWALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to place in the RECORD an address given by my friend and coworker in the field of conservation and water resources, Mr. James H. Allen, executive secretary, Interstate Commission on the Delaware River Basin, delivered before the fortieth annual convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, together with an address he delivered before the Lehigh Valley Flood Control Council:

THE DELAWARE RIVER BASIN INTEGRATED WATER PROJECT

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I am going to be somewhat brief in my presentation for the principal reason that I have brought with me a reprint of an address which I made recently, which quite thoroughly explains what the big water problem is in the northeast section of the country, encompassing particularly the States of New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Delaware.

I was interested in the remarks of the gentleman from Texas in which he told us about the Texas Water Conservation Association and the way that it is planning, and not only planning but executing its water program.

In the section which I represent, the principal problem is the problem of supplying adequate water for domestic and industrial purposes to a section of the country in which resides approximately 10 percent of the entire population of the United States. Here are located the country's largest and third largest cities, New York City being the largest, and the third largest, Philadelphia. Also in this area is a very rapidly growing metropolitan area in northern New Jersey.

Each of these sections, for a long while, has been cognizant of the fact that it must plan carefully to meet future water-supply needs. In each case, they have made numerous surveys to determine how those future demands could best be met and, in every instance, it was found that the most satisfactory source of additional water supply was the Delaware River Basin. But, the Delaware River Basin is an interstate stream and all of the parties making these individual surveys found quickly that, in order to go ahead with an individual project, they had to overcome a lot of interstate implications.

As a consequence, 3 years ago the Interstate Commission on the Delaware River Basin, which was created about 10 years previously, suggested to the States and to these political subdivisions that the time had come when they must abandon looking at this problem on a mind-your-own basis, and unite and find out for once and for all whether the Delaware River Basin could appropriately meet their future demands. As a result of that suggestion, the Legislatures of New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania, in 1949, directed the Interstate Commission on the Delaware River Basin to make the necessary engineering surveys.

This work is now in progress. About 3 months ago, we presented to the Governors of the three States a preliminary report setting forth that it was feasible and advisable for the States to join in the future construction of a single integrated water project for their mutual welfare. That project will supply anticipated future additional demands for water supply for New York City and New Jersey in a total aggregate amount of approximately 1,000,000,000 gallons of water a day. It will also provide the city of Philadelphia, if it desires, a new source of water supply amounting to about 500,000,000 gallons a day. Furthermore, the project will provide a very necessary stream regulation advantage.

In the lower reaches of the Delaware River, every time there is a drought, the industries are confronted with a situation that is difficult, damaging, and expensive, that situation being the upstream movement of brackish water. Under this proposed project, it will be possible to release into the Delaware, during times of drought, a quantity of water sufficient to keep that brackish water below any point where it can cause damage to industrial development.

In order to carry this project out, it is proposed that the States negotiate a compact creating a Delaware River Water Commission. To that commission would be delegated the responsibility for financing, constructing, and operating the proposed project. Like the projects in Texas, Mr. Jackson, we believe that this project will be entirely self-liquidating and that it will be unnecessary to call for subsidies on the part of Federal and State Governments. I agree with you that, if we are to make progress in this country, the States and the local governments must face these obligations and be willing to meet their responsibility in financing such programs. Thank you. [Applause.]

THE DELAWARE RIVER BASIN INTEGRATED WATER PROJECT

(By James H. Allen)

I appreciate very much this opportunity to acquaint you with the general features, and more particularly with the significance, of the proposed Delaware River Basin water project which was submitted last Friday to the Governors of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and New York by the Interstate Commission on the Delaware River Basin.

In all the country's history, probably no incident has arisen which so well dramatizes man's dependency upon a supply of adequate water as the situation which now confronts New York City. The critical water shortage, involving the Nation's largest metropolitan population in a series of bathless Thursdays, focuses national attention upon the Delaware River Valley and a crucial issue awaiting decision regarding its development.

The four States in which this watershed is located now have a glorious opportunity to achieve a high standard in wise government. They must take advantage of this opportunity or it undoubtedly will be lost for all time. It's now or never.

The States—New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Delaware—are about to wrestle with a problem which is as vexing as it is critical. If solved sensibly they will do themselves a tremendous service, individually and collectively, socially and economically. Of greater significance, they will be setting a new pattern for a national policy concerning control and development of the land and water resources of interstate river regions. One certainly is needed. President Truman's recent appointment of a National Water Resources Commission to study this problem is evidence of the fact.

Will the States meet or muff the challenge? The entire country is profoundly interested in the answer.

Residents of the Lehigh Valley should have more than passing interest in the question,

for yours is a highly industrialized valley and industrial areas throughout the Nation have come to realize that their future expansion is intimately related to ability to develop increased water supplies. This stark fact was strikingly brought home very recently by Mr. Eugene Grace, chairman of the board of Bethlehem Steel Co. On the occasion of a testimonial dinner, tendered by the leading citizenry of Bethlehem, the noted industrialist stated with emphasis that any substantial expansion of the steel company's operations in the Bethlehem region will hinge upon the availability of adequate and satisfactory sources of water supply. I feel quite certain that Mr. Grace would agree that the future of his company will also depend upon the continuance of the principles of free enterprise upon which this country has prospered so well.

BACKGROUND

Most of you know that Incodel has gained the reputation of being quite a prognosticator. In June 1948, well over a year before the streams and reservoirs in this section of the country began to go dry, it suggested that the time had come to find out whether the upper Delaware River Basin should be developed for metropolitan water supplies and other beneficial purposes. I assure you that it was just plain luck, not crystal-gazing, that caused Incodel to advance its proposal well in advance of the period when the rains failed to come.

In any event, the Incodel suggestion was well received and in July of 1949 it began to carry out the reciprocal directive by the States of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and New York to determine whether it would be advisable for the three States to join in the future construction of a single integrated water project for their mutual benefit and welfare.

Incodel engaged consulting engineers to make the necessary investigations. It received last Thursday a preliminary report covering the results of the first of two steps in the survey. The report confirms what Incodel anticipated, namely, that there is an urgent need for an integrated interstate water project for the development and conservation of the resources of the upper Delaware River Basin.

It is not my purpose this evening to describe the physical aspects of the proposed project in great detail. Rather, I propose to explain briefly the high lights of the project and then to discuss some of its implications, particularly those which concern the question of Federal-State relationships in the development of the water resources of the country.

INCODEL WATER PROJECT

First stage

The first stage of the proposed project is designed to provide the equivalent of 1,000,000,000 gallons of water daily. Of this quantity, it is estimated that about 450,000,000 gallons daily will be needed to meet additional requirements in northern New Jersey and New York City areas during the next 25 to 30 years. The project, in its first stage, will also provide for the storage of sufficient water to maintain a minimum flow in the Delaware River at Trenton of approximately 3,000,000,000 gallons of water per day. This will result in practically doubling dry-weather flows in summer and fall such as existed last year. Periods of low run-off of this type sometimes last as long as 6 to 8 months.

The first-stage project is comprised of the following elements:

1. A storage reservoir on the west branch of the Delaware River at Cannonsville with a total capacity of 118,000,000,000 gallons. This reservoir would be used primarily for the purpose of furnishing water in order to increase low river flows in the entire length of the river.

2. A diversion dam on the main river near Barryville holding about 10,000,000,000 gallons. The major purpose of this dam will be to permit diversion of flood flows for water supply.

3. A storage reservoir with a total capacity of 263,000,000,000 gallons on the lower Neversink River and on Basher Kill extending from Godeffroy to Summitville. The principal function of this reservoir will be to store the flood flows captured at Barryville and transported therefrom by tunnel connection between the two structures.

4. A transmission tunnel from the upper part of Godeffroy Reservoir to New York City's existing main supply tunnels in Brooklyn. From this common transmission tunnel branch connections would be extended to the major water-supply systems of northern New Jersey.

The total storage provided in the first stage of development is 390,000,000,000 gallons, of which at least 78,000,000,000 gallons will remain in the reservoirs to maintain minimum conservation lakes.

No detailed estimates of cost of the first-stage project have yet been made. Preliminary estimates indicate it will amount to about $500,000,000. The project will be largely self-liquidating.

Subsequent stages

The order of subsequent construction stages will depend upon the occurrence of expected future events.

If and when a further additional supply, above the 450,000,000 gallons a day provided by the first stage, is required by northeastern New Jersey and New York City, it will be necessary to build two additional reservoirs; one on Flat Brook in New Jersey, and one at Fishs Eddy on the East Branch of the Delaware in New York. The former would have a storage capacity of 84,000,000,000 gallons, and the latter, 157,000,000,000 gallons.

When Philadelphia, or the Philadelphia and southern New Jersey areas, desire to obtain water from the integrated project, the construction of a large storage reservoir with a total capacity of 121,000,000,000 gallons of the main channel of the Delaware River at Wallpack Bend will be required.

Water can be delivered from Wallpack Bend to these areas in either one of two ways.

The first would be by tunnel and aqueduct to points of delivery. The second method would use the Delaware River to transport water by gravity to a point immediately above Trenton.

The second method is obviously more economical and would provide a good quantity of raw water. It would also result in further augmentation of dry water stream flows.

No extensions to the first-stage project are expected to be necessary for at least 25 years.

Lehigh Valley needs

The survey gave consideration to the probable future requirements of every section of the Delaware Basin and its adjacent regions. It was determined that the demands for water in the Lehigh Valley would probably increase by 100 percent during the next 50 years. These requirements can be best met by the development of the upper Lehigh and its tributaries. It appears that the establishment of a metropolitan water district to meet the future needs of the region may be desirable. This is a problem to which the Lehigh Valley Flood Control Council could advantageously direct its attention.

SIGNIFICANCE OF WATER PROJECT

I would like now to discuss aspects of the proposed integrated water project which, in my mind, have far greater significance than its physical features.

First, I would state that, in Incodel's judgment, the project will be built. The only question is: Who will do the job—and how?

We believe the project—or a reasonable facsimile—will become a reality because it is a public necessity. Both New York City and northeastern New Jersey have to secure additional water supplies. Otherwise, their growth and prosperity will be imperiled. Philadelphia probably will not find it advisable to abandon its present sources in favor of supply from the integrated project for many years. Nevertheless, there is an urgent and immediate need for a program which will iron out the violent fluctuations in stream flows, thereby reducing floods and increasing dry weather flows along the entire length of the Delaware.

It has been well established that projects in the upper Delaware Basin will accomplish these ends. But, in this day and age, developments to meet these requirements can no longer be carried out on a disconnected piecemeal basis. That is why each State should do everything in its power to avoid acting on a mind-your-own-business basis. This would only lead to one result—litigation in the United States Supreme Court. Such procedure would involve bitter and expensive litigation, serious delay, and, most probably, disapproval of any individual project except under conditions which would make it economically unattractive.

Nor can the States procrastinate. The public is now insisting with increasing vehemence that the many uses of water required to meet the demands of modern life must be made available. People are no longer concerned about who will do the job. Results are what they are after. If the States don't move, the Federal Government will. Make no mistake about that.

Federal regional authorities

I'm in a position to know what I'm talking about. The advocates of centralization are a persistent, ambitious lot. Why, last year, as in the several preceding sessions of Congress, they introduced numerous bills designed to blanket the country with federally controlled river valley agencies, patterned after the Tennessee Valley Authority. The same bills are before the present Congress and are being vigorously promoted.

Mind you, I do not say that TVA has not done wonderful things for the Tennessee Valley. However, there is nothing amazing about that. With the faith and credit of the National Treasury behind it, with no obligation to make a complete accounting to the public, when a large part of its cost can be charged off to inflated or dubious benefits from navigation and flood control, it has been no great task to build the grandiose and awe-inspiring structures which made up this huge and complex project.

On the chance that I might be accused of being prejudiced, I refer you to the article by John T. Flynn, in the Reader's Digest of December 1947, entitled "The Hidden Red Ink in TVA's Books." In a foreword by the publisher attention is called to the fact that Mr. Flynn was formerly an advocate of TVA's. But the foreword goes on to state that, after months of investigation, he changed his mind.

Mr. Flynn's main theme has to do with TVA's accounting procedures which, according to him, are obscure, if not deceptive, to say the least. But, to me, Mr. Flynn's most significant observations deal with the question of the fundamental philosophy underlying our constitutional form of government.

Mr. Flynn describes TVA as a Federal corporation cunningly devised to accumulate power and to elude congressional authority. Having pointed out that David E. Lilienthal, its former Chairman, calls TVA democracy on the march, Mr. Flynn observes, "I think it is democracy in retreat, a return to the European system of centrally controlled provincial governors. With TVA as a beginning, the advocates of regionalism are planning, under the guise of flood, navigation, and forestry control and other excuses, to blanket America with this new type of government

which represents a complete revolution in our political system.

Other Federal threats

I, for one, do not want to see such a revolution materialize. Nor do I believe that this threat appeals to the people of the Lehigh Valley. But do not think for a moment that it is the only danger of federalization in this region. Longer established agencies of the Federal Government are licking their chops in anticipation of finding other areas upon which to fatten. One of the most aggressive and ambitious is the Department of the Interior. I would like to inform you that its Assistant Secretary, William Warne, hasn't let the critical water shortage in New York City go by without an attempt to use it as a springboard to win greater power and authority for his bureaucracy.

In an interview with representatives of the press on December 20, he made it clear that the Department is looking forward to the opportunity of assuming control of the rivers in the eastern half of the United States.

Mr. Warne said, "We don't have any new programs formulated yet for river development in the East, but there will be more of them. The present situation is leading inevitably to that. Only through comprehensive development of eastern streams can you solve the problem of water supplies which will become critical."

We of Incodel do not understand where the Department thinks it derives its jurisdiction in the matter of formulating water-project programs in the East. Certainly the Army engineers would not go for that. On the other hand, we are aware of the fact that congressional laws do delegate power to the Interior Department's Bureau of Reclamation in certain Western States with respect to the planning and construction of projects for the irrigation of arid lands. Significantly, we have heard numerous complaints from these areas to the effect that this essential use is being subordinated and penalized economically in favor of an obsession by the Bureau to produce so-called cheap public power.

Hoover Commission findings

And we are also aware of the findings of ex-Gov. Leslie A. Miller, chairman, Natural Resources Committee of the Hoover Commission. In an article in the May 14, 1949, issue of the Saturday Evening Post, he takes the Bureau to task for incredible extravagance resulting from their money-spending contest with other Federal agencies in harnessing western streams.

We in the East, and particularly in the States of New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Delaware, have always been in the forefront in campaigning for governmental reforms. We certainly do not want any part in extending a system which promises to destroy us. Already we are paying a disproportionately large share of the bill for unduly ambitious schemes now being foisted upon other sections of the Nation by federally controlled river basin development agencies.

A NEW OUTLOOK

We admit that we are now confronted with a critical water situation and will be for years to come. We know that the problems involved are complex. We are convinced that they can be best solved by the application of the principle of wholesome governmental cooperation. We claim we have the capacity to make that principle work.

The Delaware River Basin water project is our challenge. We intend to meet it.

We propose to do so by establishing by compact among the States of New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and probably Delaware, a Delaware River Basin Water Commission which would be empowered to plan, finance, construct, maintain, and operate the recommended water project. We have already taken steps toward the drafting of such a compact. A subcommittee of Incodel is at work on this task.

Under present policies and precedures now being followed in the execution of Federal water projects we would be perfectly justified in asking the Federal Government to finance the entire cost of the Incodel water project. But we do not propose to do this. Rather, we intend to set an example by paying the cost of all of the program which is obviously primarily for our own benefit, and to campaign for the adoption of a comparable policy for the Nation as a whole.

We are convinced that this principle is sound and would be advantageous and equitable to Pennsylvania and its component regions including the Lehigh Valley and also to the other States in the great Northeastern section of the country.

At the same time we recognize there are States and regions in the country that are less fortunate economically than this section and that we have an obligation to assist them in the development of their resources and economy. We should be willing to do this, but not to the extent of footing a grossly disproportionate part of the bill, as we now are doing.

At the present time, something like a billion and one-half dollars a year is being appropriated annually by the Federal Government for Federal land and water development projects. Over 30 percent of this money, or approximately $450,000,000, comes from New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Delaware. I doubt very much if more than 10 percent of what we pay in, or $45,000,000, is returned to us in the form of facilities and services. The balance goes to our poor country cousins.

Incidentally, one of the principal deficiencies at present in Federal programs for water-resource development is the lack of sound, uniform standards and criteria for the allocation of costs and evaluation of reimbursable features in determining the economic feasibility of multiple-use projects. That is one of the reasons why we in the Northeast are not getting a fair break.

It's time, in my judgment, for the adoption of some new standards. I'm wholeheartedly in favor of economically sound land and water projects, whoever may carry them out. But we have a tremendous job to do right here at home and I think we should have some of our own money to do it with. I suggest, in principle, the adoption of the following policy to accomplish this end.

Let the Congress annually set up a budget for land- and water-development programs, including stream clearance and pollution abatement. Based upon my experience and observations, I believe such programs are usually at least 75 percent for the benefit of the areas in which they are located and not more than 25 percent in the national interest. On the assumption that these ratios are reasonable, I would suggest that the Federal Government return to the States 75 percent of their share of the funds earmarked for land- and water-conservation programs and let the States decide how and where to spend this money on projects for their particular benefit. The balance could be put in a Federal pot to be used where most needed.

Some program of this general nature must be adopted, I believe, if the goal is to establish honest natural resources development programs in keeping with a policy which will put an end to the present type of situation which Governor Miller has described as "the battle that squanders billions."

Your council has definite reason to be interested in and to lend its support to changes that will result in the adoption of a sound national policy for the development of the natural resources of the country. The future of your region's foremost industries, the tax-paying producers of electric power, steel and cement and the railroads, and the future of your local governmental structure, are at stake. No organization is better qualified than your group to understand and cope with the problems involved.

If you are truly concerned about the future welfare and prosperity of your region—and of your country—you should work unceasingly for the wise utilization, conservation and development of the natural resources of the Lehigh River Valley under a system which will preserve the maximum degree of control in the hands of the people in the region directly affected.

Point 4 and the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the eminent economist, Dr. Mordecai Ezekiel, has written a very informative and illuminating discussion of the relationship between the point 4 program and the economic activities now being carried on by the United Nations. This article was printed in the weekly publication New Republic, in the issue of May 15. I ask unanimous consent to insert this article in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POINT 4 AND THE UNITED NATIONS

(By Mordecai Ezekiel)

For most of the world's population, the great wartime pledges of freedom from fear and want—for all men everywhere—are still largely a dream. Three-quarters of the world's people live in underdeveloped countries in malnutrition and poverty. They share but little in the dynamic progress of the rest of the world. The war lifted their aspirations toward political independence and economic progress, yet in most cases their food and consumption standards have not yet regained even the low prewar levels.

Meanwhile the economic outlook of a great capital-supplying region—western Europe—grows darker as the years of ECA aid run out.

President Truman's point 4 proposals offered a way to start attacking the problems of economic development in the poorer nations of the world. They also offered western Europe, where substantial progress is under way, an answer to the great economic question: What happens when the Marshall plan ends?

When approved by Congress and implemented by international agreement, the point 4 program will provide technical experts to assist countries to develop their economies. But know-how alone is not enough. Technical services are useless, as President Truman has said, unless they are followed by international investment to make the blueprints function.

In prewar days the underdeveloped countries helped finance a triangular (or multilateral) flow of trade which supported the prosperity of western Europe. The underdeveloped regions (especially in the Tropics) regularly sold to North America far more in raw materials (rubber, copra, petroleum, silk, sugar, jute, copper, coffee, tea, and many others) than they purchased in North American exports. Their surplus dollar earnings

went to western Europe, as profits and interest on investments and as payments for western European industrial products and services. There, in turn, dollars helped western Europe finance its great net imports of goods from America (including purchases of our cotton, tobacco, dried fruits, corn, wheat, bacon and lard, automobiles, office machinery, and heavy electrical equipment).

Today the underdeveloped countries are no longer able to earn a dollar surplus in foreign trade and the increases in self-government and the liquidation of foreign holdings have reduced their obligations to Europe. Instead of receiving a steady current net inflow of dollars from the underdeveloped countries, western Europe has been paying back for wartime contributions, notably in the gradual liquidation of blocked sterling balances.

Western Europe has thus been unable to finance its postwar import needs from America not only because of the war's devastation in Europe, but also because of the havoc in other parts of the world and the consequent disappearance of dollar payments. That is a major reason why, as European industry and agriculture complete their rehabilitation and as Marshall plan payments approach their end, Europe still finds itself faced with a continuing inability to buy and pay for its needed imports from the Americas.

Since western Europe broadly imports raw materials and exports finished products, no amount of integration of its own national economies can solve its over-all dollar problem; nor can the increased cooperation of western European economies with those of other soft-currency areas in Asia, Africa, and Latin America provide Europe with all the raw materials it needs; it must draw on North America, too.

This economic background is essential to an understanding of point 4's broad basic conception: To give underdeveloped nations the know-how and the means to help them help themselves; to raise their production and consumption, their exports and their imports; and to bring about a steady, dynamic increase in the world's economic activity. This increase would simultaneously make markets for the expanding industries of the Americas, Europe, and the underdeveloped countries. But whether the program can contribute to a rapid reestablishment of a multilateral system of world trade, or whether it simply creates direct markets for United States goods which will dry up as soon as our financing slackens, depends on the way in which it is carried out.

The extent of dollar investment abroad needed to enable world trade to function is indicated roughly from past experience. Since the war, the United States and Canada have financed world recovery by loans and grants running from $7,000,000,000 to $8,000,000,000 a year. In 1949 these declined to $6,000,000,000, and 1950 will be lower still. Most of those funds went to western Europe.

To make point 4 really effective in the future, international investment in the underdeveloped countries will be needed eventually in sums of around $5,000,000,000 a year. Later, the nations can pay back these investments from their expanded exports to the United States and other countries. American national income has doubled every 20 years. With continued growth in our economy, even if it is not quite so rapid, we shall need more and more imports in the years ahead, especially of raw materials. Thus we can help to provide expanding export markets for production in backward countries. During the period in which the funds are being advanced, they will provide dollars for the rest of the world to continue to buy American exports. If a considerable part of these dollar investments is spent for European products, increased investment in the underdeveloped countries can also help to restore the triangular flow of world trade. This would support the recovery of western Europe and the continuation of democratic governments, thereby making markets for European industrial products. It would also give Europe the dollars to continue its imports of American goods. Over the longer pull, as the world economy and our own expand together, we then would have time to adjust ourselves to fewer and fewer net exports, instead of having to make the change almost overnight.

If these good results are to follow, three conditions are necessary:

The funds advanced, whether loans or grants, must not be tied to direct expenditure in America.

Europe must produce the largest part of the industrial equipment needed by the underdeveloped countries.

These countries in turn must spend a substantial part of their foreign funds in Europe rather than in the United States.

All of these conditions are germane to the current issue, now hotly debated in Washington, as to whether the United States share of point 4 technical assistance should be provided directly by the United States, or whether a substantial portion should be channeled through the UN and its specialized agencies.

On their side, the manifold departments and agencies of the United States Government rightly stress the fact that they are already in the technical-assistance business. Under Nelson Rockefeller's Office of the Coordinator of Latin American Affairs and its successor agencies in the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations in the Department of Agriculture, and in parallel activities in other agencies, a steady stream of American experts has gone to many countries, especially in Latin America. Cooperative arrangements with governments have been worked out, joint corporations have been set up to finance economic development, and loans from our Export-Import Bank have backed this development. Since the war, the bank has loaned nearly three times as much to Latin-American countries as to all other underdeveloped countries, in ratio to population. Alone of the backward regions, and in large part because of American aid, Latin America's people are better fed today than they were before the war. In the same way ECA is providing technical assistance to European countries and their colonies and territories. In addition, thousands of men and women throughout the world are receiving practical experience each year in the Bureau of Mines, the Forest Service, the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, the Reclamation Service, the Public Service and other Federal agencies.

Our Government bureaus are already spending millions of dollars a year in technical-assistance activities. They are experienced in choosing personnel, establishing relations with countries, giving practical help on the spot. All they need to do is to expand their present scale of operations. On the other hand, the UN institutions have had little operating experience, and are hampered by multiple controls and international frictions. Also it is easier and simpler for a Government department to get an appropriation from Congress, for use by established Government departments, spend the money directly, and account to Congress on how it is spent, than to follow through on the spending of the money as part of the operations of an international agency drawing funds from many countries. In these circumstances, many Washington officials honestly feel they are best qualified to spend the bulk of the proposed point 4 appropriations, and they reflect this feeling to Congress.

Here, on the other side, are the arguments which favor using the UN and its specialized agencies:

First, if a substantial portion of the United States funds is channeled through the UN, it will stimulate corresponding contributions from other countries. These countries, in addition, have capable technicians in many fields available for foreign service. Why should we in the United States pay the whole cost ourselves when other advanced countries are prepared to share part of the burden with us?

Second, direct assistance from any one nation is feared in many parts of the world. Many of the poorest countries have just succeeded in throwing off foreign control. They are jealous of their hard-won liberties. Their political opposition is quick to attack any move that may suggest new dependence on foreign powers or new concessions to foreign influences. Technical assistance through the UN is on a different plane. Their governments are members and help formulate its policies; they do not endanger their independence, political or financial, in working with the UN.

Third, while the UN is newer to the business than the United States is, it has wider resources of technicians on which to draw. Even if funds are provided, the shortage of trained brains may for a long time be the factor limiting the extent and effectiveness of technical assistance. UN missions use technicians from many countries all over the world, while direct United States technical aid is largely extended through United States citizens. This makes for greater variety of viewpoint and opinion among the UN experts, and probably sounder eventual recommendations, as the editors of the New Republic have pointed out. Further, European experts, in particular, have had long practical experience in dealing with the problems of underdeveloped countries. They understand not only the physical and technical conditions, but the habits of thought and work of the people. Now that colonialism itself is dying, most of these experts are ready to give intelligent and loyal service in helping backward countries increase their output for their own benefit. In many cases these non-American experts may be more realistic and understanding in dealing with the problems of more primitive countries than are American experts. For example, in my own experience abroad, I have found American experts frequently overdisposed to assume that the answer to all problems is to do things just as we do them in the United States. Countries often may be better aided to take the next steps ahead by technicians from countries not so many decades or generations removed from them in economic and social progress. Thus American experts frequently put great emphasis on efficiency, on saving labor, even in countries where for many years to come the problem will be not to save labor but to use productively the labor already idle. Americans find it hard to understand that investment in labor-saving machinery may be wasteful compared to investment in simpler equipment to put more men to work.

A fourth argument in favor of a UN approach is that American technicians tend naturally to specify American equipment. The results were highlighted by the recent Seattle incident, where the low-cost British bid was rejected because it conformed to British instead of American methods of stating specifications. If foreign investments in underdeveloped countries are to be spent in any substantial part for equipment from western Europe, European engineers and technicians will have to help draw up the plans.

A fifth argument is that the UN agencies have much broader technical resources for giving students and workers advanced training outside their own countries. The United States uses its scholarship funds largely to bring students here for advanced technical work) in colleges or professional schools, and for in-service training in public and other institutions. The UN can provide scholarships and in-service training not only in

American institutions, but also in institutions of all the other highly developed countries. In many cases training in English, Dutch, Scandinavian or Swiss technical schools, for example, may better prepare the trainees for practical work in their own countries than would American training adapted to our advanced technology and our enormous mass-production economy. Some international scholarships are already being provided by UNESCO. The tentative point 4 program of the FAO, UNESCO and other agencies as summarized in the UN publication, "Technical Assistance for Economic Development," provides for a great expansion in such internationally sponsored technical training.

Another argument for a UN approach arises from the need for international institutes to provide short courses for qualified students from many countries. These training centers, by adding to the skill of officials already engaged in point 4 work, can produce improved technical skills in months instead of the years that it takes for students sent abroad to return and make a contribution. Such international centers have already been proved both economical and effective in the statistical training centers, sponsored jointly by the FAO, the UN Statistical Office and the host countries. These have been conducted during the last 2 years in Mexico City for Latin America, Cairo for the Near East, Paris for Europe, and New Dehli for the Far East. Reliable facts are the basis for all sound planning and development. And by bringing about material improvement in both census and crop-estimate methods in many underdeveloped countries, these statistical centers have already done a good job. Plans for large-scale expansion of such international training can be put into effect as soon as funds are assured.

The final argument in favor of a UN approach to the point 4 program is the fact that international agencies can conduct activities requiring joint international action far better than individual countries. Many aspects of economic development require this kind of international planning. The steps proposed in each country must be carefully balanced with what's being projected in other countries if some lines are not to be overstressed while others are neglected. One of the UN's major tasks is to study the economic programs of individual countries to see whether they make sense, and then to aid countries to redraft their planning in the light of the prospective world situation, and work out adjustments to make their progams more consistent.

The United States has strongly urged this joint planning as a function of UN agencies. Notable efforts in this field include the work of the UN Economic Commission for Europe, in planning and adjusting European programs of coal, steel, timber, and other products, and of the FAO in developing a worldwide review of advance agricultural programs at its annual conferences, and also more intensive regional reviews at regional conferences. Four of these regional meetings were held last fall—at Quito, Cairo, Rome, and Singapore. I made a round-the-world air trip to help staff the Singapore meeting and to listen in on the meeting in Rome. I found the frank analysis and discussion of the readjustments needed in Asiatic and European agricultural programs most encouraging. Yet this work is just beginning. If billions of dollars are going to be invested in worldwide economic development, the UN's efforts to prevent losses and failure by advance international consultation and planning will need to be greatly expanded.

No country has a monopoly on brains, skill, experience, and imagination. Many of the epochal discoveries—such as that of penicillin in this generation, or of the germ source of diseases and of the steam locomotive in earlier ones—were made outside the United States. Technical assistance through the UN and its agencies can mobilize all the technical skill and know-how of the world, to speed the process of worldwide economic expansion and to reduce the inevitable mistakes along the way.

If the United States places its major reliance on direct technical assistance through its own agencies, other countries, to the extent they provide technical assistance, may similarly expand assistance directly. But they may limit it to their own areas of interest through their own technicians. Such a tendency is evident in the recent arrangements for expanded technical assistance by the members of the British Commonwealth at their recent conference at Colombo, in the programs of other colonial powers, and in the technical activities of the U. S. S. R. which so far have been entirely unilateral. Emphasis on unilateral, rather than international, technical assistance might be a decisive and disruptive force in the world economy, tending further to split it into spheres of influence, rather than draw it closer together through UN activities.

Finally, the United States has been one of the main sponsors of the UN and its agencies, and has repeatedly pledged itself to work through them in international political and economic matters. Raising the standards of living of the peoples of the underdeveloped countries is a primary UN objective. If the United States desires to see the UN's power and prestige grow, it must give the UN a fair chance to carry its share of the operating load in dealing with the world's economic problems.

There are strong arguments for a dual approach of direct aid and aid through the UN. The UN aid would draw on the reserves of trained skill from the great army of experienced technicians in western Europe and Oceania, and the less numerous but still important able men in Latin America, the Near East, and Far East. It would help to bind closer necessary trade connections between Europe, Asia, Africa, and America. The funds needed to carry the plans into action might similarly be provided, partly from the United States and other countries, and partly from international agencies.

But only by emphasis on an international approach can the European recovery program be carried through to successful completion as part of a recovery and expansion program for the world.

Frank A. O'Connor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 24, 1950

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert the following editorial from the Newark Evening News, paying tribute to an eminent public servant, Mr. Frank A. O'Connor, of West Orange, N. J., who has retired after 56 years of devoted service to the community. I want to join the residents of West Orange in congratulating him upon his distinguished record and wishing him continued health and happiness. As the editorial points out, Mr. O'Connor carries into retirement the satisfying knowledge that his 56 years in elected office bear witness to the trust reposed in him by his neighbors.

AFTER 56 YEARS

Through three wars, changing administrations, in hard times and good, Frank A. O'Connor has served the town of West Orange. For 56 years he has been successively tax assessor, tax collector and, since the introduction of commission government in 1922, a member of the governing body. During his lifetime of civic service, begun while Grover Cleveland was serving his second term in the White House, Mr. O'Connor has been witness to the growth and industrial expansion of north Jersey. He has seen the rising tide of commerce swirl about his town and, for the most part, leave untouched its tree-lined streets, quiet homes, and ordered gardens.

Now, at 82, Mr. O'Connor has retired. One must suppose that for him life has had the usual complement of disappointments and compensations. But into retirement he carries the satisfying knowledge that his 56 years in elected office bear witness to the trust reposed in him by his neighbors. And no small thing it is.

The Frontiers of Freedom Have Widened in 50 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 23, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave I am inserting in the RECORD a remarkable tribute to a remarkable union. This is the regular daily column from today's New York Post and Home News written by Murray Kempton, Post labor editor, paying tribute to the union history written by the ILGWU:

PYGMY IN 1900—GIANT IN 1950

(By Murray Kempton)

ATLANTIC CITY, May 23.—On January 6, 1909, John Dyche, secretary-treasurer of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, got a letter from one Charles Jacobson, one of that despairing union's few active members in Boston.

Jacobson wanted to know how things were in New York. Dyche told him:

"Things are as bad as can be. Everything is dead here—dead as Queen Anne as they say in England. Locals 9 and 23 had no meetings for the last few weeks * * * (Philadelphia) wants that we should send an organizer from New York and here we have no money to pay the rent.

"The monthly financial report shows a deficit of $92. That means I drew no wages. All things considered it is as rotten as rotten can be. The trade is as bad as the union is * * * I do not in the least exaggerate when I tell you that you will be lucky if you can get a job to earn a dollar a day."

Thus, with typing corrected, an ILG officer wrote 41 years ago.

The International Ladies' Garment Workers Union, in its fiftieth anniversary convention assembled this morning, owned buildings worth $9,000,000. The reserves in its vacation fund alone total $44,000,000. It owns 3 radio stations and 9 health clinics; it has 425,000 members, employs 1,500 officers and annually it collects nearly $2,500,000 in per capita dues.

On July 1, 1890, the Gotham Knife Cutters—a precursor of the ILG—met with the pomp, the circumstance, and the poverty which attended union meetings in those

days and voted to contribute $10 of their small treasury to the striking metal workers.

In the last 3 years the International Ladies' Garment Workers Union has donated $2,100,000 to labor causes and institutions in the United States. The largest sum of all was $100,000 to support the CIO auto union's 100-day strike against Chrysler.

On March 25, 1911, there was a fire in the Triangle Waist Co. in New York. The girls who worked there had a choice of burning to death or jumping from the ninth floor of the tightly barred loft. When it was over 146 of them were dead.

The union set up a relief committee to do what it could for the families of the dead. It surveyed among others the case of A. A., 16 years old, who had earned $5 a week. She had a father, a sister, and a brother who were union members. Since there were four wage earners surviving, it was decided to grant only the death benefit of $150.

This year the ILG will raise each member's death-benefit policy to $1,000. But any ILG member who works in New York will probably retire at 65 with a pension of $65 a month plus social security. A dressmaker today is paid 13 weeks' sick benefits, and surgical and hospital expenses.

The union provides her with free glasses, clinical attention, and $50 a week vacation money. Her children are born at the expense of the union welfare fund and, at work, it takes her less than 3½ hours to earn $5.

On June 3, 1910, the Philadelphia shirt workers went out on strike. One, Sachs, their secretary, sent an appeal to other unions in which he said that the girls were striking for shorter hours because they want the chance to get an English education and free time to use the night schools.

Last year, the ILG spent $322,814 on the education of its members. The dressmaker goes to school by radio and with movies; she takes courses in art, handicrafts, history, and family problems. This year, the union opened its own college for training future officers; in previous years, it had sent some of them to Harvard.

When you joined the ILG in 1903 you had to take an oath to defend freedom of thought by tongue or pen * * * and to strive to elevate the moral and material condition of the working class.

The frontiers of freedom have widened in the last 47 years. The ILG, since 1947, has given $2,500,000 to help unions the world over. Some of that money has gone to the French and Italian and Israeli labor movements, to build orphanges in Italy, and China, to fight Communists in South America and Asia.

The ILGWU held its first convention in a loft on the lower East Side on June 3, 1900. Joseph Barondess, its first president, expressed the prayerful hope that the enterprise would bear good fruit. Five years later, things were so bad that the New York cutters considered seceding from a union with less than 6 months to exist.

This year, 14 men who joined that union 50 years ago will be guests of its convention. As a mark of what the years have done, they will wear special solid gold badges.

Tri-State Spelling Champion Eighth-Grade Girl From Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. JENISON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 24, 1950

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, the National Capital is honored this week by the presence of outstanding young students who have won honors as spelling champions in their respective sections of the country. Under permission granted to me to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, it is my desire to introduce to my colleagues in the House of Representatives a young champion from a three-State area whose home is in the Twenty-third Congressional District of Illinois, which I have the honor to represent.

Our representative in the national spelling bee to be held here this week end is 14-year-old Mary Kathryn Ruth, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. C. F. Ruth, Mount Carmel, Ill., and an eighth-grade student at Mount Carmel Junior High School. After winning her local contest, she was victorious in a tri-State competition held at Evansville, Ind., where she bested champion spellers from 20 junior high schools in the three States of Illinois, Indiana, and Kentucky. With her victory came the trip to Washington, accompanied by her mother. The story of her triumph is told in the Mount Carmel Daily Republican-Register, and is as follows:

Mary Kathryn Ruth, eighth grade pupil in the junior high school, daughter of Mrs. and Mrs. C. F. Ruth, Saturday night won the Tri-State spelling contest held in Evansville.

Twenty junior high school pupils from the 3 States of Illinois, Indiana, and Kentucky participated.

The local speller took first place in a special spell-off session held in the evening, Saturday, at the Evansville YWCA after a previous decision had given her second place.

She defeated Max Eubanks, Washington, Ind., to win tri-State honors and a week's all-expense visit in Washington, D. C., as an entrant in the national spelling bee to be held there May 26. There she will have a chance in prizes involving $3,000 in cash awards.

By winning in Evansville she also was presented with a 19-volume set of world encyclopedia from the educational division of Field Enterprises Inc.

The word on which Mary Kathryn won in the final special spell-off was "livelihood," which the Washington boy spelled "livelyhood." After he had spelled, she asked the pronouncer that he repeat his spelling of the word, and then she spelled it correctly. Then she also spelled the next word on the list, "imbecile," according to the rules of the contest and was proclaimed winner and entrant in the national contest.

An allowance of two spellings caused the spell-off session Saturday night. In the forty-sixth round of the first session Mary Kathyrn spelled "curtsey." The bell rang signifying that it was the wrong spelling and the Washington boy spelled it "curtsy." He was then declared winner.

The local speller and her mother, Charles Weaver, principal of the junior high school and sponsor of the local entrant, together with county superintendent J. A. Gibson, who were interested spectators at the match, considered it was all over and were leaving the building when they were met on the steps going out by arrival of a man who asked, "Is this the girl who was spelled down?"

He was informed that she was.

The man declared that Mary Kathryn had spelled the word right and added, "I have a recording of it and I can prove that her spelling was correct."

Members of the group were a bit startled by this development and asked the man who he was and why his interest in the contest.

He explained that he was Dr. F. W. Werking, professor of modern languages at Evansville College. He had been listening to the contest by radio and had made a recording of it, as he frequently does of programs affecting languages and words, he explained. He declared that Mary Kathryn was not beaten and that he did not like to see her declared so.

Representative of the Press, Evansville sponsor of the match, was found, and this situation explained to him. Judges were recalled separately, after departing, and each agreed that under the circumstances the contest should be continued.

Then it was that the spell-off session was arranged and the final session held in which the local speller won the tri-State championship.

Mary Kathryn, 14, comes of a family of spellers. Her maternal grandfather, C. S. Andrus, was years ago a teacher and spelling was his hobby. Her paternal grandfather, the late L. F. Smith, was a businessman meticulous in his spelling.

Her interest is not confined to spelling and words in general. In school work she plays a flute in the band and also is a Camp Fire Girl, is recorder for Job's Daughters, is a member of the Christian Youth Fellowship, sings in her church's intermediate quartet and the eighth grade sextet. She has stated she wants to be a medical missionary when she grows up.

Mr. Speaker, the national spelling contest makes an important contribution to the educational program of the country. It stimulates study and encourages young students. I am proud to recognize its worth as well as our able young champion from the Twenty-third Congressional District of Illinois.

The Mundt-Ferguson Bills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 24, 1950

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement I made at the Brooklyn Academy of Music on May 18, 1950:

THE MUNDT-FERGUSON BILLS

This is a moment in history when every thoughtful person in this country must ask himself: What is this fear that is creeping through the land like a slow paralysis throttling freedom of speech and freedom of assembly? What is this fear that is causing so many of us to look back behind our shoulders, to lower our voices and apologize for holding any unorthodox views? And above all what is this fear in the Halls of our Congress which mocks the strength of our own institution and which has resulted in the circus performance of trying to destroy the Bill of Rights in the guise of maintaining and protecting it?

I say without equivocation the Mundt-Ferguson bills which have been combined into one bill, S. 2311, and reported favorably to the Senate floor is the frankest confession of this fear and cowardness. It says, in effect, that the right to talk must be licensed. It says that guilt is not personal, but derives from association. It says that not the deed, but the thought is punishable. It flies in the face of the constitutional protection

against self-incrimination. The provisions of this bill proclaim to the world that we, the people of the United States, have not grown up, that we are children incapable of mature political judgment, that our common sense is so lacking that it is necessary to put us in a cellophane bag and protect us from every naughty, naughty word. And who, of course, is to say what word is naughty?

Pity our country, indeed, when a sedition law is so written that we, adult and mature as I know we are, are placed in a climate where metaphorically we must sit in a school room with our hands folded in front of us in rigid conformity to what a schoolmaster chooses to call good behavior.

We have gone through wars and economic crises. We have gone through civil war, but never before has so novel a proposition as this Mundt-Ferguson bill been proposed as the law of the land. Surely in the marketplace of ideas the democratic and free way of life need not fear competition with ideas of totalitarian of the right or the left variety.

With Congress so busy protecting us from ourselves, we are threatened with a new kind of paternalism which does not sit well in a society which justly prides itself on the fact that the individual is not subservient to the state. I'd like to ask "What's happened to our sense of humor? What's happened to our self-assurance? What's happened to our pride? Are we to be sheep of one color enclosed in one pasture?"

I was forcibly struck by the statement of Prof. Zechariah Chafee, Jr., noted professor of law at Harvard University, in opposition to this bill. I would like to see every man and woman in the United States read a copy of that statement. I cannot resist the temptation to quote to you one of its choicest parts:

"Let us now turn from the law to the facts. How many Communists are there in the United States? The United Press said 70,000 in 1947, out of a total population of 143,382,000 (World's Almanac, 1949, pp. 544, 164). Thus Communists form one-twentieth of 1 percent of all the people in our country. The odds are 1,999 to 1 in favor of free institutions. Suppose a football stadium holds 40,000 people. The chances are that 20 of them would be Communists and 39,980 would not. Remember, too, that it is not a question of 20 dynamiters or 20 men with concealed weapons, for then they could be arrested at once under the ordinary criminal laws. Just 20 unarmed persons who have not violated any existing Federal or State law or conspired to violate any existing law. But they have learned bad ideas about politics from foreigners and foreign books, they are thinking bad thoughts about these bad ideas, they are telling them to each other and to any outsiders who are willing to listen. What can we do to prevent them from harming the other 99.95 percent of us, who have on our side only the city and State police, almost every newspaper and school teacher and professor and preacher, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Army, the Air Force, and the Navy, never forgetting the Marines?

"Such is the clear and present danger inside the United States which (according to sec. 2 (11) of the Ferguson bill) imperils 'the existence of free institutions' and makes it 'necessary' for Congress to pass a new law 30 pages long with unheard of regulations and 10-year prison sentences 'in order * * * to preserve the sovereignty of the United States as an independent nation.' Shades of Valley Forge and Iwo Jima. If we no longer want to be the land of the free, at least let us be the home of the brave."

Now let's turn to a more specific examination of a few of its provisions. There are two basic terms in the bill, "Communist political organization" and "Communist-front organization." Neither is defined with specific precision despite the fact that the courts have held consistently that a criminal statute must be sufficiently definite so that a person may know when he is indulging in criminal acts. Note the term "Communist-front organization" which under the definition of the bill "is primarily operated for the purpose of giving aid and support to a Communist political organization, a Communist foreign government, or the world Communist movement."

What does "giving aid and support to a Communist political organization" mean? Suppose an organization is formed for the purpose of supporting the New Deal; that is, against the provisions of the Taft-Hartley law, for extension of a rent control, for broadening of the Social Security Act, for the civil-rights legislation, etc. It may so happen that the Communist Party likewise supports these measures. Will such an organization then be termed a Communist-front organization because its issues are in accord with some of the issues of the Communist Party? How easy would it be to destroy any liberal organization by identifying it as a Communist-front organization?

The bill provides that no Communist-front organization or Communist political organization shall be entitled to exemption from Federal income tax, nor shall deductions from Federal income taxes be allowed for the contribution to or for the use of any of these organizations. In other words, before you make a contribution to any organization—some organization which you have supported because of its liberal ideas—you will have to run to get information from the Attorney General, information from the Subversive Activities Control Board, or write your Congressman, or call up the editor of your favorite newspaper, or beyond that—ask yourself in the language of the bill: Am I giving "aid and support" to a Communist political organization?

You no longer join or attend a council or a neighborhood community group without first opening every closet door and looking under every bed. You just don't join. But, of course, if you must join a group, there's nothing in this legislation that prevents you from joining the Ku Klux Klan or any Fascist group or any anti-Catholic or anti-Semitic group. If you join these organizations, you don't have to register under penalty of being refused a passport, under penalty of being fined or imprisoned.

You can make hay on every street corner without worrying whether the Attorney General has your name or not, but you must, by any and all costs, avoid joining any concerted act or expression of liberal organizations.

The shadow this bill will cast is a long one, indeed. Now let's see who will determine these things. The bill says that the Subversive Activities Control Board shall, upon application made by the Attorney General, determine whether any organization is a Communist political organization or a Communist-front organization. This is a three-man board to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Three men shall determine whether your ideology is according to Hoyle. Not your common sense, not your ability to understand political issues, not your maturity, not your own judgment shall prevail. Three human beings subject to all frailty and weaknesses that all mankind is subject to will determine what organizations are good or bad for you and for the country.

It is disgraceful that the temper of the times is such that we must in every public statement say "I am not a Communist. I am not defending communism. I am defending the principles of free speech and liberty." Has it become so necessary that every public speaker must spew forth hatred and contempt of a group in order to clear himself from a shadow? Is this to be the age of the badge, the wearing of the label on every sleeve, the setting of brother against brother in the name of security. Let me repeat the words of Mr. Justice Jackson:

"Freedom to differ is not limited to things that do not matter much. That would be a mere shadow of freedom. The test of its substance is the right to differ as to things that touch the heart of the existing order."

Now let's look at this picture. It is the kind of a bill where you are damned if you do and damned if you don't. If the Subversive Activities Control Board deems the organization subversive, then you must register. If you don't, you are subject to all the penalties of the bill. If you do, I don't have to tell you what happens to you in terms of employment and the threat of social ostracism.

As I said before, to me this appears a distinct violation of the protection against self-incrimination. It must be noted as well that no trial by jury precedes the determination of the Subversive Activities Control Board. All that is left is a right of review.

And keep in mind that no overt action on the part of these organizations or any of these individuals is necessary. Just aid and support. What that aid and support may be neither I nor anybody else at this time can have any possible idea. Of course, the Subversive Activities Control Board can determine that this is not a political-front organization, but by that time the allegation has served its purpose, and as Senator McCARTHY knows very well, it takes a long, long time for the truth to catch up to a charge.

Under existing statutes we have sufficient law directed against any act of espionage, sabotage, etc. If individual laws need strengthening, then let's do that; but we have no law on our books aimed against what a man thinks, and in the name of democracy may that never happen.

I want to add one more thought. No bill now pending before Congress would serve the Communist purposes better. Passage of this bill would be a double triumph for the Communists. One, because it will serve as a most effective propaganda weapon throughout the world. The Communists can point with pride to the fact that they have reduced the powerful United States to this expression of fear and cowardness. They can point to this bill, if enacted into law, as proof of their power and, grossly exaggerate through their usual propaganda channels, the strength of their numbers and effectiveness. And secondly, they know full well that the passage of such a bill will create a climate most favorable to their way of thinking: that is, the suppression of opposition, opinion, and thought.

Let me again say that the strength of American institutions, freedom in our economic, political, and social life—is the one weapon which the Communists cannot match. Let us keep it that way.

Address by the Right Honorable Louis S. St. Laurent, Prime Minister of Canada

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. EATON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 1950

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by the Right Honorable Louis S. St. Laurent, Member of Parliament, Prime Minister

of Canada, to the Canadian Society of New York, New York City, February 10, 1950:

I am happy to have this occasion to attend a meeting of the Canadian Society in New York and I am deeply gratified to be made an honorary member of this organization. As such, I will feel more closely associated with the purposes of the Canadian Society. I can assure you they are purposes which I am anxious to support in any way that is possible for someone who is not resident in New York.

I cannot promise to observe all the formal duties normally required of members in a society such as yours.

But I know the aims and objects of the Canadian Society are already well attended to by the company of people I see before me.

To those of you who, though resident in the United States, remain Canadian citizens, or who, by birth or ancestry, are Canadian, I bring greetings from your home country.

These messages of goodwill do not, however, include any element of the sympathy which exiles sometimes expect from visitors from the homeland. It seems to me you are in the fortunate position of enjoying many advantages, with very few of the disadvantages of being away from home.

I can, therefore, only congratulate you on the fact that you have the opportunity to contribute to the life of this community and to enjoy its benefits, and, at the same time, to symbolize the happy and mutually satisfactory character of the relations between Canadian and United States citizens.

I am sure you will expect me at this point to express the appreciation all Canadians feel, whether they live in New York or are merely visitors to this city, of the fine contribution made to those good relations by our former consul general, Mr. Hugh Scully, and by Mrs. Scully.

I have not the slightest doubt that all of you who have met Mr. and Mrs. Greene will have discovered already that they are going to follow in that tradition and to make their contribution to that common fund of goodwill.

Though it is perfectly true that I am happy to be here with you this evening, your president knows I was reluctant to accept the invitation to make my visit this early in 1950.

One reason for my hesitation was that you wanted me to be in New York at just about the time we usually begin our annual session of Parliament. And I know most of you are close enough to Canada to realize what a busy time the opening of a Parliamentary session is for the members of the Government.

At the time your president invited me, we were all preoccupied with our first post-election session of Parliament and I must admit I was frankly apprehensive about undertaking additional commitments when we were so concerned about meeting those we had made during the election campaign.

That is why my first response to your invitation was negative. But shortly afterward Mr. Pearson came home to Ottawa from New York, where he had been attending the Assembly of the United Nations. While he was in Ottawa, he persuaded me to change my mind and to accept your invitation.

You might like to know how he did it.

He said it had become a tradition for the Prime Minister of Canada to speak to the Canadian Society of New York, and that this was a privilege of which I should avail myself at the earliest possible opportunity.

Of course I knew that your society would give me an unequaled opportunity to talk about Canada, and that I could find no more friendly and receptive audience.

But that fact itself was a further reason for my reluctance. I was worried about not having anything new which was worth while saying to you.

A good many years ago it was my privilege to be seated alongside of Lord Dunedin at a dinner which was followed by a lot of speeches.

After listening to several of them, His Lordship turned to me and said: "Young man when you get to be my age"—he was then over 80—"you will realize that it is unwise for anyone to attempt to make a speech unless he really has something to say. And after he has said it, he should sit down."

I told Mr. Pearson last November that I did not know anything new or different which needed to be said about Canadian-American relations at that time. He replied that some question was bound to arise which would provide me with a suitable topic.

Well, I accepted his forecast and your president's invitation. But when I sat down the other evening to prepare some notes for what I might say to you, I realized that Mr. Pearson had been wrong.

Perhaps fortunately for both countries, nothing special has developed in the relations between Canada and the United States significant enough to be made the theme of a speech.

The result is, I have nothing new to talk to you about. The best I can do is to attempt to recall some generalities which are always important in Canada's relations with this country and more particularly in the relations of both these North American nations with the rest of the world.

The first essential factor in our good relations is our mutual respect for each other, and our genuine desire not only to be fair to each other in fact, but to have that fairness obvious and indisputable.

In our day-to-day individual dealings with each other it is not difficult to achieve fairness and to have that fairness accepted as a matter of course.

But the smooth course of these day-to-day individual dealings is dependent upon peace on this continent. And peace on this continent now depends upon much more than the good relations between the people of the United States and the people of Canada.

During the whole of the last century and even the first years of this one, we, in the New World, felt little concern over what went on in other continents.

Even when war broke out in Europe in 1914 there were many who felt that though Canada might have been drawn in as a colony of a great world power, the United States could remain aloof.

Well that turned out to be impossible.

Our side won, but the cost of victory in human lives, in human suffering and in material wealth even on this side of the Atlantic, was immense. The cost was great not only while the war lasted, but also in its after-effects, during the terrible years of the thirties.

For a time after 1918 everyone hoped that men had had enough of war and that the world might look forward to an era of peace.

But, as the hope of peace faded in the decade of the thirties, a great many people in the United States turned again toward the traditional new world policy of isolation.

And many of our people in Canada went a long way with our North American neighbors on the same road.

Canada had emerged from war in 1918 with a deep national consciousness and a place of her own in the comity of nations. But our country was a nation of only 7,000,000, and we did not easily recover from the loss of over 60,000 precious young lives.

All over North America, there was disillusionment with the old world. It is easy now to see that we should have been saying "Let us try to keep war out of the world," but all too many of us were actually saying "Let us try to keep out of war."

In the result war was not kept out of the world, and neither did we keep out of war.

When war came to Europe in 1939, we in Canada, were not in automatically. But our external connections and sympathies were still important.

Reluctantly, but deliberately and unitedly, Canada entered the war by the free decision of our own people in their own parliament.

And, once more, our people put forth a tremendous effort for victory.

Again, in 1939 as in 1914, there were many who hoped and felt that the United States need not be involved. But that also proved to be a vain hope.

And notwithstanding the ultimate unconditional surrender of the nations which had set out to dominate the world, the allied victory again cost untold misery and devastation to all our peoples.

Of course, what we saved is infinitely more than what we had to expend.

And I am still convinced that if we had to do it again, we could and we would do it successfully. But we don't want to have to do it again, and I don't think we need to if we are willing to pay the price of peace.

Nevertheless we all realize—you in the United States and we in Canada—that the people of this continent cannot hope to avoid the catastrophic consequences of war whenever a major war breaks out anywhere in this world.

For many of us in Canada it was difficult to realize that appalling truth.

But when we saw that the people of the United States, with all their might, and the almost complete self-sufficiency of their economy, had to acknowledge that even they were powerless to protect themselves against the calamities of war whenever there was war in the world, we had to face that fact as a fact for us, too.

We now know—at least most of us know—that our only real hope lies in the prevention of war.

Though in 1945, our hopes were not as high as they had been in 1918, I believe there was—and is—a far more resolute determination on this continent, and among all the free nations, to look upon the prevention of another world war as a matter of urgent and grave and constant concern.

That was the spirit in which our Canadian representatives went to San Francisco to take part in the completion of a charter for the United Nations.

The charter we signed at San Francisco was the best instrument on which there was the slightest hope of getting agreement between the great powers. We knew it was far from perfect, but we thought—and still think—it was better than having no agreement at all.

No charter, however, can ensure peace unless it is reinforced by good will and a determination to cooperate on the part of the great powers.

As you know, article 43 of the charter provides for the negotiation of agreements between the members and the Security Council to make available "armed forces, assistance, and facilities, including rights of passage, necessary for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security."

Our Canadian delegations to the United Nations Assemblies made repeated efforts to have such agreements negotiated as soon as possible.

But it was not long till it became evident that one of the great powers had no intention of entering into effective military agreements under the charter to prevent war, and that therefore it was not enough for the nations which really wanted peace to rely for their security on the charter of the United Nations.

After this situation had become apparent the nations of the North Atlantic area, acting in accordance with the provisions of articles 51 and 52 of the charter, negotiated the North Atlantic Treaty.

The purpose of the North Atlantic Treaty, like that of the charter itself, is to prevent war, and to do so by a combination of actual and potential strength and unity sufficient to prevent aggression from being successful.

Of course, that means that if there is aggression against any signatory of the treaty, all the signatories become involved in hostilities. It means that the North Atlantic nations have given up the hope—and the possibility—of staying out of any future major war.

I do not think that represents a serious additional risk. Twice in a generation, it has been demonstrated that there is no real choice for North America when there is a world war. We are all involved sooner or later.

I believe firmly that the smallest risk we can take is to remain united and to remain strong, so long as there is any likelihood of aggression.

Well, now the North Atlantic Treaty organization has been established and we are faced with new problems.

The treaty itself asserts that the North Atlantic community is not just a military alliance; the North Atlantic nations have undertaken to combine their economic, social, and moral strength as well as their military resources.

And if the North Atlantic Treaty is to be an effective deterrent to aggression, that combination of strength must apply in all those spheres.

Of course, the first requirement is sufficient armed strength to prevent any sudden overwhelming blow from destroying all power of effective resistance.

But in these days, when weapons become obsolete so quickly, the North Atlantic nations could probably make no greater mistake than to concentrate on piling up armaments to the point where they become a dead weight on our national economies.

We are accustomed to think of this cold war as a struggle between two ways of life, an ideological struggle.

Of course, it is that.

But there is another way of looking at it. It is also a competition not so much in piling up armaments, as in the development of military potential.

Once we appear to have sufficient strength to prevent a sudden knock-out blow, the calculations of any potential aggressor are apt to turn from arms-in-being to estimates of respective staying power. Important though it may be not to lose the first battle, it is far more important to remain able to win the last one.

And staying power in the final analysis depends on whether we can maintain—not just in the United States, not just in North America, but in the whole North Atlantic community—a healthy, progressive, and dynamic society.

Almost all of us in North America believe that free economies, like ours, can produce greater wealth—and distribute it more fairly—than totalitarian societies.

But the mere conviction will not be enough; we must continue to demonstrate that the facts justify our belief.

Now I am convinced that all the North Atlantic nations signed the treaty in good faith and that all wish to do their part to give it reality.

It is obvious however that European nations, with economies still shaky from the dislocation and devastation of aerial bombardment, prolonged enemy occupation, cannot yet give the same response as the relatively sheltered economies of North America. And the restoration of genuine economic security to the European partners in the North Atlantic alliance is one of the most effective means of achieving military security and ultimately of reducing the burden of providing that security.

Looking no farther than this continent, there is naturally bound to be considerable difference between what a great power like the United States and a nation like Canada, with a much smaller population, can do to give reality to North Atlantic security.

In many ways the two countries are similar; but in many ways they are quite different. And I believe it is quite as important to understand the differences as it is to appreciate the similarities, if we expect to maintain that mutual feeling that we are all of us being absolutely fair to each other.

As the most powerful nation on earth, the United States has world-wide interests and responsibilities that Canada does not share. Moreover, in population the United States is about 150,000,000 to our thirteen and a half; in developed wealth and in annual national income the difference is considerably greater. On the other hand, Canada is physically a larger country than the United States—a good deal larger in square miles.

Now that means we have a very heavy national overhead. Take railways as an example. There are more than twice as many Americans as there are Canadians to provide traffic for each mile of railway in our respective countries.

And while there are, I suppose, at least half a dozen coast-to-coast highways in the United States, we have yet to complete our first transcontinental highway in Canada.

And so it goes all through the Canadian economy. Compared with the United States, we have to use a far larger proportion of our national wealth to maintain those essential services which keep a country going.

As a result, we in Canada have never been able to equal the American standard of living, though by dint of hard work we have kept not too far behind.

Then there is another great difference between Canada and the United States.

The United States, it is true, has vast problems of conservation, but this country has passed the pioneering stage, while with us in Canada a large part of our national estate is still waiting to be opened up.

If Canada is to achieve its highest economic and military potential, the development of new natural resources must be pushed ahead rapidly, and that means heavy capital outlays from our annual production of wealth.

Then there is another big difference. For the United States, with its mature and largely self-sufficient economy, foreign trade is relatively much less important than for Canada, which is at an earlier stage of economic development. We need to attract capital from outside Canada, and because of the nature of our resources we are heavily dependent on external trade. All that means our economy—and our prosperity—are more vulnerable than the economy of the United States.

This dependence of Canada on world trade, and the vulnerability to which it gives rise, are more serious because of another factor in our situation. Canada has a large favorable balance of trade with western Europe and a large unfavorable balance with the United States. And that means for us an exchange problem which the United States does not have.

In the past decade, we have experienced what is almost an industrial revolution in Canada; but by the standards of your nation of 150,000,000 our industry is still on a small scale.

The production of the whole range of modern armaments on a large scale is obviously beyond our capacity. What we must have, if we are to make our most effective contribution to our joint security, is specialization on the manufacture of a limited number of items coupled with the kind of reciprocal arrangement we had with the United States during the war.

Under the so-called Hyde Park declaration of 1941, each country produced for the other those armaments it was best fitted to produce. Each of us paid hard cash for the other's product, but we were better able to pay you because we were able to sell munitions and weapons to you. The Hyde Park arrangement involved no loans, no gifts, no charity—nothing but plain business sense. And we in Canada cannot see why a business arrangement which produced such good results for both countries in war should not produce equally good results in providing security against war.

In maintaining an effective security system there is this kind of a problem the North Atlantic nations are apt to have to face in the next few years:

The more effective the North Atlantic Treaty proves to be in pushing back the menace of aggression, the more difficult it will be to ensure that the people of the free nations will remain willing to pay the insurance premiums necessary for their security.

We shall probably hear, in all the North Atlantic countries, a good deal of grumbling, and perhaps some invidious comparisons about the share of the burden each nation is ready to bear.

I hope none of us is going to be too much worried by such grumbling or even by invidious comparisons. Free debate, after all, is the privilege of free peoples.

By contrast, the unhappy people of Poland, of Czechoslovakia, of Hungary and of Russia, are not permitted even to grumble out loud about having to bear a heavy share of the upkeep of the iron curtain.

To maintain the security of the North Atlantic community, each nation must clearly make the kind of contribution it is best fitted to make by history, by geography, by aptitude, and by resources.

Since economic strength is the essential foundation of genuine military strength, it follows that one of the main objectives of the North Atlantic nations is to keep their economies strong so that they can make their contributions toward maintaining the peace without impairing their ultimate staying power.

I think we all hope and believe that can be done and that international security need not mean any reduction in the economic efficiency of this continent nor even in the North American standard of living.

There has been such a great increase in our productivity on this continent that our material standard of living has continued to rise despite all we have thus far expended on defense or contributed to European recovery.

The massive assistance of the Marshall plan to the economic recovery of Europe has been quite as important a contribution to our common security as the North Atlantic Treaty itself.

And we can understand the emphasis your public men are laying on the importance of removing barriers to the trade of our European allies with each other.

But I do not think we can afford to lose sight of the fact that is even more important to the economic strength of the free world that the European countries and, indeed, all countries suffering from a dollar shortage, should also be able to export as freely as possible to North American markets.

It is, after all, only by accepting imports from other continents that we in North America can hope to reduce the real cost to ourselves of our contribution to the common security of the free world.

And it is only by accepting imports that we can hope to provide stable and profitable markets outside our continent for those agricultural and other surpluses beyond our own needs which both our countries do actually produce.

Canada, in this matter also, is in a somewhat different position than the United States. Though we still export rather more than we import, our over-all exports and imports are not too far from a balance. But,

as I have already said, we in Canada import from the United States far more than we export to this country, and we export to Europe far more than we import from Europe.

That is why Canada, too, has a dollar problem.

We, therefore, have a special interest in freer multilateral trade, and though I am not an economist, that seems to me to mean freer entry to this country both for European exports and for our own.

I would not venture to advocate the reduction of tariff and other trade barriers as any special favor to us. But it does seem to me that such a policy might make a tremendous contribution to the security of the free world generally and the United States in particular.

A century ago England found herself in much the same position the United States has today. England was then the greatest industrial nation, the wealthiest nation, and, therefore, the greatest potential market.

She opened that great market freely to the world and, whether as a result or merely as a coincidence, the world, herself included, enjoyed more than half a century of comparative peace and economic progress.

Might it be possible that history has there a lesson for this continent and this country at the midpoint of the twentieth century?

Be that as it may, in closing—and I must close, because I have already spoken longer than Lord Dunedin would have felt proper—I wish to express sincere and unqualified admiration for the generous and effective leadership given by the United States, its Government and its people, since the end of the war in the great task of rebuilding the economies of the free nations and the morale and confidence of their populations.

May I couple with that tribute the hope that the citizens of this great country, in their mental appraisals of the needs, the capabilities, and the actual contributions of their associates in the North Atlantic Security Pact, will be as understanding about others, and as deeply conscious of their own incomparable position, as they have proved themselves to be in the fact of the tremendous material ruins which had to be, and which to such a large extent, through their understanding and assistance, have been restored.

An American Citizen's Rights and Responsibilities Under the Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, in connection with their Americanization program each year the American Legion of Marion County, W. Va., sponsors an oratorical contest on some phase of the Constitution. This year the subject of the prepared oration was An American Citizen's Rights and Responsibilities Under the Constitution. Pupils of nine junior high schools in Marion County participated. Miss Patricia Woodruff, ninth-grade pupil of the Miller Junior High School of Fairmont, W. Va., was the successful contestant.

Since it appears that many are drifting into a way of life contrary to those principles set forth in our Constitution, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include this oration, with the hope that those adults whose thinking has become cluttered with the many "isms," foreign to our principles of American freedom, may profit by knowing how some of our younger set think about this cornerstone of our American liberties.

AN AMERICAN CITIZEN'S RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES UNDER THE CONSTITUTION

(By Patricia Woodruff)

We do not receive privileges under the Constitution because a privilege is a favor granted to an individual. But we are the possessors of rights, those actions which are justified not only in the Constitution but in the eyes of God and man.

Likewise we are not forced to perform duties because a duty is something which must be done as a result of the pressure of society. We are responsible, however, for doing those things which give meaning and protection to our rights in a free and democratic society.

We American citizens have been endowed with our rights in many ways and over a long period of time. The major ones have been received from God, the others from man-made governments, the national, the State, and the local.

Each is sovereign in some powers without which we would cease to be contributing individuals. All are necessary if we are to fulfill the purpose of our existence, to make the world a better place in which to live.

Our personal rights make it possible for us to develop our talents to the fullest, limited only by our wishes and our desires. Consequently, the citizens of other countries have not been and cannot be as progressive, as well informed, and the possessors of such a high standard of living as we.

Very early the Magna Carta set up some principles of freedom of the individual and his right to property and justice. The English Bill of Rights guaranteed personal freedom and extended the control of Parliament by the will of the people. The Declaration of Independence states that man is endowed by his Creator with the inalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Inasmuch as it covered only one phase of government, each of these documents was imperfect. However, each fulfilled some need prominent at the time and all have stood the test of time.

The writers of the Constitution realized that each of these contained fundamental rights. Therefore much of the same theory and many similar ideas are incorporated in this great document.

Although the Constitution was patterned after these earlier attempts at governmental structure, the basic principles had never before been tried successfully.

If we are to retain these republican rights, we must think of our Constitution as a living organ—living because, through amendment and appropriate legislation, it is as applicable today as when drawn up, 161 years ago.

As our social, economical, and political philosophy has changed, so, in pace, has this document. Certain rights not definitely stated in the Constitution have evolved from those clauses which imply that individuals have the following rights:

We are entitled to work in any locality of our choice, contract our affairs, start and manage any enterprise, invest in a profit-and-loss system, and buy and sell on a free market. These are but a few of the individual rights which benefit our personal success and development. We may establish our reputation, choose our jobs, join organizations, promote causes or campaigns, or in any other ways enjoy the life of one unhindered by political persecution or the wishes of our Government officials.

The Constitutional Convention was marked by many disputes over the drafting of the actual plan of government, but all agreed that there were certain laws governing personal actions which must exist to support a democracy. It is these fundamental liberties which we must keep alive. This can be done only so long as we do not abridge the rights of others because a right is valuable to us to the extent that we work to retain it for others, as well as for ourselves.

There can be no freedom without self-restraints. When we advocate the seizure of another's property by the Government or endanger it ourselves, we threaten our own freedom. If we admit that our neighbor's property rights may be questioned, we threaten our own because we are equal in the sight of the law.

Freedom of religion would be of little importance to us if we did not worship in some manner. If it were taken away, we would demand it. Because we may exercise this right, we must respect and sympathize with other's viewpoints; we must be tolerant even though we have no convictions of our own.

Protection is provided for us by the maintenance of a militia. However, there is no excuse for us to depend on this institution except in cases of emergency.

Too, we are entitled to a trial by jury. Therefore, we should help to supply one for another either by consenting to serve as jurists or witnesses ourselves. Few of us realize how futile we would feel if we were to be on trial for some reason and none of our neighbors would come to our aid.

Undeniably we have the right to speak our minds and write what we believe. But let us be sure we know what we are writing or talking about. Let us be sure we know the good as well as the evil about controversial subjects so that we will not spread false propaganda or reflect upon our Government.

Assembly is necessary at times, as we are doing today. If we are to retain this freedom, we must conduct ourselves in such a way that we do not encourage mobbing.

A redress of grievances is essential to our personal satisfaction, but this does not justify our making unreasonable demands.

We all realize the need of an intelligent and well-informed electorate. Therefore one of our greatest responsibilities is to develop the faculties of our minds, bodies, and spirits. Since there is no royal road to learning, we must make the most of opportunities to acquire the knowledge necessary to conduct us through life. Only through study, appreciation, and application can we preserve the Constitution, a living organ, for our posterity.

In closing, I would like to say that it does not seem, in daily life, that these rights are so severely challenged, but even in the smallest negligence or abuse of our responsibilities we weaken this heritage which is to pass on to our children. We must leave the Constitution stronger and more effective than we found it.

I thank you.

The People Are Recapturing the Republican Party From Its Present Bondage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, for over 18 long years the groping in the dark Republican Party has been na-

tionally under the domination and control of gigantic selfishness and greed.

It is very encouraging indeed to see State by State break the tramp hitch of these men and interests and bring back the discredited remains of the once-great Republican Party to the control of the people, as Abraham Lincoln so wisely intended.

Through lawless and unholy lobbies and by acquisition of daily and weekly newspapers and otherwise, a tremendous effort has been made to bring this Nation under the thought control of this shameless group, but it now looks as if the political sins of these un-American men and interests are slowly but surely losing them all of the ground they have gained. Their lobbyists have fled from the Capitol and their newspapers which served exclusively the limousine trade are going broke, and well-heeled but bad-meaning Republican bosses and politicians are biting the political dust. In surprising order New York, Pennsylvania, and Oregon have given reactionary republicanism a hearty political boot by electing liberals to take the places fondly coveted by blue-nosed conservatives.

The spreaders of the doctrines of divisionism and doubt have failed to fool the American people any longer.

An editorial in the Farm-Labor Press, of Council Bluffs, Iowa, published by George Woodward, Sr., had this to say in part about the reactionary Republican propaganda which for a long time has been spread journalistically:

We perhaps don't often find much to agree with in the daily newspapers but when a columnist whose writings are syndicated nationally through some dailies, recently lumped certain characters together and charged them with following the Commie line and giving outright aid and comfort to bloody Joe Stalin, he was on the right track.

Of course, the modern day Czar of all the Russias and some hapless other countries who used to be independent as well, dearly loves to see men practice the divisionist and doubt program in any country. In fact, that's how Stalin likes to operate. Get a people to doubt their government, get them to doubting each other and before long you have a condition that's ripe and ready for the Kremlin. "Bunk?" It works that way. Just take a look at eastern Europe today.

In another Farm-Labor Press column today, that of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the opinion is advanced that this great Nation of ours will never be defeated from without, if we ever go down to defeat it will be from internal causes and one can agree with this too. Certainly, the wild accusations, half-truths, untruths, and smears, being tossed around today, do little for internal or external security.

To further show what is taking place in Republican Nebraska, I wish to quote the following from the Omaha Evening World-Herald of Thursday, May 18, 1950, which discloses that liberal Republicans in Nebraska are also revolting against the men now in control whose thinkings and doings have not kept pace with political progress, or the governmental needs of the people:

GOP Is Back to the People—Adams Sees Lesson in Pennsylvania Vote

Tuesday's Republican primary elections in Pennsylvania may have their impact on the Nebraska Republican Party.

At least this is the opinion of Ernest A. Adams, county treasurer and delegate to the last National Republican Convention.

"After many years of old-guard control the Republican Party is at last being returned to the people," Mr. Adams asserted.

Tuesday the Grundy machine was beaten in Pennsylvania with the Republican nomination of Governor James H. Duff for the Senate and John S. Fine for Governor.

Just a little more than a year ago Mr. Adams stirred quite a rumpus in Nebraska Republican ranks with his charges against the old guard. His Wednesday remarks are a renewal of his campaign for a broader base of leadership in the party.

"May Realize

"The Old Guard has hypnotized the rank and file quite a few years," Mr. Adams said. "The Pennsylvania elections now more or less dispel this.

"The Old Guard has been in control in Nebraska for a number of years. Now the Old Guard may begin to realize it is to their advantage to have all Republicans working in behalf of their party."

Asked to define the Old Guard in the Nebraska party, Mr. Adams said: "They are just a half dozen people or so—everyone knows them—who have been stifling the rest of the party. They have been in control for years."

May Affect Convention

On the national level, he said, they are the Carroll Reeses, the Harrison Spanglers (former national chairmen), and Joe Grundys "who have their disciples at local levels."

The impact of Governor Duff's victories in Pennsylvania may be first felt in Nebraska in the prep-primary convention, Mr. Adams said.

He described the preprimary as "the vehicle of the Old Guard." In the past the word was passed around on what candidates should be favored and that was it, Mr. Adams said.

At this year's preprimary, Mr. Adams said, he looks for more independent thinking from delegates.

A. V. Shotwell, Nebraska's national committeeman, was out of the city until Monday and not available for comment.

Centennial Celebration at Seymour, Conn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 1950

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, on June 23, 24, and 25 of this year the town of Seymour, Conn., will celebrate its centennial year.

A community of fine people who have been an integral part of Connecticut's progress, Seymour will leave no stone unturned in the gala affair marking its one hundredth birthday.

The celebration begins on June 22 when Seymour High School graduates speak on topics relating to the growth of the town. On June 23 a block dance will be held, followed by a parade on June 24. Leland Stowe, well-known author and Seymour native, will be the speaker at ceremonies following the parade. In line with the traditions of this wonderful community, special religious observances will be held on Sunday, June 25, with a pageant and tree planting to follow.

This community, which has grown from a population of slightly more than 1,000 to 7,000 over the years, is typical of the finest in New England tradition. May Seymour continue to grow and prosper for many years to come.

As a portion of my remarks, I include a condensed history of Seymour compiled by Katharine Matthies and Mary L. Edwards:

History of Seymour

(By Katharine Matthies and Mary L. Edwards)

Ebenezer Johnson of Derby was the first white man to own land in Seymour when in 1678 he purchased the land near Rock Rimmon from the Pequot Indians. Others, among them being David Wooster, Jeremiah Johnson, and Samuel Riggs, soon followed him. Their relations with the Indians were friendly, which is greatly to the credit of those early settlers. The deeds relating to the purchase of land from the Indians are recorded in Derby.

In 1738 this settlement became known as Chusetown from the Pequot Indian, Joseph Mauwehu, who received the name Chuse from his pronounciation of the word "choose." He owned much land near the falls which he eventually sold to the white men.

The first houses were really little more than huts and the settlers had to make absolutely everything they needed in the way of building materials, tools, and clothing. Their food was raised on their own land. The first grist mill built on Little River in 1747 by George Abbott was followed by one erected there in 1760 by James Pritchard.

In 1804 the name was changed from Chusetown to Humphreysville after General David Humphreys who established the first paper mill in 1805, and a woolen mill in 1806, at the falls of the Naugatuck. It is unfortunate that the old woolen mill is not standing today for it would have been a landmark of great historical interest.

David Humphreys was born in the section of Derby, now Ansonia, in 1752. His father, Rev. Daniel Humphreys, was pastor of the Established Church in Derby for over 50 years. David Humphreys graduated from Yale University in 1771 after which he was principal of the Wethersfield Academy, until he entered the Army in 1778 where he received many promotions and became aide-de-camp, first to Gen. Israel Putnam, and then to General Washington. Washington gave Humphreys the honor of receiving the colors surrendered by Cornwallis at Yorktown and of presenting them to Congress in the name of the Commander in Chief, which he did in Philadelphia on November 3, 1781. Humphreys was met by a troop of horsemen and paraded to the State House where he presented a letter from Washington which read in part: "I have committed them (the flags) to the care of one of my aides, whom for his fidelity and good services I beg leave to recommend to Congress and Your Excellency." This letter was referred to a special committee, which on November 7 voted, "That an elegant sword be presented in the name of the United States in Congress assembled to Colonel Humphreys."

After the close of the Revolution, Humphreys was an intimate member of Washington's family at Mount Vernon and acted as a secretary and major-domo. Humphreys was sent as Minister to Spain in 1797 and returned in 1802 with the first merino sheep to be introduced into this country. These he sold for prices ranging from one hundred to three thousand dollars for a single ram or sheep. He procured a charter and was the first manufacturer of broadcloths in the United States, and Thomas Jefferson, when inaugurated President, was clad in garments the cloth of which was made in Seymour.

Besides being a soldier, diplomat, and manufacturer Humphreys was a poet and belonged to the Hartford Wits. He died in 1818 and was buried in New Haven.

Seymour was incorporated as a town in 1850 by the general assembly, the name being chosen in honor of Thomas H. Seymour, then Governor of Connecticut. The population was 1,677. The first town meeting was held on June 24 of that year, at which time Seymour was the one hundred and forty-eighth town to be recognized in Connecticut and entitled to a representative in the general assembly. Today Seymour has two representatives and a population of about 7,000.

The first school in town was the Great Hill School established in 1843 and followed by other one-room schools all of which are now gone. The Humphreysville Academy was established in 1849 and offered the first opportunity for higher education. Center School came into being in 1884 and was followed in 1914 by the Maple Street School and in 1920 by the high school on Pine Street. The Ridgeley C. Clark auditorium was added to the high school in 1936.

The early inhabitants went to Derby to church until 1769 when 26 persons signed the certificate organizing the First Congregational Church in Seymour, and erected a meeting-house where the present Methodist Episcopal Church is located. Other churches soon followed as accounts given elsewhere in this book show.

The first library in Seymour appears to have been that of the Village Church of the Congregational Society in 1817, followed by two other short-lived libraries. It was in 1892 that the Seymour Free Public Library was established in the old town-hall building on Second Street. It remained there until 1916 when it was moved to its present building on Broad Street. This library was the gift of Henry P. and Edmund Day and endowed by C. B. Wooster.

The wooden covered bridge on Bank Street was built in 1856–57 and was followed by the iron bridge at Broad Street in 1883. The latter bridge is still in use but the covered bridge gave way to progress in 1936 when the new concrete bridge was built.

The first railroad from Bridgeport to Seymour was opened in 1849, and the present railroad station was built in 1898. The electric road, or trolley, began operation in 1901 from Ansonia to Seymour and later was extended to Waterbury. The last trolley went through Seymour on June 19, 1937.

The present Whittenmore Tavern on South Main Street occupies the same building as the tavern of the same name prominent in the days of the American Revolution. Various other taverns have come and gone through the years. One still in existence is the present Dutch Door Inn on Broad Street which opened as the Seymour House in 1824. Here the horses were changed on the stage coaches running from New Haven to Albany.

Most of the old houses are so changed as to be almost unrecognizable, but the Ann Stephens birthplace on West Street still looks much the same, as does the Judge John Humphrey house on the corner of West and West Church Streets. In this house about 1790 lived Samuel Sanford, the first physician in Seymour. The Beach Parsonage on the corner of Pearl and Elm Streets was the home of Rev. Benjamin Beach, the first Congregational minister. Diagonally across Pearl Street is the Deacon E. A. Lum house with a large chimney and an old ballroom.

Seymour had three newspapers, the Independent of 1855, the Times, 1885 to 1888, and the Record, established by W. C. Sharpe in 1871. Mr. Sharpe published the Record as a weekly for over 50 years until his death and Mr. Baker continued its publication until about 1945.

The first town court was established by the legislature in 1925 with Harry F. Mannweiler as the first judge.

A perusal of this book tells the story of Seymour's development as an industrial town giving employment to hundreds of its citizens.

To name the prominent citizens, past and present, of Seymour would take many pages and the writers deem it inadvisable to mention even a few. Suffice it to say that from its earliest days Seymour had its share of noted men and women who met the needs of their times and did their part in the development of the town and the Nation.

Seymour men in large numbers participated in all the wars in which the United States was engaged from the French and Indian Wars to the Second World War. It is impossible to tell of their deeds in this limited space but the town owes a deep debt of gratitude to them.

The Seymour Red Cross did outstanding work during the two World Wars and now as a branch of the Ansonia Chapter provides life-saving training at the Legion pool and first-aid training in the factories. The Junior Red Cross is active in the schools.

The Seymour Public Health Association, established in 1919 with one nurse, now has one part-time and two full-time nurses with headquarters in the town hall, Seymour is a healthier town because of this organization, which provides TB X-rays in the high school each year and in 1949 held a TB X-ray program for all townspeople, among its many activities. The Shady Knoll Convalescent Home was established in the old Gilyard Home on Skokorat Road on January 1, 1948. It can take care of 17 people at one time and usually is filled to capacity.

In 1900 Mr. Carlos French gave the town a part of 14 acres which has been used as an athletic field; for Memorial Day exercises and other festivities. It was dedicated as the Carlos French Memorial Park on October 5, 1935.

Seymour's first post World War II housing project was begun in the fall of 1949 at Smith Acres on Walnut Street. A second project off Emma Street is under development at the present time.

Seymour today is an active, growing community with good homes, good roads, and good schools. Its fire and police departments are excellent as evidenced by the lack of bad fires or serious crimes. The recently purchased town ambulance has proved invaluable. The playground on Broad Street, equipped in 1949, is a definite factor in providing healthful recreation and in keeping the boys and girls off the streets.

And so with these few, brief high lights this chronicle must come to a close, Seymour's record is one of which to be proud. May the achievements of the past be a guide and an inspiration to growth and development in the future.

Compulsory Health Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. DURHAM
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 24, 1950

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit herewith a resolution against compulsory health insurance unanimously adopted by the Andrew Jackson Unit, No. 87, of the American Legion Auxiliary, in High Point, N. C., on May 11, 1950:

RESOLUTION REGARDING COMPULSORY HEALTH INSURANCE

Whereas the American veteran in two World Wars has defended the American free-enterprise system, which has made possible the development in this country of the highest standards of medical care and the finest medical institutions attained by any major country in the world; and

Whereas having experienced the shortcomings of assembly-line medical care typified in the form of Government-controlled medicine necessary in time of war, the veteran understands the dangers of imposing such a system permanently on the entire population; and

Whereas compulsory health insurance would impose a new payroll tax on the veteran, reducing further his take-home pay and creating new financial burdens which would increase the cost of necessities of life and thus lower the standard of living for veterans and other citizens; and

Whereas compulsion in the guise of social benefits or advancement is repugnant to the American way of life and contrary to our precepts of liberty and freedom for which veterans of two recent wars have fought and died: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Andrew Jackson Unit of the American Legion Auxiliary, High Point, N. C., does hereby go on record opposing any form of compulsory health insurance or any system of political medicine designed for national bureaucratic control; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to each Senator from the State of North Carolina, and the Representative from this district, and that said Senators and Representative be and are hereby respectfully requested to use every effort at their command to prevent the enactment of such legislation.

Socialized Medicine's Ills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 24, 1950

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Christian Science Monitor of May 22, 1950:

SOCIALIZED MEDICINE'S ILLS

The increase in reported sickness during Great Britain's first full year of socialized medicine has its significance for the United States. Much of the British program is embraced in the proposal of Government medical care insurance which the Truman administration is promoting. This part of British experience with the system will hardly recommend it to Americans.

Sickness among adult Britons rose 8 percent and workdays lost through illness 22 percent, according to a Government-sponsored survey. The increase occurred for the most part among women. The workdays lost by young women climbed 32 percent and by elderly women 41 percent, while the workdays lost by men went up 8 to 9 percent. Officials credit the growth of reported illness mainly to economic reasons—people now getting medical service who previously could not afford it.

But there are additional reasons. In the experience of European countries with compulsory sickness insurance it has long been observed that when workers are taxed for medical care they often claim it unnecessarily. That is the only way that many figure they can get something back for their money. The situation encourages a flood of patients with minor illnesses for which they would not ordinarily seek medical attention. Some doctors are consequently overworked to the point of hasty, careless diagnosis and treatment.

It is also a standard part of the Government insurance system to give weekly cash payments to claimants. The chance to stay at home and live for a while with the aid of state funds frequently militates against a speedy return to work. In many instances the cash benefits delay recovery.

The more workdays lost through illness the smaller the production and the lower the general standard of living.

These and other disadvantages of a national system of government insurance for medical care are getting no publicity from the Truman administration. British experience, however, is bringing out some of the missing facts.

National Poppy Day, May 27, 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 24, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I am including part of an article on Poppy Day written by Mrs. Howard Simmons of Providence, R. I., national poppy chairman of the American Legion Auxiliary, which appears in the May issue of National News, official publication of the American Legion Auxiliary. The article is a timely one in view of the fact that next Saturday is officially Poppy Day. It is hard to believe, Mr. Speaker, that more than 700,000 children, this past year, have received the benefits from this great program and all are children of veterans. I would also call attention, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that the poppies are made by the veterans in the hospitals.

Many years have passed since that First World War spring of 1915 when soldiers' eyes were gladdened by the sight of bright red blossoms breaking out all over the countryside.

These were the hardy poppies springing up to cover hastily dug graves with a blanket of beauty. Each spring for four long, weary years the poppies returned to brighten the dreary western front and to perpetuate their pledge that freedom should never die. Before the war's end, they even covered the grave of Lt. Col. John McCrae, whose poem In Flanders Fields had made them famous.

To the men who returned from the battlefields of France, the poppy had become a symbol of their comrades' sacrifice and they loved its bright red petals.

Each year, as the miracle of spring unfolds, the members of the American Legion Auxiliary prepare for Poppy Day—the day of remembrance. Each little flower worn on Poppy Day will show that an American is thinking and giving for the welfare of men in hospitals and the women and children in fatherless homes—those for whom the war has never ended.

Heads bowed in prayer for God and country are not enough encouragement for disabled veterans. They must never doubt that a grateful America remembers their sacrifices and heartaches. The poppy industry is the backbone of our rehabilitation program, and each year more and more veterans are turning to the American Legion Auxiliary for help and encouragement.

The number of disabled veterans has increased steadily since the end of World War II, as the results of war service have made their effects felt. During the past year more than 400,000 veterans required hospital treatment. Many of these men have become disabled after discharge from service and have been unable to prove service connection for their disabilities and receive no compensation. A majority of these veterans have wives and children who must share the hardships that exist when there is a disabled husband or father.

During the past year more than 700,000 children of veterans were aided by the American Legion and Auxiliary.

President Harry S. Truman received his poppy from the hands of the Auxiliary's national president, Mrs. Norman L. Sheehe, who pinned the poppy on his lapel in ceremonies at the White House. The President's poppy was the first of the 35,000,000 little crepe paper memorial flowers which the Auxiliary will distribute to be worn in honor of the Nation's war dead on Poppy Day.

Honor for the war dead—aid for the disabled and for needy children—these are the purposes of the poppy.

Generoso Pope, Benefactor of Humanity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. HART
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 24, 1950

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, several days ago there passed away a great American. Mr. Generoso Pope was born in Italy and came to this country as a boy. By diligence, ability, and character he made himself one of the most influential citizens of his day and generation. Because of the greatness of his heart and his love for the people among whom he was born, he will be mourned by countless thousands of his fellow citizens. In extending my remarks, I submit herewith an editorial from the Rubicon, which appeared in its May 1950 number:

Generoso Pope died the morning that this paper went to the printer and he is given the place of honor because he was a benefactor of humanity, not because he was a titan or a captain of industry or an example of the Horatio Alger idea.

Many other immigrants came here from Italy and made fortunes, some of them even greater than that which Generoso Pope amassed during the 59 years of his life, less than 50 of which were spent in this country.

Many other immigrants were as well known in this country as he was. But there were few of them who took the time to interest themselves in the plight of their fellow men.

There are many Americans of Italian origin who have made more money than they could ever use, or that their families could ever use. Nay, if we have the kind of changes which even the welfare state would make in our lives, some of the fortunes which have been thus made may be taxed away.

It would have been better if those pioneers or titans had cast some bread upon the waters during their lives, and used some of their time to help their fellow men by good works, by friendly interest, by espousing good causes.

Some of us had our political differences with Generoso Pope and we did not pull our punches when we disagreed with him. But when we were called to cooperate with him in his philanthropical interests, or when we proposed ideas along those lines, we found that he had a heart that was above the usual desire to obtain reclame in the press or over the air.

We knew Generoso Pope much better than many of his friends did. Indeed, many of his philanthropical projects were aided and encouraged by us. Only last year we had begun to discuss projects by which the Italian community in New York would have had a real Italian educational and social center, an Italian wing in one of the large city hospitals, and similar activities.

But the inexorable Hand took him away.

It is hoped that his widow, Mrs. Catherine Pope, and his three sons, Fortune, Anthony, and Gene, Jr., will carry on where Generoso Pope left off. We trust that they will be guided by his ideals, which were far above his business interests, in shaping the future of those enterprises which he founded and directed. (L. C.)

Aid to Chinese Students

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 24, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, support for the provision in the ECA bill relating to Chinese students comes from the China Institute in America with headquarters in New York City. The officers of the institute include the Honorable Henry R. Stimson and Chang Poling, honorary presidents, and Henry R. Luce, president; and among its trustees are Frank Altschul, Edwin N. Clark, Stephen Duggan, Dr. Raymond B. Fosdick, Mrs. Charles Merz, Thomas J. Watson, Jr., and other distinguished citizens. This organization is incorporated under the University of the State of New York. The resolution adopted by the institute follows:

Whereas the traditional policy of the United States Government has been to encourage Chinese students, trainees, and scholars to come to the United States and to foster educational relations for the mutual benefit of both the American and Chinese peoples;

Whereas at the present time there are about 5,000 Chinese students, trainees, and scholars in the United States;

Whereas nearly one-half of the Chinese students and all trainees and scholars are not eligible for aid under the present Chinese emergency-aid program administered by the Department of State;

Whereas the funds available at present are estimated to be only one-third of the total need;

Whereas these Chinese nationals constitute the greatest potential resource for Chinese-American understanding and cooperation;

Whereas the continued study, training, research, and teaching of Chinese students, trainees, and scholars under democratic auspices is the best way to insure maximum contribution to Chinese-American friendship: Therefore be it

Resolved, That China Institute in America, motivated by a desire to strengthen the democratic forces and to develop cultural relations among the peoples of the world, strongly urge and recommend that Congress appropriate $20,000,000 out of the unexpended China ECA funds to remain available until expended to finance a program of educational and cultural cooperation between the United States and China; and be it further

Resolved, That this program should provide for help to Chinese students now so that this education, grounded in American democratic principles, may aid the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That the institute, as a specialized private agency of nearly a quarter of a century of standing and experience, chartered as an educational corporation under the laws of the University of the State of New York, hereby offers its services to the United States of America to assist, as provided in section 103B of the proposed bill, H. R. 7797 (81st Cong.), in the administration of the funds under the direction of the Secretary of State; and be it further

Resolved, That the officers and trustees of the institute transmit this resolution to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State and the appropriate congressional committees and delegations, and to send copies of this resolution to interested national and local agencies and colleges and universities.

Fate of Some of the Reorganization Plans of the Hoover Commission Submitted to Congress by President Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 24, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that so many people have written to me inquiring about what has happened to the reorganization plans submitted by President Truman to the Congress, I take this opportunity to supplement my letters to them by giving them the following information:

Sixteen of the twenty-one reorganization plans which President Truman submitted to Congress 2 months ago become effective Wednesday.

The other five were vetoed by the Senate and do not go into operation.

The plans rejected were:

No. 1, transferring the duties of the Comptroller of the Currency to the Treasury Department;

No. 4, reorganizing the Department of Agriculture;

No. 7, transferring control of the Interstate Commerce Commission to its Chairman;

No. 11, transferring control of the Federal Communications Commission to its Chairman;

No. 12, abolishing the office of independent General Counsel for the NLRB.

The plans which become effective are:

No. 2, Department of Justice;

No. 3, Department of Interior;

No. 5, Department of Commerce;

No. 6, Department of Labor;

No. 8, Federal Trade Commission;

No. 9, Federal Power Commission;

No. 10, Securities and Exchange Commission;

No. 13, Civil Aeronautics Board;

No. 14, transferring labor standards functions to the Labor Department;

No. 15, transferring Alaskan and Virgin Islands public works to the Interior Department;

No. 16, transferring school district and water pollution control to Federal Security Agency;

No. 17, transferring public works advance planning to Housing and Home Finance Administration;

No. 18, transferring building and space management to General Services Administration;

No. 19, transferring employees' compensation functions to the Labor Department;

No. 20, transferring certain record-keeping functions from the State Department to the General Services Administration;

No. 21, transferring Maritime Commission functions to the Department of Commerce.

The recent speech of ex-President Herbert Hoover to the Sales Executives Club in New York City had the effect, I believe, of saving some of these plans from being rejected.

It is hard for me to understand why there would be much opposition to many of them becoming law. They were prepared by a task force of capable persons, at great expense to our Government, and approved by an ex-President and a President, all of whom with sincerity of heart and purpose tried to do a needed task for their country.

I wish to set forth now an editorial appearing in the Lincoln Star, of Lincoln, Nebr., on Saturday, May 20, 1950, which explains perhaps the sources of some of the opposition to certain of these reorganization plans.

MR. HOOVER LOSING PATIENCE

Herbert Hoover said the other day he was near the limit of his tolerance toward vested officials and pressure groups that threaten so many of his recommendations for streamlining the Government's business. He hasn't named names so far, except in a negative way, reminding the public that pressure groups always proclaim their glad support of reforms that affect them, while fighting them from the rear. When or if the full story is told, the people might shed some of their complacence, which has led too many to believe that plans as practical as Mr. Hoover's will just naturally be put into effect.

They won't. Not without public pressure—for which most States, including Nebraska, have voluntary citizen groups at work—and the publicizing of hostile interests that is need to spur the efforts of these.

A day is approaching on which Mr. Hoover might see fit to ask for a show-down. It is May 24, on which the 21 recommendations submitted by the President to Congress 2 months ago will take effect unless thrown out in the meantime. Last year Mr. Truman obtained approval of six of the seven plans he submitted, the seventh proposing to set up a welfare department to unify the health, education and public welfare programs now handled by the Federal Security Agency.

Opposition to quite a few of the 21 is building up inside and outside Congress. Unless taxpayers are sufficiently aroused by the burden of excessive Government costs and remediable extravagance and inefficiency they are carrying, the pressure groups will have things their own way. The outset of political campaigns makes this an ideal time for naming names.

Plywood Tariff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 24, 1950

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, our American State Department, which already has given over to the Russians a large slice of the domestic markets for American crab meat, now seems about ready to sacrifice the Douglas fir plywood industry of the Pacific Northwest to Canada and Mexico.

I say this because Secretary Dean Acheson of the State Department recently has announced that our State Department in September at Liverpool will enter into discussions to consider reducing or removing the present tariff rate of 40 percent ad valorem on imports of plywood.

If this plywood tariff is reduced, the United States will be flooded with Canadian and Mexican plywood, with the result that many of our western plywood workers and loggers, who supply the mills with logs, may lose their jobs when the present exceedingly heavy demand for plywood declines.

There are, at the present time, 56 plywood plants in the three Pacific coast States; 29 of them in Washington, 22 in Oregon and 5 in California. These plants employ 18,500 workers and have payrolls of $66,000,000 annually.

Of these 56 plywood plants, 42 are located in small towns where curtailment of their production would seriously affect the entire economic life of the communities. This is too large and too important an industry, affecting the lives of too many people and too many communities, to be sacrificed on the altar of so-called reciprocal trade.

DIFFERENCE IN WAGES

The plywood industry of Oregon, Washington, and California pays an average hourly wage of $1.72½ to its employees compared to a wage average of only $1.22 an hour in Canada. Then, too, the Canadian wages are paid in Canadian dollars which have been depreciated 10 percent. This means that the Canadian plywood worker in terms of American dollars, received a wage of only $1.10 an

hour compared to the American wage of $1.72½. In short, the average pay of American plywood workers is $69 for a 40-hour week compared, if figured in American dollars, to $44.40 paid Canadian plywood workers. This wage differential gives the Canadian plywood industry a big advantage over United States operators and unless this differential is compensated for by a tariff, it stands to reason that Canadian plywood can undersell the similar American product and capture a sizable part of the American market.

Nor is the wage rate the Canadian plywood producers' only advantage. He buys his logs 40 percent cheaper than American mills.

JAPANESE PLYWOOD

If the tariffs on plywood are reduced to permit and encourage more foreign plywood to come into the United States, Japan, also, in time, may be among the nations that will invade our markets.

Japan has upon her own and neighboring islands vast forests. In 1938, she was producing 1,100,000,000 square feet of plywood or almost one-half as much as the United States. In 1939, she exported almost one-third of her production.

In 1949, last year, wages in the Japanese wood production industries was 223.7 to 256.8 yens a day, which in United States dollars means 61 to 81 cents a day. In short, a Japanese woodworker had to labor 2 days to make as much as American workers are paid for 1 hour's work.

Surely, American plywood workers cannot and it should not be expected that they should compete with such wages.

We ought to go slow in overhauling tariffs when the reduction or removal may destroy the jobs and incomes of many thousands of our citizens.

Proposed Memorial at Arlington for Sir John Dill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 24, 1950

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks I am inserting in the RECORD an article by Walter Trohan which appeared in the Washington (D. C.) Times-Herald. This article discusses a proposal which I believe should receive the immediate attention of the Committee on Armed Services or some other appropriate committee of the House.

According to this article it is proposed that an acre of land at Arlington Cemetery be given over to a memorial for Sir John Dill, British field marshal. I do not question that he was a great soldier and that he served his country, and the common cause of freedom with great skill and extraordinary bravery.

But, Mr. Speaker, no such pretentious memorial as is being proposed for Sir John Dill has ever been erected for any one of our own country's great military leaders that are buried in the sacred soil of Arlington Cemetery. No such memorial as is proposed for this British soldier marks the honored grave of Gen. John Pershing who, as commander in chief of all the American forces in World War I held, I believe, the highest rank of any military leader in history. No such pretentious memorial stands over the last resting place of the distinguished Secretary of the Navy Frank Knox, who died while in the service of his country in the last war.

Mr. Speaker, the hallowed ground that is Arlington Cemetery is very limited. To allow an acre of this sacred soil set aside for our honored dead to be used for a memorial for a British Field Marshal seems to me to be beyond all reason. It is my understanding that an acre of land could serve as the last resting place for 300 American soldiers. With all honor to Sir John Dill, for whom the American people have the greatest respect and admiration, I believe that the American people would much prefer to have this land used to honor 300 American soldiers, with the simple markers at their graves, than it all being used for single memorial for a great British soldier. As a great military leader, I am sure that Sir John Dill himself would not wish what is being proposed for him.

I earnestly urge that this matter be looked into promptly by the proper committee before it is too late.

The article follows:

ONE-ACRE MEMORIAL TO BRITON IN ARLINGTON HIT BY VIRGINIA PAPER

(By Walter Trohan)

The Manassas (Va.) Journal yesterday called upon Congress to halt plans to erect a memorial over the grave of Sir John Dill, British field marshal, in Arlington Cemetery.

The Virginia newspaper protested against devoting an acre of the Nation's hallowed burial ground to the honoring of a foreign soldier. It urged that Congress by resolution direct the Army to disinter the remains of Dill and return his body to British soil.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars has been protesting for almost 3 years against the memorial, which the Manassas Journal charges was conceived by General Marshall, wartime Chief of Staff, and now head of the American Red Cross.

SPACE FOR 300 AMERICANS

The publication declared that Marshall browbeat the Army into violating the statutes by turning over an acre of the national cemetery to honor Dill. An acre of the cemetery would accommodate 300 American war dead.

Under Marshall's plan a $35,000 equestrian statue of the general would be raised above the grave. This would be financed by popular subscription by an organization known as the Field Marshal John Dill Memorial committee and the English Speaking Union, which worked to bring the United States into the war on Britain's side.

Marshall and Dill were both members of the highest rank in the exclusive British order of knighthood, the Order of the Bath. The grand cross of the order would make Marshall known as Sir George if he were a British citizen.

The Manassas Journal listed a roll of officers who were reversed by Marshall even after he became Secretary of State when they opposed features of the memorial plan. The paper published copies of documents signed by protesting high-ranking officers.

Marshall, who has a vast array of foreign decorations, is now pushing the Dill project. As head of the Red Cross Marshall gets $22,500 a year and he draws full pay and allowances of a five-star general of almost $20,000 a year for life. Marshall's predecessor, Basil O'Connor, would not accept pay for his services.

Dill, a former chief of the British imperial staff, was head of the British joint staff mission in the United States and was senior British officer on the combined chiefs of staff. Marshall was a member of the combined chiefs group.

CREATED FOR UNION DEAD

Dill died here in November 1944. He had served in the United States for 3 years. At his own request he was buried in Arlington. He is not the first foreign soldier to be buried in Arlington. Among the 71,000 graves—of which 13,000 have been added in the last 3 years—are a number of British, French, and Italian soldiers who died here during World War I. None have pretentious memorials.

The cemetery was created for Union war dead. A number of Confederate soldiers are buried in the area, however. A number of foreigners who served in the American Army were buried in Arlington. Most prominent of these is Pierre L'Enfant, the designer of the city of Washington, who fought in the Revolutionary War.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars has adopted a resolution condemning the Dill memorial on the ground that honors on such a scale are denied great and heroic American dead in the cemetery. Comparatively simple markers denote the graves of such outstanding Americans as General Pershing, General Sheridan, Justice Holmes, and William Howard Taft, President, and chief justice of the Supreme Court.

The Government provides a simple marker for all graves. However, shafts, statuary and tombs are permitted, when provided by private funds. The Dill statue, 20 percent larger than life size, would be the most elaborate and costly.

Newspaper Report on President Truman's Visit to Broken Bow, Nebr., on May 8, 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 24, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the Custer County, Nebr., Democratic Committee, the Broken Bow Chamber of Commerce, and the city of Broken Bow, through a three-fourths of a page newspaper advertisement in the Custer County Chief, invited thousands of residents in the area to meet with and listen to our President. West central Nebraska's hospitality was never better displayed.

The following individuals and organizations deserve the thanks of the community, and all of Nebraska too, for making the reception of President Truman at Broken Bow, Nebr., so completely successful: The Merna, Arnold, and Broken Bow Bands; the American Legion

Posts of Merna, Mason City, Arnold, Ansley, and Broken Bow; the VFW of Anselmo and Broken Bow; the Broken Bow VFW Auxiliary; R. G. Fox, county sheriff; Rae L. Simonson, in charge of parade; the Broken Bow City Police; the Nebraska Safety Patrol; Battery C, Five Hundred and Sixty-eighth Field Artillery Battalion, Nebraska National Guard; Broken Bow High School; and the Broken Bow Municipal Utilities.

The following news items appearing in the Custer County Chief, of Broken Bow, Nebr., give the reader an idea of how splendidly President Truman was greeted upon his visit there:

PROGRAM

7 p. m. (central standard time): Assembling, until 7:30 p. m., of bands at city square. Assembling of American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, veterans (in uniforms or caps) at east steps of the Custer County Courthouse.

7:30 to 8 p. m.: Parade from city square to Burlington depot with Broken Bow, Ansley, Merna, Arnold, Callaway, and Sargent bands and color guards from county veterans' organizations, plus uniformed veterans. Rae L. Simmons in charge of parade.

8 to 9:45 p. m.: Assembly of crowd at station. Diversion will be furnished by the playing of the bands alternately.

9:50 to 10 p. m.: Arrival of President Harry S. Truman's special train; release of restraining ropes and fence and overflowing of crowd onto tracks and area surrounding the station.

10 p. m.: Introduction of President Truman by Mayor Harry T. Massie, of Broken Bow. Talk by the President.

About 10:15 p. m.: Leaving of Presidential special.

FAIR WEATHER, GREETING CROWD READY FOR TRUMAN HERE TONIGHT—"HAPPY BIRTHDAY" BOUQUET WILL BE GIVEN HERE

Latest plan for the greeting of President Truman at Broken Bow tonight includes the presentation of a "happy birthday" bouquet to him. Crowds are estimated conservatively at 6,000, but, if the weather is right, they may grow to 10,000.

Arrangements for the greeting of the President and his party have been completed here by P. J. Kelly, chairman of the county Democratic committee, James R. Kelly, chairman of the county young Democratic committee, Mayor Harry T. Massie and L. J. Walker, Jr., secretary of the Broken Bow Chamber of Comerce.

Special protection and policing measures have been taken to assure a safe stay in Broken Bow for the President, Massie reported. The Nebraska Safety Patrol, Custer County sheriff's office, Broken Bow police, and the Custer County National Guard unit.

Massie stated:

"If the weather is fit, this will be a larger crowd than we're accustomed to handle, therefore, we are asking the safety patrol to assist in the direction of traffic, thus leaving Sheriff R. G. Fox and the city police under Chief Harry Brock available for control of the pedestrian traffic."

The National Guard unit, under the command of Capt. Harland C. Raymond, will control the crowd at the station, assisted by the local Boy Scouts, under their leaders, Lyle Van Wormer and Cloyd Cramer.

Secret Service men are in charge of the over-all arrangements.

Chief Brock suggested to the citizens of Broken Bow that it would be worth while for residents to lock their homes and business places and for visitors to lock their cars, because there are always some who follow these crowds with intentions of taking anything they can lay their hands on. He further suggested that the residents of the city leave their cars at home to leave enough parking space for visitors' cars on the city streets.

OVER 10,000 HEAR TRUMAN TALK ON FARM PROGRAM HERE MONDAY—REVIEWS STORY OF REA, OTHER RURAL IMPROVEMENTS

As President Truman walked out to the rear of the train in Broken Bow, he wore an expression of surprise to see such a large crowd. His first words verify this when he said, "Somebody told me that this great city of Broken Bow had 2,800 people in it. It looks to me as if there are 28,000 here tonight."

Reporters from the train estimated from 10,000 to 12,000, the largest crowd since leaving Lincoln.

"I grew up on a farm in Missouri," Truman said, "and know first-hand what it is like. Of course, I am not up to date on the subject. You see, I lived on the farm from 1905 until 1917."

"I used to milk cows by hand," he told a trackside audience. "I used to plow with a four-horse team instead of a tractor. I used to sow wheat with a drill that had only 12 holes on it, and I used to cut wheat on a binder that cut 8 feet wide."

He said he has two nephews on the same farm who get much more out of a farm than he did by using machinery. But, he said, "I don't think that those boys could follow me up a corn row to save their lives."

He said, "We have been doing a lot in recent years to make country life easier and happier. One of the most important things has been to bring electricity to the farms."

"Fifteen years ago, before we started the rural electrification program, only one out of every 10 farm families had electricity. Now 8 out of every 10 of the Nation's farms are electrified."

"I'm glad to see that Congress has now authorized loans to expand rural telephone facilities. That is another step forward."

"I regard Government expenditures for the improvement of rural life as an investment in the future of this great country. The next time," he said, "you hear somebody talk about high Government expenditures, remind him that when we spend money for raising the standard of living on the farm, we are contributing to a greater Nation. And that is the best way to preserve world peace."

"I am coming back now to talk to you and let you look at me and see if you think I have gone 'high hat' on you. I am still working for your welfare and benefit. I am your servant. That is the reason I am taking this trip across the country."

Truman ended his speech by saying he is our "public servant, hired by you in the election of 1948 and hopes most of the people in the United States will understand that I am only working in the public interest and for your benefit and for the peace of the world."

Mrs. Truman and Margaret were introduced by the President, which was followed by the crowd singing Happy Birthday. Truman waited for the bands to play one number and the family waved as the train pulled out.

HOMEY ATMOSPHERE PERVADES TRUMAN'S PRIVATE CAR

Entering the club car Monday evening, a Chief reporter was received by Mrs. Harry Truman and Margaret as if it were the living room of their Independence, Mo., home.

At the first glance plush red chairs could be seen arranged around the windows of the car with a large circular brown-topped table in the center. Blonde Margaret, attired in an attractive aqua-colored after-five dress, was standing at the back and behind the table. Mrs. Truman, wearing a simply styled print dress, stood at the side of the table at her daughter's right. Four men were spaced behind the two ladies, undoubtedly secret service agents and perhaps several were of the President's personal staff.

Mrs. Truman and Margaret were hospitable and gracious as they accepted corsages given by the town of Broken Bow, thanking everyone for a splendid reception. They asked if it had rained earlier in the evening, remarking about the downpour in Lincoln.

Mrs. Truman appeared weary, but said her trip had been very enjoyable up to now (Broken Bow.) Margaret seemed refreshed and appeared as if she were enjoying the trip tremendously. The manner of each was natural, unaffected, and homey. They were very relaxed.

As the train pulled out of the station, Mrs. Truman and Margaret, wearing the two corsages, waved to over 10,000 people standing in the rail yards.

TRUMAN SPEAKS 18 MINUTES AT SENECA

Speaking on the anniversary of D-day in Germany, President Truman delivered an 18-minute informal speech to a crowd estimated at 4,000 at Seneca, Tuesday evening.

Willard Lynch, Thedford, reports that people from Alliance to Dunning and Valentine, including Cherry, Thomas, Hooker, Grant, and Blaine Counties were in the crowd that greeted the President, Mrs. Truman, and their daughter, Margaret.

William McCreath, Valentine; Homer Finney and Seth Hanna, Seneca; were on the welcoming committee. The hosts presented a barbecue for the crowd.

The evening's events were followed with an old-time dance sponsored by the Seneca VFW post.

A very dear friend of mine, James R. Kelly, of the law firm of Kelly & Kelly, at Broken Bow, Nebr., had this to say concerning President Truman's visit:

DEAR GENE: I suppose that you have read in the papers about the visit of President Truman to Broken Bow, Nebr., and have heard that we had an enormous crowd, between 10,000 and 12,000 people here at the depot and that he was generally accepted and even the old tried and true Republicans left after his talk, feeling rather kindly toward him. I think he was wise in stopping in Broken Bow and believe that he has helped himself a great deal in this section of Nebraska.

Buffalo and Chautauqua Deans on Episcopal Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, recently, the Episcopal diocese of western New York held its one hundred and thirteenth annual convention in Buffalo, N. Y., which I have the honor to represent.

This was, indeed, a historic occasion, for the Episcopal diocese of western New York has a splendid record of over a century of service to the community and to the country. It has been outstanding in its leadership and has contributed

much to the mutual cooperation enjoyed in religious and civic matters in Buffalo.

I want to extend to the Very Reverend George F. O'Pray and the Very Reverend Leslie F. Chard my heartiest congratulations upon the election to the standing committee of the Episcopal diocese and to offer them my best wishes for continued success. They are the deans of Buffalo and Chautauqua County and both have long records of splendid leadership in the Episcopal Church.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I herewith submit an article from the Buffalo Evening News, setting forth the details in connection with this convention:

BUFFALO AND CHAUTAUQUA DEANS ON EPISCOPAL COMMITTEE

The deans of Chautauqua County and Buffalo today were elected to the standing committee of the Episcopal Diocese of Western New York at its one hundred and thirteenth annual convention in the Church of the Good Shepherd.

The Very Rev. George F. O'Pray, rector of St. Clement's Church and dean of the Buffalo Deanery, was elected for 4 years, and the Very Rev. Leslie F. Chard, rector of St. John's Church, Dunkirk, and dean of Chautauqua County, was elected for a 2-year term. A layman, Wallace J. Stackel of St. James Church, Batavia, was elected for 4 years.

Three clergymen and three laymen elected to the executive council are: Rev. H. Dimmick Baldy, St. Jude's Church; Rev. Lawrence C. Butler, vicar of All Saints Chapel, Lockport and assistant at Grace Church, Lockport; Rev. William G. Woodward, rector of Trinity Church, Lancaster, and registrar of the diocese; Dr. Roland Burton, Trinity Church, Fredonia; Theron Cleveland, St. Stephen's, Olean; Alonzo Waters, St. John's Church, Medina.

ELECTED TRUSTEES

The Very Rev. Ansel R. Morrell and the Rev. Richard B. Townsend were elected diocesan trustees. Dr. Morrell is rector of St. Mathias, East Aurora, and dean of Erie County. Mr. Townsend is rector of St. Mark's Church.

Deputies elected to the provincial synod are:

The Rev. William E. Bowker, rector of the Church of the Holy Communion; Rev. Alexander A. Corti, rector of St. Albans Church, Silver Creek, and rector-elect of St. Mark's Church, North Tonawanda; the Very Rev. John T. Sanborn, rector of St. James Church, Batavia, and dean of the Batavia Deanery; Joseph L. Blaney, Church of the Ascension; Dr. Albert E. Connolly, St. Peter's Church, Niagara Falls; James E. Wells, St. Mark's Church, Orchard Park.

Trustees of DeVeaux School are: John K. Walker, St. Paul's Cathedral; Rev. Joseph Groves, on special assignment; John Bingenheimer, St. Peter's Church, Niagara Falls.

ISLAND WORK DESCRIBED

Two trustees elected for DeLancey Divinity School are: Rev. Douglas M. Stoll, rector of the Church of the Advent, Kenmore, and William Foote, St. Mary's-on-the-Hill.

The Rt. Rev. Charles F. Boynton, newly-elected suffragan bishop of New York, described the work of the church in Puerto Rico and thanked the diocese for its contribution to that work.

Bishop Boynton, who has been serving as bishop of that missionary district, addressed a joint session of the convention and woman's auxiliary in Central Presbyterian Church at noon.

NAMED AFTER BISHOP

He especially thanked the woman's auxiliary for $7,000 it contributed to build a cottage for Mr. and Mrs. Earle Hackett of Dunkirk, who are serving as missionaries and teachers at a newly established agricultural boarding school for boys—the first on the island. The cottage has been named in honor of the late Bishop John C. Ward, one-time rector of Grace Church, Buffalo, and bishop of the diocese of Erie.

Officers of the woman's auxiliary elected this morning are: Second vice president, Mrs. David K. Hamilton, Buffalo; supply secretary, Mrs. Fulton Chamberlin, Buffalo; treasurer, Mrs. Jocelyn K. Brotz, Silver Creek; united thank offering custodian, Mrs. Joseph Goold, Harris Hill.

COMMITTEE HEADS NAMED

Mrs. Harold J. Senior, of Williamsville, president, appointed the following committee heads:

Constitution, Mrs. Welles V. Moot, Mrs. Lauriston L. Scaife; finance, Mrs. Ralph Barber, Westfield; nominating, Mrs. Howard J. Bradley, Cheektowaga, Mrs. R. A. Weise, Mayville.

Two missions were admitted into union with the convention—St. David's, Ebenezer, and St. Andrew's, which serves the Newfane, Burt, and Olcott areas.

The Reverend Kenneth W. Kadey, rector of St. Paul's Chapel, Harris Hill, and diocesan director of youth work, called for "more cooperation from the clergy in the diocesan youth program. He stressed the need for a full-time youth director and said that youth work in the diocese at present is not good.

WHY SCHOOL IS CHANGING

The Reverend William S. Hudson, headmaster at DeVeaux School, explained why the school is changing from a military to a civilian status.

"The military system and the church just don't go along together," he explained. "The military comes into constant collision with the principles of Christ. Boys come out of chapel and are, perhaps, ordered to 'shut up' by some officer if they talk in the halls. In general, if a school has a good military system, it is a poor church school."

The Right Reverend Lauriston L. Scaife summoned all loyal churchmen Monday evening to become active opponents of the forces opposed to Christianity.

"It is high time," the bishop warned, "that churchmen cease to be 'tolerant' and practice more intolerance—intolerance of everything that is opposed to Christianity.

GIFT OF $250,000

"No true, loyal, devoted churchman can tolerate the forces opposed to Christianity. We cannot be missionaries for the spread of Christ's Kingdom * * * without active opposition to the godless indifferences to all religion at large in the world today."

High-lighting the bishop's report on diocesan activities was the announcement that a devoted communicant of the diocese, who desires to remain anonymous, recently donated $250,000.

This extraordinary gift, he said, is to be made available for investment as part of the endowment for the Episcopate.

Noting that the past year has been one of planning, growth, and experimentation, in the diocese, Bishop Scaife said he hoped it will not be many years before we can devote our full time and thought to the attack on the great problems that confront us.

SAYS YOUTH WORK A PROBLEM

One of the chief problems churches must confront, he said, is work among their young people. He expressed the hope that the diocese in 5 years will be spending 10 times what we are now spending for this.

Urging that churchmen insist upon Christian influence in the total life of our youth, he added forcefully:

"We must consider Christian influence upon the media of entertainment which our young people have, for * * * a half-hour on Sunday morning * * * cannot be the limit of Christian education. We must not attempt to compete with other agencies for amusement and recreation."

The church must, however, influence the type of programs and material offered by the radio, motion pictures, and television, so that some evidences of Christianity are to be seen and felt, he asserted.

WOULD CONSOLIDATE GAINS

While emphasizing the importance of encouraging mission congregations which he called "our most critical spots," Bishop Scaife said he does not intend to seek to open any new mission work "until present gains have been thoroughly consolidated."

He reported that in the past year he has confirmed 1,181 candidates. He hailed as "gratifying" the diocese's 1950 pledges or gifts of more than $55,000 in the national church's "One World in Christ" campaign, urging that the remainder of the $72,444 goal be attained during the next year.

PRAISES RETIRING AIDE

He also lauded the woman's auxiliary and its "outstanding group of women under the leadership of Mrs. Senior."

Announcing the retirement of Arthur F. Freeman after 30 years as financial secretary of the diocese, Bishop Scaife praised Mr. Freeman as a "trusted confidant for untold numbers of the clergy and laity." A member and vestryman of the Church of the Ascension, Mr. Freeman will continue as financial consultant. Miss Emma Dupler, of Pittsburgh, has been named to succeed him.

THANK OFFERING ACKNOWLEDGED

Bishop Scaife reported that the Reverend William R. Shannon, rector of St. Paul's Church, Lewiston, has accepted a call to become rector of Christ Church, Clarksburg, W. Va., effective Sunday.

He announced the appointment of Mr. O'Pray as dean to succeed the Reverend Alanson C. Davis, associate rector of Trinity Church, who has accepted a call to become rector of the Church of the Ascension, Bradford, Pa.

The Reverend John E. Knox, priest in charge of St. Mary's Church, Gowanda, will succeed Mr. Davis as chairman of the diocesan department of publicity and promotion.

Bishop Scaife gratefully acknowledged the presentation by the woman's auxiliary of the semiannual "United Thank Offering," totaling $3,932, which will be forwarded to the national church for missionary work. The auxiliary is meeting in conjunction with the convention.

The delegates also commended Mr. Freeman and voted to send greetings to the Diocese of West Missouri, which also is meeting today. The Right Reverend Edward R. Welles, formerly rector of St. Paul's Cathedral, was consecrated bishop of West Missouri last month.

Biggest Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the thirtieth article by Mr. Frank

C. Waldrop on the infiltration of communism in our country:

BIGGEST STORY

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

The Communists of the United States of America, in the 10 years between 1920 and 1930, discovered two very important things.

First, that revolution in America was very slow business.

Second, that they were not masters in their own house.

And so it was that even as their leader, Lenin, had foretold, the "locomotive of history" roared around the curves and left many a one behind with his face in the dust.

Two such victims can tell the story for all. The witnesses for this account are Benjamin Gitlow and Jay Lovestone.

One of the strangest evenings of my life was spent in their company. It was a dinner attended by 10 or 12 of the most famous exapostles of "scientific socialism" for the United States of America.

Among those present were Isaac Don Levine, now editor of Plain Talk; Eugene Lyons, who went to Communist Russia as to a shrine and came back to devote his life as an author and editor, to its opposite; J. B. Matthews, who once led pilgrimages of Americans to Lenin's tomb and then gave years of penitent labor to researching evidence on communism, fascism, and nazism, for a committee of Congress.

There were others I will not mention, now. Some of this company had been Communists of record, some in the phrase that Matthews invented, "fellow travelers."

All had been worshipful and all were devoting themselves to saving America from that which they had come to know too well. All of them, in one way or another, and without knowing it, disclosed to me the wounds and scars a man suffers when he makes that most terrible of all discoveries, that he is regarded with contempt by one he worships.

Prison would not have driven them from their worship. More than one had done time for communism's sake. Beatings, for the sake of the cause, were satisfying tests of faith. To be outside the law of a society at which they were at open war was natural.

No. It was nothing brought against them by our world that had broken the spell.

They found they would have to choose, either to be Communists or to be men, and they chose to be men.

I am not sure that is altogether clear. Let me try again.

Bravery is actually a common enough article in human affairs. A child can be brave as any soldier on the field of battle, if that child fears a nameless Something upstairs in the dark, and yet goes up to bed without a murmur. In his mind, it is there. And his act of will in daring it to grab and eat him alive—that is courage.

A woman who has that fox in her bosom, whatever it may be, and yet looks her husband in the eye and smiles, she has won her medal of honor, too.

The woman and the child have a bond with the private soldier in the field who, on orders from a man he has been taught to regard as his commander, goes out in the open and risks his life against a gun.

But then if the parent who sent that child upstairs laughs in his face at his fear, if the husband slaps his wife with the other woman's name, and if the officer treats the soldier as a mere animal without human dignity, there is a challenge.

Somebody has to lose. The child loses his self-respect or he loses faith in the parent who ridiculed him. The wife can go to pieces, and lose the rest of her self, too. The soldier—sometimes he just puts a bullet through a back.

Anyhow, nobody can challenge the sense of manhood in anybody else and make the consequence satisfy the victim.

The fact that the revolution in America wasn't coming off as promptly as expected did not destroy the Communist faith of Benjamin Gitlow, Jay Lovestone, and those others.

They could see the reasons all around them. They were prepared to make twists and turns in daily tactics, so long as the basic strategy of a Communist world remained the same.

But the thing that threw them was the discovery not that they might well be sacrificed in the tactics—any soldier may get killed—but that they were being used.

It is one thing to die for the cause. It is another thing to have the cause spit in your face. Stalin spit in their faces. He made it clear that no matter what they might report to Moscow on conditions in America, decision for Communists in America would be made to suit Stalin's personal purposes in Russia and for Russia.

Their fundamental sense of manhood was challenged. So, in their various ways, they jumped off the Moscow Express.

Gitlow and Lovestone actually went to Moscow for a last-ditch encounter with Stalin and were lucky to get away alive. To this day they have not yet told all about how they did it.

Annual Banquet of School of Commerce and Finance of Seattle University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1950

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, as one of the sponsoring committee for the annual commerce banquet of the School of Commerce and Finance of Seattle University, it was my privilege to attend this impressive event on May 15, which, as so well stated by the Reverend Albert A. Lemieux, S. J., Ph. D., president of Seattle University, "is only an outward token of the inner growth within the School of Commerce itself."

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD the remarks of President Lemieux, which although confined to the Commerce School are indicative of the growth of this largest private university in the State of Washington. I also include the remarks of the Honorable John F. Floberg, Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Air, who was the principal speaker, following those of President Lemieux.

The remarks of President Lemieux are as follows:

This has been a very pleasant evening—a happy reunion of faculty, student, alumni, and friends. It has also been a very stimulating evening with its serious but challenging theme of military defense—a most important theme to us who live on the outer edge of a potential military front.

This is the third year that I have had the privilege to attend the school of commerce banquet. Each year, it is my impression that the banquet is getting larger and finer. For one thing, tonight we have been honored to have as our guest speaker, the distinguished Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Floberg, Seattle University, as you are aware, is one of the 27 colleges operated by the Jesuit Fathers throughout the United States—Georgetown, Fordham, Holy Cross, St. Louis, Loyola Chicago—are all sister institutions of Seattle University's and part of the same educational tradition. This year these combined colleges will graduate from ten to fifteen thousand graduates. From whatever particular school a graduate may come, we Jesuits throughout the United States consider each graduate as our own Jesuit boy. We take as much pride in the achievements of the graduates of each institution as though they had been graduated in our own particular university or college. Each institution traditionally welcomes the graduates of other sister institutions to its campus as if that campus were their own. It is a great thrill and pleasure to us tonight to be honored by a distinguished graduate of Loyola University—to have one of our own Jesuit boys as our principal speaker.

It is gratifying to note the increased number of businessmen at the banquet tonight. We are always grateful to them for their interest in and cooperation with the school of commerce. They should not forget that their presence and interest is both an inspiration and challenge to every undergraduate in the school of business.

The growth of this banquet, however, is only an outward token of the inner growth within the school of commerce itself. Since its establishment in 1945, the school has steadily grown until it now enrolls some 600 students. Each year under the very capable and efficient leadership of its dean, Dr. Volpe, its programs and staff and techniques are carefully reevaluated and scrutinized. I only hope that we have the financial wherewithal to follow our dean's commendable vision. I have observed the remark that he made tonight that he could not ask for a more loyal student body and industrious faculty. I did not hear him say, however, that he was satisfied with the president and his appropriations.

Perhaps with the interest and cooperation of the businessmen of the community displayed here tonight, some day Seattle University will have a president with ample means to realize the aspirations of our good dean, Dr. Volpe.

ADDRESS BY HON. JOHN F. FLOBERG, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE NAVY FOR AIR

The opportunity which is mine this evening to speak to so distinguished a gathering is deeply appreciated. I feel honored indeed that it fell to my happy lot to bring to the members and guests of the School of Commerce and Finance of Seattle University the greetings and good wishes of the Secretary of the Navy, the Honorable Francis P. Matthews.

It was with the greatest personal regret that Secretary Matthews found himself unable to fulfill his original intention to accept your gracious invitation and to be here this evening. He, like the Navy as a whole, has a deep personal interest in this community, which is the headquarters of the very important Thirteenth Naval District and has long been a favorite region for Navy duty.

In his stead I would like to reassure you of the Navy's gratitude for the contribution freely made by all Americans of this Northwest area in support of our fighting Navy during the war and through the years of precarious peace which have followed. Your shipyards and the nearby naval base of Bremerton built, fitted out, or repaired our ships in record time when numerical preponderance was of the utmost urgency. Your sons and daughters served in all branches of the Armed Forces, always with

the greatest loyalty and sometimes with high distinction. The immeasurable contribution which you made to the Navy's morale by keeping Seattle one of the fine "liberty ports" for our sailors, soldiers, marines, and airmen during the war was a stimulus to the fighting hearts we needed for victory.

Today the Pacific coast is no less important to the purposes of national security than at any time in the recent past. That is why the Navy today maintains and will continue to maintain in the Pacific the finest fighting force which we can afford under the finest leadership which we can mobilize among our senior officers.

We believe that in Admiral Arthur W. Radford, our Commander in Chief of the Pacific Fleet and United States High Commissioner of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, we have a worthy successor to the great naval figures who preceded him at headquarters in Pearl Harbor.

Similarly, in command of the Air Force of the Pacific Fleet, we have Vice Adm. Thomas L. Sprague, a veteran of wide combat experience in this area.

The Western Sea Frontier, which stretches from California to Alaska, is under the able direction of Vice Adm. George D. Murray, who also was in command of our fighting forces in the Pacific during the war. Under him, as commander of the northwest sector, western sea frontier, and as commandant of the Thirteenth Naval District, is our mutual good friend, Rear Adm. Howard H. Good.

The Army and the Air Force have comparable leadership of the highest quality in this important defense area. The Army has Lt. Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer, wartime commander of the United States forces in the China theater, as commanding general of the Sixth Army with headquarters at the presidio in San Francisco; and Brig. Gen. Robert A. McClure, commanding the northern subarea of the Sixth Army from nearby Vancouver Barracks. Air Force command is in the able hands of Maj. Gen. John E. Upston, commanding general of the Fourth Air Force, whose jurisdiction includes McChord Field in this State.

To name some of these military and naval leaders is not to ignore the great reservoir of strength which resides in our universities and in the business, commercial, industrial, agricultural, and financial life of the Nation and of this section of the Nation. Without the full partnership of these factors of our national economy we would never have been able to produce and distribute the overwhelming material advantages which gave our fighting men the deciding edge over the enemy both in the Pacific and in the other theaters of operation.

We have come to our position of world leadership and preeminent prosperity because from the earliest days of the Republic we have devoted ourselves to integrating capitalism in our economic affairs with democracy in our political life. We have promoted individual enterprise at the same time that we preserved individual freedom. By these same means we have given the widest measure of economic freedom and encouragement to the leaders of business.

This material way of life is what has given us the security and the opportunities necessary for the fuller development of the Christian principle of human dignity and the encouragement of the high cultural achievements characteristic of American life.

We are great not only because we are free and because we are materially strong—but because we are both free and materially strong at the same time. Greece was free but its greatness as a nation was negated by its lack of material resources. Rome was powerful but it never possessed the inner strength of democratic institutions. Napoleon, the Kaiser, and Hitler are modern examples of the eternal principle that power without popular control spells decay. On the other hand we have in our generation seen many an instance of the fact that freedom without strength leads to subservience or slavery. The economic and human burden of keeping the two in balance is heavy, but no American would live where they were not.

Seattle University is the representative of a great tradition in education which was established by a military man more than 400 years ago. Ignatius of Loyola, the founder of the Jesuits, under whose auspices this university operates, was a devoted soldier of his king before he became the spearhead of the vast movement for truth and enlightenment of which this institution is a part.

From its very earliest days the history of this continent in exploration, in discovery, in the development of democratic principles, and in the propagation of the high ideals of the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God has been linked closely with the activities of the educational predecessors of the men now in charge of Seattle University.

This rich area was the Eldorado sought by intrepid men of diverse nationalities as they endeavored to unweave the mystery of a Northwest passage. Once gained, it poured a flood of wealth in furs, lumber, and minerals into the economic bloodstream of America. Today the Northwest is the lively, progressive daughter of Columbia, matching its fine manpower to its God-given resources—and enriching the whole Nation with the promise of an ever more bountiful tomorrow. In the fulfillment of this promise your citizens are united, and the sons of Loyola are happy to share.

While collegiate business and commercial education is a comparatively new venture, which but recently celebrated its golden anniversary at New York University, the progress it has made in the past 50 years has been broad in scope and highly productive of good effects in our economic life. Our schools of commerce and finance, such as this one, have provided technically trained and practically schooled men and women for the business and industrial life of the Nation. Their training has made them men and women of independent thought. It has made them see their jobs and their institutions in proper relation to the rest of the country and the rest of the world. It has made them powerful and patriotic proponents of the American system, which is basically that of Christian, democratic capitalism. The greatest insurance that American, capitalistic free enterprise continues to exist is, to my mind, to have more human beings, both at home and abroad, understand it. Animosity for the American way of life, of which the American economic system is the very heart, can be based only on either ignorance or malice.

These men and women, graduates of this university and of hundreds of others throughout the land, who are now scattered in key positions in business and industry, are a dependable bulwark against infiltration by misguided, disloyal, or merely hare-brained ideological theorists who have never come to know the basic realities of American life. Quietly and effectively these men and women are carrying on the battle against Communist adherents in our own household. Viewed from long range, they are as truly a part of our manpower resources in the worldwide "cold war" as the men of our armed forces who are patrolling the seas, walking the barricades, or searching the skies to prevent overt acts of aggression which might lead to armed conflict.

This audience appreciates, as I do, that we are today at a critical point in the campaign for peace which we have pursued since the end of hostilities 5 years ago. The west coast, which was the scene of the organizational meeting of the United Nations, is well aware of every self-sacrificing step we have taken to promote the economic rehabilitation of devastated or underprivileged areas and to stabilize the political conditions under which universal concord might be achieved for a reasonable period of permanency.

At every turn we have been opposed by a new and revolutionary technique in totalitarian imperialism. We have witnessed the degradation of Czechoslovakia and of Austria. We have seen the Balkan countries subservient under the threat of Red battalions and the machinations of the secret police. We have seen the invader crush Manchuria and bring into subjugation large parts of China. In all these areas economic and psychological subversion have preceded political and military means in the process of enslaving one nation after another.

Wherever chaos and confused conditions have created a political vacuum, the forces of communistic imperialism have found an open channel for expansion. They have exploited doubt, dissension, and disunity. On the other hand, wherever we have acted firmly to prevent weakness or wavering we have been successful in staying this type of subversive aggression and conquest.

By taking decisive and timely action in western Europe, Greece, Turkey, Iran, and Korea, we have saved them, our friends, from falling into the orbit of the Kremlin. We are turning the tide, but we are still far away from the goal of global stability and the guarantee of freedom for all.

In recent months there have been disturbing incidents, some of which have directly affected the lives or activities of American citizens. Several countries behind or within the shadow of the iron curtain have closed our consulates or information offices. Our public officials, and at times our military leaders, have been accused or abused by the Soviet propaganda press and radio. The military services have borne their share of the tension between the democracies and the communistic dictatorship. The policing of the occupied areas in Europe and Japan by the Army has not been without casualties. Other brave men of the Navy and Air Force lost their lives in the magnificent airlift effort by which we fed and sustained the western sector of Berlin for many months. Only a few weeks ago 10 naval airmen in a defenseless plane were shot out of the sky over the Baltic, where they had a perfect right to be—an example not only of heroic sacrifice but of continued American forbearance and patience in the face of ruthless and unjustified provocation.

This is but a sketchy résumé of what has happened on the international scene since the close of the war, yet it contains all the reasons why we must continue to maintain not only diplomatic firmness but military strength if the objectives of security and peace are to be attained.

Despite the almost record peacetime expenditures which we are making for the national defense, we have quantitatively the minimum strength which we can safely maintain under present conditions. Happily, in the opinion of those best qualified to judge, the efficiency of all our armed forces is qualitatively at the highest level we have ever achieved in peacetime.

This qualitative standard will continue to improve in the future with the development of new and improved defensive weapons. We are, for example, undertaking the construction of new submarines, including two new types, the fast attack submarine and the antisubmarine submarine. The first vessels of these classes are expected to be completed sometime next year. Similarly we have built a prototype 60-ton experimental patrol plane as part of our research and development program. We are developing new and better jet fighter planes, and we have high hopes for our turbo prop aircraft engine. We are forging ahead toward the

realization of atomic-powered vessels, and we are anticipating the day when a guided-missile combat ship will be added to the fleet. Several ships including a small anti-submarine aircraft carrier, the U. S. S. *Bataan*, will be added to the Pacific Fleet this summer so as to permit increased anti-submarine training with new and ever improving equipment for fleet personnel.

Wherever possible, this increase in essential combat strength is being made without increasing the national defense budget. It is the result of economies and reallocation effectively made by the coordination of activities and facilities of the various armed services under the operation of the Unification Act as administered by Secretary of Defense Johnson. We of the military departments realize fully that the national strength depends as much upon a sound national economy as upon the numerical strength and equipment of our Army divisions, naval fleets, Air Force squadrons, or Marine Corps regiments. That is why heavy emphasis has been put upon the utmost necessity for economy in the operation of all the armed services, and a corollary which I firmly believe is that Americans well founded and well educated in our economic system and understanding it thoroughly are as effective defenders of our American heritage as are our military personnel.

The Navy is exerting every effort to translate that portion allotted to it from the $13,000,000,000 defense budget into maximum fighting strength and mobilization potential. The validity of the principle which calls for it to do so would seem to be self-evident, but economy is only popular when it is away from home. The Navy is certainly not indifferent to the effects which retrenchments in expenditures for the shore establishment have upon local economics, but our basic responsibility is to the country as a whole. By furnishing the maximum possible military effectiveness to the country within the limits of our over-all budget we are fulfilling our first duty of providing military protection to all Americans instead of jobs to a few of them. I cannot believe any fair-minded citizen would want us to do otherwise.

As businessmen or as students of commerce and finance or as experts in related fields of our national economic life, you will appreciate the practical importance of the steps we have taken to make every tax dollar allotted to the Department of Defense purchase 100 cents' worth of security for every American.

We welcome your cooperation, your recommendations, your assistance, and your support. The full and true strength of America today, as in the past, rests upon national unity. Only through the coordination of all segments of American life—of business and industry, labor and agriculture, finance and management, education and patriotic political and civic leadership can we bring to bear the fullness of our greatness upon the perplexing problems of peace which we must solve to survive.

It is comforting to know that the post-war youth upon whom will fall the responsibilities of tomorrow have been trained to know true from false democracy and have come to maturity in a time of crisis. They are serious. They are energetic. They are devoted to American ideals. They are knowing. They are skilled. They are the promise of the brighter tomorrow for which so many men died within this decade and for which as a Nation we shall never cease to strive. I salute this school for its help in fortifying its students with the fundamental principles which will help this country to persevere against those who would destroy it.

With your help and in God's good time may we come to share with all humanity the blessings we enjoy as Americans. The measure of our worthiness will always be the devotion and loyalty with which we continue to serve our fellow citizens and our common country.

Arming of the Arab States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER C. GORSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 24, 1950

Mr. GORSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters:

BUFFALO HISTADRUT FEDERATION,
Buffalo, N. Y., May 22, 1950.

Hon. CHESTER C. GORSKI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. GORSKI: Enclosed, you will find copies of letters to our President.

We feel that it is most important that you know how we feel in this regard and hope for your continued support.

Trusting that you will carry your fight even more aggressively for the maintenance of peace in the Middle East, I remain,

Yours sincerely,
MAYER D. LUDWIG,
Regional Director.

MAY 22, 1950.

President HARRY S. TRUMAN,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We have received disturbing information from sources which we consider reliable, that the Arab States, particularly Egypt, are receiving such arms, ammunition, sea and air power which are above and beyond the reasonable needs of their internal security.

We are greatly disturbed, Mr. President, that our State Department is doing little or nothing to prevent another conflagration in the Near East—our fear of another attack against the State of Israel—which may result in another world war.

In order not to disturb the precarious balance of power which has been achieved, Mr. President, we advocate that you use your good offices in expediting the attainment of such defensive arms by Israel, so that this delicate equilibrium will not be disturbed.

Knowing of your love for peace and your efforts in this regard, we respectfully call your attention to the above facts and urge you to use your great influence, together with the State Department to insist that Britain immediately stop the arms shipment to the Arab States, and that we lift the arms embargo, now in effect, against Israel.

We ask this of you in the name of 32 cities in the State of New York, representing the great majority of the Jewry of New York State.

Respectfully yours,
Hon. DAVID DIAMOND,
Honorary Chairman, Buffalo Histadrut Federation.
PHILIP ROTH,
Honorary Chairman, Syracuse Histadrut Federation.
ABRAHAM A. ZEPLOWITZ,
Regional Chairman, New York State Histadrut Federation.
Rabbi PHILIP BERNSTEIN,
Honorary Chairman, Rochester Histadrut Federation.

(Copies to Hon. HERBERT H. LEHMAN, Hon. IRVING M. IVES, Hon. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO, Hon. CHESTER C. GORSKI, Hon. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER.)

Tariff on Cotton Textiles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 24, 1950

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, following my remarks heretofore made regarding the serious threat to our textile industry, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD the attached statement from the press of yesterday:

COTTON TEXTILE INDUSTRY BRIEF SCORES TARIFF CUT—DEVICE FOR CLOSING DOLLAR GAP IS HELD DANGEROUS FALLACY

NEW YORK, May 22.—A policy of tariff cuts as a device for closing the dollar gap is a dangerous fallacy and would invite disaster at home by letting loose a torrent of foreign products from low-wage countries on the American market, the cotton-textile industry charges.

The industry in a brief filed with the Committee for Reciprocity Information warns that exports of American cotton textiles have been wrecked by the combination of devaluation and the rise of low-cost foreign competition. This drop in export trade represents a loss of more than one-half billion dollars and is equivalent to 52,000 textile jobs and millions of wage dollars.

FIRST RIGHTS HERE

"Cooperative efforts of the United States in a world recovery should not be carried to the point of weakening or endangering the American economy," the brief contends. "Our own people have first right to the fruits of the Nation which they have created."

Prepared jointly by the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., National Association of Cotton Textile Merchants of New York and Textile Export Association of the United States, in conjunction with other industrial groups, the brief was filed preliminary to tariff hearings scheduled for coming weeks.

Testimony will be presented at these hearings for consideration in tariff negotiations with 23 or more countries in Torquay, England, in September, concerning some 2,000 types of goods directly competitive with products made in at least 500 textile plants from Maine to Texas, the brief discloses.

"In greater part the dollar gap does not even exist," the brief states, "and the present unbalanced condition of foreign trade has resulted from an export contribution of four or five billion dollars a year in the form of donations to Europe's recovery and rehabilitation program."

COMPETITION UNEQUAL

"One of the gravest fears," the brief says, "is that unequal competition with low-wage countries will waste the superior efficiency of the American cotton-textile industry, which is now being used to support the programs of this country's internal economy."

"Free market competition with foreign countries means throwing into the balance our higher wages, which in major part are the measure and substance of our efficiency," the brief asserts.

As for new, improved machinery and modernization of mills, for which the industry has been paying $300,000,000 a year since the end of the war, the brief says "the means of technical progress cannot be acquired where there is a continual erosion of the wage and price structure, and a forced diminution of physical stature from the imports of sub-wage standard countries."

The industry statement also asks that the tariff negotiators consider the vital importance of the textile mills to national defense, demonstrated during the last war when not only were all military and essential civilian requirements met in this country, but those of the allies as well.

Protest of the Bobbin Manufacturers Association Against Tariff Cuts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 22, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following letter of Mr. Charles D. Brooks, president, United States Bobbin & Shuttle Co., Lawrence, Mass., to the chairman of the Committee for Reciprocity Information:

UNITED STATES BOBBIN & SHUTTLE CO.,
Lawrence, Mass., May 16, 1950.

The CHAIRMAN,
Committee for Reciprocity Information, Tariff Commission Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The Bobbin Manufacturers Association is comprised of the following companies, headquartered at the addresses indicated: American Bobbin Co., Lewiston, Maine; Jas. H. Billington Co., Philadelphia, Pa.; Bowen-Hunter Bobbin Co., East Corinth, Vt.; the David Brown Co., Lawrence, Mass.; the Dana S. Courtney Co., Chicopee, Mass.; H. & P. Spool & Bobbin Co., Lawrence, Mass.; Lowell Shuttle Co., Lowell, Mass.; N. E. Bobbin & Shuttle Co., Nashua, N. H.; W. L. Parker Bobbin & Spool Co., Lowell, Mass.; United States Bobbin & Shuttle Co., Lawrence, Mass.; Vermont Spool & Bobbin Co., Burlington, Vt.

The member companies of this association provide manufacturing employment for several hundred people in the New England States, New York, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, South Carolina, and Minnesota. The member companies produce collectively the bulk of the bobbins and spools in the United States, used by the textile industry for twisting and spinning yarn and weaving cloth.

As head of the largest company in the association I have been appointed by Mr. William Bourassa, American Bobbin Co., president of the Bobbin Manufacturers Association, to present an association statement to your committee for your earnest consideration in the tariff-cut deliberations which are scheduled to get under way May 24, 1950. This letter to you constitutes that statement.

In 1930, under paragraph 412 of the Tariff Act of that year, the duty established on bobbins imported into the United States was 33⅓ percent. In January 1948 this rate was reduced by Treasury Decision No. 51802, amending the duty downward from 33⅓ percent to 16⅔ percent. In January 1948 the bobbin manufacturers in this country were not troubled by foreign competition due to unsettled economic conditions abroad and due to the fact that the nations in the sterling area had not then devalued their currencies. The situation today, however, is different. Here in the eastern United States we have for the past 6 months been suffering from the competition of bobbins produced in Canada. These bobbins are brought into this country and sold to eastern textile mills at rates well below our own price levels. For example, this company produces an automatic loom bobbin which sells, f. o. b. Lawrence, Mass., at $100.78 per thousand. One of our customers in eastern Connecticut was able to buy Canadian automatic loom bobbins equal in quality to our product for $96 per thousand delivered to its mill, duty paid. As another example—this company recently lost an order in Rhode Island amounting to one-quarter of a million automatic loom bobbins. Our list price on this particular bobbin, again f. o. b. Lawrence, Mass., was $76.38; the mill was able to purchase a satisfactory Canadian bobbin delivered into its plant for $71 per thousand, duty paid. These are but two examples which are quoted for your information. Our competitors within the association are finding similar conditions throughout the eastern textile market. Unfortunately United States manufacturers of bobbins do not enjoy the same preferential treatment from the Canadian Government when they attempt to ship bobbins into Canada. Rather, the duty assessed by the Canadian Government against United States bobbins going into the Dominion is 20 percent, a disparity which is grossly unfair, particularly with the United States dollar at a premium in that country.

If you will refer again to the two orders mentioned above, they totaled 350,000 units. The manufacture of each 100,000 units within the total 350,000 bobbins would have provided 117 man-days of work. In other words, the loss of those two orders deprived United States citizens of 409½ man-days of gainful employment.

While our association is deeply concerned over the inroads of this Canadian competition, we are also concerned over threatened competition from Europe. We have it on excellent authority that the Emil Adolff Co., of Germany, is currently negotiating for sales representation in the United States to import German bobbins. The United States Bobbin & Shuttle Co. manufactures a particular type of maple bobbin equipped with a metal ferrule for use in Crompton & Knowles looms. The price of this bobbin is $138 per thousand f. o. b. Lawrence, Mass. The Adolff bobbin can be loaded on cars or other transportation facilities in New York, ocean freight, duty, and selling commission paid, at $113.85 per thousand.

It is obvious that the present tariff protection afforded American bobbin manufactures is totally inadequate to stem such competition. The Bobbin Manufacturers Association, therefore, prays your committee that it not only give up any thought it may have of further reducing bobbin duties but that in its stead the committee see to it that the 33⅓-percent rate originally obtaining in the Tariff Act of 1930 be immediately restored.

In the matter of wooden spools, the original duty established under the 1930 tariff was 33⅓ percent. On November 2, 1936, by Treasury Decision No. 48554, this duty was decreased to the present level of 25 percent. We are informed by the deputy collector of customs of the port of Boston that the Tariff Commission is considering reducing this 25-percent duty to 12½ percent. It takes little imagination to see that if our protection is reduced to this very low level, our spool business will quickly be placed at the mercy of foreign competition.

The manufacturers of spools and bobbins in the United States, both within and without the Bobbin Manufacturers Association, are paying high wages, unemployment insurance, social security, workmen's compensation, accident and health insurance, Federal taxes, State taxes, and local taxes; in short, they are meeting in full all obligations placed upon them, both as corporations and as individuals. They are also carrying out to the last degree their contractual relations with their employees.

In time of peace these companies have a productive capacity greater than is required to keep the entire textile industry in the United States operating around the clock. In time of war or national emergency the manufacturers of spools and bobbins are rated as a vital industry because without them the textile industry in this country would quickly come to a halt. Since it is our Government's policy to keep American vital industries in a going condition, and since imports of foreign bobbins and spools will seriously impair the financial condition of these American companies as well as reduce their ability to provide employment, it is only reasonable to ask that we again be accorded on both product categories the full 33⅓ percent protection which we enjoyed prior to 1948 and 1936.

Respectfully submitted.

CHARLES D. BROOKS,
President.

Henry Morgan Speaks His Piece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. POTTER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 24, 1950

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Speaker, with your permission, I am inserting into the RECORD an article by the columnist, John Crosby, which appeared in the Washington Post of May 23, 1950.

Mr. Crosby's article cites a speech made by the comedian Henry Morgan before the New York chapter of Sigma Delta Chi, the national journalistic fraternity. While I am not particularly fond of Morgan as a comedian, the speech cited is a noteworthy commentary of the influence wielded by a free American press and radio.

Mr. Morgan cites in his short speech the completely contradictory positions taken by the press on various issues, and thank God that we in America have a press that can present a variance in views and which is not controlled to a point where all news stories and editorials must follow a party line.

HENRY MORGAN TAKES A LOOK AT THE PRESS
(By John Crosby)

Henry Morgan, a sardonic, sometimes misguided but always honest man, lumbered to his feet before reporters, columnists, editors, and publishers at the annual dinner of the New York chapter of Sigma Delta Chi, the national journalistic fraternity, and delivered a speech. It lasted all of a minute and a half, a fine length for a speech, and it was a fine speech.

In that minute and a half, Morgan, one of the more thoughtful radio comedians, summarized his opinion of the American press.

This is a difficult assignment for a radio comedian. His listeners—reporters, columnists, editors, and publishers—could crucify the man in print if they didn't like what he said. A radio comedian needs the support of the press. He'd have great difficulty existing without it. Still, Henry spoke his mind about us freely, and while there were some barbs in this small essay, it was on the whole a flattering and (I hope) intelligent estimate. I'd like to pass it along.

AVERAGE WARPED MAN

"I was asked here this evening," said Morgan, "mainly because it's common knowledge that I am an authority on this stuff. A number of people here work on newspapers. That isn't nearly as bad as what I do. I have to read them. Some people produce

radio programs. I have it much worse than they do. I work for them—newspapers and radio—the two greatest influences of our time, I figure. You see before you the creature you have made. I am the average warped man.

"Because of you people in this room I believe Owen Lattimore is a Communist. I also believe he is not a Communist. Because of you people I believe F. D. R. was a genius and also that he ruined the country. I believe that there is more crime in this country than ever before and that our police are the best in the world. I believe that Eisenhower would make a great President except that I have read that military men don't make good Presidents and besides he will run if enough pressure is brought, he will not run, he can't run, he refuses to run, he doesn't want the job, you can talk him into it, he's trying very hard to make it look as though he doesn't want it, he's happy at Columbia, he's miserable, he's got a cold, he feels great."

HOW ABOUT A BUREAU

"You have made it possible for me to take 5 cents and buy in one package, a new picture of President Truman, my horoscope for the day, 15 comic strips and the stock market reports. And I've read some terrible things about you. You work for money. Advertising dictates your policy. The deparment stores dictate your editorials. Don't you think you'd be happier with some other system? Wouldn't it be nicer to have a bureau of some kind supervise your work? Then, if the bureau didn't like it, you could adjust or get killed.

"Still in all, it's better than having people point at you and say: 'There's a man who works for money.' Somehow it's getting to be very un-American to work for money. It's also un-American not to work and to live on unemployment insurance. It's un-American to have social security and it's un-American to have such a small amount of social security. I strongly suspect that this is all your fault.

"In short, you people in this room have put me, the average man, in a peculiar position. I now have to make up my mind for myself. As long as you keep doing that, as long as you keep forcing the man in the street to make up his mind for himself, that's as long as we'll have the only working definition of democracy that's worth a damn.

"Thank you."

A Tax Change That Might Boost Free Enterprise a Little

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEPHEN M. YOUNG
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 23, 1950

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Louisville Times of May 6, 1950:

A TAX CHANGE THAT MIGHT BOOST FREE ENTERPRISE A LITTLE

When you buy a pack of cigarettes, 7 cents of what you pay goes to Uncle Sam. This is true, no matter what the price of the cigarettes happens to be. Here is a fact that has had considerable significance for Louisville. Once upon a time this city was the country's leading producer of so-called economy price cigarettes. Those were the happy days when the economy brands sold at 10 cents a pack and the highly advertised standard brands at 15 cents.

In Louisville were two big factories producing economy brands. Those who remember the depression will remember how these concerns, operating night and day and giving steady employment to hundreds of workers, helped the community to weather the storm. One of these factories is out of business today. The other thrives, still making economy brand cigarettes but fortunately having other brands, too. It probably could double its payroll if the economy brand could get a fair whack.

This does not by any means require a depression. The fact is that the economy brands continued to enjoy favor throughout the 1930's and until approaching war and then war itself changed the tax picture. In 1940 the Federal tax on cigarettes was raised from $3 a thousand to $3.25. In 1942 the Treasury proposed to raise the tax again, but this time recognizing that it was unjust to tax both the economy and the standard brands at the same flat rate.

The Treasury recommended that the excise on the economy brands be increased from $3.25 to $3.50 a thousand and on the standard brands from $3.25 to $4 a thousand. However, Congress compromised and raised the rate to a flat $3.50 on all. That is the rate which prevails today—the 7 cents a pack that you pay to Uncle Sam. It is a rate which, coupled with increased tobacco prices and increased State taxes on cigarettes, compels the economy brand cigarette manufacturer to sell his product at a price so little below the price of the standard brand that the smoker who feels that he cannot afford the standard brand finds that he can hardly afford the economy brand, either. And, generally speaking, it is to the smoker who must economize—roll his own, if necessary—that the economy brand always has appealed.

In this smoker's behalf, the House Ways and Means Committee made a decision the other day. It voted to change the cigarette tax structure. It would leave the present rate of $3.50 a thousand on cigarettes retailing at more than 12 cents a pack. It would reduce the rate to $2.45 a thousand on cigarettes selling at not more than 12 cents a pack. The standard brand smoker and the economy brand smoker would then be each paying about 40 percent of the price of his pack to Uncle Sam. At present the standard brand smoker pays about 40 percent, the economy brand smoker about 50 percent. That is obviously unfair.

The Ways and Means Committee decision was made by a narrow margin—13 votes to 12. It may not stand in Congress. But we hope it does. The tobacco industry, including the manufacture of standard brand cigarettes, is an important contributor to the Louisville economy. The Times would not like to see any part of it hurt. We do not believe the change proposed could hurt any part of it. There is nothing in the tax revision proposed that would prevent any of the standard brand companies from entering also the economy brand field if it wished to.

The only development promised would be possibly a little more competition in cigarette pricing and tobacco buying—hardly an untoward development if we favor free enterprise.

I Am an American Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 23, 1950

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the Members of the House of Representatives to an article by Jesse C. Suter whom many of you already know through his newspaper articles concerning the District of Columbia which have appeared regularly in the Washington Star.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include his most recent article:

[From the Sunday Star, Washington, D. C., May 21, 1950]

CIVIC PROBLEMS, CIVIC BODIES—THIS IS "I AM AN AMERICAN DAY"; ON BEING A LIMITED AMERICAN

(By Jesse C. Suter)

AMERICAN DAY CELEBRATION COVERS SUNDAY AND MONDAY

By virtue of an act of Congress and proclamation by the President today is set aside and observed as "I Am an American Day." This year the celebration will be extended to include Monday. The observance today is planned to be of a religious character, when in homes and churches Washingtonians will reaffirm their American citizenship.

Monday will feature a more spectacular celebration on the east plaza of the Capitol. These exercises in the afternoon will include band and other music, a recital of the pledge of allegiance, and addresses by Vice President Barkley and others.

Such celebrations of "I Am an American" Day are usually dedicated to those young men and women who have achieved citizenship by reaching the age of 21 years during the past year, and also to those of foreign birth who have become citizens by naturalization during the same period. It is anticipated that speakers will point out to these new Americans that the American citizen, besides acquiring certain rights and privileges as such, is at the same time assuming important, grave responsibilities and duties common to all Americans.

To those new citizens recognized today who are bona fide residents of the District of Columbia, without any right of participation in the Government of the United States, there is a marked difference in the meaning of "I Am an American" from what it means to those who possess legal residence in any one of the 48 States.

Said Woodrow Wilson: "Just what is it that America stands for? If she stands for one thing more than another it is for the sovereignty of self-governing people."

The most important attribute of the American citizen is the right to participate in the Government of the United States, implemented by voting in the national elections for the President and Vice President, and voting for the Senators and Representatives who constitute the Congress.

RIGHTS, OBLIGATIONS, AND PRIVILEGES

To enjoy the rights and privileges of American citizenship and preserve them for ourselves and posterity, there are definite obligations resting upon every citizen. Included among these are rendering unquestioned and exclusive loyalty to the United States, voting in all elections, obedience to the laws, service on juries, payment of all taxes levied by the Government, serving in the Armed Forces of the Union as occasion arises and, finally, in all ways being an alert and active good citizen.

Being a true American is a 24-hour job 7 days in the week and 12 months in the year. Americans must always remember the obligations as well as the privileges of citizenship. These are personal, individual obligations and they cannot be farmed out to others. There is no sidestepping in being an American. Every loyal American should work earnestly to maintain wholesome, clean Government, and should be interested in seeing that all Americans are given equal privilege of enjoying all the fundamental individual rights possessed by other Americans.

This should include giving District of Columbia people those just rights which are now denied.

The preamble to the Constitution should be known intimately and understood thoroughly by all Americans. In reality it is the full ritual of initiation of Americans into this great Union. All Americans, whether native-born or naturalized, must experience a feeling of oneness and partnership as they read the preamble:

"We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

CONFLICTING EMOTIONS

To the voteless and unrepresented American of the District of Columbia, contemplation of this day has a tendency to arouse certain conflicting emotions. When he analyzes the meaning of being an American, it naturally suggests to him that he is one of a great body of people in a National Government created "of the people, by the people, and for the people." On second thought, it may occur to him that he can hardly be a full stockholder in this great enterprise, but only a holder of nonvoting stock, subject to assessment and numerous responsibilities, but with no vote whatever in the selection of the board of directors that governs.

As his mind reverts to the words of the preamble, he wonders why it is that the good Americans who are bona fide residents of the District are not recognized as being a part of "we the people." He recalls that the few Americans scattered over what is now the very populous District of Columbia were represented as citizens of Maryland in the Constitutional Convention in which the Constitution was formulated. So, originally, the residents of the District of Columbia were definitely a part of "we the people" who ordained and established the Constitution and through their representatives helped to ratify that important document.

It has been charged that their action also ratified the seventeenth clause of the eighth section of the first article of the Constitution which gave the Congress the power to exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever, over the seat of the Government of the United States. They may or may not have known what they were doing, but it is clearly beyond one's wildest imagination that the few who then constituted the District's population realized that the Constitution would be so construed as to deprive them of all participation in the government of their country.

REPRESENTATION AN URGENT NEED

What these voteless and unrepresented people of the District of Columbia need today more than anything else is to have their Americanism rounded out and completed. The Congress should pass and submit to the State legislature for ratification an amendment to the Constitution which will definitely give them a political status. Such amendment would empower Congress to permit all bona fide residents here who are qualified American citizens to vote for Senators to represent them in the Senate, Representatives to represent them in the House, and electors for President and Vice President.

To give "I Am an American Day" its full significance at the National Capital, it should be made to mean to the people here exactly what it means to the full-fledged governing Americans of the 48 States.

When these voteless and unrepresented Americans of the Nation's Capital rededicate themselves today to the ideals of citizenship, they should solemnly resolve to make every earnest and continuous effort to acquire through constitutional amendment and subsequent legislation those rights now denied and thereby become participating Americans in the government of their country.

There is really no practical way to put into operation the ideals of American citizenship except through participation by all of the citizens in the Government. To acquire those fundamental rights now denied to the people of the District, there is need for passage by Congress and ratification by the States of an amendment to the Constitution substantially as follows:

"The Congress shall have power to provide that there shall be in the Congress and among the electors of President and Vice President members elected by the people of the District of Columbia constituting the seat of Government of the United States, in such members and with such powers as the Congress shall determine. All legislation hereunder shall be subject to amendment and repeal."

WASHINGTONIANS HAVE NO PART IN GOVERNING THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

The Petworth Citizen, April issue, carries these eloquent patriotic paragraphs of Pearl S. Buck, under the title:

"What America Means to Me

"The only danger to our country is from within, that we forget our own power to be what we want to be. Let no American today take refuge in the willful helplessness which shrugs its shoulders and says, 'What can I do?' We have the right and the power to make our country what we want it to be. We are the kind of people that democracy produces—free, independent in our thought and behavior, fearless, forthright, and kind. I have seen many peoples of the earth, and it is not only patriotism, I think, when I say we possess these qualities to a greater degree than any other people.

"It is not boasting when I say this, either, for like a child born with great gifts, we have these qualities, not by any effort of ours, but bestowed upon us by our ancestors, by those brave men and women who came here from other lands because freedom was essential to them—the freedom to worship God as they willed, the freedom to work and keep themselves and their families from want, the freedom to believe and to speak as they believed, the freedom to live unafraid and at peace, beneath the open sky."

These uplifting sentiments echo in the deep emotions of every civic-minded, patriotic citizen of the District of Columbia. They, however, touch a very sore and tender spot when upon reflection it is noted that of all competent Americans of continental and contiguous United States these District people alone have no part, as members of the American family, in shaping the policies and maintaining such ideals.

The Washingtonian can personally live up to the highest American ideals, but he is denied the fundamental right of an American citizen to participate in the government of his beloved country through his elected representatives in both branches of the Congress and in the election of the Nation's Chief Executive.

The people of the District have the same vital interest in all national legislation, national taxation, national appropriations as Americans in the States. They are as deeply concerned in the great national and international problems as any other people in the country. They have the same earnest desire "to establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and to our posterity" as any other American.

Until an enabling amendment is added to the Constitution and Congress enacts remedial legislation thereunder, the Americans of the District will be unable to be on an equal footing with their fellow Americans of the States. Now they are equal to citizens of the States only in the bearing of burdens; then, by voice, vote, and representation they will have their just share in governing their country.

Americanization Day in Jersey City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. HART
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 24, 1950

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, on April 30, 1950, the annual Americanization Day celebration sponsored by Capt. C. E. Fisk Post, No. 132, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, took place in Jersey City. This day was first celebrated in that city under the same auspices in 1931. From small beginnings it has gradually grown into the largest demonstration of its kind in the United States. As stated by Mr. Clyde A. Lewis, commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, who was the principal guest of honor:

This Americanization Day program in Jersey City is traditional. Since its inception some years ago, it has increased in magnitude. The spirit that prompted it in the beginning has taken root in the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and has spread to other parts of the Nation. This week end, in all the 48 States and in Alaska and Hawaii, Loyalty Day demonstrations will be staged under sponsorship of the VFW.

Captain C. E. Fisk Post, No. 132, is indeed proud, as it has every right to be, of being the originator and continued sponsor of these exercises. And Jersey City is equally proud of having been the city in which this first took place.

The general chairman was again Mr. George A. Thornton, Sr. The honorary chairman was Hon. John V. Kenny, mayor of Jersey City, and the grand marshal of the parade was Master Sgt. Nicholas Oresko, holder of the Congressional Medal of Honor.

Despite the fact that inclement weather prevailed, many thousands of people watched the parade as it swung along the 2½-mile route. The parade terminated at Pershing Field where other thousands were assembled and listened to addresses from National Commander in Chief Clyde A. Lewis, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, who delivered an important address; Hon. William Flanagan, deputy mayor of Jersey City; Hon. Louis J. Messano, a member of the city commission; Mrs. Helen Murphy, past national president, Ladies Auxiliary, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States; and myself. Invocation, prayer, and benediction were offered by the reverend representatives of the Catholic, Jewish, and Protestant religions. I append herewith the address delivered on this occasion by Commander in Chief Lewis:

I am enthused with this great demonstration. The thousands who marched in this parade and the other hundreds of thousands who gathered along the line of march as spectators exemplify the spirit of the occasion—Americanism. Those who marched

and those who watched came of their own free will because of an abiding faith in the cause that inspired it. Their willingness to stand up and be counted is truly an inspiration to everyone who loves and believes in the United States and its institutions.

As commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, I am gratified to be here and to participate in this heart-warming demonstration. This Americanization Day program in Jersey City is traditional. Since its inception some years ago, it has increased in magnitude. The spirit that prompted it in the beginning has taken root in the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and has spread to other parts of the Nation. This week end, in all the 48 States and in Alaska and Hawaii, loyalty day demonstrations will be staged under sponsorship of the VFW.

The governors of 40 States and of the 2 Territories have issued proclamations calling for loyalty day observances to counter the disloyal and un-American activities long practiced on that day by the Communists. Huge parades, such as this one here today, will be held in major cities throughout the Nation—New York, Brooklyn, Philadelphia, Detroit, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Pittsburgh, Salt Lake City and Ogden, and New Orleans and Baton Rouge.

These demonstrations here, and throughout the Nation, this week end, have a twofold purpose—to reaffirm our faith in America and its institutions, and to serve notice that we will not countenance any subversive efforts to weaken or destroy this Nation, or to nullify any of the fundamental principles embodied in its Constitution, its laws, or its economic, social, and policial structure.

It is doubtful if anything in this world is perfect—and that is applicable to our country itself as well as to every phase of American life. We have our faults, both as individuals and as a government. If we own a home, we don't tear it down just because the roof leaks, or windows are broken. By the same token, we will not destroy the Nation and its institutions and substitute something new and untried, merely because a few defects here and there need correcting.

With all its faults, this is a grand and glorious country that merits the love and respect of all of us. It has served us well by giving us the world's highest standard of living. It has given us freedom of opportunity, of religion, of speech, and press. It has given us the heritage of enlightenment through free education. It has permitted the humblest of us to work, to earn, and to build the kind of lives we want for ourselves and our children.

That love of country—Americanism, we call it—in its true meaning is much more than flag waving and oratory. It is a high and noble principle rooted deep in the hearts and souls of patriots.

But there are those who disagree with our views. While we are gathering here and at other points all over the country to publicly acknowledge our allegiance to America and American ideals, members of a group which dares call itself "American" are marching to symbolize their opposition to America and the American way of life. While Moscow pulls the strings, these puppets of the Kremlin demonstrate their hatred for the free institutions they could enjoy in few other countries in the world today.

What a travesty it is to see them openly defying and vilifying the very Constitution that gives them the right to assemble and demonstrate.

In a speech a few days ago, President Truman characterized communism as a "tyrannical force which does not recognize justice as we know it." He declared further that "wherever this force extends, there is no freedom of speech, no freedom of religion, no freedom even of opinion. The State is the all-powerful arbiter of men's words and acts. Human dignity and human freedom are meaningless."

For many years, the Veterans of Foreign Wars has been outspoken in its opposition to the activities of Communists in this country. We have insisted that the so-called American Communist Party be outlawed, because we contend that no individual, or no group of individuals, advocating the overthrow of the American Government, has the right to call itself American. So far as the VFW is concerned, you must be a Communist, or an American. You cannot be both.

I am gratified to see so many young people participating in this occasion, both in the line of march, and along the parade route. These youngsters of today will make the America of tomorrow. What they make of it will depend on we older men and women of today. If we are willing to stand idly by and let them become inoculated with the poisonous doctrines of communism and other subversive forces, we have no right to expect that they will stand firm for free democracy. In our indifference, we have permitted communism to reach out into our schools and colleges, planting the seeds of doubt, and unrest, and even revolt, in the minds of American youth.

While we stood idly by, these disloyal forces have wormed their way into the inner councils of our Government. You know the tragic story of betrayal by those who professed loyalty to the country, but at the same time were handing over secret information to a potential enemy.

We were gratified to hear the President say that the loyalty program has rid the Government of all employees who were found to be disloyal, and that not a single person who has been adjudged to be a Communist, or otherwise disloyal remains on the Government payroll today. We sincerely hope he is correct.

We, as loyal citizens, can be of help in keeping traitors out of our Government. We can, as the President suggested, advise the Attorney General or the FBI of any known Communists or other disloyal persons occupying positions in our Government. As loyal citizens who have fought in defense of our democracy, the members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the other veteran organizations have always been forthright and outspoken in opposing any and all subversive and disloyal activities, whether by individuals or groups. We have been constantly vigilant, and shall continue to be so.

Our stand for forthright Americanism is challenged from another quarter. There are active and vociferous groups which are demanding that we barter our heritage of freedom at the bargain counter of world government or superstatism. They tell us, in effect, that it is old-fashioned to be patriotic, that the United States, as a nation, has outlived its usefulness, that it can no longer stand alone, but must surrender its sovereignty—its national integrity—and become a subordinate element in a dreamed-up, utopian supernation.

They would destroy the house rather than patch the leaks in the roof. They single out and accentuate the weaknesses in our system. They play upon fear of the atom bomb, the hydrogen bomb, or the bacteriological weapons which might be used by an aggressor nation of the future.

Their slogan is there must be world government now—else destruction.

It is regrettable that the legislatures of 22 of our States were taken in by this world federalist pig-in-a-poke scheme. They bought it sight-unseen, but largely through the militant efforts of the VFW and some other patriotic groups, three of them—Georgia, California, and Rhode Island—have found that what they bought was no bargain, and have rescinded their approval.

I am happy to tell you that the Veterans of Foreign Wars' battle on world federalism has just begun. We have set up machinery within our organization to carry on the fight, and we are determined that no resource at our command will be spared in acquainting the American people with the kind of bitter medicine the superstate crowd is brewing for them.

On this Loyalty Day, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, through its one and a quarter million overseas veterans, rededicates itself to the noble task of making democracy a living, virile force, not alone in this country, but throughout the world.

In proclaiming Loyalty Day in the State of New York, Gov. Thomas E. Dewey declared: "For several decades, the first day of May in each year has been preempted by subversive groups dedicated to the destruction of freedom. So far as these groups are concerned, May Day has been virtually disloyalty day."

The Veterans of Foreign Wars, with the support of all who love freedom, is determined that no shameful record of disloyalty shall mar the pages of this Nation's history.

Midcentury White House Conference for Children and Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 24, 1950

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that a resident of the Eleventh Congressional District of New Jersey, Mr. Seldon M. Kruger, of Newark, has been named to the advisory council on youth participation for the Midcentury White House Conference on Children and Youth called by the President of the United States for December 3, 1950. Mr. Kruger and Miss Ruth Schaffer, of Columbus, Ohio, who has been named by the President to the national committee of the conference, have written a most interesting paper dealing with the youth participation phase of the conference. This is the first of the conferences in which youth themselves will actively participate. This article is worthy of reading by all citizens, and I am therefore placing it in the RECORD:

MIDCENTURY WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE FOR CHILDREN AND YOUTH

(By Seldon Kruger, member, Advisory Council on Youth Participation, and Ruth Schaffer, member, National Commission)

President Truman has called a Midcentury White House Conference on Children and Youth. This conference will be the fifth in a series of such conferences under the sponsorship of the President of the United States since the beginning of the century.

The midcentury conference will base its concern for children on the primacy of spiritual values, democratic practice, and the dignity and worth of every individual. Accordingly, the purpose of the conference shall be to consider how we can develop in children the mental, emotional, and spiritual qualities essential to individual happiness and to responsible citizenship.

TO ACHIEVE THESE GOALS

In order to achieve these goals the midcentury White House conference shall—

(a) Bring together in usable form pertinent knowledge related to the development

of children and indicate areas in which further knowledge is needed.

(b) Examine the environment in which children are growing up, with a view to determining its influence upon them.

(c) Study the ways in which the home, the school, the church, the law, welfare agencies and other social institutions, individually and cooperatively, are serving the needs of children.

(d) Formulate through cooperative efforts of laymen and specialists, proposals for the improvement of parental, environmental, and institutional influences on children.

(e) Suggest means whereby these proposals may be communicated to the people and put into action.

COMMITTEES CREATED

Four technical and special committees assume responsibility for specific areas assigned by the national committee. In addition, four advisory councils, including an advisory council on youth participation, through their various channels, in the determination of policy and program for the conference. This structure is utilized also, to disperse information about the conference, and to provide means for meaningful follow-up work.

The national committee has set the date of the conference for December 3, 1950, in Washington, D. C.

ADVISORY COUNCIL ON YOUTH PARTICIPATION

Of particular interest is youth participation in the conference. Since the American Youth Commission report in 1940, no national report on the status, problems, needs of young people has been published. The biggest concern of young people today seems to be that of finding a place in their community and this complex world.

Youth must be prepared to make decisions about education, vocation, marriage, and parenthood; they must choose between many conflicting values in our society; they are concerned about peace, and fear the future. In order to become the kind of adult citizens our world needs they must be mature, stable, responsible individuals. Young people today must have opportunities to learn to take responsibilities, and must be given these responsibilities as they are ready to assume them.

The aim of the Advisory Council on Youth Participation is to achieve the most real and effective participation of school- and out-of-school-age youth in the midcentury White House conference.

In order to achieve this kind of participation five young people have been invited to serve on the national committee and on its subcommittees. These members were chosen from coordinating councils through which they can channel information and knowledge about the White House conference, and from which they can gather youth opinion.

Through the national youth serving organizations young people contribute to the conference.

Youth is represented on most of the State and local committees.

The Advisory Committee on Youth Participation will afford other means by which young people may be represented in the planning and execution of the conference.

On March 23–24, 1950, the advisory council on youth participation met at the Federal Security Agency in Washington, D. C., in order to—

(a) Recommend means for effective participation in the Midcentury White House Conference.

(b) Develop principles for and methods of youth participation in State and local White House Conference committees.

(c) Establish channels for the distribution of youth of high-school and out-of-school ages to the Midcentury White House Conference.

(d) Interpret the significance of joint planning of adults and youth in the areas of mutual concern.

Representatives from 28 national youth membership organizations and youth divisions of national organizations attended. Each organization was permitted to send three youth members in addition to one adult adviser. The youth members were selected by their agency or organization on the following criteria:

1. As a member of the constituency of the agency.

2. Being between 14 and 21 years of age. This age range was intended to include high-school, out-of-school working youth, and college youth.

3. Availability to assume continuing responsibility for the duration of the advisory council.

4. Ability to contribute to the task of the council and ability to represent young people in their agency and community.

5. Of a responsible position within their own youth organization in order to communicate their associates' interests, as well as their own.

The advisers who accompanied the delegates were either a staff member of their particular organization with responsibility for working with youth between the ages of 14 and 21 or a lay member of the organization responsible for youth programs in the agency. The advisers are expected to assume continuing responsibility for the duration of the conference and the follow-up.

As a vital part of the advisory council meeting, the delegates discussed in four groups the following questions:

1. What can high-school and out-of-school youth contribute to the focus on the primacy of spiritual values, democratic practice, and the dignity and worth of every individual?

2. What kind of home, school, church, neighborhood, and leisure time relationships develop mental, emotional, and spiritual qualities essential to individual happiness and responsible citizenship?

3. What recommendations, out of a discussion of questions one and two (above), does this advisory council make for further consideration at the December 3 meeting of the Midcentury White House Conference on Children and Youth?

From these discussions came many suggestions, which were put into the form of recommendations. The recommendations, as approved in general session of the council on youth participation, are that the Midcentury White House Conference—

1. Study and explore ways to stregthen and enrich family life;

2. Place emphasis upon spiritual values as motivation for our actions as individuals and groups in society;

3. Consider the needs of working youth as well as finding ways for their active participation in the conference and its work;

4. Be concerned with those things in life that make for security of individuals;

5. Be concerned with the civil rights as basic to the well-being of the whole American community;

6. Recognize that community life could be greatly improved and enhanced to the degree that there is group cooperation and participation;

7. To explore ways and means of providing sufficient and trained leadership for youth groups;

8. Prepare a document summarizing the changes in relationship between children and youth and adults, and recommend programs and action in light of these changes; and

9. The use of radio, press, and television, and other media be extended to tell of youth's contribution to wholesome community life.

On the basis of experience with the Youth Advisory Council of the Midcentury White House Conference, it was recommended that similar youth advisory councils be established on the local and regional level, so that there will be opportunity for more young people to participate in the Midcentury Conference. In addition, to encourage young people to work together and develop new leadership, the Advisory Council urged the establishment of youth councils. The Advisory Council also endorsed the interdisciplinary approach to problems concerning young people used by Midcentury Conference and urged that it be employed on a regional and local level.

In order that the maximum amount of youth participation be achieved on all levels the council further urged: the stimulation of local youth councils; that young working people be included in the conference; that schools and parent-teachers associations be involved in planning on a local level for the conference; that the conference help develop leadership; and that young people of all cultural backgrounds be involved in the conference.

These recommendations were sent to the National Committee of the Midcentury Conference for consideration. The results of the Midcentury Century White House Conference on Children and Youth will have greater meaning because of the positive involvement of youth. This is the first of the White House Conferences on Youth in which youth themselves will actively participate.

Through participation, young people are given the opportunity to properly function in accordance with their individual capacities. Youth participation enables young people to make a contribution toward the achievement of a goal.

As members of the Advisory Council on Youth Participation, young people are making substantial contributions to the total conference because of their status and experience as youth. On all committees, selection of youth membership was made on the basis of their potential contributions to the particular committee.

Youth is able to offer a unique service by providing first-hand experiences as youth in family, school, job, and leisure-time relationships. The ideas of young people in these areas should then be considered in planning services for youth. Although suggestions of youth should not be isolated, but should be considered along with all other suggestions and recommendations.

By involving youth in the conference not only is the potential fulfillment of the conference greater, but another large segment of millions of people within the population will be reached as contributors to the general welfare. "While the conference itself will take place in Washington, its center of interest and action will extend to every town and village, to every home and farm where children live."

The Housing Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHASE GOING WOODHOUSE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 1950

Mrs. WOODHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Hartford Times, May 13, which commends the Connecticut State housing program.

This program is very similar to the middle income housing program which unfortunately was defeated in the House of Representatives this session:

THE HOUSING PROGRAM

In 1,455 family units built under the State's housing program, approximately 5,800 persons are now living. Many more units are under construction or planned. Today's issue of the Times includes several pages bearing the news of houses recently built by private capital. Connecticut is indeed making progress in relieving the acute shortage of housing accommodations.

A closer look at the efforts of the State housing authority is well worth while because it is to that body that thousands of persons look for solution of their problem. Its records show that nearly 3,000 units are under construction. This month and in June construction of 1,500 more units will begin. The authority also says its books show that of the $65,000,000 made available by legislation to moderate rental housing more than $63,000,000 is now under signed assistance agreements with local housing authorities.

There is also a home ownership program that the State housing authority administers. Certificates of eligibility for State mortgage loans have been issued to nearly 7,500 persons. In 164 cases, loans to individual house purchasers have been approved, and there has been approval of loans to enable builders to start construction of 368 houses. Many applications in these two classifications are now being processed. The authority members have expressed the opinion that building activity is accelerating at such a rate that the $30,000,000 available for State mortgage loans may be entirely committed by midsummer.

In a memorandum from the authority office is the statement that rents paid by families living in moderate rental housing projects and the interest, 1½ percent, paid by the families obtaining State mortgage loans will return with interest, all the money borrowed by the State to finance these programs and to meet the cost of putting the programs into effect.

There is certain to be considerable public discussion of the housing program during the coming campaign and already an attempt to discredit it has begun. Honest and accurate criticism will be a good thing. But two things should be borne in mind. The housing authority operates within limits prescribed by the general assembly from which the program emerged only after a bitter partisan battle. Under the terms of that program there is the essential fact that houses are being built, that the rate of construction is increasing and that a lot of people are finding shelter within their own economic reach.

Armed Forces Day Address by Bonner Fellers, Brigadier General, United States Army, Retired, at Danville, Ill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. JENISON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 1950

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, in company with other communities across the land, the city of Danville, Ill., staged an impressive observance of the first Armed Forces Day on Saturday, May 20. The speaker was a "native son" who returned home for the occasion after more than 30 years' service to his country in the United States Army. He is Bonner Fellers, born in Ridgefarm, Vermilion County, and at the time of his retirement from the Army a brigadier general who had served his country in the world's battle zones, climaxed by service with General MacArthur from Australia to Tokyo. Because of his experience and his outstanding military career, his address on the occasion of the first Armed Forces Day has more than usual significance. For that reason I am including it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under permission granted by the House.

General Feller's address, delivered prior to a colorful flag ceremony staged by Danville Reserve military units and the drum corps of Curtis G. Redden Post 210, the American Legion, and broadcast by radio station WDAN, could be read with profit by every Member of Congress and by thoughtful citizens everywhere. It follows:

Commander Horneman, Mayor Hicks, my comrade in the Pacific war, Representative Jenison, and friends of Vermilion County, it is wonderful to be home again. I have not lived in Illinois for 36 years. Yet, I believe it is true, that I have thought of home every day since I have been away.

During World War II it fell my lot to see considerable fighting. For 2 years I shared the fortunes of the British forces in the Middle East. There some seven different nationalities were locked in combat against the German and Italian desert forces. Following this assignment I served in the Pacific where Americans, Filipinos, and Australians engaged the Japs in the jungle, on the sea, and in the sky.

I have seen the Thirty-third Division fight in the Philippines. It is my fixed opinion that there are no better soldiers in the world than the men from Illinois. This magnificent patriotic demonstration here today is typical.

During the first year I was with General MacArthur in the Pacific, I was in charge of GHQ planning. On my staff were Navy, Air Force, marine, and Army officers. The problem of unification never occurred to any of us because among us cooperation was complete. In their intense eagerness to get on with the war, members of the planning group forgot the services to which they belonged. Our operations involved use of air, ground, and sea forces in closely knitted teams. The success of each of the services—Army, Navy, Air Force—depended upon the cooperation of the other two. There was never one single instance in which the cooperation was lacking. Each arm endeavored to outdo the other in perfecting its assignment.

What then is this problem of unification and why do we hear so much about its being difficult to effect? Unification is sound in principle. Why is it not working as well as we had hoped?

The truth is, in my judgment, the trouble lies at the very top. Today the Army, Navy, and Air Force civilian and military chiefs are permitted to plan our national security without an over-all concept of how we must fight the next war. Each of the three arms—Army, Navy, and Air Force—therefore, is planning to fight the next war by playing the major role.

The Army is planning to fight it out on the ground in Europe by engaging the full weight of the Red army. This requires terrific peacetime expenditures to get ready—some twelve to fifteen billion dollars annually—for men, tanks, artillery, transportation, supply, and related activities. The Army also looks to the Navy and to the Air Force for support in combat.

Likewise, the Navy is permitted to plan for the next war, envisaging itself in the leading role. The Navy dreams of engaging the Red air forces and of bombing the war installations of the enemy from planes based on supercarriers. This requires a number of supercarriers—worth a quarter billion dollars each—in order to create the necessary sea-air team which is essential if the Navy is to retrieve its former role as our first line of defense. To fulfill this role the Navy needs some $10,000,000,000 annually.

The Air Force also is permitted to plan to play the lead should war come. It must do strategic bombing to knock out Russia's war potential. It must provide tactical air support for Allied troops in Europe, lest they be destroyed by the Red air force. It must defend Allied air bases beyond the continental limits of the United States. It must defend Alaska. As you know, since Russia has the atomic bomb and long-range bombers of the B-29 type, our cities are now threatened with destruction for the first time since 1812. If the next war comes, we shall be bombed here at home. We could have the best Army and Navy in the world and they would be powerless to defend us from air attack. Only air power can do this.

As a result of this Army, Navy, and Air Force planning in which each intends to play the major role, the cost of national defense has skyrocketed. The last national defense budget submitted was $32,000,000,000 before it was pared down to less than half this amount.

It is the policy to split the budget almost equally three ways so that the Army, Navy, and Air Force have about the same amount of money to spend. This arbitrary division has become known as the balancing of our forces.

But does this dollar balance give true combat balance? Would it not be more effective to balance our forces against our potential enemy? Russia is immeasurably strong on the ground. We can't defeat her in Europe any more than Napoleon and Hitler could defeat her. We know that Napoleon lost half a million men and Hitler lost 5,000,000 men against Russia and that both failed. Why, then, should we not avoid ground combat with the Red army and plan to defeat Russia by another means?

We have the best Navy in the world. It is essential that we keep it the best. So long as we have the Navy the Red army can never be brought to our shores. But the Navy cannot deliver the knock-out blow against Russia because deep within Russia's borders she has all the resources needed for modern war. From the sea Russia is unblockadeable. Since neither the ground nor the sea forces can win, we must strengthen our air power in time of peace so that, if war comes, we shall have mastery of the air. Russia's eternal allies of distance, winter, and manpower are impotent against air power.

The question arises: Can we defeat Russia by air assault? I am convinced that we can. We have the example of Japan. The doughboy and the marine and the sailor and the air men all played heroic parts in the last war. Credit for our brilliant victories is fairly evenly divided. It was a well-integrated team which gave us success.

But if you ask a Jap why Japan surrendered, he will tell you that 52 Japanese cities had been destroyed by air attack before the atomic bombs were dropped. He will tell you that he surrendered because his people were sick of bombing and preferred surrender to total destruction from air strikes. If this was true in Japan, is it not logical to conclude that Russia might surrender for the same reason?

To the unbiased student, therefore, it is clear our only hope of victory against Russia

lies in a peacetime Air Force capable of achieving immediate mastery of the air should war come. Once we build this air power, the likelihood of war is, indeed, remote. Yet our Government is spending more than $14,000,000,000 this year and we are not getting true military security. This is an especially dangerous situation in view of our aggressive foreign policy.

Our program in Europe cannot possibly prevent the Red army from overruning France. This fact is well known among top military leaders. We should content ourselves with sufficient equipment for our allies to prevent civil war. We can't afford the assistance we have promised Europe and we should adjust our present policy so as to save a billion dollars this year. Something like thirty to fifty billion dollars can be saved from our entire European program if we do the sound thing militarily and abandon it.

As things now stand, we are headed for trouble in Europe. Since our Army can't win against Russia on the ground and our Navy cannot deliver the knock-out blow, we should pare down our appropriations for the Army and Navy and thereby make sufficient money available for the Air Force—and I am a ground officer making this recommendation.

True unification cannot be effected until we adopt an over-all strategic concept which will be effective in deterring war and enable us to win should it come. This formula is very simple. It is: The best air force in the world supported by an adequate army and navy. It's the phrase "supported by" which our leaders refuse to insert into the concept. But until this is done unification cannot be achieved and true national defense will be lacking.

I want to repeat that unification is not held up by the GI nor by the officers under whom he serves. Rather it is held up because our very top leadership has failed to prescribe the correct strategy for our national security. It is high time this tragic situation is corrected. Until it is corrected the danger of war is very great. Until it is corrected we cannot solve our national economy. It's a problem which will not be resolved until the American people make known their will to our leaders.

Senatorial Battles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 25 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Mr. Charles Parmer, well known Washington correspondent. Mr. Parmer's comments concerning our distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], represent a well-earned and merited tribute to a great American and an honored statesman.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PARMER FROM WASHINGTON
(By Charles Parmer)

The senatorial battles—even more than the House fights—this year show a striking trend both within the parties and between the parties: a trend toward liberalism.

Most significant were two primary results within the past fortnight; in States where the Republican Party is powerful, and the reactionary element is supposed to rule, yet liberalism won out over reactionaryism.

James Duff was given little chance to win the Republican senatorial nomination over Grundy's machine candidate in Pennsylvania, yet he did it nicely.

In Oregon eastern money was poured in "by the ton" to beat the forward-thinking WAYNE MORSE. He defeated his Republican reactionary foe by 3 to 1, for the senatorial nomination.

Those two were interparty fights; each man now will face a Democrat in the elections, but the results, in two such widely separated States, show a decided liberal trend.

The next big battle looms in Utah. The fight will be to reelect one of the Nation's outstanding statesmen: Senator ELBERT D. THOMAS—"THOMAS of Utah," as he's known here and abroad. (At the moment he has no Democratic opponent in the primary.)

Big eastern interests make no bones about it—they wish an ultraconservative reactionary, and for 2 years and more those interests have been building up one Wallace Bennett. He is a former president of the National Association of Manufacturers—a group never noted for liberal thought. Mr. Bennett, I understand, is against sin.

Senator THOMAS is against sin, too; likewise he stands for and fights for legislation which places human rights above massed property. He knows that the strength of a nation is based on the welfare of its multitude of individuals.

For three terms in the United States Senate—from 1932 onward—he has fought with all his great intellectual power to make this Nation a leader—to provide conditions of living and working which will bring forth a strong, healthy, educated citizenry.

He is the Nation's authority on Thomas Jefferson—whose precepts he finds so sound that he would transplant them into today's needed legislation. During war days he was chairman of the Senate Military Affairs Committee—he saw to it that this Nation's military was the world's best. After it was all over—when the public began to forget—it was THOMAS of Utah who battled for the rights of the GI's—the right to an education, the right to his old job, if he wished it. ELBERT D. THOMAS made it embarrassing for certain interests that would forget what the men and women in uniform sacrified for the United States of America, understand their opposition?

The story can't be told yet—in full: it is still wrapped in military secrecy—I refer to his personal services in giving of his knowledge of Japan to the military (in his younger days he had been a missionary there). Top brass sought him out for advice and counsel. He it was who initiated OWI's devastating broadcasts to Japan—taking the leadership in the propaganda warfare that was so effective. Senator THOMAS, in his official capacity, saw that others got the ribbons and the medals—his reward was the satisfaction of serving well his native land.

He's served as Amercan delegate on more foreign missions, I'd say, than any living official * * * abroad he ranks as one of the world's statesmen.

At this critical hour we must keep at the wheel of Government, individuals with world outlook and practical experience in global affairs—as well as with a realistic grasp of problems on our domestic front.

THOMAS of Utah typifies the highest type of public service—free from self-interest, fearless in standing for what he holds is right—here in Washington—where his value is known—the prayer is for Utah to send back to the United States Senate ELBERT D. THOMAS—American statesman.

The Road Back to America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 25, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch:

AN APPEAL RENEWED

Under the heading, "The road back to America," the Washington Post—one of the most vigilant and constructive of American newspapers—has presented its readers with an analysis and proposal concerning the "evil atmosphere" which has descended on this country. "For weeks," says the Washington newspaper, the National Capital "has been seized and convulsed by a terror."

The Washington Post's proposal to get the country back on the right road is for the appointment of a "Commission on National Security." This Commission, which would lift the issues above partisan politics, "would elevate the current debate" and "catalyze the decencies of America."

The Post-Dispatch is glad to call attention to the Washington Post's editorial. As many of our readers will remember, the Post-Dispatch proposed the appointment of just such a national commission nearly a year ago. Our editorial, America's Grave Need, which was accompanied by a cartoon entitled "Reckless Winds," appeared Sunday, June 26, 1949. Deploring the wild abandon with which epithets such as "Red," "disloyal," "spy," and "traitor" were being thrown around, we said:

"The gravest single need in the United States today is for a national evaluation of this tangled problem—a coldly factual evaluation without favor and without bias.

"To this end, the Post-Dispatch proposes that the President appoint a commission of outstanding, qualified citizens to make an early report to the American people on the confusing elements of Communist activities and the means of combating them.

"Such a report by such a commission could perform a brilliant, patriotic service. It might well decide how the United States is to preserve its historic reliance in the great freedoms that have been ours from the Declaration of Independence to this day."

Although the commission we proposed was not appointed, extracts of our editorial were reprinted in the Christian Science Monitor and other newspapers at the time. Thus, the idea at least gained currency. But if the proposal was sound then, it is even better now, after the damage done by the McCarthy performance.

We applaud the Washington Post for its efforts to bring about the appointment of a national commission and herewith renew our own appeal to the President to meet this grave need.

Racial Discrimination in Bowling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MATTHEW M. NEELY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 25 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the

RECORD an editorial entitled "Victory for Fair Play in Bowling and Democracy," which appeared in the Minneapolis Spokesman on Friday, May 19, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VICTORY FOR FAIR PLAY IN BOWLING AND DEMOCRACY

Decision of the American Bowling Congress last week to eliminate the "whites only" clause from its bylaws was a victory for right and justice. It was also a victory for various groups and organizations which, spearheaded by the United Auto Workers union, aroused public opinion so greatly that the ABC had no other logical course to take, except to end its discriminatory policy.

Minnesota may well be proud of the part it played in bringing about the new policy. It furnished courageous, far-sighted Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, who as mayor and later Senator, served as cochairman of the National Committee for Fair Play in Bowling. It supplied the Minnesota State NAACP whose appeal to attorney-general J. A. A. Burnquist brought about a threat to obtain an injunction against the holding of the 1951 tournament in St. Paul. Its two human rights groups, the St. Paul Council on Human Relations and the Minneapolis Mayor's Council, helped organize two of the first chapters on Fair Play in Bowling, the group which has spearheaded the attack on ABC policy.

Minnesota furnished many examples, such as the Minneapolis Jaycees who not only furnished the local leader for the Committee on Fair Play in Charles Hvass, but changed its bylaws so that bowling under ABC auspices was impossible.

Minnesota contributed also the results of the Minneapolis Star and Tribune's Minnesota Poll which gave strong evidence that Minnesotans by and large were in favor of abolition of the un-American rule in the ABC. These results along with the threat of the State attorney-general's office to take court action may have been the straw that broke the ABC camel's back.

Minnesota furnished Pat Whelan, whose union of bowling alley pin setters was loud in denunciation of the ABC "whites only" law. This group would have been a key group to make the ABC see the light in event the offensive bylaw was not erased.

It is of course impossible to recount all of the manifestations which brought about ABC capitulation but no comment would be correct unless organized labor as represented by the United Auto Workers was given top credit. The UAW first challenged the ABC policy openly in Buffalo several years ago when Negro members of its bowling teams were barred from participation in the ABC national tournament.

A large majority of the white bowlers in Minneapolis and St. Paul who belonged to ABC were in favor of cleaning up the bylaws. The Minneapolis NAACP in cooperation with the Minnesota Bowling Association urged four Negro bowlers to enter the Tribune classic as a test case. The men entered the tournament by mail and when they appeared for play those in charge were flabbergasted but the entrants were allowed to participate. Johnson, the paper's sports editor, when queried, said something to the effect that if the ABC didn't like it they could "lump" it.

Way out in Spokane, Wash., bowlers in the typographic union, particularly those working on the daily paper back in October, disassociated themselves from the ABC because of the objectionable clause.

At the Buffalo tournament the UAW placed pickets around the building in which the play was held. This was the first time that a large segment of the daily press and many of the ABC members themselves were aware that the organization was committed to a whites-only program.

The first big blow to ABC came when the State of New York through its attorney general took action to bar the ABC from the Empire State because of its discriminatory rules. The second blow came when Illinois State followed suit. Another body blow came when the New York American, Hearst paper, in dramatic fashion, canceled its annual bowling tournament with 8,000 entrants because by ABC rules Joe Louis, Jim Thorpe, or Duke Kahanamoku would not be eligible to bowl.

Bill Corum, sports editor of the New York daily, made this point in announcing cancellation of his paper's annual tournament:

"Any championship not designed to produce the true champion is not, and cannot be, a true championship. For that is the basic assumption, the keystone, on which all sports are founded. So that when any potential contestant is barred by reason of creed, race, color, or bias, they are not true sports events, either. And, most certainly, they are not truly American.

"What American, once he came to think about it, would want to be the champion of any sport where a better man was barred from competition?"

Almost immediately after the New York America's action, its sister Hearst paper in Chicago, the Herald-Examiner, canceled its tourney. Action of these two newspapers focused the world's attention on the ABC.

Prior to the Hearst papers' action in late February a straw in the wind was the comment of Charles Johnson, executive sports editor of the Minneapolis Star and Tribune, who predicted in the February 5 edition of the Sunday Tribune:

"Officials of the American Bowling Association might as well make up their minds now, that eventually, sooner than they think, they'll lose the argument on discrimination in their entries.

"The campaign to eliminate the color line on entrants is coming to a head all over the country. One State after another is enacting laws that will outlaw practices such as prevail in the ABC.

"Already local governing bodies are refusing use of municipal buildings for this gigantic tournament.

"The sooner restrictions are lifted in this sport the faster will be its progress throughout the United States and the world."

An Illinois judge fined the ABC $2,500 for discrimination, suggesting that it could with profit change its racial policies.

The only religious group represented, even unofficially, in the fight was the Catholic Church. Rev. Charles T. Carow, of Brooklyn, N. Y., fought the biased ruling for 6 years in the councils of the ABC. No story of the victory over race prejudice in the bowling sport would be complete without mention of Father Carow who was really the pioneer voice crying in the ABC wilderness.

This newspaper considers the new ABC ruling a credit to the sense of fairness which dwells in the breasts of most Americans. For it was not overlong after millions of Americans had the facts in the situation that the ABC went on the defensive and victory was finally achieved. Such evidences of final justice and fair play give strength to democracy.

Thus the wave of sentiment for fair play supplemented by direct action as in the case of the court action, helped the ABC make a very wise decision.

Things like this more than any words which can be spoken makes America great and will keep her great. In no other country that we know of does public opinion force changes in such dramatic fashion for the protection of minorities. The ABC change is just another indication that America is coming of age, and many changes which must come will weld a new unity among all its people and prepare it for any challenge from without.

The Knauff Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 1950

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I have a great respect for Attorney General McGrath and for that reason I am at a loss to understand the attitude of the Department of Justice concerning the case of Ellen Knauff. He has made an exemplary record as head of the Department of Justice and I am sure upon reflection he will change the attitude of his Department anent this Knauff case. I do not agree with all the criticism against the Department of Justice as indicated in the editorial hereinafter attached. It does, however, despite its severity, reflect public opinion on this case.

The House Judiciary Committee unanimously passed the bill offered by my distinguished colleague Representative FRANCIS WALTER, of Pennsylvania, permitting Ellen Knauff to remain in this country. She is the wife of a GI. The House unanimously passed the bill, and it is now being considered by the Senate Judiciary Committee.

Despite this action, efforts are being made to exclude Ellen Knauff and to dispatch her summarily to Germany. Only a decision by Justice Jackson of the Supreme Court saved her from enforced deportation at the eleventh hour.

It is hoped that our very able Attorney General in his wisdom and human sympathy will force reconsideration of this case by the Department of Justice.

The case of Ellen Knauff has created widespread publicity as well as bad public relations for the Department. Editorials like the one I include below from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch are appearing in our newspapers:

Who owns the Department of Justice?

Does it belong to the officials who staff it? Or does it belong to the American people?

Whom is the Department of Justice supposed to serve? Is it supposed to serve the employees who are hired to conduct its business? Or is it supposed to serve the employers who pay the bill—some 150,000,000 citizens?

These are not idle questions. These questions are gravely pertinent because of the incredible case of Ellen Knauff. Mrs. Knauff, as readers of the Post-Dispatch know, is the war bride of a combat veteran, who has been barred by the Department of Justice as a so-called "security risk" without ever being told why.

Consider only the latest developments in this astonishing case.

Late Tuesday afternoon, the United States Attorney in New York, acting for the Immigration Service, asked authority in the Federal court of appeals for immediate deportation of Mrs. Knauff. This request was

refused by Judge Augustus Hand. Judge Hand said any proceedings could wait on arrival of the court decision in due course—some 15 days.

With this, the Immigration Service—a unit of the Department of Justice—decided to set itself above the ruling of Judge Hand. It ordered Mrs. Knauff to Idlewild airport for return to Germany the next morning. The reservation on the plane was marked "no publicity."

If this was not in contempt of court, it was at the very least flagrantly contemptuous of Judge Hand. But it was also already flagrantly contemptuous of Congress. A House Judiciary subcommittee had held a hearing to which it had brought Mrs. Knauff from Ellis Island under subpena—the only way it could get to talk with her. After that the Judiciary Committee recommended unanimously the bill to admit her, sponsored by Representative WALTER, of Pennsylvania, a Democratic veteran of the House with 18 years of service. Then the House, on May 2, passed Mr. WALTER'S bill unanimously.

Only Justice Jackson's last-minute Supreme Court stay order saved Mrs. Knauff from this second "lynch law" deportation which the Immigration Service tried to ram through. Whatever the security case may be against this little survivor of Hitler's persecution of the Jews, it cannot possibly justify the star-chamber record of Department of Justice. It cannot justify vindictiveness. It cannot justify stealth.

There is no question that vindictiveness was at the bottom of the "no publicity" overnight order to the airport for rush deportation. The Director of Immigration at New York, Edward J. Shaughnessy, gave it all away. When Justice Jackson's stay reached him by telephone, Mr. Shaughnessy said, "I was afraid of that."

What was the Department of Justice afraid of? Was it afraid to permit the processes of justice to work? Was it afraid of the reaction of citizens who believe in fair dealing for all? Was it afraid that it could not get away with this Fascistlike scheme in the light of duty?

We venture to predict that no more tricks of this sort will be tried by the Department of Justice in the Knauff case. After the blistering it got from Justice Jackson—a former Attorney General—the Department of Justice doubtless will pay closer attention to historic rules and procedures for appeals to the Supreme Court.

The scene now moves to the Senate, where several Knauff bills are pending. The subcommittee consists of Senators DONNELL, of Missouri, and MCCARRAN, of Nevada. They can and should help remove this blot from America's case before the world by a prompt recommendation to the Judiciary Committee.

Meantime, Attorney General McGrath ought to ask himself how satisfied he is with the record in the Knauff case.

Maintenance of Peace in the Near East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 24, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, now that the President's statement on the question of maintenance of peace in the Near East has been released for publication, I desire to place in the RECORD a letter written to me by Assistant Secretary of State Jack K. McFall, dated May 24, 1950, together with enclosure mentioned therein:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, May 24, 1950.

The Honorable ABRAHAM J. MULTER,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MULTER: In view of the interest you have expressed in the question of the maintenance of peace in the Near East, I know you will be interested to learn that the President will release from the White House on Thursday, May 25, at 11 a. m., the text of a declaration being issued simultaneously by the Governments of the United States, the United Kingdom, and France relating to the near-eastern security situation. An advance copy of this declaration is enclosed for your personal information.

It is the belief of the United States Government that this declaration will tend to increase stability in the Near East. This Government is deeply interested in the establishment and maintenance of peace in the area, and, together with the Governments of France and the United Kingdom, has sought through the attached declaration to make a contribution to this end.

Sincerely yours,

JACK K. MCFALL,
Assistant Secretary.

DECLARATION BY THE GOVERNMENTS OF THE UNITED STATES, THE UNITED KINGDOM, AND FRANCE, REGARDING SECURITY IN THE NEAR EAST

The Governments of the United Kingdom, France, and the United States, having had occasion during the recent Foreign Ministers' meeting in London to review certain questions affecting the peace and stability of the Arab states and of Israel, and particularly that of the supply of arms and war material to these states, have resolved to make the following statements:

1. The three Governments recognize that the Arab states and Israel all need to maintain a certain level of armed forces for the purposes of assuring their internal security and their legitimate self-defense and to permit them to play their part in the defense of the area as a whole. All applications for arms or war material for these countries will be considered in the light of these principles. In this connection the three Governments wish to recall and reaffirm the terms of the statements made by their representatives on the Security Council on August 4, 1949, in which they declared their opposition to the development of an arms race between the Arab states and Israel.

2. The three Governments declare that assurances have been received from all the states in question, to which they permit arms to be supplied from their countries, that the purchasing state does not intend to undertake any act of aggression against any other state. Similar assurances will be requested from any other state in the area to which they permit arms to be supplied in the future.

3. The three Governments take this opportunity of declaring their deep interest in and their desire to promote the establishment and maintenance of peace and stability in the area and their unalterable opposition to the use of force or threat of force between any of the states in that area. The three Governments, should they find that any of these states was preparing to violate frontiers or armistice lines, would, consistently with their obligations as members of the United Nations, immediately take action, both within and outside the United Nations, to prevent such violation.

Upper Savannah Soil Conservation District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. HARE
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 25, 1950

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech recently delivered by me at a meeting of the Upper Savannah Conservation District, held at Six Mile, S. C., on Tuesday, May 23, 1950:

I am indeed honored and extremely grateful for your very thoughtful and considerate invitation to be with you today and to take part in this very important occasion. I well remember the fall of 1948 when I had the pleasure of presenting prizes to the winners in the pasture contest sponsored by the upper Savannah River Soil Conservation District in cooperation with various businessmen and agricultural workers. This particular event took place on the farm of Mr. Jim Shirley which is a few miles east of the city of Anderson. Upon receiving a copy of today's program, it was with particular interest that I noticed that a number of those who received prizes in 1948 in the pasture contest are today receiving certificates of merit for continued good soil conservation farming.

The annual program of the upper Savannah Conservation District in cooperation with th Bankers Association to award certificates of merit to farmers who have done an outstanding job in conserving their soil and water resources is indeed worthy. It calls the attention of the world to the fact that here are farmers who are not only producing quality food for the dinner tables and fiber for the clothing on our backs, but who are also keeping the machinery of our food and fiber-producing plant in excellent condition for any eventuality—for peace or for the defense of our Nation. By practicing soil conservation, we are safeguarding the future of our children, our people, and our Nation by working hand in hand with the laws of nature and as long as we have prudent husbandry of our soil and water resources we can always be assured that there will be no agricultural tombstones of a better day having passed because that better day will always be in the future.

At this point I wish to commend the Bankers Association and businessmen for their realization of the necessity of soil-conservation practices by their cooperation in this program. The united and determined efforts of all will build a strong America. Events as the present one which recognize farmer accomplishments in conservation farming must indeed warm the hearts of all conservation leaders and especially the district supervisors of the Upper Savannah Soil Conservation District. The supervisors of this district are fellow farmers who have been duly elected by interested farmers in this district. The supervisors have given unselfishly of their time, energy, and in many cases of their money to help fellow farmers achieve a better living and a better life for themselves, their families, and the people of our Nation. The Board of Supervisors for the Upper Savannah District is composed of men who are outstanding leaders in the field of farming: Mr. J. B. Douthit of Anderson County, chairman, and who is also president of the South Carolina District Supervisors Association; and his fellow supervisors are Mr. W. Hugh McGee of Anderson County,

Mr. J. R. Nicholson and Mr. R. A. Reeves of Oconee County, and Mr. L. P. Thomas of Pickens County. All of them are to be commended for their faithful service to community, State, and Nation.

The Upper Savannah Soil Conservation District holds a unique and enviable place in the Nation's conservation activities. It was about 13 years ago that the farmers of Pickens, Oconee, and Anderson Counties organized the Upper Savannah District. It was the first in the State of South Carolina and the second in the United States. At that time knowledge of effective soil and water conservation was very limited. Consequently, such an organizational move to encourage fellow farmers to do something about the expensive loss in crop-producing soils and to locally take charge of a program to control this devastation must have indeed challenged the imagination of not only the leaders in that movement but also of those who merely went along out of curiosity. At this point, I am sure that it will be interesting to observe that Mr. J. B. Douthit, now chairman of the Board of Supervisors, is the oldest of more than 11,000 other supervisors throughout the Nation's 2,300 soil-conservation districts who have followed your leadership in this program. It is further interesting to note that Mr. J. R. Nicholson is the third oldest supervisor in our Nation.

I would be remiss in any remarks that I have to make today if I failed to note that there are some who substantially and energetically gave of their efforts in the establishment of this district and the promulgation of its program but who are unfortunately not with us today. I particularly recall a late friend and leading conservationist, Mr. Frank Merck, who with others foresaw that the real key to successful agriculture is conservation farming and not ruthless exploitation of the soil.

It is not difficult to see the beautiful scene or picture of agricultural security that has been painted by the craftsmanlike work of the conservation farmers in the Upper Savannah Soil Conservation District. As I drove here today it was obvious that almost every other acre is now in either small grain, hay, pasture, or grass crops. The strip rotations, flanked by many other soil and water conserving measures stood out as barriers against the loss of food and fiber producing resources. Even the world renowned five acres on the E. M. Duncan farm which held the world's cotton-production record has now joined ranks with many other acres in producing grass and clover. However, there is still present the scars of gullies and other erosion which cut cancerous growths in the face of mother earth. This is particularly true because of the two-crop system of cotton and corn which we have adhered to for many generations. But, by careful work and conservation farming these scars can be erased and agricultural security built in their place.

We are not alone in our reverence to soil and water conservation because it is of prime importance to our national life. More and more of our people are awakening to the realization that productive soil is a life-giving and life-sustaining resource—that food doesn't grow in tin cans on the shelf of the grocery store or behind the counter of a restaurant as many have supposed. People are realizing too that good food and food at a reasonable price doesn't come from fields eroded of productive soil nor does it come from fields riddled with gullies. Many are coming to appreciate that good food comes only from farms whose farmers are taking care of their land, farming efficiently, and who are holding on to their productive soil.

In practically all cases, these are farmers who are actively supporting local conservation programs—their soil conservation district program which uses the technical help of the soil conservation service and the PMA conservation program. They are farmers who are cooperating with the other agencies in the agricultural field which help farmers to achieve more efficient and better production such as the Extension Service, the Farmers Home Administration, Vocational Agricultural Program, and other agricultural agencies. I know of no better way to form a synchronized team of agricultural workers than to do so under the direction and guidance of local soil conservation district supervisors, PMA committees, and Extension Service specialists. In this way greater emphasis can be placed on the job of conserving soil and water resources.

It is time for more and more of our people to give support and recognize that productive soil and water are our most important resources because without them we could not live. Further, without productive soil our standard of living would be infinitesimal to what it is today. We must remember that it is only by the fact that our farmers are able to produce food for more than themselves that others of us can devote our labor to manufacturing, distribution, and other services for all of our people.

The necessity for more and more support for soil conservation work is well emphasized by a few statistics which I shall mention. In fact, the statistics are in themselves alone sufficient justification for the enlargement of our local, State, and Federal programs for soil conservation. In 1790, just 160 years ago, a very short time in the span of life of the world, the population of these United States was 3,129,000 people. Within 70 years the War Between the States occurred and at that time the population was in excess of 31,000,000 people, an increase of eight times the original figure. Forty years later, in the year 1900, the turn of the century, a date prior to which many of you were born, the population had increased to almost 76,000,000. In other words, the population of our country had more than doubled within a period of 40 years. The amazing feature is that in the present year of 1950 the population of our country is estimated to be in excess of 150,000,000 and the census reports indicate that such is true.

Consequently, in the lifetime of many of us the population has again doubled. If we can rely on the statistics and history of growth of our population, we may reasonably expect our population to almost double itself within the next 50 years. If that proves to be true, we are going to have to almost double our production of food for our mouths and fiber for our clothing. How can we do it if we permit our soil to be depleted. I am not an alarmist, but scientists and those who have made a study of our soils tell us that the topsoil of our country has been reduced from approximately 9 inches to about 5 inches within the past two or three hundred years. If that is true, and if we permit that to continue, then we may reasonably expect our great Nation to be a land of poverty within the next 100 years unless greater emphasis is placed on soil conservation and the conservation efforts of all farmers obtained.

If there is any doubt regarding the value of productive soil in helping us to create a higher standard of living, which provides a greater income for the farmer, the textile worker, the filling-station operator, and the businessman, we need but look to any of the many research results which show the difference in production between topsoil and subsoil.

A few years ago an experiment station in the State of Ohio removed all of the topsoil from a test plot and began using huge applications of fertilizer, manure, lime, plus excellent rotations in an effort to see what could be produced. At the same time the identical treatment was given to an adjoining plot on which the topsoil had been left and another plot on which an extra layer of topsoil had been added. The subsoil, unfortunately for the experiment, was of the best 15 percent that we have in this country. After a number of years of heavy application of fertilizer to the subsoil it was possible to build up a yield of corn to 85 bushels an acre. During the same period the plot on which topsoil had not been removed yielded 125 bushels of corn per acre, and the plot on which an extra layer of topsoil had been added yielded 141 bushels per acre. On a dollar basis the acre of subsoil produced crops worth only $337 as compared with the crops worth $698 per acre on the single-topsoil-layer plot.

It is mere folly to inquire which piece of land you would rather have or which one would give you the best yield, the best profit, or which would allow you to buy more of the better things in life for your family.

Besides being profitable for the farmer and the consumer, effective soil and water conservation holds an additionally important place in our national agricultural affairs. I wonder how many of you have given thought to the fact that if every acre of our cropland was being used for the purpose it is best suited, what changes would take place in the agricultural production picture and what would be the case of our present crop surplus problems?

Suppose we take the 1948 production year as an example and look at the effect just one soil conservation practice would have had—the practice of good rotation. In 1948 if every acre of cropland in this country had been used in a minimum soil-conservation rotation we would have had 43,500,000 less acres of row crops such as cotton and corn, and 28,500,000 less acres of small grain such as wheat and oats. That land would have been in hay and pasture crops, and the forage would have been used to feed more livestock for which there is a great demand. The most important fact is that we would not have had a surplus problem anything like we have today in corn, cotton, potatoes, and other crops. Consequently, without such surplus there would have been no necessity for acreage allotments and marketing quotas.

The more we study the effects of a good soil-conservation program the more obvious it becomes that such a program is one of the greatest things that has ever happened in our Nation. Effective soil and water conservation does much more than just protect our soil and water resources although that is very worth while and necessary. It encourages and makes possible diversified production which will result in less production of the crops now causing our surplus problems and which will eventually lead to lower farmer income.

A survey conducted on 216 South Carolina farms whose farmers are cooperating with the soil-conservation districts show exactly what happens when conservation farming is used. These farms average about 300 acres each. Before conservation farming, these farms had about 10,000 acres planted to corn and about 10,500 acres planted to cotton. After the conservation programs got underway, the acreage of corn was reduced to 7,000 and the acreage to cotton to about 8,000 acres. A reduction of approximately 18 to 20 percent in each case. With this reduction the production of the number of bushels and the number of bales remained just about the same. But, the cost of production of each bushel and each bale was greatly reduced, and consequently, resulted in greater profit to the farmer. At the same time, the acreage planted to hay and pasture crops increased by 72 percent and the number of dairy cows increased 50 percent and that of beef cows 150 percent. That is the type of land use changes taking place in all of the 33 soil conservation districts in South Carolina.

Consequently, there is no question why the Nation looks favorably upon its soil conservation districts and the job they are doing as well as all of the other governmental agencies interested in soil conservation. That is

why in the face of the tremendous national debt of more than $256,000,000,000 that the House of Representatives recognized the great need and importance to appropriate sufficient money to help farmers conserve their productive soil and water. Even in view of the necessity to cut governmental expenditures the Congress increased the appropriation for the Soil Conservation Service and other governmental services engaged in a similar enterprise in order to continue to give technical help to the farmers for the preservation of our greatest natural resource. The Congress recognized the value of the PMA conservation payment program, the Farmers Home Administration, the Extension Service, and other services by retarding many stalwart attempts to drastically reduce their appropriation. This is the case because the Congress realizes that the Nation's agriculture is its No. 1 industry and should not become subservient to any other industry whatsoever. The Congress is frequently criticized by opponents of a strong agriculture and much of the criticism centers around the cost of the present price-support program. These opponents fail to recognize that during the war the farmers did their part in expanding their facilities and production to meet wartime needs. To do this, farmers had to invest in additional machinery and make other changes that were costly and just as necessary as many of the alterations and changes that industry had to make for the production of tanks and guns. After the war, while industry could make its shift to peacetime production schedule, agriculture was compelled to continue its wartime type of production in order to feed the peoples of the world until their own agricultural plants could be put back in order. Agriculture is now in a period of readjustment from wartime production to peacetime production—some half decade after the war. Congress recognizes that this late shift is not the fault of the farmer who followed his Government's program in the fight for a democratic way of life.

Yet, there are many who criticize the few dollars that the Nation must spend in helping farmers in this shift. They forget that when industry made its shift to peacetime production that the Federal Government spent about $7,000,000,000 to aid in the conversion, together with a great reduction in excess-profits taxes for industry. Helping industry to reconvert was a good thing because it helped to maintain high industrial employment and thereby permitting the purchase of food and fiber produced by the farmers of our country. But helping agriculture in this conversion period is just as necessary and equally as wise. The Nation cannot afford not to help agriculture during this crucial period, a period which finds the income of the farmer lowering drastically fast, while the prices for machinery, seed, and fertilizer are not lowering in comparison.

There are a great many things the individual farmer can do for himself to help stabilize his income. One of the best is conservation programs being sponsored by various governmental agencies which help to cut the cost of production, use every acre efficiently, and conserve the productiveness of each acre. A few weeks ago I had an opportunity to study some figures on what the one practice of contour farming alone would do to help farmers reduce their cost of production. I was amazed to learn that contour farming alone saves up to 29 percent of the operation time and at least 23 percent of tractor fuel. This saving in power, fuel, and time can only result in affording the farmer a greater profit in the crops which he produces. Consequently, with this one illustration I am sure that each of you can anticipate what the savings might be if conservation programs are practiced in an entire farming operation.

I know that all of you are interested in the flood-control program which has been recommended for the watersheds of the Savannah River and which will be handled through your local soil-conservation district. Once started, this program will mean much to the farmers along the Seneca, the Tugaloo, and Chauga Rivers, as well as the other tributaries in our area. Many of you who own bottom land along these rivers have found it very unprofitable to use them for crops because of the hazardous floods. These floods do not originate in this immediate area, but are the result of runoffs which occur and which are unchecked in the mountainous areas above us. It is surprising to realize that the mountain region just to the north of us has the highest annual rainfall of any section in the continental United States with the exception of the coastal area of the Pacific Northwest.

We hear a great deal about damage caused by floods and according to the news stories it would appear that the greatest damage and costs occur along the big streams and to the residents of our larger cities. However, the reverse of this is true. It has been reliably established that 75 percent of all flood damage occurs in areas such as Oconee, Pickens, and Anderson Counties. The only way that this flood damage can be controlled or prevented is by proper soil-conservation practices by all of the people in any community.

A fitting illustration of the foregoing statement is quite apparent as we look off from this mountain today and see the soil-conservation farming being done by Charlie Maudlin, LeRoy Parrott, Roy LeMance, Jim Holliday, and on the farm of the late Frank Merck. When noticing their practices it is easy to see why the Soil Conservation Service has noted a marked decrease in the land siltation in Lake Isaqueena. It looked at one time as if Lake Isaqueena would be a muddy lake. I am told that due to the conservation farming being done in this community, the life expectancy of the lake promises to be many times longer than would have been dreamed of a few years ago. The preservation of the soil and water from infiltrating into Lake Isaqueena can only mean that the soil, seed, and fertilizer are remaining in the production area of its watershed and thereby resulting in a saving to the farmers in this area.

The benefits of effective soil and water conservation are never-ending. The progressive program of the Upper Savannah Soil Conservation District helps bring this fact to life. The 60-odd school teachers from this district who attended Clemson College for a period of 3 weeks last summer studying conservation recognize this and they are preparing to do their part in teaching our youth, our future farmers, that an appreciation of the soil is fundamental to success.

To insure the posterity of our Nation it is mandatory and incumbent upon all of us and the churches, the business houses, the newspapers, magazines, civic and social organizations, to accept the Biblical directive and challenge to preserve our soil because it is a Christian directive to each of us to protect God's good earth. In this challenge we must not fail.

American Policy in the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 25 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "What Are We Up to in the Middle East?" which appeared in the Salt Lake Tribune, published in Salt Lake City, Utah.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT ARE WE UP TO IN THE MIDDLE EAST?

On the twenty-fifth anniversary of the founding of the great Hebrew University just outside of Jerusalem, President Weismann, of the State of Israel, expressed hopes that someday "the Jewish and Arab nations will to their mutual benefit contribute to the establishment of a belt of flourishing countries * * * where the people of Israel and of the Arab countries will cooperate in harmony."

No doubt Hebrew University, a growing center of learning on Mount Scopus, can foster the spirit of the Middle East about which Dr. Weismann spoke so glowingly.

There are discouraging obstacles at present, however, and many of them are related to the blindly selfish policies of Great Britain, sanctioned by the United States State Department.

Since the lifting of the United Nations Security Council embargo on shipment of arms to the Middle East last August, Britain has been shipping planes, tanks, artillery, and other matériel to the Arab nations. Many observers in the unhappy region are convinced that the Arab reluctance to make final peace with Israel grows in proportion to the arms received regularly from Britain.

An Israeli request for war matériel has been rejected by the United States on grounds this country does not have enough due to treaty arrangements with other countries.

Defending American approval of British action recently, Secretary Acheson said that the arms being furnished the Arabs were solely for keeping internal order. He went on to say that the Arab states must be armed to resist aggression in the Middle East. Aggression from what source? If action is expected from Russia, why is it not equally important to arm Israel?

Resumption of hostilities between the Arab states and Israel is feared as soon as the Arabs feel strong enough. Is this what Britain and the United States want? The American Government boasts of its sympathy and assistance to democracies threatened by other powers. Yet, in the case of Israel, Washington is evasive and uncooperative.

Indecision and often hyprocisy have marked the United States policy toward Israel. This has helped to tie the hands of the United Nations. Behind the "silken curtain" of policy in the Middle East is one word, "oil." Justice and fair play get secondary consideration while the dickering and dealing goes on for that commodity.

West Losing Good Friend in Florida Congressman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 25, 1950

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting a story which appeared in the Great Falls (Mont.) Tribune of May 21,

1950, about the chairman of the Public Lands Committee.

The West has had a tried a true friend in Chairman PETERSON and I want to express to him my sincere thanks for the many courtesies he has extended to the Montana and Rocky Mountain Representatives in Congress and to assure him of our deep appreciation for his efforts in helping to build up our part of the country.

We will miss Pete, but we will always remember him for the gentleman and statesman he is. The latchstring will always be out whenever he comes to see us—which we hope will be soon and often.

The article follows:

WEST LOSING GOOD FRIEND IN FLORIDA CONGRESSMAN

WASHINGTON, May 21.—The West is losing one of its best friends from Congress, a southerner, this year.

Representative J. HARDIN PETERSON is going back to his beloved Florida to stay.

For most of the last 2 years PETERSON has been chairman of the House Public Lands Committee, which deals mainly with western problems, such as mining, reclamation, Indian affairs, and public lands.

Few of the committee's bills directly affect his own State but colleagues do not believe PETERSON could be more sympathetic toward the legislation if each one was tagged "Florida special."

The Public Lands Committee generally handles more bills than any other House committee, except that on judiciary. That means work, and the committee, or subcommittees, meet almost daily when Congress is in session, with PETERSON constantly hurrying to get measures before the House.

An indication of the volume of work is shown by the RECORD.

Since the beginning of this session, in January 1949, the Public Lands Committee has received 650 bills. Of this number, 254 have been reported, and 130 have passed Congress and are now law.

PETERSON prefers to let the westerners on the committee decide for themselves what new legislation they want. But, having decided, he backs them to the limit. On several occasions, when the powerful Rules Committee refused to clear measures for House action, he used his own authority as a committee chairman to call them up on the floor.

Both the Alaska and Hawaii statehood bills won House passage in this fashion.

Politics probably never can be entirely eliminated from a congressional committee. PETERSON is a Democrat, but under his leadership the Public Lands Committee is one of the most nonpolitical in Congress.

Recently when a group of North Dakota Indians passed a resolution expressing appreciation of the work of Representative LEMKE, Republican, of North Dakota, a Democrat, Representative MORRIS, of Oklahoma, took the lead in saying nice things about LEMKE at a committee hearing.

When PETERSON quits Congress this year, he intends to go home to Lakeland, Fla., to practice law and spend more time classifying his collection of rocks.

He has tons of rock samples stored away, from all parts of the world. One of his chief pleasures is to drive out of Washington on a Sunday afternoon and add to his collection. An Indian tribe once gave him a name which means "rock hound."

Even this hobby had its roots in the committee work. Earlier in his congressional career PETERSON was chairman of the old Mines and Mining Committee. He started bringing rock samples to meetings to add to the interest of Members who weren't too familiar with mining. From that beginning, he couldn't stop.

The westerners, and the West, are going to miss PETERSON.

Mobilization of Morale

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 25, 1950

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include a very timely editorial entitled "Mobilization of Morale," which appeared in the May 23, 1950, issue of the Christian Science Monitor.

The article follows:

MOBILIZATION OF MORALE

Armed Services Day is one visible achievement of the military unification program. We question whether everything is as cozy as Defense Secretary Johnson indicates. Much of the supposed saving from ending duplication is illusory. But eliminating separate days each year for each service is a genuine gain.

Among the speeches made to mark the day, Gen. Omar Bradley's merited special notice. Recognizing the damage that the 1946 demobilization of American power did. General Bradley is endeavoring to get the United States into a posture of alert but calm preparedness. Opposing both appeasement at the Elbe and a preventive war, he urges Americans to base their diplomatic and military policy on a recognition that western Europe must be a part of the free world.

General Bradley was the first of American military leaders to show that he understood how vital an American resolve to help hold western Europe was to the mobilization of morale among the free peoples. For several months he has been combating the defeatist belief that the Continent would have to be abandoned. He insists that Europe must be made reasonably secure from the danger of being quickly overrun and that it not be abandoned to atomic blackmail by the Soviet.

But the most notable feature of his speech was an appeal for stand-by plans for quick mobilization of our entire civilian economy. This looks like a direct response to Bernard Baruch's declaration a few days ago that to advocate selective service without including plans for a wartime draft of labor and industry was an immoral proposal. General Bradley pointed out that legislation to give emergency powers to the President would be necessary. So long as Congress would have to declare war before such authority became effective, such legislation should cause no great uneasiness.

Many Americans were convinced by the last war's experience that the freezing of wages and profits would have made mobilization speedier, fairer, and less costly. If there should be another war the United States would have far less time to complete such defense arrangements. To provide for them ahead of time is as necessary as training soldiers and making arms. It would prove that Americans not only see what would be required but do not flinch from any necessary measures.

By mobilizing morale both at home and abroad such a step could deter aggression and strengthen the defenses of peace.

Plymouth Local Fights Sam Sweet's Deportation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 25, 1950

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, another victim of this wave of hysteria is Sam Sweet, one of our leading and most active trade-unionists in Detroit. Sam Sweet is Plymouth Local No. 51, UAW-CIO, director of education and compensation. He is also editor of the union paper and chairman of the strike welfare committee.

He is charged with alleged naturalization irregularities and the Justice Department is trying to deport him to Poland. I do not know all the facts in the case, but I do know that he is the father of two American-born children, Louise, 10, and Fred, 7 years of age. Sam is well liked and highly respected by the members of Plymouth Local No. 51. His greatest offense seems to be that he has worked and fought too hard for the welfare of the members of his union.

I am glad to see that a defense committee has been formed to fight these charges and I wish them every success. I feel confident that Sam will be cleared of these charges. I would not be surprised if some of the bosses have a hand in this persecution.

I wish to include an article which appeared in the Detroit edition of the Pittsburgh Courier on May 13, 1950, as follows:

PLYMOUTH LOCAL FIGHTS SAM SWEET'S DEPORTATION

Members of Plymouth Local 51, UAW-CIO, recently reported the organization of a Sam Sweet defense committee whose function it is to fight the proposed deportation of Sam Sweet, director of the local's education and compensation department, editor of its local union newspaper, and chairman of its strike welfare committee.

The Department of Justice, local union spokesmen report, has requested the cancellation of Sweet's citizenship for alleged naturalization irregularities. Sweet became a United States citizen 4 years ago, they said, and is the father of two American-born children, Fred, 7, and Louise, 10. His case is pending in Federal court in Detroit.

Members of the defense committee are Olen Manley, chairman; Robert Elliott, secretary; Nelson Perry, Dorothy Knight, and Stanley Bartnicki, financial secretary of local 51. In a resolution deploring the Justice Department's action, member of Plymouth local said:

"Whereas it is individuals like Sam Sweet who, because of loyalty to labor's cause, are always picked as a target by employers and their stoolpigeons; and now Sam Sweet needs our support more than ever to defend himself from the attack of the Justice Department, which is no doubt instigated by the Chrysler Corp.: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That local 51, UAW-CIO, go on record reiterating our position and now we give support in full defense of Sam Sweet and condemn the Justice Department for its intimidation."

The committee further pointed out that "We have known Sweet since 1937 and the only crime he has committed has been to

serve the interest of labor, and not the bosses. He has lived in Detroit since 1930 and has been respected everywhere.

"We believe that an attack against individuals like Sam Sweet represents a threat to every one of us. If they succeed in their attempt to revoke his citizenship papers and possibly deport him, not one of the militant and courageous union leaders in this country who are naturalized citizens will be safe from persecutions of this nature."

Armed Forces Day at Rapid City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 25, 1950

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I place in the RECORD an address by Maj. Gen. Thomas D. White, of the United States Air Force, delivered at the Rapid City Air Force Base, Rapid City, S. Dak., on May 20, 1950.

The occasion dedicated the new monolithic hangar that will house B–36 planes, the largest hangar of its kind in the world.

The significance of the occasion was recognized in the area for a crowd estimated at 75,000 people were on hand. A check by military police showed that 22,000 cars went through the gates. In an area where the largest city within 350 miles has a population of 25,000, it is at once evident that such an attendance was nothing less than phenomenal.

Such an attendance gave double significance to what the speaker of the day, Maj. Gen. Thomas D. White, of the United States Air Force said, about the place of the people in the defense organization of the United States.

General White's address follows:

REMARKS BY MAJ. GEN. THOMAS D. WHITE AT THE ARMED FORCES DAY OBSERVANCE, RAPID CITY AIR FORCE BASE, RAPID CITY, S. DAK., MAY 20, 1950

The invitation to speak at the dedication of this new hangar and at your observance of Armed Forces Day is one for which I am most grateful.

Mr. Symington, as Secretary of the Air Force, had accepted the invitation to speak on this occasion, and had been looking forward to it. When his services were required as Chairman of the National Security Resources Board, he asked to be excused from this engagement, both because he is no longer Secretary of the Air Force and because the heavy responsibilities of his new job have required him to cancel all speaking engagements for the present.

Mr. Finletter, who is Mr. Symington's successor as Secretary of the Air Force, was unable to come in his place today because the responsibilities of his own new job have so far kept him from accepting any speaking engagements.

Both Mr. Symington and Mr. Finletter, however, have asked me to express their regrets and to bring you their greetings. The importance of Rapid City Air Force Base is such that they felt as honored as I to be invited here. And anyone connected with the Air Force, or actively interested in strengthening American air power, must welcome the opportunity to see this new hangar that is being dedicated today, the largest hangar in the United States and large enough to house two of our giant intercontinental B–36 bombers.

This occasion is important for another reason also. Today is the first Armed Forces Day in our history. Looking back in later years, we will be able to say with pride that we were here, that we witnessed the dedication of this enormous hangar—360 by 340 feet—and that we commemorated, with today's observance, the unification of our Armed Forces. I am sure the significance of this occasion will not be lost on any of us.

Among the many distinguished people who are gathered here, among the many friends of the Armed Forces, are two who have a very special interest in this hangar and in this occasion. Senator GURNEY and Congressman CASE serve on the Appropriations Committees of their respective Houses of Congress, and Senator GURNEY is on the Armed Services Committee as well.

Both Senator GURNEY and Congressman CASE have played important parts in passing the legislation that supports the Armed Forces and that has permitted the construction of this hangar, as well as other buildings and installations of the Armed Forces. They are interested, naturally, in seeing what the Air Force and each of the other of the services is doing with funds appropriated to it. They are interested, as all of us are, in observing the state of readiness of our Armed Forces.

Because of their interest, and the interest of all of you, the Air Force is grateful for this occasion to call attention to its role as a member of the national defense team. And I take this opportunity to speak in behalf of the United States Air Force, on what it is doing to justify the trust the American people have placed in it.

I sometimes wonder if you, voters and taxpayers, are as conscious of the fact as we of the armed forces, that each of the armed forces—Army, Navy, and Air Force—is your organization. Ultimately you control it. The Air Force is, for instance, your Air Force, not ours, though we wear its uniform. You vote for the Senators and Congressmen who determine the scope and the size and the budget of the Air Force. You may not realize it, but through them you control the military strategy of the United States; for by the size of appropriations and other laws, Congress, which is your national voice, determines definitely the limits within which strategic plans must be made.

It is obvious that American taxpayers, and all of us, in uniform or not, are taxpayers, cannot afford to spend all the money all three services want in order to set up an ideal Army, Navy, and Air Force. There has to be a limit somewhere, and there must be economy everywhere. In the interest of economy and efficiency and increased defense, Congress passed and the President signed the National Security Act of 1947, which brought all the armed forces into a single Defense Establishment. Last year, the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Louis Johnson, ordered that henceforth we would not celebrate Air Force Day or Navy Day, or Army Day, but that there would be one day of observance to pay tribute to all the armed forces on the same day. That day is today, the 20th of May. Thus we have a new day of observance springing from the new concept of national security that has been developed since World War II. That concept is one of unification into a single defense team of all the armed forces without loss of identify by any of them. The motto chosen for this day, "Teamed For Defense," expresses that concept beautifully. It expresses, miltarily, the same concept expressed politically in the motto of the United States, "E Pluribus Unum"—one out of many.

We are one Nation today, and only one. But that Nation has grown from 13 colonies along the Atlantic seaboard to 48 States stretching across the continent, plus a number of territories, notably Hawaii and Alaska, that are separated geographically, though not in democratic ideals or political aspirations, from the 48 States. No Army, Navy, or Air Force alone can defend this great continental expanse which is ours. Only a coordinated team of Army, Navy, and Air Force, of Regular Establishment and Reserve components, can guarantee our security in this air-atomic age.

In order that you may understand the requirements and obligations of the Air Force, as a member of this unified military defense team, it is essential that you be generally familiar with the roles and missions—the job, if you will—assigned the Air Force by the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The Air Force is today our country's basic strategic force.

As such, and as outlined in the basic plans of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Air Force is responsible for the protection of our territory against air attack. It is responsible for supplying the Army with required tactical air support. And it is responsible for launching the counteroffensive against the heart of an aggressor nation to crush his industrial potential and to destroy his capacity to continue his attack upon us.

The Air Force will receive full cooperation and support from both the Army and the Navy in accomplishing its mission. But the responsibility for strategic bombing is basically ours, and our budget, our training, our procurement, and our strategic plans are predicated upon this principle. The Air Force accepts the responsibility imposed by its mission and our structure-in-being is prepared to discharge our responsibility in a manner that will reflect credit on us.

The wartime accomplishments of our strategic Air Force in Europe and in the Pacific are well known. Since the end of the war we have increased considerably the range of our striking capacity and the destructiveness of our weapons.

The B–36 heavy bomber, some of which you see here now, and which this new hangar will house, is itself both the means and the symbol of that increase in range and in destructiveness. With the development of the B–36 speedy intercontinental warfare became possible for the first time; but with methods of in-flight refueling developed since the B–36, even older and smaller planes, such as the B–29 and the B–50, can be given range that will permit intercontinental use.

I am sure you will all recall the round-the-world, nonstop flight in March 1949 of the B–50 Lucky Lady II, a feat made possible by four air-to-air in-flight refuelings. Certainly, the flight of the Lucky Lady II, as well as routine flights of the B–36, demonstrate our ability to carry initial retaliatory offensive blows sufficiently far as to reach within the heartland of any possible enemy.

Not only the range, but also the speed of aircraft has increased several times in recent years.

A year and a half ago a standard Air Force combat fighter, and F–86 jet, four of which are here today, with its six machine guns and a full load of ammunition, set a new official world's speed record for all types of aircraft by flying over 670 miles per hour—over 11 miles a minute.

Only 14 months ago a six-engine B–47 jet bomber flew from Moses Lake, Wash., to Washington, D. C., a distance of 2,300 miles across the continent, in 3 hours 46 minutes, at an average speed of 607 miles per hour. But the experimental X–1 has been flown not once but many times hundreds of miles per hour faster than the speed of sound.

That means that not once, but many times, our pilots have exceeded 760 miles per hour under standard conditions of temperature and altitude.

I think these achievements—and I could name many more—indicate that the Air Force is facing, and solving, the problems presented by the changed geographic and strategic situation in which we find ourselves in this air-age world.

Our country has the scientific and technical ability to develop and produce the best Air Force in the world. Most Americans believe we should have such an Air Force. But let me voice a word of warning. To have such an Air Force will require a degree of sacrifice by all of us.

In the Strategic Air Command, of which Rapid City is one base, that need of sacrifice is particularly great, and the sense of it must be appreciated.

Strategic air operations, aimed at the destruction and dislocation of the enemy's military, industrial, political, and economic systems, and the undermining of the morale of the enemy's people, are world-wide in nature.

The units of the Strategic Air Command must not only be ready, like all military units, to defend themselves, and us, when attacked; they must be ready to counterattack immediately after an aggressive attack is made. And since that act of aggression that could precipitate us into another war, might come from any direction, across any geographic barrier, it follows that units of the Strategic Air Command must train in all sorts of climates, under all sorts of conditions, and take long operational training flights into many different parts of the world.

The training of combat crews is a never-ending task which must be pursued with vigor and consistency, because in the last analysis, when the bomber is airborne and on the way to the enemy target, the skill, determination, teamwork and morale of the crew will in large measure determine the success or failure of the mission.

And here we come to a point where conditions on the ground, right here at Rapid City, for instance, can influence combat operations.

Several years ago, the Air Force determined, by analysis of reenlistments and by actual polls, that the effect of inadequate housing on Air Force morale and effectiveness is serious indeed. Service personnel whose families either are not adequately quartered or who are required to pay exorbitant prices for moderate off-base accommodations cannot reasonably be expected to work at top efficiency or to achieve satisfactory productivity. Airmen who give prime consideration to adequate housing for their dependents are in general the kind of stable, dependable men we most need. They represent a human investment which must be protected. To retain them, to protect the investment we have in their knowledge and specialized training, their experience and their capabilities, we must give them adequate family housing.

With this in mind, the Air Force helped in sponsoring legislation that would permit the construction of adequate family housing on or near permanent Armed Forces installations. This legislation was passed by the present Congress, and signed by President Truman on August 8, 1949, as an amendment to the National Housing Act of 1934. It is popularly known as the Wherry Act because it was introduced in the Senate by Senator WHERRY of your neighboring State of Nebraska.

No legislation of recent times is so important to the morale and welfare of military personnel as this recently enacted amendment adding title VIII to the National Housing Act. It is not concerned in any way with barracks on a base, but it does make possible with Government aid, the construction of adequate family housing, with modern conveniences and modern comfort, at a reasonable rental military personnel can afford to pay. It relieves pressure on the civilian housing shortage by placing service personnel in housing reserved especially for them. Thus, it works in two ways, to strengthen the National Military Establishment and the national security and to benefit the civilian community which the Department of Defense is set up to protect.

The housing situation has been particularly bad in respect to Air Force bases because most of the Air Force bases are new, and because of the tremendous growth in the size of the Air Force between 1939 and 1950. Other services have some old and well-established bases. Most of the Air Force bases which have been constructed were built during the war when it was more important to provide operating facilities than it was to provide family housing, and in the postwar period private enterprise has not been able to provide the living quarters that the Air Force has itself been unauthorized to provide. What the Wherry Act makes possible is the insurance by the Federal Government of mortgages on rental family housing units, built by private enterprise, and the chance for such private enterprise to make proper profits out of their activity. It is all good, sound business. It is private enterprise of the sort we expect and encourage in the United States.

But one thing is required of the Air Force before such construction is undertaken, or the corporation to construct it can be set up. That is a certification, by the Secretary of Defense or his designee, that the Air Force base, for which the housing will be constructed, is deemed a permanent base. I think you will be interested if I tell you what the chances are of having Rapid City Air Force Base given this certificate of permanency, and of having a housing project initiated here.

A group of public-spirited citizens in this community, working through your chamber of commerce, have provided 65 acres of land, adjacent to the base, suitable for the sort of housing project the Air Force needs and which would be a credit to your progressive community. Negotiations are now under way for the planning, design, and construction of such a project.

Five factors must be considered before any Air Force base can be designated a permanent installation in the ordinary sense of the word. These factors are:

1. The condition of the runways. Rapid City Air Force Base has the sort of runways required for Strategic Air Command operations off this base.

2. The construction of the base itself. It is satisfactory.

3. The facilities provided, both on the base and in the adjacent community. No cause for complaint.

4. The type of construction. Look around you. The type is good. So far as the Air Force is concerned, these four factors are excellent at Rapid City Air Force Base.

Now for the fifth factor: Adequate housing.

We anticipate that our negotiations with a construction company will be successful, and as soon as they are we will execute a certificate of permanency with the Federal Housing Administration, indicating that this base is part of our permanent military installations.

So, for all planning purposes, Rapid City is a permanent base of the regular Air Force; and though we cannot say that it is such officially until we have a permanent housing project under way, I know no reason to anticipate failure in our planning.

Apparently you want us here, and we want to stay here. But I can also say that when the housing is provided, we can expect an even higher degree of morale on the part of the personnel stationed here. And nothing could be more important for the success of Air Force operations than the maintenance of this morale at its peak.

Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson has recently spelled out his definition of national security. "National security," he said, "is not just the strength of our arms. It is the sum of all our strength—our political, economic, moral, and military strength—and the strength of all the other peaceful nations of the world."

Our political, economic, and moral strengths determine what our military strength should be. They lend themselves to no ready appraisal in comparison with armaments in the hands of some enemy nation, but their value for our defense cannot be denied.

Our moral strength as part of our total defense potential is vital, though it is impossible to estimate it in terms of men and munitions. It is the strength of happy, contented families, enjoying life and democratic liberties in such a community as this. It is the strength of freemen serving willingly to preserve that freedom.

Today's observance is one evidence of that moral strength. You have come here to participate in this observance of Armed Forces Day because you believe in the United States, and you believe in democracy. You believe in peace, and you hate war. And you believe in democracy and in the United States to the extent that you are willing to fight for both and—if necessary—to die for both. You are willing to make sacrifices, to pay taxes, to serve in the armed forces, to train with the Reserves, and in other ways to support the Military Establishment we must maintain.

With this observance we honor all members of the Armed Forces, both past and present, and we pay respect especially to the memory of all who have given their lives in war. We also reexamine our responsibilities—whether we are in one of the services or in civilian life—to the Nation and to our democratic way of life.

The Air Force is convinced that the military security of our Nation and the preservation of our way of life depends upon the teamwork developed within the components of the Department of Defense. No one service can do the job alone. All services must be teamed for defense, and ready to defend the United States against aggression in any form.

But if air power is to be a decisive element in our national strength, we must have air power adequate for the purpose. And that we can have with the support of you who have come here today, and the millions of others like you in other communities and other States throughout these United States that are one Nation.

Such support is the greatest assurance that, teamed together, we can reach our common objectives—peace and security for the United States and for peace-loving people throughout the world.

Lesson in Semantics—Phrases "Iron Curtain" and "Cold War" Have Created Grim State of Mind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 1950

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article by

Thomas L. Stokes, which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of May 24, 1950:

LESSON IN SEMANTICS—PHRASES "IRON CURTAIN" AND "COLD WAR" HAVE CREATED GRIM STATE OF MIND

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

It is about time now to look at a couple of phrases composed of ordinary Anglo-Saxon words from the standpoint of semantics. That big hunk of word is defined as "the science of meaning" and "that science dealing with the relations between symbols (signs) and what they refer to and with human behavior in reaction to symbols, including unconscious attitudes," and so on.

There is first, then, "iron curtain." Winston Churchill coined it in his Fulton (Mo.) speech 5 years ago and thus lowered a barrier figuratively across eastern Europe. Cartoonists illustrated it for us. All of us on this side of it became righteous folks and all on the other side became unrighteous. That was the first division of one world into two worlds—by semantics. We long have accepted the phrase and it has become an ominous fact.

AFFECTED OUR THINKING

Then along came another "cold war." That, too, has affected our thinking and behavior. It has created a state of mind, a rather grim one. Unfortunate and unhealthy is the constant repetition of the word "war."

If you traveled eastward across Europe, you would not see an iron curtain, of course. What would you see? You'd see people working in the fields, trying to raise something to eat and something over to sell, and the country and the people would look about the way they do in Iowa or Nebraska, and if you could speak the language you'd find their daily problems about the same as those of folks over here. Some of them would be grumbling about the government, just as we do, and lots of them, you'd find, would detest communism just as much as we do.

You'd travel also through cities like Des Moines and Lincoln or bigger ones like Pittsburgh and Cleveland and you'd find people there going about their jobs, just as we do here, trying to make a living and make ends meet.

In city and on farms, also, you'd find them worrying about another war—they know what it's like too—just as we worry.

OUT TO DESTROY ILLUSION

One bold man with vision recently has begun to destroy the iron-curtain illusion. Trygve Lie, Secretary-General of the United Nations, flew right through it, went to Moscow and sat down with Joe Stalin. As a result he is pursuing his talks with the French and the British and soon again with us in an effort to get us all about the UN table once more and there to try to eliminate those phrases "iron curtain" and "cold war" from our language.

It is a happy circumstance that President Truman has reasserted our faith in the United Nations in submitting to Congress the 1949 report of the UN's work, and has pointed to its success in settling disputes in Indonesia, Palestine, and Kashmir, thus moving such conflicts indoors—from battlegrounds to conference tables, and emphasized the fine work it is doing in social, economic, and humanitarian fields through the specialized agencies recently discussed in a series of columns here, and some of it behind the iron curtain.

Very properly he rebuked Russia for her willful flouting of the UN in current walkouts, and at the same time emphasized the common-sense attitude of the UN, in the face of this display, of proceeding with its business as usual. Here he gave effective answer to Herbert Hoover's proposal to reorganize UN without Russia.

Through making the UN work we can get rid of our semantic troubles—"iron curtain" and "cold war."

How to Help the Small-Business Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 1950

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, the Lima (Ohio) News in an editorial of May 28, 1950, has clearly and logically pointed out the way to help the small-business man. In accordance with permission granted by the House, the editorial follows:

HOW TO HELP HIM

There is a great Fair Deal drive on to help the small-business man. The planners in Washington are beating their breasts in agony for his welfare and are denouncing the giant concentrations that are stifling him. They propose measures to liberalize and to extend his credit.

All of this is designed, of course, to win the gratitude of the small-business man and add his vote to the dependable Fair Deal reservoir.

One California businessman got to thinking and turned in a list of some of the governmental liabilities that are hindering him. These are:

City license tax, city sales tax, city income tax, State sales tax, State corporation income tax, State corporate franchise tax, State use tax on materials for his products, State unemployment insurance tax, property taxes, Federal social-security tax, Federal corporation income tax and (if his business is still good) both Federal and State income taxes on personal income. It is estimated his Federal taxes would be doubled if the Truman program were adopted in toto.

What is it that is most troubling the small-business man? Scan that list (it varies only slightly by States) and the answer is as plain as the vote-bait ghost written into a Truman speech.

Dr. Townsend's Contribution to Social Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 1950

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, before becoming a Member of Congress and since I have been a Member of Congress I have been interested in the problem of our elderly people. An ever-increasing number of them have been forced into retirement without any resources or means of support. Adverse economic conditions have increased the problems.

While social security has been in existence for 15 years, it has not been extended to take in the large percentage of our population, especially the rural people. The Social Security Act that is under consideration at this time was brought into the House of Representatives under a gag rule, which means that it could not be amended so as to include many, many groups that are entitled to consideration. From present indications the Senate will broaden this base, but still other millions of Americans are going to be excluded. The rural people are to be the large group that will not be included. Most people agree that labor is labor, and that all Americans are entitled to the benefits of the same social legislation.

In many industries adequate provisions are being made, but great numbers of our citizens are not the beneficiaries of any private or governmental security agency. In other words, the millions of Americans who are among the elderly group at this time still have to depend upon welfare or relief funds.

The movement sponsored originally by Dr. Francis E. Townsend has been severely criticized. The facts are that much of the social legislation that has been passed is a result of the spadework that has been done by Dr. Townsend and his group. Although the Townsend movement itself may not have had the legislative consideration that it deserved, the fact remains that if it had not been for the spadework done by this organization the elderly people of this country would not have the legislative consideration that they have had. It has always been my purpose and always will be to support legislation that gives equal consideration for every individual and every group; with the hopes that ultimately every American will have the same social security, the same benefits of unemployment insurance, and the same benefits under any social legislation that is to be considered by the Congress.

A gradual improvement in the attitude of the industrial leaders, as well as the public thinking on these important issues, leads one to believe that steady although slow progress has been made, and that the time will come when these elderly people will enjoy the benefits of an across-the-board program that will be fair to all.

Seattle's Ed Guthman—Pulitzer Prize Winner—A Job Well Done

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 1950

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, a Pulitzer prize for outstanding journalism was awarded to Mr. Ed Guthman, a reporter on the Seattle Times. Seattle is proud of the honor bestowed on one of her sons—proud not only because this was a newspaper job well done, but because it vindicated a man wrongfully accused of being a Communist.

In these days of tension and fear, to call a man a Communist without solid evidence to back up the charge, is to jeopardize his livelihood, to besmirch his reputation, to expose his family and himself to bodily harm. We know that from sad and repeated experience. Here in the Nation's Capital we have seen unscrupulous persons indulge in smear campaigns; we have heard them fling charges of communism recklessly about, causing damage and suffering, not only to individuals, but to the Nation itself.

Certain ex-Communists have made for themselves a profession as stand-by witnesses before investigating committees. They have wandered carelessly in their chosen field, not hesitating to smear the innocent with their venom, while they are supposed to identify the Communist conspirators with whom they once engaged in their nefarious and subversive work.

In the State of Washington we had a committee investigating people's loyalty, and one of these ex-Communists, Hewitt by name, was imported into the State to tell what he knew, according to the usual procedure. Hewitt testified that Dr. Melvin Rader, of the university, was a Communist, making allegations of fact which turned out finally to be false.

Mr. Guthman, of the Seattle Times, undertook to run down these charges. By painstaking investigation, encouraged by Dr. Raymond Allen, president of the University of Washington, Guthman gathered the evidence that proved Dr. Rader to be innocent, and Hewitt in effect a perjurer. Unfortunately, a New York court had prevented Hewitt from being sent back to Washington to stand trial for perjury. It was only because a Washington newspaper reporter, interested solely in the truth, devoted himself to this case that justice was finally done to the man wrongfully accused.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Bremerton (Wash.) Sun of May 17, 1950, concerning Mr. Guthman's fine work:

TRUTH, A FREE NEWSPAPER, AND THE PULITZER PRIZE

The recent honor that came to a member of the Washington State press and a good reporter—the Seattle Times and its Ed Guthman—is worthy of more than passing attention. In winning a Pulitzer prize for high journalistic endeavor, young Mr. Guthman has directed public attention anew upon the vital role of a free and unfettered press as a cornerstone of democracy.

The Pulitzer prizes for journalism reflect the platform which the late Joseph Pulitzer evolved for his St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

It is a platform that any good newspaper strives to fulfill in serving its readers: "Fight for progress and reform, never tolerate injustice or corruption, always fight demagogues of all parties, never belong to any party, always oppose privileged classes and public plunderers, never lack sympathy with the poor, always remain devoted to the public welfare; never be satisfied with merely printing the news; always be drastically independent; never be afraid to attack wrong, whether by predatory plutocracy or predatory poverty."

In the case of Mr. Guthman, the Pulitzer award was made for a series of well-documented articles which he wrote for the Times to vindicate Dr. Melvin Rader of the University of Washington, who had been labeled a Communist. The newspaper and reporter had no prior convictions in the matter; they merely sought out the truth, and the truth was—as it always is—sufficient.

In an era when the truth is often besmirched in other lands, and issues clouded beyond honest recognition, it is satisfying to observe its bright light in American newspapers.

Mr. Guthman's own story of the Rader case is an absorbing one. This is the way he tells it:

"The Times didn't get interested actively in the Rader-Hewitt dispute until after the New York judge, Aaron Levy, refused to send Hewitt back here to stand trial for perjury. Judge Levy inferred that the courts here were controlled by Communists and that if Hewitt returned he would be facing slaughter. Levy wondered what the civilization of this State really was like.

"We wondered how a judge could make such irrational statements. That was one factor in motivating our entry into the case. We were curious about the judge and decided to find out what evidence prompted him to render that decision.

"The other reason was that the judge's decision left the case unsettled, and there was little likelihood that it ever would be settled. Russell McGrath and Henry MacLeod (managing and city editors) felt that the question of who told the truth was of great interest and importance. Not only was the reputation of a university professor in doubt, but the reputation of the (Canwell) committee and Hewitt—who had figured as an important witness for the Government in immigration cases—also were at stake. Their only instructions to me were to see if I could find out the truth.

"First thing I did was to have the Associated Press get us photostatic copies of the evidence and testimony of the New York hearing. Meanwhile, I began talking to all individuals who could be counted upon—or so I thought—to be interested but neutral.

"The evidence presented to Judge Levy showed that the case had been completely one-sided and contained four misstatements of fact which were harmful to Rader. That caused us to look deeper into the case.

"From the so-called neutral sources, the only encouragement I got was from Dr. Allen (president of the University of Washington). Others took the attitude that Rader was a Communist or a fellow traveler and therefore, even though a mistake may have been made, nothing should have been done to help him.

" 'After all, he's only one man and presuming you do find he's right, you'll be upsetting the work of the committee,' one man told me.

"Then I went to Rader and told him we wanted to check his story. He was glad and was very cooperative. His story checked out. Meanwhile, I also questioned most of the ex-Commies I knew in town. None of them could put Rader in the party.

"We kept turning up evidence and affidavits which further supported Rader's case. Finally it was overwhelming in the eyes of every fair-minded person who has taken the time to study it."

This demonstration of the industry and vigilance of a newspaper and a reporter has deep significance. Dr. Rader was the principal figure in the case at hand—but it could have been you, or your neighbor, or your best friend.

A free press, with courage, sets the record straight when others were unwilling, or negligent, in their duty to do so. Dr. Rader's dignity was restored and a damaging inference against our State courts was labeled a lie.

All because a newspaper, and a reporter, sought out the truth in the best tradition of their business.

Curtailment of Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 1950

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, as sponsor of H. R. 8205, to rescind the order of the Postmaster General curtailing certain postal services, I was pleased to receive the following resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of East Orange, N. J., on May 8, 1950:

Whereas it is the judgment of the city council that the plan of the United States Post Office Department to reduce the number of mail deliveries and to effect other curtailment of mail service is not warranted; and

Whereas numerous objections have been received from the citizens of East Orange to any reduction of mail service: Be it

Resolved, That the City Council of the City of East Orange does hereby express its opposition to the plan of the United States Post Office Department to curtail the mail service in the city of East Orange and respectfully urges the Members of Congress of this State to oppose such plan; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Senators and Congressmen from this State and that a copy be forwarded to the Postmaster General.

Tariff Reduction Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made before the committee for reciprocity information of the United States Interdepartmental Trade Agreement Organization, May 24, 1950, Washington, D. C.:

Greetings. The President's Council of Economic Advisers points with pride to the drop in unemployment, which, Nation-wide, is down to an average of 5½ percent.

This is a most encouraging improvement from a general viewpoint.

There are several soft spots in the picture, however.

On close scrutiny they do not show up so favorably.

One of them is New England, where the average percentage of people who cannot find employment is up to 12 out of each 100 workers. Roughly speaking, 1 out of every 8 employable persons is jobless.

This is a serious situation.

It will become worse instead of better if the State Department is permitted to open the gates to a flood of foreign imports that will undersell the woolen and worsted industries of New England—even in New England.

Because the labor costs of foreign manufacturers who are engaged in similar work are from 4 to 20 times lower than our own.

There is not one person at this hearing who dares to suggest that we slash the pays of our own textile workers and reduce their standard of living to a bare subsistence level

in order to offset such starvation competition.

Foreign textile manufacturers are doing well, in a financial sense, even though it is at the expense of their underpaid workers. They have many other markets throughout the world where they are selling their goods without hurting the countries to which they export.

In fact, we do not need their woolen and worsted goods, because we have adequate production facilities to supply our own wants. Why, then, should the State Department encourage them to send their products here, when the immediate result would be a solar plexus blow to our own depressed textile industry?

It makes sense to help these other nations and ourselves by importing those raw materials and manufactures which we do not have or produce. But why open up the whole of the United States to all imports, when such a policy would surely harm our established industries?

Our problem is to expand rather than contract in order to provide job opportunities for our growing labor force. We cannot take care of our own workers and foreign workers at the same time when both are producing the same type of goods for the American home market under conditions that penalize the American manufacturer and the American worker.

Instead of this sacrificial policy I think the State Department would do better to advocate a point 4 program for those foreign nations to follow in their colonial holdings which they have failed to build up as markets over the years. Africa and the Orient offer tremendous opportunities for England, France, Italy, and other textile-manufacturing nations, if they would only pay some attention to the need for increasing the purchasing power of those substandard areas. Such a policy would open up additional markets in places where people need textile goods but do not have the facilities to produce them. In turn, it would help to raise the wage rates and living standards of European textile workers.

But no, the State Department is so eager to please foreign nations that it hesitates to tell them the adjustments which these nations themselves must make to meet the realities of the mid-twentieth century. Instead, it invites them to come into the overcrowded American market and just take, to the detriment of our own people. Perhaps the trouble lies in the fact that the State Department is so concerned with foreign affairs that it has alienated itself completely from the United States and its domestic problems.

You will notice that the European nations with disarming coyness are not pushing this tariff-reduction program.

That is what I fear.

They do not wish to arouse the suspicions of the American people before the gullible State Department commits this Nation to a policy that once in effect cannot be remedied.

Then they will drop the pretense and really move into the American textile market with a trade blitz against which there will be no protective barriers.

Foreseeing this, we are here to oppose it.

And I do not think that we are presumptuous in speaking up beforehand when the economic survival of basic New England industries is at stake.

Suppose we put the shoe on the other foot, just to see how reciprocal or fair, this whole business is.

Sylvan I. Strook, a leader in American textile manufacturing, had this revealing experience when his company tried to sell some woolen goods to England. The price of the cloth was $15.50 per yard. On top of this, the British Government added import duties and purchase taxes to the amount of $19.20 per yard, totaling 123 percent more than the cost of the goods themselves. It seems that the door to the textile market over there is closed, locked, and barred.

Spokesmen for the State Department and the ECA in hinting at the advisability of training textile workers for other jobs, are admitting that if their pet tariff reduction program is carried through, still more New England men and women will be thrown out of work.

In view of the administration's concern over the number of people who are out of work in the Northeastern States, it is a shocking contradiction to find two major agencies of the Government obstinately resolved to follow a plan that will increase such unemployment.

We hear much about Europe's dollar shortage, but it's Hush, Hush, when anyone happens to observe the scanty supply of same in the pocketbooks of displaced workers in our own American communities.

Could it be, gentlemen, that New England is chosen to be the humble and uncomplaining sacrifice on the altar of free trade so that other American industries may win concessions that will permit them to enjoy the double advantage of both home and foreign markets?

Mr. Paul Hoffman, Economic Cooperation Administrator, tries to make us accept the dim prospects with resignation by the following sophistry. New England textiles should not be afraid to meet this competition because I, as an automobile manufacturer on leave, do not fear competition from European manufacturers of motorcars. Mr. Hoffman goes on to say that he personally favors the abolition of tariffs on automobile imports.

Now all this sounds very logical, if not generous. But how would it work out? Our automobile production is rolling at such a record-breaking pace that supply is bound to pass demand before many months have passed.

Then what? Will Mr. Reuther, of the automotive workers union, go along with Mr. Hoffman and say: "Sure; we're not afraid. Let low-priced foreign cars come in, the more the better. It promotes international understanding."

Somehow, I do not believe that Mr. Reuther will be enthusiastic about the idea, for many members of his union will then be out of work.

At least the members will not be happy about it.

Because a man who is having difficulty in providing for his own family in the United States is not disposed to cheer on those high-policy programs that give away his job.

But to get back to New England, its textile industry, and what some call its semidepression.

In your consideration of proposed tariff reductions, never forget that your first responsibility is to work for a system of free trade that will not evict American workers from their trades.

Too many have lost them already in New England.

Visitor's Effort Unrecognized

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 25, 1950

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent granted by the House I am enclosing an interesting article from the Wichita Eagle of Wichita, Kans., of March 10. The article is entitled "Eight Million Acres Restored for Public Domain." It is a fascinating story of T. C. Elliot, who retired after 33 years of Federal service, most of which was in Washington.

The story concerns the restoration of 8,000,000 acres of land for public domain that came about through the efforts of Mr. Elliot.

Here is a case where a Federal employee rendered unusual service, even though his efforts have gone unrecognized:

VISITOR'S EFFORT UNRECOGNIZED—EIGHT MILLION ACRES RESTORED FOR PUBLIC DOMAIN

Eight million acres of land have been returned to the public domain thanks to the efforts of a former Government clerk, but the part he played in the vast transaction never has been fully told.

This is the story of T. C. Elliot, 74, retired after 33 years of Federal service, in Wichita this week visiting relatives.

Elliot has two letters, one signed by the President of the United States, and the other written by a Senator from Texas, proving almost conclusively that it was he who fathered the idea for the huge land transfer, but the irony of it is he has never received any real recognition for the act.

Elliot was a subordinate in the General Accounting Office at Washington, auditing transportation vouchers, and nearing his time for retirement, when the plan took shape in his mind.

As one close to the transportation field, Elliot knew, he recounted Tuesday, that land-grant railroads long had been lobbying in Congress to have removed from their charters the stipulation that Government supplies must be carried over their lines at reduced freight rates.

He also was aware that millions of acres of land, left over from the some 152 millions granted the railroads by the United States during the development of the West, remained unused.

Placing these facts side by side, Elliot evolved his scheme: Why not a barter arrangement, where the Government would voluntarily withdraw its right to lower rates if the railroads would return to Federal control that portion of the land grants they had not put to productive use?

A Government underling can dream up grandiose plans but obtaining a hearing is often another matter. That is where Elliot's large acquaintanceship in Washington stood him in good stead, he said.

Drafting his plan in a 12-page memorandum, he discarded the idea of submitting it through channels, electing instead to take it to a good friend, the late Senator Morris Sheppard of Texas. This was in the summer of 1939.

"Senator Sheppard looked over the papers and hesitated over whom to send the memorandum to," Elliot narrated. "So I suggested, 'Why not go to the top?' "

Thus the memorandum was forwarded to President Franklin D. Roosevelt, and soon a reply was received from the White House reporting that the matter had been submitted to the Secretaries of Interior and Justice for further action.

It is that letter, signed in the President's hand, in effect acknowledging the suggestion as Elliot's that the veteran employee always keeps on his person. The other letter is written by the Senator, and it further substantiates his claim.

Elliot left the Government service in 1944, but it was not long after, in late 1945 or early 1946, he does not exactly recall which, that a bill incorporating his idea became law. The initial statute removed the restrictive

rate clause with respect to nonmilitary supplies. An amendment which Elliot says was adopted last year included military items as well. Thus one of the biggest domestic land swaps in modern times came about.

Now a resident of Daytona Beach, Fla., Elliot plans to remain here another week with his brother, B. W. (Bee) Elliot, and sisters, Mrs. Flora Taylor, 702 South Topeka, and Mrs. Bertha Neal, 118 East Kellogg.

Who Is Competent To Decide Which News Is Slanted?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 25, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Saturday Evening Post of May 27, 1950:

WHO IS COMPETENT TO DECIDE WHICH NEWS IS SLANTED?

People who are on the alert for the beginnings of censorship in this country are taking a second squint at the proceedings brought by the Federal Communications Commission against Mr. G. A. Richards, who operates three radio stations: in Cleveland, Detroit, and Los Angeles. In February 1948, Mr. Richards, who makes things as hard for himself as possible by holding strong anti-Fair Deal opinions, was the subject of a complaint by three former employees of his Los Angeles station, who stated that he frequently ordered newscasts to be slanted in a manner unfavorable to minority groups, the Truman administration, and the depressed and despised of the earth in general. On the basis of these statements, James Roosevelt wrote to the Commission suggesting an investigation of all three of Mr. Richards' stations. Inasmuch as any attempt to control slanting runs into the touchy issue of censorship, the charges appear to rest mainly on the clause in the communications law which gives the Commission authority to pass on the character of proprietors of radio stations.

Ordinary understanding of this requirement is that by character is meant the degree of responsibility—moral, financial, or other—which might be expected of a man who enjoys the limited monopoly which operation of a radio station confers. The notion that failure to appreciate James Roosevelt implies deficiency in character would probably not have occurred to the framers of the communications law; nor would it have occurred to them that discussions or orders behind the scenes in a broadcasting studio or the proprietor's private views about certain politicians would be seriously considered as grounds on which to challenge a man's fitness to operate a radio station—particularly when there seems to have been no complaint of the fairness or impartiality of the actual programing. If a Government commission is to inquire into the opinions, prejudices, or social connections of radio proprietors, we are nearing the point of no return, as far as arbitrary censorship is concerned.

The Washington Post aptly challenges the FCC on its claim to deny radio licenses even on the ground that news was actually slanted. "We do not believe," says the Post, "that the Commission has any standards that would be a safe guide in such a venture. Every decision as to what shall go on the air and how it shall be 'played' is likely to be influenced by the broadcaster's or the newscaster's prejudices. We doubt that the FCC can apply stricter policies in the regulation of broadcasting than the press generally applies without taking upon itself the unmanageable problem of censorship." A Government bureau, permitted to decide whether prejudice or news judgment or lack of time or mere whim accounted for this or that alleged distortion, would be an important instrument of tyranny.

The argument has been that the natural limits imposed on the number of stations which can operate justified a stricter censorship than would be permissible over the press. New technological developments like FM, however, have greatly increased the opportunities for competition in broadcasting.

The Richards case sounds suspiciously like one of those "alarms in the night" which free men fail to heed at their peril.

Tribute to the Late Samuel Gompers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 19, 1950

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the enclosed tribute which I recently paid to the late and much lamented Mr. Samuel Gompers, former president of the American Federation of Labor, on the occasion of a memorial ceremony honoring him held by the Massachusetts Federation of Labor at Boston:

MAY 9, 1950.

Mr. FRANCIS E. LAVIGNE,
Director, Massachusetts Federation of Labor, Boston, Mass.

DEAR FRANCIS: I more than appreciated your kind invitation to be with you on May 13 at the Samuel Gompers centennial dinner.

I fear that my official engagements here will not permit me to attend and I very reluctantly must send my regrets. However, please let me compliment you upon the honor and tribute you are paying to one of the truly great Americans of the century.

Samuel Gompers stood out as a man, as a labor leader, and as a friend of the inarticulate and the helpless. But, most of all, he stood out as a devoted patriot imbued with great courage, possessed of clear vision, gifted with inspiring zeal. In his time and generation, he made outstanding contributions to the preservation of our free American institutions. The clarity of his opinions, the soundness of his judgment, the moderation of his approach, and the unyielding quality of his loyalty were exceeded only by his devotion to the toiling masses, who form the enduring fabric of the Nation.

You have honored me greatly in so generously inviting me to join you in honoring him and I am proud and privileged to pay my own humble tribute to the memory of this great man, who learned early in life that, in the words of William Osler, "We are here not to get all we can out of life for ourselves, but to try to make the lives of others happier."

Wishing you a most successful occasion and with greetings and best wishes to all, I am

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP J. PHILBIN.

Free Labor Against Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 24, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, a most unusually informative article has just come to my attention. It is written by David Dubinsky, the well-known labor leader and president of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, A. F. of L., and was published in the April 1950 issue of the quarterly magazine Foreign Affairs. Mr. Dubinsky's article, World Labor's New Weapon, deals with the new international labor alliance which was organized recently in London and with the role of free labor throughout the world as a dynamic force in the struggle against communism. I earnestly urge all my colleagues to read this very important article:

WORLD LABOR'S NEW WEAPON
(By David Dubinsky)

Students of international affairs were quick to recognize the establishment of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU), at London during the first week of December 1949, as "an event of historic importance, in many respects the most significant development in the struggle for a free world."

The ICFTU is not the first attempt at world labor organization. About 85 years ago, the International Workingmen's Association was founded by Karl Marx; it succumbed to the Bakunin-Marx feud and the differences caused by the Franco-Prussian War. The Second (Social Democratic) International was established in 1889, but could not weather the crisis of World War I. Its economic counterpart—the International Federation of Trade Unions (IFTU)—founded in 1901, managed to survive the war, but soon thereafter faced the ruthless assaults of the Third (Communist) International and its trade-union auxiliary, the Red International of Labor Unions (Profintern), which were set up by the Bolsheviks after they seized power in Russia. Not even the blows of the Nazis could entirely wipe out the IFTU, however, and it struggled on through World War II while Stalin was, for diplomatic reasons, officially "liquidating" his Comintern.

Despite determined opposition from the American Federation of Labor, the IFTU decided to merge with the World Federation of Trade Unions (WFTU), which had been established in January 1945 and included the Communist-controlled "trade-union" organization of Russia as well as the Congress of Industrial Organization (CIO), which hitherto had had no international affiliation. This marriage turned out to be a quarrelsome and miserable affair, for the Kremlin persisted in exploiting the WFTU as an instrument of its imperialist foreign policy. After about 4 years, the British Trades Union Congress, the CIO, and other free trade-unions withdrew.

Meanwhile, a realinement of profound importance was maturing in the ranks of world labor, and in June 1949 there was held at Geneva a preliminary conference of the free world labor organizations which set up the preparatory machinery for the recent London conference. It would be false, however, to conclude that the creation of the ICFTU was merely the results of the disintegration of the WFTU.

II

First of all, the new international is a product of a marked growth of unionism. Since 1933, American trade-unionism has expanded enormously, so that there are now 16,000,000 Americans in its ranks, and the dynamic unity demonstrated by the A. F. of L. and the CIO at the London congress raised the prestige and strength of all American labor. Across the Atlantic, the British trade-unions have not only survived a terrible total war but have risen to new heights of power. The free trade-unions of democratic Europe have revived, despite the cruel havoc wrought by the Nazis; in western Germany alone, the restored free-trade-union federation now has more than 5,000,000 members. In Latin America, labor has grown in numbers and maturity in the face of severe difficulties. In Japan there are today about 6,000,000 in the trade-unions. And in India and in the underdeveloped colonial areas, unionization has also made notable headway.

Secondly, the new international represents a fundamental departure from the pattern of all its predecessors. European trade-union aims and actions, though very important, are not its main wellspring. The present and potential strength of the new organization stem in large measure from the strength of labor in the Western Hemisphere and from the rising trade-union movements of Asia and Africa. At the London congress the representatives of the young trade-union movements of Asia and the colonial countries were vigorously independent. Here was no staging of a puppet show of colored folks, as is done—supposedly in the name of racial equality—at Communist-controlled conferences. That there was genuine cooperation on a basis of equality was demonstrated when 8 of the 19 members of the executive committee were chosen from organizations outside Europe and North America, where the great bulk of the present membership is to be found—3 from Asia and the Middle East, 2 from Latin America, 1 each from Africa, Australia-New Zealand and the West Indies. One of the most encouraging features of the London congress was the absence of great power domination. The president, Paul Finet, of Belgium; and the general secretary, J. H. Oldenbroek, of Holland; are representatives of small countries; and in order to avoid even the appearance of control by any one big power in the trade-union world, Brussels was chosen as the headquarters.

How profound a departure this is from the old game of power politics in world-labor affairs is strikingly confirmed by a comparison with the attitude of the Russian unions in 1938. The British TUC, desperately seeking to bolster the forces that were supposed to be in opposition to Nazi Germany, sought at that time to have the Soviet unions affiliate with the IFTU. But the Russians agreed to consider affiliation only on the condition that the IFTU first amend its constitution so as to provide for two presidents and two general secretaries with separate but equal authority—one president and one secretary to be selected exclusively by the Russian trade unions and the other president and secretary to be elected by a general vote of the IFTU congress, with the Russian delegates participating. The Russian unions also stipulated that no dues paid by them were to be used in any way that might be construed as hostile to the Soviet labor organization, the Communist Party of Russia, and the Soviet Government. At the same time, the Soviet trade-unions were to be assured the freedom to act as they pleased toward all other labor movements and governments.

The democratic structure of the ICFTU is anchored in the complete equality of rights of all its affiliates, regardless of the size of the country in which they function. No affiliate, no matter how small its membership, is compelled to accept the viewpoint of any other national trade-union center and the constitution provides effective democratic machinery for ascertaining common aspirations and for meeting common needs.

This principle of autonomy for national affiliates runs like a steel rod through the constitution and structure of the new organization. The prospects for full collaboration by the international trade secretariats—which are organizations for worldwide cooperation of affiliated unions in specific trades or industries—are much enhanced by the acceptance of the principle of autonomy. The IFTU and especially the WFTU could never reconcile themselves to the insistence of the international trade secretariats that their autonomy be maintained. Prior to the First World War, German trade-unionism, with its high degree of centralism, was predominant in the IFTU, and this militated against a full understanding with the trade secretariats. After World War II, the supercentralized Russian trade-unions dominated the WFTU and sought to turn these trade secretariats into mere departments of the international center. In its unrelenting counteroffensive, the A. F. of L. relied heavily on the trade secretariats and championed their autonomy.

Experience has taught the free-trade unionists the dangers of overcentralization. Hence the constitution of the ICFTU provides that: "With a view to giving special attention to problems affecting the workers in special areas or regions, in order to seek to further the aims and objects of the confederation, regional machinery shall be established for such continents or areas as may be determined by the congress or general council." The foundation for such regional machinery is already at hand in the Western Hemisphere through the Inter-American Confederation of Labor, and steps have recently been taken to consolidate effective regional machinery in Asia.

III

A third factor that made possible the formation of the new international is that in recent years there has been much rethinking of fundamentals in the ranks of free labor. Even before the London congress got under way some people prophesied that its sessions would be torn by a conflict between the non-Socialist American trade-unionists and their Socialist-minded colleagues from other lands. These prophets were wrong. On more than one occasion, when there was a difference of opinion, the delegates of the A. F. of L., CIO, and the United Mine Workers were actively supported by trade unions with a Socialist tradition and orientation. The congress steadfastly adhered to the policy of opposing communism by defending the democratic form of government. It consistently avoided becoming involved in disputes over the question of so-called free enterprise, which would divide its ranks unnecessarily. Neither British labor, the free labor organizations on the European Continent, nor some of the Asiatic unions, are advocates of free enterprise. Yet no one can question the vigor or reliability of their defense of democracy in their respective countries.

More and more American labor has come to realize that the vital line of demarcation dividing mankind today, within every nation as well as among the nations, is drawn not between those who would have the government own some industries and those who would have such industries remain under private enterprise, but between those who have contempt for the dignity of human life and those to whom human values, rights, and liberties are paramount. Last year American labor rallied to the support of the British Labor Government while it was under heavy attack in the United States and in Britain as a welfare state. This new approach represents the highest common denominator of agreement ever attained among the trade-unionists of Europe, Asia, Africa, and the Americas. Free labor everywhere recognizes the essential identity of nazism, fascism, falangism, and communism, and holds that free trade unions and governmentally controlled labor fronts are as incompatible as are democracy and dictatorship. Adhering to this principle, the London Congress rejected the Thailand and Dominican delegations because they did not represent bona fide unions.

The London declarations breathe a spirit of self-reliance, rather than a reliance on the state. The ICFTU declarations of policy have very litle Socialist phraseology in them and are refreshingly free from the clichés of the past. The word "socialism" has lost much of its luster in the eyes of labor as a result of national socialism in Germany and the "Socialist paradise" in the Soviet Empire. There is a widespread and growing feeling that though Marx is buried in London, Marxism is buried in Moscow. In its Manifesto and Declaration of Basic Social and Economic Demands, the ICFTU does not rule out competitive enterprise. Neither does it rule out public or government ownership; but in both public and private enterprise, the ICFTU insists that the workers shall enjoy certain basic rights and have an adequate voice in the economic life of their country. It is dedicated to the maintenance and expansion of democracy. In his significant address to the London Congress, President William Green of the A. F. of L., won hearty approval when he extended the concept of citizenship and democracy from the realm of political relations to the field of economy. The Manifesto of the London congress reads:

"We assert that economic and political democracy are inseparable. We demand full participation by worker organizations in economic decisions affecting planning, production, and distribution. Where vested economic interests block the road to human progress, private planning for profit must yield to public planning for the people."

In the light of the triumphant counter-revolution in Russia and the emergence of communism's offspring, Nazi-Fascist totalitarianism, an increasing number of people in the European labor movement have begun to doubt that state control is the panacea for social ills. As this doubt grows, there is a growing confidence in the usefulness of independent trade-unionism. In nearly every European country, the organization of labor into a political party preceded and, indeed, inspired the trade-union movement. The result was that political ideology greatly influenced the policies of the trade-unions. But since the war, trade-unionism even in Germany, where this development had appeared in its classical form, has undergone a profound change. In western Germany the trade-unions are bona fide and free, and are now separate from the Social Democratic Party, which is still generally recognized as the political party of labor.

The British Trades Union Congress, which has been the backbone of all British labor governments, is not immune to this process of change, and much hard thinking about basic principles is going on in its ranks. This has been especially stimulated by the fact that in Britain the trade-union movement is at one and the same time the backbone of the Government and the guardian of the prerogatives of its working-class membership. Experience has taught British labor that it is much easier to embrace a general program than to execute a particular policy.

In sum, all the free trade-unions of the Old World, while still largely continuing to advocate Socialist measures, have become aware of the dangers of bureaucratization of economic life and the growth of the octopus state. Even unions with the strongest Socialist leanings now realize the necessity of safeguarding the independence of their organizations in nationalized industries.

IV

The insistence that free labor and democracy are inseparable is at the very heart of the unequivocal opposition of the new international to all types of totalitarianism, the autocracy of Franco Spain or of Latin American dictatorships no less than the totalitarianism of Communist Russia and her satellites. With the defeat of Nazi Germany, Moscow-directed communism has, however, become the main danger to democracy and world peace. It is much more difficult to combat communism than it was to fight nazism and fascism, since communism pretends to be the champion of labor and poses as a higher form of democracy, to which it tirelessly pays homage. This is calculated hypocrisy, yet it is because of this pretense that the Communist fifth columns, with their numerous fronts, have so much more influence than the Nazi-Fascist outfits.

The defense of democracy against the Communist effort of world domination must include military measures. But military security alone is not enough. The ICFTU insists that political liberty, social justice, and economic security together form the life stream of every free nation. Economic help for the underdeveloped countries, and full national freedom for the dependent peoples at the earliest possible moment, are both essential for the defeat of totalitarianism. The paramount prerequisite in the defense of world democracy against communism or any other species of totalitarianism is not piecemeal or temporary recovery, but the integration of the economic life of the free countries into a balanced and sound world economy. The new international considers that the European recovery program and President Truman's point 4 are sound, effective policies leading to economic integration on a continental and world-wide scale.

Plainly, American trade-unionism, occupying a major place in the strongest sector of world economy, has a major part to play in this world-wide campaign. Perhaps it has something to teach its friends abroad. The standing which American trade-unionism enjoys today in the eyes of world labor is due above all to the benefits which labor organizations have won for the working people of the United States. Foreign trade-unionists are impressed by the high standard of living in the United States, and by the fact that organized labor in the United States enjoys greater recognition and more rights than in most other countries; and they have come to realize that, though American labor has a different and less radical-sounding philosophy than their own, the labor movement in the United States has in practice been very successful in defending and expanding the workers' interests.

Moreover, trade-unionists abroad have begun to perceive that, contrary to the old assumption, American labor does not limit its activities to questions of hours, wages, and working conditions, but takes an increasingly effective part in community problems and in international affairs. The traditional independence of American labor from all political parties, its critical attitude toward the state, and its inveterate and unceasing hostility to all species of totalitarianism have, nonetheless, been maintained. The success of this policy has aroused new interest abroad.

American labor has much more to offer the international free-trade-union movement than material aid. In its structure American trade-unionism provides the practical way of building a democratic labor movement free from denominational limitations. The American labor movement recognizes that the common struggle against the totalitarian menace demands that all democratic free trade-unions—Socialist, Catholic, Protestant, and the so-called pure and simple type—must unite their ranks on an international scale.

The unity of American labor at London was the decisive factor in building the first international bridge between the Christian- and Socialist-minded trade-unionists. American trade-unionism is, in principle, opposed to the organization of labor along denominational lines. In Germany, Austria, Switzerland, and Italy, American labor spokesmen, who are not Socialist-minded, minced no words in condemning all attempts to organize trade-unions on denominational lines which would only divide the ranks of free trade-unionism. Because of its resolute opposition to the organization of Christian trade-unions, American labor has gained considerable confidence among the Socialist-minded trade-unionists in their relations with the Catholic labor organizations.

At the same time it must be noted that American labor has within its leadership and membership a substantial number of adherents to the Catholic faith. Yet there are no separate Catholic trade-unions in the United States. There is not even any serious call for the creation of such labor unions. American trade-unionism has demonstrated in practice that there can be room aplenty for Catholic workers in the membership and leadership of a bona fide free trade-union movement organized on nondenominational lines. This obvious fact has convinced the overseas Catholic trade-unionists of the soundness of American labor practices.

In Europe some of the Christian trade-union organizations have been in existence for decades. In some countries they fought side by side with trade-unions whose leadership is largely Socialist-minded. The mere affiliation with the ICFTU by both of these types of unions in any one country should not be taken to mean their organic unification at an early date. Even in the United States, where no denominational differences enter into the picture, the A. F. of L. and CIO are both affiliated to the ICFTU as distinct bodies; no immediate organic unification has followed from such international affiliation. But in other countries, as in the United States, the affiliation with a common international trade-union center makes for closer coordination and cooperation among the various labor bodies. Furthermore, the common affiliation of the Christian- and the Socialist-minded free trade-unions in the ICFTU will tend to reduce the old suspicions and prejudices which have developed over the years between the two types of bona fide labor unionism.

As an active member of the ICFTU, the American trade-union movement, which is free from the antipathies and grudges rooted in the nineteenth century European conflicts between lay and clerical forces, will certainly play a prominent role in helping to overcome such diverse influences among the democratic trade-union movements. In London American labor made its first significant contribution in this direction, when Socialist trade-unionists voted to enlarge the executive committee of the ICFTU by adding the Italian Catholic trade-union leader, Giulio Pastore. Mr. Pastore was nominated by an Italian Socialist trade-unionist as the unanimous choice of the Catholic and non-Catholic democratic labor organizations in Italy.

At the same time American labor has been learning many things, and has been reorienting itself, quietly, steadily, and profoundly. After World War I foreign relations really seemed "foreign" to the American trade-union movement. Today the situation is completely reversed. American labor's complete break with isolationism first revealed itself after the destruction of the free trade-union movement in Germany and Austria, and the common struggle against nazism and fascism ushered in a new era for American labor. The change of mood of course reflected the changing attitude of the United States Government and of the American people as a whole. In 1934 the convention of the A. F. of L. considered the resolution of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union delegation "to instruct the executive council to take steps for affiliation with the IFTU"; and after some hesitation and negotiation, the A. F. of L. reaffiliated with the IFTU. It was actively associated with the International for only about 4 years; during the period 1919–39, however, for the A. F. of L. feared that the preoccupation of the IFTU with political problems would open the door to communism. United States labor did not yet realize how fundamentally antagonistic democratic socialism is to totalitarian communism; the CIO and the British TUC believed until quite recently that they could cooperate with Communist-dominated unions.

Today, the A. F. of L., the CIO, and American labor organizations outside both national federations share with Socialist-minded European unions and all other free trade-unions a common hostility to Communist despotism, and to its tools and agencies. The A. F. of L., which foreign labor once considered a conservative organization, is firmest of all in its insistence that the international trade-union movement shall continuously and energetically concern itself with such general political issues as human rights, political discrimination, genocide, the crisis in China, the national freedom and territorial integrity of weaker peoples, and the rising menace of forced labor. How far the wheel has turned is illustrated by the fact that today it is precisely the A. F. of L. which is most insistent that organized labor occupy itself with such problems. It does so because it has learned that only thus can the door be shut to communism. More and more the forces of free labor throughout the world are facing the complex problems of our difficult era in an undogmatic way; more and more they are freeing themselves from rubber-stamp phrases and absolutist philosophies, to seek practical, realistic solutions for present-day problems.

V

America was born in a revolutionary struggle for national independence, and the American people and the organized labor movement have a time-honored tradition of opposition to all forms of colonialism. The rising trade-union movements of the underdeveloped countries count on American labor to bring them powerful support in their struggles for national independence.

American labor can in turn immensely strengthen the world position of the United States if it assumes its full obligations in the ICFTU. Judging by the fantastic notions that some people abroad hold about our country, a darker and more forbidding Atlantic now hides America from the rest of the world than in the days of the first voyage of Columbus. By full participation in the international free trade-union movement, American unionism can make a major contribution toward the rediscovery of America—the real America—by the people of the Old World.

The London Congress is thus a landmark in world labor history. The road before the ICFTU will not be smooth nor will the course be easy to steer, even though a map has been provided. A basic unity of purpose and plan was achieved at London, but there are obstacles ahead and inner strains and stresses among the affiliates. Years of antagonisms will not be dissipated overnight. Much will depend on the energy and extent of American labor participation in the work of the new international. Indeed, American labor carries a doubled responsibility, for it must not only support the work of the ICFTU, but must be no less resolute in keeping the foreign policy of the United

States Government consistently and vigorously democratic. Vacillating policies, such as the one recently proposed by our State Department toward Franco Spain, can create grave misunderstandings of the American purposes among the laboring forces of Europe and Asia.

Moreover, the conflict between the ICFTU and the WFTU is bound to grow in intensity and bitterness. Both organizations are fighting for the biggest stakes in the world—the hearts and souls and minds of many millions of working people in scores of countries. Neither organization can sidetrack or soft pedal. Moscow could not possibly impose totalitarian communism on the rest of the world without first getting a stranglehold on the remaining free-labor organizations. That would entail the destruction of the ICFTU, now the head and heart of international democratic labor. The new international fully realizes the seriousness of the threat. The battle is all the more difficult because the WFTU is permitted full freedom to operate against free trade-unions in democratic lands, while the road is heavily barred to the ICFTU in all iron-curtain countries.

What is more, in France, Italy, and sections of Africa and Asia the WFTU still holds formidable positions, which the Communists won by infiltration during the 4 years when their association with the free unions covered them with a mantle of respectability. It will be a primary task for the ICFTU to unmask these organizations dominated by the WFTU and to liberate the workers from their influence. The challenge and threat of totalitarian communism to labor is worldwide. It can be met and defeated by free labor only on a world-wide basis. No trade-union movement struggling against totalitarianism in any country should be left to battle alone against an international menace promoted and supported by a gigantic totalitarian world power. A democratic world labor international is now a vital necessity for the preservation and growth of human freedom and social progress. The reality of this new internationalism was demonstrated at the London Congress, where all were allies, welded in a common cause against the threat of totalitarianism and reaction. German and Japanese free trade-union representatives are in the top leadership of the ICFTU on a basis of equality.

The new international is not based on alliances among various powers, and unlike the WFTU will not be a political instrument for any nation or combination of powers. But though it will be entirely independent of the governments of the countries where its affiliates are located, it cannot and will not be neutral in the historic struggle now going on between the democratic and totalitarian countries. No organization dedicated to the struggle for human rights and social justice can be above the battle when freedom and peace are so gravely endangered.

It is precisely because the role of free labor is so dynamic that the Communist attacks on the ICFTU are so full of fury. The establishment of the ICFTU is a categorical repudiation of the myth that Soviet totalitarianism is a progressive idea, or that the Communist system offers anything that will advance the interests of the international working class. Delegates representing 50,000,000 workers in more than 50 countries have now branded bolshevism the arch-enemy of labor. This may well turn out to be the blow that destroys the pretense under which bolshevism has for several decades made most of its gains—the supposition that it is a friend of the workers of the world. The international free-trade-union movement is a powerful weapon in the struggle for a society in which all human beings and institutions can strive to fulfill their aspirations in a civilized manner and under the guaranties of freedom.

Address of Louis Nizer, of the New York Bar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS B. HELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 11, 1950

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, Louis Nizer is a brilliant young man who practices law in New York City. He also finds time to do a little writing, and has authored the following books: New Courts of Industry, 1935; Thinking on Your Feet, 1940; What To Do With Germany, 1944; Between You and Me, 1948.

He is in great demand as an after-dinner speaker, and as a toastmaster he is without peer. At the fiftieth anniversary dinner of the Municipal Court of the city of New York, held at the Hotel Commodore, New York City, on December 5, 1949, he delivered an address which I am pleased to commend to the reading of my colleagues:

May it please Your Honors, may it please the distinguished guests on these daises, and may it please the highest court of all on this occasion—you ladies and gentlemen: Judge Lyman's words were not merely an introduction. They were a diploma—and I accept it even though I have never attended the school of virtues which it betokens. I am particularly grateful to him for presenting it with generosity cum laude.

A lawyer is the eager youth of a judge, and a judge is the mellowed ascetic age of the lawyer. It is good on such an occasion as this, all too rare, to fuse the two into one unity of professional comradeship devoted to the noblest of all causes—the cause of doing justice. I am mindful of the distinction which you have conferred upon me to represent the bar amongst such a galaxy of learned judges. But I am not unaware of the fact that this distinction is ringed with some hazards, and I intend to summon up all the resources of tact which every lawyer has a goodly supply of until he becomes a judge.

A young British naval student was examined by an admiral who had made a surprise visit to his academy. He was asked who the three greatest admirals in British history were. The young student replied, "Drake, Nelson, and I beg your pardon, sir, I didn't catch your name."

If any lawyer in this gathering doesn't know the name of every judge who bejewels this dais, I am authorized to say on his behalf that we still include those judges among the most distinguished of our day. Indeed, I am ready to make another concession to tact. We lawyers are ready this evening to obliterate from our minds those decisions which were rendered against us unjustly. I refer, of course, to all adverse decisions. We are ready to take the position which a lawyer took when he told the appellate court: "Your honors decided a case identical to this a year ago for the plaintiff. Six months ago, Your Honors reversed yourselves and in an identical case decided for the defendant. And, may I say, Your Honors, in both cases most admirably." For we lawyers are like Shakespeare's character—we take our pleasures with sadness and our troubles with a smile.

If you look upon these tiers of judicial weight (and if there are any amongst you who are not lawyers, I hope you don't misunderstand the upper tier to represent the highest court) you will see that there is room for one more dais. I should like to imagine that there is such an additional dais, peopled with the great law givers of the past.

Perhaps Socrates sits on that imaginary dais, with his long white beard, his rude nose, thick lips, and his bald pate—not a very appealing man, until he speaks. If he were called upon, I think he would say to you: "The law is not always wise, but it is wiser than those who administer it. It expresses the will and the reason of the body politic and claims by that title to overrule the will and reason of the judge and those of private men. To seek to be wiser than the laws is the very thing which is by good laws forbidden."

I should like to imagine that next to him sits rotund Lord Braugham. He says to you in a deep basso voice: "A judge can boast of his achievements only when he can say that he found the law dear and left it cheap; that he found it a sealed book and left it a living letter; that he found it the patrimony of the rich and left it the inheritance of the poor; that he found it a two-edged sword of craft and opposition, and left it the staff of honesty and the shield of innocence."

I imagine that next to him sits our own great John Marshall. If you had met John Marshall in the anteroom of this ballroom where all the judges were having cocktails before this event, you would probably have seen a man of tousled hair, unkempt suit, and mud still on his shoes from the unpaved sidewalks of Washington. He would have been convivial and informal. He might have said to you what he once did say: "The acme of judicial distinction is the ability to look a lawyer straight in the eyes for 2 hours and not hear a damned word he says."

And if you were encouraged by the informality of the occasion and the fact that at least your cocktail glass was on a plane with his, you might recall to him what Lord Hewitt once said about the failure of judges to listen: "The only impartiality possible to the human mind is that which arises from an understanding of neither side of the case."

If Judge Marshall had been inspired by the light mood, he might have told you his favorite ancedote about the time he told his brethren on the United States Supreme Court that they must no longer sip wine during the discussions of cases, except on rainy days. On one occasion he asked his Associate Justice, brother Justice Storey—to whom, incidentally, he usually turned and said, "This is the law. Now go out and find me a precedent"—he asked Judge Storey to go to the window to see whether it was raining. Judge Storey reported lugubriously that the sun was dazzlingly bright. Judge Marshall, with the resourcefulness which was later to be reflected in his constitutional opinions, said: "Well, our jurisdiction extends over so wide a territory, that under the doctrine of chance, it is very likely that it is raining some place, so we shall have Madeira."

But if Judge Marshall had ascended this imaginary dais, then you would have seen six feet two of majesty and authority, and if he would have spoken to you he might well have said: "A constitutional government is as good as its courts, no better and no worse. Its laws are only its promises. It keeps its promises or it breaks its promises in its courts."

Next to him, I should like to imagine sits William Murray, better known to you as Lord Mansfield. It was he who was responsible for the maxim of the great seal of the United States, which reads "Fiat justitia ruat coelum"—"Let justice be done though the heavens fall." He had a sensitive eye and heart. He once said: "Law and equity are two things which God hath joined together but which man has put asunder. It is the weak and the poor who need most the safeguard of a strong and independent judiciary. One cannot be sure always of running

with the pack. He may find himself the pursued rabbit."

On Lord Mansfield's left, I should like to imagine sits Judge Cardozo. Some of us feel we have been touched with greatness by knowing him. Here was a man who combined genius with saintliness. Are there any lesser words to do him justice? At a gathering such as this of lawyers and judges, in which he delighted, he would combine his wit with his judgment, like brushwood with timber, to make a bright fire.

I remember his description of that rarity, an arrogant judge, whom he described with his customary felicity, as "a judge who had a suspicious familiarity with those sections of the Civil Practice Act under the title 'contempt.'"

He delighted in telling the story of the fledgling lawyer who appeared before the highest court and proceeded with great elaboration to expatiate on very elementary principles of law. The chief judge leaned down very benignly, and in a friendly manner apologized for his interruption and said, "I trust that counsel will give this court credit for knowing the fundamentals of the common law." The young lawyer replied, "Oh, no, sir; that is the mistake I made in the lower court."

Finally, Judge Cardozo might well have drawn upon his great fund of aphorisms to tell you that in a London gallery there is a famous painting by Champaigne showing Cardinal Richelieu in three poses—one of the front of his face and two profiles facing the center. He would have told you that that is the way justice looks—both lawyers present the profiles, and only the judge in the center looks the truth directly and fully in the face.

At the end of this imaginary dais sits Judge Roger Taney. He had deep, sunken eyes and a high forehead which accentuated his ill health. He was a man of ardent temperament and iron will, and when he reviewed the changes in jurisprudence he used to tell of the old English judge who exulted in giving harsh judgments. "Whenever the facts were nicely balanced, he seemed to be friendly to injustice. The kind of judge," he would say, "who would indict you for blowing your nose and then quash the indictment because it didn't describe which hand blew it." He demonstrated the high mission of the judge who affects all eternity because he can never tell where his influence stops.

From this imaginary dais, ladies and gentlemen, and from the live dais beneath of distinguished judges, we learn, I think, the great service of our judiciary.

In the Netherlands, there are stonecutters who live in obscure little huts and each day they weigh on their scales jewels so precious, that any one of them would suffice to take them out of their poverty forever. But at the end of the day, when they have returned the jewels to their anxious owners, they sit down serenely to dinner. On the same table where they weighed another's treasure without envy, they spread their frugal meal. So lives the judge. He decides enormous issues involving other men's treasures, and even their lives, but after he has polished his opinions so that they will reflect the brilliance of his wisdom, he retires to a simple life of learning and serenity.

Tonight, we celebrate the fiftieth anniversary of the municipal court, the court of the poor who are most in need of justice; the poor who understand that justice should be the highest expediency; that justice is the bread of the nation and that the nation hungers for it. If there were 50 candles here tonight on a birthday cake, they would throw a symbolic light across the Nation. For those who govern lead the blind, but those who administer justice give light to their eyes.

And now I have finished, and I know from experience as a lawyer that there is one moment in every trial when, no matter how much the lawyer has taxed the court's patience, he is forgiven. Love flows down from the bench to him. A smile embraces him and, for a moment, the lawyer feels that he is the most popular man in the courtroom. All this is occasioned by a few words which the lawyer utters. It always happens when he says, "Your Honor, we rest." Ladies and gentlemen, I rest.

Transportation of the Mails

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. WALSH
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 25, 1950

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of discussion in the House of Representatives pertaining to the recent order of the Postmaster General curtailing mail service.

I recently addressed the House regarding the serious situation existing in the postal service, as it pertains to the transportation of the mail by the railroads of this country, and I pointed out at that time that the Post Office Department takes nearly 50 percent of what we are paying for in the transportation of the mail for empty railroad cars.

Ever since the Railway Mail Pay Act of 1916 the railroads of this Nation have collected millions and millions of dollars from the Post Office Department for the carrying of these empty mail cars, and I recently introduced House Resolution 547 calling for a complete investigation of the situation, and I wish to call to the attention of the House of Representatives, an editorial that appears in the Aviation Week, the leading aviation magazine in the United States. The editorial is as follows:

THE GREAT TRAIN ROBBERY OR OUR SELF-SUPPORTING RAILROADS

We have before us the Southern Railway's System's new advertisement in Business Week for May 6. The rails have been pretty noisy for a long time about subsidies and how they don't have any. This ad is typical.

It says that of all the forms of intercity commercial transportation, only the railroads are self-supporting. "They don't leave it to George," says the Southern.

George is you, Mr. Taxpayer.

"The railroads pay their own way. * * * It isn't easy, especially when we have to compete for business with subsidized carriers. But it's easier on you and your pocketbook, George."

Frankly, to the contrary, it does look pretty easy to us, but if what we read in the stuffy CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is true, it definitely isn't easy on us tax-paying "Georges."

For we started reading the fine print in the Appendix of the RECORD and after we got through some of the complaints of a certain Indiana Congressman we could practically feel you railroads snitching our wallets.

It certainly smashed a lot of illusions we Georges had built up in our minds from reading all those ads and press releases about how only you in the transportation world got none of those juicy subsidies.

Because Representative JOHN R. WALSH contends that ever since the Railway Mail Pay Act of 1916 was passed your railroads have pocketed millions and millions of our dollars which the Post Office Department allows you for carrying empty mail cars all over the biggest railway system in the world.

One big reason, it seems, that you railroads can be so self-supporting is that we Georges paid you in 1946, for example, for carrying 580,462,152,219 cubic-foot-miles on nonlocal surface mails, and yet you really carried only 323,677,344,195 cubic-foot-miles. That means that in 1946, 44.24 percent of the space we tax-paying Georges paid for was not used. Even now, Mr. WALSH says, the Government—meaning us Georges—pays about $250,000,000 annually to you railroads for transporting mail, but we receive only half this service we pay for. This is because—as you fellows knew all along, you jokesters—the 1916 act requires the same rate for the return of a mail-storage car as was paid for its full outbound movement, provided the car is not used by the railroad for other traffic on the return run.

In dramatic fashion, Mr. WALSH introduces testimony in Postmaster General Donaldson's own words before the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

"Yes * * * there is a difference in pay to railroads. * * * I think what you are talking about is space purchased by full cars or storage cars or what-not. That is different from the regular RPO lines, the lines in which railway postal clerks operate. Now with reference to the space for transporting mails by full carlots or by 15 feet or 30 feet or 45 feet or what-not, I think that our investigation indicated that we used about half of the space that we paid for. Under the law, if we transport a carload of mail from New York City to San Francisco we pay for that so much per foot per mile, so to speak, and then we pay for the return movement of the car, whether we use it or not. There is far more mail moving west than there is mail moving back."

After reading this, the rest of you Georges may like to know what the General Accounting Office told the Senate Post Office Committee about this particular manner in which the railroads self-support themselves out of our pockets. After its own study of the so-called round-trip provision of the act, it told the Senators:

"The study has indicated that cars carrying full pay loads out do not return promptly, but are often directed to other use for the carrier's convenience and substitute cars are returned, making it possible for the railroads to realize a greater income. The propriety of this practice is a possible question since the act does not appear to anticipate such substitution. * * * Many substitute cars are returned in freight trains and the trip is paid for at passenger rates.

"The operation of the round-trip provisions has resulted in numerous complex agreements, which assure the railroads full payment for all returned deadhead cars and empty space. In some instances the return movement is in advance of the out-bound loaded movement."

This last idea is ingenious. This wrinkle extracts our money to buy empty space on the return portion of a round trip that hasn't started yet. How self-supporting can you be?

And C. B. Allen, a very capable news hawk, finds interest in the GAO's comment: "In practically all instances, the carrier is paid more by the Post Office for the return of a car empty than if the car was carrying a payload of a private shipper. Returning a car empty is to the railroad's advantage." (Especially if it can get paid for the return trip before it starts out.)

Two years ago, Mr. Allen reported in the New York Herald Tribune, the railroad post

office practice reached the proportions of a minor wartime scandal when it was charged in Government circles that the railroads had been operating empty cars back and forth across the country, despite an acute shortage of shipping space, to collect the higher mail pay rate.

Mr. Walsh, in a final word, says "The Post Office Department has permitted the railroads to abuse this provision of law in such a way as to increase greatly the amount of empty space paid for. While some empty returns must, under the law, be paid for, this has been turned into a racket by the railroads with Post Office Department approval."

So ends today's lesson on how America's self-supporting railroads are the only form of intercity commercial transportation who don't still rely on help from the people's tax dollars. That's how the railroads are easier on you and your pocketbook.

Civil Government for Guam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAY LeFEVRE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 23, 1950

Mr. LeFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of the House Committee on Public Lands, I am very happy that today the House acted favorably on H. R. 7273, a bill to provide civil government for Guam, and for other purposes.

The people of Guam have been Americans for over 50 years. They are nationals of the United States. Some have gained citizenship, but citizenship has been only open to the few. None are aliens. Politically, economically, socially, linguistically these people are Americans.

Let us look at these people on whom we are considering bestowing the greatest privilege in this world today. The original Guamanians are known as Chamorros, who inhabited all the Mariana Islands in which Guam lies. They were large handsome people, perhaps kin to the native Polynesians of Hawaii. But no full-blood Chamorro now survives. Chamorro is the basic stock with which Spanish, Filipino, Mexican, Chinese, Japanese, and American have mixed to form the present Guamanian people. This intermixture began over 250 years ago. The Filipino and Spanish blood have been the strongest. During the years of Spanish rule the estimated population living in 1521, the year of Magellan's discovery of Guam, was 35,000. When officers of the United States Navy took the first census, the population had been reduced to 9,676.

The Chamorro were almost reduced to extinction. The surviving Guamanians had long since been Christianized, thoroughly imbued with the influences of western civilization and citizens of Spain. Since the American regime began following the Treaty of Paris in 1898, American influences have been strongest and further racial intermixture has been slight. Only 15 Japanese were found on the island in 1901 and only 39 lived there in 1940. The number of Filipinos residing among the Guamanians have decreased, until only 32 remained in 1940. The American period has been one of racial consolidation and increase. The once mixed population has merged into a Guamanian people. By 1940 they had increased to 23,067 in number.

The Guamanians have continued to increase in spite of the deaths and privations suffered at the hands of the Japanese for 2½ years during World War II. They number over 26,700 and half this population is under 16 years of age. All indications point to a future population of 50,000.

These people have not only merged and increased during 50 years of American rule, but, what is more important, they have also become Americans in habit, thinking, and language. English is spoken everywhere except by the very old, although the Chamorro tongue is still the language of the homes. Eighty-five percent of the people over 10 years of age are literate. Today almost the entire school-age population of 8,460 students are enrolled in schools. The village schools and high school run on two shifts to take care of all the pupils. Education is demanded as strongly in Guam as it is here in the United States. Guamanians have come to the United States to college and professional schools. They are coming now in greater numbers to train for the work of doctors, lawyers, engineers, businessmen, and Government administrators that are needed on their island.

One cannot be among the Guamanians but a short while before being forcibly struck with their American ways. The men and women who appeared before the hearings of the House Committee on Public Lands in November 1949, revealed a thorough grasp of the meaning of citizenship and of an organic act, and understood and presented their problems in a way that would do credit to any American community. No interpretations were needed there. They were articulate in their English presentations, clear and precise in their thinking.

A trip down the business district of the capital and adjoining villages, rebuilt since the war, show Guamanians in the business of any small American city. Two young members of the Guam Congress have a construction company and import prefabricated houses. Another is building a large modern laundry. Department stores carry well-known brands of American clothing, shoes, and dry goods. Guamanians are the owners, the bookkeepers and the clerks. The familiar sign of American famous brands, insurance agencies, shipping lines, sporting goods stores, lawyers' shingles, restaurants, hamburger stands, pool halls, and taxi companies give an index of how American the Guamanians have become.

A walk through the administration building shows all offices staffed with Guamanian clerks. In a visit to the houses of the Guam government meeting in their beautiful, mahogany-paneled modern building, one hears earnest men and women discussing intelligently and with great dignity the problems and needs of their people in a typically American manner. Across the street is a modern police station, with latest radio equipment, record systems, investigation devices, and mobile crime laboratory. A staff of 275 alert Guamanians man the force that polices the entire island, outside the military reservations. They have the responsibility of law and order for a population of 75,000 now residing in Guam. Guamanians preside over the Guam courts except for the court handling Federal business and the court of appeals.

One meets Guamanians as priests of the church, the superintendent and teachers of the schools, the island postmaster, and staff of the agriculture department.

The people for whom this legislation is proposed have been long in contact with the Western World and the American way of life. These are an educated and sophisticated people in search of local self-government and a permanent government by law. I was struck during my recent visit in Guam by the completely American character of these people. These Guamanians are no South Sea natives dressed in cotton wrap-arounds and living leisurely from the fruit of their island. Nothing could be further from pictures drawn by fiction of the South Sea people than the Guamanians. They are called Guamanians, but they are truly Americans. I found farmers tilling the soil and raising cattle, businessmen importing American manufactures and retailing goods in impressively sized department stores, young men teaching in the schools, trained lawyers sitting in the legislature and the bench of the island courts, young men and women dressed as young men and women are dressed in the offices of Washington, performing the duties of clerks and minor administrators. Cars, radios, juke boxes, soft-drink dispensers, attractive frame cottages, athletic teams, and church socials are as characteristic of their lives as any American small town.

In the past 50 years the Guamanians have become Americans. In the postwar years the influence of up to 60,000 Americans in their island has intensified the Americanism of the Guamanians. Many of them have become American citizens under the laws existing in the 1920's, when a Guamanian child could inherit citizenship if either parent were an American citizen. Hundreds of veterans who served in our armed forces became citizens in 1946 under the authority of the Naturalization Act of 1940. Many more would follow suit if there were available courts or if the naturalization law had been extended beyond 1946.

The Guamanians now live as proven Americans in custom and in loyalty, part citizens and part noncitizens. They live with American citizens all about them. Their every wish is to become citizens and gain the recognition which they highly deserve.

American Taxpayers Have Sent Nearly $100,000,000,000 to Foreign Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 24, 1950

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, with Congress giving final approval to Marshall plan funds for the fiscal year 1951 of more than $3,000,000,000, our foreign-aid program, including $15,000,000,000 of World War I debts, is rapidly nearing $100,000,000,000.

This huge sum of money represents the aftermath of both World Wars to which has been added a part of the stupendous cost of the present cold war.

My purpose in calling attention to our foreign expenditures is to emphasize the part American taxpayers are playing in an effort to promote a permanent world peace by aiding friendly nations.

The $100,000,000,000 of foreign aid does not include the vast sums of money spent on our own national defense and which are also a part of the over-all cost of the cold war.

The following tables compiled at my request by the Clearing Office for Foreign Transactions, Office of Business Economics, Department of Commerce, summarize the foreign transactions of the United States Government and reveal the huge cost of our foreign-aid programs through December 31, 1949:

TABLE 1.—*Summary of foreign grants and credits utilized and capital investment in the International Bank and Monetary Fund—By program: World War II and postwar periods, through Dec. 31, 1949*

[In dollars, rounded to nearest million]

Total	78,048,000,000
International Monetary Fund	2,750,000,000
International Bank for Reconstruction and Development	635,000,000
Grants and credits utilized	74,663,000,000
Grants	63,186,000,000
Lend-lease	47,286,000,000
Civilian supplies	4,983,000,000
European recovery	5,132,000,000
UNRRA	2,660,000,000
Post-UNRRA	300,000,000
Interim aid	557,000,000
Chinese stabilization	500,000,000
Chinese military aid	116,000,000
Chinese aid	160,000,000
Greek-Turkish aid	594,000,000
Philippine rehabilitation	452,000,000
Korean aid	29,000,000
Refugee assistance	214,000,000
International Children's Emergency Fund	45,000,000
Inter-American aid	84,000,000
American Red Cross	73,000,000
Credits	11,477,000,000
Special British loan	3,750,000,000
Export-Import Bank loans	3,022,000,000
European recovery	902,000,000
Surplus property	1,363,000,000
Lend-lease	1,672,000,000
Other	768,000,000

Source: Foreign Transactions of the U. S. Government (basic data through Dec. 31, 1949), Clearing Office for Foreign Transactions, Office of Business Economics, Department of Commerce.

TABLE 2.—*Summary of foreign grants and credits utilized—By major country: World War II and postwar periods, through Dec. 31, 1949*

[In dollars, rounded to nearest million]

Total	74,663,000,000
Grants	63,186,000,000
Credits	11,477,000,000
ERP countries and participating dependent areas	52,721,000,000
Austria	650,000,000
Belgium-Luxemburg	610,000,000
Denmark	164,000,000
France	6,221,000,000
Germany	2,624,000,000
Greece	1,165,000,000
Iceland	8,000,000
Ireland	67,000,000
Italy	2,169,000,000
Netherlands-Indonesia	1,015,000,000
Norway	208,000,000
Portugal	1,000,000
Sweden	49,000,000
Switzerland	2,000,000
Trieste	31,000,000
Turkey	228,000,000
United Kingdom	36,872,000,000
Unallocated ERP countries	635,000,000
Other Europe	12,474,000,000
Albania	20,000,000
Czechoslovakia	220,000,000
Finland	151,000,000
Hungary	18,000,000
Poland	469,000,000
Spain	15,000,000
U. S. S. R.	11,249,000,000
Yugoslavia	332,000,000
American Republics	1,196,000,000
Australia	17,000,000
Bahrein	17,000,000
Canada	173,000,000
China	3,106,000,000
Egypt	20,000,000
India	176,000,000
Iran	38,000,000
Japan	1,716,000,000
Korea	300,000,000
Liberia	17,000,000
Philippines	620,000,000
Ryukyu Islands	53,000,000
Saudi Arabia	34,000,000
All other countries	41,000,000
International organization	610,000,000
Unallocated	1,335,000,000

Source: Foreign Transactions of the U. S. Government (basic data through Dec. 31, 1949), Clearing Office for Foreign Transactions, Office of Business Economics, Department of Commerce.

TABLE 3.—*Indebtedness of foreign governments to U. S. Government arising from World War I as of Jan. 1, 1950*

Total	$15,995,659,288
Armenia	29,881,350
Austria	26,024,540
Belgium	541,001,078
Czechoslovakia	195,716,022
Estonia	27,068,086
Finland	7,791,558
France	4,953,341,449
Great Britain	7,099,209,302
Greece	38,834,815
Hungary	3,039,604
Italy	2,074,631,284
Latvia	11,191,461
Lithuania	10,034,194
Poland	338,743,114
Rumania	83,065,257
Russia	491,302,893
Yugoslavia	64,783,281

Source: Foreign Transactions of the U. S. Government (basic data through Dec. 31, 1949), Clearing Office for Foreign Transactions, Office of Business Economics, Department of Commerce (Bureau of Accounts, Treasury Department).

President Truman's Speeches at Various Points in the West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 25 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the President of the United States recently took a trip to the west coast. On that trip he made several stops throughout the country, at which he made several statements and speeches. There has been some controversy because of reports of those speeches and answers to the speeches, made by our Republican friends. In order that the RECORD may be clear, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, separately, each speech made by the President, at Grand Coulee Dam, at Wallula, Oreg.; at Pendleton, Oreg.; Umatilla, Oreg.; La Grande, Oreg.; Baker, Oreg.; Ontario, Oreg.; Huntington, Oreg.; Pasco, Wash.; Wilbur, Wash.; and at Gonzaga University, Spokane, Wash.

I commend these speeches which were made at so-called whistle stops as being good reading not only for all Americans, but particularly for Republican critics of the President of the United States.

There being no objection, the speeches were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT DELIVERED AT THE DEDICATION CEREMONIES OF GRAND COULEE DAM, THURSDAY, MAY 11, 1950

This is an inspiring occasion. We have come here to dedicate Grand Coulee Dam—one of the mightiest structures man has ever built.

With this dam, man's ingenuity and perseverance have dramatically transformed the

energy of a mighty river into a great new source of national strength.

At the foot of this dam is the world's largest power plant. It is already generating more low-cost electric energy than any other plant in the world.

Behind this dam is a reservoir which extends 151 miles to the Canadian border. The water in that reservoir not only generates electricity, it helps prevent floods. And soon, it will pour forth to irrigate thousands of acres of land which are now desert.

Grand Coulee Dam—with its tremendous power and irrigation benefits—is an instrument of our democracy, forged to contribute to a better life for ourselves and our children.

This dam was not built by accident. It is here because men with vision and determination fought for its construction. Men in the State of Washington—many of whom are here today—saw what this dam could mean to the Northwest and to the Nation. President Franklin Roosevelt, whose name honors the reservoir behind the dam, transformed their vision into reality.

This dam had to be fought for. It had to be built over furious opposition. You remember what its opponents said. One Congressman said: "Up in the Grand Coulee country there is no one to sell power to except the coyotes and jack rabbits, and there never will be." Other opponents of Grand Coulee said it would be a "white elephant." They said it would be of no more value than the Pyramids.

We can laugh today at such foolishness. Right now, the generators at this dam are being run at overcapacity, straining to meet the soaring demands for power. All about us in the Pacific Northwest—in this land that was called the land of "coyotes and jack rabbits"—new jobs, new industries, new opportunities have been created.

Today those who opposed Grand Coulee are trying to cover their tracks. They are trying to jump on the band wagon.

But they can't erase the record. They did not understand then, and they do not understand now, the progressive steps that are necessary to keep our democracy strong, and confident, and moving forward.

The fundamental error of those who opposed Grand Coulee was their failure to understand that the United States is a growing, dynamic country. They saw no need to plan and work for a greater future. The way things were, was good enough for them.

But the American people have never been satisfied with the way things have been in the past. Our whole history is a record of eager striving to make things better.

One hundred years ago, out here in the Northwest, men and women were opening up new frontiers along the Oregon Trail. They struggled and fought to create farms and cities out of the wilderness.

The opponents of progress would have you believe that the frontiers are closed. They think we should now relax and struggle no more. Those are the men of little faith.

I say to you that the American spirit which blazed the Oregon Trail is not dead. Here in the Northwest you are still pushing back frontiers.

There is no better example of that than this great dam. Less than 15 years ago, the energy of the Columbia River poured unused into the Pacific Ocean. It flowed past cities which were hampered by lack of power, and past farm lands which had been abandoned for lack of water.

In those days, the people of the Northwest made their living primarily from timber and farming. They exported raw materials and imported finished goods. They lacked the power needed to process and manufacture their own raw materials.

Yet, through the heart of their rich country flowed the greatest potential source of hydroelectric power in the Nation—the Columbia River system. This area, tremendously rich in natural resources, was stifled, its future was limited, because it was unable to tap its own native source of power.

Today, we are well on the way to harnessing that power. The imagination and vigor of freemen have put the Columbia to work.

The results are clear. The Northwest is no longer a backward colony. It is now one of the fastest-growing parts of the country. In the past 10 years, the population of Washington and Oregon has increased more than 30 percent.

Jobs—permanent, productive jobs—have been available in new industries that have been established to use the Columbia's low-cost power. In the past 12 years, 11 new plants alone have paid more than $135,000,000 in wages and nearly $50,000,000 in taxes.

Power from the Columbia has not only served industry. It has made life easier in homes and on farms. The use of electricity on homes and farms in the State of Washington is more than twice the national average.

When Grand Coulee was being built, some thought it would hurt other parts of the country by drawing plants and industries from them. Of course, that has not happened.

The plants that have sprung up here were not moved from other States. They are new enterprises, adding to the productive capacity of the whole country.

The growing payrolls of the Northwest have made bigger markets for producers in every State. The products turned out here are needed elsewhere. Nearly half the aluminum of the United States is produced along the banks of the Columbia. This aluminum is used everywhere in the country. A single rolling mill 90 miles from here—at Spokane—is providing basic materials for 600 factories, from Boston to San Diego.

What has happened here is what happens in the case of underdeveloped areas everywhere—in our country and the world. Sound, productive investment always makes bigger markets and more jobs.

Not only is Grand Coulee contributing to the growth and strength of the Nation. It is also a paying proposition from the standpoint of the taxpayers.

When the dam was being built it was attacked as a colossal waste of public funds. Well, that was a colossal misstatement. The investment in the power facilities of Grand Coulee is being repaid right now, and with interest. And in a broader sense, the entire investment has already been repaid several times over in the increased national wealth it has brought.

We are not stopping our work at this point. The Grand Coulee project itself is not finished. More power generators are being added. And over the next several years we shall begin to put water on the land below here. Thousands of family-size farms will replace the present sagebrush.

Elsewhere in the Northwest work on other dams is proceeding. Hungry Horse Dam in Montana, Chief Joseph Dam just down the Columbia from here, and McNary Dam on the Oregon-Washington border, are all under construction. These and other dams are part of the great work that must be done to produce power, promote inland navigation, reclaim land for cultivation, and prevent destructive floods.

But even more than this is involved in the development of the resources of this area for solid growth. Forests and grasslands should be placed on a permanent, sustained-yield basis. Soil should be conserved and improved. Fisheries should be protected and enhanced. Mineral resources should be opened up and developed.

All this work can and should go forward together. Resources that occur together in nature must be developed and improved together.

This is the goal we are working toward here in the Northwest. It is the same goal for which we are working in other parts of the country.

In the Central Valley of California we are developing great power resources. With the help of that power we are redirecting the available water of the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers to bring about the most productive agricultural use.

In the Colorado River Basin we are working to achieve the most sensible uses of the very limited water supply, and to expand the power supply throughout the basin.

Down in the Texas, Oklahoma, and Arkansas area a number of dams are producing power, and others are being built. In that area also, as in the lower Mississippi Valley, soil conservation, flood control, drainage, and navigation work is going forward.

In the Southeastern States we are moving ahead with the construction of flood-control and power dams on the Savannah River, the Roanoke, and other streams. In that area, also, it is necessary to shift land uses to conservation farming and to restore the pine forests.

The northeastern part of the country has great possibilities for the development of additional hydroelectric power resources. Power from the redevelopment of Niagara Falls and from the St. Lawrence project will be nearly as cheap as the power out here in the Northwest. It is badly needed. We should construct these projects as soon as possible. And there are also power sites on the rivers of New England which should be developed soon.

In the Ohio Valley, and around the Great Lakes, the principal work that is being done is on flood control, navigation, and soil conservation. There is also much need for reforestation.

The Missouri River Basin is so large that it requires consideration of all aspects of resource development. From the high plains in the West to the humid areas of the lower Missouri, this basin presents perhaps the most complex problem of all. The work that is necessary includes extensive development of flood control, irrigation, and power works, as well as increased conservation efforts on crop and range land.

I have left till last mention of the Tennessee Valley. In that valley we have made more progress than in any other. There the idea of coordinated planning for all resources was first worked out and most completely applied. The Tennessee Valley Authority has been outstandingly successful in its area.

We have worked out a set of recommendations for a Columbia Valley Administration which builds on that successful experience but recognizes the different circumstances out here. Take one simple example. In this area, a farmer's right to the use of water is vital to his livelihood, and is protected by State laws. That is the way it should be, and the Columbia Valley Administration I have recommended would have no power to tamper with anyone's water rights.

The private power lobby, and other people who have selfish interests to maintain, say the Columbia Valley Administration would be a superstate. Of ccurse, that is not true. Ask the people in the Tennessee Valley. Ask the mayors of the cities and the governors of the States in that valley whether State and local governments are stronger or weaker as a result of the progress the TVA has brought. Ask them whether they have more or less influence on what happens in their valley with an agency that has its headquarters right there where they deal with it at first hand.

They will tell you that the TVA is the greatest thing that ever happened in their part of the country.

I believe the Columbia Valley Administration is a necessary next step in the sensible, democratic development of the resources of the Northwest. I believe the people of this area think so, too. And when they make their voices heard, I am sure the Columbia Valley Administration will be established.

We have embarked, all over the country, on the task of fully developing our resources for all the people. This is a job that will take many years to complete. It will require sound and careful planning.

But it is a work that fires the imagination. We are undertaking to use the resources we have so that they will grow, and not diminish, over the years. We intend that our children, and their children, shall live in a more productive and more beautiful land than we do.

We shall not get the job done, however, by sitting still. We must continue to take positive action. And we shall have to continue to overcome the opposition of those who do not understand the greatness of our goal, or who fear some impairment of their selfish interests.

We will meet opposition from the private power groups. Many of them—there are, of course, honorable exceptions—do not want the energy of our rivers put to use as power and sold to the people at cost.

We have already met this opposition in building Federal projects. And the people have met the same opposition in localities where they wanted to establish local public power agencies, such as public utility districts and REA co-ops.

This opposition of the private power companies is wrong. It would deny the people the benefits of low-cost power they themselves have brought about through public investment.

I am sure we will continue to overcome this opposition, just as we already have done in building Grand Coulee—just as the people already have in Nebraska, in large parts of Washington and Oregon, and in other sections of the country, where they have decided to distribute power through public bodies and cooperatives.

The benefits of public investment must be passed on to the people whose tax money is being used. Those benefits must not be diverted for private profit. We will continue to fight—and win—for that principle.

No doubt we shall also have to fight those who think expenditures for resource development are a waste of public funds. They should have disqualified themselves by now. Their fantastic claims about Grand Coulee prove that they can't tell the difference between a waste of funds and a sensible investment.

Finally, we will still have to fight those who imagine that every progressive action is another step down that famous "last mile to socialism." The facts continue to make that claim ridiculous. They called Bonneville and Grand Coulee steps to socialism. Now, I ask you—is private enterprise in the Pacific Northwest stronger or weaker as a result of those dams? Have you lost or gained industries and jobs? Do the people out here have less or more freedom? The answers are perfectly obvious.

It is clear that we must go ahead in every part of the country with our resource development work. And proceed we shall. We shall not be stopped by those who are timid or short-sighted or selfish. We shall not be stopped by discredited claims or by tattered slogans.

Our whole future depends on the wisdom and maturity we bring to bear on our national problems. We are engaged in a great struggle to achieve peace in a world beset with danger and threatened by Communist imperialism. We shall be engaged in the struggle for peace for years to come.

If we are to be successful, we must display the adventurous spirit and the firm courage of our pioneering fathers. We shall not succeed if we follow the advice of those who look backward, sighing for the fancied security of an earlier time. We must have strong minds, ready to accept the facts as they are, and to make bold, new plans based on the facts.

We shall need the same kind of vision that saw Grand Coulee Dam when there was nothing here but desert.

We shall need the same kind of steady perseverance that built this mighty dam over the opposition of men with narrow minds and faint hearts.

With that kind of vision and determination we can build a world in which men can be free under laws of their own making and can live at peace with one another.

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT, WALLULA, OREG., MAY 10, 1950

It certainly is a pleasure to see you here tonight, and I am more than happy to be here.

I am sorry that we are 10 minutes behind schedule, and I can't stay with you as long as I had anticipated staying.

We have had a grand day today. Everybody has enjoyed it. I hope the rest of the evening is going to be as good as the day has been.

Thank you very much for coming out.

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT, UMATILLA, OREG., MAY 10, 1950

I am very glad to have this opportunity to visit Umatilla. I am very much interested in the McNary Dam which is being built just a short distance from here on the Columbia River.

I was well acquainted with Senator McNary. He was leader of the minority while I was in the Senate, and one of the finest men I ever met, and I am very happy that this dam, named in his honor, is going to be completed one of these days.

It will bring power and improve navigation to this region. McNary Dam is an important unit in a series of giant projects which will harness the energy of the Columbia River for the benefit of the people.

The development of this river is one of the most magnificent undertakings the world has ever known. It is a tribute to the vision and determination of the people of the Pacific Northwest. It is also an outstanding example of how the people of the Nation can achieve great goals by using the resources of the Federal Government.

The fact is that these big dams on the Columbia River would not have been built unless the Federal Government had built them.

There are some people, I think, who would rather that they had never been built. There are some people who no matter what the Government starts out to do are against it.

I have heard so much clap-trap lately from people who are against progress that I did a little research on what these same people have been saying about new programs for the last 17 years. For the last 17 years, believe me, they have been against almost everything that was proposed. And the fact that none of their dire predictions have come true does not stop them for a minute. They just keep on predicting disaster and hope that some day disaster will overtake us so they can say, "I told you so."

Here is an example that will be of interest here in Umatilla. Back in 1937—I was in the Senate then—we passed a housing law to help the cities build low-rent public housing. At that time one of these Congressmen who was against everything said, and this is what he said: "By the passage of this bill you speed the day when your mayors will become obsolete, when your governors will be simply ornaments." Well, now, that day has not arrived yet, has it? Nothing of the kind happened. What did happen was that we got some good housing built, and during the war it came in very handy.

Then, after the war, we wanted to revive this kind of housing legislation to help relieve the acute housing shortage, and what happened—we heard the same old hue and cry.

Finally, we overcame this opposition to get a public housing law in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress last year. And we are going to get some more low-rent public housing.

(A voice in the crowd: You hope.)

Yes, we hope, and if you work hard enough, you can help me to get it. That is what I am out here for.

Some of it is going to be right here in Umatilla County. I have a report right here describing one of those housing projects, and I am very glad that you are going to get it. I am sure that the people of this community are not going to be frightened or fooled by a campaign of scare words any more than I am. I am hard to scare, as you know. We are going right on working for prosperity and peace, and if we keep up that sort of program, if we keep right at it, there isn't anything in the world can stop us from getting the kind of a peace that we want, there isn't anything can stop us from getting the proper development for this part of the world and all the rest of the United States.

I can't tell you how much I appreciate this most cordial reception for me. It has been wonderful. I have been across Iowa and Nebraska and Wyoming and Idaho and a corner of the State of Oregon, and I don't think I ever had a more cordial reception or a grander time since I have been in public service, and that has been 30 years.

I was riding around this part of the world in 1948, making a bid for your votes, and I am out here now to make a report to you as President of the United States on what I am trying to do and what I want you to help me do for the welfare and benefit of this country.

It has been a very great pleasure to be here, and I appreciate your cordiality and your kindness in receiving me this way.

Thank you very much.

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT, LA GRANDE, OREG., MAY 10, 1950

Thank you very much. It looks to me like everybody in this part of Oregon is here. I see three high-school bands, I believe, one of them just performed for me and did it well—just like it ought to be.

As I came into La Grande, it is easy to see why my good friend, Justice Douglas, spends so much of his time in the Wallowa Mountains. I am glad to hear that it will take a lot more than a set of broken ribs to keep him from returning to this part of the country.

Here in this area, and throughout the whole Northwest, one of your greatest assets is timber. More people in this State make their living from lumbering than from any other industry. That is important to everybody in Oregon. When the lumber industry is in good shape, that means more jobs, bigger payrolls, and better markets for farmers and businessmen.

Here in Oregon you saw what a slump in the lumber industry could mean. Last fall and winter a lot of people lost their jobs temporarily, and a lot of logging companies were in trouble for a while.

Things are back on the upgrade now. And we have got to keep the lumber industry, and our whole economy, moving upward.

One of the big reasons the lumber industry is running full blast again is that housing construction all over the country is at high levels. A great share of the credit for that belongs to the housing programs of the Federal Government. For the last 17 years we have been developing housing legislation that is helping people right now to build and buy houses.

That is important to the people who want homes. And it is important to the lumber industry here in the Northwest. Last year 11,500,000,000 board feet of lumber were produced and sold in Washington and Oregon. That is a market worth keeping. And I am glad to know that more and more processing plants are being built out here, to turn raw lumber into plywood and other finished products.

But there are other things that need to be done if the lumber industry is to stay healthy. There was a time, in the not too distant past, when it was common practice to skim off the cream of the forests in a rush to gain quick profits.

Here in the center of the ponderosa pine region, you have learned that the management and harvesting of timber must be on a sustained yield basis. That is the way to assure a permanent lumber industry.

Another thing we must do is to make sure that our public forest resources are made available to everybody on a fair and equal basis. We must not allow any monopolistic exploitation of these resources.

Over in the western part of the State the Secretary of the Interior has just issued new access road and sales regulations for some of the public forest lands. These regulations will provide the small timber operator with access to Government timber on equal terms with the large operator. Small and large operators are now cooperating with the Federal Government in making these regulations work.

I think it is a fair way to treat the use of all our natural resources: for the benefit of everybody.

A third step we need to take is to protect the forests better against fire, and to reforest cut-over and burned-over areas. I am glad to hear that the State of Oregon is making progress in replanting timber in some of the big burned-over areas. This is a tremendous task, but I hope it will be carried out vigorously.

All this work will take a considerable investment of money in a careful, long-range program. Some people seem to think it is wasteful to invest public funds in roads, and fire protection, and reforestation. That is a very short-sighted view, and I don't go along with them, because these investments will pay off tremendously in better forests in the future.

It is the samé way with the expenditures we are making in our effort to keep peace in the world. It is a hard struggle, and the costs of national security are by far the largest part of the budget. But the cost in dollars and cents is nothing compared to the terrible cost of another war.

We must remain strong economically, strong in arms and strong in spirit. We must cooperate with the other free nations. Those are the surest ways to preserve the peace.

It has been a grand thing to see you here today. I appreciate very much your coming out. I have had a most cordial welcome in the great State of Oregon. It looks to me like everybody in this end of the State has at least had a chance to take a look at me, and that is what I want you to do.

I know that the people of your State, while some of them call themselves Republicans, they usually vote with the Democrats on every issue that counts. And I appreciate that very much—I appreciate that very much.

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT, BAKER, OREG., MAY 10, 1950

Thank you very much. You are very kind to give me a reception like this, in this great town of Baker, and I want to tell you how much I appreciate it.

You know, I know something about the gentleman for whom this city was named. He was a most remarkable man. He was the first Senator from Oregon, and he had been a Congressman in Illinois, and had helped write the Constitution of the State of California, and he came up here to make a speech for Abraham Lincoln, and they elected him to be United States Senator from Oregon in 1859.

When the Civil War broke out in 1861, he went over into Pennsylvania, and believe it or not he organized a volunteer regiment which he called the First California, and there wasn't a Californian in it.

They went down with Baker to Ball's Bluff and he got himself killed. I went to see General Marshall who lives in Leesburg, Va., on part of the old Ball farm for which Ball's Bluff was named, and the general and I took a walk over the Ball's Bluff battlefield, and we found a little plaque in the cemetery there, about 40 by 60, with 21 unknown dead buried in it. And we couldn't find Baker's grave so we took a walk about a hundred yards down in the woods and we found a little stone marker which said "Col. Edwin Dickerson was killed here." General Marshall and I didn't know whether he was buried there or not, so we got hold of your Senator from Oregon, WAYNE MORSE, to come up there and point out the place and suggest erection of a monument to that great Mr. Baker. We found out afterward that Mr. Baker was buried in San Francisco in a cemetery which he himself had promoted and made a fortune out of. So I don't know what we can do about it.

But he was a great man and I would like to see the great State of Oregon erect a marker—a decent marker—at the place where he fell. If you will read your history, you will find out something about him that will make you proud.

He was a real politician, and you know they are hard to find.

Your city, like all of the great State of Oregon, has been growing fast in recent years. That is splendid, and I hope that you keep right on growing. To do that, however, there must be continued development of the natural resources of the Northwest.

You know that there are many obstacles in the way of sensible development of your resources. You saw an example of those obstacles a few weeks ago, when the authorization for Hell's Canyon Dam—which you are advertising here today—and other projects was defeated in the Senate.

About 3 years ago, I directed the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation to get together and bring in a sensible, coordinated plan for the work of those two agencies.

This was the program that was before the Senate last month. I had a logical schedule of dam construction—I spell that d-a-m—and it had a basin account to permit uniform, low-power rates. That was obviously a good program, as far as it went.

But look what happened to that program. Hell's Canyon Dam was knocked out. The basin account was knocked out. A number of other projects were knocked out, and when the bill passed the Senate, it contained only a lopsided set of projects for one agency.

That is no way to proceed. It throws the entire program out of balance. We need to have equal consideration of all resource needs—soil conservation, reclamation, the generation of power, flood control, and everything else.

I am sure we will get Hell's Canyon Dam before we quit. We have got to have it. It will add close to a million kilowatts of power to this section of the country. It will help control floodwaters, it will help bring a higher standard of living to this entire region.

We can't go on with an unbalanced approach to river basin development. We are wasting precious time and precious resources.

That is why I have recommended the one sure way to realize unified development of all the natural resources of this region, and that is through the creation of a Columbia Valley Administration.

The Columbia Valley Administration can present a single plan for the whole area, giving the proper balance to all sections and all resource needs. And the Columbia Valley Administration would be run by men from this area, living in this area, who can work with the States and localities and present to the Congress the whole picture, not just bits and pieces of it—to be done halfway or not done at all. That is sensible. It is economical. And it is the right way to proceed.

I hope that by the time I visit Baker again—and I hope that won't be too long—we will have Hell's Canyon Dam authorized and a Columbia Valley Administration set up.

Then we will be on the right road to a full, unified, and coordinated development of the rich natural resources of the Northwest. That will help us build the kind of prosperity here in the Pacific Northwest that all of us want. Prosperity here will mean greater prosperity and greater strength for the whole United States.

And I am strong for the opportunity to develop all of the sections of the United States, not just one section but all sections. They are all necessary to keep this country the greatest republic that the sun has ever shone upon. They are all necessary to give us an economic preponderance which will cause us to get a peace in the world that will last. I am working for lasting peace. I am working for a continued prosperous economy in this country, a balanced economy which will be good for farmers, be good for businessmen, be good for laboring men, and that is the only way you can have a successful government.

I want to show these totalitarian fellows that democracy—honest-to-goodness democracy is just what the word means—can work for the benefit of all the people, and not for just the benefit of a few.

I came out here so that you could understand what I am trying to do, so that you could see me and find out if I have gone high hat since you elected me in 1948.

I want you to know that I am working for you, trying my best to carry out the things which I told you I wanted to do, and in which you showed you had confidence in me when you elected me. I am trying to do the job. I am trying to do the job for the whole Nation. I am your President. You elected me. I am working as your public servant, and I am working to the best of my ability in the public interest for all concerned.

I can't tell you how much I appreciate this wonderful gathering in this town named after the first Senator of Oregon—a great man and a great orator.

Thank you very much.

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT, HUNTINGTON, OREG., MAY 10, 1950

Thank you very much for this cordial reception. On this trip across the country, I have been passing through some very interesting scenery along the route of the old Oregon Trail. I have been glad to see the signs of increasing industrialization in eastern Oregon, because I know that the more diversified your economy is, the better off you will be.

One matter in Oregon that concerns me is your farm situation. Since 1948, there has been a decline in farm income in Oregon, and there has been a decline in farm income all over the Nation. This decline has been nothing like the disastrous drop in farm prices which occurred after the First World War, because our farm program has cushioned the downward trend.

The laws we have passed since 1933 have kept this decline in farm prices from turning into a farm depression. There is a floor under farm prices. Our farm program has kept the markets reasonably steady, and completely free of panic.

We have farm-credit institutions to prevent the drying up of credit which farmers must have.

The rural-electrification program has helped to make farming more efficient, and farm living much more pleasant. But there are still some serious inadequacies in our farm laws. We must take positive steps to reverse the downward trend in farm incomes.

We should add some perishables to the priority list along with the other basic commodities. That is especially important in Oregon, where you produce many perishable commodities for which there is no adequate price support at present.

Obviously, we can't store up meat, milk, fruit, and things like that, as we store up wheat and cotton. Loans and purchases work fine for wheat, but they don't work well for perishables. That is why we should use the method of production payments to support perishables.

I feel now that it is high time to pay more attention to farm income, instead of merely concentrating on prices—and to pay more attention to the perishable commodities.

In this way we can move toward a greater prosperity for both the farmer and the city dweller, for their interests are interdependent.

I am just as interested in improving the situation in the cities as on the farms. I shall keep on fighting for better schools, more adequate social-security laws, and a national health program. All these measures will build up a stronger economy here at home. In securing a stronger economy we are strengthening democracy.

That is the way to peace, and that is what I am most interested in attaining.

You people here in Huntington have given me a fine welcome and a fine greeting, just as every other city I have been through has. I appreciate it more than I can tell you. It has been a most happy trip across the country. People seem to be interested in their Government. They seem to be just as interested in seeing their President as when he was running for office. I am just out here to report to you on conditions as I see them and to ask your cooperation and support in carrying through the program which I think is for the welfare of this country and for the welfare of the whole world.

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT, PASCO, WASH., MAY 10, 1950

I understand that this Elks lodge here was organized July 14, 1947, under the sponsorship of the Walla Walla Lodge. It started with nothing in the treasury. It now has 700 members and a $100,000. Isn't that something? I think I'll put him in charge of the Budget of the United States Government.

You know that the Elks have four cardinal principles: Charity, justice, brotherly love, and fidelity. The purpose of an Elks lodge is to make the community in the Nation a better place in which to live. I am most happy to have a part in the dedication of their new home. They have done a remarkable job here, and I congratulate them.

I am more than happy to be with you here in Pasco this evening, to help dedicate this new Elks Building. Every time I come back to the State of Washington I get a new feeling of the vast resources which this Nation possesses. As long as I am President, I will do everything in my power to use our resources in an effort to keep peace in the world.

Early this morning, over in Pocatello, Idaho, I talked about the work which the Atomic Energy Commission is planning at Arco, Idaho, for possible future industrial uses of atomic energy.

Just across the river from here, over at Hanford, there are other atomic energy works, where we are producing the ingredients of destruction. Our wartime investment at Hanford ran to $600,000,000, and we are now spending another $100,000,000 to expand and improve the plants constructed during the wartime.

Hanford typifies the strategic importance of the vast regional arsenal we have built in the Pacific Northwest. No other section of the United States is more important to the security of this country.

Not only is the Northwest important in itself, it is also the gateway to Alaska, and we hope soon that Alaska will enter the Union as a new State along with Hawaii.

We recognize the strategic importance of the Pacific Northwest. For this reason, the Navy's largest shipyard is located at Bremerton.

In the mountains to the north, the Navy has located its new $7,000,000 radio transmitter to direct its ships at sea.

Fort Lewis is the strongest Army post west of the Mississippi.

This month, two squadrons of the Eighty-first Fighter Interceptor Wing will move into Moses Lake Air Base. The latest type jet fighters will strengthen air defenses already concentrated at Spokane, Moses Lake, and McChord Airfields. On Whidby Island in Puget Sound we have one of the biggest and most important naval air stations in the Pacific.

Now I am giving you just these few examples to show you the importance we attach to this section of the country in our whole defense picture. There has been a lot of wild talk about the Northwest and about Alaska, and about what this Government expected to do with this section of the country.

This section of the country, as I told you to begin with, is considered a key position so far as the national defense of the Western Hemisphere is concerned. You need not worry about being abandoned. We have no such intention. We never had any such intention. Those rumors were put out because your President was going to pay you a visit, and they thought maybe they could make it uncomfortable for him by putting out such foolishness. You know better than that.

Installations like these cost money. It is easy for foolish people to say that we ought to slash national expenditures by cutting defenses. As long as I have anything to say about it, I do not intend to weaken the defenses of this country to meet any short-sighted cry of economy.

The money we are spending at Hanford is also one of the soundest investments this Nation can make. At the present time and in the immediate future, it is providing the United States with a means for defense while international conditions remain unsettled.

We hope the world will come to an agreement on international control of atomic energy. We have been working hard to get such an agreement for 4 years. When we finally do obtain a stable, peaceful world, the material produced at Hanford can all be turned to peacetime uses. That is what we all hope for.

You know, there have been many engines of destruction invented in the history of the world, and nearly every one of them has turned out to be of great use in peacetime.

I have always hoped, and I still hope, that this discovery which we made under the pressure of the greatest war in history will turn out to be the greatest benefactor and the greatest help to the welfare of the world that has ever come into existence. And I am just as sure as I stand here that it will.

I hope that in the not too far distant future, the full power of this great discovery can be used for lighting homes, supplying power for factories, improving land, driving ships and airplanes about the globe in peaceful trade.

Meanwhile, our national atomic energy program serves as one of the bulwarks of the free world against aggression. It is part of our whole effort to increase the strength and effectiveness of free and democratic nations, so that communism cannot succeed in its attempt to overrun the world.

I can't tell you how very much I appreciate the privilege of being here tonight. In 1948 I tried to get here, but the Columbia River and the Snake River were both on a rampage at that time and it was not possible to get to this town. I hope that won't happen again.

If we get these great projects of the Columbia and Snake Rivers constructed as they should be, we will be in a position to control floods, to furnish power, and to make this one of the greatest parts of the United States.

You know, I have a view of the future on power. This section of the world—this part of the United States—will be one of the greatest power reservoirs in the country.

I want to see the St. Lawrence River developed in the manner in which it should be developed, and the Bay of Fundy and the New England power set-up integrated something like we have here. In the Southeast we have the Tennessee Valley Authority. We are making developments in South Carolina and Georgia which will make a power development there commensurate with that section of the country. Then the southwest power development on the Colorado River, which you all know about.

If we can get the proper development of the Missouri Valley, the Mississippi Valley, and the Ohio Valley between Pittsburgh and Denver, we will have this country with a network of power that will give us a chance to develop resources unheard of in the history of the world.

Now, that is what we are working for.

Had it not been for the development of the Tennessee Valley and the development of the Columbia River, it would have taken us much longer and cost us many more lives to win the war.

I made many an investigation out here while I was in the Senate, along with Mon Wallgren, who was a United States Senator with me on that committee which made those investigations. And we learned an immense amount about the necessity for the proper development of the Columbia Valley.

I have been out here all day preaching the Columbia Valley Authority, to make this development integrated so that it will work for the benefit and welfare of the whole northwest corner of the United States. I hope you will support me in that program.

It will be a great thing for every State that tributaries the Columbia River—Oregon, Washington, Idaho, Montana. It will be for their welfare. They will like it if they ever get it done.

You have a lot of old fogies who never want to do anything progressive. That is not true of the majority of the people in this part of the world. This part of the world is always looking forward. Your ancestors who came out here and settled this part of the world had to look forward in order to make this country great.

We must keep up that spirit. That is what I am working for. I am out here to make a report to you as President of the United States on what I hope to accomplish, as I told you in 1948 I would make the attempt to do. I am not running for anything. I am just out here to make a report to you.

I may come back later and talk a little differently.

Thank you very much.

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT, COULEE CITY, WASH., MAY 11, 1950

Senator Magnuson, Governor Langlie, Governor Bonner, and other distinguished guests, I have two Cabinet members with me this morning, the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture, so maybe we'll hold a meeting.

I appreciate most highly the cordiality with which I have been received in all these wonderful places in the States through which I have been. I am going up to Grand Coulee this morning to discuss some things in which you are vitally interested, and to explain to you how hard it is to get things like Grand Coulee done, and also to explain to you why it is that some people don't want CVA. I think the people want it—that sign says so, anyway.

Somebody told me a story about Coulee City. Some fellow in the times gone by, when they had a branch-line railroad here and a stage that ran through Bridgeport—I heard this story about several other places, so I guess it will fit Coulee, too.

This gentleman was complaining very bitterly in his diary that he never did get here on a jerk-water train in time to catch the stagecoach, and coming back he never did get back in time on the stage to catch the train, and he finally came to the conclusion that the hotel man in Coulee had made a deal with the stage and the railroads so the stage and the train never would meet. That happens in a lot of places, but doesn't happen any more. The hotel fellows these days have to put out something good because the fellow in the car can just get in and go on to the next one if he doesn't treat him right.

I want you to understand that I am enjoying this trip. I appreciate very much the fact that the people are interested in the welfare of the country, they are interested in seeing their President, they are interested in trying to find out what he stands for, and what he is trying to do.

Some 2 or 3 years ago I was out here traveling around all over the State of Washington asking for votes. I am not asking for anything now. I am here to explain to you just exactly what I am trying to do, and I am trying to give it to you so that you will understand it, without its being garbled by anybody. You are getting it first-hand from the President himself.

I want to thank you very much for the cordiality with which we have been received all over the country, through Iowa and Nebraska, Wyoming, Oregon, and Idaho; and now we are making a start in the State of Washington here this morning. I know I am going to have the same thing to say when I get out of Washington.

Thank you very much.

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT, WILBUR, WASH., MAY 11, 1940

Thank you, Senator Magnuson. I am very glad to be able to stop for a few minutes this afternoon in Wilbur. I have just had a most enjoyable and inspiring experience, and that was the dedication of the Grand Coulee Dam, one of the biggest projects ever undertaken by man.

One of the very greatest benefits that is coming from Grand Coulee is electric power. That power has been bringing new industries to this area, and it has been making a better life possible for everybody around here, both in the cities and on the farms. Farmers, especially, have been helped by power brought to them by the Rural Electrification Administration.

You know, it is hard to believe but we have only had the Rural Electrification Administration for 15 years. The REA has done tremendous things for farms all over the country, and I think it is appropriate that I helped celebrate REA's fifteenth birthday today, May 11, by telling a little of its history.

Of course, I don't need to tell you how the REA operates—right here in Wilbur you have the advantage of one of the lowest power rates in the entire country. Your electric cooperative is financed by REA.

When the rural electrification program got under way 15 years ago, only 1 out of every 10 families had electricity—every 10 farm families. Now, 83 percent of the Nation's farms are electrified.

The record here in the State of Washington is even more remarkable. Over 96 percent of the farms in this State have electricity. I wish we could do that well in Missouri.

I remember very well when I first went down to the United States Senate back in 1935, how the power lobbies and the other special interests were fighting against rural electrification. I was on the special committee that investigated the public utility holding companies, and that was one of the most remarkable hearings that ever I had anything to do with. We could make it cheaper than the holding companies and the special interests said we were going to put everybody out of business, but we did not. There are more in business now than ever, and they are working in the public interest and not for some private individual.

They said that electricity was a luxury which only the rich could afford. They said that rural electrification would never be profitable. But the argument they used the most back in those days was that rural electrification was socialism. Believe me, times never change for some people.

On the floor of the House of Representatives, one Congressman said REA would produce—and these are his words—"a bureaucratic and socialistic state." Has that happened in Washington, where you have got 96 percent of your farms electrified? I don't believe you are a Socialist State. Doesn't that have a familiar ring. Some people just never learn. They are still calling projects that would help every one of us socialism.

That is why I am making this trip. I am out to tell the people the facts. You are never going to be fooled by fancy scare words.

I am more than happy to have a chance to pay this little tribute to REA on its fifteenth birthday, and I am glad to do it right here in the great State of Washington, which has taken advantage of it better than nearly every other State in the Union.

I think one of the reasons you have been able to do that is on account of the project like this one right here we dedicated this morning.

I want to thank you all very much for this cordial welcome. I appreciate it very much.

ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT DELIVERED AT GONZAGA UNIVERSITY, SPOKANE, WASH., THURSDAY, MAY 11, 1950

I am very glad to be here today at Gonzaga University. I appreciate very much your cordial welcome and the certificate of merit you have given me.

I have just come from dedicating Grand Coulee Dam, a magnificent structure which will bring untold benefits for generations to come to the citizens of the Pacific Northwest.

Grand Coulee Dam is an example of how we are developing and using our natural resources to create richer, fuller lives for our fellow citizens.

I often wish that creating new wealth from our natural resources was all we had to do to create a better life for our people. But a good society requires far more than progress in material things.

The good society we are seeking is based on order and peaceful cooperation, among men who share common ideals of freedom and justice. And these things are not easy to attain.

For a society is made up of men, who are often weak, and selfish, and quarrelsome. And yet, men are the children of God. Men have within them the divine spark that can lead them to truth, and unselfishness, and courage to do the right.

Men can build a good society, if they follow the will of the Lord.

Our great Nation was founded in this faith. Our Constitution, and all our finest traditions, rest on a moral basis.

We believe in the dignity and the rights of each individual. We believe that no person—and no group of people—has an inherent right to rule over any other person or any other group. Our Government was established to secure individual rights, and to provide a means by which men working together, under laws of their own making, could promote the welfare of all.

Throughout our history, we have moved toward these ideals. In economic life, in political life, in social life, we have gone forward. We have demonstrated that men can govern themselves, individually and as a group, and can advance their common welfare.

We are continuing to move forward every day toward greater freedom and equal opportunity for all citizens. This is a purpose each of us must strive to achieve, in his daily life, and in his own community. It is a purpose which, in some cases, requires collective action, through our elected representatives in local, State, and Federal Governments.

One case that requires collective action is engaging our attention now in the national legislature. This is the problem of preventing discrimination in our country because of religion, color, or national origin. Such discrimination violates the basic moral principles of our society and our Government.

I sincerely hope that the Congress will enact legislation at this session to protect the rights of all citizens, to reduce discrimination based upon prejudice, and to insure that every citizen can participate equally in our national life.

The same moral principles that underlie our national life govern our relations with all other nations and peoples in the world.

We have built our own Nation not by trying to wipe out differences in religion, or in tradition, or customs among us, not by attempting to conceal our political and economic conflicts, but instead by holding to a belief which rises above all such differences and conflicts.

This belief is that all men are equal before God.

With this belief in our hearts, we can achieve unity without eliminating differences—we can advance the common welfare without harming the dissenting minority.

Just as that belief has enabled us to build a great Nation, so it can serve as the foundation of world peace.

Nations can live together peacefully, working for their common welfare, just as we do in our country, if they believe in the brotherhood of man, under God. Millions and millions of people, all over the world, know that in their hearts.

But many of them are oppressed by disease and poverty. And many are under the control of tyrants. These people are prevented from expressing, in their daily lives and through their governments, their belief in the brotherhood of man.

The great problem before us in the world today is how to break through the barriers

of ignorance and poverty—through the barriers of tyanny—and let the common people of the world combine their will for peace. The greatest obstacle to peace is a modern tyranny led by a small group who have abandoned their faith in God. These tyrants have forsaken ethical and moral beliefs. They believe that only force makes right. They are aggressively seeking to expand the area of their domination.

Our effort to resist and overcome this tyranny is essentially a moral effort.

Those of us who believe in God, and who are fortunate enough to live under conditions where we can practice our faith, cannot be content to live for ourselves alone, in selfish isolation. We must work constantly to wipe out injustice and inequality, and to create a world order consistent with the faith that governs us.

That is why—even if our own existence were not at stake—we would have the obligation of working abroad as well as at home to bring about the conditions in which all those who share our beliefs can work with us for lasting peace.

We must strive to defend human rights abroad as vigorously as we work for them at home. The Declaration of Human Rights, drawn up in the United Nations, is a landmark in the long struggle to protect the rights of people too defenseless to protect themselves.

We must continue the great work we have so successfully begun of getting the world's economy back on a sound basis, of helping the underdeveloped countries of the world improve their standards of living, and of establishing a system of world trade under which all nations exchange their goods and services with mutual profit.

So long as aggression threatens, we must keep our own defenses strong, and provide strong support to other like-minded nations who wish to build up their defenses.

For these are the practical, immediate ways to protect our moral values, and to expand the ability of others to put those values into effect.

In the face of aggressive tyranny, the economic, political, and military strength of freemen is a necessity. But we are not increasing our strength for its own sake.

We must be strong if we are to expand freedom. We must be strong if freemen are to be able to satisfy their moral aspirations.

It is the moral and religious beliefs of mankind which alone give our strength meaning and purpose.

The struggle for peace is a struggle for moral and ethical principles. These principles unite us with religious people in every land, who are striving, as we are striving, for brotherhood among men.

In everything we do, at home and abroad, we must demonstrate our clear purpose, and our firm will, to build a world order in which men everywhere can walk upright and unafraid, and do the work of God.

Owen Lattimore, Architect of China Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am including as part of my remarks a very interesting article by Mr. Victor Lasky which appeared in the New York World-Telegram and Sun on Saturday, May 20, 1950. Mr. Lasky appraises the record of Owen Lattimore and points out some facts that heretofore have not been brought to light. I commend it to the attention of the membership.

The article follows:

OWEN LATTIMORE: APPRAISAL OF A CONTROVERSIAL FIGURE—THE RECORD OF HIS VIEWS ADDS FUEL TO THE DEBATE

(By Victor Lasky)

The heated controversy that Prof. Owen Lattimore is a "top Soviet spy" has served to obscure the Far Eastern expert's role in publicizing the differences between the Kuomintang and Red China.

Mr. Lattimore has never made any secret of his views, termed by Time magazine as possibly "more dangerous than a carload of spies." But he denies his voluminous writings and varied activities follow any Communist line.

He contends that any associations he may have had with Communists were in the nature of a scholar looking for facts, just as a newspaperman does.

OFFICER OF PRO-COMMUNIST GROUP

However, he has not yet explained his current association with the American Committee in Aid of Chinese Industrial Cooperatives. This group, also known as Indusco, Inc., of 439 Fourth Avenue, raises funds for Red China. It is run by pro-Communists.

Mr. Lattimore is listed as an honorary vice president. A member of the advisory board happens to be Philip Jaffe, the mysterious figure in the Amerasia case, who pleaded guilty to possessing secret Government documents. * * *

As director of the Walter Hines Page School of International Relations at Johns Hopkins University, Mr. Lattimore has helped train many of our diplomats. He has advised two Presidents. He has been consulted by the State Department.

PRESIDENTIAL INFLUENCE?

But was he the architect of this Nation's far eastern policies which critics say led to the loss of China?

Secretary of State Dean Acheson and three predecessors have stated Mr. Lattimore never influenced them. Still, Mr. Lattimore may have had some influence on Presidents Roosevelt and Truman.

In 1944 Mr. Roosevelt sent Vice President Henry Wallace to China on a good-will mission. Mr. Lattimore went along as an adviser.

Mr. Wallace has since reported that Mr. Roosevelt "urged me to take Owen Lattimore with me" because he was "one of the world's great experts on the problems involving Chinese-Russian relationships."

At that time Mr. Lattimore had been urging the formation of a coalition government in China, composed of Nationalist and Communist elements.

This was what Mr. Wallace proposed to Mr. Roosevelt on his return. What influence Mr. Lattimore may have had on Mr. Wallace has never been disclosed.

HULL IGNORED ON APPOINTMENT

By late 1946 the coalition policy was adopted by the United States, and critics maintain it did much to sell China to the Reds.

Who brought Mr. Lattimore to Mr. Roosevelt's attention?

The facts are still obscure. But in 1941 Mr. Roosevelt named Mr. Lattimore as American political adviser to Chiang Kai-shek. Cordell Hull, then Secretary of State, apparently was not consulted; neither was Marshal Chiang nor the American Ambassador to his Government.

Mr. Lattimore has testified since that he received a call from Lauchlin Currie, one of the President's "anonymous" assistants, to report to the White House.

"I don't know who suggested my name to Mr. Currie or to the President," Mr. Lattimore has testified.

Mr. Currie was an adviser to the President on Far East problems. Named by Elizabeth Bentley as a source of information for a Soviet spy ring, Mr. Currie vigorously denied the charge. Recently, Earl Browder testified he was taken to meet Sumner Welles, then Under Secretary of State, by Mr. Currie to discuss the United States Communist stand on China.

In 1946 President Truman named Mr. Lattimore to the United States Reparations Commission in Japan. When Mr. Truman announced the Japanese surrender, reporters noticed that one of two books on the Presidents' desk was Mr. Lattimore's Solution in Asia.

URGED RECRUITMENT FROM PRO-RED STAFF

From 1942 to 1944, Mr. Lattimore worked closely with the State Department as a deputy director of the Office of War Information's Pacific operations. When in Washington he used a State Department desk, according to a former OWI colleague.

On June 15, 1943, Mr. Lattimore wrote a confidential letter to OWI's acting manager, Joseph Barnes, in which he urged the recruiting of Chinese-American personnel from the staff of the New China Daily News. This New York publication supported the Chinese Reds.

Only last year Mr. Lattimore was asked by the State Department to submit his views on Far East problems. The memorandum, a portion of which the New York Times editorially called quite shocking, suggested:

The United States should get out of Korea immediately, even if it means that nation's capture by the Russians; the United States should sever all ties with Britain, France, and Netherlands in the Far East; the United States should recognize Red China immediately.

Mr. Lattimore insisted that these policies were in the "best interests" of the United States. Asked for comment, President Syngman Rhee, of Korea, snapped:

"Lattimore has no use for Korea and China as long as Korea and China are fighting communism. Anything the Soviet Union does not like would be a liability in the view of Lattimore."

But perhaps Mr. Lattimore's influence was greatest as the undisputed spearhead of the thinking of a large group of professors, writers, and lower-echelon State Department officials, particularly in the Far East Section.

TERMED COMMUNISTS CHINA'S PEACE PARTY

This group, for varying reasons, not necessarily Communist, believed in the inevitability—some in the desirability—of a Red China and, now that it exists, in the necessity of United States recognition of that regime.

They believed all through the civil war that the Nationalists were primarily responsible for China's troubles. As Mr. Lattimore put it on October 18, 1946:

"The Communists are the peace party in China. * * * They survive only because they have the support of millions of people who are not Communists. * * * The Kuomintang are the war party in China."

That Mr. Lattimore is in accord with the Communist line, particularly on Far East problems, as apparent from his record. But Mr. Lattimore claims that is not so. He points out he supported the Marshall plan, hardly anything a Red would favor.

But his support of the Marshall plan was hedged by the same reservations held by Henry Wallace. He believed that European aid should be administered through the United Nations and that it should be made available to the Soviet satellites. And he was bitterly opposed to the Truman doctrine.

Mr. Lattimore also pointed out he was in favor of Finland during the Soviet invasion.

Asked for dates of financial contributions and speeches Mr. Lattimore made for Finland, his attorney said the February 20, 1940, minutes of a Baltimore group called Fighting

Funds for Finland show that Mr. Lattimore was one of 19 persons who "have consented to serve on the committee."

MOSCOW PURGE TRIALS LIKE DEMOCRACY

But nowhere in his record can there be found published criticism of Soviet moves during the Hitler-Stalin pact. He was the editor of Pacific Affairs, organ of the Institute of Pacific Relations, and one of the editors of Amerasia at this time.

In 1938 he wrote in Pacific Affairs that the results of the Moscow purge trials "sound to me like democracy." And he has admitted publishing articles by many left wingers and Communists.

"Throughout this period there was nothing reprehensible about the occasional publication of significant left-wing views," Mr. Lattimore said.

Amerasia, a magazine espousing Soviet aspirations in the Far East which Mr. Lattimore helped found, was edited by a Communist, Philip Jaffe, who in 1945 was arrested with five others in a case involving the theft of Government documents.

The night before the arrests two of the defendants visited Mr. Lattimore's Maryland home. Mr. Lattimore said they came to discuss a forthcoming book by one of them.

But Mr. Lattimore denies any connection with the so-called Amerasia case. He said he hadn't seen Mr. Jaffe since 1941, although both are connected with Indusco. He said he first met Mr. Jaffe in 1937 when they traveled to the almost inaccessible Yenan, then the Red Chinese stronghold, to interview leading Chinese Reds.

However, Mr. Lattimore testified under cross-examination that in the summer of 1936 his secretary was Harriet Levine, wife of Ch'ao-ting Chi, a Comintern agent whom Red China is trying at present to seat in the United Nations.

Miss Levine is Mr. Jaffe's niece.

SUPPORTED ACTIVITIES OF PRO-RED GENERAL

Mr. Lattimore also sponsored the activities of Feng Yu-hsiang, China's so-called Christian General, who perished in a fire aboard a ship bound for Russia.

General Feng, who in 1947 rejected Chiang's demand he return to China, became a pet speaker at pro-Communist rallies here, at which he denounced Marshal Chiang as a "reactionary dictator, whose rule must be overthrown."

Although Mr. Lattimore claims to have been the constant butt of Communist attacks, the record shows that his friend, Frederick Vanderbilt Field, the millionaire Communist, praised him in 1946.

The Daily Worker has referred to Mr. Lattimore's writings as "stimulating." And Soviet Russia Today, foremost pro-Soviet publication in the United States, reviewing his Solution in Asia, declared:

"It is interesting to note that Trud, the Soviet trade-union newspaper, has given Solution in Asia a long review and has quoted extensively from it.

"It must be a pleasure to the Russians to read an American book about Asia which recognizes the solid basis for Soviet prestige there."

Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 25 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Louis Johnson: Bulldog of United States Defense," by Tris Coffin, published in the June 1950 issue of Coronet magazine.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOUIS JOHNSON: BULLDOG OF UNITED STATES DEFENSE

(By Tris Coffin)

United States Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson, a big restless American with enough vitality and endurance for a dozen men, has finally landed the job he sought for years. The job is to make sure you and I are not destroyed in a sudden attack by an enemy equipped with the hideous weapons that modern science has produced.

As a result, Johnson is the second most powerful man in Washington, a top architect of Allied policy, and an administrator described by Herbert Hoover as the best in the Truman administration.

However, the Gridiron Club, famed group of newspapermen in Washington, recently described Johnson's work in a parody of the popular song, A Wonderful Guy: "All by myself I am the whole Army; I'm the Navy, and Air Force, too. I nod my head and the Congress plays dead, and now I have the White House in view."

The Secretary, who is called Louie or Colonel Johnson by friends, is tall and well built, has eyes that look out shrewdly and directly, and a voice which is surprisingly soft. Like an old-time Army top sergeant, he sums up men and events swiftly, and makes blunt decisions.

Such traits are not recently acquired; all his life, Johnson has led the fight himself, rather than give orders from the side lines. As corporation lawyer, American Legion politician, Assistant Secretary of War, and Democratic Party fund raiser, the present chief of United States defenses has thrived on hard work and conflict.

Today in Washington, the world capital where sneak plays and hidden-ball tricks are accepted strategy, Johnson is the rare exception. He prefers the old-fashioned, head-down, line buck. An intimate summed it up good-naturedly when he said, "Louis would rather try to kick his way through a brick wall than climb over it."

Most of Washington's bureaucratic generals never enter a battle without elaborate feeling-out tactics. These might include a planted story in a Washington column, a remark dropped at a cocktail party, or an attempt to gain a rival's confidence by profuse friendship. But not Johnson. He has no cultivated friends among the press; he does not go to cocktail parties.

Another significant clue to his personality is a casual remark he made during the recent bitter attack on him by Navy admirals and their adherents. A friend asked: "How can you be so calm? Congress is after your hide. Newspapers and radio commentators are demanding your resignation."

The Secretary said quietly, "You forget. I was vaccinated in Washington before."

This is an understatement. Johnson went through a cruel ordeal as Assistant Secretary of War from 1937 until the summer of 1940. During that period, President Roosevelt felt he needed in the "Little Cabinet" a figure to represent the growing clamor among veterans' groups for rearmament and to balance the isolationist tenor of some leading New Dealers.

So Roosevelt selected Johnson, ex-National Commander of the Legion, and a minor figure in Democratic politics. Johnson was supposed to sit quietly, take orders, and keep the Legion off the administration's back. In this job Johnson failed gloriously, as witness this story, never told before:

Early in 1940, a memo was submitted to Assistant Secretary Johnson by Col. James H. Burns, today a major general and Johnson's geopolitician. The report said war with Germany and Japan was inevitable, and that the United States would need a million-man army and some $9,000,000,000 for arms.

Johnson read the report carefully, turned to Burns, and said, "This is good. Take it down to the general staff and tell them I want it approved in half an hour."

The program was initialed within half an hour and Johnson bore it triumphantly to the White House for an historic meeting. He outlined the plan while Roosevelt puffed thoughtfully on a cigarette. Harry Hopkins sat in a corner. Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff, listened intently. William S. Knudsen, the automobile production wizard and later codirector of the Office of Production Management, nodded at each recommendation.

When Johnson finished speaking, the President said: "I think in big terms, but this is too big. The American people will say I am leading them to war."

Knudsen, who had been primed by Johnson, spoke up in a voice heavy with the accent of his native Denmark: "Mr. President, do you want planes?"

"Yes, Bill; but not $9,000,000,000 worth."

Knudsen kept on stubbornly: "You want planes. I need money."

Sighing, Roosevelt said: "All right. I'll accept the plan as far as planes are concerned."

The industrialist plunged on: "Mr. President, do you want tanks?"

Roosevelt looked quizzically at Johnson. Then he said: "I approve your program in toto. But let me start with a smaller figure. You make this less than five billion, and I can sell that to the public."

All during the prewar era Johnson was persuaded by Roosevelt to play an unhappy game of deception. The President feared the vigorous intervention policies of Johnson would injure him politically if he openly supported the Assistant Secretary. Also, Roosevelt was loath to fire Secretary of War Harry Woodring. So the President told Johnson to report directly to him, but to come in the side door. Meanwhile, key administration officials concerned with preparedness were told to cooperate with Johnson.

A sample of Johnson's technique was the way he got American arms to the British after the bitter defeat at Dunkirk. The Assistant Secretary insisted that a large quantity of American Army rifles be declared surplus and sold to Britain. Woodring refused to approve the deal.

The Assistant Secretary waited until Woodring was out of town. Then he declared the rifles surplus and ordered them sold to Britain. With this off his chest, he went to the White House, reported what he had done, and said, in jest: "Mr. President, if I have violated the law, I would like your promise of a pardon—in writing."

Roosevelt wrote a chit, "Louis, if you go to jail, I'll go with you."

The President, however, did not always back up his hard-driving Assistant Secretary of War so solidly. This was due to a curious combination of Johnson's own ambitions and the President's faculty for appearing to promise the moon with green cheese. The moon, to Johnson, was to get the title of Secretary of War. Roosevelt later added the green cheese by suggesting in an impulsive moment that Johnson would make an ideal Vice President for the 1940 ticket.

Johnson took both these promises seriously. His first jolt was at the Democratic National Convention in July. Cheerful and expectant, he strode into the hotel room where Hopkins and the city bosses were

picking a Vice President. The men looked up with glazed, weary eyes, and one is reported to have said, "Oh, my God, another hopeful."

The left wing of the New Deal feared Johnson, whom they glibly labeled an American Legion conservative. They cut his throat politically, and Henry A. Wallace was nominated for Vice President.

But this was only a warm-up for the big disillusionment, the one which so toughened Johnson that he can now say calmly, "I've been vaccinated in Washington before."

A few days after the convention, Johnson was called to the White House, presumably to be appointed Secretary of War. It was a tense gathering. Steve Early, the White House press secretary and Johnson's one steady friend in the inner circle, looked glum. Roosevelt was too friendly.

Felix Frankfurter, a New Deal idea man before he became a Supreme Court Justice, had sold a great thought to the President. If Roosevelt, he argued, appointed Republicans as Secretaries of War and Navy, the GOP would be seriously weakened in the campaign.

The news was broken to Johnson at this White House meeting. Anger flashed in his eyes, his fists knotted. Bernard Baruch went to him and said gently, "Son, don't do anything you will regret later. Keep your temper."

On July 25, Johnson handed in his resignation. Then, bitter and lonely, he left Washington on a train for the West. He was followed by his friend Early, who said soothingly that no one would blame Johnson if he rocked Washington by revealing the indignities he had suffered. But he would be a bigger man if he took his disappointment in silence.

Johnson accepted the wise counsel. But from that day, he worked to be, ultimately, boss of the American Defense Establishment.

Actually, the tough job of Secretary of Defense is almost tailor-made for Johnson. As a heavyweight boxer at the University of Virginia, he could outfight any man, and did. At 26 and a young lawyer, he was a hustling Democratic floor leader and committee chairman in the West Virginia Legislature. A year later, he was fighting through the Meuse-Argonne offensive of World War I.

Returning home as a colonel, he helped organize the Legion and rose to be commander in 1932. Off and on, Roosevelt brought him to Washington for public and political chores. His longest stretch was as Assistant Secretary of War from 1937 to 1940. His last mission for Roosevelt was to India as the President's personal representative. Johnson brought home the friendship of India's Gandhi and Nehru.

In the 1948 political campaign, Johnson pitched in and raised money for what many thought was a hopeless cause, the reelection of Harry Truman. He was rewarded by nomination for Secretary of Defense on March 3, 1949.

Johnson has done a remarkable job in two fields—military strategy and administration. He has also acquired more enemies than all the rest of the Cabinet combined.

When Johnson came to the Pentagon Building last year, the Joint Chiefs of Staff were deadlocked on strategy. The Air Force was preaching that an armada of B-36 bombers, capable of striking any target in the world, could win a war. The Navy retorted that giant aircraft carriers, surrounded by protective warships, were the secret to victory. Meanwhile, the Army insisted that foot troops were needed to win objectives and hold them.

Bluntly, Johnson told the Joint Chiefs: "We are not going to dissipate our strength by having two or three different strategies. That will eat up money we can't afford to waste." Then he laid down the law.

The B-36, or any later model of long-range bomber, would be the global striking force to retaliate against surprise Soviet blows. (The hydrogen bomb, which Johnson argued for in the recent wrangle within the administration, could burn Moscow to the ground.)

Ground troops of our European allies should be equipped and trained to hold against Russian tanks, infantry, and bombers. We should be willing to accept as allies any nation without aggressive aims, regardless of its politics. This would include both Communist Yugoslavia and Fascist Spain.

The American Army should be kept alerted, so that it could be enlarged, equipped, and sent to vital points in the shortest possible time. The role of the Navy was to convoy troops and supplies, and keep the seas free of enemy submarines.

To make sure there was no backsliding, Johnson halted construction of the Navy's super-aircraft carrier. He stood stonily and calmly while being excoriated by the admirals and their friends. He defied the wily chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, CARL VINSON. The only concession Johnson made was to allow the Marines to remain as a separate elite force.

The other side of his shield, the administrative side, has earned Johnson both applause and epithets. The Secretary cut $1,200,000,000 from the defense budget, and lopped 141,300 civilian employees from the payroll. The mere thought of such mayhem would make most politicians shudder, since each of the 141,300 has a Congressman or relatives who are loyal party workers.

Characteristically, the Secretary announced his reforms at an open meeting, to which he had invited all Senators and Congressmen whose districts would be affected by economies. They came with fire in their eyes. He outlined the cuts and said firmly, "I personally will tolerate no WPA in defense."

Johnson could not have carried his economy program through without a well-knit team of assistants. His chief advisers include Under Secretary Early, the master diplomat who has saved the blunt Secretary from many a blunder, and Louis Renfrow, a jovial Reserve officer and friend of President Truman for more than 30 years.

But even with Renfrow browsing around the White House, the palace guard slyly plants stories that Johnson is on the President's black list. The reason for these rumors is the suspicion, which Truman takes with a grain of salt, that the Secretary of Defense is running all out for the Presidency. To a friend who recently asked him point-blank wnether he was a candidate, Johnson replied candidly: "When I am through with this job, I couldn't run for dog catcher!"

Johnson is a realist. He would like, of course, to sit in the White House. But in his heart the Secretary knows the chances are dim. He has enemies in every hotel lobby, every cocktail salon, every politicians' stag party in Washington. He is a conservative in an administration that proudly invites the label of "welfare state."

Although Johnson's name appears daily in the newspapers, the door is firmly closed on his private life. He does not drink with "the boys," and he avoids Washington society. Every week end, weather permitting, he flies into a different life at his home in Clarksburg, W. Va.

His first act at home is to walk alone beneath the trees. The gardens are full of wild flowers, and orchids flourish in the greenhouse.

An acquaintance, seeing the blooms for the first time, asked Johnson curiously, "How long have you gardened?"

The aloof mood left him, replaced by a boyish grin. "From childhood. The first money I ever made was from selling beans I'd grown."

A photograph in Johnson's office gives another glimpse beneath the surface. It is the sensitive face of a philosopher, Pandit Nehru, Prime Minister of India. The inscription is "To Louis, in friendship."

At the end of a day, in the early evening, Johnson will walk to his office window. There he will stand quietly, looking at the Jefferson Memorial across the Potomac River. Then, cheerfully, he will stride into the outer office where secretaries are locking up their desks and say heartily, "Can I give anyone a lift over the bridge to Washington?"

Pass the Atlantic Union Resolution Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. WALSH
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 25, 1950

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, the Members of this House are gratified I am sure at the recent success of the Secretary of State in London. It has resulted in definite steps toward increasing the security of the Atlantic area. Twelve nations cannot effectively build a collective defense unless their efforts are under the guidance of some permanent body equipped to coordinate their efforts. Such a body is now to be created, consisting of the deputies of the foreign ministers and charged with considering forces and their costs "as one and not separate problems."

Twelve nations cannot economically build a collective defense if each of them maintains balanced forces. That leads to wasteful duplications which the Atlantic democracies cannot now afford. For efficiency in defense, as in business, specialization is necessary. The Atlantic Council has now reached an agreement on the necessity for "balanced collective forces" instead of balanced national forces, which is another step forward in defense of the area which is the heart of our modern civilization.

These are steps in the right direction, toward integration of the defense and the power of the Atlantic area. But, Mr. Speaker, they are only steps, steps which are actually dwarfed by the needs and the dangers we face. It is well to be gratified by the fact that they are being taken. But it would be folly to believe that they are enough.

There is not much time left before the threat to the Western World will become much more acute than it is now. Competent observers have pointed out in the press that Russia's military preparations will be completed by 1952 or 1953. By 1952 it must be expected that Russia will have enough atomic bombs to inflict devastating damage on the cities and war industries of the West. In this same year, 1952, the Marshall plan will end and our own country will be engaged in a presidential election. At that time it will be particularly vulnerable to Soviet propaganda and cold-war offensives.

There appears little possibility, indeed, that the steps taken at London and their further implementation by diplomatic methods will produce adequate defense for security by 1952. Something more, something broader, more comprehensive, and more conclusive is needed if we are to surmount the developing crisis of the Western World.

To appreciate this, Mr. Speaker, it is necessary to outline briefly some of the things which the policies agreed upon at London, and even their further implication, will not achieve.

These policies are essentially military, geared to the hope of forestalling a hot war. They do not meet the pressing problem of the cold war. The Secretary of State himself has warned us that we are in a situation where we could lose without ever firing a shot. Furthermore, because these policies are primarily military, they play into the hands of those groups in Europe who are advocating even more vehemently withdrawal into a neutral position as regards Russia and the United States. To this extent, these steps may tend toward disruption of the Atlantic community.

These policies, morever, do not rebuild the economic strength of western Europe; at the best they will reduce the drain on European economic strength caused by rearmament. Yet, until the people of western Europe, who are more numerous than we Americans, have regained economic strength, the United States must carry a disproportionate share of the total burden of Atlantic defense.

These policies, furthermore, do not appear likely to bring about more than a partial integration of Atlantic defense during the next 2 years. It is most unlikely that unity of command, full unification of forces, and complete standardization of weapons and procurement can be achieved by diplomatic methods during this short period.

If, then, policies are inadequate to safeguard our security and deal effectively with the cold war, what policy would be adequate? Mr. Speaker, there is one policy open to us now which would provide an over-all and comprehensive answer to these problems. It is a policy of democracy rather than diplomacy, set forth in companion resolutions which were introduced into the House on July 26, 1949.

This resolution, which has been given extensive hearings by the Foreign Affairs Committee, would explore the possibilities of integrating the Atlantic democracies into an Atlantic union. The resolving clause reads as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the President is requested to invite the democracies which sponsored the North Atlantic Treaty to name delegates, representing their principal political parties, to meet this year with delegates of the United States in a Federal Convention to explore how far their peoples, and the peoples of such other democracies as the convention may invite to send delegates, can apply among them, within the framework of the United Nations, the principles of free federal union.

An Atlantic union would more than repair the deficiencies of our existing diplomatic policies which I have outlined above. It could bring about rapidly and completely unity of command, unification of forces, standardization of weapons and procurement, and a maximum of specialization. All these results would lead to extensive savings in defense costs.

Creation of an Atlantic union, moreover, would rapidly lead to the rebuilding of the economic strength of western Europe. The establishment of one huge economic area of more than 300,000,000 people would provide Europeans with a huge new outlet for industrial production. It would open the way to a mighty flood of private capital to modernize and increase their productive capacity, as former Under Secretary of State Will Clayton has testified. As a result western Europe would become able to bear its proper share of the union's defense.

Such a union would greatly decrease, and perhaps eliminate, existing fears of a third world war. The union would be too strong to be defeated by war, so strong that it need not fear attack, as former Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson has stated. It would, moreover, increase its strength and expand the frontiers of freedom as it included additional free peoples by common consent.

The union's strength, increasing prosperity and the expansion of freedom it brought about, would rapidly turn the tide in the cold war. It would win the minds of men everywhere by affording them a hope of ultimate participation. Communists within it would shrink to an insignificant minority while Communist propaganda beyond the iron curtain would lose its present appeal. The democracies would obtain and keep the initiative as they spread freedom over the face of the earth, as peoples outside the Atlantic area sought to create freer institutions in order to become eligible for membership and turned to the union more and more for markets and investments. Soviet Russia, unable to attack the union, would be compelled to devote more and more of its energies to maintaining its grip on the restive populations it now controls.

At the same time, the influential European movement toward neutrality would recede. This movement is based on military fears; its participants aspire to economic unity. The union would be political and economic as well as military, affording them what they seek and removing the existing basis for their fears. Finally, the union could furnish an enduring solution to the problem of Germany by including the western Germans among its peoples at a relatively early date. This would terminate the danger of another German dictatorship and enlist German strength and skills permanently on the side of the west.

Mr. Speaker, Atlantic union is the policy which the developing world crisis makes urgently necessary. Nothing less is adequate to meet the problems with which we are faced. Anything less means growing danger from the cold war, growing risk of a third world war, and a growing menace to the cities of our country and of western Europe. Anything less is likely to be too little and too late.

Some Members of this House may ask, "Is it not already too late? Is it not too late today to form an Atlantic union?"

Mr. Speaker, the fact that such a question can be asked is in itself a compelling reason for early action, for passage of the Atlantic union resolution at this session. If we do that, we shall not be too late.

Passage of the resolution at this session would enable the President to convoke the convention it proposes, either by the end of this year or early in 1951. By the end of 1951, it is true, the convention might still be in session, for its task will be exceedingly complex. But by that time it will at least have completed much of its spadework and be well on its way to concrete proposals for union.

By the end of 1951, accordingly, if not before, the fears and frustration of the free world will have been replaced by hope and confidence, and the eyes of the rest of the non-Communist world will be focused upon the convention. These results alone can turn the tide in the cold war. Epoch-making events cast their shadows ahead.

Communism everywhere will be forced upon the defensive. Its leaders in the Kremlin will no longer be able to hope that they can split the Atlantic community, since peoples engaged in discussing union will stand together under threat or even attack. For this reason, the convention alone will reduce the danger of war. It is likely also to modify the political warfare which the men in the Kremlin are waging against us, since they will realize that the more aggressively they act, the more they will impel the democracies toward union.

We must not overlook, moreover, the beneficial effects which the convention will have upon our foreign policy. All further steps toward Atlantic integration by diplomatic means will be easier to carry out if the Atlantic democracies are exploring union. Constructive action is promoted by an atmosphere of hope. And all other governments outside the iron curtain will be more open to the views of our diplomatic representatives if they see the United States and the other democracies exploring a union which would transform the destiny of mankind.

I wish to stress here that passage of this resolution, House Concurrent Resolutions 107–111, would not obstruct our foreign policy. The Marshall plan, the implementation of the Atlantic Pact, and our manifold diplomatic activities in all parts of the world would continue. For the reasons I have outlined above, passage of the resolution would facilitate our foreign policy besides providing our Government with an electrifying idea with which to win the minds of men.

Passage of this resolution would not commit the Congress or the American people to do anything more than to explore Atlantic union. If the convention should, as I believe it would, report

out concrete proposals for union, these would, of course, require the acceptance of the Congress and the American people in accordance with our constitutional procedures.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the voice of the people, the people we represent, is beginning to call for this action. Far-seeing editors of some of our leading newspapers have during recent months called for exploration of Atlantic union. The Gallup poll, released today, provides some very striking figures on this growing trend of public opinion. According to this poll, 72 percent believed it a good or fair idea for the Atlantic Pact countries to work out a closer relationship or union, while only 14 percent thought it a poor idea. Furthermore, 44 percent of the public believed it a good or fair idea for the United States to join with these other countries in a federal union—that is something like the way the 48 States in this country are joined together, whereas only 41 percent throught it a poor idea.

If 44 percent, comprising 52 percent of those expressing an opinion, favor joining a federal union comparable to our closely integrated United States, how many more would favor passage of a resolution merely to explore the possibilities of creating a union likely to be far less closely integrated than the United States?

Mr. Speaker, in passing this resolution we have nothing to lose and a world to win—a world of peace, prosperity, and expanding freedom. We, the Congress, cannot escape history and we should not evade our responsibility to the American people. If we fail to pass the Atlantic union resolution at this session, we will be turning our backs on our responsibility, taking a chance with the destiny of our country and leaving the American people to rely for their safety upon diplomatic methods which have proved inadequate. We must pass this resolution now. We will then have done our part, as representatives of the people, to safeguard our country and to guide it onto a broad open way leading to ever-increasing welfare, happiness, and freedom.

Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRENT SPENCE
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 25, 1950

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial which appeared in the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal of May 20, 1950:

A SENSIBLE COMPROMISE ON RENT CONTROL

BRENT SPENCE'S record on rent control is such that one is inclined to take at full value his current analysis of the subject. Compromise, he says, is the order of the day—and a compromise rent-control bill is the only one that has a chance of being passed by Congress.

The compromise endorsed by the House Banking Committee and its chairman seems a reasonable one. Its local-option provisions would put squarely up to individual city governments the question of ending all controls June 30, 1950, when the present act expires, or of extending them for 6 months beyond December 31, 1950, when, under the new measure, all controls would end unless the people or the governing bodies of individual cities voted for a further 6-month extension. In the meantime, of course, if the economic or political reaction warranted, Congress would have time to think again.

In putting rent control into the hands of local officials and local voters, the new bill is a grass-roots improvement over the present arrangement whereby cities must obtain permission of the State government to decontrol. In some cities, beyond doubt, controls would be dropped precipitately. In others, where the lack of rental housing for low-income groups is great enough to produce tangible ballot-box pressure, they would be retained.

From the lobbying activities of their mayors and union leaders, it seems likely that most big cities would retain controls. The extent of Louisville's shortage has long been disputed, but we suspect that it is still great enough to deter the board of aldermen from any precipitate action in removing the Federal ceilings. Experience in cities which already have decontrolled indicates that rent increases would be highest for those least able to pay, and since low-income groups here of necessity have long been bypassing the boasted abundance of quarters available at $75 to $100 a month, aldermanic action could scarcely be justified before a factual survey showed that there was indeed no longer a shortage of low-rent housing available for those thousands of Louisvillians making $50 a week or less.

There is still some doubt, of course, whether even a compromise rent-control bill will be approved by Congress. Some landlords admittedly have suffered economic injustice under rent control before remedial steps were provided by law, and almost all object, understandably, to having their business singled out for price regulation while others are free to charge whatever they think the traffic will bear. But the whole principle of rent control resulted from a war-caused shortage in which the old element of competition for renters had disappeared completely. Until that element is restored there will remain not only the social and economic necessity but also the political wisdom of controls.

That nonpartisan belief, though often attacked as socialistic, was ringingly reaffirmed by the Republican Legislature of New York this spring, and Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, not an unambitious man, took open pride in the fact that the Republican act was much more stringent than the formula offered by his Democratic opposition. Most Congressmen in this election year, we suspect, will be moved at least toward local-option compromise by this example of grass-roots republicanism.

Expenditure of Public Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH BUTLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 25 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "State Spenders Are Active," published in the Omaha Daily Journal-Stockman on May 22, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE SPENDERS ARE ACTIVE

Figures recently released by the Census Bureau indicate that the spending bug does not confine its nibblings to the Washington bureaucrats, politicians, and free riders, but rather finds equally lush pickings under the domes of our State capitols. The 48 State governments spent $791,000,000 more than they took in during the last fiscal year. The total spending figure, around $11,782,000,000 for all States, constituted a 13-percent gain over the preceding year and close to a whopping 97 percent more than in 1945. With the exception of bonus payments to veterans, which dropped off somewhat in 1949, every major component of State expenditure showed an increase, the Bureau reports. The many functions lumped under the vague heading of "State operating expenses" accounted for nearly half of the total amount spent and exceeded the previous year by 14 percent.

Seven of the forty-eight States, however, did not follow the pack into the throes of debt and deficit. Rather, they managed to keep their financial legs on solid footing and stay within their incomes. These included Illinois, Nebraska, Michigan, Connecticut, New Jersey, New York, and Rhode Island.

While the spenders in Washington make the collective States look like amateurs by comparison, it is quite obvious that easy-money policies at the public's expense are in force all up and down the Government line. As any family head knows, running into debt is at best a very poor temporary solution to financial problems, and invites bankruptcy when continued in times of prosperity. It is little wonder that the remote Federal Government gets away with slipshod finance when the States, which are much closer to the voter and taxpayer, are permitted to continue such lavish spending beyond income.

New GI Bill Housing-Loan Provisions Are Revealed—VA May Make Loans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 25, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the following interesting news item was taken from the Broken Bow Chief, of Broken Bow, Nebr., and I believe presents some information which is of value to veterans throughout the Nation, as well as lawyers and other people who want to be regarded as well-informed persons; it should receive wider publicity than it has received heretofore:

LINCOLN.—More than 105,000 World War II veterans in Nebraska who have not yet availed themselves of loan-guaranty rights provided in the GI bill will find their home-loan benefits greatly enhanced by provisions contained in the Housing Act of 1950, a law recently signed by the President.

Some of the important changes in the GI home-loan program which will result from the new law were outlined today by Ashley

Westmoreland, Lincoln regional office manager. Westmoreland said the regulations and procedures necessary to place the new provisions into effect are now being drafted by the VA, and will be issued as soon as possible.

The VA official said principal changes in the GI home-loan program include:

1. Increasing the amount of the VA's guaranty on an eligible veteran's home loan to 60 percent of the loan up to a maximum guaranty of $7,500. Previously, the VA could guarantee 50 percent of the loan up to a maximum of $4,000.

2. Making unremarried widows of veterans who died in service or from service-connected causes after discharge, eligible for the GI loan benefits to which their husbands would have been entitled.

3. Combination Federal Housing Administration-GI loans to veterans—which currently represent about one-third of the volume in veterans' loans—will be eliminated after next October 20.

4. The maximum period of time over which home loans may be made repayable is extended from 25 years to 30 years, thus providing lower monthly payments.

5. Effective in mid-July, the VA is authorized to make direct Government loans at 4 percent to eligible veterans in certain areas where 4 percent home financing is not available from other sources. A total of $150,000,000 was made available until July 1, 1951, for direct-loan purposes. No direct loan may exceed $10,000 and veterans must meet all the qualifications for a regular GI loan, including credit and income requirements.

Westmoreland said the law also grants the VA authority to establish certain minimum construction requirements for new construction; permits the VA in certain circumstances to restore loan-guaranty rights to veterans who used their entitlement to purchase property which later is taken through condemnation or is destroyed by fire or other natural hazard; directs the agency to issue regulations limiting fees and other charges which may be made against builders and veterans in connection with the construction and sale of GI loan-financed homes, and includes provisions to make GI loans for farm dwellings easier to obtain.

Since the GI-loan program started in late 1944, more than 14,500 veterans in Nebraska had been granted GI loans for home, farm, or business purposes. The loans approved totaled $60,414,820.

The VA official said the deadline for most veterans in applying for GI loans is July 25, 1957.

United and Positive Policy in the Struggle Against Commmunism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRVING M. IVES
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 25 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an important excerpt from the address by the Reverend Laurence J. McGinley, S. J., president of Fordham University, on the evening of Wednesday, May 24, at the annual meeting of the New Jersey Club of the Fordham University Alumni Association in Newark, in which Father McGinley makes a strong plea for an end to petty recrimination and partisan maneuvering in favor of a united and positive policy in the struggle against communism.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

There is an hour, in which to each nation is offered its time of greatness. For our country that time is now. In a few short years history will judge all of us for the steps we took, and the steps we did not take, in this world crisis. The complications and excitements that bewilder us now will be seen in proper perspective then. To see them now with that same clarity, to disregard now the minor irritations and to foster the ideas and actions and attitudes which will save the world—this is our challenge. If we meet it, we will have had our finest hour.

Any hour of crisis, even the greatest, is made of many smaller crises. One such recently was of concern to Fordham. I was convinced and I remain convinced that it was necessary to defend Professor Budenz as a sincere and a courageous man. I do not wish to prolong that issue, however, nor do I intend my defense of the personal character of Louis Budenz to be used by anyone for partisan advantage or political profit.

Rather I am concerned with the far more important fact that if ever there was a challenge which should carry us above the interest of any party, which should make us disregard economic advantage, which should even extend our vision beyond strategic military position, it is the challenge of the world today. In such an hour it seems to me that the attitudes demanded of all of us are: The spirit of unity, a positive approach, and a spirit of generosity. In particular, I would voice a plea for a really international mentality, positive, large-minded and bipartisan in the sense that it is truly nonpartisan.

Only if such an attitude is profoundly shared in our policy toward other countries can we afford the divisions of partisanship on our own home scene. And only then will these divisions maintain their proper perspective. Division in a crisis is the most serious disease that can attack us. Our need now is not for consuming fear and suspicion, but for those great and liberal decisions which will alone give spiritual focus and energy to a people. Our need is for respect toward those of all parties who have the responsibility to make these decisions.

All will agree, though with various measures of alarm, that communism is a most serious threat to our Nation and the world. The question is, how best to fight it? The answer calls for vision and perspective. Certainly the Christian conscience, borne down by the weight of the tasks to be done—both the good things to be built up and the evils to be cured—will place the positive side of the struggle in the forefront. The unity of our people, the unification of Europe and its continued economic rehabilitation, the Marshall plan, the point 4 program for undeveloped countries, the United Nations prudent measures of defense, presentation of a positive spiritual idea which will appeal to the whole world because it solves and transcends purely politico-economic problems—these are some of the great things to be done.

Anything else, though it may have its place, must never overshadow such a united attitude, generous and positive. Investigations and trials may and at times must have their place in the picture. They should never obstruct the serious international ideals and work of government. Even the difficulty of China should be kept proportionate to the whole vast crisis of which it is only a part. It should be faced on the level of the crisis itself, as a national responsibility, not a partisan adventure. It would be tragic indeed if we allowed excessive concern for the elements of any one failure to render us incapable of the far greater achievements which still remain before us. Our obligation is to total wisdom and it is a grave obligation on the conscience of all men of good will.

As far as the political attitude of the Catholic Church is concerned, no single man or group is entitled to speak for her. Therefore, neither do I. She is above the political order and is nonpartisan in the most spiritual sense of the word. She belongs neither to the right nor to the left. Neither is she conservative. The church will always exercise the judgments of God on events and programs, so far as they touch the world of faith and morals. She is compelled only by her own program, which forces her to be interested in the common good of all nations.

The individual Catholic is free to choose in the political order and no one dictates to him. But he is not free to leave behind him the large and positive spirituality of the Christian. He should know instinctively that it is not enough to be anti-Communist. He will always be interested in the poor because there are so many of them. He will be concerned with justice. He will criticize boldly—but he must always be more than a critic.

If our Nation is to accept the opportunity for leadership we have before us now, we must realize that the risks are frightening. But we must also realize that what is at stake is not the protection of one or even many interests in many nations. All over the world men are becoming aware of their potentialities as men. They are struggling to realize these potentialities in new forms of political and social life. This struggle is strong in the West and it is doubly strong among the peoples of the East. What is at stake in our moment of greatness is man himself: the dignity and perfection of the human person.

In such an hour, we as Americans and Catholics have a double obligation, of patriotism and religion, to keep our vision clear. It is my own sincere belief that we as American Catholics are obliged to do all in our power, by prayer and act, to further an unselfish, positive, and united international policy on the part of our Government as the sole hope for world order and world peace. This is no time for petty recrimination. Neither the cajolery of our seeming friends nor a natural antipathy for our traditional opponents must thrust us into the separatist and divisive postion of a Catholic bloc. The temptation to permit this now is great. It is imperative that we resist it. No minor crises, no partisan maneuvering must be allowed to distract our purpose or divide our loyalties at such an hour as this.

Green Frontiers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 1950

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, at the fifteenth annual National Farm Chemurgic Convention held in Washington last March a notable address on the value and importance of agricultural research was delivered by Wheeler McMillen, president of the council and editor in chief of the Farm Journal.

I believe that this address which is entitled "Green Frontiers" and which

graphically and eloquently describes the possibilities of agricultural research will be of interest to every Member of Congress. For that reason, under permission to extend my remarks, I include this address. It follows:

GREEN FRONTIERS

The photograph which I hold up for your view is a picture of a buggy. For those of you who do not know this object from experience, I might explain that a buggy is a horse-drawn vehicle which was used for the transportation of human beings in those days of antiquity which preceded the motor age.

The market for buggies began to decline when low-priced automobiles became available to the general public. The manufacturers in the industry discovered that they had a buggy problem. They could make more buggies than the public demanded. In those medieval times there was no such thing as parity for buggies. There was no Government system of buggy price supports, flexible or nonflexible.

Some of the buggy manufacturers went into the automobile business where they made a great deal of money and created large numbers of new jobs. The automobile was better than the buggy. Vast new stores of purchasing power were created by the enterprise which supplied the demand. Consequently, today a higher proportion of American families enjoy automobiles than ever owned buggies.

The object I now hold in my hand is a potato. The potato is agriculture's 1950 model buggy. The potato manufacturers are producing more of this model than the public demands.

This situation has arisen at a juncture in time when people have been let to expect impossible things from the Government. The administration of Government has been bitterly and raucously criticized for what it has done about potatoes. Much of this criticism has been entirely unjustified and nearly all of it has completely missed its proper mark. Government should not be criticized only for having engaged in an effort which has proved less than successful. Government can fairly be criticized for having attempted to do something entirely beyond the capacity of Government to accomplish.

GIRAFFES CANNOT DRIVE

You could give a giraffe a license to drive an automobile. You could give the giraffe permission to take your car onto the highways. Neither the license nor the permission would enable him to drive the car. Such a performance would be entirely beyond his capacity. No giraffe was ever cut out by nature to become a chauffeur.

Neither is it within the capabilities of Government to direct the planting of crops or to determine the price at which they shall be sold. Every such attempt in history has come to an unsuccessful end, usually to the accompaniment of disaster.

The potato growers of the United States do not have available a new crop to plant in the sense that the buggy manufacturers of 50 years ago found a new industry awaiting their enterprise. If they did now have a new crop to which to turn, which promised equal or better profits, they would take it up. Potato growers are good farmers. They have thoroughly demonstrated their ability to adapt themselves to new methods and new circumstances. In fact, their adaptability has contributed to the embarrassment of the Government.

If the potato men could now turn to a new crop, not more than 10 or 20 percent of them would need to go into the new business in order to prevent the recurrence of potato surpluses. Some such percentage would prevent the troublesome portion of the crop from being produced, and would therefore eliminate, probably permanently, the situation which has tempted Government to reach into the taxpayer's purse.

Incidentally, this endeavor in behalf of potato farmers since the end of the war has cost the people of the United States about $429,000,000 in taxes. Handling the 1948 crop cost about $224,000,000. Indications are that the outlay for the 1949 crop will be $80,000,000. That will make more than $300,000,000 potato outlay for the 1948 and 1949 crops—three times as much for potatoes as for all the agricultural research, including market and statistical research.

That sum of $300,000,000 approximately equals the Government receipts for 2 years from all the "nuisance taxes" collected from levies on luggage, handbags, wallets, toilet preparations, sporting goods, photographic apparatus, radio receiving sets, phonographs, phonograph records, and musical instruments.

In other words, without the potato expenditure the excise taxes on that list of items could have been repealed, and the Federal deficit would have remained about the same. The money did not settle the potato question.

I remind you that I am not voicing a criticism of Government nor of the present administration. Government has simply responded to what has been presumed to be a public demand that it undertake to do some good. If it has made mistakes, its mistakes have been made because Government has been urged to attempt a feat beyond the capacity of giraffes or governments to perform. Government cannot repeal the laws of nature nor the laws of human nature.

GOVERNMENT CAN HELP RESEARCH

The potato problem can be solved. It can be solved permanently. It can be solved in full obedience to the laws of nature. All that is necessary is to find enough facts. If an alternative crop that is sufficiently attractive can be found, the recurrence of the problem can be prevented. If, as may be less likely, sufficiently profitable new uses could be found for potatoes, the problem might be cured.

The search for facts and the search for new crops are entirely within the capacity and within the proper province of government. Private industrial initiative cannot undertake all the broad research needed for the general welfare. It has accomplished many great gains for agriculture, but certain kinds of scientific research have to be begun by government. Some scientific research is being done by government, but not nearly enough.

The idea that new crops be found to prevent recurrent agricultural surpluses is neither imaginative nor theoretical. It is thoroughly established by experience. The potato itself was once a new crop in Europe and became a new crop in what is now the United States. Wheat, cotton, oats, barley, rye—in fact, all but a few of our common plants came to this territory since the first arrival of the white man. Rubber is a new crop in the East Indies. Soybeans are a new crop in the United States; a new crop returning some $600,000,000 annually to farmers and many millions of added value from processing.

A fact well known to students of chemurgy, still new to many others, is that the modern sciences of organic chemistry, plant genetics, and agricultural engineering are very little older than the twentieth century. Time enough has not yet elapsed, during a half century punctuated by wars, for modern science to explore the mysteries of the plant kingdom. And, believe me, the plant kingdom is full of mysteries. Our ignorance of the vegetable world is supercolossal.

American agriculture utilizes fewer than 200 species of plants as crops. Neither farmers nor scientists have yet found out enough about the 15,000 species of plants which are native to United States and Canada to know whether or not one of those species might for some farmers be more profitable than potatoes, wheat, or cotton. No one has done more than to name and describe most of the 300,000 species of plants known by botanists to grow somewhere on earth.

INEXHAUSTIBLE, RENEWABLE RAW MATERIALS

These are the green frontiers. They are green with promise, rich with prospect, inexhaustibly stored with hope for human kind.

American industry each year finds itself drilling more deeply for oil and going farther afield for iron. No act of Government, no ingenuity of man, and apparently not even the power of God can reproduce minerals once they are destroyed.

Beyond the green frontiers lies ever-renewable wealth. Raw materials for industry can be supplied in quantities inexhaustible, because, with every round of the seasons the annual growth can be re-created. The poverty which mankind has suffered through countless centuries can, I am confident, literally be ended whenever the leaders of men penetrate far enough into these frontiers of green to develop the rich values which can be turned to human account.

Modern science has penetrated the kernel of corn and emerged with 200 objects useful to the human race. This amazing bounty has been revealed even though the molecular structure of the starch in corn remains a mystery. Let that mystery be solved and the values will be multiplied.

Modern science has dipped into the soybean and laid before human kind more than 200 useful objects derived from that single plant. These two plants, out of the 300,000 species botanists have described, are virtually the only two which science has explored with any degree of thoroughness.

A century ago the only uses for rubber were to erase mistakes made with a pencil and to make bouncing balls and water-tight garments. Today no civilized family lives without rubber; and almost only yesterday a new use was devised which is expected to consume as much rubber as do automobile tires.

That is the new use of airfoam rubber in pillows. Sleep is one of the commonest practices of human beings. One may presume that the human race has sought comfort in sleep since the night of creation, yet it has been possible within recent months for modern science and modern ingenuity to derive from among the green frontiers of the plant kingdom an important and new device for improving the restfulness of the "sleep that knits up the ravell'd sleeve of care."

Andrew Jackson could never have imagined the countless profitable uses to which rubber has been put. Neither can we here today envision the things which in the future will become necessities for human comfort and luxuries for human delight.

WANTS YET UNFULFILLED

Nevertheless, we can now imagine some of the good things which the vegetable kingdom may be able to supply. Seven million victims of arthritis in the United States can readily imagine the relief which will be granted to them should a plentiful vegetable source of cortisone be established. You will hear from others tomorrow night about that practicable possibility.

You can imagine the desirability of a cure for the common cold. Anyone can imagine cheaper and better road-building materials; cheaper and better construction materials; more abundant sources of cellulose; more generous supplies of protein.

Man's few timid and tentative ventures over the green frontiers have been astoundingly productive. Chemurgic industrial processes last year provided markets for $1,250,000,000 worth of farm crops. Oranges and grapefruit and lemons, once new crops in California, return to that golden State every year wealth greater than the value of all the gold ever extracted from the California earth. The gold we miser away in the dungeons of Fort Knox. The citrus fruits we enjoy as they are harvested, and then grow again another year.

Industry and Government alike rest forever uneasy in apprehension of depression. Agriculture today shudders in the fear of accumulating surpluses.

Give industry an ever-expanding economy and it will not fear depression. Give Government a sufficiently expanding economy and it can pay its debts out of production. Give agriculture enough new crops and enough new uses for its products and surpluses will not reappear. Remove the specter of surpluses from agriculture and an ever-expanding economy will give us ever-expanding industry and a first class chance to save American freedom for future generations.

Over a period of 20 years Government has expanded substantially $20,000,000,000 in its efforts to meet the agricultural surplus problem. During the year while it was spending $200,000,000 to perpetuate the potato surplus, Government spent $69,000 in search of new uses for potatoes. In the same year Government spent $113,000 toward the search for new crops which it found would forever prevent the need for subsidies. And this week committees of Congress are engaged in whittling down the appropriation for agricultural research.

MANHATTAN PROJECT FOR PLANT RESEARCH

No one has yet quite voiced such a slogan as "billions for subsidies, chicken feed for research." I shall, however, venture to propose its reverse—"billions for research and eventually not one cent for subsidies."

Taxpayers have been called upon for nearly 10 times as many billions for agricultural subsidies—subsidies which have not cured the surplus problem—10 times as many as the two billions which the fabulous Manhattan project required to research and develop the atomic bomb.

What more splendid economy could be proposed than a Manhattan project for the kind of creative research that experience has soundly proved could prevent agricultural surpluses, abolish the need for agricultural subsidies, and add the blessings of new wealth, new comforts, new abundance, and new hopes for all mankind?

I propose this with the utmost earnestness. I propose it for the benefit of American farmers, American workers, American taxpayers, and American consumers. I propose it in the name of all who are hungry or needy in any country in the world. If the magnificent concept by President Truman in his point 4 proposal is to bear full fruit and is to provide the fullest advantages for the aspiring nations of other continents, a bold new program of research must be organized into the undisclosed reaches behind all the green frontiers. After all, the countries which we most wish to help to help themselves are agricultural countries. They need new crops and new industries based on their farm materials.

The horse-and-buggy days have receded into the past. Let us search beyond these limitless green frontiers in order that we may leave behind us the years of the blue potato.

Congress can pass no law that will repeal or thwart any law of nature. But it can pass appropriations that will enable science to learn how to obey the laws of nature and to uncover the beneficent facts of nature.

For far less than the twenty billions that have perpetuated surpluses, for far less than the two billions that unloosed the atomic destroyer, we can send men across the plains of the planet, up the mountains and down the valleys. They will bring in the seeds and roots and stalks of every promising plant that greens the soils. In our great laboratories the scientists will find, in some of these plants, new blessings for the people. New crops will bloom in the fields and they will yield Government supports instead of demanding price supports.

Senate Set To Vote on Aid for Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. MALONE
OF NEVADA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 25 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a press dispatch appearing in the New York Journal of Commerce of May 25, entitled "Senate Set To Vote on Aid for Europe."

There being no objection, the dispatch was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE SET TO VOTE ON AID FOR EUROPE—TAFT ATTACKS POINT 4 AS PERMANENT DRAIN ON UNITED STATES

WASHINGTON, May 24.—The Senate today agreed to vote at 3:30 p. m. tomorrow in the final showdown on a bill authorizing $3,120,550,000 in economic aid to western Europe and other non-Communist areas.

The measure passed the House yesterday, 247 to 88. Senate passage would send it to the White House for President Truman's signature.

POINT 4 UNDER FIRE

The agreement to end debate came as Republican Senators pressed an attack on a section of the bill authorizing $35,000,000 for the administration's point 4 program to aid backward areas of the world.

Senator TAFT, Republican, Ohio, denounced the point 4 provision as the opening wedge for pouring American dollars overseas "for all time to come."

Other Republicans—including Senators MALONE, Nevada, JENNER, Indiana and BRIDGES, New Hampshire—took the same tack in an attempt to send the bill back to a Senate-House conference for further consideration.

Although the Republicans poured on a heavy fire of criticism, there was no objection when Senator CONNALLY, Democrat, Texas, proposed that the Chamber vote on the huge global aid bill tomorrow afternoon.

The Senate will meet at 10 a. m. and begin voting after five and a half hours of debate.

The bill passed the House yesterday, 247 to 88.

MALONE and TAFT both hammered on the theme that the point 4 program is designed to carry on after the European recovery program expires—without any limit on time or funds.

FUNDS FOR RUSSIA?

MALONE said that under the wording of the bill, American funds could be used even to develop Russia.

"Or any of the Communist countries," TAFT amended.

Chairman CONNALLY, Democrat, Texas, of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has insisted that the administration has no desire or intention to help Communist nations through the point 4 program.

But TAFT said the way the legislation is worded, United States aid would be wide open to all countries, and he declared:

CALLED ENDLESS PROGRAM

"It marks a substantial change from the European recovery program in that it would be a permanent program for all time to come."

TAFT noted that the foreign aid bill, as originally passed by the Senate, put a 5-year limit on the point 4 program, but he said it had been struck out in the Senate-House conference report on the measure.

When the Senate first voted on the measure administration forces barely succeeded in keeping the point 4 section in the big aid bill. The vote then was 37 to 36.

Senator BRIDGES, Republican, New Hampshire, asked MALONE if he felt that the point 4 project—named after the fourth point in President Truman's 1947 inaugural address—was intended to be the vehicle for use beyond the ECA to continue American foreign aid.

"There is no question about it," MALONE replied.

NO LIMIT ON PROJECT

MALONE said the project is neither limited as to time, nor as to the amount of money to be spent.

"The cost," he said, "will depend only on how much the State Department can soften up Congress for future appropriations."

The Nevada Senator went on to attack the point 4 project as an open and above-board admission for the first time of the administration's plans for continuing foreign aid indefinitely.

MALONE said it was all part of a program starting with lend-lease, the British loan, the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration (UNRRA) and the Marshall plan, that was intended to be permanent from the beginning.

Newspaper Report on President Truman's Visit to Ravenna, Nebr., on May 8, 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 25, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, through the kind offices of Mr. L. P. Cash, publisher of the Ravenna News of Ravenna, Nebr., there was furnished to me copies of the issues of his splendid Ravenna newspaper for May 4, May 11, and May 18, 1950.

I am proud to put them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for two very good reasons, and they are to show to some of the vicious and unmannerly persons of this Nation how a President should be respected and treated always, and to give a correct newspaper report to a waiting public who wants to know the truth, and have been denied so often such journalistic opportunity.

I am indeed grateful to Mr. Cash and his newspaper force for the privilege of reading and using his fine newspaper copy and know that all of my readers will enjoy perusing these items also, unless they are abnormal Americans.

The following is from the May 4 issue:

EVERYTHING SET FOR PRESIDENT'S VISIT—STATION AREA TO BE FLOODLIGHTED AND SPECIALLY DECORATED FOR THE OCCASION; TWO BANDS ON HAND ALSO—REGULATIONS FOR PRESIDENT'S VISIT

The Secret Service department, which has charge of the President's personal safety, has outlined the following regulations relative to Mr. Truman's Ravenna stop. The public is asked to keep these in mind:

The President's car will stop west of the overpass.

No cars will be allowed to park in this immediate area, and no moving vehicle will be allowed.

No one will be permitted on the overpass, embankments, lumber piles, or above the ground level.

All traffic on the overpass will be stopped on arrival of the train for duration of the visit.

Rope barriers will be provided to direct the traffic, and the public will not be allowed to go beyond these.

The train will arrive here at 8:45 p. m., and will leave at 8:55 p. m. It will be on time.

The president of the chamber of commerce asks all business houses to display their welcome flags all day—for the Omaha Goodwillers in the morning and for the President in the evening.

Members of the veterans' organizations, and members of the fire department, in uniform, are asked to turn out in the evening, to assist with the job of policing and keep the public gathering in order.

About 1,000 people are expected here next Monday evening to participate in the greeting for President Truman, whose special train will stop in Ravenna for 10 minutes.

Mayor E. F. Kozel will introduce the President, who will address the audience briefly from the rear platform of his special car.

The special train will arrive here at 8:45 p. m. on Monday, May 8, but a short street program featuring the Loup City and Ravenna school bands has been arranged to commence at 8 p. m. The bands will then lead the crowd to the station in time for the arrival of the train. A dance will be held at the auditorium later in the evening.

Special floodlighting of the station area and other decorations are being planned by the Ravenna Chamber of Commerce committee, honoring the first personal appearance of a President in the town's history.

The President's train will stop for 30 minutes in Lincoln, and at Grand Island, Ravenna, Seneca, and Alliance for 10 minutes each.

Mr. Truman's special car is equipped with a public-address system, also specially lighted, so there will be plenty of opportunity for all to see and hear. Amateur photographers are invited to take pictures, providing they do not break security regulations.

A reception committee, which will be allowed to enter the train and meet the President personally has been appointed. The Ravenna people will include the mayor, Mr. Kozel, J. C. Flesch, and Malcolm Fisher, of the chamber of commerce, L. V. Kozel, postmaster, Senator W. J. Williams, Hugh Linn, superintendent of schools, Allard Rowbotham, representing local railroad men, Kelly Hankins, representing local farmers, and Lyman Cass, local chairman.

Democratic county committee representatives from Buffalo, Sherman, and Dawson counties will also be present, and two women, Thelma Lang of Litchfield and Grace Barmore of Cozad, members of the State central democratic organization.

Besides these, there will be other dignitaries on the train, railroad officials, etc.

The Secret Service men are expected in town several days in advance of the visit. They will determine the location for the train's stop, and check on other security matters. On the night of the President's visit, the Secret Service will be present on duty, and will be assisted by men from the county sheriff's office and the State highway patrol. Although no trouble of any kind is expected, the officers take no chances.

Mr. Truman has listed his tour of the western States as nonpolitical in nature, and his remarks are expected to be of this type. Upon completion of his western trip he will stop in Chicago for an address which he has stated will be political.

This editorial also appeared in the May 4 issue:

TRUMAN'S VISIT

The visit of President Truman next Monday evening will be a memorable occasion in Ravenna's history. This will be especially true of the small group who will be privileged to get on the train and meet the President personally. The names of the persons on this committee have been submitted to Washington in advance, where they must undergo rigid checking for security purposes.

The President is making several other stops in the State, but it appears there will be no lack of dignitaries here at Ravenna. Besides the important Government personages on the train, there will be important officers of the Democratic organization—State, district, and county—Burlington Railroad officials, and perhaps others.

The Presidential visits always have political significance, and the fact that Nebraska has been a strong Republican State in recent years doubtless has been a factor in the decision to make five stops in Nebraska. And since Buffalo County has been in the Republican column almost without exception, perhaps is a reason why Ravenna was selected as one stopping place.

In fact, what few Democrats there are in Buffalo County are located up here in this corner around Ravenna. But even then the number isn't too great.

As one of the Democratic brethren put it the other day: "If only the Democrats turn out to see the President, we'll have to go some to fill up the depot platform. Guess we will have to borrow a lot of Republicans to make the occasion a success."

The following appeared in the May 11 issue:

TRUMAN ADDRESSES AUDIENCE OF 2,500—CROWD ORDERLY, EVERYTHING ON SCHEDULE AT PRESIDENT'S VISIT MONDAY EVENING; TALKED ABOUT FARMING, CONSERVATION

President Harry Truman spoke to 2,500 rain-drenched people at Ravenna Monday night, a crowd that far exceeded expectations.

The special train arrived in Ravenna on time and was greeted with a cheer from the crowd which had been standing half an hour in a May shower.

Introduced by Mayor Kozel, the President spoke of farming and soil conservation, and said he was reporting to this farming country as a "hired hand."

He told of the advance of soil-conservation practices and the big job under way so the Nation never again would have a Dust Bowl.

He said the whole Nation was enjoying prosperity now and it was his duty to keep it that way. He said the Nation's prosperity was reaching down to every individual, the chief asset in keeping the Nation strong. By keeping it strong, he said, is the best way to keep it peaceful.

The President declared that if the Nation remains strong Soviet Russia will not attack us militarily and that the United States does not want to attack anybody.

The President looked healthy and strong and carried a big smile. He seemed well pleased at the reception here.

Mrs. Truman and Margaret made a brief appearance on the rear platform also. When Margaret appeared someone in the crowd yelled "Let's have a song." Margaret smiled broadly and waved, but seemed to enjoy the jest.

Many people here seemed to think the President looked like Albert Skochodopole, the local real-estate man. He is shorter in stature than most expected him to be.

A reception committee was on hand to shake hands with Mr. Truman, which included Democratic dignitaries from Buffalo, Sherman, and Dawson Counties. Kelly Hankins, one of the committee, who was introduced as "a wheat farmer," stopped the show. The President stopped for a short chat, asked about the crops here and about the farmers. Kelly told him the wheat didn't look very good.

Fred Wallace, of Gibbon, another of the committee, knew the Trumans when he was once chief of the AAA in Washington. He was invited into the President's parlors to say "hello" to the ladies. Emil Kozel, after introducing the President, also stepped inside the bulletproof lavish special car.

The Ravenna and Loup City bands were on hand to furnish music, but couldn't perform very well because their music got wet. But there was music, anyway. After the introductions the crowd broke into the strains of Happy Birthday, honoring the President's sixty-sixth birthday on that day.

The President got a birthday present, too. It was a fly rod and fishing flies, hand-made by Jack Krotz, of Ravenna, so he could go fishing at Grand Coulee. Pictures of Jack, and a brief account of his battle to overcome his polio handicap accompanied the gift. But the gift could not be presented publicly, as it had not been cleared in Washington. It was given to him later, after a Secret Service inspection.

A small crowd of police were on hand to keep order, but no incident occurred except one heckler who stood near the front row. The young man was a stranger to Ravenna. The aides didn't muffle him and the President didn't seem to mind, in fact retaliated to some of the sallies.

Besides a gang of Secret Service men and aides, the railroad had four special agents here, the county sheriff and his force, the State patrol force, the local police force, and a group of local Legion, VFW, and firemen who were employed in keeping the crowd orderly behind the ropes.

Special floodlights had been put up to light the station area and a big 30-foot banner which carried the words "Welcome President Truman." The President noticed it with a gesture. After the program was over, souvenir hunters got the banner. During the program, two of the floodlights went out. The hot bulbs were hit by raindrops.

Leaving Ravenna, the President's train was in the hands of a Ravenna crew. B. F. Wallace was the engineer, Max Manasil the fireman, and Claude Foerst was the conductor. The brakemen were Hutchinson and Merritt, two Alliance men, working out of Ravenna at present.

The May 18 issue contained the following:

TRUMAN'S VISIT HIT THE HEADLINES

The News is in receipt of a copy of the Los Angeles Examiner, sent by an unnamed donor, which shows that President Truman's visit in Ravenna made the headlines.

Under an eight-column banner head, the text of Mr. Truman's speech appears under a Ravenna (Nebr.) date line.

The International News Service correspondent, who was on the train and wrote the story, estimated the Ravenna crowd at several thousand.

In describing his Ravenna appearance, the correspondent wrote: "The President was bareheaded and himself was pelted by the downpour. Loudspeakers carried his voice to the crowd, but at several points his talk was barely audible. Lightning flashed intermittently in the sky."

The reason for the big headline was the President's statement that Soviet Russia will not attack this country militarily and that the United States does not want to attack anybody.

The account, which went out to all papers in the Nation, appeared on Tuesday morning, May 9, after the President's appearance here May 8.

The May 18 issue contained the following editorial:

President Truman has completed his western tour, and is back home again. The crowds which met his train were large everywhere, the papers report. We were glad that Ravenna made a fine showing in this regard, despite the rain.

Mayor Kozel got a big kick out of introducing the President and meeting the First Family. He says he is now charging his friends 25 cents to shake the hand which shook the President's hand.

Jesse H. Jones, a Real Texan and Friend of the A. & M. College of Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1950

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the Association of Former Students of the A. & M. College of Texas is honoring Jesse H. Jones, of Houston, by devoting an entire issue of the Texas Aggie newspaper to the life story of this great Texan. I am inclined to believe that Mr. Jones selected the A. & M. College of Texas as the recipient of his many gifts because he has seen the product of the school with its outstanding leaders in the military, agricultural, and business fields.

At the present time there are 28 young men at Texas A. & M. on scholarships provided by Mr. Jones, and this one donor is furthering the work of the ex-student association, for its members support the opportunity award scholarships for deserving young men who could not otherwise attend college. The first Jesse Jones scholarships were for young men studying agriculture and related subjects and since then these scholarships have been supplemented by the "Jesse H. Jones military scholarships" to provide for the development of future generals in our military forces.

We ex-students of the A. & M. College of Texas are grateful to Mr. Jones for his generosity in providing scholarships for so many young men, and we are proud to be a part of the school that is recognized for providing the thousands of officers who served in World Wars I and II and for recognizing this school that has taken boys and graduated men.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include one of the articles appearing in the Texas Aggie regarding Mr. Jesse Jones:

LEGEND IN SPITE OF HIMSELF, JESSE JONES STILL HARD AT WORK, BUILDING FOR FUTURE

Jesse H. Jones has become a legend in his own time, in spite of himself. In the public mind he has become a remote and shadowy figure of tremendous power who mysteriously pulls the strings which cause unbelievable things to happen in financial and governmental circles. Many stories are told about this man which could not possibly be true, and the tellers feel no restraint because to them he is not quite real.

This is probably the penalty of having in 76 years accomplished more in a wide range of fields than most of us are able to believe one man can accomplish in an ordinary lifetime by understandable methods. The fact that he has worked quietly, and has never seemed particularly impressed by his own success has resulted in surprisingly little being written about him.

There is nothing remote or shadowy about the man when you meet him. He is big; 6 feet, 2; around 200 pounds. He is well-built, carries himself with ease and assurance. You immediately get an impression of power, completely controlled. His unhurried manner, apparent relaxation and soft speech put you at ease, while the intent look with which his gray eyes hold yours as you talk keeps you reminded of the power underneath.

Mr. Jones doesn't waste words. Before answering a question he thinks it over and his reply is simple and direct. His questions are questions of fact, easy to answer if you know your business; disconcerting if you don't. There is nothing vague about his conversation any more than there is about his thinking.

One of the man's outstanding characteristics is his complete assurance. He acquired this early, when his father sent him to a nearby town and put him in charge of a tobacco factory at the age of 14. He learned then to use his own judgment and to trust it.

He is a complete individualist, making his own decisions and taking full responsibility for them. He has never had a partner in any of his many businesses. When he has a decision to make, in business or otherwise, he gets all of the information possible, thinks the thing through and takes the necessary action. "Every person born into the world," he once told a group graduating from college, "has an uncharted destiny. Each must meet life and life's problems for himself, and solve them in his own way. No one can do it for him."

He is a man of deep loyalties. To the people who influenced him most—his father; his Aunt Nancy, who mothered him after his mother died; Royal A. Ferris, the Dallas banker who gave him his first financial backing; and Woodrow Wilson, who showed him how political idealism must fit into a world of hard practicality—he gave a deep devotion.

This loyalty extends to his family, his party, his church, his native State of Tennessee, and to his adopted State, Texas. In his business organizations everyone works hard; he sets a fast pace and expects those around him to keep up. At the same time, loyalty begets loyalty. Few people ever quit his organizations and many of the men around him have been with him for 30 or 40 years.

At 76, Jesse Jones has a profound faith in the younger generation and in the future of his country. He had rather spend an hour talking with a youngster, especially one from the country, than visiting with some man of high position. He has never for a moment believed that the country was going to the dogs.

"I believe in my country," he wrote not long ago, "and have always operated accordingly."

Some idea of the success of these operations may be gained from the following:

JESSE H. JONES MILESTONES

1874: Born April 5, on a tobacco farm in Robertson County, Tenn., son of William Hasque and Anne Holman Jones.

1878: Upon the death of his mother, his father's sister, Aunt Nancy, a widow with two children, became a mother to both families. Until her death, some 20 years ago, Aunt Nancy was one of the strongest influences in his life.

1884: First lived in Texas when his father moved to Dallas to become associated with a younger brother, M. T. Jones, in the lumber business. Attended grammar school in Dallas 2 years, until his father moved back to farm in Tennessee.

1888: At 14, he received his first executive business experience when his father put him in charge of a tobacco factory in a neighboring town, buying, grading, prizing in hogsheads, and shipping for export, the tobacco raised by farmers in that area, and bought by his father and a partner. This first experience on his own, taught him to have confidence in his own judgment at an early age. It was necessary, since he had no one to appeal to for advice.

1890: His father brought the family back to Dallas, where Jesse went to grade school again and attended a business college. After graduating from the business college, he taught in the college for a few months, then traveled on the road as a salesman for a while, but did not make a success of it.

1891: He took a job in a lumber yard in Hillsboro, Tex., owned by his uncle, M. T. Jones, doing both manual labor and keeping books. His salary was $25 per month, then $40, then $60. A year and a half later, his father died, and Jesse went back to the farm in Tennessee to live with his family and raise his last crop of tobacco. From his father's estate he inherited $2,000 but used it to pay debts on the farm which went to his sister.

1894: He returned to Dallas and took a job with the M. T. Jones Lumber Co. at $65 a month, and in less than a year he was manager of the yard at $100 a month.

1898: On the death of his uncle he moved to Houston as general manager of the company, operating a number of sawmills and lumber yards.

1902: He started on his own by organizing the South Texas Lumber Co. with a capital stock of $20,000, $15,000 of which he owned, continuing as general manager of the M. T. Jones Lumber Co. for a half dozen years until that company was liquidated.

1905: He first entered the banking field as a director of the Union Bank & Trust Co., now the Union National Bank, and later became its largest stockholder and vice president, selling his stock in 1917.

1907. He helped to organize and was a vice president of the Lumberman's National Bank at Houston, now the Second National.

1908: Following the panic of 1907, he acquired control of the National City Bank in Houston, and later merged it with the Lumberman's National Bank. He also entered the field of building, owning and operating major business buildings. During the first year he built three 10-story office buildings in Houston. He entered the newspaper field as half owner of the Houston Chronicle.

1909: He bought control of the Merchants National Bank and merged it with the Union Bank & Trust Co. Organized Texas Trust Co., owning a majority of its stock, and was its president; later consolidated with Bankers Trust Co., which finally became Bankers

Mortgage Co., of which he is now the principal owner.

1912: Organized Houston Hotel Association and built the 1,000-room Rice Hotel, being the principal owner.

1913: He was appointed chairman of the Houston Harbor Board by the then mayor of Houston, Ben Campbell, and installed Houston's first harbor. Became part owner of the National Bank of Commerce, later to become one of the major financial powers of the Nation.

1917: Appointed by President Woodrow Wilson as director general of the Department of Military Relief of the American Red Cross, in which position he served throughout World War I, starting his long career of service in the National Government.

1918: Appointed member of Red Cross War Council. During this period his close association with President Woodrow Wilson made a lasting impression on him; one that has greatly influenced his life.

1919: Served as an American delegate to the Red Cross conferences at Cannes, France, and Geneva, Switzerland, which organized the international League of Red Cross societies. Served as a director of the Phelps Stokes Educational Commission which planned an educational system for the natives of Africa, for which he was honored by the British Government in London in 1925.

1920: Married Mary Gibbs, daughter of Dr. Jasper Gibbs, a prominent Mexia physician.

1922: Became president of National Bank of Commerce.

1923: Entered New York building field, organizing and heading Houston Properties Corp., of New York, which built and operates the Mayfair House, three large office buildings, a hospital, and numerous other buildings.

1924: Became director of finance for the Democratic National Committee, turned a deficit into a surplus for the 1928 campaign, and brought the National Convention to Houston.

1925: Received his first honorary degree, doctor of laws, at Southwestern University, Georgetown. Since then he has received 10 other such degrees: Southern Methodist University (1927), Texas A. and M. (1936), New York University (1937), Temple University (1937), John Brown University (1938), Oglethorpe University (1941), Washington and Jefferson College (1941), Lafayette College (1942), St. Louis University (1942), Northwestern University (1942). He was also awarded a regency in the field of finance by the Association of Arts and Sciences (1935).

1926: Named director general Texas Centennial Celebration to be held in 1936. In addition to heading this State-wide celebration, he conceived the idea, suggested the design, and headed the fund drive to erect the San Jacinto monument. In this same year he became the sole owner of the Houston Chronicle. In a few years he acquired the Houston Post, but later sold it to former Gov. W. P. Hobby.

1928: Unanimously endorsed by Texas delegation for Democratic nomination for President of the United States.

1932: Named a director of Reconstruction Finance Corporation by President Herbert Hoover.

1933: Named Chairman of Reconstruction Finance Corporation by President Franklin D. Roosevelt, beginning one of the most spectacular periods of national public service the country has ever seen. In 1935, 1937, and 1939, reappointed Chairman of the RFC by President Roosevelt. Later in 1939, appointed Administrator of the newly created Federal Loan Administration in charge of RFC, Export-Import Bank, Federal Housing Authority, and Home Owners Loan Corporation.

1937: Mr. and Mrs. Jones created Houston Endowment, Inc., and endowed it with a substantial portion of their estate. Through Houston Endowment they have aided hundreds of young men and women throughout the Nation to secure college educations. In addition to this principal activity, in 1945 they established and endowed the Woodrow Wilson School of Foreign Affairs at the University of Virginia.

1939: Appointed Administrator of the Federal Lending Agency; United States Senate suspended its rules in order to confirm this appointment on the day it was approved by committee.

1940: Appointed Secretary of Commerce by President Roosevelt; Congress passed a special resolution to allow him to serve as member of the President's Cabinet and Federal Loan Administrator at the same time.

1941: Appointed member of the National Emergency Council.

1942: Served on National Board of Economic Warfare, War Production Board, and Economic Stabilization Board, in addition to other governmental duties.

1945: Resigned as Secretary of Commerce and Federal Loan Administrator and returned to private life in Houston, after 15 years of Government service during two wars and a major depression.

1947: Organized Commercial & Industrial Life Insurance Co., of which he is chairman of the board.

1948: Through Houston Endowment, Inc., Mr. and Mrs. Jones gave Hedgecroft Corp. a hospital in Houston for the treatment of polio.

1949: They built a library at Mexia, Tex., honoring Mrs. Jones' parents, Dr. Jasper Gibbs, and his wife, Sallie Chandler Gibbs.

1950: Launched major building project in downtown Houston area, in block occupied by his National Bank of Commerce and Gulf buildings.

Fair Employment Practice Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 25 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, there recently appeared an editorial in the El Paso Herald-Post about the subject of the Senate's recent debate on fair employment practice legislation.

The editorial was written by Mr. Ed Pooley. Mr. Pooley is a progressive editor who pulls no punches. I ask unanimous consent to include this editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FILIBUSTER

The recurring filibuster against what is miscalled the Fair Employment Practice Commission bill is on again in the Senate. The southerners, plus a few allies, have rallied again to keep this thing out of the law. We hope they win. The bill is a phony, which will help no American.

It has become somewhat fashionable of late years to decry the filibuster as an outrage against democracy. The Communists do it, along with other leftwingers and the bleeding hearts whose pet measures are threatened with asphyxiation by senatorial gas.

We rather like the Senate filibuster. We think it is a pretty good institution in a Government such as ours. We can be quite calm at the sound of the scream that "the will of the majority is being defeated" with the realization that the rights of the minority are being protected.

The FEPC was conceived in political iniquity and born in political sin. It was never intended to aid anyone but its proponents in office. It is a vote catcher, brought up again and again for no other purpose.

There is no evidence that the will of the majority is being defeated. The majority of the Senate, perhaps, where its influence on some voters in doubtful States is well known. But not the majority of the people. Except from the Communists, the leftists, the practical politicians, and those who live by promoting "causes," we have never heard any outcry when the FEPC has been defeated. Anybody, even a pro-FEPC Senator, can see that the country gained nothing when it was in effect as a wartime measure, lost nothing when it expired, has not been hurt since, and doesn't need it now.

But those who would trade some people's rights for other people's votes pay no attention to that.

The filibuster is all that stands between them and the enactment of this odious bill. We wish for the filibusterers strong voices and great endurance. May their vocal cords stay in the pink and their throats clear and resonant, and may they talk and talk and talk until the FEPC is laid away to rest until another election year.

Perhaps, and we are thinking wistfully and wishfully, 1950's filibuster may bring death to this bit of hypocrisy.

Preserving the American Way of Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSSELL B. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 25 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address delivered recently before the Nicholson Post, No. 38, of the American Legion, Baton Rouge, La., by Chief Justice John B. Fournet, of the Louisiana supreme court.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I believe I speak for all of the members of this post who are veterans of the First World War when I say that the thought we had uppermost in our minds when we were mustered out of service and returned to civilian life was that we had had a share in crushing for all time the threat to democracy and free men that had reared its ugly head under Prussian militarism. We returned to our homes, to our jobs, and to our studies determined that we would band together as a group to insure that this threat would remain forever crushed. You younger veterans can attest to the fact that this evil did not remain crushed but, instead, again ran rampant throughout the world. You also returned victorious from the battlefield to take up the broken strands of your lives secure in the belief that this time, surely, the world had been made safe for democracy and that this time, surely, the sacrifices you and your fathers had made would not be in vain. Today, however, through the medium of a cold war that becomes increasingly hot daily, not only you but all veterans, all Americans, and all free nations find themselves again

faced with the same challenge that has vexed the human family throughout all recorded history—the challenge of growing tyranny.

We ask ourselves: "Why?" "Why?" "Why?" In what way have we "fumbled the ball"? Have the horrors engendered by these two terrible wars we have fought in the first half of the twentieth century taught us nothing? As Gen. Omar Bradley has so aptly put it, "The world has achieved brilliance without wisdom, power without conscience. Ours is a world of nuclear giants and ethical infants. We know more about war than we know about peace; more about killing than we know about living."

I believe that with the usual hindsight given to most Monday-morning quarterbacks, we all now realize our first and our biggest mistake was to hold our fire, withdraw our weapons, and, under deliberately provoked pressure applied by parents on Congressmen facing reelection, bring our fighting men home before we had won the peace. In doing these things we fell right into the hands of a people who were but waiting to turn their cannons in our direction and aim them at our retreating backs. We thought we had a friend; we found we had an enemy. We thought we had an ally; we found we had been alined with a dictatorial and tyrannical opportunist. While we naively extended our hand in friendship, an arm and hand holding a hammer and sickle was encircling our homeland. We learned the hard way that no amount of polite talk, no amount of cautious behavior, will earn for us the friendship and good will of a totalitarian nation that can understand no reason but force and that thinks nothing of starving a whole city to gain a political advantage.

The evil of communism is not a stagnant evil. It is a living and a moving thing, insidiously but surely invading every phase of our life. We find it in the Paul Robesons of our entertainment world; in the MARCANTONIO's of our Congressional Halls, in the Harry Bridgeses of our labor and economic movement, and in the O. John Rogges and Alger Hisses of our governmental departments. The American Legion deserves everlasting credit and the thanks of a grateful America for its unrelenting effort to ferret out these insidious and subversive influences and expose them for what they are.

The Legion's work in this respect is not new. In the fight against communism it has long played a dominant role. Well aware of the chaos that followed in the wake of the world conquest sought by the Prussian military and by the hate-spreading Nazis, the Legion was immediately sensitive to the threat to democracy and to America itself that was being engendered by the false philosophies and the false propaganda of the Communists. These ideologies, wearing different uniforms and shouting different slogans, were seeking a world conquest of an even more devastating nature than their predecessors—the conquest of the minds of free men and the paralleling enslavement of their bodies. Since that time the Legion's allegiance to the cause of educating Americans to the privileges and responsibilities of citizenship and the cause of making America strong—secure against aggression from without and against subversion from within—has been unswerving. The very recent All-American Conference held in New York under the sponsorship of the American Legion is but an example of its effort to build a strong and a loyal America.

Firm in the belief that the final battle in the cold war will be won or lost in the minds of men, the Legion has charted a course that calls not only for guarding our American heritage, but also for proving to the world that democracy is a real, live, and progressive thing. This is as it should be. While the Legion is placing a great deal of emphasis upon Americanism, Americanism, in the final analysis, means more than a mere negative resistance to Communism. It means a positive faith in democratic ideals and procedures. The Legion believes all true Americans have an abiding faith in the democratic way of life. It seeks but to be the instrument that stimulates our citizens and prods our Government to the end that America will be fully prepared to meet aggression from any quarter, without or within. It wants to keep America always American. I believe the American Legion, more than any other force at work in the country today, possesses the ability to do just that.

The task of steering a true American course through the succession of emergencies that are indicated for the years immediately ahead will not be an easy one. As I remarked earlier, we have had to learn the hard way that we can never live in freedom and peace while we are faced with a preponderantly hostile and undemocratic people whose enmity we have incurred for no other reason than that we persist in living as free men. Brig. Gen. Frank Howley in his current book entitled "Berlin Command," tells us in plain, everyday language that we can all understand just why it is impossible for a free people to live in harmony in one city with those who advocate a communistic dictatorship. If this is true at the local level, how much more so is it true on a national and an international level.

Are you, as Americans, doing everything you can to assist in your Legion's fight for liberty, or are you, through a sense of indifference, surrendering to this new type of enslavement? At this halfway mark in the twentieth century, it behooves each and every one of us to take personal inventory of ourselves so that we may determine what we can best do to insure that these foreign ideologies become a diminishing instead of an increasing threat to our freedom. This is essentially what Theodore Roosevelt, Jr., and Sgt. William Patterson did when, during their convalescence at a base hospital in Paris in 1918, they dreamed of an organization of veterans that became the American Legion.

An organization of veterans is not a new thing. Undoubtedly every war since the beginning of time has produced a group anxious to preserve after the end of hostilities the comradeship born on the battlefield. But the men who founded the American Legion envisioned a goal that transcended the mere spirit of good fellowship among members of the armed forces. Theirs was a vision of the vital part such an organization could play in building a strong America, in maintaining the peace, and in preserving the dignity and freedom of man. By combining their feeling of comradeship with their love of country, their desire for peace, and their determination to fight ever and always for the principles of true democracy, these founders set a seal upon our organization of veterans that distinguishes it from all others. During the intervening years the high aims and ideals of the founders have flowered into a powerful and potent instrument for good in an insecure and chaotic world. With your unstinted support, repledged in commemoration of the thirtieth anniversary of the founding of your post, it will continue to stand as one of the dominant guardians of America's destiny.

In conclusion, let me say to those of you who have been members of Nicholson Post, No. 38, for 30 years that your acts and deeds of service merit the admiration of a grateful community and its people. The goal that is uppermost in the mind and heart of every legionnaire and that is the fervent prayer of every true and loyal American is the maintenance of the peace without any detraction from the dignity and freedom of man. This can be accomplished by keeping America strong and thus insuring her safety and preserving inviolate our democratic way of life. Under the guiding hand of your leadership, that may well be emulated by your younger buddies, this goal can be brought to fruition, and we can hope for everlasting peace on earth and good will among men.

Biggest Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the thirty-first article by Mr. Frank C. Waldrop on the infiltration of communism in our country:

BIGGEST STORY

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Few men have ever openly challenged the will of Joseph Stalin and lived. Even fewer have ever told the story under oath and cross-examination.

Thus, in this and the next few days' items, I am dealing with material of rare historic quality, as I review the testimony of not one but two such men.

Whoever wants to examine the full record can find it in the hearings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities in volumes 7 to 11, inclusive, taken between September and December 1939.

Benjamin Gitlow and Jay Lovestone were the two above-mentioned. And they came before the committee armed with documents and records to support their testimony.

I happen to know a little of the background of maneuverings that caused them to appear after having declined several times before to open up their grim book of experience.

On August 23, 1939, there was signed in Moscow the deal between Hitler and Stalin that pulled the trigger for war.

That amazing contract provided that neither party would attack the other or join in a war, if either were attacked by a third power. Each promised not to join any group of powers "which is directly or indirectly aimed at the other party."

Now it is a matter of open, public record that Mr. Roosevelt's Communist friends in the United States of America, had been hammering at him for years to break the neutrality laws enacted by Congress from 1934 on.

And it is also a matter of open, public record that he began to follow their lead with the notorious "quarantine the aggressor" speech at Chicago, Ill., October 8, 1937. He was totally committed by 1939.

Thus, once Roosevelt was committed for war and with him England and France, Stalin pulled his ever-dependable double-cross. He was all set to grab off the countries that would be broken up by the wars of others when he, too, was attacked by his partner, Hitler.

It was in the moment of the world's shock at Stalin's spectacular abandonment of Roosevelt for Hitler, that the House Committee on Un-American Activities persuaded Gitlow and Lovestone to talk.

And they did so in the hope that the United States of America would at last understand Stalin and keep away from him, thereafter.

But the tragic record shows that Stalin knew his man. The Roosevelt who had fallen for his promises in 1933 and who had let the Communists run through the United

States Government thereafter, was the same Roosevelt at Yalta. So Stalin was still able, after all, to grab off the broken nations.

And so now we turn to our historic witnesses who in 1939 tried to make the country hear what Roosevelt would not.

Gitlow, the first witness, told how, at the age of 18, he became a Socialist and from then fell by stages into communism.

He was the first Communist in the United States of America to be imprisoned, so far as the records show, having been arrested in New York City in 1919, by a State legislative investigating committee.

"I was in prison for approximately 3 years and pardoned by Governor Smith in 1925, I believe," he testified.

"I had been, a part of that time, out of prison pending appeal—and in 1922, during my freedom from prison and after I was pardoned, I was always active in the Communist movement and always held one of the leading positions in that movement.

"I was always a member of the central executive committee; was a member of the secretariat; ran for public office for the party, important public offices. Held important offices in the trade-union and other activities of the organization and was highly publicized by the Communist Party press.

"My first trip to Moscow was in the year 1927. I was called to Moscow following the death of Ruthenberg, who was general secretary of the party, by a cable which was sent to the American party insisting that I come to Moscow.

"I was practically the only important party leader who had not been in Moscow. The cable which was sent to the American party instructed them that under all circumstances I was to proceed to Moscow, by Nicholas Bukharin, who was chairman of the Communist International.

"From that date on I held the highest positions in the Communist International organization. I served on its executive committee. I was a member of its presidium, its leading ruling body, and I was also a member of the executive committee of the Red International of the Trade Union, the international trade-union organization of the Communist International.

"In other words, I have served the Communist movement as a top leader and not as a rank-and-filer from the very first inception of the movement."

Thus you can see that in Gitlow we have a witness who had been in the very heart of the Communist conspiracy from its start. He should know, if anybody does, how it works.

H. R. 6217—Why Penalize the Spanish War Veteran Because Somebody Didn't Keep Records in 1898?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am informed that it is the expectation that H. R. 6217 will come before us on the consent calendar on June 5. I hope that no voice of objection will be raised and that the House speedily will pass H. R. 6217 that it may be considered in the other body and, I hope, enacted into law before we adjourn. I wish to impress upon my colleagues the urgency of this proposed legislation. Some of the aged veterans whom it would benefit will not be here if we wait for the Eighty-second Congress to do what now we have the opportunity of doing.

To the younger veterans of World War I and World War II let me explain that in the Spanish-American War there were practically no hospital records. There was much sickness, both overseas and in the camps in this country. This was due in part to the miserable and poisonous food, which later resulted in a national scandal, and in part to lack of proper medication and sanitation and even of clothing suitable to hot climates. I might furnish some idea of the conditions that prevailed by referring to my own experience. The infantry regiment with which I served in the siege of Santiago in Cuba was in action on July 1, 1898–the hottest day I, who had spent several years of boyhood in Central America, can remember—wearing an issue of heavy winter clothing. During our weeks in Cuba the beef issued us was putrid and had to be thrown away, and we subsisted on hardtack soaked in the grease of "sour belly." A month after the capitulation of Santiago on July 17, 1898, the situation as regards the health of our invading troops was so bad that in my own company but two of us were able to report for duty. It was "Teddy" Roosevelt's "round robin," for which under the laws of war he might have been court-martialed, that finally got the grievously ill remnants of the army that stormed Santiago back to Camp Wikoff at Montauk, Long Island. Of the trip from Santiago to Montauk, and the conditions on the transport, I quote from an article by Charles Johnson Post in the American Legion magazine of July 1938:

For 5 days we had been packed in on the *Grand Duchesse*. Five men to a stateroom, no hospital, sick and well lying thickly about the decks; fighting at the distilled-water butts twice a day, with the well men winning first place and the sick left to take the hot water as it came from the condenser after the one cake of ice had melted, and then hoard it in a sour tin cup in the shade of an August sun until it was tepid enough to drink. There was no water to wash a mess kit, cooking bits of bacon over candles in your stateroom with delirious men whimpering in the bunk beside you—it was better than the hardtack and salt-beef slum of the travel ration. And all of us copiously and unashamedly lousy. One man died in the former second-class washroom and his body, yellow with fever, lay there from morning to late afternoon while we stepped over it and the swinging door bumped its head with each new entrant. Another was picked from his bunk, cold and dead, with his squad bunkie lying unconscious beside him and the stateroom foul with dysentery. Each morning Gus Piton and Jimmy Lowe lifted a squad mate in a blanket and tied him to the ship's rail in a kind of hammock, and all day he lay there motionless, his eyes glassy and half open, with pus drooling from his emaciated lips. Down with typhoid, malaria, yellow jack, tropical fevers, and all varieties of intestinal breakdowns, we shuffled weakly from port to starboard to get into the shade as the sun swung from east to west. * * * There were no medicines—it was our regimental surgeon who told me so—not a pill of bismuth, only a few of compound cathartic and only a little quinine.

Conditions were much the same on the transport, the *Harvard*, on which I returned. Perhaps a half dozen of us were well enough to be about, and we spent our time nursing as best we could the hundreds who were painfully, dangerously ill, and some of whom died and were buried at sea. At Mantauk Point the fever at long last caught up with me, and for 3 months at my home in St. Joseph, Mich., I was in bed, with the doctor giving no hope to my parents. My pup-tent mated, Charley Loeffler, ill in the same manner, died, as did others of Company I. I have never quite recovered from that illness.

Yet there is no way by which I could establish officially these facts. There were no records. There was none in the case of Charley Loeffler, of the many others who died at home from illness contracted while in service, of most of those who died before reaching home.

What was true in the case of those in overseas service was equally true with those who served in the fever-infested camps in the United States. It would be difficult for the younger veterans to visualize the conditions of food, clothing, medication, sanitation, and hospitalization that were faced by the armed services in 1898. That was over a half century ago. That was really in the horse-and-buggy era. The point is that records just were not being kept.

The purpose of H. R. 6217, in a nutshell, is to keep a veteran of the Spanish-American War when he is now past 70 and grievously ill from being denied a hospital bed for the one reason that in 1898 someone did not keep books. That is all there is to H. R. 6217. It will not affect many veterans, and I am afraid it will not be many years before it will not affect any.

I hope and pray that no voice in this House will be raised in objection when this bill comes up on June 5.

I am including in my remarks excerpts from an editorial in the National Tribune of May 18, 1950:

NOW FOLLOW THROUGH

We wish it were possible to name in this comment those members of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs who voted last Wednesday to report favorably to the House of Representatives the bill, supported by Spanish War veterans, which may grant to them certain medical and hospital privileges they do not now enjoy. We would like particularly to call the roll of those who made the parliamentary moves by which Congressmen may now have the privilege of righting a wrong that has prevailed for more than 50 years through no particular fault of any individual, but the committee business was conducted in executive session, behind closed doors, so we cannot hand out those well-deserved bouquets. However, we understand that the final vote was unanimous, and we take this first opportunity to voice a fervent thanks on behalf of all surviving veterans of the campaigns of 1898–1902 to those members of the committee who did such a grand thing on May 10.

This measure, H. R. 6217, has not had an easy road to travel because there are those of hesitating mind and a bent for economy who have feared such legislation would create a precedent for the many thousands of younger veterans of later wars. Their fears are groundless because there is no parallel in history, yet both the House and Senate must

vote on the proposition and it would be well, therefore, to review the facts so that they may be understood clearly by both Congressmen and the beneficiaries themselves. Perhaps it would be well, also, for interested persons at the Veterans' Administration to refresh their memories because, although the VA has not directly opposed the bill, there has been some viewing with alarm.

H. R. 6217 would duck around veterans' regulations and give some special consideration to this group of servicemen whose ages range from 70 years through 100 and who average in age 74 years. It would for purposes alone of out-patient treatment—and, incidentally, for hospitalization when necessary—assume that they suffer from service-incurred disabilities. On the surface, that would appear to be a far-fetched presumption, but it is nothing of the sort because in most instances that is the actual fact. The men are service-connected. They suffer from disablements that actually go back to war days, but they are powerless to prove it only for the reason that in those times—48 to 52 years ago—there were no such things as official hospital and treatment records. They have no place to which to turn in an effort to show the inception of physical troubles and an unfortunate discrimination therefore arises that cannot be overcome.

Under present VA procedure, hospitalization is accorded by the Government in an order of preference. A veteran with a proved service-connected disability has first choice to a bed for the treatment of that disability. Next come peacetime veterans with conditions attributed to service in uniform, and then follow service-connected war veterans with other disabilities, and war veterans for any condition that is emergent in character. The latter are in that 27,000 line-up of applicants, who can have a bed only when available, and the Spanish War group, with the exception of about 700 of them, are so classed to the last man. Whenever a man is seventy-odd years of age, he is an emergency case. He should get some kind of a break, but he cannot because of the current shortage of hospital beds and staff, so, when he applies, he is usually denied help. He cannot afford the local hospital prices where he lives, so he is sent home to die. The medical director at the VA called such a statement "hogwash" the other day, but we have lists of cases that give the lie to the intemperate statements of the medical boss, and we are prepared to use them. That list is composed principally from the Spanish War class.

Fifty years ago these men, who would benefit by H. R. 6217, created a precedent of their own and one that is unusual in this day and age. They volunteered to a man to go away to war that cost little as such things go and that netted a dollars-and-cents return to their country high in the billions. It was the first war for humanity, was fought 'round the world under conditions that could never prevail today, and actually resulted in making ours the leading nation on earth. There was little in the way of medical care for participants who served on their nerve alone. Succumbing to diseases of the times, hardly a man was left unscarred among the 460,000 who donned the uniform. Each was given his pills, painted with iodine, and marked duty, or, if temperatures rose to far over 100°, he was packed in ice and hoped for the best. The result was eventually weakened hearts, damaged kidneys, and rotted guts. A few managed to prove later that they were sick, only because some partial records were kept on the backs of old envelopes or other scraps of paper. A few came back with lost legs or arms, and bolo scars, so they also proved a degree of service connection, but by far the most of them just came home as good soldiers do, picked up where they left off, and called it a day. Now their troubles, aggravated by age, have caught up with them, and only the Congress can give them the relief they need.

It isn't so hard to understand, when one knows about it. This bill, H. R. 6217, just straddles the years and gives a few thousand old men the just consideration that they require and which is especially essential now in this period of bed scarcity. It permits at the taxpayers' expense the bottle of medicine that will do them the most good or allows to them such other medical and hospital care as circumstances warrant without forcing the old boys to get down on their knees to beg for it. Too old to travel distances to hospitals, it brings the services to them.

This legislation has traveled a rocky road. A somewhat similar bill to grant hospital privileges on the presumption of service connection for disabilities was favored by the committee in the Eightieth Congress, but came out too late for final enactment. It was taken up twice by the Veterans' Committee during the last session, but was voted down due to that foolish fear that it might result in similar requests by younger veterans, most of whom among the disabled have medical records as complete as modern science and specialized warfare can make available. But now the committee has given unanimous consent to a somewhat modified measure the enactment of which will be a boon to these most elderly of our war veterans. Indeed, they are grateful, but the bill is not yet law.

United States-Canadian Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. VIRGIL M. CHAPMAN

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 25 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able, informative, and interesting article written by former Senator A. O. Stanley, of Kentucky, now the distinguished Chairman, United States Section, International Joint Commission, entitled "Three Thousand Miles and Never a Quarrel," which appeared in the June 1950 issue of the Rotarian, a magazine published monthly by the great organization, Rotary International.

Senator Stanley, after 12 years of brilliant service in the House of Representatives, was elected Governor of Kentucky, and his constructive administration as war Governor during World War I constitutes one of the brightest chapters in all of the glamorous history of Kentucky. His fellow citizens then elected him to the Senate. In this body he was recognized as an assiduous student, an erudite scholar, a courageous statesman, a skillful parliamentarian, a brilliant debater, a superb master of English prose, and an unsurpassed orator.

As Chairman of the United States Section of the International Joint Commission, Senator Stanley has striven industriously, diligently, and constantly in the performance of the important duties of his official position, devoting his splendid talents unstintingly to the attainment of the laudable and devoutly hoped for objective of peace, friendship, and good neighborliness between the United States and Canada.

This article from Senator Stanley's pen ought to be read by citizens of the United States and also by our friends and neighbors north of the border.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THREE THOUSAND MILES AND NEVER A QUARREL—THE CENTURY OF PEACE ON THE UNITED STATES-CANADIAN BORDER DIDN'T JUST HAPPEN; MEN MADE IT

(By A. O. Stanley, Chairman, United States Section, International Joint Commission)

Battleships poised for action at the mouth of the Columbia River; a United States Senator calling for 30,000 to 40,000 rifles beyond the Rocky Mountains; the British Premier declaring in Parliament that "England knows her rights and dares to maintain them"; and a United States presidential campaign won on the slogan "54–40 or fight"—that was the situation which preceded settlement of one border dispute between the United States and Canada about 100 years ago.

The Northwest boundary controversy finally was settled by a compromise treaty. But the Oregon question was only one of many border disputes which strained relations between the United States and Canada from the Revolutionary War until less than 40 years ago.

Today friendliness and harmony between the two great North American neighbors are taken for granted. It is generally assumed to be a natural outgrowth of the similarity of language, customs, and laws of the two countries.

History disproves that assumption. Until 1912, when the International Joint Commission was formed, interminable disputes accompanied every effort to establish the approximately 3,000 miles of boundary extending from Passamaquoddy Bay to the Strait of Juan de Fuca. On more than one occasion border controversy brought the two countries to the verge of armed conflict.

The background of hostility and distrust dates back to the period when the American Colonies broke with England. At the outbreak of the Revolution, numerous and powerful minorities resisted any resort to arms or separation from the mother country. And at the end of the war an army of exiles, estimated at more than 100,000, sailed for Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, or swept across Lake Huron and the Niagara River to people the uninhabited wilds of Ontario. They included many of the clergy of the established church, great landed proprietors of New York and Pennsylvania, and rich merchants of the seaboard cities.

With them they carried bitter memories of 8 years of savage civil warfare. They passed on to their children and their children's children stories of confiscation and exile, keeping alive a feeling of resentment and hostility toward the United States.

Sir Robert Falconer, president of the University of Toronto, in his recent work, The United States as a Neighbor, says: "A common substratum of loyalism underlies the English-speaking population of Ontario and the Maritime Provinces. * * * It may perhaps be not too much to say that the loyalists have been the most influential element in the history of these provinces * * * and until today the traditions of loyalism so pervade sections of eastern Canada that in some measure they determine the attitude of the country to the United States."

For a century an atmosphere of suspicion pervaded our international relations and literally hung like the Sword of Damocles over the borderland.

It was not until 1817 that the Rush-Bagot Convention provided for disarmament of the Great Lakes, and the boundary between Maine, New Brunswick, and Quebec set by the Treaty of Versailles in 1783 gave rise, because of its ambiguity, to a dispute 50 years later in which both sides were prepared to hold parts of the questioned territory by force of arms. The boundary finally was determined, after lengthy negotiations, by the Webster-Ashburton Treaty, which was disappointing to both sides.

And as late as 1903 a controversy over the Alaskan boundary provoked discord. In that dispute Mr. Hay induced the Senate to consent to a treaty providing for "six impartial jurists of repute" to consider judicially the questions involved. The Dominion of Canada named two representatives and the Home Government one—Lord Alvertone, chief justice of England. Elihu Root and Senators Lodge and Turner represented the United States. A 4-to-2 decision was rendered, Lord Alvertone voting with the Americans.

A strong protest arose in Canada. It was alleged that the decision was neither diplomatic nor judicial; that the British were cultivating the friendship of the United States—in this case at the expense of Canadian national interest.

Sir Wilfred Laurier, the Canadian statesman of his day most friendly to the United States, expressed the attitude of his countrymen at the time when he told the Canadian Parliament:

"I have often regretted—and never more than on the present occasion—that we are living beside a great neighbor who I believe I can say without being unfriendly to them are very grasping in their national actions, and who are determined on every occasion to get the best of any agreement which they make."

Following the Alaskan boundary dispute, it became more and more obvious that not only the prosperity and happiness of both countries but the peace and security of the world might depend in a greater or lesser degree upon the maintenance of a more friendly feeling between the two countries and in securing, if humanly possible, closer and more cordial relations.

Both Governments were looking for a more flexible and more direct means by which to settle boundary disputes. That delicate and difficult task was assigned to the two men who, in all the world, probably were best qualified to discharge it—the then United States Secretary of State, Elihu Root, whom Theodore Roosevelt declared was the wisest man he ever knew; and James Bryce, British Ambassador to the United States, and dean of the diplomatic corps.

From their efforts came the Boundary Waters Treaty, which set forth as its objective: "To prevent disputes regarding the use of boundary waters, and to settle all questions involving the rights, obligations, or interests of either nation in relation to the other or to the inhabitants of the other along their common frontier, and to make provision for the adjustment and settlement of all such questions."

The treaty provided for the establishment and maintenance of an International Joint Commission of six members to carry out that objective. Three members are appointed by the United States and three by Canada.

A commission without precedent in the history of international relations, this unique body is clothed with many of the attributes of a court of international justice. It has varied and plenary powers—administrative, investigative, arbitral, and judicial. In fact, it has some form of jurisdiction over all "matters of difference involving the rights, obligations, or interests of the United States or of the Dominion of Canada either in relation to each other or their respective inhabitants."

Few courts, national or international, have ever been called upon to exercise jurisdiction over a wider domain, a greater number of inhabitants, or more vast interests. And no such court from the days of Henry of Navarre to this day has been so phenomenally successful as the modest International Joint Commission.

At its start, in 1912, the Commission had brought before it many boundary questions of long standing, and on February 23, 1915, Senator Jones, of Washington said on the floor of the Senate:

"During the first 3 years of its existence, it adjusted more disputes than had previously been settled through diplomatic channels or by arbitration since the American Revolution."

In later years the two statesmen who set up plans for the Commission viewed its results with satisfaction.

Lord Bryce declared that "the creating of the International Joint Commission was one of the best things done in our time for peace and goodwill between the British Empire and the United States."

And in 1935 Mr. Root described the Commission's work as "a signal illustration of the true way to preserve peace by disposing of controversies at the beginning, before they have ceased to be personal and nations have become excited and resentful about them."

There is a general impression that the International Joint Commission functions only upon the request of the State Department of the United States or the Dominion of Canada and then acts only and simply as a fact-finding body, the validity of whose recommendations and conclusions is entirely dependent upon the subsequent approval of the two Governments.

That is true only in certain phases of the Commission's work and applies only to one of the 14 articles prescribing the duties, jurisdiction, and procedure of the body. Besides investigative powers, its duties are both judicial and administrative.

For instance, under its judicial functions, the two Governments have vested in the Commission an absolute and final determination as to the propriety of raising or lowering levels of boundary waters and waters crossing the boundary. Their findings in such matters as construction of dams for navigation or power purposes, the opening of irrigation ditches or any other obstruction, or diversion of international waters affecting such levels or flow are final and conclusive.

The enormous increase in the use and development of hydroelectric power has multiplied the problems arising before the Commission over 2,000 miles of lake and river front because the terms of the 1909 treaty confer on it the task of authorizing, supervising, and apportioning the use of all boundary waters for irrigation and power purposes.

Yet, despite the ever-increasing demands of both countries for the use of boundary waters and the necessarily conflicting claims of the nationals of each, which have raised a great number of questions of great delicacy and vast importance, only once in nearly 40 years of operation have the members had occasion to deliver a divided opinion. A disposition to come to a unanimous conclusion and to prevent even the appearance of discord among the Commissioners has had the most salutary effect upon both Nations.

Besides its effect on the member countries, it is infinitely gratifying to the members of this Commission to realize that this modest but efficient body has merited and received the commendation of discerning critics throughout the world.

The late Governor Osborne of Michigan, in his recent work, Conquest of a Continent, gives this picture of world-wide recognition of the Commission's value through the years:

"The example of the United States and Canada in their successful solution of embarrassing and at times irritating international problems may well be commended to other nations. At the Lausanne Conference in 1923, Lord Curzon spoke of the International Joint Commission as a possible model for the adjustment of differences at the Dardenelles. In a series of lectures at Cambridge University of Toronto, the International Joint Commission was made the subject of an address. The Prime Minister of Canada, W. L. Mackenzie King, has been instrumental in bringing it before statesmen of the League of Nations in Geneva. At the dedication of the Thousand Islands Bridge in 1938, the Canadian Premier built his address about the International Joint Commission and the Rush-Bagot agreement as important bridges of international friendship and understanding, and monuments of international cooperation and good will.

"Aristide Briand, late Premier and Foreign Minister of France, on more than one occasion expressed the desire and hope that a similar commission might be created to deal with questions along the frontier between France and Germany. At the meeting of the Institute of Pacific Relations in Shanghai one of the delegates spoke of the Commission as an example of what might be accomplished between Japan and Soviet Russia in dealing with the vexed problem of the boundary between Siberia and Manchukuo."

The civilized nations of the earth are more and more impressed with the fact that the indescribable destructiveness and horror of modern warfare necessitates the substitution of some other method of adjusting international differences. One of the greatest achievements of the international joint commission is the part it has played in drawing closer and closer together two powerful and friendly nations alike in fundamental institutions, social conditions, and spiritual aspirations.

And never before in nearly 40 years of service to both nations has the commission been called upon to consider matters of such magnitude as those now on its agenda.

Among applications and references now before the commission are:

A pollution reference covering the boundary waters at Sault Ste. Marie, the St. Clair River, Lake St. Clair, the Detroit River, and the Niagara River, which is one of the pioneer efforts for correction and prevention of pollution. Measures expected to be recommended by the commission for accomplishment by various agencies of the two governments will form the basis for legislative action by the two countries and will lead to many millions of dollars' worth of pollution-abatement activity.

The Columbia River reference calls for a comprehensive investigation of the water resources of the Columbia River Basin to determine if development of the water resources for the purposes of navigation, flood control, irrigation, power development, and other purposes is feasible and in the interests of the two governments. The reference calls for recommendations by the commission as to the divisions of costs of such work between the two countries and the extent of indemnification in either country for damages which may result from the works. This investigation is of far-reaching significance and will effect development costing several billions of dollars extending over several decades into the future.

Similar to the Columbia River reference are those of Waterton-Belly and the Souris-Red River references, while the Passamaquoddy reference calls for a preliminary investigation of the cost of making a complete survey of the proposed Passamaquoddy Tidal Power Development.

Public-works projects now or recently before the Commission, including those mentioned above along with Similkameen Dam, Libby Dam, and the proposed Passamaquoddy Project, would involve an expenditure of more than $2,000,000,000.

There is a reference before the Commission calling for investigation of air pollution from industries and vessels along the international section in the vicinity of Detroit, Mich., and Windsor, Ont., with recommendations as to remedial measures.

These and similar matters now before the Commission give an indication of the scope and character of its work today.

The Commission itself derives considerable satisfaction from noting the growing faith and confidence of both countries in its even-handed justice, bearing out the statement of former Canadian Premier Mackenzie King that in this "International Court" the Governments of the United States and Canada have "established a set of general principles, and an international tribunal entrusted with the high task of applying these principles to specific questions arising from time to time between the two countries with a fair assurance that they would be determined with something of the finality and certainty which the domestic courts in each country achieve in their sphere."

Enlisting Public Opinion in the Fight Against Crime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 25 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, if we are to have better respect for the laws of the country and more efficient law enforcement, it is, of course, necessary that public opinion be enlisted in the fight against crime.

The special Senate committee investigating interstate crime is, of course, aware that investigations and enactment of legislation is not going to prevent the operation of large-scale organized criminal activity unless the public really wants it prevented.

In 1934, Joseph B. Keenan, a prominent lawyer of Washington, who was at that time Assistant Attorney General of the United States, delivered a noteworthy address to the American Bar Association at Milwaukee. The ideas set forth by Mr. Keenan and the remedies suggested by him are equally applicable at the present time. In order that the Members of Congress and the public may have the benefit of his thoughts, I ask unanimous consent that his speech be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ENLISTING PUBLIC OPINION IN THE FIGHT AGAINST CRIME

(Joseph B. Keenan, Assistant Attorney General of the United States)

Crime has been designated by one writer as the great sewer of society. Not a pleasant subject, certainly, to receive emphasis as a feature topic of the national bar program. And, yet, because of its very stench and misery and sordidness, it is a subject which must receive the careful study of American lawyers and American laity.

So long as the problems of crime and its repression are left to those small groups that come most closely in touch with it—the social workers, policemen, prosecutors, judges, and prison wardens—and so long as the great body of citizenry remains indifferent, hostile, or ignorant, we can look for little improvement.

I would not be misunderstood as to the part which the public must take in this cause. There have been some who have urged that the primary obligations relating to the operation of the machinery of law enforcement should be referred back and placed squarely upon the public. This would be a convenient escape for those officials charged with law enforcement. But there can be no such shift of responsibility. The law enforcement machine, after it has been selected, assembled, and committed to the care of enforcement officials, must be lubricated, operated, and kept in working order by them. Occasionally a slight repair must be made, but that is a task which a mechanic must perform. On the other hand, the nature and texture of the fabric which such a machine produces is a matter of primary public concern. Whether the machine shop shall be scrapped and a completely modern one installed is again a problem which may be referred back to the public. But the functions and responsibilities of the two groups are distinct and should be kept distinct.

Some weeks ago an unarmed English bobby was covering his regular beat when he had occasion to arrest a law violator. The suspect resisted arrest, and in making his escape shot the policeman. The common occurrence of a routine arrest was suddenly transformed into an incident of national and even world-wide importance. The wound was superficial it is true, but to an Englishman that shot represented a challenge to law and order which could not pass unheeded. It was as though 40,000,000 shots had been fired at 40,000,000 separate Englishmen. Aroused citizens joined with the police in a gigantic man hunt whose only counterpart in this country was the search 70 years ago for John Wilkes Booth. The offender was surrounded and killed himself rather than face his infuriated pursuers.

Here in the United States another drama was being enacted. A young farm boy who had served 5 years in a reformatory and 3 years in a State penitentiary set out on a career of bank robbing. He was returned to the penitentiary. On October 12, 1933, in collusion with friends on the outside, he made his way to freedom over the dead body of a sheriff. After three raids on police stations and a bank robbery, the farm boy was responsible for the death of another policeman. When trapped in one of the Western States some months later with an arsenal of death-dealing weapons, he was returned—not as a cowardly killer, not as a ruthless criminal, not as one who had coldly stood over the prone body of a law-enforcement officer, and, with a machine gun, pumped a shower of lead into the helpless official. Rather, he was greated with the smile of the sheriff, the encircling arm of the prosecutor, and the morbid, grinning, curious stares of the crowd.

Strange as it may seem, he broke away from this reception committee some weeks later, and within the course of 5 months took a revolting toll in human lives and property. One of the men who fell before the guns of the bandit's gang was Carter Baum of the Department of Justice, taken in the prime of life.

When a person gets close up to the tragedy and cruelty involved in the career of this criminal it is beyond his power to comprehend what actually happened in a Washington theater before the killer was captured. When Dillinger's picture was thrown upon the screen the audience broke into applause.

Applause, mind you, for a coward and killer—applause for a man who had snuffed out the lives of husbands and fathers without the blinking of an eye—applause for one of the most loathsome creatures in the annals of crime.

And at just about that time the suspect who had the temerity to defy a British bobby was taking his own life rather than suffer the inevitable punishment and disgrace resulting from his act.

In further contrast to the activities of British subjects in supporting their police, we find certain members of the medical profession treating known gangsters for serious wounds during the period of pursuit, and performing operations with a view of concealing fugitives' identity.

How are we to account for this striking contrast? Perhaps it is to be explained by the century-old traditions, the pride of nationality, and the pride of race which so characterizes the British people.

But we simply cannot rest back, while the years roll by, with the hope that eventually a tradition will develop—a national pride emerge. The problem calls for action now. We are afflicted with an inertia, which has been the best weapon of the criminal. So long as he can expect a cheer instead of a jeer, applause instead of denunciation, he will ply his trade and rely, at the day of reckoning, for support from a worshipful public. The problem of molding a public opinion which will demand that crime be stamped out is perhaps the most fundamental problem before us.

What is the state of American public opinion and American standards today? Can we judge it by the quality of the offerings of the American press, stage, screen, and radio—institutions which have a marked influence on public opinion? Certainly, it must be recognized the moving-picture companies, for example, are in a business, and that they will do everything to keep that business on the black side of the ledger. If, as they have indirectly asserted, it is true that to produce pictures which appeal to people of culture and refinement would run their business into red ink, and if it is true that the greatest returns are from the pictures which have a primary appeal to those whose tastes are on a lower level, then perhaps, we should admit that the people are getting what they ask for, and that current offerings not merely shape—but actually represent American taste and American public opinion.

If that be true (and, of course, there is still room for debate in this field as to which came first, the chicken or the egg; I leave that question open) then American public opinion, on the issue of law enforcement, must be challenged, modified, and finally harnessed for constructive results.

Convenient as it might be to generalize concerning public opinion and crime, it is nevertheless dangerous to do so. The attitude of mind varies with the individual. On the other hand, I think it is helpful to group attitudes of mind. The public opinion may then be better analyzed and consequently better understood, and if it be destructive, rendered constructive.

The first group is made up of those persons who are simply indifferent to the whole problem. I suppose there are many reasons for indifference. It seems obvious, for instance, that an individual who has been blessed with a sheltered existence which does not bring him in contact with crime and its repression would quite naturally be indifferent to crime problems. Human nature is such that interest is more easily captivated when the evil strikes close home—or at least when it is known that it is striking close home. If every property owner could be made to see that crime concerns him just as vitally as taxes, and that, in fact, a good share of his taxes are going toward the payment of the crime bill, there would be no need to awaken him from his sleep with an appeal to his citizenship.

I feel sure that the indifference of some people is a direct result of that first reaction which any unsavory subject produces. Crime is essentially a disagreeable subject. There are so many more pleasant things to which one may devote his thoughts. Another reason for indifference grows out of a false sense of security and a childlike conception of the nature of crime. It is occasionally evidenced in the naive assumption that, when the excitement of a reform administration in a city or State has subsided, when new legislation has been passed, or when the local police chief has made a score or more of transfers within his department, somehow the community overnight becomes safe for the law-abiding, and crime is no longer a problem.

There is a second group of the public whose attitude is disconcerting. I refer to those persons who for one reason or another glorify crime and the criminals who commit it—those to whom a greater appeal has been made by the dramatic qualities of crime commission than the dramatic qualities of crime repression. Some of our agencies of public intelligence are partly responsible for the attitude. A few years ago the president of one of the large news services issued an order to all writers for the service which read in part as follows:

"The cowardly silence maintained by an arrested crook who fears underworld vengeance is neither brave, heroic, nor noble.

"When astute criminal lawyers arrange interviews with real or faked maudlin mothers of machine-gun murderers, in order to arouse public sympathy for outlaws, the story is only half told unless the reader is reminded of the brutal facts of the murder.

"Moron murderers who display animal stolidity cannot truly be said to have 'perfect control over their nerves of iron.'

"If the gunman's woman does not happen to be a girl of notoriously loose morals, this exception does not make her a society girl. If brutal companionship and the intimidation of her gunmen friends close her mouth to the authorities, underworld intimidation does not make her a romantic heroine, faithful to death.

"There is nothing mysterious or occult about the workings of the underworld to an experienced reporter. Only fiction-writers put a glamour of mystery about the sordidness, avarice, brutality, and cowardice of the underworld. Fiction-writers do not belong on press association staffs.

"Please test your crime stories by the following rules: Does the story cast such romance and glamour about the criminal that it will influence 16-year-old boys and girls to follow in the footsteps of the gunman, gangster, thug, or crook?"

I honestly believe that one flippant remark by a comedian on a radio program or in a daily newspaper column can do more to shape the public attitude on problems of law enforcement than all the learned treatises on civics and sociology. It is a tremendous power—and it should be directed in a proper channel. Too often it has been used, unintentionally and thoughtlessly I am sure, to create sympathy for the underserving, to glorify lawlessness, and to ridicule those sworn to uphold the law.

The attitude of the third group, and I believe it to be an extremely small one, may be characterized as one of hostility to any use of coercion by the Government which tends to restrict personal freedom. When, however, it is considered that most of our population is made up of descendants of men and women who resisted Old World controls—dissenters, in other words—it is surprising that we are as amenable to law as we are.

A fourth division of the public which must be reached includes those persons who, being unfamiliar with the many-sided problem of crime, are prone to offer the one solution—the one sure cure, the one panacea. It is a remarkably interesting fact that in the fields of the so-called exact sciences, such as mathematics, chemistry, and physics, an uninformed layman rarely ventures an opinion, but that in the field of the social sciences any bootblack will speak with the conviction which only years of study and training would justify. Many letters come daily to the Department of Justice, each containing some cure for the evil. And many authors of these letters will dispose of crime causes with a single word foreign-born, or unemployment, or insanity, or slums, or liquor, or firearms. Obviously, before this group can be enlisted in any worth while program, there must be an intensive effort made to impress upon its members that no one explanation will suffice, and that no one simple remedy will prove to be a cure.

There is a fifth group of the public—the group which lends cheer to those persons who must lead in any movement for the prevention or repression of crime. I have faith that in this group are to be found most of our citizenry. It is composed of those who are aroused against lawlessness, who are ready and anxious to help, who insist that they be given a part in the fight against crime. They have come to law enforcement officials with offers of assistance. I regret to say that we have not even begun to utilize the energies of this group. The militant attitude of the individual citizen is just as essential to successful law enforcement as is the militant attitude of the officials charged with such enforcement.

A well qualified writer who has recently made a study of British police methods makes a significant observation that the greatest ally of British policemanship is British citizenship. A community never secures effective law enforcement unless it not only wants it but demands it. As we come to the close of the year, in this association—a year which has been devoted to the emphasis of criminal law and its administration—it is essential that we think concerning the methods by which the problems of law enforcement may be brought forcibly to the minds of not only lawyers, but the lay citizen without whose cooperation we cannot function. It would be nothing short of tragic if, with this session, the American Bar Association ceased its emphasis upon the subject of the administration of criminal justice.

As the first step in the formulation of an aroused public opinion against crime, I should like to see the great agencies which communicate intelligence, such as the press, the stage, the screen, and the radio, apply to their offerings this three-fold test: (1) Does this offering tend to glorify crime and make heroes of those who commit it? (2) Does the offering hinder law enforcement, such as by giving to a fugitive information as to the progress of the search for him? (3) If the offering is critical of law-enforcement officials, is it fair and balanced, giving credit where credit is due and placing blame where blame honestly deserves to be placed, or is it so phrased as to cause persons to ridicule law enforcement generally?

As the second step in the formulation of an enlightened public opinion emphasis should be placed upon the study of crime, its cause and prevention, in the schools and colleges of the country. The insignificant place allotted in the curriculum to the subject of crime is far out of proportion either to the space devoted to the subject in news organs or to the vast toll in life and property represented in the cost bill of crime. It is probably safe to assert that if the proportions were reversed the result would be strikingly beneficial.

A lack of information in the field of the administration of criminal justice is one of the basic reasons for most of the public's indifference and the misdirection of its energies. This field must receive in educational institutions the share of expert study to which it is entitled before we can hope to have a public opinion which can be classed as enlightened.

No neat trick will bring about the enlightenment of public opinion. On the contrary, it is going to be necessary for each individual to revive a few of those old-fashioned civic virtues before results will be apparent.

The citizen who righteously asserts that he does not want a corrupt administration in his city but who, nevertheless, returns to office, men from whom nothing better can be expected, must be reminded that the power to vote has never been taken from him.

The citizen who castigates a jury which acquits a notorious criminal but who, when summoned for jury service, claims an exemption, must be reminded that both the privilege to serve and the duty to serve upon a jury has never been abolished.

The citizen who happens upon the scene of a crime but who, in order to avoid publicity and the bother of a court appearance, does not volunteer information but makes a hasty departure, must be reminded that criminals are only convicted upon information such as he possesses, and that such information must be produced through the medium of witnesses at a criminal trial.

These are fundamental obligations of citizenship, so fundamental that to enumerate them is to become trite. At the same time they are obligations which if not assumed will render law enforcement increasingly ineffective.

Every civic and service organization in this country which boasts of a program for human betterment will do well to make the subject of crime and its control a topic for major emphasis. Every bar association should broaden the scope of its criminal law or procedure section so as to permit emphasis upon all phases of the administration of criminal justice. Every school must assume some responsibility for acquainting its students with the complexity and enormity of the crime problem. Every organ of public information must consecrate its offering to the building of a more wholesome public opinion on the subject. Every citizen must reexamine the so-called civic obligations, assume them, and, casting aside flippancy and indifference, resolve to make American citizenship the ally of American law enforcement.

The citizens of our country have never failed to render effective service demonstrating their sincere patriotism in any attempt to overthrow our Government in time of war. The hardy pioneers who courageously built up our country would never think of affording succor or relief, sympathy or support to those who were attacking their homestead and threatening or attempting to massacre, members of their families. Even so today there is needed the same support of governmental authority. I am confident that to bring this about we need only a fuller and clearer realization of the problem to enlist the needed public support.

The World-Wide Communist Conspiracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 1950

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a speech

I delivered recently at Americanism Night exercises conducted by the Hudson, Mass., Lodge of Elks.

I also delivered these remarks in substance in a speech I made at the recent Knights of Columbus communion breakfast at Leominster, Mass.

I am greatly honored and highly privileged to join tonight in this great manifestation of American patriotism and loyalty to the Nation. The Elks of Hudson are to be heartily congratulated for arranging this magnificent meeting. It is but another instance of long faithful service rendered to the country by this great pro-American organization.

For some time past I have been profoundly disturbed by the manifestations here and abroad by the world-wide Communist conspiracy. Day by day it is becoming increasingly apparent that powerful forces are working for the destruction of American democracy and freedom throughout the world. Evidences of Communist conspiracy are widespread and most impressive. The extent to which Communists have made headway in gaining vital objectives is truly alarming. Americans can no longer afford to be indifferent or apathetic toward this growing menace to the security and well-being of the Nation. The time has come for every true citizen to rally to the support of free institutions to declare undying allegiance to our Constitution and to move actively, vigorously, and energetically to protect and defend the principles upon which this Government is founded.

The question of communism is directly connected with enduring peace in this world. That the Kremlin is in a very strong position territorially and militarily no one can deny. It is rich in resources and manpower. It has embraced widespread territories. This great world power has accomplished these results principally in three ways: 1, diplomatic concessions; 2, aggression; and 3, infiltration. At the moment the latter seems by far the most effective—and Trojan horses stand in many countries preparing to seize the first opportunity to conquer and subjugate in the name of the great totalitarian slave state which is world communism.

This situation is getting worse, not better. Wide areas of the Asiatic Continent are already involved and others are slated for involvement.

What is our Nation doing about it? Well, to begin with, we have been blocked on the diplomatic front so far as the Soviets and its puppets are concerned. It is impossible to bargain or reach agreement with nations which refuse to sit at the council table in a spirit of good faith and sincerity of purpose. That is why not only our own Nation but the United Nations organization has not been able to arrive at understandings with the Soviets concerning a wide variety of questions such as universal disarmament, international control of atomic power, territorial arrangements based on democratic principles, liberation of suppressed peoples, the ending of world-wide propaganda and conspiracy and many other questions upon which enduring world peace must essentially rest. So we have not been able, acting by ourselves alone or through the United Nations, to treat successfully with the Soviets in usual diplomatic manner.

This has made it necessary for us in the name of self-defense and security to try to organize the democratic world to check the spread of communism and mobilize cooperative forces which will be ready to resist aggression if it should come. The ECA, the Atlantic Pact, and the military-assistance program are parts of this plan. Unquestionably ECA has been effectual to a marked degree in reviving the languishing economies of democratic-minded European nations, alleviating privation and hunger, providing employment, stabilizing economic and social conditions and thus neutralizing the spread of Communist ideas and infiltration. However, there are still many spotty places in this picture and the situation is not satisfactory in that it must be clear that this Nation cannot indefinitely maintain and support so many nations and so many peoples at the expense of the American taxpayer and by the dangerous expedient of overburdening the American economic system much less extend this type of relief and assistance to even more remote parts of the world that have come under the pall if imminent Communist domination.

Moreover, the military-assistance program also contains some obvious inconsistencies.

We are told on the one hand, and I personally believe it, that jet planes, guided missiles and scientifically devised modern weapons have outmoded conventional types of military equipment, strategy and tactics, etc. We are told on the other hand that furnishing certain arms and equipment to the democratic nations will be helpful in the event of war. Most military authorities will agree that should war start the Soviets could move across the face of Europe to the channel ports within a matter of 20 or 30 days and in 60 days consolidate strong positions throughout all of Europe. If this is so, there would be real danger that the equipment and supplies we delivered might be taken by the Soviets and even be used against us and our allies. In addition, the situation in the Far East would be exceedingly difficult.

Consequently, with these things in mind we have proceeded to build up the strongest peacetime armed force in the history of the Nation. Let there be no doubt about it, we have a mighty and well-balanced war machine which embraces on land, sea, and in the air the most powerful and awful of modern weapons. I cannot go into the details of this vast organization. It is enough to state that it is up-to-date, well coordinated, ably led and ready for instantaneous action.

I hope and pray we will never have to use it but, if war is to be avoided, there is little time to lose. We should and must move on a broad front in a vigorous, sincerely-motivated all-embracing peace offensive. We must try to mobilize the spiritual, the moral, the civilized instincts of our own people and of peoples everywhere, not in the spirit of uplift or bravado, but with a real, genuine determined effort through affirmative, straightforward, and strong-worded declarations of policy, urging peace and offering peace to the Soviets and the whole world, posing the questions of universal disarmament, atomic power control, and all the other many questions that will have to be met and solved to clear the atmosphere for discussion and settlement of these grave issues.

In this quest to prevent war, our statesmanship should be wise and patient but also and above all firm, unyielding and uncompromising on matters of principle because the outcome will inevitably affect for good or evil not only our democratic ways of life but the very existence of freedom in the world. The destiny of many as a free being under God is at stake.

There can be no further delay in meeting these issues. Every month, every day, every hour is strengthening the potential enemy, enabling him to consolidate his resources, to implement new weapons of horror which he has secured through duplicity and treachery. If we wait to resolve these questions, the time will come when we may rue the day. Acting now with earnestness, sincerity and courage involves certain risks to be sure but these risks are far less than those involved in waiting for the enemy fully to prepare and savagely to strike out of a clear sky in devilish ways and with incredible means and with such force and effect that our own great Nation in one fell swoop might well be paralyzed and disabled from defending itself against those who propose to enslave us.

We can permit no divisions to beset us at home during these crucial days. A thoroughly united people we must have, a thoroughly determined people we must have, if we would avoid espionage and sabotage at a time when the internal security of the Nation will be paramount. And clearly we can tolerate no subversion either outside or inside the framework of the Government. If there are Reds in the Government let us fearlessly expose them and drive them out and let us do that job without conducting witch hunts or smearing expeditions against anyone. Peace will not come until we have made it abundantly clear that we are willing and able to insist upon justice for ourselves and other free peoples.

Fight Cancer—Help Science Help You

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHRISTOPHER C. McGRATH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 1950

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following from the New York Journal-American:

FIGHT CANCER—HELP SCIENCE HELP YOU

By Harry H. Schlacht

Oh, heavenly Father, help us to respond to this appeal in a manner that will deserve Thy blessings.

Conquer cancer. It is the prayer of humanity. It is the cause of the American Cancer Society.

It is our great problem. It is our great cause.

It is as holy as the Master's command to heal the sick.

What a stirring challenge. What a splendid opportunity for service. What an inspiration to enlist in the war against this horrible malady.

Cancer is the cruelest killer. It is the foe of mankind. It is the common foe.

This is our common fight.

Cancer does not wait for the convenience of man. It cannot be dismissed with the comment "It cannot happen to me."

It strikes all ages. It strikes rich and poor alike.

The ACS is on the march to conquer cancer. Cancer can be counted out. It can be done through the ACS.

ACS is in the forefront of the fight. It is lifting the curtain of hope to millions. It is encouraging research on all fronts. It is directing a finish fight against this enemy of humanity.

We must protect ourselves. We must protect our loved ones.

Let us not say this fight is impossible. It is not only possible, it is being done by the ACS.

There is every reason to believe that with proper financial support we shall yet find something like sulfa or penicillin that will destroy the enemy of man.

This problem is no more impossible than the atomic bomb. This enemy is more destructive than any foe we faced on any battlefield.

Hear, America, the plea of Elmer H. Bobst, leader of the American Cancer Society crusade: "Won't you join that ever-growing list of Americans who have thrown themselves into this work? If you do, I am sure God will bless you."

Every minute of the day and night millions of prayers are pouring forth from agonized souls—for relief. By heeding cries of suffering, it is within your power to become the true servants of the Lord.

Let's go—America! Let us all rally to the ACS cause. It is our cause. It is our fight.

Its success depends on us. Its success is as good as we make it.

Let us help science help you.

Let us give to conquer cancer. Let us win the fight.

International Refugee Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 25 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent of the Senate to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech made by Mr. J. Donald Kingsley, Director-General of IRO. This speech was made over Station WNEW, New York, on May 21, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"I SPEAK FOR PEACE"

The refugee is just as explosive—and even more dangerous, in many ways—than the atomic or the hydrogen bomb. As long as we have peace the bombs are reasonably safe. But peace depends in part upon our ability to solve the refugee problem, and therefore every man, woman, and child has an immediate and vital stake in it. Yet, of all the tremendous issues which confront us, this is one of the most difficult problems to visualize, to understand with clarity, to solve with assurance. But we must try.

Americans are most familiar with the problem in terms of the DP. The United States already has accepted as immigrants under the Displaced Persons Act well over 160,000 DP's. Many of you have them as neighbors. Some few have turned out badly, and you read lurid accounts of their shortcomings in the letters to the editors column. But most of them—almost all of them, in fact—have become good, hard-working, self-supporting, and productive citizens.

I, too, am chiefly concerned with the DP's, as Director General of the International Refugee Organization. The DP's are the people displaced from their home countries either during the war or in its immediate aftermath. Originally they included all the people Hitler brought from the four corners of Europe to work as slave labor in Germany. They included the inmates of concentration camps. They included the anti-Communist refugees from eastern Europe who fled before the advancing Red armies to find asylum in the west. There were 8,000,000 of them when the war ended.

With the help of UNRRA and the Allied armies, most of them returned to the homes they came from. But by the summer of 1947 more than a million remained, mostly in Germany and Austria. Most of these came from eastern Europe, from countries taken over by the Communists, and they refused to return. Most of them had suffered under nazism, hated all that Hitler stood for, and prayed for a chance to emigrate to some free, democratic country in the west.

The only practical solution for most of these people was to transfer them to new homes in countries willing to accept them. That is the job IRO was established to do.

It has been, and still is, a tremendous task. IRO is supported by only 18 of the 59 members of the United Nations. Neither the Soviet Union nor any of its satellites has ever taken part in the work of IRO or contributed to it. They have constantly opposed it. Yet in spite of this small membership, IRO is by far the largest of all United Nations agencies—almost three times as large as the United Nations itself and all of the other specialized agencies combined. To accomplish our task, we have maintained as many as a thousand camps scattered throughout western Europe and the Middle and Far East. That number is now reduced to about 300. We have organized and maintained the largest civilian shipping fleet ever operated in peacetime. We have transported overseas more than 700,000 people. Meanwhile, we have housed and fed them, looked after their health, educated their children, taught them new languages and trades.

Now we have about 300,000 left in our camps, and many more outside who look to us for help in finding new homes, or for legal and political protection in a world where refugees often find the cards stacked against them.

We must do all we can for these people within the next 12 months, because IRO will go out of existence at the end of March 1951. Above all, we must find homes in democratic countries for all we possibly can—for those who will not or cannot return to their homes in the east and have fear for the future in Germany and Austria. They—the last of the DP's—deserve first priority. It was they who suffered first, longest, and most severely under the lash of totalitarian inhumanity. They should have priority, also, because they are the most bitterly resented minority in Germany, and if left there will constitute a fuse which might well explode the most dangerous bomb in the world—the refugee bomb.

The refugee bomb is not a technical invention that you can store away in a vault and use or not use at will. But it is just as real, just as explosive, and far less controllable. Moreover, it might well be capable, if it once gets out of hand, of setting off all the others. It is this problem—the refugee bomb and how to control it—which is so vitally important and, at the same time, so difficult to visualize.

In addition to the DP's cared for by IRO, there are now approximately 12,000,000 refugees in Germany alone. About eight and a half million of these are in western Germany—more than 14 percent of the normal population of the American, British, and French zones. More are swarming across the border into the western zones every day, adding to problems of housing, feeding, and employment that are already staggering. Most of these people were uprooted from their homes in eastern Europe and forcibly expelled to Germany, with nothing more than the goods they could carry on their backs. In the western zones, they live, for the most part, in camps maintained by the Government, in conditions of indescribable squalor. Some of them are outright Nazis or Nazi sympathizers, who gave Hitler all the help they could. They deserve to suffer. Some are both anti-Nazi and anti-Communist. Some few, undoubtedly, are spies and agitators. Some, like the children, are just plain nonpolitical. But all of them are resented by the Germans—not as bitterly as the DP's, who are living reminders of German atrocities, but simply as unwanted strangers feeding and living on German soil. And all of them are a constant threat to the peace of western Europe, and therefore of the world, for they are a steady drain on the economy and a focal point of unrest.

Similar explosive concentrations of refugees have been built up since the war in other parts of the world. There still are some 375,000 in Greece, 900,000 in Palestine, 13,000,000 or 14,000,000 in India, more than half a million in Burma, not to mention the uncounted millions in China. The total is somewhere between 30,000,000 and 60,000,000.

The refugees are not only a human and an economic problem. They have become a political weapon as well—a formidable and expanding time bomb. It is a weapon which cannot be used by democratic countries, but which must be understood, recognized for what it is, and neutralized.

Even the wealthy west cannot care for all these millions and give them services and transport on the scale we provide for the DP's through IRO. But we must first pull the fuse of the bomb, by completing the work in which IRO is still engaged. In this, Americans can help directly by providing sponsorships for DP's through the United States Displaced Persons Commission.

This, I repeat, must be our first priority. I dread to think of what will happen in Germany if any large numbers of the displaced are left there when the IRO goes out of existence early next spring. Already, German newspapers are beating the drums against them—against these people who suffered for so long at their hands. Already, discrimination against DP's on the part of local courts and minor German officials has become a serious problem. Those who are left behind next year will find life hard indeed, and the more there are of them, the greater the danger of a fearsome new outburst of hate and vengeance. The fires of arrogance, of pride, of hatred, and intolerance, which were fanned for so long by the Nazis in the hearts of a whole generation, are not dead. And try as they might, with the best of good will responsible German leaders cannot damp them completely. In the name of peace, as well as in the name of humanity, we must find new homes in new lands for as many as we possibly can in the time remaining. In this, with your help, we can succeed.

But even then, our task will not be finished.

Then through continued international action, we must find effective means by which all the rights of man, including political asylum, the right of movement and the right of work, can be assured to legitimate refugees. We must develop effective means of preventing the exploitation of refugees by nations callous enough to use them as political pawns and weapons of cold warfare. And we must organize machinery to facilitate the international movement of workers, whether manual laborers, skilled craftsmen, or specialists, so as to avoid the colossal waste of skills as well as the threat to peace which results from great concentrations of stagnant manpower.

All this can be done, either by the whole world in cooperation or by the west alone. And we must do it, for our own sakes and for the sake of peace.

Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 19, 1950

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, in these times there appears to be much confusion and a complete misunderstanding of the forces which have operated

to prevent any real action on civil-rights legislation in this session of the Eighty-first Congress. In the public prints, Democrats blame Republicans and Republicans blame Democrats for the failure of Congress to act. Because of this, I believe that a brief summary of civil-rights legislative history, at this time, may clear the air and place the responsibility where it belongs.

I believe that all will agree with me when I say that the thirteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States is the basis of all civil rights. It was this amendment, made possible solely by the Republican Party—the party of Abraham Lincoln—which overthrew human slavery in this country of ours. The Democratic Party—the party of President Truman — opposed this amendment to the last man. Yet if the Democratic Party had accepted the thirteenth amendment, the acceptance would have ended, for all time, the controversy over the status of free men.

If the Democratic Party had accepted the thirteenth amendment, there would have been no necessity for the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments. The thirteenth amendment overthrew the institution of human slavery; the fourteenth amendment made our colored citizens actually citizens of the Republic; and the fifteenth amendment to the Constitution guaranteed the right of every citizen to vote, regardless of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. But the Democratic Party—the party of President Truman—accepted none of these amendments; indeed, fought them with utmost bitterness.

All fundamental rights now enjoyed by our colored people were given them by the Republican Party, whether the right to education, the right to work, to individual human dignity, or to protection of the ballot. Because in some sections of the country, under a Democratic one-party system, the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth amendments to the Constitution have continued to be nullified by legislative subterfuge and evasion, we now have with us, even today, the need for further action to guarantee the civil rights already explicit in the Constitution.

The first civil-rights bill introduced in Congress was the work of Lyman Trumbull, Republican Senator from Illinois, and one of the great lawmakers of that period. He introduced the bill in 1866. It provided that—

> There shall be no discrimination in civil rights or immunities among the inhabitants of any State or Territory.

As the debate on this measure proceeded, Senator Reverdy Johnson, of Maryland, now a Democrat where a few years earlier he had been a Whig, urged that the word "inhabitant" be changed to "citizen." Thereupon followed the first consideration of suffrage for the newly freed Negroes. The word was changed, as Senator Johnson had urged.

The civil-rights bill was passed, and promptly vetoed by the President. Whereupon the Republican Congress voted to override the veto by a heavy majority. But the civil-rights legislation proved impotent against opposition in Democratic Southern States. Thereafter Thaddeus Stevens, parliamentary wizard, speaking for the Republican Party, put the civil-rights measure into the form of the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution.

As with the fourteenth amendment, which made our colored people actual citizens, the fifteenth amendment was urged upon the country by Republican President Ulysses S. Grant, who was Abraham Lincoln's great Civil War general. The fifteenth amendment, as I have said, guaranteed suffrage to all, regardless of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. So it was, that Republicans gave the colored people of the United States that measure of civil rights they now have, and thus made possible the great strides the Negro race has made in the United States over the past three generations.

From beginning to end the Democratic Party—the party of President Truman—fought the civil-rights legislation and fought the civil-rights amendments to the Constitution. The Republican Party, led by such political giants as Lincoln, Grant, Trumbull, Fessenden, Stevens, and Sumner, led the fight for civil rights and won.

That civil rights have been stultified in more recent years can be laid to nothing but the refusal of Democrats to recognize the validity of the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth amendments to the Constitution.

In the light of this great Republican tradition of equal rights for all men under the Constitution, can there be any real question as to the responsibility for inaction by the present Fair Deal Democrat majority in Congress on the civil-rights bills?

Address by Hon. Burnet R. Maybank, of South Carolina, at Annual Meeting of Surgeons of the Southern Railway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, it was my privilege last night to address the annual meeting of the Surgeons of the Southern Railway at the Statler Hotel. I ask unanimous consent that my remarks on that occasion be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is always a pleasure for me to be among a group of doctors. Associations with medical men bring back many fond memories. I think it was my boyhood admiration for both my father and my grandfather, who were doctors, that led me to study and graduate in pre-medicine at the College of Charleston just prior to the First World War. A tour of duty in the Navy postponed my entry into medical school, and by the time I got back, it didn't seem practical to continue or even begin over as the case may have been. Otherwise, I might well have found myself seated among you tonight listening to some other Senator.

Professional men such as you seldom attend convention meetings and lectures for the purpose of having an outsider talk to you about the problems with which you are most familiar. You are afforded other opportunities to discuss your everyday experiences with learned men of science. I, therefore, would not presume for 1 minute to infringe on your hospitality in such a manner.

We do have, however, a number of common interests over which we may meet satisfactorily and to our mutual benefit.

There is not one of us who is not vitally concerned with the state of our Union and the condition of our economy generally. During the early days of each new session of Congress it is customary for the President to address a joint meeting of the Senate and the House on the state of the Union. In this address we are advised of the general condition of the country, both domestically and internationally. This is simply a report to the Nation with certain recommendations upon which the Congress is urged to act. This leads me to the first of two conditions I intend to discuss with you tonight.

The most prominent universal interest among our people at this time with relation to our domestic affairs is the state of the budget. There is mounting interest and concern over the high cost of Government as compared to the incoming revenue.

It is easy and popular to attack expenditures. It is not quite so easy to meet the day-to-day demands upon the Federal Treasury with a workable alternate plan.

The Congress is being constantly assailed and pressured to cut expenses on the one hand and to initiate new and greater spending programs on the other. This latter, I find, is not particularly hard to resist. However, a quick glance over the spending program to which this Government is committed will immediately reveal the difficulty we face in cutting the major appropriations.

Those who suggest cutting expenditures can readily name one or more appropriations which could be cut. These recommendations, when analyzed and boiled down, amount to nothing more than—"He can get along on less money, but I will need more."

In order that you may be better acquainted with the problem, I am going to give you a brief résumé of proposed budget expenditures for next year.

In the fiscal year 1951 the cost of past wars and of preserving national security will account for 71 percent of the Federal expenditures. In that one statement, gentlemen, you find yourselves face to face with a cold reality when you realize that 71 cents out of every tax dollar is used to pay for past wars and as insurance against future wars. How much, I ask, can we afford to trifle with our national security?

To go a step farther, this 71 percent, in terms of dollars, amounts to $13,300,000,000 for national defense, $6,100,000,000 for veterans, $4,700,000,000 for international affairs, and $5,600,000,000 for interest on the national debt.

The direct budget costs of World War II amounted to nearly $350,000,000,000. Approximately 60 percent of this amount was financed by borrowing. Interest on the debt, therefore, in accordance with the figure I just gave you, has become a heavy fixed charge in the budget each year.

The $6,100,000,000 for veterans will provide services and benefits for 19,000,000 ex-servicemen, including medical care, pensions, and readjustment benefits under the GI bill.

After cutting these four large slices from the budget pie, there is a little more than a quarter wedge remaining. To be more exact, 29 percent, or about $12,500,000,000, remain for all other expenditures of the Government.

Compare, if you will, the large amount of money expended annually on national defense and international security with that remaining portion which may be applied to our Nation's domestic welfare. This 29 percent must be distributed over programs including the development and conservation of national resources, promotion of health, housing, education, and economic security, assistance to transportation and the flow of trade and commerce, and many other governmental services. Out of this 29 percent the largest item is for atomic energy and stockpiling of strategic materials which, of course, is a direct war expenditure.

The small slice of the pie—the 29 percent—must be spread over many general programs.

1. SOCIAL WELFARE, HEALTH, AND SECURITY

More than half of all expenditures under this heading in 1951 will be grants to States to help them provide public assistance to the aged, to the blind and to dependent children. At the present time more than 4,000,000 persons are receiving this public assistance compared with 2,700,000 drawing benefits from the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund. This fund presently totals about $12,000,000,000, most of which is paid by the beneficiaries. The 1951 benefits under the present law will total about $800,000,000.

The Public Health Service, another recipient under this general program, gives both financial and technical help to State and local governments for many health activities. From your own experience, you know that these include such services as control of communicable diseases, hospital construction, and mental health. It also sponsors research programs into the causes and cures of such diseases as cancer, arthritis, and tuberculosis.

From this same budget of approximately $2,700,000,000 must come expenditures for crime control and correction. This includes the costs of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Secret Service, narcotics control, the work of the United States district attorneys and marshals, and Federal prisons.

2. HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

In the field of housing, your Federal Government assists in furnishing credit to home builders, home buyers, mortgage lenders, and local communities.

Gentlemen, I urge you to take note of the fact that I use the word "assists" advisedly. While the Federal Government does make some few direct loans, its principal role is insuring or guaranteeing private loans and purchasing mortgages from private holders.

If you have any doubts about the Government's role in housing, I ask you to check the true figures on financing methods for last year. Of the record number of homes constructed in this country in 1949, more than 51 percent of all new private housing construction was financed with mortgages insured by the Federal Housing Administration.

The Home Owners' Loan Corporation will have an excess of receipts over expenditures of $134,000,000 in 1951. By the end of 1951 all of the more than 1,000,000 loans made to home owners during the depression will have been repaid or sold.

3. AGRICULTURE

You have heard much of price supports. Of course, I opposed price supports on perishable goods. The Government has lost considerable money on this part of the program, and it is to be liquidated. In the meantime, the price supports on the main agricultural products—cotton, wheat, tobacco, and peanuts—have shown a profit to the Government, and the loans have practically all been repaid. In cotton alone the Government made $75,000,000 last year. There have also been substantial profits on other Government loans on major commodities.

4. TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNICATION

To help assure adequate transportation and communication industries, the Federal Government furnishes many facilities and services. It regulates economic and safety aspects of these industries, and, in some cases, assists in their development through direct or indirect subsidies. A system of grants-in-aid to States assures our country of a basic system of national highways.

Our Coast Guard operates lighthouses and other navigation aids. It maintains search and rescue facilities. It engages in law enforcement related to maritime activities.

Since 1939 airline traffic has increased by over 800 percent, and private flying has increased in similar degree. This growth has required a corresponding expansion in the program of the Civil Aeronautics Administration.

Our national security demands that our merchant marine be maintained at cost on an equal basis with lower foreign costs.

Two hundred and twenty-five million dollars will be used for shipbuilding and ship-operating subsidies in order to meet the minimum requirements estimated for national safety.

At present postal rates, it is estimated that postal operations will suffer a deficit of $555,000,000 in the next fiscal year. This is because of an enormous loss by the Post Office Department in carrying second-, third-, and fourth-class mail. The taxpayer is really subsidizing the distribution of newspapers, periodicals, magazines, catalogs, and circular mail. On second-class mail and on circular mail which goes at the minimum rate of 1 cent there has been no increase in rates for over half a century. On the other hand, the railroads and other carriers have been faced with changing conditions. They have had to raise the salaries of their employees and generally increase their overhead. Also, the costs of equipment and maintenance, plus the costs of handling the mail, have increased manyfold. The railroads, of course, are not making any money in these operations, even though the taxpayers are paying the subsidies to carry this class of mail. This is likewise equally true of the airlines where the operating costs of many of the lines to carry passengers and freight to all corners of the world are subsidized.

Now you have had in a general way a brief look at the many services and benefits demanded of our Government. I hope you will keep these various programs in mind as we turn now, for just a few minutes, to the second part of my discussion.

It is a popular pastime among certain static-minded individuals and groups to indiscriminately label every forward move by the Government as socialistic.

In a recent radio interview, Vice President Barkley recalled that he was labeled a Socialist back in 1912 for advocating Federal aid to road building. As you well know, such a program has been the law of the land since the Wilson administration. I have no personal knowledge of any advocates of States' rights refusing Federal grants for road-building programs.

I told you in the beginning that I did not intend to discuss with you any of the professional problems of your daily lives. However, there is one item in which you are vitally interested and which would, if it came to pass, have a direct influence on you professionally. I refer, of course, to the fear and apprehension over any proposed program of so-called socialized medicine.

Let me state to you categorically, here and now, that I shall fight with every weapon at my command any effort to establish socialized medicine or socialized anything else—including FEPC.

We have the same objectives, you and I. We work and strive to promote the health of the people of America. We can best promote the health of our people by preserving and building and strengthening the traditional American free practice of medicine.

We do not need to tinker with strange and untried devices to bring health to our people. We have at hand the tried and tested practices of American medicine—the fruitful products of our free American way of life that have brought to our people the highest quality of medical care to be found anywhere in the world.

We must continue to preserve the freedom of the individual doctor. We must preserve the incentives of our free medical system—the incentives for individual effort, initiative, and resourcefulness—the incentives to give the best that we have.

These incentives are not merely material rewards. They are the satisfactions that come from a job well done, that flow from the personal relationship between the doctor and his patient. We must never destroy the American doctor's unique place of trust and confidence. The present system of medical care has been too valuable, too effective, and too useful to be abandoned.

It is deep in these principles that men such as you, my father, my grandfather, and the doctors before them have laid the cornerstone of American medicine.

But let me warn you, doctors, we cannot preserve the free practice of medicine by simply denouncing socialized medicine or by a stand-pat opposition to socialized medicine. We can best preserve our free-enterprise system in the field of medicine by offering a still better solution to the Nation's medical problems than any socialized program might offer. We must go forward with affirmative, constructive medical programs that will meet the health needs of the great rank and file of the American people—programs in which, I am proud to say, the American Medical Association is making rapid advances.

Now, let me issue a warning—a word of caution. If you remember nothing else that I say here tonight, I beg of you to carry this thought back to your home, your community, and to your office.

I do not know, and I am confident that you cannot name, one instance in which the Government has voluntarily invaded the ranks of private enterprise. There is not a field into which the Federal Government has been injected except where private enterprise was either unable or unwilling to render a necessary service. I will support that statement from the information which I have already given you with respect to next year's budget expenditures.

In 1951, as I told you earlier, almost a billion and a half dollars in grants to States will help them to provide public assistance to the aged, to dependent children, and to the blind.

From that same program nearly a half-billion dollars will go to the Public Health Service.

Ninety-nine million dollars will support our efforts at control and correction of crime.

Is this socialization?

Does any State decline these grants because the program interferes with their State's rights?

I have never in my entire political life voted for the expenditure of Federal funds to States without the State having control of the distribution of the money and having the programs run by the State officials who are closer to the people and who can better realize their needs.

What about the 80 cities which will request loans from the Federal Government

during 1951 to assist them in attacking city slums? The Federal Government has nothing whatever to do with initiating this community development. The need must be ascertained and the request must be made by the city or its recognized housing authority.

I have already told you that more than 51 percent of the new private-housing construction in this country last year was financed with mortgages insured by the FHA. Let me tell you that this program has not only been grabbed up by private lending institutions—its continuation has been demanded.

It is, indeed, a strange paradox to sit at the table in the Banking and Currency Committee and listen to witnesses berate, condemn, and roundly damn the Congress for interfering with private builders and lenders—even though the Government, except in rare instances such as a few war-housing projects, has not built, does not own, and does not operate a single dwelling unit. Even though built under a Government-insured program, the cement, the lumber, the nails, and the fixtures were bought from private sources by private builders and contractors. The money was borrowed from private lending institutions. Except in municipally owned, low-cost rental units, the operation of every dwelling has been privately administered.

Is this socialization of an industry?

I say it is nothing more than the constitutional functions of a union of sovereign States in discharging its responsibilities to the people who live, work, and fight for its continued free existence.

I could cite for you instance after instance in which the Federal Government has carried its load in a mighty effort to preserve, continue, and extend these basic rights.

I hope you recognize by now that I am not talking to you primarily as doctors. I am talking to you as citizens—leading and influential citizens—in the communities which make our States and, in turn, our Union.

On the other hand, I have cited some of these examples to you because you are doctors. Doctors across the Nation seem to be united in their stand, even as you and I, in opposition to any proposal to socialize your own honorable and respected profession, or any other profession, for that matter.

I urge you, my friends, to think long and carefully. Consider what I have said. You have many friends. You have influence.

Over all the Nation a vast effort for health is being put forth by individuals and private institutions, by the States and their communities, and by the Federal Government. We must push ahead with these efforts. There is so much yet to be done.

Diseases of the heart and arteries cause one out of every three deaths in the United States and disable 8,000,000 Americans every year. The terrible death toll of cancer is rising steadily year after year. Mental sickness affects more people than any other illness.

The very progress of our civilization brings new hazards to health. We are only hours by plane from the fevers of the tropic jungle, less than 2 days away from the sleeping sickness of equatorial Africa, less than 3 days from cholera and bubonic plague. The ramparts that you, the doctors, must watch are as essential to our strength and security as the military ramparts we guard.

All that we know about the human body, all that we know about nutrition and preventive medicine, all the wondrous drugs and chemicals, the medical and surgical equipment we have—these are only the sinews and the tools of medicine. The doctor is the mind, the spirit, the genius of medicine.

Our hopes rest finally upon you. Yours is the challenge. I know that you shall meet that challenge.

Is Competition Worth Saving?—Monopoly and Competition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHASE GOING WOODHOUSE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 24, 1950

Mrs. WOODHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert herewith a speech delivered by Mr. Joseph E. Sheehy, of Groton, Conn., Chairman of the Planning Council of the Federal Trade Commission before a workshop on economic education sponsored by the Baltimore City Public Schools on Wednesday, May 10, 1950:

IS COMPETITION WORTH SAVING?—MONOPOLY AND COMPETITION

In my comments this evening I shall be expressing my personal views and shall not be speaking for or expressing the official views of the Federal Trade Commission.

* * * If there is one certainty in the maze of legal and economic problems presented in this field, it is that in our country everyone professes opposition to monopoly. Difficulties arise when we seek to define monopoly, to segregate those practices which tend toward its creation and to determine just what this thing is that we are opposing.

When a single company dominates an industry, the problem of definition is greatly simplified. The Aluminum Co. of America presents an outstanding example in this field. The evidence in the antitrust suit against that company showed that during the 5-year period from 1934 to 1938 it produced on an average more than 90 percent of the virgin aluminum ingot available for sale in the United States. The court held that under the circumstances of that case this was a monopolizing of interstate commerce within the meaning of the statute. * * * The court was considering not only the percentage of control but the use that was made of it. One such use was the limiting of imports under a system of quotas and royalties. Another was the "squeeze" put on independent sheet manufacturers by holding the ingot price unfairly high and setting the aluminum sheet price so low that the independents were unable to operate at a profit.

Another phase of the Aluminum Co. decision that is particularly pertinent concerns the consideration given by the court to the philosophy underlying our laws against monopoly. A substantial volume of evidence was introduced in the lower court in an effort to establish that the Aluminum Co. had not used its position to extort excessive profits. In fact there was a finding that over a period of a half century, the profits upon the capital invested, after payment of income taxes, had been only about 10 percent. With regard to this phase of the defense, the appellate court stated in part as follows:

"Having proved that Alcoa had a monopoly of the domestic-ingot market, the plaintiff had gone far enough; if it was an excuse, that Alcoa had not abused its power, it lay upon Alcoa to prove that it had not. But the whole issue is irrelevant anyway, for it is no excuse for monopolizing a market that the monopoly has not been used to extract from the consumer more than a fair profit. The act has wider purposes. Indeed, even though we disregarded all but economic considerations, it would by no means follow that such concentration of producing power is to be desired, when it has not been used extortionately. Many people believe that possession of unchallenged economic power deadens initiative, discourages thrift and depresses energy; that immunity from competition is a narcotic, and rivalry is a stimulant to industrial progress; that the spur of constant stress is necessary to counteract an inevitable disposition to let well enough alone. * * * In any event the mere fact that a producer, having command of the domestic market, has not been able to make more than a fair profit, is no evidence that a fair profit could not have been made at lower prices. (*United States* v. *Corn Products Refining Co.*, supra, 1014, 1015 (234 Fed. Rept. 964).) True, it might have been thought adequate to condemn only those monopolies which could not show that they had exercised the highest possible ingenuity, had adopted every possible economy, had anticipated every conceivable improvement, stimulated every possible demand. No doubt that would be one way of dealing with the matter, although it would imply constant scrutiny and constant supervision, such as courts are unable to provide. Be that as it may, that was not the way that Congress chose; it did not condone good trusts and condemn bad ones; it forbade all. Moreover, in so doing it was not necessarily actuated by economic motives alone. It is possible, because of its indirect social or moral effect, to prefer a system of small producers, each dependent for his success upon his own skill and character, to one in which the great mass of those engaged must accept the direction of a few. These considerations, which we have suggested only as possible purposes of the act, we think the decisions prove to have been in fact its purposes." (148 Fed. (2d) 416.)

Sometimes I fear we are inclined to consider monopoly as occurring only in connection with the type of single company domination illustrated by the Aluminum case. * * * Whatever the cause, there has been reluctance even in some of the courts to discover monopoly in the absence of such domination by a single company or a very limited number of companies.

* * * * *

The Federal Trade Commission's case against the Cement Institute and its members presents an excellent example of the multiple-company type of monopoly. In that case there were in addition to the Cement Institute and its officers and agents about 80 cement-producing companies operating about 150 mills. Ten of those companies controlled more than half of the mills, and there were substantial corporate affiliations among many of the others. There was, however, ample productive capacity and an adequate number of independent producers to have furnished substantial competition had they elected to compete. The record in that case showed that there was a belief general throughout the industry that the standardized nature of cement made price competition unsuited to the needs of the industry. This attitude was summed up by an official of one of the companies. Commenting on the claims being made in the industry that the pricing system in use was necessary to preserve free competition, he characterized them as sheer bunk and hypocrisy. He went on to state: "The truth is, of course—and there can be no serious, respectable discussion of our case unless this is acknowledged—that ours is an industry above all others that cannot stand free competition, that must systematically restrain competition or be ruined." * * *

The court found that this type of thinking in the cement industry had promoted concerted activities to devise means and measures to do away with competition and that out of these activities there had come the multiple, delivered-price, basing-point system. The evidence showed that it was a handy instrument to bring about the elimination of any competition. Through its use over a period of several years with but rare

exceptions, cement was offered for sale in every given locality at identical prices and terms by all producers. During that period thousands of secret, sealed bids were received by public agencies which corresponded in price down to a fractional part of a penny. It was not unusual to find prices identical to the ten-thousandth of a cent. Even during the depression of the 1930's, price competition appeared infrequently, and when it did, corrective or punitive action was taken promptly to bring the recalcitrant producer back into line.

The Supreme Court made mention of the fact that a rather high degree of concentration of productive capacity in the cement industry made concerted action far less difficult than it would otherwise have been. This whole question of concentration in industry is tied in closely with the monopoly problem. It is not possible of course, to state at what point concentration becomes inconsistent with competition in any given industry. It is always possible for a few large concerns to control a substantial portion of an industry's production and at the same time compete vigorously among themselves. It is equally possible, however, in such situations for these dominant concerns to so control an industry as to eliminate competition. Without attempting to determine in any particular industry the degree of concentration that may be considered destructive of competition, it is obvious that in those industries where the trend is toward greater and greater concentration of productive facilities, it is quite likely to be accompanied by a trend away from the harsher competitive practices.

In a report on the concentration of productive facilities, 1947, made by the Federal Trade Commission, it was shown that concentration varied greatly among different industries. One of the tabulations in that report depicted the degrees of concentration, measured on the basis of capital assets, among the three largest companies in each of several industrial groups. In aluminum three companies controlled 100 percent of the capital assets; in tin cans and other tinware, 95 percent; in copper smelting and refining, 88 percent. Three companies controlled 77 percent of the cigarette-producing capacity; 72 percent of distilled liquors; 71 percent of the plumbing equipment and supplies; and 70 percent of rubber tires and tubes. In each of 13 major industries the control of the three largest companies was in excess of 64 percent. In still another group the six largest companies controlled in excess of 60 percent. This does not mean that competition has disappeared from those industries, nor that business is conducted in them in an unfair manner. It does mean that the possibilities for restricting competition are more readily available than in the industries where the ownership of productive capacity is more widely distributed. Furthermore, it means that a trend toward a higher degree of concentration in those industries should be carefully noted by the agencies responsible for the maintenance of our competitive system. * * *

These comments concerning concentration should not be misconstrued as an attack upon bigness in industry as such. Despite the charges we sometimes hear, the enforcement agencies of Government are not attempting to put steel making back in the blacksmith's shop or return the kitten to the cracker barrel in the corner grocery store. In our complex economy big business in many lines of endeavor is essential. However, entirely aside from the legal and economic considerations involved in concentration there are other values at stake. As we have seen in the aluminum case, the Court recognized that preference might be shown for a system of small producers rather than a few large ones because of the indirect social or moral effect resulting from such a system where each is dependent for his success upon his own skill and character.

The kind of concentration that facilitates the adoption of trade restraining practices such as those that the court found in the cement industry must be restrained before it reaches the monopolistic stage or it must be regulated by the State after it has become too late to do otherwise. This latter situation is one which I presume none of us would care to see come about. It would mean the abandonment of our effort to maintain a competitive system and the substitution for it of the public-utility concept. This would place the Government in the position of regulating prices and quality in an effort to give the protection no longer made available by the competitive system. As we all know, this has been tried out in varying forms in several of the European countries. None has achieved the degree of success that would prompt us to imitate that example here. Regardless of the weaknesses apparent in our competitive system, its preservation is essential if we are to continue to enjoy the fruits of an abundant economy as freemen.

There is always a fascination about contemplating a well-ordered existence. In our everyday lives we feel that if we could just get someone to do the worrying for us—to take the multitude of little problems off our shoulders, everything would be fine. So in the economic field, when we encounter depressions and business cycles, people invariably begin to wonder why this thing can't be planned better so as to produce and distribute an abundance for all. We begin to think in terms of Government planning or at least some form of over-all Government regulation. We have seen it function with varying degrees of success in our public utilities and we begin to wonder why it couldn't be extended to cover other fields of business endeavor. Such regulation, of course, substitutes for competition an elaborate system of administration with the complicated rate hearing processes and other methods used for the establishment of prices. The efforts made during periods of national emergency to apply anything approaching these methods to the general business field have fallen somewhat short of complete success to say the least, and yet if competition is removed as a means of protecting buyer and seller, there will remain only some such form of governmental control to furnish that protection.

The competitive system with its constant reaching for new markets increases production and maintains high levels of employment. Here again I am not contending that the situation in this regard is perfect. The records in our cases show that restriction of production is not an unusual means of attempting to maintain prices, but it does not follow that if we were to succeed in eliminating this and all other artificial restraints, that full production might be maintained and unemployment eliminated. These are inherent weaknesses in our system, if you will. The remedy, however, is to continue our efforts to overcome them within the framework of our competitive system rather than to permit groups to exercise their monopolistic power by unlawfully restricting production, fixing or enhancing prices, or otherwise restraining trade.

Another form of restriction is the curtailment of industrial progress. The results of activities in this field may not be so readily apparent as in price fixing, for example, but the long-range effect may be fully as disastrous. The practice may take many different forms in those industries where competition has been restricted. Possibly a new product is kept from the market for a period of time in order to avoid disruption in existing production facilities. Another method is the pooling of patents or the deliberate shelving of a patent so as to keep a new or improved product from the market. If the competitive system is to function, the field must be kept open for the introduction of new ideas and new products as rapidly as they are developed and as promptly as men are willing to risk capital in their promotion. The patentee, of course, is granted definite monopolistic rights for a specific period of years to make, use, or vend the patented product. * * *

* * * * *

In the realm of moral values the need for preservation of our competitive system is of major importance. One of the outstanding characteristics of the American way of life is the belief that anyone with ability, initiative, and determination may achieve any goal he sets for himself. It is my firm conviction that this belief on the part of our young men and women entering the employment market each year has contributed more than any single factor to the success of this Nation. There is no other country and no other economic system which offers the reward of success so freely to those who are willing to make the fight for it. If monopoly power is permitted to be concentrated in the hands of a few and the opportunities for building up individual success restricted accordingly, this spirit will pass out of our economic picture. * * *

No discussion of the competitive system should fail to acknowledge that it is harsh. There can be no guaranty that each who embarks on that sea will be successful. For just as the rewards are for the efficient and competent, so the penalties fall heavily upon those lacking these qualities. Competition to be effective must be constantly weeding out the inefficient and those ill-equipped to make their contribution to the system. This type of selection, however, is far different from the arbitrary selection made by monopolistic groups as to who may or may not engage in a particular industry or in some phase of that industry, such as was done, for example, in the glass case, to which I referred previously. There likewise can be little question that with all its harshness it is much fairer to the individual than any system by which officials of government are given the power of life or death over industrial endeavor.

The universal danger in any monopolistic situation is the ease with which illegal activities may be introduced into the plan and the fact that in most instances the ultimate scheme is the result of gradual growth at some times scarcely perceptible on an over-all basis even to those participating in it. This, of course, does not apply to deliberate acquisitions of competitors for the purpose of eliminating competition or other acts of a similar direct nature. In such cases the purpose is obvious and the effects sought to be achieved equally well known. In the average multiple-company monopoly group, however, a start is seldom made by representatives of all companies sitting down and fixing prices or agreeing to liquidate certain competitors. Initially the objectives may be to eliminate trade practices which are in fact bad for the industry and consumers alike. Success in this regard, however, frequently encourages additional activities until the cumulative effect results in an unlawful restriction upon competition.

If I seem to be placing undue stress upon price fixing, please do not get the impression that it is the only adverse effect flowing from the exercise of monopoly power. It is clear, however, that price being of major importance in determining the success or failure of business, its control is always present in the thinking of those who achieve monopoly power, and it is a rare case indeed where such power having been achieved is not used to affect price. In this connection I should like to stress that it is not necessary for a monopoly group to agree upon a fixed

ultimate price in order to violate the law in this regard. The Supreme Court in the Socony-Vacuum Oil Co. case in 1940 had this to say on the subject:

"Any combination which tampers with price structures is engaged in an unlawful activity. Even though the members of the price-fixing group were in no position to control the market, to the extent that they raised, lowered, or stabilized prices they would be directly interfering with the free play of market forces. The act places all such schemes beyond the pale and protects that vital part of our economy against any degree of interference. Congress has not left with us the determination of whether or not particular price-fixing schemes are wise or unwise, healthy or destructive. * * *"

* * * * *

In the Temporary National Economic Committee Monograph No. 21 the section on trade associations as a means of monopolizing the market has subheadings which deal with cost accounting, statistical activities, price reporting systems, standardization, credit bureaus, and patent pools. Under these subheadings cases are referred to in which each of these classes of activities was used as a device to restrain trade. * * * * * * Those who participate in a plan are the only ones who really know what its purpose is or in what way it is to be carried out. If it is actually injuring others, there seldom is doubt in their minds as to this point. Moreover, those who develop a program of lawful, constructive activities are in the most favorable position to prevent it from becoming combined with illegal activities. The responsibility properly rests on them to avoid the illegal purpose and not upon the Government to forbid practices absolutely, even though they are sometimes innocent, or to condemn practices absolutely, even though they are sometimes the instruments of an unlawful scheme. The law enforcement agencies constantly encounter cases in which there is documentary evidence of an intent to violate the law and to cloak the violation with innocent activities or with a profession of ignorance about the proper interpretation of the law and about the consequences of the illegal acts.

* * * * *

The struggle between competition and monopoly is as old as commerce itself. * * * Our theory of opposition to combinations in restraint of trade comes to us through the English common law, but it has been developed very differently in this country. In England the principal concern was to see to it that the Government did not grant exclusive privileges to preferred groups. The fact that those groups adopted restrictive practices was not considered offensive. * * * Perhaps the difference in viewpoint between the European and American systems can best be summed up in the statement that the former is primarily an alternative to state control while in this country it is an alternative to private monopoly built upon combination and conspiracy.

Nowhere else in the world will we find the emphasis upon competition as an essential element in a free-enterprise system. * * * When monopolistic groups of any kind seek to substitute with combination, collusion, or conspiracy the corrective forces of a free, competitive market, they are performing a distinct disservice to their own industry and to the economy as a whole.

Competition is a harsh, demanding task master. It is human nature to rebel against it. * * * We have further found that monopoly in private industry leads to abuses which force government control. I trust that none of us will ever see conditions in this country reach the point where our Government will be obliged to operate the industrial machine in order to protect its people. The alternative in my opinion is a sane, rigorous enforcement of our antitrust laws which will insure a fair opportunity to buyer and seller alike. The choice in the final analysis, it seems to me, is not between monopoly and competition but between private enterprise and Government control and operation.

Tolerance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM BENTON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter from Stephen Schneck, age 17, of the Cheshire Academy, of Cheshire, Conn. This moving and original letter was the prize winner in a radio contest I conducted for Connecticut high-school students. I asked them to write me their thoughts on the subject of tolerance, coincident with the Senate debate on the FEPC bill. This letter is one of scores of remarkable letters which I received and which showed the deep interest of our young people in the problems involved in racial and religious discrimination. A number of the letters I received pointed out that young people instinctively welcome all people as friends, and that intolerance is only instilled into their hearts by their elders. I think there is a worth-while lesson in that thought for those in Congress who have opposed the President's civil-rights program, and I commend the letter to their attention.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My name is Stephen Schneck; I'm 17 and a student at Cheshire Academy.

After reading those 13 words, just what do you know about me?

Can you say that I'm dishonest, miserly, a loud-mouth? In my mind there is no one foolish enough to make these assumptions on the basis of the information I have given you.

Now let me add four more words: I am a Jew.

Many will feel now that I have given enough data to certify to all these qualities—and more.

When you read the next few lines, please understand that I am not making a plea. Nor am I making an assumption. I am stating a fact.

My race is not—any more than are Negroes, Protestants, Catholics, or Chinamen—cast from the same die.

Some men are good, some men are bad, some are a mixture of both. Notice, I say men, not races.

Whether he worships Christ, Jehovah, Buddha, or a stone, he is first a man. He breathes like you, reproduces like you, and if you beat him hard enough he will die, just like you would.

Throw him into the sun for a few thousand years and he turns black. Keep him in the shade and he's pale. Still and all, he's a member of the species known as homo sapiens, of the vertebrate class and the primate order. Can you get away from that?

Don't ever say, "He's the wrong sort of person," or hate a man because he dips his fingers into water before he prays, wears a skull cap, or is your darker brother. There are no sorts, types, or breeds. There is only the individual.

Mr. Senator, please tell your friends that when they're judged He won't take us by categories. It'll be alphabetically—with Abraham first and Zacapopolis last. Smith and Cohn and Jackson will be standing together. And when their names are read off they'd better have a better excuse than "I was a white man."

The Lord God, I'm afraid, is going to look down and answer, "So what?"

If we're going to be judged as we've judged others, then a great many people are going to get the book thrown at them.

The gates of heaven are going to open a lot faster to him who can shout, "I was a good man."

The Fog Deepens as Truman Heads West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OWEN BREWSTER
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Fog Deepens as Truman Heads West," published in the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal of May 15, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FOG DEEPENS AS TRUMAN HEADS WEST

If the American people have just now a sense of groping in a fog, it is not hard to see why this is so. A kind of unreality settles upon the events which take over the headlines. It is as if the President and Congress were moving in separate worlds, concerning themselves with problems that have no relation to one another—with ideas, indeed, that seem touched with futility even as they are stated.

The Senate occupies itself with a time-wasting ritual, a debate over the FEPC bill which already is frozen in a filibuster and which nobody may doubt is headed to the inevitable end of a stalemate. Mr. Truman is off smiling over birthday cakes, talking of the Teapot Dome of another generation, the technicalities of atomic research and the starving Chinese. After much pious clamor for economy, the lower House completed an appropriations bill after haggling whether to increase or decrease it a half to a billion dollars. (The decrease won.)

One wonders where are the assurances that the people have a right to expect—if not assurances of solutions sought, at least assurances of an effort to find solutions. The President's jaunty confidence and genial visitations at the whistle stops are hardly enough. Nor is his glibness in snatching great issues out of the bag, holding up each one briefly to the public view, either comforting or educational.

A major statement on foreign policy, for example, seems almost casual, a single item in a road-show repertoire. In a brief stop at Laramie, Wyo. (1940 population 33,651), there is what might have been a major treatment of the Far East situation, of the vast, chaotic problems of circumventing communism in China, India and Indonesia.

Instantly it merges into a discussion of Republican iniquities of the Harding era, of greed and special privilege, the National Science Foundation and the atomic project

on the Snake River. Pocatello, Idaho (1940 population 18,133), becomes the setting for a declaration, almost incidental, of the broadening program for atomic energy development.

It is far from certain that the President could do anything with any effect to bring order to the chaos that threatens in the railroad strike. But that it is a grave, immediate danger, that the influences and responsibility for order fall first upon him—and now perhaps only upon him—gives a great propaganda advantage to his political opposition, shouting now for him to hurry back and put his hand to it.

But he will not be hurried, of course. The trip is charted. The stops must be made and the confident smile must be bestowed pending the turn back eastward and the all-important stop at the Democratic Party's massive carnival at Chicago next Monday. Meanwhile this same party pulls and tugs against itself in Washington, its factions divided on an issue of civil rights, divided and irreconcilable. Here are unreality and confusion confounded: the leader promising all "if the right kind of government is kept at Washington," the elements of that government drawing farther apart in incompatibility. It is a strange season for the Truman travels.

Continuation of Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, there have lately appeared editorials in a number of very influential newspapers favoring the continuation of rent control. These editorials favor rent control neither as strict nor for as long a period as I, myself, favor it. But a great many of these newspapers have previously been in opposition to any extension of rent control. Hence, I believe these editorials are highly significant. I ask unanimous consent of the Senate to insert in the RECORD at this point an editorial from the May 20 edition of the Washington Post and an editorial from the May 22 edition of the Philadelphia Inquirer.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of May 20, 1950]

RENT CONTROL

By delaying action on rent control legislation Congress has greatly strengthened the case for its extension. For the present Federal rent control law expires June 30, and some form of local control is still needed in many parts of the country. Local control can only be obtained, in the absence of Federal rent control, by calling special sessions of State legislatures to act on proposals to substitute State systems of control. By the time the fate of Federal rent control is decided, it will be too late for the States to take the necessary steps to protect communities where acute housing shortages still exist from excessive increases in rentals.

Of course, the States should have been prepared to assume responsibility for rent regulation in anticipation of the abolition of Federal control. The Washington Post stated last February, housing shortages have become a local problem that should be the responsibility of State and local governments rather than the Federal Government. Unfortunately most of the States have fallen down on the job—no doubt in the belief that the Federal system of controls would be extended. For only New York and Wisconsin have substituted State rent control for Federal control. Four States, however, have entirely removed controls by action of their legislatures and in two other States all controls have been lifted either by local option or by the Federal Housing Expediter.

As a result of this deplorable inaction immediate abolition of Federal rent control would creat serious hardship in many decontrolled areas in which housing vacancies were far below what it considered a normal average. In Chicago, Detroit, Boston, and Pittsburgh, to take only a few examples, the rental vacancy rate is only a half of 1 percent or less. In other words, there is practically no vacant accommodations available for tenants. Other large industrial cities are in similar plight.

In these circumstances we conclude that the rent-control bill just approved by the House Banking and Currency Committee meets the needs of a critical transition period by affording protection against rent gouging to those communities that would be left defenseless by the immediate abolition of Federal rent control. This bill would extend control for another year, but only in those cities and other localities that voted to retain it. If they failed to take affirmative action, either by local referendum or legislative action, controls would be removed at the end of 1950. In addition, the authority of city governments to remove local controls at any time would be retained, while whole States could be decontrolled by their legislatures as under the existing law.

Legislation of this kind would emphasize the local nature of the problem of rent cantrol and in effect serve as a warning to States and municipalities that the end of Federal rent control is in sight. They would be given time to prepare for its abolishment and meanwhile they would be compelled to decide whether they wanted and needed such control for another full year.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer of May 22, 1950]

LOW-COST HOUSING STILL SCARCE: KEEP RENT CURBS

One compelling reason for continuing Federal rent controls, due to expire next June 30 unless Congress acts in the meantime, is the fact that the shortage in low-bracket housing for sale or rent has not been overcome by the postwar building boom.

This fact, emphasized once more by I. Herman Stern and Charles Melchiorre, members of the city housing rent commission, ought to prod Congress into prompt action on the legislation extending rent controls which was approved last week by the House Banking and Currency Committee.

It is unfortunately true that in some instances rent controls have worked hardships on landlords. Costs of renovations and repairs have gone up, and if they cannot be covered by modest increases in rents, owners of rental space suffer.

But it is equally true that the new housing being constructed is usually far beyond the means of a large segment of the population. While it tends to reduce the strain of the housing shortage, it offers little hope for those who simply cannot pay the high rents or high sales prices involved.

Most of the cases coming before the rent commission in the past 2 years had little to do with upper-bracket rents. They concerned tenants living in dwellings in the $15 to $50 monthly range, according to Stern and Melchiorre.

It is for these people that rent control is a necessity. They cannot pay the $70 to $90 monthly rents customary in newly built housing, and public housing accommodations, presumably with lower charges, will not be generally available for some time.

The rent bill reported by the House committee is milder than the present one. It contains provisions for cases where the landlords are undergoing severe hardships, and it makes it easier for any locality to get rid of controls whenever the voters or the local authorities deem them no longer necessary.

That time has come in many communities. It hasn't yet arrived in Philadelphia, especially for the low-bracket income families which can barely pay their present rents. Congress should protect these families in Philadelphia and other places by extending the modified rent-control law.

Congress Opened Barn Door—"Horse" Was Stolen While American Boys Fought, Died—War Contracts Report Reveals Shocking Crookedness by Businessmen, Some in Uniform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 25, 1950

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article that appeared in the national weekly newspaper Labor, as follows:

CONGRESS OPENED BARN DOOR—"HORSE" WAS STOLEN WHILE AMERICAN BOYS FOUGHT, DIED—WAR CONTRACTS REPORT REVEALS SHOCKING CROOKEDNESS BY BUSINESSMEN, SOME IN UNIFORM

Congress left the barn door wide open, so the horse was stolen. Now nobody can do much about it, but Congress should learn the lesson and never leave the barn door open again.

That's the moral of a scorching report sent to the Senate and House this week by Lindsay C. Warren. As Comptroller General, he heads the General Accounting Office and is "watchdog" over the money appropriated by Congress and spent by the executive branches of the Government.

Warren was an influential Member of the House before he became "watchdog," and is highly respected on Capitol Hill, but back in 1944 Congress opened the barn door despite his earnest and repeated protests.

PUT ON UNIFORM

American boys were fighting and dying on the battle fronts. The Army, Navy, and other Government agencies were signing war contracts by the billions of dollars. Often the signing was done by big-business men who had temporarily put on uniforms. Uncle Sam had no time to check up on details. The war had to be won in a hurry.

In the midst of that situation, big-business spokesmen in Congress popped up with a bill which directed the Army, Navy, and other agencies to settle and pay their war contracts without any independent audit by the watchdog of Congress or by anyone else.

As Labor reported at the time, Warren almost got down on his knees pleading against passage of the bill. He pointed out

that an independent audit, before final settlement of any war contract, was vitally necessary to protect Uncle Sam and the taxpayers against frauds and improper payments.

TELLS RESULTS

Nevertheless, the big-business lobby was strong enough to put through the bill, containing provisions which limited the watchdog to a hasty search for the horse after it was stolen. Warren's report now tells some of the results.

The Army, Navy, and other agencies have settled a total of 323,933 contracts, practically all of those made during the war, the report says. Of these, the General Accounting Office has been able to investigate only 26,566, or about 1 of each 12, and only after final payments were made.

Even this small sampling revealed excessive or fraudulent payments in 1,233 settlements, or more than 1 our of 7 of those examined, with a loss to the Government exceeding $25,000,000.

Warren said he would hesitate to hazard a guess as to the full extent of fraud or overpayments.

He gave Congress numerous actual and shocking examples of the frauds and crookedness perpetrated by war contractors. He pointed out that not a single case was discovered in which the contractor got less money than was honestly due him. It was always Uncle Sam who got gypped.

Most war contractors, Government officers, and employees made a glorious record in the war, Warren said. It is unfortunate that their accomplishments—in support of the boys who fought and gave their lives—should be clouded by the shadows of men of low character, including some in uniform, who took advantage of the opportunity afforded them by Congress, and feathered their nests.

Can Our Freedom Be Preserved?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Mr. George N. Craig, national commander of the American Legion, at Chicago, Ill., on May 16, 1950. I make the request not only because Commander Craig comes out forcefully in favor of the Mundt-Ferguson-Nixon bill, but because it is also a great speech, in general, dealing with the subject of patriotism.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAN OUR FREEDOM BE PRESERVED?

Tonight I am happy to extend to your association 4,000,000 congratulations upon the occasion of your silver anniversary, for that represents the membership of the American Legion and the American Legion Auxiliary.

We of the Legion know how you feel about socialism, the cunning consort of communism, and your fraternity know how we feel.

It is good to know that 85 percent of your membership are veterans of one or both of the late world wars. You and we are comrades, fighting side by side against "comrats" that are trying to gnaw their way into the very foundations of America.

The American Legion is absolutely in accord with your declaration that if we value our health and if we value our liberty, we must agree that compulsory health insurance—political medicine—is bad medicine for America.

If some of the crackpots should have their way—God forbid—socializing this and socializing that—they eventually would communize America.

They tell us in honeyed words that more concentrated Government control of everything will do something for us. They don't tell us what it would do to us.

Not only would they create a socialized state, but there well might follow a hypochondriac and neurotic state.

Since 1943, national conventions of the American Legion have gone on record as opposing socialized medicine and compulsory health insurance.

We stand on common ground, fighting a common enemy: socialism, the advance guard of communism.

On the great American highway we have approached an intersection, at which is a bold warning sign: "No left turn." And too many of our people are mentally indulging in the old wisecrack that they don't believe in signs.

Our Nation today is surely in need of unification of thought and purpose, unification of all its people in a firm determination to banish the enemy within our midst.

While above our heads, like the sword of Damocles, hangs the threat of atomic destruction, right under our very feet the termites of communism, with their allies the weevils of socialism, are biting their way into our schools, into our sacred institutions, into the governing bodies of our communities, our States, and now even into some of the highest departments of our National Government.

It is the honest opinion of many Americans that our Department of State fairly reeks with deceit, depravity, and double-talk; that it is a veritable snake pit in which powderpuff diplomats are playing at a game of demimond diplomacy.

HIDE THE FACTS—SEEK THE PEOPLE

It's a new national pastime: hide and seek; hide the facts, then seek confidence of the people.

The American public has indicated increasing concern, and rightly so, over the whole question of loyalty in our Department of State. Why has not the public the same confidence in those directing our foreign policy, upon which the security and the very life of our Republic depends, that it has in the FBI and in our Armed Forces?

A naval commander losing a ship, or an army officer ignorantly leading his troops into disaster would undoubtedly have his career jeopardized, if not terminated. A Secretary of State, however, who is in charge of our first line of defense, and who loses whole areas of the world through mistakes of judgment, is not even open to official criticism, much less replaced by a more competent person. Instead, he is given the task of attempting to salvage the very situation he helped to produce.

Our military high command does not trust even a handful of troops or the smallest Naval unit to anyone but a trained and qualified officer who, normally in peacetime, attains his rank and even extremely limited responsibility only after 4 years at West Point and Annapolis or comparable experience and training.

However, in our State Department today there are many top-level officials, reputed to be experts but who, on the record, are shown to be totally devoid of any significant training or experience. Here are two State Department aides considered incompetent, to say the least:

Walter M. Kitschnig, a native Austrian, was hired by the State Department at the start of World War II. He couldn't go into military service because he was classified as an enemy alien. United States citizenship was granted him hurriedly. Today he heads the Department's entire cultural relations policy with respect to foreign countries at an annual salary of $10,000.

Then there is Haldore Hanson. This 37-year-old, $10,000-a-year man has no military record and no background of industrial, financial, labor, or economic experience. Yet he is in charge of planning the disbursement of billions of dollars to backward economic areas.

There are many other such cases.

What American businessmen would consider for one moment the operation of any department of his business along the lines that some of the most responsible departments of our Government are being run today? The time has come when we must be as practical and just as hard-headed in our international affairs as we are in our private business dealings.

Our diplomats should be hand-picked at an early age, so that their training for specific assignments would make them specialists in those particular posts. They could then hold their own with the diplomatic representatives of other nations instead of being amateur society bridge players at the international poker table, where the stakes are high, for they would have been selected and trained for their jobs, not floundering through important missions and endangering the very life of their country because their posts were plums picked in the overrun orchard of politics or because of financial or other backing.

The American Legion has had introduced in Congress a bill to create a National Academy for Training in Diplomacy.

Communist eradication in governmental office should never be treated as a political pawn. There should be no political pride in discovery, either by Democrats or Republicans. Only a common and mutual desire on the part of both parties can render that public service which all citizens are justly entitled to expect from their Representatives.

American principles and the desire to preserve them rise far above party politics. Those who use politics either to cloak or prevent such discovery do an irreparable disservice to their Nation.

The time is past when our people can treat lightly any further foreign-born ideologies. To combat them we need a positive Americanism. The time has come when we must get tough.

Here in Chicago over the past week-end was held the second All-American Conference in which delegates from leading patriotic, religious, civic, and other organizations, representing more than 80,000,000 citizens of the United States, gathered in a great united effort to stop the Red tide that is creeping over our land.

From long and sometimes bitter experience, we of the American Legion have learned how cunningly the Commies contrive their plans. True, the ranks of the Communists are interspersed with criminals, cranks, and crackpots, but they have a plan.

Events of the past weeks have afforded us ample evidence of the ramifications involved in pressing charges against those in our Government's highest offices who palpably are enemies of the American way, and the immediate resignation of whom should be demanded by the American people.

The difficulty of proving that a State Department official, or a former State Department official, is or was in fact a Soviet spy was proven in the Alger Hiss case. An extraordinary chain of favorable circumstances and accidents was required to convict one

man after two jury trials of having "committed perjury in connection with Soviet espionage." If Alger Hiss had not made the mistake of challenging Whittaker Chambers to repeat his charge publicly so that he (Hiss) could sue for libel, it is doubtful that Chambers ever would have produced the now famous pumpkin papers.

HISSES IN THE STATE DEPARTMENT

Evidence is that there still are Hisses among the snakes crawling through the high grass of our State Department.

Incidentally, it required too many years to convict the Communist Harry Bridges, whose trial and deportation as an enemy alien the American Legion has been urging upon our Government since 1938.

The entire festering Amerasia case should be reopened. They have been vague promises that it will, and we are hopeful. Two individuals admitted that they stole classified State Department documents, and they were fined in a United States court. Four others, one of them still a top-level State Department official in a critical post—John Stewart Service—were involved in the same case. Upon recommendation of a representative of the Department of Justice, no charges were pressed against these four. Why? Our people have a right to know who was responsible. We have the right to demand that all the disgraceful circumstances surrounding those recommendations be brought out into the open.

Former Ambassadors Joseph Grew and William C. Bullitt should be asked to tell their stories to the Congress. As Under Secretary of State, Grew was largely responsible for the arrests in the Amerasia case. Then he was relieved of his post, and succeeded by Dean Acheson.

All Americans, regardless of political beliefs, must stand together in the common defense, and the approach must transcend even so-called bipartisanship and be divorced as completely from politics as can be made possible in a democracy. Unfortunately the present investigation before the Tydings committee is filled with bickerings, mostly along party lines. There are charges and countercharges of hit-and-run propagandist from one side and operation whitewash from the other.

When charges were first made of communism in our Department of State, Secretary of State Acheson himself should have demanded an immediate investigation. He, of all people, should have been most eager to learn the truth. If there is communism in the State Department, the public is entitled to know it. If there is no communism in the Department, the public should know that.

The public does not understand yet who recommended and who hired Alger Hiss, Julian Wadleigh, John Stewart Service, and others, including the 91 homosexuals whom John Peurifoy recently admitted had been dismissed from the State Department.

The Department of State presently employs more than 7,000 persons. Competent authorities are of the opinion that at least half of them serve no useful purpose and that many of their jobs were invented and are purely synthetic and unnecessary, and should be eliminated in the cause of security, economy, and efficiency. The Department should be returned to its constitutional function * * * that of studying and devising American foreign policy.

And, for what significance it may have, permit me to inject here the statement that the present Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, was Vice Chairman of the Hoover Commission, whose report contained no recommendations for economy with respect to the State Department. Why?

The very life and security of this Nation depends upon the State Department, and the Chinese catastrophe and our increasing worries over the Soviet Union tend to high light this question more and more. Neither political vituperations nor facetious wisecracks will satisfy the American public as the final solution or the answer to the question: What is wrong with our State Department? They want the unvarnished facts, and they are entitled to them. A restoration of confidence demands it.

When the people know the facts they will demand the riddance from every governmental office of all disloyal subversives, perverts, incompetents, and cocktail strategists.

It is now apparent to the American people that our Department of State is a centipede for putting its foot in it.

MUNDT-FERGUSON-NIXON BILL SHOULD BE ENACTED

In combating Communist influence here, a step in the right direction would be passage of the Mundt-Ferguson-Nixon bill now before Congress. This bill would require the Communist Party (1) to register and identify itself, (2) to list its front organizations, (3) label its literature and broadcasts, and (4) make fiscal reports to the Government, much as both the Democratic and Republican Parties are required to do under the clean politics act. Moreover, it denies Communists the privilege of working for the Federal Government under penalty of law, and denies them the right to get Federal passports to travel abroad. This bill was approved by the Senate Judiciary Committee by a vote of 12 to 1 and now is before both House and Senate. Your letters and telegrams to your Senators and Representatives might be an effective means to get this bill passed by Congress.

This is, quite appropriately, National Defense Week, which will culminate in demonstrations here and throughout our land on Saturday. And, it comes when the American people are being more and more confused by conflicting appraisals of the world situation.

At a news conference the other day (and I quote from the Associated Press) our President said he doesn't feel the cold war is close to turning into a shooting war with Russia. In fact, he said, he thinks the international situation is much better now than it was in 1946, the previous low point in American-Russian relations. Mr. Truman said the Nation's defense budget will be smaller for the 1951–52 fiscal year, and he is not alarmed in any sense of the word.

At the same time, the United Nations Secretary-General, Trygve Lie, while en route to Moscow on a peace mission, said things have not been so bad since 1945.

Secretary of Defense Louis A. Johnson, after a year's effort to economize in defense spending, has asked Congress for an additional $350,000,000 for defense, most of it for the purchase of planes. He based the reversal of his stand on a number of alarming elements in the world situation. But, he did not recommend universal military training, which he always has espoused. Why?

President Truman himself has rightly asked for universal military training year after year since he has been in office. How then can the Secretary of Defense so ignore the wishes of his Commander in Chief?

Secretary Johnson's request for more defense money followed on the heels of an expression of concern by General Eisenhower over some defense cuts.

About the same time Gen. Omar Bradley, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, asked the House Armed Services Committee to extend the military draft 2 years because, he said, "cold war developments have become worse in the last 5 months."

In Indianapolis last week, Kenneth C. Royall, last Secretary of War and the first Secretary of the Army, got back into circulation by saying he thought there would be no shooting war for about 8 or 9 years and that the United States is (and I quote) "as well prepared as we ought to be," the next war, he said, "won't be won with the weapons we have on hand; it will be won with weapons not yet created."

On the other hand, W. Stuart Symington, shortly before he was moved upstairs from the post of Secretary of the Air Force to the position of Chairman of the National Security Resources Board, delivered this warning:

"Today Russia has an air force whose strength is the largest in the world, and growing relatively larger month by month. Russia is steadily increasing the strength of its long-range strategic bombing force, a type of plane it did not have in World War II. The Communists do not need long-range strategic bombers in order to conquer Eurasia. Should we not ask ourselves therefore, why are they being built?"

In the light of such conflicting opinions by our leaders, it is little wonder that fear mists are clouding many minds.

We of the American Legion are not prophets of fear, but neither are we exponents of smug complacency. And, we admit that right now we are seeing red, too much red for the good of the American people, and certainly too much of it in the sacred precincts of our Department of State, which too many of our citizens believe has the hammer and sickle tattooed all over it.

Communism, with socialism its accessory before the fact, is devoid of morality, devoid of spiritual belief, devoid of culture or common decency. Verily, it is not only a fifth column, it is a filth column.

Socialism is a will-o'-the-wisp. When you follow it you sink into the bog of despotism before you know it. Socialism is like the camel's nose in the Arab's tent.

The members of your fine association, and all good American business and professional men, not only have the right to make a living, but the right to make that living worth while. We cannot permit "pink" planners to infringe upon our copyright on life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. We cannot be fugitives from faith, our faith in our God and faith in our country.

Our Nation was built through hard work and perseverance. It stands foremost among all the nations of the world because of that spirit. We ned a revival of the old American principles of hard work, thrift, and self-reliance as an antidote against socialism and communism in the United States.

We must have a plan. We must pay for it with confidence, with labor, with dollars, and with sense.

We must accomplish it.

In the words of a great American editor, "Let us maintain the Americanism which makes us free, and the freedom that makes us American."

Foreign Study With American College Credit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, there is a great deal of interest in foreign travel as an educational medium evidenced by the American people. I am particularly proud of the fact that the American Federation of Teachers is one of those organizations playing a

most constructive role in developing a sound appreciation for international cooperation. The American Federation of Teachers has cooperated with the Institute of World Studies and with teacher organizations all over the world in conducting resident study centers in which our teachers may become acquainted with the rich traditions, culture and heritage, as well as with the great social and economic problems, of foreign countries.

In cooperation with the Netherlands Teacher Federation, such an institute was held last summer at the University of Amsterdam. I ask unanimous consent to place in the Appendix of the RECORD a brief report by one of the teachers who attended that institute. In my opinion the report more than justifies the high regard in which we in America hold our friends in the Netherlands.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the American Teacher of April 1950]

FOREIGN STUDY WITH AMERICAN COLLEGE CREDIT

(By Roxie Lodge, president, East Cleveland Federation of Teachers, Local 719)

For those who want a delightful summer vacation—inspiring, gay, yet challenging and educational, I can suggest nothing better than the Institute of World Studies in Amsterdam, Netherlands. A selected group of teachers from the United States studied there last summer and earned graduate credit. This was the seventh annual session of the Institute of World Studies. It held its 1949 session at the University of Amsterdam, July 10–30, in cooperation with Syracuse University. Dr. Donald Bishop, of Syracuse University, was the American director, and Mr. William Hooykaas, representing the NOV, the Dutch Teachers Federation, was the Dutch coordinator.

The Institute was originally a part of the World Federation of Education Associations, but is now chartered as a nonprofit organization to help teachers study in other countries under the most favorable conditions. Its educational policies board includes America's top-flight authorities in the field of international education: Robert Ulich, chairman, Graduate School of Education, Harvard University; Donald Bishop, Syracuse University; Selma M. Borchardt, Washington College of Law; George S. Counts, Teachers College, Columbia University; Roy Deferrari, Catholic University of America; Uel Lamkin, State Teachers College, Maryville, Mo.; Kendric Marshall, Division of International Educational Relations, United States Office of Education; Ruth McMurray, UNESCO, Relations, Department of State; Albert Prince, Connecticut State Board of Education; Carson Ryan, University of North Carolina; Henry Lester Smith, Indiana State Department of Education.

The group of Americans attending the Amsterdam Institute last summer included teachers from Colorado, Iowa, Ohio, New York, North Carolina, Georgia, Illinois, Florida, and Texas.

The purpose of the institute is to help teachers learn something about the people and country in which they are traveling, to make informed, appreciative tourists of all who go, and to enable Americans to study abroad for credit or for audit. For us who went to Holland, the objective was accomplished through the university lectures and the planned tours of cities and excursions throughout the country. We had brilliant lectures from eminent scholars; and we had much more. We were accepted guests of the people, and the Dutch were warm and kind friends. Institute members had ample opportunity to observe the people of Holland at work and at home. We shared their rich cultural and historical background. We learned to respect these people deeply. Sturdy, trustworthy, courageous, they showed us a gayer side, too.

The first Sunday evening in Amsterdam, we were guests of the Dutch Teachers Union at the American Hotel. A delightful program of folk dancing and folk music gave us a taste of what we were to enjoy during the entire term. Even our study trips were made happy for us. On our first day of school, with Mr. Hooykaas in the lead, we wended our way over the cobble-stoned streets, alongside canals, to the university. Here we were received and welcomed by the president of the university. We met our three English-speaking Dutch professors, who were to lecture and accompany us on our excursions in Holland.

There was Dr. H. A. Enno Van Gelder, who taught us some of the history of Holland. He made it live for us. But it wasn't only a lecture course in a classroom; we visited the places where history was made—and is still being made. Our first excursion in connection with his class was a trip by motor launch through the main canals of Amsterdam, down the Amstel River to the harbor with its shipbuilding industry. We were particularly impressed by the speed with which the Dutch had rehabilitated their harbors, which were scenes of havoc and destruction during the war.

That same day we were guests of the city officials at a tea in the town hall. The burgomaster of Amsterdam gave us a most cordial welcome to his city and to all Holland. We felt we were wanted, wanted as Americans, wanted as students of European social history. It was thrilling.

In this gay and serious tempo the summer school opened. So the pace was set. So the pace was maintained, day after day. We visited the old churches of Amsterdam and the cathedral at Delft. Delft blue, Delft china took on a new meaning from that day on.

The Queen's Old Palace, the Court of Justice, the "Little Church in the Loft" where catholicism was practiced during the Reformation, and Riik's Museum were just a few of the famous buildings visited under excellent guidance. In the Riik's Museum we saw and we felt the greatness of the paintings of the great Dutch artists. The cultural history and the social history of the people were stressed.

On another tour, we were taken to the ruins of Charlemagne's castle on the Rhine. Then we went to another medieval castle, and to the famous Hertogenbosch Cathedral. Each ancient monument has its story, and these stories were told us colorfully and with a dash of humor and a zest which only a native could add. We shared their modern history, too. We were taken also to the battlefields at Arnhem and Nijmegen. We saw the ruins at Wageningen where the Germans signed the peace treaty. Our Dutch hosts showed remarkable restraint. They are a great people.

Dr. J. Zijlestra lectured on the economics of Holland and the benefits of the Marshall plan to its recovery program. We saw the Marshall plan in action. We were impressed with the use the Dutch had made of the United States help in rebuilding their economy.

We visited the diamond centers in Amsterdam and saw good craftsmen at work—good union craftsmen. And oh, we saw and enjoyed the famous cheese market at Alkmaar. The splash of color at the flower market at Aalsmeer intrigued us. The fishing fleets of Vollendam, the Island of Marken, where the traditional Dutch costumes are still worn, gave what the orthodox sightseer wants.

But we combined sightseeing and study. We spent a morning at the International Airport, the home of the Dutch airline KLM. Here we saw in some detail how the Dutch have repaired the damage done by the Germans to the airfield.

We visited the Phillips Manufacturing Co. at Eindhoven, a subsidiary of General Electric Co., United States of America, where we were guests of the company at a luncheon followed by a tour of the plant. Phillips was the largest industry visited. There we saw radios being assembled, plastic cabinets and insulators being manufactured. The place held by labor unions in a national economy—a place of dignity and power, and the matter-of-fact acceptance of their roles in promoting the national welfare, made us appreciate the social maturity of the nation and we wished that we might have had a period in which to interrogate labor leaders.

A school similar to General Motors apprentice schools in our country is a part of the Pihillips vocational educational program. Young Dutch and Belgian boys of promising ability are accepted for training in this school. A comparison with a similar school in our country would be significant.

Our third professor, Dr. B. H. M. Vlekke, lectured on "International Relations." The Hague, the seat of the International Court of Justice, gave us a laboratory approach to international cooperation. But our Dutch hosts dared no more. Dr. Vlekke devoted several lectures to the Indonesian question and frankly and freely indicated that Dutch citizens were in full sympathy with the Indonesians. The present government's response to the will of the Dutch people would, he felt, lead to the early recognition of the Indonesian Republic—with the help of the present Dutch government. Now, his prophecy has come true.

The teachers of Amsterdam were surprised to find elementary, secondary, and college teachers in our institute studying and working together, all accepted by each group on an equal basis. The inherited traditional snobbishness of Dutch secondary teachers toward the primary teachers is sure to be overcome by the increase in power and prestige of the elementary teacher. Possibly we American teachers have contributed to the spreading in Europe of an appreciation of the single-salary schedule and the recognition of the equal worth of all qualified teachers in every part of the system.

The strict academic standards of the Dutch schools, the ever-growing social consciousness of the teachers and the school officials, the passionate zeal of the Dutch teachers for world democracy impressed us greatly.

One example of the social program of the Dutch teacher is that, aided by a government subsidy, they sponsor a summer camp for school children of Amsterdam and Rotterdam. A teacher takes her class to this country camp for 2 or 3 weeks. Here the child gets physical, social, and moral training in an atmosphere which stresses the spiritual values of a free people. Several teachers and their classes are at the camp at one time. The camp is for both public and church school children. The nation as a whole benefits.

Before and after the institute we took advantage of our free time in Europe. We traveled in a number of countries. To those who wanted them the institute gave cards of introduction to UNESCO House in Paris and to other educational centers. Tours through England, Belgium, Switzerland, Italy, and France were planned by the institute, and optional with the members.

Even if one could not take these optional trips to other countries, there are volumes one could write about each day spent at the institute. The institute gave us the happiest, most profitable credit-earning summer school imaginable. We'd all like to go back.

Messengers of Reconciliation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM BENTON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a sermon by the Reverend Galen E. Russell, of the Southport Congregational Church, of Southport, Conn., which is my home community.

I am indebted to Mr. Russell for many ideas in this sermon, but I call the particular attention of the Senate to his quotation from the Screwtape letters, the quotation of the Devil when he said, "It is when the church lets her banners fly that all hell trembles." This, it seems to me, is the moral for Congress today. How do we let our banners fly?

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MESSENGERS OF RECONCILIATION

(A sermon by Galen E. Russell)

Text: "God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself, not counting their trespasses against them, and entrusting to us the message of reconciliation." (2 Corinthians 5: 19, revised version.)

I. INTRODUCTION

Last Thursday was Ascension Day. In Lloyd Douglas's book, The Robe, there is a beautiful and simple account of the disciple Bartholomew's experience of the Ascension.

Bartholomew says to his friend: "One morning we were asked to a meeting, shortly after sunrise on a hill. We know the place, for we had often spent the day there with Jesus. Knowing it was dangerous to go as a company, we went singly. When we were about halfway up the hill suddenly someone exclaimed, 'Look; there He is.' I looked up, and there he was wearing His white robe. The sunshine made it appear dazzling. He was standing on a big white rock waiting.

"The crowd bowed their heads and waited, and after a while there was a murmur of voices. We looked up, and he was gone."

"Where do you think he went?" asked one huskily. "I don't know, my friend, but I only know He is alive. I am always expecting to see Him. Sometimes I feel aware of Him, as if He were close by; it helps to keep me honest. I am not tempted to cheat anyone, lie or hurt anyone, when, for all you know, He is close by."

Christ is close by this morning. He is not bound like Prometheus and compelled to watch His loved ones in silent agony. Christ is released from time. He is alive, and God through Him is calling on us to be messengers of reconciliation. What a message. What an ambassadorship. To reconcile the contending forces in our lives, in our homes, in our congregation, and in the world. We are called upon to do just this. Christ shows us the way.

We can take an illustration from nature. Day and night the recurrence of hot and cold air—meeting each other in conflict takes place somewhere above this earth. When the conditions are right the conflict of these air currents causes a precipitation which we call rain. (I am not now talking about the rain makers. Some one said this week that they had gone too far; that they had no business to be monkeying with the Lord's work.) I am now talking about the forces of nature. Rain waters the earth for the service of man. In like manner, the conflict between good and evil as we see it dramatized before our eyes has been raining refreshment on the souls of men year after year, and age after age. We can truly sing with the poet, "The one eternal God, whom earth and heaven adore, for thus it was, is now, and shall be ever more."

II. PERSONAL MINISTRY OF RECONCILIATION

We have been given a ministry of reconciliation. How much do we use it? Is our difficulty a lack of faith, or a lack of technique? Do we find it easier to be mad at some one than to love him? Is this anger, at least the continuation of it, the work of the Devil, or the work of God? As disciples of Christ we are called upon to witness for love, truth, and kindness. As Bartholomew said "Now I feel that Christ is near. Now I do not want to lie, or hurt anyone." Family squabbles need to be reconciled. Church divisions need to be healed. Unity and harmony need to be resolved in the formula, "Agree to differ but resolve to love." The Christian way is to walk together, respecting each other, and trusting each other. This can happen when we are committed to the way.

Is this way difficult? Yes, Christ never said it would be easy. He did say that we could live victoriously. He did say He would help—"Lo I am with you always, even to the end of the world."

There is a story in C. S. Lewis Screwtape Letters, which I understand was told in this pulpit before my arrival as pastor and teacher. The Devil had his agent Screwtape on earth seeking to win converts. Screwtape reports that one of their hopefuls has just recently joined a Christian Church. He was quite concerned.

"Never mind," said the Devil. "Don't let it bother you. Just follow him. Go to church with him. Keep his mind on little things—the squeak in the deacon's shoes, the cut of the minister's hair, the hat of the minister's wife. Just keep his mind on little things and we will win. It is when the church lets her banners fly that all hell trembles."

Are we concentrating on the little things and forgetting the big and central issues? Is it our lack of vision that causes so much trouble in the world? Is there a need for reconciliation between individuals? There is a crying need for a reconciliation in Congress.

In the Senate we behold the spectacle of time, money, and energy being thrown away by one Senator MCCARTHY with his irresponsible charges. Committees of investigation are appointed to investigate those things which have been investigated two or three times before. Someone has said that Senator MCCARTHY is the Communists' best friend. At least this can be said without equivocation. He is using Communist tactics and is holding up good and constructive legislation.

I have been deeply impressed lately to note one of the most creative and far-reaching ideas to come out of the Senate Chamber. I refer to the nonpartisan bill in the Senate—a bill sponsored by both Republicans and Democrats—called the Marshall plan of ideas. This creative plan was outlined in a speech by our Senator from Southport, Senator WILLIAM BENTON, early in March. It is creative in its own right. It is dramatic in the manner it lifts our thoughts above the confusion of low politics and charts a course into the future. In the field of politics this Marshall plan of ideas points the way toward a splendid ministry of reconciliation. An explanatory word is in order.

Senator BENTON says, and he speaks from experience in the State Department, that the Communists are more efficient in telling lies about us to the rest of the world than we are in telling the truth about ourselves. With the use of radio day after day and night after night the propaganda line is the same. The propaganda line revolves around five themes. They are the same every day. First, the United States is headed for a cataclysmic clash. Second, the rulers of the United States are warmongers and Fascists. Third, in the United States the rich are getting richer, and the poor are getting poorer. Furthermore, the poor are showing an increasing sympathy for the Soviet Union. Fourth, America talks about freedom, but their statements are contradicted by racial and religious discrimination. Fifth, our character is bad. We are culturally barbarous, money-mad, and lawless. Do you recognize yourself in this description? Do you feel it is fair, or in any degree honest? Does your sense of injustice become keen to realize that these lies about the United States are spread throughout the world via the radio? Do the people of the Near East believe these stories? Many of them do. Why wouldn't they believe in them, in the absence of any other information?

To be sure, we don't pretend to be perfect. We have our problems. We do, however, say that democracy arrives at a greater degree of justice than the other forms of government.

With a knowledge of these evil forces, what do you propose to do about them? With a frank recognition that you can't kill ideas with bullets, no matter how many you shoot, what is the constructive solution? Senator BENTON has proposed an answer. His plan is headed in the right direction. The plan has six steps. First, a steadily increasing pressure on behalf of world-wide information. "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." Secondly, a speeding up of the work of UNESCO—the United Nations Scientific and Cultural Organization. The work of this Organization should be expanded so that it can make its rightful contribution for peace. Thirdly, an expanded program of foreign student exchange and movie films, showing the truth about America. Fifth, convening of a conference of non-Communist nations now, to create a better understanding. Sixth, the encouragement of a nongovernmental agency to guide American citizens in sharing their cultural and their scientific information with other countries. God has given us a ministry of reconciliation.

As an illustration of the soundness of this plan Senator BENTON cites the experience of last year. The ECA, under its technical-assistance program, brought 600 people from European industry and agriculture last year to study our methods. Two among the 600 were influential Italian labor leaders. When these two had seen American labor-management relations at first hand, when they had seen that our workers share in the benefits of increased productivity, and from the use of labor-saving machinery, when they had seen that competition is not without its economic value to our workers, they went back to Italy, pulled 700,000 workers out of the big Communist-dominated general trade union and launched an independent one. Mr. Hoffman, of the ECA, vouches for this story.

Just yesterday a letter came to our family from China. It was written by Miss Helen Smith, who visited our Women's Guild a few years ago. I wish to read you a few sentences from this letter: "We hear that some groups are wiping China off the map. We want to ask if Christians can wipe their brothers and their sisters off the map? We feel that if the world is to be held together at all, it must be held by Christians, and boy—we need a little cement these days. The future for us missionaries grows a little more dubious, but that is beside the point. We feel that the biggest concern is for our fellow Christians here. They are facing terrific odds, and we simply cannot let them down."

These words from Miss Helen Smith, of Fukien, China, are instructive. Here is Senator BENTON, with his colleagues, offering a constructive program in the field of politics, and Nero fiddles while Rome burns. You and I can do something about it. We can write our Senators and express our opinions as American Christians.

On the other hand, the political program cannot and does not pretend to take the place of a Christian missionary program. Are we going to let the Helen Smiths and our fellow Chinese Christians down in the hour of trial? In the words of Professor Scott, of the Chinese University, Chinese Christians have an unprecedented opportunity to witness before Communists for the Christian way of life. God moves in a mysterious way His wonders to perform. Granted that the Communist program is treacherous. Granted that there is personal danger for those of the Christian faith to remain in China. Do we not need to admire those who say they are going to remain? Should we not uphold their hands in prayer, and support them out of our funds? The divine commission given to the disciples on the first ascension day was "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel." Preaching the gospel means sustaining those who do preach it with something to keep body and soul together.

God was in Christ, reconciling the world to Himself, not counting their trespasses against them, and entrusting us with the ministry of reconciliation. May we be faithful to that trust.

Extension of the Draft Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MILLARD E. TYDINGS
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two editorials advocating the extension for 2 years of the Selective Service Act. One editorial is from the New York Times of May 26, 1950, and is entitled "A Reassuring Vote." The other editorial is from the Washington Post of May 26, 1950, and is entitled "Sense On the Draft."

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of May 26, 1950]

A REASSURING VOTE

We welcome the emphatic majority by which the House of Representatives has voted to extend Selective Service for 2 years. The tally was 216 to 11. Seldom does so important a measure come so near to achieving unanimous approval.

The bill provides for continued registration and classification until June 1952 of young men between the ages of 18 and 26. Actual induction into the Armed Forces would wait upon further Congressional approval. But the machinery of the indispensable Selective Service System is kept intact; a guaranty is provided for adequate manpower in case of need, and the American people, and our democratic allies abroad, now know that we have insured ourselves in this important respect against the risks of a sudden emergency.

The bill now goes to the Senate. It must be acted upon before June 24 if there is to be no interruption of the present system. We look forward confidently to prompt and favorable action.

[From the Washington Post of May 26, 1950]

SENSE ON THE DRAFT

In voting to extend the draft for another 2 years, the House has faced the realities of the cold war. Significantly, the 216–11 vote reflected none of the indecision and division that very nearly paralyzed this country in the summer of 1941. In that respect the House determination is an important gain. The draft may never be used; the armed forces are now able to fill their quotas without resorting to conscription and under the House bill actual conscription cannot take place unless Congress declares a national emergency. But the continuation of draft machinery and the registration and classification of young men when they turn 18 can help save valuable time should an emergency arise. On this point, the new term "Manpower Registration Act" (instead of Selective Service Act) more accurately describes what is intended. Aside from the insurance that the retention of such legislation will provide, it will be a symbol to this country's allies in Europe and Asia, and a warning to the Russians, of America's intention not to abandon its commitments or to slip back again into military weakness. We hope the Senate will promptly follow suit.

The Man in the Middle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Man in the Middle," published in the Baltimore News-Post of May 15, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MAN IN THE MIDDLE

President Truman's farm-policy speech in Lincoln, Nebr., the first of nine scheduled political talks on his current campaign tour, seemed to assume that the American people, including the farmers, are very simple folk.

The President spoke specifically in behalf of the so-called Brannan farm plan, which he quite frankly described as having two main objects.

One of these objects is to assure farmers of high prices for their products.

The other object is to make the same products available to consumers at low prices.

In order to do this, under the Brannan plan, the Government would make up the difference between what the consumer paid and the farmer received—out of taxes, of course.

The very unhappy man in the middle of this picture, obviously, is the taxpayer.

But since both farmers and consumers are also taxpayers, it is not hard to understand that the high prices to one group and the low prices to the other are largely illusory.

What does it profit the farmer to get an excessive price for his products if taxes take the major part of it?

What does it profit the consumer to pay a relatively small part of his income for the necessities of life if the tax collector seizes the greater part?

In actual fact, since the farmers and consumers would pay the bulk of the excessive and exorbitant taxes to give high prices to the one and low prices to the other under the Brannan plan, they themselves would be the composite man in the middle.

President Truman did not explain or even mention these aspects of the Brannan plan in his Lincoln speech.

In fact, in accordance with his past campaign methods and with his personal political philosophy, he refrained from telling the farmers the truth about the Brannan plan, well knowing that it would not be good politics to do so.

And he very obviously takes it for granted that they are not smart enough to figure out the truth for themselves.

Actually, there are even greater objections to the Brannan plan than its excessive cost from the viewpoint of the farmers.

Aside from the fact that they would have to pay the high prices to themselves out of their own pockets, the farmers would have to qualify for the dubious benefits of the Brannan plan in another and particularly odious way.

Only by submitting to a program of crop and acreage control—specifically, by sacrificing the right to decide for themselves what and how much to grow—could the farmers ever have even the illusion of high prices paid out of taxes.

That is the essence and the substance of the Brannan plan, the oldest political fraud in the world—that of promising something for nothing in return for votes, and of wiping out the major portion of the earnings and savings of people after the votes are won.

The Press and the CVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, much is written inquiring as to the reasons for the current loss of prestige suffered by the Nation's press. It is not difficult to detect a number of reasons, the most basic of which is the fact that the press no longer keeps ahead or even abreast of public opinion.

Four times, in 12 years, the press stridently opposed the election of Franklin D. Roosevelt to the highest office of the land. Only a few months ago, the press attempted to defeat President Harry S. Truman through the use of ridicule.

On important issues of the day, the press is more and more frequently found in a negative position. This is certainly the case with the proposed Columbia Valley Administration.

Not all newspapers or periodicals are to be so considered, however. The Oregon Democrat, edited by Monroe Sweetland, has been given national attention several times during the past year for its excellent reporting and fair and impartial editorializing. The following article by Richard L. Neuberger, from the March edition of the Oregon Democrat demonstrates why this publication has been so honored, and points out fairly

and clearly how the Nation's press stands on this important issue.

THE PRESS AND THE CVA

(By Richard L. Neuberger)

(The Oregon Democrat herewith reproduces a most significant analysis of Northwest journalism. It is reprinted in part, with special permission of the Nieman Foundation for Journalism at Harvard University. The Nieman Foundation each year brings the outstanding young newspapermen of America to Harvard for a year's academic training. The foundation is endowed by the will of the late Lucius Nieman, publisher of the illustrious Milwaukee Journal. Richard L. Neuberger, well-known Oregon writer and legislator, undertook at the request of the Nieman Foundation a survey of the press's attitude regarding President Truman's proposed Columbia Valley Administration. Neuberger found that, while very few daily papers within the Northwest support CVA, nevertheless CVA is advocated and backed by some of the leading newspapers of our time, including the great New York Times, the Scripps-Howard chain, the crusading Pulitzer Post-Dispatch and other outstanding mediums of American public opinion. Readers of the Oregon Democrat will be interested in the following portions of Mr. Neuberger's detailed analysis, which appeared in full in vol. IV, No. 1, of Nieman Reports, printed by the Harvard Press.)

In the majesty of a cathedral-like grove of Douglas firs, I covered the recent dedication of the Gifford Pinchot National Forest for the New York Times. To prepare myself for the event, I read the great forester's autobiography, Breaking New Ground. The night before the dedicatory ceremony, in a little mountain lodge in the Cascades, I had reached the chapter telling of Theodore Roosevelt's efforts to set aside the last upland solitudes of the West in Government reserves.

PINCHOT'S FIGHT

Pinchot described how opposition to the proposal centered in the very region where the trees stood. The Oregon Legislature begged Congress not to turn over the woods to "hands unknown and untried and recommended only by theoretical learning." Pinchot added hopefully that "eastern Congressmen believed in forestry as a general proposition and were perfectly willing to protect western forests against the depredations of western men."

My wife long since had gone to sleep but I read on, fascinated. Hadn't I been through this somewhere before? In the distance a creek trilled over a rocky riffle. Always Pinchot and Teddy encountered their angriest hostility from the area whose magnificent timber they wanted to protect. And at last the thread of the tale unraveled. "In the long run," wrote Pinchot, "it was the votes of eastern Senators and Representatives that saved the national forests of the West."

LIKE CVA

"Why," I said to no one in particular, "it's exactly like CVA."

And so, sadly, it is.

Early in 1949 President Truman proposed a regional authority patterned after TVA for the vast basin of the Columbia River. The new agency would conserve soil, generate water power, provide irrigation, improve navigation and check floods. Immediately, CVA was smote hip and thigh as "communism," "dictatorship," and "tyranny." This assault has been led by the Republican Party, substantially financed by the utility companies and, unfortunately, carried on to a considerable extent by the press of the Northwest.

This partition described by Gifford Pinchot is being repeated.

NORTHWEST NEWSPAPERS ANTI-CVA

With merely a few exceptions, the newspapers of the Columbia Basin are solidly alined against CVA. Yet many of the outstanding dailies outside the Northwest regard CVA with high hopes and undiluted praise.

Some documentation is in order. Among the large metropolitan newspapers of the Columbia Basin, only the Oregonian of Portland is not determinedly opposed to CVA. It has taken no definite position on the issue, other than to decline specific indorsement of the President's bill but to add that "some sort of over-all regional agency" is apparently necessary. With this neutral exception, the area's larger publications can detect only evil in CVA.

Four small dailies favor CVA. They are the Wenatchee (Wash.) World, the Pendleton (Oreg.) East Oregonian, the Hood River (Oreg.) Sun, and the Lewiston (Idaho) Tribune. Combined circulation of these adherents of CVA totals 35,454.

Once the granite confines of the Columbia's watershed are left behind, however, there is no difficulty in finding impressive circulation figures committed to CVA.

GREAT JOURNALS BACK CVA

The New York Times, the Washington Post, the Washington Star, the Scripps-Howard papers, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, the Chicago Sun-Times, the Louisville Courier-Journal—these and many other dailies of notable reputation have indorsed CVA without equivocation. Indeed, the Oregonian has commented on the phenomenon:

"The trend is support of CVA by such influential and nationally known publications as the New York Times and general opposition from editors of newspapers within this region."

Preponderantly, the press of the Northwest regards CVA as the ultimate in "statism" and radicalism. Yet the imaginations of Edgar Rice Burroughs and Jules Verne would not be long enough to consider radical the Eastern newspapers which have gone all-out for CVA. For example, the Star of Washington, D. C., and the Scripps-Howard papers are staunchly Republican and heavily conservative.

The Star has editorialized that "the weight of logic and common sense seems to be on the side of President Truman's proposal for the creation of a CVA to unify Federal activities connected with the development and conservation of resources in the Pacific Northwest."

TRUMAN "SOUND" ON CVA

No less fulsome has been the approval of the Scripps-Howard Washington Daily News: "President Truman has made an excellent case for creation of a CVA. * * * Among United States rivers, the Columbia ranks second only to the Mississippi in the volume of water carried to the sea. Congress should give earnest consideration to the President's plan for its better development."

Consider, by contrast, a sample of opinion from inside the Northwest, The Capital-Journal of Salem, Oreg., looks upon CVA as "a three-man dictatorship," and Boise (Idaho) Stateman is even less complimentary. It calls CVA "an unjustified intrusion upon the affairs of the region. * * * an abandonment of the rights of self-government."

Ordinarily the press of a hinterland region would be proud to unite in the company of such papers as the New York Times, the Post-Dispatch, and the Washington Post. What excuse is given for this regional disconformance?

ALIBI FALLACIOUS

The excuse, at best, is a shabby one.

Numerous Northwest dailies claim that papers in New York, St. Louis, and Washington are friendly to CVA because they themselves would not have to live under it. The implication is that the country's leading newspapers are so cavalier as to suggest for fellow Americans elsewhere in the Nation an undesirable form of government, merely because it would be beyond the circulation scope of those papers.

The charge is untrue.

The Missouri scours the city limits of St. Louis, and the Post-Dispatch has led the fight for a Missouri Valley Authority. The Chattanooga (Tenn.) Times, substantially owned by the New York Times, has supported the TVA, which operates throughout that paper's realm. All the Chicago and New York dailies endorsing CVA have been consistently for the somewhat parallel St. Lawrence seaway.

WHY A BIASED PRESS?

Why, then, is the press of the Northwest hostile to CVA while leading papers outside the region favor the President's proposal?

I believe we must go back to Pinchot's era for the answer. Opposition to the setting aside of the national forests came principally from the great lumber barons, who wanted to convert these fastnesses of fir and pine into profitable ships' decking and into two by fours. The influence of these men within the Northwest was great. Their minions filled the commercial organizations and the boards of trade. Their lobbyists were omnipresent in legislative halls. These currents rippled out into editorial offices. Pressures closed on Northwest Senators and Congressmen.

BETTER PERSPECTIVE AWAY FROM LOBBYISTS

But the power of the lumber barons diminished with each passing mile from the Northwest. Unquestionably, the timber magnates convinced some sincere editors and politicians that the fate of the sawmills and the destiny of the region were one and the same. If the forest reserves were snatched from ax and saw, how could the Northwest prosper?

Outside the Northwest, editors and politicians were able to afford the luxury of a somewhat longer perspective. If the uplands were laid bare, what of erosion and floods? Where would the drinking supply of Seattle and Portland come from? Could salmon spawn in creeks choked with logging slash? What of recreation? People could not pitch camp in a charnel house of stumps and dead branches.

And so Pinchot, first chief forester in America's history, wrote: "The conservation bill was attacked by Members of Congress from the West, who were directly concerned, and supported by Members from the East, who were not. In the fight for the national forests we were to see much more of that same partition."

POWER TRUSTS LEADS ANTIS

Today, the basic, underlying opposition to the CVA emanates from the power companies of the Northwest. A clause in the President's bill would give the new agency the right to buy out utilities operating in the Columbia Basin. Obviously, the bill is not attacked from this exposed salient. Public ownership of power is far from unpopular, as witness municipal plants in such communities as Seattle, Tacoma, Cleveland, and Sacramento.

The main assault stems from the alleged fact that CVA would take away the people's liberties. A pamphlet financed by the utilities warns that Russia has a CVA. This concern for liberty on the part of the power companies is regarded with wry faces by

residents familiar with the supineness of these companies to the Ku Klux Klan in the 1920's, when that unholy organization had sufficient strength in Oregon to secure passage at the polls of a bill closing Catholic schools.[1]

No elaborate brochures then were issued urging the populace to act "lest our form of government be changed."

PHONY DEVELOPMENT FRONT

The organization ostensibly leading the opposition to CVA is known as the Pacific Northwest Development Association. It sends gaudy 48-page booklets through the mails by the tens of thousands, heralding the material as "proof that we don't need the CVA dictatorship here." No effort has been made in the press to analyze Development Association sources of financing, although one can guess at considerable interest if, let us say, brochures of equal extravagance and anonymity flooded the region with an attack on utility companies.

Congressman HUGH B. MITCHELL, of Seattle, contends that from 1945 until 1948 four power and light corporations paid to the Development Association $18,610. "The tabulation is partial," he adds, "because all companies have not filed detailed reports for all years."

A memorial endorsing CVA was introduced in the Oregon Legislature. It was overwhelmed 19 to 10 in the senate and that was the end of it. But what chance did it ever have? One utility company spent $5,000 lobbying at the session, a sum only $1,000 short of the annual legislative pay of all 30 State senators.

GOVERNOR M'KAY'S BLUFF CITED

Utility money can hire advertising agencies, skilled writers, and printed material by the bale. Speakers on salaries and expense accounts appear before every civic organization. Conversely, debates are discouraged. Why give both sides? Governor McKay, of Oregon, who came out against CVA the first day Mr. Truman proposed it, said sanctimoniously he might favor CVA if the people were allowed to ballot on the idea.

I suggested a special session of the legislature to conduct a referendum in Oregon on CVA and promised, as a member of the senate, to cooperate with the Governor in framing a fair statement for the ballot. The reaction of a number of newspapers was to charge me with trying to put our Governor on the spot.

YOUNG REPUBLICANS CORRUPTED

The Hood River Sun, published by a founder of the Young Republican Clubs of Oregon, has declared: "It is unfortunate that a power company or any other special interests should move in on a political party and force its beliefs on a group such as the Young Republicans."

A climate is created against CVA. This conservatism, in the words of William Allen White, "goes thrilling down the line." It becomes fashionable in many circles to oppose CVA. Editors often move in these circles. The Republican Party has made antagonism to CVA so much a touchstone in the Columbia Basin that even Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, a liberal who has hailed TVA in the most enthusiastic terms, has felt it politically advisable to denounce TVA's blood brother, CVA, as "a strait-jacket for the Pacific Northwest."

E. B. MacNaughton, 69, president of the Oregonian Publishing Co., has come out for CVA. "Business interests once voiced bitter opposition to Grand Coulee and Bonneville Dams," he said. "But if Roosevelt had not given Bonneville and activated Grand Coulee, where would we be today?" MacNaughton, chairman of the board of one of the richest banks in the region, confesses that some erstwhile business associates are icily cool because of his views on CVA.

EDITORIAL VENALITY DOUBTED

Some adherents of CVA, no less guilty of overstatement than the adversaries of the project, have accused various editors of venality. I doubt this, although I always have felt regional self-interest required support of CVA. It is my opinion that the editors who think CVA would destroy personal liberty are as mistakenly sincere as those editors of long ago who feared establishment of the forest reserves would destroy the Northwest economically.

OUTSIDE HELP NEEDED

The tragedy to me, as a westerner born and bred, is that our majestic region again must be saved from itself. Our fellow citizens in the East, the Middle West, and the South must rescue us from our own subservience to local vested interests. Bernard De Voto of Boston did not exaggerate when he wrote in Harper's under the title of "The West Against Itself."

I look at the water in the tumbler at the dinner table. It is clear, cold, and pure. It foamed off the ramparts of the Mount Hood National Forest. As I write these words, thousands of men, women, and children are skiing in the national forests of the West. Next summer many times this number will swim in blue lakes and camp beneath cavernous evergreens. But what if the Nation almost half a century ago had listened not to the young forester with the handlebar mustache but to the political, civic, and journalistic leaders of the Northwest?

Where would the Northwest be today? I think of the devastation where the ax has cut clear. I recall how the lumber industry has moved inexorably southward from the British Columbia border nearly to the California line, as the stately trees have gone to satisfy the hunger of saber-toothed power saws. What would have happened to the uplands of Mount Hood and Mount St. Helens and Eagle Cap, if Teddy's forester had not lined up faithful allies on the other side of the continent?

NORTHWEST PLUNGING INTO CRISIS

Today the Northwest faces a different kind of emergency, but an emergency nevertheless. Although it contains as a region 42 percent of the Nation's potential hydroelectricity, it also is the part of the country with the most critical power shortage. Population has soared nearly one-half since 1940, and many of the newcomers are going on unemployment rolls. The rate of joblessness in the Northwest is three times the national average.

Yet the bulk of the region's press cries out that CVA will bring dictatorship and tyranny. People who were silent when religious schools faced compulsory closure now fear that public development of the Columbia River may threaten individual freedom. This is the circulation line-up in the Northwest:

Pro-CVA	35,454
Neutral	224,000
Anti-CVA	990,000

Of course, the eastern press and politicians may save us from ourselves. I am no seventh son of a seventh son, so I merely can ponder and not predict. But half a century from now, when many hearts of men have been sifted before the judgment seat, I wonder what some Gifford Pinchot of the future will write about the great fight against the CVA?

[1] Happily declared unconstitutional by the United States Supreme Court. *Pierce et al.*, v. *Society of Sisters.* 268 U. S. 510 (1924).—R. L. N.

The New Idolatry: State Worship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a sermon delivered last Sunday by Dr. Harrison Ray Anderson, of the Fourth Presbyterian Church, of Chicago, Ill. The sermon is entitled "The New Idolatry: State Worship."

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The theme: The New Idolatry: State worship.

The text: "Before Him all the nations are as nothing; to Him they are but empty and inane, then whom can you compare with God? What can you put beside Him?" Isaiah 40: 17, 18 (Moffatt).

Here is this prophet of old, Isaiah, wrestling with the problems of his day and seeking to call his people away from idols and to the living God. He takes them behind the scenes; shows them an idol; where it comes from; how it is fashioned of metal or wood by a mere man, and how it will fail. Surely it is of such a ridiculous nature that men will not set it up in place of God nor give to it—this hideous thing—the worship which God alone is worthy of.

But the author of the text is aware of a greater idolatry than that of a wooden image. It is the worship of and trust in the nations of his day as over and against their devotion to the living God. God is the eternal One, Creator of stars and of men. Before Him nations are as a drop in a bucket. He bringeth princes to nothing. As for men, they appear as they actually do from a plane—as grasshoppers. Nations are made up of these human, fallible, finite creatures. Can you compare such creatures or their creations with God? Can you put over and against God something made up of men?

Yet this is our problem today. The modern power state has come to be for multitudes of people an idol—something to which they give that which God alone is worthy of. The ever-growing state is not ultimately an economic issue or a political issue. If it were merely this, it would not be in this pulpit this morning. It is a moral and spiritual issue. Dr. Emil Brunner, of Switzerland, one of the best of the living theologians, sees state worship as the modern challenge to God. Dr. Albert Schweitzer says, "The great conflict of our times is personality versus collectivism." I was surprised to find the German Christians at the Amsterdam conference more alarmed about state worship than almost any other group there. They had seen it work out in the German Socialist state, which had promised them so much and had ended by taking over their souls and minds and bodies, except for those, like Martin Niemoeller, who stood up as Christians suffered and died. I quote from a recent letter read in the church pulpits of Berlin and East Germany, signed by Bishop Dibelius and other German Christian leaders:

"Our Lord Jesus Christ states: 'The truth will make you free.' This truth is no other than Himself, the crucified and resurrected; He is our consolation and our strength. We proclaim Him to all men even in the great

needs of our time. More than ever we see ourselves today surrounded by depressed and disturbed consciences. Without ceasing there come to the church headquarters, to the pastors and other church elders, the calls of members of the congregation. They say, 'Help us, we are being required to say what we cannot say in truth. We are being forced to participate in actions in which we in good conscience cannot take part. We must agree in decisions which we canont approve. We stand in constant danger of losing freedom, office, and bread if we refuse to participate.' "

Why are we so intrigued by the worship of the state? Why do we so readily surrender the blood-bought rights of freemen? Have we not seen the promises of the German socialist state fail? Do we not have before us this tale of horror in Russia of a great people who fell for a high ideal and wound up behind an iron door? Prisons have iron doors. Then why, with these and other examples before us, is state idolatry a threat in the America of Washington and Jefferson and Lincoln and Wilson? It is a threat because of the deception with which unthinking people are handled. They are told they will be given something free, and so they come and exchange their free manhood for the manna from Washington. They are given back some of that which was theirs, but they do not get back their souls. Why else is state idolatry possible? Because a great company of Americans have abandoned the God who made them free. They are secularist men and women without God. They cannot stand to be without God. They cannot bear the burden of a world like this alone. They cannot because they do not bow down to God. So they turn to the state and say, "Be my father; be my mother; care for me." The idol hears and winks, and says, "Brother, I will care for you, and how—for your votes."

There is a place for the state, a great place, but it's not first. Some of us here have been hurt for our country, and we love her. Therefore, we speak. Nor is one word of what I am saying a dodge from social justice or a plea for the status quo. There are living conditions and inequalities in this Nation and in our world that need righting. This can be done, and should be done, without erecting in one central power-loving government the worst injustice of all. Thomas Jefferson and Woodrow Wilson can speak. Our social justice will not be achieved that way. It will only be promised as cheese to the mouse. We will nibble and get caught. We will become mice—not men.

If you do not think there is a living, spiritual issue in what I am trying to say, look at the interest with which all things political are treated today. Each hour of the day the radios tell of politics until many of us eat Washington three times a day. The daily press and the columnists carry on with things political. Commentators scream about it and mold opinion and pressure Congress in a shocking way. When the politician realizes that he is slipping and becoming a mere man, then the build-up boys come along. I call your attention to the advertisement appearing in the Chicago papers yesterday. "For the biggest Sunday in your life see and hear Vice President ALBEN W. BARKLEY." So the politicians give us our biggest Sunday. My Bible says God gave us the Sabbath, and told us to keep it holy. Jesus Christ, whose day this is, rose on this day, and the Holy Spirit came to the church on this day—but the biggest Sunday of your life is today, say the promoters of the State show. A carload of Hollywood beauties are produced, and even Hopalong Cassidy will probably have to yell "yippee" on a white horse near a White House in Washington. The interest might lag. In other words, the minds and interests and waking thoughts of men become State-controlled and man-centered. Christians know that this place belongs to God. "Except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain."

Now all this stimulated interest takes more than interest; it takes capital. The show costs money. The Capitol is well named, only we must change the spelling. People brought their gifts of old to the idol and lavishly decorated the mute thing. Some blessing would follow. So, to support the modern power state billions must be gathered by every conceivable tax. In the 156 years of America, from 1784 to 1940, the Government of the United States spent $179,000,000,000. In the 4 years from 1946 to 1949, inclusive, which were the first full 4 years after the close of the war, the United States Government spent $191,000,000,000. You see, it costs to worship the state. And with all, there is not enough to balance the budget, but widow Jones must balance hers. There is not enough to cut the debt, but farmer Brown must cut his. And this is not all. Schemes which no man can estimate are not only advocated, but promoted, at the people's expense, for billions of additional spending and millions of added state jobs. And a great American people who have been taught to work and earn and pay their bills and save, have bought bonds with a promised increase, only to find after 10 years that the $75 they put into the bond is worth in purchasing power about $60, and not the $100 they thought they were promised. Tomorrow they will buy more, and they should. But what a commentary on statesmanship to penalize thrift and to betray those who save. President Roosevelt was reported to have told the late bishop of Washington that if he wanted money for his cathedral he had better get it soon. Just so. How much do you give to your Government in taxes and how much to God and His Kingdom? It's primarily God's money and your money—not the state's. Caesar has his claim, but God's claims are first.

But the worst feature of the modern power state, which absorbs our interest and takes our money, is neither of these. It is its power. Men grow afraid to be men in such a state. They are afraid all over the world to stand up and speak out. I debated long about preaching this sermon. Would it bring trouble to this flock? Then I thought of John Knox. I heard him say, "I am in the place where conscience bids me speak the truth. The truth therefore I speak. Impugn it, whoso lists." But I am a clergyman surrounded by a session, and while pastors and priests are victims abroad, so far they are not here. Businessmen are afraid, and laboring men are afraid. Do you talk back to the state when it can raise your income tax and in a dozen other ways penalize you? They are afraid of two things. First, they are afraid of what the state will do to them. For the first time in my life I believe that American men are afraid of their Government. That's something to ponder. The idol is doing its work. The living God sets men free from fear because they trust God.

But the real fear is not for some personal danger or cost. Let the gangsters blast us. If we die, it is glory; and if we live, it is grace. What men are afraid of is what the lust for power is doing to the men who run the state. They see humble, finite men become masters. They see their lust for power go to any length, for some few men must run the state. The idol must have his attendants, and the attendants are jealous. They see sound principles of finance thrown overboard. They see men and women lose their willingness to work hard and save, and instead see people expect the state to care for them. William Law, the mystic, who wrote A Serious Call to a Devout and Holy Life, and who so influenced John Wesley and Alexander Whyte, was made the treasurer of a fund which he dispensed to the people of Kingscliffe, the English town in which he lived. What was the result? He raised up a flock of dependent loafers. So today men who once expected to support the state now expect the state to support them.

And they see more. They see leaders become careless with the truth. They see politicians involved with gamblers and gangsters. They do not like to see that influence in Washington. It is bad enough in Chicago. They know of the drinking in Washington and they remember the drunkenness of tragic Yalta. They remember a man named Harding and his administration and his trip west. The Republican Party has not even yet recovered from that. They remember that power corrupts, and they see it at work. It adds up to this: that Government, which is to be a servant, has become a master, and men are afraid as they were afraid in Germany in 1936.

To be more specific, some of you may rember that I acted as a chaplain at the convention that nominated Mr. Truman Vice President. He was a humble man that day, with a terrible burden about to come upon him. I stood by his side and prayed for him and for the Nation, and I liked him. I have prayed from this pulpit for him ever since. As the man who prayed for him years ago, I counsel the President to quit playing with truth. The earnest people of America have too great a respect for the office of President, and they are getting weary of being kidded. President Truman would be welcome in any American city or town, either on a political trip or a nonpolitical trip, but why call this last journey and this Chicago week end anything other than what it is. The conscience of the Christian people of this Nation is being offended these days in a dozen other more serious ways. When the state becomes a god, morals seem to go. John Buchan—Lord Tweedsmuir—the late Governor General of Canada, wrote: "My fear was not barbarism, which is civilization submerged or not yet born, but decivilization, which is civilization gone rotten." Just so.

Let us see once more that God alone is God. Let the nations know themselves to be but men. Let us remember that "righteousness exalteth a nation; but sin is a reproach to any people." "For Thine is the Kingdom and the power and the glory forever. Amen."

Record of John S. Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech which was broadcast by Mr. Henry J. Taylor on the record of John S. Service. This speech is in connection with the investigation now being conducted by the Senate Subcommittee on Foreign Relations on subversive activities in our Government today and the Amerasia case, which is one of dark, black spots in the history of the United States. In this connection Mr. Taylor's broadcast is particularly interesting.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RECORD ON JOHN S. SERVICE

The same forces for protection which closed in around the then unknown Alger

Hiss are now closing in around John S. Service. All of which makes me leery. For I love this country as you do. But it is being eaten out from within.

STATE DEPARTMENT OFFICIALS BLEED

Just as Secretary of State Acheson promptly bled for Alger Hiss, so the Deputy Under Secretary of State now promptly takes it upon himself to announce—and I quote—that the sympathy and good wishes of the entire State Department go out to John Stewart Service.

Why all his big stir of defense, this bleeding, because John Stewart Service is to be questioned? Who is he?

Let me give you some first-hand facts I obtained from a man Service worked for—the United States wartime Ambassador to China, Patrick J. Hurley. I verified and confirmed these facts over the week end, with Mr. Hurley himself.

I first met Alger Hiss at the Dumbarton Oaks international conferences some months before I ever heard of John S. Service. This was in 1944.

CHUNGKING DOUBLE-CROSS

When I did encounter this man Service I was in China. There, toward the end of the war, I was with Ambassador Hurley at Chungking.

Hurley told me then that State Department officials in his own American Embassy staff—and he named them—were, in his opinion, double-crossing him with Stalin's stooges, the Chinese Communists. He said they were trying to put American policy into the Communist camp.

I can see him now, pacing the floor of his Chungking house, a worried and frustrated patriot. Behind the closed door he named these men to me, one by one.

Among others, he named John S. Service. Now remember, this was in 1945. That was nearly five long and fateful years ago—fateful for the security of your land and mine, our homes, our future, our very lives.

ELEVEN COME HOME

Shortly after I left him, Hurley ordered back to Washington from China 11 Embassy officials who, in his opinion, were so cosy with the Communists that he pulled them out. John S. Service was included in this group.

This is what Hurley said about them, publicly, in the New York World-Telegram, on November 28, 1945: "Most of them have continued to side with the Communist-armed party and, at times, with the Communist imperialist bloc, against American policy."

But Mr. Hurley, as you recall, was smeared at once by all the political forces of protection. He was given a cold shoulder by highest State Department authorities, including Mr. Dean Acheson. Then came the famous saying, "It's all a red herring."

Yet you see how truthfully and courageously Ambassador Hurley spoke—albeit how thanklessly. For today's whole outcome was foreseen and foretold by Hurley and others five long years ago. But nothing was done to save us.

THE ROYAL WELCOME

As for the men Hurley threw out, what happened to them when they got back to the State Department in Washington? Let's be exact about this.

John D. Davies, 1 of the 11, was appointed to the top planning board of the State Department, which is the "brain trust" for American foreign policy. Davies was given the job of calling the American signals about China—and at the top-policy level. He was then sent to our Embassy in Russia along with Horace H. Smith, whom Hurley also threw out.

Arthur Ringwalt, also sent back by Hurley on suspicion of procommunism, was made Acting Chief of the China Division in Washington.

Who were appointed assistant chiefs? Two more of the very same 11 men Hurley threw out in the same bunch, Edward E. Rice and Fulton Freeman.

You have seen what has happened to us in China since then—as well as in Moscow and throughout the world. Yet we talk now about "total diplomacy" in the hands of the same leaders.

Stalin must be laughing at us. "Total diplomacy"? Whose diplomacy is it we have—his or ours?

Now we come to John S. Service. Here are the facts. Please listen carefully, if you fear America's position in a next war.

First, Ambassador Hurley told me that John Service had already been relieved of his duties once in China, and sent home, by supreme commander Lt. Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer, another fine American. Nevertheless, State Department officials in Washington sent John Service back to China, through another channel, to the Communist area of Yunnan—bypassing Wedemeyer, and without the knowledge or consent of Ambassador Hurley.

THE WHITE HOUSE INTERVENES

Ambassador Hurley told me that, when he discovered this, he went to the White House and protested to President Roosevelt. Remember, all this is news. He produced letters John Service and others had written, reflecting their views. May I say that the Senate and the American people should read those letters and reports now, while the bleeding is on.

President Roosevelt authorized Hurley to send such characters home. So Service was sent home for a second time.

When Service reached America, he was arrested by the FBI. He wasn't just questioned by the FBI. He was arrested by the FBI, as Mr. J. Edgar Hoover would verify to you. For J. Edgar Hoover is not afraid of anybody. That's what makes him a great American.

THE WHITEWASH TREATMENT

Service was brought before a grand jury, but he was let off—although the claim is made that his FBI record was never fully presented to the grand jury by Government attorneys. A State Department whitewash quickly followed.

Then what happened?

Was Service detached from policy decisions? Well, hardly. After all this, Service was assigned to Japan to tell General MacArthur, of all people, how to negotiate with Russia. General MacArthur reportedly rejected Service.

But Service showed up in Japan anyway, on some kind of authority from the State Department. Then, after Mr. Acheson became Secretary of State, Service was actually boosted even higher.

Today we have John S. Service on the way to high official duties in India, a critical place in our problem of communism.

WHO IS HOLDING THE UMBRELLA

The question arises: What mysterious power has protected his record? After five long years since the charges of 1945, and after 13 months of latest so-called study, the loyalty review board of the Civil Service Commission now states that it does not feel it can give John S. Service "loyalty clearance."

He is asked to come home for the purpose of giving personal answers—no more than that at this stage. But why have the FBI record on John S. Service, and the China and Moscow background, and his FBI arrest been treated by protectors as if they didn't exist?

Certainly something has gone frightfully, tragically, terribly wrong with our security measures, even if our own officials will not admit it. For it has already been shown in court that we do have traitors working in our Government.

Blindness to the Communist strategy has already cost us Asia. It can cost us the world. It can cost us the United States. It can be a question of life and death to our Nation in the event of a surprise war—unless we wake up and insist that America's safety is more important than anybody's refusal to let the chips fall where they may—and there is no time to lose.

Salvage: New Hope for the Insane

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I have before me an article entitled "Salvage: New Hope for the Insane," by Harry Henderson, appearing in the May 20 issue of Collier's magazine. I have submitted this article to the Public Printer, and I am informed that the cost of printing it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will be $184.50, inasmuch as it is estimated that the article will require 2¼ pages. Despite that, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SALVAGE: NEW HOPE FOR THE INSANE

(By Harry Henderson)

She is a pretty, clean-cut girl who laughs easily, loves tweed skirts, works hard and likes a boy who works for the gas company in her suburban New York home town. Yet only a few months ago, classified as a schizophrenic, she was alternately moping in the wardroom of a mental hospital or screaming invitations to her funeral. And her experience, a horror tale until recently, points to significant and hopeful psychiatric advances: the development of physiological treatments for severe mental disorders.

Her recovery, for instance, was brought about the use of histamine, which until now has been considered of little therapeutic value. The development of histamine therapy and other recent experiments have stirred the hope that insanity can be prevented, perhaps cured by drugs and chemicals.

What makes her story particularly significant is that she suffered from schizophrenia, the most dreaded and most baffling of all mental illness. Schizophrenia's victims, who occupy more than one half of the beds in our mental institutions, in most cases progressively become worse, living more and more in the unreal fantasies of their disturbed minds and less and less in the real world. This process of psychotic deterioration is one which medical science has been virtually unable to arrest. Aside from surgery, only two forms of therapy—electric convulsive shock and insulin subcoma shock—are widely used in checking this disturbance of the brain function. They have, however, proved effective only part of the time. Moreover, many cases are unsuited for shock treatment so other measures must be sought.

Therefore a world-wide effort is being made to discover the physical causes of mental disease and to find new, helpful drugs. One of the greatest fields of study centers

about the relationship of the endocrine glands, such as adrenal, thyroid, gonadal, to mental illness. Surprisingly, it was Freud the pioneer detector of the psychic causes of mental disturbances, who indicated that work in the endocrine glands would reveal the physical causes of some forms of mental disease. In the summer of 1927, Freud told Dr. Johan H. W. van Ophuijsen, the well-known psychoanalyst, "I am sure that within the near future all those disorders which we treat with psychoanalysis will be cured by endocrine treatment."

While various groups of doctors have been trying to unravel the relationship of each of the numerous endocrine glands to mental disease, some of the most recent and extensive research efforts point to histamine as a promising worker in the psychoses. Histamine is not a drug but an easily synthesized body substance derived from the amino acid, histidine. It is found in every tissue in the body, with concentrations in the lungs and white blood cells, and is one of the protein-building blocks of the body.

Sporadic efforts to use histamine have been going on for years. The first attempts failed. But in 1938, Dr. Wallace Marshall and Dr. J. S. Tarwater, working at the University of Alabama Medical College in Tuscaloosa, found histamine injections improved the 35 psychotic patients on whom they tried it. That same year, in England, Dr. Horace Hill, medical superintendent of a British mental home, reported that combined histamine and insulin injections improved over half the schizophrenics he treated. In 1940, Drs. Robert W. Robb, Benjamin Kovitz, and David Rapport injected a group of long-hospitalized schizophrenics with histamine and noted slight improvements. Last year Dr. E. O. Niver, of Eau Claire, Wis., found histamine helpful in relaxing patients.

A group of doctors working at the Creedmoor State Hospital at Queens Village, N. Y., recently announced the results of the longest, most extensive experiments with histamine ever made. In 5 years they developed a histamine treatment which doubled the number of patients who could be released. It particularly benefited schizophrenics, and in treating neurotics with histamine, they found that in states of acute anxiety and tension, it gave immediate relief.

In the journal of Clinical Psychopathology they advanced the controversial theory that some forms of insanity are physical diseases resulting from the unbalanced output of the tiny endocrine glands. In their medical language it is caused by a "disruption of the cerebral metabolism due possibly to a disturbed pituitary-adrenal-gonadal relationship."

HISTAMINE FOR SCHIZOPHRENIC CASES

They use histamine and other agents, such as the sex hormones, to achieve a balance in the relationship of the output of the endocrine glands. In another series of papers in the Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease they described how they had used histamine to arrest the relentless psychotic processes which cause the brain of the schizophrenic to deteriorate.

These doctors—three of whom are brothers—are Drs. Arthur, Mortimer, and Raymond Sackler, and the psychiatrist, Dr. van Ophuijsen. Working with them were Dr. Co Tui, renowned for his work on peptic ulcers, and Dr. Harry A. LaBurt, senior director of the Creedmoor Hospital.

However controversial the Sackler-Van Ophuijsen theory of insanity, there is little question that they have opened up a broad avenue leading toward more successful rehabilitation of the mentally disturbed. In addition to many neurotics, more than 300 schizophrenics have undergone their histamine therapy. Not all improved, but the percentage who did reveals that histamine is a valuable addition to what psychiatrists call their "armentarium"—their arsenal of weapons against mental disease.

Histamine is no cure-all. It works best on certain schizophrenic types. It does not help psychotics suffering from cerebral arteriorclerosis. It helps some manic depressives and involutional psychotics. When patients who did not respond to histamine alone had electric-shock treatments added to their therapy, many who had not been helped by histamine did respond; some did not. One great advantage in histamine therapy is that while patients come out of electric-shock convulsions in a state of great confusion and suffer temporary memory defects, those responding to histamine do not.

Among those who have encouraged the Sackler-Van Ophuijsen work is Dr. Frederick MacCurdy, former commissioner of the New York State Department of Mental Hygiene. To carry on their work the Sackler-Van Ophuijsen group has been assigned a large building, to be called the Creedmoor Institute for Psychobiologic Studies, on the Creedmoor State Hospital grounds, where the medical men will specialize in clinical research in histamine, steroid, and insulin therapy.

The most successful use of histamine has been in the treatment of schizophrenics who have so long been regarded as virtually incurable. Typical of those who have been helped by histamine is the 23-year-old woman described in the opening paragraph, a catatonic schizophrenic. Here is her story, based on actual case records, interviews, recordings of fantasies and hallucinations and medical research.

We shall call her Marion Enders; besides her name other identifying details have been fictionized. Doctors warn that everyone, to some extent, has at some time suffered some of the symptoms of the schizophrenic and that you should not, upon reading such material as follows, either identify yourself with the patient or attempt to diagnose any personality difficulties of your friends or children.

Marion Enders was born to a well-known couple residing in a well-to-do New York suburb. They already had two boys and were especially delighted over the birth of a daughter. Both parents had college educations and her father had inherited a small but solidly established business. She developed rapidly as a baby, talking and walking at an earlier age than other children in the neighborhood. "She's a perfect baby," her mother was fond of saying.

A CHILD UNMOVED BY DEATH

When Marion was 4 years old, her paternal grandmother, to whom she was especially attached, died. Her mother, comforting her husband during his grief, noticed that Marion was not upset by the death. When it came time for her to go to school, she took the necessary separation from her home and mother quite easily and her mother was proud of the fact that she did not cry when left in the strange schoolroom, as other children did. She made a few friends in the class almost immediately and seemed to enjoy school. She was sensitive, especially if her father or brothers yelled at her, but not easily upset. Her worst trait was stubbornness, which her mother often said showed she was just like her father.

Occasionally she had a temper tantrum or a fit of stubbornness, but on the whole she was a quiet, extremely well-behaved child. When she was 11, her mother noticed that, unlike her boisterous brothers who were active members of groups outside the home, Marion spent most of her time alone. She had no particular girl friends or confidante.

The following year, when other girls in her class began flirting with boys and dressing to attract their attention, Marion did not. Instead of primping, she grew sloppy. In school a teacher complained that Marion did not pay attention to the work. She daydreamed and dawdled over her meals, seldom brushed her hair, and was likely to come out with odd and startling bits of information at the dinner table, items she had picked up during her incessant reading. She frequently overslept and was late for school.

One of her teachers, noticing that Marion did not mix with other pupils, never joining in group play, called Marion's mother and suggested she seek psychiatric help.

CRACKPOT TEACHERS BLAMED

Alarmed and needlessly feeling guilty, her mother took up the problem with her husband that night. He pooh-poohed the warning, vehemently denouncing those crackpot teachers. He said, "All she is suffering from is plain ole growin' pains." But he was disturbed when he discovered Marion talking to herself and noticed that she sometimes had difficulty in recognizing him. He said nothing to her mother, though, about his secret worries. Thus passed what doctors later said was an ideal time for psychiatric diagnosis and treatment. When Marion was 15, her menses finally began. In the following months she seemed to undergo distinct change for the better. Her school marks improved and she regained her position on the honor roll. Neat and clean, she spent hours brushing her hair before a mirror. But she continued her aloof detachment from group activities and took no interest in boys; her brother took her to her junior and senior proms. Under her picture in her high-school year book, the inscription read: "The girl we'd like to get to know."

After high school she took a brief course at a secretarial school, refusing—out of stubborness, her family said—to go to college. At the secretarial school she won top honors and immediately after graduation she got a job as a secretary in a branch plant of a nationally known company. Pretty, well dressed, efficient, she was advanced rapidly by hard-working executives who found that she was discreet, could be given major responsibilities and handle ticklish problems with tact. She did not mix with the other girls, and won the reputation for being mature beyond her years.

During her early days at the office her family found her bright and cheerful. But once she had reached the top, she became noticeably more irritable. Her brothers were away at college and because she often worked late, she had little to do with her parents. Almost her only pleasure was going to the movies alone. One young man phoned her occasionally. When her mother commented on this, Marion snapped that he meant nothing to her. The next time he called she refused to see him.

She was often critical of her father because he sometimes prowled about the house in his underwear. "You look so disgusting," she said. She also criticized his habit of taking his shoes off downstairs. On one occasion she complained that he had been smoking his pipe in her room. He had not, but nothing would convince her of that. She spent more and more of her time alone, and when her father once jokingly said something about her getting married she flew from the table and afterward always insisted on eating alone. To her mother she complained that the girls in the office talked about her and were jealous of her job as secretary to the boss.

At about this time, Marion's irritability began to carry over into her working hours. She would snap at the other girls when they questioned her about the office work. When one of the girls got married, she churlishly refused an invitation to her shower. She began to show up late for work. She complained to her boss that the other girls were spreading wild stories about her.

Gradually she displayed less interest in being neat. She dawdled at her work and

would make errors. In typing a letter one day she wrote, "I do wish—" leaving out a most important "not." Her boss caught the mistake and reprimanded her. She snapped back angrily, denying the error, shouting he didn't know what he was talking about, and then burst into tears. Afterward he noticed that she often sat daydreaming at her typewriter and that she seemed sad.

Sometimes she would enter his office and sit down, saying he had rung for her. When he said he hadn't, she seemed bewildered. One week end her boss was to go on an important trip, for which she was to prepare a number of briefs. She completely forgot them and he was forced to go without them. A week later she did not show up for work.

Meanwhile at home she had developed insomnia, often going the entire night without sleep. During one of these sieges of insomnia she took up the making of colored pictures, using a lipstick at first and then an old childhood paintbox. She left her room in a mess and often went unwashed. Her paintings, which absorbed more and more of her attention, were bizarre night scenes, heavy with blacks and purples, picturing tombstones and skeletons and other symbols of death.

One morning she went downstairs all dressed up and told her mother, "I'm ready to go to Aunt Mabel's."

Her mother said, "But Marion, Aunt Mabel has been dead for 6 years."

A SUDDEN OUTBURST OF ANGER

"You just told me to get ready to go to Aunt Mabel's," she cried in a rage. When her mother denied it, Marion hurled her purse at her, ran upstairs, and locked herself in her room. She refused to come out despite her mother's entreaties. That evening, when her father returned, they persuaded Marion to open her door. When they entered the messy room, Marion threw herself on the bed, complaining of pains in the abdomen. They called the family physician. He was busy with another case and could not see the girl immediately. Because of the parents' fear that Marion had appendicitis, he suggested that they take her to a general hospital.

At the hospital she became hysterical in the examination room, began to scream and to fight with the doctors and nurses. One of the doctors, after taking her blood count and observing her lack of fever or any other appendicitis symptoms, questioned the mother about Marion's general behavior. He recommended that she be removed to a psychiatric hospital, gave her a stiff sedative, and had her placed in restraint in case she awoke and started fighting again.

Her parents were stunned. They could not accept the doctor's recommendation. They believed she was "just upset." But after their family doctor had concurred with the hospital doctor, they agreed to her transfer to a psychiatric hospital. When they visited her there she made mistakes in recognition, talked in a low monotone, seemed dazed, and would break off sentences in the middle. Usually the sentences made no sense.

When her parents next visited her, she attacked them physically, badly clawing her mother. Left alone, she was quiet, unseeing. In the wardroom she would stand by herself and if anyone approached her, she would move off into the corner, sometimes crouching. She would hold her arms rigidly in an unnatural position for hours.

ABSURD ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Though unresponsive much of the time, she would sometimes answer questions with absurdities. Once asked her name by the doctor, she said, "See, he's looking into my eyes, he is falling in love with me." Then she sighed sadly. "I am dead. My ears are clogged up. I have no blood. My face is gone, my legs are dead. I have no blood."

Occasionally she would respond to her name, but she was usually uncooperative and sometimes resisted the nurses. "I have no name," she once said. "Call me mice, cat, dog. I have no husband. I'm all alone in this world. Ladies and gentlemen, you are all invited to my funeral. I am dying because my blood is poison and everyone is crying over me, looking at the mess and the way it is made."

But mainly, her responses to questions were incoherent mumbles.

When the doctors first recommended electric convulsive therapy, the father said "No." After the assault episode, however, he agreed to it. During the next 3 weeks she received a course of electric shock treatments and showed signs of improvement. She was able to visit quietly with her family and was more cooperative. She took some interest in her personal hygiene. But she refused to take any occupational therapy, had difficulty in remembering anything about coming to the hospital, and begged constantly for permission to go home.

When her family visited her, she would endlessly entreat them to take her home. They were overjoyed by the progress she had made.

After a while she was allowed to go home. She lived quietly and occupied herself with small tasks about the house. The family was very happy to have her home and when she broke off sentences or looked around bewildered, they waited patiently for her to resume. However, after 3 months, she became markedly more confused and absentminded. Her insomnia returned. One night her mother, hearing her moving about, got up and went to her room. She found Marion sitting on her bed with a strange, dreamy look on her face. When her mother asked how she felt, she smiled beatifically and said, "Last night I married God."

Her parents returned her to the hospital the next day. During the trip she frequently grimaced grotesquely and addressed her father and mother by strange names. As they approached the hospital she became mute. When the doctors saw her she was in a kind of stupor. Then, during her examination, she became so violent that she had to be placed in restraint. Her father, still worried about electric shock treatments, asked if there were any other form of therapy which would help her. Told of histamine injections but warned that they were purely experimental, he asked that they be tried on Marion.

The next day Marion had a glazed, unseeking look in her eyes. She did not respond to questioning. Nor was there any response during her first histamine injection.

A histamine injection causes swift dilation of the vessels of the brain and skin of the upper body. All the patient feels is a metallic taste in the mouth and a flushing of the face and neck, followed occasionally by a mild headache or nasal congestion. It also greatly increases the amount of hydrochloric acid in the stomach. Before the injection the patients are checked for allergies, ulcers, and hardening of the arteries. The only physical observations made during the injections are those of pulse, blood pressure, and breathing.

A small initial dosage of histamine is gradually increased until the top amount that can be tolerated is found. The Sacklers and Van Ophuijsen have found that psychotics can take large amounts of histamine while psychoneurotics can take very little of it. The patient is given two injections a day, the second following the disappearance of symptoms created by the first shot. For 3 days, during each of which she received two histamine injections, Marion remained mute, moving her arms in an unnatural fashion. On the third day her face lost its stupefied look and showed anger. A second later she laughed. Asked why, she said, "I don't know. The peppermint cup. I don't know. I don't like anything."

The following day, during the injections, she said, "To hell with him. Keep away from me." She started singing, "And not for just an hour, not for just a month," and then said, "I'll kill these, you, too. Revenge will be sweet. Whoever comes, I chose death. You'll never get a word out of me, and if you do, you'll wish you didn't. Whisky, poisons why. She's a rat. I hope she dies on the ocean. I drowned in the ocean. I am ready for the casket. She stinks on ice, oatmeal, potatoes. I have chosen death. That will make an end of it. On account of one or two dollars. Black hair, black eyes, and tweezers, coffee with milk, oatmeal, potatoes, hamburgers, and snakes. Death is nearer than you think. I don't believe in anything, I don't believe in oatmeal. Get out of my life. I'll kill you the first chance I get. Teeth or tongue, an eye for an eye and a toothless time. Don't look at me in that tone. Comb, shoes, one sheet, one mattress, and never will you say simple puss to me. Rather death. That's what I invented and a harmonica to kill you in your face and cake. I was only a mouth, teeth, and tongue."

This response, typical of the schizophrenic in that little of it made sense, was nonetheless a step ahead. The following day her appetite increased. She also looked more alert and called out suddenly, "Please, Doctor, may I have a glass of water?" Then a silly expression returned, but disappeared when she was asked who she was. "Marion," she replied. Asked where she was, she said, "Hospital." She knew the month and year. Asked why she was in the hospital, she said, "Because I came here."

SHE HEARD THE VOICE OF GOD

For 3 days after that she was mute and uncooperative, never responding, but following injections of histamine on the tenth day, she appeared restless, somewhat cooperative. She answered questions but was easily distracted by outside noises. Asked if she heard voices, she said, "Yes, I did—a long time ago."

Whose voice? "God's voice—I was Mary and Joseph."

Man's voice or woman's? "A baby's voice."

What did it say? "I don't know. It kind of stared."

See a vision? "Yes—in the sky." She then broke into a silly laugh.

Why laugh? "Because I kiss you, I don't know."

Any vision today? "No."

When did you see a vision? "A long time ago."

Can you save the world? "I thought so."

Do you think so now? "Yes," in a very faint voice.

After that session she was more responsive and more cooperative, her contact with reality steadily improving. She no longer had to be spoon-fed, but took care of herself and helped around the ward. She begged for a key so she could come and go as she pleased. She wanted to be trusted.

During the next injection period she described the physical effects of the histamine. "My heart is beating faster. I feel like I'm blushing, very warm and funny." She smiled absently, saying, "It seems very strange," and then covered her eyes. Asked why she covered her eyes, she replied, "I'm not sure. I don't know why. It's not funny. I wonder what I'll be like tomorrow."

The following day she reported. "My pulse seems to be going faster than yesterday. Warm from the waist up." After a while she complained of a slight headache and the flush became intensified, but she said, "I feel as if I have more control over what I will say and do. I don't think I shall cover my eyes any more." Asked if she

wanted to cover her eyes, she said, "Now?—no." A few minutes later she bantered with the doctor. "It's so ridiculous," she said. "Look," and she mocked her old habit of covering her eyes. "It's ridiculous. People's souls become so scientific."

AWARE OF HER RETURNING EGO

During the next injection period she said she felt warmer than ever. Asked what she was thinking of, she said, "I think my ego is returning. I thought it had withered away. I thought it had gone forever. Sometimes I thought I might turn into a babbling child the next minute." When she smiled, she was asked why. "I was thinking of a mountain I once went to. We had a picnic on it and you could see the entire valley for miles." She also reported an improvement in her ability to concentrate. "I can take care of things better, and generally I feel less depressed and more at ease. Things don't look as bleak."

In the days that followed she improved steadily. One day she volunteered what she meant by being depressed—being completely withdrawn and not caring, not doing anything, feeling dead. "There is something," she said, "more secure about being depressed than about not being depressed. I am afraid of not being depressed."

Shortly after this, she was allowed to go home but the histamine injections were continued on an out-patient basis. She now took care of her room at home and was more friendly with the family. She got a part-time job and began going to evening art classes. At times she would report sudden seizures of anxiety. "Things are sometimes very frightening in every way," she said. "I can't be specific. But it always happens when there are people around. I become very restless. I had to leave art class last night. I couldn't concentrate." But her "depression" continued to diminish and her family noticed that she now spoke more directly and expressed herself more forcibly.

She reported last month that she can concentrate much better, is looking for a full-time job. She has become quite friendly with a group of fellow art students, sometimes eats supper with them before class.

DANCING—AND A YOUNG MAN

Her family reports she is much easier to live with. She went with some members of her art class to a folk-dancing center one night and learned to square-dance. She now goes dancing once a week and at the dance one night she met a young man from the gas company who took a special interest in her. Though she still has a tendency to look away from strangers upon meeting them, she thinks she can overcome that. She says she is learning to laugh at herself and get into the spirit of things. She now invites her parents to her room and on her father's birthday she bought him a pipe.

She continues to receive an occasional series of histamine injections. Although she now seems to be making a very good adjustment to the real world, this does not mean histamine has completely cured Marion of her schizophrenia. She can, however, look forward to leading a happier and more nearly normal life. She will need histamine in much the same way that the diabetic needs insulin. Had her symptoms been recognized earlier, her stay in the hospital would have been shorter and her recovery more nearly complete. The treatment will help prevent further psychotic scarring of brain tissue, but it cannot undo damage already done.

The recovery of Marion through histamine therapy holds new hope for thousands of victims of mental disorders and their families. Histamine promises to become one of our most valuable weapons in checking mental disease. Because it is cheap and easily administered it can cut our vast outlay for mental institutions, many of whose patients could be treated on an out-patient basis.

Apart from the help it can give longsuffering patients, its great importance to psychiatry lies in the discovery that histamine is one of the keys to the long-locked secret, physical causes of mental disease. But its miracles, as in Marion's case, depend on early diagnosis and treatment.

The Peril in the Ruhr

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 1950

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article by Dr. Jean Pajus. Dr. Pajus, a graduate of the University of Dijon, formerly taught international economic and political relations at the University of California, at Berkeley, and during the war he was adviser on economic warfare to the Foreign Economic Administration in Washington. Later he served as adviser in Germany to the United States Treasury Mission and the Division of Investigation of Cartels and External Assets of the United States Military Government. He is now an economic consultant in New York City.

The article follows:

[From the New Republic of May 29, 1950]

THE PERIL IN THE RUHR

(By Jean Pajus)

The dramatic proposal of French Foreign Minister Robert Schuman to pool the coal and steel interests of France and Germany, in the interests of peace and recovery, is in fact a move to establish a Franco-German combine which, in the long run, will mostly benefit Germany. Under the Schuman plan the German, French, and Rhine-basin coal and steel interests would fix markets, production, prices, abolish customs duties, and equalize wages and social-security benefits.

In defense of the plan it can be said that if it banished France's fear of German aggression it would be a contribution to the peace of western Europe. It would enable the French to obtain coal on equal terms with the Germans. And it would equalize the social-security benefits of French and German workers.

In practice, the Schuman plan would mean the revival of the prewar international-cartel system under government aegis.

The French plan is not an answer to security from German aggression. It is not the kind of economic integration repeatedly demanded of ECA Administrator Paul Hoffman and the United States. It would not mean the internationalization of the Rhine. The real victors in Europe, if the French plan is adopted, will be the steel and coal barons of the Ruhr. The political gain of Germany's change in status would be more than offset by the elimination of all present safeguards against the rebuilding of the Ruhr potential, which the plan would put under the control of those interests which stood behind the Kaiser and Hitler.

Although Schuman's plan came as a surprise, negotiations looking toward it have been going on for more than a year. Early in November 1949 Chancellor Adenauer, the widely heralded champion of free enterprise, sent a message to his neighbors urging them to establish an international steel cartel embracing the Ruhr, France, Luxemburg, and the Saar.

These negotiations recall grimly the era just after World War I. France's dead were scarcely buried when Louis Leucheur, the late French Minister of Reconstruction, began bargaining with the Germans to form an international cartel. The reasons that prompted the French to shake hands with the former enemy were given by a prominent French senator and industrialist, Gaston Japy, who said frankly that an effort must be made to solve the metallurgical crisis by making "an association with our enemies, authors of many murders and so much ruin in our country." Then, as now, the Germans were quite willing; they had already laid plans to circumvent the Treaty of Versailles. These Germans consisted of a small group of industrialists deriving their power from the ownership of coal mines, steel works, and chemical plants in the Ruhr. Their purpose was to avoid the economic consequences of defeat and to regain their industrial power in preparation for a second bid for world domination.

The current French-German negotiations would seem to indicate that nothing has changed since those days. Note the coincidence; the Frenchman Japy proposed a French-German cartel agreement in 1923—4 years after World War I; Chancellor Adenauer made a similar proposal 4 years after World War II. Twenty-seven years ago Europe faced a crisis in the metallurgical industry and needed "consolidation." A few years after World War II Europe is faced with the problem of "economic integration."

After World War I the French complained bitterly that the Germans were in a position, despite the tremendous losses sustained under the Treaty of Versailles, to control the French iron and steel industries by withholding coal. Another complaint was that the Germans were in a position to manipulate the price of French pig iron. However, despite these complaints, there was an interdependence between Lorraine and the Ruhr, involving the dominant groups on both sides of the Rhine. Both sides saw eye to eye on labor policy and social legislation, and participated in each other's national armament programs. The industrialists of both countries were members of the same cartels and directors of jointly owned enterprises.

The basic conditions have not changed in the past 30 years. Neither have the leaders of the heavy industries in France, Belgium, Luxemburg, and the Saar, despite the tremendous damage their countries have suffered. If the present plans materialize, the world will witness the spectacle of the former members of the international cartel joining hands again. The Schwedes and the Maulicks on the one hand, the Schneider-Creusot on the other, will try to integrate Europe economically.

The German efforts to seek out their former cartel friends began soon after VE-day. In May 1945, the ashes in Düsseldorf were still smoldering, and German industrialists, bewildered, did not know whether they had any friends left. They soon found out. Walter Rohland, a trusted Nazi industrialist who had been appointed in 1943 to head the Vereinigte Stahlwerke, told the story in a letter to a friend in which he described a visit of the United States Strategic Bombing Survey immediately after the liberation of Düsseldorf:

"The United States Strategic Bombing Survey, after 10 days, left feeling very satisfied, and also with the Englishmen Hannan and Temple, everything developed perfectly. In both cases mutual friends in the United States and England respectively formed a good bridge."

Strengthened by this foreign solicitude, the German industrialists began their campaign to renew their former cartel connections.

Walter Schwede, the German representative of the Luxemburg International Steel Cartel, tells of it in a letter dated June 9, 1945, addressed to his former boss, Ernst Poensgen, the father of the International Steel Cartel:

"I learned from Rohland, who as you know visited you in Kitzbühl, that you had intended to come to Düsseldorf in order to use the weight of the authoritative position you hold with the international cartels and especially with the English group."

That was the turning point for the German industrialists. Poensgen, of course, came back to power (he died last year). The rest of his friends also came back—Wilhelm Zangen, to head the Mannesmann Trust; Rohland, who has been right-hand man for Albert Speer, Hitler's minister in charge of armaments and production, to the Vereinigte Stahlwerke; Günter Sohl, also of Vereinigte Stahlwerke, and Schwede.

Hugo Stinnes won his fight with the British and has been active behind the scenes. Hermann Reusch has emerged with enhanced prestige from his battles with the labor unions. Gunther Henle, of Klockner, is a power in the board of trustees and, with Robert von Pferdmenges, has been defending the interests of the cartels in the German Ministry of Economics.

A few must be singled out. In October, 1946, Heinrich Dinkelbach, the financial brains of the biggest German steel combine, was appointed supermanager of the Rhine industry by the British authorities. He was a heavy contributor to the Nazi Party.

Today, Dinkelbach is the head of the 12 German trustees appointed under law 75 (November 10, 1948) to control the Ruhr industries. Ostensibly this prohibits excessive concentration of economic power. Under it the Ruhr industry is managed by corporations, supervised by German trustees who exercise, with few exceptions, the normal duties of ownership pending a final settlement of the ownership question. Yet a close analysis of this law shows that applying it literally will result in a great concentration of industrial power in the Ruhr in the hands of a single powerful group, the very same forces which backed Hitler in his adventures. Indeed these trustees can create an even greater concentration of industrial power than existed under Hitler.

(A new regulation was made public by the Allied High Commission, May 17, superseding law 75. While paying lip service to the principle of decartelization, it left the question of the ultimate ownership of Ruhr industries to the West German Government.)

German labor has expressed apprehension about the efforts by influential sources to prevent the liquidation of the Ruhr cartels.

Following the promulgation of law 75, a combined steel control board was appointed to supervise the activities of Dinkelbach and his group. The Allied members of this control board—Ronald Clark, of the United States Steel Corp.; W. Harris Burland, of Britain; and Albert Bureau, of France—are supposed to control the Ruhr industry. Actually, however, they have done little or nothing.

A similar situation obtains in coal. On December 16, 1947, Heinrich Kost was appointed to the position of general manager of the German coal board. He had been a prominent member of the Nazi Party years before Hitler came to power in 1933. The vital significance of Kost's position is apparent. By virtue of his position, he can and does control western Europe's economy, since it depends on an adequate supply of coal. Modern west European blast furnaces need metallurgical coke, which only the Germans can supply.

Overshadowing Dinkelbach and Kost is the figure of Hermann Abs, whose official post is chairman of the Reconstruction Loan Corporation, the purpose of which is to rebuild the economy of Germany. Under the Nazi regime, Abs was the head of the foreign department of the Deutsche Bank, which played a key role in looting invaded European countries. He was on the board of directors of some of the most important industrial and financial organizations in Germany and in the Nazi-occupied countries; he held more than 40 directorships in major German corporations. The role played by Abs' bank in the German economy was described (p. 79) in the report on the Deutsche Bank issued by the office of military government.

The Deutsche Bank voted the largest blocks of shares of the giant companies of Germany, some of them the largest in the world. It voted 38 percent of the total stock voted in I. G. Farben, the largest chemical combine in the world; 19 percent in Vereinigte Stahlwerke, the largest iron and steel concern in Europe; 28 percent in AEG; well over 20 percent in Siemens Halske, the second largest electrical cartel in Germany, and sizable blocks in the Rhenish Westphalian Electrical Works, one of the largest public-utility trusts.

Abs played an important role behind the scenes during the meeting of the foreign ministers in Paris in November 1949.

This conference was called by Bevin to discuss the German problem, particularly the German demands that dismantling of surplus plants be stopped. Adenauer won. Emboldened by his success, he made a special plea on behalf of Germany's biggest steel combine, 19 percent of which is controlled by Abs' bank. Recalling that the Vereinigte Stahlwerke was established with more than $100,000,000 of American money—incidentally never repaid—Adenauer demanded that the United States make a new loan of 225,000,000 marks, while Belgium, France, and Luxemburg lend 75,000,000 marks to this combine. The latter sum was to come indirectly from the United States, too. To carry out this plan, Abs came to the United States in November 1949. Thanks to the vigilance of Senator GUY M. GILLETTE (Democrat, Iowa), he failed in his efforts and left the United States on December 7, 1949.

Germany badly needs foreign-capital investments, recent attempts to raise capital for investment purposes having been unsuccessful. The only source is the funds made available through the Marshall plan. Abs can decide where the counterpart funds should go, and it is a safe guess that the big corporations will be the beneficiaries of our bounty. The latest figures provided by ECA show the following appropriations earmarked for 1950–51; Britain, approximately $900,000,000; Germany, approximately $724,000,000, and France, approximately $670,000,000.

Abs knows that all western Europe faces an economic depression and is caught in a political dilemma. The situation was summed up by France's former Prime Minister Paul Reynaud, on March 31, 1950: "Europe must unite for defense. * * * The Atlantic forces should include German troops. * * * Germany must be admitted to the Council of Europe. * * * The British must become part of the union because without them, Germany, with her economic strength, would dominate the union."

From the German point of view one of the most serious obstacles to the proposed economic union has been the International Ruhr Authority, promulgated by the three Allied powers on September 28, 1948, its avowed purpose being to control the German war potential. Abs and the German Ruhr magnates have always been opposed to it because, so long as it existed, the Germans were in no position to bargain effectively with their neighbors. They did everything possible to render it ineffective, and they have succeeded. On January 24, 1950, Thomas Dehler, Minister of Justice in the Bonn cabinet, gleefully pronounced it hollowed out and outstripped. The Authority, heralded as one of the most important events since VE day, has been perhaps the greatest hoax perpetrated upon the democratic world which sincerely believed that the German war potential must and could be controlled.

Thanks to the machinations of Abs and his friends, the Authority never functioned and never even concerned itself with developments in the Ruhr. It is a matter of record that it was never given adequate funds or personnel. The reason for this failure is not hard to find. Its main purpose was to reassure France against new German aggression. The French now seem to feel there is no longer any need to fear Germany, since the latter has been invited to become a member of the council of Europe. The British seem to agree with this thesis too. On March 21, the Daily Mail wrote:

"The Ruhr Authority, which was slated to become the Allied instrument of control of German industry, has become superfluous."

In this connection, Michael Hoffman, in his dispatch from Geneva to the New York Times (November 20, 1949), reported the following significant development: "The latest and most important moves has been made by German and French steel interests that have been having discussions with the knowledge—and some high French sources say the approval and even the sponsorship—of André François-Poncet, French High Commissioner in Germany."

The ground work for the establishment of the steel cartel had been prepared early last year by Abs' friend, Herman Reusch, of the Gütehoffnungshütte. On February 23, 1949, Joseph Alsop reported from Berlin that Reusch was warmly received in the highest French circles because he came to make a deal. The deal was to offer the French heavy industry—the Comité des Forges—a 30-percent stock interest in the Ruhr. "The Ruhr industry would then be established with no nonsense about socialization, and the new Franco-German joint ownership in the Ruhr would be accepted as a substitute for the internationalization the French talk so much about," Alsop wrote. Wilhelm Zangen, of the Mannesmann Tube Cartel, made a similar proposition to the French last summer. And in fact during the past year numerous meetings have been held by the representatives of the western European steel industries for the purpose of concluding a cartel agreement.

One of the main obstacles, it appears, has been the British attitude. The British Iron and Steel Federation has had ample experience with the prewar international steel cartel; it was invited to join as a charter member but declined because of the traditional British policy of free trade. Eight years later the federation became a member; but it was then too late to check Germany's domination of the European steel industry.

Can the British afford to make the same mistake again? The answer depends on whether Britain can continue to produce steel more cheaply than its competitors, and on whether the prospective members can agree on production quotas. Aspects of this problem were discussed in the Statistical Bulletin of the British Iron and Steel Federation, on the even of the British elections last February.

According to the Bulletin, Europe will consume 58,000,000 tons of steel in 1953. The members of the Organization for European Economic Cooperation are slated to produce sixty-eight to seventy million tons, or a surplus of ten to twelve million tons. Markets must be found for this surplus. The Bulletin points out, however, that the figures quoted were based on calculations made by ECA in Geneva before the devaluation of the pound. Since then, devaluation has given the British steel producers some comparative advantage over their competitors. Britain now produces at lower cost than any of the European countries, and Germany is a close second. How long will

Britain maintain this advantage? After discussing the postwar increase in steel production as compared to 1937, the Bulletin makes a significant recommendation: "In order to avoid a sudden contraction of demand it is necessary to coordinate the efforts to increase consumption. * * * To accomplish this purpose it is essential that investments and steel-production programs be coordinated."

Thus it is clear that the British steelmasters agree in principle that a cartel agreement is necessary; and there is no doubt about the French, Belgian, and German attitudes. The only question is how to reconcile the various conflicting interests.

Can Germany be brought into this economic agreement while the other members are protected from German domination? Judging from Germany's past practices, the future is full of risk.

The history of the first international steel cartel of 1926 justifies forebodings. The cartel agreement covered the production for both domestic and export markets and provided a system of deposits and fines to compel adherence. To cover administrative costs there was a basic charge of $1 for every ton of crude steel produced. If a country exceeded its quota, it paid a penalty of $4 per ton. If a country failed to reach its quota, it received compensation of $2 per ton.

Since Germany was anxious to establish the cartel, it deliberately asked for a smaller quota than it was entitled to, and this bait was eagerly seized by France, Belgium, and Luxemburg. One year later these countries discovered why Germany had asked for a small quota. During the first year of its existence, the Germans paid $10,381,000, or 95 percent of the total fines imposed upon the overproducing cartel members. They had seized the initiative, and they kept it until World War II.

Various meetings have been held in Paris, London, and Brussels. The stumbling block has been Dinkelbach's demand to raise the level of steel production to 16,000,000 tons.

Can the British agree to this? They are afraid to grant the Germans parity in steel production, and would like to prevent this as long as possible. This is why the Allied Commission told Adenauer on March 30 that the 11,100,000-ton ceiling would not be raised. The British did not think they could afford to pay the price at present. But considering the tremendous concessions the Germans have been able to extract during the past 12 months, there is little doubt that in the long run they will win out. Therefore, Schuman's proposal, which was greeted enthusiastically by the Ruhr industrialists, satisfies the German demands.

Even should the Germans fail to obtain an immediate revision of their level of industry, they can afford to wait; in the long run, their economic strength is in their favor, because the German industrial economy is by all odds the mightiest in Europe. Their steel capacity today—more than 20,000,000 tons—is higher than that of Britain. This capacity was not materially reduced through reparations, which in any case practically came to a halt last November. The huge industrial potential Germany built up before and during the war is still substantially intact and will be improved with Marshall-plan money. The dye industry is larger than that of the United States; the prewar nitrogen capacity is largely intact; the coal-tar industry is larger than it was in 1947. The synthetic-fiber industry is still there, not to mention the I. G. Farben combine. The machine-tool inventory is the second largest in the world.

The French are now evidently convinced that they can become strong enough to offset Germany's economic power in an integrated Europe. But consider what happened to the French after the formation of the first cartel. In 1936 Germany's production of crude steel was only 2.5 percent greater than that of France. In 1938 production by one German steel combine alone—Dinkelbach's Vereinigte Stahlwerke—was greater than the combined production of all the French steel mills.

So long as we live in two worlds instead of one, the economic and political integration of western Europe is essential. So, too, is Germany's admission to the council of Europe. But an integration based on recartelization cannot solve the economic problems of western Europe, nor can it provide the necessary safeguards against Germany's economic expansion.

The Schuman plan would fall short in both respects. It contains no answer to the ever-growing surplus of steel production in western Europe which in 1953, according to Economic Committee for Europe estimates, will amount to 12,000,00 tons more than can be consumed. Paradoxically, the Schuman proposal would help the Russians since the only available market for this surplus would lie behind the iron curtain. Contrary to French claims, the probable result, under the plan, would be the elimination of the safeguards against German aggression such as the International Ruhr Authority and the level of industry ceiling.

The Germans have already made arrogant demands to be given a free hand to sell their goods to the iron curtain countries. (As a matter of fact, they have been selling large quantities of steel to the eastern bloc for some time—contrary to the dictates of our cold-war policy.) No doubt the next step will be to demand the right to rearm, which will be bolstered by the arguments, that (1) rearmament is essential to the defense of western Europe; and (2) greater production will assist in solving the growing unemployment problem. Since it is extremely difficult to believe that Russia will remain indifferent to the rearmament of the Ruhr, the situation is extremely dangerous and may even make war inevitable.

The most important questions that arise are: Will the people of Europe benefit from this deal? What voice will labor have in the planning, distribution, and pricing of products? How can this scheme succeed without a thorough overhaul of all western European tariff barriers or without the abolition of currency controls? How can it work without a payments-union plan? Will the decartelization program in Germany be the victim?

What is really needed to bring about a true integration of western Europe is a true internationalization of the Rhine Basin. There is a solution, and the means to implement it are available: decartelize Germany as provided for under law 56 and ordinance 78 of our occupation statutes; revitalize the International Ruhr Authority, established December 28, 1948; change the Schuman idea—which is actually another Franco-German cartel—into a real attempt at international control of the Rhine Basin; give to the UN, and especially the ECE, which has had ample experience in international economics, the responsibility for guiding the project. Or else it will be, as the French themselves say, "Plus ça change, plus c'est la même chose."

The Island of Manhattan: A Bit of Earth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 1950

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, Peter H. Brandt, Esq., is an attorney in New York City, specializing in real-estate law. His reputation as a lawyer's lawyer in realty litigation is well known throughout the State. Recently while browsing through some old papers he came upon an interesting article written in 1890 by one Felix Oldboy, which he reprinted and sent to his friends. I was fortunate enough to receive a copy.

The treatise is most interesting, especially, as Mr. Brandt points out, since it translates the real-estate situation in 1890 to current conditions noting that the tentative assessed valuation of the Borough of Manhattan for the tax year 1949–50 of ordinary real estate was fixed at $7,228,635,125, which was the land purchased by Peter Minuit for $24; while the tentative assessed valuation for the same year for the entire city of New York was fixed at $15,942,389,350. I found this article most interesting, and commend it to the reading of my colleagues:

THE ISLAND OF MANHATTAN: A BIT OF EARTH

When Peter Minuit, Lord Director General of the Colony of New Netherlands, bought the island of Manhattan from its aboriginal owners for 60 guilders, or $24, he was satisfied that he had driven an excellent bargain. The place of sale was the rocky point of land since known as the Battery, and the time was a May morning in the year 1626, when the primeval forest, that then shut in the waters of the bay and the little clearing on which the settlers had erected a score of huts, was decked in its most beautiful garb. The brusque, energetic, gray-haired Dutch Governor cared less for the beauties of nature than for pelts and furs, and the eyes of the red men found nothing within their horizon half so attractive as the beads, buttons, and hatchets which they received in place of money in exchange for their lands. Guileless children of the forest as they seemed, however, these red representatives of the Manhattoes and Wickquaskeeks proved to be as wily as they were warlike. They reserved to themselves the right to hunt for game in the woods of the birch-bark country, the section of the island now known as Inwood; and it took two wars and a massacre which depopulated the Bowery farms and the little hamlet of Haarlem to persuade the Dutch magistrates to recognize their claims in equity and buy them off at a considerable advance on their original figures.

Governor Minuit, though a devout believer in the future of New Netherlands, made a better bargain than he ever dreamed, when he invested $24 in the purchase of the island of Manhattan for the Dutch West India Co. Sixty years later, in 1686, when Cornelis Steenwyck, burgomaster of New Amsterdam and mayor of New York, died, the house in which he had lived, a double stone mansion on the present southeast corner of Whitehall and Bridge Streets, was inventoried at £700, and the rest of his real estate in proportion. It would have surpassed the wildest imagination of those worthy men, if they could have looked forward to our times and have seen the assessed valuation of the real estate on this island of 11,000 Dutch morgens, of 22,000 English acres, set down officially for 1890 at $1,353,893,473, and the first ward, which comprises all of the little city that the Dutch burgomasters knew, assessed at $84,844,538. Even those figures do not tell the entire truth, startling though they are. The market value of the property is fully one-third more than the assessed valuation, and the bit of earth which is bounded by the North and East Rivers, Spuyten Duyvil Creek and the Harlem, is today worth, as men phrase it, more than $2,000,000,000,000.

There is comparatively little of the soil of Manhattan left untouched by the hand

of improvement. Yet in spite of the march of bricks and mortar over green fields that have been blotted out, hills that have been leveled and babbling brooks that have been killed, the land has not lost its beauty. The roar of traffic, the din of whistling trains, the dust raised by multitudes afoot, have not abated the natural loveliness of its situation or dimmed the superb setting of its surroundings. As I grew up I learned to think this the garden spot of all the earth. I used to think that if God did not look upon this island of Manhattan when He "saw everything that He had made, and behold, it was very good," He might have done so. Geologists say that the trap rock under our streets and homes is the oldest part of terrestrial creation, and that it made its appearance above the face of the waters enveloping the globe thousands of eons before Adam walked under the trees of Eden. The old navigators who first sailed into the bays and rivers of the New World were a reverent race of men, and something of the spirit of which I speak must have prompted Henry Hudson when, standing on the prow of his adventurous little galliot, the *Half Moon*, then at anchor in Harlem Cove, he looked up through the valley of the Spuyten Duyvil and out upon the emerald meadows fringed with wooded heights that have been yesterday, and will be again tomorrow, the center of a specu'ation and strife in real estate as momentous as was the Battle of Harlem Plains on the same territory; for he wrote, in his report to the directors of the West India Co., not only that "the land was of the finest kind for tillage," but that it was "as beautiful as the foot of man ever trod upon."

Someday New York will remember the good words and great deeds of the man who uncovered to the world the site of an imperial city and who spoke prophetically of her coming grandeur and will erect a shaft to the honor of Henry Hudson. Three pictures in his life are presented to me as I write, and they are in keeping with the vein of poetry and romance which crops up through the log of the rough, courageous sailor. We see him on a Sunday morning, in the summer of 1607, in the church of St. Ethelburge, Bishopsgate Street, London, kneeling reverently with his crew at the altar railing to receive the sacrament and a blessing at the hands of God's minister before starting on a voyage to Asia by way of the North Pole. Two years later, in 1609, he is sailing under a September sun past the beautiful hills of the Neversink, through the Narrows, and into the bay, until on the 11th of that month he anchored in full view of the Island of Manhattan, filled with wonder at the marvels of "the great river" which, little as he dreamed it, was to bear his name. A year has passed, and we see the heroic navigator beating about the vast inland sea now known as Hudson's Bay in an English ship manned by a crew of adventurers who rose in mutiny against their heroic commander, and the mists of night fall around him as he drifts away in the little boat into which he has been thrust, to be seen of man no more forever. Heart of oak, he paid for the romance and poetry of his nature with his life.

In 1826, two centuries subsequent to the treaty of Governor Minuit, the total assessed value of real estate in the city of New York was $64,806,050; in 1836 it had risen to $233,732,303; in 1846, it had decreased to $181,480,534; in 1856, it had reached the large sum of $340,972,098, and now, after a generation has passed, it has become almost quadrupled. There are those who object to dry statistics, and say there is no poetry in figures. I maintain that the man who says there is no romance in the vagaries of arithmetic does not know what he is talking about. Is there no poetry in the statistics of Thermopylae, whose 300 men kept 300,000 at bay until the homes of Sparta were safe? Is there no romance in the record of the three score minute men of Lexington who, in defiance of the rules of arithmetic, stood up against 12 times their number and emphasized with the bullet their protest against British tyranny? So, running through the dry statistics of annual assessments just quoted, there is a suggestion to gray-haired men of business who are still among us of a wild speculation in Harlem real estate which created millionaires of a day to make them paupers on the morrow. In 1836 Anthony J. Bleecker, renowned among the men of his day for his wit, scholarship, and magnificent manhood, without mention of whom none would dare touch the theme of Manhattan real estate, sold lots in the far outlying village of Harlem for $1,000 each, which 2 years later, were sold for $9 each, over and above encumbrances, enriching only the lawyers as they passed rapidly from hand to hand.

The dry record of these transactions is indeed the romance of the Island of Manhattan. Clothed in flesh and blood it will quiver with animated life and speak the story of the men and women whose homes, like their bodies, are now dust. When Anthony L. Bleecker, grandfather of Anthony J. Bleecker, whom so many survivors remember so well, was in business in this city more than a century ago, he lived on Queen Street, over his store, and far out of town he had a farm which reached from the Bowery to Minetta Brook, hard by the present Sixth Avenue. Its value was a trifle, but it was a pleasant spot for the recreation of his 13 children, 9 stalwart sons and 4 daughters, and to their graves they carried pleasant remembrance of the pink and white apple blossoms in the old orchard. When it was first proposed to lay out the present Bleecker Street through the farm the children objected, and one of the daughters insisted as a compromise that a 50-foot road would be sufficient, instead of a 60-foot street that was projected. If the old farm had remained in the family, they would have been able to lead the 400 in wealth as well as blood, but what was a man to do with 13 children, and how could he have dreamed of the treasure hidden in those 36 acres. His descendants have seen the merest fragment of those acres—a bit of earth—the lot at the southwest corner of Bleecker Street and Broadway, sold 9 years ago for $185,000.

Some estates, like those of the Stuyvesant, Rhinelander, Lenox, Astor, and Goelet families remain largely intact, but the lands that went by the name of De Lancey, Bayard, Bleecker, Herring, De Peyster, Warren and Hamilton have passed into the hands of strangers and lost their inherited distinction. As a boy I remember when Union Square was considered far uptown and fashion lingered in Bond and Bleeker Streets and about Washington Square, loath to obey the command of that inevitable policeman, time, and "move on." Indeed, my earliest remembrance is of the days when the neighborhood of St. John's Park was considered the most aristocratic of localities, and there was not a family living in one of the plain but stately houses which faced that lovely oasis, whose members did not pride themselves on the blueness of their blood. Above Union Square stretched a delightful region of farm houses and fertile fields, country villas and green paddocks, bits of woodland, wastes of common lands, rocky gorges, silvery brooks, and ponds famous for perch and sunfish. Nestling down by the East River on one side, and along the Bloomingdale Road on the other, were country seats which were famous for their cheer and hospitality, and visits made beneath their roofs were like trips to fairyland. Often as I am whirled on the elevated trains through miles of streets that have taken the place of the rustic lanes and dusty highways that I once knew, I find myself trying to imagine where a house long since familiar to me used to stand, or a wooded knoll was located, and I turn to see only an aged and solitary tree standing desolate on a brand-new sidewalk, the last relic of the vanished homestead. Even the graveyards have disappeared and a newly imported citizen, lessee of a still newer saloon, draws beer on the spot where the family vault was dug and the ancestral bones were deposited with solemn pomp.

A French savant formulated the law that, in estimating real-estate values, prices must be gaged by the number of persons passing a given locality. The accuracy of this axiom has been tested and proved by the experience of London, Paris, and Berlin. Applying the same rule to New York, which finds it physically impossible to expand except in the direction of Albany and the sky, hemmed in as it is by rivers and a bay, it is evident that fabulous figures must be reached in the near future for property lying below the post office. Indeed, in no other city in the world has real estate in small and exceptional lots reached as high a figure as in New York. The highest price ever paid for real estate on the island of Manhattan was given in 1882 for a bit of earth—only 508 feet—at the southwest corner of Broad and Wall Streets. The large sum of $330.70 per foot was paid for this little plot, but it was purchased to square the adjoining property and the price may therefore be considered exceptional. On the 14th of March 1890, the property at 149 Broadway, corner of Liberty Street, 3,006.6 square feet, was sold for $544,500, or $181.12 per foot. No. 7 Wall Street brought $157.37 per foot in 1882. The Equitable Life Insurance Co. paid $155.75 a foot for the property at the northeast corner of Pine Street and Broadway, and in 1887, the Niagara Fire Insurance Co. paid at the rate of $141.10 per square foot for the property No. 137 Broadway. There is no doubt that the region covered by these figures is destined to contain a larger business population than any equal area of ground on earth, and the multiplication of vast office buildings is at once the proof and effect of the costliness of real estate in this section. London has plenty of room in which to spread and the best property there commands but $63 per square foot, with no rapid increase. In New York, on the other hand, real estate is a living and immediate issue and its care and guardianship demand the most engrossing, capable, and concentrated business management.

It is curious and interesting to watch the advance in values on Wall Street, from the time when, in 1682 John Pound, laborer, bought a lot 23 by 60 feet for about $25 (the price named was 300 guilders in wampum), to the purchase in 1773 of three lots on the north side between Nassau and William Streets, by Samuel Verplanck, for $1,350, thence to the sale in 1816 of the old City Hall lots (adjoining the Verplanck residence) for an average of $8,000 each, and so down to the purchase of No. 12 Wall Street, in 1882, by John Jacob Astor, for $300,000. Remembering the City Hotel in its maturity, I find it interesting to see it assessed on the tax roll of 1815 at $90,000 and to wonder what old Ezra Weeks would think of the valuation now put upon the Boreel Building. At that time, No. 149 Broadway was owned by Nathaniel Smith, perfumer, and assessed at $13,000, to be sold in 1890 for $544,500. Governor Dongan owned the block bounded by the present Park Row, Beekman, Nassau and Ann Streets, and being thriftily inclined, he laid it out in a garden and for half a century or more it was a pleasure resort. The first lot sold was in 1773, when Andrew Hopper purchased the premises now known as No. 1 Park Row, where he kept store for many years. He paid $1,640 for the lot, and in 1796 he was taxed on a valuation of $4,000 for the property. Fifty times that sum would not buy it today. Like all other estates,

when once disintegrated, the Dongan property passed into a number of hands, and this process probably in the end proved to be of the greatest good to the greatest number.

The city of New York went into a somewhat extensive real-estate speculation 30 years ago and purchased more than a square mile of territory in the heart of the Island of Manhattan, embracing a desolate region known as the Wilderness, a variety of swamps, miserable specimens of Shantytown, any number of rocks, and several ponds fed by springs and equipped with sunfish and minnows, to which it afterward added the wild, rocky defile known as McGowman's Pass, which had historic interest as the scene of a desperate skirmish during the War for Independence. Many prudent men shook their heads sagely and ventured their reputations as prophets that the city would not grow up to Fifty-ninth Street in half a century and that its population would have no use for Central Park until the twentieth century had dawned. If they could read of the park commissioners' voting to run railways across this somewhat artificial "dream of landscape loveliness," it might make their dust rub uneasily against the restraining sod. The city, in 1853 and 1859, spent nearly $7,000,000 for the eight hundred-and-odd acres in Central Park, and in 1871 the land was appraised by a special commission at something over seventy millions. The first tract, taken under the act of 1853, cost about $7,800 an acre. For the second tract, extending from One Hundred and Sixth to One Hundred and Tenth Streets, which could have been purchased for $4,000 an acre, the city was compelled to pay $20,000 per acre. It proved an excellent investment, for, in spite of the enormous outlay needed to prepare it for public use, the increased taxes not only paid the interest on the bonds but wiped out the principal as well and left the city with a balance of $15,000,000 in its favor.

An era of speculation followed the enactment of the law creating Central Park. The tract bounded by Fifth and Madison Avenues and Seventy-eighth and Seventy-ninth Streets, which in 1852 was sold for $3,000, brought $40,000 at a sale in 1857. Twelve years later Mr. William H. Vanderbilt offered $1,250,000 for this plot, but his offer was refused. When the city came to purchase the 120 acres of rocky ledge and ribbons of land that made up the area of Morningside and Riverside Parks, it was compelled to pay at the rate of $60,000 per acre for land it should have had the foresight to acquire at one-tenth of that sum. But foresight is a gift which few possess, while hindsight is the boast of every prosy fiend of the buttonhole who shouts into his neighbor's ear "I told you so."

When, in 1811, Gouverneur Morris, Simeon De Witt, and John Rutherford, commissioners appointed by act of the legislature for laying out streets and roads in the city of New York, made their report to Mayor De Witt Clinton, they appended some "remarks" which seem odd to the present generation of city folk. They said: "To some it may be a matter of surprise that the whole island has not been laid out as a city. To others it may be a subject of merriment that the commissioners have provided space for a greater population than is collected at any spot this side of China. They have in this respect been governed by the shape of the ground. It is not improbable that considerable numbers may be collected at Harlem before the high hills to the southward of it shall be built upon as a city; and it is improbable that (for centuries to come) the grounds north of Harlem Flat will be covered with houses." Then they added this quaint apology with a moral: "To have come short of the extent laid out (One Hundred and Fifty-fifth Street) might, therefore, have defeated just expectations; and to have gone further might have furnished materials to the pernicious spirit of speculation." Those were wise men in their generation, and De Witt Clinton, father of the Erie Canal, was the most far-sighted statesman of his age, yet they have placed on record their belief that centuries would pass before the growing city would leap across the Harlem River and begin the erection of a new city on the broad acres that then made up the homestead and estate of one of their own number, Gouverneur Morris.

I did not start out to write the story of real estate in the island of Manhattan, but merely to point a moral from the investment made by the first Dutch Governor, and the earliest and most extensive purchase of land at the junction of the two great rivers. The money which "His High Mightiness the Lord Director General" paid for the entire area of the island would not now purchase space for a grave within its limits. Yet in spite of the rapid rise in values, the real estate of the island and the city is more generally distributed than ever before, and held by fewer individuals, corporations, and families. This is a decided advantage to the community, for it not only adds to the number of those who have a permanent stake in the general peace and prosperity, but it swells the volume of business through frequent transfers, continual rebuilding, and speculative changes in land. To own and hold a single lot of real estate in the city of New York is also apt to add several inches to the stature of the average man.

A few years ago I sat under a spreading apple tree in the dooryard in front of a low rambling stone house that was built in the last century up in Westchester County, and talked with the owner, a hale old farmer of 87 winters, white as to his hair, but with cheeks like a crab apple. He told me that his grandfather had built the house, on land which had been purchased from the Indians, and that he himself had set out the apple tree 60 summers before, to make a shade for his young bride, when she came out there to do her washing. The girl wife had grown wrinkled and bent and then had died, but the tree still was flourishing and the grass that had scarcely bent to her young feet had outlived her in age. A wealthy neighbor wanted to purchase half a dozen acres of wood and swamp land which he owned apart from his farm, and had offered a generous price for it. The old man asked my advice, as a matter of courtesy, but he had evidently made up his mind, for he did not wait a reply. He shook his head and continued after this fashion: "I donno. It's a big price and mebbe it would be safe in the bank. But I like the land. It's always there. It's been there these 87 years, right before my eyes, while the money comes and goes, and I don't know where it is. The land can't run away, and I guess I'd better stick to it as long as it will stick to me."

Why Was Low-Rent Housing Rejected?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER NORBLAD
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 9, 1950

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note that the Federal Government under the provisions of the Low Rent Housing Act, offered a number of units to both the cities of Portland and Astoria, Oreg.

In both cases the city council placed the question of acceptance of this housing before the voters in the recent election.

Despite the fact that the city of Portland has a preponderant Democratic registration the voters rejected this housing by about 10,000 votes. The city of Astoria has a number of very heavy labor Democratic precincts and there it was rejected in every single precinct.

The following editorial by Mr. Fred Andrus in the Astorian Budget may throw some light on the outcome of this vote:

[From the Astorian Budget of May 23, 1950]

WHY WAS LOW-RENT HOUSING REJECTED?

How does one interpret the adverse vote in Astoria, and in Portland, too, against the adoption of the federally financed low-rent housing program?

Did the voters oppose low-rent housing as an invasion by the Federal Government into a new field, a step toward greater paternalism? Were the voters actually rejecting Santa Claus?

Or were they fearful that low-rent housing would cost them something in the way of local expenses for streets, sewers, and other necessary accompaniments to the housing projects?

We suspect it was a combination of both factors.

The average taxpayer hates to vote new burdens upon himself. This has been exemplified in Astoria, as in other communities, by rejection of new taxes on which the people vote directly. It was exemplified on a State basis at the 1948 elections when people voted for a new pension plan, but voted down the money to pay for it.

There is probably a more widespread dislike on the part of people to vote for things that cost them money than Congress realizes when it passes bills, such as the new housing act, which involves new Federal expenses.

The people would probably vote down a lot of expensive welfare legislation passed by Congress if the people had a chance to vote directly.

People could see where the low-rent housing plan might cost them something in local taxes, as in addition to the money the program costs the Federal taxpayers, and they voted against it for those reasons.

Some of them also undoubtedly voted against it because they don't consider the Federal Government should get into the paternalistic business of providing houses to the communities.

It might be well for Congressmen and Senators, when under pressure from this group or that for this or that expensive new project or paternalism, to consider the large silent mass of taxpayers who are fearful of the mounting burden of governmental costs.

The city or State government is close enough to hear something of the murmur from the taxpayers; but Washington, D. C., is too far from the grass roots. The murmur is unheard there.

City Council of Chicago and Civic, Labor, and Church Groups Demand Extension of Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 24, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on a number of previous occasions I have sought to alert the House to the grave situation that we would face in

the city of Chicago were rent control abruptly to end on June 30 of this year.

The plain fact is that partly because of the high cost of construction in our area it has been impossible to furnish new housing within the reach of thousands of our Chicago families. The result is that there is in Chicago a continuing housing shortage which has been little, if any, eased off. The end of rent control in June of this year would immediately be followed by demands for rent increases impossible for our people to meet.

I am extending my remarks to include a resolution passed by the City Council of Chicago and a letter from Leo A. Lerner, chairman of the Citizens Committee for Rent Control, enclosing the resolution adopted by affiliated organizations, also a letter from Dr. Jacob J. Weinstein, rabbi of KAM Temple.

The resolution of the City Council of Chicago follows:

CONTINUATION OF FEDERAL RENT CONTROL

Whereas on May 9, 1950, Mayor Martin H. Kennelly addressed a telegram to the Honorable BRENT SPENCE, chairman of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, as follows:

"The Honorable BRENT SPENCE,
"Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

"As mayor of Chicago I would like to present my views concerning the question of continuation of Federal rent control which is now being considered by your committee.

"In Chicago at present there is less than one-half of 1 percent vacancy in housing units except those renting for $100 a month or more. This affects more than 95 percent of Chicago's rental families.

"It is obvious and certainly should need little argument that removal of rent controls at this time and in such a market, would result in severe hardship to a large segment of this community.

"There have been practically no housing units built in the moderate rental classification during the past 10 years. So renting families will have no choice if controls are lifted. Of course, not all owners are unscrupulous, but there are some who would take advantage of such a situation, and this would result in severe hardship to many of our citizens.

"It would be less than fair if I did not at the same time point out to you the financial difficulties under which many small property owners have been operating during the past few years. Statistics show that many thousands of small property owners have not been able to secure equitable adjustments in the rentals of their housing units. This should be corrected.

"Large property owners, through their accountants and lawyers have obtained the adjustments to which they were entitled by law. But of the small property owners in the two- and three-apartment-building class, many are still receiving the same rental which they received in 1942.

"So, in urging continuation of Federal rent control I would also like to urge that the legislation adopted and its administration as well should take into consideration the equities on both sides of the question.

"MARTIN H. KENNELLY,
"Mayor."

Whereas the House Committee on Banking and Currency has approved a bill to continue rent controls to June 30, 1951, where such continuance is deemed necessary by the local authorities or the electorate: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the City Council of the City of Chicago concurs in the views expressed by the mayor in the aforesaid telegram of May 9, 1950, to the chairman of the House Committee on Banking and Currency; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be immediately forwarded by air mail to the President of the United States and Members of Congress from Illinois.

The letter from Mr. Lerner with resolution adopted by the labor, civic, and religious organizations affiliated with the Citizens Committee for Rent Control follows:

CITIZENS COMMITTEE FOR RENT CONTROL,
Chicago, Ill., May 24, 1950.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The Citizens Committee for Rent Control is composed of labor, religious, and civic organizations who are gravely concerned with the crisis facing Chicago if rent controls are removed. The problem of housing in this city is well known to you. Chicago lags far behind other cities in the construction of both private and public dwellings. There is less than one-half of 1 percent vacancy in housing units renting under $100 a month. Chief Justice Edward Scheffler, of the Chicago Municipal Court, which handles most eviction cases, warned that if controls are ended "there will be mass protests and perhaps some violence." In this great underhoused city with thousands of families doubled up, and other thousands existing in substandard housing, the abolition of controls would bring skyrocketing rents to those very persons who can least afford to pay.

The Democratic delegation from Chicago is to be congratulated on the excellent fight they are making. This committee would like to be of service to you. If there are any facts or figures needed from this area please call upon us.

Be assured that the great majority of persons in Chicago—the tenants—are behind you in this crisis. We enclose the resolution adopted by the affiliated organizations. We urge our representatives to take this expression to the floor of Congress as a statement from the leaders of this city as to the true need of Federal protection for Chicago citizens.

Sincerely,

LEO A. LERNER.

RESOLUTION FOR RENT CONTROL

We, the undersigned persons and organizations, gravely concerned about our own welfare and that of our fellow citizens, urge the Congress of the United States to enact promptly an act to extend rent control under Federal authority.

We urge that the act include these provisions:

1. Effective controls over rents to be paid.
2. Effective controls over evictions.
3. Authority for the National Administrator of Rents to control or recontrol areas.
4. Adequate provisions for administration and enforcement of all provisions.

We believe that Federal rent controls should be extended after June 30, 1950, since the facts that caused Congress to enact the 1949 act still prevail in most rent-controlled areas.

The letter from Dr. Weinstein follows:

MAY 24, 1950.

Congressman BARRATT O'HARA,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I strongly urge you to keep fighting for the Spence bill for rent control.

I am close to the pulse of many families in this neighborhood, and I am certain that there will be great injustice and intense hardship should controls be removed. I know how strong the pressures are for their removal. I believe, however, that you will win the enduring gratitude of the overwhelming majority of your constituents if you keep up the fight.

As ever,

Sincerely,

JACOB J. WEINSTEIN,
Rabbi, KAM Temple.

Which Will Be More Dangerous and Costly to the United States: To Help the Chinese Hold Formosa or To Lose Formosa?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 25, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following pertinent article from Time of May 22, 1950. For 5 years the United States has vacillated from one defeat to another in the dealings with its avowed enemy, Chinese communism. There is not much more time left:

CHINA

INVASION SEASON

May, June, July, and August are the best months for an invasion of Formosa. During the rest of the year weather conditions, including typhoons, protect the island. This summer, then, may bring an event to which the United States has already officially resigned itself—the Communist conquest of Formosa. When the Reds attack, there will undoubtedly be a great clatter in the United States, a sudden recognition that Formosa's fall may touch off a chain of reactions throughout Asia and change basically the United States position in the cold war.

Big strategic decisions, such as the one to abandon Formosa, are the responsibility of the President of the United States. To advise him on these matters, the President has the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the National Security Council composed of the Vice President, Secretaries of State and Defense, and the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board. Last year when the Communists had conquered all of the Chinese mainland, the Joint Chiefs of Staff decided that the United States should not help the Chinese Government hold Formosa. Later, persuaded by the views of General MacArthur, the Joint Chiefs reversed themselves, decided that the United States should at least send a military mission to advise the Chinese Nationalists.

Secretary of State Dean Acheson objected to this position and the matter was put on the agenda of a National Security Council meeting December 29, 1949. Gen. Omar Bradley stated the case for holding Formosa. He made a bad job of it. Acheson dominated the meeting with a few well-chosen questions. Example: Were the armed forces ready and willing to commit the necessary forces to hold Formosa?

Representatives of the Armed Forces answered that they were not willing to commit major portions of United States strength to the island. Nobody asked the pertinent question: Would it cost the United States more in terms of commitment of armed strength to hold Formosa or to lose Formosa? The discussion degenerated into fuzzy agreement with Acheson that nothing could or should be done. When Truman looked

around the room for dissenters to the Acheson view, he did not hear any, although several of the officials went away muttering that the wrong policy had been adopted.

In Washington today, responsible people will agree on the following points: (1) The United States could hold Formosa; (2) the Chinese Nationalists cannot hold Formosa without United States help; (3) the fall of Formosa will make much less difficult the Communist conquest of Indochina and the Philippines; (4) a Communist Formosa may call for a 20 to 40 percent increase of United States strength in the Pacific; (5) this increase will cost a great deal more than the cost of holding Formosa.

In spite of the implications of these five propositions, there is no serious move in Washington to reverse the December Formosa decision. Any effort to revive the issue gets lost in the old argument about whether the United States can cooperate with Chiang Kai-shek. Chiang said last week that he would be willing to see General MacArthur assume responsibility for the integrity of Formosa. If the United States through MacArthur did assume responsibility, such questions as Chiang's personality would recede into proper perspective. Formosa could then be weighed in terms of future peril to the free world rather than in terms of past United States and Chinese mistakes. So weighed, Formosa could and would be defended.

BACKS TO THE WALL

As chief of Time's Shanghai Bureau from 1945 to 1948, William Gray watched the disintegration of Nationalist China at first hand, came home doubtful that the Nationalists would ever be able to wage effective war against the Chinese Communists. Recently Gray, now a Life editor, visited Formosa, Nationalist China's last outpost. His cabled report:

Formosa represents the greatest irony in Asia today. Here, in its last refuge, Chiang Kai-shek's Government has shed the chaos and despair of the mainland, and, at least temporarily, appears to be leading an almost serene and even well-managed existence. Nobody expects that this favorable state of affairs can last indefinitely, but for the present it must be regarded as a major phenomenon in the struggle for Asia. This rich, green, formerly Japanese-ruled island is a spot of unaccustomed order. The Nationalist Government has pulled itself into presentable shape.

Chiang's Government has come to a working peace with Formosa's people, so well that about 4,500 young Formosans are willingly training to help fight the Communists when the expected invasion attempt comes, probably this summer.

No beggars

A young United States diplomat in Formosa's capital of Taipei remarked the other day: "This is a situation that China has not seen in years." It is a situation in which trains run on time, the island countryside is peaceful, the currency is gold backed and for months has been stable. There are no ragged refugees or beggars on the streets, no agitators inflaming the students, no discernible great abuses of economic power of large-scale corruption.

The prime minister, gray, smiling little General Chen Cheng, claims with evident pleasure that "in the whole of Asia, Formosa is perhaps the most stable and prosperous area." It is at least equally important, as the island's Princeton-educated Governor K. C. Wu points out, that Formosa "is the only place in the Far East that has no serious Communist menace from within."

The exact strength of Nationalist troops on Formosa is a military secret, but including some 60,000 to 80,000 troops who arrived last week after the abandonment of Hainan Island, the island's defensive force probably numbers around 400,000. There is some indication that this force, like the latest government on Formosa, is a better force than the dispirited armies that lost the mainland. The recent abandonment of Hainan Island, the Nationalists point out, was a tactical decision taken 2 months before by Generalissimo Chiang and his staff.

The evacuation of Hainan, it was observed, came off without the mass defections to the Communists which had marked similar Nationalist retreats during the campaign on the mainland. At a south Formosan port where Hainan evacuees were disembarking, I asked a wounded young captain: "Could you have defeated the Communists on Hainan if you had not been ordered to withdraw?" "Without question," he snapped back. His answer was probably a fair indication of the spirit of Hainan's five defending armies.

What do the Nationalists now ask of the United States? First of all, further economic aid: a $30,000,000 currency stabilization fund, which would release their own gold for economic development, and another $20,000,000 worth of economic assistance up to June 30, when the present ECA program ends. After that, Governor Wu has a simple formula: $10,000,000 a month in American economic aid until Formosa can get on its feet.

But the Nationalists on Formosa are also renewing their hope of military aid. Chiang Kai-shek's formula: "The United States should match the forms of aid given to the Communists by Soviet Russia. We do not expect more than what the Soviet is giving." This would imply everything up to jet planes manned by American pilots, since the Russians now provide them for the Chinese Communists.

No denial

What about this durable and much-debated personality, the Generalissimo, now that he has taken back the presidency? Chiang has done nothing at all to revive himself as a hero; if he is a reviving force, it is because the Communists, Chinese and Russian, have made him so.

Chiang neither ducks the sorry facts of his government's failures on the mainland nor denies that much past aid was dissipated in those disasters. Chiang suggests a military ECA, in effect an effort similar to that directed by United States Lt. Gen. James A. Van Fleet in Greece. Who would direct such an undertaking in Formosa? The Generalissimo would consider it "reasonable" for General MacArthur, as Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers, to assume responsibility for Formosa's integrity pending the signing of a Japanese peace treaty. But Chiang insists that there be no infringements of China's sovereignty or administrative integrity. Such a move, of course, would take the Nationalists off the hook, and place a United States guaranty on the retention of Formosa.

No doubt

It seems clear that the defenders of Formosa, fighting a 5,000,000-man army drawn from the cheap and endless manpower of China's mainland, are almost hopelessly doomed by sheer numbers if the Reds are ready to waste Chinese lives freely, as no doubt they are. Further, remembering the past, I think it is still easy to wonder whether or not the Nationalist high command seriously wants to stage a last-ditch fight to save Formosa.

But I am impressed by the earnestness of younger men far beneath the stature of Chiang—Chinese who still seem to want to save their people from communism. They are the men who cannot escape; they have no place else to go. They include the troops trained by VMI-educated Gen. Sun Li-jen with United States Army methods, and they include United States trained Navy men whose destroyer escorts are running out of 3-inch shells. Somewhere along the ragged route of failure the United States rightly or wrongly assumed a moral obligation to these younger Chinese. The look of a hungry friend is in their eyes now.

The moral question of America's right to supply arms in a civil war seems to have vanished when the Russians moved in wholesale on the other side. The Russians are now supplying the Chinese Red army not only with jet planes and Soviet advisers but with highly modern artillery and other weapons.

In this situation, as long as there are anti-Communist forces on Formosa who say they want to resist, the morality of renewed United States aid is hard to challenge.

Is This Also a Truman Red Herring?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 24, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune, published under date of May 26, 1950, entitled "The Hidden Treason":

THE HIDDEN TREASON

The small, stocky figure of Harry Gold, propelled suddenly from a colorless anonymity into world notoriety, is a portent of a deeply disturbing kind. There was nothing about Mr. Gold to distinguish him from hundreds of thousands of other Americans in minor technical or professional jobs. Of comparatively recent immigrant stock, in modest circumstances, with a good mind which had made excellent use of the great educational opportunities offered to all in this country, he was a hospital biochemist living in a quiet obscurity and apparently absorbed in his work. To find him at all the Federal Bureau of Investigation had to dredge painstakingly through a list of some 1,200 names. But once found, he has been arrested, charged with being the intermediary in the Soviet espionage system through whom the British Dr. Klaus Fuchs passed to the Kremlin the most precious and the most elaborately guarded secrets in history.

It is his utter obscurity, his completely protective coloration, which is frightening. His own family and associates never remotely suspected, they declare, that he had any Communist leanings or connections. He received his science degree from a Catholic university. He was not a rebel or a fighter, he was not a victim of persecution, there was nothing to mark him as even a possible member of the vast Communist conspiracy against our western civilization. Yet if the FBI is to be believed, that conspiracy somehow managed to reach out, to pluck him from the countless thousands of his fellows and convert him into a singularly dangerous agent for the subversion of the society whose privileges he so quietly enjoyed.

Proof, of course, remains to be established. But whatever the judgment as to Mr. Gold himself, no one can doubt—certainly not after the Canadian cases, the Fuchs case, the Hiss case, the many other similar evidences of recent years—that this is the insidious way in which Soviet Russian conspiracy, infiltration, and treason operate in our society. The lengths to which the FBI had to go to

make this arrest are instructive, and disturbing, in themselves. We are often accused of an anti-Communist hysteria, and the excesses of McCarthyism give too much ground for the charge. But there is a reason behind even the excesses, and before the portentous figure of the obscure Mr. Gold, no one can deny that it exists.

Railroad Retirement Benefits Should Be Increased

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 25, 1950

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, a number of months ago I introduced H. R. 7063, which is a bill to increase the amount of money being paid retired railroad men under the terms of the Federal statute covering railroad retirement benefits. I have felt for a long time—and said so publicly—that retirement payments to these men are much too low. They should be increased.

Retirement benefits generally have been increased throughout the United States over a period of years. Only the other day, General Motors entered into a 5-year contract with its hundreds of thousands of employees, under the terms of which it was agreed that retirement benefits paid by the company, when supplemented by general welfare retirement payments, should be in the sum of not less than $100 per month. This contract marks a new landmark in the payment of retirement benefits to the working people of America. It is a goal at which we aim.

In many instances noncontributing retirement programs furnish real competition to the contributing railroad retirement program. To my mind, the employee who makes heavy contributions over a period of his active life should have this fact calculated in his retirement payments. In other words, where a person over a period of years actually puts a part of his salary into a fund for the purpose of later producing benefits, this fact should be recognized in the size of the returns which come to him in his old age. I do not believe the retirement systems throughout the Nation go far enough to adequately recognize this principle.

My bill provides that retirement benefits shall be increased by 25 percent. In the light of the increased living costs, I think this addition to present retirement benefits is in order. An annuitant receiving $100 per month now is decidedly in a worse condition than he was in 1935, receiving the same amount of money. House rent, groceries, clothing, and incidentals have all increased enormously in price. Railroad retirement benefits have not increased in anything like the same percentage. The railroad man looking forward to a life of comfort and rest after a long run of active duty on the great railroads of this country is met by disappointment. He is entitled to more consideration.

It has been said that the Reserve Fund is not of sufficient size to stand additional benefits. There are, of course, serious differences of opinion as to this matter. The fund, however, has withstood withdrawals at a time when they were much heavier upon the fund, considering the amount of money coming into the fund, than at the present time. I am reasonably satisfied that additional benefits can be given without seriously jeopardizing the solvency of the fund. Even though this were not the case, I would say that Congress might look into the matter of whether or not a contribution might be made to the fund to equalize the amount which is paid by Congress into noncontributing pensions.

This is a serious matter, and one which should call for the attention and consideration at an early date of those interested in railroading. Our elder railroad people should not be allowed to perish before some adequate increase in pension is worked out for them.

The European Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 25, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article on the necessity of admitting Germany to the Council of Europe if western defense is to be more than an illusory slogan. The article is by the brilliant French journalist Bertrand de Jouvenel and appears in the European supplement to Human Events. Since it was written the realistic proposal by Foreign Minister Schuman for merging French and German steel and coal industries has given the brightest ray of hope for Europe in many a decade.

THE EUROPEAN SITUATION
WESTERN DEFENSE?—NOTHING
(By Bertrand de Jouvenel)

PARIS, April 1950.—Many a time in this correspondence I have dwelt upon the increasing peace of mind of the Europeans under the Marshall plan. A sense of recovery, of return to normalcy has relieved European anxiety, and induced individuals, feeling solid ground, to form and pursue their private plans. However, this new-found confidence has come from hugging daily reality and abstaining from looking too far to the future. The gloominess which alone prevails in Britain perhaps is due to the fact that only the English, so my wife bluntly says, retain the sense of responsibility of a sovereign nation.

Thus hugging the ground, European opinion remains extremely indifferent to cold-war news. Whatever the news, all that matters is that it should remain a cold war. There is the same incredulity about its turning into a real war that was so rudely shattered in May 1940. A slight tremor shook the upper reaches of European opinion after the Privateer disaster. A number of people slowly grasped that the shooting had started, and they glimpsed the possibility that the Soviet mountain might start slipping down upon us.

Such a thought, as soon as conceived, is dismissed as unbearable, for no one believes that some 15 western divisions could do anything to stop Russian lava. Not only are they far too weak but further they are strung along this long ribbon of shore which constitutes western Europe so that common defense merely means, with the one exception of England which stands behind, that each national army stands on its strip of shore, giving and receiving no help to and from its neighbor. In order that the national armies should really help each other the lands would have to stand in depth facing Russia, as if Italians fought with Yugoslavs on Yugoslav ground, and French with Germans on German ground. But, as is well known, neither Yugoslavia nor Germany is part of the combined forces.

It would, I think, be well worth while to take a poll of European opinion on western defense. I think one would find that the people don't want to think about it and, if pressed, do not believe in it.

CONTROLLED SCHIZOPHRENIA

What of the higher ups? What of the western European policy makers? Controlled schizophrenia is good mumbo-jumbo I learned from Dr. Fuchs. If I have rightly understood him, the formula provides a perfect description of top western European thinking. Our rulers are capable of keeping perfectly separate their thinking about Russia and behavior springing therefrom, and their thinking about Germany and behavior springing therefrom.

When they think about Germany, they are obsessed by the regime under which this Nation lived from 1933 onward and by the evil it wrought in Europe from 1940 to 1945. They are haunted by the will to draw its teeth. For instance, in the French zone alone, 84,000 tons of ammunition have been destroyed, 16,000 blockhouses, 6,000 kilometers of underground telephones, and 13 underground factories. Fifty thousand ex-officers are under obligation to report weekly. Every precaution is taken to preclude rearmament of Germany, and to break the officer spirit (though, come to think of it, the officers were the only ones to try anything against Hitler).

When, on the other hand, our policy makers think about Russia they desperately cast about for means of increasing security from its present level which is precisely nil. Were they suddenly offered a Ruritania standing between Russia and themselves, a land of proven military prowess and under a sympathetic Christian Democrat government, they would welcome it with open arms into their alliance and association. But this Ruritania is called western Germany. And that is enough to change our policy-makers' mood from "come in" to "keep down." This, as everyone indeed knows, stultifies all talk of western defense.

THE ARGUMENT ABOUT GERMANY

If you ask a western European policy maker why Western Germany is to be kept down, you will probably produce an outpouring of emotional arguments: "Have you no memory? Don't you remember what they did in Europe from 1940 to 1945?" The leading feeling you will ascertain is that it would be morally wrong to let Germany return too fast to a normal status. It is then for us a moral duty, as my friend Raymond Aron puts it with brilliant humor, "to lose time."

The idea of returning Germany to a normal status over a period of years proceeds from the wrong-headed identification of a

nation with an individual offender. This policy was pursued once after the First World War and worked out very badly. At the outset, under the shock of defeat, those Germans came forward who were most attuned to the western spirit and they had to bear the full brunt of our severity. I remember as a child seeing the German plenipotentiaries shut up at the Hotel des Reservoirs at Versailles—these were our friends in Germany and we burdened them in German eyes with the humiliation they, and not the imperialists, were made to bear. Over the years the treatment of Germany improved while her governments worsened. German warmongers could point to the fact that those Germans most inclined toward the Allies, an Erzberger, a Rathenau, had got the worst deal. Finally our feelings were completely relaxed when Hitler came in, and he, of all people, got the benefit of our having worked off our nerves on Stresemanns and Brünings. This he offered to the German Nation as a proof that his high-handed policy was the effective one.

This time we have seen to it ourselves that the best Germans from our point of view should be in the saddle. Is it reasonable to humiliate precisely the men of our choice and to identify in the popular mind their tenure of office with the maximum unequality of treatment, so that again, others coming after them and far less our friends will get a better deal? This procedure is obviously absurd. How much wiser the behavior of the Allies in 1814. They saw that if they installed in France a government sympathetic to their view of European order, they would give it a deep and firm foundation by making it plain that France got a far better treaty than she was entitled to out of consideration for her new government.

But the procedure we follow is not only unwise, it is, further, unjust. A nation is not in fact an individual who should do time before it can be paroled. We cannot have it both ways and in seeking out those we held guilty of inhuman actions we in fact admitted this obvious truth that a nation is a collection of people. It is not moral, it is highly immoral to punish those who have suffered under the Nazi regime. Take the case of Walter Eucken who died recently, an example of intellectual resistance under nazism. After he had endured all this, he had to end his life treated as a vanquished foe. One may say that this atonement for others is highly Christian—yes, if self-chosen, but then it should not stop at the borders of Germany and we should all do penance for the sins of our erring brethren. It would indeed be a grand sight if all the rulers visited Hitler's death place to meditate on the crime of pride.

A DIRECTORATE OF DEFENSE

It is your correspondent's opinion that Germany should be admitted into the Council of Europe on equal terms and that real powers should be granted to a civilian directorate of European defense. The nations should be taxed a certain percentage of their national budgets in favor of this directorate of defense which would dispose of these resources in favor of a European army, while national armies would be restricted to police and colonial forces. I fear the manna of American treasure falling on the several national armies, which may then touch up the regimental colors of yore. This is not common defense, but waste of money. What you want as defense directorate is not a clutter of generals, each imbedded in his national military tradition and a servant of his own government, but first-rate statesmen, like Churchill most obviously. Let such men build up European defense; they would build up European unity as a by-product. Let them be elected by their national constituencies. These ideas may seem of excessive simplicity. But we shall not advance toward European unity until we have decided to give a certain body of Europeans a distinct mandate and real powers to achieve its objects.

PATRIOTISM AND THE SOVIETS

A friend has just come to me, hot from reading an American commentator's remark that French patriotism provides a powerful counterfoil to Communist action, and he urges me to explain how far this view is opposed to the truth. Indeed, French popular patriotism is now the most solid weapon of the Soviets in their policy toward France and western union. Yes, French patriotism balked the Communists in their efforts to grip the masses until the fateful day in 1935 when Laval, visiting Stalin in Moscow, gained from him a concession which he deemed a great victory and which turned out a most fatal gift to France: the admission that the French workers should concern themselves with national defense. Within 24 hours, with miraculous dexterity, the Communist Humanité ceased insulting the army and ventured into praise of our military heroes; Joan of Arc, whose memory had heretofore been mocked, was suddenly honored as "that most glorious daughter of the people." And Red cells vied in procession around her statue with the traditional salutes of Catholic school children.

This right-about turn was immensely effective. The Frenchman cherishes national glory and was lashed into a fury by Communist guile. He lapped up the patriotic language which was used without shame by the Communist leaders, and indeed probably with sincere relish. This was 15 years ago. During all that time the Communists have been steeped in patriotism, with the sole exception of the 2 years during which the Hitler-Stalin alliance was in vigor. And during that time they had little opportunity for public utterances, having been silenced first by Daladier and subsequently by the Vichy government, which turned out very much to their advantage. After the German attack on Russia they, of course, returned to patriotism. Thus during all but 2 years of a period of 15, and these 2 a time of silence, the French Communists have spoken the language of patriotism. All those who have risen in the party during this period—that is, practically all those who are now active (it is a party of extremely young organizers)—have heard no other language.

And my personal opinion is that this language is spoken from the heart. The Communists feel far happier, as well as immensely more successful, now that they identify themselves with the past glories of France, than they did while they derided them, a practice which only pleases a small minority of debunking intellectuals. They have established firmly in their minds that they were the main heroes of the resistance, and indeed their present political enemies complacently adopted this thesis in the years 1944 to 1946; M. Mauriac then calling upon them in the Figaro, the building of which they now stone, that as they had done most, so should they—and so on.

But, will you say, if the French Communists are genuine patriots, how come that they oppose the building up of national defense? I will answer with another query: Do you call them bad patriots, those who served the British Government rather than the Vichy government? To the Communists today the real friend of France is Russia, and our Government is alining us in a coalition against our national interest. They use the whole vocabulary of resistance: The Government collaborates with the present imperialist power, and in the true interest of France this destructive subservience is to be patriotically opposed. Will people believe that? Well, quite a number of announced patriots believed during the occupation that the resistance had to be hunted down; that, surely, was much harder to believe.

The Communists find themselves today in an exceedingly strong position toward the tenets of traditional popular patriotism. They oppose the Indochina war, but so did Clemenceau. Popular patriotism has never been interested in overseas territories. The obsession of popular patriotism since 1870, when the greatest military nation of Europe was so humiliatingly defeated by Prussia single-handed, has always been Germany. Is it toward Germany that our Government takes precautions? Nay; it is against Russia, who "saved us" in 1914 and again in 1944. "Aw! Forget the Americans and the British. It is thanks to the Russians that the Germans were groggy." Thus, the Communists. And they say, "Beware, the German will come back." Who thinks of the German, the hereditary enemy? We do. Yet tomorrow your treacherous Government, true heir of Vichy, is going to rearm the Germans, spearhead of a coalition against Russia and some time master of Europe after all. Can we call that a weak case? And is it still arguable that French patriotism is a shield against communism? Nay; it is a handle, thanks to which the Communists can turn the nation against governmental policy and hold back the necessary inclusion of Germany in western Europe.

Popular patriotism is an unwieldy passion. It will run steadily against an ancient foe, regardless of new dangers and new necessities. As early as the eighteenth century, when it was far less violent a passion, France was shaken by Choiseul's swing from the traditional alliance with Prussia to the alliance with the three-century-old foe, Austria, and many historians regard it as a major cause of the French Revolution. In our time, calling to patriotism for European federation against the Soviet threat is almost in vain. It is the Communists who can successfully appeal to patriotism. Their opponents must invoke love of individual liberty and point out that such liberty can be maintained only in a new political structure.

THE KING OF THE BELGIANS

Belgium, that exemplary country of Europe, ever quoted as a model of industriousness and liberalism, is tied up in a pretty mess. According to the principles of monarchy, Leopold is her king. This status has been put to the democratic test and he got 58 percent of the votes; far more than did Mr. Truman in 1948, or Mr. Attlee in 1945. And the power wielded by Mr. Truman is immeasurably greater. Then a cry was started according to which a king cannot be the king of a mere majority. This was asserted, for instance, by an admirable English paper which upholds the memory of William of Orange. Would he in 1689 have obtained 58 percent of the votes? One doubts it. Belgian politicians of the Socialist and Liberal Parties have developed on this occasion quite remarkable theories on the limitless right of minorities. If their utterances are collected it shall be seen that the majority principle is entirely denied, an interesting departure.

The root of the matter, of course, lies deep. King Leopold's fight to regain his throne may be regarded as part of a great struggle raging all through formerly occupied countries. At the liberation, those who had held positions of responsibility, however they had got them, had done things which those without responsibilities had not done. There were reasons to sweep them aside, often rightly and often wrongly. Thus the great openings, the great carpet-bagging era. Now in a stabler situation a come-back is staged by those who regard its success as necessary to clear their honor. And the greatest of the "come-backers" is King Leopold who is watched with the keenest interest by those in other countries who find themselves in a somewhat similar position.

American Farming Era

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 25, 1950

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I have recently had a chance to go over some of the farm lands in Louisiana, the condition of which I have been familiar with for many years. On this trip, I visited some of the farms which I had seen in the low period of the depression in 1932 and 1933. I had a chance to compare these farms now with the condition in which I saw them at the early period. I was amazed at the vast change that has occurred.

In 1932 to 1936, farms in Webster, Claiborne, Bossier, Red River, De Soto, Bienville, and Caddo Parishes were being used for the growing of cotton. These same farms are still used for this purpose although there is at present a greater diversity in farming. In the 1932–36 period a great many of these farms were classified as submarginal farms, and I heard many of our people refer to the fact that the farms had lost their value as a means of earning a livelihood for our people. They were, so these people stated, so rundown, depleted, and eroded as to be unprofitable for use in sustaining families.

The years have brought a vast change in the condition of these same farms. Last year, which was one of our best cotton years, I was told that these farms in the hill section produced an amazing amount of cotton. In the period of 1932–36, the hill farmer, on many of these farms, required from 5 to 7 acres to produce a 500-pound bale of cotton. Some of them did not produce that much cotton. Last year, these farmers, so I was told, produced from a bale to a bale and a fourth per acre of cotton. Some farmers did even better than this in the hills.

On the bottom farms which in the 1932–36 period produced a bale of cotton to an acre, last year they produced two bales or better to the acre.

I attended meetings of our cotton farmers last fall and I was amazed at the cotton production stories being told. At one of these meetings, I can recall that I publicly referred to some of the stories of cotton production as being so fabulous as to border on the type of what we call fish stories. Whether these tales reported by some of our farmers with reference to two to two and a half bales per acre are correct makes little difference. The important thing is that our per-acre production of cotton is now at an all-time high.

It was in this area, Mr. Speaker, that in the 1932–36 period the United States Government chose to establish what is known as land-utilization projects. These projects were located in areas surrounded by land so poor as to be classified as submarginal land. The farmers said it was not worth cultivating in many instances. The land-utilization projects were built on land which was considered too poor for cultivation. It is in these general areas to which I now have reference in this statement.

Just as important as the increased production of cotton is the increase in the grade of the cotton produced on these farms. In the 1932–36 period cotton being produced from the so-called submarginal hill lands in Louisiana was of a rather low grade of seven-eighths-inch staple. By dint of repeated efforts by experimentation and by much toil, the staple length of the cotton has been increased to 1-inch, to 1 1/16-inch, and even 1 1/8-inch fiber. Now, on this hill land, much of which, as I have said, was considered submarginal in the thirties, the grade has improved and the length of the staple has been increased. As a result of this, naturally, the price of the cotton crop has improved and our farmers are benefiting vastly from improved methods and increased harvest.

One will naturally ask what has brought about such a vast change in the cotton lands in Louisiana; what has improved the appearance of the countryside, the condition of the farm houses, and the aspect and attitude of our farmers, especially the hill farmers. It has been due in large measure to the Federal soil-conservation program, combined with the program of maintaining reasonable farm prices. In the early period the soil-conservation program began by trying to bring order out of chaos in the farm area. This program was begun as an educational one and gradually expanded from a few farms until it covered practically every farm on the countryside. The program is now accepted as a fundamental part of farming operations.

By beginning with education and the proper use of land, by the elimination of gullies, land wash, and erosion, by building terraces, and by the institution generally of good farming practices, the value and utility of our farms has gradually been brought out. Land which when I came to Congress was made unsightly by gullies and erosion is now vastly improved in its appearance. Farmers who were bankrupt, faced the future with discouragement and helplessness, now insist on raising the fertility of the soil by use of fertilizers. They are now demanding better homes, electrification of them and their barns, and the use of modern machinery. These same farmers are now facing the future with confidence and full of plans for improvement on their farms and the advancement of their families. In the countryside which in 1933–36 was devoid of beauty, we now see little flower gardens, rows of shade trees, and pretty little houses dotting the countryside.

To my mind, the amazing part of this picture is the fact that all of these changes have occurred within the short space of time since I began to serve this area in the Congress of the United States. Had I been told that so much could have been done in such a short time when I first came to Congress, I would have seriously doubted the truthfulness of such an assertion. And yet, I am a part of all of that program. I have supported every part, parcel, and portion of the soil-conservation program. I have bent every effort and energy of my congressional life in working to improve the lot of our farmers. In my first campaign for Congress, I witnessed countless cases of hard-working, honest hill farmers of north Louisiana, with wives and children, who finished the year with less than $25 to $50 profits from a whole season's effort. I resolved that the desperate financial plight of our farmers should be my first consideration in Congress.

As I review the years, I too feel that we from farming sections can look forward with considerably more confidence in the future than we can with pleasure view the struggles of the past. Benighted, misguided, and depression farming programs have given way to well-directed and well-balanced soil conservation programs of the present. We see to a remarkable extent the advantages of this great program at the present time. We reap the advantages of this great program; but in a larger sense, it is our children and their children who will reap the magnificent benefits of a well-directed conservation farm program; and they in time will rise up to thank those foresighted individuals in authority, interested in improvement of farm life, who have made possible the new day for our farmers in the United States.

Public Power in Michigan

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 19, 1950

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, it was most amusing, as well as amazing, to hear the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] arise here in the House the other day and denounce public power as communistic, or socialistic.

The power business is a public business. Electricity has become a necessity of our modern life. It must be handled by a monopoly, and any monopoly of a necessity of life is a public business. Besides, the water power of the Nation already belongs to the Federal Government. That was decided by the Supreme Court of the United States in both the Ashwander case and the Appalachian Power case.

Suppose the private-power interests had as complete a monopoly of the electrical industry as the telephone companies have of the telephone business; just think what a burden the users of electricity would have to bear.

I pay more for a telephone in my apartment here in Washington—if I never pick up the receiver—than I pay for both gas and electricity in that apartment. Two years ago I put a telephone in my office in Tupelo, Miss., and it cost me more—if I never picked up the

receiver—than I paid for both gas and electricity in my home there.

If the American people paid as much in proportion for electricity as they now have to pay for telephones, in some places, they would do well to have one light in each house, and the chances are that the farmers would be in the dark from Maine to California.

Yet we find some people who want to turn the water power of the Nation over to this sprawling monopoly known as the Power Trust, so they can plunder the American people with rates all out of proportion, and limited only by the consumer's ability to pay.

The attempts now being made by private power interests to prevent the building of public power lines to supply power to municipally owned systems and farmers' cooperatives and force the Government to turn the power over to the Power Trust at these dams which the Government has constructed on our navigable streams and their tributaries is a repetition of their old scheme by which they tried to get their hands on the power generated on the Tennessee River by the TVA, and also along the Columbia River, and other navigable streams and their tributaries.

If they had succeeded, we would have had no yardstick to show the American people what electricity is really worth, and we would all be paying the enormous overcharges now imposed upon the people of Michigan—outside of those municipalities such as Lansing and Kalamazoo that own and operate their own power systems.

This is the battle of the century.

The greatest wealth this country has, outside of the soil from which we live, is the water power in our navigable streams and their tributaries, in which there are 394,000,000,000 kilowatt hours of hydroelectric power going to waste every year. If it were developed and firmed-up to the peak of the average year, we could not only electrify this country from one side to the other, but we could heat every house from Maine to Mexico with electric energy—the purest, finest, cleanest heat in the world.

SANTEE-COOPER

But the private power interests are trying to destroy these yardsticks, such as that of the TVA, and the Bonneville Administration. They are now making a terrific drive to get their hands on the power generated at the Santee-Cooper hydroelectric power project in South Carolina, for the purpose of blocking the efforts now being made to get that electricity to the farmers of that State at rates they can afford to pay.

I am familiar with the Santee-Cooper project. I went all the way to South Carolina, and addressed a joint session of the legislature in favor of that great development, when the bill for its creation was being considered, and was being fought by these same private power interests that are now trying to get their hands on that power, in order to monopolize it and deny its benefits to the farmers, and other consumers in South Carolina. They want to destroy the Santee-Cooper yardstick, just as they have attempted to destroy the TVA yardstick, the Bonneville administration yardstick, and other yardsticks of public-power systems, in order to impose exorbitant rates on the people who use electricity, and who have the right to get it at rates based upon the cost of generation, transmission, and distribution.

This Santee-Cooper project will be worth hundreds of millions of dollars to the people of South Carolina during this generation, if the State will just maintain it as a public-power system, keep the hands of private interests off of it, hold the rates down to the lowest possible level commensurate with sound investment, and use it as a yardstick to show the people of South Carolina, as well as the surrounding States, what electricity is really worth.

Now let's get back to the State of Michigan, and see what public power is doing for the people of that State, and what it would do if all the people of Michigan could enjoy its benefits.

The city of Lansing, the capital of Michigan, has one of the finest public power systems in the country, and has had for 56 years. I wonder if that is considered socialism or communism in Michigan.

The city of Lansing generates and distributes electricity to the people of a city of more than 90,000 population. The people of Lansing get their power through this public power system far below the rates charged by the private power companies in the State of Michigan.

That public power system is valued at more than $18,000,000, and has long since paid for itself. The city does not owe a dime on it. The power furnished free to the city, together with the taxes paid by this municipal system, I dare say, exceed the taxes paid by any private power company in any city of its size in that State.

It has no water in its stock, and is not controlled by a useless holding company.

Then there is the city of Kalamazoo, another leading city in the State of Michigan, with a population around 60,000. Kalamazoo has its own public power system, and has had for 35 years, on which it does not owe a dime.

I wonder if the people of Kalamazoo think it is communistic or socialistic for that city to own and operate its own electric light and power system, which pays, I dare say, more taxes, or more money in lieu of taxes, than is paid by the power companies in the average city of its size in Michigan. It has no water in its stock, and is not obligated to any holding company.

There is Bay City, Mich., another thriving city of about 50,000 population, which has its own public power system, and has had for 53 years, against which it does not owe a dime. Its cash contributions and taxes paid into the city treasury, I dare say, exceed the taxes paid by private power companies in any city of its size.

I am sure the people of Bay City do not regard public power as communistic or socialistic. It is not obligated to the power trust through any holding company and has no water in its stock.

I could name you a large number of other cities in the State of Michigan that have public power systems, and have had for years and years, such as Allegan, Cold Water, Norway, Niles, Marquette, Wakefield, Travers City, Zeeland, Wyandotte, Sturgis, South Haven, St. Louis, Holland, Gladstone, Escanaba, Grand Haven—and a large number of other towns, cities, and municipalities in the State of Michigan that own and operate their own generating and distribution systems, and have for years and years. They have no water in the stocks of their power systems, and do not have to pay tributes to any holding companies. Therefore they can supply their people with electricity at reasonable rates.

Let me remind the gentleman from Michigan that his State is just across the line from Ontario, Canada. If all the people of Michigan had received their electricity at the same rate they did in Ontario in 1949, they would have saved more than $117,000,000 on their light and power bills.

If the people of Michigan had received their electricity at the Tacoma, Wash., rates, they would have saved more than $133,000,000 last year. And remember that the Tacoma, Wash., light and power system pays into the city more taxes, or more money in lieu of taxes, than is paid by the power companies in the average city of its size in Michigan, or any other State.

And I might add that if the people of Michigan had got their power at the TVA rates paid by the people in my own district, they would have saved more than $119,000,000 on their light and power bills during the year 1949.

We are not trying to nationalize the power industry, as the gentleman from Michigan has charged; but we do not propose to build these great dams on our navigable streams and their tributaries, and then shut off the towns, cities, municipalities, and cooperative power associations, and turn the energy generated over to the Power Trust.

As I said, the power business is a public business. The water power of the Nation already belongs to the Federal Government. There is enough of it going to waste to electrify this country from one side to the other, and probably heat every home in America. That water power should be developed and supplied to the people of the Nation at rates based on the cost of generation, transmission, and distribution, and not turned over to the private power monopoly to wring the lifeblood from the American people by such exorbitant rates as they now impose on the people of Michigan—outside of those cities where they now have public power systems.

Instead of denouncing public power as socialistic or communistic, let us face the facts and follow the example set by the city of Lansing, Mich., as well as by the TVA, the Bonneville Administration, and other public power agencies and municipally owned systems throughout the country, and get cheap electricity to every home, including every farm home, and every business establishment in America.

That will do more to enrich our country and bring happiness and prosperity to the American people in every section

of the Nation than anything else that could possibly be done now or hereafter.

It will not only make our people prosperous and contented, but will place our country far out in front as the outstanding leader among the nations of the earth in the onward march of modern progress.

Appeasement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 31, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Post of May 25, 1950:

APPEASEMENT

All signs now point to the probability that Russia is about to win another victory over the majority members of the United Nations on the question of admitting Communist China to the organization and ousting Nationalist China from the seat she has been occupying.

Yesterday the British Government came out formally for the admission of Red China to the United Nations. France has indicated it will not stand in the way of such action. The United States will not vote in favor of the admission of Red China, but it will abide by any majority decision on the question. Thus it appears that Russia by browbeating all the other nations, by walking out of every meeting in which Nationalist China was represented, and by boycotting all essential activities of the United Nations has brought the other countries to terms. The action about to be taken on China is, under these conditions, nothing but surrender to Russia. It is base appeasement of the Munich brand and though it may appear to settle some problems temporarily it can, in the long run, produce nothing but harm. The democratic nations of the earth never seem to learn much from experience, no matter how bitter.

Memorial Day Address at Gettysburg, Pa., by the Honorable John W. Bricker, of Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 31 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, yesterday, at the historic national cemetery at Gettysburg, there occurred the annual strewing of the flowers on the graves by school children. State Senator McPherson, of Pennsylvania, presided. I had the honor to attend, together with Maj. Gen. Charles I. Carpenter, Chief of Chaplains of the United States Air Force. The speech of the day was delivered by the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER]. In order that we may all have the opportunity of reading our colleague's able and eloquent address, I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH OF SENATOR JOHN W. BRICKER AT GETTYSBURG, PA., ON MEMORIAL DAY, MAY 30, 1950

We gather this afternoon under the same panoply of heaven where one of the fiercest battles of time was fought. Those who fell here lived to build, and died to save the finest way of life the world has known. The yearning to be free is as imperishable today as then. Man's right to govern himself is yet inalienable.

They fought on this field, one battle in the never ending conflict for human liberty and individual opportunity. In that age-old struggle first one side has forged ahead and then the other. At the Battle of Gettysburg, human rights took a long surge forward and the cause of human freedom began to seem secure. From this battlefield spread the feeling that the Union would live, that righteousness would yet prevail. The question there was, Would America remain a union? Today, Will the Union remain American?

During all history there has been in the affairs of men and nations a constant conflict between the power of offense, of destruction and aggression, against man's ability to defend himself in his person and in the enjoyment of his property.

The Battle of Gettysburg epitomized that conflict. In the first day the power of destruction and of the offensive seemed too much to withstand. But on the second and third days the power of defense and of renewed strength in a noble cause took command. From the days of the Roman phalanx to the *Monitor* and the iron-clad ships, the tanks, the battleships and submarines, poison gas, bacterial warfare, the atom bomb, each implement of destruction had made necessary new defenses. The implements of peace have been ever used as the instruments of war.

Science has moved from the first fire, through gun powder and dynamite, poisonous gas, nitroglycerin, to the fission of atoms and now the fusion of force into matter. All of these can be used for peace or war for good or evil. With them we can build or destroy. We now are living in one of those epochs of history when the powers of destruction have outrun our ability to defend ourselves. The end of all we love and cherish may come unless divine providence takes a new hold on the hearts and lives of mankind.

For a century and a half America has been satisfied to fight for the right to preserve her heritage but yet has never been bent on wielding power over other peoples. Ours has been a fortunate history. From war we have turned to the pursuits of peace and to building a mighty nation. Our hearts still yearn for peace. Ruthless aggression, pelf, power, and plunder have had no part in our national development.

Our people have been willing to work. They have worked and used the God-given resources which are at hand. The spirit of compassion has controlled our lives. Helpfulness for others has been part of the life of America. Compassion for others is a glorious saga of our achievements. We have given bountifully of our labor and our wealth that others might not suffer.

Our contribution in war has been the greatest of any nation, any time, anywhere. In the recent war we contributed 14,000,000 men and women to the battle. Our fleets fought upon the seven seas. Our airmen flew the skies wherever the enemy could be found. Our soldiers carried the brunt on every battlefield where the enemy set foot. Those who fought with us fought upon limited segments of the world-wide battlefield. We gave $50,000,000,000 of our substance to our cobelligerents. Our total cost of war was half a trillion dollars.

With only 150,000,000 people, with only one-sixth of the territory of the world, we were able to do all this.

Since the days of the war, once mighty nations that had been able to take care of their own, to win wars and to prosper, to encompass much of the world, with far more people and far more resources than we have ever enjoyed, have been suppliants at our door. The spirit of compassion still prevails in the hearts of the people of our country. They have responded. We have poured out now over thirty billions of dollars to the needy of the world that they might not be engrossed in the maelstrom of an all-engulfing, destructive, godless, ruthless philosophy of government. Why have we been able to do that? The answer to that question seems to be an illusive one, that the world does not yet grasp.

The natural resources are as great in other places, the fertility of the soil is just as good, the rains fall and the sun shines on other lands as they do on ours. Why have we then been able to do so much in the cause of righteousness and human liberty? Why are we the last bastion against an economic and political foe that is encompassing so many nations and subjecting so many people?

The only answer that can be found anywhere is that we have governed ourselves longer and better and been freer than any other people of any nation on earth today. That is the heritage of Gettysburg, of St. Mihiel, of the Global War in Europe and the Pacific. But more than that it is the heritage of 160 years of human liberty, individual opportunity, the ability and the willingness to work, to build, to achieve, and to live a good way of life.

The conflict to preserve this cherished heritage, not alone is world-wide today; it is being fought at the crossroads of America. Various segments of that line of conflict are being fought out in the city councils, in the State legislatures, and in the Congress of the United States. I do not believe that any nation or combination of nations has the power to defeat us from without, but that heritage can be lost at home.

Our Government is becoming daily more and more powerful. The greed for authority over others inspires many of our leaders at this very hour—all done, of course, in the name of helping humanity. Thus, did Hitler rise to power. By such powers did Mussolini enslave the people of Italy. And by such hypocritical claims accompanied by ruthless murder and purge has Stalin enslaved the Russians and other peoples of the world.

If we are to be tomorrow, the kind of country that the men of Gettysburg died believing America to be, dreamed that we should be, and yearned for us to be, we must keep America free and freedom loving, self-governed, strong, and determined to maintain the right.

Whenever you enhance the power of government, just to that degree do you suppress human liberty. The duty of this generation is to preserve the maximum of human freedom, consistent with orderly self-government.

Where are our dangers at home?

Government power can destroy us, neglect can destroy us. Everywhere today there is a demand for personal economic security. Those who lie here had no personal security. They fought for personal liberty. There can be no economic security without political liberty.

The creative genius and individual reliance of a free people have enabled us to win every war we have fought. That creative ability cannot be ordered by government, cannot be directed by bureaucratic

control, cannot be paid for with government dole or subsidy. If we are to adopt the methods of the power and police states that we have fought to suppress, it would be as though our country, after the war between the States and in memory of the fierceness of the Battle of Gettysburg, had adopted slavery as a national policy.

Those who founded our Nation, those who have fought for it and builded it have ever known the danger of the power of government, the power of concentrated wealth, the power of organized religion, the power of the masses and the power of purposeful and selfish minorities to destroy the inalienable rights of man.

This country was builded as a bulwark against aggression and power. It was builded as a bulwark against the power of concentrated wealth and economic power that all might have opportunity. The founders knew the danger and the human suffering that followed in the wake of religious bigotry and the religious war of old and sought to free men to worship God according to each individual conscience and desire.

They knew the power of organized minorities, ruthlessly led—so they builded this country as a bulwark against the power of the organized, selfish, willful, determined minorities. They, likewise, well realized that the majority can destroy the rights of the individuals and minorities, and they builded our system as a protection against the power of the majority, who sometimes are enflamed by passing passions. So, thus, the individual and the minority groups have rights inalienable as free people so long as the Constitution abides.

Above all, they knew and have known the power of organized government to destroy human liberty. So they builded this, our Government, as a bulwark against the power of government itself. With checks and balances, the sovereignty of the State and local governments respected, with the individual's place secure, the police state has been no part of our development.

The human heart and soul, with capacity for growth and development, for service and outreach toward man's concept of his God, are the most precious things in life. To protect them our Government was founded and must continue to live. What profit us, in the end, if we gain domination and control of the world, destroy our national enemies, and lose human liberty here at home.

The spiritual and moral virtues of America will be ours only so long as we are a free people. Faithfulness in this trust today in a mighty conflict the world around will mark us as worthy of a nobler tomorrow. Recreancy now in the cause of human liberty, for which Gettysburg was fought, would tarnish the glory of the achievement of the men of Gettysburg. May we upon this sacred soil renew our determination to keep burning brightly the torch of freedom against the day for which the Master lived. May peace on earth and good will be yet the lot of men and nations. Then we will have done just honor to the heroes beneath this sacred soil.

The Jefferson Papers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. HOWELL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 31, 1950

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I want to call the attention of the Congress to a remarkable historical event—the publication of the first volume of the Jefferson papers. The tremendous task of collecting, sorting, and editing the letters and papers of Thomas Jefferson is being carried on at Princeton University in the congressional district which I have the honor to represent. Last week the first of the 52 volumes which will make up the completed work was presented in an appropriate ceremony to the Library of Congress. A fine editorial discussing the Jefferson papers which was published in the May 17 issue of the Princeton Herald follows:

THE JEFFERSON PAPERS

The ceremony being held this afternoon in Washington to commemorate the publication of the first volume of the Jefferson papers marks a milestone in the history of an extraordinary undertaking. The copies which will be presented to President Truman, General Marshall, and Dr. Freeman by President Harold W. Dodds, represent a vast amount of research and the best in American scholarship, yet they are but the fifty-second part of the whole and for that reason are little more than an introduction and a symbol of what is to come.

Before the editors and the reseach staff conclude their labors, 18,000 letters written by Jefferson will have been printed in full and a further 25,000 letters written to Jefferson either in full or in summarized form.

The sheer size of these figures appears to convey the story without further elaboration yet in point of fact it tends to obscure it. For all of these letters did not simply fall into the hands of the editors, although the principal Jefferson collection has been the property of the United States since 1848. The search for Jefferson documents was, and is, being carried out far and wide, and, as an instance, one was discovered in the custody of the Otoe Indian Reservation.

Nor do the figures convey an indication of the size and type and quality of the editorial organization required to annotate them, the multitude of controls required to catalog them, the innumerable files, cross-references, microfilms, photostats, the whole paraphernalia behind the scenes which will not be seen or probably even envisaged by the ultimate public.

The ceremony in Washington, therefore, will be an introduction, but something more—a tribute to Princeton University and the University Press, and the New York Times, which made the publication possible through financing the project as a memorial to the late Adolph S. Ochs, president of the Times. And, in a special sense, it is a tribute to the editor in chief, Dr. Julian P. Boyd, and his assistants, Dr. Lyman H. Butterfield and Mrs. Samuel S. Bryan.

Biggest Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 31, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the thirty-second article by Mr. Frank C. Waldrop on the infiltration of communism in our country:

BIGGEST STORY
(By Frank C. Waldrop)

It was slightly more than 20 years ago that Communists in America discovered something Communists in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, China and other nations have been rediscovering since 1945.

This overpowering fact is that all Communists of the world outside Russia are mere Colonials after the manner of British subjects outside England, and that Stalin handles them as expendable chattels of empire just as the British used to handle Hindus, Egyptians, Polynesians, and other lesser breeds outside the law.

Whoever was reading in this space yesterday knows that I am at present introducing details on that feature of the Soviet regime by quoting the sworn testimony of one Benjamin Gitlow to the House Committee on Un-American Activities given in 1939.

Gitlow was one of the founders of communism in this country, a member of the top policy-making board in Moscow, the Communist International, and one of the very few to quarrel with Stalin and live.

The quarrel came about this way. The Communist Party in the United States held a national convention early in 1929 to elect a leadership. William Z. Foster, who is today the titular head of the party in this country, campaigned as Stalin's man.

Jay Lovestone, of whom more in this space shortly, was found to be in control of 90 percent of the delegates.

Whereupon there came from Moscow direct orders from Stalin that Foster must get the job regardless. Lovestone and others of his faction were directed to get entirely out of the party leadership and report to Moscow for assignment in other countries.

Finally, the delegates were told that two new men would come on from Moscow as United States representatives in the Communist International, to which the locals, as in other countries, were supposed on paper to send delegates of their own choice.

In the wrangle that followed, Lovestone and Gitlow, as head of the party in the United States, and party representative on the International, went to Moscow to fight the issue out.

There they got the big news. The International in fact was not superior to the Communist organization within the Soviet Union, nor the maker of its own policies. It was actually just a dummy of foreign fronts for the personal decisions of the head of the Russian organization, J. Stalin. Today, that seems obvious—yet Communists in Europe have found it out again and again in great surprise. The ghastly shock to those simpletons of 20 years ago can well be imagined.

Said Gitlow later:

"When the decision was finally made we fought against it and voted against it. Stalin was present at the meeting and delivered a number of speeches. He lost his usual composure and became enraged. * * *"

Gitlow said that as soon as the dummy meeting was over, he was confronted by Molotov, whom we all know so well for his performances at early meetings of the United Nations, and formally read out of office for the high crime of having crossed the boss.

Now here in Gitlow's own words, is the sum of the lesson that communism pounded into him the hardest way—a lesson that Alger Hiss, Klaus Fuchs, and who knows how many others, refused to learn: "I broke with the Communist philosophy completely, because the cornerstone of Communist philosophy is the dictatorship of the proletariat, and once you accept the position that the world can be improved only by the establishment of a rigorous dictatorial regime, ruled by a few men on the top, from that moment on I felt that all freedom, all liberty, was a thing of

the past, and the very objectives that you were after could not be obtained.

"And so I broke with the concept of the proletarian dictatorship and took the position that if we are improved the economic lot of man, if man is to enjoy more political liberties, if there are to take place worthwhile social changes, those changes must take place under conditions which will guarantee to the great mass of the people more liberty, not less liberty. * * *

"In Russia we have a dictatorial regime that enjoys more power than any other ruling government in the world, because Stalin and the small ruling clique around Stalin own and control and direct the economic life of Russia, the political life of Rusia, the cultural life of Russia. In other words, what we have in Russia is a gigantic monopoly on the part of a ruling clique of all phases of Russian life."

Biggest Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the thirty-third article by Mr. Frank C. Waldrop on the infiltration of communism in our country:

BIGGEST STORY

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

What does the Communist conspiracy require of its cheap, expendable manpower in the United States of America? When an American becomes a Communist he may be ordered to do anything, from theft of atom bombs to blackmail of a high-school girl for her father's office files.

Here is just one example as told under oath by one who had himself been imprisoned as a Communist, had risen to the peak of party rank in this country and then had been contemptuously kicked downstairs by Stalin for the high crime of differing with the boss.

The following is a quotation from Benjamin Gitlow's testimony before the House Committee on Un-American Activities. It appears in volume II of the committee hearings on pages 4683-5, inclusive.

"In 1928 the Soviet Government was very hard-pressed for foreign currency, because whatever foreign currency it could lay its hands on it was storing or using in preparation for the 5-year plan. The 5-year plan was just about to begin.

"At the same time the Soviet Union was going through an internal economic crisis which also curtailed the income of foreign currency.

"Around that time the German Communist Party admitted to membership to the party one of the most expert engravers in Germany, a man who was so adept in engraving work that he could duplicate anything."

Gitlow said the Gay-Pay-OO (Soviet secret police) then set up a counterfeiting plant with this expert engraver in charge. He continues:

"But the Gay-Pay-OO was very anxious to counterfeit American currency. In 1928 Nick Dozenberg was assigned by the Gay-Pay-OO to find out the secrets of the serialization numbers of American currency bills. He once inquired of me whether I knew where such information could be obtained, but I did not know. I had no contacts whatsoever.

"After we were expelled from the party in 1929 it appears that Nick Dozenberg, acting for the Gay-Pay-OO, already had in his possession counterfeit American currency in the form of $100 bills, which were being exchanged in Cuba, in South America and in the United States proper. But the exchange was not going ahead as quickly as the Gay-Pay-OO desired. What they wanted was to make some contact to make the exchange on a large scale involving several million dollars."

Though expelled from the Communist Party, Dozenberg maintained contact with some other members who were also expelled, Gitlow said. One of these was a Dr. Valentin Burtan, of New York City, anxious for readmission to the conspiracy and ready to prove himself by any means. Says Gitlow:

"At that time, in 1933 or 1932, Burtan made the acquaintance, in a speak-easy, of a German ex-officer, an adventurous fellow, who was engaged in the job of shipping contraband munitions from the United States to Latin-American countries.

"Burtan picked up a good acquaintance with this individual and said that it would not be a bad idea; they would contact Amtorg (Russian trading agency in New York.—Editor) to arrange for the shipping of gas munitions, gas bombs, etc., from the United States to the Soviet Union because the Soviet Union was very much interested in that, and also some of the latest forms of machine guns being manufactured in this country.

"Through this German officer, the underworld in Chicago was contacted. They were first given a taste of how easy it was to pass the counterfeit money in Chicago, and then arrangements were made in Chicago to pass, I believe, around a million dollars in counterfeit money at one time.

"Burtan and this German were engaged in the job of getting the counterfeit money over to Chicago, closing the deal, and bringing the proceeds of the sale of the counterfeit money back to be turned over to the Gay-Pay-OO. The American authorities got wind of this situation. The German was arrested, and he confessed.

"Burtan was arrested later on, and the whole manipulation of this counterfeiting originated with the Gay-Pay-OO. The printing plant was never discovered because the printing plant was not in the United States. It was in Germany. The Gay-Pay-OO was never involved in this matter, though they were at the root of it.

"They were the real perpetrators of the crime, and the dupe who, out of idealistic purposes, out of the idea that he was doing something good, is serving a prison sentence for this crime."

Biggest Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the thirty-fourth article by Mr. Frank C. Waldrop on the infiltration of communism in our country:

BIGGEST STORY

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

If you're a Communist from America visiting in Moscow, pay attention to your caviar. As long as you get it fresh, unsalted, and black, you are safe.

But when the waiter brings you the gummy, red kind it's time you were already gone. Your life is in danger.

This is advice from one who knows, and you can find it in volume 11 of the hearings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities in the testimony of Jay Lovestone.

Lovestone was once head of your organization in this country—if you are a Communist. He made many trips to Moscow. He was an aristocrat of the conspiracy, one of the very earliest of the charter members. He knew Stalin, Trotsky, Bukharin, Litvinov, Molotov. In fact, as he put it:

"I might say that I have received or been subjected to the highest honors of the Communist Party in my time save one, and that is liquidation by a firing squad."

Long before the squalid episode of Earl Browder's rise to and fall from the top dishonors of communism in the United States of Americ, Lovestone was one of the conspiracy's elder statesmen.

The things that happened to him in Moscow when they switched the caviar from high quality black to stinky red, have been repeated with Communists from every country.

Stalin, whom Lovestone once called his friend and leader, sooner or later always turns out to be what Lovestone calls him now, Herr Stalin.

In other words, Stalin is Hitler as Hitler was Stalin.

President Truman may think he is getting some place when he says that he likes old Joe Stalin. Mr. Roosevelt thought that he, too, was getting some place when he tried to butter up Stalin at Tehran and Yalta by poking fun at the helpless Churchill who swallowed the insults and picked up added money for the Socialist British Empire, to this day kept alive only on a United States pension.

But you—if you are a Communist—would profit more by listening to the story of Jay Lovestone, who went to Moscow in July of 1929 with 90 percent of the Communist organization in the United States back of him.

And what happened? Here is Lovestone's own story:

"First of all, we had a very violent conflict over the question of how the party's international should be run, managed, or led. We (the section from America) advocated what was known as party democracy, and Stalin and his puppets, while they did not outright reject it, did actually vitiate every concept of party democracy that we once thought had to be in the international.

"Secondly, we had a vigorous clash with the Russian Communist Party as to the type of leadership for the international organization as such—that is, in the Communist International.

"Our position was that the Communist International should have a collective and genuinely international leadership in which Russia could be first, but the first among equals. We were against a monopoly of leadership by the Russian Communist Party.

"In the third place, we differed with the Communist International, which, in actuality meant the Stalin-led Russian Communist Party, over a series of questions involving the American institution.

"For example, we were denounced as 'exceptionalists' and that was, by the way, a high crime in the church.

"That was because we had stressed that there were certain historical peculiarities and industrial conditions in the United States distinct from those in other lands.

"We denied their claim that in the United States there was as much radicalism or as

much radical labor movement as there was in a number of European countries.

"We differed with the Stalin leadership every time on the entire American economic and political trends. The position of Herr Stalin was that the American economic system was going to pieces.

"We said that the Communist Party was headed for a big job in creating a crisis of very grave consequence to capitalism in the United States; that it was far from finished and that the beast still had a lot of kick in it.

"For that, we were roundly denounced. The theory of Stalin was that the revolution was pretty much around the corner for the United States."

The above-mentioned conference in Moscow was in July-August of 1929, a year of portentous happenings in the United States of America.

What did Stalin know that caused him in the midsummer of 1929 to think revolution was soon to pop in the United States of America?

Biggest Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 31, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the thirty-fifth article by Mr. Frank C. Waldrop on the infiltration of communism in our country:

BIGGEST STORY
(By Frank C. Waldrop)

In the summer of 1929 there was a big pow-wow of world Communist field officers with Stalin at Moscow. The boss had decided the United States of America was soon to blow apart in revolution, and he wanted to get his team ready.

The above information comes from one Jay Lovestone, who was there on the job.

Lovestone went to Moscow in March of 1929 as head of the Communist conspiracy in the United States. He escaped by means he has never yet disclosed in full, kicked from all his offices, and lucky to be alive.

Why? Well, here are his own words, repeated from yesterday because they are so full of curious significance to Americans, reflecting on the course of history these 20 years past.

You can find the original of this in volume 11 of the hearings by the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

"The position of Herr Stalin was that the American economic system was going to pieces and that this was the last and final crisis for capitalism in the United States.

"We," the Communist delegates from the United States, "said that the Communist Party was headed for a big job, in creating a crisis of very grave consequence to capitalism in the United States; that the beast still had a lot of kick in it.

"For that we were roundly denounced. The theory of Stalin was that the revolution was pretty much around the corner in the United States."

Now, all this, remember, was going on in Moscow in the late spring and early summer of 1929, when the United States of America was still enjoying the prosperity that had come with the expansion of industry for 10 busy years preceding.

What was actually going on inside the strategic war command of communism that year?

The record shows that Communists all over the world had been doing their worst to corrupt finance everywhere.

It is established that they faked bond issues, currency, legal tender of all kinds in the Western World then, as they were to do again in China in the 1930's. They had spies planted in banks and treasuries, and their most able financial minds had the assignment to do anything anywhere they could, to shatter the structure of capitalistic business.

Suddenly in Europe banks began to crash.

Then, on October 26, 1929, the New York Stock Exchange was swept with a panic wave of selling. Some 16,000,000 shares changed hands that 1 day. Who bought, incidentally, that which was sold? It took 2 years for the market to settle back to a reasonable order of business and by that time value of securities traded on the exchange had dropped by an estimated $50,000,000,000.

Whose actions really tilted the market into that catastrophic collapse?

In the chaos and the panic of the moment men who might now be able to piece the story together leaped from windows, shot themselves, drank iodine, or just collapsed on a couch and willed themselves to die. Records were lost forever.

It was a desperate hour for America and for the world. It was also desperate for Stalin.

All around him was hatred. He could not help but see Moscow was still unsafe for czars, as of old. Indeed, his "dear Kirov," the military commander of the capital, received the bulletin in 1934 that started Stalin on the bloodiest purge of our age.

Nor would the factories run or the peasants behave. The Soviet bureaucracy was strangling itself. The military were shot through with dissent.

In the United States of America there were panic and idleness and loss of value. But in Russia there were famine and ferocious brutality and no value to lose. Stalin's regime was suffering worse than any other on earth as hard times hit the world.

What exact part did the Soviet plottings of 1929 play in the succeeding waves of disaster that rolled across the United States of America from 1930 onward?

Maybe the truth will come out some day, if civilization ever gets its hands on the secret archives of world communism now hidden deep in the Lenin library, in Moscow.

But one more important truth has stood up before the world as a shining mark.

In the generation since 1929 American capitalism has endured the most fantastic kind of beating at the hands of imbeciles, experimenters, irresponsibles, traitors, and crooks manipulating the power of government.

It has fought and financed and won the most tremendous and the least excusable war in all of human history.

The genius of American capitalism has even saved Stalin himself from the firing squad he so richly deserves and now is being burdened again to face him down all over the globe and save the reputations of politicians in America who have been, through their idiotic recklessness and worse, the prime source of American trouble.

Biggest Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 31, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the thirty-sixth article by Mr. Frank C. Waldrop on the infiltration of communism in our country:

BIGGEST STORY
(By Frank C. Waldrop)

We pause now for a word from J. Stalin on the coming revolution in the United States of America.

He is addressing a special commission of world Communist field agents in Moscow.

The date, May 6, 1919.

Listen to him as recorded on the official minutes:

"I think the moment is not far off when a revolutionary crisis will be unleashed in America; when that revolutionary crisis comes in the United States it will mark the beginning of the end of world capitalism.

"The Communist Party of the United States must be aimed to be able to meet that historic moment and to head the forthcoming class combats. Preparation is necessary for this, comrades, a preparation of all forces. For this the American party must be improved and cleansed."

And so the Communists of the United States of America, on the word of this man so far away in the ancient Kremlin fortress in Moscow, Russia, suffered a paroxysm of disgraces, expulsions and reorganizations.

Two factions in the United States branch of the Communist organization had gone to Moscow. William Z. Foster headed the minority, as Stalin's man. Jay Lovestone had control of the extreme majority which had warned Stalin against attempting revolution in the United States of America.

So violent was the conflict that followed Stalin not only broke Lovestone but also he rejected his own man, Foster, who had embarrassed him by not knocking off Lovestone ahead of the visible, public, screeching row in Moscow.

And so it was that he chose an obscure hay-shaker from Kansas to be the general secretary and titular big wheel of communism in the United States of America.

The said hay-shaker was one Earl Browder, of the most native American background and appearance.

In the years to follow, Browder was to become a barometer of unmatched accuracy for measuring Stalin's pressure on the United States of America, its President and its Government. We will hear much more of him.

Whoever has had the patience to follow this winding and wayward narrative thus far may remember that I began by saying that I stumbled upon communism in January of 1930 as a young reporter freshly arrived in New York City.

As I made my acquaintance with the Communists, they were just launching what they confidently believed would be the last climactic assault on the United States of America, with Browder in charge.

They actually believed a revolution was at hand.

Thus it was that in the period 1930–33 the Communists precipitated spectacles such as the bonus march on Washington. That horror, which so shocked the people of the United States, has long since been exposed for what it was—a sham inspired and guided by Stalin.

The evidence and the proof have accumulated in great detail in congressional hearings and the disclosures of apostate Communists unveiling facts behind the facts of the day.

The bonus march on Washington is symbolic of that whole desperate moment in our national history, but it is just one of the many such Communist manufactories designed to make a bad thing all the more hideous and menacing.

Whispering campaigns started runs on banks. The President of the United States

was assaulted in secret and openly, with libels and slanders unmatched before or since.

Franklin D. Roosevelt won the Presidential campaign of 1932 and early the next year went to Miami, Fla., for the usual preinaugural rest. There, on the night of February 15, 1933, as he appeared in Biscayne Park, one Joseph Zangara pulled a pistol.

A woman snatched at Zangara's arm as he opened fire.

Five people were hit by his fusillade, among them Anton Cermak, mayor of Chicago.

Zangara, on arrest, claimed that he was an anarchist—a cover that Communist assassins had been using for many years.

How many people know that in Yugoslavia, where the apostate Tito now holds his shaky throne, there was at that time a Communist college for assassins—men specially trained for Zangara's kind of work?

Biggest Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 31, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the thirty-seventh article by Mr. Frank C. Waldrop on the infiltration of communism in our country:

BIGGEST STORY

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Stalin's ignorance and ineptitude at government, as distinguished from malicious destructiveness, was never better demonstrated than in the years 1930–39.

Of malicious destructiveness and intrigue we all know from the record that he is a master. And of his three greatest accomplishments in that field, all three were made at the expense of the American people.

One. He obtained diplomatic recognition from Mr. Roosevelt for his regime in 1933 just as it was on the verge of exploding.

Two. After the United States had been thoroughly trapped in European affairs by Mr. Roosevelt with Communist help, Stalin pulled the trigger for war in 1939 by signing a peace pact with Hitler.

Three. In 1945 at Yalta, he got Roosevelt's consent to his conquests, now so loudly denounced by the very factions in this country that were with him at the time in deed and in spirit.

It is necessary to remember these triumphs of Stalin's particular art, which is destructiveness, to see all the better his utter incompetency as a true public servant.

Remembering them, too, helps to appreciate the significance of his declaration in 1929 that revolution was at hand in America and the capitalistic world. This was before the market crash.

And how did things go in Russia as the well-advertised storms crashed in the United States of America? You don't hear so much about that in all the Communist-tainted literature of our time, but let's just review a few notable events.

Thereby we can better understand just why Stalin, by 1933, was eager to change the subject from revolution to procurement; with desperate urgency, of that point 1.

Stalin, you may recall, took charge of Russia in 1924 when the organizer of the first Soviet state, Lenin, went dead, much to the surprise of the choirs of Communist propagandists all over the world who had made him up to be not only Superman but also Indestructo.

He had some trouble getting started, but on October 1, 1928, Stalin proclaimed to the world the first of the big international campaigns that were by example to lead the world to fear, respect, and follow communism on the economic front.

On that date he announced the great Stalin 5-year plan, under which the Soviet Union was to industrialize and demonstrate the superiority of scientific socialism as contrasted with decadent capitalism.

The slogan of the day was "overtake and surpass America." And to goose the muzhiks into stepping lively, there was released a general wave of shootings for "inefficiency," coupled also with carefully tailored stories about the wonderful factories in America.

Indeed, Henry Ford became a sort of minor folk-hero for a brief spell and Americans generally were popularized as a clever set of monkeys but with no sense about government.

But that hardly lasted through the first frost. Americans, British, and German technicians and engineers who had been brought in found the situation impossible.

It is not correct, incidentally, to suggest that all Russians historically have been either flea-ridden farmers or crazy, cruel aristocrats with a few revolutionists on both sides.

As a matter of fact, in the nineteenth century Russia startled the world with the speed and vision of her progress in both science and industry.

You may laugh at the stories Moscow has been broadcasting about Russian inventions of everything from the wheel to the atom, but it's not all bunk.

If they had sense enough to put their propaganda on a basis of historical fact, instead of exaggerating in such a way as to make it seem they did it all alone and only last week by order of Stalin, they would have a case hard to refute.

Russia, when the works blew up in war and self-destruction, was actually on the way to an able, effective industry.

So when Stalin announced his great 5-year plan in 1928, he actually had a genuine historical foundation on which to base it.

True, most of the people who knew how to do the work were all dead and gone. And the plant itself was far out of date.

What little development there had been was a by-product of another of the many curious and still unclarified side deals that Germany and Russia have toyed with through the years.

At the end of the 1914–18 war, Lenin imported German generals to show him some trade secrets on running military machinery.

I will have some stories on the Red army, further along, that will show why he sent for the Germans and some consequences thereof.

He also imported German engineers at the same time, and it was they who had kept the Russian industrial machinery patched together until the time of the great 5-year plan.

James A. Farley—A Popular Choice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 31, 1950

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials from the Freeman's Journal, Cooperstown, N. Y., April 5, 1950, the Walton Reporter, Walton, N. Y., April 14, 1950, and the Catskill Daily Mail of April 15, 1950:

[From the Catskill (N. Y.) Daily Mail of April 15, 1950]

JIM FARLEY COULD WIN

Greene County friends of James A. Farley, and their number is legion, are viewing with interest the spontaneous gubernatorial boom which has been developing in his behalf the past few weeks. "Genial Jim" has been attending about the same number of dinners and other public events as in the past, but the welcome he has been getting everywhere around the State has just about amounted to an ovation. However, when he's questioned on his attitude toward making the race for the State's highest office, he's mum as the proverbial clam.

Both these facts are cited to substantiate the fact that the Farley boom is completely spontaneous, that Jim, the master politician, has done nothing whatsoever to inspire it. As a matter of fact, from where we sit, it seems pretty obvious that the former Postmaster General will not lift a finger in his own behalf unless or until the public demand has reached such proportions that his nomination without opposition is assured.

Farley is a fighter, but he is also a great believer in party harmony. He remembers that Thomas E. Dewey was first swept into the executive mansion at Albany after the Democratic Party split at Brooklyn over the candidacy of John J. Bennett, Jr. He knows, too, that as a leader in the fight for Bennett, he may risk the opposition of elements which opposed him at that time. It is our belief that those old wounds have healed, but it is also quite apparent to those who know him, that Jim Farley will require tangible proof before throwing his hat in the ring.

On the basis of the clamor in many upstate and Long Island counties for Farley's nomination, there is good reason to believe that he could defeat any possible combination of opponents at the party's State convention next summer. However, that is not enough. Without the support of all factions within the party, Farley won't be willing to make the race.

Nevertheless, we are thoroughly convinced that citizens throughout the State are waiting for the Democratic Party to offer James A. Farley for the governorship. There are many reasons.

First of all, he is a good businessman. He has proved that in a number of very important jobs, and we are confident that if he is sent to Albany, he would cut red tape, he would spend and save wisely and he would apply the rules of simple arithmetic in a manner the public could understand.

In the second place, he wouldn't evade issues, either as a candidate or as Governor. He would face every problem speedily and without pussyfooting, and once he had taken a position, there he would stand.

Finally, Jim Farley is a good politician. He once wrote that "when political organizations begin thinking about jobs and nothing else, when they forget that the public business should come first, they have begun their own death chant without realizing it. * * * The protest of the public is the best way to discipline an organization against that sort of thing."

That provides a pretty accurate idea of the kind of administration Jim Farley would offer.

So the State political picture boils down as follows:

Rank-and-file voters want Farley for governor.

The majority of party leaders want him, too.

Some of his old adversaries would like to head him off at the convention. However, these same leaders want to win, and a casual

perusal of the others who are being mentioned as possibilities should convince them nomination of Jim Farley offers the surest road to victory.

[From the Walton (N. Y.) Reporter of April 14, 1950]

A POPULAR CHOICE

Too often voters are faced with the choice of making a selection between two mediocre candidates. In such cases the voter will usually vote his party ticket without enthusiasm. He feels that his political leaders have been unwise in making the choice of candidates but that there is little he can do about the situation.

This is the year of a gubernatorial election. Gov. Thomas E. Dewey can have the Republican nomination if he desires it as he controls the Republican political machine in New York State. Regardless of whom the Republicans nominate the Democratic Party should seek to place in nomination a candidate who has outstanding qualifications—a man for whom all independent voters will feel no hesitation in voting. Such a man is James A. Farley.

Before Mr. Farley can go before the voters he must receive the nomination from the State Democratic convention. That convention has the opportunity to pave the way to certain victory at the polls. With Mr. Farley as a candidate there will be few voters who will have any doubt that Mr. Farley is a man fitted in every way, to serve them as chief executive of New York State.

[From the Freeman's Journal, Cooperstown, N. Y., of April 5, 1950]

JAMES A. FARLEY FOR GOVERNOR

On November 7 the people of the State of New York will go to the polls to name a new Governor, and the Freeman's Journal would like to go on record at this time in support of one of the great men of our time for this highly important office—James A. Farley.

Before Mr. Farley can go before the voters in November, it will be necessary for him to receive the nomination of his party at the State convention this summer. Opportunity is spreading its wings in favor of the Democrats in the State at this time, and their nomination of Mr. Farley will pave the way to certain victory in the fall.

The Freeman's Journal respectfully urges without any qualification or reservation the nomination of Mr. Farley, a man fitted in every way to serve New York State as its chief executive.

Memorial Day and Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NEIL J. LINEHAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 29, 1950

Mr. LINEHAN. Mr. Speaker, the Congress and the President have asked that this day, long sacred to the memory of departed heroes, be observed with thoughts and prayers for peace. Peace is the great question of our time. We realize now as never before that the making of peace, on which the Saviour bestowed his benediction, "Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God," is not a simple thing. Peace is something that has to be made; it is not something into which the world can drift. It is not a negative thing, the mere absence of war; it calls for positive actions and attitudes. It is not a merely sentimental thing, accomplished by good intentions and pious resolutions. It is not a one-sided thing; it takes two to make a quarrel, they used to say; now we know that it also takes two to make a peace; peace cannot be achieved by any unilateral virtue or self-restraint. Most of all, it is clear as never before that peace may be a very costly thing—not so dramatically costly as war, perhaps, but nevertheless far from cheap.

The scene which surrounds us today is evidence of that cost. Here lie buried those whose lives have been given for their country in the past. Who can estimate the worth of these lives? What these young men might have meant to the world if they had lived? What their loss means in the unrecorded sorrow of parents and wives and sweethearts and children? The great treasure of any country is not its steel mills or its rolling prairies or its public buildings, but its young people. And here we commemorate citizens whose lives, for the most part, were sacrificed in early manhood before the story they could have told could be unrolled, or their contribution made to the family or the Nation which gave them birth.

All too readily, because these dead cannot speak to us, we accept the fruit of their sacrifice in an unthinking way. We have our existence here in this country. We have our freedoms. We can proceed to worship according to conscience, to speak according to our belief, to advance with life and liberty intact on our pursuit of happiness. We exercise these privileges every day of our lives. But that we have them is due to the fact that in the past these Americans have been willing to lay down their lives for us. Privilege is always preceded by sacrifice. Theirs has been the sacrifice. Ours now are the privileges.

We do right when we honor them, with our flowers, our songs, our parades, with everything which can be provided, at this most beautiful season of the year, to remind ourselves of our indebtedness. We must also honor them by making peace.

"The making of peace," as someone has said, "is a less spectacular feat than the waging of war, but in terms of effort, determination, and skill it calls for a similar outgoing of resources."

When the United States taxes itself and strains its economy, as it is doing today, to build up the welfare of hundreds of millions of stricken and unfortunate people in many parts of the world, so that they shall be better prepared in their minds to resist the insidious propaganda of communism, this is a part of the making of peace. When the United States ties itself into a mutual-defense pact with the nations of western Europe, as it is doing today, in order to enable the free world to resist aggression that is planned against them, that is also a measure of peace. When we pour money and men into the building up of our own Army and Navy and Air Force, so that we shall not again be caught flat-footed by an aggressor with ambitions for world domination, then again we are doing something to make peace. Aggressors of the type of Hitler, Mussolini, and Stalin do not start warfare against the strong; it is the weak who invite their attention.

These measures of which I speak are all great matters of public policy. They may seem, and sometimes are, a long way off from the ordinary citizen. But each of us has his own responsibility for the peace of the world, not only in supporting the Nation in these matters of high policy, but in the ordinary surroundings of civilian life. And here, too, we may take inspiration from those whom we commemorate here today. If these dead could speak to us, I am sure they would say something like this: "Be good citizens. Do not seek for yourselves, or your group, advantages which are at the same time disadvantages to the Nation or the world as a whole. Be ready, as we were, if necessary to give the last full measure of devotion to the common weal." Or, to quote the words of one of the greatest of all the American founding fathers, Thomas Jefferson:

> Love your neighbor as yourself and your country more than yourself. Be just. Be true. Murmur not at the ways of Providence.

Such citizens are carrying on the traditions of the noble dead and are creative for the future of America and the peace of the world. That is a responsibility for all of us, which we will do well to recognize on this Memorial Day.

Recommendations of the Hoover Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 29, 1950

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, the crusade to throw the oppression of Government off the backs of the people is joined by the young people. They have exercised the ancient right of petition to Congress for relief. I present it herewith:

> We, the senior students of the citizenship class of Bronxville (N. Y.) High School, in the interest of our future life investment and in accordance with our heritage of the right to petition, do ask that some action be taken to carry out the recommendations of the Hoover report. We have made a study of the Hoover report and feel that the loose fiscal policy of the administration has created, and unless immediate corrective measures are taken will continue to create, the deplorable waste of both money and efficiency in our Government. As our generation will inherit the iniquitous results of the extravagance now being allowed we feel compelled to petition action.
>
> NATALIE MARSHALL,
> PATRACIA STORCK,
> CORNING S. PARKER,
> DAVE ATWATER
> (And 88 other members of the class).

This Changing World—L'Heureux Idea of Prayers for Peace Is Growing to Vast Proportions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 31, 1950

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article by Constantine Brown, which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of May 30, 1950:

THIS CHANGING WORLD—L'HEUREUX IDEA OF PRAYERS FOR PEACE IS GROWING TO VAST PROPORTIONS

(By Constantine Brown)

When Herve J. L'Heureux, Chief of State Department, Visa Division, returns to a post in the Foreign Service in the summer of 1951 he will leave behind—barring the outbreak of another diastrous war—a live and growing movement dedicated to prayers for peace.

Since the Last Man's Club of the William H. Jutes Post No. 43 of the American Legion at Manchester, N. H., adopted the original prayers-for-peace resolution on October 28, 1948, the movement has grown to vast proportions, without the help of any national organization or of financial endowments beyond that which Mr. L'Heureux' own finances will bear.

The extent to which the movement has grown deserves recognition on this Memorial Day, when President Truman again has called on the American people to offer prayers for continued world peace—even if the benefits of that peace are negated by the constant threat of war.

SUMMARIZED IDEAS

Mr. L'Heureux summarized the idea of his movement in an address April 15 this year before the Department of Virginia, Catholic War Veterans, at Alexandria, Va.:

"I speak to you as a fellow veteran and a layman," he said. "I am not a preacher. I advocate no new dogma. My message is simple: Prayer, a minimum of 1 minute of prayer daily at noon by every man, woman, and child in the United States, each in his own way, each according to his own faith, to seek divine guidance and assistance in securing world peace."

The simplicity of this idea, its all-embracing character, had an immediate appeal. Since the first resolution by the Manchester Legion post the following had taken similar action by May 15, 1950: Five hundred and fifty-nine veterans' organizations (individual posts), 36 veterans' auxiliary groups, 12 service clubs, 83 fraternal societies, clubs, and sororities, 143 student groups, 22 alumnae groups, 45 church groups, 133 business firms and 13 groups of Federal employees.

Besides these the national organizations have joined the movement: The Elks, the Greek-American Progressive Association, the Order of Ahepa, the Society of American Legion Founders, Delta Theta Phi law fraternity, Jewish War Veterans, and the National Executive Committee of the American Legion.

AIMS AND PURPOSES

No more succinct statement of the movement's aims and purposes could be written than that delivered by Mr. L'Heureux before the Catholic War Veterans: "Those of us who initiated this movement were actuated by a conviction that each and every person, regardless of his station in life, or his religious belief, can assist materially, through daily prayer, in achieving the peace which all of us desire so ardently. It was thought that a pause in the midst of our daily work, at 12 o'clock noon, is an appropriate time to marshal the spiritual force of our Nation for peace, with the hope that such a custom might become universal in effect.

"The establishment of this practice generally would not only be a national acknowledgement of our dependency upon God, but it might also be a source of inspiration and encouragement to the masses of unfortunate people throughout the world who look to us for moral leadership, as well as for material aid.

"The prayers-for-peace movement is thoroughly patriotic, consistent with our basic philosophy of life and with the fundamental precepts upon which this country was founded. It is not pacifist in character. It is not a substitute for adequate armament, but an indispensable, spiritual component of adequate preparedness—in fact, a properly balanced preparedness.

"While our potential enemies are straining every effort in preparation for total war, and we in the United States are taking necessary precautions to meet the challenge, why not unite, simultaneously, at least in a national, if not a world-wide, mobilization, of daily prayers for divine assistance and return to good morals and true Christian principles, with the hope of dissipating the causes for another world conflict? There is hardly a person who believes in God who, whether he goes to church or not, does not turn to God for help in times of peril to himself or to a loved one. Since this be true why wait until the eleventh hour? Why not seek God's graces now, before it is too late?"

The Raw Material for Our Social Structure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY J. DAVENPORT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 31, 1950

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an address made by Admiral Ben Moreell, president of the Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp., to the annual conference of the National Council of Juvenile Court Judges, Pittsburgh, Pa., May 1, 1950:

THE RAW MATERIAL FOR OUR SOCIAL STRUCTURE

Chancelor Fitzgerald, Judge Schramm, members of the National Council of Juvenile Court Judges, ladies and gentlemen, it is an honor to address the judges who preside over one of the most important segments of our judicial system. It is referred to as a segment rather than court because, if my understanding of your processes is correct, the actual formal court proceedings are but a small part of the total work which is done in the name of the juvenile courts.

This does not imply that the juvenile court is regarded as an administrative agency solely. It is a most important part of our judicial system. In your journal of last September, the learned Dean Pound, a most eminent scholar of jurisprudence, makes this distinction quite clearly when he speaks of the juvenile court as individualizing with regard to principles rather than unguided personal feeling. He says, too, that the juvenile court is characteristically American in that it is part of an Anglo-American system of judicial rather than administrative institutions and so keeps within the bounds of constitutional authority while employing the individualized methods of judicial adaptation of remedy to result in view of the facts in particular cases, which is characteristic of Anglo-American equity. In laymen's words, this means that you are humanitarians who apply appropriate remedies to specific cases. But you are, at the same time, wise judges who act under and by a set of principles, thus differing from so-called administrative experts who function under the theory that they are free to pursue any course and to apply any remedy which will serve an end deemed by them to be desirable.

In considering an appropriate subject for this address, I am inevitably drawn to my favorite thesis, which is the guide and precept for my own conduct. It is this: that nothing is so important to this country, and to the world, as people—human beings—individuals. Machinery, equipment, processes, buildings, communications, transportation, distribution, sales, finance, research, raw materials, even the very moral and ethical principles by which we live, are without substance and value unless we have the people—the men and women—to make them function. And the raw materials of people are children.

We, in the steel industry, know that the things we produce or which others fabricate from our products are no better than the raw materials which are fed into the blast furnaces and open hearths. The iron ore, the coal, the limestone, the steel scrap, the alloy metals—all these come together to determine the quality and the character of the sheet, the wire, the bar, the tube, or the structural member which finally results from the rolling or drawing process. Steel can be ruined by improper processing, but even with the best of processing good end products can be produced only from good steel, and this only from good raw materials.

The raw materials for steel making are much like our children. A goodly part of these raw materials are fit for use just as they are extracted from the ground. They require no special treatment. They are subjected to the traditional processes of smelting, reduction, heating, rolling, and drawing, to make sound products.

But large quantities of our coal and iron ore, in their natural states, are not suitable for the making of steel because of contaminations acquired from their environments or otherwise. In the case of iron ore, we say it must be beneficiated. In the case of coal, it must be washed, screened, and separated to eliminate undesirable parts. Frequently we resort to extensive research to develop methods for improving these raw materials so they will be useful elements for the making of steel.

The parallel, I believe, is obvious. Our children constitute the raw material from which our social structure is built. Like the coal and iron ore, most were formed and developed in an environment such that they require no special treatment, no "beneficiation," to enable them to grow into useful citizens under the influence of our normal processes and institutions—our homes, schools, colleges, and churches.

But there are some who are not so fortunate. Their environment, or perhaps some hereditary trait, requires that they be beneficiated—that they be given special treatment which will fit them to take their proper places in society, to contribute usefully to the collectivity, and to enjoy the spiritual and material fruits of productive service. And, as in the case of raw materials for steelmaking, the required special treatment

is not the same in all cases. Careful and extended research may be needed before we can determine the treatment which will serve best. I am sure that this is much more difficult in the case of children than it is in the case of iron ore and coal, but the greater effort is fully justified by the greater importance of the issue.

Whether and to what extent we beneficiate our raw materials for steelmaking is largely a question of economics. The continuing discoveries of new, large deposits of high grade iron ore in various parts of the world eliminates the question of absolute necessity and reduces the problem to one of relative costs.

But whether we can build a strong social structure is infinitely more important than any question of economics or of the physical developments of our economy. For of what use are physical developments if we do not have the strong social structure to operate them And the strength of our social structure is, in the aggregate, the summation of the strengths of the individuals who compose it.

Ours is a highly interdependent society. One can hardly take a significant action without material effect on the lives and welfare of many people. This very fact stresses the basic importance of developing the moral fiber of the individuals upon whom we must depend for the operation of our social machine. And you gentlemen here tonight carry a great burden of responsibility for the character of that development.

The value attached to the individual human being is the important distinction between our system of living and those of communism, socialism, and other forms of collectivist or regimented government. The supremacy of the individual and his liberty is the foundation stone upon which is based our concept of government as the servant of the people, not their master.

We have often lost sight of this fact. Our complex economy and the employment of large numbers of people in huge enterprises makes us think in terms of people in the mass—unions, shifts, gangs—and our quantity production induces the use of purely statistical terms, such as tons per man-hour, for units of measure. These impersonal usages serve to obscure the importance of the individual.

But when we carry this kind of thinking too far we get into trouble. Let us not overlook the importance of quantity production and distribution. That is the very essence of the great industrial and economic power which permits us to make and distribute goods at prices within the means of most of our people. It has enabled us to achieve victory in two great wars by smothering our enemies in a flood of industrial production. These results have been accomplished by means of huge aggregations of capital operated by large concentrations of human talent in the form of our modern corporations. Without them we would be vulnerable to the attacks of any avaricious aggressor.

But we must be alert to the danger which arises when these large organizations tend to become impersonal and to minimize the importance of individuals who, together, make the organization. We in industry are keenly aware of this danger. We are facing it with confidence in our ability to solve the problem. We are rapidly achieving a better understanding of how to live and work together and, as we learn more about human beings, we make faster progress toward the goal of complete social equity.

Not long ago my secretary told me a story which has great significance. He said he was discussing my periodic letters to our employees with some of our men. One of the foremen from the mill told him of an incident which had occurred the day before. It appears that the foreman, who was in charge of a labor gang, had found it necessary to speak very harshly to one of the laborers. When he had finished, the laborer, who had listened calmly and patiently, said, "You know you ought not to talk to me like that." The foreman asked, "Why not?" and the laborer replied, "Because Admiral Moreell says that I am an individual, I have dignity and I am important."

The Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp. has approximately 45,000 employees. If each one of them can achieve that belief, we will have made a great advance toward the solution of the basic problem of human relations.

As head of a great construction organization during the recent war, I was frequently faced with evidence of the tremendous latent power which inheres in the human spirit. We do not think of military organizations as taking cognizance of this power. Certainly the Prussian tradition of militarism does not recognize it. But I assure you that it was the individual spirit which make our Seabees exceed the standard of accomplishment implied by their self-adopted motto, "Can do."

Their great achievements in the face of what appeared to be insurmountable obstacles and hardships did not result from the well-planned orders of admirals and captains which were directed to men who acted as automatons. The officers provided the plans and the leadership, but the indomitable spirit of the individual men accomplished the tasks.

And that is why I believe that recognition of the importance of the individual can determine whether it shall be victory or defeat in war, spiritual and material advances or deterioration in peace.

It is significant that every nation, every civilization, which has turned away from the doctrine of the supremacy of human individuality has ended in disaster. You may ask why is it not proper that the most wise and intelligent amongst us should take charge and order our lives. There are many men and women with superior intellects. Should they not be given absolute power to arrange the lives of the others and thus produce the ultimate in efficiency and maximum good for all? It has been said that the democracies are at a tremendous disadvantage when pitted in war against the autocracies. The German and Japanese Armies appeared to be invincible. They and the civilian economies which supported them were the last word in absolute control by a few over the many. The odds were in their favor. But they did not win. They were frequently beaten by forces which were inferior in number and material equipment.

The reason is evident to any thinking person who has had the opportunity to observe the event at close hand. Absolute domination of the individual human spirit by other humans makes for moral and spiritual decay amongst both rulers and those who are ruled. Our men were endowed with independence and spirit, initiative and the moral character which goes with sound basic principles. I am sure that they did not reason this out for themselves, but there was an intuitive feeling that they were fighting for decency and fair play against immorality and enslavement.

Our men were born and reared in an atmosphere conducive to the development of their individual characters; where the only valid limitation on the right of the individual to improve his lot was that which was established by his own abilities.

In our commercial world we have many examples of what individual initiative and character have accomplished. Horatio Alger was popular because he recorded history, albeit under fictitious names. While our record is far from perfect and much remains to be done, this great country has made great advances both in material benefits and in the moral strength of its people by releasing the unlimited power of the human spirit.

It is important to note that every society which has belittled the importance of the individual and has attempted to treat humanity in the mass has also eventually belittled religious teachings and faith amongst its people. To me this is an inevitable sequence. The spirit of God does not reside in a group of people as such. The teachings of Christ invariably deal with the status of the individual. It is only the individual who can feel and live by religious faith.

I have dwelt at some length on this subject because I believe that the work of the juvenile court is so completely in accord with my thinking in respect to this matter of the strength of the human spirit. If even a small part of the children who need to be guided or reclaimed, or perhaps I should say beneficiated, fail to receive that help, we are suffering an irreparable loss to our social structure. We are discarding individuals at those stages of their lives when they can with the greatest ease be guided along the high road of achievement or, by neglect, be permitted to become a burden, or even a menace, to our society.

Let us not delude ourselves into thinking that all of the men and women who have done great deeds for our country have records which are spotless. I venture to say that many of us here tonight will recall a smudge or two which we would wish were not there. But that merely serves to spotlight the point I am making, that with expert and devoted treatment, human beings can be beneficiated to better serve their God, their country, and their fellow man.

I know that it is risky to attempt to advise experts in their own field, but I have the temerity to do so. From experience in working with adults, many of whom needed help, I have learned a lesson which may be applicable to your work with children. It is this: When a person does his own thinking and arrives at his own conclusion, the resolves which result from that thinking are more firm and more likely to stay with him. If we can concentrate on teaching people—children or adults—to think straight so that they can straighten out for themselves the angled skeins of their own lives, we are more likely to achieve success. That is the ultimate in individualism—that each one should decide for himself to do what is right with his own life, not because of material advantage to be gained or punishment to be avoided, but because it conforms to that high moral code which is the only key to the treasure house of unlimited spiritual power.

Yours is a high and noble obligation. You are working with the materials of which our Nation is built. Your devotion and competence will have significant influence on the strength and resilence of our social fabric and of our Nation.

May God give you the wisdom and courage to carry on.

Lie Should Be Given All Encouragement in Peace Mission—UN Head Undiscouraged by American Aloofness to Mediation Efforts

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1950

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article by David

Lawrence, which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of May 30, 1950:

LIE SHOULD BE GIVEN ALL ENCOURAGEMENT IN PEACE MISSION—UN HEAD UNDISCOURAGED BY AMERICAN ALOOFNESS TO MEDIATION EFFORTS

(By David Lawrence)

Trygve Lie (pronounced "Lee") came and talked and went away undiscouraged. He is apparently the only man who sees a possibility of bringing the cold war to an end, and he thinks it can be done if someone stays in the middle—and doesn't become the partisan of either side.

Again, as has so often happened in world history, an opportunity presents itself for governments to be mindful of the awful consequences of arrogance and stubbornness and to try to find a healing formula instead of resigning themselves to the ultimate business of "organized murder"—more euphemistically referred to as war.

Mr. Lie's mission to Washington is of transcendent importance. It cannot be dismissed as the journey of a meddler. What else was the United Nations created for but to furnish mediation machinery when rival powers seem unable to compose their differences through the ordinary channels of diplomacy?

TREATED WITH SCORN

It is most unfortunate that before Mr. Lie had conferred with Stalin, before he had visited London and Paris and talked with high officials everywhere, his errand was treated with scorn in dispatches reflecting official attitudes. Even before it was published that he would come to Washington to talk with President Truman and Secretary Acheson, the unofficial word was disseminated here that it wouldn't do any good.

The tragic fact is that this is characteristic of closed minds. It emphasizes a hazardous disregard of the risks of drifting from a cold war into a hot war. No high official, of course, thinks he is guilty of such indifference. Yet men in positions of responsibility often develop a kind of blind confidence in the rightness of their own judgment. They leave no room for doubt as to their own infallibility.

Trygve Lie didn't discuss with the press what he said in his intimate conversations with the President and the Secretary of State. But it is apparent that the American attitude of the moment is one of aloofness to any sort of mediation which does not start with some conspicuous act of reassurance from Moscow. There is such deep distrust about conferences themselves that they are considered superfluous. This is a dangerous state for the relations between major powers to reach and indicates more than ever the need for a bold intervention and some persistent effort to change rigid positions.

BARRIER CAN BE OVERCOME

The United States Government professes to be interested only in peace-making. It also fears that the word of the Russian government is meaningless in any pledge that would be given. Distressing as is this barrier, it is by no means insurmountable. Usually two parties to a dispute reach that particular point of mutual distrust and yet experience teaches that there are always ways to solve the unsolvable when there is a will to do some solving.

Basically, Trygve Lie can assure the American Government that Russia has a will to settle the cold war, and he can assure Russia that America has a similar desire. To get a formula for peace is not just to suggest a retreat or advance of one particular issue. The dispute, for example, over whether the Chinese Communist government shall be seated in the Security Council is not now and never has been the real issue in the United Nations. There are many more points of friction, and about all that the controversy over recognizing Communist China adds is just one more tangle in the skein of controversies which must be disentangled entirely before progress can be made.

Politically, it is risky at the moment for the Truman administration to agree to give the Chinese Communist government a seat in the Security Council, but it is even more risky politically to follow a course that can make the administration appear to be stumbling into war with Russia. The time to stop a war is long before the casualty lists start coming in and the cities of the United States begin to be bombed. Peace is a better political issue than any other.

Trygve Lie is the only man in the world who in this critical moment in the affairs of mankind can keep the doors open in Moscow and Washington. He can fly back and forth and submit proposals and counterproposals if desired. That was the spirit behind the creation of the United Nations itself. The world will be patient while Trygve Lie tries to bring some sense into the situation. It could be the most important mediation of all time, and hence Mr. Lie should be given every encouragement.

Back to America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD H. VELDE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 31, 1950

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Peoria Journal of May 24, 1950, entitled "Back to America":

BACK TO AMERICA

In a three-column-long editorial, reproduced in full-page advertisements in numerous major American newspapers, the Washington Post is appealing that something be done to start on what it calls the road back to America.

It declares that the rise of distrust in Washington, inspired mainly by the charges leveled against the State Department by Senator MCCARTHY, is endangering the future of America. The Post, while admitting the danger that exists in the operations of a Communist fifth column in this country, is fearful that the methods being used to rout out the disloyal are burning down the house of the American way of life in order to get at the rats in it.

The Post proposes, instead of the airing of charges and the leveling of accusations that reflect on innocent employees as well as the guilty, to form a Commission on National Security to survey the threats to our Government and to develop weapons and defenses against them.

Such a Commission may be able to accomplish much in the way of removing the terror that hangs over the heads of innocent people and in rooting out the agents of a foreign government that seeks our national downfall. Perhaps it should be named.

One thing, however, the Post, in its desire to put an end to what it calls witch hunting, overlooks. It shows no concern over how the subversive agents of Soviet Russia got into our Government and it vouchsafes no worry over the lack of interest being shown by the Truman administration in their existence there.

We can appoint commissions and soft pedal wild accusations but we will be making no start on the road back to Americanism until the leaders of our Government begin to concern themselves with getting rid of employees whose sympathies are suspicious. So far they haven't.

We hear a great deal of talk about the irresponsibility of the charges made by Senator MCCARTHY. Certainly his inability to produce evidence to back up his accusations is indication that he has been far from careful in the flinging of charges from within his cloak of senatorial immunity. But if we had had an administration that was on its guard against infiltration and that was determined that no advocates of foreign ideologies could arise there would have been no opportunity for a MCCARTHY to grab the spotlight.

We need to get back on the road to America all right but we can't do it until the administration gets back in the general vicinity of that road itself. Let's stop the shielding of people obviously in sympathy with communistic aspects of government and begin concentrating on true American ideals. Then, and only then, will we be on the American road.

Dalton-Lavallee American Legion Post, Easthampton, Mass., Donated Land and Building for New Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FOSTER FURCOLO
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 31, 1950

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, I think the Members of Congress and everyone in the Nation should know of a very unusual act of generosity that recently occurred in Easthampton, Mass.

The Dalton-Lavallee American Legion Post had long wanted a home of its own. The wishes of its members finally became a reality when the officials of Stanley Home Products, Inc., donated land and a building to the post. The presentation ceremonies were held on May 28 in Easthampton. A splendid presentation speech was made by F. Stanley Beveridge, founder and president of the Stanley Home Products, Inc.

The new post home is one of the finest I have ever seen and I believe the donation was an extremely rare and fine display of generosity. It is the sort of inspirational and generous act that should be brought to the attention of the entire Nation, in my opinion.

The officials and employees of Stanley Home Products, Inc., have always taken a great interest in the post and have tried to help it in every possible way. They also wanted to honor one of their present employees, Alphonse A. Laudato, Jr., of Westfield, Mass., who was awarded the Distinguished Service Cross in World War II. One room in the post home has been named the Alphonse Laudato room in his honor.

The ceremonies also saw the dedication of a magnificent 30-foot flagpole in memory of Lt. Robert A. Richardson, an Easthampton boy who gave his life in World War II.

I know all the Members will want to join with me in extending best wishes to the post in its new home and also in congratulating all associated with the Stanley Home Products, Inc., for their act of generosity which should serve as an inspiration to all.

Verdict Without Trial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 31, 1950

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post of Tuesday, May 30, 1950:

VERDICT WITHOUT TRIAL

Secretary of Commerce Sawyer's attempted ouster of two employees under fire involves a principle of vital importance. It is with the principle alone, rather than with the personalities of the two cases, that this newspaper is concerned. We believe that men accused of disloyalty are entitled to a fair hearing under the procedures of the President's loyalty program devised to deal with just such accusations. The effect of Secretary Sawyer's attempt to dismiss rather than to suspend William W. Remington and Michael E. Lee while their cases are pending is to undermine the whole loyalty program, and indeed, to threaten it with entire collapse.

Mr. Sawyer says that his action "is in no wise intended to reflect in any way on the loyalty of either of these two men" but was taken, rather, "in the interest of good administration in the Department." This is simply glossing over a bad action. The action cannot fail to reflect on the loyalty of the men concerned, and, in the case of Mr. Remington, who has been called before a grand jury, it may have the most damaging results, for it amounts to nothing less than an assumption of guilt before there has even been an indictment. Mr. Sawyer well knows that grand juries are not impervious to the verdicts of Cabinet officers.

So far as "good administration in the Department" is concerned, this can scarcely be advanced by a yielding to pressure from Capitol Hill. Quite the contrary, as subsequent developments showed. Senator MALONE said on a television program Saturday that the Secretary of Commerce acted because he was afraid, if he did not act, his Department would be investigated. The following day, flushed with his success, Senator MALONE called for a "good, old-fashioned house cleaning in the Commerce Department." He asserted that the Secretary's action showed the need for investigation of everyone connected with the Lee and Remington cases and added, with the logic that seems to be the fashion in such matters, "This should prove they're all in it together." Thus the Secretary has abdicated his responsibility as administrator, and employees of the Commerce Department are now on notice that Senator MALONE is their boss.

This is the kind of intimidation we object to. The executive has now succumbed to it. It seems to be accepting any expression of no confidence in the Loyalty Review Board that comes along from any individual Senator. The Board was created by the President for a dual purpose: to protect the Government from untrustworthy employees and equally to protect loyal employees from unjust accusations. It cannot fulfill these functions if it is ignored by department heads, as Secretary Sawyer has ignored it, and if dismissal by denunciation is to be the rule.

The threatened breakdown points imperatively, we think, to the need for a commission on security—an impartial study by an unpartisan body of universally respected citizens to weigh the procedures for determining loyalty and to clarify the climate in which they are to operate. What Mr. Sawyer has done is to supply a telling argument for that commission, and the President by this time ought to realize it. Here is one of his own Cabinet members kicking in the teeth the procedure with which he says he is satisfied.

Address of Panamanian Ambassador Herbruger Before the Panama Canal Society of Washington, D. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 31, 1950

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, the Panama Canal Society of Washington, D. C., at its annual banquet on May 27, 1950, honored the memory of one of the most illustrious of the builders of the Panama Canal, Harry Outen Cole, of West Virginia.

It was most fitting, therefore, that among the speakers on that occasion should be the distinguished Ambassador of Panama to the United States, Señor don Rodolfo F. Herbruger. His statement regarding the relations between the Governments of the United States and the Republic of Panama supplies a deeper insight into the political problems of the region which was the scene of Mr Cole's great contribution toward building the Pacific section of the Panama Canal.

As chairman of the Special Subcommittee on Panama Canal Tolls under House Resolution 44, Eighty-first Congress, I visited the Canal Zone in 1949, had the great privilege of addressing the National Assembly of the Republic of Panama, and of seeing the unique international relationship inherent in the operation, maintenance, and protection of the Panama Canal. It was indeed gratifying to observe the free relations which exist between the people of the Canal Zone and the Republic, separated only by an unpatrolled, invisible boundary line respected by all.

To make the views expressed by Ambassador Herbruger available to the Congress, I deem it appropriate that I should include in my remarks the full text of the Ambassador's statement:

Mr. President, members of the Panama Canal Society of Washington, ladies and gentlemen, it is with the greatest of pleasure that I have accepted your most kind invitation to attend the annual dinner of your organization.

The fact that the Honorable Maurice H. Thatcher, ex-Governor of the Canal Zone, is tonight's principal speaker makes this occasion the more memorable for me, due to the circumstance that the distinguished gentleman is from Kentucky, the State in which my father was born, and also because I consider Mr. Thatcher to be a real friend of Panama where his personality is remembered with a great deal of affection and where his name has been immortalized by the Thatcher Ferry and the Thatcher Highway.

As you all well know, the residents of the Canal Zone and the people of Panama live, for all practical purposes, next door to each other. The human contact between Americans and Panamanians is a daily routine, as is also the close working cooperation which for the sake of harmony has to be maintained between the official authorities in both jurisdictions.

However, because of the existence of that situation, it has been humanly impossible to avoid, at certain stages in the past, temporary strainings in the relations not only between the residents of the Canal Zone and Panama; but, also, on some occasions, between the official authorities of both areas. If some of the incidents which have occurred are sadly remembered today by good Panamanians and good Americans, maybe some comfort can be found in the fact that if an impartial observer would analyze the history of the relations between our two countries since 1903, he must arrive at the conclusion that, human nature being what it is, the number of such incidents do represent a minimum of what could be expected under the prevailing conditions.

Yet, notwithstanding those incidents, it seems to me that the daily contact which for years has now been going on between Americans and Panamanians has enabled both groups to acquire a better understanding of each other, and has thus created a more propitious climate for better relations in the future.

I am sure that today both sides do recognize and give due consideration to the fact that because of the political, social, and economic relationship and interdependence which exist between the two areas, it is not possible to solve our differences by the normal means and procedures which regulate the relations between neighboring countries. Arrangements and mutual concessions of a special nature must be agreed upon by both sides, in order to solve our problems on adequate, equitable, and permanent basis.

As the dimensions and proportions of objects vary according to the distance and angle from which they are seen, thus, in human relations, the axioms of political, social, and economic problems acquire new meanings which lead to new conclusions, when analyzed from different points of view.

Much of the misunderstandings which have occurred in the past can be attributed to a lack of willingness from both sides to exert any effort in order to try to understand the other side's point of view. May I frankly say that until very recently neither side has tried to be constructive or objective, and that both sides, when discussing mutual problems, have approached them under the sphere of its own point of view, taking only into consideration the protection of its own exclusive interests.

I am sure that most of you, who had worked in the Canal Zone, would approach today the problems which confront us in a very different way than you would have done, when you lived down there. I am confident that most of you, if appointed to a committee to study the matters which arise from the peculiar nature of the relations between the Canal Zone and Panama, would at the present time make a genuine effort to understand our point of view, and may I also state that it is the firm purpose of Panama's present administration to discuss our mutual problems with the same spirit.

The efforts of adaptation and comprehension which have been recently made by our two Governments in order to solve our differences are commendable and, so far, the results are promising.

However, if it is our sincere wish that this initial step toward objectiveness and constructiveness should become a stable and permanent policy, it will be necessary to rectify in the minds of the people on both sides the distortioned conception that still exists regarding the true nature and the real implications of the problems that we have to deal with.

Recognizing this necessity, every single official statement that has been made by His Excellency, the President of Panama, Dr. Arnulfo Arias, with reference to my country's relations with the United States of America, has indeed sought to create an atmosphere of confidence and better understanding and, on the other side the Honorable Edward G. Miller, Jr., Assistant Secretary of State for the Latin-American Republics, and His Excellency, Mr. Monnett B. Davis, United States Ambassador to Panama, have greatly contributed toward improving our relations, by statements made in press conferences.

It would be a shame if the promising results so far achieved during the past months should be wasted because of false propaganda based on misconceptions, or because of the pressure that groups on either side could apply on their respective Governments to protect petty interests.

Both Governments, therefore, must continue to take positive action in order to maintain and strengthen this policy, and all men of good will in the United States and Panama should do their utmost to help their respective governments in this task.

Because of their intimate knowledge of the political, social, and economic problems which exists between Panama and the Canal Zone, because of their ability to approach these problems today from a high-level point of view, and because of the connections that they have with different organizations in the Canal Zone, I know of no other group of people that could be of more help toward creating a better understanding between the residents of the two areas and could thereby contribute more to the solution of our differences, than the members of the Panama Canal Society.

For this reason I make a fervent appeal to all of you to work toward this end. Do remember that Theodore Roosevelt, when he visited my country, promised that all the new commercial opportunities that would be created by the construction of the Canal should revert to the people of Panama. Please keep also in mind that all the agreements that would be entered into by our respective governments, in that direction, will be mutually profitable; the economic benefits that will thus accrue to Panama will be shared by the citizens of the United States in general; and, particularly, because of their local connections, by the residents of the Canal Zone, since the Republic of Panama in its constitution has granted to United States citizens the very same economic privileges thereby granted to Panamanians.

I am confident that practical solutions to our economic differences, that could be of mutual benefit for the residents of both jurisdictions, can be found. It is only necessary for both sides to approach the problem with an open mind and a feeling of good will and understanding toward the other side's point of view.

I do wish to thank you once again for the privilege of being here tonight and to reiterate the sincere pledge of my Government to keep on taking positive action in order to strengthen the bonds of friendship between North Americans and Panamanians.

The Russians Back Down

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD H. VELDE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 31, 1950

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Peoria Journal of May 24, 1950, entitled "The Russians Back Down":

THE RUSSIANS BACK DOWN

Once again it has been demonstrated that a display of strength and firm determination is enough to make Soviet Russia back down.

This time the Russians are changing their plans for a German Communist Youth invasion of west Berlin next Sunday because the Allied forces have announced in no uncertain terms that they are prepared to deal with any emergency that arises.

Had the west Berlin government appeared fearful and disorganized, the Russians would have gone ahead with the show of strength they had planned for Whitsuntide and the Allies would have suffered a damaging loss of prestige.

The same story has been repeated time and time again. Aggressor Russia inevitably has gone as far as she dared without provoking actual resistance on the part of the democratic nations. Whenever she has come face to face with what appeared to be active opposition, she has changed her plans or dropped them temporarily until a more propitious time arrived. So it was with her choking off of travel between the western zone of Germany and Berlin. The Berlin airlift cracked the blockade and forced the Russians to back down.

The forces of oppressors are usually equipped with two plans. If opposition arises, they retreat. When the forces of Adolf Hitler marched into Poland, they had orders to turn back if effective opposition arose against them. When none appeared, they went ahead with their seizure of that nation.

This inevitable reaction of the aggressors whenever the democracies demonstrate that they are prepared to stand up for their rights is what makes the preservation of an adequate defense force in the United States so imperative. If Russia thought she could get away with the occupation of Western Germany and the rest of Europe without arousing American armed opposition, she would go ahead. Indeed, she would have accomplished such an occupation a long time ago.

Our foreign policy has been a weak and deviating one. It has given ground more often than it has presented a firm front to Russian maneuvering. For a change, we stood our ground in Berlin and let the Russians know that we meant business. The result can be seen in their announcement that they will not invade west Berlin, despite the fact that they had already given wide publicity to that intent.

If our State Department is smart, it will base future policy toward Russia on the success of the plan followed in Berlin. Judging from past behavior, that may be too much to hope for, but the lesson should be clear.

Chip on the Shoulder—Chilly Reaction to Lie's Peace Mission Out of Keeping With United States Tradition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 31, 1950

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article by Thomas L. Stokes, which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of May 30, 1950:

CHIP ON THE SHOULDER—CHILLY REACTION TO LIE'S PEACE MISSION OUT OF KEEPING WITH UNITED STATES TRADITION

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

The timid, stand-offish, chip-on-the-shoulder attitude of our Government in what approaches an international crisis is dramatized in our chilly official reaction to the current peace mission of Trygve Lie, United Nations General Secretary.

Mr. Lie has talked with Russian officials in his attempt to bring about some arrangement whereby Russia will return to full partnership in the UN so that agency can fulfill its function of settling disputed matters about the conference table as it was intended to do.

He recognizes it will take time and patience. There is no quick answer to the problems involved, including Russia's insistence on the seating of Communist China in place of Nationalist China in the Security Council. But his idea is to get the major nations, including United States and Russia, to talking again, negotiating again, in order to break the stalemate that has produced the tense and dread psychology of cold war.

EUROPE OPEN-MINDED

The UN's self-appointed emissary was well received after his Moscow visit by French and British officials who apparently see some possible bases of eventual adjustment. He returned to New York optimistic.

The open-minded attitude he found in Europe is a contrast to the negative, distrustful reaction at our State Department which was exemplified further by President Truman's refusal to discuss the Lie mission until he talks to Secretary of State Acheson on his return here and his brusque reply at his press conference that he did not know whether he would see Mr. Lie or not.

Undoubtedly he will in the near future. But the brush-off attitude is somehow not in keeping with our role and influence in the troubled world of today nor with our traditions as a great free democracy.

Nor do the attempts to discredit Mr. Lie by the whispers that he is pro-Russian.

It is sadly true that this new peace adventure comes in the midst of an emotional upheaval in this country, with the very atmosphere suffused with suspicions and fears generated by such things as Senator JOE MCCARTHY'S reckless attacks on the State Department, by the revelations of more atomic spies, by Russia's continued tactics of confusion abroad and here, by her childish and churlish walk-outs in the UN.

WILL SETTLE NOTHING

But it is also true that, with continued cold war, such things will only continue and multiply until the tension suddenly snaps on one side or the other, and then we will be right up against a hot war. Arming more and more heavily on each side will settle nothing and it is not likely, moreover, to scare either one of the two giants as each presumably hopes.

Each has got to give or there will be such an explosion as the world never saw before.

We have had two in this century since 1914. The world could hardly stand another.

A hundred and fifty years ago there was an explosion that rocked all Europe comparable—for those times and the world of that day—to those in our times, the era of revolution and the Napoleonic dictatorships and conquests. After that, the diplomats of that era sat down in the Congress of Vienna in 1815 and determined that it should not happen again and made adjustments that prevented another such general European catastrophe for a hundred years.

Nor did they have any general organization, only the will to keep the peace and brains ready to accomplish that purpose. We do have machinery in the UN. It will be tragic if we do not use it.

How Far Has America Moved Toward Socialism?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on Monday evening, May 15, it was my pleasure to share the platform at the annual congressional dinner of the Potomac Grange with one of our Nation's Capital's finest citizens, President Paul F. Douglass, of American University. I have in my hands a copy of the forthright address which President Douglass delivered on that memorable occasion. Not everyone will agree with all he said in that address. I, for one, do not fully agree, but no one will question the candid, hard-hitting and learned nature of that address.

I should like to say just a brief word about this honored American. I know of very few men who have combined excellence in so many diverse careers and so many types of public service as has my good friend, Dr. Paul Douglass. Not only has he been President of American University for the last decade, but he has been a prominent attorney, an author of many well-known books, an active member of both Houses of the Vermont State Legislature, an esteemed newspaper editor and correspondent, a member of Government study groups, an ordained clergyman and an active professor, in addition to demonstrating an amazing variety of other miscellaneous talents. There are few men indeed who can simultaneously (a) brilliantly teach a course in the history of philosophy and (b) handle a wide variety of the most practical types of up-to-the-minute community needs as he can.

Yes, here in the Capital of our Nation, he has been untiringly active in many types of service to the community. In fact, whenever the call comes for a well-known leader in community life to take the helm of some important new project, whether it be helping to collect funds to combat some disease or performing some other civic service, Paul Douglass is available to answer that call, in spite of a multitude of responsibilities.

He has simultaneously, however, brought his American University—both its graduate and its undergraduate divisions—particularly its school of social sciences and public affairs—to the forefront of American institutions of higher learning in the 48 States.

These few comments I submit as an indication of my own tremendously high admiration of him—an admiration shared by members of both political parties here on the Hill.

So, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an abridged text of President Douglass' keenly analytic address, entitled "How Far Has America Moved Toward Socialism?" be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I wish that I might be able to print the entire text but unfortunately, space limitations do not permit and so, Dr. Douglass' review of 12 principal criticisms of the welfare state must be deleted.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW FAR HAS AMERICA MOVED TOWARD SOCIALISM?

(Speech by Dr. Paul F. Douglass)

THE JOINDER OF ISSUE

The issue for America is joined.

Guy Gabrielson, chairman of the Republican National Committee, says:

"The Truman administration has entered into an unofficial compact with Socialist Great Britain to promote socialism in America. The one paramount issue," he added, "is the choice between our representative Republic and the Socialist master state. That," he concludes, "is clear enough for anyone to understand."

Harry S. Truman, President of the United States, says:

"The power of the Government exists for the people to use. The strength of the Government is being used now, and, so far as I am concerned, it will continue to be used to protect jobs and improve welfare."

THE ROLE AND ENDS OF GOVERNMENT

There you have a fundamental issue. It is this:

What shall be the goals of society and what shall be the role of government in the achievement of those ends?

GOVERNMENT AS A FEARFUL MASTER

Long ago Washington said: "Government is not reason, it is not eloquence, it is force. Like fire, it is a dangerous servant and a fearful master." He knew how easily a state can become a tyranny. As Americans we are concerned with the threat of a Socialist tyranny.

NATURE AND FORMS OF SOCIALISM

Frederick Engels described socialism as the "ascent of man from the kingdom of necessity to the kingdom of freedom." Socialism comes when the workingman seizes political power and turns the means of production into state property. Central planning substituting political judgment for market competition employs economic calculating to allocate resources rationally by a concentration of final economic power in government. This is a full-grown Socialist state.

The Chamber of Commerce of the United States defines the term "socialism" like this:

"Socialism is a system of political and economic organization under which the principal segments of the economy are owned and operated by the central government.

"Socialism may be accomplished in two ways: (1) by direct nationalization of industry, agriculture, distribution, medicine, and other segments of the economy; (2) indirectly through the creation of a climate under which the private segments of the economy cannot continue to operate effectively over a period of years, thus requiring the government to step in and take over ownership."

Under any definition socialism ultimately means the appropriation of the means of production by political society and its direction by a political bureaucracy for the achievement of politically defined goals.

WASHINGTON AND TRUMAN

To Guy George Gabrielson, Washington is a wicked place peopled with officials of a police state mentality. It holds out a set of brass knuckles instead of a cooperative hand to private enterprise. Government here holds its black jack over the steel industry. Washington governs by threat forcing private management to do its bidding.

"President Truman, who lives in the evil city of Washington," says Mr. Gabrielson, "promises everyone a gold mine in the sky." He tries to hoodwink the American people in an attempt to save the socialistic Fair Deal. Cocky and confident President Truman, he concludes, thinks that "promises extravagantly distributed and Government funds indiscriminately disbursed * * * will hoodwink the people indefinitely." "Dr. Goebbels in his heyday," he adds, "had nothing to approach the propaganda mill that the Federal Government maintains today."

AN EXAMINATION OF THE THOUGHT OF SOCIALISM'S CRITICS

I propose tonight to go behind the cliches to find out what the critics of socialism are worried about. I want to piece together the puzzle of their thought.

(Material omitted.)

THE PATTERN OF THOUGHT

* * * In Republicans' minds it (the welfare state) is synonymous with socialism. The critics of socialism oppose:

1. Taxation of those who have been most abundantly showered with the blessings of inflation.
2. Taxation on the basis of ability to pay.
3. Taxation adequate to balance the national budget.
4. Public provision for equal opportunity for persons of equal ability.
5. Social minima adequate to give the American people security against the misfortunes of accident and disease.
6. Government strong enough to deal with the problems which the American people face.
7. Performance of functions as an activity of the whole people which have not been well done or which cannot be done by private enterprise.
8. Activities of unions necessary to make collective bargaining work.
9. Adequate supports for agriculture to balance the national economy.
10. Cooperative marketing.
11. American history at the points where our past experience relates to the troubles we have faced.
12. Religion at the point where it becomes effective in social action.

I find the whole pattern—understand me, the whole pattern—of the current critics of socialism—dangerous and antidemocratic, but a degree of truth in almost every criticism.

I see no discussions in their literature about the issue of war—the great, imminent issue. I see no reference in their literature to the fact that the Federal Government in this year of 1950 will make outlays and draw checks to American business in the amount of $21,419,000,000. I see nothing in their literature about the attitudes of the American workingman in relation to socialism—but they have their polls and they know. They say nothing about the well-planned ambitions of some labor leaders to seize the means of production, to make a genuine state socialism.

The point that I am making is this: The leaders who move in the pattern which I have been analyzing are false leaders. In my opinion their arguments will only hasten the coming of socialism as a real political system.

How far are we on our way to socialism? These facts are indisputable:

1. That the Federal Government makes political decisions over larger and larger percentages of the individual's income.
2. That the brittle structure of the national economy, given its national debt structure, demands more and more central planning and political decision.
3. That the maintenace of high level economic activity and full employment demand

more and more central planning, political decision, and bureaucratic administration.

4. That our present statutory system penalizes ability and makes no provision for equal opportunity for equal ability.

5. That Government bureaucracy has increasing experience in central planning and the satisfactory administration of enterprise.

6. That spiritual values adequate to sustain a society of freemen are pretty generally absent at all levels of observation.

How far are we on our way to socialism?

We are structurally in a precarious world position which compels our Government to remain strong and grow to meet the issues that face us as a people.

We have a huge bureaucracy which has had enormous experience in central planning and administration.

We face immediate problems which the critics of the Government cannot avoid by shouting that they don't like both the Government and the issues.

We face imminent war which if lost will give us communism and if won will give us the most centralized government which America has ever experienced.

We have the trained Government personnel competent and ready to plan and operate any segments of the national economy that need attention.

We are in a situation in which the direct action of Government to maintain the economic machine in full operation must be forceful and in which the decisions of Government in the private segments of our economy must be more and more controlling.

American Government is prepared by 20 years of war and depression to administer the national economy as a socialized unit. The experience is adequate. The personnel is trained. The mood of many of our people is such as to welcome a clear transition. The climate of the world is favorable to it. America now is running against the tides of the thinking in the rest of the world.

America is much, much closer to socialism than we dream. Overwhelming majorities in the 1952 elections could in fact be decisive. We are on the borderline of state action. Men cannot remain free in a Socialist state. Complete planning implies authority to compel people to move within the framework of the plan. Coercion become an inevitable corollary of state socialism.

THE ALTERNATIVE

The one alternative to full-grown socialism lies in the positive action of citizens. Long ago Thomas Paine said that "those who expect to reap the blessings of freedom must undergo the fatigues of supporting it."

Participation

If all the people do not take an active interest in the outcome of the momentous issues which are before us, a few of the people will determine our futures for us. In 1948, when we were electing a President, a new House of Representatives, a third of the Senate, 49 percent of the eligible voters did not go to the polls. One sample analysis showed that among the list of delinquent citizens were 33 percent of all clergymen, 37 percent of the automobile dealers, 37 percent of the independent grocers, 20 percent of the doctors, 27 percent of the independent druggists, 25 percent of the members of the chamber of commerce.

Is it true that half the Americans don't care about the outcomes at all? There you have issue No. 1. Americans must get to the polls to determine outcomes.

War

It's pretty clear that we can't go on living our way of life in a garrison world. And yet I don't find among the critics of socialism very much discussion about this issue. But it is the issue. We can't solve any of our other problems until we solve this one.

A good index of our concern for the social consequences of what we do lies in this fact. From 1943 through 1951 the United States will spend $4,958,000,000 for the development of atomic energy. Of this $5,000,000,000, hardly $50,000 has been spent for research on the economic and social aspects of atomic power. Under the Atomic Energy Commission only one study on the economics of atomic power has been prepared. This is a four-volume work by Palmer Putnam on the Future of Land-Based Nuclear Power. The volume has little bearing on the title. It deals chiefly with world population growth through A. D. 2050. Research funds for the social sciences are not included in the National Science Foundation bill.

Where, I ask you, in our political structure is there a place for the objective study leading toward the elimination of war? We have Joint Committees on the Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, on the Economic Report, on Atomic Energy, on Foreign Economic Cooperation, on the Disposition of Executive Papers, on the Renovation of the Executive Mansion. Why do we not have a joint commission for the study of ways to abolish war? We have spent tens of billions on methods and instruments of war. Is it not time to devote the scientific mind to a real problem? To the problem of how man can live, how civilization can continue? Unless we do this, we cannot say that we have even tried to save our American way.

COLLISION OF RAW POWER

The meeting of human beings both inside and outside the United States is now characterized by the open collision of raw power. Elton Mayo said that while material efficiency has been increasing for 200 years, the human capacity for working together has in the same period continually diminished. The alarming break in the structure of civilization expresses itself in the disintegration of international and national community into an infinity of mutually hostile groups. We have lost the spirit of teamwork. From a sociological point of view, the only instrumentality for eliminating the collision of raw powers is a supreme coercion—the naked power of government. The conflict in belief systems will either be eliminated by this emergence of a naked political dictatorship and tyranny or by the redeeming quality of a higher loyalty.

Toynbee deals with the schism in the soul. He finds the schism in the body social merely the outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual rift.

We cannot recover that higher loyalty by the worship either of money or of power. The worship of either must end in tyranny.

Adam Smith dealt with the problem in his Theory of Moral Sentiments. He suggested that each of us change places in fancy with the sufferer. Our own moral judgments, he said, with respect to our own conduct are only applications to ourselves of decisions which we have already passed on the conduct of our neighbors. If we change situations with others, we acquire a new sense of duty in our own action.

In America we can yet worship a God who makes the understanding heart divine and the reverence for the person a Godlike quality. Here is a higher loyalty available to us.

THE USE OF GOVERNMENT

Whether we like it or not, we are going to have to use government, to work it and through it as a tool. This fact means a higher quality of craftsmanship in citizenship. Albert Goss, master of the National Grange, is the kind of citizen I am talking about. It means that we are going to deal objectively with our problems and experimentally with solutions—always with the concern that what we do is done with a sacred reverence for the individual and a sacred allegiance to the kind of freedom which reserves always the right of choice to the individual.

MEN WHO KNOW THEIR DUTIES

The only way to have less government is to govern ourselves more. The only way to have more freedom is to use wisely what we have. The only way to have better government is to become better citizens ourselves.

In 1816, Jefferson wrote to Taylor:

"What constitutes a State?
Not high-raised battlements, no labor'd mount,
Thick wall, or moated gate;
Not cities proud, with spires and turrets crown'd;
No; men, high-minded men;
Men, who their duties know;
But know their rights; and knowing, dare maintain.
These constitute a State."

The League of Frightened Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 31, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, with permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I attach the following speech of Oscar Ewing, Federal Security Administrator.

This address, delivered before the twenty-seventh convention of the International Ladies' Garment Workers in Atlantic City, May 24, is an acute examination of what Mr. Ewing very properly calls the League of Frightened Men, men who fear social progress.

LEAGUE OF FRIGHTENED MEN

It is an honor to be here. Your golden jubilee is more than a family party. It is an observance in which every American can take pride. And I count it a privilege to bring my greetings and congratulations in person to you, David Dubinsky, to all my friends in the ILGWU.

In your 50 years of pioneering for the advancement of your own membership, you have a proud and honorable history—in many ways, a unique history. Foresight and dogged determination won the epoch-making strike of 1910 with a protocol of peace and the creation of a great health program. That foresight and determination have never flagged. They have gained in stature and in vision through the years.

Nor has this vision been self-centered. You have always known that you could not be good union members without being good citizens. You have fought for the general welfare, not just for the garment workers' welfare. Some people have accused you of not minding your own business. They are wrong. It is your business—and everybody's business—to be concerned about the general welfare. About decent wages and conditions of employment. About good housing, and enough of it. About schools for all our children, and the chance for every youngster to go as far as his own brains and determination will take him. About health, and enough money to pay the doctor's bills. About insurance for the times when a man can't get a job or when he is too sick to work—and for his family if he should die. About self-respecting security in old age. About the inalienable civil rights which are

every American's heritage. About peace that does not truckle to the totalitarians.

That is what you mean by the general welfare, and it certainly is your business. That is what I mean, too, and it certainly is my business. And we intend to go right along making it our business.

TOO MANY REACTIONARIES

We shall continue to do so in spite of the peculiar opposition we face. There are too many reactionaries in America—too many men who say that you can make progress by going backward, that you can promote the general welfare by destroying the general welfare. The American reactionary may be a fine gentleman, complete with country estate. He may love his mother dearly. He may be kind to his underlings. But if he is a reactionary, his ideas add up to the fact that he is against health. Against social security. Against education. Against a living wage. Against everything that means anything to ordinary people. And, in the end, against our very liberty, our opportunity, our hopes for the future. He is against all of these things for everybody except himself.

Why are the reactionaries against these things? Is it because they are wicked people? I don't think so. I think it is because they are fearful people. We are confronted in America by a League of Frightened Men.

LEAGUE BYLAWS

The bylaws of the League of Frightened Men provide that you cannot be a member in good standing unless you distrust the people of the United States. You cannot be a member unless you shiver at the idea of scientific progress, unless you quake at the thought of the complexity of our modern civilization, unless you tremble in the face of reality. During the initiation ceremonies, when you join the League of Frightened Men, you must be able to prove that you turn pale when someone mentions the words "labor union." Then your face must promptly flush when you hear the dread name of Franklin D. Roosevelt, or when President Truman's Fair Deal is referred to. You must get a prompt case of the shakes at the suggestion that Government has a responsibility to the people to help them help themselves to security, employment, health, and education, and that sometimes people are willing to pay real money for this purpose. Finally, you must be able to raise your voice and shout "socialism" at the top of your lungs whenever you hear of an idea that was born since 1890.

If you can meet this test, you are likely to be accepted into the League of Frightened Men, and you are likely to enjoy the company of your fellow-reactionaries.

I am not sorry to say that I cannot pass this test—any more than you can. I am not afraid of 1950—any more than you are. I am not afraid of labor organizations, or of mass industry, or of jet-propelled speed, or even of atomic energy. I am not afraid of the American people. I am not afraid of their common sense, their drive, their restless desire to improve the condition of the world in which they live. I think that our restlessness, our ambition, our energy, are the most wonderful things in the world.

The league of Frightened Men would like to expand its membership. It would like to spread fear throughout the land, and make this a nation of frightened men. Well, we are not frightened. We leave fear to the reactionaries, who see ghosts, and to the unhappy peoples behind the iron curtain, who have a right to be afraid of their masters.

PLENTY OF PROBLEMS

Do not misunderstand me. I am no Pollyanna. I do not counsel sticky and stupid optimism. We have plenty of problems, plenty of troubles. But the difference between the reactionaries, on the one hand, and people like you and me, on the other, is that they can do nothing more than yearn for the past, while we are prepared to tackle these problems and lick these troubles. Their weapons are fear and inertia. Our weapons are courage and common sense.

In my job as Federal Security Administrator, I have plenty of opportunity to see the battle between reactionary fear and liberal courage.

In education, for example. The courageous, liberal, and I believe typically American idea, is that education is a good thing. We believe that any boy or girl ought to have a chance to learn as much as he can, so that when he goes out into the world he will be able to fulfill whatever talent, whatever skill, he may be best equipped for. We also believe that in a democracy we must have people who understand what the world is all about, who will make decisions on the basis of facts, of thinking, and of wisdom, who will not be stampeded by a demagogue.

The fearful people a hundred years ago—and we had them then, too, people who in the 1840's thought things were in a dangerous state and yearned for the good old days of the 1820's—these people trembled at the idea of universal public education. They said a little knowledge would be a dangerous thing. They became hysterical at the suggestion that education should be universal, and free, and paid for out of public funds. They predicted the downfall of the Republic. Inevitably the League of Frightened Men lost the battle. The American people won out.

Today nobody questions the traditional American principle of universal free education. But the frightened men have merely retreated; they have not stopped fighting.

SCHOOL PROBLEMS

Today we have a sudden increase of 30 percent in the number of children of school age. We do not have the schoolhouses or the teachers to take care of them. Too often the salaries of teachers are sadly out of line with present-day living costs. We have thousands of youngsters going to school in fire traps, in abandoned stores and garages. We have thousands who do not go to school at all because there isn't any school for them to go to. We have half our young people of college caliber unable to afford to go to college. We have, in short, a crisis in education.

Now, part of the reason for this crisis is that our system of local support and control of education—a system in which I firmly believe—has not been able to cope with the inequalities as between the States. Some States are rich, and others are very poor. An American child in a rich State is 10 times more likely to get a proper education than an American child in a poor State. So the problem is one of working out a system to help the poorer areas do a better job, without in any way disturbing the system of local control of education.

The only solution I know is Federal aid to education. That will help the primary and secondary schools. For higher education, the answer is Federal grants for college scholarships, fellowships, and student loans.

The League of Frightened Men opposes this solution. It is afraid of doing something to meet the crying need for more and better education in our country. It screams hysterically about socialism, about Federal control of education, about dictatorship. Well, we can't afford to wait for the League of Frightened Men to get over its crying jag. We don't want socialism, or dictatorship, or Federal control of education. What we do want is more and better education for every American child, whatever his race or his color or his religion, whatever State or county he may live in. And we are not going to let the League of Frightened Men scare us away from this objective.

CONGRESS TO ACT—WHEN?

I believe that Congress will ultimately pass progressive legislation in the field of education. I would be naive if I tried to tell you the exact date when it will do so, or the exact terms of the legislation that will finally emerge. But I believe we will wind up with a worth-while program of Federal aid to education, because the American people know what they want, and this is one of the things they want very much.

Not so long ago, the frightened men were in control in Washington. All through the 1920's, under their rule, the country built up to a terrific bust. When the bust came, the frightened men sat about fearfully and wrung their hands—doing nothing, as usual. The American people put in a man who was not scared, a man who warned us that the only thing we had to fear was fear itself. And, along with President Roosevelt, we were not afraid.

SOCIAL SECURITY NEEDS

In the early years of the New Deal, we established a system of social security, over the opposition of the League of Frightened Men. For the first time, on a broad scale, we recognized that in our society it is imperative that all people who work for a living should cooperate, through social insurance, so that they may have a little money for themselves when they become older, or for their dependents when they die. That was one of the proudest achievements of the New Deal. Today, in 1950, the Fair Deal is proud of the fact that this Eighty-first Congress is obviously going to pass new and broadening amendments to the original Social Security Act. I don't know what the exact terms of these amendments will be, because they are still before Congress. But I do know that Congress will make sure that social security covers millions more people than it covers now, and that the benefits will be a good deal larger—in some cases, they might even be as much as 150 percent larger. The frightened men were afraid of this, too, but the people of this country have not permitted their fantastic fears of the frightened men to prevent us from doing the intelligent thing.

Originally, we had hoped that the amendments would include social insurance for total and permanent disability. It may still wind up in the final legislation, but that will only happen if enough people insist on it. But the very fact that total and permanent disability insurance has been in and out of the amendments is a bitter commentary on how fear confuses reason. As matters stand right now, we won't do a thing by way of insurance to protect a worker against accident or illness, but we are ready to pay his family benefits as a matter of course if he just goes ahead and dies. Only the League of Frightened Men can seriously sell us the idea that it is better for your family that you should die than that you should stay alive.

LEAGUE'S AMA CHAPTER

If you think I am exaggerating, let me tell you about some of the things I have learned in the fight on another front—national health insurance. Here we have to do with the American Medical Association Chapter of the League of Frightened Men. It is a very active chapter, and extremely well heeled. Its members, however outstanding they may be as physicians, are not only fat cats but fraidy cats.

And what are they afraid of? Of all things, they are afraid of improving the health of the American people.

They are afraid of our having enough doctors to take care of the American people. In the face of a serious shortage of people in the medical and allied professions, they are afraid of anything that would make it possible for our medical schools to teach larger numbers of students so that the ratio of doctors to patients would be more in keeping with the needs of our time.

Above all, they are afraid of any system that would make it possible for people to pay for the medical and hospital care they

may need throughout their lives. Is insurance such a revolutionary idea? Does life insurance, or fire insurance, or automobile insurance, smack of Karl Marx? Has social security destroyed the Republic? To you or me, the answer is so obvious that we need not discuss it any further. But to the American Medical Association Chapter of the League of Frightened Men, the answer is, "I'm scared."

Scared of what? Scared of a system whereby people would help build up a fund out of which would be paid the bills for the care they need when they are sick. Scared of a program that would take the financial calamity out of serious or chronic illness. Scared of a plan that would simply change the method of payment for medical and hospital care, without in any way interfering with the relationship between doctor and patient.

Twenty years ago they were afraid of voluntary health insurance. They said it was communistic. Now they see that it is not communistic at all, and—because we are proposing a national health insurance program to do what voluntary plans are unable to do—now they say they're not scared of the voluntary plans any more but that they are really scared of this sinister conspiracy to destroy the fabric of our free land.

STATE OF TERROR

Why, I have seen them go so far in their terror as to say things like this, and I quote from a recent issue of the New York State Journal of Medicine: "We readily admit that under it [meaning the present haphazard system of medical care] a certain number of cases of early tuberculosis and cancer, for example, may go undetected. Is it not better that a few such should perish rather than that the majority of the population should be encouraged on every occasion to run snivelling to the doctor?"

Try that one on for size. Is it not better for you, or your wife, or your child, to perish than for you to be covered by national health insurance? That is the question that the frightened men are asking you.

Now, I am prepared to argue that the doctor who wrote those words in the New York State Journal of Medicine was suffering from a serious attack of terror. I am prepared to say, in defense of the medical profession, that most doctors would not prefer to see a human being die rather than have him "run sniveling" into the office. But these men have been so terrified by their own medical association that they have lost all sense of balance. Like the frightened animal that claws anything in reach, including its best friends, the medical profession has permitted its organizational leadership to betray its responsibility to the American people.

Let the doctors remember this: That the patient is always more important than the doctor, and that a single human being who dies because he did not have the money to pay for the medical care that might have saved him is a horrifying reflection on the Nation, the profession, and the person who is too fearful to have wanted to save him.

The American Medical Association tells us it is afraid we would wreck the personal relationship between doctor and patient. I tell them, in all sincerity, that a single article such as the one I have quoted does more to wreck this relationship than any social-insurance scheme on earth.

The American Medical Association tells us it is afraid that the Government would somehow dominate the doctors if national health insurance came to pass. I tell them, in all sincerity, that no responsible person in Washington wants to dominate the medical profession, but that we will not shirk our duty to put forward a sensible solution to the financial barriers that prevent millions of Americans from getting the care they need.

The American Medical Association tells us it is afraid that national health insurance will lead us straight to communism. I tell them, in all sincerity, that communism never succeeds in a land where human needs are met wisely and skillfully, but only in lands where fear and worry and distraction stalk the countryside.

FIGHT FEAR WITH COURAGE

I realize that you cannot fight fear with reason. It it could be done, the league of frightened men would long since have disappeared from America. You can only fight fear with an even more powerful emotion—courage. Courage to face the facts, courage to do what is right, courage to go forward.

The history of your own union, in this very field of health, is proof enough of this. Out of the sweatshops of the past, out of the tuberculosis and chronic diseases that used to beset the garment workers of another generation, you have built a magnificent health program, with your great Union Health Center in New York and your health centers in other cities. You established the first direct-service, union-sponsored medical-care plan in the United States. Your board of sanitary control, back in 1912, inspired the Public Health Service to study the health of garment workers as the very first official act of the fledgling Office of Industrial Hygiene and Sanitation. You fought against tuberculosis with the same energy that you fought against the sweatshops. Today your medical director is a member of our Public Health Service Advisory Council on Industrial Health. Not only as the son of your first medical director but in his own right, he is a leader in this field, and you can be proud of him.

In health, as in the protection of working people in the garment industry, as in political action, you have moved forward with courage and statesmanship. You have shown that you are not afraid. The League of Frightened Men will never conquer America because there are too many Americans like Dave Dubinsky and the rest of you, strong and self-confident and sensible, ready to work to make our country stronger, safer, and happier than ever before. I am proud to count myself your fellow worker in this never-ending battle.

State and Federal Management of Timber Holdings on the Olympic Peninsula in the Pacific Northwest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1950

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Charles N. Webster, publisher of the Port Angeles Evening News, Port Angeles, Wash., recently wrote a series of four articles on the management of State and United States timber resources on the Olympic Peninsula. In my opinion, Mr. Webster has rendered an outstanding public service in explaining the present situation regarding our all-important timber holdings in this section of the Pacific Northwest. The articles appeared in the Port Angeles Evening News on April 24, 25, 27, and 29, 1950. I commend to my colleagues in the Congress a careful reading of these thoughtful articles:

[From the Port Angeles (Wash.) Evening News of April 24, 1950]

GOODYEAR FORECASTS 90,000,000 FEET ANNUAL YIELD FROM STATE SUSTAINED YIELD FOREST

(By C. N. Webster)

I

State sustained-yield forest No. 1 in western Jefferson County should produce at least 90,000,000 board feet of logs annually without exceeding annual growth.

This was a guess ventured by Supervisor T. S. Goodyear in a brief talk to the Olympic Logging Conference in Victoria Thursday afternoon.

"This guess is based on a 60-year rotation, which should be ample for production of pulp and an intermediate amount of saw timber," Goodyear explained. "This estimate may, of necessity, be adjusted as more growth figures are available.

"Most of the State-owned timber consists of an even-age, overripe stand, composed of hemlock, cedar, spruce, Douglas fir, and white or silver fir.

"Probably 70 percent of the entire timber stand is more suitable for pulp than saw timber."

In his prepared talk, Goodyear did not directly venture a guess as to the present volume of standing timber in sustained-yield forest No. 1. His estimate of a minimum 90,000,000 feet annual cut, on a 60-year rotation, suggests (by multiplication) a stand of approximately five and a half billion feet.

Most of the area never has been cruised. A cruise is now proceeding under Goodyear's direction which will give the first reasonably accurate inventory of State timber in the 185,235-acre State-sustained yield forest.

Wartime cut 123,000,000

Goodyear also disclosed Thursday that logs taken from State sustained-yield forest No. 1 during the last war totaled approximately 123,394,960 board feet. This was mostly Sitka spruce and Douglas fir, for airplane construction. The spruce was all selectively cut. However, about three-quarters of a section of Douglas fir was clear cut.

Goodyear compiled this first total of actual wartime sales since he became supervisor of the forest on July 21, 1949. His source was the log scale reports to the State land office.

This wartime emergency sale, all in the Hoh Valley, represents the only cutting ever done in State-sustained yield forest No. 1.

The 1933 law establishing the forest prevents any cutting until maps and logging plans are completed for a sustained yield operation. Not until 1949 did the State appropriate funds ($100,000) to do this preliminary work.

Log scale

This 1933 law also authorizes uses of log scale for sale of timber from sustained yield forest No. 1. It is one exception to the general law requiring State timber sales on a cruise made before logging.

In a Friday talk to the Olympic Logging Conference, State Land Commissioner Jack Taylor called sales on the cruise "a horse and buggy way of doing business." He said national forest and private owners sell timber on log scale and advocated legislation permitting the State to do likewise. Such a bill passed the house last year, but not the senate.

The land commissioner also advocates appropriation for State land classification and inventory of all State-owned timber, similar to the inventory now being made on sustained yield forest No. 1.

"Your Olympic peninsula forest got the first such appropriation since statehood," Taylor said. "Last year the State land office sales totalled $15,000,000, but the legislature

refused an appropriation of only $250,000 to start an inventory. It passed the house but not the senate."

As with other State timber sales, all timber sales from State-sustained yield forest No. 1 will be handled by the land commissioner, at public auction. But payment will be on log scale, instead of lump-sum on a cruise.

Taylor said State sales on log scale also may give a better chance to the small logging operator, who now must pay cash in advance of logging and take his chance on the cruise volume.

[From the Port Angeles (Wash.) Evening News of April 25, 1950]

BUYERS OF NATIONAL FOREST TIMBER FAIL TO CUT TIMBER AS FAST AS IT WILL GROW

(By C. N. Webster)

II

Timber cutting on the Olympic National Forest never yet has reached the sustained yield limit desired by the United States Forest Service.

The Forest Service wants loggers to cut 182,000,000 board-feet per year. It has been selling timber fast enough to reach that limit, or thought it had, but timber buyers have failed to cut it that fast. For the past 5 years the actual cut has totaled from 135,000,000 to 155,000,000 feet per year.

Consequently the Forest Service has now decided to oversell—sell beyond its 182,000,000 feet limit—in an effort to get loggers to cut the desired limit.

That is the gist of what Supervisor Carl B. Neal told the fifth annual Olympic Logging Conference in Victoria Friday. He was the last of 12 scheduled speakers on the 2-day program. His topic was Timber Cutting Program for Olympic National Forest, 1950–51 (meaning the United States fiscal year ending June 30, 1951).

"We have tried to make, and we thought we had made, the timber sales needed to bring the actual cut up to the allowable cut," Neal told the assembled loggers.

"But the purchasers for one reason and another have not made the cut anticipated. Only on Hood Canal has the cut come up to the allowable.

"We now have 330,000,000 feet under contract and uncut. In addition to this we have 400,000,000 feet ready to advertise for sale. Of this backlog, about 300,000,000 feet is being advertised this spring.

"We have found we have to oversell in order to get our cut up to the allowable. How much we have to oversell we have not determined because we never have reached the allowable.

"But if we sell this 300,000,000 feet this spring and then allow 2 years for road and bridge building, I have hopes we will then reach the allowable," the supervisor said.

"We should reach and maintain our allowable cut. That is essential for good timberland management."

Region the same

Under-cutting the sustained yield capacity of national forest land is not limited to the Olympic peninsula. It applies generally to the whole Pacific northwest region.

Regional Forester H. J. Andrews, who attended the Victoria conference but did not address it, told the Evening News that actual cut on national forests of Washington and Oregon is totaling 1,300,000,000 to 1,500,000,000 feet per year.

But the allowable cut is at least 2,250,000,000 feet, Andrews said.

"That is a conservative calculation. I feel the allowable cut may readily be 2,500,000,000 to 2,750,000,000 feet. It depends upon the economic availability of our remote timber.

"For example, the upper Clackamas timber right back of Portland would require a 100-mile truck haul to market—an excessive trucking distance now. But suppose you build a mill near the timber and convert the logs to finished products before making your long truck haul. Finished products can be trucked economically much farther than logs," Andrews observed.

The same problem confronts Supervisor T. S. Goodyear, of State-sustained yield forest No. 1 in western Jefferson County. The truck haul is too long to existing railheads. Only the top grade timber will pay its way out, and Goodyear recognizes that such "high grading" is inexcusably wasteful.

Goodyear proposes a twofold solution. A common carrier railroad connecting existing lines to south and north of the State forest. A pulp mill in western Jefferson County—preferably a kraft mill for maximum utilization of low-grade wood.

Either of these alone might solve the State's problem of marketing its 90,000,000 feet of available logs per year.

Goodyear hopes to get both railroad and local mill.

Until he gets something, the State school system, which needs funds so badly for expanding population, will earn nothing from its idle timberland in western Jefferson County. And the growing capacity of this 185,000-acre State forest will continue lost to productive industry.

[From the Port Angeles (Wash.) Evening News of April 27, 1950]

PUBLIC FORESTERS, FINDING SELECTIVE LOGGING IMPRACTICAL, NOW FAVOR CLEAR CUTTING IN SMALL PATCHES; MAXIMUM 80 ACRES

(By C. N. Webster)

III

Clear cutting is generally speaking the only practical method of harvesting the public's dense Olympic Forests, although such cutting should be closely limited to patches not over 80 acres each.

On that point, supervisors of both National- and State-owned Olympic forests agreed in their talks to the Olympic logging conference in Victoria last week end.

Speaking of logging plans for State sustained yield forest No. 1 in western Jefferson County, Supervisor T. S. Goodyear told the assembled loggers:

"From the timber type maps completed to date, it appears the only practical way of logging is to clear cut the mature timber in patches not to exceed 80 acres, and reserve from any kind of logging the areas stocked with regrowth under 30 years of age."

And the United States Forest Service, which has pioneered the small-patch system, now goes even further. It favors limiting these clear-cut patches to from 40 to 60 acres each.

Both parties oppose any broadcast clear cutting in the traditional wholesale methods so familiar on private lands which contained the Olympic peninsula's best virgin timber.

Selective logging is out

At the same time the United States Forest Service has abandoned its prewar theory that selective logging is practical west of the Cascades.

This change has occurred rather quietly, considering the way Government foresters were boosting tree selection logging a decade ago. But it is nonetheless definite, as shown by a brief remark in Supervisor Carl B. Neal's Victoria address on national forest timber sales. He told the assembled loggers:

"At the present time we are not practicing partial cut or tree selection logging in the forests west of the Cascades, except in potential recreation areas and scenic strips. We have found that such a practice merely reduces our inventory and does not increase growth."

Shortly after Neal became Olympic National Forest supervisor, the Forest Service initiated in 1942 its first conspicuous selective logging experiments on the north peninsula.

Three tree selection sales near Lakes Beaver, Sutherland, and Cushman totalled approximately 60,000,000 board feet. These operations were extensively covered by word and picture in the Port Angeles Evening News at that time.

The officially approved theory was that if you remove about one-third of your old growth trees during each cut, you stimulate growth in the remainder, while also keeping the land covered with forest. The Service advocated this system as practical forestry, except on slopes too steep for tractors.

Now the official USFS doctrine is that to get continuous production, you must clear cut and start a new crop. (This does not apply east of the Cascade summit, where rain is scarce and pines grow sparsely. Selective logging is regularly practiced there.)

Staggered settings

After thus disposing of selective logging in two sentences, Supervisor Neal summarized in his Victoria address the clear-cutting system now favored on national forests:

"Most of our sales are, as you know, laid out for staggered settings. We anticipated that it will ordinarily take three cutting cycles to cut over the entire area. Possibly 40 percent will be removed on the first cut.

"The purpose of staggered settings is to decrease the fire hazard and to increase the probability of adequate reproduction on the cut-over area.

"Normally on a 100-year rotation, cutting cycles will come in 33-year intervals. To accomplish the purpose of staggered settings we figure that these intervals should not be less than the period required for the reproduction to grow to such size as to result in a closed canopy. On this basis we figure the minimum period between cutting cycles to be about 20 years. If we don't get natural reproduction promptly, we plan to plant. We want to keep the land productive."

United States timber management

While Neal's address did not mention the acreage limits on their staggered settings, this and other policy details appeared in a mimeographed statement issued last fall, labeled Access Roads to Government Timber, Senate Joint Resolution No. 24.

Although this 3-page statement bore no identification as to source, and was undated, the Forest Service used it in support of its recommendation that Congress appropriate money annually to build permanent timber access roads. It says, in part:

"Before discussing the advantages of this resolution to the Forest Service, it probably would be desirable to explain certain features of timber management as applied to the national forests.

"The Forest Service recognizes two types of cutting in the Douglas-fir region west of the Cascades: (1) Partial cutting, formerly called tree selection; and (2) area selection.

"(1) The former (that is, tree selection), (a) merely reduces the forest inventory, (b) does not stimulate growth, (c) does not tend to convert stagnant forest into a growing forest.

"It has a certain economic advantage when certain species cannot be marketed. Otherwise, its application is limited to such special areas as scenic strips and recreational areas.

"(2) In area selection, the watershed is broken down into cutting areas of from 40 to 60 acres each.

"The forest rotation, usually 100 years, is broken down into three cutting cycles. Theoretically, cutting cycles would be 33⅓ years apart. Actually, they should, as a minimum, be separated by the length of time necessary to get a stand of reproduction with a closed

crown canopy. This normally would be about 20 years.

"The forest is now on its first cutting cycle, removing alternate cutting areas of about 60 acres each."

Market price

A good example of the certain economic advantage when certain species cannot be marketed occurred on the south side of the Olympic National Forest before selective logging was tried on the north side.

This was a big long-term sale to Schafer Bros. Logging Co. of Grays Harbor. They cut the fir and left the hemlock standing for later cutting at higher prices.

The old clear cutting practice on private or State land was to leave hemlock on the ground when it wouldn't pay its way to market. Even though not cut, all trees got knocked down during the clear-cut operation.

But the Forest Service didn't believe in that practice. They wanted the public-owned hemlock used, not left to rot on the ground. Hence the remedy of leaving hemlock on the stump until marketable, instead of knocking it down as a normal part of a clear-cutting operation.

[From the Port Angeles (Wash.) Evening News of April 29, 1950]

NATIONAL FORESTERS ADVOCATE ADVANCE CONSTRUCTION OF TIMBER ACCESS ROADS

(By C. N. Webster)

IV

How best to finance new timber access roads is a problem now bothering the managers of public-owned forests on the Olympic Peninsula. They discussed it briefly at the fifth annual Olympic Logging Conference in Victoria.

Foresters who supervise our national forests now advocate Government-financed permanent access roads in advance of timber sales.

Loggers who buy the Federal timber would continue to build their temporary branch roads from the main road into each individual timber sale. But they would not build the expensive main access roads, as they now must do where none already exist.

When once built the Forest Service itself maintains all main access roads as public thoroughfares.

The Forest Service view is not shared by the supervisor of our largest State-owned forest. But his Victoria speech showed he is recognizing the same problem. Supervisor T. S. Goodyear of State sustained-yield forest No. 1 told the assembled loggers that:

"In the northern part of the sustained-yield forest, State lands are scattered and fairly accessible to existing roads. Timber on these lands should be reserved to small independent logging operators, while the solid blocks of State-owned timber, situated back in the high country where expensive road construction will be necessary, can undoubtedly only be handled by large, financially sound companies or corporations."

This State-owned forest includes most of the public-owned timber available for cutting in western Jefferson County. The Olympic Highway, U. S. 101, skirts the forest. Public roads extend up the Hoh, Clearwater, and Queets Rivers in the forest.

High-cost roads

But costly access roads into the main blocks of State timber present a formidable financing problem. Goodyear sees large capital operators as the only solution.

In order that such roads may pay out in one cutting cycle, he must sell such a large amount of timber that small operators could not bid on it anyway. And the plan to confine logging to 80-acre patches means more miles of road for a given quantity of timber in the first cut.

If the State built the main access roads in advance, maintaining them permanently for successive cutting cycles, the State might have more bidders and smaller operators would have a chance to compete. That is what Federal foresters advocate for national forest timber sales.

Supervisor Carl B. Neal, of Olympic National Forest, briefed the plan as follows at the Victoria conference:

"Our policy is to connect all timber sale areas to a public road by a road over a right-of-way either owned or controlled by the Government. We do not want competition limited by privately owned rights-of-way.

"We believe it would be in the Government's interest for Congress to appropriate sufficient funds so that we could build the roads in advance of making the timber sale.

"We prefer Government built roads because they permit better timber management, smaller sales, salvage sales, increased fire protection, and better breakdown between summer and winter logging.

"They would cost the Government no more in the long run because we would get higher stumpage prices when the Government builds the roads. As it is now, the timber buyer has to build the roads.

"About 40 percent of the volume is harvested on the first cut. This first cut has to liquidate the cost of the main road system for the entire area.

"This compels a high allowance for the first cut appraisal value. The appraisal must allow for road costs.

"If the road costs $100,000 and the sale volume is 25,000,000 board feet, $4 per thousand feet will be allowed for road construction cost. Roads so built by loggers remain Government property, the same as Government built roads."

Seven million dollars annually

The logger must build main roads to forest service specifications. Since the road is designed for permanent logging use, it has to be heavily surfaced and usually costs from $12,000 to $20,000 per mile west of the Cascades.

Regional Forester H. J. Andrews told the Evening News that national forests in Oregon and Washington now are adding 300 to 400 miles of main logging roads costing around $7,000,000 each year. He would like to see Congress appropriate this amount annually so the Government could finance the roads instead of deducting it as a logging cost on timber sales.

Current annual appropriations to the Oregon-Washington region for national forest road and trail development are around $3,000,000 (out of a $10,000,000 national total), Andrews said. This will barely maintain the existing road and trail system. The region's total is about 16,000 miles of roads and 20,000 miles of trails.

Andrews observed that advance construction of timber access roads would be especially useful in higher altitudes where the logging season is short. And it would permit prompt salvage of timber blown down or killed by fire or insects.

Public travel

Timber access roads also increase the forest mileage open to public travel. That is in national forests, not Washington State forests.

National forest policy is to keep all roads open, except specified extra hazardous areas during fire season.

State policy on the other hand is to keep its forest development roads closed. You see the locked keep-out gates everywhere that a State forest road branches off a main highway.

T. S. Goodyear emphasizes that most fires start from careless travelers. He suggests our forests would be better protected without any roads to facilitate such fires.

For many years before becoming supervisor of State Sustained Yield Forest No. 1, Goodyear was head of the State division of forestry with responsibility for protection of State and private forest lands.

Emergency stockpiles

Regional Forester Andrews suggested another potent reason for advance construction of timber access roads.

National defense officials want to stock pile critical materials. At the start of the last war, wood was not rated a critical material. It soon became one—but not until the best road-building men and equipment had been shipped off to military posts, Andrews recalled.

He explained that although 65 to 70 percent of our remaining timber is public-owned, its relative inaccessibility caused it to supply only 15 to 20 percent of the timber cut during the last war. Balance came mainly from the traditionally overcut private land.

Prior to 1941 only half a billion feet of timber per year was coming off the national forests of Oregon and Washington. War's demand trebled the cut to 1,500,000,000 feet, the current rate. But this is still far less than their sustained-yield capacity of around 2,500,000,000 feet annually.

Now defense officials want to stock pile wood. Replying to a committee's inquiry on this point, Andrews said it is impractical to stock pile wood in the huge quantities needed for wartime use. Instead he has recommended the Government stock pile timber access roads, ready to cut remote timber instantly in emergency.

If this idea should take hold with resulting forest-road money available from our huge defense appropriations, it would be something for State sustained-yield forest No. 1 to look into. That forest already benefited from Federal road money during the last war. The Government wanted spruce from State land in the Hoh Valley. Federal funds heavily graveled the Hoh road, and built a branch into Snahapish Pass.

That is a bare beginning to what the State will need to log its 185,000-acre sustained-yield forest in western Jefferson County.

Houses for Permanent Military Installations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEROY JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1950

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, houses for permanent military installations can be obtained on the installment plan by using rent money to pay installments. H. R. 8645 provides for this. Here is a general explanation of the plan provided by this bill:

The total estimated amount which will be spent for fiscal year 1950 for rent of military personnel is the staggering sum of $321,292,000. The estimated amount to be required for fiscal 1951 is $312,998,000.

The reason for this staggering sum of money, for which we have nothing to show at the end of the year except rent receipts, is that our Armed Forces are much larger than we anticipated they would be following the war. We anticipated a sharp decline in the size of our Armed Forces. However, the cold war

and the unsettled conditions of the world has made it imperative that we retain a large Army, Navy, and Air Force.

Many stations scattered in all parts of the United States, in Alaska, and in foreign countries have only enough houses to meet a very small fraction of the number of personnel on the post.

The basic compensation which a member of the Armed Forces gets is the pay of his rank and appropriate quarters. If no quarters are available then the United Sates Government furnishes him money with which to rent appropriate quarters. In the pay scale we fix the quarters allowance for the various grades of enlisted men and officers. The total number of houses required to take care of our service personnel on permanent stations has not been accurately estimated. However, the amount of money required to build adequate quarters for the personnel, not only for today, but for the next 10 years so far as can be estimated, would be such a staggering sum that we cannot begin to build anything but a small fraction thereof if we are to pay for the entire house or houses in full at the time of construction.

Consequently, the problem is how can we build houses where only a very small fraction of the cost of each unit is paid upon the completion of the contract of construction and the balance be paid thereafter on the installment plan? The key to this is found in the fact that if we do not have adequate quarters we allow personnel rent money. As mentioned above, the amount which will be spent this year is over $300,000,000. The amount which will be spent next year for rent is over $300,000,000. At the rate we are going in 10 years we would have put out over $3,000,000,000 for rent and have nothing to show, except rent receipts, for this fabulous sum. We would have no tangible equity from the $3,000,000,000 which we would have spent.

Consequently, I have felt, and I have been studying the problem for several years, that it was possible to convert this rent money into installment payments, which would pay interest and principal of the contract price of the houses. These installment payments would give us at the end of 15 years or less, the house fully paid for and thus terminate rent allowances for the occupants. These, then, could be utilized as quarters for appropriate personnel and there would be only the cost of maintenance. That is the situation that the Armed Forces have always contemplated; that is, that there would be appropriate quarters for its personnel on duty at permanent stations.

How can this be done? Here is the plan which I offer. It is the simple building and loan principle, that millions of Americans have used with which to acquire a home, where they did not have the capital necessary to pay for the entire structure at the time that it was acquired or built for them.

We will invite bids for contracts on certain permanent military stations.

We will provide in our notice for bids and in our plans and specifications that 5 percent of the total amount of the awarded contracts will be paid in cash upon the completion of the contract, and the balance in instalments as provided by this law. It is provided by this law to have each set of quarters—each living unit—will be occupied by an officer or enlisted man. We provide in the law for the payment of a minimum of $75 per month per unit of quarters—payable semiannually—until the contract cost of the entire number of quarters under the specific contract is completely liquidated. At the time of each payment interest is to be paid on the unpaid part of the contract, at a rate not to exceed 4 percent per anum. We also provide that any quarters which are occupied by military personnel, which have not been fully paid for by the Government, shall be occupied by military personnel and those persons may be allowed rent money which shall be fully applied to the unpaid purchase price of the quarters and interest on unpaid part of contract.

The minimum which we guarantee for each set of quarters—whether occupied or not—is the sum of $75 per month. Then we provide in the law that in the event someone should occupy the premises whose rent allowance was less than $75 per month, we will make up the difference to make the payment $75. We also provide that in the event that persons occupying the quarters who receive a larger rent allowance than $75 per month, and every officer except the second lieutenant receives a larger allowance, that we may apply the allowance which the person occupying the quarters is entitled to as the monthly payment for the particular quarters. If it is a captain, we will pay the amount of the captain's rent allowance, if it is a major, we will pay the allowance he is allowed. The rent money which these occupants get, as provided by the law, shall be paid directly to the contractor or his assignee to liquidate the contract.

This bill provides for not over 4 percent interest on the unpaid amount of the contract. We propose to pay this semiannually—let us take a specific case to show you how it works. Assume that a certain unit of quarters cost $10,000. The initial payment which we would make would be $500, namely 5 percent of the cost of this one house or unit in a multiple-unit building. Then we would promptly designate an occupant for the quarters. If it were occupied by a second lieutenant the rent money to which that second lieutenant would be entitled would be $75 per month. This law would apply to all units of quarters not fully paid for. Consequently, as the payments are made semiannually, at the end of 6 months we would pay the contractor for each unit of quarters, $450. This sum would be divided as follows: On the unpaid balance of $9,500, there would be $190 due as interest for the 6 months preceding the payment on the unpaid balance. This would be paid to the contractor as interest and the balance, namely $260, would be applied to the principal. Subtracting $260 from $9,500 leaves a net amount due of $9,240. Then at the end of the next 6 months we would repeat this process and pay 2 percent on the $9,240. This would equal $184.80. This in turn would be subtracted from the $450, leaving a balance of $265.20 to be applied to the principal of the unpaid debt. Subtracting this from the principal $9,240 still due leaves $8,975.80 still due.

This would be repeated every 6 months until the interest was all paid and the principal likewise all paid. It will be noted as the successive payments are made the principal becomes smaller and the ratio of the installment paid on each unit goes more largely to reduce the principal than for interest. In other words, the amount of the interest keeps getting smaller, and, consequently, the amount of the installment which goes to the principal gets correspondingly larger. You can imagine that if we had the place occupied in part by a first lieutenant at times—sometimes by a captain, or even a major—this would appreciably accelerate the time which it would take to pay out the contract and remove the obligation under it, and likewise obliterate the rent allowance.

How do we guard against an oversupply of houses? This is done in the following manner: The station commander must make an estimate and determine what houses will be needed for the next 10-year period. On this basis, no contract will be allowed to be entered into that provides more than 60 percent of the estimated requirement for houses. The secretary of each service will provide for the letting of these contracts.

All of the contractors finance themselves. This law provides a guarantee by the United States Government that the money for the initial down payment of 5 percent of the contract price will be paid to the contractor after its successful completion, and also that payment in installments, as provided by the law, with interest at the rate of 4 percent on the unpaid amount, will be paid as required by this law, that is, a minimum monthly payment for each unit of $75.

It is a guarantee by Uncle Sam, and undoubtedly any bank, financial company, or life-insurance company would be happy to take such a contract off the contractor's hands, and in that way find a place for the investment of large blocks of money at the rate of 4 percent per annum, with Uncle Sam's guarantee of payment thereof until the contract price and interest on unpaid amounts was fully paid.

In this way we can have a way to provide adequate housing for most of our military personnel by the application of rent money to the payment of contracts for houses. We will cut down the terrible rent load which we are paying now and which goes down a drain, with no tangible benefit to the Government or anyone else except the landlords who rent these houses. We will gradually obtain appropriate quarters for the people whose duty it is to provide security for the United States of America. This is bound to raise the morale of these men and their families. I have seen some shameful conditions in the various parts of the United States due to the lack of housing, and in some places even a lack of available space which may be rented for the money which we allow as rent

money. Just to mention two key installations where we need houses badly, I point out Muroc Lake, Calif., and Limestone, Maine. Many other strategic and key stations are almost as badly off for adequate housing as these stations.

It is hoped that this bill will start on its road a plan that will not only give us adequate houses, but take a great financial load off the backs of the United States taxpayers.

[H. R. 8645, 81st Cong., 2d sess.]

A bill to authorize and expedite the construction of family quarters needed at permanent military installations by authorizing the Secretaries of the military departments to contract for the construction of family quarters and to apply the occupants' basic allowances for quarters to the payment of the cost of construction, provided that no monthly payment for any unit shall be less than $75, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted, etc., That it has been the policy of the Government since its inception to provide quarters for those in the armed services who are stationed on military installations or in lieu thereof to provide monetary allowances with which to rent quarters. The present unusually large peacetime components of our Armed Forces is due to the continuing international tension which developed immediately following the cessation of hostilities. Undoubtedly, this situation will continue for an indefinite period into the future and the need for relatively large military forces will continue to be required. To promptly build and pay in full for the housing required for military personnel on duty at permanent stations would require such a vast sum of money it would be utterly impossible considering the present demands upon the National Treasury. The amounts spent each year for rental money to our married personnel, who have been provided with quarters, is over $300,000,000 per year. It is hereby declared that the purpose of this act is to provide for the construction of housing on military installations under such procedure as will permit basic allowances for quarters to be applied as installment payments upon such houses, to the end that within 15 years said houses will be fully paid for, the contractor will have made a reasonable profit and be paid a reasonable interest rate, not to exceed 4 percent per annum, payable semiannually, on the unpaid portions of said contract, and the Government will thereupon be the owner of the houses and the expenditure for basic allowances for quarters will be greatly reduced. In recognition of the intention of Congress to reduce the size of our Military Establishment as soon as possible, consistent with maintaining our national security, the number of family quarters that may be constructed under this act at any installation is limited to 60 percent of the additional family quarters which the Secretary of the military department concerned anticipates will be required at such installation during the next 10 years.

SEC. 2. When the Secretary of a military department finds that there is a shortage of family quarters at an installation in the continental United States (excluding Alaska) under his jurisdiction and considered to be a permanent part of the Military Establishment, he may contract for the construction of not more than 60 percent of the number of additional family quarters he estimates will be required at such installation during the 10-year period following the close of the fiscal year in which he makes such estimate.

SEC. 3. Each contract made under this act shall provide for (1) a down payment of not less than 5 percent of the principal obligation under the contract, (2) complete amortization of the remainder of the principal obligation by semiannual payments within such period of time (not to exceed 15 years) as may be prescribed in the contract, and (3) interest at not to exceed 4 percent per annum on the amount of the principal obligation outstanding at any time.

SEC. 4. (a) The sum of the monthly principal and interest payments shall be an amount equal to the basic allowance for quarters to which the member of the uniformed services assigned to such quarters is entitled under section 302 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, except that in no case (whether or not the quarters are so assigned) shall the sum of the monthly principal and interest payments be less than $75.

(b) Annual appropriations for rent for quarters shall be made for uniformed services personnel who occupy the quarters herein provided for, the contract price of which has not been fully paid. Said rent allowance money shall be paid directly by the appropriate officer to the contractor who built such quarters, or his assignee, and such payments shall be made until the quarters have been entirely paid for, as prescribed in this act.

(2) No member of the uniformed services assigned to family quarters constructed under this act shall be required to assign his basic allowance for quarters to the United States if, by reason of orders of competent authority, his dependents are prevented from occupying such quarters.

(c) For the purposes of this section, the terms "member" and "uniformed services" have the same meaning as when used in section 302 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949.

SEC. 5. Section 3733 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C., sec. 12), and section 1136 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (10 U. S. C., sec. 1339), shall not apply with respect to the construction of family quarters under this act, but no contract shall be entered into under this act unless (1) money has been appropriated from which the down payment required by the contract may be made.

SEC. 6. The Secretaries of the respective military services are authorized to make and promulgate appropriate rules and regulations to carry out the provisions of this act. The Secretary of Defense shall approve all such rules and regulations to the end that they may be as uniform and simple as the situation permits.

Jim Farley Speaks for International Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 31, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, with permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a distinguished speech on world trade made by the Honorable James A. Farley, chairman of the board of the Coca-Cola Export Corp., at the world trade dinner of the Milwaukee Association of Commerce in Milwaukee, May 25.

It is an eloquent expression of the faith that free world trade can help the cause of world peace, that trade barriers are barriers to international understanding and good will.

WORLD TRADE

As most of you know, the company and product with which I am associated have recently received a severe, and I think all of you here will recognize, an undeserved, blow at the hands of the French Chamber of Deputies.

It is true that this blow would probably never have been dealt us without the special agitation of the Communists in France. I don't have to go into their motives—which are to attack everything and anything that suggests that something good might come out of America. But it is also true that the Communists in France could never have succeeded in putting over this particular piece of legislation by their own efforts alone. They were aided by others, and for this one time a great measure of their support came from a group that is normally and traditionally opposed to Communist doctrine. I mean the agricultural element, and specifically the wine growers.

Now, I don't bring this up to be critical of the French wine growers. What I want to be critical of, however, is an attitude of mind. And not because it exists in France, though I regret its existence anywhere, but primarily because it also exists among certain groups of people in this country, and most unfortunately among some who have a powerful influence in shaping public opinion in America.

INSTINCT VERSUS LOGIC

I suppose the desire to shut out competition, real or fancied, is instinctive with certain people who have goods to sell or services to offer. We find this instinct deep-rooted even among banks and corporations, among corner grocers and haberdasheries, among peanut vendors and shoe-shine boys, and even among young ladies in search of a husband. But instinct and logic are well recognized to be two separate things that do not always agree. Personally, I happen to believe that the French wine growers would have put the pressure on their legislators, not to pass this legislation but to stop it, if they had investigated thoroughly and fully evaluated all the factors in the case. I could go into considerable length on this specific point, but that is not my purpose here.

What I should like to do is examine the factors that affect our own position, right here in America, in respect to imports from abroad. What are these factors?

If you are a globe-trotter like me, you cannot fail but be impressed by the way American goods have been broadcast throughout the globe, since the war as well as during it. In France you see a railroad car, and it looks French. It is small, and has those peculiar looking European bumpers instead of couplings as we have here. But if you go up and look at at it closely you see that it says on it "Made in U. S. A." You see a bulldozer in India and it is an American product. You see a huge highway truck on the China roads and it comes from America. You are surprised to see a tractor on a small farm in Italy, but your surprise ends with the discovery that it was made in America.

IMPORTANCE OF EXPORTS

You are constantly amazed at the degree to which our substance—our iron, our steel, our coal, our copper, our wheat, our food, and our clothes—dots the landscapes of the world. And you realize, as you think about it, what an enormous hole it would leave in our economy if our export business were ever to be withdrawn.

Admittedly, a large proportion of the American goods you see abroad today has been paid for with money that came from America in the first place—first through lend-lease, then through the Marshall plan, or ERP, as it is now known. I am a strong advocate of the Marshall plan. I shall go on hoping and working for its continuance as long as it is necessary. Yet it is obvious that ERP cannot go on forever, and nobody,

including myself, would wish it to. Only, when it does end there will have to be something to replace it—for our own sake as well as for the sake of those nations who are now receiving its direct benefits. For if we are to have prosperity at home, we must continue to sell goods abroad, to people who have enough of their own money to buy them, out of the fruits of their own labors and the profits of their own trade, within their own borders, with one another, and with us. That is the real purpose of the Marshall plan, or ERP—to help rehabilitate the nations so that they can again become fully self-supporting participants in the economy of the world.

There are those who argue that by rebuilding foreign industry we are only putting competitors for overseas markets back into business and thus would tend to reduce instead of increasing the volume of our exports. That argument is not valid. Against it is the whole history of world trade, which shows that the best customers, as between nations, are those who are able to sell abroad, generally in competition with one another. Even less valid, if possible, is the philosophy that in order to attain prosperity a country should export as much as possible while holding imports down to as near to nothing as it can. Surely nothing could be more unrealistic than for any concern or any nation to hope to increase its own business by keeping its customers poor.

MUST SPREAD IDEAS

I am aware, of course, that this is a world-trade dinner at which I am speaking, sponsored by groups who are especially interested in advancing world trade, and that therefore I have thus far been preaching largely to the converted. But it is not enough to settle the pros and cons of foreign trade among ourselves and for our own intellectual satisfaction. There is need for all of us who are sold on world trade to take an active part in combating the prejudice that exists in many quarters and among many groups in this country against so-called foreign competition—a prejudice that frequently sounds as bitter as that which was so successfully stirred up in France recently against Coca-Cola—a prejudice based upon misunderstanding of the very nature of trade itself, and which can be overcome only by a process of widespread education. And the need to overcome this prejudice is urgent. It is urgent because intimately involved with the question of world trade is also the question of world peace.

We hear much about the cost of the Marshall plan, and I do not deny that it is expensive. But the cost of ERP is relatively small change compared to the cost of being prepared for war. Moreover, we can foresee the end of the Marshall plan, but who at this point in history can confidently predict a day when we shall not have to pour ever-increasing amounts of money into perhaps a still larger Army, a still larger Navy, a still larger Air Force, and more and more expensive equipment? The end product of the Marshall plan is greater wealth and a better life for all the peoples of the world. The end product of military expenditures, if ever what is being purchased by those expenditures are put into use, can only be destruction and death.

Yet our military expenditures on their present tremendous scale continue to be necessary because of the kind of world we live in. I think you will agree with me that the most important single economic, political, and moral fact in that world today is Russian communism.

FIGHT RUSSIAN IDEAS

What Russian communism really is is difficult for an American even to visualize. It is so far from our own purposes that even after we see it we refuse to believe it. Its objective in regard to other nations is to produce chaos and weakness on a world-wide basis, so that the communistic idea may inherit and control. And, significantly, it is part of this policy, as it has been throughout history for every tribe or every nation who ever sought self-aggrandizement at the expense of others to shut out foreign trade.

Fortunately, we are not engaged in an armed struggle with communism. Whatever conflict exists is still in the stage of the cold war, and I am much encouraged to believe that it will never go beyond that stage. But even in a cold war no one nation can stand alone in opposition to the rest of the world. Not even Russia. Not even the United States. We need friends and allies. So does Russia. Russia is trying to win hers by promoting violence and revolution within her neighbors' borders. We can win ours only by demonstrating to the people of other nations the benefits to them of our way of life. This we can do only by opening our doors and windows and letting them look in, by showing them what that way of life has made available to us in terms of the highest standard of living the world has ever known, and therefore what it can in turn also make available to them.

Thus the more people we expose to American products the better they will understand the kind of people we are. The more who experience our merchandise, the better off both they and we will be, and the greater the mutual understanding and friendship between us.

It is well known that people understand things much better than they understand ideas. When we speak to the outsider of democracy the idea may be beyond his depth. Moreover, in the international battlefield of propaganda, the word "democracy" has been abused and distorted in every conceivable way. In fact, it is an important part of the Communist propaganda technique to appropriate the word, to give it an entirely new definition, and to claim that its own special concept of democracy, which turns out to be miles and miles away from yours and mine, is the only true democracy there is.

So when you say democracy to a European or an Asiatic, you cannot be sure exactly what that makes him think of, or whether it evokes in him any thought at all. But when you invite a man from a slum in Naples for a ride in your jeep, or offer him a cigarette or a bar of chocolate, that is something he can taste and feel. Show his wife a washing machine, and you show her a picture of a better life for herself that is more eloquent, more effective, and more convincing than any word or combination of words from all the dictionaries of all the languages in the world. To the foreigner, the most impressive thing about American democracy is that it is a system capable of producing low-priced merchandise of standard quality for universal distribution; that it is a system capable of producing for ordinary folks everywhere the kind of American merchandise, from trucks to shoelaces, that they saw and appreciated during the war.

There is no doubt in my mind that one of the most effective pieces of propaganda for the American way that could be conceived would be a Montgomery Ward or a Sears, Roebuck catalog in the hands of every inhabitant of the globe. And that includes the Russians.

FOREIGN TRADE VITAL

So, then, foreign trade is indeed vital to us, as I tried to point out at the beginning, for the maintenance of our own prosperity. But it has an even higher purpose, the advancement of world understanding and therefore of world peace. There is therefore, as I have tried to indicate, a moral obligation upon us who understand this to take an active part in spreading this doctrine among our fellow-citizens. Above all, what needs to be more generally realized is that foreign trade can never be a one-way street, as all too many unthinking people would like it to be. I do not mean that we should go out and urge people to prefer foreign-made products in preference to American-made ones, especially if it happens that the American-made product is the better value. And I do not deny that in a certain few very special instances some restrictions on the unlimited importance of a given product or a given type of product may be desirable. But I am opposed, and I think we all should be, to every artificial barrier that is not dictated by exceptional necessity. I think it is an obligation for us all to oppose any sentiment we see expressed, as we too often do, in favor of general discrimination against foreign-made products just because they are foreign-made. I believe it is our duty to be vigilant against all attempts to establish excessive duties on imports wherever there is indication that they are being proposed to merely shelter a monopoly or would-be monopoly or to protect a cherished, but perhaps not entirely justifiable, price structure for the corresponding domestic product—and to make our protests known.

COMPETITIVE STIMULUS

I think it is to the advantage of everyone for us to maintain and to insist on every possible occasion that the only really satisfactory way to meet the competition of foreign products admitted to this country is exactly the way American manufacturers have always been accustomed to meeting their own domestic competition. For there has always been competition in business, and businesses have always survived, with the public getting the benefits of greater values at a lower price as a result. It is through this process largely that America has become great and our living standards unsurpassed. And I am at a loss to see why it should make any difference to the manufacturer in Wisconsin whether the stimulus of the competition that makes him do a better job comes from Nebraska or Norway, Indiana or Italy, Austria or Alaska, New York or New Zealand.

The plain fact is that the more our domestic markets are divided among the producers of the world, the more our world market is extended and multiplied. And since, taken all together, the other peoples on this earth outnumber us so manyfold, this can only mean a gain for this country's industry, the world's most highly developed industry with the world's greatest capacity and potential for production and hence with the most goods to sell.

But there is an even greater gain to be had than that. That gain will come when, thanks to foreign trade, the peoples of this earth will become so mutually dependent that they cannot get along without each other. Then we shall have peace—permanent peace, at last.

Surely, the cause of world trade is a good cause, worth all our energies to promote. For it is the cause of peace.

Letter Carriers Are Human, Too

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have a letter from an esteemed constituent which I think will be of interest to my colleagues in their consideration of H. R. 547. This constituent is

Martin F. Kalbow, of 4300 South Ellis Avenue, Chicago, who holds the responsible position of secretary of Charles D. Duffy Branch, No. 11, of the National Association of Letter Carriers. I bespeak for his presentment of the viewpoint of the letter carriers the thoughtful attention of the Members of this body. Certainly there is no body of public servants which has more fully earned by hard and faithful service the good will and cooperative friendship of the American people than that of the mail carriers. I am sure that Mr. Kalbow's letter will be read with sympathetic eyes. The letter follows:

CHICAGO, *May 29, 1950.*

Hon. BARRATT O'HARA,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The 4,400 letter carriers of Charles D. Duffy Branch No. 11, Chicago, Ill., are very much concerned with the curtailment order of Postmaster General Donaldson of April 18, 1950, and are rising as one protesting against this drastic order which seems so unnecessary at this time, and with a cold war on our first line of communication is now threatened.

Under the curtailment program and a one-delivery-a-day system, half of the day's mail will be carried over to the late afternoon. If a letter carrier cannot cover his route due to heavy mail, it means some mail will not be delivered until the following day, and in the afternoon of the following day, causing complaints from the patron.

The carriers will be handicapped in eating their lunch on the route, and especially in wet weather, how can he eat his lunch on a curbstone when it rains? He will also be forced to wear wet clothing instead of changing into dry clothing at noon when it rains, causing him to be ill, or maybe die, on account of the drastic order of the Postmaster General of April 18.

Our letter carriers in Chicago, Ill., are conscientious and sincere in performing their duties, but this drastic curtailment order will certainly tear down the morale of these carriers.

The American people have a right to expect and request normal mail service here in the United States. Germany and England have three deliveries a day, but here in the greatest country of all, we should have only one according to the Postmaster General.

We want you to support the House Resolution 547 rescinding the order of Postmaster General Donaldson of April 18, 1950.

We know how busy you are, and we will thank you for considering this letter.

Hoping for an early reply, and with best wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

MARTIN F. KALBOW,
Secretary, Charles D. Duffy Branch, No. 11.

Nazism and Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 31, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, if anyone is still in doubt about the kinship in ideas and methods as practiced by the Nazis and Communists, the stories carried in the press in the last few days attest to the fact that basically there is no difference between them. Former Nazis in Austria and in east Germany, which is under Russian domination, seem to have no difficulty in integrating themselves into Communist ideology and in following the dictates of Moscow. Dictatorship, whether black or red, is all the same to them. Yesterday's Nazis had no love or understanding of democracy, and they have still less appreciation of it as they emerge in the role of today's Communists. We would do well to remember this fact in dealing with the Nazis and "former" Nazis of western Germany.

The following editorial, which appeared in the Brooklyn Daily Eagle, May 27, 1950, deserves more than passing attention:

NOTORIOUS NAZIS BECOME COMMIES IN AUSTRIA—KINSHIP OF TWO SHOWN

The kinship between Nazi and Communist has been made strikingly apparent by the history of the peacetime years. Although theoretically far apart, actually they have pursued identical objectives through similar means. Under Hitler and under Stalin the ends have been the same—the destruction of all freedoms, including that of worship, the enslavement of the masses, the conquest of other lands, the establishment of a world domination.

Old Nazis, deeply indoctrinated with the teachings of Hitler, have no difficulty in adjusting themselves to the ideology of Moscow. Little is involved except a change in name. Thinking and methods and purposes are all the same. There is never any great variation in the ways of dictators as they hew their way toward their objectives.

Reports from Vienna that Soviet Russia is sponsoring in Austria a pro-Soviet group recruited almost exclusively from among former Nazis of an especially evil type are accordingly easy to accept as authentic. Its leader is Adolf Slavik, a former member of the Nazi Elite Guard and one of the more notorious of the former followers of Hitler.

Austria has been one of the Kremlin's more difficult problems. Resistance to communism has been determined and effective, as was revealed impressively in the recent elections, which gave only a meager scattering of votes to Moscow's puppets. In order to make even a semblance of a showing of progress, it has been necessary for Soviet agents to seek among discredited and disreputable elements for leaders and recruits.

They are being found, although only in limited numbers, among former Nazis, some of whom have served time in prison and are willing to form any sort of an attachment that may lead to an easier way of living or a little authority. Generally, the National League, as the new Soviet organization is known, is made up of the "irredeemable type of Nazi."

In explaining his shift from nazism to communism, Slavik is reported as having said that in the event of a new war Russia would occupy all of Europe and that it was accordingly expedient to be on the winning side. Similar reasoning probably influenced his alliance with Hitler a decade or more ago, with disillusioning results.

Formation of the National League in Austria and the methods through which recruits are being found has a heartening significance. They suggest that the Kremlin is finding barren soil in Austria and that its agents are hard-pressed to make a showing.

Oregon Poll on Alaska and Hawaii Statehood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 31, 1950

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a poll published in the Portland Oregonian of May 18, 1950, which shows a progressive and overwhelming sentiment for Alaska and Hawaii statehood among the residents of that great western State:

ALASKA AND HAWAII RECEIVE STRONG BACKING IN OREGON

THE FRONT DOOR BALLOT BOX

(By Dan E. Clark II)

Where Oregonians are concerned, Alaska and Hawaii can add their statehood stars to the 48 already shining from the blue field of Old Glory.

The matter of whether to add these two Territories to the Union is now before Congress and votes may be taken before the end of this session on whether or not to admit them as full-fledged States.

Front door ballot box interviewers asked a scientifically designed cross-section of Oregonians to vote on these questions and this is how they felt when asked: "Would you favor or oppose granting statehood to Alaska? Hawaii?"

	Alaskan statehood	Hawaiian statehood
	Percent	*Percent*
Favor	88	78
Oppose	5	12
Undecided	7	10
	100	100

"Alaska is closer to us than New York," exclaimed one person, "why should we wait any longer to take it in as a State?" "Alaskans' interests are the same as ours, so why shouldn't we give them the same statehood rights we enjoy?" declared another.

Although Hawaiian statehood was slightly less popular than Alaskan, it was still favored by a large majority. The main objection here was on the racial issue, and some expressed fear of Communists in the islands.

Gives breakdown

One of the interesting features of this question was the unanimity of feeling among all segments of the population. Alaskan statehood is universally favored by Republicans and Democrats, men and women, the various educational levels, and the different age groups alike.

The Hawaiian issue shows some difference existing, but most of them are matters of indecision. These figures show the pattern of opinion:

	Favor Hawaiian statehood	Oppose Hawaiian statehood	Undecided
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
Democrats	79	10	11
Republicans	77	15	8
College educated	82	12	6
High school	80	13	7
Grade school	72	11	17

"What are we going to do with the two extra stars if they become States?" queried one anxious Oregonian.

GM Shows the Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 31, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, with permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I attach the following editorial, GM Shows the Way, by Father Benjamin Masse, from the June 3 issue of America:

GM SHOWS THE WAY
(By Benjamin L. Masse)

Last week America ended its editorial comment on the negotiations at General Motors with these words:

"UAW wants a wage increase of 9 cents an hour, a union shop, welfare benefits, and minimum monthly pensions of $125, including Federal social-security benefits. That package would cost about 31 cents an hour. Don't be too surprised if Mr. Reuther receives a substantial part of it, though he certainly won't come away with the union shop."

In the light of the thrilling news from Detroit on May 23, that prediction turns out to be conservative. Walter Reuther not only obtained a substantial part of his economic demands, including the most generous pension plan in the industry; he also left the bargaining table with something suspiciously like a union shop.

Even that doesn't tell the whole story. Breaking the news of the agreement to the press, Charles E. Wilson, president of General Motors, called the contract unprecedented in labor-management relations. His words were echoed by Walter Reuther, UAW president, who referred to it "as the most significant development in labor relations since the mass-productions industries were organized in 1936–37." Though these reactions might be suspect as emanating from interested sources, they were immediately confirmed from outside the industry. "After a period of apparent incredulity," reported the New York Times on May 24, Government officials hailed the agreement, and Secretary of Labor Maurice J. Tobin called it great news. Cyrus S. Ching, Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, was more specific. He said that it "marks a milestone in the progress of collective bargaining." In Pittsburgh, Philip Murray, president of the CIO, gave his blessing to "an amazing and very wholesome development." Finally Wall Street rendered its dollars-and-cents verdict by shooting GM stock to its highest price since 1929.

What is there about the UAW-GM contract that caused all this excitement?

First of all there is the provision, probably not matched in any other labor-management contract, that the agreement will run for 5 years, with no reopening of any kind. For the workers that means security, and for the corporation freedom from strikes. It means more. It is a vote of confidence by the biggest nonfinancial company in the world in the continued health and prosperity of the American economic system. It is also a recognition by big business that its decisions can and ought to have, in the words of Mr. Wilson, "a stabilizing influence not only on our business but on the economy of the whole country." That brings the thinking of GM and Walter Reuther much closer together than anyone thought possible in the dismal days of 1945–46.

In the second place, there is a whole host of economic benefits which enable the workers to share fairly in the increasing productivity of our most profitable corporation. Here are the main ones:

1. Four cents an hour, representing the estimated annual gain in productivity, will be added each year to the basic wage. Since the average wage now is $1.65 an hour, that means a rise to $1.85 in 1955. The basic rate for apprentices is raised an additional 5½ cents an hour, and the rate for 30,000 skilled tool-and-die workers, 5 cents an hour. The cost-of-living formula, first adopted in the 1947 contract, is retained. Under this formula wages will rise or fall 1 cent an hour, depending on every rise or fall of 1.14 points in the consumer price index of the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Though there is no ceiling on the amount wages can go up under the formula, the agreement specifies that wages may not fall below the basic rate.

2. Workers with 25 years of service can retire at 65 with a pension, including Federal social-security benefits, of $100. In the event that the Government increases benefits, however, the gain will be passed along to the workers up to a maximum of $117 a month. That feature liberalizes the present pension pattern. The contract also provides that any employee with 15 years of service who becomes totally and permanently disabled after the age of 50 becomes eligible for a disability pension ranging from $50 to $90 a month. When such a disabled worker reaches 65, he comes under the regular retirement plan.

3. Medical and insurance benefits are liberalized. All company employees and their families, with the corporation paying half the premium, will now enjoy complete Blue Cross and Blue Shield coverage. Life-insurance policies are upped a flat $500 and will range from $2,500 to $5,000. The union also won an increase of $14 a week in sickness and accident benefits. These will run from $28 to $45.50, for up to 26 weeks.

4. Also liberalized was vacation pay, which employees ordinarily take instead of days off. Workers with 1 year's service will receive a week's pay, and the amount grows thereafter proportionately with length of service. The top is 3 weeks' pay for employees with 15 years to their credit.

The union estimates that the economic features of the new contract will cost GM 19 cents an hour—Mr. Reuther had originally demanded 31 cents—or $144,000,000 the first year. Over the life of the contract the total gain of the workers will exceed $1,000,000,000. The union also estimates that in the fifth year alone the average GM worker and his family will have an income $700 above what they have today. Since the corporation's profits after all taxes were $656,000,000 in 1949, and are running at an even higher rate so far this year, these economic concessions will not unduly strain its ability to pay. They represent a laudable willingness on the part of GM to share its unparalleled prosperity with its employees.

Great as these economic benefits are, they are not so startling as the noneconomic concessions granted by the company. The union won more than 30 desirable changes in the contract, the most important of which is a modified union shop. Under the terms of the union-security clause, all new employees must join UAW and remain members in good standing for a year. At the end of this period they have the option of resigning. Present employees who are not members of the union are under no obligation to join. In view of the historic open-shop policy of GM, which was maintained as a matter of "principle," that bow to the social obligations of its employees ranks with the historic decision of Ford a decade or so ago to grant the union shop. It means that GM now concedes that its employees can belong to UAW without in any way being disloyal to the company. It means that the union is given a new status in the plant community, which approximates the status of partnership. It means, finally, that the company sees in Walter Reuther not the dangerous character portrayed in certain management circles, but a loyal American intent on using his power for the good of his industry and his country, as well as for the narrower interests of his followers.

It is much too early to estimate the full impact of this precedent-shattering contract. It seems clear, however, that it will have a generally pacifying effect on industrial relations, especially in basic industry. It will likewise strengthen the trend toward longer and more stable agreements between labor and management. It also marks as successful the 1947 experiment in tying wages both to increasing productivity and to the cost of living. Thus it may point the way to a new objective criterion for wage determination.

From the standpoint of union politics, the GM agreement bolsters the position of Walter Reuther in UAW. During a visit to Detroit last March, the writer had the impression that the Chrysler strike had weakened Reuther and given the tenacious, irrepressible Communist opposition a new lease on life. The GM settlement should regain for the young UAW leader any ground he may have lost.

Since the writer has had in the past some small differences with GM management, it gives him all the greater pleasure now to hail the corporation for breaking new ground in industrial relations. Its obvious willingness to live and work with the union is in sharp contrast with the negative, again'-the-union policy of the Chrysler Corp. Congratulations all around.

How Prisoners Become Clients Through the Cooperation of Federal Prison and State Agency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 31, 1950

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, in the current issue of the Journal of Rehabilitation, which is the official organ of the National Rehabilitation Association, there appears an article on the joint program of vocational rehabilitation of the United States Penitentiary in Atlanta, Ga.

This is a most interesting and informative article regarding the fine work being done. I have been greatly interested to learn of the fine results being accomplished through this joint program of vocational rehabilitation. I believe that readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will likewise be interested in this work, and under leave granted, I insert the article herewith as a part of my remarks:

HOW PRISONERS BECOME CLIENTS THROUGH THE COOPERATION OF FEDERAL PRISON AND STATE AGENCY

(By Bruce Hall, Supervisor of Research and Information, Vocational Rehabilitation Division of Georgia)

In a feature article published nearly a decade ago, the erudite Christian Science Monitor gave Atlanta's United States Penitentiary its motto: "Atlanta Sets the Standard." It was not an undeserved compliment to this institution, which has the custody of more than 2,000 men, mostly recidivists and offenders in older age groups. Few young first offenders are sent to Atlanta.

It takes more than modern facilities and accepted administrative policies to set stand-

ards worthy of emulation by other institutions. It takes vision, imagination, and a pioneering spirit. On that score, Atlanta seems to have been fortunate over a span of years in the individuals who have been assigned there as wardens.

REBUILDING MEN

The institution's method of dealing with prisoners was summed up rather neatly by an inmate. In an article which appeared recently in the prison's well-edited, attractive magazine, the Atlantian, he said:

"Almost from the moment the thinking inmate enters Atlanta he is impressed with the fact that his ultimate rehabilitation is the aim and goal of the prison's program. From the time he enters the quarantine building until he is discharged at the end of his sentence, his actions and thinking are channeled toward the end goal of incarceration—return to society—by placing him not under the watchful eyes of prison guards, but under the direction of instructors."

The word rehabilitation, in this connection, may be used in its broadest sense, for the prison program looks not only toward the social, moral, and spiritual rehabilitation of inmates, but to their physical and vocational rehabilitation as well.

On the 27 acres within massive walls are well-equipped shops for vocational training, a modern hospital, athletic field, and recreation areas, in addition to industrial plants, administration buildings, and other facilities. Incidentally, the prison industries during World War II furnished millions of dollars' worth of materials to the armed services.

PROBLEMS—AND ANSWERS

The distinctive program for the physically handicapped has been developed in recent years through the cooperation of the vocational rehabilitation division of Georgia's Department of Education. It grew out of a problem which confronted prison officials in 1943. A Negro who had a marked facial disfigurement, due to scrofula, was to be released to his legal residence in North Carolina. He was in dire need of plastic surgery to eliminate fissures through which his teeth were exposed. There was no provision in the budget for surgery services by an outside specialist.

The officials of the Atlanta Penitentiary sought the advice of Paul S. Barrett, Georgia's director of vocational rehabilitation. Mr. Barrett recommended requesting the assistance of North Carolina's vocational rehabilitation division. This course was followed, and North Carolina accepted the case, but the man violated his conditional release before the service could be rendered.

A failure? Maybe, in this specific case, but the experience had uncovered the approach to the problem of physical restoration of handicapped inmates who needed types of medical and surgical care not available in the prison hospital.

Other cases arose and were handled on an individual basis.

One was a white man, 52, who was 70 percent deaf and wore an artificial limb. Records showed that he lost his leg in 1915 and went to prison the following year; he had served eight sentences for various offenses, including post office robbery. He told prison officials he had turned to crime because he could not make a living. He never had begged, he said, and never would; he preferred being a prisoner. While in prison he was trained to operate a lathe.

Efforts were made to place him. Shipyards were calling for manpower, but because of his defective hearing they would not accept him. The assistance of the Georgia Division was sought. A hearing aid was provided, and when the man was released, in 1944, he was promptly placed—in a Georgia shipyard.

Two years later shipyard personnel officers told a prison placement officer that the man had never been late to work and had been absent only 5 days when ill with influenza.

If there had been a Federal-State vocational rehabilitation program back in 1915, this man might have been rehabilitated before going to prison.

A PLAN THAT WORKED

In 1947, Warden Jos. W. Sanford, since retired, conceived the idea that a program could be worked out to serve all handicapped inmates. The upshot of this was an agreement between the prison and the vocational rehabilitation division setting forth individual and joint responsibilities. It's just a simple statement, without a lot of legal phrases and technicalities.

A special vocational rehabilitation committee was organized. It comprised the prison's director of training and placement, the supervisor of employment placement, the parole officer, the supervisor of vocational training, the vocational rehabilitation counselor, and a secretary.

All inmates having vocational handicaps were called before the committee. Questions relating to physical restoration, training appliances, and future placement were discussed. Feasible cases were accepted and all forms, including the medical report from the hospital, were filled out. The Atlanta counselor then referred the case to the appropriate State or Georgia local office.

After the backlog of cases had been cleared out, the committee's work was delegated to the placement officer, Jerry Head, and the Atlanta counselor. Now the procedure is routine: if the medical examination shows a vocational handicap, the case automatically is referred to the rehabilitation counselor.

While follow-up reports are not available on all cases served, prison officials have ample information on which to base an appraisal of the program.

In discussing the cooperative program Warden W. H. Hiatt said: "It has been so successful and so helpful to us in problems dealing with handicapped inmates that we are of the opinion other institutions would benefit from a similar arrangement.

"It has accomplished a great deal for men who realize they couldn't secure employment without corrective measures. We believe that incapacitation is a big factor in getting them into difficulties. Removal of the cause is a step toward rehabilitation."

Dr. George Hess, chief medical officer, expressed himself even more emphatically: "The Vocational Rehabilitation Division has given us 100-percent cooperation. We feel there is as much to physical restoration as to anything else in rehabilitating inmates. Everyone who comes here with hernia, for instance, gets the necessary surgery. We are doing surgery in extreme case of varicose veins. And we're doing more plastic surgery. I think we're on the right road."

In connection with the physical restoration program, it should be emphasized that Vocational Rehabilitation Divisions never are called upon for surgical fees unless the operation requires the services of an outside specialist. And, of course, there are no hospitalization costs on any cases accepted by the divisions. The prison hospital is approved by the American College of Surgeons.

RESULTS ON RECORD

In his report for 1948, the rehabilitation counselor, J. J. Segars, had this to say:

"I have visited the penitentiary once or twice a week. Cooperation of all officials has been excellent and I feel the program has been much more successful than anyone anticipated.

"Since no program of this sort had been undertaken previously, I felt it was important to select carefully the cases to be accepted and proceed on a sound basis with a reasonable number rather than to attempt a large number. Every inmate referred by the institution has been interviewed, and a study made of the case history.

"The interest and cooperation of the individuals has been very good. Few have shown no interest at all. We have followed a policy of rejecting all applicants who were habitual drug addicts and those who had long criminal records.

"A good variety of services has been provided, most of which have been secured through the cooperation of the institution and without cost to State rehabilitation agencies.

"During the year we asked for and received the cooperation of eight States. Every plan calling for financial assistance from a State agency has been approved, except in one case when a counselor said he did not have funds available at the time.

"A total of $1,258.95 has been provided. These services would have cost a great deal more if the State agencies had provided them after the client left prison, since all hospitalization, dentures, artificial eyes, and training are provided by the Bureau of Prisons."

In planning training courses, consideration is given to the inmate's term. The schedule is worked out so that the trainee may complete the course before the date of his release. Courses cover a wide range, from general education to technical subjects such as television. The outside detail of trusties working on the prison farm, may get training in truck farming, tractor driving, motor repairs, and other subjects that fit in with farming.

Of course, there have been some disappointments. One was a 30-year-old amputee who had been provided with an artificial limb and placed as a tractor driver in Mississippi. He had worked only a short time when he obtained permission from his probation officer to go to another State for a better job. There he stole an automobile and is now back in the penitentiary. But an occasional failure does not discourage those who see the whole picture.

Recently we had an opportunity to interview a former inmate who had surgery and training under the cooperative program. This white man had congenital club feet. Before he was 30, he became involved in an extortion scheme. During incarceration he received corrective surgery, orthopedic shoes, and braces. He was trained as a radio repair man and, upon release, placed in employment. Soon thereafter he had an opportunity to go in business for himself. Vocational Rehabilitation assisted in the purchase of equipment. A room in his home was converted into a shop. He answers calls for radio-repair service from any part of the county and takes jobs in his shop. His earnings for the first year, he said, have averaged better than $250 a month. He has a wife and two children.

When asked about the prison program, he replied with enthusiasm, "It's fine." Then he explained that it had made it possible for him to realize a lifelong ambition in getting corrective surgery and learning a trade in which he finds real satisfaction.

National Spelling Bee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1950

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, Washington constantly has the opportunity to see extraordinary people and witness unusual events. We hear and

see so much that is unusual here, that we can, without becoming excited, extend a welcome to visiting dignitaries from other nations, watch the newest and speediest jet planes perform at almost miraculous speed, and participate in governmental activities which have the most far-reaching effects.

These are all the actings and doings of adults, educated, trained, and experienced. But I want to call attention today to an outstanding event which occurred in Washington last week, which is worthy of notice and high praise. I refer to the 1950 national spelling bee, which was held Friday, in which there were 50 contenders, ambitious, intelligent, wholesome boys and girls from every section of the country ranging in age from 11 to 14 years.

These 50 boys and girls were the champions of their respective States. They had defeated opponents in contests in their schools, their counties, districts, and States. The 50 who won the trip to Washington were the finest spelling talent of the schools of America.

These bright boys and girls faced the keenest possible competition in this contest. For many of them it was their first visit to the Nation's Capital. They were in strange territory and their competitors were strangers to them, facts which in themselves contributed to the difficulties of the situation.

The 1950 national spelling bee was the twenty-third annual contest of this group, and while all of them have been outstanding this was an extraordinary contest in several respects.

It was the first time, regular spelling-bee goers said, that the first list of words was exhausted; the first time that a speller had been eliminated, and later reinstated because the judges found the word could be correctly spelled two ways. This happened three times in this spelling bee. It was the first time the judges completely ran out of words, and the first time that the contest ended with two spellers, neither able to spell down the other, tied for first place. So this year's spelling bee created two national champions instead of one.

These two distinguished and able spellers who emerged victorious from this grueling 7½-hour contest were Diana Reynard, of Cleveland, Ohio, and Colquitt Dean, of College Park, Ga. Colquitt Dean lives in the Fifth Congressional District of Georgia, and I do not need to tell you that I am very proud of his remarkable achievement in winning, first the State championship, and then with the able young lady from Cleveland becoming joint national champion. We of the Georgia delegation are proud of Georgia's newest champion.

I take this opportunity to commend the sponsors of the National Spelling Bee for the fine service they are rendering in affording to the boys and girls of America the opportunity to participate in this wholesome, educational competition, which trains the contestants in self-reliance, self-improvement, and the principles of good sportsmanship.

This event strengthens my confidence in the future of America.

The boys and girls who took part in this contest in all its stages, will soon be men and women, and they will be the good Americans who believe in individual effort, free enterprise, and the American way, who can be depended upon to exert the necessary effort to preserve these things.

Congratulations to them upon their achievements and best wishes for their success in future undertakings.

Lawson Veterans' Hospital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 31, 1950

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, at a meeting of Gate City Council, No. 5, Junior Order United American Mechanics, in Atlanta, Ga., on May 17, 1950, Dr. M. D. Collins, national councilor of the order, introduced a resolution urging that Lawson Veterans' Hospital in Atlanta be not closed, but that it be continued for the use of sick and disabled veterans in that area. This resolution was seconded by Mr. Vester N. Owenby, and was unanimously adopted by the membership of Gate City Council.

The original of this resolution has been forwarded to the President of the United States.

I feel that Members of Congress should know of the interest of this fine civic and fraternal group in the preservation of this veterans' hospital, and I am inserting the resolution herewith as a part of my remarks:

Whereas the announced decision of the President of the United States to bring about the immediate closing and abandonment of the admirable United States Veterans' Administration hospital facility at Chamblee, Ga., and known as Lawson Veterans Hospital, in the vicinity of Atlanta, has brought deep anxiety to the veterans and families of veterans in this community who will thereby be subjected to great neglect and serious inconvenience; and

Whereas such a step will result in many veterans otherwise entitled to full hospital and clinical treatment, being deprived of this merciful consideration at the hands of the Government which they so gallantly served in time of war; and

Whereas the decision aforesaid would also result in the wasteful abandonment of Government facilities which cannot be replaced elsewhere except at huge expense; and

Whereas the decision in question does not appear to be based upon any sound determination of the actual facts regarding the overcrowded hospital situation in this community; and

Whereas the abandonment of Lawson Hospital would likewise deprive the veteran population of this community from the advantage of its proximity to the Emory University Medical College and staff composed of renowned specialists and technicians in every branch of medicine and surgery, whose skilled services have long been available to the patients of this institution.

Whereas the ideal location of Atlanta as the center of transportation and communication for the vast area immediately within the environs of Lawson Hospital has afforded to it an advantage unsurpassed elsewhere for the treatment and diagnosis of those disabilities which are a peculiar incident of war service, both from the standpoint of physical disabilities and mental infirmities; and

Whereas the decision in question apparently gives no proper weight to the foremost principle of a sound hospital program which has been held to include the idea that no existing hospital accommodations should be abandoned until adequate and corresponding facilities have been provided on an equal basis of bed-for-bed, ward-for-ward, and staff-for-staff, which may amply, properly and promptly administer to those who are in need of treatment and hospital care, and who would otherwise be displaced or transferred to distant points away from their families, and where recovery and recuperation may be seriously handicapped and retarded; and

Whereas we deplore this decision and earnestly hope that it will be revoked or modified in such a way as will prevent undue hardship and suffering from being inflicted on helpless patients, or where the existing long waiting list for admissions to hospitals shall not be further lengthened and aggravated: Therefore be it

Resolved, That in accordance with the constitutional right of all American citizens to petition for the redress of grievances, Gate City Council, No. 5, Junior Order of United American Mechanics, at a regular session thereof at Atlanta, Ga., on May 17, 1950, do hereby respectfully and earnestly petition the President of the United States to alter and rescind his previous order for the abandonment and dismantling of Lawson Veterans Hospital, and that he immediately suspend the execution thereof until such time as a more detailed and factual analysis and survey can be made of the hospital needs both present and future, of the veteran population of this vicinity; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Georgia's two United States Senators and to Congressman JAMES C. DAVIS, as the Representative of this district, in support of their efforts to prevent the consummation of the order of the President to which the above references are respectfully made.

Address by the Vice President at National Triennial Convention of B'nai B'rith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 1 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by the distinguished Vice President of the United States on the occasion of the National Triennial Convention of B'nai B'rith held in Washington, D. C., on March 21, 1950. Vice President BARKLEY shared the program with Secretary General Trygve Lie, of the United Nations. The dais was graced with such dignitaries as Eddie Jacobson, of Kansas City, former business associate of President Truman, who was a guest of honor; Mrs. Alben W. Barkley; Israeli Ambassador Eliahu Elath; Supreme Court Justice Tom C. Clark; Attorney General J. Howard McGrath; Secretary of the Interior Oscar Chapman; Secretary of Agriculture Charles F. Brannan; Senator James

P. Kem; Senator Herbert H. Lehman; John Sherman Cooper, Delegate of the United States to the United Nations Assembly; Secretary of the Navy Francis P. Matthews; Assistant Secretary of State Willard L. Thorp; Assistant Secretary of State John D. Hickerson; Benjamin Cohen, Assistant Secretary General of the United Nations; Ben V. Cohen, United States Delegate to the International Court of Justice, The Hague; A. H. Feller, Counsel to Trygve Lie, Secretary General of the United Nations; Eugene Meyer, publisher of the Washington Post and former President of the World Bank; Watson Miller, United States Commissioner of Immigration; Representative Emanuel Celler; Representative Edith Nourse Rogers; Representative J. D. Dingell; Representative Joseph Bates; Representative Louis C. Rabaut; Representative Cecil P. King; Representative Arthur G. Klein; Representative Jacob K. Javits; Representative Abraham J. Multer; Representative Richard Bolling; Representative Earl Chudoff; Representative Isidore Dollinger; Representative Louis B. Heller; Representative Edna F. Kelly; Representative Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr.; Representative Sidney R. Yates; and Representative William H. Bates. It was also my privilege to attend.

Frank Goldman, president of B'nai B'rith, in presenting Vice President BARKLEY, said:

There are few persons in the United States who are held in greater affection and regard by all people than Vice President ALBEN W. BARKLEY. His great and long record of public service entitles him to an important place in the history of our time.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, Mr. Secretary General, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, I am sure we have all been delighted and inspired by the beautiful program to which we have listened this evening. So much so that I am afraid that what I shall have to say, my part on the program, might be an anticlimax.

But I am greatly honored by the invitation which enables me to participate in this triennial convention of B'nai B'rith.

There are many things that I should like to say which have been inspired by the magnificent address of Mr. Trygve Lie. I shall not do so because I desire to make my remarks brief.

First, I wish to say that it is very fitting and appropriate always to honor men for their outstanding work while they are yet alive and may enjoy the encomiums which they hear heaped upon them by their fellow men for good work well done.

It seems to me, therefore, peculiarly fitting tonight that this great organization should give to Mr. Eddie Jacobson the citation of which he is to be the recipient.

All of his life he has devoted himself to good works and to worthy causes. He has long been active in B'nai B'rith, traveling all over this country and wherever any duty might call him, giving of his time and of his substance and his energy in the great cause of brotherhood represented by this great organization.

He has also been active in the American Legion. He has also been active and effective in the great United Jewish Appeal campaign for funds to aid displaced persons and refugees all over the world, and particularly in the new State of Israel. And in order that he might bring home to his own people and to all people of America within the range of his voice and his influence the real need of these hundreds of thousands of unfortunate people, he visited Israel itself in order that he might see first hand the great need and the distress of these unfortunates, who have found a home in the new State of Israel, and who must be supported and encouraged in their effort to build a new state—not merely a Jewish State but a state in which all the inhabitants may enjoy that degree of liberty, freedom and dignity which we claim for ourselves in these United States of America.

He has been a lifelong friend of President Truman. He fought by his side in Europe in the First World War and was associated in business with him for a time after the termination of the war.

It was therefore most appropriate and fitting that the President, when he signed the announcement of the de jure recognition of the new State of Israel, should ask his friend and comrade-in-arms to be present, together with the president and secretary of B'nai B'rith, to witness that historic act of his.

And so, I join with all of his friends here and all over the country in congratulating him upon the receipt shortly of this citation.

And it was extremely appropriate also that the President should have the president and secretary of B'nai B'rith with him at the time he signed this announcement of the recognition of the State of Israel.

We do not ordinarily bank too much on ancestry in this country where we believe in the equality of men without regard to race, religion, or color, or national origin. And, yet, we do place some store by the long and outstanding record of groups of men as well as individual men.

A boy one day asked his father, "What is an ancestor?" And the father said, "Well now, son, I am an ancestor."

The boy said, "I understand that, but why do people brag about it?"

We do brag about our ancestors, and properly so, because just as in horses and in other forms of animal life, blood undoubtedly tells among human beings.

We are especially proud—and I am happy to acknowledge it, though not eligible for membership in this great organization—we are justly proud of its ancestry, of its origin, and of its great record, that B'nai B'rith has for 107 years in the United States of America, and wherever else its influence might be felt, sought to break down the barriers of bigotry and intolerance and hatred and to teach the brotherhood of men, to inculcate in your own children through your high schools and your colleges and in your daily associations among yourselves and with all others the belief in the doctrine and the truth that God made us all in His own image, and being therefore children of the same Creator, we are brothers, without regard to our ancestry, our condition, our geography or our economic or religious or racial differences.

B'nai B'rith's great work has not been limited by geographical or racial boundaries. It has served in helping to hospitalize the veterans of our wars. It has gone wherever it heard the voice of need in order that it might administer to that need, to calm that voice by its presence, by its benefactions, by its influence, and by its courage.

B'nai B'rith I should say, being the oldest and most representative and probably the largest of all the Jewish organizations, has had an influence far beyond its own boundaries, far beyond its own lodge rooms or headquarters, because it has taught all people, particularly in the United States, that men of different origin, of different ancestry and different background, of different religious beliefs, different political affiliations, different economic status, may live together as neighbors and as friends and as Americans.

So, I am happy to be on this program, even briefly, to pay tribute to one of the oldest organizations in America, one of the most liberal of those, which harbors less of bigotry and antagonism and hatred than probably any other organization of its kind in the United States.

What we need, not only in this country, but in the world, is a breaking down of the barriers of misunderstanding, the barriers of inherited antagonism, the barriers of hatred, whose roots are deep in the soil of humanity.

Most of the wars that have cursed the earth, that have drenched the soil of all nations with the blood of their people, have grown out of inherited hatreds, misunderstandings, and unwillingness to believe that there may be another side to controversies, an unwillingness to resort to the arbitration, negotiation, and understanding that international tribunals are set up to bring about.

I know, as you know, that if it were left to the peoples of the world there would be peace.

Those who draw the water and hew the wood, those who bear the burden of taxation, the burden of the battlefield, those who hold their children and their babies in their arms, nestling at a mother's bosom to obtain the sustenance and substance of life—if they had their way, if they could speak as one voice, they would tell us and all governments that without regard to inherited hatreds, without regard to international or social-economic antagonisms, without regard to the ambitions of selfish men, they believe and want the nations of the world to sit down around the counsel table, now represented by the United Nations, to settle their disputes without resort to the sword, without the devastations that mean the ruin of the treasured accumulations of the centuries and the ages which have been brought about by the art and science and work of man.

So I am happy tonight to have heard the Secretary General give us this note of hope, of courage, with regard to the United Nations.

If the United Nations fails as the League of Nations failed, it is difficult to predict the fate of man. It is difficult to predict that another international world-wide organization might ever again rise above the ruins and the graves of millions upon millions of people.

So I have been encouraged tonight, and I am thankful to have been here to have heard this constructive and yet fair, level-headed, calm recital and appraisal by the Secretary General of the work of the United Nations.

I have faith in it. When we think of it and grow discouraged about it, we might well consider the early history of our own country.

After the Revolutionary War had been won in 1783, for the next 4 years our Thirteen Colonies, which had been united during the war, came to the brink of perpetual, permanent separation. Local jealousies inspired local politicians, and appeals to the selfish and provincial interests of communities well-nigh obliterated the desire for the creation of a nation.

Finally, 4 years after the victory, a group of men met in Philadelphia to write the Constitution—not to write it; they did not meet there for that purpose. Not a delegate who went to Philadelphia had any commission from his State to write a new Constitution, but only to amend and strengthen the Articles of Confederation under which the Colonies had limped along for 4 years.

They were men of courage and vision. They went beyond their authority. They went beyond the commissions which they bore, and they wrote a Constitution of the United States and submitted it to the Thirteen Colonies. And when it was submitted to the State of Virginia, Patrick Henry made

one of his greatest speeches in opposition to the ratification of the Constitution.

Patrick Henry—who had inspired every Revolutionary soldier. Patrick Henry—whose immortal oration in St. John's Church in Richmond has been memorized by every schoolboy—"Give me liberty or give me death"—made the speech of his life, almost, against the ratification of the Constitution by the State of Virginia, on the ground, as he said, that if it were adopted and a new nation created under it the people would lose all the liberties for which they had fought for 8 years.

Due to the influence of George Washington and of John Marshall and of others, Virginia ratified by a majority of 9 votes, and when she ratified her influence was so extensive that enough of the States ratified to create a new nation here, 13 States, not at first but ultimately, with a little population of 3,000,000, fringing the Atlantic seaboard.

And that Constitution was adopted, and this fledgling Nation took on its existence among the nations of the world.

It had its difficulties. It had its controversies. It had its misunderstandings. It had to fight a great internal war on social and economic problems three-quarters of a century after it was established. But it was united again, and is now united, and, in spite of all the discouragements, in spite of all the pessimistic views that are entertained sometimes by people in our own country, we enjoy today greater liberty and greater influence and greater friendship than we have ever enjoyed among the nations of the world.

We still enjoy the freedom which so many peoples have lost—freedom of worship, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of assembly, and two other freedoms have been added recently in recent years, which are a part of our goal, not only for ourselves but for all mankind, freedom from want and freedom from fear.

I congratulate the B'nai B'rith, not only on its antiquity of origin, not only upon the 350,000 members which honor its roster, not only for the great charitable and eleemosynary activities in which it has been engaged, not only on its success in unifying and uniting Jews of different politics, of different interpretations of their own religion, of differing economic conditions.

But I congratulate it and honor it because through its influence it has helped to break down the barriers of misunderstanding, of intolerance, of bigotry, and hatred, and, therefore I am sincere when I say that I hope that in the years to come it may not only grow in numbers, but that it may grow in influence and power among all the peoples, not only of Jewish distinction, but among all the people in this great country and all the people of the world.

We are all traveling the same road. We are traveling toward the same goal. May that goal be happiness and peace and understanding and the joy of making contributions to the elevation of the standard of life in this country and throughout the world, and the happiness that comes from individual men through their part in this great work of reformation and of realization.

Again, let me thank you, Mr. President, and Mr. Trygve Lie, and all of you who have by your presence here and by your great program made us all feel stronger and prouder that we are not only citizens of the United States but that in our way, different as it may be in every individual case, we are trying to contribute to the peace and happiness and prosperity of all mankind throughout the world.

Frank Goldman, in thanking the Vice President, said: "Mr. Vice President, when I say that everything about you breathes the true American democratic spirit, I do not mean it in any partisan sense. I feel sure that in you and Mrs. Barkley, we are graced with America's greatest ambassadors of good will. You give people throughout the world a vivid picture of the good our country seeks to accomplish. May it, under God, never hesitate to continue to fulfill this humane ideal.

"We thank you for your delightful speech and are very, very grateful for the sentiments expressed by you here tonight about the B'nai B'rith we love."

Commencement Address by Hon. Harley M. Kilgore, of West Virginia, at Davis and Elkins College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 1 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. KILGORE.. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech I delivered at the commencement exercises of Davis and Elkins College, in Elkins, W. Va., on May 30, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR HARLEY M. KILGORE, AT THE COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES, DAVIS AND ELKINS COLLEGE, ELKINS, W. VA., MAY 30, 1950

"The only limit to our realization of tomorrow will be our doubts of today."—FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT.

Dr. Purdum, distinguished guests, and members of the class of 1950 of Davis and Elkins College, I would be less than candid if I failed to say that I am honored to be here this morning. This is my second opportunity in 2 days to speak to large groups of young people who are entering new phases of their lives. Last night I spoke to the graduation class of my home town high school in Mannington. I do not know how many of those boys and girls will enter colleges this fall, but I hope the number is large, because there is a great need in the world today for well-trained, clear-thinking young men and women.

I do not know how many of you young men and women will continue your formal education after today, but I sincerely hope that all who have such an opportunity will take advantage of it. There probably are some here today who are tired of classrooms and studies. This is a normal reaction after 4 years of hard work. Do not let this reaction deter you in your quest for education. If you do, you will regret it in the years ahead.

Those of you who will not have an opportunity to take advanced work at another education institution should give serious thought to how you can best continue your education at home. There are many possibilities, and I am certain your college professors will be glad to advise you on how to take advantage of them.

I mention these things to emphasize the great need today for educated men and women, the need for people who can recognize truth when they see or hear it; people who have learned to love democratic rights, and stand willing to fight for them even if the cause be unpopular.

It is customary at commencement for the speaker to tell the members of the graduating class that they are embarking on a grand new experience—that the world is awaiting them with eagerness. Whether or not this is true today is a philosophical question I shall leave to other commencement speakers. What is true, and it is a fact that cannot be emphasized enough, is that this commencement and similar commencements throughout the Nation, are being held at a time when the world desperately needs a great transfusion of free, democratic ideals.

STRUGGLE OF IDEAS IS WORLD-WIDE

The world today is engaged in a great struggle over political and economic ideologies. This is a struggle to determine whether or not freemen can build and maintain and expand democratic societies. This is a struggle to determine whether people shall serve the state or the state shall serve the people. In a real sense it is a struggle to determine the political and economic fate of the world. This struggle is commonly called the cold war.

Frankly, I feel we should banish the term "cold war." In no sense does it depict the real meaning of the issues involved in this world-wide struggle for the minds of men. In addition, the term "cold war" leads many people to express the belief that this struggle can be settled only through armed conflict. This is a suicidal approach.

We have learned, or at least we hope the world has learned, through the suffering of two terrible wars in my generation, that armed conflict does not settle many real problems, least of all conflicting ideologies. And the greater the conflict, the less chance for anyone to emerge victorious. In an age of guided missiles and atomic weapons, the victor would suffer only a little less than the conquered.

If any real victory is to be achieved in this present world-wide struggle, it can come only without armed conflict. This does not mean that we should abandon our defenses. Far from it. We must at all times be ready, not only in a military way, but also politically and economically, to meet the challenges of the forces of totalitarianism.

The important point to remember is that this struggle is for the good will and support of human beings all over the world. If we are to achieve that goal, it can come only through our giving them the moral and material assistance they need in building democratic societies. It will come through the spread of ideas that men can accept freely, without thereby losing their freedom or the opportunity for freedom.

MORAL AND MATERIAL SUPPORT ESSENTIAL

No one can exaggerate the scope of our task. In the simplest terms, it means we must find a common ground of agreement with all democratic nations and strengthen the spirit of cooperation among them. We have come a long way since that June day in 1947 when Gen. George C. Marshall made his immortal speech at Harvard University, pledging our help to the needy peoples of the world. The Honorable Winston Churchill referred to the speech of our then Secretary of State as the most unsordid act in all human history. The Marshall plan has been a great success. We also feel optimistic over the possibilities of success for our newer efforts to bind together the nations of western Europe.

In fact, there is every reason to believe that these programs will be successful if they receive the wholehearted support of the Congress and the American people. This means moral support as well as the costly material support that is so essential in these programs.

There is another phase of our search for world peace that has achieved little attention and less success. I speak of the hope of many of us of finding an avenue of approach to the peoples of the so-called satellite nations. This group includes the nations of eastern Europe, China, and those

bordering countries that are dominated partially or completely by Russian-trained Communists.

Through a gradual process, we must wean the peoples of those nations away from Russian domination, if real peace is to be achieved in this or the next generation; we must penetrate the iron curtain and give our moral support to the subdued but still-existent democratic forces in those lands.

There are some people who say we should seal ourselves off from the satellite nations. By following such a course, we are admitting to the belief that we can achieve victory in this world struggle only through armed conflict. And no thinking person will subscribe to such a thought. It is only if we make an appeal for freedom everywhere—and offer our full moral support and material support, wherever possible, to the exponents of freedom—that we stand a chance to emerge as victors in this grave struggle.

SATELLITE NATIONS OFFER REAL CHALLENGE

Freedom has been stifled behind the iron curtain, but according to reliable reports from Europe, it is not dead in the satellite nations. There is unrest, both political and economic, in many of the satellite nations, but the democratic forces in those countries cannot be mobilized, or at least will not be mobilized, unless we of the free world offer them great moral encouragement.

I think it should be emphasized that we have done very little thus far toward reaching those people. To some extent this has been due to the difficulties encountered in binding together the free nations. It also has been due to our own fears and doubts and indecisions, largely manufactured by witch-hunters who have wrapped themselves in self-designed cloaks of superpatriotism. At this period in history, we should pause to recall the words of the late President Roosevelt: "The only limit to our realization of tomorrow will be our doubts of today."

As an amateur student of history, I believe I recognize the importance of studying the past for guidance in the formation of decisions on problems that are with us today. At the same time, it should be obvious that no sensible person would hold that the problems of today and tomorrow can be solved by living in the past, or by compounding confusion with indecision and fear.

DELIBERATELY FOMENTED CONFUSION

One of the most unfortunate factors today is that much of our present political atmosphere is charged with confusion. I speak not of the unintentional type of confusion that can be expected to arise in any difficult period, but of deliberately fomented confusion. The apostles of doom who are responsible for this tragic and deplorable situation are deadly enemies to our democratic society.

If you believe these are harsh words, I agree. Sometimes it takes harsh words to bring home the fact that the healthy functioning of a democratic form of government is primarily dependent on a unanimity of purpose and ideals. The founding of our democracy derived its main strength from a cohesiveness of democratic spirit. It has run all through our history. There have always been dissenters, there have always been doubters, there have always been prophets of doom—but the country progressed and prospered beyond the fondest dreams of its founding fathers, primarily because their ideals and their strong purpose so completely overshadowed the doubters, the dissenters, and the professionally unhappy.

Today this small group has taken on a significance far beyond any it previously had, because of the world-wide struggle of ideas—democratic versus totalitarian. The apostles of doom give comfort to our enemies by spreading fear here at home. It is important as it never was before that we recognize fully those in our midst who endanger our democracy. The confusion they sow can only be combated if we recognize these architects of devastation who put fanatical theories, personal neuroses, or political gain above the values of democracy.

To successfully combat the confusion they sow we must recognize them and then oppose them with every weapon that a free and democratic people possess. Bear in mind that if we must fight military strength and armed aggression our weapons and our methods are fairly obvious, but the fight against confusion presents a far more subtle problem, as well as a very deadly enemy. A totalitarian regime thrives on confusion, but a democratic society can endure and grow only through cooperation and trust among people.

LESSON OF "ENGLAND'S GRAVEST HOUR"

While I was driving here I recalled the words that were spoken by a great Englishman, Mr. Winston Churchill, just 10 years ago. It was June 1940. It was the gravest hour in England's history. It also proved to be England's finest hour. Mr. Churchill recognized better than anyone else that England could survive—and bear in mind that there were only a few people around the world who thought England could survive at that grave hour—only if the full resources of the nation were mobilized against the enemy. That was the atmosphere when Mr. Churchill told his countrymen: "If the past undertakes to sit in judgment on the present, then the future will be lost."

With those words Mr. Churchill mobilized a great nation for a desperate fight. It was not only the building of armaments and the training of people to use them, but also the conditioning of the people to the full realization of the struggle and what it meant in terms of human endeavor and human life.

There is a great lesson for us today in that incident of history. We are now engaged in a great struggle that will determine the fate of ourselves as well as other democratic peoples. We cannot win this fight by crawling into a shell. We can win only if we are willing and able to mobilize our full resources for the struggle for peace as we did for war.

APOSTLES OF DOOM COMPLICATE TASK

The task is complicated tremendously by the fact that we are faced with the apostles of doom on one side and a great totalitarian force on the other. We recognize the totalitarian force, but sometimes we fail to recognize the other enemies, and that is why they are so deadly. If these foes within our own house succeed in compounding confusion in their malicious campaign, then we may lose our cherished democratic rights.

This would prove the greatest possible victory for our enemies and it could mean the end of democratic government for generations to come. Protecting our own democratic rights while pursuing our search for peace will not be easy. It will be long and costly. But we must be prepared to pay that price if we hope to ignite the flame of democracy around the world.

In conclusion, I wish to say that whether our Nation succeeds or fails in this great search for peace will depend in great measure on how well you and your fellow college classmates throughout the Nation meet the challenges of this day.

I urge you to give serious thought to these words from the constitution of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization: "Since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defense of peace must be constructed."

May you go forth to join in the search for peace.

Dedicatory Address, Schools of Levittown

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. KINGSLAND MACY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 1, 1950

Mr. MACY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a dedicatory address made by me as the member of the New York State Board of Regents for the Tenth Judicial District, last Friday, at the opening of the new Division Avenue School, comprehending the three other school buildings erected in the past few years, on behalf of the Catholic War Veterans, the Jewish War Veterans, the American Legion, and the Veterans of Foreign Wars, at Levittown, Long Island, N. Y.—a village that was created out of Hempstead Plains within 4 years' time to accommodate a population of 40,000 people:

Mr. Chairman Gambling, reverend clergy, Supervisor Patterson, Congressman Hall, my esteemed colleague, members of the four great veterans' organizations represented here—the Catholic War Veterans, the Jewish War Veterans, the American Legion, and the Veterans of Foreign Wars—the many distinguished guests present, and fellow Americans:

My great pleasure in being with you tonight to participate in these impressive dedication ceremonies derives from several sources. As a member of the Board of Regents of the State of New York, which has jurisdiction over all phases of formal education in New York State—from the kindergarten through postgraduate work—I am delighted to have a part in the dedication of this great new school building, which in the years and decades to come will serve many thousands of your children. I represent the tenth judicial district on the board of regents and that is the district in which you of Levittown and Nassau County and I of Suffolk County live. So, I am close to your educational problems and it is my intention to continue to be an active ally in helping you solve them.

It happens, too, that I am your Representative in the Congress of the United States, representing as I do the First Congressional District of New York, in which most of you and I reside. My colleague, Congressman LEONARD HALL, represents most of Nassau County in the Congress. I feel particularly fortunate in representing what I believe to be the pioneer section of your great county. Here in this community of Levittown we see dynamic young America at its best. Here we see thousands of men of action and valor busying themselves in the pursuits of peace.

Here is a broad expanse of thousands of comfortable homes in an area that but a few years back was a collection of potato farms and truck gardens.

Most of those at these ceremonies have chosen to cast their lot with a brand-new community—a community whose fame is already world-wide.

While it is true that the men and women of Levittown had to cross no trackless plains or climb rugged mountain passes to get here, they are mid-twentieth-century pioneers because they have set up a new community and are determinedly and enthusiastically intent on making it the best community in the country in which to raise their children

and round out their adult lives. And what a magnificent beginning has been made.

In addition to my pleasure in being with you in the two capacities I have mentioned, I am deeply appreciative in being asked to deliver the main address at these ceremonies dedicating this great new institution of learning for the very young of this community, which is made up almost entirely of veterans and their families, to the memory of deceased war veterans whose last full measure of devotion to their beloved country made it possible for us to assemble here in peace and safety today and tonight.

The building of the Division Avenue School results from the cooperation of many men and women. If I attempted to enumerate now the names of all individuals and the official agencies, from the local level up to New York State officialdom, that played an active part in making this magnificent structure a glorious reality, the list would be so long I would have to take most of the time the committee in charge has set aside to me for these dedicatory remarks. Congratulations to every one of you on the accomplishment of such a splendid work on behalf of your children and the children of today and tomorrow.

Levittown is unquestionably unique among the housing developments of the country. That uniqueness does not consist solely in the remarkable, almost overnight growth of a large community—a growth that had it occurred in California or Florida would have been hailed as a boom, with the probable resultant immediate creation of artificial, inflated values. As important as growth is, I want to apply a different yardstick than mere growth in pointing up Levittown's uniqueness.

To me the most unique part of this extraordinary community is that Levittown and the Levitt Corp. set an example for the entire country and for every other major housing development that may be later instituted in reserving land for school buildings before the homes in which the students-to-be would live, were built.

It was said of fictional Topsy that "she just growed." If she "just growed" in pleasing mold it was a benign act on the part of the Great Creator. But Levittown didn't just grow. Levittown was wisely planned in all its details and a basic part of that long-visioned wisdom was in the provision that was made for the education of the young—your young. Had that foresight not been employed it is difficult to imagine just how those interested in the education of the young—those of you who have now or will have young to educate—would have coped education-wise with the enormous growth of this community and the immediate neighborhood. Wise initial planning came to full fruition through coordinated effort and enthusiastic co-operation between official agencies and interested individuals every step of the way.

The board of regents, having been fully informed in the school district's acute educational needs and the certain prospect of continuing developing needs, expressed its confidence in the stability of this remarkable community by approving two bond issues—one in the sum of $2,135,000 and the other in the sum of $1,650,000.

The first bond issue was for the purchase of four school sites, at a combined cost of $185,000 and the erection of two schools, the Center Lane School, costing $250,000, with accommodations for 250 children and the Division Avenue School we are now dedicating. The Division Avenue School will make immediate provision for 600 students and is wisely planned so as to permit the building of another wing large enough to take care of an additional 600 students.

The second bond issue, as most of you know, was for the erection of the Abbey Lane and Gardiner Avenue Schools, each of which is designed to care for 600 students.

I understand that preliminary plans are being considered for a fifth school, to be known as the North Side School, to be built at a cost of $896,000, with seats for 720 pupils.

So, it is quite obvious that in Levittown we are not dealing with the storied little red schoolhouse of affectionate American memory. Parenthetically, although nearly everywhere the little red schoolhouse is as extinct as the surrey with the fringe on top, it still exists in too many backward rural sections of our country. But, the little red schoolhouse, nostalgically written about by Mark Twain in his Tom Sawyer, in which children from the first to the tenth grades were all housed in the babble of one room, with sanitary facilities out back somewhere, has not existed in these parts for many years. We look back on it with affection but like the mustache cup it is not for this enlightened day.

No, here in this brand-new, thoroughly modern community of Levittown we are not dealing with 30 or 40 children walking or riding horseback to a little red schoolhouse from all points of the compass from miles around. We are preparing and furnishing shining new and completely practical facilities for thousands of children inhabiting a comparatively limited geographical area. It can truly be said we are dealing here with the finest kind of mass production of which our land is capable—its cherished children by the many hundreds, with thousands to follow.

The Board of Education of Union Free School District No. 5—and I like those words "Union" and "Free" tied in with the description of a school district—simultaneous with the beginning of this great housing project, were alert to the serious financial problems that would arise in connection with the building of schools adequate to keep pace with one of the greatest home-building operations in history. Your district superintendent, Harry W. Gross, your Nassau County officials and your Nassau County Planning Commission measured the extent of the problem at an early date and went forth to meet and grapple with it.

Members of the various divisions and bureaus of the State education department visited the school district repeatedly and discussed with the school board the formulation of plans, which included the instructional, the financial, and the construction of buildings. They were ably assisted by consultants employed by the school district. The Levitt Corp. was most cooperative with the district superintendent and the board of education in the selection and setting aside of desirable sites for school buildings.

The financial study that was made clearly indicated that the usual State-aid formula was not adapted to Levittown and to Union Free School District No. 5. Consultations with State Senator John Bennett and Assemblyman Frank Becker and in co-operation with your other capable legislators from Nassau County and you able county executive, Hon. J. Russel Sprague, resulted in the decision that legislation should be introduced that would give special State-aid consideration to Levittown. Senator Bennett and Assemblyman Becker were most diligent in seeing to it that the needed legislation was enacted in Albany—not always an easy task.

This legislation gives the commissioner of education power, with the approval of the director of the budget, to set up a special State-aid formula that would avoid undue hardship on the taxpayers of Levittown. Only as a result of this legislation has it been possible for union free district No. 5 to build up, within the past 2 years, a splendid school system without invoking a burdensome tax levy.

Under the usual State-aid formula, the State pays $200 for each elementary student and $250 for each high school student in average daily attendance over a 3-year period. Levittown, because of its shining newness, could present no such average daily attendance figure. Accordingly this requirement was waived and Levittown was granted the same amount of State aid on the basis of average daily attendance during the best 4 weeks of either December or January. It is very likely that this school district will need this special State-aid consideration for some time to come. The State education department will keep in constant touch with the situation and will continue its readiness to assist the school district in every way possible.

In dollars and cents, permit me to cite the figures showing what Levittown would have received in State aid under the usual formula and what it has actually received as a result of the special consideration given. Figures are usually dry and uninspiring but those I am about to recite are anything but that to residents and taxpayers of this school district. In the year 1948–49 the aid normally received from the State would have been $625. The aid actually given was $36,174.77. In the year 1949–50 the aid normally received would have been $37,398.80. The aid actually given this year, under the special formula, has been $102,373.77.

The series of facts I have just cited have been made available to me in my capacity as a member of the board of regents. I am glad to share them now with the good people of Levittown, whose interest in them is direct.

When we look back to 1940 and realize that the total enrollment of students in what was then an intensively developed farming section was 60 students and that the same area now has approximately 2,000 students, we get some idea of what the future has in store. Within the past 2 years you have provided actual accommodations for 2,300 boys and girls in four economically constructed, soundly planned buildings.

All concerned must continue to look ahead because the school population will continue to increase year by year for at least a decade or so. The further development of adequate educational facilities in this district and in this general section will continue to be a matter of primary interest to me in my capacity as a regent.

I won't attempt to describe the facilities within this beautiful building we are now dedicating. As it stands, the statement that it is as fine an elementary school as there is in the country cannot be challenged. It has everything—literally everything—to contribute to the mental and physical welfare of the children fortunate enough to attend it. In my opinion, there will be little or no "hooky" played from this school. It is too pleasant a place, having too many facilities, for a youngster to want to stay away from. Truly a new day is dawning in education when a young student's comforts and pleasures in his school can vie with those to be found in the home. And under the head of pleasures I am not including the fully equipped dental clinic. The old-time "hooky cop," familiar to many in this audience, who I now believe functions under the more impressive title of "attendance officer" may conceivably have to seek other employment in Levittown.

There could be no more fitting motive than the one surrounding this ceremony in which we are dedicating the Division Avenue School to the memory of the war veterans who laid down their lives for their country. I understand that the exact wording of the dedicatory plaque will be "The schools of this community are dedicated in memory of those who fell on the field of battle defending the American heritage

which we and our children are still privileged to enjoy." Simple, dignified words, those; not flowery, not poetical, not rhetorical, but direct and understandable by young and old. They add up to the deep sentiment we feel here at these exercises, a sentiment that will endure as long as young eyes can read, ponder and understand those words.

It is completely fitting that on this date, just 4 days before the Nation as a whole observes its most hallowed holiday—Memorial Day—that we precede and thereby add to, the general country-wide honor being paid our fallen heroes.

This new school—this pile of brick and mortar and glass and modern materials that fashioned it—and they are the materials of peace and not the matériel of war—which for many years and generations to come will echo and re-echo the happy voices of the carefree little Americans who will use it—is a part, and a large part, of what the men and women who died in World Wars I and II, and in fact all other wars our country has been forced to fight, laid down their lives for. This is what they would have liked to have lived to see in our free America. In their warriors' Valhalla I know they are sharing our deep satisfaction in the driving of still another strong rivet to strengthen our American system of free education.

They, the hallowed and honored dead, and those of you who also wore the uniform but who were permitted by God's infinite grace to return to your country, made possible this Division Avenue School, and all other schools to be built hereafter in this free land of ours. They, and you the living, have made certain that their children, your children, and the children of all devoted and loyal Americans in the district, can here receive the first lessons in good Americanism, can learn the early needful lessons of adjustment to their fellows, can be grounded in good living and clean thinking, and can get their first conscious glimpse of the great usefulness that is potentially inherent in the lives of all of us, no matter how humble.

Our valorous dead and our living former soldiers, sailors, and marines fought for many reasons. The United States of America cannot possibly mean identical things to two or more men because of the individuality of our own thought processes. We all share our love of country, while admitting that the ramifications of that deep, devoted feeling vary with each of us in our private thinking. Love of country defies exact definition. It has many facets but regardless of our private thoughts and feelings all of us as Americans have definite beliefs and determinations in common.

We are against tyranny, oppression, and totalitarianism in any and all forms. Orthodox Democrats and Republicans have that common meeting ground as Americans regardless of the techniques they advocate in their determination to keep this country free from these threats.

We believe that the state exists to serve the individual, not to control him, not to mold him in identical pattern, not to make him march in economic or political lock step. We, as Americans, believe that the state, or the Government—if the word "government" makes my meaning clearer—is not, never should be, and was never intended by the founding fathers to be the inflexible, impersonal master of its citizens. If that happens we cease to be citizens and become subjects.

All too often in the recent past and in this year of 1950 we find a tendency on the part of some of those in high places in Government and in its executive bureaus to forget that in the last analysis the rank and file of our people are the only controlling force and that officialdom by "directive"—an imported bureaucrat's smooth word with unpleasant implications—edict or command cannot make 150,000,000 citizens of varying racial and religious backgrounds dance like puppets to the planned economy pull of its strings.

Our honored war dead knew well the harsh and needful disciplines of military life. War, which by its very nature violates all rules of normal living and demands implicit and immediate obedience, must not be permitted to intrude its harsh exactions into our peaceful, permanent way of life. Our honored dead were free of military and Government dominance before they donned the uniform. They were glad to wear the uniform in order to get a distasteful and highly dangerous mission behind them. At the end of the war they expected to return to their homes, doff the uniform, and fit themselves, free of Government domination, back into the mold of a peaceful world—in a country everlastingly free of the blood, sweat, and tears of war. We must see that their ideals, their hopes, and their desires are not thwarted through any act of ours.

Those we honor at this dedication fought for the right to say "yes" or "no" on programs or policies affecting their welfare, their homes, and their children. They were prepared at all times to abide by the consequences of their decisions. They merely wished them to be free decisions, not reached by coercion or implied threat.

They wanted no dictators here or even the remote threat of dictation. They fought against the dictatorship idea and its resultant tyranny in the midst of carnage and indescribable horror. So must you who served the country continue in these days of peace to fight for that ideal. So must all of us who are the beneficiaries of the sacrifices of the dead and the living.

Alien ideologies have no place on American soil, no matter how palatably they may be presented by some of those temporarily in high places. The American way of life is still the finest way of life to be found in the world, granting us as it does complete individual freedom, within the law, under the Constitution of the United States. And you will agree that the Constitution remains the finest document ever written by man on behalf of man. We can and do amend it to meet changing conditions in a changing day but we retain its basic structure because the Constitution and the flag are the symbols of free men. The written word of the Constitution and the unfurled magnificence of Old Glory combine to exemplify the faith under which Americans have lived and died since our emergence as a free people.

It seems to me that our departed heroes would have little patience and give short shrift to those in the educational and political world who would re-tailor our mode of living to fit the statism mold. Under statism, or government dictatorship, this new school would not be a place designed solely as one in which to impart needful knowledge to the young; it would be a festering point, regardless of the beauty of its surroundings, for a supernationalism that demanded slavish obedience to the dictator ideal from all, even from lisping tots in the kindergarten and first grade.

At this Memorial Day season particularly, and every other day in the year, we must be on guard, to see to it that the sacrifices made for us are not taken for granted. What our war dead stood for and died for must forever be graven in our hearts and imbedded in our consciousness. For us to slip, even slowly and imperceptibly, down the road of state socialism into inevitable dictatorship and tyranny, would make a mockery of their sacrifice.

We must realize, as I believe we are all beginning to, that the problems of peace are equally as grim as those of war. And just as urgent. We are learning the hard way that we just can't ponder while others act.

If we do not remain alert to our responsibilities, the sacrificial heroism of others will become dangerous lethargy for us, the living. The proud sacrifice made by our heroic dead could evaporate into soft national indulgence. If we permitted that, our national pride would degenerate into national indolence. And then our war dead, whose mortal remains are scattered over many battlefields and at the bottom of the seas could justifiably accuse us of not keeping the faith, because in lethargy, soft indulgence and indolence we would be easy prey to those whose design is world conquest.

We continue to believe firmly, and believe it has been demonstrated throughout our national life, that human beings enjoying the blessings of equality and liberty, will not take the yoke of any oppressor, from without or within, on their shoulders. Americans look ahead. They work for, scheme for, plan for better things for enrichment of their national and personal lives. Ancient and medieval systems, devised for the enslavement of the individual, can find no fertile soil in which to sprout within our borders. We will continue to forge ahead, if we retain a proper awareness of our national destiny, with our eyes fixed on the ideal of freedom for ourselves and those properly within our orbit of influence.

Despite the traitorism of an occasional Alger Hiss, no group of subversionists, no slimy alien cells within our borders, nor any propagandists from without, can convince Americans that our time-tested institutions are outmoded. Ours is and will continue to be a government by consent—by ballot box consent—of the governed. We will resist to the death the taking root here of a godless, materialistic Communist concept. We who abhor war—you who have fought and are bone weary from its horrors and futility—will forever resist any attempt to force alien isms and "ologies," disruptive of our way of life, down our national throat.

Under our Constitution we bind ourselves to refrain from the oppression of minorities. And we do just that. Inequalities and discriminations are becoming rarer and rarer.

Our Bill of Rights gives us the right to worship God as each of us chooses in contrast to countries in which those who have religious ideals are among the first oppressed, silenced, jailed, or executed.

In free America we have the right to examine in detail the acts of our Government and officials and criticize them if we see fit. We can change our lawmaking and administrative officers when we deem a change to be necessary for the good of the country.

We have the right of petition and peaceful assembly. We have the right to speak our minds. The words I am saying now could not be uttered behind the iron curtain or in any other land in which the dictator dwells and despotically lashes his little voiceless people into the rut he decrees they must travel.

We have the right to seek employment. We have the right to quit our job if we don't like it or desire to better ourselves. We have the right to go into business; to train for and practice a profession. We even have the right to fail. We, as free men, accept no cradle-to-the-grave paternalism from a know-all, want-all government, and we grant our next-door neighbor, or the man down the block, the identical rights we reserve for ourselves.

It is these rights, after 171 years as a nation, that have made us great, the envied of the world, enjoying the most freedom and the highest standard of living found anywhere.

These are some of the rights our heroic dead fought for.

On behalf of their children and ours, we fervently hope that war will never again come to this globe; that it will never reach our shores, desolate our cities, and lay waste our peaceful countryside. None knows better than the soldier that war, instead of being a chivalrous adventure, carried on

under inspiring flapping banners to the accompaniment of stirring trumpets, is a cold, scientific method of bringing about mass destruction without discrimination between the combatant and noncombatant.

The next war between major powers, which would inevitably involve the rest of the world, would be no idealistic adventure, pitched on a high plane, sparked by high-sounding and heart-warming slogans. Military men and scientists tell us that the next world war would be global suicide. Hence, common sense tells us we must do what we honorably can to avoid war. To do so, it follows we must have public officials in high places in whom we have implicit trust—men who have no taint of acquiescence of fellow-travelerism about them.

It behooves us as a nation to continue to be strong and resolute; to strengthen and uphold the political, educational, and economic systems of which we are individual representatives and recipients.

The strong do not attack the strong. The history of wars, from the beginning of time, in that the predatory aggressor attacks out of a belief that the nation to be attacked, is weak, irresolute, has no stomach for even a defensive fight, and will bow cravenly and supinely to the threat of the sword. We know from the history of the last two world conflagrations just how lightly we were regarded by aggressors. Coldly, calculatingly they counted our ships, our planes, our troops, and gauged the extent of our matériel. They decided that although potentially strong in resources we were weak in the will to defend ourselves—that we were a nation of fat sheep ready for the shearing.

Twice in a quarter of a century our national character was misgauged. Twice our burning desire for peace misled the international spoilsmen and the dictators. Twice we were caught off guard. And twice the United States of America had its sweet dreams of peace and brotherhood forcibly intruded on, and we had to fight for our existence as a free nation and win wars costly in our greatest asset—our young men.

There is some evidence that another aggressor may be contemplating the same mistake made previously by aggressor nations. But twice burned, in our case, is thrice shy. We are determined that we shall be permitted to pursue our national life in peace. Thus we are determined to be strong, so strong that our very strength, our readiness, will be the balance of power—for peace.

Our will to remain free, to repel invasion of our country from without and treachery on the part of the weak, the misguided or revolutionary from within, to uphold our ideals and live as free men, will prevent world war III. By continuing to be strong, alert, and adamant in our belief that all men are created free and equal and should be permitted to live and prosper under that philosophy, we will guarantee that the sacrifices made by those heroes, to whom we are dedicating this institution of learning, were not made in vain. By our deeds henceforth, and not by our words on this or any similar occasion, we will memorialize them in the only way they would consent to be memorialized.

This school in union free district No. 5, in the county of Nassau, in the Empire State of the greatest Nation in the world, is a fitting symbol of the patriotic devotion of the American fighting men who have passed on. Although they cannot see their children in it, we are serving them and their ideals by building it, equipping it, dedicating it, and using it for the education of free boys and girls in a free Nation.

So, this occasion should—and I feel certain does—mean more to us than the mere dedication of a school building that is the last word in modern planning. To give it its full meaning it must be an occasion for the re-dedication of every one of us to the never-ending fight for freedom.

If we thus re-dedicate ourselves here and now, we truly honor those who have gone before and made possible the continuance of the God-given blessings we now enjoy.

It has been a deeply satisfying experience to share with you the accomplishments of this day.

Thank you.

Atlantic Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 1 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address delivered by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] before the Atlantic Union Committee, at Washington, D. C., on June 1, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY SENATOR GUY M. GILLETTE (DEMOCRAT, IOWA) BEFORE ATLANTIC UNION COMMITTEE LUNCHEON, HOTEL SHOREHAM, WASHINGTON, D. C., THURSDAY, JUNE 1, 1950

Ladies and gentlemen, I wish to compliment you on your timely presence here this week for the 1950 Work Conference for Atlantic Union. To me, the Atlantic Union proposal is one of the few hopeful signs on an otherwise dark and dreary horizon, one of the few constructive ideas looking beyond the bleak fixation of the so-called cold war. I am both honored and pleased to have an opportunity this afternoon to speak briefly to you about it.

Rather than undertake the wholly unnecessary task of urging your support for a proposal to which I know you are already committed, I think it might interest you to know how one Senator, who was not always a strong advocate of Atlantic Union, came to his decision to support the resolution introduced last year by your chairman, my friend and colleague, Senator KEFAUVER, of Tennessee.

I can't help smiling when I recall that only 3 or 4 years ago I had the pleasure of debating on the radio against the Atlantic Union idea with its most outstanding exponent, the great jurist who is your committee's president, Justice Owen Roberts. Times and the world have changed since then, and, to a certain degree, I have changed with them.

During the discussion of the North Atlantic Treaty on the Senate floor last summer, I tried to sketch the long, painful road that the nations have traveled toward the goal of a world free from war and with substantial and dependable moral, spiritual, political, and economic securities. More progress has been made in this direction in the last 25 years than in all the centuries of the past. Our own country, during the recent world war, completely ended the policy of withdrawal from the world that had caused it to reject the League of Nations, and joined with its allies in taking five major steps away from isolationism and toward the creation of a world compact or coalition for peace. Those five steps, which I cited during the Atlantic Pact debate, were the following:

Step No. 1: The Atlantic Charter, which spelled out in terse and unmistakable language the principles for which we and our allies were waging war.

Step No. 2: The Connally resolution, which sought to commit our Nation, so far as the Senate could commit it, to cooperation with the rest of the world in building an organization for peace and security.

Step No. 3: The Moscow Declaration, which insisted that, prior to writing a peace treaty, the nations should draft a tentative document for cooperative peace efforts, to be ready for study, revision, and hoped-for acceptance before the end of the war.

Step No. 4: The United Nations Charter, the tentative draft of which was presented at the Dumbarton Oaks Conference, after protracted conferences between Secretary of State Hull and a bipartisan group of Senators to which I had the honor and privilege of belonging.

Step No. 5: Ratification of the United Nations Charter and establishment of the new world organization.

As one who participated in some of these great steps taken by our country toward a world without war, I believe I have quite intimate knowledge of the principles on which our actions were based and of the goals which we were then seeking to attain.

With the glorious record of these five great steps toward world peace, it was not surprising that when the Atlantic Pact was proposed there should have been widespread skepticism among our people as to this new military alliance. Did it constitute a sixth great step in the direction of world peace? Was it a retrogression, a reversal of direction? Or was it an evasion, if not negation, of the fundamental principles to which all had subscribed?

I for one was unable to reconcile the Atlantic Pact with the principles to which our country had subscribed, and in the implementation of which I had personally taken some part. I therefore opposed this pact as a step backward and as a military alliance which could not, by any twisting of meaning, be considered as a reinforcement of the United Nations. Nevertheless I voted to ratify the pact, since the situation had developed to a point from which there was no return. The United States had already been committed, and it would have gravely embarrassed our national leadership as well as jeopardized our position vis-à-vis the people of western Europe, had the Senate at that late date failed to ratify the treaty.

I can assure you, however, that I have rarely, if ever, cast a vote with greater reluctance, greater hesitation, or greater regret.

On the heels of the ratification of the pact came the military-assistance program, which I not only opposed but for which I felt absolutely no compulsion to vote. This program was committing our country to a backward course for years to come, and to a policy of militarism and force that could, and probably would, destroy completely the very values and equities which we sought most to preserve.

Even prior to the debate on that bill, however, I had reached the conclusion that, since the United States had ratified the Atlantic alliance, the one remaining hope was to transform that alliance, if at all possible, into something other than a purely militaristic pact.

Seeking some practical way to give human, as contrasted with military, content to the Atlantic Treaty, I found in the resolution offered by Senator KEFAUVER an instrument whereby the American people might succeed in implementing the pact by some means other than the then pending bill for a program to ship military weapons to foreign armies.

If the countries grouped together in military alliance could be intimately associated in a political, economic, and moral union of democracies, then the negative and retrogressive military emphasis might be equal-

ized or even overbalanced by the social, political, juridical, and spiritual emphasis of a union of peoples in a federal structure.

Until the pact was ratified, I had been supporting proposals for a world-wide coalition or organization of nations for peace. After the pact was ratified, I was obliged to retreat a step myself, without abandoning the hope of world-wide coalition. Ratification of the pact underlined and affirmed the division of the world into two hostile camps. For the American people, it was the turning point at which the United States Government declared that the world could not now be organized as an effective unity. The sixth great step toward world peace could not then and there be taken.

I therefore saw in the Atlantic Union the starting point from which might possibly develop, in time and in a different, more organic way, that great world coalition or union for peace, which all thinking men know, at the core of their minds, is the only way the world will ever eliminate international war while remaining, at the same time, free and democratic.

Considering the Atlantic military alliance a drastic move away from world unity, I believed that through a constitutional convention of at least the Atlantic democracies, the military alliance could be transformed into a nuclear union leading to a steadily growing and widening federation of democratic peoples. Such a transformation, I thought—and still think—would be a stupendous and ringing victory for reason over force, and for human dignity over brass-knuckle diplomacy.

Yet, I do not consider even the political and economic federation of the Atlantic democracies sufficient to our need. What is ultimately needed is a world-wide union, including as many nations as can be incorporated within it in the near future, and including, someday, all the nations of the earth. For the present, this is a hope deferred. A democratic federation must be composed only of democratic countries, and so long as antidemocratic, totalitarian regimes hold power in parts of the world no completely global union is possible. Attempts to achieve that world-wide union now might even turn a dream into a ghastly nightmare.

Let us therefore start with what is feasible and also desirable. The Atlantic Union is only a beginning, a regional application of the concept of union, but it is both feasible and desirable.

It has astonished me that those responsible for our foreign policy in the Atlantic region have not welcomed the Atlantic Union idea with open arms, for it is the only approach to the Atlantic area that offers real possibility of permanent solution for the manifold problems—financial, industrial, political, diplomatic, and military—besetting the peoples on both sides of the ocean.

It offers the only program seeking to draw together, into one single comprehensive and comprehensible whole, all the economic and political measures that have up to now been treated individually, separately, and with slight promise of ultimate success.

The Atlantic Union proposal goes far beyond any mere military alliance, and bypasses the weaknesses inherent in all alliances while at the same time reducing the emphasis on unadulterated militarism.

Not only that, it would provide for the people of the Atlantic community so much more than military security—an illusory and unattainable goal in any case in the modern atomic world. It points the way for a real union of peoples in an organization already familiar in structure to the American people in our Federal Union of the United States itself, with all that means in economic progress, political liberty, and spiritual values.

In a recent column in the New York Times, Mrs. Anne O'Hare McCormick wrote that she saw rising dimly out of the London Foreign Ministers' Conference, the outlines of a reborn continent, the ancient continent of Atlantis. We may hope that such a continent, with the Atlantic Ocean as its mare nostrum, may evolve from conversations among foreign ministers of great Atlantic powers. But if we depend on such limited means to achieve our purpose, we shall, I am afraid, wait for many, many years.

Secretary Acheson, in a noteworthy address not long ago in San Francisco, called for total diplomacy. To my mind, that meant participation of the whole American people in the formation and application of our world policy. What better way can the American people participate in total diplomacy than by joining themselves voluntarily in an association of other peoples, in a fusion and merger of the resources, the skills, the cultural values, the spiritual and moral attitudes, and the common humanity of peoples now living separately but as neighbors on the shores of the North Atlantic?

Finally, Atlantic Union is the only answer that I have been able to find for the most acute and critical single problem on the Continent of Europe; a problem that is becoming more aggravated and in more need of speedy and permanent solution than any other in that part of the world. I refer to the problem of Germany and its proper place among the other nations on earth.

Of all the many proposed solutions to the problem of Germany, the soundest, safest, and most practicable proposal seems to me to be the incorporation of the German people within a broad trans-Atlantic framework of democratic nations.

Germany is a three-way problem involving Europe, America, and Russia. Our problem is to find a way to prevent Germany from either uniting with the Soviet Union in a new Russo-German alliance, or uniting with a western European federation so as to dominate Europe and compel it finally to turn its back on the Atlantic and toward collaboration with Russia. Success in finding a way to accomplish this will call for far greater diplomatic ingenuity than we have so far demonstrated anywhere. In fact, it will call for efforts far greater than traditional diplomacy can even envisage.

The most feasible way to solve this problem is to evolve, out of the tentative efforts toward western European integration or federation, a union of Atlantic countries having such a preponderance of industrial production, manpower, markets, and, above all, democratic vitality—having, in a word, such an appeal to the German people and the people of western Europe—that none of the antidemocratic and anti-American elements in Europe or in Germany can succeed in seizing power or in divorcing either Germany alone, or Germany together with western Europe, from the Atlantic community.

Western European union will not provide a solution to the German problem, certainly not a solution in keeping with the interests of the United States or the rest of the Atlantic region. Although the Schuman proposal for a French-German coal-and-steel consortium has been widely and even enthusiastically acclaimed, a second look at its possible implications may lead many to revise their original opinion and see in it a proposal essentially divisive rather than cohesive in nature. Already there are faint indications that some realize that a Europe organized without America might become a Europe organized against America.

Leaving aside all the other easily imagined consequences of such an outcome, we can certainly see that it would mean splitting the Atlantic community in two and destroying all hopes for a democratic Atlantic federation.

A European federation would not have American or Canadian members, and it might well not have even the participation of Great Britain. What assurance is there, then, that with three of the principal democratic nations of the Atlantic region left out, the European union would or could remain democratic, or that it would remain friendly to us and not seek an arrangement with the Soviet bloc?

These dangers can be eliminated at one stroke: by the participation of the United States, along with Canada and Great Britain, in a trans-Atlantic union of all the free and democratic countries bordering on the North Atlantic Ocean and incorporating soon afterward all the democratic countries of western Europe, including Germany, of the Mediterranean region, of the South Atlantic area, of Africa, Asia, and the Pacific.

For the peoples of the countries lying around the ocean that now connects rather than separates the Old World and the New, a federal union is the loftiest and most logical proposal that has so far been offered them since the establishment of the United Nations. For the other democratic nations of the world, on whatever ocean or continent they may be, the concept of an Atlantic union as a nucleus for a broader and greater union will stand out as a beacon light in a darkening world, beckoning them to join with us in what we hope may one day become an all-inclusive union of the peoples of the entire globe.

Achievements of Freemasonry in the History of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 1 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of an address which I delivered at a meeting of the Reading Consistory, Scottish Rite Masons, at Reading, Pa., on Friday evening, May 26, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In the glorious history of American greatness freemasonry has recorded many chapters of brilliant achievement.

The list of outstanding patriots, statesmen, and leaders who have been prominent in the work of the Masonic fraternity is long and impressive.

Masons had places of leadership in the struggle for American independence. They helped build the foundation of these United States. They upheld the principles of social, political, and religious liberty. They have fought and sacrificed in every generation to preserve the American heritage of freedom of the individual and equal opportunity in the pursuit of happiness.

We have every reason to be proud of the part they played in religion, charity, moral, social, and cultural uplift, and in the cause of good government.

In every crisis Masonic brethren have served God and our country with courage and humility and with loyal devotion to the sacred ideals of the American Republic.

Today we are in another crisis. We are in a time of confusion and danger—a time

when evil men who deny God conspire behind an iron curtain to destroy freedom and to enslave mankind.

Their hope is to weaken America, to break down our moral and spiritual strength, to bring us to economic collapse and thus gain mastery over our country and the world.

The basic doctrine preached by the Communist enemies of freedom is that the United States can be forced to spend itself into destruction.

The people of the Soviet Union are told repeatedly that it will not take a shooting war to conquer America. It will not be necessary to drop bombs upon our cities.

Propaganda is constantly spread among them that our system is doomed because we are pursuing fiscal policies that must inevitably lead to national bankruptcy.

In our own midst Soviet agents give vigorous support to every proposal which means greater and more extravagant spending by the Government.

They are seeking to speed up the inevitable collapse of our financial structure under a crushing burden of debt and deficits.

They encourage the selfish demands of pressure groups. They advocate the adoption of every socialistic scheme which holds out the false promise of something for nothing.

In their work of undermining the foundation of American freedom they are aided by disloyal fellow travelers and fuzzy-minded pinks as well as thousands of misguided "do-gooders."

They find their greatest hope for success in a spendthrift administration at Washington and in the spendthrift attitude of many of our people.

The greatest danger confronting America is not atomic warfare that might be launched against us by a foreign foe.

I am convinced that a more serious and more imminent threat to American freedom is the bomb of national bankruptcy.

The real danger we face is the destructive, explosive power of excessive taxation, Government extravagance, debt, and inflation.

Against that danger we must build our defenses high and strong. If order and stability are to be restored—if we are to return to safe, sound, common sense management of our national affairs—it must done through the strength of the people of the United States.

Our order can play an important part in developing that strength because our members are a cross section of the best elements of Americanism.

As you well know, no man can be a Mason who does not believe in a Supreme Being. We must mobilize all the moral and spiritual forces at our command to keep America strong. If we falter or fail, human liberty will surely perish and individual freedom will vanish from the earth.

What has our plan of individual freedom done for us as a nation?

In less than 200 years we have made more progress than any other people since the world began.

From a little group of sparsely populated colonies along the Atlantic coast we have expanded our territory to the slopes of the Pacific.

We have built a diversified empire of industry, agriculture, and transportation without equal in all history. Our commerce extends to every corner of the world.

We have developed the rich, natural resources of our country for the benefit of all mankind.

We enjoy a cultural and spiritual level never attained by any people.

We have been able to build churches, schools, hospitals, research institutions, and centers of art and music for the benefit of all our people.

Listed among our assets are 250,000 churches of every denomination. They are in the great cities. They are in the mountain valleys. They are on the hill tops.

We give more for humanitarian purposes, to the Red Cross, to research foundations, to hospitals and for higher education than all other nations combined.

We sent our missionaries to preach the word of God to all the distant islands of the seas.

Our people own more homes, more life-insurance policies, and more savings accounts than those of any other nation on earth.

We are pouring out billions of dollars to restore stability to the free nations of the world and to help them resist the advance of godless and churchless communism.

Millions would starve without the productivity and the generosity of the United States.

With this wonderful list of achievements it would seem we have no dangers. But we have and it seems to me that this is a time to consider them.

As I said before, we have the great danger of national bankruptcy caused by excessive taxation, extravagant Government spending, debt, and inflation.

We are now spending for local, State, and Federal Government almost $65,000,000,000 per year.

We are collecting taxes of thirty-eight billion for the Federal Government, six billion in payroll taxes and about sixteen billion for State and local government.

That is a total of $60,000,000,000, or 28 percent of our national income. In other words, it takes more than one-fourth of our production to govern ourselves.

But unfortunately, this enormous amount is not enough to pay for all the costs of government. We will have a Federal deficit in this fiscal year of six or seven billion dollars and a similar deficit next year. There are also large deficits, through borrowed money, in many of the States and municipalities. State and local government debt have increased enormously since the close of the war.

By adding these new deficits to the present staggering burden of debt, we are placing a crushing mortgage on the future of our children.

If we are to avoid national unbalanced budgets we must either increase taxes or cut down the cost of Government.

Many of us believe that an increase in taxes will not bring additional revenue because taxes are now so high that they are reaching the point of diminishing returns. When that time comes it is a stern warning that the cost of government must be reduced.

The American people must, in some way, be aroused to this danger. Deficit spending can finally destroy us. We must have a balanced budget or this country cannot escape bankruptcy.

Another great danger in our country is inflation.

There seems to be a new wave of inflation in the air. What is causing it?

There are three main reasons:

1. Government is spending at the rate of six to seven billion dollars a year more than it receives in taxes. This puts more money in circulation which is highly inflationary.

2. The Government has put into effect a policy of easy money through grants and loans. This also puts an enormous amount of money in circulation and depreciates the value of the dollar.

3. Increased wages without a corresponding increase in production. Greater productivity aids in keeping down inflation.

Inflation comes so slowly that its dangers are not recognized until too late. It is like a thief in the night.

Inflation makes savings worth less. It makes money buy less.

Inflation reaches into the pockets of every working man and woman to steal some of the real value of the dollars they work for.

Inflation is a great danger to our way of life. It destroys the fruits of labor. It destroys the value of the pension to the disabled soldier and his dependents. It destroys the value of unemployment insurance. It destroys the value of the grants to those who are on relief. It destroys the work of the frugal.

Because of the Government's inflationary policies the $100 savings bond bought 10 years ago for $75 will buy only $60 worth of goods today.

Inflation robs young men of opportunity to get ahead because it takes twice as much capital to start a small business today as it did 10 years ago. The same condition makes it difficult for an existing business to expand.

Back in the 1930's the planners increased the money supply by taking us off the gold standard and by devaluating the dollar. We resorted to deficit financing. After World War II the planners sensed deflation and again they increased the amount of money in circulation.

We must never forget that a government that continues to go into debt must have inflation in order to catch up. It looks as if inflation would help balance the budget but in reality it does not, because with inflation comes devaluation of the dollar, thereby increasing the cost of government.

Let us consider what happens to a nation on the road to bankruptcy.

Taxes become more excessive and burdensome. Inflation destroys purchasing power. Wages decline in real value as prices climb higher and higher. The standard of living is lowered. Unemployment is increased. Venture capital is dried up. The expansion of industry and business creating new jobs is stopped.

With this comes rationing of food, clothing, and all the necessities of life.

Confusion and unrest spreads among the people.

Then the bomb of bankruptcy explodes with all the horror and suffering of atomic warfare. Not a single citizen escapes its destructive force.

Savings are wiped out. Life-insurance policies become worthless. Values established by generations of toil, thrift, and sacrifice disappear.

Out of the smashed and ruined economy a socialistic form of dictatorship rises to take control. Government becomes the all-powerful and absolute master of the citizens.

The people are controlled and regulated in their daily lives by the iron hand of a planned and regimented police state.

The free enterprise system is destroyed. All industry is taken over by the government and free labor unions are outlawed.

Human rights, human dignity, and freedom of the individual are lost.

As so well stated by that distinguished statesman, James F. Byrnes: "Every individual, whether farmer, worker, manufacturer, lawyer, or doctor, will be an economic slave, pulling an oar in the galley of the state."

So many say that government can never curtail individual liberty here in the United States.

Let us take one illustration.

A century ago individualism was deeply rooted in Great Britain. The British carried the flag of freedom.

But today they are controlled and regimented. They cannot repair their own homes without government consent. They are told where to work. They are told where

to plant and what crops they are to raise. Medicine is under political control with such tragic results. They have nationalized many of their great industries.

Here in the United States we have not yet gone in for public ownership of our industries, yet the Government competes with private enterprise in many lines of business.

During the last 20 years we have been putting ourselves into strait jackets through price supports and Government loans to both big and small business. State and local government have been going hat in hand to the Federal Government for aid in projects which could be better done by local and State government or by the people themselves.

Another danger lies in the fact that as individuals we have allowed our material progress to advance beyond our gains in spiritual strength.

We have allowed envy, greed, selfishness and lust for power to blind us to the eternal laws of God.

We have been indifferent toward law evasion, racketeering, chiseling and other corrupt results of the desire for an easy way of life.

Furthermore, too many of us have begun to feel that Government can plan better than God.

As Americans what course should we pursue for the good of our country?

We must all take an intelligent part in government. At the last primary election 400,000 Republicans did not vote in Philadelphia. That is an unfortunate situation.

In the past our greatness as a people rested on the spirtual strength and character of our people, their love of freedom and their willingness to work and sacrifice.

We want to keep America safe with freedom for the individual. We want to live in a period of reason and not of force.

To be in that position it seems to me we must observe the following:

1. We must willingly obey the laws of both God and man. Our obedience to law must be an inward expression and not under compulsion from an outward force. Let us continue to be a God-loving people. Let us fill the churches of every denomination. Let us preach righteousness, truth, tolerance, hard work, thrift and the love of God.

2. All should willingly and enthusiastically serve the Nation, both in time of peace and time of war. Peacetime service is so important. If we demand it strong enough our fiscal policies would be sound. We will have individual freedom and not Government paternalism. Centralization of government can destroy us. When Government directs when, how and where we are to work and what we are to plant, production is lost and our liberties are curtailed. That will not happen if we do our duty as peacetime soldiers fighting for the American form of government contemplated by the founding fathers.

3. Let us work for peace and good will but let us maintain our material, physical and spiritual strength. We must be materially strong. We must be strong in military preparation. We must be strong in our spiritual attainments.

4. Let us live in peace and righteousness with each other and with prayer, spread those ideals throughout the world.

5. Let us resolve that this Nation, founded to sustain the God-given liberty of the individual, shall live forever and become stronger as the generations pass.

In making this resolve we must remember that God remains unchanged.

We must move ahead with faith in God and faith in ourselves.

We can continue this country as the Nation of opportunity if we will to do so.

There are still frontiers to conquer.

They will not be conquered by a socialistic state.

America will never be a socialistic country if the people do their duty.

Appeal to Humanity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS B. HELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 31, 1950

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, within the Soviet sphere, a system of concentration camps exists, rivaling in extent and horror those of Nazi Germany. President Truman has stated, on the best authority available to him, that the Russians hold 16,000,000 hopeless human beings in these camps.

On the basis of thousands of documented reports from escapees from behind the iron curtain, the distinguished French journalist and writer, David Rousset, who was imprisoned from 1943 to 1945 in the Nazi horror camps of Buchenwald and Neuengamme, issued an appeal to humanity, reprinted in abridged form below, for an investigation into the Soviet concentration camp system. I wish to commend his appeal to humanity to the reading of my colleagues:

[From the New York Times of February 28, 1950]

AN APPEAL TO HUMANITY

(By David Rousset)

I address this appeal to the conscience of all free men.

During the last 5 years there have been increasing numbers of reports on the Soviet system of concentration camps. The war, which opened the Nazi camps to the world and then destroyed them, also broke the silence which concealed Russia's remote territories. Under the pressures of the war and its aftermath, non-Russian nationals, after being deported into Russia by the thousands, were then freed. As these victims escaped to the west, a horrible landscape of concentration camps was unveiled.

Sources of information in regard to the Russian concentration-camp system are widely varied. They come from every nationality—Poles of every political complexion, even Communist; from Germans, Jews, central Europeans, Spaniards; and from Russians, including MVD officials. Even the Soviet legal texts themselves attest to this horror. All this cannot be a conspiracy. The number of documented reports and their insistence do not permit us to reject them without a hearing.

Vishinsky tells us there are correction camps where men are rehabilitated through labor. Not so many years ago Gestapo Chief Himmler posted above the infamous Sachsenhausen camp the slogan "Joy through work."

The Soviet code of corrective labor was recently published abroad. I will quote only two parts. Section 129 recalls that in October, 1943, "institutions for corrective labor were transferred from the Ministries of Justice to the NKVD (now MVD) of the U. S. S. R." It is an ill omen when the highest police organization of a government takes charge of the reeducation of its citizens. Section 8 states: "Those persons are sent to correctional labor camps who have been condemned by (a) a sentence passed by a tribunal; (b) a decree of an administrative body." There is no possible misinterpretation: the law recognizes and approves deportation without trial.

The stone buildings of Buchenwald, built to last, gave that prison city the aura of eternity. The same feeling grips you when you examine the file on Russia. Even after the German experience, the immensity and stability of the Russian concentration camp system staggers us. Like the Germans, they have a transport system involving all the horrors which we know so well—the station platform with frozen bellies and feet, the stench in the ship's holds, the masses of men dying on heaps of their own excrement. But innovations have been added. The Russians also have special trains for prisoners, old passenger cars transformed by sealing the windows and replacing partitions with iron gates, so that the guards in the passage may watch their cargo. In order to transport 800 to 2,000 deportees over a period of several weeks, converted freight cars are used, with iron tubes through the flooring for toilets, tiers of wooden bunks, and sentry stations connected by telephone to the commandant's car. These small new details are alarming, for they indicate a special kind of calculation, necessary only in the case of permanent institutions.

The camps make the police an imposing social power within the state, a well-defended master of manpower. Their central administration, the Gulag, is one of the largest economic trusts of the U. S. S. R. Contracts are prepared on the basis of the prevailing wage rates, but since deportee labor costs far less, the difference is absorbed by the police corporation. Here again the inmate of the concentration camp supports his guardian. The Nazi SS reached this state only at the very last stages of its existence. In this sense the world of the concentration camp develops like a cancer within society, corrupting the executioner along with the victim.

Out of the cacophony of the thousands of documented reports, the "concentration camp man" emerges. He is nightmarishly typical. He is hungry, sick, and afraid. He lives in wooden barracks, or under a tent, or in earth caves. His fate is locked between barbed wire barricades, beneath observation towers. Under constant threat of dogs and rifles, he works far beyond the power of his muscles. Given neither the means nor time to wash, he wears foul rags. He is awakened before dawn; at night, having returned exhausted from work, he stands in an interminable line, near a hospital lacking medicaments. In the middle of the night, in every kind of weather, he is aroused by blows to unload freight cars. This is a faithful condensation of hundreds of reports—and thousands of such reports exist.

The world of the concentration camp keeps growing. Yesterday the Soviet Union had only political detention camps. The cruel war of the collectivization period started her on this enterprise of forced labor which plays its part in every economic sector, including scientific research. The present network of camps spreads across Siberia to the White Sea and the Baltic, from the very outskirts of Leningrad and Moscow to Baku.

During nearly their entire existence, the Nazi camps were but one apocalyptic aspect of a general pathological pattern. Only during the last years did they become an integral part of a society founded on a new type of human exploitation. In Russia this development is entirely completed. The class that organizes the camps is not threatened with extinction. It is in possession of all power and firmly resolved to carve out its future. These camps are thus an expression of normal relations, the natural development of a new type of society. And it is this unique quality of the Soviet system of concentration camps which fills us with such horror.

Imagine the mass graves of the old Buchenwald erupting with a resurrection of their dead, delegates of a protesting humanity united on the great square under the flares and in the snow, listening to the drumbeats and waiting to be counted. How would they

judge the safe, comfortable, intelligent citizens of the West who heard these new cries of terror and did nothing to answer? The strongest obscenities would be too weak. Millions of men today suffer horribly, with no hope.

I do not ask the world to state: "Concentration camps exist in Russia." Some might reply: "Our information is insufficient to pronounce such a serious verdict. I only ask you to say: "The file must be opened."

So that the file may be opened, I now propose the establishment of a commission of inquiry, consisting of former political deportees, inmates of the Nazi concentration camps, men who know the world of the concentration camp and cannot be duped. Once established, this commission would formally demand from the Soviet Government the right to conduct an investigation on the spot, within the Russian camps.

The Soviet Government solemnly denies the charge that its system of corrective labor camps constitute a crime against humanity. Our proposal, that men who have suffered as victims of the Nazis shall freely study the corrective labor camps, offers the Soviet Union the fairest way to justify its good faith before the world.

Rebuttal of Board of Trade Arguments Against Home Rule for the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 1 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD answers to some arguments prepared by the board of trade against the so-called home rule bill for the District of Columbia. My reason for asking that these answers be printed in the RECORD is that some time ago the distinguished gentleman from Texas, Representative TEAGUE, placed in the RECORD the arguments of the Board of Trade of the District of Columbia, which for some strange reason is opposed to home rule for the very people whom the board of trade is supposed to be representing. So these answers have been prepared to the arguments of the board of trade.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REBUTTAL OF THE BOARD OF TRADE ARGUMENTS AGAINST HOME RULE FOR WASHINGTON

On March 24 the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a leaflet prepared by the Washington Board of Trade entitled "Does the Kefauver Bill Really Provide for Home Rule?" This leaflet is full of misstatements and misconceptions calculated to confuse and deceive the ordinary citizen. In order to keep the record straight on this important issue, Mr. President, I have prepared a rebuttal of the arguments against home rule for Washington which are currently being made by spokesmen for the board of trade.

REBUTTAL

Argument: The Kefauver bill (S. 1527) would bring carpet-bag rule to Washington—meaning local government by outsiders.

Rebuttal: Section 302 of the bill provides that members of the District Council, which would be the governing body of the city, must reside and be domiciled in the District. The bill contains no provision which would prevent the appointment of local men to the positions of District Manager and department head. There is plenty of local talent in Washington for these top executive jobs and local citizens might well be chosen for these important posts. But if only District residents were eligible for appointment to these places, the new government would be unreasonably handicapped in obtaining the best talent for the task. City management has become a national profession during the past 40 years, and it is common practice for manager cities to hire the best administrators wherever they can be found. The problems of city management are essentially similar throughout the country. From the viewpoint of home rule, however, it does not matter where the District manager and the 12 department heads come from so long as they are subordinate to a locally elected legislature composed of local residents. Under the manager form of government, department heads are responsible to the city manager who appoints them, the manager in turn is responsible to the city council which appoints him and can remove him, and the council in turn is responsible to the voters who may change its composition on election day.

Under the present system, Washington in fact is now governed by outsiders. For Congress is now the governing body of the District of Columbia and all the Members of Congress come from other parts of the country. The chairmen of the District of Columbia Committees of the House and Senate are customarily spoken of as the "mayors" of Washington. Mayor MCMILLAN comes from South Carolina, and Mayor NEELY comes from West Virginia.

Moreover, even under the present form of District government, department heads are often appointed from the States. Eleven of the present forty-two department heads in the District government were not residents of Washington at the time of their original appointment. For example, Dr. Corning, the Superintendent of Schools, was then a resident of Nebraska; Dr. Seckinger, the District Health Officer, lived in Georgia; and Mr. Shea, the Director of the Board of Public Welfare, came from Massachusetts. One advantage of appointing outsiders is that they are independent of any local interest group affiliations.

Argument: No real home rule is possible under the Kefauver bill.

Rebuttal: The essence of home rule, as it is understood throughout the United States, is the making of local policies by locally elected officials. The Kefauver bill transfers the local law-making power of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to a locally elected District Council. Over the years Congress has delegated to the District Commissioners broad powers to make rules and regulations to protect the life, health, safety, and general welfare of all persons and property in the District of Columbia. (See 1, D. C. Code 226.) Their ordinance-making powers, which the Council would inherit under the Kefauver bill, cover 90 percent of all local matters and would not be subject to congressional or Presidential review. The other 10 percent—corresponding to legislation on the State level—will become effective in 45 days under the bill, in the absence of negative action by concurrent resolution of Congress or subsequent veto by the President. For all practical purposes, this will be home rule for Washington. For municipal legislation will be enacted by a council elected by the people of Washington instead of by a Board of Commissioners appointed by the President. Short of a complete delegation of legislative authority by Congress to the Council, this will be as much home rule as the Constitution permits. So much self-rule is surely better than none. Nine-tenths of a loaf is preferable to none at all. The insistence of the board of trade upon the whole loaf, knowing it to be unattainable, may conceal their secret desire for none at all.

Argument: Congress cannot surrender its exclusive authority over the seat of the National Government.

Rebuttal: This objection refers to article I, section 8, paragraph 17, of the Constitution of the United States, which reads:

"The Congress shall exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding 10 miles square) as may, by cession of particular States, and the acceptance of Congress, become the seat of the Government of the United States * * *."

It is well settled in our constitutional law that the word "exclusive" in the paragraph quoted above was meant by the founding fathers to exclude the authority of the States over the Federal District. But there is nothing in the Constitution to prevent Congress from delegating its legislative authority, as the legislature for the District of Columbia, to its own agent. In actual practice, Congress since 1879 has made broad grants of local legislative authority to the Board of District Commissioners who have wide powers to make rules and regulations covering purely local matters. Similarly, Congress could make a locally elected city council its agent for the enactment of municipal legislation in the District of Columbia. This is what the Kefauver bill provides for.

Argument: The only way to obtain genuine home rule for Washington is through national representation of the District of Columbia in Congress.

Rebuttal: This argument puts the cart before the horse. It overlooks the fact that successful local self-government has been a condition prerequisite to national suffrage and representation in Congress throughout our history. Before the various States have been admitted into the Union since its creation by the Original Thirteen States in 1789, they have had to prove their capacity to govern themselves competently in their local affairs.

Home rule consists in the right of a community to control its local affairs through its own locally elected representatives in a city council. That is what is meant by home rule throughout the United States. If the people of Washington could elect Representatives in Congress, these Representatives would have no more voice in running the local government of the city than Members of Congress from Chicago or Philadelphia or New York have in running the government of those cities. Members of Congress from the District of Columbia would not perform any of the local legislative or administrative functions which are the essence of home rule. They would serve as national legislators. Long repetition of the argument that national suffrage and national representation is the road to home rule for Washington may have led some unthinking people, parrot-like, to believe it. But this argument is, in reality, a smoke screen designed to conceal other grounds of objection to local suffrage for the District of Columbia.

Argument: The District council would be dominated by the two councilmen to be appointed by the President under the Kefauver bill.

Rebuttal: The Kefauver bill provides that the District council shall be composed of 11 members; nine elected by the qualified voters of the city, and 2 appointed by the President of the United States. Since each of the 11 councilmen would have one vote, apiece, it is obviously absurd to argue that the 2 members appointed by the President could make their will prevail over the other

9. The provision for the appointment of two councilmen by the President is designed to protect the Federal interests in the National Capital. At present the District government is headed by a Board of Commissioners all three of whose members are appointed by the President. The board of trade has not objected to this arrangement. Are they sincere in objecting to the presidential appointment of 2 out of 11 councilmen? Another precedent for presidential appointment of local District officials is seen in the fact that during the territorial period (1871–74) the President appointed all the members of the upper house of the bicameral District legislature.

Argument: The 1-year residence requirement in the Kefauver bill for voting in District elections is not long enough.

Rebuttal: The typical residence requirement for voting in the United States is residence of 1 year or less in the State and 6 months or less in the county. Thirty-three States require 1 year residence in the State; 5 States require 2 years residence in the State, and 9 States require 6 months residence in the State. No State requires a longer residence than 1 year in the county.

The proposal for a longer residence requirement for voting in District elections is probably designed to exclude from the local electorate the so-called floating population of Federal employees to whom spokesmen for the Board of Trade frequently refer. Yet census figures show that the average tenure of office of Federal employees in the United States at large is more than 11 years, and the average of those who reside in Washington, D. C., is believed to be even longer. More than one-fifth of the population of Washington is composed of officials and employees of the Federal Government and many of them think of Washington as home.

Argument: The Kefauver bill provides that registered voters in other places may vote in the District if they have lived here 1 year.

Rebuttal: Section 1206 of the Kefauver bill provides that "a person who is otherwise qualified shall not be disqualified by being entitled to vote in another jurisdiction." The board of trade fears that this "dual voting" provision might give persons resident in Washington, but legally domiciled in the States, the balance of power in District elections. According to the board of trade's own estimates, Federal workers would comprise 20.7 percent of the total District electorate. Four-fifths of the local electorate would not be Federally employed and only one-ninth of the total population of the District maintain legal domiciles elsewhere.

The fundamental error in this objection is the attempt to distinguish between "transient" Federal employees and "permanent District citizens." This is a false dichotomy. Federal workers resident in Washington are "people of the District" as much as anyone else who lives here and has a stake in its government. To suppose that the "genuine" people of the District are a few native sons or the eight-thousand-odd members of the board of trade is a supercilious conceit which is contrary to fact.

The chief purpose of the so-called "dual voting provision" of the Kefauver bill is to increase the size and improve the composition of the District electorate by allowing some 100,000 Federal employees to vote in District elections who reside here, but maintain legal domiciles in the States whence they came. These people have a vital stake in this community because they own property and pay taxes here, send their children to local schools, and depend upon local municipal services. If persons who actually live here in Washington, but retain legal domiciles in the States, were denied the right to vote in District elections, two classes of citizenship would be created in the District of Columbia. In one class would be the residents of Washington who have seen fit to retain voting rights in another jurisdiction and who, if unable to vote in District elections, would look to Congress for the protection of their interests. In the other class would be the residents of Washington who do not have the right to vote elsewhere and who would look to the District Council for the protection of their interests. Between these two classes of citizens, as well as between Congress and the Council, conflicts would certainly arise which might jeopardize the successful conduct of the District government.

Argument: The Kefauver bill does not confer the right to vote in national elections upon Washington residents.

Rebuttal: It is true that the Kefauver bill does not confer this right. Congress cannot confer the right to vote in national elections upon the residents of the District of Columbia simply by passing a law. The Constitution of the United States grants the right to vote in national elections to the inhabitants of the States, and the District of Columbia is not a State. It will require a constitutional amendment to enable the residents of Washington to vote in national elections. Proposals to amend the Constitution to this end have been introduced in Congress for many decades, but none of them has ever been approved by Congress for submission to the State legislatures in accordance with the prescribed amending process. For 40 years the Washington Board of Trade has tried in vain to induce Congress to propose such an amendment. But for various reasons Congress has always been deeply opposed to national suffrage and national representation for the people of the District of Columbia. The chances are slim indeed that such a constitutional amendment will ever be adopted. To ask that home rule be suspended until the District has been granted national representation, as the general counsel of the board of trade has done, is to fly in the face of both history and common sense and to classify oneself as an obstructionist against any form of District suffrage.

Argument: The city-manager form of government, which the Kefauver bill proposes for Washington, is unworkable.

Rebuttal: The manager form of city government is modeled upon the internal structure of the modern American business corporation. Under the manager form of government, an elected council is the governing body of the city, and a manager, appointed by the council to serve at its pleasure, is the chief administrative officer of the local government, subject always to the control of the council. Thus, the city manager corresponds to the general manager of the private corporation, the city council corresponds to the board of directors of the private corporation, and the voters correspond to the stockholders.

Since the manager form of city government was first adopted by Staunton, Va., in 1908, more than 900 American cities and towns have adopted it, almost a third of them since the late war. The manager form of city government has long been recommended by the National Municipal League in its model city charter. So successful, indeed, has been the experience of American cities with this form of government that less than 3 percent of them have even abandoned it.

Argument: No city the size of Washington has ever had the manager form of government.

Rebuttal: Cleveland, Ohio, with a present estimated population of 900,000, has had the manager form of government. Cincinnati, with a present population estimated at 500,000, is the largest city in the United States now having this form of government. Among other large cities which now have the manager type of government are Rochester, Hartford, Richmond, Dallas, and Oakland. The basic principles of the manager form of government are applicable to cities of any size.

Argument: The District Manager proposed by the Kefauver bill would become the all-powerful boss of Washington.

Rebuttal: Section 502 of the Kefauver bill provides that "the District Manager shall be the chief executive officer of the District government. He shall be responsible to the District Council for the proper administration of the affairs of the District coming under his jurisdiction or control. * * *" To this end he is given powers of appointment, removal, and supervision commensurate with his responsibilities. But he is subordinate to the council which appoints him and which may remove him at any time. He must perform his duties in such a way as to meet with the approval of the council. Under the manager system, the line of responsibility runs straight up from the bureau chiefs to the department heads to the manager to the council to the electorate. Each has the power to dismiss those below it in case of corruption or incompetence, subject of course to the safeguards of the civil-service merit system. The general experience of the manager cities in the United States has been that the manager has not become the boss of the town.

Argument: Home rule would result in higher real estate and income taxes in the District of Columbia.

Rebuttal: Under the present system, increases in District tax rates must receive congressional approval. Under home rule, bills raising local tax rates would be subject to congressional veto. Taxation without representation is now the rule in the city of Washington. District residents have no voice in the determination of their tax rates or as to how their money shall be spent. Under the Kefauver bill they would have such a voice. Proposed changes in the tax rates would have to be initiated by the representatives of the people in the District Council and could be disapproved by Congress or vetoed by the President. Thus, whether District property and income taxes went up or down, they would change in response to the decisions of the elected representatives of the people in the District Council, subject to a congressional and Presidential veto. Washington would have taxation with representation for the first time in 75 years.

Argument: Transient residents would vote for bond issues which the permanent residents would have to pay for.

Rebuttal: This argument is based upon the false assumption that there are two kinds of people in Washington—the permanent residents and the transient, floating population. The population of Washington is as stable as that of any city in the country. To be sure, the individual composition of the federally employed population in the District of Columbia may change from time to time. But as long as Washington is the Capital of the country there will always be a hard core of Federal employees resident here—even if they are not the same people—to help pay the carrying charges on a local debt.

No State in the Union limits the right to vote on bond issues to its so-called permanent residents.

It has long been an accepted principle of public finance that governments should pay for their current operating expenses out of their current revenues, and that they may borrow for capital improvements such as schools, highways, plant and equipment, etc. In keeping with this principle, section 701 of the Kefauver bill authorizes the District government to borrow for capital improvements, but limits its maximum indebtedness to an amount not exceeding 5 percent of the

assessed value of the taxable real property in the District.

The Kefauver bill also provides a triple hurdle for bond issues. First, they must be approved by majority vote in the District Council. Second, bonds may be issued only after approval by majority vote in a popular referendum. And, third, the bond issue may be disapproved by Congress or the President. These three safeguards, together with the 5-percent debt limit, will prevent the new District government from rash debt ventures.

Argument: Passage of the Kefauver bill will mean the reduction or elimination of the annual Federal payment to the District.

Rebuttal: Title XX of the Kefauver bill provides for an annual Federal contribution toward the cost of the District government amounting to 20 percent of District local revenues during the preceding fiscal year. This formula, if it were now in effect, would produce a Federal contribution to the District of $20,000,000 in 1950. The actual Federal payment to the District this year is a lump sum amounting to $12,000,000. Thus the formula in the Kefauver bill would increase the Federal payment in 1950 by $8,000,000.

Argument: The passage of the Kefauver bill would not save much congressional time.

Rebuttal: One of the main arguments in favor of home rule for Washington has been that it would relieve Congress of the onerous task of functioning as a city council for the District of Columbia when it ought to be devoting its full attention to more important national and international problems. It has been carefully estimated that the House of Representatives alone devotes 3,000 man-hours each session to the consideration of District affairs. The House and Senate together probably devote at least 5,000 man-hours a year to District of Columbia business. The House of Representatives sets aside 2 days each month for the consideration of District business.

Most of this congressional time would be saved under home rule because the formulation of District legislation—most of the 28 stages in the enactment of an act of Congress—would be devolved upon the District Council and the time spent in its consideration would be spent at the local level instead of at the national level. Under the legislative veto procedure set forth in the Kefauver bill, for possible use in the 10 percent of District legislation subject to congressional review, all Congress need do under home rule is vote up or down a concurrent resolution of disapproval if one is introduced.

Argument: If Washington had home rule, the colored people would capture control of the District government.

Rebuttal: This objection is not openly raised by the board of trade, but it is whispered about and is one of the silent obstacles to passage of the Kefauver bill. The truth is that, under the method of voting provided for in the Kefauver bill, no minority group in the District could possibly win a majority of the nine elective seats on the District Council, or a majority of the seven elective seats on the Board of Education. Title XII of the bill provides for a system of city-wide voting in which the candidates who receive the largest number of votes in the general election shall be elected to these offices.

The Negro population of Washington has been remarkably stable through the years. Since 1880 it has varied between one-fourth and one-third of the total population of the District. At the present time, according to the latest census estimates, the Negroes account for about 30 percent of the city's population. This percentage would entitle them to three out of the nine elective seats on the District Council. In Richmond, Va., which has the manager form of government and where 32 percent of the population is colored, only one of the nine members of the city council is a Negro. The colored people have the right to participate in the political life of a community in proportion to their numbers and their qualifications. The experience of other cities in the United States where the colored people are allowed to vote shows that they do not vote en bloc, but scatter their votes as the white people do. In short, it is a myth that home rule for Washington would mean domination by the Negroes.

Investigation of Interstate Gambling and Racketeering

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 1 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement I have prepared on the subject of interstate gambling and racketeering, a radio speech on the same subject, delivered by me on May 27, 1950, from Station WGN at Chicago, Ill., and several newspaper editorials relating to the same subject.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

AN ALL-OUT FIGHT AGAINST CRIME

Today it was my pleasure to pay a visit, with my colleagues on the Senate Crime Committee, to President Truman to discuss executive-legislative cooperation for the purpose of coping with the problem of interstate gambling and racketeering. It has always been my opinion that only by the most complete cooperation on the part of both branches of the Government and the judiciary can we lay the basis for permanent legislation which will wipe out the shame of the cities—with so many major metropolitan centers now being under the thumb of organized crime—under a combination of gambling, racketeering, dope peddling, slot machines, policy rackets, etc.

My radio address on nonpartisan probe

Last Saturday night I delivered by means of transcription, an address over the great Station WGN, Chicago, on this issue. I tried to emphasize that there are promising signs that the committee investigation will be a nonpartisan probe. However, already there are some signs that some rotten political influences are at work in the Democratic organization to pervert, distort, and send off on a tangent the crime investigation. Of course, any such charges on my part will be denied publicly. I do not expect any member of the majority party to admit: "Yes, we are a little unhappy at some of the criminals who may be discovered because many of these hoodlums are heavy contributors to the Democratic Party organization and because in countless wards, precincts, counties, and even at the State level there is a close relationship between organized crime and shady politics."

No, no one will admit that publicly but I have substantial evidence or else I would not be making the statement that I have already made concerning shady political influences at work.

I repeat that I do not make these allegations for partisan purposes—in order to show up the Democratic Party. I make these allegations publicly because I am anxious to have the strongest, most effective possible probe. I want to put the crooked politicians on notice to beware because we are wise to their game.

I would not want this probe distorted into a Republican smear hunt. At the same time, what is far more important and far more dangerous, I do not want this probe distorted into a whitewash of filthy influences which work in many of our major cities, particularly crime-ridden Chicago.

I believe that my own Republican Party is deeply desirous of the finest, highest type of investigation, and I believe that responsible elements in the Democratic Party are similarly desirous. I have high confidence in the committee staff and personnel. However, as reflected in skeptical newspaper editorials and articles which I have in my hand, many Americans are deeply dubious whether the Democratic Party, whose hands are still stained by the blood of the Kansas City murders and by "pendergastism"—whether the Democratic Party will have the guts to allow a completely nontrammeled, nonpartisan investigation.

While all of this attention, however, is being devoted to the Federal effort to probe crime, I hope that there will not be the slightest lessening by States and localities of vigilance in cracking down on local rats. We have it on no less an authority than the notorious Frank Costello himself, as pointed out in a Wisconsin State Journal editorial, that gambling could not exist unless it had a green light from local officials.

Newspaper editors' counsel sound

I believe that the opinion of the alert newspaper editors throughout the Nation should be consulted because these men are well aware, based on long investigative experience, of the lawless element in our midst.

We of Wisconsin have always been proud that ours is a relatively crime-free State, but we know that we are challenged as is the rest of this Nation to further improve enforcement of the law.

The racetrack wire-service boys in Milwaukee, the numbers men, plying their trade undercover in my State, can be assured that we are going to look under the rocks to find these crawling insects there as well as elsewhere throughout the Nation.

RADIO INTERVIEW BETWEEN SENATOR WILEY AND HIS EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, SATURDAY, MAY 27, 1950, ON STATION WGN, CHICAGO, ILL.

CRACKING INTERSTATE CRIME

SENATOR. Does crime pay? You, my listeners, and I were brought up to believe that crime does not pay. That the wages of sin are death. That he who lives by a gun will die by a gun.

To a considerable extent, what we learned is still very true. Crime, generally speaking, does not pay. It does not pay, thanks to our great Federal Bureau of Investigation; thanks to honest law-enforcement officers in most of the country; thanks to the work of active crime commissions. Thanks to them and to you, the honest citizens of America, crime, generally speaking, does not pay.

But a new investigation by the United States Senate's special committee looking into inter-State gambling and racketeering is now getting under way, and it seems very apparent already that to a certain extent, materially speaking, crime does pay. It pays off and pays off well to the syndicate, to the strong-arm boys in its employ, to many crooked policemen on city beats, to many tin-horn gamblers, it pays to some rotten judges, to some serflike officials in many big centers of our country.

Government officials are by and large honest

Now, my friends, don't get me wrong. By and large your Government officials are honest, decent citizens. I say that contrary to the distorted picture which Red Russia tries to paint of us—a distorted picture of an allegedly corrupt, venal America. You know, the worst thing that could happen in the world would be for Mr. and Mrs. Average American to lose faith in his or her officials. However, a second thing would be to keep faith in those officials who are rotten, corrupt, and who ought to be in jail rather than in city halls.

Committee is going to operate silently

SECRETARY. Well, Senator WILEY, you are a member of that special Senate committee which is probing into crime. Can you tell us something about your work?

SENATOR. Glad to. But please understand, friends, it is not my plan now to present any so-called inside story of the confidential things we are going to do. Let the hoodlums worry about that. Let them keep guessing about our confidential plans. Let them grow increasingly uneasy, because this committee, generally speaking, is going to operate on them with an expert silent treatment. At the same time, however, members of the committee, like myself, feel that it is up to us to help inform the American public of certain essential background facts regarding our war against the underworld. That is why I am happy to speak to you now.

Competent committee and staff

SECRETARY. Well, Senator, how do you feel about this anti-crime committee itself?

SENATOR. Truly, I can answer that by saying I have tremendous confidence in the committee chairman, the Honorable ESTES KEFAUVER of Tennessee and in my colleagues on the committee—both Republican and Democrat. I know that they want to do an honest, conscientous job. I am glad that we have a very competent and experienced chief counsel in the person of Rudolph Halley—who gained invaluable experience with the old War Investigating Committee.

We must be nonpartisan

SECRETARY. Do you feel that this committee should operate on the basis of bipartisan policy?

SENATOR. No. We all definitely feel we must be nonpartisan, not bipartisan. Let's shove partisan considerations in the ashcan. It is up to the Senate committee to pull no punches whatsoever in its investigation. Let the chips fall where they may. If the spotlight falls on a crooked Republican organization, then I say let's get the facts and tell the truth about it. If the spotlight falls on a nest of democratic racketeers, then let's also tell that story. There must be no whitewash, no glossing over any sordid situation, no matter whose political toes are stepped on.

SECRETARY. Is this nonpartisan approach the way things have proceeded thus far?

Advice to the mob: hands off the committee

SENATOR. Well, frankly speaking, not completely. I know that certain outside influences tied up with crooked big city organizations have already attempted to put the heat on, have subtly attempted to apply pressure, to use influence to distort the purposes of this committee. Let me repeat that my friends—I am charging that certain outside—I emphasize—outside—influences, and frankly—they are connected with the Democratic political organization—are apparently already attempting to use pressure to pervert the committee's work.

The big shots have already tried certain high-up channels of approach. Undoubtedly they are going to try others. I say, however, publicly here and now: You had better lay off, boys. You had better not try any wise-guy stuff on this committee. You had better keep your filthy hands and filthy attempted influence away, because if you do try to use pressures, they are going to boomerang against you and you'll be doubly sorry.

Now, my fellow Americans, I would like to make this charge more explicit, but I do not want to reveal more facts than are necessary at the present time.

The new look in racketeering influence

Let me point out that these influences are not of course of the blackjack, pistol-packing, lead-poisoning type. They are subtle, silk-glove, apparently respectable influences, the sort of thing one would expect from billion-dollar racketeering influences—tied up with shady politics. This is the new look, so to speak, in United States rackets—a look of respectability.

SECRETARY. How about the old rough look? Has it disappeared completely?

SENATOR. No. It's still there. You can still see the old look too. Just look around you—in Chicago—or anywhere else in most big cities. You'll see them: The vicious dope peddlers, the crooked ward committeemen, the rotten precinct captains, the numbers kings, the slimy slot-machine boys, the hoods, the thugs, the trigger-crazy rats.

SECRETARY. That's certainly quite a list, Senator. I think, however, that we are particularly interested in what you say about the change—the new look—that has occurred in crime and criminal methods—the fact that the gangsters have gone respectable and now are wearing tuxedos and silk hats in place of exclusively the old garb of street hoodlums.

SENATOR. Yes. One of the most disgusting trends of recent years has been the movement of ill-gotten crooked money into decent, respectable American businesses. It is perfectly nauseating for me to read the records that I already have, showing how ex-bootleggers and other riff-raff have suddenly blossomed behind all sorts of fronts into tremendous ownership of stocks and bonds in some of our Nation's largest companies. These filthy rats cannot do anything but bring filth into these businesses and to distort them for their own nefarious purposes.

SECRETARY. I'm sure it isn't easy to get all of the facts involved, is it, Senator?

How crooks have infiltrated business

SENATOR. That's right; it is almost impossible to get a complete financial picture of the interlocking directorates by which the big-time racketeers have infiltrated into many upstanding American businesses. Like an octopus they have used their dirty finances to reach out their tentacles into the following types of business, among others: Hotels, transit companies, motion-picture theaters, laundries, gasoline stations, real estate, railroads, automobile franchises, etc.

There are all sorts of agents or go-betweens, sometimes 10 times removed, from the hidden "big shot" who really pulls the strings.

I know that my colleagues on the Crime Committee intend to expose this so-called respectability trend by facts.

Stockholders' battles between crooks and honest groups

Already, if you follow reports, you have noted that stockholders' battles are breaking out all over the country between decent elements and the go-betweens of the crooks. I think that we can expose the go-betweens and enable decent citizens to maintain control of American companies.

SECRETARY. I gather, Senator, then, that speed is essential to prevent the racketeers from becoming still further entrenched in respectable businesses.

SENATOR. Absolutely. I am hoping that decent stockholders and bondholders and company officials will "hold the fort," so to speak—will hold out and not sell out or give in further to these hoodlums in the various States.

SECRETARY. Well, Senator WILEY, time is running out, and perhaps we might run down on some of the matters covered in the broadcast thus far.

Summary

SENATOR. I can summarize as follows:

First. Crime has gone "big time." It is obviously a huge multi-billion-dollar affair, operating behind a thousand false fronts.

Second. The Senate Crime Committee, I trust, is going to do a nonpartisan job.

Third. The wise-guy racketeers and their big city political machines had better keep hands off and quit trying to use pressures on us, because if they don't they are going to regret it twice as much as they are going to regret having gone into racketeering in the first place.

Fourth. There is no need to exaggerate interstate crime. The simple facts speak for themselves. Most American businesses are decent and honest, just as most citizens are decent and honest. Let no one become cynical and begin to think that every business is crooked or that every public official is a crook. Such vicious rumor mongering and cynicism is as bad as, or worse than, being so innocent as to believe that there is almost no crime.

Fifth. Uncle Sam, your Federal Government, has a great responsibility. But it alone cannot do the job. The crime commissions in the various States, the honest municipal officials, the district attorneys, the sheriffs, and all other honest Government workers at State, county, and local levels must do the basic job.

I conclude, my friends, as I began. We—you and I—were taught that crime does not pay. We want our children to grow up in an America as crime-free as possible. But to make it so we have got to take the profits out of crime, out of gambling, out of racketeering, out of the tie-up with shady politics. We must make sure that crime does not pay.

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Journal of May 22, 1950]

HEADLINES DON'T CLEAN HOUSE

Senator WILEY said the other day that he expects no headline hunting in the investigation of Nation-wide crime by the five-man Kefauver committee of which he is a member.

There will be "silent sleuthing" instead of "cop and robber circuses," said Wisconsin's senior Senator. The investigation will be "full, fair, and with the attitude of let the chips fall where they may—whether they hit Democrats or Republicans. * * * I have no intention of making it a Kansas City smear."

* * * * *

The crime investigation is too important to let it be turned into headline hunting. What the Nation needs is facts—facts that will help honest officials clean up crime and force indifferent officials to do the same thing. It needs facts that will end whatever connection there is between public officials and gangsters wherever such connection is found.

The job, as Senator WILEY said, is to "clean house." * * *

[From the Green Bay (Wis.) Press of May 20, 1950]

THE PROBE OF CRIME AND SUBVERSIVES

It is a fair question to ask: Do the people expect an honest exposure of crime and subversives?

We are moved to present the question because if there is a full and sincere exposure of both crime and subversives across the country and the elimination of their effectiveness, the Democrats are almost certainly defeated in the next election and they know it.

Anyone who wants to go to an almanac or blue book and read the figures in the populous States which resulted in Mr. Truman's

election in 1948 will clearly understand what we mean. Judged by those figures Mr. Truman simply cannot carry such great States as California, Illinois, and Ohio without the aid of the underworld.

* * * * *

The electoral vote in great States like California, Illinois, Ohio, and Michigan can easily swing an election. Even one of those States has been known to be decisive.

The Democrats for the past 20 years have had the support of the gambling element and of subversives because they gave them something. Now, of course, the Democrats realize that they gave them too much. But in expecting such elements to be reasonable or restrained, the Democratic leaders showed that they have very little conception of either Communists or criminals. Both elements will grab everything in sight. If the Reds are given a few important places, they always contrive to take over. If criminals are given a little special protection, they immediately become bold and brazen. If they are permitted by threats and blackmail to force someone to sell them a lucrative business at a ridiculously low price, as actually happened at Kansas City, they insist upon and secure from the political boss immunity from even the ordinary license fees exacted of all business of their nature.

A few years ago a member of the Chicago Crime Commission estimated that the underworld was good for 200,000 votes in that city. He included the women and the members of their families. It was quite a revelation to observe the list of the thousands who were employed in the numbers rackets, or daily picking up bets on the ponies all over the county, or servicing, selling, or installing slot machines, or engaged in the small backroom dice and stud operations, and of course those occupied in the dining, dancing, and ornate gambling palaces.

If these committees on subversives and on crime actually and earnestly sought to give the country the entire and unembellished truth, they would perform a marvelous public function. To date they have indicated no purpose of doing any such thing. Between serving the country and trying to insure the maintenance of their own power, Democratic leaders have lost no time in making a decision.

[From the Wisconsin State Journal of May 10, 1950]

HAND ON THE GREEN LIGHT

Americans who manage to muster up a little interest in presidential elections, but seldom bother to vote otherwise, should take to heart the words of one Frank Costello.

Mr. Costello's social and economic activities lie in the fields of racketeering, gambling, and what have you. Speaking before a committee of Congressmen investigating race horse betting, "Frankie" came forth with a great truth:

"Gambling can't be operated by anyone," he said, "unless you can get a green light from somewhere, like local officials."

Mr. Costello should know, being an old hand at the game.

Wisconsin, during the past few years, has pretty well purged itself of the criminal fringe that fed itself principally from the millions in nickels and dimes dropped into the slot machines. A succession of good State administrations, plus both enlightened and outraged local thinking and action, has resulted in a Wisconsin markedly free from organized gambling.

We can keep it that way. We can, in fact, go even further in our clean-up campaign by paying attention to the local officials who—as Mr. Costello says—are the ones with authority to switch on "the green light."

[From the Fond du Lac (Wis.) Commonwealth Reporter of May 15, 1950]

NO MORE SLOTS

We compliment the Federal circuit court of appeals in Chicago for ruling that States have the right to bar slot machines. The issue arose in Wisconsin which has an anti-gambling statute. The test was provided when slot machines were seized on an Indian reservation, theoretically under the control of the Federal Government. The operators were arrested, but they appealed that State law does not apply to an Indian reservation.

There is always the argument that people are going to gamble anyway so why not legalize it and enable the States to collect some revenue from it.

We do not know whether there is such a thing as honest gambling, so perhaps we ought to take a peak into some of these slot machines. A great majority of them are manufactured in Chicago and the manufacturers claim they leave the plant set to pay out at least 75 cents on the dollar. But accompanying those machines are instructions explaining how they can be geared to pay out nothing or 10, 20, 40, or 60 percent of the cash poured into them.

Federal licenses were paid on slot machines in nearly seventy thousand places last year. Conservatively there probably were ten times that many machines.

It is impossible to estimate the gambling syndicate take on slot machines, but the California commission on organized crime said last year that the gross take by people who control slot machines probably is around two billion dollars annually.

Yes, the Chicago court acted wisely.

[From the La Crosse (Wis.) Tribune of May 25, 1950]

GAMBLING TAKE AND NATIONAL DEFENSE

A billion dollars a month—twelve billions a year.

That's the take of gambling in the United States—bookmaking, slot machines, and policy games. It is just the commercialized games of chance that are included in this estimate.

The figures come from a new survey on gambling compiled by the American Academy of Social Science. It is no Johnny-come-lately outfit, either, dating back to its organization in Philadelphia more than threescore years ago.

This organization has made a thorough study and published its results with these conclusions:

1. The ordinary gambler is a sucker who must lose in the long run.

2. Big-time gambling can't operate without political or police protection.

3. Gambling rackets are helped by legitimate communications channels, and elimination of sports wire services to bookmakers would reduce them from a major national racket to a petty local nuisance.

It breaks down the $12,000,000,000 taken by the promoters of chance as $8,000,000,000 to the bookies, $3,000,000,000 for the numbers racket, and a billion to the one-armed bandits.

One who thinks seriously cannot escape the thought that this $12,000,000,000 is getting close to our total bill for national defense—about 10 percent under the proposed budget for this coming year.

Yet there are many who believe we are spending too much on armaments—say it goes for nonproductive outlays.

What a comparison.

"I will say unto God my rock, Why hast Thou forgotten me? Why go I mourning because of the oppression of the enemy?" (Psalms 42: 9.)

Better Medical Care Without Compulsion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1950

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, as the old saw goes, "Many a true word is spoken in jest." Certainly Bing Crosby summed up the situation with regard to socialized medicine in Great Britain when, upon losing in the British golf tournament last week, he quipped, "Well, I didn't come to Britain to win at golf anyway, I just needed another wig."

Consider the number of aging Hollywood actors who would need new wigs if we embarked upon socialized medicine in this country. Now, at least, they have to go to Britain to get them. The tourist trade is stimulated and the dollar shortage eased by our refusal to adopt this socialistic scheme. This remark emphasizes the evils and the dangers of allowing its advocates to get their foot in the door. The constructive alternative is, of course, to encourage the development of voluntary health insurance plans, for instance, through the device of permitting income-tax allowances for premiums paid to these voluntary plans.

My bill, H. R. 6819, sets forth a solution to the problem of providing better health for a greater segment of our population. There is no doubt that some answer to this urgent question is needed. The allowance of tax credits for contributions to voluntary health plans is in accord with the traditions of individual initiative and a free opportunity system, unfettered by governmental dictation or interference.

Compulsion is neither necessary nor desirable, since this easier and cheaper method of broadening the scope of medical care for our citizens is available, provided the real interest of our leaders is in providing better medical care for a larger segment of our people, rather than in creating a small army of additional Federal employees to administer a Government insurance company and ride herd on the doctors, dentists, and nurses of the country.

Truman's Chicago Circus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks heretofore granted, I am inserting in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Truman's Chicago Circus," which appeared in the

Rural New Yorker, New York, N. Y., June 3, 1950:

TRUMAN'S CHICAGO CIRCUS

Though several tons of newsprint and hundreds of pounds of ink were devoted to various incidents in President Truman's latest "nonpolitical" tour through the West, only minor mention was made of the final event that was obviously planned to be the master stroke in public relations. After a week of whistle stops at which the President spun his dangerous political philosophy in a disarmingly folksy manner, he was welcomed to Chicago by members of his Cabinet who had held a meeting the previous day.

It was this meeting of our Government's Cabinet that merits comment and censure. It was an extraordinary event, conducted something along the lines of a circus. For the first time in this country's history, the Cabinet met in public before an audience and facing television cameras. Called to order by Vice President BARKLEY in the Chicago Opera House with seats available for 4,000 spectators, the meeting had no purpose other than to beat the drum prior to Mr. Truman's arrival. On one of the walls was a gigantic framed poster of the President, wreathed in heroic olive sprays, very reminiscent of Hitler and Mussolini displays, and quite similar to the monster posters of Stalin that now adorn every pedestal and market square in the iron-curtain countries.

According to all reports, this so-called pep rally in Chicago—that is what its sponsors called it—was a complete dud, with fewer than 25 percent of the seats occupied. The simple fact appears to be that the general public was not interested in spite of all the heavy advance barrage of publicity. Indeed, it was most fitting that the people did not respond to this shameful spectacle where the top Government officials acted out a farce in an open arena, going through the motions of being inspired by the grotesquely enlarged countenance of their leader, who gazed down on them wisely and beneficently from the wall above.

Hitler and Mussolini, the originators of the leader complex, are gone. They were toppled by the forces of American democracy. Stalin, the lone survivor of the original totalitarian trio, is supposed to stand for everything we are against, and opposed to all the principles that we hold dear. Yet, right in our own midst, our own Government sponsors a public demonstration, paid by all the taxpayers, that one would more naturally expect to see in the Kremlin at Moscow, or could have seen a few years back in der fuehrer's Berlin.

Mr. Truman may have thought he made some good political hay in his most recent barnstorming trip, and he probably did. But the Chicago episode proved to be a haymaker of quite another sort—a wild swing without the expected wallop. Let us hope it will never again be repeated, or even attempted, within the confines of this Republic.

Reorganization of the Government Departments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 1 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial dealing with the reorganization of the Government departments, published in the New York Times of Thursday, May 25.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SIXTEEN OF TWENTY-ONE

With the dead line passed for a congressional veto, the scoreboard shows that 16 of the 21 plans for reorganization of the Government submitted to Congress last March by President Truman now go formally into effect. That the score is as high as this is due in large part to the efforts of the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report, to some effective speeches on the floor by Senator BENTON, of Connecticut, and to a belated but welcome decision by a sizable group of Senate Republicans not to play politics with this issue. The score might have been even a bit higher if President Truman had stuck a little more closely to the original recommendations of the Hoover Commission—for example, in the case of remodeling the National Labor Relations Board.

The need for modernizing the vast, antiquated machinery of the Federal Government is so imperative, the possible gains both in better administration and in money saved are so substantial, that there is good reason for satisfaction in the results just achieved. At the same time it must be noted that only one of the 16 plans now put into effect—this one relating to the merchant marine—involves a major operation. The others are chiefly concerned with establishing a clear line of control from the Chief Executive to various department and agency heads—a wise and necessary reform, but one by no means earth-shaking in importance.

So far as major operations are concerned, the Hoover Commission originally recommended 18. Four of these have now been accomplished: that involving the merchant marine (just noted), and three others (effected at the previous session of Congress) involving unification of the Armed Forces, reorganization of the State Department and creation of the General Services Administration. On this larger and more important scoreboard, therefore, there remain 14 "major operations" still to be achieved. Since these 14 deal with such highly important matters as veterans' affairs, social security, and natural resources, it is evident that there is plenty of work still to be done—on the part of the President, of Congress, and of all those outside the Government who are interested in more efficient and economical administration.

Let Us Look at the Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1950

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the farm program of our Government has been in existence for many years. The price-support angle was started in 1920 with the establishment of the Federal Farm Board. It was followed by the AAA of the 1930's and by the Steagall bill of the early forties. The Steagall bill which broadened the base of commodities support was killed by President Truman on December 31, 1946, by Executive Order 2714. The issue has been rather more political than agricultural since that day. The Hope bill was passed by the Eightieth Congress and is similar to the Steagall bill. To have any supports of any value the Hope bill was passed by the House and was in operation in 1948 and 1949. The Hope bill was really an improvement of the Steagall bill. Much criticism was directed to the Aiken bill that was to go into effect January 1, 1950, in the campaign of 1948. The Eighty-first Congress, when it passed the Anderson-Cooley bill in 1949, really passed a bill very, very similar to the Aiken bill. The Anderson-Cooley bill was a step backward legislatively. In the first place, it is special-privilege legislation, in that some commodities are given preferred legislative consideration, and in the second place it is antilivestock in its provisions. The feed price is supported at a higher percent of parity than is the livestock products obtained by feeding the grain. In fact, some livestock products do not have any mandatory support whatsoever. The support price of manufacturing milk was $3.21 per hundredweight under the Steagall and Hope bills and $2.72 per hundredweight under the Anderson-Cooley bill.

The Hope bill is a milestone for American agriculture. The approach was based and is based on three premises. One is that all major farm commodities are entitled to equal support legislation and second that labor performed in production of food is entitled to a minimum wage somewhere near comparable to the minimum wage provided other groups; and third it was legislation based on law and not based on the opinion of any one person.

All legislation is a question of trial and error. The Hope approach was in my opinion the most fair and the most acceptable approach we have obtained as yet. It is based on the philosophy that we should keep the best we have ever obtained and try to improve it. There is no reason why the next goal should be 100 percent of parity. We may have plenty of promises but you will note that in 1946 under the OPA and large subsidies that the farm income of each State was lower than the years under the free Steagall year of 1947 and Hope years of 1948–49. You will also note that in 1950 nearly every State is experiencing a smaller income in spite of the fact that the stock market is rising, big business activity is thriving, and that we are going in debt fifteen to twenty million dollars more every day. Farmers are paying more for many items they buy but sell for less. The 1949 farm prices were not supported in accordance to the law and it should also be remembered that we had a balanced budget under the Eightieth Congress instead of an economy based on ever-increasing debts.

So I repeat that the Hope bill originating from the Committee on Agriculture of the House under the leadership of our distinguished colleague from Kansas, the Honorable CLIFFORD HOPE,

has given us a pattern and a hope of better agricultural things to come—the Hope bill—the farmers of America owe a great debt of gratitude to our colleague from Kansas, the Honorable CLIFFORD HOPE. His constructive agricultural leadership will long be recognized. It is hoped that we can regain the losses that resulted from the passage of the Anderson-Cooley bill.

My conclusions are based on observation and a study of the official tables which I include in my remarks at this point, and any Member can check his own State:

TABLE 1.—*Cash receipts from farm marketings, by States, by months, 1946–50*

[In thousands of dollars]

State	January					February					March				
	1946	1947	1948	1949	1950	1946	1947	1948	1949	1950	1946	1947	1948	1949	1950
Alabama	17,430	18,963	18,465	31,793	13,354	12,332	21,879	14,675	23,610	14,877	13,127	23,858	16,991	14,763	12,958
Arizona	11,535	15,476	21,851	23,564	31,165	10,326	12,592	15,851	13,741	12,672	13,614	17,303	17,272	18,213	13,805
Arkansas	27,374	31,967	27,095	51,545	23,613	19,294	34,670	17,893	36,299	22,338	16,368	29,483	22,184	31,255	18,693
California	104,284	121,692	149,690	158,318	137,029	84,012	111,061	111,456	106,989	82,980	90,529	112,262	113,846	113,706	93,406
Colorado	28,592	36,671	51,101	32,828	42,873	24,370	30,779	32,172	27,261	30,842	20,638	32,768	38,243	35,498	29,708
Connecticut	25,541	15,540	14,966	14,087	13,941	9,480	12,540	14,092	11,548	11,270	10,138	16,227	16,664	15,068	15,694
Delaware	5,957	5,152	6,525	10,860	6,534	6,232	5,206	6,303	8,548	6,100	7,222	5,031	6,385	7,749	7,191
Florida	43,826	32,966	32,833	32,429	44,550	42,824	28,853	31,412	36,383	47,082	54,017	35,446	34,524	48,448	59,588
Georgia	17,341	23,151	27,457	30,641	21,086	20,458	24,013	19,068	25,770	19,252	15,089	29,289	21,438	20,146	17,880
Idaho	24,172	29,576	36,805	26,941	24,858	15,699	21,302	25,332	18,288	20,399	13,645	24,362	23,730	26,055	19,751
Illinois	104,955	153,667	205,852	154,947	151,100	94,375	133,108	112,926	120,778	122,476	88,214	128,352	127,587	141,055	129,697
Indiana	56,429	76,311	96,670	69,616	67,962	48,832	71,037	62,042	61,837	59,065	47,715	69,054	70,610	74,869	68,909
Iowa	134,074	221,423	227,066	244,268	232,225	138,852	181,084	162,402	167,333	144,853	106,981	178,437	135,815	173,636	143,546
Kansas	69,085	113,764	98,642	75,726	87,661	49,135	74,883	54,178	56,840	62,225	35,449	77,164	58,970	70,421	51,899
Kentucky	85,935	116,503	86,260	98,636	112,718	41,874	45,077	32,156	28,910	21,152	17,278	25,381	27,868	25,008	23,457
Louisiana	19,128	28,082	31,175	40,723	29,036	9,250	17,525	10,302	20,723	7,493	9,445	11,371	12,354	18,038	11,122
Maine	11,266	27,872	21,206	17,635	14,948	8,136	31,246	18,456	20,819	15,092	15,968	22,026	22,718	24,200	18,311
Maryland	11,389	12,550	15,382	18,480	14,116	10,784	12,109	13,737	15,492	13,724	12,689	13,629	15,792	16,187	15,279
Massachusetts	15,112	14,954	15,624	16,335	13,773	9,662	11,513	13,794	12,721	11,105	10,751	13,441	14,500	13,355	12,326
Michigan	40,309	52,434	51,714	52,323	54,683	32,762	41,557	39,756	45,636	43,255	36,401	47,476	47,519	47,741	44,664
Minnesota	72,983	109,151	129,604	102,710	101,458	76,423	87,319	91,454	81,413	88,186	68,655	99,353	88,864	98,090	87,149
Mississippi	23,743	35,336	27,931	69,499	17,677	19,334	30,726	21,748	49,785	11,452	16,141	33,366	17,913	26,825	12,011
Missouri	56,303	78,496	84,989	79,685	69,914	48,962	61,310	55,243	64,853	59,087	43,672	65,909	58,659	68,860	61,556
Montana	21,332	33,094	35,172	24,589	20,672	12,423	18,499	14,410	15,546	14,760	9,706	17,549	13,778	17,138	15,896
Nebraska	72,867	99,733	115,506	90,842	80,286	73,939	89,068	68,902	74,217	78,175	56,459	92,275	72,620	74,832	55,744
Nevada	1,983	2,923	3,798	2,100	2,272	1,673	2,418	3,727	2,288	2,384	1,387	2,901	4,053	3,553	2,832
New Hampshire	3,993	4,872	5,319	5,364	4,217	3,536	4,222	4,806	4,719	3,882	3,931	4,985	5,201	5,102	4,488
New Jersey	14,413	16,317	16,485	19,048	15,743	12,143	14,846	15,236	17,050	14,526	13,333	17,180	18,238	18,599	16,900
New Mexico	5,698	8,088	13,177	14,448	12,848	5,919	7,727	7,150	9,433	8,922	7,005	9,721	7,204	6,887	5,211
New York	52,643	62,508	68,619	70,080	63,734	40,767	52,735	61,662	54,754	53,749	48,225	59,851	70,533	64,732	57,593
North Carolina	24,574	47,992	33,980	29,106	19,747	20,486	23,901	23,003	29,462	16,876	23,456	29,531	23,915	24,580	18,156
North Dakota	36,463	61,837	67,989	40,203	28,781	18,492	38,236	26,414	20,885	17,658	19,183	43,798	27,382	28,589	23,250
Ohio	56,489	73,063	84,519	72,572	70,861	45,122	62,139	63,014	58,440	55,484	51,188	71,649	77,547	77,439	71,271
Oklahoma	26,103	42,305	40,266	38,139	51,237	19,264	34,230	25,833	26,985	32,477	19,185	35,328	31,152	32,053	27,864
Oregon	19,024	23,057	21,592	22,548	21,009	13,777	18,481	15,552	17,013	16,524	14,788	20,423	17,559	22,921	16,507
Pennsylvania	52,470	52,891	61,331	62,710	53,493	46,243	58,698	55,838	55,579	47,222	44,200	66,843	68,521	63,287	58,536
Rhode Island	1,479	1,698	1,975	1,757	1,497	1,239	1,534	1,821	1,730	1,470	1,286	1,665	1,806	1,829	1,689
South Carolina	10,108	11,759	17,363	19,817	8,064	13,326	15,905	11,622	13,590	7,907	15,377	20,015	13,470	8,849	7,819
South Dakota	34,886	59,495	69,679	48,930	42,792	39,244	49,032	36,886	37,878	32,879	25,970	48,288	37,409	39,134	28,622
Tennessee	41,978	51,787	43,669	46,693	46,522	27,798	33,301	26,517	29,307	23,080	22,493	27,394	34,056	22,417	21,196
Texas	76,341	100,839	160,559	116,868	196,636	52,750	73,971	62,700	92,685	99,804	64,305	97,808	101,234	89,538	85,006
Utah	9,618	10,720	10,464	10,627	10,409	7,479	8,128	8,894	8,752	8,692	7,766	9,206	9,865	8,998	8,183
Vermont	5,806	9,102	9,525	9,538	9,054	5,546	7,566	8,647	8,268	7,624	7,284	10,036	10,925	9,316	9,276
Virginia	26,159	40,889	33,942	32,359	33,677	17,124	21,556	22,533	22,599	20,172	17,179	23,198	22,749	26,346	24,718
Washington	36,518	50,239	40,647	44,563	35,892	26,886	37,930	26,879	33,808	29,076	22,636	33,959	27,531	41,207	24,762
West Virginia	6,518	9,412	8,715	8,030	7,177	4,647	6,464	6,424	6,611	5,600	4,470	7,428	7,223	7,549	6,969
Wisconsin	67,776	77,946	93,686	76,785	68,667	58,870	81,822	82,812	65,675	65,240	64,765	83,096	89,083	81,826	79,401
Wyoming	4,882	6,734	8,122	5,831	6,694	4,663	5,156	7,506	4,806	4,770	4,691	6,296	7,521	4,840	4,220
United States	1,716,884	2,330,997	2,545,002	2,367,136	2,238,255	1,406,764	1,868,954	1,665,236	1,767,657	1,595,930	1,334,014	1,951,411	1,811,021	1,910,747	1,642,709

State	April					May					June				
	1946	1947	1948	1949	1950	1946	1947	1948	1949	1950	1946	1947	1948	1949	1950
Alabama	12,990	18,393	19,580	18,919	----------	13,944	17,942	19,576	19,411	----------	12,933	15,589	19,719	15,926	----------
Arizona	15,753	13,690	20,750	17,845	----------	14,104	12,366	20,665	17,762	----------	16,463	18,267	20,574	17,249	----------
Arkansas	21,337	19,324	28,873	29,093	----------	18,863	16,895	23,066	26,221	----------	16,006	19,546	23,633	20,694	----------
California	103,875	127,408	119,692	115,456	----------	143,967	165,584	153,032	150,194	----------	192,306	192,267	212,375	189,032	----------
Colorado	20,514	26,655	39,372	25,590	----------	13,644	21,215	33,110	34,047	----------	13,503	19,219	29,060	32,140	----------
Connecticut	8,614	15,372	17,603	12,023	----------	7,067	11,604	14,729	9,956	----------	6,776	10,462	12,404	8,590	----------
Delaware	4,308	6,378	7,570	9,679	----------	6,479	6,673	7,950	7,521	----------	7,233	7,076	8,545	7,103	----------
Florida	59,337	36,101	39,538	54,890	----------	45,352	37,323	39,716	43,149	----------	22,349	23,967	21,453	21,775	----------
Georgia	15,322	21,972	22,013	23,724	----------	18,443	21,062	21,819	23,039	----------	31,352	24,935	34,546	27,275	----------
Idaho	13,480	18,457	22,121	18,592	----------	12,661	16,976	18,374	19,227	----------	13,123	13,593	18,994	15,577	----------
Illinois	88,706	132,206	134,990	128,183	----------	90,111	126,041	134,949	123,259	----------	66,070	149,584	161,698	130,984	----------
Indiana	54,689	73,061	70,655	66,154	----------	57,480	71,984	75,421	70,738	----------	45,882	73,075	84,807	66,864	----------
Iowa	112,847	168,654	144,131	147,732	----------	109,338	180,274	154,520	137,760	----------	92,736	179,776	192,124	159,620	----------
Kansas	37,328	77,303	81,665	56,248	----------	39,679	60,674	83,138	73,637	----------	94,429	66,957	91,872	90,776	----------
Kentucky	16,020	25,333	23,669	20,854	----------	18,755	26,442	30,046	26,793	----------	18,405	29,860	38,315	31,096	----------
Louisiana	12,086	13,944	14,899	19,979	----------	13,341	13,400	11,849	12,181	----------	13,422	11,497	12,897	13,670	----------
Maine	12,989	15,132	21,068	19,388	----------	7,394	732	13,579	10,288	----------	6,410	−3,089	8,360	8,264	----------
Maryland	10,691	15,594	16,666	17,036	----------	14,655	19,884	20,906	23,325	----------	18,684	21,877	25,437	20,568	----------
Massachusetts	10,622	13,371	15,703	13,141	----------	10,261	13,215	15,340	12,508	----------	9,718	11,961	13,583	11,259	----------
Michigan	38,049	50,429	51,590	48,319	----------	38,422	46,298	53,219	53,362	----------	40,845	49,316	59,658	46,942	----------
Minnesota	67,349	83,385	85,973	85,758	----------	72,820	92,346	102,412	90,318	----------	64,788	95,735	116,059	96,979	----------
Mississippi	14,167	14,842	27,910	25,496	----------	13,589	16,386	19,195	20,844	----------	13,661	15,868	19,267	16,421	----------
Missouri	46,564	67,001	65,897	60,584	----------	50,257	69,538	74,405	66,502	----------	44,413	77,949	85,687	71,676	----------
Montana	6,376	14,092	14,035	14,603	----------	13,801	14,448	16,085	25,235	----------	12,436	12,063	17,714	23,800	----------
Nebraska	54,273	81,914	83,320	79,393	----------	48,023	75,856	72,670	65,901	----------	43,382	76,546	81,158	77,033	----------
Nevada	1,323	2,523	3,554	2,093	----------	1,437	1,933	3,440	2,777	----------	1,993	1,817	2,491	1,906	----------
New Hampshire	4,119	5,174	5,656	5,456	----------	4,302	4,960	5,546	5,416	----------	3,856	4,634	5,488	4,553	----------
New Jersey	15,412	17,628	19,983	20,148	----------	21,058	21,290	22,801	23,035	----------	24,269	23,691	30,659	27,957	----------
New Mexico	8,140	8,949	13,088	13,030	----------	6,935	7,523	9,766	11,058	----------	6,559	8,395	7,404	6,073	----------
New York	48,019	60,926	67,796	61,484	----------	50,152	59,965	68,533	60,732	----------	56,400	61,117	79,174	63,989	----------
North Carolina	18,157	19,603	24,856	26,281	----------	21,971	24,577	26,444	28,714	----------	25,543	31,400	34,731	26,170	----------
North Dakota	16,745	23,264	34,602	23,228	----------	30,570	32,082	46,299	39,508	----------	29,245	31,279	61,697	42,875	----------
Ohio	53,053	75,314	75,607	69,204	----------	57,994	68,098	75,973	66,447	----------	55,043	70,359	83,414	66,905	----------
Oklahoma	20,451	27,440	40,763	29,432	----------	21,714	28,583	46,896	35,576	----------	90,754	87,774	77,355	65,706	----------
Oregon	12,837	17,877	18,576	15,003	----------	14,726	17,768	19,971	18,235	----------	21,209	22,935	27,079	26,449	----------
Pennsylvania	46,789	59,357	78,478	70,086	----------	47,204	58,816	64,834	67,843	----------	51,507	63,085	71,979	69,034	----------
Rhode Island	1,372	1,474	1,755	1,633	----------	1,253	1,444	1,769	1,583	----------	1,119	1,300	1,745	1,506	----------
South Carolina	11,948	18,024	12,774	16,460	----------	11,978	12,878	16,302	14,426	----------	15,682	15,088	16,169	14,572	----------
South Dakota	25,912	34,429	37,650	32,526	----------	27,040	43,654	42,535	40,778	----------	26,485	43,580	50,151	51,040	----------
Tennessee	18,543	25,222	25,908	20,911	----------	21,509	26,023	32,483	28,011	----------	22,953	30,899	33,476	28,021	----------
Texas	102,172	103,479	162,472	134,668	----------	94,196	116,112	146,684	133,981	----------	132,056	169,351	139,277	130,414	----------

TABLE 1.—*Cash receipts from farm marketings, by States, by months, 1946–50*—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

State	April					May					June				
	1946	1947	1948	1949	1950	1946	1947	1948	1949	1950	1946	1947	1948	1949	1950
Utah	6,868	8,113	9,874	9,059		7,708	7,877	10,721	8,997		9,083	9,926	12,519	10,965	
Vermont	8,616	11,180	12,269	11,325		8,701	10,200	12,156	10,677		8,487	9,643	12,238	9,495	
Virginia	16,533	21,182	22,586	24,291		18,275	22,603	28,122	25,419		24,009	25,991	33,492	28,757	
Washington	18,864	28,270	30,989	22,258		21,555	31,996	31,070	29,973		27,881	34,378	34,116	35,659	
West Virginia	4,181	6,972	7,100	6,491		4,892	7,341	7,901	6,746		8,029	8,838	10,467	8,513	
Wisconsin	64,646	80,879	93,664	73,598		75,502	88,951	99,779	83,765		77,088	90,242	116,542	86,779	
Wyoming	4,269	5,270	6,051	5,294		3,609	4,193	6,698	8,678		4,792	4,615	5,876	7,775	
United States	1,387,255	1,812,560	1,995,334	1,822,608		1,466,731	1,854,020	2,056,494	1,915,553		1,641,367	2,064,233	2,357,478	2,036,426	

State	July					August					September				
	1946	1947	1948	1949	1950	1946	1947	1948	1949	1950	1946	1947	1948	1949	1950
Alabama	14,643	16,574	17,276	16,602		14,631	17,797	23,897	16,448		34,250	45,992	52,340	33,107	
Arizona	12,977	13,774	19,711	14,351		4,776	6,408	6,671	5,906		6,459	8,757	8,419	9,669	
Arkansas	22,270	20,823	26,315	22,900		18,121	21,994	31,232	21,815		38,459	61,796	49,384	53,060	
California	226,930	204,635	206,475	170,896		222,479	214,759	208,334	177,438		238,712	208,647	203,989	168,893	
Colorado	33,470	35,983	39,667	34,551		40,000	49,006	51,932	48,063		37,692	61,134	57,732	55,606	
Connecticut	8,738	9,655	11,091	9,495		8,675	10,254	14,588	11,288		10,645	12,439	15,955	12,610	
Delaware	12,409	9,611	10,562	10,774		9,739	10,352	11,593	10,267		7,719	9,325	10,139	8,533	
Florida	13,808	12,605	17,286	12,631		15,121	18,173	15,848	20,245		12,638	12,659	14,399	14,844	
Georgia	43,739	41,295	48,487	41,119		49,992	56,885	55,623	57,180		35,586	57,301	50,193	34,655	
Idaho	17,310	18,769	22,295	15,622		32,948	35,605	32,408	31,388		40,278	51,518	42,310	42,419	
Illinois	175,865	175,091	187,789	146,187		113,158	134,581	139,371	117,052		66,136	140,833	129,097	114,531	
Indiana	107,570	100,360	101,425	80,289		82,707	88,009	90,221	77,262		53,574	100,503	99,725	87,214	
Iowa	199,017	208,022	171,510	140,342		135,396	182,854	162,359	130,917		73,431	168,915	149,119	127,374	
Kansas	155,928	219,537	154,292	137,563		97,314	130,605	100,685	112,010		55,345	112,413	78,255	74,640	
Kentucky	36,504	38,074	44,666	37,034		30,017	34,048	39,682	37,484		22,294	38,825	41,809	36,592	
Louisiana	10,644	11,990	11,449	11,572		13,173	24,379	34,630	18,509		31,327	50,705	55,438	41,246	
Maine	8,451	9,575	10,662	9,562		7,884	11,490	13,267	9,357		10,751	12,177	14,303	14,100	
Maryland	39,146	36,297	34,839	33,617		27,187	33,124	30,432	26,837		15,747	21,693	22,321	19,905	
Massachusetts	13,613	15,471	16,015	13,677		14,992	17,109	19,313	16,578		24,161	21,400	21,889	17,511	
Michigan	79,059	66,854	82,704	62,461		71,588	72,429	70,021	61,859		65,428	78,499	69,151	64,242	
Minnesota	93,542	93,664	98,448	78,593		115,571	130,975	151,513	105,243		73,245	129,955	118,476	103,943	
Mississippi	14,032	16,122	22,484	17,699		13,520	17,235	23,865	15,398		32,407	64,867	68,937	36,713	
Missouri	101,912	109,780	114,281	88,414		73,769	89,197	89,433	78,935		55,109	107,436	95,141	78,703	
Montana	18,513	18,869	20,449	14,221		39,337	39,939	37,308	22,233		44,965	66,125	53,409	37,360	
Nebraska	114,571	123,215	95,254	69,568		76,958	93,796	86,482	71,107		51,042	79,672	71,591	66,243	
Nevada	2,184	2,519	2,928	4,378		2,588	3,982	4,141	3,463		4,662	6,776	7,032	5,558	
New Hampshire	4,578	5,538	6,191	4,890		4,671	5,923	6,575	5,618		4,977	6,725	6,749	5,943	
New Jersey	32,271	36,129	44,057	33,708		50,716	45,564	46,590	42,353		28,536	36,478	33,532	28,664	
New Mexico	9,512	12,444	8,465	9,767		6,725	7,931	5,476	7,532		11,114	11,976	10,943	10,077	
New York	81,863	82,938	97,984	73,979		103,419	89,797	109,267	86,631		100,872	98,974	106,383	92,978	
North Carolina	27,545	27,226	29,057	24,238		86,844	41,082	85,152	100,499		139,313	150,804	185,539	173,454	
North Dakota	42,870	33,780	36,993	21,082		81,430	84,876	79,120	58,234		74,609	124,733	95,173	73,690	
Ohio	110,876	97,063	115,764	82,132		82,641	83,912	87,031	77,137		63,405	92,963	90,044	81,717	
Oklahoma	67,132	81,654	70,005	89,646		46,192	49,297	53,385	69,356		36,830	62,849	52,862	51,569	
Oregon	37,032	36,207	42,888	35,117		44,875	55,782	49,042	41,484		52,212	53,442	45,442	42,509	
Pennsylvania	64,662	69,181	76,225	60,996		71,081	71,257	75,467	65,313		65,296	74,985	74,076	67,884	
Rhode Island	1,692	1,783	1,974	1,674		1,957	2,051	2,292	2,128		2,278	2,535	2,652	2,437	
South Carolina	21,073	13,821	19,481	15,045		63,634	42,196	66,057	60,151		61,184	69,290	58,996	33,754	
South Dakota	51,973	59,844	50,542	36,009		56,775	76,915	72,746	46,328		44,480	82,146	75,316	51,757	
Tennessee	28,632	30,578	35,462	30,605		24,211	29,300	32,899	27,062		24,488	44,406	42,359	41,189	
Texas	139,002	165,616	114,320	140,853		120,817	163,696	192,715	200,434		132,436	235,614	218,406	224,440	
Utah	10,913	13,219	12,510	10,717		11,413	12,335	12,336	13,114		16,441	20,456	21,639	17,588	
Vermont	10,466	10,852	11,519	10,558		9,194	9,755	11,358	9,454		8,848	10,286	11,244	10,106	
Virginia	34,685	38,729	40,802	32,733		32,180	30,256	35,577	32,108		31,582	33,805	51,224	42,705	
Washington	52,644	60,577	52,624	55,701		70,185	73,938	57,552	59,050		68,789	76,451	62,245	66,217	
West Virginia	10,699	11,149	12,401	10,509		15,339	11,352	15,517	13,186		13,681	13,547	15,388	13,401	
Wisconsin	102,738	95,414	114,828	87,800		88,540	84,170	99,205	77,164		75,012	91,078	97,068	81,010	
Wyoming	7,404	7,036	6,127	5,218		7,405	9,331	13,516	12,033		18,314	29,334	33,074	29,340	
United States	2,527,107	2,619,942	2,588,579	2,167,995		2,411,885	2,626,301	2,753,724	2,410,651		2,216,159	3,153,239	2,990,907	2,601,700	

State	October					November					December				
	1946	1947	1948	1949	1950	1946	1947	1948	1949	1950	1946	1947	1948	1949	1950
Alabama	74,210	92,583	95,304	58,098		72,156	68,642	83,060	65,150		36,135	35,447	45,370	19,042	
Arizona	12,532	15,770	16,713	21,271		22,278	26,027	26,894	37,718		20,234	24,354	25,312	37,340	
Arkansas	110,291	132,876	124,488	63,656		77,022	67,960	104,912	120,679		52,492	51,501	78,328	47,234	
California	317,282	244,177	239,726	215,883		230,458	246,290	249,501	274,920		193,944	189,410	195,972	176,054	
Colorado	55,058	73,116	74,560	62,962		60,335	67,334	57,909	56,230		38,943	48,456	43,803	37,458	
Connecticut	11,371	11,892	14,944	11,476		10,995	11,932	22,242	16,149		12,106	12,566	14,295	11,615	
Delaware	6,367	8,016	8,579	7,045		6,670	7,475	7,571	7,074		6,428	7,202	6,932	5,187	
Florida	31,482	25,347	25,634	32,492		38,289	27,523	28,927	34,643		33,099	30,620	33,745	40,491	
Georgia	76,994	93,106	97,422	70,939		57,911	71,558	78,368	60,487		30,582	48,865	43,086	28,433	
Idaho	34,456	45,225	36,002	39,790		51,410	52,179	59,545	44,369		30,606	39,825	34,038	25,477	
Illinois	236,085	235,260	219,477	242,621		183,375	174,799	165,394	156,800		156,754	189,300	157,950	129,514	
Indiana	118,360	135,433	126,925	113,275		102,409	101,657	92,813	79,279		81,900	101,616	87,144	71,980	
Iowa	197,604	205,085	188,696	209,205		227,229	251,231	224,797	171,975		207,322	262,436	224,143	185,328	
Kansas	87,693	109,585	160,446	71,769		83,330	86,798	84,708	66,052		83,755	83,266	83,468	66,920	
Kentucky	39,222	47,184	42,874	34,460		28,946	39,677	51,458	46,933		80,646	131,908	132,744	105,501	
Louisiana	41,327	59,094	60,787	42,105		41,852	51,117	51,208	53,005		40,462	42,293	44,372	44,766	
Maine	15,722	16,554	22,529	13,986		13,634	16,799	23,403	17,108		16,624	17,371	22,444	13,646	
Maryland	17,278	18,563	19,634	17,330		15,908	16,739	17,973	16,691		14,931	15,025	16,103	13,657	
Massachusetts	24,993	20,237	20,416	18,631		18,480	18,707	21,572	19,888		13,548	17,290	18,090	15,673	
Michigan	82,329	75,647	76,432	73,776		69,396	67,451	61,754	63,350		56,462	59,886	54,047	54,350	
Minnesota	119,282	148,306	131,704	115,652		122,666	124,180	113,913	101,241		110,144	130,088	103,893	90,206	
Mississippi	70,251	115,231	110,099	52,451		41,866	77,631	96,292	105,516		32,679	52,636	76,900	32,170	
Missouri	143,207	137,741	134,929	103,312		113,388	111,899	117,354	108,162		99,698	104,803	109,699	80,363	
Montana	50,810	64,204	84,048	47,360		46,514	42,647	53,139	33,960		28,193	28,277	33,418	22,441	
Nebraska	84,323	83,319	104,593	86,716		78,771	83,011	84,240	69,854		86,508	94,167	89,411	77,383	
Nevada	6,323	5,917	7,638	6,110		4,750	4,551	5,290	4,560		3,148	3,451	4,341	3,421	

TABLE 1.—*Cash receipts from farm marketings, by States, by months, 1946–50*—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

State	October					November					December				
	1946	1947	1948	1949	1950	1946	1947	1948	1949	1950	1946	1947	1948	1949	1950
New Hampshire	5,734	6,328	6,536	5,874	----------	4,891	5,604	5,669	5,204	----------	4,832	5,606	5,498	4,664	----------
New Jersey	28,933	26,374	27,798	24,633	----------	19,936	19,871	22,100	20,021	----------	16,892	18,272	19,371	17,324	----------
New Mexico	34,397	43,091	50,151	42,842	----------	30,306	28,913	39,530	38,138	----------	10,834	13,785	16,437	18,321	----------
New York	87,517	91,936	89,540	78,989	----------	70,652	82,348	79,003	72,665	----------	66,033	73,763	67,928	60,629	----------
North Carolina	194,482	184,360	177,258	138,162	----------	122,290	120,083	96,160	70,345	----------	40,767	58,301	51,868	36,309	----------
North Dakota	66,983	107,923	106,926	59,709	----------	55,925	66,598	61,548	38,020	----------	39,174	46,508	38,581	23,210	----------
Ohio	110,750	111,200	115,800	105,062	----------	104,111	97,500	96,898	86,324	----------	79,082	91,666	83,814	71,642	----------
Oklahoma	64,878	79,227	118,583	63,970	----------	55,248	64,391	69,804	71,632	----------	43,007	46,053	46,425	48,456	----------
Oregon	47,409	44,597	54,532	37,197	----------	40,654	42,667	41,666	35,059	----------	36,196	31,842	32,663	25,730	----------
Pennsylvania	64,247	69,494	69,874	64,821	----------	60,378	66,741	62,988	57,115	----------	58,476	64,320	64,400	55,401	----------
Rhode Island	2,150	2,284	2,433	2,190	----------	2,026	2,101	2,129	1,930	----------	2,075	2,075	2,054	1,881	----------
South Carolina	51,684	53,690	53,553	34,570	----------	25,459	33,460	39,049	25,764	----------	16,717	20,097	24,626	12,230	----------
South Dakota	55,279	63,205	68,392	65,041	----------	51,699	52,615	50,863	40,712	----------	48,029	60,470	49,407	37,420	----------
Tennessee	63,076	63,640	71,566	45,632	----------	48,511	50,457	59,139	57,029	----------	50,275	64,469	65,321	46,494	----------
Texas	177,581	281,271	276,482	266,739	----------	168,270	246,402	244,074	360,847	----------	121,981	178,920	135,732	245,612	----------
Utah	17,668	17,809	16,912	13,323	----------	18,659	21,215	17,887	15,514	----------	13,145	16,253	14,300	11,754	----------
Vermont	9,455	10,141	10,785	9,454	----------	7,888	8,652	9,621	8,163	----------	7,970	8,202	9,073	7,700	----------
Virginia	60,833	55,192	61,163	52,246	----------	57,252	54,417	55,098	51,931	----------	33,730	45,245	40,574	36,221	----------
Washington	74,809	73,513	101,385	52,682	----------	51,453	50,422	53,424	40,965	----------	44,552	39,421	47,719	33,401	----------
West Virginia	17,634	13,445	14,817	13,134	----------	10,361	11,835	13,214	11,572	----------	9,251	10,900	10,425	9,606	----------
Wisconsin	92,784	97,832	97,078	83,961	----------	96,231	92,540	88,499	77,693	----------	83,013	92,403	78,280	68,222	----------
Wyoming	36,252	39,158	34,985	34,197	----------	22,332	20,397	22,845	19,829	----------	8,268	11,630	10,977	8,762	----------
United States	3,429,487	3,754,978	3,871,148	3,126,799	----------	2,923,970	3,155,043	3,215,445	3,038,265	----------	2,402,342	2,822,260	2,695,126	2,316,639	----------

Source: Farm Income Situations.

TABLE 2.—*Government payments, by States, annually, 1946–49*

[In thousands of dollars]

State	1946 [1]	1947 [2]	1948 [3]	1949 [3]
Alabama	6,843	4,673	4,150	5,482
Arizona	3,153	2,165	1,792	745
Arkansas	6,756	6,788	5,044	4,043
California	45,729	13,004	13,611	9,220
Colorado	17,042	11,321	9,456	3,472
Connecticut	3,977	650	531	393
Delaware	1,345	593	517	246
Florida	5,484	4,284	3,428	2,180
Georgia	7,412	8,542	6,395	5,903
Idaho	10,239	6,069	6,941	5,059
Illinois	35,183	11,151	10,402	5,904
Indiana	21,784	8,324	6,034	3,869
Iowa	44,948	12,124	10,748	5,301
Kansas	20,220	11,737	7,365	6,079
Kentucky	15,577	11,688	8,608	5,024
Louisiana	11,795	9,079	8,558	9,093
Maine	3,208	1,203	1,206	744
Maryland	6,163	2,743	1,660	1,688
Massachusetts	4,805	869	979	470
Michigan	29,034	10,288	8,460	4,195
Minnesota	51,894	8,888	9,879	5,781
Mississippi	9,935	6,827	5,684	4,766
Missouri	25,021	12,286	6,398	5,493
Montana	11,889	7,023	6,538	3,379
Nebraska	23,639	13,568	8,505	6,841
Nevada	793	404	429	129
New Hampshire	1,763	528	495	399
New Jersey	6,540	1,386	993	629
New Mexico	3,913	3,689	2,552	1,064
New York	42,686	7,918	5,159	4,475
North Carolina	9,677	8,056	7,905	7,557
North Dakota	20,426	6,814	6,984	3,547
Ohio	27,011	9,952	8,110	4,557
Oklahoma	16,873	8,467	5,676	6,654
Oregon	8,766	4,016	4,196	2,450
Pennsylvania	27,363	6,723	5,318	4,828
Rhode Island	791	128	92	65
South Carolina	3,704	3,403	3,260	2,634
South Dakota	15,074	5,996	4,419	4,241
Tennessee	13,416	6,907	5,613	5,160
Texas	38,502	23,914	16,438	14,739
Utah	5,872	3,123	3,077	1,881
Vermont	7,528	1,071	1,535	1,112
Virginia	9,721	5,719	4,040	3,517
Washington	11,794	3,803	3,998	2,210
West Virginia	4,090	2,885	1,946	1,918
Wisconsin	67,684	9,402	8,275	4,260
Wyoming	4,618	3,622	3,106	2,057
United States	771,680	313,813	256,505	185,453

[1] Payments under dairy, sheep and lambs, and beef production, agricultural conservation, Sugar Act, and price-parity programs.

[2] Payments under agricultural conservation, Sugar Act, and price-parity programs.

[3] Payments under agricultural conservation and Sugar Act programs.

Source: Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

In 1946, for the United States, the $771,680,000 in subsidies was only 3.01 percent of the $25,635,645,000 total income from farm sales and subsidies combined.

In 1947 the income from farm sales was $30,013,938,000, and the subsidies were $313,813,000, which was only 1.03 percent of the total farm income from sales and subsidies.

In 1948 the subsidy was 0.83 percent of the total farm-income sales and subsidies.

In 1949 the subsidy was 0.67 percent of the total farm-income sales and subsidies.

The price at the market place is the real problem. The subsidy is very, very small in comparison to the price in the market place.

In the meantime we should keep in mind that certain individuals and groups that pretend to show such deep love and affection for farmers in general and dairy farmers in particular are the same ones that promoted the onslaught on the dairy business by their support of the oleo bill. Their new-found interest is most evident but far from convincing.

A Senator's Vote: A Searching of the Soul

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 1 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article which appeared in the magazine section of the New York Times of April 30, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed as follows:

A SENATOR'S VOTE: A SEARCHING OF THE SOUL—PRINCIPLES AND PRACTICAL POLITICS COMBINE TO MAKE DECISIONS DIFFICULT YET CONSISTENT

(By PAUL H. DOUGLAS)

WASHINGTON.—There were 226 roll-call votes in the Senate last year. As the clerk called our names, those of us on the Senate floor had to answer either "aye" or "no." Many times we wished an issue had never arisen. Many times the issue itself was not clear. Many times we felt that the truest answer was neither "aye" nor "no" but "maybe." Still, we could not stall by repeating the truth that there was much to be said on both sides. In the Senate, when our names are called, the time for objectivity ends. We must answer with a categorical "aye" or "no."

What lies behind the words that are spoken? What leads one Senator to vote "aye" and another "no?" This question is not only of absorbing interest to a gallery that includes all of America. Men on the Senate floor also ask the same question. "How," we ask, "did we get that way and how did the fellow next to us or on the other side of the room reach the same or an opposite conclusion?"

The "realists," as always, have a simple answer. They explain that a Senator either votes according to the weight of his mail or by a rule-of-thumb estimate of how political forces are balanced in the home State. The more cynical among the realists add that a Senator votes the way some political boss, some utility or banking magnate, or some labor leader wants him to vote. In this view, a Senator is a moral puppet who responds more or less automatically to external pressures exerted on him by organized groups in the community at large.

Now, there may be Senators who cast votes in this manner. But if there are such, I do not know them. All Senators, of course, are sensitive to the climate of opinion. They must be. How else could representative government function? All Senators, too, read their mail. They are quick to spot and give special weight to unprompted, open-hearted letters, whether they are scratched on rough paper or written on embossed stationery. They all make tabulations on how the spontaneous mail runs when a controversial issue is approaching a vote.

But experience has taught them that the volume of mail is no true index to public opinion; that the most articulate are often those who have a concentrated special interest; that the great mass of the public, with its diffuse general interest, would, if pressed, frequently state views contrary to those voiced by the disciplined letter writers.

In itself, of course, there is nothing virtuous or evil about disciplined letter writing. Saints and sinners alike have used the device for ends both good and bad. Anyone has a right to use this device to influence public policy. Moreover, there is no difference be-

tween a thousand identical letters or postcards sent in by individual members of an organization, of a thousand signatures on a document sent in by the secretary of the organization. Both are aspects of the right of petition.

But the question here is how the best soundings of public opinion can be made by a Senator. In a great State every group interest divides itself into an infinite number of conflicting internal parts, so much so that the differences within groups are often greater than the differences between them. To whom, then, should a Senator listen? I believe his most accurate sounding of public opinion comes about in an almost subjective way.

The Senator, returning to his home State, throws himself open to a tidal wave of voices, of heavings and pullings this and that way. Gradually, and almost unobtrusively, the clamor of many voices somehow yields a consensus that is clearly identifiable to him. Whether he agrees with that consensus or whether he tries to change it is another matter. Bill Herndon used to explain this to Abraham Lincoln by saying that "he felt things in his bones." And Lincoln, in reply, would comically refer to this as "Herndon's bone philosophy." Yet Herndon was closer to the truth than Lincoln suspected.

Some Senators, overburdened with the routine of office work, are often unable, or forget, to return to their point of origin. Others who make these returns for political soundings expose themselves to the charge that they are neglecting their duties in Washington. But the quality of their decisions inevitably becomes better or worse according to the degree to which they can immerse themselves in the bath of genuine public opinion. Apart from these immersions, a Senator has certain selected points of contact which enter into the complex of forces that shape his vote.

There are people in America of experience, objectivity, a devotion to the common good, and a unique skill in making prudent decisions regarding public matters. No one elected them to their posts of opinion makers. They are that by the sheer force of their arguments. Most generally they are content to express their viewpoint to a Senator over the telephone or by a brief call at his office. But whether they do it this way, or invite the Nation to eavesdrop, they command enormous attention. These devoted servants of the common good may not make up a Senator's mind on how he should vote. But what these men and women say must be answered by a Senator before he casts his vote.

In this connection it is America's good fortune that there are several of these aristocratic Democrats who are Members of the present Senate. One, whom we all deeply respect, is the man whose name is called first at voting time. He is Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, Republican of Vermont, who can neither be bought nor bluffed, fooled nor frightened. I openly confess that there have been times in the Senate when my mind has been in great doubt right up to the voting time.

And then Senator AIKEN's name would be called. And I, for one, have often been influenced by the character of his sturdy response to the Clerk. Like the rest of us, he may err on an issue of fact. But, like his Democratic counterpart, Senator FRANK P. GRAHAM, of North Carolina, he has never, to my knowledge, erred on a moral principle.

Is there any thread that runs through a series of separate votes cast by a Senator? At first glance the answer seems to be a negative one. Yet the appearance of pure pragmatism in Senate voting is highly deceptive. For all the wide range of matters on which they cast their votes, in one way or another, all Senators have repeatedly asked and answered the basic questions in politics.

What, for instance, should be the relationship between the one and the many? What should be the relationship between the leaders and the people? What should be left to the operation of custom and what should be made the subject of law? Which body of practices should be institutionalized and which ones should be left in a free-floating state? At what point must the system of rights be made to intersect with the system of duties? What is the area in which the right of dissent can operate without subverting the will of the majority? These are timeless questions, asked everywhere. In each vote on a particular measure the Senators also vote on a general principle. Indeed, it is the operation of the general principle on their thoughts which gives a discernible inner unity to most of their decisions.

At the same time, while the general principle can be stated and examined objectively, its application to a particular case is often undertaken in a mood of emotional stress. A politician, no less than a surgeon, is commonly reluctant to describe these inner stresses. It is not because his motives are base, or because an open statement of his own struggle would disturb the patient with whose life he is entrusted. It is due more to the reluctance of Americans in all walks of life to expose their inner thoughts and deepest values.

But it so happens that I have been a Quaker of sorts for many years and have painfully acquired the habit of open confession. If I reveal the factors which lay behind my own votes on several matters of current interest, perhaps I can speak for a number of my more reticent colleagues in the Senate.

The first difficult decision I faced was on the problem of Federal aid to education. I believed in the principle of Federal aid because the average income per school child in most of the Southern States is only about one-half the national average and only a third of that in the most prosperous States. The result is that though the South taxes itself for education at a level above the national average, the yield does not produce enough money for decent schooling, whether the children are white or Negro, since its taxable resources are low. Federal aid, representing a levy on the taxable resources of the Nation as a whole, is needed if the average southern child is to have a decent chance in life.

But I soon found that the real conflict was not so much on the program of Federal aid itself as on the relation of the private and parochial schools to it. Some people wanted to specify that Federal money could not be used in any way for private schools. Catholic groups, on the contrary, felt that such moneys should be provided to the private schools, not for religious instruction, but for collateral services such as health, transportation and nonreligious books, and that if State laws prohibited this, then the Federal Government should withhold the proportionate funds earmarked for such States and should, on its own, distribute money directly to the private schools.

These two views appeared irreconcilable, though the sincerity of their respective proponents could not be questioned. But if either view became public policy, the effect would be to engender a bitter and divisive religious controversy. I was deeply disturbed by such a prospect and hoped a way could be found which would heal an imminent breach. One avenue of approach suggested itself.

Whether children are in public or private schools, and whether they are Protestant, Catholic, or Jewish, children present a uniform health problem, and what is done to improve their health has a beneficial effect upon the community as a whole. In consequence, it appeared to me that a distinction could be drawn between health services on the one hand and transportation and books on the other; that Federal aid for these health services should be furnished to all children, whether they were in private or public schools. Under this view, the schoolhouse at certain hours in the term would have the status of a convenient neighborhood dispensary.

I helped, therefore, to prepare a bill appropriating $35,000,000 for health services to children in all schools, which, when enlarged by local funds, would make available a minimum yearly average of $2.40 for each child. I should note that the measure, although a supplement to the Federal aid bill then under discussion, was kept apart from it so that a vote for the supplemental bill could proceed on its merits alone.

Having gained the approval of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare for this measure, I thought with its members that the question of using Federal funds for transportation of private school students could best be left to the decision of the people in the various States and localities. By localizing decisions on the transportation features of the education bill, I hoped that the Nation as a whole could be spared a religious controversy.

The Thomas Federal aid to education bill, as reported out to the Senate, embraced this principle. It gained the overwhelming approval of the Senate which, by a roll-call vote of 63 to 3, defeated an amendment which would have confined all Federal funds to the public schools. At the other pole, the Senate, by a voice vote, defeated an amendment requiring that these funds must be furnished for auxiliary services to all private schools.

But, as is now known, the House rejected the formula proposed to it by the Senate. It sends the school-health bill to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, while the education bill was sent to the Committee on Labor, where it was referred to a Subcommittee on Education headed by Congressman BARDEN, of North Carolina. In due course, Congressman BARDEN offered a bill which explicitly denied Federal aid to any private school.

The ensuing bitter discussion has thus far prevented agreement over a formula which would permit this much-needed legislation to pass. I still feel confident, however, that the Senate has pointed the way to gain what is needed.

A similar problem came up in connection with the public housing and slum clearance bill. As matters developed on the Senate floor, those of us who were devoted both to the principle of low-cost housing and slum clearance and to the principle of civil rights, were jockeyed into a heart-rending position. My friends, Senators MAYBANK, of South Carolina, and SPARKMAN of Alabama, had introduced a measure providing $1,000,000,000 over 5 years to help clear slums. It also guaranteed the interest on local-housing bonds sufficient to construct 810,000 housing units, to the immeasurable benefit of at least 3,500,000 persons, or about one-quarter of our slum-dwelling population. I was privileged to work with these men in helping to draft the measure, and in the process I came to wish that more of my northern friends could appreciate the public spirit and devotion of these sons of the South.

Then came a body blow which was all the more telling because it was in the form of an amendment which dealt with a problem of elemental importance to all Americans. Senator BRICKER of Ohio proposed an amendment to the housing bill providing that all public-housing projects in every city must be thrown open to Negroes and whites. Every liberal-minded Senator wanted to vote for that amendment. But the problem of choice took on a different shape when the amendment was placed in its legislative setting.

To begin with, Senator BRICKER was the spokesman for some 25 Republican Senators who were openly opposed to public housing. Secondly, these same men had shown little interest in an earlier effort to liberalize Senate rules so that civil-rights legislation could be passed. On the contrary, most of them had joined the forces which made those rules all the more restrictive.

What then was the purpose of their civil-rights amendment? The answer was perfectly clear. It was to get northern and western Senators, like myself, who were for housing but against segregation, to join him in support of the Bricker amendment. But what would happen next? The passage of the amendment would then influence some 20 southern and border-State Senators who were for public housing to abandon that support because of the Bricker "civil-rights" amendment. Once the housing measure as a whole came up for a vote, they would vote against it, which is what this group had wanted all along. We would then wind up with no slum clearance and no low-income homes. No one on the Senate floor was really deceived by the move.

I chose housing, as did virtually every Senator who was also a vocal supporter of civil rights. We voted for housing and against the Bricker amendment, knowing all the while that we exposed ourselves to sharp attack from fellow supporters of civil rights elsewhere who were not familiar with the legislative picture. I felt it to be of the utmost importance that the character of the choice before the Senate should be explained to the country as a whole. Nearly all my political friends urged me not to do this, saying that the subject was so delicate and so highly charged with emotion that anything anyone said would be misunderstood and attacked.

Still, I felt confident that discussion would clear the air. I pointed out that on the basis of past experience Negroes would probably occupy one-third of the units built and that, therefore, about 270,000 families, or over a million and a quarter members of that race, would be provided with decent housing. I furthermore pointed out that most of the public housing projects in the North and West would explicitly bar segregation by local ordinance and that the civil rights principle would be extended rather than curbed.

If, on the contrary, the Bricker amendment was passed, we would have a vacuous assertion of civil rights but no homes in which they could be asserted. Virtually all Northern and Western liberals reechoed this same view and the housing bill was passed without the Bricker amendment. We all felt that we had the right to choose the ground on which we could fight for civil rights as a measure in itself.

I might mention one more inner struggle between my heart and my head, between my sympathies and my reason, which gave me a few bad days. The first appropriation bill to come up last year was that for the Department of Labor and Federal Security. I was more interested in these agencies than probably any others because I had campaigned for the causes they represented in their formative days over 2 decades ago. I had actively fought for old-age pensions and unemployment insurance and had played a modest part in getting them adopted into Federal and State laws. Moreover, as an early advocate of public employment offices, and as one who has constantly used price and wage statistics of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, I knew the importance of these two branches of Government work. I wanted all of these agencies to be adequately financed so that they could do effective work.

But I also knew most Government agencies were overstaffed, and from personal experience with the labor agencies I was quite certain that they were not immune from this occupational disease of officialdom. I felt the staffs of these agencies could be pruned with profit and that this was especially necessary in view of the big impending Government deficit.

The Republican leadership was proposing a 5-percent cut in the administrative expenses of these agencies. As the hour for voting approached, I was torn emotionally by a strong conflict. My inner conflict was made even more intense because I knew that many conservatives wanted to cut the welfare agencies to the bone while at the same time they would later defend wasteful subsidies granted those economic groups that didn't need them. "Why," I asked myself, "should I play into their hands?"

During the last hour of the debate, I left the Chamber and sought the quiet of the Senate reading room. As I sat there alone, it became clear that even though it meant disappointing my friends and my party, I must at all costs vote my convictions. If I were to urge prudence in the way the taxpayers' money was spent, I must apply economy even to those agencies and causes in which I was deeply concerned.

As I debated the issue with myself, I resolved it in the conviction that in time fair-minded people would see that economy was also a virtue and that to be a liberal one did not have to be wastrel. I thereafter went back into the Senate and voted for the cut. The incident was crucial. It forced me thereafter to relate a zeal for prudent expenditure with a desire for human welfare. Having tried to apply the pruning knife on causes which were close to my heart, I was free to seek economies elsewhere with good grace.

Yet all the foregoing does not really explain how and why a Senator casts his vote this way instead of that. When the committee hearings and the important books and articles on a proposal are read; when the mail has been apprised; when the briefs and arguments have been weighed; when the wise men, living and dead, have been consulted, the Senator still faces the task of moving his own lips to say yes or no. On the clerk's list, his name stands out in all its solitude. And that is the way he must vote.

It is also, I believe, the primary way in which he decides beforehand how he is going to vote. His hour of decision is not seen by the outer world. It can come in the dead of night, in periods of reverie in one's office after the day's work is done, over the breakfast or dinner table with one's family, or in a taxicab ride to or from the Capitol. It is at these times, I believe, that the final decisions which affect the life of the Nation are generally made. The tension of the roll call merely expresses the decisions which 96 widely differing men, with different background, have already made in the quiet of their individual consciences.

The Private-Enterprise System and the Church

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 1 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the Reverend Daniel A. Poling, editor of the Christian Herald, and national president of the All-American Conference To Combat Communism. The address was delivered before the Conference of Business Public Relations Executives, in the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, in New York City. I think the Members of the Senate will find the address exceedingly interesting because it points out the relationship between Christianity and the private-enterprise system.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PRIVATE-ENTERPRISE SYSTEM AND THE CHURCH

(Address delivered by Daniel A. Poling before the conference of business public relations executives, Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York City)

In a letter received some time ago from a distinguished member of this conference appears the following paragraph: "Frankly it is my impression that industry, generally speaking, has done a poor job in developing satisfactory communication with the clergy. Perhaps it is more accurate to say that industry has practically neglected this duty. At any rate there is surely a dire need for a better understanding between the two."

Reverse the order and make the paragraph read: "The clergy, generally speaking, has done a poor job of developing satisfactory communication with industry," and you have an equally significant and, I believe, equally true statement. In each instance the paragraph, though properly modest and forthright, is, I think, perhaps an overstatement, but an overstatement that points up the "dire need for a better understanding."

First, then, let us agree, and certainly we do agree, that what we variously call free initiative, individualism, capitalism, the dignity of personality, or the American way of life is that which makes America tick. It is the reason for our continuing existence, And above all others it is the reason for our uniqueness and power. In it lies the world's best, and I think last hope of escape from regimentation and the final totalitarianism. The survival of this freedom, the survival of America stands not upon the past but upon the present, not upon the founding fathers, but upon you, upon you and upon me. Freedom is both an inheritance and an achievement. If it is to continue, if it is to defeat communism, it must be rewon in each succeeding generation. It must be rewon in this generation and it must be reborn in me.

You are public-relations directors, and I with my clerical associates have a place in the broad field of public relations. Gentlemen, right here is the first and supreme selling job of our time. With a certain diffidence in your presence, but with a deep conviction I submit to you that the American way of life must be sold by and to the individual and not by group pressure or mass propaganda.

I may be mixing my figures, but what began with a single-shot musket will not be perpetuated by broadsides from battlewagons. Individualism just can't be sold in bulk. It's against nature. Whatever the media used, and all media should be used, individualism must be made attractive to, it must be sold to, the individual.

At the beginning, before George Washington and progressively afterward the American way of life was a complete and natural liaison of the religious and economic concept of individual dignity and personal liberty with individual responsibility. The home, the church, the school, and industry were at one. Certainly they were never antagonistic.

Rather they were like four peas in the pod of freedom.

Is it not true that in the first half of the twentieth century and specifically since World War I the above concept has been forgotten if not denied? Consider the church. I believe that Christianity is and should be first personal and social always. I also believe that this order and emphasis are vital. Personal first. Reduced to its pure essence, Christianity is Christ, and Jesus preached to, dealt with, and saved individuals. To Him human personality was the principal thing—a little child was to the Nazarene more important than a city. He did not attack governments nor institutions as such. Rather He dealt with the man in authority, the man himself. Certainly, He influenced society and His teachings turned the world upside down. But His formula was, "Change the man, and the changed man will change the world."

Today, however, the Christian church releases social charters and promotes plans for world peace, delivers philippics against private property and has intimated that capitalism and communism are equally responsible for what is wrong with the social order. As churchmen we are eager to offer advice and final judgments in fields where we reveal ourselves as definitely less than mature specialists. I am not suggesting that these are matters beyond either the knowledge or responsibility of the clergyman. I do insist that they are not his first and principal task. As God's man and Christ's successor, these are not the unique reasons for the clergyman's high calling. Jesus said, "I am the good shepherd." Also He said, "I am come to seek and to save the lost" or "the confused," and "I am come that they might have life and they might have it abundantly." Humbly I affirm that my supreme business as a clergyman is just that.

We have all been captured by the fetish of intellectual, social, and spiritual as well as industrial mass production. Mass production which makes automobiles cheaper and refrigerators available to more people at a lower cost may also cheapen thought. Cheap thinking obscures basic principles, clouds the clear vision of the American way of life, obscures American unity and leads us into the darkness of misunderstanding between races, faiths, and economic groups.

How then can the original concept of American freedom, the rights and responsibilities of the individual whatever his creed, clan, or economic status be regained? By turning again to the way we came in. Not by going back, certainly not. But by resolutely going forward. The way is still here, and thank God the door is still wide open.

Men do not work for systems and for ideologies. They work for themselves or for and with other men, men like themselves. Companies that emphasize stock buying and holding by employees strengthen the American way. A partnership on whatever scale is within the divine principle of sharing.

On my very recent trip to Israel I found the amazing labor movement there encouraging its members to become capitalists. The union itself is literally a capitalistic organization. Starting from scratch as it did, it could become just this. Now it is also the principal agency and influence in developing industries with private capital.

Let me return to mass methods in selling individualism. No leaflet, no full-page advertisement will ever take the place of the "top" saying, "You did a swell job yesterday, Harry, how's the missus?"

J. C. Penney is known as "the man with a thousand partners." Twenty thousand is more nearly correct. There are many facets to the clear diamond of his success. But this shines brightest: His personal relations with personalities. This has been so intimately part of the man that always when one of his associates failed, Mr. Penney regarded the failure as his own and tried to do something about it.

Here again enters the church. Men are still won as individuals, even as in Christ's time, not in a "Bankers for Christ Week" or in a "Workers for Christ Month."

Understanding and good will cannot be standardized. Always it is a two-way street. The clergyman and the businessman have a common stake in American freedom. Indeed the individual citizen has with every other citizen this same stake. The first word in our national name is united. And when our unity is shattered or weakened by any one of us or by any group among us, the foundations of liberty are to some degree at least undermined.

Too frequently the preacher removes himself from the everyday interests and practical problems of the layman, and nearly as often the layman assumes that the preacher would not or could not be interested in the problems of the pew. Responsibility for misunderstanding or a lack of understanding may be just about equally distributed, but as a preacher I charge myself and those of my calling with dereliction because we have not moved in to remove the barrier and solve the problem.

Too often we have accepted the financial support of men whom personally we respect and admire but whom as a class we criticize without knowledge. We owe it to ourselves to become acquainted with their industrial activities and economic standards, and I venture the suggestion that industrialists owe it to themselves to make an open door for us to industry. Generally the preacher has at least a background of practical experience with hard work, a fair measure of fundamental intelligence, and a spirit that responds to a friendly invitation.

In my own thinking, in my own decisions, in my own attitudes I have been influenced chiefly not by full-page advertisements nor by articles released from upper Broadway and Wall Street offices, but by you. And right here I should stop to call part of the long roll: Charlie Wilson, K. T. Keller, Robert Peare, James Kraft, J. Warren Kinsman, Paul Garrett, Franklin Bell, Ward Wheelock, Jack Duff, Jim Jarvey, Marvin Pierce, Albert Diebold, and Harvey Firestone. These men and so many others are the real reasons why I believe in business. I believe in their principles, their wisdom, their patriotism. I have witnessed their unselfish sacrifice in the service of our country. I have been associated with them in the activities of the church, and upon their character American enterprise stands firmly.

The journal of which I am editor affirms this broad principle and practices it. Our life stories of great Americans continue to be one of the most popular features of our editorial content. Names I have mentioned are among those that have stood at the head of our columns. Also the great Christian labor leader, John Ramsey. And Mr. J. C. Penney's Lines of a Layman is one of our most popular regular features.

It is the intimate and personally acquired "know-how" that counts. Years ago in one of my earliest pastorates in Canton, Ohio, I had as president of my board of trustees the president of the Imperial Plow Co., Frank Neise. He just assumed that I would not be interested in Imperial plows until one day I told him that I had walked between the handles of an Imperial plow down a long Oregon furrow. I said that I would like to see how the old plow was made. Eventually I knew as much about the Imperial plow as the president of the company knew.

In those days Saturday was a full work day, and some of you may be old enough to remember the week hours. With the pastor of the First Baptist Church I organized a Saturday afternoon church baseball league. It was the second organization of its kind in the United States. When I went to the president of the Imperial Plow Co. to suggest a half-day holiday on Saturday, I had a running start on his attention and support. He threw around a lot of weight in Canton, Ohio. To make a long story short, Saturday afternoon became a holiday for Canton industry, and industrialists came with the other workers to see the games.

We are not finally impressed by academic thinking. We judge by results. We judge Christianity by the people who represent it, good or bad. We judge business by the men of business. I hope that you men will make a serious effort to personally interest your clergy in what you are doing and trying to do. Also what I say to you here I have said and I shall continue to say to my clerical associates. I do not believe that there will be a single occasion in which either you or I will be rebuffed. We need to know what manner of men we are, what our problems are, what our ideals are. We need to know each the other man's reason, his viewpoint, his ideals.

For years, or from the time I was 10, Will Rogers was my intimate friend. I met him under unusual circumstances when he was doing rope tricks with a dog and pony show and after I had distributed handbills announcing the show. Years later during the period of his appearance on Broadway when he took the place of his friend, Fred Stone, after Fred had cracked up in an airplane accident, we had time together. I was pastor of a Fifth Avenue church then and spent a good many matinee afternoons in Will's dressing room while he made up. One afternoon we discussed a mutual friend who was then in public life and under severe criticism. Will sat on the bench in front of the glass with a towel under his chin. Suddenly he got up, threw down the towel, stepped over behind me, placed his hands on my shoulders and looking over the top of my head to the spot where he had been sitting, said, "Dan, you can't tell what a man sees when you are looking at him. You have to get behind him to see what he is looking at." Right there Will made vocal my philosophy for public relations, my philosophy for relationships between the clergy and industry, my philosophy for my relations with you and indeed with all other Americans. I never see life whole until I see it through the eyes of the other fellow and certainly as a churchman and clergyman I never know American business and I never know you until I see your problems, your hopes, your failures, your triumphs, yes, and until I see America through your eyes as well as through my own.

Also I am still won as my heart is captured. The grip of a strong hand always holds me. Don't send your preacher a booklet. Go to see him. Hand him the booklet when you say good-bye. And I shall try to practice what I preach. I'll not send you a sermon.

Misunderstanding fills the vacuum created by a lack of understanding. Understanding in the area under discussion is equally my responsibility and yours, and misunderstanding comes as I live and work with you and as you live and work with me.

Just 10 years ago a young man having finished his divinity course at Yale became the pastor of a church in Schenectady, N. Y. Conditions were in such shape that there was only one direction in which that church could go. The young domine started at the bottom. The war came along and put him into a chaplain's uniform so that he had less than 3 years in which to complete his mission. But in these 3 years he demonstrated what I have been talking about. One evening he called a group of his men together. They

represented all levels of business activity—banking, the shop, and of course living in Schenectady, General Electric. He sold them the idea that they could and should sell the church. When they became panicky and suggested that this was definitely not their line, he grinned and answered, "But you sell, don't you? You belong to the church? Your wives and children belong to the church?" He made clear to them that all he wanted was their selling ability.

He had a plan. The men discussed it with him. He told them just about how many men there were in that city who were not in the church and whose families were not in any church. They spent a week end together in a hotel with an expert in the field of human relations. They organized an intensive and down-to-the-grass-roots, man-with-man "talk-it-over." Certainly they didn't carry Bibles and read passages. They did now for the church what they did for themselves and for their various enterprises. They added to these enterprises the church and included in their over-all personnel, the preacher. Before the domine went off to war the large, near-empty sanctuary and its Sunday school rooms were pretty well filled. And though he never lived to see what men see now, the thing he started, the understanding he helped achieve, the unity in common effort he made dynamic, today demonstrates in Schenectady everything I would say.

Finally, this unity demonstrates America's first imperative in a time when the world rocks. The command to American unity is the first command. And without unity—not uniformity—the unity of all faiths, colors, races, and economic groups, America can only become a lost cause.

My theme today is vastly more than relationships between the clergy and business. Inclusive of that it also comprehends the greater things. What we do here and now to achieve understanding, cooperation, and good will, helps make America strong.

Excerpts From Address by Hon. Hubert H. Humphrey, of Minnesota, at Annual Convention of International Ladies' Garment Workers Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 1 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, our able and distinguished colleague the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], on May 25 was the featured speaker at one of the sessions of the annual convention of the International Ladies' Garment Workers Union, at Atlantic City, N. J. I ask unanimous consent of the Senate to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from this address.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We have a great responsibility this year. The future of our domestic economy hangs in the balance as we face increasing unemployment over all the United States. At the same time on the international scene millions of people all over the world wait to see whether international conflict can be avoided and whether they can feel free and secure to live their lives without war and without destruction.

To a large extent what you and I do as American citizens will determine the answers to these questions. To a very significant extent what you as members of the organized labor movement do will answer these questions for ourselves, for our children, and for the people of the world.

This is true because we live in a political democracy. We live in a country where the people have the responsibility to make the decisions. We live in a country, also, where increasingly the people are affected by political decisions.

There was a time not so long ago when it was possible for most Americans to live their lives and except for occasionally paying some taxes—and not too much of that—they had very little to do with the Government in Washington. Today, however, the situation is quite different.

I need not tell you that labor's rights are no longer secure merely through the process of collective bargaining with employers. Today the rules of collective bargaining and the rights and privileges of organized labor are the object of political determination.

Politics, effective political participation, must go hand in hand with the growth and the development and the maintenance of a strong labor movement in America.

We seldom ask one another any longer "Are you interested in politics?" The simple fact is that if we do not take an interest in politics we might as well make up our minds that our freedom and our very being becomes endangered.

The Taft-Hartley experience in one major respect has taught us a very important lesson. You and I know that the free labor movement can never achieve its objectives when the rules of collective bargaining are stacked against it and when the umpire and the referee operate one-sided rules and regulations.

The Taft-Hartley Act has destroyed the neutrality of Government in labor-management relationship. The Taft-Hartley Act says to every American worker that no matter how you may fight, no matter how just is your cause, the orders are stacked against you and you haven't got a chance to ultimately win.

There is a volume of evidence coming to Washington these days demonstrating that the Taft-Hartley Act is crippling the growth of the union movement, particularly in the South and in some of the other areas of this country where union membership is not as strong as it is in the industrial East and in the industrial centers of the Midwest and far West.

I say this without fear of any successful contradiction, there will not be any labor-management peace in this country until this grossly unfair antilabor legislation is removed from the statute books. There can be no labor-management peace until the economic relationships between labor and management are no longer settled by the general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board, but are settled around the conference table between employers and employees.

I want to say one more word about the problems of organized labor in the South. If democracy means anything, if freedom means anything, it means that working men and women have a right to organize and form unions of their own choosing. If our American heritage has any significance, it means that the right to bargain collectively must be protected and preserved.

Today many hundreds of thousands of American men and women—yes, many hundreds and thousands of garment workers—are denied this inherent right.

Organized labor in the South today faces problems very similar to those that the organized labor movement faced all over America in the late 1920's and the early 1930's. It faces threats of violence, coercion, flagrant brutality, and an atmosphere of fear and intimidation.

The economy of America, not just the economy of the South; in fact, our very democracy depends on bringing to the attention of the American people the true facts of industrial anarchy which exists in so many sections of the South.

That is the way we in America face our problems. That is the way we in America dealt with industrial anarchy in the 1930's. The LaFollette's civil liberties committee of that day brought to light the true facts of collective bargaining and the American people acted to correct these evils.

Again today the American people must be told the facts. Enlightened citizenry and an informed public opinion is our objective. I hope that the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee and its Subcommittee on Labor-Management Relations can help achieve that objective.

For the labor movement and for American working men and women to fulfill their responsibilities, however, they must be concerned with more than just the Taft-Hartley law or the minimum-wage law—important as these may be.

American democracy needs and welcomes an aggressive instructed political-action program on the part of organized labor.

At this point, however, we must understand ourselves. Political action does not mean top level strategy. Make it crystal clear in your own minds that elections are not won in Washington, D. C. They are frequently lost there, but they are not won there.

Elections are won by hard work and by active participation in every voting precinct in this country. The essentials of a successful political campaign—the essentials as I see them are the following: A program, and I put program first—a program that meets the needs of the people, and one that is worked out cooperatively with the rest of organized labor and the liberal movement. Secondly, candidates willing to fight for the people. We have got too many candidates where you have to fight for them. We need candidates who are willing to go out and fight for you, to fight for the American people.

Thirdly, there is a need of political organization that belongs to and is controlled by and managed by the rank and file of the people.

Finally, a clear-cut statement of the issues in language, in the simple language that is understandable by all of the people.

Now, my friends, if you have those ingredients, if you have a program that meets the needs of the people, candidates willing to fight for the people, if you have a political organization that belongs to the people and they are a part of it, and if you have a clear-cut statement of the issues in language that is understandable by the people, I submit to you no one can beat you, no one. There is the essence of success.

Today as we face the acid test for American democracy, the 1950 elections, there are disturbing signs. One of the most significant of these disturbing signs is the frantic efforts by the Republican Party. It is engaging in a smear political campaign rather than discussing the issues which face the American people. The Republican leaders are attempting to frighten the American people by repeating false charges and by waving the red flag. I know that the International Ladies'

Garment Workers Union is well aware of the Communist danger in America. I know that the International Ladies' Garment Workers Union was in the lead among the labor unions in America to remove the Communist menace from within its ranks. Those of us who really oppose communism, however, and who have had the opportunity to oppose them and fight them and to defeat them know that the cause of anticommunism suffers when it is made into a political football and when the charge is recklessly bandied about.

The liberal movement for democracy in America faces a dangerous coalition. Never in our history has there been a greater propaganda barrage against the American workmen and against the interest of the American people than there has been during the past year. Ever since the miracle of November 2 the soothsayers have been concocting some kind of a new witches' brew to pour out to the American people. While we were celebrating and while we were patting each other on the back the old rear guard was in there plotting and planning every day of the week, getting their machinery ready again for the onslaught.

There is a dangerous coalition, a coalition that distorts public opinion, a coalition that defies the truth, a coalition not interested in the presentation of the truth.

This Dixiecrat-GOP coalition, under the leadership of the TAFTS, the WHERRYS, and the BYRDS, has lost faith in America. They condemn our policy at home and abroad with the same wild irresponsible charges. At home it is the welfare state that they oppose and abroad it is our aid to Great Britain and western Europe.

I would not deny that there is some merit to the Republican claim that the Fair Deal program seeks the welfare state as an objective. The welfare state is a legitimate objective—one that is perfectly consistent with our traditions and with the current wishes of the American people. A state which is devoted to the welfare of its members, a state which looks upon man and his welfare as an end in itself, is one I support and urge you to support.

The United States began as a welfare state when its Constitution charged the Government with the responsibility of the "general welfare" of its people. In a sense, this was one of the great differences between this new country which was born and the tired nations of Europe in the eighteenth century.

From that day until this day the history of the American development has been a history of providing greater welfare for its people.

The political leadership exemplified by the TAFTS, the WHERRYS, and the BYRDS refuse to accept the fact that two World Wars and a major world-wide depression have changed our world.

We are not the America of 1800 nor of 1900. We are the America of 1950. We are the America which is the greatest financial power the world has ever known. We have to act with a sense of great social responsibility. We are the greatest industrial power in the world. We must learn to use that power maturely.

The American labor movement, which represents the essence of democracy in our economic life, must recognize it has a responsibility for international leadership. If democracy is to prevail in the world, we in the United States must help it prevail. If we fail, we fail with it.

The liberal and social democratic forces of the world are our friends in Europe. They look to us for friendship and for assistance. We must respond to them with our own friendship and with our own helping hand.

Investigation of Military Government in Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1950

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD a statement in support of House Resolution 425, which I introduced on January 12, 1950, and which provides for an investigation of the American military government in Germany and the civilian administration which succeeded it, and for other purposes. This statement should help us all to become more cognizant of the existing situation in Germany, and I hope will serve as a guide for the panacea of the now extant evils. The statement and attachment A follow:

STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 425

(Introduced by Mr. SABATH, January 12, 1950)

This resolution (H. Res. 425) calls for an investigation of the American military government in Germany and the civilian administration which succeeded it, to ascertain the facts which permitted or encouraged the reestablishment of cartels, the resumption of power by former Nazis, the resurgence of fascism, nazism, and the rebuilding of German military strength and war potential. This resolution would authorize and direct the Committee on Foreign Affairs to conduct this study and investigation, reporting to the House not later than June 1, 1950, or thereabouts.

UNITED STATES POLICY TOWARD GERMAN CARTELS AND DENAZIFICATION

The United States policy toward German cartels was laid down in JCS-1067 (Joint Chiefs of Staff) and the Potsdam agreement of 1945. Under these directives, the United States military authorities were directed, among other things, to break up the concentration of German cartels and economic power. The basic philosophy was patterned after our own Sherman Antitrust Act of 1890. Soon after the defeat of Germany the mandate to carry out the decartelization program of Germany was entrusted to the four occupying powers; however, these powers failed to arrive at a common understanding of the problem. After the setting up of the bizonal administration for Germany, military government law 56 came into being, and formed the basis for all of our decartelization policies. This law was promulgated February 24, 1947. At the same time ordnance 78 was introduced in the British zone. To all intents and purposes these laws are in effect today. The preamble of law 56 reads as follows:

"This law is enacted in accordance with paragraph 12 of the Potsdam agreement in order that (1) to prevent Germany from endangering the safety of her neighbors and again constituting a threat to international peace; (2) to destroy Germany's economic potential to wage war; (3) to insure the measures taken for Germany's reconstruction are consistent with peaceful and democratic purposes; (4) to lay the groundwork for building a healthy German economy."

Paragraph 2 of law 56 reads as follows:

"Cartels, combines, syndicates, trusts, associations, or any other form of understanding or concerted understanding between persons, which have the purpose or effect of restraining or of fostering monopolistic control of domestic or international trade or other economic activity, or of restricting access to domestic or international markets, are hereby declared to be excessive concentrations of economic power within the purview of this law."

Paragraph 3 of law 56 provides that "all economic enterprises having their headquarters in the United States zone and employing in Germany more than 10,000 persons shall be examined as prima facie constituting excessive concentrations of economic power."

As regards our denazification policy, under the directives from the United States Government and the Potsdam agreement (concerning the elimination from important posts in the German public and private life of active Nazis) the United States military government enacted law No. 8 in the early months of the German occupation.

FAILURE TO ENFORCE THE UNITED STATES POLICIES IN GERMANY

It is an historical fact that the German industrialists, financiers, and cartelists contributed mightily to the rise of the Hitler Nazi regime in 1933. After Hitler came into power these interests worked closely with the Hitler regime to help it unleash World War II. On the other hand, American financiers, industrialists, and bankers have worked closely before World War II with the German industrialists in order to enhance their own selfish interests. United States collaboration with German interests to the detriment of the United States continues to this day.

It would appear that the American-vested interests have not learned the lessons of the interwar period. As early as the spring of 1942, at a time when the United States was fighting for its survival, the geopolitical section of the United States War Department which comprised a group of industrialists with German tie-ups, recommended that a powerful Germany be rebuilt after the conclusion of World War II.

Thus, it was no surprise that soon after Germany surrendered, American and British representatives of corporations which had invested heavily in German industries prior to and during the Hitler regime, appeared on the scene, either in the Army or as high officials or as advisers and took charge of implementing our policy toward Germany. Among the Americans were: Col. Sosthenes Behn, Kenneth Stockton and Mark Sundstrom, of International Telephone & Telegraph; Charles H. Powell, of Westinghouse; Brandon Gove, former head of Socony Vacuum of Rumania; Robert E. McConnell, formerly of General Aniline & Film Co. (I. G. Farben); Peter Hoagland and Graime Howard, formerly of General Motors in Germany; Rufus J. Wysor, former president of Republic Steel, and many others.

The New York investment house of Dillon, Read & Co. must be singled out in this connection because it has played a prominent role during the twenties in building up the German cartels and heavy industries with American money. Three of its leading members have played a prominent role in American life for a number of years. These men were: the late Secretary of Defense, James E. Forrestal, former president of Dillon, Read & Co.; William H. Draper, Jr., vice president of Dillon, Read & Co.; and Paul Nitze, former vice president of Dillon, Read & Co., and presently chairman of the State Department policy planning board (see attached statement A). Mention must also be made of Draper's son-in-law, Philip Hawkins, who was instrumental in killing our German decartelization program.

Our policy is and was to destroy the German cartels. Thus far, we have failed

to carry out that policy and the people of America have not been told the truth about our failures. Witness the fact that over 2 years ago, on January 8, 1948, former Secretary of War Kenneth Royall publicly stated: "We have abolished the pernicious cartels." Not only have we not eliminated the German cartels, but the same Germans are again working with international cartels which they had helped to set up before World War II.

THE FERGUSON COMMITTEE AND TESTIMONY TAKEN IN CONNECTION THEREWITH—AN ANALYSIS

Some months after Secretary Royall's untrue statement to the effect that cartels were eliminated, pressure was brought to bear by some who knew the true facts about United States decartelization policy. Secretary of War Royall then appointed a committee to study the results of our decartelization and deconcentration policies in Germany. The committee was headed by a former member of the Federal Trade Commission, Garland S. Ferguson and comprised two other members, namely, S. S. Isseks, and A. T. Kearney.

The findings of the Ferguson committee were presented to Secretary Royall on April 15, 1949, after extensive testimony taken in Germany and Washington. The findings of the committee were that not one single cartel was eliminated in Germany since VE day.

It is worthy of mention that the results of the painstaking investigation made by Chairman FERGUSON and the able members of his committee, were given little or no publicity, and the report itself comprising over 130 pages was difficult to obtain, although it was public information. As a matter of fact, the verbatim testimony taken in connection with the Ferguson committee investigation has never been made public at all. It is kept under lock and key in the Pentagon Building. The chairman of the Committee on Rules succeeded, however, in obtaining the verbatim testimony to be used in connection with House Resolution 425 and this investigation.

The reason the Ferguson report was not publicized and why access to it was made difficult to the public, although contrary to the desire of the Ferguson committee, will be revealed by the photostatic copies of the verbatim testimony by such individuals as: General Clay, General Draper, Colonel Wilkenson, Mr. Bronson, Mr. Hawkins, Mr. Charles Collison, Mr. Coleman, Mr. Johnston Avery, Mr. Laurent, Brigadier Oxborrow, Gen. Arthur Wilson, Mr. A. Sacks, Mr. Martin, Mr. Bartels, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Spencer, and others.

The nature and essence of the secret verbatim testimony taken in connection with the Ferguson committee can best be summarized by a statement made on January 28, 1949, by Hon. Johnston Avery, former Chief of the Enforcement Section, Decartelization Branch, and presently an Assistant to the United States Attorney General (p. 102) when he stated:

"I think the facts will support the statement that such men as General Draper, Wilkenson, and Hawkins felt that the only way to bring about industrial revival in Germany was by rebuilding along the old industrial lines. We kept pressing Bronson, Hawkins, Wilkenson, for additional decisions on Henschel, Bosch, VKF and Shoe Machinery (the processing of which has been completed and same lacked only approval by top authorities). I became convinced that they (the top authorities) had no intention of allowing the dissolution of any combine or monopoly." (p. 105) "I was not guessing altogether as to their attitude. On November 7, 1946, Mr. Bronson while he was control officer of I. G. Farben, had told me perfectly plainly and in so many words that he was glad he was not in the Decartelization Branch because he did not believe in the antitrust approach. He said that all of his background had been with big business and his sympathies were there too. * * * And it was certainly no secret that Mr. Wilkenson (the economic advisor to General Clay) did not believe in the decartelization program. I believe he had been admirably frank in that respect. However, the decartelization program was under the direction of these men."

The verbatim testimony of all the witnesses who were subpenaed by the Ferguson committee bears out Mr. Avery's statement and is available to the members of the House Committee on Rules.

Special mention must be made of General Clay, the former American Military Governor of Germany, whose attitude on decartelization up to 1948 was above reproach. A typical instance is provided in his memo dated October 12, 1946 (ex. 25) to General Draper wherein he stated:

"I don't believe we can accomplish our purpose without striking out large corporations in Germany. I personally and fully am in sympathy with the decartelization based on size until we can destroy conditions which did exist in Germany."

However, something apparently happened to General Clay's attitude in this regard, for it is a fact that in the spring of 1948, General Clay completely took it upon himself to reverse our decartelization policy. (See Exhibit 11–A.) Exhibit 11–A unequivocally shows that General Clay must be blamed for the complete reversal of our decartelization policies and for the failure to enforce MG Law 56, afore-mentioned.

In a secret conference held by Clay with Bronson and Wilkenson, Clay stated: "That he realized that when his program was made public there would be a scream to the high heavens from the strong antitrust group, but that there had been similar screams before as exemplified by the sounding-off of Martin back in the States, but that the screams had come and gone and there would probably be little more major interest to create a serious scream."

FAILURE OF UNITED STATES DENAZIFICATION POLICY

Our denazification policy in Germany has been a dismal failure. An analysis made by John Herz in his study entitled "The Fiasco of Denazification in Germany" in the Political Science Quarterly, volume LXIII, December 1948, shows that 12,753,000 persons had been registered under the German law for denazification as members of the Nazi Party and its affiliates. Of these, 9,073,000, or nearly three-fourths, had been dismissed as nonchargeable. By April 1948, 2,373,000 of the remaining 3,209,000 had been amnestied. By June 30, 1948, the remaining 836,000 had been tried and 37 percent of their number exonerated. Of the 526,680 thus convicted, 50.8 percent were classified as followers, 10.7 percent as lesser offenders, 2.1 percent as offenders, and 0.1 percent only as major offenders. These findings were in the lower courts. The appeal tribunals as of March 31, 1948, confirmed sentences on only 27 percent of the above convictions and the trend was to lessen and shorten the sentences.

Of the 526,680 convicted Nazis, 430,890 received sentences composed exclusively of fines less than 1,000 reichsmarks (about $100 of the then current legal market and considerably less than one-half that used on the extensively used open market). By May 1948 only 1,677 Nazis remained in internment camps.

The latest trends of the rising tides of nazism and nationalism in Germany were discussed in the New York Times March 4, 1950, page 1—United States Fears Nationalist Rise in Germany Despite Curbs, by Drew Middleton. On March 9, 1950, New York Times, page 1, SS Men Get Homes of Hitler Victims, by M. James. On March 10, 1950, New York Times, page 12, German Officials Accused by Police—Wuertemberg-Baden Regime Said To Be Balking Inquiry on Nazi Court Frauds, by M. James. Then on March 13, 1950, New York Times, page 4, German Rightists Drawing Together, by Drew Middleton.

Witness an editorial appearing in the Christian Science Monitor of February 8, 1950, entitled "Mr. McCloy Calling the Germans": "We welcome his (McCloy's) statement of American policy on Germany, but not because it unearths any unsuspected facts or newly discovered ways of dealing with them. Rather we welcome it as indicating that American officials are catching up with actualities in Germany and beginning to understand why many Americans have been disquieted about the application of American policy to the German question. Unfortunately one speech won't bring democracy to Germany, or rid that nation of latent Nazis, or of the ultranationalism which is so easily exploited by aggressive forces in the country. Unfortunately, too, Mr. McCloy's address contained a fair quantity of material for self-congratulatory treatment of the German press."

"Main theme of McCloy's address: (1) German leaders have paid too much attention to issues with other countries like that with France concerning the Saar, and not enough attention to internal problems such as unemployment. (2) There has been too much thinking about a German Army and Air Force, too little about the processes of democratic government. (3) Too much reliance on United States material aid, not enough recognition that the United States has a right to insist that American aid will not again be misled and misused to strengthen Germany for military adventures."

Another excellent article appeared in the Washington Daily News under date of February 14, 1950, as follows:

"From the northern Rhine region backward to Bavaria in the South, the signs are multiplying that militant nationalism and Pan-Germanism are on the rise. In the press, government offices, industry, the universities, and even in the Bonn parliament, nationalists and Nazi elements have moved more brazenly in the open. * * * Dissident members of Chancelor Konrad Adenauer's own Christian Democratic Party informed Leon Dennen of the Washington Daily News that Adenauer is now little more than a puppet of the industrialist, the Catholic hierarchy and the former officers corps. * * * Two extreme rightists groups have merged to form the German Reich Party, controlling 600,000 West German votes.

"Thus today, as after World War I, the Germans are being told that they were not really beaten in battle, that they lost through the undermining efforts of plotters and saboteurs only. Before the theme was: 'The Jews are to blame for everything.' Now it is the stab in the back." Dr. Franz Richter, prominent member of the National Rightist Party, declares Germany must refuse to serve foreign imperialists. There can be no collaboration in a military way between West Germany and the western powers, he said, until Germany has regained her full sovereignty and the last occupation soldier left. Dr. Kurt Schumacher, leader of the Socialist Democrats and recognized as one of the chief supporters of real German democracy recently said that 6,000,000 Jews

killed in Nazi gas chambers and tortured in concentration camps stood between Germany and the civilized world. Wolfgang Helder, a Bonn parliament deputy and member of the strong rightist group disagreed. "It was a pity, yes, that the Jews were done away with in gas chambers, he said. Other means could have been found."

As a matter of fact, Mr. Howard Ambruster in the Daily Compass of March 7, 1950, carried an article on Germans Send Pro-Nazi Here as Consul. Mr. Ambruster says that "The newly appointed Consul General at New York of the West German Republic, Hans Schlange-Schoeningen, is roundly denounced as a violent anti-American and pro-Hitler anti-Semite in a petition now being sent to Secretary of State Acheson."

Recent newspaper accounts of one Nationalist Party meeting reported that the old Nazi national anthem was being sung again in Germany.

Yet our policy toward Germany, as established in 1945, pledged that "German militarism and nazism will be extirpated and the allies will take in agreement together now and in the future the other means necessary to assure that Germany will never again threaten her neighbors or the peace of the world."

In this connection, Mr. James Martin, former head of the Decartelization Branch, American Military Government, testifying before the Ferguson committee on January 27, 1949, at page 7 of his testimony, stated: "In my presence General Draper and other members of the economics division in a rapid succession of set speeches made statements emphasizing the need for German economic recovery and intimating that the removal of Nazis from the ranks of industrial management and the threats of a decartelization program were retarding and hampering German recovery."

Perhaps the most cogent reason for the necessity of conducting a thorough investigation of the failure of our occupation policies is evidenced by a statement made by Colonel Wilkinson, chief economic adviser to General Clay in answer to a question put forth by a member of the Ferguson committee as to his whole philosophy on United States policy (p. 9, Wilkinson Testimony, December 18, 1948): "When a group of 12 editors from the United States were being briefed in Berlin on the economic situation * * * I stated that in the execution of the military government policy in Germany we were often faced with a situation where we pulled on the hand of a man lying on the floor and wondered why he didn't get to his feet in spite of the fact that we had one foot on his neck. I explained that the policy of the United States Government as set forth in the Potsdam agreement and in the directives of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to Military Government called for important measures on demilitarization, reparations, restitution, denazification, and decartelization, which in their execution could not fail to have a most disruptive effect upon the other policies of military government which were directed toward the reconstruction of Germany."

CONCLUSION

President Truman stated his position on December 2, 1948, at the first press conference after his election when he stated that the German cartels would not be revived as long as he was in the White House (p. 19, Ferguson committee report).

Since then, although there has been a change in the American military governor, the succession of Mr. McCloy to General Clay, nothing has been accomplished in the field of denazification and decartelization, and indeed, we have recartelized and renazified and remilitarized Germany.

In view of the foregoing facts, it is imperative that a thorough and complete investigation be made so as to enlighten the Congress and the American people on the subject of our demilitarization, denazification, and decartelization policies in Germany, and further so that we may know who the high officials are in our Defense and State Departments who have been and are presently scuttling our basic German policy.

ATTACHMENT A

AMERICANS WHO HAVE CONTRIBUTED TO THE SCUTTLING OF OUR POLICY TOWARD GERMANY

PAUL NITZE

Paul Nitze was appointed recently as chairman of the Policy Planning Board of the Department of State. He succeeded Mr. George Kennan. Prior to this appointment Paul Nitze was Deputy to Assistant Secretary of State Dr. Willard Thorp, in charge of economic affairs.

Nitze has been in Government service since 1940. In 1942 he was connected with the Board of Economic Warfare (BEW)—his business being to purchase goods necessary to carry on war. While with the BEW he had extensive dealings with some of the prominent cartel representatives. One of his very intimate contacts was Maurice Hochschleid, the kingpin of the tin cartel in Bolivia. Hochschleid used to refer to Nitze and say that Nitze was one of the few men in Government who he could get along with famously.

Intercepted communications between Hochschleid and Nitze reveal that Nitze was the recipient of favors bestowed upon him by Hochschleid. Nitze's activities were brought to the attention of President Roosevelt, which resulted eventually in Nitze's quitting the Foreign Economic Administration in 1944. The FEA was the successor agency to the BEW.

When Nitze severed his connections with the FEA, he was appointed adviser to the War Department because of his connections with James Forrestal, the then Secretary of the Navy—and his superior officer in the banking firm of Dillon, Read & Co., New York.

In 1945, Nitze was appointed deputy director of the United States Strategic Bombing Survey (USSBS), the purpose of which was to make an analysis of the strategic bombing since Germany's downfall. Nitze went to Germany to study the effects of the bombing upon Germany's heavy industry. He, together with a group of experts from the USSBS visited the Ruhr industries and had extensive discussions with the leaders of the German heavy industry; the very same leaders who pushed Hitler to wage war (W. W. II). The United States investigations team in the Ruhr subsequently found a letter in the files of the largest steel cartel in Germany—Vereinigte Stahlwerke—to the effect that the USSBS people gave an assurance to the German heavy steel industry leaders that a bridge of friends of United States, Germany, and Britain, was formed to protect the German heavy steel interests. Incidentally, the Vereinigte Stahlwerke to whom this assurance was given in particular, was established in 1926 by the Dillon, Read & Co. investment house of New York with American money which was never repaid. It is strange, therefore, that one of the men who was vice president of Dillon, Read & Co., namely, Mr. Nitze, should have been appointed deputy director of the USSBS.

After his survey of Germany, Paul Nitze and his group went to make a similar investigation of the effects of bombing upon the Japanese industries. In this connection it must be pointed out that our entire policy toward Japan has also been completely emasculated.

Paul Nitze was appointed vice president of Dillon, Read & Co., at a very early age. It is reported that he was able to accomplish such a feat because of his marriage to a Miss Pratt, whose father is heavily interested in the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey and General Motors Corp.

Nitze's uncle, Mr. Hilken, was the chief paymaster for the Kaiser sabotage team which blew up the Black Tom and Kingsland plants in 1917. The damage was $55,000,000 and it was the greatest sabotage act in the history of the United States.

Paul Nitze has been largely responsible for the scuttling of our postwar policy toward Germany while in the State Department, since his task was to frame our foreign economic policy.

Memorial Day Address by Hon. Herbert H. Lehman, of New York, Before the Hyde Park Home Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 1 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on Memorial Day, May 30, the Hyde Park Home Club, formed by neighbors of President Roosevelt in 1932, held its fourth annual Memorial Day service at Hyde Park. It was my privilege to deliver the Memorial Day address on that occasion. I ask unanimous consent of the Senate to have the address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Today the Nation is paying tribute to its heroic dead. We honor those who have fallen on many battlefields in our struggles for liberty and justice. We remember the sacrifices which those men, and others, have made. Today, we rededicate ourselves to the defense of the principles for which those men died and which again call for our complete devotion.

We are gathered in this quiet garden because this is the last resting place of one man who gave to this cause and to this country the last full measure of devotion.

The last full measure of devotion. These are not my words. They are the words of that other civilian soldier of an earlier war, Abraham Lincoln. And today these two men, Lincoln and Roosevelt, so dissimilar and yet so alike, are linked in the embrace of history, among the leaders of America's heroic dead.

It was only 5 years ago that Franklin D. Roosevelt died. Was it 5 years ago or was it 50 or was it yesterday? Time has as little meaning for a figure as towering as his, as inches have for the measure of a mountain.

In paying special homage to Franklin D. Roosevelt on this Memorial Day, we do not single him out as more worthy than the hundreds of thousands in America and the millions everywhere who have fallen in the fight for freedom. We merely recognize that he was and always will be a symbol of those lesser known men who yielded their lives, too, on the battleground of liberty.

Of course our tribute cannot add to the deeds that were done or enhance the sacrifices that were made. What we can do here

today is to enlarge our friendship with Franklin D. Roosevelt and reexamine the causes for which he and the others died, and perhaps leave here with some new insight into those forces which moved him to the services which he performed.

Even those of us who cherished the rich treasure of his friendship can enrich our knowledge of him. For he was many-sided, as the deep knowledge of both joy and suffering make people many-sided. And here in Hyde Park we can see, in some perspective, that which gave him joy in the midst of suffering and that which gave him calm in the midst of tumult.

I have read somewhere that it is the misfortune of the famous that they cannot know the lot of those who pass unnoticed from the cradle to the grave; that it is the misfortune of the rich that they cannot feel the constraining touch of nature and necessity; and that it is the misfortune of the always successful that they can never know the feel of battle against odds.

Franklin D. Roosevelt was famous and successful. Yet by his own peculiar experiences and his own personal sufferings, he came to appreciate the lot of the obscure and the unnoticed, to feel the constraining touch of nature and necessity and to know the meaning of battle against overwhelming odds.

This knowledge and this appreciation helped make him a compassionate man and an outstanding leader of men. This transformation was one of those accidents of which history is made. Happy accident, too, that there came to his side that great lady who, like her husband, is loved by mankind because she loves mankind. This pair belongs truly not to America but to the world.

Franklin D. Roosevelt was what might be called a marginal man. He was of the rich, and yet also of the poor. He was of the west, and yet also of the east. So real was his acquaintance with mankind that he expressed for them what they could not express—their dreams, their hopes, their trials and tribulations.

He had a creative way of profiting deeply from any occasion that brought him into contact with new people. He took away from a meeting with people not just a superficial impression, but the essence of a new experience.

So in 1932, when he became President of the United States, hungry people, desperate farmers, and bewildered businessmen were, to Franklin Roosevelt, something more than statistics. They were men and women. They needed what he had once needed, courage and direction. He gave them courage and direction.

He knew of suffering far more than most of us will ever know. He dealt with his personal problem of physical suffering with a dignity and strength that gave courage to all men who felt themselves handicapped in life. He lived silently and nobly with an affliction in a way which moved men to wonder who might otherwise have been moved to pity.

No one who ever watched President Roosevelt ascend the ramp at Madison Square Garden carrying the weight of his large frame on the strength of his arms and hands, then reaching the rostrum, raise his arms in salute to the people, could remain unmoved. For anyone who had seen this had seen and shared in courageous living.

Only once in all his long public life did he refer to his handicap. But when the time came, and he knew that he must sit and not stand as he addressed the Congress, he had no false pride. He said simply to the Congress, as he asked their indulgence that the weight of his braces required that this time, he remain seated.

So he lived greatly in a simple but powerful way. He made all of us feel that real problems could be solved; real barriers could come down; real sorrows could be borne silently and with dignity.

This is the legacy which he left us. It is a creative legacy. We share today not our sorrow that he has gone, but his urge to move ever forward toward the day when all the people shall have food and shelter, warmth of home and loved ones, justice within our country and peace throughout the world. This is a good legacy, left by a man who knew that as we push back the barriers of class, race, and creed we find the fullness of life itself.

These were the real and simple things which he taught us. But these lessons in living are only a part of what he left behind. And they account only in part for the great despair which filled hearts and minds the world over when he died, and for the pain which is not yet quite gone.

I sat at his right hand during the 4 years that he was Governor of this, my well-loved State and was also his. I helped him in every way it was possible for me to help him. Yet it was I who was helped—in grasp and understanding of the problems of that day, and of the problems that were to come later.

Governor and later President Roosevelt did not have a ready-made formula for all the problems of his day. In fact, he avoided formulas. His genius was in his ability to improvise solutions to problems as they arose—solutions which borrowed from the past and yet were very much geared to the present. His touchstone was, "Will it work? Will it meet the need?"

Hence it is difficult to say what he would have done, in any specific situation today. What we do know, however, is that, to meet the problems, his actions would have been sound. He was the enemy of inaction, unless that inaction, itself, were a form of action, President Roosevelt's fundamental faith was that no problem was insoluble; it was only a matter of persisting until the right solution was found.

How would President Roosevelt have felt about the growing threat of communism? And about the current attacks on the State Department and the Government Departments generally? What would he have done about the threat of subversion and espionage from Moscow-inspired sources? And about the atomic bomb and the cold war?

These questions occur to us often as the swiftly moving stream of events sweeps us down the rapids of these perilous times.

We cannot answer these questions. Perhaps we should not try. We must only know that Roosevelt would have tried, as his successor is trying, to solve these problems within the flexible framework of a basic devotion to democracy at home and a tolerant understanding of the world abroad. No fixed framework of preconceived notions would have found him. No rigid obstacles of whatever magnitude would have stayed him. No approach, however bold and unprecedented, would have frightened him.

Because I knew the man, and his patriotic devotion to his country as well as his boundless devotion to mankind, I am appalled at the endless repetition of the slander that President Roosevelt was naive or shortsighted or weak or even worse in his dealings with the Russians.

I say that those who make such charges speak with little knowledge and great prejudice. President Roosevelt was the grand architect of our victory over a savage and ruthless enemy. He was bold and courageous enough to take calculated risks in diplomacy, as all his generals and admirals did in military operations. That grand strategy brought the enemy to bay and led to his downfall.

That this strategy did not succeed in solving the basic problem of the relations of Soviet Russia with the world is not to President Roosevelt's discredit any more than it was to the discredit of Winston Churchill. That problem had been with Europe and the world since 1917. It had its origins in centuries of history. Its current manifestations are the result of all the forces which combined to produce the industrial revolution, and all the consequences which flowed out of that revolution. That problem, too, can and must be solved. But to attribute the present tragic state of world affairs to failure or error on the part of Franklin Roosevelt is a base injustice and a sad reflection of inability to understand the meaning of the present struggle.

Today, despite these slanders, the fame of Franklin Roosevelt grows steadily in this country, as it does throughout the world. In many lands there are majestic boulevards named in his honor. In many a village in far-off countries, squares and public buildings bear his name. But these are only the products of men's hands. A much more transcendental memorial is in the hearts of millions of men and women—yes, and children too—who know of President Roosevelt only as a remote and inspirational figure who fought in his land and in every land for justice for every man, and for the liberation of the oppressed and the enslaved.

In this world, convulsed by a conflict that is neither war nor peace, swaying on the very brink of disaster, the name of Franklin Roosevelt means to many millions of men and women, hope and peace. To these millions, Franklin Roosevelt lives on as a symbol of faith in brotherhood and understanding.

High on a hill overlooking Washington is that shrine called the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier. Here in Hyde Park we have the Tomb of the Known Civilian Soldier. Franklin D. Roosevelt is famed and honored for his deeds. Wherever in the world there are men called civilized, wherever the values of liberty and dignity and humanity are recognized, and wherever men dream of freedom and of progress, there the name of Franklin Roosevelt is known and honored. Among our enemies, as among our friends, this name symbolizes the everlasting struggle upward which is man's lot in this world.

Why can we not somehow make use of this faith which men and women in every land have in Franklin Roosevelt? Why cannot this faith become the bridge over which we may cross the seas of hate and suspicion which divide people from people? Why cannot the devotion which we in America have for Franklin Roosevelt become a language in which we can communicate with peoples who are otherwise cut off from us?

We must cherish no illusions about the present world situation. Ahead of us is darkness and peril. There is no simple formula for peace and justice in a world divided against itself, with one entire sector of mankind under the rigid control of a brutal and tyrannical regime.

But if, in opposing this tyranny with all our strength, as we must, we fail to exhaust every possibility for avoiding the catastrophe of a war which can spell the end of our civilization, we will have denied our obligation both to the dead and to the living. We will have betrayed the great trust which we bear. We will have failed completely in our obligation, not only to oppose the Communist terror, but to save mankind from final disaster. This is our responsibility. We cannot escape it.

On this Memorial Day, on this day of remembrance of all our heroic dead, here in this last resting place of Franklin D. Roosevelt, we must rededicate ourselves to this great task.

As the tired and thirsty traveler is refreshed at the roadside spring and continues on his journey with renewed vigor, so we

must take resolve and inspiration from this occasion and this ceremony, to redouble and again redouble our efforts.

In the shadow of Franklin Roosevelt's garden, in the shadow of his home, yes, in the shadow of his world, let us recall the words he wrote, shortly before his death, but which he never spoke:

"Today we are faced with the preeminent fact that, if civilization is to survive, we must cultivate the science of human relationships—the ability of all peoples, of all kinds, to live together and work together in the same world, at peace. Let me assure you that my hand is the steadier for the work that is to be done, that I move more firmly into the task, knowing that you—millions and millions of you—are joined with me in the resolve to make this work endure."

Though he was not spared to carry out this high purpose, we, who are here, must still be joined together, under the leadership of his spirit, to press on toward that goal.

Discriminatory Practices of Colleges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 31, 1950

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I read with great interest and alarm, a statement by Gov. Chester Bowles on the Inter-racial Commission's report on discriminatory practices of colleges with regard to applicants for admission. Governor Bowles is presently the chief executive of the State of Connecticut and was formerly the great and outstanding Administrator of the OPA.

Governor Bowles calls attention to the discriminatory practices with regard to college admissions that prevails in the private nondenominational institutions of higher learning in his State. The same situation exists throughout our country, and I sincerely regret same.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, it would be in the best interests of our country and would strengthen the position we hold in the world if we could bring about better understanding among the various groups in the United States and thereby eliminate such discrimination. Such constructive action and understanding on our part would, I am confident, unify our Nation and our enemies would not be able to, from time to time, point out that we should first clean our own hands before we attempt to show them that democracy is the best and only intelligent form of government. There can be no discrimination in a real democracy. The article, appearing in the December 1949-January 1950 issue of American Unity, follows:

DELAY IS DANGEROUS

(By Chester Bowles,[1] Governor of Connecticut)

The special report of the Inter-racial Commission on the question of discrimination in Connecticut educational institutions will be greeted by most of our citizens with mixed feelings. One phase of the report dealing with our Connecticut public tax-supported colleges—the University of Connecticut and our four teachers colleges—will make us all feel proud. This study clearly establishes the fact that in these five public tax-supported colleges, Protestants, Catholics, Jews, and Negroes are accepted solely on the basis of their scholastic ability, aptitude, and character.

This, of course, is as it should be. Nevertheless, it is good to know that these colleges, in which all of us as taxpayers have such a special interest, have taken the leadership in eliminating all discrimination and prejudice based on race, creed, or color.

The junior colleges and secretarial schools also have succeeded in eliminating discrimination against Jews, Negroes, Protestants, and Catholics.

SHARP AND UGLY

But the record of our private nondenominational colleges in this field of discrimination seems to be a rather dismal one. Some of us may not be surprised to find that prejudice exists in these institutions. But the commission's report prevents us from closing our eyes any longer to how sharp and ugly that discrimination often is.

It is quite true that these colleges do not shut their doors to minority students. The record shows, however, that among the students who seek admission from high school, a clear preference is shown for Protestant boys and girls over Catholics, Jews, and Negroes. Protestants are accepted in 61 percent of the cases, Catholics in 49 percent, and Jews in 41 percent. Superior students of the discriminated-against groups have a better opportunity than those of moderate scholastic ability. But in every group the evidence is clear.

But this represents only half the story. Fifty-five percent of the students in our private nondenominational colleges in Connecticut come from private, nondenominational preparatory schools. And here the discrimination is even more blatant. For instance, only 10 out of 31 of these preparatory schools in Connecticut stated directly that they would admit Negroes. The degree of discrimination against Jewish boys and girls could not be accurately determined by the commission. But the fact that only 9 percent of all boys and girls in private preparatory schools are of Jewish parentage forces us to some obvious conclusions.

Another area of discrimination which could not be covered in the report involves the question of discrimination among the students at our private nondenominational institutions on the campus itself. The University of Connecticut by action of the faculty and the students called for an end to all discrimination on the basis of race, creed, or color in choosing members of fraternities or sororities. But the action of the University of Connecticut is the exception that serves to set off the ugly fact that practically every fraternity in the other nondenominational institutions is more concerned with a seventeenth century concept of social acceptability, which is one of the things we fought so vigorously to eliminate in the Second World War.

There are those who tell us that if we will only wait long enough that the conditions described in this report will eventually adjust themselves. In spite of the extremely bad record outlined in this report, there is no question but that progress has been made in the last generation, and particularly in the last 10 years. But today our democratic way of life is challenged by the totalitarian concept of the Communists. There is a grave question as to how long we can wait for the slow process of evolutionary change in a period in world history in which we are judged throughout the world not by our words, but by our deeds.

I am deeply hopeful that not only members of the legislature but every thoughtful citizen in Connecticut will study this report carefully and will speak out in clear and unequivocal terms in denouncing the conditions which it has brought to light.

I would also like to call, with all earnestness, on the heads of all our private nondenominational institutions and our private nondenominational preparatory schools to take action—forthright, vigorous action—to eliminate discrimination wherever it exists.

[1] The above is the text of a statement by Governor Bowles on the Inter-racial Commission's report on discriminatory practices of colleges with regard to applicants for admission.

Reeducating Germany With Nazi History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 1 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Reeducating Germany With Nazi History," by Telford Taylor, which appeared in the New York Times Magazine of May 28. Mr. Taylor, as a brigadier general, prosecuted war criminals at Nuremberg and later served as United States chief of counsel for war crimes from October 1946 to August 1949.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REEDUCATING GERMANY WITH NAZI HISTORY—A PROSECUTOR AT NUREMBERG URGES THAT FACTS DISCLOSED THERE BE USED TO TEACH DEMOCRACY

(By Telford Taylor)

Everyone knows the old story about the German, the Englishman, and the Frenchman who wrote essays on the elephant. The German wrote a six-volume series entitled "An Introduction to the Study of the Elephant"; the Englishman, a pamphlet on "The Elephant and Empire"; the Frenchman, a sprightly and daringly illustrated volume called "L'Eléphant et Ses Amours."

The recent episode in Berlin when, upon the urging of Chancelor Konrad Adenauer, a large audience arose and sang "Deutschland Uber Alles" provided an actual and equally pat revelation of national characteristics. In attendance were the three Allied military commandants of the British, French, and American sectors of Berlin, who all remained ostentatiously seated during the singing. When the meeting broke up reporters asked the three gnerals for their comments.

The British general observed that the demonstration "was in shockingly bad taste." The Frenchman—one can almost hear his weary Gallic sigh—remarked that he had "heard that song before—all too often." The American commandant declined to comment, but one of his aides confided to the reporters that "the general hopes the whole affair will blow over."

Such hopefulness is typical of American attitudes toward the "democratization" of Germany. But the truth is that deeply rooted national feelings and issues do not "blow over," nor can they be changed or solved merely by appropriating funds for ECA and the Air Force.

It has been the basic purpose of the occupation not only to disarm Germany and reduce her economic war potential but to promote her "democratization" by means usually described as "reorientation" and "re-education." And yet it is in this very field that the occupation's accomplishments have been least impressive. In large part this disappointing showing has been due to lack of effort and emphasis—in short, to an absurdly tiny investment of money, talent, and prestige. Here was at once an emergency and an opportunity which should have been tackled as a major national undertaking. Instead, it has been a backwater in which a small group of able and sincere men have struggled valiantly to move the boulder with a toothpick.

To alter the German Weltanschauung is an ambitious undertaking which must be approached with a prayerful awareness not only that our powers are limited but also that we are at the mercy of the international elements. Since 1945 the Germans have seen much to support the conclusion that a nation's own military strength is still its best guaranty of security. The appeal of nationalism derives its greatest strength from the shortcomings and great failures of international political idealism.

The hard cynicism and revived jingoism thus evoked in Germany by world events are often aggravated by statements of non-German writers and public figures which seem to parallel the nationalist line. The following are good examples:

"The exterminative wars which were planned, plotted, and waged against the American Indians during the latter half of the nineteenth century equaled in atrocities anything the Nazis ever did and were extremely popular at the time.

"For 3 years after the unconditional surrender we kept the Germans on rations little or no larger than those in Nazi concentration camps. * * * There was no crime the Nazis had committed which we or our allies had not also committed.

"Crimes committed by American personnel representing the United States seem so horrible in retrospect that it is difficult to believe that Americans could have resorted to such beastial practices."

These are the public pronouncement respectively of the British military expert Maj. Gen. J. F. C. Fuller (in the magazine Ordnance for June 1948), the American writer Freda Utley (in her recent book, the High Cost of Vengeance), and Dr. George N. Shuster, president of Hunter College (speaking before the Academy of Political Science on April 7, 1949), who has recently been appointed Commissioner for Bavaria by High Commissioner John J. McCloy.

Of course, in any land of free speech and press, there will be wild words. But the Germans for 12 years were cut off from contact with the democratic Western World and subjected to a news and literary diet narrow and distorted beyond anything we can imagine. As a result, most Germans lack the ordinary informational background which helps us to evaluate the printed word and reject the obviously spurious or grossly exaggerated.

The primary task of reorientation should be to lay before the Germans the true facts about the recent past and thus help to fill the informational vacuum left by the Nazis. For this task certain lines of endeavor have so far been slighted, rejected, or overlooked—lines which, even at this late date, hold considerable promise. There is a vast accumulation of readily available and highly effective material which has not been exploited. I refer to the official German documents which fell into our hands at the end of the war, and which formed the evidentiary basis of the Nuremberg trials.

It is my strong conviction that these documents, if intelligently presented, would be invaluable for purposes of democratization. My opinion is based on a number of general observations of the postwar German mentality and the German reaction to the occupation and democratization during the 5 years since the end of the war.

First of all, I think that we have overestimated the reeducational potential of plugging democracy in the abstract and via the customary channels of propaganda, such as radio, press, and movies. We failed to take into account the fact that, throughout the Nazi era, the Germans were subjected to an incessant barrage of political indoctrination, the hollowness and untruth of which were driven deep into the German mind by the utter defeat and ruin of 1945. This taught the Germans a lesson, but it did not teach them democracy. Primarily, it induced a profound distrust of all opinion-forming official pronouncements and exhortations, and a bitter cynicism. Now, when the average German hears or reads statements about the advantages of democracy, American style, his impulse is not to weigh the truth of what is stated but to wonder what ulterior purpose lies behind it.

Second, although the young people of Germany share this suspicion and cynicism, they are immensely curious about the world. They are painfully aware that nazism cut Germany off from intellectual contact with the rest of the world, and are correspondingly hungry for information and new ideas about government and society. But democracy, as a political commodity, faces their cool and calculating appraisal rather than their eager acceptance.

Third, we have tended to rely overmuch on what lawyers call autoptic profference— that is, proving the nature of a physical object by displaying the thing itself in court. We have endeavored to show democracy to the Germans by holding up the American way of life for their inspection, admiration, and emulation. So far we have gotten lots of inspection, and the seamy side of our way of life has not escaped notice. Furthermore, we have, somewhat unimaginatively, stressed colorful and indigenous features of American political life—such as the New England town meeting—which are not universally essential elements of twentieth century democracy and which are of dubious export value.

In any event, democracy is not a thing that can be effectively displayed like merchandise in a shop window. Particularly when it is offered under the label "Made in America," it is likely to encounter a sales resistance stemming from national pride. There is no doubt that this pride, mixed with suspicion, has measurably diminished the beneficial effect of the American information centers—the "Amerika Hauser."

Finally, we have misgaged human nature in trying to make the Germans feel contrite by harping constantly on the death and destruction that the Third Reich visited on other nations. Warsaw, Belgrade, Coventry, and Kiev are distant cities to the average German; what his compatriots may or may not have done there he is far from sure of—and he is by no means eager to find out. What the French or the Russians or the English say about this may not, he suspects, be any more trustworthy than what Goebbels used to say.

The rubble to which almost every large German city was reduced is, on the other hand, part of everyday existence in Germany. Whatever may have been done to the Jews and the Poles, thinks the average German, it can't be any worse than what has happened to him. Indeed, the stories of havoc wrought by the Wehrmacht in foreign lands gives many Germans a very considerable satisfaction. At least they were once cock of the walk; at least the other fellow got a black eye.

It is only human nature that the Germans are more readily and lastingly impressed by the harm nazism did to Germany than by stories (terribly true though they are) of ravages wrought by the Third Reich in foreign lands. But the Germans could hardly help being lastingly impressed by the true facts about what nazism did to Germany and to German institutions. And for this purpose, the captured German official documents are peculiarly suitable. They are German, not foreign. They are contemporaneous proof of what actually transpired in Germany, not propaganda concocted to sell the Germans a democratic bill of goods. Their authenticity has been established beyond question by the Nuremberg testimony of the very men who wrote, received, or distributed them.

Indeed, it is by means of these documents—and, for the present, in this way only—that the lessons of the war crimes trials can be driven home in Germany. I think that the High Commissioner's office has not fully appreciated what is involved here. Last January, in reply to a letter from Bishop A. J. Muench of the Vatican Mission in Frankfurt, requesting an amnesty for convicted war criminals, Mr. McCloy wrote:

"I feel that it would be very unfortunate if any considerable body of responsible Germans should undertake to question the fundamental principles on which the war crimes prosecutions were based or the judicial scundness of the procedure which was followed and the judgments which were reached in those cases. I do not think that any German who sincerely believes in the future of Germany as a responsible and peaceful member of the community of nations can reasonably doubt the enormity of the crimes of which the war crimes prisoners have been convicted or the fundamental principles of international justice pursuant to which they were tried."

This, with all respect to Mr. McCloy, is cart-before-the-horse psychology. The legal principles of the Nuremberg trials are not above controversy in the United States. And there is no reason to attempt to discourage such discussion in Germany.

From the standpoint of "reorientation," emphasis should be placed on the facts disclosed in the documents rather than on principles of jurisprudence, or on convictions and sentences. If these facts are widely disseminated and become part of the common informational background of German opinion, there will be little need to worry about the German attitude toward the trials.

The Nuremburg and other captured documents tell an eloquent story of the course of German and European history during the very period which is still dark to most Germans. They are therefore ideal material for educational use, and their meaning would be eagerly absorbed by German students and young people generally. They contain a virtually inexhaustible supply of clear proof of damage and decay in nearly all phases of German life under nazism.

For example, I know of no more striking illustration of the corrupt effect of the Nazi tyranny than is afforded in the field of medicine, where Germany once ranked so high, by the documents revealed during the Nuremberg "doctors' trial." As early as April 1933, respected Social Democratic and Jewish doctors in Berlin were publicly degraded and maltreated. Soon the established medical societies were dissolved and the entire professional apparatus was brought under party control.

The prostitution of medical education was speedily accomplished; "political doctors" in S. A. and S. S. uniforms swarmed through the universities and were appointed to the

leading chairs. Students were required to spend an ever-increasing part of their time in Nazi and semimilitary exercises; scientific attainments commanded less and less respect.

By the time the war came, the entire profession was demoralized and its standards debased, to the grave detriment of the medical services of the Wehrmacht. From this low level, the path led straight to the inspeakable and often superstitious medical experiments on concentration camp inmates, amateurishly contrived and fruitless as well as fiendishly cruel. All this emerges starkly and dramatically from the documents.

The same lessons are equally manifest in other branches of science, in law, and in economic organization. In the broader field of politico-military history, the impact of the documents is no less compelling. No one who has read the memoranda of Hitler's conferences with his generals will remain long in doubt as to how the absorption of Austria and Czechoslovakia was planned and consummated, or who was responsible for starting the war and subsequently initiating such side aggressions as those against Norway, Greece, and Yugoslavia.

The texts of such key documents should be part of the basic material for school and university instruction in history and politics, and should be widely available in libraries and information centers throughout Germany.

Certainly these documents would also help to accomplish the final discrediting of the old gods of German nationalism—the leaders of the officers' corps. The absurd pretensions of this inept, archaic, and unprincipled clique are mercilessly exposed in their own reports.

Here, for example, we can see the German army reaping the harvest of its own stupid and brutal policies for the "pacification" of the Balkans by the indiscriminate slaughter of hostages in such numbers that the inhabitants, instead of finding security through good behavior, were driven into the ranks of the partisans. The warnings against such tactics from German occupation officials went unheeded. The German generals thought they were being cold and realistic, but in fact, they were giving an eloquent demonstration of the rigidity and lack of imagination characteristic of their caste.

Gen. Franz Halder (chief of the German general staff from 1938 to 1942) and his fellows are busy these days trying to retrieve the prestige of the generals by blaming their disaster exclusively on Hitler; this is to be the World War II substitute for the stab-in-the-back legend of World War I. Halder's little pamphlet, Hitler als Feldherr, has had a phenomenal sale throughout Germany, and it is highly important that this meretricious and dangerous teaching be counteracted by unassailable documentary proof, circulated just as widely.

Is it now too late for effective action on our part in support of the aim of democratization? It is easy to argue that the time for all this is past, that we have set up the Bonn government and must not now meddle in internal affairs, that the Germans must be allowed to work out their own destiny. The occupation statute did not reserve any authority to the High Commission in the field of education. Will not the Germans spurn any further reorientation as an annoying interference?

So far, Mr. McCloy has wisely rejected this defeatist attitude. The cold war, far from reducing the importance of promoting democracy in Germany, has made it a vital necessity, basic to the success of our foreign policy. Expansion and renewed emphasis—including more money and the participation of leading educators—are gravely needed.

But there is also much that can be more effectively accomplished by nongovernmental agencies. Every gathering of American liberals at which the German question is discussed ends in a demand for support of the liberal and democratic element among the German people. These inchoate pleas can only be implemented by establishing contact with such elements. A refreshing and constructive example is that of Roger N. Baldwin, who recently resigned his long-held directorship of the American Civil Liberties Union, and who is now helping to establish a German Civil Liberties Union. It is to be hoped that many other American institutions and individuals will similarly dedicate themselves to this stupendous task; there is ample opportunity and crying need here for intiative, imagination, and devotion.

NUREMBERG STORY

The basis for the Nuremberg verdicts was a 25,000-word indictment drawn up by legal experts of the four big powers in 1945. There were four counts:

1. Participation in a conspiracy to commit crimes against peace, war crimes, and crimes against humanity.
2. Commission of crimes against peace, in the planning, initiation or waging of a war of aggression.
3. Commission of war crimes through violation of the laws or customs of war.
4. Commission of crimes against humanity through the murder, enslavement of civilians before or during the war, or persecution on political, racial, or religious grounds.

Extension of Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1950

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, the extension of rent control is of such vital concern to my home city of Chicago, I consider it highly important that certain facts be brought to the attention of the membership of this House. I now insert in the RECORD a letter received from Mr. Leo A. Lerner, chairman of the Citizens Committee for Rent Control, Chicago, Ill.; the resolution adopted by the Citizens Committee and other organizations in Chicago on rent control; a letter addressed to Hon. Martin H. Kennelly, of Chicago, by the Citizens Committee for Rent Control; the views of Mayor Kennelly and the City Council of the City of Chicago, together with the resolution adopted by the city council urging the extension of rent control to June 30, 1951:

CITIZENS COMMITTEE FOR RENT CONTROL,
Chicago, Ill., May 26, 1950.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The citizens committee for rent control is composed of labor, religious, and civic organizations who are gravely concerned with the crisis facing Chicago if rent controls are removed. The problem of housing in this city is well known to you. Chicago lags far behind other cities in the construction of both private and public dwellings. There is less than one-half of 1 percent vacancy in housing units renting under $100 a month. Chief Justice Edward Scheffler of the Chicago municipal court, which handles most eviction cases, warned that if controls are ended "there will be mass protests and perhaps some violence." In this great under-housed city with thousands of families doubled up, and other thousands existing in substandard housing, the abolition of controls would bring sky-rocketing rents to those very persons who can least afford to pay.

The democratic delegation from Chicago is to be congratulated on the excellent fight they are making. This committee would like to be of service to you. If there are any facts or figures needed from this area please call upon us.

Be assured that the great majority of persons in Chicago—the tenants—are behind you in this crisis. We enclose the resolution adopted by the affiliated organizations. We urge our representatives to take this expression to the floor of Congress as a statement from the leaders of this city as to the true need of Federal protection for Chicago citizens.

Sincerely,

LEO A. LERNER.

RESOLUTION FOR RENT CONTROL

We, the undersigned organizations, gravely concerned about our own welfare and that of our fellow citizens, urge the Congress of the United States to enact promptly an act to extend rent control under Federal authority.

We urge that the act include these provisions:

1. Effective controls over rents to be paid.
2. Effective controls over evictions.
3. Authority for the national Administrator of rents to control or recontrol areas.
4. Adequate provisions for administration and enforcement of all provisions.

We believe that Federal rent controls should be extended after June 30, 1950, since the facts that caused Congress to enact the 1949 act still prevail in most rent-controlled areas.

American Veterans' Committee; Chicago Industrial Union Council, CIO; Chicago Federation of Labor; Independent Association of Machinists; Independent Voters of Illinois; Japanese American Citizens League; Chicago Ethical Society; Jewish Labor Committee, NAACP; Illinois State Conference; Public Housing Association; Urban League; and Chicago Tenants' Federation.

CITIZENS COMMITTEE FOR RENT CONTROL,
Chicago, Ill., May 24, 1950.

Hon. MARTIN H. KENNELLY,
Mayor, City of Chicago,
Chicago, Ill.

DEAR MAYOR KENNELLY: Due to the seriousness of the crisis which the end of rent control would bring to Chicago, many citizens and labor groups have banded together to form a Citizens Committee for Rent Control. The purpose of the committee is to bring to the attention of the public and to our legislators in Washington the widespread support for controls in this area. Already the fight for continuation of Federal controls is being led by the Democratic delegation from Chicago in the House and by LUCAS and DOUGLAS in the Senate.

Governor Stevenson's appearance before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee and your wire to the House Committee highlight the fact that Illinois and Chicago are the Nation's number one "distressed areas". Most of the rural areas and small cities have been decontrolled. New York has its own State rent control law. Therefore the task of protecting its own citizens by Federal controls falls to the larger cities where controls are still desperately needed.

The committe believes that the official support of Chicago's leaders for rent control must be made clear and vigorous. Therefore we recommend that our city council

pass a resolution stating the real and continuing need for controls and endorsing the local option rent control bill. Furthermore, that such a resolution be introduced by you, the mayor, stressing the official concern about the urgency of the situation. Such a resolution would put a strong weapon in the hands of our Congressmen who are making such a splendid fight for their constituents.

We look for the introduction of such a resolution at the May 25 meeting of the council. We shall continue to support you in your endorsement of controls for the protection of Chicago citizens.

Cordially,

LEO LERNER.

CONTINUATION OF FEDERAL RENT CONTROL—VIEWS OF MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF CITY OF CHICAGO, MAY 25, 1950

Whereas on May 9, 1950, Mayor Martin H. Kennelly addressed a telegram to the Honorable BRENT SPENCE, chairman of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, as follows:

"The Honorable BRENT SPENCE,
"Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency,
"House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

"As mayor of Chicago I would like to present my views concerning the question of continuation of Federal rent control which is now being considered by your committee.

"In Chicago at present there is less than one-half of 1-percent vacancy in housing units except those renting for $100 a month or more. This affects more than 95 percent of Chicago's rental families.

"It is obvious and certainly should need little argument that removal of rent controls at this time and in such a market, would result in severe hardship to a large segment of this community.

"There have been practically no housing units built in the moderate rental classification during the past 10 years. So renting families will have no choice if controls are lifted. Of course not all owners are unscrupulous, but there are some who would take advantage of such a situation, and this would result in severe hardship to many of our citizens.

"It would be less than fair if I did not at the same time point out to you the financial difficulties under which many small property owners have been operating during the past few years. Statistics show that many thousands of small property owners have not been able to secure equitable adjustments in the rentals of their housing units. This should be corrected.

"Large property owners, through their accountants and lawyers have obtained the adjustments to which they were entitled by law. But of the small property owners in the two- and three-apartment-building class, many are still receiving the same rental which they received in 1942.

"So, in urging continuation of Federal rent control I would also like to urge that the legislation adopted and its administration as well should take into consideration the equities on both sides of the question.

"MARTIN H. KENNELLY,
Mayor."

And whereas the House Committee on Banking and Currency has approved a bill to continue rent controls to June 30, 1951, where such continuance is deemed necessary by the local authorities or the electorate: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the City Council of the City of Chicago concurs in the views expressed by the mayor in the aforesaid telegram of May 9, 1950, to the chairman of the House Committee on Banking and Currency; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be immediately forwarded by air mail to the President of the United States and Members of Congress from Illinois.

STATE OF ILLINOIS,
County of Cook, ss:

I, Ludwig D. Schreiber, city clerk of the city of Chicago, do hereby certify that the annexed and foregoing is a true and correct copy of the certain resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Chicago at a regular meeting held Thursday, the 25th day of May A. D. 1950.

Witness my hand and the corporate seal of the said city of Chicago this 25th day of May A. D. 1950.

[SEAL] LUDWIG D. SCHREIBER,
City Clerk.

More Disappointment in Prospect for Taxpayers From Capitol Hill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 1, 1950

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Mobile (Ala.) Register. The editorial follows:

MORE DISAPPOINTMENT IN PROSPECT FOR TAXPAYERS FROM CAPITOL HILL

Pending in the Senate appropriations committee is the omnibus appropriations bill recently passed by the House, calling for about $29,000,000,000 to finance most Federal agencies for the fiscal year starting next July 1.

It is the feeling of Representative KENNETH B. KEATING, of New York State, and no doubt that of many taxpayers all over the country, that the Senate should go further than the House went in trimming the size of this so-called single-package money bill.

"As I think back over the passage [by the House] of the omnibus appropriation bill," says Mr. KEATING, "I cannot refrain from pondering how appropriate is the title 'omnibus.' The bill just passed reminds me of a nice, new, shiny bus.

"This omnibus, jet-propelled and steam-heated, started out with the brave legend, 'Economy or bust,' stenciled on the side. It limped back into the Senate garage covered with dust and amendments and all you could read was the bust.

"The weary taxpayers, who had been taken for this expensive ride, were astounded at the fare which the driver demanded. They had been told that this year they were going to get the economy size ride and had been promised that the fare would not be more than they had in their pocketbooks.

"At the very last minute the driver relented and scaled down his estimates of the gas necessary to visit all the Government departments and agencies. Somewhat relieved, the passengers settled back and counted the dollars they had saved.

"But they were still overburdened with subsidies, pet projects and other mementoes of their trip. * * * The trip had cost less than they had feared, but much more than they could afford. And they still ran the chance that after they thought they were safely home, they might get an added bill for repairs from the Senate garage.

"Every passenger ought to sit down and write to the repairman at the other end of the Capitol that they hope, when the bus is overhauled, it will be found that riders have a refund rather than a further charge coming to them."

If concerted, determined effort had been made in the House, the omnibus single-package bill surely could have been reduced more than the amount of economies claimed to have been written into it.

Taxpayers are aware that this huge bill, although designed to provide funds to operate most regular agencies of the Government for the next fiscal year, does not cover all the demands for Federal spending, by a good deal.

For instance, the bill makes no provision for foreign aid or interest on the Federal debt, two big items. These are among the spending demands to be handled separately.

It is not yet indicated just what the Senate will do about trimming down the size of the omnibus bill. In the meantime, however, the general prospect as to 1950–51 fiscal year spending by the Federal Government is that the taxpayers will witness a continuation of extravagance.

This Congress would do the Nation a real service if it would reverse the style of recent predecessors and choose the course of sound economy instead of extravagance in handing out money to spending agencies.

The chance of the present Congress doing that seems, however, to be growing more remote as the session progresses. In short, the present Congress shows prospects of becoming another keen disappointment to the taxpayers in its handling of the purse strings.

Why Rent Controls Should Be Extended

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN B. SULLIVAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 1, 1950

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, with rent control due to expire June 30, and with proposed legislation providing for its extension to come before the House of Representatives sometime after June 12, I am including in my extension of remarks a discussion by me of why rent control should be continued, broadcast over KWK, St. Louis, Mo., on May 14, 1950.

In the following questions and answers are some of the reasons why I sincerely believe that the welfare of our Nation requires that rent control be extended.

I urge my colleagues in the House to ponder these reasons and I earnestly hope that they will recognize the driving necessity of such further legislation.

The discussion follows:

ARE RENT CONTROLS NECESSARY?

ANNOUNCER. Here in Washington, the fight over keeping rent control another year is growing more intense. Those who want controls to stay on tell us that without them, there will be a terrific rise in rents, a rise most tenants can't adequately pay.

Those who want controls taken off declare that landlords have been denied fair rent increases under the present law. The question soon will be voted on by Congress.

Here to tell us his views on rent control is Congressman JOHN B. SULLIVAN, Eleventh District, of St. Louis. To start out bluntly, Congressman SULLIVAN, do you think rent control still is needed?

Representative SULLIVAN. I do. I certainly do.

Question. Why?

Representative SULLIVAN. It's wanted. And the reasons it's wanted come in the letters I get—I and the other Congressmen—and in the cold bare facts.

Question. Letters—from whom?

Representative SULLIVAN. From people—people who rent. People who work hard to make ends meet. Wives who know how much has to be spent on food, on clothing for their youngsters, on other necessities. Husbands and wives who know the absolute maximum they can afford for rent. Here's a letter, for example, from a middle-aged gentleman in the Eleventh District in St. Louis, which I represent. His job brings in $55 a week for himself and his wife. There aren't any children. But—he says:

"Last year we were put out of our old place; the house was bought, and the new owner took the downstairs while a relative moved into our flat upstairs.

"We looked and looked for another flat; we couldn't find anything. I took off from work to look, and some weeks I lost 3 or 4 days' pay because my wife couldn't get around so good and I had to find us a place to live.

"The places we saw wanted much more than we could afford. Finally, one of the men at work told me his cousin was buying a place, and this flat would be for rent.

"We went to see the landlord right away, and he was nice about it; he just said we'd have to take care of the repairs. There were three rooms and they did need working on, and the rent was $75. But we figured we had to have a place, even if the rent was higher than we figured on, so we took it.

"We've been scraping pretty hard to get by. The landlord already told us the rent goes up to $100 if rent controls stop.

"I don't know what we could do then because the wife can't work; I don't guess anybody would hire her because she hasn't worked since we were married except keep house. I don't know how I could bring home any more money, either. So please vote to keep on rent control."

That's one letter. Here's another:

"We live in a rooming house because it's all we could find. We have two rooms for my husband, me, and our three children. We pay $20 a week rent now. It used to be $12.50 a week. My husband drives a cab; he brings home about $40 with the tips included in that. The rent has gone up twice and the landlord is trying to get it raised again. He gets $80 a week now from the people who live in this house. So I just pray every morning and every night that nobody takes rent control off because if it is taken off, I don't know what people like us will do."

Question. Those letters are typical?

Representative SULLIVAN. They're duplicated hundreds of times. I get 50 letters like that to every letter coming in to ask that rent control be ended. Now, it used to be that a tenant could shop around and find a place to live. That isn't true any more. His choice is strait-jacketed. There are high rents on the vacancies—and there are very few vacancies, if any at all.

Question. But JOHN, you think that if rent ceilings were removed, that more vacancies would show up—and that rents might rise, but they'd level off in a short while?

Representative SULLIVAN. Let's not kid ourselves. To begin with, we have too many families living in crowded quarters, doubling up, living in places that should have been condemned a long time ago. If any vacancies would show up—at reasonable rentals—they'll grab them. But with the rise in population—and in St. Louis, the population has gone up an estimated 200,000 in the past 10 years—we can appreciate the problem. It's simply this—we've had that rise in population—we've had an uncounted number of families living together in small, cramped quarters—and the Department of Labor now tells us that last December there were just about 1,500 dwelling units for rent in the entire St. Louis area. There just isn't the rental housing available that people need. Now, as far as rents going up and then leveling off—we've had an unforgettable experience with that contention. Back in 1946, you remember, a fight was made on price control. We were told that if price control was taken off, prices might go up but they, too, would level off and would come to rest at less than the OPA price. Is that what happened? No, there were exorbitant price increases. And the consumers paid through the nose. The same thing would occur if rent controls came off. The spiral would begin—and soon would be out of reach of those least able to afford an increase.

Question. What about the cities where decontrol has been tried?

Representative SULLIVAN. Well, take Omaha, Nebr., for example. Rents were reported up 166 percent there after decontrol last November. Dallas, Tex., is another city. Rents went up 35 percent in Dallas. They went up 41.3 percent after Houston tried decontrol. And so on around the country, wherever decontrol was established. Did they come down again? You know the answer.

Question. What does this mean in terms not only of money but in terms of people, in terms of national welfare and economy?

Representative SULLIVAN. It means just this: With general rent increases, tenants would have to pay a lot more money in rent. That would mean that they'd be cutting down on buying food, clothes, and other necessities. When people cut down on buying, industry finds it has to produce less. That brings about unemployment. And I might point out that a jobless tenant often can't pay any rent at all.

Question. Do you take the position, then, that landlords don't deserve any rent increases?

Representative SULLIVAN. No one has ever opposed fair and justified rent increases for landlords. I do take the position that the law must be fair to both, and that the fairness is to be judged, not by one side or the other, but by the national welfare and interest. Now, I would like to point out here and now that 10,787 St. Louis area landlords received authorized rent increases between November 1949 and the end of April. These increases alone amounted to $97,663 more each month for the landlords. They averaged almost $6 for each of the 16,958 dwelling units covered during the 6-month period by the increases.

In April alone, raises in rents were O. K.'d for 1,608 landlords. These applied to slightly more than 3,000 housing accommodations.

Question. Why, then, is pressure being applied for the end of rent control?

Representative SULLIVAN. The pressure has a profit purpose. On the scales used to measure this demand that rent controls be halted, a sack of gold weighs more than public need. But let's calculate again on the basis of more cold facts. Look through a St. Louis newspaper. See the listings of rooms and apartments and flats for rent. Most of them start at $80, $85, $90 a month. And the people who need rental homes just don't make that kind of money. Those rents aren't going to come down if rent controls are ended. On the contrary, they're likely to go up. Well, we're told, a lot of people who are renting now will buy homes if rent controls are taken off. Let's not be taken in by that argument, either. Again, the fact is—and the loan companies will tell you this—that an increasing number of American families spend more than they earn.

Question. Where will they get the money to buy? There's a limit to what they can borrow.

Representative SULLIVAN. Equal with that is the fact that the backbone of our housing system is rental dwellings. Any break in that backbone will be felt along the entire body of our Nation. It would mean social and economic disruption, hardship for many of our people. And this will remain a danger as long as we continue to have more people looking for places to rent than we have rental accommodations to take care of them.

The public good will not be served by an act so ill-timed and so ill-advised as dropping rent controls now. Such a move would bring sudden sky-high rent boosts. It would result in a chaotic scramble by families to find new rooms when they are forced to leave their old dwellings by rents which are raised beyond reach of their pocketbooks.

It would mean cutting down for many of food bought, of milk and meat and vegetables and fruit, of clothes and household goods and appliances and the thousands of other items and services on whose steady and high production our good economy depends.

Much stronger consideration could be given the arguments for ending controls if landlords now were not being fairly treated. But, under the present law, they are receiving rent increases.

I am working for a strong Federal rent control law—a law that will cover all States. We cannot depend on the exigencies of chance; we cannot anticipate that the legislatures of our States all will come through and pass laws to protect tenants.

Sound sense and reason—the welfare of our Nation—dictates that rent controls—national rent controls—must stay on.

Growth of Alabama Business From 1939 to 1948

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1950

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, preliminary figures recently released by the Bureau of the Census of the United States Department of Commerce indicate a remarkable growth of Alabama business receipts during the period 1939 to 1948.

Examples of this growth are as follows:

	1939	1948
Retail sales	$436,000,000	$1,631,400,000
Wholesale sales	415,700,000	1,641,100,000
Service trades receipts	22,700,000	89,000,000
Hotel receipts	4,800,000	13,000,000
Amusement business receipts	7,000,000	20,800,000

The period also witnessed a remarkable growth in employment in certain businesses, examples of which are as follows:

	1939 employees	1948 employees
Retail trade establishments	54,774	91,366
Wholesale trade establishments	14,636	26,007
Selected service trades	11,333	20,465

Mr. Speaker, in my judgment, no State in the Union has more possibilities for future growth and development along business and industrial lines than does the State of Alabama. Our great natural resources of good climate, high annual rainfall, coal, timber, water power, industrial water, oil, gas, gravel, salt, limestone, iron ore—to name only a few, coupled with the enterprise of our people point the way to an expanding economy in the years that lie immediately ahead.

As a part of my remarks, I include a letter and statement from the Department of Commerce:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
Washington, May 22, 1950.

The Honorable CARL ELLIOTT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ELLIOTT: Enclosed is a copy of the preliminary release of the 1948 Census of Business for the State of Alabama, which I though would be of interest to you.

If you have need for additional copies, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,

NELSON C. PIERCE,
Special Assistant.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS, 1948 CENSUS OF BUSINESS — RETAIL, WHOLESALE, SERVICE TRADES—PRELIMINARY

ALABAMA

Retail, wholesale, and service establishments located in Alabama showed a substantial expansion in dollar volume of trade from 1939 to 1948 according to preliminary figures from the 1948 Census of Business released today by the Bureau of the Census, United States Department of Commerce.

Retail sales in the State during 1948 aggregated $1,631,400,000, an increase of 274 percent over the $436,000,000 sales in 1939, when the preceding Census of Business was taken. Wholesale sales volume in the State showed a 295-percent rise over the same period, reaching a total of $1,641,100,000 in 1948 as compared with $415,700,000 in 1939. The service trades included in the Census of Business reported receipts totaling $89,900,000 in 1948 compared with $22,700,000 in 1939. Hotel receipts moved from $4,800,000 in 1939 to $13,000,000 in 1948. Amusement businesses in the State recorded receipts of $20,800,000 in 1948 compared with $7,000,000 in 1939.

Employment in the State also rose over the 9-year period between 1939 and 1948 for the trades covered by the Census of Business. Retail trade establishments reported 91,366 paid employees for the workweek ended nearest November 15, 1948. Of these, 74,791 worked the full week, and the remainder part of the week. The comparable total and full workweek figures for 1939 were 54,774 and 44,551. Wholesale trade establishments reported a total of 26,007 full- and part-week employees for the week of November 15, 1948, compared with 14,636 for the same week in 1939. For the selected service trades, November 15, 1948, paid employees numbered 20,465; the comparable figure for 1939, adjusted for change in scope between the two censuses, was 11,333.

These preliminary figures have been compiled from similar releases being made available for each county in Alabama. Final figures, superseding the preliminary data for Alabama, will be included in a State bulletin to be issued in several months. Similar data will be made available in preliminary and final form for each of the States.

TABLE 1.—*Census of business preliminary results for 1948, by trade group—Alabama*

Trade group and kind of business	Number of establishments	1948 sales and receipts	Active proprietors of unincorporated businesses November 1948	Paid employees, workweek ended nearest Nov. 15, 1948	
				Total employees [1]	Full workweek employees
Retail trade, total	28,669	$1,631,403,000	27,903	91,366	74,791
Food group	11,848	415,138,000	11,680	13,549	9,740
Eating and drinking places	3,970	82,700,000	4,005	13,475	11,430
General merchandise group, general stores	2,368	248,430,000	2,164	18,845	13,453
Apparel group	1,185	113,600,000	1,041	7,797	6,161
Furniture, home furnishings, appliance group	1,240	91,694,000	1,066	5,536	5,181
Automotive group	1,239	203,434,000	1,164	10,721	10,313
Gasoline service stations	2,891	86,066,000	2,886	4,971	4,087
Lumber, building, hardware group	1,102	115,629,000	1,172	6,280	5,678
Drug and proprietary stores	866	50,538,000	859	4,333	3,603
All other retail stores	1,960	134,174,000	1,866	5,799	5,140
Wholesale trade, total	2,578	1,641,053,000	2,037	26,007	[2]
Merchant wholesalers, total	1,524	774,643,000	1,281	18,394	[2]
Groceries, confectionery, meat	277	167,885,000	257	3,075	[2]
Farm products, edible	183	72,151,000	200	2,289	[2]
Tobacco	28	33,418,000	23	380	[2]
Furniture, home furnishings	15	3,083,000	9	103	[2]
Automotive supplies	171	25,023,000	163	1,320	[2]
Electrical merchandise	63	45,851,000	27	770	[2]
Hardware, plumbing, heating	46	76,708,000	30	1,491	[2]
Lumber, construction materials	111	77,148,000	96	2,005	[2]
Machinery, equipment, industrial supplies	215	74,002,000	154	2,570	[2]
All other merchant wholesalers	415	199,374,000	322	4,388	[2]
Manufacturers' sales branches, offices	246	418,784,000	3	3,866	[2]
Petroleum bulk plants, terminals	428	150,577,000	388	1,850	[2]
Agents, brokers (merchandise)	208	197,925,000	187	774	[2]
Assemblers of farm products	172	99,124,000	178	1,123	[2]
Selected service trades, total	6,946	89,917,000	7,006	20,465	18,703
Personal services	4,232	51,610,000	4,198	15,606	14,341
Business services	210	6,727,000	176	1,226	1,079
Automotive repairs and services	1,406	19,451,000	1,466	2,269	2,060
Other repairs and services	1,098	12,129,000	1,166	1,364	1,223
Hotels	207	13,036,000	169	3,468	3,305
Tourist courts and camps	170	2,282,000	166	406	355
Amusements	801	20,769,000	535	3,706	[2]

[1] Includes employees paid for less than the full workweek.
[2] Not available.

All-American Conference To Combat Communism Wins Endorsements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 1 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD resolutions adopted by the State convention of the Knights of Columbus at their meeting last month in Illinois. This information comes to me from Vincent L. Knaus, grand knight of the Knights of Columbus for Illinois, and I call special attention to the resolution endorsing the newly organized All-American Conference To Combat Communism, of which Rev. Daniel A. Poling, of New York City, is now the national chairman.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Realizing the seriousness of the times we live in, when over one-half of the world is enslaved by totalitarian communism, our own people remain indisposed and idle to the threats all around us, to destroy our constitutional liberties and our American way of life, and the agents and stooges of the Kremlin are ever on the alert to divide the American people so as to render us impotent in the coming struggle of God against Satan.

We make the following recommendations to this convention, to be transmitted to the local councils of our great State and Nation.

I

We recommend that under "good of the order" at the council meetings there be a 10-minute discussion on the attendant evils of socialism and communism and the value of our inherited constitutional liberties and achievements of the American way of life by a competent speaker. That this matter be well and ably handled and that it be given widespread publicity in the local press—the sentinels of liberty—in our communities.

II

That a splendid publication on the subject just recited is Counterattack, a weekly four-page letter that not only exposes the evils of totalitarianism, its agents and stooges here in the United States and elsewhere—names names and makes specific recommendations on a week-to-week basis that gives us ammunition with which to fight our enemies, that is reliable and can be accepted and that each council ought to subscribe to this publication which costs $24 a year and which is cheap at the price and is now considered the No. 1 enemy of communism here in the United States of America.

III

That in order to destroy the ugly scourge of communism, there must be presented a united front against the enemy by uniting with other organizations recognized, as representative and national in scope and have a record and present a determination to fight communism and express and accept the ideals of American principles, ideals and objectives and such an organization was just organized in this city May 13, 14, 1950 and known as the All-American Conference to Combat Communism.

Our forces must be united and not dispersed, our attacks must reach the objectives sought to be attained, because if we are not united, divided we will utterly fail and will never recover our lost constitutional liberties and regain the achievements of the American way of life.

We, therefore, recommend that the Illinois State Council and the Supreme Council affiliate with the All-American Conference to Combat Communism, at once.

IV

The the revelations at Fatima and the occurrences at Lipa demonstrate beyond the shadow of a doubt that in waging a war against this satanic ideology we must be spiritually armed and protected—that prayer and sacrifice are concomitant barrages to storm heaven to avert our threatened catastrophe and destruction.

We recommend the family rosary, recited daily, in the homes of our members. That the Knights of Columbus inaugurate in our beloved State—a 15-minute radio program—State-wide—under the direction of our beloved State chaplain and bishop, to reach Catholic and non-Catholic alike—to a method of prayer that has never failed and will not fail us now.

That our council meetings, at the closing prayer a decade of the rosary be recited, dedicated to the coronation of our blessed mother as queen of heaven.

V

That annually in the State, as an observance, of the Illinois State Council and by local councils—at a suitable date—we offer our prayers and hold an annual Communion Sunday in memory of Archbishop Aloysius Stepinac and Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty, (and all other martyrs to the same cause), of the torture and struggle they underwent and now remain the symbols of freedom against depravity in government.

That our beloved State chaplain and bishop be consulted on this program—to make it a fitting tribute to these two men and others of our faith that stood up against tyrants and confessed their faith before men. (In this connection we recommend the sale and distribution of the Cardinal Mindszenty Commemorative Medal.)

VI

That there is no substantial difference or distinction in the brand of world communism, whether it be Russian, Titoism, or Chinese, as all seek to enslave man totally—both in body and soul. That this totalitarian ideology is directed at America as an enemy and that any help of any kind given by our Government of our money or influence to the Russian satellite countries be roundly condemned as action of disloyalty to the principles and ideals many times expressed by our Government in world affairs.

We recommend that our members, council and the State Council so express themselves in letters to our elected or appointed servants of all political faiths of our Government whenever the opportunity presents itself and not to quit for a time and leave the matter dormant but make it a barrage of letters until the matter is finally disposed of and concluded. This is our duty and responsibility as men and we must be ever true to our allegiance to our God. This is not meddling in politics.

VII

We commend the excellent work done by Rev. Edward J. Duncan, director of the New Man Foundation at the University of Illinois, and ask his kind assistance and cooperation with his staff in the work of the Religious Liberty Committee and we present our solicitude to Rev. Robert T. Hutch, director at Carbondale, with the same objectives in view.

Conclusion

That in order to insure this committee in its great work throughout the State that our State Deputy continue to appoint a State committee on this subject, representative of the whole State and that meetings be called at least four times a year.

Dated May 16, 1950.

HENRY H. FONKE,
Vice Chairman, Breese.
BERNARD MILLBURG,
Secretary, Morrisonville,
DAN DOYLE,
Alternate, Taylorville.
HOWARD WOODBURY,
Father Marquette.
VINCENT L. KNAUS,
Chairman, Santa Maria Council, South Chicago No. 1511.
FRANK J. PREE,
Centralia.

Plugging Loopholes in Our Tax Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1950

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, sometime ago I wrote a letter to the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House, expressing my feelings and views relative to plugging the loopholes in our present tax laws. This is a statement that I would have made personally had it not been for the illness of Mrs. Sabath which precluded my appearance.

I feel that the committee should give due consideration to my views set forth in the enclosed statement and, under unanimous consent, I embody both the letter afore-mentioned and the statement in the RECORD:

HON. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Due to the illness of Mrs. Sabath and myself, which I am pleased is not serious, I was precluded from appearing personally before your committee.

Therefore, I submit to you the importance of enacting legislation which will eliminate the many loopholes in the present tax laws and at the same time eliminate the several tax exemptions to trusts, so-called charities, institutions of higher learning, life insurance companies, and the mining interest depletion allowances, all of which are evading Government tax in one form or another and which amount to hundreds of millions of dollars annually. If my suggestions be carried out you can easily repeal the excise tax and eliminate deficit spending.

All of you, I am sure, desire to bring about the reduction of the burdens that fall on the average taxpayers, as you so frequently point out. I feel that if you consider my enclosed statement, you too will come to the conclusion that it is deserving of your favorable consideration.

Sincerely yours,

A. J. SABATH,
Member of Congress.

REPUBLICAN DUPLICITY

Mr. Chairman, the President, in a recent message to this Congress, urged the inclusion in the proposed tax revision bill of specific provisions for closing the many loopholes in the present tax laws, and to repeal the exemptions presently allowed many corporations such as oil companies, life-insurance companies, and other corporations and organizations, on the huge sums used by them for purely speculative purposes. Some of our major education institutions are included in this category because of the tax exemptions granted in their original charters as charitable or eleemosynary institutions.

Some years ago certain industrialists who had accumulated tremendous wealth conceived the idea of setting up trusts or foundations effective upon their death for the very laudable purpose of benefiting our institutions of learnings, for research in medicine and other fields—to aid the needy, and for other worth while purposes of improving the general welfare. Among these are the Carnegie Foundation, the Russell Sage Foundation and later, the Rockefeller Foundation. The profits from their operations were quite generally used for the specific purpose for which they were originally created. They have added to the material growth and welfare of our country. They were placed in a tax-exempt status because their income was used for humanitarian and worthy purposes.

Realizing the looseness of the provisions of the present law, a large number of greedy individuals conceived the idea of taking advantage of the law to serve their own selfish purposes, with the result that in the name of charity and higher education thousands of so-called family trusts have mushroomed in the last few years, resulting in a loss of hundreds of millions of tax dollars to the Government each year.

The Virginia Law Review of February 1948 reported that there are in existence today more than 10,000 foundations of this type, and the vast majority are of the "family" variety. The actual number is not known, it may well run into double or triple that number. These trusts are very secretive about their business. They take the position that their finances are nobody's business. They have long feared the spotlight of publicity and the possibility of legislative action to bring them in line. These foundations receive today preferred tax treatment. They are definitely obligated to justify their public sanction. The larger and older foundations have recognized this responsibility; annual reports are published and the public can ascertain where the income goes. All should be required to report their financial and other operations, and tax exemption should be limited only to their direct contributions to institutions with an active program for social welfare.

Let me point out a few of the operations of recent date of some of these so-called trusts or foundations.

The Hershey family formed the nonprofit Hershey Industrial School, which today owns most of the profitable Hershey Chocolate Co. Because of its tax-exemption status, operating costs of the company are not high. True, they contribute to the school, but it

would be very interesting to know the exact story of the millions of its profits that have gone into the building of a sugar empire in Cuba.

In October 1948 a Chicago real-estate operator organized the Boston Foundation. Its first move was to purchase and lease the Edgewater Beach Hotel on Chicago's lake front. The real-estate operator is now president of the operating company, leasing the property from his own foundation. Its contributions to Chicago charitable institutions last year was $105,000, in tax-exempt money. It would be interesting to know where the balance of the profit went.

A year ago one of the South's profitable textile operations was turned into a tax-exempt foundation, involving its $34,000,000 holdings. The community gets about $400,000 in tax-exempt moneys—about equal to the taxes the company formerly paid locally. All of its other huge profit total is tax-exempt to the Federal Treasury.

Our universities and colleges have gone into business in grand style under this strangely overlooked weakness in our laws. Union College recently purchased all of the properties of Allied Stores Corp., one of the largest national department-store chains. The same college recently acquired the Abraham & Straus property in Brooklyn for $9,000,000 and immediately leased it back to Abraham & Straus at low rentals under an 80-year lease.

Oberlin College owns Montgomery Ward, Sears, Roebuck, and Woolworth locations in many parts of the country. The University of Pennsylvania, headed by that eminent Republican, Harold Stassen, and a Presidential candidate of that party, owns the Lit Brothers Store property in Philadelphia. Lit's, of course, leases it from the University at a very favorable rental.

Columbia University, the haven of General Eisenhower, owns the site of much of Rockefeller Center. Cooper Union owns the property upon which the Chrysler Building stands. New York University has gone into the macaroni business in a big way; it is also interested in the manufacture of piston rings, table china, leather goods and other products through the ownership or control of business institutions, all enjoying tax-free status. Had these particular corporations remained in private status last year, they would have paid $1,500,000 in Federal taxes. The Bureau of Internal Revenue, realizing that noodle making was stretching the dough too far, went into court to compel the university to pay taxes. This case is pending at the moment in our Federal courts.

Meanwhile, the involvement of educational institutions in the field of banking, real estate, commerce and industry goes merrily on. Universities own haberdasheries, citrus groves, movies, cattle ranches, the Encyclopedia Britannica (owned by the University of Chicago) and a large variety of other enterprises. The University of Wisconsin controls patent pools and collects royalties. Universities and colleges, together with foundations, have an annual income from their business activities of well over a half billion dollars annually. Were this income not tax-exempt, they would pay $173,000,000 in Federal taxes annually.

Realizing the danger involved in the rapid spread of this system, the Association of American Colleges has issued a warning that the right to tax exemption has been abused by many colleges, and should be watched very carefully.

Some of our Republican friends in Congress are directing blasts against the cooperatives for not paying just taxes. However, I want to point out the cooperatives are in an entirely different position from these so-called charitable trusts and educational institutions. Cooperatives are set up to supply goods and services needed by their membership. Furthermore, about 30,000 cooperatives do pay income taxes, while only about 5,000 do not. By selling goods to their members at reasonable prices, the co-ops have succeeded in throwing much-needed light on the exorbitant prices charged by many of the big private monopolies, while these so-called charitable trusts and foundations, interested in securing all the profit they can possibly squeeze out of their commercial operations, do nothing that might offend the corporate giants they are nested in. The Biblical observation, "Charity covers a multitude of sins," applies very aptly to the operations of these family trusts and foundations of recent years.

An interesting light was thrown onto the operations of one of these so-called trusts some months ago as a result of the investigation conducted by the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce into the operations of Textron, Inc.

This investigation disclosed that Textron, Inc., had employed the device of charitable trusts to a substantial extent as a means of acquiring risk capital which was used in its business transactions, such as sales and leases of plants and equipment and by substantial loans to Textron, Inc., and its affiliates. A number of trusts were created to provide the large funds this firm needed for its gambling operations. The operators of this scheme formed six different trusts in the New England area. First. The Rhode Island Charities Trust—named the city of Providence Community Chest as the sole beneficiary. The trust was formed in 1937, but testimony revealed that not a cent was paid to the Community Chest until 1945, and then the sum of $10,000 was turned over to it. During 1945, 1946, and 1947 the Community Chest received a total of $85,000 from the trust, while the officers and the bank handling the funds for the trust received a total in excess of $140,000. This trust has never made an accounting to the beneficiary, nor has its books ever been audited. This is the story, substantially, of most of these so-called charitable trusts.

But the most disconcerting and dangerous feature of all in the operation of some of these trusts is brought out by the experience of the city of Nashua, N. H., with this corporation and trust. They purchased the Nashua Textile Mills in 1945, a mill which had been a mainstay of the economy in this community since 1823. Its previous owners were essentially manufacturers and not speculators in mill properties. Through the cooperation of loyal local labor the mills and the community prospered. Textron closed this plant shortly after acquiring it, transferring its activities in this field to Puerto Rico, where cheap, sweat-shop labor was available, throwing 5,500 real American workmen out of jobs and demoralizing the community.

This is a clear indication of tax-free income misused to destroy American unions, and to blight the spirit and destroy the well-being of American labor. It is high time some action was taken to eliminate such demagogic and un-American practices through the inadvertent cooperation of our own Government.

These loop-holes and tax-evasion schemes must be eliminated. If prompt action is taken, the present excise taxes can be reduced or repealed as I have so consistently urged, and it would aid materially in reducing or eliminating the deficit we are faced with and place the country in a sound financial position.

I am informed, however, that 10 of the Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee, unfortunately, in combination with a few southern Democrats, are holding back the efforts of the Democrats who seek to remedy the pernicious situation referred to above. I fully realize these Republicans are under the influence of the National Association of Manufacturers, among other pressure groups, which are opposed to any fair elimination of these loop-holes in the law. The Republicans themselves should try to pry themselves loose from this vicious influence and I sincerely hope that some of the afore-mentioned 10 Republicans will recognize their responsibility to the people and aid the Democratic Members in amending the present law.

There is one more point I want to bring out clearly in connection with these lease-back deals made between the trusts and foundations who purchase businesses, land, and properties, and the firms who lease them back at favorable long-term rentals. The rent they pay is a deductible item in their income-tax returns, again reducing the taxes they would otherwise pay to the Federal Government, and also giving them an unfair competitive advantage over the small-business competitor. It is tending to build up monopolies more and more, while driving the small-business man to the wall.

In the interest of legitimate, honest small business, and in the interest of the honest taxpayer, as well as in their own interest, these Republican members should join with the Democratic members of this committee who are trying to bring out a bill as urged by our President, and vote to eliminate these loopholes that are resulting in the loss of hundreds of millions of dollars of revenue to the Treasury each year. Not only that, but these same Republican members should vote with the sincere Democratic members to eliminate the exemptions that have been given to life-insurance companies, oil and mining interests, and other giant monopolies via the so-called depletion allowances, by which these groups have been able to evade their just contribution to the cost of government which protects and safeguards their far-flung interests.

In addition to those now being charged with tax evasion, I have noticed that the steel and lumber racketeers have robbed the American people of millions and millions of dollars. I also observed that the textile manufacturers who controlled the price of textiles and the shirt manufacturers who boosted the price of $1.50 shirts to $5 and $6, saying the least, their actions have been criminal.

I feel that their activities should be penetrated as well as those of the war profiteers whose activities have been ignored.

I feel, therefore, Mr. Speaker, that if the Ways and Means Committee fails to report a fair bill, eliminating these loop-holes and tax-avoidance schemes, the full responsibility will lie with the Republican members of that Committee, and the Republican Party will be foreclosed from charging that we Democrats failed to repeal or reduce excise taxes as recommended by the President and which we Democrats desire.

If the Republicans continue to oppose a fair tax bill, I shall insist in the next Congress that the number of Republicans on the Ways and Means Committee, as well as on some of the other committees where legislation recommended by the President is held up in which the masses are vitally interested, be reduced so that the majority party as now constituted, and as I know will continue in control of our legislative body, shall actually have a working majority in the next Congress and work for the will of the people.

How Does Rural Housing Affect Family Living?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT E. JONES, JR.
OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1950

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, recently I asked a farmer who had just completed construction of an entire new set of buildings on his farm, "Just what do you think of this farm housing loan program which has made your new construction possible?" His answer was, "My wife got the house she's always wanted, and she's satisfied. I've got the new barn I want, so I'm satisfied. She'll enjoy working in the new house, and her work will be easier, too. And my new barn's as good as our old house used to be, so it's taken a lot of work out of the chores and we can enjoy those things now while we're young enough to appreciate them, and not wait until we're so old that we can't enjoy them even if we can afford them then."

I have heard a lot of comments like that, and each time I hear them I am glad once more that I introduced H. R. 1373 during the first session of the Eighty-first Congress. That rural housing bill, cosponsored in the Senate by Senator SPARKMAN of Alabama, has since become the farm housing title of the Housing Act of 1949; and in 6 months has already made it possible for over 2,000 farm families to have better housing than they had before or than they could have paid for without Government aid. An estimated 140,000 farm families will eventually have more adequate housing because Congress passed this law, and with that much improved housing in our Nation, the rural-slum areas will almost disappear.

But just how will this new farm housing affect rural living?

The home, whether it is a magnificent residential estate or a small dwelling unit, is the center of our better human relations. The home which, with its surrounding environment, has the atmosphere of being healthy, safe, and wholesome is the very essence of democracy. It is where our good citizens are born, grow up, and take their place in the community and Nation. By improving the home, then, we automatically improve the future citizens of our communities and Nation.

When no real home exists, or where the home is inadequate, unhealthy, unsafe, and unwholesome, we are breeding disease, high infant mortality, and social instability. In slum and blighted areas, such as now exist in many parts of our rural South, we are breeding bad future citizens, families which may listen when foreign ideologists whisper, or who would be physically unable to fight for our country if we should be attacked.

Have you forgotten that the highest percentage of rejects for physical reasons during the draft was in our southern rural areas?

The kind of housing that a family has plays an important part in the success or failure of that family. Our homes should provide comfort, convenience, privacy, an opportunity for the development of personalities, an opportunity for mental and physical development, and the cultivation of friendships. How many of these six goals are actually possible in the rural slums which are all about us? Not many. Yet with the hopes held out for 140,000 new farm buildings through Government aid—about half of which will be in the South where the need is greatest—all six are again possible.

But if we are to accomplish this goal, it will require the united efforts of all of us, not merely the passage of legislation and the appropriation of some money with which to make loans. The things which can be done by individuals to help bring about better rural living are exemplified by the recent work of the Virginia Federation of Home Demonstration Clubs. That group made an unbiased survey of actual housing conditions and needs in their State, and published it under the name "Farm Housing in Virginia." Then this booklet was used as a study piece by the various clubs, and each club set up some project which would help make better housing possible in their State. The same idea could be used in every State, and with any group which is really interested in helping farm families live better.

How serious is our rural housing situation today? A few figures may startle you, but should convince you of the need for better rural housing if we are to create a more healthy America. Did you know that 9 percent of all farm dwellings have no toilet facilities at all, and over 80 percent still depend upon outdoor toilets? Did you know that only 2 percent of all farm dwellings have kitchen sinks? Only 29 percent have any sort of water at all within the dwelling? The most common source of water on the farm is a well or a spring—and only 6 percent of the wells or springs in the South are adequately covered to protect them from disease and filth. In one county studied recently, 90 percent of all the farm dwellings were without screens for their windows, and many did not even have glass in the windows.

It is to correct evils such as these Senator SPARKMAN and I decided it was necessary to include farm housing in the Housing Act of 1949. Now it is possible for a farm family to obtain the housing they need for adequate, safe, and wholesome living; using Government credit if they are unable to obtain the improvements otherwise.

Under procedures established by the Farmers Home Administration to administer this program, certain minimum standards have been set up, and no farm housing loan will be approved unless the dwelling meets these standards. Let us see what some of these standards might mean in increased convenience to the housewife, increased safety to the family, and in more wholesome living for everyone who enters the new dwelling.

First, there must be ample room. We consider a city section a slum where the dwellings have less than one room per person average; yet the average of all farm dwellings is more crowded than that. But the FHA standards require that the new dwelling provide ample space for the entire family, not merely a place where they can be herded together for the night like cattle.

There must be adequate storage space. A farmer's gross income is probably the smallest of any occupational field, yet a family which grows and stores its own food can live adequately from that income. The FHA standards require that the family have enough storage space so they can store all the food they need during the growing season, for use later in the year. There must be closets, too, for storing things other than food. If you go into most farm dwellings today, you will find them almost completely devoid of adequate storage space for clothes, linens, quilts, cleaning supplies, medicines. But the new dwellings built from loan funds authorized by the Farm Housing Act of 1949 will provide this badly needed closet space.

Perhaps the most important thing that the Housing Act of 1949 can accomplish for the farm housewife is to make over her kitchen into something which is the model of convenience and smart appearance. Running water will be installed, built-in cabinets included, modern kitchen equipment made possible by installation of plumbing and electrical inlets. Assistance in planning the kitchen lay-out, too, will make it possible for the housewife to save many steps.

For the 80 percent or more of farm families who still depend on the washtub for their bath, the biggest convenience added through proper use of loan funds will be the bathroom. What this means in added privacy alone will be worth the entire program.

Suppose we stop for a moment and see just what has been done during the first 6 months of operations of this farm-housing program. Reports of the Farmers Home Adminstration indicate that by June 1st they had received applications from over 20,000 farm families who desired housing loans to modernize or rebuild their farm dwellings. Of these, approximately 2,000 have already received loans amounting to $7,500,000; another 5,000 have been tentatively approved for loans, subject to appraisals or title clearance. Another 5,000 are presently being submitted to county committees for approval. It is estimated that $25,000,000 will have been loaned to farm families for new housing by July 1st.

Of the loans made to date, about half have been for complete rebuilding of the dwelling. Old structures with their leaky roofs, sagging walls, and unsafe foundations have been torn down and new, modern structures built to replace them. About a fourth of all money loaned to date has been for building other than dwellings, and three-fourths to rebuild or remodel existing dwellings. Water systems have been installed in all cases where it did not already exist, and

installations of electrical fixtures have also been included where not already available.

In the 4-year program set up by the Housing Act of 1949, a total of $275,000,000 was authorized for rural-housing loans, and this would make it possible for an estimated 140,000 farm families to have more adequate housing than in the past. With half the Nation's farm population in the South, and with the housing problems more acute in the South than elsewhere in the Nation, it is estimated that somewhere near 75,000 southern farm families will have better housing under this program within the next 4 years. A thousand or more of these probably will be in north Alabama.

The first loan in the Nation was made in Jackson County, Ala., and I had the privilege of attending the ceremony when the disabled veteran received his check, and have since seen his modern six-room house which replaced the ramshackle house he previously occupied. The new dwelling has asbestos shingles on the sides, a fireproof roof, a decorative front and back porch. Inside there are hardwood floors, which are kept highly waxed and would grace any city dwelling. There is a nice fireplace in the front room, closets in each of the bedrooms and in the connecting hall. The kitchen has built-in features and—for the first time—running water. The loan funds included money to install an electric pump and to pipe the water inside the house. If the same house were in a good residential district up in Washington, D. C., it would sell for $12,000—but the veteran built it for less than $4,300. The family's first child, born recently, made its start in a new home which it will enjoy for many years to come; but, without this loan it might have been born in the drafty, unhealthy, impossible-to-heat old house.

I am proud that I had a part in making it possible for this child, and thousands of others, to be born into a more American home atmosphere than would have otherwise been possible. Let us give the same opportunity to all our farm families.

I sincerely believe that a farm family will work harder, make more money, and fight to maintain a farm home if—should adversity strike—that farm home is a comfortable and attractive one. If the place is dilapidated and run down, or if it lacks the modern conveniences which make living worth while in America, the family is more likely to have an "Oh, what is the use?" attitude. They have less reason to desire to farm efficiently, participate in community affairs, or to share their homes with friends.

I also believe the rural church and the rural schools will benefit by this new housing program. Indirectly, perhaps, but the church or the school is no better than the component individuals who make up its congregation or assembly. The child will take more interest in its studies and do a better job of preparing its homework where there is a good lighting system in the home. There will be less chance to pass disease from one scholar to another if the sources of some of these diseases are wiped out by home improvements. There will be a better comradeship among the pupils if the child feels he can bring his companions home to also enjoy the modern conveniences. And the church, depending as it does upon contributions from persons who attend, will find that with the prosperity of a new home or more efficient farming buildings, the farmer can come to church more regularly and contribute more to its upkeep.

The home demonstration clubs will benefit too. Families who might have once held back from attendance because they didn't want to invite other club members to their homes will not have that reason for nonattendance now. And many of the lessons in good homemaking, which are learned in home demonstration club work are not possible to practice in the present dwellings of our southern farmers, but will be possible under the new housing program.

Our State Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 31, 1950

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, a very interesting article was brought to my attention on a discussion of a diabolical scheme involving our State Department, which bears out my contention that, unfortunately, the State Department gentlemen of our Government have been, and are presently being, influenced by shrewd, conniving British diplomacy. It is a privilege to insert this discussion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

A DIABOLICAL SCHEME AND OUR STATE DEPARTMENT

The Economist of London, a weekly review, stated in an article on Jordan, Israel, and the Arab world, that it was most likely that the Hashamite Kingdom of Jordan and Arab Palestine would eventually become one and that, as King Abdullah always relies on the Arab Legion to maintain himself in power, without its support, he "could not keep his throne for a week" and realizes that he owes his position to the British "who are responsible for building up, training, maintaining, and financing the legion."

Hence, it is obvious that the so-called peace negotiations, almost reaching fruition, between Jordan and Israel, were merely a blind to learn how much Israel was ready to concede in order to attain peace, so that British Bevin might estimate how much to demand of Israel by way of the threat of the British concocted and controlled Mufti's Arab League and of the heavy armament Great Britain has been introducing among the Arab States that might be prepared for the second round, in the hope of recapturing all of Palestine and the Arab world under British suzerainty. All else is camouflage. Abdullah's surrender to the Arab League was a foregone conclusion as soon as Britain thought the time ripe.

Handing over Arab Palestine to Abdullah is tantamount to turning it over to the British. Is there any legal or logical reason why Jordan should be permitted, by a mere unilateral declaration, in view of the UN resolution of November 29, 1947, or any subsequent events, to annex Arab Palestine and thus become a constantly threatening thorn in Israel's sides?

The chief disappointment, however, is the agreement with this diabolical scheme manifested by our State Department.

When will it recognize that America's acquiescence to the British Foreign Office conspiracies is entirely out of harmony with American interests? These demand a strong, democratic, and industrialized Middle East, not a Middle East eroded and milked dry by the greedy appetite of British colonialism. The willingness of certain influential members of our State Department to follow the British line wherever it happens to lead, surely is as fit a subject for congressional investigation as was the activity of those other men who were fascinated by the Communist idea and who have done so much incalculable harm through their influence in the making and carrying out of American policy. Whether consciously or unconsciously, a subversion of our policy in favor of the British is quite as dangerous to our welfare as one in favor of the Communists.

Kansas in the Springtime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY DARBY
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 1 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. DARBY. Mr. President, spring in Kansas is beautiful and picturesque, especially at this time of year in the enchanting Flint Hills in southeastern Kansas. Within this vast agricultural area, one may gaze from hill to hill observing Herefords grazing against a backdrop of oil derricks—and silos, that seemingly stand guard like sentinels spaced across the sweep of grasslands. Few writers are more capable of capturing on paper the magnificence of such splendor than Mr. M. Seaton, publisher of the Coffeyville (Kans.) Daily Journal. He is one of our outstanding journalists and civic leaders—a young and very capable one—whom we Kansans proudly admire.

The Flint Hills country, covered with the famous blue-stem grasses, makes the best pasture land in the world. Cattle gain more weight per day in this area than in any other section. Because of the importance of this district in my State to the livestock industry, I want to call to the attention of my colleagues and other readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial by Mr. Seaton, entitled "Spring in the Flint Hills." I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPRING IN THE FLINT HILLS

One of the loveliest experiences of spring in southeast Kansas is a trip across the Flint Hills on a lazy, sunny day.

Last week we drove down against the dusty wind from Abilene to El Dorado, on down to Winfield, and then to Coffeyville. As we turned east across the hills of Cowley county the wind dropped, and from Winfield to Sedan the beauty of the blue stem country spread out around us.

Nature was in a pleasant mood the day she designed Chautauqua and Cowley counties. The hills roll like swells in the open ocean. Streams turn and twist in the troughs, bordered with the green of budding trees. As your eyes travel up or down the stream from the highway they are met with the wondrous beauty of redbud trees, bending gently forward over the current as if they were bowing in a watery minuet.

High up in the grassland, spotted here and there like diamonds on a velvet cloth, are man-made ponds whose waters gleam as bright blue in the sun as mountain lakes.

From high points in the hills one can see far ahead vistas of promised beauty shrouded in the mist of distance. At nearly every turn similar scenes reappear, changing slightly as one advances but only as friends change with time's advance, basically the same with just the shade of difference that heightens interest.

Herefords graze against a back-drop of oil derricks. Silos stand guard, symmetrical sentinels spaced across the sweep of grasslands. Nestling in safety beside these guardians stand the farmhouses of cattlemen.

The beauty of the Flint Hills in spring is the kind of beauty some women have: The smiling, kindly face that gives assurance of a peaceful mind and loving heart.

To drop down into the valley of Sedan after a drive across the western hills is the perfect homecoming.

Potential for Prosperity: Peaceful Trade Between Israel and Rest of Middle East

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1950

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, a very interesting article on trade and commerce in the Middle East appeared in the magazine Israel Speaks, the May 26 issue. It is my firm belief that through trade and commerce lies the road to peace and prosperity.

Mr. Nortman, the author of this article, is an economist on the staff of the Jewish Agency for Palestine, and is author of the agency's definitive brochure, Investing in Israel.

POTENTIAL FOR PROSPERITY: PEACEFUL TRADE BETWEEN ISRAEL AND REST OF MIDDLE EAST

(By P. Bernard Nortman)

From an economic viewpoint, Israel and the states of the Middle East complement each other to a very marked degree. The Arab countries produce many of Israel's needs, while Israel turns out products essential to the people of the Middle East.

The Middle East includes not only the Arab States (Egypt, Syria, Lebanon, Transjordan, Saudi Arabia, Yemen, Iraq), which at present carry on little or no trade with Israel, but also Turkey, Iran, Ethiopia, Aden and Cyprus, which at present—especially Turkey—carry on extensive trade with Israel.

When trade relations between Israel and the Arab States are resumed in the future, many areas of economic cooperation can be worked out—not only in the exchange of products, but for mutual assistance in developing agriculture, industries, banking, insurance and shipping, and in such public services as social hygiene and education for the Arab States.

NINETY MILLION PEOPLE

In the Middle East area live 90 million people, 80 percent to 90 percent of whom are tied to the soil as peasants, engaged in primitive agriculture, barely earning subsistence for themselves. Nevertheless, sharp though the contrast may be between a modern standard and their present way of life, these 90 million souls are potential customers for the fruits of modern industry. In Israel, on the other hand, only 20 percent of the people are engaged in agriculture, while 80 percent are involved in industry, commerce, trade and the professions.

The occupational distribution of the people of the Middle East has deep economic significance. First, since the Arab countries produce the same things, mainly food and raw materials, they have little need to trade with each other. This is borne out by the relatively little trade, with few exceptions, that now exists among them.

Second, although the Arabs do not have to trade with each other, Israel can provide a large market for middle-eastern food and raw materials, with which the demands of its population and industries can be met. What can the Arab countries receive in return from Israel? The answer is: A vast variety of semi-finished products, machinery and finished consumers' goods. Even with the low subsistence level of the Middle East, there are at present millions of actual customers in this area able to pay for goods.

The accompanying chart indicates the type of trade which Israel and other Middle East nations can carry on with each other. For example, Israel can get grains, leather, manganese, iron ore, oil, phosphate rock from Egypt, while Egypt can buy a whole variety of metal products, diamonds, shoes, chemicals, pharmaceuticals and citrus fruits from Israel. It is possible to multiply this one example many times over for each of the Middle East countries.

Third, trade between Israel and the rest of the Middle East would help alleviate the foreign-exchange difficulties which exist in all these countries.

Beneficial as the exchange of raw materials and food from the Arab countries for finished products from Israel would be to the economy of each, economic relations between the two can achieve even higher goals. These are countries, which, compared with American standards, economically are still in the eighteenth century. Each could help bring the other up to modern standards—Israel, by offering its skilled and professional labor, her neighbors, their food, raw materials, and vast potential market. Thus trade between Israel and the other Middle East countries is a natural. Furthermore, the people everywhere behind the borders, are eager for resumption of this trade.

RAISING SIGHTS

Another point: It is a well-known fact that the largest volume of foreign trade is carried on not between raw-material-producing countries and manufacturing countries, but between highly industrialized nations. America's trade is greater with Great Britain and France than with raw-material-producing nations.

Nations which produce only raw materials usually have a low standard of living and cannot afford to import manufactured products in quantities sufficient to raise this generally low standard of living. At present most of the manufactured goods that the Arab countries import go to a very small percentage of the population. The goal to aim for in trade between Israel and her neighbors is not merely an exchange of currently produced goods, but an industrialized Middle East and an improvement in the standard of living which would bring all sections of the population up to modern levels.

At present, the huge local demand for Israel-manufactured goods created by the tremendous increase in Israel's population, leaves only a small portion for export. To supply both the domestic and export markets, Israel must modernize and expand her industries on an efficient, technically modern low-cost basis.

New additional capital, especially foreign capital, has an opportunity to go in now to build up Israel industry so that when Near East trade is resumed in the hoped-for near future, goods can pour forth to the millions in the Middle East who cry out for them.

PALESTINE TRADE WITH MIDDLE EAST

(Major items only, based on 1944–45 figures)

Imports from

Egypt: Rice, wheat, and other grains; cigarettes, raw cotton, fibers and hairs; molasses; glassware; wool yarn and textiles; flax, hemp and jute, leather; books and other printed matter.

Saudi Arabia: Camels, sheep, other livestock; hides and skins.

Iraq: Barley and other grains; sheep and other livestock; fruit juices; dates; crude petroleum; linseed; hides and skins.

Iran: Legumes and nuts; dried fruit; tombac leaves (chewing tobacco); crude petroleum; hides, skins, furs; carpets; motor fuel.

Syria and Lebanon: Barley, wheat, and other grains; livestock; dairy products; apples, other fresh fruit, nuts; potatoes and other fresh vegetables; raisins, oilseed; tree trunks and branches; agricultural seeds; wood products; cotton piece goods, silk crepe; rayon fabrics; cordage and twine; cloaks and wearing apparel.

Turkey: Cake meal and oilseed; sheep and other livestock; fruits, nuts, fresh and frozen fish; dried fruit, olives; tobacco and cigarettes; wood, timber, linseed oil.

Transjordan: Barley, wheat, and other grains; legumes; sheep and livestock; bananas, grapes, other fruits; tomatoes and other fresh vegetables; raisins; clay; raw wool; hides and skins; chemical fertilizers.

Exports to

Egypt: Oranges, diamonds, plateglass; refined fuel and motor oils; iron, steel, other metal products; industrial machinery; wool, silk, rayon, leather, other apparel; chemicals, drugs, and medicines; paints, dyes, and varnishes; leather bags, etc., leather goods.

Saudi Arabia: Oranges, plate glass, shoes, other footwear; brass, copper products, insulated cable, wire.

Iraq: Fruit juices, liquors, diamonds; chocolates, sweets, starch, glucose; glassware, plate glass, stoves, burners; iron and steel products, cotton textiles; industrial machinery, shoes; socks, stockings, wool, other apparel, lamps; tanned hides, leather, toiletries, matches.

Iran: Fruit juices, liquors, olive oil, plate glass; mirrors, glassware, diamonds, safes, textiles; door, window fittings, stoves, burners; iron and steel products, drugs, medicines; tanned hides and leather, leather products; handbags, shoes, other footwear, stationery; wearing apparel, paints, dyes, varnishes.

Syria and Lebanon: Oranges, grapefruit, melons, tobacco, cocoa; cocoa butter, raw

wool, refined fuel; motor oils, bricks, earthenware, plate glass; mirrors, glassware, safes, stoves, batteries; electrical, iron, steel products; insulated pipes for wiring, cotton textiles; industrial machinery, socks, stockings; wearing apparel, underwear; fertilizers and chemicals; paints; dyes, and varnishes; tanned hides, leather, leather goods; toilet preparations and dentifrices; kerosene, motor fuels.

Turkey: Refined fuel and motor oils, kerosene; diamonds, asphalt, furs; razor blades; dry batteries; chemicals, motor fuel; essential oils.

Transjordan: Machinery, iron and steel products; shoes, other footwear, textiles; wearing apparel, legumes, wheat flour; melons, oranges, dried figs, sesame seeds; olive oil, other edible oils, olives, soap; potatoes, other fresh vegetables, sweets; cement, plate glass, lamp glass, glassware; wood tables, other furnishings, kerosene; motor spirits, tanned hides, sole leather; matches, toilet preparations, stationery.

The Jerusalem Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the United Nations Trusteeship Council is scheduled to begin its seventh session today at Lake Success. One of the most important problems on the Council's agenda is the Jerusalem question. This question can be reasonably solved at the present session of the Trusteeship Council. I am optimist enough to believe that such a solution is possible, and with it we shall remove a major obstacle in the way of peace in the Near East.

Just a week ago, on May 24, a group of 285 distinguished Americans, including many outstanding Christian religious leaders throughout the country, submitted a proposal to President Truman for a solution of the Jerusalem question and the protection of the holy places. They suggest the establishment of a United Nations Commission, comprised of the representatives of the various religious faiths, as an international curatorship over the holy places.

The proposal of the 285 American leaders merits the fullest attention and consideration by the Trusteeship Council, the United States Government and its representatives in the United Nations, and the members of both Houses of Congress. The ideas and proposals contained therein are not contradictory to the plans advanced by the Government of Israel, but are supplementary thereto. Both should serve as a practical solution of the Jerusalem problem. In fact, a solution of this grave problem at this time would be a great moral boost to the work and the efforts of the United Nations in other fields of international activity.

Mr. Speaker, I am placing in the RECORD the statement presented to President Truman and the names of the 285 sponsors of this proposal and commend it to the attention of all my colleagues:

MAY 24, 1950.

The Honorable HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President of the United States,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The undersigned have the honor to submit to you a proposal for the settlement of the grave problem confronting the United Nations, and, therefore, the United States, respecting the protection of the holy places in the Jerusalem area.

This proposal is submitted to you in behalf of the appended list of 285 distinguished Americans, who have studied this question for some time. They include 19 Protestant Episcopal bishops, 18 Methodist bishops, 6 Evangelical bishops, 1 African Methodist Episcopalian bishop, 42 heads of Christian theological seminaries, 7 college presidents, 20 college professors, 9 writers and editors, 77 Protestant Episcopal leaders, 25 Unitarian leaders, 26 leaders of other denominations, and 35 outstanding personalities in various walks of life.

Our proposal is that there should be established an international curatorship for the holy places throughout the area formerly known as Palestine, to be discharged by a United Nations commission composed of the representatives of the Catholic, Protestant, Jewish, Greek Orthodox, and Moslem faiths.

The function of such a commission would be—

(a) To authenticate the holy sites in Palestine.

(b) To be responsible for their preservation.

(c) To insure free access to them at all times.

(d) To supervise the restoration of such holy sites, if any, as may have been damaged in the Palestine war.

The international commission shall have the power to employ guards.

It shall be responsible to the Security Council.

Respecting the political administration of the Jerusalem area, we propose that there shall be established two zones—

(a) A Jewish zone comprising those sections in which Jews now live and have lived since 1860, to be integrated with the Jewish State.

(b) An Arab zone, comprising the areas in which Arabs now live and have lived since 1860, to be integrated with an Arab State.

We offer this plan as a substitute for the proposals now pending before the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations. We ask that the principle embodied in the proposal for an international curatorship be accepted as the basis for American policy with a view to the later presentation of a statute to the United Nations based on this principle.

The proposal for an international curatorship for the holy places was initially submitted to the last session of the General Assembly of the United Nations by 15 American leaders. Neither this nor any proposal received serious consideration by the General Assembly in the unfortunate atmosphere which produced the resolution of last December.

We bring this proposal to your attention now because events have amply demonstrated that the internationalization of the Jerusalem area through a corpus separatum, in the sense of the December 1949 resolution, is both unfair and unfeasible. The statute which has been drafted by the Trusteeship Council can never be carried out, not only because Jordan and Israel both oppose it, but primarily because the statute is based on neither a legal nor a practical reality.

Under the statute the United Nations is called upon to establish an international city in an area of more than 100 square miles with a population of 160,000 in order to protect 36 holy places concentrated in an area of less than 1½ square miles.

In a statute consisting of 43 articles, there are precisely 2 articles dealing with the holy places, religious buildings, and sites holy place, religious buildings, and sites shall be protected and freedom of access to them secured.

It is noteworthy that under the status quo of May 14, 1948, the holy places, so recognized, were limited to 10 in an area of 1 square mile. Not one of these places was in the area held by Israel. In the course of its deliberations of recent months the Trusteeship Council prepared and accepted a new definition of holy places under which the original 10 were augmented by 26. Of the 36 sites now designated as holy places by the Trusteeship Council, only 2 are within the Israel zone of Jerusalem. The remainder are largely concentrated behind the walls of the old city, held by the Government of Jordan.

It is to protect these 36 sites that the United Nations, under the statute drafted, is called upon to establish and maintain a vassal United Nations city or state. There is no provision in the Charter for such an international enclave. The Charter, in describing the purposes of the trusteeship system, declared that its purpose is "to promote the political, economic, social and educational advancement of the inhabitants of the trust territories in a progressive development toward self-government and independence, as may be appropriate to the particular circumstances of each territory and its peoples and the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned."

The draft statute not only fails to conform to this provision, it would turn the clock backward. It provides that the internationalized area shall be under a governor, appointed by the United Nations, subject neither to the legislative council to be set up, nor to the courts. The populations of the city are to be represented through a legislative council of 25 elected members and 15 appointed members. In a city where the Jews constitute the overwhelming majority, with a population of 110,000, the Moslems more than 40,000, the statute provides that the Moslem, Jewish, and Christian communities each shall elect eight members, and those who adhere to none of these communities, one. In addition, the three religious communities are to be permitted to name 15 members on a ratio to be decided by the governor.

No provision whatsoever is made for the economic welfare of the 160,000 inhabitants of the Jerusalem area. The economic aspects of the situation are dealt with in one article of the statute, whereby the governor to be appointed by the United Nations is empowered to take prompt steps "to formulate with the advice and help of such experts as may seem to him desirable the economic and financial principles upon which the government of the city is to be based." The governor is given 6 months from the time of his appointment to submit to the Trusteeship Council a plan for the economic and financial organization of the city.

What the statute entirely ignores is (1) that the city of Jerusalem is divided into two zones, and is operating as such, i. e., an Arab zone under the command of King Abdulla of Jordan and a Jewish zone now fully integrated into the State of Israel: (2) that neither the Arab nor Jewish community is now or ever has been self-sustaining.

Virtually the entire Arab population of Jerusalem, some 50,000, live behind the walls of the old city. Not a single Jew is to be found in the old city of Jerusalem.

For the Arab population, internationalization with its so-called autonomy, spells dis-

integration. Under the mandatory government the Arabs were the special concern of Britain which spent considerable sums on Arab education and health services and the modernization of its agricultural methods.

Under the draft statute no substitute for the help of the former mandatory power has been arranged. Today, the local Arab authorities in the old city are unable to maintain educational and health services on their own or to insure employment. Only full and recognized integration with a state responsible for its welfare can save the Arab population of the old city from disaster.

Jewish Jerusalem is a new city, 90 years old, initiated in 1860 and developed by Jewish funds and efforts. Under the mandate the economic progress of Jewish Jerusalem was made possible by the fact that it was the home of the central Jewish authorities, thus creating employment; that it received funds from tourist traffic; and that direct contributions were made by Jewish funds abroad to various institutions in Jerusalem.

Today, the Government of Israel has assumed responsibility for the welfare of the new city. Saved during the war by Israel efforts, the Jewish community owes its rehabilitation to the Israeli Government and people. The latter have assumed responsibility for repairing war damage, creating employment, establishing industry, providing an essential public-works program, and assuring security.

To maintain the entire corpus separatum the United Nations has voted the sum of $8,000,000.

To meet the most essential need of Jewish Jerusalem alone, the State of Israel, operating on an austerity basis, has already appropriated more than $21,000,000. The municipal budget for Jewish Jerusalem for the period 1949–50 is IL £1,500,000 ($4,200,000). The income of the municipality is estimated at IL £520,000 ($1,456,000), leaving a deficit of more than IL £900,000. The Israeli Government has appropriated IL £900,000 ($2,520,000) to meet that deficit. In addition, it has appropriated IL £4,700,000 ($13,160,000) for administrative, police, and public services; IL £5,500,000 ($15,400,000) for enlargement of the water supply, housing, repair of war damage, credits for the purchase of raw materials for local industries, and so forth, a total of $21,080,000.

Under the draft statute Israel and Jordan, both, are asked to move out of the picture. But no provision is made for the United Nations to assume the responsibilities of which these governments are to be divested. The resultant economic chaos can be envisaged.

Nor is this the total story. In view of the opposition of both Jordan and Israel to the draft statute, the United Nations would have to impose it. This would require a large police or military force, which the United Nations does not have.

For the administration of a peaceful city the Israeli Government employs 400 policemen at a cost of $4,400 annually to maintain 1 policeman and his equipment, but emphasizes the need for rural police and frontier police. Under the armistice agreement, 3,200 soldiers maintain peace and security as between Israel and Jordan.

It is clear from the foregoing that the objective of protecting holy places is best served by a plan which is acceptable to both peoples and in conformity with the provisions of the Charter. The principle of an international regime, applied solely to the protection of the holy places, on which the proposal for an international curatorship is based, is likely to find such acceptance.

What is equally significant, it would satisfy the essential purposes of the United Nations. For it offers protection to the holy places, their preservation, and access to them, not only in the Jerusalem area, but throughout the Arab and Jewish territories. It removes the holy sites from the realm of factional dispute. It establishes an effective deterrent to desecration. At the same time, it assures that the two communities shall be enabled to develop normally and in freedom.

A United Nations commission, representing the principal interested faiths, and backed by the Security Council, is the best possible safeguard against any misuse of the holy sites. For any breach of the agreements respecting the holy places would automatically invoke the action of the Security Council. That in itself would serve as a potent deterrent.

By permitting the integration of the Arab and Jewish zones with the Jewish state and an Arab state, the United Nations puts responsibility for the well-being of 160,000 human beings where it belongs. This is a responsibility which the United Nations is in no position to discharge but which, nonetheless, must be discharged.

The settlement of the Jerusalem question along lines which reflect the realities of the situation will go far toward resolving the problems which still remain. Arabs and Jews, living side by side, in a peaceful Jerusalem, can do more to hasten peace between Israel and the Arab world than any fiat of an international body.

It is not in the interests of the United Nations to continue to press for a statute which must remain one of record and not of fact. The plan submitted by the signatories is feasible, provides the foundation for lasting peace, and, if adopted, will redound to the prestige of the United Nations.

You, Mr. President, who played so large a part in bringing about the resolution of November 1947, establishing the partition of Palestine, can help to put an end to unnecessary controversy by authorizing the American delegation to take the leadership in resolving this question.

The record of our country on this issue is a good one. It has opposed the internationalization plan on the score of its unfeasibility. More than that is now required, namely, leadership in espousing a constructive proposal as a substitute for an unjust and unworkable one.

It is our hope that, under your direction, the United States will now sponsor a democratic and practical solution such as we believe the international curatorship proposal to be.

Respectfully submitted.

Freda Kirchwey, President, the Nation Associates; Arthur Cushman McGiffert, President, Chicago Theological Seminary; Norman B. Nash, Episcopal Bishop of Massachusetts; Reinhold Niebuhr, Professor of Christian Ethics, Union Theological Seminary; G. Bromley Oxnam, Methodist Bishop, New York; James G. Patton, President, Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union; Curtis W. Reese, Dean, Abraham Lincoln Center; Henry A. Atkinson, Secretary, Church Peace Union; Donald B. Cloward, Executive Secretary, Northern Baptist Convention; Bartley C. Crum, Member, Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry; Dale DeWitt, Regional Director, Unitarian Association; Frederick Bay Eliot, President, American Unitarian Association; William Emerson, President, American Association for the United Nations; Henry W. Hobson, Episcopal Bishop of Southern Ohio.

SPONSORS OF PROPOSAL FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF AN INTERNATIONAL CURATORSHIP FOR THE HOLY PLACES SUBMITTED TO PRESIDENT HARRY S. TRUMAN

PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL BISHOPS

Rt. Rev. Douglas Henry Atwill, Protestant Episcopal bishop of North Dakota, Fargo, N. Dak.; Rt. Rev. Carl Morgan Block, Protestant Episcopal bishop of California, San Francisco, Calif.; Rt. Rev. Wallace E. Conkling, Protestant Episcopal bishop of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.; Rt. Rev. Henry H. Daniels, Protestant Episcopal bishop of Montana, Helena, Mont.; Rt. Rev. Angus Dun, Protestant Episcopal bishop of Washington, Washington, D. C.; Rt. Rev. Goodrich Robert Fenner, Protestant Episcopal bishop of Kansas, Topeka, Kans.; Rt. Rev. Charles Kendall Gilbert, Protestant Episcopal bishop of New York, New York, N. Y.; Rt. Rev. Charles F. Hall, Protestant Episcopal bishop of New Hampshire, Concord, N. H.; Rt. Rev. J. Thomas Heistand, Protestant Episcopal bishop of Harrisburg, Harrisburg, Pa.; Rt. Rev. Henry W. Hobson, Protestant Episcopal bishop of southern Ohio, Cincinnati, Ohio; Rt. Rev. Charles A. Mason, Protestant Episcopal bishop of Dallas, Dallas, Tex.; Rt. Rev. Arthur W. Moulton, Protestant Episcopal bishop of Dallas, Dallas, Tex.; Rt. Rev. Norman B. Nash, Protestant Episcopal bishop of Massachusetts, Boston, Mass.; Rt. Rev. George Ashton Oldham, Protestant Episcopal bishop of Albany (retired), Washington, D. C.; Rt. Rev. Austin Pardue, Protestant Episcopal bishop of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Rt. Rev. Lambe Edward Parsons, Protestant Episcopal bishop of California (retired), San Francisco, Calif.; Rt. Rev. Noble C. Powell, Protestant Episcopal bishop of Maryland, Baltimore, Md.; Rt. Rev. Frank Archibald Rhea, Protestant Episcopal bishop of Idaho, Boise, Idaho; Rt. Rev. John Moore Walker, Protestant Episcopal bishop of Atlanta, Atlanta, Ga.

METHODIST BISHOPS

The Very Reverend James C. Baker, Methodist bishop of southern California, Los Angeles, Calif.; the Very Reverend Fred Pierce Corson, Methodist bishop of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.; the Very Reverend Ralph S. Cushman, Methodist bishop of Minnesota, St. Paul, Minn.; the Very Reverend Dana Dawson, Methodist bishop of Kansas, Topeka, Kans.; the Very Reverend Ivan Lee Holt, Methodist bishop of Missouri, St. Louis, Mo.; the Very Reverend E. W. Kelly, Methodist bishop of Missouri, St. Louis, Mo.; the Very Reverend Gerald Kennedy, Methodist bishop of Oregon, Portland, Oreg.; the Very Reverend Paul B. Kern, Methodist bishop of Tennessee, Nashville, Tenn.; the Very Reverend John Wesley Lord, Methodist bishop of Massachusetts, Boston, Mass.; the Very Reverend Francis J. McConnell, Methodist bishop of New York (retired), Lucasville, Ohio; the Very Reverend H. Clifford Northcott, Methodist bishop of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.; the Very Reverend G. Bromley Oxnam, Methodist bishop of New York, New York, N. Y.; the Very Reverend Glenn R. Phillips, Methodist bishop of Colorado, Denver, Colo.; the Very Reverend Clare Purcell, Methodist bishop of Alabama, Birmingham, Ala.; the Very Reverend Marshall R. Reed, Methodist bishop of Michigan, Detroit, Mich.; the Very Reverend Alexander P. Shaw, Methodist bishop of Maryland, Baltimore, Md.; the Very Reverend Donald H. Tippett, Methodist bishop of northern California, San Francisco, Calif.; the Very Reverend William T. Watkins, Methodist bishop of Kentucky, Louisville, Ky.

BISHOPS OF THE EVANGELICAL UNITED BRETHREN CHURCH

Bishop A. R. Clippinger, Evangelical bishop of Ohio, Dayton, Ohio; Bishop F. L. Dennis, Evangelical bishop of Indiana, Indianapolis, Ind.; Bishop E. W. Praetorius, Evangelical bishop of Minnesota, St. Paul, Minn.; Bishop C. H. Stauffacher, Evangelical bishop of Missouri, Kansas City, Mo.; Bishop I. D. Warner, Evangelical bishop of California, Puente, Calif.; Bishop V. O. Weidler, Evangelical bishop of Missouri, Kansas City, Mo.

BISHOPS OF THE AFRICAN METHODIST EPISCOPALIAN CHURCH

Bishop Reverdy G. Ransom, African Methodist Episcopalian bishop of Ohio, Wilberforce, Ohio.

HEADS OF THEOLOGICAL SEMINARIES

Dr. I. H. Alston, Allen University Divinity School (AME), Columbia, S. C.; Dr. Edward R. Bartlett, Iliff School of Theology (Methodist), Denver, Colo.; Dr. Conrad Bergendoff, Augustana Theological Seminary (Lutheran), Rock Island, Ill.; Dr. W. Barnett Blakemore, Jr., Disciples of Divinity House (Disciples), University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.; Dr. Ahva J. C. Bond, dean, Alfred University School of Theology (Seventh Day Baptist), Alfred, N. Y.; Dr. Stephen J. Corey, acting president, College of the Bible (Disciples), Lexington, Ky.; Dr. Raymond L. Cramer, Simpson Bible Institute (Christian and Missionary), Seattle, Wash.; Dr. E. E. Flack, Hamma Divinity School (United Lutheran) of Wittenberg College, Springfield, Ohio; Dr. Sandford Fleming, Berkeley Baptist Divinity School (Protestant Episcopal), Berkeley, Calif.; Dr. Eugene B. Hawk, dean, Perkins School of Theology, Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Tex.; Dr. J. Arthur Heck, president, Evangelical School of Theology (Evangelical United Brethren), Reading, Pa.; Dr. Bernard J. Holm, Wartburg Theological Seminary (American Lutheran), Dubuque, Iowa; The Very Reverend Alden Drew Kelley, dean, Seabury Western Theological Seminary (Protestant Episcopal), Evanston, Ill.; Dr. M. B. Lanier, Simmons University (Baptist), Louisville, Ky.; Dr. Bernard M. Loomer, Divinity School (Northern Baptist), University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.; Dr. Arthur Cushman McGiffert, Jr., president, Chicago Theological Seminary (Congregationalist), Chicago, Ill.; Dr. Walter Muelder, Boston University School of Theology (Methodist), Boston, Mass.; Dr. Algoth Ohlson, North Park College Theological Seminary (Evangelical), Chicago, Ill.; Dr. O. R. Reuben, Morris College, Theological Department (Northern Baptist), Sumter, S. C.; Dr. Harry V. Richardson, president, Gammon Theological Seminary (Methodist), Atlanta, Ga.; Dr. Ralph W. Riley, American Baptist Theological Seminary (American Baptist), Nashville, Tenn.; Dr. Thomas D. Rinde, Western Theological Seminary (United Lutheran), Fremont, Nebr.; Dr. Wallace W. Robbins, Meadville Theological Seminary (Unitarian), Chicago, Ill.

Dr. Walter N. Roberts, president, Bonebrake Theological Seminary (Evangelical United Brethren), Dayton, Ohio; Dr. Lawrence Rose, General Theological Seminary (Protestant Episcopal), New York, N. Y.; Dr. George W. Sadler, acting president, Baptist Theological Seminary, Zurich, Switzerland, secretary, Foreign Mission Board, Southern Baptist Conference; Dr. Wilbour Eddy Saunders, Colgate Rochester Divinity School (Northern Baptist), Rochester, N. Y.; Dr. F. W. Schroeder, Eden Theological Seminary (Evangelical Reformed), Webster Groves, Mo.; Dr. Henry H. Shires, the Church Divinity School of the Pacific (Protestant Episcopal), Berkeley, Calif.; Dr. Lorin J. Sieck, Concordia Seminary (Lutheran), St. Louis, Mo.; Dr. Willard L. Sperry, Harvard Divinity School (undenominational), Cambridge, Mass.; Dr. Russell Henry Stafford, the Hartford Seminary Foundation (interdenominational), Hartford, Conn.; Dr. W. R. Strassner, Shaw University School of Religion (National Baptist), Raleigh, N. C.; Dr. Charles L. Taylor, Jr., Episcopalian Theological School (Protestant Episcopal), Cambridge, Mass.; Dr. G. H. J. Thiboudeaux, president, Lampton Theological School, Campbell College (African Methodist Episcopal), Jackson, Miss.; Dr. J. S. Ladd Thomas, dean, Theological School, Temple University, Philadelphia, Pa.; Dr. Harold W. Tribble, Andover Newton Theological School (Northern Baptist), Newton Centre, Mass.; Dr. Harry Trust, Bangor Theological Seminary (Congregational Christian), Bangor, Maine; Rev. Percey L. Urban, dean, Berkeley Divinity School (Protestant Episcopal), New Haven, Conn.; Dr. Guy L. Vannah, New England School of Theology (Advent Christian), Brookline, Mass.; Dr. George Ross Wells, dean, Hartford School of Religious Education, Hartford Seminary Foundation, Hartford, Conn.; Dr. Alexander C. Zabriskie, dean, Protestant Episcopal Seminary, Alexandria, Va.

PROTESTANT EPISCOPALIAN CLERGYMEN AND LAY LEADERS

Rev. Melvin Abson, East Syracuse, N. Y.; Rev. Roger W. Bennett, Newton Lower Falls, Mass.; Rev. E. A. De Bordenave, Tappahannock, Va.; Rev. Dillard H. Brown, Washington, D. C.; Mrs. John K. Burleson, Berkeley, Calif.; John K. Burleson, Jr., Berkeley, Calif.; Katharine A. Burleson, Berkeley, Calif.; Miss Gertrude C. Bussy, Baltimore, Md.; Rev. Thomas H. Carson, Texarkana, Ark.; Rev. Thaddeus Clapp, Worcester, Mass.; Rev. David R. Covell, Jr., Cleveland, Ohio; Miss Grace A. Crosby, West Barnstable, Mass.; Rev. Gardiner M. Day, Cambridge, Mass.; Rev. George H. Easter, St. Louis, Mo.; Dr. John H. Fitzgerald, secretary, the House of Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Prof. Joseph Fletcher, Cambridge, Mass.; Rev. Kenneth Ripley Forbes, Philadelphia, Pa.; Rev. George Lorenzo Grambs, East Orange, N. J.; Rev. William Grime, Great Neck, N. Y.; Rev. John M. Groton, Westerly, R. I.; Beatrice M. Hamilton, Boston, Mass.; Rev. Robert Hampshire, Farmingdale, N. Y.; Rev. Robert Hatch, Waterbury, Conn.; Rev. William Heath, Buffalo, N. Y.; Rev. F. Douglas Henderson, Minneapolis, Minn.; The Very Reverend Louis M. Hirshon, dean, Christ Church Cathedral, Hartford, Conn.; Davis R. Hobbs, Tunkhannock, Pa.; Rev. J. Ogden Hoffman, Jr., Monrovia, Calif.; Rev. Kenneth DeP. Hughes, Cambridge, Mass.; Rev. Philip W. Hull, Martins Ferry, Ohio; Rev. David R. Hunter, Boston, Mass.; Miss Ruth Jackson, Littleton, N. H.; Rev. Gordon M. Jones, Toledo, Ohio; Rev. Orrin F. Judd, Upper Montclair, N. J.; the Very Reverend John M. Krumm, dean, St. Paul's Cathedral, Los Angeles, Calif.; Mrs. Mary Leakey, Hawthorne, N. J.; Rev. Henry Lewis, Ann Arbor, Mich.; Rev. Charles W. Lowry, Chevy Chase, Md.; Rev. Hugh McCandless, New York, N. Y.; Rev. Robert Magill, Lynchburg, Va.; Rev. William H. Marmion, Birmingham, Ala.; Miss Lucy Randolph Mason, Atlanta, Ga.; Mrs. Mortimer Matthews, Glendale, Ohio; Mrs. Stanley Matthews, Tucson, Ariz.; Rev. Randolph C. Miller, Berkeley, Calif.; Rev. A. T. Mollegen, Alexandria, Va.; Mrs. John F. Moors, Brookline, Mass.; Rev. J. Brooke Mosley, Wilmington, Del.; Deaconess Elizabeth Newbold, Burlington, N. J.; Rev. Thomas F. Opie, Great Barrington, Mass.; Rev. W. Norman Pittenger, New York, N. Y.; Rev. Richard Greeley Preston, Worcester, Mass.; Robert J. Riddle, Philadelphia, Pa.; Rev. Robert N. Rodenmayer, Northampton, Mass.; Rev. Wallace E. Rollins, Sweet Briar, Va.; Rev. William B. Schmidgall, Tunkhannock, Pa.; Miss Vida D. Scudder, Wellesley, Mass.; Rev. Oscar J. F. Seitz, Gambier, Ohio; Rev. Massey H. Shepherd, Jr., Cambridge, Mass.; Rev. Arthur M. Sherman, New York, N. Y.; Mrs. Mary K. Simkhovitch, New York, N. Y.; Rev. C. H. Simpson, New York, N. Y.; Rev. Robert E. Smith, Trenton, N. J.; Rev. C. E. Snowden, Philadelphia, Pa.; Rev. William B. Sperry, Detroit, Mich.; Miss Lucy C. Sturgis, Boston, Mass.; Rev. Malcolm Taylor, Brookline, Mass.; Mrs. William G. Thayer, Boston, Mass.; Rev. Cornelius P. Trowbridge, Morristown, N. J.; Rev. Luther Tucker, Cincinnati, Ohio; Rev. Charles E. Tuke, Lansdowne, Pa.; William C. Turpin, Macon, Ga.; Rev. William M. Weber, Littleton, N. H.; Rev. Theodore O. Wedel, Washington, D. C.; Rev. Walter N. Welsh, Syracuse, N. Y.; Rev. Bradford Young, Manchester, N. H.; Mrs. Robert Zava, Laguna Beach, Calif.

COLLEGE PRESIDENTS

Dr. A. H. Compton, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.; Dr. George L. Cross, University of Oklahoma, Norman, Okla.; Dr. William W. Edel, Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pa.; Dr. Bryn J. Hovde, New School for Social Research, New York, N. Y.; Dr. D. W. Malott, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kans.; Dr. Henry B. Trimble, Emory University, Emory University, Ga.; Dr. Charles J. Turck, Macalester College, St. Paul, Minn.

UNITARIAN CLERGYMEN

Rev. Waldemar W. Argow, Baltimore, Md.; Rev. Joseph Barth, Miami, Fla.; Rev. Dr. Leon M. Birkhead, New York, N. Y.; Rev. Raymond B. Bragg, Boston, Mass.; Rev. Edward A. Cahill, Nashua, N. H.; Dr. Dale DeWitt, director, Middle Atlantic States Unitarian Association, New York, N. Y.; Dr. Frederick May Eliot, president, American Unitarian Association, Boston, Mass.; Rev. Samuel Atkins Eliot, Cambridge, Mass.; Rev. Norman D. Fletcher, Montclair, N. J.; Rev. Donald Harrington, New York, N. Y.; Rev. Ralph N. Helverson, Ithaca, N. Y.; Rev. Dr. John Haynes Holmes, New York, N. Y.; Rev. Duncan Howlett, Boston, Mass.; Rev. Charles R. Joy, New York, N. Y.; Rev. Robert Killam, Cleveland, Ohio; Rev. Leon R. Land, Flint, Mich.; Rev. John G. MacKinnon, Wilmington, Del.; Rev. Jack Mendelsohn, Jr., Rockford, Ill.; Rev. Wilburn B. Miller, Cambridge, Mass.; Rev. Leslie T. Pennington, Chicago, Ill.; Rev. Palfrey Perkins, Boston, Mass.; Rev. Charles Francis Potter, New York, N. Y.; Dr. Curtis W. Reese, dean, Abraham Lincoln Center, Chicago, Ill.; Rev. Alson H. Robinson, Princeton, N. J.; Rev. Hugh Weston, Natick, Mass.

RELIGIOUS LEADERS (MISCELLANEOUS)

Rev. H. Parr Armstrong, Fort Worth, Tex.; Dr. Roger D. Bosworth, Columbus, Ohio; Rev. Rogers T. Burton (Congregational), Irvington, N. J.; Rev. Charles H. Campbell, Flushing, N. Y.; Rev. Donald B. Cloward, executive secretary, the Northern Baptist Convention, New York, N. Y.; Rev. Henry H. Crane (Methodist), Detroit, Mich.; Rev. E. F. Farnham, Los Angeles, Calif.; Rev. Dr. Theodore Ainsworth Greene, New Britain, Conn.; Rev. Harvey W. Hollis, Executive Secretary, Federation of Churches of Christ in Albany and vicinity, Albany, N. Y.; Rev. Dr. Roy M. Houghton, New Haven, Conn.; Mrs. Esther Holmes Jones, Philadelphia, Pa.; Rev. Donald G. Lothrop, Boston, Mass.; Rhoda E. McCulloch, New York, N. Y.; Rev. Dr. Charles S. MacFarland, Mountain Lakes, N. J.; Rev. Dr. William Pierson Merrill, New York, N. Y.; Rev. Frank N. Miner, Executive Secretary, Flint Council of Churches, Flint, Mich.; Rev. Dr. Wilhelm Pauck, Chicago, Ill.; Rev. Rockwell Hammon Potter, Hartford, Conn.; Rev. Ralph H. Read, Maplewood, N. J.; Rev. Dr. Paul Scherer, New York, N. Y.; Rev. Dr. G. Vaughn Shedd, Boston, Mass.; Rev. Dr. Harold Paul Sloan, Philadelphia, Pa.; Dr. Norris L. Tibbetts (Presbyterian), New York, N. Y.; Dr. Joseph King Vivien (Methodist), Nashville, Tenn.; Whitney S. K. Yeaple, Executive Secretary, New Hampshire Council of Churches and Religious Education, Concord, N. H.; Rev. Dr. Reuben K. Youngdahl, Minneapolis, Minn.

COLLEGE PROFESSORS

Dr. James Luther Adams, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.; Prof. John L. Childs, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.; Prof. George S. Counts, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.; Prof. Clyde Eagleton, New York University, New York, N. Y.; Prof. Henry Pratt Fairchild, New York University, New York, N. Y.; Prof. Leland M. Goodrich, Brown University, Providence, R. I.; Prof. Paul L. Hanna, University of Florida, Gainesville, Fla.; Dr. Georgia Harkness, Garrett Bible Institute, Evanston, Ill.; Dr. S. Ralph Harlow, Smith College, Northampton, Mass.; Dr. Alvin Johnson, New School for Social Research, New York, N. Y.; Prof. Horace M. Kallen, New School for Social Research, New York, N. Y.; Dr. Frederick D. Kershner, School of Religion, Butler University, Indianapolis, Ind.; Dr. Halford E. Luccock, Yale Divinity School, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.; Prof. Reinhold Niebuhr, Union Theological Seminary, New York, N. Y.; Dr. Harry A.

Overstreet, Mill Valley, Calif.; Dr. Thomas Clark Pollock, Dean, Washington Square College, New York, N. Y.; Prof. Harris Franklin Rall, Evanston, Ill., Dr. H. Shelton Smith, Duke University, Durham, N. C.; Dr. Leonard A. Stidley, Graduate School of Theology, Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio; Dr. Henry U. Wieman, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oreg.

WRITERS AND EDITORS

William Rose Benet, New York, N. Y.; Dr. Henry Seidel Canby, editor, Saturday Review of Literature, New York, N. Y.; Marshall N. Dana, editor, Oregon Journal, Portland, Oreg.; Oscar Hammerstein II, New York, N. Y.; Spencer D. Irwin, editor, Cleveland Plain Dealer, Cleveland, Ohio; Freda Kirchwey, editor, the Nation, New York, N. Y.; Archibald MacLeish, Boston, Mass.; Dr. Thomas Mann, Pacific Palisades, Calif.; Rex Stout, Brewster, N. Y.

DISTINGUISHED AMERICANS (MISCELLANEOUS)

Dean Alfange, New York, N. Y.; Mrs. David Alter, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Mrs. Sherwood Anderson, New York, N. Y.; Dr. Henry A. Atkinson, secretary, the Church Peace Union, New York, N. Y.; Dr. Frederick T. Bertram, Willimantic, Conn.; J. M. Blalock, Columbia, S. C.; Mrs. Jeanetta Welch Brown, president, the National Council of Negro Women, Washington, D. C.; Dr. Hugh Chamberlin Burr, Rochester, N. Y.; Miss Elisabeth Christman, secretary, National Women's Trade Union League, Washington, D. C.; Bartley C. Crum, member, Anglo-American Commission of Inquiry, New York, N. Y.; Representative Helen Gahagan Douglas, Washington, D. C.; Dr. Clark M. Eichelberger, director, American Association for the United Nations, New York, N. Y.; Frank B. Frederick, Boston, Mass.; Mrs. Louise S. Freese, Sioux City, Iowa; Lloyd K. Garrison, New York, N. Y.; Dr. Charles Hartshorne, Chicago, Ill.; Sidney Hollander, Baltimore, Md.; Dr. John Paul Jones, president, National Peace Conference, Brooklyn, N. Y.; J. M. Kaplan, president, Welch Grape Juice Co., Westfield, N. Y.; John F. Lewis, Jr., Philadelphia, Pa.; Dr. Walter C. Lowdermilk, Berkeley, Calif.; Marshall McDuffie, New York, N. Y.; Dr. Victor Obenhaus, Chicago, Ill.; Rita Ochmann, Cleveland, Ohio; Mrs. G. Edgerton Parsons, New York, N. Y.; James G. Patton, president, Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union, Denver, Colo.; Judge Harry N. Peterson, St. Paul, Minn.; T. Edwin Quisenberry, Chicago, Ill.; Walter Reuther, president, United Automobile Workers of America, Detroit, Mich.; Quentin Reynolds, Longmeadow, Mass.; William Rosenblatt, vice president, Advisory Council, the Nation Associates, New York, N. Y.; James H. Sheldon, administrative chairman, Non-Sectarian Anti-Nazi League, New York, N. Y.; Mayor Paul H. Todd, Kalamazoo, Mich.; Dr. Charles Trexler, New York, N. Y.; Sumner Welles, Oxon Hill, Md.

In Fact Exposes $200,000,000 Advertising Kitty—Spurs Six Big Magazines To Join Anti-Welfare-State Smear Orgy—26,000,000 Readers Propagandized by Popular Weeklies, Plus Monthly Reader's Digest

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1950

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is only too obvious to everyone that the Republicans have been engaged in a terrifying campaign of smear and vilification, the lowness of which we have never witnessed before.

Every low breed of character assassin—immoral and discredited ex-Communists, stool pigeons who are proven wife beaters and who deserted their small children—any hireling who will lie for money, is being used in this desperate campaign by the Republicans.

The injustice, misery, the broken careers and ruined reputations of decent courageous Americans, caused by these spiteful and unfounded charges, arouse our anger and indignation.

The method employed by these Republican accusers to injure or eliminate people who differ from them in their political views is nothing novel. It was used by the ancient Romans against early Christians. The guide will tell you an interesting story as he takes you through the catacombs at the Franciscan Monastery in the city of Washington, and of course we all remember how the Nazis used it on a gigantic scale against the Jews. That is why it is important that everyone read the following article that appeared in the little, but fearless, magazine, In Fact, on May 29, 1950. It clearly shows how the Republicans, big business, and big propaganda are all tied in together:

TWO HUNDRED MILLION DOLLAR ADVERTISING KITTY SPURS SIX BIG MAGAZINES TO JOIN ANTI-WELFARE-STATE SMEAR ORGY—26,000,000 READERS PROPAGANDIZED BY POPULAR WEEKLIES, PLUS MONTHLY READER'S DIGEST

Papers shape public opinion with reactionary propaganda. This fact is not only well known, but is probably accepted by many of the 52,000,000 Americans who each day buy that many copies of the 1,750 dailies published in the land. "You can't believe what you read in the papers," has been an accepted adage for a long time.

Fewer readers, however, are aware that the popular weekly magazines do much the same propaganda job, disguising their work behind a subtle, sugar-coated facade of slanted news, entertaining fiction, photos and fancy four-color ads.

Yet analysis by this weekly of just six of the more popular weekly magazines, plus the Reader's Digest, shows that more than 26,000,000 Americans who buy each issue are actually buying the political, social and economic views of the powerful groups fighting the public welfare.

PUBLICATIONS ASSAIL MAGAZINE BIAS, SMEARS

"For perhaps the first time in this country's history big magazines of wide circulation, supposed to be entirely free from bias on political and economic issues, are becoming bitter and untruthful organs of propaganda," the railroad paper Labor noted April 8.

In an article headed: "Big magazines go on smear orgy," the paper continued "Heaven knows the daily press is bad enough in its attempt to confuse and mislead the public, but the magazines are going still further. They are generally subtle and always utterly unscrupulous."

In a special editorial May 6, the Madison (Wis.) Capital Times, one of the few dailies which speaks for the general welfare, also took note of the increasing amount of propaganda in the magazines as well as the newspapers—one of the few times a daily newspaper has said anything in criticism of papers and publications. In an editorial headed: "Spotting propaganda," the paper said it would begin a regular series to "expose the tricks of suppression, distortion, deemphasis, and overemphasis given to current developments. * * * It is our purpose to expose treatment of the news that creates an unfair and biased opinion in the public mind. The instances of biased reporting and editorial comment which ignores important facts are becoming more numerous. The Capital Times believes that these efforts to propagandize the American people should be exposed."

ARTICLES ECHO BIG BUSINESS PROPAGANDA LINE

This weekly's investigation of the leading magazines engaged in this activity shows that in each case, the weeklies are well paid for their work on behalf of big business. The six slick weeklies last year received $201,290,267 in advertising revenue. In each instance, the propaganda campaign in the magazines' columns paralleled the propaganda campaign of the business organizations, such at the NAM, or the political party of these interests, the GOP. The only instance of a big magazine not in on the advertising payoff is the Reader's Digest, which accepts no advertising for its domestic issues, but believes in reaction as a matter of principle.

Here is the line-up of the six weeklies probed by this weekly, plus the Digest, and the amount each received, as well as the number of buyers each fools with every issue.

Magazine	Circulation [1]	1949 advertising revenue
Life	5,341,626	$76,346,727
Saturday Evening Post	4,034,169	59,259,119
Collier's	3,072,298	17,064,959
Look	3,041,630	15,064,179
Time	1,535,993	23,771,730
Newsweek	672,589	9,783,562
Reader's Digest	9,000,000	[2]
Total	26,708,305	201,290,267

[1] Latest available figures.
[2] No advertising.

COLLIER'S HITS MONOPOLY PROBE, REASON BARED

One of the best examples studied by this weekly is Collier's, exposed several years ago as closely tied to the J. P. Morgan banking and industrial empire. In recent months, faced with tough competition from the Saturday Evening Post, Collier's "jazzed up" its format, made a big appeal for popularity by aiming its material toward the common man. But analysis of current issues shows that scarcely a week goes by without a Collier's assault on some phase of the common man's welfare.

Here's just part of this year's picture:

January 7 issue: An editorial: Let's Not Chop Ourselves Down, an attack on the monopoly investigation in Congress headed by Representative EMANUEL CELLER. Inasmuch as all monopoly probes over the past decade have shown that the House of Morgan is the single most influencial and dominant outfit in the field of banking, industry, and utilities, by last count controlling more than $30,000,000,000 worth of assets, among them 13 giant industries with hundreds of subsidiaries, 12 utilities with dozens of subsidiaries, 7 major railroads, and 3 of the country's largest banks, the Collier's attack on the Celler monopoly probe could hardly be described as one from an objective or disinterested observer. (For the benefit of people who can't visualize how much a billion is, Frederick H. Ecker, chairman of the multibillion Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., recently offered this definition: "If you were to count every minute in every day since the birth of Christ, you would just about reach a billion. We (Metropolitan) have ten of those." And the Morgan empire has 30.)

LABOR, SCHOOLS, HEALTH AMONG MAGAZINE'S TARGETS

January 14 issue: Another editorial: We Are for Taft's Reelection, describing the coauthor of the Taft-Hartley law as just an old-fashioned liberal.

March 4 issue: Article by former Secretary of State James F. Byrnes, now a powerful force in the Dixiecrat movement, attacking Government spending—the old line of big business for curtailing spending for social services while increasing expenditures for arms.

April 8 issue: Article by Senator TAFT, Is President Truman Taking Us Down the British Road? This was an attack on the welfare state, the smear word with which reaction hopes to block and defeat proposed Fair Deal legislation like housing, health, FEPC, and so forth.

April 22 issue: An editorial headed, "Let's win the cold war," a play on words. The editorial was not concerned with the East-West propaganda war but with the campaign to expose antihistamine pills as useless and harmful. "The hot campaign against cold pills seems both exaggerated and unworthy," the editorial said. It did not say that the patent-medicine manufacturers are among the Nation's biggest advertisers, nor did it approve the action of the Federal Trade Commission in accusing five of the most widely advertised pill makers with false and misleading advertising.

April 29 issue: Article by Maj. Benjamin H. Namm, Brooklyn department store owner and one-time endorser of Mussolini, headed, "Would you enter a door marked socialism." This was another attack on the welfare state, this time with an appeal for an even greater propaganda offensive by big business to force their concept of the American way down the Nation's gullet. Textbooks which question the wisdom of the NAM's philosophy should be banned from schools, teachers who don't praise without stint the laissez faire concept of free enterprise should be purged, and every propaganda medium should be used to ram home Namm's and NAM's beliefs, the article said.

LABOR DISSECTS TAFT-COLLIER'S FAIR-DEAL SMEAR

It isn't very often that a small publication will take on both a goliath magazine and a political sacred cow, but the railroad weekly, Labor, last month did a job on both Collier's and Senator TAFT worth mentioning. Commenting on Taft's anti-welfare-state article in the magazine, Labor wrote (April 8):

"The article constitutes the maddest kind of effort to fill the hearts of Americans with fear and suspicion.

"First, TAFT gives a highly distorted picture of what's happened in Britain under what he calls the Socialist program of the Labor Party. Then he claims President Truman's Fair Deal proposals 'parallel almost exactly the measures enforced by the Labor government of Britain.'

"What's his proof? The answer would be funny if not so serious. His first piece of evidence is that Truman made a postwar request to Congress for certain temporary price-fixing powers to curb inflation, which was a direct result of the war. Yet TAFT tries to make it appear that the President wanted permanent peacetime price-fixing. That's a plain lie.

"Next TAFT claims Truman sought power to go into business. What are the facts? Truman in a message to Congress asked authority for a study of production facilities which are in short supply, such as steel 'and, if found necessary, to authorize Government loans for expansion of production facilities to relieve such shortages.'

"At that time the steel industry wasn't meeting the needs of private business, and so Truman sought some tentative means of overcoming the bottleneck. That's a far cry from the kind of Government nationalization which TAFT portrays.

"The Ohio Senator really reveals his hand in his third exhibit. He cries that Truman wants to establish more TVA's around the country to develop cheaper power, as well as build transmission lines and finance generating plants for the Rural Electrification Administration cooperatives.

"Clearly, in his attack on the TVA and REA and the farmers co-ops, TAFT is cuddling right up to the power trust. One wonders what the farmers of Ohio and the Nation will think of a Senator who cries socialism at a Government which entered the field to give farmers electric power at reasonable prices through the REA because private companies had refused to do the job. * * *

"Finally, TAFT comes to Truman's proposals for health insurance, disability insurance and Federal aid to the States for the care of the needy. All these he lumps under his blanket bugaboo of socialism, British style.

"That and more pure, unadulterated propaganda fills the article, and Collier's gives it the leading position. We don't question the right of Collier's to run an article glorifying TAFT, but if it professes the least claim to impartiality its columns should also be opened to the other side.

"There's little chance of that. Collier's, along with the Saturday Evening Post and Reader's Digest and other national magazines, have been carrying a flood of propaganda articles smearing organized labor and the Fair Deal program, while closing their pages to anything remotely resembling a defense of the labor movement or of progressive legislation. That's not what Americans call fair play."

LUCE'S TIME-LIFE MAJOR FORCE IN PUBLIC OPINION

As the publisher of the biggest, richest, and lushest weeklies in America, Henry Luce and the arrogance of his Life-Time magazines have long been a topic in journalism circles. With an advertising income of more than $100,000,000 annually from just the two publications, it is small wonder that Time-Life always champions the cause of what Heywood Broun called the upperdog.

"Often wrong but never in doubt," has been a suggested motto for Time-Life journalism for many years.

Of Luce himself, New Republic, March 27, said, he has a conviction that his periodicals are saying what God would say if God had all the facts.

Typical of Luce's Life-Time approach to their readers was his picture magazine's special midcentury issue last winter.

Adhering to the Luce concept that the American half century was solely the work of big-business men and politicians, with a sprinkling of professional entertainers and sporting characters, Life selected as its typical, average American, a salesman earning slightly more than $10,000 a year, living in the most modern equipped house in one of the best neighborhoods and enjoying all of the luxuries and comforts which are described in the $100,000,000 worth of four-color ads featured in Life-Time last year.

Also in keeping with the big business theme that America is perfect, and anyone who mentions the defects in the system and seeks to correct them is either a Red or at least a fellow traveler, Life has joined the campaign to oust Secretary of State Acheson. "Mr. Acheson has great virtues, but they do not include a confident belief in America," the magazine pontificated in March, when the McCarthy attacks on the State Department got under way.

SATURDAY EVENING POST IS SLICK ORGAN OF NAM PROPAGANDA

Like its main competitor, Collier's, the Saturday Evening Post can also boast to its advertisers that in return for the $59,000,000 it received last year, scarcely a single issue hits the stands without some attack on the welfare state or its component parts, particularly organized labor.

In recent weeks it featured several hoaxes to put over its reactionary propaganda line. One story, The Federal Snoops Are After Me, told in tear-jerking fashion how an unhappy publisher of a weekly paper was terrorized and victimized by the Government which took a dim view of his employing children to fold papers after school for a "lark," for "cider, cookies" and a "little pin money." Upon investigation after the story appeared in print, the Labor Department revealed that the great-hearted publisher, Robinson McIlvaine, had hired children as young as 11, worked them as late as 11:30 p. m., and paid them as little as $1.25 for 8 hours' work. The Saturday Evening Post story reached over 4,000,000 buyers. The Labor Department correction made a few labor publications. The great Saturday Evening Post refused to print a correction.

Controlled by Walter Fuller, a past president of the NAM and now an active member of its governing board, the Saturday Evening Post has always followed the NAM line. Today, the NAM campaigns against the welfare state, Government spending, and bewails the success of left-wing agitators in promoting Socialist measures. Analysis of the Saturday Evening Post's articles and editorials over a period of months shows substantially the same expressions of alarm.

SMEARS LABOR, REJECTS REPLY, FACTS CITED

In a story headed: "SEP lies again in dirty campaign to defame labor," the railroad weekly took note of a current Saturday Evening Post editorial a little more outrageous than some of its others.

"An extraordinary drive to smear organized labor and labor legislation has been started by the Saturday Evening Post. Ordinarily it would be called a propaganda campaign, but it's worse. It's a campaign of outright lying," the paper said.

It went on to take apart the Saturday Evening Post's editorial, Must Propaganda Be the Monopoly of Our Leftists. Among those it described as leftists were the AFL and its League for Political Education, and the CIO's Political Action Committee, the Americans for Democratic Action, and the American Farm Bureau Federation, which is admittedly far over to the right in the political spectrum.

The AFL sought space in the magazine to refute the charge, but like the Labor Department, was turned down.

In the answer, the AFL's radio commentator, Frank Edwards, described the editorial as a magnificent piece of piffle, adding:

"Big business and big banking spend eight times as much for lobbying as all their so-called leftist opponents combined. Free speech is so nearly nonexistent that it exists only in fragmentary form where it can be found at all. You can count the real independent newspapers of this country on the fingers of one hand."

Among the facts contained in Edwards' detailed refutation of the Post's charges was a section dealing with radio, which the Post said was being monopolized by labor.

"There are 3,000 broadcasting stations in the United States; we reach about 150 of them," Edwards said. "The Post calls that pressure. What kind, gentlemen. Low pressure?"

The American Economy: Freedom's Test

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1950

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend by remarks in the RECORD I wish to make known to my colleagues

that there exists in Detroit the Economic Club and it is most ably presided over by its president, Mr. Allen B. Crow. Through his administration there has been brought to the city of Detroit from time to time some of the outstanding students of the country, and the membership of the Economic Club constitutes a roster of Who's Who in dynamic Detroit. It is indeed a pleasure for me to insert in the RECORD the able remarks of Mr. Leon H. Keyserling, chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, on this most fitting subject, Freedom's Test:

Mr. KEYSERLING. Mr. Chairman, and all of you who have been kind enough to come and talk together today, I wish that Mrs. Keyserling were here, because then I would have a chance to straighten out one of my domestic problems. That problem arises out of the fact that on a recent occasion when I had to make a talk, and Mrs. Keyserling was present, the person next to her asked her what I was going to talk about and she said, "I can't be at all sure, but you may be sure it isn't the topic assigned to him." Well, I could straighten myself out a little bit if Mrs. Keyserling were here today, because I am going to try very hard today to talk about the topic assigned to me, The American Economy: Freedom's Test.

And let me say at the beginning that I wish it were practical to organize meetings of this kind in a manner that would permit more freedom in the course of the meeting itself. By more freedom, I mean that I would like it if we could start a meeting of this kind by having those of you across the table raise points for discussion, because it is perfectly obvious that the American economy and its problems are so vast, so complex, that it is awfully hard for someone in my spot to know even where to begin without knowing just what is on the top of your minds at the present moment. So I do cherish, as one of the most valuable parts of a meeting of this kind, some opportunity, not for a question period but for a discussion period at the end, and I hope that you will begin sharpening your pencils so that although the time allotted to us is not too long we may have that give and take, that exchange of ideas and frank response, which seem to me of the essence of our kind of free society and free economy.

The fact that I think the American economy presents a test of freedom is the reason why I'm interested in economics at this time. For if the problems of the American economy related only to the question of our daily bread, only to the troublesome question of meeting payrolls, or meeting the cost of living, these problems would be important indeed but they would seem in some respects secondary compared with the vast, looming, overwhelming problems which face our Nation of 151,000,000 people—if I forecast the census correctly—in a world of something like 2,250,000,000. But when we look at ourselves in the context of the current world situation, we realize that the American economy is indeed freedom's test, we realize that whether we shall survive, whether we shall prosper, whether we shall be able to hold on to those freedoms which we all value more than anything else—the fundamental freedoms of human beings, in their business lives and in their personal lives and in their social and political lives—we realize that the outlook on all these momentous issues depends very much on the strength and stability and progress of the American economy. And that is why I think the problems of our economy are so transcendently important, because I think that how effectively we deal with them will determine more than anything else how fully all that we cherish most does survive here and elsewhere in the world.

I don't think that the most important aspect of this issue is whether our economy is strong enough to maintain national security or defense measures. It is. Nor is it whether our economy is strong enough to maintain its international programs and obligations. It is. In a more fundamental sense, our future depends on how well we thrive and prosper in the advancement of our own economic system because the other peoples and the other nations of the free world are looking to the United States as the demonstration of that blend of free enterprise and free government which has made us strong and to which we look to keep us strong. And if we should perchance, through neglect or mishap, give even a temporary demonstration that we cannot retain this economic strength in full, then we shall have removed from the eyes of the other peoples of the world the thing which gives us more influence, which gives us more leadership, which gives us more prospect for success, than armaments and other things—although those, too, are important.

In this connection, we have to take account, as realistic people, of how we are judged by others. And I think it very important to recognize that they do not judge us always by the tests that we apply to ourselves. It is not satisfactory to them to say, although it is important, that we are economically more powerful than the rest of the world—although we are; that we're infinitely more productive and more ingenious than other industrial nations—although we are; that we have the highest standards of living and have made the most progress. All this is true, but I think we will be judged primarily in the eyes of the world—not to speak of in the eyes of our own people—not by what we have, for which there are many historic and other reasons for which we should be thankful, but rather by what we do with what we have. After all, the test of the salt of a man is not the talents he was born with but how well he uses what he has. We all prefer the industrious hard-working person of reasonable ability to the person blessed with great ability who wastes his time and accomplishes little. So the test of the American economy will be, not whether we have more than others, but what we do with what we have. And that test will be posed primarily—in the eyes of the free world, I say again—in terms of how well we are successful in avoiding what others have come to think, rightly or wrongly, has been one of the liabilities of the American economy, its inability to achieve a reasonable measure of stability and a reasonably steady rate of growth. That liability from time to time has cut across the path of our economic progress; it has created from time to time a degree of unemployment of plant and resources and manpower to an extent which has made those in other places, and some within our own country, look askance at our resources and at our institutions. Thus, I think that the greatest task we have in the years ahead is to find the ways—I say "the ways" because there is no one way or no one panacea to bring more stability and growth into the American economy than it has shown in peacetime years in the past.

I say "more" advisedly. I don't say "perfection," because let me make it clear at the very beginning that I realize that while there is no absolute conflict there needs to be some reconciliation between security and stability and the dynamism which has made our economy grow the way it has. Perhaps if we sought for absolute security, if we sought for absolute stability, we would have to sacrifice too large an amount of the initiative and of the dynamism and of the drive which in the long run have enabled us to accomplish such great results. But there must be some reconciliation, at least to the extent of not paying a price for our progress so high that from time to time it unduly jeopardizes our progress. If there is any one thing upon which I think the majority of us would be in agreement, it is that we could not afford a degree of instability which might bring to our economy, in terms of its current size, anything even roughly comparable to the degree of instability, or the degree of unemployment that we have had measured against the size of our economy in the past.

To make myself clear when I talk about unemployment, let me say that I'm not talking simply about jobless workers. I'm talking also about unemployment of managerial skill, unemployment of our plant and resources, unemployment of our financial resources, which are really the counterpart of unemployment of manpower. For let us always remember that manpower itself has no wealth-creating value in our economy except insofar as it is united and wedded to managerial skills, to plant and equipment, to financial resources, and to business know-how. So when I use that simple word "unemployment," I'm talking about our economy as a whole and not talking only about jobs.

Yet I do think that jobs are one of the important measures of unemployment, and the reason for that goes beyond purely material things and gets into certain other values. Certain trends are taking place in thinking within our own country, not to speak of the rest of the world, to the effect that a high level of joblessness cannot be defended. Even if on strictly economic grounds we were to accept the view—which I emphatically do not accept—that our system might become more efficient with five or six or seven million unemployed, or at least could support this number without strain, public opinion holds otherwise. I think it is part of practical and realistic business people not to argue a question which is already determined in the public mind. We must recognize as a given factor in the situation, just as surely as rain is a given factor in a situation, that if unemployment does rise above a certain level, the composition of freedom about which we have been talking cannot so easily be assured. No one can look with confidence upon any advent of high and sustained unemployment. I would be the first to say that in such a period, as in the past, the combination of experimentation, of rapid change, which is forced upon the people and the Government by that kind of situation, does not provide a full solution even though it brings some improvements.

Therefore, it seems that the first prerequisite of trying to maintain and advance our freedom, to maintain those values which are the hallmark of the American economy, is to start at the rewardingly high economic levels where we are now and try to avoid any critical downturn; because the hour of crisis necessarily produces rapid improvisation and experimentation. We should try to avoid the advent of conditions which, as they became more severe, would become harder and more dangerous to deal with. In fact, we must strive for still higher activity and for much lower unemployment.

Let me try briefly to cite just a few figures—I don't want to bore you with many—as to the size and nature of the problem of maintaining reasonably stable growth in the American economy. Many people wonder why, with our economy for 1949 as a whole only 1 percent below 1948 in total level of real output (after adjusting for price changes) unemployment which averaged about 2,000,000 in 1948 changed to about 3,500,000 in 1949 and was about twice as high at the end of 1949 as at the end of 1948. Why did that great change in unemployment take place, when 1949 as a whole was only 1 percent below 1948 in total output of goods and services?

The reason it took place was twofold, and in those twofold conditions we have evidence

not only of the strength and the magnificence and the awe-inspiring quality, but also of the central difficult problem, of the American economy. These twofold conditions are: Increases in productivity, which means being able to do more with the same number of people, and second, growth in population and in the labor force.

Now we come into 1950 and we see, in the first quarter of this year, at roughly speaking the levels of business activity of the latter part of last year, a further increase in unemployment, and for the same two reasons.

I well recall that in the years 1946 through 1948, when I talked with many business economists about productivity, in view of their concern as to whether productivity was really going to increase, I said: "I think enough of the American system of business, of its enterprise and its judgment, to be absolutely incredulous when it is said that an American industry which invests more billions of dollars than ever before in peacetime history in the fundamental improvement of plant and equipment will not achieve vastly increased productivity when we settle down from the immediate postwar situation and when we have a time to digest the results of that improvement."

While the indexes of productivity are always slow in coming in, that increase is now taking place, and I believe that 1950 and 1951 and 1952 will bring ever-increasing evidence of a new release of productivity forces which should at least maintain the best records that we made in any comparable number of peace-time years in the past—and I wouldn't be at all surprised if it exceeded them.

Let's just look a very few years ahead and see what this current and potential increase in productivity, plus the growth in the labor force, put before us as the central problem of the American economy. Let's just take a period of 5 years, roughly speaking, to 1954. Now, that may seem like stargazing, but is it really a long time in the life of a great nation? Does it seem to us a very long time ago that the war ended? And that was almost 5 years ago.

Over a 5-year period, if we maintain the increase in productivity which our past record (even when averaging periods of depression as well as prosperity) would indicate, and maintain only the same level of business activity and the same level of total national output which we had in 1948 (which seemed to us like a phenomenally productive year) then we would end up within four or five years with ten to twelve million unemployed. To make myself perfectly clear, I'm not predicting ten to twelve million unemployed. I don't think we're going to have it. I think we've got to avoid it. I think we will avoid it. But I'm merely using this statistical illustration to show that the great and most important law of our kind of economy is that it cannot be stable by standing still. It must grow in order to live and thrive and prosper. Therefore, if I may say so, when I hear people saying, "Well, conditions are perfect because national income, output, employment, are just as high as they were in 1949, and that was a good year, and pretty nearly as good as 1948 which was the best year we ever had, and so we're all in the clear"—when I hear this said, I must register my dissent. The fact is that if employment and output and level of business activity remained constant, even at the highest levels we have ever known, we would year by year accrue more unemployment of business resources, of financial resources, and of manpower. And we would accrue all of the problems that go with such increasing unemployment.

Let me illustrate that in just one more way, and then get to some questions of program and analysis. Suppose we take it in dollar terms instead of taking it in job terms. If between now and 1954 we achieve that minimum desirable rate of steady growth, about 3 to 4 percent a year, which is necessary to prevent unemployment of all kinds from rising constantly above its present base, our national income over the next 5 years in the aggregate would be approximately $125,000,000,000 higher than if we stabilized output and income at current levels, and would be about $300,000,000,000 higher than if over the next 5 years we went up and down as in some cyclical periods in the past. Over a 10-year period, the respective figures would be around $500,000,000,000 and $800,000,000,000. These figures are a measure of the size of the problem of expanding our markets to absorb the potential output of our technology and our business resources and our skills and labor force at reasonably full employment. And when we think of these figures measured against the cost of the last war, measured against the size of the national debt, measured against the best national income that we ever had in any year before the war, then we appreciate the size of the problem, a problem of business analysis and of business action in exploring and encouraging and developing prospective and potential markets.

It does stand to reason that, however much we may look across the seas for the further development of those markets, we must find most of them fundamentally within our own shores. The very simple reason for this is that, in the long run, as a simple proposition of economics, if our foreign trade of whatever size it may be is to be on a stable basis, it must in the long run be balanced—and I won't go into all the complexities and details—by an inflow as well as by export of materials and goods and services. There may be some variance, depending upon undisclosed items and upon a lot of technicalities, but broadly speaking as we expand our markets abroad they must be balanced in one way or another by imports because if they are not we are simply compounding a problem rather than moving toward solving it. And since that rough balance must take place, the fact remains that in the long run, we still have the problem here at home of finding domestic markets roughly approximating our domestic output. I always like to mention this, because I hear in so many places that facile assumption that if in some way we can exploit foreign markets, if in some way we can develop undeveloped areas, then we will no longer have the fundamental problem of the relationship between our home product and our home output.

So as not to be misunderstood, I do not mean by this that a program of developing world trade is unsound. I think it is necessary. I do not mean that such things as the point 4 program have no point. I think they're good and desirable. I think we need a healthy world economy and a healthy world trade, but let us not confuse that fact with the assumption that if we are successful in that problem we can avoid the central problem here at home.

Now, coming finally to the question of what broad problems confront us as we are faced with the challenge as to whether over the next 5 years we can very substantially reduce unemployment below the 4,700,000 figure of February 1950, or whether we face a rise to six or eight or ten or twelve million.

Economics is a peculiar science. It's a science of words as well as of facts, and when someone talks words alone one gets many different answers to problems and much seeming disagreement. But when one talks facts, it is surprising to note the extent to which businessmen, labor people, economists, and others in the long run identify the problem rather similarly. They identify the problem as one of balance among the various forces of the economy. By that balance they mean, first of all, that our price structure, our price machinery, which is really the operation of our economy, yield enough in profits to business to provide both the funds and the incentives—and I use both advisedly—the funds and the incentives to continue the improvement of its plant and equipment, to continue its basic expansion, to continue the maintenance of its necessary reserves, at those levels which make full use of our great technology. If business income, as a part of the total flow of national income, is not high enough for these purposes, we may temporarily have a high and rewarding level of consumption, but we will be impoverishing that central basic resource, our technology and our plant and equipment, our industrialization, in other words, which enables us to progress in the long run.

As a corelative those of this problem of balance, if it happens that business income is higher than is necessary for these purposes, and other forms of income correspondingly too low, we have that deflation which results from inability to clear the markets of goods. Looking at the other side of the coin, with respect to personal incomes of all kinds all over the country, which are sometimes called consumer incomes, if they get too high in relation to output we have inflation and overdemand for the products available. But if they get too low, I repeat, we have deflationary pressures.

In this task of seeking balance—a balance which will never be a perfect one, but which must be kept within workable limits if we are to have reasonable stability—what forces have we at work in the private economy? We have three great forces. We have the powerful force of organized labor, organized both on the political and on the economic front. We have the great force of farmers, organized not so much on the economic front because the nature of their industry does not permit that, but certainly organized on the political front for the seeking of a larger share of national income than they would get if the programs which they favor were not adopted. And then we have organized business, which in its various ways is seeking self-protection and self-advancement.

There are only two ways in a free economy by which those three great forces may seek adjustment. One way is through conflict. Conflict on the economic front, through the breakdown of collective bargaining. Conflict on the political front, through the bidding of favors, based upon the delivery of votes.

We have gotten along thus far despite this kind of conflict, and we would certainly none of us surrender all of this kind of conflict for anything that might take its place. We would rather have the conflict, we would rather have the headaches, we would rather have the trouble, than to have the suppression or the restriction or the national planning which could be the only substitute in the kind of economy we have for some of this conflict.

But I think many of us are coming to realize increasingly that some of this conflict must be replaced, or at least ameliorated, or at least reduced, by a second way. This involves use of certain other guides to the conduct of freemen in a voluntary free enterprise economy.

What are these other guides? In the final analysis, they cannot be self-denial or self-sacrifice or altruism, because in the final analysis it is the very definition of our kind of economy that the pursuit of gain, the following of self-interest, is the motivating force which drives the economy forward. Those people who go around saying that labor should be unselfish, that farmers should be unselfish, that businessmen should be unselfish, seem to me to propose no solution to the problem. It seems to me that they don't even state the problem. The problem is rather to find some restatement of this ostensible conflict so that it is made clear that there are many areas in which the self-in-

terests of one and the self-interests of the other coincide. In other words, we must find more ways of stating what I believe to be an ultimate truth about our economy—that in the long run, for our economy to grow and thrive and prosper and be reasonably stable under a free system, there must be more and more areas where labor and business and farmers appreciate that their real interests do not conflict in the long run.

If a farmer should achieve a price-support program which holds out to him the hope of a higher portion of the national income than is consistent with that level of wages or that level of profits which is needed for a healthy industrial system, if he should get a level of supports which holds out to him the inducement to a volume and composition of agricultural output which our economy simply cannot digest, then the farmer in the long run will not benefit thereby. And the same thing applies in the case of the businessman and the worker, neither of whom can benefit in the long run by getting more than the economy can afford to give.

How can areas of mutuality of interest be more carefully defined? It depends upon men of good will, and I believe, despite anything that may be said to the contrary, that a majority of the responsible leadership in all of the vast groupings of the American economy are men of good will. If we don't start with that assumption, we can't get anywhere. There are the troublemakers, there are the recalcitrants, there are the adventurers, but we must start with the assumption that most of the leadership is made up of men of good will who are groping for answers that will be workable answers in a free economy.

It seems, under these circumstances, that to get this reconciliation of interest so that there will be more areas of agreement, lesser areas of conflict, and at least a reduction of the areas of conflict upon some of the most dangerous ground, we must all try through improved economic study and analysis to define more carefully how the whole economy works in its main parts, and how its related parts synchronize and fit together.

This does not mean national planning. This does not mean the adoption of laws to put all or most of these things into effect, although laws in some areas of national policy are necessary. Let us remember that, in our kind of free economy, even laws must rest upon majority agreement and the broadening of areas of consent because without these you don't get the laws enacted in the first place and you certainly don't get them effectuated even after they are enacted. So those who say "Let's substitute law for voluntary study, for agreement on a voluntary basis" are just avoiding the problem because the problem exists in either event.

The most promising approach to this widening of areas of agreement, involving management and labor and farm groups, is to try to define over some reasonable period of time what a few broad requirements and prospects of our economy are—prospects which we all sense and should share. For example, suppose we start with the proposition that a 300 billion or higher annual national output within 4 or 5 years is not a pipe dream, is not pie in the sky, but is simply a factual definition of a goal that we have to reach if we are not going to be in serious trouble. And then suppose we try to use improved analysis and economic study to examine candidly and frankly, for example, what kind of funds business needs for investment in plant and equipment, what kind of output of steel and of agricultural products are broadly consistent with these objectives of a free and growing economy, and what all this implies for certain price adjustments and for certain wage adjustments and for certain farm policies. There would still be a range of conflict. I think it would still be true that each group would try to shape and edge its analysis a little bit to its own particular point of view. But I also think that through some such method of voluntary approach and consultation there would gradually emerge some broadening areas of agreement which would reduce the conflict and which would provide guides to viable, voluntary decisions in a free economy.

What does that optimism arise out of? Not simply out of a Pollyanna feeling. Let us look back to the first half of 1949. There then appeared many of those factors which in the early 1920's and again in the late 1920's and early 1930's produced a very serious and prolonged decline; there was a sharp commodity break, a sharp farm price drop, and a rapid decline in profits in many industries, a sharp rise in unemployment. The business sentiment that was accruing at that time was fraught with uncertainty. Yet we came through that test in 1949 much better than in earlier periods. Why? Because, throughout the economy at many main and strategic sectors of the business community, there were voluntarily practiced and put into effect improved economic judgment and knowledge based upon broader horizons and wider study and more information than had been available 15 or 20 or 30 years ago. In the handling of inventories, in the management of prices, in the handling of payrolls, and other items too innumerable to mention in the short time here, I think there was a very decisive change for the better as against years ago. At these various strategic points in the economy, there was more impartial study, more analysis, and more effort to relate the problems of each particular industry to the country as a whole.

Finally, we come to Government policy, which I have not the time to discuss at great length here. By defining these common objectives in broad areas, we could undertake a practical, business-like and economic examination of how Government programs, designed initially with the narrow purpose of raising revenues or supporting farm income or paying social security benefits, would be tested by their effect upon the wealth and the health and the stability of the economy as a whole. They would be tested by the incentives which they provide for general growth and stability and expansion through the normal channels of voluntary trade.

Applying that approach to tax policy, I think that a primary judgment of tax policy should be, not only how much revenues it raises on paper in the first instance, but also what its effect upon the whole economy is—how it affects incentives, how it effects growth, how it affects initiative, and many other matters of that kind. And while those responsible for tax policy would still in the final analysis have to make certain reconciliations of judgments, they would have a star to guide themselves by, which I think now is partly lacking.

So that both in the area of private policy and in the area of public policy we have need for this study, this refinement, and this redefinition of the vast and inspiring and realizable goals of the American economy.

In closing, I want to say just one thing about how that might affect business policy. The businessman is always torn by the problems of tomorrow as against the problems of next year. So long as the business community focuses entirely on the problems of tomorrow in a literal sense, on how the next strike may be settled, or on how a current strike may be settled, on whether a majority of economists or others guess that the next 6 months will be good or bad—I think that so long as attention is focused solely upon these very short-run considerations alone, there will be a tendency for businessmen to take the kind of action which in itself tends to make the economy somewhat more unstable.

For example, if a large group of businessmen, strategically located, should feel that the economic outlook over the next 6 months or over the next year is not good, then their policies of investment—which seem to me to be a primary conditioner of the economy—would trend in the direction of liquidity rather than in the direction of use of funds. This, if in large enough volume, would in itself exert a pronounced downward-pressure factor. If, on the other hand, wide and strategic sectors of the business community look more years ahead, recognize that in the long run we have not begun to tap the full potentialities of our markets, that our standards of living are not a fixed thing, that our ingenuity in the development of new products is not a fixed thing, that our capacity to adjust prices to markets is not a fixed thing—if the business community looks ahead in this way and realizes that America should not be sold short, then the investment and pricing policies of business, as well as the policies of other organized groups, would move in step with the long-range upward movement of the American economy.

If there is any utility in the enterprise in which some of us in Washington are engaged, it is not in anything that we may ourselves arrive at in an "ivory tower," it is not solely or mainly in what the Government may find or decide to do, but it is rather in having some slight effect upon stimulating throughout the economy in all its parts a real sense of the things which unites and hold together the American people. These things which hold us together, in world terms, are vastly more important than the things which seem to divide us. The questions which we need to solve together are much more important than any questions which the faint-hearted may think are insoluble. The record of our past is, on the whole, inspiring regarding our capacity to move ahead. If we can bury the hatchet, define our problems commonly, apply to them the best judgment and the best thought of our business analysis and our economic study, and try to arrive at more agreements and wider common consensus as to what needs to be done, then we have never lacked and we never will lack the technical ingenuity and the skill and the resources to go ahead to a successful conclusion. [Applause.]

Mr. CROW. Dr. Keyserling, I have a few questions here. Two I shall read as one because they really express the same idea.

(Reading question:) "As a realistic and presently a prosperous people, how long can we stand deficit spending and $42,000,000,000 budgets?"

The other, bearing on the same issue. (Reading question:) "Do you not think it important for the Government to begin to reduce its expenditures and live within its income, as private enterprise must do?"

Mr. KEYSERLING. Those two questions are fundamentally the same, and it's perfectly obvious that I couldn't answer either of them to my satisfaction, not to speak of yours, in a very short period of time. So I will just make a few very brief points.

In the first place, it is the objective of the Government, as I understand it, to balance the budget as rapidly as feasible. I think that the level of national income and general prosperity are now high enough to justify a balanced budget and a surplus for the reduction of the national debt. At the same time, our economy adjusts itself slowly to change, and the decisions on the tax side and the decisions on the expenditure side which have been made in the past would seem to me to make it unwise to try to achieve a complete budget balance overnight.

Let me illustrate by one simple example. I might believe that, if taxes had been reduced by $3,000,000,000 instead of 5 or 6 in 1948, we would now be closer to a balanced budget and our business system would not have been appreciably worse off if the tax reduction had been smaller. But it would not necessarily follow from this—in fact, it does not follow from this, that I would believe that taxes ought to be increased by $3,000,000,000 now, because in the current stage

of the economy the increase of taxes by $3,000,000,000 now would, I think, do a great deal more damage than if we had reduced taxes by $3,000,000,000 less than they were reduced 2 years ago.

I use this merely as an illustration. Realistically, looking at a cross section of the situation in where we are now, I think we ought to try to balance the budget as rapidly as feasible by moderation in tax policy, and by economy in expenditures. We should not think that if we reduced public outlays by $5,000,000,000 tomorrow, we would immediately bring the budget into balance. The fact is that either one of those two things—I shouldn't say the "fact" because it can't be proved—but the prospect is that either one of those two extreme things would hit the economy a blow more rapidly than it can absorb the blow. Therefore, I think we should move gradually along various paths to a balanced budget.

But let us always remember, realistically, that the most important path of all toward a balanced budget is a resumption of the normal growth pattern of the economy. With profits being the most volatile part of the income structure, the drop in revenues which results when there is even a slight cessation of the upward movement o the economy affects the Federal budget very adversely. We can easily balance the budget over a 3- or 4-year period, even with some tax reduction in the totality, and even if current levels of expenditures should not change, if the economy resumes its normal growth pattern. But if the economy does not grow, if unemployment increases, you have two results: You have, first, a greater drain upon the public purse, which would be imposed—and you all know realistically that it will, whether you would be for it or not—at Federal, State, and local levels; second, you would have much lower tax revenues at any given level of tax rates in a declining economy.

That is why I think we must always center upon those policies which will do most to resume the normal upward growth trend of the economy as the most important step toward a balanced budget. We should practice economy in expenditures in all those areas where this can be safely and prudently done, but some of the figures running into five or six billion dollars as to what might be accomplished through administrative improvements in the government, are just not borne out by the facts.

Mr. CROW. We're getting some good questions here, gentlemen.

(Reading question:) "It was an accepted concept of the New Deal that we were faced with a contracting economy. What occasioned the Fair Deal to accept the concept that our economy is an expanding economy?"

Mr. KEYSERLING. Well, that is just because knowledge comes but wisdom lingers. As we go along we make progress. And I think that there are many respects in which the American people—the business system, the labor system, the farm system, the government system—learned a lot from the experience of the 1930's.

There are two very important things we learned. One of these very important things is that the most dangerous thing to do is to wait until you have a serious economic crisis before applying thought and action to the problem before us. And this is the greatest present test of freedom in our democracy. As a democracy, we have always been able to rally after the crisis appears. After we're bombed, after we have a depression, we work our way out of it. But I don't think that either in the international field or in the domestic field can we safely afford to wait for a crisis again because the first bombing might be more serious. The impact of a depression might be more serious. And, therefore, the first thing we learned from the New Deal period is that we cannot again indulge in that process of waiting.

The second thing we learned is that if the economy moves too far downhill, it doesn't seem that the range of governmental measures which may be then used are in themselves sufficient to bring about complete recovery. I haven't time to document this. Some will say that this was only because these measures weren't on a large enough scale, but I don't think that's the case. I think it's rather because our economy is so predominantly a private-enterprise economy that unless there is reasonable health, and unless there is full attention to the problems of stability in that private enterprise section of the economy, the complementary action of government while important, cannot alone do the job. And that's why I think we are quite validly placing a great deal more stress upon what combination of programs, private and public, will do most to create and to promote an environment in which reasonable stability and a reasonable rate of progress will be attained in our private enterprise economy itself. That is one of the reasons why there has been a shift, and I think a legitimate shift, from what was called the theory of stagnation to a recognition that we have by no means even begun to reach the frontiers with respect to the growth and the expansion, the fair profit return, the enlargement of employment, the enlargement of markets, which can be attained within that great and predominant sector of our economy which is and should remain privately operated.

Mr. CROW (reading question). "How much unemployment can be accounted for by an educational system that turns out too many unemployables?" [Laughter.]

Mr. KEYSERLING. I think that anyone who carefully studies the facts of the past few years will find a correlation between business trends and unemployment trends which will show that unemployment results primarily from a decline in the levels of business activity, or, in the alternative or together with it, a failure of fundamental business activity to grow fast enough to provide a larger number of jobs.

There may be some unemployment caused by attitudes among the unemployed. But I don't think that this is the basic thing, and I think that those who feel that it is the basic thing may perhaps be distracted from the real problem. For the most part, when our industrial system is growing and thriving and expanding, the number of jobs increases. For the most part, when our economic system is faltering or hesitating or moving backward, the number of unemployed increases. And, after all, this is a two-sided problem. It isn't only a problem of the person being adjusted to the job. It's also a question of the job being adjusted to the person. For example, I think we have witnessed over the years, and I think we are going to continue to witness a growth in the number of people over 55, or over 60, or over 62. That's just the nature of our population. We are going to continue to witness an increase in the number of people over 40. We are going to continue to witness an improvement in general education, which will make fewer people willing or suited for certain types of work which 25 or 35 years ago people were willing to do, or at least did.

As these changes are taking place, and they are going to continue to take place, they impose a responsibility, not only upon the educator, not only upon the physician, but also on the business system itself, gradually to realize that through its training programs, and through the whole scope of its business management, some adjustments must be made and some new thinking done.

Mr. CROW. We have just time for one or two more. Here's a very fundamental one.

(Reading question:) "Do you believe that this better balance between agriculture, labor, and management can be attained without enforced Government quotas and the control of wages and prices?"

Mr. KEYSERLING. I think that a great deal of progress can definitely be made, in times of peace, without enforced government control of quotas and prices, and I think that's freedom's test. I don't think, though, that you dispose of a problem by showing that it's difficult. In some ways it's more difficult to do things through consensus than to do them by force. But the whole nature of our economy, the whole nature of our Government, and the whole nature of our free society, is that we have always elected, and will always continue to elect, I hope, to do as many things as possible through consensus, and as few things as need be through force. That makes it harder to do, in some ways, but I think it's the better way. I think it's the way that has made our economy what it is, and the way that we must continue with increasing efforts to try for in the future.

Mr. CROW. Here are two more questions that again mean about the same.

(Reading question:) "What part would prices play in attaining the $400,000,000,000 or $800,000,000,000 national income? That is, the inflationary factors."

(Reading question:) "Why should we have a $325,000,000,000-a-year national income when, in the light of the past, prices will increase proportionately, thereby penalizing the thrift of individuals and the people who are on pensions?"

Mr. KEYSERLING. Well, in the first place, the second question involves, as I understand it, a mistake of fact. If prices generally had increased proportionately with growths in dollar national income, the real output of the economy and the real standard of living would not be higher now than it was before the war. That is palpably not the case, because if you compare 1949 or 1950 with 1939 or 1929, or any other year that you choose, even after making adjustments for changes in the price level—in other words, even when you deflate the gross national product—you still find a real national output which is ranging between 1¾ and 2¼ times as high as before the war. When you adjust this for increases in population, you find an actual improvement in standards of living, or per capita consumption as a whole, which is about 40 percent or more higher than before the war.

So, my first point would be that it simply is not true that we haven't made real progress in national growth in any period in the past long enough to overcome the effects of short range instability—in other words, the depression eras.

Secondly, it is true that if real national progress is made but is accompanied by an increase in the price level, rather than by a general decrease in prices, there are hardships placed upon fixed income groups. That's perfectly true. I think this simply means that we have to look to the question of whether certain supplementary programs might not be helpful in alleviating their lot to a certain extent. I think anybody who would say that, in order to readjust, we should have a return to the price level of 1939, or even two-thirds or one-half or one-third of the way back to the price level of 1939, would be committing us to about as big a recession as any that we have known. I think we have reached a plateau of a higher price level than we had before the war. And I think that if we can reasonably stabilize at this point, and make some further moderate adjustments, we have reached a safe enough foundation in most areas to move ahead to rounded growth.

There is another part to that question that I think I didn't get.

Mr. CROW. Well, I'll give you three more and we'll close with them. You can answer these three as one. [Laughter.]

(Reading question:) "What is the composition of the present unemployment figure? Isn't some degree of unemployment normal in a capitalistic society?"

The other two bear on the same question.

(Reading question:) "How many presently 'unemployed' are retired or institutionalized?"

(Reading question:) "Aren't there at least 5,000,000 Americans who are more or less nuts—including some Republicans, as well as many Democrats?" [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. KEYSERLING. Well, I wouldn't applaud the assertion that a lot of Americans are nuts. If it were true, I would be worried about it. [Laughter].

But, more seriously, the estimate that I made that over the next 10 years we would have to have a total aggregate national output $800,000,000,000 above the level of what it would be in a period of cyclical instability was not an estimate based upon changes in the price level. It was merely the transposition of a constant price level into real output of goods and service. In other words, if you simply start with the national output as around $250,000,000,000 in 1948, and calculate the 3 to 4 percent growth per year (which, of course, compounds from year to year because you're starting from a higher base each year) which would be necessary to hold unemployment to low levels, and then you add up your results over the next 10 years and measure the total against an output over the next 10 years which fluctuated as it did between 1929 and 1939, then you would arrive at the figures I have given. So these figures are the real measure of the economic problem confronting this Nation over the next 5 or 10 years, and they are not based upon a rising price level. Of course, if you had some rising price level during that period, your dollar figures would be bigger, and if you had some falling price level they might be somewhat smaller.

Now, coming to the question of the composition of the unemployed and whether we need unemployment in this country for various reasons, I would say this: I am perfectly willing to have that question asked, so long as those who ask the question realize that among those entitled to answer the question are the unemployed themselves. In other words, so long as you realize that the four or five or six million people who happen to be unemployed shall also be asked what is a healthy level of unemployment, and that they have quite as large a stake and quite as large an interest in that problem as those who are employed, then I think it's a sound question. That isn't based upon sociology or morals. That is simply based upon the fact that we live in the kind of society—and I happen to be glad that we do—where people who are unemployed, provided that they are able to hold jobs, feel that they are entitled to an opportunity to hold a job. And I'm also glad that we live in the kind of society where there are enough other people besides the unemployed who feel the same way. In any event, that sentiment is a given fact, and I think the faster we recognize realistically that it is a given fact the safer our business system will be and the safer our free society will be.

As to the exact desirable level of unemployment, some people will set two million, some will set three, some will set three and one-half, and some will set four, as the safe or maintainable level. I think that the safe or maintainable level needs to be lower, relative to the size of the labor force, than it was during the 1930's because I don't think that during the 1930's we had a sufficiently stable and sufficiently prosperous economy. And, also, I think that because of world events a ratio of unemployment to the total labor force and to total population even somewhat but not much lower than it was in the 1930's would impose a very severe test upon our basic freedoms as I have defined them.

Therefore, I should say that it should be our goal to try, through a composite of private and public actions, to hold unemployment down to levels ranging between two and three million. I would set that as the prime goal. I certainly think that, whatever the optimum desirable level may be, a situation where unemployment is growing, as it has been growing now—allowing for seasonal variations—for about 15 months—I think that is disturbing. I think that's our great central national economic problem. And as I have said before, this isn't only an unemployment of manpower, it's also unemployment of business resources because business resources are not fully used until they are wedded to labor in the production of goods and services. [Applause.]

Mr. MARSH. Thanks for that audience participation, and thank you Mr. Keyserling for coming here and presenting those viewpoints of yours. The meeting is adjourned.

Adjournment.

Poland Looks Toward Peace—Poles Seen Stressing Industrial Progress Over Military Plans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1950

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to submit for the RECORD a very interesting article that appeared in the Washington Star Tuesday, May 30. It is an article by Daniel De Luce, a very reputable Associated Press foreign correspondent. This information confirms reports that the Poles are putting their energies into reconstructing and rebuilding their much destroyed nation and not into a military-armament program. The article follows:

POLES SEEN STRESSING INDUSTRIAL PROGRESS OVER MILITARY PLANS

(By Daniel De Luce)

WARSAW, May 30.—Poland, a cornerstone of the Soviet bloc, apparently counts on a long peace in Europe.

Military preparedness is directed by Polish-born Soviet Marshal Konstantin Rokossovsky. But it is taking a back seat at present to the 6-year economic plan.

For rebuilding Warsaw, the Government this year is spending as much as for the combined armed forces.

For industrial developments, three zlotys are appropriated to each one given Marshal Rokossovsky's Defense Ministry.

The military share of the Polish annual budget is 10 percent—equivalent of $214,235,000.

Western sources describe Poland's military situation as typical of other bloc powers. None has been armed to the teeth except Yugoslavia, which subsequently broke with Moscow.

In sight is a gradual build-up of eastern armies during the 1950's. Each will try to indoctrinate all ranks with communism and political officers will exercise great authority. There will be standardization of weapons and tactics with Russian help.

RECONSTRUCTION HAS PRIORITY

Yet reconstruction has priority over remilitarization. That includes, of course, the creation of strategic heavy industries, steel above all, in once backward agricultural countries.

Soviet military tutelage is by now commonplace in the bloc. Poland's invitation to a Soviet marshal to join her government and politburo, however, seems likely to remain unique.

When Marshal Rokossovsky turned up in Warsaw last November, he was no stranger. He had led a Soviet army group, including the Polish First Army, in liberating a large chunk of Poland from the Germans. Since the war, he has stayed in Poland as commander of the Soviet line of communication through Silesia.

Marshal Rokossovsky was born in the Warsaw area in 1896, when it belonged to the Russian Empire. A Communist-approved biography relates that his father was a locomotive engineer, his mother was a school teacher, and he was left an orphan at 13.

By turn a factory apprentice, stonemason, and Czarist military conscript, he was barely out of his teens when the Bolshevik revolution flared up. He joined the Red Guards and won distinction as a cavalry officer. Years later, he showed the same dash as a tank force commander outflanking the enemy at Stalingrad.

TITOISM WAS RUMORED

Rumors of Titoism (nationalistic behavior) circulated here concerning some key Polish officers before Marshal Rokossovsky took control. Retirements instead of criminal trials have marked a quiet shake-up in the general staff.

Marshal Rokossovsky exercised special care in naming a new chief of political leadership in the armed forces, his choice being Brig. Gen. Edward Ochab, a fellow member of the politburo.

The regular strength of Poland's armed forces was 160,000 men last year and may have been increased to 200,000. During several postwar years, they were outnumbered by the security police.

Marshal Rokossovsky appears in Parliament wearing a Polish uniform devoid of medals and ribbons. Six feet four inches tall, and ramrod straight, he seems tactful and modest behind his military reserve.

He has tightened up security. Important frontier zones have been sealed off from civilian tourists. Tanks, aircraft, truck borne rocket launchers, and field guns have been sent to him by the Kremlin.

But the main attention of the Warsaw government, despite Marshal Rokossovsky's presence, is not on remilitarization. It is on a thousand and one industrial targets to be hit by 1955.

The question is not guns or butter. It is blast furnaces.

So You Want To Write Your Congressman?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL C. MICHENER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1950

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, many groups and associations are urging their members to write directly to the Congressman concerning legislation in which these groups are interested. This attitude on the part of these associations has undoubtedly increased congressional mail manyfold.

A constituent has called my attention to an article in the Link, published by

Carter Oil Co., and pursuant to the permission granted by the House, I am including that article, which is as follows:

SO YOU WANT TO WRITE YOUR CONGRESSMAN?

So you would like to write your Congressman? Equally interesting is the fact that your Congressman would enjoy getting your letter.

Hundreds of thousands of letters are cascaded upon the desks of Congressmen in Washington each week. But millions of other Americans have never written their Congressman. Many of these citizens at one time or other have felt a desire to make their views known on important questions but have hesitated to write to their Senator or Representative. As a result, vocal minority groups have profoundly influenced legislation, while the great majority of Americans sat idly by in indifferent silence.

"Next to voting in elections, writing letters to Congressmen—Senators or Representatives—is the highest privilege a citizen has in fulfilling his part in the Democratic process. Every citizen has this privilege and can exercise it as often as he pleases. Those who sit back and say to themselves that it is useless to tell their Congressman how they feel about pending legislation are failing in their duty and missing the right to grumble when things don't go as they wish."

The quotation is from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—Appendix issue of Monday, March 3, 1941, and was an extension of remarks of Hon. Fritz G. Lanham, of Texas, in the House of Representatives.

A condensation of additional information in the remarks follows:

Congressmen are profoundly influenced by their mail. More often than not it determines how they will vote on vital legislation. An avalanche of correspondence on one side or the other usually affects their vote. They contact their party leaders to find out what it is all about and often, if there are complaints against an administration measure, take their problem directly to the President.

When you have something worth while to say to your Congressman, feel free to write. He expects you to write when you want to express your views on important matters.

The average Member gets 200 letters a day—and woe to him if he ignores them. He knows that every letter represents a potential vote, and unless he is a rare exception, he wants to keep his seat. Also, many Representatives have their eyes on the Senate, and many Senators have theirs on the White House. But, even forgetting their personal ambitions, they know it is their duty to reply to their constituents and to others interested in their activities.

So important do Congressmen consider this duty that they try to answer all letters within 24 hours. An average of half of each day is devoted to reading them and dictating replies. Often they work late at night.

They are impressed by well-written letters, but the contents of your letter are what count.

There is an art to writing a Congressman. Here are the fundamentals:

Address him correctly, using the accepted forms: Thus: Hon. Robert D. Jones, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.; and the salutation is My Dear Senator. Or: Hon. John Smith, United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.; Dear Mr. Smith. If you don't know your Congressman's name, write to the Secretary of the Senate, or to the Clerk of the House, and ask them, respectively for lists of the Senators and Representatives by States and districts. They will answer by return mail. Or ask your local newspaper editor who is well informed on such matters.

Make your letter express your individuality. If you are joining others in writing on a certain subject, use your own words. Don't let anyone else write your letter.

Be brief and to the point. State your case as concisely as possible in the first paragraph. In the second, if you are not a personal friend of the Congressman, identify yourself; who you are, your business connections, your reasons for being interested in the question, your family connections—especially if any relatives are in politics. This information may be vital to the Congressman in casting a vote.

Be sure to give your address and sign your name legibly. A surprising number of persons neglect this and bear lifelong grudges against Congressmen who have been unable to reply.

If you are a woman, tell about your family connections; the Congressman may be a friend of your husband, father, or brother. Also, if your given name could be either feminine or masculine identify your sex.

Letters generally are more effective than telegrams except where time and distance make a wire imperative. There have been instances in recent years when investigations have disclosed wholesale receipt of telegrams by Members of Congress bearing the names of persons who have denied ever sending or authorizing such messages.

If your Congressman votes the way you wish, or does you a favor, write him a thank you note. Congressman are often criticized for the way they vote; they seldom receive praise. Accordingly they often get a one-sided view of public opinion, and switch their votes under the erroneous belief that they are doing what the public wants when actually they may be following the desire of a carping minority.

A note of appreciation will make the Congressman remember you favorably the next time you write, and if it has to do with a favor done you, it will enable him to close his files on your case, thus helping him in the orderly conduct of his office.

If you have a problem with any of the Government departments, bureaus, commissions, or boards, write your Congressman and get his advice about procedure. He knows how to cut through governmental red tape.

And there are a number of things you should not do in writing your Congressman:

Don't apologize for writing and taking his time; it is his job to give you a hearing.

Don't begin with "as a citizen and taxpayer"; he assumes that you are not an alien and he knows you pay taxes.

Don't say, "I hope this gets by your secretary." The secretary always reads the mail first, unless it is marked "personal," and you are implying that the Congressman does not know how to run his office.

Just because you disagree politically with your Congressman don't ignore him and write to one from another district about something that pertains to your own community; congressional courtesy calls for the delivery by the recipient of such a letter to the Congressman from the district involved. Thus, it is wise to write to him direct.

If you write the two Senators from your State, don't send your Representative a carbon copy; write to him also—it's the courteous thing to do.

When a measure in which you are interested is pending in the House, write your Representative; don't write your Senators until it has passed in the House and reached the Senate.

Never threaten a Congressman by saying, "I'll never vote for you if you don't do such and such." He will probably tell you that he doesn't want a vote of that kind.

Former Vice President Garner, veteran of 38 years in Congress, had this to say about his mail:

"Letters are a Congressman's bread and butter. If they fall off, he is like a movie star about his fan mail. He thinks he is losing his popularity. Throughout my long service, I have made it a point to reply to every letter and to ask the writers for information and what they believe and think about national questions."

It is after all the straight-forward letter, carrying the appeal of earnestness that commands the interest and respect of Members of Congress. A Congressman never tires of hearing from constituents who have something to contribute to the welfare of the Nation. He knows they write straight from the heart, that he is their voice in Washington and their friend at court.

Epitaph for Rufus Woods—American Idealist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1950

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the West—and particularly the Northwest—was saddened by the death, this week, of one of its outstanding citizens and journalists—Rufus Woods, editor of the Wenatchee Daily World, in the State of Washington..

Thomas L. Stokes, in a column that appeared on May 31, in the Washington Evening Star, has captured the spirit of Rufus Woods, a true American visionary who lived to see his vision become a reality.

At a time when idealism and visionaries are frequently the objects of ridicule, the story of Rufus Woods is particularly worth noting and remembering. I feel privileged to insert in the RECORD Mr. Stokes' article:

NEW FRONTIERS AHEAD—GREAT DREAM OF SMALL-TOWN EDITOR CAME TRUE IN GRAND COULEE DAM

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

A fellow named Rufus Woods died this week.

You may not have heard much about him. He was a hustling, bustling, alert, constantly curious editor of a small-town newspaper in a still new country—the Daily World of Wenatchee, Washington. He was a dreamer and a true pioneer of our new frontier, a man-made frontier of great dams that provide cheaper power for homes and industry and water for reclaiming arid lands to offer new opportunities for our people. He is part of the saga that has made us a great Nation.

Rufus Woods leaves his monument, already built, in Grand Coulee Dam, of which he had been called the father. He was far away from there, at Toronto, Canada, on a trip with his family, when he was stricken—still searching, looking into apples for cultivation in the great agricultural area that Grand Coulee has opened up, and into power development problems. He closed a full life of service at 72.

GREAT DREAM CAME TRUE

This reporter recalls the first time he met the buoyant, energetic editor, back in 1937, on a trip with President Roosevelt to Grand Coulee Dam, then in the process of construction. Rufus Woods was an excited, eager man that day; his great dream was coming true. He got on the Presidential special train, his arms filled with copies of his newspaper containing reprints of an article he had written 19 years before, with the long headlines familiar to small papers of that era, but telling concisely the whole story:

"Formulate brand-new idea for irrigation grant, Adams, Franklin Counties, covering

million acres or more. Last and newest and most ambitious idea contemplates turning of Columbia River back into its old bed in Grand Coulee, the development of a water plant equal to Niagara and the construction of the greatest irrigation project in the world, first conceived by William Clapp, of Ephrata, Wash."

Beside the reprint was a box:

"On July 18, 1918, appeared the first article ever written on the Grand Coulee Dam. The Wenatchee World editor had gone to Ephrata, where he met W. Gale Matthews. Gale said 'Come with me. Let's go over to Bill Clapp's office. He has a story for you.'"

Rufus Woods got the story, the conception of the Grand Coulee project, and from that day in 1918 he began a crusade that eventually brought the hundreds of men we saw that day 19 years later in 1937, tiny ants far below in the Columbia River bed, working at the dam which since has been completed and which President Truman visited again on his recent trip to the Pacific Northwest.

MET USUAL SKEPTICISM

Rufus Woods met the usual skepticism of the pioneer. One of his friends, Judge P. S. Steiner, of the Supreme Court, wrote him after reading his story in the newspaper: "You are proposing damming the Columbia. Verily, Baron Munchausen, thou art a piker."

But in 1922, Rufus Woods got Gen. George Goethals, builder of the Panama Canal, out to inspect the site, and General Goethals said it was practical. Presidents Coolidge and Hoover said it should be done, but did nothing about it. It was not until Franklin D. Roosevelt came along that it found the dynamic creator and dreamer who pushed it forward, another part of his great plan for our new frontier which saw creation of TVA in the Tennessee Valley, Bonneville in Oregon, the Central Valley project in California, and envisioned other great projects still waiting for realization—an MVA for the Missouri Valley, a CVA for the Northwest, tying together in one great system Grand Coulee, Bonneville, and other developments along the mighty Columbia, and the St. Lawrence-Great Lakes waterway, among others.

It is a good time to think of Rufus Woods, his idealism, and his unselfishness, and his unflagging persistence.

We have got to keep our new frontier moving forward always.

Fiat Money and Its Consequences

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, our Government is operating under a debauched currency. The present system of cheap devalued money is cheating the farmer, the wage earner, the pensioner, the annuitant, and the life-insurance policyholder.

Unsound currencies have brought ruin unspeakable to nations throughout the centuries. The Biblical injunctions in Deuteronomy xxv: 13, 14, 15 warns in these words: "Thou shalt not have in thy bag divers weights, a great and a small. Thou shalt not have in thy house divers measures, a great and a small. But thou shalt have a perfect and just weight, a perfect and just measure shalt thou have."

I have introduced a bill (H. R. 3262) to restore the right of American citizens to freely own gold and gold coins; to return control over the public purse to the people; to restrain further deterioration of our currency; to enable holders of paper money to redeem it in gold coin on demand; to establish and maintain a domestic gold-coin standard, and for other purposes.

Under leave to extend, I am inserting as a part of my remarks an address by Dr. Walter E. Spahr, executive vice president, Economists' National Committee on Monetary Policy, entitled "Federal Monetary Policy":

FEDERAL MONETARY POLICY

(By Walter E. Spahr, executive vice president, Economists' National Committee on Monetary Policy, professor of economics, New York University)

Dr. Spahr, asserting our monetary policy aims at easy and cheap money, attacks present irredeemable monetary system as dishonest and as depriving people of power to exercise direct control over public purse. Holds our irredeemable currency system opens gate to socialism and yields to demands of selfish pressure groups, in addition to fostering destructive disease of inflation. Contends, because of our money system, we no longer have a healthy economy.

Our Federal monetary policy is that of easy or cheap money. Practically every device known to man for providing a people with a depreciated and cheap money was employed by our Federal Government in 1933–34. Provision was made for the issuance of fiat United States notes, for depreciation of the dollar by suspension of redeemability of all currency except silver certificates, for devaluation of the dollar, for expansion of our currency by means of various silver laws. Pump-priming programs and deficit financing by the Federal Government contributed much to the great expansion of our deposit currency.

The Government's cheap money policy, since the devaluation of the dollar in 1934, and aside from the relatively minor effects of our silver laws, rests upon our system of irredeemable currency as a foundation.

Such a currency provides the Government with what is perhaps the most subtle device thus far discovered with which to get control of a people without revolution, without their approval, and without their understanding until it is much too late. It is probably the most important device a government can employ in instituting government management of a people and their economy.

KEYNES ON DEBAUCHING THE CURRENCY

The late Lord Keynes, who gave so much attention to these matters and who contributed so much to the institution of governmentally managed economy in this country and England, stated a fundamental truth in 1919 when he said in his book, The Economic Consequences of the Peace (Harcourt, Brace, and Howe, New York, 1920), pages 235–236, that "There is no subtler, no surer, means of overturning the existing basis of society than to debauch the currency. The process engages all the hidden forces of economic law on the side of destruction, and does it in a manner which not one man in a million is able to diagnose."

An irredeemable currency is a debauched currency. And Keynes' assertion that not one man in a million is able to diagnose the manner in which a debauched currency operates on the side of destruction of a private-enterprise economy seems to be borne out in this country in high degree. The executive department of the United States Government, the Treasury, most Federal Reserve authorities, the majority of Congress, and, of course, the general public, including a large number of economists and newspapers of the social, pro-Government-management variety, are all doing their best to perpetuate an irredeemable currency in this country.

Some of those people know what they are doing—they want a governmentally managed economy. Others do not understand; they fall in that large group, mentioned by Keynes, who are unable to diagnose the evils in an irredeemable currency.

Perhaps there is another group—those who understand the evils of statism and do not want it, yet who, for reasons of personal gain, wish to keep the good will of, or obtain favors from, our Federal Government and therefore fawn upon it. They do nothing to fight off statism; and they either embrace, or fail to oppose, an irredeemable currency.

Keynes made another observation that is pertinent to such people—and he was not referring to the great mass of people who do not understand the principles of monetary standards and system; he was referring to what he called the great capitalist class. Said Keynes (ibid., p. 238): "They allow themselves to be ruined and altogether undone by their own instruments, governments of their own making, and a press of which they are the proprietors. Perhaps it is historically true that no order of society ever perishes save by its own hand."

OUR CURRENCY IRREDEEMABLE

The nature of our variety of irredeemable currency needs to be understood by the responsible men and women of this country who wish to save the United States from the evils of a governmentally managed economy.

Domestically, all our currency—money and deposits—is irredeemable insofar as gold for domestic monetary use is concerned. Silver certificates are redeemable in silver for monetary purposes; but the silver money is not directly redeemable in, or convertible into, gold.

Internationally, we are on a restricted gold bullion standard. We permit foreign central banks and governments to sell gold to the United States for dollars, or to redeem their dollars in gold bullion at the statutory rate of $35 per fine ounce under Treasury regulations. Other foreign holders of dollars do not in general have this privilege.

EVILS OF IRREDEEMABLE CURRENCY

The evils in our system of irredeemable currency, with the right of redeemability denied to all but foreign central banks and governments, may be summarized as follows:

1. It is a dishonest currency. It gives our Treasury and Federal Reserve authorities privilege without corresponding responsibility. They are authorized to issue promises to pay which they do not intend to redeem and do not redeem. They cannot be held to an accounting by the holders of these so-called promises—foreign central banks and governments excepted.

Although a promise to pay is one thing, and the thing promised is something else, these so-called promises to pay (except in the case of silver certificates) are merely redeemable in other equally irredeemable promises. The thing promised becomes nothing but the promise itself.

The essence of the issue involved in this confusion of promise and performance was stated by Chief Justice Chase in the case of *Bank* v. *Supervisors* (7 Wallace, 31 (1863)) when he said that "The dollar note is an engagement to pay a dollar, and the dollar intended is the coined dollar of the United States. * * *"

Similarly, Justice Bradley, in the *Legal Tender cases* (12 Wallace, 560 (1871)), said: "No one suppose that these Government certificates are never to be paid; that the day

of specie payments is never to return. And it matters not in what form they are issued. Through whatever changes they pass, their ultimate destiny is to be paid."

Said Secretary of the Treasury John Sherman in 1877—it was John Sherman who did so much to make the greenbacks redeemable in 1879: "There is a large class of people who believe that paper can be, and ought to be, made into money without any promise or hope of redemption; that a note should be printed: 'This is a dollar,' and be made a legal tender.

"I regard this as a mild form of lunacy, and have no disposition to debate with men who indulge in such delusions, which have prevailed to some extent, at different times, in all countries, but whose life has been brief, and which have shared the fate of other popular delusions."

This form of lunacy prevails in this country today; and the fact that it is a popular delusion that ends in national tragedy, if not overcome by statesmen, is not yet understood by a majority of our Congress.

2. When the Federal Government in 1933 deprived the people of the United States of a redeemable currency it also deprived them of their power to exercise direct control over the Government's use of the people's public purse. When our people had a currency redeemable in gold, every individual had power, to the extent he possessed money and deposit currency, to register his disapproval of the policies and practices of the banks and Treasury by demanding redemption of their promises to pay. Each individual had the power to send his message of disapproval to the central signal system in the Treasury and Federal Reserve banks—to their gold reserves—over the golden wires, as it were, provided by a system of currency redeemable in or convertible into, gold. When distrust of the value of the banks' and Treasury's promises spread, the number of warning signals increased. Every demand for redemption was recorded by a drawing down of the gold reserves of the Federal Reserve banks or Treasury. No individual needed to join with other individuals in some organization for the purpose of sending a plea to the Reserve banks or to the Treasury or to Congress in behalf of sounder monetary or fiscal procedures; each individual could act alone and could record his judgment directly.

With the institution of our system of irredeemable currency, all the golden wires, running from all our people to the central signal system, were cut. The power of the people to record, in an effective manner, their approval or distrust of bank, Treasury, and Government monetary and fiscal practices was destroyed. The signal lights went out both at the central signal board and for the people of the United States. It was as though our people had been deprived of the right to vote. The right to record their preferences for different types of dollars is probably as important, as a method of controlling the public purse, and, therefore, the Government, as is the right to vote one's political preferences. Power to control the public purse by direct pressure of the individual is imperative if the individual is to retain his freedom and is to be able to record his prererences in any effective manner. We need to consider the fact that individual freedom, private enterprise, and freedom of international trade and exchange reached their greatest period of development when nations had redeemable currencies.

Since the golden wires to the central signal system were cut in this country in 1933, our people have only had the power to protest and to appeal through other devices—through organizations, appeals to Congressmen, letters to the press, and so on—all of which efforts have been ineffective because they can be, and have been, ignored

When a government deprives a people of the power to exercise direct control over its use of their public purse, it frees itself from responsibility to them; it can and generally does ignore their protests; and it can, and often does, become their boss.

3. The use of irredeemable currency has enabled our government to purchase the support of vote-delivering pressure groups and to put the people's purse at their disposal.

When a government frees itself of the possibilities of direct control by the people over its use of their purse, it cannot be held effectively to an accounting and, if so disposed, it can use the people's purse to buy the support necessary to keep itself in office. A basic policy then is to gain the support of large vote-delivering pressure groups. The people's money is distributed in a manner designed to insure the desired political support. Vote-delivering pressure groups soon perceive that monetary favors are to be obtained in exchange for political support and rush to Washington to make the best terms possible. One result is that the Government becomes the prisoner of those whose support it can purchase, and the people's purse is passed by Congress to the control of the vote-delivering and favor-seeking pressure groups.

That is, in the main, the state of affairs that prevails in the United States today, the basic cause of which lies in the institution by the Federal Government in 1933 of our system of irredeemable currency.

Pressure groups need to be dealt with in accordance with the standards of statesmanship rather than in accordance with those of the politician. The latter is a self-server; the statesman considers the national welfare solely. Statesmanship requires the brand of character revealed by Governor Lee, of Utah, who is reported to have said regarding government support of farm prices: "I would say to the farmers, 'The price of freedom is the same to you as it is to everyone else—a little hardship when times are adverse.'" (Time, April 24, 1950, p. 28.)

Since statesmanship does not characterize the majority of our Congress, the people of this country have seen their purse put in the hands of favor-seeking pressure groups by politicians; and our system of irredeemable currency has made it impossible for our people to correct this state of affairs.

OPENS GATES TO SOCIALISM

4. Our irredeemable currency opens the gate to, and invites, socialism. The purchase of the support of vote-delivering pressure groups places the Government on the road to socialism in high degree or in a thoroughgoing manner. Incomes of helpless groups must be funneled to the members of these pressure groups. Wealth must be taken from some and be given to others as benefits. Projects pleasing to the pressure groups must be undertaken. Competitive markets must be hampered, circumvented, or destroyed in order to extend favors in the form of price controls, subsidies, rent controls, monopoly powers to organized labor, and so on, to those whom the Government endeavors to favor. The Government enters into unfair competition with private enterprise by engaging in productive activity, free of tax and similar burdens borne by private enterprise; by lending the people's money to unprofitable enterprises at noncompetitive rates; by extending other favors and services at prices below those of competitive markets.

This great variety of Government undertakings, most or all of which constitute steps in the direction of socialism or paternalism or totalitarianism, is made easy, and is invited by our system of irredeemable currency. Since the Government is freed from accountability to the people, money is made easy for the Government and its beneficiaries to get; and the favors of pressure groups can be obtained without the central signal board flashing any lights of protest and warning.

There is, apparently, no instrument as potent, or as fundamental, or as necessary, as an irredeemable currency if a government is disposed to lead a people into socialism. Conversely, there is probably no more effective device that can be employed to arrest a march into socialism than to make the people's currency redeemable, thus restoring to them the power to exercise direct control over the Government's use of their purse.

The evidence seems overwhelming that a defender of irredeemable currency is, wittingly or unwittingly, an advocate of socialism or of government dictatorship in some form.

So long as a government has the power over a people, that is provided by an irredeemable currency, all efforts to stop a government disposed to lead a people into socialism tend to be, and probably will prove, futile. The people of the United States have observed all sorts of efforts, organized and individual, to bring pressure upon Congress to end its spending orgy and processes of socialization. It should be amply clear by this time that none of these efforts has succeeded. Moreover, there is no good reason for supposing that any of them, except the restoration of redeemability, can succeed in arresting our march into socialism. A government possessing the powers given it by an irredeemable currency can ignore the pleas and protests of such groups and individuals. And, if it be disposed to lead a people into socialism—which appears to be the policy or tendency of our Federal Government—it does ignore such groups and individuals.

If, therefore, the majority of Congress would spare the people of the United States the suffering and disasters inherent in socialism, that majority must face the fact that the first and necessary, and possibly the only, means of doing this lies in the restoration of redeemability in our currency.

5. Our Government's move toward socialism and its yielding to the demands of self-serving pressure groups has resulted in profligate spending and dissipation of our national patrimony. There seems to be no good reason for supposing that this spending and dissipation can be ended so long as the majority of Congress is composed of politicians and so long as they have an irredeemable currency at their disposal.

These politicians have been and are converting our Federal Government from what should be the responsible agent of the people into their autocratic boss. The fact that our United States Government is, constitutionally, a government of restricted and delegated powers, while the States have governments of general powers, seems today to be ignored. The implication of that should be pondered by us all. This most basic concept in our constitutional arrangements is treated today as though it does not exist. One may ask: What has become of constitutional law in this Nation? When constitutional law dies and the people are deprived of the power of control of their public purse, that nation is on a road that has led many another country to catastrophe. There seems to be no valid reason for supposing that if the United States continues on such a course it will be immune from these common consequences.

6. Our system of irredeemable currency has enabled our Government to build a huge bureaucracy, national and international, that cripples private enterprise domestically and in foreign trade and exchange. Since gold imports and exports, legally made, are under the control of our Federal Reserve banks and Treasury, these and other Government-owned or dominated institutions automatically gain control of all legally

conducted transactions in foreign exchange. Such control reaches to exchanges of goods to investments, and to travel, and subjects the ingenuity of private enterprise to the crippling impedimenta of government regulation. This is an important part of government management of a nation's people and economy. It is totalitarianism at the international boundary line; and, from that point of vantage, government control is reflected back into the internal economy of our country in many and often subtle and far-reaching ways.

MULTIPLE QUOTATIONS OF DOLLAR

7. Our system of irredeemable currency has provided multiple quotations for our dollar at home and abroad. This is a characteristic of weak currencies. After resumption of specie payments, beginning January 2, 1879, Secretary Sherman, one of our greatest students of monetary principles, said in May of that year: "I want to convince everybody that * * * the United States is not bound to have its notes hawked about at a discount, but that a note of the United States may travel about the world, everywhere received as equal to gold coin, and as good as any note ever issued by any nation, either in ancient or modern times." Today our Government cannot correctly make that claim. It cannot and does not prevent the so-called promises of our Treasury and Reserve banks, in the form of irredeemable money, from being hawked about at a discount.

8. Under our hybrid system of irredeemable currency and restricted international gold bullion standard, the gold reserves in the United States Treasury are usable only by foreign central banks and governments. Although the gold certificate reserves in Federal Reserve banks are computed against all their Federal Reserve notes and deposits, only foreign central banks and governments can obtain these reserves, and, through them, the Treasury's gold. All other holders of Federal Reserve notes and deposits are denied this right. Our people and institutions, with claims against those reserves of precisely the same kind as those held by foreign central banks and governments, are denied access to those reserves, while they are placed at the disposal of foreign banks and governments.

That sort of discrimination cannot have any valid defense. If there must be discrimination—and normally there should not be—it surely should be in favor of our people and institutions. During World War I, we suspended gold payments in our dealings with foreign countries, but we maintained freedom of redemption at home. Since 1933, we have reversed this procedure; we have maintained redeemability for foreign central banks and governments while denying it to our own people. This is merely one aspect, but an important one, of the obsession in behalf of internationalism that has swept this Nation like a mania.

CONSEQUENCES OF IRREDEEMABLE CURRENCY

The consequences of our use of an irredeemable currency have diffused themselves throughout our economy in a multitude of ways. Money is the bloodstream of a nation. An irredeemable currency is a diseased and corrupted bloodstream. Secretary Sherman said of it in 1877: "A depreciated paper money cheats and robs every man who receives it of a portion of the reward of his labor or production, and in all times it has been treated by statesmen as one of the greatest evils that can befall a people" (Recollections, I, p. 589). Keynes said in 1919—and he assumed he was quoting with approval a statement supposed to have been made by Lenin—that by "* * * a continuing process of inflation, governments can confiscate, secretly and unobserved, an important part of the wealth of their citizens. By this method they not only confiscate, but they confiscate arbitrarily; and, while the process impoverishes many, it actually enriches some * * *" (Op. cit., p. 235).

Irredeemable currency, easy money, and a depreciating purchasing power of the monetary unit constitute a destructive disease—subtle and far-reaching in nature. Nevertheless, the popular demand is for more and more of a depreciating currency—for the very thing that injures. As the artificially stimulating effects of a depreciating currency wear off and as maladjustments and hardships multiply, the popular demand for this narcotic becomes more intense. In due time great distortions appear, fears become widespread, and the rate of depreciation tends to increase. Productive machinery stalls, savings disappear, and unemployment, hunger, and distress stalk the land.

We in this country seem to take the position that we shall escape these evils. There is perhaps no way at this date to estimate with accuracy what the final outcome for us is to be if we continue with the poison inherent in an irredeemable currency. Our disease is of the creeping variety, and extremely deceptive, because of the hybrid nature of our irredeemable currency system. Nevertheless, we have our powder kegs. For example, besides the basic evils mentioned, there are the great potential dangers which exist in the huge surplus of reserves in our Federal Reserve System. These could support an expansion in our bank deposits to the extent of $360,000,000,000 in addition to the present $162,000,000,000. The annual rate of turn-over for our great volume of bank deposits is relatively low (12.3 for 332 reporting centers as compared with the rate of approximately 30 in 1929). Should the rate rise to that of 1929, prices could reach fantastic levels in this country. The expansion of consumer credit is now two and a half times that of 1929.

WE NO LONGER HAVE A HEALTHY ECONOMY

A healthy economy is one in which the maximum harmony in relationships exists among the agents of production and the forces operating in the exchange of our goods and services, in consumption, and in the distribution of income. Today we have a mixture of the healthy and unhealthy with the two sets of forces apparently almost in balance. Among the unhealthy forces at work, our irredeemable currency, easy-money policy, and various governmental policies—particularly those involved in governmental management of our economy—are eating more and more deeply into our structure. As the maladjustments grow relatively more important as against the forces that contribute to harmonious relationships in our economic system, we should expect a corrective reaction to set in.

If at that time additional injections of cheap money should be made by Government planners in an effort to overcome falling prices and losses, the poison in the economic system would merely be increased and the painfulness of later readjustments would be magnified.

It needs to be emphasized that national well-being and harmonious relationships are not necessarily indicated by expansion in such aggregates as the volume of money and deposits, total spending, and national income figures. Aggregates of that type may reveal nothing as to economic harmonies or maladjustments. When a nation's currency is depreciating rapidly, as, for example, in Germany in 1920–23, such aggregates would reach great size. But no sensible person would suppose that they would reflect economic soundness or prosperity. Economic collapses can start from any high point in any major index of production or price expansion when a sufficient number of strategic factors are pinched between costs and prices and severe distortions overbalance the forces struggling for harmony. Much attention is being directed these days to such aggregates as national income, national product, total volume of wages paid, total profits, total savings, total spending, and so on. These aggregates are a favorite tool of the Keynesian economists and economic planners. The concepts commonly involved, and the manner in which these aggregates are often used—to say nothing of the unreliability of the data—frequently will not withstand careful analysis. The inferences sometimes drawn are too simple to fit the facts; and sometimes they have dangerous implications because of what they obscure. It is with harmonies and disharmonies in our economic system, rather than with aggregates, that we should concern ourselves chiefly in our analyses of business conditions and economic well-being.

We also need badly to stop our practice of looking at assets while ignoring liabilities. The debt of our people is stupendous. Any individual with wealth to mortgage can create the appearance of a great increase in his well-being by borrowing to the limit and spending freely. He may increase his assets and his productive activity, and he may easily demonstrate that he is better off—if he will ignore his liabilities. A great proportion of the analyses and discussions of our economic well-being is concerned solely with assets while the liabilities, which may become the ruthless bosses at any time, are ignored.

It also needs to be emphasized that harmonious relationships are fostered only when objective standards of appraisal are given free play, and that the only objective standards that exist as to what is the proper price for a commodity or service are those provided by the operation of the forces of supply and demand under conditions of free and fair competition. The price of a bushel of wheat is proper when all buyers and sellers involved determine it in a freely competitive market. Every other notion as to what is a proper price for a good or service is subjective. The employment of subjective standards is the device of the wishful thinker and the dictator. When a government substitutes its judgment as to what prices should be, in lieu of their determination by all buyers and sellers in free markets, it is instituting dictatorship. There is no objective or scientific standard of appropriateness involved in a subjective standard. The latter is merely a matter of the wish and of the will of the authority which has the power to enforce its will.

Government dictatorship creates economic maladjustments rather than greater harmonies in economic relationships. Government prescription of minimum wages, of prices for farm products, of interest rates, of profit margins are all acts of dictatorship. The management of a nation's currency, as it is done when the currency is irredeemable, is an act of dictatorship at one of the most sensitive nerve centers in a nation's economy.

There has been a rapid increase in the infliction of the subjective standards and will of Government officials on the people of this country in recent years. We are in the midst of a struggle between those pushing for Government dictatorship and those who desire free markets and the objective standards they provide.

When President Truman stated recently that he proposed to claim credit for such prosperity as we now have, he revealed, perhaps inadvertently, that he thought we had already attained a sufficiently high degree of Government management of our economy for the party in power to claim credit for what he seemed to regard as a healthy prosperity. The implication of his claim seems to have been lost upon the people of this country.

Since a healthy economy rests upon the determination of values and price by the objective standards of the free market, rather than by the employment of the subjective standards inherent in dictatorship, it is the duty of a good Government to provide the people with objective standards for measurement. A good monetary standard requires that there be a monetary unit of

fixed weight and that all substitute monetary promises be redeemable in the standard monetary metal—if standards of honesty are to be respected. Tampering with a standard of measurement after it has been prescribed, whether it be the foot, the gallon, the pound, or the dollar, has no defense. Such manipulation is an attempt to substitute subjective desire and will for the objective standards on which all science rests.

The unsound in Federal easy-money policies and in many other aspects of our economy cannot be eliminated so long as we attempt to operate with an irredeemable currency which is a basic feature of a governmentally managed economy which, in turn, rests upon subjective evaluations—the tools of dictators.

SUMMARY OF SOUND MONEY BENEFITS

The benefits to be obtained from the institution of a redeemable currency may be summarized as follows:

1. Our people would once more have an honest currency; and Treasury and Federal Reserve officials would once more be conforming to accepted standards of honesty in respect to honoring promises to pay on demand.

Dishonesty is a fatal element in the social and political fabric of a nation. Its consequence is trouble. There is no valid defense for this current manifestation of dishonesty in officialdom. When the bonds of integrity are loosened at official levels, the disease spreads rapidly through the foundations of society and its social institutions.

Secretary of the Treasury John Sherman stated correctly in 1877 (Recollections, I, p. 589) that "There are times when such [irredeemable] money is unavoidable, as during war or great public calamity, but it has always been the anxious care of statesmen to return again to the solid standard of coin. Therefore it is that specie payment * * * is pressed by that great body of intelligent men who study these questions, as an indispensable prerequisite for steady business and good times."

Sherman made another pertinent observation: "Why ought not anyone who issued a promise to pay on demand be made to pay it when demanded, or pay interest thereafter?" (Ibid., p. 591.)

2. Power to control the Government's use of the people's purse would be returned to their hands where such power belongs. The fact that they might exercise that power slowly or too late, as has been the case sometimes in the past, does not alter the fact that the constant threat of its use tends to keep a Government and the banks within bounds which do not raise fears. Every individual would be free to exercise his own judgment as to what percentage of his dollars he would prefer to put in gold in an effort to protect the value of his savings. If, with this freedom of choice, people are misled and fail to take the proper protective measures, they cannot charge their misfortune to a lack of power to use their own judgment. With a redeemable currency at their disposal, they would have a power not possessed today, and it seems reasonable to suppose, if our Government should continue with its programs of profligate spending and dissipation of our national patrimony, many people would begin to exercise their power to protect their savings and to this degree tend to bring this practice to a halt.

3. Multiple quotations for different kinds of dollars should disappear. All our currency would be convertible into, and have equal value with, gold. Restoration of redeemability would be somewhat like the replacement of a weak and dangerous foundation of a tall building with the best and strongest foundation materials known.

4. The introduction of redeemability should instill confidence and provide incentive for more saving, more investment, more trade and, consequently, more and safer prosperity. The consequences would depend much upon the management of credit and the behavior of all the other forces that affect production and prices. A good basic monetary system, like good strong rails on a railway, is a great facilitating instrument and, moreover, contains some elements of safety. But neither provides an insurance against the consequences of human foolishness or stupidity or recklessness or bad management. Although the institution of redeemability should invite great social benefits, bad fiscal and banking policies and practices could precipitate a serious situation despite the existence of a gold standard and redeemable currency. The problem is to get good monetary management under the restraints of a redeemable currency. The solution to the problems inherent in the uses of credit is not to be found in freeing money managers from the restraints provided by a redeemable currency.

Said the wise John Sherman: "To resume is to recover from illness, to escape danger, to stand sound and healthy in the financial world, with our currency based upon the intrinsic value of solid coin.

"Therefore I say, may resumption be perpetual. To wish otherwise is to hope for war, danger, and national peril, calamities to which our Nation, like others, may be subject, but against which the earnest aspirations of every patriot will be uttered." (Recollections, II, p. 704.)

5. Return to a thoroughgoing gold standard and redeemable currency would permit a free flow of all our money into and out of the country. Private individuals, free to go when and where they can and will with their dollars of all kinds, should revive and stimulate foreign exchanges of goods and services in every form. Private ingenuity could go to work once more; and, when millions of interested people, in search of profit and pleasure, are given freedom and opportunity to accomplish their purposes, they usually manage to succeed in high degree. No Government agency or Government plan can match the accomplishments of private individual initiative in the development of international exchange of goods and services.

6. With the great benefits of private ingenuity freely available once more in international exchange, and with all our dollars freely interchangeable with gold at a fixed rate, at least those aspects of the difficulties in exchange which now exist between us and the rest of the world because of the irredeemable features of our currency, would be eliminated. The great benefits of our return to redeemability, which should soon be obvious, should set an encouraging example for other countries, should hasten the removal of restrictions by them, and should in the end make their road back to redeemable currencies much easier.

7. A restoration of redeemability could not and would not insure people against sharp ups and downs in productive activity and prices. All that it could do is to provide the best type of currency known—one that, by its nature, does not cause a country to take the course to disaster made possible by an irredeemable currency. Before that unfortunate course can be taken the redeemability of a currency must be destroyed.

Business and price fluctuations are the result of a multitude of forces. The part played by a redeemable currency might well be of minor or negligible importance in the fluctuations of production and prices. In no event could it be the controlling factor. In high degree it is a facilitating instrument, a self-liquidating, and therefore sound, medium of exchange—a passive factor. It is an irredeemable currency that becomes a potent causal force because the elements of depreciation and the potential dangers inherent in such a currency enter into people's calculations and plans. A gold standard and redeemable currency, on the other hand, do not carry these germs of disease; they must come from outside—from abuse in the use of credit.

There is perhaps no single act of Government that could bring more important benefits to the people of the United States than a restoration of redeemability of our currency at the present statutory rate of $35 per fine ounce. Responsible people who wish to serve their country well probably could do nothing so important as to persuade their Congressmen and Senators to pass the Reed bill (or Hale bill) which provides for such redeemability. Shortly after the institution of redeemability the multitude of distortions and evils caused by irredeemable currency and by the Government's easy money policy should begin to disappear; our persistent march into the Death Valley of socialism should be brought to a halt; and our Nation should be back on the course that should lead to better days for the people of the United States.

Chicago Leads Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER A. CHESNEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1950

Mr. CHESNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to insert the following article which appeared in the June issue of the American magazine.

Further articles on this great movement started in Chicago appeared in February's issue of Red Book, May's issue of the Reader's Digest, the Catholic Digest, Good Housekeeping magazine, and many of the country's daily newspapers.

I believe that this article, and the information contained therein, merits the attention of all of us:

THEY MEND BROKEN MARRIAGES

Several months ago, a couple went to Attorney Samuel M. Starr, of Chicago, Ill., seeking a divorce. Their bitter wrangling drove Starr out of his own office. In an adjoining room was waiting one of his former clients, a divorcee, who had had a problem similar to that of the pair in his office. On an impulse, Starr asked her to talk to the quarreling couple. She agreed, and the next thing Starr heard, the couple had patched up their differences and were second honeymooning.

The success of this chance meeting prompted Starr to form a unique organization in Chicago called Divorcees Anonymous. It consists of 100 ex-mates who voluntarily give time and efforts to help others save their marriages. These women range from business executives and insurance brokers to school teachers. All have one thing in common. They know first-hand the loneliness and frustration, the social and economic dislocation that follow divorce, and have frequently found these to be worse than the problems that broke up their marriages.

When a wife goes to Starr asking for a divorce, he first asks her if she wants to save her marriage. If she does, he introduces her to a DA member with a similar personality, one who had a similar problem in her own marriage. The member becomes the woman's sponsor, and not only points out the disadvantages of divorce, but also offers constructive help to save the woman's marriage.

Starr says the chief causes of divorce are the "other woman," money, and liquor. If the DA finds that the troubled wife has "let her appearance go," she suggests ways to correct it. She helps work out family budgets. The sponsor will take the woman to DA meetings. Starr presides at all meetings, and when a man's touch is needed, he talks to the husband alone, or to the wife. Most members of DA, he says, feel that if they had it to do over again they could save their marriages.

While the organization is in Chicago, Starr helps out-of-towners by mail. Starr and the DA's give their time without pay. Ministers, divorcees, and lawyers in other cities have sought out Starr with the idea of starting chapters in their own cities, having heard of the movement through word of mouth. Starr is a divorce lawyer exclusively, is happily married, himself, and the father of three children. When away from divorce problems he enjoys fishing, golf, and baseball.

A Witness Would Correct the Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD T. MILLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 1, 1950

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, in an extension of remarks by the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia, under the title of "Lynch Law for Ducks and Geese," which appears in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 24 last, certain references appear to a speech made by Hon. William C. Coleman. In prefacing his article, the author says:

It deals with a meeting of sportsmen in Baltimore for the discussion of shooting regulations, at which the senior Federal judge of Maryland, Hon. William C. Coleman, of Baltimore, is alleged to have made the astounding statement that he did not intend to enforce the Federal regulations which prohibit the shooting of ducks and geese over baited waters.

In fairness to all concerned, the record should be put straight. As one of those in attendance at the meeting in question—which took place in Annapolis, not Baltimore—and who listened closely, I know that no such statement was made directly, or by implication. To the contrary, Judge Coleman, speaking informally by request of the chairman, as an individual lover of sport, clearly stated as preamble to his remarks, that as a judge he would continue to enforce all laws regardless of his personal views as to their merits.

William C. Coleman's long record of scrupulous integrity and ability as a judge, lawyer, and citizen, makes any defense of him personally superfluous. However, the Senator from Virginia, for whom I have high regard, has been misled by loose reporting and interpretation of the forthright statement made by the judge at the public meeting, which was held under the auspices of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service in Annapolis, Md., on April 28.

The purport of the pertinent portion of his remarks was that Judge Coleman frequently found the evidence produced with respect to alleged baiting violations too nebulous to warrant conviction in a criminal case, or to even justify prosecution. He stated there was widespread evasion of the law in the Chesapeake Bay area; and that he considered it ill-advised and unfair to hunters who strictly conform to regulations, and that as an individual he believed the law should be changed. He compared the situation to the lawlessness that developed during prohibition when lack of public support resulted in a worse condition than that which the law sought to improve.

The meeting in question was largely attended, and those present included leading sportsmen, hunters, and conservation authorities from many localities. Not a single voice was lifted in criticism of the judge's comments. His views were enthusiastically received. It is to be regretted that there was no transcript made of the proceedings. Were one available, I am confident that the Senator would read the judge's remarks with interest and appreciation, if not with approval.

Some Thoughts on Savings Bonds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD H. VELDE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 1, 1950

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Peoria Star of May 29, 1950, entitled "Some Thoughts on Savings Bonds":

SOME THOUGHTS ON SAVINGS BONDS

The United States Government is now pushing another savings bond drive and the bonds, without doubt, are an excellent investment. We would have no comment here interpreted to mean anything else.

But there are complicated problems back of the savings bond drive and it is interesting to glance at them.

Ten years ago, savings bonds, returning in 10 years four dollars for each three invested, were sold to the public. Since this is the maturity year, almost three-fourths of a billion dollars will have to be paid to holders of the bonds issued in 1940. How is the Government to raise the money to redeem these bonds? The current sale of savings bonds is the answer. The Government is simply making an effort to sell the bonds back to the people.

A similar but greater effort will have to be made in 1951 when the number of maturing bonds will be double those of this year. In 1952, the Government will have to sell almost $4,000,000,000 worth of the bonds back to the people, or find some other source of revenue for redeeming them. In 1953 the amount will be $6,800,000,000; in 1954, $8,700,000,000; in 1955, $7,500,000,000. And in the next 5 years they will level off at around $5,000,000,000 a year. In the next 10 years, the Government is faced with the problem of refinancing $57,000,000,000 worth of savings bonds.

During the war, people bought bonds for patriotic reasons. That motive does not now exist. Buyers now appraise the bonds for their value as investments. They will be in competition with other kinds of investments. How can the Government meet the competition?

Not by offering a higher rate of interest, because that would depreciate the value of all outstanding bonds. Nor can the Government heavily emphasize the virtue of investing $3 now and getting $4 in return 10 years from now; because people are learning that unbalanced Federal budgets inflate the currency, and $3 today may buy more than $4 (or even $5 or $6) in 1960.

With the Government committed to a policy of deficit financing, it would seem an utter impossibility to redeem $57,000,000,000 in savings bonds in the next 10 years except by borrowing through negotiable bonds, the kind that find their way to banks and become the basis of further currency inflation. Yet the savings bonds were originally offered to the public for the avowed purpose of avoiding wartime and postwar inflation.

A couple of weeks ago, President Truman was offering to double the income of the average American family. It is just such things as this savings bond problem that make the President's promise sound hollow. For the same process that would double the average family income by 1960 would return the equivalent of $2, instead of four, for every three invested in savings bonds this year.

The Accumulation of Dried Skim Milk Is Not Surprising

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 1, 1950

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the fact that the CCC has now accumulated 280,000,000 pounds of dried skim milk worth a value of some $33,000,000 is not surprising. Why is this product accumulated?

Before World War II the annual production of dried skim milk was between four and five hundred million pounds for animal feeds and human consumption. The 1949 production was 937,000,000 pounds. This adjustment was a means of providing additional food during the war. Farmers were asked to: First, sell whole milk; second, the dairy plants were asked to divert dried skim milk from animal feed to a product for human consumption. The dairy farmers and the dairy plants conformed to this request with the result that a large accumulation prevails. There is a support price of some 12 cents per pound. It is the cheapest form of animal protein. It contains 35.6 percent of digestible protein. This is twice as much protein as in meat costing up to a dollar a pound. While considerable quantities have been used in the baking and other industries, a method of finding a ready, desirable and expanding market for this good product has not been developed.

One of the drawbacks and hindrances of finding an expanding market for this skim milk has been the trade barrier or embargo that has been erected in our cities. Take Washington for example, skim milk from grade A milk or milk reconstituted and made from grade A milk cannot be legally sold in this city the only city in the United

States where the Congress controls the legislation. It is a ridiculous situation. We have distributed millions of pounds of dried skim thru the school lunch program to millions of American children including those in Washington and yet the same product is denied millions of Americans on phony trumpt up public health requirements.

If the Congress put a support price on a product and then prevent the same product to be sold on the market how can one expect anything but an accummulation of the product?

It was evident that this dried skim would be in abundant supply when the ECA was passed. I introduced an amendment that earmarked $65,000,000 for purchasing this most excellent food. The amendment was deleted in the other body. No doubt it was one more example of the influence of King Cotton since over $500,000,000 worth of this product was purchased.

During the past years over 100,000,000 pounds of this product was sold through the ECA for 3 cents per pound, leaving the farm program the opportunity to take a $9,000,000 loss to be charged up to the agricultural program. My understanding is that the ECA is just waiting for Congress to adjourn so that another one of these deals can be made. In the meantime, I presume additional thousands of bales of cotton will be shipped at parity of above parity prices.

We can expect to hear additional criticism of these accumulations but keep in mind that the domestic trade barriers that are and have been erected and also realize the facts that millions of pounds are and have been imported.

Anytime the public wishes to demand that this product has the same marketing consideration that the Coca-Cola enjoys and anytime these trade barriers and embargoes are removed, this wonderful product will find its way in the channels of trade. Until then of course the metropolitan press will have a topic to discuss and I hope with all the facts in mind. In the meantime a visit to an automat should provide a method of providing mass consumption of this great product.

We should also keep in mind the millions and billions involved in readjusting the business and labor postwar domestic and foreign programs. In comparison, the cost of the agricultural readjustment has been small.

Ten Little Free Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, this is the story of 10 little free workers in our free land. These are the workers: Reddy, doctor, railroader, miner, steelworker, farmer, lawyer, grocer, sales clerk, and reporter.

Ten little free workers in this country fine
and fair.
But if you cherish your freedom—worker
have a care!

Ten little free workers—Reddy was doing fine
Until the Socialists got him—then there
were nine.

Nine little free workers laughed at Reddy's
fate
Along came Federal medicine—then there
were eight.

Eight little free workers thought this country
heaven
But the Government took over the railroads,
then there were seven.

Seven little free workers 'til the miners got
in a fix
Uncle said coal's essential and took over,
leaving six.

Six little free workers 'til the day did arrive
The steel mills too were federalized—then
there were five.

Five little free workers—but the farmers are
free no more
The farms have been collectivized—that
leaves only four.

Four little free workers the Government did
decree
All must have free legal advice—then there
were three.

Three little free workers—the number is
getting few,
But with Government groceries selling food—
then there were two.

Two little free workers—our story's almost
done,
With clerks at work in Federal stores—that
leaves only one.

One little free worker—the reporter
son-of-a-gun
Musn't criticize Government—so now there
are none.

Ten little workers—but they are no longer
free
They work when and where ordered, and at a
fixed rate you see,
And it all could have been prevented if
they'd only seen fit to agree
And work together instead of saying, "It can
never happen to me!"

What Your Dollar Is Worth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. VELDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1950

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Peoria Journal of May 28, 1950, entitled "What Your Dollar Is Worth":

WHAT YOUR DOLLAR IS WORTH

President Truman delivered an address at Kansas City last September 29 in which he declared that the national income of the United States could be raised from $200,000,000,000 to $300,000,000,000 and that each family with a 1949 income of $2,000 a year then should have $4,000.

The President didn't explain whether he was speaking of income less taxes. Nor did he promise that when the national income went to $300,000,000,000 that the price level would remain unchanged.

These conditions would make a considerable difference in the effectiveness of a $4,000 average income for the families of the United States. If prices or taxes go up along with the national income, the family with a $2,000 income today won't find that a $4,000 income gives them twice the purchasing power that they have with $2,000.

If the dollar continues to devaluate as it has in the last 10 years, the man with Mr. Truman's $4,000 income won't be much better off than he is now with only $2,000.

The dollar on April 15 last, according to Editorial Research Reports, was worth in consumer purchasing power only 59½ cents of the 1939 dollar. The average family with an income of $2,000 in 1939 needed $3,365 on April 15, 1950, to buy the same goods and services as 11 years before.

A break-down in consumer purchasing power of the dollar on April 15, 1950, as compared with the 1939 dollar, is as follows:

	Cents
All items	59.5
Food	48.5
(Meats, 43 cents.)	
Wearing apparel	54.0
Rent	85.0
Fuel, electricity, refrigeration	70.0
(Gas and electricity, $1.02.)	
House furnishings	54.0
Miscellaneous	65.0

Then, in addition to having a devaluated currency, there is the matter of increasing income taxes that also take a nibble at the family dollar.

To consider only the Federal income tax, in 1939 a married man with only his wife to support paid nothing on a net income of $2,000. In 1950 his Federal income-tax obligation is $101. A single person with no dependents and a net income of $2,000 paid $32 for 1939 Federal income tax; he pays $201 on that income now.

Looked at in the light of a depreciating currency, assailed by increasingly high taxes, Mr. Truman's $4,000 average family income and $300,000,000,000 national income don't look as big as he would like them to. If the trend which has developed under his administration continues, we will need that much and more just to keep even.

Biggest Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the thirty-eighth article by Mr. Frank C. Waldrop on the infiltration of communism in our country:

BIGGEST STORY

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

The first really full-scale, carefully drawn project to organize all life in Russia on a pattern of scientific socialism began on October 1, 1928.

Up to that time, the Communists were only temporizing from day to day. They were preoccupied with getting a grip on the organs of control at home and on setting up their Communist Internationale, to produce revolutions in every other country.

But in 1928, they uncorked the first great 5-year plan, to socialize all the means of production and distribution.

To get the factory system going, they imported a considerable force of foreign engineers and technicians. The most famous of these was an American, Col. Hugh Cooper.

Colonel Cooper built the best of all the Soviet industrial weapons, the great Dneprostroy, a hydroelectric dam across the Dneiper River in the Ukraine, that supplied power for development of the coal and iron system in the Donetz Basin and set the pace for further development at Magnetogorsk, a sort of Siberian Pittsburgh behind the Ural mountain chain, but lacking any qualities of decent living for the unfortunates condemned to duty there.

The Dneprostroy was the key and arch supporting the whole Soviet industrialization program, and except for it there could have been nothing improved at all.

In 1942, incidentally, the Russians blew it up to keep Hitler from using it and not until 1947 was it even partially restored to operation.

The Dneprostroy was the greatest single achievement in Russia between two wars, and it was American in concept, design, and execution.

Stalin's government accomplished nothing within sight of it, though visitors at the New York World's Fair who saw a model Dneprostroy there with running water, lights, and factories around it, were never told so.

Stalin's government showed its ability in supplying the manpower and operational talent for the industries built by American, British, and German technical genius.

The first of the great Soviet trials and shooting campaigns under the 5-year plan began early in 1930. Factory managers walked in fear of their lives, and with good reason. Moscow set production schedules, failed to supply the means of achievement, and then held the manager guilty of sabotage for any deficiencies.

Stalin's withering touch next was felt on the farms.

In the old days of propagandizing against the czars it had been standard policy for the revolutionaries to promise bread, peace, land.

In a region where vast undeveloped emptiness lay all around the monarch held title to more real estate than did any combination of his subjects.

Collective farms were a long-established imperial practice and the people hated them, just as they hated the imitation czars of the nonroyal nobility.

And so it was that in the early years of the Soviet regime the farm population was pacified by allowing it to think the land it worked so hard and fiercely was the people's own property.

Then Stalin, in the application of the great 5-year plan, lifted his blood-dripping finger.

The small landholders soon found themselves enemies of the people. Off they were dragged to work on construction jobs at the other end of the empire. Their families were broken, their lives came to nothing. They were just horses to be worked until dead.

Once more the czar, Stalin, took back the land in accordance with the local variety of the Brannan plan of government agriculture.

The farmers fought back in their own way. They refused to turn in their crops. They killed their cows and ate them, also their sheep and pigs.

The Russian domestic animal population, already far below the 1913 census, took another catastrophic plunge. It has not fully recovered to this day.

Stalin sent troops into the Ukraine, Russia's richest growing region, and confiscated the produce. Meanwhile there came one of those famines periodic in the Russian wheat country, a combination of very cold winter and no rain.

The result: Some 12,000,000 people died in the Ukraine and Caucasus Basins while Moscow held onto the food seized the year before.

As in the factories and on the farms, so in the Moscow palace politics. The first of the great series of trials and executions of Communists by other Communists began in 1929 with the case of Nicholas Bukharin, the head of the Comintern (Communist Internationale).

This was as if Mr. Truman, after his famous quarrel with Secretary of State Byrnes, had set the FBI on him.

Something He Overlooked

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 1, 1950

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Mount Vernon (Ohio) News:

SOMETHING HE OVERLOOKED

President Truman denounces as obstructionists and mossbacks those who oppose his Fair Deal program or any part thereof.

His implication is that these obstructionists are standing in the way of progress and are, for selfish reasons, fighting measures designed for the general welfare of the American people.

But the President doesn't tell the whole story; he has overlooked something, either intentionally or unintentionally.

That something is the cost of the program he advocates. The Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Department has just completed a study of the cost of Mr. Truman's proposals.

Fifteen proposals in this program are now under consideration by Congress.

If all fifteen received the approval of Congress, $7,000,000,000 would be added to the Federal budget for the fiscal year 1951.

That would be just a starter, however. Within 5 years, the study revealed, they would add more than $25,000,000,000 to the annual budget, bringing it to above $65,000,000,000 a year.

The 15 proposals and their first-year and subsequent yearly cost, respectively, are:

National health insurance, $15,000,000 and $7,000,000,000.

Social-security extension, $250,000,000 and $6,000,000,000.

Industrial safety program, $3,000,000 and $5,000,000.

Aid to education, $300,000,000 and $500,000,000.

National Science Foundation, $15,000,000 and $100,000,000.

National Commission Against Discrimination in Employment (FEPC), $600,000 and $5,000,000.

Special assistance for rental and cooperative housing, $10,000,000 and $50,000,000.

Labor Extension Service, $3,000,000 and $27,000,000.

Universal military training, $600,000,000 and $3,000,000,000.

St. Lawrence seaway (operating costs), $8,000,000 and $30,000,000.

St. Lawrence seaway (construction costs), $100,000,000 and $100,000,000 (for 10-year period).

Military housing and public works, $600,000,000 and $1,400,000,000.

Assistance to underdeveloped areas (point 4), $35,000,000 and $500,000,000.

Brannan farm plan, $5,000,000,000 and $6,000,000,000.

Commercial production of natural resources, $11,000,000 and $400,000,000.

Incentive payments for development of minerals, $70,000,000 and $70,000,000.

The grand totals are: For the first year, $7,020,600,000; and for subsequent years, $25,187,000,000.

Some of these proposals have merit, some are in the questionable status, and some should under no circumstances be enacted.

But the wisdom of taking on the added expense of even the meritorious proposals is to be doubted.

The United States, along with the rest of the world, is passing through a critical stage of history. This country, in its role of leader of the free people of the world, is committed to extraordinary expenses, such as maintaining a huge defense force in time of peace and helping friendly nations with economic and military aid, at great cost.

Our first responsibility is to build defenses of such strength that they will deter the Communists from aggression, or, failing in that, assure that democracy will survive the onslaughts of communism or any other ism.

We cannot do that and have all the "progress" Mr. Truman advocates simply because the American people cannot afford to undertake this double burden.

If we neglect our defenses to finance the Fair Deal program, all the "progress" gained by these expenditures would be quickly nullified if it came to a test with some totalitarian power, as it undoubtedly would if our attention were diverted from building our defenses by concentration on the Fair Deal program.

Character Assassination: Disloyalty Charges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 1, 1950

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, an interesting book entitled "Character Assassination" has just come off the press. The author is Jerome Davis, who himself won a libel suit against one of America's most popular magazines for labeling him as Communist. The enclosed article is a review of the book by Ernest Pisko in the Christian Science Monitor:

DISLOYALTY CHARGES: ILLUMINATING SURVEY
(By Ernest Pisko)

Those who are libeled today as "disloyal," "un-American," and "Communist" are in distinguished company.

In George Washington's own words, every act of his administration was misrepresented so insidiously as to make him appear a Nero or a common pickpocket. Thomas Jefferson was called a traitor who first gave the stab to American liberties, Abraham Lincoln was called hater of the Constitution, and pledged to subvert it. Franklin D. Roosevelt was charged with being a dictator, Communist, and Fascist.

It is likely these four Presidents were confident in their more serene hours that history would vindicate their actions and that the mud splashed upon them by their contemporaries would crumble, fall, and allow the true flame of their character to serve as beacon for coming generations.

But to people in a less exalted position, the thought of posterity does not offer the same measure of consolation. They are more dependent upon, and therefore more concerned about, the reputation they have in the eyes of their fellow citizens. While a Lincoln

could shrug off the charge that he was disloyal to the Constitution, a civil servant, teacher, or businessman—publicly accused of disloyalty—may soon find his career broken and his economic existence gravely threatened. The records of the past 5 years show hundreds of cases where this happened or almost happened.

We read about them in our newspapers, hear of them from our favorite newscaster, but rarely is our reaction more than short-lived indignation. Still less do we try to visualize the suffering that slander inflicts upon its victim. That is why Jerome Davis' book Character Assassination must be earnestly recommended as a guide to what lies behind the headlines of recurrent Washington disloyalty stories. It is a poignant and a disturbing report on the injustice and misery resulting from doubtful, unfounded and often plainly malicious charges of a quite arbitrarily defined "un-Americanism."

The method thus employed to injure or eliminate people who differ from the accuser in their political views, their religion or their race, is nothing novel. It was used by ancient Romans against early Christians; by the Roman Catholic Church against all kinds of heretics; by the courts of the Holy Alliance against liberals; by the admirers of Johannes Brahms against the admirers of Richard Wagner; on a gigantic scale by the Nazis against the Jews; and in the United States, as in many other countries, against the advocates of social progress.

Mr. Davis, who himself won a libel suit against one of America's most popular weekly magazine for labeling him as "Communist," analyzes the technique of character assassination as employed against groups—labor, Negroes, Jews—as well as individuals. His documentation is comprehensive, his presentation unemotional. That in many past instances the methods and basic attitudes of the Congressional Committee on Un-American Activities, and of some individual Senators, appear rather close to those of obscure "masters of the smear brush" outside Congress, is not the author's fault. As the great Russian satirist Gogol wrote: "Don's blame the mirror if you dislike the face it shows you."

In his concluding chapter, Recovery of Faith in Freedom, Mr. Davis makes several valuable suggestions as to how to insulate our minds against intolerance. While general adoption of these suggestions would be desirable as a means to insure cleaner fighting, it would not, as the author apparently believes, render fighting altogether obsolete. Not all disagreements spring from intolerance. There is such thing as an honest difference of opinion. And there are limits to the freedom to differ for which Robert M. Hutchins, of Chicago University, pleads in his introduction to Mr. Davis' book. Within these limits, however, a healthy democracy will be harmed less by vigorously expressed differences between its citizens than by their mutual indifference.

The Climate Is Better Than the Day's Weather

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 1, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, for years in Chicago Charles E. Merriam has been an institution. His fame is international. As the Morton D. Hull distinguished service professor, now emeritus, at the University of Chicago, he contributed a mighty force to the molding of the political thought of several generations. As counselor to Presidents, governors, mayors, and others in high public office, his influence upon the developments of his times has been large. Today as an elder statesman, as it were, he occupies a unique and enviable position of eminence.

From Charles E. Merriam has come the contribution of a phrase that might well be an accepted expression of the American outlook on the present troubled sea of international affairs. Mr. Merriam, trusting in the loftier and mightier powers of justice and brotherhood, is undisturbed by the menaces of the cold war and the ugliness of the clouds. To him they constitute merely the weather of the day and the climate, he adds hopefully, is better than the day's weather.

I am happy to bring to the attention of the House the following excerpt from an article on world government by Mr. Merriam in Common Cause magazine in which this phrase is used:

The inventiveness of mankind is equal to the demands made upon it for creative development of legislative and representative agencies, adequate to the lofty purposes of emerging world order. A yes or no to the problem of the precise locus of power, military and fiscal, is not likely to be found without the helping hand of human fraternity, inspired by the hope of realizing the highest ends of humanity. These balances are important, no doubt, but reliance upon the means rather than the ends of world order will prove very difficult and even disastrous. But this is no reason why energy and inventiveness in other areas than those of steel and gold should not be applied to the tests.

Complex and baffling as this problem may be, the alternative of world chaos staggers the imagination. The dreadful possibilities of calamity quicken our pace toward a world community and commonwealth in which justice and right preside. After all, hope is a more powerful motive than fear in leading us to the realization of the highest destiny of man. As a long-time student of government, I do not counsel surrendering to hate, violence, duress. I look to and trust in loftier and mightier powers of justice, liberty, welfare, brotherhood. The climate is better than the day's weather.

Address of Vice Adm. C. E. Rosendahl

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 1, 1950

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am glad to call the attention of the House to a memorable occasion in Ocean County, N. J., which took place on May 24, 1950. On that day the governor of the State and other high officials dedicated the new bridge across Barnegat Bay between Seaside Heights and Island Heights and it was officially opened to traffic. This new bridge has taken the place of an old wooden bridge built in 1914—36 years ago, under the sponsorship of the man whose name the new bridge bears—Thomas A. Mathis.

It was a fine occasion in which many citizens took part and it will do much to enhance the many attractions of Ocean County and make them more available to the public. It is significant to note also that this year marks the centennial year of the founding of Ocean County and it is most appropriate that this bridge should be available for use of the public at this time.

Vice Adm. Charles E. Rosendahl, retired, whose record in the Navy is well known as the most prominent advocate of lighter-than-air craft, is chairman of the Ocean County Centennial Committee and he made the principal address at the official opening of the Thomas A. Mathis Bridge; I am very glad to include it in my remarks.

Your Excellency Governor Driscoll, Congressman Auchincloss, Commissioner Miller, Captain Tom, Mr. Hansen, citizens and friends of Ocean County, the County of Ocean, one of the jewels of the necklace of the State of New Jersey; land and sea of romance, sportsmanship and tradition, heartily welcomes you here on this milestone occasion in our history.

This year of 1950 is our centennial as a major political entity of the State; but this is only one of the recent facets in the history of this vicinity. You recall that New Jersey itself was one of the original thirteen Colonies. But our part of the State gained recognition as far back as the year 1609, yes, 1609, when the Dutch sailing Captain, Henrik Hudson, sailing in the *Half Moon*, sighted a section of southern Ocean County where now is located our world-famous Barnegat Light on Long Beach Island. Writing in his log-book of this sighting, Captain Hudson said: "A pleasant place to see and a good land to fall in with." With that we all agree.

Another Dutch sailing captain, for whom Cape May was named, gave the name of Barendegadt (in the true Dutch spelling) to the inlet since of that name, meaning "rushing waters." The famous yachting authority, Clarence Lovejoy has called Barnegat Bay, "the finest shallow bay in America."

And while time does not permit my mentioning here the many other outstanding features of our county, I hope you will forgive my slightly prejudiced mention of the fact that Lakehurst was one of the very first international transoceanic airports in the world.

If one really tried, he could stand almost indefinitely and boast of our county, but there are others better at that than I. However, one cannot omit mention of the prominence of our waters in the sailing world; that some of the best beach bathing and sunburns; some of the largest fish—and understandably some of the tallest fish stories—spring from our waters.

We may not have an actual "fountain of youth" but surely something just as good. For here today in our midst is our county's oldest living citizen, Martin Schwarz, Sr., now in his ninety-second year; and still going strong at his market he has operated in Toms River for now over 62 years. Something besides business must have been good to him all these years.

And to prove that we still turn out sturdy men in this county, in this parade today we had William Richard Waller, Jr., of Seaside Heights, born exactly 4 days ago.

To at least two other distinguished men also here, this must be a sentimental and heartening occasion. Our old friend, Cap-

tain Tom Mathis, is one of the two men still alive who privately financed the present—and soon to become the past wooden bridge alongside us, put into service in the year 1914.

And in proof that progressive mental and technical growth are still rewarded, it is no mere coincidence that the builder of this fine modern edifice being dedicated today, is none other than the same Ole Hansen who in 1914 built the lift bridge alongside us—still functioning perfectly today—both Mr. Hansen and the lift.

A centennial year is not a bad occasion to ponder where we can go from here in other developments as well. Let me mention but one suggestion. To land travel, this fine new edifice we are dedicating today is a great asset and adjunct to our county and State. But let us not forget that the abundant waterways in our midst, also are both pleasant and profitable travelways, and we should not overlook their comparable development.

To Captain Tom and his contemporaries it must be heartening to realize that Ocean County has certainly not stood still in the 36 years since the adjoining wooden structure was the last word. Indeed, this new modern cousin is the most dramatic illustration possible, of the progress of Ocean County. This strong, sturdy, sinew is striking evidence that we are still young and growing stronger.

Let us not forget that this bridge will be utilized and enjoyed not only by curselves but also by the many thousands of visitors who come from far and wide to share with us the beauties, pleasures and resources nature has bestowed upon us. By coincidence, it was on the 24th of May, 1883, some 67 years ago that the Brooklyn Bridge was dedicated, to become a household word and known to countless millions. Who can estimate the millions who will come to know our most modern bridge in six decades to come?

I assure you, Governor Driscoll, Commissioner Miller, Captain Tom, Mr. Hansen, and all the other far-sighted men responsible for this splendid accomplishment, that we of Ocean County are indeed grateful for your efforts in providing us with this modern facility for these modern times.

So, in behalf of the Board of Chosen Freeholders of Ocean County, and as national chairman of the Ocean County Centennial Commission, I hereby express to New Jersey the gratitude and appreciation of our people for this fine bridge, dedicated as it shall be to the peaceful pursuits and healthful recreation of all who live here or come here. This is indeed a most outstanding day in the history of Ocean County, and we are grateful to you for it. Thank you.

Address of Gen. George C. Marshall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 1, 1950

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Gen. George C. Marshall at Memorial Day Services, Arlington National Cemetery Amphitheater, May 30, 1950:

This is Memorial Day—a day dedicated some years ago to the stirring of our memories of those who fell in the country's battles, many of whom surround us here in Arlington Cemetery. There have been many Memorial Day addresses here and there will be many more, but as for me, my memories go back to a certain day where in an olive grove on the scene of a fierce battle which had just terminated in a great allied victory, I joined with troops resting from the ordeal of battle on that field. They observed their Memorial Day on the ground they had first fought for and where their fallen comrades had but a few days previously been laid to rest. There we were not talking of the remote past—our thoughts were centered on the scenes of fury and devastation around us and the certainty of greater struggles soon to follow. Many of the men in that particular regiment, an unusually large percentage as a matter of fact, fell in the further fighting, and it was evident that each man was thinking of the sacrifice he very probably would too soon be called upon to make. The setting that evening, the expressions on the faces of those men, and the prospects of the immediate future made a profound impression upon me which I would recreate in your minds today, if it were possible for me to translate the emotions of that hour. Those men quite evidently looked to us to redeem the sacrifices their comrades had already made and that they felt they were soon to make, as so many did. The situation was concrete and very much of the present, and not a retrospect of the past as is largely ours today.

As chairman of the Battle Monuments Commission I am concerned with plots of ground all over the world where our men lie buried, young men brought to a sudden ending of life in the fight to maintain our way of life. Our great responsibility to them is to protect their loved ones and their friends from the agonies and miseries of war. Their living comrades, the veterans of today, alone know what war really is—that there is nothing to be said in favor of war except that it is the lesser of two evils. For it is better than appeasement of aggression because appeasement encourages the very aggression it seeks to prevent. And it is far better than submission to tyranny and oppression, because without freedom and respect for human dignity life would not be worth living.

Unless we are faced with the choice of these terrible alternatives, I think we should concentrate on finding peaceful solutions to the world's problems. Peace should be a dynamic force and not a negative condition that is merely the absence of armed hostilities. We should support to the full every existing instrument to the building of a more stable world. So long as there is a forum for open discussion of international disputes, the United States should be a participant. So long as there remains a conference table around which the nations can gather, the United States should be the first to attend and the last to retire. Only thus can we earn the right to stand here in the presence of the graves of these many men who were cut off in their youth from the life we enjoy and say in good conscience, "We are doing our best to justify your sacrifice."

A most terrible aspect of war is the toll it takes of the youth of the country. The average age of the men of the armed forces in the last war was about 26 years. The average age of those who perished would probably be less since the older men in service were not generally employed in combat.

And so, we lost almost 300,000 of the Nation's youth.

Repeated depletion of vigorous and productive manpower has been the undoing of many civilizations. We have been relatively fortunate in that our wars have not resulted for us in wholesale destruction. But we cannot be certain of the future.

It would be unwise, it seems to me, to console ourselves with the thought that we would ultimately win if hostilities should break out again, because I fear that the victorioues power in another war will stand amidst its own ruins with little strength left to reestablish itself or to offer assistance to its neighbors. It will only enjoy the empty triumph of inheriting the responsibility for a shattered and impoverished world.

To one who follows the current trend of thought among the western European powers it is evident that they are well aware of this. They realize that whoever wins another war, their generation will lose it; they know that peace is a condition necessary to their survival and they look to this country not only for material and military strength to offset the probability of war, but more importantly I am sure that they look to us for a clear restatement of the moral principles we feel are essential to a peaceful international society.

Some have suggested that the United States should take the lead in dissolving the United Nations and in setting up a new organization composed only of like-minded nations. Personally I think it would be unfortunate for the peace of the world deliberately to upset the precarious equilibrium that now exists. The United Nations symbolizes one of mankind's highest aspirations—an international house of democracy, a true brotherhood of the nations. We should not, it seems to me, deliberately turn away from that symbol, else we would weaken our moral position before the world and surrender at least a part of our leadership in the fight for peace.

One of the things for which our comrades gave their lives was to bring fellowship closer to reality. We have not realized that dream. Admittedly the United Nations is an imperfect organization. But remember it does provide a forum where words can be used instead of bullets. And so long as this forum remains open there are cracks in the iron curtain through which some of our ideas will penetrate.

Those who have lost faith in the organization profess alarm because the eastern powers use it as a platform for the dissemination of Communist propaganda. But we also have the privilege of telling our story through the same medium. And in any contest of ideas I think honesty will finally win in the long run, for truth must prevail, and I'll wager my money on American principles of freedom and equality under law, and tolerance and justice for all men.

Then, too, we have much the better story if we tell it well and tell it affirmatively. We have taken the offensive regarding communism. But we should constantly remind all people that no nation has ever embraced any form of totalitarian rule through exercise of the popular will.

However, the ferment that is stirring around the world today is not all Communist-inspired. A large part of it, I believe, results from an upsurge of peoples who have long suffered in poverty and misrule. And the millions who live under such subnormal conditions are entitled to a fair share of the God-given rights of human beings. It is a challenge to the more favored nations to lend assistance in bettering their lot.

Furthermore, self-interest demands that we give close attention to these peoples, for their situation is the seedbed for either one of two ways of life—democracy or communism. If we act with wisdom, we can guide this yearning to the better things of life through democratic channels.

We must present democracy as a force holding within itself the seeds of unlimited progress for the human race. We should make clear that it is a means to a better way of life within nations and to a better understanding among nations. Tyranny inevitably must fall back before the tremendous moral strength of the gospel of freedom and self-respect for the individual.

But we must have in mind that these democratic principles do not flourish on

empty stomachs. And that people turn to the false promises of dictators because they are hopeless and anything promises better than the miserable existence they endure.

However, I am certain that material assistance alone is not sufficient. The most important thing for the world today, in my opinion, is a spiritual regeneration which would restore a feeling of good faith and good will among men generally. Discouraged people are sorely in need of the inspiration of great principles. Such leadership can be the rallying point against intolerance, against distrust, and against that fatal insecurity that leads to war. I hope that we will provide that leadership. But we will have to get back to first principles if we are to speak with a voice that will kindle the imagination and rouse the spirit.

We have made much of America's strength and material prosperity. We have talked a great deal about the American way of life. But our material prosperity may or may not be exportable. A dynamic philosophy, on the other hand, knows no restrictions of time or space. And we do have an American creed that comes to us from the deep roots of the past. It springs from the convictions and hopes of men and women from many lands who founded this Nation and made it great. You will find that creed, that heritage in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution with its Bill of Rights.

Although it may have been without a clear realization, those were the things for which our men fought and died; those are the ideals which we can offer to the world with the certainty that they have the power to inspire people and to impel them to action.

I do not mean that we should try to persuade other people to accept our form of Government, but rather the great fundamentals on which it is based. I mean that the basic principles on which our Government was founded are timeless and have validity for all mankind.

But it must be remembered that raising our voice to the world imposes upon us a most serious obligation. We cannot convince others unless we are true to ourselves. We must be satisfied in our own hearts that we give more than lip service to these principles we profess.

When we call for our great individual freedoms, we must be sure that no infringement of these rights is permitted or tolerated because of emotions of the moment.

In some such spirit let us devote ourselves to a generous service to our fellow men just as these dead about us dedicated their lives to that service. I believe that our lost comrades would want it exactly that way.

We have before us the greatest task ever faced by any generation of men in the fight to preserve peace. War, I say again, is no longer just an evil. In this age it seems intolerable.

Our greatest tribute to our dead will be a devotion to the resolve that war must not happen again. But we must not—I emphasize, we must not, as we invariably have done in the past, render ourselves impotent, an invitation to the ruthless aggressor. Also, we should not place complete dependence on military and material power. It is a difficult road we have to follow but we have a wealth of lessons from the past and with clear heads and with genuine willingness to support our efforts, I think we can lead the world into a better life than now seems apparent.

"With malice toward none; with charity for all; * * * let us strive on to finish the work we are in * * * to care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow, and his orphan * * * to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves, and with all nations."

Reckless Misgovernment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks I am including an editorial by Arthur Capper on the subject of Government spending. He calls attention to the fact that a Nation which accumulates a deficit of $12,000,000,000 in two peacetime years is recklessly misgoverned. I agree. I am including the article at this point:

A Nation that runs up a deficit of $12,000,000,000 in two peacetime years is being recklessly misgoverned. It seems probable that deficit spending by our Federal Government will amount to that huge sum before June 30, 1952. The deficit this current fiscal year is estimated at six and one-half billions. There is nothing to indicate that spending during the next fiscal year will be much reduced—it seems more likely to be increased—and the deficit in 1951–52 easily could exceed $6,000,000,000. The 2-year total probably will not be less than 12 billions and might be a billion or two higher.

Incurring such deficits, without doing anything about it, is evidence that those in authority are indifferent to the dangers that such a course creates—dangers of inflation, of crushing debt, of a weakened economy that may, in a future emergency, be unable to survive.

All over the United States today the spenders are in the saddle and are riding high. If they can't get enough money from the people through taxes, they borrow it. Emergencies which can be used to justify additional spending appear in Washington in endless procession. And it is not much different in some States. The spending racket has been thoroughly organized and perfected during the last 18 years, and even the small fry in Government have muscled in on it.

But the blame is not all on public officials, guilty as many of them are. It comes right back to the folks at home. Everybody seems to be grabbing for Federal money. Chambers of commerce, city administrations, civic groups, airport officials, State governments, colleges, hospitals, schools, highway commissions, corporations, farmers, businessmen, individual citizens—all have their hands stretched out in the direction of the Federal Treasury and they are clamoring for handouts.

These folks constitute the biggest, the most powerful lobby in the United States. It puts tremendous pressure on both the legislative and executive branches of Government. The projects being promoted usually are desirable, even though they may not be essential. But the sad part of the situation is that these folks, most of whom are worried by high taxes, great debt, and deficit spending, don't seem to realize that the demands they continually make have much to do with keeping the spending spree going at top speed.

Mr. Average Citizen is the fall guy. He works. He pays taxes. He votes for the persons who so recklessly spend his earnings. He has a $257,000,000,000 Federal debt burden on his back, not to mention his personal debts and those incurred by States, counties, and cities.

Bad trouble lies ahead if we continue on this course. It almost seems, sometimes, as if a deliberate attempt was being made to bankrupt our country, to bring about an economic crash that would destroy our free enterprise system and overthrow our democratic form of government. Whether this is true or not, the end result will be the same. No nation can follow the course we are traveling along the reckless spending trail and not eventually go on the rocks. Any citizen knows that. His good sense will tell him so.

What can you do about it? You can do a lot. You are the only one who can do anything about it, you and other folks who are paying taxes and shouldering debt to keep the spenders going.

Here are some of the things you can do:

You can protest to your Congressman and Senators and urge them to vote against new spending and to support every move for economy.

You can refuse to ask for Treasury handouts, either on your own account or as a member of a group.

You can vote against the spenders in city halls, in county courthouses, in State capitols, and in Washington.

You can protest about high taxes.

You can talk to your neighbor and persuade him to follow your lead.

This reckless spending will stop when the people demand it and not until then. It is up to you.

ARTHUR CAPPER.

An Experiment in Higher Education Expands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that I voice the sentiment of my colleagues from Illinois in expressing regret over the loss of the Illinois colony in the National Capital of Aaron J. Brumbaugh, and his brilliant wife, who has been so active in the fight for home rule in the District and in other civic causes.

As vice president of the American Council of Education, Mr. Brumbaugh rendered a distinguished service to the cause of education, the effects of which will be lasting and will be reflected in educational thoughts and patterns in countries far removed as well as in our own United States. The new work to which he is going holds a challenge that was understandably irresistible to one whose life work has been to bring within the range of an ever greater number of people the cultural influence of higher education.

It will be recalled that during the presidency of Robert M. Hutchins, now chancelor, at the University of Chicago a bold experiment in admitting to college courses students who satisfactorily had completed 2 years of high-school work attracted wide national attention. The curriculum, having met the test of practical experience in the colleges of the large university, is now being extended under the direction of Mr. Brumbaugh to a small middle western college, with a rich historical background.

Because of the great interest of the House in education and the attention its Members must give to all phases of the educational problem as it affects us nationally, I am sure my colleagues will find interesting and helpful the following article in the University of Chicago magazine of May 1950 by Robert M. Strozier, dean of students:

BRUMBAUGH FOR PRESIDENT

Aaron J. Brumbaugh, A. M. '18, Ph. D. '29—well remembered by university alumni as a former dean of the college and dean of students—is leaving his post in Washington, D. C., as vice president of the American Council of Education. He is to become president of Frances Shimer College at Mount Carroll, Ill., on July 1. [Succeeding Albin Bro, now on an important assignment to Korea.]

Equally interesting, Frances Shimer will then become coeducational, and adopt a curriculum of liberal education modeled on that of our own university college. The 4-year program of liberal education will begin after the end of the sophomore year of high school, and an AB degree be awarded, after completion of 14 basic courses, as at Chicago.

John Russell, now acting president of Shimer, and I made a trip to Washington to see Mr. Brumbaugh and work out a plan of affiliation; subsequent meetings of the boards of both the university and Shimer confirmed the plan.

A coeducational school only 120 miles from our campus, administering much the same college program in quite a different setting, should prove to be a most interesting experiment. Shimer College, which is 97 years old, has an excellent physical set-up, attractive surroundings, an able staff, and a commitment to general education. From time to time, I meet parents who would like to have their children enjoy our college program, but who prefer not to send them to a large university.

Shimer may prove the solution for them. Its campus offers such added attractions as a stable of riding horses, tennis courts, swimming pool and golf course. Mount Carroll is a charming, small town and the college is almost a self-contained community.

The decision to adopt the Chicago curriculum, according to an announcement made by Shimer trustees, is in order "to promote and expand the opportunities for a general liberal education, and to cultivate the teaching and testing techniques which best support such an education." For several years, Shimer has been experimenting in the use of some of the general courses, offered by the College of the University of Chicago. Now it will not only extend the use of these courses, but adopt the testing and examining procedures of the Chicago plan. In addition to the required basic program, students will be able to take the noncredit courses in music, art, and drama for which Shimer is well known.

The University of Chicago is interested in the collaboration since it permits expansion and development of the Chicago type of liberal education in a college not directly a part of the university. Chancelor Hutchins, of course, has consistently maintained that the Chicago college offers a kind of education which can be universally established through colleges generally, and the Shimer adoption should provide independent evidence as to the value of the Chicago program.

To provide for cooperation, an affiliation which has existed legally with the university since 1896, but which hasn't been in practical effect for many years, will be reactivated. There has always been a continuing informal relationship between the two institutions through their boards of trustees. Dr. Harper was a member of the Shimer board, as was Thomas W. Goodspeed, Alonzo K. Parker, Frank J. Miller, and Lathan A. Crandall. President Ernest Cadman Colwell of the university is presently a member of the board and its vice president.

The new affiliation agreement will be revived at the end of 5 years, but may be terminated before that time with the consent of the boards of both institutions. Thereafter, either may terminate upon a year's notice.

Frances Shimer originally was established in 1853 as a coeducational college. During the Civil War all its male students were in the Union Army, and Shimer became a woman's college. For a period after World War II it admitted some male veterans, as nonresident students. In 1896, Mrs. Frances Wood Shimer, cofounder with Miss Cinderella Gregory, transferred control to a self-perpetuating board of trustees. The original academy buildings were destroyed by fire in 1906 and replaced by the present quadrangle of 12 main buildings of stone and brick, of colonial style architecture. Average enrollment has been running about 200.

Irish Ambassador Addresses American Irish Historical Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER A. LYNCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 1, 1950

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, the annual dinner meeting of the American Irish Historical Society of New York was addressed this year by the first Ambassador from Ireland to the United States, Hon. John J. Hearne. On this occasion the society celebrated its fifty-third anniversary by the presentation of its gold medal to Chief Justice John T. Loughran, of the New York State Court of Appeals.

Annually the society selects an outstanding individual as the recipient of its award. Mr. John S. Burke, president of B. Altman & Co., said in making the presentation to Justice Loughran that the award this year was "in tribute to his eminence as a jurist." Previously Mr. Joseph Scott, of Los Angeles, head of the American League for an Undivided Ireland, was the recipient of the medal, which has been presented to a distinguished list of historians, writers, and others who have achieved prominence.

The American-Irish Historical Society was organized in New York 53 years ago and is located at 991 Fifth Avenue, where its extensive library on Irish historical subjects is available for reference work. One of the founders of the society was President Theodore Roosevelt. Heading the society today is Mr. James McGurrin, commissioner of jurors for the city of New York and himself an author of note. His excellent biography of Bourke Cochran is a most authoritative work on the heroic life of that distinguished lawyer, Congressman, and leader of the cause of freedom.

Mr. Terence J. McManus, secretary of the New York County Lawyers Association, was the chairman of the dinner and presented to the guests from various parts of the Nation, the speaker of the evening, Ambassador Hearne.

The text of the address by Ireland's Ambassador, for which I have received unanimous consent to include in my remarks, is as follows:

Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, 3 years or so ago the American Irish Historical Society celebrated its golden jubilee. The occasion was marked by appropriate ceremonies and the event itself became a landmark in the progress of your society as well as an episode of unusual interest and importance in Irish-American history. The half century of the existence of your organization spans the whole eventful interval in which the national political movement in Ireland, interrupted by the death of Parnell, successfully continued for a while under the leadership of a United Irish Parliamentary Party, interrupted again and ruptured if not shattered by the impact of World War I on Anglo-Irish affairs, was finally consolidated in the counsel and reformed in the philosophy of Sinn Fein. It happens that the period of which I speak largely synchronizes with that of my own lifetime, a coincidence, I do not need to add, of no significance at all in Irish history, but, as you can imagine, a circumstance of more than passing interest to the first Ambassador of Ireland to the United States of America.

When, some weeks ago, I received your invitation, Mr. President, to be your guest speaker on this occasion, it occurred to me that it might not be inappropriate to offer you a brief account of political developments in Ireland with which you are long since familiar, but which, when presented to you at the end of a definite period or phase which has already become a turning point in our affairs, may commend itself to a great historical society like yours not only as a record but as a review. I know that the primary object of the American Irish Historical Society is to place the achievements of our own people in America in their true light in American history. Notwithstanding that fact, or rather because of it, I am sure that a review of the political achievements of our people at home during the period of which I speak will have a deeper interest for you than for any audience anywhere as distinguished and as devoted as this to the study of the authentic history of our people abroad, but to the study also of the story of the historic Irish Nation itself, its significance for other nations, and its place in the peaceful and harmonious development of the world.

The major political problem of Ireland in our time, Mr. President, was that of national freedom. The struggle for freedom had taken various forms. Within it had been fought the Irish land war, from it came the revolution and the cultural revival, and around it there crystallized, in the final or penultimate phase, the greatest constitutional controversy of the age. My purpose this evening is to indicate the broad course of the constitutional struggle as I saw it take place, that is, in the half century or so between the treaty of 1921 and the proclamation of the republic last year.

Irish constitutional history in that interval is a record of uninterrupted progress through a continuous evolutionary process. The whole story of that evolution, and its political background at home and abroad, remains to be written. No work with which I am acquainted has followed it through the stages by which the constitutional system was gradually changed and finally transformed. The national constitution of Ireland, enacted by the people in 1937, was in one sense the logical culmination of these events. In another, it stands apart from them and in a wider historical context. For when that instrument was adopted the episode was over in which Irish constitutional history could be summed up as the record of a successful effort to free our institutions of the restrictions imposed on them from

outside. The path had been cleared for developments in a new direction and of a wholly different kind. The time was, moreover, ripe for an authentic expression of the national will upon the form and basis of our society. And so, when the national constitution was adopted, a whole new policy emerged with an unfettered organic structure enshrining a national code of doctrines and principles of permanent value and universal validity.

The treaty of 1921 stands at the beginning of the development of which I am speaking as the most sharply controversial document in modern Irish history. It became, however, as much by the criticism of its opponents as by the patriotism of its authors and the advocacy of its supporters, an instrument of progress. Hailed, on the one hand, as a stepping stone to freedom, as freedom to achieve freedom, and condemned on the other as an attempt to foist the British colonial system on an old European nation with no colonial history or outlook, the treaty almost wholly determined the trend of our constitutional policy for over a quarter of a century. It largely determined our international policy as well. For out of the treaty emerged a great national objective; that is, an objective of the two major political parties in the state, to remove at first the colonial implications, and ultimately, the colonial form of the constitutional system based upon its more objectionable terms. That objective was achieved by the work of successive Irish delegations at British Commonwealth Conferences culminating in the Statute of Westminster of 1931.

Out of the treaty came at the same time a national objective to secure some general recognition of the status of Ireland in the world at large. This was achieved by the appointment of ministers in the key capitals of the world, the attendance of Irish representatives at international conferences, the conclusion of treaties with other states, and, above all, the determination of all parties to keep the foreign policy of the country steadily based on the League of Nations. The two strategies were not separately conceived or separately pursued: they were distinct, but complementary, and, together, constituted the best plan we could devise for a diplomatic campaign on two very complicated and, sometimes, fugitive political fronts. Their success was not immediate. It was slow, gradual, but inevitable, and, in the end, complete.

A detailed account of the succession of textual constitutional amendments which accompanied or followed our steady advance in those years, amidst difficulties which, at times, seemed insurmountable, would fall outside the scope of these observations. Let me sum up what took place in that connection by saying that, in a period of 11 years, 38 articles of the constitution of 1922 had been amended or repealed. Only 32 of the original 74 had remained intact. The character of the parliament, the executive and the judiciary had undergone a fundamental change. Legislative, executive, and judicial sovereignty had been established. Let me sum up what resulted, in a wider connection, by saying that the whole legal machinery of the colonial British Empire had been disassembled, and that the method of agreement had replaced that of imperial control as the instrument of cooperation between the countries of the group which then came to be called the British Commonwealth of Nations. And let me sum up what resulted in the world at large by recalling that, one by one, the countries of the British Commonwealth had established diplomatic missions abroad and had otherwise generally followed the path we had taken to national sovereignty and separate membership of international society.

All I am saying, Mr. President, may seem trite, somewhat outdated, and archaic. I am fully aware of that. But I am trying to sketch for you as briefly as I can the picture as I saw it on my way to Washington. It was a very long and arduous journey, because I have come a long distance and have been coming a very long time. I am not speaking personally. I am referring to the first ambassador of Ireland to this great country.

I have indulged in that seeming digression to escape from the rigor of my text. But let me continue.

The absolute liberation of our political system, by democratic processes, to the extent which I have described was the chief development of all prior to the National Constitution of 1937. The treaty-constitution settlement broke down internally and externally. It broke down internally because it imposed a system of government on our people which, however acceptable to others, was axiomatically unsuited to the genius and traditions of the historic Irish nation. It broke down externally because it sought to define relationships, avowedly international, in constitutional terms. It stood against a permanent national tradition and a contemporary international trend, which, together bore down upon it, and bore it away. The evolutionary process in which the settlement of 1921 was caught up, and which, for the reasons I have stated, it accelerated, belongs to our constitutional history, as an incident in the struggle for freedom, rather than as a normal event in the substantive development of our national life. The real force which mostly, and most continuously influenced, and, at the appropriate time deflected our course in the years under review, as you and I can so clearly see it this evening, was a coherent public opinion amounting to a national frame of mind on the basic issues involved. It preceded, informed, and survived the whole abnormal episode, so that, in the end, it was the people themselves who determined the form of our fundamental law and defined the juridical character of our relations with all other nations.

I remarked a moment ago, Mr. President, upon the length of time it took to reach the point at which full recognition was accorded to our international standing by the reception in Washington and elsewhere of Irish representatives of the highest diplomatic rank. Let me tell you of the circumstance which postponed that development for so long. It was our preoccupation with the problem of national unity. During all that time national unity was the chief politics of every Irishman worthy of the name. The whole soil of Ireland is the property and domain of the whole Irish people. If any man tells you today that the question of the ownership of the national territory of Ireland, or of jurisdiction over this or that part of it, can only be settled by dividing it into two, that man's argument will, I know, have the same effect upon the mind of every member of this society and on the mind of every American citizen as the plea of the false woman who would solve the question of the ownership of a little child by putting it to the sword, had upon the judgment of King Solomon. The partition of a small nation, Mr. President, is a wholly evil thing. It is one of the cruelest wrongs that can ever be inflicted upon a people.

All the principles involved in 1921 in the issue of independence have ever since been involved in the issue of national unity. The main question is whether the majority of the Irish people, living in Ireland, have the right to rule the whole of our famous island. To put it in another way, the question is whether any power has a right to forcibly occupy any part of the territory of another country against the declared wishes of the people of that country. For the partition of Ireland was not effected by Irishmen. The problem of Irish unity is not primarily an Irish problem: it is an Anglo-Irish problem. At every stage of the constitutional development which I have been describing, party after party offered hostages to their political fortunes in Ireland to secure British friendship, and British cooperation on plans for a united Ireland. National unity was not forthcoming, on the basis of the British Crown, or on the basis of membership of the British Commonwealth. We offered every kind of guaranty for the protection of the religious minority. We offered proportional representation. We retained, for a time, the British Privy Council as a final court of appeal as a safeguard for minority rights. We offered a federal system. And on the abdication of King Edward VIII, we enacted the External Relations Act as a symbol of cooperation abroad and a basis of unity at home. All these efforts failed. And almost everyone of the offers made imperiled domestic peace, but our leaders, holding that national unity was an issue prior to every other, save that of national sovereignty, kept on keeping the door to unity open. Don't think for a moment that because our efforts failed, they were not justified. We want unity, but we also want peace. And we are going to achieve unity without civil war. Never were our people more united than they are today on that challenging and unchangeable policy. It is an issue good enough and great enough to command the duty and the discipline of all Irishmen at home and throughout the world. Twenty-five years ago we blazed the cause of Irish independence across every continent and placed it in the keeping of this great democracy. Today, we are taking the same course and committing the cause of national unity to the same keeping. The same principles of democratic liberty which made America great will make Ireland one.

And, one day, Mr. President, an Irish Ambassador will speak to this great society of yours on behalf of a United Ireland. Would to God it were I. And he will explain to you why he was so long in coming as the representative of an Ireland again one and undivided and entirely free, as I endeavor to show you tonight some of the obstacles that lay in the path of the representative of an Ireland not entirely free on his way to Washington. And his audience will think as, I am sure, you are thinking this evening what a pity and a shame it is that elementary justice can so long be withheld from, and elementary right so long denied to a storied, peace-loving land, cradle and nursery ground of missionaries of peace in every corner of the earth, cofounder of Western civilization, and beloved motherland of so many communities of free and moral men which now forever girdle the globe.

Let me turn for a brief moment, Mr. President, to an aspect of my subject which has not often been overlooked or obscured. What has mattered most to our people and our leaders through all the phases of our constitutional history has been the inner life of the nation rather than the external form of the state. Freedom can be lost and won, and lost and won again. But if the life of a nation is destroyed it can never be restored. Ireland might never gain the whole world but she had gone perilously near suffering the loss of her own soul. It was only when the inner life of the nation was at stake that Irish nationality came to be expressed in terms of freedom. Freedom is not an end in itself. It is a condition of self destiny. The whole purpose of the age old Irish stand against aggression and persecution had been to secure for those who would survive the struggle, however long it might go on, freedom to found an Irish commonwealth on the tradition of life for which our people have been known. Irish national policy had always been expressed in these positive terms. To end alien rule yes,

but to end it for a great spiritual purpose. That was why even before all the obstacles in the way had been removed, our people gave themselves a new national constitution which embodied the whole philosophy of life with which our race had been identified at home and throughout the world for more than 1,000 years. That was why at the same time we began the great work of reconstructing our society from top to bottom in the part of the national territory we at present effectively control, and ultimately upon the whole island. Now we go forward confidently under the aegis and star of a system of our own making, dedicated to the Almighty God of our fathers, in which the sacred and secular civilizations of our glorious legend, transfigured again, are woven at last into the organic life of the nation.

Memorial Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. KINGSLAND MACY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 1, 1950

Mr. MACY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following Memorial Day address I made on May 30, 1950, at Central Islip, Long Island, N. Y., in dedicating a park and stone monument commemorating the war dead of that village in the last war:

Mr. Chairman, honored and distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, it is a great and signal honor for me to have a part in this solemn ceremony in which you of Central Islip dedicate your war memorial. Here today you record for posterity the names of your men and women who responded to our country's call and pay everlasting tribute to those who left this village never to return. While we cannot believe that anywhere in America its task forces have been forgotten, not every community sees its hope of a memorial realized. It is to Central Islip's great credit that its civic-minded and patriotic citizens, working as individuals and through local organizations since 1943, reached the desired goal.

The entire village shared in this endeavor, and from that fact alone I am sure those whose names are perpetuated on this memorial know deep gratification. Many have had a part leading up to this day of dedication: Thomas P. Walsh (chairman), George Davison, Richard D. Clarke, Sr., George Howarth, the late Patrick Clerkin, Fred Cordes, and Dr. Earl McCoy, not forgetting Arthur Mulligan, who served with the committee until his death, when this labor of love was taken up by his mother. Others were Mrs. Dorothy Wagner, Judge Vern L. Furman, Michael Van Ditto, Harry Rude, Henry Wolf, Sr., Dorothy Waddington, Marcella O'Connell (secretary), and Dr. Corcoran. There were others, too. Everyone had a hand.

To secure a fitting site for the monument, which is enblazoned with 10 gold stars and the names of Central Islip's entire fighting complement of World War II, the people of this community sought land from the county and procured it for this memorial park. Designed and laid out under the supervision of Dick Clarke, it will belong for all time to the people, even as the memory of the names on this monument about to be unveiled will belong to them.

As we are gathered here this morning to think on our dead, men are gathered all over these States. In almost every community for miles on miles we are turning out of our homes and converging at this hour on our Main Street corners and village squares in an observance that has, for me, at least, something of native America in its very essence. This is Decoration Day.

It is a day for sad observance, but it is not wholly a sad day, and by that very reservation America is proved a young people, accepting sorrow in their portion, bowing their heads, and then again taking up life's forward march.

We stand here together now with full heart, remembering. We congregate quietly, not forgetting that the possibility of our so doing is owed to the valiant resting forever in the seas or far places or brought home to sleep in our village graveyards. We think on our Nation's past and momentarily grow fearful of our Nation's future. We pause to reflect solemnly on life, its brevity and meaning, but this afternoon, after we have laid the last flower on the graves of our dead, we will put away our shining fire wagons, lay aside our uniforms, and crowd the children into the family car to drive them to the movies. We Americans can take sorrow in our stride and our bitterness turns to optimism so swiftly that older nations, long rancoring, do not understand us. This is not shallowness. This is the surging of strength. In this, this resiliency, this ability to see the sun anew each day as a new thing, lies America's brave defense against the destructive forces of science and the evil as yet inherent in men.

This is a day of national awareness and civic communion. From public gatherings and intermingling there emanates a pervading communal power that can be assuring and even elevating, or, in the case of an incited mob, destructive. Thus it is as we gather this morning, neighbors and friends together, we become participants in action. Possibly we may not think of it as action, since it needs must be quiet action (call it resolve, if you will), but here and now this morning let us silently determine to bend our efforts toward safeguarding and bettering our land.

Can we be in the presence of our starry flag, surrounded by men and women in the uniforms of their country, without vowing to ourselves humbly and without grandiloquence, that nothing shall despoil it or harm in anywise the things for which it stands? Can we be in the presence of our flag without realizing that though it is a symbol of safety, so powerful a Nation have we become, it is at once a stern and terrible emblem reminding us that it, and it alone, has first call upon our lives?

The blood and agony and the anxiety of war are horrible, but more horrible still is the stupidity of war. America is a great force for peace, for today deep in its subconscious there is instinctive aversion to the idea of aggressive warfare. With our might and technocracy we could set out like some Alexander to conquer the world, but we do not want to fight at all except to defend those things we hold precious. If this were true of all other nations, we would not need to pour billions into the maws of the armsmakers but could spend our heritage upon the enlightenment and betterment of all our people. As it is, with global conditions as they are today, we can only maintain our vigilance, trust our leaders will find sustaining wisdom from within our great tradition, and hope that as mankind climbs slowly up evolution's hill to greater spiritual heights, reasoning will do away with warring, and peace will no longer be but intervals of bickering truce used to build armaments instead of understanding.

We cannot look on the flag on this day three generations have set aside to bedeck the graves of heroes, without thinking thus of the flag and its dominion over our bodies as mere flesh and blood, but corollary to it is the flag's symbolism of home and fireside which is the contracted essence and heart of the thrilling expanse that is freedom.

It is to this thing, this freedom, we can direct our will today, and in the days ahead to next Decoration Day. If we are to keep it, we must work unremittingly. We can let nothing—Government or individuals—destroy it.

We must protect the law's orderly process, but we must not let it coil itself around us; we must not bureaucrat ourselves into ineffectuality; we must not trade our great historic concepts with the potential of proof for attractive theories that must forever remain hypotheses because they are not grounded in truth.

This is the task that confronts us historically. Ours is an era of preservation, just as the era of the Revolution was an era of creation. We must dedicate ourselves to the belief that freemen can remain free within the framework of our Government.

This is a difficult thing but is a simple thing too. It demands performance on the simplest level, the level of the individual, which, conversely, as God and our Constitution decree, is the highest level.

Only if the individual in the home, in the church, in the school, in the polling place, in his heart, insists on the maintenance of first principles will we keep our freedom. Only if America safeguards that freedom so we can go forward seeking deliberately for brotherhood, only then will war be an antique reminder of an age long past, and generations to come will not know the sorrowful pride of carving the names of sacrificing men on monuments such as this which we now dedicate in gratefulness and thoughtful humility.

Today as we look upon its beauty and renew our faith to it, we are proud it was this flag—this flag and what it has given and promises—that took James Krause thousands of miles from Central Islip to die in the invasion of Okinawa, and made Edward Francis McGrath to give up his young life in the transport run of the North Atlantic and its dark waters. It was for this flag that Dale Watts died on the Siegfried Line, and William Sykora in a Nazi prison camp. It was this flag's defense that took the lives of Frederick Dietz in action in the South Pacific, Arthur Mayer in embattled France, and Thomas O'Kane in shell-torn Italy. For this flag these youths have been transmuted for our sake into gold stars, and, with their companions in arms, Robert Storey, George Monsen, and John Duffy, they will live in memory not only as lads once known in this village, but as a part of the history of the United States of America.

For it, for us, they laid down their lives and this morning our hearts go out to those they left bereft and longing. The unlived years of these 10 men are a gift to us.

United States Is Without Effective Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 1, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, that outstanding writer, Mr. David Lawrence, points out in a recent article that the United States is without effective leadership. I am including as part

of my remarks the article which appeared in the Washington Star of May 23, 1950:

PLEA FOR A COMMISSION GIVES IMPRESSION THAT PRESIDENT HAS FAILED

When a newspaper of influence in the National Capital comes to the tragic conclusion that fear and frustration abound in the country and that a commission of citizens should be appointed to survey the major aspects of national security, it is a rather clear indication of the fact that America is without an effective leadership today, either in the executive or legislative branches of the Government.

The Washington Post presents a lengthy editorial analyzing the deep and troubled state of the Nation's mind, and comes up with a suggestion for a national commission. Senator HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, Democrat, promptly introduces a resolution calling for the appointment of such a commission.

What is most remarkable is that the editorial finds considerable fault with so-called witch-hunting and congressional investigations and condemns those who have tried to capitalize for selfish political gain the frustrations of the hour, but does not say a single word about the utter lack of competence of the leadership in the Congress, nor a single word about the fact that America is supposed to have elected in 1948 a Commander in Chief who presumably was deemed by a majority of his countrymen capable of dealing with the very problems that a commission is now asked to solve.

PRETTY LARGE ORDER

The editorial recommends that the commission be unpartisan and that it survey "the internal menace of the fifth column, civilian defense, development of new weapons, the size and use of military expenditures, economic restoration of our friends and allies."

This is a pretty large order and gives the impression that somehow the President of the United States has failed or there would not be now a suggestion that a national commission take over and do what the President and his Cabinet officers and various national security councils and interdepartmental committees should have been doing right along.

What would be more to the point would be an examination of the reasons why the morale of the country has deteriorated under the Truman administration. It doesn't require any resolution by Congress, either, for a group of prominent citizens to assume the initiative and take a look at the serious damage that has been done to America by the ward politicians in both parties.

The country is sick and tired of politics—the machine variety that is tied up with gambling and gangsterism, and the machine variety that appoints to office only persons cleared by a national political committee.

The country is also sick and tired of political junkets that are brazenly called nonpolitical. It is sick and tired also of the way in which innocent persons are smeared while whitewashes of guilty persons are permitted.

COVERUPS SUSPECTED

The word from the country generally is that there is strong suspicion of all sorts of coverup of scandal and wrongdoing. The Amerasia case, the Fuchs case, the Hiss case, the mess at the Army finance center at St. Louis have all contributed their share to Nation-wide distrust. Also, no matter how many denials or counterdenials are issued, the fact remains that China has been lost to the west and the Communists rule more territory than any government ever acquired without a war.

The leadership in Congress is lacking because the central issue is not how many Communists stole papers or what persons sent in memoranda to formulate foreign policy. The real issue is why China was lost. The so-called white paper doesn't explain it, and only the other day Paul Hoffman of the ECA admitted publicly that China might have been saved from the Communists if a realistic attitude toward that country had been pursued in time.

The basic trouble with America today is that it is saddled with rigid tenure for Presidents. In Britain or Canada or Australia they can overnight turn out a leader who fails and get another in his place. They can turn out one legislative body and elect another that is responsive to the people's wishes. In America, leadership can be inadequate and it takes months and months and sometimes years to get a new leadership. If a commission is needed now, it is one that will propose an amendment to the Constitution permitting the recall of executives and legislators as is the custom in other democracies.

Arkansas, Land of Opportunity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILBUR D. MILLS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1950

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following addresses of the Secretary of the Treasury, Hon. John W. Snyder:

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY SNYDER AT THE SIXTIETH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE ARKANSAS BANKERS' ASSOCIATION, HOT SPRINGS, ARK., WEDNESDAY, MAY 24, 1950

ARKANSAS, LAND OF OPPORTUNITY

I am glad to be able to participate in this annual meeting of the Arkansas Bankers' Association, for it recalls many memories of my early days in banking here. It is always a real pleasure to be able to renew so many old friendships, and to revisit familiar and cherished scenes.

It is usually on the occasion of a return visit that you find out what has been going on since you have been away. That is not the case today, for I have constantly kept in touch with developments here. The progress of Arkansas has commanded Nation-wide attention and your accomplishments have aroused intense interest.

As the close of the war, Arkansas, along with the rest of the Nation, faced a crucial economic test. Under the pressure of wartime activities, our economy had grown to unprecedented heights. Concern was widespread as to whether such a high level of wartime production could be converted into comparable peacetime production.

Arkansas had an answer to this problem. It called for business and government to work together in unified effort—not just to maintain the gains already made but to move forward to even greater growth. The tremendous wartime expansion of your industrial facilities had awakened the entire State to possibilities that had for years lain dormant in Arkansas' fields, forests, rocks, and streams. The people of Arkansas accepted this great new challenge and went to work.

The farmer, the banker, the factory worker, and the tradesman joined hands to build up their own home towns. They knew their State's strength was dependent upon the growth of their individual communities. As a result of this cooperative effort, Arkansas has not only met its civilian readjustment, but is finding an even greater prosperity.

As leaders in the financial field, as well as in your own communities, you bankers have played a most important role in Arkansas' decade of matchless progress. The important thing is, however, that you have only made a beginning in the achievements that can be yours if you continue to work together in common bond. For it is in your possibilities for future development that Arkansas merits its title as the "Land of Opportunity."

The better balanced economy which this State enjoys today has come, as you know, from increased industrialization. Manufacturing leads the way in a growing region. And, as manufacturing grows, so grows the entire economy.

Arkansas is, of course, essentially an agricultural State. But it is dynamic industrial development which brings even greater productivity to agriculture. It has already brought science to agriculture on a scale which even the most visionary would not have thought possible at the beginning of the decade—airplane sowing and fertilizing, mechanical equipment cultivating and harvesting your cotton and your rich new crops of alfalfa, soybeans and rice.

The great strides you are making in continuing to bring new industries to your State is a tribute to your cooperative endeavors. As a result of the industrial awakening here during the war, you have added some 1,500 new manufacturing enterprises in the postwar years.

Much of the new industrial wealth that is being added to your State comes from increased mineral production and fabrication. Arkansas is especially well-known for its bauxite which has attained not only national but world importance. It is here that over 90 percent of the bauxite or aluminum ore mined in North America is produced.

This strategic material was an invaluable asset to our Nation in wartime. Arkansas was able to step up the production of this mineral from 362,000 tons in 1939 to over 6,000,000 tons in 1943—a 17-fold increase within just 4 years. As you have converted to a peacetime production, bauxite continues to be highly important to your State's economy. Bauxite is currently bringing in an annual income of around $9,000,000, and even greater returns are forecast as your plants move into capacity production.

You may be interested to know that it was back in 1891—the year Arkansas bankers held their first annual meeting—that bauxite was first discovered in this State. Only a century ago, in fact, aluminum was so scarce, it had a price equal to gold. Later, in 1863—the Treasury was considering the possibility of using this newly discovered metal in coinage. The Director of the Mint, in the annual report of the Secretary of the Treasury for that year, admitted, however, there was one serious deterrent, and that was price. Aluminum was then selling at $10 a pound. But the Director went on to state that if the cost per pound shall be reduced to one-third of its present price * * * this subject will deserve, and should receive, the earnest and favorable consideration of the law-making power. It is interesting to review this statement in light of today's market price of around 17 cents a pound. I might add that there is no consideration being given today to using aluminum in our coinage.

Bauxite is, of course, but one of Arkansas' many mineral resources. Your future as a mineral producer and fabricator will depend in a large measure on the development of your nonmetallic deposits—limestone, dolomite, clays, shale, sand, gravel, tripoli, novaculite, barite, and gypsum.

Barite, a product of just this past decade, has already shown dramatic gains. With an initial production of 2,500 tons in 1939,

valued at $16,000, your barite production increased by 1948 to 362,000 tons at a value of over $2,500,000. Arkansas now ranks first in barite production in the United States.

The tremendous supply of high-grade clays likewise offers great possibilities here for the ceramics, as well as other industries.

Technological developments in the petroleum industry also hold exciting challenges for Arkansas' future development. This industry, originally producing kerosene and lubricants, then gasoline, is rapidly becoming a chemical industry. It has been estimated that some 5,400 products are being currently produced from petroleum. Additional by-products are being discovered daily. Expansion of facilities along these lines will bring even higher returns to your petroleum industry.

As bankers in your individual communities, you, of course, have the information and experience to judge the particular lines of expansion which offer the greatest opportunities for sound development in your own localities. A prime consideration, of course, is that there be a market for your products. In determining market potentialities, however, you are no longer restricted by county lines or State boundaries. The expansion of air-transportation facilities here during the wartime period opened up vast new markets for your products. Your fresh fruits and vegetables, for instance, which not so long ago had to be sold in neighborhood markets or not sold at all, are now, within a matter of hours, on dining tables in far distant States due to developments of refrigeration and more rapid transportation.

Markets, fundamentally, are people with purchasing power. Within your present Southwest trading area live approximately 36,000,000 people. Moreover, within a 500-mile radius of Arkansas there are over 66,000,000 people, representing a tremendous potential marketing area. Many of your products, of course, move into every State in the Union and some go into export trade.

In evaluating your opportunities for growth, it is essential, therefore, that you be alert to business trends not only in your own State but throughout the Nation.

Today, business sentiment, on a national scale, is noticeably optimistic and new business has been on the upgrade. There is a general feeling of stability and there is a growing conviction that 1950 will prove to be one of the most profitable business years in our history.

People this year have more money to spend and invest than ever before. Personal incomes, even without the veterans' dividend, are running at an exceptionally high annual rate of over $212,000,000,000. In addition, personal savings, which represent potential purchasing power, amount to another record $200,000,000,000.

Last summer we had an impressive demonstration of the powerful influence of consumer demand—the underlying strength of our economy. Despite a downturn in production and employment, consumers showed no tendency to curtail their buying. Retail sales remained high month after month, until factories eventually were obliged to step up their production.

The continued high level of retail sales, which shows no slackening in 1950, provides a firm foundation for this year's business trend. Total retail sales so far this year, in actual unit volume, are over 6 percent higher than during the comparable period last year.

Reflecting our profitable business outlook, industry recently has engaged in a record-breaking program of capital expansion. New plants have been built, improved processes have been initiated, and new equipment has been installed to take advantage of the great technical advances of recent years.

This plant and equipment expansion is still strongly under way. In fact, new contract awards in April for prospective construction of commercial and manufacturing buildings were 66 percent higher than in the same month last year, with a gain of 22 percent for the entire first quarter. New awards in the first quarter for public-utility construction were one-fourth higher than last year. New orders for machinery and machine tools have been rising sharply since the third quarter of 1949.

The expansion of industrial capacity will provide new jobs for our growing labor force. This is currently being evidenced by a substantial upturn in employment.

Other business trends likewise lend an optimistic outlook. With our population increasing at a rate of 2,500,000 persons each year, we have an ever-growing market for our goods and services.

Also, our accumulated demand for many products, dating back to the long period of wartime shortages, is still far from being satisfied. Automobile production in May, for example, is likely to establish a new high record, yet this will be only the second month to exceed the monthly production record established 20 years ago. And we now have 30,000,000 more people to buy automobiles than we had then.

The construction industry this year is establishing new records. New home construction, as you undoubtedly know, is at the highest level in our history. Moreover, new contracts awarded for future construction of residential units continue at a spectacular pace.

Since we entered the war in 1941, the number of electric power customers has been increased by more than one-third, but we are continuing to add 2,000,000 more customers a year. The gains in this industry, I know, hold particular significance for the people of Arkansas.

All these business trends point to continued economic growth. We have every reason to expect that the firm business foundation we have built in these postwar years will be maintained. It will be maintained so long as we avoid excesses of speculation or credit expansion, which, in the past, have been the direct cause of business recessions. I am certain the bankers of the Nation will continue to accept the responsibilities that fall to them in assuring orderly credit conditions.

America looks to the future with confidence. Never before has our economy been stronger. Our opportunities for further growth are greater than ever before. We know, however, that with opportunity comes responsibility. If we continue to work together—in both domestic and international affairs—our opportunities of today will be realities tomorrow. This, I am sure, we will do. For here in Arkansas, as well as in America, we are blessed with an abundance of human resources as well as natural resources.

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY SNYDER AT MEETING OF THE LIONS, KIWANIS, ROTARIANS, AND OTHER CIVIC GROUPS, AT BLYTHEVILLE, ARK., FRIDAY, MAY 26, 1950

It's good to be back in Blytheville—to mingle with old friends, to refresh old memories, and to again enjoy your fine hospitality.

Mississippi County enjoys many distinctions in the field of agriculture. The people of the Nation know its dark, rich farm lands produce more cotton than any county in the United States; more soybeans than any area in the South. Mississippi County's undisputed dominance in the production of cotton fiber brought the world's championship cotton-picking contest to Blytheville—an annual event which attracts thousands of contestants and visitors from all over the country.

Crops of the soil have spread the fame of Mississippi County all over the world; but, in the presence of you old friends, I am more convinced than ever that the county's best crop is people. For nowhere are they finer, nowhere are they friendlier or more generous.

I am indebted to Blytheville's Lions, Rotarians, Kiwanians, and other civic organizations for the opportunity they have given me to be your guest here today.

As an honorary member for more than a quarter century of the Forrest City Rotary Club, I feel quite at home in a meeting of these combined service organizations here in Blytheville.

I have always been a strong believer in clubs and organizations such as those represented in this meeting. Your service to the town, county, State, and Nation lies not alone in the development of ideals but in placing those ideals into practice. Through your good works you have taught men and women everywhere that service—honest, helpful, cooperative service—is one of the greatest offerings of humankind. I am deeply interested in the international scope of your clubs, for I am confident that if the spirit of the Lions, Kiwanians, and Rotarians could be planted in every community throughout the world, the prospect for world peace and unity would be greatly enhanced.

Unity, the motivating force behind clubs like yours, is thoroughly American. Historically, its first demonstration came with the establishment of our political independence, and down through the years this spirit of cooperative action has sparked all of our victories and achievements. The manifestations of unity are on every hand. They take the form of parks, roads, schools, playgrounds, and recreational facilities. Better educational systems, better social conditions, better towns and communities—these are all tributes, not to the efforts of individuals, but to groups like yours working together, for man's greatest accomplishments come through cooperation with his neighbors.

A fine example of volunteer cooperative action is the savings-bonds program of the United States Treasury Department—a sales program which depends in large measure upon the efforts of a large body of men and women who are willing to give a part of their time to the service of their Government. While I should, perhaps, not engage in shop talk at this very pleasant reunion of friends, I do want to point out that this volunteer organization, active in every State, has sold the idea of thrift to millions of Americans, who now hold over $48,000,000,000 in United States savings bonds.

Some people ask what the rewards are of community service—where and how it profits the individual to give of his time and energy to public causes and programs. The answer, it has always seemed to me, is a simple one. Whenever a man contributes to the betterment of his community; contributes to the enlarged influence of his State or Nation, and makes them better places in which to live—he contributes to himself as well as to the welfare of his fellowmen.

America is but the reflex of the communities which in the aggregate constitute it. Therefore, your manifestations of civic conscience and civic interest in Blytheville are of concern to the Nation as a whole, not only for what you do among yourselves alone, but for what you inspire in others.

All of our real achievements as a Nation had their beginning at the community level, where the fundamentals of good citizenship—free discussion, cooperative effort, and individual responsibility for progress—have their greatest meaning. When you work together in the creation of a better community or a better town, the results of your efforts are not confined to local boundaries. You have also made a fine contribution to a better county, a better State, a better America.

The accomplishments we have made in this country since the close of World War II

bear testimony to the effectiveness of our system of government in the face of changing conditions. Quickly converted back to peacetime use, our industries have modernized and expanded their productive facilities and extended the benefits of the new processes and techniques of the war years to such an extent that 1939 and 1940 already seem to belong to a more distant past.

Television, air freight, frozen foods, the new plastics, new sources of electric power, tens of thousands of miles of new highways, high peacetime farm production, 3,500,000 new homes—these are but a few instances of the tremendous surge forward in the period since the war.

Personal incomes are running at a rate of well over $200,000,000,000 annually, and the total liquid savings of the American people amount to another $200,000,000,000. Industrial output is at near-record highs. Our economy is flourishing, and our financial position is sound. We are fast recovering from the effects of world conflict and have been able to share some of our well-being with less fortunate nations, who seek to restore their war-wrecked economies. We have worked and are working earnestly for a lasting peace throughout the world, while of necessity maintaining defenses against any aggression that might threaten our free institutions.

To attain our goals on both the domestic and foreign fronts, we must rely strongly on our system of free enterprise—a system which has brought us safely through every trial and emergency of the past. I have a deep and old-fashioned faith in that system, which gives me a calm and pervading faith in the future of America. I feel that we are making unusually fine progress.

In listing the assets of the Nation, I failed to enter what we all consider to be one of this country's prime holdings—the moral character and determination of its people, for it has truly been said that "a State to prosper, must be built on foundations of moral character; and this character is the principal element of its strength and the only guaranty of its permanence and prosperity."

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY SNYDER AT THE FIFTH ANNUAL CRAIGHEAD COUNTY 4-H CLUB BANQUET, JONESBORO, ARK., MONDAY, MAY 29, 1950

I am happy to join with the people of my home town in honoring these outstanding 4-H Club members—boys and girls who are making such a fine contribution to their community, their State, and Nation. My warmest congratulations are extended to the central figures at tonight's banquet—Craighead County's 4-H Club champions, Alma Jean Boley of Herman, and Virgil Griffin of Otwell; and the entire membership of the Dixie Club, whose group and individual achievements have made theirs the outstanding 4-H organization in the county. And Billy Pugh, president of the Craighead County 4-H Club Council, deserves special commendation for the able manner in which he is presiding over this meeting.

Surely no finer program has ever been devised than that being carried forward by 4-H clubs. With the encouragement and aid of such adult groups as the County Farm Bureau, 4-H develops among its members those qualities of character which are so essential for useful citizenship. They are taught how to create better homes for better living—how to conserve nature's resources for security and happiness—how to produce more abundant crops. But of equal or greater importance is that part of the 4-H program which stresses good health, the sharing of responsibility for community improvement, and the necessity for maintaining peaceful and friendly relations among the nations of the world.

Yours is the largest rural youth organization in the world today. Its membership last year was almost two million strong, and since the first 4-H Club was organized, over thirteen and a half million boys and girls have benefited by its teachings—and the Nation has been greatly strengthened through its accomplishments.

The four-leaf clover emblem, representing your motto of "head, heart, hands, and health," went along with American forces during the recent World War. In Japan, the islands of the Pacific, and western Germany, the wholesome philosophy of 4-H has taken firm hold. Requests, I am told, are coming in from far-away lands for advice in forming clubs. Typical of the spread of this work was the recent organization of a club of 55 members on the island of Saipan by a native agricultural worker, who, as a student at the University of Hawaii, had become familiar with modern farming techniques, and the aims and objectives of the 4-H organization.

Your interest in world activities is reflected in the recently inaugurated International Farm Youth Exchange project, a project which last year enabled 48 4-H Club members to go to Europe, and brought young farm people from 9 European countries to America.

I have a very deep feeling that this group of boys and girls from our Nation's farm communities constituted a most effective diplomatic mission.

As a native of Jonesboro, my pride in the boys and girls of Craighead County is understandable. But, abandoning personal interest, I can say to you in all sincerity that Arkansans are deeply grateful for the work you have done and are doing.

Back in 1927, Arkansas was named the Wonder State by action of the State legislature. But all of us are aware that the Wonder State, as we know it today, was actually created long before that date by young people like you, who lived on Arkansas farms and in Arkansas fine towns and communities.

Many of the members of my generation fell victim to the notion of the times that greater opportunity lay in the large centers of population—that the small town and farm did not hold sufficient promise for the future. So they migrated to the cities, not realizing, as do you 4-H Club members, that making two ears of corn or two stalks of cotton grow upon a spot where only one grew before, presents as great a challenge as any ordinarily encountered in business or industry or statecraft. But in the light of more mature understandings, they now realize that without the production of the farms you 4-H members represent, without your energy and enthusiasm and vision, the arteries of trade would wither, and the cities of the land would vanish.

The cooperative farm extension program in which 4-H clubs are affiliated, has been an important factor in bringing the farms of eastern Arkansas to their present fine production. County, State, and Federal governments have joined forces, here and all over the country, to help farm people with their problems—to teach them the values of conservation, crop rotation, and livestock improvement. The development of rural electrification has made electricity the servant of the farm and farm home. And a system of price supports has removed some of the elements of chance from the business of agriculture.

While the Government has lent its support to the Nation's farmers, I am convinced that the genius of the individual has been of greatest importance in achieving the marked changes that have taken place in Jonesboro, in Craighead County, and throughout our country during recent years. Government may create a favorable atmosphere for achievement—but, in the final analysis, the success of any venture is based largely upon the ingenuity of individuals—upon their ability to work harmoniously together in pursuits and causes of common interest. These characteristics—ingenuity and unity—enabled us to make our great contribution to victory in the recent war; and, when applied on an international scale, they will help us to maintain our leadership among the nations of the world.

These same characteristics have made possible Arkansas' notable advances in agriculture and industry. Its roads and schools and homes are among the Nation's finest and, after having seen a good part of the world, I am convinced there is no place under the sun I had rather call home. The primitive settler, who inspired the dialogue and music of "The Arkansas Traveler," has long since moved on. The fertility of the eroded fields of his time has been restored, and all-weather roads have replaced the rutted trails over which his oxcart passed in the long ago. A modern school occupies the site of his log cabin, and a factory has been built where the old fellow swapped yarns with passers-by.

Business and industry here have kept pace with the Nation's forward march. Arkansas has seen many changes, but the people themselves retain the friendliness and hospitality for which they have always been noted. I feel quite sure that these fine human qualities were developed long ago to the highest perfection possible, and that no device of the electronic age can improve them.

As a Nation we have made rapid strides toward full recovery from the effects of a long and costly war. Our credit structure is in a strong and healthy position. We are building as never before, and the opportunities for the future appear limitless.

Of course, there are situations that require constant watchfulness. In the international field we must exert every effort to strengthen the forces working for peace. We must maintain adequate national defenses. We must unite as never before in solving the problems which came in a war's aftermath, both at home and abroad. Above all, we of the older generation must strive constantly to make the decisions and do the things for you boys and girls—the future citizens of America—which will insure a peaceful world, a prosperous world, a world of freemen.

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY SNYDER AT THE DEDICATION OF A WAR MEMORIAL OF THE KING-BEAZLEY POST OF THE AMERICAN LEGION AT FORREST CITY, ARK., TUESDAY, MAY 30, 1950

You have accorded me a great honor by inviting me to attend these ceremonies in connection with the dedication of this beautiful war memorial, this monument you have erected to honor the brave men from St. Francis County who gave their lives in the two World Wars.

Forrest City is a second home to me, and the presence in this assembly of so many friends, made during the years I spent here, adds greatly to the pleasure of my return. The King-Beazley Post of the American Legion, which is sponsoring these ceremonies, was organized as the Forrest City Post in 1919, and I was one of its charter members.

That was in the days, as many of you will remember, when people talked of Chateau-Thierry, of Belleau Wood, of the Meuse-Argonne offensive. The first great World War had just been won by the forces of democracy, and the troops of Arkansas had returned to their homes with new garlands of victory on their battle standards.

Guadalcanal and Attu, the Normandy Beachhead and the Burma Road, Anzio, the Belgian Bulge, Okinawa and Iwo Jima had never been heard of. They were the battlefields of the future, the strong points of another world war to be stormed and conquered a quarter century later by the sons of the men who had crossed the Rhine in 1918.

As a member of the Expeditionary Forces of 1917–19, I personally know something of the bravery and spirit of the men from this

area who fought in the First World War. And the heroic deeds of Arkansas-born soldiers, sailors, and marines, who gave their strength to more recent victories of our forces on the coral beaches of the Pacific and in the hedgerows of Normandy, are still fresh in everyone's memory.

Engraved in the granite of this impressive memorial are 109 names—familiar American names like Allen, Andrews, Ferguson, Hall, Williams, and Young—all St. Francis County men who failed to return home from the great wars. Listed in this roster of heroes are the names of the two Forrest City boys for whom your Legion post has been renamed—Frank King, Jr., who gave his life in Germany; and Ralph Beazley, whose life was sacrificed in the western Carolines. These were sons of old friends of mine, Frank King and J. W. Beazley, who, with me, had no thoughts when I left Forrest City 26 years ago that we would ever be engaged in a second world conflict.

The men honored by this memorial died in defense of those ideals of justice and freedom which have made America the strongest nation in the world, her people the happiest. They bravely carried the standards of decency across wide oceans and strange continents; sacrificing life itself that our own liberties might be preserved, and in order that people everywhere might be given opportunity to enjoy a way of life which has been ours since the birth of the American Republic.

In the hearts of each of you, memory has erected an invisible monument to your war dead—this memorial of stone has been built in order that future generations may know of their heroic deeds. There is, however, a greater and more lasting monument to the heroic dead of every war in which we have engaged since the Republic was founded. It is this broad country of ours—still free, still vital, still a land of opportunity, still the leader among all the nations—a monument upon which succeeding generations may look with admiration.

Our country is working, as never before, for the causes of peace. We know that the prosperous country is not the war-torn country, but the one that devotes its energies to constructive building, to the development of its resources, to the betterment of its institutions. But until all of the nations of the earth join with us in our quest for lasting peace, we must adequately maintain our defenses, we must make sure that no aggressor nation threatens the freedoms we have purchased at such a great price.

In describing the spirit that made the American soldier the ablest fighting man in the world, the late Gen. George Patton told this impressive story:

When our troops were driving across North Africa, the General saw a Signal Corps private, oblivious of personal danger, climb a telegraph pole under direct enemy fire. Patton asked him what he was doing on the pole at a time like that. "Fixing the wire," the soldier replied. "Isn't it pretty unhealthy right now?" the officer inquired. "Yes, sir, it is," the boy answered, "but this blasted wire's gotta be fixed."

Members of the forces which today fight for permanent peace should be inspired by this story of a courageous soldier—a soldier who knew his job had to be done regardless of the dangers involved.

As we dedicate this memorial to the men who gave their lives on world battlefields, we should resolve to emulate their high courage in solving the problems which are ours to solve in this postwar period.

Unfortunately, peace is never achieved on the battlefields. The supreme sacrifice made by members of the Army, Navy, Coast Guard, Marines and Air Forces in campaigns on opposite sides of the world represented the initial and most important part of our latest struggle. Their victories made us a more confident Nation. They helped us to retain that dynamic spirit which built America as a world leader. The job must be finished by us who live.

At the close of the war, we faced a crucial economic test. Under the pressure of wartime activities, our economy had grown to unprecedented heights. Could such a high level of wartime productivity be converted into secure peacetime production? That was a question the country had to answer.

In the presence of Governor McMath and other distinguished guests from all over the State, let me say with the excusable pride of a native, that Arkansas was a leader in this Nation-wide effort to bridge the economic canyon which lay between war and peace. The people of Arkansas have undertaken to see that business and Government work together as a team—not just to maintain the gains already achieved, but to move forward in ever-greater growth. The necessities of war had awakened Arkansas to the possibilities which for a century had lain dormant in the State's fields, forests, mineral deposits and streams. With the same courage that characterized your fighting men in uniform, you accepted this great new challenge and went to work—united, as never before, in a common purpose.

The results lie on every hand—increased industrial output; new factories and new homes; expanded mine production; hundreds of miles of newly paved roads; new sources of electric power; better schools, and better towns, and more productive farms. As a single example of your enterprise, 1,500 new businesses have been added, providing nearly 30,000 new jobs, and industries are continuing to locate here at the rate of around 500 a year.

United as never before, your farmers, bankers, factory workers, and tradesmen joined together to build their own home towns—good towns like Forrest City—in the confidence that their State's strength was dependent upon the growth of individual communities. So Arkansas has not only met its problems of readjustment, but is finding ever-greater prosperity in peacetime. You have kept faith with your fallen heroes. You have done your full share toward keeping the Nation strong and vital—our best guarantee of a peaceful and prosperous future.

Never before has the American economy been stronger—never before have our opportunities for further growth been more evident. The development of our human resources has kept pace with the marked development of our natural resources. We have gone a long way during these few postwar years, but we must continue to work closely together in order that the achievements of the future may compensate for and reward the great sacrifices of the past.

We believe in democracy; we believe in freedom; we believe in peace. It is our responsibility—our very great opportunity—to prove to men and women everywhere that the American system of free entrprise, which is based on these beliefs, can accomplish more than any other system on the face of the earth.

Harry Outen Cole—An Outstanding Builder of the Panama Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 1, 1950

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, a year ago I was privileged to be the principal speaker at the fourteenth annual dinner of the Panama Canal Society, of Washington, given in special honor of one of our former colleagues in this Chamber, Hon. Maurice H. Thatcher, of Kentucky, and member of the Isthmian Canal Commission and Governor of the Canal Zone during the construction of the Panama Canal. That was a notable occasion, at which our colleagues Congressman Reed, of New York; Cannon, of Missouri; Michener, of Michigan; Thompson, of Texas; former Congressmen Smith, of Idaho; and Bradley, of California; the Ambassadors of Panama and the Dominican Republic, Lt. Gen. Robert L. Eichelberger, Maj. Gen. Sandiford Jarman, together with other distinguished men and women—some of them who served with Governor Thatcher on the Isthmus—were in attendance and joined in paying him tribute. My address then given was placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

On Saturday evening, the 27th of May, the society held its fifteenth annual dinner at the Broadmoor Hotel in Washington, and there was again a fine body of men and women in attendance, with the Army Band Orchestra to render the musical program. Mr. Edward H. Davidson, an old-timer, president, presided. Again I was a guest. Memorialization of Harry Outen Cole, recently deceased, was the feature of the dinner, and the principal address of the evening was that given by Governor Thatcher in tribute to Mr. Cole, who was one of the outstanding engineers engaged in the construction of the Canal, and in charge of the great works in the Pacific division. The address was, in every respect, a splendid effort, and, under leave accorded, it is included with my remarks, as follows:

HARRY OUTEN COLE: A EULOGY

(Address of Maurice H. Thatcher, former Governor of the Canal Zone, and former Representative in Congress, at the fifteenth annual dinner of the Panama Canal Society of Washington, D. C., on the evening of May 27, 1950)

Mr. President, distinguished guests, fellow members of the society, ladies and gentlemen, it has been written—

Where are the Friends of Yesterday? They sleep
For aye; and we who tarry Here must keep
Their Mem'ries greener than their Graves until
Our own Farewells cause other Friends to weep.

However, while this occasion is one of memorialization, we do not mean that it shall be sad or mournful. We pay tribute to one who, in his career, typified all that is best in our American life. By his own industry, diligence, perseverance, talents, integrity, and ambition he rose to the highest place in one of the Nation's most honored professions. By the best school and college preparation, and through the exercise of the indicated qualities, he climbed the arduous slopes of worthy achievement, and climbed them with such dispatch that while he was yet in robust and youthful vigor, he stood on the summit of a well-earned fame.

Nothing is more commonplace or trite than death, yet we would wish to believe it a gate rather than a wall. But whatsoever it may be, it is well that life be lived at its best for the good of all. He whose memory we commemorate this evening certainly chose the better part, and thus toiled and wrought. Our Panama Canal Society of

Washington now seeks to do him honor—and thereby to honor itself—for what he was and did. It desires to pay tribute to his memory for the worth of his life and labors; and particularly, for the splendidly effective and useful service he performed in and about the building of the Panama Canal. This society was organized by those who were his fellow-workers in that great undertaking—most of whim knew him in the construction days.

To these he was a friend and comrade; and they are especially desirous of indicating, in a just and appropriate manner, their appreciation of his Isthmian labors. They bring to this altar of memory their roses of affection and esteem. They are proud of his deeds, and are grateful that they witnessed their performance. I have been chosen to express—as best I can—these sentiments for both those of the construction era yet surviving, and those who have carried on since that time—members of the society. For the honor thus accorded me I am grateful, and only wish that I were better able to say that which I know and feel.

In the death of Harry Outen Cole, of Morgantown, W. Va., which occurred on the 13th of February 1950, another old-timer has passed into the Great Beyond. During the construction of the Panama Canal he was one of the outstanding engineers of that mighty project. From 1908 to 1914 he was engaged in the work of building the locks, dams, and other features of the Pacific Division of the Canal set-up, from 1908 to 1912 as assistant resident engineer; and from 1912 to 1914 as resident engineer of the division, succeeding the late Sydney B. Williamson in that post, and thus serving until the work of the civision was completed and the entire Canal job finished.

It was my privilege to serve as a member of the Isthmian Canal Commission and head of the Department of Civil Administration of the Canal Zone during the years 1910, 1911, 1912, and 1913. My headquarters and residence were in Ancon on the Pacific side. Throughout my Isthmian tenure I saw Harry Cole thus employed and I can bear witness to his faithful and highly efficient services. He was a civilian engineer; and, as we know, the entire Canal personnel was predominantly civilian. Skilled and widely experienced in his profession, in the full vigor of health and enthusiasm, of boundless energy, resourceful, tireless, and clear-visioned, he performed his difficult tasks in superb fashion. He achieved enduringly. Whatever he did in the building of the great interoceanic link has stood the tests of time and use; and his name is imperishably written into the history of the Canal.

Those who were employed in this work of construction—in whatsoever branch—have been known as old-timers. Their ranks have been greatly depleted by the passage of the years. Perhaps less than a half dozen of the engineers of that period yet survive; and what is true of the engineers is largely true of every other group thus participating.

A native of West Virginia, Harry Cole—as we always called him—was born near Morgantown April 3, 1874, the son of Nimrod Cole and Sara Jane (Lough) Cole. In the schools of his State he received his education, graduating from the West Virginia State University in 1898, with the degrees of B. S. and C. E., and with membership in the Phi Kappa Sigma. He was married twice: first, in 1901, to Mabel Wilson, whose death occurred in 1921, and who was survived by their one child, a daughter, Catherine, yet living, and married. His second marriage was in 1929, to Margaret Buchanan, who survives him, as does, also, his brother Otis O. Cole, who honors us with his presence this evening, and a sister. He was draftsman and designer, 1898-1904; bridge designer for several railroad companies, 1904-08; designer, assistant resident engineer, and resident engineer, Pacific Division of the Panama Canal, from 1908 to 1914, as already stated. After completing his work on the Canal he rendered important service in Chile for the Chile Exploration Co. and Braden Copper Co. developments. From 1920 to 1945 he headed, as president, the Cole Bros. Construction Co., engaged in the building of highways, bridges, and other works, chiefly in West Virginia—in which activities he was greatly interested because of his ardent desire to serve the State of his nativity. Since 1945, up to the time of his death, he considered himself in retirement, though his concern for whatever affected the Panama Canal and West Virginia was deep and abiding. Among his varied services might be mentioned his membership on the National Panel of Arbitrators and the American Arbitration Association. He was, also, a life member of the American Society of Engineers, and was accounted one of the ablest members of that important organization. In addition, he was a life member of several Masonic bodies, and had membership with the Elks, Kiwanis, and other fraternal groups.

All in all Harry Cole was one of the Nation's most eminent civil and construction engineers, and his work in the two American Continents—including that on the Isthmus of Panama—bears eloquent testimony of his skill and enterprise. Collectively, his achievements constitute an outstanding and lasting monument to his memory. He was a man of character. In addition to his eminence in his chosen field, he was possessed of the finest qualities of forthrightness, courage, sound judgment, diligence, and simplicity; and he had an undoubted capacity for friendship. He never failed to measure up to whatever came to him in the way of responsibility; and whatsoever he undertook, he accomplished with efficient promptitude. While the loyalty and affection for the Panama Canal, on the part of all its builders, have been proverbial, with him it was especially true. As regards the various important enterprises with which, in a long, full life, he had been connected, undoubtedly that of the construction of the Canal held first place in his heart of hearts. The difficult problems encountered and mastered in that work; the vast value and significance of the mightiest of all water-links, built, owned, maintained, and operated by the great country of which he was a son and citizen; and the fact that he was privileged to perform such an important role in such a vital enterprise, all united to create in him, in marketd degree, the sentiment of attachment just named.

On the Isthmus we noted his skill, his clear judgment, his ceaseless activity. Day by day we saw great projects, under his hand, grow into form and shape, and become the fruitage of the dreams which conceived them. These works stand in enduring evidence of his genius. Yet what he did so well was, in that aggregation, more or less typical. Others, in his own and other fields of Isthmian service—caught up by the same spirit of inspiration—wrought similarly in all the categories, engineering, construction, health and sanitation, and civil affairs. What a mighty team the whole constituted! And Harry Cole stood up with the highest and most capable of the lot.

And thus there was brought to a glorious consummation the dream of the centuries and the miracle of the ages: the sundering of the land to unite the seas in the veritable Passage to the Indies, so arduously—but unavailingly—sought by Columbus and the many other indomitable navigators and explorers that followed him. How fortunate it was to have been associated or identified with the stupendous task. With what pardonable pride may everyone feel who was engaged in it—especially those of our own great Nation. In the old flat arch in the city of Panama each brick or stone was indispensable; each was a key; and thus this architectural paradox has stood through the generations, a monument to the craftsmanship of Spanish builders. In like manner each person, each group, that contributed in any worth-while way to the construction of the Canal, helped to rear the watery arch from ocean to ocean, over which the commerce of the world is moving, and earned the world's gratitude thereby.

In all this I would, of course, include the Government, the officials, and the people of the Republic of Panama. Their aid and cooperation, throughout, were absolutely necessary, and most freely given; and our Panamanian friends join us in profound gratification that, in the providence of things, the Panama Canal was built and has been maintained. The interests of the two countries are identical, and we must be, and remain, friends—each striving for the common interest and in the spirit of the Golden Rule.

And in this general connection I may add that I have long hoped to see erected in the Canal Zone a memorial, collective in character, which would provide appropriate and adequate recognition and memorialization of the services of all those individuals, groups, and agencies that—directly or indirectly, and in a substantial way—contributed to the genesis and construction of the Canal, beginning with the early discoverers and navigators, and coming on down to the French effort and the finished work. In Congress I proposed such a memorial, and introduced a measure therefor, approved by two Governors of the Panama Canal, but, at the time, considerations of national economy were such as to preclude enactment. While I would not in the least subtract from the fame of the outstanding figures, I have always believed that to all those who made their contributions tangible and enduring recognition is due and that a grateful Nation should remember and memorialize all. Indeed—

There were workers great, and workers small—
As judged by rank—in the enterprise;
But glory enough there was for all,
And each was great to seeing eyes.
Let fame take care that her scroll be just,
And to give to each his meed of praise—
Else, out of the ashes and the dust,
The shade of censure shall upraise.

There is something else which might be appropriately mentioned. Although his engineering labors and accomplishments in and about the construction of the Panama Canal constituted, indeed, the crowning work of his life; yet in the current discussions of the type that should be adopted for increasing the capacity of the Canal, Harry Cole was willing to see the splendid monuments of his toil scrapped to be recreated in a single grouping of the three flight-locks on the Pacific side under what has come to be called the "Terminal Lake Plan"; and with his accustomed candor, courage, and vigor he so expressed himself by voice and pen. I mention this, not in any spirit of controversy, nor for the purpose of entering into any discussion of the issues—touching which able men may differ—involved in the so-called "Battle of the Levels," but solely with the idea of illustrating the character of the man, and his habit of rising above purely personal considerations in any matter of grave importance. In various public ways he gave currency to his opinions and conclusions. Because of his eminence as an engineer, with such outstanding Canal construction experience, his views commanded and held the attention of all informed persons interested in the subject; and especially of those in Congress who were immediately charged with any duties relative thereto, or who were especially interested in trans-Isthmian waterways. Thus, what he had to say in this connection—whether by address, statement, or publication in technical periodicals—be-

came parts of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and entered into the libraries of the Nation. There was never any doubt of the fact that in all this he was motivated by his best judgment and experience, and by patriotic impulse; and his views commanded, and will continue to command, the serious consideration of all.

Two years ago he was the principal speaker of this society at its thirteenth annual dinner, given in tribute to Sydney B. Williamson, his predecessor as resident engineer of the Pacific division, and he then spoke with his accustomed forcefulness and frankness in regard to these matters.

In all his domestic and public relationships Harry Cole's conduct was altogether praiseworthy; and he was a man of faith and reverence. The world is immeasurably better for his life; and his example, professional and private, will serve to light the way of those who, in their day, strive to walk the ways that he knew. Unfailingly he bore a torch. Of optimistic spirit and outlook, he was ever active, and in apparent health until almost the moment of his death. His widow and those of his blood have the general sympathy; and they will find comfort in the memory of what he was, and did. The Nation is made poorer by his passing, but has been greatly enriched because of his achievements.

And so it is that while we must lament the fact that he is no longer with us, we are deeply grateful that he lived, and labored as he did; and that many of us knew him as a fellow worker in the construction period, and through the years that followed, cherishing meanwhile the important friendship thus induced. We rejoice that there was given to his beloved country such a life and career; that he was spared to a mature age, serving every public and private cause of merit possible; that he was himself to the last, with his faculties unimpaired; that he lived as the "happy warrior," with life as a glorious adventure; and that when the time came for him to go, he went quietly, suddenly, and without lingering distress.

"How soon, how soon the Threads of Life are spun!
How quick the Sands of Life's lone Glass are run!
How strong the Tide that bears us out to sea!
How Much is hoped, but ah, how Little done!

Yet, when the Light shall wane within the West,
May we not count ourselves as something blest,
If, on the Whole, in justice we can say,
Our All—though Little—was, and is our Best?"

Harry Cole, too, gave the world his all; but it was by no means little, and he also gave the world his best which, indeed, was the best. His death emphasizes the value of his life, and its worth and fame will long serve to inspire those who come after him. If the mortal span were not comparatively short, and if men and women did not have to work under the pressure of necessity, their achievements would, in all probability, be far less than they now are. Whether we are able to recognize it or not, there must be an overruling logic in what we call life and death, and we must strive to be comforted by this consideration. All was well with Harry Cole here, let us have faith to believe that all is well with him there, and that what he did so well here will, in some way, serve him there. His memory will surely be kept vital by his old associates, and by his friends generally, until they follow him; and so long as there shall be a Panama Canal, or any history of it extant, so long will the splendid story of his deeds endure.

Stockpiling and Mineral Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 1, 1950

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, it should be one of the current obligations of our Government to see to it that we have a healthy and commanding metal mining industry ready at all times to take care of our needs whether our Nation is engaged in peaceful pursuit or armed conflict activities. This can be done without an excessive drain upon our Federal Treasury. It can be done by private industry with very little governmental interference, providing it is afforded some protection from unfair competition with slave-produced metals from foreign countries.

In my opinion, it is not to the credit of our National Government or those connected with it that our metal mining industry finds itself in the sickened condition which exists today. Neither is it to the credit of those in administrative authority that the Buy American Act has been bypassed as it has in relation to the stockpiling program. It is my thought that the situation, as it currently exists, is very clearly shown by an address of Robert S. Palmer, executive director of the Colorado Mining Association, made before the Mountain States Association at Boise, Idaho, on May 22, 1950. In his talk on stockpiling and mineral security, Mr. Palmer pointedly shows that there is an immediate necessity of aid to our domestic mining industry. I am pleased to print his remarks in the Appendix, under the permission which you have heretofore given me. They follow:

STOCKPILING AND MINERAL SECURITY

(Address of Robert S. Palmer, executive director, Colorado Mining Association, before the Mountain States Association, Boise, Idaho, May 22, 1950)

Congress recognized the importance of minerals to our well-being in times of peace and to our safety and security in times of emergency by enacting Public Law 520, approved by the President on July 23, 1946. The act is cited as the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act but is generally referred to as the Stock Piling Act.

The policy of Congress was clearly set out in the first section as follows: "It is the policy of the Congress and the purpose and intent of this act to provide for the acquisition and retention of stocks of these materials and to encourage the conservation and development of sources of these materials within the United States, and thereby decrease and prevent wherever possible a dangerous and costly dependence of the United States upon foreign nations for supplies of these materials in times of national emergency."

The statute provides that the Secretaries of War, Navy, and Interior, acting jointly through the Munitions Board, shall determine the quality and quantity of materials to be stockpiled. Provision is made in section 3 of the act for purchase at the direction of the Munitions Board by the Procurement Division of the Treasury and for storage, refining, rotating and under certain circumstances disposal. Section 7 provides that the Secretary of the Interior, through the Director of the Bureau of Mines and the Director of the Geological Survey, "is hereby authorized and directed to make scientific, technologic, and economic investigations concerning the extent and mode of occurrence, the development, mining, preparation, treatment, and utilization of ores and other mineral substances found in the United States or its Territories * * * which are essential to the common defense or the industrial needs of the United States, and the quantities or grades of which are inadequate from known domestic sources, in order to determine and develop domestic sources of supply, to devise new methods for the treatment and utilization of lower-grade reserves, and to develop substitutes for such essential ores and mineral products; on public lands and on privately owned lands, with the consent of the owner, to explore and demonstrate the extent and quality of deposits of such minerals, including core drilling, trenching, test pitting, shaft sinking, drifting, crosscutting, sampling, and metallurgical investigations and tests as may be necessary to determine the extent and quality of such deposits, the most suitable methods of mining and beneficiating them, and the cost at which the minerals or metals may be produced.

In addition to the Stock Piling Act, there are two other statutes which affect the organization for stock piling. Under the provision of the National Security Act of 1947, as amended, the Munitions Board became the successor to the Army and Navy Munitions Board. The act also created the National Security Resources Board, which was made responsible for advising the President concerning policies for establishing adequate reserves of strategic and critical materials, and for the conservation of these reserves. Under the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, the affairs of the Bureau of Federal Supply were transferred to the General Services Administration and the Federal Supply Service of that Administration succeeded to the function of the Procurement Division (later the Bureau of Federal Supply) of the Treasury Department.

In addition to the basic stockpiling acts and the organization authorizations, there are a variety of arrangements providing for the purchase of materials under the Economic Cooperation Administration Act of 1948. This act, as amended, provides for assistance to European countries, and in section 115b5 provides that in consideration for such assistance participating countries are to facilitate the transfer to the United States of materials in actual or potential deficiency in this country. Subsection 115b9 provides for access to such materials by United States nationals. Section 117 of the ECA Act provides for promotion by the Administrator of an increase in production of materials in which the United States is deficient. In section 8d of the amendments to the ECA Act of 1948, approved April 19, 1949, provision is made for allocation of not less than 5 percent of the special local currency accounts for the purchase of strategic and critical materials and for local administrative expenses of the United States in the participating country. Further provision is made for the Administrator to initiate programs and aid where appropriate services to obtain or stimulate increased production of materials are needed in the United States. The administrator is also authorized, with the approval of the Director of the Federal Supply Service, to enter into long-term contracts (not to exceed 20 years) for the purchase of strategic and critical materials for the stockpile.

There are several additional statutes relating to the methods of obtaining materials

for the stockpile. Section 204e of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 provides that the administration may accept strategic and critical materials in lieu of cash to cover the proceeds of lease or sale of surplus property. Such strategic and critical materials may then be transferred to the stockpile. Two additional statutes relate to the use of surplus agricultural commodities. For example, the Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized under an act approved June 7, 1949, to accept strategic and critical materials produced abroad in exchange for surplus agricultural commodities in its possession. This statute provides, however, that the Munitions Board retains the right to determine the quality and quantity of such materials and provision is made for reimbursing the Commodity Credit Corporation from stockpile appropriations at the market value of such materials.

This detailed account of the legal authority for the stockpiling program should be understood before we can grasp the full significance of policies of our Government relating thereto, and the conflict engendered by the philosophy of those in and out of Government who have come to the conclusion that we in the United States have so exhausted our mineral reserves that we should depend upon foreign production largely in building up our national stockpile.

Strategic and critical materials, as applied to stockpiling, have been defined as "materials whose procurement in adequate quantity, quality, or time is uncertain during war. The uncertainty may be due to lack of sufficient domestic or other dependable sources of the raw material, lack of production facilities and equipment, inadequate transportation, poor distribution of supply, lack of skilled manpower, and lack of electric power. * * * Materials become strategic and critical because they are required in a war economy to such an extent that the need exceeds the supply."

The classification of what is a strategic or critical material may change, as witnessed during World War II, much to the distress of the civilian population of the United States which was denied many of the metal necessities required to carry on ordinary living according to American standards.

The amounts of money expended for stockpiling seems to be somewhat of a secret, but the best information obtainable indicates that up until the present appropriation which has been approved by the House of Representatives, there has been appropriated $1,065,000,000 plus 470 million for contract authorizations. When considering such huge expenditures it is a bit startling until it is realized that approximately $42,000,000,000 have been made available for foreign aid.

What effect has this program had on the domestic mining industry and the development of domestic sources of supply of these essential materials? Using a recent study of the condition of the small mines the picture is not good, for 73 percent of the lead, zinc, copper, silver, and gold mines in the 11 Western States have closed since 1940. In that year there were 8,246 producing metal mines in the Western States while only 2,244 were recorded in 1948. The percentage of closures on a percentage basis since 1940 is as follows: California 77 percent, Colorado 83 percent, Arizona 69 percent, Montana 71 percent, Idaho 71 percent, Nevada 62 percent, Oregon 92 percent, New Mexico 73 percent, Washington 82 percent, Utah 43 percent, and Wyoming 75 percent. As the present Director of the Bureau of Mines said recently in St. Louis, "The domestic mining industry is a sick industry. The price of (mine) products is not keeping pace with increasing costs of metal production and increasing costs of exploration." He also said, "It has become obvious to all but the most blind that our reserves have not been developed at the desired rate. The need for encouraging exploration must become more fully recognized."

Similar testimony depicting the deplorable condition of the domestic mining industry was presented to the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the House Committee on Public Lands at extensive hearings. A cost study of mining in the Rocky Mountain region further revealed that the mining industry's main cost is labor and that the grade of ore is falling off. To illustrate: In 1939 the average zinc-lead content per ton of ore was 16 percent, but dropped to 10 percent in 1948. While the metal content of the average grade ore was receding labor costs were mounting to the extent that the costs for mining were increased 2.9 times or practically 3 times those of 1939. The studies further showed that the labor cost alone for metal in the Western States was 8.7 cents per pound, or 4.6 times the 1939 mining cost per pound of contained metal. Today the labor cost is estimated at 70 percent in our area of the total operating cost per ton mined. This is greater than that of any other industry and does not include the labor costs of producing finished metal products.

The causes of these increased labor costs are well known to most thinking Americans. Perhaps they can be attributed largely to actions of our Government. Social advances have proven an expensive item. In addition, innumerable taxes have been heaped upon the industry and have become so burdensome that in many cases mines have been forced to close, and in others development and exploration programs have been given up as too expensive. All of this bears directly upon the national safety and security of our Nation, for without a healthy, active, going mining industry we can have no security in this country nor can we maintain a sound economy.

While these burdens were being heaped upon the American producers by our Government, we find that liberal aid and assistance was being extended abroad. In using the word "assistance," this is the term used in Washington when speaking of financial contributions to foreigners or foreign governments; but when similar aid with reference to the domestic mining industry is proposed, those who are primarily interested in developing foreign sources of materials with cheap labor and direct financial aid are prone to yell "subsidy." Possibly they do this because they have portrayed the word "subsidy" in such a way to make it most objectionable to the average American citizen.

Aid extended to the socialistic government of England or the communistic government of Yugoslavia is sanctioned but aid to the domestic mining industry is called "socialistic." Witness the most recent release from the Economic Cooperation Administration, dated May 2, 1950, as follows:

"A new search for copper, manganese, lead and zinc now is being conducted in the desert and mountains of Algeria with the aid of Marshall-plan dollars" (United States taxpayers' dollars). "Thus far French geological crews, working under the supervision of the Algerian Mineral Research Bureau, have been furnished about $1,140,000 worth of American equipment. In addition about $2,604,000 worth of Marshall-plan equipment is helping to modernize existing Algerian mines. Algeria's major lead mine is being converted from an underground system of mining to an open-pit operation. Other mining programs (and I am quoting from the report), including electrification and road building, are being financed with the equivalent of $2,625,000 in counterpart funds—francs deposited by the French Government to match ECA direct dollar aid."

A similar program for domestic mines is still pending before the Congress of the United States, although the Eightieth Congress did enact such legislation designed to encourage domestic exploration and development only to have the bill vetoed by the President.

Perhaps the additional influx of lead from Algeria into our markets will add to the difficulties now being experienced even by the low-cost high-grade integrated lead-mining companies of this Nation. A Lead Committee has presented a petition to the Tariff Commission asking tariff relief under the escape clause of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements. In its petition this group alleges: "That the lead-mining industry is threatened with and has already suffered serious injury from an unprecedented peacetime flood of lead from Mexico, Canada, Australia, Peru, Germany, Yugoslavia, and elsewhere." You will note that Algeria is not mentioned in this list. The petition continues: "The main reason for the extraordinary volume of lead imports to the United States has been the low tariff on lead ore and metals and the unforeseen currency devaluation by Mexico in 1948 and by Great Britain and other countries in September of 1949. Imports have multiplied sixfold compared with the prewar record and have grown to the point that imports are equivalent to or above the domestic mine production in volume."

The lead committee states further that "the lead industry does not believe it is in the best interest of the country to be overwhelmed. Unemployment is increasing in the lead mines and numerous properties have already closed down. Part of the competition objected to comes from lead diverting from Europe to the United States by communistic Yugoslavia, where labor conditions are utterly different from what they are in this country." The petition continues: "It is imperative for the mining industry to seek the restoration of traditional reasonable tariff protection under which the lead-mining industry of the United States has maintained world supremacy." It recommends an upward revision of the tariff on lead in ores and concentrates from the present rate of three-fourths of a cent to 2¼ cents and an upward revision of the tariff on lead in bullion and metal from the current 1.06 cents to 3$\frac{3}{16}$ cents. The 1930 rates on lead ores were 1½ cents, and on metal 2⅛ cents. These were cut 50 percent by the Mexican Trade Agreement, with the proviso that they should be restored to 1.2 cents per pound on lead in concentrates and 1.7 cents per pound on metal 30 days after the termination of the unlimited national emergency. Unfortunately, the unlimited national emergency has not terminated.

An examination of this brief shows that in 1932 the tariff protection provided per pound of lead in ores of 47.2 percent; that the tariff protection in 1950 on the same item was only 6.8 percent. It should be kept in mind that not only have tariffs on metals been severely cut but the United States is at present operating in a comparable inflationary economy while other countries importing this metal to our shores have devalued their currencies to such an extent that it is very doubtful whether the increased tariff recommended by this distinguished group of gentlemen would produce the desired results. In passing it should be noted that the devaluation of the pound not only nullified modest tariff protection but provided an additional bonus or subsidy of 2.26 cents a pound to the Australian lead producer. The committee evidently feels that this is not a fair competitive development and urges immediate tariff relief.

The zinc situation is not quite the same, for although under the Tariff Act of 1930

the tariff was 1½ cents a pound on zinc bearing ores and 1¾ cents on zinc slabs, it was cut to ¾ cent a pound in the Geneva agreement of January 1, 1948, on the first item and to 0.87½ cent a pound on the second. The supply of zinc concentrates is short in the United States today and there seems to be a world-wide shortage of this metal which, among other uses, is combined with copper in the making of brass. Perhaps you have forgotten but many soldiers who used the substitute of steel cases for cartridges when zinc and copper became so short during World War II have not forgotten how important it is to maintain a dependable supply of these metals for the use of our armed services.

Other suggested relief measures include tax concessions, which of course are desired by the mining industry. The repeal of the Securities and Exchange Acts have also been advocated; but the more practical people in the mining business—largely those who are not drawing salaries unless their mines are actually operating and producing metals profitably—have come to the conclusion that something has to be done to save our domestic mining industry—but quick. These mining people by the hundreds, together with their employees in the mines of America, have joined forces in support of S. 2105, commonly known as the O'Mahoney bill. This measure passed the Senate of the United States and died in the House on March 16, 1950, for lack of 22 votes. Among those who opposed the passage of the measure in the House was a group of Congressmen who felt that the Stockpiling Act as referred to earlier in our discussion should be applied in such a way as to bring about the desired result, which all agree should be a healthy, active going mining industry. Some of these men were sincere in their views and they have shown their sincerity by requesting the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives to appoint a subcommittee for the purpose of studying the serious problem.

In a communication dated March 21 of this year between this committee and the Munitions Board, it is stated that on March 16 of this year a debate took place in the House of Representatives which related in many important respects to the national defense; that the committee is extremely disturbed by the information brought out in the debate on S. 2105; that the bill was defeated by a vote of 166 to 144; that the legislation was directly pertinent to the Stockpiling Act, and that similar legislation has been coming before Congress since the passage of the Stockpiling Act; that each time the legislation has been defeated by the narrowest of margins. The committee stated further that it is convinced that the Stockpiling Acts contain ample authority to accomplish the National Defense purposes of S. 2105; that the debate brought out that it is the policy not to implement the stockpiling authority in accord with the intent of the law; that if this is correct there is evident need for corrective legislation. Further the committee stated that it would sponsor such legislation unless remedial action is indicated. Additional information is contained in the letter which serves no purpose here except that it points out that one of the objectives was the conservation of strategic and critical materials whenever and wherever possible through the exploration, development, and production of such materials in this country. According to the committee any other course of action is ridiculous from a national defense viewpoint.

The committee also stated that it is compelled to the conclusion from the March 16 debate on S. 2105 that a serious situation has been permitted to develop in the domestic mining industry through intentional failure to carry out the expressed intent of the stockpiling acts.

In answer to this letter the committee received a letter which evidently enjoyed the approval of the administrative agencies. In this it was stated that the Government's efforts to assure sources of materials in the interest of national security are larger than the stockpiling program; that officially in commenting on S. 2105 the Munitions Board on behalf of the Department of Defense had stated:

"It is the position of the Department of Defense that any reasonable measure designed to support a strong productive and efficient mining industry is in the interest of national security. The Department of Defense has, however, consistently stated that any program designed to provide such support should remain entirely distinct from the program of stockpiling for national-security purposes. Under no circumstances should the separate objectives of the two programs become confused in the process of developing legislation supporting the mining industry."

Further, "There is nothing in the statute nor in its history which indicates that there is any intent or that it is the policy of Congress to encourage subsidization of high cost production." Here let it be noted that no such interpretation was made of the foreign-aid program, and yet in the interpretation of the Stockpiling Act it is quite apparent that those in our Government are determined that we shall not subsidize the domestic mining industry in like manner to the aid being extended to foreign producers: The letter continues:

"We are aware of no means by which the application of the Buy American Act to stockpile purchases can accomplish the purposes of S. 2105. This bill, as we understand it, was offered as a means to stimulate private exploration and development of domestic mines and to preserve marginal minerals producing capacity by making payments to mine owners to help them keep their mines pumped out and properly timbered when not in production. There have been repeated suggestions that the Stockpiling Act be employed to carry out these purposes, but we have not felt either authorized or justified in taking any such action."

Further, the official position of the defense agencies and of the administration, as stated in the official letter to the Armed Services Committee, shows that that group favors "any reasonable action to preserve domestic minerals-producing capacity in an operable or stand-by condition, even if its production is not now required for the stockpile or able to compete on the open market. * * * That it is clearly in the interest of the national security to preserve production capacity of strategic and critical materials that would be available to this country in time of a war emergency. It is a matter of significance to the national security. A strong, productive, and efficient domestic mining industry contributes importantly to the national security."

Congress intended the Stockpiling Act be used as an aid to the domestic mining industry, but a directive of the Executive has so tied the hands of stockpile authorities that there is little likelihood that the domestic mining industry will ever receive the aid which it needs from that statute. True, several contracts have been made with domestic producers but they are not of much help to the vast majority of mines which are experiencing the rashes of distress imposed upon them by a government which only this week has appropriated three billion one hundred and twenty-one million additional American dollars for foreign aid—$35,000,000 of this to be used for backward nations and a certain portion for guaranteeing investments in foreign countries.

A statesman once said, "Never attempt the impossible nor oppose the inevitable." Perhaps tariff relief can be obtained under the present administration but realistic students of the subject are not convinced that such a program is possible. Perhaps tax relief can eventually be secured for the mining industry but this also may take time. The only possible aid which can be secured before the adjournment of the present session of Congress is, in the judgment of those closest to the problem, the passage of H. R. 8221, which is in fact the O'Mahoney bill revised in the House so as to eliminate the Board and place the administration directly in the hands of the Secretary of the Interior. The appropriation has been cut in half and other minor amendments have been made, but in substance this is the same measure which has had the support of the rank and file of the mining industry of the United States.

Those of us who have worked diligently to aid and assist the mining industry appeal to you who represent numerous lines of business to join with us in strengthening the mining industry of the United States, with the idea in mind that by so doing you will be securing your own safety and the safety and security of our Nation. There are many battle crys being used in an effort to pass legislation during this day and age of changing conditions, but at no time in the history of this Nation has there been a more vital question before the Congress of the United States. Let us hope and pray that those charged with the responsibility of acting will do so now before it is too late. If we can't have a bipartisan foreign policy let us hope that we can at least develop a bipartisan domestic mineral policy.

Memorial Day, 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1950

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the residents of Altoona, Pa., in cooperation with the various veterans' organizations and patriotic groups, conducted the annual Memorial Day program at Fairview Cemetery on May 30.

It was my privilege to deliver the following Memorial Day address:

This is a day of prayer and reflection—prayer for those in whose honor we observe this Memorial Day and for the loved ones they left behind; reflection upon the noble principles for which they gave their all and upon the manner in which we cherish and safeguard those principles.

Memorial Day symbolizes the spirit of the American people—the will of a great, free, and enlightened nation to pay proper tribute to its honored dead. Today, from a myriad of flagpoles, Old Glory flutters at half staff as a moving reminder that, busy though we are, we still are willing to pause and remember the sacrifices of the heroes in whose honor we are gathered here.

Yet, free as we are, enlightened as we are, we are divided in our allegiance to the freedoms and the blessings for which these heroes died. While we and untold thousands of other Americans are reaffirming our fervent hope for an end to the anguish and the horror of war, others among us, cringing with fear of another conflict, are beseeching us to lay our precious heritage of freedom upon the altar of "peace at any price."

What more appropriate time than on Memorial Day to consider certain dangers which threaten our country today?

It is the day when we look back and review the causes in which our departed comrades died. By the same token, it can and should be a day for looking ahead in appraisal of the forces which seek to destroy us and make a mockery of the noble principles for which those honored dead gave their full measure of devotion.

Every thoughtful American is deeply concerned over a growing movement that has as its ultimate objective the destruction of the United States as a free, independent Nation, and the abject surrender of our national sovereignty to a visionary and untried system of world government.

Such a proposal is embodied in several resolutions now before the Congress of the United States. It has the backing of a number of groups, and each has advanced its own ideas of the form such a world federation should take.

But basically, they are the same. They have a common objective—unconditional surrender by this country of its powers and prerogatives as a free and independent Nation.

It is common knowledge that servitude cannot buy peace and freedom. No truer words have been spoken than those of Patrick Henry when he voiced his immortal query: "Is life so dear or peace so sweet as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery?"

There is no longer room in this country for extreme nationalism. Never again can we withdraw behind our two oceans with a sense of security from attack from any quarter.

Likewise, there is no place in America for the other extreme—the super-state idea with its dream of peace through surrender, its false assumption that nations with diverse interests, different languages, and varying standards of living, can be welded into a federation of states comparable to the American Republic.

The world state idea is not new. As early as the fourth century before Christ, Plato dreamed of a world republic. Plato's effort to bring peoples together in such a union failed, and that failure set the pattern for subsequent unsuccessful attempts.

Perhaps the nearest approach to a successful world federation was the Roman Empire, that is, if one may use the word "successful" in describing a union that was held together by sheer force of arms. This "superstate" lasted for 500 years, its unity maintained largely because of the might of the Roman legions.

Napoleon dreamed of a world empire or world state. He, like Alexander the Great, sighed for more worlds to conquer, but he found that conquest alone could not unify peoples of divergent interests, conflicting religious beliefs, and differing ideas of the fundamental principles of government.

Sir Thomas More got nowhere with his utopia of the sixteenth century. Francis Bacon found no takers for his "New Atlantis" in the sixteen hundreds. The German philosopher, Immanuel Kant; the French novelist, Anatole France, and an English philosopher, James Harrington, all failed in their proposals to set up world government, as did one William Ladd with his international solution in the eighteen thirties.

Within our own generation, we have seen the collapse of two "superstate" attempts—those of Kaiser Wilhelm and Adolf Hitler.

It is noteworthy that, in modern times, efforts to form world federations have inevitably brought war. The unification of Germany led to domination of the whole by Prussia, and brought on two wars—the Franco-Prussian War of 1870, and the First World War in 1914.

Attempted unification of Italy led to dreams of revival of the old Roman Empire. The rise of fascism, then war, were the inevitable results. When the Yugo-Slav federation was formed, with a union of Serbs, Croats, Montenegrans, and Hungarians, unity was lacking, and minorities looked to Germany, which even then was preparing for the war which came in 1939.

A distinguished American, Warren R. Austin, one of the United States representatives at the United Nations, has described any attempt to create a world government as "a stepping stone into a cloud-cuckoo land of mutually inconsistent possibilities," and he added that he does not believe that world government "is feasible in the foreseeable future."

Our own State Department is of like mind. Testifying recently on a world government resolution introduced in Congress by Senators TOBEY, of New Hampshire, SPARKMAN, of Alabama and KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, Assistant Secretary of State John D. Hickerson has this to say:

"We recognize that the growth of a world community requires the existence of an impressive beacon which reflects the aspirations of the world's peoples. We recognize the importance of working through the standards which have been set forth in the Charter of the United Nations.

"We recognize the concern of the American people and their desire to review under present world conditions what we undertook to accomplish in creating the United Nations. We also recognize that organizational form can contribute to clarifying public understanding of what they do and do not want to accomplish through international organization.

"But for the reasons given we cannot support this resolution."

He stated further that "We cannot afford to risk jeopardizing or losing what we have without some real assurance that we are getting something better in its place."

Proponents of world government schemes have carefully avoided answering two vital questions concerning their proposals. One has to do with the Soviet Union. They advance their ideas of world government as the most logical means of stopping the armament race among nations of the world. But, in the same breath, they admit there is little likelihood that Russia would join a world federation now or in the foreseeable future.

Can we assume for one moment that a world federation with Russia on the outside would put an end to the building up of armed strength? Would the Soviet Union halt, or even slacken, its armament program while the proposed federation went ahead with the building of a world army, navy, and air force?

On the other hand, should the Soviet Union and its satellite countries join the federation, would not Russia and its puppet states be in position to exercise a majority vote in the world government?

Available figures clearly indicate that such would be the case.

Were the government to function on a popular representation basis, Russia, China, and the Soviet satellites in Europe would have a total of 750 votes, while the peoples of the North Atlantic Pact nations, and the peoples of South America could muster no more than 500.

Even with a smaller differential, we could not for one moment assume that the United States, in most cases, could win the support of all the non-Communist nations within the federation.

The other question which the world federalists have left unanswered is that of immigration. Under any system of world government worthy of the name, there would have to be freedom of movement among all its citizens—just as we in this country are free to go from one State to another without restriction or regulation.

This could mean only one thing: That the gates of the United States would be thrown open. With its high standards of living, its high wages, its unlimited industrial opportunities, the United States would be a magnet that would attract teeming hordes of the underprivileged from other countries.

The result would be an unprecedented burden upon the labor market and upon the economic machinery of this Nation. Could the United States, by any stretch of the imagination, expect to gain the support of a world congress in erecting barriers against such an invasion?

Upon this day of prayer and reflection, upon this day when we pause to honor those who have died in the cause of freedom, I beseech the American people to heed this warning of imminent peril. I beg them to recall the words of Abraham Lincoln, who said, "You cannot strengthen the weak by weakening the strong." I plead with all true Americans to join a crusade against the spread of the plague of world federalism.

George Washington, in his infinite wisdom, told us that "There can be no greater error than to expect or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation. It is an illusion which experience must cure, which a just pride ought to discard."

Let us, on this Memorial Day, rededicate ourselves to the noble causes in which these our comrades died. Let us fortify ourselves to resist the evil schemes that would tear down the structure we have reared in the blood of these heroes.

Peace we must have if we are to survive. But it must be peace with honor. Let us here, beside the resting places of our honored dead, resolve to give our best—all that is in us—in the cause they espoused. More we cannot give. To give less would bring dishonor upon them.

Jefferson-Jackson Day Dinner Address by the Vice President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM CONNALLY
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 2 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner address delivered by the presiding officer of the Senate, the Honorable ALBEN W. BARKLEY, Vice President of the United States, at Austin, Tex., on May 27, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am greatly complimented by the invitation to come to Texas at this time to participate in the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner. I am greatly complimented by the great crowd which has assembled here in the name of democracy's two earliest heroes—Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson.

I am happy to be here because the Democratic Party today is still true, and has always been true, to the fundamental principles laid down by Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson in the establishment and fortification of the democratic ideals in the Government of the United States.

I am happy to be a member of the Democratic Party, not alone because of its origin, not alone because it is the only continuous, uninterrupted political organization in the history of America, but because of the unexampled record which it has made, and is

making, in applying democratic principles and ideals to the solution of the people's problems.

The Democratic Party has written into the statutes of this Nation a greater record of progressive legislation than all other political parties combined. It is, and has been, the only real progressive political organization in the history of the Nation. Most of the legislation which the growing complexity of our economic and social life has made necessary was enacted under Democratic leadership. The first rural mail route in America, and the first act to regulate commerce, were brought about under Grover Cleveland, the first Democratic President since the War Between the States. The initial steps toward the reformation of our civil-service system were taken by him.

Following the stalemate and deadlocks during 12 years of Republican administrations following Mr. Cleveland, the Democratic Party produced another great leader, during whose administration more recognition was given to the current needs of an enlightened legislative program than in any previous period.

It was under Woodrow Wilson that the first act granting Federal aid in the construction of highways was authorized. It was under Woodrow Wilson that a workable farm credit system was set up. Of course, it ceased to function under the Hoover administration because of the lack of confidence of the people in that administration and in its method of dealing with the tragic problems of the people. But after that it was revived again and is and has been a serviceable agency of the Government in behalf of agriculture.

It was under Woodrow Wilson that the Federal Trade Commission was set up, offering a forum for honest business to seek redress against monopolistic practices. It was under his administration that the Clayton antitrust law was enacted, modernizing the machinery against monopolistic practices, and giving to labor and agriculture a charter under which they might form associations for their advancement and protection.

It was under Woodrow Wilson that the great Federal Reserve System was established, which has given us the soundest and the best banking system in the history of this country, or of the world. It was under the Wilson administration that the policy of dollar diplomacy began to give way to an era of friendship among the republics of the Western Hemisphere. It was under Woodrow Wilson that a new freedom was set before the American people as a worthy goal of government and its relationships with them.

World War I interfered with this great progressive legislative program for dealing with our domestic economy, and concentrated all our efforts in the world's greatest struggle for democracy up to that time.

Then came Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover, which was characterized in the beginning by the great era of public corruption in the Nation, and in its ending by the greatest depression and debacle in the history of the Nation. As has always happened, the people turned again to the Democratic Party for leadership. It turned to the great Democratic leader, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, and elected him by an overwhelming majority.

No President ever faced a more tragic situation. No President was ever called on suddenly to infuse new confidence into the people. He did this by a series of bold, dramatic demonstrations in support of Jefferson's belief and his lifelong policy that the Government should be the servant of the people and not their master. Roosevelt made the Government the servant of the people in every field of human activity, whether of labor, industry, agriculture, or international trade. He revived the waning confidence of the people in government itself.

The long list of legislative enactments to make our Government and its people more responsive and responsible to the growing need of the modern day in which we live cannot be matched by any previous record in the history of the Nation.

Farm legislation, seeking to put agriculture on an economic basis equal to industry, was enacted, which included not only an Agricultural Adjustment Act but soil conservation, rural electrification, farm supports, research into the discovery or greater markets and greater uses for agricultural products. This was linked with flood control to protect our river valleys from recurring and devastating floods, which each year destroy more property than it would cost to protect the people permanently against these disasters.

A Fair Labor Relations Act, giving equality to employer and employee, was enacted. Minimum wages and maximum hours were provided for labor.

A reciprocal trade program, which has expanded our trade with the nations of the world, was inaugurated, and has been continued over the opposition of the antiquated Republican idea of unscalable tariff walls.

A social-security system was initiated, providing old-age pensions, old-age assistance, and unemployment compensation, and recognizing the duty of society to those who have spent their lives in its service. This system is now on the verge of further expansion and greater benefits.

These are only a few of the great measures which the Democratic Party, under its leadership for more than three-quarters of a century, has brought to the American people. I challenge any other political organization, past or present, to show such a record.

World War II came to interfere with and retard this great domestic program of rehabilitation. But, in spite of World War II, with all its tragedies and expenditures, we are still the most prosperous and most happy and most democratic Nation under the shining sun.

This great record of progressive legislation and administration has been continued by President Harry S. Truman, who is carrying on the burden of government in the tradition of Jefferson, Jackson, Cleveland, Wilson, and Roosevelt.

We are seeking to make democracy more democratic, government more responsive, and the people more conscious of their obligation to government, no less than its obligation to them.

Many of these measures to which I have referred, from Grover Cleveland to Harry S. Truman, were objected to and opposed on the ground that they were paternalistic, or that they invaded the field of private enterprise. But, we know that great national problems can only be solved through the cooperation of the people and their government. It is of no value to call measures for the benefit of the people either paternalistic or socialistic. Jefferson was called a visionary and a demagog because he advocated equality of the people, because he advocated the public education of the children by the State, and established a great university as the capstone of that system.

Jackson was called a dictator because he used the rough and ready powers of his personality and his office to destroy institutions that were gnawing at the vitals of democracy. It was Cleveland who said that "Public office is a public trust, and not a private snap."

They accused Woodrow Wilson of being a scholar in politics and a visionary dreamer, but his dreams came true in the realization of a magnificent program that benefited all classes of our people, regardless of their occupation.

They applied epithets to Franklin D. Roosevelt and they have applied them to President Truman. But we do not believe in government by epithet. We do not believe in government by slogan alone. A little segment of the reactionary Republican leaders has issued a slogan for the 1950 congressional elections, "Liberty versus socialism."

But the American people are no more frightened by epithets than are the leaders of the Democratic Party. The American people are not beguiled by euphonious slogans. They are not beguiled by empty promises and empty phrases, because of the bankruptcy and intellectual sterility of those who lead the opposition. The record of the Democratic Party is its slogan. It hurls no epithets at its opponents. It invites them to an enlightened consideration of the day in which we live, and an enlightened solution of the complex problems which face not only our people, but face the world.

In the midst of this great record in behalf of our domestic prosperity and happiness, we have been required, in one generation, to fight two World Wars to preserve democracy, liberty, and free institutions. Peace has not yet settled upon the world, and because of this, we have been required to undergo additional sacrifices in the way of aid to the freedom-loving peoples, in order that they may bolster their own courage and their own institutions against communistic invasion and economic chaos. We have been compelled to maintain a peacetime armed force greater than ever before, and greater than any of us anticipated at the conclusion of World War II.

While these burdens are heavy, we have enjoyed a prosperity which is unequaled in any period in our history. Republican mouthpieces claim we are on the road to bankruptcy and we are on the last mile toward the police state. No nation is on its road to bankruptcy whose people enjoy a national income of $220,000,000,000 per year. No nation is on its way to bankruptcy which, in 1 year, produced $250,000,000,000 worth of goods and services, for which it finds a ready market. No nation is on its way to bankruptcy which has more than $100,000,000,000 of savings, which it has accumulated since the dark days of the late 1920's and early 1930's. No nation is on its way to bankruptcy which is able to guarantee the deposits of the people in its banks without crippling the soundness of its economy. No nation is on its way to bankruptcy which finds 60,000,000 people employed at higher wages than ever before. No nation is on its way to bankruptcy into whose hands the leadership of the world has been thrust, and which is seeking and is able to carry the torch which is essential to light up the dark places of economic and political realities, so as to make our own democracy and our own institutions safe, and prevent our having to become an armed camp to protect ourselves against the godless and ruthless ideology which seeks to engulf the world.

These are the things that make Democrats proud. We may have some individual differences over issues that are vital, or seem vital to many groups of our people, but, in spite of these, we are more completely united than any political party that offers us opposition. This grows out of the fact that we look forward, instead of backward. We are not like the South American bird that flies backward and never knows where it is going, but only where it has been.

I congratulate the democracy of Texas upon its outstanding delegation in the Senate and House of Representatives, not only now but in the days that are gone. I am happy in the company of my old friends and fellow workers for a generation, Speaker SAM RAYBURN, Senator TOM CONNALLY, and a new and able Senator, LYNDON JOHNSON. Through the years I have served in both Houses with many of the outstanding statesmen of Texas, and I have received inspiration from their courage and their forward looking viewpoint in dealing with the problems of this complex day.

I look forward to long and honorable service by the Democratic Party on behalf of the people. We live in a democratic age. We must act democratic in dealing with this age, and the Democratic Party and its leadership afford, at present, the only instrument through which this leadership can be secured.

Address by Hon. Elbert D. Thomas, of Utah, on Unveiling of Statue of Brigham Young

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 2 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the address which I delivered yesterday at the ceremonies held in the rotunda of the Capitol in connection with the presentation of the statue of Brigham Young by the State of Utah.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Brigham Young has been dead 73 years. Few people who hear my voice saw him. He is, therefore, a figure of history. Mention of his name produces emotional reaction. Like all great men in history, he both attracted and repelled his contemporaries. An uncle of mine was an idealistic follower of Brigham Young and sacrificed unbelievably to join him in the "valleys of the mountains," only to turn against him at first sight. Yet my father saw Brother Brigham and thought him the greatest man alive and honored him as such to his dying day.

In my family is one who is a descendant on both his mother's and father's side from the first group of 1847 pioneers who entered the Salt Lake Valley with Brigham Young. Today, therefore, is a day of happiness to me as it is a day of happiness to all other sons and daughters of our Utah pioneers.

The placing of Brigham Young's statue in the Nation's Capitol is acknowledgment of his contribution in the building of this Nation. Just to mention the number of Brigham Young's sons, grandsons, and great-grandsons who served in the armed forces of the United States in time of war is honor almost beyond comparison for one man and a service outstanding enough to bring the thanks of the Nation.

It took courage to conquer the desert. It took sacrifice to build a home in a barren place. It took faith to select a wilderness for a "promised land." But to leave to unborn generations the ultimate success of his great undertaking demanded an understanding of eternal purposes both for his people and his country. Brigham Young lived, planned, built, and worked in tune with the Infinite, and God was his companion not only when he prayed but in all walks of life. We who were raised by those who knew Brother Brigham know that they perish who are not led by vision. Faith, love, courage, sacrifice, devotion to a cause and to one another, understanding, and wisdom, are all words which will ever be associated with Brigham Young and his work. We, today, sensing our debt to our pioneers because of their courage, faith, and zeal in carrying the American flag into foreign territory, find in those attributes complete satisfaction. But because these attributes are so worthy of honor we sometimes fail to recognize the real national and international significance of what they did. Therefore, my task today is to present the meaning of the migrations, under Brigham Young's leadership, in the making of America.

In 1847, Utah was Mexican territory. The contest for the control of what is now the western part of the United States had been going on for years. The Spanish-Mexican control reached as far north as Oregon. The Russians were in Alaska and had settlements as far south as California. French fur traders had penetrated most of the West and traders from all nations were wandering over it. The British claimed the Pacific coast between what was Russian and Mexican territory. The United States seemed, therefore, to be checked as far as ultimately having a Pacific coastline.

America, for many years before 1847 and for several years after, was on the alert and restless about her boundaries. There were the Texas independence and later the Mexican War. These represent active, expanding cultural and political groups with economic hopes. The people of the United States were not united in their reactions to these great movements. No one saw clearly, as we do today, the naturalness of our expansion to the Pacific. The period was one of political disagreement, plans and counterplans, and internal strife which ended only with the close of the War Between the States.

During the Mexican War the Government recruited Mormon boys as an active unit and, before that, did nothing to hamper Sam Brannon's sea journey to California. But counteraction to overcome the success of both journeys was in minds of many. Americans feared Americans quite as much as they did the British, the Russians, and the Spanish-Mexicans.

There were four separate migrations which, as far as the people who took part in them were concerned, were above pure adventure, conquest, pursuit of wealth, or expanding empire. One, although connected with war and therefore part of conquest, was the march of Kearney's army with its Mormon battalion. This march cut the Mexican-controlled empire in two.

Two movements were wholly inspired by Mormon thought and necessity; the pioneer journey, under the leadership of Brigham Young into the Salt Lake Valley; and the trip of Sam Brannon and his associates around the Horn to San Francisco. The fourth decisive journey was the sister movement of those who carried the Bible and the plow into the Oregon Territory.

The journey to Oregon was for homemaking and home-building. The Mormon expeditions were for the same purposes, but motivated by revelation and in fulfillment of prophecy. They carried with them the Bible with its prophets of the past, but they always acknowledged being led by living prophets of the present.

Brigham Young led a band of religious devotees to a new home. His life's mission was to bring souls to God. But in founding a home for such souls, gathered out of the world, he wanted to make that home a place where those souls could develop to their ultimate spiritual and temporal potentiality. Therefore, his settlements meant not only the home, the plow, and the Bible, but also the school and the theater. Add to these the irrigation ditch, the source of life on earth, and the temple, the promise of life hereafter, and we have the basic institutions on which Utah was founded. Work conquered the desert, but religion put meaning into the work.

As a founder of a State, Brigham Young wanted that State to be a place where soul growth would never be hampered. He believed that men's lives could be bettered by better conditions for life. He was both a man of religion and a founder of a State. And what State in history has persisted without religion?

But from the standpoint of Nation-building, the Brigham Young inspired movements had above their vision, their relying on the plow and the Bible, and their home-building culture, something even more significant. It was their international effect. Millions have made homes in foreign lands without affecting the international politics of those lands. But the Mormon journeys resulted in the transferring of political sovereignty, a transporting of a culture and a civilization, and making certain of a land dedicated to the free.

America's expansion did not stop with the coast. Perry with his ships was in Japan by 1853. Caleb Cushing had negotiated his treaty in China in 1844. The Mormon-credited part of America's restlessness in the Pacific was Gibson's so-called conquest in Hawaii in 1861. Mormon missionaries had circled the globe before the death of their prophet-founder in 1844 and before the migration to the Rocky Mountains began. Brigham Young represents the spirit of all this activity, world-wide in its significance and ultimately global in its effect.

The Utah pioneer movement, whether viewed as part of the spread of the white man over the globe, or whether viewed as a movement inspired by United States restlessness, has left its mark on its people and in the development of American culture and traditions. Every true follower of Utah pioneer ideals, whether he be American or foreign-born, knows the part Brigham Young's leadership played in the building of America. And when he is thoughtful of things to come, he views with unquestioning faith the influence of this great leader of men in the destiny of the world.

One cannot speak of Brigham Young and Utah's pioneers without using the word "Mormon." And when once the word is used one thinks of religion. But, in the building of Utah and the vast country which became Utah Territory, men and women from many nations and many faiths took part. All people contributed, all influences were there, all constructively built, and, in the main, cooperatively.

It is the united people of Utah who today honor Brigham Young in the placing of this monument. It is the united people of Utah who have builded our State and Territory. Utah is not a one-religion State. Its people are of all nationalities. Utah is as cosmopolitan as any State in the Union. But her people are all Americans. They are as free as the glorious air they breathe, for, in spirit, Utah is America.

Washington News Letter by Hon. Francis J. Myers, of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 2 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD my Washington News Letter of May 4, 1950, which is in the nature of a personal report to the people of Pennsylvania.

There being no objection, the news letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON NEWS LETTER—A PERSONAL REPORT TO THE PEOPLE OF PENNSYLVANIA

MAY 4, 1950.—A $42,400,000,000 Federal budget was recommended by President Tru-

man for the coming year. House and Senate Appropriations Committees, seeking ways to reduce this figure, are nearly finished with the one-package appropriation bill which will provide funds for operation of our Government between July 1, 1950, and June 30, 1951.

War accounts for 71 percent of the budget—paying for past wars, and preventing future ones. The four largest budget items, totaling nearly $30,000,000,000, make up this 71 percent.

National defense: $13,500,000,000 (almost one-third of the entire Federal budget) is earmarked thus: Navy, $4,100,000,000; Army, $4,100,000,000; Air Force, $4,400,000,000; development of new weapons, $250,000; and stockpiling strategic materials, actually an investment, is listed as a $650,000,000 expenditure.

Veterans' services and benefits: $6,100,000,000 for our 19,000,000 veterans of all past wars. This is $800,000,000 less than last year, and the money goes for care of the disabled, construction of hospitals, education and training, loans, and pensions to some 3,000,000 veterans or their families.

Interest on the public debt: $5,600,000,000 for interest on savings bonds. Our national debt, now $258,000,000,000, increased sixfold during World War II.

International affairs: $4,700,000,000 is the estimated cost of our bipartisan measures to achieve peace and halt communism. This is for programs such as the Marshall plan and point 4, for military aid abroad, for conduct of our foreign affairs, and for our contributions to the United Nations.

All other costs of Government are estimated at $12,500,000,000, or 29 percent of the budget. Of this total, $3,300,000,000 goes direct to States in loans and grants for programs which the States administer, frequently matching Federal funds with their own. Loans to industry, and for purchase of mortgages, will total $1,600,000,000, and $2,000,000,000 goes for Federal public works, such as flood control, reclamation, etc. The $12,500,000,000 consists of:

Social welfare, health, and security: $2,700,000,000 in grants to States for care of the aged, blind, and dependent children, for public health programs, school lunches, grants to communities for hospital construction, and so forth.

Natural resources: $2,200,000,000 for maintenance of rivers and harbors, flood control, forest and mineral resources, fish and wildlife. Eight hundred million dollars of this money goes for atomic developments for peacetime and national defense.

Agriculture: Two billion two hundred million—$500,000,000 less than last year—for price supports, loans, conservation, rural electrification and telephones.

Housing and education: One billion eight hundred million dollars for aids to public and private housing, slum clearance, school housing, school aids, libraries, and museums.

Transportation and communication. One billion seven hundred million dollars for highway construction by States, local airport construction, merchant marine, and the Post Office.

All others: One billion eight hundred million dollars for RFC loans to business, unemployment compensation, labor mediation services, statistical compilation, everything else.

The President estimated this budget would cause a $5,300,000,000 deficit. However, if you consider that Government loans to business, to communities, and to individuals, actually are investments that will be repaid, these investments would be listed as "assets" under many business accounting practices—and thus, our actual deficit would amount to something between $1,500,000,000 and $2,000,000,000, instead of $5,300,000,000.

A balanced budget is everybody's goal. Cuts which undermine our peace efforts or that threaten national security are out of the question. Nor can cuts be made in programs such as slum clearance, flood control, FHA insurance, RFC loans, farm credits, and many others, which encourage new growth of private business and strengthen our national life. But many economies can be achieved. The number of Federal employees has been cut almost 50 percent in the past 5 years, and today, 3 out of 4 Government workers are found in the Department of Defense, the Post Office, and the Veterans' Administration—three vital fields. Hoover Commission recommendations already carried out by the President and the Eighty-first Congress will permit big savings in the future—and still greater economy can be had by carrying the Government reorganization work forward. I have consistently supported the Commission's purposes—as I have other sound measures for achieving economy—and I shall continue to do so.

Natural Gas at the Crossroads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 2 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an address entitled "Natural Gas at the Crossroads," delivered by Mr. Roderick Stephens on the occasion of the annual convention of the Pennsylvania Retail Coal Merchants Association, at Wernersville, Pa., on May 25, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATURAL GAS AT THE CROSSROADS

I have never been sufficiently interested in the subject of ostriches to discover whether this powerful bird really does bury its head in the sand when danger approaches. But I am sufficiently interested in the fuel industry to have studied the growth of the natural gas market and its impact upon the Nation's economy and security. And, in either case, you don't have to do much studying to know that burying your head in the sand is not a very good method of dealing with danger.

So, I was very pleased to hear from Langdon Cook, your program chairman, that the Pennsylvania Retail Coal Merchants Association had scheduled two talks on natural gas—a subject that involves serious problems for you as citizens and as fuel dealers. If what they say about ostriches may be true, but it is obviously not true about you.

Of recent years, my associates and I have had occasion to make an intensive study of natural gas and its vital role in the Nation's peacetime and wartime economy. We have also studied the impact of natural gas upon all branches of the coal industry and upon the oil industry. Out of these studies has come one all-important conviction.

It is this. Granted that, at the moment, natural gas is a cheap, convenient fuel; that does not necessarily mean that the public welfare will be served by the construction of facilities adequate for its distribution, for unlimited domestic, commercial, and public-utility use, from the Pacific to the Atlantic and from Canada to Mexico.

For one thing, we do not know that we have enough natural gas for such widespread use. There has never been an authoritative, disinterested determination of the quantity that is actually available from pools already discovered. All estimates so far made have come only from interested industry sources and the discrepancies in these estimates, as officially recorded, are startling and ominous.

We should also calculate the amount of natural gas which will be required yearly for the efficient operation of the extensive network of long-distance pipelines already constructed or authorized. These lines are supplying certain areas and certain types of users, each of whom has already invested in gas-burning equipment. Each of these pipelines has been promoted and authorized on the basis of an assured supply for 20 years. On such representations users in these areas have been induced to discard coal- or oil-burning facilities and to buy new equipment. Should we not demand a comprehensive and authoritative estimate of the total amount of natural gas already dedicated by contract to supply these pipelines and these areas and these users to the end of those contracts? Should not this information be had before new consumers are induced to scrap existing facilities and invest in new equipment? Wouldn't Governor Dever, of Massachusetts, and others who are demanding that natural gas be piped into their communities, be wise to demand such information before users are urged to discard fuels which are giving satisfaction, and of which a supply is assured for centuries?

Nor do we know how much natural gas remains undiscovered. Obviously estimates of the total content of new wells struck in the course of test drilling are subject to all the uncertainties and exaggerated hopes and ofttimes desperate need of wildcatters and promoters of varying degrees of responsibility. Yet it is on such irresponsible data, so-called, that additions to proven reserves of natural gas are soberly reported, year by year, by committees of the American Gas Association. The same sort of data are relied upon by committees of the American Petroleum Institute to justify reports of additions to proven reserves of petroleum. By identical processes joint committees of these two Nation-wide, powerful, and representative industry associations report jointly on the proven reserves of natural-gas liquids.

Earlier this month, I addressed the Anthracite Conference at Lehigh University on the topic Our Fuel Resources and the National Defense. I refer you to that address (which I can supply in quantities) for chapter and verse to support my earlier statement that our information on natural gas and oil reserves is undependable; in fact, is misleading.

When natural gas was first used in Pennsylvania and in New York State, it came largely from within each State. Today, however, these local wells are largely exhausted and these States are now depending for their present and future supply on natural gas that must be transported by long distance pipelines from Texas, Oklahoma, and other fields almost 2,000 miles away. To propel natural gas for so great a distance, very high pressure must be maintained throughout the ystem. Pressure booster pumping stations must be installed at intervals. Also, the pipes must be laid near the surface so that repairs can easily be made. This system does make for quick repairs. It also makes sabotage correspondingly easy. Even in peacetime every foot of this great network of pipe lines is actually policed by inspectors. Helicopters are being used to speed the discovery of breaks in the lines. In the event of war, I wouldn't want to be solely dependent on so vulnerable a source of fuel. And I wouldn't want to be living near one of those pipe lines. When they explode, brother, they really blow.

This explosion factor is no bogey raised by jealous competitors. All one has do is to refer to the record. Not a week goes by that an

explosion is not reported along the Big Inch or Little Big Inch lines. Not only is this a hazard of the long-distance transcontinental lines; it is a hazard wherever gas is distributed under pressure. It is my belief that this accounts for the increasing frequency of reports of violent explosions in gas-served homes. More high-pressure local service areas are being created. It is obvious that the greater the pressure, the greater is the amount of gas that will escape, if a leak occurs. This means a larger area of explosion, once an explosive mixture develops and is ignited.

Admittedly, gas is convenient, but convenience is a relative term. If the consumer wants convenience, it can be had from coal or from oil or from manufactured gas. Many persons do not realize how much convenience has been built into the newest automatic coal-burning equipment. Why, then, go 2,000 miles for natural gas?

Some say it's cheap. How cheap, say we! Not today, as a household fuel! Tomorrow, perhaps, not for industry. Why not find out? Why climb on the band wagon of the promoters of long distance pipelines until you know what the cost of natural gas will be tomorrow, next year, and beyond? Already, the price of natural gas has doubled in the field. There is much glib talk about the cheapness of natural gas. Why not get the facts before spending hard-earned dollars to convert perfectly good coal or oil-heating systems? That is a question that many people have ignored, to their sorrow.

Where I come from, veterans are being sold cheap houses. Many of them have a little gas furnace in the attic. It has a tiny insulated smoke pipe running through the roof. It's automatic. It's cheap for the builder, but it's costly for the veterans. He's tied to gas for his heat and hot water. Only last month, our local paper reported a survey of the county. Its headline read, "Gas Heat Cost Found Higher Than Forecast Before Rate Rise." The article closed with this comment: "The mild December-January period this year increased the gas bill only 34 percent compared with a 28 percent increase in the first year of the new rates. But the subzero snaps in February were reflected in gas bill jumps of 49 percent last year and 62 percent this year. Such a gas user can hope we don't have a normal winter—or switch to an oil burner." Notice, please; no mention of coal. That is a reflection of the essential unity of the oil and gas industry. They will always gang up against coal.

That last remark points up a vital problem; the problem of convertibility. This involves the question of ability to convert if the need arises, as well as the question of the availability of the fuel. If conversion is for the sake of economy, delay would not be too serious. If it is a matter of necessity, delay in obtaining equipment or unavailability of fuel might be serious. In an emergency—a war emergency perhaps—it could entail tragic consequences for those whose gas supply has been interruped.

Is war so remote a contingency that the public can afford to ignore the danger and to make its decision on the simple basis of convenience? I don't think so and I don't believe you think so. Certainly, such responsible and diverse authorities as the Chairman of our Joint Chiefs of Staff (General Bradley), the new Chairman of the National Security Resources Board (Mr. Stuart Symington), and the eminent Republican consultant to the State Department, John Foster Dulles, all agree that we cannot afford to disregard the threat of war.

Less than 10 days ago, Mr. Dulles warned the Nation that if we wait for a shooting war before imposing the discipline of wartime on our economic and political life, "we shall have waited too long."

"Usually free societies shift over to disciplined action only under compulsions of armed attack," Mr. Dulles said. "If that kind of attack were to come now, we would respond with quick transition. * * * Our political confusions would be brought to an end. * * * Political smearing would be called off. * * * Our economy would quickly be shifted from its fabulous production of sport cars, radios, television sets, and gadgets, to meeting more serious needs. Certain consumers would tighten their belts and exercise self-discipline."

On May 14, the executive secretary of the Munitions Board, Petroleum Division, Rear Admiral Biggs, United States Navy, said that "every last drop of oil that this hemisphere could produce would be required were this Nation to become involved in another war. Some may say," he continued, "that we have about 1,000,000 barrels per day excess productive capacity and that, plus savings, should carry us—but," he warned, "while a parallel set of conditions carried us through World War II, let us not lose sight of the fact that conditions have changed. In the first place, military demand in another war would be greater. Secondly, on the civilian side, each year sees demand getting greater and greater." On the subject of military demand, he cited as one example, the jet engine, which "requires 7 times as much fuel per hour as the conventional reciprocating-type engine." Admiral Biggs also asserted that "we must realize that the more civilian demand increases, the less we will be able to cut it back in the event of war, since less and less of the total being consumed can be classified as non-essential."

It would be interesting to review the significance of Admiral Biggs' reference to our need for every last drop of oil this hemisphere could produce. Does he mean to imply that our Defense Establishment could protect tankers bringing oil from South America? If that is so, it would have an important bearing on our fuel situation. If, as I have reason to believe, we will be wholly dependent upon what we can produce and transport within our borders, then the problem is even more serious than his statement seemed to imply. This situation points up the need to project and adopt a national fuels policy.

As fuel men, you will also be interested in a statement by Mr. Frank W. Abrams, chairman of the board of Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey) at a very recent meeting of the Committee for Economic Development. Mr. Abrams suggested that management must apply to its relations with the rest of the community "the same type of searching analysis that it would make of its more usual business problems." Speaking for business, Mr. Abrams continued: "We must curb our occasional enthusiasm for special protection or other forms of assistance. We must be sure we do not support the imposition of measures that are of benefit only to the interests that we may personally represent—measures that may fail to service the interests or may even be contrary to interests, of everyone else."

In the light of this statement by Admiral Biggs, repeated in almost identical words on Monday of this week in San Francisco by Fleet Admiral Nimitz, I wonder whether Mr. Abrams might not now be prepared, as a matter of public service, to recognize the need for an authoritative and disinterested study of our reserves of fuels, our fuel needs, and our ability to meet those needs, in the event of war?

I use the word "now," advisedly, for I have yet to see or hear of a public statement by the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey or an official of that company or any other major oil company, projecting the situation that would confront their company, or their industry, or the oil-consuming public, in the event of war.

If the glaring discrepancies of official industry estimates can be reconciled and if a study of present and potential domestic demand for oil and natural gas disprove the fears that our lack of a national fuel policy invites disaster in the event of war, such a survey will more than justify itself, in the consequent demand for these fuels.

I pointed out on another occasion that it was with precisely such thoughts in mind that Senator FRANCIS J. MYERS, from Pennsylvania, introduced on the floor of the United States Senate by unanimous consent, on March 15, past, a resolution of inquiry which was referred to the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. This resolution, known as Senate Resolution No. 239, proposed that the committee (or a subcommittee) shall inquire into the available fuel reserves of the United States, with the aim of formulating an over-all domestic fuel policy.

Can we now look to Mr. Abrams to join in urging passage of the Myers resolution? Will Eugene Holman, too, agree to support a disinterested appraisal of our fuel supplies and fuel needs?

While other resolutions have been introduced in this Congress to inquire into the fuel problem from various standpoints, Senate Resolution 239 is the only one that goes directly to the heart of the problem. In urging favorable action, Senator MYERS suggested that our growing dependence on oil might require the development of a synthetic-oil industry upon which we could depend if the onset of war ended our imports of oil. That question would, of course, be directly within the scope of the inquiry he is urging.

In his introductory speech, the Senator referred to a similar problem which we faced at the onset of World War II when our principal sources of natural rubber were cut off by enemy action. By deep civilian rationing and the expenditure of huge sums of money, we hastily improvised a synthetic rubber industry which saved the day for us and our allies.

If there is likely to be similar need for a synthetic industry to produce high-octane gasoline and other essential products of petroleum, our first and most logical course of action would be to erect these plants in natural-gas territory. The reasons for this are simple. We have the know how and are actually producing high octane gasoline at present-day competitive prices from natural gas in a large commercial plant in Brownsville, Tex. It is true that the Government and private industry are experimenting with processes to convert coal, also oil shales, into gasoline, but such projects are still in the experimental or pilot-plant stage. For those reasons, it may well be that it is contrary to the national interest to use natural gas as a low-grade boiler fuel. This may sound like a plug for coal. Actually, I believe it is a plug for national defense.

Rail transportation service and facilities are also directly involved in the problem of national defense. Transportation of men and material involves the military problem of logistics. There is no more important problem of logistics than the logistics of fuels for defense. Here, too, it is vital to recognize that we cannot improvise rail facilities and we will do well to determine how rail transportation will be affected, if a widespread conversion of fuels will be demanded by defense needs.

This whole question of fuels deserves serious thought. It also demands vigorous action. We need to know the facts. I know no better way of learning the facts, than by way of the Myers resolution. If you agree, I suggest you communicate with your two Senators and urge them to press for a favorable report from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. That will bring the resolution to the floor for adoption. Once it reaches the floor, I predict favorable action will follow without delay.

Natural gas is at the crossroads. Let's see to it that it takes the right turn.

To the Pioneers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 2 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, the unveiling of the statue of Brigham Young in the Capitol has brought forth the thoughts of pioneer days in the minds and hearts of many. I ask unanimous consent to have the poem written by Leonard R. Bailey, of Salt Lake City, Utah, printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO THE PIONEERS

The Mormon pioneers' faith was strong;
They worshipped God in prayer and song.
They did not cross the dreary plain
In quest of power or worldly gain.
They were an exiled band to flee
From a land their fathers helped to free.
New England gave to that noble band
The choicest blood of all her land.
Trials over which their sires had won
Were none too great for these valiant sons.
It took that stock and breed of man
Who crossed the seas to cross the sand.

The despot had no place with them;
For they were all God-fearing men.
They broke no laws, nor e'en rebelled
Though tortured by the imps of Hell.
No sect nor creed loved country more;
They were the products which she bore.
Then need a nation blush with shame—
Born and made in freedom's name—
For on her borders that winter's night
Homes burned and men were put to flight.
Pursued by a lawless drunken band,
They bade farewell to their native land.

Befriended exiles on foreign soil,
Homeless after a life of toil,
Not a murmer escaped their tongues
As they turned to the land of the setting sun.
These were the pains that were sent to warn
That the virile West was not yet born.
No greater march was ever planned
O'er a thousand miles of desert land.
Who took that journey knew his mind;
The weaker ones were left behind
With heirlooms garnered through the years—
A parting fraught with hope and tears.

To give one's all for religion's sake
When even life is set at stake,
That belief is more than mere pretense;
Truth demands such recompense.
Had they been loath this price to pay,
There would have been no West today.
Gold and adventure took men by,
Sagebrush attracted not the eye;
Yet a triumphant gaze stood on every face
As their leader exclaimed, "This is the place!"
They thanked their God on bended knee,
And unfurled Old Glory to a western breeze.

Days were divided into pounds;
The quotient small was passed around.
Each household had its meager share
Meted out with a mother's care.
The wolf of want lived at their door,
There were no rich, for all were poor.
Yet the greatest love that was ever known
Was found in those first Mormon homes.
The sound of a prattling babe was there;
A mother's love song filled the air.
There was no time to give to strife
When time for all had a lease on life.
The day of trial and want is o'er;
The West has opened wide her door.
Where once all life appeared entombed
Now a thousand orchards bloom.
The streams that nurtured desert seed
Are harnessed to a city's need.
Where sagebrush flanked the paths they trod
A Temple rises to their God.
Proud we are to bear the name
And laud the sires from whence we came.
Now that their long, long race is run
The load is shifted to their sons.

Then praise the man whose faith and might
Gave substance to a dream for right.
Genius, seer, and statesman great—
A town unique lies in his wake.
Symbolic, Brigham Young will stand
Among the heroes of our land—
A man who led, yet could abide
The counsel of a Higher Guide.
Who shall say that his day has passed
So long as the glowing West shall last.
As we see the outgrowth of his plan
We're proud to claim the Pioneer Man.

—*Leonard R. Bailey.*

Biweekly Report by Hon. Francis J. Myers, of Pennsylvania, to People of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 2 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD No. 26 and No. 27 in the series of biweekly reports made by me over the radio to the people of Pennsylvania.

There being no objection, the broadcasts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF TRANSCRIPTION BY UNITED STATES SENATOR FRANCIS J. MYERS OVER PENNSYLVANIA RADIO STATIONS, WEEK END OF MAY 12-14, INCLUSIVE (NO. 26 IN BIWEEKLY SERIES)

Senator MYERS. Now that spring is really down to business in putting on its annual show, millions of people all over Pennsylvania are busy making plans for all sorts of out-of-door activities—long drives into the country or picnics or hiking or bird walking or fishing.

We in Pennsylvania have been particularly fortunate because our State has been heavily endowed with a great many natural attractions. We have our mountains, our great forests, our lakes and streams and rivers, and a widely varied selection of plant, animal, and bird life which have been the proud possessions, not only of Pennsylvanians, but of people all over the country.

America has always been blessed with great natural resources, but as a Nation we have not always used our natural bounties wisely. Our early history is dotted with tales of wild extravagances in slaughtering great numbers of birds and animals, of denuding great areas merely to strip them of their timber, then leaving the land to be carried away by erosion, and the instances of this sort of thing are innumerable.

But for half a century or more we have had a growing consciousness of our duty to preserve these natural resources for the generations to come. Today, as a result of the efforts of those who fought long and hard for conservation, every State has its own parks, and forests, and there are national forests and national parks scattered from one end of America to the other. Moreover, conservation efforts made on privately owned land have done an almost unbelievable job in helping to restore our forests, save our land and our wildlife. Our States have enacted game laws, and as a result of a treaty with Canada, we have the laws which protect migratory birds. These are, all of them, examples of what is being done to preserve our natural resources for the use and enjoyment of our people.

On this broadcast, I have invited Mr. Albert M. Day, Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of Interior to join me in a discussion of some of the programs that are going on today in Pennsylvania. Mr. Day, when he became Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service in 1946, brought with him to that job more than a quarter of a century of distinguished Government service in the field of conservation and wildlife management.

Mr. Day, I know that for some years now there has been a Cooperative Wildlife Research Unit in operation at State College. Could you tell us something about it?

Mr. DAY. The Cooperative Wildlife Research Unit at Penn State, Senator MYERS, is 1 of 14 such units that have been established in land-grant colleges all over the country. The original program was established by Congress back in 1935 to assist in the training of specialists in wildlife management, and to provide information for the proper use of wildlife resources.

All of the units receive cooperation from the land grant colleges where they are located, and the balance of the funds for the program are furnished by State game commissions, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, and from the Wildlife Management Institute. I might add that the Wildlife Management Institute, though it cooperates in the program, is a private organization, and contributes to the units because the institute shares with the schools, the States, and the Federal Government a real interest in promoting wildlife management work.

The unit at Penn State is one of the older ones in the program, and has done a fine job in helping to train men and in bringing back a number of birds and animals that needed better management.

Senator MYERS. What are some examples, Mr. Day, of the work that's been done at the cooperative unit at State College?

Mr. DAY. The wild turkey is a good example. Fifteen years ago, wild turkeys were quite scarce, and were becoming fewer every year. The Pennsylvania Game Commission went to work on the problem and started taking eggs laid by wild birds, and hatching them out in incubators where, under controlled conditions, many more of the young birds survived. After the first set of eggs was taken, the birds in the wild would nest a second time, and that way it was possible to get two broods a year. Today, as a result, wild turkeys have increased greatly in numbers. There are more wild turkeys in Pennsylvania now than in any other Northern State—more than in all the other Northern States together. The cooperative research unit worked closely with the commission on many phases of this wonderfully successful turkey-restoration program.

Senator MYERS. What about deer? Although I find it hard to believe, someone told me recently that there are probably more wild deer in Pennsylvania today than there were in Columbus' time. Is that really true?

Mr. DAY. Yes, Senator MYERS, there are probably more deer in Pennsylvania now

than there were when America was discovered, although there aren't as many today as there have been in the past. At the peak, there were perhaps a million deer—and only about half that number now.

Senator MYERS. Why is that, Mr. Day?

Mr. DAY. You see, Senator, deer depend upon getting their food close to the ground—and they do very well in young forests where there is a lot of underbrush. Under those conditions, 3 to 5 acres of land will support enough food to feed one deer. But when the forests grow older, and the trees get tall enough to shade out the underbrush, a single deer may be forced to range over 50 to 75 acres to find enough to eat. People who remember seeing many deer in a particular area in the past are always surprised when the number diminishes, but they don't seem to realize that the forests have grown up in the meanwhile, and the woodlands will then support fewer animals.

So, while the amount of underbrush is being replaced by aging forests in Pennsylvania today, there is still much more food available for deer now than was to be found in early colonial times when most of the State was covered by giant forests.

Senator MYERS. Are other animals and birds affected by the changes that take place in the way the land changes over the years, even when there is no hunting? I'd think that deer wouldn't be the only ones affected by the fact that forests grow older and that underbrush disappears.

Mr. DAY. Oh, yes, Senator MYERS. All wildlife feels the effects of changes in the kinds and amounts of food. Many of the game birds—take the ruffed grouse, for example—thrive best where there is a lot of ground feed and cover, and because they are woodland birds, the grouse population changes with the changes in the character of woodlands. That's true of the woodcock and the bobwhite as well.

Senator MYERS. What are you able to do, Mr. Day, when you see particular kinds of animals or birds declining in population as a result of diminishing food supplies?

Mr. DAY. A great deal, Senator. Most people who live in the country get a great deal of pleasure from having many wild animals and birds around them, just to have them there, or perhaps for hunting. So a great many private landowners want to know what they can do to their land to restore certain kinds of wildlife when they're on the decline.

The cooperative research unit at Penn State and the game commission have an extensive educational program in operation—and for that matter, so do many private organizations—among the sportsmen and others interested in conservation. As a result, we are able to advise landowners as to changes they can make on their own land. And the changes generally improve the land at the same time. It's usually safe to say that if you find a reasonable amount of animal and bird life in an area, that the land itself is valuable and is in good shape. On the other hand, run-down land generally is pretty well depleted of wildlife, so landowners are generally anxious to make changes that increase wildlife and improve the value of land at the same time.

Senator MYERS. Well, what about farm ponds, Mr. Day? In driving around Pennsylvania in recent years, I've noticed more and more ponds on farms, and in talking to farmers about them, I've been told that these ponds serve many purposes. They store water that runs off during a rain, and the ponds don't need to be fed by springs or streams at all—so they provide the farms with more water, and at the same time, lessen the dangers of floods on the rivers to some extent.

But the farmers tell me, too, that they are stocking the ponds with bass and sunfish and that some of the fish are coming from hatcheries owned by the Federal Government.

Mr. DAY. That's quite correct, Senator MYERS. The United States Fish and Wildlife Service has hatcheries at Lamar and Farnsworth, and last year we furnished about 50,000 bass and sunfish for farm ponds. That was about one-tenth of the fish we produced in those two hatcheries. The hatchery up at Farnsworth stocks the streams in Allegheny National Forest, and this year Farnsworth is ready to stock the Allegheny Forest with about 45,000 legal-sized trout.

Senator MYERS. Where does the State fish commission fit in with the two hatcheries operated by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, Mr. Day?

Mr. DAY. The United States Fish and Wildlife Service does all of the stocking done in Allegheny National Forest, and we furnish stock for the farm ponds, because the State fish commission doesn't participate in either of these programs. We of the Fish and Wildlife Service also stock streams and rivers elsewhere in Pennsylvania in response to the applications which we receive, and in this field we work along with the State fish commission so that our program of stocking streams fits in with their own.

Senator MYERS. The Pennsylvania State legislature does not appropriate any State funds at all for these fish and game programs as I understand it, and both the Fish and Game Commissions must depend upon revenues from the Federal Government received under the Pittman-Robertson Act, and from license fees collected from sportsmen through the sale of hunting and fishing licenses. I understand that license fees brought in about $3,500,000 last year as a result of selling some 600,000 fishing licenses and over 850,000 hunting licenses in Pennsylvania. As I recall, the State of Pennsylvania got quite a bit of money from the Federal Government for conservation work last year under the Pittman-Robertson Act. Do you happen to recall the details, Mr. Day?

Mr. DAY. Yes, Senator MYERS. The Pittman-Robertson Act provides that the Federal Government should turn back to the States the money collected in excise taxes on the sale of sporting firearms and ammunition. The share each State gets depends upon the number of licenses sold in each State, and upon the area of each State. Last year, the money turned back to Pennsylvania under the Pittman-Robertson Act came to $431,000. The only condition which the act imposes on the States is to require that the money be spent only for wildlife purposes, and for no other. In Pennsylvania, it has been used for farm game development, forest wildlife improvement, and for research.

Senator MYERS. One more question, Mr. Day—though this is a bit early for this one—how do you expect the duck-hunting season to be this year?

Mr. DAY. Tough question, Senator. We hope that it may be about the same as last year—but a lot depends on whether there are drought conditions on the northern breeding grounds. There has been a big increase in hunters since the end of the war, and we have had a few dry seasons on the breeding grounds—so the ducks haven't fared so well. But that is one of the problems we are really devoting a lot of attention to, and the revenues from the Federal duck stamp are doing much to keep the ducks and geese on the wing.

Senator MYERS. Thank you very much, Mr. Day.

My guest on this broadcast has been Mr. Albert M. Day, Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service.

TEXT OF TRANSCRIPTION BY UNITED STATES SENATOR FRANCIS J. MYERS OVER PENNSYLVANIA RADIO STATIONS, WEEK END OF MAY 26 TO 28, INCLUSIVE (NO. 27 IN BIWEEKLY SERIES)

Senator MYERS. Some things seem almost impossible to picture. Can you imagine, for instance, a circus without a clown? Or a schoolroom without blackboards? Or this country of ours without millions of cars and trucks streaming along millions of miles of highways?

And yet, just 50 years ago, in the lifetime of many of us, a handful of cars—8,000 to be exact—and practically no surfaced highways was the picture. Even by 1916 our State of Pennsylvania only had 230,000 registered motor vehicles.

But today America has more than one vehicle for every four persons. Pennsylvania itself has over 100,000 miles of highways. Over 6,000 cities in the country are entirely dependent on busses and automobiles for transportation. Almost 90 percent of the Nation's farm products now reach their markets by highways, and some could not even be harvested without highway transportation. The fact that four out of five farms today have electricity can be traced, to a large degree to the availability of highways. We have consolidated rural schools, week-end motor trips, rural-mail delivery—in short, a way of life the continuance of which depends a great deal on having cars to drive—and highways to drive on.

The Federal Government, from its very beginning, has played an important role in developing our highway system. Our Constitution assigns to the Federal Government the duty of providing for national defense, establishing post roads, and encouraging commerce among the States. And any of these duties offers plenty of justification for the active steps taken by Congress to grant help to the States for constructing highways.

Today, I have as my guest, Mr. H. E. Hilts, Deputy Commissioner of the Bureau of Public Roads, that division of the Department of Commerce which handles the Federal-aid program for the construction of highways. Mr. Hilts, a native of Pennsylvania, has had many years of experience in this field, both with the State and National Governments. He served as deputy chief engineer of the Pennsylvania Highway Department back in its infant days in the 1920's, and has been with the Federal Government since 1936.

Just when did this business of constructing decent highways first begin to receive serious attention, Mr. Hilts?

Mr. HILTS. That depends on how far back you want me to go. As a matter of fact, our State, Pennsylvania, can claim the most important development in highway construction in the early days after the Revolutionary War. Back in 1792, a 65-mile stretch from Philadelphia to Lancaster was macadamized. And this surfacing, according to highway historians, marks the beginning of construction of hard surfaces suitable for use throughout the four seasons of the year.

Senator MYERS. Well, I didn't really mean quite that far back. Didn't some legislation passed by Congress back in President Wilson's administration represent the first important effort to handle the problems brought on by rapid growth in the number of motor vehicles?

Mr. HILTS. That's right, Senator. In 1916 Congress passed the Federal-Aid Road Act, a large number of States—Pennsylvania was not among them—had not even organized State highway departments. But since the legislation provided that no grants could be made unless the States had working organizations to handle the highway construction, all the 48 States soon had highway departments.

Senator MYERS. What was the main objective of this initial legislation—was Congress

aiming primarily at helping those living in cities to move from one large community to another?

Mr. HILTS. The 1921 amendment to this early legislation provided for a Federal-aid primary system—which consists now of 233,583 miles of rural and urban roads. Incidentally, Pennsylvania has 7,699 miles in the primary syster and eligible for improvement with Federal funds. Though most of the first construction did in fact represent connecting roads between cities, the one group which most welcomed this work were the farmers, whose battle cry was "help get us out of the mud." Federal help was particularly important back in those days because unless the roads could be made at least, shall we say, navigable, people were not going to buy cars. And unless people bought cars, the State governments could not receive the large income from license taxes and gasoline taxes needed to build up their highways.

Senator MYERS. Since that time, of course, Congress has amended the original legislation and passed additional legislation to carry on with this important work. The present law authorizes Federal grants amounting to $450,000,000 a year through 1951, and the Senate Public Works Committee is now beginning work on a bill already passed by the House which carries the program, with some modifications, through 1953. How do you determine what share of this $450,000,000 goes to the various States?

Mr. HILTS. Three factors receive primary consideration—the State's area, its population, and its mileage of post roads. Pennsylvania rates high on all of these and as a matter of fact, only two States receive a greater allocation than Pennsylvania's $24,000,000. But getting back to Federal legislation dealing with highways, I think the effect of the 1944 legislation deserves some real emphasis. It designated two new highway systems in addition to the already existing Federal-aid primary system. One, the National Interstate Highway System, is considered by most experts to be the Nation's most vital, both in peace and war. This system will include 40,000 miles of highways and city streets which pass through one-third of the counties of the Nation and connect most United States cities of more than 50,000 population. And the system carries 20 percent of the Nation's rural traffic, though the roads make up only a little more than 1 percent of the Nation's total mileage.

The other system is to be made up of the principal secondary and feeder roads, including farm-to-market roads, rural free delivery mail, and public-school bus routes, either inside or outside municipalities of less than 5,000 population. This system now includes nearly 400,000 miles of roads.

Senator MYERS. Yes; I remember those provisions well. I was a Congressman at the time and supported the bill. Under that 1944 act and under the 1948 amendments, and under the new amendments now being studied, definite allocations are made for each of these three categories of highways. But let us talk now about specific projects in Pennsylvania. How does your office work? Do you insist that Pennsylvania and the other States meet particular standards on each project before you grant them financial aid? It would seem to me that different States have different traffic problems and different weather conditions, and that standards for the whole country would be mighty tough to set up.

Mr. HILTS. That has been the Bureau's feeling, Senator. Certain suggested minimum standards drawn up by the American Association of State Highway Officials are used by us as a guide, but the States have wide latitude in proposing the character of improvements. Most of them, of course, are quite willing to conform to the association's standards.

Senator MYERS. How is Pennsylvania using most of its Federal aid these days, Mr. Hilts?

Mr. HILTS. Well, here's what's happened: There are serious deficiencies on all classes of highways. Pennsylvania has elected to use much of the primary Federal-aid funds in removing the big bottlenecks in cities.

Senator MYERS. The cities certainly do need help. There's nothing quite as aggravating as traveling 160 miles on the Pennsylvania Turnpike within a few hours and then running into a bottleneck when you approach and enter Pittsburgh.

Mr. HILTS. Yes; Pittsburgh's a perfect example. But when that Penn-Lincoln Parkway is finished in a few more years, you'll be able to go through the city in a matter of minutes. The whole project is scheduled to cost about $81,000,000, with the Federal Government assuming approximately half the bill. There will be a 27-mile-long, 4-lane highway, 23 separation structures, a 4,225-foot twin tube tunnel through a section of the city, and ample ramps and interchanges to provide access to and from the parkway. And when one considers the importance of Pittsburgh in the industrial production of our country, it is easy to understand why the Federal Government is so willing to encourage any plan which will aid speedier movement in and out of the city.

Senator MYERS. Then there's the $3,356,000 highway now being built on the southern approaches of Williamsport, with Federal aid totaling $1,898,000. This project, already about 10 percent completed, will consist of a modern four-lane divided highway crossing the Susquehanna River on a new bridge placed above the flood crest of the river.

Mr. HILTS. Yes; and that's another project in which Federal funds—over $6,000,000, to be exact—are being used. Experts have estimated that when completed, this facility will accommodate a traffic volume of 50,000 vehicles per day.

Senator MYERS. These projects we've talked about all go through certain cities in Pennsylvania. Are there any projects under way which completely circumvent city streets?

Mr. HILTS. Plans are now being drawn up for just such a highway in Lancaster. This city is a very compact, congested one, and a highway by-passing the city will mean local traffic can move much faster. This will be a $2,000,000 project and Federal aid will total $1,000,000.

Senator MYERS. What about some of the other activities of the Bureau of Public Roads? I've been told the Bureau does extensive research work.

Mr. HILTS. Most of our research today centers around such projects as making a detailed analysis of observations of actual maximum volumes of traffic for the many and varied conditions found on both rural and urban highways, or studies on speed and driver behavior. Our research work has enabled us to avoid failures and improve all classes of road surfaces. For example, modern heavy duty concrete pavements are twice as strong as those built in 1920. Bituminous pavements are far more satisfactory. Study of traffic and driving habits enables us to design roads for actual rather than imagined needs.

Senator MYERS. Does the Bureau grant any funds to the States for research purposes?

Mr. HILTS. Yes, Senator, Pennsylvania and the other States are allowed to use 1½ percent of their funds for highway planning surveys. Furthermore, the Bureau has undertaken to assist the States in organizing surveys and coordinating work so that data could be used for analysis on a national basis.

Senator MYERS. One last question, Mr. Hilts. How does the national defense situation affect the highway construction picture? Are any plans being made for military highways?

Mr. HILTS. Yes, the main highways used by normal traffic are the most important military highways. Defense authorities have told us to go ahead with present plans laying particular emphasis on the National System of Interstate Highways. We discovered during the last war that with only a few exceptions, the areas that had a great deal of traffic in peace time and needed improved highways were the same areas that produced war material. Thus all the present expenditure could—without stretching the point—be classified as defense expense.

Senator MYERS. Thank you, Mr. Hilts.

Communists in the State Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 2 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an address on Communists in the State Department delivered by me on May 25, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fellow Americans, thank you very much for the opportunity to be with you tonight to discuss a subject which, in my opinion, towers in importance above all others. It is the subject of international atheistic communism. It deals with the problem of destroying the conspiracy against the people of America and free men everywhere. There are many phases of this subject which we might well discuss. However, the time is limited. Therefore, your program chairman and I have agreed that I shall briefly hit a few of the high spots and then will try to answer some of the many questions which I understand you editors want to ask about the anti-Communist fight in Washington.

Ladies and gentlemen, many of you have been engaged in this all-out fight against communism long before I came on the scene. You have been engaged in what may well be that final Armageddon foretold in the Bible—that struggle between light and darkness, between good and evil, between life and death, if you please.

At the start, let me make it clear that in my opinion no special credit is due those of us who are making an all-out fight against this Godless force—a force which seeks to destroy all the honesty and decency that every Protestant, Jew and Catholic has been taught at his mother's knee. It is a task for which we can claim no special credit for doing. It is one which we are obligated to perform. It is one of the tasks for which we were brought into this world—for which we were born. If we fail to use all the powers of mind and body which God gave us, then I am sure our mothers, wherever they are tonight, may well sorrow for the day of our birth.

To fight, however, we must have facts. Those facts we do have. They stand as clear silhouettes, outlined by the fires of communism that are sweeping across Europe and Asia and flickering on the shores of America.

We know that the major aim of communism, as stated by its atheistic leaders more than 30 years ago, is to create a Red

China, thence a Red Asia, wash it with a Red Pacific—and then enslave America.

In this connection let us take a look at the magnitude of Russian success and the enormity of our disaster in China. This is the disaster to which Mr. Acheson refers as the dawning of a new day; the disaster to which Mr. Lattimore refers as a "limitless horizon of hope."

For whom is Mr. Acheson's new day dawning? Who faces Lattimore's limitless horizon of hope? Not China. Not the forces of democracy in America, but the military masters of the Soviet Union.

The question in the mind of a man elected to represent the people of this Nation and indirectly the people of the world is, Why is this so?

Is it because we are less intelligent than the Communists? Is it because we can't match them in courage? Is it because their devotion to atheism is greater than our devotion to God? Is it because we are less willing to stand up and fight for what we think is right? Ladies and gentlemen, the answer to all those questions is "No." Then what is the answer? Is it in our leadership? To that my answer is "Yes," and I challenge anyone to find another answer.

I have been naming and presenting evidence against those leaders who have been responsible for selling into Communist slavery 400,000,000 people—those leaders responsible for the creation of Communist steppingstones to the American shores.

Those in power in Washington say that this is not so; that those are not the men. Now if I have named the wrong men, then the American people are entitled to know who is responsible for the tremendous Communist victory in Asia and the dismal American defeat—the greatest defeat any nation has suffered in war or peace.

It is essential, therefore, that we put the spotlight of exposure on those who are responsible for this disaster. This is important, not for the purpose of exposing past failures, but because those same men are now doing America's planning for the future. Unfortunately they have become so deeply entrenched that almost every power of the Government is used to sabotage any attempt to expose and root them out.

Let me give you one example of the difficulty experienced in pointing the spotlight of exposure on those who are a threat to this Nation. It is an example of the extent to which men honored with high positions will go to conceal communism, men whose shadows hover like vultures over the corpse of China and whose actions rip at the backbone of freedom in America.

It is an example of the extent to which the State Department will go in order to deceive and practice a deliberate fraud on the American people. In order to give you this example, it is necessary to publicly divulge information, which I had hoped could be properly presented to the committee. I am going to give you several reproductions of secret loyalty files.

I have first carefully eliminated any material which might in any way interfere with the workings of our investigative agencies.

The documents which are being given to you tonight should under no stretch of the imagination be kept secret. The secrecy label could only be applied to protect those who would cover up their incompetence or double-dealing.

First, let me give you a brief history leading up to the decision to make those files public. When I began the presentation of the case against Owen Lattimore, the State Department's architect of our Far Eastern policy, I considered it necessary to present evidence having to do with his sabotage of a wartime ally, an ally because of whom many of your sons and brothers are today alive.

I, therefore, informed the Senate that Lattimore in a letter to Joseph Barnes (an individual whose activities have been described in executive session before the subcommittee) instructed him, in effect, to get rid of all Chinese employees in the Office of War Information who were loyal to our Chinese ally, Chiang Kai-shek, and to replace them with Chinese Communists or with Chinese loyal to the Communist cause.

Later, when addressing the American Society of Newspaper Editors, I furnished them complete copies of and discussed the Lattimore-Barnes letter. The State Department then came screaming to Lattimore's defense. It produced an 8-page white paper to show that McCarthy was a liar, especially in regard to the Lattimore letter.

This white paper, which took nearly a month to produce, was supervised by Edward Barrett, Mr. Acheson's publicity chief. He was Mr. Lattimore's superior when both worked in the Office of War Information. He was also the superior of Dr. Chi and Mr. Chew Hong, whom I shall discuss.

Now, Mr. Barrett got the Lattimore letter from the files of Chew Hong, and if he wants to deny that, I will name the hour and the day he removed it.

When Acheson's publicity director and his expensive staff prepared the white paper they had before them the same files which I shall present to you tonight.

I had hoped it would be unnecessary to produce these files in public. I frankly would not have produced them merely to present a link in the Lattimore chain of evidence. But I feel that I owe the American people a duty to show them the calculated, vicious fraud which the State Department tried to sell to the American people.

The Department was given a chance to come clean, and refused. Now I could merely tell you what is in the files which I am about to show you. This I have done in a number of instances, but always with the same result; namely, the issuance of a press release from Acheson's official spokesman, backed by all the power and prestige of the State Department, saying that McCarthy lies—there is no such evidence in the files. Obviously if I were merely to tell you what was in these files the State Department would issue its 14 points or its white paper tomorrow denying each and every statement made in regard to the files.

Therefore, I ask you, ladies and gentlemen, what would you do if you were in my position? In view of my past experience with Acheson's hatchetmen, could you recommend any course other than the actual production of the files?

The copy of the Lattimore letter, as well as the files to which I shall refer, is being supplied to you. You will find a copy of all of the documents to which I refer in these brown envelopes on the table. I invite you to take complete sets along with you.

Now let me read to you from the State Department white paper sent to some 500 newspaper editors and produced by the State Department's $10,000- to $15,000-a-year men.

"Point 12: Senator McCarthy said to the ASNE: 'This letter from Lattimore to Joseph Barnes, dated June 13, 1943, * * * was an order to Barnes to get rid of all Chinese employees with OWI who were loyal to Chiang Kai-shek, and supplant them with Chinese loyal to the Communists.'

"The facts: * * * The letter does not say what Senator McCarthy asserts it did. What it does say is: 'In the circumstances, we have to be extremely careful about our Chinese personnel. While we need to avoid recruiting any Chinese Communists, we must be careful not to be frightened out of hiring people who have loosely been accused of being Communists. * * * For our purpose, it is wise to recruit as many unaffiliated Chinese as we can, to pick people whose loyalty will be reasonably assured on the one hand by the salaries which we pay them and on the other hand by the fact that they do not receive salaries or subsidies from somewhere else'."

The purpose of the white paper is to prove that the Lattimore letter actually instructed Barnes to avoid hiring Communists. Now in this respect, in view of the fact that both the State Department and McCarthy have the facts, one or the other is a liar.

Furthermore, both the State Department and McCarthy had plenty of time to study this letter and the files which explain it. So that the lie of which the State Department or McCarthy is guilty must be deliberate.

You will note the Lattimore letter tells Barnes to get rid of all Chinese except Dr. Chi and Chew Hong and to replace all of the discharged Chinese by employees from the New China Daily News. Now this, as you will note, is mixed up with 4 pages of double talk.

Now I ask you to keep in mind those three names—Dr. Chi, Mr. Chew Hong, and the New China Daily News. Those names are the key to this letter and the State Department's fraudulent cover up.

You editors will find that the Lattimore letter boils down to the statement "Keep Dr. Chi and Mr. Chew Hong as a nucleus, fire everyone else, and then hire only those connected with the New China Daily News."

Unless, of course, you have personal knowledge of the New China Daily News or have the information in the Government files on this Communist publication and unless you have the files of Dr. Chi and Chew Hong, you could easily be deceived by the State Department's barrage in regard to this letter. I am, therefore, submitting to you the secret files on those two men who were indispensable to Lattimor's operations, showing that the Civil Service Commission had found that one of them was unfit for Government service because of his Communist connections and that the other had been rejected by one of the examiners because of his communistic activities, and that his case was still pending at the time Lattimore intervened to keep them both on. You will note also that the files show that Dr. Chi whom Lattimore fought to keep with him at all costs had been discharged as commissioner of education in Shansi Province in China because of his Communist activities.

You will note also that at about the time of the Lattimore letter to Barnes the Civil Service Commission, at Lattimore's request, reopened the case on Chew Hong and Chi. You will note that the files show that Lattimore stated that even if Hong were a Communist he still wanted him in this job. You will not further the official finding that the New China Daily News was a publication by and for the Communists and that both Hong and Chi had been editors of that Communist paper.

You will also note from the files that Lattimore was informed of the complete background of Chi and Chew Hong, which included the fact that Chi's son was a member of the Communist Party, and, in fact, so high up in its councils that me was a delegate to the Third International in Moscow. In connection therewith I call the Justice Department's attention to Lattimore's testimony on pages 1859 and 1860 of the record in which he states he never had any information from any source to indicate young Chi was a Communist.

I also call your attention to the fact that Dr. Chi's son had been designated by the Communists as their representative to the United Nations and is waiting until Latti-

more, Acheson, and Trygve Lie maneuver the recognition of Communist China.

I further call your attention to the statement of Admiral McCullough in the Steely report to the effect that if Hong, who had been declared ineligible because of his communistic activities, were to be removed that others higher up in the organization should go for the reason that the evidence against them was more damaging than it was against Hong.

You will note from the file that all of the Communist activities of Chi and Hong and the fact that the New China Daily News was a Communist paper were brought to Lattimore' attention, but that he nevertheless insisted that Chi and Hong be retained and his order to Barnes to hire only employees of the Communist paper still stood.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, this information was all known to the State Department when its white paper was issued. It was known to Mr. Barrett who was Lattimore's and Chi's boss in OWI—Barrett, who incidentally in his white paper says all of the OWI's correspondence is now in the State Department and available to him.

The evidence in the files of Chi and Hong forms merely one of the links in the Lattimore case that could have been supplied without using the files and frankly the files would not have been used for that purpose alone.

The State Department cover-up changes the picture, however. It was only after it became obvious that the State Department was using its entire press corps to defend Lattimore that I decided to take this step.

It will be necessary to reveal other files if the cover-up continues. This cover-up is worse even than the Lucas-Tydings-McMahon whitewash. It is deliberate fraud, organized and propagandized with one idea in mind; conceal, cover up, keep from the American people the truth. This, ladies and gentlemen, makes one sick way down deep inside. I cannot stomach it. I am sure that you would not either. I doubt that any American would. Ladies and gentlemen, I would consider it criminal for any elected official to stand idly by while this fraud is being perpetrated. For it is a sinister effort to avoid honesty. It bears a basic corruption that permeates the State Department's small closely knit high command. Instead of shooting square with the American people, we find men in high places who offer us bits and pieces of evidence to help them conceal instead of reveal the truth. These men are not paid to dishonestly protect reputations of the inner circle. They are paid to put it on the line for America, not to shuffle off the bottom of the deck.

This is not the time to play games with half-truths. We cannot afford the luxury of high-paid phonies peddling propaganda to protect the reputations of men who have proven themselves unworthy of the confidence of the American people.

Let us call on those men once and for all to come clean. Let us make the honest voice of this land reverberate in their ears until they tell the truth, now and forever. The tracks of liars always leave a trail. In tracing for you tonight that trail, let me say now that wherever it leads, whoever is revealed walking in those tracks, the trail will be followed to the very end. We cannot and we will not be sidetracked now by sly men who would rather save their jobs than see America secure.

In that white paper the State Department also called attention to another alleged falsehood in one of my speeches. Let me again quote therefrom:

"5. Senator McCarthy said to the ASNE: 'First let's look at that perennial joiner, Dr. Philip Jessup, our Ambassador-at-large. * * * Why does he always join Communist fronts? Why not anti-Communist organizations?'

"The facts: Dr. Jessup testified, before the subcommitee, that he had joined no Communist-front organizations."

For your information I am enclosing in the folder for each of you photostats of five Communist-front organizations with which Jessup was affiliated. You will note that Mrs. Jessup appears on the executive committee of a sixth Communist-front organization. The reason for including this with the photostats on Philip Jessup is because of the close affiliation of Philip Jessup with this organization also.

I again quote from the white paper in regard to Jessup:

"6. Senator McCarthy said to the ASNE: '* * * Dr. Jessup had control of the magazine Far Eastern Survey, when the Communist campaign in 1943 was initiated therein to smear Chiang Kai-shek and deify all the Communists. * * * I pointed out that he was head of the Research Advisory Board having complete control of the magazine during the height of the Communist Party line campaign."

"The facts: Dr. Jessup was not chairman of the Research Advisory Committee of the American Council of the Institute of Pacific Relations in 1943. He was merely one of 50 trustees of the American Council."

The purpose of this, of course, was to show that Mr. Jessup did not have charge of the Far Eastern Survey. You will note the clever double talk. They quote me as having stated that at the height of the Communist party-line campaign on the part of the Far Eastern Survey that Dr. Jessup was head of the Research Advisory Council which had complete control of the magazine. The "facts" they give were that he was not the chairman in 1943.

Now those who prepared the white paper had my speech before them. They knew that I did not say he was chairman in 1943. They knew I said he was chairman at the time the Communist smear reached its height, which was in 1944.

Now here is a photostat to show that he was head of the Research Advisory Council in 1944, at the height of its Communist Party line campaign, as I stated, and, ladies and gentlemen, photostats do not lie—and incidentally the Research Advisory Council has complete editorial control of the publication.

In connection with the statement, and I quote:

"He was merely one of 50 trustees of the American Council."

Let me quote Mr. Jessup's own testimony under oath:

"I was a member of the board of trustees of the American Council of the Institute from about 1933 until my resignation * * * in 1946. I was chairman of the board of trustees of the American Council during 1939 and 1940. I was the chairman of the Pacific Council from 1939 to 1942. I have also at various times served as a member of the executive committee of the American Council and in 1944 as chairman of the Research Advisory Committee."

I also pointed out to the ASNE that this publication controlled by Jessup and which was following the Communist Party line, was being sponsored by Communist money. At that time I had succeeded in obtaining photostats of checks totaling $3,500. The State Department in answering belittled the Communist money, stating that it totaled only $3,500 as compared with a total expense of $200,000. Now, you can be sure that the State Department had the facts and knew exactly how much Communist money had been contributed to Jessup's publication. It was very easy for them to get this information because all they had to do was to ask Jessup. Now, let us see how truthful they are about this figure of $3,500.

Since that time I have succeeded in digging up photostats of another $3,000, making a total of $6,500 paid to support the publication which Mr. Acheson's Ambassador at Large Jessup supervised. You editors know how difficult it is to obtain a photostat of checks from an unfriendly scurce—an almost impossible task—so you may be reasonably certain that when I have succeeded in getting photostats totaling $6,500 that many, many more thousands of dollars of Communist money was used to support that publication. Photostats of those checks are also enclosed in the folder.

Now Mr. Budenz has suggested to the committee that they subpena the records of the Communist, Field, who was signing the checks, but the Tydings committee says "No—we will use him and Browder as character witnesses for Lattimore, but we will not put on the record the total amount of Communist money used to support Jessup's publication, nor will we put on record what projects of other State Department experts were supported by Field's Communist funds."

It would not seem unreasonable to ask Messrs. Lucas, Tydings, and McMahon to explain why they fear the financial records of Mr. Field. I have no power to get those records. They can do it very simply by subpena.

Ladies and gentlemen, I have suggested time after time that a man who uses Communist money to support a publication which is selling the Communist Party line, should under no circumstances whatsoever hold the high position of Ambassador at Large, in which position he is helping make the plans to spend billions of American dollars to fight communism.

As I have said before, if Philip Jessup was too dull or too naive to know why the Communists were supporting the magazine which he was controlling, you can be certain that the Communists knew what they were buying and made certain they were getting more than a dollar's worth for every dollar spent.

When this information was brought to Truman's attention, immediate action was taken. This action consisted of giving Jessup top-secret clearance to A- and H-bomb information. And, in the face of this, there are those who say McCarthy's tactics of publicly exposing these men is wrong. He should dig up the information in secret and secretly give it to the President. What think you, ladies and gentlemen?

Ten days ago I stated I would spend some time tonight answering the now thoroughly discredited attack which Senator Chavez made against Louis Budenz, one of the witnesses who is responsible for lodging many Communists in jail. However, in the meantime Chavez's attack has been thoroughly discredited and effectively answered by others more competent to do so than I.

As many of you know, it is now an open secret that Chavez had practically nothing to do with writing the speech and even had difficulty reading this typical Communist Party line attack put together with the assistance of a Communist lawyer—a Communist lawyer who certainly deserves a promotion in the party for having succeeded in using the floor of the United States Senate as a transmission belt.

I suggest that you analyze that speech so that you may fully grasp the clever Communist line, the creation of which the Senator from New Mexico is not capable. For example, let me read to you one short paragraph:

"Members of the Senate and House should stop competing with the Executive branch of the Government in purging alleged subversives. This is a demand that all congressional committees stop trying to investigate Communist infiltration in the United States."

This certainly requires no comment.

I have been extremely happy that Protestants, Jews, and Catholics have spontaneously come to the defense of Louis Budenz since this stupidly vile attack upon him, his wife, and his family. It indicates that the Communist Party shall not be successful in its attempt to inject religious bigotry into this fight.

Now I was not disturbed in the least by this attack from the standpoint of its effect upon Louis Budenz. As we all know, for a period of time he was a top official of the Communist Party. However, since that time he has dedicated himself to the cause of Americanism. He has given unlimited help to the Federal Bureau of Investigation. He is in an all-out campaign to expose Communists in dangerous places. This is being done at great risk to his life and to the reputation of himself, his wife, and his family. Thus he has truly carved for himself a place in the hearts and minds of all people who love America.

Each of these Communist inspired attacks upon Louis Budenz cause him to increase in stature and will not even remotely deter him from testifying against those who would destroy America.

However, I was very deeply disturbed by the fact that Senator TYDINGS, chairman of the committee which ordered Budenz to appear, and Senator LUCAS, majority leader of the Senate, on the Senate floor supported this attack. In so doing they very seriously impeded the task of exposing Communists in our Government.

Their actions notified every prospective witness that he and his wife and family would also be subjected to this type of insanely vicious communistically inspired smear if he dared to help expose Communists in Government. Unfortunately, it has had the effect of making it more difficult to obtain valuable witnesses who are less courageous than Louis Budenz.

Ladies and gentlemen, in the brief time spent with you tonight I have tried to give you the high lights of a difficult and dangerous situation that exists. You have as a flaming back drop to my remarks the facts of the world as you find them today. Communism is no longer a creeping threat to America. It is a racing doom that comes closer to our shore each day. To resist it we must be intelligently strong.

Such strength will come only from men and women dedicated to the whole hearted defense of democracy. The average American who constitutes the heart and soul of this Nation is so dedicated. We must be sure that those who seek to lead up today are equally dedicated. We cannot survive on half loyalties any more than we can find the facts of the Communist conspiracy with half truths.

Reverend Herbert's Sermon at Linton Hall Military School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1950

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, Linton Hall Military School is a grammar school for boys, and has classes up to the eighth grade. It is located near Bristow, Va., among the rolling hills and beautiful valleys. It is not far from where the bloody battle of Bull Run was fought.

I wish to submit a short, but excellent, address that was delivered by the Reverend Walter W. Herbert, of Alexandria's St. Mary's Church, to the boys attending this Catholic school on the Nineteenth Annual Military Day:

A school is like a great tree which grows from a tiny seed planted in the depths of the earth. Each year, it puts forth leaves, and then, when they are mature, sends them out on the wings of the wind to all parts of the earth. And each one of these leaves bears unmistakably the mark of the tree from which it came.

Fifty-six years ago, a seed was planted in this green valley. Now, it has grown and become a great school which each year sends forth its students, each bearing the mark of the things he has learned here.

Out from this valley they go, one by one, that they may be lights to light up the darkness of our times. They go out that by the teachings of our Lord, they may be guides to lead in a world in which leadership has come to mean the same as force.

The challenge which the world throws into the face of you who go out from this school is not an easy one. Here in classroom and chapel, you have learned of the gentle Christ and have been taught that you should obey Him. But if you try to be good, the only thing the world will say is that you are weak. Here you have been taught of the goodness of God, and yet if you believe in God, the only thing that men may say about you is that you are old-fashioned. Here you have been taught that your soul is more important than anything else in the world, but if you value your self-respect more than the opinions of others, the only thing that they may say about you is that you are foolish. They said the same things about our Blessed Lord in his day, and He knew that nearly 2,000 years later they would be making the same remarks about His followers, and that is why He could declare from another mountain to those sitting in another green valley:

"Blessed are ye when they shall revile you and persecute you and speak all that is evil against you untruly for my sake, for your reward is very great in heaven." (Matthew v: 11–12.)

And that is why also, in the Sarcrament of Confirmation, He sent you the Holy Ghost, to make you strong and perfect Christians and soldiers of the King.

But as you go out into the fight for Christ, we would that you be not merely fighters in the ranks, but leaders. We wish that your good example may shine before all that many may be moved to draw close to God because of you. It is a strange thing but true that a soul which turns its back upon God is not satisfied to go along its own miserable way to destruction alone, but must draw others after. But if that is true, it is equally true that if a soul loves God it cannot rest until all around it love God also. That is why saints are so unpopular and disturbing to many in the world. That is why they are thought to be weak, old-fashioned, or foolish. That is the challenge that you have to face. This is the challenge for which you have been preparing these many years at Linton Hall.

You will take many memories with you as you leave these grounds in a few short weeks. There will be memories of friends, of good times spent, of games won, of the give and take of school life, which is only a little preview of the give and take of your life outside. As the years go on and these things become dim in your memories, you will forget much of what has happened. But there is one thing about Linton Hall that few of you will ever be able to forget, and that is the sacrifice and devotion to those who labor here. Fifty-six years ago, four nuns planted the seed that is today Linton Hall. The struggles that have intervened have not been easy. There have been dark days when all seemed lost, days of hardship and poverty, but in spite of all this, Linton Hall prospered. For it is like the house in Scripture: "The rains descended and the floods came, and the winds blew and dashed against that house and it fell not because it was founded upon a rock." (Matthew vii: 25.)

Those four brave souls have now become 84, and the original handful of students has become 247. And now a new hall must be added to shelter the ever-growing number of those who come. Indeed, these stones must rise and continue to rise in the years to come as a glowing tribute to the dreams of those who first planted the seed, and as a pledge that all those who have labored here have not labored in vain.

May nothing that you ever do betray the trust that those who have been your teachers place in you as you go forth. May nothing that you ever do erase the mark which Linton Hall places upon you, for it is the mark of the cross of our Lord.

May you keep your faith, may you love all men. If you do, then in the words of St. Paul:

"I am sure that neither death nor life, nor angels nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor might, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature shall be able to separate you from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord." (Romans viii: 38–39.)

Arming of the State of Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1950

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a petition from my good friend, Hon. George W. Armstrong, of Natchez, Miss., to the President of the United States with reference to arming the State of Israel at the expense of the American taxpayers.

We owe a duty to those Arabs who have occupied that country for approximately 2,000 years. Many of them were Christians, and they were all on friendly terms with the United States until this so-called State of Israel was set up and recognized overnight by the administration without consulting the Congress of the United States.

For my part, I am not willing to appropriate money out of the pockets of the overburdened taxpayers of the United States to underwrite the Crucifixion, or carry on a war with a friendly people.

Mr. Armstrong's petition to the President follows:

MAY 27, 1950.

To the President and the Congress of the United States.

GENTLEMEN: The Associated Press of May 26, 1950, reported that Secretary of State Dean Acheson entered into an agreement with Prime Minister Attlee of Great Britain and Prime Minister Schuman of France, by which the United States would permit the shipment of arms to the State of Israel and to the Arab countries for alleged defense purposes. As an American citizen I protest against this unrighteous agreement.

It is in fact an agreement to sanction the invasion of Arab homes and lands by the Zionists and deny the Arabs the power of

self-defense. Israeli is supported by the Zionists of the world with unlimited funds for the purchase of arms and munitions, while the Arabs are poor and unable to cope with them.

I therefore petition you to repudiate this vicious and unholy agreement.

Respectfully submitted.

GEO. W. ARMSTRONG.

Growth of Business in the Southeast From 1939 to 1948

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ELLIOTT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 1, 1950

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, the following facts about the 9 Southeastern States of Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Virginia, are confirmed by recent releases by the United States Bureau of the Census covering the 1948 census of business:

First. Between 1939 and 1948, retail trade in the States mentioned increased 252 percent, as compared to a 214 percent increase for the United States as a whole. The figures for 1939 are $4,500,000,000. The figures for 1948 are $16,000,000,000. Thus, these Southeastern States had a remarkable growth over this 9-year period as a consumer market.

Second. Alabama retail sales had a remarkable growth during this period, growing from $436,000,000 in 1939 to $1,631,403,000 in 1948. This is an increase of 274 percent as compared with a 214 percent increase for the United States as a whole. Thus, Alabama's increase is 60 percent greater than the United States increase. Alabama almost quadrupled her retail sales between 1939 and 1948.

Mr. Speaker, these figures indicate that the South is experiencing great growth. New sources of income, improved methods of farming, diversification of agriculture, new industries, all are a part of the picture.

As a part of my remarks, I include an article styled "Markets and Finance: Southeast's boom officially confirmed," by Joseph K. Heyman, which appeared in the Birmingham News, Sunday, May 28, 1950:

MARKETS AND FINANCE: SOUTHEAST'S BOOM OFFICIALLY CONFIRMED

(By Joseph K. Heyman)

ATLANTA, May 27.—The tremendous growth of the Southeast as a consumer market has been officially confirmed by figures from the 1948 Census of Business, current Census Bureau releases show.

Stores and other retail outlets in nine Southeastern States rang up total sales of more than $16,000,000,000 in 1948. The total was $4,500,000,000 in 1939, the last census year.

These figures are derived from preliminary reports of the 1948 Census of Business which are just now being released in piecemeal form. On the basis of thees reports we have calculated retail sales totals for each Southeastern State and for the region as a whole. The final official figures may vary slightly from ours, but probably by not more than 1 or 2 percent.

The Southeast enjoyed a sales gain of 252 percent between the two census counts. This is substantially better than the 214 percent gain for the United States as a whole. It is further evidence that Dixie is on the rise.

Every State in the region beat the national gain. The rankings of the percentage increases are shown in the accompanying chart.

Florida and Alabama top the list. Both of these States almost quadrupled their retail sales between 1939 and 1948.

The other seven States were close together, with increases ranging from Mississippi's 251 percent to Georgia's 234 percent.

The new census clearly confirms that the Southeast is a bigger part of the total United States market than it was prewar. It is a segment of the United States market which is continuing to grow, a fact that businessmen throughout the Nation will carefully note.

In the decade from 1929 to 1939, the Southeast increased its share of the national trade dollar from less than 10 cents to more than 11 cents.

By 1948, our share had jumped further to 12.5 cents.

Every State in the Southeast except two—Mississippi and Alabama—shared the rise in retail sales between 1929 and 1939, relative to the United States as a whole. And all nine bettered the United States average gain between 1939 and 1948.

Our huge jump in retail trade has come about mostly because of our hike in income. Total income payments before taxes were about $7,000,000,000 in 1939. This figure had ballooned to over $24,000,000,000 by 1948.

In addition, Southerners spend a larger portion of their total incomes in retail stores. We have to, because our incomes are lower. We must pay more of our earnings out to the grocer, the druggist, the clothing salesman, etc., for the necessities of life.

Nationally, retail stores took a little over 63 cents out of every dollar of income in 1948. In the Southeast, trade took about 67½ cents from each dollar.

We are closing the gap as compared with other United States citizens, however. In 1939, the average southerner spent 6 cents more out of each income dollar in retail trade than the average United States citizen. In 1948, we spent only 4 cents more than the average.

Despite our great improvement in retail trade, we are still well below the national average on a per capita basis. The average southerner bought a total of $640 of merchandise from retailers in 1948, as compared with purchases of $880 per person for the country as a whole. We still have a way to go to reach the level of the rest of the country.

The table below shows the dollar totals of retail sales for 1939 and 1948 by States and the percentage gain between the two censuses.

	Millions of dollars		Percent change
	1939	1948	
Alabama	436	1,631	+274
Florida	615	2,329	+279
Georgia	625	2,086	+234
Louisiana	486	1,668	+243
Mississippi	282	991	+251
North Carolina	633	2,210	+249
South Carolina	332	1,143	+244
Tennessee	607	2,074	+242
Virginia	628	2,200	+250
Southeast	4,644	16,331	+252
United States	42,042	130,300	+210

Award to Twentieth Century Club of Iuka, Miss., in the Build-a-Better-Community Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. STENNIS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 2 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the General Federation of Women's Clubs, have been laudable and forward-looking sponsors of a Nation-wide Build-a-Better-Community Contest, which drew 2,912 entries. Prizes were awarded at the recent fifty-ninth convention of the federation.

The Twentieth Century Club of Iuka, Miss., an organization of 17 women in a fine Mississippi city of 2,000 persons, was awarded the $10,000 sweepstakes prize for the Nation's best betterment program and $5,000 for the best job done by a club with less than 50 members.

For its project the club established an eye, ear, and nose clinic, brought in two doctors for a general health clinic, organized garbage disposal, started a cancer study unit, organized cub scout packs, bought a merry-go-round for a playground, ran a clean-up campaign, landscaped parks and the yard for the Negro school, and instigated a dial telephone system.

I take great pride in the outstanding achievements of these fine ladies, who had the cooperation of the inhabitants of this splendid little city and wish to commend all of them publicly for their unselfish devotion to the public interest and the outstanding accomplishments of their combined efforts. I see this as another indication of the progress Mississippi and the entire South are making.

The report of the splendid achievements of these patriotic and forward-looking ladies is of value and interest to the Members of the Congress and the people of the Nation, and I therefore request unanimous consent that the attached news item from the Washington Post of June 2 be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MISSISSIPPI CLUB TOPS—FEDERATION NAMES NINE CONTEST WINNERS

BOSTON, June 1 (U. P.).—The Twentieth Century Club, of Iuka, Miss., an organization of 17 women, won $15,000 in prizes tonight for a "face lifting" operation on Iuka—a town of 2,000 persons.

The prizes were awarded at the fifty-ninth convention of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, sponsors of a Nation-wide "Build a Better Community" contest which drew 2,912 entries.

The Mississippi women's group was one of nine clubs honored by the federation for civic improvement programs. Iuka won a $10,000 "sweepstakes" prize for the Nation's best betterment program and $5,000 for the best job done by a club with less than 50 members.

Honored by President Truman as "one of the most vital forces in American democracy," the Iuka Club won top honors for work done almost entirely by the 17 club members.

For its project the club established an eye, ear, and nose clinic, brought in two doctors for a general health clinic, organized garbage disposal, started a cancer-study unit, organized cub-scout packs, bought a merry-go-round for a playground, ran a clean-up campaign, landscaped parks and the yard for a Negro school, and instigated a dial telephone system.

Other winners of $5,000 prizes were the Tippecanoe County Federation of Women's Clubs, Lafayette, Ind., for establishing a Girl Scout camp, and the Senior and Junior Women's Clubs of Marianna, Fla., for work in combating hookworm disease in Jackson County, Fla.

Prizes of $3,000 went to the Sorosis Club, of Orlando, Fla.; the Cosmos, Fidelis, and Searchlight Clubs, of Overbrook, Kans.; and the El Progreso Club, of Alpine, Tex.

Other national contest winners were the Harrodsburg Women's Club, of Harrodsburg, Ky.; the Junior Chilhowee, of Maryville, Tenn.; and the Twentieth Century, Study, and Women's Clubs, of Rolla, N. Dak., each of which was awarded $2,000.

President Truman's message, read at the presentation ceremonies, said the federation's contest is "helping to strengthen democracy at its very foundations in the local community."

"Communist and other totalitarian states believe in running affairs from the top down," Mr. Truman said. "In the United States we are proving how superior it is to carry on our Government from the grass roots upward."

Prize money, donated by the Kroger Co., Midwest retail food chain, is to be used toward furthering civic-improvement projects. The contest awards high-lighted the third day of a meeting of 2,500 delegates representing 11,000,000 clubwomen in the United States and abroad.

No Whitewash, Please

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 2 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "No Whitewash, Please," which appeared in the May 23 issue of the Oroville (Calif.) Mercury.

There being no objection the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NO WHITEWASH, PLEASE—WASHINGTON POST PROPOSES TO FEED CONFIDENCE TO THE PEOPLE—WE WANT SOMETHING BETTER

Things are at a pretty pass in Washington. The Capital has been "seized and convulsed by a terror," according to the Washington Post, which comes out with a full-page editorial about it—an editorial that apparently has been reproduced in many large newspapers throughout the country, for it appeared in the San Francisco Chronicle in full-page display form.

The Post devotes the space to a denunciation of witch hunts such as have gripped Washington. By witch hunts it refers to such campaigns as that conducted by Senator MCCARTHY, who has been making rather wild charges directed at the State Department.

The Post refers to the cancerous growth of totalitarianism, the great menace of Russia and Russia's fanatical fifth column in every country, including ours, which is menacing our safety.

The Post comes up with a solution. It demands appointment of a commission of leading citizens to assess our over-all security "and to give to the American people the fullest possible information." The commission would be appointed by the President and would be nonpartisan, etc., etc.

Two-thirds of the page is devoted to denouncing witch hunts. They are so bad that it is trite to denounce them. The question is, what causes witch hunts and would a nonpartisan commission, as advocated by the Post, remove the causes back of witch hunts.

The editorial devotes some space to the present plight of the State Department and cites this:

"Revilement of our diplomats has come to such a pass that in a recent line-up for tickets for a symphony concert in Washington a man who admitted to a reporter that he was from the State Department was publicly laughed at."

Such is the situation. Can a correction be made without getting at the cause? We think not.

Then, what was the cause?

We submit that Senator MCCARTHY, liberally dealt with in the Post's editorial, would have got no where with the public had he not had a rich field in which to sow his seeds of distrust.

Here are some facts that all remember, but should be set down here to explain what led up to the present sad situation with regards the State Department:

In 1945 the State Department helped to hush up the Amerasia case so that the public never got to know how it happened that hundreds of State Department documents were stolen. No one ever was brought to trial although six were arrested. Two were assessed small fines on pleas of guilty. The cases of the others were dropped. The Amerasia scandal would have died right there had it not been for the Hiss case.

Years ago many of the facts in the Hiss case were taken to the State Department by Whittaker Chambers, but the State Department sneered it down. The Hiss case simmered along until Congressman NIXON broke it open in the House Un-American Activities Committee. Now Hiss stands convicted as a traitor. Hiss had been very prominent in the State Department, helped write the United Nations Charter and stood behind President Roosevelt at Yalta when China was sold out to Stalin. Even after Hiss was convicted, the Secretary of State would not turn his back on him.

Still the State Department might have escaped the witch hunt had it not been for the Fuchs exposure, with which it had nothing to do, and the loss of China to the Communists, with which it had everything to do.

After the sell-out of Chiang Kai-shek at Yalta, where Hiss was operating "on our side," the Russians proceeded to move in on China, and a vigorous and influential clique in the State Department proceeded to belittle Chiang and praise the Communists. They influenced Secretary of State Marshall until his uterances caused Chiang to lose face sufficiently to lose all.

This major defeat for United States policy—a loss that nullified most of what we had fought for in the war of the Pacific—placed the State Department in a vulnerable position, to the extent that all the other faux pas came up to slap it in the face.

These are the reasons for the present witch hunt, if such it is. The country isn't convinced it is just a witch hunt, thinks something else exists that has not been uncovered, and that the State Department may have been covering up.

Give a man or a department a bad reputation and he or it must work himself out of it the hard way.

It is not enough merely to call it a witch hunt and dismiss it—by appointing a commission "of leading citizens."

Meanwhile the President, who has refused data to Congressmen, finally lets them see it, but not to make notes, not to take their attorneys with them, not this and not that.

Meanwhile the President breaks down the nonpartisan foreign policy by his actions and the Republicans take the opportunity to blame the State Department, and make it stick, too.

No, you can't salve the American people by appointing a commission of leading citizens to pass glorified hand-outs to the press. The State Department must show by its actions that it will not tolerate infiltration by Communists and will not tolerate Communist-inspired policy. It will take time for it to work itself back into the confidence of the American people, but it will take more time than necessary if it and the President don't start now, instead of following the white wash proposal of the Washington Post.

"Tories" Using Teachers to Warp Young Minds; "Heat" on Churches

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1950

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, the enclosed article reveals the clever way in which big business has set out to beat the Democratic Party and the Fair Deal program that was adopted by the Democratic convention. This article appeared in last week's issue of the progressive and very alert weekly newspaper, Labor.

"TORIES" USING TEACHERS TO WARP YOUNG MINDS; "HEAT" ON CHURCHES

Close all your town's schools for the day. March the teachers to a labor union hall. Give them a fancy dinner, and talks on the misdeeds of big business and political reactionaries. Tell them to pass this "information" along to their school children.

Impossible? Businessmen would "raise the roof" if anything like that were tried in your town? They certainly would, but they are doing exactly that kind of thing in cities and towns all over the country.

How it is being done wholesale in one State is told in a series of articles in the Madison (Wis.) Capital Times, progressive paper published by "Bill" Evjue, who knows propaganda when he sees it.

"B-I-E DAYS"

The National Association of Manufacturers and the United States Chamber of Commerce, the articles explain, have joined in a program of Business-Industry-Education Days. Labor exposed this program when it was first revealed about a year ago. Since then, it is now disclosed, B-I-E Days have been held "in a score of Wisconsin communities."

In each of them, a program carefully planned by the NAM and C. of C. was fol-

lowed by local businessmen. The program has these steps:

The schools are closed, either all day, or at least half a day.

The businessmen take the teachers on "personally conducted" tours through local industrial plants.

BANQUETS FOR TEACHERS

Then comes a "banquet in the evening, at which the teachers are fed and entertained by the local chamber of commerce or some other organization of business or industry.

"At each of these banquets there was a speaker—usually a prominent local banker, businessman, or industrialist.

"An analysis of the addresses given at half a dozen of these B-I-E days in Wisconsin communities reveals the following dominating themes:

"1. High taxes are killing private enterprise and initiative.

"2. The Truman health program is the same as socialism or communism.

"3. Government regulation of business is ruining the American way of life.

"4. Teachers should tell their pupils that freedom in America is being stifled by radical plans made in Washington.

"5. Government spending leads to communism.

"6. Public housing, publicly owned electric power systems, and public welfare programs are leading the United States to socialism."

FORM CHILDREN'S THINKING

At Stevens Point, Wis., for example, over 200 school teachers heard a B-I-E Day speech by Carl N. Jacobs, corporation president and a director of the United States Chamber of Commerce. Jacobs gave the usual scare talk about the welfare state, complained that "business is maligned by those whose sympathies are for Government or labor," urged the teachers to carry his message back to their schools, and told them this:

"You can inspire the youth of today to choose its form of society. The choice will, in large measure, be determined by the kind of thinking you stimulate." Could anything be plainer than that? Plant our propaganda in children's minds, reactionary big-business spokesmen tell the teachers, and the children will grow up thinking what we want them to think.

When George E. Watson, Wisconsin State superintendent of schools, was asked about these B-I-E days, he said they were perfectly proper.

But when asked whether he would approve closing the schools for a Labor Union Day, he said, "I will have to think that over."

"HEAT" PUT ON CHURCHES

This column has discussed John T. Flynn's reactionary propaganda book The Road Ahead. Hundreds of thousands of a boiled-down version of it are being distributed by the so-called Committee for Constitutional Government.

The complete book contains a chapter 10, which attacks the Federal Council of Churches. That organization, composed of liberal churchmen of various Protestant denominations, champions progressive measures and the cause of labor.

The Reader's Digest magazine, which originally published the boil-down of Flynn's book, also printed a nasty article by Stanley High about what he called Methodism's pink fringe. This article also was an attack upon liberal churchmen.

NO ONE SAFE FROM SLANDER

Why are these attacks significant? Because they show that not even prominent and obviously respectable church members and ministers are safe from slander as pinks and Reds, if they dare to challenge the reactionary interests represented by such propagandists as Flynn and High.

As an eminent Presbyterian minister recently wrote Labor: "The 'heat' is being turned upon the churches. Ministers who have long stood with you for social justice are being persecuted by a smear campaign. Pressure is being put on us to go backward from our social viewpoints."

REA Power Lines in South Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GUY M. GILLETTE

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 2 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a communication by Claude R. Wickard, Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, relating to REA power lines in South Carolina. The communication was published in the Washington Post of today.

There being no objection, the communication was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REA POWER LINES IN SOUTH CAROLINA

(By Claude Wickard, Administrator, Rural Electrification Administration)

A full-page advertisement by the South Carolina Electric & Gas Co. in the Washington Post of May 21 charged the Rural Electrification Administration with a misuse of Federal funds.

Because of the national influence which your paper exerts and because of the false, misleading, and unfair statements and implications contained in the advertisement, we are taking this means of calling to your attention and the attention of your readers the facts regarding our lending policy in general and the facts in this case in particular.

The power company advertisement was directed specifically against a loan of $7,595,500 made by the Rural Electrification Administration in January 1949, to the Central Electric Power Cooperative of South Carolina for the construction of transmission lines. These lines will bring low-cost hydroelectric power from the Santee-Cooper Dam to rural areas served by REA cooperatives in South Carolina.

The authority of the REA Administrator to make loans not only for distribution lines but also for generation and transmission facilities was clearly set forth by the Congress in the Rural Electrification Act.

Although not required under the law, it has been REA policy since the beginning of the program to make loans to finance generation and transmission facilities only where one of two conditions exists: Either that an adequate and dependable supply of wholesale power is not available to meet the cooperatives' needs, or that a saving can be achieved in the cost of power to rural consumers. This policy is well known and has been reviewed from time to time by various committees of Congress. The application from the South Carolina cooperatives satisfied not merely one but both of the requirements listed above.

This loan will bring about a saving averaging more than a quarter of a million dollars annually over the life of the loan for farmers of the State under rates they have been paying. Furthermore, with power from Santee-Cooper Dam delivered over their own transmission system, the rural people will be assured of adequate power to meet their growing needs.

As to the adequacy of the present facilities in the area, Chairman Winchester Smith, of the South Carolina Public Service Commission had this to say before the REA loan was approved: "The power transmission lines in lower, central, and eastern South Carolina are wholly inadequate * * * there is a woeful shortage of distribution lines, inadequate service and power in the area above-mentioned."

Contrary to the impression the advertisements tried to create, the transmission system to be built by the co-ops will not only improve service and effect a saving for the present 43,000 consumers, but will assure adequate low-cost power that will enable the co-ops to bring electric service for the first time to about 25,000 additional rural families.

No duplication of lines is involved. Only about one-fourth of the co-op lines will parallel the commercial utility facilities and in these cases the co-op lines are necessary to carry additional loads that the utility lines are not capable of handling. When a single-lane highway becomes so overcrowded that it cannot carry the traffic, the addition of another lane may be paralelling, but it certainly cannot be classed as duplication. Any Arlington or Alexandria motorist will testify that the new Potomac Bridge does not represent any unnecessary duplication of the Highway Bridge.

The existing transmission facilities of the power companies were constructed to serve municipalities and densely populated areas. They were not built to handle the loads which the cooperatives have created in areas the power companies would not serve. The sole purpose of the REA loan is to enable the co-ops and the rural people to serve themselves with ample low-cost power over transmission lines designed and constructed specifically to meet their needs.

The loans made by REA must be repaid to the Government with interest. The repayment record of REA borrowers is outstanding. Therefore, these loans are no burden on the taxpayers of the Nation and there is no basis whatever for the insinuation that this loan will waste at least $9,000,000 of your money.

The charge that the loan will result in killing the power company is palpably absurd. The cooperatives cannot take away from the company any business the company itself has developed. The only business involved in the REA loan is the business which they, the cooperatives, have themselves developed and which they have been giving to the power company through their purchase of wholesale power. And, according to its own statement to the SEC, the power company's sale of power to the electric cooperatives amounts to less than 1 percent of its total revenues.

The cooperatives are simply exercising their right, as private business enterprises, to purchase wholesale power where they find it most advantageous. Obviously, this is fully in accord with our system of free enterprise. On the other hand, a serious threat to our system of free enterprise lies in the actions of the power company, which wants to interfere with the free economy by maintaining a monopoly situation which would give the cooperatives no alternative and would force them to buy their power from the company on the latter's terms.

It is a matter of record that at the time the Santee-Cooper Authority was created the companies were charging the cooperatives 11 to 14 mills per kilowatt-hour for power. They had the field to themselves and they opposed the development of power at Santee-Cooper. When this effort failed and the dam was built they insisted that they buy all the power and transmit it to the cooperatives at high rates. They successfully opposed the building of transmission lines by Santee-Cooper to carry the low-cost power to the rural electric cooperatives. It was only after repeated requests of the Santee-Cooper Authority and the cooperatives that the

power companies reluctantly reduced their rates to the cooperatives.

The South Carolina Electric & Gas Co., which Mr. McMeekin represents, put up the strongest resistance to this request but finally agreed to charge a 7½-mill rate on the company lines. In addition, the cooperatives had to bear the cost of bringing the power from the company lines to their load centers. This 7½-mill rate was in effect at the time REA made the loan to the cooperatives to put in their own central transmission system, which would deliver power from Santee-Cooper to their load centers at 6 mills per kilowatt-hour.

On May 22, the day after the full-page advertisement appeared in the New York, Washington, and South Carolina newspapers, the cooperatives received a letter from Mr. McMeekin stating that he had reduced the rate to 5½ mills. Obviously, this latest reduction, coming 16 months after the loan was made, was for the purpose of confusing the issue and it should be viewed in the light of Mr. McMeekin's prolonged and stubborn resistance to making Santee-Cooper power available to rural electric cooperatives at a reasonable cost.

If Mr. McMeekin had been successful in his opposition to Santee-Cooper and the efforts of REA cooperatives to reduce power costs, the rural people in South Carolina would be paying so much for their power that it would be impossible for them to realize maximum benefits from this essential service. It also would have precluded the possibility of thousands of farm families in the State getting electric service under the area-coverage policy of the co-ops.

During the time that REA had the co-op's application under consideration, power companies were given many opportunities to present their case. In April 1948, South Carolina power company officials conferred with us regarding the proposed loan. Again on December 21, they were invited to a conference with REA. Neither at this meeting nor at any other time was a firm offer made which was nearly as favorable to the cooperatives as the Central Electric Power Cooperative plan, taking into account the combined factors of price, quality of service, and assured ability to deliver the amounts of power needed.

During January 1949 representatives of the South Carolina companies outlined two alternative plans. Neither contained concrete rate proposals and both were indefinite and unsatisfactory in many other respects.

On the basis of these facts, REA approved the loan and executed a loan contract with the South Carolina cooperative officials. This means REA has entered into a binding agreement with the cooperative to advance the loan money under the terms of the contract.

REA has no legal right to withhold funds now on the basis of proposals made subsequent to the loan by the power companies unless these proposals are approved and submitted to us by the cooperative.

CLAUDE R. WICKARD.

WASHINGTON.

Jet Transports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 2 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Jet Transports," which appeared in the Washington Post for Sunday, May 28. The editorial relates to a bill, recently reported favorably by the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which would authorize the Government to flight-test new aircraft. As it is pointed out in the editorial, both Britain and Canada have experimented extensively with jet transports, and have proved their practicability beyond doubt. Meanwhile, American aircraft manufacturers have not produced a jet transport, nor do they have plans for doing so. I hope that soon we may see an American-designed transport equipped with a turbo-prop engine.

I am also very happy that the President has sent the name of Mr. John McCone to the Senate for confirmation as Assistant Secretary of the Air Force. Mr. McCone, together with Secretary Finletter of the Air Force, served with distinction on the President's Air Policy Commission, and made an intensive study of the whole field of aeronautics. I believe Mr. McCone and Secretary Finletter will make a brilliant team which will assure the United States maximum security in the field of air power.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JET TRANSPORTS

The recent flight of a Canadian jet airliner from Toronto to New York in less than an hour emphasizes the sad position of this country with respect to jet transports. To date there is not a single jet-powered prototype for civil use, and the military has shown no disposition to pioneer jet craft which might be adapted for airline traffic. Meanwhile, both Britain and Canada have experimented extensively with jet transports and have proved their practicability beyond doubt.

All this gives added importance to the Johnson bill now before the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee to authorize the Government to defray the costs of testing new transport aircraft. Unlike a similar bill to provide Government help for developing new private planes—a field which, despite the decline in sales, the manufacturers are capable of financing and marketing—this is a virgin territory. Neither the aircraft manufacturers nor the airlines can bear the expense of developing jet transports, though the airlines undoubtedly would buy models already proved. Yet several good engines are available for prototypes, one more efficient and more powerful than the British counterpart. The combination of jet power with propellers in the new turboprop engine gives promise of being as economical as the conventional piston-type engine, and incomparably faster.

American progress in jet transports is vitally related to national defense, because in wartime the military is certain to fall back on civilian airlines to supply rapid transportation. In any future war conventional planes will be hopelessly slow and outmoded. Yet if there is to be jet-transport development, it is apparent that the Government will have to help. Probably it is too late to expect the Johnson bill to be included in this year's appropriations, though it has the approval of the Bureau of the Budget. But certainly Congress ought to pass the authorizing legislation for implementation next year. Provision for continued progress in aircraft development is a good deal more important than most of the pork-barrel projects voted with such abandon.

The South Is a Cattle Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1950

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, the South is potentially the greatest cattle country in the United States. Cotton acreage control allotments are hastening a realization of this fact.

Alabama increased the number of its cattle in 1949 by 11 percent. Quality is also improving at a rapid pace .

Our climate, our high annual rainfall, our 10 to 12 months grazing season, our ability to grow grain crops with which to supplement our grasses and clovers, are some of the factors that will make us a great cattle country.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article on this subject from a recent issue of the Gulf Breeze, published in New Orleans, La.:

THE SOUTH IS A CATTLE COUNTRY

We now have 53 head of cattle per hundred people in the United States—80,000,000 cattle for 151,000,000 people. The ratio of cattle to people has varied during the past 25 years from 48 per hundred people in 1928 to 62 cattle per hundred people in 1944. Cattle numbers per capita are still below average and are not likely to become excessive during the next several years.

In the period January 1, 1949, to January 1, 1950, there was a decrease in cattle population in California, Oregon, Montana, Wyoming, North Dakota, South Dakota, Colorado, and New Mexico and only an increase of 3 percent in Texas and Michigan, an increase of 2 percent in Washington, Nevada, and Utah, and an increase of 1 percent in Nebraska, Kansas, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Indiana, and Ohio, and no increase in Idaho. There was an increase of 1 percent in New England, 2 percent in New York, 2 percent in Pennsylvania. During this same period there was an increase in Oklahoma of 7 percent, Louisiana 8 percent, Mississippi 10 percent, Florida 10 percent, Arkansas 11 percent, Alabama 11 percent, and Georgia 11 percent. There were also definite increases in Tennessee and South and North Carolina.

It is interesting to compare the animal increase with increase in population of people. In 1940 we had in the continental United States, excluding possessions, 131,669,275 people. In 1950 we probably have 151,000,000 people. During the past 10 years the earning power of the American people has increased much more rapidly than has the population. We have 20,000,000 more people with more than double their former earnings, to buy livestock products, including dairy and poultry products. We show only a slight increase in cattle and hogs and a tremendous decrease in sheep; but a rapid increase in population and an even more rapid increase in purchasing power. With a minimum wage of 75 cents per hour as contrasted with a wage of 75 cents a day within the memory of many of us, the American people can afford to and do eat more meat, milk, and poultry products than ever before.

Only a few years ago the country west of the Mississippi River produced approximately 70 percent of all the cattle, and the country east of the Mississippi River consumed approximately 70 percent of all livestock produced. The growth in population in many sections in the East has been small but growth west of the Mississippi has been tremendous.

California and other Western States formerly shipped to other sections a great part of the cattle and dairy products produced in that section. Their industrial population has increased so rapidly that these States now cannot supply enough of the livestock products to feed their own people and other sections are shipping beef, pork, and even dairy products into these States that formerly exported much of their production. The west coast is rapidly becoming industrialized. The range country of the West where cattle have been produced is shrinking in area year by year, comparatively fewer people are living on the farm, and thousands have moved to industrial cities. Besides this, erosion, dust storms, drought, and hydroelectric development has had a tendency to decrease the grazing area.

In the South, and especially the Southeast, (God's country) the number of cattle is increasing rapidly and the quality is improving even more rapidly. We are learning to stop erosion and are learning to build good, permanent 12-month pastures, and we are rapidly learning to produce more grain—more corn and more small grain. We are becoming the great Clover Belt of the Nation, not only from the standpoint of pastures, but also from the standpoint of seed. We have increased and improved our marketing and processing facilities until now every farmer has a market and many communities have good markets and processing plants.

Our businessmen—bankers, merchants, manufacturers, and distributors—as well as our farmers, need to become cattle-minded. They need to know more about the value of livestock on the farm—how it increases the per capita agricultural wealth and how it furnishes additional income for the lawyer, the doctor, the banker, the mechant, and everyone not on the farm. The farmer himself needs to realize the dignity of agriculture and especially the dignity of the cow.

All farmers cannot be dairymen, beef-cattle farmers, sheep, hog, or poultry farmers, but there is a place on every southern farm for some livestock. First, we need livestock, dairy products, and poultry products to better feed our own people. We have countless thousands of people even on our farms, to say nothing of the towns and cities, who do not consume enough livestock and poultry products. This is true all over the United States but especially true in the South where we have many farmers who do not have milk for their families, do not have butter to spread on their bread, and do not know the value of the various types of cheese. We have farmers who do not have enough eggs to supply the family and who rarely ever have a chicken for home use.

If every American would add 10 cents a day to his meals in the form of some livestock product it would require more than a billion bushels of corn to produce the food consumed by this additional 10 cents expenditure on the part of American eaters. If we consumed more of these health-giving protein foods we would enjoy better health and we would also enjoy a better prosperity.

The Northwest and West simply cannot compete with the South in the production of livestock when the average southern farmer learns the value of good, permanent pastures, the need of better markets, and the necessity for better types of livestock and poultry. A cow producing 6,000 pounds of milk is worth five times as much as a cow producing 2,000 pounds. A hen that lays 50 more eggs than the average hen is of real value and if the average hen in the South could be made to produce 50 more eggs than are now produced, poultry would be profitable.

But we do not produce as many pounds of beef as some sections, and we do not produce as many eggs per hen; and it is simply because we are not trying to do a good job. We can become the great livestock section of the Nation—we should—we must—and we will—when we learn to utilize our natural advantages and learn to work more and play less, to plan more and dream less, and to have a pride in agriculture rather than a hope to get off the farm.

We have the climate, the grasses, the clovers, the water, and the advantages of a superior freight rate to the great consuming markets. We must quit dreaming and sleeping and get busy and every one of us assume the responsibility of doing our full part to develop our country.

What has been said as to cattle and poultry could be said with even more emphasis as to sheep. The sheep population of the United States has decreased 35 percent in 10 years. There is hardly a section in our district that could not profitably carry a few sheep. The lime lands of Alabama and Mississippi and the brown loam lands and the red lands of all of our three States can produce excellent pastures, and we should have within a few years 10 times the number of sheep in this district that we now have.

Eighth Annual Tournament of Orators

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement referring to the eighth annual tournament of orators.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We have long recognized the fact that a more thorough knowledge of American history and a better understanding of the contributions of our great forefathers toward the development of our constitutional form of government is necessary for the building of solid Americanism—indeed, it is the cornerstone of good citizenship.

Very recently there occurred an incident in Maryland which I should like to call to the attention of the Senate, an incident which has profound significance in the development of young minds throughout the Nation toward a more steadfast appreciation of their privileges as Americans.

The incident to which I refer is the eighth annual Tournament of Orators, sponsored throughout the Nation by the Hearst newspapers under the guidance of Mr. William Randolph Hearst, the eminent publisher.

Each year, the Hearst newspapers select one of our outstanding forebears as a personality to be eulogized by high-school and college students of America, in competition for some $25,000 in prizes and trips to the city staging the national finals.

This year, James Madison, fourth President and father of the Constitution under which we live and enjoy our liberty and freedom, was chosen.

Forensic competitions were staged in the metropolitan areas and attracted thousands of students into the long, grueling series of elimination contests.

Then, on Friday, May 12, the finalists from the Pacific coast, the Midwest, and the East coast met in Baltimore to determine the national champions of the high-school and college divisions.

It was my privilege and pleasure to have attended this inspiring scene, attended also by outstanding public officials and members of the judiciary, including jurists of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals, the Virginia Supreme Court of Appeals, and the chief judge of the supreme bench of Baltimore.

This tournament was widely commended for its great contribution to the development of young students into a spirit of appreciation of what their citizenship means to them, including commendations from a number of distinguished Members of the Senate itself.

For the record, I should like very much to set forth some of these tributes to the Hearst newspapers, for it is my considered opinion these newspapers have rendered invaluable service to the Nation at a time when our every thought should be directed toward loyalty and steadfastness in support of our American institutions.

From the Supreme Court of the United States:

Mr. Justice Stanley Reed:

"The contest that the Hearst newspapers are sponsoring makes an important contribution toward a better understanding of our Constitution. I hope that it will be most successful."

Hon. MILLARD E. TYDINGS, Senator from Maryland:

"Of the three men preeminent in establishing the Constitution—Washington, Madison, Marshall—James Madison has been named with historic justice, the father of the Constitution. Calm, studious, tolerant, deliberate, his constructive ability and conciliatory disposition fitted him admirably to take the leading part in the development and formulation of this instrument of our liberties. I am happy to see honor being paid to this great American to the end that all may become better acquainted with the foremost architect of our constitutional form of government."

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD, Senator from Virginia:

"There has never been a time when all of us needed more to be conscious of what our Constitution means to us, to realize the blessings it bestows upon us every day, and to rededicate ourselves to its fundamental principles.

"To study the life and works of James Madison is to do all these things, and therefore I congratulate you upon the selection of President Madison as the subject of the eighth annual Tournament of Orators and compliment you on the fine work you are doing through this competition.

"Of course I am pleased that you should select such an eminent Virginian as the subject for this year's orations. He shared honors with Thomas Jefferson as founder of the Virginia democracy and with Jefferson and others as founder of the American Democratic Party. He served as a representative of his community in the Virginia Legislature, and as a Representative of his State in Congress. He served his friend Thomas Jefferson as his Secretary of State, and he served his Nation as its President.

"But, with all his other public service, he is best known in the history of our country as the "father of our Constitution." In my opinion no man could ask for greater honor, and it is gratifying that the students of

this Nation should do him honor at this time."

Hon. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, Senator from Virginia:

"Virginia contributed to the Colonial fight for freedom the greatest galaxy of unique minds and characters ever furnished in a limited area to a great cause.

"Washington, with little formal education, contributed a leadership based primarily upon his unselfishness and unsurpassed integrity. Patrick Henry, the "spark plug" of the Revolution, furnished the most eloquent voice this Nation has ever produced; in fact I would rate him as one of the greatest orators of all time; Jefferson furnished the leadership of a brilliant mind, highly trained, and I rate him as our greatest political philosopher.

"But it remained for the analytical mind and legal training of James Madison to present the meaning of the Constitution to the Thirteen Sovereign States in a way that brought about its ratification by the necessary majority. But for Madison, Virginia would not have ratified; and if Virginia had not, the new Nation would not have been formed.

"In my opinion, the name of Madison must be included among the truly great statesmen of history who have helped to shape the destiny of the world. It, therefore, is most appropriate that the News-Post should use the name of Madison in connection with its Tournament of Orators, which will focus the attention of our youth on the lives and accomplishments of the founding fathers who made this Nation great."

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON, Senator from Washington:

"Your annual Tournament of Orators honoring President James Madison is an inspiration to American youth. My very good wishes go to you and the participants."

Hon. HENRY CABOT LODGE, Jr., Senator from Massachusetts:

"The Hearst Newspapers are to be congratulated in sponsoring this national contest and I send the finalists my very best wishes."

Hon. MARGARET CHASE SMITH, Senator from Maine:

"Our greatest hope for the future will come through our young people and I know of no greater contribution than the one that you and your associates are making in impressing youth with the need for appreciation of the basic principles of American freedom."

Five distinguished American educators served as judges to select the two national winners. Those chosen were Agnes Mary Ott, of Mount Mary College, Milwaukee, and John Rydgren, of Franklin High School, Seattle, Wash. Each was presented a $1,000 Government savings bond which the Federal Reserve bank in Baltimore had filled out back stage and made ready for presentation as soon as the judges' findings were made known.

It was a historic event and its inspiration will be felt for many years by those who witnessed it. The Hearst Newspapers have performed an exemplary service to the Nation.

The Civil-Rights Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE R. HOEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Mr. Frank R. Kent in the Washington Evening Star of June 4, 1950, discussing the civil-rights program, in which he describes the whole movement as political.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CIVIL-RIGHTS PROGRAM TERMED POLITICAL

An incontestable fact about politics in this country—and, probably, in any country—is that lying and hypocrisy steadily increase as the voting population grows. The larger the vote, the more fruitful the field for the demagogues and fakirs.

Beyond dispute, this is the basic reason for the cheapening of our public service during the last two decades in which the vote in presidential elections has gone from 38,000,000 in 1932 to 49,000,000 in 1948. The estimate for 1952 is approximately 55,000,000. Few will dispute that in those years, from the White House down, ethical standards have been lowered while the intellectual and moral inadequacy of our public representatives has reached an all-time high.

Perhaps the most convincing illustration of the situation is in the so-called civil-rights program of Mr. Truman, the chief feature of which is the fair employment practices proposal now pending in the Senate. It is the simple truth that among the proponents of this legislation there is more humbug and less sincerity than about any other proposal that has been before Congress in many years.

With rare exceptions, not so much as a trace of sincerity on this issue exists among the politicians in either party. With these it is wholly a matter of politics. There is and has been for 14 years a contest between the parties to hold the Negro vote in the 10 States of the North where it holds the balance of power. Particularly, is this true of the Democratic Party, which since 1936 has become more or less dependent on this vote in most of these States and which only began to be interested in the Negro after 1936, when for the first time, it succeeded in weaning away from the Republicans a large percentage of the Negro vote which had been their basic asset since the Civil War.

The story of how this was done has been told before, but the present situation makes it worth briefly repeating. In 1934, ex-Senator Guffey of Pennsylvania sold the idea to James A. Farley, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, that with more patronage for the Negro he could carry Pennsylvania. Mr. Farley felt that if this could be done in that State it could in others. He and Senator Guffey sold the idea to Mr. Roosevelt, who enthusiastically cooperated. The start was made by naming a Negro editor from Pittsburgh as an Assistant Attorney General, the highest public office ever held by a Negro. This was followed by an avalanche of Negro appointments to a large variety of Federal jobs.

In the 1936 campaign, the astute Mr. Farley supplemented this by putting on the committee pay roll a large number of Negro preachers, teachers, deacons and others more or less oratorical who were sent through the 10 States to spread the gospel that Roosevelt and the New Deal were the true friends of the Negro. As a result of that campaign, more than 90 percent of the heretofore solidly Republican Negro vote was transferred to the Democrats—and most of it is still Democratic.

* * * * *

There was not an ounce of principle or sentiment in the whole performance. It was a coldly calculated and cleverly executed political plan. Ever since the Democrats have coddled, cuddled and cajoled the Negro vote in every possible way. The climax came in the 1948 convention when the civil-rights plank, upon which the FEPC is based, was adopted. Now so deeply committed that, despite the determined revolt in the South, administration leaders cannot let go without risking loss of a vote that has become vital.

Address of Clyde T. Ellis, Executive Manager, National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, at State Meeting of Rural Electric Cooperatives, Public Power Progress Day, Jackson, Miss., May 26, 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 5, 1950

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks, I am inserting an address delivered by Hon. Clyde T. Ellis before the Rural Cooperative Power Association, at Jackson, Miss., on May 26, 1950, which I hope every Member of Congress will take the time to read.

Sixteen years ago, when we started the drive for rural electrification in the Tennesseee Valley area, only 10 percent of the farms of this Nation enjoyed the use of any electricity at all. Today we have 85 percent of the farm homes of this country electrified, and it is my hope that we may soon reach them all.

Electricity is the greatest servant mankind has ever known, and the only one the man or woman of ordinary means can afford, and they can afford it only when it is provided at rates based upon the cost of generation, transmission, and distribution.

One kilowatt-hour of electricity is equal to the strength of a strong man working 10 or 12 hours.

Every Member of Congress is, or should be familiar with the fact that a horsepower has always been considered to be equal to the strength of 10 men. A horsepower of electricity is 746 watts, which is a little less than three-fourths of a kilowatt. A kilowatt, which is 1,000 watts, is equal to the strength of more than 10 men. But for the sake of argument, let us say it is equal to the strength of 10 strong men. A kilowatt-hour of electricity then would be equal to more than the strength of 10 strong men working 1 hour, or 1 strong man working 10 hours.

In other words, pumping water the same distance, it would take a strong man more than 10 hours hard pumping to pump as much water as an electric pump would pump with one kilowatt-hour, which in the district I represent amounts to around 2 cents.

This not only applies to the water pump, but it applies to the washing machine, the milking machine, the feed grinder, the hay drier, the electric fan, including the attic fan, and other appliances that are now being used to remove the drudgery, brighten the home, inspire hope, and stimulate the pride of the farmers and their wives and children. It is, as I said, the greatest ser-

vant mankind has ever known, and if we will develop the rest of the water power that is now going to waste in our navigable streams and their tributaries, amounting to 394,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours a year, and distribute it to the people of this Nation, and especially to the farmers, at rates based upon the cost of generation, transmission, and distribution, we can make this the richest and most powerful Nation the world has ever known.

The organization of which Hon. Clyde T. Ellis, former Member of this House, is the head, is driving toward that end, and I take pleasure in inserting his speech in the RECORD at this point.

The speech referred to reads as follows:

ADDRESS OF CLYDE T. ELLIS, EXECUTIVE MANAGER, NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION, AT STATE MEETING OF RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVES, PUBLIC POWER PROGRESS DAY, JACKSON, MISS., MAY 26, 1950

Mr. Chairman and friends, this day, May 26, 1950, will long be remembered, we hope, as the date in the fifteenth year of the rural electrification program of the United States on which you first celebrated Public Power Progress Day.

WHAT IS NRECA?

Perhaps I should say a word to you about my bosses. They are the farmers of Mississippi and 42 other States who are members of the rural electric co-ops and power districts which in turn are members of their national service organizations. They number some 2,500,000 rural families, or about 10,000,000 people. NRECA is a voluntary association. It was organized from the grass roots to perform several services for the rural electric systems country-wide just as Mississippi Services, Inc., was organized at the grass roots to perform several services Statewide.

About 86 percent of the rural electrics of the country are members of NRECA, and the membership is growing constantly.

MISSISSIPPI PLAYS LEADING ROLE

Mississippi has enjoyed a unique and significant position in America's internationally celebrated rural electrification program. The program was born in Mississippi, in the back of a furniture store at Corinth. It was there that a few Mississippi business and farm leaders met with Tennessee Valley Authority officials one afternoon in 1934 in search of ways and means of getting TVA power out to the farms. Following that meeting Alcorn County Electric Power Association was organized.

By the next year, 1935, other co-ops had been organized in the valley, and it was already evident that the co-op constituted probably the best vehicle by which the farmers might be served, or serve themselves, with electricity.

REA WAS BORN IN 1935

By that time, too, there was strong sentiment both in the valley and in other areas for the Federal Government to expand the opportunity for farmers to help themselves via the rural electric-cooperative process. And so President Roosevelt by Executive order established the Rural Electrification Administration that year and authorized it to lend public-works funds for construction of rural power lines.

It was thought then that most of the funds would be borrowed by commercial power companies. Over the next few years several million dollars were borrowed by them, but they soon lost interest.

The American farm families did not lose interest, though, and by another year the demand for a permanent and expanded program was so great that Congress enacted and there was signed into law in May 1936 the Rural Electrification Act.

Let it be remembered, too, that in the year 1936 only 1 farmer in 10 in the United States had electricity, and those were principally in the suburbs and along the main highways in the North and East. The situation was far worse here where only nine-tenths of 1 percent of the farmers in Mississippi had electricity. Let it be remembered, also, that by 1936 the electric age had been with us for about half a century, and that by then practically all of the farmers of Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Germany, and Japan had electricity.

WE WANT PEACE

As a southern farmer and an employee of farmers, I know but one language—the language of frankness. I am not here to criticize, and, if what I shall say may seem critical of anyone, it is only because the facts are that way. I must give you the facts. I can assure you that I have come here today with an olive branch in either hand. We want no fight with anyone. We want only to serve electricity to ourselves. We want to serve no customer of the power companies—and we cannot under the law take one of their customers. We want no part of either communism or monopoly. We want to strengthen, and we believe we are strengthening, the American free, competitive enterprise system.

PROGRAM HAS HAD DIFFICULT STRUGGLE

When the farmers began organizing electric co-ops most power companies refused to cooperate. They refused, and some still refuse, to sell us wholesale power at reasonable rates without restrictions on its use.

Those first years were a struggle indeed. As the program got under way, most power companies rushed their crews out to skim the cream, to serve the best areas, leaving us usually the more thinly settled sections. That is still going on in some States. For several years Congress did not provide adequate loan funds and it was also difficult to obtain loans in many areas under the requirements of the original act. The interest we were required to pay was about 2.7 percent and we were required to amortize the loans in 25 years. As you know, the commercial power companies never amortize their capital structure, but rather continue to pay interest dividends on their preferred stock-bonds. Finally the farmers, through their Rural Electric Cooperative Association, initiated and sponsored through the Congress what is known as the Pace Act. This amendment to the original act reduced our interest rate from 2.7 to 2 percent, which at that time still gave the Government a net profit of about 1 percent; and it extended the amortization period from 25 to 35 years.

The Pace Act was passed, however, after we were already at war and whereas it would have otherwise made possible a rapidly expanding, area-coverage construction program, we were suddenly stopped by an order of the Office of Production Management to cease all use of copper and aluminum. The farmers, however, through their NRECA, were soon able to prove to Government officials that where farmers would make certain uses of electricity, those uses would constitute the equivalent of one or more farm hands. OPM relaxed its order and our construction program was permitted to continue on a limited scale.

POSTWAR EXPANSION WAS RAPID

After the war our construction program was accelerated to a point never before achieved in the electrical industry anywhere in the world. As of last June 30, 78 percent of the farmers of the country had electricity. The rural electrics were serving well over half of them. Mississippi, like my native State of Arkansas, however, continued near the bottom of the list in percentage of farms electrified. By comparison with the national figure of 78 percent on June 30, only 49 percent of your farms were electrified. I shall return to this point but will note now that a principal reason for the lagging program in Mississippi has been the lack of dependable wholesale power at reasonable rates without restrictions on its use in some sections of the State.

REA PROGRAM IS MAJOR INDUSTRY

Even though your program has lagged by comparison with other States, it has nevertheless become a major industry. Already $46,907,105 have been actually invested by your 27 electric cooperatives, and REA has agreed to lend your systems $19,362,806 more. Your co-ops are already serving more than 175,000 farms and rural establishments over more than 40,000 miles of line. What industries in your State are larger than that?

Incidentally, I am sure you will be pleased to know that not one Mississippi co-op is delinquent on its repayments to REA. In fact, 18 of them are paid ahead of schedule a total of $744,333. Nationally REA has not lost a dime on an electric co-op loan and its less than one-tenth of 1 percent delinquencies excel all known loan-repayment records on a comparable scale.

Nor is the $46,000,000 investment already made by the co-ops the whole story. By the time the farmer has his house wired and purchases his refrigerator, water pump, radio, and other appliances, he usually has invested from one to two dollars for every dollar that the co-op invested to get the electricity to him. He buys his equipment, of course, from his local merchant and the local merchant advertises that equipment in the local newspapers and over the radios. This is all new business. The farmer thus helps the competitive, free-enterprise system of Mississippi. And in the industrial cities thousands of people labor to produce the refrigerators, water pumps, radios, and over 200 other appliances as well as to produce the construction materials that go into the building of the lines.

In the fiscal year 1949, your Mississippi electric co-ops purchased and sold to the farmers 239,399,633 kilowatt-hours. Thirty-nine percent of this was purchased from the commercial power companies, for which your associations paid the power companies $744,333.

Your co-ops expect to serve within a few years more than twice as many consumers as at present. They are already having to rebuild, "heavy-up," their systems because the farmers are using so much more power than anyone dreamed of a few years ago. With the farmers' loads already doubling every 5 years and with many new uses coming in, such as air conditioning, television, and high-frequency cooking (the farm wife may soon be able to cook her whole meal in 5 minutes)—with all these new uses we have no idea how high our loads will skyrocket, nor where the power is coming from. There is a growing need for your co-ops to generate some of their own power; and this will require further investments.

Based on these facts it would appear that the rural electrification construction program in Mississippi is not more than one-fourth completed.

MERCHANTS ARE BEING PROPAGANDIZED

The merchants of this State and of the country, many of whom depend upon the trade of our members, are being fed a lot of propaganda against cooperatives. This propaganda is coming primarily from the National Tax Equality Association, which, according to its lobby registration filing, is largely financed by the commercial power companies. NTEA is endeavoring to poison the businessmen against co-opes in general

and against electric co-ops in particular. It it endeavoring to persuade Congress to levy net income-tax equivalents on income we don't have.

Perhaps I should take a moment to give you the farmer's conception of what his electric co-op is. Let's take ten, or a hundred, or a thousand farmers who are neighbors. No one of them could afford to build his own power system, but all of them together could afford to build one to serve all of them. So, in order to get electricity, after waiting half a decade, they form a cooperative association in which each farmer is a member and has one vote. The association is just like any other corporation except that they agree that no one will make a profit, for the motive is service. Isn't that just about the way the farmers in the early days built the country schools and churches? The fact that the farmers now form a co-op really makes no difference; the co-op is merely a sort of partnership arrangement.

They then borrow money from REA to build their lines and they pay it all back with interest. They own the lines. They thus recapture and put to work again that same old pioneer spirit that has built America. Can anyone show me a better example of free enterprise at its best? Everyone benefits by the electric co-op, including the commercial power companies, who sell us over half of the power we use.

WHO PAYS WHAT TAXES?

The power companies constantly refer to themselves as "taxpaying electric companies." But they are really just tax gatherers, for we and their other customers actually pay their taxes. And the people have to pay them several dollars in profits for every dollar and companies pay the Government in taxes on those profits. The power companies, you know, enjoy a special income tax status under the law. They are not required to report all of their profits as other corporations are.

SPONSORED RURAL TELEPHONE LAW

Time will permit me to mention only a few more of our efforts and problems.

The farmers, through their NRECA, sponsored the Rural Telephone Act, but only after appealing desperately to the existing telephone companies over a 5-year period to serve the rural areas. We cannot have efficient electric service in the country without telephones to report outages quickly. The rural-telephone program is getting off to a slow start, partly because Congress has not approved adequate funds for administrative purposes. The Bureau of the Budget requested $50,000,000 for telephone loans for next fiscal year. The House has cut that in half. Budget requested over $2,000,000 for telephone administrative purposes and the House has cut that to less than $1,000,000. REA already has $35,000,000 in telephone applications on hand over and above those which it has funds to cover, and we expect the applications to continue to come in rapidly during the next fiscal year. We don't know what the Senate will do.

ADEQUATE RURAL ELECTRIFICATION LOAN FUNDS

The House of Representatives has again approved adequate funds for rural-electrification loans for the next fiscal year. It made some cut in the budget request for rural electrification administrative funds but this is believed to be not too serious. We congratulate the House of Representatives and the Agriculture Subcommittee of its Appropriations Committee upon its refusal to yield to the power companies in their demands for a restriction being placed upon our right to generate our own power.

Your able Congressman, JAMIE WHITTEN, is chairman of the Agriculture Subcommittee.

We don't know what the Senate will do.

POWER SUPPLY IS BIGGEST HEADACHE

The Rural Electrification program's most perplexing problem, however, both in Mississippi and throughout the country, is power supply. Your northern Mississippi cooperatives are more fortunate in being able to purchase wholesale power from TVA. But we should understand now that TVA is rapidly running out of hydropower and that more and more steam plants are going to be necessary, for TVA has assumed full responsibility for serving its area and it must not fail that responsibility.

Propaganda campaigns are being carried on not only to hurt TVA but in an effort to stop river-development programs in other areas. Multipurpose dams similar to those of TVA are being constructed across the river in Arkansas, but the power companies are waging bitter battles to prevent the wholesale power from being delivered to the load centers over Government transmission lines as is being done in TVA and in the Northwest.

The Government, as you know, is nowhere in the retail power business, and we don't want it in that business. Where the people's power is produced in the people's dams from the people's water, we do insist that the people's co-ops and municipally owned systems should be able to buy the power wholesale at cost delivered to the load centers over self-liquidating lines. That is America's power policy.

The power companies are endeavoring to persuade the Congress to require all Federal power to be dumped at the dams where usually only the power companies are big enough to go after it. Their fight is really a fight to maintain their monopoly over supply. It is the same fight that they are waging against your proposed generating plant in south Mississippi. Southern Mississippi cooperatives have never had a reasonable power supply. In the first place their rates have been too high; in the second place the power has not been delivered to their load centers; and in the third place the power companies tell the co-ops to whom they may sell power and in what amount. They even charge them a higher rate for larger loads served. Such practice is dictatorial and un-American.

In southern Mississippi, when the co-ops had finished their expensive engineering studies on a generating plant, the power companies suddenly decided they could give them a better rate. And REA in passing on the application considers that last deathtrap offer in determining whether there would be a sufficient saving to justify the loan. But no power company can make a contract that it or a stockholder who can show he is not receiving adequate return on his investment, or a customer who can prove he is discriminated against, cannot break. I find growing sentiment for a change of REA policy to require that, before any such last-minute offer is considered, the company shall be required to show that the rate is compensatory and nondiscriminatory.

These power company battles to kill our efforts to generate some of our own power necessary to achieve efficient, reliable area coverage have been particularly bitter against us in the South. I came here this morning from North Dakota where I was honored Tuesday to participate in a ground-breaking ceremony at Voltaire for a 40,000-kilowatt co-op generating plant to serve the farmers of nearly half the State. Ottertail Power Co. is cooperating and will wheel much of the power we produce out to our load centers for us.

As we stood out there on the prairie and watched Senator YOUNG turn over a spade of buffalo sod with a few hundred people, including descendants of the old Sioux warriors, and including power company officials, side by side with the farmers; as we looked toward the setting sun—the last remnants of a departing winter snow glistening back at us—to view in our imaginations a multimillion-dollar living monument to men working peacefully together in a free land; and then we bowed our heads to give thanks and saw the wild, purple, crocuses smiling up at us—well what do you think? I think He was there with us.

Another power company in North Dakota is operating one of our generating plants for us. We have a similar arrangement with a power company in Iowa. In these cases the power companies benefit, the farmers benefit, the merchants benefit—everybody benefits.

But we've seen nothing like that in Dixie. Our New York-controlled power companies don't seem to know the War Between the States is over.

Today the power companies of Virginia are fighting us in our efforts to generate some of our own power. They are waging an extended battle before the State regulatory body.

In Kentucky the power companies are fighting our efforts to generate some of our own power in an extended battle before the State regulatory body.

In Oklahoma, Missouri, Arkansas, and, to a lesser extent, in Louisiana, the power companies are engaged in bitter campaigns against our efforts to generate some of our own power. In Alabama and Florida the power companies, by court action, have temporarily stopped our efforts to generate some of our own power.

In South Carolina we are in the process of building a substantial generating and transmission system to supply part of our power requirements, but the power companies are carrying on a ruthless campaign to stop us. I hold here in my hand a full-page ad from last Sunday's Washington Post entitled "Did You Tell Your Congressmen to Kill My Business?" and signed, S. C. McMeekin, president of South Carolina Gas & Electric Co. This is directed at Congress and the executive branch, of course. Let me read you two sentences from it: "A Federal agency and a Government-financed power development have combined in a project which will ultimately destroy us." "The execution will waste at least $9,000,000 of your money and destroy a sound American company worth $100,000,000." Doesn't it seem a little ridiculous that a $9,000,000 farmers' co-op could destroy a $100,000,000 commercial power company?

Under the law our rural electric cooperatives cannot serve anyone who is already served, so we can't take one of his customers. How then could we kill his business? It sounds like Hitler screaming that the Low Countries were about to invade Germany. Enough propaganda like this could destroy our country.

OUR POLICY

In closing, I want to state what has been our policy during all of these years. We desire to work with the power companies. We are not against them.

In our retirement program we have purchased substantial quantities of their stock, believing it a good investment. We appeal again to the power companies, especially in the South where they are fighting us the hardest, to stop fighting us and work with us to build a better Southland and a better America.

Power companies of Dixie, you, too, are benefiting from TVA for you have beneficial power exchange arrangements with TVA. You are benefiting from our farmers' electric co-ops, for you are selling us great quantities of power. Now, won't you throw down the sword, accept our olive branch, and join with

us in making Public Power Progress Day a permanent public power progress, peace, and prosperity day?

We are honored to work with our colleagues, our county and home agents, our legislatures and State administrations, and our press and radio in this great program. We in your national office are honored to work with your able congressional delegation. No American has contributed more to this program than your own JOHN E. RANKIN.

We want to work with everyone.

It may require the supreme effort of all of us, working together, to keep the hordes of mechanized, pagan Communists from our shores and to preserve democracy for the world. God, help us.

Ireland United

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER A. LYNCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 5, 1950

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me by unanimous consent, I am including in my present remarks my statement relative to the partition of Ireland which is part of the record of proceedings before the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Among the witnesses who testified were my old friends, Charles T. Rice, a classmate of mine at Fordham University, and Richard Dalton, an old-time resident of Bronx County, N. Y., a large portion of which is in my congressional district. My statement follows:

Mr. Chairman, I wish to express to you and to the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs my appreciation for giving me this opportunity to make a statement with respect to House Resolution 270, introduced by our distinguished colleague, Hon. JOHN E. FOGARTY, of Rhode Island, and having to do with the partition of Ireland. I am thoroughly in favor of the resolution. It is my considered opinion that the resolution embodies that great American principle of the right of self-determination of all nations, and that being so fundamental an American principle it should be quickly and unanimously reported out by your distinguished committee. I have no doubt that it will be overwhelmingly passed by the House.

It indeed seems strange to me that there should be any opposition to this resolution. It is founded in justice. There is no reason that a foreign power like Great Britain should say to its small neighbor to the west that you may have your freedom except as to the people of six counties of your nation, and those people must remain under the domination of Great Britain.

Ireland is an entity; it always has been and it always will be. Naturally and geographically it is an entity with the people overwhelmingly of the same national origin. Ireland has always resented the imposition upon her of the force of British arms. She has never been conquered by the British because her national spirit and her national integrity have ever been bulwarks against any foreign subjugation.

It is as unseemly for the British to carve out six counties from the Irish nation as it would have been for the United States, when it granted independence to the Philippines, to have carved out from those heroic islands Mindanao, Cebu, or any other part of this new Pacific republic.

In spirit Ireland has been a republic since 1798 when the first Irish Republic was initially proclaimed by united Irishmen. On Easter Monday of 1916 the same spirit that had moved Irishmen more than a century previously again brought forth, and for the second time proclaimed the Irish Republic. There remained, however, the recurrence of that memorable date in the year 1949, for the Republic of Ireland to be internationally recognized as such. During the intervening years between these two later dates the voice of Ireland was not unheard in the councils of the world. Unfortunately it was unheeded. Had the strong protestations of DeValera not fallen upon the deaf ears of the nations of the world when he denounced the invasion of Ethiopia by Mussolini and the criminal attacks of the Japanese in Manchuria, perhaps World War II would have been averted. The Irish Prime Minister knew what it meant to have his small country invaded. He likewise knew that if the great nations of the world chose, as they did, to disregard the fundamentals of nationhood and permit a government to be imposed upon a people, contrary to their wishes, that the result would inevitably lead to further outrages and final war.

It is a strange commentary that the one nation who raised her voice for justice for Ethiopia and Manchuria should now be excluded from the council of the world, the United Nations, by the veto of communistic Russia. It is likewise a strange commentary that this one nation that is so essential to the defense of western Europe should be compelled to refrain from joining the partnership of the Atlantic Pact because to do so would have meant the unthinkable recognition by the Irish Government of the right of Britain to superimpose her will upon a portion of the Irish people, and refuse to them the right of self-determination in conjugation with their fellow countrymen.

Great Britain may delay the day but she cannot evade the day when all Ireland shall be united as one nation. Despite 12 generations of oppression and degradation under British rule, and despite programs of confiscation, exile, and death, the freedom and national integrity of the Irish nation will extend, not only to 26 counties but to all of her counties. Those places in the six separated counties that have been hallowed by Irish faith and Irish ties will once again be part of the Irish nation. When partition is ended Armagh will be what it has always been—a part of Ireland and not of Britain—and so with other places in Ireland made sacred by Irish sacrifice and Irish blood.

To partition Ireland, Britain had to commit two crimes—one, the partition of Ireland itself; the other, the partition of Ulster.

In order for the puppet government of Northern Ireland to exist, it was necessary that the British Parliament cut off from Ulster the counties of Donegal, Cavan, and Monaghan. By no other way than by this exclusion from the operation of the act of partition could the dominant position of the Unionist majority around Belfast be continued.

Mr. Chairman, if self-determination is to be granted to any people, it should be granted to the people of Ireland because the country meets every requirement of a united government. There are three well-established tests that bear me out. Ireland's natural boundaries are not man-made, but God-given. The Irish Sea is more of a boundary than the line that separates Canada from the United States. In its second test Ireland has a national history. I venture to say that no nation can claim a longer national history. Finally, the inhabitants of the island are of the same race, the same color, and speak the same language. It is true that there is a disparity of religion, but if differences of religion are grounds for national partition, then, indeed, there would be few nations in the world.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, permit me to urge, with all the sincerity at my command, that your distinguished committee favorably report the Fogarty resolution so that the House of Representatives might record its belief that all nations shall have the right of self-determination and that the Republic of Ireland should embrace the entire territory of Ireland unless the clear majority of all of the people of Ireland, in a free plebiscite, determine and declare to the contrary.

What Is the Difference?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 5, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend heretofore granted, I am inserting an editorial in the RECORD which appeared in the Wall Street Journal under date of June 5, 1950:

WHAT IS THE DIFFERENCE?

We pose the question: Who is more dangerous to the welfare of the Nation if left free to go his way, an uncaught race-track gambler or an undetected disloyal or untrustworthy public servant?

This question, to which the answer ought to be obvious, is pertinent because of the fact that President Truman recently denied a congressional investigating committee full access to Government records when it sought to probe charges of espionage yet he now throws open the records to another committee probing charges of gambling.

To track down and break up an alleged gambling syndicate, the President has authorized the opening of income-tax records in spite of the long tradition that these records be kept confidential and not be used as a general catch-all for other misdemeanors. He is also reported to have urged all agencies of the Government to cooperate with the investigating committee.

But to track down graver charges of improper security by Government employees, and still graver charges of some outright disloyalty, the President offers little help. His attitude is that the records of the FBI and other interested agencies in loyalty cases are closed. What is contained in these records is small business of Congress.

Now, the interest of the administration in putting an end to a gambling ring, if such exists, is highly commendable. If a congressional committee, with the assistance of the executive branch, can expose such a crime syndicate and put its members behind bars, it will have performed a signal service.

But is this more or less vital than the exposure of a spy ring, if such exists, and putting its members behind bars?

Mr. Truman has defended his refusal to cooperate with the spy probe on the grounds that Congress ought not to go around making blanket investigations—"fishing" expeditions, he called them—which invade citizens' privacy and might unjustly besmirch some citizens' characters.

Yet the gambling probe, with which he will cooperate, is likewise a blanket investigation. Many individual income-tax records will be

scrutinized merely on suspicion; the individuals will be questioned and cross-questioned merely on suspicion. Here, too, men who may be innocent will be grilled simply because they associate with some unsavory characters. And here, too, the victims will scream about "guilt by association."

The fact of the matter, of course, is that the so-called blanket investigation upon reasonable grounds is as old as the English common law. It is the principle of the grand jury, and it is a principle of great value to the common welfare.

Why, then, the distinction between one probe and another? There is none in law or logic, and the puzzled citizen will have to search for it elsewhere. The suspicion grows that while in one case the administration welcomes distracting headlines, in the other it dares not permit exposure.

Wake Up America!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1950

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, one of the many Wake Up America programs sponsored by the Benevolent Protective Order of Elks was held at State College, Pa., May 25, 1950.

The program was preceded by a colorful parade which traversed the streets of State College, the line of March ending in the high school stadium where several hundred persons were in attendance.

It was my distinct honor to participate in the splendid patriotic program and to deliver the following address:

Mr. Chairman, Exalted Ruler, brother Elks, ladies, and gentlemen, I consider it a high honor to have the privilege of participating in the first annual Wake Up America program sponsored by the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks.

As a member of the Altoona lodge, No. 102 (BPOE), I have long been familiar with the great effort of the Elks in promoting love of country which, in other words, is unadulterated patriotism.

This annual observance of Wake Up America is very timely and takes its place alongside the annual Flag Day celebrations sponsored for many years by the Elks throughout the United States.

I want to commend the officers and members of the State College Lodge of Elks for joining with other units of our great organization in a concerted effort to arouse the American people during these trying and perilous days.

This demonstration of patriotism is typical of the type manifested daily by members of the Elk fraternity. It is Americanism pure and undefiled, and not the watered-down version of patriotism that some supposedly good Americans are content to call love of country.

When I accepted your kind invitation to participate in this Wake Up America program, I did so because I wanted to make my contribution to your efforts to arouse the American people to the fact that the American form of Government is being challenged, as never before, and in a cunning and deceitful manner.

Since the close of World War I, many of us have watched the growth of communism and have warned our fellow citizens of what was taking place. Yes, many of us have been accused of being Red baiters and of seeing a Red behind every tree. Great patriotic organizations, including the Elks, have been ridiculed because they have pointed their finger at communism on the march.

I say to you, in all sincerity, it is time for America to wake up.

The fact is that while we meditate upon our standard of living, and work and pray for peace, Russia overruns the world. Already she has gone farther, taken more territory, and enslaved more people than Germany had done when we were drawn into World War II.

Czechoslavakia, China, Poland, Bulgaria, and half of Germany already have been swallowed; Jugoslavia, Malaya, Finland, and Formosa are almost within the Russian bear's paws. How far does it go until we are next?

The Russian aim, apparently, is not war, at least not in the foreseeable future.

Judging from their established pattern, the Soviets hope to exhaust us economically and then destroy us by subversive force.

Since the close of World War II, one fact has become increasingly clear. Communist aggression stands as an ominous threat to world peace.

We have lived so long in the atmosphere of cold war that unrest and chaos are taken for granted.

Communist seizure of China was virtually unopposed. Indeed, free nations have officially recognized the puppet government of Red China. This regrettable action is deplored by every red-blooded American. The Communist tactic of seizing free, sovereign governments stands as a direct violation of the spirit, if not the letter, of United Nations' Charter.

We Americans would do well to give heed to our position on the Soviet timetable of aggression. No one—with average intelligence—could believe that America is immune from Red expansion.

In the 1930's we were aroused by the marching slogan of the Nazis: "Today, we rule Germany; tomorrow, the world." Bitter experience, the blood at Anzio, Normandy, and Iwo Jima, burned deeply in our minds the significant lesson that tyrants love to brag about their plans.

On this occasion, when we implore America to wake up, that lesson rings in our ears. It forces us to examine the boasts of our modern tyrants.

In every issue of Communist dogma, under the title "Problems of Leninism," published over the signature of Stalin, appears this basic belief: "It is inconceivable that the Soviet Republic should continue for a long period side by side with imperialistic states."

Stalin continued, by saying, "Ultimately, one or the other must conquer. Meanwhile, a number of terrible clashes between the Soviet Republic and capitalist states will be inevitable," he said.

That statement of Communist philosophy has been repeated many times since the close of World War II. The leaders of Russia have not only emphasized their goal of world domination, they have predicted the doom of all other political systems—especially capitalism.

On May 2, 1950, in a speech in New York City, Hon. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, in speaking of the presence of subversive persons in the United States, said:

"The subversive elements are utilizing America's tolerance as a cloak to plan and to commit crimes, which, when successful, destroy the very tolerance which enabled them to gain their victories.

"They use tolerance as a springboard for infamy, deceit, and intolerance. These elements which would destroy American liberty are today at work in America."

The FBI director also told his audience that: "The times demand candid and forthright words. Communists have been, and are today, at work within the very gates of America.

"There are few walks in American life which they do not traverse. Their allegiance is to Moscow; their hopes are spurred by the writings of Marx and Lenin, not Jefferson, Madison, and Lincoln; their enthusiasm is whetted by expediency and deceit; not tolerance and brotherhood.

"Godless materialism is the idol of communism, and the destruction of the God of our fathers is their goal," said Director Hoover.

He deplored the fact that many unthinking Americans scoff at the menace of communism and attempt to laugh off the fact that such a destructive force has a membership in the United States of approximately 55,000 and that behind this force of traitorous Communists stand a half million fellow travelers and sympathizers ready to do the Communist bidding.

The FBI chief emphasized that "these Communist influences practice their double-dealing, double-minded, double-tongued, and double-faced tactics on all fronts of our American life, whether it be in politics, in labor, in the press, in radio, in motion pictures, in the schools, or even in some of our churches," said J. Edgar Hoover.

He warned Americans not to be misled by those who try to calm us by the statement that the Communist Party in the United States is not large in membership, or that they have not polled a large number of votes in an election.

"This line of talk," Mr. Hoover said, "is voiced by the ignorant and the apologists and appeasers of communism in our country in an effort to minimize the dangers of these subversives in our midst.

"In some places where there are only one or two men working the Communists cause, more results are obtained than where they have larger organizations," said J. Edgar Hoover.

He continued by saying: "The thought of a Soviet United States is at once revolting to every right-thinking American.

"We have seen the Communists at work and have observed the application of their principles sufficiently to know what would happen here if they succeeded in the attainment of their objectives.

"If every American faced the reality of what the fulfillment of the Communist objective would mean to him—he would be inspired to work harder to preserve the individual liberty and freedom which is part and parcel of our American way of life."

I have given you excerpts from the New York speech on May 2 of Hon. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, because he is a recognized authority on communism and subversive influences in the United States.

In addition, his timely admonitions are a stern warning to sympathizers and appeasers of communism who try to lull us to sleep by charging that vigilant Americans who ferret out subversives are afflicted with a bad case of the jitters.

The poor deluded Americans who peddle such a line are, whether they realize it or not, dupes of Moscow. "Let us not become hysterical," is their chant.

This phrase is Red propaganda of the brightest hue and it is uttered by prominent persons who are entrusted with the responsibility of molding young minds, and who are supposed to be above the average in intelligence.

The hysteria chant is directed to all Americans who insist that Communists, fellow-travelers, pinksters, and parlor Bolshevists should be unmasked and not allowed to pose as simon-pure Americans.

This hysteria propaganda is directed in the hope that it will depict America as a land of fanatics full of fear and panic and that all American citizens are living under a reign of constant terror in their daily lives.

The real objective is to divert attention from the Moscow gospel of hate and to discourage just criticism of the Communists in the United States.

To attain this objective we are asked to ignore communism as a menace to this Nation, and instead to shed tears for so-called intellectuals and self-styled liberals in our midst who are labeled as "martyrs" and victims of a Red scare.

I think you will agree that we Americans are a tolerant people when you recall the numerous spy rings and the traitorous actions of the Coplans, Eislers, Fuchs, and the 12 New York Commies, and Alger Hiss.

These are only a few of the parasites in our midst who have been brought to trial.

Yes; we have more patience than Job in dealing with subversive elements and when our American blood boils at the thought of these traitorous characters, it is not a case of hysterics, but it is the revulsion we feel when we think of the treatment accorded a nation whose sons have shed blood on every continent in the belief they were on a mission of universal peace.

If we are foolish enough to allow ourselves to be rocked to sleep while being told in baby-sitter fashion of the Moscow version of the little boy who cried, "Wolf! Wolf!" and by so doing spurn the advice of Hon. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, then we are first-class morons and we deserve the fate in store for us from our decision to trade our American liberty and freedom for a double-barreled portion of intellectual hog wash with its genuine Moscow flavor.

There is one happy and redeeming characteristic of the American people that the phony liberals overlook and that is the ability to detect an assault on the American form of government as soon as the pattern of the attack becomes obvious.

Already the rank and file of American citizenship is aroused over the treacherous conduct of many in our midst and you can be sure that they are not going to adopt a complacent attitude in dealing with these shyster Americans.

Who will deny that the world situation overshadows every other consideration in our lives today in importance and yet our actions are weak and inadequate. We need a bold program of action equal to the task and up with the times.

We need to purge the Communists not just from key positions in Government offices, but from everywhere. The plea of freedom of speech for Communists is nonsense, because they intend to overthrow the Government of the United States, and that is treason.

We need to double our world propaganda activities to carry the story of freedom to all peoples.

We need a rebirth of the spirit of our fathers who founded this country.

We need their courage, their common sense, and their concern for the common good of decent people.

We need to go forward together with the conviction of free people and with the spirit of humanity to meet the challenge that Communist dictatorship now makes against our religion, our freedom, our flag, and our very lives.

Yes, America must wake up if we are to survive.

Was Potsdam a Success?

REMARKS
OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, President Truman did not fool the American people when he told Secretary Acheson that the London Conference was the most successful meeting since Potsdam. Apparently he is unaware of the crimes that were committed in the name of the Potsdam Conference which he headed as Commander in Chief in July and August of 1945.

It is true that Mr. Truman, as successor to our war President, inherited the political sins of the Yalta and the Quebec Conferences, but it is not possible that he has forgotten the havoc and chaos that flowed from them.

Mr. Speaker, so that the record may be straight on the "success" of Potsdam, I call attention to a few incidents that have happened since that unfortunate meeting:

First. It confirmed and approved the sell-out of China to Communist Russia of Manchuria, Korea, and the Kuriles. China had no notice of the Roosevelt-Churchill-Stalin deal until 1 year later. Success?

Second. It confirmed and approved the double cross of the liberty-loving Polish people by insisting that certain boundaries be changed to accommodate the demands of Stalin. And further, the Conference insisted that a provisional coalition government be established, which ultimately led to Communist control of the political and economic life of the Polish people. Success?

Third. It was the Potsdam meeting that inaugurated the diabolical Morgenthau plan with the following results:

(a) Millions of people were robbed, raped, turned out of their homes, forced into slavery, tortured, starved, driven to suicide, and killed. Is this success?

(b) Dismantled German industrial plants that had no connection with the war and permitted the Soviet to take and ship heavy industries to Russia at the expense of the American taxpayer. The total cost was many millions of dollars, and dismantling still continues. Is this success?

(c) It cut from Germany 30 percent of its arable land producing 25 percent of its food, with the result that the United States was called upon to furnish food to starving people. Is this success?

(d) It approved the most inhuman dumping operation in history by Russia, in the uprooting and expulsion into Germany of 14,000,000 defenseless refugees from the Sudetenland, Austria, Hungary, and Poland. It crammed at least 68,000,000 people into a war-ravaged area smaller than Great Britain which could not support itself. Is this success?

(e) Decreed that Germany was to be reduced to the status of an agricultural and grazing society, notwithstanding that Germany prior to the war was almost wholly industrialized. Is this success?

(f) It authorized the Nuremberg trials of alleged war criminals and found many guilty by virtue of association, thereby setting a precedent unheard of in Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence. Is this success?

(g) It failed to insist upon the release of war prisoners contrary to the rules of war and international law. Unknown thousands are still held by Russia for slave-labor purposes. Is this success?

Fourth. At Potsdam, Mr. Truman, his State Department, and his military leaders, agreed to a plan which resulted in Russia setting up a blockade of Berlin that denied access to that city of American and British personnel. The Berlin airlift became necessary thereafter at a cost of millions of dollars to American taxpayers and the loss of American lives in that operation. Who was responsible for that fiasco, Mr. Speaker? The President was then Commander in Chief and it was his responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, if the Potsdam Conference was a success as the President said, then we can only hope and pray that Mr. Acheson's mission to Europe last month will never reach the same level; it was a new low in the history of our country. Even the Washington Post, in an editorial on May 31, 1950, referred to that meeting as "the flat, stale, and unprofitable Potsdam agreement." The Post has never been anti-New Deal. So Potsdam must be recorded as a rank failure and not a success as Mr. Truman intimated.

Ireland Must Be One and Indivisible

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 1950

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the recent visit of Sir Basil Brooke, Prime Minister of Northern Ireland, to the United States and Canada should serve to refocus the attention of the American people on the subject of partition in Ireland.

At this point, it seems to me, the Irish and Irish-Americans can use all the support they can raise to secure complete unity and freedom for Ireland. My coreligionists and myself, perhaps more than other groups, can readily appreciate the intensity of feeling which partition has generated in the hearts of the Irish and in those of Irish antecedents everywhere. Ireland to them will always be the little bit of heaven that dropped from out the sky one day and never, while they are conscious, will they be reconciled to what they consider England's occupation of their six northern counties. The Irish have not been niggard in their support of Jewish aspirations in Palestine and I believe it is due,

in part, to their own historic struggle for freedom and independence. They, too, have long felt the yoke of an oppressor.

It has occurred to me that some of my constituents, absorbed as they have been in a similar struggle in Palestine, may have lost sight temporarily of this problem which has bedeviled the Irish. To them, the establishment of the Republic of Ireland may mean the end of the matter. To the Irish, nothing could be further from the truth. The External Relations Act was repealed in December 1948, but as a tribute to the enshrined heroes of the abortive Easter Monday Rebellion of 1916, the proclamation of the Irish Republic was delayed until Easter Monday of 1949. Then, jubilantly, Ireland severed its last direct tie with the British Crown. For the first time in 795 years, Ireland was independent in law as well as in fact. As the saying goes, it was a great day for the Irish and they enjoyed it to the hilt. They could be safe in the thought that they were rid of the hated Black and Tans for good. The Irish could now unfurl the precious tricolor anywhere at any time, without reprisal. At long last, Pease and the martyrs who died with him were vindicated. In celebration, thousands upon thousands streamed into Dublin's fair city. Friendship with England did not seem impossible, as a touching message from England's King George was joyfully received. Pope Pius sent his blessing. It is said only De Valera frowned. "Public rejoicing is out of place," said he, "as long as our country remains partitioned."

You might well ask, "Why partition?" It must make as little sense to you as it does to the natives of Ireland. I shall try here to summarize the background of this problem, as gathered from Irish sources of information.

Until the second decade of this century, Ireland had always been regarded as a national unit, until the British Government maneuvered a very irregular division, due to a struggle for power between the two big political parties in Britain, the Liberals and the Tories. The Liberals were committed to self-government in Ireland and the Tories were violently opposed. As the Irish tell it, the Tories decided to kill two birds with one stone and used the proposed grant of home rule to Ireland to drive the Liberals from office. The British Tory leaders visited northeast Ulster, agitated the majority, armed the rank and file, and faced the Liberals with a crisis. The Liberals, rather than leave office, solved the dilemma by abandoning their pledges to Ireland and their own self-government bill, and adopted the expedient of partition.

For more than 4 years prior to December 1918, several British efforts were made to secure Irish acceptance for some plan of dismemberment but all such negotiations broke down. On December 14, 1918, a general election was held in which the whole of Ireland participated. The issue was whether Ireland, exercising the right to self-determination, proclaimed by the victors in World War I, would declare her independence and set up a national legislation. The election was held under British law and was carried out while a British army occupied the whole island. The result was overwhelmingly in favor of national independence. Excluding the universities, there were 101 parliamentary electoral divisions in Ireland. Seventy-eight of these declared for independence and only 23 against. In view of this trend, the elected representatives of the people assembled in Dublin on January 21, 1919, declared Ireland an independent nation and established a government and legislature.

But Britain refused to accept the right of the Irish people to make laws for themselves, and by the imposition of martial law, by the use of the Black and Tans, set off a systematic wave of terrorism which will live long in the Irish memory as well as that of the world. But the Irish people held tenaciously to their bitterly won progress and it was then that the British Parliament in 1920, passed the act dividing Ireland into two parts. The British then sought to impose their own governmental institutions on each part, through the use of an army of occupation.

The enforcement of such a settlement was rejected by five-sixths of Ireland. Britain succeeded, in Belfast, in setting up a separate government for the six northeastern counties.

In setting up this separate government in Ulster, Britain not only defied the democratically expressed will of the Irish people, but also the majority inside the selected area. The Tories of the northeast of Ulster were opposed to self-government for Ireland and to separation from Britain, but they were opposed also to the division of their country. While they accepted the separate government and parliament when set up, thereby accepting partition, at no time did they desire it as a solution.

You cannot expect an Irishman to view dispassionately the cutting up of his homeland any more than you could expect a mother to remain calm while some intruder in her home hacked away at her child. They cannot be expected to remain quiescent when they regard the obstinate, greedy domination of the six counties by a small clique of rich men who gained their power by force and fraud and maintain it by discrimination and gerrymandering constitutencies. Such practices justify any degree of Irish bitterness. The six-county area cut off in 1920 had never existed before as an entity in history, politics, or economics. It was not Ulster, which is a Province of nine counties. It had no natural boundaries or unity within itself. The Tories—whose existence was made the excuse for partition—were in a majority in a continuous area not as large as two of the counties, with smaller concentrations in other parts of the six counties. Their strength lay principally in Belfast, in County Antrim, and in the northern half of County Down.

It is the solid contention of the Irish that in the rest of the area, taken as a block—four and a half counties out of the six—there was and still is a majority for independence.

When partition was first imposed, the population of the six counties was 1,250,000. More than half of this population occupied Belfast, Antrim, and half of Down. In this area the political division was 552,000 Tories to 149,000 Nationalists. In the other four and a half counties, there were 281,000 Nationalists and 268,000 Tories. These figures tell the story. The numerical strength of the Tories in the one and a half counties would enable them to outvote permanently the Nationalist majority in the adjoining four and a half counties. Given a chance to vote, Armagh, Derry, Fermanagh, Tyrone, and southern Down would as a bloc have declared for union with free Ireland. However, they were given no such choice. To make assurance doubly sure, the British statute which partitioned Ireland added to the corner in which the Tory votes were concentrated as much Nationalist territory as it was believed those Tory votes could always dominate.

In separating the northeast from the rest of Ireland, Britain intended to hold a part of Ireland in pursuance of her imperial policy. In May 1949, the British Government introduced legislation known as the Ireland Act to determine the position of Irish citizens in Britain following the repeal of the External Relations Act by the Irish Parliament. Into this act, the British Government deliberately inserted a clause designed to endow the partition of Ireland with an abiding permanency.

The British already had the power to prolong partition. They themselves hold the border with a chain of British customs posts and customs officials. British armed forces occupy the six counties and the British treasury levies and collects some 90 percent of the total tax revenue, thereby exercising a great influence on the finances of the area.

Not content with these powers, the British Government put into the Ireland Act, the following, as an additional barrier to the reunification of Ireland:

> Parliament (i. e., the British Parliament) hereby declares that Northern Ireland remains part of His Majesty's dominions and of the United Kingdom and affirm that in no event will Northern Ireland or any part thereof cease to be part of His Majesty's dominions and of the United Kingdom without the consent of the Parliament of Northern Ireland.

It should be stressed that the area electing the parliament was carefully designed to insure that the nationalists and others who stand for the unity of Ireland would never win a parliamentary majority. The Belfast region, although only one-third of the area, elects 34 members of the house of 52.

Further, the Ireland Act specifically prevents the people of the six counties from deciding the issue. An amendment leaving the decision to the people and not to the parliament was rejected by the British Government. This has been the British policy since partition was imposed and Mr. Lloyd George in 1916, in a secret letter, stated that partition must continue even if the majority in the cut-off area wished it to end. Britain has always ignored any suggestion of holding a plebiscite on the issue of partition, just as she ignored the will of the Irish people in imposing partition.

In the Ireland Act the British provide themselves with two vetoes on Irish unity.

One through their own Parliament, at Westminster, and one through the Parliament they forced on Belfast.

The Irish make a telling point of the ingenuity of this system which enables British statesmen to insure that partition continues and at the same time to assert that the matter is really one for the Irish to settle among themselves. The antidemocratic nature of the partitionist clause was so evident that 140 members of the British Government Party, risking political repercussions for themselves, refused to vote for the act in the critical division. The bill passed, but not until nearly 200 members of all parties, with a very large proportion from Labor, had failed to endorse the clause which makes the Parliament of Northern Ireland sole arbiter of any change.

Complaint now rises not from the original act, as I understand it, but from the fact that it has never been repealed. It has been reinforced with restraints through the years. For instance, the Northern Ireland Minister of Home Affairs, or any police officer to whom he delegates power, may suppress any public meeting or newspapers merely by "proclaiming" it. This year St. Patrick's Day parades were banned in Northern Ireland and protest was so widespread, we now have Sir Basil Brooke publicly stating that he should not be blamed for the affair.

The St. Patrick's Day parades were banned by British home office, said he, because Nationalist element in North wanted to march into a Loyalist village.

I guess any reason is better than no reason, to Sir Basil Brooke.

A flagrant manipulation of the electoral boundaries has been permitted to the effect that where Nationalists are in a majority they can secure only a minority of the representation. For instance, Derry is the second city of importance in the partitioned area. For that reason the Tories were determined that the Nationalists would not represent it in Parliament. They so gerrymandered the boundaries as to create a new "city division," cutting the city itself in two, and bringing in a huge rural area. The excluded part of the city was then placed in another constituency. In district after district it is thus made impossible for the Nationalist majority to elect a majority of the local representatives. The Tory minorities are given substantial majorities of the seats on county councils, urban district councils and rural district councils in areas where the population is predominantly Nationalist.

Naturally this policy is encouraged by the British Government. A recent bill changed the qualification required of local electors. It gave those with property several votes and deprived many with lower incomes of the single vote they had. As the bill was going through the Belfast Parliament, a member of the administration admitted that its purpose was to prevent Nationalist voters, where they formed the majority, from controlling their own public boards.

All Ireland has a population of 4,248,165. Eighty percent of that population want Ireland to be one national unit. All Ireland has 32 counties. Of these a block of 30 counties, with an area of over 80 percent, want Ireland to be one national unit.

No one has truly benefited from partition, least of all the British, inasmuch as their policy in Northern Ireland has placed them in a wholly untenable moral position. She has pursued in Ireland tactics she has deplored in use against peoples elsewhere. She has served to create and maintain a festering sore in an island so adjacent to her own that the continuance of the injury seems to be the height of national folly. Britain is as dependent on the production of Ireland as she is sustained from that in Scotland and Wales.

The argument is raised that Ulster has a higher standard of living than Ireland on the average. Between World Wars I and II the economic situation in the cut-off area was so bad that the British Government listed the region as depressed area No. 1, worse even than the mining towns in South Wales. As the postwar boom subsides signs of economic depression are returning.

The Government of the Republic of Ireland has made very substantial progress in encouraging industry. Schools and hospitals have been built. A huge power plant in Limerick has harnessed the river Shannon and will eventually provide electricity to the whole country. Newspapers are well-circulated, and the people are well-informed. Unemployment is low and farm prices are up. It is believed that the Irish would be ready and willing to fight with the west. Although exponents of communism today flourish in many countries, there are few Communists in Ireland. It is abnormal and highly unsatisfactory for a small island to be split in two permanently in a world where unity is becoming more and more desirable. As for Ireland as a whole, this disruption of the country prevents the fullest development of the nation's resources through coordinated efforts on the part of all. Partition causes energy that would otherwise go to the building up of the country to be devoted to righting a wrong no group can suffer quietly.

The pattern of partition has persisted too long. It cannot be stressed too often that no rivers or mountains divide Ulster from the rest of Ireland. The frontiers established are highly artificial, cutting through streets, farms, town lands and even houses. Such an unnatural and fabricated line of demarcation is monstrous. It is obvious no British Government, no matter what its party composition, will lift a finger to end it. Yet the people in the Republic of Ireland are possessed of a passionate conviction that Ireland will once again be united. That their devotion to this ideal has not slackened was reaffirmed only recently by the Minister of External Affairs, Mr. Sean MacBride. He claimed that whatever party differences might exist on matters of internal policy, all the parties in the state were loyally cooperating with a firm determination that this time they would not allow any internal differences to hinder the progress of the nation or to weaken their effort.

Partition is the sole remaining issue between Ireland and Great Britain today. In commenting on the recent Ireland bill when introduced in the British Parliament, Minister of External Affairs MacBride voiced his chagrin about reports to the effect that the State Department in Washington had stated that American policy would not allow President Truman to intervene between Ireland and Britain to secure the ending of partition. He further stated:

I am fully aware that that has always been the attitude of the State Department. * * * I cannot help, however, regretting that the leading democratic republic in the world, should not at least take an interest in and assist in ending the situation which, in addition to being undemocratic, is dangerous and damaging to the unity which should exist in the democratic world.

The statement of Minister of External Affairs MacBride is eminently sound.

It does seem that the leading democracy in the world, the United States, should take a decisive step to right an obvious injustice. There is now pending in the Congress House Resolution No. 270, introduced by my distinguished colleague from Rhode Island, Mr. FOGARTY. This resolution states in part:

Resolved, That it is the sense of this House of Representatives that the Republic of Ireland should embrace the entire territory of Ireland unless the clear majority of all of the people of Ireland, in a free plebiscite, determine and declare to the contrary.

I am in thorough accord with this resolution and shall support it to the *n*th degree. I believe it should have the unqualified support of all the Members of the House.

Welcome, Veep, to Louisiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 5, 1950

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under previous authority to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to submit an editorial from the Southwest Citizen, published in the largest city in my district, Lake Charles, La., in connection with the recent visit of Vice President BARKLEY, as follows:

WELCOME, VEEP, TO LOUISIANA

Few national officeholders would be more welcome in Louisiana than the Veep, and the Citizen joins the rest of the State in wishing Vice President ALBEN BARKLEY well when he comes to Baton Rouge and Hammond for speeches this week.

The Veep has brought color and life to an office that is altogether too often without it. The Nation followed his jet-propelled romance breathlessly, and has since accorded him a good will and an almost universal popularity that few political figures enjoy.

He'll make three speeches in the State—all at extremely important and worthy functions.

He'll participate in exercises marking the twenty-fifth anniversary of Southeastern Louisiana College in Hammond on Saturday,

May 20. That night he'll address a gathering in New Orleans.

Next day he will be guest of honor at a community-wide meeting in Baton Rouge under auspices of the United Jewish Appeal. He'll speak on "A World Mission of Mercy," and will describe the American effort to repair damage to human life and freedom in the aftermath of the war.

Louisiana is lucky to have such a pleasant-spoken and distinguished visitor. We are glad to have him on board.

Annapolis and West Point

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1950

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, Maj. Gen. Hugh J. Knerr, United States Air Force, retired, was, at the time of his retirement, the Inspector General of the United States Air Force. During the existence of the Congressional Aviation Policy Board of the Eightieth Congress, General Kneer acted as alternate adviser to Gen. H. H. "Hap" Arnold.

Maj. Gen. Hugh J. Knerr graduated from the Naval Academy at Annapolis in 1908 and served as an ensign in the Navy until 1912 when he transferred to the Coast Artillery Corps of the Army. He was one of those dauntless spirits who, in 1917, became an aviator in the then young and startling Air Corps. In 1939, while air officer of the Eighth Corps area, he retired as a colonel because of physical disability incident to military service. However, later in that same year he returned to active service and was sent to England shortly after the outbreak of World War II, where he saw high administrative service in the United States strategic air forces in Europe. As stated above, he retired in 1948 as Inspector General of the United States Air Force.

He was associated with Gen. William "Billy" Mitchell and was long a partisan to get air power recognized as a strategic weapon for the United States. He collaborated with General Andrews in furthering the doctrines of a separate air force in active service.

In his work as alternate adviser to the Congressional Aviation Policy Board, General Knerr contributed enormously through his thorough knowledge and understanding of all three military services, having served in each. While strongly partisan for the recognition of air power as a prime strategic weapon for the defense of our country, he was thoroughly unsympathetic toward those who adhered to the ancient philosophy of the old school tie. His own service in all three branches of the Defense Establishment convinced him of the need for unification of all of the armed forces.

Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I take pleasure in including an article by Maj. Gen. Hugh J. Knerr, United States Air Force, retired, which sets forth his ideas in connection with the service schools. The article follows:

SERVICE SCHOOLS NEED NEW IDEAS—THE PROFESSION OF ARMS DEMANDS CIVILIAN TRAINING AS WELL AS MILITARY KNOWLEDGE

(By Maj. Gen. Hugh J. Knerr, USAF, Retired)

While we are locked in a cold war with a relentless antagonist, to propose the abolition of the service academies at West Point and Annapolis may sound like a particularly virulent form of heresy. What! Abolish processes which gave us Grant and Lee, Dewey and Pershing, Arnold and MacArthur! That the proposal comes from a graduate of the Naval Academy only compounds the heresy.

Yet it is my conviction that if we are to educate our military properly for the responsibilities of the air-atomic age, we should, indeed, abolish these venerable institutions as they are presently constituted. We should abolish them because as undergraduate schools they do not meet our requirements; they create more problems than they solve; they are relics of the age of Clausewitz and Mahan.

I'll complete the heresy. The Air Force, instead of advocating the abolition of West Point and Annapolis, is now asking Congress to authorize a third service academy. The Joint Chiefs of Staff support this request. I spent 32 years in the Air Force and supported most of its objectives; but on this point I am in complete disagreement with the Air Force command. The third academy, I am convinced, would be an expensive step backward.

I believe the time has come when we should deliberately and thoughtfully redesign our system of military education. This is the age of technology. The preparation for and the waging of war has become an infinitely complex operation. Our military department is a vast and integral portion of our economy. Against an enemy who may array three-fourths of the earth's population against us, we can survive only by massive employment of superior technology. So the requirements of a military officer in 1955 and 1960 will be a long way from what they were in the gallant but simple days of cavalry movements across the plains.

In our military department now we have approximately 180,000 officers—76,080 in the Army, 60,600 in the Air Force, 44,000 in the Navy. In the peacetime future we shall need at least 12,000 new, young officers a year for active duty, and this will increase because technology demands a higher and higher percentage of officers.

How shall we select these officers? How shall we induce them to follow military careers? How shall we train them? What can we wish for them in the way of education so that they can be entrusted safely with the preservation of our western heritage?

It seems to me that the elementary requirement must be a liberal, well-rounded college education. Our industries seek their key replacements among college graduates. Our professional schools require academic degrees of their entrants; law and medicine require prelaw and premedical degrees. I believe the military must require a premilitary degree.

That we must have the college graduate is being demonstrated daily. Even as we fought World War II every branch of the service was frantically sending officers to college; yet, with all this activity, the percentages of college graduates including the service academies, in the officers corps in 1946 were: Navy 70 percent, Army 50 percent, Air Force 30 percent. Today all branches, particularly the Army and Air Force, are struggling to give their officers basic college training. So for the future we can start with nothing less than the superior, 21-year-old college graduate.

But each year where shall we find 12,000 superior 21-year-old college graduates who want military careers? West Point and Annapolis currently are providing about 1,000; some of these are held in service by compulsory 3-year contracts; and the relative importance of academy graduates in our military department steadily is declining.

Less than 10 percent of the officers now in the Air Force are from West Point or Annapolis. Our vital operational commands like the Strategic Air Command and the Tactical Air Command are headed respectively by Lt. Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, of Ohio State, and Maj. Gen. Willis H. Hale, who advanced from the ranks. Many of the Navy's most brilliant young officers never saw Annapolis; and the same is true of the Army.

Naturally, and for obvious reasons, most of the top commands were held by graduates of the academies. I do not disparage these officers; I am proud to have been one of them; I am aware of the historic contribution made by the academies to the safety of this Nation.

But I cannot agree that superior personal honor and patriotism can be instilled only at a service academy. In my experience the academy graduate has evidenced no superior capacity over the college graduate. In my own Air Force commands I have preferred the college graduate to the academy graduate because the former suffered from fewer inhibitions, was more eager to learn, and more receptive to innovation. Many senior officers in every branch of the service have agreed with this opinion; some have not.

So to our problem of providing each year 12,000 superior, 21-year-old college graduates who want military careers—to this there are three possible solutions. First, we can build the air academy and let the three academies provide about one-eighth of the graduates and the colleges seven-eights. Second, we can build the air academy, expand the three manifold, and hope that they can provide most of the 12,000. Or third, we can abolish the academy system and adopt a new plan whereby the colleges will supply them all.

Since the first course is the one we have followed until now, we are familiar with its disadvantages. That there is a natural conflict between academy and college graduates is well known. Rightly or wrongly, it is widely believed that the academy graduates control the Military Establishment and favor one another. So, since he is aware of this handicap to himself and since he has a natural antipathy for military service, why should the superior college graduate choose an active military career? The very fact that academy graduates seem to be in control of the military department often prevents our getting superior college graduates and forces us to take more of the inferior ones.

The second course can be objected to on several grounds. My principal objection is to the nature of current academy training.

I don't believe in educating American boys in a cloister. I think when you take a healthy 17-year-old away from his home environment and shut him up for 4 years, whatever you teach him, you are likely to do him more harm than good. You convert such boys into a class apart, and in an age when war has become total we don't want a samurai in America.

In trying to save western civilization our only resource is brains. All the advantages of brawn and numbers are on the other side. We can forestall a war—or win one—only if our people have better technical educations; only if our military leaders are superior technicians who are constantly finding the new and more effective means to enforce our will. I believe our colleges are more likely to produce men of this type than are our service academies.

Our academies are still placing too much emphasis on formal military training. In wars in the air-atomic age the only men who

need to march in step are the police. The pistol, the rifle, the manual of arms, squads east and west—all these are useful only to the police who establish order after the decision of war has been gained with atomic and biological weapons. West Point and Annapolis are institutions where the technical training of individuals is made secondary to gymnastic exercises in military bearing.

Their 1949 football records provide a fair guide to the two academies. Annapolis is the better technical school; West Point has an excellent physical education program; but in the matter of imparting technical knowledge and teaching men to think, they are both far behind our better colleges.

So I favor the third course, the plan under which we would abolish West Point and Annapolis as academies—as undergraduate institutions—and depend entirely on our colleges to supply the 12,000 superior and broadly educated 21-year-olds. The colleges can do the better job; the academies were founded in other times for other purposes; in any likely case the colleges must do most of the job; so why not have an end to the old conflict between college and academy graduates and pass the responsibility to colleges which have or will create good departments of military science and tactics?

This plan would not necessitate abandonment of our traditional congressional appointments to an academic education at Government expense. Public officials now making appointments to the academies could instead award scholarships to the approved Reserve Officers Training Corps colleges. We might even increase the number of such scholarships. But the appointee, instead of going to West Point or Annapolis, would first go to his State University or perhaps be allowed to choose any college which is on the approved list.

When the appointee reported to the college of his choice, ROTC officers would become his faculty advisers and administrators of his scholarship. They would begin teaching him military ethics; insist on a high order of scholarship and personal conduct; recommend technical courses to prepare him for his military specialty; begin teaching him to operate machines; send him to summer camps to train with his fellows; hold the power of dismissal over him; but otherwise, would allow him the widest possible latitude in the selection of his courses.

This doesn't mean that a military education would become any easier or any less Spartan than it is now at the academies. If anything, it would become harder; for there is no easy way for a man to educate himself for military responsibility in 1960. He can't avoid higher mathematics, physics, chemistry, astronomy or philosophy. He has to exercise his brain and prepare to think and reason.

But, by educating our officers in the colleges, we can put the emphasis on technical instead of on military training. We can, therefore, make the military career more attractive to a larger number of superior men; we can avoid the dangers of the cloister—of creating a class apart; we can leave the stuent in a natural civilian environment until he is 21; and, in my opinion, we can thus better create a young man who is more of an individual and better trained to think and initiate.

On graduation, on recommendation by his ROTC officers, the young appointee-graduate then would stand competitive examinations with all the ROTC graduates who aspire to military careers. The examinations would be to determine the recipients of 12,000 probationary commissions in the military department of the United States. In the competition for these commissions the boy who had been educated at Government expense would have no advantage over the one who had been educated, with ROTC, at private expense.

Suppose the boy educated at Government expense fails in the competitive examinations? He will have been given preparation for a civilian career and can be commissioned in the Reserve. At first this might seem wasteful, but it is actually less wasteful than the present system. A fifth of the appointees to West Point and Annapolis fail to finish, and a fourth of the graduates choose civilian careers.

The 12,000 successful competitors would be granted probationary commissions and would be ready for assignment to one of the three graduate schools of the military department: West Point, Annapolis, and Randolph Field.

Yes, I believe that West Point and Annapolis along with Randolph Field should be reconstituted as 2-year graduate schools of a single military department. The venerable academies should embrace a new and honorable destiny: they should cease dealing with 17-year-old cadets and midshipmen and begin dealing with 21-year-old college graduates; instead of training a few for 4 years they should train all of our peacetime regulars for 2 years.

Once this change were made at West Point and Annapolis, and Randolph Field were added to them, then many of our old problems would begin to disappear. The 12,000 college graduates holding probationary commissions could be assigned to one of the three: 4,000 to each school, thus giving each a student body of 8,000. For the first year the men could be assigned without regard to specialty since the first year should be largely devoted to an over-all study of triphibious warfare.

For the second year they could be shuffled again and assigned to the schools of their specialty; and upon successful completion of the second year they could be permanently commissioned and assigned to active duty.

The old conflict between Academy and college graduates would be ended: Promotion could be had on ability. The old Academy-spawned rivalries between Army and Navy could be forgotten, for these new officers would hold their commissions in the military department. They could all wear the same uniform and denote their specialties with suitable insignia. Even those who operated different types of machines would understand that modern warfare must be planned and waged as a single operation.

We would have done with much of the old waste and duplication. A capable supply officer could purchase food, not for the Army, the Navy, or the Air Force, but for the Defense Department. Our pilots could operate today from an aircraft carrier and tomorrow from a land base. Our experts in electronics—and they must multiply—would be expert whether they were operating on land, at sea, or in the air. We would need only one program for the development of guided missiles, not three, as we have at present.

In this connection, the Air Force command, in advocating a third Academy, is breaking faith with Billy Mitchell and with most of us old-timers who fought so long for the recognition of air power. Mitchell and the rest of us believed in a single military department: We believed in unification, not triplication.

The present organization is a compromise accepted by the Air Force in order to gain autonomy. If the Air Force is no longer to strive toward true unification, if Air Force energies are to be devoted to the construction of a third service bureaucracy, then Gen. Billy Mitchell can start turning over in his grave.

These are perilous times for America and for western civilization. The honorable profession of arms bears a terrible responsibility. One of our responsibilities is to attract to our profession the ablest young men of the Nation, then to train them to defend freedom's bastion in a totalitarian sea. If we are willing to be unselfish, if we are able to make the necessary changes, if we will cooperate first with our free colleges, and then with our free industries I believe we can build an American defense organization which will be equal to the challenges.

Foreign Agricultural Trade Policy Advisory Committee Stresses Importance of Foreign Trade to the American Farmer

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEPHEN M. YOUNG
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1950

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert the following report, dated April 28, 1950, of the Foreign Agricultural Trade Policy Advisory Committee:

FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL TRADE POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE SUBMITS REPORT

The Foreign Agricultural Trade Policy Advisory Committee, formed in November 1949, to advise the United States Department of Agriculture in matters involving foreign agricultural trade and policies, has submitted a report to Secretary of Agriculture Charles F. Brannan following its second meeting April 24 and 25.

The report is the second submitted to Secretary Brannan by the committee. The first, rendered after the committee's initial meeting January 6, 1950, emphasized the magnitude of the foreign-trade problem and the need for detailed study by both Government and trade groups, and suggested full exploration of questions involved prior to specific policy recommendations. Seven policy areas were listed for such exploration. (Press release USDA 62–50.)

The Foreign Agricultural Trade Policy Advisory Committee is composed of representatives of farm organizations, land-grant colleges, the agricultural press and agricultural industry invited by Secretary Brannan to serve as members. (Press releases USDA 22–50 and 2526–49.)

The committee's second report follows:

"The agricultural industries of the United States are being rapidly and dramatically confronted with problems growing out of the alleviation of wartime and postwar shortages of farm products. As a result farmers and others interested in agricultural production and marketing policies must of necessity give prompt and vigorous attention to the developing foreign trade situation as it affects the probable future foreign markets for American farm products.

"One of the questions which needs to be weighed most carefully in this connection is the fact that any agricultural or other program which endeavors to maintain prices above market levels for any considerable share of the time is inevitably nationalistic. It comes into conflict with efforts to develop international trade and other forms of international cooperation.

"Such programs are nationalistic and take us back on the road to isolationism because—

"1. They lead to well-nigh irresistible demands that trade barriers be raised to keep products of other nations from sharing in the artificially high prices they provide.

"2. They involve keeping American resources out of fullest use to curtail output in order to raise prices, and it is not logical to expect that imports which will defeat that objective will be acceptable.

"3. They increase the difficulties of exporting because prices are above those from competing sources of supply.

"4. They foster programs of export dumping which invite retaliation from other countries.

"5. They require barriers to keep products sold abroad at lower prices from returning to our markets.

"6. They encourage an expansion of State trading because of the Government controls necessary in their effective operation.

"7. They encourage similar nationalistic programs for the expansion of uneconomic production in other countries to replace our products which in turn will lead to further demands for restrictive action.

"While the inevitable adjustments in the postwar pattern of international trade will probably impose rather heavy adjustment problems on some segments of agriculture, it must also be recognized that similar adjustments may be required of other segments of the American economy. To the extent that nonagricultural imports into this country may be developed as a result of a high level of domestic business, a high level of world production and trade, and a minimum of restrictive barriers, the necessary downward adjustments in our important agricultural industries may be minimized. Our agricultural and other programs should have sufficient flexibility to make them adaptable to a constructive foreign-trade policy.

"The United States today is the world's leading Nation. As such, it must weigh the consequences of its every action on its relationship to the rest of the world. Our efforts to get other countries to lower trade barriers and to work together for maintaining an enduring world peace will be seriously hampered, if not completely nullified, if this country pursues domestic programs in conflict with our international aims. It is essential that Americans generally recognize these facts."

Members of the committee who attended the April 24–25 meeting were: Homer L. Brinkley, secretary and general manager, American Rice Growers' Cooperative Association, Lake Charles, La.; E. F. Creekmore, E. F. Creekmore & Co., New Orleans, La.; E. W. J. Hearty, E. W. J. Hearty, Inc., New York, N. Y.; Edward J. Grimes, vice president, Cargill, Inc., Minneapolis, Minn.; O. B. Jesness, head, Division of Agricultural Economics, University of Minnesota, St. Paul, Minn.; Paul D. Sanders, editor, the Southern Planter, Richmond, Va.; W. A. Schoenfeld, dean of the School of Agriculture, Oregon State College, Corvallis, Oreg.; R. E. Short, vice president, American Farm Bureau Federation, Brinkley, Ark., and Jesse W. Tapp, vice president, Bank of America, San Francisco, Calif.

Committee members unable to be present were: A. S. Goss, master, the National Grange, Washington, D. C.; Robert F. Loree, chairman of board, National Foreign Trade Council, Inc., New York, N. Y.; W. I. Myers, dean of the College of Agriculture, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.; Edward J. O'Brien, Jr., Edward J. O'Brien Co., Louisville, Ky.; and James G. Patton, president, Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America.

Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the Chelsea Record, Chelsea, Mass., June 1, 1950:

CHURCH AND COMMUNISM

Far from showing a disposition to pull out of Communist-controlled countries, the Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions is planning special training for missionaries assigned to such areas, it was announced recently.

Viewing the rise of communism as a new problem for the church, and pointing out that it must be reckoned with in nearly every part of the world, the Presbyterian statement said that Christianity can neither flee from communism nor compromise with it on basic moral and spiritual issues. It must meet man's needs on the spiritual level, where communism has nothing to offer, say these churchmen.

This militant stand, contrasting with an attitude of aloof disapproval of communism, may prove in the long run to be an effective means of dealing with this destructive force. The patience needed in waiting for its results, however, is likely to be monumental.

Biggest Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the thirty-ninth article by Mr. Frank C. Waldrop on the infiltration of communism in our country:

BIGGEST STORY

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

For the 10 years from 1929 to 1939, Stalin's greatest political concern was that of killing other Communists who had tried to make a revolution against him because there was no legal outlet for differences of opinion.

Down below the Moscow stratosphere the people of Russia sweated and bled and strained to carry out the 5-year plan of 1928 and its revisions.

This was supposed to make Russia a fairyland of "scientific socialism" and guaranteed material plenty. The mere technical fact that it failed to do so has been overlooked ever since by Soviet apologists.

The Moscow palace wars came about because so many Communists themselves knew this plan was bunk and protested at the harsh and inhumane demands Stalin put upon the people in its name.

The consequential 10-year purge and bloodletting in high places should not be confused with the special and separate issue of Stalin's personal war on Leon Trotsky.

That was simply getting rid of a talented fellow-revolutionary who knew all the tricks of overthrowing a government and had his eye on Stalin's job.

The 10-year purges from 1929 to 1939 had overtones and undertones of Trotskyism, to be sure. But more than that they represented the resistance of ordinary common sense to the rigidity of Socialist planning.

The official records of the world-remembered "Moscow Trials" of 1933–39 contain such staggering evidence as the case of Henry Yagoda, head of Stalin's own secret police. Yogado first killed for Stalin and then was wiped out by Stalin with no thanks for services rendered.

One of the most fantastic Yagodo stories has to do with his use of drugs. He was a chemist. So he impregnated one victim's room with mercury paint to poison him slowly. Another had a bad heart. Yagoda ordered his medicines mixed so as to blow the heart muscles apart.

Karl Radek, once Stalin's favorite newspaper editor, made a confession that to this day has never been fully unraveled in all its peculiarities.

Just one tantalizing allusion concerned the case of Gavril Princep, earlier noted here.

Princep was the utterly obscure and unimportant Serbian student who shot the Austrian archduke, Franz Ferdinand, in 1914 and set off World War I.

Who put Princep up to that? And why, more than 20 years later, would Karl Radek, the old Bolshevik and confidant of communism's chiefest aristocrats, drag him into court as a part of his own defense? This is a challenge to lovers of international mystery and wheels within wheels.

Then, there is the case of Rosengoltz, the commissar of trade, who was exhibit No. 1 of the horrors of being religious in a regime officially atheistic. This same Vishinsky, who is now Russia's Foreign Minister and was until recently chief nuisance at the United Nations, prosecuted him.

Vishinsky confronted Rosengoltz on the witness stand with the charge that when arrested Rosengoltz had in his pocket a piece of bread. Within the bread there was a rolled-up cloth. Inside the cloth was a paper.

And on the paper? Not a coded message from Trotsky. Not a numbers slip, nor even the name of the hottest horse at Laurel raceways. On the paper was inscribed—incredible for an old Bolshevik—a prayer.

Exposed in this criminality, Rosengoltz defended himself by saying that he didn't think anything of the prayer. His wife made him carry it.

In 1933, 1,000,000 Communists were kicked out of the party. On December 1, 1934, Sergei Kirov, one of Stalin's closest friends, governor of Leningrad and specialist in chorus girls, was shot dead in the street.

In 1937 Marshals Gamarnik, Tukhachevsky, and seven other generals evaporated.

It was as if Generals Bradley, Collins, and their chief assistants in our general staff were snatched from the Pentagon and shot in the Justice Department basement.

It took Stalin from 1929 to 1938 to get up the nerve actually to shoot Bukharin, the old Bolshevik mentioned yesterday as the first of the top brass to be fired, but finally he did.

Also, he fired Maxim Litvinov as Foreign Minister in 1939 in spite of 18 years of faithful intrigue in his service.

Litvinov's crime was to have persuaded Stalin in 1934 into the League of Nations and in early 1939 to have favored lining up with Britain against Germany. He was defined as "too western."

But this is getting over into Soviet foreign affairs. Today's account is just a glancing note on the purges at home.

The actuality is too vast and complex and awful for handling in less than a very long book. The important point for now is that all of it was well known to the world at the time. By 1933 Stalin's character stood revealed to civilization as worse than Hitler's.

Yet President Franklin D. Roosevelt, who made a career of denouncing Hitler, took up Stalin. When citizens tried to warn him, he boasted, "Oh, don't worry. I'm an old horse trader. I can handle him."

Biggest Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 5, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the fortieth article by Mr. Frank C. Waldrop on the infiltration of communism in our country:

BIGGEST STORY
(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Stalin's inability to govern the people of Russia by any peaceable means has been the theme of this chapter now coming to a close.

How many Americans have ever heard of Gen. Anton Vlasov? Today, Vlasov is a scattered handful of dust, lost and forgotten in the shattering upheavals of nations and nationalities that have been the pastime of this century.

But he remains a symptom of the indestructible worm in Stalin's apple.

When the Germans attacked Russia on June 21, 1941, Anton Vlasov was one of the Soviet Army's most trusted high officers. He commanded the whole front just north and west of Moscow.

Hitler's first, whirling attack, as the public record shows, carried the Germans deep into the best of Russia. In fact, German scouts actually got close enough to Moscow to take a long-range photograph of it.

And General Vlasov? All he did was lead an army of 100,000 Russians over to Hitler. Next, he set up at Brest-Litovsk in Poland where the first German-Soviet treaty was made by Trotsky a generation before, and began a radio campaign calling on the Russians to come one and all, over the line.

Did they come? Well, Americans landing on the Normandy coast on D-day found thousands of Russian troops in the German defense lines.

They were fugitives from Stalin who preferred Hitler.

And one of the great problems of resettling civilization in Europe at the war's end was that other thousands of Russians who had escaped the iron curtain in the confusion and refused to go home.

Can you name any victorious nation in history—in all human history—that has had such a problem?

That its citizens, in victory, would choose wandering the face of the earth rather than to go home?

Can you imagine two States of our Union having been so disloyal if we had been invaded in 1941, as to have their constitutions jerked as soon as Washington could get around to it?

Well, that happened in Russia.

In September 1941, the Volga-German Autonomous Republic of the U. S. S. R. was dissolved. The "Germans" had been Russians for 200 years, but that wasn't long enough for Stalin.

In 1945, the Crimean Autonomous Republic was also bounced. Too many citizens had gone over to Hitler during the occupation.

As a matter of fact, serious students of the German operation contend that Hitler could have won Russia altogether if he had not been so orthodox a Nazi.

In the first fighting of 1941 the German military had the complete dissolution of the Soviet Empire well under way.

The German Army's target was the Russian Army. And it had that army badly whipped and on the run. The civilians left in the wake of the fight were little worse off than before. In fact, a number of German military governors were having excellent success with them—better than we have had in Germany, as a matter of fact, according to much evidence.

But in 1942, the Nazis took over from the military governors and were so cruel and stupid, politically, they drove Russia back into Stalin's arms.

In a way, it was repayment to Stalin for having in 1933, driven Germany into Hitler's.

The revolution Stalin had predicted and undertaken for the world in 1929 had been a catastrophe for mankind, but no success for Stalin.

The United States of America had eluded him, as he had been warned before the attempt by Communist delegations from this country.

In Germany, the Communists from 1930 on collaborated with the then insufficient Nazis, to destroy the Weimar Republic that had already too impossible a task put upon it by the cruel and Draconian peace of Versailles which the United States of America, to its eternal honor, had refused to sign in spite of Woodrow Wilson's bullying.

At Stalin's order, the German Communists precipitated for the second time after 1918 a revolutionary crisis.

The result was Hitler, so many Communists turned Nazi.

They supplied a theory and doctrine for what otherwise was just a brutish rabble, and the spirit of their doctrine evolved straight from Marx and Lenin.

Never forget Nazi was an abbreviation for National Socialist Party.

Finally, Stalin by 1933, had a revolutionary crisis of his own at home. Factories were idle. Farmers were idle. People were in revolt all around him.

Suddenly there came a call from over the sea from F. D. Roosevelt, Stalin was saved.

Biggest Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 5, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the forty-first article by Mr. Frank C. Waldrop on the infiltration of communism in our country:

BIGGEST STORY
(By Frank C. Waldrop)

The historical facts of Mr. Roosevelt's secret maneuvering on Soviet recognition in 1933 are at last beginning to come out, and as in all his other transactions with Stalin, the facts devastate his reputation.

It is well known to all in Washington who have survived the Roosevelt dynasty that the late President was preoccupied with fixing records in such a way as to glorify his imperial memory in the histories.

He is the only President of the United States ever known to do such a thing as set up a museum and library of his career papers, carefully arranged and edited with the utmost precaution to guide the thinking of those who would undertake to evaluate him in time to come.

But for all his precautions Mr. Roosevelt failed to bar the gate against the record.

I happen to know of one eminent personage who is even now writing his memoirs. This personage has an impeccable standing, both as to his character and as to his knowledge of the facts.

He has decided to spill the beans under the provocation of the frauds and the distortions that attempt to make Roosevelt's record on Russia something that it is not.

His book is well on its way, and it is nonpolitical, literal, and personal. But it is prejudiced. It is prejudiced toward the facts.

It is going to make some liars' faces red, for they cannot successfully challenge either the veracity or the personal experience and knowledge of the personage involved.

Out of respect for him and his position, I am going to cut off on this matter right here, except to say the gentleman in question has never run for public office in his life, but politicians all over the civilized world—and Stalin as well—know him and know that what he writes has the support of indisputable fact.

His memoirs will be in print within the year, I am told. The manuscript is already going through a final revision. I mention this just by way of seeing how much hog's caution is left between the ears of current so-called historians.

These have given themselves up to propagandizing for the Roosevelt dynasty instead of reviewing objectively the things that have actually happened in the U. S. A. under that dynasty's malign and disastrous abuse of power.

If any such historian reads this, and can guess the identity of the personage now preparing those memoirs for publication, the said historian will not be the best of company for his wife and family, hereafter.

And so now we turn in this series to the final and worst chapter of all, the experiences of the American people brought down upon them like the plagues of ancient Egypt and the afflictions of Job, by Mr. Roosevelt's granting of diplomatic status in this country to the Communist conspiracy against civilization.

Mr. Roosevelt took office, you will remember, at a time of wildest fear and panic. An assassin had almost shot him a short while before. The banking system of the Nation was utterly jammed and stalled.

Very few people indeed even heard, let alone heeded, the obervations of careful and nonpolitical economists who said that the United States of America was already coming out of the depression of 1929.

Whoever wants an insider's account of Mr. Roosevelt's temperament and behavior of those times will enjoy Raymond Moley's After Seven Years.

Mr. Moley was chief of staff of the original brain trust. But he didn't last long, once his master was in office.

His precise and devasting record of the goings-on of the times will tell you why.

At any rate, whoever was around here then can remember that 1933 was a time of excitement and a feeling of impending change such as Washington had not known in the memory of the oldest inhabitant.

As for me, I was as excited as anybody. At the start of this series I told how I met up with communism in New York City in 1930 as a very young, undeveloped reporter.

By the time I got to Washington, July 31, 1933, I was a little more experienced and I was beginning to realize that some influence utterly revolutionary really was taking hold in the United States of America.

Something was making people restless and dissatisfied with the Constitution that laid down the rules of the American game. Something was drilling into the heads of public officials that means could be excused if only they would profess ends that appealed to popular ideals.

The only necessity was to disguise the means, when these were unpopular, and to label a governmental bludgeon as a feather.

Then, perhaps, the people would not feel its blows.

It was in this climate of Rooseveltean deceptiveness that Communists and their friends undertook their campaign to obtain official United States diplomatic recognition for Stalin's dictatorship.

Biggest Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 5, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the forty-second article by Mr. Frank C. Waldrop on the infiltration of communism in our country:

BIGGEST STORY
(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Would you say that William Green, head of the American Federation of Labor, has more sense than Justice Felix Frankfurter and a whole shoal of professors?

Well, get a copy of the New York Times for January 30, 1933 and look on page 4.

There, you will find what Green had to say about United States recognition for the Soviet Union.

Alongside it is the position of the professors. Frankfurters position was, as usual, given in secret, but in a few paragraphs I will tell about it.

Here is what Green said:

"It is the opinion of the officers of the American Federation of Labor that upon the question of recognition of Soviet Russia the issue is clearly drawn."

On the one side, he said, were those who "seek to cherish and foster American principles and to preserve American institutions."

On the other, "those who would risk all that our citizenship has gained through almost 200 years in experimentation in the principles of free government for a probable and uncertain increase in the sale of American commodities."

He was talking about the propaganda campaign of the day, so reminiscent of the first Soviet campaign over here in 1918–20, that if the United States of America would only let down the bars it could do business with Stalin.

Said Green:

"This argument is not influencing and will not influence the judgment and opinion of American labor in favor of Russia, Russian recognition or Sovietism."

Green held that until the Soviet Union had abandoned its program of world revolution, its operations in the United States of America, and had adopted the principles laid down by Charles Evans Hughes when he was Secretary of State, the American Federation of Labor would fight recognition in every way.

Now that was statesmanship on the part of old Bill Green, I submit. Yet the Soviet was recognized, and the labor movement in the United States of America was riddled and racketeered and used by communism in a generation-long operation that is not finished even yet.

But even, so, the record as above emphasizes once more, as I have tried to show from the beginning of this series, that communism in the United States of America is not a labor movement.

It is a drive for power by maladjusted intellectuals, idle rich who cannot find useful work to do, and by neurotics of all varieties.

For instance, right on the same page with Green's declaration in that same New York Times you will find a story headed:

"Two hundred and sixty eight colleges join in plea for Soviet. Eight hundred faculty presidents and faculty members urge Roosevelt to press recognition. Status held peace peril. Petition started by Fellowship of Recognition also holds curb on Japan is prevented."

Among the signers of the petition were such famous educators as William A. Neilson, Robert Morss Lovett, Sidney B. Fay, Manley O. Hudson, John Dewey, Nathaniel Peffer, George S. Counts, William H. Kirkpatrick, Marion E. Park, William I. Hull, Ernest Minor Patterson, Thomas Woody, Benjamin H. Williams, Alva W. Taylor, John R. Commons, Alex. Meiklejohn and E. A. Ross.

Prof. Reinhold Neibuhr was chairman of the "Fellowship of Recognition," but he wasn't the real brains. As usual, the Communists had a front man and a hidden manager.

I have the story of the fellowship from the man who organized it, J. B. Matthews.

Matthews eventually became director of research for the House Committee on Un-American Activities and has given his life ever since to showing Americans what communism really means. Matthews tells me:

"I worked for many months as executive secretary of the Fellowship of Recognition on this petition for the recognition of Soviet Russia.

"Among those whom I personally solicited was Prof. Felix Frankfurter. He sent word back that we should kill the campaign and the press release, inasmuch as he had the President-elect in his vest pocket and could guarantee recognition."

Among those who helped him get signatures, said Matthews, was Margaret Lamont, wife of Corliss Lamont, the son of Thomas Lamont, member of the House of Morgan and one of America's most famous bankers.

And there you have a comparison between the American Federation of Labor the American intellectuals and Mr. Felix Frankfurter, as the stage was being set in 1933 for F. D. Roosevelt to turn the Communists loose on the United States of America as never before.

Reorganization Plans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 5, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the Daily Evening Item, Lynn, Mass., June 1, 1950:

STREAMLINING GOVERNMENT

Vital streamlining of the Federal Government still has a long road to travel.

Thanks to a late spurt in Congress, we made more progress this year than it seemed we would. But that doesn't obscure the fact we should have done a lot better.

In one big batch President Truman submitted 21 reorganization plans, most based fairly closely on the recommendations of the able Hoover Commission which studied the problem exhaustively. The Senate killed 5 and the other 16 are now in effect.

Offhand that score looks good, but the results need to be analyzed a little. Former President Herbert Hoover, who headed the Commission, says only 1 of the 21 plans calls for major surgery on a Government department. That's the one putting the Maritime Commission into the Commerce Department.

The Hoover group recommended 19 major administrative shifts. Three others, besides the Commerce Department change, have already been approved. They include reorganization of the State Department and unification of the armed services. But that still leaves 14 to be acted on.

Not until these are instituted can the Government begin to realize the efficiencies and economies promised from this great streamlining program. Saving of perhaps $3,000,000,000 annually depend on carrying the plan to completion.

Mr. Hoover does not appear to be worried because some of Mr. Truman's proposals vary from the Commission's. "The President has the right and duty to present his own ideas in these matters," he says.

What does trouble Mr. Hoover is the kind of opposition some plans have aroused. Proposals for realining the Treasury, the Agriculture Department, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the Federal Communications Commission were killed. Mr. Hoover is said to feel pressure groups worked hard against reforms that would affect them, while shouting loudly for all the others.

Toward all of these the Senate and House should take a constructive, statesmanlike attitude. If they do not, congressional spouting about Federal waste and inefficiency will have an empty sound for a long time to come.

Our Economic Advisers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 5, 1950

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, there is no question that the confusion in Washington extends to every department of the Government. Likewise, there is no question that the most serious confusion manifests itself in the White House.

The president has surrounded himself with economic advisers who are noted for their advocacy of wild, radical theories. Leon Keyserling is now the President's chief economic adviser but his theories are not consonant with the theories that made America great.

I see that the President, no doubt upon the advice of Keyserling, has added to his Council of Economic Advisers one Roy Blough who was formerly connected with the Treasury Department in the days of Secretary Morgenthau and Randolph Paul. In those days, as I remember, Roy Blough and Randolph Paul were the principal advocates of placing a tax on spending. They evidently felt that with the income tax taking practically all the money that many people had left after keeping their families that the Government should then proceed immediately to tax every item that the citizen spent. Think of that; taxing spending with a tax on earnings and a tax on spending how far are we from socialism?

Mr. Speaker, I repeat, the White House surely is confused.

The editor of the Athens Messenger, which is published in the district which I have the honor to represent, recently published an editorial in line with what I have said. The editorial is as follows:

DANGEROUS ADVISERS

There is a group of advisers to President Truman called the Keyserling group, none of whom have ever had any successful business experience, but whom the President considers experts on economics. It is probably the most important radical group of people steering this country further and further into a

chaotic condition because their belief is that printing-press money and government subsidy is the way to prosperity.

The Keyserling group says that profits are too high (even while it counts on siphoning off the greater part of profits by taxation, wherewith to continue the Government's wild spending) so the profits must be decreased by increasing the expense of doing business.

The group says that wages should be raised, to decrease profits; that prices should be further raised, but not enough to cover increased costs. They claim that Government deficit is a good thing—that it is O. K. to spend more than is received. The Keyserlings plan to so conduct the Government that these ideas will be realized, so that more inflationary conditions will exist, bringing greater trouble to readjustment, which is inevitable.

They justify this crazy reasoning with their "purchasing power theory" which says that the Government will pump money, one way or another, into the hands of the greatest number of people, who, of course, will spend it for goods and services. This stimulates business, everything expands automatically, and everybody thinks it is just dandy, and votes for more of the same stuff.

The theory is just like the rat-and-cat farm, where rats were to be raised to feed the cats, whose carcasses (after skinning) were fed back to the rats, the product of the project being cat skins. Supposed to economics in perpetual motion, if anyone asked about the market demand for cat skins, the whole thing showed up for the joke it was.

One high Government official feels, however, that such phony economics as the Keyserlings feed to the President all the time is not reasonable. He holds, on the other hand, that the faults of our Government come from the failings of the Members of the House of Representatives and the Senate, who, in too many cases are unwilling to represent the people correctly because they think more of holding onto their jobs and playing smart politics than they do of the country's welfare. He advocates a replacement-of-Congressmen campaign, to put new life and guts into the national legislature.

That, of itself, would be a good idea; that is, get enough capable men to run for congressional seats opening throughout the Nation, to put a new complexion in Congress. But, how long would it be before the new Congress would follow dangerous radicals like the Keyserlings, too?

Soil Conservation on Indian Lands

REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1950

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, as all my colleagues know, I have long advocated proper and effective soil conservation for America. I have also constantly insisted that the Indian service practice more soil conservation on the Indian lands of our country, especially on such as the Navajo Reservation.

I have in my hand a letter from a soil conservationist, Mr. Flory, who handles soil and moisture conservation for the Indian service. It proves conclusively that the most effective thing this Congress can do for our Indians in order for them to go forward and have a higher standard of living is to see to it that their soil is conserved and that it is made more fertile.

Mr. Speaker, the Indian problem will confront us so long as they are left to eke out a bare existence between the weeds and rocks and dry dust, that is a certainty.

The letter referred to follows:

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS,
BRANCH OF SOIL CONSERVATION,
May 3, 1950.

To: All Soil and Moisture Conservation employees.

Subject: Zeal and fire that will not falter or tire.

I cannot refrain from passing on to you the lift I got on my last field trip from an Indian farmer on a brushy, rocky, steep, small mountain farm. This man was about 50 years old. His family had been raised and had left for homes of their own. During all this period he had struggled with the slopes, the rock, and the brush in producing meager crops for a precarious living. His pastures were weedy, brushy, and of low-carrying capacity; his buildings and fences were dilapidated; and then, within the past 2 years, something happened. He was sparked by the zeal and enthusiasm of an understanding soil conservationist who has his hands in the earth. This Indian's eyes had a light in them that had never been there even as a youth because he was making a tired old farm live. He and the farm were being vitalized together. There is no doubt that the remaining years of his life will be richer and more exciting than all the past. He now knows what to do. He has a plan—a farm plan—made for him and his farm. He is confident of the response of the good earth. Evidence of his enthusiasm was at every turn. He had cleaned the brush and rock off his land; he had limed and fertilized it according to its needs; he was using each field according to its proper use. He had planted the best pasture mixture known. He was proud as Punch with the rich mixture of Kentucky 31 grass and ladino clover that had replaced the broom sedge, brush, and poverty grass on his steep hills. His eyes glowed with pride as he pointed out his contented fat cattle and hogs enjoying this luxurious repast. He had planted the best improved varieties of hybrid corn. He had repaired his fences and buildings. He was modernizing his home and was anxiously awaiting the coming of electricity this summer.

This man is on his way. He is not going to need much help any more, but what a shame that he was frustrated in his farming efforts during the most productive years of his life. What of the great numbers of young Indian men to whom land is available, who are indisposed, or apathetic toward using their land? Most of them don't know what they could do or how to do it. All they need is a sparking. Many of our SMC boys are giving that essential spark. Are you? Do you look over your work area and evaluate yourself in terms of people you have helped and inspired to a better way of life by getting them to work in harmony with nature, rather than against all her laws? It's like striking a spark from flint to tinder. Start the fire and it will go on and on, opening up constantly new excitements, new curiosities, and new stimuli for the rest of an existence. Curiously and happily, each such experience will carry you along also to greater heights of satisfaction in knowing that you had a small part in making a life more complete and in conserving and improving another bit of land for posterity.

The Indian lives closer to nature, understands more of her moods, and tries to accommodate his life and actions to her moods to a much greater extent than most other people. Great numbers go miles and miles to listen to Indian chants, watch the dances, and yet understand practically nothing of what the Indian is trying to portray. Few realize that what he seeks in these chants and dances is to become a part of nature, rather than view it as something apart like most of the whites do. His voice lifts to a shrill falsetto, then descending quickly to the deepest notes, repeated over and over to the timing of drums, tunes in with the sounds of the wind; the rising and falling sounds of water rushing downstream, the music of the stars. Nature's voice speaks to him and he joins his voice with it.

Do we know the fundamental, scientific facts of plant and animal nutrition, plant physiology, and plant ecology? Are we close enough to the land ourselves, and are we endowed with the intelligence, human understanding, zeal, and fire to make our knowledge an effective tool in the hands of the tiller of the soil, to use his land in harmony with nature?

A gratifying percent of SMC workers have the above attributes. I am inspired by their enthusiasm and their works on every field trip. This is to give them approbation and encouragement. There are, however, others who have missed the greatest satisfaction and remuneration a conservation position with Indians offers, because they have not caught this spark, and, consequently, cannot pass it on or warm themselves in its kindled warmth. They see obstacles instead of goals or heights to attain, but strangely, all the boys with the spark had the same obstacles but took them in their stride. The stumbling block to the diffident is a stepping stone for those with the zeal and fire that does not falter or tire.

Remember, we are not succeeding in conservation until a folk knowledge, a behavior, or cultural pattern of conservation, is firmly fixed. When the Indians in your area practice conservation from habit, then they have attained full stature as farmers and citizens.

EVAN L. FLORY,
Chief, Branch of Soil Conservation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Lynn, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article which is the thirty-third of a series of articles appearing in the Daily Evening Item, Lynn, Mass., June 1, 1950, on mayors who have served the city of Lynn, Mass., during the 100 years since Lynn became a city in 1850. The series is being written by Lawrence J. Quirk, whose grandfather, the late William P. Connery, Sr., was one of Lynn's most colorful mayors 40 years ago. Mr. Quirk is an honor graduate of Suffolk University and has had extensive experience as a newspaper and free-lance writer:

MAYORS OF LYNN, 1850–1950

(By Lawrence J. Quirk)

William P. Connery, thirty-third mayor of Lynn and the first to serve under the commission form of government, was one of the most beloved and respected men in the city. Known as the sage of Connery's Corner,

he was a man who was not afraid to fight all the way, whatever the personal sacrifice, for the principles he held dear. He willingly passed up numerous opportunities to make a fortune because he would not yield an inch to expediency.

A true and sincere crusader for total abstinence, he was for years a one-man membership committee for the famous old Father Mathew organization and brought hundreds of men into the society's Summer Street quarters to take the pledge. He was one of the foremost original members of the Anti-Saloon League organized by the Rev. Ralph Ward, now a Methodist bishop, of which he was treasurer.

Mr. Connery fought for progressive civic reforms and improvements for many years, making pithy pronouncements on all important questions of the day from his coal office at Connery's Corner, Pleasant and Wheeler Streets, where men of all classes and creeds were wont to congregate. His friends often called him too charitable for his own good. He gave unstintingly. Many a poor family found coal in its cellar without ever receiving a bill, and he thought nothing of taking off his rubbers or overcoat and handing them to a man in need.

A picturesque and colorful personality, he was noted for his philosophical wit and enlivened many a gathering with songs and dances from the extensive repertoire he had built up during his early minstrel touring days as Billy Barlow. As a speaker he was sincere, forceful, and persuasive, taking his audience straight to the heart of the matter under discussion with a meaty, pertinent statement of the facts as he saw them.

Elected alderman in 1901, at a special election to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Alderman Charles C. Fry, he immediately projected himself into the Walden Pond Dam controversy then raging. His fighting speeches resulted in a subsequent investigation of the contracting methods employed in that project. He loved the political game, its stimulation, its variety and challenge, and he always counseled his sons, William P. Connery, Jr., and Lawrence J. Connery, who later represented the Seventh District in Congress from 1923 to 1941, to "fight hard, but fight clean, and be honest at all costs."

Mr. Connery was personally responsible for launching the political career of many a noted city, State, and national figure, and if he thought a young fellow had the right stuff in him, he would put him through his paces in the best Connery's Corner style. He was known in Lynn as "The Father of Grade Crossing Abolishment," talked about the question constantly and kept it before the public, and while alderman battled at every turn for its serious consideration.

During his term as mayor, the overhead passes of the Boston and Maine Railroad were finally completed, though he had argued for a subterranean tunnel in the Central Square area as a better solution to the problem. He did, however, win out on the matter of keeping Silsbee Street open, and forced the building of an underpass to maintain the continuity of that thoroughfare.

Under the commission form of government, which went into effect at the start of Mr. Connery's term, in 1911, the mayor served also as Commissioner of Public Safety, along with four other commissioners, elected respectively for finance, public property, streets and highways, and water and water works. Mr. Connery was an eminently constructive and forward-looking mayor, strictly honest in all his dealings, and kept a firm hand on all city departments, notably the police, which he turned into an outstanding law enforcement agency which cut to a minimum all vice and crime in Lynn.

Motorcycles were first purchased at this time for police use, and Mayor Connery authorized the motorization of the fire department, for which new equipment was purchased and a two-way engine house constructed in the Highlands. A new Breed's Pond dam was built, increasing the water storage to 1,700,000,000 gallons, and several new pumping stations were constructed.

The school system was regraded and a kindergarten subprimary class was established. The Master Chase Schoolboys Association presented a fountain to the Whiting School in memory of the famous schoolmaster, Henry L. Chase. Classical High School was dedicated in June 1911 and the Brickett School was completed the same year. Many three-to-six tenement blocks were erected at this time, and a number of new factories went up.

The Lynn Tuberculosis Sanitarium was established late in 1911 as part of a program initiated by Mayor Connery's administration for the protection of public health. A 60-cent reduction was effected in the tax rate, which resulted in the coming of new manufacturing concerns to Lynn, and Mayor Connery's administration urged further reductions if they could be brought about without sacrificing important public services and improvements.

Other events of the Connery administration were the founding of the new Catholic parish of St. Pius in East Lynn, under the pastorate of the Reverend John P. Gorham; two serious fires, one at the Brett Lumber Co. building and the other at East Lynn Odd Fellows Hall; the renovation of the interior of city hall; the installation of city motorboats on the ponds for the protection of children swimming; and the erection of fire escapes on the exteriors of a number of school buildings.

Mayor Connery was born in Lynn, on Rockaway Street, on October 15, 1855, and attended the Lynn schools, after which he went on the stage, touring the country with enormous success as a singer, dancer, and monologist under the name of Billy Barlow. He later returned to Lynn, and in 1879 started a coal business. In 1882 he was married to the former Mary T. Haven, and in 1887 moved from his Alley Street residence to the famous Connery's Corner, Pleasant and Wheeler Streets. Afterward he constructed a home at 8 Wheeler Street while continuing to conduct business on the corner.

Active since 1876 in all worth while political movements in Lynn, he was alderman in 1901, a Democratic Presidential delegate from Massachusetts in 1904, and in 1911 and 1912 mayor of Lynn. He retired from the coal business and moved from the corner in 1915. He made his home on New Ocean Street until his death on November 24, 1928. He was the father of six children, the youngest of whom is the mother of the author. Connery Playground, in the heart of the brickyard he loved so well, was dedicated to his memory.

Constitutional Liberties Endangered by World Government Proposals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial, which was published in the Retired Officers Bulletin, June 15, 1950, volume 6, No. 3, entitled "Constitutional Liberties Endangered by World Government Proposals":

CONSTITUTIONAL LIBERTIES ENDANGERED BY WORLD GOVERNMENT PROPOSALS

"He who sacrifices his freedom for security, loses both."—Benjamin Franklin.

Legislatures of 22 States have signified their approval of world government which has for its purpose to develop the United Nations into a world federation. Thirty-two States—only 10 more—can force Congress to call a convention with a view to amending the Constitution. Such an amendment, if ratified by 36 States—only 14 more than those now approving—would not only change our Constitution, but our entire way of life.

House Concurrent Resolution No. 64, Eighty-first Congress, reading: "*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That it is the sense of the Congress that it should be a fundamental objective of the foreign policy of the United States to support and strengthen the United Nations and to seek its development into a world federation open to all nations with defined and limited powers adequate to preserve peace and prevent aggression through the enactment, interpretation, and enforcement of world law," was introduced June 7, 1949, and hearings thereon were held October 12–13, 1949. The testimony given is contained in a publication of 292 pages. That resolution was sponsored by a total of 101 Representatives from 33 States.

Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 56, similar in import to House Resolution No. 64, was introduced July 26, 1949. It was sponsored by 19 Senators from 17 States. Hearings on the Senate resolution were begun, but not yet completed.

Also most alarming is the existence of a committee composed of 11 professors who have drafted and promulgated a world constitution. Six of those drafters are from the University of Chicago, while the remainder are one each from Harvard, Cornell, Stanford, St. Johns, and Toronto. It was their draft of a world constitution which was introduced at the Senate hearings, and may threaten the Constitution of the United States.

Proponents of world government claim it would eliminate chiefly the threat of future war, yet they fail to show that wars cannot be prevented until the causes of war are removed. Certainly any program that could end major wars appears meritorious, but let us not be misled by plausible reasoning and alluring arguments. We must face political realities and consider what requirements world government would impose upon us, the leading free nation in the world today. They would: (1) Abolish our Federal Constitutional liberties; (2) destroy our national independence and sovereignty; and (3) practically enslave over 2,250,000,000 people comprising the world population.

Moreover, a world constitution would supersede our Federal Constitution, eradicate the tripartite division of our Government, take away our constitutional system of checks and balances, obliterate the office of President of the United States, and erase our Supreme Court.

Were it not for the temporary success of Mein Kampf and the present socialistic plight of England, Russia and China, the beguiling scheme outlined in the world constitution, and which would subvert our Federal Constitution, would not be worth serious consideration.

But past events require that we be alert. The one worlders have already been successful in influencing some of our State legislatures and numerous Members of the Congress. There is no way of determining how many more might succumb to their subtle efforts, and it is timely, therefore, to point out that this so-called world government plan would further work havoc with our Senate and House of Representatives, and doom our Bill of Rights.

A few more of its serious consequences would admit of arbitrary searches and seizures, unfair trials, excessive penalties, ex post facto laws, the curtailment of free speech, and liberty of the press.

Just what would we do if called upon to answer for a capital or infamous crime with-

out a presentment or indictment of a grand jury? Or be twice put in jeopardy for the same offense? Or be compelled to be witness against ourselves? Or be deprived of property without due process of law; or have it taken for public use without just compensation?

Under such a sad state of affairs, one might possibly be arrested and even denied a speedy public trial by an impartial jury; or even kept in ignorance of the nature and cause of the accusation. Perhaps the accused would not be confronted with witnesses against him, nor would he have means of obtaining witnesses in his favor. Excessive fines might be ruinous; bail prohibitive. Cruel punishments could be inflicted; even the privilege of the writ of habeas corpus might be suppressed.

Through the liberty exercised properly by our free press, we have learned recently how those things are now being done in other countries. Thus they are not merely remote probabilities; they are cold facts which would confront us, if we chose that system of justice—or, rather the lack of it. Under "World Government" mind you, there would be no Federal Constitution, as we know it, interpreted by an independent judiciary. The individual freedoms upon which our country was founded would be lost. Gone also would be the freedom of thought which their current news inspires.

The power to lay and collect taxes would pass from our Federal Congress to the "World Government." Understandably, that would admit of unlimited taxation. The power to tax involves the power to destroy. The power certainly should not be vested in those who may wish to exploit our resources.

Socialist planned economy as suggested by the world government constitution would wreck our present economic system. In that connection, they would have the power to administer a world bank, establish fiscal agencies, regulate the value of money, issue currency, and control credit. In short, property values in the United States would be imperiled, and the economic welfare of our people, especially those dependent on retired pay and annuities, impaired.

Boundary lines, which are now within the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court to fix, would come within the powers of the world government. Possibly all existing State boundaries in our country would be eliminated or reoriented. In that event, the present distinction between State and National Government would be obliterated. Pride of State would be lost; for that matter of what country would our people be citizens?

No religious guaranty is contained in the world constitution. Obviously, that omission would not bother the Communists, but what would become of our Christian religion in the absence of our constitutional guaranty of religious freedom? Religious effort might be abolished. What, then, would become of our moral standards, and equally important, our spiritual values? Experience has proved that when people are once deprived of the freedom of religion, the loss of other freedoms follows fast. For when you destroy faith, you destroy the roots of human decency. Search for confirmation of that principle need extend no further than an examination of the effects atheism has wrought behind the iron curtain in Russia.

What also would become of "We, the people of the United States"? The world constitution dictates that we become the ward and pupil of the world commonwealth. Are we, the self-sufficient people of these United States to be reduced to the condition of needing a guardian?

An objective of world government is to fuse into a whole the many diverse groups of mankind, regardless of their peculiar customs, characters, and religious or racial differences. Within 3 years after the foundation of world government it would prescribe one language to be spoken, one unit of currency to be used, a single system of weights and measures, and a universal calendar. That visionary document is discreetly silent as to how a satisfactory universal language would be evolved, how it would be taught to the various language groups, or whether it would be accepted.

A further proposition is that world government would supervise and approve all laws concerning the movements of people, both as regards emigration and immigration, including the issuance of passports. That admits of a probability and even the possibility, if you please, of our eventually having an oriental population in lieu of one predominantly Aryan.

World government would take over the regulation of commerce which the Congress now supervises. Thus it is not difficult to figure out what might become of the agencies of the Federal Government charged with the regulation of commerce—foreign and domestic. The question should be asked: How can a super-government expect to succeed in such matters when our present Federal Government finds its own reorganization so difficult to attain?

With respect to representation under the plan for world government, the two and a quarter billion world population would be entitled to 2,250 delegates in its federal convention. Our representation would be about 150 delegates. Present party conventions would, of course, be a thing of the past. A world-government convention would be divided into nine electoral colleges, with each nominating three candidates. From that total of 27, three men are selected, and the one receiving a two-thirds majority is elected president.

The 9 electoral colleges select 27 men. Nine lists are presented to the convention by the nine colleges; thus making the membership of the world council of 99 men. In those men would be vested the power to enact legislation for the world republic. The president and the world council would then proceed to establish: (1) a house of nationalities; (2) a senate; and (3) an institute of science, education, and culture.

The world constitution places supreme judicial power in a grand tribunal composed of 60 justices; the chief justice being the world president. Those justices are appointive by the president for a tenure of 15 years. Five justices would be assigned to each of the five benches.

What they designate as the supreme court consists of seven justices; one selected from each of the five benches, with the chief justice (world president) as chairman, and the chairman of the world council as vice chairman. There are no constitutional provisions that the justices be learned in law, no limitations as to age, or that they are expected to follow precedent so that the law shall have any degree of certainty.

A tribune of the people is provided to represent the minorities. He is selected by a secret vote in their federal convention, but is not a member of the council. His official tenure is for 3 years. Allegedly his main function is to defend the natural and civil rights of over 2,000,000,000 individuals. Naturally, there could easily arise linguistic difficulties, and there would certainly be varied interpretations of right among the many diverse groups.

The world constitution provides for a chamber of guardians, with the president as chairman, and six councilmen elected for 3-year terms. That chamber would control all appropriations for the budget of peace and defense. The president, being protector of the peace, is deemed the proper leader of the chamber. The armed forces of the world republic would be under its direction. It would have a general staff and an institute of technology, which would determine the technological numerical level to be set as limits to the domestic militias of the single communities or states, or the unions thereof. Armed forces and the manufacture of armaments beyond the levels thus determined would be reserved to the world government. Officers holding professional or active rank in the armed forces of the federal republic, or in the domestic militia of any competent unit, would not be eligible as guardians.

World government jurisdiction would extend to the judgment and settlement of any conflicts among the competent units, with a prohibition of recourse to violence. Its authority would extend even further to the organization and stationing of the Federal Government Armed Forces, as well as to the limitation and control of weapons and of domestic militias in the component units.

It is at this point the claim is made that war can be outlawed and that peace must be universally enacted and enforced. Ironically, that is to say that they shall have peace, even if they must make war to secure it—a self-contradictory policy that runs counter to the lessons of history.

Thus, to world government would be given the power to prohibit the possession by any nation of armament and forces beyond an approved level, arbitrarily deemed to fit requirements. Just what would become of the existing military establishments of this or other countries is not set forth in their guiding manual. That same world government would likewise be empowered to provide armed forces, as may be deemed necessary, for world law enforcement.

Should our Government ever become involved in world government, our present Federal Constitution would, as stated previously, be superseded, and our control over our own armed forces would be lost.

Consequently, the power of our Federal Government to provide for the common defense of the United States, to support, increase, or reduce the strength of our armed forces, and to conscript, would terminate.

Our Congress would have no authority to call forth the military to execute or enforce our laws, or to suppress insurrections or repel invasions. All national defense statutes now in force would no longer be operative. No difference would continue to exist between the Regular Army and the militia, as the forces of world government would supersede both. The Congress of the United States, if one existed in those circumstances, would be powerless to provide for the organizing, arming, and disciplining of the militia, or even governing that portion employed in the service of our country.

No longer would we have our own President, with his status as Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces, whose authority it now is to direct the over-all movements and procedures of those forces.

Doubtlessly, the present constitutional right of our people to maintain and bear arms, within limits, would be infringed, and the consent of home owners would have no consideration when the world government might desire to quarter troops in private dwellings.

What would become of the glorious traditions of our armed services? Would our fine service academies pass into history? Could there possibly exist any feeling of security, defensively or otherwise, for the people of our country? Obviously, we would have to abandon the constitutional and statutory right of self-defense once we became a part of world government. Possibly we might be placed at the mercy of a powerfully armed international mercenary force responsible only to whatever clique of Asiatic or European politicians might be in power in the world government at a particular moment.

Furthermore, the world government would have the sole right to organize and dispose its forces. To that extent our sons would become slaves of the world state. The atom and H bomb would be taken over with our gold.

Remember, at least 101 Representatives and 19 Senators and 22 States have already

approved of world federation, which now has a world constitution to guide its activities.

Abraham Lincoln, whose great character is graphically portrayed in the front cover picture of this issue, once said: "You can fool all of the people some of the time, and you can fool some of the people all of the time, but you can't fool all of the people all of the time."

Let us not fool ourselves concerning the grave implications of this impractical dreamer's paradise. There are serious dangers lurking behind every facet of its structure that should be exposed. Experience has taught us to beware.

We gained our rich national possessions and our way of life the hard way and, if need be, we will preserve them in that same determined manner.

A significant remark once made by Grover Cleveland, which is as true today as when it was spoken, is that: "A government for the people must depend for its success on the intelligence, the morality, the justice, and the interest of the people themselves."

Accordingly, it is for all those who subscribe to the views herein stated to do everything within their power to bring this important matter to the attention of every person devoted to the preservation of our liberties, freedoms, culture, and institutions; lest, under the terms a world government would impose, they be taken from us, to be restored not again.

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The views of this association expressed in the above article are based largely upon the researches and writings of the distinguished American jurist, Dr. R. J. C. Dorsey, LL. B., LL. M., M. DIP., M. P. L., D. C. L.)

River Development in New England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 5, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following self-explanatory letter from the Honorable Paul A. Dever, Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts:

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT, STATE HOUSE,
Boston, May 13, 1950.

Hon. THOMAS J. LANE,
House of Representatives, Congress of the United States, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LANE: I am writing to emphasize and underscore the statements contained in President Truman's recent message to Congress related to river development in New England.

The provision for New England river development, as contained in the rivers and harbors bill, falls far short of meeting the normal and justifiable legislative requirements of New England for its river development. New England industries are starving for cheap power. New England agriculture has never had the benefit of Federal development of our streams for flood control, irrigation, and soil conservation. The people of our cities have never had the advantage of river-basin development which takes into consideration protection from pollution, promotion of municipal and domestic water supply, and the development of recreational facilities.

The President showed clearly that the rivers and harbors bill does not spell out the development of our rivers on the basis of any such multipurpose utilization. Legislation which fails to take into account these varied uses of our water resources is defective and inadequate.

The President also put his finger on the lack in the rivers and harbors bill of any provision for cooperation in the planning stage on the part of all agencies with a definite interest in river-valley development. He further emphasized the exclusion of representatives of the New England States, specifically chosen for that purpose, from any survey and planning commission, and, finally, the President stressed the absurdity of planning for the development of an area like New England and at the same time excluding the St. Lawrence River from consideration.

I am thus reemphasizing what the President said as a means of urging you to bend every effort to remedy the injustice done your constituents in the rivers and harbors bill by supporting legislative and administrative measures to remedy this injustice. I have in mind particularly the bill introduced by Senator GREEN which would remedy all the defects I have above pointed out.

With kind regards, I am,
Sincerely,

PAUL A. DEVER.

Prosperity Under Democratic Administrations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 5, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as the summer comes on us and the work of the Eighty-first Congress is in sight of completion, it is heartening to all of us who are supporting the administration of President Harry S. Truman to know that all is well with the country, and that there is to be no break in the long years of prosperity which have attended the conduct of the National Government by Democratic Presidents and under laws enacted by Democratic Congresses.

The issue to be determined by the elections in November is whether the American people wish to hazard another depression such as was visited upon the country under the last Republican administration and which wiped out the fortunes, the savings, the jobs, and even the hopes of an entire generation.

David Lawrence's United States News and World Report in the issue just out prints the results of a long and careful research conducted for the primary purpose of advising American businessmen and investers of exactly the present state of the country economically, and what reasonably can be foreseen in the future. As to the future, the publication in its Newsgram From Washington, commenting on the fears of some businessmen of a bust after the pattern of Republican years, says that the businessman "who resists the idea of change, keeps looking for a bust as bad as 1929–33, or worse, holds off, resists expansion and sees trouble just around every corner" is the "businessman who has missed the boat to date and may keep on missing it."

The article from the United States News and World Report issue of June 9, 1950, follows:

ONE BILLION JUMP IN DIVIDENDS—STOCKHOLDERS REAP RICHES FROM 1950 PROFITS

Business profits point to a bonanza for stockholders this year. Dividend payments may top $9,500,000,000, a record. Company earnings are staying high. Less is being plowed back into the business. It means more for shareholders. There will not be extra checks for everybody. Prospects vary, industry by industry. Stockholders, watching the profits curve, can see what to expect

Stockholders this year are to get a record flow of cash in the form of dividend checks. Earnings are good and growing better. Boards of directors are in a position—and a mood—to pay out a slightly larger proportion of earnings, and to keep less in the business.

The result is a prospective total of dividends that will reach, and probably exceed $9,500,000,000 for 1950. That is $1,000,000,000 more than the previous record, set last year. It is more than $1,500,000,000 above the dividend total in the boom year, 1948. Flow of dividend checks will reach its peak in the last quarter of this year. Year-end extra dividends probably will be liberal and numerous.

Even after record payments to stockholders, corporations as a group will improve their position substantially in 1950. They still will have left about $9,700,000,000 of their profits for use in their businesses. That total is well under the $13,200,000,000 that corporations retained after paying out dividends in 1948. Now, however, there are less-urgent programs of expansion—inventory building and new plant and equipment will require smaller sums.

Profits totals this year probably will be the second largest in history. For all corporations, the aggregate will come to about $32,000,000,000 before taxes and $19,200,000,000 after taxes, on the basis of the present outlook.

Total earnings, in fact, may well be more than that, and are very unlikely to be any less. Output of most products—and for most companies—is growing. Efficiency of industry, too, is improving. Wage-cost increases are not the factor they were in earlier postwar years. Company pension programs granted in new union contracts are less costly than big wage raises would have been. Prices are holding firm or tending to rise, as demand for almost all products holds high or rises. These are signs that point to healthier earnings.

Net income, of course, is not going to be uniformly higher. Nor are stockholders' checks. Not all corporations are going to be rolling in profits after expenses are paid and Government takes its cut. Some industries are not keeping up with the broad trend, and many companies within prosperous industries are lagging behind. But for industry as a whole, big and little, the over-all prospect is excellent.

Brightest prospect right now is the one that faces owners of shares in manufacturing firms. These companies, as a group, are counted on this year to report a rise of about 17 percent in earnings after taxes. With a larger proportion of those earnings to be paid out, stockholders should get about 30 percent more in cash dividends than they did in 1949.

Profits of auto makers, immense last year, are to be even greater in 1950. Output is running at a spectacular rate of more than 9,000,000 cars and trucks a year. That performance could trim the fat from the car market again before many months pass. Then some of the smaller companies might not do so well. Yet earnings of auto makers for 1950, as a whole, are to be enormous.

Companies that turn out building materials and equipment for new homes are find-

ing another lush field. Their output and sales are being pushed up rapidly as the building boom rolls on at an astonishing rate. Lumber profits are to set new records for many companies. Lumber production is soaring, and prices are rising. Leading producers of building, heating, and plumbing equipment report first-quarter profits that averaged nearly 40 percent above those of a year earlier. Leaders in cement, stone, and glass showed gains averaging nearly 25 percent.

Many companies in other industries, too, are riding high on the building boom. Manufacturers of electrical equipment, radios and television sets are examples. Television sales—and profits—are counted on to boom for many months.

Profits that mean more cash for stockholders are confidently expected to be greater in steel and oil, too. Prices of both, particularly oil, have been rising. Steel mills now are expected to operate at capacity, or above, during most of 1950. Oil-company sales are being boosted by purchases of new autos, and by gas purchases of vacation drivers.

Stockholders are to watch the profit curve rise appreciably in still other industries. Outlook is good for companies that make paper and for those that fabricate rayon and rubber.

Profit declines that occurred for some industries in the first quarter are to be reversed during the rest of 1950. That is the prospect for companies producing nonferrous metals, machinery for industry, and equipment for railroads. Sales of these products are to rise as industry decides to spend more heavily in the growing 1950 boom.

Aircraft companies, meanwhile, are to become more active and prosperous on Government contracts. Profits also are expected to improve substantially for chemicals, paints, and similar products.

What these brighter prospects can mean to individuals who own stock, at a time when corporations can be more generous with their earnings, is shown by dividend trends already apparent.

Cash dividends going to stockholders already are in a period of rapid growth. For individuals who own shares in some 100 large producers of nondurable goods, checks received in the first quarter of 1950 were up by an average of 14 percent from the level of a year earlier. In the same period, the rise in profits of those firms was negligible. Stockholders of big oil companies got 35 percent more in dividends, while profits of their companies averaged 25 percent less than they had a year earlier.

Persons who own stock in companies making durable goods find the same trend. Shareholders of a group of the major machinery producers, for example, were paid 50 percent more in dividends in the first quarter of this year, while the rise in their firms' profits averaged less than 10 percent.

Other industries are likely to show more moderate gains in profits and dividends. Companies that sell the products of industry, at both wholesale and retail levels, probably will have an average rise of about 10 percent in profits this year. Stockholders, on the average, may get a dividend rise of no more than 5 percent.

Smaller gains in profits are being predicted for food and drug stores, and for restaurants. Clothing and general-merchandise firms may fare no better this year than last, but their earnings in the second half of 1950 are expected to be better than those of late 1949.

Electric-power companies are enjoying real prosperity, and are likely to do still better. Demand for power keeps rising. So do rates. Telephone and and other communications companies, too, have a bright prospect. Shareholders in communications and utilities probably can count on 15 to 20 percent more cash in 1950. A gain of about half that amount is due for investors in finance and service firms.

Railroads—at least those in class I—may end the year with a better showing than they have had last year. But the rest of the transportation industry, generally, is not counted on for much improvement over 1949.

The situation is less favorable for some other groups of companies. Entertainment business is off, particularly for the movie industry. Department stores, mail-order houses, and many producers and sellers of a wide variety of nondurable goods are not doing so well.

Altogether, however, the outlook for profits and dividends in 1950 is good. For 1951, too, the dividend prospect right now is bright. Any downturn that occurs in the next 2 years is expected to find many corporations in a position to go right on paying out dividends at a generous rate.

Marshall Plan and Point 4

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 31, 1950

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is my unbiased opinion that the Marshall plan has accomplished more for the security of our Nation and its people than any other bill passed by the Congress of this Nation. It is also comforting for me to know that this is a bipartisan measure and that Republicans are to be congratulated equally with Democrats for its success.

It is always distasteful to pay out sums of money for any cause, but we all abhor even to a greater extent the expending of money for the prosecution of a war which in addition to spending of enormous sums of money, could snuff out the lives of one-half our people overnight and destroy our natural resources. An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure, and it would be a greater service to our country to expend a few billions of dollars in precautionary measures now, than to squander hundreds of billions in the fighting of a disastrous war in which even the victor would be the loser.

It would seem to me that no sum of money however great is too much to spend to prevent a war or stop the onward march of communism. The money expended so far has, to a great extent, stopped the further spread of communism on the other continents, which means that we have a longer lease of life on our freedom and liberties here.

The sum of $3,000,000,000 outlay on the Marshall plan and point 4 program as a preventive of war is very small indeed, compared to some $300,000,000,000 which the last war cost, not considering the slaughter of young American men.

Aside from the commercial and humanitarian benefits of this program, it is important that resource developments be geared up to feed, clothe and shelter an ever-increasing population. It must be borne in mind that population growth always out runs the means of subsistence, and causes many of the world's ills. With an estimated population of 3,000,000,000 in the year 2000, which is an increase of 1,000,000,000 in the short spread of 50 years, it is imperative that the world prepare now to accomplish the herculean task of providing sufficient production for this increase of world population. The problem of feeding this increased population can best be met by introducing modern ways of production to backward areas.

We all are aware of the fact that we cannot afford to continue indefinitely pouring money out to these countries, and it is incumbent upon us to devise some means to help these countries to help themselves as in advocated in point 4 program. Our own undeveloped areas beyond the frontier were made productive, just as these areas can be made productive, by American private capital with negligible amount of Government financial assistance.

This program for the development of backward nations will cost the taxpayer of our Nation little if any money, and trade relations with these countries after they are developed will bring in billions in revenue to our Nation and perform a service to the people of the world that will be pleasing to God and man. It is high time that we were turning away from political rivalries and petty differences and accomplish something worth while for the common people.

Whether we like it or not, the American way of life and the Russian philosophy are in a race to death for world domination and every effort made now in support of our way of life will be well rewarded. This program can be carried on in a business-like way on a bipartisan basis. If we adopt a genuine bipartisan policy and throw the political spoils system to the four winds, success will crown our efforts.

Notwithstanding that ours is a rich and powerful Nation, the undeveloped nations number some 28 or 30 countries with a population of 1,800,000,000 with a per capita income of less than $100 per year. This is a threat to our way of life. With only 7 percent of the world's population, it is essential that we strive to train and educate a large percentage of the world's people along our way of thinking, our way of life and our democratic free-enterprise system if this Nation, comprising only 7 percent of the people of the world, is to survive.

That a great field exists for the development of backward areas of the world cannot be denied. Such development financed by private capital as were the undeveloped areas in America, would cost the taxpayer little, if anything, and would be beneficial to all humanity. Older residents well remember when our own Nation, or large sections of it, was undeveloped; when the Indians—little less civilized than the people the President now speaks of—were herded into reservations so the West could be developed; when States like Oklahoma were staked off by the Government and thrown open to settlement that the land might be used for production purposes.

These States were just as unproductive then as the undeveloped countries of the world are now. At that time there was no need for the Government or private capital to go outside this Nation for the development of other backward countries throughout the world. There was great need then for a program of development right here at home that required all the assistance that both Government and private capital could furnish.

But today we have, technically speaking, no frontiers in America; and it is natural that both Government and private capital, not as a matter of exploitation, but for the good of all humanity, would look with sympathetic eyes on other undeveloped countries of the world and extend their scientific knowledge and know how in the improvement of these countries and their people.

Such efforts would not only materially help the people of America, but it would raise the standard of living of two-thirds of the world's population, who as President Truman said "are living in conditions approaching misery. Their food is inadequate, they are victims of disaster, their economic life," he says, "is primitive and stagnant. Their poverty is a handicap and a threat to them and to more prosperous areas."

One can visualize the millions of acres in undeveloped land on the continents where the people are unable, through lack of technical knowledge, machinery and perhaps intelligence, to grow sufficient food to feed themselves and their starving people. It would be a sin if this great Nation with its great flow of capital did not develop these vast areas which would benefit all civilization with little, if any, cost to the American taxpayers. Private capital would willingly furnish the finance needed and would be assured of good returns on their investment while the Nation would profit later through trade relations with these countries.

Such an undertaking, too, would be a contribution toward the elimination of communism, and a cushion against a major depression, and Congress should cooperate to the fullest extent with the President and American capital to enhance this program. It is surprising that something was not done about this before now. Often during the past years many economists pointed out that if we did not curtail the increasing population, it would be only a matter of years until the earth would not produce enough foodstuff and starvation would face the human race.

Our Government, with the capital and technical proficiency that we have in this country, could improve the conditions of the land and the people on the other continents to the extent of making them self-supporting, instead of pouring out money to them indiscriminately, and at the same time stop the onward march of communism.

One of our eminent commentators has said:

If we duck our responsibility western Europe would rather soon become a new province of the Soviet Empire, and we in the United States would experience the equivalent of a gigantic military defeat, probably without a shot having been fired.

If Russia would overrun western Europe we would have to increase our defense expenditures considerably.

A large point 4 program would benefit the United States immensely and is a necessary condition for a prosperous world as well as a prosperous America. When income of the underdeveloped areas is increased, the United States will profit from increased sales in these areas. The least we can do is to minimize the resentment of the world's poor by a system that will raise their standard of living as well as ours.

The opposition contends that this is one more part of the socialistic communistic scheme to further tax the American people. Nearly a half hundred organizations have besought Congress to adopt this program, and few, if any, reputable organizations are against it. Among the organizations supporting this program is the National Association of Manufacturers, the New York Bar Association, the Guarantee Co. of New York, and the Farm Bureau. It is hardly possible that these institutions and organizations are promoting communistic or socialistic schemes. All the organizations who are supporting this program know that the promoting of prosperity abroad means a prosperous economy at home—that a prosperous world is a peaceful world.

Oil Workers Dissatisfied

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 5, 1950

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, the International Oil Worker in its recent issue carried the following significant editorial:

ORGANIZED LABOR IS GETTING TIRED OF PRETTY PROMISES BUT NO ACTION FROM DEMOCRATIC PARTY

There are many people who say that organized labor and the Democratic Party walk hand in hand and sleep in the same bed. These people say that CIO-PAC is simply a wing of the Democratic Party.

The time has come to make it clear that there has been no marriage between organized labor and the Democratic Party. It is true that they have been seen keeping company from time to time, but there has been no actual pact, formal or informal, between the two.

And furthermore, if the Democratic Party keeps treating organized labor as it has in the past few months, it is doubtful if there will be continued friendship between the two.

To put it bluntly, organized labor is getting plenty disgusted with the Democratic Party. Speaking for the Oil Workers International Union (CIO), at least, we can say that we have found the Democratic Party long on promises and sweet talk and terribly short on bringing home the bacon.

Let us itemize the promises and the deliveries of the Democratic Party since the workingmen and the farmers put it into power again in 1948:

The Democratic Party promised to repeal Taft-Hartley. With a clear majority in both Houses of Congress, the Democrats failed to do this.

The Democratic Party promised to pass fair employment practices legislation. It has failed to do so. In fact, 33 Republican Senators voted to stop the filibuster and take up FEPC a few days ago, while only 19 Democrats so voted. And the Democrats have 12 more Members in the Senate than do the Republicans.

Democratic Members of the House and the Senate, including House Speaker SAM RAYBURN, rammed through the infamous Kerr bill to raise natural-gas prices. President Truman, fortunately, had the courage to veto this one.

The Senate has not yet passed the improved social-security law, even though the industrialists are now in favor of it.

The Democrats sold out 25 cents and several millions of people short in the minimum-wage law. They settled for 75 cents instead of a dollar and excluded millions of people.

The Democrats blocked the removal of the infamous Robert Denham from his dictatorial power in NLRB. And we cannot forget that President Truman first appointed Denham and in so doing brought shame to the Government of the United States.

The Democrats have done nothing about the Brannan farm plan; instead they have allowed the present crazy-quilt farm plan to remain on the books. The Democrats have not even had the nerve to talk openly about national health insurance.

Offhand, we can recall two good measures passed by the Congress—the housing bill and the oleo tax repeal. Very good, as far as they go.

A good many labor people voted for Democrats 2 years ago—yes, and worked hard for them—because of the good party platform.

But apparently the platform is just window dressing to the party bigwigs.

Democratic Senator ED C. JOHNSON, in a recent Jackson-Jefferson Day dinner, said bluntly that "platforms don't mean anything."

Well, Senator, we in labor consider a platform a promise and we don't like people who break promises. We have a habit of tossing out on their behinds our union officers who break promises and we will endeavor to do the same to public officers.

Recently a State Democratic chairman said to a PAC representative: "We are not worrying about the labor vote. Labor has nowhere else to go except to the Democratic Party."

You may be mistaken, Mr. Chairman.

From all over the Nation, a groundswell of complaints against the Democratic Party is coming from rank-and-file union members to the headquarters of oil workers international union and to the union newspaper.

In essence, these complaints say: "The Democratic Party is kidding us—the Democratic leaders are talking sweet, and delivering nothing."

Sometimes the Democratic leaders do not even talk sweet. They pick their candidates and tell labor to take 'em and like 'em, without asking labor what we want in the way of candidates.

So what is organized labor going to do about the failure of the Democratic Party to deliver the goods?

Mainly, we are going to pay less and less attention to party labels and more and more to the individual candidate.

We are going to endorse and work for those individuals who look best, regardless of party affiliations.

Eventually, one party or the other—or a new party as yet unborn—will come to realize that the powerful labor vote can make or break a political party.

We mean to do no hollow chest beating. Frankly, the labor vote has not yet been as well-mobilized in the past as it should be and it probably will not be in 1950.

But year by year, the labor vote is being better mobilized. The power and the unity

of the labor vote is growing year by year. The time will come when it will be decisive.

And let it be perfectly clear to the Democratic Party that this vote will not necessarily be mobilized behind that party.

When the budding maiden that is labor political action has blossomed into a fully mature beauty, she will not be waiting patiently in the moonlight for Mr. Democrat to come along.

No, she has had her share of broken dates and she may be out seeing the sights with some other fellow—playing a little hard to get.

Larchmonter Founds Program To Buck Farm Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1950

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I present for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following article which appeared in the May 25, 1950, issue of the Larchmont (N. Y.) Times by Francis S. Quinn, Jr., concerning the founding by George E. Bailey, of Larchmont, of the Association for the Abolition of Farm Price Support, Inc.:

LARCHMONTER FOUNDS PROGRAM TO BUCK FARM PRICE CONTROL

(By Francis S. Quinn, Jr.)

An enthusiastic young Westchester lawyer has jumped into the middle of the farm-price support controversy and is ready to battle Government-controlled prices with the weapon of public opinion.

As founder and head of the recently organized Association for the Abolition of Farm Price Support, Inc., George E. Bailey of 64 Ridge Road, Larchmont Woods, is convinced that the present policy of the Government in guaranteeing high prices to farmers by buying up abundant foods and letting them rot in Government warehouses is a criminal waste.

The ultimate goal of the organization is to lower prices for foods by doing away with governmental controls.

"There is no such thing as surplus of food in the United States," Mr. Bailey declares. "Merely a surplus of food at present prices."

Referring to the findings of a recent study made at Michigan State College by economists, he pointed out that a 2-percent increase in livestock in the United States would have more than taken up any wheat surpluses since 1930. And if meat were put on the market at a lower price, people would eat more and farmers would then sell all their livestock plus all the grain needed to produce the livestock to sell to the people.

Attorney Bailey was raised in Marion County, Ohio, and as a youth lived and worked on a farm. He studied agriculture in school and matriculated at Heidelberg College in Ohio for a year before attending Ohio State University where he received his LL. B.

After practicing law in Steubenville, Ohio, for 3 years, he entered the Army in 1941 and went overseas in 1943.

In Bari, Italy, he had first-hand experience with food in large quantities as purchasing officer for the Adriatic Base Command. The major portion of his purchases were of vegetables and other perishables and he soon had a clear picture of the marketing of farm products.

He joined the law firm of Reid & Priest of New York, tax specialists, in 1946 after he left the service. He married and settled down to what he thought was strictly a lawyer's career.

The subject of food prices began to crop up in spare-time luncheon discussions and although he doesn't recall exactly how it all began, eventually the discussions reached the point of putting up or shutting up. Thoroughly interested in farm price control and dissatisfied with the way the Government was handling the situation, he decided to do something about it.

In October 1949 press releases of his proposed stand against price control were sent to New York papers. Mr. Bailey was soon swamped with telephone calls, telegrams, and letters.

People were interested in his ideas. So, to show his own sincerity, he immediately formed the Association for the Abolition of Farm Price Support, Inc., with his own money, and the inquiries mushroomed to 800. They came from persons in all walks of life, from farmers, laborers, and bank presidents.

Needing some capital to work with, since the association is not only nonpolitical but nonprofit, he set up a regular membership fee of $1 with active sustaining members contributing $10 per year.

At the end of April the membership numbered some 300 from 13 States, and except for two or three obvious profit seekers, they are all interested parties with the future of our country at heart, Mr. Bailey sincerely believes.

"We are now getting about five new members per day with the average steadily increasing," he says.

The association went into an intense study of the farm problem before taking any constructive action, but early this year it began to roll as 1,000 copies of a pamphlet entitled "You Are the Victim of the Farm Price Support Program" were distributed all over the country. Last month another thousand copies were issued.

Why does farm price control exist today? In his pamphlet, Mr. Bailey states: "The enactment of the postwar farm price support program was possible only because there was no organized opposition from those adversely affected by the program. When the present farm bill was before the Eighty-first Congress, not one person appeared to represent the consumer and the taxpayer.

"The key to effective opposition to the present ruinous farm program is organization. To that end, the Association for the Abolition of Farm Price Support, Inc., has been organized."

He then appeared on Philip Alampi's farm news program on WJZ. After his talk, he received 80 to 90 replies asking for more information, which is all the more remarkable since the program goes on the air at 6 a. m.

"They were all favorable," Mr. Bailey says, adding with a grin "except one. And that suggested I ought to stick to law."

The queries were from persons mostly in the lower income levels and included a high percentage of laboring people and farmers.

A sudden wiping out of farm price supports would only create a collapse that would lead to chaos, he admits, so the elimination must be gradual.

"Price support does not create wealth," he declared. "It merely takes some wealth from one group of taxpayers and shifts it to another."

This in itself will benefit neither the farmer nor the consumer in the long run, Mr. Bailey maintains.

"Certain basic economic principles should be stated to understand this," he declares. "Production must be controlled by something or somebody. The American way of control is by price.

"If high price levels are artificially controlled, then the production must be controlled in only one way—by the Government.

"The American farmer has the choice of two methods of control: he can have high prices and complete governmental control of his production, or he can have price controlled by the market and he can have freedom."

Suppose there will be no revision of the present farm price support program?

"The administration, afraid of the public reaction to the tremendous cost of supporting prices, will impose rigid controls on production in order to limit expenditures," Mr. Bailey declares. "Unless that trend is reversed, complete socialization of American production will come within the next decade."

He hopes to make his association national in scope with branches in each State and chapters in each city.

Henry D. Bulkley, of 405 Weaver Street, Larchmont, now is attempting to form a local chapter of the organization in Larchmont.

Plans of the association include the publishing of a monthly newsletter to be sent to all members in addition to various pamphlets and other material.

Two months ago Mr. Bailey was invited by Chairman HAROLD COOLEY (Democrat, North Carolina) of the House Agriculture Committee to send witnesses to Washington to explain their views on farm legislation. No date, however, was mentioned in the invitation, merely "sometime after Easter," according to Mr. Bailey.

REA: Its Value to Business as Well as Farms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 9, 1950

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, all the farmers of Oklahoma know and appreciate the great value of rural electrification—its record of accomplishment and service to the farm families throughout the Nation.

But in going over the State county by county, I find that few of the townspeople realize what REA has accomplished—not only for the farmer—but for independent Oklahoma business as well. Some townspeople, misled by utility propaganda and ill-advised statements of their political demagogues, have the effrontery to compare rural electrification with socialism or with Government dictatorship. Nothing could be farther from the truth.

REA is a going business concern in Oklahoma—as in our other 47 States. These farmer-owned and farmer-operated businesses are successful—not only in getting electricity at a reasonable rate to the farms of Oklahoma—but also in paying back to the Government with interest the money loaned to do the job. They pay State taxes, pay standard wages, and buy from Oklahoma's private businesses.

The farmers of Oklahoma and other States are doing the job that the high-up utility men said was impossible. They are disproving the big utility claim that

it took at least a $1,000 prepayment or more to bring electricity to each farm.

I have discussed the value of REA at seven annual meetings where from 800 to 2,500 farm members turned out to see that their enterprise is well-managed and to make decisions on important REA matters. It is their business and they are out to see that it continues to succeed.

Let us look at the record—a record unequaled by any other Government program for success and for repayment of loans. Let us see what REA has done, not only for the farmers but for Oklahoma business as well.

Free enterprise business in Oklahoma has built every one of the $60,000,000 worth of lines erected in our State. This work went to private contractors for the low bid. The worker, the lumberman, the insulator, and conductor distributor, the construction business were granted this $60,000,000 in new work because of the enterprise and pioneering of Oklahoma farmers. This sixty million in work would not have been possible without REA.

Nearly 100,000 members of REA now are on the Oklahoma lines. Each one spends at least $500 for wiring, lighting, and appliances—many much more. All this was spent through free enterprise stores in our towns. That is another $50,000,000 for Oklahoma business—a total of $110,000,000 in business for our State which would not have existed without REA. Is not this really strengthening and building up Oklahoma's private enterprise?

Oklahoma's invested wealth thus is $110,000,000 greater, the State is that much richer because of this investment—every penny of which went through private-business enterprise. Is any business which adds $110,000,000 to the independent business of Oklahoma unfair to business?

This is new business, business which would not have existed without REA. It is virgin territory—to fill a vital need where no other business existed in this line before. Only through Government cooperation with long-time interest-bearing loans could this new business have been created.

Fourteen years ago, 89 percent of the farm homes of America were in darkness. Only 11 percent of the farms had been electrified in the 40 years in which electricity had become an everyday necessity in the towns. Today—in 14 years, this 11 percent has been increased nationally to 78.2 percent of all American farms. In Oklahoma we have only 56 percent of our farms electrified, so there is much more work that must be done to extend our 36,000 miles of rural lines.

Up to December 31, 1949, these REA's of the Nation owed Uncle Sam $203,346,158 for repayments and interest due to that date. They have repaid him $223,114,845—about $20,000,000 ahead of time in their repayments. Can any other Government-lending operation show such a result? Of this amount, Uncle Sam has collected $91,999,730 in interest alone—and the remainder is repayment on principal.

The gross yearly business—again business which could not have existed without REA in Oklahoma, now totals more than $5,000,000 each year. This means pay rolls for workers, money spent for materials, tools, poles, and wire—all through private business enterprise.

Can this be unfair to business—contrary to our system? Even the big utilities who seek to discredit the REA so much—who spread unfounded rumors of Government interference with their monopolies—profit to the extent in Oklahoma of nearly a million dollars a year in the sale of wholesale power to the REA lines.

Each year the use of electricity on farms climbs to new heights as the farmers use more and more electricity in their farm work—as well as in good farm living.

This ever-increasing demand requires—makes absolutely necessary—that far-sighted farm managers of these REA's have some independent sources of electric energy. With a $60,000,000 investment in distribution lines, we cannot—we must not—be left without some firm and dependable source of energy to put on their lines to take care of an ever-expanding use of farm electricity. That is why I have insisted REA must have additional power properly distributed for REA use. Without a dependable source of reliable low-cost power we endanger this $60,000,000 investment.

The private utility lines were built years ago before REA started to serve city load centers. REA has developed an entirely new load pattern—far removed from the big cities—yet today using a vast amount of electric energy. Instead of being handcuffed and shackled, with no source of energy excepting that which the utilities are willing to sell—after meeting all of their city demands—REA needs access to some of the vast power generated at Government flood-control dams. Who would deny farmers access to this needed power? Not I. I do not want to see this power, created with public funds, turned over in special privilege deals to two giant utility concerns to sell this public power back to farmers at whatever price they can demand.

Adequate power, properly placed in the line, and at low enough rates to insure maximum use of electricity on the farms is my goal and also the goal of the Oklahoma REA's. Any effort to double-cross the farmers to put them at the mercy of the giant utility cooperations will be fought by every farmer on the line.

Oklahoma farmers cannot be fooled, they know the score—they know the issue—they know special privilege when they see it. As one old farmer told me: "Shucks, that ain't socialism—that's electricity."

I have dwelt long on the financial soundness of REA investments, its repayment with interest, its creation of new business for thousands of little businesses of Oklahoma. More important perhaps than all of this is the human side of REA.

Talk to the farmers yourself and get the feeling of the new life that comes to them and their families when that vital wire touches their farm. They leave the darkness of the nineteenth century and live immediately in the bright light of the twentieth century and modern full home life and better living. That REA wire means bright electric lights, electric irons, washing machines, dependable radios, refrigerators. Talk to the appliance dealers in the small towns. Most of them admit that from half to two-thirds of their appliance business goes to these lines that the big utility executives thought could not or should not be built.

Realize the years of drudgery that are removed from farm women when they have the same chance to have electrical labor-saving appliances that city wives have had for so long a time.

One appliance dealer in the western part of the State where a new line was being extended told me this story: "I asked the young GI farmer what appliances he was going to buy, now that the line had reached him.

"He said: 'Mister, I'm going to buy my wife every appliance you've got to sell that will make her work easier. I'm going to buy a washing machine, an electric stove, a separator, and lots of other things as fast as I get the money to buy with.

" 'You see, Mister,' he said, 'I saw my mother die at 40 doing the washing for us six kids, pulling the butter up out of the well, bringing in the wood for the stove, churning, and separating the milk, mending clothes over a kerosene lamp, and other chores.

" 'That REA line and the things that it'll run will let my wife live a lot longer and we're going to have all the things she needs.' "

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the fights I have been in to help get more rural electrification for the farmers of Oklahoma and the Nation. It has not been an easy task—and those who oppose this great program are always on the job with the cry that Government is interfering with private business. These big utilities companies have their friends in Congress and in the Senate—some in powerful places where the damage they can do is tremendous.

Oklahoma needs to change its representation in the Senate this year. The record is clear and Oklahoma farmers cannot be misled or fooled. They want a man who understands and will fight for their interests—and not for special privilege—in that high office.

Another Tax Grab

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1950

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Malden (Mass.) Evenings News:

ANOTHER TAX GRAB

Latest effort of the spenders to dig deeper into the earnings of the American people has to do with dividends from their investments. House tax arrangers have tentatively approved a withholding tax of 10 percent on dividends. The plan would be similar to that now employed with respect to wages,

the money to be taken at its source, and would bring an estimated $150,000,000 in new revenue. The tax eaters make the claim that many persons do not report earnings from such investments, and they are out to get their hands on the money before it comes to rightful owners. This plan would make the corporations collection agencies for the Government, as all employers now are. It would place a heavy burden on corporations and the cost of collection and necessary bookkeeping would be tremendous. This would reduce earnings, result in smaller dividends. This thing cannot go on forever. Eventually the American people will be forced to revolt against a Government which is milking them dry in the form of taxes. If the money went for necessary Government, to finance national defense, or to retire national debt, there would be hope for the future. But when millions are wasted in vote-enticing projects the time has come to call a halt. The only weapon available for an attack on the spenders is votes. They should be lining up now for the coming battle.

Federal Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. M. G. BURNSIDE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 5, 1950

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter written to me by the Governor of West Virginia, Okey L. Patteson, dated May 25, 1950:

Hon. M. G. BURNSIDE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BURNSIDE: It has been called to my attention that, unless extended by pending legislation, Federal rent controls will expire throughout the Nation on June 30, 1950.

As you undoubtedly know, rent control now affects only those cities in West Virginia which are located in our highly industrialized sections such as Wheeling, Charleston, Huntington, and Bluefield. I am advised, however, by the rent-control officials, that there are about 300,000 rental housing units still subject to the Federal law and that these rental units house an estimated 1,000,000 people, which is only slightly less than half of our population.

I have seen the statistics gathered by the Bureau of Labor Statistics on rental increases in cities which were decontrolled during 1949 by local or State option and I am alarmed that such a possibility might exist in our larger cities in West Virginia. I am alarmed because of the possibility that labor may feel it necessary to demand wage increases to compensate for rent increases, which, of course, could mean considerable industrial unrest within the State and a corresponding loss of income to the State treasury.

According to the information which I have received, the extension bill should be before you for debate and a vote in the very near future. I feel it is my duty as Governor to urge you not only to vote for a continuation of Federal controls of rents, but also to take whatever measures may be available to you to the end that the extension legislation will be passed.

With the kindest regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,
OKEY L. PATTESON,
Governor.

The Real Issue in the Hoover Reorganization Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 5, 1950

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Christian Science Monitor by Joseph C. Harsch, chief of its Washington news bureau:

BUREAUCRACY: ENTRENCHED AND UNCONTROLLED
(By Joseph C. Harsch)

Do we, or don't we, want our public affairs run by someone we can throw out of office come next election day?

That really is the issue behind all this furor over the Hoover Reorganization Plan and what Congress is doing to it.

Some of our public affairs are run that way now, Harry S. Truman and his Cabinet are subject to the will of the voters. We can turn them out in November of 1952 if a majority of us don't like the way they are running our affairs.

What we do not realize is that there is nothing the voters can do about large chunks of the Federal Government. We can't get at these officials directly at the polls or indirectly through the party in power. And they don't work for the public as a whole. They work in frequent fact for special group interests.

The elected President of the United States can control the members of his Cabinet, and through the members of his Cabinet he can control those portions of the departments of Government which take orders from a Cabinet officer. But not until you look through a Congressional Directory do you discover how many branches of Government there are which take no orders from anyone.

For example, the Patent Office is located physically inside the Department of Commerce Building. But the Secretary of Commerce has no authority over the Patent Commissioners. If the public became dissatisfied with Patent Office policy, there isn't a thing it could do about it directly, or immediately.

Of course, usually there is no great trouble about patent policy. And it isn't likely that the Commissioners of Patents would long pursue a policy which made them unpopular. They are human, and probably would adjust themselves to a great wave of public disapproval. But the point is that if some Patent Commissioner wished to defy the Secretary of Commerce and the President and public opinion there is nothing voters could do about it at the next election day. Getting rid of President Truman would not touch the Patent Office, because Mr. Truman has no authority over it.

The same condition is even more true of the great independent commissions of government such as the FCC, the SEC, the FTC, and the ICC. They are as independent of the elective process as the Supreme Court. We as voters can influence these commissioners in that vacancies are filled by Presidential appointment. Over the long run we can get commissions we like if we get a succession of Presidents we like. But it a long process. There is no direct responsibility to the voter.

This is the condition which the Hoover report on Government reorganization is trying to reduce. Mr. Hoover does not propose to abolish the system entirely. It is too deeply established for that. But his reorganization plan would expand the area of control of the President over the Federal establishment. It would give the President more authority. Therefore, it would give the voter more authority.

Also, it would make the President and his Cabinet more responsible than they are now for the affairs of government.

But the special interests served by these various agencies of government do not like tampering with the present system. The railroads protect the ICC. The banks protect the Comptroller of the Currency. They don't want him under the Secretary of the Treasury. The ship lines tried to protect the Maritime Commission, but that effort failed. The Maritime Commission had been so generous with the ship lines over such a considerable period of time that Congress wanted no part of it any more.

The issue lies between the theory of government by specialists and the theory of government by politicians. In Germany they use the theory of government by specialists almost exclusively. The politician has become a vermiform appendix on the German body politic. England is the great mother of government by politicians. We use both systems, but of recent years have been using the specialists more and the politicians less.

This is the trend Mr. Hoover is trying to halt and reverse for the simple reason that the voter does not control the specialist, but does control the politician—if he chooses to.

Labor and the Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENDERSON LANHAM
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 5, 1950

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, the editorial which appeared in the Chattanooga Daily Times on Thursday, June 1, which I am including with my remarks, expresses what I think is the general feeling today relative to labor unions, their rights and responsibilities under today's industrial conditions and our complex civilization.

The editorial is so moderately worded and written in such a sympathetic spirit and so well expresses my own views on the subject that I am glad to give my endorsement to it and to present it herewith:

LABOR AND THE LAW

There is at present a great body of law on our statute books dealing with labor-management relations. The legislation has been made necessary because of the growing complexity of our industrial system and because the interplay of workers' demands and management's concessions has become so important to the national economy.

This mass of regulation is still fluid and is likely to be so for years as varying social, economic, and political factors come into play. Changes result not only from outright legislative repeal or amendment but also, more subtly, from judicial interpretation.

A story elsewhere on this page today deals with Supreme Court decisions handed down this term on labor matters. From them may be discerned a possible pattern for the measure of legality in labor relations. In essence, it represents the feeling that labor's powers must be made increasingly subject to reasonable control in the interest of the general welfare.

Most of the notable decisions have dealt with the right to picket, long regarded as an extension of the right of free speech. The seeming trend is toward limitation of picketing when it becomes more a matter of coercion than advertising, when it is employed to gain objectives which are not the rightful concern of the union, or when it is used in violation of valid State laws.

This newspaper has long supported labor in its attainment of rightful objectives. We will continue to do so, including the right to picket peaceably. At the same time, we realize that intemperate use of picketing—when it passed from the vocal or visual stage into that of the physical with violence to persons or property—has cost labor untold public support. The controls are a reflection of that withdrawal of sympathy and approbation.

But beyond that, the laws are also a recognition that the power of labor has reached the point that it carries with it definite responsibilities in its use. The legislator's task is to balance the two: To channel the power into outlets which serve labor's proper interests, and to assess the responsibilities which labor owes to society in general.

There are signs that labor-management relations are entering a new phase of stability. The recent General Motors 5-year contract is one such indication—and one marked by heightened statesmanship on the part of both the union and the company.

The hoped for goal is for the law to serve as a mere guidepost to peaceful settlements, rather than a barbed-wire barrier on which both sides lacerate themselves in costly struggles.

The present Supreme Court is liberal-minded. That it should be seemingly inclined to restrict labor's actions should be a stern reminder for unionists to avoid abuses of their great powers. As a continuing friend of the labor movement, we hope responsible leaders will accept the apparent trend in lawmaking for what it is—an indication of labor's approaching maturity as an economic force.

Guilty Before Trial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent heretofore granted, I am inserting an address entitled "Guilty Before Trial," delivered by Benjamin F. Fairless, president of the United States Steel Corp., at the Boston Jubilee of 1950, Mid-Century Celebration of Progress, Boston, Mass., May 18, 1950:

It is a pleasure and a privilege to be here today and to take part in this great jubilee that the Boston Chamber of Commerce is staging. I am particularly happy to see assembled in this room such a representative cross section of American enterprise. Here at a table in front of me I see some of my old friends from the Smaller Business Association of New England, and at other tables throughout the room are many of the outstanding business and industrial leaders from almost every section of the country.

Believe me, gentlemen, I am proud indeed to stand in the company of men who have done so much to give the American people the most bountiful standard of living this world has ever seen. It is reassuring to know that success in business is not yet regarded as a disgrace in this great land of ours, and that fruitful enterprise is not without honor, except, perhaps, in some parts of our National Capital.

However, I must confess that I am a little surprised at the boldness of the Boston Chamber of Commerce in arranging this celebration at all. Now I wouldn't say, of course, that you are boasting or bragging about your city, because I realize fully that no true Bostonian would ever permit himself to take more than a modest and becoming pride even in Boston's most spectacular achievements. But I will say that you are certainly making no secret whatever of the fact that Boston is big and important and rich and successful.

Perhaps you gentlemen have forgotten that Boston is an incorporated city, and that no corporate entity today can safely possess the characteristics to which you are pointing with such natural and pardonable pride. So I think I should warn you that down along the banks of the Potomac, the wise and prudent businessman speaks of these things only in apologetic whispers and the motto that he follows is: "Grow slow."

I do not wish to convey the impression, however, that this antipathy toward bigness and success is universally entertained in Washington. It isn't. There are Government officials who, I feel sure, look with high favor upon big business and good profits; and it is a great pleasure to have one of these Washington friends with us today. I refer, of course, to the distinguished Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Graham. He has my deepest sympathy for he has to meet what I suppose is the largest payroll in the world—the Federal payroll. On the other hand, I am certain that he must be very grateful indeed to all of us businessmen for the help we give him. I do not know, of course, how well he makes out with the rest of you gentlemen; but as far as United States Steel is concerned, the tax collectors are getting two and a quarter times as much out of our business as the stockholders are.

So I think we have a right to assume that we are all among friends, and that the long-range interests of the Government and of business are really the same things after all. How could it be otherwise when Government is wholly dependent upon the success of business and industry; when business and industry are equally dependent upon successful Government and when the American people are dependent upon both? So any development which threatens the welfare of business or of Government is—and ought to be—a matter of immediate concern to both.

And that is why I want to talk with you today about a problem that President Truman discussed in a special message which he sent to Congress 2 weeks ago—a message on small business. It was a temperate, reasoned, nonpolitical exposition of his views on the subject; and it is in this same temperate, reasoned, and wholly nonpolitical vein that I propose to comment upon it.

After saying a few guardedly kind words about big business, the President pointed out that—great and successful as this economic system of ours has been—it still is not as good as he, or any of us for that matter, would want it to be. He said that it is not providing jobs for all the men and women who want work, and that—if it is ever to provide full employment—more new businesses, and more small businesses, must be established. He recommended therefore that Congress pass legislation designed to provide these new, small businesses with capital and with technical assistance.

Now gentlemen, I have noticed that whenever our Government officials set out, these days, to be helpful to some segment of our economy, they think almost automatically in terms of money—of financial aids, or subsidies. These are governmental crutches which may serve well enough to support an economic invalid, but—of themselves—they can do nothing to cure his basic affliction. Unless the Government contemplates going into the crutch business permanently, therefore, the day must come when these businesses will be able to stand squarely on their own feet. So I can't help wondering if the President, in his program, has really probed down to the roots of the trouble.

Certainly we must recognize the fact that for more than 300 years, our American economic system has provided employment for our people as our Nation has grown. Of course, there have been temporary periods of depression and famine—the "lean years" that have always beset both the agricultural and industrial advances of mankind since the days of Joseph and the Pharaohs. But over the centuries, generally, there have been jobs in America for all.

Now, if what the President says is true—if our system is no longer fulfilling our employment needs in this day and hour when we are enjoying a relatively high peak of prosperity—then, somewhere, there is a monkey wrench in the machinery. And since all of us here in this room are intimately acquainted with the working parts of our industrial economy, it seems to me that it's up to us to find the monkey wrench before it is too late.

Let's look around. Here we are in Boston, the birthplace of American manufacturing and one of the Nation's great centers of investment capital.

More than 125 new manufacturing enterprises are established here in greater Boston every year. So, clearly, we do have new businesses. Moreover, Massachusetts has more investors in proportion to its population than any other State in the Union, and the savings deposits in Boston's banks are nearly three times the national average on a per-capita basis. Clearly, therefore, there is available capital for business here.

Why is it then that we do not have more new businesses? Why are investors unwilling to risk more of their savings? Or, why are our people unwilling to seek more of this capital and to set themselves up in business?

Gentlemen, as a mechanic who has had some slight experience with this great industrial machine of ours, it is my professional opinion that we will do well to look for that misplaced monkey wrench in the Washington gear box. In fact, it would not surprise me if we were to find several monkey wrenches there.

We shall certainly find tax laws that discourage investment and that encourage small businessmen to sell out, and to cash in on their capital gains.

We shall find widespread antagonism toward profits and a reluctance to recognize the facts of inflation. Everybody realizes that a worker who earned $30 a week in 1939 now has to get $51 in order to have the same amount of purchasing power. Yet few people seem to understand that the stockholder who got a $6 dividend in 1939, now has to get $10.20 on that same investment, just to break even in terms of our present-day, 60-cent greenbacks.

We shall find other laws and attitudes that will certainly tend to discourage even the most venturesome newcomer to the field of business but the biggest monkey wrench of all—the greatest single drawback to the effective operation of our modern economic system—is the amazing but undeniable fact that the minute any man successfully establishes himself in any business nowadays, he automatically becomes a potential jailbird.

Yes, the truth is that we have on our Federal statute books today a complete hodgepodge of so-called antitrust laws which have been allowed to grow, like Topsy, for 60 years, and which cannot be reconciled even with each other. And the only way a busi-

nessman can be sure of obeying them all is just to go broke.

Now gentlemen, I am not a lawyer and I'm not going to ask you to take my word for that. I shall merely read you a comment written by Supreme Court Justice Jackson when he was the head of the Antitrust Division in the Department of Justice. He said:

"It is impossible for a lawyer to determine what business conduct will be pronounced lawful by the courts. This situation is embarrassing to businessmen wishing to obey the law and to Government officials attempting to enforce it."

In other words, gentlemen, nobody in business, in Government, or anywhere else, knows what the law is except the Supreme Court of the United States, and sometimes even the members of the Court don't seem to be too sure about it. In fact, the present judicial attitude toward our antimonopoly laws reminds me of a quotation from Ralph Waldo Emerson which is carved in large letters on the side of the new Hunter College building in New York, but which might be equally appropriate if chiseled on the marble walls of the Supreme Court building in Washington. It says:

"We are of different opinions at different hours; but we always may be said to be, at heart, on the side of truth."

Now that is a very commendable philosophy. An enlightened willingness to change one's mind from hour to hour may be a fine thing in the academic atmosphere of any college or of any court, but speaking as a practical businessman, I can only say, "It's a helluva way to run a railroad."

So we come face to face with the fact that laws governing business are not really written in Congress, but in the courts, and what five members of the Supreme Court say the law is, may be something vastly different from what Congress intended the law to be.

Again I do not ask you to take my word for it. I refer you to a quotation cited by United States Supreme Court Justice Burton in his dissenting opinion in the Cement case. There it was pointed out that the basing-point system had been in use by industry for half a century, and that Congress—after repeated study—had steadfastly refused to pass any of the bills proposing to outlaw it. Then it was said:

"We know of no criticism so often and so forcibly directed at the courts—particularly the Federal courts—as their propensity for usurping the functions of Congress. If this pricing system which Congress, over the years, has steadfastly refused to declare illegal, is now to be outlawed by the courts, it will mark the high tide in judicial usurpation."

Yet the Court, as you know, did outlaw the selling methods used in the cement industry. The result was that the heads of more than 100,000 American businesses—men who had been conducting their affairs in a perfectly law-abiding manner—were suddenly confronted by the possibility of being classed as criminals.

Gentlemen, I don't have to tell you that if we persist in that kind of a system of law—and if we enforce it impartially against all offenders—virtually every business in America, big and small, is going to have to be run from Atlanta, Sing Sing, Leavenworth, or Alcatraz.

And that is no mere personal opinion on my part either. One of the severest critics of this legalistic merry-go-round we live on is Chairman Lowell Mason of the Federal Trade Commission, whose duty it is to enforce many of these laws, and who can therefore be regarded as one of the Nation's outstanding authorities on the subject.

He says:

"American business is being harassed, bled and even blackjacked under a preposterous crazyquilt system of laws, many of which are unintelligible, unenforcible and unfair. There is such a welter of laws governing interstate commerce that the Government literally can find some charge to bring against any concern it chooses to prosecute. I say that this system is an outrage, and that it's time the Government did something sensible about bringing its own operations up to the same standard of ethics that it expects of business."

Now those are strong words, coming from a member of the Federal Trade Commission and from a man who was appointed to that office by President Truman. Unfortunately, they are also true words.

The unhappy fact is that once a man goes into business, anything he does is wrong. We don't need a lawyer to tell us that. Most of us know it from our own personal experience. Let's take the question of competition, for example:

To a practical businessman—and stripped of a lot of legalistic gobbledygook—competition is a very simple thing. It exists when two or more companies are trying to sell similar products to the same customer. But when the businessman of today tries to compete in the open market, what happens?

If his product is of approximately the same quality as that of his competitor, if each competitor provides the same service, and if both enjoy equally good reputations for dependability and integrity, it is perfectly obvious that both are going to have to offer their wares at the same price in order to keep in the running.

But if both quote the same price, that fact alone is construed to be evidence of collusion and a violation of the Sherman antitrust law.

So our businessman cuts his price, tries to undersell his competitor, and thinks he's staying safely on the right side of the Sherman Act. Don't ever try that, my friends, because then you're in real trouble under the Robinson-Patman Act. Look what happened to Minneapolis-Honeywell, and to Standard Oil of Indiana when they tried to cut their prices to meet their competition. The A. & P. has been accused—among other things—of consistently underselling its competitors. And one of the charges in the suit that the Department of Justice has brought against du Pont is that the company lowered the price of cellophane 21 times.

So if our businessman obeys the Sherman law, he is probably violating the Robinson-Patman Act, and if he obeys the Robinson-Patman Act he is almost sure to be violating the Sherman antitrust law. He can't lower his price safely, and he can't leave it where it is; so the only thing left for him to do is to raise it. There's no law against that, of course, except the law of supply and demand.

If he raises his price, and his competitors don't, he goes out of business. If his competitors do follow his lead and raise their prices too, he can stay in business, but he's right back where he started so far as the antitrust laws are concerned, and in addition to that he is almost certain to get an invitation—or a subpena—from Senator O'MAHONEY and Congressman CELLER. Whatever he does, he's sunk.

It's no wonder people are reluctant to rush in and start new businesses today. The only mystery to me is that any new businesses are started at all.

But that is only a part of the story. The laws governing competition and prices have been changed frequently. Mr. Mason puts it this way:

"In 1932," he says, "we put a pants presser in jail if he conspired to fix prices. In 1933 we put him in jail if he didn't. Next year, vice versa again.

"Later on, if he went into the coal business, we assessed a heavy penalty against him if he didn't charge a fixed price. That is, of course, if the coal was soft. If it was hard, vice versa.

"Then take the meat packers. We made them get out of the retail chain-store business in 1920. But now there are half a dozen big retail chains in the meat-packing business. I guess the meat packers just went into the wrong business first."

Is it any wonder, gentlemen, that a businessman gets discouraged these days when not even his lawyer can figure out which end is up?

But that's not the end of his troubles either. In 1941, in the Rigid Conduit case, the Federal Trade Commission's staff came up with a wonderful new theory. It decided that it didn't even have to go to the trouble of finding a businessman guilty of any transgression of the law. His personal guilt—or lack of it—didn't matter. If the Commission felt that there was a social danger involved, it could issue an order against him anyway.

Lowell Mason, in a recent speech before the American Steel Warehouse Association, in Texas, pointed out that this interesting theory of justice—whereby a man could be penalized without being found guilty of anything—was introduced in Russia by Commissar Krylenko.

"It is not clear," he says, "whether the Federal Trade Commission got the idea from Krylenko, or whether Krylenko got it from the Commission."

In any event, he observes, Krylenko has since been liquidated; but the American authors of the same philosophy within the Commission have not.

These, then, are a few of the hurdles that confront the intrepid soul who would venture into the business world today—but they are only a few. A compilation of the orders already issued by the Federal Trade Commission shows that there are more than 2,200 different business practices that have been held to be illegal. So our newcomer in the field would, of course, do well to memorize this list with painstaking care before he even unlocks the door of his own office.

Gentlemen, I shall not belabor the point further. I merely submit that when every businessman in America can be found guilty of violating the law, then there is something wrong with the law—and not with the businessmen. From our theorists in Washington today, we hear a great deal about "tightening the loopholes" in our antimoponoly legislation.

In heaven's name, gentlemen, what loopholes?

What we need is not a tightening of the laws, or a loosening of them, but a complete redefinition of lawful business conduct. To quote one final thought-provoking sentence from Lowell Mason: "The Comintern loves it when the men of America who govern, pit themselves against the men of America who produce, and it's time that the Government and business stopped playing cops and robbers with each other."

To that, I think all of us here will utter a profound "amen."

It takes a man of real courage to go into business today, knowing that he must satisfy the conflicting remands of his workers, his stockholders, and his customers. Any man who can do that deserves to succeed for he is performing a great public service. And if he is willing to take such risks, it seems to me that he is entitled to look to his Government for aid—not in the form of loans, or grants, or subsidies—but in the form of clean-cut, understandable rules which clearly mark the boundaries of good and lawful business practice.

The defining of those boundaries should not be left to those who hate business, to those who seek personal or political power over it, nor to theorists who want to experiment with it. It is not a job for irresponsible

underlings in Federal bureaus. It is a job which requires the highest skills of Government officials who understand the problems of business, and of businessmen who understand the problems of Government. It is a job—in short—for men who have a mutual respect for the rights of each other, and a common devotion to the welfare of America.

If the realistic and informed men of Government will ever sit down with reasonable and experienced men of business and make up their collective mind as to what monopoly really is, what competition is, what business conduct is ethical and proper, and what business conduct is injurious and wrong, I think we will find fewer monkey wrenches in the machinery, and the Government will be able to get out of the crutch business in short order. I believe we need then have no fears about our economic system. It will continue—as it has for these past 330 years—to provide us with the jobs we need and the abundance of goods and services that has made America the wealthiest, happiest, and most secure Nation in the world.

But all this is not just going to happen of its own accord. It is not going to happen at all unless we do something about it. As Americans we take pride in this historic city and in this historic State—in Faneuil Hall, the cradle of our precious liberties, and in the Bill of Rights which was forever to protect us from the petty tyrannies of thoughtless and indifferent government.

I can think of no more appropriate surroundings therefore in which to dedicate ourselves here and now to the task of winning from our Congress at Washington the one remaining right that today is unjustly denied to every businessman in America and to every man in America who may wish to go into business.

That is the right to be right.

A Visit With Scott Lucas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "A Visit With SCOTT LUCAS," by G. Edwin Popkess, Jr., which appeared in Popkess' Dairyman's Journal for May 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A VISIT WITH SCOTT LUCAS

I had the pleasure during the last week in April to go to Washington on business and while there to have lunch with SCOTT W. LUCAS, senior Senator from Illinois and majority leader of the United States Senate. This was quite an interesting experience for myself and Benjamin O. Cooper, auditor of public accounts, State of Illinois, who accompanied me.

SCOTT LUCAS was a very gracious host, in spite of the fact that he is quite busy handling the affairs of running the United States Senate.

As we sat down in Senator LUCAS' quarters to have lunch with him, my first observation was the three big glasses of good, wholesome milk at our places at the table. Upon questioning him, Senator LUCAS informed us that he drank over two quarts of milk each day. My remark to this was that if every citizen in the country would do likewise, there would be no surplus supply.

It was quite interesting to observe that the Senator's luncheon included many varieties of dairy foods, including the one and only, butter, plenty of good American cheese and a cottage cheese salad. Naturally my reaction is that Senator LUCAS is a real booster of dairy products and a large consumer of all dairy foods.

Senator LUCAS was quite interested in discussing with me the many problems affecting Illinois farmers and dairy farmers specifically.

He stated to me that he wishes the individual farmers of Illinois would write letters to him to make known their wishes on farm legislation and other legislative matters affecting them.

In the case of the recent oleo legislation and other legislation affecting the farmers, he stated that he received very few letters from the farmers of Illinois, but received many from the city dwellers of our State. An interesting fact in this connection is that last month Senator LUCAS received and answered personally 50,000 pieces of mail from persons from all parts of the country. He told me that his average is approximately 25,000 letters a month.

We discussed many world affairs, including numerous Army problems, with which I am quite familiar. Naturally, a man in his position has carefully studied every problem affecting our country, but the amazing thing to me was that he could discuss each and every one of them in detail.

As I sat and visited with Senator LUCAS after lunch, I thought about the fine record he has made as the Senator from Illinois. I thought of how proud the people of our great State should be to know that an Illinois Senator has been chosen the majority leader of the United States Senate, the man who guides the destiny of all bills and all matters coming before the Senate.

After several hours of visiting with him, I knew that Senator SCOTT W. LUCAS is a man who is devoting his entire time in Washington to seeing that the wishes of the citizens of the State, which he represents, are carried out to the best of his ability.

After leaving him, we had an opportunity to visit with other Representatives, Senators, and distinguished members of the press in Washington. All of them had a good word for our Senator, SCOTT W. LUCAS.

As I left Washington, my reaction to my visit with SCOTT W. LUCAS was that he wants to do what the farmers of the State of Illinois want him to do, but in order to do this, he must be advised of their wishes. I feel that this is one place where our farmers have slipped. Too many of them have been willing to sit back and criticize without making their wishes known. It is one thing to elect a man to serve you, but in order to have him serve you properly, you must advise him of your wishes.

So I say to the farmers of the State of Illinois, your senior Senator SCOTT W. LUCAS is doing a real job for you in Washington. He is a man of experience, a real leader, and one that you should see to it is reelected in November to this high office.

Curtailment of Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1950

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, under the permission granted to me, I am glad to include with these brief remarks a copy of a letter I have today received from Mrs. Paul Megill, corresponding secretary of the Ladies Auxiliary to the National Association of Letter Carriers, branch 225, Asbury Park, N. J.

This letter very clearly and in a temperate manner describes the effect of Postmaster General Donaldson's recent ill-advised order curtailing the postal service. If the administration would endeavor to implement the recommendations of the Hoover Commission in the reorganization of the Post Office Department, there would be little need for curtailment of the service and the causing of distress to so many faithful governmental servants.

We are too apt to forget that the Post Office Department is a service to the people of the country and is not a business, and it is a service which the citizens expect to be maintained, nor do they expect it to be operated in an extravagant manner. Businesslike methods applied to this service would bring about a modernization and an increased efficiency which would be reflected in substantial savings and improvement of the service.

I feel confident that the Postmaster General will reconsider his decision in this matter so that the distress as set forth in Mrs. Megill's letter is alleviated. As she points out, no other nation in the world has curtailed its postal service, and it seems entirely out of order for us to do so. I hope my colleagues will read Mrs. Megill's letter, which follows:

LADIES AUXILIARY TO THE
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
LETTER CARRIERS, BRANCH 225,
Asbury Park, N. J., June 2, 1950.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE AUCHINCLOSS: In behalf of the Asbury Park Letter Carriers' Auxiliary, No. 225, we wish to take this opportunity to thank you for the reply to our letter concerning the curtailment of the Postal Service. We do appreciate all you have done and are doing to help us in the upheaval in the postal service.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, we are writing the following to inform you of the facts as we know them to exist in the Asbury Park Post Office.

The curtailment order which goes into effect on June 10, 1950, is this: The Postmaster has ordered 20 (8-hour schedule routes) cut to 13. The letter carriers are to report at 6:30 a. m. and case their mail for the route; due to the enlarged volume they are given approximately 3 hours to sort or case letters, magazines and papers. They are then to go out on the street and deliver that mail in approximately 5 hours street time but, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, what is so inhuman about it is there are no provisions for lunch. The orders are, "take at least a half hour for lunch with whatever provisions you have made for lunch." For the few letter carriers downtown it isn't too much of a hardship to put his pouch in a box and walk to the post office where he can eat his lunch in comfort but what about all the other carriers who find themselves out in residential sections? Surely they are not able to carry their lunch pails all around the routes; if they should have their lunches sent out by mail truck where are they supposed to eat that lunch and find sanitary facilities? Residential areas have no public service stations and not even a chair is provided to sit on to eat that lunch nor is any protection from the extreme heat, rain or cold as the case may be. Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, is this the Government's re-

ward the carriers receive after years of faithful service, many men who have 25, 35, and 40 years of carrying mail? It will be a hard continuous grind for whenever the carriers load is lightened by delivery he will have to pick up another relay.

The relays by the way are not all sent to locked mail boxes but to private residence porches. This order has already had repercussions in two published articles: One was thrown away in the trash by an unsuspecting resident and another was the theft of seven sacks of mail from a New York apartment house. The respect a letter carrier has for mail is to guard it almost with his life and now the Government orders it thrown around promiscuously.

The letter carrier is not against economy in any form because he necessarily knows every meaning of the word, but it seems so ridiculous to spend millions of dollars to transport mail quickly from one part of the country to another just to lay around awaiting delivery.

In view of the recent strikes in industry we hesitate to think what would happen if these unions suddenly found that the provisions for lunch were completely wiped out of their workday.

None of the countries receiving aid from our country have cut their mail service.

These are the facts, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, having no desire to delude a busy man like yourself.

Thank you for being so patient with a group of women who are much concerned about the endurance and health of our husbands.

Sincerely,

Mrs. PAUL MEGILL,
Corresponding Secretary.

NEPTUNE, N. J.

Tom Miller, of Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER THORNBERRY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 5, 1950

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, on May 27, 2,400 Texans joined together in Texas' Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner to honor the Democratic Party and to pay their respects to several of today's outstanding leaders of the party. The dinner was held in Austin, the capital of Texas, and in the district which it is my privilege to represent.

On the Monday following the dinner, May 29, the Austin American, in a front-page editorial, gave high and deserving honor to the man who did more than any other one individual to make the dinner the success which it was—the biggest Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner held anywhere in the United States with the exception of the Washington dinner.

Texans attending the dinner had the privilege of hearing Vice President ALBEN BARKLEY, who had with him his lovely wife. Speaker SAM RAYBURN, Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, Congressmen WRIGHT PATMAN, BOB POAGE, JOHN LYLE, and OLIN TEAGUE were also in attendance.

The man behind the dinner, Tom Miller, has long been a keystone in the Democratic Party of Texas and the Nation. For 16 years he served as mayor of the city of Austin, and for the past few years he has served as finance chairman for the Democratic Party in Texas.

Only last year he was honored by the citizens of Austin in being chosen as Austin's most worthy citizen.

As the editorial says, "Tom Miller rates right at the top among Texans who really do things for Texas."

Big Texas takes off its hat to Tom Miller, the man who does things in a big way for his State and his party.

The editorial follows:

MILLER SHOWS HIS SIZE

The Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner demonstrated a lot of things as noteworthy as the cashier's check for $100,000 handed to Speaker SAM RAYBURN for deposit to the account of the Democratic Party.

In money and in spirit, the affair has already been tagged the biggest and the best in any of the 48 States. It was proof that Texans are still taking their party straight, undiluted and unhyphenated. It showed, convincingly, Austin's know-how in putting on and handling a whooping big show.

And, while the plaudits are still ringing, we think it demonstrated the fact that the man behind the dinner—Tom Miller—is a big man in a climate conducive to the production of big men. He rates right at the top among Texans who really do things for Texas.

Austin people have suspected this all along. The dinner is the most recent proof positive.

Any affair that fetches $100,000 and 2,400 people is quite a project. It requires the talents and the time of a lot of people and every member of the committee in charge is deserving of the glory. It doesn't minimize the efforts of anybody else to hand Tom Miller a lion's share of it. He was the man who gathered in money and victuals, handled a thousand details of worrisome aspect, saw to the comfort of incoming visitors from Vice President BARKLEY and his wife down to the least known Democrat from the forks of the creek and commanded a crew of loyal workers here in Austin.

He was, you can say, the man who caused the dinner to be.

Characteristically, Miller wasn't at the head table when the show came off. He wanted it that way. But the fourth table back on the south side of the coliseum, where he sat with his family, was a head table, too. A big man sat there.

Trygve Lie Should Not Be Invited To Address Congress

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 5, 1950

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I thoroughly disagree with the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] in his ardent desire to have us invite Mr. Trygve Lie of the so-called United Nations to address the Congress of the United States.

This so-called United Nations is already attempting to arrogate to itself the powers and prerogatives of a superstate, a supergovernment. It is already invading various States of this Union and meddling with their internal affairs.

Many of our States have alien land laws, which forbid an alien from owning land in those States. In my opinion, every State ought to have such a law. Recently a Japanese appealed to this so-called United Nations to outlaw the alien land laws of California. The United Nations, in violation of the Constitution of the United States, in violation of the Constitution of the State of California, in violation of the sovereignty of the United States of America, arrogated to itself the prerogative of declaring the alien land laws of California null and void.

There are a dozen or more States that have these alien land laws. If this Communist-dominated United Nations has the power of a supergovernment to invade the State of California or Louisiana, or any other State, and wipe its alien land laws from the statute books, then it can invade any other State, wipe out its school laws, its labor laws, its laws of descent and distribution, its marriage laws, its laws against various crimes, or any other laws with which the members of that supergovernment disagree. A large number of the Communist delegates would probably find all laws undesirable.

Strange as it may seem, a crazy court in California rendered a decision backing up this mandate of the United Nations declaring the alien land laws of California null and void. Every member of that court who voted for that decision should be impeached, and if the Supreme Court of California should go off on such a tangent, then the State of California should clean out its supreme court.

Thomas Jefferson said that if this Government was ever destroyed it would be destroyed by the courts.

The rest of you may do as you please, but I, for one, representing the people of the sovereign State of Mississippi, do not propose to sit here and see our Government destroyed in this way.

Our first duty is to protect our country from her enemies at home, as well as abroad. If we fail to discharge that duty, then God save America.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OREN HARRIS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 5, 1950

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I have supported Federal aid to education for our public schools since I became convinced of the dire need and came to the conclusion that in this field there is a direct responsibility of the Government. After the principle of local control and other fundamental policies were determined in the last Congress, I supported the bill before the committee and even signed the discharge petition on the Speaker's desk after the Education and Labor Committee failed to report it to

the House for consideration. I made a statement of my position at that time.

It is disappointing to me that this Congress has likewise failed to assume the responsibility and provide this needed legislation. With others I had hoped that the Congress would have taken action before now. In that this second session of this Congress is well along and rapidly passing, I take this opportunity of again expressing my views and desire that some action yet will be taken.

In that the Senate has passed a bill authorizing $300,000,000 per annum for Federal aid to assist the States in financing their public schools, this now becomes a responsibility which rests upon this House.

Unfortunately the religious subject has been brought in as an issue. This question can and will be ultimately settled. I have previously stated my position that this program should apply to our public schools. This would be in keeping with the purpose and intent of the Constitution in preserving the separation of the church and state.

In my judgment there is no unfinished task before us that is of greater importance than the enactment of a Federal-aid-to-education bill.

The education of our boys and girls lies at the foundation of our way of life. In any nation where the power of government is derived from the governed the exercise of that power depends for its success upon the enlightenment of all citizens. Universal suffrage makes universal education a necessity.

'Tis education forms the common mind:
Just as the twig is bent, the tree's inclined.

The strength of our Nation is to a large degree the product of common knowledge and understanding on the part of men and women in every community in every State. That person best lends himself to democracy who is best grounded in the political, economic, and social institutions and traditions that distinguish the American way of life. The basic institution for the development of this common background of knowledge and understanding is our public schools. It is in the early years of the life of each citizen that the foundations of loyalty and of right attitudes are laid. The defense of our Nation is in the minds of our citizens. Good schools are essential and should be provided wherever there are children to be educated.

We know, however, that today there is in the United States no equitable distribution of educational opportunity. There are 10,000,000 persons who are for all practical purposes functionally illiterate.

There are several million school-age children who are enrolled in no school at all. There are perhaps 2,000,000 who are under the direction of teachers unable to qualify for the lowest standard certificate. In many instances classrooms are presided over by persons with no more than a high-school education. The ratio of substandard certificated teachers to teachers holding standard certificates today is 20 times higher than at the beginning of World War II.

It is of course impossible to appraise with exactness the penalties that flow from these conditions. We do know that they are heavy. They undercut our economy. Poverty and illiteracy are closely related. These penalties also constitute a threat to our national security in time of war, a fact that is strongly attested by the heavy rejection rate for educational shortages under selective service during both World War I and World War II.

"The sure foundations of the state are laid in knowledge, not in ignorance," declared G. W. Curtis, an outstanding leader of American thought in the last century. It is time, in the light of our own experiences in the twentieth century, that we shape a course of action with respect to the education of our young people that conforms to the basic needs of our country.

To my knowledge the House Committee on Education and Labor has this year given considerable time and study to Federal aid to education measures. In late March the committee agreed, according to reports that I am sure are reliable, to consider H. R. 5939—often referred to as the Burke public-school teachers' salary bill—sometime after April 17.

We are familiar with the controversies that have raged around Federal aid measures before the committee, particularly S. 246 which the committee rejected by a vote of 13 to 12. The Burke bill avoids the area of religious conflict in Federal-aid legislation by limiting the use of Federal funds to the salaries of public-school teachers. All benefits in controversy are excluded from such legislation.

I should very much like to have an opportunity to vote on a measure of this kind and I urge, Mr. Speaker, that the House Committee on Education and Labor advance a bill which will give an early chance to vote for the improvement of educational opportunities for our young people.

The most critical need today in education is for qualified teachers. We do not have as many of them as we need.

There is a shortage of qualified elementary school teachers in every State. We need 90,000 qualified teachers to replace those now employed on substandard certificates. We need an additional 75,000 each year to fill vacancies created by resignations, retirement, and death. Another 15,000 are needed to reduce overcrowding of classrooms in each year for the next 10 years. An additional 32,000 are required to take care of the extra million school-age children this year as a result of the wartime and postwar baby boom. A total of 212,000 public school teachers are needed now.

Estimates indicate that only 35,000 elementary school teachers will come from our teacher-training institutions this year, of which number only 22,000 will be college graduates. This contrasts sharply with the 103,000 that are required if our obligations to our children are to be met.

Mr. Speaker, every possible effort should be made by the House to pass a Federal-aid-to-education bill before adjournment.

This legislation should be accorded the highest priority on the House Calendar.

There is time in which to act on such legislation.

The Nation can afford to make a decent educational opportunity available for its children. We have voted a large sum, running into billions of dollars, for European aid. We have voted almost $2,000,000,000 for public works. We have voted an addition $1,500,000,000 for highway aid to be expended over a 2-year period. We have done these things without finding such expenditures to be particularly disturbing to a majority of the Members of this House.

But when it comes to authorizing the relatively small sum of $300,000,000 per annum for the educational welfare of our children there are those who begin to gag and say "This is the road to socialism" or to something else when as a matter of fact the Federal Government has been providing aid in one way or another to education for a century and a half.

This was effectively stated by the chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor during the 1949 hearings on S. 246 and H. R. 4643, page 257, when, referring to organizations that have opposed the enactment of Federal-aid legislation, he said:

> The thing that astounds me with these organizations is that they get so meticulously careful in a matter of this kind—
>
> Federal aid to education—
>
> and I have hurdled more objectives than you might think to arrive at the place where I am—we get so meticulous about those things, but when it comes to a British loan, or $7,000,000,000 to Europe, or $1,000,000,000 here or somewhere else, there is never a protest. And I believe you will agree with me there is not a better investment on God's earth than education and children.

It is my firm belief that this House will pass any reasonable Federal-aid-to-education legislation which the House Committee on Education and Labor will report. It is my sincere hope that the committee will move to early action in order that all of us may have a chance to perform a service which has long been overdue.

The Right To Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 5, 1950

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, of all the rights of Americans, none should be more precious to them than their right to vote.

In Italy, where the people have far less educational advantages than in the United States, 89 percent of all eligible voters went to the polls in Italy's last election. In Germany and in France, the percentage of those voting in na-

tional elections has been even higher. Yet, in the United States in the last presidential election, only 52 percent of America's eligible citizens voted.

All of this goes to show, I think, that those who have been deprived of the right to vote, as most Europeans have in the times past, prize higher than we do the precious right to vote.

A very thought-provoking, informative, and patriotic editorial on this subject, written by Mr. Albert S. Goss, National Grange master, appears in the current issue of the National Grange Monthly.

In this editorial, National Grange Master Goss says:

THE RIGHT TO VOTE

The average American takes great pride in those sturdy souls who fought the Revolutionary War to gain the right of self-government, yet 48 out of every 100 citizens entitled to vote in the last general election did not take the trouble to cast their votes. The right to vote is very dear to those who have personally lived under the heel of oppression. In a recent election in Italy, despite all its illiteracy, 89 percent of the eligible voters voted. France and Germany have bettered this record but in 1948 only 52 percent of our eligible American citizens took enough interest to vote.

You may be sure that everyone who had some special ax to grind went to the polls. With half of our people staying home, every Communist and every crackpot in effect casts two votes. With a little ganging up and concentration in the proper places, they are able to wield tremendous influence because of the apathy of those of us who have come to take freedom for granted.

Most of the States in the following table should be thoroughly ashamed of their record. Even the best of them have nothing of which to be proud. The table shows the percent of eligible voters who voted in the 1948 general election:

Utah	74.6
Colorado	71.4
Delaware	70.9
Montana	70.3
Nevada	69.0
West Virginia	67.8
Idaho	67.6
Illinois	67.5
Massachusetts	66.8
North Dakota	66.5
Rhode Island	64.8
Indiana	64.7
South Dakota	64.6
Connecticut	64.0
Minnesota	63.6
New Hampshire	63.4
New Mexico	63.0
New York	62.5
Kansas	61.0
Iowa	60.0
Missouri	60.0
Wyoming	60.0
California	59.9
New Jersey	59.9
Wisconsin	59.0
Nebraska	57.7
Ohio	56.5
Washington	54.9
Michigan	53.0
Pennsylvania	52.5
Vermont	51.8
Kentucky	50.1
Oklahoma	50.0
Arizona	47.3
Oregon	47.0
Maine	46.6
Maryland	43.0
Florida	39.4
North Carolina	38.6
Tennessee	37.0
Louisiana	27.7
Texas	26.6
Virginia	23.7
Arkansas	22.0
Georgia	21.8
Mississippi	16.6
South Carolina	13.9
Alabama	13.7
United States average	52.0

The Granges throughout the land could render no greater service at this time than to lay plans for a practical program for getting out the votes. Some States already have held their primaries. In many States the days for registration will soon be over. It is not enough to get out the vote of the Grange members only. Granges should put on campaigns for getting every eligible voter registered and then follow up with a campaign to get out the votes.

We live under a representative form of government. Our duty is to see that those placed in a position of official responsibility are truly representative of the people within their districts. Much of the sad state of affairs into which we have drifted is due to the fact that we have allowed minority groups to take over.

It is high time that the people speak for themselves.

Both Union and Confederate Soldiers Are Honored by Chicago's Civil War Monuments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress I introduced a resolution for an all-faiths memorial, being joined by many of my colleagues as sponsors. As the authorization of this living memorial to the spirit of tolerance would not entail an expenditure of public funds and would serve a wholesome and useful purpose, I hope that some action on the resolution may be taken before we adjourn.

There is a distinction only in form between a memorial and a monument Both keep alive in the present the spirit of the past. They preserve and glorify the virtues of those who have trod the road before us and set the pattern of our course. I would say that no force is more potent in the molding of the national character of a people.

Each generation of Americans has made its own distinct contribution, both physical and moral, and the nature of this contribution can be read in the monuments and memorials that have been left in its wake. Our generation perhaps to a greater degree than any that has preceded has progressed along the lines of tolerance. Truly, Mr. Speaker, ours is the generation of tolerance. We have learned not only to work together, but to pray together even though our approach to the infinite ear is through different faiths and creeds. This is the thought behind the resolution for an all-faiths living memorial. The form of the memorial, it is provided, is later to be determined by the members of the commission that would be created.

Monuments and memorials often tell as much if not more of a people than the printed words in books of history. In Chicago, where Abraham Lincoln was nominated for the Presidency, is a monument to John A. Logan, great son of Illinois and a hero of the armies of the North. In Chicago also is a monument to some 6,000 Confederate soldiers who died as prisoners in the camp named for Lincoln's great rival in the political arena, Stephen A. Douglas.

Under the caption "Decoration Day Tour" Charles Collins, conductor of the Line o' Type or Two in the Chicago Tribune, has a description of monuments in Chicago associated with the heroes of the war of the sixties. I trust that my colleagues will find the article as interesting as I did. The Line o' Type or Two column is widely read in the Middle West. One of the predecessors of Mr. Collins as the conductor of the column was the late beloved Richard Henry Little, one of the greatest of the many great and famous newspapermen produced by Chicago. His sister, I might add, is the wife of Arthur Sears Henning, long known in the Capital as the head of the Chicago Tribune Washington staff. The article on Chicago's Civil War monuments follows:

DECORATION DAY TOUR

In Grant Park at the foot of Ninth Street, facing Michigan Avenue in an excellent position to review military parades, is the equestrian statue of Gen. John A. Logan, who led the movement for the establishment of Decoration Day as a national holiday. It stands on a high mound, which is often described by humorists as the only hill in Chicago. Such wags are always wrong, and in this case, it should be noted that there is a higher artificial mound in Lincoln Park, which bears a statue of Governor Oglesby, elected in 1865, 1872, and 1885.

The Logan statue, completed in 1897, represents the talent of a great American sculptor, Augustus St. Gaudens. [See also his seated Lincoln, a few blocks to the north.] Ancient wags of the town have been known to say that Logan's horse, a highly spirited animal, seems ready to flick a fly off its nose with its fore hoof. Connoisseurs of large scale public sculpture, however, have a high regard for this blending of horse and man in heroic bronze.

An inscription on the pedestal of Chicago's memorial to General Logan says that he is buried beneath the statue. This is a statement of an intention that was never carried out. He was buried in Washington. * * * Perhaps the inscription is no longer legible, for much of the bronze lettering and ornament around the base of the pedestal has been ruined by vandalism. The Chicago park board sleeps over this problem year after year. It will not wake up until somebody steals Logan's horse.

In Oak Woods cemetery, on the south side, there is an impressive memorial to the Confederate soldiers who died in captivity at Camp Douglas. Burials, about 6,000. Identified and named with rank and regiment on bronze tablets are 4,275. This roster forms a sampling of the racial backgrounds of the rank and file of the Confederacy. About 99 percent of the names are of English, Welsh, Scottish, and Irish origin.

In St. Boniface cemetery [Clark Street and Lawrence Avenue] near the west wall, there is a memorial to members of a regiment of German-speaking citizens of Chicago who fell in the Civil War. The inscription is

in German. Most of the names suggest orgins in the Rhineland area.

In Calvary cemetery, Evanston, near the Chicago Avenue entrance, partly visible to every passer-by, there is a monument in memory of Col. James A. Mulligan, a Chicagoan who recruited and commanded the Twenty-third Illinois Volunteers, entirely composed of men of Irish birth or descent. This regiment was called the Irish Brigade, but it is not to be confused with the other and larger Irish Brigade led by Gen. Thomas F. Meagher, a New Yorker.

Colonel Mulligan died of battle wounds at Kernstown, Va., July 26, 1864. His last command was, "Lay me down and save the flag." These words form his epitaph.

The Proposed Milk Embargo—We Hear About Free World Trade But We Must Meet the Domestic Embargoes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 5, 1950

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the proposal to reestablish an embargo on milk coming into Washington is of national importance. Washington is the only city in the Nation over which the Congress has direct control. While the administration invites larger and larger imports of foreign dairy products by continually lowering the duty, it is a party to erecting embargoes on the marketing domestically of dairy products. My contention is that grade A milk should be allowed to be shipped interstate the same as any other grade A product. The erecting of trade barriers under the guise of trumped up health standards will not stand analysis.

In a few months in my State, Wisconsin, where milk is now bringing as low as 5 to 6 cents per quart and where one-eighth of the milk of the Nation is produced, nothing but grade A milk can be produced.

It does not make sense to first, complain because the CCC accumulates dairy products when the Government itself is a party to preventing products from being marketed, second, to erect artificial embargoes that affect domestically produced dairy products and not even require imports to meet the same standards, third, to be a party to a program that subsidizes synthetic products like oleo, filled milk, filled cream, filled ice cream, and when this is done, to turn around and put an embargo on the marketing of grade A milk wherever produced.

First, if any milk, or milk products, like dried whole milk or evaporated milk, has the endorsement of doctors for baby feedings and, second, if any milk, or milk product is distributed by the millions of pounds through the school-lunch program, it looks ridiculous to try to maintain that the same milk is not good enough for the general public; third, if other drinks can be marketed by mechanical or self-service, there is no valid reason why grade A milk is not entitled to the same markets.

In the meantime please go slow when you complain about the price of milk, or when you complain about the CCC accumulations.

I include a copy of a bill I have introduced to meet this problem and my letter to Washington's health officer and his answer thereto:

H. R. 1555

A bill to authorize the shipment of grade A milk into the District of Columbia

Be it enacted, etc., That the dairy plants in the District of Columbia are authorized to purchase, receive, process, sell, and distribute shipments of (1) grade A milk from any of the 48 States in the United States; (2) to receive, process, sell, and distribute cream made from grade A milk from any of the 48 States in the United States; (3) to purchase, receive, sell, and distribute natural skim milk and dried skim milk manufactured from grade A milk; (4) and to receive, process, reconstitute, sell, and distribute in the District of Columbia, as bottle milk, any milk made from dried or natural skim milk made from grade A milk and cream made from grade A milk with present legal requirements for butterfat and milk solids.

This act shall take effect 30 days after its enactment.

APRIL 6, 1950.

DANIEL L. SECKINGER, M. D.,
Health Officer, District of Columbia, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: It will be appreciated if you will kindly advise me whether or not it is permissible, under the present regulations in the District of Columbia to—

1. Ship skim milk, made from grade A milk, into the District of Columbia and distribute this milk.

2. Bring dried skim milk into the District of Columbia, reconstitute it and sell it as skim milk.

If this is not permitted, would you be kind enough to advise me why it is not?

Sincerely yours,

REID F. MURRAY,
Member of Congress.

GOVERNMENT OF THE
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
OFFICE OF THE HEALTH DEPARTMENT,
April 13, 1950.

Hon. REID F. MURRAY,
Member of Congress, Seventh District, Wisconsin, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MURRAY: In accordance with your request of April 6, 1950, I am enclosing herewith answers to your questions relating to the distribution of skim milk and dried skim milk in the District of Columbia.

1. "Ship skim milk, made from grade A milk, into the District of Columbia and distribute this milk."

The Milk Act, Public, No. 496, Sixty-eighth Congress, approved on February 27, 1925, defines skim milk as "that part of milk from which the fat has been partly or entirely removed and shall contain not less than 9 percent of milk solids, inclusive of fat." This definition is taken from section 13. The health department has taken the position that skim milk sold in this city must be obtained from fluid milk from producers (dairy farms) who hold a permit and from pasteurizing plants (dairies) who likewise hold a permit under provisions of this act, which is enclosed herewith.

2. "Bring dried skim milk into the District of Columbia, reconstitute it and sell it as skim milk."

Section 10 of the Milk Act requires labeling of both skim milk and reconstructed milk and section 13 clearly defines reconstructed milk. Although the problem presented by your question has never arisen, the health department would take this position: Dried skim milk if obtained from dairy farms holding a permit, separated and dried by a pasteurizing plant (dairy) holding a permit, could be reconstructed and offered for sale as skim milk provided it was labeled "reconstructed skim milk." The term "reconstructed" used in the Milk Act is analogous to your term "reconstituted."

Section 2 of the Milk Act provides that anyone desiring to ship fluid milk or cream into the District of Columbia must first secure a permit from the Health Officer so to do.

In conclusion, will say that in the advent the Health Officer's authority would be challenged, the Corporation Counsel would be asked to render a legal opinion.

Sincerely,

DANIEL L. SECKINGER, M. D.,
Health Officer.

What's Wrong With Profit?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 5, 1950

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include the following editorial taken from a recent edition of Pathfinder magazine:

WHAT'S WRONG WITH PROFIT?

Several months ago the following item appeared in the Newark (N. J.) Evening News:

"The Pennsylvania Railroad was attacked today by the Essex-West Hudson CIO Council for 'devotion to the principles of profits first, the public welfare last.' Joel R. Jacobson, executive secretary, accused the railroad of fantastic greed and unmitigated gall in announcing a dividend of 50 cents and simultaneously accepting a rate increase."

The actual fact is that the dividend did not come out of current profits, because for many months the Pennsylvania Railroad had been just about making expenses and even at times operating at a loss. The 50-cent dividend was paid out of earnings from previous years, prudently saved for such a situation. But the most disturbing (and incomprehensible) thing about it is the kind of thinking that considers payment of a dividend evidence of "fantastic greed and unmitigated gall," and that it is wrong for a railroad to accept a rate increase in order to operate at a profit instead of a loss.

What's wrong with operating at a profit? Every business concern must make a profit if it is to stay in business. Any company that fails to take in more than it pays out is headed for bankruptcy—and its employees for the loss of their jobs. Indeed, it was a labor leader who said: "The greatest crime against labor is a business that fails to make a profit."

And what about the millons of people who have saved money and invested their savings in the stocks of the Nation's corporations? Aren't they entitled to a profit on their money? If not, why should they risk it? And from where then would come our factories and the jobs they provide?

Corporations are people, people just like you and me, people who have invested their savings under the very common, very human, very understandable incentive of making a

profit. There are 18,000,000 such people—corporation is only a legal word by which their investments are pooled for collective and efficient use.

There are some people who would have us believe that to make a profit is an evil thing. Yet they themselves expect interest on their bank savings accounts and dividends on their life insurance policies—and these are made possible by business profits. Everyone who owns a savings account or life insurance policy shares in the profits of American business.

The hope of profit is a universal driving force. America was built on it; it was the dream of profit that made people willing to risk their savings in the new factories, new machines, new ideas from which have come our high standard of living, our high wages, our steady growth. And our hopes for continued progress and prosperity and a still higher standard of living have a common foundation—profit. It is what spurs men on to make things more efficiently, to sell them for less, to make what is a luxury today available to everyone tomorrow.

We all want to keep America strong, its factories humming, its people steadily employed at good wages, but to achieve these goals, American business must be healthy and prosperous. And to be prosperous, it must operate at a profit. The man who sells his home for more than he paid for it is not condemned for having made a profit. Why should we deny the necessity for a legitimate profit to American industry and the 18,000,000 thrifty people whose savings enable it to operate?

Texas Production Credit Associations Are Farmer-Owned

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. R. POAGE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1950

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, on December 31, 1940, the 36 production credit associations in Texas returned to the Federal Treasury the last of the Government capital which had been advanced to them. They are now entirely farmer-owned institutions operating on the money and credit supplied by their own members.

I think this is an outstanding record. As chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture which has charge of all farm credit activities I am especially delighted that the farmers of my own State have set such a fine example for the Nation.

There should be very few who would be bold enough to criticize a Federal program of assistance in establishing this needed farm credit. Those who have criticized may find it difficult to explain that the farmers have paid off their indebtedness to the Government and are evidencing the ability to operate a sound and needed credit system.

As of this date, the two largest segments of our farm credit program in Texas are entirely farmer-owned. They are the Houston Land Bank and the 36 production credit associations. Our committee has sought to find a workable and sound basis for placing the Bank for Cooperatives on this same road to private ownership. This endeavor has not been easy, but I believe that, given time, we will be able to make of this cooperative bank another farmer-owned institution.

The REA financed cooperatives are not a part of the Farm Credit Administration, but they are closely related to its work. They, too, have made great strides and are making a wonderful record of meeting their obligations. Many of them have actually made substantial payments on their indebtedness before it became due. I think that the farmers of Texas are to be highly congratulated, and I think that they are entitled to the appreciation of the taxpayers of the entire Nation for the fine example which they have set.

The great achievements of the Texas production credit associations and of the land bank prove that farmers can and will use Government help to provide for their own needs and that they can and will stand on their own feet at the earliest opportunity.

A number of our leading periodicals have commented on this fine record. I attach some of these comments:

[From the Temple (Tex.) Telegram of January 2, 1950]

SUCCESS OF TEXAS PCA LAID TO FARMER, RANCHER GROUPS

(By Louis Franke)

Two things, to my mind, stand out in the announcement made yesterday that the Texas production credit district, 1 of 12 in the country, had repaid to the United States Treasury the last of $8,000,000 advanced to the Texas associations as operating capital under the Farm Credit Act of 1933.

Make it three.

The third is that it's hard to understand why anyone in these days would voluntarily give up the free use of Government capital and in so doing take on a tax bill that is going to run around a quarter million dollars a year. As one man put it to me, "The way everyone has their hands out to the Government these days, you could almost say that what the production credit associations did isn't the American way. I wouldn't be surprised if someone investigated them."

But the other two things together make up the plan or system which a lot of people believe is responsible for the success of the associations.

The first is the loan system whereby a committee of farmers and ranchmen pass on the requests of their neighbors who want to borrow. It just stands to reason that a man who is raising cotton would be a better judge of another cotton farmer's ability to raise cotton than anyone else. It's a wonder someone didn't think of that long ago.

Back of the loan committee plan is a pretty sound philosophy—look first at the man who wants to borrow. The committee also considers the repayment capacity of his business. Instead of looking at the proposition at first to see whether it is safe for the association, they figure out whether it is sound for the farmer.

They also go into the purposes of the loan. Will whatever he wants to buy make money for him? And here is a strange thing—they tell me it is not unusual for a committee to decide that the applicant is not asking for enough money. Then they call him in and say, "What you are asking for looks to us like it will not be enough to make your business as efficient as it could be. So we doubt if it will pay off, and therefore it is not a sound loan. But, if you will borrow a little more and do it right, we will approve the loan."

Finally they look at his financial condition, the progress he has been making and—and only then—his collateral. They figure that if the man, the repayment capacity of his business, his present financial condition and the purpose for his wanting the loan pass muster, the value of his collateral will be secondary.

It adds up to this: the more weaknesses that show up in the first four items, the more important the collateral; and the more important the collateral becomes, the less desirable the loan.

In 16 years of operation under this system, the 36 Texas associations together have made almost 240,000 loans totaling over $900,000,000; their losses ran to less than five cents on $100. That is a pretty good recommendation for the plan.

The second strong point seems to be the intermediate credit bank system, through which an association is able to discount its loans and reach into every part of the Nation to borrow money wherever private investors have money to loan.

Over in India it has frequently happened that people in one valley have a complete crop failure and starve while in a nearby part of the country there is a bumper crop and no market, due to the lack of transportation facilities.

The same thing has often happened in the past in the United States in the field of credit. Credit sources in one part of the country dry up and in another there may be plenty of money available.

The intermediate credit bank system has bridged the gap. The investment public has so much confidence in the short-term debenture issues of the intermediate credit system that private banks, trust companies, insurance companies and securities brokers oversubscribe each issue several times.

The sounder a loan is, of course, the lower the interest rate. The Federal intermediate credit bank issues currently pay a little less than one and a half percent interest—only a little more than government bonds.

The system stood the test of the depression of the early 1930's and never saw the time when it was not ready to discount any sound note.

[From the Temple (Tex.) Telegram of January 2, 1950]

WACO PRODUCTION CREDIT GROUP PAYS OFF LAST $5,000 OWED

Among the 36 production credit associations of Texas which retired the last of their Government capital last week was the Waco association, of which Bell, Coryell, McClennan, Bosque, and Falls Counties are members, Burt Davidson, field representative for the association in Temple, announced.

Mr. Davidson said that of the 36 associations in Texas, nine paid off their capital in 1948, six in the first part of 1949, and now the remaining 21 are paying off theirs.

The Waco association now has about 1,000 members of the five Central Texas counties, Mr. Davidson said. Bell County has about 200 members.

Originally the Government put about $350,000 into the Waco association as capital, and the association has been paying it off all along.

The last payment, which was made Saturday, was for $5,000.

"We will now be just like any other institution. We have retired all of our Government capital and are fully member-owned," he said.

The production credit association was set up in the thirties when it was difficult for farmers to obtain loans from private institutions.

Farmers can borrow from the TPCA for any agricultural purpose, including the education of children, to buy a new car, buy equipment, and other such purposes.

Interest is 6 percent, paid only on the number of dollars the farmer uses and on the number of days he uses them.

[From the Waco (Tex.) Tribune-Herald of January 1, 1950]

PCA PAYS OFF DEBT

An unusual story of how a group of farmers, in the depression year of 1933, accepted the invitation of the Federal Government to organize a production credit association for Bell, Bosque, Coryell, Falls, and McLennan Counties, and have seen the organization progress from rags to riches in 16 years, is revealed in the business records of the Waco Production Credit Association.

Ben D. Giles, McLennan County director and vice president of the association, told reporters that the last dollar of Federal capital was returned to the Government on December 31, culminating a program of retirement of Government stock begun 5 years ago by the local farmers and ranchers—over 1,000 in number—who are now the sole owners of the business.

All 36 production credit associations of Texas have done likewise, and Texas has led the Nation in attaining complete member-ownership.

With this voluntary retirement of all Government-owned stock, automatically follows the liability for the Federal income and all other taxes that other businesses and corporations pay. At a time when so many people and organizations are trying to escape taxes and to live off the Government, it is a novelty to see Texas farmers hand back their Government capital and voluntarily assume tax liability.

ORGANIZED IN 1933

Organization of the Waco association took place on December 28, 1933, when a meeting of 30 farmers and businessmen was held at the courthouse in Waco. John Gorham of Waco, route 3, was chairman and Louis Williams of Marlin was secretary of the group, which also included J. H. Youngblood, Ross Brown, S. Y. Meharg of Waco, R. L. McKnight, Jr., L. E. Ellwood of Temple, J. E. Masters, Sr., of Lott, W. C. Pallmeyer of Steiner, Tom C. Parks of Clifton, D. H. Attaway of Hewitt, R. J. Phillips of Iredell, H. C. Odle of Meridian, D. V. Poston, Charles E. Dansby of Valley Mills; T. W. Hander, Carl H. Aiken of Belton; John P. Geisler of Riesel; W. D. Walker of Satin; Holley Haynes of McGregor; Sanford Garrett, G. H. Bargainer of Reagan; M. Blankenship, A. C. Schloeman, D. I. Glass, P. H. Martin of Gatesville; S. J. Barnard of Mount; J. F. Dulaney of Mart; and J. W. Whittington of Oenaville.

The first board of directors was composed of Ed Brewster of Temple, M. Blankenship of Gatesville, Charles E. Dansby of Valley Mills, Ross Stricklin of Reagan, and Robert A. Gorham of Waco, Route 3.

The present board of directors is composed of Lloyd Williamson of Pearl, Ben D. Giles of Waco, Route 3; R. M. Jones of Clifton, Lathel O. Caskey of Belton and W. D. Walker of Satin.

GETTING THE RECORD STRIGHT

Carlos Val. Smith, secretary-treasurer and manager of the association, who succeeded J. R. Taylor in November 1944, said: "I am indeed proud that our members, by their loyalty and cooperation, have made it possible to realize the dream of owning our credit institution.

"I would like to get the record straight," he continued, "on two points about which the public has been confused.

"(1) Production credit associations are not 'relief agencies,' 'Government outfits,' nor even a 'New Deal' invention. They are owned, controlled, and operated by local farmers and ranchers. They are part of a complete system of credit for agriculture planned back in 1912, started off in 1915 with the establishment of the Federal Land Banks, carried forward another notch by the establishment, in 1923, of the Federal Intermediate Credit Banks, and rounded out in 1933–34 by the establishment of the production credit associations.

"(2) Production credit associations do not lend, and never have loaned, any Government money. The object of the system is to tap the great reservoirs of private credit in the money market of the country and make this credit available to agriculture through lending institutions owned and controlled by the farmers themselves.

"Our association," Smith added, "brought over $1,600,000 of this money into the central Texas community in 1949, to the benefit not only of farmers and ranchers but of people in all other lines of business."

[From the Dallas (Tex.) Morning News of Jan. 2, 1950]

TEXAS PCA CLEARS ITS INDEBTEDNESS

Hearty congratulations are in order for the State's 36 production credit associations and their coordinating agency, the Production Credit Corporation of Houston. During 1949, these associations put through a most remarkable transaction—they paid back to the Federal Government every cent of taxpayers' money that the Government used in organizing them in 1933–34. The associations, therefore, enter 1950 backed solely by private funds. They are full-fledged units of private enterprise. They must pay income taxes and all the other innumerable duties of which they have been exempt. And no one is happier about the whole thing than PCA itself.

PCA was organized and still exists solely to meet short-term credit demands of Texas farmers and ranchmen. Actually, PCA is an extension of the agricultural credit system that began with the establishment of the Federal land bank in 1917. The land-bank system already has returned its Government investment. And now PCA is following suit. Almost 33,000 Texas farmers and stockmen have dug into their pockets for $8,000,000 to cover the Government's original investment in PCA. Then the borrowers have forked up another $7,000,000 to establish capital and surplus needed to support PCA's volume of short-term loans.

The system requires borrowers to buy capital stock in proportion to the size of their loans—$5 in stock for every $100 loan. But the $15,000,000 raised includes only about $3,000,000 in capital stock that borrowers legally were required to purchase. Indeed, borrowers wanted to own the system to such an extent that they have retained $3,200,000 in stock they were under no obligation to keep. They also have purchased an additional $3,000,000 in stock, and they have kept intact about $5,800,000 in surplus from earnings over the past 16 years.

Embedded in the action of these Texas farmers and ranchmen is a neat little sermon on Americanism. They were under no legal obligation to put up that extra money. No other PCA district has done it. They could have retained Government investments in PCA. They could have continued to pile up tax-free profits and surpluses for many years. They could have enjoyed financial security. But they didn't. They weighed security against freedom. They chose freedom.

[From the Dallas (Tex.) News of December 8, 1950]

HERE ARE THE FACTS ABOUT PRODUCTION CREDIT ASSOCIATIONS IN TEXAS

1. They are organizations owned and operated by farmers and ranchers—making loans for crop and livestock production.

2. They obtain their loan funds by selling their loans to the Federal Intermediate Credit Bank of Houston, which in turn gets its funds by selling short-term bonds to private investors in all parts of the country.

3. In 1949 these associations brought about $100,000,000 of this money into Texas communities to the benefit not only of farmers and ranchers but of people in all other lines of business.

4. Although the Government furnished the initial capital stock back in 1934, these associations do not and never have loaned Government money.

5. The last dollar of this Government capital in the 36 production credit associations in Texas were paid off at the end of 1949, and all these associations are now completely owned by farmers and ranchers.

6. These associations now pay Federal income and other taxes just like other privately owned business.

The production credit associations and their 33,000 farmer-rancher stockholders would like for every businessman in the State, as well as all agricultural people, to learn more about what these financial organizations are and how their services benefit the whole community. Headquarters of the associations are located in the following Texas towns: Amarillo, Austin, Beaumont, Brenham, Bryan, Canadian, Coleman, Corsicana, Crockett, Crystal City, El Campo, Gonzales, Harlingen, Houston, Jasper, Laredo, Lubbock, Marfa, Marshall, McKinney, Memphis, Mexia, Midland, Plainview, Robstown, San Angelo, San Saba, Stamford, Stephenville, Sulphur Springs, Sweetwater, Texarkana, Tyler, Uvalde, Waco, and Wichita Falls.

[From the Country Gentleman of January 1950]

EXTRA! THESE TEXANS REFUSE TO LEAN ON UNCLE SAM

The 36 production credit associations in Texas are doing something that deserves the thoughtful attention of the whole country. They are paying off the last dollar of the capital advanced by the Federal Government to enable them to become established.

In a time when large numbers of people are seeking dependence on the Government, it is exceptional to find a group that is voluntarily giving it up. The action is all the more impressive when these facts are considered: The use of this Government capital was free and no time limit was set for its return. In paying it all off, the associations automatically became subject to Federal income and other taxes, from which Congress had exempted them so long as they retained any Government capital.

When Congress set up the production credit system in 1933 and appropriated $120,000,000 to get it started, it aimed to assure the permanency of the associations and also to permit the gradual return of Government capital. The PCA's were made cooperatives, with each borrower buying stock in proportion to his loan. Eventually, it was intended, the farmers and stockmen were to own these associations completely through the purchase of capital and the accumulation of earnings into surplus reserves. The responsibility for achieving these ends was put upon the farmer-stockholders. They were to operate and control the associations, performing the tasks of making repayable loans and building up strong, self-supporting institutions, through boards of directors chosen from among themselves.

The farmers and stockmen who directed the affairs of the Texas PCA's took these provisions literally. During a 16-year period they made loans totaling $844,434,623. Losses plus the reserves set up to take care of such contingencies amounted to less than 5 cents on each $100 loaned. They also kept in mind the other half of the arrangement. By last July 1 all but $105,000 of the $7,835,000 of Government capital once advanced to them had been returned. The last of it is being paid off right after January 1.

It took some hard effort and personal sacrifice by the PCA stockholders to attain this financial independence. To increase earnings they agreed to higher interest rates and service fees on their loans and they dug down into their pockets and bought more stock than was required of them. But they met the challenge, and they begin their self-owned status with around $15,000,000 of capital and reserves. This is a sum equal to 25 percent of their highest volume of loans, a ratio which they seek to maintain.

The Texans are the first of the 12 production credit districts to become wholly farmer-owned. By this action they have erased the charge, often made, that these farm credit agencies are subsidized competition. Their reasons, as well as what they have done, are worth noting by the rest of the country. They felt they should carry out their end of the bargain made by Congress. And they like to be independent. That attitude should bring a lift to the hearts of a lot of Americans.

[From the Saturday Evening Post of January 7, 1950]

A FEDERAL BENEFICIARY GETS OUT ON ITS OWN

A national trend has been reversed by the 36 farm production credit associations in Texas. Instead of leaning on the Government, they have voluntarily returned all the Federal capital that had been advanced them.

This action is remarkable because the use of this Government capital was free and the users of it were under no pressure to pay it back. It is even more remarkable because, by returning all of it, the associations became subject to Federal income and other taxes, from which they were exempt as long as they retained any Government capital.

Production credit associations are a branch of the Federal Farm Credit Administration. Congress created them in 1933, when short-term credit for farming purposes was difficult to obtain, and provided $120,000,000 to enable them to become established. They are cooperative institutions, operated and controlled by their farmer-stockholders through boards of directors chosen from among themselves. Borrowers are required to take out stock in proportion to their loans. Congress specified that the Government capital was eventually to be returned and the associations were to become farmer-owned through the purchase of capital and the accumulation of earnings into surplus reserves. But the law was indefinite as to when this was to take place.

The use of Government capital and their tax-free status frequently led to charges that the PCA's were a form of subsidized competition with banks and other lending agencies. To this the reply was made that they provided loans that banks were often unable or unwilling to make. Whatever the merits of the contending arguments, the farmers and stockmen who directed the affairs of the Texas PCA's decided they wanted no advantages. By last July first, all but $105,000 of the $7,835,000 of Government capital which they once held had been returned. The last was paid off immediately after January 1.

This independent status was not easily attained. The stockholders agreed to pay higher interest rates and service fees on their loans in order to increase earnings for the cooperative, and they bought more stock than was required of them. In this way they accumulated $15,000,000 in capital and reserves, a sum sufficient to enable them to become self-supporting.

These Texas farmers and stockmen were willing to assume the added obligations because they felt they should carry out their end of the agreement and return the taxpayers' money. One may hope that their example is a sign of a returning self-reliance in this country.

Danger Marks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include in my extension of remarks a splendid address delivered on April 26, 1950, before the Kiwanis Club of Los Angeles, Calif., by Floyd B. Odlum, an outstanding American, whose stirring message of decency and Americanism, as well as sound advice from a man of knowledge of world conditions, should be read by as many persons as possible.

DANGER MARKS

Ex-Secretary of the Navy John L. Sullivan wrote me last fall requesting that I make a speech on behalf of the National Conference of Christians and Jews. His letterhead bore on it the following purpose of the organization:

"To promote justice, amity, understanding, and cooperation among Protestants, Catholics, and Jews, and to analyze, moderate, and finally eliminate intergroup prejudices which disfigure and distort religious, business, social, and political relations with a view to the establishment of a social order in which the religious ideals of brotherhood and justice shall become the standards of human relationships."

That bylaw sold me immediately. I told Mr. Sullivan I would go anywhere my arthritic bones would permit and speak before any group, whether in high school, on street corner, or in banquet hall. I am glad he chose Los Angeles, for, while I earn my bread and butter in the East, my home, my voting residence, is in the desert section of Riverside County, Calif. I am also glad that a Kiwanis Club luncheon proved to be the forum because I have great respect for your organization and the effectiveness of its members to analyze what is good for our communities and hence our Nation, and then to translate into action a sound position.

When asked the other day for a title for my talk I spontaneously gave it as "Danger Marks," for I had been thinking about how things are going today in the world and I am disturbed because of serious basic danger marks I see. These basics are all directly contrary to the established objectives of Brotherhood Week and the purposes of the National Conference of Christians and Jews.

We are in the middle of a war today. We not only are fighting a war at this very moment, but it is probably the most serious war we have ever faced. Our way of life, which we here in the United States find generally to our liking, is in peril, great peril—yes even our existence itself for a great many of us is at stake.

Shortly after VJ-day, Stalin published a new edition of Communist dogma titled "Problems of Leninism" and it said among other things:

"It is inconceivable that the Soviet Republic should continue for a long period of time side by side with imperialistic states. Ultimately one or the other must conquer. Meanwhile a number of terrible clashes between the Soviet Republic and the bourgeois states will be inevitable."

In contrast with the above, I read a few days ago in a Los Angeles newspaper an interview with a returned American visitor from Russia, who said, "They (the Russians) say that capitalist and Communist countries can live in peace without necessarily even doing business with one another."

The first statement is direct from the horse's mouth, so to speak. The other could come from the same animal by a more circuitous and indirect route, whether the person knew it or not. It is representative in any event of one of the techniques of the Russian plan of conquest.

At about the time Stalin uttered the threat and forecast just quoted, he and his small group dominated approximately 200,000,000 people. Today they dominate nearer 700,000,000 people. And they are ever on the move for more workers in their ideological quarries.

The United States of America is the mortal enemy of the system that Stalin and his small group of codictators would impose on the world. Our way of life must perish or theirs must, according to their own affirmations, and I believe them. They are utilizing everything in and out of the books to accomplish our downfall. What is going on is rather lightly called by some a cold war. Strike out the word "cold." It is coldly planned, true enough, but it is plain unadulterated war to destruction. While keeping an iron ring around themselves so that their workers may not know the truth, the boss dictators are fighting with everything they have in this, the third world war. They shoot when they please. The fourth world war with its outright physical destruction in terrible form, will in my opinion asssuredly come by attack on us unless we win and win fairly promptly the third world war now on. The arsenal for the Communists in this, the third world war, consists of deceit, propaganda, the stirring up of prejudice between race and race and group and group, and the forcing of us in defensive measures to extend ourselves economically to the breaking point, and if possible in ways that will be wasteful. Stalin and his associates hope to lead us into depression so that out of the dissatisfaction, unrest, and turmoil that would ensue, and which they are now engendering with every means at their command, they may capitalize from within our own ranks, using our own people to conflict by revolutionary process with others of our own and thus save the risks to the Communists of an atomic or hydrogen bomb, guided-missile type of shooting, searing warfare.

But they are getting ready for that type of attack too and hope to name the day for its surprise start like the Japanese did at Pearl Harbor. But Pearl Harbor will be peanuts compared to the next surprise strike from Russia unless we nullify it now.

Russia has a land army greater than the combined armies of the United States and all its allies or potential allies. Russia has the world's largest submarine fleet and is building more and more. Russia has an air force that already has strength in nearly all categories larger than our own, and is building more planes at a faster rate than we are. Russia, with the help of the plant and personnel that were taken over in Germany, has the atomic bomb and is well advanced in the field of guided missiles. You don't need to take my word for this. I am quoting on this subject the public statement made in San Francisco last week by Secretary of Air Stuart Symington.

I say all these things because I want to arouse you to our real imminent peril. The people in a democracy control our national actions in the last analysis. That means you. It is therefore not good for the people to fail to comprehend the danger marks about them. Democracy can only live on truth. Dictatorship of the kind we have in Russia has the initiative but can only live behind iron curtains and on lies. We are spending a large portion of our national income for defense—about 50 percent of our taxes go that way. It should be spent as wisely as it is energetically. You should know about this and make your views known to others. Wastage should be a crime. Failure to spend where it counts most in the

war of today and tomorrow rather than along the lines of a Normandy or an Iwo Jima, for pure example, should be a double crime. Geography and shore lines no longer count. There is today a frontier only between ideologies. Our front-line trench is the truth—for ourselves and as an offensive against our enemies. Truth must be known here. We should have an aggressive campaign of truth abroad. We should know as much about what goes on behind the iron curtain as we blithely publish about our own defensive plans. We should carry the message of our democratic ideology as aggressively and more so than it is being sabotaged today by Russian dictators.

If communism is our greatest danger mark then next in line comes home-grown prejudices and intolerances. I don't need to tell you that prejudices and intolerances are wrong—you know it. But they are positively dangerous as well. They are the stuff on which the germs of communism and chaos breed and grow. And they are being fostered by our enemies every second in the day without holiday or sick leave or featherbedding.

One cannot legislate a man's feelings. Man's inhumanity to man makes countless millions mourn. Consider what the prejudices of Hitler cost the world. And these inhumane attitudes come from the heart and the mind. Understanding and respect for others must be learned. They are not natural traits. It is easy to contemplate tolerance benevolently after a good luncheon of today's sort, but later on I beg of you to think of this objectively and from the standpoint of our own national welfare as well as our own good and happiness as human beings living together in a society.

America is still the melting pot for humanity as well as the cradle of liberty. Here we have thrown together every race, color, and creed—and out of the composite must come a harmonious whole. It's not strange that we have had our impacts of temperaments and races. Strains of every race and strands of every nation make up the warp and woof of our American tapestry. An Irishman does not think or act like a Scotchman; or a Pole like an Italian. And in some cases we are hardly a generation away from the motherland; the old customs, legends, and traditions.

The result is the so-called minority groups with their pressures. Oliver Wendell Holmes said, "If a man is a minority of one we lock him up"; but the minorities we are talking about are not that kind.

You and I are parts of some minority or other. That goes for every race and every creed in this country. There is nothing inherently wrong about being a part of a minority—a view that some of my Republican friends will gladly support. So long as the minorities are trying to live together within the fabric of our chosen pattern of government and society, they have a right to be tolerantly and judicially heard. When they are banded together to destroy our Government they must be rooted out and destroyed. It's no longer a private fight. We should all get into it—all the other minorities.

We sometimes resent these minority pressure groups. We should in some cases rightfully blame these minorities who have seized upon civil rights and made them a club for political purposes and by so doing have not only obscured issues but postponed good results.

But please remember that here in the conglomerate of American life the minorities, taken together, make up the majority. And the rights of the majority so defined are paramount.

Al Smith in 1942 said, "The thing we have to fear in this country is the influence of the organized minorities, because somehow or other the great majority does not seem to organize. They seem to think they are going to be effective because of their known strength, but they give no expression to it."

Every problem in the field of group relations is really a problem of individual relations to be individually solved. The germ of intolerance is pretty difficult for one to identify within one's self. But this can be done. If allowed to run its course intolerance can be more destructive than most other diseases combined for it is a psychological disease. Get your feelings toward your fellow man out in the open for analysis. If we want our rights respected we must see that the rights of others who are living within the framework of our society are respected.

If we in America, against our background of free institutions and economic well being, fail to work out proper patterns of human relations, democracy is indeed lost. Man can this way be proved incapable of governing himself from within. The victories wrung out of two wars in our lifetime will prove fruitless unless we translate into reality the ideal of equality and freedom that belong with the word "America."

The cost of discrimination and intolerance in industry and commerce alone in terms of national income is tremendous, some say as much as $30,000,000,000 a year. Discrimination makes for unhappiness, inefficiency, and lower productivity.

Human dignity and vision are intangibles of industry. In factory or business, no one who does not respect the integrity of himself and those about him can be an asset to his company. No one who is hurt, angry, or disillusioned is going to develop much in the way of ambition or vision. And we need these qualities and work of the right sort as never before. Businessmen cannot afford the wastage of intolerance and discrimination in their organizations. They must start to eradicate it in the front office.

The individual is most important to our society. The rights of a minority are the responsibility of all the people of the United States. That responsibility can be neglected only at your peril.

Happily brought up in a Methodist parsonage as I was, and moving about with my preacher father from town to town and meeting in these new places communities of Swedes or Poles or English, I never knew what intolerance was. I see good and bad in all as individuals but not as groups or races. I wish we were all that way. As a boy I heard someone recite the following. It stayed with me in substance at least, although I don't know the author and have never seen it in print:

"America mine! Aye, brothers, and thine.
Thine from Ireland, from Africa's plains,
From the fair lands of Italy, Austria, Spain.
America! Thy very name ripples with music,
And rolls like the oceans that surge past the mystical poles.
Here on the sod under night's pall I cry out thank God!
For it's free and for thee and for me.
The fairest, the rarest that man ever trod,
The dearest, the sweetest twixt the sky and the sod,
And it's mine and it's thine, thank God!"

We have it here—America, with its resources, open spaces, opportunity, and freedoms. Let us preserve it for ourselves and our posterity—all of us. Let us do so by treating our fellow Americans as brothers, as a part of one great majority supporting our system and way of life, made up of individual human beings entitled within this framework to their little differences and personal opinions, even as you and I.

Because of the danger marks all around us and the forces trying to engulf us, it is time for us all again, for our mutual benefit, in the language found at the end of our Declaration of Independence, to "mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

Tariff Reductions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT HALE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 5, 1950

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

To the Men and Women of S. D. Warren Co.:

You and I and all the others in the Warren Co. are facing a very real problem, and because it is a problem that may well develop into a highly dangerous situation, I want to tell you a bit about it.

This fall the State Department of our Federal Government is holding a meeting in England to reduce the tariff rates on certain foreign products that are imported into this country. The theory is that if we make it easier for foreign producers to sell in this country we shall adjust the balance of trade and close the dollar gap and thereby promote recovery in Europe.

Our kind of paper—book paper—is on the list of items that are to be cut in tariff rate. If tariff rates on our kind of paper are cut (and they are very likely to be unless we do something about it), then it will become easier for foreign paper makers to sell their printing papers in the United States.

Now, as a practical matter, this won't help Europe at all, because Europe needs all of the paper that it can produce with its limited supplies of wood, and it won't have any paper left to send over to this country.

But it will greatly help Canada. Canada has plenty of wood. Canada's wage rates in the paper industry are about 20 percent less than ours. Canada has devalued the Canadian dollar so that if a Canadian producer sells for 90 cents in this country, he gets a full Canadian dollar in return in his country.

If you put all these together—low wages, devalued Canadian dollar, and plenty of wood supplies—you see we have a very real threat across the border.

Some of you may remember that all tariff was removed from newsprint in 1913. That move killed the American newsprint industry so that today only five or six mills make newsprint in this country. Over 80 percent of the newsprint that is used in the United States is now made in Canada.

The same thing could happen to book paper. Our customers would stop buying from us because they could get similar grades made in Canada at a lower price.

Of course, the State Department and ECA and the others that are trying to build up Europe say that American industries can shut down, and that perhaps unemployment relief will be forthcoming. But unemployment relief is a poor substitute for wages.

Moreover, you may be certain that Canada is not lowering her tariffs. The Canadian tariff is so high today that we can't ship paper there. But our State Department wants to make our tariff so low that Canada can ship paper here. They call them reciprocal agreements, but it's a one-way street and there is no reciprocity whatsoever.

You can see how dangerous this is. If there were a tariff reduction, Canada, with lower wage rates, could gradually take over the United States book-paper market, as it did the newsprint market. In that case, you and I are going to have a tougher and tougher time.

I don't like this and I assume you don't, either. It's all unnecessary because it won't help Europe; it will help Canada, who doesn't need the help, and will hurt us badly.

I'm appearing before the Reciprocity Committee in Washington for the whole

paper industry the early part of June, but, frankly, I doubt if my arguing, and the arguing of others, does much good.

More good would come, I think, if a good many of you wrote your Senators and Congressmen in Washington and told them how you felt about this.

Lord knows, we don't want Westbrook and Gardiner to become ghost towns. Let's tell the lawmakers how we feel.

This is a pretty complicated subject and I've tried to simplify it as best I could. But if I've missed something, or if this isn't clear, drop me a line or ask Everett Ingalls.

In any event, I wanted you to know what we were facing, and the importance of it to all of us.

Sincerely,

GEORGE OLMSTEAD, Jr.,
President.

MAY 26, 1950.

Spirit of America Meets the Red Flag's Spirit and Old Glory Talks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 5, 1950

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by William T. Kerr, Yeadon, Pa., founder and national president of the American Flag Day Association:

SPIRIT OF AMERICA MEETS THE RED FLAG'S SPIRIT AND OLD GLORY TALKS—AN AMERICAN PATRIOTIC FANTASY

(By William T. Kerr, Yeadon, Pa., founder and (since 1898) national president, American Flag Day Association)

The Spirit of America was returning from a regular round of visits to American historical scenes where our national liberties were saved or established, among them Lexington, where stands the memorial stone bearing these words "Stand your ground; don't fire unless fired upon, but if they mean to have a war, let it begin here. Captain Parker"; Concord, Ticonderoga, Valley Forge. Her last stop was Gettysburg, where the Federal Union and Old Glory were saved, with the words of Abraham Lincoln ringing in her ears, "Government of the people, for the people, by the people shall not perish from the earth." Interested as she always is in that greatest of all melting pots, our American public-school system, she stopped at one large city school, seeing boys and girls of all ages entering, all classes, races, and creeds, many of whose parents came from foreign lands seeking civil and religious liberty and an opportunity to worship God as their own conscience dictated. Waiting she heard united voices singing "My country 'tis of thee, sweet land of liberty," and delightedly watched through the windows the upraised arms as together they saluted our Stars and Stripes and heard them in unison repeat, "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the country for which it stands, one nation indivisible, with liberty and justice for all." To another interested observer the Spirit of America said, "As long as we can maintain and protect from destruction our free nonsectarian American public-school system, recognizing one God as Father, undominated or controlled by any sectarian group, and they continue to teach loyalty and devotion to our Nation, our flag, and American institutions, the Republic is safe."

The Spirit of America resumed her journey stopping at Philadelphia and Pittsburgh. It was June 14 and they were celebrating Flag Day in honor of the Birthday of the Stars and Stripes, June 14, 1777, adopted by the Continental Congress, the great Commonwealth of Pennsylvania having made Flag Day a legal holiday in 1937. En route west leaving Pittsburgh where the English-speaking civilization was firmly established and Pittsburgh became the "Gateway to the West," she was surprised and stopped by the sudden appearance of a male figure completely in red. Meeting almost face to face Spirit of America said, "Will you please tell me what all this red means, is it some warning, I only know red as stop or warning." "Well," said the red figure, "that's what I am glad to do, I want the whole world to know it for that is my job. I am a Communist, our color is red, see this flag, it is the living red flag of revolution which my comrades and I have been preaching since Karl Marx days. That red, white and blue rag of yours that I see displayed will disappear, this is not a guess, we Communists are sure to take over this country, as the sun shines, then behind our government will stand our red army to enforce our rule. You know of course we are trying to get control of all labor organizations and if we do and no one can work unless they belong to our unions, we will have absolute control of those who create the wealth of the world. Our rule will govern and our red flag will fly."

He said this with a straight face though he must have known that in no other place on earth are people as well taken care of except in isolated instances, or paid as much for their services or have easier working hours, more leisure, greater comfort, and more real freedom of all kinds than here in the United States.

Spirit of America smiled at the bravado of the red visitor and said, "Come and visit with me one of our imposing buildings, it is one of our county court houses, where with other public transactions justice is dispensed impartially by judges of the peoples own choice and not by dictators." In front stood a large monument of justice weighing the scales, in a wide hall near the entrance there floated from a staff a fine silken United States flag with its 48 bright stars and brilliant stripes, bright sunlight shining on them, streaming through a window.

"Admit, won't you," said Spirit of America, "That omitting everything else but the viewpoint of beauty alone, for you and your friends also like the beautiful, that this is one of the most beautiful you have ever seen. You called it a rag because you were ordered to but in your own heart you know it is beautiful as a picture alone, you also know that it represents nearly 145,000,000 Americans, many of whom came from your own land and are now a part of this Nation by naturalization. If your own people had free press and radio to know the real truth, you and others would know that our Nation saved you from destruction in the late world war and we sent over to your people thousands upon thousands of millions of dollars to help defend you and in peace after the war stopped continued to do the same to help feed you. Your leaders do not tell you that and make you believe that they give it to you. I haven't time to tell you more than we sent $20,000,000,000 overseas to help you and other nations recover and never asked a cent indemnity, but I want our flag to talk to you, so that if your leaders permit you, when you return, you can tell everyone what you saw and heard on this visit, come closer and listen while our flag tells you what she is and represents, listen:"

"I am the Stars and Stripes symbol of an indivisible united country, a Nation forever one.

I depict the Pilgrim Fathers and other freedom-seeking exiles, brave pioneers, the wilderness, savages, countless hardships, homes, schools, and churches erected, cities, towns, villages created, a new civilization established.

I envisage Lexington, Valley Forge, and Yorktown; Washington, the father of our country; Lincoln, the savior of our Nation; and other patriots who sacrificed all that I might have victory and honor.

I recall bugle summons, fife and drum beats, tramping feet, clanking sabers, flashing swords, clatter of horses' hoofs, rumbling guns, smoke and noise of battle, incomparable deeds of heroic men and brave women that can never be forgotten.

I symbolize, too, all that is above, beyond, outside of and finer than war, for I am the voice of peace.

I awake to duty where voices may be silent and betoken achievement in every sphere of usefulness and for humanity.

I never went on a selfish mission and wherever I go there is a shrine.

I belong to no political party, faction, age, rank, sex, color, or creed. When you salute me I rejoice for then I know you have not forgotten your great privilege of citizenship.

I am not for special occasions alone, but a constant living token of inspired service for God and country. When I hear the Star Spangled Banner, your cheers at my display, I know you are singing a psalm of praise expressing your love for our institutions.

I am the personification of your Constitution and laws, the voice of every citizen, emblem of the sovereignty of the people, a pledge of hearts devotion, then beacon light of liberty, and wherever I go on land, on sea, in air, there go the millions who make us the greatest Nation on earth.

I have flown proudly through all the years since my birth. Keep me unashamed for I am what you are—nothing more.

I am Old Glory, your flag, the only banner in the world's history which never dropped in defeat. "Protect us by Thy might, great God our king.

The last words came as a solemn prayer and the Red visitor seemed transfixed, America's spirit said, "Carry home, if you will this message of peace and good will, that is what we want for every people. We covet no other nation's lands and the thousands and thousands of millions of American dollars we have been sending to your people and others have been and are to restore your prosperity and success, with civil and religious freedom."

Like a flash Red vanished. To Old Glory, America's spirit said, "Would that you could only send your message into the hearts of the whole wide world. They should know it."

Equality for Women Under Law Defended

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 5, 1950

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Stella E. Barker which appeared in the Des Moines Tribune under date of Monday, May 29:

EQUALITY FOR WOMEN UNDER LAW DEFENDED

To the EDITOR OF THE TRIBUNE:

I was shocked beyond measure at reading the editorial from the Michigan Journalist printed in the May 22 issue of the Tribune.

I am trying to be charitable enough to think that Mr. Jim Murray, the author, tried to be funny, but he was very "unfunny."

In my generation I have never seen a woman cross a mud puddle on a man's coat, but I have seen our fine, sturdy women (and proudly) carry feed through the mud puddles to livestock on our Iowa farms; I have seen our courageous young women living in trailer camps while their GI husbands finished their delayed education; I have seen middle-aged women leaving their homes to take jobs in order to augment a family income and insure an education to their children.

Mr. Murray speaks of beauty. He refers to "Grandmaw's picture." My grandmother's picture showed stooped shoulders and the lines of suffering and privation as a result of pioneering, lack of medical care, improper food and heavy labor. Wasn't she a good citizen? And wouldn't you be willing to give her the dignity of lawful equality instead of classing her, as in some States, in the same category as a child or a moron?

Graceful postures, beautiful long hair, soft voices—Where are Jim Murray's eyes? Has he ever stood on a university campus and watched our young women, graceful as gazelles, walking from class to class; or seen the glowing head of hair she so proudly carries? And how can he discount the beauty of voices not only of singing stars, but the voices of magnificent speakers—and for women's equality—as Margaret Chase Smith, Katharine St. George and others in our Halls of Congress, as well as women like Michigan's Hazel Myers, California's Lester Fulwider, Iowa's Helen G. Irwin and Mrs. Raymond Sayre, New York's Pauline Mandigo, Missouri's Margaret Hickey?

Some women do drink, smoke, wrestle, and so forth—but do they do those things in greater proportion than men? Why not name names on the other side of the ledger?

The unloosing of the philosophy of kindliness, understanding, courage, tolerance, and willingness to accept a just share of political, social, and economic responsibility without the stigma of inequality under the law may well help both men and women to a fuller life in our democracy.

As a resident of Des Moines for 20 years, I am experiencing a sense of deep disappointment at the Tribune, that it would reprint an editorial like this. It is a far cry from the fine, fair comments that our late beloved Harvy Ingham used to put in his column. He fully believed in the contribution women, as citizens, could make and never failed to say so.

STELLA E. BARKER.

DES MOINES.

Armed Forces Day Address by Brig. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered on Armed Forces Day, May 20, 1950, at Sioux Falls, S. Dak., by Brig. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau, Assistant Commandant, Army War College, Fort Leavenworth, Kans.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mayor Saure, Colonel Renth, fellow members of the Armed Forces, ladies and gentleman, it is a very great pleasure to be here today to contribute in a small way to the efforts you have made to set aside this week end with particular thought to what the Armed Forces of your country mean to you.

In days as fraught with a cold war and portents of impending war as these are, it behooves us to pause in our daily lives to consider from whence we came and whither we are going. To those of you who believe in a Supreme Being, I suggest, also, your frequent prayers that those who guide the destiny of both our own and the opposing forces in the world can find a peaceful solution to our problems. The gap is wide, the enemy is brutal and realistic. The way is very, very difficult.

The President of the United States has called upon the Nation for the first time to pay tribute to all the Armed Forces on this specific week end. It represents a departure from previous years when the Army and the Navy and the Air Force each had their own special days set aside. It represents an advance that has been made possible by the unification of the Armed Forces. All the difficulties that may have arisen are relatively small in nature compared to our accomplishments in bringing the Armed Forces under more unified control. Now we are "teamed for defense."

While planning on the joint level between the services is continuing to improve, we have achieved concrete gains in the way of a unified Military Air Transport Service and a unified Military Sea Transport Service. Purchases are being coordinated through the Munitions Board; medical service, through a joint committee; and civilian components and personnel, through joint policy boards. A uniform Career Compensation Act has been enacted and a unified code of military justice is well on its way.

In the same way that an industry must organize for efficient production and operation, or that labor and agriculture must be organized for the most efficient production and benefits as affect the whole, so also in this constantly changing world must our Armed Forces be organized and integrated to insure complete cooperation and collaboration between all elements concerned when the unfortunate business of war is thrust upon the Nation.

Only a relatively short time ago, Jules Verne considered encircling the world in 80 days as a major accomplishment, and it was a matter that intrigued all those who read his book. As of today the world has been circled several times in less than 10 days, and in the light of present-day supersonic developments, there is no reason to believe that it will not be possible to circle the entire globe within a matter of 48 hours within a relatively few years. Thus distance no longer means security or protection.

In the field of thought communication, whereas Washington had to send a man on horseback for a hard day's ride from New York to Philadelphia to carry the reports of events during the Revolutionary War, and news from Europe took at least 3 weeks by sailing ship. Today, in a matter of an hour, people can be informed anywhere on this globe of occurrences in any other part of the world. Such speed in thought transference and transportation means increased rapidity, not only in the conduct of our everyday business but, in particular, with respect to our need to be ready and able now to resist aggression on the part of an enemy power who is mobilized and able to operate over vast distances in amazingly short periods of time.

It is not a pleasant thought that this should be so, and all of us would like to be able to live our lives in a normal manner among our relatives, friends, and contemporaries without the constant possibility or threat of war hanging over our heads or without enduring the cold war that exists today. Nevertheless, such conditions are not possible today, and every single American fully realizes that fact. The line of demarcation between war and peace has disappeared under the Marxian theory of conquest. Let us not be deceived on this point. Furthermore, the advent of the atom bomb, guided missiles and other modern developments, together with the vastly increased range of the airplane, has endangered the security of people everywhere, even in the interior of our great country.

Fate has thrust upon us a certain role whether we like it or not. The crescendo of conflicting interests, played on the drums of destiny in this world of blinding speed and atomic power, finds us as one of two focal points around which all the forces on this earth are rallying. The verdict of the future—yes, the very continuance of the right to enjoy the moral, social, economic, and political values of our western civilization—will depend on our courage and astuteness in meeting this challenge by the Marxian theory of dialectic materialism called communism. History, like a fascinating woman, only bestows her favors on the brave and the strong, never on the bashful or weak. There must be no doubt as to our determination not only to contain but to destroy the virus of communism.

I am not sure that all Americans fully appreciate the nature of the threat that faces us. You undoubtedly realize that the manpower of the only nation on earth having the potential for aggression against us far outnumbers our own. I am sure that you also know that the present state of the already mobilized hostile army, navy, and air force is such that in the initial months, if not years, of a war, we would be severely pressed at every turn. While we boast of our great industrial capacity, the fact is that as of today the Communist production of war materials far outstrips our own. As a matter of fact, in certain critical items, she is producing more each month than the total of such items we have in the hands of our troops. While our over-all industrial capacity far exceeds any other nation's today, we must realize that the great proportion of our production is devoted to capital goods and to meet everyday civilian needs. The Communist zone, with their low standards and their regimentation and slave labor, has found no need to consider the comforts of its people, and nearly all of its very considerable and rapidly increasing production is devoted to turning out the tools of war. When these facts are considered, together with the mobilized force that is ready for action at any time, then the nature of the threat to America, Europe, and the world becomes more apparent.

I have just returned from 2 years in Germany where I had the privilege of commanding the First Constabulary Brigade, one of two such armored units in the United States zone of Germany. The other major tactical element was the First Infantry Division, of long and glorious fame. These units, supported by an almost negligible tactical Air Force, constitute all the combat troops between the eastern zonal border and the west. Of course, the British and the French in their respective zones of Germany have some counterpart of these small American forces, but the total force involved is entirely inadequate to do more than temporarily delay the advance of the masses of enemy troops, generously supported by tactical air forces that are available now in eastern Germany.

The recognition of this serious situation in which the likely aggressor has the capability to push us back to the Atlantic whenever it pleases is, of course, one of the rea-

sons why the implementation of the North Atlantic Pact and the Marshall plan are of such great importance. The nations of western Europe have done much with American help to restore some semblance of their prewar status and development; but until they are in a position where they have at least an even chance of resisting a hostile thrust from the east, they cannot, in confidence and with some hope for security, advance much farther on the road to stability and progress. The instability that has appeared in some western European governments is just another indication of the uncertainty the people of those nations have felt as to which way to turn in order to go forward to peace and security.

It is not a pleasant thought to realize that in a world where we like to think our civilization is advanced, such conditions can exist. Nevertheless, our civilization is no further advanced or secure than the most backward or recalcitrant of the powers that have the force to destroy it; and that force definitely exists today. Only when you can observe at close hand the conditions under which the peoples subjected to the Communist heel have to live, can you fully appreciate what it would mean to have America reduced to the status of a secondary power at best, or at worst, another colony under the hammer and sickle. Such occurrences are not impossible, and it is with a view to preventing them that we must be alert and understanding as to the national requirements for security.

In this connection, it is important to state that while the strength of our arms is very important, there are other factors of great importance, too. Our national security rests on our moral, social, economic, political, and military strength—and the strength of all other nations allied or sympathetic to our cause.

While we have given generously of our bounty in food, medical supplies and capital goods to other less fortunate nations—yes, even to former enemies, the No. 1 need in the west is to replace fear with courage, hope with determination, vacillation and compromise with the ultimate of objectivity and realism. To do this, a firm military posture is one of the prerequisites. Then with confidence in our cause and in our course we can go forward. No team ever won a game by merely hoping to avoid defeat.

Many of you here are descendant from ancestors who held this western frontier against the ravages of the Sioux and other warlike tribes over a period of many years. You know the stories of massacres and depredations during our westward push in the nineteenth century. I say to you that there is another vast and vital frontier wherever the prongs of communism infect the peoples of the world. One segment of this frontier today is in the United States zone of Germany, where 100,000 American troops and probably another 150,000 American men, women, and children representing South Dakota and the other 47 States and Territories, stand guard as an outpost against a threat that would make an Indian attack seem innocuous and gentle. You cannot divorce yourselves from a sense of real responsibility in this situation unless you wish again to feel the guilt that we Americans knew after Pearl Harbor and Bataan.

The National Government recognizes the seriousness of devoting too much of our national income and wealth to the Armed Forces. We are all hopeful that peace can be established, and every effort must be bent to that end. Nevertheless, there is a minimum standard below which our defensive capability must not fall, without the most dire threat to the future of the Nation. All services are being required to keep their regular forces to a minimum since, by virtue of the fact that they must be employed 365 days a year, they are the most costly. At the same time, more and more dependence is being placed on the increased readiness of our National Guard and reserve forces. The officers and men of these forces have a more serious responsibility facing them than may, at times, be apparent. We need the support of the entire population to provide additional officers and men for these forces and the sympathetic understanding and support of the entire population as to their purpose and their importance. The seriousness of the present situation is such that all Americans are more alert than ever before, and we must not be lulled into the sense of false security of olden days where minute men rose overnight to save the country. Our best estimate today on reaching wartime productive capacity is a minimum of 18 months, and it takes tanks and planes and ships to fight a modern war. Courage, while indispensible, is entirely inadequate. We must not fall into the category, phrased so aptly by that great ally and Englishman, Winston Churchill:

"God and the soldier I adore,
In times of danger, but not before.
The danger passed and all things righted,
God is forgot and the soldier is slighted."

The moral of this little poem should be clear, and the soldier means all of those who wear the uniform of this country and the industry and labor to support them in the field.

And so I feel that I can tell you this by way of assurance, that your Department of Defense stand is neither self-satisfied nor complacent. It feels deeply the compelling responsibility which rests upon it for making certain that if the means are not provided to maintain a balanced capacity in these times of peril, it will only be because the Nation is unwilling rather than uninformed.

Under these conclusions we must maintain trim, highly mobile, and efficient forces which must not be allowed to fall below a safe minimum, and a superior industrial posture capable of immediate explosive expansion. For should overt aggression come, it will be swift beyond measure. There will be no comfortable cushion of time again, in which to make ready; no safe opportunity to marshal a latent strength, as in the last two conflicts.

I have tried to present to you in a brief way the reasons I believe the readiness of adequate Armed Forces of the Nation is more important than ever before and why we need your understanding and support. It is also fitting at this time, however, that we pay tribute to all those of the Armed Forces of this country who have passed on, whether on the battlefield or with the passage of time. It would be hard to determine how many have served their country in war, from the founding of the Republic, through the days of Custer and Reno in this Territory, and on down to the soldier, sailor and airman of today who is also guarding a frontier. The contribution of these men and women, all citizens—all from the body politic, is quite apparent in the greatness of our country today. While our country has been made progressively great for 175 years by the courage, intelligence and initiative of all of its citizens, that progress could have been terminated on any one of the several occasions during which we have found ourselves engaged in major conflicts involving the life or death of the Nation.

Wars are the crises in the lives of nations. With courage and some blood we have been able to survive all the past operations. With vigilance, fortitude, a reasonable degree of preparedness and faith in God, we can hope to survive any the future may hold. That is the greatest challenge to the American people today.

Decisions by the Supreme Court—Newspaper Comment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "An Historic Day in the Supreme Court," by Arthur Krock, which appears this day in the New York Times. I also ask to have printed an editorial entitled "Separate But Equal," also from the New York Times of today.

There being no objection, the article, and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN THE NATION—AN HISTORIC DAY IN THE SUPREME COURT

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, June 5.—The hitherto easy-going observance of the "separate but equal" doctrine, which the Supreme Court in 1896 (*Plessy* v. *Ferguson*) decreed as satisfying the "equal protection" mandate of the fourteenth amendment, and which the States and interstate carriers have relied on to legalize racial segregation in schools and transportation facilities, was a mass of tatters today after the Court read three decisions. It still exists in the realm of judicial theory; the Chief Justice said it need not be reexamined. But the net of the decisions was that "equal" must be as definitely proved as "separate," by tests which obviously will be difficult if not impossible for the States to meet, as Texas and Oklahoma failed to do today.

The Solicitor General, Philip B. Perlman, did not induce the Court to reverse Plessy and say that "separate but equal" facilities are repugnant to the Constitution because the very fact of segregating colored from white is a denial of colored equality under the laws. But he got the substance of what he was after, and unanimously. From now on a community must be able to prove beyond question that a segregated complainant receives educational services equivalent to those rendered the racial majority. And to do that will impose crushing financial burdens on the community.

Hence, while Mr. Perlman did not get the Plessy doctrine specifically overruled, he got the Supreme Court to put a price tag on it which may have the same effect in numerous localities. And in the field of interstate transportation the Department of Justice completely carried its point—that segregation in dining cars, etc., imposes an "undue disadvantage" on colored persons, sometimes on white also, that clearly violates the Constitution. In taking this position, which the Court sustained, the Department successfully attacked the finding of another arm of Government—the Interstate Commerce Commission—that this type of segregation was within the law.

MR. VINSON SETS A LIMIT

As in the case in which the Chief Justice declared for the Court that restrictive realty covenants, being repugnant to the law, were not by it enforceable, Mr. Vinson in the college segregation cases from Texas and Oklahoma did not attempt to extend legal restrictions to individual preferences in human association. In the covenants decision

he said it was not illegal for a set of private persons to agree among themselves that they would not sell or rent their properties to members of specified groups, but they could not ask the courts to require any of their number to keep the compact. In deciding today the complaint of McLaurin, the Negro student at the Graduate School of the University of Oklahoma, the Chief Justice wrote:

"For some time the section of the classroom in which [McLaurin] sat was surrounded by a rail on which there was a sign stating 'reserved for colored,' but these have been removed. He is now assigned to a seat in the classroom specified for colored students; he is assigned to a table in the library on the main floor, and he is permitted to eat at the same time in the cafeteria as other students, although here again he is assigned to a separate table.

"These restrictions signify that the State * * * sets McLaurin apart from the other students. The result is that [he] is handicapped in his pursuit of effective graduate instruction [because these restrictions] impair and inhibit his ability to study, to engage in discussions, and exchange views with other students * * *. State-imposed restrictions which produce such inequalities cannot be sustained.

"It may be argued that [he] will be in no better position when these restrictions are removed, for he may still be set apart by his fellow-students. This we think irrelevant. There is a * * * constitutional difference between restrictions imposed by the State * * * and the refusal of individuals to commingle when the State presents no such bar."

FACTS WEIGHED MINUTELY

In the case from Texas, the Negro petitioner, Sweatt, was not, like McLaurin, admitted to the graduate school reserved for whites. A separate law school finally was arranged for his use. But the Chief Justice today for the Court said "we cannot conclude that the education offered [Sweatt] is substantially equal to that which he would receive if admitted to the University of Texas Law School," and "we hold that the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment requires that [Sweatt] be admitted" to the latter.

The facts on which the Supreme Court decided that McLaurin and Sweatt as students were not receiving the equality of opportunity assured by the Fourteenth Amendment, and that therefore the partial segregation of the one and the full segregation of the other must be abandoned, were so minutely inspected that litigation inevitably will follow, based on conditions in segregated primary and secondary public schools and colleges. The Court made it crystal clear today that it will sympathetically entertain any plea of inequality.

In the field of lower education, especially in the secondary public schools, the social bases of segregation are much broader and deeper than in the colleges. If and when the Supreme Court applies today's formula and solution to these, where it finds segregated facilities unequal, the real test of community acceptance will come.

SEPARATE BUT EQUAL

The Supreme Court did not overturn the "separate but equal" doctrine in the three decisions involving segregation handed down yesterday. What the Court did seem to be saying in one opinion was that Negroes entering the Southern Railway Co.'s dining cars did not in fact receive facilities equal to those given white travelers. It was also true, as Justice Burton pointed out, that the railway's rules "impose a like deprivation upon white passengers," but it was not a white passenger who complained.

In two other opinions, involving the law schools of the Universities of Texas and Oklahoma, the finding was that Negro students were not offered, as Chief Justice Vinson said in the Texas case, a "legal education equivalent to that offered by the State to students of other races." The Court upheld the Negro's right to equality of treatment. In practice, the full exercise of this right might mean an end to segregation. But this was not what the Court said.

Decisions such as this have a compelling power on the individuals, corporations, or public agencies involved in them. They will not of themselves change folkways overnight. No matter what rules the Southern Railway Co. or any other southern railroad may adopt, some kind of segregation will doubtless persist on dining cars running into the Deep South. It will persist, too, in southern universities. An individual belonging to a recognizable minority lacking political power may easily be denied privileges to which he is legally entitled. There are, sad to say, more or less subtle ways of achieving this.

The Supreme Court has stated what the law and the Constitution are as of this present date. It is good to have this statement made. This Republic cannot recognize degrees of citizenship. But as long as considerable numbers of people, including the majority or dominant elements in whole communities, think differently, we cannot expect the millennium. The situation calls for a period of education—how long a period no one can say. Meanwhile, it is for the more liberal elements in the Southern States to see to it as well as they can that the broadening out of human rights is accomplished with as little friction as possible. There will need to be continued cooperation by the enlightened leaders of both races.

Diversion of Additional Water From the Niagara River for Power Purposes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I have recently received a copy of a letter addressed to the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee by Mr. Earle J. Machold, president of the Niagara Mohawk Power Corp.

The subject of that letter is the pending Niagara Treaty whose approval Mr. Machold unreservedly advocates. The support of this great corporation for the Niagara Treaty was expressed in such forward-looking terms that I issued a statement praising Mr. Machold's attitude. I join with him in urging immediate action of the treaty.

I have obtained the kind permission of the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee to present Mr. Machold's letter for insertion in the Appendix of the RECORD. I ask unanimous consent that this letter be so inserted.

I also ask unanimous consent to insert into the Appendix of the RECORD the statement I issued in comment upon this letter.

There being no objection, the letter and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NIAGARA MOHAWK POWER CORP.,
May 23, 1950.

Hon. TOM CONNALLY,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Your committee presently has pending before it for consideration and recommendations the treaty recently negotiated by representatives of the Government of the United States and representatives of the Government of the Dominion of Canada to permit diversion of additional water from the Niagara River for power purposes.

As chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, you may find it helpful in your deliberations, to have a statement of the policy and position of the Niagara Mohawk Power Corp. (which owns the Niagara Falls Power Co.) with respect to the proposed treaty.

The Niagara Falls Power Co. is presently the only company or organization, public or private, which utilizes the waters of the Niagara River for power purposes on the American side of the river It (the Niagara Falls Power Co.) holds a 50-year license from the Federal Power Commission, issued in 1921 (license No. 1) under the provisions of the Federal Water Power Act, authorizing the diversion of 19,725 cubic feet per second of water of the Niagara River for power purposes which, together with 275 cubic feet per second covered by temporary authorization granted in 1928, is utilized, under the terms of the license, in its Schoellkopf Station to develop 365,000 kilowatts of electric power. It also presently utilizes 12,500 cubic feet per second of water from the Niagara River under temporary permits, making use of its Adams Station, which develops about 80,000 kilowatts of electric power. In addition, the Canadian Niagara Power Co., Ltd., a subsidiary of the Niagara Falls Power Co., presently utilizes approximately 10,600 cubic feet per second of the waters of the Niagara River on the Canadian side to develop 80,000 kilowatts of electric power, 35,063 kilowatts of which are exported to the United States pursuant to a firm contract with the Niagara Mohawk Power Corp.

At the time the proposed treaty was negotiated, representatives of the two governments had available for their consideration the September 1949 report of the Bureau of Power, Federal Power Commission, entitled "Possibilities for Redevelopment of Niagara Falls for Power." This report sets forth in detail the recommendations of the Bureau for ultimate and complete utilization of the waters of the Niagara River for power purposes consistent with the preservation of the scenic beauty of the Falls in the Niagara River.

Representatives of Niagara Mohawk Power Corp. cooperated with engineers of the Federal Power Commission and of the Power Authority of the State of New York in preparing that report. All of the participants are in accord concerning the engineering recommendations contained therein, with the exception of certain minor details which are not important here.

The study from which the above-mentioned report of the Bureau of Power emanated actually was suggested by the writer to the Federal Power Commission and to the Power Authority of the State of New York early in the year 1947. After conferring with both agencies it was agreed that representatives of the two government agencies and of our company would endeavor to agree, from an engineering viewpoint, upon the manner of best utilizing additional waters of the Niagara River for power purposes, when and

if the International Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909 should be revised to permit additional diversion.

The report itself acknowledges appreciation of the cooperation and assistance given by Mr. Edwin S. Bundy, vice president and chief engineer of Niagara Mohawk Power Corp., in its preparation.

As the Bureau of Power report indicates, we advised the Federal Power Commission that, in the event additional diversions should be authorized by treaty between the two countries, this company desired to use such additional water for the development of electric power.

We are prepared to finance any such development and are fully able to do so.

The Niagara Mohawk Power Corp. renders service to about 880,000 electric customers in an area of about 21,000 square miles, having a population of approximately 2,800,000 persons, and extending from Albany and Hudson on the east to Buffalo and the Niagara frontier on the west, and north to and including Odgensburg and Massena on the St. Lawrence River. We will have constructed, since the end of the war, to and including 1952, additional electric generating capacity of 700,000 kilowatts (mostly steam) to meet the expanding demands of the farms, homes, commercial enterprises, and industry of this territory.

The entire Niagara Mohawk Power Corp. system is interconnected by a network of high voltage electric transmission facilities. It also has high voltage transmission facilities interconnected with the systems in New England on the east; New York City, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania on the south; and with the system of the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario on the west and north.

While recent widely publicized estimates of the need for additional electric-power development in the territory may be on the extravagant side, our own studies indicate that the Niagara Mohawk Power Corp. system must provide a minimum of 850,000 kilowatts of new generating capacity between 1952 and 1960 to provide for expected increase in demand for electric service in its territory alone. If you attribute the same rate of growth to the other systems serving the public in the State of New York, it seems certain that by 1960 the 1,132,000 kilowatts of additional generating capacity which will be made available by the proposed additional diversion of the waters of the Niagara River for power purposes will be utilized within the State of New York and, as a matter of fact, can be utilized in the system of Niagara Mohawk Power Corp. alone.

Electricity has contributed importantly to a better way of life and to the standard of living in this country. Dependable electric service has become a vital necessity to modern society. The availability and dependability of such service at the lowest possible price consistent with sound economics has become a matter of social as well as economic consideration and concern.

The furnishing of abundant, reliable, and low-priced electric energy to the people in the territory which we serve is one way we contribute to greater enjoyment of modern, comfortable living conditions and to the further advantageous use of electric service in rural and farm areas.

Almost 100 percent of the farms in the territory of Niagara Mohawk Power Corp. now are taking our service or have it available to them, and by the end of this year I expect to be able to state that electricity is available to all of the farms in our service area.

Much publicity has been given in recent months to the average rate per kilowatt-hour paid for electric service by domestic consumers in New York State. The New York State power authority reported the 1948 average use of electricity by domestic consumers in the State of New York to be 1,218 kilowatt-hours and the average cost to be 3.81 cents per kilowatt-hour. To set the record straight, I want to record that in the Niagara Mohawk system in 1949 the average cost for domestic consumption was 2.61 cents per kilowatt-hour (2.66 cents in 1948) and for farm use was 2.20 cents per kilowatt-hour (2.30 cents in 1948). The average use in 1949 for domestic consumption was 1,691 kilowatt-hours (1,623 in 1948) and for farm consumption 3,553 kilowatt-hours (3,148 in 1948). This use will be greater and the average cost less in 1950 due in part to a rate reduction made effective on May 1, 1950.

I have related these facts in order to inform you briefly of some of the circumstances and consideration, which lead us to be wholeheartedly in favor of the confirmation of the treaty between the United States and Canada authorizing further permanent diversion of waters of the Niagara River for power purposes.

The rapid growth in demand for electric service in the State of New York leads us to believe that additional substantial steam electric generating capacity will be required in the years ahead, even though all available hydroelectric power resources are fully utilized.

We are confident of further industrial expansion in the State of New York, and that domestic, farm and commercial customers will increase in numbers and in annual use of electric service. Greater use of electric energy, and its utilization for the performance of tasks to which it is not now applied, will contribute substantially to our expanding economy.

If the electric capacity and energy to be derived from the additional diversion of waters of the Niagara River are not made available, the companies now rendering electric service in New York State will have to provide other production facilities to meet the growing demands for electric service.

We urge you to give favorable consideration to the proposed treaty. In the event of its approval by the Senate of the United States, we expect to ask the Federal Power Commission to grant Niagara Mohawk Power Corp. a license for the development of electric energy through the utilization of the additional waters so authorized to be diverted for power purposes.

There are no considerations of navigation, reclamation, flood control or irrigation involved in the proposed additional diversion of waters of the Niagara River. Here is one instance where the problem is confined to the naked question of use of waters of a stream for power purposes alone.

By reason of its constant study and experience in the use of the waters of this very river for power purposes for over 50 years, Niagara Mohawk Power Corp. has the know-how to make this development and we are prepared to undertake it without the use of public funds.

In addition, we estimate that the private corporation making this development would pay approximately $23,000,000 annually in Federal, State and local taxes, divided as follows:

Federal	$9,250,000
State	4,300,000
Local	9,450,000

The difference between the estimated cost of electric energy from a public as compared to a private development, as set forth in the report of the Bureau of Power above referred to, its primarily attributable to the estimated taxes to be paid in the event of development by a private company, and to a differential in money costs. That report makes no allowances in lieu of taxes in the event of public development and financing.

I do not wish to be understood as favoring confirmation of the proposed Treaty only upon the assumption that Niagara Mohawk Power Corp. will be authorized to utilize the additional waters to be diverted for production of hydro-electric power.

The demand for electric service in the Niagara Mohawk Power Corp. territory, and in the State of New York will, in our opinion, increase so rapidly in the years to come that utilization of this natural resource for power purposes is imperative because of the economy in the cost of generating hydro-electric power from that source.

The Niagara Mohawk Power Corp. hopes that it will be permitted to construct and operate the facilities to utilize, for power purposes, the additional waters of the Niagara River proposed to be diverted.

Having confidence in the fairness of any governmental agency or agencies that may be concerned with the construction or operation of additional hydro-electric production facilities for utilizing the additional waters of the Niagara River, we feel certain that some fair method of cooperation and mutually satisfactory policy can be arrived at, in the event our company is not authorized to undertake the additional development.

The private utility companies now rendering electric service in New York State (their consumers, employees and stockholders) should be participants in the effort to utilize the full potentialities of the power resources of the Niagara River in a manner consistent with the best interest of the public and without jeopardy to the great scenic spectacle at Niagara Falls.

Very truly yours,

NIAGARA MOHAWK POWER CORP.,
By EARLE J. MACHOLD, *President.*

JUNE 2, 1950.

Mr. Earle J. Machold, president of the Niagara Mohawk Power Corp., has made available to me a copy of the letter addressed by him to Chairman CONNALLY of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. I am very favorably impressed by the fowardlooking attitude shown by the Niagara Mohawk Power Corp. in regard to the pending Niagara treaty. I am very pleased to know that Mr. Machold states unreservedly his support of the pending treaty regardless of whether his corporation or any other private corporation is given the right to develop the power which will be provided under the terms of the pending treaty. I am also gratified to read that Mr. Machold has every confidence as I do that some fair measure of cooperation and mutually satisfactory policy can be arrived at between the Niagara Mohawk Power Corp. and whatever other entity is given the responsibility for developing the new power source.

I am, of course, unalterably committed to the development of this power as a public resource by public agencies since I do not believe that this resource which belongs to all the people of New York and of the United States as is firmly established by law and by court interpretation—should be diverted to private corporations with consequent profits at the expense of the consumers. Nevertheless, I am ready to let the Congress and the appropriate governmental agencies make this decision and, with Mr. Machold, I urge that the Niagara treaty should be approved without delay.

I do not agree with Mr. Machold that the forecasts of New York power needs falls on the extravagant side. Experience has shown that all such forecasts in the past have been on the conservative side. Not only must the resources of the Niagara but also those of the St. Lawrence and every other possible source of hydroelectric power potential in the Northeast be developed at the earliest possible time.

Origin of the Name "Washington"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a communication which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune signed by Eric Underwood, of London, England. It is always refreshing to note the interest which foreigners have in our George Washington.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FIRST WASHINGTON—AN APPEAL TO SAVE ORIGINAL HOME OF PRESIDENT'S ENGLISH ANCESTORS ON BANKS OF THE WEAR NEAR DURHAM

To the New York Herald Tribune:

In this year in which the city of Washington celebrates the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of its foundation, an Englishman will, I hope, be excused from reminding your readers of the origin of the name of the Capital of your great Nation.

In a mining district of a remote part of England on the banks of the River Wear a few miles from the city of Durham is a small village the name of which is first recorded at Wesyntone in a Saxon charter dated A. D. 973.

In the days when men spelt as they pleased the name is found in various forms, but as early as A. D. 1311, one William acquired the village of Washington, exchanging for it a neighboring hamlet which he released to the bishop of Durham for a "free rent of 4 pounds" and the service of "attending the bishop's great hunt with two greyhounds." About this time surnames were coming in, and William took the name William De Washington. He was the first man in the world to bear the name of Washington and the first definitely known ancestor of the first President.

For some 200 years the Washingtons lived in this village where may be seen the Saxon font in which they were baptized and the foundations of the house in which they lived. In A. D. 1376 they sold the property. The parchment recording the transaction and bearing a leaden seal on which are impressed the three stars and two stripes which, with an eagle as crest, had been adopted before this as the armorial bearings of the Washington family, is shown at Durham Cathedral.

The first distinguished member of the family was John Washington, Prior of Durham of 1416–46, who built the cathedral cloisters. The present dean of Durham has written the following lines on the link between Washington, England, and Washington, D. C.:

"Wind that carrieth random seed
Little it careth and hath no heed
Whence it cometh or whither blown
Nor of the crop thereafter sown—
If it be corn or idle weed.

"Over a thousand leagues of sea,
Rich in promise of things to be,
From a Durham village the seed was blown
And in far Virginian fields was sown—
Little seed of a mighty tree.

"Proud Mount Vernon, daintily set
On her rolling river, may well forget
The story told of a far-off day
And an English county far away—
But the old pit village remembers yet.

"Washington, heir to a noble name,
Knowest thou whence thy lineage came?
Yet great Potomac and little Wear
Are linked in a memory both hold dear,
Linked in a heritage of fame.

"Winds of God, is it all unknowing,
Careless alike of seed and sowing,
Careless of human hopes and fears,
That ye sweep idly across the years
Winds of destiny, blindly blowing?"

After the departure of the Washingtons the original manor house fell into decay and was rebuilt in 1613. It is today again in a dilapidated condition but not beyond restoration. It occurs to me that the preservation of the earliest place to bear the name of Washington and which still bears the name, the house of the first man named Washington and the residence of the Washingtons for two centuries, is a matter of at least as much interest to the citizens of the United States as to Englishmen.

I would like to suggest that a committee of outstanding men and women of both countries should be formed to consider the future of this house and whether it would be appropriate that it should be restored and equipped as a museum and shrine of the English-speaking peoples.

ERIC UNDERWOOD.

NEW YORK, *March 11, 1950.*

After Thorough and Detailed Study, the Air Force Concluded That To Move Watson Laboratories From Eatontown to Griffiss Air Base at Rome Is in the Best Interests of National Economy and Defense—Why Not Let Them Avail Themselves of the $36,000,000 Invested and Reduce Annual Operating Costs by $1,000,000?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. GARY CLEMENTE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 6, 1950

Mr. CLEMENTE. Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of shadow boxing done with respect to appropriations and the economy effected by the so-called one-package bill. This is particularly true as to the recommendations made to the Committee of the Whole with respect to the 10 percent cut in appropriation and the amendment providing that 1 vacancy in every 10 shall be filled. This is going to require a whole heap of explanation in the coming campaign.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Armed Services Committee, I for one cannot understand why, after the hearings were held and the subcommittee report rendered which so fully stressed the need for transfer of the Watson Laboratories, action was taken to strike this from S. 2440. This is an item about which we are going to hear a great deal spoken in the coming campaign. In fact, unless correction is made with respect to this matter before November, the shadow boxing which has taken place with respect to the consolidation of electronic research laboratories is going to become the subject of discussion that might easily decide some several seats in this House in the next session of the Congress.

I am referring particularly to the repudiation of the fact-finding by the special subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee which involved the eventual transfer of the Watson Laboratories from their present location to some central location of a more permanent nature.

Mr. Speaker, they who have arbitrarily passed up the inestimable benefits which would have accrued to the Nation's defenses as well as that which would have resulted from the increased efficiency and economy effected by the consolidation of the electronic research centers are merely paying lip-service to the economy drive which this House is presumed to have under way.

There is no disputing the fact that this Congress would have saved practically $1,000,000 a year had we had the courage and the stick-to-it-tive-ness to have followed the recommendations made by the military personnel and supported by the hearings held by a subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee that looked into every phase and angle of this question.

Mr. Speaker, it is well to remember that the proposal to consolidate at some one central point all electronic researches applicable to the operations of our Air Forces was instituted immediately after VJ-day in 1945. It was instituted by the then Secretary of War, Robert W. Patterson, whose splendid record for achieving economy and efficiency in his Department is a thing of which American people everywhere are justifiably proud.

Mr. Speaker, this is a matter altogether of concern to the Department of the Air Force. Insofar as they are concerned, it involves merely the elimination of one installation, with a view to increasing economy and efficiency. When queried with respect to this change, the Honorable Louis Johnson said that it was not primarily a matter of the Department of Defense, it was an Air Force matter, and of a certainty it had his tacit approval inasmuch as it meant both an increase in national security and a savings to the American taxpayer.

The United States Department of the Air Force as we know it now was not then in existence. It was still a mere arm of the United States Army, so that the studies projected with respect to the consolidation of electronic research centers was a matter of investigation by the United States Army itself.

Two years of incursive and intimate study was made of that question which was begun in September of 1945. It was not until May 1947 that a decision was reached that in order to achieve a maximum of economy and efficiency—commensurate with costs—that the elec-

tronic center should be assembled at Griffiss Air Force Base located at Rome, N. Y.

During the intervening period various activities were conducted which aimed at perfecting the move, which in November of 1949, or four years subsequent to the time it was initiated, resulted in a directive to effect the physical transfer of the so-called Watson Laboratories and its personnel from Eatontown, N. J., to Rome, N. Y.

Mr. Speaker, that decision was reached only after long study by competent officials. It was predicated solely on the increased efficiency and national security as well as decreased personnel and costs which would inure to the taxpayer—but it was not pleasing from a standpoint of political skulduggery and back scratching.

As a result thereof, in January 1950 and prior to the actual physical transfer of the Watson Laboratories, the House Armed Services Committee created a special subcommittee to investigate the termination of work at Eatontown, N. J. and the establishment of the electronic center at Rome, N. Y.

Public hearings were held by the newly created subcommittee in Washington, D. C.

The subcommittee visited among others the present location of the Watson Laboratories at Eatontown, N. J., as well as the Griffiss Air Force Base at Rome, N. Y.

It was not until March 21 of this year that the subcommittee submitted its rereport to the House Armed Services Committee. That report, in effect, approved the action of the newly created Department of the Air Force in transferring the laboratories, but a minority adverse report was submitted by my good and long-time colleague on the House Armed Services Committee who sits on the other side of the aisle, the Honorable HARRY L. TOWE, a member of the subcommittee.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I note that in a statement made to the subcommittee Mr. TOWE points out and let me quote the gentleman from New Jersey:

> During the course of the controversy over the proposed move of this facility, numerous Members of Congress, as well as outside individuals and organizations, have expressed their desire to be objective about this situation. * * * My position is no different than theirs, but perhaps it will assume more validity when I say to you that the Watson Laboratory is not in my district. It is more than 70 miles away, and its retention or removal has no political significance to me.

Mr. Speaker, may I say that I count myself numbered among those who Mr. TOWE has stated are motivated solely by the best interests of national defense and an economy in Government, and moreover, like my good friend, HARRY TOWE, the Watson Laboratories are not in my district. Further, like the gentleman from New Jersey, I too am 70 miles or more distant from Eatontown.

I do not know why my friend from New Jersey chose to ignore the exhaustive studies started in September of 1945 by competent military authorities who have testified as to the actual conditions that gave rise to their recommendation for the change. Neither do I know why he waited until March 21, 1950, to render the statement. Certain it is that as a member of the Armed Services Committee he must have known of the proposed move, but Mr. TOWE dismissed all such considerations by stating in his communication that—

> I am sure that Members are well aware of the fact that pressure from the proper sources applied at the proper time will accomplish wonders.

There is no denying the fact that there should be a centralization of expenditures for electronics made applicable to our military air services.

It goes without saying that we in Congress should be guided by what we regard as unimpeachable testimony given by responsible military or other personnel as to operations and costs.

Of a certainty we, in this body, do not want our military to continue to pour money down rat holes and keep highly inefficient, out-moded military installations activated to serve political ends of certain strategically situated and powerful Members who achieve power in a large measure because of seniority in this body.

I have pondered on what my colleague from New Jersey stated when he said:

> Pressure from the proper sources applied at the proper time will accomplish wonders.

Despite all the testimony given with respect to the enormous savings that would be effected by the movement of the Watson Laboratories activities from one point to another, the taxpayers will be further assessed to carry on a highly inefficient, uneconomic, and wasteful operation due solely to the exercise of undue congressional pressure being placed upon somebody not as yet identified unless the conferees agree to stand by the bill as it passed the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, who is there in this House who would tell any administrator in the executive department that he may not save money and render even a greater public service by doing a job more economically and efficiently?

Mr. Speaker, from a reading of the report of the special subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee which was appointed to investigate the removal of the Watson Laboratories, I learned that the main area of Watson Laboratories comprises 163 acres of Government-owned land which was transferred to the Air Force from the United States Army Signal Corps at the time that autonomy was granted to the Department of the Air Force. The installation presently employs 1,191 civilians, 53 officers, and 25 airmen.

In order to improve efficiency and to reduce costs, the Air Force is desirous of returning to the Army Signal Corps one of its many centers of operations and removing the laboratories located thereon to another unit. This latter installation, known as Griffiss Air Force Base at Rome, N. Y., originally was constructed as an aircraft maintenance and supply depot at a cost of about $36.000.000. Replacement cost is now estimated at approximately $66,000,000. The Griffiss Air Force Base comprises an area of 5 square miles, and the buildings are of a permanent construction and in excellent condition. They are air-conditioned, centrally heated, and extremely well lighted with fluorescent lights. They are surrounded by excellent concrete highways and sidewalks. The base is amply served with rail and truck terminals. In addition, the base has a first-class airport with concrete runways and aprons. The air base is complete with administration buildings, signal tower, and hangars which the Air Force states can be used in connection with the type of work done at Watson Laboratories. The hangars are presently being used and are housing the experimental type aircraft necessary to the work at Watson Laboratories. Certain modification of the buildings at Griffiss Air Force Base is necessary. There is an item in the public works bill in the amount of $2,781,500 for this purpose. In addition, there is an item of $240,000 in that bill for construction at the Griffiss Air Force Base incident to the moving of the laboratories.

In comparison with the foregoing, the subcommittee reported to the Committee on Armed Services that they found the Watson Laboratories at Eatontown, N. J., to be occupying temporary quarters which were constructed during the last war and are mainly of a wood-siding and tar-paper construction. Furthermore, there is no landing strip at the present site of the Watson Laboratories, and they found it necessary for personnel to drive approximately 40 miles to McGuire Air Force Base, which is presently used in connection with the work at the Watson Laboratories. However, McGuire Air Force Base is a fighter base and presently being used for that purpose.

The Air Force contends that the electronic testing at the fighter base interferes with fighter activities, and when the test flying is being done it is often necessary to cancel fighter training in order that the two do not conflict. Furthermore, the experimental planes, which range from B–29 size down, are now based at Griffiss Air Force Base, and when testing is necessary it requires the planes to fly to McGuire Air Force Base, a distance of over 200 miles, undergo the experimental training and then to return to Griffiss Air Force Base. The Air Force contends that this is not only expensive, but is a loss of personnel working time, all of which could be avoided if the laboratories were physically located at Rome. In addition, the Air Force produced detailed airway charts which showed that the Watson Laboratories, McGuire Air Force Base, and Greater New York area to be one of the most densely air-traveled sections of the world. As a safety feature, this was compared with Rome, N. Y.. which has only one airline connecting it with other points in the country. In lieu of this, a small privately owned airport can be used, but testimony showed that this airport has macadam runways and that landings on these runways have resulted

in continual wheel undercarriage and propeller repairs to aircraft. It is also contended that this airport is unsuitable because of its small size.

The Department of the Air Force contends that if Watson Laboratories are retained at its present site, it will be necessary to start a large building program which would eventually entail the expenditure of approximately $17,000,000 if all of the buildings are to be replaced with permanent-type structures. Even if this is not done, extensive repairs are now necessary. The Air Force further contends that it is not economical nor in the best interests of the national defense to allow an installation presently valued in excess of $60,000,000 to be declared surplus and stand vacant while permanent-type buildings are built at the present site of the Watson Laboratories.

The subcommittee did not find that there was any disagreement between the witnesses in favor or opposing the move concerning the fact that a considerable sum would have to be expended on Watson Laboratories if it was retained at its present site. The disagreement comes about as to how much it would be necessary to spend. The subcommittee reported, however, that it "is of the opinion that the representatives of the Air Force, who have spent many months studying this project, are in a better position to know of the needs for research and development within the Air Force than are the employees of Watson Laboratories or private citizens who are concerned only with that installation."

It is also significant to note that many of those opposing the move have never seen nor inspected the facilities at Griffiss Air Force Base.

The representatives of the Air Force further testified that it is the intention of the Department to consolidate other electronic activities at Griffiss Air Force Base, after the contemplated move has been completed, in the interests of coordination and economy. Without a considerable building program this could not be accomplished at Watson Laboratories. At Griffiss Air Force Base a long-range program of centralization could be accomplished without further expense for buildings inasmuch as there is ample space, not only for Watson Laboratories, in its present size, but for any expansion which may be envisioned at this time. Furthermore, according to the Air Force, many of the buildings at Griffiss Air Force Base are so built as to be readily adaptable to the type of work carried on at Watson Laboratories. Much of this work is confidential and secret. Therefore, buildings at Griffiss Air Force Base, with only one entrance and exit and with no windows, are ideally suited for this type of work as they are easily susceptible to being protected and guarded. This is not true at the present location of Watson Laboratories. The buildings are of such a construction that they do not easily lend themselves to secret-type experimentation.

It appears from the testimony that the contemplated move of the Watson Laboratories has been publicly known for some time. While witnesses disagreed as to when it was first made public, the acting president of the Rome Chamber of Commerce read newspaper articles into the record which disclosed that the move was contemplated and was a matter of public knowledge at Rome, N. Y., as early as 1948.

The congressional delegation concerned with this move stated that they first learned that the move would definitely be made in October or November 1949. The subcommittee cannot help but feel that the opponents of this move have delayed in bringing the matter to the committee's attention. On the day of this subcommittee's first meeting, two officers and some equipment had already moved to Griffiss Air Force Base. On February 8, 1950, between 66 and 70 additional officers and equipment were due to be moved and it is therefore, apparent that this committee is investigating an action which in part, at least, has already been accomplished. The entire move is phased over a period of about 2 years. This is done so as to disrupt the workings of the laboratories to the least possible degree, and the representatives of the Air Force testified that it phased the move so as to move all of the employees of a certain laboratory and its equipment at an identical time.

The subcommittee heard considerable testimony concerning the proximity of the Watson Laboratories at its present site to other laboratories in the immediate vicinity, and particularly to Fort Monmouth, N. J. It is recognized that the engineers at Watson Laboratories do work in close connection with the private laboratories and the universities in the locality. On the other hand, the representatives of the Air Force testified that by removing the laboratories to Rome, N. Y., excellent opportunities would be afforded for the scientists to work with a new General Electric laboratory which would then be only 35 miles distant. There is also testimony concerning the number of contracts with private concerns which are supervised by scientists of Watson Laboratories and which companies are physically located in the New Jersey area. The Department of the Air Force recognizes the fact that some additional travel will be necessary to continue this supervision until the contracts expire, but they feel the advantages of the new location far outweigh this disadvantage. The Air Force cited many facts and figures to show that by no means were its contracts entirely confined to the New Jersey area. The Department's testimony discloses that it has many contracts in the Midwest which is an electronics center, and that some contracts are being supervised as far away as Los Angeles. The Department points up the fact that due to the many different types of contracts necessary for electronics work, no particular location can be ideally suited, for the private contractors dealing in electronics are widely scattered throughout the entire United States. Suffice it to say that the Air Force expresses confidence that the removal of the laboratories from the New Jersey electronics area is not of such importance that the move should not be made because of this fact.

Testimony disclosed that there will be adequate housing at Rome, N. Y., or in other towns or cities within commuting distance. It was also shown that this housing was constructed by private capital, primarily for the employees who were to be moved to Griffiss Air Force Base. The subcommittee heard no complaints from the opponents of the move concerning inadequate housing of personnel at Rome, N. Y. At the suggestion of the Air Force, approximately 400 housing units have been constructed by private capital in the Rome area. In addition, the commanding officer of Griffiss Air Force Base informed the subcommittee that he is reserving 50 units on the base for key personnel. Furthermore, bachelor officers' quarters on the base will be made available for single personnel, both ladies and men, for temporary purposes until such employees find a permanent location suitable to them. As a matter of fact, representatives of the Air Force contend that it will not be necessary for moving personnel to incur one night's hotel expense while awaiting permanent quarters.

It is understandable that there is considerable opposition to this move. Many of the employees at the present site of the Watson Laboratories have purchased homes or have leases and, in addition, have their children in school in that locality. Furthermore, it is recognized that this section of New Jersey will suffer economically by the removal of this payroll from that section. On the other hand, it is felt that the interests of national defense and of economy should prevail over private interests. In this connection, it must be noted that when the subcommittee made its inspection several officers were questioned as to the matter of selling privately owned homes. Due to a housing shortage in the Watson Laboratories area of New Jersey, the persons questioned were of the opinion that privately owned homes could be disposed of at no loss to the owner, and, in many cases, at a profit, in the event the Air Force continues with its plans to vacate the laboratories. In fact, the program of the Signal Corps does call for some expansion at the base, and the subcommittee suggests, in the event the program of the Air Force is adhered to, that the Monmouth Army Base give thought and study to the complete utilization of the facilities of the Watson Laboratories.

There is need for a prompt decision of this problem. Some material has already been moved to Griffiss Air Force Base. Other equipment is crated and ready to be transported. The Department of the Air Force is holding the move, however, pending report by this committee. Further delay will result in serious inconvenience and expense to the Government and to the personnel employed at the laboratories.

Much of the foregoing factual information I have culled from report No. 179, which is a consideration of proposed removal of the Watson Electronics

Laboratory from Eatontown, N. J., to Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome, N. Y.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the foregoing and despite my membership on the Armed Services Committee, I am altogether at a loss to know why that committee voted to delete from S. 2440 a comparatively small appropriation that would have meant an undisputed savings of millions of dollars to our taxpayers. Certainly, the people as well as the press of upstate New York who are altogether acquainted with this problem—will, in the coming congressional and senatorial campaign, have many questions to ask for refusing to avail the armed services of an existing plant and structures wholly suited to their use with the present-day value of $60,000,000.

It baffles even me to understand why a branch of our military is not permitted to reduce its operating charges by as much as a million dollars a year and is compelled to carry on electronic research and other developments in tar-papered shacks, heated with potbellied stoves, as described by the special subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee in its regular report.

The Banker-Farmer Relationship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT E. JONES, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 6, 1950

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, recently my good friend Mr. T. E. Williams, a distinguished citizen of Athens, Ala., and the retiring president of the Alabama Bankers Association, addressed the annual convention of that group in Mobile, Ala. Mr. Williams' speech is so important I want to make it available to every Member of the House. No man in Alabama could be as well equipped and informed on the subject as Mr. Williams, and his vast knowledge of the economic problems facing the Alabama farmer makes his observations particularly interesting. No Alabaman has contributed more of his time, energy, resources, and imagination to the welfare of the farmer and farm life than has Mr. Williams. The product of his life work is to be found on every farm in north central Alabama. I commend his speech to you for your consideration. It follows:

Our State has made much progress in both agriculture and industrial expansion. Since we have a special topic on the industrial phase of our work, and since agriculture is the foundation stone of Alabama's economic life, I shall cal' your attention to the over-all Alabama farm picture, and the place bankers occupy in this picture as it now looks:

1. A ceiling on cash crops—cotton, peanuts, potatoes. There is nothing to indicate a bigger outlet for these products. So production control very likely will continue.

2. The only big opportunity for increasing farm production in Alabama is with livestock and trees. Since trees are different and will be discussed in a separate topic, we will confine this discussion largely to livestock.

3. The mule and horse days are gone. Tractor power has become a must for efficiency, for economy, and to do the kind of farming which is essential to good profits.

4. Our biggest handicap at present is inadequate capital. Information and land are available, and farm labor is adequate, but most farms are very inadequately financed.

When a two-horse farmer, for example, shifts from mule power and equipment to tractor power and equipment, he increases his financial needs for power and equipment 5 to 10 times.

Pastures and other feed crops are essential to profitable livestock farming, but land preparation for pasture is expensive.

A good example of this is alfalfa. To plant an acre of alfalfa calls for from $40 to $50. Other crops cost less, but any of them calls for big money. Fences, too, are expensive, and most farms don't have enough fences.

And buying livestock to get started, or to expand, also costs money. Around $200 is needed to buy either a good dairy cow or a good beef cow. Some use a higher figure. This means at least $2,000 for either a dairy or beef herd of 10 cows, which is not a big herd.

Underneath all this is the fact that there are millions of acres of land in Alabama now producing little or nothing. This land is adaptable to feed crops, especially grazing, and it should be in production.

To prepare, fertilize, and seed this land calls for much money, and the privilege to lend this money at reasonable rates is yours.

This brings us to the opportunity of the bankers—ye managers of money who hold the progress of your communities in your hands. We urge you to study the farmer's needs, the individual farmer, and the improved methods. Yes, get out from behind your desk and visit your farmer customers. Break bread with them. Get some sand between your toes, some manure on your shoes. You can then understand better his problems and his needs. You might be persuaded to loosen up and make more of what I consider the best type of loans a country bank can make—farm loans.

Livestock farming is the landowner's responsibility. While tenants and sharecroppers may have a part in the operation, bankers, as a rule, can and will deal with landowners.

No Government agency can serve the needs of the farm people as well as the individual country bank.

Lippmann Deplores United States Obsession With War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 6, 1950

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article by Walter Lippmann, which appeared in the Detroit Free Press, Sunday, June 4:

LIPPMANN DEPLORES UNITED STATES OBSESSION WITH WAR

(By Walter Lippmann)

WASHINGTON.—General Marshall, speaking in Arlington Cemetery, found it necessary to warn the country against the "surrender" of any "part of our leadership in the fight for peace."

He used these words in replying specifically to Mr. Hoover's proposal to break up the United Nations. But he was thinking of something much bigger than that. The theme of this exalted and faithful address was that we are failing to provide leadership to mankind in the fight for peace.

Having said that, of course, we must remain well armed and that we must use our economic power constructively, General Marshall warned the country that "we should not place complete dependence on military and material power." The word complete was not, I think, carelessly and accidentally used. For no one who has been a close observer of things in Washington can fail to feel that for a variety of reasons, some of them objective, some psychological, some personal, some partisan and political, the administration's foreign policy has in the last year created the impression here and abroad that it places virtually complete dependence on military and material power.

This impression may or may not reflect the real views of Mr. Truman and of Mr. Acheson. But that this impression has been created and that it has spread around tne world is certain.

It is reflected at home in the defeatism shown in the Gallup poll, which finds a majority of the people expecting war within 5 years. It is reflected abroad in a drastic decline of American popularity among the broad masses of the people. This country has hardly begun to realize the extent and the depth of the loss of confidence in our wisdom, and even in our motives.

We have allowed ourselves to become identified with the idea that war is inevitable, and that our whole foreign policy is determined by the strategic necessities of the United States. As long as that is the picture of ourselves which we permit mankind to regard as the true picture, no money we appropriate for armaments and no contributions we make to recovery can arrest the breakdown of American influence abroad.

"War," said General Marshall, "is no longer just an evil. In this age it seems intolerable." The plain fact is that we have allowed the Soviet propaganda to associate us with the intolerable evil of war. Indeed we have helped the Soviet propaganda by all kinds of incendiary utterances from the Pentagon, from the State Department, from various foreign missions abroad, in Congress, and in inspired radio and press commentaries.

We have played right into the hands of the Soviet propaganda by explaining that everything we do, every decision we take, is based on a strategical calculation about war. This damnable obsession has gotten to the point where we can hardly send milk to babies abroad without explaining that this is an important action in our cold war with Russian communism.

The official theory of peace has been that it can be preserved if the Atlantic community is united and strong. Until it is stronger and more united than it is now, we must not talk about peace. We must not let the Russians think we wish to negotiate. For that will only make them think that we are weak.

We must not let our own people think about negotiation. That will only make them soft and unwilling to vote the money, to create the armies, and to face the sacrifices which are necessary to make us strong. We must concentrate our whole attention and effort on strengthening and uniting the Atlantic community—and then, eventually, we shall extend the area of possible agreement.

This theory is, I venture to believe, almost but not altogether sound and true. It is more than a mere half-truth. It is decidedly less, however, than the sufficient truth.

The defect of the theory is that you cannot unite—and keep united—the Atlantic community unless you can convince the exposed nations of continental Europe that you are organizing peace. If you treat the Atlantic community as a military coalition for war, or allow the impression to exist that that is what you are doing, you will not, in my opinion, be able to unite the Atlantic community.

For there are many countries in the Atlantic community that cannot surely be defended in case of war. There are some which cannot be defended at all. They cannot be intimately associated with the Atlantic community unless they believe that in that association war can be prevented. The more probable that war appears to be, the stronger the tendency of the undefendable countries to break away from the Atlantic alliance.

Therefore, it is safe to predict that no matter what the agreements reached by the governments in London, the unity and strength of the Atlantic alliance will decline, not increase, unless the administration succeeds in identifying itself, once more, with the probability and with the hope of peace.

Effect of Foreign Importations on American Optical Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter written to me by C. A. Mowrey, of the DuMaurier Co., of Elmira, N. Y.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DUMAURIER CO.,
Elmira, N. Y., June 1, 1950.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Another vital American industry is being destroyed.

As you already know, industry after industry is being destroyed by our "benevolent" Government. Those that are not already bankrupt are rapidly approaching that condition.

The safety and well-being of this Nation depends on many of these industries. A world war III could easily be lost because of this short-sightedness.

Now the American binocular business is a victim. Manufacturers of binoculars and other optical instruments cannot hope to compete with the influx of Jap glasses. This condition not only makes for hardship to American manufacturers, but prevents the training of skilled help demanded for defense instruments.

During World Wars I and II the United States Government begged civilians for all kinds of binoculars, field glasses, and telescopes. Such conditions will again prevail if the wreckers in Washington are not stopped and stopped soon.

Let us take an example: A 7x50 millimeter prism binocular made in this country sells for $175 plus $35 excise tax. The Jap copy sells retail for $30 plus $6 tax. By no stretch of imagination could any American manufacturer hope to equal this.

This ruinous condition exists all along the line. Opera glasses are sold wholesale in the United States for the unbelievable price of 27 cents each, duty-paid and a profit to the importer. Reading-glass lenses for 8 cents each landed. This is below the cost of the rough glass to domestic makers.

The binocular production alone in Japan has reached the staggering total of 120,000 a year. Untold quantities of other optical instruments are also produced. Any American manufacturer who risks money on producing a new item is sure to have it copied in Japan, forcing him out of the market.

We defeat a cruel, arrogant enemy. We then slobber over them and allow their imports to come in at 10 to 20 percent of the American cost. Every such item takes that much away from our own workmen. And the amounts are reaching alarming proportions.

We do not object to clean competition, but do object strenuously to such unfair and baseless slaughter of our industries. They are wrecking our livelihood. They are wrecking our defense.

The Waltham Watch Co. is already bankrupt. The glove industry is on the rocks. The optical industry is being obliterated. The china industry is hard hit. Linens, shoes, necklaces, and countless of others. And the President wants still lower duties.

When will this damnable condition be stopped? We believe that import duties should be raised to an equitable level.

These deplorable conditions are being brought to your attention. We hope that you will use your influence to correct them before it is too late.

Sincerely,

C. A. MOWREY,
DuMaurier Co.

Happenings in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, program No. 26 in a series of radio addresses entitled "Happenings in Washington," delivered by me on June 5, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAPPENINGS IN WASHINGTON

(Program No. 26)

This is ED MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital, and bringing you another discussion of Happenings in Washington.

I want to talk to you at this time about the cat with 99 lives—about the subject that will not die.

I want to talk to you about communism in our Government. The administration has sought to whitewash the cat, to kill it, to whistle it away, to make people forget it is there.

Yet the subject remains very much alive. Our people continue to be disturbed over whether the seditious elements have all been purged from our Government.

In recent weeks there has been a great deal of confusion about communism. The air here in Washington has been clouded with charges and countercharges, statements and denials.

Under those conditions there is danger that we might lose sight of the main objective. And that is to drive out of the Government every one, high or low, who is tinged with disloyalty to our country and to crush the poisonous influence of communism wherever it may be found.

From time to time, new evidence is uncovered, indicating that official Washington is not yet cleansed of those who spread the corrupting ideology of communism and serve as spies for the masters of the Kremlin.

The last time I spoke to you about this was shortly after Alger Hiss had been convicted, a few months ago.

The administration seemed to feel that the Hiss case was probably the last of it and that now the cat was dead.

The administration took no action to improve the laws protecting us from traitors and spies in such situations as was disclosed in the recent arrest in Philadelphia of Harry Gold. You recall he is held under $100,000 bail on the charge of aiding the British scientist who turned atomic secrets over to Russian agents during the war.

I want to discuss two other recent developments.

The first is the notorious Amerasia stolen-documents case of 1945. The administration thought it had buried Amerasia under 6 feet of whitewash. But it is back, as alive, as smelly and as shameful as ever. I will tell you about that in some detail.

But, first I want to talk about a speech made 2 weeks ago by the Attorney General of the United States. In it he made the positive statement that the FBI knows every Communist in the United States and that not a single Communist is now working for the Government.

My fellow Pennsylvanians, think for a moment how much damage could be caused by that loose and careless statement.

It is no secret that loyalty investigations are being conducted in many departments of the Government. It is well known that the FBI is making secret check-ups. It has been stated that Federal grand juries have been considering some cases.

And here is the Attorney General saying, in effect: "There is no need to search for Communist disloyalty. Among the 2,000,000 men and women on the Government payrolls we don't have a single Communist."

I say, my friends, that the chief law officer of this Nation, at a time when these investigations are going on, had no right to make a remark like that.

I say he would serve the Nation better if he gave less time to such speeches and more time to suggesting ways of strengthening the espionage laws of our Nation, to protect us from traitors.

And now let us turn to the Amerasia case. For those of you who don't recall the details, let me remind you briefly:

In June of 1945, six people were arrested in connection with the theft and transmission from the State Department of certain "classified" documents.

They contained information concerning the activities of the State Department, the Office of Naval Intelligence, the Military Intelligence Division, Office of Strategic Services, and the Office of War Information.

Remember, we were at war at that time. And keep in mind also that papers referred to as "classified" are marked "secret," "top secret," and "confidential."

The charges were watered down. One defendant, Philip J. Jaffe, editor of a pro-Communist publication called Amerasia, got off with a $2,500 fine. It was held that he had merely collected the documents as background material to write articles for his magazine.

Another, named Larsen, a far eastern expert in the State Department, paid a $500 fine. The rest were cleared.

Two things stand out in connection with that case.

The first is that while the FBI thought it had a very strong case, the Justice Department insisted it was a weak case and that even the actions of Jaffe and Larsen, and I quote directly from the court record, "did not involve any element of disloyalty."

The second point is that the Government minimized the nature of the stolen documents. The Government claimed they were trifling, unimportant papers which were not really secrets at all. The Government speedily buried the Amerasia case and thought it would stay buried

And to this very day, they are insisting that the stolen documents were only small stuff.

I am going to list for you some of the papers which were found in the office of Amerasia magazine during the FBI raid.

There were two State Department documents marked "Top secret."

There were 20 original State Department papers and 14 copies of other State Department documents, all classified as "Secret."

There were two original OSS documents. There were two Naval Intelligence documents "Secret."

There were nine documents from Military Intelligence labeled "Secret." There were three OWI secret documents. Then there were dozens of papers labeled "Confidential."

When Larsen was arrested and his home raided, the FBI found 19 copies of State Department papers, 7 Naval Intelligence documents, 2 papers from Military Intelligence, and 2 War Department documents, all marked "Secret." And there were dozens of other papers from all these Departments and agencies labeled "Confidential."

This, mind you, was during the war. When our people first learned that the papers had been taken from the State Department files, high Government officials said it was not serious.

They declared "a lot of that stuff is nothing but bits of information about China, Korea, and India, of no value to any foreign country."

They are still putting up that argument down here in Washington. It seems to me anyone should know the answer to that now. Certainly, informed people should have known the answer in the middle of 1945.

We all know how the Russians armed the Chinese Communists and supported them in the drive to take over China from the anti-Communist regime of Chiang Kai-shek.

No wonder they knew how far they could go. No wonder they moved so surely and so boldly. No wonder they couldn't be bluffed or fooled. Imagine having such a mass of secret information about the attitude of our State Department and our armed forces in China and all of east Asia.

Let, even today, after all that has happened, there are those in high places in Washington who contend that the material was worthless.

Now let me move up a year to 1946, when a special House committee investigated the Amerasia shame in secret session.

At the conclusion of the hearings the committee made a report in which the Democratic majority approved the administration stand of a weak case.

One Republican member of the committee was ill. The other two filed strong dissenting reports, charging there was disloyalty and that the case should be reopened. The majority report did state that wartime security in the State Department was practically nil and that anyone could walk out of the place with secret documents.

The testimony before this committee, given behind closed doors, was impounded and not disclosed. Recently, as the pressure to look once more into the Amerasia case became stronger, the testimony was made public for the first time.

Let me tell you some of the interesting things which were not disclosed in 1945 when two men got off with small fines and four other persons went scot free.

First, it was disclosed that little Amerasia magazine, with about 2,000 circulation, had a large back room equipped with machinery to copy documents in large quantities. Operatives of our Government discovered that photo copies had been made of many of the secret stolen documents.

Now, my friends, can anybody suggest why a loyal publication would be making quantities of copies of Government documents marked "secret" and "top secret."

And the FBI files show that Jaffe, the man who ran the publication, was a member of many Communist-front organizations and had been many times in communication with Communist leaders.

Second, the State Department's own security officer, appearing before the House committee in 1946, was asked whether possession of the stolen documents by any outsider would be a serious threat to the security of the United States.

He replied, and I quote:

"Very definitely. There is no question about that."

Does that sound as though these documents marked "secret" and "top secret" were worthless?

One high official of the FBI testifying at those closed hearings said there was no doubt that Philip Jaffe, who ran Amerasia, had access to almost everything in the files of the Government wartime agencies.

Does that sound as though the Amerasia case was something to be brushed off and hushed up? Or should the Government have dug right down to the bottom, exposing every dark corner to the light?

Now we know that Alger Hiss was part of one ring stealing documents from the State Department. And at the Hiss trials, a former State Department man named Julian Wadleigh admitted that he was part of still another ring stealing documents from the State Department for Russian agents.

We know that Judy Coplon was found guilty of dealing with a Russian agent to betray Government secrets.

Here in the Amerasia case is a fourth example of a leak as wide as the Mississippi River through which secret documents poured out into unauthorized hands.

The American people have a right to know whether there was a fifth and a sixth and a seventh leak. They have a right to know whether disloyal rings operated in other departments and agencies as well, or whether their activities were confined to the State Department.

And furthermore they have a right to demand that their Government make a complete investigation and not a whitewash.

My own fight against communism is well known to you. I was in the thick of the fight when many of our people were unaware of the danger. In those days those of us who denounced communism as a menace to American freedom were ridiculed and called red baiters.

Even as recently as 1947, President Truman, in a letter to former Gov. George H. Earle, of Pennsylvania, wrote, and I quote:

"People are wrought up about the Communist bugaboo, but I am of the opinion that the country is perfectly safe as far as communism is concerned."

My fellow Pennsylvanians, if our country is to be made perfectly safe against communism, there must be no whitewash this time. There must be a full and complete disclosure. We must know where we stand. We must be assured of a thorough housecleaning in our Government.

This is ED MARTIN speaking to you from the Nation's Capital. I will be with you again in 2 weeks. Thank you for your attention.

The 15 Top Men in the United States of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY P. CAIN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, Merryle Stanley Rukeyser, International News Service economic commentator, recently offered his judgment on 15 prominent American leaders. This evaluation appeared in the Seattle Post-Intelligencer.

Among the named leaders is Frank McLaughlin, of Seattle, a close personal friend of mine. Others named are colleagues of ours, and good friends, too.

I ask unanimous consent that the Rukeyser comments be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, where they can be applauded by those who share Mr. Rukeyser's views.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE 15 TOP MEN IN UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

(By Merryle Stanley Rukeyser)

Who are the top men who are running the United States of America?

The question was raised in an inquiry from James R. Young, associate editor of the Anderson (S. C.) Daily Mail, who planned to discuss the subject in a civic club talk.

I think the significant personalities are not necessarily those in big posts. Sometimes the individuals at the top are creatures of circumstances, and depend heavily on the ideas and guidance of others. Sometimes the front-line thinkers are in inconspicuous posts. On the other hand, much publicized men frequently turn out to be little men in big jobs.

It seems to me that the subjoined have been making significant contributions to the survival of the American competitive system:

1. Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, president of Columbia University, for his meritorious postwar service in interpreting the American system in terms of liberalism and human freedom. He has been at the forefront of the battle against statism and collectivism.

2. Gen. Douglas MacArthur for his majesty of expression and sureness of execution of carefully thought-out programs in war and in peace.

3. Bernard M. Baruch, financier, philanthropist, and wise counselor of Presidents. Mr. Baruch has rare gifts of timing, of foresight, and of reducing complicated situations to simple terms.

4. Albert Einstein, physicist extraordinary, at Princeton University, whose creative imagination laid the basis for revolutionary explorations in the realm of atomic energy.

5. Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, who, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Nonessential Federal Expenditures, has through the years hewed to the line in behalf of national solvency and prudence.

6. Senator WALTER F. GEORGE, Democrat of Georgia, who with Senator BYRD and others has provided a common sense voice in the Senate, especially in matters relating to taxation and governmental finances.

7. Senator ROBERT A. TAFT of Ohio, Republican Senate leader, who as the antithesis of a demagog prefers to meet issues rather than

dodge them, and who had the courage to utter unpopular truths.

8. Alfred P. Sloan, Jr., chairman of the General Motors Corp., for his monumental work in building the world's No. 1 automobile company Mr. Sloan's special genius has been in recognizing that the benefits of improving efficiency and better technology should be distributed among customers, workers, and stockholders.

9. Herman W. Steinkraus, president of the Bridgeport Brass Co. and president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, for his forthrightness in affirmative presentation of the merits of the American competitive system.

10. Fred J. Emmerich, president of Allied Chemical & Dye Corp., for his exemplification of the great value in the modern corporation of the comptroller's factual approach to the dynamic problems of business.

11. Ludwig von Mises, a new American, formerly head of the Austrian School of Economics, for his masterly theoretical proof that Marxism is reactionary and that modern capitalism is the creator of liberty and material advancement. His newest tome, "Human Action," is an effective antidote to Marx's "Capital" and John Maynard Keynes' "The General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money."

12. T. Coleman Andrews, Richmond, Va., accountant and former director of the General Accounting Office of the United States, for his revealing official audit of Tennessee Valley Authority, which debunked the pretense that it was a yardstick for measuring private utility companies.

13. Senator GEORGE W. MALONE, Republican, of Nevada, for his level-headedness in avoiding the bandwagon of internationalism. He ruggedly seeks to relate international economic policies to the needs and welfare of the domestic economy.

14. Father Edward A. Keller, director of the bureau of economic research at Notre Dame, for his development of a technique for analyzing contemporary social and economic trends in terms of simple, double-entry bookkeeping.

15. Frank McLaughlin, president of the Puget Sound Power & Light Co. of Seattle, for his unremitting effort to demonstrate to fellow corporate executives that the risks of positive expression may be less than the hazards of cowardly failure to face issues. Mr. McLaughlin has been a pioneer in the use of concept advertising.

The Missouri Valley Authority—Article From Burdick's Magazine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in North Dakota, there has been such a false and vicious campaign against the Missouri Valley Authority—commonly called the MVA by the Power Trust and their friends—that I am happy to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article written by Representative USHER L. BURDICK. For clearness, conciseness, and truth, the article is unequaled.

The Nonpartisan League for years has constantly advocated MVA; and it has been endorsed by its candidates on the Republican ticket, headed by T. H. H. Thoresen, for Senator; Usher L. Burdick and Martin Stenehjem, for Congress; and Frank A. Vogel, for governor, all of whom has supported the MVA.

I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled, "The Truth About the Missouri Valley Authority," which appeared in USHER L. BURDICK's magazine for May-June 1950, may be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TRUTH ABOUT THE MISSOURI VALLEY AUTHORITY

In North Dakota there are a great many against an MVA, and also many for it. I shall give my reasons for supporting the enterprise:

First of all, the Tennessee Valley Authority was put through Congress with intense opposition—not from the people, but from the Power Trust. Many faults were found with it, but principally the charge of "interference with private business." Right here, it must be remembered that this is not strictly a private business, but a great public business. When this great enterprise was started, the power rates in the South were prohibitive, running as high as 8 cents per kilowatt-hour, but today the same service is being delivered for 1 cent per kilowatt-hour. Along with REA, the Southern States are being electrified completely and it is a known fact that this cheap power has put the Southern States back on the map. More industrial development is now in progress in the South than in any part of the United States.

TVA'S COST YARDSTICK

Not only has TVA delivered cheap power, but it has developed a yardstick of costs that the private power companies have been compelled to consider in other sections. Today there are four of these great public enterprises furnishing power and the yardstick for a considerable section of our country.

They are:

The Tennessee Valley Authority; Tacoma, Wash., municipal.

The Bonneville power; and in Canada, the Ontario Authority.

Had the Tennessee Authority rates been in use in North Dakota in 1948, there would have been a saving to the people of $6,922,513.

Had the Tacoma, Wash., rates been in use in North Dakota for the same year, there would have been a saving of $7,304,898.

Had the Bonneville rates been used in North Dakota, the saving would have been $5,960,139.

Had the Ontario rates been used in North Dakota, there would have been a saving of $7,541,751.

Taking an average of all these authority prices for North Dakota, there would have been a saving of $6,932,325.

Remember also that today the people of the United States are paying $2,000,000,000 more in power rates than they should pay, and that without these authorities the people would be paying $4,000,000,000 more than they should.

As other public power authorities are created, the rates to the consumers everywhere will be reduced. Sharply reduced in areas covered by the authorities and much reduced in other sections where private power companies are compelled by these authorities' rates to reduce them.

The stock objection to these public power enterprises is that they not only interfered with private business, but it created another bureaucratic set-up that can defy not only the people, but the Government as well. There is no foundation, whatever, to this charge for the reason that public power is not a private enterprise, but a public one, and the directors of an authority are appointed by the President with the consent of the Senate, and can be removed at any time.

Pope Offers Plea for Social Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 6, 1950

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, the fight against communism cannot be won by merely building more armaments and making speeches of vituperation. The fight must be directed against poverty, hunger, injustice, disease, and unfair exploitation. We can no longer shut our eyes and say that what goes on in the rest of the world is none of our business. Likewise we should be on the alert against those who insist on throwing dead cats in our backyard. By that I mean all of those reactionary, backward, and repudiated rulers in the world who will not institute reforms demanded by their people, and finally when the people have lost all confidence in them, come running to us for money and help, with the cry that the Communists are after them.

We can win our fight against communism with the expenditure of very few dollars if we insist on social justice, and oppose human exploitation wherever we find it. No people desire to be shackled by communism.

I wish to submit an article which appeared in the New York Times, Sunday, June 4:

POPE OFFERS PLEA FOR SOCIAL JUSTICE

ROME, June 3.—Pope Pius today called upon people and governments to pool their resources in a world-wide campaign to bring about social justice and halt the march of atheism and materialism that might ultimately lead to a shooting war.

In making this appeal the Pope, according to Vatican circles, clearly indicated that he supported the United States economic policy in Europe, which has been advocating the removal of all restrictions to trade to bring about better exploitation of resources by all nations participating in the Marshall plan.

If this is not done, Pope Pius said in an address, there is a possibility that countless millions of people, lured by demagogs and false promises, will revolt against the existing social order.

"Only a coalition of all people of good will in the whole world, for large-scale action loyally and harmoniously carried out, can bring a remedy," he said. "This is the way in which one of the most preoccupying factors in the international situation can be eliminated—one which more than any other is feeding today the ruinous cold war and threatens to unleash a hot war, a burning incomparably more disastrous war."

SOCIAL JUSTICE NEEDED

The lack of social justice, Pope Pius declared, had made disgruntled and impoverished people a fertile breeding ground for "the spirit of evil," which Vatican officials said was in this case the papal synonym for communism. For that reason unemployment

was "the most urgent problem, which weighs like a nightmare" upon all old industrial countries, the pontiff declared.

The question then, he continued, was that of attaining a normal productivity capable of securing steady employment—a just, vital space for workers adequate to and compatible with the dignity of a man.

A healthy production, wisely adjusted to consumption and to the needs of the people instead of an economic policy that selfishly seeks to exploit material resources for pure gain and without paying heed to the needs of the human family is the surest way to bring about social improvement, the Pope said.

A sound economic policy can be followed without destroying the right of private property, which is upheld by Roman Catholic social doctrine, he declared.

PLEA FOR SOCIAL BENEFITS

He stated the workers should receive social benefits and the opportunity of improving their condition to the greatest possible degree without, however, forcing the employer to relinquish control of the means of production to place them under collective ownership.

Those who wish to push social policy further in this direction, "strike against a limit where the danger arises that the working class may follow the errors of capital," which consisted in the creation of large cartels. These big industries also eliminated private ownership, which they transferred to anonymous trusts.

"A Socialist mentality would accommodate itself very well to such a situation," the Pope said. "But this development would disquiet those who know the fundamental importance of private property in promoting initiative and determining responsibility in the economic field."

The removal of the danger inherent in atheism and materialism, the pontiff declared, can be attained if men act in "the spirit of justice, love, and peace." The church, he continued, which has foreseen that danger, is already doing whatever it can to alleviate suffering and therefore must be aided and supported by all those who are likewise fighting or will fight against social injustice.

Reconstruction Finance Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1950

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, with permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am happy to attach an analysis made by Fiduciary Counsel, Inc., of the activities of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The Counsel is a truth-seeking organization whose job it is to get all the facts possible regarding particular subjects and present them in an unbiased manner. The attached analysis of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is presented in exactly that manner. I was particularly impressed by the following statement appearing in the analysis: "Looking back on the Corporation's record, it is evident that under the guidance of its directors and officers its functions have been performed at a substantial profit and the over-all aid rendered to the economy far outweighs the relatively small number of objectionable situations."

The analysis of current operations of the Corporation was made through the fiscal year ended June 30, 1949, and balances shown in the analysis are as of that date.

I have obtained from the Corporation additional significant statistics for the first 10 months of the current fiscal year which are as follows: 4,499 business loans aggregating $454,226,000 have been approved during these 10 months; 50 percent of these were for $25,000 or less, and 88 percent were for $100,000 or less.

During this same period Federal National Mortgage Association, a subsidiary of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, has made commitments to purchase $1,765,907,000 of home mortgages guaranteed by the Veterans' Administration or insured by the Federal Housing Administration. Actual purchases during this period have aggregated $760,982,000. The Association's and RFC's program of reselling these mortgages to private investors has been progressively successful during the current fiscal year and through May 19, 1950, approximately $226,000,000 of sales have been closed at premiums aggregating approximately $2,000,000.

Net earnings of the Corporation during these 10 months have been approximately $23,025,000 after making provision for estimated future losses of $7,613,000. The net earnings include $14,075,746 earned by Federal National Mortgage Association. Total loans and securities outstanding as of April 30, 1950, were approximately $1,900,694,000, exclusive of foreign loans and other assets amounting to $230,580,000.

Since preparation of the attached analysis, salaries of the Directors of the Corporation have been changed by Public Law 359 to $15,000 per annum with the salary of the Chairman of the Board fixed at $16,000 per annum. All employees of the Corporation are now under the Classification Act.

The analysis follows:

THE RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

SUMMARY

Since organization in 1932, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation (the RFC) has been engaged in a wide range of constructive activities. Most notable, of course, was the assistance rendered to banks during the depression years following the crash in 1929. In the period 1932–38, loans aggregating $1,300,000,000 up to 5,816 going banks were authorized, of which $1,100,000,000 was used. In addition, the Corporation purchased a total of $1,100,000,000 of preferred stock, capital notes, and debentures in 6,139 banks. Moreover, loans were authorized to 2,773 closed banks, and $984,000,000 was advanced to institutions of this type for distribution to depositors. This aid was of considerable importance in bringing about a sound banking structure, which in turn was a prerequisite for the economy's recovery.

Throughout its life, however, one of its primary purposes has been to extend loans to business enterprises. Few, if any, of the requests for loans have originated from businesses carrying prime credit ratings since these were handled by private banks. Thus, most of the Corporation's loan activities involved situations carrying relatively high elements of risk. Although it has operated under such conditions, the RFC's loan record has been exceedingly good. Practically every financial institution in the country has losses from loans and the RFC is no exception. However, the actual loss ratio experienced by the Corporation has been relatively low. For instance, since 1932, on all types of loans and investments totaling roughly $10,000,000,000, net losses have been less than five-tenths of 1 percent. For business loans in its loss ratio has been about six-tenths of 1 percent.

Activities have been quite profitable and since inception net income before reserves has amounted to $559,000,000. The Corporation has taken a very conservative stand in regard to setting up reserves against future losses. As of June 30, 1949, total reserves for this purpose amounted to about $89,000,000. During the past year about 53 percent of earnings, or $9,200,000, was earmarked for this purpose, which in turn represented 1.4 percent of basic risk assets outstanding. Thus, it is seen that the Corporation is in a position to absorb relatively large losses (such as appears probable in the case of Lustron) without impairing its financial position. In accordance with the RFC Act, as amended, the Corporation in July 1948 retired, by payment of $225,000,000 to the United States Treasury, its capital stock in excess of the $100,000,000 authorized. Moreover, in December of the same year it paid $307,000,000 to the Treasury which represented dividends on its capital stock. The financial results mentioned above clearly refute the claim made from time to time that the Corporation loses the taxpayers' money.

Public reaction to the Corporation varies widely. Because of its political aspects it is very often difficult to find a truly unbiased opinion. It should be recognized that the RFC was created by and now operates under legislation passed by Congress. Therefore, the Corporation as an entity should be judged primarily on the following basis: Has it performed a beneficial service to the economy and has it carried out its functions as stipulated under the various acts? Looking back on the Corporation's record, it is evident that under the guidance of its directors and officers its functions have been performed at a substantial profit and the over-all aid rendered to the economy far outweighs the relatively small number of objectionable situations. This is borne out by a review of the various phases of the Corporation's life.

EARLY ACTIVITIES

At the beginning of the 1930 depression years, the shortage of available credit was considered one of the important stumbling blocks to recovery. In order to open up new sources of credit and thereby help to alleviate this condition, the RFC was created by Congress during the latter part of the Hoover administration in January 1932. Operations began in February 1932 and at the onset, its functions consisted of making loans to banks and other financial institutions, insurance companies, agricultural credit agencies, and railroads. With the exception of advances made to railroads, direct loans to business were not made. Later in the 1930's, it became apparent that there was a need for credit in other fields. As a result Congress broadened the Corporation's functions considerably. For example, additional legislation gave it the authority to purchase preferred stock of banks and insurance companies and the capital stock of agricultural credit corporations and national mortgage associations; to make loans to business enterprises, mining interests, agricultural improvement districts, and public school authorities, and to assist in financing the construction of public works and self-liquidating projects.

During this early period (1932–38) the work accomplished by the Corporation was of definite aid to the economy. Most notable, of course, was the assistance rendered banks. In this period, loans aggregating $1,300,000,000 to 5,816 going banks were authorized, of which $1,100,000,000 was used. Although 2,128 of these institutions failed after receiving aid, the remainder, or 3,688, were enabled to continue. In addition, the Corporation purchased a total of $1,100,000,000 of preferred stock, capital notes, and debentures in 6,139 banks. Loans were authorized to 2,773 closed banks, and during this period $984,000,000 was made available to these types of institutions for distribution to depositors. Many other sections of the economy were also aided. Loans were made to railroads, insurance companies, savings banks, and building and loan associations. Considerable assistance was given to States, municipalities, and school districts which made possible the construction of many useful projects, such as highways, aqueducts, bridges, housing developments, and schools.

THE WAR PERIOD

During the defense and war periods, Congress again broadened the powers of the RFC in order for it to carry out various programs deemed essential to the national defense and war effort. These functions, carried out mainly through subsidiary companies, included financing plant conversions and construction, providing war-production facilities, acquiring critical and strategic materials, paying subsidies deemed necessary by other governmental agencies and numerous other undertakings. During 1947, these wartime powers were terminated and at the present time all of these activities except the operation of the rubber and tin programs have either been liquidated or are in the process of liquidation.

CURRENT STATUS

Public Law 548, Eightieth Congress, which was approved during May 1948 constitutes the basic legislation under which the RFC presently exercises its loan functions. This legislation, which extended the life of the Corporation to June 30, 1956, set its capital structure, stipulated the purposes for which it was continued and defined its authorizations and lending limits. Capital was set at a maximum of $350,000,000, comprised of $100,000,000 of capital stock, owned by the Treasury of the United States with the balance, $250,000,000, representing surplus. Any surplus accumulated in excess of this amount is required to be paid to the United States Treasury in the form of dividends on its capital stock. As stated in the law the Corporation's primary purpose was defined as follows: "To aid in financing agriculture, commerce, and industry, to encourage small business, to help in maintaining the economic stability of the country and to assist in promoting maximum employment and production." In order to carry out its operations, the Corporation was given a wide range of authority (within certain limitations) to engage in the following loan activities:

1. To purchase the obligations of and make loans, directly or in participation with banks, to business enterprises, including railroads and air carriers.

2. To make loans to financial institutions.

3. To subscribe for or make loans upon the nonassessable stock of insurance companies, or to purchase capital notes or debentures of insurance companies. Limit—$15,000,000 outstanding at any one time.

4. To purchase the obligations of or make loans to States, municipalities, political subdivisions or public agencies. Limit—$200,000,000 outstanding at any one time.

5. To make loans deemed necessary because of floods or other catastrophes. Limit—$40,000,000 outstanding at any one time.

The aggregate of commitments for all of the above activities cannot exceed $3,500,000,000 at any one time. Within the over-all limits there is no restriction as to the amount which may be advanced to any one borrower. The specific lending authorities extend to June 30, 1954.

Congress also gave the RFC the authority to make loans to or purchase the obligations of businesses engaged in prefabricated housing and in large-scale modernized site construction of housing. A limit of $50,000,000 in commitments at any one time was placed on this category.

Through its only subsidiary, the Federal National Mortgage Association, the Corporation maintains a secondary market for mortgages on homes and rental housing projects insured by the FHA or guaranteed by the Veterans' Administration. By purchase of these mortgages, principally from mortgage companies, banks and other financial institutions, additional mortgage credit is made available to regular channels.

In addition to the above operations, the Corporation is also responsible for the following activities:

The tin program: In 1947 and 1948 the RFC was directed, by specific legislation, to continue the Government's tin program until June 30, 1951. Under this program the Corporation is responsible for the operation of the Government-owned tin smelter at Texas City, Tex., and for other related activities. Moreover, it is required to finance research in tin smelting and processing. The tin program was adopted early in the war in order to insure an adequate supply of this essential material. At the present time operations serve to maintain stand-by facilities in addition to providing a source of supply.

The rubber program: The Rubber Act of 1948 provided for the maintenance of synthetic rubber facilities and required that a minimum amount be produced and consumed each year. In addition, it was stipulated that research activities in this field should be continued. The President of the United States was given the power to carry out the provisions of this legislation. He, in turn, placed the operating functions in the hands of the RFC. Although the RFC has the authority to run the various Government-owned plants, they are at present operated mainly by private companies. This program is also designed primarily to provide standby facilities and as such it is an integral part of our defense program.

THE CORPORATION—ORGANIZATION AND LOAN PROCEDURE

Operations are carried out through its headquarters in Washington, D. C., and 31 regional agencies located throughout the country. The management is vested in a Board of Directors consisting of five persons appointed by the President of the United States by and with the consent of the Senate. No more than three members are permitted to be of one political party. The directors' salaries are set at $12,500 per annum, while that of the Chairman of the Board is fixed at $15,000 per annum. The process of placing all employees under Civil Service is being completed. Salaries are thus limited by over-all civil service policies. Aside from the Directors, the two top salaries are paid to the General Counsel and to the Special Assistant to the Board of Directors, both of whom receive $12,500 per year. Other salaries range up to a limit of $10,330 per annum. At the end of the last fiscal year, employees numbered about 4,600, of which approximately 3,100 were assigned to the 31 agencies.

Requests for loans originate primarily at the regional offices and they are authorized to approve all advances up to $100,000. Commitments of $100,000 and over require the approval of the Washington office. In accordance with the act, certain standards should be met before a loan is approved. It must be shown that the borrower tried to obtain the loan through regular channels, but was unable to obtain the loan on reasonable terms. Moreover, the loans should be of such sound value or so secured as to reasonably assure retirement or repayment. In addition, loans cannot have a maturity beyond 10 years, except in the case of loans to States or other political subdivisions, in which case they may run for 40 years.

From the above it is apparent that most of the requests for loans originate from parties who are unable to obtain reasonable terms from private sources. Since this is considered so important, what may be termed unreasonable? Usually, this involves either the rate, term, or collateral. The RFC does not make a loan merely because a higher rate, i. e., above the RFC 4 percent, is demanded by private sources. It should be shown that for the risk involved, the RFC rate is more in line with comparable risks. Many requests for loans are made because the term (maturity) offered by the private source is not acceptable to the individual business. In practice, the RFC appears more willing to grant longer terms on loans for working-capital purposes.

Since the Corporation does not strive to underbid commercial banks in the loan field, it cannot be classified as a true competitor. Moreover, it cannot be said that the RFC accepts just any loan refused by private banks. This is made clear by comparing the number of business loans authorized with the number requested. Although there is a lapse of time between application and approval, it is estimated that roughly 51 percent of the business loans applied for during fiscal year 1949 were turned down. Actually, commercial banks are often able to make loans by virtue of the RFC's participation in the transaction. Moreover, through its financial counsel, the RFC advises business concerns on management and financial problems. As a result of this aid, many firms are then able to establish credit lines in private channels.

Funds for the Corporation's loaning activities are obtained from its authorized capital and surplus of $350,000,000 and borrowings from the United States Treasury. There is no limit on the amount which may be borrowed, although it is clear that the Corporation's lending limits serve as an indirect ceiling. The Secretary of the Treasury fixes the rate on these borrowings, after giving consideration to the average interest costs on outstanding United States Government marketable obligations. Over the last announced period, this rate was set at 2 percent.

CURRENT OPERATIONS

The RFC is now one of the largest lending units in the country. On a consolidated basis, outstanding loans and securities held (which largely reflect loans) amounted to $1,250,000,000. By comparison, loans and discounts of the three largest private banks in the country at the end of 1949 amounted to $2,801,000,000, $1,381,000,000, and $1,350,000,000, respectively.

Business loans: During the fiscal year ended June 30, 1949, the Corporation approved 3,509 loans aggregating $348,900,000. Banks participated in 1,261 or 36 percent of these loans for an additional $39,600,000. A large number of the loans granted were to small businesses, evidenced by the fact that of the 3,509 loans authorized, about 52 percent were for less than $25,000, and 88 percent were for less than $100,000. The amounts involved, however, reflect a different picture. Of the loans authorized, 93 of them (3 percent) accounted for $200,400,000, or 57 percent of the total amount made available. Nevertheless, the above figures clearly bring out the fact that considerable assistance was given

to small business. Loans granted during this period were used primarily for expansion of facilities and working capital. Nearly 68 percent of the loans made was to manufacturing enterprises, while the balance was made to nonmanufacturing businesses.

Public agency loans: The importance of this activity has declined materially since the depression years of the 1930's. As of June 30, 1949, outstanding loans and securities of this type amounted to only $30,000,000. More recently, however, the Corporation experienced a sharp upturn in the demand for these loans and it is probable that they will approach the $200,000,000 limitation very shortly.

Catastrophe loans: In the past fiscal year the Corporation declared the existence of 20 emergencies resulting from major disasters. During this period 605 loans were made for a total of $3,800,000. A large portion of these advances were made to borrowers in the Columbia River area, where extensive damage resulted from floods.

Federal National Mortgage Association: This subsidiary has been very active in purchasing home mortgages insured by the Federal Housing Administration or guaranteed by the Veterans' Administration. During its fiscal year ended June 30, 1949, the Association purchased approximately 63,000 mortgages having a principal value of $423,500,000. This compared with a net increase in holdings of only $46,000,000 during the previous year. It is the Association's intention to resell its mortgage holdings to financial institutions. Although none were sold up to June 30, 1949, a small number were disposed of since that date. A review of a recent list of offerings showed that 4½-percent mortgages were offered at a premium of 2 points, while the 4 percent liens carried a premium of around one-half to five-eighths of a point.

Finances: Operations during the past fiscal year continued on a profitable basis. Consolidated net earnings for fiscal year 1949 amounted to $8,100,000 after deducting $9,200,000 as provision for losses. This figure includes net earnings of $2,900,000 resulting from operations of its subsidiary, the Federal National Mortgage Association. These figures do not include the results of the rubber and tin programs. During this period, operations of the rubber program resulted in a net loss of $702,000, which figure, however, included expenditures of $2,300,000 for maintenance and protection of stand-by plants and facilities. Operations of the tin program resulted in a net profit of about $8,000,000.

Total loans and securities held amounted to $1,254,000,000 against which it held $89,000,000 as reserves for losses. Other balance sheet items consisted mainly of cash $8,300,000, loans to Great Britain and the Philippines aggregating $174,000,000, and various other assets amounting to $62,900,000.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS, RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Harley Hise, chairman; age 60. Democrat; entered Government service as a clerk in 1913. Was examiner, then chief examiner, of the Federal Farm Loan Board. Later, went to the west coast to accept the position of vice president and manager of the Pacific Coast Joint Stock Land Bank of San Francisco. Afterward these banks as a group were liquidated by the Government and he worked in this field until 1938. In the intervening period he became associated with various real estate firms on the west coast and from 1927–29 was vice president of the American Trust Co. in San Francisco. In November 1940 the Governor of California appointed him custodian of accounts of the Pacific States Savings & Loan Corp. In addition, he was named State building and loan commissioner. The period from January 1943 to July 1947 was devoted largely to personal affairs, after which he was appointed director of the RFC. Presently he is director of Federal National Mortgage Association; director, Western Pacific Railroad.

Walter Lee Dunham, age 68; Republican; early work in the banking field included the position as vice president in the Highland Park State Bank, Detroit, Mich., after which he became vice president of the Dimes Savings Bank, Detroit. He was also president of the Detroit Savings Bank and president of the Detroit Clearing House Association. Appointment to the RFC was made in 1949. Presently, president, Walter L. Dunham Co., Inc.; vice president and director, General Foundry Co.; vice president and director, Bostick Foundry Co.; director, United States Commercial Co.

Harvey J. Gunderson, age 44; Republican; graduate of University of South Dakota, member of the bar of that State. Came with the RFC in 1932 as legal counsel and in 1941 made assistant general counsel. In 1937 he was appointed general counsel for the Disaster Loan Corp. In successive stages from 1940–45 he served as assistant general counsel, general counsel, and executive vice president and general counsel for the Metals Reserve Company of Washington, D. C. Appointed a director of the RFC in 1945. Presently, director, Federal National Mortgage Association.

Henry A. Mulligan, age 63; Democrat. At the start of his career he was assistant engineer Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co., after which he was a liquidator for the United States Customs in New York. In 1920 he was an auditor with the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, following which he became auditor, later chief auditor, of the War Finance Corporation. From 1927–32 he served as examiner, later chief examiner, for the Federal Farm Loan Bureau. He came with RFC in 1932 as assistant treasurer and was later made treasurer. He was appointed a director of the Corporation in July 1941, Presently director, Federal National Mortgage Association.

William E. Willett, age 54; Democrat. Early employment was as a bank clerk and from 1920–31 was engaged in the banking and investment business. Appointed a national bank receiver in 1932 and became a district supervisor for the Comptroller of the Currency in 1933. Came to RFC in May 1934 as an examiner, later became assistant chief, examining division. From 1933–47 he was a special assistant to chairman of board and in June 1948 was appointed director of Corporation. Presently director, Federal National Mortgage Association.

Statistical analysis, Reconstruction Finance Corporation (consolidated basis)

[In thousands of dollars]

	June 30, 1949	June 30, 1948	June 30, 1947
NET EARNINGS			
Before provision for losses	17,350	29,087	33,900
After provision for losses	8,131	21,411	19,836
Provisions for losses	9,219	7,676	14,064
BALANCE-SHEET ITEMS			
ASSETS			
Cash	8,263	129,263	265,621
Loans, securities and related receivables (net)	1,176,244	817,318	704,491
Loans to foreign governments:			
Great Britain	114,001	155,162	187,536
Philippines	60,003	60,003	60,003
Loans to and securities of U. S. Government agencies		41,339	892,445
Other assets	62,922	42,589	35,966
Total	1,421,433	1,245,674	2,146,062

Statistical analysis, Reconstruction Finance Corporation (consolidated basis)—Con.

[In thousands of dollars]

	June 30, 1949	June 30, 1948	June 30, 1947
LIABILITIES			
Capital stock held by U. S. Treasury	[1] 100,000	325,000	325,000
Surplus	[1] 250,000	559,320	551,901
Reserve for contingencies	6,340	15,864	
Notes payable to U. S. Treasury (net)	855,176		695,968
Other liabilities payable to U. S. Government agencies	126,873	234,729	352,029
Liabilities to the public	70,527	104,930	214,480
Special reserves	12,517	5,831	6,684
Total	1,421,433	1,245,674	2,146,062

[1] Decrease from 1948 reflects repayment of $225,000,000 of capital stock and transfer of $307,000,000 of surplus to the U. S. Treasury.

REGARDING FIDUCIARY COUNSEL, INC.

1. Fiduciary Counsel spends approximately half a million dollars annually on financial research and investment management. It is a truth-seeking organization. Its job is to get all of the facts possible which affect business, securities, and the stock market and interpret these facts for the purpose of protecting its clients' investments, rather than merely presenting what they like to read. It must be 100-percent unbiased in its studies and conclusions.

2. This money is spent and this information is gathered to protect the investments of less than 100 of the most distinguished families in America. Their investments total over half a billion dollars. This large aggregate fund and the small number of clients permits the most intensive work possible. Naturally, unusual results follow.

3. You may be helped by reading "Protecting Your Capital Against All Hazards." Simply request it from Fiduciary Counsel, Inc., 40 Wall Street, New York 5, N. Y.

Secretary of Defense Johnson Addresses the Graduating Class at Annapolis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1950

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including an address delivered by Hon. Louis Johnson, Secretary of Defense, before the graduating class of the Naval Academy at Annapolis on Friday, June 2, 1950.

In that address Secretary Johnson pointed out the fact that the Navy, working harmoniously with the Army and the Air Force, will give our country strength, and with that strength will come peace and honor.

The address referred to follows:

"The way of an eagle in the air."

"The way of a ship in the midst of the sea."

Gentlemen of the graduating class of the United States Naval Academy, you have chosen a career where you must make it your primary concern to learn the wonders of these two ways.

You have made an admirable start. You have met the rigid, physical, mental and

moral tests of the United States Naval Academy and have proved your right to take a place of honor and leadership in the defense of our country. You have gained the privilege of being known for the rest of your lives as Naval Academy graduates, and that is a distinction that will always mean a great deal to you.

You have every reason to be proud of that distinction. In evaluating the quality of your preparation for your duties, the Service Academy Board had this to say recently about both Annapolis and West Point:

"The mission of the service academies is to provide undergraduate instruction, experience, and motivation to each student so that he will graduate with the knowledge, character, and the qualities of leadership required of a junior officer. The Board is impressed by the extent to which the existing academies are achieving the objectives of this mission, particularly in the field of character and leadership."

The full significance of that citation may be more firmly grasped when I remind you that the Service Board included, in addition to the two Academy superintendents, such distinguished American educators as: James P. Baxter, president of Williams College; Dwight D. Eisenhower, president of Columbia University; Frederick A. Middlebush, president of the University of Missouri; Edward L. Moreland, executive vice president, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; George D. Stoddard, president of the University of Illinois; and Robert L. Stearns, president of the University of Colorado, chairman. I know of no more competent judges of education than these men, either as individuals or as a group and their generous praise of the quality of your training should be a source of great satisfaction to you.

The primary mission of Annapolis is to produce well-equipped ensigns for sea, air, and shore duty, but in doing so it is not neglecting qualities of a good education—a familiarity with culture, with literature, and with history, with economics and with government. The report of the Teaching and Testing Methods Panel to the Service Academy Board offers its opinion that "Academically, the Academy compares favorably with the best 20 undergraduate civilian colleges in the country."

I welcome you, therefore, not only as junior officers in the Department of Defense, but as educated men in a dynamic world that calls for the soundest and the most courageous thinking. You are entering upon your career at a time when all basic values and even scientific facts are under close scrutiny and unceasing challenge. As officers you will have to meet many vital issues. I have every confidence that you will do so with an open mind—that you will search for the truth and find it, and that you will always act upon it with the courage and the integrity that have become so much a part of you as a result of your training at the United States Naval Academy.

You are entering upon a naval career at a time of great transition, and you will be privileged to play a vital role in the scientific revolution that will unfold itself. Your ability to meet each scientific challenge successfully, the country may take for granted. Revolutionary shifts from sail to steam, from wooden ships to ironclads, from surface to aircraft and submarines, too, are the kind of changes to which the United States Navy traditionally adjusted itself. And no one familiar with the ingenuity of the present generation doubts your ability to adjust yourself to atomic energy, jet power, or guided missiles.

Moreover, the quality of your training, and the proficiency you have gained have made you eligible for service not only as officers in the United States Navy, and the United States Marine Corps, but also in the United States Air Force.

I have every reason to feel that those among you who have chosen the Air Force as your branch of service will likewise meet all the scientific challenges that will confront you with a similar degree of success. The fact, let me add, that you are entering the Air Force by way of Annapolis instead of West Point, which has been the customary way in the past, I assure you will prove no bar, of any sort, to your advancement. Indeed, such interchange between services is not anything new—for years, and long before unification became a fact, Annapolis men have been finding useful, happy, and successful careers among their sister services. As an illustration, I cite the fact that the Army and the Air Force have had 12 general officers who attended the United States Naval Academy between 1910 and 1920. When the roll of air generals is called in 1980, I am confident that this graduating class will be well represented.

Moreover, you will find both in the Air Force and in the Navy, officers who have attended neither of our two great National Academies, who will prove themselves equal to any position of responsibility, trust, or authority within the assignment of the services. Because of their specialized training, Academy graduates are rightfully expected to set a high standard for the entire service, but you will find many non-Academy colleagues who will adapt themselves quickly, and in the long run reach some of the highest ranks.

In your climb up the ladder you will find that every effort is made to promote men on the basis of merit. Forget about luck as an element in your selection. A few pennies tossed at the base of Tecumseh were never enough to help you when you were a midshipman. They will not be enough while you are an officer. In fact, there may be no Tecumseh available for your prayer or appeal. If you devote yourself assiduously to your career, the rest will take care of itself—above all, don't neglect your studies—for they have only begun.

By studies, I mean not only the formal textbook and classroom variety, although you will have plenty of that, too. In fact, the life of the serviceman has become just one school after another. You not only must prove yourself a specialist in some field and more or less of an expert in many others of your own service, but more and more you must show an ability to participate in joint activities with other services and be prepared to take your responsibilities in positions of trust affecting all of our Armed Forces.

Unification of our Armed Forces is now a fact, and graduates of the Naval Academy are contributing wholeheartedly toward its full realization. I am not prepared to say that all differences among the services have been resolved or that none will ever arise again. In fact, toward that kind of unification none of us aspires. We appreciate that vigorous men with strong loyalties are bound to disagree on occasion, but we have a right to demand that ultimately, after adequate discussion, they will get together in the national interest and come to definite decisions that will bind them all.

I say without any hesitancy whatsoever that the spirit of unification has become a real and universal force throughout the services. The progress made in the year has exceeded our most sanguine expectations. And I am especially pleased to make this statement in the presence of your superintendent, Admiral Harry W. Hill. For he, as Director of the National War College, successfully served to inculcate the spirit of unification among a large number of top-flight officers of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force who took the course. Likewise his predecessor as Superintendent of the United States Naval Academy, Admiral James L. Holloway, has performed similar useful services in the interest of unification. He never lost an opportunity to promote its cause among you, and you, too, played your part admirably.

The comradeship, the understanding, the friendships that have grown among Annapolis and West Point men as a result of the "Camid" joint exercises, for instance, and the exchange of visits between the two academies, in the long run have done much to promote unification, to strengthen the common effort of all of our services for the establishment of a sound and adequate common defense. Our common defense includes not only our armed might but the spiritual quality of our American creed, dedicated to help man everywhere in his struggle against any sinister forces that would deprive him of life, and liberty, and deny him the right to achieve, in human dignity, happiness for himself and his family in the way of his own choice.

In your course at the Naval Academy you have been introduced to the study of our Government, and our political and economic institutions. This study you should continue throughout your life, and the adherence to the principles upon which they are based should guide you in your everyday conduct throughout your career.

Your study of our Government and a thorough understanding of our democracy will strengthen your faith in our country and enable you to marshal favorably its performance and its promise against any of the alien doctrines that would subvert them. We live in a world where communism has millions of adherents. Some are Communists by blind conviction; some by compulsion. But there they are—millions of them, and we cannot bury our heads in the sand and deny their existence, or their influence upon the present state of world affairs. In fact, the present size of our own Military Establishment is an example of how seriously nations are being affected by the dangers of imperialistic communism.

As an educated man, as an officer, you must know and understand the purposes of the threat so that you can help in its repudiation as a philosophy and in its control as a military force. The more you study it and set it up beside democracy the more convinced you will become that communism is a retrogressive movement, that it destroys freedom, that it is a treacherous detour on the great historic road toward individual dignity, national prosperity, world peace, and security.

But you must not only study democracy, you must exemplify it in your conduct. As chosen representatives of American citizenship at its best, you must live democracy. The discipline inculcated here at Annapolis is calculated to raise the standard of your conduct to the highest levels. You are adhering to the code, not because you fear you will be punished if you violate it, but because honor, decency, and an appreciation of the right are the dominant principles which govern you. In following the code of American citizenship at its best, you will prove loyal to Annapolis as a worthy alumnus, to your service as an officer and a gentleman, and to your country as an exemplary citizen and defender.

You are the heirs of a great tradition. Those who have preceded you out of these gates into the world of service, have preserved the freedom of the seas for us and our friends, and have denied them to our enemies. They have given freely of their all to achieve the great mission of the United States Navy, which today remains as significant and as honorable as ever.

Under the leadership of those who are at the helm of the United States Navy today and with your own example of devotion to duty and to the ideals of our country, you

and those who will follow in your tradition will continue to perform in new glory the historic and honorable role of the Naval Academy in the defense of our country. America can be confident that the United States Navy, working harmoniously with the other members of the defense family, the Army and the Air Force, will give our country strength; and with strength will come peace and honor.

A Call to Conscience

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 6, 1950

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor of Saturday, June 3:

A CALL TO CONSCIENCE

A shaft of light has just struck the United States Senate. It was generated by the courage of the Chamber's only woman Member. The conscience and common sense it expresses should dispel the miasma of confusion, suspicion, and fear in which national affairs have recently floundered. We will not try to summarize the simple, moving eloquence of MARGARET CHASE SMITH'S speech, but commend every word to our readers' attention.

The first notable thing about this statement and the declaration of conscience by seven Senators is that they put patriotism above politics. They are concerned primarily with the way too many in both parties have played directly into the Communist design to confuse, divide and conquer. They castigate the Truman administration for lack of leadership and complacency about Communist infiltration. They denounce Republican leadership for contributing to confusion and for political exploitation of fear, bigotry and intolerance.

Both parties are responding in political fashion. But we cannot too strongly emphasize that there is a call to conscience which should be considered first not for its partisan effects but for its aid in conserving basic American values. Mrs. SMITH'S light pierced behind the facade of current controversy to point out how basic principles of Americanism are endangered by character assassination. She listed the right to criticize, the right to hold unpopular beliefs, the right to protest, and the right of independent thought.

These rights are infringed when their exercise costs any American citizen his reputation or his livelihood. Here is one of the tender intangibles in the fabric of freedom which too many Americans are not sufficiently guarding in this time of tension. One of the reasons for opposing communism is that it attempts to dragoon thought and speech. But when the expression of independent or unorthodox opinion lays a citizen open to headlined charges of disloyalty and to disgrace and discharge from his job without any proof of guilt, it is time to recognize that the tyranny of totalitarian thought control can be imposed by mob hysteria as well as by Red dictators.

Anyone who looks into the long perspective of history to see how human freedom has been won and lost must be touched by this aspect of the Smith appeal. The Senator from Maine underscored it by asking the Senate to do some soul searching. She declared it has been made a rendezvous for vilification, for selfish political gain at the sacrifice of individual reputations and national unity. Certainly members of both parties should be jogged by their consciences when they permit members to use official privilege to persecute individual citizens with impunity.

It is this injustice, plus the dangers of intimidating free opinion by loose charges of communism, plus the damage to America's diplomatic front against Moscow, that causes this newspaper to oppose McCarthyism. We want no whitewashing of the guilty. We insist that Reds be rooted out, but by more efficient, professional methods. We hold no brief for the Truman administration, and feel it has been lax about leaks. We disagree with most of its domestic policies and have criticized its political tactics. But we are convinced that political tactics are causing some Republicans to use McCarthyism in a way to endanger several fundamentals of freedom and to do grave injustice to individuals.

This is not a partisan matter, as is proved by the fact that this position has been taken not only by other independent newspapers but by many Republican papers, and now by this important group of Republican Senators. We sincerely believe with them that this is a question of conscience. We believe it calls upon all of us for greater efforts to rise above personal prejudice or petty partisanship, for a new willingness to exercise prayerful citizenship.

Businessmen, Farmers, and the Brannan Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the Nonpartisan League, which endorsed its candidates on the Republican ticket, is supporting the Brannan plan; and I take pleasure in asking unanimous consent of the Senate that an article prepared by Representative USHER L. BURDICK, which appeared in Burdick's Magazine of May-June 1950, may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

In my judgment, Mr. President, the above article correctly sets forth what the Brannan plan really is; and I am happy to announce to the Senate that I have been informed that every candidate endorsed by the Nonpartisan League on the Republican ticket is actively supporting the Brannan plan. At least, the Leader, the official paper of the Nonpartisan League, so states. These candidates are as follows: T. H. H. Thoresen, for United States Senator; Usher L. Burdick and Martin Stenehjem, for Congress; Frank A. Vogel, for Governor; Ray Schnell, for Lieutenant Governor; Frank Albers, for secretary of state; Berta E. Baker, for State auditor; Albert Jacobson, for State treasurer; E. T. Christianson, for attorney general; A. J. Jensen, for insurance commissioner; Math Dahl, for commissioner of agriculture and labor; and William Mills, for public service commissioner.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUSINESS AND THE BRANNAN PLAN

No piece of legislation in recent years is so generally misunderstood as this so-called Brannan plan. It is misunderstood because it has been grossly misrepresented by large business interests. The support price in use now, and the support price under the Brannan plan is also misunderstood.

The reason and purpose of any support price to agricultural products is not to protect the farmer alone, but to protect all business in the United States. Keen businessmen should be enthusiastic supporters of support prices, for the reason that the depression of 1933–34 demonstrated clearly and definitely that when the agricultural belt cannot get a fair price for its products, a chain of events starts that demoralizes the business of the Nation. We remember 26-cent wheat in North Dakota, we remember that this price hardly covered the cost of harvest and threshing.

FARM BUSINESS SUFFERED

What happened? Local business in North Dakota felt the jar when the farmers had no income. Banks failed on every hand; stores were filled with merchandise but there were no buyers. Soon the manufacturers had their goods piled up in warehouses, but could not sell. When the manufacturers could not sell the goods, they had to stop their mills. Labor then went out by the tens of thousands, and at one time in that depression 15,000,000 men and women were walking the streets looking for jobs. That was the result of no price for farm products. The depression didn't stop there, farmers were foreclosed and dispossessed by the thousands because they could not pay their interest. Taxes went right along and thousands more, who didn't owe a cent, lost their lands through tax sales.

See the millions it cost this Government to supply these 15,000,000 people with food, shelter, and clothing. In one appropriation bill alone in 1935 the money for this purpose amounted to $4,000,000,000. Those of us who lived through that depression are determined that it shall not occur again, and without support prices, there is a bright prospect that it will occur again.

The present support-price program differs with the Brannan plan in only one particular, although both are supported by the Public Treasury. The Brannan plan permits agricultural products to move to market, and the price received is the market price. At the end of the crop year if there is a loss to farmers by reason of a demoralized market that difference is made up from the Public Treasury. There may or may not be a loss, but in any event the support comes from the Treasury, the same as it does today.

A MONEY SAVER

A man in business, at first glance, says why should I have to contribute tax money to support a bunch of farmers? When he gets over his first flurry of resentment he finds that he is supporting himself and his business. He is preventing a collapse that will destroy all business, from the local merchant to the manufacturing plants, and mean the support of idle millions in the labor fied. The cost of this support may not be large—it certainly will be less than the annual cost of supporting 15,000,000 idle people. On our program to support wheat, it has cost the taxpayers nothing, and, in addition to that, the Government has made a clear profit of $49,000,000. We have lost on potatoes, but that is because there was no production standard available to indicate

what amount each producer was to be supported on. Besides, we let down the bars and permitted the importation of potatoes from Canada at the request of machine manufacturers who could see no other way of being paid for machinery sold to the Canadians. The Brannan plan will prevent another potato loss such as we have had.

Another feature of the Brannan plan is to permit the consumers of America—the overwhelming majority of the people—to purchase their products at the market price. If the market is low they benefit. Well, what if they do benefit? In case of a Nation-wide depression poor people and the great bulk average of the Americans become distressed, and some of them will have to have Government aid which will cost more than any support from the Treasury under the Brannan plan.

In the interests of keeping our business healthy, every businessman in North Dakota should support the Brannan plan. Lay aside the prejudices you may have and see if you are not willing to contribute a tax to keep the business from the farm to factory normal.

What Reciprocal Trade Is Doing to This Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 31, 1950

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address I made on a subject in which I am very much interested, reciprocal trade:

What is meant by reciprocal trade?

Is it really reciprocal?

How does reciprocal trade tie in with the International Trade Organization, commonly called ITO?

Many people are confused by these terms. So let us define them.

Reciprocal trade, in theory, is an excellent thing. It means that we manufacture certain goods, grow certain crops, and we sell them to other countries to keep our factories and our farms in a healthy economical condition. In turn, other countries manufacture and grow various products which we buy. In order to keep these goods and crops flowing freely between countries so that everybody can prosper and there can be a free exchange, we agree with other countries to lower our tariffs so that they can sell in our country.

We have operated under this so-called reciprocal trade treaty for more than 15 years now and have consistently lowered our tariffs until today they are lower than at any other time for 50 years.

Now is this reciprocal trade really reciprocal? The answer is "No." It has brought about a dumping of foreign goods into our markets at prices that make it impossible for our domestic markets to compete. The protection formerly given to our American workers is being wiped out. In spite of this, the State Department has announced that conferences will be held in England beginning September 28, for the purpose of discussing tariff concessions on 2,500 items. Seventeen nations in South America, Central America, Europe, Asia, and Africa will take part.

The International Trade Organization, hatched in Habana, Cuba, is another free-trade movement. It has 58 members. Fifty-four of these have already signed up. And this country will have one vote—the same vote, for instance, that little Costa Rica has. These representatives will meet once a year, add up the production and markets of the world and then divide these markets on the basis of population. So we will have to take and like what these representatives say will be our share of the world's markets. In turn, these countries will flood our country with cheap labor products, and the standards of our living here will go down just as sure as night follows day, if we sign up for ITO.

There are so many examples that it is difficult to select even outstanding ones. But let me begin with my own Sixth District in Maryland.

The Persian Gulf and Venezuela seem a long way from Maryland, and yet those two countries have had the effect of throwing men out of work in my own district. The Kempton coal mine is shut down, throwing the men out of work. Ten years ago these men were making $7 a day. Now they get $14.75; that is, if they could work. But oil imports have helped put them out of business. Kempton was one of Maryland's biggest mines. It employed 218 men and produced 1,300 tons of coal a day—enough to load 21 railroad cars. Now, what are these men going to do? What is going to happen to their families?

The Vindex mine closed down on March 1. All of you know what happened to Shallmar. These are not the only sections affected. The Georges Creek field near my home town of Frostburg has been affected. That field is the oldest bituminous field in the country. Instead of 6,000 miners employed, there are now only about 2,000 and most of them are idle. The answer lies in these figures. This imported fuel oil, directly competing with coal, totaled 42,000,000 barrels in 1946, increasing to 47,000,000 barrels in 1949 from Venezuela alone.

But that isn't all. We are dumping potatoes while we are importing them from Canada cheaper than we can buy them here. We are importing wheat while our wheat bins are overflowing. Agriculture as well as industry is being undersold by cheap labor foreign markets. Men are losing jobs all over the country because of the so-called reciprocal trade agreements and now we are confronted with further dumping through the conference to be held in London and the International Trade Organization.

The Waltham Watch Co. case is another typical example. In the middle 1930's, the United States was producing about 53 percent of all the fine, high-quality, jeweled watches—before the reciprocal trade agreements went into effect. Today about 85 percent of our jeweled watches and watch movements are imported.

What has happened? Our well-paid American workers have lost their jobs. They have been thrown out of work. They and their families and their communities are suffering. But, equally as important, is the loss of their skills. The watch industry is most important to our national defense. These men worked on fine precision instruments that were vital to our winning the war. Switzerland, which has taken our watch market, did the same kind of work for Germany. What will happen if this cold war turns into a hot war? How will we obtain the necessary precision instruments?

I was talking to some of my colleagues the other day about this all-important question. I asked a Member of Congress from West Virginia, "How are your glass and pottery factories getting along?" His answer was, "They are all closed down." I received practically the same answer from a Pennsylvania Member who told me men were laid off or working part time.

All these jobs are pawns in this international game.

Now further tariff cuts are contemplated—textiles, for instance. Now, we have a large synthetic textile plant in my district. What it will mean to those workers' jobs, I don't know. There is a further cut in pottery, glass, china, chemicals, rayons, paper, leather goods, clocks, fish products, wines, and dairy products. Knowing that some of these cuts are going to affect jobs in my own district, I certainly am not in favor of these cuts.

But we are not the only ones who are suffering. The hat manufacturers are in danger. Union officials have warned that the American hat industry is in grave danger and workers face the loss of their jobs. Felt imports from Czechoslovakia, one of the iron-curtain countries, have jumped 300 percent in this last year.

And in my own district linen napkins have been picked up in a chain store with the words "Soviet Union" on them. They are selling three for $1. Identical napkins made in the United States sell at $1 or $1.25 apiece. We are fighting a cold war, with a tremendous debt and deficit and with a tax load on our shoulders crushing every taxpayer in this country—and yet we are importing from Russia not just manganese that we need for steel, but linen handkerchiefs.

We are importing many other products made by slave labor. We have millions of pounds of dried surplus eggs that we can't even give away. But we are importing dried eggs from China which has gone communistic. We have more butter than we know what to do with, but we are importing butter.

Now this reciprocal trade business has been sold to the American people as a means to help our friends and allies get on their feet and help us fight the cold war. We are asked to sacrifice the jobs of our people to help in this global give-away program. Then is it right that our men should be thrown out of jobs, our factories closed, to help those who openly proclaim themselves our enemy?

Why are we letting slave-labor merchandise undersell the product of our American workers?

Is Russia our friend and ally, are Bulgaria, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, Poland, and Communist China our friends and allies?

We have been told that we are buying strategic materials from those countries—things to help us stockpile for our defense.

But what are we getting? Furs, shoes, rubber footwear, walnuts, and canned crab meat, among other things.

Are we going to furnish our soldiers with fur coats? Right now our domestic fur business is hanging on the ropes.

Is Russian canned crab meat a strategic material? Are we going to feed it to our soldiers?

Are walnuts from Communist-controlled Manchuria a secret weapon? Our California nut industry, which is suffering right now, would like an answer to that question.

Will rubber overshoes from Czechoslovakia be used for guided missile purposes?

We have a law in this country that states we may bar from our markets any goods produced by foreign slave labor. Why isn't this law invoked?

You can rest assured that Russia buys no handkerchiefs or frills from us. And they certainly don't buy anything that results in unemployment for their own people.

I ask you, why do we allow the United States to be made the dumping ground for iron curtain or any other countries?

Why do we allow the jobs of our workers to be exported?

There is no sense in this sort of competition.

I know we must trade with other countries and I am in favor of reciprocal trade if it is really reciprocal. I cannot see the United States being made a dumping ground for free trade at the expense of our own workers and their jobs. There has been nothing reciprocal about these trade agreements. Other nations do not reciprocate. In case after case, other countries have withdrawn their concessions with us while still enjoying the full benefits of our concessions. I say, when concessions are withdrawn by others, then let us withdraw ours.

I believe in helping free nations in need of assistance to restore and raise their standards of living. I believe we can do this without our American workers, in addition to being burdened with high and indirect and hidden taxes, being deprived of their jobs to bolster a foreign policy which, in my opinion, has not been an outstanding success.

The best security for the American worker is a good job at good wages. And that is the best security for peace.

Hon. Joseph E. Ransdell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1950

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, it is my great honor to incorporate in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article which appeared a few weeks ago in the Monroe (La.) Morning World about former United States Senator Joseph E. Ransdell, when he was honored at a dinner at Lake Providence, La., when there was conferred upon him the papal distinction of Knight Commander of the Order of St. Gregory the Great.

I also enclose herewith an article which recently appeared in Catholic Action of the South, written by Mr. Adras LaBorde, Senator Ransdell's biographer.

I take this opportunity, too, Mr. Speaker, to add my congratulations to this great and distinguished son of my State. Senator Ransdell, now near 92 years of age, is still a tremendous factor for good in our Nation. It is fitting that the religious leaders of my own church, to which he has been loyal and devoted, should pay these great tributes to him while he is still with us:

EX-SENATOR FROM EAST CARROLL PARISH CONFERRED WITH HONOR

(By Mrs. H. T. Van Fossen)

Ninety-one-year-old Joseph E. Ransdell was honored recently at a dinner in Lake Providence, La., and conferred the papal distinction of Knight Commander of the Order of St. Gregory the Great.

The former United States Senator, who served as a legislator for 32 years and did much to promote the Carville Leprosarium, the National Congress for Rivers and Harbors and the National Institute of Health was cited as "having brought great honor and prestige to Lake Providence."

The Most Reverend Charles Paschal Greco, D. D., Bishop of Alexandria, commended the Senator for his many years of loyal service and devotion especially throughout the years that the Ku Klux Klan flourished in Louisiana and the Southland.

Bishop Greco pointed out that Senator Ransdell was repeatedly returned to Congress from an area of the State where only 1 percent of the voters were Catholic. He praised the American people for their fairmindness and appreciation of one's loyalty to duty whether of their faith or not.

Ransdell was later termed "a great servant of God and the people of Louisiana" by the bishop.

More than 200 friends and churchmen of Northeast Louisiana were guests of St. Patrick's congregation at the dinner honoring Senator Ransdell.

Speaking at the dinner, Judge Frank Voelker, of the sixth judicial district, asserted "this is a unique occasion, the average person rarely receives such recognition or has an accolade bestowed upon him during his lifetime."

Judge Voelker pointed out, "Senator Ransdell has brought great honor to our little town. His reputation as a statesman has brought prestige to his hometown and for this we can be appreciative."

A number of years ago Senator Ransdell was made a Knight of St. Gregory. The order of St. Gregory the Great is a pontifical order of knighthood founded by Pope Gregory XVI in 1831. There are civil and military divisions and each is ranked into Grand Cross Knights of the first and second class, commanders and knights.

"This order is bestowed in recognition of distinguished service to the church," Judge Voelker said.

"We honor a man already loaded with honors and prestige," Judge Voelker said, "a man who today is in his ninety-second year of fruitful living, one who despite his many years of useful service is still working day by day for the betterment of the community in which he lives."

Msgr. John C. Marsch, pastor of St. Matthews Church in Monroe, read the English translation of the papal rescript. Charles F. Zimmer was master of ceremonies.

Msgr. John Vandegaer, of Natchitoches, and Roy Aycock, of Alexandria, former pastors at St. Patrick, commended Senator Ransdell for his humbleness, helpfulness to his fellow men in East Carroll Parish, in dividing his large landholdings in East Carroll Parish into tracts and selling them to small farmers whom he financed, and assisted in inaugurating the first colored Catholic congregation in Lake Providence.

The Catholic church and school of 1925 and today was compared by Monsignor Marsch who pointed out that Senator Ransdell was a native of Rapides Parish and was a former classmate of his mother.

Overcome with emotion Senator Ransdell asserted, "I am too full for utterance. This is the greatest honor of my almost 92 years. I came to East Carroll Parish 67 years ago and the people here have been good to me. What I have been able to accomplish has been through the assistance of my friends here and throughout the State."

The dinner honoring the East Carroll Senator was sponsored by the Associated Catholic Men's clubs of northeast Louisiana and T. P. Coenen, of Rayville, and his brother, W. R. Coenen.

[From Catholic Action of the South of February 23, 1950]

INVESTITURE RECALLS LABORS OF HUMBLE SON OF MOTHER CHURCH

(By Adras LaBorde)

ALEXANDRIA.—When Bishop Charles P. Greco, of Alexandria, invests Senator Joseph E. Ransdell, of Lake Providence, as a commander in the Knights of St. Gregory, Sunday, he will be honoring one of the greatest Catholic laymen to appear on the Southern scene since Chief Justice Edward Douglass White.

Senator Ransdell, nearing 92 years of age, will become one of the select few named by the Pope to the high honor of Knight Commander.

A glimpse into the life of Senator Ransdell shows more than adequate justification for the honors bestowed upon him by his church.

Joseph E. Ransdell can look back upon a full life; full in the sense that he will leave the fruit of his work to the benefit of many generations to come, and full in the sense that he has used his God-given talents usefully, and in the courageous defense of his treasured Catholic faith.

The story goes back to 1858—just before fraternal strife tore up the Nation. Senator Ransdell was born in that year, on a cotton plantation on Bayou Roberts, in Rapides Parish, La.

His life covers nine-tenths of the fastest moving century in the history of man. His 50 years as a public servant span that great half-century during which America emerged from the shambles of civil war and a mere frontier to the greatest Nation on the earth—five decades crowded with breath-taking progress in transportation, communications, industrial, and social evolution.

STANCH CATHOLIC

The Senator is an integral part of the glorious history of those 50 years. More important still, as a Catholic layman, stanch in his faith by word and deed, his very presence on our Nation's stage has given him a stellar role in the phenomenal growth of the church he has loved and served so untiringly. He was born under a President who was elected by the anti-Catholic Know-Nothing Party. He reached the height in public life just in time to champion his faith against the fury of the Ku Klux Klan. With an avidity of interest and intellectual acumen which belies his years he daily follows with joy unfeigned the progress and victories of his church.

Joseph E. Ransdell recalls vividly the more sharply etched memories of his childhood—the slaves, the Union and Confederate armies, himself as a 6-year-old refugee of the war fleeing to Texas with his family, the poverty and toil and turmoil of reconstruction, his father's death in a sugar-mill accident when he was 11.

Having to work as a youngster to support a fatherless family, he had only a few months of formal schooling. He is indebted for his basic education mainly to his convent-reared sisters and to Father Menard, his pastor at Alexandria—the stalwart church pioneer of central Louisiana.

By the time he was 19, young Joe Ransdell was riding his pony 25 miles to Spring Creek to teach in a small country school. Thirsting himself for greater knowledge, he received a scholarship to Union College at Schenectady, N. Y. He fondly recalls his preparation for his first trip north, particularly how he procured Father Menard's lightweight overcoat by exchange for his heavy riding coat more appropriate for the pastor's horseback rides to missions.

GRADUATES WITH HONORS

Joe graduated with honors in 1882, winning the much-prized Blackford gold medal for oratory. His stay up North presented opportunities for the young student to manifest two traits which have characterized his life down through the years: A strong and vocal adherence to his faith in the face of adversities, and a penetrating evaluation of the common problems and general welfare of the Nation as a whole against local and sectional interests.

After graduation, Joe made his home with his brother-in-law, Tom Montgomery, in the delta town of Lake Providence. There he studied law under the tutelage of Tom's father. After 1 year he passed an examination and was admitted to the bar, in 1883.

Joe began his public life in a truly Washingtonesque manner that same year. He was appointed parish surveyor. The next year, at the age of 26, he was elected district attorney and was reelected without opposition in 1888 and 1892.

On November 15, 1885, he married Olive Irene Powell, of Lake Providence, who had joined the church 2 days earlier. Not financially able to take a honeymoon or even to settle down, the couple were given lodging with Father Mahe, the pastor at Lake Providence.

Joe declined renomination as district attorney in 1896 and devoted himself to the practice of law for the next 3 years. During this period he represented his area at the Louisiana Constitutional Convention of 1898.

In 1899 he ran for Congress and won over four prominent opponents, because "I said only nice things about them." In December he began a term of duty in Washington which was to continue for 32 years.

Noteworthy in Joe's election for seven consecutive terms as Congressman from the Fifth District is the fact that only 1 percent of his constituents were Catholic. Some misguided politicians tried on occasion to make an issue of his faith but to no avail. His integrity and earnestness were too well known to become besmirched by the lies of demagogue or religious bigot.

His 14 years in the House of Representatives and 18 in the Senate were marked by accomplishments which cannot be detailed here. In brief, they included:

The rookie Congressman had seen the floodwaters of the Mississippi and its tributaries regularly rampage through the fertile fields of his homeland. It was natural that flood control should have been a pet project from the start. The United States Government at that time did not conceive of flood control as its responsibility. A means of winning friends for this new departure had to be devised. As a result of Joe's efforts, the National Rivers and Harbors Congress was reorganized and Joe served as its president for 13 years. In that capacity he was largely responsible for the steadily increasing appropriations for the Nation's rivers and harbors. The over-all, long-term, flood-control plan which has followed the disaster of 1927 is his crowning victory. Every citizen residing in lowland areas owes him a personal debt of gratitude.

PUBLIC HEALTH CHAMPION

Senator Ransdell's interest in public health was whetted by memories of the great yellow fever epidemic of 1905, when he had rendered personal service in his own community. Visits to Puerto Rico and Panama during the fight to make the tropics safe for human habitation further confirmed his determination to provide man with every weapon against disease that modern science could devise.

In a speech on the floor of the Senate in 1916 he reminded his colleagues that rural health was the Nation's prime duty—that if billions could be spent to advance the art of killing in war, certainly smaller sums should be spent to advance the art of prolonging life. Ten years later he introduced his bill creating the National Institute of Health, a great clearinghouse of health for mankind, for scientific techniques in the conquest of disease. It took him 4 years of utter persistence to sell the strictly humanitarian measure to patronage-minded Congressmen. Nothing of its kind had ever been pushed through. An eminent medical authority epitomized the value of his labors in establishing the Institute in these words: "* * * there are probably 1,000,000 people living in this country today who would not be living if it had not been for your advocacy of that public health measure."

Along these same lines it was Senator Ransdell's efforts that led to the establishment of the national leprosarium at Carville, La.

The Senator held remarkably advanced views on American foreign policy. He supported President Wilson wholeheartedly in World War I. After the armistice and upon learning that the President was going to Europe to confer with Lloyd George, Clemenceau, and Orlando on world peace, he urged Wilson to make his foreign policy bipartisan by taking along ex-President Theodore Roosevelt as adviser. In reply, Wilson admitted that he needed help, but not that man.

Senator Ransdell deplored the President's partisan politics when so much was at stake. He publicly deplored, too, the fact that proceedings leading to the Versailles Treaty did not mention the name of God, and that the proceedings did not open with prayer or appeals for Heavenly aid.

ALINED WITH WILSON

He alined himself with Wilson in the postwar fight for ratification of the treaty and for United States membership in the League of Nations. In one of his strongest speeches in his long public life he predicted before the Senate that 50 years hence it will be a matter of common wonder that there should have been any opposition to the League of Nations. His prediction was wrong only in that it came to pass much sooner.

As the dominant Catholic layman in the public life of the Nation for half a century, Joseph E. Ransdell had many opportunities to speak out for his faith. He never missed such a chance.

In June of 1914 Notre Dame University recognized his catholicity by conferring upon him an honorary doctorate of laws. At commencement exercises that night he proved his ability to foresee social evils by devoting his talk to the dangers of divorce. He predicted that the divorce rate would increase steadily to threaten the foundation of our society. That very year he introduced in the Senate a proposed constitutional amendment which would prohibit divorce with the right to remarry. Even then he was running deliberately counter to the spirit of the times.

He found time during the busy war years to make three important speeches on his faith: "The patriotism of Catholics," a timely topic at a Knights of Columbus celebration at Richmond, Va.; "The influence of Bishop Russell"; and "What a nation has a right to expect from the Catholic college graduate," at the graduation exercises of Villanova College, Philadelphia, Pa.

PAID HIGH HONOR

High honor was paid him in 1926 when he was invited to address the International Eucharistic Congress at Chicago. His talk on "The holy Eucharist doing for the soul what the hand of God the Father has done for material nature" was to be long remembered by the tens of thousands who heard it.

From the crowded coliseum of Soldiers' Field, Chicago, the Senator's inspired language flowed into the Halls of Congress to refute unjust criticism of his church. The refutation was in answer to vitriolic attacks of Senator Tom Heflin, of Alabama, who tried to slander the church in general and the KC in particular.

After 32 years in Congress—the longest tenure of any Louisianian—Joe Ransdell's popularity as an honest, God-loving public servant collided head-on with the ascending political star of Huey P. Long. His defeat shocked him, but left him without rancor. To this day he says that his defeat was a favor in disguise. Already in his early seventies, he returned to Rose Villa, his home on the cypress banks of Lake Providence, to resume his role as country gentleman, and to attend to his business interests and the public welfare.

On March 9, 1935, Mrs. Ransdell passed away. The Senator's grief was heavy, but his faith eased the burden.

By now, far beyond the classical life span of threescore and ten, the Senator gave no indication of feeling his years. He divided his properties into family farms and established almost 100 tenants, white and colored, on land of their own. Of his work in this connection, an official said, "East Carroll will always owe a debt of gratitude to Senator Ransdell. He gave opportunity to many poor farmers who otherwise would still be share croppers. Their success stands as a monument to Mr. Ransdell and the encouragement he gave these worthy people."

On February 13, 1938, in his parish church at Lake Providence, Joseph E. Ransdell was invested as a Knight of St. Gregory the Great. It was the first time a layman in a rural community of Louisiana had been so honored, and the first time any man in the diocese of Alexandria had received the coveted knighthood.

Despite his memories of applause when he shared the limelight on the national stage, despite the high recognition accorded him by his church, Joseph E. Ransdell remains a humble son of mother church, a wonderful parish man. At 91 he assists at mass, missal in hand, and receives holy communion every morning.

His great love is the new parochial school his generosity made possible. He is an active member of the Holy Name Society. A few months ago he helped to organize the Associated Catholic Men's Club of Northeast Louisiana. More recently he drove 180 miles to Maryhill to inspect with gratification the magnificent plant, seminary, retreat house, and youth camp which his bishop (Bishop Greco) was erecting. He looks forward to an early retreat at Maryhill.

Truly, Joseph E. Ransdell deserves the honor of commander in the Order of St. Gregory.

Winthrop College Commencement Exercises

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, on last Sunday, June 4, the Honorable John E. Peurifoy, Deputy Under Secretary of State, addressed the graduating class of Winthrop College at Rock Hill, S. C.

This was an important occasion for two reasons in particular.

First. More than 300 young ladies were completing their formal education in one of the largest girls' schools in the Southeast and were about to enter into the everyday activities with which we in the Congress have such great concern.

Second. The address was delivered by a native South Carolinian who has already rendered at a youthful age important and illustrious services to his State and his Nation.

The remarks of the Secretary were well and appropriately directed to the members of the graduating class.

I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed at this point in the RECORD.

Mr. McCARTHY. By whom did the Senator say the speech was made?

Mr. MAYBANK. By Deputy Under Secretary of State, Mr. John E. Peurifoy, at Winthrop College. I may say to my good friend from Wisconsin, we are fellow South Carolinians. I am very proud of him.

Mr. McCARTHY. I have no objection.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE JOHN E. PEURIFOY, DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE, TO THE GRADUATING CLASS OF WINTHROP COLLEGE, ROCK HILL, S. C.

I have always been pleasantly aware of Winthrop College. It is a known fact that this institution, through its many hundreds of graduates, has exerted a strong and beneficial influence on South Carolina. I, personally, have felt that influence. For one thing, my foster mother is a Winthrop graduate. Then, some of the teachers who struggled with me in my early school days were trained here. And, many of the girls with whom I grew up received the benefit of the sound education that is given here. So, coming to Winthrop is very much like renewing an old acquaintance and, at the same time, making a new one.

In the last couple of weeks, as I was anticipating this trip I experienced the usual pleasant expectations of visiting South Carolina, but here there was a new and stimulating element included—the thought that this would be no ordinary occasion. On the contrary, for the more than 300 of you who are concluding your undergraduate work and venturing out on the careers of your choice, this, I realized, would be a unique event, a milepost or a turning point in your lives. This realization gave me a sense of particular interest and, at the same time, evoked a feeling of personal responsibility. I thought it would be useful if I passed on to you some fundamental ideas that have impressed themselves on me in the course of my experience in the Department of State.

It occurred to me that education is a process that never stops. To him who has, it shall be given—as long as a man draws breath he will be learning more and more new things and through experience the old things that he has known will shine in new and varied colors. And I do have hope that through education the world progresses and, in the lives of good people, civilization moves further and further away from the law of the jungle.

I cannot look upon international problems from a detached, impersonal angle. Instead, I see and have always seen problems in terms of human beings. When a great issue comes up I see behind it families, homes, and the solid human values that you have learned about here and in which we all place such great importance.

It was with those values in mind that I cast about for some conclusions that might help you see more clearly the problem of peace and security in the world of today and, at the same time, help you toward a more constructive and perhaps a happier life.

There is an inscription carved on the pediment of the Union Station in Washington. When you visit your Nation's Capital remember to look for this inscription. It says, "He who would bring home the wealth of the Indies must take the wealth of the Indies out with him."

We cannot go empty-handed into the world and expect to reap a harvest. What we reap depends on what we have to give. You of the class of 1950 are not going empty-handed into the world. You are taking with you much more than the wealth of the Indies—the wealth of an American tradition, the wealth of 4 years' experience on the Winthrop College campus, and the wealth of nearly 2,000 years of Christian heritage. Added to this wealth is the dividend of youth, and all that youth embraces—vigor, imagination, courage, independence.

This wealth which makes you strong is the target of our enemies just as much as the material and industrial wealth of our great country. There is no doubt at all that our country has been singled out as the main target of Communist aggression. That fact in itself is significant. It is, in a way, a tribute to our moral and material strength.

We are fair game because we represent everything communism opposes. We believe in God. Communism is an avowed philosophy of nonrecognition of God. We believe in freedom and human rights, and we work ceaselessly to extend them more and more each day. Communism denies the rights of the individual. In Russia there is only one right, the right of the State above all else. We have the secret ballot and Russia has the secret police. We believe in free enterprise—the Russians oppose it. We permit our national neighbors to go and come freely across our borders. There are no military barriers between us and Canada or Mexico. The Russians control the people and dominate the governments of their neighbors.

So we see communism is not at all a positive philosophy but a very negative creed. It opposes every principle for which we stand. Let me warn you of the class of 1950 that far too many people in this world go through life always against and never for anything. It is so easy and often even popular to be against everything. Some, animated more by emotions than by convictions, become professional crusaders, against their government, against certain religions, and sometimes even against the young people.

I'm sure all of you have at some time heard that the younger generation is going to the dogs. It was going to the dogs when I was a boy. My father told me it was said to be well on the way to the dogs when he was a boy. In the days of Cicero, Terence delivered tirades on the hopelessness of the young Romans. So it is an old stale story, and I want to go on record as saying never have I had more confidence in the youth of America. You are a great improvement over what I was at your age. You are more poised, more mature, and more spiritual. Never could Lucinda Matlock say to you—

"What is this I hear of sorrow and weariness,
Anger, discontent, and drooping hopes
Degenerate sons and daughters,
Life is too strong for you.
It takes life to love life."

I hope that you of the class of 1950 will be positive and not negative in your attitude and approach toward life. Let us all be affirmative—not negative. Let us be constructive—not destructive. Let us talk less about communism and talk more about democracy. Let us play down Russia, and play up America. While we must take a realistic view of our weaknesses, let us always remember our sources of strength. While recognizing our flaws, let us capitalize our virtues. Naturally we have differences among us, but let us advertise our unity.

The great nations of this world, those that have exerted most positive influence for good on the history of men, are those nations whose leaders were men of vision with great spiritual qualities. The iconoclasts, the dictators, have their brief innings, fall, and are remembered, if at all, only for the evil they worked.

The achievement of moral leadership lives on forever. Ancient Greece, constricted in size and arid in soil, gave the standards of truth, beauty, and liberty as we know them today. From tiny Palestine came a philosophy which has determined the moral code of the Christian world for 2,000 years. The might and wealth of greater nations have vanished, but the vision of the prophets of Judah and the teachings of Christ are a potent influence in the world today.

One key to the future is what I have called the fourth dimension in citizenship. We Americans have learned through long years of practice to accept the responsibilities of citizenship in our own home towns and our own States. We have demonstrated that we are both willing and able to handle the broader responsibilities that go with citizenship in this great Nation.

But now something more is required of us. The security problem to which I have already referred, plus the ever-increasing compactness of our world and the interdependence of peoples, all those elements combine to make necessary a new level of individual responsibility. For want of a better term let us call this new requisite world citizenship. I don't mean world citizenship in a literal sense, of course.

The application of the fourth dimension in citizenship by the American people and by peoples in other countries has been growing steadily since the end of the last war. Acceptance of the concept derives from two factors. The first, of course, is self-interest. Whatever help we give other freedom-loving people to become strong is, in the long run, helping ourselves. The second factor—the moral one behind world citizenship—is realization that we have a responsibility toward our fellow man, that we are, in fact, our brother's keeper.

You will recognize the interplay of both of those factors in the major foreign actions that the United States has been carrying out since the last war. That interplay is evident in our support of the United Nations, in the Marshall plan, in the Truman doctrine, the Rio and North Atlantic Treaties, the Mutual Defense Assistance Act. It is also inherent in the point 4 program and our support of such other cooperative ventures as the International Trade Organization.

Secretary Acheson has recently described one phase of our foreign policy as creating "situations of strength" against Communist expansion. He said that, being very realistic people, the Soviet leaders of communism could be influenced by such situations of strength where nothing else meant anything to them. Wherever communism has been faced up to in a determined manner it has generally been checked.

If we are to continue to hold off immediate threats to the peace by opposing them with strength we must continue to think and act in the fourth dimension of citizenship. Likewise, the long-pull job of creating lasting conditions in which peace can thrive will require that we exercise increasingly our responsibility on the world scale.

The thousands of young men and women who, like yourselves, are graduating from colleges and universities everywhere will one day fall heir to the reins of leadership on all levels of activities. You are relatively few in number. Because of that, upon you must fall the responsibility for the spread of the fourth dimension of citizenship. Yours will be the responsibility in that you have been given the opportunity to understand the nature of the stakes at issue.

You will have the duty of maintaining standards and extending them among those who have not had equal opportunities. That means, in plain words, that each member of this graduating class must take on the job of acting and speaking his knowledge and convictions on the world issues which can, like a thunderbolt or an earthquake, bring disaster into the most secluded of American communities. And, if I may say so, seeking

to achieve those standards gives a zest and an excitement to adult living.

As you assume your places in the order of things you will be playing a role of ever-increasing importance, no matter what your walk of life. What is more, you have as inspiration the accomplishments of your predecessors at Winthrop who are a credit not only to this institution but to the great State of South Carolina as well.

A small percentage of you may find your way into the Government, bringing to it the fourth dimension of citizenship that I have been talking about. In the Federal service, I am proud to say, there are many dedicated people, people motivated by an overwhelming zeal in the accomplishment of their duties, a zeal which denies any selfish considerations of personal gain.

There are a good many such people serving this country in the Department of State. I have special reference to our people who have, for all practical purposes, given up all the comforts of life as we know them to represent democracy and freedom in the farthest reaches of civilization. These people are serving in places where food is all canned, where water must be boiled, where disease is rampant, and in many instances where one must contend with secret police. These people are really on the frontiers enduring hardships that would be forbidding to most of us. These courageous Americans are working at the level of the fourth dimension. They are doing an essential job, helping to bridge the gap between our standard of life and that of people who have been submerged for centuries. They are the modern-day pioneers. They are all too few in number.

Those of you who do find your way into the Federal service will find the Washington scene to be exciting and, at the same time, challenging. But you will find inspiration, as I do, in the example of the service that has been rendered our country by South Carolinians who have become preeminent in world affairs.

You who are graduating here today will bring home the wealth of the Indies because you are taking it out with you.

GOP Woman Senator Blasts Four Horsemen of Calumny—Margaret Smith's Declaration of Conscience Hits McCarthyism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1950

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, on May 5, 1950, I delivered a radio speech in Detroit, in which I stressed the fact that the Republicans were deliberately engaged in a campaign of smear, fear, hate, and suspicion; and that they expected to ride to victory on this appeal to these base and low emotions of the human race.

On June 1 the Senator from Maine was joined by six other Republican Senators who admitted publicly that they could not stomach the dirty, filthy, smeary, character assassination that their own Republican Party was engaged in.

This statement of repudiation and disassociation from those who would play in the garbage pail will be well received and highly commended by all decent citizens.

I wish to include an article by the very able and distinguished Washington correspondent, Blair Moody, which appeared in the Detroit News on June 2, 1950:

GOP WOMAN SENATOR BLASTS FOUR HORSEMEN OF CALUMNY—MARGARET SMITH'S DECLARATION OF CONSCIENCE HITS MCCARTHYISM

(By Blair Moody)

WASHINGTON, June 2.—It remained for the lady from Maine, Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH, to lead Republicans in a repudiation of McCarthyism and to lay on the line in a declaration of conscience, what many in the Senate (and in the press gallery) have been thinking, feeling, and privately saying for weeks.

"I am not proud," said Senator SMITH, as Senator MCCARTHY (Republican, Wisconsin) sat a few feet away, "of the way the Senate has been made a publicity platform for irresponsible sensationalism * * * a forum of hate and character assassination sheltered by the shield of congressional immunity.

"As a Senator I am not proud of the reckless abandon in which unproved charges have been hurled from this side of the aisle * * * or the obviously staged, undignified countercharges from the other side * * *.

"I do not like the way the Senate has been made a rendezvous for vilification, for selfish political gain at the sacrifice of individual reputations and national unity.

"I am not proud of the way we smear outsiders from the floor of the Senate and hide behind the cloak of congressional immunity * * * and yet if we say the same thing in the Senate about our colleagues we can be stopped on the grounds of being out of order * * *. Surely we should be able to take the same kind of character attacks that we dish out."

THE FOUR HORSEMEN

"I don't want the Republican Party to ride to political victory on the Four Horsemen of Calumny—Fear, Ignorance, Bigotry, and Smear."

Six other Republican Senators—IVES, of New York; AIKEN, of Vermont; TOBEY, of New Hampshire; MORSE, of Oregon; HENDRICKSON, of New Jersey, and THYE, of Minnesota—joined with Mrs. SMITH in a joint statement, accusing both the Democratic administration and certain elements of the Republican Party of unwittingly, but undeniably, playing directly into the Communist design of confuse, divide, and conquer.

"It is about time," said the seven Senators, "that we stopped thinking politically as Republicans and Democrats about elections and started thinking patriotically as Americans about national security based on individual freedom. It is high time we all stopped being tools and victims of totalitarian techniques * * * techniques that, if continued unchecked, will surely end what we have come to cherish as the American way of life."

While Senator SMITH'S demand that Senators "do some soul searching * * * weigh our consciences * * * on the manner in which we are using or abusing our powers and privileges" was directed principally at her own party, she also blistered President Truman, without naming him, for lack of leadership.

NATIONAL FRUSTRATION

She said that there exists in the country a national feeling of fear and frustration that could result in national suicide from lack of effective leadership in either the legislative or executive branch.

The Democrats, she asserted, have provided the Republicans with plenty of political issues without resorting to political smears.

"The Democratic administration," Mrs. SMITH charged, "has completely confused the people by its daily contradictory grave warnings and optimistic assurances * * * by its complacency to the threat of communism here at home and the leak of vital secrets to Russia * * *. It is time for a change and Republican victory is essential to the security of this country.

"Yet to replace (the President) with a Republican regime embracing a philosophy that lacks political integrity or intellectual honesty would prove equally disastrous to the Nation."

It was then that Mrs. SMITH said she did not want to see the Republican Party "ride to victory on the Four Horsemen of Calumny." and went on:

"I doubt if the Republican Party could—simply because I don't believe the American people will uphold any political party that puts political exploitation above national interests. * * * Such a victory would be a lasting defeat for the American people. * * * It would ultimately be suicide for the Republican Party and the two-party system."

AMERICANS FIRST

The seven-Senator statement declared, "we are Republicans—but we are Americans first."

"It is high time," Mrs. SMITH said, "that we remembered the Constitution speaks not only of freedom of speech but also of trial by jury instead of trial by accusation.

"Whether it be a criminal prosecution in court or a character prosecution in the Senate, there is little practical distinction when the life of a person has been ruined.

"Those who shout the loudest about Americanism in making character assassinations are all too frequently those who ignore the basic rights of Americanism—the right to criticize, to hold unpopular beliefs, to protest, to think independently.

"The American people are sick and tired of being afraid to speak their minds lest they be politically smeared as 'Communists' or 'Fascists' by their opponents. * * * Our country is being psychologically divided by the confusion and suspicions that are bred in the United States to spread like cancerous tentacles of 'know nothing, suspect everything' attitude. * * *"

James W. Wadsworth Retires

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1950

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, the editor of the Rochester (N. Y.) Democrat and Chronicle has, with rare insight, caught the spirit of the true JIM WADSWORTH in editorializing on his announced retirement from Congress. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this editorial and also an appreciation of his public service by Mr. Arthur Krock of the New York Times:

CONGRESS WON'T BE THE SAME

"JIM WADSWORTH retiring? I can't believe it."

That was the reaction of the average western New Yorker to the startling news that came from Washington Wednesday announcing JAMES W. WADSWORTH'S decision to retire from Congress at the end of his present term.

A congressional election without the name of JAMES W. WADSWORTH on the ballot in the

Forty-first District? A Congress roll call without a calm voice answering "Here" when the name of "WADSWORTH of New York" is reached? It does seem almost unbelievable.

He has been in public life so long that we of western New York have been prone to take him for granted. But in our hearts we were always proud to have such a Representative in Washington.

To the Nation he is a familiar name, an elder statesman, one of the really distinguished figures in the Congress, one of the few who has served in both legislative branches—through two great wars—for a total of 30 productive years.

But to us in the Genesee country he will always be "Young JIM," our neighbor from up the valley, a personality of rare charm, the aristocrat with the democratic ways, the tall, bald, square-shouldered man who speaks so easily without any rhetorical flourishes but with a forthright forcefulness, whose face is creased into a thousand wrinkles when he smiles his ready grin. It is hard to believe that he is in his seventy-third year.

He was born to wealth and position. He was of the landed gentry, of a house that settled in the Genesee Valley in 1790. His father and his grandfather before him served in Congress. He might have been just a playboy squire, riding to hounds over the ancestral acres.

Instead he went in for public service at an early age. His father, James W. Wadsworth, Sr., taught him as a boy the mechanics of farming and of managing the valley estates. He went to Yale in the family tradition but he also played an able first base for the Geneseo town team. He volunteered for service in the Spanish-American War. Once as a youth he risked his life in a Genesee River flood to save some of his father's prize cattle. For 5 years he managed a ranch in Texas and rode the range with the cowboys.

That was after 6 years in the State assembly. He was elected from Livingston County in 1904 when he was only 27 years old. He conducted no front porch campaign. He went out among the voters, as he always has. JIM WADSWORTH greets dirt farmers with the same unaffected geniality with which he meets the leaders of the Nation—and he has known most of them in his time.

He was only a second-year man in Albany when he was chosen speaker of the assembly, the youngest man ever to hold the post. He showed his independence and presided with such tact and ability that he won the praise and the friendship of the opposition.

Representative WADSWORTH'S political career is a familiar story—his election to the United States Senate in 1914, his service as chairman of the Military Affairs Committee for 7 years during which he was author of the World War I Selective Service Act. Then came his defeat by Robert F. Wagner, Democrat, in 1926.

Contributing to that defeat was WADSWORTH'S uncompromising stand against prohibition and his earlier opposition to woman suffrage. He never took the popular side just to win votes. He always had the courage of his convictions. That is a bromidic phrase but it describes JAMES WADSWORTH'S intellectual integrity.

In 1932 he became the nominee of his party for Congress in his home district. Few who served in the august Senate have ever deigned to run for the lower House. It was in the tradition of John Quincy Adams, who served in the House of Representatives after he had been President of the United States. It was a fortunate thing for the Forty-first District—and America—that WADSWORTH had no false pride. Public service has been his life. It is in his blood.

His experience has been invaluable in Washington during as troubled a time as America has ever known. Opponents have branded him a Tory and reactionary because he feared the drift of his country into strange new ideologies. Pacifists have called him a jingo because in time of danger he wanted a strong America. Yet all respected his courage, his sincerity, and his candor.

Since 1905 with the exception of two brief interludes, he has been in the public service. It has been a stormy time. Through it all the gentleman from Geneseo never lost his grin, his temper, or his convictions.

There is something Churchillian about this western New Yorker who has the stoutness of one of the great oaks of the valley he loves so well, the valley where his family has lived for 160 years and where he will spend his declining years.

There is only one JIM WADSWORTH. To the Nation he may be an elder statesman, a figure of history. To Rochester and western New York, the homeland, which recognizes his statesmanship but which also knows him as an engaging personality, a very human individual, somehow he will always be "Young JIM" from up the valley, who used to play first base on the Geneseo town team.

A GREAT PUBLIC FIGURE IS PASSING

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, June 1.—The news that Representative JAMES W. WADSWORTH will not stand for reelection in the Forty-first Congressional District of New York calls to mind many a notable parliamentary struggle in which his wisdom, courage, and integrity were devoted to a high patriotic concept which rose above any partisan consideration. So often did Mr. WADSWORTH occupy this uncrowned height in Congress that he came to be recognized as the conscience of the House which, though it might evade, it admired and respected.

But one day in particular emerges from the haze of memory—August 12, 1941. On that day Pétain commanded the beaten French to collaborate fully with Hitler; Berlin announced the defeat of the Soviet armies west of the Dnieper in the Ukraine; and, alarmed by the growing aggressions of Japan, the United States and Great Britain warned the Japanese war party to keep its hands off Thailand.

On that day, with Pearl Harbor less than 4 months away, the House was debating the bill to extend by 18 months the military services of those already taken by the draft. This passed by one vote, 203 to 202. Opposed were 135 Republicans, 65 Democrats, and 4 of the assorted minorities. In favor were 182 Democrats and 21 Republicans. It was to these latter Mr. WADSWORTH made the plea without which, in the opinion of many watchers of the event, the draft extension would have been rejected on the ground that the administration, to win the election of 1940, had misrepresented the draft law as a brief and passing need.

As a young legislator from Livingston County, speaker of the New York Assembly in the first decade of this century, a two-term Senator who was defeated for a third because he steadfastly declined to compromise then unpopular principles, and Representative since 1932, Mr. WADSWORTH made many distinguished public utterances. But probably none will assay as importantly as that of April 12, 1941, in the judgment of history.

THE ARGUMENT

He began by pointing out that, since the whole Army was only slightly more than 1 percent of the population, "it must be the most efficient Army for its size, if we can make it so." Taking as an example the Twenty-seventh Division of the New York National Guard, he showed that subtraction from Army cadres in training of those in selective service who would be returned to civil life by defeat of the pending bill "would wreck them as a team for at least 8 to 10 months." He spoke as an expert on this practical aspect of the issue, and the listening House well knew he rated that status.

Then he turned to the world situation, saying in part:

"Hitler has carried the ball from the beginning of this terrific game. He has gained ground on every play and there are no rules in the game as he plays it, much less a referee. You see his activities today plus the activities of Japan. Against whom was the alliance between Japan and the Axis powers primarily directed? Against the United States, have no doubt about it. And that alliance was made after we passed the selective service law.

"Look at the far-eastern situation. Is it not of more concern to us today than it was a year ago? See what the Japanese are doing. Every sensible man knows that our vital interests are menaced."

THIS IS THE WHOLE QUESTION

Turning to the Republican side of the House, Mr. WADSWORTH described the consequences in Europe and North Africa of the fall of France, forecast what would follow if Russia, then fighting alone, was conquered, and assured his colleagues that, when Hitler felt ready, "the signal will go to Japan." Quoting Mark Sullivan that "America is not moving toward war, war is moving toward America," Mr. WADSWORTH concluded his appeal by saying:

"We are trying to do something from day to day which will discourage anybody from attacking the Western Hemisphere. The fend-off policy accounts for the acquisition of the island bases. So it accounts for the occupation of Iceland and Newfoundland. Would this House vote to retire the Marines from Iceland today? I think not. We do not dare take chances, not for one moment. It is conceded that if legislation of this kind is not passed the defense of the United States will be seriously weakened for many, many months.

"This is the whole question before us, as I see it. My prayer is, Mr. Chairman, that our decision shall be made in the interest of the safety of the United States."

Republicans Show Lack of Organization and Discipline—Now They Deal With a Case of Conscience—"Its Disposition May Not Be Easy," Says W. K. Kelsey

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1950

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to submit an article by the highly respected and widely read correspondent, W. K. Kelsey, who writes a daily column for the Detroit News, under the title "The Commentator":

THE COMMENTATOR

(By W. K. Kelsey)

To expect that the "declaration of conscience" read in Senate, Thursday, by Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH, of Maine, publicly backed by six other Republican Senators, and admired by some others who congratulated her later, will have much effect on the rest of the party in that body is irrational.

Although the declaration was critical of the Democratic leadership, the only reason for making it was the McCARTHY charges and their support by many Senators who hoped they could be made to stick, so that the Republican Party would be given a popular issue in this campaign year; as Mrs. SMITH put it, "in the hope of riding the Republican Party to victory through the selfish exploitation of fear, bigotry, ignorance, and intolerance."

In a following speech, Mrs. SMITH said: "The Nation sorely needs a Republican victory. But I don't want to see the Republican Party ride to a political victory on the Four Horsemen of Calumny, Fear, Ignorance, Bigotry, and Smear."

The declaration illustrates something more than the stirrings of conscience among seven disgusted Senators. It illustrates also a lack of organization and discipline in the opposition party.

To be sure, there is a similar lack in the Democratic Party; but that is no good reason why the Republicans, who ought to be in a position to take advantage of Democratic lack of cohesion, should take such long chances as they did in permitting Senator McCARTHY to proceed as he did.

The McCarthy affair could not have happened in the British Parliament. In the first place, no member of the minority party would have dared make such charges without the full approval of the party leader, who would not have given it without making sure that there was plenty of fire behind the smoke, and that he could afford to throw the full support of the party behind them.

In the second place, such charges, given such support, would force the appointment of an investigating commission to deal with them under strict rules of evidence, with full protection of witnesses, and of the rights of the accused.

TIME TO ENFORCE DISCIPLINE

"It is ironical," said Senator SMITH in her speech, "that we Senators can in debate in the Senate directly or indirectly impute to any American who is not a Senator any conduct or motive unworthy or unbecoming an American—and without that non-Senator American having any legal redress against us—yet if we say the same thing in the Senate about our colleagues we can be stopped on grounds of being out of order.

"I think it is high time that we remembered that we have sworn to uphold and defend the Constitution. I think it is high time that we remembered that the Constitution, as amended, speaks not only of freedom of speech, but also of trial by jury instead of trial by accusation."

It is also high time that political parties crack down on irresponsible Members who jeopardize the interests of the party, to say nothing of those of the Nation. It is always a temptation to discover and make the most of some fault in the opposition, especially when that opposition controls the executive department. But it is extremely bad policy to yield to that temptation without looking ahead and making sure that the attack will find a real joint in the armor.

In the present instance Senator McCARTHY was not only permitted but encouraged to go ahead, although every experienced newspaperman began to laugh when JOE changed the number of his accused Communists and fellow travelers almost day by day before declaring he would "stand or fall" by the case against Owen Lattimore—and then declined to fall.

If the Republican steering committee had taken JOE in hand when he changed his statistics it could have saved the party's prestige. But it didn't, even though it must have known Mr. McCARTHY, and been aware that figs are not produced from thistles. So now the party must deal with a case of conscience. Its disposition may not be easy.

The New War Against the South

REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN H. GUILL
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 6, 1950

Mr. GUILL. Mr. Speaker, the Fair Deal of President Truman's so-called Democratic Party can now officially and permanently be called the "raw deal."

The shameful decision of the United States Supreme Court in the Tidelands case yesterday "legalized" the cold-blooded theft of an estimated $1,000,000,000 by a vicious and totalitarian administration which falsely calls itself democratic. The "raw deal" administration has stooped so low as to pick the pockets of our Texas school children and to break the most solemn word of the United States Government.

Another decision of the Supreme Court struck a blow at the ancient and sacred traditions of the South. It also struck a severe and damaging blow at the entire concept of States' rights as we knew them and as our forefathers knew them.

Mr. Speaker, these decisions, following the infamous veto of the Kerr bill, represent definite aggressive and calculated steps by the "raw deal" administration against the State of Texas. As long as Texans continue to support in office their worst enemies, the Socialists who call themselves Democrats, they can expect to be stabbed in the back repeatedly as a reward for their misplaced loyalty. June 5, 1950, was Black Monday for Texas and the South.

It should be apparent now to every single thinking citizen of this country living below Mason and Dixon's line that the Truman administration has declared war upon the South and intends to carry that war to a brutal and successful conclusion.

Compared to this cold war of 1950, the War Between the States was a clean and honest conflict. The War Between the States was fought in the open by men who are willing to fight and die for principles in which they believed. The cold war against the South of 1950 is one-sided and it is fought with knives in the dark. It is fought by legal ambush and sly administrative practice. It is fought by infiltration, treachery, and deceit. It is fought by nameless men in secret places and there is no mercy, little honesty, and less decency among those who fight it.

For years the representatives of the Truman administration have made little attempt to hide their hostility toward the South. But the people of the South continued to disregard the thunder on the left. They could not believe that the party which they have so loyally supported in the past has been stolen completely away from them and has fallen so low as to become an instrument of totalitarianism. They found it difficult to accept the fact that the machinery of the Democratic Party has been stolen by a gang of self-seeking Socialists.

As a result, before the people of the South became fully aware that the cold war was on—they found they had already lost several vital battles. They found that the forces of totalitarianism were over the border and marching upon them.

In the Elmer W. Henderson case—whereby segregation of Negroes from whites in dining cars was judged by the Supreme Court of the United States to be illegal—a learned brief was submitted for the "raw deal" administration by Philip B. Perlman. Mr. Perlman documents his case against southern traditions with constant citations from official Soviet Russian publications.

Mr. Perlman argues that discrimination in this country caused unfriendly reaction in the foreign press and cites a Russian article by a man named Frantsov to support his claim.

Mr. Speaker, there is something definitely ridiculous about this country's worrying about the reaction of Russia toward our policies of discrimination, when Russia itself is the most brutally discriminatory nation in the world today. There is certainly something sinister in the spectacle of a representative of this country supporting what are wrongly called civil rights with admonitions from Russian authorities representing a nation where there are no rights at all.

As a matter of fact, from among a handful of references to publications cited by Mr. Perlman in his brief which I personally checked this morning, I found works by a Soviet propagandist, a stockholder in the New Masses, a contributor to Soviet Russia Today, several members of the left-wing Lawyers Guild, and signers of the call to the notorious pro-Moscow National Writers Congress.

When the traditions of the southern part of these free United States are held up to scorn by the "raw deal" administration in contrast to the principles of the Soviet Russian Government, we may well pause and consider along what dangerous roads our so-called Democratic leaders are driving us.

Mr. Speaker, almost every major project of the "raw deal" administration has been directly in opposition to the best interests of the South. In every case where the interests of the South conflicted with the interests of the big city machines of the North, the President has decided against the South.

The entire concept of States' rights has been put to scorn and whittled away so that, unless we strike back through the ballot box, States' rights will be as dead as the ancient cities of Greece.

The Kerr bill veto, the Sweatt case, the Henderson case, the McLaurin case, all constitute a roll call of infamy and coercion. If the "raw deal" administration had attempted any such rankly discriminatory and subversive legislation against any section of the country where the two-party system prevails, it would have been defeated at the polls and its minions sent back to the obscurity they so richly deserve.

But up until now the South in general, and Texas in particular, have been played for suckers. The "raw deal" administration has taken it for granted

that the South would continue to vote for the Socialists who call themselves Democratic no matter how much it was abused.

But, Mr. Speaker, sir, if other sections of Texas and the South do not follow the lead of the Panhandle of Texas in refusing to vote "Ja" at every election—we shall find our traditions and our way of life destroyed. We shall find our courthouses and our statehouses operated through directives issued by left-wing agitators here in Washington. We shall see our freedom and our liberty dragged in the mire of socialism.

The gage has now been thrown down. It is up to the people of Texas and the South to pick it up and strike back or else they can resign themselves to the fate of never again being treated with respect, fairness, or consideration by the totalitarians of the Truman "raw deal."

Hall Wants Free Open American Elections

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1950

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, recent Sunday editions of the Binghamton Press tell the real story of the desperate efforts of the hate-HALL elements to make the August 22 primary in New York's Thirty-seventh Congressional District an iron-curtain election.

From now on until the day arrives for filing petitions, the bosses will spend most of their time trying to squeeze out everybody but their tailor-made candidate. Along with sundry, sordid advocates of the Nazi plebiscite, they will pour cold water on the hopes of every free agent in our primary.

Anybody with a grain of self-respect or an ounce of manhood will resent the insulting references to their not having a chance in the primary. I am sure that Messrs. Westfall, Bond, and Morrissey will resent and resent strongly the same belittling tactics directed at them which these political bigwigs have used on your Congressman for a generation.

I say again what I have said several times in this campaign, that I do not believe the newspapers or any moneyed tycoon will be able to scare these men of the people out of a free primary.

From their independent and fearless manner, I am certain the Messrs. Westfall, Bond and Morrissey will not bow to the ridicule, and the weltering abuse which Triple Cities newspapers will heap on them for daring to upset the well-laid plans of certain wealthy advertisers to put a catspaw in Congress from this district.

Frankly, I am indignant over such lewd and lousy tactics.

As an exponent of the popular primary system, I resent having these millionaires interfere with the only opportunity the people of our section will have to choose their Representative.

I accuse the big shots of trying to scare out three rank and file Americans like myself who want to exercise their privilege of running for Congress. I accuse these partisans of the single name ballot of strongarming all other candidates out of this race by dampening their ardor, their enthusiasm, just as they have mine for the past 11 years.

I insist that Messrs. Westfall, Bond and Morrissey have as good a chance as I have or as the cringing creature supported by the political dictators of the southern tier.

In the name of free American elections, I demand the big boys stop trying to keep honest men from running for office. I call upon them to do the patriotic thing and stop throwing cold water on the hopes of the American people.

Urgent Need To Adopt Hoover Commission Reforms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY M. JACKSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1950

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD, under leave to extend my remarks, an excellent letter I have received from a Seattle lawyer, Mr. Kenneth A. Cox, who has been working very hard to arouse interest in his community in the work and reports of the Hoover Commission. I consider this one of the finest letters I have received on this subject. In view of the rejection by the Senate of five reorganization plans submitted by the President, I think it particularly appropriate that such a letter, which calls for enactment of all Hoover recommendations, despite the protests of particular interests, be called to the attention of the Congress.

SEATTLE, WASH., *May 23, 1950.*
Congressman HENRY JACKSON,
House Office Building, Washington D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN JACKSON: I have been intending for some time to write to you and some of the other Members of the Washington congressional delegation regarding the recommendations of the Hoover Commission as to the organization of the executive branch of the Federal Government. However, as is so often the case, I kept putting the matter off until recent items in the newspaper forceably reminded me that unless some concerted effort is made, many of the worth-while recommendations of the Commission may come to nothing, either because of inertia or of pressure of special interest groups.

I am a member of the Seattle Junior Chamber of Commerce and for the past year have been serving on its governmental affairs committee. In that capacity, I have been in charge of the local phase of the United States Junior Chamber's Nation-wide "Operation Economy," which was designed to build popular understanding of, and support for, the Commission's recommendations. In addition to this, for the last 2½ months I have been serving as chairman of the Washington State Bar Association's speaker's committee on the Hoover report. In the course of this work I have made approximately 15 talks to groups of all kinds and my friends and associates have made several times that number of appearances. It has been our universal experience that the people before whom we appeared were vitally interested in the Commission's findings and wholeheartedly endorsed, in broad outline at least, the recommendations which the Commission has made. The one possible exception to this, of course, has been the veterans groups. I have appeared before one such group and a friend of mine has addressed two others. It is our feeling that even here among those persons who actually take the trouble to think about the matter, the feeling is that the Commission is right. Certainly I, as a veteran, find nothing in its recommendations as to veterans' affairs which I do not consider to be constructive.

It is my understanding that you and all of the other Members of our congressional delegation have at one time or another gone on record as favoring the Commission's proposals. It is therefore discouraging to read recently of the defeat by the Senate of four of President Truman's reorganization plans which, as far as I have been able to determine from the press, conform essentially to the recommendations of the Commission. Certainly the proposed subordination of the Comptroller of the Currency to the Secretary of the Treasury and the proposals to give increased administrative powers to the chairman of certain of the regulatory commissions seem directly in line with the Commission's recommendations and also seem to me to make excellent sense. Although I realize that the Commission made no very detailed statement regarding the Department of Labor because of the then pending debate over repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act, it nevertheless appears to me that the proposed change in respect to the general counsel of the National Relations Labor Board was in line with the Commission's strong recommendation that in no case should a subordinate ever be given powers completely independent of his superiors.

It therefore concerns me very much that these measures should have been defeated. I can understand the action with regard to Mr. Denham because of the strong emotions which are generally felt as regards the Taft-Hartley Act. However, I can find no explanation for the other three actions except on the ground of personal pressure by interested parties in the agencies themselves. It is obvious, of course, that none of the agencies affected by the Commission's proposal is likely to be willing to have the suggested changes made. However, if we are to get any good from the work of the Commission, it seems to me that those special interests must be submerged in the over-all interests of the country at large. It seems to me, furthermore, that we must take advantage of the work of the Commission, not primarily because of any tax savings it might effect, but because it seems to me that there is real question as to whether our democracy can continue to exist and thrive in the world of today under a government so badly organized and so devoted to out-worn procedures as ours now is. Unless we can effect a rational structure for the executive branch and lay out sensible and efficient procedures to be followed by our executive officials, it seems to me that we cannot expect to deal effectively either with the problems of our domestic economy or of the international cold war. I am sure that there are mistaken recommendations in the Commission's report, and that Congress should give careful scutiny to measures proposed to it as seeking to put the Commission's ideas into effect. However, it seems to me that unless you and our other representatives do something affirmatively to forward the job of reorganization, the work of

the committee will simply gather dust and we will continue to struggle along either until the Government reduces itself to absolute futility or until our Federal budget becomes so large as to impair the health of our general economy.

My investigation into the work of the Hoover Commission has convinced me that it represents a great forward step in the eternal struggle to make our Government actually work for us and that the great bulk of its recommendations should be adopted. I cannot urge you too strongly to do everything in your power to forward the work of the Commission.

Very truly yours,

KENNETH A. COX.

Help for Underdeveloped Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 6, 1950

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent granted to me today, I insert the following letter written by the Honorable Warren R. Austin, representative of the United States to the United Nations and United States representative in the Security Council, to the Secretary of State:

UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE
TO THE UNITED NATIONS,
May 11, 1950.

Hon. DEAN ACHESON,
Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I find the attached summary of reports from some 800 local discussion groups of the People's Section (American Association for the United Nations) indicative of a growing public opinion in support of a program of technical cooperation for development through the United Nations. I hope it can be given general circulation to officers of the Department and other Government agencies interested in the point 4 program.

I note with particular interest the emphasis on strengthening the United Nations by using it as the instrument for international cooperation in this great effort to help underdeveloped nations help themselves.

These groups express their views after study and discussion of the issue. Therefore, their opinions are considered in the light of the information.

The small outlay of funds called for during the initial stages may obscure the importance of the undertaking and cause people to think of technical assistance as purely technical and of small assistance. It encourages me, as I am sure it will encourage you, to know that organized groups of Americans are probing into this matter and finding out for themselves what great things can be accomplished with so little, through international organization.

Nothing, in my judgment, can be more permanently contributory to international peace and stability than uniting people in a common enterprise. When, through their own international agencies, they act to attack the common enemies of ill health, wasteful administration of Government, poverty-breeding methods of agriculture and industry, they become identified with a positive program which can pave the way for expanded production, stable Government, and a better life for all.

As this job is tackled in large part through the United Nations, not only will we achieve the results we seek in lifting the level of life and trade and self-reliance, but we will be strengthening the institutional life of our world organization.

Sincerely yours,

WARREN R. AUSTIN.

The Late Ronald C. Alford

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 6, 1950

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, the residents of West Orange, N. J., mourn the passing of their beloved town clerk, Mr. Ronald C. Alford, who served his community most creditably for many years. West Orange has lost a trusted public servant who will be missed by all. Although I did not have the pleasure of personally knowing Mr. Alford, I was well acquainted with his splendid record and with the esteem in which he was held by his neighbors. Mr. Alford performed his duties throughout the years with unfailing devotion and courtesy, and set an example as a public servant that could well be emulated by all who aspire to public office. The following tribute appeared in the West Orange Chronicle of May 25, 1950, and expresses very well the sentiments of the community:

A SINCERE AND ABLE PUBLIC SERVANT

Ronald C. "Ronie" Alford proved his faith in West Orange's future when he accepted the appointment of town clerk shortly after the commission form of government had been adopted. It wasn't much of a job then as the town had not begun the rapid growth that started later in the twenties. It meant a sacrifice at the time he took it but he never regretted the decision.

Ronie gave to West Orange the type of service that this Nation's forefathers intended for public office when they drew up the historic documents that established democracy in this country. He could no more make a sinecure of it, so popular in many places in these days of political operation, than he could have changed his fundamental character. It was natural and axiomatic with him to put in a hard day's work every day, to give the utmost in service, to cooperate to the fullest extent, and to maintain a cheerful countenance at all times. As town clerk he was to many people the official representative of the town's municipal government and there could not have been a better one. Because of nature of his duties, he had without doubt, more knowledge and information about the town's municipal machinery and its functioning than anyone else in town. His ability was recognized and respected by those who served in municipal capacities outside the town.

It would perhaps not be entirely accurate to say that it would be difficult to find someone of sufficient stature to fill his shoes because Ronie would have been the last to consider his shoes big. His modesty was as apparent as his sincerity. But whoever is selected to succeed him will find that they are very exacting and very conscientious shoes he must fill. And his successor will have little success in eclipsing a memory of a man who dedicated his life to serving his town, sincerely and well.

Lynn, Mass., Centennial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 5, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include herein my remarks over radio station WLYN on Sunday, June 4, 1950, at which time Lynn, Mass., was honored on its one hundredth year as a city:

Greetings. This is the happy birthday of a city.

Of the 100,000 people who call it home.

Friends and business acquaintances in even greater numbers congratulate you on this proud occasion.

A man's first loyalties are to his God and to his family.

In the ever-widening circle of his experience in life, his community ranks next in his affections. Whether by birth or through adoption, he claims it as his own, stimulated by its past accomplishments, to work for its progress in the future.

To you who live and produce in the place called Lynn, it is the very best city on earth. Others are larger, wealthier, or more famous, but these are nothing compared with the friends and neighbors that are yours here.

A city is more than an individual pattern of streets and homes and factories and stores. It is more than city hall, the newspapers, schools, churches, or the identifying landmarks that give it a unique quality.

Walk down Main Street on a late Sunday morning, after services.

At once you are conscious that something is missing.

The buildings are still there, but the old familiar faces are absent. Most of them are reunited with their families or have left the city on highways that lead to the beaches or the mountains.

Main Street is quiet and almost empty.

Somehow it seems longer and wider than it used to be.

Even the stores seem to be sleeping.

For Main Street is not the same without its people. Almost instinctively you turn down a side street—any side street that will lead you to friends and loved ones. For these are the heart of your city, without which its streets and its buildings would be lifeless.

On an anniversary such as this, we become aware of the network of human associations, reaching back through generations, that give a person nourishing roots in his community.

A traveling salesman has a surface cheerfulness that is necessary to his occupation. It also helps to keep him going until he can get back to the base called home.

The people of Lynn have so much to talk of when they speak of home.

For their roots extend deep into the very beginnings of our Nation—to the year 1629, when a few intrepid pioneers selected this land by the sea as a favored spot on which to build shelters for their families.

These men did not ask guaranties of security, before they ventured into the unknown, for if they did, Lynn would not be the thriving industrial center that it is today.

There was sparked the enterprising spirit that is the true kernel of the American character—a spirit that was strengthened by example as son succeeded father, and the people of this city faced up to the problems that confronted them during the different periods of its growth.

In the early town meetings, every citizen had a chance to speak up on questions of local policy and thereby helped to build that tradition of responsible self-government that stands this community in such good stead today.

Those town meetings, in bringing people together, also made them more neighborly. As the settlement grew up through village and town to the status of a city, its inhabitants never lost this precious human quality. Even with the increasing mechanization and the replacement of home industries by huge factories threatening to smother the individual in the crowd, the people did not succumb to standardization.

In business, government, and labor they maintained close and constant touch with those who were delegated to represent their larger numbers. This active two-way communication has not only preserved but is constantly infusing new life into their democratic processes.

They are not afraid of "bigness" because they have learned to guide it.

Thousands of Lynn folk work in one of the Nation's largest factories without being overwhelmed by its size. Both management and labor are to be complimented for making the adjustments required in this new area of industrial relations, which reflect credit on both. Management represents some. Labor represents others. But all involved are human beings, needing each other.

This ability to work out an understanding of any problem on which human beings may have opposing viewpoints is a development of that spirit of neighborliness with which they solved earlier and simpler issues.

This is a tradition passed on through heritage from the early settlers of this community.

It is being actively practiced today.

It is the reason why the residents of Lynn are proud of their city on its one hundredth birthday as they pause to take stock of past accomplishments and then look forward with confidence to its future.

As a Member of the Congress of the United States, whose privilege it is to represent you in our National Legislature, I have an opportunity to observe many communities; some are declining, others are marking time, but most are advancing.

It is clear to me that your city is blessed with that pioneering vigor which welcomes any challenge that the future may present. Your industrial foundation is that of a growth industry which is ever developing new products and new techniques. This, in turn, is inspired by the skill and faith of every man and woman of Lynn.

You are the city.

As such, may I rejoice with you on this birthday anniversary and predict even greater happiness and prosperity for Lynn, a city distinguished by its friendly people.

Farewell to Ambassador Elath

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Israel's first Ambassador to the United States, Eliahu Elath, is leaving these friendly shores this week for a brief return to his homeland and subsequent assumption of the very important diplomatic post of Israel Ambassador to the Court of St. James's. He was a great force for good will and for the establishment of the friendliest relations between the United States and Israel. Many of us in both Houses of Congress have come to know him well personally and to appreciate his great admiration for the American people. We wish him godspeed and new successes as a statesman in the years to come.

I desire to place in the RECORD two brief editorials, one from the New York Herald Tribune of June 5, 1950, and the other from the New York Times of June 6, 1950, as follows:

AS MR. ELATH DEPARTS

As Eliahu Elath departs for Israel, before taking up his new post as Israeli Ambassador to Great Britain, he takes with him the consciousness that he has won many friends in America, for himself and for the state he represented here in a crucial stage of its development. First as an emissary of the Jewish Agency for Palestine, then of the Provisional Government of Israel and finally as Ambassador, he knew troubled times, when the destiny of the new nation hung in the balance, and when the shifting tides of great-power policy were uncertain and difficult to gage. But the scholarly Elath, learned in the life and zealous for the cause of Israel, was equal to the heavy responsibilities which rested upon him.

Israel is fortunate to have a man of his charm and capability to represent her in Britain, especially since he is succeeded here by Aubrey Eban, who has proved his mettle and made so many American friends while serving as Israeli delegate to the United Nations. One of the most severe tests of a young state is to choose men of character and ability to speak for it abroad; Mr. Elath and Mr. Eban provide a happy augury for Israel's future.

SPOKESMAN FOR ISRAEL

If the young State of Israel had had a hundred million people to choose from instead of less than a million, it could not have found a more effective ambassador than Eliahu Elath, who left his Washington post yesterday to go to the Court of St. James. Mr. Elath is a scholar, a broad-minded statesman who understands that Jew and Arab must be friends, a diplomat who kept his dignity and built up his influence during 3 years in the United States before the State of Israel was recognized, a democrat who sees the world in broad, human terms. As he has done here, he will surely make friends for Israel in London. Our good wishes go with him. They go, too, to Aubrey Eban, who has been doing excellent work as Israel's delegate to the United Nations and who will now become ambassador in Mr. Elath's place.

A Little Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, from a constituent of the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan comes a letter which, as I wrote the writer, if one-half true, should be a warning to the farmers.

Inasmuch as a reference of the situation to the local AAA would disclose the writer's identity and if what he writes is true subject him to persecution, there seems to be little, if anything, I can do to help.

The letter reads as follows:

JUNE 5, 1950.

Hon. CLARE E. HOFFMAN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRIEND CLARE: I feel that it is high time that I write to you pleading for you to use every effort at your command to prevent the New Dealers, or Fair Dealers, or any other Communist-dominated element of the Democratic force, to put through the Brannan plan and to refuse any further financial support of the AAA, the Soil Conservation Department, or any other of their organizations that are claiming to help us farmers, and if at all possible I ask for legislation to disband these organizations which are undoubtedly the arch enemy of our American way of life. I did feel a few years ago that after the war was over an investigation would be carried on throughout the country and that numbers of these AAA and follower organizations members would be tried by our civil courts and executed as spies and traitors, but I have long since given up any hope of their getting their just dues.

Some people might think that the above is a rash statement. It is not. It is the truth, and I am going to try and outline some of the persecution that I went through at their hands and I have met other farmers who have been persecuted in similar ways.

Back in 1932, when the New Deal element first came into power, I was about 40 years of age, owned 85 acres of land, had sent or was sending most of my children through high school. I had a family of 10 children. I supplemented my farming by butchering and selling direct to consumers in ——— the livestock that I raised. Although I considered myself a rather poor man financially, I would find myself the victim of the envy of some others in the neighborhood because they were not doing as well as I had. You probably know how such can be.

In 1934, after the death of my mother, I purchased the balance of estate from other heirs, making me 277 acres. I am only reciting these happenings that you may see the why of what followed by AAA. I have found that the AAA followed one pattern whenever possible in the different communities.

First, they chose field workers who were down-and-outers, were on the losing end financially. Then they would pick out some farmer who still had his head above water and would win lots of followers by preaching that he didn't have any right to own so much property, and so forth, and the funny thing was that it worked.

I had to quit the butchering and selling business, not because of sanitary reasons or any local ordinances, but because of the New Deal hog edict. Even the little pigs were killed off. I was forced to quit as a farmer was only allowed to butcher and sell in 1 year about 300 pounds of dressed meat. I went to see the Federal dictator who had charge of this district and he warned me that I would be prosecuted to full extent of the law if I butchered and sold more than that amount. He told me that the liquor bootlegger was a piker compared to my crime.

I quit, as I had already heard of several who had been fined a great deal more than their hogs had sold for. I felt rather bitter about what I considered infringement on my rights. I could see the handwriting on the wall. I refused to sign up to AAA and wrote several articles criticizing the administration that were published in several State papers. For all this I was further persecuted. I was now only engaged in general farming, raised wheat, oats, corn, potatoes, hogs, cattle, and dairy products and chickens to sell. Was that I couldn't raise

potatoes to sell. They cut my wheat acreage to something less than 20 acres. The total acreage of wheat on this farm when I bought this latter part was about 75 acres. That is, they cut me to less than 20 acres on my farm of 277 acres.

I explained to the AAA that I was feeding a large percent of my wheat but they informed me that I could buy wheat to feed. I ignored the allotment of less than 20 acres and planted 30 acres. That summer after harvest I was notified that I was fined several hundred dollars or could pay it in several hundred bushels of wheat. I have forgot the exact amount but I have the papers laid away. I refused to pay up. I was notified to be at ——— on a certain date at the ——— and that farmers would receive their wheat-marketing cards, otherwise I could not feed or sell any of my wheat. I went to this meeting only to see my neighbors given marketing cards and I and a few others like myself refused cards and notified not to feed it either.

I told the AAA bunch to go to hell. I organized a few who were in the same position as myself. Then I joined the ——— which was affiliated with the national organization. They hired William Lemke, of North Dakota, to represent and defend us. (I have here at my desk the newspaper account of his death last Tuesday for which I admit I feel rather sad. I have met him personally. He was a great guy.)

The war was on by now or rather we were in it. I was notified that my fine had been reduced and warned to pay up. I still refused to pay. Finally I was notified that if I would sign a bond they would issue me a marketing card. They finally reduced my bond to $10. I still refused to comply. My son, the only help I had on farm was drafted by Army draft board. I fought it off the best I could. The man who was the head of the AAA office was also the head of the war board who passed on deferments for agricultural purposes. My son was refused deferment for agricultural purposes although the only other help I had was my 11-year-old son.

One day when I was in town a Democrat who was in business, not a farmer, came to me and said they are planning to take your boy off your farm and put him in the Army and it is because of your stand against the AAA and your refusal to sign up a bond on the wheat issue. I told him I know it. He said come with me and I'll sign that bond and they won't take him. At first I refused, but at his urging I finally agreed. At the AAA office I felt rather embarrassed and humiliated when he interceded for me and explained that I had changed, that I would be a good AAA man henceforth, etc., and that he was there to sign my wheat bond. I was told that I must get two bondsmen for the $10 bond. I got one immediately as an old man came in. I received lots of kind smiles from the AAA office personnel for submitting to this which was I suppose expected to make it easier to take. They took my son into the Army anyway.

He was refused deferment. Later a good Democrat friend came to me and told me that if I would write a request to President Roosevelt asking that my son be deferred that the local office would see that it was done. I write all of this that you may see the part that the AAA and local politics were playing with my destiny. I, of course, refused to knuckle down and write to Roosevelt. At my appeal for help I was offered a young man of draft age from an adjoining county who had no experience at farming, but who had been exempted for agricultural purposes. I refused to hire him at his wages. I went it alone except for my 11-year-old son who was in school.

During the war I was continually hampered by the ration board, which office was entwined with the AAA. I was refused gasoline ration to drive to and from any other set of buildings on south end of farm, about a mile apart. I was told that I could walk it. I had livestock there to take care of. Of course, I didn't walk it. I was continually hampered by notices to report at ration boards or they would cut my tractor gas allotment.

One day a man who represented himself as from the State tax department came while I was at south farm buildings doing chores and caring for livestock. He barked out a command for me not to crank my tractor, that I was in wrong with the State of Michigan in filling out a form for gasoline tax refund. I refused to be intimidated, and asked him what was wrong. He said he had five counts against me. I promptly answered each. On some told him to check with the Standard Oil Co. There was nothing wrong. Then he said that he had been talking with my wife, and she had told him that I had been driving my tractor from my house where I lived to south buildings to care for livestock every day. He claimed I didn't have any right on the highway with my tractor. I told him to go to hell.

At that time two other neighbors' tractors were coming down the road. I said why don't you go out and jump on to them fellows? I got rid of him by agreeing to let him take off 25 gallons from any claim that I might have used on tractor on highway. Now, don't think for a minute that there wasn't any connection between this and the AAA. It was all a system of terrorizing me—to break me financially and otherwise. At this point let me tell you about how just recently I was talking with another farmer about AAA.

He was telling me about how his wheat acreage was cut so drastically and how he was fined heavily. How he refused to pay up. How he managed to sell his wheat. How they sent a man after him who represented himself as a State tax man. How this man ordered him not to drive to his farm—the one that was a couple or 3 miles from where he lived—to care for his livestock and to carry on his farmwork. How the ration board would not allow him automobile gas to do so. So he was forced, he told me, to sell about 160 acres of his 300-acre farm. Now I believe you see the connection between the AAA and the ration board, and this man who said he was from the tax department.

My younger son is in partnership farming with me now. This last fall we were given an allotment of only 25 acres for wheat. Yet, last summer we had out and harvested 44 acres. I protested this 25-acre allotment but was refused an increase. We have a lot of part-time farmers who work in town and plant large acreages of wheat. Some of these fellows plant several hundred acres. This is encouraged by the AAA, as it has a tendency to confuse the issue and it does make the surpluses that will force the controls.

Last fall during wheat-planting season a peculiar condition was happening. While we were told that 25 acres was our limit, considerable of these farmers who had been good AAA followers were planting real high above their claimed allotment. At our inquiry they would say that they were not going to abide by the AAA allotment. Well, I finally commenced to understand and told my son that I bet these fellows were in a deal with the AAA and that probably the AAA would get Congress to lift the allotment after they had overplanted and after it was too late for us other fellows to plant.

As you probably know, that was just what was done. Now this spring we have a corn allotment. Ours was set at 18 acres. Last year we raised 30 acres. I did not protest for an increase for in the past no increase has been granted me. I could not get the amount of oats planted that I had planned so am putting it into corn. That will probably put us much over our allotment. I have pondered this question of what to do. We keep livestock and have to have feed. If we do this somehow we will be penalized. If we don't raise the feed then where will we be financially?

Now for the past several years I have been signing up to the AAA. I have to or I wouldn't be allowed to live. But don't misunderstand me. I detest it.

If the Brannan plan is given the authority of law then I and others like myself are just legislated out of life.

My people were pioneers in this country and I own my farm home here but I know that this is a very lengthy letter to ask you to read, but I am fully convinced that there is nothing that is happening behind that nasty iron curtain in Russia but that is being duplicated here under mock democracy.

If the AAA, the power that be, knew that I had written this letter they would arrange to get me somehow, and I know from past experience.

If you wish to use any or all of this, I will give my permission but please do not disclose my identity or the county where it came from so it would be possible for them to trace it.

I will appreciate hearing from you.

One Hundred and Seventy-fifth Anniversary of the Battle of Brooklyn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleagues from Brooklyn, Messrs. CELLER, PFEIFER, KEOGH, O'TOOLE, HEFFERNAN, HELLER, and Mrs. KELLY, and I have today introduced bills providing for the issuance of a special postage stamp commemorating the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the Battle of Brooklyn.

The pages of American history are replete with many heroic episodes attesting to the valor and spirit of sacrifice on the part of the people who fought to establish and maintain the independence of this country. In our efforts to safeguard the freedom and independence of the American people in a world of true peace in our own day, we often go back and refresh our memory about the early days of our nationhood, those crucial and sacrificial days when the fate of the future American Republic was being determined. Those days have always been a source of great inspiration and genuine patriotism to the American people, and they will continue to be so for generations to come.

One of the most inspiring historical events in our Nation's history dates back to the early Revolutionary period, to that eventful year of 1776. We refer to the Battle of Brooklyn—sometimes known also as the Battle of Long Island—which occurred on August 27, 1776, just a few weeks after the Declaration of Independence was formally adopted, heralding the birth of a new and great democracy.

In the Battle of Brooklyn we have the origin of the modern Dunkirk idea; that is, the withdrawal to safety of a large body of troops across a barrier of water under the most adverse military conditions. Gen. George Washington's successful retreat during the Battle of Brooklyn and the subsequent effect of his strategic act must have left such lasting impressions on the British that they never forgot it and, in turn, used it with great success themselves just 10 years ago at Dunkirk in June 1940. Similarly, as Dunkirk helped to save the final victory for Britain in our days, so the Battle of Brooklyn helped to save Washington and his army from being surrounded and captured—a fate which would have sealed the doom of the American Colonies and dashed to earth their hopes for independence.

The Battle of Brooklyn has not been sufficiently and properly evaluated by our historians in the past. It unquestionably ranks with Lexington and Concord and Valley Forge and many other historic battles of that period as an event of major importance. It merits a place of honor in the annals of American history. Although officially the Americans lost that battle and retreated across the East River to Manhattan, it actually proved to be a significant turning point in the war. It slowed the British military effort against the Americans and it kept our forces intact and in a state of high morale. As we look back today upon that event in the perspective of history, the sacrificial spirit of those early Americans heroically defending the revolutionary cause at the old Stone House in Brooklyn stands out as one of the most courageous chapters in our history.

We are approaching a significant anniversary of this notable event which lends itself most fittingly to a commemorative celebration and to paying homage to those valiant martyrs by extending appropriate recognition to their heroic deeds and sacrifices during the Battle of Brooklyn in 1776. On August 27, 1951 we will celebrate the one hundred seventy-fifth anniversary of that historic event.

It was just prior to that battle that General Washington addressed his troops as follows:

> The enemy have now landed on Long Island and the hour is fast approaching on which the honor and success of this army and the safety of our bleeding country depend. Remember, officers and soldiers, that you are freemen fighting for the blessings of liberty—that slavery will be your portion and that of your posterity if you do not acquit yourselves like men.

The people of the Borough of Brooklyn intend to celebrate this anniversary with the proper dedicatory services, wide civic participation, and suitable programs as a manifestation of patriotism in a living democracy.

The bill we are introducing today calls for the issuance by the Post Office Department of a commemorative postage stamp memorializing the Battle of Brooklyn. It will bear a design depicting the battle and will be issued on the anniversary date indicated.

The Test of the Dairyman's Strength

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1950

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Chenango County Farmer:

The dairyman of the Thirty-seventh Congressional District will be given three tests in 1950. The test of his strength of fighting spirit, the test of the strength of his vote, and the strength of his loyalty to his Representative in Congress—EDWIN ARTHUR HALL.

It will be remembered that in 1948 Congressman HALL was said to be the main target under Democratic fire for they wished him removed from Congress and no means were to be spared to remove him, and the good work was to be done in Binghamton for his greatest strength was there. It was soon learned that his strength in Binghamton was so great and in the rural districts also, that all the schemes, even the $50 schemes were fruitless.

But the plans and schemes have taken a new turn in 1950. Reinforcements are needed and what better place to look for them than among the dairymen for there could be a net laid for them and him also. It is a great help to some if the farmer can be kept a slave to help pay others' expenses. The Brannan plan was carefully written but it was expected the farmer would object as he had a little experience with dictators during World War II. Then he was told when he must arise, when he should retire, where he could go, where he must not go, what he could do and not do, what crops he could raise, and how much he could raise. But if the farmers objected there was another way; he could be compelled to take it. So the net tightened until the farmers turned to their Representative for help.

Just as expected, Congressman HALL asked that the farmers be allowed to survive by giving them a fair price for their produce. He asked that the dairymen be given a price for milk that would cover the price of production. What was the answer? The price of milk was lowered.

Then again he did the expected. He asked that the price of dairy feed be lowered until the farmer's milk check would pay his feed bill. What happened? The price of dairy feed advanced. He asked that the suffering dairyman in drought-stricken areas of which his district was a part be given help to place them on their feet again. What was the answer? They were told hay would be available at from $35 to $50 per ton. That was the help the dairyman got. And each time he was refused help the net tightened around the dairyman and his Representative. For if the dairyman could be compelled to lose confidence in his Representative the rest would be easy.

Congressman HALL has repeatedly tried to keep the farmer from being caught in some net that has been cast for him. Despite threats it would cost him his seat in Congress he has been loyal to his dairymen. He has fought the manufacturers of oleo. It is true he voted for repeal of all taxes on oleo because manufacturers of butter and even the dairymen asked for a compromise; asked that all taxes be removed and oleo be left uncolored. The manufacturers of oleo accepted the removal of taxes and then asked that they be allowed to color their product yellow. Congressman HALL fought stubbornly to prevent interstate commerce and coloring of oleo but the manufacturers gained victories. But this should not reflect in any way on Congressman HALL's ability. Although the southern Democrats gained victories they swore vengeance on those who fought them.

And has Congressman HALL any other enemies? He has been named as the world's champion on remembering faces and shaking hands. Can it be possible, when in Washington, he has forgotten or purposely declined to shake the hand of John L. Lewis or Joe Stalin? Would he forget and ignore two such prominent men as they and then come back to his own home town and remember every face and shake the hand of each constituent?

The dairymen should give all this careful thought. Their Representative is a candidate for Congress among several other candidates. The Republicans are anxious to keep all the power they have. For that reason the incumbent should be chosen.

The dairymen should remember every time they yield an inch the enemy advances one mile. And if the dairymen surrender their representative, they have surrendered everything.

The dairy industry is a business and no business of any kind is so great it cannot be injured or ruined. Are not the Triple Cities shoe factories already in similar danger?

If the dairy industry is to be saved it must be saved by the dairyman, not by politics. And any who doubt Congressman HALL's capability, stability, integrity, and loyalty should ask himself the question, "Why are the opposition and manufacturers of oleo so determined to rid Congress of him?" That is all that is needed to prove the worth of Congressman HALL to his party and his dairymen.

EDWIN ARTHUR HALL is not the man to be influenced or bribed. He is not the handyman around Washington, working for his own party only when the opposite party has no use for him. If he was that type he would have no trouble staying in Washington for the other party would see he was kept there.

If the people of Binghamton are planning a strategy, if votes can be pooled to defeat him, the dairyman can use that same strategy and votes can be pooled to elect him. He is representing the Democratic dairymen as well as the Republican. When he fights for one he fights for the other.

The dairymen should forget politics when electing their Representative for it is for their interest to do so. They must fight and fight to win. They should not fight for him one day and be against him the next.

Congressman HALL is flanked on all sides in the Triple Cities by friends who can neither be influenced nor bribed. Their support with the dairymen's should be sufficient for it was said in 1948 his strength in the cities and the strength of the farmers were 50–50.

If the dairy farmers of 1950 have the fighting spirit of their forefathers to fight for their liberty, they will start fighting while the fighting is good and while they have a Representative in Washington to fight with them and for them. If the Republican dairymen value their liberty they will go to the primaries and demand liberty by casting their vote to renominate their Representative, EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. And if the Democratic dairymen have the fighting spirit to answer the challenge hurled at the dairymen and their representative, "Get help if you can," they will answer that challenge with another challenge in November—"Take my Representative from me if you can." (Chenango County Farmer, by Mrs. D. E. Huntley, R. D. No. 1, Greene, N. Y.)

Reserve Components Policy Board Is Hope of ROA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 19, 1950

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a speech delivered at the annual banquet of the Michigan Reserve Officers Association convention at Battle Creek, Saturday, June 3, 1950:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, members of the ROA and ROAL: I know of no better way to cover the main problems of interest to reservists than to summarize the activities of the new Board set up a year ago, in the office of the Secretary of Defense to handle those problems.

I say that for this reason. The history of the Army and the Air Force, in particular, in regard to their Reserves has not been very good. This is not so true of the Navy and Marine Corps; and I can understand, at least in part, and sympathize with the Army and Air Force in their dealings with some of their problems.

But certainly one reason they have had trouble can be traced to the general-staff system. Here is why. Under that system, all the military—not excluding the Reserves—head up in the Chief of Staff. The civilian Secretary usually knows only as much as the Chief of Staff lets him know. And the Chief of Staff is almost always what in the Navy is known as a "line officer"—a field soldier who is more sensitive to the problems of the standing combat forces than to anything else.

I am not standing in judgment on that. I just say that is the situation. Whether it is good or bad, generally speaking, is another subject that I can't try to cover tonight.

But, taking that as a fact, it leaves the Reserves behind the service eight ball. The Chief knows about and is interested in the Infantry, the armored force, and so on, but when it comes to the civilian Reserves, he can give their needs attention only on a part-time basis.

Now, this situation has produced several bills in Congress to put Reserve matters in the Army and Air Force in the hands of the civilian side of the Departments—to take these matters away from the complete control of the Chief of Staff and General Staff and vest them in a civilian Under Secretary or Assistant Secretary for Reserve Affairs. Your ROA has been interested in that in the past, and it might get active eventually in the Congress if a strong enough case is made for it.

But, in the meantime, a really great step forward has been taken for the Reserves. The Defense Department last year set up what is known as the Civilian Components Policy Board. It is an intrinsic part of Secretary Johnson's office, and, therefore, takes the place of the previous efforts to get these matters away from Chief of Staff control in the Pentagon.

I believe it has the opportunity to accomplish more for the services' Reserves than anything done in recent years for them, and that is why I want to tell you about it tonight. That Board, only a year old, functioning on the same high level as the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Munitions Board, the Research and Development Board, and the Personnel Policy Board, is, I expect, to affect the military future of every member of our civilian components, active or inactive. And, given close scrutiny and gentle prodding by the Congress, I think its impact on the reserves will be all to the good. (I have to say here that the way some things have gone for Army and Air Force Reserves in the past makes me suspect that any progress by this Board would be bound to be good.)

So now, how does this new Board work. Listen closely to this. It is exceptionally important to each of you here and to Reserves all over the Nation.

This Civilian Components Policy Board makes recommendations direct to the Secretary of Defense on Reserve matters of major policy. In all other Reserve matters—that is, those not of a major policy nature, and there are many of these—the Board has the full delegated power of the Secretary of Defense under the Unification Act. (Judging from our recent experiences in the Congress, I needn't remind you that that power of the Secretary is not inconsiderable. You can see that your new Board is in a position to wield a really big stick if it has to.)

Specifically, though, your Board has this assigned job. It is charged with the plans, policies, and programs of the Army, Navy, and Air Force in the Reserve area. Of course, it is founded on the basic concept that it should function only as a staff agency—a concept supposed to be characteristic of all activities in the Office of the Secretary of Defense, even though that wasn't done recently in respect to closing of military hospitals over the Nation, including Battle Creek here in Michigan. But, insofar as your Board goes, it has done that, and hence has left in the Army, Navy, and Air Force Departments their responsibility for their own Reserve programs.

Now, I want to point out here that your Board is not, by any stretch of the imagination, a rubber-stamp outfit for the Regular services. Twelve of its voting members are themselves members of the civilian components. Two come from the Organized Reserve Corps of the Army, two from the National Guard, two from the Naval Reserve, two from the Marine Corps Reserve, two from the Air Force Reserve and two from the Air National Guard. These are senior officers with many years of service who have been and are active in these affairs in Washington and over the country. Their membership on this Board is a splendid step forward for all Reserves, and I am looking for really substantial results to flow from their efforts.

Now, there are seven other voting members of the Board. They are the chairman, who is Mr. Edwin H. Burgess, and a civilian assistant secretary and a top-ranking officer from each of the three military departments. Each of these members is a man of high executive caliber, thoroughly experienced and qualified for making top-level policies and decisions. For example, Mr. Burgess, the chairman, is vice president and general counsel of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad. That is certainly high calibre experience. And he only recently succeeded Mr. William T. Faricy, who is president of the Association of American Railroads. Mr. Faricy was the chairman of the Civilian Components Policy Board from its inception until last month. The Board's retiring executive officer, Luke W. Finlay, a brigadier general in the Organized Reserve Corps, a graduate of both West Point and Yale University Law School and World War II executive officer of the Army Transportation Corps, is now returning to his position as counsel for the Standard Oil Corp. of New Jersey. I understand that General Finlay will be succeeded by Rear Adm. I. M. McQuiston of the Naval Reserve, also a very able man. The admiral has been associated with the Naval Air Reserve since World War I and was an original member of the Civilian Components Policy Board.

So that is the composition of your Board in the Pentagon. I have seen few Washington boards as good. It seems to me that it will take a superhuman effort on the part of someone to keep it from doing fine work, and I think you'll agree.

Now, bear in mind that the Board is not a full-time organization. It has convened, I understand, for seven sessions since October of last year. However, it doesn't stand still in between sessions. An executive committee, composed of the three civilian members of the Board and the Chairman, is empowered by the Secretary of Defense to act for the Board when the Board is not in session and action is too urgent to wait for the next session. Also, the Board has a full-time research and planning staff. Like the Board itself, it is a well-balanced group of Regulars, Reservists, and National Guard men, who have been selected from their various military departments. So there is continuity in the executive committee and the research and planning staff despite the part-time nature of the Board.

So much for the Board's make-up. Now, let's get to what it is doing.

I am sure that by far the most important matter before the Board since it was created is the so-called Armed Forces Reserve Act. It has been before the Board since its first meeting in October, which is too long, in my opinion, but I have believed in giving the new Board a reasonable chance before finding too much fault with it. Now, this Armed Forces Reserve Act is a piece of so-called must legislation. It is to come to Congress for enactment in the near future. What it does is to broaden the previous so-called Roper bill—H. R. 2828 of this Congress—so as to apply generally across-the-board to the civilian components of the three services. The Roper bill, as you probably know, was the Navy's intended modernization of the Naval Reserve Act of 1938 and was a magnificent job which now is to benefit all Reserves.

So this is to be a sort of charter for all Reserves. It will provide a base in law for the organization of the civilian components of all the Armed Forces. It was processed some time ago by the Civilian Components Policy Board with the hope that it might be introduced in this Congress and hence would be available for general discussion by Members of the Congress, the civilian components, veterans' organizations, and all individuals concerned. The legislation is to include a section covering matters common to all the services and also a section covering items peculiar to each of the military departments.

To give you an idea of the importance of this measure to each of you, I will hit its high points very briefly.

It has a section covering standard contracts for members of all civilian components on extended active duty. An allowance for uniforms for officers of all the services is established commensurate with the allowance which Naval Reserve officers have received for some time. The so-called common Federal commission bill is included, providing for a common Federal commission for officers of the National Guard and Organized Reserve Corps. Items such as these which are the subject of separate proposed legislation have been included in this bill in order to make it an all-inclusive general basic law for all Reserves.

A section of the Navy title of this bill prescribes that Reservists serving on active duty during any future war or national emergency shall be transferred temporarily to the Regular Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, as the case may be. The effect of this provision is to place naval reservists while on active duty in the same position as the Regulars.

The legislation does not deal primarily with matters which are the subject of other major laws, such as pay, retirement, and the universal code of military justice, except as those matters have to be mentioned in

connection with certain sections of this bill. Of course, it is not the aim of this bill to change those laws.

Your board has moved two other legislative measures that are of great importance to a well-balanced reserve program. High priority has been properly attached to the reserve training facilities bill, and to a proposed Reserve Officers Training Corps bill. The first of these is just about to come out of the House Armed Services Committee and authorizes the construction, on a joint usage basis, of additional facilities needed for the training of the expanded postwar reserve programs. The second, which is now tied up in the Bureau of the Budget but soon to come up to Congress, modernizes existing ROTC legislation and is extremely important. It would make available to all the services on an across-the-board basis provisions comparable to those now enjoyed by the Navy alone under the Holloway Act, thus bringing about parity among the services in the procurement and training of sorely needed junior officers for the three regular services and their civilian components.

And there is more legislation that has been considered by your board. A military and naval science buildings bill has been proposed. If the Congress passes it, it will authorize the Army, Navy, and Air Force to make grants to certain educational institutions for the purchase, construction, and expansion of military and naval science buildings. These grants of moneys could be made to accredited universities and colleges granting baccalaureate or higher degrees at which ROTC, NROTC, or AFROTC units now exist or may hereafter be established. The grants are set up to be used to defray a portion of the costs of construction of a permanent building, or buildings, or altering, remodeling and enlarging an existing building or buildings, for use as a military or naval science building, or both. The idea is to provide space for instruction in military or naval science including space for Army, Navy, and Air Force personnel, and security and housing for military and naval instructional equipment.

For other legislative items being considered by the board, I will dash these off: Amendments to your retirement law (Public Law 810) to broaden the scope of retirement benefits extended to certain nurse and WAC members of the civilian components; amendments to Public Law 108 providing additional benefits for members of civilian components who suffer disability or death from training injuries; measures which will permit the services to furnish rations in kind to enlisted reserve and National Guard personnel engaging in inactive duty training; expansion of the military amateur radio system program; provisions for active duty status for United States property and disbursing officers, and bills to establish an Armed Forces Reserve medal and Armed Forces Reserve commendation medal.

I mention all of this because it begins to look to me as if the legislative requirements of our Reserve forces are now and will continue in the future to have sympathetic direction from a high level in the Department of Defense, and that is very important to the success of the Reserve programs. But there are other important elements in the development and maintenance of the civilian components besides legislation. One is the very important subject of fiscal matters, and that one is mighty hard to reach, in its planning stages, by the Congress, so the Board can strike a tremendous blow there if it carries out its responsibilities as it is expected to. Based on reviews of budget estimates and studies of the composition of the individual components themselves, the Board can make powerful recommendations to the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Secretary of Defense with respect to the fiscal requirements of the Reserves and the effect of possible budget limitations on a planned state of readiness if such limitations are imposed. This could be the Board's most productive arena, judging from the previous experience of the Reserves with the service dollar.

But to go on about your new Board. Even in its brief operation to date, it has considered a wide diversity of matters other than legislation and money. Some of these items have been completed. Others are still in various stages of study and development. For instance, a study is now being made of the current status within each of the three services of what has thus far been done to implement the recommendations made to former Secretary of Defense Forrestal by an earlier committee on civilian components. You will recognize the report of this committee as the Gray Board Report. It had 90 recommendations. They were intended to determine the type and character of civilian components to be maintained, the missions they should have, the most desirable size and composition, the proper relationship of such components to the several armed services and to one another, the ways in which the desired purposes could be attained with the maximum of harmony, efficiency, and economy, and the elimination of a host of inequities and disparities among the several components. The Board has reported to me that it is going to determine the need for further implementation by the services of these Gray Board recommendations in an effort to arrive at the most satisfactory organization and efficient state of readiness of the civilian component forces.

And here is another interesting development. I think it is a corker. The idea is that the members of all civilian components of the Armed Forces should have equal opportunity to participate in the formulation of policies pertaining to the organization and administration of the civilian component program. To do this the Board is recommending that each of the services develop a plan of local civilian component advisory groups. A successful plan of this sort has been in effect for several years in the Navy. It works this way: Local Naval Reserve units and individual Naval Reservists are invited to submit recommendations and comments on their local programs to a Reserve policy group at their naval district headquarters. The local group screens and consolidates the recommendations and comments for forwarding by the naval district commandant to the statutory Naval Reserve Policy Board, which convenes in Washington. I am enthusiastic over this plan. There is too much of this submission of matters through command channels. This idea is much more desirable from the point of view of the individual, and I think all Reserves will find it a much better means of conveying recommendations to the people in Washington who have the power to decide and act.

How to get enlisted Reserves for the armed services is also being studied. This is being done by an ad hoc committee of the Board. There is serious need for a definite program in this field throughout the services, and it ought to move along now that the Board is getting its teeth into it. The study will also cover such allied problems as the allocation of Reserve units so as to use most efficiently the enlistee potential in the population and prevent competition between civilian component units; and the value and need for an expansion of the junior ROTC or the establishment or expansion of other organized and supervised programs.

A joint advisory panel on ROTC affairs has also been set up. It will make recommendations to your Civilian Components Policy Board concerning over-all ROTC policies and the coordination of the ROTC plans, policies and programs of the three military departments. Civilian educators closely associated with the ROTC throughout the country are being invited to participate with representatives of the military departments in developing these recommendations.

Now, I am sure I don't need to remind you that the Regular establishments form a very small portion of our peak military strength in time of war. This created a need to establish policies for the assignment of all Regular officers to duty with the Reserves at some appropriate point in their careers. It also required some indoctrination of all officers so assigned in the problems of the Reserves and the opportunities afforded by such an assignment. There had to be two purposes in mind in dealing with this. One was to give the professional military men who must be the leaders of our wartime forces intimate familiarity with the understanding of the problems, state of training, and psychological outlook of our citizen soldiers. At the same time we have to provide the Reserves with the skilled guidance and supervision that only the professional military man can give. This brings your Board in the picture again. A set of principles for the guidance of the military departments in the assignment of Regular officers to reserve duty was recommended by the Civilian Components Policy Board and approved by the Secretary of Defense. If these are observed conscientiously over the years, they should have far-reaching benefits to the entire Military Establishment.

Well, I could keep this sort of thing up for a long time. For example, the Board has set up on-site planning boards at all jointly utilized facilities. In this it is supported by 52 National Defense Reserve Facilities Boards located in each State, Territory, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. These were transferred to its jurisdiction when the Reserve Facilities Committee was transferred from the Munitions Board some time ago. It has also reviewed the fiscal year 1950 construction programs and examined current construction costs. Passage of the proposed Reserve Training Facilities bill now in the House will move this along, but in the meantime, varying degrees of joint usage are already under way in more than 700 Reserve training facilities.

The problem of procurement of Reserve pilots is also being taken up. The problem of adequate training of enlisted personnel for all the Reserves is not only being studied but has recently been broadened to include a proposal to use a system of trade school and college scholarships as an inducement to young men of appropriate age to participate in summer training programs with a view to their subsequent recruitment in the Reserves. A program for the cross-training of members of the Civilian Components of one service by appropriate units of other services is in the mill, and the achievement of uniform standards among the services to the greatest possible extent is being sought on all such matters as drill pay, active-duty training, promotion, age-in-grade regulations, allowance of retirement credits, and the like. The Defense Department and with other interested agencies are also trying to develop policies on the proper interrelationship between the Reserve programs and selective service on the one hand and between the Reserves and other claimants for essential manpower on the other.

I realize that this list is long, but I think the progress made thus far is extremely gratifying and you are entitled to know about it. For the first time in history the Reserves of the Armed Forces, through their own Board, are participating on a policy-making level, in decisions affecting all Reserves, and I say that things are looking up in the Pentagon.

For a final word, I will say that the Armed Services Committee has a Special Subcommittee on Civilian Components which is standing by just in case the Board rests

too long on its oars. It may swing into action this fall, at least to keep in close touch and to prod things along a bit, but the main thing is to know that in the Pentagon, and on Capitol Hill too, you now have groups in existence that can carry your battles for you in Washington. Just keep that in mind and let the committee know if things look like they're going wrong. I think we can stoke up the furnaces, get the fires going in a hurry, and really get results.

A Profile of Hon. Jacob K. Javits, of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 6, 1950

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent granted to me today, I include the following article from the magazine New Yorker concerning our colleague from New York, Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS:

PROFILES—THE GENTLEMAN FROM NEW YORK
(By E. H. Kahn, Jr.)

To a Representative in Congress it seems that the Members of his particular body politic are, individually and collectively, the nicest, most generous, and most deserving people in the world. He spends about half his time looking out for their special interests, and his motto with regard to them is, as a rule, "Service with a smile." JACOB KOPPEL JAVITS, the Republican-Liberal standard bearer, in the House, of the Twenty-first Congressional District of New York, has a fine set of shining white teeth, and, though by nature a rather solemn man, he is often moved to display them in fond welcome upon the approach of a constituent, much in the manner of a maitre d'hotel upon the approach of a steady and well-heeled customer. The demands on JAVITS' patience, endurance, and resourcefulness are, on the whole, infinitely more severe than those a head waiter has to cope with. JAVITS has served 3 years in Congress, and during that stretch has been asked by his flock to handle around 10,000 matters. Should an ex-soldier in the Twenty-first District, which takes in the upper West Side, including the entire northern tip of Manhattan and has a population of nearly a third of a million, feel, as one did not long ago, that the Veterans' Administration was unfair in its decree that he ought to be treated by psychiatric therapy rather than by psychoanalysis, JAVITS is the man with whom the complaint is apt to be lodged. Should a lady be of the opinion that the Bureau of Internal Revenue is demanding of her a dollar and seventeen cents more than she owes on her Federal income tax, or another lady, representing an Elizabethan reading club, be of the opinion that the New York Public Library carries a shamefully inadequate stock of the books favored by her society, JAVITS is the man who is likely to hear about it and be expected to do something about it. He is a public servant of remarkable fortitude and energy, and every few waking hours he does a favor for a constituent—sometimes without knowing about it, since he has a staff of six assistants who dispose of many such problems in his influential name.

JAVITS is so conscientious that he makes sure his constituents are looked after even when he is thousands of miles away from them. In the summer of 1947, while in Europe on a congressional fact-finding expedition, he had a good deal of legislative research to attend to, over a wide area, but nonetheless he took pains during a stopover in Dublin to get in touch with the American consul regarding the issuance of a visa to a cousin of one of his constituents, who was eager to migrate to the Twenty-first District, and upon finding himself in Vienna he took equal pains to expedite the admission to this country of a rabbi, then in a displaced-persons camp, whom a group of constituents wished to import to officiate at their temple. JAVITS scarcely ever fails to react sympathetically to a plea for help from a resident of his district. Recently, a young man in Washington Heights wrote in to say that he thought he was losing his mind, and what did his Congressman propose to do about it? "I am sure you will remain sane," JAVITS replied, and urged the man to feel free to call on him again if he needed further advice.

The gentleman from New York is a dazzling example of a successful progression from rags to riches. His father's monthly cash earnings never exceeded $40 and his political activities were confined to proselytizing for Tammany Hall on the lower East Side; his mother could neither read nor write until she was 55. The fact that the son of this underprivileged couple may now affix an Hon. to his name, is a familiar figure in the Bankers Club, calls John Hay Whitney "Jock," and can, without quivering, pay a check at "21," where he frequently dines when in New York, is an inspiration to many of his constituents, among whom are quite a few refugees from Europe seeking the realization of the American dream. In JAVITS' rapid rise to eminence they see the fulfillment of the aspirations they entertain for their own children, and they would be delighted if their Congressman were to make even more splendid political progress in the future. So would he.

The Congressman's father, Morris Javits, was born in 1862 in Mielnitza, which was then part of Austria and is now part of the Soviet Ukraine, and was entrusted by his parents to a rabbi, in whose steps it was hoped he would follow. Instead, when he was 22, he migrated to the United States and, like so many other newcomers from eastern Europe, went into the clothing industry. He made pants. He had been here 7 years when he met his future wife, Ida Littman. She had been born in Palestine, the child of a farmer's daughter who had married a traveling salesman from Vienna while he was passing through Galilee and had been abandoned by him shortly thereafter. Ida's mother subsequently married a Russian and went off with him to Odessa, leaving the girl in Palestine, where she was obliged to go to work at the age of 6. Ida joined her mother and stepfather in Odessa when she was 16, and 2 years after that, when the stepfather died, mother and daughter came to New York. Ida went into the clothing trade, too. She made neckties. She was married to Morris Javits in 1893, and they had two sons, Benjamin, born the following year, and JACOB, born in 1904 and for most of the time since then known informally as JACK.

Morris Javits was a dreamy type, ill at ease in a materialistic world, and his wife, a practical woman who considered pants-making a precariously seasonal trade, obtained a degree of security for the family by persuading her husband to devote himself instead to superintending three dingy tenements near the corner of Orchard and Stanton Streets. That at any rate meant they could live rent-free. She helped support the family by selling toys and drygoods from a pushcart. There were about twenty adult tenants in each of the tenements over which her husband presided, and the senior Javits, in addition to performing his custodial duties, represented Tammany Hall on the premises. Before every election, he would go to a nearby saloon, and from its proprietor, who controlled political disbursements in that neighborhood, receive a $2 honorarium for each tenant eligible to vote and ostensibly willing to vote Democratic.

In return for his taking the trouble to distribute these incentives, he was allowed by Tammany to perform minor philanthropic functions in its behalf, such as fixing any parking tickets acquired by pushcart peddlers on his corner. JACK attended public school in the neighborhood. By the time he finished the elementary grades, in 1916, his brother had left City College, had set up shop as a collector of bad debts, and was studying law at Fordham in his spare time. During the First World War, the family moved to Brooklyn, where Morris Javits died, after an operation, in 1918. On becoming the head of the family, his older son, for the sake of convenience, moved his mother and brother to Washington Heights. In high school up there, JACK won a prize for scholarship, was elected chairman of the senior class day committee, and was appraised by his fellow students, in their class yearbook, with the phrase "You can't tell from first appearances," a judgment that was certainly prophetic in at least one important respect, for his only appearance on the political scene up to then had been as a youthful and ardent soapbox advocate of socialism.

JACK JAVITS was graduated from high school at 16, and within a few months, having decided to forego a college education, was earning $75 a week as a salesman of printing inks and lithograph stones. In 1922, his brother was admitted to the bar, began to practice law, and turned his bill-collecting business over to him. While chasing debtors, JACK attended New York University Law School on the side, a college degree not then being a prerequisite for such study, and, showing an early aptitude for a legislative career, won the post of anchor man on the debating team. In 1924, he, too, abandoned bill-collecting, and became a clerk in his brother's law office. He continued in that capacity until he had completed his law course.

JACK was admitted to the bar himself in 1927, and joined Benjamin in practice. Their firm, Javits & Javits, came to enjoy considerable success in representing minority stockholders in bankruptcy and reorganization cases, some of which involved millions of dollars in contested funds and, ultimately, a hundred thousand or so in legal fees for the stockholders' counsel. In most instances, JACK was the courtroom man and the desk work was done by Benjamin, who over the years has become noted as an expert in anti-trust matters and has distinguished himself avocationally by helping to draw up the National Industrial Recovery Act, by helping to found a pressure group of stock- and bondholders called the Investors League, and by writing a number of books on high finance, among them a sensationally untimely one, published in 1929, entitled "Make Everybody Rich—Industry's New Goal." He has also been active, in a behind-the-scenes way, in politics, and soon after JACK began practicing law urged him to cultivate a similar interest by joining the National Republican Club. JACK was agreeable. He had been cool toward the Democratic Party ever since, as a child, he had observed his father greasing the neighbors' palms, and he had reached the decision that the Socialist Party espoused too utopian a program to warrant his continued support. He became a fervent disciple of Fiorello LaGuardia, worked hard for him during the 1937 mayoralty campaign, and in 1940, when the Norris-LaGuardia committee was formed to stir up non-Democratic enthusiasm for President Roosevent's third-term campaign, went along with his idol. JAVITS' defection from the Republican ranks on that occasion has since prompted some old-line members of the GOP to take a jaun-

diced, if not downright suspicious, view of him, but nowhere near so jaundiced or suspicious a view as they might have taken if any Republican other than Wendell Willkie had been the candidate.

At a dinner party early in 1941, while JAVITS happened to be in Washington on business, he met an Army general who was deputy to the head of the Chemical Warfare Service. The two got to talking, and the general casually mentioned that the service had been having a tough time arranging for the manufacture of a certain kind of paper filter needed for gas masks. JAVITS was then, and his firm still is, counsel for the National Paper Trade Association, and the next day, seeking to do a favor for his acquaintance of the evening before, he got in touch with an official of one of the many companies affiliated with that organization and obtained his promise to produce the filters at once. The general was astonished at the ease with which this civilian could dispose of a problem that had been stumping the military, and JAVITS was invited forthwith to become a two-day-a-week consultant to the Chemical Warfare Service. It was one of those dollar-a-year jobs. Thanks to the National Paper Trade Association and other prosperous clients of his law firm, JAVITS could afford to take it, and did. He impressed his new associates so profoundly that by November, despite his never having studied either chemistry or warfare, they asked him to become a full-time civilian aide to the chief of the Service. He accepted, and the following March was commissioned a major. By then, he had achieved such stature in military circles that his swearing-in ceremony was attended by five generals. That fall, in an effort to make his knowledge of soldiering somewhat commensurate with his rank, he took 6 weeks of concentrated basic training and proceeded straight from that to the Command and General Staff School, at Fort Leavenworth, Kans., thus becoming possibly the only soldier in American history to make an academic jump roughly the equivalent, in civilian circles, of skipping from kindergarten to the Institute for Advanced Study.

At the end of the war, JAVITS, by then a lieutenant colonel—he is now a colonel in the Chemical Reserve—decided not to devote himself exclusively to the law but to have a fling at politics. Through George Medalie, a friend of his and a prominent Republican of long standing, he became head of the research division at the campaign headquarters of Judge Jonah J. Goldstein, the Republican and Fusion nominee for mayor in 1945. JAVITS' duties consisted mainly of writing speeches, and he wrote a great many, all dealing soberly with significant issues and brimming with research. Goldstein never delivered any of them, having determined to pin his hopes—unsuccessfully, as it turned out—on winning recognition and votes as a gang buster. Nonetheless, the Republican leaders in the city were grateful to JAVITS for his efforts, and, scouting about for a suitable means of showing their appreciation, came up the following summer with the nomination for Congressman from the Twenty-first District. On the face of it, this reward appeared as unsubstantial and unappetizing as an empty ice cream cone, for the Twenty-first was a notoriously non-Republican district. The last previous Republican to be sent to Congress from there had won out in 1920, and then only after three successive defeats. In the 1944 election a Tammany man had swamped his Republican rival by 91,747 votes to 40,718. JAVITS, however, was delighted with the nomination and undismayed about his prospects. He moved at once from a midtown hotel where he had been staying to an apartment at Riverside Drive and One Hundred and Sixteenth Street, on the southern fringe of the Twenty-first, and shortly thereafter to more spacious quarters on the Drive at One Hundred and Fifty-first Street. (A Congressman doesn't have to live in his district, but it is considered expedient for him to do so.) He persuaded the Liberal Party to give him its official nod, too. As that party was then in its formative stage, a petition with 3,000 signatures was required to get JAVITS a Liberal Party line on the voting machines. JAVITS energetically collected a thousand signatures himself.

When JAVITS started his campaign, he was unknown to most of the residents of the Twenty-first District, and the Twenty-first District, even though he had lived in it briefly while in high school, was pretty much unknown to him. The candidate immediately sought to atone at least for his own ignorance by conducting extensive local research, in which he enlisted the services of, among others, Elmo Roper. JAVITS was rewarded with, and made public, such findings as that the Twenty-first contained 50 percent more high-school graduates and 25 percent more college graduates than the average for New York City's 23 other congressional districts, and that within it were 6 homes for the aged, 81 churches, and a hundred delicatessens. JAVITS further revealed, presumably to bolster his prospective constituents' hopes about their life expectancies, that 61 funeral parlors in the district had gone out of business between 1940 and 1946, and that 3,500 births had occurred there in 1945, as against only 100 deaths. (He didn't bother to append a footnote to this last statistic explaining that the Harkness Pavilion, where numerous babies destined to live in other districts are born, is situated in the Twenty-first, but in politics there is rarely time for footnotes.) Crammed with pertinent facts and figures, JAVITS began to make himself a familiar sight, and sound, on upper Broadway and its environs. For a couple of months, he delivered half a dozen speeches a night, often from a white truck with a paralyzingly loud amplifier on it, which became known in the community as the Javits Dream Boat. He also dropped in at some eight hundred local retail establishments, none of them funeral parlors, where he buttonholed from 5 to 50 housewives a visit. Having ascertained that the district was an exceptionally literate one, he spent a mere $25 on cigars but put out $300 for pencils, which had his name inscribed on them and which he gave to anybody who would take one. All in all, the campaign cost around seventy-five hundred dollars (twenty-five hundred of which was JAVITS' own money), including such items as $106.08 for banners, $326.46 for posters, and $35.23 for lollipops that he and his cohorts passed out, principally to nonvoters. JAVITS smiled at, or gently patted the heads of, countless neighborhood children but, according to his recollection of those bustling days, did not kiss a single one. "People don't want you to kiss their babies," he said later. "It is insanitary."

JAVITS got a couple of lucky breaks in 1946. For one thing, the Democrats selected an uninspiring candidate to run against him. For another, the non-JAVITS vote was split when the American Labor Party put up a man of its own. On top of that, JAVITS identified himself, to the disgust of his opponents, as a highly unorthodox kind of Republican, coming out in favor of the Office of Price Administration and against the National Association of Manufacturers, and declining to give more than lukewarm assistance to the concurrent campaign for reelection being waged by Governor Dewey. (JAVITS' relationship with his State's reigning Republican has never been exactly cozy.) It is perhaps not quite true that the emergence of JAVITS in the Twenty-first District was comparable, as one of his more rhapsodic admirers has claimed, to a flower's suddenly blooming in a cesspool, but in any event he won by 6,000 votes over his nearest rival, notwithstanding the fact that, owing to a slip-up on the part of the Board of Elections, the name of the Republican candidate for Congress in the Twenty-second District erroneously appeared in place of JAVITS' on one voting machine in the Twenty-first.

Soon after taking his seat in Congress, in January 1947, JAVITS established himself as a maverick in the Republican herd that then constituted the legislative majority. During the Eightieth Congress, for example, when the Republican leaders in the House advocated easing up on rent controls, JAVITS voted to strengthen them. It pains some of the old-guard Republicans to see a man dressed in their colors behave every now and then, as JAVITS does, like one of the opposition. "Why are you always against us?" a Republican legislator once asked him sorrowfully at a party caucus. Actually, JAVITS is not always against the Republicans, but when he is with them, it is often only to vote on routine legislation. In the Eightieth Congress, he sided with the majority of his fellow-Republicans about 60 percent of the time; in the Eighty-first he has been with them only 25 percent of the time—by far the most heretical record of any of the Republican delegation from New York State. Tris Coffin, a Washington correspondent, has referred to him as "the cross of the GOP," and a member of the Democratic bloc in the House said cheerfully, not long ago, "We thank God for JAVITS, because in a crucial situation we can almost always count on him for another vote." JAVITS professes to be hurt both by the Democrats' thus taking his vote for granted and by the Republicans' viewing him as a distant and eccentric cousin. He considers himself a perfectly bona fide Republican, in the tradition of Theodore Roosevelt, Fiorello LaGuardia, and, regardless of JAVIT's apostasy in 1940, Wendell Willkie.

JAVITS is not the kind of legislator who gets along easily with clubhouse politicians. He prefers dry Martinis to straight bourbon and has spoken up on the floor of the House in favor of art, throwing in learned references to such esoteric figures as Rembrandt and Grandma Moses. The clubhouse boys, while respecting his possession of the basic political asset, the ability to win elections, are leery of such carryings-on and of the intensity of his preoccupation with serious issues. They cannot comprehend a man who, 3 years before the scheduled end of the European recovery program, will make, as JAVITS did last year, a 20-minute speech in Congress outlining a plan he has conceived all by himself for a post-ERP plan. "Jack don't fall into the category of what the mob calls the regular-guy category," one high-placed old-time Republican politician in New York recently said. "He's too polished and dignified. Why, I went to a party at his house once and he had artists and scientists there—people like that." JAVITS hopes to stick with politics, and since being a Representative is an uncertain occupation—involving running for office every 2 years—he would like to extend his theater of operations. He had hopes of doing so by becoming the Fusion candidate for mayor last year. When Newbold Morris got the designation instead, JAVITS sportingly agreed to serve as chairman of his campaign committee, undoubtedly figuring that the position would help him to get better acquainted with the mob and perhaps even in time to be accepted as a regular guy.

In 1948, running for reelection to Congress, again with both Republican and Liberal blessing, JAVITS had a harder time retaining his seat than he had had getting it. The Democrats, recalling how badly they had fared 2 years earlier in a three-cornered race, joined the American Labor Party in putting up Paul O'Dwyer, who not only proved to be a forceful candidate in his own right but had the advantage of

being the Mayor's brother. To meet the challenge of this formidable adversary, JAVITS campaigned even more earnestly than he had in 1946. He had innumerable persuasive brochures printed, among them one advising voters that the difference between a JAVITS defeat and a JAVITS victory would be the difference between a $50 grocery bill and a $10 one, as well as the difference between a tepee in Central Park and a home with a wood-burning fireplace and a footstool. He went to such trouble to make a special appeal to every conceivable voting group that he even imported a testimonial from George Mardikian, a San Francisco restaurant man with high standing in Armenian-American circles, and had copies of it printed in Armenian for distribution among the few dozen voters in the Twenty-first District who could read that language. For voters whose reading was confined to comic books, JAVITS got one up. The climax showed its hero, Congressman JAVITS, bravely disarming and soothing an enraged veteran who, on the brink of being tossed out of his home, had threatened to shoot a marshal trying to enforce the eviction order and was holding the entire neighborhood at bay. (The incident related in the comic book was not based on fact, but, as one of Javits' campaign workers noted afterward, what incidents in comic books are?) JAVITS' opposition aimed a barrage of equally spirited literature at him. The American Labor Party was particularly active, claiming that he was a crony of Governor Dewey's, stressing his having hobnobbed with bankers, and calling him "a Big Business Representative, a demagogue who poses as a liberal to deceive an independent, progressive community." The real JAVITS, withstanding this stream of ammunition as stanchly as the comic-book JAVITS had risked the fire of the distraught veteran, squeezed out a victory over O'Dwyer by less than 2,000 votes.

What with elections to the House coming up every 2 years, its Members who hope to stay in it generally make a point of keeping themselves, or their names, on display as much as possible in their home districts. JAVITS worries so much about his legislative responsibilities (he has admitted to having once spent a sleepless night brooding about how he should vote the next day on a single amendment) that he isn't able to participate personally as much as he would like to in community affairs in northern Manhattan, but he is omnipresent there in spirit. In his name, for instance, residents of the the Twenty-first are offered free advice on rent problems by a dozen politically minded lawyers who take turns giving counsel at five clubhouses—four Republican and one Liberal—in the Twenty-first, a service that nearly 5,000 of JAVITS' constituents have availed themselves of. His name, furthermore, receives wide institutional circulation. He is a trustee of the Jewish Memorial Hospital, a director of the Manhattan Civic Club, an honorary director of the Inwood Community Center, an overseer of the Jewish Theological Seminary, an honorary adviser of the Gold Star Window Committee of the Temple of the Covenant, and a member of the advisory board of Aufbau, a German-English weekly that has some 20,000 readers in the district and in whose advertising columns he has had himself extolled during his campaigns as "dein Kandidat." His most enterprising scheme for keeping himself firmly established in the consciousness of his constituents has been to send a multigraphed letter twice annually to every one of the 90,000 heads of families in the district. In anticipation of this semiannual event, JAVITS makes a long speech on the floor of the House, summarizing his legislative accomplishments during the previous half year. Then, after the speech has appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, he buys reprints of it, to send out with his letter, at the bargain rate of a third of a cent apiece. Even so, and even though he enjoys the use of the congressional frank and therefore doesn't have to pay postage on this sort of correspondence, it costs him nearly $2,000—mostly for having envelopes addressed—every time he thus unburdens himself.

JAVITS always closes his reports home by urging his constituents not to hesitate to call on him or write to him any time they are so minded. Many of them don't have to be urged. He receives between 50 and 100 letters daily, and is extremely careful about acknowledging, or having some member of his staff acknowledge, all of them, except those written by crackpots and nonconstituents. As a lawmaker of a Nation whose law is often word in distant lands, he receives in his mail a regular sprinkling of communications from Egypt, Argentina, Ireland, Turkey, Yugoslavia, Korea, Bulgaria, Denmark, and other regions outside the Twenty-first Congressional District. He is also bombarded with ponderous tomes bearing the imprimatur of such domestic groups as the National Grain Trade Council, the American Near East Society, and the Chiefs' Council of the Tonawanda Band of the Seneca Indians. Many organizations with axes to grind put all Congressmen on their mailing lists and keep them there the year around; others seek out the legislative eye, or ear, only when working toward some particular end. On the whole, JAVITS has been less pestered by spokesmen for special-interest groups than Congressmen are often thought to be. "No lobbyist ever offered to take me to dinner, or to the theater, or get me a girl, or anything," he said the other day. "I guess I have the reputation of being unapproachable and pretty busy, and well enough off to buy my own dinner. When I first came to Washington, the lobbyists ignored me because I was considered too unimportant to be worth cultivating. Now that I am worth the effort, the people know where I stand on things, practically the only lobbyists who don't pass me up are those who represent idealistic causes, and they can't afford to take me to dinner. I usually end up by having to take them to dinner."

JAVITS is habitually polite to all representatives of groups who, whether over the dinner table or merely in an exchange of correspondence, manage to engage his attention, since he is well aware how foolish it would be for a man in his position needlessly to antagonize the advocates of any point of view held by a plural number of voters. He is polite even to nonvoters. A while ago, along with his colleagues, he was subjected to a slew of communications from residents of the District of Columbia who, whipped into action by the Washington Times-Herald, were urging the defeat of legislation providing that stray dogs in that city might be taken from the municipal pound and used in medical research. JAVITS, who has a high regard for medical research, would undoubtedly have been on the affirmative side of the matter if it had come to a vote, which it didn't, but he saw no point in putting himself on record any sooner than he had to, and in reply to the dog-lovers he sent out an artfully equivocal form letter that read, "Dear Friend: Thank you for your communication with respect to humaneness to our good friend, the dog. You may be sure that I will have your views very much in mind as the bills affecting the subject come before us here."

Only a fraction of JAVITS' mail from home contains expressions of sentiment on national issues. Most of it consists of appeals for help from people who, finding themselves in real or fancied difficulties, have hit upon the notion of writing to their Congressman about them. A sampling of JAVITS' correspondence a while back unearthed a letter from a man who wanted the Government to pay him $15,000 compensation for the oversight of an Army surgeon who had left a sponge in his stomach during an operation; one from a widower who wanted to find out if his wife had owned any war bonds that he didn't know about; one from a laborer who had worked on the Panama Canal from 1904 to 1920 and wanted to collect some money he thought he had coming to him through a retroactive increase in pay authorized by a 1944 act of Congress; one from a manufacturer of concrete window frames who wanted the Federal Housing Administration to show an interest in his product; one from a mail carrier whose feet hurt and who wanted a transfer to the more sedentary position of postal clerk; one from an applicant for a civil-service rating who wanted an investigation made of the fact that he had been allowed only an hour and a half to take a 2-hour exam; and one from a gentleman who wanted a Spanish-American War pension for himself and, for his three sons a commission in the Regular Army, an appointment to the Naval Academy, and a page's job in the House. Even if JAVITS had been eager to assist the prospective pageboy, he couldn't have done much about it. As far as patronage is concerned, his personal pickings have been very slim. A Republican Congressman, and especially a junior one, is unlikely these days to get more than a whiff of the pork barrel, much less to have a chance to dip deep into it. Aside from the six Government-paid posts on his own staff, JAVITS has had only a couple of plums to dispense, neither of them notably juicy. Both were $2,400-a-year jobs—a guard's and an elevator operator's—on the House staff.

Constituents who want JAVITS to do something for them frequently preface their requests with some such generality as "Since I know that you have but to wave a wand to have things happen, I wonder if you—" The assumption is false. In only about 25 percent of the cases in which JAVITS is invited to wave a wand is he able to do anything like what he has been asked to do, a circumstance that is carefully taken account of in the conduct of his office. Not long ago, in the course of transferring a young lady from his personal staff to a job in his law firm, he explained to her apologetically that he was shifting her not because she lacked industry or efficiency but simply because she lacked sufficient warmth for the job; it was imperative for a man in his position, he went on, to have assistants who could give comfort and sympathy to the 75 percent of his constituents for whom no more substantial service could be rendered. Her successor is a young lady whose "Sorry, no dice" is as gentle and soothing as a lullaby.

Despite his inability to make the dreams of 75 percent of his constituents come true, JAVITS is diligent about going through the motions of pleading their causes, however lost. When the Federal Government is involved, he or one of his staff dutifully gets in touch with the agency concerned, and since all appropriations bills originate in the House, the Congressman's avowal of interest almost always results in swift, though seldom favorable, action. If it is a New York State matter—as in the case of a man who complained that his son had been discriminated against in an examination for State prison guards, or in the case of a deposed notary public who was anxious to have his commission reinstated—JAVITS usually turns it over to a State assemblyman from his district with whom he is on cordial terms, and who, of course, gets to vote on appropriations for State agencies. Then there are constituents who want nothing in particular of the Federal or the State Government but, feeling that a congressional blessing is useful anywhere, beseech JAVITS to furnish them with letters of recommenda-

tion for jobs in private industry or with character references to supplement their children's applications for admission to colleges. And, finally, there are those who ask for tickets to the Army-Navy football game, to which, they have heard correctly, JAVITS is allotted 16 seats a year, 8 on each side of the field. JAVITS gets so many requests for these from powerful political associates—to say nothing of ordinary constituents, who control only a single vote—that since becoming a Congressman he has attended no Army-Navy game himself.

For all services rendered, and comfort and sympathy bestowed, JAVITS expects no special thanks from his constituents, except, perhaps, votes the next time he may need them. Now and then, however, a constituent who knows that JAVITS is still a partner, though a largely inactive one, in Javits & Javits offers to throw a bit of business his way. JAVITS is at liberty to accept such a token of gratitude unless it is litigation involving the Federal Government, in which he may refer his would-be benefactor to someone else in the firm but may not touch the case himself. Just as his political life affects his professional life, so does it affect his home life. His wife cannot switch from one neighborhood grocer to another, for instance, without explaining at great and mollifying length her reason for making the change; grocers, after all, are voters.

JAVITS has been married twice, the first time, in 1933, to a daughter of one of the Ringling brothers. They were divorced 3 years afterward. In 1947, he married Marion Ann Borris, a young lady 20 years his junior. They have two children, a boy and a girl. The boy, named Joshua, after the late Rabbi Joshua Loth Liebman, who officiated at the Javitses' wedding, was born the day before the current session of Congress convened. The birth of the girl, named Joy, occurred in September 1948, on a day, as it happened, when JAVITS had scheduled a political tea at his home for fifty ladies from his district who were working to get him reelected. Mr. Javits, exhibiting in fine measure the patience required of the wives of Congressmen, played hostess most of the afternoon and had her baby that night. The Javitses met at Fusion Campaign Headquarters in New York in the fall of 1945. The then Miss Borris, a native of Detroit who wanted to be an actress, had taken a campaign job during a lull in her theatrical career. They were married 2 years later, in spite of the fact that one night, early in 1947, when JAVITS had asked Miss Borris out to dinner she had to compete for his attention with a delegation of Greeks who were trying to persuade him to plump for increased aid to their country.

The Javitses have two homes—a three-room apartment in Washington, on the edge of Georgetown, and a seven-room apartment in New York, at 450 Riverside Drive. Their home here is just a few blocks west of that of JAVITS' most illustrious constituent, Dwight D. Eisenhower. JAVITS is delighted to be the general's representative. When Eisenhower ascended to the throne of Columbia University and to residence on Morningside Drive, the Congressman took note of the honor that had been conferred on his district by saying on the floor of the House, "We will try to make him comfortable in the Twenty-first and we will try to make him very happy. The General's view of the Hudson River and the Palisades, which is truly magnificent as seen from our district, will, we believe, make him feel that New York can be very beautiful, homelike, and a real rest from the labors of war while he undertakes the arts of peace." A friend who had read this speech of welcome visited JAVITS at home and, after enjoying the magnificent view of the Hudson and the Palisades from his window, voiced his doubt that Eisenhower could see either of them from Morningside Drive. "Don't quibble," said JAVITS. "The General can see them from his office anyway." The friend, a real quibbler, later encountered one of Eisenhower's aides and asked about the view of the Hudson and the Palisades from the office. "Can't see either one from there," said the aide. "There are too damn many buildings in the way."

Every Saturday, barring acts of God or Congress, JAVITS holds open court for his constituents in his law offices, to 630 Fifth Avenue, in Rockefeller Center. Congressmen are granted free office space, when it is available, in Federal buildings within their districts, and may take advantage of their prerogative, but the only eligible buildings in the Twenty-first are a couple of overcrowded post offices. JAVITS estimates that it would cost him at least $5,000 a year to maintain an office in his district, and since the law office is already set up, he uses that. On a normal Saturday, he may have around 20 appointments with constituents, and, inasmuch as they often show up in delegations, may receive as many as 50 or a hundred of them. It is a fairly simple matter for any constituent, or group of constituents, to get an appointment with him; few businessmen are as readily accessible to customers as most Congressmen are to voters from their districts.

One recent Saturday, the first of JAVITS' callers was a colored woman employed by a Federal agency, who informed him that her supervisor, in making recommendations for promotions, had been discriminating against her for 8 years because she was a Negro. JAVITS said he would have an investigation instituted at once. Then came a Puerto Rican, who hoped JAVITS could arrange to have a disability pension he was drawing as a result of the Second World War paid to him in a lump sum, rather than in the monthly installments he had been getting, so that he could start a small business. JAVITS said that he would inquire into the possibilities but that he was doubtful. Then came a naturalized German Jew, who carried on alternately and interminably about the revivification of nazism in Germany and a plan he had for mixing alcohol and gasoline to take the place of fuel oil. JAVITS listened to him for 20 minutes, and finally said, "I understand, I understand, but what do you want me to do?" It turned out the man didn't have anything specific in mind; he just wanted to talk to somebody. Then came two men who were planning to make a nonpartisan survey of the state of civil rights in a portion of the West Side of Manhattan and hoped JAVITS would be a cochairman, along with Representative FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT, Jr., whose district, the Twentieth, was also involved. JAVITS said he'd be glad to, and asked what ground they proposed to survey. From Fifty-ninth Street to One Hundred and Twenty-fifth, they told him, and JAVITS possibly having in mind the fact that the only part of his district to be covered would be a stretch from One Hundred and Twenty-fifth down to One Hundred and Fourteenth Street, urged them to extend their northern limit to One Hundred and Thirty-fifth. "You wouldn't want to cut Manhattanville in half, would you?" he asked sternly. They agreed that that would be an ungallant thing to do, and departed. Then came a businessman, who during the Second World War had lost a consignment of brush bristles in Switzerland. He said the Swiss Government had confiscated them and had paid him only a fraction of their worth. As a German refugee to this country and technically an enemy alien he had been helpless at the time, but now he was a naturalized American citizen, and would JAVITS please prevail upon the State Department to intercede with the Swiss, so he could be paid in full?

"I'll do what I can," JAVITS told him. "But you must remember that I can't force the Federal Government to do anything for you. I'm only a small part of the Government. All I can do is use my influence."

"That would be fine," said his visitor. "And I can't begin to tell you how much I appreciate your listening to my private troubles. I'm sorry to have taken up so much of your valuable time."

"Don't be silly," said JAVITS. "That's a Congressman's job. That's my duty."

Pioneers Are in Demand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT THOMAS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1950

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Glenn H. McCarthy, of Texas, at the University of Wisconsin:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, members of the Wisconsin Men's Association, ladies and gentlemen, I understand this occasion is to honor the men of Wisconsin who have made some contribution to their university community. I congratulate both this association and the men so honored. I feel humble in the midst of such a magnificent group. Yet I am without words to adequately express my pride in being selected for this address.

When I was invited to come to Wisconsin for this occasion, I forsaw another opportunity for a bit of Texas bragging. The more I learned of your State and this great university, however, the more convinced I became that such an attempt would be ridiculous. In fact, you have turned the tables on me. After my visit here today I intend to go home and do some Wisconsin bragging.

Down in Texas we are rather proud when we hear patriots refer to our State as the last stronghold of democracy. Yet it leaves us with a feeling of responsibility and loneliness. Looking over this city, this university, and this wonderful audience, I feel able to report back to the great Republic of Texas that we have at least one ally in Wisconsin, in our determination to fight against foreign isms.

I trust you have heard that we McCarthy's, be we Democrats or Republicans, hold little brief for things un-American.

When your chairman invited me to speak, he told my public relations man it was because I was a fighter. Until then I had hoped that that part of my reputation had been localized to Houston, or at least Texas.

I must admit that my armor is a bit soaked with foreign oil imports now and they tried to slow down the fight in me. But in the process I have picked up a few new and fancy techniques.

Seriously, ladies and gentlemen, there is an insidious story going around this country today. It is the myth that opportunity is a thing of the past—that the last frontier has been reached. As an American, I resent it.

That claim is the most absurd lie in this world of lies we live in today. The truth is that never in the history of mankind has there been more opportunity. A hundred frontiers exist today where one existed at the turn of the century. Opportunity beckons every individual who is an individual. It cries for men who are men. Once men had to seek opportunity. Today opportunity seeks men.

Pioneers are in demand. Men willing to put forth blood, sweat, and tears are scarce. The trouble is that men are blind to the real facts. They haven't the sight to see them. They are listening to the siren call of paternalism and the impractical promises of socialism. They are spending their energies looking for something for nothing, mostly from their government. They forget that no government ever gave anything to its people that it didn't first take away from the people.

As in the pioneer days of this Nation, men need courage, imagination, hard work, and brains to make the most of the opportunity that is here. There must be a revival of the spirit of the pioneer. With that there is no limit to the progress we can make.

For man to follow the progress available to him he must be of an inventive, challenging, inquiring mind. Today men listen to propaganda from every side and never once question it. No pioneer ever did the normal things. He kicked out of the routine and plunged ahead on his own.

The pioneering spirit is still around. You see it in men fighting for an education. It is recorded in the success stories of the day. Those who want opportunity bad enough to make the necessary sacrifices will find it in America.

The political philosophy laid down by the founding fathers of America unleashed the creative energies of millions of men and women. Under the Old World method there was no freedom of thought or action. That is still true in most of the world outside of the United States today.

Americans have more of this world's goods than all of the rest of the 2,000,000,000 people on earth today. With a scant 7 percent of the world population we have created more wealth than the others combined because we are free to act as individuals.

The answer to this is that man, in America, has been given the incentive to progress. Incentive is the father of initiative. Incentive to live in peace, to live as free men and women, to worship as we choose, and to profit from our individual efforts. These are the things that give America the drive that has led us to the leadership of the world.

Ladies and gentlemen, what I am about to say tonight may seem strange to you. But I suppose that you expected a strange man in a strange country to bring you a new message.

I have spoken of opportunity. I believe it presupposes certain responsibilities, one of which is to defend it. I see a danger to our Nation today. It is a danger not only to the initiative and the opportunity we enjoy as Americans, it is a threat to the entire domestic economy of the United States.

You live in a part of the country where there is no oil industry, or at least no oil production. You cannot be expected to recognize the menace of foreign oil imports at a time when exports have been drastically reduced.

It will be difficult for you to understand my contention that the American economy is basically an oil economy, unless I explain myself.

I have spoken of the tremendous progress this country has made in less than 200 years. Let me remind you that the greater part of the industrial progress of this country has been made in the last 50 years. It is my contention that without the oil industry that would have been unlikely. We are living in the automobile age and the air age. Without our modern oil industry, brought about by independent wildcatters, there would have been no such ages. Spindle Top, a salt dome along the Gulf coast of Texas, gave birth to the modern oil industry. It would have been either there or somewhere else. It had to come. But it took American initiative and incentive to bring it about. That discovery not only made the automobile possible. It made it necessary. Prior to Spindle Top, the oil industry was merely an illumination and lubrication business.

With that discovery, man's imagination in this country was fired anew. In its wake came hundreds of new oil discoveries, most of them by wildcatters. In its wake came new demands on the steel industry, the transportation industry, and the automobile industry was born. New interest in aviation was inspired. New energies were unleashed under our freedom. Here was created an industry that America could call its own—men of vision and courage, unafraid of hard work, developed a know-how that until today no other nation on earth possesses. That know-how is how we search for, drill, and produce oil wells. It is our own American industry. The spirit of that industry has permeated every other industry in this land today. Petroleum has aided magnificently in winning two world wars. It is the greatest bulwark we have standing between us and the threat of world communism today.

Yet, at this very hour six oil companies out of more than 35,000 operating in this country are pursuing a policy which threatens the life of the entire domestic oil industry, if not our national economy itself.

Those six oil companies are importing almost a million barrels of foreign petroleum and petroleum products into this country every day.

Independent producers of oil find most of the new reserves. Without new reserves America would some day be confronted with a serious oil shortage. With independents active, none of us will ever see the day when this country is without oil for peace or war. Wildcatters keep searching when the major executives decide it is too risky. They rush in where angels fear to tread. For every Wildcatters keep searching when the major dry holes. They are like the slot machine players. You hear of only those who hit the jackpots. Those who feed the kitty without any return are anonymous. Even the jackpot winners usually sit around and put back all of their winnings, plus what they came with. It is the occasional wise player who walks away with a little profit. Carrying the comparison a little further, when the odds are set highest, the play is the hottest. Reduce the odds and the play cools off. Eliminate the chance to win and only the idlers seeking amusement stay around.

No major oil company finds much new oil in this country. Yet this country constantly depends on new discoveries. It is necessary for the domestic oil industry to remain strong, virile, and prosperous if the independent is not to be destroyed.

My objection to this foreign import policy is that we are importing 26 percent more oil than we imported in 1948, while we are exporting 23 percent less than we exported the same year. While I have no objection to normal imports, I think they should be balanced with exports. I am not urging legislation to restrict imports, I am hoping the President of the United States will call these six or seven company heads to his office and appeal to their patriotism and their business statesmanship.

Two years ago the Commerce Department had the power to curtail exports 20 percent without legislation. Today we can curtail imports without legislation. Legislation will come as surely as the importers continue their unprincipled practice. A practice which benefits 6 or 7 out of 35,000 operators in this country.

And that practice is not hurting the domestic oil industry alone. The coal miners and operators, the railway workers and railroads which transport our oil and coal also suffer. American labor in all fields has suffered because of this selfish, unwise policy. Because of foreign oil imports alone, one coal mine in Pennsylvania closed the other day throwing 1,200 miners out of work permanently.

It is not often that I am prone to single out any one man or any one department of our Government, but in this case I will. I do so because in the Interior Department the independent oilman seems to have a sympathetic friend. And in the Senate of the United States, as well as the House of Representatives, he has many champions. But I would like to answer a few remarks made recently by the Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs.

This State Department spokesman, Mr. Willard L. Thorp, claimed that he was stating the administration's policy on foreign oil imports. It is my understanding, however, that he might not have reflected exactly that. Although he pointedly denied it in advance in his article, he demonstrated very little regard for the domestic oil industry. He did admit his interest in foreign oil. Your Senator McCarthy says the State Department is full of subversives. I'm not in a position to argue that point. I will say that it is shot through with ignorance of our national economy, and I think that is as bad.

I have contended that war with Russia is inevitable because democracy and communism cannot live under the same sun. The Communists refuse to let us live in peace. I believe that as soon as we have developed oil along the Persian Gulf sufficiently to power the Russian planes and tanks, along with that oil they already have, we will see the outbreak of war. Mr. Thorp gives me a new fear. I gather from his statement that war might even come over a fight for the $18,000,000,000 of American money invested in that area, as well as the $260,000,000,000 in potential profits. It is bad enough for a peace-loving country to be forced into a war to defend itself against aggression and to protect our way of life. It is a much worse thing to be forced into a war to defend foreign investments that should never have been made and billions in profits that will accrue to six or seven major oil corporations.

I am not suggesting that it happened, but merely hoping that there has been no commitment on the part of our State Department to protect those investments and profits. Mr. Thorp had a lot to say about the thousands of stockholders in the major importing companies. He thinks they are entitled to the profits to be gathered there. What will happen to their profits here?

I wonder if he was around when the Mexican Government arbitrarily expropriated the properties of American oil companies back in the middle thirties. That could happen in the Arabian area.

He was very careful to point out how much these oil companies were promoting the American way of life and free enterprise—more so, he said, than by any governmental actions. I know little of governmental actions in foreign countries. I do know these companies engage in the exploitation of foreign property by hiring natives at un-American slave wages. They make deals for land with the kings instead of common landowners. They pay tax pittances, if any at all, that are of no benefit to ordinary citizens. They produce wells at the frightful rate of 10,000 to 15,000 barrels a day. Then they bring their ill-gotten product back here to destroy a decent, economy-building industry like the American domestic oil industry. That may be the democratic way and free enterprise Mr. Thorp knows. It isn't the way I know them.

This State Department official contends that increased oil imports offer no threat to our domestic economy. I hold that the supplanting of domestic oil with foreign oil is not only hurting the domestic economy but that it threatens the life of the domestic oil-producing industry, which is

of prime importance in peace and vital to our freedom in war. Any serious weakening, actual or threatened, to an industry so vitally essential as the oil-producing industry is a matter acutely affecting our national security and our expanding peacetime economy.

What conclusion is to be drawn from these statements that the State Department backs a policy of continued heavy imports by these big companies? Either the Department is pursuing its policy regardless of the harmful effect of this domestic industry and the interests of our Nation, or that it has blinded itself to these effects.

Foreign oil, Mr. Thorp wrote, can be a great benefit to us in the next war. How? That is the question any man with common sense is bound to ask. I doubt that we could get the oil out of the wells in Venezuela But it is a definite fact, beyond the slightest question, that Russia would take over the Persian Gulf fields in the first hours of war. No military mind in the world questions this fact.

Had this Nation been dependent on foreign oil in the last two wars it would have lost both of them. It will be more dependent on domestic oil in the next war. Because of the submarine warfare in World War II, let me remind you that our tankers could not move safely from Gulf of Mexico ports to the eastern seaboard. We were forced to build a tremendous pipeline, known as the Big Inch, to transport 80 percent of our oil to points in the East. As the war ended it had become recognized that a pipeline to the west coast was equally essential.

Earlier I spoke of opportunity. I think there should be plenty for men with integrity, brains, and loyalty in our State Department.

Is oil a wartime essential to our national security? Who doesn't recall Patton's armies in the Battle of the Bulge when tanks and all motorized equipment was grounded for days while men fought for their lives? How short is the memory of the gentlemen of the State Department? In whom are they interested?

Before you get the idea that I am attacking others for what I would do myself had I the opportunity, I'd like to make one thing clear. I have had foreign oil opportunities. I have had them in the Middle East, in Mexico, in Canada, in Venezuela, and in the Argentine. This is a matter of principle with me. I avoided those offers for the very reason I am opposing foreign development with American dollars and American know-how today.

There may be a day when it will be reasonable for us to venture into foreign fields but that day is not on the horizon at present. It will be the day when we know we have heard the last roar of belligerent guns, and the day when we know such oil is necessary to preserve democracy and our free enterprise.

Ladies and gentlemen, tonight we seek pioneers, pioneers in the shaping of American public opinion. I have said there are new opportunities and new frontiers. You will find the new frontiers at the four corners of the earth where our fighting men have gone in search of peace. They went forth to bring the fruits of our inventive and manufacturing genius to all mankind. They went out to defend our way of life on the one hand and on the other to create new frontiers of thought.

Today we see the iron curtain moving closer and closer to us. We know we have yet another fight on our hands. We hope the world can be made safe for democracy.

There must be an aroused and indignant public opinion. It is my purpose tonight to awaken you ladies and gentlemen and make you aroused and indignant.

I implore you to use your God-given rights as free men and women and give thought to the important problems of the day.

I thank you.

Unemployment Among Middle-Aged Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 6, 1950

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD today in a statement to the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, considering the problems of unemployment with relation to the Social Security Act, stated:

"Mr. Chairman, one of the most serious problems within the over-all problem of unemployment is the amount of unemployment among the middle-aged workers who are considered 'bad pension risks.'

"This is not only a problem for private business but it is a problem demanding the alert and detailed attention of the various governmental agencies concerned with this type of economic difficulty. I feel that it is an extremely important and very delicate sociological problem which should not be associated with any unsound or destructive economic scheme attempting to repair a wheel within a wheel.

"I sit in my office in Wilkes-Barre every day that I am home and listen to the pleas of hundreds of able-bodied men without work. I feel that I am qualified especially to speak on this subject, Mr. Chairman, because of the fact that I represent a district which is one of the most acutely distressed areas in the Nation, insofar as male unemployment is concerned, of all ages.

"My interviews with these groups of men have brought to my attention the tragic case of the jobless man of 45, who is too young to retire, and too old to find a job.

"This may be a strange sermon for me to preach in view of the fact that in my district it is almost impossible to find a job for anybody, but I shall give this committee the benefit of my considerable experience with men of all age groups in their quest for employment.

"Certainly, the executives of the modern American business world should revamp and reexamine their hiring and firing policies and preach the gospel of intelligence into the ears of their personnel people. Today there is being built up a new scrap pile of human beings and this is a disgraceful and unnecessary economic waste.

"There is no doubt that advancing age is a handicap to any man looking for a job. And in these days of rapidly developing pension plans the middle-aged job seeker is looked upon as a bad pension risk largely because the bookkeeping people in the actuary's office are ready to complain that his age messes up their scheme in a plant where employees retire at a given age.

"I think the time is right for American business to tackle the problem itself to see whether or not the problem can be solved by American business ingenuity, but this much must follow, Mr. Chairman, that if American business refuses or fails on this matter, then the Government, whether you like it or not, must step in and see if a solution is possible.

"A new slogan should be injected into the whole field of employer-employee relationship; that is, that a man's age must not be held against him. Modern business thinking and employment rules should be examined to conform with the known physical and economic facts, that in this year of our Lord 1950 the middle-aged man is not ready for the scrap heap, physically or mentally.

"This will not prevent the hiring of younger men and should in no way interfere with such a program. With the increase of our population and the development of our economy generally, ways and means must be found for the development of American industry to absorb the abilities and experience of every man who wants to work."

Ireland Must Be United

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 6, 1950

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker under leave granted me, I am including my statement that Ireland must be united, which is part of the record of proceedings before the Foreign Affairs Committee. My statement follows:

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to have this opportunity to speak against the present partition of Ireland, and to ask that your committee give favorable consideration to the legislation now before you. I introduced House Resolution 529, which was referred to you. However, I am interested in the final result, and am in favor of any measure which would assist the people of Ireland to establish their complete independence.

We know that during the First World War, Great Britain gave a guaranty to Ireland that immediately after the war the people of Ireland could have a free election. When the election was held in 1918—the people in Ireland voted 4 to 1 for complete independence. Thereafter, England by threats and force, did all she could to cause the people to rescind their vote. When these attempts proved futile, she brazenly broke her promise and kept a stranglehold on the six northeastern counties—allowing Ireland to keep 26 counties in southern Ireland. For this breach of faith, there is no excuse.

The Irish people today are asking that a free election be held in all of Ireland to determine whether or not it shall be one united country. Ireland's right to take her place as an undivided nation in the world's family of nations is denied her because of England's tyranny and oppression. Ireland must be given the opportunity to settle, by a majority vote of her people, how she wishes to be governed. She must be given a chance to free herself from the rule of any foreign power.

We cannot forget the contributions of the Irish to our own Nation in its fight for freedom and democracy. They gave of their lives and efforts in our struggle for independence—and they have never failed to carry their share of the burdens of any nation when democracy was at stake. We owe it to the people of Ireland to assure them that we believe in independence for them too—and that we sincerely believe they should be allowed to govern themselves. We will prove our sincerity when we demand that the partition of Ireland must be removed. There is no question that a free plebiscite would result in a united Ireland. Then, Ireland would be enabled to join the Atlantic Pact, which in turn would be an advantage to Ireland, Great Britain, and the United States, from the standpoint of defense.

I urge your committee to help us fulfill our duty to Ireland, and to report favorably the necessary measure looking toward the end of Ireland's partition and aiding unification.

Labor Sees the Danger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 6, 1950

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted by the House to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therein a statement or release by the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers on the question of public power.

This organization realizes that if Government takes the place of private industry and private investment that their interests will be jeopardized. This organization of workers has taken the same position that I have maintained through the years and since my service in Congress in regard to public power.

Government controls the rivers and their potential power. For this reason, it is proper that the Federal Government should build the power dams or any other dam by which electric energy is generated as a byproduct.

My opposition has been and is now to the transmission and disposition of such power in direct competition with private investment and private enterprise, in many instances already serving the areas affected.

If the philosophy of public ownership is so desirable and is carried to other activities, we shall soon have a Government patterned after the Russian idea. I am bitterly opposed to it and every loyal American should be opposed to such a principle.

The statement included herewith should be read by every Member of Congress. It reflects sound American principles.

THE INTERNATIONAL EXECUTIVE COUNCIL OF THE INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF ELECTRICAL WORKERS ENDORSES THE ACTION AND POLICY OF INTERNATIONAL PRESIDENT D. W. TRACY IN OPPOSING PUBLIC OWNERSHIP TREND IN THE ELECTRIC LIGHT AND POWER INDUSTRY

In the interests of the commonweal there is no more pressing need than provision for flood control, irrigation, navigation, and the prevention of soil erosion.

By reason of geography and the topography of the land such provision and prevention is necessarily and inescapably within the realm of Federal obligation.

In the fulfillment of such obligation our Federal Government properly conceived the idea of utilizing hydro power for the purpose of generating electricity as a byproduct of soil conservation and irrigation. The International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, AFL, heartily endorsed and diligently supported the idea.

However, in the interval since the inauguration of this program there have been developed and instituted procedures engendered by a false concept of the fundamentals of Americanism.

The Rural Electrification Administration was brought into being for the purpose of facilitating the transmission of electricity into rural sections. Under the Government power program, however, the facilitating intent has been substituted for by a plan involving what could well be and assumes all the aspects of the first step in the evolution of governmental ownership of the generation, transmission, and sale of electricity to the individual consumers. Under this program the operations of the Rural Electrification Administration combined with the functioning of the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, and the Army engineers, have extended the scope of the program to a point that threatens peril to legitimate free enterprise.

The scope of the program now embraces the generation of electricity by power other than that procured through irrigation and flood control, steam as an instance; the distribution of electric power and the sale of electric power in direct competition with privately owned electric utility companies.

The Rural Electrification Administration, through its financing of cooperatives, has proceeded to the extent of using public moneys supplied by the taxpayers for the building of electric transmission lines parallel to existing privately owned distribution systems. The progress of this procedure is such as to clearly indicate complete duplication of transmission facilities in competition that can only lead to extermination of private utility companies. Such complete extermination has been accomplished in the State of Tennessee and is rapidly approaching completion in the State of South Carolina and is making rapid progress in the State of Nebraska.

In pursuing the above policy the Rural Electrification Administration has lowered the quality of work standards and ignored the rights of electrical workers to bargain collectively.

The resulting situation is anomalous indeed. In the first instance while the fundamental policies of the Federal Government champion the rights of labor to organize and bargain collectively, the Administration of the Rural Electrification completely ignores these rights of labor. In the second instance one branch of Government is engaged in the prosecution of trusts and combines on the premise that the operation of such trusts is inimical to the common weal. At the same time a department of the Government is nurturing a governmental monopoly of the generation, distribution, and sale of the greatest power man has mastered for industrial production, home necessities, and public convenience.

The International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers does not raise its voice on the subject of public power in behalf of private companies or their management. We have met the abuses of power by these companies in the past and have achieved substantial correction. Today 90 percent of the workers in the privately owned electric light and power industry are covered by union contracts and the IBEW itself represents more than 75 percent of the organized employees in this industry.

The International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers raises its voice on the subject of public power at this time in the interest of organized labor in the electric light and power industry. The subtle transformation of the Government program from the proper purposes of providing power as a byproduct of the initial program and of furnishing a "yardstick" for private utilities has reached the stage where it threatens free enterprise in this industry. We support free enterprise not only in our capacity as citizens of the United States but also in our capacity as representatives of organized labor. The increase in the area of Government and quasi-Government ownership operation in utilities necessarily carries with it a decrease in the area of freedom for labor as well as other groups.

Labor cherishes its right to bargain collectively for wages, hours, and working conditions. It fights the abrogation of such rights whether in the form of antilabor laws or in the more complicated form of transferring their status to employees of the Government without any rights to bargain collectively or otherwise exercise their economic strength.

The International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers has had drastic experience with the effect on its interests resulting from the transfer of utilities from private to public or quasi-public ownership.

In a recent case where the ownership of a utility was transferred to a municipality the IBEW was deprived of collective bargaining rights by an order of the court even though the majority of voters of the municipality had enacted an ordinance requiring their officials to bargain with the union.

Labor does not choose to have its welfare determined by the administrative orders of Government officials no matter how well-intentioned they may purport to be.

Under fascism, nazism, and communism the people work for the State. Under the policies inaugurated by the Rural Electrification Administration those employed on electrical properties work for the Government under the guise of cooperatives. It is a distinction without a difference.

That the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers has been cognizant of these developments for some time was indicated by its expressed concern in 1948, when its international president, D. W. Tracy, in an address before the members of the Edison Electric Institute, in the course of his remarks said:

"I would not be talking heart to heart in a manner consistent with my expressed desire in my earlier remarks if I did not say: we need and must have more democracy in Government and more democracy in business with less Government interference in business and in labor. In an effort to prevent possible misunderstanding of my statement I emphasize the fact that the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers endorses, advocates, and defends the profit system. Call it capitalism if you will but the fact remains the system is an element of Americanism because it is the economic system of our land and has contributed to the higher standard of living in this country which at once becomes the envy and the hope of common people in foreign lands."

The international executive council of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers today endorsed the action of International President Tracy and unanimously subscribed to this public release in defense of freedom of labor, in defense of freedom of legitimate enterprise, and in defense of freedom of cooperation between both to the benefit of the commonweal through safeguarding the elements of Americanism, against assault, by authoritarian or State power on the liberties that have identified America as the country where labor has an effective voice in the establishment of conditions of its employment.

Jefferson Davis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARDIN PETERSON
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 6, 1950

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered before United Daughters of the Confederacy by Congressman ARTHUR WINSTEAD, United States Capitol, Statuary Hall, Saturday, June 3, 1950:

Madame Chairman, members of the United Daughters of the Confederacy, ladies and

gentlemen, our meeting here today is prompted by our desire to pay tribute to a great American, a citizen of Mississippi and the South and a leading figure of all time in this great Republic. Jefferson Davis, the first, last, and only president of the Confederacy, was no doubt misunderstood and criticized more by those who did not know the facts, or who cared nothing for the facts, than probably any other American. There were those who held Jefferson Davis responsible for the secession of the Southern States and also for the War Between the States, but the record does not so reveal. The record shows that he fought for the right of the States to secede under the Constitution, but never advocated that they do so. The record also shows that after the Southern States did secede he remained loyal to them because of his belief that they were acting according to their constitutional rights.

In an address delivered by Bishop A. Galloway at the University of Mississippi, June 3, 1908, he had this to say: "Mr. Davis had his limitations, and was not without his measure of human faults and frailties; but he also had extraordinary gifts and radiant virtues and a brilliant genius that rank him among the mightiest men of the centuries. He made mistakes, because he was mortal, and he excited antagonisms because his convictions were stronger than his tactful graces; but no one who knew him, and no dispassionate student of his history, ever doubted the sincerity of his great soul or the absolute integrity of his imperial purpose. Let us, on his anniversary day, learn some patriotic lessons from the life history of this greatest Mississippian. Jefferson Davis began his life well. He had a clean boyhood, with no tendency to vice or immorality. That was the universal testimony of neighbors, teachers, and fellow students. He grew up a stranger to deceit and a lover of the truth. He formed no evil habits that he had to correct, and forged upon himself no chains that he had to break. His nature was as transparent as the light that shone about him; his heart as open as the soft skies that bent in benediction over his country home; and his temper as sweet and cheery as the limpid stream that made music in its flow through the neighboring fields and forests."

Jefferson Davis had an accomplished war record in the defense of the United States. He served in many and varied capacities. As a Member of the Senate, in the opinion of many, he served at a time when no doubt the Senate was composed of more outstanding and able Senators than at any other time. With such men as John C. Calhoun, Daniel Webster, Henry Clay, Stephen A. Douglas, and many others, he was described at that time as "eloquent among the most eloquent in debate," and worthy to be the premier at any council table of American statesmen. The historian Prescott pronounced him "the most accomplished" Member of the body. Senator Henry Wilson of Massachusetts afterward spoke of him as "the clear-headed, practical, dominating Davis."

Jefferson Davis was sincerely and unfalteringly devoted to the doctrine of State sovereignty and all the practical questions which grew out of this doctrine. He held steadfastly to the fundamental fact that the Union was composed of separate, independent, sovereign States, and that all Federal power was delegated, specifically limited, and clearly defined. He never lost sight of the fact that the Articles of Confederation declared that "each State retain its sovereignty, freedom and independence, and every power, jurisdiction and right, which is not by this Confederation expressly delegated to the United States in Congress assembled," and that this principle was transferred intact to the Constitution itself. Jefferson Davis stood on the doctrine that one function of sovereignty was the right to withdraw from a compact, if occasion demanded. Quoting again from Bishop Galloway: "Jefferson Davis' farewell to the United States Senate, in which he had so long towered as a commanding figure, and where he had rendered his country such distinguished service, was one of the most dramatic and memorable scenes in the life of that historic Chamber. Mississippi, by solemn ordinance, and in the exercise of her sovereign right, had severed her relation with the Union, and he, as her representative, must make official announcement of the fact, surrender his high commission, and return home to await the further orders of his devoted people. It was a supreme—a fateful hour—in our country's history. The hush of death fell upon the Chamber when Jefferson Davis arose. The trusted leader, and authoritative voice of the South, was about to speak, and an anxious Nation was eager to hear. Every Senator was in his seat, Members of the House stood in every available place, and the galleries were thronged with those whose faces expressed the alternating hopes and fears of their patriotic hearts. The fate of a Nation seemed to hang upon that awful hour.

"Pale, sad of countenance, weak in body from patriotic grief and loss of sleep, evidently under the strain of sacred, suppressed emotion, and yet with the calmness of fixed determination and settled conviction, the majestic Senator of Mississippi stood hesitant for a moment in painful silence. The natural melancholy in his face had a deeper tinge as if the shadow of his country's sorrow had been cast upon it. His good wife, who witnessed the fateful scene and felt the oppressive burden that almost crushed the brave heart of her great husband, said that had he been bending over his bleeding father, needlessly slain by his countrymen, he could not have been more pathetic and inconsolable. At first there was a slight tremor in his speech, but as he proceeded his voice recovered its full, flutelike tones and rang through the Chamber with its oldtime clearness and confident strength. But there was no note of defiance, and he spoke no word of bitterness or reproach. He was listened to in profound silence. Hearts were too sad for words and hands too heavy for applause. Many eyes, unused to weeping, were dimmed with tears. And when he closed with these solemn words, there was a sense of unutterable sorrow in the entire assembly. 'Mr. President and Senators, having made the announcement which the occasion seemed to me to require, it only remains for me to bid you a final adieu.' "

Jefferson Davis returned to his home in Mississippi. He did not seek nor desire the leadership of the Confederacy, which was thrust upon him by unanimous vote, and from which the people who knew of his great and outstanding abilities and who trusted his leadership, refused to release him. He, therefore, felt constrained to accept the Presidency and the responsibilities of the office. The South felt that peace with two governments was better than a union of discordant States. Horace Greeley himself said: "If the cotton States shall decide that they can do better out of the Union than in it, we insist on letting them go in peace."

Aware of the possibility for war, the Southern States seceded without the least preparation for it. There were no guns, no establishments for their manufacture or repair, no soldiers or vessels had been provided in preparation for war, either offensive or defensive. The South's desire was to live in peace and friendship with their late confederates, and did all they possibly could to accomplish this end. We all know now that many sincere and outstanding leaders in our Nation, from both the North and South, earnestly sought some method by which their differences might be recognized and settled without conflict. Yet, because of agitators, radicals, and propaganda by unscrupulous persons, the dreadful conflict resulted. It was only when the Federal Fleet set out for Fort Sumter that the realization came to the South that war was upon them. We can all see now that had the truth been known and understood as to the intent and purpose of such leaders as Jefferson Davis, and other southern leaders, as well as some of the northern leaders who sought a peaceful solution, this tragic war would never have occurred.

Thus today every true American, from both North and South, should appreciate this great United States of ours and our form of Government, which we must retain. The southern boys have volunteered for service in the two wars of this generation as freely, if not more so, than have the boys in any section of the country. They have bravely fought in defense of the flag of the United States of America and for the protection of peace-loving people everywhere. Today, with the cold war raging, with communism spreading in every area of the world, with some in our own midst, it behooves each of us to be tolerant and understanding of each other's problems and to keep a united America. With atomic bombs, the possibility of H-bombs, and other modern methods of warfare, it is absolutely essential that we keep ourselves united and strong. It is sad indeed that in these crucial times we have some people who would stir up racial strife and prejudice and hatreds and divide our people in order to perpetuate themselves politically and for other selfish purposes. Many of us today believe in State sovereignty, in the constitutional processes of government, and that States can better regulate their own problems, in many cases, than can the Federal Government. We believe it essential that these principles be retained if our Nation is to stand.

We have understanding, appreciation, and cooperation in the Southern States today. We recognize our differences and our problems and we believe in solving such differences and problems in a peaceful and honorable way. We find agitators today as we found them in previous years, who would divide and conquer, who would stir up strife and turmoil. There are those who advocate the so-called civil rights program, including FEPC, with the might of the Federal Government to be used to enforce social change. Surely we oppose the efforts of these agitators who are trying to stir up trouble in our section of the country where we have lived peacefully as two races for these many years. There is not much difference in the opinions of honest people in the North and South who want to promote the welfare of all our people, work toward a better understanding and improve the economic conditions of the Negro in both sections. However, there are those of us who believe firmly that these problems can better be solved by local people, rather than by Federal legislation—much of which we of the Southern States believe to be unconstitutional.

It is indeed strange that the great mass of those who advocate such legislation as FEPC, and other measures directed toward the South, come from sections of the country where there is more discrimination than is practiced in the South. Sections, other than the South, have more subversive groups, more Communists, more agitators, more racial prejudice and discrimination than there is anywhere in the South. The South was one of the most poverty-stricken areas, after the War Between the States, that could be found anywhere, yet there has never been any place of communism in the South. We had no Marshall plan, we had no ECA, we had no financial support from the Federal Government, but in many cases we had Federal interference. Our forefathers had a will to do and a willingness to work and so built a great segment of this Nation. With brave hearts they worked. Men and

women, with common understanding and mutual agreement, labored together for the betterment of all the people. We feel that they worked well in spite of few tools with which to work, with little or no capital. These fine people of our beloved Southland have through the years developed a splendid area, an area of industrial progress and agricultural advancement. In the last 20 years we have made more progress than any section of the Nation.

Today, at a time when much of the Nation's energies and efforts are being used to hold back communism abroad and to weed communism out of Government at home, we do not have to worry about communism in the South.

Today, as in the days of Jefferson Davis, we are faced with problems caused by those who would destroy constitutional processes. We would not have armed conflict, but by every peaceful and constitutional means at hand, those of us in Congress, those in every walk of life must band ourselves together to oppose those who would destroy local self-government, those who would create an all-powerful national state, which, through the use of Federal force, would control the individual, destroy his initiative. Though such movements are offered in the name of liberty, it is the same thing that has led to the dictatorships abroad and would eventually destroy our great Nation at home. Many of us are making the fight against such programs. We are striving in every way to protect local self-government. We believe that if the American people can be made aware of these dangers, these problems can be solved and free people will continue to run their own affairs. Today, as we honor the great American, Jefferson Davis, and the many others who had a part in giving us in the South so great a heritage, may we reaffirm our faith in our beloved Southland and pledge anew allegiance to the principles upon which this, the greatest Nation on earth, was founded.

As Jefferson Davis said in the only book he ever wrote of that tragic period of our history: "It is needful that the truth, the whole truth, should be known so that crimination and recrimination may forever cease, and then on a basis of fraternity and faithful regard for the rights of the States there may be written on the arch of the Union 'Esto perpetua.'"

Anthracite Research Laboratory

REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1950

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, as part of my program in the interest of the great anthracite coal industry and the vital area in which it is located, as well as in the interest of the general national welfare and security, I have, this day, introduced a bill to provide for the establishment and operation of an anthracite research laboratory at Wilkes-Barre, Pa.

This is the third in a series of bills I think necessary for the immediate aid, and for a long-range plan, to render assistance to a major segment of the Nation's economic life. The first of these bills was for the construction of an office building, garage and storage center at Wilkes-Barre, Pa., for the field headquarters, in the anthracite area, of the Bureau of Mines of the Department of the Interior. The second bill in the program was introduced by me last week, and that was for the Government purchase and stockpiling of anthracite coal to guarantee production and employment. And now I present to the House this bill, which looks to the future and calls for a full-scale, all-out, effort on the part of the Government, science and the industry itself, to preserve and develop further, this great mineral gift which Almighty God, in his bounty to America, placed in the hills and valleys of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, I have insisted from the floor of this House, time and time again, that the Federal Government has a great burden of responsibility to the anthracite industry. Two weeks ago, in support of my plan for stockpiling, I said:

> To a great extent the major part of the economy of the Northeastern United States is dependent upon the mining of anthracite in the anthracite coal fields of Pennsylvania.

The problems of this vast mining industry are not alone those of the day-to-day production and marketing, but must include those of preservation, readjustments, improvements, new uses for anthracite—and we find that these factors call for legislative assistance.

It will be suggested that there is a newly built anthracite laboratory soon to be opened in the lower coal fields of Pennsylvania. For this gesture from the Government we are grateful. But make no mistake about it, this so-called laboratory is a mere gesture in the face of the magnitude of the economic problem which faces the Nation in this urgent drive to succor this basic fuel industry. In a small and limited way and within the narrow scope of its purpose, the recently built laboratory will render a distinct and welcome service.

But keeping in mind the vast potential to the national welfare inherent in the hard coal economy—mineral, manpower, financial, and defense—the present laboratory is a teakettle. The full brilliance, imagination, and skill of American science; the unlimited storehouse of American know-how must have the cooperation, encouragement, and substantial financial aid of the Government itself. The combination of these elements properly housed will, as always, do their full share in contributing to this phase of the over-all plan to revive and develop and enlarge the scope of anthracite in America's future abundance.

This is a major problem and calls for major action.

We must profit by the now well-known adage "Too little and too late."

The site designated in the bill is Wilkes-Barre, Pa., in the very heart of the anthracite-coal fields. Twice as many hard-coal miners—35,000—work in this locality as in any other part of the hard-coal fields—nearly half the total of the men still employed in anthracite-coal mining. The Anthracite Coal Institute is located in Wilkes-Barre. This body represents over 80 percent of the anthracite producers in the country. The main offices of the Glen Alden Coal Co. is in Wilkes-Barre. This company is the biggest single producer of anthracite in the world. The producers are eager to extend full cooperation of their skills, experience, mines, and so forth. Labor is anxious that this laboratory be built; that this work be under way at once. The 1,000,000 people who depend on the industry in this limited area, where the hard coal is found, look hopefully for this kind of practical help.

We do not want a dole. We do not want the United States Treasury to put a permanent prop under the anthracite. But we are in trouble, we do need emergency, temporary help and we ask for this great laboratory as assurance that we can work our way out of this problem into a brave new future for our area and our country as well as our families, our businesses, our self-respect, and our peace of mind and heart. We abhor communism. You will find none of this evil in the hard-coal country—did you ever stop to think of that? We do not want Government censorship or dictatorship—we do not want socialism—but we do want Uncle Sam to help us out of a tight spot and to help us see the right road for us to follow into the years ahead.

Research in anthracite—the development of assistance in matters pertaining to new and more effective methods of using anthracite, new fuel uses, nonfuel uses of anthracite—all of these things call for a complete and unreserved effort. This will not permit, not now, any halfway measures, a gesture here, a meeting there, a suggestion, an idea, good, bad, indifferent. No longer can we meet this issue halfheartedly.

Mr. Speaker, this is a desperate cause. This is no boys' game. We need a laboratory, not a coffee pot.

The facilities of Wilkes College and King's College, both institutions of high learning and repute, will be at hand with all the other advantages so necessary and peculiar in need to the purposes I envisage in the operation of this wonderful scientific giant.

Think what added courage this will give to the strong hearts of the hard coal peoples.

We are being assailed on all sides by competitive fuels. We do not protest mere competition, but when our competitors receive preferment we seek equal rights. Even now, with the limited effort the economic status of the industry will permit, a new world is opening for the use of anthracite. In addition to sponsoring research work on improved equipment for utilizing anthracite as a heating fuel, research will bring to the public a long list of nonfuel uses of anthracite. Some of the present new fuel uses of anthracite are graphically shown as acid-resisting vats, and so forth; activated carbon; battery plates; black concrete roads; carbon brushes; carbon electrodes; carbon refractories; carbon structural forms; carburizer; cement kilns; desludging agent in oil refining; diaphragm plates; electric furnace resisters; filter medium; flashlight batteries; foundry cupolas; foundry facing; heat transfer tubes; manufacture of briquets; manufacture of chemicals; manufacture of coke; manufacture of graphite; manufacture of producer gas; paper mill digester blocks; paint pig-

ment; reduction of ores; sintering of ores; telephone granular carbon.

Figures are not available at the present time which would give in detail the size of the total anthracite nonfuel market. However, listed below are authoritative figures on the approximate annual tonnage involved in the major applications:

Cupola fuel	100,000
Filtering	7,000
Foundry facing	3,000
Manufacture of briquettes	926,000
Manufacture of chemicals	1,000
Gas producers	645,000
Manufacture of coke	256,000
Manufacture of electrodes	17,000
Ore sintering	257,000
Special uses	121,000
Total	2,333,000

The building of this great laboratory and the execution of this program embraces the whole broad vision of economics and technology. These things have been talked about for years. The various Government agencies have lamented the need for a plan, a program of action. Well, Mr. Speaker, here it is. I want to see all of these well-wishing Government departments get behind it.

The use of an abundant supply of energy-resource material has made the United States of America the great world power that it is today. I have, as I have mentioned, legislation now in the House dealing with the immediate fuel-production problems and the guaranty of the continued fuel supply if national defense measures ever curtail the use of oil and gas for such purposes, especially domestic heating.

A major readjustment in the fuel-energy economy of the country has been taking place during the past several decades. This proposed laboratory will devote a phase of its work to this important field.

New markets beyond the realm of the traditional fuel use must be discovered for anthracite. The potential has no boundary. We cannot afford to neglect to explore this territory further when such little experiment, as now accomplished, promises such rich opportunities.

Improved metallurgical processes and scarcities of important mineral resources all demand this great and dramatic effort.

Do not forget that anthracite coal was the original fuel in the open hearth furnaces in the production of steel. The return of anthracite to this vital use alone would justify this proposed laboratory and operating fund of $10,000,000. The fantastic discoveries of iron ore in South America will place this raw material for steel, when it arrives on our Atlantic seaboard, just a few miles from the anthracite coal fields of Pennsylvania. Imagine this boon to our economy, the harnessing of hard coal open hearth steel production units to the unlimited Venezuelan iron ore deposits in the coal fields of Pennsylvania! Such a venture in itself would justify a sum ten times $10,000,000—if only for the experiment—and yet we know it is a practical and economic and desirable fact, including the fact of geography. Liquid fuel from hard coal; gaseous uses from hard coal; here are other avenues down which experimentation must go—and at once.

No panacea for anthracite industrial ills exists or can be concocted. At once voices will rise against this proposal. "It's too late" some will say. Other "Gloomy Gus" cries will be heard. "Not worth the money" and "Coal is finished." We have no time for these "Sad Sacks." We are going places and we are in a hurry!

Mr. Speaker, anthracite being a fuel and a source of important basic materials entering into the industrial pattern of the country should be a relatively simple product to link successfully into the present and future national economy. Experience and research, but of necessity on the large scale required by this bill, should join to define and later enlarge the areas of opportunity for the industry.

There remains two further pieces of legislation in my program of short- and long-range aid to the anthracite industry and northeastern Pennsylvania. These bills will include provision for the benefit of areas suffering from chronic unemployment and a plan to develop the many phases of the general economy of the area and surrounding and adjacent areas. These steps will come in due course—as for now—the $10,000,000 anthracite laboratory program.

Mr. Speaker, to prevent the loss to the national economy of this vital natural resource and economic disaster to millions of our citizens and to promote the general welfare, I have introduced this bill.

Point 4 Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAY LeFEVRE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 6, 1950

Mr. LeFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial taken from today's New York Times. Mr. Speaker, the President signed the bill yesterday for over $3,000,000,000 to continue the ECA program. I voted for this bill when it was before the House believing that we should finish the job we started in helping the European countries to become self-sufficient again. Having seen the damages brought on by the war in 1945, in many parts of Europe, I felt that we really had a moral obligation to give assistance to these countries.

I did not believe that the point 4 program should have been attached to the ECA bill. In approving of this feature, we are embarking on a new venture which it seemed to me deserved much further study. No one can deny that the objective of the point 4 program is a very worthy one. We all would like to see every nation in the world further developed and given a higher standard of living. My fear is that we are reaching out a little too far at a time when a good many countries are depending upon the solvency and strength of the United States. We know that $35,000,000, the amount in the ECA bill to carry out the point 4 program, is only a drop in the bucket. This is the first step.

The Committee on Ways and Means have worked long and hard in an effort to bring out a new tax bill. From all corners of our country we have been urged to reduce the emergency excise taxes. The committee has approved of some reductions but in an effort to satisfy the President to increase other taxes in order to offset the reduction in excise taxes, the committee has run into many snags. To my way of thinking, some of the suggestions have been very unfair. How could they approve of an increase in the taxing of surpluses of savings banks and building and loan associations and at the same time refuse to tax other mutual associations who are in competition with private enterprise. Yesterday a member of the committee brought to our attention a bill before the committee asking the American taxpayers to appropriate $85,000,000 to build roads in four countries or provinces which I doubt whether any of us had even heard of. Mr. Speaker, this is going too far. We must have unity among our own people and we certainly cannot get that by further burdening our taxpayers. We must give some real consideration to the welfare of our own industries so they in turn can give full employment to our own large segment of labor which needs protection in many lines at this time.

POINT 4 BEGINS

In signing the act authorizing the expenditure of $3,120,550,000 for foreign economic assistance during the coming fiscal year, President Truman emphasized yesterday that the major new step forward in it is represented by one of its smallest items—the $35,000,000 for the point 4 program. This is the bold new program for the development of underdeveloped areas proposed by Mr. Truman in his inaugural address more than 16 months ago, to provide a start for a great international cooperative enterprise for the achievement of a world of peace, plenty, and freedom. Because of the political circumstances under which it was launched it has only recently been approved by Congress over stubborn opposition. But now it is incorporated into law; Capus M. Waynick, Ambassador to Nicaragua, has been named as preliminary director of it, and assuming that the authorization will be followed by actual appropriation of the funds, the program is at last on its way.

Other programs in the economic aid act carry far larger authorizations. But these programs are temporary, designed to overcome the immediate ravages and dislocations of the war. The point 4 program is a long-range program designed not only to maintain the gains achieved by the other programs but also to provide an instrument for expanding world economy on the basis of private initiative and free enterprise as the best means of promoting democracy and freedom. In that sense it may be regarded, like the equally long-range North Atlantic Pact, as another potentially tremendous contribution to the defense of the free world against Russo-Communist imperialism.

The first steps contemplated under this program call for technical assistance to underdeveloped areas on an organized and

sustained basis in cooperation with the United Nations, individual governments, and private organizations already engaged in this work. But, as Mr. Truman again emphasizes, and as the United Nations subcommission on economic development agrees, the main support of the program will have to come from private capital invested on a business basis which will relieve governments of the burdens of the present recovery programs. This demands a new approach to the problem of foreign investment.

On the one hand, as the United Nations subcommission urges, underdeveloped countries, protected from colonial exploitation, will have to create an atmosphere congenial to such investments in order to attract private capital. On the other hand, private capital will have to forego excessive profits previously justified by political instability in the investment areas. The proposed partial Government guaranties for private capital against confiscation or freezing of profits, and specific treaties protecting such investments, are among the ways to achieve these ends. But in the long run the success of the program will depend on good faith and energy on both sides.

Censorship in Radio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEPHEN M. YOUNG
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 6, 1950

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, the attention of the Members of this House has previously been drawn to the proceedings of the Federal Communications Commission against radio stations KMPC, of Los Angeles; WGAR, of Cleveland; and WJR, of Detroit. Quite recently my distinguished colleague from New York, Congressman TAURIELLO, in an address on this floor, challenged the propriety of the Federal Communications Commission's using—as one of its star witnesses—a man by the name of Clete Roberts who, while on the witness stand, had the effrontery to classify all southern Italians as "not being worth a tinker's damn." At this point I want to wholeheartedly agree with my colleague in challenging the credibility of such a witness as Roberts, and I also want to compliment him for his staunch support of all individuals in this country of southern Italian extraction. No one can look into the faces of little Italian children and meet daily with Italians for more than 2 years without forming a high opinion of and strong affection for Italian people.

I served in a humble capacity with the Fifth Army in Italy throughout the bitter war years. I was in every part of Italy from Salerno to the Swiss border and in the great offensives of the Fifth Army and on the Anzio-Nettuno beachhead. I was in constant contact with the Italian people. I repudiate from my very soul as slanderous and untruthful the statement of this witness, Roberts.

Over and above the fact that when Congress created the Federal Communications Commission and gave it certain authority over radio and other methods of communication and wrote into the act a definite ban against any form of censorship—over and above this all-important fact—I am interested in this matter because there seems to be a definite plan on the part of certain Republican leaders to make this case a partisan issue. I have before me speeches which have been made on the floor of the Senate by such Republican leaders as the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON]. These speeches clearly indicate to me that they are using this particular case as means of building up material for the coming November elections. I have every reason to believe that other Republican Senators will be speaking out in connection with this particular case.

The purpose of my remarks today, therefore, is to serve notice that I am opposed to any form of censorship with regard to any phase of our communications systems. I do not believe that the Republicans can succeed in taking credit for the preservation of this basic factor in our democracy, and I suggest that the Democratic Party could well take cognizance of what I believe is a well-advanced plan on the part of the Republicans to use the present case as political propaganda.

I have made it a point to look into this case and unhesitatingly state that if it is the plan of the Federal Communications Commission to penalize the owner of these stations because of his personal views, then the Federal Communications Commission is going far beyond any authority vested in it by Congress.

Freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and freedom of the air waves are basic privileges which have made this democracy of ours the great Nation it is. I can hope that the Federal Communications Commission will keep this in mind. It might be well, Mr. Speaker, if this particular case were looked into by Republicans and Democrats alike. I have here an editorial of the Washington Post under date of April 11 in connection with this matter and I add this editorial to my remarks as it deals with some very vital questions which have arisen as a result of this case against these three radio stations:

SHADOW OF THE CENSOR

A hearing of great importance to the radio industry and the public has recessed in California. It involves charges of bias and news-slanting against George A. Richards, the owner of KMPC in Los Angeles and two other powerful radio stations. Three former employees of Mr. Richards charge that he ordered them to distort and color the news so as to discredit some individuals and groups and to reflect credit upon others. Since the Federal Communications Commission has no powers of censorship, the issue boils down to whether or not the licensee is a fit person to operate radio facilities subject to regulation in the public interest.

Of course, no broadcaster is free to operate his station, using public facilities, solely as he may see fit. In the broad sense of the word he must serve the public interest or give way to someone else who can. But the public interest thus to be served necessarily has a very broad meaning. The FCC is not at liberty to put a broadcaster off the air because it may disagree with his viewpoint or because he may fall short of perfection in the management of his broadcasts. The history of broadcasting in this country shows relatively few abuses of the freedom that Congress has granted to the licensees in shaping their own programs. That record is not such as to warrant the disciplining of broadcasters by the back-door method of finding them unfit persons to operate a radio station, unless their activities fall hopelessly below the minimum standards of public service.

If the Silver Shirts, the Communist Party, the Ku Klux Klan, or a gang of outlaws were operating a broadcasting station to further their own interests, there would be no question about the necessity of withdrawing their license. But these are extreme cases. It would be a very different matter for the FCC to undertake to discipline a broadcaster because of the manner in which he "played" the news. If Mr. Richards should be put off the air for trying to slant the news against the persons and groups that are anathema to him, where would such a policy end? To be consistent the Commission would then have to withdraw the licenses of stations slanting the news against other political figures and organizations. We do not believe that the Commission has any standards that would be a safe guide in such a venture, and if it did the enforcement of such a policy would go seriously against the grain of our traditions.

Every decision as to what shall go on the air and how it shall be "played" is likely to be influenced by the broadcaster's or the newscaster's prejudices. The best radio stations and the best newspapers hold these prejudices in check struggling for fair and unbiased presentation of the facts. But it is common knowledge that slanted newspapers flourish, presumably because the people wish to read them. Would it be feasible for the Commission to put off the air a broadcaster catering to prejudices that were common with big metropolitan dailies in the same city? To be sure, the number of broadcasting channels is limited, but so are the opportunities for publication of a daily newspaper. We doubt that the FCC can apply stricter policies in the regulation of broadcasting than the press generally applies without taking upon itself an unmanageable problem of censorship. The public interest demands a wide range of freedom on the air as well as in the press. The danger of the FCC embarking on a policy of censorship seems to us much greater than the occasional abuse of freedom by licensees whose prejudices color their judgment.

Arming of the Arab States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 6, 1950

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important problems confronting world peace today is the situation in the Near East with respect to the sale of arms to the Arab states by Great Britain.

The news last week that the free powers have accepted a joint responsibility for the maintenance of peace in the Near East is truly welcome. Their determination to put a stop to the arms race engendered by British shipments of heavy arms to certain of the Arab states will depend upon the determination with which these assurances are administered.

Certainly the large number of Members of the Congress who urged upon Secretary Acheson the three-power dis-

cussion which has apparently resulted in this agreement will continue their interest and deep concern with the result of this development and will cooperate in seeing that it brings the assurance of peace.

This illustrates once again, I think, the lesson we have learned since World War II—winning and maintaining the peace is a daily job—it must be worked at just as hard, if not harder, than winning a war.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I herewith include an address made on this important subject on May 24, by my colleague, the Honorable ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO, Member of Congress from New York:

ADDRESS OF HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, BEFORE MASS MEETING TO PROTEST ARMING OF THE ARAB STATES BY GREAT BRITAIN, MADISON SQUARE PARK, NEW YORK CITY, WEDNESDAY, MAY 24, 1950

I am happy to be here this afternoon to discuss with you a matter which has been troubling me for some time. I have long taken an interest in the struggle for the establishment of the Jewish state and I have followed with keen interest the growth and development of Israel in the last 2 years.

To me, the situation today in the Near East is very disturbing. The fact that England is rearming the Arab states on an unprecedented scale, particularly Egypt, whom she is supplying with jet planes, cannons, tanks, and other heavy military equipment is, in itself, a very grave situation. It is even more disturbing when we realize that our own State Department is giving its approval to this British action and is thereby encouraging future trouble in the Middle East.

It is for these reasons that I took the leadership in approaching my colleagues in Congress to organize concerted and bipartisan action to bring to the attention of Secretary of State Acheson the dangerous policy which he is following in the collaboration with Mr. Bevin.

On March 28, a group of 32 Congressmen, headed by me, met with Mr. Acheson in his office and we spoke to him very frankly and bluntly about this situation.

When the time approached for Mr. Acheson's departure for Europe to attend the Foreign Ministers Conference, we submitted to him a statement signed by 51 Members of Congress in which we again indicated to him our views and objections.

Yes, my friends, he sent us a reply just before he left Washington, but I don't mind telling you that to me Mr. Acheson's reply was painfully disappointing. It is simply a repetition of the allegations of the State Department during the last 3 months. There is no need for me to go into a detailed analysis here. Mr. Acheson says, and I quote: "There has been no indication that the United Kingdom is diverting any undue proportion of its resources into military production." I say to you, my friends, that this statement, to put it mildly, is misleading. The amount of arms and the kind of arms which England is diverting to the Arabs may not represent an undue proportion of England's resources, but it certainly is out of proportion to the needs of the Arab states for their internal defense. Egypt and the other Arab states do not need jet planes and cannons for internal defense against their own people; these arms are intended for a purpose, and for one purpose only, for aggressive action against Israel in a war of revenge.

Mr. Acheson prefers to close his eyes to the fact that there is an inconsistency between his words and his deeds. The right hand does not know what the left hand is doing. He fails to realize that there is a conflict between the declared policy of the United States regarding peace in the Near East and the policy of our State Department which approves the shipment of offensive arms by England to the Arab states. I said that in my public statements, I am saying it here today, and I shall keep repeating that the State Department's approval of Britain's arming of the Arabs is contrary to the established American policy and is an incitement to a renewal of war against Israel.

All our efforts to bring to the realization of the State Department the serious situation and the dangerous path upon which it is treading have been answered with pious and meaningless words by Mr. Acheson. These words are being nullified every day as every delivery of arms reaches the Near East. These words are a mockery of our policy of professed friendship toward Israel. In fact, they are cruel toward the infant State of Israel because its very life is being threatened by this overwhelming supply of arms to the Arab states by England, with the blessings of our State Department. I believe it is high time for us, as Americans, to insist that Mr. Acheson bring his action in line with the true American policy toward Israel—a policy of peace and not of war.

The United States, which was the first country to extend recognition to Israel, owes a moral duty to the inhabitants of the Jewish state and certainly to the 400,000 DP's and other homeless Jews who came there in the last 2 years with the encouragement and financial support from this country. I say to you today that it is our moral obligation not to expose these people once again to slaughter; they have suffered enough already.

We are told that the rearmament of the Arabs is also dictated by the concept of security of the Middle East against a possible attack by a third power. If that be so, then I ask: Why should not Israel be included in that program? Why is not Israel entitled to the opportunity of military preparedness against a possible assault by the Arab countries in view of their constant threat? To me, the policy of arming the Arabs and at the same time refusing to supply arms to Israel, is a policy of discrimination against Israel and favoritism toward the Arab states. The fair-minded people of this country will never acquiesce to such a policy of discrimination and they will never condone Mr. Bevin's anti-Israel policies by placing the people of Israel at the mercy of fanatical Arab leaders. The rearming of the Arabs and at the same time the denial of arms to Israel is not the way to peace—it is the way to chaos and war.

Israel is an outpost of democracy in the Middle East which is shaped in the image of our own American democracy. It is guided by American ideals of freedom, equality, justice, and liberty for all, regardless of race or creed or national origin. The United State needs Israel as an outpost of democracy as much as Israel needs us. It was all this that prompted me to take an interest in this problem and to try to persuade our State Department to avert a renewal of the war in the Near East before it is too late. Let Mr. Acheson beware of Mr. Bevin's anti-Israel psychosis and not encourage the efforts of the Arab leaders who are eager for new bloodshed.

I promise you here today that I shall continue these efforts; I shall continue my endeavors to make the State Department realize that it is following a dangerous policy. I shall continue to do everything in my power until a permanent and lasting peace is established between Israel and the Arab states.

A final word: Thank God we live in a democracy—the American democracy. Through the force of enlightened American public opinion we shall compel the Department of State to listen and to act. The right hand shall know what the left hand is doing. Let this message go forth from this magnificent gathering:

America will never desert Israel, as Israel never deserted America. Israel did not fail us. We shall not fail Israel.

Pertinent Comment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. CALEB BOGGS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1950

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, there is published each week in Wilmington, Del., one of the finest, if in fact not the best, labor newspapers in this country. The newspaper to which I refer is the Labor Herald.

In solid substantiation of my statements about this outstanding newspaper is the fact that the Labor Herald received national recognition in November 1949 when it was selected for one of the top awards of the Freedoms Foundation.

The editor of the Labor Herald is Mr. Frank Saylor, who writes for each issue a column entitled "Pertinent Comment." In this column Editor Saylor expresses his views on national as well as local affairs. Mr. Saylor expresses his views with thoroughgoing honesty, independence and patriotism. Consequently, his incisive appraisals of matters of public interest are thought-provoked and merit the earnest attention and consideration of all of us.

Mr. Speaker, I am fully confident that you and the other Members of this body will be in full accord with my previous statements when you read Mr. Saylor's latest column which appeared in the Labor Herald of June 3, 1950, which I am including below as a part of my remarks.

Mr. Saylor's column follows:

PERTINENT COMMENT ON MATTERS OF LOCAL AND NATIONAL INTEREST

(By Frank Saylor)

Attention is directed to the news article in columns six and seven which expresses the apprehensions of the executive council of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers of the trend toward the socialization of the electrical industry. Apparently there is a growing realization, here and abroad, that a joker accompanies many a package of so-called social gains. The electricians have found that they can't deal with the Government as an employer as they did with privately owned utilities; in fact, it's possible that collective bargaining can be completely eliminated and working conditions arrived at on a take-it-or-leave-it basis. It's only been 3 years ago that President Truman who for purely political purposes gags at the Taft-Hartley law proposed to draft the railroad labor force into the Army to break a strike.

There are still some old-line unionists who didn't fall for the idea of the Government leaning over backward to favor labor in what was essentially a vote-getting gesture rather than a manifestation of sympathy for men who work for wages. Incidents such as the threat of forced railway labor and refusal of the REA to bargain with the IBEW show how the wind's blowing. Few Americans can conceive the possibility of a society made dependent upon Government, tasting in the

end involuntary servitude. For that matter neither could the people of England. When the Socialists took over in England they announced that they would, for the first time, demonstrate a planned society without forced labor. It took less than 2 years before they had to resort to forced labor, euphemistically calling the order a control-of-engagement order. It was to be temporary, for the emergency only, and was limited to 14 months. Before its life expired, the time limit was extended for an additional year. Last year it was extended again, and is still in force. It is true that the order hasn't been widely resorted to, but there it is, a power in the hands of the government against that government's pledge to reconcile planning with freedom.

First to awaken to the dangers of a society dependent upon Government was business, big and small. However, for some strange reason, the objections of business and associations of businessmen to economic panaceas was presumed to be prima facie evidence that fat cats were being gored and labor and so-called liberals continued their support of the planners. That the opposition of business to economic experimentation which persistently came a cropper should operate to inspire a counterreaction attests the extent of the infiltration of Marxist thought and its concept of class antagonism.

It has only been lately that labor has become aware of the insidiousness of the Government invasion into the field of labor legislation. When labor asked for and got enforced collective bargaining, first in the Wagner Act and later in the Taft-Hartley law, it yielded its own freedom as the railroaders, the coal miners, and the electricians have come to realize.

Right now there is a movement afoot for Government to come to the aid of small business. If this aid realistically went about aiding small business by reducing taxes, much could be said for it. But no, the proposal is to extend Government credit and if that credit is accepted, those who accept it surrender control of their business.

Another movement proposes legislation granting Federal aid for the public-school systems of the States. Some years ago it was believed that Federal aid would come to the rescue of the so-called poorer States by providing assistance when the need is greater than the State can bear. Since then there has been such growing centralization of power in the Federal Government, and disregard of the rights of the States and local authorities by the national administration that thinking educators have arrived at the conviction that Federal aid cannot be accepted for public schools without ultimately losing control of them to the Federal Government.

Gov. J. Strom Thurmond, of South Carolina, is apprehensive of Federal aid to schools and decided that South Carolina can best take care of its own education. Says he:

"We are already improving our school program, and the control of that program should be retained in our communities and in the State, where our taxes can be made to yield their maximum returns. Will we gain by sending our educational dollars to Washington, to be put through the Federal shrinking machine?

"The vital issue confronting us is whether we can maintain a locally supported and locally controlled public-school system. This Nation has grown great because of our free public schools. They are the bulwark of our liberty and the backbone of our democracy."

The point to it all is that there is a persistent drive toward bureaucratic dictatorship with men enslaving themselves by bargaining with government for favors at the expense of their freedom. There are heartening indications of a growing awareness of the trend. Best of all the awareness is not political. The trend cuts across party lines and is no longer the exclusive property of the Democratic Party which traded so successfully upon it for a score of years. Labor, business, and educators are beginning to sense that once there are Federal concessions, there is a yielding of freedom, a surrender of control, and, in the recognition of racial groups in law, a possibility of being discriminated against by law.

First we had Secretary Acheson declaring that he would not turn his back on Alger Hiss, twice-convicted perjurer, and now it's Judy Coplon, radiant in her wedding gown and awaiting sentence as a spy. Years ago guilt in such instances would have been the end of the road for Americans, and their names would have gone down in history for infamy. So far gone are our sense of values today that convictions for perjury and espionage, rather than being marks of infamy, might well be considered the prelude to a happier life. Patriotism? Why, patriotism is the refuge of scoundrels. Nationalism? In it is the poison that causes war. According to such lights, to transmit confidential information to another nation is but ignoring narrow, arbitrary nationalistic barriers and as for being a yankee doodle dandy, that's passé. Who knows but what in some future day, the way things are going, Hiss and Coplon will be put down in history as the prototypes of advanced world citizenry which is unhampered by outdated copybook morality?

Aliceville, Ala., Seeking New Industries, Has Many Advantages To Offer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1950

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, the town of Aliceville, in Pickens County, Ala., in the district which I have the honor to represent here, is a growing, public-spirited, neighborly and progressive town.

Though situated in one of the best agricultural sections of Alabama, it realizes the desirability of industrial growth and expansion, which together with its fine agricultural and cattle potential, will give it an economic balance that will raise the incomes of all its people.

I said Aliceville was a growing town. Its population has doubled since 1940.

I said Aliceville was a public-spirited town. This has been demonstrated a hundred times within the past few years in the manner in which its townspeople get together to put over a particular program or civic objective. The town is well kept, and its new buildings—and there are many of them—reflect the pride which their owners have in their town.

Aliceville is a neighborly town. Its people get along well together. Both races of its people live in harmony and understanding. Its people and civic organizations work together to promote its growth.

Aliceville is progressive. Its new buildings, its new businesses and industries all radiate a pride in its future. Soon it will have a new hospital toward the building of which the Federal Government will contribute two-thirds the cost, under the provisions of the Hill-Burton Hospital Construction Act of 1949. It has a housing project, a swimming pool, a recreation building. Under construction is a $25,000 cattle sales barn, a $100,000 fertilizer plant, a new modern picture show building.

Aliceville has a wonderful transportation system, two railroads, several paved highways, and is located near the Tombigbee River which in the interest of national defense must be developed at an early date. The proposed connection of the Tombigbee and Tennessee Rivers will give Aliceville water, rail, and highway transportation.

It has many natural advantages, fine people, good climate, high annual rainfall, is surrounded by good farming and cattle lands, and an abundance of pine timber. Its transportation system gives it a superior connection with the growing markets of the Southeast. It has an adequate supply of both white and colored labor for several new industrial enterprises.

As a part of my remarks I include an article from the Aliceville Informer, published at Aliceville, Ala., in its May 24, 1950, issue styled "Aliceville as an industrial site," written by Mr. G. N. Downer and his daughter, Miss Betty Downer:

ALICEVILLE AS AN INDUSTRIAL SITE

In connection with the coming Alabama Industry Days, G. N. Downer, with the help of his daughter Betty, has prepared the following historical factual statement on our town:

LOCATION

Aliceville is located in the southwestern part of Pickens County, which is in the western part of Alabama, about 8 miles east of the Mississippi State line and about 100 miles west of Birmingham, 165 miles northwest of Montgomery, 35 miles southeast of Columbus, Miss., 86 miles north of Meridian, Miss.

CLIMATE

Aliceville has a temperate climate. The summers are long and warm, but the temperature seldom rises above 100° F. The winter temperatures rarely fall below freezing and then only for a day or two at the time. The average temperature for the winter months is about 47°, for the spring 64°, for the summer 79°. Rainfall is about 50 inches, well distributed. The average growing season is about 230 days.

POPULATION

The population of Aliceville in 1910 was 640; in 1920 was 940; in 1930 was 1,066; in 1940 was 1,476. The census for 1950 has just been taken and we understand that it will run approximately 3,200 to 3,500 people.

Most of the original settlers came from South Carolina, but many were from Tennessee, Georgia, North Carolina, and Virginia. For the most part, the present population is descended from these, but a few people from the North and East have come during recent years in connection with lumber and other industries.

OCCUPATIONS

The main occupations of the people of the community are, in importance: Agriculture, cattle, forestry, building industry, saw and planing mills, cotton mills, railroads, wholesale and retail trade, professional service, and domestic and personal service.

There is an abundance of labor available in this territory, some of which is skilled.

The Alabama Mills has a plant in Aliceville employing about 450 people. There are several large lumber companies and a large stave mill. Three cotton gins, seven large warehouses, a Coca-Cola bottling plant, sand

and gravel business, a machine shop, cold storage and we have under construction a $25,000 cattle sales barn and a $100,000 fertilizer plant. We have also, several first-class garages and repair shops. We have a very modern funeral home locally owned.

We are especially proud of the fact that in the business district of Aliceville, we haven't a wooden building, all of them being masonry constructed. There is under construction now a modern picture-show building equal to any in west Alabama.

INDUSTRIAL SITES AND BUILDINGS

The town secured from the Federal Government the old prisoner-of-war camp, together with the waterworks and sewage system. This site has 132 acres of land with streets, sidewalks, railroad sidings, electrical installations and is adjacent to highway and railroad. This property is available to any industry wishing to locate here. Located on this property at the present time is a $25,000 recreational building and a $25,000 swimming pool which is city owned and operated.

COMMERCIAL

Aliceville has one bank, the Aliceville Bank and Trust Co., with total resources of about $2,500,000. Business failures are unknown in our town and there are many high class merchandise establishments.

MUNICIPAL

The government of Aliceville is conducted by a mayor and five councilmen. The city has about 10 miles of paving and about 6 miles of sewage.

The water supply of Aliceville comes from a system of deep wells, electric pumps and elevated standpipe with 563,000-gallon capacity. Gravity pressure is 68 pounds.

Adequate fire protection is provided for a small town with a modern fire truck manned by a paid fire department. The city is adequately policed by a chief of police day and night.

The city maintains a splendid school system presided over by a superintendent and 21 teachers. The junior and senior high have a registration of about 275 students with 10 teachers, and elementary school has an enrollment of 339 students with 11 teachers. Aliceville schools are fully accredited and zealously maintain this high scholastic standing. It has all modern equipment including a gymnasium, lunchroom, lighted athletic field, vocational department and a good band and music department.

The religious life of Aliceville is cared for by seven congregations. Most of these are modern brick buildings.

We have a Rotary Club and chamber of commerce.

Pickens County maintains a full time standard health unit. We think one of the best in the State.

TELEPHONES

The telephone system is owned by the Alabama Telephone Co., which is in close connection with the Southern Bell Telephone System.

TAXES

Pickens County has a reasonable tax rate—total State, county, and city being $3.10 per hundred, and assessments are reasonable and fair. The indebtedness of Pickens County is very small, due to efficient management of its county officials. After February 1951, Pickens County will be clear of debt, as we now have Federal bonds to liquidate all outstanding bonds on that date.

POWER

Light and power are furnished by Alabama Power Co. They have in the last few years built a high-powered line, replacing the old line. They maintain an office and maintenance crew in Aliceville and give excellent service.

TRANSPORTATION

Aliceville is well situated in regard to transportation. There are two railroads through Aliceville. The S. L. & S. F., which connects Pensacola to the great Middle West via Memphis, Tenn., and the A. T. & N., which was recently purchased by the S. L. & S. F. and was reconditioned at a cost of $3,000,000, connects the G. M. & O. at Reform and terminates at the Alabama State docks in Mobile, giving us two deep-water ports.

In addition to the railroad facilities, we have several motor freight lines. We have a network of paved highways. There are few towns with facilities as great as Aliceville's transportation.

LABOR

Aliceville has never had any labor trouble whatsoever, and is not threatened by any. Our local labor is of a higher type than much imported labor which is found in many other places. This is one of the biggest factors in the industrial development of our town.

SUMMARY

We need several small industries and our town is well situated for their development. We have good native-born American people, good church and school facilities, and an unusually strong bank for a small town. Health conditions are above the average. We have an abundance of good drinking water and a modern sewerage system.

Our local industries at the present time represent approximately a million-dollar capital investment employing 600 people with an anual payroll of $2,685,000.

Biggest Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the forty-third article by Mr. Frank C. Waldrop on the infiltration of communism in our country:

BIGGEST STORY

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

For 5 cents you can get the official story entitled "Establishment of Diplomatic Relations With the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics." Just apply to the Superintendent of Documents, Washington, D. C.

This is absolutely indispensable material for anybody who wants to see what a fool Stalin made of Roosevelt from the very start of their many dealings.

And since it is official, unqualified, and consists of the actual state papers exchanged between Messrs. Roosevelt, Hull and other high dignitaries with their opposites in Russia, nobody can argue very strongly that the facts are otherwise.

These state papers will be reviewed here in summary. But first, some evidence on the climate of public sentiment and the propaganda of the hour, as the issue of recognition was coming to its climax in 1933.

The big talk of the day was that recognition would open up "vast" business operations between the United States swamped in a surplus of goods, and famine-haggard Russia.

As soon as Mr. Roosevelt was in office the talk got more positive than ever. Speaker of the House Rainey gave off a statement that is a fair sample.

He declared the United States was losing at "least $500,000,000 a year" in trade with Russia by delaying recognition.

He said that he could vouch for that personally, after having been to Russia on an inspection trip with the House Ways and Means Committee.

He said that he found the Russian people "happy and contented and hard working."

Not long after that, Jesse Jones announced that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation would grant a loan for the Soviet to buy cotton.

Several "inside" columnists began to expound the advantages of putting $1,000,000,000—that is one billion dollars—in credit at the disposal of the Soviet, who were declared most reliable credit risks.

"They always pay their bills," was the slogan.

And Mr. Raymond Moley, the white knight of the hour, was reported as having the specific Presidential assignment to talk over recognition in close detail when he should arrive in London for the famous economic conference that was supposed to rebuild world trade.

Little attention was paid to the facts. In Russia, the people that Speaker Rainey described so falsely as "happy and contented" were actually suffering the ravages of famine.

This was the period in which Stalin was at the worst of his attack on the farmers.

The small landholders, familiar to the world as kulaks, were being kicked off their property and sent to Siberia. Russia was teetering on the edge of collapse and full revolt.

At Geneva, preceding the London economic conference, there was a disarmament conference. And there, too, the drumfire of propaganda was that the United States of America would find in Russia an enormous new market for our surplus goods.

The American business community was bewitched with this fascinating prospect. But what were the facts?

In fact, what little dealing foreign business had conducted with Stalin was already crashing, right and left. I have recounted earlier how Mr. Averell Harriman and some friends had their shirts ripped up the back in undertaking a gold exploration and mining concession in Siberia. That was in 1927–28.

But allowing for the shortness of memory and the eternal gullibility of Wall Street bankers who cannot believe it when a man says he means to destroy them both in their work and personally in their lives—so vain can they become—consider a more current case.

In 1933, to smash the last vestige of foreigners' standing with the Russians, Stalin ordered the arrest and trial of six British engineers working under a contract the Soviets had with the Vickers Co., a sort of combination General Electric and United States Steel.

At the very moment Mr. Roosevelt was rushing headlong into Stalin's trap, the British were in the midst of a terrific, open quarrel.

The British diplomats had always been impressed with the firm intentions of Lenin, Trotsky, Stalin & Co., to cause a world revolution as they had said publicly and repeatedly.

But pressure for trade, after 1918, had evolved from a mere commercial agreement to an exchange of ambassadors.

Now, in 1933, the British started withdrawing.

Their first act was to cancel all trade relations, using the attack on the Vickers engineers as a basis. The road was then open from there to a complete end to diplomatic relations.

They overlooked Roosevelt.

Fuel Oil in New England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER
OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1950

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, the following testimony given by Mr. Eugene Holman, president of the Standard Oil Co.—New Jersey—before the Oil Imports Subcommittee of the Select Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives is of particular interest to the New England area, where the continued importation of certain types of oils is of great importance to industry, to the householder, and to the merchant fleet:

FACTS ON THE IMPORTATION OF OIL INTO THE UNITED STATES AND THE POLICY OF STANDARD OIL CO. (NEW JERSEY) ON OIL IMPORTS

ABUNDANT SUPPLIES OF FUEL ENERGY MEAN HIGH LIVING STANDARDS

Modern production and transportation rest largely on a foundation of fuel. The burning of fuel in machines to augment the energy obtained from manpower and animal power can increase enormously the output of goods and their availability to consumers. The per capita consumption of fuel is an index of a nation's standard of living.

The United States uses energy at an annual rate of 234,000,000 British thermal units per capita. (As used here, the term refers to energy obtained from coal, petroleum, natural gas, and hydroelectric power.) Although this country has but 6 percent of the world's population, it accounts for 45 percent of world use of energy. All other nations combined consume, on the average, only one-tenth as much per capita.

The only nation that even approaches our country in use of energy is Canada, whose per capita consumption is about 85 percent of ours. The European recovery plan nations use about 25 percent as much as we do on a per capita basis; Russia, 18 percent; Asia, 2 percent.

By employing 10 times as much energy per person as the average for the rest of the world, the United States produces 2 to 4 times as much goods per labor-hour as even the most highly industrialized nations of Europe.

In the United States the use of energy has increased about a hundredfold during the past century, and national income has been multiplied by almost the same amount over the same period.

DIFFERENT FUELS MAKE VARYING CONTRIBUTIONS TO ENERGY SUPPLY

The principal sources of fuel energy in the United States are coal, oil, and natural gas. The production, processing, and distribution of these fuels are carried on by thousands of business firms. These firms compete for business in the particular industry in which they are engaged—that is, in the coal industry, in oil, or in gas. But, in addition to such competition, there is competition between fuels in the over-all energy market.

Over the years the proportion of total energy supplied by the three fuels has varied, reflecting changing conditions of availability, competitive vigor, convenience, new uses and efficiencies developed through research, price differentials, and other factors.

A century ago, for example, the entire fuel supply of the United States consisted of coal and wood. Then, in 1859, the first oil well was drilled in Pennsylvania, and petroleum began adding to the Nation's fuel supply.

In the early period of the oil industry, petroleum was chiefly useful as a source of kerosene for lighting, displacing whale oil almost entirely for use in lamps. Kerosene lighting was, in turn, largely displaced by electric lighting, and the oil industry had to find new markets.

With the coming of the automobile, a major shift developed in the oil industry. Oilmen, who had earlier made as much kerosene as possible from their crude and had regarded gasoline as a bothersome byproduct, now tried to reduce yields of kerosene and to increase the yields of gasoline. Automotive fuel became the principal product of the oil industry, and methods were sought and found to obtain more gasoline from crude oil than is naturally in it. Thus, although a profound change had occurred in the pattern of the Nation's fuel needs, adaptability and research enabled the oil industry to keep on growing.

More recently, further evolution of the fuel market has seen petroleum become outstandingly useful as a source of fuel for heating, for driving locomotives and ships, and for generating industrial power. And such evolution has not stopped. Today, natural gas is becoming increasingly important as an addition to total fuel supplies. In the future, atomic power, and heat from the earth and from the sun, may well make their contributions. It is clear, then, that the business of supplying energy is not a static one, and, as there have been shifts in it in the past, there are shifts taking place now and there will undoubtedly be more in the future. By bringing greater conveniences to consumers and by increasing the total of energy available to the Nation, such shifts have spelled progress for America.

OIL PROVIDES A GREAT ADDITION TO THE NATION'S FUEL ENERGY

In the gasoline business companies within the oil industry compete with one another. There is little or no competition for gasoline from nonpetroleum fuels because there is no substitute for liquid fuel in most kinds of small- and medium-sized mobile equipment.

However, in the fields of space heating, marine and railroad transportation, generation of electricity, and factory power, suppliers of petroleum fuels compete not only among themselves but also with suppliers of other fuels. In these fields petroleum has been able to win and hold high consumer acceptance. Among factors that have built acceptance are oil's efficiency, cleanliness, and convenience, as represented by high heat content in relation to bulk, absence of ash, automatic feeding into combustion chambers, and ease of controlling the fuel flow in consuming equipment.

The great importance of petroleum to the Nation's supply of energy is indicated by the fact that use of oil in the United States has gone up 60 percent since 1940. This does not mean that oil has displaced an equivalent amount of other fuels over that period. On the contrary, the increase in the use of oil has represented an addition to the total amount of energy available to the Nation.

In 1940 the energy used in the United States amounted to 24,200,000,000,000 B. t. u.'s. It was obtained from 487,000,000 tons of coal, 1,300,000,000 barrels of oil, 2,600,000,000,000 cubic feet of natural gas, and 54,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of hydroelectric power.

In 1949 energy used in the United States had risen to 32,100,000,000,000 B. t. u.'s, obtained from 468,000,000 tons of coal, 2,100,000,000 barrels of oil, 5,500,000,000,000 cubic feet of natural gas, and 96,500,000,000 kilowatt-hours of hydroelectric power.

Thus it can be seen that, while coal made approximately the same contribution to the Nation's energy supplies in 1949 as in 1940, the total energy available to the Nation was materially higher in 1949 because of additions from other sources. On the basis of heating value, oil supplied almost half of the increment. The amounts of energy used in the United States from 1940 to 1949 are shown, by sources, in chart 1.

OIL IS A MAJOR AMERICAN INDUSTRY

The production of oil from domestic resources, its conversion into useful products, and the distribution of the products to millions of consumers constitute one of the largest and most important of all American industries. The great development of petroleum resources in this Nation has been a fundamental factor in the remarkable growth of our country and in its security. The strength and welfare of the Nation will continue to depend importantly on a successful and strong domestic oil industry.

The industry makes its contribution to the energy supply of the United States principally from oil deposits it has discovered and developed within this country. In addition to the oil it produces from domestic fields, however, the industry provides energy for the Nation through imports. Oil has been brought into our country in varying amounts for a long time; 35 years ago the United States was importing some 18,000,000 barrels a year.

The oil industry also exports, and has done so for many years. In fact, American oil exports began within 2 years after the drilling of the Drake well at Titusville in 1859.

Oil, for a number of reasons, is brought into the country at the same time that other oil is being shipped out. For example, imports are useful in providing types and quantities of oil that are not readily available from domestic sources when needed.

And oil is exported because many foreign nations that require substantial volumes of it have little or no petroleum production or refining facilities of their own and turn to the United States to buy special-purpose crudes or, more importantly, finished products.

AMERICANS HAVE LARGE OIL INVESTMENTS ABROAD

In the early years of the industry, American oil was usually sold to consumers in foreign countries through third parties. In the 1880's American oil companies began setting up facilities for carrying on direct marketing operations of their own. American refining activity abroad began about this same time but remained relatively unimportant until after World War I.

Foreign crude oil production by Americans began around the turn of the present century—first in Mexico and, a little later, in Rumania. By the time of our country's entrance into World War I there was American production also in Peru and, on a very small scale, in the Netherlands East Indies. Participation in foreign production increased markedly during and immediately after the First World War, and direct investments by American citizens in petroleum properties abroad had passed the $1,000,000,000 figure by 1930. Very large additions to such investments have been made recently, and the total stands today at more than $3,000,000,000. Americans have oil-producing properties in 20 countries in both hemispheres, and almost half the proved oil reserves outside the United States are owned by American companies.

Investments by Americans in petroleum properties abroad have been and are of great value both to the United States and to the world. In many countries operations of American oil companies have been a powerful factor in raising living standards. Employment, vocational training, general education, modern housing, and health facilities have been provided for the nationals, who have been able to earn the means for purchasing material comforts they never knew before. Opportunities have been created for

the establishment of many new businesses, and the whole economy has been quickened. Revenues flowing to the governments in the form of royalties and taxes have provided means for building roads, harbors, homes, hospitals, and schools.

OVERSEAS OIL OPERATIONS BENEFIT OUR NATION IN WAR AND PEACE

Oil deposits outside the United States, developed by Americans, have been highly important to the defense of the free world in two wars. In World War I the widespread use of oil-burning ships created a tremendous demand for heavy fuel oil. Mexican crudes were particularly suited to the production of this grade of fuel, and large quantities were imported into the United States. It may be noted here parenthetically that, when the fighting ended in 1918, world use of oil continued to rise, and Mexico became the leading oil-exporting nation. A large part of Mexican production was brought into the United States to offset deficiencies in domestic supplies, and in the 3 years 1920–22, for the first time in its history, the United States imported more oil than it exported.

In World War II our domestic supplies of oil for industry and for the Allied armed forces were supplemented to an important extent by oil from Venezuela, and, in the later stages of the conflict, oil from the Middle East was of great importance in fueling operations in the Pacific. Without Caribbean and Middle East oil sources to draw on, the military requirements of the United States and its allies for oil could not have been met in the amounts and at the times demanded.

American oil activities abroad have benefited our country no less in times of peace. Profits to American companies from overseas operations create tax revenue for the United States Treasury and produce dividend income for hundreds of thousands of American families. The purchase in this country of drilling machinery, casing, line pipe, and other equipment for the development of foreign properties brings millions of dollars of business to American firms and provides employment here. As previously undeveloped countries achieve higher productivity and better living standards, they become better markets for American goods, better customers of the American exporter, manufacturer, workman, and farmer. And the money that foreign countries earn from development of their oil resources furnishes them with means to pay for American goods without relying on loans or grants of funds from American taxpayers.

Foreign trade is often thought of solely in terms of selling American-produced goods abroad or of buying foreign-produced goods here. However, a major part of the foreign trade of American oil companies does not follow that pattern. Most often it consists of producing oil in one country abroad, perhaps refining it in another, and selling it in still a third. Thus, the oil involved in such commerce never touches our shores. It does, however, contribute to the economic well-being of foreign countries and of our own country.

THE ROLE OF OIL IMPORTS IN UNITED STATES FUEL SUPPLY

Although most of the oil produced by American companies abroad is also used abroad, some of it is imported into the United States to supplement our own supplies. And the effect of the importation of oil on the domestic oil industry has long been a subject of discussion and debate. It is a question which can properly be considered only against a background of the industry's nature.

The oil business is one in which volumes have followed a generally rising trend. Consumer use of its products has risen year after year with few exceptions. To keep pace, the production of crude oil has also increased.

As is inevitable in a natural resource industry, however, the growth of oil demand and the growth of crude oil supply do not follow exactly parallel courses. Discovery of new oil to replace that which is used occurs at an irregular rate. At times, the constant search for oil will lead to a major discovery, as in east Texas in 1930. Such an event may be followed by a number of years when, although exploration is continued energetically, no important new discovery is made. Then, sooner or later, the unremitting search is rewarded by some new major find, such as occurred in Scurry County, Tex., in 1948.

Meanwhile, fluctuations of consumption—influenced by weather, industrial activity, military needs, or other factors—may not coincide with the times of peak additions to reserves. As a result of these circumstances, there have been periods in the United States when rising demand for oil has pressed hard upon domestic supplies. When this does happen, as it did in the winter of 1947–48, the availability of oil from American properties abroad has been of the greatest importance to the Nation.

On the other hand, there have been periods when productive capacity has been expanded at a somewhat more rapid rate than demand has risen. It is at such times that apprehension is expressed about imports and that proposals are made for restricting the volumes of oil brought into the United States from overseas.

Such a situation exists at present. Today, some domestic oil producers feel that their business is being hurt by imports, and they strongly assert this position publicly. Similar assertions come from coal interests, which contend that oil imports are injuring the coal industry by taking part of the over-all fuel market it would otherwise supply.

These arguments have been carried to agencies of Government, with pleas that administrative action be taken to restrict oil imports, and to the Congress, where various legislative proposals have been introduced that would restrict such imports either by imposition of quotas or by raising tariff rates to a level that would amount to virtual embargo.

Because proposals of this kind bear directly on the vital subject of the Nation's energy supply, they merit the most serious study and most careful examination of the premises on which they rest.

DOMESTIC OIL PRODUCTION HAS FOLLOWED A LONG-TERM UPWARD TREND

Domestic production of oil decreased in 1949 from the level of the preceding year. However, this decrease followed a period in which the industry had set new highs of production for six consecutive years.

At a level of 5,042,000 barrels per day, domestic oil production in 1949 was higher than in any other year of the industry's entire 91-year history, except for 1947 and 1948. It was 918,000 barrels per day, or 22 percent, higher than the average for the 6-year war period, 1940–45. It was 1,836,000 barrels per day, or 57 percent, higher than the average for the 5-year prewar period, 1935–39.

Production of coal declined in 1948 from the all-time peak reached the year before, and slipped again in 1949 to the lowest level since 1939.

Meanwhile, imports of oil, taking crude and products together, have increased yearly since 1942.

The decreases in domestic oil and coal production have been attributed by some almost entirely to larger oil imports. The facts do not support this view. Other factors are obviously involved.

Oil imports have been rising for the past 7 years. But domestic oil production also rose during six of those years and reached an all-time record in 1948. The relation of the two movements is shown in chart 2. Over other periods, too, domestic production has grown at the same time that imports were increasing.

To cite specific figures, imports were higher by 413,000 barrels per day in 1949 than in 1940, yet domestic production was higher by 1,345,000 barrels per day in the later year than in the earlier one. Or, taking the postwar period, imports were 265,000 barrels per day higher in 1949 than in 1946, yet domestic production was up 291,000 barrels per day.

One indication of the vigor and prosperity of the producing end of the oil industry is the number of new wells drilled. Chart 3 shows the number of wells drilled by oilmen in the United States since 1940. It will be seen that, on the basis of this criterion, the domestic industry's vigor was not diminished in 1949. In the first quarter of 1950, 9,126 new wells were drilled as compared with 8,346 in the first quarter of 1949.

Further, proved reserves of crude oil and natural gas liquids in the United States are at the highest level they have ever reached, having been increased by over 1,500,000 barrels during 1949 alone. Numbers of drilling permits issued, exploration activity as measured by numbers of seismographic and geophysical crews in the field, and many other evidences all point to a high level of strength and health for the domestic oil industry.

DRAFTS ON INVENTORIES AND LOWER EXPORT DEMAND AFFECTED 1949 OUTPUT

There are several reasons for the decrease in domestic oil production in 1949 as compared with 1948. One is that, in 1948, oil in storage was being added to at a rate of 293,000 barrels per day, whereas, in 1949, stocks were being drawn down at a rate of 8,000 barrels per day.

During 1948 the oil industry was exerting itself to correct a condition of tight supply that had existed in the early part of that year and in 1947. It will be recalled that in the winter of 1947–48 the American public and the Government were seriously concerned about the Nation's oil supply. Almost daily, newspaper headlines proclaimed their anxiety. Some persons even thought the country was facing a permanent dearth of petroleum and would have to start immediately to make synthetic liquid fuel on a large scale.

Faced with this sudden demand upon it, the oil industry made a tremendous effort to find new oil fields, drill more wells, and expand the great complex of equipment required to refine oil and get it to people. The industry succeeded well in this task. Once again it showed that alarmist predictions about it were ill-founded. It expanded its productive capacity to heights never reached before and began to rebuild inventories of crude and products which had been heavily drawn down to meet the public's need.

With inventories replenished to overflowing, some cut-back below maximum productive capacity was inevitable in 1949. It would have occurred whether oil was imported or not.

The decrease in 1949 from 1948's all-time peak in domestic oil production is further accounted for by a decline in oil exports. Quantities of crude oil and products shipped out of the United States have gone down from 568,000 barrels per day in 1944, the peak export year, to 328,000 barrels per day in 1949. Loss in export demand from 1948 to 1949 amounted to 40,000 barrels per day.

This decline has been due to the fact that parts of the world which used to depend heavily on the United States for crude oil and oil products now have other sources of supply. In the reconstruction of European countries, and in the increasing industrialization of others, refinery installations have been newly erected or have been expanded,

so that these countries are now able themselves to fill more of their needs for finished oil products.

More importantly, the discovery and development of vast oil deposits in other parts of the world—notably the Middle East—have made it practical for many nations to look to those areas for petroleum supplies rather than to the United States. Chart 4 shows graphically how areas such as western Europe, which obtained large amounts of oil from the United States before the war, are now drawing much of their supplies from the Middle East.

HEAVY FUEL OIL ACCOUNTS FOR A LARGE PART OF IMPORT TOTAL

A substantial part of oil imports into this country is of heavy residual fuel. The relation of such imports to the domestic oil industry is entirely different from the relation of other types of oil imports to the domestic industry.

Imports of heavy residual oil provide a means for economically supplying a desired fuel to consumers in certain parts of the country. If these imports were reduced or cut off, output of domestic crude oil would not increase by an equivalent amount because of the economics of production of heavy fuel oil, the uses to which it is put, and the places where it is used.

Heavy fuel oil is the residue left over after lighter products such as gasoline and kerosene are distilled from crude petroleum. Since the lighter products normally have higher market value, the domestic refiner historically has sought to maximize their production and to minimize the residue of heavy fuel oil. He does not seek to make heavy fuel oil but obtains it as a byproduct of his operations.

Heavy fuel oil is used principally to power ships and to burn under boilers in factories and in central generating stations. In the eastern seaboard States, with their great ports and highly industrialized sections, there is far greater demand for this oil than can be supplied as byproduct from domestic refineries normally serving the area. It is to meet the eastern seaboard demand that residual imports are brought into this country. Geographical distribution of demand for residual fuel in 1949, and the part supplied by residual imports, is shown by chart 5.

It will be seen from the chart that the great bulk of all the residual fuel consumed in this country comes from domestic sources. This has been the case for many years. Even in the areas of heavy consumption along the eastern seaboard and Gulf coast, domestic refineries supplied an average of 80 percent of all the residual fuel used in the years 1946–49.

The balance of the demand for heavy fuel oil (some 15 to 20 percent of the total in recent years) has long been met by importing fuel oil or heavy-fuel-oil crudes. The total demand cannot be met from domestic sources today simply because heavy fuel oil cannot be made economically from domestic crude except on a byproduct basis. If more crude oil were run through domestic refineries to meet the total demand for heavy fuel oil on a byproduct basis, the production of lighter products would greatly exceed demand for them.

And enlarging output of domestic residual fuel oil other than as byproduct would mean the deliberate down-grading of crude oil into fuel oil, the value of which is usually well below that of crude oil because its market price gravitates to a point where it will compete with coal.

Since there is no economical way of meeting, from domestic sources, the full demand of American consumers for heavy fuel oil, the importation of heavy fuel oil has furnished the means for taking care of the marginal 15 to 20 percent of fuel oil demand.

The use of residual fuel oil has followed a rising trend over the past two decades, although it has declined slightly in the past 2 years. Meanwhile, yields of residual fuel at domestic refineries have tended to shrink because improvements in refining technique have made it possible to obtain larger proportions of more valuable products from the crude oil processed. These circumstances further underline the necessity of imports if the full demand for residual fuel is to be satisfied.

If such imports were cut off or severely reduced, the total demand for fuel oil could not be met except by the highly uneconomical means just explained. Under such circumstances there seems little doubt that the cost of fuel oil to consumers would increase sharply and that the total fuel-oil market demand would shrink materially.

DECLINE IN COAL OUTPUT DUE TO MANY CAUSES

Beginning with the outbreak of war in Europe in 1939, the bituminous coal industry reached successively higher levels of production in every year through 1944. (Bituminous coal accounts for over 90 percent of the coal produced in the United States and for virtually all the coal consumed by American industry.) There were declines in 1945 and 1946, although production was still well above the prewar level. Then in 1947 the industry reached an all-time high figure of 630,000,000 tons. The following year output was 599,000,000 tons (still well over prewar production), but in 1949 a severe decline took place—to 434,000,000 tons, a drop of 27 percent. This decrease coincided with drastically reduced activities in the mines due to strikes and to a 3-day week over a considerable period. In 1949 an estimated 28,000,000 fewer man-days were worked in the bituminous coal mines than in the year before. Coal output is shown in chart 6.

Some people believe that the decrease in use of coal has been caused by imports of oil. Statistics, however, do not show this to be the case. They show, on the contrary, that, while coal has lost some business to oil, a very small fraction has been due to oil imports.

For example, petroleum in the form of gasoline for automobiles and planes, fuel for jet planes, diesel fuel for buses and tractors, lubricating oil, and many other products does not compete with coal at all.

As Diesel fuel for locomotives and marine use and as home-heating oil, petroleum has partly displaced coal because of oil's greater efficiency and convenience for these uses. It should be noted, however, that virtually all the Diesel fuel and home-heating oil used in this country come not from imports but from domestic crude.

In the form of heavy residual fuel, petroleum also competes with coal, largely on a cost basis, as a source of factory power and for generation of electricity.

It is pertinent to examine figures for coal consumption both in the categories where it competes with middle distillate fuels (Diesel and home heating oils) and where it competes with heavy residual fuel.

In 1948, 101,000,000 tons of coal were burned in American locomotives as against 68,000,000 tons in 1949. This represented a decline of 33 percent, the largest percentage loss for the coal industry in any category. At the same time, use of residual fuel burned under boilers of steam locomotives also showed a decline—in the order of 30 percent.

The figures thus indicate that both coal and residual fuel oil are being replaced for locomotives by increasing dieselization of railroads. Dieselization is a development of technical progress being carried forward by the railroads of the Nation. The fact that only about 430 steam locomotives have been built since the war while more than 8,000 Diesel units have been built is due to the efficiency of Diesel propulsion as compared with steam propulsion and to the operating economies which Diesels permit.

In the home heating field, although oil and gas are taking care of most of the additions to the total number of houses in the Nation, coal use has remained fairly stable.

The greatest volume loss by the coal industry in 1949 as compared with 1948 was for industrial uses other than electric power utilities and railroads. The decline here was from 247,000,000 to 191,000,000 tons. For the same period, use of residual fuel in industry outside of electric power utilities and railroads increased from 200,000,000 barrels to a little more than 206,000,000. The increased quantity of heavy fuel oil so used was equivalent in heating value to 1,500,000 tons of coal, as against coal's loss of business in this category of 58,000,000 tons. The difference was undoubtedly due to lower manufacturing activity in the Nation (perhaps as much a result as a cause of reduced coal production), and to some replacement of coal by natural gas.

Use of natural gas, it may be pointed out, has been growing at a rapid rate. Reserves of this energy source have been greatly increased in recent years. Under circumstances favorable for its development and for its transmission to consumers, use of gas can be expected to grow. It will thus offer sharper competition for both coal and oil.

In the public-utility field use of coal for power generation declined from 96,000,000 tons in 1948 to 81,000,000 in 1949. At the same time use of residual fuel by utilities rose from 37,000,000 barrels to 60,000,000. The increase of 23,000,000 barrels of fuel oil was equivalent in heating value to somewhat less than half the outlet that coal lost in this field. The fact that public utilities turned to oil in 1949 to supply a larger part of their fuel requirements was due, beyond any doubt, to their inability to get coal because of strikes or to their anxiety that they would be jeopardizing service to their customers if they could not have an assured fuel supply.

Although coal lost about 18 percent of its outlet in the field of marine fuel in 1949, this was not large in volume. Coal has lost outlet for this use over a considerable period, concentrated chiefly in the years 1910–20. Because of the greater efficiency of oil for ships, it is highly improbable coal could regain this market even if imports of heavy fuel oil were entirely eliminated. It is almost inconceivable, for example, that our Navy would ever go back to using coal. The same is true of the merchant marine.

Coal lost 18,000,000 tons of export outlet in 1949, reflecting rehabilitation abroad and expanding output of foreign mines. The reduction in coal consumption in 1949 against 1948, by classes of use, is illustrated in chart 7.

In 1949, the year in which coal experienced its severe loss of business, the increase in imports of residual fuel over the year before was equivalent in heating value to about 5,000,000 tons of coal, or slightly over 1 percent of the production of coal for that year.

It seems likely that the problems which the coal industry is experiencing stem not from oil imports but from a changing pattern of the over-all energy market as served by coal, oil, and natural gas.

These problems can best be understood by looking at the facts squarely; they will not be solved by attributing effects to the wrong causes.

FOREIGN PRODUCTION OF STANDARD OIL CO. (NEW JERSEY) DEVELOPED TO MEET NEEDS

As a company which plays a substantial part in providing oil for the American economy, and as one which has oil-producing interests both in the United States and

abroad, Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey) gives constant study to the volume and type of oil imports and to their relation to the domestic industry.

Jersey Standard was established as an American company and has its roots in this country. Of its 215,000 stockholders, some 209,000 are American citizens.

The company has been an important element in the domestic oil industry for more than 50 years, and its career has covered a large span of the oil industry's history. It has shared in the development of the domestic industry—and has contributed to that development. Today its affiliates in the United States produce crude oil in 18 States and market in 27 States and the District of Columbia.

Jersey began in its earliest days to extend American business overseas by the export of refined products. The company's first fixed investments outside the United States were virtually all in marketing properties.

Jersey's first producing interest abroad was in Rumania. In 1914 the company obtained an interest in a Peruvian property and began to expand its output. In Mexico a Jersey refinery helped provide heavy fuel oil to power allied navies and United States war industry during the First World War, and in 1918 an interest was acquired in a Mexican producing property.

World War I made heavy demands on the oil resources of the United States, and fears of a shortage in this country were voiced in the immediate postwar period. The war had also shown dramatically the importance of oil to a nation's military strength. In the years following the war, the United States Government urged American oil companies, as a matter of national policy, to make intensive effort to develop oil sources abroad.

A Jersey affiliate obtained a concession in Colombia in 1920. A year later the company began exploration in Venezuela, and in 1928 and again in 1932 it added to its interests there and developed large-scale production. After long negotiations Jersey and four other American companies in 1928 obtained a minority interest in the Iraq Petroleum Co., which had little production at the time but held concessions on what was thought to be promising oil territory in the Middle East. (Later withdrawals left the American interest in Iraq Petroleum Co. shared by Jersey and one other company.) In 1948 Jersey made a $75,000,000 investment in Arabian American Oil Co., providing additional capital for the development of an area on which two other American oil companies had obtained a concession just before World War II.

The history of crude imports into the United States by Jersey affiliates has been, briefly, this: In 1921 the affiliates were importing an average of 98,000 barrels per day of crude oils. They imported an average of 49,000 barrels per day of crudes during the 20-year period before World War II. In 1947 the average was 87,000 barrels per day. Beginning in 1948, imports of crude were stepped up as rapidly as possible to meet a serious, though temporary, oil shortage that confronted most of the country.

Then, when it became apparent in December, 1948, that domestic crude oil was again coming into good supply, Jersey Standard's affiliates began to cut crude oil imports as rapidly as possible. They made successive reductions in crude imports from 160,000 barrels a day in January, 1949, to 75,000 barrels a day in February, 1950. Their crude imports for the first quarter of 1950 averaged about 75,000 barrels a day, compared to an average of 127,000 barrels a day for the first quarter of 1949. The average rate of crude imports for the first quarter of 1950 is less than that in any of the years 1947, 1948, or 1949.

The company's crude oil imports have been primarily of crudes to make heavy fuel oil or of types not readily or economically available in the United States and needed to make such products as special lubricating oils, waxes, and asphalts.

JERSEY'S IMPORTS CONSIST PRINCIPALLY OF HEAVY FUEL OIL

Jersey's foreign production was not originally acquired to supply oil primarily for use within the United States. The company's programing with respect to production of crude oil overseas has always been on the premise that such oil would find its chief outlet through the company's marketing facilities overseas. Jersey also regards its foreign oil production, however, as useful to our own Nation in supplementing domestic supplies of fuel. This is no recent or novel position for the company. Its import program has already attained substantial dimensions as early as World War I when its Mexican properties were among those called upon to help supply heavy fuel oil for naval and industrial use.

Ever since then the principal product imported by Jersey has continued to be heavy fuel oil. The company has many customers for this product in the industrialized east coast area of our country. And only on rare occasions has the company been able to obtain enough heavy fuel from domestic sources to supply those customers. In order to assure them a regular supply, therefore, it has supplemented the heavy fuel available to it domestically by importing from Caribbean sources.

A breakdown of Jersey's imports by types, and the proportion of the company's imports to total oil imports, is shown in chart 8.

A HEALTHY DOMESTIC OIL INDUSTRY IS VITAL TO JERSEY

Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey) has a very lively motive for not wanting oil imports to impair the domestic oil industry—Jersey is itself a part of the domestic industry. The company has large investments in this country. In 1948, its affiliates had a net crude oil production from domestic fields of 428,000 barrels per day and, in 1949, 337,000 barrels per day. Last year the affiliates' net purchases from others averaged 276,000 barrels of domestic crude oil daily. Jersey's domestic affiliates had refinery runs of 622,000 barrels per day in 1949, and their product sales amounted to 767,000 barrels daily.

It is obvious that with stakes of this size in the domestic oil industry Jersey's own welfare is inseparably linked with the welfare of that industry as a whole. Simply as a matter of common sense, the company would not conduct its affairs in such a way as to damage the long-term value of its investment and business.

VIEWS OF STANDARD OIL CO. (NEW JERSEY)

Views of Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey) on the subjects of American development of oil resources abroad, its own overseas oil production, and imports—views which have been arrived at after careful study and after consideration of the facts contained in the foregoing pages—may be summarized as follows:

1. Abundant supplies of fuel are essential to our country's industrial strength and to high living standards for its people.

2. Since the United States depends on domestic sources for the great proportion of its energy needs, it is of major importance to have strong and dynamic companies engaged in all domestic fuel industries. But no action should be taken which would unnecessarily burden American consumers simply to shield one segment of the fuel industry from competition or normal economic evolution.

3. Imported oil, which has long supplemented domestic sources, has an important part to play in the total supplies of energy available to the Nation. The economy of the United States, more than that of any other nation, has been built on abundant supplies of oil. With 21 percent of the world's estimated proved reserves located within its own borders, the United States currently produces 56 percent of the world output of oil and natural gas liquids, and accounts for some 60 percent of world use. The United States is in no danger of running out of oil; it has large reserves already discovered, and large additional reserves will almost certainly be discovered in the future. Supplementation of these domestic resources through imports, however, would appear to be clearly in the interest of the national economy and of conservation.

4. Any attempt to erect an oil-tight dike around the Nation and to bar the American consumer from access to oil from abroad would not serve the interests of consumers nor the country's economy as a whole. Conversely, the best interests of the United States would not be served by a "flood" of imported oil, even if such a flood were physically and financially possible, since such an occurrence would disrupt domestic energy industries to the long-run disadvantage of the Nation.

5. Jersey Standard subscribes to the statement on oil policy, including the sections on imports, adopted by the National Petroleum Council. (The National Petroleum Council is a group, widely representative of the industry, appointed by the Secretary of the Interior to advise the Department of the Interior on matters which the Department submits to it for consideration. On July 3, 1948, the Secretary asked the Council for advice concerning United States petroleum policy, and on January 13, 1949, the Council unanimously approved and transmitted to the Secretary a report titled, "A National Oil Policy for the United States.") Accordingly, we believe that imports of crude and products into the United States should always be considered in relation to their effect upon the long-range preservation of the national security, the welfare of the American consumer and the domestic industry, and the sound growth of international trade.

6. American oil operations in other countries make important contributions to the economies of those countries, helping them to build up their living standards and to earn the means to purchase American goods. The American economy is part of the world economy. The development of natural resources, as represented by American oil operations abroad, enhances world trade and, therefore, is in the interest of our own Nation. Oil operations constitute an important bond and point of contact between America and nations whose friendship is an asset to us. It follows that every effort should be made to avoid acts which would jeopardize the economies of such nations.

7. Sources of foreign oil would be of vital importance to the armed forces of the United States in the event of war. Avoidance of war is to be wholeheartedly hoped and worked for. Nevertheless, our country would be courting disaster to be unprepared for emergency. In the event of emergency our forces and those of our allies might well be deployed in parts of the world where they could be more readily supplied with fuel from sources outside the United States than from within it.

8. The domestic oil industry now has a margin of efficient capacity over current production which is somewhat less than the margin that existed when the United States entered World War II. Some margin of productive capacity is obviously desirable.

9. Legislation or Executive orders which imposed a rigid formula on the rate, or which increased the price at which oil enters this country, would limit flexibility in meeting variations in domestic demand, jeopardize relations with friendly nations, and lessen the incentive for Americans to enlarge foreign investments. Any such action would be

a backward step in American aspirations toward freer and larger world trade. Moreover, any such action would foreshadow still further Government controls and a stultifying of the initiative and independence that have made the American oil industry a leader in inventiveness and technical progress.

10. We expect domestic demand for petroleum products to rise so that there will be increased crude requirements. However, we do not expect crude-oil imports by our affiliates during 1950 to increase above the average which has been maintained since early this year. Over the long term we believe that the continuing growth of America and the rise of living standards will call for the use of increasing amounts of fuel energy. We believe that rising fuel requirements will call for an expanding production of domestic oil, and may call for expanding volumes of imports as well. We do not believe these two things are incompatible nor that domestic production and oil imports must follow opposite trends. On the contrary, we believe the two can follow largely parallel courses, as they generally have in the past.

11. The factors applying to crude-oil imports differ greatly from the factors governing residual fuel imports. In considering oil import statistics, most people lump figures on crude oil and fuel oil together. This practice can be misleading, and a distinction should be made between crude oil and products in reporting and considering the statistics and in trying to draw conclusions from them.

12. Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey) acquired its foreign sources of oil primarily for the supply of foreign markets. These sources are also an important contribution to the building of world trade and—particularly important today—a means of helping friendly nations to achieve better balances in their international commerce without expense to the American taxpayer. They are sources of special crude oils the company may not be able to obtain domestically when needed. They are protection to American consumers against shortages in the face of possible sudden short-term peaks in demand resulting from abnormal weather or other factors. They are supplementary sources of supply insuring the country against any possible long-term inadequacy of domestic supply. Finally, they are supplies and facilities available to our country in the event of emergency.

As a matter of policy, Jersey Standard is following these principles:

(a) With domestic crude in good supply, the company's imports of crude oil are being kept to a minimum consistent with the maintenance of its foreign sources of oil for the purposes listed immediately above.

(b) The company plans to import residual fuel oil to the extent that the domestic supply economically available to it is not sufficient to meet demands of its customers.

(c) The company will do its best to maintain its properties overseas for the purposes listed in the paragraph numbered 12 above and as sound investments for its 215,000 stockholders.

A Book Review on Beards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES J. HEFFERNAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 6, 1950

Mr. HEFFERNAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a book review on beards which appears in the current issue of the Explorers Journal, published by the Explorers Club, New York, and edited by Commander Wendell Phillips Dodge, well-known explorer and editor:

BEARDS, THEIR SOCIAL STANDING, RELIGIOUS INVOLVEMENT, DECORATIVE POSSIBILITIES, AND VALUE IN OFFENSE AND DEFENSE THROUGH THE AGES

EXPLORING JOWL JUNGLES

As most early explorers were adorned with beards of various descriptions which they carried to the then unexplored regions of the earth, to say nothing of present-day explorers who are members of the Explorers Club and might be called pogonotropists without limiting themselves to eating horseflesh, or hippophagists, eaters of horseflesh who wear beards, the author of Beards makes too much of this play on horsey words in such a book. He might have been closer to nature had he really entered the jowl jungles by going on a beard expedition to the East Indian archipelago and the peninsular mainland for the long-armed, closely approaching man Hylobates, of the family Simidiae, subfamily Hylobatinae. Of a blackish color, they are marked with white on the face and hands, and their beards resemble that of Horace Greeley, who advised "Go west, young man." To Reginald Reynolds I would say, "Book passage on a P. & O. ship for the Far East and keep on going to Sumatra, to Assam—and, for the best-known bewhiskered gibbons, to Tenasserim." I doubt, however, if these hylobates are either pogonotropists or hippophagists. But, then, it's been a long time since I've read the Origin of the Species and traced the beginning of men's beards to gibbons.

In any event, overlooking the aimless wanderings of Mr. Reginald Reynolds in and out of the book racks of the British Museum, here is a book written expressly for the more adventurous of our members.

Despite his meanderings through a mirrored maze of thesis sort of research, the author of Beards really has done a painstaking and rather thorough job about this most provocative subject down through the ages. Wearers of beards, and by all means others, will find out more than meets the eye, as one Will Shakespeare had a way of putting it. And so, when the chairman of the club's library committee, our onetime, for a time, be-whiskered "Dan" Streeter asked me if I would review this book, how could I do other than say yes? I suppose, between us, his picking on me had nothing whatever to do with my own baby gibbonish facial fringe. Nevertheless, "Dan" Streeter slyly sent along a list of club members he could think of off-hand who either wear beards, or have indulged in the luxury at one time or another. If he, or I, have missed any member of the Explorers Club who either now wears a beard, or has done so on expeditions, or what have you, we are sorry. So, just write in and tell us about it, won't you?

The chairman of the club's library committee sent me a kind of graph, headed "Full Beards," "Part Beards," "Goatee," and "Mustache." And woe unto you, "Dan" Streeter, for putting me under the heading, "Goatee." I protest, for I wear what is known as the "Imperial." I used to wear a sort of "Vandyke," only my whiskers were untrue to him—or to me, for except when I let 'em grow wild all over my face, and looked more Russian than the Russians, the best I was able to raise was an "Imperial." Of course, I do have a "goatee," as does every wearer of a beard. But, a goatee is no beard, nevertheless.

To stop digressing, and get back to "Dan" Streeter's beard graph of Explorers Club members, here's the way it shows up:

Full beards: Gen. A. W. Greeley, Peter Freuchen, A. R. Crawford, Dr. Otto Schmidt, our late wearer of the beard beautiful, Dr. William H. Jackson; Amos Bonsall, Ernest Ingersoll, James A. Ford.

Part beards: Burton Holmes, Rudolph Kersting, Prince Albert, of Monaco; Dr. Otto Nordenskjold, Frederick W. Stokes.

Goatee: ("Dan" Streeter headed the list with this reviewer's name, but its libelous) the late late Dr. Franklin P. Lynch, Ernest Ingersoll, Nelson, Ernest Thompson Seton, Daniel D. Streeter (for two short periods in the long, long ago), Sir Hubert Wilkins (again, Sir Hubert has worn a real and beautiful beard, which is far, far more than a mere goatee), Daniel Carter Beard (he also, wore a real beard that covered up his goatee, which any self-respecting beard should do); our late good old captain Edwin Willard Deming, Sir Wilfred T. Grenfell, Albert Operti, Henry B. Kane, Dr. Antonio Carlos Simoens da Silva.

Mustache: Rear Adm. Robert E. Peary, Dr. Fridtjof Nansen, Gen. David L. Brainard, Dr. William Beebe, Lawrence I. Grinnell, Henry Fairfield Osborn, Sir Harry Johnston, Frederick S. Dellenbaugh, Dr. Frank M. Chapman, Matthew A. Henson, Dr. Sven Hedin, Sir Douglas Mawson, Col. Theodore Roosevelt, ex-President of the United States, Frank D. Millett, the Chief of Clannfhearghuis of Strachur, Lowell Thomas, Henry F. Evans, Frederick A. Ober, E. O. Hovey, and others.

I would add, too, the name of Capt. Sergius M. Riis, who wore a rough-and-ready Volga boatman kind of beard during his action service in the Red Army of Trotsky during the Red revolution, while he was officially dead in the files of the Navy Department in Washington, D. C. Riis' beard at that time made our genial Peter Freuchen's a tame affair, indeed. Then there is Capt. Hassoldt (Bill) Davis, who wouldn't dream of beating about the jungle bush without a cheek-and-chin bush of his own, and always emerges from the deep jungle bearded like a king.

And now, to get on with the review of this book of Beards. The author, himself, reverts to beards with an observation of E. B. Shuldham, M. D., in his monograph on Clergyman's Sore Throat (London, 1878), remarking that "the beard is an accident of sex, nay it is an accident of individual capacity for hair growing, but nature has been generous enough to give all her children a nose." Proceeding to Lactantius as an authority on the virtues of the beard, he held that the beard added to the dignity of the mature body, adding that it contributed to the differentiation of the sexes. He found it also an ornament of virility and strength.

Asking "had Adam a Beard?" the author dug up "that the father of the human race had a beard from the first instant of his creation, and that all men before the Deluge also had them," citing Giuseppe Valeriano de Vanetti's Barbaliogia "and then some" in the somewhat longish title in 1759 as proof.

Reginald Reynolds spared himself no end of delving into the, shall we say, lore of the beard, and came forth with many interesting items, among them that of a certain learned scholar who said that long hair "is symbolic of the multitude of sins, hence clerics are directed to shave their beards; for cutting of the hair of the beard, which is said to be nourished by the superfluous humours of the stomach." (Guillaume Durantis, Rationale, 1459.)

"Shall we join the Ladies?" hardly heard any more with the passing of genteel living and of the old-fashioned but comfortable

dining room, where the men would remain to smoke after dinner, the while the ladies retired to powder their noses, when it was about time to proceed to the drawing room, leads one to the author's question, "Why women have no beards." Quoting a certain Mr. T. S. Gowing, who wrote a small book on "The Philosophy of Beards," Mr. Reynolds lets Mr. Gowing state his case:

"* * * Woman was made a helpmeet for man, and it was designed that man should, in return, protect her to the utmost of his power from those external circumstances which it is his duty to encounter."

Always willing to give both sides of the question, the author of the book, Beards, says that a learned French doctor, Jean Rioland the younger, "was dissatisfied with the explanation that beards are given to us for protection precisely for this reason, that women most need such protection and are not provided with it. To him I must ascribe yet another explanation, that nature intended the beard as a warning of puberty in order that sexual segregation may take place when lanugo begins to sprout."

Mr. Reynolds sets forth that the painter Liotard is said to have lost the love of his wife when he removed the beard in which he had wooed and won her. Proceeding to "examine the earliest chins of which we have any record," the author states that the first beards were false. He refers to the custom of the early Egyptians tieing false beards, sometimes made of metal, to their chins for ceremonial occasions. Even the Queens of Egypt came eventually to wear such beards, their's being of gold, like the beards of the Pharaohs.

"But when we turn to Assyria and Babylon," says the author of this highly informative and intensely interesting book called Beards, "there is lyrical matter in the ornamental variety to be observed, chiseled in sculpture by artists who, with light hand, traced the parallel waves of royal and military whiskers. Here, indeed, we may find the first bona fide beards; for if those of Egypt were false, those of China, were they never so ancient, could not have been compared with such magnificent growths."

How many of you readers of the Explorers Journal have ever seen an American Indian with a beard? Well, the author of the book we are considering tells of the shaving of half the beards—which, by the way, I used to live in almost mortal fear would happen to mine while asleep, shipmates and others often threatening to do the job. It seems, from the book, that Capt. John Smith told of the Red Indians of Virginia shaving half their beards. It is to be presumed they had their squaws do so, using two sharp-edged sea-shells for a razor. If any of you would like to see a woodcut illustration showing an American Indian with a half beard. delve into John Bulwer's Anthropometamorphosis (1653).

That little chore accomplished, turn to the frontispiece of Saxton's Atlas of England and Wales (1579). This should be of decided interest to all explorers, for it shows the allegorical figures of Geography and Astronomy with vast bushy beards. Another such beard was used by its wearer, Gaspard de Coligny, a Huguenot admiral as a parking-place for his toothpicks when not in use.

Our author certainly did a lot of arm-chair exploring of the human beard, having something to say, also, on the "Discovery of the New World and the Old Beard." But then, as one beard to another, also to a half beard—oh, well, to all who read this, I do solemnly recommend your picking up a copy of Reginald Reynolds' Beards. Then, if you don't like at least 5 percent of what you find in it, you are at liberty to "beard the lion in his den," this reviewer being a Leo and a beardist.

Establishing and Operating the Greenville (S. C.) Farmers' Wholesale Market

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1950

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I submit herewith a brochure on the establishment and operations of the Greenville (S. C.) Farmers' Wholesale Market.

This amazing establishment, with its outstanding results in so short a time, has been largely the work of the marketing commission assisted by its able secretary, a marketing specialist under the Clemson College extension service.

We are justly proud of achievements in this important field thus far and feel that the knowledge thus gained will be helpful to other communities. Secretary Martin is now in Washington at the request of Chairman COOLEY, of the House Committee on Agriculture, to testify on the problems of marketing.

ESTABLISHING AND OPERATING THE GREENVILLE (S. C.) FARMERS WHOLESALE MARKET

(By Robert H. Martin, secretary, Greenville County Marketing Commission, marketing specialist, Clemson Extension Service)

Three years ago public officials felt that a modern marketing facility was needed in Greenville. Over 100,000 persons lived within a radius of 2½ miles. Within a 50-mile radius 700,000 persons made their living in the cities and on the farm. The city area is surrounded by fertile farm land. The Marketing Facilities Branch of the United States Department of Agriculture reported in its survey here that annually the Greenville trade area (a 10-mile radius) was consuming about 27,500 tons or 2,200 equivalent carloads of fresh fruits and vegetables. Eggs consumed annually in the trade area is about 200 equivalent carloads and 150 carloads of dressed poultry. In 1944 farmers of the vicinity of Greenville harvested for sale about 8,600 acres of vegetables. We are within 30 miles of the largest peach growing county in the world.

These facts and the fact that our only marketing place was a wide street where truckers, farmers, and grocers gathered early in the morning and made many of us feel the need for a facility that would cut handling costs from the farm to consumer.

We tried to interest our three banks in financing such a facility. They were not interested in the project and did not want to take a chance on its success.

The members of the Greenville County legislative delegation became interested in establishing a public wholesale market here. They bought 27 acres of land, passed an act appropriating $100,000 and authorizing the borrowing of another $100,000 by the Greenville County Marketing Commission to set up the new market. The act made the loan of $100,000 a full faith and credit of the taxing power of Greenville County, the bankers were anxious to loan the $100,000 at 3-percent interest and all three participated.

It appears that we have a perfect example of the need for legislation such as is contained in the bill H. R. 8320. Without the insuring of our loan by the county, it would have been impossible to have expanded our market after only three months of operation. We see the need of other facilities, but all funds are spent. Our loan is for a 10-year period; however, it should be for a 40-year period as is provided in H. R. 8320.

Thinking that the committee might be interested in pictures of the modern marketing facilities and what the cost, I have prepared this information on the pages to follow.

Also, I felt that the committee would like to know of the income and expenses of operating a marketing facility. This is shown on a chart following the pictures. This shows the market's first year of operation and with the expansion program completed, the net profit should be greater in the years to follow.

Putsch That Failed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Minneapolis Morning Tribune of Wednesday, May 31, 1950. The real lesson from the Berlin episode of Sunday, May 28 is that the Communist putsch was not tried when its organizers knew in advance they faced firm resistance. Thus far this has been the unvarying pattern of Soviet behavior, which should give powerful guidance to our conduct in the future wherever Communist aggression is threatened:

PUTSCH THAT FAILED

The world can breathe a little easier now that the Whitsunday demonstration by east German Communists has come and gone. There was no violence, although Communist leaders had openly hinted the affair might develop into a spontaneous bid to drive the western powers out of Berlin.

That no putsch was attempted was probably due to the elaborate preparations made by the west to preserve order by force if necessary. These preparations were as well advertised as the demonstration itself and they had the full support of non-Communists in western Germany.

Clearly the Soviet master minds behind the demonstration were not ready to provoke an incident that might turn the cold war into a hot one.

Still, propaganda forays like this to test the psychological defenses of the West do not make the task of peacemakers any easier. They give the lie to the soothing words of Soviet leaders who, according to Trygve Lie, just back from a 90-minute conference with Stalin himself, say they want nothing but "peace, peace, and peace."

There was no bloodshed in Berlin Sunday. But there were plenty of insults directed against the West. The marching bands, the disciplined young people, who performed like radio-controlled robots, and the ominous appearance of the east German "people's police" force suggested nothing that might promote understanding between East and West.

As we have come to know the tactics and strategy of cold war, the demonstration must be put down as a hostile act against the

West. Allied occupation officials in Germany are certain that others may be expected as long as the divided occupation of Berlin continues.

The United Nations secretary-general has talked with President Truman and Secretary of State Acheson about trying to persuade Russia to end its boycott of the United Nations. Presumably he discussed Stalin's reaction to the Lie peace mission and relayed the Soviet dictator's "terms" for returning to the security council. Peace-loving peoples the world over pray that something concrete may emerge from these talks that would indicate peace is attainable. Unfortunately, there are more grounds for pessimism than for hope.

The schism between East and West remains wide and deep. As Dr. Charles Malik of Lebanon said in his classic discussion of "War and Peace" before the UN General Assembly last fall, we will have peace only when the non-Communist world feels at ease with Communists. But he added that this can never happen so long as the West "knows that the Communists wait only for the day of its damnation."

Mr. Truman would be naive indeed to commit this country to a Stalin-approved peace formula without first insisting that the Soviet Union show by acts and deeds that it is ready to abandon its bid to rule the world. The American people have every right to be suspicious of Soviet promises so long as they must be judged by what happened in Berlin Sunday.

The Responsibilities of Organized Industry in Our Expanding Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 7, 1950

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a panel presentation before the 1950 spring meeting of the American Trade Association Executives in Washington, D. C., by Robert E. Harper, moderator, managing director, National Business Publications, Inc.; Hon. Frank Buchanan, chairman, House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities; Hon. James M. Mead, commissioner, Federal Trade Commission; H. B. McCoy, director, Office of Domestic Commerce, United States Department of Commerce, and Alexander Kirk, assistant director, International Trade Promotion Division, Economic Cooperation Administration:

THE RESPONSIBILITIES OF ORGANIZED INDUSTRY IN OUR EXPANDING ECONOMY

Mr. HARPER. Mr. Vice President, ladies and gentlemen, distinguished guests and fellow members, I have already been privileged aplenty in being permitted to perform as your program chairman for this edition of our spring get-together.

Now, it is my added high honor to serve as the moderator of this panel of personalities who are tops as far as talent goes, and who are on top of four of the most significant responsibilities of our times.

We read the headlines today and every day, and we find ample cause to wonder just what are the responsibilities of organized industry in our expanding economy? Headlines that startle our most vivid imagination; that play havoc with our choicest conviction; that quicken our gravest concern for the future. Headlines such as these: "Scientists say first atom-fuel motor to be built next year"; "Political punishment of business charged"; "Rise in United States imports forecast during 1951-52"; "John Bull's dollar-getting experts lend their acumen to south Asia"; "United States said to be facing chronic unemployment due to Government's economic policies."

Headlines about happenings that are part and parcel of our expanding economy * * * happenings that create issues and cause conflicts regarding our responsibilities.

Your moderator, for whatever his opinion may be worth in these deliberations, is inclined to believe that nothing is going to be settled in the sense in which things were once supposed to be settled, for the simple reason that knowledge will probably continue to increase and will inevitably alter the world with which we have to make terms.

But, it is for the purpose of expert opinion that this foursome is brought together with you today * * * so, I am only wasting time, by not letting my panel get at the subject at hand—"The responsibilities of organized industry in our expanding economy."

We shall follow this procedure. I shall introduce each panel member separately and he shall speak on the subject briefly without interruption. Following the presentation by the fourth and last member of the panel, I shall throw the session into an open forum and, as you see, some of the members of this audience have provided me with enough questions to keep us lively the remainder of the day.

Now, then, first to address you is a native of McKeesport, Pa., and a graduate of the University of Pittsburgh, plus postgraduate work in economics at Columbia. The first and only Democratic mayor of his home town, he was elected No. 1 citizen in 1941 and served until 1946. Prior to 1941, he had been an educator and business consultant. First elected to represent the Thirty-third District of Pennsylvania to fill an unexpired term in May 1946 and reelected in November 1946 to the Eightieth Congress, and again in November 1948 to the Eighty-first Congress—he is a member of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, and the House District Committee. He is married and is the father of not two but twin daughters.

Ladies and gentlemen, I am proud to present to you the distinguished chairman of the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities—the Honorable FRANK BUCHANAN. Congressman, the floor is yours.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I appreciate the invitation to discuss the responsibilities or organized industry with the leadership of America's top trade associations. We all talk so much and think so much about our rights and privileges and immunities under a free form of government and under a free-enterprise system that it is refreshing and stimulating, and important, to discuss once in a while this concept on the other side of that coin, that is, the responsibilities which go with our free political life and our free-enterprise system.

As representatives of the great trade associations, you no doubt have many important problems before you, of a technical or specialized nature. You are to be congratulated then for going out of your way, and inviting Government officials and Members of Congress to come in and point warning fingers at you about your responsibilities to the economy and to the general public.

You leaders of America's trade associations have already exhibited a fine sense of responsibility which is to be commended, and whether you get much guidance or not from this panel, you can't be blamed for not having made the effort.

The first piece of meddling advice I'd like to give today is a little impertinent, perhaps, but I'd like to suggest that instead of restricting this discussion to the subject "Responsibilities of an Organized Industry in an Expanding Economy," we change "in" to "for," making it the "Responsibilities of Organized Industry for an Expanding Economy."

We have gone through the equivalent of a new industrial revolution in America in the past 10 years under the stress of war—hot and cold. During the good part of that period, industry had heavy responsibilities—terrific responsibilities—which were shouldered in the cause of total war. Many of those responsibilities were taken on voluntarily, others were imposed by Government.

In the years since the end of the shooting war, most of the Government-imposed responsibilities have been removed. Industry is getting back to making its own decisions again. We have been beset with fears of inflation. We have had some scares about recession and collapse. There were always plenty of optimists around to tell us everything was going to be all right, but most of us as individuals and as citizens had our doubts and fears about who was going to get hurt.

There is no doubt now that we came through those boom years of 1947-48-49 better off than most of us had ever dared hope. Economically 1949 was not as big a year as 1948, and in fact, to some the drop was significant enough to appear as a full-blown recession, and yet 1949 was about the best year we'd ever had in total economic well-being at any time in our history, other than 1948.

There was a good amount of business sense and statesmanship demonstrated in 1949, particularly in the early half when prices and profits started down. The fear reaction, the panic reaction, always incipient in a situation like that, did not develop. There were many balancing mechanisms in our economy today which were not present 20 years ago.

This stability in our economy has been the end result of recovery and reform measures adopted over the past 15 years. But essentially, I think a good part of the credit for bringing us through 1949 in good shape was business responsibility. There were not the wholesale wage slashes and cut-backs and inventory depletions which accompanied previous dips in the economy.

We have today a dynamic and expanding economy. Now, when I said earlier that I thought we should discuss the responsibilities of organized industry for an expanding economy and not merely in one, I had in mind the conviction that in the days and years ahead—if we can keep the world from falling apart at the seams, then industry has the greatest responsibility for achieving a continuing full employment economy.

Business leadership and business statesmanship are needed more today than ever before. Business must lead and lead toward the right goals in America and our world of today or forever after take the consequences.

Democracy is a flexible thing, and freedom-loving Americans in a democracy have learned to accept change. Extremism from any side does not appeal to our people. Free enterprise, a bit chastened and somewhat reformed, came through the great depression of 20 years ago still free, and we have come through the greatest war in history with not less freedoms than before but actually with more.

In past eras economic and financial mayhem has been committed in the name of free enterprise, but wise business leaders have seen these fallacies and want no more of it.

And so, antitrust laws that restrict the freedom of businesses; labor laws that restrain unbridled freedoms of both labor and management must come about. Brakes must be applied to labor management and government when balance end equilibrium are threatened.

We have come a long way in recent years toward these goals of industrial progress.

Government meddling helped to bring about some of these improvements. Many of the reforms imposed by Government were bitterly fought at the time as too severe, but I believe, and like to think, that the fair-minded businessmen who worried thrcugh these years of reform will acknowledge that the reforms were made necessary by the failures of large segments of American industry to shoulder responsibilities which were properly and rightfully theirs, responsibilities for treating workers as human beings, for exercising a social consciousness as a necessary part of the profit motive in a free nation of free people.

It is significant to me that no matter how deep our economic distress ever became in America, there was never—any time—and I even include the deepest darkest days of the depression of the thirties when any substantial, responsible area of the American electorate seriously challenged the place of the profit motive in our economic system. There have been times, frequent times, when many Americans were disturbed—and properly so—over the excesses of profit-taking but no political party which advocated the elimination or even the sharp curtailment of the profit motive ever received more than a paltry fraction of extremist votes. And I don't think the credit for that can properly go to those few die-hards of an obsolete reaction who screamed "communism" at every moderate reform in our economic structure; it should go, instead, to the inherent fair-mindedness and common sense of the American people.

If we can assume then, that most Americans sincerely and genuinely believe in the profit system and a free enterprise system—and I frankly believe that is a fair assumption—the responsibility of organized industry today in—or for—an expanding economy rests on a continuous demonstration of faith in America and in the good sense of her people. That faith has been demonstrated and upheld as valid many times in the past decade when our very existence as a nation of free men was at stake. It has been demonstrated frequently in the last few years, too, when there was not the emotional stimulus of war for our very lives to bolster our determination.

The war taught us amazing new techniques for vast productive miracles. After the war, industry went ahead confidently to exploit those techniques. Technological progress had zoomed during the war; after the war, business, under the spur of profit expectancies, used those techniques with confidence in the stability of America's absorptive capacity. Plants were expanded dramatically. Colossal investments in new plant and new enterprises were taken. The risks have proven, in most cases, to be good.

Television, an experimental plaything as far as most of us were concerned 10 years ago, crashed on the postwar scene with the impact of an industrial giant. Plastics, electronics, gadgets of all sorts rushed to new markets.

The result was a steadily expanding economy, a steadily expanding working force, an unbelievable 60,000,000 jobs and an accelerated national income which 10 years ago we would have thought fantastic.

We have been concerned in the past about attaining full employment. The goals we set then have been exceeded and will continue to expand in the future.

We are going to keep expanding our economy and our job opportunities for the good and simple and necessary reason that—if we are to continue to maintain dynamic capitalism—we've just got to add job opportunities. We haven't been creating them fast enough. Our labor force has been increasing faster than employment opportunities. And so we have this specter of increasing unemployment at a time when employment should be on the increase. This is critical.

It has been said that the way to make more employment is to make more employers. Employers are made, of course, by providing incentive, by providing investment funds, and by providing markets and profit possibilities.

Despite the anguish over taxes, incentive is very much present in the American economy, as expanding productive facilities attest to. Much of the investment money for this expansion is coming from profits. Funds for new businesses and new enterprises are not available from new investment sources. They must be provided from somewhere. The investment markets have not been made generally attractive to the small investor. Big financial institutions with available capital are often restricted by law in their freedom to invest.

Just what is the answer to this dilemma?

Either investment must come from private sources or increased demands on Government will be made by small-business men seeking capital to start new enterprises.

We have seen it in housing finance, and the RFC is openly besieged for loans for new businesses.

Government has the responsibility—and you of business are just as insistent as any other group that it shoulder that responsibility—for keeping us secure in our freedom, secure from invasion or attack, secure from depression and collapse. Government is not some impersonal thing, it is people. It is you and me. We all want the same things for our country and in war we pull together with unified determination. We group together in common defense against a visible enemy. We curtail our human greeds and our human selfishness.

Peace—even this halfway peace which is armed truce—doesn't evoke the same unity. We all want the same safety and security for America but, humanly, we want the biggest slice of the pie we can get. We don't figure a little extra cut of that pie is going to really hurt anybody, until we find everybody grabbing off a little bit more than he should—or trying to grab—and the first thing we know, the pie just doesn't go around. Somebody gets left out.

In a nation of full and equal citizens, we can't go letting too many get left out of jobs, opportunities, housing, education and other wants and necessities. We best look out for our own interests by looking out for each others'. In a free enterprise economy, in a free political society, our first responsibilities are to our fellow citizens and to our communities and to our nation. If we carry out these responsibilities, our Nation and our economy will continue to remain strong.

When there are jobs for all of our people, when the door of opportunity continues to remain open, then we need have no fears as to our Nation's future.

To keep our system operating successfully, we must continue to expand. There are a lot of young people coming out of our schools and colleges in the next few months and to many of them free enterprise is just an abstract phrase.

Can we make it a reality?

This is our basic responsibility.

It is fundamental; it presents a never-ending challenge.

Mr. HARPER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for a masterful job of getting us off on the right foot, down the right road, toward the right goal.

Our next speaker needs no introduction to any Washington audience nor, for that matter, to Americans everywhere. Born at Mount Morris, N. Y., he rose from water boy on a railroad to tender of switch lamps and maintenance of way man. Seeking knowledge in the law, he took employment on the Capitol Police Force, so he could study at night, soon followed by his election to his home-town County Board of Supervisors. In 1914, his fellow-workers saw fit to name him president of his local railroad union. From 1915 to 1918, he served as a member of the New York State Assembly. He did his job faithfully and his friends and constituents recognized his ability, sending him to the United States House of Representatives in 1919, where he served 10 terms. Then he stepped into the shoes of a United States Senator, where I first had the pleasure of knowing him as Chairman of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Post Roads. During the war, he was Chairman of the Senate Special Committee to investigate the national defense program, having succeeded to that post when his colleague, Harry S. Truman, resigned to become Vice-President.

Senator, I am happy to have the honor of presenting you to my fellow trade association executives as the Hon. James M. Mead, Commissioner, Federal Trade Commission.

Mr. MEAD. It is a pleasure to meet today with you men who are taking such an important part in the development of an economy which is producing living standards undreamed of in the previous history of the world. We have but recently come through a world war with its attendant waste of human values and property values. This country has not only withstood the shock of that waste and gone forward to new economic heights but has also shouldered the burdens of a substantial portion of the free peoples of the world. History presents no counterpart of this situation. Never before has a nation, proceeding without thought of conquest or domination, made such a voluntary contribution toward the preservation of right principles among its fellow nations. The decisions which have brought about this unprecedented atmosphere of cooperation among freedom-loving people were born of great courage, vision, and idealism. It has been possible to make them effective, however, only because our economy at home was sound. It was built upon a sound foundation, and it was possible, therefore, to expand it rapidly enough to meet both domestic and foreign needs. You men who are responsible for the efficient operation of trade associations have contributed your full share to the building of that economy.

Since coming with the Federal Trade Commission, I have been questioned concerning the attitude of that Commission toward trade associations and also as to whether I personally favored or opposed trade association activity. As a matter of fact very recently a sentence was selected from an opinion of mine dismissing a complaint and was construed in a manner to indicate that I entertained some personal opposition to trade associations. I think the opinion in that case shows very clearly that I have no such thought in mind. I was merely pointing out the absence of media of any kind through which agreements or understandings might have been reached or enforced in that particular case. It is undisputed that in the past some trade associations have served in that capacity. Certainly I had no intention then or now of condemning trade associations in general or of detracting in any way from the spendid work that the great majority of those associations are performing. Please be assured, therefore, that I hold firmly to the belief that no suggestion of wrongdoing arises from joint action taken in an effort to solve mutual problems or to improve the well-being of any group so long as those who participate do

not act in such a manner as to injure those who do not participate, including competitors, supplies, and customers. This kind of joint effort in my opinion is the proper field for trade associations. I have not been empowered to speak for my colleagues, but I believe that represents their thinking as well as my own. Conversely, however, when a group seeks to improve its lot at the expense of others, then those others need protection. That briefly is the theory underlying the laws that prohibit agreements in restraint of trade.

When any group through its trade associations or otherwise looks for easy solutions to its problems by methods that hurt others, such as fixing prices, excluding competitors from the market, restricting production, preventing innovations, etc., it is performing a disservice to its industry and to the economy as a whole. It not only directly damages the public interest but also diverts attention from the harder, more inventive, and more useful devices which would benefit the position of the participating group without hurting others.

It is obvious that there are many activities which may be handled through trade associations with regard to which the likelihood of resultant unlawful restraints upon competition would be either nonexistent, or most remote. Some that come to mind in this field would be legislative and informational services, research activities, studies dealing with employee relations, overseas markets, etc. Another broad field in this category is the developing of meaningful trade terminology with reference to commodities and characteristics of commodities for which there are no precise words or concerning which the interpretation of language differs substantially. The Federal Trade Commission and trade groups have collaborated in working out the definitions of such terms as "preshrunk," "gold-filled," "shock resistant," and the like. Such cooperation creates the possibility of making accurate representations in the place of hazy or inaccurate ones. This enables both industry and the Commission to assist in protecting honest businessmen and consumers alike from the effects of misrepresentation. The Commission's rayon rules present a good example of that kind of work.

As contrasted with joint activities of this type, there are the practices which almost inevitably involve unlawful trade restraints. These, of course, would include all forms of price fixing and price manipulation. Incidentally in that connection, I fear that at times there is a tendency to believe that unless the practice results in the actual fixing of a price, it may not be unlawful. I would like, therefore, to quote briefly from the Supreme Court's decision in the Socony-Vacuum Oil Co. case in 1940:

"Any combination which tampers with price structures is engaged in an unlawful activity. Even though the members of the price-fixing group were in no position to control the market, to the extent that they raised, lowered, or stabilized prices, they would be directly interfering with the free play of market forces. The act places all such schemes beyond the pale and protects that vital part of our economy against any degree of interference. Congress has not left with us the determination of whether or not particular price-fixing schemes are wise or unwise, healthy or destructive. It has not permitted the age-old cry of ruinous competition and competitive evils to be a defense to price-fixing conspiracies. It has no more allowed genuine or fancied competitive abuses as a legal justification for such schemes than it has the good intentions of the members of the combination. If such a shift is to be made, it must be done by the Congress. Certainly Congress has not left us with any such choice."

Between the two extreme types of practices, those where unlawful results are unlikely to be found and those which cannot be engaged in without producing unlawful results, there is a great variety of practices whose legality must be tested against the results which they produce. For the most part they are capable of being used without harming others. Experience has also shown that they are equally capable of being used in such a way as to harm others. For this reason the Commission can neither unqualifiedly condemn nor unqualifiedly approve trade-association activities involving such practices.

In the Temporary National Economic Committee Monograph No. 21, and, incidentally, I was a member of that Committee, the section on trade associations as a means of monopolizing the market has subheadings which deal with cost accounting, statistical activities, price-reporting systems, standardization, credit bureaus, and patent pools. Under these subheadings cases are referred to in which each of these classes of activities was used as a device to restrain trade. Yet any one of these activities may be innocently used by other associations under other circumstances. It is unfair to conclude from this that the law is capricious or uncertain or that it exposes association managers to undue risks.

Those who participate in a plan are the only ones who really know what its purpose is or in what way it is to be carried out. Likewise, they are in the most favorable position to know in considerable detail just what consequences it has had. If it is actually injuring others, there seldom is doubt in their minds as to this point. Moreover, those who develop a program of lawful, constructive activities are in the most favorable position to prevent it from becoming combined with illegal activities. The responsibility properly rests on them to avoid the illegal purpose and not upon the Government to forbid practices absolutely even though they are sometimes innocent, or to condemn practices absolutely even though they are sometimes the instrument of an unlawful scheme. The law-enforcement agencies constantly encounter cases in which there is documentary evidence of an intent to violate the law and to cloak the violation with innocent activities, or with a profession of ignorance about the proper interpretation of the law and about the consequences of the illegal acts. For this reason these agencies are understandably skeptical of associations that hav^ able legal counsel, and whose membership consists of enterprises most of which have able legal counsel, who profess to be apprehensive and uncertain about what they may legally do.

It seems to me that if trade associations are to serve the needs of industry and at the same time remain within the established legal boundaries, the first requirement is that their managers believe sincerely in the preservation of the competitive free-enterprise system. Recently there was called to my attention statements contained in speeches delivered several years ago by trade association managers, whom I am advised have achieved considerable prominence in that field. The following is quoted from one of those speeches:

"Under the system of unrestricted competition honestly carried out, prices are always either too high or too low. * * * As a matter of fact we have never been able to try out the system of unrestricted competition honestly because, notwithstanding the antitrust laws, men have been forced through motives of self-preservation to work together in various ways to control prices and to avoid the ultimate risks of a system under which they were supposed to operate. * * *

"If I were in a position to write the ticket for industry in this country, I should give each industry the right to name the prices at which its products should be sold and I should enforce these price determinations through due process of law."

I hope and believe that the philosophy expressed in this quotation is far less prevalent today than it may have been when the speech was made. For certainly there would be troubled waters ahead for any association whose course was charted by such a compass.

When I was invited to appear here this afternoon, I naturally sought out some current literature on the subject of trade associations with a view to informing myself as to the problems with which you might be most concerned. From this I gained the impression that the problems were of recent origin—or in any event had been greatly aggravated by recent activities of the enforcement agencies of the Government. It further appeared that those agencies were taking progressively stricter action against cooperative activities in industry. When I sought to test the character of current actions against those taken in similar situations a generation ago, however, the facts failed to support the contentions made in this regard in some current trade journals and magazines. So let us check the record. I found, for example, that the Federal Trade Commission in its very first proceeding involving the activities of a trade association, Docket 17, Bureau of Statistics of the Book Paper Manufacturers (1917), after finding that the association and its members had been engaged in a cooperative plan to enhance and maintain prices of book paper through the association, ordered the various members to "forever cease and desist from continuing their respective memberships in the said Bureau of Statistics of the Book Paper Manufacturers, or from reorganizing the said bureau, and shall not create or join or become members of any such bureau or similar organization having for its purpose the objects, or any of them, charged in the complaint."

They went further than that for in that same case the secretary of the association was ordered to "forever cease and desist from continuing said Bureau of Statistics of the Book Paper Manufacturers, or from reorganizing such bureau, or from creating, managing, conducting, working for or becoming connected in any capacity with any other bureau or similar organization having for its purpose the objects charged in the complaint as having been the objects of said Bureau of Statistics, or similar objects, and from being connected with or assisting in any concerted movement to enhance prices of book-print paper, or maintain such enhanced prices, or to bring about substantial uniformity of such prices, or from aiding and assisting in any capacity in effecting or maintaining such enhancement, or such uniformity of prices through the medium of telephone communications, or by correspondence, or by personal meetings, or through other communications or in any other manner whatsoever."

Nearly 30 years later the Commission had occasion to issue another order to cease and desist in the book-paper industry, this time against the various manufacturers and the Book Paper Manufacturers' Association, covering a somewhat similar cooperative price-fixing effort. In this latter case, however, the Commission merely required the members of the association to cease and desist from exchanging through the association or any other agency certain current and future price information.

Another case in point on this subject is *American Column & Lumber Co.* (257 U. S. 377, decided in 1921). In that case the Department of Justice had charged that a trade association and its members had violated section 1 of the Sherman Act through the exchange of price and statistical information. In upholding the charge the Court stated:

"Genuine competitors do not make daily, weekly, and monthly reports of the minutest details of their business to their rivals, as

the defendants did; * * * and they do not submit the details of their business to the analysis of an expert, jointly employed, and obtain from him a 'harmonized' estimate of the market as it is and as, in his specially and confidentially informed judgment, it promises to be" (p. 410).

The Federal Trade Commission, in its report on "Open-Price Trade Associations" (S. Doc. No. 226, Feb. 11, 1929), stated:

"The circulation of price and statistical information in a form to identify the results for individual members is so unnecessary to the general statistical work of associations and so susceptible of abuse that it might explicitly be declared illegal irrespective of intent. The impropriety of the practice of members of an association giving information as to 'minutest details of their business to their rivals' in what purported to be statistical reports was adverted to by the Supreme Court in the Hardwood case."

The Commission added, however, that:

"With the development of rules of trade practice, on the initiative of the associations and with the cooperation of this Commission, it is reasonable to suppose that the marketing of goods will become more and more an open and aboveboard affair and that much of the machinery needed to find out what competitors are doing may be dispensed with. What is needed in its stead is more comprehensive trade statistics."

In the disposition of its legal cases the Commission has not found it necessary to issue orders requiring trade associations to cease all exchange of price and statistical information. It has been careful to limit the provisions of its orders so as to prohibit only those systems and programs of exchanging and disseminating price and statistical information found as a matter of fact to have trade-restraining effects in the particular case before the Commission for its consideration. It is clear that the position of the Federal Trade Commission in condemning activities of trade associations falls far short of the oft-quoted position of Adam Smith. Furthermore, it is clear that in terminating unlawful activities the Commission has not found it necessary in recent cases to employ fully the drastic remedies suggested in the Supreme Court decision from which I have just quoted.

I can only conclude from a comparison of the Commission's current actions against trade associations with those taken a generation ago and with earlier court decisions that the Commission's current position shows no antagonism on its part against the lawful activities of trade associations. It has not relaxed its vigilance insofar as unlawful practices are concerned, but obviously it has sought to put out the fires without destroying the structure. It can never be tolerant of illegal activities because the Congress has created it for the purpose of eliminating all practices that fall within that category. I hold firmly to the belief that trade associations have by no means exhausted the possibilities of developing lawful activities of great benefit to their groups and to the whole economy. We shall be pleased to explore with you the problems in this field and to render every possible assistance consistent with the protection of the public interest that has been intrusted to us by the Congress.

Mr. HARPER. Thank you, Senator, for giving us one of your always exacting interpretations. You have sharpened our thinking and I know that you have stimulated a number of questions for our forum to follow.

The third member of our panel was born in Richland, Ind., attended Purdue University, and was graduated from George Washington University with an A. B. in economics. He entered the Department of Commerce in January 1920 and was assigned to the Bureau of the Census, transferring to the United States Treasury the following December. He returned to Commerce in July 1928 as a member of the Specialties Division of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, becoming Chief of the Division in 1938. In October 1942, with a reorganized Bureau, he was appointed Chief of the Industrial Economy Division. When the Office of International Trade was organized in 1945, he was named Chief of the Commodities Branch, remaining with the OIT until he was appointed Deputy Director of the Office of Domestic Commerce under the late Gen. Albert J. Browning. When General Browning resigned to become a vice president of the Ford Motor Co., our next speaker took over as Acting Director, being appointed Director in August 1946.

Fellow member and guests, I give you, at this point, an old friend of trade association executives, but one who always has a new and meaningful message for such representatives of business and industry as we. The Director of the Office of Domestic Commerce of the United States Department of Commerce, Mr. H. B. McCoy.

Mr. MCCOY. Americans have the reputation of being a Nation of joiners. In no other country do its citizens organize for group effort as much as in the United States. This is a natural consequence of a large population with a high standard of living and the many diverse activities of business, recreation, and social which are part of our modern life. Business alone spends many millions of dollars annually in activities which are carried on through business organizations.

For many years, the Department of Commerce has compiled various kinds of information on organized industry. In fact, keeping abreast of trade association developments in this country is probably the single oldest activity of the Department of Commerce during its almost 50 years of existence. According to our latest survey of nonprofit organized business groups, there are now more than 16,000 national and local organizations of businessmen. This huge body of organized business activity is probably several times the number of such groups that were in existence when I began my service with the Department of Commerce 30 years ago. In addition to the 16,000 trade groups, we have a record of more than 10,000 local luncheon clubs of business and professional men.

There are now 1,500 trade associations of national scope (manufacturers, retailers, wholesalers, service industries, and the like) and 2,500 regional or State groups, plus 8,000 purely local associations. In general, these organized business groups are dedicated to the welfare of their particular industry or trade and they carry on a large variety of functions and activities to achieve their objectives. Of the 12,000 purely trade associations, 2,000 are of manufacturers, 5,000 are of retailers (or of wholesalers) and another 5,000 are of business service firms (including those in construction, mining, and other miscellaneous activities).

The other major type of organized business is the chamber of commerce, of which there are about 4,000. Quite obviously, this type of organized business effort is devoted to the general welfare and the problems of a particular city or area. Chambers of commerce are generally regarded as purely promotional organizations, but they do carry on a great many activities that are not of direct promotional character.

The large number of organized business groups is probably not excessive by any reasonable standard in relation to our total business population. While the growth of organized industry groups has been rapid during the last quarter century, we have also had a large increase in our business population. According to statistics developed by the Department of Commerce, there was an average of 3,900,000 business firms in operation during 1949, which was slightly below the number in 1948, but was 600,000 more than those in operation 10 years before, in 1939. Parenthetically, this mass of 600,000 business establishments is in the main composed of small business firms. This large increase, mostly in the small-business area, does not bear out statements made during the past two or three postwar years that hundreds of thousands of small businesses have disappeared due to absorption by larger firms.

We do not, as yet, have complete statistics on the size distribution of businesses for the most recent years for comparison with data collected and tabulated by the Department of Commerce for the year 1939. During that year when the business population was 3,300,000, nearly half of all business enterprises had no paid employees; 37 percent had only 1 to 3 employees; 14 percent had from 14 to 19 employees; 3 percent had from 20 to 99 employees; and only 1 percent employed 100 or more. There is a considerable variance, however, in the size distribution among the major types of business. According to estimates of our Office of Business Economics, the following size distribution is indicated for manufacturing (approximately 200,000 enterprises): 15 percent had no employees; 32 percent had from 1 to 3 employees; 29 percent had from 4 to 19 employees; 17 percent had from 20 to 99; and about 7 percent had 100 or more.

It is thus evident that the preponderant number of smaller business enterprises are found in the distributive and service industries, but, even so, the manufacturing industries are largely small businesses.

We estimate that the 1,500 trade associations of Nation-wide importance have a gross membership of 1,000,000 business firms. An additional large membership is accounted for in the regional and local trade groups, including, of course, chambers of commerce. Actually, business organizations are active in about 4,000 cities and towns. However, in the discussion this afternoon we are largely concerned with organized industry groups which are national in scope and character. If our estimates are reasonably accurate, probably not over one-fourth of our business establishments belong to an organized industry group of this kind. Even if the roughly 40 percent of all business establishments, which are individual proprietorships, are eliminated as having no potential membership possibility, there is still apparently a very large number of small businesses which do not have affiliations with the principal organized business groups of national character. The questions might be asked, does this indicate that the typical organized industry group has no particular attraction for a large number of small businesses, or that the organized groups have made no effort to increase their membership among small-business firms? Personally, I do not know which is the correct answer, although I suspect that a highly qualified affirmative answer might be given to both questions.

The Department of Commerce has for many years been a supporter of organized business effort when the objectives of such organizations are to promote the general welfare of consumers and the owners and employees of the businesses. Where business organizations achieve such objectives that are being operated in the general public interest and are thus entitled to general public approval.

It is hardly necessary before this audience to discuss the various and well-established functions and activities of trade associations. Some time ago the Department made an analysis of the extensive range of services that trade associations gave to their employees. Just recently, we made available a report enumerating 75 of the more common and popular trade association activities which we hope will be useful to all organized business groups which are concerned

with appraising and improving their services to members.

Trade association activities, like everything else, are expensive undertakings. Although the number of trade associations and the scope of their operations are impressive, the great majority of these groups have small budgets and small staffs. As Jay Judkins points out in his "National Associations of the United States," of the 1,500 associations which endeavor to serve the major industries and trades of the Nation, only 210 have a staff of 15 or more; 330 have a staff of 6 to 14 employees; while 970, or about two-thirds of all of them, have an average of only three employees each. Thus, in discussing what trade associations might do to aid small business, it must be kept in mind the limitations of activities the members put on these groups through financial contributions to their operations.

An expanding economy, such as ours, requires large business investments, both in new and existing enterprises. We must provide each year employment for over a million new workers that are added to our labor force. As I have indicated previously, we now have about 600,000 more business firms than we had in 1939 which is a direct corollary to the expansion of our business activity during the past 10 years. Although we have no facts or figures on which to base a judgment, I believe that a very large share of these new enterprises are owned and operated by individuals having limited business experience. As everyone is well aware, new businesses are undertaken by people without any business experience; other businesses are established by those who have previously been employed in a certain line of business, have gained some experience in some phase of it and then strike out on their own. Due to the high level of business activity, particularly the 3 years immediately after the end of the war, small businesses prospered. As competitive conditions returned to a more normal situation, the capabilities of small-business management is being tested. It is this fact, it seems to me, that offers the greatest opportunity for organized industry to be of real service to the country in assisting small businesses which deserve help and thus help in maintaining our business expansion.

Most of the authoritative studies that have been made of the problems of small business generally emphasize two major factors that are of the greatest importance in the organization and operation of small enterprises. These are the availability of adequate financing and capable management. Organized industry cannot be of very much assistance in connection with the financing of small business. By and large, most small businesses must be initially financed by the resources of the owner and with the help from relatives and friends. It is in the field of management that organized industry can be of greatest help to small business. Under the designation of management, I refer to all types of operations in which business decisions must be made, such as purchasing, production, and marketing.

It is not feasible within the time limits this afternoon for me to discuss in detail the widely varied activities of trade associations which are now and may in the future aid small business. Some of the best examples are readily available as public information. One of the best sources is the ATAE awards program, which was inaugurated in 1929. We have recently prepared a summary of the entire series of contests. The summary is being forwarded to the ATAE Advisory Committee for suggestions and comments before it is put into final form. This summarization, entitled "Outstanding Services of Trade Associations, 1930–1949," is available on the exhibit table in this room. A review of the 124 submittals which have been made since the inauguration of the said program reveals numerous projects and programs of trade associations which have been beneficial to small business. Some of them were designed specifically for this purpose.

Of the many kinds of things that organized business can do to help small business, I should like to discuss two which I think are of outstanding importance. These relate first to technical research, largely in the manufacturing industries, and second to merchandising and sales promotion which are common problems to practically all small businesses. The most often mentioned disadvantage of small business is that of technical research. Large companies can afford to maintain research laboratories to improve their products, develop new products, and increase productive efficiency. Small business is at a particular disadvantage in this field. However, there has been definite development in the last few years for trade associations to finance technical research, the benefits of such research is available to all members, large, medium, and small. As a matter of fact, the results of such research are frequently made available to nonmembers. In order that small business may compete with one another and with big business, it must have access to technical information and guidance at costs which small business can afford. In some fields of production and processing technological progress is very rapid. An outstanding example is the chemical industry. New production and new processes developed in the laboratories find their way quickly into commercial production. Small business can be at a serious disadvantage unless it has access to these developments as promptly as possible. This is a very fruitful field in which organized groups can provide an outstanding service to small business and to the public generally.

Hundreds of thousands of business inquiries are received each year by the Department of Commerce both here in Washington and through our 42 field offices. For the last year, these inquiries have increased and have been characterized by an increasing proportion being devoted to marketing and sales promotion. It is in this field that the small business needs stimulating ideas, information on markets and market statistics, and advice and guidance on sound and productive sales promotion methods. This seems to me again to be an extremely useful function for organized industry to assist the smaller business community. Not so long ago, it was common practice among business not to reveal successful merchandising and sales promotion ideas and methods. About 20 years ago, I became quite familiar with the activities of a trade association in a rather important industry. The trade association meetings were largely social affairs. It had few members from small businesses and the reason was obvious; the activities of the trade association provided nothing of value to a small business and I suspect not a great deal of value to the other members. Today, that trade association has several very important activities which are useful to all members, including small business. The membership of small business in this association is now very substantial. It attracted the smaller members because it has provided statistical services, marketing information, advice on the selection and training of salesmen and other similar subjects which the smaller businesses could apply directly to their operations.

I believe that trade associations are generally aware of their public responsibilities. A number of trade association executives feel that their organizations are on trial and that they must not only continue to justify their existence to their members but also to carry on their work in such a way as to merit public recognition of their value to our society. That trade associations are giving increased attention to the responsibilities they have to aid smaller businesses is, I believe, sound judgment on their part. The emphasis on small business is not merely an attempt to single out one segment of our business life for special or preferential attention. Small business asks for no special preferences or favors; it does ask for fair treatment and an equalization of its fundamental disabilities as compared with big business. By serving small business, organized industry groups will serve all business.

Mr. HARPER. Thank you, Mr. McCoy, and you likewise have stirred our thoughts about such basic elements as small business and I know that there'll be questions in the hopper for you.

The final participant in this panel presentation was born in Chicago, holds a bachelor of arts degree from Harvard and spent a short time in the Army in the First World War. From 1921 to 1942, he was in the investment banking business in Chicago and, in 1942, he joined the war effort as a civilian at Wright Field in Dayton, Ohio, in the renegotiation of war contracts and subcontracts, continuing in that work, both in and out of uniform, until February 1949. During the last 2 years of his renegotiation endeavor, he was a member of the Army Price Adjustment Board which had charge of all renegotiation activities for the Army and the Air Force. In March 1949, he came to the Economic Cooperation Administration and was attached to the office of his old friend and fellow townsman, Wayne C. Taylor. With the formation of that agency's International Trade Promotion Division, our next speaker became its Assistant Director.

Ladies and gentlemen, here is a man with a message of merit about a responsibility that must be reckoned with, regardless of the pros and cons, and the man's name is Alexander Kirk.

Mr. KIRK. I understand the topic under discussion here today is the Responsibilities of Organized Industry in Our Expanding Economy. This is a very large field to attempt to cover. I would therefore like to take the liberty of expressing my views and those of ECA on one highly important aspect of this general topic, one which we feel is probably the most important economic problem confronting the free nations of the world today. This is the responsibility of organized industry in bringing about a balance of payments between the United States and the nations of western Europe at a high level of international trade for the over-all good of our domestic economy, for the sake of keeping our allies out of the hands of communism and for the prevention of a third world war. This will mean, of course, that if American industry chooses to assume this responsibility, it will not only accept without protest a greater flow of imports from western Europe, but it will do everything it can to encourage and help the distribution of imported merchandise in this country.

Now, even if we were all as dumb in ECA as our critics would like to have you believe, none of us is so dumb that we do not recognize that this is a highly controversial subject. There are very many sincere and intelligent people, in addition to those who have special axes to grind, who believe that all this talk about increasing imports and balancing payments is a lot of bureaucratic nonsense. They foresee that this policy, instead of being of benefit to our national economy, will result in the ruin of many of our domestic producers and the throwing out of work of millions of Americans. Now I grant that if the United States Government should suddenly remove all barriers to the importation of foreign goods and at the same time the nations of western Europe should achieve the miracle of persuading their manufacturers to concentrate all their efforts on exporting goods to this country, our domestic producers in some lines might be in for a very bad time. Even under these impossible cir-

cumstances, however, I believe that American industry, especially those engaged in mass production, would be able to compete very favorably with anything our friends across the Atlantic had to offer. But ECA is not advocating that our domestic market be flooded with a vast amount of goods produced by cheap foreign labor. All we want to do is to increase imports to the extent that is necessary to achieve an international balance of trade so that our allies can purchase from us with dollars what they have to have. As Mr. Hoffman has stated again and again, the increase in imports which is necessary to bring about this balance is negligible in comparison with our national production of over $240,000,000,000.

Some industries may be hurt in varying degrees if imports are increased only moderately. That is probably true. But if we don't increase imports and the nations of western Europe have no dollars to spend in this country when Marshall-plan aid is over in 1952, our export trade will decline to a mere trickle. Inasmuch as so many of our industries depend on a healthy export market for the difference between profit and loss, the disappearance of that export market in 1952 would, in our opinion, have a disastrous effect on our domestic economy. There would not even be an export market for such basic commodities as our wheat, cotton, and tobacco, which we have always, as you know, exported in vast quantities to Europe.

There is one general argument against our program advanced by some of our better-organized opponents which has always struck me as particularly fallacious. This is that our export trade is in the hands of a few large industries and that the average American business—particularly small business—has no stake in international trade. Therefore, the program to increase imports in order to maintain exports hurts the average American business and helps only the favored few. In the first place, I am not prepared to admit that our export business is entirely in the hands of a few large corporations. I do not think it is, although I have not seen the figures. But, for the sake of argument, let us assume that it is. We are all well aware of the tremendous system of subcontracting which exists in our industrial system. It was large before the war and it received a tremendous impetus during the war. Practically all of our large producing corporations subcontract to a greater or lesser degree components of their finished products. A sharp curtailment in our export trade would, therefore, not only affect the direct exporter but business generally, large and small, from Maine to California.

Whether we like it or not, this problem of the dollar gap exists. The question is, What are we going to do about it? It is not a new problem and has existed since the outbreak of the First World War in Europe in 1914, at which time the United States changed from a debtor to a creditor nation. Unfortunately, however, the viewpoint of many of our governmental, industry, and labor leaders has not changed from that of the period before 1914. I was brought up in a high-protectionist school myself. I can remember only too well when I was a boy in the early 1900's my father getting purple in the face with rage at the very suggestion that we should buy more imported articles.

Many of you may have seen the report of the ECA-Commerce mission, or, as it is commonly known, the Taylor report, which was published last October. This was the result of an intensive study, both here and abroad, undertaken at Mr. Hoffman's request by Wayne Taylor and a group of international trade experts from the Department of Commerce and private industry. This report points up the problem of the dollar gap and states that from 1914 to 1939 the United States exported $101,000,000,000 more than it imported. As none of our exporters sell their goods abroad for marbles, this tremendous so-called favorable balance of trade had to be financed in some way. It was found that the United States Government, either through direct grants or loans, had contributed $68,000,000,000 of this total amount. In other words, we have been unconsciously subsidizing our export trade over the past 35 years at the American taxpayer's expense to the tune of $68,000,000,000.

The report goes on to say that the problem can be solved and offers four alternative courses of action. The first is to continue advancing dollars to the governments of western Europe indefinitely. In our judgment this is no solution and is undesirable, to say the least.

The second is to let nature take its course and permit our exports to fall to the level of our imports after 1952. This would mean closing the dollar gap at a very low level of international trade. This is by far the easiest way to solve the problem, but the consequences would, in our judgment, be disastrous. The nations of western Europe would not have the dollars to buy what they have to have from us to maintain any sort of decent standard of living. Communism, which feeds on human misery, would sooner or later take them over and the Western Hemisphere would stand alone against the forces of world communism. If all of us as taxpayers complain today of our tax bills, I would hate to contemplate the taxes we would face under such circumstances for defense or for war. Furthermore, as I have already stated, our export trade would go to hell in a basket which in itself could well be the cause of a major depression in the United States. This is what our dear friends in Moscow so avidly desire.

The third alternative is to increase the investment of private American equity capital in western Europe and its overseas dependent territories. We consider this highly commendable. It is, however, a long-range program and could not possibly, by itself, close the gap between now and 1952. I have learned through long experience that American businessmen have the peculiar habit of acting like businessmen, and certainly under world conditions as they exist today, there are no great incentives to risking capital in far-away places. We are hopeful, of course, that this situation will change for the better.

The fourth alternative, and the one which ECA is recommending, is the increase of direct imports from the participating nations into the United States. The International Trade Promotion Division has been formed in ECA to do what it can to implement this recommendation. We realize only too well, however, that we and the Government as a whole can merely scratch the surface of this problem and only help point the way. The real job on this side of the water has to be done by American industry and American labor working together.

That is why we consider that organized American industry and labor have the major responsibility for the success or failure of this program. If you choose to accept it and meet this challenge of the cold war in the same gallant spirit you did in the shooting war, then, and only then, will the United States and its allies be safe from the inroads of communism.

We have a saying in ECA which I am sorry to say is not original with us. We picked it up somewhere. I think it sums up the situation rather neatly: "If you want to exhale, you have to inhale. Otherwise you die."

Thank you very much.

Mr. HARPER. Thank you, Mr. Kirk, and you have indeed made a major contribution to these proceedings. In fact, there is so much interest in your area of operation that it has prompted numerous questions for this occasion, and you might as well launch our question-and-answer period with this one.

(There followed a full hour question-and-answer period.)

Ladies and gentlemen, as much as I dislike to ring the bell, the time has come to bring this session to a close. May I, therefore, say to the members of my panel that your audience and I think that you have had dled a tremendous assignment with the greatest of ease; that we are much in your debt for the great store of knowledge that you have so graciously imparted for our benefit; that we think you're swell for taking time out on a precious Saturday afternoon to come to our meeting; that, if you hadn't come and participated so wholeheartedly, it wouldn't have been the success that it is. May I say to the audience that my panel and I think that you are quite a collection of intelligent people and that, if you hadn't been here, participating as you did, it wouldn't have been worth while for us to be here either.

May it truly be that we have learned to know each other better, and I am confident that we have at least improved our thinking considerably concerning "The Responsibilities of Organized Industry in Our Expanding Economy." Mr. Vice President, we reluctantly give the meeting back to you.

Depreciated Savings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD H. VELDE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1950

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Peoria Journal of June 4, 1950, entitled "Depreciated Savings":

DEPRECIATED SAVINGS

The Government of the United States currently is embarking on a campaign to sell United States savings bonds. Purchase of such bonds is just as patriotic and desirable as it was during the war years when everyone rushed to lend their dollars to Uncle Sam. Savings bonds still are one of the finest investments that an American can make and the forthcoming campaign deserves the whole-hearted support of all Americans.

A government selling bonds to its citizens, however, if it is to continue to deserve their support has a high obligation to insure the investors that they will be getting their money back and a fair return to boot.

A dramatic warning concerning the fate of invested dollars has been voiced to its customers by the biggest financial institution in the Pacific Northwest, the Washington Mutual Savings Bank of Seattle.

In big advertisements, the bank reminds its customers that the savings they put away represent things that they are doing without today so that they can have the things they need and want tomorrow. It asserts:

"You have a right to expect that your saved dollars will be worth a dollar when you spend them. They won't be worth a dollar when you spend them if our Government keeps on spending more than it takes in. If you spent more than you earned, consistently, you'd have to face the consequence. Government can't do otherwise.

"Continued overspending causes inflation. Where dollars no longer are based on real values they no longer buy a dollar's worth when you spend them. That makes every dollar you earn and save worth less."

The bank has some further advice:

"But you can do something to keep your dollars worth a dollar, to make your saved dollars as valuable tomorrow as they are today Every savings bond purchaser, every savings account holder, everyone who owns insurance or draws a pension has a special reason for speaking out against Government overspending. If enough of us let our Congressmen know we want it stopped they can put on the brakes. Tell them. Speak up in meetings. Write letters about it. If all of us work to stop this overspending, if all of us demand it, it can and will be stopped."

Every citizen of the United States who has savings of any kind is affected by the depreciation of those savings brought about by inflation. If the dollars you save today are worth only 59 cents tomorrow when you are forced to use them you may wind up in serious trouble. It is most important to every person who has savings that the Government put an end to its inflationary economic policies.

Report of the American Legion Foreign Relations Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am including as part of my remarks a report by the American Legion Foreign Relations Commission at the request of Mr. Miles D. Kennedy, legislative director. Several of the recommendations made by the commission are not consistent with my own thinking and hence this extension constitutes no personal endorsement of resolutions:

REPORT OF THE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMISSION TO THE NATIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, INDIANAPOLIS, IND., MAY 3, 4, AND 5, 1950

Eleven members of your National Commission on Foreign Relations met in Washington, D. C., on May 1 and 2, 1950, and on May 3 and 4 the executive section of four members of this same commission met in Indianapolis.

It was the unanimous opinion of all members that a complete statement as to the foreign policy of the American Legion should be presented to the national executive committee at this time. This decision was prompted by the urgency of the international situation and the need for greater dissemination of information concerning our foreign policy to the membership of the Legion and to the American public.

We have such a policy for your consideration today. We urge you to hear it out, for in the terrible conflicts now raging in the world today, our salvation lies in the strength and soundness of the muscles and minds of the American people. To act wisely we must know the issues. To keep continuity in our thinking and actions we must have a fair and understandable policy—a policy that applies alike to all nations and peoples. Continuity, constancy, and vigor are essential, and their foundation is knowledge.

The foreign policy of the American Legion is primarily dedicated to the preservation of freedom, freedom of the individual, and of human liberties.

The menace in the world today is the spread of Soviet communism, whose aims are the destruction of human liberties and eventual world conquest. Therefore, the foreign policy of the American Legion is to fight communism everywhere.

Instead of condemning the mistakes and inadequacies of the past let us now unite our efforts and actions toward the one goal of destroying the threat of world dominion by our real enemy—Soviet Russia.

No longer should we contain communism in one part of the world, then ignore its continued and successful advance in another part. No longer will we tolerate trade or diplomatic expediences which save us pennies today, but which will cost us dollars tomorrow. Our foreign policy must be consistently dedicated to the principle that the greatest contribution that can be made by the United Sates to a peaceful world is the preservation of freedom for those who will be free—and through our moral, military, and economic strength, the destruction and complete elimination of false and untruthful philosophies and ideologies which are loose in the world today.

We retain our faith in the United Nations. We believe that it can be made an effective world authority which can prevent aggression if the Charter is amended immediately as suggested by the American Legion in November of 1946 to accomplish the following:

1. Removal of the veto power in the two specific instances of matters pertaining to aggression and preparation for aggression.

2. The adoption of the United States proposals for the international control of atomic energy and the establishment of arms quotas, both to be guaranteed through a system of positive international inspection.

3. Establishment of an effective tyranny-proof international police force. This force would consist of two parts, an independent active force to be under the direct control of the Security Council and a reserve force made up of the national contingents of the major powers capable of backing up the active forces when necessary. The result would be that the United Nations, through an effective police force, could enforce its decisions, prevent aggression and the preparation of aggression, and so maintain the peace.

We believe that the American Legion plan for strengthening the United Nations provides the essential basic requirements of, and the first steps toward, true world-wide enforcement of law and order, which is the immediate necessity.

The American Legion is opposed to any form of World Federation or World Government at this time.

In 1948 the American Legion recommended a mutual self-defense pact composed of the nations of the North Atlantic area. Our suggestion was made fully a year before the North Atlantic Pact was approved by Congress.

As a result of the North Atlantic Pact the nations of western Europe, Canada, and the United States are militarily stronger than at any time since World War II. Arms and essential materials are now flowing and must continue to flow to our allies in this area so that the North Atlantic Pact countries will have the necessary equipment and trained troops to make a formidable stand against any aggressor.

We now urge the countries of the North Atlantic Pact to join forces within the United Nations to insist on the amendment of the United Nations Charter to accomplish the objectives of the American Legion Plan as stated above. In this way the democratic nations of the west would thereby declare to the world their intention of making the United Nations an effective authority for peace.

We further urge these same democracies which sponsored the North Atlantic Pact to send delegates to a convention to be held soon in the United States to explore the possibilities of the establishment, within the framework of the United Nations, of an association for closer political cooperation among freedom-loving democracies.

To preserve faith of others in our system of freedoms we must continue to help those war-torn nations and people of the world, who will first help themselves, to rebuild their countries and to regain their basic liberties. We therefore urge continuation of the European recovery program as provided for in the present Economic Cooperation Act. We believe that this program has been administered to the benefit of the American people and that it has accomplished its purpose of rehabilitating the economies of western Europe and has contained Communist expansion in this area. We urge all possible economies in the administration of ECA, so that our own economy will not be jeopardized. We heartily endorse a proposal that a study by a commission be made sufficiently prior to June 1952 so that appropriate recommendations can be made to the Congress and the American people as to what steps, if any, might be necessary after that time to continue economic help to the countries of Europe who have joined forces with us in our fight for freedom.

World trade is important to the peace of the world and to the economic well-being of the United States and our allies. We approve the statement of principles outlined in the Habana Charter for the establishment of the International Trade Organization as an agency of the United Nations and believe it would be to the advantage of the United States to ratify the establishment of this organization.

We should encourage economic, educational, and spiritual development in western Germany. This area will again be a critical spot in Europe's development. But Americans must be realistic in their aid and ever watchful in their assistance in eliminating military power in Germany. We must not abandon these people to the Russians, but equally we must avoid the historic danger of strengthening them to a point where they will again menace their neighbors whom they overran in two World Wars.

We should support in every way possible the religious minorities in the satellite countries in Europe that are trying to hold the last citadel of freedom in their countries—the right to worship God as they please. These people have seen the state subjugate the church, and then try to abolish the church. We must support them in their fight to regain freedom of worship.

Some central European problems cannot be solved until the final settlement of the Austrian peace treaty. Many important issues are at stake. Confidence in western Europe and American will be greatly aided by our insistence that the treaty be concluded as soon as possible.

Americans can view with pride the accomplishments of our helpfulness and aid in the eastern Mediterranean area. Greece would not have a democratic form of Government today if it had not been for the bipartisan support of the Truman Doctrine of 1947—which stated that Communist aggression should advance no further in Europe without the United States, through the United Nations, taking notice of, and doing something about, such aggression. America fought Communist aggression in this area, for we wanted the people of the Near East to have a chance to mold a destiny of their choice—and not one dictated to them by Moscow.

We must continue to effectively and affirmatively enlighten the people of Europe and Asia to the truth of the American way of life in the advantages, both material and spiritual, to be gained by free people operating under democratic processes—where the individual is served by the State without being dependent upon it. Containment of Soviet aggression is not enough. We must go forward to the destruction of the aggressive

power of the Soviet police state. Massive propaganda projects must be launched to take the truth to all corners of the world so that all peoples will have an understanding of the basic issues in this great struggle for freedom's survival.

We believe that good results in this direction have been obtained by the Office of International Information and the United States Information Service. We urge that these two agencies and others operating under the guidance of our State Department continue to take the truth to the far corners of the world. We urge Congress to allot sufficient funds to carry out this important phase of winning the cold war.

The American Legion urges opposition to the expansion of communism in Asia. We propose that our Government extend every reasonable assistance to foster all influences favorable to democracy. We oppose recognition of Communist China.

At the 1949 Philadelphia convention we urged that our support should be made available to any patriotic groups or organizations of Chinese whose principles and stability are worthy of our confidence and who will vigorously fight communism and outside aggressors to preserve the basic rights and liberties of a free China.

We again say we reject defeatism and abandonment of this area to Communist aggressors. The immediate threat is at Formosa and in the Philippines. We abhor the idea of abandoning the free and independent government of Formosa. If we are opposed to Communist aggression, and if we are the world's last and greatest protector of human liberties, then certainly we cannot abandon Formosa at such a crucial moment. If we do so, then we are merely borrowing a temporary period of peace until we are forced to face the same issue in another place, which will be just a bit closer to the heart of our national defense structure.

We believe it is imperative that our Department of Defense appraise the defendability of Formosa at once, with the thought that Formosa be preserved, with our help, as a bastion of freedom and a base for military operations against the Communist aggressors on the mainland of Asia.

We should also aid the Philippine Government, in every possible way, to resist the infiltration of Communist aggressors and to maintain a free, democratic government.

Because the North Atlantic Pact has been of such immense value and protection to the countries involved and because a similar regional alliance might be a deterrent to Communist expansion in the Pacific and far-eastern areas, we again urge our Government to lend its aid in forming a regional alliance under article 51 of the United Nations Charter, composed of those countries of the Pacific and far eastern areas, who, through self-help and mutual aid, desire to guarantee their mutual defense and to preserve individual liberties.

The President's point 4 program recommends that Congress provide funds to finance technical, scientific, and managerial knowledge to underdeveloped areas of the world, and also, limited financial assistance for the creation of productive enterprises. The President has requested $45,000,000 to finance the program for the first year.

This plan suggests assistance in many fields and emphasizes technical projects in health, industry, labor, agriculture, and scientific research with respect to natural resources in underdeveloped countries showing particular need. The wise and careful administration of such a program bears great possibilities for the development of international understanding and cooperation, and would contribute considerably to the enlargement of world trade.

The American Legion approves, in principle, the President's point 4 program. We urge the full cooperation of our Government with private enterprise in the development of such a program.

The foregoing should constitute the foreign policy of the United States as visualized by our Commission at this time. The best evaluation of any foreign policy is whether or not it can keep the peace. We know that we cannot have peace by just wishing for it or by negotiating a temporary breathing spell with the Politburo.

We will have peace only after we have accepted and absorbed the fact that we in America must offer the leadership necessary to win this great global conflict of ideas. We must fight the insidious menace of communism and totalitarian aggression with all our might and resources. We must gather to us, as allies, all people who will be free—all who are willing to join with us in this final battle for liberty, justice, and democracy.

And when successful—as we will certainly be—our peace will be built upon the rock of self-reliance of all free people, good will, and international law, internationally enforced. Only then can we openly admit to ourselves and to each other that we have found true peace and real security.

All this is possible if we, as individuals, accept the responsibility to do our share to protect our own liberties. With our trust in God we shall find divine guidance along the rough road that lies ahead. This call for God's help is not to lull the peace-seeking into weakness and compromise. Only in strength of character and arms and purpose, based on Christian principles of justice and righteousness, will America be able to offer proper leadership to peace-hungry citizens of the world who starve for God's most cherished gift—human dignity.

FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMISSION,
WILLIAM VERITY, *Ohio, Chairman.*
CHARLES GONSER,
Washington, Vice Chairman.
LEON HAPPELL,
California, Vice Chairman.
ROGERS KELLEY,
Texas, Vice Chairman.

The New England Shoe and Leather Industry Hurt by Tariff Reductions

REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 7, 1950

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the situation regarding imports, while it affects us particularly in New England, also affects other sections of the country and makes me urge passage of the resolution which I introduced (H. Res. 564) which would provide that a committee of five Members of the House of Representatives be sent to Torquay, England, to sit in and advise those who are deciding what the tariff shall be under the reciprocal trade agreements.

I think it is extremely important that we send our Members over there; other countries have sent observers and advisers. The United States today, in my opinion, has the most to lose by the lowering of the tariffs. Some of our industries in New England will have to go out of business, Mr. Speaker, if aid is not given.

As part of my remarks, I include a letter I received from the New England Shoe and Leather Association, dated June 2 of this year, and a letter dated June 6, 1950, which I received from the Acting Commissioner of Customs, concerning dumping of shoes from Czechoslovakia:

NEW ENGLAND SHOE AND
LEATHER ASSOCIATION,
Boston, Mass., June 2, 1950.

Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN ROGERS: In behalf of our association and members in the shoe, leather and allied trades, we commend you for your forthright action, with other New England Representatives, in writing Secretary of State Dean Acheson requesting that present uncertainties of manufacturers as to future tariff reductions which might be approved by the Committee for Reciprocity Information be alleviated.

We also wish to bring to your personal attention the position of our association with respect to proposed reductions in shoe and leather tariff duties. In the case of shoes, although many items are included for reductions in rates, none of these types are in serious competition with domestic production and retail sales, and our association, therefore, does not plan to enter any opposition. The types of shoes currently being imported, namely women's cemented and men's welt shoes, are not included in the lists for tariff reductions.

However, in the case of leather items, our association strongly endorses the position of the Tanners' Council of America against any further reductions in United States tariff rates. Our association takes the position that the shoe as well as the leather branch of our industry has been injured by discriminatory and unfair trade practices abroad. Cuts in the low United States leather tariffs will not help foreign trade and will only encourage the restrictive foreign controls and obstacles that have prevented New England tanners from getting foreign raw material.

Our association has today advised the Committee for Reciprocity Information of its opposition to any further reductions in United States tariff duties on leathers. Your support of this industry position, in behalf of your constituents, will be greatly appreciated by our officers and members.

Very sincerely yours,
MAXWELL FIELD,
Executive Vice President.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
BUREAU OF CUSTOMS,
Washington, June 6, 1950

Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MRS. ROGERS: Reference is made to your letter dated March 29, 1950, transmitting a letter from the New England Shoe and Leather Association, requesting that an investigation be conducted of the possible dumping, under the Antidumping Act, 1921, of shoes from Czechoslovakia.

The Bureau has ordered various investigations with respect to Czechoslovakian-made women's shoes to determine whether the provisions of the Antidumping Act, 1921, should be invoked.

In view of the facts developed, the settlement of customs duties on women's shoes from Czechoslovakia is being suspended, and such shoes are being released to importers only if they post special bonds to protect the revenue pending a determination of whether

any special dumping duties are assessable on such shoes under the law.

As numerous letters have been received by the Bureau directly from the New England Shoe and Leather Association, that organization has been furnished the above information directly by the Bureau.

Very truly yours,

D. B. STRUBINGER,
Acting Commissioner of Customs.

Ohio Canned Foods

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN McSWEENEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 7, 1950

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, each of us has a distinct pride in his own State. At this time I would like to call the attention of the House to the fact that Ohio, among its diversified industries, has a great canning industry, which is doing everything to provide better and finer foods for our people. Thursday some of my fellow citizens of Ohio are here to help in the dedication of a building which is devoted almost entirely to the study of means for the improvement of foods and the betterment of canning processes for our people. In these times of high food production improved canning methods are very essential in order to cut down waste and at the same time retain not only the nutritious value of the food but also its full natural flavor. To prove that we do have very fine foods the Ohio canners have donated two delicious products, tomatoes and sauerkraut, which will be served tomorrow. We are asking you to participate at your luncheon with us in having some Ohio prepared canned foods. So I, as a Representative from Ohio, urge you please not to forget that on the menu tomorrow there will be something from Ohio for you at your luncheon. It is a gift from the canners of Ohio.

OHIO CANNED FOODS

OHIO CANNED FOOD ON CAPITOL MENU DAY, JUNE 8, 1950

A brief history of the canning industry in Ohio follows:

More than 100 canning plants are operated in Ohio, and upward of 50 different canned vegetable, fruit, and specialty products, from applesauce to turtle soup, are produced by these canneries with an annual pack close to 5,000,000 cases valued at over $15,000,000.

Canning plants have sometimes been described as large community kitchens where growers of perishable crops find a ready cash market for their crops, and local housewives and other workers find seasonal employment. Ohio farmers produce for processing almost a half million tons of vegetables and fruits from over 75,000 acres, and for which the canners pay about $8,000,000 annually. And some 15,000 in-plant workers and 10,000 field workers are paid wages of from $5,000,000 to $6,000,000 each year by the canners of Ohio.

Not only does Ohio produce a large quantity of canned foods, but the quality, too, is outstanding. Ohio's tomatoes and tomato products are among the very best, as is its sweet corn, its sauerkraut, and its pickles. Proof of the exceptional quality to be found here is that many of the world's leading food processing companies maintain large processing plants in Ohio.

THE OHIO CANNERS ASSOCIATION

The association was organized 43 years ago at a meeting in Columbus, Ohio, July 18, 1907, called for that purpose by Frank E. Gorrell, the then secretary of the National Canners Association. During the intervening years, the association has grown from very modest beginnings into an organization comprised of more than 70 members, large and small, including all but a very few of the canning establishments located in the State.

THE NATIONAL CANNERS ASSOCIATION

It is of special significance that on June 8, 1950, several Ohio canners will be in Washington to witness and take part in the dedication ceremonies of the new $1,000,000 research and administration building of the National Canners Association. This building is the culmination of many years of planning and study by the canners of the Nation, and was built to fulfill the needs of this industry for continued research to better supply the people of this country with wholesome, nutritious, economical foods, conveniently packaged, and readily available.

OHIO CANNED FOOD ON CAPITOL MENU

Ohio canners are pleased to give Senators and Representatives from all sections of the United States the opportunity to enjoy the fine quality of Ohio's canned foods. Therefore, they have supplied the tomatoes and sauerkraut that are being served Thursday, June 8, in both the Senate and House Restaurants.

Liberty or License, by Lloyd T. Binford, Chairman, Board of Censors, City of Memphis, Tenn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 5, 1950

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, if we do not protect our children from the evil influences which the Communists and their fellow travelers are trying to spread before their eyes and drum into their ears, then we may expect to see our country dragged down to destruction.

An article appeared in Collier's magazine on May 6, 1950, entitled, "You Can't See That Movie," in reply to which Hon. Lloyd T. Binford, chairman of the board of censors of the city of Memphis, Tenn., in a letter to that magazine on May 30, 1950, said:

MAY 30, 1950.

The EDITOR, COLLIER'S MAGAZINE,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: In the article in your issue of May 6, You Can't See That Movie, Mr. Velie assumes, without citing his authority, that censorship is an infringement on the rights and privileges of a discerning public regardless of any State or city ordinance which created such censor board.

The Memphis Board of Censors is not a volitient council but a judicial body authorized by a special act of the General Assembly of the State of Tennessee, under which the city of Memphis enacted an ordinance prohibiting "immoral, lewd, or lascivious pictures" or "pictures which are inimical to public safety, health, morals, or welfare." The ordinance provides that the chairman and two members of said board shall be the judges, with one vote each, who shall fulfill their oaths of office by banning all movies or acts which violate the laws of the city of Memphis.

The function of the Memphis Censor Board has been to carry out the purpose and spirit of the city ordinance. The members of the board, individually and as a board, have consistently endeavored to be just in their interpretation of the city ordinance, so as to give to the public desirable and acceptable entertainment.

The board has never censored a picture because of Negro actors, and have certainly never censored an all-Negro cast, but it has censored pictures where Negroes take roles which are not consistent with our policy of segregation in the South.

Rochester starred here recently in an all-Negro stage play and with Lena Horne in Cabin in the Sky. Lena Horne starred also in Stormy Weather at Loew's State Theater.

In the movie Curley the censor was not due to Negro and white children playing together but because the Negro was in a white school—a condition that does not exist in the South.

The board censors pictures in which outlaws such as Dillinger, the Daltons, and James brothers are glamorized, because children are apt to make heroes of them.

Your magazine article does not attempt to defend Duel in the Sun and numerous other immoral, lewd, and lascivious pictures banned by this board. Anent its invectives on typewriters, hair-do, office, and octogenarians, I might remind your writer that some of the most brilliant minds at present and in the past history of America and England or, in fact, the world, are or were octogenarians.

The chairman is duly sensible to the scorn and ridicule of his devotion to those timely virtues of morality and decency, which accounts for his aversion to exhibitions and performances which are profanely vulgar, immoral, or obscene, regardless of the distinguished dramatic ability of the performers, and he cannot agree with those who regard such as desirable entertainment or a credit to dramatic art, and sincerely regrets that he does not merit the accusation of being puritanic, accepting Webster's definition of such. But this may be a matter of no concern to those who apparently believe there should be no laws requiring decency and morality in public entertainment.

I am enclosing an article entitled "Liberty or License," which sets forth my ideas on censorship. You are free to use any or all parts of this if you so desire.

Yours very truly,

LLOYD T. BINFORD,
Chairman, Memphis Board of Censors.

With the foregoing letter Mr. Binford enclosed a copy of his article entitled "Liberty or License," which every patriotic American, and especially every Christian American, ought to read. I am inserting it at this point.

The article referred to follows:

LIBERTY OR LICENSE

(By Lloyd T. Binford, chairman, Memphis Board of Censors)

Is censorship liberty or license; an infringement upon the rights and privileges of a discerning public, or a lawful restriction of public exhibitions and performances which are immoral, lewd, or lascivious, or those based upon stories of adultery and murder, or which glamorize gangsters and their way of life?

Edmund Burke, the great English statesman and philosopher, declared: "Men are qualified for civil liberties in exact proportions to their disposition to put chains on their own appetites; in proportion as their soundness and sobriety of understanding is above their vanity and presumption; in proportion as they are more disposed to listen to the counsels of the wise and good, in pref-

erence to the flattery of knaves. Society cannot exist unless a controlling power upon the will and appetite is placed somewhere; and the less of it there is within, the more there must be of it without. It is ordained in the eternal constitution of things, that men of intemperate habits cannot be free. Their passions forge their fetters."

Many of the leaders of the motion-picture industry of Hollywood have proved themselves incapable or unwilling of putting chains on their own appetites. They have shown themselves to be lacking in soundness and sobriety of understanding. They steadily have become more vain and presumptuous, and they have scorned the counsels of the wise and the good—the clergy, the educators, the social- and civic-minded citizens.

So, instead of constantly whining about laws adopted to curb their destructive, malicious activities and making personal attacks on those selected by the people to censor their productions, they would do well to examine themselves, then curb their own passions which have, and which are, forging their fetters.

All good Americans believe in liberty, but when individuals or groups confuse liberty and license, as the leaders of Hollywood have done, then do all good Americans believe that laws should be passed, or arrangements be made, to curb the activities of such individuals or groups.

Liberty is privilege. License is abuse of privilege. Liberty is freedom from domination. License is a reckless doing of all that caprice or passion may choose to do. Liberty is a sweet power of personal choice. License is a nasty disregard of propriety.

There are those who control the Hollywood motion-picture industry and have abused privilege. They have shown a nasty disregard for propriety. More—because of their rapacity for money and power, they have commercialized vice, they have publicized perversion, and they have glamorized crime and immorality—degeneracy in all of its ugly forms—until more and more empty seats in the theaters are more vividly revealing the indignation of those upon whom they, for far, far too long a time, have been inflicting their indecencies.

Which is it to be for the gentlemen of Hollywood: liberty or license?

Are they going to control their own, evidently abnormal appetites? Are they going to down their own vanity and presumptuousness? Are they going to refrain from disregarding propriety, listen to the counsels of at least some of the wise and good, and enjoy freedom from domination, the sweet power of personal choice and the steady clicking of the vending machines in the box offices of the theaters? Or are they going to ignore the handwriting on the wall, continue to permit their passions to rule their minds and have more and more legal restrictions placed on their industry, more and more censorship imposed on their productions, with the public staying away from their theaters in ever-increasing numbers?

The decision in this matter is not up to lawmakers. It is not up to censors. It is not up to citizens. In the long run, it is up to the Hollywood producers, themselves; for those who really desire to enjoy self-government, must first learn to govern self.

The great American banking system operates under controls. Censorship in action? Yes. The medical profession has its legal curbs, as well as its own intermedical code of honor—the hippocratic oath. Censorship in action? Of course. The legal fraternity is subject to strict rules and ethics of behavior. Censorship in action? Certainly. The great American free press is prohibited from printing and distributing libelous, salacious, or obscene matter. Censorship in action? By all means. The Federal Communications Commission maintains strict vigilance over the business of broadcasting. Censorship in action? Every bit of it. Why, then, should not this powerful motion-picture industry, the mighty influence of which is felt all around the earth, be subjected to checks in the good, old American way?

Why do leaders of this financial octopus, this immense propaganda machine, wail so loudly when the suggestion is made that they clean house, get rid and stay rid of the Communists, and the marijuana addicts, and drunks, and libertines, and others of such ilk, and discontinue producing films which give the people of other lands a warped picture of our land and distort the sense of values and corrupt the impressive minds of the youth of all lands?

Is there some mysterious reason why leaders of Hollywood should be permitted to ignore our American laws, our American principles, our American traditions, and disregard the proprieties of our many millions of Christian citizens? If there is, it is time we found out about it.

Is not moral turpitude just as odoriferous in Hollywood as it is anywhere on earth? Is it not more far-reaching in its effect on others, due to the wide publicity given it by box-office-conscious advertising men, and money-hungry studio executives who labor under the false impression that maggots can successfully be used, forever, as magnets?

Is it not significant that groups have been formed all over this country, as well as in many foreign countries, to combat the evils of Hollywood, including representatives from such organizations as the Catholic Legion of Decency, the preview divisions of many churches, the Parent-Teachers Association, the Professional Women's Clubs, the University Women's Clubs, the Y. W. C. A., the D. A. R., and many other constructive groups?

Is it too much to ask that historical pictures be historically correct?

Is it too much to ask that no finger of derision be pointed at any religion?

Is it too much to ask that no stones be cast at such things as moderation, temperance, fidelity, and other virtues?

Is it too much to request that no disrespect of law and order and of our American form of government be shown?

Is it too much to expect of the big brains of Hollywood that they show at least a glimmer of understanding of sectional and controversial problems, then portray them fairly and honestly?

Is it too much to demand that such subjects as marriage and family life be treated with due dignity in order that their bonds may be respected and strengthened?

Is it too much to demand that fatherhood, motherhood, citizenship and patriotism be held in the high esteem such things should warrant?

Many of the policy-makers of Hollywood look down upon the millions who view their pictures as uneducated morons with the undeveloped mentalities of early teen-agers. But millions of us who were not able, when young, to go to college, have learned in the tough school of experience that one doesn't have to possess a doctor of philosophy to be a wise dad. Nor does it take a master of arts to be an excellent mom. And we know the difference between right and wrong, good and evil, liberty and license, things about which many of the leaders of Hollywood's motion picture industry seem to be tragically confused.

On May 3, 1950, at Santa Cruz, Calif., Dr. C. C. Trillingham, superintendent of the Los Angeles County Schools, speaking before the opening session of the annual convention of the California Congress of Parents and Teachers, had this to say: "Decent citizens and their children have been, for entirely too long, the victims of those who, operating under the guise of freedom and democracy, have been permitted to sell anything, print anything, show anything, the result is increased lawlessness."

Dr. Trillingham declared that "suggestive and salacious literature, movies, the radio and television shows that portray crime and violence, and debase family life, are evils that threaten children and youth" and he further spoke of those "unwholesome influences" at the risk of being termed a long hair.

A committee of child welfare of the League of Nations analyzed 250 Hollywood-made films and found them—97 murders, 51 cases of adultery, 19 seductions, 22 abductions, 45 suicides; of the characters in these 250 Hollywood-made films, there were 176 thieves, 25 prostitutes, and 35 drunkards.

Censorship is the guardian of children.

Censorship is the officer of the law who protects those endangered by unfortunates gone berserk.

Censorship is the health officer to arrest and control contagion.

Censorship is the conscience of the people, operating in America's constructive system of checks and balances, to check the spreading of lust and licentiousness, destroyers of homes and nations as well as individuals.

If the motion picture industrialists wish to avoid annoyance from lawmakers, censors, and citizens alike, they should discontinue the production of pictures that annoy all who believe in decency and are opposed to degradation. It is up to them to make a choice.

Which is it to be, gentlemen, liberty or license?

Maintenance of Peace in the Near East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1950

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and statements:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, June 1, 1950.

Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. ROGERS: The President has rereceived your letter of May 22, enclosing copies of telegrams addressed to you by Mr. James Cantor, president of Lowell United Jewish Appeal, Lowell, Mass., and Mr. Edward Ziskind, president of the Lowell Hebrew Community Center, Lowell, Mass.

By direction of the President, I am sending you herewith, with the thought that you may wish to pass them on to your constituents, the enclosed copies of a joint declaration by the Governments of the United States, the United Kingdom, and France, as well as copies of a statement by the President.

Very sincerely yours,
MATTHEW J. CONNELLY,
Secretary to the President.

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

During the recent meeting in London, the Foreign Ministers of the United States, the United Kingdom, and France had an opportunity to review the security and armaments situation in the Near East and to consider what action their Governments might take to provide greater stability in the area. As a result of this consultation, a three-power declaration is being issued. This is another of the many valuable results of the London meeting.

The participation of the United States Government in the declaration emphasizes

this country's desire to promote the maintenance of peace in the Near East. It is the belief of the United States Government that the declaration will stimulate, in the Arab States and Israel, increased confidence in future security, thus accelerating the progress now being made in the Near East and contributing toward the well-being of the peoples there.

JOINT DECLARATION BY THE GOVERNMENTS OF THE UNITED STATES, THE UNITED KINGDOM, AND FRANCE

The Governments of the United Kingdom, France and the United States today issued the following Joint Declaration:

"The Governments of the United Kingdom, France, and the United States, having had occasion during the recent Foreign Ministers' meeting in London to review certain questions affecting the peace and stability of the Arab states and of Israel, and particularly that of the supply of arms and war material to these states, have resolved to make the following statements:

"1. The three Governments recognized that the Arab states and Israel all need to maintain a certain level of armed forces for the purposes of assuring their internal security and their legitimate self-defense and to permit them to play their part in the defense of the area as a whole. All applications for arms or war material for these countries will be considered in the light of these principles. In this connection the three governments wish to recall and reaffirm the terms of the statements made by their representatives on the Security Council on August 4, 1949, in which they declared their opposition to the development of an arms race between the Arab states and Israel.

"2. The three governments declare that assurances have been received from all the states in question, to which they permit arms to be supplied from their countries, that the purchasing state does not intend to undertake any act of aggression against any other state. Similar assurances will be requested from any other state in the area to which they permit arms to be supplied in the future.

"3. The three governments take this opportunity of declaring their deep interest in and their desire to promote the establishment and maintenance of peace and stability in the area and their unalterable opposition to the use of force or threat of force between any of the states in that area. The three governments, should they find that any of these states was preparing to violate frontiers or armistice lines, would, consistently with their obligations as members of the United Nations, immediately take action, both within and outside the United Nations, to prevent such violation."

Nothing But Victories

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 7, 1950

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am including in the extension of my remarks an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor for Tuesday, June 6, which I think is an outstanding expression of the concept of American philosophy:

NOTHING BUT VICTORIES

Too many Americans are acting as if they were afraid of their shadows. One would never suspect they were the sons of pilgrims and pioneers. At a time when the United States has become the most powerful Nation in history millions of its citizens are thinking defensively. They appear obsessed with security—seeking it almost wholly in material measures, military and economic. In this atmosphere General Marshall's exhortation to fear no "contest of ideas" is welcome.

In these times of cold-war tension it is easy to oversimplify the basic struggle in the world. On the diplomatic front it is visibly a power contest between the Soviet and the United States. But that is only the narrowest aspect. There is a larger contest between the ideas of tyranny and freedom. And beyond that is an even more basic struggle between atheism and religion, between material and spiritual concepts of man. General Marshall was endeavoring to widen our view of the task in hand when he said that the world's great need is for spiritual regeneration.

The temptation continually is to use material means to combat ideas. In the present stage of mankind's thinking, self-defense requires physical preparedness. But this distinguished soldier was urging Americans not to place complete dependence on military and material power. He reminded them that in any contest of ideas, honesty, freedom, equality under law, tolerance and justice will win.

It would be helpful to remember that these ideas have proved revolutionary time and time again. It would be useful to recall that America has long been an arsenal of inspiration. And what the world needs far more than it needs American money, machines, or atomic bombs is fresh inspiration. It can get inspiration from America only if Americans get back to first principles and trust the ideas that have been the Nation's foundation stones. Too much of the world sees political corruption, crime, vulgar movies, racial discrimination, industrial strife, and boastful, intolerant nationalism as America's chief products.

These, too, are subversives. General Marshall pointed out that communism is only one of the ferments in the world which are challenging Americans today. He appealed for a wider regard for oppressed peoples and new visions which will kindle the imagination. That compassion and those visions will find their firmest base in religion's inspiration.

Let Americans trust the dynamic power of free ideas. Let them recall Wendell Phillips' assurance:

"Whether in chains or in laurels,
Liberty knows nothing but victories."

Of course, that confidence comes from spiritual concepts of liberty. Today the religious fundamentals for those concepts are more widely available than ever. Knowing that, who can doubt that the future lies with those who embrace and practice the ideas of freedom and brotherhood? These grow from what Longfellow called the larger thought of God.

A Wrong Foreign Policy in China and the Far East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 7, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am including as part of my remarks a paper given by Mr. William Albert Harbison before the White Plains, N. Y.. Chamber of Commerce, on April 20, 1950. I commend it to all Members who are interested in what our foreign policy has been in China and the Far East:

OUR FOREIGN POLICY WITH REFERENCE TO CHINA AND THE FAR EAST

Very gravely we are situated today with a state of affairs more serious than confronted America prior to the Second World War.

There are many educators and persons in high places, politically speaking, who today stand for appeasement, taking matters philosophically and going so far as to think that after all the Communists have something substantial to add to present-day civilization and that we should not be too much concerned about the apparent aggression of the one political totalitarian power about which very much of world thought is now concentrated.

We do have our Lattimores, our Services, our Leighton Stewarts, our former Joe Stilwells, our Henry Wallaces, and others of the same type as Philip Jessup, who at the recent conference at Bangkok advised his hearers that they had nothing to fear in communism. Jessup's apparent meaning was not that there was no danger of the infiltration or invasion by China or Russia of Indonesia and Indochina but that even should it occur there should be no fear of communism itself.

Perhaps from the standpoint of those who have not the evangelical faith as a basis of their convictions, whether Protestant or Catholic, there is some ground for their position.

However, we are speaking from the standpoint of an American citizen who thinks of his country with institutions founded largely on a fundamental Christian basis, whether Roman Catholic or Protestant. We think in terms of the categorical and ontological difference between the heart of communism and the heart of the Christian faith. We think in terms of products and byproducts that emanate from these two fundamentally different positions.

If the Government of communistic Soviet Russia was something else than a totalitarian regime and if Marxian communism was not in its essence the inspiring basis of totalitarian aggression in the carrying out of its pattern of life, the western nations would not have the same cause for concern.

It is well known by all parties today, however, that we are dealing with just such a totalitarian enemy to Christian civilization. For over 100 years the representatives of the Christian faith, whether Protestant or Catholic, from Great Britain and the United States have carried on in China and in the Far East. As a corollary to the work and propagation of the Bible and Christian faith by these representatives Gen. Chiang Kai-shek and the Kuomintang in China promulgated a constitution for the Chinese people in 1946 that went far beyond the expectations of the Communists in the northern part of the country. The Communists accepted the plan but when they discovered, under it, they would have to give up their military control in northern China they resumed hostilities against the Nationalist Government.

In final answer to the smear campaign carried on by the leftists in America and abroad against Chiang Kai-shek and the Kuomintang, it can be said, without refutation, that there was free access to all parts of China, under the Nationalist regime, for representatives of the American and British Bible Societies, the Pocket Testament League, the American and British Leprosy Missions and the missionaries of both the Roman Catholic and Protestant Churches, whereas within any territory controlled by the Communists such representatives were threatened, imprisoned, and put to death.

The United States has had an over-all foreign policy eminently portrayed by such outstanding Secretaries of State as Hay,

Stimson, Root, Hull, and Presidents Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson. Republicans and Democrats alike they stood for the open door in China and for the integrity of that great country.

At the close of the Boxer Rebellion in China, brilliantly exemplifying American policy, Secretary Hay alone among the four nations involved refused to accept payment for the lives of our nationals. He accepted $900,000 in property damage but turned back $11,000,000 of indemnity funds with the statement that it was impossible for China to pay for the lives of our citizens—they were invaluable.

China on her part accepted the returned money as an act of friendship and with the proceeds until the money was exhausted sent her students over to the United States to be educated in our Christian colleges and State universities.

Secretary Stimson, before the first invasion of Manchuria by the Japanese, endeavored to get Great Britain to unite with us in opposing Japan's entering Manchuria. Unfortunately England, enjoying a lucrative commercial treaty with Japan, refused to join hands with the United States and Secretary Stimson did not feel justified with the weak condition of our own Army and Navy at that time in risking, single-handed, war with Japan.

Unfortunately during the Franklin Roosevelt administration our country went so far in its leanings and sympathies toward communism, with special reference to its leadership, that the representatives of our country in China were almost all those who favored the communistic regime as opposed to the Kuomintang and Gen. Chiang Kai-shek.

It was entirely possible had the leadership been different and had the United States unequivocally backed the Nationalist Government with financial support during the past 3 or 4 years under the administration of a strong military staff and civilian committee cooperating with Gen. Chiang Kai-shek and the Kuomintang, Manchuria could have been held, the industrial center and source of raw materials for all its industry, and all China could have been retained under what would have eventually become representative government in that great country.

Many warning voices and the advice of such leaders as General MacArthur, General Chennault, General Wedemeyer, Congressman Judd, long a missionary in China, Ambassador Bullitt, Admiral Radford, and others advocated the policy above outlined, but were not in a position to put it into effect because of the then leadership in Washington and the type of representatives sent out from there to China and the Far East.

Through the failure of the United States, to all intents and purposes, China has been lost to a totalitarian regime under the direct dominance of Soviet Russia. That dominance is clearly depicted in the disclosure in the March issue of the Atlantic Monthly made by Nora Waln in the article on Young China at the Crossroads. In this article is a reported disclosure of the Harbin secret agreement concerning Manchuria made between Soviet Russia and the Chinese Communists.

The forced confession by physical duress of an innocent employee of our Embassy in Hungary and the still more recent shooting down of an unarmed plane of the United States over the Baltic are only up to date accumulating evidence of the outlaw character of the government that we are dealing with in Soviet Russia.

The British Intelligence Digest published by Kenneth de Courcy in London, Toronto, and New York in its April 1950 issue calls attention to the fact that what the Christian church of all creeds and interpretations has been predicting for 2,000 years as to the end of the present dispensation, scientists themselves are now stating. Einstein's warning, although discounted by de Courcy, is that the human race may wipe itself out with the hydrogen bomb.

At length the present administration through its Secretary of State has turned far away from its previous attitude as depicted above in China and speaks out for a total diplomacy and the reply of Dean Acheson to the dastardly shooting down of 10 Americans in an unarmed plane would appear to indicate that today we have the beginnings of a bipartisan and unequivocal approach to our foreign policy.

Surely past history indicates that we should not recognize Communist China nor permit its entrance to the United Nations and the displacement of the Chinese Nationalists there.

Under total diplomacy past history would further emphasize the strategic importance of giving every support including military aid to Gen. Chiang Kai-shek in his last stand on Formosa and his backing of guerrilla warfare against the enslavement of Chinese citizens in China proper.

There is every logical reason why the western nations should say thus far and no farther to totalitarian aggression and, without declaring war, stop with force, and push back all such aggression.

Total diplomacy will logically include immediate demands for release of all Americans behind the iron curtain in either Russia or China or their satellites and the necessary steps taken to accomplish this whether by force or otherwise, all with a benign purpose and without a declaration of war.

Total diplomacy will ultimately require severing diplomatic relationship with Soviet Russia and the recognition of all Communist totalitarian powers as anti-God and outlaw governments.

Department of Agriculture's Highest Award Goes to Woman for First Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 7, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article on Miss Lucy Maclay Alexander, formerly of Belleville, Ill., in my congressional district which appeared in the May 31, 1950 issue of Pathfinder. Miss Alexander on May 25, 1950, received from the United States Department of Agriculture its Distinguished Service Award—the highest of its annual employee citations and the first to be awarded to a woman. A brother of Miss Alexander, Mr. Robert P. Alexander, resides in Belleville at 615 South Jackson Street:

THE LADY KNOWS MEAT

Little, precise, gray-haired Lucy Maclay Alexander has cooked or supervised the cooking of what would add up to a mountain of meat—some 2,900 cuts of beef, 3,800 cuts of lamb, 1,700 cuts of pork, 900 turkeys and 300 chickens.

Because of this enormous cooking project, women all over the Nation today are cooking their family's meat according to detailed, scientifically evolved recipes that didn't exist 15 years ago. And for her contribution to it Miss Alexander this week received from the United States Department of Agriculture its Distinguished Service Award—the highest of its annual employee citations and the first to be awarded to a woman.

Miss Alexander, who grew up on an Illinois farm, came as a chemist to USDA 31 years ago. Then in 1926 she was transferred to the Department's home economics research laboratories. There she started work on the how-to-produce-better-meat investigation in which three United States Department of Agriculture bureaus, 25 State experiment stations, and the National Livestock and Meat Board have participated.

FALSE DOCTRINE

Properly to judge the meat samples which came to the Bureau in Washington and to the 25 stations, it was necessary first to develop standardized cooking and testing methods. By the time, seven years later, when these standards were published, the long-established idea that meats had to be seared to hold in their juices was well exploded. Work by Miss Alexander and other home economists had proved that cooking meats at low to moderate, instead of high temperatures, keeps protein tender, lessens shrinkage and holds in juices. Cooking teachers accordingly began to change their tune. Cookbooks started giving temperature and time directions for cooking meats based on the type, cut, weight and degree of doneness desired.

Miss Alexander and her staff themselves wrote seven recipe leaflets, the latest of which, Meat for Thrifty Meals (1942) has been ordered by more than a million people. All of the recipes in this leaflet call for low, constant temperatures. Though this method is convenient and saves fuel, it isn't always better for all cuts of meat than one which combines high and low termperatures. When Miss Alexander does a roast at home in her Washington, D. C., apartment, she starts it with a sear. "You can have a sear and slow finish function at a low average temperature," she says.

HOW MUCH GRAVY?

Her tests have shown that a 12¼-pound rib roast, placed on a rack in an open pan, will shrink, after roasting five hours at a constant temperature of 250° F. to 10¾ pounds. Roasted four hours, with a 20-minute start at 500° and a quick switch to 300° for the finish, it will cook down a half-pound more, to 10¼ pounds. The first method produces a half-pound of pan drippings, the second, a pound—not a serious loss if the cook wants a lot of gravy and prefers a richer brown on her roast.

BUSMAN'S HOLIDAY

Currently Miss Alexander and her staff at the Beltsville, Md., labs are doing only "desk cooking"—paper work with some of their accumulated research data. Even this keeps her so busy that she doesn't have much time for kitchen cooking at home. "Why," she says, "baking a cake would be a luxury." Fortunately, her own favorite meat dish is one that can be turned out in a hurry. It's not a fancy one. To meat expert Lucy Alexander nothing tastes better than gound beef with cream gravy.

Know Your Waterways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 5, 1950

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under authority to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to submit an article from the Washington Post,

of even date, by the Marine News, New York, as follows:

KNOW YOUR WATERWAYS—SHIP TO RAIL—RAIL TO SHIP

Except for the low cost of water transportation, it would be impossible for railroads to obtain the volume of traffic that they do on combined water and rail or rail and water tonnage. In many cases the cost of such tonnage, if handled solely by railways, would be excessive or prohibitive. An example is the millions of tons of coal carried annually by rail to ports on the Great Lakes and the East coast for transshipment by water. A large part of this tonnage is again handled by railways after its movements by water. And whence comes most of the vast tonnage carried by railways from coastal and inland ports into the near and far interior of the Nation? It comes from vessels using the splendid system of harbors and waterways—coastal, Great Lakes, and inland—prepared by the Federal Government. Certain tonnage is naturally the business of railroads or trucks. Other tonnage is naturally the business of waterways and can be so transported with great benefits to consumers at costs no other system can approach.

Trouble-Shooter Diplomat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS B. HELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 7, 1950

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following article from the New York Times magazine section for June 4, 1950:

TROUBLE-SHOOTER DIPLOMAT

(By Gertrude Samuels)

WASHINGTON.—One of the great figures in Israel's diplomacy—a new art for one of the world's newest democracies—is a scholarly man who is now emerging as his country's No. 1 diplomatic trouble shooter. He is Eliahu Elath, the new Israel Minister to the Court of St. James.

Step by step since long before Israel was a state, Mr. Elath has been used to make Israel's story and hopes understood in strategic areas of the world. For years he fought—sometimes single-handed—for understanding with the Arabs in typically direct fashion—by living with them in the desert, studying with their leaders, building friendships. Always he was moved on to where trouble was brewing and leadership counted. With understanding and sound relations in Washington of prime importance, he was sent here after the war. Besides dealing with the State Department, he represented Israel at the San Francisco Conference—for which the Jews had no credentials—and fought her battle for recognition in the United Nations.

Two years ago he became Israel's first Ambassador to the United States. Tomorrow he flies to London, which recently accorded Israel full recognition and has thus become a new focus of diplomatic effort because of Britain's role and influence in the Middle East. If and when India recognizes Israel, he is expected to move on to that post, because of its strategic importance for Israel's security.

It seems likely that London will find him—as this capital has found him—unique both as a diplomat and as a person. The three-story house at 2210 Massachusetts Avenue where he set up his embassy 2 years ago is so modest as to be easily overlooked among the pretentious facades of Embassy Row. Its pleasant reception room with its simple blue furnishings and Star of David flag made visitors vaguely aware of contrasts between this bit of sovereign soil and the formality of the city without. Hebrew and English mingled in telephone conversations. Young men and women on their way to second- and third-floor offices and archives called each other by first names, an Israeli custom. A youth in his twenties wore a leather glove over his right "hand."

On the second floor where Mr. Elath had his own sparsely furnished office—decorated with pictures of President Weizmann and shelves of books on Islam, American politics and philosophy—one soon realized that the openness, warmth, and informality of the embassy must stem from Mr. Elath himself. It is now exactly 25 years since he went to Palestine as a student and laborer, having fled from Russia for illegal Zionist activities. And visiting and interviewing him, you come to know a man of so many dimensions, so much faith in human relationships, and, above all, so much humility amid his success that you are forcibly reminded of other typical Israelis like Ben-Gurion and Lubianiker, who also rose from the ranks to fight for an idea—and win a state.

The paradoxical thing about Mr. Elath (pronounced aye-lot') is that for all his informality he looks like a diplomat. He is a tall, strikingly handsome man in his late forties, who dresses conservatively (unlike the starchless Ben-Gurion). His hair is silvering at the temples. His green eyes are meditative or restless as he speaks in Eastern European accents, with the savoir-faire of the scholar, puting fact beside fact with quiet precision.

And as you observe his dealings with people, you are conscious of a deep sensitiveness that makes him—sociologist, teacher, journalist, diplomat—acutely responsive to the challenges of his mission. There is, in his direct manner, the hard realism of all who have been part of Israel's struggle and who view the road ahead without illusions. But there is also frank nostalgia when he talks of the objective closest to his heart—peace with Israel's Arab neighbors. He has lived among the Arabs, knows them intimately and counts many as his friends, in the Middle East, in Washington, and in London.

Perhaps better than any other Israeli diplomat, Mr. Elath symbolizes his country's hopes. He was made to order for Washington. It is a lobbying city and he has a special genius for infighting—for getting the facts across systematically to individuals who count; for reaching, when the going is tough, the right people at the right moment. Besides, he has spent half his life studying the Arabs and tells you bluntly that the future of Israel depends on the destiny of the whole Middle East.

"Our victory," he says, "was more than the victory of 650,000 over 40,000,000—more than a military achievement. It was the great victory of an idea—the readiness of self-sacrifice to the ideal that there is justice. There are few accidents in world history, and it isn't an accident that the Jewish State was established. It was, let us say, a reward for the 650,000 because 6,000,000 Jews had perished in the Hitler epoch. It was a reward to show that the sacrifice of the Jews of Israel was not in vain.

"Israel," he continues, "must and will contribute to humanity and to its neighbors. It must be a democratic example for other nations to follow. Development schemes such as the Jordan Valley Authority will benefit the whole Middle East.

"For although we have been almost destroyed by them, there is no bitterness in our hearts toward our neighbors," he says. "We need peace because of our immigrants—we must absorb them, give them homes, develop their skills, put all of our modern scientific achievements to industrial use, turn all our energies to development.

"And we want peace because I believe, with my thinking Arab friends—and we are not sentimental or mystical—that we will all perish if the whole of the Middle East does not raise its standards of living. The danger to us is not so much from a second round (though we don't underestimate the danger from their potentates) as with our remaining a flourishing oasis in a decaying society."

There are few Arab leaders in Washington whom Elath didn't know as fellow alumni of American University in Beirut, or as fellow journalists or as fellow statesmen in the Middle East. Bonds with his Arab friends have not been severed by political differences. He knows that their hopes are Israel's hopes: that political democracy can become a reality in the Arab countries only through improvement of social and economic conditions for the sick and illiterate masses; that education now limited to the few must reach the remotest villages in this transition from the camel to the atomic age; that instead of fighting Jews, they must turn their energies to fighting disease and starvation.

And he quietly adds:

"We don't expect understanding and peace to come overnight. The Arab Goliath is angry with the Israeli David. But I believe in the cooperation of the Arabs—and if I didn't sincerely believe this, I wouldn't believe that Israel has a chance in the Middle East."

To understand Mr. Elath's objectives, you have to see him within the context of his country's needs and dreams; you have to understand the philosophy which he brought to Washington before Israel was born, for that seemingly hopeless struggle to get traditionalists in this Government to reconsider their thinking about Palestine.

He was born Eliahu Epstein (he adopted the Hebrew name Elath recently) in the Ukraine in 1903 and fled illegally to Palestine in 1924 after spending a year in jail for Zionist activities. Many friends of that generation "are still in Siberia." The young Epstein dug ditches, worked on Royal Air Force installations, tilled the soil of a new kibbutz. Suddenly, "a new world opened for me." On installations being built at the Jordan-Saudi Arabia border he came in touch with Arabs.

As he watched with wonder and excitement, "the Bible became a Baedeker"—centuries-old customs were still practiced. And he decided to stay on, to study their way of life, in particular that of the nomads or Bedouins, "because I realized that we'd have to know the Arabs for our own security, not only as politicians but as people." When a new school of Oriental studies was opened at Hebrew University, he enrolled on his certificate from the University of Kiev, to specialize in Arab affairs. Here he met and married his wife, Zahava, who was also a student.

From Judah Magnes, president of the university, he received his "greatest inspiration and encouragement" to go to live among the Arabs and study there, rather than at Oxford or the German universities, as was the custom. On a scholarship, he went to Syria and for 8 months he made his life with the Bedouins now living in their tents, now wandering with them in the wild desert, accepted as one of them, learning their language.

When later, he continued has studies on a Rockefeller Foundation fellowship at the American University in Beirut, he was the only Jew in a class of 20 Arabs (many of whom today hold diplomatic posts). He traveled to the hinterlands again, dressed as an Arab in desert robes and keffiyeh, aspiring "to do everything to build bridges instead of walls with our Arab neighbors." From those

and earlier nomadic wanderings came numerous studies and two books The Bedouins, Their Life and Customs, and The Population of Transjordan.

From 1934, when he joined the Middle East Division of the Jewish Agency, until 1945, Mr. Elath spent half of his time traveling in Iran, Iraq, Syria, Arabia, Egypt—systematically meeting their leaders, learning their attitude toward Zionism. The most critical and dangerous part of his career began 5 years ago—in Washington.

Alone, and with no status, Mr. Elath came as an observer to the San Francisco Conference and as director of the Jewish Agency office. He found himself "more isolated than in the Syrian desert." It was difficult "just to obtain the noblesse oblige of officials." He met people in the State Department who were actively hostile, conditioned by political and economic ties in the Middle East; people who opposed Zionism or who were ignorant about Palestine; people whose way of thinking was so fixed that they disliked change and, anyway, "never got out of line." Knowing these things was "my greatest asset because it gave me no illusions." He set about, not to quarrel with his critics but to educate; if not to change their attitudes, at least to improve them.

Thus, as his friends recount, Mr. Elath came to be known as definitely partisan, but as one who never lied or exaggerated. He might be "wrong" from where they stood; he was never wrong on facts. Doggedly, systematically, he showed them his people's shortcomings and mistakes—and also his people's logic. He showed them where terrorism was against their cause and worse for the Jews than the Arabs. He made it clear that "we were not against the British but against the policy of the British Government, for had not the same generation that produced Bevin also produced Balfour and other great men like Cecil, Lloyd George, Churchill?"

Above all, he clarified the Arab picture. He explained that the Jews' return to the Middle East was a political renaissance—that they were not the enfants terribles of that part of the world, that they were not there to help themselves alone, or even as missionaries, but really to integrate themselves with the Middle East, combining their eastern origins with western elements; that whatever the Jewish numbers, they would always remain a minority in the Middle East, and so would understandably seek relationships with their Arab neighbors.

The past 2 years have brought the most dramatic fulfillment of Mr. Elath's work and hopes. The first milestone came on May 14, 1948, when the Jews proclaimed their state in Tel Aviv. And the story of American recognition is now a classic. The White House called minutes after Tel Aviv's announcement to ask whether Mr. Elath was prepared to accept recognition for his Government. Mr. Elath promptly said he was—though he had no time to refer to his home Government for approval, nor did he even know its name. He rapidly wrote the letter of acceptance in the name of the "Jewish state," suddenly heard what it was to be called over the radio, rewrote it to read "State of Israel."

A second milestone came with America's $100,000,000 loan to the infant state—"because material support means political support and stronger confidence in us." The third milestone was American support for Israel's admission to the United Nations. One of Mr. Elath's most cherished papers is a handwritten note from a representative of an Arab state:

"Mr. Epstein (Elath), I welcome you, my friend. I hope you will take part in our debates."

Greatest among the factors that Mr. Elath credits for these successes is the support of Americans of all faiths, who saw parallels with their own fight for independence, for survival and the building of a democracy.

His associates in London will find that Mr. Elath follows a rigorous schedule. A voracious reader, his working day in Washington began at home with American and foreign newspapers. He reached the embassy by 9 o'clock, put through telephone or teletype calls to Israeli representatives in New York, Los Angeles, Lake Success, and sent telegraphic dispatches to his home Government. On a typical day he would receive the press, other ambassadors and Aubrey Eban, Israeli's delegate to the UN and successor to Mr. Elath as Ambassador to Washington.

He would lunch with Methodist clergymen and talk off-the-cuff for an hour on the creation and goals of his country (while they took copious notes). Then he would go over to the State Department for a conference with Middle East experts. Next there would be staff meetings of first secretaries and the commercial and military attachés (stepped up recently by concern over arms shipments to Arab countries). His dispatches are said to have been brilliantly knowledgeable (and, as his American-born secretary adds patiently, "they kept us late").

On his way home to his apartment at the Shoreham Hotel, he would make a hurried stop to buy records of some Bach sonatas. For dinner, he and Mrs. Elath, a vivacious woman who studies sculpting, might entertain another Ambassador and his wife.

For all his popularity in Washington, Mr. Elath gave the impression of a lonely, restless person. He dislikes the pomp and crowds of semiofficial cocktail gatherings (there is little of this in modern Israel), and chafes against formal social walls which shut out lower-echelon diplomats whom he also longs to know. His tastes are simple—he turned down a $50,000 gift from the Washington Jewish community for an embassy, in favor of giving the money to the United Jewish Appeal for new immigrants.

Just as Mr. Elath was a unique figure in Washington, so his staff, which numbers 39, contrasted sharply with that of older embassies. The Israeli diplomats are mostly young and have seen service with the British and Israel defense armies. But the business of running a new embassy without adequately trained personnel often posed problems. The difficulty had been to find people trained in delicate diplomatic work, with broad knowledge of the whole of the Middle East as well as the American mentality. As he put it, "It's not Madison Square Garden which makes public opinion but the hard work of knowing individual people who count."

The feeling has been that Israel is sending out too many untrained people from the kibbutzim (collectives), or strong chauvinists with the old feelings of intrigue. One solution, some feel, is to pick a legation like Rome where candidates for the foreign service may receive pilot training before being sent on to such major powers as the United States. Devotion and zeal, they say, are fine, but they don't make up for the lack of trained diplomatic technicians.

The road ahead for Mr. Elath in this third year of Israel's independence is full of the challenge he thrives on—the test of full understanding with Britain, the critical problems of Jerusalem, of Israel's economic struggle, and, above all, the quest for a real peace. Ask him the outcome on these tests, and he'll tell you: "We're not out of the woods. But our program is strong and just. Since we cannot afford the luxury of being pessimistic about the Arabs, we can continue to strive for their understanding and cooperation. These differences will be straightened out."

Seeing how the moving finger has already written, it all seems possible.

Commencement Address by Ambassador Henri Bonnet at Florida State University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 7, 1950

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, on Monday, June 5, at Tallahassee, Fla., His Excellency, Henri Bonnet, Ambassador of the French Republic, delivered a highly interesting, eloquent, and inspiring speech at the graduation exercises of the Florida State University.

In view of the traditional and long-standing friendship existing between the French people and the people of the United States and the fact that the distinguished ambassador included in his scholarly address several highly important observations on current world problems, particularly those referring to western Europe and to the recent significant proposals of the French Foreign Minister to create a pool of the heavy industries of France and of Germany, I ask unanimous consent that the address of Ambassador Bonnet may be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I fully appreciate the privilege of being today the guest of Florida State University and of addressing such a distinguished gathering of professors and students at the end of a year of fruitful work, and on the eve of a holiday, which, I hope, will be for all of you most restful and propitious to the fulfillment of the wishes and projects you may have formed during months of study. It is also a great joy for me to pay a visit to this wonderful State upon which nature has bestowed her most glorious gifts, both of resources and beauties, and which, in the early days of the European settlements, Jean Ribaut, from Dieppe, France, one of the first pioneers, called "the fairest, fruitfullest, and pleasantest of all the world." It is a source of pride to all Frenchmen that their countrymen were among the first to open that rich and lovely part of the United States to European civilization, and that the names of Laudonniere and Ribaut are forever associated with the history of Florida where, with their heroic Huguenot followers, they toiled, suffered, and died, thus writing one of the most inspiring pages of that epic which is the founding of the United States of America.

What a great lesson of courage and faith—upon which we must still meditate today—was bequeathed to us by those early settlers in their struggle against man and nature. They had come to the shores of America animated by their deep love for freedom of thought and religion, and at the same time, by a noble spirit of adventure, anxious to open new lands to western culture and spread their faith to the New World. They were motivated also by an unshakable confidence in the future and in the unlimited possibilities offered by this land to human valor and ingenuity. Their destiny symbolizes the whole history of mankind, ever advancing along the paths of progress, and despite destructions and tragedies, realizing new achievements, thus ultimately adding to the wealth of human victories over all kinds of adverse forces and creating a world

which science, art, and research are enriching still with their many accomplishments and brilliant promises for the future.

What a great lesson of tolerance and cooperation is also to be found here; how much faster and smoother would be the pace of progress were we wise enough to put aside the misunderstandings, quarrels, and feuds which stained with blood the early days of the pioneers on these shores as well as the whole history of mankind. We now live in an era in which the necessity of cooperation in every field of human endeavor is more than ever to be stressed. A striking evidence of this need can be found in your daily studies at this beautiful university. The days have long passed when the mind could almost entirely master the field of human knowledge. This does not mean, obviously, that the youths of today should not be given a solid and extensive foundation of learning before specializing in their chosen branches of activity, in order to enable them to play their parts intelligently in the life of modern society. That is the way to prepare youth to exercise that most enviable privilege of a useful citizen—independence of judgment; that is to say, the ability to think for himself without accepting biased or false ideas. But there is nowadays no branch of study or research which does not depend to a large extent on the work being accomplished in related fields; it is not only through the work of the past generations that the scholar of this day builds up his store of knowledge, but also through the inventions, achievements, and discoveries of his colleagues, those active in other domains as well as in his own. It is a fact that today no problem can be solved, no construction work accomplished, without a close cooperation among men engaged in the most diversified activities.

Indeed, cooperation should be the motto of the world today, and I believe that the ideal of understanding, of mutual cooperation, of combined effort toward a common high goal is more urgently needed in the domain of international relations than anywhere else. Here again we might recall the lessons given to us by the pioneers; unlimited possibilities and shining promises are offered to a world where new victories over the unknown are constantly being won; and yet, at the same time, we are all of us conscious of the terrible impending dangers, of the destruction and devastation which might once again spread over the globe and sweep away, as would a tidal wave, most of the wonders accumulated in our lands through years of patient efforts. We must gird ourselves against such a threat, and, in a common and tenacious endeavor, build up a durable peace.

As you are about to enjoy a well-deserved vacation, I should hate to be unable to give you a word of hope and of confidence. True, there are dangers, but I remain convinced that we can still preserve peace for the coming generations. Unfortunately, there is no magic formula enabling us to reach this objective which, undoubtedly, corresponds to the longing of millions and millions of the people on earth. The hopes which all of us, after the terrible ordeal of the last war, had placed in international cooperation, have not been fulfilled. A deep distrust and a sharp division have developed in our contemporary world; we had hoped to ensure peace by common agreement, by the establishment of a collective security, by the outlawing of war; this remains our goal—the goal of the United Nations. But, meanwhile, we have had to resort to the older system of armed peace, of the prevention of war by the creation of a superior force to deter any possible aggression.

At this point, fortunately, one finds a ray of hope. If we are not in a position to build at once a United Nations endowed with decisive powers, if we cannot ensure now the undisputed reign of international law, giving universal foundations to collective security, we can, at least, and must, act efficiently and promptly in a more limited sphere, strongly organizing our Western World, as a means of maintaining universal peace. Our hope rests on the successfully growing cooperation among the democratic peoples who dwell on the shores of the Atlantic Ocean—a powerful association of nations, rich in their civilization and their natural resources, possessing the same faith in freedom, the same respect for the dignity of man, the same love for peaceful progress, all of them firmly determined to fight if necessary for the preservation of the liberties inherited from their forefathers, but all of them convinced also that they must strive in every way possible to bring about honorably the blessings of world peace.

That cooperation among the peoples of the Western World was still further strengthened recently on the occasion of the inter-allied meetings held in London. You will allow me to say a few words here on one of the most promising developments of this last period, one which, it is true, directly concerns my country, but which also is most important to the future of the world. You have sometimes heard doubts expressed on the ability of old Europe to unite. One of the proclaimed purposes of the Marshall plan was to help the old Continent to link its various peoples more closely, both economically and politically. I believe that it is not an overstatement to say that one of the most serious obstacles to inter-European cooperation will be removed when the recent dramatic proposal of my Government for an industrial union between France and Germany is implemented, as I am fully confident it will be.

We in Europe did not do soon enough what, at the end of the eighteenth century, your founding fathers did when they decided to federate their Thirteen Colonies. In the meantime the industrial revolution of the nineteenth century took place, adding terrific economic difficulties to the political reasons which prevented a federation of Europe—a lengthy heritage of wars, rivalries, ambitions, and deep-seated feuds. It is not an easier task to remove custom barriers from around nations of forty to fifty million inhabitants than it would be to suppress them here in your prosperous United States, but there is not the slightest doubt in my mind that something must be done in that direction that Europe must become a big market open to a broader and more fruitful competition, nor is there any doubt that there is a popular longing in the Old World for such an achievement. The problem is, How to begin? I think a solution was offered a few days ago by the French Foreign Minister when he proposed to create a pool of the heavy industries of France and of Germany. I do not need to stress the political consequences of such a bold act. In the terms of the decision of the French Cabinet, "it would make war not only unthinkable but materially impossible" between two nations who have been enemies for a thousand years. It required a great deal of courage on the part of the French Government to make such a decision when, in the last decade, our country had once again been invaded and bled white, and during four long and dark years, ruthlessly oppressed by the Nazis.

What I especially want to emphasize today is that a new principle is involved in the proposed agreement which may lead to entirely different and promising developments in Europe—a principle which would amount, when applied, to the curtailment of the sovereignty of the participating nations in the vital field of their economic lives. The purpose of this agreement is to put the coal and steel industries of Germany, France, and of other countries of western Europe, should they desire to join us, as we hope they will, under a common high authority composed of independent and well-qualified personalities, appointed by the member governments and endowed with real powers of decision for the development and modernization of production, the broadening of markets, the expansion of exports, and the improvement of the standard of living of the industrial workers in the participating countries. The powers of the high authority would be defined by a treaty to be ratified by the Parliaments of France, Germany, and any other nation becoming a member of this new association, and after those ratifications have been obtained the decisions of the high authority would be binding on all the participants in this enterprise. It would be the first step toward a federation of Europe; it might very well change the entire course of history for the old continent.

It is worth noting that such an organization would differ vastly from the cartels which have, from time to time, been formed to prevent competition within a given industry; first, because the new arrangements would be both public and subject to public control instead of being based on secret agreements. Second, because the proposed industrial union would be supervised by independent appointees, defending the interests of all, instead of being administered by the representatives of vested interests. Finally, because the objective of this project would be to ensure the merging of markets, the expansion of production and of competition in the international field, instead of exploiting exclusively national markets protected by restrictive practices.

These developments aim at the reinforcement of the Atlantic community because, internationally as well as nationally, the strength of a society rests on the vigor of its component parts. On one side of the ocean, there is the most powerful nation of our contemporary world, the United States of America; on the other side, we must recreate gradually a group of nations closely united and fully able to develop their immense potentialities. Only thus will we be in a position to build together a stronghold of peace.

I am happy to add, as a tribute to the policy followed by your Government and by your Congress, that the bold decisions now in the making could not have been taken without the help so generously given by the United States through the Marshall plan, enabling the countries of western Europe to rebuild their economic systems and renewing in them the confidence so indispensable to the planning of a better future. There can be no better proof of, nor more promising a reward for, the farsightedness of the policy of the United States toward her old and faithful allies of the Western World.

Less than 3 months ago, I was in France, and I can assure you that the wonderful contribution of the American people to the recovery of my country is deeply and fully appreciated by the hard-working French citizens. You may also be assured that the community of ideals shared by the founders of our two Republics remain intact, and that the youth of France has the same aspirations and the same enthusiasm which it has often been my privilege to see and admire in the youth of America.

Let me express the sincere wish that many of you, and I would like to say all of you, will visit Paris and France in the not-too-distant future, and that as many French students as possible will be able to come here to see with their own eyes the great achievements of the American people, so that the close and lasting friendship between the United States and France will not only endure, but become more and more a dear and living reality for our two nations.

Against Recognition of Red China

REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I hope that our Government will resist every effort that is being made to recognize the Chinese Communist government in the United Nations. On last Friday the Gallup poll reported that public sentiment is more than 2 to 1 against recognizing Red China. If we really want to contain communism here is a good place to start. Notwithstanding the report we have to date that both England and France are for recognition, let us take a different course and act in accordance with the sentiment of the people of this country.

As part of my remarks I include the following Gallup poll:

PUBLIC SENTIMENT MORE THAN 2 TO 1 AGAINST RECOGNIZING RED CHINA—VOTERS IN SURVEY LAND IDEA OF BIPARTISAN POLICY, BUT SAY WE DO NOT HAVE SUCH POLICY NOW

(By George Gallup, director, American Institute of Public Opinion)

PRINCETON, N. J., June 1.—Although Britain's Foreign Minister Ernest Bevin is urging that Red China be given a seat on the UN, American attitudes toward the Chinese Communist regime are just as hostile as ever.

The latest survey by the American Institute of Public Opinion finds, for instance, that diplomatic recognition of the Chinese Reds by the American Government is opposed by a vote of more than 2 to 1.

The question of the relationship of western democracies to the Chinese Communist regime is the basis of the current impasse in the United Nations. Refusal to seat the Red delegation has caused Russia to boycott the major functions of the UN, bringing much of its work to a standstill.

While Britain has been friendly to the Red regime, Washington has remained adamant in refusing to extend diplomatic recognition to the Peiping Government.

To determine whether American public sentiment had changed any toward the Chinese regime, the Institute put the question of recognition before a representative cross-section of the voting population after testing people's knowledge of developments in China.

It was found that approximately two voters out of every three (65 percent) had a correct idea of how China is governed. (All of the China mainland is governed by a Communist regime. The island of Formosa is governed by the Nationalists.)

The second question was: "Do you think the United States should recognize the new government in China—that is, do you think we should send an ambassador and have dealings with this government in China?"

The vote:	*Percent*
Favor recognition	16
Opposed	40
No opinion	9
Total	65
Not familiar with China situation	35
Grand total	100

A similar survey in November 1949 showed a ratio of 20 percent for recognition, 42 percent against.

VIEWS ON BIPARTISAN POLICY

The administration's China policy has been singled out for attack by a great many Republican leaders. They argue that we might have been able to prevent the fall of China into Communist hands if we had followed a different policy, and that if Republicans had been consulted by the administration in dealing with the problem of China the outcome might have been different.

Actually, some Republicans contend we have a bipartisan foreign policy in name only. They say that it consists mainly in inviting Republican leaders to approve policies that have already been determined upon by the administration.

So far as the general public is concerned, the term "bipartisan foreign policy" is little known. Only one voter in every four knows what the phrase means or refers to.

This "informed" group of voters say almost unanimously that a bipartisan foreign policy is a good idea, but most of them declare that we do not have such a policy now. Republicans, especially, claim that we do not.

Here are the findings in the Institute survey: "When you hear or read about the term 'bipartisan foreign policy,' what does that mean to you?"

	Percent
Generally correct answers	26
Don't know and incorrect	74

The term refers to joint determination by Republican and Democratic leaders of our actions and policies in dealing with other countries.

The 26 percent familiar with the term were asked: "Do you think it is a good idea or a poor idea to have a bipartisan foreign policy?"

The vote:

	Percent
Good idea	21
Fair or poor	3
Don't know	2
Total	26

"Would you say that we now have a bipartisan foreign policy, or not?"

Here is the over-all vote and the vote by parties:

	Republicans	Democrats	All voters
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
Yes; we do	10	9	9
No; we do not	21	9	14
Don't know	3	3	3
Subtotal	34	21	26
Not familiar with term	66	79	74
Total	100	100	100

United States Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1950

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, on May 23, the Honorable Alf M. Landon, of Kansas, delivered an impressive and informative address at the convocation of the College of Emporia in Emporia, Kans., on the subject, United States Foreign Policy.

Mr. Landon, as you know, is a former Governor of the State of Kansas, and was the candidate for the Presidency on the Republican ticket in 1936.

Mr. Landon has given a great deal of consideration and study to our international problems. His views on the United States foreign policy are worthy of the careful consideration of the Members of this House, as well as the public at large.

UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY

Before embarking on his nonpolitical excursion to the Northwest, President Truman told the American people that the international situation was improving. That remarkable statement followed close on the heels of General Bradley's words that the world crisis had worsened in the past few months.

The cold facts support General Bradley. For that reason I cannot succumb to the easy temptation to speak only what people may like to hear. If our great Nation is to survive we must face up to uncomfortable facts. The plain truth of the matter is that we are drifting toward disaster and unless we radically change our course we may soon find ourselves over an abyss.

The Soviet possession of the atomic bomb has completely altered our struggle for survival. Today our situation is extreme. Within the next few years it can become hopeless. Atomic scientist Harold C. Urey has warned that the next 2 years could—and probably will—see the atomic lead of the United States effectively wiped out.

Perhaps that ominous prediction inspired Secretary of State Acheson to set 1954 as essential completion date for the Atlantic pact military defenses.

If the Soviets attain atomic equality and retain their present overwhelming superiority on land and their comfortable margin of superiority in tactical air power they will be able to play with us like a cat with a mouse. The march of events for the past 5 years is making nonsense of most of the American plans to contain Soviet aggression.

Once the American people see our situation in proper perspective they can be depended on to deal with it effectively. In the race for survival it is later than we dare think.

We won World War II at tremendous cost, and lost the peace. The foundations of American security will be undermined in the months which lie ahead unless frank leadership requires our people to pay a still heavier price for their own survival.

I need not dwell long on the facts of Soviet aggression. Soviet leaders have made it quite clear that they seek the complete destruction of the non-Communist world. Whenever possible they have adhered to these aims in practice. Communist philosophy has always rejected all previous standards of international conduct. Trickery has been exalted to the number one principle in Soviet foreign affairs. To the Kremlin no real distinction exists between war and peace except in the emphasis placed on military or political and psychological pressures.

Since VJ-day the Soviet Union has conquered a greater empire than that won by Hitler and the Japanese at the height of their military aggression. The Soviet Union stands today as a more completely military state than Nazi Germany or ancient Sparta. Communist gains in Europe and Asia are as real as if they had been won in pitched battles against the West.

Nothing breeds success like success. The Soviets are becoming confident if not downright cocky. Malenkov, ranking man in the Politburo—possibly being groomed for Stalin's successor—reflected this attitude when he recently stated "With the victory of the Chinese people, the people's democracies of Europe and Asia together with the Soviet

socialist power embrace a population of approximately 800,000,000."

There is not one single action taken by the Soviet Union since the end of the war consistent with the aims of permanent peace.

In the face of this threat the policies adopted by our Government have been confused, faltering and invariable late. We have been slow to recognize the danger and slower in reacting to it. We have tried to preserve our peace by refusing to stand by our principles. One of the factors of the present crisis has been American indecision and vacillation in high places.

On the credit side the Administration belatedly rejected the trend of appeasement so much in vogue in Washington when Churchill made his electrifying speech at Fulton, Mo., in 1946. But meanwhile we have lost the great nation of China to our cause and we have not even begun to advance against the forces of tyranny.

Expansion engenders expansion. The frontiers of communism have been advancing while those of freedom have been receding. As the free world is being compressed into a smaller and smaller area by the malignant growth of communism, the number of choices open to us become fewer.

The appalling tragedy of the present situation stems, in part, from the reluctance of our leaders to make these choices because they believe them unpopular with the people. My trust in the character of the American people is greater than that. To save our skins the false sense of security—created by groundless official assurances must be dispelled.

Let us look at the record. Despite our tremendous efforts to restore peace and prosperity to a war-torn world the underlying tension created by Soviet aggression continues unabated. Despite our efforts to contain communism, the Soviet empire is relatively stronger today than at any time in the past. Despite our tardy efforts to restore our military strength the balance of military power is tipping toward the Kremlin. It will continue to do so unless we immediately mobilize our resources on a scale far beyond that contemplated by the administration.

The inadequacy of American foreign policy can be seen on any map. It was also revealed by the insolent Soviet action in shooting down the American plane in the Baltic with the loss of 10 American lives.

It is an ironic fact that the United States at the peak of her power stands almost at bay before the assaults of a nation inferior to us spiritually, politically, and industrially. The only fair way to judge a policy is by the results it obtains. The conduct of American policy since the end of the war is a tragic failure by this standard.

The primary weakness of our policy lies in the fact that it has never aimed at a clear cut, positive objective. It is absolutely essential to know where you're going in order to make any progress. The only aims ever announced for our policy have been those of containment and resistance. Except in a few areas, such as Greece, we have been on the political defensive. Even the Atlantic Pact, the most positive step undertaken by the administration, is essentially defensive in character. It is time to move forward, for if we continue to hold only to negative objectives we will lose even them.

In war whether hot or cold the side which stays permantly on the defensive will lose. Moreover, even our negative policy of containment has been applied inconsistently. I for one cannot view our loss of China as a triumph of American diplomacy. Whatever the true causes of this debacle may be the American position in the Far East has been weakened. The present rulers of China once described as agrarian reformers by State Department policymakers are tied to Moscow with a rod of iron. This defeat—one of the most far reaching in modern times—took place while our announced policy was to contain Communist aggression.

It is only fair to say, however, that things might be worse. Wallace and the appeasement he championed was given his walking papers. We have made the great decision to stop the retreat in Europe, and finally in Asia. But we have not yet taken the offensive, we have not yet seized the initiative. Moscow has called the main plays in world politics since 1945. I look forward to the day when decisions made in Washington will give the evil men in the Kremlin as many sleepless nights as their schemes have brought to millions of free men the world over.

This time of crisis calls for radical new decisions in our foreign policy. We need a brand of American leadership worthy of the name. The time we have to act in is very limited. It can be made to work for us if we strike out this moment on a new course. Unless we adopt a bold, new political program the Soviet Union will inevitably draw ahead.

We read the history of the Roman Empire today because their political leaders were more courageous and had greater vision than the leaders of Carthage.

Whether the future historians will write of our heroes and principles of freedom or of our national destruction depends on the type of leadership we receive during these crucial years before the Soviets can match our atomic stockpile

Political objectives must be down to earth if they are going to influence action. The Soviets have never been squeamish in setting forth their avowed policy. "One or the other must conquer" has been the motto of the Kremlin. Since it is obvious that none of our spiritual beliefs, none of the principles which have inspired our Nation since its foundation could survive the Communist conquest, the first objective of American foreign policy must be equally as bold, equally direct. In plain words, our primary objective must be the separation of the world-wide Communist Party from power.

I do not suggest the elimination of the Communist Party will solve all the ills of the world, but I do assert that a just peace is impossible as long as the Soviet Union is ruled by the Communist Party.

The only way to clear an area of rattlesnakes is to destroy their nests. The main nest of the Communists is in the Kremlin. As long as we continue to tackle communism only in places remote from the center, such as Greece or China or Iran, we can only gain indecisive results at the expense of great effort. We have poured millions of dollars into Greece yet we have not solved the problem of communism there. It is obvious to anyone that the Communist campaign to conquer Greece will be renewed whenever it suits the Communist purpose to resume operations toward the Dardanelles. Our air lift to save Berlin from Communist domination also cost hundreds of millions of dollars. Yet today Berlin is no more secure than when the Soviets again permitted us to send food overland into this beleaguered city.

Lacking a real objective the few victories we have won in the cold war have achieved limited results entirely out of proportion to their vast costs. The Soviets on the other hand have really lost nothing by these abortive forays.

I want to make it quite clear that our objective should be the destruction of the organism of the Communist Party and not the people it enslaves. Rather, we must declare all people who are laboring under the yoke of that monstrous tyranny to be our allies. The Russian people themselves must be encouraged to join us in the battle for freedom.

I submit that in the world of today we Americans are the real revolutionaries. Our wisest course is to push our revolutionary ideas of political and economic freedom under the rule of law to the farthest corner of the earth.

Just as our country could not exist half slave and half free, the world itself cannot endure divided as it is today. The time for making deals with Moscow has ended. Let those who say that a genuine peace can exist as long as the Communist leaders rule the Kremlin come forth and state the basis for their pipe dream.

Modern technology has made the world one. That peace can be established as long as a permanent political schism exists between east and west is out of the question. Let us be as courageous as the Communist and recognize the life and death nature of the struggle.

Once we establish the destruction of Communist power as our primary objective we can end the drift which still characterizes the conduct of our affairs. Practical political offensive campaigns can then be undertaken.

First, we must end our cowardly acquiescence to the status quo existing behind the iron curtain. We must publicly proclaim our sympathies with millions suffering from the iron heel of communism in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Hungary, Rumania, and the smaller countries of eastern Europe. We must hold open to them the hope of eventual liberation just as we did to the people of Europe when they were subjected to Nazi tyranny, and to the people of China and the Philippines when they lived under Japanese militarism. These people enslaved by Communism must be told that the dawn of liberty will follow their night.

That campaign is essential to all of our existing programs for unless the Soviets are forced to withdraw to their 1939 borders, there is no chance whatsoever of European recovery succeeding. The iron curtain stands as a barrier to the natural flow of trade between eastern and western Europe on which Europe's healthy economic life depends.

European recovery also requires European unity. Perhaps the most heartening omen on the entire world scene is the recent French offer to integrate their economy with that of Germany. Political and economic unity are inseparable and this concrete and enlightened action on the part of the French holds seeds of great promise. European unity has been one of the constructive aims of our foreign policy but one that has not been prosecuted with all the skill and influence we possess.

Much of our European aid program has been conducted like a vast international WPA. It has not furthered practical steps toward European unity. As the arsenal of democracy during World War II we properly insisted that our military equipment be used to gain the common objectives against the enemy. We are the arsenal of freedom in the cold war and in the interest of our European friends we must exercise our right to promote European unity with every ship filled with American goods or arms. I believe Europeans will welcome this type of leadership.

German unity must be one of our goals within the larger framework of a European order. Rather than trying to suppress this basic instinct of the German people we must encourage it.

The iron curtain cuts squarely across Germany. At Yalta the Soviets detached large areas from Germany as part of a clever, long-ranged political swindle. This maneuver, which has become increasingly obvious, is to hold out the bait of these stolen territories as inducement for German unity within the Communist orbit. We must defeat this scheme. Germany is a vital member of the

West and must become unified as a western nation and not as a Communist satellite. The unification of Germany as a member of the Atlantic community will crack the iron curtain at its weakest point. It will do more than any other single thing to destroy the base of Communist power.

Our natural preoccupation with Europe must not make us forget the vast problems of Asia. We have a policy for China—announced over 50 years ago by Secretary of State John Hay—the open-door policy. That policy was our guide in World War II, when much of China was overrun by the Japanese, and must continue to be ours during the cold war, when all of China has been enslaved by the Communist puppets of Moscow.

Nor can we forget Japan. Under present policies Japan will be supported by an American dole for generations to come. A program must be found to harness the skill and industry of the Japanese people so that they can support themselves and contribute to the mutual well-being of the millions of people in Asia and the Oceanic Islands.

Each specific step I have advocated is a positive part of the over-all offensive to destroy the Communist power. Success achieved on any front will help crack the iron curtain and force the Communist power to disgorge its conquests. We cannot allow the Communists time to consolidate their gains to prepare new springboards for further advances. Nor can we suffer the world-wide appendages of the Kremlin—the Communist Parties of France, of Italy, of Japan, of Latin-America, and even of the United States—to sabotage our offensive. We must cut the spinal cord of these fifth columns by severing their connection with Moscow. We must initiate a world-wide campaign to smash the apparatus by which the professional agents of Moscow sow the seeds of treason and disunity through the camp of the free world.

Let us not permit necessity for this essential campaign to be obscured by false cries for civil liberty, by maudlin totalitarian liberals. Treason is not one of the civil liberties defined by our Constitution. I can see no harm in any native Communist Party, but only the greatest peril in Moscow-directed fifth columns.

The United Nations must become our battleground for freedom. When the aims of the Charter of the United Nations are realized the cold war will be ended. When the aims of the United Nations are practiced in eastern Europe the iron curtain will melt away. The United Nations is a ready-made instrument through which the free peoples of the world can press their offensive for peace and survival.

Perhaps the Soviet Union will not choose to remain in a revitalized United Nations. Today their participation in the United Nations is extremely limited. Of the 34 separate bodies, commissions, or agencies of the United Nations the Soviet Union has never joined or is boycotting 22. We can no longer permit Soviet obstructionism to block the real work the UN can accomplish.

I realize that the measures I advocate to you today are far in advance of those officially sponsored by the administration, but the crisis we face will not be solved either by halfway policies or procrastination.

A freedom offensive does not imply war. There are many means at our disposal to force back the frontiers of communism short of war. We have great power and joined with our friends we must use this power to destroy tyranny.

The dangers of a strong policy are infinitely less than those of a weak one. Suppose, for example, we remain on the political defensive and continue to spend $20,000,000,000 annually in national defense and foreign aid? Twenty years from now, after spending four hundred billions on a fruitless policy, we will be worse off than we are today—and the Soviet Union will be immeasurably stronger.

A unified command under the Atlantic Pact means little unless the democracies of western Europe are prepared to back it up with the integration of their economics as well as military measures. There is, of course, the risk that an offensive policy will provide the men in the Kremlin to strike before their base system is utterly destroyed by the forces of freedom. This risk we must courageously accept as the lesser of two evils.

There is a stronger chance that an accelerated offensive policy will generate sufficient power for the western democracies to prevent world war III. Consequently, I can see no better path toward peace than to energetically push forward the frontiers of freedom. The shackles of tyranny will be our fate if we blindly refuse to make this choice in time.

The time is now.

Fifty-fifth Anniversary of Jewish War Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OWEN BREWSTER
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 7, 1950

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, recently the Jewish War Veterans of the United States celebrated their fifty-fifth anniversary at a dinner in New York, at which occasion they honored Mr. Louis B. Mayer, one of America's great civic leaders, by awarding him the gold medal of merit in recognition of his distinguished service in behalf of world understanding of America and the American way of life. I was present at the dinner and noted the enthusiasm with which Mr. Mayer's address was received by a large audience of distinguished Americans, and I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Louis B. Mayer's address inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Your Eminence Cardinal Spellman, Mr. Toastmaster, Mr. National Commander, distinguished guests, officers and men of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States, ladies and gentlemen, to say that I am deeply touched is entirely inadequate to express what is in my heart. I have been most fortunate in having been honored before. But never have I experienced such depth of emotion as in this moment. I shall treasure it always, be inspired to be worthy of this trust, that I may truly live in the reflection of the high American ideals you cherish.

General Klein, a veteran of two wars, has been generous with his praise. I have known this dynamic man for many years. I have learned to admire him for his devotion to his country and his untiring efforts to the cause of the Jewish War Veterans.

He was a combat soldier in the recent war. He earned his promotions and medals on the field of battle from General Douglas MacArthur, one of the world's greatest soldier-statesmen.

I am proud to call Julius Klein my friend.

Eric Johnston, the brilliant head of our motion picture industry, has been very kind in his remarks. I know he shares the gratitude that overwhelms me; that these men and women, representing true greatness in the church, statesmanship, education, the military, all fields of endeavor, of all faiths and creeds, are gathered here for this occasion. And I cannot help but wonder what the foes of our democracy would say if they could look upon this banquet, in one of the world's most magnificent hotels—owned by a man who started as a bellboy—and honoring a son of immigrant parents.

Where else on this earth, except in a nation of free people, could this happen?

His Eminence Cardinal Spellman is not only a great churchman, but one of the kindliest men I have ever known. His friendship is a priceless gift. Your presence here this evening, Your Eminence, is an inspiration.

I have always felt that being an American is a privilege. If I have served my country in any measure, I am grateful, indeed, for the opportunity to have done so. But whatever contribution of citizenship I may have accomplished could only be very small before the towering patriotism and sacrifice symbolized here this evening by these fine men who fought the fight of freedom on the battlefronts of our wars.

The badge of Americanism you have pinned upon me is more precious than any honor I have ever known. I am sure I shall achieve none greater. It is an emblem not lightly worn. I pray that I may wear it well. For these are times of challenge. The freedoms for which you, your fathers, grandfathers, yes, and great-grandfathers, fought are periled.

Yes; I meant great-grandfathers. They were the early Jewish immigrants who founded your organization. They fought in the Civil War, 10,000 of them, 7 winning the Congressional Medal of Honor.

They had come from despotic nations in Europe, and for them the freedoms of America had a very special meaning. Their experiences in countries from which they had fled made this a sweet land of liberty, indeed. They needed no warning against complacent acceptance of the rights and human dignity enjoyed under our democracy. They knew they were worth fighting for.

More than 50 years ago they founded the Jewish War Veterans organization, these refugees from European tyranny, as a symbol of the readiness of Americans of their faith to defend with their lives the doctrines of spiritual, political, and social freedom upon which our Nation was conceived.

They wanted, too, to see the ideals for which they had fought, preserved, and handed down to generations to come, that there might be carried forward in peace the unity of brotherhood they had enjoyed in time of their Nation's need.

How proud they would be if they could behold these sons of their sons who are gathered here tonight, and who have served so well in the fulfillment of this heritage of patriotic devotion.

And long before these founders of your fine organization, there were others who had borne arms for freedom. They were with DeKalb and Pulaski in 1776, at Brandywine and Valley Forge. They shed their blood with their Christian comrades, that this Nation of freemen might be born. They fought on the high seas in 1812, joined Sam Houston at the Alamo, and charged San Juan Hill with Roosevelt's Rough Riders. They were there not because they were Jews. But because they were Americans.

Those not fortunate enough to reach our friendly shores remained behind to defy the brutality of dictatorships and to eventually set up their own independent and sovereign state. Those brave men transformed a dismal desert into a living paradise and they are even now establishing a close kinship between our democracy—the oldest in existence—and the state of Israel—the youngest.

America has always paid tribute to the oppressed who by their own initiative and gallantry gained their independence and because we are pioneers, we acclaim the pioneers of Israel.

Today the Jewish war veterans carry on the tradition of their founding fathers. Again they stand ready to defend, at any cost, this heritage of freedom—to repel those forces who would change our system of government, and substitute, in it place, a philosophy opposed to every human dignity and liberty we enjoy.

You cannot believe in God and be a Communist—because communism is synonymous with atheism. You cannot be a Communist and call yourself an American—because communism calls for the overthrow of that which is the envy of the world—and that is America.

The Jewish war veterans—most of whom are also members of the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars. Disabled American Veterans, and other patriotic organizations—are committed to wage a total effort against these influences in America, and to here present a solid front against those who would undermine our national security through racial, religious, and social tensions.

Russia makes much capital on the exploited myth of discrimination and prejudice against minority groups in America. But I am quite certain there could exist no organization behind the iron curtain that even remotely resembles the Jewish War Veterans. Here in its membership we find employer and worker; manufacturer and union craftsman, Republican and Democrat, united with a singleness of thought and deed.

This they would take away from you. Oh, the American way of life. It is soft, decadent, capitalistic, greedy.

Well, if they have something better to offer, why don't they let us see it? In fact, if they had something just as good, they would have no trouble selling it to their own people. We know, however, that they have failed there too, for the existence of a secret police, is proof enough their own people want no part of their so-called paradise.

I always understood successful merchandising depends upon how attractively you display your wares to the customer. Now, if what Russia wants us to buy is so new and wonderful, so much better than anything we have now, why doesn't she raise the curtain and let us see this superior brand?

"America is rich only for the rich," they shout. Certainly, America is rich. We only pray she may continue to so prosper.

But is America only for the rich?

There are in the United States today, I am told, some 50,000,000 automobiles. Are they being driven only by the wealthy?

Across the vast breadth of our land are spread great communities. Here in these homes swell the heart of America. Its family life. More than 40,000,000 of them. Forty million privately owned homes. I wonder, are they all millionaires?

In our colleges, the institutions of high education, are 2,500,000 students, American boys and girls, studying to be scientists, clergymen, teachers, doctors, engineers, lawyers, merchants. Are they only from well-to-do families?

Savings accounts, I am told, have reached an all-time high, some two hundred and twenty billion—in bank deposits, Government bonds, savings and loan associations.

Is this exclusively the hoardings of capitalistic giants?

No, my friends, the savings of the American worker.

And further, they have another $100,000,000,000 in insurance policies and pension reserves.

Yes, if I were Joe Stalin I think I'd keep the iron curtain closed, too.

Several years ago, I recall, Russia pounced upon some newsreels showing an unfortunate incident in Detroit. They exploited it frantically to show the people under Communist domination what a terrible place America was. But the whole effect of propaganda was lost when the Russian audience discovered that everybody in the newsreel was wearing shoes. They couldn't believe their eyes. People flocked to see the film, not for the riots, but to see how even all Americans had shoes to wear. They yanked the film. But fast.

Small wonder that American motion pictures are barred from Russia. They don't dare let their people see them. How could the commissars of propaganda explain the thousands of workers' automobiles outside our factories, or the homes of our workers, the smiling faces, the happy children, the clothes, the abundant food, the many commonplace evidences of prosperity and happiness being enjoyed under the American way of life?

The American motion picture has much to be proud of in its record of achievements. It reflects the fundamental concepts of the democratic freedom that gave it birth. It could have flourished only under our system of free enterprise. If I have been able to render a patriotic service, as you have honored me tonight, it is because I have been privileged to be a part of an industry dedicated to these American ideals.

Today, as our Nation engages in an unselfish struggle for world peace, the motion-picture industry stands ready, as always, to serve. As veterans, I am sure you know how important our films were in the factor of morale and training during the war.

Motion pictures went with you, brought a reminder of home to you, in the training camps, front lines, tents, caves, ships, any place a projector could be set up. And motion-picture personalities came to you in person, too. To Africa, France, England, into the jungles of New Guinea, that bit of entertainment might be yours for an hour or two, that you might see a familiar face and hear a familiar voice.

Some 4,000 film personalities and entertainers served in this fox-hole circuit, organized by the Hollywood Victory Committee. They made nearly 50,000 personal appearances, traveled 4,000,000 miles by ship, plane, jeep, and foot to reach you. Besides that, they have made 20,000 appearances at hospitals in this country to visit your comrades.

We gave our films, thousands of prints, that our fighting men might be entertained.

There were training films for the Armed Forces, documentary films for home and foreign consumption, for war effort incentive, to fortify the determination for victory, to strengthen the ties with our allies.

And most important of all was the contribution of thousands of our men and women of the motion-picture industry who served so gallantly in all branches of the Armed Forces.

The spirit of Americanism with which the motion-picture industry pledged its efforts to help win the war continues today in like contributions toward winning the peace. Such fine films as Thirty Seconds Over Tokyo, Bataan, Wake Island, Joe Smith—American, They Were Expendable, and The Story of Dr. Wassell have been followed by such pictures as Battleground, Command Decision, Iwo Jima, Task Force, and Twelve O'Clock High in rededication of America's will to live in a world of peace.

I don't blame Stalin for not showing our pictures in Russia. He couldn't hold a population of 180,000,000 in enslavement without keeping them in ignorance of conditions in America. The curtain of darkness was dropped not only to shield our eyes from the truth about Russia, but to hide from Russian eyes the truth about America. When the day comes, and that day must surely come, that the light of truth penetrates that curtain, Mr. Stalin will have his hands very full indeed.

Truth, my friends, is the most powerful weapon on earth. Thank God, we have it on our side.

The Communists say we are not perfect. We're not. Nothing is, this side of Heaven. But show me any country that can anywhere match our record of accomplishment for improvement of living and working standards, certainly the highest in the world; the great strides we have made in wiping out poverty, increasing the opportunities under free enterprise, advancements in education, health, welfare, all the things that contribute to the happiness, well-being, and independence of the individual.

Show me something better than this, Mr. Stalin, and I'll become your No. 1 Communist.

By nature we are a kind people, gentle, peace loving. We fight wars, but only when we have to. We are anything but militaristic. We have never had any aspirations of conquest. We gave Cuba her freedom as she was able to enjoy her independence. We did the same with the Philippines. We have never wanted anything from anybody. We want nothing now. Most of all, we don't want anything from Russia. We don't even want to change her ideology. If she wants communism, that's perfectly all right with me. But why should she want us to change our way of life, and to embrace a philosophy completely opposed to everything we hold so dear?

The natural complacency of the American people is often mistaken. Some years ago I was concerned over the apathy of our people toward voting. I complained about it to my dear friend, William Randolph Hearst, told him that the people weren't paying enough attention to the best interests of their country.

Mr. Hearst replied, "Son, let me tell you what I have discovered through the years. I admit there are periods in which our people coast along, cease to think, enjoy happy times. Then something very important happens, and they begin to think, and when they begin to think, Louis, don't worry; they always think it through."

I hope, I pray, we will not need another Pearl Harbor to arouse us to think. We have been hearing of a cold war so long it is now an accepted condition. Our Secretary of State talks of total diplomacy. Our military leaders warn there is no defense except the power and ability to overwhelm and destroy our enemy. Some say we can lose the next war without firing a shot. Our atom bomb is small comfort now. Yet we keep our doors wide open. Russians come and go pretty much as they please. They are entirely free to do anything in this country you and I can do, with the single exception of voting.

But my real quarrel is with those who call themselves American Communists. They're not Russian Communists.

Oh, no. These are different. They are Americans. American Communists. A very special brand. A rose by any other name, the poets say, smells just as sweet. But all Communists have the same odor to me, regardless of label.

If communism creates such a paradise in Russia, I just can't understand why these crackpots stay here. Why don't they go to this paradise of communism and enjoy all the happiness to be found there, and just leave us here to suffer in our misery?

Surely we need no further evidence than the happenings of the past year to convince us that the danger is very real. Our well of freedom has been contaminated.

We cannot and must not shut our eyes to the fact that there are subversive elements in our country. But we must also bear in mind that we live in a democracy where the law takes its natural and democratic course.

I am certain the Federal Bureau of Investigation under the able leadership of J. Edgar Hoover, is well able to ferret them out—the Department of Justice under the guidance of Attorney General J. Howard McGrath is well able to prosecute them and our courts can be depended upon to mete out justice.

Some of our complacent friends assure us that nothing really serious is going to happen, that the world is just experiencing growing pains, another way of saying a bloodless revolution, and that out of it will emerge philosophies of liberal thought, but far from communism. Just don't worry. Everything will be all right. Don't be old-fashioned. Don't be a reactionary.

Socialism is said to be far short of communism. Socialism? They tried it in Australia and New Zealand. Socialism was won by an overwhelming vote and then lost by an overwhelming vote. You are aware of the results of the recent elections in England, results which indicate that socialism is not well thought of as it used to be. As a former Canadian I have always held the British nation in great respect, a Rock of Gibraltar among the great nations of the world. Certainly, there are no more courageous and sacrificing people on earth. But as that fine American, Al Smith, would say, "Let us look at the record." I am afraid the record of this experiment in socialism is not a happy one.

After World War I, England not only recovered from her economic wounds, but managed to also help some of her sister nations to get back on their feet as well. But today under her socialistic regime, the record shows a far different story. Why?

Little Holland, Belgium, even Finland with her problem of geographic location, are rapidly regaining their economic footing. But mighty Britain is not. It is certainly not for us to say how England should or should not govern herself. That is for the people of England to say for themselves. The spirit of the English people is unconquerable. The Battle of Britain proves that. The recent elections are very significant. What Mr. Hearst said about American people applies to all people who are free to think.

No, socialism is no longer an experiment. Destroy the incentive of a man and you destroy his productivity. Destroy his productivity and you destroy the nation.

America, my friends, has become the custodian of freedom, human dignity, economic security. It must remain so, at any cost. We must be strong, prepared, that no nation may dare attack. And, as long as we stand for ideals based upon the Ten Commandments, we have nothing to fear. God was with us when we fought against dictators. He will be with us in any war against pagan aggression.

Never, in all civilization, has the world so needed God as now. Far too many of us, I am afraid, have taken him for granted, perhaps forsaken his paths of righteousness. But today, in the face of the perils that confront us, there is a great rush back to God, in the churches, tabernacles, synagogues, seeking the guidance that only He can give to us, to lighten our hearts, to give us hope, and strength for the road ahead.

We must have faith, my friends. It is our greatest armor, our mightiest sword. Faith to believe in our fellowman, in our country, and in our God.

Our battles are not yet won. The freedom for which you so gallantly fought is endangered. I charge you, veterans of our wars, with maintaining this freedom, that our rich heritage shall not perish; that the blood of your comrades shall not have been shed in vain. God grant you will continue to be vigilant; that our torch of liberty may be held even higher, and shine even brighter in the hearts of free men in the world of peace.

I thank you.

Commencement Address by David E. Finley at University of South Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 7, 1950

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the Honorable David E. Finley, director of the National Gallery of Art, at the commencement exercises at the University of South Carolina, on June 5, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I feel greatly honored that my own university should wish to confer an honorary degree upon me and should ask me to address this graduating class. No honor means so much to us as the approval of our own people, and though I have lived outside the State for 40 years, South Carolina is still home to me, as it is to all loyal South Carolinians, and all South Carolinians that I have ever known or wish to know are loyal.

"Home," says T. S. Eliot, "is where one starts from." And he adds, rather disconcertingly: "As we get older the world becomes stranger, the pattern more complicated of dead and living." And so, as I look around me today and see not only the members of the graduating class of 1950 but also many of those who graduated with me in the class of 1910, I cannot avoid contrasting the outlook on life which we had 40 years ago with that which you have today, as you try to make plans for the good life that you hope to enjoy in the years ahead.

My own generation has been a transition one, during which we seem to have passed from a world of more or less stable values and fixed standards of morals and behavior, both personal and international, into a world where nothing appears to be stable and the old sense of security has disappeared.

When I was at this university from 1906 to 1910, men thought they could predict with some degree of certainty what would be the conditions of life for themselves and their children within, at least, the foreseeable future. But now no intelligent man or woman can feel a complete sense of security about many of the things most vital to us which we formerly took for granted—I mean fundamental things, such as life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Nor do I mean to infer that the only threat to our liberties arises from totalitarian governments, real and menacing as that threat most certainly is. We also carry the seeds of destruction within ourselves, when we show a willingness to abdicate our standards of morality or to regiment ourselves so that the individual becomes merged in the mass, as there has been a tendency to do in recent years, even in this fortunate country of ours.

The dangers to our way of life that confront us today did not arise suddenly nor are they primarily the results of the two World Wars through which we have passed, devastating as those wars have been. It is true that these wars brought about a demoralization of Europe and a dislocation of economic relationships throughout that vast continent and its tributaries in Asia and Africa, so that in Europe a vacuum in power has been created, with the centers of power shifting to America and Russia. Furthermore, as a result of the unprecedented increase in population in Europe during the last 150 years, the abundance of things that were available during the nineteenth century to satisfy Europe's material wants has disappeared, giving rise to great uncertainty as to the future until new trade routes and other national alignments shall have become established. All of this, because of our close affinity with Europe, has posed problems for us in America, which are neither easy of solution nor can they be brushed aside, as we were able to do in the happier and more carefree days before 1914, when England kept the world more or less stabilized.

In all the welter and confusion, however, we must not lose sight of the fact that even if the two World Wars had never happened and the new alinements I speak of had come gradually and less painfully we would still face problems of the greatest magnitude in adjusting ourselves to changes in our way of life that have been forced upon us as a result of inventions and discoveries during the first half of the twentieth century. Our mode of living has been almost completely changed within the lifetime of many of those here present by new means of transportation, such as motorcars and airplanes; new methods of communication, such as the radio, television, and the movies; and a system of Nation-wide production and distribution that has reached unprecedented development in this country in the last 50 years. On top of these and other inventions and discoveries which have so altered the manner and tempo of our daily lives, we, like Europe, have had the stress and dislocations of two World Wars from which we have emerged triumphant but shaken both in body and spirit.

These are serious problems, but we know they are capable of solution if faced with courage and intelligence, as I am sure they will be, not only by my generation but by you, the coming generation, as you take over your responsibilities for the welfare and safety of this great country of ours.

Such problems would be difficult of solution at any time and under the most ideal conditions of peace and order in the world at large. But they are made far more difficult by reason of the fact that we must at the same time face and overcome, or at least neutralize, the greatest threat to our freedom and security that has arisen since western Christendom was saved from the Asiatic hordes on the plains of Vienna in 1683. The concept of the free state versus the police state, with all that is implied in the survival of our religious, cultural, and political freedom, is now at issue; and a decision is being forced upon us by powerful and ruthless men who would destroy our way of life if they could. It is the old conflict between Athens and Sparta—does the state exist for the individual or the individual for the state?

Our great American experiment is one of freedom with diversity, and it has produced a system of government and society that does not allow men to be forced into a uniform pattern or to be told what to think and what to create on the intellectual and spiritual level. So long as that system is preserved intact, we shall be safe. And while it is necessary to be on our guard against the infiltration of totalitarian doctrines, there is no reason to fear that such an alien and materialistic philosophy will ever become established here.

In a great and powerful country, with a Christian civilization such as ours, the kind of doctrines to which I have just referred could be imposed only by force, as is now being done in some of the oldest and proudest nations of eastern Europe, such as Czechoslovakia, where the traditions of civil and religious liberty are as old and revered as in our own country. America has always been able to defend herself from outside enemies; and no one who knows the strength

and vast resources of this country need fear for her ultimate safety or her ability to repel any attempt to impose an alien rule on us by force. Self-defense may be costly, but freedom is worth any price and your generation, no less than my own, does not need to be convinced of that fact. A strong nation, equipped to defend itself and aware of dangers that threaten it, is less likely to be attacked than one living in a fool's paradise, as we have come to realize after the bitter experience of two long and costly World Wars.

These dangers that I have spoken of are largely physical dangers and they can be met and overcome by physical means, if such means are employed with courage and energy. But there are other dangers more insidious and, in the end, more devastating against which courage and energy alone will not prevail. Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty and nothing can save us from eventually losing that liberty if ignorance and apathy should become national characteristics. If we are to be saved, a high degree of intelligence is needed and an informed public opinion, based upon an understanding of the facts. For, in a modern democracy such as ours, the final decision must be made by the average man, who in the mass constitutes the ruling power and who, in the end, must pay the price for wrong decisions.

And yet, today the average man is forced to make decisions about the most complicated questions of government, economics, sociology, and international relations, as to which he cannot properly inform himself without a clearer understanding of cause and effect than is possible under our present system of education. The tragedy of our times is that our progress in the conquest of matter has far outstripped our moral development. We have eaten of the tree of knowledge, of good and evil, and are only too aware of our moral deficiencies which have been brought into sharper focus by the startling inventions and discoveries of recent years. As a result, we find ourselves involved in one of the great crises in history, when humanity is seeking new paths through the dangers and the potential blessings of the atomic age—an age when man has discovered new forces with unlimited possibilities for good and evil, but distrusts his capacity, as did the original Adam, to control them.

More than 25 years ago, the well-known Spanish philosopher, José Ortega y Gasset, told us: "Our age is characterized by the strange presumption that it is 'superior' to all past time; more than that, by its leaving out of consideration all that is past, by recognizing no classical or normative epochs, by looking on itself as a new life superior to all previous forms and irreducible to them. We live at a time when a man believes himself fabulously capable of creation, but he does not know what to create. Lord of all things, he is not lord of himself. He feels lost amid his own abundance. With more means at his disposal, more knowledge, more technique than ever, it turns out that the world today goes the same way as the worst of worlds that have been; it simply drifts." "Hence," says Ortega y Gasset, "the strange combination of a sense of power and a sense of insecurity which has taken up its abode in the soul of modern man."

The Spanish philosopher has diagnosed our disease. But neither he nor anyone else has yet offered us a cure. And, indeed, there is no quick and easy cure, for the disease that afflicts us is deep-seated and will take a long time and great patience to eradicate. We are suffering from an incapacity to deal with the problems of our own lives and to find some solution for those problems as they affect us both in the mass and as individuals. Our incapacity is due in part to inertia, but in a much greater degree to ignorance on our part as to the cause and effect of the forces we must control; and that ignorance is due to lack of education on the moral and intellectual, rather than the technical, level.

We are far from ignorant in technical matters. In fact, the world has never seen a great nations, such as ours, so proficient and so highly organized on the technical level. We are the envy of the whole world in that respect. The American know-how, as it is called, is the goal toward which men are striving in England no less than in the remote and backward corners of Asia and Africa. Throughout the world there is a profound respect for the man who knows, especially in pure and applied science and in technological matters. In our own country we have elevated the specialist to a position in the community which, as a rule, he is not qualified to fill. Because he knows a great deal about his own special subject, we expect him to speak with authority in other fields, in which he may be quite as ignorant as ourselves.

The fault is largely in our system of education. The trend in recent years in this country has been to emphasize technological or vocational training, especially in the sciences, with the result that man is becoming specialized, knowing only his own subject. On all other subjects his critical faculties are becoming dulled and he is being conditioned to depend for cultural nourishment on the movies, the popular magazines, television, and all the other means of mass communication. Insofar as young people are concerned, their taste in their early years is being largely formed by what they see and hear at the movies or over the radio or read in the comic books, as they are called.

Even a subject so important to sound citizenship as American history is given a minor place in our educational system. A Nationwide study by the New York Times has disclosed that at present only a little more than a third of our institutions of higher learning make United States history a required course for all undergraduates, while less than one-third of our colleges ask a year of American history as a requirement for admission. The gravity of the situation is recognized by most educators, and conditions, I am happy to say, are improving but very slowly.

The same situation exists in the field of the arts. Comparatively few colleges and universities have adequate courses in art or the history of art and still consider these subjects of minor importance as compared, for instance, with science. Fortunately we have in all parts of this country museums which are in a position to contribute to the education as well as the pleasure of the American people. There are great museums in many of our larger cities, as well as the National Gallery in Washington, which are equipped to offer you an opportunity to become familiar with many of the greatest works in the field of art. Likewise in Columbia you have a newly established museum which, with your art department in this university, can make a valuable contribution toward equipping you to enjoy many of the best things that life can offer you.

You must, after all, live the whole of your own life in your own company, so be sure that you have within yourself resources that will save you from too much boredom. Art and literature offer you, at the very least, an escape from the boredom of modern life, when our daily lives must so largely conform to the routine of the machine age and to the established patterns of mass production and distribution, even in the field of entertainment.

You and others like you, who are receiving degrees from colleges and universities throughout this country, comprise in many respects the elite of our modern democratic civilization. You are at least equipped with a knowledge of certain facts and have had an opportunity to learn to think, which is an achievement of the greatest magnitude and, if acquired, will prove invaluable to you in the years to come. But I am sure that in your case, as in my own when I graduated from this university 40 years ago, there is a clear realization of the fact that your real education has just begun and that you must now learn how to achieve the aims you have set for yourselves in life.

No one has stated this more clearly than that great thinker and teacher, Dr. Werner Jaeger, who tells us: "Education is not the cultivation of certain abilities; it is not the communication of certain branches of knowledge, at least all that is significant only as a means and a stage in the process of education. The real essence of education is that it enables men to reach the true aim of their lives. This effort cannot be restricted to the few years of what is called higher education. Either it takes a whole lifetime to reach its aim, or its aim can never be reached."

What Dr. Jaeger has said of the individual is true also of the whole body of citizens in a self-governing society, such as ours. The central problem of our lives today is the same that other civilizations have faced and failed to solve in the past. How can we educate the whole people to govern themselves in relation to each other and to the world at large? The age-old question asked by Socrates still waits for an answer: "Is education (in more than a technical sense) really possible?"

Somehow we must answer that question in the affirmative, if America is to avoid the fate of the Greek city-state. For America, though continental in extent, has now become a city-state in the sense that all the people comprise one community, interdependent on each other and equipped with a system of communication that keeps us informed of current happenings and ideas to an extent not possible even in Athens in the centuries preceding her fall.

The Greeks were well aware that education was necessary for a self-governing society. They recognized, too, the importance of medicine for its social and cultural values, though they were more concerned with the maintenance of health than the treatment of disease. Demosthenes did his best to reeducate the Athenian democracy before it was too late. But, in the end, after the heroic and successful fight against the Persians, the city-state passed away, due largely to the inability of the average man and woman to understand and live up to their former greatness. They were faced with the grim necessity not only to fight Philip and his Macedonians but to obtain, by self-education, a world outlook which would equip them to deal with world issues and so to preserve the great civilization which they and their ancestors had created. Greece failed to obtain that outlook and as a world force disappeared, though Hellenism lived on, dispersed throughout the world, to become later a vitalizing element in the western civilization of which we are a part.

We, in America, are the heirs of the Mediterranean world; and to Israel and Greece and Rome, as later to England and France, we owe much that is best in our culture and our ideas of freedom. But we are not only a religious and idealistic people; we are also a very practical one. And so we must find an answer to the challenge America faces today: How shall we preserve our liberty and our idealism in a world that is fast becoming regimented and apparently concerned mostly with materialistic ends?

If we can succeed in saving ourselves and our own civilization, we shall no doubt achieve even greater things. Indeed, the impact of ideas from America and western Europe upon Russia may eventually transform the outlook of that vast country, with its large and vigorous population, as Greek humanism transformed Rome and, merging with the Christian concept of life, gave us our western civilization.

That is the challenge and the opportunity that is offered to you in the last half of the twentieth century. You have the possibility of seeing the world as it will be 40 or 50 years from now. It may be a world in which

atomic energy has been reduced to a humble and useful role in serving humanity, as electricity does today. It may also be a world in which wars and the threat of annihilation are things of the past, because your generation faced these dangers with courage and intelligence and so found a way out of the spiritual morass in which we now seem to be floundering.

I believe that you will find the answer to some and, perhaps, all of these problems and for that reason I rather envy you in graduating today. For, I feel certain that, whether you know it or not, you have a glorious past still ahead of you.

Hydroelectric Development in New England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 7, 1950

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The $64 Question," published in the Boston (Mass.) Record of May 24, 1950, and an editorial entitled "Out in Cold," published in the Boston (Mass.) American of May 25, 1950, relating to river development in New England.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Boston (Mass.) Record of May 24, 1950]

THE $64 QUESTION

President Truman has in effect reminded members of the New England congressional delegation that they got almost nothing for their own communities in the recently-enacted $1,720,000,000 rivers and harbors bill although they have saddled their communities with the expense of dams, power plants, and other improvements for the South, West, and Middle West.

And in this instance Mr. Truman is entirely right.

With the exception of the survey of the Merrimack and Connecticut Rivers, which Senator LODGE demanded and almost did not receive, New England is literally left out in the cold. Not a cent to save cities like Lawrence, Lowell, and Manchester with their woefully obsolete and inadequate power installations. Not a cent for Passamaquoddy, the biggest and most valuable tidal power site in the world. Not a cent for Enfield Rapids on the Connecticut line, which the Army engineers have called "one of the Nation's finest and most desirable power sources."

There still is time for our Senators and Congressmen to exert themselves in behalf of their constituents and to bring home the hydroelectric power "bacon."

But will they risk antagonizing the selfish interests which have blocked the development of New England rivers for a full generation?

That's the $64 question.

[From the Boston (Mass.) American of May 25, 1950]

OUT IN COLD

Senator LODGE, a Republican, has the distinction of being the only member of the New England congressional delegation to score in the recently enacted $1,720,000,000 rivers and harbors bill.

He persuaded the Democratically controlled Congress to authorize a survey of the hydroelectric potentialities of the Connecticut and Merrimack Rivers and their tributaries.

The other New England Senators and Congressmen got nothing, probably because most of them asked for nothing.

This obviously angered President Truman, and he registered his indignation this week in a stinging message to the House of Representatives, in which he deplored the fact that New England was left out in the cold and implied that the Democrats from the area, who had repeatedly recorded themselves as favoring the development of water-power resources, had taken a political powder when southerners, westerners, and midwesterners were getting multi-million-dollar appropriations for their constituents.

Of course, the present session of Congress has several weeks to go, and the New England Democrats, irked by Senator LODGE'S victory, may exert themselves before they come home to start their reelection fights.

But the odds are against their accomplishing anything worth while.

The South, West, and Midwest already have the hydroelectric gravy, and New England, as usual, is allowed to foot the bill.

Louis Johnson: Bulldog of United States Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 22, 1950

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include an interesting article on our Secretary of Defense, Louis Johnson, written by the well-known Washington reporter Tris Coffin, and appearing in the June 1950 Coronet magazine:

LOUIS JOHNSON: BULLDOG OF UNITED STATES DEFENSE—HIS IS THE UNENVIABLE JOB OF SAFEGUARDING AMERICA AGAINST A SUDDEN ENEMY ATTACK

(By Tris Coffin)

United States Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson, a big, restless American with enough vitality and endurance for a dozen men, has finally landed the job he sought for years. The job is to make sure you and I are not destroyed in a sudden attack by an enemy equipped with the hideous weapons that modern science has produced.

As a result, Johnson is the second most powerful man in Washington, a top architect of Allied policy, and an administrator described by Herbert Hoover as the best in the Truman administration.

However, the Gridiron Club, famed group of newspapermen in Washington, recently described Johnson's work in a parody of the popular song, A Wonderful Guy: "All by by myself I am the whole Army; I'm the Navy and Air Force, too. I nod my head and the Congress plays dead, and now I have the White House in view."

The Secretary, who is called Louie or Colonel Johnson by friends, is tall and well-built, has eyes that look out shrewdly and directly, and a voice which is surprisingly soft. Like an old-time Army top sergeant, he sums up men and events swiftly, and makes blunt decisions.

Such traits are not recently acquired; all his life Johnson has led the fight himself, rather than give orders from the side lines. As corporation lawyer, American Legion politician, Assistant Secretary of War, and Democratic Party fund raiser, the present chief of United States defenses has thrived on hard work and conflict.

Today in Washington, the world capital where sneak plays and hidden-ball tricks are accepted strategy, Johnson is the rare exception. He prefers the old-fashioned, head-down, line buck. An intimate summed it up good-naturedly when he said, "Louis would rather try to kick his way through a brick wall than climb over it."

Most of Washington's bureaucratic generals never enter a battle without elaborate feeling-out tactics. These might include a planted story in a Washington column, a remark dropped at a cocktail party, or an attempt to gain a rival's confidence by profuse friendship. But not Johnson. He has no cultivated friends among the press; he does not go to cocktail parties.

Another significant clue to his personality is a casual remark he made during the recent bitter attack on him by Navy admirals and their adherents. A friend asked, "How can you be so calm? Congress is after your hide. Newspapers and radio commentators are demanding your resignation."

The Secretary said quietly, "You forget. I was vaccinated in Washington before."

This is an understatement. Johnson went through a cruel ordeal as Assistant Secretary of War from 1937 until the summer of 1940. During that period, President Roosevelt felt he needed in the Little Cabinet a figure to represent the growing clamor among veterans' groups for rearmament and to balance the isolationist tenor of some leading New Dealers.

So Roosevelt selected Johnson, ex-national commander of the Legion and a minor figure in Democratic politics. Johnson was supposed to sit quietly, take orders, and keep the Legion off the administration's back. In this job Johnson failed gloriously, as witness this story, never told before:

Early in 1940, a memo was submitted to Assistant Secretary Johnson by Col. James H. Burns, today a major general and Johnson's geopolitician. The report said war with Germany and Japan was inevitable, and that the United States would need a million-man Army and some $9,000,000,000 for arms.

Johnson read the report carefully, turned to Burns, and said, "This is good. Take it down to the General Staff and tell them I want it approved in half an hour."

The program was initialed within half an hour and Johnson bore it triumphantly to The White House for a historic meeting. He outlined the plan while Roosevelt puffed thoughtfully on a cigarette. Harry Hopkins sat in a corner. Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff listened intently. William S. Knudsen, the automobile production wizard and later codirector of the Office of Production Management, nodded at each recommendation.

When Johnson finished speaking, the President said: "I think in big terms, but this is too big. The American people will say I am leading them to war."

Knudsen, who had been primed by Johnson, spoke up in a voice heavy with the accent of his native Denmark: "Mr. President, do you want planes?"

"Yes, Bill, but not $9,000,000,000 worth."

Knudsen kept on stubbornly: "You want planes. I need money."

Sighing, Roosevelt said, "All right. I'll accept the plan as far as planes are concerned."

The industrialist plunged on: "Mr. President, do you want tanks?"

Roosevelt looked quizzically at Johnson. Then he said, "I approve your program in toto. But let me start with a smaller figure. You make this less than five billion, and I can sell that to the public * * *."

All during the prewar era, Johnson was persuaded by Roosevelt to play an unhappy

game of deception. The President feared the vigorous intervention policies of Johnson would injure him politically if he openly supported the Assistant Secretary. Also, Roosevelt was loath to fire Secretary of War Harry Woodring. So the President told Johnson to report directly to him, but to come in the side door. Meanwhile, key administration officials concerned with preparedness were told to cooperate with Johnson.

A sample of Johnson's technique was the way he got American arms to the British, after the bitter defeat at Dunkirk. The Assistant Secretary insisted that a large quantity of Amercan Army rifles be declared surplus and sold to Britain. Woodring refused to approve the deal.

The Assistant Secretary waited until Woodring was out of town. Then he declared the rifles surplus and ordered them sold to Britain. With this off his chest, he went to the White House, reported what he had done, and said in jest, "Mr. President, if I have violated the law, I would like your promise of a pardon—in writing."

Roosevelt wrote a chit. "Louis, if you go to jail, I'll go with you."

The President, however, did not always back up his hard-driving Assistant Secretary of War so solidly. This was due to a curious combination of Johnson's own ambitions and the President's faculty for appearing to promise the moon with green cheese. The moon, to Johnson, was to get the title of Secretary of War. Roosevelt later added the green cheese by suggesting in an impulsive moment that Johnson would make an ideal Vice President for the 1940 ticket.

Johnson took both these promises seriously. His first jolt was at the Democratic National Convention in July. Cheerful and expectant, he strode into the hotel room where Hopkins and the city bosses were picking a Vice President. The men looked up with glazed, weary eyes, and one is reported to have said, "Oh, my God, another hopeful."

The left wing of the New Deal feared Johnson, whom they glibly labeled an "American Legion conservative." They cut his throat politically, and Henry A. Wallace was nominated for Vice President.

But this was only a warm-up for the big disillusionment, the one which so toughened Johnson that he can now say calmly, "I've been vaccinated in Washington before."

A few days after the convention, Johnson was called to the White House, presumably to be appointed Secretary of War. It was a tense gathering. Steve Early, the White House press secretary and Johnson's one steady friend in the inner circle, looked glum. Roosevelt was too friendly.

Felix Frankfurter, a New Deal idea man before he became a Supreme Court Justice, had sold a great thought to the President. If Roosevelt, he argued, appointed Republicans as Secretaries of War and Navy, the GOP would be seriously weakened in the campaign.

The news was broken to Johnson at this White House meeting. Anger flashed in his eyes; his fists knotted. Bernard Baruch went to him and said gently, "Son, don't do anything you will regret later. Keep your temper."

On July 25, Johnson handed in his resignation. Then, bitter and lonely, he left Washington on a train for the West. He was followed by his friend Early, who said soothingly that no one would blame Johnson if he rocked Washington by revealing the indignities he had suffered. But he would be a bigger man if he took his disappointment in silence.

Johnson accepted the wise counsel. But from that day, he worked to be, ultimately, boss of the American defense establishment.

Actually, the tough job of Secretary of Defense is almost tailor-made for Johnson. As a heavyweight boxer at the University of Virginia, he could outfight any man, and did. At 26 and a young lawyer, he was a hustling Democratic floor leader and committee chairman in the West Virginia Legislature. A year later, he was fighting through the Meuse-Argonne offensive of World War I.

Returning home as a colonel, he helped organize the Legion and rose to be commander in 1932. Off and on, Roosevelt brought him to Washington for public and political chores. His longest stretch was as Assistant Secretary of War from 1937 to 1940. His last mission for Roosevelt was to India as the President's personal representative. Johnson brought home the friendship of India's Gandhi and Nehru.

In the 1948 political campaign, Johnson pitched in and raised money for what many thought was a hopeless cause, the re-election of Harry Truman. He was rewarded by nomination for Secretary of Defense on March 3, 1949.

Johnson has done a remarkable job in two fields—military strategy and administration. He has also acquired more enemies than all the rest of the Cabinet combined.

When Johnson came to the Pentagon Building last year, the Joint Chiefs of Staff were deadlocked on strategy. The Air Force was preaching that an armoda of B–36 bombers, capable of striking any target in the world, could win a war. The Navy retorted that giant aircraft carriers, surrounded by protective warships, were the secret to victory. Meanwhile, the Army insisted that foot troops were needed to win objectives and hold them.

Bluntly Johnson told the Joint Chiefs: "We are not going to dissipate our strength by having two or three different strategies. That will eat up money we can't afford to waste." Then he laid down the law.

The B–36, or any later model of long-range bomber, would be the global striking force to retaliate against surprise Soviet blows. (The hydrogen bomb, which Johnson argued for in the recent wrangle within the administration, could burn Moscow to the ground.)

Ground troops of our European allies should be equipped and trained to hold against Russian tanks, infantry, and bombers. We should be willing to accept as allies any nation without aggressive aims, regardless of its politics. This would include both Communist Yugoslavia and Fascist Spain.

The American Army should be kept alerted, so that it could be enlarged, equipped, and sent to vital points in the shortest possible time. The role of the Navy was to convoy troops and supplies and keep the seas free of enemy submarines.

To make sure there was no backsliding Johnson halted construction of the Navy's superaircraft carrier. He stood stonily and calmly while being excoriated by the admirals and their friends. He defied the wily chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, CARL VINSON. The only concession Johnson made was to allow the marines to remain as a separate élite force.

The other side of his shield, the administrative side, has earned Johnson both applause and epithets. The Secretary cut $1,200,000,000 from the defense budget and lopped 141,300 civilian employees from the payroll. The mere thought of such mayhem would make most politicians shudder, since each of the 141,300 has a Congressman or relatives who are loyal party workers.

Characteristically, the Secretary announced his reforms at an open meeting, to which he had invited all Senators and Congressmen whose districts would be affected by economies. They came with fire in their eyes. He outlined the cuts and said firmly, "I personally will tolerate no WPA in Defense."

Johnson could not have carried his economy program through without a well-knit team of assistants. His chief advisers include Under Secretary Early, the master diplomat who has saved the blunt Secretary from many a blunder, and Louis Renfrow, a jovial Reserve officer and friend of President Truman for more than 30 years.

But even with Renfrow browsing around the White House, the palace guard slyly plants stories that Johnson is on the President's black list. The reason for these rumors is the suspicion, which Truman takes with a grain of salt, that the Secretary of Defense is running all-out for the Presidency. To a friend who recently asked him point-blank whether he was a candidate, Johnson replied candidly: "When I am through with this job, I couldn't run for dog catcher."

Johnson is a realist. He would like, of course, to sit in the White House. But in his heart the Secretary knows the chances are dim. He has enemies in every hotel lobby, every cocktail salon, every politicians' stag party in Washington. He is a conservative in an administration that proudly invites the label of "welfare state."

Although Johnson's name appears daily in the newspapers, the door is firmly closed on his private life. He does not drink with "the boys," and he avoids Washington society. Every week end, weather permitting, he flies into a different life at his home in Clarksburg, W. Va.

His first act at home is to walk alone beneath the trees. The gardens are full of wild flowers, and orchids flourish in the greenhouse.

An acquaintance, seeing the blooms for the first time, asked Johnson curiously, "How long have you gardened?"

The aloof mood left him, replaced by a boyish grin. "From childhood. The first money I ever made was from selling beans I'd grown."

A photograph in Johnson's office gives another glimpse beneath the surface. It is the sensitive face of a philosopher, Pandit Nehru, Prime Minister of India. The inscription is "To Louis in friendship."

At the end of a day, in the early evening, Johnson will walk to his office window. There he will stand quietly, looking at the Jefferson Memorial across the Potomac River. Then, cheerfully, he will stride into the outer office where secretaries are locking up their desks and say heartily, "Can I give anyone a lift over the bridge to Washington?"

A Thought for Memorial Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 7, 1950

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, we, in Minnesota, have been unusually fortunate in the many communities throughout the State which have been served by alert and outstanding country weekly newspapers. There are nearly 500 of them and they rank among the best in the Nation on the basis of all standards.

There are those who believe that big-time activity in journalism is concentrated exclusively in large metropolitan daily papers or in the activities of nationally known columnists. I do not wish to make any invidious comparisons, Mr. President, but I do want to make the statement that in the field of journalism, a really authentic voice, typical of our American life, is that of the country editor.

I recently read in the Montevideo News, published in a small city in Minne-

sota by Mr. Ludwig I. Roe, a former president of the Minnesota Editorial Association, an editorial which I believe indicates the thoughtfulness and insight of these leaders in journalism. It is entitled "A Thought for Memorial Day" and it relates to the danger of too great dependence upon government. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial from the Montevideo News be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A THOUGHT FOR MEMORIAL DAY

"The history of liberty is the history of the limitation of government power, not the increase of it."—WOODROW WILSON.

What makes this statement of present interest is not who said it first—but who is saying it, and thinking about it, in 1950.

It would be expected that Woodrow Wilson, student and historian, philosopher and politician, would see that liberty lives when powers of government are limited. He was restating what Jefferson and Madison, Washington, Franklin, and Hamilton put into the first set of ground rules for the great American game.

But a statement with a famous man's name pinned on it becomes a "quotation." It comes to life when taken as a guide by somebody in your town. Early in May we heard a young fellow put this up to a group of men and women. "The history of liberty is the history of the limitation of government power, not the increase of it." He said it with a lot of seriousness.

He was no big shot. Instead he was a young fellow working hard to make his way. He had been in the war, he had taught school, now he is a salesman. He had the right answer figured out—the way to keep liberty is to limit government power, not increase it. We hope he was talking for his generation.

Wars have been fought to protect liberty. Lives have been paid in those wars. On Memorial Day a million American families will be the more sharply reminded of the personal investment made for liberty. Millions more will recall they put something into the defense too.

Liberty can be threatened during times of peace—by the spread of government power—just as surely as it was threatened during war.

Mr. Truman's Political Morals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 7, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Times-Herald for May 26, 1950:

MR. TRUMAN'S POLITICAL MORALS

Mr. Truman was asked at a recent press conference whether he had any comment on Senator TAFT's statement that his administration was "politically immoral." No, he had none, the President responded. We shall therefore offer ours.

ELECTION IN KANSAS CITY

We shall first note that the statute of limitations will run out Sunday on a matter in which Mr. Truman has some interest. On the night of May 27–28, 1947, the safe was blown in the office of Kansas City election commissioners and the ballots comprising the evidence of wholesale vote frauds in the Democratic Party primary of 1946 were stolen. Mr. Truman at the time was in a Kansas City hotel just a few blocks away.

That was the primary in which Mr. Truman had decreed that Representative ROGER SLAUGHTER, a Democrat, be purged. For 25 years Mr. Truman had enjoyed the support of the Kansas City machine built by the late Tom Pendergast and now run by Pendergast's nephew, Jim.

Slaughter had had the support of the machine in winning two terms in Congress. As a member of the Rules Committee, he failed to follow Truman's orders.

In July 1946 Truman summoned Jim Pendergast to Washington and personally demanded Slaughter's defeat. The President on July 18 informed his press conference that he had done so.

On primary day he flew to Kansas City to throw the weight of a personal appearance into the campaign to unseat Slaughter. Mr. Truman's hand-picked candidate, Enos Axtell, was nominated by 2,300 votes.

Axtell failed to carry his own township. He lost every ward until he came to the four key wards under Pendergast's control. In two precincts in these wards Slaughter was not credited with a single vote.

According to Maurice Milligan, former Democratic United States attorney for western Missouri, Axtell's victory "smelled to high heaven of fraud."

Milligan's successor, Sam M. Wear, and the Department of Justice, then under Tom Clark, now elevated to the United States Supreme Court, went through some perfunctory motions of investigating, but decided there was no case.

Then the Jackson County grand jury stepped in. It indicted 71 Pendergast henchmen, reporting that there "had been a deliberate and calculated plan to miscount votes and otherwise steal the election" from Slaughter.

The report of the grand jury was received on May 27, 1947. That night the courthouse safe was blown and the ballots stolen. The next day Attorney General Clark was trying to explain to a senatorial committee in Washington why he had shown so little interest in the Kansas City vote frauds.

News of the safe blowing arrived just as he was about to depart to receive an honorary degree in Texas as a champion of civic virtue.

The Senators called some more witnesses. Mr. Truman's United States attorney for western Missouri, the dawdling Mr. Wear, appeared and admitted that, in the light of the safe blowing, things "looked suspicious."

But, added Mr. Wear, "I have an awfully good alibi." Mr. Wear had been absent from Kansas City that night. He had an alibi. It is not usual for United States attorneys to offer alibis.

PRESIDENT KEEPS QUIET

Maurice Milligan takes up this story in his memoirs of his fight against the Pendergast machine, originally published under the title of "Missouri Waltz." He had broken the Pendergast machine once. He had sent 259 of the Pendergast mob to the penitentiary for fraud in the elections of 10 years before, when Tom Pendergast customarily counted 60,000 ghost votes.

In 1939 Milligan caught up with the boss himself. Tom Pendergast pleaded guilty to evasion of $551,000 in income tax on unreported income of more than $1,000,000.

Of this sum, $305,000 represented bribes Pendergast had received for the settlement of a case involving the release to insurance companies of millions of dollars in overcharges on fire insurance premiums paid by Missouri policyholders.

Pendergast got 15 months and was ordered to take no part in politics after his release from prison. He turned over the remnants of his machine to Jim Pendergast.

President Truman for 25 years had been the friend and political creature of the Pendergasts. He was Tom's third choice for the Senate in what looked like a losing year.

The Truman luck—and the Pendergast methods of delivering an election—worked, and Harry was on his way to the White House. When Tom died in 1945, Truman, then Vice President, said, "He was my friend, and I was his," and flew to the funeral.

After Milligan's work, Kansas City had honest elections for awhile, but upon Truman's election as Vice President, Milligan was ousted as district attorney. Then in 1946, as President, Truman, in the words of Milligan, "breathed new life into an organization that for all practical purposes was dead as a doornail."

He brought the Pendergast machine back to life and, with it, its vote frauds, corruption, and gunplay, which recently resulted in the murder of Charles Binaggio and Charles Gargotta, underworld characters and Democratic politicians. The killing took place under a huge photograph of the President himself.

We quite understand why Mr. Truman has no comment.

Trinity Evangelical and Reformed Church, Buffalo, N. Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 7, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of the Members of Congress the splendid record of the Trinity Evangelical and Reformed Church of Buffalo, N. Y.

This thriving parish has a fine history of over 40 years of service to its community and its parishioners. It occupies a respected place in the community of churches and has done much to bring about mutual understanding and cooperation among churches of the various denominations in western New York.

Because of the diligent and fruitful labors of its ministers, whose efforts have have been productive of an abundant harvest, Trinity Church finds it necessary to embark upon a fund-raising campaign to enlarge its facilities in order to take care of its needs.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am herewith enclosing a brochure which tells the story of the rapid growth of this parish and the present necessity for its expansion:

TRINITY IN RETROSPECT

Forty-one years ago Trinity Evangelical and Reformed Church had its beginning. It had its origin as a reformed church. The site selected for this embryo church was at the corner of Suffolk and what is now Berkshire Avenue. It was only a small house of worship, but apparently it was large enough to meet the needs of the small group of worshippers in those days when Kensington was largely woods, brush, and corn fields.

This small chapel immediately became the meeting place for the community. It was the pioneer church of the Kensington area

and, as such, opened its doors willingly to every progressive Christian movement, and still continues to identify itself with every genuine effort to promote civic and community growth.

In 1920 the church was incorporated and the site of the present church building on Kensington Avenue was selected for a new and larger church. The cornerstone of the church was laid in 1922 and in the spring of 1923 the present church was dedicated to the worship of God.

The present basement was added in 1932 in order to accommodate the church school. Adequate as it doubtless was for the religious education of youth in those early days, it has long since outlived its usefulness. Visit the church school any Sunday morning and you will readily comprehend the woeful inadequacy of this phase of our church life, and the reason for this inadequacy is because of the limitations of space and a church school lay-out that is antiquated for present-day religious instruction.

KENSINGTON, A COMMUNITY WITH AN AMAZING GROWTH

The Kensington community has been included within the city limits since 1870; it was very sparsely populated to 1920. It consisted largely of farm land and wooded areas traversed by a few dirt roads. Even Bailey Avenue, the principal thoroughfare, was a poorly kept dirt road used chiefly by travelers whose destination was either the country club or the poorhouse, the two main points of interest on the avenue.

After the First World War, however, a period of phenomenal growth took place. During the decade from 1920 to 1930 the population of the area nearly tripled, rising from 18,000 to 49,000. The census of 1940 gave a population figure of 54,297. The new settlers were, for the most part, the sons and daughters of Buffalonians who resided in the neighboring areas of the city, especially the so-called Fruit Belt and the Cold Spring section. German and Irish-Americans were the chief nationality groups represented.

COMMUNITY GROWTH INCREASES THE CHURCH'S RESPONSIBILITY

The church should be the most alert and vital institution in the community. It is to the church that the community naturally turns for spiritual guidance and the strengthening of its moral fiber. The church can never be indifferent to the fundamental needs of the community. The church that is alert to its program of service must keep pace with neighborhood growth.

Trinity Church, located at the strategic center of Kensington, dare not evade this God-given opportunity and obligation to expand its physical facilities. Large numbers in this growing neighborhood are seeking religious guidance for themselves and for their children. Trinity Church has always been concerned about the vital needs of the community and at this time of crisis it will not fail to meet its full obligation.

The average attendance for each church service at Trinity since January 1, 1950, has been in the neighborhood of 350. The church auditorium seats 270 worshippers. Consequently, at every service the ushers have been obliged to put chairs in the aisles and crowd the overflow worshippers into other available spaces.

On special occasions when more people attend worship services, such as Palm Sunday and Easter Sunday, the basement area has to be utilized and loud speakers are installed in these basement rooms to take care of the overflow crowds. It is unfortunate, but nevertheless true, that this overcrowding which increasingly is becoming a problem at Trinity, gives even well-meaning members an excuse—even though a lame one—to become careless in their church-going habits. More than once a member has said, "I won't go to church today. I don't enjoy my worship under crowded conditions."

Then, too, Trinity Church School for years has faced a serious problem. Because of the limited accommodations available for the sessions of the church school, Trinity cannot offer space for a program of religious education for the older 'teen-age group—a group which definitely needs all the help Trinity can give them in these decisive days. They are the men and women who should fill places of leadership in our church of tomorrow. They should now be in training for this leadership in our present-day church school.

The church school has an approximate enrollment of 250 children. These children are in the four church-school departments—i. e., beginners, primary, junior, and senior. Each department meets in its own rooms, but, inasmuch as the rooms are not soundproof, it is impossible to shut out from any one department whatever is transpiring in the adjoining department. Imagine the confusion and the unspiritual effect of four separate departments in adjacent rooms, each singing its own hymn of worship. This is not an imaginary experience but one that takes place with embarrassing frequency Sunday after Sunday at Trinity, and always with disconcerting results.

Furthermore, in the evening it is impracticable for more than two groups to meet at the same hour. There is an immediate need for adequate facilities where the young people of Trinity can hold their group meetings and socials, but lack of space and the present inadequate layout of meeting rooms in the basement compel Trinity, with much regret, to see our young people go elsewhere for their entertainment. In such days as these when all sorts of allurements entice our youth away from the church, Trinity should provide an adequate place where its young people can have their own club meetings in an environment that builds rather than destroys character.

A FORWARD LOOK

The church consistory has not been unmindful of the handicaps which Trinity has faced in recent years. As a matter of fact, it has on many occasions discussed the problem and sought to find the best solution. Realizing that the overcrowding was becoming daily more acute it has been decided that the only satisfactory solution could be found in a direct appeal to every member and friend of Trinity. It was voted that an intensive campaign for funds get under way this spring to provide the capital with which Trinity might expand its physical facilities and meet the challenge of a growing community.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to congratulate the pastor and his parishioners on their fine record in religious educational and civic matters and to express the hope that their drive for funds will be overwhelmingly successful in order that they can continue to contribute to the well-being of the community in the fullest measure.

Why Not a Brotherhood Lobby?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK BUCHANAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1950

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me before the National Conference of Christians and Jews, June 7, 1950, Waldorf-Astoria, New York, N. Y.:

WHY NOT A BROTHERHOOD LOBBY?

Mr. Chairman, reverend clergy, distinguished guests, furriers, wives, and friends, brotherhood connotes an ideal sense of human relations. It is synonymous with all the inherent decencies that exist in the soul of mankind. But like a lot of good words, it is often used without the force of sincerity back of it.

I believe, and I think you will agree with me, that brotherhood means an association of people who truly believe in the Golden Rule—"Do unto others as you would have them do unto you." Brotherhood is a condition of tolerance. It connotes a spirit of righteousness which shows itself in everyday acts of kindness and ordinary human decency. The opposite of brotherhood is intolerance, bigotry, and hatred.

You people gathered here this evening are zealots in the brotherhood army. I am a buck private in your ranks. If the things that you and I believe in, the thoughts that fill our minds in our endeavors concerning brotherhood, were to take hold of the great majority of men everywhere, then I do not believe there would be a Ku Klux Klan, a Gerald K. Smith, or his ilk, nor an existing cold war or possible hot war in the offing.

Our problem ladies and gentlemen, is both simple and yet colossal. Our task is clearly to continue to work toward a brotherhood of man in our everyday life—in every word—in our every act. But this is not enough. The task is to swell the ranks of these zealots of brotherhood. In other words, we have got to sell others on the idea.

Now how might this be accomplished? It so happens that I am chairman of the Special Committee Investigating Lobbying Activities. For months past, representatives of various pressure groups have come before our committee and we have been investigating their means and methods of operation. Some of these lobbies are good lobbies—that is, they represent the people's interests. Others work equally as hard and are exceedingly effective. But they represent not the people's interests, but special interests out to exploit the ordinary citizen.

In observing their modes of operation, the thought occurred to me—Why is there no really effective brotherhood lobby? There are scattered efforts here and scattered efforts there which are made to put the idea of brotherhood across, but there is no overwhelming pressure of great numbers of people who believe as you and I do to see to it that the principles of brotherhood that we stand for become the common practice, not alone of this Nation, but of all the nations of the world.

A lobby consists of one person, a small number of persons or a large organized group. We have found in our investigation of lobbies that those groups which are extensively organized—and often teamed up with other existing groups with kindred ideas—are far more effective in presenting their ideas and promoting their particular causes than smaller groups.

But each individual must do his job or there will be no collective effort. From personal experience, let me try to explain how this works. I hope you will not consider me an egotist for speaking in the first person on this matter.

As a youngster in the world of sports, I played with Poles, Slavs, Italians; I played with Negroes; I played with Christians, with Jews, boys on the baseball diamond, the football gridiron and the basketball court. No one asked, "What is your religion, your creed, your nationality?" As athletes we knew each other as contestants in fair play. We played to win but always with fair play.

When my playing days were over, I became an educator and coach. I carried into the schoolroom and into the gym, the gridiron and diamond, what I learned and

believed in when I played the game. I taught fair play.

These boys were the sons of hard working and brawny coal miners, steel workers, little pack peddlers and storekeepers; the sons of the Kelly's, Cohen's, DeAngelo's, the Swede Swanson's and the colored Johnson's.

When these kids walked out on the field, or on the court, there were no signs on their backs labeling them as to their religion or their nationality.

Does not the New Testament teach Christians, "All things whatsoever you would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them; for this is the law of the prophets." Is this not the same precept that was given to the Jews long before Christ? The Old Testament puts it this way, "What is hurtful to yourself do not to your fellow man. That is the whole of the Torah and the remainder is but commentary." Therefore, the lesson to the Jews and the Christians is the same, it is the Golden Rule and the Golden Rule is the brotherhood of man.

I have guided my life so by this rule that I have never known the difference between the Jews and the Christians in my appraisal of them. I appraise the Jew and the Christian by how he thinks, how he lives, and what he does in this life.

I must confess that before my entry into politics on the national scene, I did not realize that hate, prejudice, and discrimination was so wide, so deep-seated and rooted in the hearts and minds of men. I learned that this terrible hate had seized millions of people throughout the world and that these millions were teaching millions more hate and discrimination, provoking brother against brother, son of man against son of man. I say that millions were teaching millions to learn to hate. I say again "earning," because we are born without hate and prejudice in our heart and mind and soul. No, hate is not part of our birthright.

Somebody, somewhere, is spreading this hate doctrine, tonight. Yes, there is a lobby spreading this hate doctrine.

Men of great wealth and influence have been meeting and propagandizing by deceit, trick and fraud, hate and prejudice against our Government, hate and prejudice and discrimination against Jews and hate and prejudice against God-fearing Christians because these Christians dare to espouse the cause of the underdog, the underprivileged, the well-being of all peoples. Yes, today and every day the leaders of the hate lobby are regimenting the cranks, the lunatic fringe, the uncivilized Midas to march on Congress. In this hate lobby, we have discovered that these professional haters want no brotherhood of man—they want to exchange in our era of culture and social advancement, hate for love, mob rule for the benefit of the few select and favored against a brotherhood of man for the benefit of all.

Tonight, I am asking the Gentile and the Jew, the black man and the white man, the merchant, the banker, the worker to mobilize a brotherhood lobby to fight these forces of hate. The Secretary of State said not long ago, "Discrimination against minority groups is a handicap in dealing with other countries." To show the world we in America must lead the way against religious prejudice and discrimination. The brotherhood lobby must fight the hate lobby, pamphlet against pamphlet, dollar against dollar, until the last vestige of hate is crushed in the schools, the colleges, the factories, the stores, the churches, the streets and even the Halls of Congress; and every man and woman who lends his name, his influence and his money to the hate lobby must be exposed. As far as I am concerned, no hate lobby will operate in secret in this great country of ours. The light of publicity will be shed on these haters. The present Federal Lobby Act provides that sponsors and contributors should be named, and I shall do my utmost to see to it that they are named.

Now a word of caution to the clergy and you men and women who are interested in the social and religious problems of our daily life. We have found that the very lobby organizations of which I have spoken—I mean the hate lobbies—are studiedly seeking, through their subtle propaganda, to enlist you in their unholy crusade. Their methods are so clever, their catch phrases and words so neatly turned that it is, I must confess, sometimes difficult to determine that one is being propagandized.

Christians and Jews speak the same language. We speak in the Lord's Prayer, "Our Father, who art in Heaven." He is not the Christian Father, He is not the Jewish Father, but He is the Father of all. He is the Father that brings and binds us together with all humanities in a brotherhood for this noble work of the National Conference of Christians and Jews.

Pledge yourselves to work unceasingly, to give to the cause unstintingly, so that this great lobby of brotherhood will destroy the forces of ignorance, hate, discriminations, and prejudice.

Address by Gen. Omar N. Bradley at the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1950

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, there is no living person for whom I have a higher regard than I do for Gen. Omar Bradley, and I feel sure that many of you here today share this opinion. The tremendous responsibility that he now has as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff would probably prove too great a task for most men, but the General seems to thrive on such difficult tasks.

We were very proud to have General Bradley come to Texas last week for the commencement exercises at the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas, and under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the General's address on that occasion.

ADDRESS BY GEN. OMAR N. BRADLEY, CHAIRMAN, JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF, AT THE COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES OF THE AGRICULTURAL AND MECHANICAL COLLEGE OF TEXAS, COLLEGE STATION, TEX.

President Bolton, distinguished guests, men of the graduating class, ladies and gentlemen, it is an honor to be invited to participate in the commencement exercises of the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas this year. All my grown life, I have worked side by side with the graduates and former students of Texas A. and M. in the Armed Forces of the United States. Your school, and the men who have represented it, have elicited sincere admiration wherever they have served.

For many years, I have wanted to visit College Station and, in a sense, become more closely associated with the Aggies. Tomorrow, en route to West Point to join my classmates of the Military Academy at our thirty-fifth reunion, I shall feel that these exercises today have rounded out the association with the Texas Aggies that I have always cherished and respected.

More than 70,000 former students of Texas A. and M. have served in the Armed Forces, 20,000 of them in World War II. Of this number, 14,000 were commissioned officers and helped furnish the invaluable leadership that gave this Nation a victory for freedom, and the free world.

Among the men who have served with distinction in the Armed Forces, the Aggies have furnished 29 generals and 1 admiral. Six of your former students have won the Nation's highest award, the Medal of Honor.

But the close association with the military forces of our Nation is not all past history. More than 700 members of this graduating class have served their country in uniform. The important contribution of your college to our military strength continues to make itself realized—among other ways, by one of the country's outstanding ROTC units.

Every American citizen realizes that under our form of government, we do not try to maintain standing forces capable of winning a major war. Traditionally, and practically, we depend on Reserve forces, which include the National Guard and the Organized Reserve. For these forces, and for the expansion of our Regular forces in time of war, we depend upon the mobilization of the trained leaders from the Reserve programs. The continued emphasis on Reserve officer training in the colleges of our Nation in peacetime is essential to American security.

The privileges of American citizenship carry with them obligations of leadership in all walks of life. Not the least of these obligations is the duty to perform as leaders in the Armed Forces of your country in time of emergency. The excellent training that members of this graduating class have been afforded in one of the country's outstanding ROTC units will serve you and your Nation well if we are ever called upon to defend America.

The presence of so many veterans here, the glorious record of Texas A. and M. participation in our defense, and evidence of your continued readiness if called upon again, make me feel right at home here in College Station on this commencement day.

I have mentioned all of these associations to the military life of our country for a special purpose. For 70 years Texas A. and M. has furnished leaders to the Armed Forces of our country, and to many other fields. They have contributed, through their leadership, to the strength and spirit that marks the United States role in world affairs today. There is a continuing need for leadership in this Nation, and for this Nation in world affairs. We look to the graduates of 1950 to help furnish the renewed strength and purpose that will guide us in the twentieth century.

Your commencement exercises here mark a turning point in the lives of the young graduates. This year of the midcentury, 1950, may well be the year of the turning-point in the relationship of our country to the rest of the world. The events that have taken place in the past decade have brought us face to face with decisions which will affect your lives, the lives of your children in the years to come, and the future of this country. It is an obvious fact that the future of freedom, and the well-being of the rest of the world, depends upon the success or failure of the young men and women of this Nation.

Therefore, the young men who graduate here today have a double responsibility: To themselves, that their future lives are constructive and productive; and to the Nation, that the United States will contribute competent and forceful leadership to the free world.

It is all well and good for us to speak of leadership, and the need for leadership in national affairs. Unless we decide, however, the objective we Americans seek, the leadership we provide could be badly misdirected. Like any course that is planned for college

students, the end result which the student hopes to achieve must be determined before he begins.

In 1937, 1938, and 1939 we watched the growing menace in Europe. We saw Czechoslovakia, Poland, France, and the Low Countries fall victim to the German Army. In 1940 and 1941 we supplied lend-lease, while the citizens of Great Britain fought their terrible battle for survival. Finally, we were attacked and we joined in an armed conflict.

The American people have always had a strong distaste for war. We believe in peace—and we want peace and security, in a world that is livable for men of all creeds and all nations. But twice in my adult lifetime we have been forced to resort to war in search of peace. Despite our efforts, the peace we have today is a shaky one.

If peace and security combine to form our primary objective, then our leadership must guide us in a course that will eventually lead to fulfillment of this objective without further recourse to arms. The great problem of 1950 is the determination of the proper course in world affairs and domestic affairs that we must follow. That is the problem each of you, as a responsible citizen-leader, must solve for your own generation, and for generations to come.

At first this may seem an awesome task. If you look backward through history, you can see a record of many centuries of failure—failure on the part of men to follow Christian principles and provide peace and happiness.

If you look at the present, you find yourselves surrounded by a quagmire of unsolved problems in an uneasy world.

If you look to the future, you find a great need for faith, strong spirit, and generosity.

Faith in yourselves and your fellowmen: Without such confidence the negotiations made by our leadship will not be valid.

Strong spirit: An ever-strengthening spiritual fiber in every action we take. The greatness of this Nation and the blessings bestowed upon us are, in large measure, due to the moral and spiritual leadership that our forefathers have always carried forward in their daily lives.

Generosity: In this I see no apparent shortcoming. Internationally our Marshall plan and our other programs have exceeded any humanitarian demand. Our domestic programs have shared the advantages of this great economic and political system with more of the people than ever before in history. But when we speak of generosity in relation to our leadership we must continue, rather than limit, any programs which will contribute to peace and reconstruction.

In all these things—faith, strong spirit, and generosity—my generation has found them to be rewarding so long as they have been properly placed. This has meant faith in the right, not in selfish gain. This has meant a strong spirit for freedom and its highest principles. It must mean generosity to those people willing to help themselves, so that our efforts are not wasted.

I believe all of these principles apply today in the exercise of leadership which you graduates must provide.

No man would dare to stand before the class of 1950 and demand adherence to such principles or faith in the American idea if he were not sure that you had been provided the necessary means to meet such demands. This Nation, however, has provided the young men and women of 1950 with many worthwhile advantages.

First and foremost, you have been given an opportunity to get for yourselves a fundamental education in many important fields. At Texas A. and M., there has been almost unlimited opportunity for you in science, in agriculture and veterinary medicine, engineering and arts. In the true Texas tradition, you have been provided with outstanding training in military science, in aeronautical science, and in physical education. The men of Texas A. and M. can stand up to any men in the world, and compare favorably their education and training for leadership—leadership in the pursuits of peace, and if it comes to war, leadership in battle.

This combination is significant. The capability for a productive peace, coupled with the ability to defend your beliefs as well as your resources, is essential to survival. For in the world today, the nations which most need assistance are those which have regained economic opportunity, and some worldly goods, but which lack the strength to defend themselves in case of aggression.

This is a new experience for some of the nations which we befriend, and it is one with which we must sympathize. It is a condition in those nations which we want to help them correct. Our great opportunity lies before us in western Europe, and I feel sure that Americans will give full consideration to continuing the project we have underwritten so far, provided that those nations do everything they can to help themselves.

Again I say, you men of Texas A. and M. are fortunate because you have been provided the educational and economic opportunities, and you have been given the training with which to protect those opportunities if any unfriendly nation attempts to transgress upon them.

There is another heritage which is especially close to the citizens of Texas. It is not singularly yours, for other generations, from the early Greeks all the way to modern America, have had such encouragement. But there is a spirit of Texas—a spirit of independent action and forthright courage—that is yours today. This heritage is marked by an historic incident, the defense of the Alamo by those brave Texans who were declaring their independence as a republic.

Many times I have drawn inspiration from the message sent from the Alamo on February 24, 1836, by Col. William Barrett Travis, who was in command of that besieged garrison. Because that inspiration is such a vital part of your background and your preparation for leadership in the world you are entering, I would like to repeat it here:

"To the People of Texas and All Americans in the World—Fellow Citizens and Compatriots:

"I am besieged by a thousand or more of the Mexicans and Santa Anna. I have sustained a continual bombardment and cannonade for 24 hours and have not lost a man. The enemy has demanded a surrender at discretion; otherwise the garrison are to be put to the sword if the fort is taken. I have answered the demand with a cannon shot, and our flag still waves proudly from the walls. I shall never surrender or retreat then. I call on you, in the name of liberty, of patriotism, and everything dear to the American character, to come to our aid with all dispatch. The enemy is receiving reinforcements daily and will no doubt increase to three or four thousand in 4 or 5 days.

"If this call is neglected, I am determined to sustain myself as long as possible and die like a soldier who never forgets what is due to his own honor and that of his country—victory or death.

"WILLIAM BARRETT TRAVIS,
"Lieutenant Colonel, Commandant."

This message from Colonel Travis has all the elements about which we have talked—faith, good spirit, and generosity—for Travis and his command pledged themselves to give their lives for Texas, and for the principles upon which they stood. With the training and education you have received, and the inspiration of your Texas heritage, you give promise of renewed vigor and strength for this Nation.

Each man of this class can be proud of his achievement, and can well afford to be grateful to those people who have helped him toward this milestone in his career. The faculty members, and your parents are certainly proud of you this day, and you in turn can be grateful for the opportunity they have provided.

I see among the audience many of the wives of the graduates. They have also made sacrifices in order that you might complete your education, and your preparation for the vital role you must play. These young women deserve your thanks, and the gratitude of my generation. In the years to come, if you men are to fulfill our expectations, they will have an ever-increasing share in your success and advancement.

That some unfulfilled promises of man's destiny still remains is challenging, rather than disheartening. For so long as there is a need in this world, there shall be a source. And in America, your generation must be the wellspring of inspiration, ideas, accomplishment, and leadership for this needful world. It is my privilege to congratulate you and your college on the work you have done, and the capabilities you have demonstrated for the difficult tasks that lie ahead.

An Example of Interfaith Understanding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 7, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, in these troublesome times when it often seems that humanity has lost its humane traits, it is a great relief to know that there are still many among us who are not carried away by helplessness and despair. One of the most notable examples that has come to my attention in these postwar years is the work being done by Mrs. Martha Sharp, the wife of a Unitarian minister in Chicago. She is one of the founders and leaders of an organization to help in the rehabilitation of former refugee and DP children now in Israel. The work she and her associates are doing is truly one of the finest examples of interfaith understanding and promotion of international good will.

Instead of forever criticizing and condemning one another, instead of arousing ill-feeling and inciting hatred against each other, let us try to emulate what Mrs. Sharp and others are trying to do these days in a world drifting gradually toward ruthlessness and evil. The following news item from the New York Times, June 7, 1950, is commended to the attention of my colleagues:

WOMAN OFF TO SEE HER 20,000 CHARGES—UNITARIAN MINISTER'S WIFE TO VISIT CHILDREN'S VILLAGES ESTABLISHED IN ISRAEL

Mrs. Martha Sharp left New York last night by plane to visit her 20,000 children. In the next month she will help some of them move into the only real homes they have ever known and watch others learn to play children's games for the first time.

These thousands of Israeli boys and girls are Mrs. Sharp's charges by long-range adoption, for she is a founder and national vice chairman of Children to Palestine, Inc., an American organization that is bringing them out of starved and fear-ridden backgrounds to a new life in a new land.

Although this will be Mrs. Sharp's fourth yearly visit to Israel it will have a special

meaning for her. Soon after her arrival in Lydda tomorrow morning she will visit the children's village of Ben Shemen in Kfar Vitkin, 30 miles north of Tel Aviv.

CHILDREN FROM DP CAMPS

Here, with a $25,000 assist from Children to Palestine, are rising 10 houses for children who hitherto have known only barracks and displaced persons' camps. This settlement will be named the Rev. Samuel A. Eliot Village, after the organizer of this interfaith rescue movement.

A second village, for 2,000 young refugees who formerly had only tents, will be dedicated to Eddie Cantor, Mrs. Sharp said. The comedian has given $35,000 toward construction of the settlement and will arrive in Israel by ship shortly after Mrs. Sharp, who plans to take him on a tour of the work being accomplished by her organization through Youth Aliyah.

One of the happiest tasks of Mrs. Sharp's trip will be helping to distribute thousands of games and pieces of athletic equipment. A ton of gear for table tennis, basketball, soccer, baseball, boxing, marbles, and checkers has already been shipped to the play-hungry youngsters and two more tons will arrive during her stay.

MEL ALLEN HEADS CAMPAIGN

Eventually, Children to Palestine hopes to send $300 worth of sporting goods to each of 220 Israeli settlements where orphaned children live. This project, called operations sports for Israel, has Mel Allen, the radio broadcaster, as chairman.

Mrs. Sharp, who is the wife of a Unitarian minister in Chicago, said she also plans to reassess the needs of the youth communities. Schools, recreation centers, and playgrounds, she said, must be added to give the young people a well-rounded life.

The vice chairman of Children to Palestine summed up the group's philosophy like this: "We can't bring up a child like an orchid and then transplant him into a bramble patch. All of the ills of the world today are caused by people who were children a generation ago.

"If we can give today's children some understanding of each other's needs, some feeling for sharing, perhaps we can help to change their world tomorrow."

War and the Seaway—Vital Need for Labrador Iron May Finally Win O. K. for Long-Sought St. Lawrence Waterway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 7, 1950

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article by James C. Munn that appeared in the Sunday magazine of the Detroit Free Press of June 4, 1950, as follows:

WAR AND THE SEAWAY—VITAL NEED FOR LABRADOR IRON MAY FINALLY WIN O. K. FOR LONG-SOUGHT ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY

(By James C. Munn)

WASHINGTON.—The rich iron ores of Canada's bleak Labrador may eventually be the means of winning congressional approval for the long-sought $800,000,000 St. Lawrence seaway and power projects.

The proposed seaway, which is held to be of prime importance to Detroit's future, would enable deep-draft ships to travel all the way from the mouth of the St. Lawrence River to Duluth, Minn., 2,350 miles away at the westernmost point of the Great Lakes.

For decades construction of the seaway has been blocked by power companies, railroad management, and port cities of the Atlantic and Gulf coasts.

These interests have always contended that the seaway, and its related power development, would work an unfair economic hardship on them. Senator LEHMAN, Democrat-Liberal, New York, and other advocates say such claims are without foundation.

Valid or not, recent testimony before the House Public Works Committee left the impression that the opposition arguments may crumble before the growing need of this Nation for new supplies of iron ore.

Domestic reserves of high-grade iron ores in the Great Lakes area are nearing exhaustion. The steel industry realizes this and in recent years has spent millions seeking new deposits.

In addition to the Labrador deposits, estimated to contain 350 to 400 million tons of rich ores, new sources have been found in Venezuela and Africa.

But these discoveries raise a transportation problem.

The South American and African ores can be shipped to eastern coastal ports at reasonable cost. But freight charges for the railroad haul to the midwestern steel centers might make it economically unfeasible to use them.

Even should the freight-rate problem be solved, a further difficulty arises:

Could steelmakers expect adequate ore supplies—from abroad—in time of war?

Secretary of the Interior Chapman and Secretary of the Army Pace, to mention only two, think not. What is the alternative?

Labrador ores, they say, could be brought through the protected inland route that the St. Lawrence seaway would make possible.

But why can't Labrador ores be shipped over the existing St. Lawrence-Great Lakes waterway? They can, but not enough to maintain the present level of steel prices.

The existing 14-foot St. Lawrence channel isn't deep enough for the ore ships now in use between the Lake Superior ore district and the steel cities of the Great Lakes.

A channel at least 28 feet deep would have to be dredged through the international rapids section of the St. Lawrence. The rapids are near Massena, N. Y., only about 600 miles from the sea.

What would happen if the steel industry, eventually, has to depend wholly upon foreign ores?

Almost unanimously the answer—from seaway proponents—has been that steel makers would be forced to move from the Midwest to the East coast unless the deeper channel were dredged.

One witness told the House committee that if that should happen, Detroit, world center of automobile production, would become a ghost town.

Senator LEHMAN summed up the case for the seaway this way:

"To decline to take advantage of the opportunity (that the seaway affords) is sheer wastefulness and extravagance.

"To refuse (it) for sectional or narrow economic reasons is to display disrespect for the ultimate interests of our country."

LEHMAN said he was speaking as much of the power development of the river as of the seaway.

President Truman, too, has expressed concern about possible failure to make the best use of St. Lawrence power potentialities.

In a message to Congress May 22, criticizing the 1950 Rivers and Harbors Act, he pointed out that Congress had placed responsibility on the Army to survey the Merrimack, Connecticut, and other New England rivers to determine their power possibilities.

"It may well be," he said, "that some of the power sites to be developed in New England should be interconnected with the St. Lawrence or other northeastern power sites in the interest of more power at lower cost for the whole region. But the present act does not even require that this possibility be investigated."

The President approved the act, however, despite the objections he found in it.

Engineers estimate that proposed power facilities near Massena would generate more than 13,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of energy a year. The production would be shared equally between this Nation and Canada.

The power facilities would be built by the Federal Government and then sold to New York State. The State would administer distribution of the power not only within the State but to adjoining States.

New York witnesses have testified that the adjoining States would get a fair share of the energy. Such a provision is contained in the pending bill.

Advocates of the project thus argue that the power development would cost the Federal Government nothing. And that the same would be true of the seaway, because of tolls that would be levied on shipping.

Canada, which is eager for the seaway, has agreed in principle to the tolls of proposition.

The Department of Commerce has estimated that tolls would pay off the seaway cost in about 53 years.

There is no chance that Congress will authorize the project, first discussed more than 50 years ago, in this session. The bill must be reintroduced in the next Congress.

Then it will again be subjected to a searching examination, adding new words to a record that already runs into the millions.

Address of Hon. W. Sterling Cole, of New York, at Dedication of Indian Monument, Painted Post, N. Y., May 30, 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. STERLING COLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 6, 1950

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, there is only one Painted Post. Of all the towns and cities and communities in this great country, only one bears the distinctive name and has the unique historical background as that of Painted Post, Steuben County, N. Y.

Even before the Revolutionary War this locality was a trading center where the English traders exchanged their wares for the Indian furs, located at the confluence of the Tioga, Canisteo, and Conhocton Rivers, in the upper watershed of the Susquehanna River. According to legend, the place where the trading occurred was marked by a large oak post, painted brilliant red. This area figured largely in the French and Indian Wars and the early conflicts between the English settlers and the Indians.

During the colonial period the valleys of the Chemung River tributaries comprised the domain of the Senecas. This

unit of the Iroquois confederacy was called a door of the six nations through which passed communications with West and South.

The border wars brought the white man into this region. Visitors to this area during the American Revolution found on this site an oak post which was square to a height of 4 feet and then octagonal to the top. The surface was painted red and decorated with 28 black figures without any heads and 30 black figures with heads on. Numerous allusions to the painted post regarded it as a memorial to a fallen chieftain, a marker for assemblies, and a war post around which dances were held.

The original post endowed this place with a name which will endure as long as recorded history. By 1808 the first namesake had disintegrated and a fitting substitute was deemed necessary. In 1824 Capt. Samuel Erwin commissioned John Wygant to fashion a symbol for the site of the painted post. This memorial was carved from sheet iron and depicted an Indian tribesman attired in head dress, jacket, and leggins. For half a century this quaint figure swung on a pole near the place where the first post stood.

In 1880 a second sheet iron Indian was erected at the southeast corner of Water and Hamilton Streets. This life-size figure represented a chief dressed in a red jacket and buckskin trousers equipped with a bow and tomahawk. The warrior was attached to the top of a tapered octagonal post which was 18 feet high and painted red. This symbol served as a landmark for four decades. A later memorial supplanted this figure which was removed after World War I.

In the summer of 1893 a subscription was circulated for the construction of a stone monument surmounted by the metal replica of an Indian chief. This memorial was dedicated June 21, 1894. The purposes for which it was erected were inscribed on its face:

To perpetuate the name of Painted Post, preserve its traditions, and honor the memory of its early settlers.

On November 20, 1948, a violent wind toppled the chief from his pedestal and shattered the figure. At a town meeting held April 7, 1949, citizens of the village of Painted Post and town of Erwin approved a proposal to replace the damaged monument. This memorial was moulded by Norman B. Phelps and erected in 1950 by popular subscription to commemorate the founding of Painted Post and to preserve for posterity the traditions of its heritage.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the address delivered by me on the occasion of the dedication of the new monument to the Indian Chief Montour on May 30, 1950:

There is no season of the entire year, each with its distinctive coloration and temperature, which could be more appropriate for a great home-coming celebration such as this has been, than that season of the year when it is lilac time in old Steuben. I dare say that without exception each one of the sons and daughters of this historic community who have moved into the outer world for his life's activity, yearns to return to the land of his fathers, to the soil where his roots are sprouted, to the scenes of his boyhood, to his friends of yesterday and there to relive the comforting caress of a devoted mother, to sense the echoes of a father's wise counsel or to catch the smile or cordial greeting of a long-lost friend. Nowhere in all the world is the landscape more beautiful, are the people more stable in their attitudes of life nor more genuine in their hospitality than these valleys of the Conhocton, the Canisteo, and the Tioga when they are flooded with the beauty and fragrance of blooming lilacs.

Such an impulse it was which prompted me to accept with considerable readiness the invitation extended to me to return and to participate in this celebration. But there was something more than lilacs which beckoned to me, something beside the beauty of these valleys and the richness of their people—Painted Post has a very unique spot within my treasure of memories and has filled an unconscious influence upon my life. Not only do I have the distinction of having been born in this unusual community but it was in the company of the graduating class of the Painted Post High School that I, some years later, made my first visit to the Capital city of our Nation, where in still later years I was called to spend a considerable portion of my mature lifetime in the public service through years that have been fraught with distress, dismay, trials, and tribulations, bloodshed, and war in our national life. During those intervening years as I have driven from my home on the Conhocton to my office on the Potomac the route has taken me under the shadows of the Indian warrior whose statue was the pride of the residents here and the symbol of America's origin and growing greatness—a statue which is being replaced today by this marvelous successor. Most often these trips have been made alone and I was given to meditate upon the quality of the people who first came to deal with the Indians, to clear these forests, to build the log cabins, and to give us the rich heritage of independence, of thrift and industry, of self-denial and self-reliance, of courage and adventure, of faith and perseverance, fearless of nothing save God alone. The lessons gained from those meditations have been of great value in the performance of my public duties.

Moreover, the knowledge which I have that there is a considerable number of people now living here who through the public-school system years ago were exposed to the very discipline, philosophy, and education which was my own privilege and heritage in the home, gives me a feeling of closeness and kinship with the people of Painted Post.

So it is that I am delighted to join you in this great occasion—the lilacs, tender memories, reflective influences and inspirations, consecrated devotion to the memory of a noble soul—all these have united to make me feel highly honored in the opportunity afforded me to participate in this sober though gala celebration.

Coming as does the conclusion of this 3-day celebration of homecoming at Painted Post on the eve of the 1 day honored throughout our land as Memorial Day, it is entirely appropriate that we give some thought to the significance of the sacrifices of our military heroes, our own sons and daughters whose lives have been offered upon the altar of national independence and national security and endeavor, if possible, to find some lesson through which we can strive to be worthy of their sacrifice. But, to me, Memorial Day is something more than tender reflection upon the exploits of our military men and women—it is a day for solemn tribute to the memory of all those who have passed along the way of life a bit ahead of the rest of us and who have already entered into the haven of eternal life for they quite as much as the military people are the ones whose influences and endeavors in mortal life have contributed to the greatness of our Nation.

The shepherd or parent who watches over and cares for his little flock, nursing their wants and pains, guiding them along the paths of richness and honor, warning them of the dangers of pitfalls and temptations, giving strength to their bodies and to their character, even though unknown and unsung beyond the borders of his own little vale, is as much responsible for the greatness of our national life as is he whose life is prematurely snuffed on the field of battle. The glory and glamor of war does not surround him but instead his patriotic shroud is the silent mist of godliness.

To the everlasting glory of those who sacrificed on the field of battle and to those whose sacrifices were in the home or the factory would I choose to set apart and dedicate this Memorial Day.

How, then, can we best perpetuate their name and memory? Is it enough that we mark his final spot with a graven stone, to be decorated on this day each year with some choice floral beauty warmed with our kisses and our tears? Is it enough that we attach his name to some great structure or institution in the hope that through it his virtues will be perpetuated? Is it enough that we reproduce his image in stone or pigment? Is it enough that we consecrate our wealth to the purposes for which he lived? To be sure, all these are proper but there must be something more than these materialistic manifestations of our love and affection. With the passing of time these symbols, too, will pass and be gone and lose their real significance.

In doing honor to the memory of those men and women, who, by their sacrifices, call to our attention that true liberty is beyond price, let us recognize that to such Americans as they the flowers and the flags will be but empty tribute if we fail to rededicate our hearts and minds to those sublime truths which they held so dear. Only by our steadfast attachment to the immortal principles of human behavior and human relationships which guided their heroic deeds or their humble service to mankind can we hope to perpetuate their memory and fulfill our indebtedness to them.

More and more, it seems, the people of the world are moving into the realm of materialism and away from the realm of idealism; more and more are we captivated by the material values of life rather than the spiritual. Ever increasing emphasis is placed upon the physical comforts rather than the moral principles of human conduct. Our leaders of political thought and social progress constantly endeavor to provide greater programs for gratifying needs of the body rather than nourishment for the soul. Students of science are daily unlocking doors to the secrets of the universe and with each disclosure something is added to the long list of things which, it is felt, we as a people should have in order to give us greater happiness. Stockpiling of strategic materials and atomic weapons is the watchword of the day with no corresponding emphasis upon the stockpiling of moral resources. The philosophy of freedom from physical want is gradually replacing the older philosophy of fear of God and freedom from spiritual need. Personal security is becoming the goal of human existence in place of and at the inevitable price of personal liberty; security of the body supplants security of the soul.

Security, personal security, those things which are needed to fill the temporal wants of our bodies, is the byproduct of liberty, personal liberty. Security without liberty is bondage; liberty is the mother of security and there can be no true happiness without both.

The great patriot Patrick Henry, whose clarion cry has rung through the centuries, called for liberty or death—not security or

death. His forebears had the security of vassalage in the mother country but that was not enough, that was not the sort of thing that Patrick Henry wanted for himself and his children. Security was to be had to the colonists, provided they continue to pay homage and tribute to the royal provider—but they chose to cast it aside in order to obtain the personal freedom necessary that each one might be able to provide for his own security in the manner and to the extent which his own talents would permit.

Out of the Bible comes the admonition that man cannot live by bread alone but by the word of God. Deep down in that dumb region of the heart in which we dwell alone there must be something of substance in order to have true happiness and which collectively creates a massive power of moral force more compelling than any physical power yet constructed by the hand of man. There is a certain tranquillity of the heart, born of a good life rich in moral virtues, which no amount of physical comforts can provide or replace.

Here we stand today trembling in awe of the fearsome force of the atomic age in which mankind has the capacity of self-destruction. Even the horrific power of the atomic blast will give way to the greater force generated by moral armament and it can be made the tool for good instead of evil. Most assuredly civilization is on the brink of disaster unless there is kindled into life the dying embers of a moral force built of the fabric of lofty ideals, steadfast courage, vision, faith, and a passionate sense of justice to all men and all races.

No less dangerous in the field of international relationships as in our domestic affairs is the current tendency to place undue, if not complete, reliance upon the effectiveness of material things in the preservation of our national security and happiness. More and more we look to our armies and navies and air forces, together with those of our friendly nations, to maintain the peace of the world and defend our own independence. To the same extent as undue reliance upon crass materialism as the provider of the general welfare will be our undoing in the personal field at home, so will a complete reliance upon military force, in the end, cause us to lose the very things we seek to maintain abroad. We cannot allow ourselves to be lulled into a sense of security through the mistaken notion that the power of the sword, the use of brutality and violence, is the only way by which the problems of nations can be solved. Surely, we have learned in the last two experiences with war, if we never knew it before, that a nation which resorts to force as its sole instrument of national policy suffers immeasurably even though that nation may be victorious in battle.

Too many of our people have come to regard war as the only way out of our present international difficulties. Certainly military preparedness is essential to our national survival, but it is not the only way; it is not the exclusive way. The great power of moral force is just as persuasive in the affairs of nations as it is in the daily affairs of people. To be sure the current philosophy of the Russian tyrants is wholly at variance with our own and some day the two may clash, but it is not inevitable that they clash on the field of battle; not if we are prepared to do the things which are necessary to prove to the Russian people and to the world that their way of life is wrong.

In order to find that way and to develop that force which is necessary to be effective, we must devote much time and thought to searching our own souls in quest of the formula. Are we ready to make the sacrifices necessary to bring about an understanding with the Russian people and are we prepared to make the adjustments in our own daily lives in order to make those understandings a reality? Can we be sure that righteousness is entirely on our side and that theirs has no element of justification? Have we the proper humility of spirit which is so essential to establish a common ground of understanding with other people? Is ours the only formula for control of the hydrogen and atomic bombs which will effectively remove the specter which constantly threatens our existence? Can we endure the austerity which a surrender of some of our materialism will produce in our search for fair dealing and justice?

All this is the part of that idealism for which our patriots and forebears lived during their lifetimes. It may not bring immediate results—it may never produce the degree of mutual understanding and trust which is so essential to a peaceful world. But certainly it is worth the try. The goal of this kind of victory is worthy of our most concientious thought and endeavor.

At home and abroad, our leaders must have a vision fashioned from the warp of Christian principles, fired with the courage of these patriots, sacrificial to the extent of their example, steadfast in their attachment to the immutable laws of God.

There are two ways ahead for America—one leading to brilliance and happiness, the other to darkness and despair. The former is lined with fortitude, forbearance, and faith, the latter paved with sensual delights and physical comforts. Which road shall we take—the one we have been following in recent years, strewn with false promises spoken by false prophets or the way of our fathers, the road set by those we honor today?

For my part the choice has been made. Chief Montour, Col. Arthur Erwin, Patrick Henry, those nameless fathers and mothers whose guidance we must pass on to our own children, made that choice for me. I join with you in the prayer of the poet:

"Wake in our breasts the living fires,
The holy faith that warmed our sires;
Thy hand hath made our Nation free;
To die for her is serving Thee."

Labor-Management Relations Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OREN HARRIS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 7, 1950

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, during the consideration of the Labor-Management Relations Act before the House in May of last year determined efforts were made by some to repeal the act outright, returning to the original Wagner Act. Others felt the dire need of an appropriate revision of the Taft-Hartley Act.

The proposed substitute known as the Wood bill, and which became the minority compromise proposal, indicated that even the original sponsors of the Taft-Hartley Act felt there were some revisions needed.

There were some who believed that the proposed Wood bill would be even more restrictive toward labor organizations than the present act.

The Wood bill was in fact in most instances similar to the present Taft-Hartley Act. There were many who believed the proposed revisions of the Wood bill were not sufficient to properly adjust the present law.

Several of us met in conference with the leadership of the House and members of the committee in an effort to work out a reasonable compromise resolving certain differences in a manner that would provide what many of us believed to be a more appropriate revision of the act.

As a result of this conference a proposed compromise was worked out. It was offered as a substitute on the floor of the House the next day by a member of the committee, Mr. SIMS, of South Carolina, but beat by a few votes.

This proposed compromise, which I helped formulate, provided retention of a number of basic provisions that was felt should be retained in any revision of the National Labor Relations Act. In fact all but about two of the basic provisions at difference were agreed to since several had already been included in the proposed bill. It was decided the two remaining differences would be left to determination by amendment on the floor.

When Mr. SIMS proposed the substitute he gave a complete explanation of the provisions, and I extend his statement herein with my remarks:

SIMS SUBSTITUTE

Mr. SIMS. The substitute bill I have introduced is simply the Lesinski bill with seven changes.

The first change in effect adopts the Taft-Hartley provisions for dealing with a national emergency.

The second change adopts in effect the Wood bill provision requiring labor organization officers and employers to sign anti-Communist affidavits.

The third change guaranties free speech to employers.

The fourth change requires labor organizations to bargain in good faith.

The fifth change requires labor and employee organizations to file organizational and financial statements.

The sixth change creates a temporary labor relations commission to study and make recommendations concerning labor relations.

The seventh change makes it entirely clear that railroad employers, employees, and their representatives, as well as subject matter to the Railway Labor Act are exempt from titles I, II, and III, of this bill.

Personally, I am not wedded to all the provisions of this measure. There are a number of changes which I would make if I were writing a labor-management bill to suit my own taste. But a bill that would suit my taste would not pass this House of Representatives.

I mention this because I realize that this bill will not meet with the complete approval of anyone here today. I believe that each of us here today is faced with a compromise. I believe that each of us here must weigh the good and the bad and then determine whether the good outweighs the bad.

Legislating would be a simple job indeed if we could vote our sincere convictions on each individual provision without taking into consideration the ultimate goal and the overall strategy involved.

Let us face facts. Those of us interested in repealing the Taft-Hartley Act and enacting the Lesinski bill know, or should know, that if the Lesinski bill is voted on without any amendments, it will be defeated. It becomes our duty then, if we are genuinely interested in repealing Taft-Hartley, to amend the Lesinski bill in such a way that it will pass this body.

From talking with some of the members of my committee, from talking with a number of southern liberals, from talking with key

Members of the House from all sections of the country, I am convinced that there are at least two amendments to the Lesinski bill which are necessary if a sufficient number of votes are to be gained to repeal Taft-Hartley. There are many Members in Congress who would like to vote for the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act who feel, and feel very deeply, that a new labor law should include, first, a strong provision dealing with a national emergency, and, second, a requirement for union and company officers to sign non-Communist affidavits.

Let us examine the substitute bill which I have introduced and see how it deals with a national emergency. On pages 23, 24, 25, and 26 of the substitute print you will note that the national emergency provision of the proposed substitute is exactly the same as the Taft-Hartley provision dealing with national emergencies, with two exceptions: First, the emergency boards of inquiry are required to make recommendations for settlement of the dispute which the President is directed to make public; and, second, the statement of and secret ballot on the employer's last offer of settlement are omitted. As under the Taft-Hartley Act, injunctions against a strike or a lock-out may be obtained by the Attorney General for a period of not more than 80 days.

Now, let's look at pages 15, 16, and 17 of the substitute print. This is the section requiring a non-Communist affidavit. This provision is exactly the same as the Wood bill, with three exceptions:

First. Investigations or proceedings may be undertaken by the Board so long as no certification is made in a representation case and no complaint issued in an unfair-labor-practice case where the required affidavits have not been filed.

Second. Affidavits are required of employers, including owners, partners, receivers, trustees, and any officers of employers, or of any national or international employer organization of which the employer is a member or affiliate.

Third. The term "officer" is broadened to include any person performing a policy-making, governing, or executive function or who is a member of any policy-forming, governing, or executive body of an employer or labor organization or of any national or international employer or labor organization, as the case may be.

Section 110 of the substitute print on page 11 protects the freedom of speech of both employers and employees. The amendment provides that the National Labor Relations Board shall not base any finding of an unfair labor practice upon any statement of views or arguments, either written or oral, if such statement contains under all of the relevant circumstances no threat, express or implied, of reprisal or force, or offer, express or implied, of benefit. Under these provisions the statement, if relevant, may be admitted in evidence for what it is worth, and the statement may constitute an unfair labor practice, but only if other relevant circumstances show that the statement actually represents a threat of force or reprisal or an offer of benefit.

Section 109 of the committee print, on page 11, is a new section which would make it an unfair labor practice for a labor organization to refuse to bargain collectively with an employer, subject to the provisions of section 9 (a). It is recognized that the provision will be applied only infrequently, since unions exist for the primary purpose of collective bargaining on behalf of employees. It is also recognized that under modern economic conditions the procedures, scope, and subject of collective bargaining are constantly changing and developing. Accordingly it is provided that the provision contained in section 109 shall not be construed to require a labor organization to bargain separately with respect to any particular unit or units, or to agree to any particular procedures or conditions with respect to collective bargaining. Thus, the section safeguards industry-wide and area agreements such as those which have been reached through collective bargaining in many industries. It also leaves to the parties the development of procedures and conditions of collective bargaining as seems best to them, for example, in accordance with their constitution or charter or bylaws. Situations of the type presented *In re American Radio Association* (82 N. L. R. B. No. 151, April 19, 1949) and *In re National Maritime Union* (82 N. L. R. B. No. 152, April 19, 1949) are not intended to be unfair labor practices under the bill.

Section 111 of the substitute print on page 12 contains provisions similar to those contained in the Taft-Hartley Act with respect to the filing of organizational and financial data by labor organizations. In addition, certain organizational and financial data must be filed by employers bringing charges of unfair labor practices against a labor organization. It is provided that the Board is not to certify a labor organization as bargaining representative nor issue any complaint of unfair labor practice based on a charge filed by a union or by an employer unless the union or the employer, as the case may be, has filed with the Secretary of Labor the required organizational and financial information.

Section 405 of the committee print on page 29 makes it clear that those subject to the Railway Labor Act do not come under the provisions of title I, II, and III of this bill.

Title V of the committee print on page 30 creates a Temporary Labor Relations Commission composed of 20 members—5 representing management and 5 representing labor to be appointed by the President, 5 Members of the House to be appointed by the Speaker, and 5 Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate. The Commission is to make a thorough study and investigation into the underlying causes of disputes between labor and management.

In summing up let me say, ladies and gentlemen, that the substitute which I have introduced is the Lesinski bill with seven amendments.

First. The Taft-Hartley provisions for a national emergency.

Second. An anti-Communist affidavit.

Third. Free speech.

Fourth. Labor organizations required to bargain in good faith.

Fifth. Labor organizations to file organizational and financial statements.

Sixth. Creating a Temporary Labor Relations Commission.

Seventh. And a clarifying amendment.

I urge the Members of this body who are genuinely interested in the trade-union movement and who are interested in discarding the restrictive provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act to join together on this compromise measure.

This substitute protects the American public from the whims of a labor gangster and at the same time protects and encourages the right to bargain collectively. I urge its adoption without crippling amendments.

Buchanan, the Dictator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 19, 1950

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, it looks to me like the so-called Buchanan Select Committee on Lobbying Activities has gotten out of hand. In fact, it has gone so far afield as to warrant its abolishment.

Happenings before the Buchanan committee the past 2 weeks or more, indicate that the chairman, and his supporters are hell-bent on getting just one side of the lobbying story and are using their offices to drag in the mud anyone who has the courage to oppose the Truman-Pendergast regime.

Yesterday, Tuesday, June 6, Chairman BUCHANAN and his majority, bent on discrediting anyone believing in constitutional government, denied Dr. Edward A. Rumely, executive secretary for the Committee on Constitutional Government, the right to make a statement before the committee, regardless of the fact that Dr. Rumely had been summoned under committee subpena. However, Mr. BUCHANAN did permit Dr. Rumley to file his statement.

Under permission to extend my remarks, I include Dr. Rumely's filed statement so that it may be made available to all Members of Congress and to those who may be interested. The statement follows:

STATEMENT FILED BY DR. EDWARD A. RUMELY BEFORE THE BUCHANAN SELECT COMMITTEE ON LOBBYING ACTIVITIES, JUNE 6, 1950

I ask the opportunity to make a statement while I am under oath and subject to cross-examination rather than to be compelled to release it to the press without such scrutiny by you and your committee.

This statement, I believe, may be helpful to you, your committee and to the Congress in presenting the matters at issue, in their proper perspective. First, let me say that nothing in this statement is intended as a personal criticism of Mr. Louis Little or his assistants. During the 2 weeks while they were in our offices, they acted with courtesy and consideration.

Our complaint goes to part of the job that they were sent to do, and to what we believe is a wholly misguided and unconstitutional conception on your part of your powers.

When Mr. Louis Little first called, he said, "Chairman BUCHANAN thinks that a new form of lobbying has developed. Lobbyists no longer primarily buttonhole Congressmen but instead reach out to the public back home and build public opinion that causes constituents to speak up to their Congressmen, and thus legislation is influenced. Your organization, we regard as the most efficient operation on the right or conservative side, and we want to see just how you project your viewpoint to the country."

I was horrified at the thought that a branch of Congress could enter the field of dissemination of ideas among citizens in an area where, under the Bill of Rights, they are guaranteed privacy and complete freedom from government interference.

When I was a young man, a student of medicine in Europe, almost 50 years ago, an incident occurred that left a lifelong impression. One fall, one of our friends, a fellow intern, in medicine, did not return as we had expected he would for his studies. About a month later, a middle-aged Russian woman, a fellow student of medicine, came and asked, "Please give me 10 francs. The reason our friend and fellow student did not return is that he has been exiled into the coldest part of Siberia where he is shivering without adequate clothing and we are collecting money to buy sheepskin coats and blankets with the wool on them to keep him warm."

This student, leaving for home in July, had left a little money to have his mail for-

warded, but he had subscribed to a magazine published in Switzerland, to come to this hospital and it was also forwarded. It was on the prohibited list of the Czar's secret police, and the arrival of a single number, showing a year's subscription, caused the police to put this student away for 1 year in exile in Siberia.

In history that is the kind of thing that happens when government invades the area of molding people's thinking—in Russia under Stalin, in Italy under Mussolini, in Germany under Hitler. American correspondents who observed the rise of Hitler report that it was not so much the excellence of his own propaganda as the ability to knock down and shut off the expression of any opposing viewpoint. That, Mr. BUCHANAN, is exactly what you are doing.

The CIO News in an editorial directed to your committee, entitled "Lobby Probe," said on May 8: "We would like to see a full explanation of such outfits as the Committee for Constitutional Government." In the June 5 number, reporting on your meeting with the press, this same publication says, "At a press conference BUCHANAN made no bones of his personal distaste for these three organizations." We were one of the three. You are further quoted, "Congress is entitled to know which financial interests are back of attempts to influence public opinion and legislation."

Do not clergymen and educators influence public opinion? Are you going to suppress them?

This statement quoted by the CIO News—also on page 1 of the New York Times—confirms the viewpoint outlined by your representative, Louis Little, as the objective of your investigation. We challenge your power to meddle in the processes by which the American people have facts and educational material in books and other publications, presented to them, from which, ultimately, public opinion results.

Of the thousand or more opinion-molding organizations at work, the most gigantic machine ever built is that of the labor monopolies. They report collection of $425,000,000 annually of regular dues, with an estimated $200,000,000 additional in assessments and the services of 100,000 shop stewards, paid by stockholders but misused for political purposes, often against the long-range interests of the workers themselves, as well as the stockholders.

Next in power is the bureaucracy of the Federal Government itself, with 45,000 on the payroll engaged primarily in press agentry, and costing $70,000,000 annually, plus tens of millions in free postal service to promote their loaded propaganda for bigger and bigger government. The CIO News reports: "The name of the CCG first came up in the lobby probe several weeks ago when Leo Goodman, directer of the housing committee, charged that it financed some of the activities of the real-estate lobby. Goodman said the CCG sent out mail, paid for print material attacking rent control and Federal housing legislation." The CIO has spent probably hundreds of times as much as we, using its gigantic machine to pressure for rent control, urging confiscation of part of the home owner's income by rent control.

Now, at CIO behest, you and your agents are digging into how we distribute our educational material to citizens back home, on these rent-control and housing issues.

We are carrying on, in the area of public opinion, a nonpartisan, nonprofit, educational effort, influencing public opinion, as do newspapers, magazines, periodicals, churches, service clubs, colleges, and innumerable other forces.

It was Jefferson's concept and that of the men who wrote our Bill of Rights that with the free play of such forces, all sides, uncurbed and uninfluenced by government, even the unpopular side of a question, could be presented and heard. The citizens, with the information before them, could come to sound conclusions and, by their votes, wisely guide the course of their government.

Your agents showed little interest in the tens of thousands of individual purchases of books and literature. For example, on the day after Lincoln's birthday, we received 2,171 units, aggregating $9,452; 30 of these were contributions, averaging $12 each; more than 2,000 purchases of books and literature and the Bill of Rights, with an over-all average of $4.50 each.

Your agents took back to Washington, for your information, copy of our auditor's annual financial reports for the years 1949, 1948, and 1947. For example, the 1949 report shows that we had received no contributions in excess of $490 and only 158 contributions ranging from $101 to $490; 5,526 contributions of less than $10; 1,707 ranging from $11 to $25 and 1,051 ranging from $26 to $100. The average amount received in contributions during 1949 was $22.20, just about the amount the average union member pays in dues. In that same year, we sold books and literature in 22,000 separate orders, averaging $15 each.

You had these facts before you, yet you put out a totally false statement that went through the press of the whole United States, saying that you were seeking to find out Rumely's "financial angels." It is true that a few who bought more than 100 books or whose support amounted to more than $100 are public-spirited citizens with means or in prominent position. If you now demand their names and present them as typical of the support of the committee, as you have done, you ignore the evidence before you and misuse the confidence of the press in a congressional committee to project to the Nation a totally false picture. If any private individual or institution put out such a biased and unfounded press interview, it would be looked upon as downright dishonesty.

We have sold about 600,000 copies of Flynn's book, The Road Ahead, during the past 5 months, in tens of thousands of individual orders, ranging from 1 to 10 copies each; a small percentage of the total sales were purchased in quantities, by individuals and institutions, for redistribution. Demanding and releasing the names of these buyers, you would again create a false picture in the public mind. The CIO reports: "BUCHANAN believes that the Committee for Constitutional Government is the parent of a network lobbying against labor and the Fair Deal," and be believes that "the investigation of the financial backing of three organizations will reveal the ties."

That statement of yours, based on your surmise, is false, for our committee has no ties with other organizations. With 80,000 who have given financial support, it, of course, is probable that a small percentage also have given support to other organizations. But you have projected to the whole country an unfounded surmise, before your committee has had a chance to see the facts. That's biased propaganda on your part and not objective investigation.

See attached hereto a statement released by Sumner Gerard, one of our trustees, setting forth how your demand for the names of the purchasers of our books and literature violates our rights—the rights of all citizens—under the first and fourth amendments to the Constitution.

Four of your agents went to work in our office during 2 weeks, going through books of accounts, our files, correspondence, and inspecting every piece of literature and the books that we have printed and distributed. We gave your representatives more than 98 percent of what they asked for—responding to 24 out of 25 demands, although much of it was irrelevant to the purposes of this investigation. For example, your agents went through our correspondence with Members of Congress. They picked out correspondence with Republicans or with Jeffersonian Democrats like Senator BYRD, but when they saw comment from men like Senator PEPPER on our releases, they left that to one side.

It is for the reasons set forth in the Gerard statement and these reasons that we are declining to give you the names of the quantity purchasers of our books and literature. Also, the names of a few who made loans for the purpose of enabling us to advertise and promote the Fighters for Freedom movement, which has no relation to lobbying activities before Congress; also to pay for the printing and promotion of early editions of The Road Ahead.

I am taking this stand after consultation and on the advice of my counsel, Neil Burkinshaw, and after consultation with the trustees of the Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc.

EDWARD A. RUMELY.

Requests for Veto of Basing Point Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 7, 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a memorial to the President by representatives of small business asking for a veto of Senate bill 1008. I also ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD, a similar request to the President from Mr. C. Wilson Harder, president of the National Federation of Independent Business.

There being no objection, the memorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C.,
June 6, 1950.

TO PRESIDENT HARRY S. TRUMAN:

This memorial was written in the hope that we would see you personally. We have, however, requested the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN as our spokesman, to present this memorial to you.

Mr. President, on the 5th of March 1936 representatives of independent businesses were designated to confer with the President of the United States, the late Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt—the designation coming from a meeting held a day before at Constitution Hall, in which over 2,000 or more independent businessmen from all over the Nation were present. In that visit with the President on March 5, 1936, was Mr. John Dargavel, Mr. R. H. Rowe, and Mr. George J. Burger, and others. These representatives were from industries in the retail distribution field, such as druggists, grocers, independent tire dealers, etc.

Three of that former delegation are among the petitioners in this memorial. At the meeting on March 4, 1936, at Constitution Hall, this meeting was addressed by the late Honorable Joe Robinson, Member of the United States Senate and Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN, Member of the House of Representatives, co-authors of the Robinson-Patman Act then pending before Congress for action. The spokesmen for independent businesses on the 5th of March 1936, requested the President to give his earnest consideration to the pending Robinson-Patman Act and what it meant to the future of the free enterprise system, and more important, independent business of this Nation if and when the bill was finally voted by the Congress

that he would give his support by signing the bill. To his everlasting credit a few months later the bill reached the President's desk and he signed the Robinson-Patman Act. This law has stood the test of the courts during the past 14 years and it can be said without fear of contradiction that it has been the lifeblood in maintaining the free enterprise system and fair competition. This bill has helped to preserve all independent establishments in our economy.

Mr. President, now we face a critical situation. A bill has now been passed by the Congress which is known as Senate bill 1008. It is our opinion that we representatives speak for independent business of this Nation when we urge you to veto this bill for the following reasons:

1. It is a very bad bill. It will destroy the antiprice discrimination provisions of the Robinson-Patman Act. It will weaken the very antitrust laws which both major political parties swore solemnly, during their 1948 election year campaigns, to enforce and strengthen.

2. It will sacrifice small and independent businessmen to the demands of monopoly business. It will mortally injure small and independent businessmen whose interests both major political parties swore solemnly, during their 1948 election year campaigns, to protect and advance.

3. It will increase monopoly domination of American business, something which both major political parties swore solemnly, during their 1948 election year campaigns, they would oppose firmly.

4. The bill will not, as its sponsors claim, benefit small and independent businessmen—rather it will injure them. S. 1008 has not been given the thorough airing all legislation should receive. Senate and House sponsors of the bill have refused to hear, in committees charged with considering the bill, the objections of small and independent businessmen to the measure.

5. Finally, it is our considered view that if S. 1008 should become law it will impose on small business a calamity of the first magnitude, and will eventually result in nullifying the entire antitrust laws.

Solely in the interest of independent business and its further welfare we respectfully urge you to veto this bill.

Fourteen years ago we pleaded with your predecessor to sign the bill to protect independent business of this Nation, and today, 14 years later, we respectfully ask you to save this needed and necessary legislation.

GEORGE J. BURGER,
Vice President, National Federation of Independent Business.
JOHN W. DARGAVEL,
Executive Secretary, National Association of Retail Druggists.
R. H. ROWE,
Vice President and Secretary, United States Wholesale Grocers Association.

Mr. C. Wilson Harder, president of the National Federation of Independent Business, Inc., today called on President Truman to veto the basing-point bill, S. 1008.

Mr. Harder stated: "This legislation is contradictory of everything that you personally and your party have pledged to independent business." Mr. Harder further stated that "instead of safeguarding our free way of life, this bill will place our Nation on a sure road to either socialism or industrial fascism."

Following is the complete text of Mr. Harder's message:

"For our Nation-wide membership we call on you as a court of last resort to veto S. 1008, the basing-point bill that is now on your desk. This legislation is contradictory of everything that you personally and your party have pledged to independent business. Instead of strengthening the antitrust laws, this bill weakens them by ripping the guts from the Robinson-Patman Act. Instead of preserving and extending small-business welfare, this bill lays small and independent business firms wide open to the rapacious price discriminations of their giant competitors. Instead of combating and checking the growth of monopoly, this bill will promote the growth of industrial concentration in our land. Instead of safeguarding our free way of life, this bill will place our Nation on a sure road to either socialism or industrial fascism. Mr. President, we can tell you that our Nation-wide membership, which is the largest of any business organization in the land has been apprised of this legislation and that our members have voted overwhelmingly against it. We are looking to you to breathe life once more into your party's pledges to small business by an immediate, forthright veto of S. 1008. Will you kindly advise your decision and reasons for same?

"C. WILSON HARDER,
"President, National Federation of Independent Business."

Walter Report Praised

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 7, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, with permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I attach the following excerpt from a page 1 article in the May 11 issue of Der Zeit, an independent German paper published in Hamburg. The article titled "The Gates Are Opening," was written by Robert Strobel, the paper's Bonn correspondent:

THE GATES ARE OPENING

The German refugee problem cannot be solved by the Federal Republic alone. Simple as it is to recognize this, until now Germany was the only one of all countries in the world to do so. Now, for the first time, matters appear to be taking shape. A proposal has been made for an internationally organized mass emigration of a million Germans, and President Truman is said to have approved already on principle this proposal of the so-called Walter report. Even though its practical effect may not be expected for some time yet, one thing is certain at present: It is a pearl among the reports of our time, which are so numerous, so voluminous and so poor as to contents.

What is particularly agreeable to note is that American observers have examined the emigration problem not from a single point of view but from all those which come into question in the matter, including the results to German national economy of mass emigration. There are certainly many problems still to be solved before such large-scale emigration can start, but a beginning has been made. The world is not only recognizing the international bearings of the evacuees problem but is also accepting the consequences. This is good news. The gate is not yet open through which the despairing people desire to emigrate to a new home and which could serve as a safety-valve to remove a dangerously high pressure from the Federal Republic; but it seems to be about to open. Francis E. Walter has turned the key in the lock.

Stop the Curtailment of the Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 7, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following is my statement to the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, expressing my opposition to the curtailment of postal service:

Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank you and the members of this committee for giving me this opportunity to express my views on the curtailment of the postal service.

We have always prided ourselves on the efficient manner in which our Post Office Department is administered and the speedy and excellent postal service it has rendered to the American people. No country in the world can point to such matchless service to its people. It is one of the things which are a part of our democratic system and which only a democracy such as ours can produce. Communication—and speedy, efficient communication at that—is not characteristic of totalitarian regimes where it is discouraged or banned entirely.

There is no necessity for postal curtailment at this time. The American people have a justifiable right to expect better postal service and not less. They are paying for it at their local post offices, and they are paying for it in their taxes to the Government. Our Government owes to the people a Government-financed efficient postal service. We must maintain this service for the sake of our business and commercial relations which must continue uninterruptedly.

Above all, it should be remembered that this is a service to our people and is not intended to earn any profit. In fact, we should not even expect to break even on this service and should be ready to subsidize it as the need arises.

Curtailing it to a one-delivery-per-day system, with half of the delivery carried over to the late afternoon or to the next day where the mail is heavy, constitutes a tremendous injustice to many people.

Let me cite only one or two instances of hardship. Many of our professionals, such as physicians, dentists, writers, and others operate out of offices at home. Living in residential areas, they are restricted to receiving mail only once a day, and since collections from mail boxes in those areas have also been curtailed, they are being severely discriminated against.

Incidentally, let me remind the members of this committee that Members of Congress are also getting mail only once a day at their homes, and you know well that much of the mail from our constituents is directed to us at our residences. I for one strenuously object to this curtailment of the prompt delivery of my constituents' mail to me and mine to them.

In addition to the handicap which this curtailment causes to business establishments and to professionals and the inconvenience which it is causing the public, let us not overlook two other factors. One is the loss of employment to many thousands of postal workers; the other is the undermining of the morale in the Post Office Department and its numerous branches throughout the country. These employees have been hard-working, loyal personnel, who have given many years of their life to the service. In New York City, for example,

we are told that about 5,000 to 6,000 such postal employees have lost their jobs or are on the verge of losing them because of this curtailment.

I am convinced that this is false and dangerous economy which may result in irreparable damage to American business enterprise and to our whole economic system. Let us find the means to cover the deficit of the postal service and let us reestablish that service so that it may continue to function and to serve the needs of the American people as in the past.

FEPC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Times-Herald for June 6, 1950:

LUCAS CAN'T DO IT

Ever since May 19, when the Democrats in the Senate ran out on their pledge to put FEPC over, Majority Leader LUCAS has been promising to bring the matter up for another vote.

Do not be taken in by such talk. The Democrats have killed FEPC for this session of Congress.

And, even though LUCAS has shown a complete lack of political know-how in his job, we think that even he realizes that FEPC is dead for this session. If that is so why does he persist in playing along with the idea of another vote? Here's the answer:

JUST TALK

There are three reasons why his boss Harry Truman apparently thinks another vote is necessary. One is that it still gives the administration a feeble peg on which to hang its claims that the Democrats are the true friends of the Negroes. LUCAS can keep on shouting that he tried and tried. Second, it will satisfy a demand from the FEPC supporters that the Members who are absent on the first vote stand and be counted.

Third, it will give Truman another chance to demand election of a rubber-stamp Congress in November. He can promise all over again to get FEPC through if the voters will give him his kind of a Congress.

Of course, such claims are the worst of political hooey.

The real truth is that the Democratic Party is split down the middle, platform promise or no platform promise, on FEPC. On the other hand, the majority of Republicans in the Senate are ready and willing to live up to their promises.

And so, after LUCAS had fumbled around until it was too late to beat the southern filibuster against the bill, a phony attempt was made to clamp down on the debate. It takes 64 votes to put cloture in force in the Senate.

DEMOCRATS KILLED IT

On the cloture vote May 19, 52 Senators voted for it and 32 against it. It would have taken 12 more votes to enforce cloture. A breakdown shows that while only 19 Democrats voted for the cloture rule, 26 voted against it. On the other hand, 33 Republicans voted for it and only 6 against it.

The figures show absolutely that FEPC was killed because the Senate Democrats refused to follow their leader. And what good is a leader without followers?

Now, there were 12 Members of the Senate absent when that vote was taken, 9 Democrats and 3 Republicans. LUCAS must be able to add all 12 of these votes to the 52 who voted with him on the first vote to win when he calls it up again. He can't get them.

And the supporters of FEPC should not be fooled any longer by his stalling tactics.

Nor should they be fooled when the bill is finally sidetracked and Truman goes on another political tour and tries to pull the wool over the eyes of the voters by posing as the great champion of civil rights.

Biggest Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the forty-fourth article by Mr. Frank C. Waldrop on the infiltration of communism in our country:

BIGGEST STORY

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

This piece may be an embarrassment to the Honorable Louis Johnson, now Secretary of Defense, for it recalls a time when he was right about something and Mr. Roosevelt, whom he so venerates today, was wrong.

Mr. Johnson was then national commander of the American Legion. The Roosevelt administration was warming up the propaganda drums for Soviet recognition. The American Legion was against it.

So on April 19, 1933, a mass meeting was held at the old Washington Auditorium, here, with some 5,000 persons in attendance, representing a national variety of patriotic, fraternal, religious, labor, and civic organizations.

On the platform with Mr. Johnson that evening were the Rev. Edmund A. Walsh, S. J., of Georgetown University; William Green, head of the American Federation of Labor; and Hamilton Fish, Mr. Roosevelt's own Congressman and then still his good friend.

Father Walsh is the vice regent of Georgetown and renowed authority on Russia.

Mr. Fish at that time had just wound up a congressional investigation into Communist activity in the United States started in 1930, and an excellent source today of indisputable fact.

William Green was most honorably and firmly on the public record as repudiating on behalf of United States organized labor any interest in Soviet recognition. He had really declared the idea of Soviet trade a fake and had clearly defined the issue as one of giving or withholding support to a bloody tyrant who meant the United States only ill.

Mr. Johnson read to the assemblage a letter from Bainbridge Colby, whom I mentioned earlier in this series as the first United States Secretary of State to give out a definitive official view on the Soviets.

Mr. Colby, in the last days of the Wilson regime, had written a letter to the Italian Ambassador opposing recognition until the Soviets had proved, not just promised, abandonment of world revolution, had proved, not just promised, an enlightened and a generally peaceful outlook.

His letter to the patriotic meeting in Washington on April 19, 1933, was a redefinition and careful delineation of the importance to the whole world of dissolving the Soviet barriers against civilization.

Can you imagine, for instance, the benefits that would have come if Russia after 1918 had allowed her citizens the one simple freedom to travel the world, read the world's literature, know the world's ways, and allow the world the same privilege in Russia?

The hatreds, suspicions, and ignorant fears that are essential to the Soviet discipline could not have withstood such a barrage of reality.

That is why the Soviet leaders have never dared to this day, to allow a free meeting between Russia and the civilized world.

Russians understanding another side to life would never have submitted to the demands put upon them by the Communists. The very contrast between civilized life and the barbarous oppressions at home would have been enough to crush the Soviet system without the world having had to face its present prospects of war.

But civilization and the Russian people were barricaded away from one another by communism. And Mr. Roosevelt foolishly saved Stalin in his critical hour of 1933 when the Russians were revolting against him.

That meeting here in Washington on April 19, 1933, was an effort to withstand the propaganda for recognition with a summation of facts.

The reality of the Soviet regime, as contrasted with the propaganda, was thoroughly expounded with full, factual evidence in support.

As a matter of fact, it was expounded not only in Washington but from Europe as well. Guglielmo Ferrero, the most famous philosopher-historian of the day, issued explicit warnings against the foolish notion that anybody could do business with Stalin.

From the Vatican came the voice of experience. The Pope asked what guaranties Stalin would make against further suppressions of civilization at home and abroad.

Nobody can say that Mr. Roosevelt was not warned, or that wise men, both at home and from all over the world, neglected to caution him.

He was told to be careful, to watch his step, to realize that he was lightly juggling dynamite. But it did no good.

He had his mind fixed on making sensation. He had his eye fixed on the headlines. And Prof. Felix Frankfurter, as testified earlier in this series by one who had a part in the whole dirty business, had Mr. Roosevelt "in his vest pocket." The tragedy was happening.

Taxpayers Charged for Political Junkets of Administration Officials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 9, 1950

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article by Mr. Louis Bromfield which appeared in the Tacoma News Tribune on May 14, 1950. The article is

an excellent one, dealing with political junkets by administration officials. It follows:

TAXPAYERS CHARGED FOR POLITICAL JUNKETS OF ADMINISTRATION OFFICIALS

(By Louis Bromfield)

At last Congress has shown signs of moving in on the leaders of Mr. Truman's administration and the Democratic National Committee. For months and years now every taxpayer, regardless of his feeling toward Mr. Truman and his socialistic platform, has been paying his share of the expenses to promote Mr. Truman, his friends and his ideas. How? Through the old Pendergast ward politics system of charging up expenses of political campaigning to the government itself.

Let's look at the record. For months now Mr. Brannan, Secretary of Agriculture, has been touring the country, making speeches attempting to sell Mr. Truman and his welfare state to hundreds of thousands of citizens. There has been and there can be no pretense as to what he is doing. The attitude is wholly partisan both as to ideas and as to politics. The Democratic National Committee rather than the taxpayer should be paying the bill which runs in a year or so into hundreds of thousands.

Mr. Tobin, Secretary of Labor, has been following the same pattern, rarely making anything but partisan political speeches which sound as if he were a paid propagandist for the big officials of organized labor whom the Democratic National Committee woo so passionately. Who paid for it all? You and I.

Mr. Ewing, Federal Security Administrator, tours not only this country but Europe with special attention to the socialist government of Great Britain. On his return he did quite a bit of traveling and talking in praise of British socialism and in particular of socialized medicine, which is simply a backhanded way of making hay for Mr. Truman and his program. Who paid for it? You and I.

BILL COMES TO MILLIONS

And so, on and on it goes, throughout most of the Democratic office holders in cabinet and administrative posts. Virtually every one of them is guilty and when we add up the total, including Government planes which are freely commandeered in the interests of the Democratic Party, the bill comes to many millions of dollars. Who pays it? Not the Democratic Party campaign fund but you and I every time we pay our income tax, or go to a movie or send a telegram or ride on a train or buy a cigarette.

Under law and constitution, all the posts represented in this spending of taxpayers' money for the benefit of Mr. Truman and his friends were set up as administrative posts clearly established as nonpolitical. Under the long 17 years of Democratic rule, they have turned more and more simply into debased political sounding boards in which the administrators spend more and more time away from their inefficient, expensive and confused departments in making political speeches.

The Department of Agriculture, for example, was clearly established by law and for many generations by honest precedent, as an agency for research and education, beneficial to American agriculture. The present Secretary is a New Deal Denver lawyer without direct contact or experience with agriculture or any of the farmer's problems. How much time does he spend trying to straighten out the administrative mess into which his Department has been made by successive political appointees? How much time does he spend pressing research and education? And how much time does he spend on the road selling Mr. Truman, the welfare state and socialist ideas which would completely regiment the farmer in return for an inadequate check paid out of taxpayers' money?

EXPENSES PAID

Only recently at a Minnesota meeting, farmer members of the Production and Marketing Organization—incidentally the worst political set-up in our Government—were given per diem pay and expenses by car, train, and in hotels, to travel considerable distances in order to hear Mr. Brannan make a political speech in favor of the welfare state, the Brannan plan, and Mr. Truman. Who pays for this skulduggery? Guess. It is not the Democratic National Committee.

The President himself is no better. Recently it was recorded that he winked at reporters when he mentioned his forthcoming nonpolitical trip to the Northwest and back again with speeches at every whistle stop. The trip will cost well in excess of a hundred thousand dollars. Who pays for it? Guess who. You and I. When clearly it should be charged to the Democratic Party campaign fund.

This is the kind of thing we get when we place in office men who are essentially professional and sometimes cheap ward politicians.

Fortunately Congress has begun to take notice of these practices which honest citizens can regard only as an outrage, not only against themselves but against decent democratic government. Mr. Stalin and his friends operate on the same system but more frankly and honestly. It might just be that this situation is a good subject for a letter to your Representatives in Washington. That's the only way we shall stop what is one of the cheapest and most shameful practices in American history, as subversive to good government and good democracy as anything the Communists have ever attempted to pull off in our midst.

The High Crime of Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 19, 1950

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, the Treasury statement for May 31, 1950, shows our Nation has run in the red $3,230,012,100 so far this year. It shows that the high crime of inflation is being aided and abetted by our Congress, which every year votes more and more for the spending which is depreciating the purchasing power of the dollar.

In 1939 the dollar was worth a fraction more than 100 cents in the markets of the Nation. By 1949 the purchasing power was down to 59.1 cents. Today it is even lower, and reports of events which happened yesterday convince me that unless the trend is halted we are on the road to the biggest bust of all time.

Steel scrap which sold for $15.75 a ton in January 1939, advanced to $26.32 in August 1949. Yesterday steel scrap was quoted at $46 a ton. Steel is one of our basic commodities, and this advance in price since last August will be reflected in prices of almost everything in the durable goods industries.

Food costs also have risen too fast for the good of the Nation.

A basket of 18 food items which cost $4.92 at the grocers in 1939, advanced to $11.44 by August 1949. Today that same basket will cost $12.52. This is an advance of 9 percent in 9 months.

Food costs have risen 254.47 points from the 1939 level. The dollar is worth only 39.3 cents in the grocery store today. The following table illustrates the trend, which must be stopped if we are to save America from disaster.

INFLATION HITS THE FAMILY MARKET BASKET HARDER IN 1950

The cost of 18 items making up the family market basket advanced substantially above the August 1949 price according to our latest survey of advertised prices by Washington, D. C., chain stores.

In 1939, the items could have been bought for $4.92. By August, 1949 the price advanced to $11.44. The latest survey, by Paul O. Peters, well-known economist, shows the prices as of June 5, 1950.

Item	March 1939	August 1949	June 5, 1950
Beef, chuck roast, 5 pounds	$0.85	$2.15	$2.75
Vegetable shortening, 3 pounds	.47	.85	.90
Butter, 92 score, creamery, 1 pound	.25	.70	.71
Flour, 12 pounds	.39	.98	1.12
Sugar, 5 pounds	.22	[1].42	.46
Coffee, 1 pound	.14	[1].42	.74
Potatoes, 10 pounds	.19	.43	.50
Bread, 2 pounds	.15	.27	.28
Milk, 2 quarts	.28	.40	[1].38
Pork and beans, 2 cans	.13	.23	.29
Corn, niblets or equal, 2 12-ounce	.20	.35	.33
Picnic ham, 3 pounds	.45	1.17	1.29
Lettuce, head, 12 ounces	.05	.12	.15
Salad dressing, 1 pint	.17	.35	.33
Pears, 2½ size can, 2 cans	.30	.78	.74
Peanut butter, 1 pound	.17	.37	.37
Sirup, Vermont Maid, 12 ounces	.15	.27	.26
Eggs, standard, cartons, 2 dozen	.35	1.18	.96
Total	4.92	11.44	12.52

[1] These items were on special sale.

In March 1939, the public debt stood at approximately $40,000,000,000.

On May 31, 1950, the Treasury reported the public debt at $256,350,132,734.

The deficit for the fiscal year 1950 to May 31 was $3,230,012,100.

Every dollar of deficit spending contributes to the inflationary pressures now forcing the prices of foods and other commodities upward.

It is the old story of money competing for goods in the market place.

Memorial Day Means Keeping Faith With Those Beyond

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 7, 1950

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Forest Republican, Tionesta, Pa., for June 1, 1950:

MEMORIAL DAY MEANS KEEPING FAITH WITH THOSE BEYOND

Memorial Day is our most revered public secular day in America. It's meaning is joined in sacred ritual.

This is logically and rightfully so. Its roots lie deep in the lives of our people.

It is an occasion that brings to the surface strong emotional ties with the past.

For all, it is a time of communion with loved ones who have voyaged beyond these earthly shores. A time when we do honor to their memories. In this, there is something akin to the worship of their ancestors by the Chinese.

Both here in America and there in Asia, we venerate the greatness and the virtue of those who have gone on before us in our several family strains.

In so doing we derive inspiration and good. We pass on to our posterity the essence of our collective heritage, the parts that make up a stimulating and noble tradition. A tradition that charts the advance of our own strong civilization marching on toward its final destiny. A destiny of enduring vitality, it is our hope and prayer.

As we think of our civilization, our lofty culture, the beneficiary of the great thinkers and philosophers of Greece and Rome and of western Europe, we can and should rightfully give pause to consider how this historic trend toward truth and righteousness continues to gather momentum.

This 2,000 year old sweep toward bringing mankind into line with the Golden Rule of the Man from Galilee, into the faith of the Sermon on the Mount.

As one of the millions who have seen military naval service, may I suggest that perhaps the most decisive element which has driven our Christian way of life ahead is one that in recent generations is often taken for granted, or underrated, or even overlooked altogether.

I refer to the resolute courage of the individual to face death in defense of his country, and of his ideals.

Is not the grim necessity for such courage in this day a supreme challenge? Is this not the kind of challenge that British historian Arthur Toynbee means, when he lays down his rule that civilizations only survive if confronted with overwhelming hazards which are overcome?

In these dangerous times more than one European nation capitulated with little or no resistance to the harsh, pagan Nazi invader of 1940.

Briefly, these surrenders came about because too many individuals were unwilling to face the possibility of making the supreme sacrifice while fighting for freedom, albeit in extenuation of their civic defalcations, it should be noted that they had suffered severely and too much during World War I.

I cite this particular bit of modern history that here today in this beautiful resting place of the dead, within the very shadows of their tombstones, we may more fully, more clearly, and more reverently evaluate the true greatness of those who gave their lives in conflict that this Nation might carry on.

Further, that we may grasp the real and far-reaching world significance of their supreme sacrifices, let us not forget that the wars of the United States have ever been just ones and don't let any recent history textbooks tell you otherwise. Such historians are warped in their views. These wars were all waged to the ultimate end that the great weight of our Federal Union shall be maintained in being as a mighty force in the defense of liberal, constitutional principles and of western, Christian culture.

At this hour, I would dwell a moment longer upon our debt to this brave and noble band of patriots who have so gallantly marched on into the west.

Ours is a debt which transcends the power of words to define and of numbers to give substance. It is infinite and incalculable. It can never be paid.

However, we who have survived can do this. We can keep faith with America's war dead that they shall not have died in vain. This, then, would seem to be the challenge for citizens of today if our Republic is to continue.

Through the strange workings of fate this solemn obligation has never before confronted citizens of America at a more sinisterly threatening period in our short but stirring history.

The wake of each world war seems to find us a Nation facing more baffling and more ominous problems than before. Neither conflict has made the world safe for democracy, nor for decency.

Perversely, out of these same struggles mankind has spawned the age-old destroyer of democracy. I refer to tyranny, the arch-scourge of free institutions, set up under a purely authoritarian concept of conscienceless communism, propagated by a band of fanatically and dangerously efficient gangsters, befowling the fair countrysides of the earth with their brands of godless materialism and venomous hate of class against class, spewed from the walls of their Kremlin.

This unclean and vengeful movement of world-wide proportion, this vendetta of mad dogs in human shape against the decencies of men and aimed at the very fiber of our Christian civilization, poses probably the hardest problem that men of good will have ever had to contend with.

The problem is predominantly one that must be solved on this side of the Atlantic. If America fails, truly the forces of darkness will envelop the earth, and the eclipse of truth and righteousness may last for ages to come.

We can visualize hardly one single question that confronts America in this approaching Armageddon which is capable of easy and clear-cut solution.

For instance, we must be armed so adequately that we cannot be struck down in the North American region by a dynamically delivered, Pearl Harbor style, sneak attack. However, at the same time we must not seriously distort and weaken the vitality of our national economy by an all-guns-and-no-butter pattern of industrial output. Who is wise enough to say where the dividing line should come?

Another poser is the question of foreign aid. It is clear that Europe must be helped economically and by direct transfers of military supplies if the west is to establish in Europe enough power, and in time, to discourage Stalin from starting world war III, or if conflict is unavoidable, to stop the Slavic hordes dead in their tracks east of the Rhine.

If we give too much to Europe, we will bankrupt ourselves, thereby bringing on a rigid, planned economy and socialism in our own land. In this dilemma, where should we cease our overseas expenditures in order to retain our own fiscal solvency and industrial strength?

So many other decisions of equal complexity now confront the citizens of the United States, not the least of which is the job of countering fifth columnists, not only in the midst of many communities, but, according to many indications, within the walls of Government offices, disloyal persons influencing policies and exercising authority.

How are we going to root out, remove and justly penalize such sinister borers from within, and still preserve the great constitutional guaranties of our personal liberties? These two objectives are almost incompatible.

It is clear that here in America, at the midpoint of the century, we all as citizens must give the study of public questions our utmost attention. These problems must be solved. Our Government officials, charged with the specific tasks of meeting these responsibilities are only human and but too fallible. They need the response of a strong and informed public opinion.

We are often prone to find fault with our Congressmen, to berate their actions, and to belittle their collective judgment. It is an easy habit to fall into, and manifestly a very unfair one. I made progress in curing myself of this tendency by substituting the words "American people" for the word "Congress" whenever I angrily made some such loose statement as, "Only a stupid and short-sighted Congress would do such a thing."

Congress is in fact the American people. It is a mirror of our citizenry. It responds quickly and accurately to the wishes of the people. They will get just as sound and effective action from Congress as they demand, and no more.

When they deride and express doubts as to the effectiveness of Congress, when they speak of it in terms of futility they are in effect indicating themselves as unfit for self government; they are denying the integrity and effectiveness of representative government. An institution which is making its last stand in America. Even England has gone Socialist.

Representative government must survive and return to the misguided people of other lands. It is facing the supreme test in this generation. As I have said before, our Christian civilization now hangs in the balance. It can only survive if Americans can muster the interest in their own problems, and exercise the straight thinking, the wisdom, and the restraint necessary to influence their government officials toward coming to sound and honest decisions.

This is our present, immediate, and compelling obligation to our heroic war dead that they may sleep in peace, in the knowledge that we will not let them down, that we are keeping faith with them, and that their untimely passing shall have been definitely instrumental in bringing about a better world for their children, their children's children and their posterity.

In closing, we salute our heroes buried here who have left us in the springtime of their lives, who sacrificed so much that religion, decency, freedom and the concept of the dignity of man might survive on earth.

We who carry on shall not forget them, nor shall we fail them in the great battles for what is just and right.

NOTE.—The foregoing Memorial Day address was given by Admiral Davis at Marienville and at Pleasantville and is published here for its editorial content.

The Disabled American Speaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1950

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an editorial which appeared in the May 25, 1950, issue of the paper Disabled American Veterans, pointing out very vividly and with sincere apprehension the effects of the Taber-Jensen amendments to the omnibus appropriation bill which recently passed the House. It should be revealing reading for those who supported these amendments, which will undoubtedly injure our most deserving veterans, the disabled veterans:

SENATE HOLDS VETERANS' FUTURE

Shortly before the omnibus appropriation bill passed the House this month, a burst of

strength on the part of an economy bloc resulted in an amendment which calls for a drastic 10-percent personnel cut in all nonmilitary agencies of the Government.

Another amendment which was included in the bill as passed by the House provides that nonmilitary Federal agencies be prohibited from filling more than 10 percent of their job vacancies during the fiscal year 1951. Luckily, the amendments excluded VA medical personnel.

Although it is too early to determine the exact results which such a measure would have on the Veterans' Administration, it requires little imagination to realize what a tremendous potential threat this legislation is to the successful administration of veteran benefits.

For example, a quick mathematical computation reveals that a 10-percent slash in the total VA staff, excluding medical personnel, would result in the firing of nearly 20,000 VA workers. A reduction-in-force program of this size would make the recent firing of some 4,000 VA employees look like child's play.

Although considerable economies could be effected in the VA without jeopardizing veterans' benefits, economy to the extent proposed by the House would drastically curtail services to veterans which are due them under laws enacted by Congress.

In view of the haphazard methods used by the VA in past reduction-in-force programs, it is alarming, to say the least, to contemplate a straight 10-percent personnel slash. In all probability, the most deserving veterans—that is the disabled—would suffer first if this measure becomes law.

Within the next few weeks the Senate will decide whether to approve these controversial provisions. Upon the decision of these legislators and the President of the United States rests, to a large extent, the continued success of the entire veterans' program.

Our Position in Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 7, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD a highly informative article by that great far eastern expert, Mr. George Sokolsky, on our position in Japan and the magnificent work being done there by Gen. Douglas MacArthur for the good name and prestige of the United States of America:

THESE DAYS
(By George Sokolsky)

It is not necessary at this time to have a peace treaty with Japan. A conference for that purpose can only complicate the Asiatic situation, weaken the position of General MacArthur, and imperil Japan, which happens at this moment in history to be the only important outpost of American defense in the western Pacific.

Were Japan in the possession of an enemy of this country, Alaska's position would be untenable from a military standpoint.

There are two ways of establishing a peace treaty.

1. To call a peace conference of all the nations in the Far East which would impose their will on a fallen foe. Such a conference would include Soviet Russia and either Nationalist or Soviet China. It it is desirable for Soviet Russia to attend, the conference would have to include Soviet China.

That would mean the end of a free Japan, allied to the United States. For both Soviet Russia and Soviet China would have to demand terms that would aid them in their planned purpose of Sovietizing Korea and ultimately turning Japan into a satellite of the Cominform—the federation of Soviet countries.

Also, it is to be noted that Great Britain has become involved precipitately in the recognition of Soviet China, which is now an embarrassment to both the United States and the United Nations. The Socialist government of Great Britain has been pursuing, in both Asia and Europe, a policy without conscience with the sole object of strengthening British trade, come what may.

It was in pursuance of this policy that the British prematurely recognized Soviet China and embarrassed the position of the United States in the United Nations.

Similarly, Great Britain is sabotaging the Franco-German coal and steel pool—the first hopeful sign for the reconstruction of western European economic life.

Dean Acheson, in his address to Congress, recognized the tremendous significance of the Schuman proposal for this pool, which he acknowledged as acceptable under American policy.

In the Pacific, the British represent not only themselves, but the eight nations of the Commonwealth, whose policies and purposes fluctuate widely. Before the war, the Japanese gave evidence of extraordinary ability to compete not only with Great Britain but with the other countries of the Commonwealth. The Japanese did an enormous business in the British colonies and in India.

The British, in their present socialistic attitude, are likely to wish to impose such harsh terms upon the Japanese as to vitiate the amazingly constructive work of Gen. Douglas MacArthur. This is one reason why the Japanese fear a peace conference.

Every Japanese who comes to this country pleads against such a treaty. Yukio Ozaki, the 91-year-old Japanese statesman, made this clear in an address at the dinner of the American Council on Japan recently.

The other way is for the United States, which won the far eastern war, practically alone, with only such aid as Nationalist China could provide, to make a separate treaty with Japan. Parenthetically it may be pointed out that Japan was able to take Hong Kong and Singapore with surprising ease; yet China managed to stand.

The Japanese and General MacArthur would prefer a treaty between the United States and Japan abolishing the state of war which still exists.

The State Department is sending John Foster Dulles to Japan to discuss the matter with General MacArthur. It is generally assumed that John Foster Dulles represents the Republican Party in the State Department as part of a bipartisan policy.

This is an error because no bipartisan policy over far-eastern matters exists or ever has.

This is one of the reasons for the Republican attacks on the far eastern policy of the State Department. Mr. Dulles is not a far-eastern expert, which may or may not be an advantage. Perhaps he may bring to the problem a wholly new point of view.

At any rate, General MacArthur will have no illusions on what can be done. There have been vast differences of view between the State Department and General MacArthur on the far eastern policy of this country, as there have been between the State and Defense Departments.

There is, however, this:

When MacArthur speaks on Japan, the American people will listen.

Problems Relating to the Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 7, 1950

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address made by me in Grand Rapids, Mich., on May 27, 1950, at the joint Michigan convention of postal supervisors and post-office clerks:

Mr. Toastmaster, honored and distinguished guests, members of the Michigan branch of postal supervisors, and members of the Michigan Federation of Post Office Clerks, it is a very real privilege and pleasure for me to meet with you at this thirty-second annual convention in my home city of Grand Rapids. We in the furniture capital of the world welcome you and urge your return, individually and collectively, to this community.

I am particularly pleased to have the opportunity to discuss with you some of the perplexing and controversial problems relating to the postal service. The problems to be discussed are not limited in scope to the welfare of postal employees, but rather directly concern our citizens as a whole. Even though some of the technical problems may be of prime importance to those assembled here this evening, because the Post Office Department literally touches the home of every citizen of this country, the legislation and administrative decisions in reference to the Department are of universal interest. I only ask that we all examine the issues, not only as Government officials and employees, but as citizens of the greatest Nation in the world today. This is the Nation which the rest of the world is depending on as the champion of freedom and the bulwark against the insidious forces of totalitarianism. Under no circumstances in this time of crisis should the United States as a whole or any group of its citizens take any action that would weaken us internally or otherwise. Because of the long record of patriotism and unselfishness of those here tonight I know your future activities will be in the best interest of our Republic.

The deficit in the Post Office Department, totaling $550,000,000 annually, has become a major concern in our Federal budget problems. This bugaboo has been highlighted of late by the fact that the Federal Government has an increasing deficit in prospect for the next fiscal year. As you probably know, since this deficit has mounted to its present-day proportions, the Post Office Department has consistently recommended against the enactment of all proposed legislation directly benefiting postal employees which involved additional costs to the Department. A good example of this is the vigorous protest by the Department in opposition to the $450 annual wage increase granted by the Eightieth Congress.

Our discussion tonight might well begin with a review of the legislation enacted during the present Congress which directly benefits you as employees of the Department.

POSTAL EMPLOYEES LEGISLATION

In 1949, during the first session of this Congress, Public Law 428 was approved. Under this law postal employees received a flat salary increase of $120 a year. Those employees in certain categories which did not have at least three longevity grades were given these grades. For the first time postmasters and supervisors were given longevity grades. These grades amounted to $100

each, except in the case of fourth-class postmasters, who received instead increases of 5 percent of their base salary. For most postal supervisors, since practically all have 25 years of service, this meant an increase of $420 a year, in other words, $300 for their longevity grades and $120 as the result of the flat increase. Also under Public Law 428 the entrance salary for regular employees was increased by $200. This was accomplished by elimination of the first two grades for regular employees. Hereafter substitute employees will still enter the postal service in grade 1, but after they have served a year, will be promoted to grade 3. This is a logical step, although I believe it probably did not go far enough. For example, when Public Law 134, Seventy-ninth Congress, was approved, all employees who were on the rolls of the Post Office Department received an increase of $400 a year. However, the annual entrance salary for postal employees remained at $1,700. For all other Federal employees the basic entrance salary was increased.

There were additional beneficial sections of the original bill (H. R. 4495) as it passed the House which were eliminated in conference with the Senate. I am referring to the increased annual leave for postal employees of 5 days a year and a uniform allowance. In my opinion, the annual-leave situation today is one of the most controversial issues in Congress. Presently it is the subject of study by congressional committees and the Bureau of the Budget, and probably one of these days in the near future firm recommendations will be made with respect to this problem. Whatever these recommendations may be, in my judgment they will inevitably be more favorable for postal employees inasmuch as at the present time postal employees receive 11 days less annual leave and 5 days less sick leave than other Federal employees.

I am sure all of you are familiar with the Comptroller General's decision which voided many increases which the Department proposed to make under Public Law 428 and which were obviously the intent of Congress when that law was passed. To correct these interpretations of the law the House during this session considered a number of remedial bills. The first was H. R. 6553, to permit rural carriers to count all of their time in postal service toward longevity grades. The second was H. R. 6603, to permit custodial employees to count certain service toward their longevity grades. When these bills reached the Senate, it was suggested by the Post Office Department and the Comptroller General that there be a general review by Congress of the decision of the Comptroller General and that the language of Public Law 428 be clarified in one legislative proposal. Accordingly, H. R. 6553 was amended in the Senate. This bill is now Public Law 500, Eighty-first Congress, and under it the following is established:

Three longevity grades to which all employees will be entitled after 13, 18, and 25 years of service. These longevity increases are of $100 per annum for regular employees, except that fourth-class postmasters will be paid 5 percent of their base pay rather than the $100. In qualifying for these grades, employees may count all years of postal service and custodial employees may count their years of service both with the Treasury Department and the Post Office Department. Special-delivery messengers may count their time when they were paid on a fee basis. Clerks in third-class post offices may count the time they were working in the post offices as employees of the postmasters prior to their classification under Public Law 134, Seventy-ninth Congress. Temporary employment may be counted where it is for a period of more than 1 year or where it is continuous to the date of appointment as a classified employee.

Some employees may find it advantageous to remain under the present system of longevity promotions. This law will permit them to select either the present system or the new longevity grades. However, gradually there will be a conversion to the new longevity-grades system of 13, 18, and 25 years for all employees. This will simplify the law with respect to longevity promotions and is a definite improvement.

The Senate amendment further provides that longevity increases granted supervisors will not be counted in deetrmining whether such a supervisor's salary exceeds $4,170. This is the top limit permitted supervisors who are granted overtime compensation on Sundays, holidays, or during the month of December.

Another piece of legislation of interest to postal employees is H. R. 87. This bill, as you know, will give veterans who entered the postal service after World War II credit for their military service toward their promotions in the postal service on a pro rata basis. The basic logic for this particular legislation is based upon the fact that the time a man spent in the military service should be given the same consideration as that time spent in the postal service toward promotion. In other Government positions outside of the postal service many veterans entered civil service for the first time and qualified for higher classifications based upon their military experience and skill. For example, the prospective employee might have been an adjutant in the Army and by virtue of that experience qualified for a high grade position as a personnel officer under the Federal civil service. Many veterans used their experience as radio technicians, electricians, and other capacities in the military service as a basis for qualifying for certain civil-service examinations and the records show that the policy of the Civil Service Commission was liberal in this regard. Furthermore, veterans who entered private industry, in many cases, were also able to use military experience as a basis for obtaining positions at a higher rate of pay. In the postal service however, regardless of the qualifications of the individual, educational background, business experience or military assignment, a prospective employee must still enter at the lowest pay grade.

The Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee has already recommended favorably H. R. 87 as it passed the House, including the July 1, 1950, cut-off date, and it is expected that the bill will come up for Senate consideration at the next call of the Senate Calendar. Because of the Department's objection to the proposal there is some likelihood that the President may veto the bill but that obstacle will have to be overcome once the Senate acts favorably.

The House Post Office and Civil Service Committee has presently under consideration a number of bills which are designed to reclassify the salaries of postmasters and supervisors. Unquestionably most of the supervisors here tonight are familiar with the terms of H. R. 4757, which is under active consideration by the committee. Hearings have already started on this bill in both the House and Senate committees. Generally speaking, there seems to be agreement on the point that the classification of postmasters and supervisors should be reexamined, particularly in the light of the successive flat increases which have occurred beginning in 1945. It is fair to say that the consensus among the committee members seems to be that if inequities and inequalities can be identified, they should be corrected and, furthermore, there is a similar feeling in the House favoring such an approach, and those of us not on the committee simply await the initial action by that group.

There has been, however, a modifying factor with respect to flat increases as they affect postmasters and supervisors. I refer specificially to the over-all increase in the gross receipts in almost every area. In 1936, for example, the gross receipts of the postal service were $665,000,000. Today, for fiscal year 1949, they are $1,571,800,000. In Grand Rapids, during the period from 1936 the gross receipts have grown from $1,303,965 to $3,567,042 in 1949. If the postal rate increase bill passed by the House is approved by the Senate, potal revenues will be increased by another $150,000,000 which in effect will represent an increased salary for postmasters and supervisors.

There is other legislation of interest to supervisors and clerks which is presently under active consideration by committees of Congress. First, a bill sponsored by Representative REES, of Kansas, H. R. 2586, which would make it possible to relieve clerks who have made payments on money orders where the signature has been forged and where the clerk has taken satisfactory precautions. The other is aimed at reducing the cost on bonds to department employees. Several of the proposals relate only to postal employees and would set up a fidelity bond trust by the employees themselves. Other cover all Federal employees. One which is receiving favorable comment in the discussions of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Department is a bill which would have the Government pay the bond premium but provide for coverage on a blanket bond basis rather than have thousands of individual bonds. The adoption of this proposal would result in considerable savings to the employee and a much lower cost to the Government and seems superior to handling the problem on an individual basis.

The members of the House and Senate committee having jurisdiction of Post Office Department problems have no easy job. They are harassed from all sides. The general public wants more and cheaper service. Business, religious, educational, and many other groups fight doggedly against rate increases. Employee organizations are naturally interested in legislation favorable to them. The committee's problems are further complicated by the attitude of the Department which is reluctant to make any favorable recommendations that will increase costs. Frankly the committee members are not to be envied.

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL'S CURTAILMENT ORDER

Probably no order of the Postmaster General in history has been as widely publicized or as warmly debated as the Postmaster General's order directing that only one delivery a day will be given in residential areas and two in business areas. Probably no other single decision by the Postmaster General as it now stands will have as great an impact on employees in the Department as this particular order because more than 10,000 employees are allegedly scheduled to be released as a direct result.

I think the Postmaster General might have helped the situation to some degree for all concerned if he had given some prior notice that he expected to curtail the delivery of mail as outlined in his order. I direct your attention to the fact that if the Postmaster General wishes to save money there are a number of other places where such savings could be made in the postal service. It is my view that the whole service curtailment issue should be examined by a responsible congressional committee, and I was informed on Thursday that the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service is scheduled to begin exhaustive hearings on the matter on June 1. I respectfully suggest that if the Postmaster General is making this move in order to save taxpayers money, he should say so. He should not use the excuse that there

is a shortage of funds appropriated by the Congress. I am informed, and the records indicate, the Post Office Department was allocated practically all funds requested from the Congress for this fiscal year.

This order, which was sprung upon the public totally without any preliminary preparation, has created a great deal of consternation among the users of the mails. It has the appearance of turning back the clock from the standpoint of service and, if carried out, will disrupt delivery service in all first-class and most of the second-class post offices. In addition the tone of the order, together with directions of the Deputy Postmaster General with respect to the threatened discharge of employees, has had a drastic effect on the morale of our postal workers.

It is inconceivable that if reductions in force are carried on in a proper and orderly manner that this curtailment order should necessarily affect any regular or substitute employees since there are many more than 10,000 temporary employees at the present time. Also, if the program were properly planned, normal attrition could be utilized for reduction in force procedures and with few exceptions no present postal employee including temporaries needs to lose his job. This order unfortunately, like so many others in the postal service, was made on a mass basis without preliminary experimental work. It was made before other economies with a lesser impact on the public or the postal employees had been instituted. These other economics have previously been brought to the attention of the Postmaster General as a result of studies made by the Congress and the Hoover Commission.

Let me give you several specific examples of what I mean. In the Eightieth Congress, the Post Office and Civil Service Committee suggested that the elimination of the individual recording of special delivery mail be eliminated at a saving, which was estimated to be $1,000,000 a year. This particular recommendation was taken up by the Senate Appropriations Committee and the Department was requested to run a sample test in two cities. These sample tests worked out very well and then the policy was extended throughout the postal system. There was no disturbance to the public. Service was actually improved during the test period by the lessons that were learned in the experimental period. Good sense would seem to dictate that this should have been the procedure if a general curtailment of service was to be ordered. In other words, the Department should know beforehand what the result would be in each area from the standpoint of service to the public and the effect on postal employees. The public and the postal employees should have been properly prepared for such a move and given an opportunity to express their views.

Another example of where economies might be effectuated and service improved is in the adoption of mechanical sorting equipment in the larger post offices. The Postmaster General has stated such a policy is a success at the Chicago post office where a machine was rebuilt and improved after such a recommendation was made by the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee during the Eightieth Congress. Wherever practicable such machinery should be placed in other larger post offices in order to effect needed economies.

Public Law 231, Eighty-first Congress, established for the first time in the postal service a research and development program. In the establishment of such a program the Post Office Department, in its official reports, merely left this idea entirely up to Congress without making any specific recommendations. However, now that the law has been enacted, the Department has listed a whole succession of developments which they expect to make and improve under this program.

THE HOOVER COMMISSION REPORT

Many people are asking questions about the Hoover Commission report and its effect on the postal service. You, as employees in the postal service, are probably asked these questions more than anybody else and, for that reason, you may be interested in a short summary as to what action has been taken to date with respect to the Hoover Commission proposals as they affect the postal service.

Reorganization Plan No. 3, which has already been approved and is in operation, places into effect the following recommendations of the Hoover Commission:

1. Establishment of a Deputy Postmaster General (sec. 3).

2. Establishment of a board of seven advisers to the Postmaster General (sec. 6).

3. Abolishment of the Bureau of Accounts, including the offices of the controller and purchasing agent (sec. 5).

4. Abolishment of the First, Second, Third and Fourth Assistant Postmasters General and provides for the appointment of four Assistant Postmasters General (sec. 4).

5. Transfers to the Postmaster General the functions of all subordinate offices and agencies of the Post Office Department (sec. 4).

Recommendations of the Hoover Commission Task Force with respect to a research and development program have been placed into effect by Public Law 231 (Eighty-first Congress). By an amendment to the rate bill the House approved the Hoover Commission recommendation that the Postmaster General be empowered to set the rates on special services. The 1951 budget incorporates the Hoover Commission suggestion of a performance budget. Recommendations with respect to the accounting and fiscal control of the postal service are incorporated in two House bills, H. R. 5775 and H. R. 6395. These bills are under consideration by the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee. Hearings on companion bills have been held in the Senate. The differences in views with respect to both of these bills concern the extent of control over expenditures which will remain with the Comptroller General. When these differences are resolved, legislation will probably be approved. I hope we will have an opportunity to vote on the legislation during this Congress.

The recommendations of the Hoover Commission with respect to regionalization of the postal service have met with stiff opposition from Postmaster General Donaldson, who has said:

"I would not want to be Postmaster General if this particular recommendation were put into effect, and I would have the responsibility of providing present postal service."

As you know, of course, the postal service has already been regionalized in many respects, such as the Railway Mail Service, which now has 15 divisions. There is a similar regional set-up for the airmail service. The Central Accounting Office is another regional set-up. The pay for rural carriers is handled on a State-wide basis. The apparent tendency within the postal service itself appears to favor a gradual development toward the regionalization of the postal service. Unfortunately, however, there has not been a corresponding delegation of authority by the Department.

With respect to the Hoover Commission recommendation that the airmail subsidy be separated from airmail payments, the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which handles this legislation, is currently considering bills which would effect this separation. This is another complex problem involving the proper amount which should be designated as outright subsidy. In my opinion, we should arrive at a means of separating this subsidy and thereafter, under the formula, the subsidy should not be charged to our postal service. I firmly believe that our domestic aviation system should be kept strong, not only as a means of transportation but as an asset in our national defense set-up, but at the same time such subsidies should not be charged against the Post Office Department.

The final recommendation of the Hoover Commission pertains to senatorial approval of postmasters throughout the country. The alleged objective is to eliminate politics from the postal service. Frankly, I do not think politics as such are likely to be entirely eliminated by such a change. Most of the politics takes place long before the names are ever submitted to the United States Senate. Personally I favor career men for such jobs. It has worked extremely well in Grand Rapids under our able postmaster, Art Hamilton. If the Hoover Commission recommendations will result in career appointments, I favor the proposal wholeheartedly. However, the question of senatorial approval of certain Presidential appointments, including postmasters, is a Senate prerogative and is a matter which in my judgment should be solved first in the Senate before the House takes any action.

I have tried to outline in my remarks what I believe are the three major fields of interest to postal employees at the present time, namely, legislation concerning postal employees; secondly, the order of the Postmaster General curtailing service; and third and finally, the Hoover Commission recommendations for the postal service. It is my sincere hope that my comments have been helpful. Thank you.

False Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, appended is an article on the cut in postal service by Mark Sullivan in the New York Herald Tribune of May 25, 1950. He calls the economy resulting from this cut an odd little anachronism. Every Member should consider this most carefully and compare this small saving at great inconvenience, a saving which I am convinced that the people do not want, with the enormous outlays in farm-price supports and other programs as suggested by Mr. Sullivan:

SAVING IN MAIL SERVICE CUT HELD UNLIKELY TO EQUAL BUSINESS LOSS—MARK SULLIVAN SAYS PUBLIC MIGHT ACCEPT IT IF IT WERE PART OF A BROAD ECONOMY PROGRAM

(By Mark Sullivan)

During some days past the public has begun to suffer inconvenience about mail. It is caused by a series of curtailments of postal service announced by the Post Office Department on April 18, with direction to postmasters to give the public 30 days' notice in advance of putting the curtailments in effect. The announced curtailments include:

Reduction of deliveries in city residential districts to one a day. Reduction of Saturday deliveries in business districts, in some cases from three a day to two, in other cases

from two to one. Reduction of parcel-post deliveries to one a day in both residential and business districts. Reduction of collections from street mail boxes. Reduction in hours during which post-office windows are kept open.

These reductions are felt by every person who receives a letter or posts one, and even more by persons who send or receive packages. The sum of the effects is a slowing down of mail service, affecting literally everybody. The jibe of Senator WILEY, of Wisconsin, that 50,000,000 American families have been hit in the mail box is accurate.

TO REDUCE EXPENDITURES

The purpose of these curtailments is to reduce expenditures of the Post Office Department. During the present fiscal year ending June 30 the estimated expenditures of the Department in excess of postal receipts are some $500,000,000. An estimate of the savings by the present curtailments of service during some 6 weeks remaining in the fiscal year is some $30,000,000 or a little more.

The people as taxpayers are to be saved some $30,000,000. The people as users of the postal service are to be subjected to inconvenience, including some loss. It may be doubted whether the $30,000,000 saved is equal to the loss in the carrying on of business. The aggregate of delays to letters and packages, affecting every individual and ramifying cumulatively into every line of business, can be seriously large.

Yet the people might accept inconvenience and loss without complaint, or even with some glow of cheerfulness in sacrificing for the national interest—if they supposed that this $30,000,000 of reduction in expenditures of one Government department was part of a broad program of reduction generally, part of a determined purpose of the administration to keep Government expenditures below Government income, to balance the Government's budget.

In such case the people might accept inconvenience in the spirit in which the people of Britain accepted the "austerity program" of that country's government.

INDEFINITE DECLARATION

But Mr. Truman's attitude about balancing the budget is an indefinite declaration for an indefinite future time. His statement at Pendleton, Oreg., on May 10 was: "I want to balance the budget of the Federal Government just as much as anybody else does. * * * We will do (this) just as soon as we safely can." And the people know that spending programs initiated by the administration and now in effect have made it impossible to balance the budget this year; there will be a deficit of some $6,000,000,000. Because some of these spending programs increase automatically year by year, the budget cannot be balanced next year; the time of balance, if ever, is in the indefinite future.

The $30,000,000 reduction in Post Office Department expenditure is an odd little anachronism, in an immense trend going in the opposite direction. The tininess and the contradictoriness of it can be grasped by comparing it with a single example of Government expenditure, that which is done through the Department of Agriculture.

In the case of the Post Office Department, the administration saves $30,000,000 for the taxpayers and makes all the people pay for the savings by enduring inconvenience and loss. The case of the Department of Agriculture is complexly opposite. That Department takes many hundreds of millions of dollars from the taxpayers and then uses the money for a purpose which is officially called price support of farm crops, but which in fact, of course, is equally support of the prices the people must pay for food. At this moment there is before Congress a request by the Department of Agriculture for authority to lay out $2,000,000,000 more, additional to what has already been laid out for price support.

Register and Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1950

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I attach hereto a copy of a radio speech I recently delivered in my district:

My friends, the time is again approaching when it will be your privilege and duty to elect someone to represent you in Congress. In addition to electing your Congressmen, you will elect a United States Senator, your Governor, the members of your county delegation and other State and county officials.

At first glance, this year's election may not seem to be any more important than those in the past. A few moments' consideration, however, reveals that the election this summer will be one of the most important in our history. Because of its importance, because statistics show that in recent decades we have neglected this privilege and duty and because some of you are confused as to the new voting procedure, I should like to talk with you briefly about the coming election and the manner in which you must qualify in order to vote.

One of our great Revolutionary patriots, Thomas Payne, described the years during which we fought for our independence as "times that try men's souls." Since our war for independence, this Nation has faced and successfully overcome numerous apparently insurmountable obstacles or threats to our freedom. Those obstacles or threats have, for the most part, been in the form of totalitarian armies. In our own generation we have been forced to engage in two great conflicts to protect our democratic way of life. When faced by such dangers, the people of this Nation have followed the example of their Revolutionary forefathers and have overcome them.

Today we are again faced by problems which make these times "times that try men's souls." Unfortunately, the problems that we face today are different from those which we have faced in the past. We are not presently confronted with the possibility of losing our freedom by armed might but by the infiltration of ideologies which plot the destruction of our way of life by revolution. Because of the nature of today's threats to our freedom, we cannot confidently rely on past experiences but must employ new plans for defense.

That which threatens our existence today is the spread of communism—that deadly philosophy which is more dangerous than armed conflict.

The communistic campaign against us is as skillfully planned as any military maneuver. Instead of guns, the forces of communism use words and ideas. Instead of attempting to amass armies along our borders they are attempting to gain positions of influence in governmental departments, in labor unions and other organizations. We are now as actively engaged in a war with communism as we were with the Fascist forces during the recent armed conflict.

Your Government is, of course, cognizant of the war that is being waged against us and is doing everything possible to combat these tactics. It cannot, however, successfully defend this Nation without your help. Just as during the shooting war it was necessary for each citizen to work toward its successful conclusion, so are such efforts necessary today.

There are many ways in which you must act in this regard. It is no longer a matter of choice. Right now, at this time of the year, there is one thing in particular that you must do. You must qualify yourself to vote by registering and then by casting your ballot in the coming elections.

Our form of government is based on the concept that it is a Government of the people, for the people and by the people. To insure the preservation of that idea, we have elections in which every qualified citizen is eligible to express his opinions. During the past half century when we should have exercised this right to the fullest, we have neglected to do so. Because of our neglect, our Government is not in truth of, for, and by the people. Especially those of us who live in the South know this to be true. There are those who have gained positions in our Government who, consciously or unconsciously, are assisting those who would destroy our democratic way of life.

Most of us realize, of course, that we are at present engaged in a so-called cold war with the communistic countries and that possibly the inaction of some citizens may be weakening us in combating the spread of communism. Nevertheless, many of us feel that our one vote is not important enough and do not bother to go to the polls to vote. In 1948, for example, only 51 percent of tne eligible voters of this country took part in the election.

Random facts from the past, however, reveal that your one vote may change the course of our destinty. For example, the father of our Democratic Party, Thomas Jefferson, was elected President of our country by 1 vote in the electoral college.

Rutherford B. Hayes was elected President by one vote of a special electorial commission. The member of the commission whose vote elected Hayes was a Congressman who had been elected to Congress by one vote. That vote was cast by a citizen who, though ill, insisted on exercising his privilege of voting.

The States of California, Idaho, Oregon, Texas, and Washington became States by the margin of one vote.

And, more recently, the act of Congress which provided for the drafting of men for service in World War II passed the House of Representatives by just one vote.

Thus it is that your one vote might be responsible for the success or failure of our present battle with communism.

You may be sure that the communistic interests in this country will be actively engaged in the coming campaign. Not only will they see to it that those who follow their line of thought are qualified to vote, they also will attempt to discourage you who are opposed to their views from voting. Thus, by failing to vote, you will, in effect, be voting for those who would destroy our form of government. Remember, if you fail to vote, you will, in effect, be voting for those who would destroy our form of government.

As you realize, there is hardly any sphere of activity which is not now controlled or affected in some way by government. Unless you participate in electing those who formulate the policies of our Government, you will be leaving in the hands of others the future of your jobs, your homes, your children—every aspect of your freedom.

If America is to remain strong and free, we must protect ourselves from the enemy within our gates. You can do so by registering and subsequently voting in the coming elections.

The process of voting this year, as you know, has been changed. In order to vote in the Democratic primary this year you do not enroll as in the past, but you must obtain a registration certificate or possess a certificate which has been issued since 1948. It is not necessary that you have any tax receipts to obtain this certificate. It is only necessary that you be 21 years of age before November 7, 1950; that you be a resident of the State 2 years, of the county 1 year, and of the precinct 4 months. You must also be able to read and write any section of the Constitution or have paid taxes on property assessed at $300 or more in 1949. You must secure this certificate on or before June 10 in order to vote in the primary to be held on July 11.

America stands today as the sole sentinel of freedom of the individual; the sole champion of freedom of speech and the press; the sole land of individual opportunity. Your failure to vote in the coming election may result in the loss of our American freedom.

Register today or before June 10; then vote in the primary on July 11. The peoples of Europe neglected their right to vote and lost it. With it they lost their freedom. We must not let that happen here.

Clear, Courageous Call—Senator Smith Points Way To Remedy for the National Feeling of Fear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1950

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article by Thomas L. Stokes that appeared in the Washington Evening Star of June 6, 1950, as follows:

CLEAR, COURAGEOUS CALL—SENATOR SMITH POINTS WAY TO REMEDY FOR THE NATIONAL FEELING OF FEAR

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

One clear, courageous call from a woman, Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH, Republican of Maine, has served to diagnose what she called "a national feeling of fear and frustration" and to clarify the atmosphere and point the way to a remedy.

Her condemnation, within her own party, of McCarthyism and its exploitation for campaign purposes and her criticism of the lack of leadership in the Democratic administration and its simultaneous grave and Pollyanish size-up of the world situation explain some things that have been happening in recent weeks.

The resulting confusion plainly has had its part in the attitude of both parties and the type of campaigns that have developed for the congressional elections this fall.

DEPLORES FEAR CAMPAIGN

Some Republicans, on the one hand, have been bent upon a campaign of "fear, bigotry, ignorance, and selfishness," as it was described and deplored by Mrs. SMITH and a number of her Republican colleagues who joined in a statement, combined with old-fashioned isolationism that would blind itself to the needs of the rest of the world and to our responsibility in helping to meet them.

Lately, on the other hand, a tendency has been noted in the administration to whip up a sort of saber-rattling jingoism, which does not become us, with less emphasis upon the leadership for peace to which we are obligated by our traditions and our World War II aims.

This might be analyzed as a defensive reaction within the administration to the reckless campaign by Senator JOE MCCARTHY (Republican of Wisconsin) along with the Alger Hiss conviction and the atomic spy revelations. This manifests itself in increasingly bitter excoriations of Russia, with no longer any differentiation between her people and the rampant crew in the Kremlin, in increasing emphasis on arms as the only resort to achieve peace, and by a cynicism about peaceful overtures of another sort and about the United Nations despite continued lip service to peace and the United Nations.

BOTH PARTIES OFF BALANCE

Both political parties obviously are off balance and intemperate, as Mrs. SMITH's statement pointed up.

Her reference to the administration's "daily contradictory grave warnings and optimistic assurances" was graphically illustrated the same day she spoke in the Senate, for example, by the ominous tone of President Truman's message to Congress requesting additional arms appropriations for western Europe and other areas and by his statement at a press conference a few hours later that the world is closer to real, permanent peace than at any time for the last 5 years.

The American people are capable of undergoing any sacrifices necessary for our national security. They will support a strong national defense and the combined national defense plan with western Europe. Congress, despite some controversy which is natural, has demonstrated that, and will continue to demonstrate it.

But the American people also are a people of hope. While they are doing these necessary things, they would like at the same time to see at least a beginning in other directions, to see us in some visible ways move toward strengthening the United Nations, toward eventual disarmament.

Tariffs on Cotton Textiles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1950

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I attach hereto a statement I gave this morning before the Committee for Reciprocity Information, Tariff Commission, in opposition to a possible cut in the present tariffs on cotton textiles:

Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission, not only am I grateful for the privilege and honor of appearing before you this morning but especially would I thank you for the privilege of speaking first. You will understand that Members of Congress are crowded these days and it is necessary for us to get back on the Hill.

Before my formal statement, I beg to make reference to my own experience with textiles. While I own no stock in any textile industry, I feel that I can truthfully say I am one of textiles' products. Before I reached the age of 10, I became a regular employee in the textile mills of my district. For 12 hours of arduous work, I received 25 cents a day, less than 2 cents an hour. Now, as you know, under a recent act of Congress, the minimum hourly wage in our mills is 75 cents per hour. The average wage is in excess of $1 an hour. For nearly 30 years I have represented the textile people of my home county in one capacity or another. I am reliably informed that more cotton is spun and woven in my congressional district than in any other district in the United States. With this background, Mr. Chairman, I believe I am qualified to speak for the chief industry of our State and the Southland.

I am appearing at these hearings because I am vitally interested in the matter of cotton textiles. In the very near future our United States of America representatives will depart for Torquay, England, to negotiate on a very large number of items for reciprocal tariff cuts. Textile men in this country are interested in over 2,000 items manufactured by more than 1,000 mills from Texas to Maine.

I am vitally concerned as to the possible effects that might result when our negotiators come home from England with all kinds of tariff cuts granted to foreign nations. At this moment our tariffs on textiles are 30 percent lower than the tariffs in the 1930 Tariff Act. If a further cut is to be made, the deleterious effects of such a cut will have wide repercussions in our domestic economy.

During the war years our textile industry was asked to increase its production manyfold so as to supply the war and civilian needs of not only this country but of our allies too. Due to our high production ability and technical ingenuity we were able to fulfill these increased demands, however, since 1945 we began to recede from our wartime peak and presently we are operating at only 75 percent of our war maximum. In fact, since 1947 our export market has been cut down by 1,000,000,000 yards per year, or the total volume of $535,000,000 annually. It is this type of cutback which is proving most injurious to our textile industry.

Mr. Chairman, the basic trend in world trade of textiles in the postwar period may be briefly summarized as follows: The volume of cloth and yarn competing for markets has steadily risen and this rise is being accelerated. Markets for exports of United States textiles, however, are steadily shrinking and in the course of events we may expect this shrinkage to continue as other areas begin to produce their own domestic textiles. The reason for the decline in exports has been listed variously as currency exchange difficulties. I would say that this certainly has contributed to the cut in the volume of our trade. A further reduction in our trade followed upon the recent devaluation of currencies.

War-ravaged countries are being rapidly rehabilitated and from some of them large quantities of textiles are being sent out in world markets to compete freely with our own. I might say that many of these war countries are now attempting to sell their textiles in our own country for the dollars which they need. The difficulty in this competition is the fact that competition is very often in those lines which we are peculiarly able to produce ourselves. I take the case of Osnaburgs where large quantities are being dumped on our markets at 1 cent per yard below current wholesale prices.

Mr. Chairman, not only are world markets being diminished insofar as our textile exports are concerned, but a new and competing industry is entering the field, namely, plastic film sheetings and coated fabrics. Cotton men all over the United States are

beginning to be concerned about the competition offered by this new industry whose production is averaging an estimated 14,000,000 pounds per month. This industry is being pushed by many large companies with experienced methods of selling, and therefore, will have an appreciable effect on cotton consumption in this country. The volume of sales by the plastics group is now large enough to merit serious attention from every member of the textile trade since these plastic products are moving into fields previously held by cotton, linen, rayon, and other established fibers. In the end use these plastic fibers become tablecloths, aprons, upholstery, shoe bags, food and storage bags, slip covers, etc., and these are almost all uses formerly supplied by the various fibers. Large yardages have already been lost to the fibers in this manner and further losses are inevitable.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to stress another fact, namely, the textile position in Japan, from whom we are getting an increased competition by the month. Within the last few months the military government in Japan has allowed local management to come back again under a sporadic occupational supervision. Japan certainly will attempt to recapture its prewar markets. Many governmental officials in this country may discount the fact that presently only small quantities of Japanese goods, as compared to our billion yards of consumption, are coming into the United States of America. The point to be stressed is that the Japanese textile industry has been rehabilitated, the only curbs extant being the number of bales of cotton which Japan is allowed to import. For example, in 1949 Japan was allowed 850,000 bales. During 1950 this total will rise to 1,300,000 bales. During 1949 Japan exported 720,000,000 square yards of cotton piece goods. During 1950 cotton spinners in Japan estimate a range of from 850,000,000 to 1,000,000,000 square yards as being available for export.

One might easily say that there is such a large backlog of reqiurements unsatisfied during the war that it will take Japanese spinners some time to supply this backlog. The point is, they are attempting to supply the need. Many of the areas in the Japanese prewar orbit of trade are no longer available to them, and so the Japanese automatically will attempt to push their products in other areas. Certainly the dollar area looks very profitable when you know that labor costs in Japan are one-tenth of those obtaining in the United States.

In this connection I should also draw attention to the fact that in November 1949 the sterling area—Japan trade agreement was signed by which shipments from Japan during 1950 to British-controlled areas will exceed 300,000,000 square yards.

Japan is rapidly making strides in recapturing her prewar trade volume. A further fact merits our attention since it affects the total volume of trade available to United States textile exporters, namely, the exportation of textile machinery by Japan. In the new dominion of Pakistan a series of mills have been or are being built with the aid of Japanese technicians and Japanese-made textile machinery. One such mill now operating has 10,000 Toyoda and 10,000 Howa spindles and is serviced by Japanese technicians under contract. Another plant has purchased 600 Toyoda automatic looms. Another plant will soon receive 10,000 Howa spindles and 400 Howa looms.

Mr. Chairman, it is significant that when India was partitioned the Pakistan area had only 14 mills and 165,684 spindles. Plans have now been completed for 80 mills and 2,000,000 spindles. All of these mills will be new, modern, and superefficient, and Japan is supplying most of the machinery.

For world textile manufacturers these plans spell only one thing, namely, the potential loss of a huge and vital market. Thus England which did supply a very large portion of the textile trade in India will suffer serious cutbacks. It is well to assume that she will attempt to find other outlets and the United States of American certainly will offer one of the most profitable ones.

Mr. Chairman, I reiterate, if our export markets are being cut down it means that our domestic manufacturers will have to push their goods on the local markets. However, at the same time our tariff gates are being lowered and increasing competition is resulting from textiles originating in countries who have a long tradition of being textile exporters, notably England, France, Belgium, and Japan. Even Switzerland is stepping up its exports to the United States.

It is an undeniable fact that the world will depend on United States raw cotton for many years to come. In fact under ECA we are exporting approximately 5,000,000 bales a year. Assuredly this is of great help to our cotton growers, but at the same time one must recognize that many other areas of the world, especially underdeveloped, underindustrialized nations will begin to produce cotton on a larger scale. At present the prices of our raw cotton in our big Southern markets average around 33 cents a pound. This is three times the prewar price of the Dixie staple. One might say that the prices are affected by the demands for cotton from our own cotton mills, by overseas demands for our raw cotton, by the Government-supported price program, and now by the 20-percent acreage reduction in 1950 plantings. Of this large amount of raw cotton being exported overseas, I am just wondering how much of this same cotton is returning to these self-same shores as imported textiles. In this country we buy the cotton at the same price, process it with our well-paid labor, whereas the same cotton is being sent overseas and processed by labor at the very most one-third as high as ours, so that no matter what the tariff margin these foreign textiles can always compete successfully on our own markets. I submit to you that nobody can compete on such terms. The result is the closing of processing mills in this country and resultant unemployment.

Mr. Chairman, I have thus far mentioned existing tariff cuts, diminishing world markets, the effect of cotton substitutes, the drive for American dollars, the competitive situation from Japan, the loss of world export markets due to the export of textile machinery from Japan, the world need of cotton subsidized by our gift programs, and the competition by cheap labor.

I omit the point 4 program under which under-industralized nations may be assisted in erecting their own textile mills, and semitropical agricultural nations may be assisted in growing cotton.

The competition is here with us. We are concerned about it. In fact this competition is such that we cannot possibly compete successfully. I have facts concerning the sale of children's dresses, made in Japan, in my own home State at three for $1 retail. The wholesale price of an equivalent dress made in the United States of America is about $1 each. How can we in this country compete against such prices?

I, therefore, wish to protest against a possible cut in tariffs in the negotiations soon to take place in England. In fact I wish to stress the importance of the escape clause in our existing agreements, namely, importations of textiles on which we have granted tariff concessions are already proving injurious to our domestic producers and hence these concessions should be drastically revised or eliminated. I thank you.

Action Needed on Imports From Iron-Curtain Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CALEB BOGGS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 7, 1950

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, about 2 weeks ago in a public statement I called upon the administration to take appropriate action immediately to protect American workers in industries which are being seriously crippled by imports from Communist-controlled nations.

At the time I directed attention to the fact that each day brings new evidence of growing unemployment in this country by reason of increasing quantities of tariff-free or preferential imports.

I also said at that time, Mr. Speaker, that it is a startling fact that a large part of these very imports which are handicapping American industries and causing increasing unemployment among American workers are coming from Russia, Czechoslovakia, and other forced-labor nations which continually make it clear that they are our enemies in the present cold war.

In view of the foregoing, I was extremely interested and pleased to read in the Philadelphia Inquirer of June 4, 1950, a fine editorial on this subject, as well as a splendid and factual article by the well-known Washington correspondent, Mr. Herman A. Lowe.

Again I say, Mr. Speaker, that remedial action by our Federal administration at the earliest possible date is imperative to protect and preserve American workers, American industries, and American dignity in the eyes of the world.

I wish to include as a part of my remarks the following editorial and the article by Mr. Lowe to which I have just referred:

AMERICAN DOLLARS FOR CZECH INSULTS

Communist Czechoslovakia's deliberate campaign of hectoring and insult against the United States appears now to be part of a scheme to break off diplomatic relations with this country and perhaps with other western powers.

That is the opinion of Dana Adams Schmidt, New York Times correspondent in Czechoslovakia until last Wednesday when he and his wife fled under imminent threat of arrest on the usual espionage charges.

Whether Mr. Schmidt's view is correct or not—and that will be demonstrated by events—it seems to us for many reasons that the time is at hand for the United States to take vigorous action in relation to the outragious activities of the Czechoslovak Reds against us.

On another part of this page Herman A. Lowe, writing to the Inquirer from Washington, points to the fact that while the Commie stooges of Russia at Prague are going the limit to smear the United States, they are also flooding goods, manufactured by slave labor, or little better, into this country.

Worse than that, the Czechs are getting these goods into American markets under specially favorable tariff rates, to compete

and undersell similar goods made by American workmen.

Now why are we standing for that, and how long do we intend to stand for it; that is, how long does the State Department intend to ignore facts that have become plainer week by week for months?

It is one thing to accept some goods made in friendly countries of western Europe which we are trying to help through the Marshall plan, even if these imports do create problems in our own industries. But it is a very much different matter, and entirely indefensible, when we permit and even encourage competing imports from behind the iron curtain.

It's small wonder that we are not winning the cold war. Here is a situation that demands a show-down. The joke on us, according to Mr. Lowe, is that the theory that we must traffic with the Czechs and other iron-curtain countries because we need strategic materials from them has fallen down. We are getting very little in the way of strategic materials, if any.

How large is this practically one-way trade with Czechoslovakia? How much more trade of the same sort is coming, with similar tariff preferences, from other Russian-controlled areas where the same pattern of insult and harassment is being followed?

We have been friends, and still are, to the Czech people. Their once-free republic was actually formed after the First World War in Independence Hall in this city. Our quarrel, a righteous one, is with the choice assortment of Red servants of Moscow who now constitute the Government of Czechoslovakia.

They have moved step by step against America, eventually fabricating the usual spy trials to set up charges of espionage against American diplomatic personnel and those of other nations as well. Our diplomatic mission has been reduced to 12 persons.

The State Department, it is true, has shut down the Czech consulate general at New York, a slap on the wrist that was promptly followed at Prague by a new propaganda blast at present and former American diplomats and others, including Mr. Schmidt.

Meanwhile, the Czech Commies are getting good American dollars through the free-and-easy preferential tariff flow of their manufactures, covering a wide range, into the United States. The Czech Commies are no doubt laughing among themselves at our stupidity.

We are not called upon to tolerate Communist Czechoslovakia's spit-in-the-face tactics. Certainly we are not called upon to finance them by fostering a lucrative and actually privileged trade that is all to their advantage and to our disadvantage. If the State Department can't or won't do anything about this, Congress should, and very quickly.

United States Neglects the Economic Front in the Cold War Against Czechs

(By Herman A. Lowe)

WASHINGTON, June 3.—Newspaper headlines in recent days have featured our vest-pocket cold war with Czechoslovakia. The Czechs claimed our embassy staff in Prague was much too large and was undoubtedly loaded with spies and other suspicious characters.

They brusquely ordered us to get about 40 of our diplomats out of their country. We countered by notifying the Czechs to shut down consulates and reduce their embassy staff in Washington. Then they got even tougher, and we got tougher.

This private cold war began to smoke and sizzle. People were impressed with how the State Department took no nonsense from these Russian satellites. It was a hopeful indication that maybe our striped-pants corps was not going to let itself be pushed around too much.

Sounds very good, huh?

Well, here's the other half of the story.

All the time the Czechs are kicking our people out of their country and while we appear to be talking back real fearless, we are allowing them to dump a flood of their goods into the United States under the most favorable tariff terms we extend to anybody.

What is more, when we lower our tariffs still further at Annecy, England, next fall, the Czechs will get the benefit of those reductions.

There are some interesting angles of this to be pointed out.

First, operating under iron curtain wage scales, Czechoslovakia is now beginning to land some items—such as bone china—so cheaply on our shores that they are taking the American market away from Britain, our ally and friend.

Second, not only Czech china and glassware, but also such things as shoes and hats are beginning to cut into American production of the items and to result in layoffs in this country.

Third, our manufacturers do sell to Czechoslovakia. However, while the Czechs may pour almost any commodity they wish into the United States, we do not have the same freedom of export. In all the iron-curtain countries foreign trade is nationalized.

Of course, the story has been told that we trade with the Russians and their satellites because we must obtain strategic raw materials for our national defense stockpile. That was partly true a few years ago. But today they are giving us almost no strategic materials.

Here are some of the strategic goods the Czechs are sending us:

Motion-picture films, dental burrs, metallic cartridges, motorcycles and parts, machinery parts, sewing machines, light fixtures, jewelry, brooches, rosaries, gold-plated brass items, table knives with shell handles, upholstery nails, china dishes and ornaments, blown glass, glass chandeliers, glass bottles, plain glass, glass jars, baskets, wood furniture, artificial flowers, rayon fabrics and laces, woolen rugs, woolen apparel, hats, caps, woven worsteds, cotton fabrics, damask tablecloths, napkins, towels, rags, burlap, handkerchiefs, gloves, cordials, brandies, rubber balls, etc.

And although it may put American workers on the relief rolls, our State Department has no intention of getting mad enough to end this good thing for Czechoslovakia or any other Russian satellite.